Appendix

In Defense of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the misconceptions of the nature and functions of Congress which cause some of our critics to demand drastic reforms in our legislative process are exposed and analyzed by our former colleague, the Honorable Frank N. Ikard, who is now president of the American Petroleum Institute.

Mr. Ikard's timely presentation appears in the fall issue of Petroleum Today, which went in the mail a few days ago. I believe he has made a splendid statement worthy of the consideration of Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It follows:

IN DEFENSE OF CONGRESS

(By Frank Ikard)

Attacks upon the legislative branch of our Government are hardly a new phenomenon. Congress has long been a prime target for criticism, much of it anything but gentle.

In the last century, for example, a Cabinet officer stated flatly: "A Congressman is a hog. You must take a stick and hit him in the snout." If that seems to be an extreme statement, then read what a national magazine had to say on the same subject just a few months ago: "The congressional system protects and sometimes even seems to nurture a core of playboys, timewasters, knaves, and demagogs."

I am not disturbed by such absurdities—though I confess that I sometimes wonder just how a nation governed so poorly has managed to survive, much less prosper. Neither am I bothered by constructive criticism aimed at helping the Congressman to do his job better. I am very much disturbed, however, by the increase in recent years in the serious demands for drastic reform of Congress. For it indicates to me that a growing number of Americans believe that Congressmen either cannot or will not perform their proper function.

This function, as it was established by the men who framed the Constitution, is based upon two guiding principles. The first is that prospective laws must be carefully examined, and deliberated over, by the elected spokesmen of those to whom the laws would apply; that is, by the representatives of all the people. The second principle is that these spokesmen for the people must have sufficient powers to provide a check on and a balance to the judicial and executive arms of government.

Thus, as his first duty, the Congressman must represent his constituents—with all their various and often conflicting points of view on any given subject. At the same time, he must carefully and painstakingly examine every aspect of a proposed piece of legislation.

Obviously, under these conditions Congress cannot be expected to move very rapidly on any particular issue. Obviously, this was the way the Founding Fathers intended it. Yet it is on this very issue that many of the critical attacks on Congress are based. Commonly the attack is contained in some such phrase as "do-nothing Congress." But whatever form the attack takes, the critic has action in mind. He means, "Don't just stand there, Congressmen—do something."

Such critics believe that the slowness of congressional deliberations is a weakness. Actually, it is a strength. It guarantees consideration for individuals, it preserves freedom, it protects property—as representative government is intended to do.

Moreover, there are times when it is best to do nothing. Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, recently made the point most forcefully:

"By some distorted logic, the merit of a legislative session has come to be judged by the number of laws enacted. If these are numerous, Congress is thought to have done well; if the number of bills sidetracked is high, the session is deemed a failure. This misconception indicates that we have forgotten the whole theory of our form of Government * * *. The true measure of a Congress could very well be the measure of bad bills it refuses to pass."

When Senator BEALL mentions the "theory of our form of Government, he has something specific in mind; namely, the check that Congress, by constitutional mandate and by tradition, puts on the executive branch of our Government. For criticism of congressional "slowness" and of "do-nothing Congress" is often but a prelude to demands for a surrender of substantial congressional powers.

Commonly such demands are based upon this kind of reasoning:

Under our present system, when the Chief Executive proposes a program to meet important issues, he sometimes cannot even get his program to a vote. When it does come to a vote, it is often defeated. What is required, then, is to make Congress subordinate to the executive branch or, at the very least, to change our system to the parliamentary system in which the Chief Executive is the majority leader and can always get his programs voted on.

Now, it is true that some desirable legislation has not materialized because it was bottled up in committee or talked to death by filibuster. But it is equally true that at one time or another every shade of political opinion in this country has benefited because delaying tactics of some kind were available. The lengthy debates that characterize a congressional session bring issues to a point, inform the public on the particulars, and serve to prevent the Nation from being stampeded along dangerous or undesirable paths.

How prevalent is the serious criticism of Congress? I would cite two recent examples of such criticism, both delivered by Members of the U.S. Senate itself.

One Senator declared that Congress is subject to such influences as the frequency of elections and the pressures of party organizations, influences that "do not encourage serious and sustained study of international relations * * *. Accordingly, I think that we must contemplate the further enhancement of presidential authority in foreign affairs."

The other Senator spoke out even more strongly for an expansion of Executive power at the expense of Congress. "Surely," he said, "we have reached the point where can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least." His call for increased control by the Federal Executive included the following statement: "I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America—local, State, and National—are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

This Senator also made a reference to a broader subjects, one that encompasses the threat to congressional independence and, in my view, to the individual citizen himself. The Senator said that the "nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is a hallucination."

In this connection, I should like to call your attention to some remarks made recently by another Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. More than 50 million people, he pointed out, are receiving Federal payments that total more than $50 billion each year. "These recipients," he said, "with their families, could total half our population." Senator BYRD added: "Name an area of endeavor, and the chances are there is a Federal subsidy program to go with it * * * [and] every Federal payment takes its toll in centralized restraint and control."

The operative word is "control"; and I would suggest that it is, in our day, something more than a hallucination. I think, for example, of the proliferation of executive and administrative agencies in Washington. Many of those who believe that Congress, with its diverse local loyalties, is too big and too slow moving to meet the needs of the mid-20th century would have Congress pass some of its powers to these agencies as well as to the Chief Executive. These critics hold that the Nation needs more efficiency, more central planning.

I have come to be suspicious of that word "planning," particularly when it is used in connection with our economy. It carries the implication that the private sector of our economy is somehow failing and that only the public, or governmental, sector can set things right—presumably with more rules, more ceilings, more regulations.

Yet it is inconceivable to me that our economy would be stronger and healthier if more business decisions were made in Washington and fewer were made in the marketplace. As a matter of record, private decisions by consumers and the business managers who compete to serve them have done pretty well so far. Our current gross national product, for example, is running at an unprecedented annual rate of $580 billion.

This is a tremendous accomplishment, unequaled at any time in any other nation in the world. We should not now delude ourselves with the belief that paternalism—with all its controls—can somehow substitute for an economy based on intense and imaginative competition among free men.

It seems to me that those who would drastically change our economic way of life have something in common with those who would change the traditional relationship between Congress and the executive branch of Government. Both sets of critics believe they are working toward greater efficiency. Ac-

tually, in both cases, they are guilty of the same error: quarreling with success.

It is in part because Congress is a slow, deliberative body that our structure of laws is so sound. The rules and interpretations that shape congressional action do not preclude change. They do demonstrate, however, because they have served us so very well, the wisdom of caution—of building carefully from precedent to precedent.

Likewise, the strength of our form of government can in large measure be attributed to the checks and balances built into the relationship among the three separate branches of government. The history of Congress is a tribute to the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in this regard.

There is today, perhaps to a degree unmatched in the past, a need for serious and thoughtful critics to point up the weaknesses that may appear in the structure of our representative government. Somewhat like the prophets of old, they warn us of pitfalls and wrong turnings that may lie ahead. But it seems to me that we also have a great need for citizens who will speak up and say what is right with our governmental system.

Let it be known that representative government today is not some kind of noble experiment now drawing closer and closer to a tragic end. Rather, it is the steady and ever-developing fulfillment of an ancient and magnificent dream.

George Meany Is Truly a Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Victor Riesel which appeared in the New York Journal-American of Monday, January 6, 1964:

MEANY, MAN OF THE YEAR

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON, January 6.—President George Meany of the AFL-CIO is known by the enemies he keeps. They are legion—and they have mighty legions. For amongst his virulent critics and opponents are the Soviet Union, the underworld, Fidel Castro, and Jimmie Hoffa.

Therefore, this column hereby nominates Mr. Meany as the labor man of the year not only in the United States but in the world.

Few in America realize it, but it was George Meany, speaking just a mile or so from the Soviet sector, who first demanded that the Russians rip holes in the wall.

In a tough speech on July 5, 1962, I heard this leader of some 13 million American workers cry out for free passage of Berliners both ways through the Red concrete barriers.

For months after that, the Moscow world radio excoriated the ex-Bronx plumber who has frustrated Soviet propaganda operations and terrorism on many continents. Soviet broadcasts became particularly bitter when Meany, though approving the nuclear test ban accord, warned working people everywhere to continue to be suspicious of the Communist International.

Meany refers to the Soviet-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions as a fifth column plotting to undermine the democratic nations.

When Fidel Castro's terrorists, bribers, and infiltrators began invading Latin America, Meany invited American industrialists to join with labor in a common fight on Latin communism. Together, U.S. labor and business launched the American Institute for Free Labor Development to train young Latin unionists for construction against Castro, Khrushchev and Mao.

HELPING TO BUILD HOMES

Under Meany's guidance the AFL-CIO "investment division" is collecting millions of dollars to help Latin unions build homes for their members.

But Meany's work is by far not all international. He started 1963 by fighting for American GI's, as a member of the Randall Commission which is looking into the need for raises for the Armed Forces. He was the only committeeman to argue for pay increases for the two lowest grades of enlisted men.

Working quietly and off the record, Meany attempted to end the New York newspaper strike, the billion-dollar waterfront strike and the rail crisis in their early hours.

KEPT HOFFA OUT OF COUNCIL

And it is "Stonewall" Meany who has kept Jimmie Hoffa out of the AFL-CIO—thus keeping Hoffa off the federation's high council where the teamster could wield even greater power.

For his statesmanship in some of the most critical areas of our society, Meany easily is the world's Labor Man of the Year—and of the decade.

Independence of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Federal Republic of Cameroon celebrated the fourth anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President, Ahmadou Ahidjo, and to His Excellency the Cameroon Ambassador to the United States, Jacques Kuoh Moukouri.

Four years ago, French Cameroon took its place as the Republic of Cameroon at the head of the procession of African States which were to achieve independence during 1960. Less than a year later, in October 1961, the British Southern Cameroons joined its already independent neighbor to form the Federal Republic of Cameroon. This was the first experiment in the union of a British territory and a French territory, and observers were none too optimistic about its chances for success.

The federal republic inherited some serious problems from both of its federated states. When French Cameroon achieved independence the central government was struggling to keep in power against a revolt instigated by a dissident political group. A state of emergency had been declared in 11 out of 21 of the country's departments. A number of banana plantations—bananas are the staple crop—had been devastated. Quibbling and rivalry threatened the coalition government. The British Southern Cameroons were hardly more stable; revolt was expected to flare up at any moment.

Surprisingly the union of the two territories took place without serious incident; the transition was amazingly smooth. Much of the credit for this successful union and for the prosperous development of the federal republic must be given to Ahmadou Ahidjo, the patient and skillful President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon.

The Constitution, which provides that President and Vice President must be chosen from different parts of the federation and includes both a national federal assembly and legislative assemblies of the federated states, has worked satisfactorily. English and French are both official languages. The franc has replaced the pound as the monetary unit. French-officered Cameroonian troops have kept order, and British civil servants on contract have continued to work for the federal government.

In fact, the pessimistic prognosis of 1960 has been proved quite wrong. Politically, Cameroon has become one of the most stable of the new African countries. Its economic recovery has been outstanding. The Government is pursuing an active policy of assisting the development of agriculture, which is the basis of the Cameroon economy. The production of cocoa, Cameroon's chief export crop, has been expanded. A second crop, coffee, is becoming increasingly important to Cameroon's export tills.

On the African scene federation enhanced Cameroon's stature. Cameroon held a central position in the French-speaking Union of African and Malagasy States, and with the formation of the Organization of African Unity has become a stanch supporter of continent-wide cooperation. Cameroon's relations with the United States have consistently been cordial. As an indication of our interest in the welfare of the Federal Republic of Cameroon the United States has extended bilateral assistance, as well as multilateral aid through the United Nations and the European Economic Community. A number of Cameroonian students have already come to the United States on educational exchange programs, and we heartily welcome and encourage further contact between the people of Cameroon and those of the United States.

We offer sincere congratulations, President Ahidjo and the people of Cameroon, on the fourth anniversary of your independence.

Joliet Youths Participate in the ROTC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we can all be proud of the young men of the

Joliet Township High School, Joliet, Ill., who participate in the high school ROTC program. Not only does this training in military science and tactics provide a sound foundation for their future endeavors, it instills in them a fine community spirit which is an inspiration to all of us.

An editorial in the December 6, 1963, edition of the Joliet Herald-News outlines one of their civic projects during the recent holiday season. I commend it for your reading, and include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

YOUNG MEN OF ROTC SHOW COMMUNITY SPIRIT

The Joliet Township High School unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is not exactly a recreational group. Its members are studying what the Army calls military science and tactics in a serious way.

But these high school youngsters in recent years have shown the kind of community spirit and desire for service that reflects well on all teenagers and verifies the fact that, in the main, today's young people have high ideals and fine purposes.

The ROTC is currently launching its annual drive for foodstuffs to be distributed by the Salvation Army to needy families at Christmas time. The goal of the campaign is 10,000 cans of foodstuffs, sufficient to help fill the baskets of some 550 families on the Salvation Army's list of those who have encountered adversity through illness, unemployment, or death.

Families with children in school can send their canned gifts to school with their children. Those who do not have children in school can wait for a call by a uniformed ROTC cadet. It is stressed that only uniformed cadets will be used in this collection.

Capt. Dale Sweetwood, who heads the ROTC program at JTHS, will direct the collection activities, and coordination will be provided by the battalion staff. Funds raised by the Salvation Army through its bell-ringing appeal will be used to add chicken or turkey and fresh vegetables to the baskets, providing all the ingredients for a bounteous Christmas meal.

Since the ROTC cadets attend classes and carry a full high school study program, the campaign means that they will be giving up many of their leisure hours to collect and classify the foods which are contributed. They are to be congratulated on the enterprise and civic spirit they are showing, and adults of the area can be assured that these young men, participating in a worthwhile campaign, are preparing themselves for future leadership when they have completed their education.

E. Humphrey Doulens Dies Following Heart Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. Humphrey Doulens, of Norwalk, died December 30, bringing an untimely end to one of the most interesting careers I know of. The following absorbing article from the Norwalk Hour tells the story but I want to take this opportunity of adding my own expressions of regret at his death and extending my sympathy to his family and friends:

E. HUMPHREY DOULENS DIES FOLLOWING HEART SURGERY

E. Humphrey Doulens, who parlayed the good graces of Lady Luck and a unique personal magnetism into a career as the personal representative of America's leading concert artists, died Monday night in St. Mary's Hospital of the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn., following heart surgery. He was 57 years old.

The ailment thus brought to a premature end a career that began in 1924, when a young, inexperienced auto showroom clerk became the Norwalk Hour's South Norwalk reporter. When it ended he was vice president of the Columbia Concerts Bureau of New York City, the largest concert management organization in the world.

Through it all he was aided by a keen sense of business and a flair for news, but what probably carried him farthest was his own personality. Its force was perhaps best measured by a school chum, Stanley Joseloff of Westport, who remarked at a 1955 testimonial honoring Mr. Doulens that "whereas most of us have to learn how to light up light bulbs, Humphrey has learned how to light up people."

When he embarked on a career in journalism that day in 1924, he very likely had little idea where it would lead him. He had always been interested in music, particularly the opera, and he maintained interest while learning his reportorial ropes at the Hour. But it was news that occupied his energies, and he learned his trade well.

CITY EDITOR

Within 5 years he had become city editor of the now defunct South Norwalk Sentinel, having joined its staff after a year with the Hour. And 5 years after that, in 1934, he became editor of the Bridgeport Post's Sunday edition.

After a relatively short period with the Post he resigned to become a music critic with Newsweek magazine. Up to that point, his career had reflected orderly development as a journalist. But it was at that point that he met the late Grace Moore.

He took on the interview assignment with greater feeling than reportorial detachment would allow. He had long been awed by her beauty and voice. Ushered into her presence, he was even more awe-stricken.

Miss Moore was less impressed, however, reacting in a manner then characteristic of the opera star's temperament. "I have no story for you, young man," she intoned with a glance that should by all rights have withered the most seasoned of interviewers.

HOW TO SUCCEED

"The sight of you is story enough," said the entranced young reporter. He got the interview.

It was shortly thereafter that Columbia Concerts Bureau, which handled Miss Moore's affairs, needed a personal manager for her. In a talk with company officials, she recommended Humphrey Doulens.

The offer was duly made, and the choice must have weighed heavy upon the young journalist who was just about to enter his prime in communications. Whether to give up a career he knew and was talented at for one that was unknown and might bring failure—that was the decision that had to be made.

To the man who as a boy had used every available penny to see the opera and as a youth had sold healing salve to buy a phonograph, the choice was predetermined if not easy. He accepted the offer.

HELPED STARS SOAR

That was in 1938. From then on his life was a whirl of stars, and tours, and promotions. His job, as he was to discover, was mainly promotion of his stars. And the lifeblood of promotion is publicity.

Thus it was for publicity that he coached Lily Pons for hour upon hour in baseball lore so that she could be interviewed by the sports editor of a southern newspaper and not be eclipsed on the news pages by the World Series, then in progress.

Following the interview, after impressing the editor with her knowledge of the great American pastime, she asked who was playing in the series.

As personal representative, he was also charged with making all arrangements necessary for a concert tour and thus making certain that all his star would have to do is sing. I was in this capacity that he mounted a burro and pursued Miss Pons through the most backward of Mexico's backward areas as she sought out a fortuneteller she had heard of. Fortunetellers were something of an obsession with the opera star.

COOKING PROBLEMS

Then there was the more routine assignment of finding alternate accommodations for Miss Moore when she was invited out of the Blackstone Hotel in Chicago after blowin two fuses with a hotplate. Asked by the hotel manager whether she had been cooking, she had replied. "What do you think I am, a chorus girl or acrobat? I am Grace Moore." But after the second fuse blew, it didn't much matter. What did matter was a new hotel.

And so it went, for over a quarter century with Columbia, with time out for Air Force service during World War II. Others whom he managed over the years were Andre Kostelanetz, Hildegarde, Dorothy Kirsten, Mimi Benzell, Gladys Swarthout, and Licia Albanese.

In the late 1930's he escorted Miss Pons to a performance of the Ringling Brothers-Barnum and Bailey circus and became enthralled with life under the big top. He became the confidant of circus impresarios and on several occasions was called upon to devise special ideas for circus promotion stunts.

With the success that marked so many other of his endeavors during his lifetime, he soon became recognized as an outstanding authority on circuses and circus life and his name shines brightly on a plaque in the Circus Hall of Fame in Sarasota, Fla.

One of his proudest moments was leading a camel, while appropriately garbed, in a circus spectacular.

Through it all he continued to reside in Norwalk, his home town. At the time of his death he lived in Lafayette Circle.

Surviving is a brother, Roger B. Doulens, vice president of Pan American Airlines, and resident of Alexandria, Va., and a niece, Mrs. Janet Doulens Hertzel.

He was the son of the late Edward Burch Doulens, who for many years was local Republican Party leader and deputy sheriff, and Caroline MacMaugh Doulens.

Pilot Radio Corp.: Pioneering Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the communications industry has played a most decisive role in influencing our daily lives. Since the introduction of the

radio, a host of new products and technical developments have poured forth from the Nation's manufacturers so that today we are not only more knowledgeable but have a greater understanding of the world we live in. It is hard to believe that this industry is little more than half a century old.

Recently, one of the pioneering radio equipment manufacturers in our Nation—Pilot Radio Corp.—moved into a new $2 million plant in Yonkers, N.Y. It is a company whose history has spanned 45 exciting years of developments in the home entertainment industry and which has pioneered many of the developments that today we take for granted.

Its continued development of new products in stereo high fidelity is widening the world of information and entertainment for all of us. Therefore, I feel the following will be of interest to my colleagues and ask them to join me in saluting the Pilot Radio Corp., for the significant contribution it has made to the communications industry.

In 1919 America was recovering from its baptism of fire as a major world power. In that year, when radio was still in the crystal stage—and television, color TV, FM broadcasting and stereophonic sound were developments either unheard of or in the thinking stage—the Pilot Radio Corp., started in business.

From the beginning the company produced quality radio equipment for the home. The company's insistence on quality soon made Pilot the largest parts manufacturer in the world for radio hams and experimenters.

In the ensuing years Pilot has entered almost every phase of the home entertainment industry, maintaining and strengthening its reputation as a manufacturer of quality equipment. The company's growth since 1919 has been sparked by its continual emphasis on new developments and it has become widely known in its field as a pioneering firm.

The following are a few of its achievements, which have influenced the home entertainment industry in America and the world.

The first shortwave radio made available to the public was the Pilot Super Wasp, introduced in 1925.

The first TV broadcast demonstrated at New York University used equipment developed and produced by Pilot. The picture was flashed across the Hudson River from station WRNY in New Jersey in 1928. A year later, Pilot's station W2XCL received a U.S. Government television station license.

In 1930, Pilot introduced the Midget and Auto Pilot automobile radios. Also in that year Pilot technicians made a flying laboratory tour in the company's research airplane to South America to study weather and its effects on radio transmission.

Commercial TV receivers were produced by Pilot in 1937 and in that same year, the company introduced the Nation's first self-contained battery powered portable radio with shortwave. Two years later, the first commercial FM receivers and phonographs were put on the market.

In 1948, Pilot introduced the first television receivers to sell for less than $100. Its model TV-37 sold for $99 at a time when most receivers were selling for $400.

These developments are only a sample of the pioneering developments contributed by the company. And today Pilot is carving out a new reputation for itself in the stereophonic high fidelity field.

If television is the king of the communications world, then high fidelity is the crown prince. Interest in high fidelity is at an all-time peak. Stereo consoles and components are the featured attractions in living rooms throughout the Nation. Increased leisure time is enabling more and more Americans to enjoy the cultural enrichment offered by radio, records, and television. The boom in high fidelity is increasing our awareness of the spoken as well as the musical world. Radio programs and records are not confined to music, but include plays, lectures, dramatic readings, even foreign language courses.

This cultural explosion has been fed, to a great extent, by the high fidelity industry. After World War II the first of the high fidelity components, FM tuners, found their way into thousands of homes. Many of these tuners were made by Pilot, for the company was the first to introduce them to the American public in 1947.

Five years later Pilot was again at the forefront of the industry when it decided to concentrate its facilities on the production of high fidelity equipment exclusively. In 1957, with the development of stereo, it began its production of stereo components. Then in 1961 the company introduced one of the first precision instruments for the reception of FM multiplex stereo broadcasts and in 1962 it developed a unique signal sampling circuit for FM stereo reception that utilizes no operating controls.

The company today is applying advancements made in rocket and missile research to its consoles and components. It recently developed the first completely transistorized stereo portable phonograph to accommodate an AM/FM stereo tuner, and is now using solid state circuitry selectively to insure better sound reproduction.

Pilot is one of the few manufacturers of stereo equipment to maintain quality control over the cabinets for its consoles. It employs skilled craftsmen to make and hand finish all cabinets in the woodworking facilities of its new plant.

Under the leadership of a new chief officer, Roland J. Kalb, also a Westchester County resident, the company is showing new growth as it meets the continuing demand for stereo systems that all but bring the concert hall into the living room.

Mr. Kalb, who was trained as an engineer in Vienna, and who saw service in the French underground during the early years of World War II, arrived in the United States penniless, but an expert in radio design and marketing. Since taking over Pilot's direction, he has furthered the company's tradition of producing only the best and is helping it reach new heights in the wonder world of stereo high fidelity.

Americans can be proud of the achievements of this 45-year-old pioneering company. Yonkers residents especially are proud to have Pilot as a new neighbor and wish it continued success in the exciting years to come. I am happy to offer my congratulations as it begins its 46th year in the home entertainment industry.

The Proposed Cultural Center and S. 1652

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times, Tuesday, January 7, 1964. It expresses many of my sentiments. It also conveys the sentiments of scores of Americans. And it gives endorsement to the arguments of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. This is a time for calm and serious deliberation which was so characteristic of President Kennedy. It would be desirable that this House show the calm judgment of true statesmanship in this matter—a characteristic that the late President Kennedy shared with others in our history.

THE KENNEDY MEMORIAL

As its first order of business today, the House is scheduled to vote on a bill to provide some $30 million in public funds to establish a national cultural center as a memorial to President Kennedy.

Like so many other indiscriminate tributes, this proposal has been rushed through the Senate—and now the House—out of a sense of grief, irrespective of its meaning or its appropriateness. While John F. Kennedy was a highly cultured and civilized man, his interest in the arts was only one of many pursuits. Congress would do well to pause to consider whether this is the best way to honor his memory. We doubt that it is and at least we think more time should pass befor an irrevocable decision is made.

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, raised some extremely pertinent questions on this subject in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published last Friday, which the Members of the House would do well to read before voting on the proposed memorial today. There is no need for the haste which is now being shown—haste that makes one wonder whether Mr. WIDNALL is not right in asking if this particular memorial concept may not be a mere face-saver "for an otherwise faltering project" unable to raise the required funds through public subscription.

The National Cultural Center should stand on its own merits. The proposal to finance it now in important part through public money is a complete reversal of the original plan, which was that the Federal Government would provide only the site. Furthermore, as Mr. WIDNALL points out, the Government is in effect pledging itself to provide annual operating funds to keep the project solvent—because obviously a Presidential memorial cannot be allowed to go bankrupt. In addition, the provision for a loan of $15.4 million

for construction of parking facilities is, as Mr. WIDNALL says, tantamount to putting "a first mortgage on a Presidential memorial for the first time in our history."

These are valid objections, and Mr. WIDNALL raises many others. Together they strongly suggest that the Congress, which has yet to provide a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt, is being too hasty in deciding on the national memorial for John F. Kennedy. There is no need for haste or waste, which are so inconsistent with the President's character, particularly with his sense of fitness and his intellectual deliberation.

Independence Day of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, January 4 marked the 16th anniversary of Burma's independence. I take this opportunity to extend congratulations to His Excellency U Win Maung, the President of Burma; His Excellency Gen. Ne Win, the Prime Minister; and His Excellency the Burmese Ambassador to the United States, On Sein.

Burma became an independent sovereign state at 4:20 a.m., on January 4, 1948. It was the moment which the Burmese astrologers considered most propitious. The attainment of independence by Burma was not only a signal success for Burmese nationalism, but was also a tribute to British statesmanship. The people will long remember the dignity and grace with which the British ended their rule over Burma and left it free.

Independence came to Burma without bloodshed, without resentment, and without ill feeling. The ease of the transition was misleading in that it gave little hint of the many problems and difficulties that lay ahead. Shortly after independence several armed groups began to oppose the Government. The most significant of these have been the disaffected minority races, especially the Karens, the Shans, and the Kachins. Two rival Communist parties have also been in armed opposition since independence. Their numbers have been reduced in recent years, but they still remain a substantial threat to the peace.

While the forces of insurrection in Burma are not at present a critical threat to the Government, their harassing activities have seriously unsettled the stability of Burma. Under these adverse conditions the Government has not been able to properly concentrate on the social and economic development of the country. Gen. Ne Win has set out to solve the great problem of factions in Burma. It is to be hoped that he will succeed in unifying the country behind his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in its foreign relations Burma has preferred to follow a policy of nonalinement. It has preferred not to take sides on the political issues dividing the free world and the Communists. It is a fact, however, that the Government has taken steps to put down the Communist insurgents within its own borders. In this way, it has shown that it is aware of the dangers of Communist subversion.

The relations between the United States and Burma have always been cordial. We have supported Burma in its attempt to solve its many problems free from the interference of outside forces. Today the United States continues to believe that Burma's economic and political growth as a free nation is important to the Asian area and to all the countries of the free world.

Life Begins at 40: Why Penalize Elders Who Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the injustices of our present social security law is timely and should be of deep concern to our older citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 1140, a bill to remove earnings limitations, which would correct the injustice of penalizing those citizens who live on earned income, while permitting those who live on dividends to go scot free.

It is a palpable absurdity to let multimillionaires collect social security and at the same time forbid the wage earner to collect his or her social security if earning more than $100 per month.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of justice, the wage limitation should be dropped.

The article follows:

LIFE BEGINS AT 40: WHY PENALIZE ELDERS WHO WORK?

(By Robert Peterson)

For years I've been trying to support Uncle Sam's contention that elders who earn more than $1,200 a year should forfeit something from their social security checks.

I tok my unpopular stand after going to Washington, digging into the facts, and making an honest effort to understand the reasoning behind the social security law restricting the earnings of beneficiaries between the ages of 62 and 72.

Those with whom I talked reminded me that the social security program was not intended to serve those elders lucky and healthy enough to continue working. Instead, it was devised primarily to help those seniors who could no longer work. Looking at it from that point of view there seemed to be merit in this law requiring that those healthy and active enough to earn more than a hundred a month should relinquish a bit of their social security.

But I'm changing my mind. People have come to view their social security benefits as inalienable rights, and the law restricting their income has been held up to such ridicule and castigation that it has ceased to be regarded as a sound and worthy instrument. Its very existence seems to undermine man's faith in the integrity of our laws, as witness a letter sent to this column recently which asserts, "This law is so stupid that I have begun to question all the laws under which we live."

Although I respect the premise on which this law was based, I think this earnings restriction should now be abolished for these reasons:

First, the reasoning behind the law is not easy to understand. Second, it violates our traditions to be told that a man who retires can receive a pension, while a man who has the spunk and will to continue working must forfeit all or part of such a pension. Third, it is discriminatory because the restriction applies only to earnings from employment rather than to income received from such sources as dividends or rentals. Fourth, it is geriatrically unsound to do anything which discourages—rather than encourages—older people from working as long and as enthusiastically as they possibly can.

Of course, there are those who would like to abolish the entire social security program and who contend that people should stand on their own feet and provide for their own support in old age. But experiences here and abroad have shown that a large percentage of the population is simply unable to do this.

Our social security program, adopted in 1935, is here to stay and has won the solid aceptance of millions of citizens whose lives would be considerably grayer if it had not come to pass.

The lawmakers say it will cost about $2 billion a year if the law is changed to remove restrictions on the earnings of social security recipients. But since this is obviously what people want, let's trim the budget at some other point and permit the will of the majority to prevail.

A Realistic Look at the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial by David Lawrence in the January 13, 1964, edition of the U.S. News & World Report. Mr. Lawrence very clearly points out the dangers that exist in our present policy of giving economic aid to the Communists, and I would urge my colleagues to weigh his words carefully.

A REALISTIC LOOK AT THE WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

These are days when illusion seems to supersede realism. An avalanche of words about "peace" descends upon the citizen, and he is led to assume that an agreement with Russia to discontinue certain nuclear tests is in itself firm assurance of a utopian era.

Realism, however, tells us that the world situation today presents a parallel to what happened before World War I and World War II, respectively. The naive West has again become a victim of the fallacy that to build up your adversary's economic strength is the way to "peace."

What is being witnessed now is the same misguided acceptance of the enemy's alleged good faith as we saw in the 1930's. Only this time the United States has gone along with the procession. America heretofore has stood for self-determination of peoples

and for the freedom and political independence of all nations, large or small. Now, in a mood of complacency, the policy of the United States seems headed along the path of appeasement, if not surrender.

For, as we survey the world today, we see more than a billion people under the yoke of or allied with Communist dictatorship. We see the Soviet Government consolidating its position in Asia, in Africa, and in Central and South America. We also see the Western powers, in sheer expediency, getting ready to accept the status quo everywhere—to acquiesce in the conquests of the Communists and call it "peace." Whether in relation to Berlin or to Cuba, the pressure is to "live and let live"—the very essence of an opportunism that leads to surrender.

Every use of the word "peace" in the official dialogs, every suggestion about further "talks" between East and West is interpreted as a sign of the so-called turn toward peace and away from war.

Unhappily, the American reading public has been asked to believe that there have been only two courses before us—peace or war. The Soviets obviously don't want a military war any more than we do. If they can achieve their ends without a war—solidify their gains and maintain their role as conquerors of a vast area in the world—why should they precipitate a process of nuclear self-destruction?

The world today has seen the decay of moral principle in international affairs. The theory that "might makes right" has been tacitly accepted by Western diplomacy.

The puppet governments of the states in Eastern Europe under Communist control have lately been given a little flexibility in handling their own affairs. This has been hailed in the West as significant "progress." But may it not be rather an example of Moscow's astuteness? Already the West has eagerly begun to finance trade with Communist states in Eastern Europe, thus relieving the Soviets of their burden as economic caretakers of the satellites.

The extent of the rift between Red China and the Soviet Government has been exaggerated. Moscow has control of China's military behavior and exercises considerable influence on the economic side. Where else could Red China get such economic support?

Irrespective, however, of the motives behind these Asian policies, the truth is that the Communist empire in the world is not being eroded. Military domination of this vast area continues. Political control by the Soviets is a fact, not a theory, throughout the Communist domain.

Communist infiltration is increasing in Africa. The Communist subversive movements have multiplied in Latin America, particularly since the United States has acquiesced in the Soviet conquest of Cuba despite flagrant violation of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

We may talk all we like about the "peace offensive" we are going to carry on in 1964, but to make deals with Moscow that give the Communists economic aid and to make available our credit facilities to finance their imports is to accept the Communist imperialists as partners. It means abandonment of the hundreds of millions of captive peoples in Eastern Europe who have looked hopefully to us. Removal of the causes of economic discontent helps to strengthen puppet governments and thereby discourage revolution.

It is dangerous, moreover, to assume that, when the Soviets build up their economy, they will not increase their demands as they intermittently revive their threats of a nuclear war. We are still burdened with a $50-billion-a-year expense for armament, much of which we would not have to spend if a free people ruled in the Soviet Union.

Our enemy in World War I was an autocratic government. Our enemy in World War II was also an autocratic government. In the prewar years in both cases, we helpd the aggressor to grow strong enough to attack us. Will we repeat the error, or will we stop giving economic aid to Communist imperialism?

Appeasement never pays. Realism commands us to reexamine our policies.

Minority Views on House Joint Resolution 871

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution makes the following principal changes in the National Cultural Center Act, Public Law 85–874; 72 Stat. 1698, as amended:

First. The National Cultural Center is renamed to John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and is designated as the sole national memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy within the city of Washington and its environs.

Second. The Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is required to submit an annual report of its operations, including a detailed statement of all money received and disbursed by it, to Congress, in addition to submitting such a report to the Smithsonian Institution as required by existing law.

Third. The Board is directed to provide within the Center a suitable memorial in honor of the late President and is required to transmit to Congress a detailed report of any such memorial which it proposes to provide. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution must approve such memorial before it is provided.

Fourth. Appropriations are authorized in the maximum amount of $15,500,000, to match dollar-for-dollar private contributions, for the purpose of carrying out the act. Under existing law the entire cost of the Center is to be financed by private contributions.

Fifth. The Board is authorized to issue revenue bonds having a total face value not in excess of $15,400,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to purchase such bonds, to finance parking facilities for the Center.

Sixth. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any gift which he finds to have been contributed in honor of or in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy and to pay the money to appropriate appropriations or other accounts.

I have strongly supported the National Cultural Center from its inception, and I took a leading role in the enactment last year of a 3-year extension of the time during which funds might be raised for its construction.

There are millions of people in America who want a memorial to the late President, John F. Kennedy, and I am one of them, but they, and I, want it to be a suitable and adequate memorial. I introduced a bill, H.R. 9463, to accomplish this very purpose. The millions who sense the need for an adequate memorial should have a voice in its selection, if it is to be national in character and a truely adequate and appropriate memorial. If we build a memorial that does not adequately reflect President Kennedy's deep interest in the basic freedoms, in the dignity and rights of the individual, in his desire for world peace, and in the other things, including the breaking of the religious barrier to the Presidency, that he fought for so valiantly, we will do a great disservice to his memory, and future generations of Americans, and the late President's family, will be dissatisfied and grieved over our failure to act with prudence now. It has been reported that Mrs. John F. Kennedy has become embarrassed because of the naming of so many things after her late husband. Let's not add to the grief of this brave and gracious lady by acting in blind haste to establish a national memorial that may prove to be inadequate.

The National Cultural Center may have the potential of an appropriate memorial if it, and the memorial features to be provided therein, properly reflect the important things for which President Kennedy stood. But there is no assurance that this will be the case, for wholly inadequate thought and study have been given to the matter. If a memorial commission were established, as provided by H.R. 9463, we would not become victims of our own emotional hysteria, dashing about madly looking for ways to express our abhorrence of the horrible crime that took his life and to express our affection for his memory. Such expressions of national feeling for our martyred President are laudable, but a permanent national memorial conceived in emotionalism may not withstand the critical analysis of history. The Washington Monument and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials were carefully planned in an atmosphere of calm reflection, and they are adequate and in good taste.

Numerous local and State public facilities have already been, or are being, renamed in his honor, such as Idlewild International Airport in New York City, NASA Launch Operations Center, and Cape Canaveral itself, in Florida, a street from O'Hare Airport to the Loop in Chicago, a toll road from Baltimore, Md., to Wilmington, Del., and others that we hear of from day to day. It has been proposed to rename the Cape Cod Seashore and the District of Columbia Stadium after him. As one of its final acts last session, the Congress authorized the coinage of a new 50-cent piece with the likeness of the late President on it. All these things may be well and good, but mature and considered judgment should be the genesis of a national memorial yet to be constructed, rather than frenzied haste to atone, in some small way, for our shame over the assassination of a uniquely gifted young leader of our country.

I am not in favor of haste merely for haste's sake. Good taste, human compassion, and the need for exercise of mature judgment demand that we take sufficient time to calmly and dispassionately evaluate the greatness of the man and then to design and construct a suitable memorial depicting his greatness that will be supported by history.

House Joint Resolution 871 was hastily drafted and rushed through the Committee on Public Works during the closing days of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Time was not permitted for adequate questioning of witnesses, and many serious questions as to the adequacy of the Center as a memorial, as to its adequacy as a center for the performing arts, and as to its financial feasibility were summarily passed over. A majority of the committee ordered the joint resolution reported on December 17, 1963, and the committee report was filed the same day, without even affording time for the preparation of minority views to be filed with the report.

What a national disgrace it would be if President Kennedy's memory was limited solely to his interest in the performing arts, and if his national memorial should be a bankrupt theater with, what some claim will be, inadequate seating capacity and without a live resident orchestra to accompany touring operas, ballets, and other performing groups. Testimony before the committee indicated these unfortunate eventualities to be entirely possible, but a majority of the committee, intent upon rushing the joint resolution through, would not permit the time to inquire in detail as to these matters.

I believe the establishment of a national memorial to President Kennedy should follow the time-honored and proven procedure of creating a memorial commission to give full study and consideration to the type of memorial that would be most appropriate to his rightful place in history. It was to serve this end that I introduced H.R. 9463 to establish a John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission, to be composed of 13 members, made up of 4 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, 4 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 members to be appointed by the President of the United States from among private citizens of the United States. This commission would have the duty to make a full and complete study and evaluation with respect to any plan or plans for a memorial and to consult with the members of the immediate family of the late President. My bill would require that the commission submit to the Congress a preliminary report of its findings and recommendations within 6 months after the commission is organized and to submit a final report setting forth the results of its study and evaluation, together with its recommendations, within 3 years.

There is ample precedence for this procedure. By an act approved February 9, 1911, a Lincoln Memorial Commission was created. This commission recommended construction of the now well-known and much visited Lincoln Memorial, for which $3,678,720 was appropriated by Congress. This memorial, which was dedicated on Decoration Day, 1922, is generally accepted by historians and others as being as nearly perfect a memorial to President Lincoln as could be designed.

The Thomas Jefferson Memorial was constructed in accordance with recommendations made by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, which was created by an act of Congress approved June 26, 1934. Congress appropriated $3,405,064 for its construction, and the memorial was dedicated on April 13, 1943—the 200th anniversary of the birth of President Jefferson.

By an act approved August 11, 1955, Congress established the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and even more recently, by an act approved April 8, 1960, Congress established the James Madison Memorial Commission, to consider and formulate plans for the design, construction, and location of permanent memorials to these two great Presidents.

There is no reason why a similar commission should not be established to develop plans for a memorial to President Kennedy. In fact, precedence as well as good sense dictates that such a commission should be established to study fully the proposal of making the National Cultural Center the national memorial to President Kennedy as well as to consider alternatives. The real danger in rushing ahead at this time to fix forever the permanent memorial to President Kennedy is that no thought has been given to any alternatives to the Cultural Center proposal, which alternatives might be found to be far more suitable. On the other hand, if such a commission should find that the Cultural Center would be a fully adequate memorial, appropriate memorabilia can be added later without delaying commencement of construction of the Center.

Although I have been a dedicated supporter of a performing arts center in the city of Washington, I am equally, if not more, interested in the establishment of a suitable national memorial to President Kennedy. If both of these purposes can be served adequately by the same facility, then it will have my full support. We do not now know this to be a fact, however. We must not let our enthusiasm for the National Cultural Center override our better judgment and permit the memory of our late President to be used to promote funds for the Center, in derrogation of the establishment of a proper memorial. We may be taking unjustified advantage of a deeply sentimental situation. If what we do proves to be a mistake, it will evidence a national instability that is not truly reflective of our national character.

In my opinion, House Joint Resolution 871 should not be enacted at this time, but instead, a bill similar to H.R. 9463, to establish a John Fitzgerald Memorial Commission, should be enacted. I propose to offer the House of Representatives an opportunity to substitute the provisions of H.R. 9463 for those of House Joint Resolution 871. However, if House Joint Resolution 871 is to be enacted now, it should be amended to provide, at least, for the appointment of a congressional commission to pass upon the details of any memorial to President Kennedy proposed to be provided within the Center. To accomplish this purpose, in the event the provisions of H.R. 9463 are not substituted for those of House Joint Resolution 871, I plan to offer an amendment to House Joint Resolution 871 substantially as follows:

Page 3, line 11, strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections".

Page 3, line 17, after "Institution" insert the following: "and the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission".

Page 3, strike out line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "'such memorial.

"'(e) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission to be composed of eight members chosen as follows:

"'(1) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

"'(2) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate.

Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after its approval of a memorial as provided in subsection (d) of this section.'; and".

Independence of Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Sudan celebrated the eighth anniversary of its independence. On this memorable occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to the President of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, Lt. Gen. Ibrahim Abboud; and His Excellency, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Osman Hadary.

Sudan was one of the first African states to attain independence in the post-World War II emergence of newly independent nations in Africa.

Sudan is also one of the most interesting and crucial of the newly independent African nations because it serves as a bridge between the Middle East and Africa, both geographically and culturally. Situated to the south of the United Arab Republic and separated from Arabia by the Red Sea, the northern part of the Sudan is inhabited chiefly by Arab-speaking Muslims while the southern plain is peopled by seminomadic negroid tribes. North and south are joined together by the lifegiving Nile whose wa-

ters cultivate Sudan's cotton crop, the basis of the countrys' economy.

Much has been achieved in the Sudan during its first 8 years of independence. The government of President Abboud, which attained power in a military coup in 1958, has successfully consolidated its power after an initial period of instability during which it was threatened by radical, anti-Western elements.

But the most startling gains have been in the economic sphere. The well-known Gezira irrigation scheme, begun in 1925, has been substantially enlarged, and with it the production of cotton has been considerably increased. This and other irrigation projects are operated on a partnership basis between the Sudan Government, which receives 40 percent of the cotton crop; the tenants, who also receive 40 percent; and a marketing board, which receives 20 percent. The Government is responsible for the irrigation system, the local population for the labor on the land, and the board for practical administration and the ginning and marketing of the cotton.

A good indication of the soundness of the Sudanese economy is the fact that the country can meet its vital needs through export earnings and regularly return a surplus to the national budget with which to finance a large portion of its development plans. A 10-year development plan which went into effect in 1961 envisioned an annual growth rate of 5.2 percent over the period 1961–71. Of the $1.5 billion total expenditures projected by the plan some $960 million was to be financed by the Sudanese Government.

While cotton is still the Sudan's most important crop, reaching a production of more than 1 million bales during 1962, the Government has encouraged crop diversification to lessen the present dependence on a single crop. Wheat acreage is being rapidly increased with a view to eventual self-sufficiency, and plantation crops such as tea, coffee, rice, castor bean, and kenaf are being developed.

A beginning has also been made in industrial development—chiefly in light industry, such as fruit canning and chemicals, and in the processing of the country's primary products, such as sugar refining, cardboard manufacture, and textile production. The Government is eager to encourage private industrial development and has agreed to grant tax concessions and other privileges.

For your remarkable achievements since independence we congratulate you, President Abboud and the people of the Sudan, and express our best wishes for a continued fruitful development.

Danger Is Not Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was closely identified with the creation of the Peace Corps. Mr. C. Hammond Blatchford, of North Tarrytown, N.Y., has written a poem in tribute to President Kennedy entitled "Danger Is Not Past." This poem simultaneously captures the spirit of the Peace Corps and of our departed President. I commend it to my colleagues for its beauty and understanding:

[From the Tarrytown (N.Y.) Daily News, Dec. 7, 1963]

ISSUES WARNING TO ALL OF US

DECEMBER 5, 1963.

THE DAILY NEWS:

President Kennedy may have been concerned with some of these threats to our Nation when he told his audience at Fort Worth on the morning of his death that "we live in a dangerous and uncertain time":

DANGER IS NOT PAST

Danger is not past while despots use
Men as mere creatures, puppets only for their needs.
Danger is not past till all can choose
And freely live according to their creeds.

We cannot claim that our United States
Excels all other ways of life,
While we have slums and gangs and hates,
And headlines scream of racial strife.

We should not brag that we produce more goods;
We cannot sing abroad fair freedom's note
Till we outlaw our thugs and hoods,
And guarantee to all their right to vote.

Now let us therefore order well our land.
While we have time to see and do the right.
With fresh resolve may we for Justice stand,
And dwell with men as brothers in God's sight.

No, danger is not past, nor is our chance
To heal, to feed, to help wher'er we can
Within our means, at home, abroad,
To aid the cause of universal man.

—C. H. BLATCHFORD.

NORTH TARRYTOWN.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing tribute appeared in the Tarrytown Daily News on December 7, 1963. Some readers of this great newspaper have suggested that this poem be distributed throughout the Peace Corps. At a time when America is rededicating itself to the challenges of the sixties, this would seem to be a most worthy objective.

Inertia of Congress Reflects People's Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article by Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer appeared recently in the New York Daily News.

It is a good answer to some of the criticism of the so-called liberal press. It would be well for some of these critics to remember that the Congress is answerable to the people. In the case of the Members of the House of Representatives, they are especially sensitive to the will of their constituents.

INERTIA OF CONGRESS REFLECTS PEOPLE'S WILL

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

CHICAGO.—To consider our Government and the working of our Constitution objectively, I find it useful to get out of Washington among the citizens whose will is still the final power in our country.

Here the agitation against congressional "inertia" and the current presidential succession seems mistaken and partisan.

Congress is doing just about what the Founding Fathers expected of it and Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, aged 72, would make a satisfactory President. He was elected and not appointed. This is how a democracy should work.

Congress has generally blocked the President's legislative program. They say.

This is the privilege the Founding Fathers deliberately gave it when they created checks and balances. If they had wanted the President to legislate, they would have given him that power.

REFLECTS PEOPLE'S WILL

Congress reflects the will of the people. If this Congress has dawdled over or voted down a large part of President Kennedy's legislative program, it is because the Members felt no sufficient pressure to pass these bills.

Are the present complaints against congressional inaction not motivated by a preference for the specific reforms Kennedy proposed?

The late President was right. Congress is wrong, these people say; therefore, all Presidents should be given more power. But suppose the situation were reversed, that, say, BARRY GOLDWATER as President were proposing a nationwide right-to-work law or a bill to divest the Government of TVA or to cancel trade, exchanges and diplomatic contacts with Russia.

WHAT CRITICS FEAR

Critics also say our law of presidential succession is outdated. But what the critics really seem to fear is that an accident to President Johnson would give the Presidency to Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK. MCCORMACK, to their taste, lacks the necessary liberalism and above all the necessary youth. So let's change the law of presidential succession.

JOHN MCCORMACK was elected to the House by the same Massachusetts voters who sent J.F.K. to the White House.

As for being too old, let's look at history. The greatest statesmen of our time are Churchill, Adenauer, De Gaulle and, going back in 1917, Georges Clemenceau. Two of them were over 60, two over 70, when they took office.

In general, young people are at a disadvantage in politics. They lack the knowledge of people which only experience can give.

Congressman Ben F. Jensen Asks the President a Few Pointed Questions—The Most Important Question Is, Will He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will our new President remove all socialistic roadblocks to progress as did West Germany, by giving the green light to investment capital and by not trying to fool the

people? Let us not forget that in less than 5 years after being devastated by World War II, the West German mark was accepted at face value worldwide, and the people enjoyed prosperity again.

Will he insist on a balanced budget starting next July 1, so that taxes can be safely reduced, so that the slogan, "Sound As a Dollar," will again ring true in all nations, so that the flight of our dwindling gold supply will be halted before it leads to a greatly reduced value of the dollar in your pocket, bringing financial disaster to all Americans, be they rich or poor?

Will he explain to the American people the fact that the ultimate consumer of goods and services must pay every penny appropriated and spent by his or her local, State, and Federal Government, and that over 70 percent of our goods and services are bought, used, and consumed by people whose annual income is less than $6,000, and hence these so-called "little people" are really footing most of the bill? Will he explain that the claims by the big spenders that they are helping the little people by "soaking the rich," is just so much political claptrap, for business and industry must add every tax to the first cost and high operating expenses on all commodities sold, or soon be forced to close shop?

Will our new President use the same good American business sense while in the White House that he has used in amassing his own personal fortune?

Will he admonish the heads of our nearly 50 million American families that under our constitutional, competitive, free private enterprise system of government, husbands and wives establish a sovereign government of their own choosing, which is their home, and that their future, the future of their children and their country depends entirely upon just how well these combined 50 million American sovereign governments perform day after day, by first taking care of themselves and their families, if able to work and earn a good honest living, by being law-abiding, and by living up to their own citizenship responsibilities, for therein lies the future happiness and prosperity of our blessed land?

Will he say, "Fellow citizens, this is the American way so plainly provided for in our U.S. Constitution, which was built for and around the individual, so different from the demands of the Communist dictators wherein all the people must think and work only for the State"?

We are anxiously waiting and hoping, Mr. President, that you will.

The Two Magic Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint of an article by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which appeared in the January issue of Guideposts:

THE TWO MAGIC WORDS

(By James Farley)

Not long ago in my mail I received a request from a college student in Pennsylvania, a young man who said he was writing a thesis on Government. He knew of my background in politics, and asked me to fill out a questionnaire.

There were at least 40 questions, and some of them called for detailed and complex answers. I was quite busy but, believing that any interest in Government should be encouraged, I sat down with my secretary and dictated a long reply. It took most of one afternoon, but I finally sent it off with the little glow of satisfaction that comes from completing an arduous and voluntary task.

I looked forward to receiving from this young man some acknowledgment as to whether I had helped him or not. But I have yet to hear from him to this day.

I told myself that it was a matter of no great consequence and to put it out of my mind, forget it. But obviously, since I am writing about it now, I didn't forget it. I didn't forget it because I was disappointed.

The truth is, ingratitude hurts everyone. It also hurts the person who fails to show appreciation because he may make an enemy where he could have kept a friend.

Simply feeling gratitude isn't enough; it has to be demonstrated, one way or another. Perhaps the boy in Pennsylvania was appreciative but if so his appreciation is wasted because he never told me. Two words—thank you—could have made all the difference.

Furthermore, the incident made me examine myself. When someone's performance hurts or displeases you, it is a good idea to ask yourself whether traces of those unpleasant characteristics may not exist in you. So I asked myself, how much do most of us appreciate the countless little daily acts of courtesy or kindness on the part of other people that make our lives smoother and more comfortable? How grateful are we, really, for the privilege of living in a country where it is possible for most of us to take freedom and justice and security for granted? How much thankfulness do most of us feel for the marvelous gift of life itself, and how adequately do we express this to the Giver?

The honest answer to each of these questions was painfully clear. Not enough. Not nearly enough.

And so I have decided to make a new year's resolution to try to change my attitude from a passive to a more active one where gratitude is concerned.

To thank the people who make my world run smoothly—waitresses, elevator operators, taxi drivers, barbers, anyone—not just with a casual word or an impersonal tip, but with some expression of genuine interest in them as fellow human beings.

To make myself more aware of the miraculous privileges involved in simply being an American, and to show my thankfulness by working without thought of reward (yes, even answering unsolicited questionnaires) to make the best country in the world even better.

To remind myself every day of the infinitely precious value of every minute of existence, and to show my gratitude to God not only with prayers of thanksgiving but by living as close as possible to the way He wants me to live.

A basic rule in showing appreciation, I have found, is this: Do it now. Do it while your sense of gratitude is fresh and strong. If you put it off, it becomes all too easy to forget it. When Christ healed the 10 lepers, only 1 came back to thank Him, and He commented a bit sadly on this frailty of human nature. If you feel a flash of thankfulness act on it before the impulse dies away.

Children have this strong sense of gratitude. A few years ago, out in Iowa, a teacher asked her fourth-grade pupils to write a prayer of thanks "for the small blessings which make your life happy and good." The 29 papers that were handed in gave thanks for such things as "the sound of laughter—erasers that make mistakes disappear—the smell of chocolate cake in the oven—colored leaves that swirl and fall in the autumn—big, red, garden tomatoes—my sister's smile on Christmas morning—and for God's care."

A second stage of gratitude is thankfulness, not just for the pleasures and benefits of life, but for its hazards and hardships as well. It takes some insight and maturity to realize that troubles and difficulties have values, but they do. All of us have heard of handicapped people who struggled so fiercely to overcome their handicap that ultimately they became champions. The Pilgrims thanked God for their first harvest, but they might well have thanked Him, also, for the difficulties that they met and overcame, because it was on this anvil of pain and suffering that they forged the character of a new nation.

The third stage of gratitude is what the poet, E. A. Robinson, had in mind when he wrote that there are two kinds of thankfulness, "the sudden kind we feel for what we take, the larger kind we feel for what we give." When you begin to feel gratitude for the opportunity to be of service, to help others, to make the world a better place, then you are getting close to the self-forgetfulness that the Bible tells us is the secret of true happiness.

If you can increase your sense of gratitude and your willingess to express it throughout the coming year, you will make the people around you happier, and you will become a happier person yourself. There is a great magic in those two words, "thank you."

It is impossible to be grateful and embittered at the same time for gratitude must have an object, and if one is grateful for life, then one must be grateful to the Giver of life, the Giver of all things.

"Gratitude," says an old quotation, "is the fairest blossom which springs from the soul; and the heart knoweth none more fragrant." This I will remember as I try to keep my resolution for 1964. I hope you will try it, too.

Report of Activities of the House Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of activities of the House Committee on Armed Services, including the report of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations, for the 1st session of the 88th Congress:

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

During the 1st session, 88th Congress, 229 meetings were held by the full Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees, as follows:

Full committee	74
Subcommittee No. 1	16
Subcommittee No. 2	8
Subcommittee No. 3	63
Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee	5
National Military Airlift Subcommittee	5
Real Estate and Construction Subcommittee	11
Research and Development Subcommittee	27
Special Investigations Subcommittee	20
Total meetings	229

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

A total of 38 bills and resolutions were reported to the House. Of this number, 36 were passed by the House and 2 are pending on the House Calendar. Of the bills passed by the House, 17 have been enacted into law and 19 are pending before the Senate.

In addition to these legislative actions, 134 acquisition and disposal projects were referred to the Real Estate and Construction Subcommittee for consideration; 125 of these projects were approved, 2 disapproved, and 7 withdrawn by the department which made the submission.

There were 35 printed hearings and special reports, containing 6,890 pages of printed hearings and reports.

RÉSUMÉ OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Private laws

Private Law 88-35, H.R. 2192, To Authorize the Readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy

Mr. Sowa was admitted to the U.S. Naval Academy as a congressional candidate from the second district of New Hampshire on July 1, 1957, and discharged on July 11, 1960, for reason of physical disability caused by deafness. After thorough examination, approved by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy, Mr. Sowa was found to be physically qualified for reinstatement to the Academy. Legislation was necessary, however, because Mr. Sowa exceeded the maximum age established by law for appointment to the Academy; and since the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy may not exceed limitations established by law.

Public laws

Public Law 88-2, H.R. 2438, To Extend the Induction Provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for Other Purposes

This law extends the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

Also, it extends the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

It also extends the Dependents Assistance Act, the law under which E-1's, E-2's, E-3's, and E-4's with 4 years of service or less are entitled to increased allowances, because of dependents, from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

In addition, it extends the so-called doctors draft law from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

Finally, it extends from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

Public Law 88-8, S. 1089 (H.R. 307), To Authorize the Sale, Without Regard to the Six-Month Waiting Period Prescribed, of Cadmium Proposed To Be Disposed of Pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act

This legislation provides congressional approval of the disposition of 2 million pounds of cadmium held in the national stockpile. In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88-28, H.R. 2440, To Authorize Appropriations During Fiscal Year 1964 for Procurement, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation of Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels for the Armed Forces, and for Other Purposes

Public Law 88-28 provided authorization in the amount of $15,314,291,000 for defense programs for fiscal year 1964 in two major areas.

It included authorization of appropriations in the amount of $11,915,200,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in form identical to previous enactments of the fund authorizations required pursuant to section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, as initially approved August 10, 1959.

It also included a similar authorization of appropriations in the amount of $3,399,091,000 for the research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels as required for the first time by the amendment to section 412(b) contained in Public Law 87-436, approved April 27, 1962.

Section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149 provided that "no funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date."

Public Law 87-436, added to the authority quoted above: "* * * the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels * * *."

Public Law 88-41, H.R. 2439, To Authorize the Secretary of Defense To Lend Certain Army, Navy, and Air Force Equipment and Provide Certain Services to the Boy Scouts of America For Use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for Other Purposes

This legislation authorized the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide other logistical services as may be necessary to support the Sixth National Jamboree of the Boys Scouts of America to be held at Valley Forge State Park, Pa., during the period beginning in July and ending in August 1964.

Public Law 88-63, H.R. 6681, To Improve the Active Duty Promotion Opportunity of Air Force Officers From the Grade of Major to the Grade of Lieutenant Colonel

This law permits the Department of the Air Force to exceed the numerical limitations on the number of officers who may serve in the grade of lieutenant colonel by 4,000 for a period of 1 more year.

Public Law 88-77, H.R. 2998, To Amend Titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, With Respect to the Award of Certain Medals and the Medal of Honor Roll

This law expands the authority for the award of the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, and the Silver Star by the various military departments, and the Coast Guard, with respect to the Medal of Honor, so our Government can give proper recognition to acts of heroism and gallantry which may occur during cold war conditions short of situations when our Armed Forces are at war with an enemy of the United States. Personnel receiving the Medal of Honor under the qualifying provision of this law will have their names placed on the Medal of Honor roll and receive the certificate and pension provided by sections 561 and 562 of title 38, United States Code, beginning at age 50.

Public Law 88-82, S. 546, To Authorize the Secretary of the Navy To Grant Easements for the Use of Lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a Nuclear Electric Generating Station.

This legislation authorizes the granting of an easement for the use of approximately 90 acres of land located in the extreme northwest corner of Camp Pendleton, Calif., to Southern California Edison Co. and San Diego Gas & Electric Co. The easement, to be granted at fair market value, will permit the two companies to construct and operate a nuclear generating plant on the land. Additional easements will be granted for access road, railroad sidings, and transmission lines.

Public Law 88-107, Senate Joint Resolution 51 (H.J. Res. 367), To Authorize the Presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, Retired

The purpose of this law is to appropriately recognize the outstanding contributions of Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired, to the development of airpower.

Public Law 88-110, H.R. 6996, To Repeal Section 262 of the Armed Force Reserve Act, as Amended, and To Amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as Amended, To Revise and Consolidate Authority for Deferment From, and Exemption From Liability for Induction for, Training and Service for Certain Reserve Membership and Participation, and To Provide a Special Enlistment Program, and for Other Purposes

The purpose of the legislation is to consolidate into one provision of law the authority for the special enlistment active duty for training programs available to Reserve personnel.

The law provides the departments with authority to continue in effect a modified form of the so-called 6-month training program available to non-prior-service personnel. The program would permit enlistments for a 6-year period of Reserve service, 4 months or more of which would be performed on active duty for training.

The law will provide equity in the Reserve program by establishing a maximum 6-year Reserve obligation for all personnel.

Public Law 88-132, H.R. 5555, To Amend Title 37, United States Code, To Increase the Rates of Basic Pay for Members of the Uniformed Services, and for Other Purposes

This law is the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963. It provides:

1. Increases in basic pay for members of the uniformed services with over 2 years of service.

2. Permanent professors at the Military and Air Force Academies after 36 years of service are entitled to a pay supplement of $250 a month, not to be included in computing retired pay.

3. Increased special pay for physicians and dentists at the 6-year point from $200 to $250 a month; and from $250 to $350 at the 10-year point.

4. Recomputation of retirement pay:

Persons retired prior to June 1, 1958, who are paid retired pay under the Career Compensation Act, may elect to recompute their retirement pay under pay scales in effect on September 30, 1963, or receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, based upon their retirement pay, whichever is greater.

Persons retired after June 1, 1958, but before April 1, 1963, receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase based upon their retirement pay.

All persons originally retiring after April 1, 1963, will compute their retirement pay based upon the new pay scales in Public Law 88-132.

Persons retired under laws other than the Career Compensation Act receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase.

Retired and retainer pay in the future will be adjusted to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. In January of each calendar year after 1963, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the percent that the annual average of the Consumer Price Index (all items—U.S. city average) published by

the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the preceding calendar year has increased over that for 1962 or, if later, for the calendar year preceding that in which the most recent adjustment in retired or retainer pay has been made under this law. If the Secretary determines the percent of that increase to be 3 or more, the retired or retainer pay of a member of former member of the Armed Forces who became entitled to that pay before January 2 of the year in which the Secretary makes that determination shall, as of April 1 of that year, be increased by that percent, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

5. Submarine pay for certain members training for duty on nuclear-powered submarines is authorized.

6. Incentive pay for duty inside a high- or low-pressure chamber is authorized.

7. Multiple payments of incentive pay is authorized.

8. Special pay for duty subject to hostile fire providing $55 a month is authorized. It is not retroactive.

9. Foreign duty pay is hereafter permissive. The President is given the authority to authorize foreign duty pay in the locations outside the continental United States that he selects.

10. A new family separation allowance of $30 a month is authorized for those serving in grade E-4 (more than 4 years of service) and above, where dependents are prevented from being with their service sponsor. It is not authorized for those occupying Government quarters.

11. Officers in the grade of major and above who are without dependents may elect not to occupy Government quarters even though they are available, and at the same time be eligible to receive their quarters allowances.

Public Law 88-145, S. 812, To Provide for the Release of Restrictions and Reservations on Certain Real Property Heretofore Conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America

The purpose of this law is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to release certain restrictions and reservations on certain real property previously conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the Secretary of the Army upon payment by the State of Arkansas to the United States of the fair market value of the property concerned.

The objective of the legislation is to grant relief to the Arkansas State Board of Education which is the unwitting victim of circumstances over which it had no control.

Public Law 88-154, S. 1994, To Authorize the Disposal, Without Regard to the Prescribed 6-Month Waiting Period, of Certain Waterfowl Feathers and Down From the National Stockpile

This legislation authorizes disposal of approximately 5,800,000 pounds of waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile and waives the requirement for a 6-month waiting period before this disposal could begin.

Public Law 88-174, H.R. 6500, To Authorize Certain Construction at Military Installations, and for Other Purposes

The purpose of this legislation is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1964.

The total authorization granted is as follows:

New authorization:	
Title I (Army)	$199,633,000
Title II (Navy)	202,462,000
Title III (Air Force)	488,367,000
Title IV (Defense agencies)	24,403,000
Title V (Housing)	685,312,000
Subtotal	1,600,177,000
Deficiency authorization:	
Title I (Army)	$3,209,000
Title II (Navy)	87,000
Title III (Air Force)	166,000
Total	3,462,000
Title VII (Reserve components):	
Army National Guard	7,500,000
Army Reserve	4,700,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	5,700,000
Air National Guard	15,970,380
Air Force Reserve	4,600,000
Total	38,470,380
Deficiency authorizations:	
Army National Guard	84,000
Army Reserve	60,000
Total	144,000
Grand total of all authorities	1,642,253,380

Public Law 88-228, S. 1767, To Authorize the Secretary of the Army To Convey a Certain Parcel of Land to the State of Delaware, and for Other Purposes

This law authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Delaware certain property located at the Fort Miles Military Reservation which is now excess to military requirements.

Public Law 88-236, H.R. 3005, To Amend Sections 510 and 591, of Title 10, United States Code, To Remove the Requirement that an Alien Must Make a Declaration of Intention To Become a Citizen of the United States Before He May Be Enlisted or Appointed in a Reserve Component

This law eliminated an obsolete requirement in the statutes relating to enlistments and appointments in the Reserve Forces.

Public Law 88-238, H.R. 4338, To Amend Title 37, United States Code, to Authorize Travel and Transportation Allowances for Travel Performed Under Orders that Are Canceled, Revoked, or Modified, and for Other Purposes

This law authorizes reimbursement to a member of the uniformed services for travel performed by himself and/or his dependents, or both, under orders that direct him to make a permanent change of station and that are canceled, revoked, or modified, directing his return to the station from which he was being transferred, or are modified to direct him to make a different permanent change of station.

This law is retroactive to October 1, 1949.

At the close of the 1st session, 88th Congress, the following bills which were reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Armed Services were—

1. Pending on the House Calendar:

H.R. 6600, to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

H.R. 9124, to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes. (Considered by House under suspension of rules, on December 2, 1963, and failed of passage.)

2. Passed by the House and pending in the Senate:

H.J. Res. 375, providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument.

H.R. 189, to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California.

H.R. 384, to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes.

H.R. 393, to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

H.R. 2512, to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2664, to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

H.R. 2988, to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities.

H.R. 2989, to further amend the Missing Persons Act to cover certain persons detained in foreign countries against their will, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3179, to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4177, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city.

H.R. 4739, to amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, with regard to advance movement of dependents and baggage and household effects of members of the uniformed services.

H.R. 6000, to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

H.R. 6767, to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents.

H.R. 7248, to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194.

H.R. 7356, to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

H.R. 7499, to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.

H.R. 8200, to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8265, to confer jurisdiction over the Iowa ordnance plant reservation upon the State of Iowa.

H.R. 8427, to provide for the establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes.

RÉSUMÉ OF ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEES

National Military Airlift Subcommittee

March 1, 1963, the chairman appointed a special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift to review the actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in the 1960 report of the previous Airlift Subcommittee.

The subcommittee was to determine the degree to which the previous recommendations had been implemented, update all the salient points pertinent to military airlift, and determine whether or not any new problems had arisen during the 3-year interval.

The review revealed that of the 11 recommendations made in the 1960 report, 10 had been implemented in whole or major part.

The one recommendation on which no action had been taken was the redesignation of MATS as the Military Airlift Command. At the conclusion of this year's review the subcommittee reiterated its conviction that sound reasons exist for this redesignation.

The subcommittee was gratified to learn that the long-range airlift capabilities of MATS have been increased by 60 percent over the past 3 years, and that this capability will be quadrupled by 1968 if the current C-141 procurement program is fully implemented. However, deficiencies in airlift capabilities remain because of the Army reorganization under the ROAD concept and because of increased emphasis on maintaining a quick reaction capability to move Army forces to any trouble spot in the world.

The deficiencies result in part from the fact that substantial tonnages of very heavy and outsized equipment that is organic to an Army division cannot be air transported at all, or can now be transported only in the C-124 and C-133 aircraft. Both of these aircraft currently are planned to be phased out of the active inventory in the 1968-69 time period.

It is the judgment of the subcommittee that a new, very large, turbine-powered aircraft must be developed as a followon for the C-124's and C-133's. The subcommittee recommended the earliest possible approval of plans for the development of such an aircraft.

Subcommittee for Special Investigations

House Resolution 84, passed by the House, January 31, 1963, authorizes the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

1. Relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of material, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

2. Relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

3. Involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

4. Involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense;

5. Relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services; and

6. All other matters within the legislative jurisdiction conferred by law or the rules of the House of Representatives upon the Committee on Armed Services.

House Resolution 146, passed by the House February 27, 1963, appropriated $150,000 for the expenses of conducting the investigations and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 84. Both resolutions were made effective from January 4, 1963.

On January 29, 1963, by Committee Resolution No. 5, the Committee on Armed Services authorized a special investigations subcommittee, with the members of the majority to be selected by the chairman of the committee and those from the minority to be selected upon recommendation of the ranking minority member of the full committee. Pursuant to this authority, Chairman VINSON, by letter dated January 31, 1963, to Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., appointed the following as members of the subcommittee: Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman; Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Hon. OTIS G. PIKE, Hon. WALTER NORBLAD, and Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER.

This subcommittee has jurisdiction over such matters as are assigned to it by the chairman of the full committee in accordance with House Resolution 84.

The subcommittee operates within the general scope of subcommittees previously organized by the Committee on Armed Services, under successive resolutions since the 81st Congress. The subcommittee's rules appear in a document entitled "Rules and Organization of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Under Authority of House Resolution 84, 88th Congress." The rules were adopted at an executive session of the subcommittee on March 5, 1963, and ordered to be printed for the information of persons having business before the subcommittee.

The professional staff and clerical assistance authorized under House Resolution 146 consist of a special counsel, an investigator, and three clerical employees.

The monthly and cumulative expenses of the subcommittee are reported in its monthly report, submitted by the chairman of the full committee to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. These expenses also were reported in detail in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this year.

STUDIES RESULTING IN REPORTS AND/OR HEARINGS

1. Relation of cost data to military procurement

The authority of the General Accounting Office to examine cost data was challenged by a contractor from whom the Department of the Air Force had purchased electronic equipment under a contract which totaled approximately $2 million. The contractor, Hewlett-Packard Co. of Palo Alto, Calif., sought support for its position in part in Public Law 87-653. The immediate purpose of the subcommittee's inquiry was to review the facts to determine the need for or desirability of recommending legislative action to clarify the intent of Congress in existing legislation.

After several weeks of investigation both in Washington, D.C., and at Dayton, Ohio, a hearing was held on May 22, 1963, at which representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Department of Defense testified. Representatives of the Department of the Air Force and Hewlett-Packard Co. attended as observers.

The subcommittee has taken no further action, since the General Accounting Office and Hewlett-Packard Co. agreed to submit the dispute to the courts for judicial determination. The matter is presently being handled by the Department of Justice.

The hearings have been printed.

2. Russian trawlers traffic in U.S. territorial waters

The subcommittee received reports concerning the activity of the Russian fishing fleet, particularly along the coast of Florida. After several weeks of investigation, both in Washington and the field, public hearings were held on July 9 and 10. Testimony was received from representatives of the U.S. Coast Guard, the Department of State, the Department of the Navy, and a private charter-boat operator. The hearings were printed.

The subcommittee submitted a unanimous report to the chairman of the full committee which recommended, among other things (1) that the Departments of State and the Navy, and the Coast Guard adopt a uniform national policy which would permit the Coast Guard to take such immediate and unilateral action as may be required in the national interest whenever vessels having electronic or other capabilities which constitute a threat to the security of our country are found transiting our territorial waters; and (2) that the Seventh Coast Guard District publicize the assistance which civilian sources could render to augment its surveillance activities, and, particularly, invite commercial and private boatowners to report all sightings of Iron Curtain craft in U.S. coastal waters.

The agencies concerned were requested to comment on the recommendations. Their responses indicated general agreement; the Coast Guard response contained the details of the national policy on the surveillance of the Russian trawlers, as well as the procedures established by the three agencies to implement the policy. The policy, if fully implemented, would meet generally the subcommittee's recommendations.

3. Air defense system changes

On April 26, 1963, the Department of Defense, through its Office of Public Affairs, announced "a realinement of the U.S. air defense forces." The announcement identified by location the 6 semiautomatic ground environment (SAGE) direction centers and 17 long-range radars that would be closed.

At the direction of the chairman of the full committee, an investigation was initiated in May 1963 to determine the procedural manner in which the decision was made and the effect of the planned changes on our defense system. The investigation entailed the review and analysis of several thousand pages of Department of Defense, North American Air Defense Command, and Air Defense Command documents, the interview of numerous military and Department of Defense personnel and 3 days of hearings, June 20, and July 11 and 18, which, because of the nature of the security information involved, were held in executive session.

The subcommittee's unanimous report, also classified, was transmitted to the chairman of the full committee by letter from the chairman of the subcommittee on October 28, 1963. Chairman VINSON, in turn, transmitted copies of the report to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force, inviting any comments they cared to make, particularly with respect to the report's salient conclusions. Secretary Zuckert's reply of November 6, 1963, indicated his support for the Air Force position expressed to the subcommittee by Assistant Secretary Imirie and General LeMay. An interim acknowledgment of November 1, 1963, was received from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, but no official comment on the conclusions has been made by Mr. McNamara.

4. Air Force procurement policies, procedures, and practices

In order to examine certain stated Air Force procurement policies, procedures, and practices and compare them with actual performance, the subcommittee chose as a case study contracts between the Air Force and TYCO Laboratories, Inc. The contracts call for basic research in the field of energy conversion; their costs to date are $1,150,000, and the Air Force has stated that before the work is completed the cost to the Government may run as high as $10 million. The contracts are sponsored by the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, one of the tenant organizations at Hanscom Air Force Base, Bedford, Mass.; the laboratories are a part of the Air Force Office of Aerospace Research. Procurement services are provided the laboratories by the Electronic Systems Division (ESD), the host organization at Hanscom. ESD is a part of the Air Force Systems Command.

The subcommittee's inquiry to date has been directed toward determining whether the Air Force has properly executed its contracting responsibilities; particularly, whether the procurement function of ESD has been dominated in this instance by Cambridge Research Laboratories.

The study is not complete at this date. Five days of public hearings have been held, August 21, November 12, 13, and 14, and December 2, 1963. A report is being drafted and it is expected that it will be ready for submission to the chairman of the full committee in early January 1964.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AND SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The reports of the General Accounting Office on subjects within the purview of the subcommittee are referred to the subcommittee as they are issued.

CONTINUING STUDIES

The subcommittee has under continuing study a number of specific cases which fall into rather definite groupings. Practically all of these relate to procurement, including such categories as sole source, small business, inadequacy or restrictiveness of bid invitation specifications, etc.

What I Believe and Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, an article entitled "What I Believe and Why," written by President Lyndon B. Johnson in April 1959, appeared in the Reader's Digest of January 1964.

I think this is a significant article, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD today:

WHAT I BELIEVE AND WHY

(By Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States)

(NOTE.—President Johnson wrote this revealing declaration of his personal and political philosophy when both he and the late President Kennedy were serving in the U.S. Senate. First published in the Texas Quarterly, it is reprinted here from the April 1959 Reader's Digest.)

I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat—in that order. I am also a liberal, a conservative, a Texan, a taxpayer, a rancher, a businessman, a consumer, a parent, a voter, and not as young as I used to be nor as old as I expect to be—and I am all these things in no fixed order.

I am unaware of any descriptive word in the second sentence which modifies, amends, or is related by hyphenation to the terms listed in the first sentence. In consequence, I am not able to define my political philosophy by the choice of a one- or two-word label.

At the heart of my own beliefs is a rebellion against this very process of labeling and filing Americans under headings: regional, economic, occupational, religious, racial, or otherwise. I bridle at the casualness with which we ask each other, "What is your political philosophy?" I resent the question not because I suspect it of guile and cunning, but for its innocence. Our political philosophies, I have found, are the sum of our life's experience. God made no man so simple or his life so sterile that such experience can be summarized in an adjective.

I regard the right to hold one's own political philosophy as a cornerstone of American freedom. Our Constitution is distinctive in that it prescribes no national dogma: economic, social, or religious. The mandate of our American system—and perhaps its ultigate genius—is that the people shall be the true philosophers of the government within limits set by our Nation's basic law.

This is an ennobling concept, but it has certain frailties and we seem quick nowadays to crush it. We crush out the individuality of our political beliefs and, by this process of high-speed sorting and classifying Americans, automate our choice of courses and sterilize our explorations of the reasons why. The American in me, as well as the Texan, reacts strongly against the merging of the individual into the mass in the name of dogma.

Some might point to the Senate, where I serve, and suggest that the example there of a two-party, two-philosophy system contradicts this thesis. The opposite is so. Had I not been privileged to serve in Congress, I might never have come to hold the respect for individuality of philosophy that I do.

The very purpose of our Congress is to arrive at national decisions by bringing together 534 individuals, representing some 174 million individuals, to achieve a consent on the way the Nation should go. Were we bound by rigid dogmas, there would be no more cause for assembling Congress than for bringing the Soviet Presidium together. We are not so bound, and it is a great part of my own philosophy that the Congress reaches a very dubious decision when its choices are made solely by head counts of the partisan division.

This leads to a listing of the specific tenets of my own beliefs:

First. I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

Second. I believe there is always a national answer to each national problem, and, believing this, I do not believe that there are necessarily two sides to every question.

Third. I regard achievement of the full potential of our resources—physical and human—to be the highest purpose of governmental policies, next to the protection of those rights we regard as inalienable.

Fourth. I regard waste as the continuing enemy of our society, and the prevention of waste—of resources, of lives, of opportunity—to be the most pressing of the responsibilities of our Government.

These tenets, I concede, are simple. They are certainly personal, for I have developed them over 50 years from my own experience.

Concerning the first, I realize that in these times it may seem excessively idealistic. But I do not believe that it is, either in principle or in practice.

Always in my work at Washington I am reminded of my own origins. I was born to the hill country of Texas, a remote region then and still remote today. My neighbors and relatives there live independently, self-contained. They are distant from many national issues, yet neither distance nor limited information makes them any less a party to the decisions we reach in Congress. Knowing them as I do, I know that it would be much more difficult for me to secure unanimous agreement among them than among the Senators in Washington. In this individuality, my neighbors are not different from Americans everywhere. There is likely to be merit in the views of the minority. We have an obligation to seek out that merit, and not merely to content ourselves with obliging the majority. For the majority's wisdom—however wise—is never the sum of all wisdom.

What we do too often now is to resort to expedients. To grant audiences to 174 million Americans would be exhausting. So we make our classifications, and our cross-classifications, which permit us to forgo the listening and the searching we ought to do. Trouble compounds when, having made our divisions on one basis, we extend the application to other issues and other decisions. Adopting such a pattern, we construct false equations which produce false answers.

This equation process is much a part of our party systems, and contributes to the myth that "there are two sides to every question." True, there are two parties. That is not the same as two sides. But, by maintaining the two-side concept, we satisfy our consciences that when a partisan majority has prevailed there is no need to reexamine an issue. Our reasoning is that since there are two sides, either side would have been acceptable, and hence the answer decided by political strength does not require closer scrutiny.

This popular view is, I feel, counter to our basic American philosophy. I do not believe we have arrived at an answer until we have found the national answer—the answer all reasonable men can agree upon—and our work is not done until that answer is found, even if the process requires years.

Here fits the third tenet of my philosophy—and the fourth. Had America been bound by the Constitutional Convention to the philosophies of the 18th century—and by the limits of the wisdom and vision of those times—we would not have the nation that is ours today. Our rising greatness through more than 180 years has come from our freedom to apply our accumulating knowledge to the processes of our self-government. Or, to state it another way, this has come because America's course has been left to the living. Thus, the 18th-century Constitution has allowed for growth so that it is still strong, still good for our 20th century.

Our Nation, like all other nations, is possessed of certain resources—of nature, of position and of the human mind. Whatever we are to be, we must build from those things at our disposal, and to content ourselves with less than the ultimate potential is to deny our heritage and our duty.

Obviously, having come from a land like Texas, I feel this strongly. Of all endeavors on which I have worked in public life, I am proudest of the accomplishments in developing the Lower Colorado River. It is not the damming of the stream or the harnessing of the floods in which I take pride, but rather in the ending of the waste of the region.

The region—so unproductive in my youth—is now a vital part of the national economy and potential. More important, the wastage of human resources in the whole region has been reduced. New horizons have been opened to young minds, if by nothing more than the advent of electricity into rural homes. Men and women have been released from the waste of drudgery and toil against the unyielding rock of the Texas hills. This is fulfillment of the true responsibility of government.

Conversely, the elimination of waste of this sort carries with it a continuing obligation for government—at all levels—not to create waste itself by extracting from the people the fruits of their new opportunities through improvident excesses in spending and taxing. This is an increasingly critical problem.

These, then, are the tenets of my political philosophy. Some who equate personal philosophies with popular dogmas might inquire, endlessly, as to my "position" on this or that issue. Philosophies, however, are not made of answers to issues, but of approaches more enduring and encompassing. With these approaches I have set down I can seek and, I believe, find answers to issues as they arise.

By personal choice I am a Democrat, for in that party I can best apply and express my beliefs. But I am, as I said in the beginning, a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator and a Democrat, in that order—and there, for me, the classifying stops.

Independence Day of Western Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the first sovereign Polynesian state was inaugurated on January 1, 1962, when Western

Samoa became independent. The anniversary of the important occasion is being observed today, and I take this opportunity to congratulate Head of State Chief Malietoa Tanumafili II, Prime Minister Fiame Mata'afa Faumina, and the people of Western Samoa.

New Zealand occupied the group of tropical islands in the South Pacific in 1914 and administered it as a mandate and, later, as a trusteeship. In a plebiscite in May 1961 a substantial majority of the Samoan voters expressed themselves in favor of independence on January 1, 1962.

The young nation, now 2 years old, is often pictured as a romantic South Sea island area where nature supplies most of the simple needs of the people with a minimum of effort. But the Western Samoans know that although the islands are endowed generously with beauty and a favorable climate, these are not enough to face the reality and demands of independence.

The nation's population, now about 150,000, is increasing rapidly. The rate of growth is among the world's highest. The average annual cash income is less than $30 a person. While it is true that cash requirements are not extensive in this South Sea island society, the needs are still greater than the income.

The economy is based on tropical agriculture. The three chief products are copra, cocoa, and bananas, and all three are threatened in varying degrees by diseases, typhoons, and other problems. New food and export crops are needed to provide for the growing population, but further land development is, of course, limited.

It is also true that there are only a few leaders of real competence among the western Samoans, although there may be some in the making. Very few have had the training or the education to prepare them to handle the problems of government. New Zealand must, to an extent, accept responsibility for this state of affairs. In carrying out its mandate New Zealand's biggest fault was its failure to give the Samoans technical and administrative training. On the other hand, New Zealand has much on the credit side; it showed a remarkable willingness to grant the people of western Samoa independence at an early stage; and it has given the Samoans considerable financial benefits. New Zealand is contributing $225,000 a year toward educational development in western Samoa. As an independence gift, New Zealand also donated assistance to strengthen the administrative system at a cost of $125,000 a year for 5 years.

Western Samoa, unlike many newly independent countries, has not sought to establish many diplomatic posts overseas. It has realized that it not only would be an expensive undertaking, but that it would also divert talent abroad just when it is most needed at home. Western Samoa's foreign affairs are handled through New Zealand diplomatic missions.

For the present the Polynesian state does not propose to join the United Nations, although it has become a member of the United Nations' Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—ECAFE. The step has made western Samoa eligible for assistance from the agency.

The question of joining the British Commonwealth has also been put aside for the moment by western Samoa. For the time being the Commonwealth countries are treating the new state more or less as if it were a member.

Modern western Samoa is working hard today to make itself an effective and responsible member of the world community. The progress of the first Polynesian state of the 20th century meanwhile is being watched closely by other island groups in the Pacific that are approaching independence.

Hatred Pulls Triggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial by Mr. George W. Hess in the St. Helens (Oreg.) Sentinel Mist entitled "Hatred Pulls Triggers." This is very timely in view of the fact that the Congress is currently considering regulation of firearms:

HATRED PULLS TRIGGERS

Assassination of President John F. Kennedy with a cheap but deadly mail-order rifle turned national attention toward the easy availability of firearms to irresponsible persons in this country.

It engendered a wave of emotional and sometimes almost hysterical clamor for tighter controls on purchase, possession, and use of guns. There even were some suggestions for abridgement of the constitutionally guaranteed right of every law-abiding citizen to keep and bear arms.

Now that the period of national mourning has ended, and with it the bitterest pangs of poignant national grief at losing a respected leader, it is time to review the firearm aspect of the tragedy from a calmer perspective.

In the first place, banning firearms because a fanatic used a gun to murder a President is like outlawing automobiles because more than 30,000 persons are killed in car wrecks every year. It is attacking the effect rather than the cause.

Stronger legislation to curtail sale of weapons to persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents and other social undesirables would be some help in curbing misuse of firearms. However, in the long run its main result would be merely to increase the cost to furtive purchasers of guns for illicit use.

Much stiffer penalties for use of a dangerous weapon in the commission of a crime would be a stronger deterrent to illegal utilization of firearms. Great Britain has such laws, so stringent that it has been found unnecessary to arm her uniformed policemen with anything more potent than a club.

Again such regulation bears little relationship to a gun used for political murder. The head of the Secret Service has said there is no sure way to protect a leader from a patient, intelligent, and determined would-be assassin armed with a high-powered rifle.

The relative simplicity and ease with which President Kennedy was killed, apparently by a social misfit without accomplices bears this out.

Instead of melting its arsenal of privately owned guns, the United States must find means to uproot the myriad big and tiny plots blossoming into a great vineyard of hate in the Nation. The real cause is philosophic, not materialistic, in the pulling of triggers in Dallas, across the South, and even at Ford's Theater a century ago.

In a land where hatred for constitutional authority, for Negro, Catholic, Jew, policeman, Yankee, businessman, union member, Protestant, Puerto Rican, or politician is nurtured by parents and taught to children generation by generation, the elimination of triggers will not stay the assassin's hand.

Milwaukee Steamfitter, Professor, Cite Need for Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the need for the tax cut contained in the administration's tax reduction-reform legislation, now pending in the other body, was dramatically pointed up in an article which appeared in the January 1964 issue of the United Auto Workers' UAW Solidarity newspaper.

It tells the story of Marion Matyasz, a 37-year-old father of four and a steamfitter at American Motors Corp., in Milwaukee and how a tax cut would benefit him and thousands of other American workers like him.

The article also cites the views on the tax cut of Matyasz's fellow Milwaukeean, Prof. Robert J. Barr, chairman of the economics department at Marquette University. Professor Barr believes that a tax reduction would substantially aid the economy and increase employment.

I commend this interesting and informative article to the attention of my colleagues:

AN INCOME TAX CUT NOW WILL HELP CREATE JOBS

In Marion Matyasz's 1960 Rambler Ambassador, it's a 12-minute drive from the American Motors plant to his home at 1623 Belleview on Milwaukee's northeast side.

"Another $4,000 and she's all ours," Marion said for the third time. He was standing in snow looking up toward his seven-room frame house.

"She's probably 50 years old already," he added.

When you ask a fellow what he'd do if he had a little extra income every year, there's a good chance he'll think quickly about the mortgage.

All the way from the plant, Marion's conversation kept swinging back to crowded, aging Belleview Place—a big-city street on which his youngsters were growing up, along which his wife walked to the supermarket and which, in late December, looked clean with snow.

Marion Matyasz, 37, father of four, UAW member and steamfitter at American Motors, had been talking about what he and his family could do if their income taxes were

cut, as President Kennedy, and now President Johnson, thought they should be.

"We're all in the same boat, kind of," Marion said. "We've talked about the tax cut at the shop and everybody figures a hundred ways to spend the extra money."

This would confound some of the conservatives in and around Government who claim families would salt away a good percentage of what they might save in taxes.

"What no one at the shop can figure is: Why is it taking so long to get taxes cut? They've been debating it in Washington for almost a year."

Marion's right: the proposal to reduce taxes paid by all income-tax paying families has been talked about, written about and examined from all angles, by experts and those who parade as experts.

Yet the U.S. Senate hasn't been allowed to vote on the proposal because Virginia Senator HARRY BYRD insists Government spending must drop in an amount at least equal to the total cut in income taxes. Such a cut in Government outlays, of course, would wipe out the effects of the tax cut.

And so liberals and conservatives in Government have been locked over a question of economics. Liberals say: more family purchasing power will create more demand, thus more jobs. Conservatives (while demanding more tax relief for business) nevertheless say: Government spending must be reduced if income taxes are reduced, otherwise inflation will set in.

The liberal's reply: but if Marion Matyasz and all other people who benefit from a tax reduction spend that money, new jobs will be created, business will be stimulated—and Government eventually will get back more in revenue than it released by cutting taxes in the first place.

So Marion Matyasz is an important young man, in more ways than one. His spending can prove the liberals right.

The tax-cut proposal would free an extra $8 billion for family spending.

The Matyasz family's share would be more than $100 a year.

"It'd be nice to guarantee the wife and kids a little vacation next summer," Marion threw in as a late thought on how he'd spend his "share."

Apart from the economics involved, there are a few moral considerations such as: giving families a chance to meet more of their needs. Such as: trying to use the powerful taxing system to create more jobs.

Marion Matyasz may not realize it but he's among the elite of the 10 million Americans who work in manufacturing industries.

He's a skilled tradesman earning $3.30 an hour and yet:

He's given up bowling to help meet family expenses.

He's "getting hemmed in" by medical expenses.

"A nicer home" keeps getting further away.

Fully employed most of the past 10 years, Marion has no complaints. In fact, he considers himself lucky.

If he readily could use more dollars to meet his family's needs, imagine how much more lesser-paid workers need help.

"We're now saving around $150 a year," Marion said, looking quickly at his wife, Marcella, who keeps the family budget. She nodded.

"That's crisis money—or new home money. Whichever comes first," Mrs. Matyasz said.

"Like I said, we're not complaining. I know a lot of guys who aren't as lucky as we are. I wish they were.

"If you have to tell people how much I owe on the house, how I have to kick the television set before it'll work and if you have to say we're living in a part of the city that isn't the suburbs, if you have to say all these things to prove that a guy even as well off as I am could really use a hundred more dollars a year—then say it."

Give Marion Matyasz and his family $100 more a year to spend and there's a good chance that a recession can be avoided in 1964.

Deny the Matyasz family and millions like them this additional purchasing power and 1964 could see the Nation's employment level drop off seriously.

That's the opinion of Prof. Robert J. Barr, chairman of the economics department of Marquette University, considering the importance of income tax-cut proposals now awaiting action in Congress.

Professor Barr has never met Marion Matyasz—but by now he knows his story. Marion might be surprised to know that he could be the subject of discussion in economics classes conducted by Professor Barr as the Milwaukee economist tries to make a very important point to his students:

"This country needs a tax cut now, to stimulate the economy, to create the greater business activity which, in turn, could create new employment—all of which would generate new revenues for government."

Professor Barr has been at Marquette since 1937. He came here from the University of Toledo. Canadian-born, he considers himself a conservative in economics, a self-rating which doubtless would surprise Milwaukee's liberal community.

Professor Barr is worried today.

"We can't expect the automobile industry to keep having record sales years. When the market falters, the steel industry and all related industries will falter.

"We should be concerned about the home construction industry because it seems to have extended itself beyond the capacity of people's ability to buy."

And Professor Barr worries about this fact: The rate of unemployment stays high despite the general look of prosperity.

He favors the income tax-cut proposal as one quick move that will add new zest to our economy.

He would also like to see Government increase its spending rather than decrease it.

"Unfortunately, the influence of government hasn't been allowed to bear fully on the economic problems we face," he said.

If spending generates business activity and assures high employment, then the benefits of increased private spending (by individuals and business) shouldn't be cancelled out by curbing the Government's role as a spender, he continued.

"I hope our autoworker friend, Marion Matyasz, gets his income tax reduction soon," Professor Barr said. "And by that I mean all American families.

"I'm sure they will prove, by spending to meet their needs, that as a nation we can do more than just hope for better times."

The Bright and Challenging Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently the chamber of commerce at Rock Hill, S.C., was privileged to have presented to them an address by one of the great industrial and transportation leaders of our country, Mr. D. W. Brosnan, president of the Southern Railway System. Rather than try to add to the magnificence of his remarks by comment. I include as part of my remarks President Brosnan's challenging address:

THE BRIGHT AND CHALLENGING FUTURE

(Address by D. W. Brosnan, president, Southern Railway System, before the chamber of commerce, Rock Hill, S.C., November 12, 1963)

According to your local history, Rock Hill's first building lots were laid out in 1851 and your city began to have a future. It came to have that future only because another already existing and thriving community and its citizens lacked the vision to understand what a railroad could mean for them. They rejected the future. Here is what happened:

A railroad had been begun in 1847 to connect the cities of Charlotte and Columbia. Opposition developed to having the railroad run through an existing town, and it was necessary to lay out a new route which traversed what were then virgin forests and some cultivated land in this general area. The town that turned down the railroad is not much larger today than it was in 1847.

A gift of land from a supporter of the new railroad led to the present site of Rock Hill being used as a supply depot and place of residence for workers building the Charlotte & South Carolina Railroad. Rock Hill was on its way. It was later to have another railroad built through it—ambitiously named the Charleston, Cincinnati & Chicago. This railroad and the Charlotte & South Carolina are now part of Southern Railway.

You are heirs of the faith and judgment of those men of more than a century ago who recognized that railroads could bring new meaning into the lives and fortunes of residents of this great State of South Carolina. Rock Hill exists as proof they were right. They were right in their time. If you doubt at all they were also right for your time, try to imagine Rock Hill without railroad service.

All the prosperity you have—the growth that has occurred and is still to occur—is founded on your bedrock resource of railroad service. Industry would not have been interested in Rock Hill if it had no railroad. Highways and the motor carrier industry that uses these highways add a further dimension of usefulness in your economy but it still remains true in this country today that no important industrial center—large or small—exists where there is no railroad.

I am not here tonight to attack highway carriers or barge lines. As a matter of fact, I approve of them if for no other reason than that they provide competitive forces in transportation that keep railroads trying to improve on what they have to offer the public. Monopoly never has the right answers to improving services and products and lowering prices for people. Competition does, and we would all be very much better off if that truth were fully recognized in the laws regulating railroads, laws which unnecessarily limit competition.

Whatever limits competition in transportation adds to the costs American industry must include in prices it charges customers, both domestic and foreign. Transportation is a business cost which often can be the determining factor in the success or failure of any given industry.

Competition in transportation is imperative if any industry is to be well served at lowest prices in its own competitive struggles. Great emphasis is placed nowadays upon American efforts to penetrate foreign markets with American goods. Equally, there is great concern about the ability of American industry to meet competition in domestic markets from foreign-made products. Whether goods are intended for export or are to be sold here in competition with imported products, waste anywhere in the production cycle cannot be tolerated if success is to be achieved.

South Carolina, for example, knows about the effect of foreign competition in the textile products markets of this country and in the sale of American textiles abroad. You and I understand that many factors are involved and I do not suggest that a reduction in transportation costs can by itself remedy present difficulties. But this much is sure. Any reduction in the costs of transportation from raw materials sources through processing, handling and distribution to final markets can help relieve the cost-price squeeze in the textile industry and all other industries.

On Southern Railway we know it is good business to try to lower the prices we must charge customers. More than this, we think we have a moral obligation to try to help people save money on transportation. Every penny Southern makes is earned in the South and this demands much of us. Our fortunes are tied directly to the South's present economic welfare and to the agricultural, industrial and business growth the South will make in future years. We intend to continue to do our share to encourage growth.

Southern Railway has been an active builder of the South since 1894 when the present company was formed. It has willingly assumed the obligations of encouraging agricultural and industrial growth. No other mode of transportation except your railroads dedicates any substantial part of its income and management talent to such purposes. We have never been economic parasites.

Industry needs and must have railroad service. Proof of this can be found that just within the past 10 years about 3,500 firms have built new plants or warehouses or substantially expanded existing ones along Southern Railway System lines alone.

About one-tenth of these, or 345 to be exact, have been in South Carolina. They represent a total investment of $418 million and furnish employment at good wages to about 35,000 people in South Carolina. About 20 percent of the spending for industry in South Carolina has occurred within your own York County. It certainly isn't hard to understand why Rock Hill has grown and far more than doubled in population.

Southern works cooperatively with local chambers of commerce like your own, and with other development agencies in the South. We play no favorites—the important thing is that new industries are located in the area we serve. They bring more job opportunities for people, especially our young people, and they are income builders for communities. Our job is to help get industries located where they want to be and to serve them well once they are located.

Serving well means keeping transportation prices down for old and new industries along Southern lines. We have worked on this extensively and intensively for years and are beginning to see some measurable results of our efforts. It takes time and talent and money to generate lower costs that can be converted into lower prices for customers. We've put all three to work in the public interest—in your interest—trying to meet our moral obligation to develop the best and lowest priced transportation posisble.

There's a great challenge—actually hundreds of different challenges—in meeting such an obligation. Often we must ignore tradition and break new ground. Spurring us on is the knowledge that our success as a railroad is measured strictly in terms of our usefulness to people and our ability to save them money.

I've time tonight to talk of only one such instance. The way in which we worked it out will contribute enormously to the future of the South as a whole and will have a very favorable economic impact in Rock Hill. This can amount to millions of dollars of new income annually in the trading territory of which you are the center.

Several years ago we took a long hard look at the grain traffic we were handling on Southern. More particularly we took a long hard look at the traffic we weren't handling. A study was begun of ways to get grain traffic into railroad cars. We learned that unregulated itinerant highway truckers were our principal competitors. Our job would be to develop services, equipment, and pricing that would match or better what our competition was doing.

Before we were through we had broken new ground in a number of fields. We needed huge, lightweight, cost-saving cars to handle grain in large loads. There weren't any to be had. So we designed them ourselves and had them built. Our design called for the use of aluminum. No railroad car builder was experienced in using aluminum, and we had to go to the aircraft industry for advice. We got it and the cars were built—more than $13 million worth of cars for hauling grain.

That was only a beginning. We worked out details for using these cars that would let us offer the lowest possible prices to customers. Prices had to be low to meet competition. We found we could offer prices that would return us a handsome profit although we reduced our rates an average of 60 percent to bring grain in bulk from the grain-surplus Midwest into the Southeast which raises only a small part of the grain it consumes. Savings throughout the South as a result of the rates will be between $35 and $40 million a year just on the grain presently shipped into the South from other parts of the country. A Clemson agricultural economist estimates South Carolina's savings at from $3 to $4 million a year on present grain usage alone.

It took about 22 months before we could put the rates into effect and they really aren't safely in effect yet. Extended Interstate Commerce Commission hearings and lawsuits brought in the Federal courts by opponents to the rates—none of whom must have their rates approved either in waterway or highway movements—held up the savings to you and others in the South. Then the ICC decided it wanted to protect the barge operators on the Tennessee River who carry grain at any price they choose. The Commission said Southern would have to increase the low rates by 16 percent to protect Tennessee River ports.

Southern doesn't want the increase. Our present low price is a proper one. In fact, the increase will cause us to lose business we are now getting. The increased rate ordered by the ICC would not be a sufficiently competitive one to attract business. This would be bad for us. But it will be even worse for you.

What the Commission has done is to discriminate against every inland city and town in the South, telling them, in effect, that they are second-class places that have no right to the same low freight rates as towns and cities that are located on rivers. If the Commission's action which we are fighting in the Federal courts is allowed to stand, Rock Hill and York County will lose millions of dollars annually. Here's why:

You lie in the center of an important but only partially developed livestock and beef cattle region. One of the things holding up further development is that it costs too much to import the feed grains needed to finish off the beef cattle into high-class marketable animals. Today the Southeast, with 16 percent of the population of the country, only feeds out 3 percent of the finished beef. Additionally, the Southeast consumes, each year, 1 billion pounds more beef and 1 billion pounds more pork than it produces.

South Carolina itself consumes 119 million pounds more beef than it produces, 110 million pounds more pork than it produces, and 11 million pounds more chickens than it produces. As you can see, it will be of great economic importance for South Carolina to be able to raise what it consumes in these food categories. High grain freight rates has been one of the important factors in retarding this development.

As things are today, the entire Southeast produces only a fractional part of the beef and pork its people consume. Studies by agricultural economists indicate that just closing the present gap between production and consumption can mean a billion dollars a year to the Southeast in additional income from livestock, meat processing, and associated industries. A very substantial share of this added income—amounting to many millions annually—would be generated right here in York County and in the Rock Hill market territory. I know you could use it.

Southern is going to help you get this additional income. For example, earlier this year we created a new department on our railway with the sole responsibility that of serving and furthering the growth of agri-business in the areas we serve in the South. The head of this department, with the title of manager, Agri-Business Services, is John Duncan, a successful Georgia farmer and former president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation. He recently was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Government, which post he resigned to come with Southern.

South Carolina's importance in this program was given recognition several weeks ago through the appointment of Heyward N. Dantzler as assistant manager, Agri-Business Services, with headquarters at Columbia. Before coming to work for Southern he was commodity director for the South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation and last year was named "Young Farmer of the Year" by the Orangeburg Chamber of Commerce. He was a leader in getting the Charleston elevator that has been such an important factor in the exportation of soybeans produced in South Carolina and adjoining States. In his new post with Southern he will devote his time and effort exclusively to assisting in the development of South Carolina's agricultural industry.

Clemson College reported recently that "livestock, a dynamic agricultural enterprise, kicked in some $110 million, or 30 percent of the total farm income, into the business tills of the State last year." This can be greatly increased and will be if a great cattle-fattening industry isn't killed off by the arbitrary action of the ICC in favoring river over inland points on grain freight rates. According to the Clemson people there are about three-fourths of a million acres of idle land in South Carolina that can be put to profitable livestock use.

It's good to have you on Southern's side in this fight to keep the advantage of greatly needed low grain freight rates. Rock Hill has joined with more than 100 other South Carolina cities, towns, and public bodies in opposing in the Federal courts the Commission's action that would raise the rates. Dozens of livestock and poultry and feedmill firms and associations have also joined the fight to let progress continue in South Carolina under competitively low freight rates that will help build the agri-business of the State.

You are entitled to the best low prices we can generate for you. Southern intends that you shall have these to the full extent of its ability to put them in force. Excessive and outmoded regulation of railroads hampers us in many instances today and keeps you from saving money. Congress has legislation before it in the form of bills Nos. S. 1061 in the Senate and H.R. 4700 in the House of Representatives that will cure this. They should be passed to let all common carriers compete on more nearly equal terms for your business.

Their passage will mean savings of billions of dollars a year for the American people when competition replaces regulation. I urge you that you tell your Senators and your local Representative in Congress that you want these bills passed. They are important to every person, every industry, every farmowner in South Carolina.

Rock Hill and Southern have a bright and challenging future. Our partnership which started in 1852 is still vigorous today and is on the threshold of an even greater future. That's why I urge you to help us to extend our usefulness. We will all benefit if you do your part and demand that we be free to serve you with our best low prices. Always remember that you are saving your money when railroads lower prices.

Sister Carries on Brother's Work in Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this opening day of a new session of the Congress of the United States, I am expressing for all the people of the Second Congressional District of Illinois our heartfelt good wishes to Miss Elena Radley in the work of dedication she is undertaking to carry on the unfinished business of her fallen brother. Our thoughts and our prayers will be with her.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the Chicago Sun-Times of January 5, 1964:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 5, 1964]

ELENA RADLEY'S GOAL: SHE'LL CARRY ON DEAD BROTHER'S TASK IN COLOMBIA

Elena Radley's brother, Lawrence, 23, died while serving in the Peace Corps. He was in a DC-3 that crashed in the Colombian jungle on April 22, 1962, killing 30 persons.

The young Chicagoan was one of the first two Peace Corps members to die on assignment. He was honored by the city council and a Peace Corps training camp was named for him as a memorial.

Now dark-haired Elena, a resolute girl of 21, is out to create a greater memorial to her brother's name—a memorial of continuing service. She is going to Colombia for the Corps just as he did.

SHE'LL CARRY ON

Interviewed in her home at 2915 East 77th, Elena said: "I'll tell you one thing. I have a tremendous desire to work with the Colombian people because my brother loved them so much.

"They were warmhearted and responded to him so well. He thought they were wonderful. That's why I want to go."

Elena will be working on an educational television project to tackle the country's illiteracy and general education problems.

"It is work my brother would have loved," she said. Lawrence had a degree in journalism from the University of Illinois and had submitted plans for filming a Colombian community development project a few days before he died.

FUND SET UP

A fund was set up by Field Enterprises Educational Corp. in his name to finance a program for producing visual aids and film strips to be used by Peace Corps instructors.

The youth's father, Albert Radley, is regional sales manager for Field Enterprises Educational Corp., publishers of World Book Encyclopedia.

"My brother had hoped to accomplish a lot in Colombia but, unfortunately, he couldn't," she said. "So I want to work doubly hard."

A UNIVERSITY GRADUATE

Elena is a graduate of South Shore High School and the University of Michigan, where she majored in American studies.

She first decided to join the Peace Corps when she heard the late President John F. Kennedy speak of it at Ann Arbor, Mich., and asked to go to Colombia after her brother died.

She trained for the Corps in New Mexico, where she lived in small villages and taught Spanish-speaking children with the aid of the University of New Mexico's educational television station.

The Good Life of Herbert H. Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit Jewish News of Friday, December 27, 1963, by the distinguished editor and publisher of that fine newspaper, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, entitled "The Good Life of Herbert H. Lehman."

This excellent article sets forth very well the reasons why this distinguished public servant, former Governor of New York, long term U.S. Senator, and beloved fighter for deserving and humanitarian causes, was so much held in the affection of all Americans everywhere. His great humanity, rich contribution to the welfare of the American people, and dedication to the public welfare will long be remembered.

[From the Detroit Jewish News, Dec. 27, 1963]

THE GOOD LIFE OF HERBERT H. LEHMAN

(By Philip Slomovitz)

Herbert H. Lehman lived a good life. He served his country and his faith well. In the final actions of his life, as evidenced by the bequests totaling $815,000, recorded in his will, he continued the generosity that marked his lifetime activities.

What a great lesson is left by this prince among men to the generations that follow him. He had never forgotten the less affluent, and his bequests are an admonition to all his contemporaries not to permit a day to pass, even by those in the best of health and much younger than he was when he was called to the Great Beyond, until they have prepared their final testaments and in them made certain that worthy causes are provided for.

Too many among us think of these things when it is too late. Herbert H. Lehman was never forgetful. Of him it may well be said that he lived well and therefore he died with glory attested to his name.

A great biography was written of him by this country's most eminent historian, Allan Nevins. It was published early this year by Charles Scribner's Sons and was a best seller for many months.

Mr. Lehman liked our review of that biography and he commented on it in three unsolicited letters to this reviewer. Because that review contained several references to unique aspects in the career of the great American Jewish personality, some portions of it are offered here anew:

In "Herbert Lehman and His Era," Allan Nevins, Pulitzer Prize winner for biographical writing, relates the interesting story of this noted leader's life. Mr. Lehman, former Governor of New York and later the Empire State's U.S. Senator, is equally the fearless spokesman for Jewry, and as such also he is portrayed in this impressive biography.

Nevins traced the background of the Lehmans to the arrival in Montgomery, Ala., from Bavaria, of Herbert's father, Mayer. The biographer correctly points out that "no student of southern history needs to be told that from early colonial days Jewish families of intellect, culture, and character enriched the life of the section." He then mentions noted Jews who became prominent in the South.

The story of the elder Lehman and his brothers, which commenced with the mercantile business in Montgomery, continues in New York, where the brothers opened an office in 1858. They retained their southern interests, and Mayer was one of the ardent supporters of the Confederate cause.

Herbert, Mayer's eighth and last child, was born March 28, 1878. He grew up in an environment of pride in the Jewish heritage and faith, of a deep interest in Temple Emanu-El, and other Jewish institutions.

With his brother, Irving, Herbert shared many interests, including the Jewish, and the family's traditional observances, especially at the Passover Seder, are noted. Here is an interesting historical note in relation to the Lehmans and the New York of their time:

"Everywhere in that part of Manhattan were scattered Jewish households, many of which looked to Temple Emanu-El as their religious citadel. Its rabbi, the learned Gustav Gottheil, was a towering figure in moral and spiritual influence. Born and educated in Prussia, he had served in the Berlin Reform Synagogue before he was called to a 13-year pastorate in Manchester. Exposure to the best English liberal thought had helped prepare him for an assistantship to Samuel Adler, who had become rabbi of Temple Emanu-El shortly before the Civil War. Gottheil in 1874 was chosen head of the congregation, over which he was destined to preside for almost a quarter century. Even the orthodox Jews of the city, who at first disliked his heterodox ideas, were charmed by his geniality, generosity, and in later years his Zionist leanings."

It was in such an environment that Herbert H. Lehman grew up. It was in the era of the Strauses and the Seligmans and the Schiffs and the Guggenheims—in an era when Jews emerged as the greatest philanthropists in the land.

Lehman rose to leadership in Jewish ranks as well as in American politics. He became a leader of JDC in the 1920's. He came in contact with the refugee and displaced persons problem as head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

He was not without his experiences with anti-Semites. He had an early experience, in Wurzburg in 1867, when he and one of his sisters encountered Prussian officers who marched straight forward and crowded the young girl into the gutter. "I was mad enough to fight the whole German Army," he said later, and his biographer writes: "It is significant that although he learned to speak German fairly well, he quickly forgot it. German had been the language of Temple Emanu-El until the early 1880's, but with few exceptions, the Jews of central Manhattan had no love for Germany."

Nevins relates here the experience of Joseph Seligman who, as a Jew, was denied stay in a Saratoga Springs Hotel. The episode, he relates, brought a strong eulogy for Jews from Henry Ward Beecher. The offenders soon went bankrupt and Saratoga hotels

were opened to Jews. Nevins relates that Seligman was a friend of President Grant who offered to make him Secretary of the Treasury.

Anti-Semitic occurrences in Russia and Romania and the later Hitlerite events are recalled in evaluating Lehman's relief efforts in association after World War I with Herbert Hoover and in later decades.

Nevins credits Lehman with an understanding of the values of the Yiddish theater and the Yiddish press, although he did not know Yiddish. "The great voting population of the Lower East Side," Nevins writes, "pressing steadily outward (the Yiddish-speaking element being highly mobile) was soon to form a special political body; for though Jews seldom voted as Jews, they did vote with a pervasive intelligence, liberalism, and faith in ethnic democracy. This political body was to prove vital to Herbert Lehman's career."

Lehman's friendship for Alfred A. Smith, his close ties with the Roosevelts, his work with many of the liberal political elements in New York, comprise some of the most valuable and descriptive portions of the Nevins biography. And there also was strong affinity for the movements that assisted in Israel's unbuilding.

Nevins described the Lehmans' visit in Israel at the invitation of David Ben-Gurion, their special interest in Hadassah activities and in the Weizmann Institute. Recalling this visit to Israel in 1949, Nevins writes:

"He and Mrs. Lehman had taken a refugee steamer from Marseilles, the *Negbah*, full of Jewish immigrants; a little vessel of 5,000 tons, but well appointed. Recalling that when they were in the executive mansion in Albany they had always kept a stock of lollipops for the neighborhood children who liked to run in, by a sudden inspiration they carried two large cannisters of candies abroad. Lehman filled his pockets when he went on deck, and by the second day he was 'Uncle Lollipop' to all the youngsters in the vessel. Since this trip he has maintained a close interest in the Weizmann Institute, the Hebrew University, and the Technion in Haifa. He became chairman of the board of overseers of the Jewish Theological Seminary. He has had time to resume his early interest in the Henry Street Settlement, where he and Mrs. Lehman erected a building, 'Pete's House,' in memory of the son lost in the war. A list of the organizations to which he belonged and contributed, made up by Carolin Flexner on October 30, 1945, had numbered 275, ranging from historical societies and civic bodies to Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic philanthropies; and the number hardly shrunk in the ensuing years.

"His sentiment for Isreael has the depth that has become characteristic of him. Some of his fellow Jews thought that it was uncritical, although he emphatically reprobated Irgun and Stern Gang crimes and told Ben-Gurion to his face that he was flagrantly wrong in suggesting that American Jews had a duty to join the ingathering of the race. He had refused to the last to become a Zionist, but once the new nation was born he accepted the fait accompli and supported its growth.

Nevins caught the spirit of Lehman's Jewish loyalties by quoting, at this point, from the principles that were enunciated by George Eliot in "Impressions of Theophrastus Such."

It is the battle that Lehman conducted during his lifetime for social justice, for civil rights, for the good causes that beckoned for champions, that received special emphasis in the Nevins story. In it is portrayed one of the truly great men of our time.

The Lehmans created an ingenious attraction for youngsters of New York (the Lehman Zoo for Children in Central Park, New York City). Nevins stated in the closing paragraphs of his deeply moving biography:

"For a long time the Lehmans, when in town, visited the place daily. They had moments when the satisfaction of this creation seemed more immediate than all the achievements of city affairs, of UNRRA, and of the senatorial years.

"A quietly touching expression of general gratitude, indeed, was visible to the observant in the years. Throughout the city no figure was better known than Lehman's or evoked a more spontaneous manifestation of popular respect. When he alighted from his car in lower Manhattan elderly Jewish watchers could be seen pausing and murmuring cheerfully to each other, 'He looks strong,' or solicitiously, 'He doesn't look so well today.' Most New Yorkers had ceased to wear headgear except in the bleakest weather, but as he walked slowly along the street what hats there were came off in a gesture that had hardly been seen since Peter Cooper's day. At public meetings it was noted that people—especially the older people—would lean out as he passed down the aisle and touch his sleeve, as if they thought that this garment would shed some virtue. If he went to the theater the intermission between acts would bring one or several strangers to his seat: 'I just wanted to say, Mr. Lehman, how much I admire you.' He ran a daily gamut of such tokens of appreciation and deference; and in Al Smith's phrase, they were 'from the heart.'"

They are all well earned encomia. The brilliant Nevins biography proves it.

[From the Detroit Jewish News, Dec. 27, 1963]

RABBI LEHMAN'S J.F.K. TRIBUTE INSERTED IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The address that was delivered by Rabbi Moses Lehrman in tribute to President Kennedy, at the spontaneously gathered memorial service at Congregation B'nai Moshe, has been inserted in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL included the speech with a complimentary reference to Rabbi Lehrman.

The B'nai Moshe service, held on Monday, November 25, the day of the funeral of President Kennedy, drew, on speedy notice, more than 1,600 worshipers.

National Association of Broadcasters Offers Rating Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the recent investigations by Congress into the radio-television ratings industry, I think it is very significant that the National Association of Broadcasters on December 20, 1963, handed down its proposed general criteria for the industry. This is the first concrete effort of the industry to regulate itself rather than be subjected to government regulations. The need for control and reform in the rating field is necessary and the National Association of Broadcasters effort to have all rating firms subscribe to the code is a step in the right direction.

I include in the RECORD a copy of an article from Broadcasting magazine of December 23, 1963, which sets forth the proposed criteria:

NAB OFFERS ITS RATING STANDARDS—RATING FIRMS NEED AUDIT TO GET NAB SEAL OF APPROVAL

Proposed general criteria and standards of National Association of Broadcasters' Ratings Council were in hands of rating services Friday, December 20. In covering letter, Donald McGannon of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (group W) and council chairman, said they were product of several revisions and redrafts.

Specific standards tailored to individual services will be provided in future, he said. Rating firms will be required to subscribe to standards as condition for NAB seal of approval based on independent audits of each service.

There are 14 points under NAB's general "ethical and operational" standards and 14 so-called "disclosure" standards. Under ethical and operational standards, rating services would:

Seek to control all forms of bias in all phases of research; open entire operation to audit service; provide names of respondents to clients except those on permanent sample; "rigorous control" of sample; maintain for 12 months records on all those who refused to keep diary and complete records on where placed; "strict quality control procedures shall be exercised on all external and internal operations before, during and after survey"; verify field work, including spot checks of respondents; require interviews to certify that field work actually has been performed, and encourage fieldmen to report unusual cases of extreme data, such as TV set turned on for 24 straight hours or more, and keep records on disposition of such reports.

Disclosure standards would require concise description in report of precise methodology used, including definition of sample, technique, areas surveyed, periods when data obtained, known shortcomings and weighing and adjustment factors; disclose to users omissions, errors or biases which are unavoidable; clearly point out in each report deviations from standard operating procedure.

Also, publish total number of attempted and usable interviews; clearly define geographical areas of each report; include in report explanation of use of sample error with examples from report itself; clearly state all weighing or adjustment procedures in permanent records and make available to all users along with reasons for adjustments; indicate minimum number of sample returns required for valid report and normal sample return for each survey, and when report sample is below normal but not below minimum.

Each service would be charged with determining if stations being surveyed engaged in "hypoing" or unusual promotional activities during rating period. This would include asking station for notarized statement as "to whether it is or is not employing abnormal promotion devices" and disclosure of replies. Each service would be required to publish "distorting influences" on normal programs during survey period.

Drama Demonstration Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing facts in modern American society is the increasing gap between our advantaged citizens and those who have suffered from economic and cultural disadvantages. The num-

bers of these disadvantaged have increased. The statistical evidence in terms of crime and delinquency is becoming all too evident.

A group of concerned individuals and community organizations in San Francisco have formed a grassroot committee working with and in a disadvantaged community in San Francisco. Among other programs pertaining to the motivational development and education of culturally deprived youth, a new program was created which may become significant nationally in terms of motivational and educational developments.

Mrs. Irving Levy, working with the San Francisco Western Addition District Council, and as chairman of the Councils Motivation for Youth Committee, prepared a new approach to the motivation and education of culturally disadvantaged youth in junior high schools. Working with the San Francisco Unified School District and the United Community Fund a program was prepared to use drama as an instrument for teaching the unmotivated child in his subject matter in school. This proposal was to initiate the program on a demonstration basis, not only in school, but to continue drama and creative art programs in all of the recreational and group work agencies in the area surrounding the school so that the youth in the program would be assured of continuity in their lives. This program not only offers subject matter, but, equally, it offers vocational guidance and image building that these youth so badly need. It offers these youngsters an opportunity not only to learn a skill but the chance to show it off to a variety of audiences including patients in hospitals, homes for the mentally retarded, and the aged. It makes the youth recognize they are learning something which will give them a skill as well as to feel that they are offering something to other people in the community. It also gives them something which will be of value in their leisure time all of their lives.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, this project is a startlingly good example of a creative approach in meeting head on the challenges the culturally deprived child presents to us. From an overview it ties in well with the Youth Employment Act and various compensatory education programs.

Further details regarding the drama demonstration project can be obtained from the Western Addition District Council, 2501 Sutter Street, San Francisco. This bold and imaginative program is one, Mr. Speaker, I am sure a number of our colleagues would be quite interested in.

Tax Credit: Lifesaver for Private Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, our Government has provided tax credits to encourage private home ownership and the purchase of industrial stocks because both benefit our Nation as a whole. Yet neither home or stock ownership is as important to the future well-being of the United States as an educated citizenry.

The time has come for the Federal Government to acknowledge the importance of higher education by extending a tax credit to students and their parents for expenses incurred at institutions of higher learning.

For that reason, I have introduced H.R. 5935, which would extend a tax credit for educational expenses. Many Members in both Houses of Congress have introduced measures with a similar purpose.

The need for this type of legislation was explained recently in an article in the periodical, Our Sunday Visitor, entitled "Tax Credit/Lifesaver for Private Colleges." The article was written by the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, S.J., chairman of the Political Science Department of Marquette University, Milwaukee, and a recognized authority on Federal aid to education.

Because of the pertinent information on tax credit for educational expenses which the article contains, I commend the attention of my colleagues to it.

The article follows:

TAX CREDIT—LIFESAVER FOR PRIVATE COLLEGES

(By Rev. Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

(Father Blum is head of the Department of Political Science of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis. He has written and lectured extensively on tax justice for private schools.)

The cost of going to college is soaring. And it will continue to soar. The cost of going to a private college is in fact soaring out of sight like a Polaris missile. The skyrocketing of tuition charges in private colleges leaves most parents without a choice in the education of their children. In fact if they're not in the middle or upper income bracket, they're forced to send their children to State colleges.

Many parents, however, want to send their sons and daughters to private institutions. But they are deeply concerned about the rapidly rising tuition charges in private colleges. Their concern is clearly revealed by the questions asked me by two Milwaukee insurance salesmen. They are John Peterson and Paul Hamilton. Each is the father of five children, the oldest of whom is a senior in high school.

Let me relate to you some of the more important questions they asked and my attemps to answer them.

1. Mr. Peterson. As you may know, Paul here plans to send his oldest son to Marquette University and I want to send mine to Southern Methodist University. But with tuition soaring so rapidly in private schools, we don't know whether we can afford it. What we would like to know is, do you think that tuition at MU and SMU will continue to rise?

Answer. Yes, John, it will. Private colleges and universities try to keep tuition as low as they can. In fact tuition covers only about half the full cost of education. But if private colleges are going to continue to do a good job of teaching, they must have a good faculty. You wouldn't want them to sacrifice quality to keep tuition down even more.

A good faculty costs a lot of money. This is true despite the fact that college instructors are the poorest paid professional people in America. Then too it is becoming more and more costly to hire all the other people needed to run a college—staff people in the administration, library, maintenance, and in research laboratories.

COSTS STILL RISING

All these things, to say nothing of the physical plant and facilities, make the running of a college or university a high-cost operation. These costs have risen sharply in the last decades, and they will continue to rise in the years ahead. Higher costs mean higher tuition in private schools.

In 1930, for instance, a sample of 50 well-known private colleges and universities charged a tuition of $250. Today the tuition in these schools is nearly $1,200. During this period tuition in the Ivy League schools rose from $375 to $1,575. In many private schools tuition increases have been less sharp, rising to a median tuition in private institutions of about $800 in 1963.

It is difficult to answer your question about tuition increases in the years ahead, John. But if the recent past is any indication, we'd better hold our hats. From 1960 to 1962, tuition income in private institutions rose 34 percent, without a significant increase in student enrollment. All indications point to sharp tuition increases during the 1960's.

2. Mr. Peterson. Private education has already priced itself out of business for most parents. If tuition continues to rise sharply, only the rich will be able to send their children to private colleges.

Answer. You're absolutely right, John. Spiraling private-school costs are forcing more and more parents to send their children to tax-supported schools. In 1949 more than 50 percent of our college students attended private colleges. By 1963 the number had tumbled to less than 37 percent. And it has been predicted that by 1975 less than 20 percent of our students will be in private institutions.

High-tuition private colleges find it extremely difficult to compete with low-tuition, tax-supported State institutions. For example, this fall the University of Wisconsin has a freshman class increase of 16 percent; Marquette University had a decrease of 2 percent. While the public universities and colleges of Wisconsin enjoyed a freshman class increase of 12 percent, the private institutions of the State suffered a decrease of 4 percent.

Dr. Lawrence Kimpton, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, stated the problem of private education bluntly when he said: "To put it in the crassest terms possible, it is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away."

3. Mr. Hamilton. I can sympathize with the financial problems of private colleges, but with tuition more than $1,400 at Chicago, I can well understand why parents purchase their children's education at the University of Illinois where tuition is only $170. Yet I see the problem of private education. In such an impossible competitive condition, how can a private school survive?

Answer. That's the problem, Paul. If private institutions raise their tuition to maintain a high-quality faculty, they price themselves out of business. If they keep their tition low to attract students, their faculty salaries will of necessity be low, also. Then they lose their best teachers and become mediocre schools.

When colleges refuse to compromise their quality and charge tuition, they price themselves beyond the reach of all but the rich. Less than a decade ago, Milwaukee-Downer, a distinguished liberal arts college founded in 1848, was a prospering, high-quality, liberal arts college. In 1956 it got a new neighbor, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Downer's tuition is $1,200; UWM's is $236. Caught in this most difficult competitive situation, Downer painfully watched its students shift to UWM, until by the fall of 1963 it had only 152 students.

ROOM IN PRIVATE COLLEGES

The inevitable happened. Milwaukee-Downer will close its doors in June 1964. Many Wisconsin students who might have

gone to Downer will now go to the State university. There it costs the taxpayer about $4,000 to supply facilities for each additional student, and at least $1,500 a year in educational costs for each student.

Similar situations prevail in many sections of the country. While private colleges have empty classrooms, State institutions are expanding at great expense to accommodate the influx of students. In Wisconsin, for example, while private schools have 5,500 vacancies, citizens are taxed to duplicate these unused facilities in public institutions.

Public institutions are in a building boom to meet student needs, yet no fewer than 795 accredited colleges and universities reported vacancies in the fall of 1963. Among these schools are some of the finest in the Nation.

Moreover, there are no fewer than 456 4-year private liberal arts colleges with fewer than 1,000 students. Their average enrollment of full-time students is 545. With a modest expenditure of funds, these colleges could, under proper circumstances, double their enrollment, and thereby improve both the quality and efficiency of their educational operations.

4. Mr. HAMILTON. I guess Chancellor Kimpton is right. It's hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away.

Answer. How many Cadillacs do you think you'd sell at $4,800, Paul, if you were in competition with a State-owned and operated auto agency which sold Cadillacs at an 80 percent discount? Not many. Milwaukee-Downer finds itself in the same kind of educational market. While it is trying to sell its education product at $1,200 a year, UWM is selling roughly the same product at $236, an 80 percent discount. Most private colleges are in similar circumstances.

Only the most highly endowed private colleges can survive such an unequal competitive situation. Looking to this situation, Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, former president of New York University, predicted that "by 1975, perhaps not more than 4 percent of the post-secondary students of the country will be attending private institutions."

5. Mr. PETERSON. In view of the educational needs of the Nation, the loss of most of our 1,300 private colleges and universities would certainly be a catastrophe.

Answer. For the taxpayer, yes. The replacement cost of the facilities of these schools would be something like $6.4 billion. And, moreover, it would cost the taxpayer about $2.4 billion a year to pay the educational costs of the 1.6 million students who now attend private institutions.

The loss of diversity in education would be an even greater catastrophe. "Diversity, whether in education or in anything else," observed Chancellor Kimpton, "is a long-established and valued American principle. We do not want a monolithic system of higher education; we need precisely the kind of variety that public and private colleges provide. And if there develops a little competition between them, this also follows an old and valued American principle."

6. Mr. PETERSON. Private colleges and universities are already pricing themselves out of business, yet, as the cost of education increases, they'll have to raise their tuition higher and higher. Is that right?

Answer. Yes, higher tuition is inevitable. Most private schools do everything they can to keep tuition down as low as possible. They have organized nationwide fund raising programs to meet their operating deficits, yet they are forced to raise their tuition charges.

You know, John, that tuition in most private schools covers only about half of the full cost of education. Tuition at SMU is $900, yet the full cost of education is probably about $1,600. This means that the school is giving everyone of its students a $700 subsidy.

TAX CREDIT PLAN

7. Mr. HAMILTON. Do you have any positive proposal to save our private colleges and universities, and to make it possible for John and me to send our sons and daughters to private schools?

Answer. Yes, Paul, the tax-credit plan. Under this plan the Federal Government would permit parents to subtract a portion of tuition and fee charges from their income tax bill. If the Government were to grant a 30-percent tax credit on tuition and fees, for example, John could subtract 30 percent of the $900 tuition at SMU, or $270, from his tax bill. If his income tax bill is $1,000, he'd pay only $730.

Dozens of bills providing for a 30-percent tax credit on tuition and fees have been introduced in Congress every year for the last 10 years. The last spring a new kind of tax credit plan was proposed. While testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Mr. Roger Freeman, of Stanford University, proposed a graduated tax credit on tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education. The idea immediately caught fire in the U.S. Senate.

8. Mr. HAMILTON. You mean Senators introduced bills which provide for a graduated tax credit on tuition and fees?

Answer. That's right. Senators as far apart politically as GOLDWATER and HUMPHREY introduced bills based on Freeman's sliding tax credit formula.

Let me give you HUMPHREY's tax credit schedule, which differs only slightly from GOLDWATER's. His bill (S. 1677) provides a 75-percent credit on the first $100 expended on tuition, fees, books, and supplies; a 40-percent credit on the next $400; a 30-percent credit on the next $500; and a 20-percent credit on the next $500.

9. Mr. PETERSON. HUMPHREY's plan sounds interesting and intriguing to me. Just how would it work?

Answer. Let me illustrate, John. But for the sake of simplicity, let's ignore the cost of books and supplies, and include fees under tuition.

The first thing to note is that all parents would be aided by HUMPHREY's tax credit plan. But those who send their children to tax-supported schools and low-tuition private schools would get greater help. If you were to send Fred to Wisconsin University where tuition is $236, you'd receive a $75 credit on the first $100, and a $55 credit on the next $136, for a total of $130.

If you were to send Fred to SMU where tuition is $900, you'd receive a $75 credit on the first $100, $160 on the next $400, and $120 on the next $400, for a total of $355.

In out-of-pocket money, it would cost you in tuition only $136 to send your son to UW, and only $545 to send him to SMU.

10. Mr. PETERSON. In terms of our financially hard-pressed private colleges and universities, the passage of the Humphrey bill would enable these institutions to raise tuition without pricing themselves out of business.

Answer. You're right, John. Many private schools have already priced their product so high that, even in a scarce market, they have unsold space. Yet, despite this fact, tuition increases are inevitable. And with every tuition increase, the children of another socioeconomic segment of our society are forced out of private into public education. Such segregation of students along financial lines is bad for private education; it is bad for America.

The purpose of the tax credit is to help parents pay their children's tuition. Hence, the effect of the tax credit plans would be to enable parents to continue to send their children to private colleges, even if these schools were to raise tuition sharply.

RELIEVED OF BURDEN

HUMPHREY's tax credit plan would enable private colleges to be relieved of a part of the heavy financial burden of subsidizing their students. That is, schools could share with parents the monetary benefits of the tax credit.

11. Mr. HAMILTON. You mean colleges could raise their tuition substantially, and thus reduce their student subsidy?

Answer. That could be done, Paul. For example, SMU could raise its tuition from $900 to $1,100 under the Humphrey plan with these beneficial results for SMU and for John. SMU's subsidy to Fred would be reduced from $700 to $500 a year, and John's out-of-pocket payment for his son's education would be reduced from $900 to $695. Thus Fred would receive the following subsidies for his education: $695 from his father, $405 from the Federal Government, and about $500 from SMU.

In view of the fact that if Fred attended UW the taxpayer would subsidize him to the tune of about $1,500 a year, a tax credit of $405 to enable him to go to SMU is little enough. Fred's education, whether received at UW or SMU, will equally serve the general welfare and national defense. If the common good justifies an expenditure of $1,500 a year for each student at UW, the median income of whose families is $9,000, it surely justifies a tax aid of $405 for Fred and countless other students whose families earn no more.

12. Mr. HAMILTON. The tax credit plan sounds like a terrific program to me. Are there any objections to it?

Answer. Yes; but most of the objections, as Senator RIBICOFF pointed out, are specious. When Treasury Secretary Dillon argued against the tax credit plan before the Senate Finance Committee, RIBICOFF told him that these same arguments had come from administration after administration and Treasury official after Treasury official and "have been specious."

The Federal Government has, in fact, five other tax credit programs going, the last of which was enacted in 1962. This last program gives a tax credit to business for industrial improvements. Secretary Dillon himself urged that this credit be granted to business. If a tax credit for business is good public policy, why not a tax credit for higher education?

13. Mr. PETERSON. What are some more arguments in favor of the Humphrey bill?

Answer. First, the tax credit is fair. It gives greatest help to low-income families who must send their children to low-tuition private and public institutions. The higher the tuition the lower the percent of the credit; and moreover, there is no credit whatever on expenditures for tuition, fees, books, and supplies in excess of $1,500. In other words, there's no credit on the last $500 spent at a prestige school.

Also, John, the Humphrey bill gives parents whose children receive a heavy tax subsidy in State institutions less in dollar aid than it gives parents whose children receive no such subsidy.

A feature of the Humphrey bill that interests many students provides that students who earn their own tuition can claim the tax credit. If a students pays part of his tuition and his parents the rest, the tax credit is prorated between them.

Second, the tax credit is more equitable than a tax deduction. A deduction on tuition and fees would give families in high-income brackets more help than those in low-income brackets. Those families which need help least would get the most help.

On a $1,000 tuition, for example, the tax credit plan would give equal help to all families, regardless of whether they're in the 20-, 30-, 50-, or 91-percent income bracket.

AN AID TO ALL

Third, the tax credit would help every family that can afford to send their children to college. It is not, obviously, the purpose of the tax credit plan to effect a social revo-

lution by making it possible for low-income families to send their children to Harvard. A Federal scholarship program may be adopted for that purpose. However, the tax credit would enable schools to give more scholarships to the children of low-income families.

Fourth, the tax credit plan is the most economical and most efficient way for the Federal Government to assist our young men and women to go to college. It assures a dollar's worth of education for a dollar of Federal assistance. It avoids the bureaucratic-shrinking a tax dollar suffers when it passes through a Federal agency.

The Humphrey bill would give help where help is needed—to tuition-paying parents; it would not, as is the case with all existing Federal aid-to-education programs, pour hundreds of millions of dollars into a handful of rich private and public universities, while hundreds of other schools which are educating hundreds of thousands of young men and women get nothing.

Under the Humphrey bill parents would receive help roughly in proportion to their need. Through higher tuition, schools would lose less in operating costs and thus be better able to do the job of educating. Even the critics of the tax credit have not offered a plan that can compare in economy, efficiency and fairness with the Humphrey plan.

Fifth, the tax credit plan avoids the highly controversial church-state issue. Following a long line of Federal precedents in both education and welfare programs, it would subsidize the demand, not the supply. That is, it would aid the student, not the college.

Sixth, the tax credit plan would provide Federal assistance for higher education without Federal control. Since the Government would aid the demand, there would be no legal basis for controlling the supply, even if the Government should want to do so.

Seventh, the tax credit plan is simple to administer. The parent need only claim the credit when he pays his income tax, or makes his claim for a refund.

14. Mr. HAMILTON. The Humphrey bill sounds terrific to me. How do we get it passed?

Answer. Since the Treasury is opposed to Senator HUMPHREY's bill, Congress needs the support and encouragement of hundreds of thousands of parents from across the Nation.

Congressmen have introduced more than 130 bills to provide tax benefits to parents who have children in college. In other words, Congressmen are well aware of the financial burden these parents carry. But they will not act on the Humphrey bill unless parents initiate a nationwide grassroots movement urging them to do so.

Inform your Representatives and Senators, and also the administration what you think of Senator HUMPHREY's tax credit plan.

The President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States Takes a Hard Look at the Federal Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the subject, and the fact that the Congress will shortly be called upon to provide many additional billions of dollars to the Federal urban renewal and public housing programs, I call attention to a speech by Edwin P. Neilan, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, as well as to the policies of the influential National Association of Real Estate Boards. Mr. Neilan spoke before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Ind., on January 6, 1964.

It is important to note that Indianapolis has achieved well-deserved national recognition for its self-help urban renewal program which does not involve 1 cent of Federal subsidy. For this reason, President Johnson might well look at the self-help urban renewal program in Indianapolis before developing his urban renewal and public housing recommendations for consideration by Congress. He should also take note of the policies of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, since these policies would sharply cut back Federal residential and nonresidential urban renewal programs.

The American Municipal News, published by the American Municipal Association, reported on December 31, 1963, that:

In residential renewal, the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) urges Congress to reduce grants from two-thirds to one-half the net project cost. In the case of nonresidential renewal, the organization calls for termination of all capital grants and the substitution of loans on projects "which are economically sound." Loans would then be repaid "because of resultant increased real property tax revenues."

The group's policy expressed the view that nonresidential renewal "is of vital importance to the preservation and continued growth of our urban areas" but stated that "Federal capital grants for urban renewal can be justified only when the reuse is predominantly residential or for public use, and when the community concerned has an adequate minimum standards housing and building code with a credible record of enforcement."

I include the complete text of the speech by Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce on January 6, 1964.

SUPERMARKET FOR SUBSIDIES

(By Edwin P. Neilan, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States before Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Ind., January 6, 1964)

It is with sincere pleasure and anticipation that I appear tonight before the members and guests of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce. With pleasure, because the Indianapolis chamber over many years has been a stalwart leader in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, both in promoting the principles which the national chamber has advocated and in carrying into action many of the goals which we have urged upon chambers of commerce nationally. Indianapolis and, indeed, all of Indiana has been a bulwark of community enterprise and civic self-reliance in an age that finds too many communities too ready to look to Washington for solutions involving Federal handouts.

In reviewing activities of local chambers from a national vantage point, it is rewarding to recognize that a dynamic chamber leadership is a necessary ingredient for a progressive local government responsive to the needs of its own citizens. This is most evident here in Indianapolis. You are to be complimented and, I would hope, emulated by an increasing number of cities, looking inward to a responsible local solution of their own problems instead of outward for irresponsible and expensive Federal aid.

As you know, Indianapolis in past years has been the beginning point of many political campaigns. Tonight, let us determine that it also will be the starting place for a nonpartisan, nonpolitical campaign: for a citizens' war against that particularly sordid brand of corruption that has eaten into this Nation's urban renewal and public housing programs. The corrupters mask themselves as humanitarians and civic improvers; the truth is they are political pigs who have pushed their snouts into the public trough and are gorging themselves on human misery. What's more, the feast has been largely at the expense of citizens who use their own resources and their own ingenuity to meet their own problems in their own way.

That is a serious charge. It will be substantiated here tonight by evidence developed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as a result of an intensive investigation into our national pork barrel scandal.

The pork barrel as a symbol of political bribery and seduction is really outmoded. The pork barrel so dear to the hearts of old-time political hacks has been replaced by a kind of supermarket of subsidies designed to dazzle irresponsible shoppers with projects beyond compare. The officeholder still presides, but by a combination of political packaging and dishonest salesmanship he disguises the fact that he is really dishing out political fatback that costs much more than it's worth.

Beginning last summer, we at the national chamber, who have worked to keep the Federal budget for ballooning above the $100 billion mark, have reintensified our war against the corrupters. We have redoubled our efforts to alert the Nation to the gross immorality of using public funds for bribes and subsidies to forge political power across this land, in the cities and the States as well as on the national scene. We want the whole country to know that the lion's share of these tax dollars from Washington go to the political favorites, not to the victims of poverty and misery for whom many of these subsidies were legislated and intended.

There's nothing cheap about our new supermarkets of subsidy. They are well-stocked with projects that cost billions of tax dollars, plus billions more of deficit dollars piled onto our $300 billion-plus national debt. You can shop for old-fashioned rivers and harbors projects, dams, lakes and reservoirs. They are useful, because they satisfy less sophisticated electorates. But you can also go for a chic modern ski tow or a posh resort hotel with a manicured golf course; you can obtain a comfortable jail for those captured social malefactors that local citizens are not disposed to pamper; or a marina for the yatching set; a new factory which will dress up the outskirts of your town even if it puts several other privately financed firms out of business. You name it and you can get it at the pay-later-if-at-all check-out counter of this supermart. There is no truth-in-advertising law to force politicians to tell you the true cost or who pays the bill. Too many people, too many businessmen, too many once-independent cities and counties, dazzled by the gleaming attraction of these subsidies and bribes push their way to the counter without, for one moment, reckoning the true costs.

Neither major political party has completely clean hands in this matter of subsidies and political bribery of the electorate. Neither can all businessmen say that they do not bear bribery stains on their own palms. It is the responsibility of all decent Americans to cry "Halt" to this watering down of community responsibility, this dilution and diversion of the dollars we need to expend in the public sector of our economy. This pub-

lic sector requires a flow of funds. We do not question this fact. What we do question is the evaporation and the contamination which takes place along the way.

I submit that it is patently idiotic, as well as grossly immoral to continue to rocket down the road to centralized government in the face of a Federal budget in excess of $100 billion which is only feeding on itself to become even more swollen. We must reassert our local independence, regenerate our local initiative, reassume our local responsibilities and reenergize local handling of local problems. It can be done. Chambers of commerce across our country—your own in particular—have proved it.

The President of the United States has called for a campaign to obtain a dollar's value for every dollar spent by the Federal Government. This is a sentiment with which we can wholeheartedly agree. Our concern is deeper, however; an even greater consideration must be directed at a determination of the real need for the Federal Government to be spending those dollars in the first place.

Let's take a hard look at two show-window items in the subsidy supermarket: urban renewal and public housing.

The national chamber has recently completed a major and objective examination of the Federal urban renewal and public housing programs. It is a factual study, one that demonstrates five astonishing political facts:

1. A major portion of the Federal urban renewal and public housing dollars are being spent in areas where housing is relatively good and incomes are relatively high. Poorer areas get the leftovers.

2. Dollars are not being distributed in proportion to the number of substandard homes in an area or in proportion to the preponderance of lower family incomes in that area.

3. Local irresponsibility is actually encouraged. The less the people of each State use their own tax resources the more Federal dollars they get for urban renewal and public housing.

4. If all communities had gotten their "fair" share on the same basis as the politically favored communities, the urban renewal and public housing programs would have totaled about $100 billion instead of the $8.8 billion that have presently been committed. This is larger than our current Federal budget and equals more than one-third of our entire national debt.

5. The Federal Government's "take" on these programs is 12 percent. We taxpayers have had to put up $1 to cover Federal overhead for every $7½ that's gone back out in subsidy funds—money which rightfully should be raised by local communities in the first place.

Let me repeat: (1) a major portion of Federal urban renewal and public housing dollars is being spent in areas where housing is relatively good and incomes are relatively high. Poorer areas get little or nothing. To illustrate this point, let us look at six States: Connecticut and New Jersey; Utah and Wyoming; and Arkansas and Mississippi.

In Connecticut and New Jersey, where over 70 percent of the families earn over $4,000 a year and less than 20 percent of the housin is substandard, the Federal housing grants are exceedingly high. For each family with less than $4,000 income they amount to $2,682 in Connecticut and $1,949 in New Jersey, compared with an average grant of only $615 per family for the country as a whole.

Contrast this with Utah and Wyoming, which at last official report had no public housing, and no urban renewal projects. Yet they have just about the same proportion of low-income families and substandard housing as have Connecticut and New Jersey.

One might ask, why? Could the answer lie in the realm of political power?

And what about Arkansas and Mississippi? In both these States, more than 40 percent of the housing is substandard and over half the families are in the low-income brackets. In fact, Mississippi has 49.2 percent of its housing rated substandard and 62.8 percent of its families has low incomes. Yet they receive Federal housing grants amounting to less than $250 per lower income family.

These figures support my second point, that Federal housing dollars are not being distributed in proportion to housing or income conditions in any given area. Rather, the facts indicate that the harvest to be reaped from this liberal sowing of tax dollars is votes, not better housing.

The third point, that there is a direct relationship between Federal subsidies and local irresponsibility is amply supported by State and local tax records. Our study shows that in 1962, State and local taxes varied by States from a low of $74 per $1,000 of individual personal income to a high of $115. And we found that, on the average, for each decline of $10 per thousand in these taxes there was an accompanying rise of $235 in Federal renewal and housing subsidies. The plain truth is that the citizens who support their own communities, their own States, are forced also to reward the irresponsibility of those areas which are unwilling to tackle their own problems.

Fourthly, if these programs actually worked impartially, without political preference—if every community in the country got the same relative share of Federal grants that the favored areas have received—we'd all be bankrupt. The extra cost would be as much as our present whopping annual budget and one-third or more of our present national debt. Nothing could better illustrate the absurdity of surrendering local responsibility to big government in Washington.

Finally, the cost of administering these programs, of paying for bureaucrats and their bungling political partisanship represents $1 of every $7½ expended in subsidies. That is a very high price, indeed, to pay for the privilege of sending our tax money to Washington so that it can be routed back to politically favored communities.

Perhaps few of us would complain if these subsidized communities were actually getting their substandard housing eliminated or reduced faster than communities which do not get Federal handouts. But comparison of the 1950 and 1960 census reports indicates clearly that this is not the case. Between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of substandard homes was cut in half, in both subsidized and unsubsidized areas, so that the relative success in fighting bad housing would appear to have been unaffected by subsidies or the lack of subsidies.

In 1960, however, in the subsidized areas only one-eighth of the housing was substandard. In other areas one-fourth or almost twice as much housing, relatively, fell into this classification. This clearly establishes the fact that subsidies go to areas where housing is relatively good.

As I have stated, progress in housing improvement was the same between 1950 and 1960 in both the subsidized and the unsubsidized areas. Both areas cut their problems in half. The point, however, is that even more progress can be made if dollars dribbled away on their long route through Washington are used in communities directly for the people that the public sector funds should help. Otherwise Federal power to discriminate is the power to dictate or to show political favoritism, and there is plenty of evidence that discrimination exists in the distribution of renewal and housing funds. In fact one is forced to conclude that these programs are also used for vote buying.

New York City stands to get more than $1 billion from the programs as they are now committed, and it still has many of the slums it had when the program started—plus some new ones. Of course, New York City is also a political plum of unmatched concentration.

Now let's look at Newark, N.J. New Jersey has no State income tax, but Newark, another neat and tidy concentration of votes, stands to get more than $214 million in subsidy funds and boasts one of the highest grants per substandard housing unit in the United States—over $9,000 per unit.

These are the reasons why we feel that advocates of these programs must be forced to reevaluate their concepts. Our facts are so compelling that they demand a national, nonpartisan, taxpayer-oriented campaign to end the fiscal travesty of these Federal programs. It is too often blandly said that opponents of Federal programs do not offer alternatives or solutions, and for that reason cannot be taken seriously. The chamber of commerce does offer responsible citizens of this Nation a plan and a program far more efficient, far less costly, far less cumbersome and far more American than these Federal misadventures. These programs, no matter how pure they may have been in original concept, have been twisted, diverted and mismanaged into a caricature of good government and financial responsibility. We citizens—and certain Congressmen and Senators who have ardently wooed the voters with these subsidies—must wake up to the realization that the political payoffs have gone principally and directly to local political bosses in cahoots with the administrative bureaucrats of the Federal Government who handle these programs.

In the light of this shameful record, it is difficult to understand how the Housing and Home Finance Agency—which holds these programs in its bureaucratic embrace—can be seriously considered as qualified for a Cabinet role in our National Government. This Agency would have itself elevated to the status of a Department of Urban Affairs, a super-Department in which it would centralize all the Federal subsidy programs for our urban areas.

These billion-dollar blunders are not going to be corrected easily. The president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials commented only last fall that 1964 will see a slugfest unequaled in the history of public housing and renewal programs. These gentlemen recognize their failures. They recognize the inequities. They recognize the exorbitant cost of these programs. They recognize that opposition exists and will increase as the facts are made known. They have been conducting a deliberate and calculated program to manipulate public attitudes in support of renewal and public housing. They have set up workshops on procedures to be used in winning local elections, openly advocating the infiltration of local real estate boards and chambers of commerce, recommending that the role of the Federal Government be subordinated in public discussions and urging preorganized or "stacked" public hearings and other similar tactics to confuse the public. Federal housing authorities prepare complete programs of public relations for local renewal agencies to utilize at each stage of planning and completing a project, cautioning that these must be distributed by nongovernmental groups to avoid a patently illegal act. The act is avoided but the intent is clear.

We are all for the "slugfest." It is late in time for private enterprise and the American taxpayer to do a little slugging on their own behalf. But it is not too late. Both urban renewal and public housing programs will outrun their authorizations this year, and the Congress will have to determine the future course of these programs during this session. Let us assist them in making a

correct determination to terminate these political payoffs.

We look forward to the "slugfest" for the simple reason that commonsense, common decency, and fiscal integrity dictate an end to the misuse of Federal funds, both of the tax dollars you are paying today and the heavier Federal debt with which the future of our country is being mortgaged.

We maintain that these programs are local responsibilities and can be solved locally, as Indianapolis has demonstrated. We maintain that under any circumstance they are not being administered fairly, but are being used to bribe the electorate, to subsidize political employees, to penalize the cities and counties that exercise their own fiscal responsibility, to benefit the relatively well off, and to make the poor poorer. They cannot be justified morally, nor can they be justified economically or defended ethically. It's time we made an end to them.

One View of Recent Events in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the situation in South Vietnam is one of continuing concern to Members of Congress. The United States has made heavy commitments in money and manpower in the effort to defeat the Communist Vietcong rebels.

In a current issue of America magazine, Miss Marguerite Higgins, well-known journalist and Pulitzer Prize winner, reported her views on the situation following a recent visit to South Vietnam.

Her article makes a number of pertinent points on current events in that troubled country and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SAIGON SUMMARY: OUR COUNTRY PLAYED AN INGLORIOUS ROLE IN THE FINAL DAYS OF THE DIEM REGIME

(By Marguerite Higgins)

What is the meaning of the five tragic self-immolations that took place in Vietnam in the 6 weeks following the November coup d'etat against Diem? How did it come to pass that under the military junta, which seized power in the name of an end to "persecution," there have been more suicides by fire over a short period than had ever been the case under President Diem and his brother Ngo Dinh Nhu? Even though virtually ignored by the Western press, will this latest spate of suicides by fire—without clearly stated reason—destroy at last the false notion that the repeated acts of self-immolation in Vietnam were indisputable proof of massive persecution of the Buddhist religion by President Diem, a Roman Catholic?

Will historians be more equitable with President Diem than his contemporaries were?

On two trips in Vietnam in 1963, one before and one after the coup d'etat, this writer was never able to find an instance of repression on religious grounds. Under Diem, there was repression of Buddhists, Catholics, Confucianists, etc., when—in defiance of clearly stated laws—they took to the streets to demonstrate against the Government. But Diem's repression was not directed against a religion. It was aimed at overt political opposition. There were deplorable police excesses in Vietnam, but there is no sign that they were desired or condoned by Diem any more than police excesses in Alabama are condoned or desired by Washington.

There was, for a long time, a clear double standard in Vietnam, in which accusations against Diem gained, in most cases, giant headlines, but attempted refutations received only perfunctory notice. For instance, last summer Thich Duc Nghiep, the Xa Loi pagoda spokesman, told reporters dramatically that 365 persons in a Saigon suburb had been arrested "because they were Buddhists." That figure was headlined throughout the world. But when I went to the suburb in question, I found that a routine check was being made of a neighborhood through which the Vietcong often infiltrated. I stayed for 2 hours to talk with those rounded up as they emerged from the police compound after questioning. I talked to 20 persons—ancestor worshipers, Catholics, Confucianists, Taoists, Caodaists, etc.—before I finally found a genuine Buddhist among those picked up. So the charge of "365 persons arrested because of being Buddhists" was invention.

There is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American press corps in Saigon thought—out of the most idealistic and patriotic motives—that they were serving a good cause in arousing world opinion against Diem. Whether his strengths and faults were greater or less than those of his junta successors remains to be seen.

It is certain that under the military junta, Vietnamese have been jailed for far less than was necessary to send a person to prison under Diem. Said a European observer: "Under Diem, a Vietnamese had to do something specific against the regime to get into trouble. Under the military junta, a Vietnamese can be jailed without charge, simply under the suspicion that he was loyal to the Diem regime when it was the legally constituted authority."

Sanche de Gramont, of the New York Herald Tribune, has estimated the number of arbitrary arrests right after the coup as around 500. So far, Mr. de Gramont and this reporter are the only ones who have written with any detail about the junta's reversion to some of the police state tactics the Saigon press corps so bitterly cirticized in Diem.

Nowadays, some of the most ardent anti-Diem writers, such as David Halberstam, Saigon correspondent of the New York Times, acknowledge that the Buddhist agitation of last summer and fall was politically motivated. In an admiring magazine article written by his close friend George J. W. Goodman, Mr. Halberstam is quoted as saying: "I always said it. The Buddhist campaign was political. * * * I thought I always emphasized that this was a political dispute under a religious banner—the only place an opposition had found to gather in an authoritarian regime. * * *"

Whatever Mr. Halberstam's intentions, his and other press dispatches last summer and fall did create the impression in the outside world that some kind of religious crisis was going on inside Vietnam. And it was the image of religious persecution—false as it was—that paved the way for Diem's downfall. Without the embarrassment of being the patron of a country suspected of battling Buddhists, it is doubtful that the United States would ever have reached the decision to try to get rid of Diem. The authorities in Washington knew, of course, that the conflict in Vietnam was political, not religious. But they were reluctant to speak out lest, in the process, they attract to Washington some of the onus being poured—with hardly any contradiction—on Diem.

By staying silent, Washington acted as if it thought Diem guilty. And this helped to complete the vicious circle.

Or as Roger Hillsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, put it: "After the closing of the pagodas on August 21, the facts became irrelevant." So, evidently, did a sense of perspective. What, for example, about the fact that President Diem was far more lenient to his political opposition than President Sukarno of Indonesia or Premier Sarit Thanarat of Thailand, both recipients of American aid? Whereas some 300 political prisoners, at most, were found in Diem's jails, the prisons of Thailand, Indonesia and Burma were filled—and are still filled—with tens of thousands of political victims.

"But," explained a procoup State Department officer, "the world spotlight is not on those countries, and it is on Vietnam."

At the State Department, there have been some attempts to rationalize the coup d'etat by describing it as necessary to save the Vietnamese war effort from going to pieces. One difficulty with this argument is that it makes liars out of Secretary of Defense McNamara, Chief of Staff Maxwell D. Taylor and Gen. Paul Harkins, who testified under oath to Congress in October that the war was making reasonable progress. If the State Department ever took seriously the argument that the disturbances in the cities would affect morale in the countryside, it betrays a regrettable lack of understanding of the structure of Vietnam and of the gap between the countryside, where the war will be won or lost, and the cities, where less than 10 percent of the Vietnamese live.

For the Buddhists, intellectuals and students who marched the streets in anti-Diem demonstrations could not have cared less about the war—before the coup, or after the coup. Vietnamese students in particular tell you quite frankly that one reason they prize admission to a university is that it enables them to avoid the draft. Vietnam's intellectuals have narrow horizons, are excessively inward turning, and make constant and factional criticism their specialty. Except for a handful of terribly militant leaders, Buddhist monks are rather passive. If the success or failure of the war were to depend on these groups, Vietnam would have been lost from the start. As to the effects in the countryside of the critical clamoring by Vietnam's spoiled young intellectuals in the cities, it was virtually nil. The American attitude seemed to be that if a Vietnamese student demonstrates, virtue is on his side and the government is wrong. But in the countryside there were many peasants and plain soldiers who disapproved of the defiance of the regime—in those rare places where anyone knew anything whatsoever of what went on beyond the next village.

If there was any slowdown in the war in September and October of 1963, it was because the Vietnamese generals—under American prodding—were concentrating on thoughts of a coup d'etat, while Diem and Nhu, out of fear of America, were concentrating on how to prevent a coup.

It was not until after the coup d'etat that the Vietnamese war took a decidedly downward turn. The military junta with its uncertain leadership, after purges of key (and scarce) officials, finally plunged much of the countryside into the confusion from which it purportedly was trying to save Vietnam.

No wonder the Vietcong took advantage of the situation to seize the military initiative for the first time in many months. No wonder that, in the 2 months after the coup d'etat, the military junta lost more real estate, lives, and weapons to the Vietcong than at any previous time in the war.

It was precisely out of fear of such predictable consequences of trying to change regimes in midwar that Secretary of Defense McNamara and Central Intelligence Director John McCone opposed a coup d'etat. But they were overruled by the procoup d'etat faction led by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Under Secretary of State Averell Har-

riman, and Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Roger Hilsman.

The Diem-must-go decision came shortly after the temporary closing of about a dozen (out of 4,000) pagodas on August 21, which outraged Washington. Diem said that his only aim was to get the Buddhist leaders out of politics and back to religion. The Vietnamese leader insisted that unless he shut down the propaganda machinery of the pagodas and put a halt to the glorification of suicide by burning, public disorder in the cities would mount and world misunderstanding would deepen. Washington disagreed. Further, it felt that Diem had not only humiliated it and flouted its advice, but had broken a promise to be conciliatory. Washington's anger was heightened by horrendous stories of alleged killings and brutalities during the pagoda raids. (There were no such killings, as the monks themselves later said.)

In any case, on August 24, the State Department sent out word—without the knowledge of Secretary McNamara or of CIA Director John McCone—instructing Ambassador Lodge to "unleash" the Vietnamese generals with a view to toppling the Diem government if they could. Plotting among educated Vietnamese, including the generals, is a kind of national pastime, as chess is to the Russians. Until lately it had been a pretty harmless pastime, because everybody knew that real action was dependent on an American green light—and until August such a green light had been withheld.

But on Sunday, August 25, Washington publicly gave the generals a green light in a Voice of America broadcast that virtually called on the Vietnamese military to take over. At the same time, Ambassador Lodge asked the CIA to poll the Vietnamese generals and see when and if they were ready to translate revolt talk into action.

Diem's shock at the Voice of America broadcast and the CIA poll of the Vietnamese generals can only be imagined by turning the tables around. Suppose the United States were engaged in a war against the Communists in which we depended almost totally on aid from Vietnam; suppose, in the middle of that war, Vietnam issued a broadcast calling for the American Joint Chiefs of Staff to overthrow the American Government.

The miracle is that the Diem regime survived as long as it did the virtual declaration of political war served on it that August by Washington.

What, after many months of hesitation, finally decided the generals (in mid-October) to stage the coup? In separate interviews with this correspondent, members of the military junta spoke of these factors:

1. The late President Kennedy called, at a press conference, for "changes of policy and maybe personnel" in Vietnam.

2. Washington announced the withdrawal of 1,000 American soldiers by the end of 1963, and possible total withdrawal by 1965. (Said one general: "That convinced us that unless we got rid of Diem, you would abandon us.")

3. The economic aid was cut. Many generals agreed that this cut was psychologically the most decisive goad to a coup d'etat. "It convinced us," a key plotter explained, "that the United States was serious this time about getting rid of Diem. In any case, this was a war we wanted to win. The United States furnished us with the jeeps, the bullets, the very guns that made the war possible. In cutting economic aid, the United States was forcing us to choose between your country's help in the war and Diem. So we chose the United States."

Ironically, President Diem did make some important concessions to the United States in September and October. For example, in mid-September President Diem agreed to every point put forward by the United States in a program to reform and consolidate the strategic hamlet program in the Mekong delta. Many Americans had long felt that this program had been overextended. At last President Diem agreed with the diagnosis and decided to do something about it. Why was this move toward the American position never publicized? One Western diplomat put it this way: "Ambassador Lodge and his deputy, William Truehart, were so determined to get rid of Diem that they were opposed to putting him in a conciliatory light. They were afraid this would strengthen the hands of those in Washington against a coup d'etat."

Even at the 11th hour, Ambassador Lodge could, of course, have turned off the revolt if he had chosen to give the slightest sign that the New Frontier and President Diem were even beginning to move to heal their rent. As one member of the military junta put it: "We would never have dared to act if we had not been sure that the United States was giving us its moral support."

In the last hours before his death, President Diem was stripped of any doubt whatsoever of Washington's hostility. Telephoning the American Embassy from the palace at 4:30 p.m. on November 1, after the bombardment had started, President Diem asked Ambassador Lodge: "What is Washington's attitude toward this?" Lodge replied: "I don't know Washington's attitude. After all, it is 4:30 in the morning there."

"But you must have some idea," Diem said.

Whereupon Lodge turned the conversation to the matter of Diem's safety, offering him an airplane to take him out of the country. Could anything have indicated more clearly that in American eyes the success of the coup d'etat was a fait accompli?

The only certain thing about the murder of President Diem and Counselor Nhu is that they were shot in the back (Diem in the neck, Nhu in the right side) with their hands tied behind them. Nhu also had a dagger or bayonet wound in the chest, which was apparently indecisive.

These facts were established beyond all doubt by this reporter through photographs and through talks with military eyewitnesses, attendants at St. Paul's Hospital (where the bodies were first taken) and from information given by two relatives, a niece and nephew who handled the preparations for the burial.

In the light of the way Diem and Nhu died, there is a strong possibility that the shootings were ordered by some or all members of the military junta. Would a junior officer take such a responsibility on himself?

Now for the Buddhist leaders who started it all: have they got what they wanted? I use the word "leaders" advisedly, for of the Buddhists in Vietnam, who form about 30 percent of the population of 14 million people, the overwhelming majority are largely nonpolitical. Buddhist monks tend to be somewhat passive. They would never have dreamed of resorting to violent demonstrations had they not been subjected to the skillful and inflammatory propaganda that poured from the humming mimeograph machines of the Xa Loi pagoda. By the end of last summer, the original grievances of the Buddhist leaders in Hué—matters of property rights, flag flying, etc.—had largely been met by the Diem regime.

In the midst of the anti-Diem ferment I wrote an article asking: "What do the Buddhists want? They want Diem's head, not on a silver platter, but wrapped in an American flag."

You have to hand it to the Buddhist leaders that they got what they wanted. But will this satisfy the more militant Buddhist leaders? It is heady stuff, even for Buddhists, to have the attention of the entire world focused on you, and to exercise the kind of political power than can topple governments. Will, for instance, the venerable Thich Tri Quang, the mastermind of the Buddhist campaign and by far the most intelligent and militant of all, be satisfied to take a political back seat?

Thich Tri Quang is a Buddhist leader from Hué who was granted asylum at the American Embassy even though his past is in some controversy. According to records of the French Colonial Office, he had twice been arrested during the postwar French occupation of Indochina for dealings with Ho Chi Minh. By his own admission, he was a member of the Vietminh Communist Liberation Front. He claims to have fallen out with the Communists later. Again according to the French, who still have representatives at Hanoi, Thich Tri Quang's brother is currently working for Ho Chi Minh in the Communist Vietnam's Ministry of the Interior. The duties of Thich Tri Quang's brother are the direction of subversion in South Vietnam.

None of this, of course, proves anything about Thich Tri Quang's current attitude toward the Communist Vietcong. What does seem clear is that he learned a lot from the Communists about organization and propaganda. He ran his emergency headquarters at the Xa Loi pagoda like a company command post. Orders were barked out, directing a demonstration here, a protest meeting there. Messengers scurried in and out, carrying banners with their newly painted slogans. Respectful monks brought in the latest anti-Diem propaganda blast for Thich Tri Quang to review word by word.

In my discussion with Thich Tri Quang, I was somewhat taken aback at his indifference about the war against the Communists. When I asked whether the occasional outburst of turmoil might not offer the Vietcong the opportunity to infiltrate among the demonstrators, Thich Tri Quang shrugged his shoulders and said: "It is possible that the current disorders could lead to Communist gains. But if this happens it will be Diem's fault, not ours."

In the same interview in the Xa Loi pagoda, Thich Tri Quang told me that his preferred solution for Vietnam was neutralism, adding: "We cannot get an arrangement with the north until we get rid of Diem and Nhu."

The Vietcong are suspected of having led several of the attacks against property on November 1, the day of the coup d'etat. For instance, a small but violent gang of young people attacked and demolished the newly opened headquarters in Saigon of the Asian Anti-Communist League. This league had no connection, financial or otherwise, with Diem. Yet the coup-day rioters systematically removed its anti-Communist literature onto the streets, burned it, then wrecked the headquarters.

Whether the new military junta's government by committee can do any better than Diem and Nhu remains in doubt. The junta is ripe for further coups and countercoups. In any case, it was not because he enjoyed being condemned by world public opinion that President Diem engaged in repressive measures (mild as they were by Asian standards). The new government will be faced by similar problems, because the fundamental situation has not changed. For example, the change of government has not altered the tendency of Vietnam citified intellectuals to take to the streets.

Within 2 weeks after the coup d'etat, 10,000 students at Hué demonstrated noisily against the military junta because it had not dismissed several professors who had been loyal to Diem. This is but one example of pressure by mob. Can the military junta long tolerate decisions enforced by street mobs, or justice by demand of the newly freed and utterly irresponsible Vietnamese press? Three Saigon newspapers have closed—and rightly—already. The smut and sheer mendacity of the postcoup "free press"

of Vietnam is one of the blackest marks of recent months in the annals of Vietnam's so-called intellectuals. In view of the indiscipline, factionalism and irresponsibility of citified Vietnamese, can the military junta long escape resorting to the same tight rein held by President Diem?

The only sure thing in Vietnam today is that the United States has set an extremely controversial precedent by encouraging, for the first time in our history, the overthrow in time of war of a duly elected government fighting loyally against the common Communist enemy.

In Memoriam: John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial tribute to our late President read to the Wayne County (Mich.) Board of Supervisors on November 26, 1963, by one of its members, Dr. Broadus N. Butler. Dr. Butler, a distinguished citizen of Detroit, is assistant to the dean of the Wayne State University College of Liberal Arts:

IN MEMORIAM: JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Supervisor Broadus N. Butler)

At the height of the first ray of hope for a new national climate of brotherhood, democracy, and opportunity in this tragedy ridden 20th century comes the assassination of the one President of the United States who has symbolized not only for America, but for the world, the ideal of executive leadership toward the full recognition of human dignity.

This has been a century in which the respect of person and human dignity has been trampled unto death and degradation in some dramatic way in each generation. This century has seen three major international wars take millions of lives, untold numbers of smaller wars add up to more millions. It has seen genocide in the extermination of 3 million Jews in Germany, the rise of communism and massacres in Asia, the assassination of Mohandas Gandhi in India, apartheid and the killing of thousands of black Africans, particularly in Angola and South Africa. It has suffered killings, riots, and more than 50 bombings of churches and schools—killings of men, women, and children—in the United States. The past decade of this century has seen this violence go unmitigated and unpunished in our own Nation. It has watched the overthrow, by violence of government after government throughout the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy tried in less than 3 years to write a chapter of human dignity and equality of opportunity for all into our national life. He tried to see and move optimistically toward a new climate of brotherhood and hope at least in our own land, if not throughout the world.

We must now face finally and ultimately the stark fact that is no joke that fanatical forces of the right and the left have tried and are still trying to write an obituary for this great, overgrown and, they think, dying Nation. One hundred years ago, Abraham Lincoln told this to the 19th century Americans in the Emancipation Proclamation and in the Gettysburg Address. He tried to set this Nation in the direction of freedom and respect for person, and they killed Mr. Lincoln.

In this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Gettysburg Address—98 years after the assassination of Abraham Lincoln—the ablest and most dedicated spokesman for those ideals in the 20th century was suddenly shot from the same kind of darkened crevices of hate.

They killed President Kennedy. The same hands; the same forces. The same harbingers of hate, greed, tyranny, avarice and arrogance demonstrated again and beyond a doubt that they will still stop at nothing to prove that the American creed of democracy and brotherhood is not viable—that America will die before she will be free. And, like Mr. Kennedy, she will die unless we acknowledge this shocking reality. We must finally know that the extreme right would rather see the Nation dead than see one Negro free; the extreme left would rather kill the Nation than see one American free. That was the essence of the meaning of the assassination of Mr. Lincoln. That was the essence of the failure to implement the original Declaration of Independence. That is now the essence of the meaning of the death of President Kennedy.

The President is not dead; the presidency lives. But the only President since Abraham Lincoln who devoted so much of his executive resources and moral suasion to give real meaning to civil rights, equal opportunity, and human freedom is dead. No, we say in disbelief. It cannot be. But, it is.

In our time, there is one and only one significant difference between America and Germany, Italy, Japan, and the other countries that died of their own involvement in violence. America and America's creed of freedom revived and saved them. America retrieved them with men, the ideology of freedom, and with all the moral power and economic resources that it takes to recover a dead society from itself and infuse it with a new vision of life and hope—a new freedom from its own ashes. Now, it is America. Can America save America? Will God? Will Americans? This time it is we, ourselves. What will we do now?

Goodby, dear Mr. President. May your soul and your memory—your ultimate sacrifice—save a people and a nation so great as ours that cannot otherwise save itself from its own domestic violence. Will those who could not learn from the deaths of Christ, of Lincoln, of Gandhi now see that the shot of hate that pierced John F. Kennedy, was aimed to kill Thee.

Americans, be of good judgment and firm dedication to complete his unfinished task. In the transition from John Fitzgerald Kennedy to Lyndon Baines Johnson there is one great comfort for our saddened Nation. The Presidency moves from strength, courage and moral integrity to continued strength, courage and moral integrity in the quest for democracy, for domestic brotherhood, and for international peace.

Our hearts go out to the President's family and especially to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy who has suffered the double personal tragedy of the loss of a son and a husband in so short compass.

May the wisdom of our departed President rest upon and give strength to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson. May his soul and purpose pervade the whole American citizenry across the land to remove the hate and bigotry which besets us. May the people of America now see the light and learn the truth that his martyrdom beams forth so clearly to us. Cannot we hark the painful miracles of this year? Cannot we heed the words of our great and departed exemplar who implored us to "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

Jesus Christ said, in effect, "If you will love God, you must love one another." Every recent martyr has echoed, "If you will love one another, you must love me." Let every American learn to love—to respect the person and dignity of—one another.

(Read to the Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Tuesday, November 26, 1963.)

George Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1964

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay well-deserved public tribute to a man of unusual gifts and inexhaustible energy, a man whose memorable contributions to all of northeastern Minnesota stand as a monument to his life's work, my dear friend and dean of journalists on the Mesabi Iron Range, Mr. George Fisher.

Celebrating his golden anniversary of journalism, 47 years of which were spent with the Hibbing Daily Tribune, George Fisher announced his retirement on January 1, 1964. Throughout these many years of devoted service to the public interest George Fisher has truly been the voice, conscience, and spirit of all the good people in the Iron Range area. His retirement—surely well-earned and deserving—brings to his many friends and admirers feelings of sadness mixed with pride over his achievements and gratitude for his contributions.

In true journalistic tradition George Fisher started at the bottom of the ladder as a young reporter, working himself up to be city editor, managing editor, and finally executive editor. Not content to achieve excellence as a journalist, he has taken the lead in many local matters of public interest, spearheaded numerous civic projects, and been active in many organizations. His untiring efforts have on three occasions won him the honor of being named Hibbing's outstanding citizen.

Mr. Speaker, the eloquent and warmly sincere editorial in the December 26, 1963, edition of my hometown newspaper, the Free Press of Chisholm, Minn., sums up the thoughts and emotions of all of us in northeastern Minnesota on the occasion of the retirement of "Mr. Hibbing," our beloved George Fisher. I commend to all the moving story of this remarkable man:

GEORGE FISHER'S TREASURES

Perhaps no other profession in the world is so studded with joys, pin-pricked with sorrows and jeweled with rewards of personal satisfaction as is that of journalism.

Those who follow in the footsteps of the fourth estate watch each day's events blaze on the horizon, die in the ashes of forgetfulness and torn newspapers, and then watch them kindled into new flames as dawns another day and the rising sun shoots new directives.

THEY FEEL THE HEARTBEAT

The efforts of the vast working corps often remain unsung. These men and women ask, nor demand recognition. Their fruits of

their endeavors are spelled out in the accuracy of their stories, details and authenticity of their research to educate a strong and healthy nation. In times of joy, they fade into the darkness and observe with an inner satisfaction the happiness of a surging, forward democracy of humanity. They feel the anguish of war, the tragedy of assassinations, the pain and death of accidents; the desolation of destruction and violence, the heartbeat of the new-born babe; the pride and accomplishment of a college diploma; the hope of the downtrodden; the hunger and cold of the poor; the pulse of mankind's yearning for peace.

An integral part of all of this fascination for more than half a century has been the dean of journalism on the Iron Range, the indomitable, persevering, dedicated George Fisher. Journalism is a field that knows neither night nor day. Compensations and remunerations are not measured in terms of money. The reporter's "Beat", known to the man on the street as an assignment, becomes like a drug. The events and happenings of little towns, big cities, thriving, teeming states, a young democracy, and powerful nations race through the bloodstream. Once the smell of ink, the hum of the typewriter and linotype, the roll of the presses, and the pressure of deadlines get into your blood, there is no turning back. One just keeps on driving, working, racing, writing. This, Mr. Fisher has done with a dignity and respectability that marks the great men in journalism.

EDITIONS ARE MEMORIALS

This man's greatest memorial tribute are the editions of the Hibbing Daily Tribune, ageless, yellowed and preserved for the past 46 years. His chronicles, anecdotes and editorials magnify the heartbeat of the Iron Range. And as he gathered the material for his many stories and columns, he sowed the seeds of friendship which have blossomed into a magnificent symbol of the kind of wealth that money cannot buy. Because he was fair, firm, determined, kind and just, Mr. Fisher earned for himself a following that encircles his beloved Iron Range, his grief-stricken United States, and his embracing world.

A BIGGER MAN

Though the formal records will show that Mr. Fisher is retiring from his position of executive editor as of January 1, 1964, his colleagues and friends know way down deep that the ring of the telephone, the clang of the siren, the hum of the typewriter will quicken his pulse, and an unexplainable "something" known as a reporter's ninth sense will start racing through his veins.

The years have been kind and good, spiced with humor, rare joys, and some very bitter sorrows. All have made Mr. Fisher a bigger, more tolerant, and understanding reporter and American citizen. His journalistic contributions, his civic accomplishments, his reservoir of friendships are treasures he can always cherish.

We, your colleagues, are proud of you, Mr. Fisher, and in sincere tribute, thank you for a "job well done."

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Hon. Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army, Named West Virginian of 1963 by Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army, is an outstanding example of capability, experience, and dedication in public office—a citizen of high ideals who believes himself compelled to serve his country to the limits of his abilities.

For his significant contributions to the well-being of our land, and for the manner in which he epitomizes the energy and individuality of his native State, the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail has selected Cyrus Roberts Vance as "West Virginian of 1963."

From schoolboy athlete to Cabinet member, "Bob" Vance's life has been one of continuous achievement. He has worked hard, and has attained much. Leaving the Navy after distinguished World War II service, Secretary Vance won recognition in the legal profession as a partner in a prominent New York firm. In 1957 he came to Washington as consulting counsel to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and later was appointed as General Counsel to the Department of Defense. In mid-1962, the Clarksburg native succeeded Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., another West Virginian, as Secretary of the Army.

In the December 19, 1963, issue of the State magazine of the Gazette-Mail, editorial staff writer, George Lawless, describes Cyrus Vance the man, and explores the complex and demanding world in which he lives and works. I commend Mr. Lawless' article to the attention of my colleagues and urge that they join me in expressing heartfelt gratitude and congratulations to the West Virginian of 1963, a gifted and devoted public servant, the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance.

I ask unanimous consent that the Sunday Gazette-Mail article, "West Virginian for 1963," be printed in the Appendix, together with my congratulatory letter to Secretary Vance dated January 7, 1964.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIAN FOR 1963

(By George Lawless)

In a few days Cyrus Roberts Vance is slated to take over the No. 2 post in an organization charged with awesome responsibility—defense of the free world.

Vance, 46, is expected to replace Roswell Gilpatric as Deputy Defense Secretary under Robert S. McNamara.

A native of Clarksburg, the tall, tousled Secretary of the Army is the Sunday Gazette-Mail's selection of "West Virginian of 1963."

For the past 18 months, as boss of almost 2 million military and civilian personnel, with an annual budget exceeding $5 billion and with branch offices in 58 countries, Vance has commanded one of the biggest businesses in peacetime history.

In that period, he has weathered several major crises, starting with the Cuban confrontation and Berlin flareups and continuing through racial battles in Mississippi and Alabama. Vance also is credited with helping to realine and reorganize the U.S. Army into the world's most effective strike force.

Last August 2, at White Sulphur Springs, Vance told southern Governors' conference that the United States and its NATO allies could win a conventional war with Russia. This offhand remark points up the changes wrought in our Defense Establishment since the midfifties, when the West depended almost solely on a "Chinese wall" of nuclear bombers to retaliate to any aggression.

"This country * * * continues to require the best defense in the world—a defense which is suited to the sixties," declared the late President Kennedy last January. "It means improved air and defense missiles, improved civil defense, a strengthened antiguerrilla capacity, and flexible nonnuclear forces. For a division of well-equipped men on a border may be more useful to our real security than the multiplication of awesome weapons beyond all rational need."

This new military posture—and the man who may ultimately be charged with its total implementation—makes Cyrus Vance one of the most important men of our century.

He was appointed General Counsel to the Department of Defense on January 4, 1961, as one of President-elect Kennedy's first official moves. Vance succeeded Secretary of the Army Elvis Stahr, former president of West Virginia University, 17 months later. Stahr left to become president of Indiana University.

During his tenure as General Counsel, Vance earned the reputation of being "the hardest worker in the Pentagon."

He's the only man there, said an awed aide, "who comes to work earlier and stays at the office longer than McNamara."

There are, indeed, some striking similarities in the makeup of McNamara and Vance. Both are wholly dedicated to their job, both are precise, confident, and controlled.

"Very incisive mind, unusual integrity, good balance and judgment," are words coworkers use to describe Vance.

The only evidence of his bad judgment—from the average person's viewpoint—might be the mankilling schedule he maintains. He's always at his Pentagon office desk well before 8 a.m. each day and rarely leaves before 9 p.m. This often inclures Saturdays and Sundays.

"My wife (Gay) wishes I could organize my time better so I could shorten my hours," Vance grins, then adds a note of seriousness:

"There's just so much to be done. You literally could work 24 hours a day and still wouldn't get all the work done."

This almost total dedication to duty is pleasing to the hard-driving McNamara, former president of Ford Motor Co. He reportedly found the more relaxed approach of former Army Secretary Stahr a bit irksome.

Cyrus (Bob) Vance was born on St. Patrick's Day in 1917 in an old family manison at the corner of Pike and Sixth Streets in West Clarksburg.

He was the fourth generation of Vance in the city. His great-grandfather, Col. Cyrus Vance, was a former mayor of Clarksburg. His grandfather, Col. John Vance, was a member of the first succession legislature at Wheeling.

Bob is one of two boys born to Mr. and Mrs. John Carl Vance. His brother, John, is 2 years older and former assistant attorney general under Governor Marland. John practiced law in Clarksburg until 3 years ago, when he became a writer and editor for the American Bar Association's Legal Journal at Rochester, N.Y.

Bob Vance was a Navy lieutenant and gunnery officer abroad destroyers for 20 months during World War II.

He attended Kent School, a private prep school in Connecticut, and Yale University. He received his B.A. degree in economics in 1939, went on to Yale Law School. In 1942 he was graduated cum laude.

After Navy service, he was named assistant to the president of Mead Corp., a manufacturer of paper products, with headquarters in New York. In the following year, he joined the law firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, one of the leading Wall Street legal concerns. Vance was made a full partner in 1952.

He married Grace Elsie Sloane, daughter of the retired head of W. & J. Sloane Co., of New York, in 1947. The Vances have five children, Elsie, 15, Amy Sloane, 13, twins Grace Roberts and Camilla, 12, and Cyrus Roberts, Jr., 9.

The foregoing is bare biography.

It chronicles the rapid rise of a bright young man to a high position in the business world. It illustrates the career path a well-trained, wealthy man would normally take.

But behind this brief outline is the story of an exceptional individual, a man who has the destinies of millions locked in his agile mind.

Who is Bob Vance? How did he get there and where is he going? Those are questions impossible to answer, but some insight can be gained by tracing his career. The rounding out of a personality can be partly done by probing the thoughts of loved ones, close friends, and colleagues.

The search begins in the Pentagon, through the giant spaghetti bowl of corridors to room 3E718, located on the outer ring of the puzzle palace overlooking a mall. Here is where the man spends most of his waking hours; in its spacious confines history is being written.

On a typical day, he will have awakened around 6 a.m., skimmed through three newspapers during a hearty breakfast while awaiting the arrival of his civilian chauffeur. ("Bob absolutely refuses to use an enlisted man for the job; he believes it's not a military function," a close friend confides.)

He usually arrives at his giant oaken desk between 7:15 and 7:30 a.m. On it is a carefully prepared memorandum—which he had written immediately before departure the previous evening—outlining the chores of the day. He reviews it as he drinks a cup of strong coffee, 1 of about 15 during the day ("a carryover from my Navy days").

When the daily schedule is set in his mind, Vance whips across the hall to the cable room, where he reads overnight dispatches from his worldwide organization. After dictating replies, he returns to his desk for the beginning of a series of conferences. On an average day, between 35 and 40 high-placed personages will meet with him, interspersed by almost constant phone calls. And always, lurking in the tight schedule, is that quick summons from the White House or the Hill or the Strategy Board.

Glaring balefully across the large room at the oil-painted resemblance of Elvis Stahr is the portrait of Henry L. Stinson, the only man appointed twice as Army Secretary. The flag-lined office in itself is a fascinating study. About 20 by 50 feet of buff rug and off-white walls, the Secretary's suite is more of a living quarters than an office. Off to one side is a complete kitchen, from which luncheons are served almost daily at noontime conferences with key figures. Another feature is a bedroom, where he sleeps spasmodically during prolonged crises. It includes a handsome trophy case filled with awards and mementos of his military tours, but visitors are rarely permitted to inspect it. Displayed prominently in the case is the West Virginia Distinguished Service Medal awarded during his visit last summer to the 16th Special Forces encampment. The Preston County site, incidentally, is the only National Guard encampment he has visited during his term of office.

Vance has strong ties to West Virginia, although his residence in the Mountain State has been relatively brief.

He was only 6 months old when his father, a highly successful insurance man, accepted a post in New York as vice president of Baird & Co., an international insurance firm. The family moved to sedate Bronxville, N.Y. Mr. Vance headed the war materials insurance board during World War I. When Bob was 5 years old, the father suddenly contracted pneumonia and died.

The family returned to Clarksburg and took up residence at 123 Main Street West, in an imposing old two-story colonial home built in 1804. It is the oldest residence in Clarksburg.

At this point, Mrs. Amy Vance became the dominant factor in molding the man who now holds one of the most critical posts in Government. Today a tireless civic worker in Clarksburg, Mrs. Vance had some rather progressive ideas about rearing her fatherless children 40 years ago. She sought to teach them self-discipline, independence, and personal integrity.

"She has always given me good advice," says Bob Vance. "I remember the year she took us to Switzerland, to a private school near Clarens on Lake Geneva. She insisted that we learn to speak French. So she placed us with a Swiss family that could not speak English."

Mrs. Vance explains: "I felt that if they were to learn the language, they'd have to live with it. I only visited them on weekends, and little English was spoken even then."

"I think this is a good example of her efforts to each us self-reliance," her son remarked. "It taught us to adapt to change."

This early oversea experience paid off in another way years later. During World War II, brother John served behind the lines as an intelligence agent in advance of General Patton's 3d Army, speaking French like a native in successfully contacting underground fighters.

Bob Vance decided to be a lawyer when he was about 8 years old. He explained:

"We used to spend Sundays with the John W. Davises. (The families are related; James H. Davis III, State senator from Kanawha County, is a distant cousin.) I used to browse in Mr. Davis' law library. I remembered the smell of bound leather, and those wonderfully big shelves of law books."

Davis, a distinguished attorney and former Democratic candidate for President in 1921, used to pose legal problems to young Bob and ask for solutions. Flattered, Bob would spend hours researching the law library before delivering an opinion.

He was enrolled at Kent School shortly after the family's return to Clarksburg in 1930, and spent only summers at home after that. At school, he earned the nickname of "Spider" as star wing on the hockey team.

"I grew about 8 inches in 1 year," said the slim 6-footer, "and I was all elbows and knees coming down the ice." Vance also rowed crew and played football. Coincidentally, Kent had a rousing sports rivalry with nearby Choate, where another passable football player named John F. Kennedy was enrolled.

During World War II both Kennedy as a PT-boat commander and Vance as a destroyer gunnery officer participated in a number of engagements, including the Solomons campaign, but never met.

At Yale, Vance played varsity wing on the hockey team, was a member of the Fence Club, Scroll and Key, Torch Honor Society, and, in law school, was selected student director of the Yale Moot Court of Appeals.

(A back injury suffered in a hockey game at Yale caused recurring pain, until last fall Vance was forced to undergo corrective surgery during the height of the Cuban crisis.)

As an up-and-coming civil trials lawyer at Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, Vance handled a number of important cases. His firm represented, among others, Texas oil interests and the Ford Motor Co.

Vance first entered Government service in 1957, when Russia's launching of sputnik shook up U.S. defense planners. During 1957–60 he was special counsel to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Later he was named consulting counsel to the Special Senate Committee on Space and Astronautics. Chairman of the latter committee was Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Democrat, of Texas.

"Senator Johnson told me that the work probably would only take a couple of weeks," Vance recalled smilingly. "Four months later we were still hard at it, working practically around the clock."

Vance was known in Washington as a quiet, highly competent legal prober during the space hearings. "He was around 2 weeks before many of us realized he was there," one key figure in the hearings remembers.

His committee performance, coupled with his economics background, led to a telephone call to his New York office 1 day late in 1960.

"It was right before Christmas, and I was asked to come to Washington as counsel for the Department of Defense. I only had a couple of days to give an answer. * * * It really shook up our plans for the holidays," he recalled.

Vance was labeled a "Lyndon Johnson man" by several Washington columnists who considered him a protege of the then Vice President. Later, as his stature rose in the Deparment, he was tagged with the term "McNamara's man."

Vance bridles at both implications.

"I like to consider myself my own man," he snapped, then added with a grin, "I believe you should be loyal to the people you work for and do the best job you can." In answer to the obvious question, ex-Navyman Vance replied: "I cheered for Army during that game."

Washington pundits feel that Vance is the man who has President Johnson's "ear on national security matters." And his precision of thought, orderliness and attention to detail draws McNamara's respect.

Vance, quite expectedly, is a fast and voracious reader. He can speed read through a thick sheaf of reports and replay every vital phrase.

"He has a photographic memory," his mother, Mrs. Amy Vance, said pridefully. "I remember one time we took a motor trip out West. Bob had been on the same route years before—and he remembered every turn in the road before we came to it."

Joseph P. Condry, a boyhood chum in Clarksburg, said Bob Vance excelled in all sports as a boy. "But he probably wasn't a natural athlete like his brother John. Bob's ability came through long practice."

Condry, an attorney, State racing commissioner and executive secretary of the West Virginia Savings & Loan Association, recollected:

"Bob used to come back to Clarksburg every summer. He wasn't the typical snobbish kid home from prep school. I remember we'd play tennis every day, and he had a controlled, perfect swing. Most of us in the west side gang would slop the ball around, but Bob would stick to the form he was taught, even to the extent of losing a game."

Daniel V. Louchery, Clarksburg attorney and former State Republican chairman, recalled Bob as a serious boy, but added "we did all the things that growing boys do."

Louchery, who practiced law for 5 years with John Vance before the latter went to Rochester in 1960, was a classmate of John F. Kennedy at Choate.

Col. William E. Miller, lifelong friend of Bob Vance, remembers spending endless hours at the comfortable old Vance home. "We must have eaten a million gallons of peanut butter," he grinned, Miller, assistant adjutant general in the West Virginia National Guard, was instrumental in getting Vance to visit Camp Dawson, where he was post commandant, during last summer's special forces training exercise.

According to his mother, Bob Vance likes to wear plain combat fatigues during his visits to military installations. During last summer's giant Operation Big Lift to Germany, Vance startled a number of GI's when he approached them to chat in company with a group of top generals. "They thought he was a lowly private at first," an aide commented.

His working uniform, however, is usually an Ivy League-cut suit, preferably pinstriped, and he wears red ties, badly knotted. Because of his long work hours, he and his pretty blonde wife, Gay, do little entertaining at their magnificent Georgetown home, acquired from outgoing Navy Secretary John Connally, who resigned to run successfully for Governor of Texas. Connally presently is recuperating from wounds incurred during the November 22 assassination of President Kennedy.

The $22,000-a-year Army Secretary and his wife try to avoid the Washington social swim, preferring to devote their rare hours at home with the children and puttering around in their garden.

An Episcopalian, Vance is a former vestryman in the Church of the Heavenly Rest, looks forward to Sunday services in Washington when time permits. "It's the only time our family is ever completely together," he remarked. His oldest daughter, Elsie, attends St. Timothy School at Baltimore, and and the four younger children are enrolled at Potomac School.

A man of Spartan habits, probably inherited from his Welsh ancestors, Vance sips an occasional highball at social functions, and sparingly smokes cigars and cigarettes.

He is painfully reluctant to talk about himself, but he describes with obvious pride the things "we feel we have achieved in the past few years." A team thinker, Vance fre-

quently lapses into the third person when describing his mission.

"We have improved our Army's combat readiness immeasurably in the past 3 years," he says. "Another major achievement has been the development of a strategy of flexible response * * * we are making good progress toward greater mobility involving air assault."

With the job always unfinished, what about his future? "I'll stay on the job as long as the President wants me to," he answers humbly.

Eventually, however, he hopes to form his own private law firm.

"I feel every person who has had certain advantages should give some thought to public service," he observed. "I've always felt very strongly that all of us have an obligation * * * to me it is just as important to make a contribution at the local level as it is in State or Federal Government. We all have a duty to perform."

That is the man—Cyrus Robert Vance—who is our choice for "West Virginian of 1963."

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS,
January 7, 1964.

Hon. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CYRUS: Congratulations on your selection by the Sunday Gazette-Mail of Charleston as "West Virginian for 1963." The fully merited designation places your name on a select honor roll of distinguished natives and citizens of our State who have made vital and important contributions to the progress of West Virginia and the Nation. To have been so appropriately honored in West Virginia's centennial year is another distinction which justifies the commendation which I am privileged and pleased to extend.

May this new year give to you added achievement and a sense of constructive service as you carry forward the vital assignment in our Defense Department.

Very truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Help-Wanted Ads Increase With Rising Demands for Skills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in its December 31 issue, the Wall Street Journal carried a lead story showing that help-wanted ads have recently risen sharply even while unemployment remains a serious problem. The reason is that the unemployed workers do not live where job openings are appearing and, even when they do, their lack of wanted skills generally makes it impossible for them to fill the job openings.

The job vacancies are almost entirely for skilled personnel. Openings for teenagers and others with few or no skills are almost nonexistent, according to the Journal article. The irony is that employers are finding it increasingly difficult to fill their openings for skilled personnel. The answer to the problem is clearly training and retraining as well as greater mobility among the unemployed in going where the jobs are.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Wall Street Journal of December 31, 1963, in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HELP WANTED: ADS TO LURE WORKERS RISE, REVERSING SLUMP; DEMAND HIGH FOR SKILLS; 4-MONTH UPTURN SHOWS BUSINESS OPTIMISM; SOUTH, WEST, MIDWEST PACE GAINS—AN ANOMALY IN WEST VIRGINIA

"Help wanted: Immediate openings for salesmen, engineers, department store clerks, office workers, draftsmen, machinists, waitresses, construction workers, managers, and many others. Apply in almost any large city."

This imaginary ad sums up thousands of actual appeals for workers now showing up in newspapers across the Nation. Taken together, the ads show a striking trend: Help wanted advertising has risen sharply in recent months from year-ago levels, reversing a downward slide through most of 1963.

The increased volume of such advertising is notworthy for several reasons. For one, it suggests continued confidence by businessmen that the economy will continue to steam along at high levels, at least in the near future. Employers tend to expand work forces only when the outlook is for rising sales and favorable conditions.

Also, the heavy volume of help wanted notices points up important aspects of the Nation's jobless problem. The unemployed often don't live where job openings are appearing; and even when they do, their lacks of wanted skills make them round pegs for square holes.

FRUSTRATED EMPLOYERS

Employers in many areas, particularly the South, Midwest, and Far West, are eager to hire and often are frustrated by the scarcity of workers for the jobs they want to fill. The jobs going begging are most often in skilled and technical fields where a premium is placed on experience. The unemployed tend to be the unskilled, the unschooled, and the inexperienced.

While job ads nationally are on the rise, city-by-city figures show that the search for workers is not evenly distributed around the country. In some of the largest U.S. cities, where chronic unemployment is a problem, help-wanted ads in November trailed a year ago by as much as 10 percent. These cities include New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston.

But in other cities, employers are scrambling to hire available workers. In the South, Nashville help-wanted notices in November soared 63 percent ahead of a year ago. Atlanta posted a 29-percent gain, Jacksonville 32 percent, and New Orleans 35 percent. In the West, Los Angeles, Phoenix, and San Diego reported up to 24 percent more ads. In midwestern towns like Flint, Mich., Peoria, Ill., and Indianapolis, job offerings are running well ahead of a year ago.

The U.S. jobless total has hovered under 6 percent of the work force in recent months, well below the 7.1 percent peak for 1961 and 7.6 percent for 1958, both during recession periods. At latest count, in mid-November, the Labor Department estimated total unemployment at a seasonally adjusted 5.9 percent. But the overall figure may mask the real problem. Teenagers, for example, had an unusually high rate, 17.7 percent in mid-November. Yet only 3.2 percent of married men were jobless.

STEPPING UP RECRUITING

Whatever the magnitude and precise nature of the country's unemployment, it's clear that employers are stepping up their efforts to recruit some kinds of workers. Help wanted ads trailed the 1962 pace every month this year through August, according to a continuing survey of over 100 major daily newspapers by B. K. Davis & Bros., a Philadelphia company that publishes monthly data on such ads. Then, in September, the ad volume moved 1 percent ahead of the 1962 month. In October it jumped 5 percent ahead and the following month showed a 6-percent gain.

Though December figures aren't in yet, the rise should be in the same range as November's, says Gerald G. Griffin, publisher of B. K. Davis' monthly reports. He adds, "There's no question that despite the high national unemployment rate, employers are looking increasingly hard for more professional-type workers such as those in the service industries in many areas of the country."

A Wall Street Journal survey of about a dozen cities turns up ample evidence that skilled and experienced workers are in demand and hard to find.

The Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star reports help wanted ads in September through November ran 30 percent ahead of the like 1962 months. Ernest Roberts, classified ad manager, attributes this to across-the-board improvement in general business conditions. A key factor: Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria's biggest employer, is enjoying high sales and is hiring. Caterpillar says it's easy to find shop and assembly workers, but it's running into trouble finding enough research technicians, draftsmen, and detailers.

DEFENSE INDUSTRY DEMAND

Defense and aerospace industry spending is creating demands for workers in many areas. The New Orleans Times-Picayune and States-Item says help wanted advertising is up 20 percent this year from 1962. "The biggest category of help wanted ads seem to be recruitment copy for the space projects, with engineers the most sought-after group," says Fred W. Oabes, classified ad manager. "But all types of skilled and technical people are in demand."

A big factor in New Orleans' hiring boom is a Chrysler Corp.-Boeing Co. plant that is turning out Saturn rocket boosters for the lunar exploration program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The 10-percent boost in military pay effective last October 1 is stimulating local economies that are heavily dependent on defense installations. This in turn spurs hiring. The San Diego Union's help wanted ads in the first half of December showed a 6-percent gain from the year-ago period, according to Stanley Whilldin, classified ad manager. The military pay hike adds an estimated $100,000 daily to the previous $1 million a day military payroll in the area, he says.

Many employment agencies voice frustration when trying to match job orders with applicants. "We could place 100 able secretaries today if we had them," complains L. B. Dow, Jr., manager of the Memphis office of the Tennessee Department of Employment Security. "And there's a constant demand for skilled mechanics and technicians, but we're dragging the bottom of the barrel when it comes to qualified applicants.

WANTED: $15,000 MANAGER

Even jobs with relatively lavish salaries can be hard to fill. A spokesman for a major Atlanta, Ga., employment agency notes, "One company has had us looking for a general manager at $15,000 to $20,000 a year for more than 3 months, but we haven't been able to find any qualified applicants, even though we've run ads all over the southeast."

The Atlanta Journal and Constitution reports help wanted ads "are definitely setting records this year." November topped the year-ago month by 29 percent and every month this year, except February, has shown

gains from 1962. "The only reason I can give is that business has been good in Atlanta," notes a spokesman. Officeworkers top the list of employees being sought, with department store sales help also a key category. "Very few of the ads are for unskilled help of any kind," he adds.

The $41 billion Interstate Highway System now being built with 90-percent Federal financing is touching off a search for construction workers in many areas.

Construction of Interstate 70 near Wheeling, W. Va., is among factors putting that city among the leaders in help wanted advertising gains lately. Wheeling's November job ads rose 30 percent above the 1962 level.

Wheeling is an anomaly in a State where a depressed mining industry has become a national symbol of chronic joblessness. But Wheeling is an industrial town, situated in a peninsula of land jutting up between Pennsylvania and Ohio. "It should have been in Pennsylvania if they would have kept the map straight," notes William A. Bell, manager of promotion and national and classified advertising for the two Wheeling dailies, the News-Register and the Intelligencer.

LITTLE BITS ADD UP

"We've had no big hiring (in Wheeling), just little bits that add up," says Mr. Bell. Besides the demand for highway workers, employment is up at Wheeling Steel Corp. and among some local coal operators. Valley Camp Coal Co., Cleveland, says its Wheeling area mines have increased employment about 15 percent this year from a year ago.

Valley Camp Coal is looking for skilled workers, but says they're hard to find, even in a State full of unemployed coal miners. Among men in short supply are those able to operate cutting machines and shuttle cars. "Electricians are just nonexistent and we have to train our own," says D. S. Cunningham, general superintendent.

In sharp contrast to the stepped-up help wanted advertisements aimed at skilled workers, most cities report that ads for teenage help are almost nonexistent.

The Indianapolis Star-News is among papers that report almost no demand for teenage workers. The paper actually discourages employers from advertising specifically for such younger help. "We don't think they should be taking jobs away from family men just because they'll work for less," says Paul C. Schulz, classified ad manager.

Hardest hit of all among the teenagers are those without a high school diploma. Ralph Gable, manager of the Ohio State Employment Service office in Columbus, says high school graduates have no trouble locating jobs, because Columbus is enjoying relatively full employment. "But it's difficult to place high school dropouts," he adds.

Our Captain Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph F. Spalla, of Baltimore. The poem, written in the style of Walt Whitman's "Oh Captain, My Captain," is a tribute to the late President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CAPTAIN LIVES

(On the style of Walt Whitman's "Oh Captain, My Captain")

Say thou the captain doth not speak?
E'er in mortal silence held?
Pray not that this be so,
Tis told he waits on sunlit heights,
Cross 'Tomac's green banked rill,
Yes! There! There! There he stands,
Mid Arl'n'ton's valored band.
Oh say! Say not! Say not to us!
Our beloved captain's dead.
Say thou the flashing smile, unruly lock,
Shall ne'er more be seen?
That "vigahed" voice forever dimmed
Neath mournful tread of saddened feet?
Oh say! Say not! Say not to us!
Our beloved captain's dead.
For short tenure he strode,
The forecastle's embattled tenement,
There commanding with brave stand,
The destined course of this God favored land.
A Madonna knelt, no sign revealing,
The tragic aura of her woe,
'n pressed a circlet made o'gold
In our captain's stilled hand.
A covenant death could not void
Twas in that moment made.
Lo! She leaves! She leaves him not!
Daily to his side she goes,
To abide n'whisper tender words
That only he should know.
O shriven day! O grieved loss!
Engraved upon our hearts will stay.
Stay thy hand! Thou forlorn fate!
Turn back the pierced shards in flight,
Return to us our captain brave
To lead our way these peril'd days.
O tiara'd mother of our shores,
Thou harbored dame of liberty
Lift up thy beaconed torch e'er higher,
To guide our captain on his way.
Console us in our grief O mother,
Assuage our murderous pain this day.
"Hush! Hush! My people! Hear me!
My son, your brother, passed by this way,
And stopped to bid the time of day.
I told him to be faithful, I told him to be free,
For nowhere in this wide wide world
Will be found one such as he."
"Yes," she seems to whisper
With vibrant voice aglow,
"He lives! He lives! He lives in immortality!"

John McCormack Well Fitted To Assume Presidential Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged to request that I may be permitted by unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by James G. Colbert, well-known newspaper columnist of Massachusetts, entitled "JOHN MCCORMACK Well Fitted To Assume Presidential Post." This editorial appeared in the week of December 16, 1963, issues of the following newspapers: Dedham Transcript, Needham Chronicle, Newton Graphic, Parkway Transcript, West Roxbury Transcript, Norwood Messenger, Westwood Press, Norfolk County Press, and the Blackstone Valley News.

Mr. Colbert is one of the most highly respected members of the press. He is widely read, an astute political analyist and has a broad background in newspaper work. Formerly, he was political editor of the Boston Post and a prominent writer for the Record American. He is recognized as one of the great newspapermen of our time.

The article follows:

JOHN MCCORMACK WELL FITTED TO ASSUME PRESIDENTIAL POST

(By James G. Colbert)

If Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK isn't the best qualified person to step into the Presidency in the event anything happened to Lyndon Johnson, it would be difficult to figure out who is.

That's why objective observers of the political scene can't quite understand what is behind the attacks leveled at MCCORMACK by certain self-annointed pundits.

When a law was enacted back in 1947 providing that the Speaker of the National House of Representatives would be next in line for the Presidency, there was no outcry of protest.

An extraordinary situation was created at that time. Harry S. Truman had taken over the Presidential reins upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. There was no Vice President. Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was Speaker of the National House as a result of the Republican wave which rolled across the Nation in 1946.

Had Truman died in either 1947 or 1948, he would have been succeeded by MARTIN, and the Presidency would have passed from a Democrat to a Republican.

That would have represented an upheaval rather than a smooth transition in the National Government. But the columnists now questioning whether MCCORMACK should remain next in line for the Presidency raised no objection to MARTIN back in 1947 and 1948.

With all due respect and deference to JOE MARTIN who was an able Speaker, it would be preposterous to claim that MCCORMACK is any less qualified for the Presidency today than MARTIN was 16 years ago.

A legitimate argument could be raised against MCCORMACK if he were to stand for election as President. That is that he has reached the age where the enormous Presidential burdens could prove too heavy for him to assume for a 4-year period.

MCCORMACK, however, isn't running for the Office. He simply is holding himself in readiness in case any emergency should develop in the next 13 months.

With the possible exception of Lyndon Johnson, JOHN W. MCCORMACK probably is better qualified to be President than any Vice President back through the sweep of the years who stood only a heartbeat from the Presidency.

It is fair to say that JOHN MCCORMACK is better prepared for the Presidency at this moment than was Harry Truman when Franklin D. Roosevelt died in 1945.

JOHN MCCORMACK fills the second most important and powerful post in the National Government. His power far surpassed that of Lyndon Johnson when John F. Kennedy was President.

The truth is that some Washington commentators have never given JOHN MCCORMACK full credit for his outstanding work and his great accomplishments in Congress.

That is largely because MCCORMACK is a modest, self-effacing man who does not shoulder anyone aside to get the spotlight.

He shuns Washington's social life and cocktail parties to which some of the commentators attach so much importance. He

is too busy working to attend such affairs. That may be a grievous failing in the eyes of some capital pontificators.

McCormack was seriously boomed for the Democratic nomination for Vice President back in 1948. He had widespread support and would have been a potent contender if there had been an open convention fight. Instead, he stepped aside when Harry Truman indicated he wanted Alben Barkley as his running mate.

In 1956, Massachusetts Democrats voted 3 to 2 for McCormack as their presidential preference over Adlai Stevenson who was subsequently nominated a second time as the Democratic candidate for President.

Many honors have come to McCormack in his public career. Except for his election to the speakership, it's doubtful that he values any of them more highly than the vote of confidence the people of Massachusetts gave him in the 1956 presidential primary.

One can't help but wonder what kind of man the columnists, who have been rapping McCormack, think should be standing next in line for the Presidency.

Shouldn't he be a man experienced in Government who could move into the breach in a national emergency? If so, who better can meet that test than John McCormack?

It's also becoming a little wearying to read in syndicated columns that John McCormack is no Sam Rayburn. Of course, he isn't. The two men were different in many ways. There was only one Sam Rayburn just as there is only one John McCormack.

John McCormack really needs no defense from this writer or anyone else. His record speaks for itself. His name will live in history long after those who directed barbs at him are forgotten.

Comments of Pegge A. Cooksley, of Ucross, Wyo., on the Assassination of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, among the thousands of articles and comments evoked by the brutal assassination of President Kennedy, few have been as eloquent as a Farm Bureau release authored by Pegge A. Cooksley, of Ucross, Wyo.

Writing for the Sheridan Press under the date of November 29, 1963, Mrs. Cooksley draws attention not only to the overwhelming grief of the people of Dallas, but also to the impact of the killing upon the attitudes and perspective of our young people.

Mrs. Cooksley's article, written a few days after the assassination, remains one of the few that can stand valid and credible in the searching light of retrospection, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FARM BUREAU

(By Pegge A. Cooksley)

President Lyndon B. Johnson has assumed the office of our Chief Executive under the most trying circumstances. It is natural that with every change of our leaders there emerges a little feeling of reservation and unrest but we can thank God that we have a type of government that, even in such cases as the swift, tragic incidents of last Friday, we are not left long without an elected leader and sentinel of our welfare. In this instance, Lyndon B. Johnson, a man of many years governmental experience, a man who proved his strength in our Congress, stood prepared to accept the duties of the President who was so brutally taken from us.

President Johnson has set an example for us to follow by resuming the execution of our own duties and responsibilities as quickly as possible though the shock we have suffered may be long in healing.

One of our first responsibilities should be to the people of the proud and beautiful city of Dallas and the State of Texas whose grief, perhaps, is deeper than anyone elses in the Nation. Those thousands of people who greeted the Kennedys with warmth and compassion have been made to feel, by some, that our national tragedy weighs heavily upon their shoulders. If there is any humility in our hearts we will let them know that our sympathies rest with them as well as the Kennedy family. Instead of shame and guilt Dallas should be consoled by the fact that they gave to Mr. Kennedy in his last hours the triumph of friendship and happiness. The warped morals and values of the Marxists will prompt them to strike anywhere and it was the misfortune of Dallas that theirs was the scene selected for this atrocious crime against humanity.

We have another responsibility which is to our young people. The death of our President will probably remain deeply etched in their minds for the rest of their lives and they should understand that such acts are not Christian or American. They should understand that although people may disagree sharply on political matters they do not condone any act of violence against flesh or property whether it be against our President, the merchant, the farmer, or truck driver. The murder of officer Tippitt and assassin Lese Oswald should leave in us as deep a sense of repulsion as it has for the death of President Kennedy. We have no right to abuse—or condone the abuse—of the person or property of any other man.

Our young people should understand that it is ordained by our Constitution and Declaration of Independence that ours shall be a "government by the people" and if we are to preserve that government of liberty and human dignity we are obligated to speak out against those things which we feel are not in keeping with or not conducive to the strength of our Constitution. But we abuse that responsibility when we criticize with an open mouth and closed mind. We abuse that privilege when we take the laws into our own hands. We must be guided by constructive thought of practical application as to economic value and the personal rights of others. We cannot be derelict in either of these responsibilities.

We have a responsibility of morals and moral ethics and we have a responsibility in government. They are not foreign in nature to one another. What is foreign to both is the abridgment of the privacy and rights of others.

When and How To Cut Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the November issue of the Tax Review, published by the Tax Foundation, contained an article by Roswell Magill on the subject of "When and How To Cut Federal Taxes."

Mr. Magill was a former Under Secretary of the Treasury, is now chairman of the Tax Foundation and of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, and as such, has ample background for his very constructive thoughts.

His article follows:

WHEN AND HOW TO CUT FEDERAL TAXES

(By Roswell Magill)

In facing the question of whether taxes should be cut now, it is important to keep clearly in mind what we can hope to accomplish by a tax cut. In understandable but probably excessive enthusiasm, some persons have claimed that tax reduction is virtually a panacea that will do everything from easing juvenile delinquency to reducing the problems which grow out of automation. Even more restrained advocates offer a tax cut as a magic charm to bring what might be called instant prosperity, or at the least, to provide insurance against recession.

This is overstating the merits of tax reduction. As the Committee on Federal Tax Policy has pointed out in its new report, "Financing America's Future: Taxes, Economic Stability, and Growth," modification of the tax system alone cannot solve today's unemployment. The latter has its sources in a variety of conditions, such as lack of training for the new job opportunities, shifts in consumer demand, difficulties the unemployed face in moving to other areas, the unattractiveness of some depressed communities for new investment by business, wage demands, competition from abroad, and so on.

No tax changes can eliminate all the problems involved in unemployment nor all the obstacles to job creation for the young people who will be seeking work. It would be wise not to expect modification of the tax system to accomplish such miracles. On the other hand, there are certain things—important things—that we can expect to accomplish by the right kind of tax change.

First and foremost is a reduction of the tremendous burden which finds the average American paying more than one-quarter of his income to government at all levels. The personal income tax, including payroll taxes, now accounts for 62 percent of total Federal tax revenues. This compares with 22 percent in the 1930's and 44 percent during World War II. A tax change which permits the individual to spend more of his money the way he wishes, instead of handing it over to government to spend, would in itself be a big accomplishment. A tax change which permits private choices to govern more spending decisions is desirable on its own merits. All of us know, of course, that we must pay out some of our earnings for the cost of government. But what we are now compelled to pay is great than seems truly essential.

Secondly, we can expect the right kind of tax change to stir up new economic activity of all kinds. This Nation has grown great and prosperous through advances in the private sector. Reduction of tax burdens on the private sector is not only a valuable end in itself but also a means of aiding progress. The present Federal individual income tax actively discourages all too many people from making their best contribution to growth and prosperity. The highest tax rates fall on men and women whose efforts are highly productive. The heaviest rates fall with greatest weight on the fruits of additional efforts and additional saving. The burdens on business also act as a drag on progress.

It is not generally recognized that the individual income tax rates ranging up to 91 percent fall not only on individuals but also

in fact on the earnings of most businesses. Of the 11 million businesses in the United States in 1960, 10 million were sole proprietorships and parnerships. The high rates of the individual income tax hit hard those which are successful. Earnings which their owners would use to finance growth and job creation go to the tax collector. A personal income tax which puts such obstacles in the way of business growth is not an aid to business expansion.

Though tax reduction will not work the wonders sometimes predicted, tax changes of the right kind will result in more private spending, saving, and investment, aiding economic expansion and job creation. Business is so much a part of our economic life that every dollar paid in any form in taxes will have some influence on business—and consequently on economic growth. General tax reduction, therefore, will make for a healthier, more efficient, more progressive economy.

Thus, two results we can expect from proper tax changes are an increase in the ability of the taxpayer to spend more of his money as he sees fit—an enlargement of his freedom—and increased economic activity that would have the ultimate effect of raising further the American standard of living.

These are worthy goals. They do not have the immediate political appeal of eliminating unemployment or eradicating juvenile delinquency, but tax changes which help bring them about ought to have widespread appeal.

PLAN TAX REDUCTION FOR LONG RUN

Basing a decision on these anticipated results only, the present is definitely the time to cut taxes. Unfortunately, there is one other weighty consideration—the general fiscal situation. Growth of Federal spending has outstripped population increases, the rise in prices, and the average rise in the national product. By some time next year, the Federal Government will have spent $1 trillion since the end of fighting in Korea. Contrary to popular belief, the biggest spending increases have been in domestic programs, not defense. Accumulated Federal budget deficits in the past 10 years, after allowing for some surpluses, will total about $40 billion by next June 30. Should taxes be cut in the face of this history of deficits, especially if a tax cut would increase the probability of deficits for several years in the future? What Congress does now in reducing taxes cannot be reversed easily. It is hard to change the tax law. Rate cuts now are not likely to be restored if deficits persist and inflation increases. Tax reduction now should be planned with the longrun in view, not chiefly the needs of the next few months.

The problem of budget deficits cannot be dismissed as something which tax reduction will eventually eliminate. There is only one safe way to finance tax reduction for the years ahead. That is by restricting Federal expenditures.

I strongly agree with the recommendation of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy that Federal budget expenditures be held to $95 billion for the next 3 years—$7 billion more than 1962. This ought to be enough to buy the Federal Government services the country really needs. A ceiling of $95 billion seems to me to be in keeping both with the President's promise to keep spending down and with the admonition in the present tax bill to take "all reasonable means to restrain Government spending."

A $95 billion level of spending can be achieved, despite the so-called built-in increases in spending. The Nation can take the tax reduction path to economic expansion instead of risking the expenditure-increase path, which offers no assurance of healthy longrun economic expansion. We shall need to curtail and defer programs, large, and small, that appeal to certain groups; adoption of new and expansion of old grant-in-aid programs for States and localities must be postponed or abandoned; we may need to check the growth of Federal payrolls. If the tax path is to take us where we want to go, we must do what needs to be done to hold down spending. I see no need for huge increases in public works spending or other deferrable programs which feed the budget deficit and invite inflation. Although it is said or implied that inflation is dead, the record of recent years in this country, and events today in some foreign countries must make us careful to avoid inviting inflation.

Federal spending is already so large that a standstill at $95 billion is far from austerity. If coupled with tax changes that leave more money in the private sector, this goal is not unrealistic. When we urge the tax reduction, instead of the expenditure-increase, approach, we implicitly endorse the principle that the Federal Government shall not play an everexpanding, evermore dominating role in the economy; that the vast bulk of economic endeavors should be left in private hands; and that the States and localities should not become increasingly dependent upon the Central Government.

To answer my original question more directly, I believe that taxes can and should be cut now, provided clearcut and effective restraints are placed on Federal expenditures. A carefully designed tax and expenditure program might achieve budget balance by 1966.

The second major question is: Does H.R. 8363 offer the best program for tax reduction? My answer is that it is not the best way.

The present bill is deficient. The amount of tax reduction involved raises issues which I do not wish to discuss now because I wish to focus on the kind of changes proposed.

Present tax burdens on low, as well as on high, incomes are excessive. In presenting the bill originally, the administration gave a somewhat different reason for concentrating revenue losses at the low end of the bracket scale. The President placed predominant emphasis on increases in consumer spending to solve the problems of unemployment and growth. The present bill reflects this view by providing that the bulk of tax reduction would go to the lowest income brackets to bolster consumer spending.

Whatever merit this approach may have had as a temporary expedient in what may have seemed a prerecession situation last winter, this merit has been largely dissipated by economic events since. National income and industrial production are high and show no signs of turning into recession. Under these circumstances, there is no reason to fashion a tax program which will be with us for many years with the predominant objective of giving the economy an artificial stimulant with real risk of inducing more inflation.

A stimulus to consumption may help raise gross national product in the short run. For the longer run, however, growth of consumption depends on expansion of production—and this, in turn, depends on investment.

I do not see how consumer demand can lead to added investment unless the savings to pay for more investment are available. Consumer demand will not create good jobs by the hundreds of thousands each year unless the necessary capital is also available. The bill before you does far too little to make more savings available for investment in relation to what would become available for consumption. Such a pattern cannot be best for longrun growth and job expansion.

LOWERING RATES CAN BE MORE THAN TAX REDUCTION

In view of the investment needed now and in the future, I am astonished that more is not done in the present bill to reduce the highest tax rates. I am not enough of a mathematician to determine whether in a strict sense the bill would actually steepen progression. But the individual income tax rates are more graduated at the lower end of the scale. They are also more compressed at the top. Even under the New Deal, the rate graduation continued to $1 million and then to $5 million. During World War II graduation stopped at $200,000. Now the top level is pushed down to $100,000. Whatever the reasons given to justify progression, I can imagine no logical basis for such a rate scale.

Instead of the 14- to 70-percent rates of H.R. 8363, rates changing from 16 to a top of 50 percent, with much lower burdens than at present in the middle brackets, would be more conducive to economic expansion through savings, efficiency, and incentive for effort. Rates anywhere near 70 percent will inevitably damage the economy by forcing—and I do not think the word is too strong—persons with higher incomes to let tax factors govern much of their business, professional, and investment activities, as they do now. The tax rates which are important for revenue are those applying to the low brackets. The rates important for incentive are those higher up where the revenue involved is relatively slight and substantial relief is not costly.

Lowering tax rates on both corporations and individuals can be far more than a tax reduction. The right kind of rates will also comprise the most important tax reform that can now be made in the Federal tax structure. This kind of reform requires not only a sharp reduction in the top rates but substantial lowering of rates in the middle brackets. Such reductions would be fully justified on grounds of fairness. Moreover, we find here the business, professional, governmental, scientific, artistic, creative leadership whose incentives for the best of effort are so vital for progress. And, of course, much investment originates in these income ranges.

BUSINESS PROVIDES SOME 60 MILLION JOBS

An increase in the dividend credit, not its elimination, is called for if we want to encourage job creation, plant modernization and expansion through investment. A move in the wrong direction is worse than unfortunate and inequitable. It puts investors on notice that the excessive burdening of dividend income will continue, apparently without end. Corporate financing through equity securities will be more difficult.

The reversal of the normal and surtax rates for corporations has disturbing implications. At present, large corporations pay at a rate about 70 percent above the rate on the first $25,000. Under H.R. 8363, the extra burden is almost 120 percent. Such disparity is hard to justify. While we all look with favor on removal of burdens on smaller corporations, we must remember that larger corporations are important providers of jobs; that their owners include more small than rich investors; that big corporations make many of the products which are used by the vast majority of consumers. The proposed tax discrimination seems to me an unjustified burden on businesses of great importance, i.e., on their owners, employees, and consumers. Would it not also make later reduction on the 48-percent rate politically difficult?

"Economic growth" is to a large degree another way of saying "business growth." When it comes to creating new jobs, private business now provides some 60 million jobs, compared with the 9 million paid for out of taxes. About 81 percent of the net total of goods and services created in this country is produced by privately owned enterprises. The best way to achieve economic growth would be to eliminate some of the tax restraints on business. For revenue reasons the process cannot take place all at once. But gradual reduction of the corporate in-

come tax to 30 percent (20 percent under $25,000) is possible.

Recent improvements in depreciation policies are to be applauded. They could be made even more constructive by removing doubts and restrictions growing out of the reserve ratio test. It would also be wise to change the tax law to tax income earned abroad by American companies so as to let them meet the competition of foreign businesses in other countries.

These and other specifics on changing the Federal tax structure are given in more detail in the new report by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy.

Although discussion of details has not been my purpose here, one matter must not pass unmentioned—complexity. The law now is much too complex. H.R. 8363 would add more complexities. Fortunately, the bill does not contain the President's proposal to treat transfer of property at death as occasion for realizing capital gains (or to provide carryover of basis). Regardless of the weakness of the arguments in support of the proposal, the complications involved should end the matter.

There is one other point I should like to mention. If Congres should pass a substantial tax reduction bill, embodying major reforms in the rate structure, there is still the chance that expenditures will not be controlled to any appreciable degree. If the budget deficits get out of hand and, more serious, inflation threatens, we should not reinstate the destructive rates of the present income taxes.

As pointed out by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, there are a number of tax alternatives including a value-added tax and various types of excises which would be better for the Nation than reimposition of present income tax rates. I mention these alternatives, but I really have faith that Congress will make them unnecessary by reasserting its constitutional control of the purse strings and keeping a tight clamp on spending increases. Despite the tremendous spending pressures to which all members of Congress are subject, a great many Americans will applaud and support renewed efforts to control Federal expenditures and thus make it possible to advance safely along the road to economic expansion via tax reductions.

Dilatory Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal of January 6, 1964, there appears an exceptional article by Jonathan Spivak. It is a study in depth of the measures of public welfare enacted by the Congress during the administration of President Kennedy.

Mr. Spivak has taken the time to examine the record of legislation with thoroughness and objectivity. The result is a most erudite and fair evaluation of a major aspect of the work of the Kennedy Congresses.

This country, as Mr. Spivak notes, has taken a monumental step forward in the fields of education, mental health, drug reform, antipollution work, and many other fields of welfare. The full impact of the measures enacted will not be felt immediately. But in the years ahead, they will be of immense benefit to all of the people of the Nation. The Kennedy Congresses did not ignore foreign relations any more than their predecessors. But they did concentrate on the vast accumulation of neglected domestic needs. Mr. Spivak's article goes beneath the superficial criticism of recent weeks and sets forth in detail how these Congresses remembered and acted on behalf of the forgotten American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mr. Spivak.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILATORY CONGRESS?—MAJOR WELFARE ACTIONS ARE OVERLOOKED AMID CRITICISM

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—When the Nation's lawmakers troop back to town tomorrow, they will face a raft of unfinished domestic legislative concerns.

Civil rights, tax reduction, public school education aid heads the list of long deferred Kennedy proposals that have been stalled and stymied in Congress labyrinthian ways. Thus the politicians are increasingly berated for their alleged inactivity and unwillingness to come to grips with the country's urgent needs.

This chorus of criticism from the press and public, however, obscures the monumental health, education, and welfare contributions of this Congress and its predecessor. The lawmakers, under the spur of the New Frontier, have enacted a medley of new programs, some highly controversial and all significantly expanding Uncle Sam's commitments—at a potential cost of billions in coming decades. And many of these measures breezed through, with surprising speed and facility, the same Congress that is now being blamed for dilatoriness.

"We do not have any complaint at all," declares one legislative expert at the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. "Just think of what Congress has given us this year alone—mental health, mental retardation, medical schools and all the education measures."

EXTENSIVE WELFARE LEGISLATION

Some administration experts even believe the reforms and additions to domestic welfare programs in the Kennedy years compare favorably with the results during the heyday of the New Deal. They certainly surpass at least the legislative yield in any comparable span of years since then. "We think Congress is grand," declares one administration education expert.

One reason for the spate of public criticism, of course, is that the programs already passed have not been blessed with the promotion attending the unenacted measures. And a good many of the new programs admittedly don't merit equal billing with such potentially sweeping and emotion-arousing changes as adoption of social security-financed medical care for 18 million of the Nation's aged. Furthermore, some are so specific and limited in import, such as a measure raising the ceiling an extra $45 million on the Government's college student loan program, that few outside the immediate beneficiaries are aware of the change.

But compelling testimony to Congress' activity during the New Frontier will probably be revealed in the Johnson administration's new antipoverty program. Officials have already made it amply clear that major portions of this attack on poverty, itself a Kennedy concept, will not be new at all. Instead the program will stress deploying such going Government operations as vocational education, manpower retraining and welfare aid to the unemployed—all enacted or enlarged in the last 3 years—more effectively agaist poverty and ignorance.

THE FIGHT AGAINST POVERTY

"Almost every Kennedy domestic program we've gotten through Congress deals in some way with poverty. It's hard to demonstrate that any real new tools are needed," declares one high administration official.

As so often happens with new legislation, however, it will be years before the full fruits of the new health, education, and welfare undertakings are realized. One of the very earliest of President Kennedy's domestic legislative successes, the 1962 welfare reform amendments stressing rehabilitation rather than relief, is only now being adopted and applied by State and local welfare agencies. And the major 1963 measures—including classroom construction aid for colleges and universities, modernization and expansion of federally supported vocational education, and new programs for the prevention of and research into mental retardation—won't begin to have any large impact for a year or so.

But even though the final effect of these programs can't be clearly preceived, one point is evident. The current Congress and its predecessor, despite impatient cries from some liberals, have already redeemed many of the Kennedy administration's myriad requests for social welfare legislation. The result has been to plunge the Federal Government into new and uncharted obligations on a broad domestic front.

The initial cost of these new programs will be measured in a few hundreds of millions of dollars a year. In fact, because of the overall appropriations slowdown, some of the health and education programs passed in 1963 have yet to receive their first financing from Congress. And the Johnson economy drive may hold down spending for a spell. In the years ahead, however, the sums required are bound to mount rapidly.

But cost is only one measure of the scope of these programs. Another is the difficulty facing the Federal Government in discharging its new responsibilities.

The drug amendments of last year, hastily passed in a congressional fervor to avoid a repetition of the thalidomide tragedy, are a case in point. These long-sought changes gave the Food and Drug Administration greatly enlarged powers to assure the efficacy and safety of prescription drugs. Before their adoption, FDA had been prepared to push for other legislative changes expanding consumer protection throughout its domain, particularly over the marketing of cosmetics. But the agency's realization of the complexities of administering the new prescription drug powers has dimmed its ardor. Now FDA officials are content to carefully cultivate their additional drug responsibilities before seeking major new assignments from Congress.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

This year a little-noted piece of legislation, the Clean Air Act, conferred on the Federal Government the authority in certain circumstances to compel antiair pollution action by cities and industry. Such Federal enforcement powers have been used for years against water pollution hazards. But their new application provokes many uncertainties. So much less is known about the causes and cures of air pollution that experts believe it will take years to work all the kinks out of a Federal air pollution enforcement program.

In the area of education, Congress failure to enact Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, in large part because of the opposition of the Catholic Church, diverts the spotlight from its substantial achievements. Education aid measures passed in 1963—benefiting higher education, vocational education and medical schools and students—far surpass the total yield of Federal education legislation in all 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. Any one of

these programs would probably be sufficient in the years ahead to work major modernization in the Nation's educational system.

A close examination of the component parts of the new education acts reveals that this Congress has pushed forward on more than a dozen fronts. Two existing vocational education programs, the rural-oriented Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, were liberalized. Specialized vocational programs to aid school dropouts and impoverished pupils were adopted. The first specific Federal construction aid was approved for vocational education schools, medical schools, dental schools, public health and nursing schools, junior colleges, graduate schools, college and university classrooms, libraries and science facilities. Large amounts of new Federal aid were provided for training teachers of handicapped children. And this is just a partial list.

ACTING WITH ALACRITY

As to the argument that Congress is constitutionally unable to act with alacrity on controversial issues, consider just two examples.

The far-reaching drug reform amendments were pushed through in a matter of months, even though there were dozens of detailed and difficult technical issues at stake with the drug industry and doctors arrayed on opposite sides.

The highly complex mental health and retardation measures, setting the stage for a long-term Federal commitment to the care of the emotionally ill and those born with brain damage, raced through Congress in less than a year. Furthermore, though the Senate endorsed the administration's recommendations, House Members worked significant and substantive changes. Some legislative veterans consider the record on mental health and retardation almost unparalleled. At the very least, such complicated welfare legislation usually requires debate in one session of Congress before enactment in the next, if then. Often Congress may take years to become convinced of a public consensus and act.

Many administration men take the view that the lawmakers' current hesitation on medical care, civil rights, and tax cutting is less a reflection on Congress performance than an indication that deep public and political uncertainty still surrounds these measures. So, even though the Congress that convenes tomorrow for its second session must wrestle with and resolve some very pressing domestic issues, it already has compiled a legislative record that, in important ways, confutes its critics.

Hon. Howard Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of a warm friend whose character you highly respected is always a great shock and impresses one that life on this planet is not eternal. From the first day that I met HOWARD BAKER when he came to Congress, a warm friendship developed and over the years our ties of mutual understanding became stronger and stronger. Quiet and unassuming in his manner, he had an active and most intelligent mind, devoted to service and supported by a courage and strength of will which was extraordinary. It was natural that he made many friends and the respect that they had for him was convincing testimony of his sterling character.

He served his country well as a Member of Congress and contributed much in the consideration of legislation. In meeting his responsibilities to his constituents he was most conscientious and there is no doubt that he will be hard to replace.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his widow and children and I feel sure they will be comforted in the knowledge of the glory of his life of service.

Inflationary Signs Multiply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the tax bill in the House last year, I repeatedly warned that a reduction of taxes accompanied by a large increase in Federal spending would be likely to lead to a renewal of serious inflationary pressures in the country. That view is now becoming more generally accepted. Recently, I have noted in the press numerous statements that the wage-price push is likely to be renewed this year.

Concern about the dangers of inflation has been expressed by the Federal Reserve Board Chairman, William McChesney Martin. Chairman Martin has pointed to a number of factors adding to inflationary pressures, including the financing of budget deficits this year. An article in the U.S. News & World Report of December 23 entitled "Is Inflation on the Way? A Look Ahead," cites economists as saying that all of the ingredients for inflation are present, including a strong rise in business, growing confidence of businessmen and consumers, a push by unions for bigger pay raises, bigger budget deficits, and a big tax cut. As the article concludes:

The lull in inflation of recent years now seems to be coming to an end.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert this article from the U.S. News & World Report at this point in the RECORD:

IS INFLATION ON THE WAY? A LOOK AHEAD

(Suddenly, inflation—not deflation—is a growing worry. Why the switch? Unions are readying a push for bigger pay hikes. Budget deficits are swelling in size. Mortgage, other debt is rising fast. All this on top of a record business upsurge. For the latest trends:)

Inflation warnings are being sounded once again. They come at a time when the cost of living is creeping up a little faster, when unions are preparing new demands for pay raises, when deficits of government are growing.

There's been almost no broad inflation of prices in this country for about 5 years.

Yet, all the while, governments have been borrowing more and more. Money available for borrowing has been kept very plentiful. There's been a sharp rise of stock market prices into new high ground. The boom in building, financed by superabundant mortgage credit, has kept gaining momentum.

A warning of inflation danger, growing out of this whole situation, was sounded on December 10 by William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Martin, testifying before the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate, said: "We have a duty and responsibility to prevent inflation, and inflation is a very real problem."

The Reserve Board Chairman warned that a cut in taxes, to be made on 1964 income, will add to this inflation problem. He warned as well that the U.S. dollar, now supposedly secure, is not out of danger of a run by foreigners who have claims on this country's gold.

Demands for wage increases, somewhat restrained in the last few years, are expected to rise rather sharply in the election year ahead. If wage rates go up, so will prices.

Interest rates, Mr. Martin predicted, are going to rise as inflation pressures increase. An effort will be made, too, to keep the supply of money under firm control.

FIRST WORRY: MORTGAGES

At the moment, the renewed worry about inflation is related less to the danger of an early general price inflation than it is to inflation of mortgage credit. There is a feeling also that installment credit may be inflated by easier and easier borrowing terms to a point where dangers may arise.

Expressions of concern over the volume and terms of mortgage lending are beginning to be heard more frequently from officials. As one put it:

"The mortgage market presents a picture of larger and larger sums chasing fewer and fewer mortgages. In the long run, the present practices will result in a market oversupplied with overpriced buildings and inflated valuations, thereby endangering the security which an investment in real estate should normally provide."

Another official expressed deep concern about the trend toward mortgage loans made on the basis of appraisals that he sees as inflated.

Signs of trouble ahead are reported by a banker well informed on the mortgage field. Said he: "Already, in many instances, permanent mortgage lenders have been requested to make—and have granted—modifications of mortgage contracts deferring amortization because of slowness of occupancy of new structures."

A point is being made that each inflation tends to differ from the earlier inflation.

In the 1920's, the inflation first centered in Florida real estate. That bubble burst in 1926.

Then, in 1928 and 1929, inflation fever gripped the stock market. Prices of stocks reached fantastic heights and then collapsed.

The inflation of the middle and late 1950's was a wage-price inflation. Wage cost rose faster than output per worker, putting upward pressure on prices. That spiral was slowed, if not entirely checked, by 1958.

Now there is concern, in and out of the Government, that real estate might become the big inflation area of the 1960's.

FROM $250 TO $90,000

Real estate prices have soared in scores of communities all across the country.

A few examples, picked at random:

Land along Shirley Highway, an expressway into Washington, D.C., was bought for $250 an acre in 1948. Today it is worth $90,000 an acre.

In Belvedere, Calif., 17 miles outside San Francisco, lots that sold for $3,000 in 1950 now can command $20,000.

In New York's Wall Street area, land has reached $500 a square foot—more than $21 million an acre.

Population growth is one reason for the rise.

More and more people are competing for a limited supply of land in cities and suburbs.

What concerns authorities, however, is the mushrooming of credit to finance real estate purchases—with little money down and payments stretched over many years.

Real estate today is floating on a sea of credit.

Never before has mortgage debt risen so high.

Behind this rise, in turn, is a record increase in individual savings. To put these funds to work, banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies have been pushing hard to make mortgage loans.

Now there is growing concern about overbuilding in many parts of the country. Office buildings in some big cities have to give concessions to attract tenants. Vacancy rates on rental housing have risen. So have foreclosures on single-family homes.

These signs of trouble led Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to warn builders on December 12 that many of them are overdoing it.

Says one mortgage banker: "You've got inflated values, open speculation. Quality of mortgage credit has deteriorated. Watch out if this keeps up."

Trends in other types of credit are causing concern. One example: Automobile loan terms that are being stretched further and further—up to 42 months in some cases.

Charges are being made, too, that some bankers are getting sloppy in lending practices. Example cited: Making loans on commodities without checking to be sure that the commodities actually exist.

STOCKS: CREDIT SOARS

Stock-market credit is another area being closely watched. While nowhere near the levels of 1929 relative to stock values, stock-market credit has shown a substantial rise in recent months.

In the 15 months ended in October, stock-market credit rose $2.3 billion—up 47 percent.

Concerned, and detecting speculative psychology, the Federal Reserve Board recently raised margin requirements. Stock buyers must put up 70 cents in cash for each dollar of stocks, compared with the previous 50 cents.

The Federal budget is seen as adding to inflationary pressures in months to come. Government spending, despite economy efforts of President Johnson, will go on rising.

Ahead is an era of $100 billion budgets. The tide of Federal red ink will flow on—added to during next year by a tax cut.

Size of budget deficits between 1961 and 1965 now is unofficially estimated at more than $37 billion.

Finance experts see little chance of a balanced budget before 1968.

Sooner or later, large and continuing deficits are reflected in a rising level of prices.

This point was made by Chairman Martin in his testimony:

"If the money supply is being increased inordinately without any relation to the flow of goods and services, just to cover a Treasury deficit, it is just a matter of time before prices begin to rise."

Mr. Martin said that recent budget deficits have been financed without adding to inflation. But he added: "Now we may be reaching the limit * * * The time has come when we must not let this inflation get ahead of us again as it did in 1955."

WHERE COSTS ARE MULTIPLIED

At the State and local level, the picture is much the same.

Spending keeps on rising; and the rise, unbroken since the end of World War II, is much steeper than that of the Federal Government.

As you can see from the chart [not printed in RECORD], State and local spending is almost six times what it was just 17 years ago.

Revenues are lagging behind, even though taxes are constantly being raised. The result: Debt of States and localities is climbing steadily as they borrow more and more to make ends meet.

Prices in some instances are beginning to reflect a revival of inflationary pressures.

In recent weeks, prices have moved higher on commodities including tin, sugar, hides, cocoa, lead, zinc, rubber, wool tops, coffee, and mercury.

Consumer prices—the cost of living—keep inching upward. The rise in the past year was above 1 percent. Some items that cost more: men's suits, haircuts, tires, movie admissions, women's wool dresses and coats.

For the period ahead, many economists expect a more pronounced rise in prices. Nothing drastic, but a somewhat faster rise than has occurred in the recent past.

All the ingredients are there, say the economists: A strong rise in business, growing confidence of businessmen and consumers, a push by unions for bigger pay rises, big budget deficits—and a big tax cut.

The lull in inflation of recent years now seems to be coming to an end.

Howard H. Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the year that is gone—the 1st session of the 88th Congress—has been the most gruelling in my 17 years in the House and the frustrations, the disappointments, and the unrelenting pressures to which we have been subjected have resulted in all too many of our colleagues being called to their eternal rest. Perhaps, too, the fact that we are the constant targets of those who want only to make capital out of Congress resistance to bad legislation has been a prime reason for the fatalities that marked last year's legislative path.

Today we mourn the passing of a distinguished and dedicated colleague who was a tower of strength on our Ways and Means Committee where he lent his not inconsiderable talents to the reporting of good legislation or, which is equally important, to withholding immature measures that could only add to the socialistic menace which is bearing down upon us. HOWARD BAKER was a man who recognized a basic commitment to represent the interests of his constituents but he also accepted the larger mandate stemming from national welfare as a whole. Good men of this man's stature are not readily encountered and he will indeed be hard to replace.

One of our cherished privileges was that of service with Mr. BAKER's son-in-law, the Honorable William C. Wampler, who was here with us in the 83d Congress. During that period we came to appreciate the fine traditions of the Baker family, not only through the father but also through the daughter, and our hearts go out to those who suffer in this bereavement. Mrs. Dague joins with me in a prayerful petition that the family of our late colleague will find consolation in the assurance that there are so many who mourn with them in this sad hour.

Suddenly Found Millions in Foreign Aid—Treasury Illustrates Program Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News of January 3, 1964:

SUDDENLY FOUND MILLIONS IN FOREIGN AID—TREASURY ILLUSTRATES PROGRAM WASTE

(By Jack W. Gore)

After all the wailing and gnashing of teeth by President Johnson and his foreign aid supporters over the so-called damaging fund slashes Congress finally got around to enacting this week, it is now revealed that the legislators and the taxpayers still got played for suckers in the deal.

Quite conveniently, the foreign aid spenders had a little ace up their sleeves they didn't pull out until a new foreign aid appropriations bill was steam rollered through a balky Congress.

The ace was a neat little $669 million in unspent and uncommitted funds which were left over from previous appropriations and which AID officials presumably didn't discover until they started surveying the much-publicized damage done when Congress slashed $1.5 billion from the $4.5 billion in new funds the AID spenders wanted.

So now it turns out that despite all the crocodile tears that were shed, the foreign aid spenders will be able to go on handing out our money in just the same overly generous manner they have become accustomed to in past years.

One would have to be very naive indeed to believe the cock-and-bull story that AID officials didn't know about this windfall until after the new foreign aid appropriation bill was approved. Even in spend-happy Washington it is a bit difficult to lose track of $669 million, and if anyone actually does believe the foreign aid spenders weren't aware of the fact they had these unspent and uncommitted funds lying around, it only provides further proof of the sloppy and wasteful manner in which the program is being conducted.

The suddenly discovered surplus will come as no surprise to Members of the House and Senate who had long argued that if no new money was appropriated for foreign aid this time around, the program could still continue at almost its present level from the great backlog of funds still unspent from previous appropriations. Representative OTTO PASSMAN claimed this backlog was in the neighborhood of $7 billion but AID officials, even while admitting Representative PASSMAN might be correct, insisted all this money, although still unspent, had been earmarked for projects already approved but not yet launched.

Had the truth of this matter been laid before the Congress there is little question but that even greater slashes would have been made in the program than eventually

were made. But neither Congress nor the taxpayers were told the full truth, and now we are expected to believe that AID officials didn't know about this surplus either until they suddenly discovered it after the new aid bill cleared the Congress.

This kind of business aptly illustrates why Congress and the taxpayers have become thoroughly disillusioned with this whole program. Even President Johnson admits the program must be reanalyzed and sharply improved before any further money requests are put before the Congress. Yet, whom did Mr. Johnson select to make the reanalysis and recommend the improvements?

He made the same mistake other Presidents have made in packing his appointed study committee with State Department personnel and others who have long favored the program and who can hardly be expected to find much fault with their own baby.

We doubt that this new committee will look at recent Treasury statements which clearly point out the necessity for big retrenchments in some of our spending programs. The statement of last December 27, for instance, reveals that in the year just past our national debt increased by almost $6 billion despite the fact Government revenue increased by over $3 billion.

The debt now stands at almost $310 billion. And while the debt keeps climbing our gold supply keeps falling as clearly indicated by the fact the Treasury reported a loss of over $400 million in our gold reserves from December 27, 1962, to the same date in 1963.

Much of this gold loss can be directly attributed to our wasteful and badly mismanaged foreign aid program. It is one of the most unpopular spending programs among the taxpayers that the Washington bureaucrats have ever devised. It is propagandized with false facts and false promises, yet when Congress tries to chop it down to proper size it is subjected to the heaviest kind of armtwisting pressure to keep it going with added billions every year.

It is sickening enough to see our money spent in reckless and wasteful manner right here at home. But it is downright nauseating to witness the manner in which it is being thrown away overseas, and particularly when AID officials either deliberately distort their needs or don't have a bookkeeping system adequate enough to tell them just how much they have laying around in unspent and uncommitted funds.

Morris Morgenstern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, before the turn of the century, a high education was enjoyed only by a privileged few. Most young men, regardless of their talents, were unable, because of economic pressures, to go beyond secondary school.

As a boy on the lower East Side, Morris Morgenstern was in the latter group. But although he personally was unable to receive a full education, he vowed that he would one day help others whose inability to pay stood in the path of advancement, and also those organizations dedicated to bringing to young people the rewards of full educational opportunities. In large measure, he has fulfilled this promise.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit an article which appeared in the December 8 edition of the New York Journal-American, an article which I believe provides us with a graphic description of Mr. Morgenstern's boundless generosity and fervent desire to help his fellow man:

MORGENSTERN TO DONATE $50,000 TO JEWISH SCHOOLS

Banker-philanthropist, Morris Morgenstern, will present a $50,000 gift through the New York Journal-American's John F. Kennedy Memorial Fund to the United Lubavitcher Yeshivoth (ULY), a network of religious schools here and in Israel.

Announcement of the gift was made yesterday by the Morris Morgenstern Foundation, with offices at 10 Columbus Circle.

Mr. Morgenstern will present the grant to Rabbi Samarious Gourary, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Yeshivoth, next Thursday in the office of Kingsbury Smith, publisher of the Journal-American.

"I have selected this newspaper for this honor because I firmly believe the Journal-American has helped strengthen our democracy and stands as an inspiration and guide for other publications," Mr. Morgenstern stated.

"The New York Journal-American has been a crusader for freedom," he continued. "It has been in the forefront in the protection of human rights, ranging from religious freedom to freedom of speech.

"Freedom will not perish as long as organizations such as Hearst Publications are maintained in strength and are supported by the community.

"The Jewish community is proud of its relationship to the New York Journal-American," Mr. Morgenstern noted, "and gratified at its support of worthy charitable causes."

EAST SIDE BOY

A onetime East Side boy who has given millions to charity, Mr. Morgenstern has been a supporter of the ULY since it was established in the United States in 1940.

Mr. Morgenstern, in fact, is chairman of the sponsors committee for the organization's 24th anniversary dinner tonight in the Hotel Astor.

ULY itself provides religious and secular education for 30,000 children and teenagers throughout the world. In this country alone, there are 10,000 pupils in 12 schools, most of which are located on the east coast. The original and main branch is at Bedford Avenue and Dean Street in Brooklyn.

The man who sparked the Yeshivoth educational movement in the 1920's was Rabbi Joseph Isaac Schneersohn, once sentenced to death by the Communists for his religious and educational activities.

FREED BY SOVIETS

Rabbi Schneersohn was freed by the Soviet Government at the insistence of then President Hoover. Later he traveled to Washington to thank the President, and it was while there that he and Mr. Morgenstern met.

"I was deeply moved," Mr. Morgenstern said, in recalling his first meeting with Rabbi Schneersohn. "I drew great inspiration from the fact that his ordeal did not crush his spirit nor his enthusiasm."

Rabbi Schneersohn went back to Europe, but he was forced to flee from the Nazis and in March 1940 he returned to the United States. He established the ULY in Brooklyn, and at the time of his death in 1950, Rabbi Schneersohn's dream had become a successful reality.

The ULY programs are now under the spiritual leadership of Rabbi Mendel Schneersohn, his son-in-law and successor as a member of the same rabbinical family.

A J.F.K. MEMORIAL

Mr. Morgenstern views his gift to ULY as a "memorial to President Kennedy, who believed that effective educational programs were vital for our youth and essential to the growth of this country."

An immigrant who came here from Russia with his parents at the age of 4, Mr. Morgenstern never obtained a university diploma.

He sold newspapers at the age of 6 and, with an older brother, made soda bottles when he was 13.

Yet, he graduated from elementary school, and high school, and later took courses at Cooper Union. He knows, then, the value of education, and through donations he has aided such institutions as Harvard, Yale, CCNY, NYU, Brown, Columbia, Barnard, Wellesley, Cornell, and Dartmouth.

A FINANCIAL WIZARD

Mr. Morgenstern acquired his fortune by first expanding his soda bottle business, and then by financing other business operations. A skilled mortgage investor, he was described by associates as a financial wizard while still in his 20's.

But perhaps the measure of this man can be best exemplified by an incident that occurred 12 years ago.

Reading in a newspaper that a man had stolen a chair to help furnish his tiny apartment, Mr. Morgenstern first hired a lawyer for him, then paid for a complete set of apartment furniture.

"I got better things to do with my money than spend it on myself," Mr. Morgenstern once said.

It is a personal credo he has lived up to every waking moment.

The Need To Popularize Basic Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a speech presented by Dr. Omer C. Stewart of the department of anthropology, University of Colorado, at the 62d annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in San Francisco on November 23, 1963. In view of current national and international tensions, I feel that Dr. Stewart's remarks are most timely, and I am glad to bring them to the attention of my colleagues:

THE NEED TO POPULARIZE BASIC PRINCIPLES

(By Omer C. Stewart, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.)

I wish to present some basic anthropological concepts which I feel have relevance in international affairs. If these points seem too obvious to warrant discussion here, let me assure you they are not accepted by vast numbers of people, some in both the legislative and administrative branches of our Government.

Human beings are a unique section of the animal kingdom because they have culture. Culture provides the tools to utilize the natural environment and to communicate with one another in ways which are not available to other animals. We must conclude from

this that human behavior is of a different order than behavior of other animals. Although all human beings show their relationship to other animals in the physical inheritance of bodily forms and the inheritance of patterns for animal physiological functions, the only known hereditary behavior patterns are the ability to cry, suckle, grasp, etc., observable in newborn infants the world over. If humanity inherits other animal behavior patterns, these become so obscured by the infinite number of known learned behavior patterns that such other possible innate patterns are not established. There persists, of course, the needs for food, shelter, companionship, care of infants, sex, etc., to keep the species in existence. These needs are so completely controlled by human rules and customs, however, that we seldom think of them as part of our animal nature.

Although it is a common practice in popular rural lore to make analogies between breeds of dogs, or cattle, or horses, and groups or races of men, we know that the influence of culture on man renders such analogies spurious.

Culture is behavior and ideas learned and transmitted from generation to generation, and as learned behavior, it predetermines or modifies such a large part of human behavior that we can work on the assumption that all adult human behavior is learned.

War is a part of culture and as such it is a learned cultural complex which can be changed or abandoned. I am constantly surprised at the small number of people I have found who accept this point of view and who are willing to base their ideas concerning the possibility of learning peace upon such propositions. The belief that international warfare must always be part of world culture because it is "natural for nations to fight as they always have," is the popular view. The idea that since war is inevitable, it would be folly not to be prepared for war is a conclusion based upon the proposition that "war is natural." The U.S. Congress and the administrative branch of the Government appear to act on the assumption that the world will be "naturally" subjected to world war III. Seldom do the molders of world opinion indicate that they understand that warfare, like cannibalism, is a culture pattern subject to the same learning process as other aspects of culture.

One of the corollaries to the proposition that culture is learned behavior is the proposition that cultural differences result from the accidents of history, usually recognized as the presence or absence of materials or environmental conditions. The acceptance of this point of view appears to me to encourage the acceptance of diversity in various aspects of culture because it equalizes culture so far as origin and method of development are concerned. The concept of culture removes the basis for preserving some ancient beliefs only because they are said to be divinely revealed.

There are numerous other corollaries to the proposition that human behavior is learned that could be germane to a discussion of world affairs by anthropologists. However, the points just presented are probably sufficient to serve as examples to the next suggestion I wish to make. May I say first that I am encouraged to put forward these elementary ideas because of the reaction of the members of the Anthropological Association in general and the anthropologists of the vicinity of Denver, Colo., in particular to the invitation a year ago by the Wenner-Gren Foundation to participate in a series of conferences on "Anthropology and World Affairs." It seems to me that a sad and embarrassing conclusion must be drawn from the fact that only 46 professional anthropologists responded to the first invitation to consider the problem of world survival of the magnitude of those subsumed under the theories of "Deterrent Strategy." The analysis by Philosopher Robert Paul Wolfe of the 46 papers sent as initial statements regarding "Deterrent Strategy" causes me further concern. Thirteen, or more than one-fourth, of the respondents "insisted that anthropology and anthropologists should have nothing to do with" theories of the use or nonuse of atomic bombs in world affairs. Furthermore, the reaction of several of the 20 additional anthropologists who met in Denver for the Wenner-Gren conference convinced me that there are a number of members of our profession who believe it improper and unwise for us to be concerned with such modern problems as trying to find ways to avoid an atomic world war.

Is this evidence that a large portion of anthropologists feel they should, symbolically, labor exclusively in archaeological trenches to throw light upon the paleolithic or in ivory towers sorting kinship terms, ignoring the insights of their training to help solve the great problems of our times? I wish to propose that American anthropologists should all be teachers as well as scientists, and teachers of broad scope whose subject is not only man and his past, but man and his outcome.

To be anthropologists we should share some general principles. The majority of professional anthropologists accept as a working hypothesis the proposition that "culture is learned behavior." We are the scholars most concerned with culture. It is our duty as anthropologists, as scientists, and as human beings to teach everyone available by all possible means the basic precepts of culture and the universal role of culture.

If the leaders, opinion molders, and decision makers of the world were convinced that war is learned behavior, and that mankind can learn to live without war, the chances for the survival of our way of life would be improved.

But I must repeat, those who believe war is inevitable because it is natural and part of innate human nature can be expected to devote themselves to preparing for war. Since it appears that the vast majority of people of the world believe behavior is inherited and that war is natural and inevitable, we are faced with a tremendous task of enlightenment. As the discoverers of culture and as the experts in the scientific study of culture and its relationship to race, religion, nationality, war, etc., we should recognize that anthropologists cannot avoid the responsibility to the scientific community and to mankind, for making our knowledge known. It is our duty to popularize as well as to write for fellow scientists those basic propositions we have discovered, without which people on all levels of political powers in all areas of the world can make grave errors.

To strengthen the argument that anthropologists should be concerned with current national and international affairs, I will cite more evidence of popular misconceptions which continue to exist and which interfere with congenial national and international relations. The most spectacular national phenomenon in the United States currently is, of course, the irrational intensity with which citizens in the Southern States are trying to preserve special privilege to Caucasions and to deny legal equality to Negro citizens because of the expressed or implied convictions that there are bad character traits genetically linked to kinky hair which cannot be changed through education. Both the size of the population which accepts such fallacies and the intensity of the desire to maintain the positions of privilege rationalized by the fallacies are truly shocking. The impact of anthropology in the southeastern section of the United States has been small indeed. With few anthropologists in the Southern States the profession could have little direct influence, but limited number is no longer an excuse in the Northern and Western States. Yet in the North and West in a dozen States antimiscegenation laws continue to remind us that innate inferiority is assumed to be inherited with darker skin pigmentation. Our national immigration laws, based as they are on the assumption that some peoples are genetically unfit to be freely admitted to American citizenship, are further evidence of the pervasiveness of the notion of inheritance of group behavior.

The myth that only white Christians can be trusted to keep treaty commitments or can be expected to respect basic human rights reduces American support for the United Nations and hinders all efforts to negotiate and compromise international disputes. The mistrust of all who have a strange appearance, particularly those with dark skin, pervades American traditions nationwide, and persists because it is predicated on the belief in the innate inferiority of colored people. With the increase in the numbers of the members of the United Nations who represent nations with predominant colored populations, support for that international body decreases in the United States.

There is probably no anthropologist who would deny that total disarmament of all nations, insofar as weapons for international war is concerned, would be a desirable condition, if the peace of the world could be insured. Anthropologists desire the survival of the species, Homo sapiens, and the continued growth and diffusion of civilization. Anthropologists see dangers to humanity resulting from unjustified fear of strange-appearing people and unusual customs, fears growing out of ignorance and misinformation. As scientists and teachers we must attempt to improve the chances for human survival in every way possible.

We should accept our civic responsibilities as have fellow scientists in other fields. Part of the report of the 100th anniversary program of the National Academy of Sciences should strengthen our resolve to speak out on public issues. The Academy honored Dr. Linus Pauling, "the only man to win both the Nobel Peace Prize and the Nobel Prize" for scientific achievement, who suggested at the meeting that the Nation would be better served by spending money for research on molecular structure than on sending a man to the moon.

We might find even greater encouragement from another report of the anniversary meeting, attended by the President of the United States and more than half of the living members of the Academy and their distinguished guests, who nearly filled Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C. Let me read from the November 1, 1963, issue of Science:

"The most memorable event of the final Academy session on the nature of the scientific enterprise was the lecture by Robert Oppenheimer. On the difficult matter of how and when scientists should speak on 'common and public questions,' Oppenheimer said:

"'If I doubt whether professionally we have special qualification on these common questions, I doubt even more that our professional practices should disqualify us, or that we should lose interest and heart in preoccupations which have ennobled and purified men throughout history, and for which the world has great need today.'

"Oppenheimer, perhaps the American scientist who has paid the highest price for his role in increasing the light from the tower, received the greatest ovation of the 3-day session: a moving recognition by his colleagues of a quality of character even rarer than first-order scientific achievement."

The National Academy of Sciences by its actions reported above invites us to do our utmost to ease international tensions and to help prepare the populations of the world for rational evaluation of all problems. The

anthropological point of view of the primacy of culture in human affairs, if universally employed, could be an immeasurable force for reason, objectivity and tolerance in intergroup relations. General acceptance of the basic principles I have outlined might change the world climate of opinion toward human behavior in a manner comparable to the shifts in physical science resulting from the acceptance of Einstein's theory that $E=MO^3$.

Lagging Growth Rate Not the Cause of High Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the noted financial columnist, J. A. Livingston, has commented that a new explanation is needed for the high level of persistent unemployment in the United States. Citing our high growth figures of recent years in comparison to those of other countries, Livingston suggests that the lagging growth rate argument simply will not do any longer.

It is indeed encouraging to see a greater understanding develop about our economic system and its behavior in recent years. It has long been my opinion that our economy is vital and vigorous. It is experiencing dynamic growth and a large part of our economic problems, including unemployment, are the growing pains that accompany that growth.

Under unanimous consent, I include J. A. Livingston's column from the Washington Post of January 6 in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

U.S. GROWTH RATE TOPS MOST OTHERS

(By J. A. Livington)

Needed for the New Year, a new explanation of continuing and persistent unemployment in the United States. Lagging economic growth won't do.

In the last 3 years, the United States has been a leader in the industrial parade. And this could have a profound influence on economic trends—on our exports and imports—in the years ahead.

Since the low of the 1960–61 recession in January 1961, industrial production here has advanced 23 percent. The comparable gain for the 20 nations comprising the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development was 14 percent.

Why, we even outpaced both Western Germany and France, nations which America's growth addicts have held up to us as models: What do they have that we haven't?

Perhaps now we can tag off what it truly was: A passing phase.

This country came out of the war with its industrial plant expanded and intact. The "arsenal of democracy" quickly converted to peacetime production.

Output soared, and so did prices, as we supplied the pent-up wants of Americans and the people of other countries—vanquished as well as allies.

Then, as other nations rebuilt, their industrial production expanded more rapidly than ours. They ran short of workers. But now they are entering a slowing-down phase.

Among major industrial powers of the non-Communist world, only Japan and Italy have expanded production much more rapidly than we in the last 3 years:

	Percent
Japan	32
Italy	30
United States	23
France	19
OECD nations	14
West Germany	10
Great Britain	8

And something else, equally important, is happening. Inflation is subsiding here, but not in most countries of the world.

For instance, Premier Khrushchev's government failed last year to reduce income taxes or increase the minimum wage, as promised. This is an indirect way of hiding inflation. And the Soviet newspapers report instances of discontent.

The following table compares price increases (cost of living) in the United States with other leading nations since 1960. Only two countries—Greece and Canada—showed a lower increase. And note that Italy and Japan are among the inflationary leaders. Inference: A correlation between rapid growth, expansion, and rapidly rising prices:

	Percent
Japan	21
Denmark	16
France	14
Italy	14
Switzerland	11
Sweden	9
Great Britain	8
West Germany	7
The Netherlands	6
Belgium	5
United States	4
Canada	3
Greece	3

Will what took place here also take place abroad? As costs rose in the United States, businessmen introduced laborsaving devices. Result: The number of workers today in manufacturing industries is 17,300,000, slightly less than the peak in 1953. Yet production is 36 percent greater.

Emulation is the first law of economic competition, even as in sports. One vaulter demonstrates the zip of a glass pole, others copy. One dash man speeds his takeoff with starting blocks, all soon do it. So it is with plant layouts, with machinery, with the use of conveyor belts, pallets, and tow trucks.

As Western Europe copies and improves on our production and techniques, economic dislocation will take place. Belgium has already discovered the difficulty of finding jobs for coal miners.

And, as growth in Europe decelerates, American exports may be profoundly affected. Booming business encourages imports of raw materials and machinery from the United States.

Moral: As 1964 begins, don't be moored to 1963 and earlier concepts about growth and inflation. It's a cliche but also a fact that this is a changing world of complex economic crosscurrents.

Do We Maintain Two Standards in Dealing With Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was reason for the American people to be confused, disturbed, and disgusted, it was given yesterday when this administration criticized and denounced the British sale of buses and spare parts to Cuba.

The State Department's opposition to this deal with Cuba because it "does not help our efforts to isolate the Cuban regime," is a farce.

How can we, in good conscience, justify our criticism of this sale of nonstrategic goods when we are selling one-quarter billion dollars worth of wheat to Russia, Bulgaria, and other Iron Curtain countries?

Do we maintain two standards in dealing with communism? Is the Cuban brand of communism any different than Russia's?

How can we expect other countries to respect our wishes when we speak from both sides of our mouths? How can we expect our allies to respect us when we rap them for selling nonstrategic material to a Communist country and then we go ahead and feed our Communist enemies?

Is it any wonder that our American people are confused and disturbed?

Hon. Howard H. Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in mourning the sudden passing of HOWARD H. BAKER of Huntsville, Tenn. The House has lost a Member, whose personal charm and magnetism made him firm friends on each side of the aisle. He merited and had the respect and affection of everyone in the Congress.

HOWARD BAKER was a legislator and a public servant who not only was an exemplar of the best traditions of the Congress but enhanced them by his service here. A man of firm convictions and principles he had that rare quality of being able to disagree without being disagreeable, of vigorous opposition without offense and a candid honesty which added to the admiration and respect we had for him.

In coming to the House, HOWARD BAKER brought vast experience in human relations and public service which helped make him such a valuable counsel on the Ways and Means Committee and in the daily deliberations of the House itself. Before coming to the Congress, he long had been acknowledged as a leader and thinker in the affairs of Tennessee and an outstanding member of the bar, with a reputation that was not bounded by State lines. He was almost as widely known and respected in my own State of Alabama as he was in Tennessee. He came well equipped to serve here because of his service in the Tennessee Legislature, as an attorney gen-

eral, a judge, and had a keen interest and knowledge of national and international affairs because of his repeated elections as a delegate to national Republican conventions.

HOWARD BAKER was loved, honored, and respected as a person and as a public figure. He contributed greatly to our recent history and national well-being and his memory will be cherished as long as any of his colleagues remain to miss him. To Mrs. Baker and his three children, I extend my deepest sympathy.

William Joseph Green, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the ever-swinging scythe of the Grim Reaper has taken its heavy tool of our Pennsylvania delegation and we stand with bowed heads as we contemplate the loss of these colleagues who so completely earned our affection and respect while they were laboring in the legislative vineyard with us.

Especially have we been touched by the untimely passing of Bill Green who was taken at the apex of his career and who left the national scene at a time when this Nation can so ill afford to lose a public servant of his stature. Incidentally, this brief eulogy will probably be read by partisans who will have difficulty in understanding how legislators of such diverse political viewpoints could feel themselves so bereft when a colleague of the opposite persuasion is called to his eternal reward. To answer them is simply to emphasize that disagree we may in matters of policy but in the end we judge our brother by his code of ethics and by how he discharged his obligations and kept his word. A worthy opponent in the legislative lists was this departed warrior but with it all he was one who called his shots and hesitated not to be magnanimous in victory.

The record will probably reveal that Bill Green and I voted alike on but few issues and I suspect that our political philosophies were as far apart as the poles. But having said that I am sure that each of us, according to his lights, wanted the same thing; namely, a life of peace and security for all mankind. I also have within me the firm conviction that had I ever wanted a favor, political or otherwise, I would have found our Philadelphia friend ready and willing to lend me a hand.

It was my sad privilege to join in the sacred rites observed in his passing and I could not help being impressed, as one of a different denomination, by the dignity and solemnity of the requiems intoned in his behalf. And I am sure that in his place of quiet rest beyond the sunset Bill has been pleased to observe that he has had a place in my humble if inelequent prayers.

This departed friend left a loving wife and devoted children who will not quickly be turned from their sorrow. But we who are still in our pilgrimage must remember them in our devotions, and Mrs. Dague and I shall prayerfully petition the Master to enfold them in His comforting arms.

Congress: Plus and Minus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during our recent holidays, my attention was directed to an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of December 26, 1963, entitled "Congress: Plus and Minus." The editorial writer analyzes the achievements of the 88th Congress in the 1st session. I commend it to my colleagues for a more objective view of ourselves than has been our fortune among many other analysts, commentators and editorial writers:

CONGRESS: PLUS AND MINUS

We take a kinder view than many toward the 1st session of the 88th Congress. If, as is obvious, it wound up the year in a tug-of-war between the call of duty and the savor of Christmas turkey wafting from the hometowns, this should not stamp the whole, long session as fruitless and bumbling.

The list of achievements is respectable, if not monumental.

The House finally passed (thus assuring its adoption) a $3 billion foreign aid bill. While the sum fell well short of the administration's request, it was greater by $200 million than the sum the House had granted earlier and represented a compromise with the Senate's $3.3 billion measure. The House also relented and gave the President authority to guarantee credit for private wheat sales to Russia. Senate concurrence is assured.

Congress passed the 3-year, $1.2 billion loan-and-grant program to build college classrooms, libraries and laboratories. This was a nick-of-time movement to meet the needs of the avalanche of war-babies now approaching college age.

Other useful measures to help the Nation's education system meet its burgeoning needs were the $225 million increase for vocational education aid, $527 million in new funds for job training for school dropouts and jobless adults, and a large-scale aid program for medical-dental school construction.

Two congressional actions of historic importance were the creation of an arbitration board in the rail dispute, and the Senate's ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. In the former, Congress reluctantly asserted that the Nation may interdict a strike that imperils the public welfare. In the latter, the Senate sanctioned a step on the road to general disarmament.

There were the bills to speed the treatment of mental health patients, and to boost military pay nearer what private industry pays for commensurate service. All were important; some were trailblazing.

As to the major measures that Congress failed to pass—tax cuts, civil rights, medical care for the aged under social security, and general school aid—these failures cannot be laid exclusively on Congress' doorstep. In each of these areas sharp, painful differences exist within the American people, and Congress, we believe, is a fairly accurate reflection of these differences.

A tax cut, for example, would have come long since except for a bipartisan demand for some compensating demonstration of governmental economy, to moderate the impact on the budget and the peril of inflation. Some such demonstration appears to be forthcoming.

Millions of Americans—including virtually the entire medical profession—fear the socializing impact of the administration's medical care bill. And the disputes over civil rights and school aid reflect important divergences among the people in the areas of race, religion, and the extent to which the Federal Government should usurp traditional rights of the States.

When the late President Kennedy told his last news conference that the legislative program was in the throes of "an 18-month delivery" he was not reciting the fact as a national tragedy.

For the decisions being threshed out were—and remain—critical in their impact upon history as well as upon the present. Whether the national debates on taxes, civil rights, foreign aid, and education are regarded as good or bad they are, in our kind of system, inevitable. We do not say that Congress' slow space has resulted entirely or even mainly from a statesmanlike determination to explore all sides of the issues. But whatever the motives were, that has been the result, and the Nation has not suffered unduly in the process.

The Present Situation in the Executive Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hoppe, who writes for the San Francisco Chronicle and other papers, has written two articles which are very apropos of the present situation in the executive department.

One appeared December 3 in the Chronicle and the other on December 23 in the same publication.

The two columns follow:

MR. JOHNSON WILL GET THINGS DONE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—It's very reassuring to see how highly everybody in Washington regards our new President, Mr. Johnson. While they all had the greatest love and respect for Mr. Kennedy, they'll tell you, Mr. Johnson is really going to do much better.

Because Mr. Johnson "knows how to get things done." And that, in Washington, is the highest possible tribute you can bestow.

For, as you know, getting things done in Washington isn't easy. It takes cunning, strategy, compromise, intrigue, and devious plotting to get an increase in your office's allotment of postage stamps. And as everybody here spends all day at their desks trying desparately to get things done, they understandably have the greatest esteem for anybody who can get things done.

So everybody here is saying that while Mr. Kennedy had grace, brilliance, courage, wit, and all the other qualities of great leadership, he "never did quite understand the way to get things done" in Washington.

For example, "He never really understood the legislative process." Nor did he quite comprehend the depth of interdepartmental rivalries.

But Mr. Johnson. Ah: "He knows every nook and cranny on Capitol Hill." "He knows where every bone in this town is buried." "He knows how to compromise when he has to." "He knows how to knock heads together when he must."

"He knows how to wheedle." "He knows how to wheel and deal."

"He knows how to get things done."

Personally, I don't doubt it for a minute. I'm sure Mr. Johnson will get things done. And it's very comforting. Of course, at the moment there seems to be some confusion as to precisely what Mr. Johnson's going to get done. But at least everybody here has confidence in him.

The southerners say happily that Mr. Johnson's going to be "more realistic" on civil rights; several southern Democratic Senators are even planning to vote Democratic next year.

And the Negro leaders here have announced they're backing Mr. Johnson to the hilt. Because "he knows how to get a strong civil rights bill through Congress."

The liberals are already rubbing their hands. Because if there's anybody who can get medicare, Federal aid to education, and the various welfare programs passed, it's their Mr. Johnson.

And the conservative business interests are already toting up their increased profits. Because, as everybody knows, Mr. Johnson is "more business minded."

So just the knowledge that Mr. Johnson knows how to get things done has made everybody happy. And everybody in Washington is sure he'll make them a great leader. Which I'm sure he will. Of course, after listening to such talk for a week, I can't help but hope one small hope:

I hope he'll make a great President for the rest of us, too.

ROOM AT THE TOP—BUT NOT MUCH

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Everybody's amazed at how smoothly Mr. Johnson's taken over the White House. And particularly at how firmly he's convinced the world he'll continue in Mr. Kennedy's footsteps. Me too. For the life of me, I can't see where he's putting everybody.

Because one of the first things he did to prove he was going to be just like Mr. Kennedy was to persuade Mr. Kennedy's entire White House staff to stay at their desks and serve under him. Which gave us all a feeling of continuity. And the second thing he did was to bring in a whole lot of old friends from all over. From all over Texas.

Which is fine. But have you ever seen those tiny offices in the White House? Mr. Kennedy's people alone occupied every cubic inch. And they were mostly just medium-sized Bostonians. Oh, I have an uneasy feeling trouble is brewing.

(Scene: One of the larger six-by-six offices containing five secretarial desks occupied by nine secretaries and one executive desk. Seated behind this are Mr. Larry F. (Irish) Mafia and Mr. Billie Jack Sweetwater.)

Mr. MAFIA. I do not wish to complain, Billie Jack, for I know we must work together in harmony for the good of our country. But you have inadvertently slipped over to my side of the chair again. Talk about big Texas spreads.

Mr. SWEETWATER. Well, now, Irish, I'm right sorry. I must've done it when I reached out to poke back those there papers of yours which you kind of accidentally been edging across the chalk line onto my half the desk.

Mr. MAFIA. Kindly scrunch up a little so I can sign this postmastership application. And seeing you brought it up, let us discuss that chalk line you drew. It looks at least an inch and an eighth on my side of the middle. Where is my half of our ruler?

Mr. SWEETWATER. Now look at here, Mafia, You accusing me of claim jumping? And get your elbow out of my sasparilla, you no-account paper rustler.

Mr. MAFIA. Your sasparilla! That's my choc malt. And do you know what you're sipping through? That's the last straw! Sweetwater, I am going to call up the President and request a new seat mate.

Mr. SWEETWATER. No you don't, you Boston wardheeler. It's my day to use our phone.

Mr. MAFIA (leaping to his feet). Then I'm writing a memo. Because this desk, you Texas varmint, isn't big enough for both of us.

Mr. SWEETWATER (leaping to his feet too). All right, Mafia, go for your pen. I ain't known as the fastest ballpoint west of the Pecos for nothing.

No question about it. With two factions of such different temperament jammed into the White House like that, one of these days ink is going to flow. And somebody's going to be edged out sideways. Mainly because there's not enough elbow space to toss anybody out frontways.

Which all goes to illustrate Mr. Johnson's problem. He wants to reassure everybody he's going to be exactly like Mr. Kennedy. Only he's very different. And, if you ask me, the White House isn't big enough for both of him.

Hiring the Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying, indeed, to note that progress is being made in providing employment for the mentally retarded. Often in discussing job opportunities for the handicapped we refer only to the physically handicapped. It is equally important that the mentally retarded man or woman have an opportunity to contribute to society to the maximum of his ability.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the New York Times of January 6, 1964, discussing job opportunities for the mentally handicapped in the RECORD at this point:

HIRING THE RETARDED: 1963 MARKED EMPLOYMENT TURNING POINT FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

To the 2 million mentally retarded persons of employable age and their families, 1963 marked the turning point for their prospective employment.

Throughout the country, community programs for the mentally retarded have been slowly demonstrating the truth of the slogan of the National Association for Retarded Children—"the retarded can be helped."

As a new booklet published last year by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped points out, the retarded are beginning to demonstrate not only that they can be helped, but that they in turn can be helpful.

The booklet, "Guide to the Job Placement of the Mentally Retarded," emphasizes that mental retardation by no means implies a total absence of skills and aptitudes.

A person's intellectual capacity may be retarded, but not necessarily the rest of him.

SAFER THAN MANY OTHERS

With such placement, mentally retarded workers can be better employment risks than many other workers with unstable job histories, poor work habits, and lack of training.

Mainly, the kinds of job the mentally retarded can do—and do well—are unskilled, service or short-cycle repetitive tasks. Other workers become bored in such jobs, but not the retarded. They can take pride in the ability to do such work.

Job satisfaction, job fulfillment, and job accomplishment are the factors that differentiate the stable worker from the drifter. These reactions are characteristic of mentally retarded workers. Studies have shown them to be exceptionally stable, loyal, reliable, and dependable.

Employers who have job openings in the "low skill" area have two readily available resources. They are the local office of the State employment service and of the State vocational rehabilitation agency.

Other sources are sheltered workshops and occupational training centers serving the retarded, schoolwork programs of public and private schools, and the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Before the applicant comes for his interview, the prospective employer should be provided with a summary of his qualifications, background, training, education, and employment record.

Prospective employers should not be overly concerned with the applicant's intelligence as rated by testing. If the firm has a staff psychologist, this information used in context with the other data will have some meaning.

Although there is a relationship between intelligence and job performance extremely few jobs today call for a high IQ score as a basic requirement.

Greater emphasis in modern personnel practices is placed on descriptive phrases such as "the work requires considerable judgment" or "the individual needs a high degree of initiative and imagination."

Such jobs are obviously not for the mentally retarded. They find their niche in jobs calling for simple skills, few decisions, and established, repetitive routines.

OTHER FACTORS STRESSED

More important than the IQ in filling such jobs are the factors of education, training, job experience, motivation, attitude, appearance, personality, and general health.

These are the factors that must be kept in mind during the interview. The job interview should be begun on the proper level of understanding with the mentally retarded applicant.

He should not be talked to as though he were a child, but the interviewer must also remember to use terms that clearly describe or illustrate what needs to be done on the job.

When a mentally retarded person is employed, the same good, sound, personnel practices should be used as with all new employees.

There are two factors to which special attention should be paid.

First, the new employee should have an early opportunity to meet his foreman or supervisor and coworkers. Some companies with experience in employing the retarded always have him meet his prospective immediate supervisor before actually employing him.

Second, the new worker should have sufficient opportunity during the first few days on the job to orient himself to his new surroundings.

Like all new employees, the retarded are anxious the first few days on the job.

There is much that is new and much to be learned and this may take the retarded a little longer.

A frequent characteristic of the newly employed retarded is shyness, but this tapers off with familiarity with his environment and acceptance by his coworkers.

Again, Nothing Gained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials that recently appeared in the McPherson Sentinel, a newspaper published in McPherson, Kans., in my congressional district.

The first editorial entitled "Reward for Charity," points to further evidence of waste of American taxpayers' dollars for foreign aid and the need for a complete revamping of our foreign aid program.

The second editorial entitled "Full Circle," serves to remind us of the need to maintain constant vigilance and alertness to Communist tactics and aims.

The two editorials follow:

REWARD FOR CHARITY

Too often the reward for charity is ingratitude and even insolence. Such is the case in Cambodia, a dinky little country next door to Vietnam.

After taking fat handouts from our blubberfat foreign aid program, Cambodia has grown progressively more insolent until rumor has it that Cambodia is celebrating the assassination of President Kennedy.

The cause for all this insolence is quite clear. Cambodia has decided it can get more free charity from Red China than from us, so it is trying to make friends with China by insulting us.

How much have we gained from the millions we gave Cambodia? How many other little nations are grabbing our handouts with no friendliness toward us and only until they can make a better deal with our enemies?

Cambodia is another example of the need for a sweeping housecleaning of our whole foreign aid program.

Why waste money on people who turn around and oppose us?

FULL CIRCLE

Round and round we go in the cold war. First Khrushchev blows hot and then he blows cool and friendly.

After quite a spell of friendly and peaceful behavior, he now is blowing hot again. First the Berlin blockades with no valid excuse. Then another American soldier shot in the demilitarized zone in Korea. Mr. K. really topped off his latest troublemaking when he arrested Yale Professor Barghoorn as an accused spy.

So once again the cold war has turned full circle from warlike actions to peaceful declarations and back to more warlike behavior.

During Mr. K.'s calm spells it sometimes is hard to remember that he is dedicated to only one thing: Communist control of the whole world. He will use every trick to weaken our standing with neutral countries and to weaken our own courage to stand on our rights.

Don't expect the Communists to change. They will continue to keep the circle turning from war talk to friendly talk and back to war talk as long as they think they can get us off balance.

National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we consider today a bill to name the proposed National Cultural Center in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy.

I am honored to have filed this bill. I did so because I believe in the high purposes of the Cultural Center and because I believe this is the most fitting of the memorials proposed for the late and beloved leader from my home State of Massachusetts.

I am honored, too, to have filed it because I believe that such a memorial should be nonpartisan in origin and nonpartisan in its adoption by this Congress. The memory of President Kennedy belongs to the whole Nation; to the whole world; to all the people he sought to serve.

Someday this Cultural Center will be a source of pride to every American. It will be a cultural stimulus to the Nation, and it will be a home for the arts in the Nation's Capital.

Ever since the dawn of Christianity, nations have been proud of their cultural progress. We have considered ourselves one of the foremost, yet, in some respects, we have lagged behind foreign nations in the support that we have given to the fine arts. We must be as anxious to lead in this endeavor as we are in any other.

The late President Kennedy and his remarkable wife, Jacqueline, made a conspicuous contribution to the elevation of our taste for the fine arts. Music and poetry and painting received recognition in the Kennedy administration far beyond any that those arts had received in prior years. Both of them possessed artistic good taste which all good Americans have envied and appreciated. This good taste gave their administration a class that was good for the country and its people. I know that John F. Kennedy would be proud to have this Cultural Center bear his name. This can be a real memorial to him and a mark of honor to his wonderful widow.

This Congress must approve a suitable memorial for the late President and appropriate adequate funds for it. It must be located in Washington, D.C., the city which was so dear to his heart and in which he did so much for humanity.

If we approve this bill today, we will forestall some less worthy memorial later. We will assure that what funds are to be appropriated will be spent usefully in a great national endeavor. We will be paying timely and appropriate homage to our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

Painful Deficit Ahead—New Spending Curbs Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the January 4, 1964, issue of the Alhambra (Calif.) Post-Advocate contains an editorial of interest entitled "New Spending Curbs Needed."

In the editorial the Post-Advocate calls for effective effort for reducing Government spending and for a stringent curtailment of any Government leanings toward a welfare state. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

PAINFUL DEFICIT AHEAD—NEW SPENDING CURBS NEEDED

President Johnson is, without question, attempting to effect economies in Government. The image of frugality he is seeking to create already has impressed the public. But barring a miracle of economic planning, the budget to be sent to Congress in January for the 1965 fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, probably will be in excess of $100 billion.

The Budget Bureau has tentatively worked out spending totals that approximate $101.5 billion. Whether the President's freeze on Federal jobs and the cutback in U.S. military installations can reduce the total below the $100 billion mark is doubtful.

The President is eager to get the budget under the $100 billion level because he realizes there still is strong resistance in Congress to the tax cut bill. Congressional objection to the tax reduction stems from the knowledge such a measure would be foolhardy if Government spending is to be increased.

Mr. Johnson and his advisers are aware, as are most Americans, that continued increases in Government spending with the accompanying growing deficit can lead only to greater and greater inflation.

As a result, the domestic economy, our international trade, and this country's international payments problem all would deteriorate. There could not possibly be a sound economic growth.

It therefore is up to Mr. Johnson to seek new and logical areas in which to curtail spending. Instead of targeting the military and its installations—key to national defense—he could explore welfare programs of one kind or another that drain billions from the budget.

Maurice Stans, former Budget Bureau Director, recently pointed out that this country's debt already is in excess of $300 billion—more than is owed by all other countries in the world combined.

Even if the President succeeds in squeezing the budget below the $100 billion mark, the deficit still will be painful, possibly in the neighborhood of $8 billion.

Mr. Johnson admittedly has built-in problems in attempting to effect an economy

drive. There is, for example, a new Federal pay raise that becomes effective tomorrow. There also will be boosts in space spending included in enacted and pending appropriations. Also, the President must be cognizant of the voter lure entailed in big spending programs by the Federal Government in many sections of the Nation.

The President's economy drive, if directed in proper channels, would stimulate free enterprise. It should be aimed, we believe, at a stringent curtailment of Government leanings toward a welfare state. That is where real economies can be made, but, unfortunately, there has been no indication for this type of cut. To the contrary, it is indicated that money saved on defense may be applied to social programs.

Scranton Makes Pennsylvania Hum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the imagination of the entire Nation has been captured by the tremendous thrusts which Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, is making to improve the economic climate of the State of Pennsylvania. Already, and for the first time in many years, Governor Scranton has reduced the unemployment rate in Pennsylvania from 9 to 6 percent. Following is an article written by Ed McLaughlin which represents a typical comment on Governor Scranton's imaginative program:

SCRANTON IN CLOSE HARMONY AS STATE'S BUSINESS HUMS

(By Ed McLaughlin)

HARRISBURG, PA.—Within the past few weeks these events have happened in widely separated parts of Pennsylvania:

A $456,012 loan was made to Diversifications, Inc., the industrial development branch of the Greater Johnstown Chamber of Commerce. That money will be used by Bestform Foundations of Pennsylvania, Inc., in the erection of a $1,040,000 undergarment plant in Cambria County, which will eventually employ 250 persons.

Out in the Dutch country of eastern Pennsylvania, a clothing manufacturer was at his wit's end from trying to cut through bureaucratic redtape in order to complete a sizable expansion to his plant. He turned to a newly created State council, comprising top people in key departments. The council found that a bureaucratic menial had misread the manufacturer's plans, and refused him permission to install a necessary elevator. The council saw to it that this difficulty was quickly corrected, and the producer is now completing his expansion plans.

Frank L. Magee, chairman of the executive committee of Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh, was named chairman of the "100,000 Pennsylvanians for Economic Growth." Beginning October 1, this group will attempt to enlist 100,000 citizens of this commonwealth in a massive "Talk Up Pennsylvania" campaign.

Though seemingly unrelated, these three developments are symptomatic of the vigorous action the State government is taking to hypo an economy long watered down by the decline in the importance of coal as a fuel, the exodus of the textile industry to the South, and the minimized importance of rail transportation.

Some call Gov. William W. Scranton the catalytic agent behind Pennsylvania's new drive to become a formidable factor as a business-industrial location and as a tourist mecca.

In fact, aids of Governor Scranton contrast his approach to those of his immediate predecessors. "If you wanted to see Gov. George M. Leader in the mid-50's, you had to be interested in mental health. With Gov. David Lawrence, whose administration preceded Scranton's, the pitch was highway safety. With Governor Scranton, it is strictly industrial development."

Under the Governor's urging, the legislature this year bolstered the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority by providing it with more funds. In addition, tax benefits to business were liberalized. Research and development firms establishing new facilities, were exempted from capital stock and franchise taxes. Better depreciation allowances were permitted, and extension of PIDA help was made available for firms in the distributing industry, to encourage the building of new trucking centers, warehouses and the like. Scores of loans have been approved this past summer alone.

Governor Scranton, in an interview with Fairchild News Service, said he is interested not only in encouraging out-of-State firms to locate in Pennsylvania, but also in showing that "Pennsylvania loves the firms already operating here."

For this reason, he has been campaigning to eliminate as much red tape for businesses as possible, and in weeding out incompetent State employees. For this latter purpose, he utilizes an interdepartmental clearing council, comprising key State people, which has the express purpose of "unsnarling red tape and the inevitable delay and confusion caused by bureaucracy."

Recently, a Governor's aid explained, it was the action of this council which enabled the Dutch country apparel manufacturer to get his expansion plans moving after months of delay. The council also has helped speed up the approval of architectural plans for new buildings in a department—that of labor and industry—which reportedly was "notorious" for losing material in its bureaucratic mazes.

Governor Scranton carried out a campaign promise when he encouraged the formation of the committee of "100,000 Pennsylvanians for the Economic Growth." Officially, this organization will come alive October 1, and recruiting efforts will begin.

Businessmen, industrialists, and other citizens participating will be urged to "talk up" Pennsylvania's economic advantages, the impact that the new network of interstate highways will have in making this State the hub of the northeastern U.S. megalopolis, the State's scenic beauties and historic sites, and the like.

In working so closely with businessmen, Governor Scranton is seen in many quarters as taking on such stature that he is being seriously mentioned as a possible Republican presidential candidate.

He denies any such intentions, pointing out he has no organized group supporting him. However, political observers feel the Governor—whom the Pennsylvania delegation will support as a "favorite son" candidate next summer—may be the answer if the GOP convention is hopelessly deadlocked over Governor Rockefeller or Senator GOLDWATER.

Many segments of the press—notably Time magazine—have written favorably of Governor Scranton. In fact, Greater Philadelphia, a local magazine for businessmen, recently projected Scranton's nomination in an article called "Scranton versus Kennedy: Bright Hopes for a Dark Horse."

Health Insurance Coverage for the Aged Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the January 6 New York Times outlines the progress that was made last year by the health insurance industry. Particularly significant is the fact that a sizable increase was registered in the number of persons over 65 covered by health insurance plans. Sixty percent of the over 65 age group was covered in 1962. Precise figures are yet available, but that figure is now expected to be considerably higher.

Under unanimous consent I wish to insert the article from the New York Times at this point in the RECORD:

COMPANIES PRESS HEALTH POLICIES—14.5 MILLION NOW COVERED—EMPHASIS ON AGED GROUP

The health insurance industry has chalked up major gains.

At the same time, it pressed a campaign against Federal medicare last year by offering more special policies for the aged.

By the year's end, according to estimates of the Health Insurance Institute, 145 million persons were covered by private health insurance. This was an increase of 3.6 million over 1962. Only 42 million had such insurance in 1946.

As to the aged, no figures were available yet for last year. But a sizable increase was indicated over the 1962 total of 10.3 million insured persons over 65. That was 60 percent of the age bracket.

In 1952, the 3.4 million insured persons over 65 represented 26 percent of the Nation's aged.

MANY DRIVES CONDUCTED

Several mass enrollment drives were conducted last year to attract more aged persons to specially designed private insurance programs. The campaign is continuing with a Federal medical care program for the aged expected to come before Congress.

Mass enrollment programs were conducted separately by at least three companies—Continental Casualty, Mutual of Omaha, and the Fireman's Fund—and within States by groups of companies forming underwriting pools. Such groups operate in New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Texas.

A western plan will soon have its first enrollment in California, and may eventually include other States.

More than 200 insurance companies and many other organizations, such as the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, are offering health protection. Several insurers sell policies that cost more in the insured's more productive earning years, but become fully paid by 65.

An institute study showed that four of five insured workers had the right to continue their health protection into retirement.

BENEFITS AT $7.8 MILLION

Benefits paid by the health insurance industry to persons filing claims totaled $7.8 billion last year, compared with $7.1 billion in 1962. The benefits came from all types of organizations, including insurance companies, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and other nongovernmental insurance.

Of the 145 million protected under hospital expense plans, the institute estimated that 135 million also were covered under surgical expense plans, and 101 million had

regular medical expense protection, which helps to pay for nonsurgical care by physicians.

In 1962 there were 3.8 million fewer persons under the surgical expense plans, and 2.8 million fewer carrying regular medical insurance.

Major medical expense insurance continued to be the fastest growing of all health insurance programs. In essence, these policies pay a major portion, often 75 to 80 percent of medical costs above an initial deductible amount, which may be taken care of by basic hospitalization or surgical policies.

It was estimated that 41.5 million carried major medical insurance, for an 8.4-percent gain over the previous year.

Policies providing income during disability were carried by 45.5 million people, according to the institute's estimate, marking a rise of 600,000.

"The insurance industry will continue to develop its newer insuring programs, such as coverages for mental illness, nursing home care, dental care, and long-term loss of income, and further refine and improve its basic health programs," says James R. Williams, vice president of the institute.

Italian Bishops' Anti-Red Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been directed to a report from Rome by the world-famed correspondent, Constantin Brown, discussing the reassertion by the Catholic Bishops of Italy on their effective stand against communism. The article and accompanying editorial appeared in the November 11, 1963, edition of the Nashville Banner, but is as pertinent today as it was then.

Especially pertinent to point out is that the Catholic Bishops of Italy have revised and reinvigorated their effective anti-Communist activity at a time when our administration is rushing wholeheartedly into the subsidy and support of communism.

The articles follow:

BISHOPS REVIVE ANTI-RED STAND

Roman Catholic bishops of Italy have moved for direct church action against members of the faith in that land who embrace communism; and while the immediate interpretation is in terms of a roadblock to Red gains in and through political infiltration there, its significance surely is worldwide.

Writing from Rome, Banner Foreign Correspondent Constantine Brown cites its meaning in those dimensions. To his interpretive article on this page today, attention is invited, its conclusions inescapable.

Historically, catholicism was a factor of resistance—helping check the spread of a Red contagion, as in Latin America, where both the masses and firebrand politicians seeking to use them were sensitive to the ultimate weapon of excommunication. No less in Europe did Pope Pius XII exercise a strongly restraining influence, with no illusions, much less preachments, of "peaceful coexistence."

There can be no argument but that Pope Pius' anti-Communist attitude and leadership were all that kept France and Italy from going all-out Communist after World War II.

Whatever its benign purpose, or overly optimistic concept of the hope it stressed, there can be no doubt that the "Pacem in Terris" encyclical of the late Pope John stretched thin the barriers to communism which had prevailed under that predecessor. In the wake of it, Italian Reds mustered a strength now haunting that land with the threat of political upheaval.

Pope Paul knows that. As a student of history he also must know what has happened in Latin America—essentially a Catholic continent—where communism has made its gains. To call the A-B-C roll of those countries in peril, like Argentina, Brazil, and Cuba, surely is reminder enough.

Communists and their fringes undoubtedly welcomed Pope John's encyclical as at least an implied policy-switch from the Vatican's long-standing position—and unquestionably they made the most of it. Softness toward communism, whether on the part of ecclesiastical authorities or Government policymakers, opens the door to exactly the Red depredations that have occurred.

It is pertinent to remark, as does Constantine Brown, that Pope Paul apparently has recognized the fact, and is prepared to exercise that role of firm convictions that prevailed on the part of the hierarchy until a countering influence, climaxed by the encyclical in question, supplanted it with compromise.

The indicated recovery of a policy footing realistically determined holds promise of bringing stronger resistance of communism—in this hemisphere and out of it—and warrants public attention.

As news beamed to Latin America, it assuredly would have profound significance and a salutary effect.

ITALIAN BISHOPS' STATEMENT CONDEMNING REDS IS SIGNIFICANT

ROME.—The statement issued recently by the Italian Episcopal Conference condemning communism and emphasizing excommunication for those who practice Communist atheism is regarded here as likely to have worldwide political repercussions. This is particularly true for Italy and is considered in Italian political circles as a bombshell which may affect considerably the Italian political situation.

A coalition formed by the Christian Democrats, liberal Socialists Democrats, and Marxist Socialists is by way of coming to office. It has been a widespread impression among political observers that this heterogenous coalition may not remain in office long but will eventually make room for a popular front government including the Communists who garnered 8 million votes at the last April election.

The passivity of the Roman Catholic Church which has and still plays an important role in Italian life, was regarded as at least partially responsible for the Communist gains. The kindly late John XXIII did not see the insidious danger of communism. Although he had not abolished the excommunication order issued under Pius XII, his Pontificate had not used it, and taking their cue from this, the Italian clergy no longer condemned Communist atheism from the pulpits.

Shortly before the April election Pope John issued his famous encyclical "Peace on Earth" which called for good will among men. This was skillfully "interpreted" by the Italian Communists to mean that the church had embraced coexistence and had removed excommunication for those who cast their votes for the Communist Party.

This belief was strengthened by the fact that in March of last year Pope John had received Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexis Adhzubei, in a private half-hour audience.

As a cardinal, the new Pope Paul was regarded as "somewhat left of center." But there is a great difference, said a ranking bishop, "between Cardinal Montini and Pope Paul." The responsibilities of an archbishop are regional; those of the Pontiff universal.

Pope Paul became particularly concerned with the increased power of the Italian Communists after he had received the visit of Konrad Adenauer a few weeks ago. The two men, who had known each other well for a number of years, talked about the universal atheistic inroads, and more specifically of the danger of the Communists taking over Italy through skillful intrigues and propaganda.

According to those close to the Vatican, the German Chancellor (as Adenauer then was), made a deep impression on the Pontiff, who agreed with "der Alte" that something drastic must be done immediately.

This, of course, was a very delicate matter as Pope Paul does not want to give the impression he is reversing the policies of his predecessor, but merely emphasizing what Pope John seemed to have failed in getting across. Pope Paul could not issue another encyclical. Moreover, in the midst of the Ecumencial Council it was considered unwise to make any statement concerning political matters. Hence the Pope was reduced to silence.

It was decided, therefore, that the Italian Episcopal Conference could speak indirectly for the Holy Father. A group of bishops, under the direction of the strong anti-Communist Cardinal Siri of Genova, drafted a statement and submitted it to the Pope for his approval.

Whether coincidental or not, it happened that the anti-Communist anti-Marxist declaration occurred within 24 hours after the Marxist Socialist Party conference ended, and Nenni had received the approval of the Party to enter into a coalition with the Christian Democrats.

The effect of the bishops' statement made a deep impression throughout the country. According to well informed sources, it particularly impressed President Antonio Segni who fears the effects of the left-of-center government on the nation's shaky economy, and fears even more the formation of a popular front government. His only prerogative as chief executive is to dissolve Parliament after consultation with the presidents of the Chamber and the Senate.

Heretofore he has been afraid to resort to such a step, but now that the Church has made it plain that the Pacem in Terris Encyclical was definitely misinterpreted by the Communists, Segni may not have the same compunction. If the new government to be formed shortly proves itself incapable to solve the country's difficulties he may issue the order of dissolution, convinced that in another election the Communists, after the bishops' statement, will lose ground.

Prayer and Bible Reading in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of Congressman BECKER, of New York, I am submitting a meaninful and pertinent letter from a Kentucky woman for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

The writer of the letter suggests that one of the great current needs of our

country is the restoration of prayer and Bible reading in our public schools as provided by a constitutional amendment that has been proposed by Congressman BECKER, myself, and others. This lady, Sonia Hall, Louisville, Ky., is herself a living testimonial to the efficacy and worth of prayer. Her letter mentions the fact that she is suffering from a cancer that the doctors referred to as incurable and it further states that more than 2 years ago her doctors gave her from 3 to 9 months to live. But, as this earnest Christian says, she prayed over her problem and thereafter continued to live for many months after the supposed end of her lifespan as determined by medical science.

The letter sent to Congressman BECKER by Mrs. Hall's Louisville friend, Mrs. Bertie English, another stalwart Christian woman of faith, is as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
November 22, 1963.

To the People of the United States:

Why, oh why don't you, all of you, stop and ask yourselves: "Just why are we up in arms trying to permit prayer and Bible reading in our public schools?" Today, November 22, as I lay on my bed, sick with cancer, but more sick at our world, I watched television. I saw the awful thing happen to our President. This act sent every God-fearing person to their churches and on their knees. This should be a red-letter day for everyone and I think the letters put together should say, Let us keep prayer and Bible reading in our schools. So, if there is another tragedy like this, your children and grandchildren will know how to pray, never hear a prayer or see a Bible unless they see it in school. So many homes never say God's name except in a curseword. They have no Bibles in their homes. These same people are not interested in sending their children to Sunday school or church; they never attend themselves. I owned a rooming house for 8 years and I know what I am saying is true. So, if these children never hear a prayer or see the Bible in school, they will never hear about God. Parents, if you have a teacher in your school that will take the time to read and pray with your children, give her your blessing. When we of our country are unconcerned, the suggestion of taking Bible reading and prayer from our schools, we are guilty of the juvenile delinquency that takes place in our streets and alleys. Today, just think back on November 22, 1963, how quickly and how submissively and humbly everyone turned to God in our hour of tragedy. This same God, you are saying, don't teach about in our schools. The 22d of November everyone realized we needed God. We needed to pray that everyone, large or small, rich or poor, needed to know how to pray. If you take prayer out of school, the day is coming when there will be a scattered few that will be able to pray and there'll come some day when you will hear the cry: "Why don't somebody pray?" Most of the boys and girls of today will not know how to pray. People, please stop, look, and listen. We will need praying people and these people are now our schoolchildren. I think it was quite ironic the day our President was killed, little, big, old, and young all races went to their knees in anybody's church to pray to our one God. While in Congress a bill is hanging, trying to permit prayer in our schools. This is the one place all children can hear about God, for the law forces them to attend school. If this bill is passed, then someday we will need prayer and God will say, "I know you not."

Two years and four months ago, my doctor said: "You have cancer and there is nothing we can do. We cannot operate, you have from 3 to 9 months to live; no more." I have always been a praying woman. I loved and trusted my God, so I prayed. Every Christian in my church prayed for me. I belong to the South Louisville Christian Church, Louisville, Ky. People from other churches prayed for me, and so 2 years and 4 months later, I am still here, have been able to go about my daily life a little more slowly but able to do a lot of things. God hears prayers from his children, and some children will have to learn to pray in school or they won't know how.

You don't have to point and say, You have to go to this church or that church. Just plainly teach God and the Bible as it is written and teach them to pray to God in Jesus' name. Teach them about heaven and hell; they will learn the rest when put on the right road. And any man or woman that would kick against this had better get down on their knees and pray, for there is a God, there is a heaven, and there is a hell, and don't you forget it.

SONIA HALL,
Christian Church Home.

Otepka Pays the Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic problems confronting any democratic society is how to keep the public informed on matters of national interest without breaching security needs for secrecy. This problem also extends to the amount of information revealed to the Congress by intelligence officials. At the request of Miss Grace Bancroft of New Bedford, Mass., I would like to call the following editorial from the Standard Times of November 7, 1963, to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

OTEPKA PAYS THE PRICE

The dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, a State Department security officer, is sad evidence that the outspoken anti-Communist has everything to fear in the diplomatic bureaucracy, and the leftwinger is assured of the ultimate in protection.

Otepka was the principal witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that made an 18-month investigation of why U.S. diplomats were so misinformed as to the Communist orientation of Fidel Castro.

Otepka discussed in detail the background of one William Arthur Wieland, who had charge of the State Department's Cuba desk during Castro's rise to power.

The subcommittee reported that Wieland, who formerly lived in Cuba under the name Montenegro, a fact he had not disclosed on his employment application, had been guilty of grave errors of judgment and had failed to forward to State Department superiors material concerning Castro's Communist ties.

A State Department investigation of Wieland concluded he was not disloyal but that, as the subcommittee concluded, his judgment was faulty.

The net result: Wieland is still holding a comparable important position in the State Department; Otepka is now dismissed for allegedly furnishing to the subcommittee copies of classified documents concerning the case, in violation of a Truman administration order on executive department privilege with reference to classified papers.

Is the American public supposed to believe that Otepka's alleged violation is the first instance of classified information finding its way out of the State Department? Has not the administration, and others before it, constantly leaked the import of such documents to news media when the objective was considered of sufficient importance, political or diplomatic?

Security officer Otepka may have violated a regulation. But, if so, it was in cooperation with a sensitive and security conscious arm of the Government, an important agency of the U.S. Senate, and his motives could only have been of the highest.

Had Otepka belonged to the powerful, entrenched "fourth floor" of the State Department, there can be little doubt a way would have been found to excuse his transgression. But he does not belong, as Wieland apparently does. For the one, retribution is inexorable, speedy, and harsh; for the other, long winded extenuation, security, preferment. This is a miserable contrast in how not to beat the enemy.

American Legion Backs Discharge Petition No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the following news release from the national headquarters of the American Legion, based upon resolution 25, adopted at the 1963 National American Legion Convention.

The preamble to the constitution of the American Legion opens with:

For God and country we associate ourselves together for the following purposes.

The statement I am inserting gives a very clear picture, not only of the position of the American Legion taken at the 1963 national convention, but as to why we had to resort to a discharge petition. I am sure the members in the 16,000 posts of the American Legion will make their voices heard in support of this petition.

I am also inserting herewith a copy of a letter sent by Maurice T. Webb, director of the National Americanism Commission, to American Legion units all over the country, which is self-explanatory.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Indianapolis, Ind., December 19, 1963.

To: Members, National Americanism Commission, department Americanism chairman, chairman, vice chairmen and members, National Americanism Council.

Subject: Discharge Petition No. 3 in Congress.

Enclosed with this letter is a news release from the American Legion News Service relative to Discharge Petition No. 3, initiated by Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, to bypass the House Judiciary Committee and bring legislation proposing a constitutional amendment permitting voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools, to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote.

The legislative division of the American Legion will be in touch with department commanders, department adjutants, national

executive committeemen, and other key officials of our organization on this subject; however, the legislative director requested the undersigned to convey this message to those of you to whom this letter is addressed.

Unofficial figures show that 122 Members of Congress have already signed Discharge Petition No. 3. A total of 218 signatures are required in order for this legislation to bypass the House Judiciary Committee and be voted on by Members of Congress.

The purpose of this letter is to earnestly request each of you to contact your Congressman and urgently request that he sign Discharge Petition No. 3, as soon as he returns to Washington, after conclusion of the Christmas recess. This is a golden opportunity for each of us to take a positive position in support of a resolution adopted during the 45th national convention in Miami Beach, Fla., which was a restatement of action taken during the 1962 national convention in Las Vegas, Nev. Our present policy on the subject of voluntary prayer in public schools is embodied in 1963 convention Resolution 25, a copy of which is enclosed for your information.

This is a golden opportunity for the American Legion to support, in a positive way, a mandate of the national convention and, if Discharge Petition No. 3 is successful, each Member of Congress will have an opportunity to vote on the legislation calling for a constitutional amendment to be submitted to the people for ratification or rejection. This is the correct way for important matters to be resolved in the United States and by your active interest in this action to give Congress and the people the right to decide this issue, you will be proving that you and the American Legion believe in our constitutional form of government.

Sincerely,

MAURICE T. WEBB,
Director,
National Americanism Commission.

NEWS FROM THE AMERICAN LEGION

WASHINGTON.—The American Legion announced December 18 that it supports House Discharge Petition No. 3 to bypass the House Judiciary Committee and bring legislation proposing constitutional amendment permitting voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools to the floor of the House for a vote. The discharge petition was initiated by Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, after repeated unsuccessful attempts to win release of the legislation that is bottled up in the Judiciary Committee.

The American Legion's supporting position is based upon Resolution 25, adopted at the 1963 national convention.

The action stems from Supreme Court decisions banning compulsory prayer and Bible reading in schools. A number of House joint resolutions proposing constitutional amendments to permit voluntary prayer were introduced in the last session of the 87th Congress. All died in the Judiciary Committee. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, 131 such resolutions have been introduced and now languish in the same committee, with no indication of forthcoming action.

If the discharge petition obtains the 218 signatures necessary (it is reliably reported it now has 122), House Joint Resolution 693 will come before the House for vote. Fifty-four of the one hundred and thirty one resolutions are identical to House Joint Resolution 693.

A discharge petition is a seldom used parliamentary procedure but it is authorized in the rules of the House. The American Legion has supported discharge petitions but once or twice in its history and does so now, only because of the unusual circumstances surrounding the prayer and Bible reading issue, and related possibilities.

There are those who now would remove the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance, and do away with "In God We Trust" on our coinage. House Joint Resolution 693 would also protect reference to the deity as now in official use.

The names of the 122 signers of Discharge Petition No. 3 are unavailable, due to rules of the House. Legislative Director Clarence H. Olson suggests that many of the Representatives will be at home during the brief Christmas vacation, offering opportunity for personal contact in support of the petition. Olson also suggests that when writing to a Congressman, urging his signature, to be sure to associate the request with House Discharge Petition No. 3. Senate action is now pending at this time.

A Realistic Look at the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, current U.S. policy unfortunately seems to be rooted in the fallacious assumption that economic assistance to the cold war enemy will somehow brighten the prospects of peace.

Appeasement never pays. Realism commands us to reexamine our policies.

These are the concluding words of a searching, forceful article by David Lawrence which appears in the U.S. News & World Report issue of January 13, 1964, and which warns us that we are making the same mistakes today in our relations with an adversary which led to World War I and World War II.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Lawrence's article entitled "A Realistic Look at the World," at this point:

A REALISTIC LOOK AT THE WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

These are days when illusion seems to supersede realism. An avalanche of words about peace descends upon the citizen, and he is led to assume that an agreement with Russia to discontinue certain nuclear tests is in itself firm assurance of a utopian era.

Realism, however, tells us that the world situation today presents a parallel to what happened before World War I and World War II, respectively. The naive West has again become a victim of the fallacy that to build up your adversary's economic strength is the way to peace.

What is being witnessed now is the same misguided acceptance of the enemy's alleged good faith as we saw in the 1930's. Only this time the United States has gone along with the procession. America heretofore has stood for self-determination of peoples and for the freedom and political independence of all nations, large or small. Now, in a mood of complacency, the policy of the United States seems headed along the path of appeasement, if not surrender.

For, as we survey the world today, we see more than a billion people under the yoke of or allied with Communist dictatorship. We see the Soviet Government consolidating its position in Asia, in Africa, and in Central and South America. We also see the Western Powers, in sheer expediency, getting ready to accept the status quo everywhere—to acquiesce in the conquests of the Communists and call it peace. Whether in relation to Berlin or to Cuba, the pressure is to live and let live—the very essence of an opportunism that leads to surrender.

Every use of the word "peace" in the official dialogs, every suggestion about further talks between East and West is interpreted as a sign of the so-called turn toward peace and away from war.

Unhappily, the American reading public has been asked to believe that there have been only two courses before us—peace or war. The Soviets obviously do not want a military war any more than we do. If they can achieve their ends without a war—solidify their gains and maintain their role as conquerors of a vast area in the world—why should they precipitate a process of nuclear self-destruction?

The world today has seen the decay of moral principle in international affairs. The theory that "might makes right" has been tacitly accepted by Western diplomacy.

The puppet governments of the states in Eastern Europe under Communist control have lately been given a little flexibility in handling their own affairs. This has been hailed in the West as significant progress. But may it not be rather an example of Moscow's astuteness? Already the West has eagerly begun to finance trade with Communist states in Eastern Europe, thus relieving the Soviets of their burden as economic caretakers of the satellites.

The extent of the rift between Red China and the Soviet Government has been exaggerated. Moscow has control of China's military behavior and exercises considerable influence on the economic side. Where else could Red China get such economic support?

Irrespective, however, of the motives behind these Asian policies, the truth is that the Communist empire in the world is not being eroded. Military domination of this vast area continues. Political control by the Soviets is a fact, not a theory, throughout the Communist domain.

Communist infiltration is increasing in Africa. The Communist subversive movements have multiplied in Latin America, particularly since the United States has acquiesced in the Soviet conquest of Cuba despite flagrant violation of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

We may talk all we like about the peace offensive we are going to carry on in 1964, but to make deals with Moscow that give the Communists economic aid and to make available our credit facilities to finance their imports is to accept the Communist imperialists as partners. It means abandonment of the hundreds of millions of captive peoples in Eastern Europe who have looked hopefully to us. Removal of the causes of economic discontent helps to strengthen puppet governments and thereby discourage revolution.

It is dangerous, moreover, to assume that, when the Soviets build up their economy, they will not increase their demands as they intermittently revive their threats of a nuclear war. We are still burdened with a $50-billion-a-year expense for armament, much of which we would not have to spend if a free people ruled in the Soviet Union.

Our enemy in World War I was an autocratic government. Our enemy in World War II was also an autocratic government. In the prewar years in both cases, we helped the aggressor to grow strong enough to attack us. Will we repeat the error, or will we stop giving economic aid to Communist imperialism?

Appeasement never pays. Realism commands us to reexamine our policies.

The Korean Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a television speech that I will deliver on Sunday, January 12, in New York as a result of the observations of a trip that I made to Korea and South Vietnam between December 14 and 24, 1963. At that time I discussed the military, economic, and political situations with representatives of their countries. The following pertains particularly to the demilitarized zone in Korea which can be appropriately called the Korean wall:

THE KOREAN WALL

(By JOHN M. MURPHY, Member of Congress)

We in the West tend to symbolize the cold war with the Berlin wall, which runs like an ugly scar across the former capital of Germany. Its identification in our minds with Communist tyranny was etched even sharper over the Christmas holidays, when the Red puppet leaders of East Germany briefly opened the wall to admit West Berliners for visits with their relatives in East Berlin.

But while the free world's attention was focused on the Berlin wall, I was viewing another wall—a less dramatic one, perhaps, but even more grim and far deadlier. This wall is, prosaically enough, a strip of dirty, weather-worn engineer's tape, two inches wide, which stretches 151 miles across the Korean Peninsula from the Han River estuary in the west, to just below the 39th parallel in the east.

It passes between bleak, snow-covered hills which still bear the gashes of shell fire, the charred and splintered trees and the debris of a war that is not yet over. It winds through frozen valleys, threading brushwood and weeds that cover former farmlands now sown with a deadly crop of mines. Two thousand meters out from it, and paralleling it north and south, are strands of rusty barbed wire. Posted along the wire at intervals, like silent sentinels, are yellow and black signs which warn: Caution—no admittance—DMZ.

This is the demilitarized zone, the line of ground contact between the opposing sides at the moment of cease fire, which now separates the Republic of Korea from the Communist north. Inside this no man's land nothing moves except the ceaseless wind, and the silence is oppressive. There are no bricks and mortar here, but this is a wall, unseen but hostile, and there are no openings in it even for Christmas.

In Berlin there is at least some contact between East and West, a sense of communication with those on the other side. People do pass through the wall, and there is no readily discernible feeling of deep enmity in the air. Nor is there an urgent sense of danger; frustration, perhaps, and even bitterness, but the Berliners seem convinced that, somehow, an accommodation will be worked out for whatever crisis confronts them.

Not in Korea. The hostility between North and South is as deep and total as it was a decade ago, when I fought there as a young infantry officer just out of West Point. What contact there is between sides on the Military Armistice Commission is coldly official; as always, the Communist members lie, insult, and obstruct; it is basic with them to violate the terms of the truce. Their double-dealing long ago became so brazen that we do not permit their inspection teams on our side of the line.

On the troop level, there is every attitude of war except actual shooting, and at times there is even that. We—and when I say "we" I am speaking of the United Nations Command—have roughly 1 million men under arms in South Korea. The vast majority, of course, are Republic of Korea troops, augmented by our own 1st Cavalry and 7th Infantry Divisions and a token force of British and Turkish troops.

The line is patrolled constantly, day and night, by both sides. They pass in hostile silence, and sometimes the North Koreans spit on our men as they file by. On strategic hills we have built concrete bunkers, manned around the clock and protected against infiltrators by coils of barbed wire, mines, and trip flares. Twice daily helicopters fly the 151 miles of the truce line to flush out enemy probers.

For in Korea there is only an armistice—the longest armistice in history—and, in my opinion, there will be no peace settlement worked out in the foreseeable future. Perhaps we may in time arrive at an accommodation with the Russians, but in Korea we are dealing with the Red Chinese, who, at this point in history, can be dealt with only by force. In Korea, as in every other area of their influence, the Peking Marxists play a waiting game, constantly probing to find a weak spot, military or economic, and exploit it.

The danger in Korea is clear and present. Behind that wall of silence lies an implacable foe, restrained from another savage assault only by the realization that we maintain a superior force to oppose them. Behind this force is American determination and American money and resources, a combination far more powerful than any Peking can muster. Peking is quite aware of this.

But Peking is also aware that there is a growing dissatisfaction—or perhaps disenchantment is the better word—with foreign aid in this country, a feeling that a reappraisal is due. There is no doubt but that savings can and should be made, that there have been waste and mismanagement in the aid program, that we have been wide of our target in many areas. No program so vast could be perfectly administered. But to advocate sweeping slashes in military and economic aid, without regard for the critical areas of the cold war, is to court disaster.

This is precisely what Peiping is waiting for in Korea, in South Vietnam, in Cambodia—everywhere the Red tentacles reach. In Korea, we have spent more than $5 billion since World War II, militarily and economically. We lost 54,246 dead and counted 103,284 wounded in defending the country from Communist invaders. Last year, we spent more than $90 million. Were we justified in expending this blood and treasure? Having just returned from 2 weeks in Korea—2 weeks in which I conferred at length with civil and military officials and talked with scores of South Koreans in all walks of life—I can tell you that the answer is "Yes."

Some Americans might ask, "What difference does it make to a powerful country like the United States if Red China does take Korea, or South Vietnam, or Cambodia? They're a long way off." Militarily, we could cope with such a setback. But that is not the point. The point is that such conquests would not necessarily make us weaker, but would make Red China far, far more powerful. Economically, Peiping is in trouble. Its resources are strained simply to feed its people.

Every acre of rice land, every factory it can seize, free, in Red China the equivalent in manpower and raw material for further conquest. The amazingly fertile fields of Vietnam alone would feed Red China's millions, enabling them to throw all their energies into building Red China's war machine. This is the thought we must keep uppermost in our minds when we consider the value of continued foreign aid. Every man we arm, every factory we underwrite to strengthen the economy of a threatened country such as Korea, is a defeat for communism.

It is our will alone that is keeping the enemy on the other side of that silent wall in Korea. We must not let it weaken.

The Evolution of an Instant Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Lucius Beebe, in his column which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on December 23, 1963, seems to have some justifiable complaints about his fellow members of the fourth estate. Also in his column are some rather poignant observations:

THIS WILD WEST

(By Lucius Beebe)

THE EVOLUTION OF AN INSTANT STATESMAN

This reporter has not been in Washington except on the most trivial and fleeting occasions since the years of the 1941 war when Evalyn Walsh McLean was undisputed queen of the Capital's social life and when that life itself was the most opulently upholstered existence in the United States.

There may have been a war on but nobody would have known it who got caught up with the New Deal wartime administration whose entertainments were the most lavish in memory. The Roosevelt administration believed in austerity for everyone outside of government circles, but Washington was the only city in the United States where from 1941 through the surrender of Japan there was no shortage of vintage champagne, 40-year-old cognac, male house servants or fresh caviar.

As a frequent visitor to Mrs. McLean's social bashes in those perilous times, the only hardship I ever encountered was the occasional necessity for sharing a taxi from Union Station to Georgetown with a Congressman or Senator. Sometimes it was Thurman Arnold which made the hardship a real pleasure.

My impression in absence is that whatever the Kennedy regime may have done in recent years to raise the general cultural tone of the White House, the level of Washington reporting has declined immeasurably. All reporters, it appears, are Democrats which makes for a fairly low level of public service to begin with. All are favorable to the administration and available to its good offices and, often enough, personal charm.

Reporters, even at the exalted level of a Washington bureau, which ought to breed something resembling objectivity but no longer does, are not as of this writing disinterested observers; they are crusaders, pleaders of special causes and partisans of the good works, usually spurious, which are the stock in trade of opportunistic politicians in office anywhere. News reports reek of social and political prejudice, and the personal sentiments of the reporter dominate the news.

The best available example has been the treatment accorded the self-styled Negro rev-

olution which, without any least or slightest evaluation of its merits or shortcomings, has been accorded a press whose slavering adulation has made newspapers everywhere justifiably suspect. The frauds, fanatics, exhibitionists, freedom riders, and other obnoxious freeloaders who have attached themselves to the Negro cause have gotten precisely as good a press as the responsible element of civil rights partisans. In the end it has been bad advertising for a perhaps meritorious cause and has done irreparable harm to what image the press had remaining to it.

The accession to office of a new President has caused a remarkable revision upward of the Washington correspondents' estimate of Mr. Johnson's importance, wisdom, sagacity, farsightedness, benevolence, statesmanship, humanity, rectitude, and capacity for progressive leadership. Almost none of these qualities were associated with him when he was Vice President.

A great many people had some difficulty remembering his name as occupant of an office Mr. Dooley characterized as "not exactly a criminal offense but no credit to a man's character." When President Kennedy, yielding to Mr. Johnson's importunities, sent him on a foreign mission to distribute ballpoint pens among the heathen, the newspapers of the land and the press, too, were surprised that such a person existed.

Today he is the recipient of a Washington press almost as favorable, profuse, and emotionally charged as that of his predecessor. Granted, as the journalistic merchants of platitude have been avidly pointing out, the office makes the man, many Americans are surprised that it made Mr. Johnson practically overnight.

He is almost the only example of an instant statesman on record.

Without any least derogation of a man on whose capacity for high office the fate of civilization may well depend, especially if he is reelected next year, this tumultuous acclaim of Mr. Johnson's importance, wisdom, sagacity, etc., confected on short notice seems ill considered and scarcely the mature judgment of close observers over a prolonged period of time.

The truth is that Washington correspondents are enthusiastic supporters of whatever administration is in office at the moment, and especially so if the incumbent is a Democrat. Only by investing the pricipal excuse for their professional existence with almost unearthly qualities of sapience and glamour can they bask in the reflection of the same characteristics.

They made Calvin Coolidge a statesman of the first magnitude, and in the light of that accomplishment arraying Mr. Johnson in the robes of an Augustus should be a pushover.

The President's State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply impressed with President Johnson's State of the Union address. I feel that he has the strength of conviction and ideas. He is a man of action with a keen grasp of the Nation's problems. He possesses the leadership and the ability to deal with these problems at this crucial period in our history. I think the Nation is fortunate to have a man of his capacity and talents as its leader.

What specifically appeals to me is President Johnson's strong attack on poverty and his efforts to eradicate this evil from our country where many millions of people still suffer the ravages of poverty. I am particularly pleased of the way he is continuing the struggle toward realization of the Kennedy program, especially civil rights, tax reduction, and medical care for our elderly citizens.

I am also in accord with the various other proposals advocated by President Johnson today and I trust this will mark the beginning of a highly successful Johnson program in the best interests of the Nation.

The President's statement that "we will not be buried" indicates his awareness of the Communist problem. The strength of our Armed Forces is proof positive that we will not knuckle under to Communist threats.

I am convinced the American people will support President Johnson in all these endeavors, both at home and abroad.

A Program for Cooperation and Research and Development on Behalf of Better Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Public Roads has established an enviable record in maintaining good and productive relationships with State highway departments and with the highway industry.

A special report published in the American Road Builder magazine, the official publication of the American Road Builders' Association, illustrates this. It describes how the Bureau of Public Roads and the highway construction industry, represented by the American Road Builders' Association, have developed a program for cooperation in research and development on behalf of better highways.

The program of cooperation between the Bureau and the American Road Builders' Association has been formally spelled out in a "Memorandum of Understanding," which describes operating procedures the American Road Builders' Association's Research and Development Committee will follow in its liaison with a Bureau task group. The director of the Bureau's Office of Research and Development, Robert F. Baker, endorsed the "Memorandum of Understanding" with the statement:

I found the statement to be extremely sound and one which provides the basis for a healthy relationship.

Mr. Baker also pointed out that Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton is very pleased with the procedures for cooperation between the Bureau and the highway construction industry.

Under unanimous consent, I include this special report in the RECORD as an example of a very desirable and fruitful type of cooperation between Government and industry.

The report follows:

COOPERATION IS THE KEYNOTE OF THIS ENTERPRISE ON BEHALF OF BETTER HIGHWAYS

ARBA's Committee on Research and Development has developed a "Memorandum of Understanding" with the Bureau of Public Roads describing the operating procedures which the ARBA committee will follow in its liaison with a BPR task group.

In a letter endorsing the memorandum of understanding, Robert F. Baker, director of research and development, Bureau of Public Roads, said: "I found the statement to be extremely sound and one which should provide the basis for a healthy relationship. As you know, I am supporting without reservation this type of cooperative effort between industry and our research and development program. I am quite impressed with the committee which you have selected for this purpose."

Mr. Baker added that Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton also is extremely pleased to have this support of ARBA for the BPR research and development program.

The ARBA committee, headed by Commissioner J. C. Marshall, Minnesota Department of Highways, was organized to engage in studies concerning research problems of major importance to industry; to determine the capabilities of industry to perform research and development work; and to assist in the promotion and adoption of successful research and development findings.

The text of the "Memorandum of Understanding" is as follows:

"The American Road Builders Association, a nonprofit organization representing the highway construction industry, has served as its spokesman for more than half a century in behalf of improved methods, materials, equipment, and engineering to produce the best highways possible at reasonable cost. ARBA's all-inclusive membership (official, professional, educational, and commercial) is, therefore, keenly interested in highway research and development activities.

"The association, desiring to assist the Bureau of Public Roads research and development program, has formed a research and development committee with a chairman, secretary, and 26 members. The purposes of this committee are to advise BPR of research problems of concern to industry; to advise the BPR regarding the capabilities of industry to perform research and development work; and to promote the adoption of successful research and development findings.

"BPR is initiating an expanded highway research and development program independently and in cooperation with the Highway Research Board, the American Association of State Highway Officials, State highway departments, institutions of higher learning, and private enterprise. BPR welcomes the assistance and cooperation of ARBA in the highway research and development program. In this mutual effort, care will be exerted to insure that such cooperaprojects will not duplicate or interfere with the work of other organizations cooperating with BPR on research and development programs.

"The following guidelines for a modus operandi are agreed to:

1. BPR and ARBA will each designate a task group, including a chairman and a secretary, to meet and work with each other. The Secretary of the BPR task group will be authorized to coordinate directly with the ARBA committee secretary in maintaining the affairs of the two units on a current basis.

2. Meetings will be scheduled, as agreed by the two chairmen, and will be held, unless otherwise agreed upon, in Washington, D.C.

3. ARBA will conduct surveys to secure an inventory of highway research and development activities being conducted by industry, universities, highway contractors, counties and local government, and other groups included in ARBA membership, except those conducted by State highway departments, as information concerning State highway activities is already available to BPR. The surveys conducted by ARBA will be made in support of the Bureau's Office of Research and Development activities to maintain a reference as to the total national effort in research and development that is being made to improve the efficiency of highway transportation.

4. ARBA will canvass its members for the projects they recommend for research and development under the BPR program. The committee will screen them to prevent duplication and to establish need and priority. The list will then be discussed with the BPR task group before submission to BPR for action.

5. ARBA will periodically canvass its members for information about their capability to perform research and development projects and will furnish the list to BPR.

6. ARBA will assist, as requested by the Bureau, in disseminating information concerning highway research and development.

7. ARBA will assist at every opportunity in getting early acceptance of research and development findings into practice.

The BPR task group will be headed by Mr. Baker, with H. A. Radzikowski, deputy director for development, as secretary. The other members of the task group are: William B. Huffine, J. York Welborn, D. O. Woolf, C. A. Steele, Curtis L. Shufflebarger, John Laing, L. R. Schureman, and C. F. Rogers.

The ARBA members of the research and development committee, serving under Mr. Marshall, are:

Contractors division: Richard R. Stander, president, Mansfield Asphalt Paving Co., Mansfield, Ohio; and Nello L. Teer, Jr., president, Nello L. Teer Co., Durham, N.C.

County division: I. Ray Geer, Lewis County superintendent of highways, Lowville, N.Y.; Joe Harrison, Howard County engineer, Kokomo, Ind.; and A. B. Kaltenbach, director, Department of Public Works, Baltimore City, Towson, Md.

Educational division: Ladis Csanyi, Department of Civil Engineering, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa; Emmett H. Karrer, professor of highway engineering, the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; and James W. Spencer, highway research and extension engineer, Department of Agricultural Engineering, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Engineering division: Edward J. Donnelly, J. E. Greiner Co., Baltimore, Md.; Herbert Goodkind, Goodkind & O'Dea, Montclair, N.J.; Everett S. Preston, E. S. Preston & Associates, Columbus, Ohio; and R. C. Vogt, Vogt, Ivers & Associates, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Manufacturers division (CIMA): Robert B. Bradley, vice president, International Harvester Co., Melrose Park, Ill.; and R. P. McKenrick, executive director, Construction Industry Manufacturers Association, Chicago, Ill.

Materials and services division: E. W. Bauman, managing director, National Slag Association, Washington, D.C.; J. E. Buchanan, president, the Asphalt Institute, College Park, Md.; Robert S. Holmes, manager, construction marketing, U.S. Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; G. Donald Kennedy, president, Portland Cement Association, Chicago, Ill.; and V. A. van Praag, Los Angeles, Calif.

Municipal and airport division: Arthur D. Bird, city engineer, division of engineering, Cincinnati, Ohio; George L. Tenney, director, department of public works, city of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Bernard Werner, director of public works, city of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md.

Membership-at-large: Ray W. Burgess, director, Louisiana Department of Highways, Baton Rouge; and H. H. Harris, commissioner, Virginia Department of Highways, Richmond.

Consultant: C. L. Miller, head, Department of Civil Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Secretary: Herbert G. Lux, ARBA, Washington, D.C.

The work of the committee will be outlined during the special technical session at the 1964 ARBA convention in New Orleans.

You Are Your Own Defender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been increasingly distressed at the growing conflict that has arisen between the investor-owned electric utility companies and the rural electric companies of this Nation. With a firm conviction that both parties have an important role to play in supplying the ever-increasing electric power needs of a growing country, it is my hope that the present divisive trend will be reversed. Indeed, it must be reversed. Understanding must be sought. But such understanding is little enhanced by published articles similar to that in a recent edition of a national magazine. The responsibility for answering such articles in clearly indicated in an editorial written by the statewide manager of the Colorado Rural Electric Association, Howard E. Scott. The article follows:

YOU ARE YOUR OWN DEFENDER

(By Howard E. Scott)

But life's clamor proceeds. The rural electrification movement was a case study in the December Reader's Digest.

By its own testimony 24 million copies of this artful potpourri are purchased monthly in 13 languages. This lays upon its editors an awesome responsibility to speak fairly on those areas it covers. But its story, "The REA—A Case Study of Bureaucracy Run Wild," by Kenneth O. Gilmore and Eugene H. Methvin, is not fair.

Worse, it is but an echo of the big smears offered from the longplaying record of the giants of the electric utility business. It is, in short, an insult to the thousands of citizens in this State who own, operate and control their own private electric business.

Why? Because it proceeds on the totally unfounded assumption that the rural electrics are not private enterprise. Only from so massive an initial error can so much additional error be jerrybuilt to form the strawman which the article can then demolish.

The rural electric cooperatives, if we may repeat ourselves, are private taxpaying utilities who, for whatever growth they may have had, still operate in the thinnest parts of the total electric market. They are not equally blessed, but all have continued to do what they have always done—serve the areas left over when the electric market was plucked clean by old line utilities. They began because they were needed to fill an empty void. They have earned more than insult for this labor, insult built upon the whole cloth that they are—somehow—pawns of a "bureaucracy run wild."

But read it for yourself. It's you they are talking about. You, the enterprising citizen who had to build for himself. They may pounce on "bureaucracy" as a more appealing word—but it is you and your business they damn as a tax eating monster. Your business has no better defender than you. Left undefended, it is but a pathetic subject of slander. This kind of abuse of a free people should not be passed off as a case study. What ran wild was the pen that wrote the diatribe.

Reflections on Social Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with the Nation's official mourning period for our late President having terminated, a grieving nation continues to gain a perspective and find our place in history.

I am pleased to present the following letter by Dr. Dean Lobaugh, superintendent of Davis schools, which went out to local teachers in their monthly newsletter:

Since the day of assassination of John F. Kennedy pundits have been attempting to find a meaning for this heinous act in terms of our national life and character. The subsequent murder of the suspected assassin has, of course, only complicated the search for meanings. Did these violent acts reveal deep flaws in our national character, or were they isolated acts of aberrant characters?

What reflections do these acts have in our national program of education, if indeed we have a national program? What can we as school people learn for our future guidance?

It seems to me that our basic lesson comes not from the violent incidents themselves, but from certain aspects of public reaction. To the extent that we felt horror at the act of assassination, and a sense of deep condemnation at the subsequent act of murder, we demonstrated the integrity of our national character, and justified our basic training as citizens of a free society.

Assassination and murder have occurred in other sophisticated societies, though seldom, it must be admitted, in such dramatic juxtaposition; I cannot feel that the acts themselves can be blamed on the American people as a whole.

What can be blamed, and what has tremendous implications for us as teachers, is any feeling on the part of any people, that political action by assassination is ever justified, or that, in the case of the murder of Oswald, there is ever a time when men may properly take the administration of supposed justice into their own hands.

We cannot deny, I think, that there were persons who openly or secretly applauded the removal of Mr. Kennedy from the political scene, and by holding such thoughts condoned the assassination; and there were yet others, still more numerous, I suspect, who applauded the murderer of Oswald, and who actually hope that he will go free to assume a kind of hero's role.

What we must teach our pupils, with more depth and sincerity than ever before, are the fundamental aspects of government by law—the election or renewal of those who govern us through the exercise of the ballot, and the right of even the seemingly most guilty person to personal protection and an orderly trial.

Dear colleague, whether you succeed in teaching the subjunctive case or irrational numbers to each pupil in your class this you can teach the lowliest: only as a nation under law can we continue to exist as freemen.

DEAN LOBAUGH.

John F. Kennedy: A Remembrance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to read a most penetrating and sympathetic remembrance of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with special reference to his interest in and respect for science. This monograph appeared in the magazine Science, which is the publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and I have asked unanimous consent so that all our Members may read it.

The author, who has been the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, is a gifted man himself, both in scientific and administrative fields. He had been an associate and an adviser to the late President from the years when Senator Kennedy had first sought his advice in intricate technical matters. The need to comprehend the possibilities of science, to use it wisely as we probe for better solutions to our problems, is one that weighs heavily upon Congress continually as it confronts wide-ranging decisions.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner will shortly be leaving his post at the White House, where he has been the third to serve in this critical modern position since it was established some years ago. He has been assigned new and comprehensive duties at one of the Nation's great centers of scientific research. He will be succeeded by a scientist of considerable attainments, Dr. Donald Hornig.

I want to pay my personal respects to Dr. Wiesner, whom I have worked with closely in recent months as part of my responsibilities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development. I have profound respect for the public spirited and dedicated way in which Dr. Wiesner has contributed his knowledge and his abilities to the Federal service. From his university days in Michigan, through his notable war work, to the recent years in which he has been obliged to weigh the resources and potential of our national scientific effort, he has always made a magnificent record.

I know he will continue to follow closely the matters of science and public policy which have concerned him so greatly.

JOHN F. KENNEDY: A REMEMBRANCE

(By Jerome B. Wiesner)

(His respect for science as an instrument of good was one of the Chief Executive's distinctive qualities.)

Never have I been given a more difficult task To put into words the true spirit and charm and intelligence of John F. Kennedy would be impossible even for a writer far more gifted than I. It would take the telling of many tales, a description of his handling of problems large and small, a detailed history of his 3 brief years as a world leader, to show his true greatness.

I have just returned from Arlington National Cemetery where thousands of people from all over the world paid their last respects to the man who had given them so much hope. It was a beautiful, cold, sunshiny day, the kind he loved. One could almost call it a New England day. The day was like the President, radiant and crisp. He added something indescribable to every occasion; his smile brightened it, his humor livened it. He had a quick and often sardonic humor and a quick mind. To these he added an optimism about the future and a determination to bring out the maximum capabilities of our people, and, indeed, of all mankind. He was an intelligent, educated man. He was a kindly man. I never knew him to do a mean thing to any person. He was never too busy for a word of greeting. He had a strong temper but one that subsided quickly. Challenged, he responded firmly. Big problems were never allowed to submerge the small, today's problems to obscure tomorrow's. At the height of the great crises of his tenure—the Bay of Pigs disaster, the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviet Union, Mississippi, Birmingham, the confrontation with the Soviet Union over the missile installations in Cuba—he still talked about the future. He retained his monumental interest in the details of the ongoing business of Government. He read an amazing amount, and seemingly remembered it all. He often asked about obscure stories concerning science buried in the New York Times or the London Observer or any one of the dozens of papers and periodicals he somehow found time to read.

VISION AND OUTLOOK

I met Jack Kennedy while he was a Senator from my home State of Massachusetts. He needed advice on technical matters, particularly military technology and nuclear test ban, issues then occupying much of my time. I agreed to help largely because friends asked me to and because he was my Senator. I heard from him only infrequently at first and saw him even less. But even those brief contacts caused me to admire him, so that I readily agreed to join up and provide what little help I could when he became the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. Many things impressed me then and drew me to him. There was, of course, his charm but there was much more. I was most impressed by his quick, almost instinctive understanding of problems once he was given the facts. His background ill prepared him for an interest in scientific matters, yet his interest was lively. He was, in fact, then a member of the Harvard University Visiting Committee. Obviously unprepared to understand the theory of scientific subjects, he tried to get a physical feel of the matter. For example, he was forever trying to get someone to explain electromagnetic propagation comprehensibly. He didn't call it that. He wanted to know how radio worked. But when one tried to answer, one learned that the question was not about electron tubes or transistors or coils—these were manmade things which he could believe—but why and how did nature really allow energy to be sent through space.

Someone called him a truly modern man, this first American President to be born in the 20th century. And he was that. He had confidence in and used the modern tools. In a real sense technological marvels gave him his chance to be President. Without the airplane and television, he would not have been able to wage his successful campaign in 1960. And he never forgot this. His vision and outlook made it easy for him to understand other products of technology. President Kennedy, better than any political figure I have known, understood the social significance of modern science and technology.

As I try to remember the things that impressed me most about the President, four qualities stand out: his intelligence, his hopefulness, his sense of history, his striving for excellence. All of us who worked with him were proud of him. His very appearance, his composure, his sensitivity for every situation led us to an ever-growing admiration. He was the President from the very beginning, and as he was tested in his terrible job, he grew.

His vision and perfectionism may best be seen in his speeches. He had a vision of what he thought the world could be, and he projected this in his poetic prose. His inaugural address set the plan for his administration, and he strove consistently to reach the goals he set then. He said, "To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

And about the arms race, "Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction. * * * Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us. Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations."

Much of President Kennedy's hopefulness was derived from his conviction that science provided our Nation with vast powers for good. In the inaugural speech, he summed this up with, "Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths and encourage the arts and commerce." He was ever pressing to put technology to work. In foreign affairs, for helping other nations, for insuring our security, in seeking solutions to our domestic problems, he looked to science for the clues.

NATIONAL ACADEMY SPEECHES

Twice he responded to invitations to speak before the National Academy of Sciences, and, as far as I know, set a precedent for Presidential attendance at Academy functions.

On April 25, 1961, the President, in dedicating the new wing of the Academy, disregarded his prepared text and in an eloquent extemporaneous talk revealed his sensitive understanding of the necessary cooperation between the Government and the scientific community. In calling upon the Academy and the scientific community, the President remarked:

"This country must move forward, and most of the areas where we must move forward involve most sophisticated problems which your experience and training can help us to solve. One of the problems, it seems to me, of a free society is the fact that all of the questions which we must decide now are extremely sophisticated questions. It is difficult enough for those who hold office, either in the administration or in the Con-

gress, to attempt to make a determination between alternate courses of action—fiscal policy, monetary policy, agricultural policy, international policy, disarmament, arms control, all the rest, all of these involve questions to confound the experts. For those of us who are not expert and yet must be called upon to make decisions which involve the security of our country, which involve the expenditures of hundreds of millions of billions of dollars, we must turn, in the last resort, to objective, disinterested scientists who bring a strong sense of public responsibility and public obligation. So this Academy is most important."

Again, on October 22, 1963, a month to the day before the tragic events in Texas, the President appeared before the Academy on the occasion of its anniversary convocation and he emphasized the importance of basic scientific investigations, the contributions that science can make to international objectives, and the interdisciplinary and intercultural aspects of science in playing its role in modern society. He also dwelt on a theme that he many times expressed, the need for applying the results of scientific and technological advances to the conservation and development of natural resources. During his relatively brief stay in office he gave physical meaning to these objectives.

On the subject of basic scientific research, the President said in his last Academy speech:

"But if basic research is to be properly regarded, it must be better understood. I ask you to reflect on this problem and on the means by which, in the years to come, our society can assure continuing backing to fundamental research in the life sciences, the physical sciences, the social sciences, on natural resources, on agriculture, on protection against pollution and erosion. Together, the scientific community, the Government, industry, and education must work out the way to nourish American science in all its power and vitality."

President Kennedy regarded international scientific cooperative activities and scientific exchanges as one of the strongest bridges to other nations, and at the Academy celebration he expanded on this view. "I would suggest that science is already moving to enlarge its influence in three general ways: In the interdisciplinary area, in the international area, and in the intercultural area. For science is the most powerful means we have for the unification of knowledge, and a main obligation of its future must be to deal with problems which cut across boundaries, whether boundaries between the sciences, boundaries between nations, or boundaries between man's scientific and his humane concerns."

He closed his talk with an anecdote that revealed the strength of his conviction about the importance of basic research to the country's future when he remarked, "The great French Marshal Lyautey once said to his gardener: 'Plant a tree tomorrow.' And the gardener said, 'It won't bear fruit for 100 years.' 'In that case,' said Lyautey to the gardener, 'plant it this afternoon.'" "That is how I feel about your work," said the President.

BASIC RESEARCH AND MANPOWER

Under the President's leadership there has been a substantial strengthening of the basic research grants of the National Science Foundation in recognition not only of the need for the results of such research, but also of the essential role of basic research in the training of new scientists. In a news conference on January 15, 1962, the President expressed his concern about the future adequacy of our scientific and technical manpower in referring to a study of Soviet technical manpower that had just been published by the National Science Foundation. He said, "This has been a matter of some concern to me for some time because one of the most critical problems facing this Nation is the inadequacy of the supply of scientific and technical manpower to satisfy the expanding requirements of this country's research and development efforts in the near future." He called upon the President's Science Advisory Committee, in cooperation with the Federal Council for Science and Technology, to report as quickly as possible on the specific measures that could be taken to develop the necessary, well-qualified scientists and engineers, and he reinforced his personal concern with the words, "To all those who may be within the sound of my voice or who may follow your stories in the papers, I want to emphasize the great new and exciting field of the sciences." Following submission of the Science Advisory Committee report of December 1962 on needs for graduate training in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences, the President's 1964 budget for the National Science Foundation reflected his acceptance of the PSAC judgment of the importance of increased support for graduate education. This is also reflected in his proposed legislation to increase the number of fellowships under the National Defense Education Act, and in his extemporaneous remarks at the National Academy celebration he expressed his deep disappointment in the failure of the Congress to support this program.

SPACE PROGRAM

During his administration he made persistent efforts to strengthen the U.S. space program. He saw in it the opportunity to serve many national needs. He was firmly convinced that Soviet space supremacy had greatly weakened the United States in its foreign affairs. He saw military hazards in a lagging space capability. He saw the exploration of space as one of the great human adventures of this century, and he appreciated the important scientific possibilities of space exploration. He dedicated this Nation to a massive space program with a firm target of a manned lunar landing in this decade. This is a costly program and his decision to undertake it was not made lightly. He talked to hundreds of people in the process of making his decision and he weighed the costs with real concern. In the end he became convinced that the United States could not remain second in this important field. Despite continual review, he remained convinced of the correctness of this course.

Yet with the closing of the gap between United States and U.S.S.R. outer space capabilities, he followed through his inaugural theme with the proposal to the U.S.S.R. for a joint moon venture.

He also followed through on his inaugural hopes of conquering the deserts, and the national efforts at desalinization were greatly reinforced, along with a stepped-up program of underlying basic and applied research to overcome the barriers to economic desalinization.

NATURAL RESOURCES

In the field of natural resources, the President early in his administration took steps to accelerate the pace of the national program in oceanography, and at the same time provided leadership and backing both for congressional support and for a coordinated, balanced, and imaginative interagency approach to oceanographic research. An old sailor, he had a special interest in this research. He got a particular pleasure when the Presidential yacht *Williamsburg* was converted into an oceanographic research vessel. For a film on oceanographic research just completed, the President provided the opening and closing lines. Recently, after I had recovered from the consequences of a sailing accident, inaccurately reported, he offered to give me lessons in sailing and press relations. He called upon both the National Academy of Sciences and the Federal Council for Science and Technology to study and make recommendations for strengthening the Federal efforts across the broad horizons of natural resources in the land, sea, and air so that they can better serve the needs of the American people.

Early in his administration, too, the President lent substance to his desire to encourage commerce through science and technology by initiating a national program to strengthen civilian technology, including the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. In remarks prepared for delivery in Dallas, never given, the President pointed out that communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities tend to attract the new and growing industries. He congratulated those who recognized the relationship between leadership and learning and the need for community support for the advancement of learning underlying the creation of the forward-looking Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

President Kennedy's interest in international aspects of science was again highlighted in his September 20, 1963, address to the United Nations, where he urged a world center for health communications to warn of epidemics and the adverse effects of certain drugs; regional research centers to advance common medical knowledge and train new scientists and doctors for new nations; and a cooperative system of satellites to provide communication and weather information on a worldwide basis. As a result of his initiative, work has already begun in the World Meteorological Organization to develop the outlines of a world weather system and to strengthen basic research in atmospheric sciences on an international basis.

In connection with technical assistance to newly developing countries, the President was instrumental in bringing about closer attention to the need for research underlying the planning and execution of the AID program. This was reflected in the formulation of his Alliance for Progress program with its emphasis on science education, and in the establishment of the Office of Human Resources and Social Development in the Agency for International Development.

There are numerous other examples of President Kennedy's interest in promoting the development and application of science on an international basis, ranging from his initiative in establishing the United States-Japan Science Committee and his encouragement of the scientists' Pugwash movement, to his request for specific studies from his Science Advisory Committee, including a study of the problem of hoof and mouth disease in Argentina, the problem of waterlogging in Pakistan, and most recently his initiation of a study of the boll weevil problem in cotton production, a matter of international as well as national concern.

ARMS CONTROL

I have already referred to the President's strong conviction about the need for bringing about adequately safeguarded international arms control, a matter that occupied a very substantial part of his time from the very first days of his administration. The whole world can be thankful for two major accomplishments that flowed from his efforts, two monuments to his labors on the road to peace—the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the nuclear test ban treaty—which can inspire us to persist in the efforts to avoid the nuclear holocaust that so haunted him. One of his first acts was to propose to Congress the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the world's first governmental activity dedicated solely to the study of disarmament problems. As a result, the U.S. Government now has a small cadre of professionals in this extremely complicated and important field.

The signing of the nuclear test ban treaty gave the President enormous satisfaction. For him it proved that meaningful disarmament steps were possible, and it justified the

hundreds of hours of debate and study, the deep disappointments along the way. His striving for this treaty, begun in the first days of his administration, weathered many bitter disappointments and was the subject of much unjust criticism. He could hardly have been blamed had he abandoned hope after the Russians resumed nuclear testing in the summer of 1961. Characteristically, though, he continued his attempts to work out an acceptable agreement. The question of the need for further nuclear tests in order to enhance our national security involved highly technical issues and extremely controversial ones as well. So did the capabilities of nuclear test detection systems. The President made himself an expert on these subjects. He listened to many briefings and more debates. He talked to experts with every possible view and finally formed his own conclusions.

In the process he also achieved an understanding of the role of scientific advice in policy matters. In his last National Academy address he said, "As the country had reason to note in recent weeks during the debate on the test ban treaty, scientists do not always unite themselves on their recommendations to makers of policy. This is only party because of scientific disagreements. It is even more because the big issues so often go beyond the possibilities of exact scientific determination.

"I know few significant questions of public policy which can safely be confided to computers. In the end, the hard decisions inescapably involve imponderables of intuition, prudence, and judgment."

The President called the nuclear test ban treaty a small first step. Since its signing, the nations of the world have also responded to his call for a pledge to prohibit the placing of nuclear weapons in orbit. He hoped that these agreements would be followed by many more.

President Kennedy not only understood the need to invest resources for extending our understanding of science and its applications but also saw the need for institutional change to guide and assist the mounting governmental involvement in science and technology to serve national objectives. He shared the view that the Federal scientific enterprise would be best served by strengthening the individual agencies whose missions required the exploitation of science, rather than by the creation of an all-encompassing department of science. Toward this end he sought the inclusion of a technically educated individual at the policy level in each department which is heavily dependent upon science for the accomplishment of its mission. The evolution of the Office of Science and Technology also reflects this policy of building strength in the individual agencies. On March 29, 1962, after much discussion, he sent a message to the Congress providing for reorganization in the field of science and technology. He pointed out that the ever-growing significance and complexity of Federal programs had earlier necessitated several steps for improving the organizational arrangements of the executive branch. The President believed that the creation of the Office of Science and Technology would facilitate communication between the executive branch and the Congress. The wisdom of the President in making this proposal is being increasingly realized through the activities of its director, in its close collaboration with the Bureau of the Budget, its presentations to congressional committees, and through its leadership in initiating long-range planning of research and development within the Federal agencies. To assist this work, the National Science Foundation has created an Office of Resources Planning, and closer ties with the National Academy of Sciences have been established through its newly created Committee on Science and Public Affairs.

These are only the highlights of President Kennedy's broad interest in science and technology and the tangible forms they have taken. Although much progress has been made, much more needs to be done. But because of his interest and suport we have a stronger base upon which to extend the already impressive contributions of American science and technology.

Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, Inc., Calls for Action on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution approved by the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, Inc., which declares their support for the administration's vitally important civil rights bill. The Federation consists of 225 voluntary health and welfare agencies in the Greater New York area. This resolution presents cogent reasons for the speedy passage of civil rights legislation and should be read by all of us.

The resolution follows:

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7152

The most important single issue before the Nation and the Congress at this time is the free exercise of the legal rights to which all Americans are entitled. The entitlement of the Negro people to equal rights can no longer be a matter of controversy. These rights are clearly established by our Constitution, the law of the land, and time and time again they have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Negro is not asking for special rights or privileges, he is asking that his rights as an American be effectively assured.

History has disclosed that the passage of time alone will not bring about the nationwide voluntary recognition of these rights. The Negro people have been waiting for almost a century; their patience is understandably strained. Effective action is needed by the Federal Government—now—not to grant new rights but to guarantee that established rights are fully protected.

The Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, as a Christian organization devoted to the cause of human welfare, has always recognized that the issue of civil rights is inextricably interwoven with problems relating to the welfare of all people. Not only is the work of improving the physical well-being of all underprivileged people acutely hampered by discrimination in all its forms, but the goals of welfare work are effectively thwarted. These goals do not involve bringing about the mere physical improvement of the individual's lot; they involve the establishment of an environment in which the moral and spiritual well-being of the individual can flourish. This cannot be achieved if legal rights are denied or are not effectively enforced.

The federation welcomed, therefore, the efforts of the late President Kennedy to bring about legislation that would do much to enforce recognition of the established rights of the Negro people. It welcomes the support President Johnson is giving to this legislation, and it strongly urges the speedy enactment of H.R. 7152 by the Congress.

Approved December 16, 1963.

The Fallen Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest tributes to our late beloved President that has come to my attention was written by Mr. Jerry Bakst for the Suburban World which is published in several editions throughout the towns of Essex County, N.J. I know the Members will be interested in reading Mr. Bakst's moving eulogy which follows in full:

THE FALLEN EAGLE

(By Jerry Bakst)

No one in Verona, no one in Cedar Grove, regardless of political viewpoint or party preference, can have escaped the sense of shock, disbelief, dismay, and grief over the horrible news that the Nation's youngest elected President had been struck down by an assassin's bullet.

He was like a strong, young eagle, shot down in midflight on powerful wings by a senseless hunter, and the leaden thud when he fell was made stronger by the memory of him in the majesty of flight.

He was the first President—the first leader of the free world—born in this century, and an example of the best this country can produce. He had a keen mind, a curious and probing intellect, an energetic body, great and tremendous zeal for hard work, a monumental grasp of facts and figures, an appreciation of complex ideas, and a zest for life and service. He was the product of excellent family training and schooling.

He was seasoned and hardened by combat—in competitive sports, the horror of war, and the tough world of political campaigning—all of which served as a kind of crucible to fuse the fine natural gifts of heart and of mind and body into a personality of steel that was geared to cope with dangerous and challenging world of the 1960's. He strove always for excellence.

He could have been a dilletante and a playboy. He chose public service. And he summed up his concept of how Americans should think in a dangerous and challenging age when he declared, in his superb inaugural address: "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

He saw the challenge to his generation as "a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle—year in and year out—a struggle against the common enemies of mankind—tyranny, poverty, disease, war itself." And as he took on the most terrible burdens of responsibility that could rest on any American in the "long twilight struggle" in which this Nation is engaged, he declared bravely, for the world to hear: "I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it."

He lived as he believed. "* * * Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions—Were we truly men of courage * * * were we truly men of judgment * * * were we truly men of integrity * * * were we truly men of dedication * * *."

He believed in service and sacrifice to his country: "To maintain our freedom, to demonstrate that we are the truly revolutionaries, that their system is as old as Egypt—

will require more discipline, sacrifice, and vitality than this country has ever shown." And on another occasion: "The New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises * * it is a set of challenges. It sums up not what I intend to offer the American people, but what I intend to ask of them. It appeals to their pride, not their pocketbooks. It holds the promise of more sacrifice instead of more security."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the first of his religious faith to become President and in that sense he crossed an important New Frontier, as did his country in electing him. He pledged solemnly to defend our traditional separation of church and state. He lived up to that pledge, often in the face of bitter criticism from the very people who opposed him because they feared he would not.

In the loss of this young American eagle, this country has suffered a severe blow. But his own words of challenge, his own call to sacrifice, his own call to courage, judgment, integrity, and dedication will, if heeded, see this Nation through under its new Chief Executive, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, Made Headway During 1963 in Grappling With the State's Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague in the House of Representatives, Hon. William W. Scranton, affectionately known as "Bill" and now Governor of Pennsylvania, enjoyed a successful first year in office. Some of his accomplishments are described in the following article of January 3, 1964, written by Jack Lynch of the staff of the Associated Press:

GOVERNOR CAN LOOK BACK ON 1963 WITH SATISFACTION

(By Jack Lynch)

HARRISBURG.—Pennsylvania's new-look Governor led the Commonwealth through an exciting and prosperous year in 1963.

And in the process, William Warren Scranton established himself as one of Pennsylvania's brightest presidential possibilities in a century.

The vigorous 46-year-old Republican unleashed a flood of new ideas and concepts that shook staid, old Pennsylvania to its foundations.

His activities, from dancing the Charleston at the inaugural ball to a host of promotional ideas with the Madison Avenue touch, brought cheers from most Republicans and Democratic complaints that the Governor might be more flash than substance.

The unalterable fact is that Pennsylvania's unemployment and relief rolls dropped during the first 11 months of the Scranton administration.

It must be left to the experts to determine how much of the improvement should be credited to Scranton and how much is a direct result of the nationwide economic climb.

Scranton made little headway in his economy efforts during the first 6 months because he was operating under a budget left from the Democratic Lawrence administration.

But from July through November, the Scranton administration claimed to have slashed operating costs by 2.8 percent, from $39.2 to $38.1 million.

Much of the saving was accomplished by reducing the State payroll from 81,000 to 79,000. The Governor also ordered the line held on salaries, although there were some exceptions that stirred cries of favoritism.

He sharply restricted coffee breaks and parties and demanded more courtesy to persons having dealings with the State.

The Governor insisted on a full day's work from every employee and went so far as to have golf courses watched for workers playing on State time.

During the period there were 26,200 hirings for State jobs, indicating the firing of holdover Democrats was near to that figure. Still there were complaints from Republican leaders that the Governor was not moving fast enough on patronage matters.

The State's overall unemployment total dropped from 430,000 persons in January to 294,000 in November. The decline was from 9.4 to 6.4 percent of the total labor pool.

The number of persons requiring public assistance also declined, from 467,904 to 423,930 persons.

Scranton increased the sales tax from 4 to 5 percent, but he doubled the appropriation for attracting new industry to the State and provided the money for the first school teacher salary increase since 1957.

Along with the cigarette and liquor tax increases, the sales tax levy boosted State general fund revenues, exclusive of highways, an estimated $65.8 million.

Scranton initiated a sweeping advertising program in national periodicals, formed councils on business and industry and science and technology and the Committee of 100,000 Pennsylvanians for Economic Growth.

Within the Government, Scranton created an interdepartmental clearing council to help cut redtape for businessmen dealing with Commonwealth.

Scranton would go to almost any length to attract publicity for the Commonwealth.

He agreed to almost every request for a promotional picture, many of which made the front pages around the Nation.

His promotion-minded aides dreamed up the controversy with the State of Kentucky on whether the frontier rifle carried by Daniel Boone, a Keystone State native, should be called the Pennsylvania or Kentucky Long Rifle.

Pennsylvania lost its claim in a formal shootoff, but Scranton scored a bullseye with the ancient rifle in the proceedings at the old Boone homestead near Reading.

On the whole, Scranton can look back on 1963 with satisfaction.

He went into the new year at the head of a Government in the black with virtually no prospect of new taxes and as one of the bright young men of the Republican Party, who just might become the GOP candidate for President at the convention in July.

Memorial to President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, Americans throughout this country and abroad, participated in countless memorial services as a mark of respect to the great heritage of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

Just such a service was held at the Community Church of the Sandias in San Antonito, N. Mex., and the Reverend Arthur C. Opperman opened this sad occasion with a short but poignant message which I repeat today so that my colleagues may have the benefit of his wisdom and perception:

Today we bow our heads in sorrow and in shame. Our American sense of honor and dignity has been totally outraged. Our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, of 2 years, 10 months, and 2 days, lies in state in our Nation's Capitol, the victim of a spirit of hate and violence which we as Americans shudder to contemplate.

Our deepest sympathy is with the Kennedy family, and our sincerest prayers are with our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Times of Bible prophecy of evil are upon us, and we are reaping the awful harvest, the first fruits of a national apathy in the face of the surging waves of secularism, pluralism, and the subtle brainwashing of godless communism.

All men do not have the capacity for freedom. In the slave world, assassination is the common way to remove men from office. One hundred years ago a great wave of hatred and violence produced a like man with the mark of Cain. Nourished on the godless doctrines of Marxist atheism from his youth, Lee Harvey Oswald, possessed by a weak, poisoned, un-American, freedom-hating mind, has engulfed our Nation in this horror ecumenical.

Peiping's Shadow Over Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, while tensions have eased somewhat in certain sections of the world, we enter a New Year still facing problems of grave concern to all free peoples, and casting a wary eye on the actions of the Chinese Communist government.

I have read with a great deal of interest an article on "Peiping's Shadow Over Africa" written by a distinguished former newspaperman from India, D. G. Savarkar. Mr. Savakar is knowledgeable on world affairs having lived in several countries and traveled extensively in many others. His vews on the significance of the African tour made by the leaders of Red China recently are worth consideration and I am appending his article here for the information of Congress:

PEIPING'S SHADOW OVER AFRICA

(By D. G. Savarkar)

The African tour of the Chinese Communist leaders, Chou En-lai and Marshal Chen Yi, has momentous significance for the future of world politics and for Afro-Asian politics in particular. Marshal Chen, the Chinese Foreign Minister, attended the independence celebration of Kenya in Nairobi last week. Mr. Chou, the Prime Minister of the Chinese People's Republic, arrives this week in Cairo to begin a tour which will include, in addition to the United Arab Republic, visits to Algeria, Guinea, Ghana, Somalia, Mali, and Pakistan. Most simply, the tour represents a dramatic reaching out by

Peiping for closer relations with Africa and all the diplomatic, economic, and political advantages such a relationship might hold. But beyond this, the tour represents an attempt to integrate Africa into the long-range policy goals of the Chinese Communist Government.

CHALLENGE TO THE SOVIET UNION

In this context, it represents another step in China's massive challenge to the Soviet Union. The increasingly gloomly outlook for any Sino-Soviet reconciliation may have convinced Peiping that it has little to lose by challenging Moscow on territory it has already staked out as its own. The Russian leadership on its part has been quick to sense the intent of their Chinese comrades and to respond. Word has been spreading in East European diplomatic circles of an official Moscow memorandum circulated to all Communist Party officials in the Eastern bloc, clearly and explicitly warning that the Soviet Union would not permit Peiping to jeopardize its relations with Middle Eastern and African countries.

SINO-INDIAN RELATIONS

Sino-Indian relations will also furnish a major item for discussion during the tour. Ever since the massive assault on the Indian positions in Ladakh, Peiping has been particularly sensitive to opinion in the nonalined nations on this issue. This concern on Peiping's part has become intensified following its rejection of the compromise program suggested by the six-nation Afro-Asian mediation group. The official Chinese publication, Peiping Review, has recently underscored the party line on the India question. An article in the November 15 issue of this journal accused Mr. Nehru of producing "out of his hat the bugbear of 'Chinese aggression' and * * * a 'Chinese threat.'" According to this argument, the border problem with China was of Nehru's own creation so that it might be used as a "red herring" to divert the Indian public's attention from problems at home. Explaining the twisted logic of this position will require all the persuasiveness at Mr. Chou's disposal, particularly in view of his high-sounding professions at Bandung in 1955 of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other nations.

USE OF RACIALISM

But perhaps the dominant motive in the minds of the Chinese Communist leaders is one which holds even more far reaching consequences for global politics than either the Sino-Indian border conflict or their fratricidal desire to undercut the Soviets. This is to advance and publicize the identification which China seeks with colored peoples all over the world. By developing the thesis that China is the natural leader of all the colored peoples of Asia and Africa, it hopes to identify both the United States and the Soviet Union with white colonialism in the minds of Afro-Asians. Such a dichotomy has not only the obvious strategic advantage, if it succeeds, of exploiting the virulent force of racialism, but also emphasizes one of China's bitterest ideological disagreements with the Soviet Union—its insistence that only Peiping's aggressive policies can sweep away what it describes as the "neocolonialism" of the United States through unyielding support of the national-liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

To advance this latter aim, the Chinese are expected to urge the convening of a new Afro-Asian conference—a successor to the momentous Bandung conference of 1955—which, through the exclusion of the Soviet Union, will dramatize Peiping's claim to be the most powerful force in the new colored world it is striving to create.

TIMING FOR MOVE

The timing for this dramatic enlargement of China's ambitions in Africa must have been a complex one. It may not be unrelated to Mao's advancing age and his impatience to see China in the seat of world leadership he feels it rightfully deserves. Tactical considerations may have played a part too—Peiping may feel that this winter is an advantageous time for it to act boldly, while the Soviet Union's prestige is still low, following its catastrophic failure in agricultural production, and China appears to be partially recovered from its own drastic reverses in the days of "the great leap forward."

LIMITED SUCCESS

But while speculation into the background of the tour continues, China's new policy gambit has already met with limited success. The announcement in Dar-es-Salaam that Tanganyikan President, Dr. Julius Nyerere, will visit Peiping in early 1964, will inevitably encourage the authors of China's new African offensive. The agreement of Kenya to open diplomatic offices in the People's Republic—the first of Britain's former East African colonies to do so—offers another entree for Chinese influence.

DANGER OF ENTANGLEMENT

Though China cannot pose the threat to the African countries that it does to its immediate neighbors in southeast Asia, there are still many reasons why the rising governments of Africa should look warily on the new friendship offensive of Peiping. First, it is obviously perilous to become involved in the internecine rivalry which now convulses the Communist bloc. Secondly, it would be foolish to jeopardize future Western or Soviet aid which Africa needs through an involvement with a government which can ill afford the immigration of capital to other economies. (Total Chinese aid to the countries Chou will visit has been estimated to be less than $150 million. Moscow has not been slow to capitalize on Chinese weakness in this area, deriding Peiping's aid to new countries as "invisible."). Finally, China's brutal and aggressive treatment of its neighbors, Tibet and India, will weigh heavily in the evaluation the young African nations make of Peiping's bid for friendship.

With the coming of independence and the rise of leaders such as Mboya, Nyerere, Banda, and Kaunda—who understand both the democratic process and the need for multiracial cooperation in their countries—the future for former British Africa is bright. It will remain bright if their countries can avoid entanglement with the tortuous internal politics of the Communist bloc.

New Ideas for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Dr. Amitai Etzioni, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, which appeared in the November 25, 1963, New Leader. The article, entitled "Democracy's Future in Latin America," presents many interesting ideas for new approaches in our policy which merit discussion and study. The article follows:

DEMOCRACY'S FUTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Amitai Etzioni)

(NOTE.—Amitai Etzioni, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, spent the past summer studying political and economic conditions in Latin America.)

China fell to the Communists, despite strenuous American efforts, partly because of an imbalance between the objectives of U.S. foreign policy and the means available to secure them. A similar discrepancy now exists in Latin America where the United States favors elected governments but appears incapable of protecting them against military coups: Seven elected governments have been unseated since President Kennedy took office in 1961, including four this year alone, and the Governments of Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica today have good cause for concern about their future.

Perhaps one reason for the present U.S. predicament is the absence of a realistic picture of conditions in Latin America. In most countries where the military has seized power, for example, it was the predominant national force even before leaving the barracks; the change was merely from one form of military control to another, not a sudden leap from democracy to military dictatorship. The coup in Argentina illuminates the pattern.

To many North Americans, Argentina's recent history reads as follows—1958: election of Arturo Frondizi to the Presidency; March 1962: temporary suspension of democracy by a military coup; July 1963: restoration of democracy with the election of Dr. Arturo Illia. This simple view assumes that, like a faucet, democracy can be turned on and off, and then on again. Yet the fact is that Argentina knew little democracy under Frondizi. His 4-year rule was marked by 34 crises—the Argentine term for the 34 occasions when the military drove to the door to warn the President against veering too far from the course it approved. On countless other occasions, Frondizi cleared his policy with the generals over the phone; often he simply followed the policy he knew they favored. When in 1962 he thought his popular following strong enough to support an independent move and refused to endorse the ouster of Castro's Cuba from the Organization of American States, he himself was ousted. Thus on the 35th crisis the tanks did not stop at the gate—they crashed it.

Nor was democracy restored in mid-1963. The army denied the followers of Juan Peron, a large and important segment of the population, the right to participate in the election; and radical candidates who were too active were either arrested or harassed. Although welcomed with hopes reminiscent of the beginning of Frondizi's reign in 1958, the new President has to operate under the old code. Like his predecessors, he will have to keep his policies within the boundaries set by the various military factions or be unseated. And in Argentina, as in most of Latin America, the latter is the more likely possibility.

This is not to say that the military always exercises exclusive control, although it may occupy the government palace or the barracks behind it. Almost invariably it forms a coalition with some other group, such as the landlords, the industrialists, or even the labor unions. In other words, it tends to tolerate a range of policies consistent with its views and acts mainly as a powerful veto group. Even in Venezuela, where the military is not particularly strong and apparently prefers to wait at least until the popular President Romulo Betancourt finishes his term next month before making a move, this is in some measure true. Yet when the small pro-Castro Venezuelan terrorist group intensified its activities and killed several army men, Betancourt felt constrained to waive the constitutional rights of his country's two extreme leftwing (but non-Communist) parties; otherwise, he might well have found himself entering premature retirement.

In Honduras and in the Dominican Republic the civilian heads of state were less successful than Betancourt as tightrope walkers. Ramon Morales, the elected President of Honduras, first worried his generals

by introducing some mild leftist reforms (though he is a stanch anti-Communist). When he further alarmed them by forming a loyal civil guard, he was summarily evicted.

Morales' removal marked the 136th coup in the 142 years since Honduras won its independence. Such a tradition is not erased by an election, any more than 8 months of democracy under Juan Bosch was sufficient to rehabilitate the Dominican Republic after 30 years of Rafael Trujillo. The military might return to the barracks tomorrow, as it already has in Peru and Argentina, but this will not make democracies of these countries. The military veto will continue to be decisive, and therefore much heeded during and after the elections.

It is here that the North American view is often naive. The return of the army to barracks, when combined with national elections, is generally regarded as "a first step" toward democracy. But such optimism is seldom justified, not only because the elections are usually manipulated, but, more importantly, because this "first step" is rarely followed by the logical second step: by the army permanently retiring from politics and allowing the gradual evolution of democracy. Instead, elections merely mark an interval between coups. When the military retreats behind the scenes, it does so mainly because it desires a respite from the mundane job of running the civilian government, as well as from the infighting that usually develops among its politically active factions. After a brief timeout, however, the troops are ready once again to mount the tanks that practically know their own way downtown. Thus, in Latin America the difference between most elected and military governments is one of degree: the elected are not democratic, and the military do not completely ignore civilian needs.

It is never wise to equate democracy with elections, which are regularly held by totalitarian governments from the U.S.S.R. to the United Arab Republic. The critical requirement of democracy is orderly change in government, in accordance with the people's freely expressed desires. And this entails much more than mere ballots and voting booths.

For democracy to work, the majority of politically conscious citizens have to be so committed to its principles that if they party loses an election they will not turn to the army (assuming it is aligned with them) or form an army of their own to repeal the results. Such a commitment to democracy is acquired in part through education in the formative years at home; it is later cultivated in the school, and reinforced by the press, television and other means of mass communication. The point is that the democratic personality must be able to withstand the high level of frustration involved in permitting an opponent to take office without succumbing to the temptation of barring him by the use of force. Unfortunately, the typical family structure of Latin American countries is more like that of Southern than Western Europe; it does not provide the setting for such tolerance to frustration. Nor do most of the schools or the mass media encourage it.

But even where the democratic tradition does exist, it can only be maintained when the ruling party is responsive to all major segments of the population and does not use its power to favor some groups at the expense of others. From the enormous gap in Latin America between rich and poor, between city and countryside, and between favored ethnic groups and neglected ones, it is clear that this requirement also seldom prevails. On the whole, existing governments do the most for those who need the least. Similarly, when the neglected groups do take over, as in Mexico, the privileged classes have real reason to fear for their property, if not for their lives. Both sides tend to resort to violence, either to protect their position or to enlarge it, since what political machinery there is does not provide any peaceful means of adjusting conflicting claims.

A government has to be at least partially effective if a country is to support democracy and reject rule by military junta. When governments are regularly thrown into the kind of political and economic chaos that one finds, say, in Brazil; when they cannot maintain law and order, as is the case in Colombia's countryside; or when they are mismanaged by a president who is drunk most of the time, as in Ecuador before the recent coup, it is small wonder that few tears are shed if the military takes over. When corruption and favoritism dominate the civil service and political parties do not reflect the views of the major social groups, but instead serve as vehicles for opportunists eager to build their fortunes and advance their friends and relatives, democracy is reduced to a thin veneer—the removal of which soon exposes the harsh political reality.

Still, democratization is possible in Latin America. True, few of the region's republics have the necessary components for achieving it. But this simply means we must recognize that the process will be a slow one, as indeed it was in the West. Those who would support it must be prepared to face many setbacks, as well as decades of patient and constructive work.

The Kennedy administration believes that extensive social and political reform offers the best solution to the area's problems. Reforms, it is felt, will undermine the appeal of communism, will improve the standard of living, and will allow more freedoms. Yet these various goals are not all that harmonious.

Take, for example, the problem of economic development. Some aspiring Democratic governments choose to yield to the demands of their people and divert many major resources from capital investment to immediate consumption; others fail to foster development because they are simply too ineffectual. Then there are nondemocratic governments which push development ruthlessly, adopting such measures as forced resettling of peasants and drastic agrarian reform and achieving success largely by ignoring their people's distressed condition. Should the United States encourage the overthrow of these nondemocratic governments and support the backward democracies?

In matters of security, too, some elected Latin American governments do not see eye to eye with the United States, while several of the military governments are among the most loyal followers of policies laid down in Washington. Frondizi, for instance, would not support U.S. efforts to oust Cuba from the OAS, though the generals who unseated him did. Is Washington to support the elected governments opposed to its views, and discourage military coups that would bring these countries into line with U.S. foreign policy?

To further complicate the situation, U.S. businessmen exert pressure on the administration to get along with the government in office wherever they have large investments. In Lima, U.S. corporations are believed to have favored resumption of diplomatic recognition and aid immediately after the July 1962 military coup. In Venezuela, a visitor cannot long escape the conclusion that the foreign oil companies would quite willingly trade Betancourt's left-leaning democracy for a government more congenial to their own interests, whatever its political coloration.

Nor does Congress give the administration a free hand in defining its Latin American policy. The list of requirements a country has to meet before the United States is allowed to help it (and hence the government in office) increases with each year. Even a visit to Castro's island by a head of state is enough to create troubles on the Hill for a Latin American republic, as President Aldolfo Lopez Mateos of Mexico recently discovered. It is no secret either that some members of U.S. military missions feel their Latin American counterparts constitute the best organized and most reliable anti-Communist, pro-American group in the area. Thus the administration must play the juggler in its effort to formulate an effective and coherent hemisphere policy.

Perhaps even more important, the instruments available for promoting U.S. policy are meager, imprecise, and quite unsuited to accomplishing the goals set by the administration. Except in some extreme case, for example, the use of military force to advance U.S. goals obviously has to be ruled out because it would alienate so many Latin Americans. Even the most progressive minded people I met in Latin America would rather leave Haitian tyrant Francois Duvalier in office than have U.S. marines remove him and revive—to use their phrase—Yankee gunboat diplomacy.

Second, the permanent withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from all Latin American governments that do not please the United States would leave most of our ambassadors there unemployed. Actually, it is desirable to maintain an open line of contact with nondemocratic governments, if only to keep in touch with the democratic opposition. Occasionally, this also proves a useful channel for encouraging democratization, as was the case not long ago in the Dominican Republic.

Economic support from the United States in the form of loans, grants, technical assistance, etc., yields comparatively feeble leverage in most Latin American countries. The stopping of U.S. aid to Duvalier in May 1963 after he reelected himself to another 6-year term, had little immediate effect. If the West continues to withhold its aid from Brazil, and if the Government survives without it, Brazil may well declare a moratorium on its multi-hundred-million-dollar debts to Western countries, and save—by not paying interest and principal due—enough to keep going. Moreover, even when economic pressure is more potent, it is hardly likely to move a tyrant to exile himself, or to persuade groups opposed to progress that they should support development projects. The common compromise is to placate the United States by holding elections, without initiating the basic social changes essential for economic and political improvement.

The objectives of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America, therefore, must be brought into harmony with the means available. Proposing unobtainable goals only generates false hopes. And to begin with, it must be recognized that no force on earth can transform most of the countries in the hemisphere into real democracies in the near future.

We can and should require of any country that it undergo a minimum of democratization, however. Only after police brutalities, firing squads and imprisonment without trial are eliminated, may we associate with an essentially totalitarian regime without severely compromising our conscience and reputation. Dealings with such regimes should be kept at the most reserved and limited level of diplomatic relations, excluding all aid, technical assistance and trade subsidies, and focusing the condemnation of the hemisphere upon them. If they do relent, as the Paraguayan Government is reported to have done, they should be readmitted to the Western family of nations; if, like Duvalier in Haiti, they do not, the United States should exert every effort to support opposition groups short of shipment

of troops, fully expecting that it might take years before the tyrants are brought down. Here there is no room for compromise.

Beyond this minimum admission requirement, the United States should recognize that democratization is a process, not a quality that a country has or does not have. It should encourage this process by tying economic aid more closely to progress: Assistance should be given to improve the educational and administrative systems. Support for new universities for the training of both political leaders and administrators might be one approach, serving to extend the spirit of mutual tolerance and responsiveness. Bringing Latin Americans to this country for training could also help, if carried out on a larger scale than at present. But the United States should be the first to stress again and again that the impact of these and all other measures will not be dramatic. Most of the work has to be done by the Latin Americans themselves and will take time; democracy can neither be imported nor rushed.

The overriding importance of economic development should be freely admitted. Countries that foster democracy and economic progress simultaneously deserve special consideration, of course. But the United States should fully support all governments that push hard for development (including even autocratic regimes), as long as basic human rights are not violated.

While the meager instruments available to implement U.S. foreign policy should be used to support progress and to indicate disapproval of stagnation, not to mention regression, they should not be wasted on twisting the arms of countries to vote for U.S.-sponsored resolutions in the United Nations or the OAS. Getting others to denounce Castro might help score points with the voters at home, but this does not really hasten his downfall.

It is worth noting, too, that in the past the spread of communism in Latin America has been countered in a way that has strengthened already oversized military establishments. This drains both resources and manpower from development, and nourishes the very forces that subvert U.S. policy in the hemisphere by preventing democracy from taking root. The same task could be accomplished more effectively, and without these undesirable side effects: The Latin Americans could be asked to form a regional security force, similar to the growing Latin American free trade area, under the OAS or some other regional organization. Such a pooling of national forces would allow the reduction of national military establishments as the regional organization grows. Also, it would remove military units from internal politics by stationing those of one country in another country or, better still, by merging the units of different nationalities.

To spur this development, the United States might consider stopping all military aid to national forces and shifting its assistance to a regional force. To the degree that individual Latin American military groups oppose the formation of a regional force, the United States has no choice but to protect the area from the outside by using its Navy and Air Force to block Communist invasion of Central and South America. The handling of small indigenous Communist groups should be left to the large local military forces, but they should not be supported with additional equipment. Shifting the emphasis of U.S. assistance from military to economic aid would accelerate progress—which is still the best way to inoculate Latin American societies against totalitarianism—and would weaken the forces that occasionally allow these countries to play at democracy, but not to pursue it as a permanent mode of life.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Heritage of Knowledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 28, 1963, the Brewster Memorial Reference Library was dedicated at Kingston, Pa., in my congressional district. The library, an addition to the long-established Hoyt Library, consists of the late Attorney William Brewster's highly selective collection of historical and legal volumes which he accumulated over a span of many years. Attorney Brewster was a distinguished lawyer, scholar, and historian who began his career from a very humble beginning. Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, an historian from the city of Pittston and a personal friend of the late benefactor, delivered a most impressive address at the library dedication ceremonies and it gives me great pleasure to submit as part of my remarks today the address on that occasion by Mr. McCarthy. The address follows:

BREWSTER'S HERITAGE: KNOWLEDGE

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we are assembled to honor the memory of the late William Brewster, distinguished lawyer, scholar, and historian, and to dedicate his generous legacy to Hoyt Library, which he served on its board of directors for 30 years and as its president for 20 of those years.

This wing, just completed, will house Mr. Brewster's valuable collection of books and papers dealing with history and the law. Their selection by so eminent an authority makes them doubly valuable.

In this sanctuary we have an example of the man's generous nature. He not only bequeathed this collection to Hoyt Library, but also left it an adequate sum to build a house for it.

Thus he provided not only for the preservation of his collection, but also for the convenience of future students and scholars who may come here to consult its priceless treasures.

This generous streak in his character was not unknown to me. I had the good fortune to know Mr. Brewster over a period of many years. As a younger man, interested in history, I enjoyed sitting at his feet, in a manner of speaking. When I needed historical information, I was sure to get it from him, if he could lay his hands on it.

William Brewster had memories as well as knowledge in that richly stored mind of his. He liked to talk of the past. This is natural in an historian. But he also liked to reminisce. I am glad I listened, for in that way I learned much about his background and growing up.

Mr. Brewster was born, an only child, in modest circumstances on a farm in Brooklyn, Susquehanna County, Pa., in 1877. This was formerly known as the Hopbottom Settlements. The locality was largely inhabited by farmers with New England backgrounds.

It is more than coincidental—perhaps providential—the three most outstanding historians of Wyoming Valley migrated here from the Hopbottom Settlements. They were Isaac Abel Chapman, Charles Miner—and the third man of monumental stature to write on Wyoming Valley, William Brewster.

Mr. Brewster was the 10th generation of the Brewster family in America. His father was Charles Miner Brewster, a descendant of Elder William Brewster who organized the Pilgrim Church at Scrooby, England, in 1606. He was the ruling elder of the congregation on its flight to Holland, and aboard the *Mayflower* which carried them to the New World.

On his mother's side, Attorney Brewster was a descendant of Roger Williams, and of Orlando Bagley, one of the Minute Men who fought in the battles of Lexington, Bunker Hill, and Saratoga.

On his father's farm in Brooklyn (Susquehanna County) he performed the usual chores of a farm boy in his day. He drove the cows to pasture and brought them back. He churned butter. He fed the chickens. He helped his father lay in the winter's wood supply. The family had a few sheep and young William Brewster looked after them. Much of the family's clothing came from the sheep's wool.

It was a frugal and demanding life, yet the boy seemed contented with it. I know Mr. Brewster cherished fond memories of his boyhood on the farm. He never lost interest in agriculture. This is borne out by the acquaintances he cultivated among farmers of the Back Mountain area around Dallas. He inquired about planting conditions in the spring, and the harvest in the fall. The farmers often consulted him regarding their probelms, and he always gave them a friendly hearing.

By modern standards, Attorney Brewster had an inadequate formal education, but it was comparable to that received in the 1880's and 1890's by boys who later rose to positions of leadership in politics, military service, business, and the professions. Ambitious boys like Bill Brewster read far beyond their years and school curriculum.

In those far-off days young Brewster was full of curiosity about everything—always desirous of gaining new knowledge. His early boyhood may be likened to Benjamin Franklin's younger days, when that individual saved his pennies to buy books and copied laboriously from the Spectator to develop a clear and incisive style of writing.

Mr. Brewster's formative years were not unlike those of young Abraham Lincoln who read and studied by the light of an open fire. Brewster's preparation for his illustrious career as a historian parallels the early lives of men such as Thomas Jefferson, John Dickinson, and John Adams, who studied and researched history as a preparatory step to their respective careers.

After graduating from Brooklyn (Susquehanna County) High School, young William Brewster obtained a position as reporter and later served as editor on the Stroudsburg Daily Times. During this period he attended night classes at Stroudsburg Normal School. Completing his course of study, he was graduated in 1895.

Late in that year Mr. Brewster came to Kingston to become the West Side representative for the Wilkes-Barre Times. In 1898 he succeeded the late Thomas F. Heffernan as West Side representative for the Wilkes-Barre Record. This was the same Mr. Heffernan who later published the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent.

While employed on the Wilkes-Barre Record news staff, Mr. Brewster registered as a law student. He studied law in the offices of Judge Daniel A. Fell and R. W. Davis. Subsequently he spent a year at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Brewster was admitted to the Luzerne County bar in July 1900. He was also admitted to practice in the Superior and Supreme Courts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and in the U.S. District Court of Appeals.

Attorney Brewster remained in active law practice until his retirement in 1956. For 54 years he faithfully served the people of Kingston Borough as a member of the school board and as its solicitor. He was also solicitor for Wyoming Borough and Franklin Township School Districts.

Mr. Brewster was what might be described as a lawyer's lawyer. He was respected as an authority on the Constitution of the United States. But his specialty was school law. In this phase of law practice he had few equals in the United States. Fellow lawyers consulted him on specific points.

Mr. Brewster possessed a deep knowledge on land claims in this region. During court proceedings, the judge on the bench often took Attorney Brewster's word as to whether a disputed deed contained certain phraseology. This was a tribute not only to his memory, but also to his integrity. Normally, the court requires certified copies of statements of this nature.

Considerate of young lawyers, Attorney Brewster would often go out of his way to help them with their problems. This courtesy and generosity endeared him to many members of the Luzerne County bar.

Mr. Brewster's interest in local history, especially of the Wyoming Valley, ran parallel to his law practice. The financial rewards from his law practice made it possible for him to invest in books which interested him. Fortunately, he continued buying books in his field almost to the end of his life. Thus the Brewster Memorial Reference Library is richer than it might otherwise be.

Brewster's earnings from the law also gave him the leisure to write books as well as to collect them. His books were labors of love.

I might say the writing and study of American local history are essential for any true understanding of American cultural development. There lies the grass roots of our civilization.

In my opinion, the local historian is the base for all phases of the broad story. It is he who develops and proves the exact role played by a specific community, individual, or small band of hardy leaders in development of a region or some portion of its economy. The student of local history has a particular advantage, if he so desires, to examine, explore and throw light on, at close range, the very roots which generated a specific action. An accepted generalization of history is sometimes modified by findings which present the inner, moving local history of the event on which it rests.

Writers of local history, therefore, have a great responsibility. They must be men of character—honest and accurate. Such a man was William Brewster.

Regarding Mr. Brewster's personal writings, it is not within the scope of this address to review his already-established

name in the field of American history; consumately researched and finely written historical works which will add progressively respectable luster to his already-noted name as generations go by.

Viewed from a distance, it has sometimes been thought Mr. Brewster's most widely known book here should bear a less serious title than: "A History of Certified Township of Kingston."

But, notwithstanding, the erudite appeal and long acceptance of the above work reveal Mr. Brewster's recognized specialty in the realm of local and Pennsylvania history.

Persons who have never done historical research, and then embodied their facts and discoveries into writing, would not be aware of the hard, painstaking hours, the loneliness and solitude essential to the accomplishment of the great objective of the creator of the works. To Mr. Brewster all the accompanying hardships through his creative efforts were more than compensated in the satisfaction—each of his historical works was widely read—and what to him was even more satisfying—they were acceptable to the best minds of the public and were widely acclaimed as works of the utmost authenticity and scholarship.

In respect to the books he wrote, copies of which are part of the Brewster Memorial Reference Library, he left us more than literary works. He has bequeathed to us much of himself as a creative person. During his lifetime he sought no rewards for these literary efforts beyond the gratification of having added somewhat to mankind's knowledge.

Mr. Brewster's writing of local history grew out of his love of the Wyoming Valley and its people. His interest in local history began soon after his arrival here in 1895. He made his first serious attempt at writing local history in the early 1920's. It consisted of a series of articles for special West Side editions of the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent. The articles were histories of the various towns located west of the Susquehanna River.

Mr. Brewster's series impressed many people, including Attorney Henry Gordon, then a member of the Kingston Borough School Board. Mr. Gordon encouraged Mr. Brewster, then the board's solicitor, to write a history of Kingston Township for use in the Kingston Borough schools.

Mr. Brewster undertook the task. His book established him as an outstanding local historian, and his volume served as a model of its kind. It is truly an impressive work.

Mr. Brewster is also author of: "The Fourteenth Commonwealths: Vermont and the States That Failed." Another of his books is titled: "The Pennsylvania and New York Frontier."

In addition to his books, Mr. Brewster wrote many historical articles and delivered historical addresses. Among these were: "Origin and Influence of the Pilgrims," delivered before the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society of Wilkes-Barre on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the arrival of the *Mayflower*; "The Connecticut Claim," given at the commemorative exercises at the Wyoming Monument on July 3, 1939; and "The Beginning of the Anthracite Industry," delivered at the convention of the Mine Inspectors Association of the United States and Canada. These addresses were later published.

Mr. Brewster deplored the fact more up-to-date history of the Wyoming Valley was not being researched and compiled. We spoke about this on several occasions.

In my own research on Wyoming Valley's history, I noted a vast gap which exists between the era ending with the Civil War and the century following the war.

In my personal observations I feel this gap leaves uncovered much of the activities of our varied population stocks with their sharply differentiated cultural inheritances.

Without these immigrants, there could not have been the expansion of the anthracite industry which long brought prosperity to the Wyoming Valley and its people. I have reference to the Irish, Welsh, English and Scotch; and the Italians; also to the Polish, Lithuanians, Slovaks, and other nationals of the great Slavic race. These were the ancestors of a large proportion of our present population. I also have in mind Wyoming Valley's Jewish population—some of whose forebears commenced settling here after the development of anthracite mining.

I do not mean to imply the men of all nationalities who worked in our anthracite mines those many generations ago are completely forgotten. James J. Corrigan, the noted historian of the anthracite region, has reviewed much of their collective experience in his brilliantly written articles. George G. Korson, the former Wilkes-Barre Record newswriter, who became internationally known for his work in the field of folklore has maintained for us a clear insight into the lives of many of these miners. Korson tapped the anthracite miners' oral sources for traditional folksongs, anecdotes, reminiscenses, and folkways, in: "Songs and Ballads of the Anthracite Miner," and in "Minstrels of the Mine Patch."

Mr. Brewster's query: "What is being done by people whose ancestors came here—say after 1845—remains unanswered. This query, in my opinion, is the real challenge to present day historians. To those interested in studies of this nature, the Brewster Memorial Reference Library can be their training ground, the fertile field for their development, and the reservoir for their sustenance.

Undergraduates of the various high schools and colleges in Wyoming Valley will find an unlimited fund of material in Mr. Brewster's heritage. He left knowledge. These books and papers will be of no real value, however, unless—and—until they are read and studied.

Scholars from across the entire United States will come here to study these works when their availability is made known to them through the medium of the Union Catalog of Kings College.

And now the time has come to sit down. Before I do so I want to quote from Addison in the Spectator, which is an apt tribute to the memory of our benefactor, William Brewster:

"Books," wrote the famed English essayist "are the legacies that a great man leaves to mankind, which are delivered down from generation to generation as presents to the posterity of those who are yet unborn."

And that, my good people, is all I have to say on this occasion, the dedication of the Brewster Memorial Reference Library—except—if—as I think true, each man's death diminishes us, I am grievously decreased by the passing of William Brewster. He was my friend.

The Program and Activities of the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, delivered at Carpenters' Hall, London, England, on December 9, 1963:

THE PROGRAM AND ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(An address by Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, delivered at Carpenters' Hall, London, England, at the invitation of N. M. Rothschild & Sons and Model, Roland & Co., December 9, 1963)

This is the first time I have spoken in public in Great Britain and I am most appreciative of the opportunity to speak before this large and distinguished company. For their courtesy in extending the invitation to speak today and for their willingness to make all the necessary arrangements I am greatly indebted to Messrs. N. R. Rothschild & Co., and to Model, Roland & Co.

May I say at the outset that, like all Americans, I have been profoundly touched by the shared grief which has everywhere been evident in the loss of President Kennedy. In such sad moments as this we learn to appreciate the bonds of international friendships which are the foundation for our hopes of a better world.

The subject of my talk today is the program and activities of the Federal Power Commission of the United States.

It may seem a poor expression of my gratitude for the hospitality which you have accorded me to delve into the arcane subject of the U.S. system of public utility regulations, especially since I am sure that most of you have far more than a surface acquaintance with the subject.

Nevertheless, to be sure that we are all on common ground, I shall try as briefly as possible to explain the fundamental nature of this unique system. Even in the United States the subject is regarded as one of specialized interest. Those of you with an understanding of the nature of the U.S. system of regulation will therefore have a great advantage over the vast majority of my fellow Americans.

I should not pursue this unexciting course if there were an agency in Great Britain to which I could refer you by way of close analogy. The Electricity Council and the Natural Gas Council, neither of which has operating responsibilities, which provide advice and guidance to the respective industries with which they are concerned, and which impose a national perspective on their operations, perhaps come the closest, but there the similarities end.

In the United States of all the basic industries only the mails are exclusively Government owned and operated. The railroads, the telephone and telegraph industries, the electric power, natural gas and other fuel industries, are all either wholly or predominantly in private hands, despite the fact that they are the foundation of an industrial economy and by their nature are not subject to the same forces of competition as other commercial enterprises. Private enterprise operates a larger share of these vital industries in the United States than in almost any other country. In common with most students and observers of this phenomenon, I am convinced that this has been possible only because of the development in the United States of a system of regulation of these companies which protects consumers against exploitation as a result of their monopoly position, which insures their service in the public interest, and at the same time provides assurance to these companies of an opportunity to earn a reasonable return on their investment.

The beginning point in an understanding of the American system of utility regulation is that a group of industries, "public utilities" in our nomenclature, including those I have mentioned, have a special status in the American constitutional system.

The present day concept of utility regulation dates from 1876 and the decision of the

U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Munn* v. *Illinois*. That case, which involved State regulation of the activities of warehousemen, held that the inhibitions in the Federal and State constitutions against interference with private property did not prevent regulation in the public interest of property dedicated to the public use. In the language of Chief Justice Waite:

"Looking, then, to the common law, from whence came the right which the Constitution protects, we find that when private property is 'affected with a public interest, it ceases to be juris privati only.' This was said by Lord Chief Justice Hale more than two hundred years ago, in his treatise De Portibus Maris, 1 Harg. Law Tracts, 78, and has been accepted without objection as an essential element in the law of property ever since. * * * *Munn* v. *Illinois*, 94 U.S. 113, 125–126 (1876)."

It will be of especial interest to this group that this landmark decision was based upon the treatises of Lord Hale and the decisions by Lord Kenyon and Lord Ellenborough construing the common law obligations of enterprises dedicated to the public use. The American doctrine is therefore an outgrowth of the British common law, but which has been formalized and expanded to a very remarkable degree as required to regulate the great public service industries which have been leaders in the overall rapid growth of the American economy.

It is only necessary to add on this phase of the subject that with respect to such public utility industries it has been held that the State and Federal constitutions authorize broad controls over rates, service, and financing. This is not to say that all the regulatory statutes are as broad as would be permitted on constitutional grounds. Indeed, some are quite restricted in the scope of regulation they permit. All of them, however, function through a board, commission, or other administrative agency.

A distinctive feature of the American system of regulation is that it functions under the scrutiny of the courts to insure not only that the administrative agencies operate within the limits prescribed by the Congress and the State legislative bodies which created them, but also that these agencies do not transgress the protections afforded by the Federal and State constitutions against the confiscation of property. In U.S. constitutional parlance, the prohibitions against confiscation include not only the taking of the property itself, but also the destruction of the value of property by denying the owners the right to earn a reasonable level of return. The American Constitution not only contains the guarantees of substantive due process but also assures each public utility of a fair hearing so that the constitutional protection cannot be thwarted by arbitrary procedures.

The earnings standards are for the most part prescribed by the courts as a part of the constitutional protection afforded to private property devoted to the public service. They were described as follows in 1943 by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of the *Federal Power Commission, et al.* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 320 U.S. 591, 603.

"The ratemaking process under the act, i.e., the fixing of 'just and reasonable' rates, involves a balancing of the investor and the consumer interests. Thus we stated in the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. case that 'regulation does not insure that the business shall produce net revenues' (315 U.S., p. 590). But such considerations aside, the investor interest has a legitimate concern with the financial integrity of the company whose rates are being regulated. From the investor or company point of view it is important that there be enough revenue not only for operating expenses but also for the capital costs of the business. These include service on the debt and dividends on the stock. Cf. *Chicago & Grand Trunk Ry. Co.* v. *Wellman*, 143 U.S. 339, 345–346. By that standard the return to the equity owner should be commensurate with returns on investments in other enterprises having corresponding risks. That return, moreover, should be sufficient to assure confidence in the financial integrity of the enterprise, so as to maintain its credit and to attract capital."

Another feature of the American constitutional system which has an important bearing on the regulation of public utility companies is the division of authority between the States on one hand and the Federal Government on the other. The American system is one of a division of responsibility in which the Federal Government is confined to matters of national or interstate concern. In those areas, of course, it is supreme. As to local intrastate matters, the States are supreme. The sometimes shifting boundary between national and State areas of concern is defined and policed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Federal Government's interest in the regulation of the natural gas and electric power industries in the United States is expressed in the Natural Gas Act and the Federal Power Act, both enacted by the Congress in substantially their present form in the 1930's. They are administered by the Federal Power Commission, and are confined largely to the interstate and wholesale aspects of the two industries.

In the United States the natural gas and the electric power industries are quite different from each other in their organizational structure and the geographical spread of individual company operations. These differences to a large degree determine the impact of Federal regulation.

The major deposits of natural gas in the United States are in the States on the western side of the Gulf of Mexico, particularly Texas, Louisiana, and some of the adjoining States. From these fields large diameter pipelines radiate out to markets in all parts of the country. Seventy percent of all the natural gas produced in the United States is sold in interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

As a result primarily of the localized nature of natural gas deposits, the natural gas industry is divided into three distinct segments. First, there are the producers, who are virtually the entire petroleum industry. The Commission has no jurisdiction over their production operations as such, but when the gas is sold for use in interstate commerce, the Commission has authority both to determine whether the sales should be permitted as in the interests of public convenience and necessity and, if so, at what price and on what terms.

The intermediate segment of the industry consists of the great transmission pipeline companies—El Paso Natural Gas Co., and Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., are the two largest—which transmit the gas through giant pipelines as much as a thousand miles or more to centers of distribution which include every metropolitan area in the contiguous United States except for two States in New England, Maine and Vermont. The Federal Power Commission exercises comprehensive jurisdiction over the interstate pipeline companies. The pipeline companies must secure the Commission's approval for their purchases and sales and for the construction of facilities. The Commission determines both the price at which they buy the gas and the price at which they sell it and must insure that the difference allows the industry an opportunity to meet its operating expenses and earn a reasonable return on the investment in transmission facilities.

The third segment of the industry comprises the distributors of the gas in thousands of communities, large and small. These are under State regulation exclusively and their relation to the Federal Power Commission is only as purchasers from the pipelines who depend upon the Commission to protect them in their ability to buy gas at fair prices and on reasonable terms.

Some companies carry on both long-distance transmission and local distribution operations. The Columbia Gas System is an example. In such a case the Federal Power Commission regulates the transmission operation and State agencies regulate the distribution functions.

On the electric power side, the industry's structure is significantly different because of the broad availability of fossil fuel and hydroelectric resources in the United States. The sources of generation are widely dispersed and usually are located within or close to the service territory of the operating company.

In the private sector of the industry, which is perhaps 75 or 80 percent of the total, typically each large company is an integrated operation and takes responsibility for the generation, transmission, and distribution functions. Some of the companies even own their own fuel sources. Although there is a considerable degree of interconnection among the various power systems of the industry, less than 10 percent of the power which is produced by the private companies is sold at wholesale in interstate commerce to distributors for resale. The Commission's role in assuring purchases and sales of electricity in interstate commerce is of great importance but its direct impact is on a much smaller part of the total business of the electric power industry than with respect to the natural gas industry.

The Commission's approval is not required in order to build electric power facilities in the United States except for hydroelectric plants. The Commission has limited authority over the securities of electric companies operating in interstate commerce where the State commissions do not exercise a security review jurisdiction. I might add that the Commission has no security jurisdiction over natural gas companies.

Having sketched in the framework in which the Federal Power Commission functions, I should like now to discuss a little more fully the programs and activities of the Federal Power Commission in the last 2½ years as they have affected the natural gas pipeline companies.

I single these companies out for special attention, because their operations are to such a large degree subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

I believe that the natural gas pipeline industry is a good example of the successful operation of the American system of private ownership of utility companies functioning under public regulation. The Commission has regulated the interstate pipelines virtually since their inception. In the last 20 years these companies have become a bulwark of the American economy. Their assets have grown from $860 million to over $10 billion while their revenues have increased from $300 million to $4 billion in 1962. In 1945, natural gas accounted for about 14 percent of the energy market. Today it provides a third of all of the energy units consumed within the United States, including the energy consumed by automobiles and other mobile equipment. Thirty-four million homes now receive natural gas service. Sales of the entire natural gas industry in 1963 will exceed 14 trillion cubic feet.

The Commission's certificating authority has been exercised to insure that each pipeline project is supported by adequate gas reserves. It has also been exercised to insure that new facilities will not undermine the market or the financial stability of existing pipelines. Investors and consumers alike have a strong interest in the exercise of the

Commission's responsibility to insure that gas is transported from the producing fields to metropolitan centers as economically as possible. The result is greater assurance of return for pipeline investors and lower rates to consumers.

Frequently there is a question raised as to the future of the natural gas business in the United States, based as it is upon a resource which is not unlimited in quantity. The truly spectacular growth of the natural gas business in the last 20 years is in itself the investor's answer to this question. The flow of billions of dollars into pipeline transmission systems must be based upon the implicit conclusion that these companies can look forward to a longtime and profitable place in the national energy picture. The trend of reserves added each year gives credence to this assumption. By the test of conservative estimates of discoveries and optimistic projections of growth, in itself an improbable combination, we must look to the next century before substitute forms of the fossil fuels such as converting coal or the plentiful oil shales to high B.t.u. gas will be needed to replace natural gas.

For more than two decades after the Natural Gas Act was passed there was uncertainty as to whether the Commission's functions included the regulation of the prices at which natural gas was sold by producers in the field. The present members of the Commission are entirely clear that under the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court we have a duty and responsibility to regulate field prices. This, I believe, provides an important measure of protection not only for consumers but for investors in the securities of pipeline companies.

Producer regulation, I am compelled to admit, poses many difficult new problems, because gas production is totally unlike the customary fields of utility regulation. The Commission is now pushing forward with a solution to this long-neglected problem based upon fixing uniform rates in each of the production areas. We have divided the country's gas-producing fields into separate pricing areas and established interim ceiling prices in each area.

These ceilings are the limits of the prices at which we grant certificates for introducing new gas supplies into interstate pipelines, and we are suspending for the maximum statutory period of 5 months all rate increases in excess of our ceiling prices.

We have brought well along areawide rate proceedings to fix just and reasonable rates in the two major gas-producing areas, the Permian Basin in New Mexico and Texas, and southern Louisiana. Recently we have initiated proceedings in two other major producing areas. The four proceedings now underway will fix the rates for 75 percent of all of the gas flowing in interstate commerce.

The Comission's producer rate regulation has already resulted in stabilizing the prices at which the pipelines buy their gas supplies, following a preceding decade of rapid advances in field prices. Recent data indicate that in the last 2½ years the price line has been held at an average of between 16 and 17 cents a thousand cubic feet in the field.

One problem which had begun to assume serious dimensions at the time the present commissioners took office has been completely eliminated. When field prices were rapidly escalating, the pipelines in turn were forced to file numerous applications for rate increases. Under the Natural Gas Act the Commission may suspend filings for increased rates for a period of 5 months after which period they got into effect automatically but subject to refund of any amounts ultimately determined by the Commission (subject to review in the courts) to have been in excess of fair and reasonable charges. Most of the rate increases were suspended and went into effect subject to refund. The Commission was so bogged down with the volume of work and the complexity of the proceedings that it did not keep pace with its dockets, and the amounts of revenues which the companies were earning, on what was virtually a contingent basis, reached enormous dimensions, well over a billion dollars, and in 1961 this amount was increasing at the rate of $10 million a month. As a result, few, if any, of the large pipeline systems were able to show solid earnings figures to investors, who were required to speculate as to how much of current earnings and of what amounts set aside as surplus might ultimately be required to be refunded.

The contingent refund problem is no more, I am happy to say. All of the major cases have been disposed of, for the most part by settlements agreed to by all the parties concerned—pipelines, their customers and the Commission. Approximately $550 million has already been refunded or is in the process of being refunded. As a result, consumers are paying a fair price for their gas and there is no longer a major pipeline company which cannot present to investors solid earnings figures as a basis for investor appraisal of its securities, and as a basis for management to project future expansion programs.

As a result of the stabilization of field prices there have been few applications for rate increases in recent months and, in addition, the pipelines continue to find new ways to reduce unit costs so that I do not look for a repetition of the situation in the past when practically all of the pipelines had major rate increase applications pending before us. Nevertheless, the Commission has taken steps to insure that if such applications are filed, they can be disposed of promptly. In addition to encouragement of the settlement technique we have reorganized our procedures for disposing of cases by trial and decision in order to permit expeditious handling.

The assurance of price stability has given new impetus to the marketing programs of the pipeline companies and their distributors. They are now proceeding with great aggressiveness to seek new markets both in industry and by expansion of household use. To support its new marketing program the industry is placing increasingly greater emphasis on research and development, particularly with respect to air-conditioning and other utilization equipment. As you know, in most of the United States summer temperatures are sufficiently high to create a great demand for energy for air conditioning, that is to say, space cooling.

On the electric power side of the Commission's jurisdiction, I mention again the relatively small proportion of industry production which is sold at wholesale in interstate commerce. As in the case of gas distribution companies, the earnings of the electric power industry are determined to a great extent by State and local regulatory agencies where these companies operate. I should say that the principal financial impact of the Federal Power Commission upon these companies is by way of encouraging lower cost operations through stronger interconnections to facilitate full coordination of power system operations and by setting standards which may commend themselves to the State and local agencies which have exclusive jurisdiction over sales at retail.

I should not fail, before concluding, to mention the Commission's National Power Survey, now underway, in which we hope to point the path toward a fully coordinated system of power supply for the United States in the 1970's. You may not know that there are 3,600 separate electric enterprises in the United States. Of these, 450 are owned by private investors, accounting, as I have mentioned, for 75 or 80 percent of the entire industry. The 225 largest of these account for 98 percent of the total electric power revenues for the private sector. The balance of the industry consists of five Federal agencies, about a thousand rural electric power cooperatives and about 2,200 local public systems, mostly municipal. These enterprises vary from the magnitude of TVA with over 13,000 megawatts of installed capacity and annual output of 66 billion kilowatt-hours a year, to enterprises too small to support economic sources of generation of their own.

On the whole, I believe the American power complex is the largest, most modern and most efficient in the world, but the industry still has far to go to attain the economies available through full integration. The aim of the National Power Survey is to encourage the industry on a voluntary basis to achieve such economies by full cooperation among all industry segments, while retaining the advantages of the stimulation and enterprise which result from the availability of an enormous pool of technical and management personnel within which each group is striving to set an example for the others.

The fact that the American electric power industry is and always has been pluralistic in structure, has proven a great stimulus to management improvement and cost reduction. In an industry where direct competition is wasteful, competition by example has proven an effective substitute. I speak, of course, of American conditions and do not suggest that the American system, which has developed under unique conditions, could or should be exported.

There are some in the United States who still regard regulation of public utilities as an unwarranted intrusion upon free enterprise, but I believe that most well-informed people agree that the institution of private or investor ownership of public utilities depends on the existence of public utility regulation by State and Federal authorities.

In my opinion it has been the development of public utility regulation as an American institution which has made it possible for private enterprise to continue to flourish in these fields of activity. Intensive U.S. development of and reliance upon public regulation has resulted in the creation of administrative agencies with the powers and resources to assure that regulated industries conduct their affairs in such a way as to serve the public interest. Even so, our constitutional system with its guarantees of substantive and procedural due process has provided investors with the necessary security to make it possible to attract the capital required for these public services. By judicial decision and a long-developing tradition the respective areas of governmental authority and of management discretion and responsibility have been distinguished so that the managers of the enterprise have an incentive to do a good job for their owners and customers within a general framework which protects the public against exorbitant charges and failure or inadequacies of service. The securities of electric power and natural gas companies are outstanding favorites of investors in the United States.

I should be the last to urge that this system of public utility regulation does not have its flaws or that the work of the regulatory agencies, State and Federal, could not be improved. By and large, however, the regulatory system has worked reasonably well and to the general satisfaction of the American public; and the regulated industries have both shared in the growth of the Nation and have stimulated that growth. From the long-range point of view effective regulation is not a threat to the utilities but is a condition to their continued existence in the private sector of our economy.

I believe that any impartial observer would find it difficult to say that the natural gas and electric power industries which the Federal Power Commission regulates are not healthy and financially strong. They are among the largest and fastest growing industries in the United States. In the energy

field the United States is the world leader by a wide margin. These two industries provide energy in forms which are among the most convenient available and which have the highest growth potential. There will of course be competition between them in the future to determine their respective shares of the Nation's ever-increasing energy market but this competition should prove healthy for both industries and for the country as well. Each industry has an assured market of its own and the competition will only determine the precise share of the growth in energy use which each of them will capture.

The demand for energy in the United States continues to grow as our population increases and as we achieve an even higher standard of living, although the rate of growth is offset in part by increased efficiency in the use of energy. The electric power and natural gas pipeline industries will share in this growth. Technological advances and the improvement in industry operating conditions provide reason to look forward to an even more solid foundation for their future progress and future earnings within the limits permissible for public utility enterprises. The Federal Power Commission intends to exercise its functions in a manner that will encourage constantly improved industry performance.

The Marine Technology Society: A Long-Needed Organization in a Vital Scientific Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues an organization which I believe will make a great contribution in the future development of a vital and challenging science—oceanography—the study of the vast, almost limitless resources of the seas.

The organization, the Marine Technology Society is a nonprofit venture. Its purpose is to bring together scientists, engineers, businessmen—in short, all those who have an interest in developing oceanographic knowledge to tap the physical resources beneath the surface of the oceans.

The group is incorporated in the State of New York, but already has a nationwide membership. Its headquarters are in Washington, D.C. Its formation is timely. The House has passed a national oceanographic bill. The Federal Government has announced a long-range program of oceanographic research. This professional group can help meld the many discoveries and potential projects into a uniform source of complete knowledge about what's going on in oceanography. Its purpose is not to compete, but to collect information and see that those who are working in the complex field of oceanography are aware of the achievements that have been made and the experiments underway.

I personally am pleased to have the opportunity to join this organization. I believe it offers a vehicle for the exchange of information, the collating and disseminating of ideas and the ideal focal point for discussion of and formulation of valuable oceanographic projects. My home district of San Diego County, Calif., is the center of varied and advanced oceanographic research.

The Marine Technology Society has been very active since its relatively recent formation. It has launched studies and programs aimed at establishing sound marine conservation policies. It is investigating the problems of the standardization of oceanographic instruments, a necessity if world progress in the arts of underwater science is to progress rapidly.

The MTS is not interested primarily in academic knowledge alone. One of its chief projects is studying how marine sciences can help the economics of nations which now have limited technological and economic resources.

Now in progress is an evaluation of present undersea vehicles available for oceanographic work, and a projection of the future requirements for such vehicles.

Another project involves checking the practicality of using obsolete underwater communication cables for oceanographic data retrieval.

Perhaps its most ambitious program, and one of unquestioned value and need, is the collecting and classifying of all now available technical literature pertaining to marine science.

In essence this group is aiming to bring together the many separate phases of oceanographic discovery into a coordinated, knowledgeable, workable organization. Much like the creation of a fabric, it will weave together the various strands of research which hitherto have been pursued largely in random, uncoordinated fashion by many organizations having diverse interests.

Since the House and the Federal Government have embarked on an ambitious oceanographic program, the Marine Technology Society has scheduled its first national conference, a symposium on "buoy technology" to be held in Washington, D.C., on March 24 and 25, 1964.

Congress has a great interest in the success of MTS in realizing its objectives. It will be helpful toward making our Federal oceanography program an effective operation. It will establish the preliminary forum for discussions concerning the important interchange of oceanographic data between nations—a step toward world accord, cooperation, and ultimate greater prosperity.

My colleague, Representative HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography, wrote the secretary of the society, shortly after its formation:

The objectives of our legislation seem well in line with the objectives which your proposed new society would seek to promote. It would seem to me that a professional society of the caliber you have in mind could be most helpful to various interests within and without Government who are concerned over the need for the prompt and effective advancement of a national oceanographic program.

It has been said that we know more about the surface of the moon than the ocean's floor. We are now striving to push our sum of knowledge about the ocean and its floor. The Marine Technology Society may well become the hub of a united drive to explore, analyze and utilize the full depths and expanse of the world's oceans.

Rise in Spending Predicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, those who expressed dismay during the past 24 hours at President Johnson's promises to spend and save with equal vigor can find the explanation on the front page of this morning's Washington Post. The sleight of hand, miracle, and legerdemain necessary to accomplish this apparently impossible feat are quite simple. It appears to be a matter of tampering with the books. I enclose the article from the Post as follows:

RISE IN SPENDING PREDICTED—BUDGET NOT AS AUSTERE AS IT SEEMS, ADMINISTRATION ECONOMISTS SAY

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Administration economists insisted yesterday that there is less austerity in the Johnson budget than meets the eye.

They contended that the surprise $97.9-billion spending plan would support a brisk rise in the economy despite the apparent holddown on Federal outlays.

Their argument rests on two grounds:

1. The proposed new cut in taxes withheld from paychecks would pump an extra $200 million a month into the hands of the fastest spending consumers.

2. The $97.9 billion total was reached in part through a series of devices—"gimmicks" to less friendly observers—that will actually permit a rise in Government spending during 1964.

ECONOMISTS DISAGREE

Outside the administration, economists disagreed over this analysis. Some accepted the argument that the budget will not be as inflationary as it appears. Others, however, said that no bagful of accounting tricks could now stop the lack of Government spending from exerting a drag on total business activity.

Perhaps the shrewdest judgment ignored the conflicting figures. One economist, a veteran of the Washington budget wars, said:

"Johnson's a clever man with clever people around him. No matter what his budget says, you can bet he'll have the economy going up like a roman candle at election time."

If this assessment proves correct, Mr. Johnson will have demonstrated that you can have your cake and eat it, too. He will have simultaneously deprived the Republicans of the economy-in-Government issue, promoted welfare programs, and sparked a climbing economy.

TAX CUT'S EFFECT

In any event, administration experts conceded that they are borrowing for this year some of the stimulus expected in 1965. If the lower withholding rate takes effect by March 1, the tax cut in 1964 will amount to more than $8 billion instead of the $6 billion

originally planned. Then, next year, the second stage of the tax cut will come to about $3 billion instead of $5 billion.

How can a budget that calls for less spending actually allow for more spending? This is how the experts say it will be done:

The Government will speed up its outlays between now and June 30. These expenditures are to be charged off to the current Kennedy budget, not to the new one that Mr. Johnson will present for the accounting year starting on July 1.

LEGISLATION ASSUMED

The new budget will propose selling off to private investors an extra $750 million to $1 billion in Government assets. This covers such items as federally insured home mortgages and Export-Import Bank loans. To the man in the street, the proceeds from such sales should be counted as a gain in revenue. But in the Alice in Wonderland of Federal budgetry, this goes as a cut in expenditures.

The budget will also call for a substantial drop in spending to prop up farm prices. This forecast assumes that Congress will approve new legislation it has previously scorned. In any case, the Administration has limited control over this figure. Farm spending depends primarily on the market prices of supported products and they, in turn, depend on the weather and similar unpredictable factors.

This does not mean that all of the budget restraint is a trick done with mirrors. Administration aids say that the holdback in defense and some other outlays is every bit as genuine as advertised.

In fact, the Johnson economists are bracing themselves for criticism from fellow professionals generally and liberals in particular.

To liberal critics, the White House aids will point to the budget for tackling poverty and for other welfare programs. New authority to spend will rise by $1.5 billion in this sector. Moreover, it will be augmented by an extra $800 million of payments from Government trust funds. These funds are not counted in the popular or administrative budget.

Scientific Research: Dr. Vannevar Bush Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have had over a period of years the experience of listening to many witnesses when testifying in justification of various scientific research and development programs for the armed services. The cumulated information obtained in these hearings has generated increasing concern over the validity of the arguments for much that has been sought.

It was, therefore, most heartening to read in the December 27, 1963, issue of Science, the magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, of which Dr. P. H. Abelson is editor, a most thoughtful statement made by Dr. Vannevar Bush on November 21, 1963, when testifying before the House Select Committee on Government Research.

Featured as an editorial by the editor of Science, this statement by the wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development contains views derived from experience and warnings that must not go unheeded by those in the legislative and executive branches of our Government who are in varying degrees responsible for the formulation of our great programs of research and development.

The indicated statement by Dr. Bush, which I quote as part of my remarks, is commended for study by all Members of the Congress, especially those assigned to committees with cognizance over the development and appropriation for our scientific programs:

VANNEVAR BUSH SPEAKS

The spectacular success of applied research during the war led to a fallacy entertained by many. It is that any problem can be solved by gathering enough scientists and giving them enough money. To solve the problem of the common cold assemble a great institution, fill it with scientists and money, and soon we will have no more colds. It is folly to thus proceed. The great scientific steps forward originate in the minds of gifted scientist, not in the minds of promoters. The best way to proceed is to be sure that really inspired scientists have what they need to work with, and leave them alone.

A man sitting at a desk and thinking is not an expensive proposition. A scientist directing a team and operating an expensive array of apparatus is. The costs of research go up very rapidly when one gets into hardware. When money comes easily there is a tendency to rush into use of complex equipment too fast and too far. We may be making this mistake.

If the country pours enough money into research, it will inevitably support the trivial and the mediocre. The supply of scientific manpower is not unlimited.

In any broad program of research the keyword in regard to any one aspect of the program is "relevance." It is a good word to have in mind in examining any research program. Competent directors of research know what it means. Probably "conducive to progress toward the main object of a program" is as good a definition as any. Just finding out something new is not by itself sufficient justification for research. It needs to mean something when we find it.

It makes sense to ask a young researcher in basic research what he is trying to find out, what sort of knowledge he hopes to have at the end of his program which does not now exist. Surprisingly often the answer will be hard to extract. But it makes no sense to ask him just how he is going to do it, what it will cost, or how long it will take. If he knew the answers it would not be basic research.

When scientific programs are judged by popular acclaim we inevitably have overemphasis on the spectacular. That is just what we have today. The deeply important scientific advances moving today are not easy to understand. If they were they would have been accomplished long ago. Outstanding scientific progress, which will most affect the lives and health of our children, is not grasped by many.

Since the war we have seen a strange, and to my mind dangerous, development. The armed services have called upon universities to manage great programs of research and development, involving secrecy, and often calling for business judgment. Some of this has been avoided by the creation of independent nonprofit organizations. We ought to find a better way. The universities will respond, when called upon the Government to undertake burdens in the public interest. But management of secret programs is not their proper business, and they should not be thus utilized. We ought to be ingenious enough to avoid loading our universities with tasks which may interfere with their proper function of turning out educated men and women.

It should never be forgotten that the main task of the universities is to educate men. The country will need skilled professional men in the future as much as it will need new knowledge. As we now go we are not meeting this challenge sufficiently. Every research program placed in a university should be so ordered that its product is not only new knowledge but skilled educated men.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the Republic of Chad will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and on this memorable occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbaye, the President of the Republic of Chad; and His Excellency Adam Malick Sow, the Chadian Ambassador to the United States.

The Republic of Chad achieved independence from France on August 11, 1960, but the formal independence day celebrations were deferred until January 11, when the seasonal rains were over. Thus, January 11 became the anniversary date on which Chad's independence is commemorated, the date on which we offer our congratulations to the people of Chad.

Chad, a landlocked country in central Africa, is a territory of great geographic variety. It is a land of desert in the north which becomes savannah, then plain, then intense forest as one travels southward. It is a land of mountains and rivers and of abounding bird and animal life. Its people are as varied and interesting as its topography—Arabized nomads, Negroid herdsmen, fishermen and primitive villagers, Moslems, Christians, and Animists. Over the centuries nomads from the north and sedentary populations from the south have mingled in Chad. Islamic conquerors penetrated in the 14th century to find flourishing African empires, and in the 19th century the Europeans began explorations of Chad. Chad has been a melting pot of ethnic groups, for it has long been one of the most active crossroads of trade between the East and tropical Africa.

But the new independent Chad is no longer satisfied just to be a crossroads. It is determined to build up a reputation of its own on the world scene. Chad and its former ruling colonial power, France, have continued on good relations since independence. On independence day President de Gaulle sent a telegram which said:

Chad enters the concert of nations. In the heroic days of the war she did not fail to

stand by France. She can rest assured today that France will not fail to stand by her.

In turn, Chad negotiated agreements with France for close cooperation in foreign affairs, defense, and financial and economic matters.

Chad has made commendable progress in developing its economy since independence in spite of drawbacks such as inaccessibility, transpotration difficulties, and the great distance to major seaports. At independence Chad had under 1 mile of paved road, from Fort Lamy, the capital, to the airport. Roads are being improved, however, and Chad's airlink to the outside is becoming increasingly important. Chad's chief economic asset is cotton, which makes up approximately 80 percent of the country's exports. The basis of the economy is agriculture, and about 96 percent of the population are engaged in subsistence agriculture, stockraising, and river fishing. Chad has begun an industrialization program, however, and already there are a handful of cotton gins, soap factories, peanut oil mills, and brick kilns.

Over half of Chad's imports come from France, but Chad has started importing some American products such as gasoline, trucks, lubricating oils and greases, air conditioners, and refrigerators. Chad's ties with the West are strong, and the Government is trying to attract foreign capital to develop a new industry of potential importance: tourism.

On the third anniversary of their independence we congratulate the people of Chad for the progress they have achieved thus far and wish them every success for the future.

Farley Mingles With Postmasters—Says Postal Workers Closest to People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by the Honorable James A Farley, former Postmaster General, at the convention of the National Association of Postmasters in Honolulu, Hawaii, last fall. Mr. Farley's remarks appeared in the November-December 1963 issue of the Postmasters' Gazette:

FARLEY MINGLES WITH POSTMASTERS—SAYS POSTAL WORKERS CLOSEST TO THE PEOPLE

(NOTE.—Friends of James A. Farley, Postmaster General from March 4, 1933, until succeeded by Frank C. Walker September 11, 1940, thought he appeared in better health and more jovial than in years. Especially delighted to see him again were the members of the Farley class, as he calls them, and at his request they stood proudly at the several occasions where he spoke. They were commissioned while he headed the Department. Relaxed and reminiscent, the former Postmaster General strolled around the spacious hotel grounds, conferred with Post Office Department and Members of Congress who were there, but he showed little favor for the casual attire that everybody else had adopted. All of the Farley class on Oahu Sunday morning and as many others as could crowd into the village's tapa room hailed him at a leisurely breakfast arranged under the chairmanship of John McCann, of Oglesby, Ill. Mr. Farley indulged his well-nourished listeners (now completely under the spell of the Land o' the Lei) with stories of his world travels (he is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.) and some post office oddities recalled from his own experiences.)

You have business this morning, and there is no reason why I should intrude on your time. I know you have a long and important program to finish in this business session.

I am glad to be here, as I have said, and it was a disappointment to miss the few conventions I have. An operation on my eye caused me to miss one. I missed the Chicago convention, and I don't think I missed but one or two others since I retired in 1940.

It is hardly necessary for me to tell this group of postmasters how grateful I am to them, those who were appointed under me, and how grateful I am to those who still carry on, who were appointed by my successors.

The post office is the closest thing a community has to its National Government. I was happy during the years I served as Postmaster General to do all I possibly could to have post office buildings erected wherever allowed or were necessary.

Probably some of the most pleasant hours of my postal career were spent going all over the country dedicating a post office, laying a cornerstone, attending postal gatherings of all kinds—postmasters' conventions, rural carriers' conventions, and all kinds of conclaves dealing with the growth and development of the postal service.

I will always be close to the postal service. Hardly a day goes by when I walk from my hotel to my office that I don't come in contact with letter carriers on their routes.

When I stop and say to the younger fellows, "My name is Jim Farley. How are you?" they usually stop for a second look as much as to say, "Who are you?"

However, the older fellows know me and I talk with them about their problems.

CLOSE TO THE PEOPLE

The Postal Department has always been closer to the people than any other department of the Government.

Postal people are in my judgment a more dedicated group than the employees of any other Department. Now that isn't said in an unkindly way. The reason, in my judgment, is because they are closest to the people. This is particularly true in the small post offices, small cities, and towns or villages where they have the post offices.

Everybody in the community knows the postmaster and the postmaster knows all. They are mutual friends—they know their troubles, know their successes.

I congratulate those of you who are still carrying on from the time you were appointed by me as postmaster. The fact that you are here and still carrying on is a great tribute to your loyalty to the Department and your integrity and to those who recommended and appointed you.

I have come in contact with many employees and postmasters who were appointed after my time and I know they, too, are carrying on in the same manner, doing the same type of job and that they, too, will continue to be loyal to the Department during their years of service.

You have a new Postmaster General now. I had not had the pleasure of meeting him until yesterday. He is a man highly regarded by the people around the country who have come in contact with him. I am sure President Kennedy would not have appointed him unless he felt sure he would make a fine Postmaster General.

His predecessor, Postmaster General Ed Day, did a good job. He won the affection and admiration of everyone in the Department with whom he became acquainted and with whom he associated. And I am sure Postmaster General Gronouski will carry on in the same way. I am sure he is already properly indoctrinated to the Post Office Department position and it won't be long until all of you will be knowing him well and, I am sure, calling him John. I urge you, although I know it isn't necessary, to give him all the support and encouragement you can and carry on as you have been with his predecessor.

SPEAKS OF SNYDER

I can't close without paying a tribute to John Snyder and the officers of the association who have been associated with him during his 2 years as president. The association has grown and prospered under his very able leadership and I am sure he has more than justified the confidence reposed in him by the postmasters who elected him 2 years ago and again last year. John is the postmaster in Oconomowoc. I have had considerable experience in dedicating post offices but his was the only post office where I poured evaporated milk on the cornerstone. (It was Carnation evaporated milk. Date July 27, 1937. Business in Oconomowoc was suspended, the city decorated, and Postmaster Snyder was escorted to the post office by the American Legion band. Farley was given red carpet treatment; dignitaries from Wisconsin showed up. As is his custom, Postmaster Snyder had area postmasters as his guests. Ed.)

When I started dictating a letter to John I told the girl it was to Oconomowoc and she kind of stopped and looked and listened and said, "Where is Oconomowoc," I will never forget it because of that occasion and because of John.

He has been a fine postmaster, he has been a fine leader, he has a fine family and he is a patriotic American and I congratulate you, John, and wish you well in the days ahead. I wish for you and your devoted family many, many years of continued good health and happiness.

I hope those of you here will continue to enjoy yourselves and you will all go back fully refreshed from your vacation and will return to work and take on as you did before, and God willing, I will be looking for you in my home at the Waldorf when you come to New York in 1964. Good luck.

Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we mourn the death of President Kennedy and dedicate ourselves to combat all forms of hate and violence, it would do well for us to take note of the bigotry and intolerance displayed in the attacks by one newspaper in this city against the scheduled erection of the Shevchenko statue. After 3 years of hearings, discussion, and wide reporting about this project, it is strange, indeed, that these ill-tempered attacks have been made at this late stage. But what is even stranger is the tone and ill-informed character of this assault. Apparently the forth-

coming monument to the freedom and independence of all the captive nations, including those in the Soviet Union, has struck a sensitive nerve in certain circles here.

Three years ago I played an instrumental role in the passage of legislation providing for the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko, poet laureate and hero of Ukraine and immortal exponent of the freedom of all nations. All aspects of this project were carefully examined and deliberated upon. Our chief objective was to honor a man whose name and works are today and for the future a monument to individual liberty and to national freedom and independence throughout Eurasia. We were intent then, and are so now, not to allow the totalitarian masters in Moscow and their puppets in the empire to pervert the full meaning and significance of Shevchenko for their own ends. In the hearts not only of Ukrainians but of all captive peoples the name of Shevchenko means freedom and liberty which, of course, are anathema to the Communist rulers. More, with stress on the exploited and the oppressed, his works are a monument against bigotry and intolerance.

It is ironical that a man who devoted his entire life against bigotry and intolerance should be subjected in our land of freedom to these very vices. However, we can be truly thankful for the freedom of the press in our Nation. Such freedom permits an exercise of moral responsibility and integrity which alone are sufficient to counteract the bigoted statements published by others. In this case the largest Washington newspaper has again earned the highest respect and esteem for its recent editorial. I wish to incorporate as part of my remarks the superb editorial, titled "Association Again," that appeared in the December 4 issue of the Evening Star.

ASSOCIATION AGAIN

The last degree of desperation on the part of opponents to the statue of Taras Shevchenko is marked by the solicitation of approval of the project by the Soviet Ukraine's chief of mission at the U.N., in the belief that such approval would be the kiss of death for the plan.

Naturally, the official approved wholeheartedly. Since the Ukraine is presently one of the Communist republics of the Communist Soviet Union, the conclusion is drawn that the 19th century Ukrainian poet and voice for freedom was a Communist.

The name for this process is a little over 10 years old. It is called, "Guilt by Association." It is also expressed this way: "If the Communists are in favor of a thing, we must oppose it." It is disconcerting to see this irresponsible fallacy applied to a poet deeply revered by Americans of Ukrainian descent.

Winston Churchill celebrates and Charles de Gaulle denounces a transatlantic people called the Anglo-Americans. But the fact is there is much more to the Americans than their Anglo beginnings. We are Irish, French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Scandinavian. We are Swiss and Netherlanders and African. We are also Ukrainian.

This happy variety in our composition is expressed, among other ways, in many of the monuments in the Nation's Capital. Foreign or foreign-born heroes are commemorated here in bronze or stone, usually from the efforts of American private societies, deriving their unity from a common land of origin. Thus, John Ericsson, who gave the Union the *Monitor*, is remembered in a statue given by Americans of Scandinavian descent. The bronze Jeanne d'Arc on Meridian Hill is the gift of the Societe des Femmes de France, located in New York.

This traditional process has been followed in the project to erect a statue to Taras Shevchenko in the little park at P and 23d Streets NW. The land has been set aside by Congress. The statue is being paid for by private subscription. The Nation and the Capital will be enriched by the remembrance of a far-off poet and hero who devoted his life to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, there is quite an interesting immediate background that prompted the responsible editors of the Star to come out with this pointed editorial. For this background and since one or two persons in administrative bodies concerned with the statue have been badly misled by the vicious attack published in another organ in this city, I believe our Members should carefully read the following items which I append to my remarks: First, a statement written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and sent to the National Capital Planning Commission; second, an editorial on "The Shevchenko Affair" which appeared in the November 7 issue of the Armenian newspaper, the Hairenik Weekly; and third, a very pointed letter—one among scores that the Washington Post has refused to publish—sent by the Ukrainian Medical Association of North America:

DECEMBER 1, 1963.

Mr. W. C. DUTTON, Jr.,
Director, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUTTON: Upon my return to the area this evening I found and carefully read your letter of November 29, acknowledging in behalf of Mrs. Rowe my letter of November 10. I am grateful to you and her for your reply.

Since the rules of the Commission preclude my appearance to confront Mr. Louchheim for the purpose of having him attempt a justification and substantiation of the pernicious fabrications peddled by Mr. James R. Wiggins, the editor of the Washington Post, I should like to comply with the last sentence of your letter by having this letter serve as my short statement on the Shevchenko statue project. I trust that this statement and the easily accessible material referred to will be presented to the members of the Commission before the December 5 meeting so that they may be properly apprised of the ugly situation created by Mr. Wiggins' editorials.

Although Congress alone can determine for whom memorials are to be erected and in this case, while some editors slep, held open and fair hearings 3 years ago, I for one am strongly of the belief that every citizen should come to know why the Shevchenko statue is being erected. Despite their inflammatory and bigoted character, the Post editorials have been most welcome for the interest they have stimulated, so much so that congressional proposals are underway for a Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress and also a Shevchenko stamp next year, not to mention a necessary reprint of House Document No. 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–61."

Apart from serving as prime evidence for such further construction action, the deliberate distortions and misinformation contained in the Post editorials are being developed into an objective study of journalistic abuse and intolerance, which the members of the Commission should be familiar with. It is important, therefore, that you bring to their attention the following CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issues: November 13, 1963, pages 20583–86; November 14, pages 20736–41; November 20, pages 21447–50. These represent only a beginning; many more are to follow in demonstrating to our people another source of hate feeding in our society. Whereas the Post's editor has largely suppressed the massive replies of protest to his mendacious editorials, as well as refusing to open up his paper for a countering article by an American Shevchenko scholar, in the RECORD both sides are being presented.

In order not to be goaded into an unfortunate situation, I earnestly feel the members should ponder the following additional points after reading the initial contents of the above issues:

(1) The utterly contradictory nature of the muddled Post editorials e.g., the October 18 one fears the statue as a weapon "in a fierce cold war propaganda campaign against the Soviet Union," the November 1 one fears Khrushchev "could lay a wreath on this memorial." There are dozens of others. In one breath Shevchenko is an "idol of the Communist Party," then an "ardent nationalist" (November 12)—and so a circle is squared.

(2) The contradictory nature of the Post's editorials to its own articles and reports; e.g. the vicious charge of anti-semitism against the poet in the editorials to Stephen S. Rosenfeld's tempered and balanced account on this subject (September 29). The comical aspect of all this is seen in the Post's September 23 editorial, urging a statue for Shakespeare, who had far more to say about Jews than did Shevchenko in his righteous protests against Jewish and lordly Polish administrators of the serf system in the Russian Empire.

(3) The arrogant ignorance of the editor who admits he has "never read a line of Mr. Shevchenko's verse" (September 23). Yet, establishing the poet's universal status, Shevchenko's works have been translated into over 50 languages, by Poles, Russians, Jews, Germans, the British, Americans and others; with culture and dignity our late President Kennedy on two occasions exalted the poet and said on March 25, 1961, "I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian Poet Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage"; world-renowned Jewish, Polish, German and other scholars—like Albert Einstein, Abram Joffe, Stanislaw Kot, Max Plank—have been members of the world Shevchenko Scientific Society which bears the name of the freedom fighter and perpetuates his humanist works. One could go on and on to demonstrate the offensiveness and bald affront of these editorials to people of culture and understanding.

(4) The smear of freedom and justice in the editor's smear campaign; e.g. in all the editorials the central purpose of the statue is omitted, namely a memorial to a universal poet and national hero upon whom our own great tradition rubbed off and whose great message is the just freedom of all nations, including his Ukraine. Most pertinent to this purpose has been Congress aim to prevent the Communists from abusing and exploiting this symbol of universal freedom for their own ends. This is the crux of the project, and the recent journalistic gimmick of the Post (Nov. 29) headlining on the first page "Communists Love Shevchenko" over a report of a puppet Soviet Ukrainian representative's comments on the statue here proves again the grave lack of understanding show by the paper's editor. Aside from the fact that this is old stuff which we encountered in 1960–61, it is significant that the U.N. puppet also carefully sidesteps the central purpose of the statue—the theme of

world freedom which every address at the groundbreaking ceremonies emphasized.

I am perfectly aware that these issues are beyond the determination of the Commission. They were fully and openly discussed 3 years ago in Congress. However, the Members in their role as citizens should be informed of them.

Sincerely yours,

LEV B. DOBRIANSKY.

UKRAINIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF NORTH AMERICA,
November 4, 1963.

The EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: We are writing to you in behalf of the Ukrainian Medical Association of North America, which represents over 1,000 physicians and dentists of Ukrainian descent living in the United States and Canada.

In response to the editorial article in your paper of October 18, 1963, entitled "The Shevchenko Affair" we have received numerous telephone calls and letters from our members expressing their indignation and concern. They are deeply disturbed by the articles in your paper opposing the erection of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., the Capital of our freedom-loving country, the United States of America.

Your apparent distortion of the facts makes us wonder why you are opposing the erection of a monument honoring a great humanitarian, who, more than 100 years ago was advocating the American type of democracy in the Ukraine and in all Europe.

Shevchenko served the cause of freedom with all his genius. He was a fighter for freedom; and awakened the enslaved nations in the czarist empire, including the Ukraine, Shevchenko's own country.

He saw in the United States the ideal of political and social freedom. In one of his poems he appealed to God for a George Washington for the Ukraine, who would lead his nation to independence.

Homage has been paid Shevchenko by reknown poets. His poems have been translated into over 50 different languages. His greatness has been noted by scholars of Slavistics all over the world.

It is beyond our comprehension why your paper has belittled Shevchenko and why you insulted Congress by implying that it did not know what it was doing when it approved the monument.

Your articles show very little knowledge of Shevchenko, his work, and the reasons why Americans of Ukrainian descent donated their efforts and hard earned money to erect the monument. What is worse, you did not even attempt to ascertain the true facts from competent sources before attacking our "tiny group."

You are puzzled by the facts that the Soviet Communists pay tribute to Shevchenko, claiming him to be one of their own.

You probably are aware, however, of the fact that the Moscow tyrants are masters in twisting the truth. Look what they did to the term "democracy." They have also twisted Shevchenko's words.

A study of Shevchenko's original works will reveal the whole, unqualified truth to you or any other reader. He was a champion of freedom and a fighter for individual dignity. He loved truth and despised tyranny; particularly the kind that took advantage of the weak and helpless. He fought for the rights of women and the Negro. If Shevchenko were alive today he would oppose the Moscow dictatorship with the same force and energy that he displayed against the imperialistic czars of his time.

We Americans of Ukrainian descent strongly feel that a statue of Shevchenko has much to offer not only to Washingtonians but to all Americans who will visit our great Capital for it will always be a symbol of mankind's continued efforts to spread the ideas of a political system and social order that America has given to the world.

It seems to us that your paper should join us in our efforts to erect a Shevchenko monument in the Nation's Capital at no cost to the Government rather than join those who oppose it.

In any event, we sincerely ask that you discontinue your intemperate attacks on our motives and in fairness and justice present the project and the people concerned in their true light.

Yours truly,

MYRON L. ZARYCKY, M.D.,
President.

OLEH WOLANSKY, M.D.,
Secretary.

THE SHEVCHENKO AFFAIR

Since the Communist corruption of world morals we have witnessed all kinds of violations of good taste but, occasionally, we come across a shocker which really leaves us limp from the exhaustion.

Such shocker is a recent editorial of the Washington Post in which, incredible in this benighted age of ours as it may seem, the author takes callous exception with, what would seem to a genuine American, an eminently patriotic act, and calls for the prompt cessation of all work on the construction of a monument to the memory of a Ukrainian poet named Taras Shevchenko to be erected in Washington as a symbol to the deep attachment of the Ukrainian people to the principle of national freedom and their determination to win their independence.

The Post belittles a great and dedicated Ukrainian poet who fought with his pen all sort of tyranny and paid a heavy price for his "audacity," belittles some two million odd Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and an imposing segment of the American body politic who have made an equally imposing contribution to the culture and the political philosophy of America as a "tiny group," calls the monument to Taras Shevchenko a "monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans," and with unabashed arrogance, calls the entire affair a manipulation of a tiny group of Ukrainian Americans to fight the cold war in their own way and to promote "their own implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood."

This, we submit, as coming from presumably a Thomas Jefferson or Patrick Henry type American, is too much of a shocker by itself to need further comment. Svoboda, the Ukrainian Weekly, thinks such sentiments could only emanate from either ignorance or malice.

We think the Svoboda editor is rather naive. Svoboda underestimates both the education and the intelligence of the Washington Post.

We only feel constrained to say that we certainly have met this entity before and his language is not entirely unfamiliar to us. And we daresay, this element which plays with the fate of captive nations and ridicules their asperations to independence, if an investigation were made of its past vote on critical issues involving communism vs. anticommunism, it would be discovered that invariably that vote was cast in behalf of Tito as against Mihaelovich and Mao Tse-tung as against Chiang Kai-shek.

Farmers Hard Hit by Imports of Beef in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I shall include an article by Verne Peyser in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Mr. Peyser points out the effect of beef imports on the pocketbooks of our cattlemen.

Along with other Members of Congress I have urged President Johnson, Secretaries Freeman and Dean Rusk to immediately impose an embargo on meat imports to the degree that will be effective. The article follows:

YEARLY LOSS $3.5 MILLION IN THIS COUNTY: FARMERS HARD HIT BY IMPORTS OF BEEF IN UNITED STATES

(By Verne Peyser)

A national problem is costing Pottawattamie County farmers $3.5 million or more a year.

The problem: Imports of beef into the United States which threaten to reach a new annual peak of 1 billion pounds this year.

TOP CATTLE FEEDING AREA

County Extension Director Clifford Johnson said Saturday the $3.5 million pocketbook loss to cattle feeders—due directly to beef imports—is a conservative estimate.

"The figure could possibly double that," he said. "This has a whale of an impact on the economy."

Southwest Iowa—with Pottawattamie County in the lead—is one of the Nation's largest cattle feeding areas.

Other counties in the area also feel the impact of prices—which this week were around $21 per hundredweight compared to $27, a year ago.

Ronald Sealock, chairman of the chamber of commerce agricultural committee, noted imports are a definite factor in lower cattle prices.

LOWEST PRICES SINCE 1957

"Imports are now about 11 percent of the total domestic consumption of beef," he said. "This factor, together with increased cattle numbers and heavier market weights, has caused the lowest cattle prices since April 1957.

"This has had a marked effect on the buying power of farm people residing in Pottawattamie County, which in turn is being felt in the city—especially among retail businesses."

Economists feel when one section of the economy is hurt, the impact is felt by everyone—the farmer, the businessman, the housewife.

TRUE MARKET

How do imports affect the U.S. cattle market?

U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, explained it this way in a speech to the Senate:

"As you well know, the cattle industry is free from all Government controls. Therefore, we have a true market where supply and demand do determine the prices.

"The per capita consumption of imported beef has jumped in the last 2 years 81.8 percent. Thus it is patent that the increased consumption of beef which is imported into this country at prices below our production costs have pulled down the prices received by our livestock men."

Some Agriculture Department officials have argued the meat imports are not serious. They have contended imports will be offset by exports.

RATIO 25 TO 1

Fred W. Gilmore, president of the Omaha Union Stock Yards Co., had an answer to this.

"For every dollar of beef or veal which we export, beef and veal imports equal $25."

Gilmore, speaking to the Rotary Club here, noted there are no restrictions on the quantity of meats that can be imported into this country.

"Our import duty on boneless beef is 3 cents per pound, one of the lowest in the

world," he said. "Most other countries have high tariffs, restrictions or other trade barriers which restrict or even have the effect of prohibiting livestock and meat imports."

IMPORTS INTO MIDWEST

Representative RALPH F. BEERMANN, of Nebraska, a Republican member of the House Agricultural Committee, told the Nonpareil that in the first 6 months of the year 829,000 pounds of imported beef came into the Midwest.

This is only a small part of total imports, but the effect is evident.

Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, of Iowa, a member of the House Agricultural Committee, said one of the major factors in the predicted drop in farm income is the decline of livestock prices, and the decline of livestock prices is largely due to alltime high imports.

Statement of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies in Support of H.R. 7152

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7152

The most important single issue before the Nation and the Congress at this time is the free exercise of the legal rights to which all Americans are entitled. The entitlement of the Negro people to equal rights can no longer be a matter of controversy. These rights are clearly established by our Constitution, the law of the land, and time and time again they have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Negro is not asking for special rights or privileges, he is asking that his rights as an American be effectively assured.

History has disclosed that the passage of time alone will not bring about the nationwide voluntary recognition of these rights. The Negro people have been waiting for almost a century; their patience is understandably strained. Effective action is needed by the Federal Government—now—not to grant new rights but to guarantee that established rights are fully protected.

The Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, as a Christian organization devoted to the cause of human welfare, has always recognized that the issue of civil rights is inextricably interwoven with problems relating to the welfare of all people. Not only is the work of improving the physical well-being of all underprivileged people acutely hampered by discrimination in all its forms, but the goals of welfare work are effectively thwarted. These goals do not involve bringing about the mere physical improvement of the individual's lot; they involve the establishment of an environment in which the moral and spiritual well-being of the individual can flourish. This cannot be achieved if legal rights are denied or are not effectively enforced.

The federation welcomed, therefore, the efforts of the late President Kennedy to bring about legislation that would do much to enforce recognition of the established rights of the Negro people. It welcomes the support President Johnson is giving to this legislation, and it strongly urges the speedy enactment of H.R. 7152 by the Congress.

Approved, December 16, 1963.

The State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson's state of the Union address was enthusiastically received by almost every segment of American life. It was concise, it was direct, and it was reassuring.

The President's attack on the residual poverty on the American scene which afflicts up to 40 million Americans constitutes the most stirring news of his message. This will rekindle the hopes of the unemployed, overlooked people in the central cities and in the distressed areas of the country. The expressed hopes and aspirations of the President have a special meaning—they have a sound of certainty.

Following is an editorial which today appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

STATE OF THE UNION

President Lyndon B. Johnson's first state of the Union message contained many seeds of encouragement for the Nation and for the world.

The emphasis which he placed on economy in Government reflects the mood of the taxpayers. His surprise budget cut to $97.9 billion—about $500 million below the current budget—will be gratefully welcomed.

Mr. Johnson's statement that weapons must not be stockpiled on a wasteful or provocative scale should be good news to all peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

In accompanying this statement with an announcement that production of weapon-producing uranium is being cut back 25 percent and four plutonium piles are being shut down, he issued a challenge which Khrushchev can ill afford to ignore.

The President was forceful and convincing in his plea for quick action on a tax cut. He fortified his request by reciting the steps he is taking to reduce governmental spending.

With the President stressing time as being of the essence in passage of the tax-cut legislation, any hope of simultaneous tax reform appears gone for the time being. But the crusade for such reform will continue and, we believe, will succeed at a later session.

Mr. Johnson's statements on civil rights were unequivocal and bolstered expectations that this session of Congress may enact the strongest civil rights legislation of the last hundred years.

The broad goals of the President's announced war on poverty will find sympathetic acceptance. It is in these specific methods which he has proposed for waging that war that he is certain to encounter substantial congressional opposition.

Many of these methods were part of the general welfare program of the late President John F. Kennedy and were given cool receptions in the House and Senate during his lifetime.

It is difficult to believe that Mr. Johnson could hold fast to his economy plans if all or even a large part of the welfare legislation he requested were given him by Congress and it would appear that much of this legislation has not caught fire with the people at home, if past congressional inaction upon it is an indication.

The Plain Dealer found much that was promising in the President's message. We like particularly the evidence of a strong hand in the White House.

The Cleveland Press had this editorial comment:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

There was but one item of big news in President Johnson's message to Congress on the state of the Union—but that was a blockbuster.

The Federal budget for the next fiscal year, he pledged, not only will be held below $100 billion. At $97.9 it actually will be kept below the total for this year—by more than half a billion dollars. The deficit will be cut in half.

The message admirably caught the spirit of the times which is troubled by social inequities but fearful of the inflationary effect of continued red-ink spending. It certainly caught the spirit of Congress. The President was interrupted 80 times by applause, in the course of a 40-minute speech.

Mainly, President Johnson spoke out for the program of President Kennedy, but he gave it an emphasis which was definitely Lyndon Johnson's.

He strongly urged tax reduction and enormously improved the prospects by proposing economies to balance the loss in tax revenues. We still believe tax reduction should follow—rather than precede—a balanced budget, but since some tax bill will be passed, let it be done quickly. As the President said, the Nation's business should not be kept guessing.

He pledged "all-out war on human poverty and unemployment," but promised to finance the projects this may involve by curtailing less urgent programs and, in general, "by insisting on a dollar's worth for a dollar spent."

He left no doubt as to his stand on civil rights by urging passage of that legislation, including the public accommodations section as a moral issue. His comment included some of the most powerful lines of his message: "Today Americans of all races stand side by side in Berlin and Vietnam. They died side by side in Korea. Surely they can work and eat and travel side by side in their own country."

The "war" on poverty is age old and, as the President suggested, current solutions do not involve "a short or easy struggle." This rich Nation is, however, in unique position to score significant advances provided our resources are not frittered away on visionary and extravagant schemes. The President listed a number of projects, most of them already before Congress, some of them controversial, many desirable on their own merits so long as the money is available.

But the most promising project of all, in our opinion, lies in the proposed elimination of Government extravagance, freeing tax money for productive, job-creating private enterprise.

The President's plea, not too likely to be observed in this election year, for a non-partisan approach to national problems, touches a responsive chord in a nation which is weary of petty bickering in Washington.

And his foreign policy, concisely stated, rings true to American tradition; "We must be strong enough to win a war and wise enough to prevent one. We shall neither act as aggressors nor tolerate acts of aggression." And then the direct answer to Khrushchev: "We intend to bury no one, and we do not intend to be buried."

The program thus eloquently stated is ambitious. There are rocks in the legislative road. Unpredictable emergencies will test the kind of stuff Lyndon Johnson is made of. But with this first definitive message to Congress and the country our new President has, in our opinion, made an excellent start.

Remarks on the Inauguration of the Korean President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made while attending the inauguration of the South Korean President, Mr. Chong-hui Park. At that occasion I had the good fortune to express my sentiments to the Korean Committee of the Relations Center International, Allies of the Korean War which is the worldwide organization of the Korean veterans who are bound by ties of having participated in the Korean fight. It is my privilege to include my statements at this time.

REMARKS ON THE INAUGURATION OF KOREAN PRESIDENT

Two years ago, in a White House conference with President Kennedy, General Park pledged that elections to return the Republic of Korea to civilian control would be held in the summer of 1963. In honoring that pledge, General Park greatly strengthened the cause of the free world and bound even closer the ties between his country and mine. Today, General Park is President of the Republic of Korea, the choice of his people in a free and open election. This demonstration of political stability and maturity in a land that not long ago was a battleground in the global conflict between democracy and Communist aggression does honor to the people of the Republic of Korea. It means that the Republic of Korea will remain a bulwark in the struggle to preserve freedom against those who would impose tyranny upon the world.

As we all know, this struggle suffered a severe blow in the tragic death last month of the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in whom the free world had found a leader of imagination, courage, and vigor. When the bullets of a mentally warped youth—a Marxist, I might point out—robbed us of this great leader, there were doubts of America's political stability and maturity expressed in some parts of the world. There was a question, implied if not expressed, that, if such a deed could be committed in the Uinted States of today, was the United States ready to assume the burden of leadership of the free world?

First, let me say again that this was the deed of a madman; he was a Marxist, yes; but probably his Marxism was incidental. In the past month I have read totally unfounded stories in the foreign press which hinted darkly that the assassination of President Kennedy was the result of a political plot—perpetrated either by rightists or leftists, depending upon the point of view of the writer. The possibility that the President was a victim of some sinister cabal has, of course, been thoroughly investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Not a shred of evidence has been unearthed to support such a possibility. In fact, no American President has ever been a victim of a political assassination, and by that I mean a plot to usurp power through the murder of the existing President. In every case, these crimes were the deeds of deranged men.

Our Government, like yours, is a government of law, not men; a government of free choice arrived at openly. Those in other parts of the world who feared that the assassination of President Kennedy would rob the United States of the power of decision at a critical time in world history obviously were not familiar with the democratic process. The death of a Chief Executive of the United States has never, even for a day, interrupted the continuity of its government. The Communist world, I am sure, took sober note of the smooth transition of power from President Kennedy to President Lyndon Baines Johnson—and noted too how swiftly the people of the United States closed ranks, regardless of their political attitudes, behind their new President. In his initial address to the Congress of the United States, President Johnson made two points crystal clear:

(1) That the death of President Kennedy would in no manner whatsoever lessen the resolve of the United States to further the cause of freedom everywhere.

(2) That the United States would continue to meet its worldwide commitments, military, and economic.

Thus you may rest assured that the United States will fulfill its international role. Obviously, my country cannot bear the full burden alone. In order to triumph in this global conflict between the free world and the slave, we must have dedicated, steadfast, and progressive allies. In the Republic of Korea we have such an ally, and in President Park we have the firm, purposeful leader demanded by the magnitude of the task before us.

Earlier, I mentioned the ties that bind your country and mine. Let us examine those ties again. It was here in Korea, on June 25, 1950, that communism unleased its first post-World War II assault on a then uncomprehending world. On that fateful day, 60,000 Communist-indoctrinated troops, led by 100 Russian-built tanks, struck a daggerlike blow at the free world everywhere. Let it be remembered that the United States—though still not recovered from the strain and shock of a bitter, global war—answered the Communist challenge without hesitation. With our gallant comrades in arms—notably the resolute troops of the Republic of Korea—we met the Communist onslaught and turned it back in bewildered defeat only to face at a later date the hordes of Communist Chinese. And these too we drove back, though greatly outnumbered. As a young infantry officer, I myself took part in that bloody conflict and was wounded in it; thus, like millions of my countrymen, I have a personal stake in preserving the freedom of your country.

All told, 5,720,000 Americans served here in Korea in the active phase of our joint battle against the Communists—and I say active because that war has never really ended. Of those almost 6 million Americans, 54,246 gave their lives here, and 103,284 were wounded. The casualties of the troops of the Republic of Korea were equally heavy. During the conflict and in the subsequent years the United States has gladly contributed $5.4 billion to keep the Republic of Korea militarily and economically strong. Today, 50,000 American troops still face the Communists along the truce line, where they stand shoulder to shoulder with your soldiers to make certain that never again will we be taken by surprise.

Thus we are bound by ties of blood and common aspiration; together we threw back our implacable foe and together we will contain that foe. Here in Korea you have proved that not even the upheaval of a terrible war—an unfinished war—can shake the basic strength of democracy nor impede its progress toward a better life for its people. In the United States we have shown that not even the shock of a President's assassination can shake the basic strength of a government of law nor impede its progress toward the fulfillment of the democratic ideal—the dignity of man. Our countries are indeed fortunate to have two strong leaders—President Park and President Johnson. Under them, I am certain we will achieve our common goals—security with honor and freedom with responsibility. Thank you.

A Rural Cooperative Administration for Rural Poverty Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the statement of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, northeast resources development meeting, Washington, D.C., January 8, 1964:

It is appropriate and fortunate that you are meeting in Washington at this particular time.

There is an atmosphere of tingling newness in Washington today that comes only at those times when a new President presents his program to a new session of Congress. It is a time of beginnings, a time of hope, and also a time of apprehension, for optimism in Washington is tempered always with an appreciation of political realities.

This is also a time when Washington and the country are moving out of a period of grief for the tragic death of President Kennedy. A great and brilliant man is dead—but the country lives and moves hopefully forward, as he wanted it to move forward.

Within about 3 hours from now, President Lyndon Johnson will make his first state of the Union address to a joint session of Congress. Many of the concepts he will present are ones he shared with President Kennedy because the problems of the country and the world do not change with a change in leadership. But there are indications that President Johnson will also challenge the Congress and all of us to deal forcefully and creatively with several areas of deep personal concern to him—and to us.

One of these is rural poverty. Too often in the past, poverty has been considered largely in terms of city slums. Programs to alleviate poverty have been concentrated on conditions in urban areas.

Yet it is a tragic fact that more than half of the poverty in this country exists in the rural areas. And poverty has many faces. There is, of course, the face of total destitution, in which hunger and misery exist side by side with the abundance of the American farm. The social and economic causes of total destitution are as many and as varied as the sociologists who have studied them. In a realistics sense, they can be attacked only through enlightened and long-range programs of education and readjustment. In the meantime, we can hope that better programs can be evolved to reduce the misery and ease the suffering of such unfortunate people.

But there are other faces of poverty in rural America short of utter destitution. There is poverty of opportunity, which is reducing many areas to a status similar to that of poor farms, in which once-proud and independent people find themselves dependent for a major share of their livelihood on various doles and subsidies.

I'm speaking of that wide sector of rural America—of farms and country towns—where the old greatly outnumber the young because the young have had to migrate to the cities like modern-day Oakies and Arkies, to the cities in a search of opportunity.

I'm speaking of those areas which have ceased to exist as communities of rural people—places where the stores are gone, churches are gone, banks are gone, country doctors are gone, and the people who are left live in the shadowy world of memory and regret.

It's true that the man who has a cow has milk for his children; that a man who can farm a few acres can feed his family, and perhaps sell enough produce to buy the basic necessities in life. If he's frugal enough, and his self-denial is great enough, he may even provide an education for his children—always with the thought that they will have something better, that they will be able to leave home and find a job somewhere.

They do leave—educated or not, jobs or no jobs. Behind, they leave stagnation and decay.

Surely this is not the American dream. Surely the time has come when we can bury false pride and speak honestly about what we see happening to rural America. Surely we can recognize the poverty of opportunity we see around us and do something about it.

It seems clear enough to me that the commodity farm programs, however good, have failed miserably to provide sufficient economic opportunity and stimulation in rural America. They have not filled the great void and vacuum, particularly in the marginal areas. I do not claim to be an expert in the farm commodities arena, and I don't know what the answer to the farm problems may be—if there is an answer. I know we must have commodity programs of some type, and I hope those who are wiser can evolve that part of the farm solution.

But I think the time has long since passed when we can depend on farming alone to sustain a rural economy. Rural America must be diversified. What we must have in order to get it is rural areas development on a much wider scale than anything we have known to date. We must develop appropriate industry and business in rural America, we must develop the great recreational potential, we must locate food and fiber processing plants out in the areas where the products are grown.

Many of these things must be done by cooperatives—because only as cooperatives can many enterprises survive in the marginal areas, and only through cooperatives can the benefits of such activity be retained there to further broaden the economic base.

We have dramatic proof in the rural electrification program that this approach will work. When commercial power companies refused to electrify rural America, even with the help of Rural Electrification Administration loans, it became the policy of the Government to encourage and assist in the creation of cooperatives to do the job.

Today, the vast network of rural electric and, to an extent, rural telephone cooperatives, is composed of home-owned, nonprofit, dynamic corporate organizations virtually blanketing the regions of greatest rural need.

The rural electrification program has been, and is, the one bright spot in a tragically declining rural America. Certainly it ably demonstrates that intelligent and realistic cooperation between the Government and its people can meet human needs and accomplish economic miracles—and do these things within the framework of an enlightened free enterprise system.

The nearly 1,000 electric cooperatives are taking the lead in some effective rural areas development but find their tools and resources totally inadequate for the task.

There is a great body of law dating back over the century, including that creating the Department of Agriculture, in which Congress has directed USDA and other agencies to promote and support farm and rural cooperatives—but these laws are now totally inadequate.

As you know so well, the Department of Agriculture is sponsoring and assisting in the rural areas development program, and it's fine as far as it goes. But USDA has no new law to support RAD and, at best, RAD is only an attempt to coordinate the existing programs of various agencies.

The Area Redevelopment Administration has been and is also helpful, but for various reasons it has not been the dynamic undertaking so many people envisioned when the legislation was passed.

In my opinion, we need a Rural Cooperatives Administration in the Department of Agriculture, charged with the responsibility of developing new cooperative organizations in rural America, and backed by the resources and authority needed to do a dynamic job in the style of the REA of the 1930's and 1940's. This agency, which might include many of the present cooperative functions of the Department of Agriculture, would be directed to get out and promote and help organize a variety of cooperative organizations. In my opinion, this Rural Cooperatives Administration should have the type of loan-making authority which REA now has—because in addition to leadership, the greatest need of the new cooperatives would be for the capital to get started.

The rural cooperatives would, of course, be nonprofit in nature and would serve as a tremendous stimulant to the entire rural economy, including the profit sector. It often happens that many activities which are not considered sufficiently profitable for established concerns to undertake must be performed on a nonprofit basis, either by the Government or by the people themselves through cooperatives. Of the two, the cooperative approach is by far the most desirable. We are convinced of this because of our experiences with our program here at home and our efforts to help develop rural electric cooperatives in the Latin American countries.

It seems to me that this would be a dynamic and realistic approach to eliminating the poverty of opportunity in rural America. I think it is the kind of direct action program which might appeal to President Johnson, because of his intimate personal experience with the establishment of the rural electric cooperatives in Texas. He saw the effect in his own home, his own community, and his own State when the rural electrics were created.

It might also appeal to the Congress, which for a hundred years has urged and supported cooperative-type enterprises in the rural areas.

It is true, too, that President Johnson was directly involved in the New Deal programs and philosophy which produced REA. He is not the kind of man to be either blinded or intimidated by the selfish interests who scream about various kinds of "isms" whenever a new idea is proposed. This is the kind of imaginative leadership rural America must have in this time of great need.

One of the regions most troubled by the poverty of opportunity includes parts of several of the States represented at this meeting—the region broadly defined as "Appalachia." Much of this area is now chronically depressed and cries out for strong and direct action in restoring economic opportunity.

The area of Appalachia has enormous social and economic problems, similar in many respects to those of the Tennessee Valley in the 1930's. The Nation proved, through the multiple resource development activities of TVA, that such problems can be solved. TVA is a worldwide symbol of intelligent planning and dynamic action.

But is a TVA-type development being considered for Appalachia? No. The pleas of the people of that region are drowned out by the pompous opposition of those who are professional haters of the TVA approach to regional development.

The Kennedy administration was deeply committed to developing a program to aid Appalachia. A Commission was appointed to study the problem and develop a plan of action. It has submitted its report to the President. Hearings have been held throughout the area. The power company spokesmen showed up en masse to argue against any TVA concept. When a subcommittee of the Commission reported favorably on the desirability of further developing the power resources of the region, the power companies screamed about proposals for a TVA-type organization.

And what happened? According to the New York Times, Mr. John Sweeney, the Executive Director of the Commission, rushed to deny that the Commission had ever "entertained the idea of creating another Tennessee Valley Authority as part of the general assault on the poverty of the area." This statement was made, according to the Times, after Don. B. Potter, president of the Monongahela Power Co. warned Federal officials that "the very mention of TVA sends everybody's bristles up."

Is this what we have come to in this country? Are Presidential commissions so afraid of offending special interests that they won't even consider something those interests don't like? I can inform Mr. Sweeney that it is only the bristles of the power companies and the coal companies and their allies which rise at the mention of TVA. Every public opinion poll taken in the past few years, including those sponsored by the power companies, shows overwhelming popular support for TVA.

I don't know whether the creation of a carbon copy of TVA for Appalachia is a good idea or not. Many people think so. I do know that if this troubled area is to be helped, the electric power resources, both hydro and steam, must be developed. We have studies which show that power from mine-mouth, steam-electric plants in West Virginia can be delivered to New York City at a cost less than that produced at the most efficient plant of the Consolidated Edison Co. in the city. It seems to me there is something significant about this, particularly since New York industrialists are complaining bitterly about the Chinese wall of high power rates around the city.

With the modern transmission techniques now at our disposal, cheap electric power from Appalachia could be transported easily to the load centers of most of the rural electric systems in the Northeast, at a cost far below what your co-ops are now paying the commercial companies for their wholesale supply. There is a ready and expanding market for all the power which can be developed in Appalachia, hydroelectric and coal. This is the chief marketable resource of the region—and any development plan which ignores it will be totally unrealistic and ineffective.

And if Appalachia wholesale power, most of which no doubt would be purchased by the power companies—if that power would be cheaper in New York City, it would be even cheaper in Wilkes-Barre, Scranton, Wheeling, and Harlan. This would contrast with the fact that the cost of retail power to the

consumers throughout Appalachia is among the highest in the Nation. Ridiculous when we consider that Appalachia is undergirded with the Nation's principal low-cost coal reserves and contains substantial hydroelectric potential, particularly for electric system peaking usage.

Whatever variations of TVA might be required to meet local conditions, I strongly urge the development of a regional, TVA-type organization to attack the poverty of opportunity which is now so widespread in Appalachia. And I urge that it be accompanied by the development of new cooperative organizations that can take full advantage of the region's human and natural resources.

There is no inconsistency between a TVA-type organization for a given area and a Rural Cooperatives Administration, any more than in TVA where all the power in the rural areas is produced by TVA but distributed by 52 electric cooperatives. Each approach can stand alone, but for an area like Appalachia, both are needed.

I commend all of you for your determination to continue the fight for the development of the power resources of the Northeast. I only wish every region of the country would do what you are doing. The mere fact that this annual meeting would attract such a variety of top-caliber speakers from the Senate and White House and the Government agencies is an indication that you're moving under a full head of steam and your efforts are getting the recognition they deserve.

Keep up the fight. You're going to succeed, because you must succeed.

Communist Party Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the House and of the citizens of Michigan and Detroit particularly, to a matter of very serious concern.

I have recently learned that a John F. Kennedy Memorial Tribute Committee meeting scheduled to be held next Sunday, January 12, in the auditorium of the Copernicus Junior High School in Hamtramck, Mich., is in fact a Communist Party affair.

The gathering, ostensibly sponsored as a memorial meeting commemorating the death of President Kennedy, is actually a Communist Party ad hoc committee meeting under the auspices of the Communist Party of Detroit.

This Communist Party ad hoc committee has made arrangements for the use of the Copernicus Junior High School auditorium at 11410 Charest, Hamtramck, and the Detroit Communist Party group is going all out to make the meeting a huge success.

It is my further information that Coleman Young, a Negro leader for many years in the Michigan district of the Communist Party and currently affiliated with the Communist Party, U.S.A., is scheduled to be a speaker at this rally. Young reportedly is also being promoted as a candidate for Congress in the next election.

The Communist Party ad hoc committee has sent letters under the name of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Tribute Committee to prominent political leaders announcing the meeting as being sponsored by "Americans of Polish Descent" in honor of the late President's memory.

My purpose in calling this to the attention of the House is to alert prospective invitees and participants to the actual nature and sponsorship of this meeting.

Address by NAACP Chairman Donald Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Buffalo, N.Y., NAACP Chairman Donald Lee:

ADDRESS BY NAACP CHAIRMAN DONALD LEE

Ladies and gentlemen, honored guests, and fellow participants of the first annual labor conference of the Buffalo Branch, NAACP: It is my pleasure to welcome you, on behalf of the labor and industry committee to the beginning, or what we believe is the beginning, of a series of programs designed to acquaint the community in general with the problems and opportunities that are present in the labor scene. I am especially pleased to have present at this conference Mr. Odell Clark who has in his address summed up, as a commanding general must, the total battle scene, or, rather, labor picture. We now address ourselves specifically to the city of Buffalo.

Buffalo, the city of good neighbors, will be put to a series of severe tests in 1964. We of the Negro community who have seen token progress in human rights during the last months of 1963 are determined to achieve more progress in 1964. We are determined to ascertain whether this is truly a city of good neighbors.

We of the labor committee find it impossible to accept the feeling of many white and some Negro Buffalonians, that discrimination does not exist in our fair city. We cannot ignore the many, many people who have walked in and out of our office with complaint after complaint. We are resigned to the fact that Buffalo, like an ostrich which buries its head in the sand, waiting for trouble to leave; has forgotten that she has bared to the world not only her most vulnerable spot, but also an extremely ugly spectacle. So, while we close our eyes and ears, reality remains unchanged. The problem must have a solution. We say the only solution is full equality now.

Our people will no longer listen to token words intended to build false hopes. We want action now. We are tired of ghettos; we are tired of lies; we are tired of people thinking for us; we are tired of being the last hired and first fired; we are tired of being underpaid; we are tired of welfare and handouts; we are sick of being unemployed; we are sick of frustrations; we are sick of being second-class Americans; we are sick of "Uncle Toms" and most of all we are sick of you, "Mr. Charlie." We are sick of your preachments of brotherhood and love. We are sick of turning the other cheek; so now we turn to direct action.

The Negro of Buffalo, though a mite resistant, has found true dignity in a picket line, exercising his democratic right of freedom of protest. After years of praying to God about our problems, we now take heed to the phrase "The Lord helps them who help themselves." When we pray now, we pray to God that truth and justice shall overcome. We want job equality now.

We, the citizens of Buffalo, realize we must not only stage demonstrations, but make full use of the dollar. We shall buy where we are employed and are treated with respect, for in the words of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, "God the Father, God the Son, and God the almighty dollar." That is the white man's holy trinity.

We are here today, not to boycott or demonstrate, but to determine what some of our problems are and what we must do to solve them. We are proud to live in New York State, which has such esteem for human dignity that several years ago a law was passed banning discrimination based on age. But, before we reach this particular situation, we would like to see solved the problem of color.

Not wanting to bore you with figures, we feel all areas of employment must be open to the Negro in order for him to have a future in labor, especially those positions termed "white man's jobs."

Our speakers today are quite fluent in their respective fields, but we should like to pose some questions before you enter your workshops.

(1) Women in general—what can be done to assure that after our girls have spent time and money on advanced training such as IBM, etc., that industry will begin to accept them on their qualifications?

(2) Automation—since our unemployment figures are three times as high as the white work force, we feel a shorter work week must be considered in this workshop.

(3) Manpower retraining and industrial placements—what can or is being done to insure that Negroes are not victims of discrimination in these two areas? Why don't we have more Negro placement interviewers?

(4) Human rights—how can you educate the public in general as to their rights and privileges and restore the public confidence in your agency?

(5) Unions—what can unions do to help in the question of equal opportunity in employment? What can be done about lily-white unions which lead to lily-white trades?

(6) Apprentice and training—it is obvious to the Labor Committee, Jim Crow leadership leads to Jim Crow policy. The question is what can be done to increase the incidence of Negro apprentices in the trades you have jurisdiction over?

We hope these and many other questions will be asked and answered, and a successful conference evolve from them. We believe in this our city. To those so-called liberals, both black and white, who say go slow, or don't demonstrate, we can only state that if we achieved full equality tomorrow, it would still be 187 years too late. Speed, my friends, becomes a matter of how free you are. So, you carry your cross and I'll carry mine, and we'll walk freedom's road together. We shall make democracy work. This could happen only in America.

Happy Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, through the years the Honorable James A. Farley has become a very well-known and pop-

ular figure on the American scene. As Democratic national chairman, as Postmaster General, and now as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., he has often been in the spotlight. However, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an article from the December 5, 1963, New York Daily News which reports an interesting, but little known, piece of American history in which he played a major role.

The article follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Dec. 5, 1963]

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY

On December 5, 1933—30 years ago today—Utah became the 36th State to ratify the 21st amendment to the Constitution, thereby making this amendment law.

The 21st repealed the 18th, which for almost 14 years had been trying to ram Federal prohibition down the American gullet.

James A. Farley—whom may the good Lord bless and keep—was the individual hero of this drama.

As Postmaster General in the first F. D. Roosevelt administration, which took office March 4, 1933, Mr. Farley let the State legislatures know that Federal patronage would be pretty much withheld by him as dispenser in chief of choice Federal jobs until the needed 36 State ratifications of the repeal amendment were in. Hence the breakneck speed with which repeal was achieved.

So ended a disastrous attempt to regulate people's personal habits by law.

John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 871) providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have listened this afternoon to what I consider to be one of the greatest speeches ever delivered by a President of the United States on the real problems facing our people and our Nation. He talked about 40 million American people within the confines of the United States who are going daily without either enough to eat, enough to wear, without adequate housing, without adequate funds to pay their medical bills, or without jobs. That is 40 million Americans living in poverty.

I especially liked that part of his speech which I thought was the keynote of his address when he said:

> Let us now here resolve to declare unconditional war on poverty within the United States of America.

I applaud him for that statement, and I shall back him in that unconditional declaration of war on poverty.

However, I cannot reconcile that news media of our Nation within the next few hours will have headlines "The Congress's first answer to President Johnson's plea for an unconditional war against poverty in our land was to borrow $31 million to build a palace of culture in the Nation's Capital." I cannot reconcile doing that at this time.

I believe in a fitting memorial for the late President, John F. Kennedy. He was a great President. He gave this country a feeling of hope and something new that was very much needed. I was a personal friend of his. On many occasions I left my friends on the left and joined with you people on the right in helping him with his program. I believe that he tried to do the best for America. I loved him. I fairly worshiped the man. But I do not think we are going at this thing in the right way.

Very frankly, I thought deeply about this over the Christmas holidays. I more came to the conclusion that there is too much obvious commercialism behind this thing. A project that was destined to failure is using the tragic event to use the President's name to obviate a failure.

It reminds me of a book I read recently written by a woman in California on the high cost of dying. There is too much of the aspect of the undertakers taking advantage of the emotions, of the fears and the sadness of the bereaved in trying to extract from them every dollar that they possibly can before the body is cold. This bill gives me too much of that kind of an impression.

A memorial for President Kennedy? Yes, by all means. But let us give him a fitting memorial representative of his life and his work. A memorial resurrecting a failure is not a true memorial. A memorial on borrowed money is not a true memorial. Let us appoint a congressional committee as was done for President Lincoln to come up with a memorial of real meaning and one befitting the whole character of a great President.

Support for H.R. 9548

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1963, I introduced H.R. 9548 which would prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking functions, specifically accounting and bookkeeping that would not ordinarily come within the traditional concept of banking. I have received the following letter supporting this bill and expressing what are some good reasons for its enactment. I commend the letter to the attention of our colleagues:

BANK OF UTAH,
January 2, 1964.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. Congressman,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Banker issue of December 23, 1963, and December 24 carried an interesting article on legislation introduced by you to place bankers back in the banking business and confining accounting to that honorable profession.

The story of your legislation has also been featured in the business section of one of Utah's largest newspapers, the Deseret News. The writer, in addition to calling attention to your aims, mentions the fact that this would be a blessing to the little banks all over the country who are being squeezed into big consolidation by well-healed banks with expensive automation equipment offering to do all of the accounting and payrolls of customers in return for allowing them to freeze into their bank the recipient's account, and, worst of all, every employee's account, which is 100 percent monopoly. This is happening in this area and the Federal Reserve Board throws up its hands and offers no interest.

I don't know of anything, Congressman, that would do more in the next few years to destroy little banks than this selfishness on the part of big institutions to reach out in other professional fields to pay for their expensive equipment.

I congratulate you and hope that this potential aid for your legislation will interest you.

Respectfully,

FRANK M. BROWNING,
Chairman of the Board.

Contradictions in Administration's Wheat Sale Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, two articles which appeared side by side in the New York Times January 8, 1964, highlight once more the monumental side-by-side contradictions in the administration's policy of wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

The first describes CIA's conclusion that the U.S.S.R.'s chronic agricultural woes have been a major reason for the recent massive slowdown in Soviet economic growth.

The second shows that the administration is relentlessly eager to bail the Soviet economy out by means of the wheat sale, among other things, without a convincing quid pro quo from the Soviets. Secretary Freeman is so eager, in fact, that in effect the U.S. taxpayer is now subsidizing the U.S.S.R.'s shipping costs for the wheat. He not only is reversing the previous denials of agricultural officials that shipping costs would be offset by the selling price of the wheat; he is also flatly contradicting the promise of President Kennedy in his October 9 statement that no subsidy to the foreign purchaser would be involved.

I certainly wish the administration would spell out what it hopes to gain internationally and how far it hopes to go in building up Soviet economic power and, consequently, the U.S.S.R.'s worldwide mischiefmaking capability.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the two news articles:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 8, 1964]

SHARP SLOWDOWN IN SOVIET GROWTH REPORTED BY CIA—AGENCY PUTS ECONOMIC RISE AT 2.5 PERCENT YEARLY, BELOW THE U.S. LEVEL—GOLD RESERVE FALLING—FARMING SETBACK AND SHIFT IN INVESTMENT BELIEVED RESPONSIBLE FOR LAG

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 7.—An exhaustive analysis by the Central Intelligence Agency has concluded that the Soviet Union's economic growth in the last 2 years has been less than 2.5 percent annually, well under the rate of the United States.

In addition, the CIA has concluded that Soviet gold reserves have fallen to less than $2 billion, far below estimates made elsewhere. These conclusions have been made public by the Agency.

The CIA put the value of the Soviet gross national product, or total output of goods and services, last year at about $260 billion, slightly less than half that of the United States. The United States is widening the gap each year at recent growth rates, according to the report, and this widening is expected to continue.

The Central Intelligence Agency has virtually exclusive responsibility in the U.S. Government for evaluating the Soviet economy. Several hundred economists and other analysts work full time on the question. They primarily use published sources, which are now numerous, but the information is supplemented by some data obtained clandestinely.

GROWTH SLOWED ABRUPTLY

Like many other analysts, the CIA experts concluded that Soviet economic growth in the postwar period was rapid until the last few years. While the rate varied from year to year, it was usually between 6 and 10 percent, well above the U.S. average of 2.5 to 3.5 percent.

In the last 3 years, partly as a result of a surge in 1961 following a recession, the U.S. growth rate has averaged about 5 percent. The official estimate for the next year is also 5 percent.

For the future, the CIA analysts expect that the Soviet Union will be able to improve upon the poor performance of 1962 and 1963.

However, they do not believe that the Russians will be able to return to the growth rates of the earlier postwar period. A growth in the range of 4 to 5 percent, about the same as that of the United States, is considered a reasonable prospect.

Since these are percentages and the United States has a much higher base, such a result would mean that the gap between the two economies would continue to widen in absolute terms.

In addition to the slowdown in the Soviet growth rate, the CIA has also detected a major reduction in the rate of growth in investment—the base for future growth. In 1962 and 1963 each, total investment rose only 4 to 5 percent, far less than in the earlier postwar period.

The CIA analysts develop a figure for the Soviet gross national product by valuing in dollar terms the output of all the sectors of the Soviet economy. The Soviet Union does not use the concept of gross national product in its statistics.

SOVIET CONCLUSIONS DIFFER

Soviet figures on industrial production alone would indicate much less of a slowdown in overall growth than the CIA's conclusions. However, the CIA is confident that its analysis is correct, based on various techniques of evaluating Soviet official statistics and other information.

There is no doubt in the mind of the analysts that the Soviet rate of growth has slowed greatly in the last 2 years, although they do not say that their figures are correct to the last dollar.

The analysts stress that their picture is not one of an economy in collapse or suffering from such ills as unemployment. But neither is the Soviet economy any longer a world pacemaker in expansion and growth. Every major non-Communist industrial nation has exceeded the Soviet growth rate in the last 2 years.

Three major reasons are given for the slowdown in economic growth.

The first is a shift in the so-called mix of the Soviet economy, that is, investment away from the heavy industries, raw materials and power supply toward the more sophisticated elements of modern industry.

"It was easier to build more and more steel mills and cement plants and hydroelectric dams than it is to build chemical plants and diversified consumer goods," one analyst said.

ARMS AND SPACE COSTS CITED

The second reason has been a very large increase in military and space spending since about 1957 or 1958. While this counts as a part of the gross national product, it is antigrowth in that it takes resources and personnel from productive investment.

This has been particularly true since the shift of the military effort toward modern weapons such as missiles.

The third reason is the serious decline in agricultural output in the last 2 years. The CIA now calculates that the total Soviet food production this year will be only about 3 percent above 1956 and, on a per capita basis, will actually be 7 or 8 percent less than in 1956. Wheat output last year is put at a minimum of 10 million tons below 1962.

Part of the problem results from bad weather. In the peak Soviet agricultural year, 1961, food output was 20 percent above 1956.

The analysts are careful not to attribute the serious worsening of the Soviet position to the nature of the state-controlled Soviet economic system as such, though they say this could be a factor.

The CIA analysts foresee no decline in the Soviet resources devoted to modern weapons, though there might be small cutbacks in conventional forces. Nor is there expected to be any easing of the investment problem posed by the move away from the simpler basic industries.

Thus the overstrain on the economy, in the sense of a shortage of human and material resources for investment, is expected to continue, even with some improvement in farm output. The best course for Moscow, it is believed, would be to find extra resources, in the form of plants and equipment, in the West.

However, given the low level of Soviet gold reserves, this could be done only if the Western nations were willing to sell on credit, preferably, from the Soviet viewpoint, credit of more than 5-year terms.

This reasoning is a factor behind the strong U.S. drive in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to get agreement on a limitation of credit terms extended by West European countries to the Soviet Union.

Soviet gold production is put at about $150 million annually. Moscow's sales of gold in the West have been running at more than $200 million a year, and last year were a little more than $400 million.

Thus, gold sales cannot finance a big extra volume of Soviet imports of capital equipment from the West. Credit terms would be essential, the CIA believes.

The Russians have approached suppliers in Britain with specific proposals for purchases on terms running well beyond 5 years. They are not believed to have been successful, but the British Government refuses to make a binding decision barring such terms.

GAIN ASSERTED BY SOVIET

The chief Soviet economic planner, Pyotr F. Lomako, asserted last month that his country was continuing to gain on the United States in industrial production.

Mr. Lomako asserted that Soviet industrial production in 1963 was 65 percent of that of the United States, a gain of 2 percentage points over the 63-percent ratio that the Soviet Union reported for 1962.

While the Central Intelligence Agency estimates that the annual Soviet economic growth during the last 2 years was less than 2.5 percent, the Soviet Union asserts that in 1962 alone its national income—a concept similar to gross national product—rose 6 percent.

Last month Premier Khrushchev denounced speculation in the West that the Soviet Union would need credits to realize its ambitious chemical expansion program. He asserted that the Soviet Union would be able, if necessary, to achieve the chemical production goals from its own resources.

While acknowledging that Soviet grain production had fallen last year, Mr. Khrushchev spoke glowingly of what he asserted were continued high rates of industrial growth. He said that Soviet cotton production last year was the highest in the country's history.

The Premier gave the first absolute figures on the growth of production of key commodities last year; these data are compared as follows with the corresponding output figures for 1961 and 1962 (all data are in millions of metric tons except for electricity, which is given in billions of kilowatt-hours, and shoes, stated in millions of pairs).

	1961	1962	1963
Steel	70.8	76.3	80.0
Oil	166.0	186.0	205.5
Electricity	328.0	369.0	411.6
Cement	50.9	57.3	60.3
Shoes	443.0	456.0	461.0
Fertilizers	15.3	17.3	20.0

Many Western observers have noted that in the last 2 years the Soviet economy was showing signs of slowing somewhat from the rapid growth rate of the 1950's. But the estimate of the slowdown made public by the CIA yesterday appears to be far more radical than any other yet published in the West by a responsible source.

Specialists on the Soviet economy have been aware for many years that comparisons of Soviet and American economic growth are full of pitfalls, and that even analysts who accept the same basic data may come to rather different conclusions.

One difficulty arises from the question of what to measure. The Soviet analysts include in their estimates of Soviet production only the output of material goods—steel, grain, shoes, etc.—and leave out the production of services—haircuts, medical services, the work of teachers, etc.

American analysts include both material production and services in their analyses. The two different definitions tend to produce differences in final evaluations.

A second difficulty arises from the lack of an unambiguous way of adding up production of different goods and services. Should output be valued at Soviet prices or American prices? Experiments have been made in the United States in which the same group of production targets have been valued in both Soviet and American prices. Significantly different results could be obtained, depending upon which price system was employed.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 8, 1964]

HODGES SAYS BIG WHEAT SUBSIDY IS DESIGNED TO CUT SOVIET COSTS

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, January 7.—Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said today that

the price of Durum wheat sold to the Soviet Union by a private trader last week had been specially arranged by the Government to offset part of the cost of shipping.

Mr. Hodges freely discussed this aspect of the arrangement at a press conference. The point was specifically denied by Agriculture Department officials last week.

Mr. Hodges said he was not familiar with every detail of the transaction. But he said, "It is my understanding that the price of some of the wheat was set so the seller would be able to absorb part of the shipping cost."

Transporting at least half the grain in American ships, whose rates are higher than the rates of others, is required under rules laid down by President Kennedy for the transaction. The extra cost stalled negotiations for the wheat sale for some weeks, while the Russians sought a less expensive deal.

COMPANY GETS SUBSIDY

The Agriculture Department agreed to pay a subsidy of 72 cents a bushel to the Continental Grain Co. on the 350,000 tons of Durum wheat included in last week's $90-million sale. There are about 37 bushels to a ton of wheat.

The subsidy was as much as 14 cents higher than other recent subsidy payments on Durum wheat.

Agriculture officials had flatly denied that the large subsidy was in any way an attempt to offset shipping costs. They said they would have approved a 72-cent subsidy on any transaction as large as the Russian sale "regardless of the country of destination."

The subsidy on export sales of wheat is paid to the exporter to enable him to meet the world price for wheat. The American price is higher than the world price.

A total subsidy of about $25 million was paid on the million-ton sale to Russia, of which the Durum wheat constituted about a third.

TOTAL COST $78.5 MILLION

Thus, wheat valued at $90 million in this country will be bought by the Soviet Government for $65 million, plus the costs of transportation. The total bill to the Russian Government, including transportation costs, is estimated at $78.5 million.

Mr. Hodges also announced today that the Commerce Department had granted additional licenses to export grain and other products to the Soviet Union and its European satellites.

The new licenses authorize the sale of $42 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union, $9 million in wheat to Bulgaria, $545,000 in raw cotton to Hungary and $133,000 in tobacco to East Germany.

In addition, the Commerce Department announced that it had amended two licenses issued in November for the sale of wheat to Hungary, increasing the permissible quantity to be sold. A license originally issued for $7,538,000 worth was increased to $8,292,000 and a separate license originally issued for $8 million worth was increased to $8,855,000.

In Memory of John F. Kennedy: He Passed Our Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy by Miss Marty Hale, the "Old Spinner," of Steubenville, Ohio:

IN MEMORY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY: HE PASSED OUR WAY

He passed our way and left for us a smile,
A handshake that was friendly and sincere.
There seemed no barriers nor wall between,
He had a voice that seemed to draw us near;

Not a sophisticate with put-on airs,
A manner that was warm and down to earth,
These were the sort of things we loved him for,
The thing for which the whole world knew his worth;

Our leader and our friend he went his way.
And left us saddened as we saw him go;
A wave of hand, a smile and he was gone,
His country stunned beneath the crushing blow.

With heart and soul he sought to do God's will;
And as we watched his cortege pass today,
With silent prayer for those he left behind,
We thanked the good Lord that he passed our way.

He passed our way and left his legacy,
A touch of God we had not known before;
The years will find the world remembering
His own to love his name forevermore.

He left for us the will to carry on,
And right the wrongs for which our country cries.
His dauntless spirit will keep urging us,
Like the eternal flame that never dies.

His loved America will dry her tears.
Another hand will carry on, his way;
And as we strive our hearts repeat these words,
The world is better that he passed our way.

MARTY HALE.

Reappraisal of Administration Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place into the RECORD an article which appeared in the Macedonian Tribune, Indianapolis, Ind., December 5, 1963, as translated from the original Bulgarian language.

The article speaks for itself in pointing up once again the misguided nature of our policy of coexistence with the Communist Government of Yugoslavia. Foreign policy collapse of the last 3 years continues unabated, and I only hope that by presentation of facts such as these, the public might be alerted and demand a complete reappraisal of administration foreign policy.

REAPPRAISAL OF ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICY

In its issue of November 16 the New York Times published an article which had appeared in the Vienna Cronnen Zeitung. The article describes the modern piracy perpetrated by the Tito's Communist regime. The Vienna newspaper printed facts and information from its Trieste correspondent which show how Yugoslavia produces and does business with "American" cigarettes, "Italian" shoes, "Swedish" glass and glassware and other goods bearing foreign titles. With masterfully falsified labels these goods are illegally shipped to the countries of the western democracies for sale on the open market.

The Vienna newspaper made mention of the fact that Italian authorities have confiscated such "Made in America" cigarettes on fishing boats on the Adriatic seacoast and that they lodged a protest with the Belgrade Government. The sole result of that protest, according to the paper, was the dismissal of the manager of one of the firms in Rovin whose factory had engaged in producing the American brand cigarettes Pall-Mall, Winston, Chesterfield, etc.

On different occasions we have commented in this publication on this particular subject. Many Italian and Croatian immigrant newspapers have also written on this same subject.

At one time a factory in the city of Scopje produced American cigarettes most of which were shipped to Western markets to compete with the genuine American brands.

It is a well-known fact that the opium which is produced in Macedonia under Yugoslav rule is put at the disposal of the UDBA, the secret and feared police. After the opium has been properly prepared and sorted the UDBA finds illegal ways and means to dispose of it in the Western World. Unquestionably part of these shipments find their way in the United States in order to help undermine the American "capitalistic" society.

As far as we are concerned it is only very natural that the Tito's regime should engage in such contrabands because it came to power in a way of a contraband. An impartial international investigation will reveal even more inconceivable deeds of these modern pirates. How is it that so far no one has tried to enforce the existing international rules and regulations covering deals of this kind? Does anyone doubt that all of this is done with the complete knowledge and consent of the government of Tito? Such being the case we ask "the experts," should these international pirates be granted the privilege of the most-favored-nation clause by our Government in Washington? We must not forget that through such contrabands the modern pirates inflict moral and material damage on American firms.

Doctors the Same the World O'er

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of January 4, 1964, by Arthur Hoppe, entitled "Doctors the Same the World O'er."

[From the (Washington) Evening Star, Jan. 4, 1964]

DOCTORS THE SAME THE WORLD O'ER—AMA (AFRICAN MEDICINEMEN ASSOCIATION) VIOLENTLY OPPOSES SOCIALIZED WITCHCRAFT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

It's always gratifying when these newly emerging African nations model their customs after ours. So I'm pleased to report that in Kenya, which only emerged 3

weeks ago, they're already having a fight over socialized medicine. Just like here.

The reason I know this is an old friend now in Kenya sent me a clipping from a Mombasa paper. It says:

"An organization to deal with all harmful witchdoctors has been established in Mombasa, the Luo Anti-Magic and Witchdoctors Association. The association has nothing against useful witchdoctors, its president said, but would like to see them registered by the government. The association would also approach the government so that fees for witchdoctors who are approved can be set."

That's all the clipping says. But you can be sure a radical proposal like this will meet stiff opposition. From, I presume, the powerful African Medicinemen Association. Or AMA. Because, as you know, the AMA is everywhere violently opposed to socialized witchcraft.

Oh, I can see the AMA president rising in righteous indignation before the AMA convention. His name is probably something like Dr. Worthhelmer P. D. Mbonga. And he is, I would guess, a prominent Nairobi eye, ear, nose, throat and entrails specialist.

"Fellow members of the most revered profession in the whole wide world," he cries, shaking his ju-ju stick in anger, "these vicious proposals are aimed at the heart of organized witchcraft. They would, I need not tell you, destroy the sacred witchdoctor-patient relationship."

The vast convention hut is filled with shouts of outrage as the assembled witchdoctors beat their gabunga drums and toss their kubu-feathered headdresses into air.

"Will we submit to being registered by some government clerk who couldn't pass freshman demonology?" continues Dr. Mbonga, his necklace of hubugu bones rattling in rage. "Worse, will we allow this self-same clerk to set the fees we charge? A standardized fee schedule. This way, gentlemen, leads to totalitarianism.

"Imagine. We would be allowed, I presume, a flat 12 casabas, two yams and an old goat for, say, driving out an evil spirit. But we members of our sacred profession know that this can entail a simple, inexpensive treatment or an incredibly delicate, costly operation. Depending on the patient's condition, complications, and bank account.

"Who else but we men of science understands what we do? Who else knows the long years of arduous training we must undergo, disemboweling chickens? Who else, then, can decide what our highly skilled services are worth? Gentlemen, we must defend to our last gasp the inalienable right of us sacred African witchdoctors to charge what the traffic will bear."

The AMA delegates, at a fever pitch, vote unanimously to assess themselves 125 calabashes apiece to fight the proposals. Each then models a small statue of a government official. And the convention ends with all delegates gathered around a slow fire for a monster effigy barbecue.

Just like here.

Here's How To Play Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the January 6, 1964, issue of the Los Angeles Times contains highly noteworthy comments on the Federal budget.

In the editorial, entitled "Here's How To Play Budget," the Times comments on the preparation of the budget and states that the goal seems to be to allow an administration to increase spending and yet at the same time to appear economy minded.

On the basis of the information on the budget contained in the state of the Union message, the Times analysis seems highly prophetic.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Los Angeles Times editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

HERE'S HOW TO PLAY BUDGET

The favorite indoor sport at the White House these days is the budgetary "numbers game." It is a pastime requiring great skill, for the goal seems to be to allow an administration to increase spending and yet at the same time to appear economy minded.

Thus the $100 billion budget President Johnson will submit is made to seem a triumph of frugality, in spite of the fact that it is more than $1 billion higher than the present spending total and would be the biggest peacetime budget in history.

This is done by issuing an early announcement that the proposed budget for the next fiscal year will be somewhere between $102.3 and $103.5 billion. The original estimate is then pared down in a series of well-publicized if somewhat ambiguous reductions.

Congress, however, will be in no mood to play games when the President's actual budget recommendations are presented later this month.

The No. 1 item on the Capitol Hill agenda this year is enactment of a tax cut to stimulate the economy. Congress, and the Nation, will be taking the calculated risk that the certain immediate loss of tax income will be eventually offset by additional revenue resulting from increased employment and production.

But a major tax reduction, such as the $11 billion cut passed by the House, cannot be justified if Government spending is not also restrained. The most optimistic proponents admit that no substantial revenue benefits from the tax cut will be felt for at least a year.

Members of Congress, therefore, will be wondering just what a White House spokesman meant when he said the President feels that budget cutbacks will give the administration economic room to move on a whole range of social problems which up to now has been impossible.

They will want to know, for instance, how Mr. Johnson can rationalize his proposed vast new housing program while preaching economy and urging a tax cut.

There is broad popular support for a tax reduction, but the President is misreading the public attitude if he assumes that he can use money saved in one part of the budget to add new spending programs.

And Congressmen would do well to remember that they have a responsibility not only to check White House spending but also to curb their own pork barrel appropriations.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

My Private War With Hoffa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 10, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the January 4–11, 1964, issue of the Saturday Evening Post carries an article written by a prominent fellow-Nebraskan and a good friend of mine, Mr. Tom Coffey.

Many of my colleagues will remember Mr. Coffey as one of the "star witnesses" who in 1958 appeared before the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. Mr. Coffey's article is appropriately titled "My Private War With Hoffa" and details the outrageous treatment he received at the hands of the Teamsters boss and his henchmen. Although Mr. Coffey won the legal battles in his "private war," he was forced out of business. Mr. Coffey now is city manager of Sidney, Nebr.

The testimony given our committee by Mr. Coffey was in large part responsible for tightening prohibitions against secondary boycotts as a part of the Landrum-Griffin Act, signed into law in 1959.

With Teamsters Boss Hoffa now trying to further enhance his hold on a large and important segment of the Nation's transportation system through nationwide contracts, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY PRIVATE WAR WITH HOFFA

(By Tom Coffey)

When I read these days about Jimmy Hoffa's drive to negotiate a nationwide trucking contract for his Brotherhood of Teamsters, I can't help thinking of my own war with Hoffa which lasted nearly 17 years. Jimmy has come a long way since I first met him. Not only is he pressing to control all trucking everywhere in the United States; he also wants $600 million in wages and benefits over the next 3 years for his 1.5 million Teamsters—already the biggest, richest (assets of $1 billion) and most powerful union in the Nation. If Jimmy Hoffa gets his way, he could easily strangle the country with a nationwide strike.

The stakes in my war with Hoffa, weren't that big, but they were everything I had. I'd started with a single, battered four-wheel International during the great depression and I'd built a truckline that gave 35 families a good living. I had 25 big red Coffey Transfer rigs rolling freight in and out of 90 Nebraska and Kansas towns, and our $100,000 payroll was the biggest thing in Alma, Nebr., my hometown. But we didn't have a union, and I felt that if Hoffa came after me, he could drive me to my knees with a contract I just couldn't afford.

I was afraid for another reason. There were two bitter Teamster strikes in the Midwest in the late 1930's and early 1940's, and I saw the shootings, bombings, and the head-busting. Isaw windshields knocked out with railroad spikes, and I knew what a tablespoonful of sugar in the gas tank did to a truck engine. You didn't buck the Teamsters unless you were ready to risk everything.

Then, one day in 1947, it came my turn under the muzzle. I had a load of butter tied up in Lincoln; the Teamsters refused to move it and so it sat there on a loading dock. My phone rang the next day and an official at Teamster headquarters in Omaha said, "Coffey, we're going to organize you." A few days later Jimmy Hoffa came down from Detroit, and for 2 days we sat around a smoke-filled hotel room.

I can see him now, sitting there with his coat off, his tie open, his shirt sleeves rolled back and his mouth going. He took time to impress me and my lawyer with how tough he was, describing his first days as an organizer when he battled cops, strikebreakers, and bosses.

"I always gave as good as I got," he said simply.

He was obviously moving to consolidate Teamster strength, to build a power base in the Central States Conference (12 States) from which he would rise to the union presidency, then held by Dan Tobin. He'd singled me out, I had heard, because I had the reputation of being an independent cuss, and if he could "scare Old Man Coffey into signing," the other small operators might fall in line too.

The "peddle trucker"—carrying freight door to door rather than from terminal to terminal—is especially vulnerable to labor trouble, because he works on a small profit margin and depends on volume to stay alive. Any interruption of his business cripples him while his competition grabs up his business. Added to this, peddle operators ship interstate through larger companies, the over-the-road outfits. This is called "interlining." When the Teamsters open war on a trucker, they often put out the word that he's in wrong with union people; his cargo is "hot." Suddenly the other lines refuse to do business with him. This is the illegal secondary boycott. It's also economic blackmail.

"You know," I said to Hoffa, "the two of us started driving rigs and worked our way up. We're on opposite sides of the table now, but we both still want the same things for the industry."

His answer came like a crack between the eyes. "There's no room for the small operator anymore," he said. "One day the Teamsters will negotiate a nationwide contract with a committee of not more than 10 big-line truckers."

The fear of being caught in this squeeze between the Teamsters and the big lines ruined my sleep. My trucks bounced from town to town servicing small businesses. My men were paid for an 8-hour day, but the Teamsters wanted a dual-scale contract with the peddle driver paid by the mile for driving and by the hour for unloading. Because we had no way of knowing how long a man would spend unloading, this would have made us vulnerable to padding and featherbedding.

Most of the big operators, who haul only from terminal to terminal in large cities, weren't affected by this provision, so they allowed the union to write it into the Central States contract, knowing full well what it would do to the little truckers like Coffey Transfer.

I wanted no part of that contract, but I felt that Hoffa could wreck my company, one way or another, if he wanted to. So, when he offered me a 3-year contract without the featherbedding clause, and promised that I could renegotiate it when it expired, I signed. I thought my labor troubles were over.

I learned better—and learned how Jimmy Hoffa keeps his word—when our contract ran out 3 years later, Teamster headquarters told me: "Hoffa isn't happy. He says we're gaining nothing with your contract." I was given an ultimatum: Sign the regular Central States contract, and pay for featherbedding, or get ready for a strike. My answer was to send back the union cards belonging to my men.

For the next few weeks I drove to work each morning half expecting to find pickets, meaning that I'd been hit with a phony strike. But the threat passed. I heard through the grapevine that Hoffa was too busy for "small potatoes."

It was 5 years before we heard from the Teamsters again, and my men were just as pleased to be nonunion. They were independent types, mostly from farm backgrounds. Moreover, these weren't just my drivers; they were neighbors, and some of us served together on the school board and the town council. Where I could, I tried to make life easier for them. If they needed a downpayment on a house, if there was another baby coming, or if someone needed an operation, they could get an interest-free loan. And, whenever we got an increase in freight rates, all the employees recevied pay increases.

In those 5 years our volume increased each year, and I found time to serve on the Governor's highway advisory committee, to become mayor of Alma, and to spend a term in the State legislature as a senator.

Then, in the spring of 1955, smooth-talking Teamster organizers driving good-looking cars came around, and I knew the honeymoon was over. When they left, after 6 weeks, I got a registered letter saying Teamsters Local 554 in Omaha represented my employees.

"Prove it," I said, challenging them to bring me pledge cards with a bona fide signature of each man they claimed to represent. Toward the end of August, three Teamsters officers came to my office with seven cards. In addition to other employees, I had 22 drivers working in Alma, Omaha, Lincoln, and Holdredge, but they had pledges only from 1 man in Lincoln, 4 in Omaha, and 2 in Alma—both of whom denied signing the cards.

I pointed out that under the law they must have signatures from 51 percent of the men before they could claim to speak for them and demand a contract.

"We're organizing from the top down," one of them said. "We don't have time to fool with the little companies."

Now I got mad. "If you push me, I'll demand a consent election with the National Labor Relations Board."

They laughed at me. "We'll strangle your operation before you ever get an election," they said. "We'll throw up a picket line, and you'll be broke before a single vote is counted."

I said I'd take my chances, and that simply and finally ended our meeting.

One morning a few days later I reached the office and found a fire-red Cadillac convertible parked on the street. A blubbery pug, weighing more than 300 pounds, was waiting inside. He said his name was Barney Baker, that he was in charge of Teamster organizing in the State and then he told me, in rich Brooklynese, "I'm holding a meeting of your men on the dock at 10 a.m."

Ten o'clock was one of our busiest times, an hour when we'd be fighting to get out freight orders. "Not on my time you're not holding any meetings," I said. "Why don't you just leave?"

I took him by the arm and though I'm 6-feet-2 and 225 pounds, I felt stunted alongside him. To my surprise, he left without a word of protest.

"Don't you know who that was?" my brother Glen asked me later. "Barney Baker is Hoffa's No. 1 labor goon. You're lucky he didn't break up the office."

Baker, I learned, was a former prizefighter and longshoreman, an ex-convict who began a notorious career as a union troublemaker in New York in the 1930's. He became known as a specialist in stink-bomb throwing, was shot and wounded in a gang war in 1936, and later left town in a rush after a longshore hiring boss was murdered. When Robert F. Kennedy was chief counsel to the Senate Rackets Committee, he summed up Barney Baker by saying his presence in a meeting was sufficient to squelch opposition to whatever Hoffa proposed.

My brother explained that Baker recently had been doing Teamster dirty work in Kansas City and Wichita and now was headquartered in Omaha. We knew we'd better be careful.

The morning of September 22, 1955, Glen, who ran our Omaha office, found three of the seven men who worked there picketing outside. I immediately fired the men as illegal strikers and hired others, and we kept the trucks rolling. There were no pickets at Alma, Lincoln, or Holdrege—only at Omaha—but the union claimed to have an "imaginary picket line" around all our operations.

Within 3 days, imported labor goons appeared and began their campaign of harassment, obviously intended to scare us into signing their contract. There were six and sometimes eight of them, and they sat in cars parked around the Omaha terminal. They often blocked the driveway. Then in full view of the passing traffic they would clean their shotguns. When they were questioned, they said it was hunting season and they were getting ready to do some shooting. If one of our trucks pulled away, they'd follow. If it stopped to pick up or unload freight, they would picket the terminal. None of this did our business any good.

Beefy Barney Baker was directing this crew. He told the newspapers the Teamsters were striking for recognition, boasted that the Teamsters had a $36 million strike fund and claimed, "We're waging a clean fight."

The second week of the strike marked the start of the violence. We had tires punctured with ice picks then. We had wiring torn out of motors. We had air hoses wadded with paper so brakes would fail. We had threatening phone calls to drivers' wives. Calls like, "If you want your Johnny to get home from that junior high school at 3:30 today, you better tell your old man to stop driving for Coffey."

Trucking is a 24-hour business, and I always kept a phone alongside the bed. Calls in the middle of the night had never bothered me, but the ones I got now were different. The phone would ring, I'd pick it up and there would be no one on it. Then I'd lie awake in the darkness and think about what was going on in other areas. I read of fires and dynamitings in Texas. In Tennessee, a trucker was shot at 20 times. A terminal was raided in Ohio, and $4,000 worth of truck tires were slashed.

I spent protest telegrams to the Governor and mayor of Omaha, demanding protection. All I got from this was a little sympathy and a few paragraphs in the Omaha papers. A police official admitted to me, "What the Teamsters are doing to you, they could do to any business in Nebraska, and we couldn't stop them."

One night my wife and I were sitting home watching television with the two youngest of our three daughters when there was a loud noise, like a rock (or a bomb?) hitting against the front porch. I turned out the lights and rushed the women to the back of the house. I turned on our yard lights and waited. I heard nothing but the sounds of the night, and then I felt like a fool. Maybe it was just some kids being funny, but you can't be sure when you're fighting a labor war.

Another time one of my Alma drivers had a railroad spike thrown at him from a speeding car. It struck the trailer over the cab, scarring the sheet steel.

"If it hit the windshield," the driver said, pointing at the imprint, "no telling what would have happened."

Early in October the Teamsters threw up a secondary boycott, and overnight the other truckers stopped giving us freight. Our truck would pull up to a warehouse, but there wouldn't be any load for it. A shipping clerk told one of my men, "As far as I'm concerned, you Coffey fellows are not in business."

When I called these truckers, most of whom were old friends and had done business with me 20 or more years, I got the same excuses. "Sorry, Tom. I don't dare go along with you. You know how it is; they'll strike me in Chicago or Kansas City if I interline with you."

This was hard to take from old friends, but they were right in their estimation of how hot the Teamsters were ready to make it for those few who remained loyal to us. One of my closest friends in the industry, Ralph Darling, conscientiously tried to give us business until the Teamsters closed down the Darling Transfer Terminal in Kansas City, claiming there was an "unsettled grievance" there. The terminal manager then had to call Teamster headquarters in Detroit and promise not to ship with Coffey.

When I complained to Barney Baker that the boycott was illegal, he snarled, "That's too damn bad. Wars are started illegally too. My orders are you're to sign a contract." I told him to go to hell.

Within 2 weeks of the boycott, our interline business dropped to zero. I began to see friends turn into enemies. I couldn't sleep. I lost 25 pounds; and my hair, which had gray flecks, turned white.

My family, of course, shared my suffering. Marilyn, our second oldest daughter, who was away at college and home only weekends, wrote me a letter which I wouldn't trade for all the money in the Teamster treasury.

"When we were little kids," she wrote, "and something went wrong, a zipper got stuck, a doll was broken, we'd always come running to you to patch things up. 'Daddy fix' became sort of a motto around the house. I saw you this weekend really worried, and for the first time I realized this fight might be a losing one, that perhaps Daddy couldn't fix and that you might have to throw away a lifetime's work because of one bad spot. I'm glad you're not the sort of person who, when trouble comes along, takes the easiest way out. I want you to know how terribly proud of you I am."

When the pickets first appeared, I asked my lawyer to petition for an NLRB consent election. The Teamsters opposed our application and began legal delaying tactics. We also brought charges against the local before the NLRB, citing the secondary boycott, a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. On the same grounds, we asked the U.S. district court to issue a temporary injunction.

White the court was considering its decision, the labor board made an investigation and then filed secondary-boycott charges against the Teamsters. Then, on January 24, 4 months after we were struck, an election was finally held among the seven men in our Omaha office. Before the election, the union complained that we had electioneered unfairly by threatening to fire the men if they voted for a union. The NLRB found us innocent, but, by challenging the board's decision now, the Teamsters prevented the votes from being counted. Under the regulations, an election cannot be completed where there is a pending complaint.

These were long, hard days. I was constantly on the road between Alma and Omaha, 242 miles apart, and when I wasn't behind the wheel or taking care of trouble in one of our shops, I was in court. My legal fees ran between $500 and $700 a month, but we didn't seem to be getting anywhere. The Teamsters could stall another month or two, my lawyer said. The advice I heard was, "Give up the business; you can make a living."

But I was 49 years old, and I had been in trucking almost my whole life. We had been a big family of six boys growing up on a half section of land—1 mile long, a half mile across—near the Nebraska-Kansas border. I worked my way through Hastings College and I became a trucker in March 1929, when some neighbors hired me to haul their corn and livestock to market. After that I just kept going, picking up little jobs.

What it had taken me 27 years to build, the Teamsters were destroying in a matter of months. By the end of February I was desperate. My cash was gone, my credit had been cut almost in half, and so much bitterness had been stirred up I wasn't sure we could ever get back all our old customers. We might have worked something out with the Nebraska Teamsters, if Hoffa had let us alone.

You couldn't talk to that Barney Baker, though. He had my brother so blind mad and fuming that Glen was riding around with a shotgun on the front seat and a pistol in his glove compartment. He'd trail our trucks out of town at night, and he swore that if he caught the Teamsters at something, he'd shoot. I knew that he really meant it. This helped me make up my mind.

The last week in February I called the men together in Alma, and the sound of my voice was all the noise there was in that room. They sat on desks or stood there quietly, shifting from one foot to the other. I don't remember much of what I said, except I told them we had decided to sell out and would see to it they all got jobs. I'm glad to say they all did.

On March 1, 1956, I announced publicly that we were liquidating. Two years before this I had been offered $88,000, for the business. I wound up selling everything piecemeal for $30,000 cash.

We were out of business a full month when the NLRB announced that we had beat hell out of the Teamsters in the election, winning 4–0—the other three votes were disallowed. On top of this, the labor board found the union guilty of causing the secondary boycott. But these were hollow victories.

Hoffa's Teamsters had caused damage that no legal judgments could repair—and not only to Coffey Transfer. When our trucks stopped rolling across Nebraska, a handful of little towns were left without a daily freight service, and at least one country doctor was without necessary drugs and medicines on a day-to-day basis.

The day we shut our doors the population of Alma was 1,750. All but three of the families who worked for Coffey Transfer have since moved away to look for other jobs, and the population is down to 1,343. When we went under, the effect in Alma was almost the same as if General Motors had closed in Detroit.

I'm not nearly as bitter now as I was then. I have a good job as city manager of Sidney, Nebr., and there have been other consolations. In 1961, Barney Baker was sentenced to 2 years in jail for extortion, and about a year ago I won a final victory over Hoffa. Another Nebraska trucker and I had sued for treble damages under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, and we settled out of court for $61,200 on January 17, 1963. I was glad to settle, to be finally rid of the Teamsters after nearly 8 years.

Organized labor has done a lot of good for the working man. I have three brothers who are steelworkers and good union men. They, and millions of others, are the beneficiaries of labor's progress. But Hoffa and some of those he surrounds himself with, the ones who believe the end justifies the means, are wrong for labor and bad for the country.

Call to Excellence in Leadership

SPEECH

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Ripon Society, a group of outstanding young men in the Cambridge-Boston, Mass., area addressed a call to excellence in leadership to Republican leaders throughout the country. It is a thoughtful statement of our political situation—idealistic yet practical in its approach to the vast number of problems facing us today. It calls upon us to provide an effective moderate point of view in developing a strategy for an assault on the domestic and global issues at stake today. I commend it to my colleagues and urge them to read it carefully.

This statement is the product of the thoughtful discussion and study by the Ripon Society for many months. It is offered in the spirit of constructive effort to build a Republican Party which will be equipped to lead the Nation in the years ahead and reflect credit upon our two-party system.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the statement for printing in the body of the RECORD:

A CALL TO EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE NEW GENERATION OF REPUBLICANS

(From the members of the Ripon Society, Cambridge, Mass.)

For a moment a great Republic stood still. Everywhere men reacted first in disbelief and horror, then in anger and shame, and then in more measured thought and silence. The President is dead. A nation is in mourning.

History provides us with few such occasions to pause and reflect upon the state of our society and the course of its politics. While we yet sorrow, so must we seize this moment before our thoughts slip away to be lost in the noise of life as usual.

It is in this context that we have chosen to speak. We speak as a group of young Republicans to that generation which must bear the responsibility for guiding our party and our country over the coming decades. We speak for a point of view in the Republican Party that has too long been silent.

The Republican Party in 1964 faces not only an election but a decision. Shall it become an effective instrument to lead this Nation in the remainder of the 20th century? Shall it emerge from the current flux of American politics as the new majority party? Or shall it leave the Government of the Nation to a party born in the 1930's and without a leader capable of transforming its disparate elements to meet the challenge of a radically new environment? We are convinced that the choices the Republican Party makes this year will have an incalculable effect on the destiny of our Nation.

We should like to approach this decision from three aspects—the strategy for achieving a new Republican consensus, the nature of a Republican philosophy appropriate to our times, and the qualities of excellence required in our leadership.

TOWARD A NEW REPUBLICAN CONSENSUS

Election results in 1960 and 1962 indicate that there is no clear political consensus in the country. We are perhaps at one of those points in our political history when a new majority is about to emerge.

American politics has been by and large one-party politics. A single party has been dominant for considerable periods in our past history—the party of Thomas Jefferson, the party of Abraham Lincoln, and most recently the party of Franklin Roosevelt. Each of these great parties emerged during a period of revolution in political ideas and was based upon a new majority consensus.

The Roosevelt coalition of the 1930's is still the majority party in this country. It continues to control both Houses of Congress and the majority of State Governorships. Yet its loyalties are fading, its base is eroding, and its dynamism has been exhausted. F.D.R. forged his great coalition of the urban minorities, trade unions, liberal intellectuals, farmers, and the Democratic South on a program to meet the economic distress of the depression years. Accordingly, the Democratic Party of today looks back to 1932 and 1936 and has never quite been able to escape the dialog of domestic politics from that period. In a real sense the Democratic coalition of the 1930's, dedicated to the preservation of its economic and social gains since the great depression has become the standpat conservative party of today.

John F. Kennedy was attempting to rebuild the Roosevelt coalition—to infuse it with the idealism of a new generation that found the political issues of the depression years increasingly irrelevant. He was seeking to lift the Democratic Party to a broader international concern. If, as appeared likely, he had faced the exponent of a virulent Republican conservatism in 1964, he might well have built a majority that would have assured the renewed dominance of the Democratic Party.

But fate deprived him of that opportunity—and fate also delivered control of his party to a leader far closer to the era of Roosevelt than to his own. Lyndon Johnson, it can safely be predicted, will try to put Roosevelt's coalition back together once again. But if he succeeds, will he be able to educate and transform his party and Nation to the tasks of the future? Trained as an apprentice of the New Deal; representing the southern wing of his party with its decidedly regional orientation; inclined by temperament to national rather than international concerns; will be not be a "prisoner of the past?" While the Nation may admire his knowledge of and ability to manipulate political power, Lyndon Johnson is not likely to fire the hearts and minds of Americans. His, at best, would be an administration of continuity.

If the Democratic Party, bound to the cliches and fears of past history, is incapable of providing the forward-looking leadership this country needs, the Republican Party must. There are at least two courses open to the party—the strategy of the right and the strategy of the center. We feel strongly that the center strategy is the only responsible choice the party can take.

The strategy of the right is a strategy for consolidating a minority position. It is perhaps best described as an effort to build a coalition of all who are opposed to something. As an "anti" movement it is not surprising that it has been singularly devoid of positive programs for political action. The size and enthusiasm of the conservative movement should not be discounted, however. It represents a major discontent with the current state of our politics, and, properly channeled, it could serve as a powerful constructive force. But the fact remains that the strategy of the right, based as it is on a platform of negativism, can provide neither the Republican party an effective majority nor the American people responsible leadership.

The strategy of the right should be rejected for another basic reason. It is potentially divisive. Just as Disraeli warned the British Conservative party a century ago of the dangers of the two Englands, so would we speak out against a party realinement of the small States of the West and South against the urban centers of America—or any similar realinement that would pit American against American on the basis of distrust or suspicion. We must purge our politics of that rancor, violence, and extremism that would divide us. In the spirit of Lincoln, we must emphasize those goals and ideals which we hold in common as a people:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

We believe that the future of our party lies not in extremism, but in moderation. We believe that a moderate course of progressive Republicanism can be justified both in terms of strategy and philosophy. The moderate course offers the Republican Party the best chance to build a durable majority position in American politics. This is the direction the party must take if it is to win the confidence of the "new Americans" who are not at home in the politics of another generation: the new middle classes of the suburbs of the North and West—who have left the Democratic cities but have not yet found a home in the Republican Party; the young college graduates and professional men and women of our great university centers—more concerned with opportunity than security; the moderates of the new South—who represent the hope for peaceful racial adjustment and who are insulted by a racist appeal more fitting another generation. These and others like them hold the key to the future of our politics.

Since 1960 John F. Kennedy had moved with shrewd political understanding to preempt the political center. Republican moderates for the most part remained silent. By 1964 the Republican Party, perhaps with a Presidential nominee from the conservative right, would have had great difficulty in reclaiming the center. Now the very transfer of power means that the center is once again contestable. We believe that the Republican Party should accept the challenge to fight for the middle ground of American politics. The future lies here. The party that will not acknowledge this political fact of life and courageously enter the contest for power does not merit and cannot possibly win the majority support of the American people.

Must the Republican Party then adopt Kennedy-new frontier programs to compete for the center? No. Such a course would be wrong and it would smack so obviously of "political opportunism" as to insure its defeat. The Republican appeal should be rooted in a moderate Republican philosophy and should call forth the best leadership and vision the party can produce from its rich history and current strengths. As Republicans, we must prove to the American people that our party, unbeholden to the hostages of a faded past, is a more flexible instrument for the governing of this great Nation and for the realization of the noble American aspirations of human dignity and peace with honor. What then are the dimensions of a moderate yet dynamic Republican approach that can galvanize the elements of a new Republican consensus?

TOWARDS A MATURE REPUBLICAN PHILOSOPHY

A Republican philosophy capable of capturing the imagination of the American people must have at least three attributes. It must be oriented toward the solution of the major problems of our era—it must be pragmatic in emphasis. It must also be moderate in its methods—concerned more with the complexities of the means toward a solution than with a simplistic view of the ends. And finally, it must marry these attributes of pragmatism and moderation with a passion to get on with the tasks at hand.

Our philosophy must be oriented toward the solution of problems. The image of negativism that has too frequently been attached to our party must be dispelled. The new generation in American politics is looking for a party that is able to grasp the realities of its world, that exhibits a sensitivity to the problems that are its concern. This means that the first task of the Republican Party is to recognize and to begin devising approaches to the problems of the last half of the 20th century. We note only the most salient of domestic problems: the legitimate aspirations of the Negro in the northern cities, as well as in the South; the human adjustments to the process of automation in industry and in business; the phenomenon of the megalopolis with the attendant problems in housing, transportation, and community services; the emphasis of quality in our educational system, our health services, and our cultural services in general.

The Democratic Party will have solutions or purported solutions to all these domestic problems. But does it have the imagination demanded by the new world we face? Or will its answers merely be retreads of the New Deal, more of the same, more indiscriminate massive Federal spending, more Government participation in the economic and social life of the Nation and individual?

The greatest mistake would be for the Republican Party to turn its back on these problems. Without this beginning we cannot utilize the strengths of our free enterprise system, of the individual initiative that has characterized our citizenry, of the infinite variety of our private institutions, the potential strengths of our several levels of government. If we fail here, just as if we fail to contest the center, the battle will go to the Democrats by default.

If our times demand new vision and new solutions on the domestic scene, how much greater is the need on the international front. The greatest challenge this Nation will face in 1965, 1970, and 1975, will most likely be decisions in its foreign policy. Merely to continue our foreign policy will not be enough. The American President must now serve as the first statesman of the world. America must assume the responsibilities commensurate with its power.

We must have the creative imagination and political sophistication to shape our policies to meet constantly changing distributions of power. At the same time we must have the perspective to give our foreign policy a direction that will meet the test of decades. We must get on with the paramount task of forging a new relationship with Europe. This will involve a new and more realistic approach to the question of nuclear sharing. The problems of the alliance—political, military, and economic—will demand the finest qualities of statesmanship, of political engineering, of shrewd bargaining and compromise of which we are capable as a people. In our relationships with the Communist nations we must be sensitive to the diffusion of power within the bloc and the opportunities and dangers this affords. We must recognize and develop those areas of common interest such as arms control measures to reduce the chances of war by miscalculation or accident. At the same time we must check Communist aggression in whatever form it takes. We must develop a strategy for economic, technical, and military assistance that both merits the support of the American people and fulfills our commitments and responsibilities as leader of the free world.

Vision is a recognition of problems; it is a function of leadership. The Republican Party has produced a proud lineage of pragmatic statesmen since Lincoln. It is our hope that once again it will provide the leadership to meet the occasion.

While our philosophy and our program must be pragmatic, so must it be moderate. Simply to define the problems is not to solve them. The moderate recognizes that there are a variety of means available to him, but that there are no simple unambiguous ends. He recognizes hundreds of desirable social goals where the extremist may see only a few. The moderate realizes that ends not only compete with one another, but that they are inextricably related to the means adopted for their pursuit. Thus he will most likely set a proximate goal. While working for limited realizable objectives he will be especially concerned with the means, the environment in which the goals are achieved. The moderate chooses the center—the middle road—not because it is halfway between left and right. He is more than a nonextremist. He takes this course since it offers him the greatest possibility for constructive achievement.

In contrast, the extremist rejects the complexity of the moderate's world. His is a state of mind that insists on dividing reality into two antithetical halves. The gray is resolved into black and white. Men are either good or evil. Policies are either Communist or anti-Communist. It is understandable that the incredible complexity and mounting frustrations of our world will cause men to seek one right answer—the simple solution. The moderate cries out that such solutions do not exist, but his would appear to be a thankless task. Who will reward him for telling them their dreams can never be? It is not surprising that the doctrinaire has always reserved his greatest scorn for the pragmatist and not for his opposite number. The moderate poses the greatest danger to the extremist because he holds the truth that there is no truth.

Moderation is not a full-blown philosophy proclaiming the answers to all our problems. It is, rather, a point of view, a plea for political sophistication, for a certain skepticism to total solutions. The moderate has the audacity to be adaptable, to seek the limited solution most appropriate to the needs of his nation, its institutions, and its people. The Republican moderate approaches these problems from a more conservative perspective, the Democratic moderate from a more liberal one. The fact that we may meet on common ground is not "metooism." It is time to put away the tired old notion that to be real Republicans we must be as different as possible from our opponents. There is no more sense in that view than in the idea that we must be for isolationism, prohibition, or free love because our opponents are not. It is time we examined the merits of a solution in itself rather than set our policy simply in terms of the position the Democratic Party may have taken. We would do well to hear Paul's injunction to the Philippians: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just * * * if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Today we feel that the Republican Party must once again affirm its great tradition of pragmatism blended with political responsibility. But can the moderate produce the image of conviction and dedication that has been so much a part of the attraction of extremists throughout history? Is the flaming moderate just a joke, or is he a viable political actor? Can we be emotional about a politics so pluralistic, so relative, so limited in its range of available maneuver? Perhaps we share the too abundant enthusiasm of youth but we feel that we not only can—we must. We must show our world that our emotion can be aroused by a purpose more noble and a challenge more universal than the cries of an irresponsible extremism. Tempered with an honest uncertainty we must be ever willing to enter upon yet another crusade. We must learn to be as excited about openmindedness as we once were about final answers, as dedicated to partial solutions as we have been to panaceas. We must engage life as we find it, boldly and courageously, with the conviction that if we and reason endure we shall surely succeed—and with the knowledge that the greatest sin is not to have fought at all.

TOWARD EXCELLENCE IN REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

The assassination of John F. Kennedy has put the Republican Party in the position of fighting the election of 1968 in 1964. It has required that the party define not only a new strategy and a positive program but that it choose the men who are to lead it in these great tasks. The party must now find these men; men who can forge a new national party; men who can renew the great progressive Republican tradition; men who possess the qualities of excellence that we should be the first to see as the Kennedy legacy.

It is still too early to take the full measure of our late President. As Republicans we have disagreed and still disagree with many of the programs of his New Frontier. As members of the responsible opposition we have been critical of his administration's performance. But as Americans and as members of a generation still younger than his, there was something in John F. Kennedy that we admired. It would be petty indeed to deny this, dishonest to deny that we look for no lesser qualities in the future leadership of our own party.

John F. Kennedy brought to the Presidency a perspective of the years ahead. His vision of America and its role in the world was not simply the product of youth, of that "new generation of Americans" to whom the torch had been passed. It was derived from those qualities of mind and spirit that comprise his legacy to us: his sense of imagination and inquisitiveness, his subtle and keen intelligence, his awareness of the ultimate judgment of history, his courage to affirm life, his love for the art of politics, his respect for excellence. Robert Frost had spoken of his era as an age of poetry and power. He brought to the Presidency a style and a zest that challenged the idealism and won the enthusiasm of our generation.

Republicans protested with candor that there was too much style and not enough substance to his policies. Now, fate has denied us a full answer. The merits of the man and his leadership will be debated long beyond the coming campaign; but there are lessons in his life and death that we cannot completely escape. We have witnessed a change in the mood of American politics. After Kennedy there can be no turning back to the old conceptions of America. There

can be no turning away from the expectations of greatness that he succeeded in imparting to our vision.

To all thinking Republicans the meaning of November 22 should be clear. The Republican Party now has a challenge to seek in its future leadership those qualities of vision, intellectual force, humaneness and courage that Americans saw and admired in John F. Kennedy, not in a specious effort to fall heir to his mantle, but because our times demand no lesser greatness. Our party should make the call to excelence in leadership virtually the center of its campaign platform for 1964. The Republican Party should call America's finest young leaders into the political arena. It should advance its talented younger leadership now to positions of responsibility within the national Republican Party and the Congress. Great government requires great men in government. In a complex age, when truth is relative and total solotions elusive we can do no more than pledge the very best qualities of mind and soul to the endless battle for human dignity. And we dare to no less at every level of social activity, from the Presidency to the town selectman. As Republicans, we feel confident that Americans everywhere will join such an appeal.

We issue this call to excellence in leadership with the full realization that there is much essential work yet to be done before the November elections: the selection of the candidates, the building of a record in the 88th Congress, the shaping of the party platform, the planning of strategy for the campaign. We have not nor do we pretend to spell out a specific course of action. We fear, however, that these efforts will fail unless the party is motivated and directed by the broader and deeper concerns we have voiced. Without this vision and sense of purpose, the Republican Party will most certainly fail in the broadest sense of providing America the responsible leadership it needs.

The moderates of the Republican Party have too long been silent. None of us can shirk the responsibility for our past lethargy. All of us must now respond to the need for forceful leadership. The moderate progressive elements of the Republican Party must strive to change the tone and the content of American political debate. The continued silence of those who should now seek to lead deserves our party and Nation alike. The question has often been asked, "Where does one find fiery moderates?" Recent events show only too clearly how much we need such men. If we cannot find them, let us become them.

Some Thoughts on Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 10, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, American aviation is the best in the whole world. This is the message by a man who knows—our former colleague now a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Honorable Chan Gurney.

I invite the attention of my colleagues, as well as other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to a speech recently delivered by Mr. Gurney and entitled "Some Thoughts on Aviation." I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHAN GURNEY, MEMBER, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE TRANSPORTATION CLUB OF SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., NOVEMBER 20, 1963—"SOME THOUGHTS ON AVIATION"

It is a pleasure to be with you this evening, on the occasion of your annual meeting. My talk is intended to give you some idea as to my personal plans for the next few years, and then to give you some thoughts I have accumulated in the dozen years I have been a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, possibly colored by my previous Washington assignment which you gave me as your representative in the U.S. Senate for my first dozen years away from our State

Taking it all in all, my present final 6-year term in aviation is continuing through the calendar year 1964 because of my appointment by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on December 9, 1958. At the end of that time I will have had more than 25 years in Washington, and that is long enough for this South Dakotan to be away from home. To this Mrs. Gurney says amen. We will move back to Yankton in the fall of 1964. This is a definite arrangement I have promised my good wife, so that is final.

I want to be out where the West begins because I have a great desire to hear the coyotes howl again, and I think Yankton is the place to be because one can take a sleeping bag and go into the Devil's Nest country across the new lake behind the dam at Yankton and hear the coyotes almost any night. Up here at Sioux Falls, where the population has increased tremendously—more than double since I lived here—you have new streets, new subdivisions, new manufacturing, new everything, including interstate highways and what have you, I am sure that you have to go farther west because you have no chance of hearing a coyote howl in this our biggest South Dakota city—and how wonderful it is.

Tonight my talk will be on the progress of aviation and the relationship of the Civil Aeronautics Board to this dynamic industry.

I expect many in this audience do not have a clear understanding as to the fuhctions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and have not had time to differentiate our functions from the job the Federal Aviation Agency has to do. First, the CAB, meaning Civil Aeronautics Board, is a small agency of few more than 800 people, contrasted with the FAA which has almost 40,000. We call the CAB a quasi-judicial agency, for although we do have many executive powers, decisions are arrived at through the judicial process as outlined in the Administrative Procedure Act. That act gives litigants certain specified procedural rights between the time original petitions are filed and a final decision of the Board. Each litigant has a fair chance to present evidence, appear in a public hearing before an examiner, file briefs, the right to present argument to the Board, and to receive a final judgment of the Board as is done in court procedure—even to the extent of filing petitions for reconsideration and appealing to the U.S. courts any decision that a petitioner contends is unfair or unjust or in violation of existing law.

The CAB, among many other duties, sets the rates that passengers pay for their tickets, after a filing by the airline, and the same on any cargo they ship, and sets the rate the Post Office must pay to the airlines for carrying the mail. We also set up the transportation network of the certificated airlines, designate which communities they may serve, and see to it that they give adequate service to these cities and towns. It is also our responsibility to investigate all aircraft accidents to determine whether there are any deficiencies in the airplane or in its operation, which may give us a lead on how to increase safety of flying in any way. Although I would like to give more time to this, our No. 1 responsibility—safety in the air, I must pass it over by just stated that we do count it our No. 1 responsibility. That job has been very well done, for since 1940 the Board has been able to come up with the probable cause of more than 94 percent of all U.S. air carrier accidents, and in somewhat more than half of these corrective action has been taken so that United States scheduled airline accident fatalities for more than 10 years have been less than 1 fatality in 100 million passenger miles. This is in face of the fact that there are almost 2,000 aircraft in scheduled operation. For our international carriers, this is the third consecutive year that they have experienced no fatal accident—a truly remarkable record.

The Federal Aviation Agency personnel are commonly known as the policemen of the air, but they do much more than that. They see to it that every manufactured airplane meets high safety standards, and the same for the crew that flies them. The plane is approved only after it passes all safety tests, and the crew must also pass rigorous technical as well as physical and efficiency examinations. Manufacturing and maintenance procedures must also meet the FAA high standards. The FAA also selects, installs, and maintains all navigation aids and then operates this equipment in the safest possible way.

This is a thumbnail sketch of the difference between the two agencies that have prime responsibility in the aviation field. Each of these agencies is operating under the basic Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, reenacted in 1958, which in its declaration of policy states that the CAB in the exercise and performance of its powers and duties in accordance with the public convenience and necessity must encourage and develop an air transportation system best adapted to the present and future needs of the commerce, the postal service, and the national defense. And I emphasize national defense. There are other policy guides stated in this law and one I should also like to emphasize is that which requires the Board to consider competition to the extent necessary to assure a sound transportation system.

Now, I want to give you a thumbnail sketch of some of the ideas and beliefs that I have endeavored to follow since my term began on the CAB in March of 1951. First, each Government agency tends to build on itself and the fault is not always with the agency itself. Congressmen have said many times during and since the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act that they consider the CAB an arm of Congress. This because it was obvious, and remains obvious, that Congress could not possibly handle the myriad of details necessary to regulate the air industry or to promote and develop a sound air industry, needed for our air commerce, postal service, and national defense. Communities petition for service—and more service. These petitions must be handled. Airlines desire to grow as does every other private industry in this free country of ours. They must compete with other airlines just the same as a grocery store which has a competitor starting up across the street. Providing competition to the extent necessary—but only to the extent necessary in the public interest—is mandatory on the Board in order to be sure the best possible equipment and service are provided to the communities and people of the United States.

A sound, stable air industry is the responsibility of the CAB. On any air route where competition already exists to the extent needed in the public interest, an additional air carrier or carriers should not be given the right to fly that segment. A plethora of carriers makes it uneconomic for all. The

sult has been that too many additional carriers have been added to many of the airline routes in the Nation. I have contended that many of these decisions were wrong, that the decisions caused a dilution of airline revenue for all carriers on those routes, that the additional competition was uneconomic and was not in the best interest of the traveling public or the airlines. This is proved by the fact that even the strong carriers are not making the return on investment to which the Board has said they are entitled.

Aviation is a dynamic industry, started by young men in the twenties, and even before World War I. They saw not only the romance of flying, but also the need our country had for being first in world aviation. The air industry is now one of the largest in the United States, and thank Heaven for that. The young people who started first in aviation are now tops in their field—in flying, in manufacturing, and in the many jobs that must be done properly to make aviation reliable and safe. My only quarrel with a regulatory agency is that sometimes it becomes overburdened with regulatory work and neglects the promotional side. Members of a regulatory agency must not live in an ivory tower thinking they know how to operate an airline better than those actually in the business who know the job firsthand and from the group up.

Here I interject an important phase of national defense, for I feel it has a bearing on what I am about to say. Our very existence during World War II was dependent on those who knew about flying and those who manufactured the machines they piloted and, yes, the ammunition they carried. We, as citizens of the United States, are greatly indebted to the "fly boys" and those who kept them in the air. The commercial airlines have the planes for the Nation to use in an emergency and the know-how to make the best use possible of them when the country calls. My view is there should be minimum regulation and maximum promotion for our country's interest and protection, all consistent with our responsibility under the law. The operators should be permitted to operate in our capitalistic system of government as a private enterprise without burdensome regulation. It is my considered judgment it is in the best interest of the people of the United States, and certainly the Government, to develop the strongest possible commercial airline network, for it has a top place in the transportation of our country. Our decision in cases involving the economics of an airline operation can make or break the air transport system.

Now, why have I said that the CAB has neglected the promotional side? I will try to explain. The trunk airlines in the past 10 years are short on their net profits, taking them all together, by more than half a billion dollars under the rate of return the Board has previously decided was necessary for their economic well-being. What do I mean by economic well-being? I mean enough profits to attract investors that will provide the necessary capital. Huge amounts are needed when you consider that for jet equipment alone the trunk airlines have already expended for equipment on hand over $2,111 million-odd dollars. These same carriers have on order jets to be delivered in the next few years that will cost them over $800 million—$865,220,000 to be exact. These figures, I want you to know, do not include the supersonic jets which the airlines have said they will need to keep up with the advancement of the art and which our country will need in its national defense. The Board in its regulatory job on rates and the granting of excessive route segments to too many airlines has not considered the great necessity of the airlines to make reasonable profits to maintain a sound, stable air industry serving the public interest.

Without question, we have the best aviation system in the whole world. Without question our people—62 million of them carried as passengers each year by the scheduled airlines—know it is a good system. Also, the fact that last year 62 percent of the 2½ million persons who crossed the North Atlantic by air were U.S. citizens leads me to believe the people of the United States are sure the airplane is here to stay. I believe there is a necessity for these air passengers in international travel to help out wherever possible by using U.S.-flag carriers in preference to those of other nations, first because I am sure they will get a good ride, and it would be in our own self-interest by helping out the balance-of-payments problem—the gold question, so to speak. As a result of our Government's having entered into reciprocal agreements with foreign nations for the exchange of air routes, 19 different foreign airlines operate across the North Atlantic to our shores. We have three flying the Atlantic—one a cargo carrier, Seaboard & Western, and the other two, Pan American and Trans World Airlines. Thirteen years ago our airlines carried 75 percent of this international passenger traffic, but this percentage last year declined to less than 50 percent. To increase our share of the market, it is essential that the U.S. travelers prefer U.S. airlines. In spite of this declining share of the market, the progress of our air carriers has been great. More people are flying on better and faster planes, with better service. Much help has been given by the Board, but policies tried and true too often change. I give credit to airline management for providing the citizens of the United States the best air transportation possible at the lowest economical price. Let the airlines suggest rates that will keep them a viable industry, able to purchase the best machines available, keep up with the advancement of the art, and return a reasonable profit to the stockholders of the airlines. The Board should keep in mind always that its regulatory activity must only be enough to keep an economically strong, healthy and vigorous air transport system.

During my term on the Civil Aeronautics Board I have seen the airlines go heavily in debt for the newest, best, and safest airplanes possible to secure, the greatest advancement being in the last few years when those who travel have been happy with the speed and safety of the jet airplanes. Remember, if you will, that the international and domestic trunk airlines made this possible by obligating themselves for $2 billion or more for new jet equipment, and they are continuing to buy additional modern airplanes for the long and medium-long stretches of their systems. The FAA and CAB are pushing for a short-range compact plane for the local service lines that will operate more economically and guarantee that the smaller communities receive, and continue to receive, the service to which they are entitled. By that I mean faster, air-conditioned, pressurized jet or turbo-prop airplanes. Even with this big investment in flying equipment, the airlines have continued to hold their prices down. Consider, if you will, the 8 to 12 cents per mile it takes to run an automobile. Compare it with the tourist fare, economy, or thrift airline fares that are available—or even compare it with the price charged for a trip from Sioux Falls to Pierre, S. Dak.—that is, the per-mile cost. I challenge you to drive from here to Pierre early in the morning, transact your business there, and return that evening feeling fit as a fiddle and ready to do a decent day's work the next day. Some per-mile rates in the United States for the very heavy areas of traffic are below 4 cents per mile. The rates have been no lower than this at any time since commercial air travel was first offered, and they now run between that figure and 7 cents per mile—with an average, I would say, of around 5½ cents for a coach seat. Contrast that with the difference in the cost of an automobile when it first appeared on the scene and now. I remember buying five model-T Fords in Yankton for our company just before World War I, at $280 apiece. I heard of a fellow the other day who bought a wonderful Ford for $3,900. Of course, you can buy smaller models for less money, but I still remember that model-T and how wonderful it was. Contrast too, if you will, the low cost of air travel per mile with the growing prices you pay for the house you live in, clothing you wear or things you eat, and you will come up with the answer—the airlines have held the line.

To conclude, I want to put in a strong word as to my belief that the local service airlines must be supported by the traveling public and also supported by the Civil Aeronautics Board in every way possible. All of you buy airmail stamps and the aggregate sale of these air mail stamps totals around $200 million per year. Let's say it costs the Post Office to handle airmail one-half of that amount and that the payment (called subsidy) now going to the local service airlines is between $60 million and $75 million per year. For a long time I have felt that the word subsidy used in this connection was wrong. It looks to me like the users of air mail pay for this service. Since it is necessary to move this mail, the services of the local carriers are necessary to provide this transportation to all communities of the United States, be they large or small. Local service airlines feed passengers into the trunklines, sell tickets, and advise the travelers the best way to reach their desired destination. The local service airlines take your mail and bring mail back to you. We could not do away with that service any more than we could do away with rural free delivery, and who is there here who would say the farmer is not entitled to delivery of his mail as well as the businessman on Broadway? Congress is alive to this necessity and in very recent statements by House and Senate Committees they have told all of us, including the Civil Aeronautics Board, that they will continue to support a sound local service system, and by that I mean such airlines as North Central, Ozark, and Frontier. They take care of South Dakota now and will continue to do a better job as travel increases on the better airplanes they expect to get in the not too distant future. I predict that within 3 or 4 years that wonderful veteran of local service fame, the DC-3 aircraft, will be put out to pasture and replaced by pressurized, air-conditioned, faster airplanes, going around 200 miles an hour. These planes will serve the thinnest routes, be of smaller size—carrying from 14 to 24 passengers—able to land on the shortest fields, thereby cutting airport costs for the smaller communities which cannot support a larger airport. It behooves the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue its active endorsement and support of the local service industry for our United States of America.

With that, let me say it has been a joy to be back in Sioux Falls, my home number two, and I hope it will be not too long before I see you again.

Poetic Tribute to Jacqueline Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending

my remarks to include a poem brought to my attention by the Honorable Marshall Korshak, sanitary district trustee, Democratic committeeman of the fifth ward in Chicago and for many years an outstanding member of the State Senate of Illinois.

George Gremley, the author of this beautiful tribute to Jacqueline Kennedy, in a letter to Mr. Korshak wrote:

Your very dear friend, Dan Lynch, asked me to send you this poem I wrote on Thanksgiving Day. I have been told this is what all the people would like to say of a valiant lady and that I was fortunate enough to put the idea in the form of a poem.

I am sure my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD share in Mr. Gremley's sentiment and will appreciate his poetic tribute to a noble lady enshrined in all our hearts.

THE END OF A SMILE

A smile was seen, more than 4 years ago.
It had warmth and beauty, it seemed to glow.
A smile at conventions, state functions, and such.
A smile on trips, that gave queens a touch.
A smile for this, and a smile for that;
A smile for a husband, she called Jack.
A smile for the children, Caroline, and John.
A smile to behold, in every town.
A smile at the airport, beautiful and pretty.
A smile for the people, of that chosen city.
A smile in the car, along the way.
And then it happened, and people pray.
A smile that is gone, and in its place;
A vision of majesty, and everlasting grace.
A smile we pray, may someday appear;
To gladden the hearts, who hold her, so dear.

With deep eternal feeling,
GEORGE GREMLEY.

John F. Kennedy Memorial Center

SPEECH
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I joined with my colleagues in introducing the legislation before us today because I believe that to rededicate the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center would be the most appropriate memorial to our late President.

Although the Center has been in the planning stages since President Eisenhower endorsed the idea in 1958, President Kennedy and his wife gave the Center real impetus and sought to insure that our Nation's Capital would have a suitable place for the performing arts. The approval with which this proposal was greeted is an indication of how fitting a memorial it will be.

Here we will have a living monument where Americans from all over the country can appreciate the performing arts in a setting worthy of their dignity.

President Kennedy was aware that nations are judged in the sweep of history as much by the quality of the arts and the support they receive as by the prosperity of their economies and the strength of their defenses. He sought by his own example to encourage Americans to know and respect the arts. We can do no less than to follow his lead and insure the success of the Center.

Reporting the News to Russia: Radio Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have called to my colleagues' attention on a number of occasions the splendid work that Radio Liberty "the most powerful voice heard in the U.S.S.R." is doing to give the Russian people accurate information of events in the world. Because Radio Liberty is a private, not a governmental operation it can be more forthright. I do not say this in an adversely critical sense to our diplomats and other governmental officials. By the very nature of their duties and responsibilities there is much that they must leave unsaid.

I have been very much impressed with two recent articles on the reporting of President Kennedy's assassination to the Russian people prepared by Paul N. Sanker, public affairs director of Radio Liberty, based upon Radio Liberty's research and broadcasting activities.

The first article entitled "The Soviet Press After the Assassination" describes the Russian reporting. The second article "From Radio Liberty: Tragedy and Hope" describes the reporting from America:

FROM RADIO LIBERTY: TRAGEDY AND HOPE

The shocked dismay and horror of the American people over the assassination of President Kennedy was shared by others all over the world. The peoples of the Soviet Union were no exception. In addition to their sympathy for Americans, many Soviet citizens are deeply concerned about the tragedy itself. They wonder how it could happen in the United States. They have long been nourished by official propaganda about so-called "aggressive circles in the United States who want war with the U.S.S.R." Therefore, many citizens in the Soviet Union may tend to accept Radio Moscow's assumption that President Kennedy was killed by rightwing extremists. They are also apprehensive about possible changes in American policy which could increase international tensions.

VAGUE IDEAS OF DEMOCRACY

Many Soviet citizens are not fully aware of the strength of the American constitutional system which ensures an orderly transition of power when such tragedies occur. They are not given the facts which show that the American political system assures continuity of government policy, particularly in foreign relations.

After continued exposure to long-term official pronouncements about the many rightwing extremists in the United States, the Soviet citizen may find it difficult to accept the possibility that the murder of President Kennedy may have been done by a leftwing extremist, even though the suspect admitted his preference for Marxism.

RADIO LIBERTY COVERAGE

There are many questions in the minds of Soviet listeners concerning the assassination of President Kennedy and the slaying of Lee Oswald. Initially, Radio Liberty informed its listeners of the tragic events as they unfolded. World reaction was reported by Radio Liberty correspondents in London, Paris, Rome, Stockholm, the United States, and the Far East. All the facts known about Lee Oswald and Jack Ruby were reported, as well as the efforts to fix guilt for the murders. Radio Liberty's news coverage on the police investigation of Oswald—by virtue of giving all the solid, confirmed facts—gave Soviet listeners a picture which differed from that presented by Radio Moscow. Russian propaganda continued to blame "rightwing extremists" in the United States.

All of Radio Liberty's 18 transmitters, in Europe and the Far East, were used to bring the full story to Soviet listeners. Commentaries stressed not only the peaceful transition of power, but the positive aspects of continued Soviet-American relations, with the provision that the Kremlin would negotiate sincerely.

Profiles of the new President, Lyndon Johnson, were used to acquaint listeners with a man who is little known in the U.S.S.R. Such knowledge is necessary to help dispel any suspicion or fear the Soviet citizen may have concerning future policies of the United States. One of Radio Liberty's tasks in the aftermath of the tragedy was to inform its Soviet audience that relations with the United States are not faced with drastic change under a new administration.

ASSURANCE FROM WASHINGTON

A Radio Liberty correspondent interviewed Republican Members of the Congress, who assured Soviet listeners that the new President had bipartisan support for many of the policies initiated by Mr. Kennedy. At the same time, these legislators pointed out that although they may disagree with some of Mr. Johnson's domestic policies, they generally supported him in foreign relations. All of the Congressmen emphasized the necessity to close ranks behind the President at this time, while reserving the right to debate the issues in the future. This is the kind of authoritative evidence needed to show an apprehensive Soviet audience that they need not fear a drastic change in U.S. policy. These interviews with Republican leaders in Congress were broadcast by Radio Liberty along with President Johnson's address before the joint session of Congress. With that program, Radio Liberty ended its emergency schedule of special programing on the events and the aftermath of a tragic day in the history of the United States.

THE SOVIET PRESS AFTER THE ASSASSINATION

The Soviet press and radio gave heavy coverage to all of the events connected with the assassination of President Kennedy. The murder itself was described as a "monstrous crime" and America's grief, according to the press, was shared by all Soviet citizens. Television in the U.S.S.R. devoted much of its programing to the death of the American President and its aftermath. The funeral cortege was picked up and relayed from Telstar, a first in Soviet controlled communications. Messages of condolence from Communist leaders and from ordinary citizens were widely heard and read.

THE OSWALD-RUBY AFFAIR

The arrest of the alleged assassin, Lee Oswald, was reported by Soviet media after a delay of some 18 hours. The report consisted of carefully selected items, picked mainly from American sources. They were presented in such a way as to give the impression that Oswald had been framed by the Dallas police. The Soviet reports intimated that an attempt was being made to blame

the assassination on the American Communist Party and that "ultrarightists" were fanning "anti-Cuban and anti-Soviet hysteria." They gave no actual evidence of any such hysteria, but simply repeated over and over again, that it is being fanned. Mention of Oswald's shooting by Jack Ruby was followed by reports which questioned the fact that Ruby found it so easy to get to Oswald, implying that it was a put-up job. Radio Moscow quoted Agence France Presse as saying that Ruby's involvement was not accidental.

U.S. MEDIA QUOTED

In the week following the death of President Kennedy and his alleged slayer, Soviet media continued to headline the stories.

Radio Moscow followed the line that "ultra rightist, pro-Fascist" elements were responsible for President Kennedy's assassination. Tass, the official Soviet news agency, insisted that the crime was the work of "racists, the Ku Klux Klan and Birchists." (The Soviet press quoted Chief Justice Earl Warren as saying that "forces of hatred and malevolence (were) eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.") Pravda reproduced a drawing from a Chicago paper showing the statue of Lincoln covering his face with his hands. Izvestia carried an article by a Soviet lawyer charging "deliberate bungling" of the investigation. A New York Times article was quoted, "demanding the whole truth."

SOVIET COMMENTS PENETRATING

Based on Dallas police statements, the Soviets maintained that the police are trying to charge the U.S. Communist Party with Mr. Kennedy's murder. A Radio Moscow commentator stated that the crime had a political character and that it had been carefully planned. "It is not by chance that it happened in Texas, a stronghold of U.S. segregationists and of the Birch Society," said the commentator. He also noted that Texas is the State from which "GOLDWATER, the idol of the rightwing elements, is drawing support."

Pravda's New York correspondent reported that "certain circles" are trying to cover up the traces "and to make use of Kennedy's murder to stir up anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban hysteria." Radio Moscow quoted CBS correspondents, saying that uncertainty is now prevailing in Washington concerning the future foreign policy line of the new President, especially in the field of East-West relations.

DALLAS IS SOVIET TARGET

Soviet media went on to speculate about Oswald's murder. They wondered why the police did not explain how Oswald's slayer, Jack Ruby, was able to penetrate the police station at the time Oswald was transferred to the county jail. Said a Moscow broadcaster: "Ruby's presence was not accidental. According to one report, he worked with the police. There are many other questions which the police are not answering. Oswald's mother and wife, who could throw light on the case, are kept incommunicado."

Pravda's New York correspondent, Strelnikov, described in an article "how the wild men prepared the crime in Dallas." He said there were more and more indications that it was a carefully planned operation. Radio Moscow quoted a Dallas university student as telling his mother before the assassination: "I bet 10 to 1 Kennedy will be murdered by one of these Texas maniacs." And Moscow radio also told its listeners that "one gains the impression that the circle of suspects was deliberately reduced to one single individual. The possibility that others might be involved seems to be intentionally put aside."

Tass' New York correspondent reported that the "gutter press in the United States is using Oswald's murder to stir up anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban hysteria." The Associated Press was accused of distributing the text of a radio discussion "on Radio New Orleans, August 21, in which Oswald took part and slandered the Soviet Union. Even the Dallas district attorney admits there is no proof Oswald was a Communist."

SOVIETS FEAR POLICY CHANGE

The Soviet line vis-a-vis President Kennedy's death is similar to that followed by the Russians after the death of Franklin Roosevelt. This line follows the idea that "in death, he is loved, but 'they' are preparing public opinion for possible changes in U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R." The "they" in this case, refers to "militaristic" or "aggressive" factions, never clearly identifiable, in the United States who are usually connected with plots against the Soviet Union. The suspicion and fear runs deep, only because the Soviets have never had a clear idea of the operation of a Democratic political system. At the moment, however, there is no solid evidence that Moscow is planning to take advantage of what it considers a moment of weakness for the United States, in order to create new international crisis.

RADIO LIBERTY,
New York, N.Y., December 4, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for taking time from your busy schedule for the interview. It went to our oversea stations by cable on Wednesday, and was used in connection with President Johnson's address to the Congress.

I am enclosing a copy of the interview plus two stories I wrote based on Radio Liberty's research and broadcasting activities. You may use them in any way you see fit. If you find them useful for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the press or your constituency, please let us know. We would be pleased with this kind of help.

I am sure that Mr. Sargeant would also appreciate a note from you with any clips or mention of Radio Liberty which you may have been able to generate in the RECORD or in the press.

Your greetings were conveyed to Mr. Sargeant as you requested. He was pleased, as always, to hear about you and your good will toward us.

Sincerely,

PAUL N. SANKER,
Public Affairs Director.

Howard H. Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 10, 1964

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Howard H. Baker," published in the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of January 8, 1964, being a tribute to the late Representative Howard H. Baker, of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOWARD H. BAKER

Representative Howard H. Baker's untimely death, following a heart seizure at his Knoxville home Tuesday morning, strikes hard at all who knew him as an attorney, political leader, and public official. His fatal illness came without prior warning, just 5 days before his 62d birthday.

A stalwart Republican who gave his party loyal support in and out of office, Mr. Baker was above all else a Tennessean who loved his State and a public servant who rendered willing service to his whole constituency.

He was first elected to Congress in 1950 and had been returned to office by majorities of 2 to 1 or better ever since. The margins reflected not only the traditional Republican leaning of the Second District but his own popularity as well.

As one who knew the worth of the TVA, Representative Baker stood firm in his support of it and, although soundly conservative in his outlook, he was not averse to bringing the power of the Federal Government to bear on problems too burdensome for local solution alone.

Good Will Declaration of Concord, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, of all the wonderful celebrations of the Christmas season just past, the most moving may have been the good-will declaration of Concord, Mass. The declaration conceived by a group of Concord residents concerned with the achievement of true justice and equality in the world simply declares:

To new Concordians, prospective residents, and visitors of whatever race, creed, or national origin who share our desire for congenial good will, we extend a warm welcome in the Concord tradition.

The declaration has been signed by representatives of churches of all denominations and by town officials and all interested residents. Although we must create the legal framework within which equal justice can be achieved, that goal will be realized in the last analysis by the individual efforts of citizens of good will. Under unanimous consent, I insert a letter from the chairman of the Concord Finance Committee and an article from the Boston Record American of December 26 in the appendix of the RECORD.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORSE: In the battle to end racial discrimination and all the concomitant bitterness and struggles that arise from it the town of Concord, birthplace of the American Revolution has come up with another revolutionary idea.

Till now the attack has been mainly through legislation, Executive orders, enforcement, demonstrations, pressures, punishment for noncompliance, etc., needed groundwork.

Concord thinks there is a new way to the same end, to be used compatibly with these other methods which seem to be making some headway. The idea is simply to draw on the latent reservoir inherent in the minds and hearts of the great majority of American citizens—the reservoir of good will.

The Concord declaration of good will, signed by all the clergy of the town of every denomination, by the selectmen, the archivists, and a large cross section of its citizens simply declares:

"In the spirit of Concord friendly living we extend a warm welcome in the Concord tradition to new Concordians, prospective residents and visitors of whatever race, creed, or national origin who share our desire for congenial good will."

The enclosed material contains a reproduction of the declaration and comments on it to date.

A down-east philosopher, Charles Fletcher Dole, wrote some years ago, "Good will is the mightiest practical force in the universe."

Concord believes it is there and needs only to be awakened and uttered. I hope other communities and the press of the country will help forward this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. MOORE,
Chairman of the Finance Committee.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Record American, Dec. 26, 1963]

CONCORD URGES BROTHERHOOD AS WAY OF LIFE

The spirit of brotherhood is marching in Concord where minutemen stood once by the "rude bridge." There the first great victory for freedom was won in these United States.

There's no flag waving; there's no committee. It's just Concordians in a quiet, simple, but positive, manner, making it known to the world that whoever comes to live there, or visit there, will be welcomed with good will.

The idea is the spontaneous outgrowth of quiet conversations in small groups. The symbol, if it can be called a symbol, is a poster-sized card resting on the prized White House table in the Concord Free Library, with a sheet for signatures.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

The grassroots folk of Concord, who conceived the idea, call the parchment card "The good will declaration." Reproductions will be offered in the churches of Concord next Sunday and at the Loring N. Fowler Memorial Library, in West Concord, from then on.

The original, bearing a reproduction of the statue at the "Rude Bridge," symbolizing the early victory for freedom and a group of books symbolizing the Concord tradition of freedom of thought and expression, fostered by its famous authors and essayists, says:

"In the spirit of friendly living, we extend a warm welcome in the Concord tradition to new Concordians, prospective residents and visitors of whatever race, creed, or national origin, who share our desire for congenial good will."

CLERGY AND RABBIS

The original is signed by clergymen and rabbis of Concord churches and synagogues, plus the entire board of selectmen. An accompanying explanation tells the story simply:

"You have the opportunity," it says, "to participate in promoting an idea for strengthening the spirit of brotherhood in Concord both because of your own inclinations and because of the position of the churches in furthering new humanitarian endeavors.

"All of us who benefit, in the light of freedom, as citizens of Concord, owe a debt of loyalty to those beloved leaders who created the Concord tradition by their steadfast dedication to the highest principles. We honor them by rededicating ourselves."

PEACE AND BROTHERHOOD

It is hoped, the pamphlet says, "that as many townspeople as are imbued with the revitalized spirit of brotherhood" will sign. "Concord has a rare opportunity to demonstrate a shining new beginning at this season, which this year marks, with unusual soul searching, a juncture in human affairs."

Concord, as have many other communities, has its "welcome wagon" which goes about its mission of greeting newcomers, but the new idea, born in a community long famous for its acceptance of new ideas, goes deeper than a physical welcome. It is a spiritual welcome, a proffer of good will from an entire community toward any stranger of good will who may enter the town to live or visit.

Its authors hope that it will foster a spirit of brotherhood that will result in a victory as great as that won for freedom on April 19, 1775—a victory for peace and brotherhood.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Economists Face Good Job Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have pointed out where jobs are going begging in our society. Very often, although not always, these jobs are in very highly skilled areas, reflecting the demand for more skilled labor in a rapidly growing and technologically advanced economy.

An article in the Washington Post of December 28 points up another area where job openings are ample. At the annual convention of the American Economic Association, the employment exchange reported 1,000 job openings for economists, paying from $6,000 to $25,000. Here is another example, it seems, where jobs requiring advanced training and education exceed the supply of people trained and able to fill them.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post be put in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 28, 1963]

ECONOMISTS' NEW MOOD—"WHY WORRY?"

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

BOSTON, December 27.—There are 1,000 job openings for economists at the convention employment exchange here and they pay from $6,000 to $25,000 a year.

This footnote to the partly affluent society may help explain why so many economists are only marginally concerned with solving the public policy problems that agitate Washington.

The economists, more that 4,000 of them, are gathered here for their annual reunion, job hunt and examination of the state of their art.

If Gottfried Haberler, their nominal leader, is right then economists interested in public policy should be technologically unemployed and the Government should close shop. The central theme of Haberler's presidential address is that all is more or less right with the world.

Is Washington worried about poverty and the slow growth and high unemployment of recent years?

NO DEEP REPRESSIONS

It shouldn't be, Haberler suggests. "Contrary to what is often said or implied, the overall performance of the American economy has been quite satisfactory."

After all, there have been no deep depressions, he argues, and total output per person has been rising faster than ever.

Are Government officials disturbed over the growing gap between the world's rich and poor nations? They shouldn't be, Haberler implies. The poor countries, he contends, have been benefiting from the increase in world trade and prosperity in the industrial centers has spread to the less-developed periphery. If you don't believe it, Haberler will cite the fact that exports and imports of poor countries have been rising.

To be sure, Haberler is not entirely typical of the profession, although he is president of the American Economic Association this year. He stands well to the right of most of his colleagues, including those at his own school, Harvard.

But even after this is said, Haberler's disdain for Washington's worries reflects a prevailing mood among the economists here. The prestige papers are those that apply the calculus to such questions as properties of efficient accumulation paths in the closed linear model of production.

JOB VACANCIES

Does this magesterial mood reflect the economists' own well-being? According to Edwin Gooding, of the Boston Federal Reserve Bank and registrar at the employment center set up at the convention hotel there are 10 job vacancies for every 9 economist applicants. The median or middle level salary for newly minted Ph. D.'s is $8,200 in the colleges, $9,000 in Government and $9,500 in industry.

The median offer for seasoned senior economists ranges from $12,000 in academics to $15,000 in industry. While bearable, these rates are less dramatic than the beginning pay, suggesting that there is some disenchantment with economists as they grow older.

Not all the economists here are happy about their colleagues' inattention to policy problems. A minority wing believes that such concerns for the principal reason for the art. And within this group, a smaller band is questioning whether the current state of economic theory is of much help.

GALBRAITH'S APPROACH

John Kenneth Galbraith, another Harvardian, touched on this theme today.

"Economics is rigorously conservative in accommodating interpretation to underlying change," he complained.

For example, "the modern corporation has not yet been assimilated to standard economic theory, although the corporate system is all but coterminus with the largest part of economic life."

The Alice in Wonderland world of economic theory, Galbraith observed, "makes no distinction between a Wisconsin dairy farm and General Motors except to the extent that the latter may be supposed to have some of the technical aspects of monopoly."

But to make his point, Galbraith had to go to Cleveland and deliver his paper to an alien professional body, the American Association for Advancement of Science.

He would have been out of place here.

Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, now that the columnists and editorial writers have had their say on the failures and shortcomings of Congress during the last session, it is refreshing to hear a voice speak out in a reasonable and logical assessment of these alleged failures and shortcomings.

As a prominent business and civic leader, Frederick T. Bolte of Atlantic City, points out to me in forwarding an item from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly of January 6:

With all the hue and cry in the press about the lack of action by the 88th Congress, the enclosed seems like a more sound and rational appraisal. It may be that sometimes in the matter of legislation the wiser course could be to make haste slowly.

I agree, and I am sure many of my colleagues will not only agree, but will welcome the article which follows:

SALUTE TO CONGRESS—THE RECORD IS BETTER THAN THE CRITICS PRETEND

The legislative branch of the U.S. Government, perennial whipping boy of all who seek unbridled power for the executive, has been getting its lumps again lately. Back in New Deal days, F.D.R. used to lash out at "Martin, Barton and Fish"; a decade later Harry Truman vented his wrath on the "do-nothing" 80th Congress. However, the 88th, which recessed briefly on Tuesday after winding up a wearisome first session, has suffered the most far-reaching abuse. From commanding positions on television and in the press, the whole liberal establishment has heaped scorn upon the Nation's lawmakers. According to one noted journalist, their reputation "has sunk lower than a snake's belly." The public's attitude toward Capitol Hill, added Stewart Alsop, "is a mixture of indifference, amusement and contempt." Even the Ford Foundation subtly threw in its two cents worth when it disclosed last week a grant of $85,000 to the American Assembly of Columbia University, to finance a scholarly study of "An Effective Congress."

As the Food Foundation seems to suspect, there is indeed a crying need for fresh enlightenment—chiefly among the strident critics cited above. Contrary to their misguided views (which, by the way, would have appalled the Founding Fathers delighted George III), the U.S. Constitution has endowed the legislative branch, not the executive, with authority to make the Nation's laws. The White House may propose; Congress, in due course, disposes. In the session that has just drawn to a close, moreover, the process of deliberation, while frustrating to some observers, has scarcely proved a waste of time. For example, by carefully weighing pros and cons, the House Ways and Means Committee produced a tax reduction bill far superior to the original draft of the Treasury. In other cases protracted debate has prevented the hasty enactment of legislation which, on closer scrutiny and second thoughts, turned out to be ill-conceived, unnecessary and unwise. Across the board it has heightened public awareness of issues. The 88th Congress to date may not have passed many laws, but, within its own bailiwick, it has given the country tolerably good government.

Those who measure such things strictly in terms of quantity are not likely to agree. Probably not since 1932, when a Democratic Congress chose to balk a Republican Presi-

dent at every turn, has the legislative process moved at so slow and (at least to some) painful a pace. Despite heavy pressure from the administration, the lawmakers passed neither the civil rights nor the tax bill. The House Ways and Means Committee took no action on so-called medicare, the scheme to provide the aged with hospital and nursing home care through new payroll levies under social security. Federal aid to public schools remained a dead letter. Where Congress showed unexpected vigor, as in the case of foreign aid, the results were calculated to please neither the White House nor its spokesmen in the fourth estate.

Hence the shrill chorus of denunciation, which, in recent weeks, has echoed loud and long. A look at the record, however, suggests that Congress deserves something better. In terms of what they achieved, as well as what they balked at, the lawmakers have done well by their constituents. The tax bill is a case in point. Originally designed to restore confidence after the stock market crash of 1962, the measure took 18 months to clear the House Ways and Means Committee. While vexing to the executive, which repeatedly warned of the dangers of recession, the delay has had no visible effect on the stock market, or on employment, production and trade, all of which lately have reached new highs. It has given Congress time to analyze, and to reject, some of the doctrinaire soak-the-rich proposals with which the Treasury version was loaded. What has emerged from the weighty deliberations of the Committee is far from ideal—Barron's still leans to the view that budgets should be balanced before taxes are cut. However, both philosophically and fiscally, the new bill makes more sense than the old.

With respect to other pending measures, delay has proved equally salutary. Many months ago the White House telecast an emotional appeal for medicare, which, save for Chairman WILBUR MILLS and some equally levelheaded colleagues on Ways and Means, might have swept to passage long ago. Now that the Nation has had the opportunity to weigh alternatives—especially after recent hearings on Capitol Hill disclosed that the program will cost far more than the official estimates—the chances are that cooler heads will prevail. By the same token, despite recurrent pleas of impending crisis, Federal aid to public schools has failed to make much headway in Congress. Notwithstanding the absence of such assistance, State and local governments each year have managed to stave off the "crisis," which, with the population explosion fizzling out has grown increasingly remote.

No law, most people would agree, is preferable to bad law. By this yardstick alone, all the foregoing suggests, the legislative branch of government rates high marks. Moreover, though the political pundits somehow have failed to mention the fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD boasts a positive side. As a necessary part of the law-making process, Congress enjoys sweeping powers of investigation. In recent months it has put them to good use. The persistent probing of Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, helped shed some badly needed light on the murky origins of the TFX contract award; it also led to the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee months ago unmasked the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, with which Presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was somehow connected, as a Communist front in the pay of Havana. The Senate Rules Committee right now is delving into the tangled financial affairs of one-time Secretary to the Senate Majority Bobby Baker, an investigation which has rippled far and wide.

As for actual legislation, the 1st session of the 88th Congress did more than pass its customary quota of bills. Unlike any of its recent predecessors, it launched a determined effort to correct the excesses, and undo some of the damage, of statutes already on the books. The bitter struggle waged by the House to curtail foreign aid succeeded in whittling the annual appropriation to the lowest level in years; it also underscored the scandalous fact that the program has become a grabbag proffered to nations which, in theory and practice alike, are hostile to the United States. For the first time in living memory, Congress also sought to crack down on the freewheeling Rural Electrification Administration. Finally, it flashed an overdue warning to the Federal Communications Commission and other overzealous regulatory bodies. So far, it told the FCC in effect, and no further.

Like the "do-nothing" 80th Congress, which endorsed the Truman doctrine, approved the Marshall plan, and cut taxes, the 88th thus is likely to deserve well of history. The same can hardly be said of its detractors, who, in their zeal to manipulate the future, have shown an unlovely bias toward the present and disdain of the past. "The less government we have the better," said Emerson well over a century ago. The truth of that statement has just been reaffirmed.

Bar Mitzvah Ceremonies for Rachel Rose Hanan and Morris Rubin Hanan Held at Etz Ahayem Sephardic Congregation, Montgomery, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a copy of the Bulletin of Etz Ahayem Sephardic Congregation of Montgomery, Ala., and the talks made by Morris Rubin Hanan and Rachel Rose Hanan at the ceremony mentioned in the Bulletin.

Ths beautiful ceremony brings to our attention the historical heritage of these good people and their intense loyalty and contribution to the progress of our great Nation:

BULLETIN OF THE ETZ AHAYEM SEPHARDIC CONGREGATION, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Capacity congregation witnessed the first Bat Mitzvah, the Daughter of Commandment Ceremony and Bar Mitzvah for Rachel Rose Hanan and Morris Rubin Hanan at Thanksgiving morning services, November 28, 1963, and the following evening.

The celebration was held at Etz Ahayem Sephardic Congregation, corner Lebron and Augusta Streets, Montgomery, Ala., with the twin leading the impressive Mitzvah with exemplary skill.

The celebrants are the twin son and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Rubin Morris Hanan, prominent religious leader, merchant, and dedicated leader of the State's program for the aged.

In closing the Mitzvahs, the youthful Rabbi Solomon Acrish lauded the lengthy renditions by Rachel and Morris and reminded the congregation that Rachel was the first Sephardic Jewish girl of Etz Ahayem Congregation to become Bat Mitzvah, the daughter of the commandment. He cited the training provided for the children by their parents and grandparents and then presented two mementos to the youthful Hanans.

Following the Thanksgiving Day services for Morris R. Hanan, who closed with the thoughtful expression that "it shall be my fond contribution to conduct myself in such a way that would bring honor and glory to my parents, to my congregation, and to my country," and "it is my duty to uphold, respect, and to revere the traditions of my fathers."

Rachel said the occasion of her Bat Mitzvah ceremony inspired many thoughts, "I am mindful," she said that I am entering into responsible womanhood. I realize, too, that I have the privilege to be the first Spanish-Jewish girl to inaugurate this new institution in our synogogue. May I ever prove worthy of this honor and privilege and in future years may these moments serve as a source of courage and inspiration to me."

Rubin Franco, the president of the congregation, presented copies of the Holy Scriptures to the two youths and said, "Such an example of devout religious faith as we all hold as the example of untiring service to your community and country have been well instilled in both of you and your parent and grandparents."

Rachel Rose Hanan's words received the undivided attention to the congregation. The message contained in her oration is not so much a manifestation of her ability to preach as an opportunity to emphasize valuable religious truths by which our younger girls and those present may live.

Rabbi Acrish said full advantage must be taken of the occasion so that the lesson gained be lasting. It seems also that the individual girl to be inspired with the fact that the Torah is a valuable treatise of human wisdom, a guide for everyday conduct.

BAR MITZVAH CEREMONY SPEECH BY MORRIS RUBIN HANAN, THANKSGIVING DAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1963

Worthy rabbis, my dear parents, relatives, and friends, today marks a special day in my life. I am today officially accepted into the congregation of Israel as a responsible member. The Bar Mitzvah ceremony is my initiation into the fold of Judaism. Since time immemorial, Jewish boys have waited with impatience and keen anticipation for this occasion, alway- desirious of becoming an active member of his congregation and sharing the duties which Judaism places upon the individual. I therefore, in behalf of my sister and I, welcome all of you, my dear friends and relatives, who have come to join with me on this happy occasion.

I assure you that I will always be proud of my religion and my inheritance that Almighty God has given me. Through my studies in my Hebrew and Sunday schools I have learned that we are inheritors of the great Jewish religious traditions which have as their ultimate goal, the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth.

The God we serve is a God of love and righteousness who would have us be holy as He is holy. The Torah, which we cherish, is a comprehensive guide for spiritual living, concerned with every aspect of human behavior. The prophets of Israel, dedicated to God and their fellow men, bade us to pursue charity, justice, and loving kindness among all of God's creatures.

On this, my birthday, the fine people of America are observing a great day in the American calendar, a day of thanksgiving. There is nothing like it elsewhere in the world. It does not commemorate a great battle or the birth of a great leader. Thanksgiving is the expression of a deep feeling of gratitude by the American people. It is a day set aside to recognize God for all the goodness he has bestowed upon the American people of all faiths.

Today's reading of the Torah is concerned with Jacob's prayer when God appeared to him on the road to Bethsheba. As Jacob gave thanks unto the Lord, even today the

people of America are giving thinks to Him. The American people realize, as did Jacob, that all our blessings come from the Almighty God.

All my life I shall try to recognize this day as not only the day of my birth, but a day of thanksgiving to the Lord our God, that I may face the future undismayed. I offer thanks to Him today, not only for the gains that I have made, but what came not my way.

When I start thinking about our many blessings, I recognize the rights we take for granted in a free country, the freedom to worship according to my belief, freedom of expression, and countless other freedoms that you and I enjoy today. Americans never think of what it would be like to live under a dictator. Millions of our people suffered at the hands of Hitler in Europe, and a very few were able to flee to America * * * two of those who did were my grandparents. I well remember when my parents would recount their story, and many times would stop and say with tears in their eyes, "We love America and God bless her." They could appreciate freedom and they gave genuine thanks for it because they knew what it was like when freedom was taken away.

Every day is a new page in my book life, and it is my duty as a new member of this Sephardic Jewish congregation and as a citizen of America to sum up this day as a time for devotion and of service to the God of Israel, who is the Author of all that is good, of all that was good, and of all the good that will be.

As I grow older, I am sure that I will find even greater inspiration, when I learn to understand that all hardships experienced by my people had to be experienced in order to preserve our way of life. It is my duty to uphold, to respect, and to revere the traditions of my fathers. I know that in my efforts to perfect myself as a Jew and as a citizen, I will have the continuous inspiration and encouragement of my dear parents. I know how happy all of us would have been if my beloved grandparents had been with us to join in this joyous occasion. It was God's will that they should not be with us but I know that their spirit rejoices at this time with us.

I am most thankful to my Rabbi Solomon Acrish and Dr. Morris Capouya and the teachers for their guidance and encouragement and their constant help to make this day possible. Words fail me at this time to express my gratitude to my parents and family who provided me all the comfort and opportunities to reach this day. It shall be my fond contribution to conduct myself in such a way that would bring honor and glory to them, to my congregation, and to my country. Thank you.

SPEECH BY RACHEL ROSE HANAN, FRIDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 29, 1963, AT THE BAT MITZVAH (DAUGHTER OF THE COMMANDMENT) CEREMONY

Worthy Rabbi, my dear parents, relatives, and friends, the occasion of my Bat Mitzvah (Daughter of the Commandment) ceremony this evening inspires me with many worthy thoughts. I am mindful that I am entering into responsible Jewish womanhood. I realize, too, that I have the privilege to be the first Sephardic Jewish girl to inaugurate this new institution in our synogogue. May I ever prove worthy of this honor and privilege, and in future years, may these moments serve as a source of courage and inspiration to me.

I welcome all of you who have come to participate in my rejoicing and to share with me and my family the festivities of this day. I have selected a passage from our Torah as an example of the sublimeness of our heritage and the source of our convictions.

I am proud that I was privileged to belong to a spiritual community, a community of conscience, and a community of teachers, sages, prophets, and martyrs, a community held together by magic ties, not by forts, guns or special privileges.

The Jewish people have fought all the demons that prowl the earth in the dark. They have fought all the evil spirits that cannot endure the light, and they have always emerged a dedicated people, champion of God. They may be maimed and crippled and limping as was our father Jacob after wrestling with the angel, but they always emerge as a spiritual community.

My people have met, on their long journey throughout the ages, every strutting tyrant, every evil idolator and every cruel dictator from the vicious Canaanitish gods, to the crusaders, the inquisitors, and the Nazis. My people have met them and have survived them because we have been filled with the spirit of God which is eternal, and my people live by the eternal light.

Another reason that I am proud of my heritage is that, being a minority group, my people are inevitably fighting for the health, welfare, understanding, and acknowledgment of all people. I am consciously and joyfully a new warrior of the Lord. I rejoice in the heritage of my fathers, and this moment I thank God that I am a Jewess, for, if we are religious, it is far better that we are persecuted than to be a prosecutor.

I am indebted to my parents and family, who have worked and sacrificed in my behalf. I shall never be able to repay the debt I owe them, but instead it shall be my task to make myself so worthy of the Jewish heritage and my American citizenship, that they would take pride in me. I also recall at this moment, my beloved grandparents, who though physically removed from us, continue to influence my life. They were the spiritual inspiration in our home and the guiding spirit in our family. Would that they were present here tonight to witness this occasion, because their love and devotion for this synagogue and for everything Jewish and American, will always be a source of strength and loyalty to my heritage to me. As they taught me, so will I teach my children because that is the central principle of good Jewish life.

I am grateful to my Rabbi Acrish, to Dr. Morris Capouya and to my teachers in the Sunday schools, whose encouragement and inspiration have helped me overcome many difficulties and barriers.

I pray to the Almighty God as I stand here tonight, being initiated into the faith of my people, that He will be ever with me, guide me, and to help me in all my tasks and obligations so that I will not fail in my duty as a Jewess and as an American. Thank you.

New York Times Calls for Overhaul of Draft Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of January 10, the New York Times calls attention to the inequities as well as the other problems connected with the draft law and urges a major reexamination of how our Nation selects, recruits, and retains the number of men required annually by the Armed Forces. It has been my view for some time that an alternative to or a major revision of the draft law which expires in June 1967 is badly needed.

The New York Times is to be congratulated for its attention to this problem which is of such importance to this Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the paper's editorial be included in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1964]

REVISING THE DRAFT

The new studies by the Defense Department of means and methods of procuring military manpower are welcome, though tardy. They should be supplemented by investigations by appropriate congressional committees and by private groups.

For it is none too soon to begin to consider alternatives to or major revisions of the draft law, which expires in June 1967. It has been clear for some time that the inequities in the present law and the great increase in the draft age population, plus technological changes in the armed services, require a major reexamination of how to select, recruit, and retain the numbers of men required annually.

There is much that is wrong with the present draft law. It is in no sense universal; only about 58 percent of the men reaching age 26 (the upper induction level) ever serve. There are all sorts of exemptions. Aside from the inequities, the draft per se (except when applied en masse in wartime) is a wasteful system. Shocking, too, are the high percentages of those rejected for mental or physical defects or illnesses.

The studies ought to be directed primarily at two objectives:

Can the services be maintained at required levels without the compulsion of the draft? Without additional inducements toward professionalism—higher pay, quicker promotion, more psychic rewards, or what not—this seems doubtful. We cannot afford to gamble with security. Britain has discarded the draft and, as a result, she has not been able to maintain her army at a size commensurate to her needs or plans. The United States may be able to do so, but only if we provide more inducements to volunteers.

What can be done about the intolerably high rate of rejections? President Johnson has made the first partial move by directing that all 18-year-olds be examined immediately upon reaching draft age to permit correction of, or treatment for, remedial defects. But this is a palliative. The large number of men rejected as psychiatrically unfit is a challenge to the Nation's program of mental health. How is it to be met? Where are such men to be treated? Who is to treat them?

Answers to these and scores of other questions dealing with the procurement of military manpower—and indirectly with the social health of the Nation—are long overdue.

School Lunchrooms and the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding young Kansan, Harlan S. Parkinson, director for Latin America of the Wheat Growers' Association, was recently decorated by the Chilean Government with the Order of Merit "Bernardo O'Higgins" in recognition of exemplary work in or-

ganizing a school-lunch program. The editorial from El Mercurio, Santiago's leading daily, sets forth in some detail the outstanding achievement of Mr. Parkinson which I am certain will be of interest to Members.

[From El Mercurio, Santiago de Chile, Monday, Dec. 9, 1963]

SCHOOL LUNCHROOMS AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Recently, the Chilean Government decorated a North American, Mr. Harlan S. Parkinson, with the order of merit "Bernardo O'Higgins" in the rank of official in recognition of his work in organizing a school-lunch program in our country which will be developed throughout all the schools in the southern area of Santiago. The program began this year with the construction of a pilot school lunchroom named "Abraham Lincoln" at School 327 in the slum area of German Riesco.

The construction of this large pilot school-lunch building was paid for by donations from Great Plains Wheat, an association of 300,000 North American wheat farmers who set aside a part of their profits to cooperate with the Alliance for Progress and food for peace to improve the nutritional conditions of children throughout Latin America.

In developing this program, Harlan Parkinson, the director for Latin America of the wheatgrowers' association, asked only that the fathers of the children of the school who will be benefited by the lunch, work voluntarily forming labor teams, who in their free hours and during the evening would construct the lunchroom. The heavy construction of the building was completed in 3 months and after a short time, a large and modern kitchen was installed where teams of mothers of the same children, daily prepared the meals, supervised by trained nutritionists. The mothers received food to feed the members of their family who remained in their homes.

Harlan Parkinson is not a member of the U.S. Government, nor of the Alliance for Progress, but represents the spirit instilled by Kennedy in his fellow citizens to aid in an effective form the needy people of this part of our continent. Two years ago, Parkinson developed this type of program by feeding undernourished children in the poorest slums of Lima.

To enlarge the scope that will be realized by the work of Parkinson, his association has signed a contract with the National Health Service with the backing of the Agricultural Department of the U.S. Embassy and Care, to feed all the undernourished children in the primary schools of our slum areas.

In our judgment the work carried out by Great Plains Wheat is a practical demonstration of what it would mean for our country to implement, hopefully very soon, more programs combining the Alliance for Progress and food for peace.

National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, now that the appropriation bill on independent offices has been finally enacted, I am pleased that the House version of an item of $5 million for the beginning of a modernization program of the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center at Pomona, in my district, was left intact.

At the time of the passage of the bill in the House last October, a very fine report through the medium of the press was made in a feature article by Gary Shenfield, of the Philadelphia Bulletin staff. It appeared in the Sunday Bulletin of October 13, 1963, in the New Jersey section of this very fine newspaper, which has a growing circulation in my south Jersey area. The report was based on an interview with Col. William F. Harrison, U.S. Air Force, retired, the manager of the center, who has contributed greatly to a more successful operation of the center in directing the FAA reorganization and reorientation of the facility now underway.

As the Representative of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, I commend the Bulletin and its staff reporter, Gary Shenfield, in this fine piece of informative and factual reporting, and I thank Colonel Harrison for his frank and honest appraisal of the installation under his charge. It is a pleasure to know that such an important Government installation as NAFEC is under the guidance of a capable and dedicated public official with a lifetime of public service behind him.

The article referred to is as follows:

The National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center at Pomona is a permanent installation, its manager assured Atlantic County residents today.

Col. William Harrison (USAF, retired) said the $5 million voted by the House of Representatives on Thursday for modernization of the installation should quell rumors that it might close down.

Such rumors were widespread nearly 3 years ago. They were revived this summer when the NACEF payroll was slashed and when the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association recommended that the place be "phased out of existence" for "lack of productivity."

The House allocation, Harrison said, represents "a token approval of our $35 million, 4-year facilities program."

He said the $5 million will be spent in 1 year on construction, and added:

"It answers the question of how the new facilities will be financed. The Federal Government will build its own facilities."

NAFEC, the Federal Aviation Agency's 6,000-acre aviation laboratory, was established 5 years ago on the site of the old Atlantic City Naval Air Station. It is using the same prefabricated buildings that once housed Navy carrier pilots.

Requesting funds for the modernization earlier this year, FAA Administrator Najeeb Halaby asked Congress for $10 million, calling the current facilities "trashy."

Harrison this week looked out the window of his paneled office at the newly paved road, bordered by trimmed lawns, leading to the 155 sparkling white prefabricated buildings.

"We may be poor, but we're neat," he said in his slight, but distinct, Carolina accent. "The buildings on this former base are 20 years old. The life expectancy on temporary buildings in normal use is 10 to 15 years. These prefabs have been almost rebuilt, supported by steel, to house computers, air traffic control systems, simulation equipment, and special data processing equipment."

Across the street from Harrison's office is the former Navy hospital. It is now a light electronics laboratory.

"There is no central power setup at the center," Harrison said, "and this calls for many substations, and wires strung throughout the site here. New buildings would have the power source built into them to meet the requirements of the laboratories."

NAFEC has only one hangar. The other one on the site is used by the New Jersey Air National Guard. Harrison said the Navy-built hangar was originally wood trussed, but has been supported and resupported with steel, creating a serious weight problem.

"Last winter," Harrison recalled, "I was faced with 22 frozen restrooms on the base, although our boilers were delivering a full head of steam."

He blamed this on construction, and said the temperature would go no higher than 33° on the second floors of some of the buildings. A 2-inch water main froze and broke, flooding two floors of a laboratory last winter, he said.

"With modern satisfactory construction, this wouldn't have happened."

NAFEC employs 2,100 civil service and contracted personnel, with an annual payroll of $15 million. Three hundred FAA projects are underway there.

"I think the employees should be proud, Atlantic County proud, in belonging to and supporting such an important research center," Harrison said.

"Our master plan began when the laboratory started functioning. We first installed $22 million in electronic facilities here. We are currently repairing the 10,000-foot instrument runway at a cost of $1.5 million.

"The original 5,000 feet of Navy runway had to be replaced. Four-engine jets carrying loads 200 times heavier than carrier aircraft have been tested at the facility. It was the original center section that gave us trouble.

"We added 2,500 feet at either end of the landing strip when we took over the abandoned Navy base.

"Pending congressional approval, we hope to continue our master plan by building laboratories and supporting administrative units. We hope to erect a new runway which would make it possible for this center to be in continuous operation and handle the heaviest jets.

"I'm not too disappointed with the $5 million cut by the House Appropriations Committee. It will just take a little longer to complete the modernization. It's a start, and a good one, and it's been a tremendous challenge to develop complicated new air traffic control systems and techniques in an environment of general deterioration and impossible modification. Maintenance problems have been critical at times."

The Administration's Road to Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's address at the opening of the 2d session of the 88th Congress, rather than being a report on the state of the Union, seemed to many of us to be the paving on the road to a utopia.

The broad assistance to all people for all things belies the administration's assurances for economy in our Federal Government. To carry out even a small portion of the suggested program will require vast expenditures to be paid for by,

not only the taxpayer of today, but by our children and our children's children.

The editorial in the January 9 edition of the Chicago Tribune on the President's message to the joint session of the Congress contains much food for thought. I commend it to you for your thoughtful study:

EVERYTHING FOR EVERYBODY

President Johnson's state of the Union message, written in a peculiar form of Morse code dot-and-dash English, is an unabashed campaign document in an election year. In this mishmash of spending proposals, there are enticements for everybody with a hand out. No possible prospect is overlooked.

Furthermore, Johnson can get it for you wholesale. Although his prospectus contains everything Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy ever thought of, and some things they did not, his administration is, he says, to be frugal. We are to have more, for less spending, with a tax cut thrown in.

Frankly, the specifications are fraudulent, as these things always are. Thus the spending is to $97.9 billion, but the obligational authority is to be $103.8 billion. This simply means that about $6 billion to be extracted from Congress—if Congress comes across—represents deferred spending, authorized for the coming fiscal year, but to be spent in future years.

Mr. Johnson represents that spending will be $500 million less than the projected figure of $98.4 billion for the present fiscal year, and that his requests for obligational authority will be $4.1 billion less than those in the last Kennedy budget.

There is also the statement that a deficit originally projected at around $10 billion will be reduced to $4.9 billion, and this with an $11 billion cut in income taxes. As Senator DIRKSEN remarked, it will take fiscal legerdemain to accomplish everything Johnson has proposed within the budget figures he outlines.

Those who have been tempted to take Mr. Johnson's noises about prudence and economy at face value will notice that his message is a complete blueprint for the welfare state on a total scale. There is scarcely an area in the national life into which the President does not propose to move, with all that that means in spreading the Federal tentacles over the individual.

Paternalism is to supply a Domestic Peace Corps, Federal health care for the elderly under social security at no more than $1 a month, mass transit in the cities and low-fare transportation between them, more schools, libraries, hospitals, and homes than ever were provided by any other Congress; extension of the minimum wage, more help for depressed areas, plus a study of the effects of automation and another study to determine whether work can be spread by cutting down overtime pay.

Along with all this there is to be unconditional war on poverty, together with a tax cut by the first of February, the portmanteau civil rights bill, and the most effective, efficient foreign aid program ever. And everything, Mr. Johnson says, can be done without any increase in spending.

Mr. Johnson represents that his cornucopia of goodies should be viewed as a bipartisan program that need provoke no quarrels between Democrats and Republicans or between Congress and the administration. That could be so if everyone looks forward to a refreshing hike along the road to socialism.

Somehow we doubt if everybody is that enthusiastic about buying Mr. Johnson an extended lease on the White House. If the Republicans are looking for issues, there are plenty of them to be found in this political cargo of trade goods to bedazzle the natives.

An Amendment To Permit Bible Reading and Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues and I have introduced resolutions proposing a constitutional amendment to permit Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. Of course, I believe this should be on a voluntary and nonsectarian basis. I feel my colleagues will be interested in reading the editorial comments of the Pottstown Mercury on this important subject and have included them at this point with my remarks:

A LOCAL PREROGATIVE

Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pottstown's aggressive lawmaker in Washington, is pushing hard for quick passage of a constitutional amendment to allow Bible reading and prayers in public schools.

He now is campaigning strenuously to get such a law, bottled up in committee, out on the House floor. In addition, he has written a law himself.

If we omit Bible reading, prayer, and religious observances of Christmas, Thanksgiving, and Memorial Day from the public schools, we shall find it difficult to convince our children that Christian teaching and practice are important.

School activities are a great part of the child's life. If moral and religious training be omitted, he will inevitably draw the conclusion that we do not consider them to be of vital importance.

To abandon prayer and Bible reading, to forsake our basic principles and to surrender the convictions of probably 95 percent of our people is an unnecessary and uncalled-for concession to the small minority which does not share the same opinion.

Any who do not wish to hear the Bible read or to be present when prayers are said or when any kind of religious observance takes place may be excused from attendance, but let us not retreat from all public acknowledgement and supplication to God, the reading of the Bible, the singing of Christmas carols, and all Christian acknowledgments.

We believe in majority rule in all matters that do not violate the rights of others and certainly the continuance of the long-time traditions of our country do not infringe upon the rights or well-being of anyone.

No one can plead the first amendment as a basis for abandoning all religious observances in our schools.

The first amendment says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

This amendment limits Congress. It does not limit any of the States.

When it was adopted several of the States had what might properly be called "an establishment of religion."

There was no thought that this amendment would interfere with these practices.

Congress has not passed any law "respecting the establishment of a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" and there was and is no basis for the action the Supreme Court has taken in this respect.

In ruling against Bible reading and prayer in our schools the Court is actually violating the Constitution by prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

We believe the local school board in each case should determine the extent of Bible reading, prayer, and religious observances to be carried on in the schools of that district.

This is only exercising the religious freedom guaranteed to the people by the first amendment.

The local school boards know the wishes of the parents of their communities.

If there are districts in which the people do not wish to have these observances, well and good, but the majority of the school districts where they are very much desired should not be restricted or prohibited in the exercise of their unquestioned rights.

We hope this season of the year will remind us to insist upon the preservation and observance of our traditions.

Spending Pressures Raise Inflation Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the need for Congress to resist election-year pressures to increase Federal spending is succinctly pointed out in this month's issue of Nation's Business. The desirability of increased allocations for area redevelopment, mass transportation, fallout shelters, medicare, public works, and numerous other controversial programs must be weighed against the threat of inflation, a particularly insidious form of diluting the dollar.

The pending tax cut, viewed against the background of a $25.5 billion increase in the deficit since 1961, compared with a $12.4 billion deficit during the last 4 years of the Eisenhower administration, is an additional reason why Congress must forestall any increase in nonessential, low-priority expenditures. Preventing inflationary pressures is one of the most positive things we can do for our constituents. Therefore, let us be mindful of the complex interrelations between cutting taxes, increasing Federal spending and deficits, and, most important, inflation which threatens to neutralize the effectiveness of the tax cut.

The article follows:

SPENDING PRESSURES RAISE INFLATION DANGER—UNCHECKED INCREASES IN FEDERAL OUTLAYS COULD WIPE OUT BENEFITS RESULTING FROM TAX REDUCTION

Congress will be caught this year in a squeeze between election year pressures for more Government spending and a new threat of inflation that could wipe out the benefits you would get from a tax cut.

Many economists, political leaders, and businessmen see a long-range threat in continued major increases in Government spending.

Their views will be important in congressional debate over mounting deficits, and

the political campaign in which issues of big government and big spending promise to play a major role.

You can expect a decisive test of Government economy pledges which will influence political and economic developments affecting business far beyond the election.

Of course, President Johnson has pledged to make Government a model of frugality. But it remains to be seen how successful he will be.

Spending proposals pending in Congress include:

A $355-million item for the controversial Area Redevelopment Administration, which subsidizes new and expanding business ventures in depressed areas.

Mass transportation, $375 million for a 3-year start on a program that could swell to $15 billion or more as additional cities climb aboard.

A $190 million, 1-year start for a fallout shelter program to cost a total $2.1 billion over 5 years. Health care for the aged under social security, which could cost some $2 billion initially just for those eligible for benefits but who have never contributed to the program.

These, of course, are apart from extensions to other programs guaranteed to grow from year to year.

Nor do they include such items as a $1 billion expansion of the accelerated public works program, a proposal to pump some $5 billion into the Appalachian area, or a host of other Federal remedies for a host of needs discovered by politicians who find them unsatisfied by States and localities.

Considering the possibility that even a minority of these may be approved, many businessmen and economists are already concerned by the prospects of inflation.

Here are some typical expressions of this concern:

John W. Barriger, president of the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Railroad Co., fears that "the advantages of (the tax cut) could be nullified by inflation."

A former Chief of the Railroad Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the 1930's, he adds: "I have never been impressed that Government spending represents full value received for the outlays. And I haven't felt that a cut in expenditures would curtail any essential services."

S. M. McAshan, Jr., president of Anderson Clayton & Co., of Houston, says a general inflationary trend abetted by increased Federal outlays will give a lift to the economy, but he adds that a stimulus of this type is unsound and would help business only temporarily.

Still another, W. A. Johnston, of Chicago, president and chairman of the executive committee of the Illinois Central Railroad, calls early tax relief "essential to an upward economic trend" this year, but warns that unrestrained Federal spending will reduce confidence and harm business prospects.

Some Government officials argue that budget deficits are not necessarily inflationary.

Many thoughtful economists agree—provided the deficits are temporary and are managed by Government borrowing the savings of individuals and institutions so as not to distort the money supply.

The inflationary effects result chiefly from sale of Government securities through the commercial banking system, which creates money by increasing bank reserves. "That's just one step away from printing the money," says one business economist.

Aside from current expansionary forces, the problem of inflation, as viewed by authorities interviewed by Nation's Business, should be examined in terms of the size of future deficits and the way they are managed.

As to the size of the deficits, administration officials point to the whopping deficit of $12.4 billion incurred by the Eisenhower administration in fiscal 1959, which exceeds any since.

But, balancing surpluses against deficits, the cumulative deficit during the last 4 Eisenhower years was $12.4 billion—his first 4 totaled $15.1 billion—compared to the $25.5 billion increase in the deficit since 1961.

NEW PROBLEMS AHEAD

Many economists feel that prices have remained stable despite recent deficits because these have not been managed through the banking system, which would have inflated the money supply, but fear the future deficits would be.

"The Government will no doubt finance the deficit through banks," says B. H. Beckhart, professor emeritus of banking, Columbia University, an authority who urges restraint in Government spending.

"With the magnitude of the deficit we are facing, the Federal Government will have to turn to the banking system late next year," agrees a private business economist, "because the magnitude of deficit will be too large for savers to absorb it."

Charles J. Zimmerman, president of Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., agrees, adding: "The start of it might be psychological." He explains that a lack of confidence in Government responsibility among institutions and individuals with funds to save could force the Government into inflationary deficit management.

"One could feed on the other," he says, "and this would lead to a stepping up of the pace of inflation."

Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, points out that Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, testified that financing of the temporary deficit increase resulting from the tax cut through savings would have a dampening effect on the desired economic stimulation.

Monetary inflation, economists agree, can be translated into pressure on prices through the laws of supply and demand, under which more money would be available through Government spending without a corresponding increase in production.

Economy advocates see a whole series of expansionary factors and other forces which, when added to a tax cut and increased spending, could cause inflation.

Several point out that the Federal Reserve System has been following a moderately expansionary policy in increasing bank reserves.

One authority notes that total loans and investments in a 1-year period increased from $222 billion to $241 billion, a 9-percent rise far outstripping the increase in national output and other measures of economic activity.

Others point to increases in consumer debt and mortgage debt in particular, plus some deterioration in the quality of debt.

Although figures for unemployment are high, the rate is considerably lower among married men; this category, in fact, is approaching the full employment level.

This, plus the fact that many of the unemployed are women, teenagers, and the generally unskilled, suggests that inflationary policies would create pressure to raise the wages of the skilled employed, rather than put many jobless back to work.

Much of the unused industrial capacity counted on to absorb increased demand in the economy is obsolete. Just as putting unskilled workers to work would increase production costs, so would increased use of inefficient plant and equipment.

WHAT INFLATION WOULD DO

Many of the consequences of inflation are outlined by Dr. Leslie C. Peacock, deputy manager of the American Bankers Association, who tells Nation's Business:

"It is our view that unless the tax cut is accompanied by very strict control over Federal spending we will likely find that the cost and price pressures resulting from the combination of rising economic activity, further expansion in Federal spending, and enlargement of private purchasing power could leave us in a position which would make more difficult than ever achievement of international equilibrium and domestic economic growth."

One element of the problem is worldwide confidence in the dollar and the Nation's balance-of-payments problems, which could be harmed further by wage increases. Dr. Peacock adds:

"With the economic stimulus provided by both a tax cut and a spending increase, against a background of strong economic activity, the task of assuring that wage increases are no greater than productivity gains is likely to prove very difficult."

Finally, he warns: "One of the objectives of the tax cut, to encourage business investment and improved productivity, is likely to be jeopardized if the prospects are for further inflationary deficits."

Congressman CURTIS adds that the closing of an American factory because of import competition is as much a consequence of inflation as overall price increases.

CONTROLS COULD RESULT

Thus, lack of political restraint could lead to controls, says Professor Beckhart, citing the proposal to impose an interest equalization tax on investments abroad.

"I would hate to see us go down that road," he says.

"It would be followed by various types of domestic controls (including price controls). That's almost the universal history of controls. It may take some time for that to come about, but that's the usual sequence."

Of course, many who are aware of an inflationary threat do not share Professor Beckhart's pessimism. Walter Fackler, associate dean of the University of Chicago's School of Business, puts it this way:

"I don't see any immediate inflationary pressures.

"Government spending does tend to keep going up. I think it would be foolish to think that that trend would be reversed."

A tax cut should help hold spending down, he says, because of the size of the prospective deficit. "Not that you're going to reverse the trend, but you might slow it down." But he warns:

"There are certainly latent inflationary possibilities. If we have the tax cut and the Federal Reserve Board continues to be mildly expansionary and because of an election year you get a lot of new Government programs, the possibilities of inflationary pressure building would be there."

If taxes were not cut, he adds, recourse to massive Government spending as an alternative economic stimulant would be far more inflationary.

Country Conceived in Liberty or Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, many have believed for years in the Golden State of California that it was basically unjust that local real estate brokers act in the capacity of censor of the morals of a community in appraising the prerogatives of what real property shall be sold to whom.

Seventy complaints out of 19 million people during the first 3 months of oper-

ation of the California fair housing law is apparently too much for the brokers to take. Ken Leake in the Woodland Democrat writes about their efforts at repeal:

AS WE SEE IT—HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST

In a letter published Friday in this newspaper, the steering committe of the Davis Fair Play Committee issues a clear warning of the certain increase in bigotry and interracial tension that would be the inevitable result of a successful attempt to place the continuance of the Rumford Fair Housing Act on the ballot in November 1964.

As the committee pointed out, the legislation has not been given a fair chance to prove itself and the attempts of the California Real Estate Association to amend the law before it has been given a working chance is "too rash, too sudden, too ill advised."

It is the wrong time and the wrong place for such an attempt and the real estate agent's haste also indicates that they are doing it for the wrong reason.

But the error of the real estate association is more than a mistake in tactics—it is a mistake about the nature of democracy in America. The real estate men object to "forced housing" as if the right of any man to buy and sell property is absolute.

Many of the CREA members have served in the armed services or they have fathered sons who have answered the call of their Government and entered the Nation's armed services.

No real estate agent could possibly argue that property rights are more sacrosanct than human rights—that the Government may impose universal military training on its citizens but must keep a strictly do-not-touch attitude about property.

The general welfare is more important than any vested interest in property, and the people of the United States have always affirmed the priority of the public good.

Without that general recognition, the people of the United States would not have consented to the establishment of the principle of eminent domain and without eminent domain, there would never have been the railroad, that spanned the continent, the great system of public works that helped in the development of the West and the present expansion of our public school system.

Today, every city and county in the State rely upon planning commissions to protect the public interest against uses of property that would be inimical to that interest.

A property owner who wanted to build a rooming house in a single-residence neighborhood would find a group of neighbors who would take a dim view of the unrestricted use of his property.

The building, plumbing, electrical codes and other standards imposed upon the property owner also serve to underline the assumption that a man can develop his property as he sees fit only when it does not result in harm to the public.

We think it is just as important for every American to have the right to live where he chooses as it is for every home to have a wall of a certain thickness, a sideyard requirement and maximum densities.

This Nation was conceived in liberty and to the proposition that all men are created equal, and any legislation that seeks to implement the first condition of the American dream has a right to a working chance and in the conviction that no presupposed feudal rights of property take priority over it.

Woman President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Chicago American on January 8, 1964, entitled "For a Woman President," that is very deserving.

The article follows:

RUNNING SMALL COLLEGE CAN BE BIG BUSINESS

The president of one of southwest Chicago's most industrious enterprises is a 43-year-old, 5 feet 2 inches dynamic career woman. She appears at her office in the heart of her 155-acre plant at 7:45 each morning. She dresses each day in the same, conservative black outfit. Her manner of dress is closely followed, in fact, by much of her staff. She oversees a tight operation with an annual operating budget of $2 million, and a total monthly payroll of $110,000 to 300 full- and part-time employees.

Unfortunately, her enterprise never shows a profit, but neither has it ever operated in the red. For Sister Mary Olivia, R.S.M., operates a business that deals in ideas rather than products, and in satisfaction rather than profit. She heads Saint Xavier College at 103d Street and Central Park Avenue—academically identified as a liberal arts institution for 1,000 women students, but industrially, one of the largest, most progressive, fastest growing businesses in the area.

The continual adaptation of the Saint Xavier College method of operation to the business world's techniques was an absolute necessity, according to Sister Olivia. "We were forced to develop the fiscal policies and proven financial and organizational practices of big business by two factors: our rapid growth, and the ever-increasing difficulty of financing our operation," Sister Olivia explained. "In 1952, our plant investment was $1 million, on 10 acres at 49th Street and Cottage Grove Avenue. In 10 years, this investment has soared to $10 million on 155 acres. In the same 10 years our faculty increased from 45 to 80; our operating budget from $288,000 to $2 million.

The problem of rapid growth is actually one part of the increasing cost problem. "All educational institutions," said Sister Olivia, "whether tax supported or private, are encountering rising costs. For State colleges and universities, this results in increased dependence on taxpayers. But for private institutions, the result is intensified solicitation of alumni, parents, corporations, and foundations, and a highly competitive situation develops."

The competition among private institutions for every support dollar is obviously a keen one. St. Xavier College is engaged in a major 5,600,000 development program scheduled for completion in 1965. Of this amount, $4,500,000 is represented in a 36-month campaign stimulated by a Ford Foundation matching grant of $1,500,000 to the college in 1962. To receive the full grant, the institution must raise from its own resources, $2 for every Ford dollar, or $3 million in 3 years.

The college to date has raised $1,400,000 from corporations and foundations in Chicago and throughout the country; from its own president's council, a group of area businessmen and civic leaders; from Chicago-area alumnae; and from graduates and friends in the Cleveland, Los Angeles, San Francisco and New York areas.

"To remain on schedule between now and June 1965," said Sister Olivia, "we must realize an average of about $3,000 per day. And much of this $3,000 must come from sources who are being solicited by representatives of many other worthwhile causes, both educational and charitable."

To help meet the challenge, Sister Olivia plans to travel approximately 50,000 miles in the next 18 months, usually accompanied by the college director of development, Sister Mary Jeannie, R.S.M. As president, she is further assisted by the services of a complete college business office, a development center which oversees special events, proposals, fundraising, planning and scheduling, and a public relations office.

Sister Mary Olivia received some experience in the business world before becoming involved in her present position as educator and business administrator. She graduated from St. Xavier College in 1942 with a degree in chemistry and was employed as an industrial chemist for American Steel Foundries in Hammond before deciding to enter the Sisters of Mercy.

The John F. Kennedy Memorial Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, on November 27, 1963, I introduced H.R. 9254 to designate the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center and to appropriate sufficient matching funds for completion of the Center. From the copper-mining towns of my district to the metropolitan centers of the east coast, few Americans are left untouched by the cultural richness of our society which the late President so prominently brought to the public's mind. Seldom, if ever before, has an American President made such an impact on the development and appreciation of the arts.

Americans from every section of our great Nation are justifiably concerned that our late President be honored in the most fitting manner. We should not now allow our deliberations to become arguments of partisan criticism. Let us proceed in the forthright fashion which the American people demand of their Congress. The Members of this body, perhaps more than any other section of our public, were closely touched by President Kennedy's stimulus for a reawakening interest in our heritage. I ask my colleagues to support the Cultural Center legislation with provision for adequate funds. Such legislation will assure a proper stage for this country's perform-

ers and certainly a fitting tribute to the one man who did so much to enhance American performance and enjoyment of the arts.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski on Suppressed Letters in Support of Shevchenko Statue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the editor of the Washington Post took it upon himself to criticize ill tempered-ly all Americans and groups supporting the Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital, he apparently did not know how sophisticated and advanced the subject was. His wild criticisms constituted an attack upon the informed judgments of the late President Kennedy, our present President Johnson, the Congress, millions of Americans of various ethnic and religious backgrounds, indeed, upon the society we call America and the principles of life it represents. One need only read his editorials from September 23, 1963, to November 12 to witness the erraticism of thought and hollowness of position on this subject.

Apart from these editorial errors and failures, what is really distressing is the editor's suppression of scores of letters that had been sent in protesting and rebutting his fallacious views. In our open society error is rightly entertained in open and frank discussion, but we do not tolerate in the press or elsewhere a major suppression of opposing views and evidence. Considering the number of editorials that have appeared in the Post and then the various accompanying news reports, which have all the marks of a concentrated campaign, it is evident that over 90 percent of the letters sent to the Post were not published. From copies received here it appears that hundreds of letters have been sent in popular opposition to the unjust and erroneous notions of the Post's editor.

Because of the seriousness of this whole case as concerns the relations of our country with the captive peoples not only of Ukraine but all other captive nations, I have selected just a fraction of the letters written by Americans from all sections of our country, whose rebuttals are pointed and quite informative. I ask that these letters be appended to my remarks. Included also is a letter I have written to the Secretary of the Interior on this subject and his reply to me.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1963.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been customary in America in the past years to honor outstanding leaders of each nationality of the European countries.

In keeping with that tradition is the erection of a statue for the great Ukrainian patriot and poet, Taras Shevchenko, authorized by an act of Congress (Public Law 86-749, September 13, 1960) in the city of Washington. As you know, the site was selected to be at 23d and P Streets NW., and the dedication occurred on September 21, 1963.

Due to some misunderstanding, the matter has been brought to your attention therefore my letter to you.

Regardless of what may have transpired, all Americans of Ukrainian descent are behind the erection of the statue.

Likewise, may I remind you that Shevchenko was known in many of the Central European countries where individuals were fighting for their freedom. He can be compared to our Jefferson in America and as the representative of all Europeans that have known him and read his writings.

I therefore urge you to permit the erection of the statue, as authorized by law, so that all Americans, in honoring a fighter against tyranny and oppression, can take pride in their heritage and in so doing will be better Americans.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1963.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LESINSKI: Secretary Udall has asked this office to explain our position in regard to the progress of the proposed Shevchenko memorial discussed in your letter of December 17.

There has arisen recently a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the purpose of a letter dated December 4 to the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission from Secretary Udall. From newspaper accounts and correspondence, it appears that this purpose is being construed to be opposition to the memorial project. We assure you nothing could be further from the truth.

When it became known, through an announcement at the November 7 meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission, that consideration would be given to revoking the Commission's approval of the site for the memorial, the Secretary wished to recommend to the Commission that in any restudy of the memorial project as a result of the Commission's action, the Department's proposal for a National Capital Parks Memorial Board should be included. This is in keeping with our longstanding policy for seeking appropriate means of assuring that sites will be available for future memorials which, in all respects, merit a location on parkland in the Nation's Capital.

We recommend the establishment of the memorial board as a means of meeting the critical situation which confronts the National Capital Parks system today. The board will provide an effective method for focusing attention on the problem and will help all concerned to view the numerous proposals in proper perspective. It is our opinion that, notwithstanding the worthiness of the Shevchenko Memorial, the larger question of the appropriate use of the very limited public land available should first be resolved. As long as this situation is left unsettled, no memorial project should be authorized on public land in our Federal city.

The construction drawings for the Shevchenko Memorial have been reviewed by this office, but our comments are being withheld pending the outcome of the National Capital Planning Commission's impending action. The announcement on November 7 drastically altered the progress of this project, and we feel it inadvisable to proceed until the question of the site is settled.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. We shall be happy to furnish you any additional information you need.

Sincerely yours,

T. SUTTON JETT,
Regional Director.

THE TRIDENT QUARTERLY,
Chicago, Ill., November 19, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For over a month now, the Washington Post has engaged in a polemic battle with a number of Ukrainian-Americans over the proposed monument to Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C. As I understand them, your objections to the Shevchenko statue can be summarized as follows:

(1) Taras Shevchenko did not have the remotest connection with American nationalism, with the United States, or with the American way of life.

(2) The Soviet Union has dedicated libraries, collective farms, plants, villages, and memorials to Shevchenko's name. The implication here is that Shevchenko must have contributed something to the growth of communism and because of this, it would be "un-American" to erect a memorial to him in our Nation's Capital.

(3) Shevchenko was anti-Semitic and anti-Polish.

Since I believe none of these objections are valid, permit me to enumerate a number of facts, supported by quotations from scholarly, reliable, and non-Ukrainian sources, in answer to your objections.

Fact No. 1: The nationalistic ideals of self-determination, personal liberty, and national organization were first realized during the American Revolution.

"In reality, nationalism arose as a dominant force in the 18th century in Western Europe and in North America; the American and French Revolutions may be regarded as its first powerful manifestations. * * * Nationalism meant, in America as well as in revolutionary France, the adherence to an idea, looking toward a common future of freedom and equality, not toward the past which had been characterized by authoritarianism and inequality." ("Nationalism," Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. XVI, 1951.)

Fact No. 2: Taras Shevchenko was a Ukrainian nationalist who, in his writings, actions, and by his very life, demonstrated a spiritual connection with the ideals of American nationalism.

"The first Ukrainophil program went so far as to demand that Ruthenians (Ukrainians) should be guaranteed autonomy and linguistic independence in a pan-Slavist federation (republic) after the American model." (Masaryk, Thomas, "The Spirit of Russia," vol. I, Macmillan, 1955, p. 302.)

"Shevchenko was the first not only to proclaim his opposition to autocracy and serfdom, but to demand a complete separation of the Ukraine as a nation from Russia." (Kohn, Hans, "Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology," 2d ed., Vintage Books, Random House, 1960, p. 70.)

"While there is a tradition of separate political development in the Ukraine, modern nationalism—the doctrine that persons of a distinctive culture should constitute an independent state—came late to this area. To a close observer, the first stirrings of nationalism among educated groups in the Ukraine would have been apparent early in the 19th century, and by the middle of that century

Taras Shevchenko, the greatest name in Ukrainian literature, was giving poetic expression to nationalist aspirations." (Armstrong, John, "Ukrainian Nationalism," 2d ed., Columbia University Press, 1963, p. 3.)

Fact No. 3: In an effort to "Sovietize" the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R., and to fulfill their own political ambitions of complete amalgamation of all nationalities, the Communists have resorted to a deliberate falsification of historical fact and have transformed the national symbols of their captive peoples to fit the Russian Communist mold.

Stalin's "A Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" "launched an extraordinary phase of history rewriting, with gross falsification of evidence, which has spread out now into the satellite states and must absorb a high proportion of the time and effort of modern Communist historians, (Rostow, W. W., "The Dynamics of Soviet Society, A Mentor Book, The New American Library, 1952, pp. 121–122.)

"In the first stage of 'Sovietization,' generous grants of 'self-determination' and local cultural 'autonomy' are usually made. In this stage, and to a lesser degree throughout the later stages of development of a Soviet 'republic' manipulation of symbols of nationalism serves important psychological purposes. The persistent attention devoted to this theme is impressive; even discounting for its very important role in foreign propaganda, it is difficult to doubt that the Kremlin appraises shrewdly the value of frequent gestures of recognition of group identities." (Barghoorn, Frederick C., "Soviet Russian Nationalism," Oxford University Press, 1956, pp. 128–129.)

Fact No. 4: Taras Shevchenko's rule role as Ukrainian patriot and a fighter for freedom has been deliberately distorted by the Russian Communists.

"At the same time efforts were made to identify the outstanding cultural figures in the non-Russian republics with their Russian counterparts and with Soviet thought and the traditional Russian heritage. The best example of these efforts in the Ukraine involved the preeminent Ukrainian writer Taras Shevchenko." (Sullivant, Robert S., "Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917–57," Columbia University Press, 1962, p. 230.)

Fact No. 5: The erection of monuments to Taras Shevchenko in the U.S.S.R. is a deliberate effort on the part of the Russian Communists to manipulate a nationalist symbol and to falsify the image of a beloved Ukrainian national hero.

"The Soviet Ukraine has become an administrative part of the economic complex and the military base of the U.S.S.R. for the totalitarian bureaucracy. Stalin's bureaucracy, it is true, erects statues to Shevchenko, but only in order to press with this monument on the Ukrainian people, to force them to eulogize the Kremlin violators in the language of the Kobzar" (Trotsky, Leon, "On the Ukrainian Problem," Byulleten Oppozitsii, 77–78, May, June, July, 1939, p. 6).

As for your allegation that Shevchenko was anti-Semitic, I refer you to the Jewish author, Arnold Margolin ("From a Political Diary: Russia, the Ukraine, and America," Columbia University Press, 1946, p. 27.)

Your objection to Shevchenko on the grounds that he was anti-Polish also has little basis in fact in view of his progressive ideals regarding a pan-slavic federation with unity and equality for all Slavic peoples. On this point, I refer you again to Kohn's "Pan-Slavism," Masaryk's "The Spirit of Russia," as well as to "The Handbook of Slavic Studies" (Harvard) edited by Leonid Strakhovsky and "A History of Russia" (Random House) by Jesse D. Clarkson. If Shevchenko protested against the excesses of Polish landlords in Ukraine, this no more makes him anti-Polish than your protests against the way some Americans treat Negroes makes you anti-American.

Finally, your statement that Shevchenko was not a universal poet depends on your definition of universality. According to the "Slavonic Encyclopedia" (edited by Joseph S. Roucek, Philosophical Library, 1949), Shevchenko is "universally regarded as the greatest of Ukrainian authors and one of the great poets of the Slavonic world."

It is my sincere hope that with the above information as a starter, you will make a more careful study of Taras Shevchenko and reevaluate your position regarding his monument in Washington, D.C.

Personally, I am delighted that our Congress has permitted the Ukrainian-American population to erect a statue to Shevchenko. It will serve as reminder to Ukrainians all over the world (the U.S.S.R. included) that America, unlike Russia, fully understands and appreciates its multiethnic society and that Americans are not, as you hint they should be, oblivious of the positive contributions of other nationalities, no matter how insignificant their number on these shores. Most important of all, however, the Shevchenko memorial in Washington will stand for all time as a reminder to the world that the real significance of the American Revolution of 1776 has not been forgotten.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON B. KUROPAS,
Editor.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *October 1963.*

THE EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In an article published in your paper, October 18, 1963, your contributor demanded an annulment of the decision of Congress to erect in Washington a monument to Taras Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet. It is characteristic that in the atomic age he is denying the right of independence to the Ukrainians, a nation of a thousand years' history, while in recent times many nations in Africa and Asia have been established, some of them thoroughly unknown in the past.

It was a brilliant history because the Russians deemed it necessary to appropriate this history for themselves notwithstanding the truth that the origin of their state could be only on their territory. We have in mind the princes' period from the 10th to 14th century. The subsequent history was a tragic one, however, Bohdan Khmelnitsky, the chief of state, compares quite well with Cromwell and another Chief of State, Irvan Mazeppa should be considered one of the first leaders against the Russian aggression.

The Ukrainian Republic first fell victim to the Soviets. The Ukrainians belong to the nations who suffered most severely in the loss of both population and material goods in the First and the Second World Wars.

We think that the first problem of the world now is to keep peace through a union of all cultural nations. Your appeasement of the Russians would lead only to a rather great catastrophy.

As to Taras Shevchenko he has been called a representative of his nation such as Homer to the Greeks, Virgil to the Romans, Dante to the Italians, Shakespeare to the English, Goethe to the Germans and Mickiewics to the Poles. Considering a nation as to her merits, we think more of her cultural achievements in the past than of her leaders, and therefore the above comparison.

Shevchenko was one of the great lyric poets, a poet of bravery as exhibited in his poems "Hamaliya" and "Ivan Pidkova," a defender of human dignity as proved in his poems "Catherine" and "Maidservant" and a great freedom fighter as exhibited by his works—"The Caucasus," "The Dream," "The Neophytes," etc. and by his life. His poem "Mary" reminds us of the great madonnas of the Renaissance. He was a painter of distinction, in his days likened to Rembrandt; an engraver, acknowledged by the Imperial Russian Academy of Arts as an academician, and a novelist. His novels "An Unfortunate," "The Twins," "The Artist" and "A Journey" are especially worthwhile mentioning and reading.

As a poet Shevchenko grew on the foundation of native folk poetry. His lyrics may compete with the lyrics of Shakespeare, created on a similar basis. Shakespeare tops all poets with his knowledge of men.

Shevchenko's most beloved writers were William Shakespeare whom he read in Russian and French, Walter Scott and Charles Dickens. A lasting influence left on him the Bible that he read since his earliest years of schooling.

Jacques Maritain in his "Art and Poetry' (p. 144) calls a true poet—a hero, priest, savior. My opinion is that such marking would in a best way refer to Taras Shevchenko who saved the Ukrainian nation from submersion by his creative work. He longed for a Washington for his nation that she may become free.

W. BESOUSHKO, Ph. D., Ed. D.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
December 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: By now you are well aware of the hostile, unfortunate, and humiliating policy recently adopted by the Washington Post and some individuals toward the erection of the Shevchenko Monument.

It is indeed a puzzle as to why the Washington Post embarked on so provocative a course. Who actually instigated this matter? Unfortunate and humiliating not only because the Post's recent strategy has morally affected thousands upon thousands of Americans of Ukrainian extraction but the millions of Ukrainians scattered throughout the free world and especially those freedom-seeking Ukrainians within the Soviet Union. These people especially look upon the U.S.A. as the strongest and foremost foothold in the expression of freedom. What effect will this have especially upon those enslaved Ukrainians who eventually will learn of this incident and should it become a fact—Shevchenko the freedom-seeking laureate barred from the capital of justice—Washington, U.S.A.? How will our Congressmen appear to these unfortunate souls?

Never has Shevchenko been accused of being anti-Semitic. Neither during the czarist regime, nowhere in Europe, nor even now under communism. The honor for coining this degrading accusation can be claimed by the Washington Post. The mere fact that Shevchenko to whom freedom was a highly prized luxury was the first to sign a protest against discrimination of Jews is something to be considered. In 1858 an anti-Semitic article appeared in issue No. 35 of magazine Illustration. A protest was in turn issued and signed by the following literary figures at that time: Shevchenko, Chernyshivsky, Mr. Stepkin, I. Turgenev, etc. This was not an exercise in penmanship but a decisive indication of courage by a humanist and an individual who truly believed in "the holy liberty" with complete disregard for his personal welfare and most definitely not an anti-Semitic action. Shevchenko by the way, was under close police supervision at this time. Nor a minor incident in 1861 in Pryluky where a Jewish villager's house and possessions were going up in flames, Shevchenko unhesitantly began carrying out the possessions and helped rescue the Jewish family, calling to all villagers to pitch in the rescue. After the fire Shevchenko made a statement to the onlookers stating that a person in need and want regardless of his nationality or religious belief becomes for us our closest brother (Memoirs on Shevchenko, 1958, p. 108). Is this an act of anti-Semitism?

Have the critics paused for a moment as to why the Communists adopted Shevchenko and projected his works to suit their aims? If perhaps for the same reason as they say Polsanov instead of Fulton for the steamboat and Popov instead of Marconi for the radio, and of so many others. It is a well-known fact that all well-known personalities in czarist Russia who had the courage to protest against social injustice and government atrocities had been appraised in such a form by the Soviet Government as to make them become predecessors to the introduction of communism. To make Shevchenko a hero of communism is not an objective approach but falsification of facts. Shevchenko was deeply religious who believed in the freedom of the nation and the individual. To portray Shevchenko in the way the Communists do is an insult and descreatión not only to the memory of Shevchenko but to the entire Ukrainian nation.

Nor is Shevchenko a newcomer to the North American hemisphere. For in Winnipeg, sanctioned by the Canadian Government, a Shevchenko statue has been erected and now stands before the Parliament Building. Is then the decision of the Canadian Government to be considered Communist influenced? Are we here so ill briefed as to be unable to distinguish right from Communnist propaganda?

The Post states that "Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans," can't we say likewise about the Joan of Arc and Dante statues which are located in our Capitol?

Now just who is this Shevchenko, as one of the Post's editors seems to be so uninformed. Permit me to quote a foreword by O. Biletzky in a book entitled "Taras Shevchenko" printed in 1961. "A great son of his people: Shevchenko was and remains forever a Ukrainian poet, as Dante for the Italians, Shakespeare for the English, Pushkin for the Russians. For millions of people throughout the world Shevchenko discovered Ukraine, along with its freedom-loving people. He deeper than all others recognizing his present-day Ukrainian actuality, creatively considered its most serious problems and showed the characteristic types with the Ukrainian nation in all its national, social, and psychological aspects.

"But Shevchenko, the poet, does not belong to one nation, he belongs to the entire world." Thus writes this literary academician.

Chechov the world known writer and dramatist in a letter to Krimsky wrote "I love the Ukrainian nation which gave the world a giant like Taras Shevchenko."

In another letter to Krimsky (a well known literary figure) from K. Stanislavsky on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Shevchenko's death, he writes, "Shevchenko's works will last for centuries and will always awaken in the heart of people noble feelings.

"I remember with what blessings I first read the Kobzar in Russian. It was difficult to read without great feeling this wonderful self-artistic, brillant, and highly refreshing language and deeply moving work. In it is Shevchenko's entire soul, his thoughts, his ideas, his heart. I bow before Shevchenko the poet, a steadfast fighter for the well-being of the individual.

"In Shevchenko I see and feel the entire beauty of the human soul, he was a true bard of his people." Written in 1911.

The Encyclodepdia of Literature, Philosophical Library, New York, 1946, Editor Joseph T. Shipley, on Ukrainian literature has this to say, "Perhaps one of the greatest of all Slavonic poets. * * * He was in the truest sense a social democratic poet and he combined this with such deep feeling in language and expression that he is esteemed throughout the Slavonic world."

M. Gorky, the world renowned writer, once made a statement about Shevchenko as "first national poet, who did not abuse through personal laments national thoughts and feelings. In his complaints about personal fate one can feel the complaints of the entire Ukraine, in his memoirs on Kozak freedoms one can feel the desires of the entire nation." And in another statement the Russian Gorky commented thus about Shevchenko the, "First truly democratic, namely national poet of Ukraine."

Shevchenko was a genius not only in poetry but in art and a remarkable collection of Shevchenko's art can be found in a book entitled "T. H. Shevchenko—Artist" by Havdaya, published in Kiev, 1955, by Mistetsvo, U.S.S.R.

Justice and tolerance were second to none in Shevchenko's nature and his admiration and friendship for Negroes can be ascertained through his friendship for Ira Aldridge; the Negro actor who Shevchenko met and became fast friends in 1858. As a result of this friendship Shevchenko drew a masterful portrait of Aldridge with pencils in black and white on shaded paper. It can be found in the above-mentioned book.

The Washington Post editorial of November 1, 1963, states that Shevchenko "the poet is the idol of Communist Party members." Let us pause and analyze. Do the editors relize that Shevchenko existed when communism was still dormant in its cradle? Surely Shevchenko cannot be accused of Communist sympathies. He is guilty only of his geniusness and a great desire for justice. It ist only natural that the Soviets adopted Shevchenko for theirs because of his magnificent gift of expression and talent. His eloquence of speech from the people, for the people, and to the people is above any reproach. Fortunately all literary manuscripts written on Shevchenko in Czarist Russia, before the 1917 revolution, are in itself a concrete and direct opposition to any Communist pretentions.

What more can be said but that your support in behalf of erecting this monument is urgently petitioned. Not only by the Ukrainian Americans but by Ukrainians throughout the world who look upon your wisdom and wholehearted backing of this project.

I believe that you as a true American will not alter from your original decision to support this project nor that you will be misled by misinformed editorials. I believe that the freedom and just humanism so advocated by Shevchenko will not fall victim to fallacy and that your original decision will not be swayed by people who know so little about Shevchenko but who are, instead, so well briefed by statements and convictions coming from the other side of the wall.

Sincerely yours,

O. REDCHUK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
November 4, 1963.

Mr. JAMES R. WIGGINS,
Editor and Executive Vice President of the Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: Thank you for your letter of October 25, 1963. I am not surprised that you are questioning: "We still see no reason whatever for using public ground in the city to erect a memorial to a Ukrainian poet not identified in any way with the national history of this country or its people."

We cannot apply your statement to the 2 million Americans of the Ukrainian origin who donated, as you stated in your article of October 25, 1963, "It has raised more than $275,000 in individual contributions ranging from dimes and quarters from schoolchildren to $500." Those who donated are our American people. They share the same obligation under the Constitution of the United States as the rest of the citizens do.

Taras Shevchenko appealed to America in his famous poem "Yurodyvy," ("God's Fool") written in 1857 at Nyznyi Novhorod, in which the poet wrote:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe
your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find man."

In these words Shevchenko contrasted the reactionary, rotten, autocratic order of the serfdom with the political order defended by George Washington. Taras Shevchenko called on the Ukrainians to hope and expect their own George Washington. In his poem, "Yurodyvy" ("God's Fool"), he attacked all tyrants, czars, and oppressors, and all enemies of human freedom.

A survey shows that many public places and city streets in the United States bear Shevchenko's name, for example, a public park in Passaic, N.J., a street in Franklin, N.Y., an avenue in Auburn, N.Y., and other countries in the free world such as Canada, Brazil, and Argentina. Those who thus honored Shevchenko did not deem his works or person strange, as you appear to be doing at this time.

Referring to your editorial of November 1, 1963, entitled "Monument to Ignorance" especially your quotation "It is inconceivable that a statue would be dedicated to him in Tel Aviv or in Warsaw, for example." I would like to inform you that prewar Polish Government, during its 20 years' existence, subsidized the Ukrainian Institute in Warsaw with the main reason to translate Shevchenko's work into other European languages. I hope you will soon hear more about the Polish Government subsidy from the former president of that institute, now professor at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., also president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, Inc., Prof. Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki.

Those who were forced to leave their countries before Communists took over are obligated to inform the free world about everlasting contribution of Taras Shevchenko's democratic ideals for which he fought, and which are so dearly preserved and protected by the United States, as the bastion and the beacon of world democracy.

The monument for Taras Shevchenko built in Washington will be a Ukrainian Mecca in the free world, and for the U.S. Government and all citizens of America a contribution to the freedom and those ideals that the poet fought so hard for.

In erecting the statue to Shevchenko, Americans of all races, color, creeds, and national origins will pay tribute to a poet and artist leader in man's struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny.

I am convinced that you will revise your attitude toward the building of a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington and you will see it fit to retract your derogatory articles of October 18, 1963, and November 1, 1963, for the benefit of the democratic principles that I hope you and your paper stand for.

Hoping to serve you with all information available to me, enclosed you will find a small token of my esteem: Shevchenko and the Jews; Ukrainians and the Jews; and the Ukrainian Quarterly No. 3, 1960.

Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN S. HOLIAT.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
October 31, 1963.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Washington Post is conducting a campaign against the commemoration

of Taras Shevchenko, with the statue in our Nation's Capital.

Because your name was brought up in the editorial from October 18, 1963, I am sending you a copy of my reply to the editors of the Washington Post.

I also wish to express my sincere appreciation for your continuous support of the Shevchenko statue project as well as your continuous interest in the oppressed people of Ukraine.

I am sure that I also express the feelings of thousands of Minnesotans of Ukrainian descent.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL J. KOZAK, M.D.

OCTOBER 31, 1963.

THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.:

GENTLEMEN: With great disappointment, as well as indignation, I read your editorial published in the Washington Post on October 18, 1963, under the title "Shevchenko Affair."

Your editorial stated that "Shevchenko statue should never have been approved by Congress. There is no legitimate reason why 19th century Ukrainian poet * * * should be honored with the statue at an enviable location in the Nation's Capital." Here is a glance at this man's biography to prove that here truly is a man who devoted his life and his art to the struggle for the oppressed and underprivileged, and he certainly merits a token of commemoration in our Nation's Capital, which is a stronghold of freedom and justice for the entire world.

Taras Shevchenko, occupant of first place among the Ukrainian creators, great thinker, freedom fighter, spent 47 years of his life in the Russian Empire. Of these 47 years, only 9 years were spent as a freeman. All of his writings reflected his never-ending opposition to tyranny in all forms, not through the use of arms, but through his pen he gained the title of "freedom fighter." Throughout his works he championed the rights and liberties for all oppressed people. He fought for all persecuted minorities under the power of the czarist regime. Shevchenko was one of the group that risked retaliation by the Russian police when he signed the protest in the defense of oppressed Jews.

He believed in the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence, the ideals of freedom, human dignity, and self-determination not only for Ukraine, but for all subjugated people. In one of his poems Shevchenko wrote the following: "When shall we get ourselves the Washington to promulgate his righteous law? But someday we shall surely find the man."

Shevchenko was not looking for a Russian Lenin to bring freedom and justice to Eastern Europe, but he was looking for a man like George Washington "to promulgate his righteous law." Shevchenko was the one who, within the Russian Empire, attempted to spread the ideals of the American Revolution, something that most Americans would like to have seen happen a long time ago so that our children would not have to look at the missiles pointed at us by Lenin's ancestors 90 miles off our shores.

Furthermore, these days when millions of human beings are suffering under the yoke of ruthless tyranny, the Shevchenko statue in George Washington's Capital would symbolize and immortalize not only Ukraine's never-ending struggle for freedom but the struggle of all mankind and would provide inspiration for all people.

Your editorial also stated that "misguided and careless reception given the statue proposal by Congress." I strongly object to your attempt to label our Congress—the most democratic institution in the world, as an assembly that makes decisions and passes laws carelessly without proper thinking, studying, and consideration. This is exactly what enemy propaganda wants us to believe.

Further, using rather not the most polite expressions, you are trying to lead your readers into the belief that the idea of the statue originated from a "tiny group of Americans of Ukrainian birth or origin." Here I would like to inform you that this idea received wholehearted support from thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent in all corners of the United States. Through generous donations by dedicated people, who belong to all social strata—workers, farmers, and professionals, made this project possible. Maybe this group of Americans is not too large, but it is great in spirit, the spirit of American ideals of democracy, dedicated to the cause of spreading these ideals beyond the borders of our land.

Your editorial also stated that "there are elements which are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox and even Ukrainian background." Do you know that one of the sponsors, Hon. JACOB JAVITS, is Jewish, and Hon. JOHN LESINSKI is of Polish ancestry? Do you know that American Ukrainians are a religious people and in great majority Catholics or Orthodox, and they all wholeheartedly support this idea? And Russians? Well, we live in a free and democratic country and it is their privilege to object or disagree, if they so desire.

It is hard to understand, how an American editor of a respectable paper could muster so much hatred against the Ukrainians, victims of Russian communism, who are trying to promote the American ideals. It is hard to understand, how a respectable newspaper such as yours, could depart so far from the truth and cease to be factual and fair by publishing such an editorial, that for Americans of Ukrainian descent will always remain as an "editorial of shame."

I hope you will show a further interest in the life and activities of this great Ukrainian, Taras Shevchenko, and will correct the damage done by adverse publicity produced by your editorial to the memory of this great martyr for freedom and human dignity.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. KOZAK, M.D.

DETROIT, MICH.,
December 12, 1963.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I categorically protest against the insinuations of Washington Post in Washington in connection wtih the project of Taras Shevchenko monument, champion for liberty of Ukraine, and I fully support your attitude in above matter.

I remain,

Respectfully yours,

T. CYMBAL.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Jersey City, N.J., December 2, 1963.

To the EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.:

Your recent editorials and articles attacking the project and the sponsors of the Shevchenko Monument in Washington have not only been unfair, but also inaccurate ad intemperate. It is difficult for us, a benevolent fraternal society of Americans of Ukrainian descent, as well as other Slavic groups, to comprehend the bitterness of your tone with its rude innuendoes. As one of the organizations that helped initiate the project, we take sharp issue with your slurring remarks as to who and what the sponsors are, with the charge that approval was obtained from a "misguided" Congress in an artful manner; and your unsubstantiated offhand opinion that Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans. We further are offended by your insinuations that our desires and ideas are not worthy of consideration because they are not American.

We do not quarrel with your opposition to the Shevchenko statue. That is your right and privilege and we genuinely respect that right. We simply want to underline that you have unjustly and without cause attacked the motives of a responsible, law abiding, God worshipping, self-sustaining, self-reliant, and hard working group of Americans of Ukrainian ethnic background who revere Taras Shevchenko, a universally acclaimed champion of freedom.

We are not a tiny group, because we number over 2 million. For example, our association is one of four fraternals enthusiastically supporting this project. We insure over 82,000 members. We do business in 27 States. The Ukrainian Workingmen's Association has 24,000 members; the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics has 18,000 members; and the Ukrainian National Aid Association has 6,000 members. Our Ukrainian Catholic Church with dioceses in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Stamford, Conn., numbers over 300,000 parishioners. Our Ukrainian Orthodox Church with headquarters in Bound Brook, N.J., has over 200,000 members. All of the above with other institutions such as the Ukrainian Women's Federation of America, the Gold Cross, the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Ukrainian American Veterans, the Ukrainian America Catholic Veterans (two veterans are recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor), the various youth and student leagues and numerous professional societies are wholeheartedly part and parcel of the sponsoring group.

These groups have deepseated roots in this country. Our association, for instance, was organized in 1894. We publish a daily paper in Ukrainian called "Svoboda" or Liberty, founded in 1893, and a weekly supplement in English, the Ukrainian Weekly. We also publish a monthly bilingual children's magazine entitled "Veselka" (The Rainbow) as well as numerous books, in English and Ukrainian.

Last week the University of Toronto Press published the first volume of "Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia" which we sponsored and financed. All of this we do at our own cost and with our own hard earned money even though we are fully aware of the fact that the Government is financing numerous similar projects at home and abroad. If we really were as clever and devious as you charge our "tiny group" to be, we should have been able to get this done without cost to us.

As I write this letter to you, I am plagued with a feeling of shame. Not because I belong to a group of Americans of Ukrainian descent who were one of the last nationality groups to come to these shores en masse at the turn of the century. I am not ashamed of that, because I have known many of these good, generous, trustworthy people all my life. I also know that Ukrainian-Americans can trace their lineage back to the Jamestown Colony and New Amsterdam. Neither am I ashamed that these immigrants originally had only muscle, brawn, and steadfastness to offer in helping to build up and operate the great coal, steel, railroad, automobile, and textile industries, or that they were farmers. Or that by-and-large they were poor and lived on the wrong side of the tracks. What we all are ashamed of is that an institution such as yours, steeped in the American way of life with a responsibility to maintain respect for all peoples not only in this country but in the entire world, as our great thinkers and statesmen are ceaselessly advocating, should so irresponsibly attack our motives and, we believe, with malice

aforethought. And I might add that we are not alone in this thought. Every self-respecting minority group having learned of your stand got a queazy feeling in the pits of their stomachs. For your information we enclose a resolution passed by the Pennsylvania Fraternal Congress representing 73 fraternals of various ethnic and religious groups with about 1 million members in Pennsylvania.

To reiterate, we do not ask you to agree with us. You are entitled to your opinion that Washington has too many statues. All we ask is that you present a full and honest story: your side and our side, such as who and what kind of people are sponsoring the project; who is providing the money to cover the costs for the memorial which includes rebuilding the plot into a landscaped park with benches, pool, and paths; who the sculptor is and how and by whom the statue was selected; and, most of all, who Shevchenko was as documented by responsible writers and scholars of various nationalities and religious groups. That information is available, could have been and can be obtained by you if you so desire. For instance, you could have confirmed that Prof. Albert Einstein was a member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society since March 17, 1929. He most certainly would not have accepted membership in this society if Shevchenko had been anti-Semitic. This also is true of the many other prominent scholars of Russian, Polish, and other nationalities who hold membership in the same society.

On behalf of our membership, which has 31 branches throughout this country and Canada named after Taras Shevchenko, the patron of our association, we appeal to you for objective treatment of the memorial for Taras Shevchenko for we are certain that the symbolism of the project will nobly lend itself to a better understanding not only of the history of Ukrainian and other Slavic immigrants who came to America with their inborn appreciation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence but also would lead to clearer perception of the past and present aspirations of their kinsmen for freedom and justice in the entire world.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH LESAWYER,
President.

WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: We, the Ukrainian-Americans of Seattle, Wash., and vicinity, feel that it is of the most pertinent urgency that we express our thoughts about the rash statements concerning the construction of a monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko appearing in various issues of the Washington Post.

First of all, recalling the statement, "why gullible Senators and Representatives should have approved such a memorial, when all of the offended minorities are among their constituents * * *" we answer, we believe in our Government and in what they do. We are of the opinion that they are informed Representatives of the general public and interests benefiting our country and the world, contrary to your opinion that they have been gullibly misled into approving the bill 86-749.

By the impression given in your newspaper, it appears that our American Government favors accommodating the Communists by approving the resolution, and your belief is that they will be benefiting all the constituents represented by disapproving the bill which has legally and formally been passed. A brief look at communistic issues clearly shows that your articles and opinions are parallel to theirs and they are using it for their own propaganda purposes. Since the resolution was first being approved till now, 3 years later, nothing has been mentioned in your newspaper, the Washington Post, until the groundbreaking and dedication of the memorial to this great world figure. We would like to be informed of who is behind this whole "Red affair"?

It is our conviction that the Washington Post doesn't work for the benefit of this great Nation and the freedom and peace of the whole world, but for your own sadistic pleasure in contriving antagonism and friction among the citizens of this country for the distinct benefit of the Russian Communists. Therefore, we Ukrainian-Americans of Seattle, Wash., are in strong protest of this blasphemy heaped upon this great poet of humanity and enemy of all opression. How do you think this will affect the feelings of all peoples striving for their liberty and independence throughout the world if the American Government disapproves a bill which it has formally resolved? What will be the consequences?

We strongly feel that you will change your opinion about this whole affair and straighten it out for the benefit of all mankind.

Courteously yours,

THE SEATTLE BRANCH OF THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL COMMITTEE.

DECEMBER 11, 1963.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LESINSKI: Please find enclosed copy of my letter, which I sent to the Washington Post.

Please accept the words of my sincere admiration, for your patriotic service to our country, and for your dedication to the cause of freedom for all men and all nations of the world.

Respectfully yours,

ROSS KUZMYCH.

DECEMBER 11, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read with great disgust and astonishment the editorials in the Washington Post in regard with the erection of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C.

My astonishment comes from the following reasons:

1. How could it happen, that these articles passed—unnoticed, I believe—through the editorial desk of such a respected newspaper as the Washington Post? The articles showing complete ignorance of their authors concerning the matter, they are pretending to be the experts?

2. Great part of the arguments in these articles is so identical and consonant with the ones used by Kremlin propaganda against the erection of the monument, that the readers may feel a strong impression, that these articles have been inspired by the Communist propaganda bureau.

3. It seems, that the authors of these articles are trying to imply, that the legislators of our country are ignorant, and do not understand, what kind of legislative acts they are passing through.

I am convinced, that the nearest future will show, who fell the victim of misinformation, the Parliament of the United States, or your newspaper.

Therefore I ask you, sir, to go deeper into the whole matter, and to stop publishing such articles of doubtful and suspicious value, before more harm and damage will be done to the good name and prestige of your respected newspaper.

Very truly yours,

ROSS KUZMYCH.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *December 6, 1963.*

CITY EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are strongly opposed to the enforcement of the public law which allows the erection of a statue to Shevchenko in our Nation's Capital. Your opposition stems from various reasons, some of them contradictory. One of your reasons would seem to be that Shevchenko is unknown in America and that he is the son of a small nation. This is obviously a misunderstanding or a deliberate concealment of the truth. Among Slavic peoples the Ukrainian nation is numerically second to the Russian, and it is one of the largest nations in Europe, equal in number to the French nation. And Shevchenko is not only the greatest Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, but also the spiritual father of modern Ukrainian national renaissance.

Ukrainians are also part of our American Nation which is composed of various ethnic elements. Can you, in the name of democracy and the equal rights of God and man, deny one integral part of that American Nation its rights to the Nation's Capital? Our national emblem bears the motto "E Pluribus Unum." Included in this "pluribus" are people of Ukrainian descent. Should they be denied the right to call Washington their Capital and choose it as the site for a memorial to one who, for them, is the symbol of the highest integrity? It was not in vain that Shevchenko, in the dark moments of bitterness toward the Russian-czarist-imperialist regime upon his return from a 10 year exile, and threatened with new exile, penned his yearning in a poem for just such a righteous independence and social order as was achieved in the United States by the father of that country, George Washington, and added the fervent hope that one day Ukraine would have its own Washington.

Every year, wherever they live in the entire world and with a piety perhaps never shown by other nationalities toward even their most celebrated heroes, Ukrainians hold solemn programs honoring Shevchenko. In the 100 years since his death, this honoring of Shevchenko has surpassed the bounds of reverence and now borders on a cult. This unusual respect to Shevchenko is also paid by all American generations of Ukrainian descent. Even if you, or anyone else, have not understood this cult of Shevchenko, or deem it unjustified, would it not be proper—on traditional grounds of tolerance—to leave this cult alone and not interfere in its practice by fellow-citizens of Ukrainian descent?

There is another aspect of your conduct equally as incomprehensible. Even if you feel that Shevchenko does not deserve a place in Washington, would it not be proper—again based on our traditional grounds of respect for the status quo and respect for the interests of others which do not conflict with public interests—not to take away from the Ukrainian group in this country their legal right, which they have already obtained, and by public law at that? How can this legal and bona fide right be taken away from them now, without some really frightfully important reason concerning the public interest? Besides this public-legal aspect of the matter, there is also the private-legal side not to be overlooked, because, as you know, the statue is almost complete at the cost of almost one-quarter of a million dollars.

To err—is human. It is my firm belief that Congress did not err in enacting, and the President of the United States did not err in signing the law regarding the Shevchenko statue—but you do. Would it not be an act of real American honesty to admit your mistake or stop prolonging it and embroiling other Americans and their Government officials?

Yours truly,

JAROSLAW PADOCH.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
December 9, 1963.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are greatly concerned and shocked on the debate for Taras Shevchenko monument. Although Taras Shevchenko is not very well known to American people, it is worthwhile to explore him since he is represented by the free people of Ukraine. He was born

a serf in the feudal system and the only hope he poetically put in words was "democracy," for which this country of ours stands.

We make this appeal not to fail us and have our plans carried out as planned.

Very truly yours,

HELEN NORKA.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
December 10, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It was with great concern and deep disappointment that I read the remarks of your newspaper about Shevchenko. I cannot understand how you could allow that kind of unfair evaluation of this great man who dedicated his whole life to the cause of freedom, for which he suffered and finally died, be displayed on the pages of your paper.

Freedom is the tradition of the United States and it has always honored fighters for man's liberty regardless of national origin. Why is your paper retreating from this tradition?

I ask the Washington Post to stop rendering bad service to the cause of freedom.

Very truly yours,

GLORIA SZYSZKA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
December 11, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was deeply moved and disappointed at the remarks made, in your editorials, about Taras Shevchenko.

It was unbelievable that you could show such complete lack of knowledge of Eastern European history, in its relationship to the West, and your ignorance with regard toward Taras Shevchenko, champion against oppression.

I, a Ukrainian, and a citizen of the United States, protest against the editorials made by the Washington Post.

Being a law-abiding citizen, I am using the only weapon at my disposal. I am appealing to your better judgment and knowledge to revise your misleading editorials.

Taras Shevchenko's place in history is beside Sun Yat Sen, Masaryk, Thomas Paine and yes, even your favorite hero, Shakespeare.

Very truly yours,

EWHEN LUDKEWYCZ.

WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: The position which America takes in regard to all enslaved nations will determine how the whole world regards us. They will judge how well the United States lives up to its own, stated ideals of freedom and equality for all by its actions. It will be America's benefit to have all enslaved nations in our camp fighting for us, now, and during a world crisis.

Taras Shevchenko is the "Spirit of Liberty" for all the subjugated nations past and present. He is the force which symbolizes the strivings of all those oppressed by injustice and tyranny.

If your newspaper strives so diligently to procure the canceling of the resolution for the construction of a monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, it will be a victory for communism. American prestige will be lessened in the world and faith in the United States will be lost in the hearts of the oppressed people, who keep their eyes on the United States as their only source of strength and hope. We do not believe it is a good idea to sow seeds of discontent and prejudice among the people by printing such articles, thus creating friction among the citizenry.

In regard to the ideals of liberty represented by such men as Taras Shevchenko, we feel that the minority and majority groups of the United States should work as a unified nation to promote and to encourage these very ideals by combating the oppression which communism inflicts, and we advise you to check your sources of information very carefully. In unified protest, we would like to see the discontinuation of Russian propaganda.

Courteously yours,

UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS OF SEATTLE, WASH., AND VICINITY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *December 9, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The Washington Post editorials attacking the erection of the Shevchenko monument were a great blow to me as an American citizen and Korean veteran. Did they receive any tips from un-American forces? We do not expect them to love Ukrainians but would appreciate some respect for the great Shevchenko and also for the Ukrainian nation which is fighting against communism.

I hope the editors of Washington Post will revise their opinions.

Sincerely,

WOLODYMYR SHTOYKO.

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 10, 1963.*

The EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read your series of articles in your newspaper, in which you firmly oppose the erection of Taras Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C.

Your argument cannot convince the average American citizen, but only proves that the editors of your paper are poorly informed with the problems of national minorities in Ukraine, as well as the national problems of Eastern Europe.

The Washington Post is today the only paper in the United States which sides with the Russian Communists opposing the idea of having the monument erected by Americans of Ukrainian origin to the person who is today the symbol of struggle against Russian imperialism and colonialism.

I recall that after the assassination of President Kennedy your paper condemned all kinds of hatred that has brought about this vicious and tragic act; yet, at the same time, your paper incites that hatred among those national groups that fled Ukraine, or those of neighboring countries that live, at present, in the United States. It has come to my attention that no national groups have supported your campaign against Shevchenko.

I would not wish that the Washington Post would remain in history as the propagator of hatred and the suppressor of Shevchenko's ideas, which have spread beyond the national boundaries and have become the ideals of all humanity.

Sincerely,

OSYP ZINKEVYCH,
Chemical Engineer.

STRATFORD, CONN., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The last six articles concerning Shevchenko have caught my attention because of their inconsistency, incoherence, and lack of knowledge about the great poet. I believe that the American people would benefit much more if you could supply them with facts, not accusations which are based on similar articles found in Russian magazine U.S.S.R. and on possible influence of people who never could see or agree to free Ukraine.

It is with great regret I must write this letter informing you that it is unfair and unjust to misinform the American people just because they are not familiar with Shevchenko.

The traditional freedom loving United States cannot and must not be dishonored by articles in the Washington Post that are completely opposite in nature to the basic principles of this country.

It is my advice to you:

1. Find out more about Shevchenko not by reading Communist propaganda, but by becoming more informed about the man himself.

2. Live up to the great American way of life—freedom and justice under God for all men.

Very truly yours,

JAROSLAW LUCHKAN.

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was born behind the Iron Curtain and come to the United States to find freedom which I really enjoy.

I like to read your newspaper and when I can't afford it, I go to read it in the library. With great concern and deep disappointment I read your remarks about Taras Shevchenko. I can't understand why every African nation can enjoy freedom and why that freedom is prohibited to East European nations? Why? Why those remarks printed in your newspaper?

Taras Shevchenko is known among all enslaved East European nations. He is a champion of freedom not only for Ukrainians but for Armenians, Georgians, Liberal Russians, Islamic nations of Russia and other nations enslaved by Communist Russia.

I ask the Washington Post to change its mind and in the name of freedom support a cause which is the cause of our great country.

Very truly yours,

IVAN PANCZAK.

TRENTON, N.J.,
December 11, 1963.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is with deep regret that I noticed, that your newspaper, which was usually quite objective, has fallen in the last couple weeks under influence of advisers who try to bring harm to the United States.

Here I am referring to your vicious campaign which you have recently started in your newspaper against the erection of a monument in Washington, D.C., for the greatest poet of the Ukrainian people—Taras Shevchenko.

In my opinion such a monument can serve as useful means of the United States against international communism, since it would stress our support for freedom for all colonized nations, and among them for the nations enslaved by Russia, of which Ukraine is one. By erecting the aforesaid monument the United States would become a champion for freedom for all the people under foreign, colonial domination and not only those which were colonies of the Western countries. To miss or misuse such an opportunity in the present state of cold war could be very unfortunate and damaging.

Because of this, I sincerely hope that your newspaper shall understand the erroneous stand which you took in this case—and will support this undertaking for the benefit of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

L. S. ONYSHKEVYCH.

DECEMBER 9, 1963.

To the EDITOR,
The Washington Post.

DEAR SIR: Your recent series of articles concerning the subject of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., calls for some additional explanation.

Taras Shevchenko has risen in his own time from the lowest depths of enslavement, ignorance and misery (due to the Russian misrule in Ukraine) to the highest levels of intellectual standards, achieving all this through his own forthright character, ingenuity and will power. Forced to live far away from his native soil in the sometimes brilliant, but more often hostile environment of St. Petersburg, he had enough intellectual, honesty, and courage to dodge the authoritative opinion of the reviewer Belinsky, and the seemingly omnipotent power of the autocratic Nicholas I.

The sympathy and admiration so often professed in America for the underdog and the self-made man should in all fairness also apply to Shevchenko. However, the editorial policy of the Washington Post seems to be more sympathetic to the subtle and casuistic arguments so typical of the descendants of the once cruel and cunning Muscovities of the 19th century that came to this country, and while enjoying its freedom, still would like to see it denied on various occasions to others.

Whatever the outcome of this discussion, it makes a large number of Americans aware of the greatness of Shevchenko, which in itself is certainly a very positive thing.

Yours truly,

PETER HRYCAK.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y.,
December 10, 1963.

The EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am shocked at the content and the number of your articles attacking the Shevchenko Monument and those who have backed it; i.e. the Ukrainian community in the United States. To whom are you trying to make your articles appealing?—not the typical, sound-thinking, regular American, for he would never oppose the erection of a monument to a man who preached and fought for American principles of democracy and freedom.

What are your real reasons for trying to belittle a man who was deemed worthy of a monument in Washington by the Congress of the United States, who was deemed worthy of translations of his works into 40 languages? Do you mean to say that the Members of the Congress, the many hundreds of eminent scholars and authors all over the world (not even taking into consideration all the hundreds of thousands of readers of Shevchenko) do not know what they are saying or what they are doing? But you—your few men on the staff, ill-informed, hardly acquainted with the poet—you know better. The many letters disproving all your accusations written by competent men do not seem to convince you either. It is strange how presumptuous a newspaper can get.

Just one more thing—you consistently play up the fact that "Communists love Shevchenko." But a Washington newspaper should know that Communists join everything they cannot fight, and just as they were the ones who invented everything in the world, they convert everything and everybody to communism whether it makes sense or not. Why, then, do they attack with such vehemence this erection of the Shevchenko Monument in Washington in the Soviet press? They should be proud instead.

Gentlemen, it is time for a Washington newspaper to demonstrate an awareness of the facts of today's political life, to think logically for itself, not be told what to think.

Very truly yours,

IRENE STECURA.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y.,
December 10, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I would like to express my strongest protest at your editorials and articles concerning the erection of the Shevchenko Monument in Washington, D.C.

Your attacking our Senators and Representatives (like our President Johnson, Senators JAVITS and KEATING et al.) as well as other agencies on grounds of ignorance—is hypocrisy of the highest order.

What do you really stand for? You have probably received hundreds of letters defending the memory of Shevchenko but, nevertheless, I am sending to you one more vote for the Shevchenko Monument.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN O. STECURA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
December 9, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your persistent and indiscriminate campaign against the erection of the Shevchenko Monument in Washington, D.C., which has been already approved by an act of the U.S. Congress is a shocking activity that appears to be guided by ill will toward the Ukrainian people and its great national poet.

Taras Shevchenko, a poet, humanitarian, dedicated fighter for freedom, justice and brotherhood, has predicted that the Ukraine will rise again and "receive its own Washington"—the event that is still to come. He enjoys a special place in the hearts of all Ukrainians, and the funds for the erection of his monument have been contributed by hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Ukrainian descent.

The position of your paper is inconsistent with the longstanding American tradition of sympathy with the cause of freedom and justice for all oppressed peoples in all parts of the globe, that was recently reaffirmed in such official acts as the issuance of the special series of the "Champion of Liberty" postage stamps, and other acts of the Congress.

I urge you to stop your misguided campaign against the Shevchenko memorial, in which your paper curiously unites with the wishes of the Kremlin.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN WOLCHUK.

BRONX, N.Y.,
December 8, 1963.

The EDITORS OF THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: When I first read your unprecedented attack against the Ukrainian national poet Taras Shevchenko, I thought that you are a victim of misinformation and I intended to send you, for enlightening, some works of the Swedish literary critic Alfred Jensen, of the French historian Roger Tisserand (see his book "La vie d'un people—L'Ukraeine," pp. 227 ff.) and of the British poetess Vera Rich.

However, your further attacks prove that your biased and discriminatory approach has nothing to do with misinformation. Contrariwise they display your unfounded hate against a man who in his poems glorified freedom and admired the great Washington as an example of a valiant freedom fighter.

Your continuous attacks not only against the man who died 103 years ago, but also against the fellow citizens of Ukrainian descent do not serve well our American way of life.

Curiously enough your attacks are pretty well synchronized with the similar attacks coming from Moscow. Is this a mere coincidence?

Let me ask you in words of Cicero—"Quousque tandem abutere Catilina patientia nostra"?

Your truly,

WOLODYMYR SAWCHAK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
December 9, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your newspaper printed a number of articles concerning one of the greatest poets of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko.

We do not believe that the author of these articles could be so completely ignorant about the literature, culture, and history of Eastern Europe to which also belongs Ukraine.

Basing on these articles, we see that "the Washington Post" definitely has had intentions and extreme hate for everything that is Ukrainian.

As American citizens of Ukrainian origin, we feel it is our duty to bring to your attention, that the stand you are taking in this matter, contradicts the ideals of the United States and insults our feelings toward our country of origin—Ukraine.

Sincerely,

PETER PIASECKYZ.
FREUS PIASECKYZ.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
December 8, 1963.

The WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: You must dislike Ukrainians in free world a lot to write such articles against them in your newspaper. I know only one other person who certainly agrees with you, and that is Mr. Khrushchev himself. He does not want the monument of Shevchenko to be erected in Washington either. What a similarity of feelings.

That is too bad the American people are exposed to such unfair and untruthful information about a man like Shevchenko whose ideals were precisely those of our George Washington.

Is your ideal, Mr. Editor, George Washington or maybe Khrushchev, or better yet, Stalin? Be honest and answer it to yourself.

Yours truly,

IRENE LAWRIWSKY.

BUFFALO, N.Y.

To the WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Regarding your opposition to the erection of monument of T. Shevchenko in Washington, this is to inform you that Ukraine has close to 50 million people—of course not all of them are in the free world. But those people who have the right and duty to the human race to speak out the truth muffled behind the Iron Curtain.

No matter how many of us are here, no matter how rich or poor we are, we are representing the urge to freedom which lives in the heart of every Ukrainian here and there no matter what the Soviet press says.

The monument of Shevchenko to be erected in Washington is not the favor done to the Ukrainian people living in the States, it is an acknowledgment of greatness of the man himself who stressed the importance of freedom for all peoples (Americans included) at the time when this freedom was greatly jeopardized here and abroad.

We have our freedom here. Why not glorify the man who stood for it so bravely and died for it. If the word "freedom" is not an empty phrase to you, such articles should have no place in your newspaper.

Your disapproval of Shevchenko can only mean one thing—you are too much under the influence of "charming" Soviet colony in your town.

Yours truly,

GEORGE LAWRIWSKY.

HYATTSVILLE, MD., *November 20, 1963.*

The EDITORS, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: You have made it. You and your organ should be commended for the Red banner. If Khrushchev would again

visit the United States, he probably would not fail to pay you a visit for a splendid job you have done during the past few weeks.

It just proves how good you are in the field of Russian Communist reality. However, you have failed to see what Moscow fears most. That is, any outside support to the powerful force for nationalism among the subjugated non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

Your unsigned defamatory articles on the Ukraine's poet-laureate and Europe's freedom fighter "the poet of a small minority," "a play in East-West relations" "the idol of Communist Party members," "an anti-Semite," etc., as you put it, show how much you know about Shevchenko's literary writings.

For your information, Shevchenko's works are so great that the Russian Government has done everything to remake Schevchenko into its own Communist image. Most of his fiercely anti-Russian and antidespotic poems were purged and reedited to suit Russian Bolshevik aims.

You probably know that the main purpose of the memorial was, is, and will be to serve as a symbol of human freedom, equality, and justice—the universal values for which Chevchenko stood. To quote Dr. Frederick Brown Harris' article in the October 13 Sunday Star, "For the years to come this statue will be an altar of intercession for the emancipation of all captive nations. This statue will publish the fact that America is well aware that the U.S.S.R. is not a nation, but a colonial empire claiming sovereignty over non-Russians numbering more millions than there are Russians."

Today, the non-Russian nations enslaved by Bolshevik Russia work unselfishly and unceasingly to rid themselves of the despotic rule of Moscow. They do so by holding up the shining exponent of true liberty, Taras Shevchenko, as their symbol of inspiration and incentive.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL DANKEWYCH.

PASSAIC, N.J., *December 7, 1963.*

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently I had the opportunity to examine your editorials and other writings directed against the Shevchenko monument in Washington, and I have come to the conclusion that your opposition to the monument must be based on either a great prejudice or an equally great ignorance.

It is regrettable that you should fail to realize the significance of the errection of such a monument in the Capital of this country. No doubt you are aware of this Nation's leading position in the civilized world, and yet you fail to see that a monument to Shevchenko, who is one of the great figures of the civilized world, would be also a monument to America's leadership in the world. The fact that the general public in this country is unfamiliar with Shevchenko is irrelevant, because it is never too late to make him known to the Americans. The monument should be considered as an attempt on the part of the American Ukrainians in that direction.

Your recommendation to the Ukrainian-Americans, and presumably to the Americans of other origins, to leave "the quarrels of their ancestral homeland where they originated" sounds ironic, because your campaign is having exactly the opposite effect. It is reviving, I hope not to a great extent, some old Ukrainian-Polish, Ukrainian-Russian and Ukrainian-Jewish enmities based to a great extent on mutual prejudice—the enmities which are already dying out even in the ancestral homelands of these peoples.

May God bless you and have mercy on you.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN LEGEDZA.

UKRAINIAN STUDENT ORGANIZATION OF MICHNOWSKY (TUSM),
Philadelphia, Pa., October 20, 1963.

The EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Your recent pseudo-messianic editorial, "the Shevchenko Affair," October 18, 1963, calling for the immediate cessation of the construction of Taras Shevchenko's statue since it would be a "monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans" is a good example of bad writing. The only real conclusion one can reach after stumbling through this statement of strained polemic character is that you object to the construction of the statue, with a valid reason for this objection, if any, hidden fortuitously or intentionally in a mass of dishonest reasoning. Your concern for national unity would be laudable if you only did not stretch that concern to obfuscate the point that you are attempting to make, whatever that may be. A catastrophe such as you describe in terms of disunity and recrimination resulting from the construction of Shevchenko's statue could only occur in the passionate imagination of an editor who has space to fill and nothing to fill it with. The alarmist conclusion—which is quite simply an appeal to the reader's emotion to provide his own reason for the editor's conviction, and in so doing agree with the editor—is laughable since it is rooted in that imagination.

However, you are partly right when you state that the statue was "conceived as a blunt weapon in the cold war." This weapon is not so blunt as you might think. And the "implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood" does not seem so implausible when you consider that the 13 colonies also held an "implausible" goal of nationhood. If you are so anxious to find a "monument of disunity" you have only to look at the Berlin wall. No great mind is required to see its significance; you should not miss its point. Richard Nixon in "Khrushchev's Hidden Weakness" (Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 12, 1963) states that "only the mobilization of an aroused and informed American public opinion will prevent the sellout of the right of 97 million enslaved peoples in Eastern Europe to be free." When you say that "as a poet Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans" you put the proverbial foot in your mouth. Quite simply you don't know what you are talking about, for freedom has universal significance not only for Americans, but for all nations.

MARK IWASZ,
Secretary for English Correspondence.

THE DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIANS FORMERLY PERSECUTED BY THE SOVIET REGIME,
New York, N.Y., December 5, 1963.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Reading those protests concerning the erection of the Ukrainian poet Shevchenko's memory, you, as you state in your articles, base it not on his incompetence or ability to which you even agree but rather you lay it flatly on the fact that he is not well enough known to merit the right of improving the looks of an empty area.

I do not want, for lack of space, to sing the eulogies of a great man who can do those better than I through both the work he left behind and the indomitable spirit which history recorded. Rather I will only observe that your attitude would be on par with a South African country where the erection of a Shakespeare is to be refused on the grounds that he is not well enough known.

Indeed it doesn't speak well for the educational system of this country to ignore a man who because of his ability has 160 Russian institutes, libraries, 340 collective farms, 15 industrial plants, 190 towns and villages, 140 memorials, 775 streets and boulevards named after him. Not counting that his works were translated into 52 languages and that he is a well-known figure in European cultural circles.

Respectfully yours,

A. GUDZOWSKY,
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., December 10, 1963.

To the EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is with great concern and deep disappointment that we, the members of the UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota, have noted that your newspaper has printed derogatory articles about the greatest Ukrainian and world-famous poet and freedom fighter, Taras Shevchenko, advocating against the erection of a monument in the capital of the United States, to this genius and freedom fighter.

We cannot understand how you could allow such an unfair evaluation of this great man, whose books and poems are translated into many languages, including Swedish, Polish, German, English, Russian, Chinese, etc., a man who has dedicated his whole life to the cause of freedom, for which he suffered and finally died.

The members of the UCCA, and especially the pioneers who came to North Dakota at the end of the last century from that area (Kiev) where Taras Shevchenko was born, are very much alarmed and upset at your attitude which seems to coincide with the line of the oppressors of Ukraine—the Russian-Communists. To these people, their children and grandchildren, Taras Shevchenko is more than just a national hero.

I have been requested by the hundreds of our members and by representatives of our communities to write to you in vigorous protest against your attitudes. Therefore on behalf of the UCCA, North Dakota State Branch and the 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living here, I demand that a proper and decent retraction be published by you.

Since freedom is the tradition of the United States and it has always honored fighter's for men's liberty regardless of national origin, I trust that you will see fit to retract your now infamous articles.

I also ask the Washington Post to stop rendering bad service to the cause of freedom and to our great country.

Yours truly,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.,
October 31, 1963.

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial "The Shevchenko Affair" in the October 18, 1963, issue of the Washington Post was a blow to my conviction on the versatility of your editorial staff. Reading your comments on the Shevchenko monument in Washington, I could not help but entertain the suspicion that in this case your paper was used as a tool by some un-American forces. Only by taking into consideration your long record of patriotic and freedom-loving stands I persist in hoping that your opinion on the Shevchenko monument was a slip, a mistake, or a hasty conclusion based on incomplete and distorted information supplied by someone to you on these matters. Your editorial was offensive not only to over 1 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, but also to many more millions of Americans of eastern European background.

Taras Shevchenko was a Ukrainian poet well known over the whole of Eastern Europe,

who gallantly fought for the common cause of freedom for nations enslaved and oppressed by Russia. Therefore, his works gained admiration and friendship among many nations living under the yoke or the constant threat of Russian tyranny. A man of his principles and caliber could not be offensive to anyone but to the imperialist oppressors themselves, who fear the might of Shevchenko's words and memory. Your list of nationalities offended by Shevchenko is therefore completely wrong except, perhaps, certain groups of Russians, Red or White, who still support Moscow's goal of domination and expansion.

Works of Shevchenko were translated and published in over 50 languages and this should prove to you that Shevchenko is not a cipher, or the pet of a small minority. Your attempt to brand the erection of Shevchenko monument as a weapon in the cold war belittles Shevchenko and the just cause of his ideals. Schevchenko inspired the fight for liberty of many nationalities. His ideals survived the once-strong White Russian imperialism and will, no doubt, survive the treacherous coexistence and Red Russian tyranny of today. It would only benefit Americans to declare their admiration and belief in the just aspirations of eastern European nations by honoring Shevchenko with a monument in Washington. The strength and popularity of Shevchenko's works forced even the Red Russians to change their tactics—from banning Shevchenko's poems, to claiming him as a prophet of their "just revolution." The Russians never liked Shevchenko, but they realized his popularity soon enough and turned to distorting his works and to lying about him in order to make him appear one of them.

I hope you will revise your opinion on the Shevchenko monument. It is worth pointing out that most of your distorted facts on Shevchenko and on Ukrainian Americans look very familiar to us, who follow Communist Russia's press attacks on the free Ukrainians in the United States of America and in the free world. I would advise you to check your sources of information very carefully. Forty-five million Ukrainians cannot be ignored and, surely, cannot be wrong.

Yours respectfully,

WALTER SOCHAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Freedom is the tradition of the United States and it has always honored fighters for man's liberty regardless, of national origin. Why is your paper retreating from this tradition?

I was greatly disappointed reading the remarks of your newspaper about Shevchenko. I cannot understand how you could allow these unfair and unkind expressions about this great man who dedicated his whole life to the cause of freedom, for which he suffered and died, to appear on the pages of your paper.

I ask the Washington Post to stop misinforming the public and dedicate itself to the cause of truth and freedom.

Very truly yours,

MIRA WASYLYSZYN.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

EDITOR: Your articles concerning the erection of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., were a showpiece of misrepresentation stemming from total ignorance of basic facts.

Having brought the Ukrainian-American community in this country down to an "insignificant group," you have failed to investigate the important role these people play in the life of our America. They are represented in every aspect of that life, many being faculty members in our fine universities and colleges. They are teaching our kids to cherish and maintain the precious liberties we now enjoy, liberties for which both Shevchenko in Ukraine and Washington here have fought.

The fact that Shevchenko's writings are not familiar to you surely does not mean they are unknown to the American people. It may surprise you how much you could learn from an average college student about Shevchenko.

So, let's stop this foolish scribbling until you know what you're talking about. Then I am sure you will reverse your thinking.

Truly yours,

ZENON MIAHKY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
November 22, 1963.

J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: For the past several weeks, I have been reading your various comments, both editorially and otherwise, with reference to the "Shevchenko Affair."

I wish to add my protest to those of the many others over your arbitrary stand on this matter. Surely, by now, you should have made the effort to reverse your stand and admit your whole attitude needs an evaluation.

If you are really sincere in your attitudes it would seem to be in your best interests to learn whether Taras Shevchenko is really worthy of the honor the American-Ukrainians wish to bestow on him. There is nothing wrong, in fact it may even be ennobling to admit that you might have been mistaken in your judgment and that Shevchenko is deserving of immortality and that Congress was right in alloting the land they did and not that this whole "affair" is a propaganda wedge.

Sincerely,

ANNE HARRISON.

DECEMBER 9, 1963.

Mr. JAMES R. WIGGINS,
Editor and Executive Vice President, the Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: I have just returned from Rome, where I spent several weeks as correspondent at the Ecumenical Council and saw how people of all creeds, colors, and national origin work together in search of unity and better relations among men. But upon my return I found that your newspaper which I had come to regard as one of the truly liberal and democratic publications in the country, has been engaged in a vitriolic, discriminatory, and biased campaign against the monument of Taras Shevchenko and by implication, against 2 million American citizens of Ukrainian background and origin.

In your charges that Shevchenko was "anti-this" and "anti-that" you are completely off base, simply because whoever advised you to initiate this campaign, was clever enough to conceal the true facts about Taras Shevchenko. He was a determined enemy of slavery and of those who perpetuated it in Ukraine, regardless of whether they were Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, Germans, or Frenchmen. In this wise he is recognized by all freedom-loving people. He stood for the unconditional freedom and equality of all races, nationalities, creeds, and cultures, and in the full sense of the word, he was a champion of universal freedom. Therefore, your allegations that his writings were offensive to certain nationalities are totally baseless.

Moreover, your attempt to becloud the significance of Shevchenko by citing Mr. Luka Kizya, permanent delegate of Soviet Ukraine to the United Nations, who expressed his approval of the Shevchenko Monument (but not of the people who are building it—American citizens) is only a too often used cliche pattern which cannot convince any knowledgeable person. As a matter of factual record, the entire Soviet press, which means the Soviet Government, was vehemently against the Shevchenko statue in Washington, especially for one particular reason which regrettably you fail to recognize. The Communist interpretation is that Shevchenko did not advocate for Ukraine a "just and righteous law of Washington," which meant a rule by the people and for the people, but that he admired George Washington as a "revolutionary figure." Free Ukrainians say that Shevchenko wanted Ukraine to be a free and independent nation, just as the United States was under George Washington.

The fact that Shevchenko is honored in Ukraine under Russian Communists and elsewhere throughout the Soviet empire does not detract from his universal significance as a champion of freedom. In that sense the Bolsheviks seem to be more astute than your specialists, because they (the Reds) are trying to espouse a great freedom fighter, while your liberal newspaper is determined to reject and denigrate him.

Surely, William Shakespeare, William Faulkner, Edgar Allen Poe and Robert Frost are also read and honored in the U.S.S.R. Are they to be considered Communist writers or sympathizers of the Bolshevik state and ideology?

I regret that your newspaper has stooped to such a degree of hate and vituperation against the Ukrainians that it had to resort to the opinion of a Soviet puppet in Ukraine for ammunition. You have fallen into a trap, and it will take some time before you realize how great a damage your newspaper has done to the cause of universal freedom by staging this unnecessary campaign of hatred against Taras Shevchenko and the people from whom he sprang, the Ukrainians.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER DUSHNYCK,
Editor, the Ukrainian Quarterly.

MANVILLE, N.J.,
November 29, 1963.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have seen the article entitled "The Shevchenko Affair" which appeared in Washington Post on October 18, 1963, with which I strongly disagree.

I feel that a statue of the Ukrainian poet is a splendid idea for Washington. Shevchenko, who wrote about freedom, wished it not only for Ukrainians, but for all mankind. A monument to Shevchenko in the Capital of the United States will be another testimonial to the cause of freedom.

Very truy yours,

DEMYS BEOLUAVSKY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
December 10, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: Your repeated smears of and groundless attacks on our Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, Taras Shevchenko, will always be remembered by us Americans of Ukrainian descent as attacks on us and the whole Ukrainian nation behind the Iron Curtain—the nation which has been in Communist yoke for the past 45 years.

In the past, I had always regarded your newspaper as something special, as a paper of high standing and the defender of justice and truth. Is that what you call justice by degrading us and by smearing our poet? Is this truth when you label him "anti-Semitic" or "ununiversal" without having the slightest idea whom you are talking about nor the slightest grounds or

sources to back your preposterous allegations? Or do you mean to tell me that the freedom of the press in this country means nothing but smear, smear, smear, without any kind of journalistic ethic or the responsibility to the public for the falsified information?

I am sorry, you do have "very reliable" sources. They are the Soviet magazines, the Communist press and the representatives to this country and the United Nations. As a matter of fact, Pravda has made similar statements against the erection of this memorial. Or, would you say, that people who hide behind your editorials just could not find any other more neutral and unbiased sources on Shevchenko's background. If they could not, why have not they written on something they know about rather than on subject they are illiterate and know nothing about.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. WITWICKI,
Disabled Veteran of Korean War.

JERSEY CITY, N.J., *November 6, 1963.*

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: I read your latest editorial on the Shevchenko Monument under the heading "Monument to Ignorance" in the November 1, 1963, issue and cannot understand how a paper of your reputation can call a unanimous decision of the U.S. Congress "ignorant" and how you could lose your temper in an editorial.

The fact that you do not know much about Shevchenko proves ignorance on somebody else's part, not on the Congressman's who sponsored the bill on the erection of the Shevchenko Monument. How is it that you and your literary editor have not read any poems of Shevchenko or books about him, at least in English? (And there are many.) Judging by your opinion on Shevchenko, "your slip is showing."

If we had had Congressmen earlier in Congress like JAVITS, KEATING, LESINSKI, and JONES, we would not have the Communists at our doorstep in Cuba, and we most probably would have no threat from Red Russia. We had many good chances to stop communism in the beginning in 1917 and 1918 by supporting the independent nations of Eastern Europe now enslaved by Russia, including Ukraine. Thank God we now have able statesmen in our Congress who realize the menace of communism and do not jump to their feet to please "good old Joe" (Stalin) or "jovial and friendly Nikita."

I am now convinced by your recent editorials that you should sponsor the erection of a monument to ignorance. If you do decide to do that, you need not look far the likeness of "homo ignoramus" to put on its pedestal. You should perpetuate the likeness of one of your friends, "experts" who bungle everything and is a master at alienating enslaved nations, the best allies our still free and democratic United States of America can have.

Yours respectfully,

WALTER SOCHAN.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIRS: In the history of mankind one finds from time to time such men who uphold universal ideals and fundamental principles. Taras Shevchenko was such a man. A man who sprang up from serfdom, a man who was known for his love of his fatherland, Ukraine, a man who loved all offended people, and a man who was willing to give up his liberty for others. Yet, although he lived in such a land, which was forgotten, both by history and politicians of the time, he, Taras Shevchenko, was able to rise above all of this and serve as a beacon for all enslaved peoples. His ideals, his cries for freedom, his yearning for a liberator of these forsaken peoples, all serve to say, that he was the spokesman for all who were and will ever be enslaved by tyranny.

In your protestations against the erection of the monument for Taras Shevchenko, you fight a symbol of freedom through all ages as long as tyranny and despotism prevail. Yet, by this, your action, you stand with the enemies of freedom. Is it because Shevchenko is a Ukrainian? Maybe if he were Scotch or French or English, you might stand for, not against him. Is it because you actually think that the Ukrainians are just a petty force of people, who could really never contribute to the cause of mankind?

I am truly sorry to see such an attitude professed, for if this is what America stands for, hatred, bigotry and prejudice, we are truly all at a loss, for what the American forefathers fought for, no longer seems to hold true—that all men are created equal and that all have the right for the pursuit of freedom.

Very truly yours,

Dr. N. A. HRUSZKEWYCZ.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., BRANCH,
NEW HAVEN, CONN., *November 29, 1963.*

EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We were dismayed and shocked to read your unwarranted and unfounded attack on Taras Shevchenko. The echo of your remarks was heard even here in New Haven, Conn., and evoked questions in our minds as to why you have embarked on such a slanderous attack.

The period of time was short between your editorial stating that Shevchenko was and still is an obscure poet unknown to most and read by so few till the next editorial wherein you had become experts on the poetry and worth of this "obscure" poet. Yet you became experts enough so as to brand him a "pet of a small minority"; an objectionable person in his views of other nationalities and not a poet of significance in his artistry. It is amazing how in such a short time, anyone could have familiarized himself with the extensive and varied works of this poet.

We beg to differ with you on all these points—it is not only among Ukrainians, to whom he is a prophet and a national hero, that he is revered but if ever you calculated the number of Americans of Ukrainian heritage and Eastern Europeans who know of and deeply regard this poet you will be surprised to learn it is beyond the classification of a "minority."

It is very surprising that a newspaper which should at least try to be objective and accurate in reporting should stoop so low as to slander on the basis of misinformation.

We condemn your attempts as maliciousness and urge you rather strongly to reread Shevchenko and through objective investigation reevaluate the position you accord Taras Shevchenko.

OLEG R. MYKETEY,
Chairman, UCCA Branch, New Haven, Conn.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The campaign you started began with a statement, that the Shevchenko monument will be built by a group of Ukrainians while there are many other national groups opposing the idea. Later you stated that the whole action has political rather than cultural character which may result in unnecessary complications of relations between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.

After this you tried to convince your readers that Shevchenko was a poet completely unknown to Americans. Now you turn around and state that Shevchenko was almost a Communist poet, for whom no place should be granted on the Washington grounds.

After reading these contradictions I wonder what is truth and what is false. As I see it, you fight the idea of erection of Shevchenko monument by all means, but you fail to express the real reasons.

I think the newspaper should inform the readers with true facts and not doubtful ones, but you furnish neither logical nor historical proofs for your discriminating charges.

Very truly yours,

SERHIG ZAPOLENKO.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *December 8, 1963.*

EDITOR,
The Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorials attacking the erection of the Shevchenko monument were a great blow to me as a freedom-loving American citizen of Ukrainian descent. It seems to me that you are working under a mistaken notion that the erection of this monument was supported by a very small group of Ukrainians. Schevchenko to a Ukrainian has all of the same significance that Washington has to an American, and the fact that so many thousands of Ukrainians donated to the erection of this monument is proof of your misconception.

It is also unforgivable, that a newspaper of your stature should use Communist propanda material, such as the magazine USSR, and interviews with officials of the Soviet Government, as the basis for its editorials. It is a well-known fact all over the world that Communists contort everything to their own liking to such an extent that the original is not recognizable. Why not base your work on literature on Shevchenko published in the West, and especially in this country?

I sincerely hope, Sir, that you will be persuaded to drop this regrettable action on your part, and that you will become friends of Ukrainians, and will help us fight for—not against our cause, which is much the same as the cause of this great country.

Very truly yours,

ROXOLANA CHABURSKA.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *December 11, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Although the Washington Post is one of the leading papers in the United States, it is only quite recently that I took to reading it—since you started your campaign against Shevchenko. And I feel I should call your attention to certain points.

To us, people of Ukrainian descent, he is not only a great poet but also an outstanding freedom-fighter and a victim of tyranny. Since freedom is a common cause regardless of nationality, all freedom-liking people would be expected to approve our efforts to honor his memory. The uninformed may not support us, but certainly have no reason to object. It is bewildering that a great paper in a free country chose to start an active campaign against this project.

It is a fact that Shevchenko's greatness is acknowledged everywhere and by groups of all persuasions, right, moderate and left. Should your campaign reach its goals, the Communist propaganda will not fail to take advantage of the situation. They will point out that in "capitalistic, imperialistic United States there is no appreciaion for freedom and its champions."

If you are aware of such an unwanted effect of your action, maybe it is time to reconsider your position.

Very truly yours,

ZENO V. CHRAPLYVY,
Professor, St. Louis University.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *December 11, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It is indeed alarming that your newspaper, enjoying a high reputation, has taken a stand against a worthy cause. I mean the proposed monument of T. Shevchenko in Washington.

Shevchenko is acknowledged as champion and martyr of freedom not only by Ukrainians. The best writers of many nationalities translated his works and thus seconded his ideals. All people who share the lofty ideals of freedom should support our project; those who lack information would be at most indifferent. But how can people of good will actively fight it? What is the purpose? Only damage can result from such a hostile activity.

As your reasons and intentions are not doubted, we suggest that you reconsider your standpoint.

Very truly yours,

MARY CHRAPLYVY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *December 8, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The remarks in your newspaper about Taras Shevchenko have cast a dark shadow upon the freedom of men. Shevchenko fought for freedom, and because of this he suffered and finally died.

The United States is the land of the free and the home of the brave. The United States honors fighters for man's liberty.

How can a newspaper in the Capital of this free country go against a man who dedicated his whole life to the cause of freedom?

Very truly yours,

GLENDA PIK.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.,
December 10, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your articles attacking the erection of the Shevchenko monument have taken me quite by surprise. The Washington Post has been known to defend the ideals of freedom of the human being, and now all at once you are changing this policy? Why?

By this step you are doing a great injustice to the Ukrainian nation. Shevchenko has suffered many years in Siberian labor camps and finally died for his cause, the very same cause for which the United States has been fighting from the very beginning of its existence. By condemning Shevchenko you are condemning a George Washington.

Your action can be ascribed only to misinformation.

I hope you will avail yourself of more precise information, not literature which has been twisted into a convenient representation.

I believe that a truer conception will change your course of action.

Very truly yours,

NATALIA SHUST.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
December 6, 1963.

To the EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is with deep concern and disappointment I took note of your vicious attacks on the editorial pages of your paper against the proposed erection of Shevchenko's monument in our Nation's Capital. Shevchenko's life, work, and art were a dedication in the fullest sense to freedom and liberty, not only for his native land—Ukraine—but also to others enslaved by Moscow. He paid the highest price for his beliefs; he died for them.

America was built by men and women who harbored the same stanch love for freedom and justice as Shevchenko did. It is therefore difficult to understand the motives of your paper when attacking the fitting endeavor of American citizens of Ukrainian descent who wish to pay homage to a great poet and freedom fighter. Your paper has, undoubtedly, given a great disservice to the cause of justice contrary to the American tradition of fair journalism.

May I urge you to read and evaluate the work of Taras H. Shevchenko in order to form your own opinions and not to "borrow" them from the magazine "U.S.S.R." and other sources of dubious origin.

Yours truly,

BOHDAN PASZKOWSKYJ.

ELIZABETH, N.J.,
December 11, 1963.

SIRS: In regard to your disgraceful editorials which I believe were spawned from an ignorance of facts about a man who is comparable, in the eyes of freedom-loving Ukrainians, to an American George Washington, or a Hungarian Kossuth, or, in literature, an English Shakespeare, I wish to present some facts.

In the romantic literary movement of the 19th century, which swept the Ukrainian nation, although it was subjugated under two empires, there appeared one man who has since been dear to all Ukrainian nationalists—Taras Shevchenko. In his collected works "Kobzar," he related various aspects of Ukrainian life and legends, and he dug into the glorious Kozak past for such poems as "Hamalia," "Haydamaki," and "Ivan Pidkova." Shevchenko and several others organized the Society of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in Kiev. This society demanded abolition of serfdom and demanded freedom of press, thought, speech, and conscience. It visualized a Ukrainian Republic in a lossely knit Slavonic federation not dominated by any one country. The members of the group were arrested and Taras was exiled to Central Asia for 10 years. The Tzar's own hand added a prohibition of writing and painting. Shevchenko was never to see his homeland again and in his "Zapowit" he wrote:

"When I die, bury
Me in a grave
In the wide steppes
Of beautiful Ukraine.

"Bury me and rise up,
Break your chains
And with your hateful enemy's blood
Shower your freedom.

"And as for me in this big family
In a new, free family
Don't forget to remember
With a tender, silent word."

The first part of Shevchenko's own eulogy was fulfilled; he is today buried on a cliff overlooking the Dnieper River. The second part was also fulfilled, though only briefly, when the Ukrainian Republic was born out of the World War's destruction; it was short lived, however, because the armies of several "neighboring" countries simultaneously destroyed her while the West watched with apathy or even helped the invaders with supplies and troops. Those of Ukrainian descent and the refugees from enslaved Ukraine in this country have put together their nickels, dimes, and dollars in an attempt to honor Shevchenko by respecting the wish in the last part of "Zapowit" above. I only implore you to try to understand and respect this wish of a people which the world has forgotten and looked upon with apathy throughout their many centuries of foreign enslavement.

GEORGE LEWYCKY.

TRENTON, N.J., *December 7, 1963.*

THE EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Responsibilities of a newspaper toward the public, as you well realize are too wide to be mentioned here. But your right to this claim should be based on unprejudiced attitude and unbiased information—as much as possible. It is the latter that is so noticeably lacking in your articles against the Shevchenko monument which is to be erected in Washington.

At this moment no one in this country can complain about insufficient scholarly or other sources about the great poet and a great man, who with his pen and his life fought for freedom and taught others to do the same—Taras Shevchenko. His great regard for the freedom of every man can serve as an inspiring example to all people, regardless of race or nationality.

I hoped that you would not stoop to limit yourself to such obviously one-sided advisers or information, but would try to see Shevchenko as he really was. Please understand that it is not only the many thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent (who chipped in their contributions to make this project possible) who deeply cherish the ideals for which Shevchenko stood and gave to freedom-loving Ukrainians, but also readers of other nations and races who felt his touch of genius and universal message.

I sincerely hope that you would review your stand and help us honor a great man—in universal terms.

Respectfully yours,

LARISSA M. L. ONYSHKEVYCH.

WATERTOWN, CONN., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Through our press we learned that your well-established newspaper printed editorials in which you discuss the advisability of constructing a monument in memory of T. Shevchenko on the grounds of Washington.

As American citizens, we are surprised and shocked that the objective editors can support the idea of a dual morality. We support the freedom fighters in South Vietnam, we supported freedom in Algeria and Israel, we support freedom fighters in the South in the United States of America, but we deny the right to freedom of a 42-million nation in civilized Europe.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. M. TROJAN.

BRONX, N.Y., *December 8, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing to protest at the anti-Shevchenko articles which have appeared in your newspaper. They were unfair to the memory of a freedom-loving poet and to the people who wish to honor him.

I hope you will drop this regrettable action and champion the cause of freedom and not oppose it.

Yours truly,

MARTHA BACHYNSKY.

DETROIT, MICH.,
December 4, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You are rendering bad service to the American people with your remarks about Taras Shevchenko. Your evaluation of his life and deeds is completely wrong and evidently based on false sources.

I ask you to get acquainted with the whole truth about this great man and freedom-fighter, Taras Shevchenko, and to stop your

campaign against his monument in Washington. You can find an unbiased information about him in the "Ukraine, a concise encyclopedia," newly edited by the University of Toronto Press, or in the writings of Prof. C. G. Mannings.

Very truly yours,

DR. JOSEPH E. BOYCHUK.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, as a freedom-loving American citizen of Ukrainian descent, wish to express my great dissatisfaction with your slanderous editorials in regard to the Shevchenko monument. I cannot understand why such a well-respected newspaper as yours would have to resort to the spread of false and cheap Communist propaganda.

I am sure, sir, that if you would only read some of the literature about Shevchenko that was published in the free Western World, you will drop this regrettable action on your part.

Very truly yours,

STEPHAN LUCIW.

CHICAGO, *December 7, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It was with great concern and deep disappointment that I read the remarks of your newspaper about Shevchenko. I cannot understand how you could allow that kind of unfair evaluation of this great man who dedicated his whole life to the cause of freedom, for which he suffered and finally died, be displayed on the pages of your paper.

Freedom is the tradition of the United States and it has always honored fighters for man's liberty regardless of national origin. Why is your paper retreating from this tradition?

I ask the Washington Post to stop rendering bad service to cause of freedom.

Very truly yours,

JULIAN SAWARYN.

FORDS, N.J., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my displeasure at recent articles in your newspaper about Taras Shevchenko. As one of Irish descent, like the late President Kennedy, I object to these statements about a great lover of freedom. His works should be examined in a fair way.

Yours truly,

RICHARD RYAN.

THE UNITED UKRAINIAN STUDENTS ASSOCIATION, INC., U.S.A., *December 9, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We American college students of Ukrainian descent wish to express our strong opposition to your stand on the Shevchenko memorial statue in Washington.

We believe that were you better acquainted with the life and work of Taras Shevchenko you would realize the moral significance that he has for all peoples who are denied freedom.

May we suggest that you approach him and the Ukrainian nation without bias but with sympathetic understanding.

Very truly yours,

WLODIA HNATIUK,
Secretary.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., *December 8, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that the Washington Post has been having editorials attacking the erection of the Shevchenko Monument.

To me, an American citizen of Ukrainian descent, it has come as a heavy blow. It is very hard for me to see such editorials as mentioned above and to believe that in this great country there are people who oppose the honoring of great freedom fighters of other nations.

I should appreciate your taking proper action in stopping these editorials.

Very truly yours,

ULANA M. BABIUK.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *December 9, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have spent 14 years in the United States. I came here to find freedom and became an American citizen. My heart goes out to anybody seeking freedom and liberty.

Your editorial attacking the erection of the Shevchenko Monument, a monument for Ukraine's greatest freedom fighter, was a great blow to me. I cannot understand how you can attack a person who to the Ukrainians is as significant as Washington to the Americans.

I hope that you will fight for freedom and not against it.

Very truly yours,

ARETA HALUSHCHYNSKA.

DENVER, COLO., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am another one of the "small group" of Americans of Ukrainian descent that supported erection of Shevchenko's monument and I can't figure it out why you are opposing it. I can see why Soviet propaganda is against erection, but why the Washington Post? Shevchenko dedicated his whole life to the cause of freedom; he dreamed about Ukrainia's own Washington. For these dreams he finally died. Surely a newspaper of your statue should know these facts. Yet your evaluation of this great man is quite unfair and erroneous. Why don't you study Shevchenko's works more closely? And if you do, I am sure you will change your opinion and the tone of your writings.

Very truly yours,

L. S. KOLTUNINK.

BRONX, N.Y., *December 9, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorials attacking the erection of the Shevchenko monument were a great blow to me as a freedom-loving American citizen of Ukrainian descent. Your paper reported that the monument is supported by a very small group of Ukrainians. For your information, thousands of Ukrainians donated to the erection of this monument.

Your paper should not use Communist propaganda material. Why not base your work on literature on Shevchenko published in the West, and especially in this country?

Very truly yours,

OSTOP WYNNYK.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *December 8, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorials attacking the proposed Shevchenko Monument in Washington are to me, an American citizen of Ukrainian descent, a completely unjustified attack on Shevchenko, his significance for all Ukrainians, and, indeed, his significance for all freedom-loving peoples.

That a newspaper of your stature should use Communist propaganda as a basis for its editorials is very dismaying. The Communists adopted Shevchenko as their own only when they utterly failed to pervert and destroy his values.

I sincerely hope that you will abandon your regrettable stand and support not so much our cause as the cause of freedom.

Very truly yours,

SOPHIA DOROSHENKO.

VILLANOVA, PA., *December 9, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was highly disturbed reading your editorials in which you criticized the erection of the Shevchenko Monument. Let me point out that this great poet and man stood up against the despotism which has suppressed the human dignity, and personal and political freedom of all nations which were then part of the Russian empire. This includes Poles, nations of the Caucasus and many others.

In this country personal freedom and human dignity are some of the most important virtues which have laid foundation to our constitution and gave strength to many generations of patriotic Americans to develop free, democratic society.

Please change your mind. It will be a move in the right direction and it will serve the cause of freedom.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN MAKSYMOWYCH, Ph. D.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *December 10, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I must strongly protest to the editorials attacking the erection of the monument to Taras Shevchenko. Your notion that this monument was supported by a very small group of Ukrainians is very mistaken.

For a Ukrainian, Shevchenko is a symbol of freedom of mind and spirit, strength, love for humanity, and good will personified. For us Shevchenko represents a tie between the native country we had to leave behind and our new home, which share the same ideals.

I believe that if you would avail yourself of literature, which was published in the West, you would not base your opinions on a magazine like the U.S.S.R., or interviews with Soviet officials. I believe that you would be working for, not against, the cause of Americans of Ukrainian descent.

Yours truly,

OKSANA SHUST.

BUFFALO, N.Y., *December 9, 1963.*

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It was regrettable and deep disappointment to read the remarks in your newspaper about Shevchenko.

Sir, it seems to me that your source of information was rather circumstantial than factual, stating that small group of Ukrainians supported this drive for erection of the monument.

Moreover, it is unforgivable to use Communist propaganda material and interviews with Communist officials for this purpose.

Sir, have you learned nothing as yet from the past?

How much one trusts the people that broke so many treaties since the end of World War II? Why not base your work on literature on Shevchenko published in this country?

The man that your paper is degrading stood up for freedom which is a part of our great Nation's tradition.

Why is your paper retreating from this tradition?

Let the torch of freedom be alight all over the world not subdued by ignorance, biased opinion, and hatred.

Very truly yours,

MARK J. STASIUK.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
December 9, 1963.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Taras Shevchenko is one of the greats of world history. Alien oppression has impeded his name to be known the world over, but known it will be because the principles for which Shevchenko stood and for which he suffered are the principles of liberty and human rights. They happen to be the same as those which we cherish and live by in this country.

Sincerely,

O. M. BILANIUK, Ph. D.
Assistant professor of physics.

DECEMBER 9, 1963.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, Ukrainian-American businessmen in New York, cannot comprehend why you permitted such unjustified and unfounded defamation on the pages of your newspaper of the great man Taras Shevchenko, who suffered, fought, and gave his life for freedom.

The name of Taras Shevchenko is known all over the world. We would therefore advise you to look him up in the libraries not only in the United States, but also in many other countries, where you will certainly find many works in various languages written about Taras Shevchenko by non-Ukrainians—this would enable you to fill the blank spots which you have about this poet. You would then be convinced by non-Ukrainian historians and men of letters, and perhaps apologize for the uncalled-for treatment you have given him. To the Ukrainians Shevchenko is the same kind of fighter for freedom as George Washington to the Americans. Proof of this can be found in the hundreds of thousands in conributions given by thousands of Ukrainians to erect a monument to Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN KRUPKA,
President.

IRENE HOSHOWSKA,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
December 9, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have considered the Washington Post to be a better newspaper, dedicated to promote the knowledge and truth among the people. However, recently we were very disappointed to find several articles attacking the erection of T. Shevchenko monument. These articles based on a unilateral information or rather misinformation, hurt the feelings of many and many people because Taras Shevchenko has the same significance to a Ukrainian that George Washington has to an American. The ancient Romans used to say in such cases: "Audi alteram partem."

We hope that you take that advice, especially when you intend to write an editorial about Taras Shevchenko.

Very truly yours,

Dr. & Mrs. ROMAN DZIADIW.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
Oswego, N.Y., December 9, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.:

With reference to your recent editorials concerning the Shevchenko monument permit me to express my view. I am familiar with Shevchenko's life and writings and I think that he was a great poet and, above all, a great freedom fighter. A monument to him would symbolize the universality of human striving for freedom. The American revolution had—and continues to have—repercussions all over the world. It can be shown that Shevchenko's writings and struggles were inspired by the same spirit that animated American revolutionaries and that they are worthy expressions of it.

Sincerely yours,

R. TRATCH,
Assistant professor.

Inflationary Danger Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in her column in the Washington Star of January 9, Sylvia Porter warns of the possibility of renewed inflation during the current year. Citing the danger signals of increased consumer and business spending, massive tax cuts, stiff union demands for wage boosts, and a big budget deficit, she points to the dangers which a renewal of inflation would hold in this fiercely competitive world.

Under unanimous consent I include her column in the RECORD:

NEW CYCLE OF INFLATION COULD START EMERGING

(By Sylvia Porter)

The remarkable stability in our living costs which you and I have enjoyed for 5 full years could be seriously challenged as 1964 ages. For the first time since the war booms ended in the late fifties there are signs that a new cycle of moderate inflation could start emerging by the end of this year, and here's why.

First, the tax cuts which we're to get in 1964–65 will give us billions of dollars of extra spending power and we'll spend most of the dollars. The Government also will be running a big budget deficit and thus will be pouring many more billions into the economic stream than it will be taking out in taxes.

Although there is an abundant supply of most goods and services, there are forces which will put upward pressure on prices.

WHAT LABOR SEEKS

Second. Organized labor has made it clear that in 1964, money will be back in style. The United Auto Workers' Walter Reuther intends to lead a drive for a breakthrough on the cash wage front. The Teamsters' James Hoffa is set to fight for a national contract in trucking and for larger cash wage increases.

Since 1958, businessmen generally have been absorbing annual wage increases without boosting prices, because the rise in output per worker (productivity) has kept pace with the rise in wages. But if this situation reverses in 1964, the danger of a new wage-price (or price-wage) upswing will be clear.

Third. Corporations across the country have been steadily eating into the margins of their unused plant capacity during these 35 months of sustained business expansion.

The slack in their operations has been a key factor operating against price hikes, but if the tax cuts do spur factories to near capacity, the basis will be laid for price increases.

Fourth. World raw material prices have been firming and the long slide since the Korean war seems to have been arrested at last.

Higher prices for basic commodities are bound to put pressure on prices of manufactured goods right up the line.

THE INTERPRETATION

So far, most price boosts are viewed as just healthy indications of a strong economy. Admittedly, the Government's consumer price index—our index of living cost changes—has been climbing around 1½ percent a year (give or take a fraction) and is now at an alltime high.

But a living cost increase of well under 2 percent a year is considered reasonable in a business upturn. The index of wholesale prices has scarcely budged in 6 years. Rarely in the 20th century have industrial prices remained so stable for so long a period.

While it costs you around $10.75 to buy the market basket of goods and services which $10 bought in 1957–59, that's not a significant living cost advance considering the span of time. While the $1 which bought 100 cents of goods in 1957–59 buys only 93 cents worth now, that's hardly a major erosion in our currency's buying power over a 6-year span. What's more, most of the rise in the consumer price index has been due to increases in prices of such services as medical and personal care, rising expenses of operating a house, climbing costs of eating away from home.

Now, though, there are danger signals in the combination of increasing consumer and business spending, massive tax cuts, stiffer union demands for wage boosts, a big budget deficit.

"INFLATION A PROBLEM"

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin is saying it plainly: "Inflation is a very real problem." The President's chief economic adviser, Dr. Walter Heller, is warning businessmen that "the American public would have little sympathy" if they should "take advantage of expanding markets to boost their prices in the light of record and rising profits."

President Johnson is likely to come out with some tough talk about inflation in his major messages to Congress this month and he's ready to back up the Federal Reserve if it slams on the credit brakes to prevent, as Mr. Martin says, "inflation getting ahead of us again as it did in 1955."

A creeping rise in prices we can accept as a penalty for prosperity. More than that we cannot tolerate in this fiercely competitive world, and every responsible American should know it by this time.

Newspaper Says President Johnson Flunked First Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 2, 1964, issue of the Seattle Times expresses the severe disappointment of the Pacific Northwest forest products industry at our new President's first veto:

JOHNSON'S BLOW TO U.S. LUMBER

President Johnson's pocket veto of a bill that would have required that Canadian lumber entering the United States be marked as to country of origin is a severe disappointment to the Pacific Northwest.

In the Northwest's view, Mr. Johnson has flunked the first test of his willingness to follow through on the lumber-aid program announced with some fanfare by President Kennedy in July 1962.

One provision in that program called for establishment of a "preference for American

products in the purchase of lumber by the Defense Department, the General Services Administration, and other Federal agencies."

That provision has thus far been largely ineffective, and it is difficult to see how—in view of Mr. Johnson's veto of the marking bill—it ever can be effective.

The President denied the U.S. lumber industry this simple measure of relief despite the fact that Canada itself insists on a label of origin on its imports and also marks "made in Canada" on its lumber exports to every country except the United States.

There was not even united Canadian opposition to the bill. The Victoria Colonist stated last December 18: "A good bargain is a good bargain whether it is labeled or not. The 'made in Canada' label on lumber is the hallmark of quality. We should be proud of it."

On Christmas Eve President Johnson, acting in the aftermath of the Studebaker Corp.'s action to end automobile manufacturing in South Bend, Ind., announced a five-point program for aiding laid-off workers and attracting new industry to the Midwest city.

It is difficult to resist contrasting this prompt Federal action with the negative attitude that seems to dominate Washington, D.C., thinking regarding the heavy unemployment problem in this State.

In addition to the sudden blow, affecting 5,000 jobs, caused by cancellation of the Dyna-Soar space-glider program, forest-product employment in Washington has dropped from 79,341 in 1951 to 63,980 in 1963.

The forest-product-employment figures would be much worse were it not for the ingenuity shown by major companies in diversifying their products under the impact of Canadian waterborne lumber's increasing domination of the United States east coast market.

British Columbia's share of that most lucrative of cargo-lumber markets has risen in just 3 years from 45 to 70 percent.

And yet—as a key industry official has pointed out—every move made by the American lumber industry to get equal treatment with Canada in our own markets has been torpedoed by one source or another.

President Johnson has just fired the most recent torpedo.

Botulism Symposium at the Taft Engineering Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Milk and Food Branch of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati is playing host to approximately 300 participants at a symposium on botulism which began today in Cincinnati.

Botulism has become a serious problem as last year there were more than 40 cases reported. At this meeting representatives of educational institutions, directors of State laboratories, representatives of the various food industries, and other interested parties will pool their information and attempt to make some determination of what must be done to attack the complex problems involved.

This symposium is another fine example of the excellent work being done at the Taft Center. The wealth of trained personnel and facilities, both public and private, in the Cincinnati area, as well as the central location in the country, make possible the fine work there. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Taft Center for its role in sponsoring the meeting and wish all the participants success in their deliberations.

The Pope's Historic Pilgrimage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the few bright spots in current international events is the good will and potential developments resulting from Pope Paul's pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

The importance and significance of the pilgrimage were very properly discussed in an editorial in the Wednesday, January 8, Chicago Sun-Times, which places proper emphasis on the visit, as it pierced through the political complications of the Mideast area. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 8, 1964]

THE POPE'S HISTORIC PILGRIMAGE

Pope Paul VI has returned to the Vatican after an unprecedented pilgrimage to the Holy Land where, amid shrines and scenes reminiscent of Jesus of Nazareth, he was most graciously received by both rulers and people.

That those shrines and scenes are scattered over what is now a divided Holy Land—some of them are in Jordan, an Arab kingdom in which the followers of Mohammed dominate, and others are in Israel, where Jews are working in reestablishing a homeland—only emphasized his mission. Three great religious movements, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity, fused, if only briefly, as a consequence of the Pope's pilgrimage. That Pope Paul was able to journey to the Holy Land and be received with grace and affection demonstrates the slow but certain trend toward understanding and brotherhood abroad in the world today.

Pope Paul's visit was also marked by his meeting with Athenagoras I, the ecumenical patriarch of the Orthodox Eastern Church. That church, known officially as the Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church, was an integral part of early Christianity and flourished in the Byzantine Empire that long centered on Constantinople, now Istanbul. It spread throughout the East, especially in Greece and in the Slavic countries. Its relations with Rome were characterized by growing estrangement from the 5th to the 11th centuries. The final break between Rome and Constantinople came in 1054.

Athenagoras I of Constantinople is regarded as first among equals by the patriarchs of the 14 other Orthodox churches, each an independent national church. He does not possess any jurisdiction over them. He is, as ecumenical patriarch, a symbol of their theological unity and as such met with the Roman pontiff in a further demonstration of that ecumenicity now characterizing the three principal branches of Christianity—Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant.

The split between Rome and Constantinople preceded the Protestant Reformation in Western Europe by approximately five centuries. Christianity has long been fragmented by theological disputes and the rival ambitions of kings and potentates. Optimistic indeed would be one who predicted that the current ecumenical movement will result in an organic reunion of its major divisions in the forseeable future. Understanding and tolerance must, of necessity, come first. But they are beginning to be manifest.

The meeting between Paul VI and Athenagoris I was historic. It was the first encounter between a Roman pontiff and an ecumenical patriarch since 1439 when an abortive effort was made to heal the schism which had split Christianity in 1054.

The invited presence of Protestant observers at the Vatican Emucenical Council has been in the same significant pattern.

Pope Paul and his widely beloved predecessor, Pope John, have contributed greatly to the dialog so essential to Christian unity. Only time will tell whether such unity will develop into union.

Paul's Holy Land pilgrimage emphasized anew the common source of the various divisions in Christianity. It also emphasized the fact that Christian, Jew, and Moslem worship the same God, urging thereby on all a greater acceptance of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a November 7, 1963, press release of the Department of Justice referring to Government suits brought against a New York druggists' association which used the State fair trade statute as a cover for violating the Federal antitrust laws. This association, among other illegal activities, compelled and coerced druggists to maintain fair trade prices, harassed druggists who did not observe fair trade prices, and threatened to seek and sought reprisals by manufacturers.

Over a period of many years similar types of illegal activities have been engaged in by ardent retail fair traders. The quality stabilization bill, if enacted, will lend itself to this same misuse on a national scale.

QUALITY STABILIZATION

The Department of Justice today charged a New York retail drug trade association with participating in two price-fixing conspiracies, one concerning prescription drugs and the other concerning drug products in general.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said the defendant, the Nassau-Suffolk Pharmaceutical Society, Inc., Woodmere, Long Island, N.Y., has agreed to entry of consent judgments forbidding the practices charged by the Department.

Proposed judgments, to become effective in 30 days, were filed today at the same time

as the complaints in U.S. district court in Brooklyn.

Mr. Kennedy said these judgments should have the effect of reducing drug prices to the public in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

The defendant trade association is made up of more than 70 percent of the druggists in those two counties. The member firms were named as coconspirators.

Total annual sales of drug products and related goods in the two counties exceed $70 million, the Department asserted, and prescription drug sales by the members of the defendant association alone exceed $25 million.

Both complaints charged conspiracies in restraint of trade, in violation of section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The first complaint alleged that Nassau-Suffolk and its member druggists have conspired to fix prescription drug prices by having the association distribute pricing schedules to retail members and inducing both member and nonmember pharmacists to adhere to the schedules.

As a result, consumers in the two counties have been forced to pay "high, arbitrary, and noncompetitive prices" for prescription drugs, the complaint said.

The proposed decree filed today would enjoin the association from fixing prices, establishing any schedule of prices, distributing any such schedule, and from policing the pricing practices of any pharmacist.

The second complaint alleged that the association and its members have conspired to stabilize prices for drug products and related goods by agreements to adhere to so-called fair trade prices.

Retail drug prices were policed by the association. It advised manufacturers of departures from fair trade prices and urged them to sue price-cutting druggists, the complaint said.

The association harassed druggists who did not maintain minimum resale prices by threatening suits, recommended attorneys to prosecute such suits and paid expenses of such suits, the compliant alleged.

The proposed decree in this case would forbid the association to conspire to stabilize resale prices, to induce others to sell at any particular price, to police prices, to urge manufacturers to enforce fair trade prices, or to threaten or instigate lawsuits to maintain fair trade prices.

The Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts permit States to pass laws which let manufacturers set and enforce resale prices on trademarked products. Mr. Kennedy said these laws, however, do not permit persons in competition with each other, like the retail druggists named as coconspirators, to agree that each will urge manufacturers to enforce or that each will itself enforce fair trade prices.

Kennedy's Legacy to Negro Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the memorial tribute by Edward B. Toles at the Cook County Bar Association memorial services at the Metropolitan Community Church in Chicago on December 15, 1963:

THE LEGACY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY TO THE AMERICAN NEGRO LAWYER

Four thousand American Negro lawyers are grateful for the legacy of light left to each of them as they mourn the passing of the greatest benefactor to their professional advancement in American history. The revered words and accomplished acts of John F. Kennedy in our behalf during his administration will forever remain treasured legacies. John F. Kennedy's actions for the Negro lawyer are indeed legacies that a "great genius leaves to mankind which are delivered down from generation to generation as presents to the posterity of those who are yet unborn."

Never had any American President given so much to so many in his full recognition of the Negro lawyer who, in all American history, had received so little from his own Government.

Never before had Negro lawyers been advanced professionally so rapidly to high positions never before attained in their own Federal Government. The legacy of this good, kind, and great President will forever live after him in the heart, soul, and mind of every Negro lawyer.

It was on August 31, 1960, during the American Bar Association sessions in Washington, when we first met him in the Capitol offices of the then majority leader Senator Lyndon B. Johnson. The full text of John F. Kennedy's first message to the American Negro lawyer is as follows:

"As the guardian of our constitutional rights, the Federal judiciary must have at all levels the best possible judges. This means that appointments must be made on the basis of merit. But it also means that an active search must be made to find outstanding men and women of all races and backgrounds.

"With more than 4,000 Negro lawyers in this country there are many outstanding Negroes from whom to choose future judges. President Truman led the way in appointing the first Negro lifetime Federal judge and the first Negro on the court of appeals. But the fact that only one other Negro has been appointed as a lifetime Federal judge and that no Negro has ever been appointed a Federal district judge shows how far we still have to go in making our judiciary representative of the best of all our people.

"I assure you that in a new Democratic administration there will be far better representation, on the basis of merit, of persons of all our racial groups, including particularly those who in the past have been excluded on the basis of prejudice. For no American should be disqualified for any office because of his race, color, religion, or family origin. It is time for us to practice what our Constitution preaches. The Federal service should be a model of Americanism, in which there are no traces of any form of arbitrary discrimination."

From that day on the rest is history, for in the 2 years, 10 months, and 2 days of his short administration he had completely fulfilled all of his promises for the Federal judiciary and had added many more which are included in the chronological highlights of "The American Negro Lawyer, 1844–1963."

He nominated five Negro lifetime Federal judges (two await Senate confirmation)—more than any other President in history. He appointed the first Negro District Court Federal judge and later added three more. He appointed three Negro District of Columbia Municipal Court judges for 10-year terms including the first Negro woman jurist; 8 judges in all.

The New York Times, Sunday, October 6, 1963, stated: "Only 16 Negroes have ever been named to the bench by a President." But actually there have been 18 Negro judges appointed by Presidents and of the 10 now presently sitting and 2 nominated, 8 were nominated by John F. Kennedy.

John Kennedy's legacy to us also includes the first two Negro U.S. Attorneys in history appointed to U.S. Districts in San Francisco, California, and Cleveland, Ohio; the first Negro lawyer as Commissioner of the District of Columbia; the first Negro lawyer member of the Federal Trade Commission; the first Negro lawyer member of the National Labor Relations Board; the first Negro lawyer as executive vice chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; first Negro lawyer as General Counsel of an U.S. agency, Aid for International Development; and first Negro lawyer as U.S. Marshal, District of Columbia.

John F. Kennedy's last message to the Negro lawyer, dated August 8, 1963, was the following telegram from Hyannis, Mass., to our 38th annual meeting of the National Bar Association in Chicago's Sherman House. It demonstrates his personal concern and dedication to the cause of human rights coming at a time of his own personal loss of his infant son, Patrick Bouvier Kennedy. Two days earlier a White House secretary had personally telephoned this writer that the President's message would arrive.

THE LAST MESSAGE OF JOHN F. KENNEDY TO THE AMERICAN NEGRO LAWYER

EDWARD B. TOLES,
Editor, Cook County Bar News,
Chicago, Ill.:

I am delighted to extend my greetings and good wishes to the annual convention of the National Bar Association for the year 1963.

One hundred years ago the first great step was taken in the progress of the American Negro toward full and meaningful citizenship. Since that day, much has been accomplished by courageous and dedicated Negro leaders and their white colleagues. But full freedom has not been achieved.

Today we are witnessing a rebirth of the determination of Negro Americans to secure for themselves the equality of opportunity and treatment which is rightfully theirs. And that determination is shared by millions of white Americans throughout the land. Through private and governmental action many doors formerly closed to Negroes have been opened within recent years—and, in fact, within recent months and weeks.

But, as we all realize, if we are to assure the settlement of our problems in the courts and not on the streets, strong Federal action is also needed. As you know, I have asked the Congress to enact civil rights legislation which will provide reasonable and meaningful answers to some of the most immediate problems. I am deeply gratified that your program will deal with these present needs and their solution. You, as members of the bar, can render a real service in interpreting to your local communities what has been accomplished and what further action is needed. You have, moreover, a unique opportunity to serve as catalysts in promoting mutual understanding between Negro and white Americans. You may well be proud of your contribution to the American way of life as members of a distinguished profession and as leaders in your communities. I wish you a successful and rewarding meeting.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

HYANNIS, MASS.

The life of John F. Kennedy will always be remembered for in his short years he has kept his "rendezvous with life." Our famed Negro poet, Countee Cullen (1903–46) wrote:

"Though wet nor blow nor space I fear,
Yet fear I deeply, too,
Lest Death should meet and claim me ere
I keep Life's rendezvous."

And so John Fitzgerald Kennedy's legacy to us may be summed up in Walt Whitman's words on the "Death of President Lincoln, April 16, 1865."

"He leaves for America's history and biography, so far, not only its most dramatic reminiscence—he leaves in my opinion the

greatest, best, most characteristic, artistic, moral personality."

And now to the future, as President Kennedy quoted from Clough in one of his last press conferences, "But westward, look, the land is bright."

This land will be bright under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson. He has pledged to continue where Mr. Kennedy left off. President Johnson's past strong actions for civil rights are well known; as Senate majority leader he guided the first civil rights legislation in almost a century through the Senate in 1957 and 1960 and as chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity established by President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925 on April 7, 1961, he has effectively aided employment of Negroes by private corporations both South and North. President Johnson met with 21 of the largest Government contractors and worked out an agreement with them to eliminate discrimination in hiring, training, and promoting Negroes.

President Johnson last August 11, 1963, in a speech in Sacramento, Calif., decried the condition of the Negro in voicing his determination to fight discrimination and said:

"We know today—as we have known for 100 years—that it is wrong for taxpaying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans to be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society.

"We know it is wrong that Americans who fight alongside other Americans in war should not be able to work alongside the same Americans, wash up alongside them, eat alongside them, win promotions alongside them, or send their children to sit in schools alongside children of other Americans.

"We are determined that this oldest and most difficult of all domestic problems must be solved, can be solved and will be solved by a responsible nation working together at every level.

"And we know that America will be a stronger Nation and Americans will all enjoy a more peaceful and a more rewarding life together when this problem of human rights is resolved."

And then speaking on the site of the Battle of Gettysburg, last Memorial Day, Mr. Johnson said:

"Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact.

"The Negro today asks justice.

"We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking patience."

In his first speech to a joint session of Congress, Mr. Johnson also hit on the civil rights issue. He told the legislators that "No memorial or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought."

"We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights," he said. "We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law."

And finally in his Thanksgiving speech from the White House, Mr. Johnson again went out of his way to to bring up civil rights in an eloquent prayer:

"Let us pray for His divine wisdom in banishing from our land any injustice or intolerance or oppression to any of our fellow Americans, whatever their opinions. Whatever the color of their skins—for God made all of us, not some of us, in His image. All of us, not just some of us are His children."

High Standards Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Mallory rule is a simple, equitable requirement, in full accordance with the Constitution, that an arrested person must be taken before a judicial officer without unreasonable delay.

Despite its reasonableness, despite its soundness and despite its necessity in a free and open society, this rule has been under attack and has even been severely abrogated in recent sessions of Congress.

Recently a distinguished and knowledgeable body—the Judicial Conference of the United States—voted its disapproval of all proposals "which seek to abrogate the McNabb-Mallory doctrine."

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has commented on this wise and timely action in an excellent editorial which I commend to our colleagues' attention.

[From the Washintgon Post, Jan. 2, 1963]

HIGH STANDARDS

The Mallory rule has had a resounding vindication from a source unusually well-qualified to appraise it—the Judicial Conference of the United States. The Conference, composed of top Federal judges across the country, voted its disapproval of all proposals "which seek to abrogate the McNabb-Mallory doctrine."

We think this judicial action is altogether appropriate and timely. The rule in question is essentially a rule of evidence. In the McNabb case decided in 1943 and again the Mallory case decided in 1957, the Supreme Court held that a confession obtained through violation of the law requiring the police to take an arrested person promptly before a judicial officer may not be admitted as evidence in Federal prosecutions. This is an effort to preserve the integrity of Federal courts—by keeping them from any connivance in a police practice which violates the law—and an effort to protect the rights of accused persons. As such, it is peculiarly a matter for judicial rather than legislative determination.

There have been efforts for several years past—successful in the House—to modify the Mallory rule by legislation. These are as needless as they are dangerous. They are needless because the rule does not adversely affect the prosecution and conviction of criminals in any significant degree. U.S. Attorney David Acheson indicated in a 1962 television interview that in only two cases a year did his office drop a prosecution or lose a conviction because of the Mallory rule. His predecessor, Oliver Gasch, said in a speech in 1960 that Mallory questions were of controlling importance in fewer than 5 percent of criminal prosecutions.

Efforts to undermine the Mallory rule are dangerous because they are, in essence, efforts to subordinate principle to expediency: they would rob accused persons of rights in order to make the work of the police easier. But this is precisely the sort of thing that courts are created to forbid. There is reason to rejoice that the Judicial Conference of the United States is adhering so resolutely to the high standards of American justice.

Galbraith Attacks Mistaken Proposal To Break Up the Agency for International Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, once again the U.S. foreign aid program is being restudied and plans for reorganization are in the wind. I would like to associate myself with a view of this situation expressed admirably by Prof. J. Kenneth Galbraith in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published on Sunday, January 12.

Professor Galbraith, formerly Ambassador to India, points out clearly and cogently the fatal defects in the proposal to break up the Agency for International Development and to distribute its functions to State Department regional bureaus. I commend this letter to the attention of the Members of this body.

GALBRAITH DEFENDS AID—ECONOMIST OPPOSES ITS TAKEOVER; URGES AUTONOMY FOR PROGRAM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is hard to take seriously the suggestion in the news story that the Agency for International Development is to be broken up, its functions parceled out among the regional bureaus of the Department of State and its operations made subordinate to the day-to-day political concerns of the Department. President Johnson is both experienced and, we may assume, well-advised on these matters and it seems likely, therefore, that nothing will come of the proposal. Still it is so foolish and at the same time such a hardy perennial that it is well that the largest number of people be informed on the matter.

Over large parts of the world the AID program is the most powerful instrument of our foreign policy. For a nation as rich as the United States to live in comparative harmony with so many countries that are so poor is a great achievement. We do. And we enjoy the reputation on the whole of being a good and compassionate friend, because we are helping these countries through the hardships of early growth and thus offering an alternative to present privation and to the more violent therapy of communism.

PRICE OF HELP

The AID program justifies itself fully in its promise of development for other countries without unbearable hardship or violent (and perhaps also hopeless) revolution. It would lose its value if it were to be subordinate to day-to-day politics—U.N. votes, support against Castro, toeing the line on alliances. Such demands would mean that the price of our help was the one thing even more precious to the new countries than economic development—their national independence.

The foregoing argues for a generous autonomy for the AID program. It needs to be related to our other foreign policy activities—there is neither argument nor any great problem about this—but it needs even more a steadfast and professional attention to the longrun goal of economic improvement in the countries with which it is concerned.

Administrative considerations argue also for autonomy. The task is different from that of diplomacy; many of the older State

Department officers are neither qualified for nor even especially interested in the tasks of economic development. And while the AID organization is not perfect it is both better led and better adapted to its task than the State Department. Specialized oversea enterprises, from the Marshall plan to the Peace Corps, have always worked best when they have had the requisite autonomy.

Why, then, do we have these proposals? All concerned with American foreign policy should have the reasons vigilantly in mind. In the first place the AID organization has for long been a favorite target of the far right. Others, including those who describe themselves as liberals, while agreeing on the importance of our assistance program do not rally effectively to its defense.

OPPOSITION TO AGENCY

This makes the AID organization a safe object of the aggressions not only of regressive and predatory legislators whom few of us would wish to see in charge of our foreign policy—and who speak for a small fraction of American opinion—but, also of the bureaucracy as well.

Most members of the State Department would support the notion of an autonomous AID. Some senior officials (with the support of an occasional noncareer officer who is susceptible to establishment clichés) continue to regret the loss in World War II of the Department's monopoly over foreign policy. One consequence is the undercurrent of criticism which flows from the Department on the operations not only of AID but also of the U.S. Information Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency and which is often unfair and sometimes untrue.

The more important consequences are those recurring suggestions that all overseas activities should be brought under the immediate authority of the Department, whatever the cost. The State Department does not administer its present tasks with precision. However, since prestige is easily mistaken for competence, this does not deter some members from asking for more responsibilities.

Finally, the AID organization is strongly subject to the reorganization syndrome. This causes people, on encountering an agency charged with a difficult task, to conthat the difficulties will disappear if only there is another reshuffling of the offices and bureaus. The problem of getting other nations on the path to development is the most difficult we have ever faced. It won't happen overnight.

To the man whose mind consists of organization charts and simple solutions it always seems certain that difficulties will dissolve if agencies are only reshuffled once more. Such attitudes are, of course, inimical to sustained progress.

What the AID organization needs is not another reorganization. It needs support against those who would destroy an indispensable instrument of policy and patience while it shows what good and continuing leadership can accomplish.

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 4, 1964.*

A Second Vice President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Judge Benjamin S. Schwartz of the juvenile division of the court of common pleas in Hamilton County, Ohio, has recently written an interesting letter on the subject of presidential succession. I believe that these views merit wider consideration, and, for that reason, I am attaching hereto a copy of Judge Schwartz' letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer.

DEAR SIR: Your fine, timely editorial in the Friday, December 6, Enquirer entitled "Do We Need a VP?" raises a very important issue.

Could we not consider electing first and second Vice Presidents for our country? By the Constitution, the Vice President presides in the Senate, and the second Vice President could preside in the House.

Probably this is not a new idea, but it has become more important in view of recent events and the fact that one in four Presidents dies in office.

While it is true that no successor to the Vice President has ever become President, this is no reason that it could not happen.

In Dallas, President Johnson as well as President Kennedy could have been assassinated. It is also true that President Johnson has a heart ailment. At the same time, the Speaker of the House is not the Nation's choice, and serious consequences could follow if ever a successor to the office of President would not have the backing of the American people.

Furthermore, in the past, there have been instances when the Speaker of the House has been of a different political faith than the President. In such a case, an overnight change could lead to chaotic conditions.

The advantages of having a second Vice President could be many. Instead of retiring our Presidents after leaving office to inactivity and positions where they make little contribution to the public welfare following their vast experience, they could be considered for second Vice-Presidency, and thus give our country the benefit of their knowledge and ability.

As pointed out in your editorial, President Johnson has no deputy upon whom he can lean for help with the vast problems with which he is confronted, yet everyone recognizes the great need for such a person.

Presidents are human beings and can be taken from us without notice, so, let us insure better continuity and security in this office, and not depend just on blind faith, hoping that nothing more will happen.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. SCHWARTZ.

Federal Employees and the Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1963, I introduced a bill, H.R. 4845, which calls for the creation of a bipartisan commission to review Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of the U.S. Government. My bill refers specifically to the Hatch Political Activities Act, originally enacted in 1939.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since the enactment of that law, and there seems to be widespread support for a reexamination of the act. My bill provides for the creation of a 12-member commission to make a full study of the Hatch Act and an appraisal of its operations in the light of events and developments over the past 25 years. The commission would be set up for 1 year, at the conclusion of which it would submit its findings and recommendations to the President and Congress.

On August 13, 1963, the U.S. Civil Service Commission submitted its views on my bill to the House Administration Committee, to whom the bill had been referred for consideration. Writing for the Commission, Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., stated that "the Civil Service Commission is fully in accord with this legislation." He then added:

In the intervening years (since the Hatch Act became law) circumstances within society and Government have undergone significant change. We feel, therefore, that it would be appropriate now to reexamine the Hatch Act and related legislation in the light of current conditions.

In view of the above opinions expressed by the Civil Service Commission, I believe that the House Administration should schedule early hearings on the bill. 1964 is a very important election year; consequently, action on my bill is very timely and necessary.

The Civil Service Commission recently also prepared interesting information in the form of questions and answers regarding the political activities of Government employees. I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of Mr. Macy's letter and the Commission's questions and answers. They are as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1963.

Hon. OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Room H-329, the Capitol

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request of April 18, 1963, for the views of the Civil Service Commission on H.R. 4845, a bill "to create a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government."

The Civil Service Commission is fully in accord with this legislation.

Almost a quarter of a century has gone by since the principal statute restricting political activity of Government personnel, the Hatch Political Activities Act, became law. In the intervening years circumstances within society and Government have undergone significant change. We feel, therefore, that it would be appropriate now to reexamine the Hatch Act and related legislation in the light of current conditions.

We have no objection to any of the personnel and salary provisions of this legislation. We note that section 6(a) would authorize the proposed commission to appoint and fix the compensation of personnel without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Because the commission is of temporary duration, we are not opposed to this exemption.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Civil Service Commission emphasizes again that Federal employees and members of their families have the right and obliga-

tion to register and vote. Queries and comments of Federal employees, addressed to the Commission, indicate that many people do not realize the extent of permitted activities under political activity rules governing Federal employees. A number of the questions are from Federal and District of Columbia Government employees who are residents of the District of Columbia and who are planning to register to vote for President and Vice President. The questions range from those dealing with rights and restrictions under specific provisions of the Hatch Act to those dealing with the Federal Government's attitude toward cooperating with local authorities in an effort to get citizens to register and vote.

The following questions and answers have been prepared for the guidance and information of employees.

REGISTRATION, VOTING—GENERAL

Question. What is the Commission's general philosophy with regard to the individual's participation in registration?

Answer. The Commission, over the years, has expressed the view that it believes all citizens should be encouraged to register and to vote, and that no impediment should be permitted which would hamper an individual from participating in registration activities and voting.

Question. May a Federal employee participate in nonpartisan registration drives?

Answer. Yes; to the fullest extent possible.

Question. May he direct such nonpartisan registration drives?

Answer. Yes; he may exercise complete supervision.

Question. May a Federal employee participate in a registration drive conducted by a political party which is not carried out on behalf of specific candidates?

Answer. Yes, with certain qualifications. If the Federal employee is engaging in registration activities for the purpose of encouraging the registration of voters on a partisan political basis, such activity would violate the Hatch Act. The employee must see to it that his role in the drive is wholly nonpartisan in character and that he impartially registers voters for the party of their choice without attempting to influence the individual being registered.

Question. In most States a registrar is appointed by the county clerk or clerk of the court. Can a Federal employee accept such appointment?

Answer. Yes, if in doing so he gets permission from his agency and the work does not interfere with his agency's business. This is a matter for each agency to decide.

Question. May a Federal employee be excused for a reasonable time to vote or to register to vote?

Answer. Yes. As a general rule, where the polls are not open at least 3 hours either before or after an employee's regular hours of work he may be granted an amount of excused leave which will permit him to report for work 3 hours after the polls open or leave work 3 hours before the polls close, whichever requires the lesser amount of time off. If an employee's voting place is beyond normal commuting distance and vote by absentee ballot is not permitted, the employee may be granted sufficient time off in order to be able to make the trip to the voting place, not to exceed a full day.

For employees who vote in jurisdictions which require registration in person, time off to register may be granted on substantially the same basis, except that no such time is granted if registration can be accomplished on a nonworkday and the place of registration is within reasonable 1-day round trip travel distance of the employee's place of residence.

Question. May U.S. property be used for registration purposes?

Answer. Yes. A White House memorandum dated January 23, 1962, expressed the administration's desire that Federal activities cooperate with local authorities and nonpartisan citizens groups in programs to facilitate registration. This memorandum reaffirms a similar White House memorandum issued October 17, 1960.

Question. How far does the Federal Government's cooperation with local officials extend in registration and collection of poll tax?

Answer. Such cooperation may include: (a) Publicity among employees concerning the deadlines and locations for registration and for payment of poll taxes; (b) provision of space on Federal installations for persons authorized to handle registration and payment of poll taxes; and (c) other measures which will not result in undue disruption of the public business and which are voluntary in nature.

GENERAL RESTRICTIONS

Specifically, an employee covered by the Hatch Act cannot run for any office as a partisan candidate or campaign for any partisan candidate or engage in any partisan political management. By partisan candidate is meant one representing a National or State political party such as the Democratic or Republican Party. He may not run for office, even as an independent, in an election in which partisan political designations are used, unless he lives in one of the communities to which the Civil Service Commission has given partial exemption in connection with his local government.

Question. Does the Hatch Act apply to part-time Government employees?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The Civil Service Commission enforces the Hatch Act for the competitive civil service. Does this mean that employees holding excepted positions (outside the competitive civil service) are not subject to the act?

Answer. No. Excepted employees are subject to the act, but in these cases the employing agency is responsible for enforcing it.

Question. What employees are prohibited by the Hatch Act from active participation in politics?

Answer. Employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia, including temporary and part-time employees. The political activity of employees of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with a federally financed activity is also restricted.

Question. Are any executive-branch employees exempt from the restrictions of the Hatch Act?

Answer. Yes, there are a few specific exemptions listed in the act. Among them are (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws. There is also a partial exemption for Federal employees who live in communities in which large numbers of voters are employed by the Federal Government. This partial exemption is fully explained in the final section of this release.

Question. What is the penalty for violation of the Hatch Act by a Federal employee?

Answer. The most severe penalty for violation is removal. The minimum penalty is suspension without pay for 30 days.

Question. Please explain for employees affected by the Hatch Act just what their responsibilities and rights are under the act.

Answer. They have the right to vote and to express their political opinions, but are forbidden to take an active part in partisan political management or in partisan political campaigns. In connection with Federal employees' right to vote, the Commission emphasizes that political activity restrictions do not relieve employees of their obligation as citizens to inform themselves of the issues and to register and vote.

Question. Is it possible for a Federal employee to run for public office on a partisan party ticket?

Answer. No. Federal employees cannot be candidates for any National, State, county, or municipal office filled in partisan elections. They may run for local office only in elections that are nonpartisan; that is, where all the candidates appear on the ballot without partisan party designation such as Democratic or Republican.

Question. May a Federal employee serve as an election officer?

Answer. Yes, provided that in doing so he discharges the duties of the office in an impartial manner as prescribed by State or local law, except that he may not become a candidate for such office in a partisan election.

Question. May a Federal employee serve in an unofficial capacity at the polls as a checker, challenger, distributor, or watcher, or in any other post in behalf of a partisan political candidate or partisan political party?

Answer. No. He may not assist such candidate or party in any way at or near the polls.

Question. May a Federal employee use his auto to take voters to the polls on election day, or lend it, or rent it for this use?

Answer. Generally, no. However, the employee's auto may be used to transport himself and members of his immediate family to the polls. In addition, members of a car pool may stop at the polling place to cast their votes on the way to or from their places of employment.

Question. May employees covered by the act attend political rallies and join political clubs?

Answer. Employees covered by the Hatch Act can attend political rallies and join political clubs, but they cannot take an active part in the conduct of the rally or operation of the club. Other things they are prohibited from doing are becoming involved in soliciting or collecting political contributions, distributing campaign material, and selling dinner tickets, or otherwise actively promoting such activities as political dinners.

Question. May an employee who is subject to the Hatch Act write a letter to the editor of a local newspaper, expressing his opinion on a partisan issue?

Answer. Yes, but he must not solicit votes for or against any political party or candidate. If he solicits votes, it is a Hatch Act violation.

Question. May he make a campaign contribution to his party?

Answer. Yes, but he cannot be required to do so. The contribution cannot be made in a Federal building or to some other employee who is prohibited by Federal law from accepting contributions. Of course, as a Federal employee, he cannot solicit political contributions.

Question. May employees covered by the Hatch Act wear campaign buttons in the interests of one of their favorite candidates?

Answer. Yes. They may also display political posters or pictures in the windows of their homes or on their automobiles.

Question. May a Government employee's wife who is not a Government employee help a friend campaign for political office?

Answer. Yes. The act does not restrict the activities of an employee's wife or of other members of his family in any way.

Question. If an instructor in a State university wants to run for office on a partisan party ticket, would this be a violation of the Hatch Act?

Answer. No. The Hatch Act does not apply to teaching positions.

Question. What should an employee do if he does not know whether a certain activity violates the Hatch Act?

Answer. Since ignorance of provisions of the law will not excuse a Government employee from penalties for violation, he should present the matter in writing to the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. 20415 before engaging in the activity.

Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last November the world saw a brilliant life snuffed out when an assassin's bullet struck down our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

Many millions of words have been spoken in tribute to what this great man accomplished during the 2 years and 10 months he served as our President. Many memorials are being prepared in his memory. However, the most lasting memorial will be the works he himself contributed to the greatness of our country.

One of these was his diligent effort on behalf of civil rights. This effort is clearly embodied in the civil rights bill now pending before the Congress.

I believe the American people share the sentiments which are expressed in the following excerpt from a newsletter published by the Alameda branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on December 19, 1963.

I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the president of this branch, Mr. Carter Gilmore:

NEWSLETTER

The world will long remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Although we are saddened by his death, I know the world will be a better place because a man of his character lived among us.

The United States can at last take a long look at itself and realize what hate and bigotry can do, not only to one man but a nation, that is deprived by the tragic death of such a noble President—one who had so much he wanted to do for every American, white and Negro alike.

His beliefs shall live on, for men of goodwill will not let them die. His civil rights bill before Congress now makes our fight more intense, more dedicated.

Our hearts go out to his family, especially to his widow and children whose superb dignity made most children proud to be Americans.

The Negroes' quest for human right will go on, not only because we must, but because of men like Medger Evers and our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Sincerely,

CARTER GILMORE,
President.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks and include extraneous matter, I wish to insert six columns by Arthur Hoppe published in the San Francisco Chronicle pertaining especially to the Federal Government and personalities with whom we are all familiar.

Mr. Hoppe has acquired a tremendous following and Pierre Salinger of the White House staff has said: "He is the best political humorist in the country."

His articles follow:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Dec. 15, 1963]

SECURITY IS A WET BLANKET

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Having a government to protect you from evil certainly makes you feel secure. My Government protects me from evil nations abroad and evil men at home. And more and more lately it even tries to protect me from me.

The trend isn't new. For years, the Government has tried to protect me from being a wastrel. It now has compulsory social security to make me put away for my old-age and compulsory withholding taxes to make me save up for a rainy day. Which it thoughtfully provides every April 15.

So I'm now more secure. And the Government kindly wishes me to wear a seat belt and quit smoking.

All over the country laws are in the works to make seat belts in cars compulsory. Of course, if I get in a wreck, my seat belt won't help anybody else. But it'll protect me. And naturally my Government wishes to protect me from my own carelessness.

And now it yearns to make me quit smoking. You can tell. Everywhere the Government is appointing committees and study groups to gather data so it can inform me smoking's bad for me. Which I already know. And, sure enough, some eager legislator will demand a law taking my cigarettes away from me. For my own good. Because, he'll say, I'm not strong enough to quit on my own. And, alas, it's all too true.

For, woe, I'm a careless, spineless spendthrift. But, I ask, is my Government protecting me enough from me? For example, there's no doubt I eat too much. Where is my Government, I want to know, when second helpings are passed around? A simple law limiting caloric intakes would do wonders for my longevity.

And another thing, I hate to wear galoshes. I know I'll catch pneumonia sooner or later. Doesn't my Government care? Why have we no galoshes law? And what about my tendency to stay up too late? My inability to budget my paycheck? My abject failure to brush my teeth after every meal? There's no question that if my Government doesn't step in soon, I'll be the death of me yet.

For I, like many a human being, am a self-indulgent, self-destructive profligate. And yet, oddly enough, I resent my Government telling me so. Come to think of it, it's none of their business. True, we individuals form governments to protect ourselves from others. And others from us. But I say it's my inalienable right to protect myself from me. Or to try. Indeed, if you ask me, this is the essence of individual freedom.

Besides, when it comes to carelessness, profligacy and waste, I think my Government's got its hands full with itself.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Dec. 18, 1963]

CIVILIZATION IS VERY WELL-BALANCED

(By Arthur Hoppe)

President Johnson and I are very sore at Congress for upsetting his "well-balanced foreign aid program" with a meat ax.

Mr. Johnson's mad because Congress lopped foreign aid so heavily. Me, I'm mad because they lopped it so lopsidedly. We'll never be able to call it well balanced again.

Actually, I've always admired the delicate equilibrium we achieved in helping our fellow man overseas. Over the years, just about half our money has gone for economic aid and half for military aid. Or, to put it another way, half has gone to build better schools, better homes, and better lives for our underprivileged brethren. And the other half has gone to give them guns to kill each other off with.

You certainly couldn't ask for a more well-balanced program than that.

But now the House has lopped $800 million off the foreign aid bill. And every lop of that $800 million was lopped off economic aid. It throws the whole thing out of whack. Oh, it's plain we're in for trouble.

First of all, while we'll be able to give these unfortunates as many guns, bombs, and rockets as before, we'll have to curtail our various programs to wipe out illiteracy. And in these days of technological warfare, what good, I ask you, is an illiterate soldier?

For example, can we expect a Vietnamese peasant who neither reads nor writes to understand the training manual for a burp gun? Or to fly a plane so that he can drop napalm bombs on his fellow Vietnamese peasants? Of course not.

And we will have to cut back on our many projects to clothe, feed, house, and cure our needy fellow humans overseas. Consequently, the armies we go on arming will be more ragged, sick, and hungry than before. And as any general will tell you, it's hard enough as it is to get these ragged, sick, and hungry people to charge out there and kill one another.

I don't wish to be overly pessimistic, but I can foresee the day when native villages will be stacked high with unusued American guns, bombs, and rockets. Which the natives are too illiterate to use and too sick and hungry to care much about anyway.

Oh, I suppose they'll find the strength to throw rocks at each other occasionally. Or maybe even stab each other with spears once in a while, the way they used to. But these primitive weapons, as you know, are terribly inefficient. And such a reversion will mean that 15 years of our well-balanced foreign aid program has gone for naught.

So let us pray Congress puts the program back in equilibrium. One solution, of course, would be to trim military aid $800 million, too. But I wouldn't suggest that for a minute. Everybody knows we give guns to the unfortunate for their own good.

No sir; the only way out is for Congress to restore that $800 million in economic help. Our Congressmen must come to realize the basic Christian concept behind our well-balanced foreign aid program:

It is our duty to help the poor to lead better lives and die happy; equally.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Dec. 20, 1963]

THE BREAKDOWN OF OUR SYSTEM

(By Arthur Hoppe)

You undoubtedly read about the runaround the Government's giving my friend, Mr. Jefferson Poland, a very gentle, very non-

violent, very likeable young anarchist. They won't let him register as a subversive.

It's a crying shame. Mr. Poland's been trying his best to register with the Subversive Activities Control Board ever since last February. He feels it's his duty to the taxpayers because the Board's been in business 13 years. And it's never registered a single subversive.

So he applied. And you'd think the Board would be terribly excited to get an application at last. But, no, all Mr. Poland got for his efforts was a snippy letter saying the Board registered only "members of Communist-action organizations." And no anarchists need apply. And why didn't he take his business somewhere else?

Well. Is this any way, I ask you, for our public servants to treat the very public they were hired to serve? I demand an explanation. And, until one is forthcoming, I can only supply my own.

Scene: The Subversive Activities Control Board, Registration Division. At the moment the Division's 273 clerk-typists are all clerking and typing furiously, primarily because the Board members themselves are holding their regular semiannual meeting around a somewhat dusty table at one end of the office.

CHAIRMIN. Well, gentlemen, that takes care of the Rose Bowl office pool, contributions for Miss Pennyweather's wedding present and our complaint to GSA on the lack of adequate parking facilities for Board members. Is there any other business before we adjourn until next June?

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. Well, sir we have received an application from a young man.

CHAIRMAN (sighing). Whose nephew is it? You know we're overstaffed now. After all, our $182.6 million budget won't cover everybody.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. No, sir. This young man doesn't want a job. He wants to register as a subversive.

CHAIRMAN (elatedly). A subversive? Register? Oh, that will be a feather in our caps. I foresee a doubled budget next year. Send that young man the proper forms to fill in, airmail.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY (hesitantly). But, sir, that's just it. I've checked the stock room and we have 142 different forms, from employment forms to retirement forms. But we don't have any subversive registration form. There just hasn't been a need.

(Hubbub reigns. The Board finally votes to appoint a study committee to recommend a proper form and report back next June. The meeting is then adjourned.)

Nonsense. Such a form should be simple to draw up: "Name, address, social security number, name of subversive organization, previous subversive organizations (list last organization first). Reason for termination. When do you plan to overthrow the Government? Where? By force and/or violence? Do your wear corrective lenses? In case of accident Notify_____." And so forth.

And they had better act fast. For if our Government can't find a way to register subversives like Mr. Poland, then where are we? Why, we'll have a whole mess of subversives running around trying to overthrow the Government without having filled in the proper application forms.

Such a breakdown in our orderly system can lead only, I fear, to one thing: sheer anarchy.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Jan. 2, 1964]

HAPPY IS THE MOM, ROCKY IS THE DAD

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in television land. It's time for another episode of the "Rocky Road to Happiness," the romantic story of Rocky Nelson and his search for an answer to that grave national problem: Can a young man of 55 find love? And not lose the ladies' vote?

As we join Rocky today he is all alone in his New York penthouse with his bride, Hysterical O'Brien. Alone, of course, except for the usual 17 aids, 13 computers, and the daily public opinion polls. Hysterical is happily knitting a pair of blue booties.

AID. Well, chief, the polls show you are still thought of as one of the great romantic figures of our time. And consequently, you've dropped another three percentage points.

ROCKY (gloomily). Thanks a thou, fella. I thought my masterful speech insuring world peace forever might pick me up a little support from the lady voters. Isn't there anything we can do to win them back?

HYSTERICAL (blushing). Excuse me, dearest, but there's something I've been meaning to tell you.

ROCKY. Not now, fella. (To his aids:) What if I went BARRY one better and promised to abolish all taxes? Try that on the computer, fellas.

HYSTERICAL (holding up booties). Dearest, look at these.

ROCKY. You knit very well fella. (To an aid:) What's the computer say?

AID. Drop dead.

ROCKY (pacing the floor). OK, let's not panic, fellas. There must be some one all-important, overriding issue which would swing the voters back to my moderate, detailed, well-thought-out stand on world affairs. One * * *.

HYSTERICAL (coyly). Wouldn't you like to hear the patter of little feet around the penthouse, dearest?

ROCKY (absently). Sure, fella. But don't get a French poodle. It wouldn't be good for my image. (To the aids): What we need, fellas, is an issue none of the other candidates can top. An issue which we can present triumphantly to the convention in July. An issue which will warm the hearts of every lady delegate. An issue——

HYSTERICAL (blurting it out). Dearest, I'm going to become a mother. In June.

ROCKY. Well, I don't know, fella. It's an interesting idea. But between us, we've had nine children already. And a 10th might well cost us the support of the Planned Parenthood Association. No, I think we ought to stick to the less controversial issues. Now, on civil rights——

AID. We could run this motherhood thing through the computer, chief.

ROCKY. Sure, fella. Go ahead. Meanwhile, as to the Berlin question——

AID. Chief, chief. The computer digested the motherhood bit, blew two fuses, played "Rock-a-bye Baby with Ruffles and Flourishes" and declared you the next father of your country.

ROCKY (taking Hysterical in his arms). Fella, you've made me the happiest candidate in the Republican Party. BARRY will never top this.

Will BARRY be able to meet this challenge? In only 6 months? Tune in to our next episode, Folks. Meantime, as you go down the byways of life, friends, remember: Love may alienate the lady voters. But the results will bring them back.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Jan. 8, 1964]

PRESENTING: A NEW CULTURAL SERIES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We executives here at Another Network, Inc., have been checking over our television programs for the coming year. And we're in trouble.

As you may recall, we have a heart-throbbing daytime serial going called, "The Rocky Road to Happiness," starring Rocky Nelson and his young bride Hysterical O'Brien. And for the kiddies, there's this jim-dandy adventure series—"Gary Boldwater, Boy American." But what have we got to appeal to the whole family during prime viewing time? Nothing.

So we've been working on it in typical creative tee-vee fashion. First of all, we asked ourselves: What are the two most popular programs on the air today? Well, "The Beverly Hillbillies" is No. 1 and "Bonanza" is a close second. Next, in typical creative tee-vee fashion we asked ourselves: What can we steal from both of them?

And I think we've got the perfect combination. It's about the rooting-tooting, folksy Jay family who strike it rich. Only they aren't hillbillies. They're cowboys. And the pa of the family is Elbie. Yes sir, old Elbie Jay.

Elbie's kind of a cross between Walter Brennan and John Wayne. Lots of earthy horsesense but steely eyed. And he's not known as "the fastest handshake west of the Pecos" for nothing. For he's the top wrangler in the whole of Texas, which, as you know, is the home of plain and fancy wrangling.

Now Elbie's married to this pretty gal name of Birdie Bird. And they've got two cute teenagers names of L'il Bird and Bye-bye Bird. Plus plenty of lovable kinfolk like Aunt Jessie and Uncle Huffman and Cousin Oriole. And they all live down Texas way on "the little spread," where Elbie does a lot of hard work. Which is all for the Birds.

Then one day while mending fences he hits a gusher of Texas oil money. The whole family a-saddles up and a-heads back East to live in this big white house. Which they call the expensive spread. And the Jays have many a rib-tickling adventure in high-class society, each one proving that folks are pretty much folks the world o'er, no matter which fork they eat with. And that when it comes to problems, good old-fashioned horsesense sure does beat all.

Meanwhile, Elbie's got his work cut out for him as foreman of the expensive spread. And it takes all his know-how as a top Texas wrangler to ride herd over these sharp eastern galoots. But simple, homespun virtue always triumphs. Besides, any man who can wrangle his way to the top in Texas can hold his own in a wrangle anywhere.

Moreover, in each action-packed adventure Elbie can always count on his faithful sidekick, Sancho Pierre, who also serves as sort of a foil for the hero's rapier-like horsesense.

So we've got a rollicking, thrilling plot, a cast of warmly human characters and a hero everybody can identify with. And all that's been holding up production is the lack of a title. We rejected "The Bonanza Hillbillies" as too familiar. While "The Wrangler" and "Birdsmoke" made it seem just another western.

But at last we're ready to roll. Yes sir, we have a title we feel captures the very essence of our new series, one which describes in a folksy phrase what every program will be full of: "Heaps o' Horsesense."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Jan. 9, 1964]

ELBIE JAY MEETS THE PRESS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How's things with you-all tonight? Welcome to "Heaps o' Horsesense," the rib-tickling tee-vee adventures of that rootin-tootin' Jay family—starring ol' Elbie Jay, the friendliest wrangler ever to wrangle his way out of Texas.

As we join Elbie, his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, and their two cute tads, L'il Bird and Bye-bye Bird, they've struck it rich and they've a-moved into this big white house back East. That's Elbie there now, a-pokin' through the East Room with his faithful sidekick, Sancho Pierre.

ELBIE. Right fine place. Soon's I get my initials branded on these fixings it's going to seem just like home.

SANCHO PIERRE (worriedly): Chief, the newspapermen are demanding a press conference and you've got to build your public

image. Only you know them. They'll try to skin you alive.

ELBIE. Well now, Pierre, any friends of yours are friends of mine. The varmints. You tell 'em we'll have one of them there ol' press conferences right now.

SANCHO PIERRE. OK, Chief. I'll set up the State Department Auditorium. Let's see, klieg lights, coaxial cables, Nielsen surveys.

ELBIE. No sense a-goin' to all that fuss. Just you open that there door and herd 'em in.

SANCHO PIERRE (horrified). In here. But, Chief, that's unheard of. You can't build a public image in here.

ELBIE. As my granddaddy used to say, "A mule down a gopher hole is worth six crows in the schoolmarm's toolshed." Just you leave it to me.

(Sancho Pierre hesitantly opens the door. One hundred and sixty-two slick Eastern newsmen rush in, eager for blood.)

ELBIE (cool as a mushroom). Howdy there, boys. Glad you-all could come chat a spell. Have a souvenir ballpoint pen and a souvenir ashtray. Had a little trouble getting my picture on them pens. Lucky I'm tall and lean.

ACE NEWSMAN. Sir, what are your plans for increased monosodium glutinate exports to the Common Market in view of EFTA's opposition to the GATT agreements on—

ELBIE. That's a right fine question you asked there, son. (Pierre, unscrew a souvenir doorknob for that lad). And I want you-all to know we're a working on that problem mighty hard. Now, boys, have you-all seen around this place? This here's my office and that there's the Blue Room. Skee-daddle along now. And this here's Birdie Bird's bedroom—

BIRDIE BIRD. Elbie. You've just got to learn to knock.

ELBIE. Now don't get your feathers ruffled, Birdie Bird. Our dear friends here have seen ladies in pin curlers before. And this here's our L'il Bird's bath. Oops, excuse us, L'il Bird. And this here's the backyard and that there's my horse on which I'm about to ride off into the sunset while you boys go write your mighty fine stories about my warm, lovable family and how I'm working hard on any problems you got on your minds. And, Pierre, cut down a nice souvenir chandelier for each of the boys on their way out.

Is this any way to build a public image? Do you think for a moment these smart Eastern newsmen will be influenced by folksy charm and personal attention? As usual?

So come and visit with us again, friends. And meanwhile, as you mosey on down life's long trail, remember: All it takes to build a public image is a heap o' horse sense.

How Explain Our Illness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, how, in a society oft held as the symbol of freedom, do we explain the groups of extremists and the exponents of hate who sow bigotry and arrogance; who create a climate of violence and distrust—a climate where a President can be assassinated, where his chief suspect is immediately slain, where loyal Americans including a former President and the Chief Justice of our highest court are viciously maligned?

In a thoughtful article which appeared recently in the Washington Post, the noted historian and author, Henry Steele Commager, has explored this serious and far-reaching question.

Among his many searching observations, Professor Commager has made the important point that hate is a boomerang; that "those who would enslave others must first enslave themselves, so those who would hate outsiders find that hatred turns inward and consumes their own society."

Mr. Speaker, this article makes a valuable contribution to a needed self-analysis.

HOW EXPLAIN OUR ILLNESS?

(By Henry Steele Commager)

Lyndon B. Johnson comes to the Presidency of a Nation which is beset by division and the spectacle of hatred and shaken by a pervasive sense of guilt.

The assassination of President Kennedy, and the killing of the chief suspect, have dramatized for us the lawlessness and violence, the fear and suspicion and hatred which lie so close to the surface of American life.

We had prided ourselves on our unity. We had prided ourselves on having a society that was all but classless, where neither race no religion nor class nor politics created those deep divisions that afflicted so many countries of the Old World. We awoke to discover that we were in fact filled with racial hatreds, resentments and fears.

We awoke to discover that though we settle our political issues amicably enough, there were large elements of our society which rejected peaceful settlements but chose violence. We awoke to discover that though we do not confess to having class divisions, and though the movement from class to class is an easy one, there is as much class consciousness, class frustration and class hostility here as in most of the nations of Europe.

We had been proud of our tradition of due process of law, and we discovered, in the last decade or so, that under pressure we too were ready to flout and even to abandon due process; that when those we hated or feared were sufficiently wicked—or sufficiently dangerous—we let our traditions go by the board.

It is a shocking and sobering revelation of men's minds unhinged, of men's passions unleashed.. How explain our current illness? How explain violence in American life? How explain those deep divisions, those hatreds, those fears and suspicions? How explain the extremist groups, the hate groups and the violence they so readily embrace?

An easy explanation is that we are still so near the frontier, with its tradition of violence; that we are not yet housebroken, as it were. But other peoples, too, are close to the frontier: Canadians and Australians have frontier traditions, but their society is not racked by violence.

Furthermore, the violence of our day differs from that which we associate with the frontier and is not to be explained away by appeal to that tradition. Dallas and Birmingham are scarcely frontier cities; they pride themselves on their sophistication.

The members of the White Citizens Councils, the Birch Society and the Minute Women are for the most part of the middle, even upper middle class; they are reasonably well educated and socially respectable. The Universities of Mississippi and Alabama are well removed from the frontier, yet both university communities have provided us with shameful exhibitions of violence against a weaker race.

A BORROWED EXCUSE

Race provides the second fairly easy explanation of violence. Slavery, said Jefferson, is a continuous invitation to the most boisterous of passions. We have assumed that what was true for slavery remained true for race relations after slavery was a thing of the past; that what was a spurious excuse then becomes an acceptable excuse now.

But other societies have managed to maintain peaceful and harmonious relations among different races: our own society in Hawaii, for example, or the societies of the Latin American cuntries, or—to take a more recent and more relevant example—Israel.

No, the causes of our sickness are not to be found in the history of the frontier, or even of slavery. They must be sought rather in our society as a whole, not in a particular section or group. All these share in the malaise; all are, in varying degrees, responsible. The explanation is to be found most clearly in the impact of recent history on passions and attitudes deeply ingrained in the American character.

World War II bred violence and lawlessness. It was the first war in which it was taken for granted that civilians were proper targets, just as were the military. It was not only the Nazis who took this for granted over Rotterdam and Warsaw; we took it for granted over Hamburg and Tokyo.

We took for granted, too, the righteousness of the use of the nuclear weapon—the very symbol of indiscriminate slaughter of civilian as well as military. It is not possible to conduct war in this fashion for 4 years and not harden the moral sensibilities of those involved.

A SUBTLER FURY

Even after the worst of wars, however, tempers subside and animosities are forgotten. So after this greatest of wars: within a few years we had forgiven the Germans and the Italians and the Japanese and every augury promised the restoration of peace and harmony. Instead, the cold war thrust itself fiercely and implacably across the international horizon. One world became two, and then fragmented into many.

The fury of the cold war, if not more terrible than that of the hot, proved more lasting and more subtly poisonous. There is no purpose now in portioning out the blame for the cold war; there is enough to go around. What is sobering is that hatred of communism and Russia bred suspicion and fear and hatred at home as well.

What is sobering is that the frustrations of international relations were permitted to erupt on the domestic scene. What is sobering is that those whose hatred could not reach the Russians vented that hatred on those they could reach—on fellow Americans who were not sufficiently ostentatious in their own animosities against communism, those who incurred the suspicion of the extreme haters.

HATE IS A BOOMERANG

As those who would enslave others must first enslave themselves, so those who would hate outsiders find that hatred turns inward and consumes their own society.

The enemies of communism in America felt themselves frustrated and thought it proper to go to any lengths to escape from their frustrations, to ignore due process and violate the rules of fairplay and decency in their war on subversion. The antics of a McCarthy, of a Jenner, a Velde, of a hundred State and local anti-American un-American activities committees, all testify to the lengths to which these would go.

But other peoples and nations have been similarly frustrated; how explain the special character of the American frustration and the readiness of so many Americans—even otherwise decent Americans like Senator Taft—to take advantage of McCarthyism

for political purposes? Why is it that we assume that we should be exempt from frustration?

Here we come to something of crucial importance in the American character. In 1821, Chancellor Kent asked, rhetorically, "Are we a peculiar people?" The answer has almost always been yes. We assume that we are in fact a peculiar people, that the rules and principles that apply to other peoples do not apply to us.

Tocqueville, too, noted this habit of supposing ourselves exempt from the rules of history, and from Tocqueville to Brogan, European commenators have noted this characteristic. We think that we can bestride the stream of history, that we can indeed command that stream, even when it is swift and turbulent. We think that there is a special destiny for us, special rules, special laws—and special privileges and exemptions as well. We are not subject to the limitations and the frustrations reserved for less fortunate peoples; we are a people apart and a special providence watches over our destinies.

Thus our nuclear experiments are justifiable, but the Russians are a violation of morality; thus our readiness to use the nuclear weapon is right and proper, for we would use it in a righteous cause; the Russian use of that weapon is not to be tolerated. Thus we can propose to arm our Western allies with nuclear weapons, but it is immoral for the Russians to arm the East Germans or the Chinese with nuclear weapons.

We conveniently forget—if indeed we ever take in—that we are, so far, the only nation ever to use the nuclear weapon, and that our own nuclear experiments in the atmosphere outnumber those of any other nation. As all of these activities are in a noble cause, they don't really count.

THE FEEDERS

What we have here is deeply ingrained vanity and arrogance—vanity and arrogance fed by isolation; by school histories which teach that we are indeed a peculiar people; by filiopiestic societies which insist that we are somehow superior to all other nations, morally and politically; by a thousand editorials, a hundred thousand radio and television programs, which play up the villainy of our enemies—the Russians, the Chinese, the Cubans—and our own morality and nobility.

It is fed, too, by histories which exalt everything American; which brush aside our wars of extermination against the Indians but cheerfully contrast our treatment of the Indians with their treatment by the Spanish; which paint slavery as a kind of fortunate accident for the African Negro; which pretend that we have never had class conflict in the United States; which assure us that our melting pot really melted.

Of course, in some ways we have been a peculiar people—more successful than others, more fortunate than others. But has this not been in large part a function of the wonderful bounteousness of nature, of isolation, of an empty continent, and should not all this induce humility rather than arrogance and pride?

Thus, out of all this—out of our great good fortune, out of our assumption of a special destiny reserved to us by history and providence, out of the frustrations of the cold war—came the notion that we had a right to have our way of history and that any failure was to be explained by incompetence or by treason. What other explanation, after all, was possible? And out of this came the habit of violence, the habit of suspicion, the habit of hatred.

If only incompetence or treason could explain failure to have our way of history, then it was right and proper to visit upon incompetence and treason the most extreme fury. Out of this came hatred and violence—hatred of the nonconformist, hatred of the dissenter. Out of this came justification of violence against the "disloyal," the "subversive." Out of this came the habit of vanity, of arrogance, that thought itself justified in ignoring the ordinary rules of fairplay, the rules of law.

Out of all this—the tradition of frontier violence, the special saturation of race relations in the South, the double standard of morality, the assumption that the ordinary rules did not apply to us, that we were exempt from the laws and the processes of history—out of all this has come that bigotry and arrogance and vanity and violence which so deeply shocks us today.

In a simpler day, we could take all this in our stride. We can no longer do so. Now we are a world power; we can no longer indulge ourselves in childish vanities and temper, in childish displays of jealousy and violence. Now we act out our destiny on the great stage of history; now history itself glares upon us.

Now we must square our conduct with principles of right and morality that will withstand the tests of history. Now we are called upon to unite in that noble entreaty: America, America, God mend thy every flaw; confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law.

Nobel Prize Winners Associated With University of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Carl W. Larsen, director of public relations, for a complete list, with biographical sketches, of the 22 Nobel Prize winners who have been associated with the University of Chicago, which is located in the district I have the honor to represent. Under unanimous consent, I include the list herewith:

A. RECEIVED AWARDS WHILE ON THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Albert Abraham Michelson (1907, physics): The first American to win the Nobel Prize, for his optical precision instruments and for the spectroscopic investigations made with them. He was the first to measure the rigidity of the earth and the diameter of a star. A member of Harper's first faculty, he was professor of physics from 1892 until he retired in 1930. He was Martin A. Ryerson distinguished service professor from the establishment of the chair in 1925 until his retirement. He died in 1931.

Arthur Holly Compton (1927, physics, with Charles Wilson): For his discovery of the vapor condensation method of rendering visible the paths of electrically charged particles. Compton proved that light has certain properties of particles as well as of waves. He was professor of physics at the university from 1923 to 1945, chairman of the department of physics and dean of physical sciences from 1940 to 1945, and director of the university's South American cosmic ray expedition in 1941. He was the Charles H. Swift distinguished service professor 1929–45, and director of the metallurgical atomic project, 1942–45. He left Chicago in 1945 to become chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis, and served in that post until 1953. He was a distinguished service professor of natural philosophy there until his death in 1962. One of his books is "X-Ray in Theory and Experiment," written with Samuel K. Allison, now Frank P. Hixon distinguished service professor at the university.

B. RECEIVED AWARDS FOR WORK DONE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, BUT AFTER APPOINTMENTS ELSEWHERE

Alexis Carrel (1912, medicine): For his work on vascular suturing and on the grafting of blood vessels and organs. Carrel developed the method of blood vessel surgery for which he received the Nobel Prize while he was at the university's physiological laboratories in 1905 and 1906. He left to join the staff of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, became a member of the institute in 1912, and a member emeritus in 1939. He died in 1944.

Robert A. Millikan (1923, physics): For his work in the elementary electric charge and on the photoelectric effect. Millikan measured the charge on the electron, the fundamental unit of electricity, while he was a member of the university faculty. He was a member of the physics staff at Chicago from 1896 to 1921. He left to become director of the Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics and chairman of the executive council of the California Institute of Technology; he became professor emeritus at Cal Tech in 1945. He died in 1953.

Willard F. Libby (1960, physics): For his work in radiocarbon dating which has revolutionized man's knowledge of the past. He was one of the discoverers of the existence of radioactive carbon atoms in the atmosphere, and he developed the technique for the use of this carbon-14 in measuring the age of archeological and geological remains. Dr. Libby joined the University of Chicago faculty in October 1945, and did his research on radiocarbon dating on this campus. Announcement of his work was made in 1949 at the University of Chicago. He took a leave from the Chicago faculty in 1955 to become a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. After his tenure on the AEC, Dr. Libby joined the faculty of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Maria Geoppert Mayer (1963, physics, with J. Hans D. Jensen of the University of Heidelberg, Germany): For her theoretical model of the nucleus. She and Jensen simultaneously published papers in which they said the protons and neutrons inside the nucleus could be described as being arranged in a system of shells, as are the electrons in the larger atoms. Each shell of orbit corresponds to a specific level of energy and a nuclear particle can pass from one to another only by an abrupt "quantum jump." Mrs. Mayer joined the University of Chicago as a voluntary research associate in the Department of Physics and the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies in 1946, when her husband, Joseph, became a professor of physical chemistry. Her research was done at the university and at Argonne National Laboratory, which the university operates for the Atomic Energy Commission. She joined the faculty of the University of California in La Jolla in 1960. Their citation read: "In 1948–49, however, Goeppert-Mayer in Chicago and Jensen and his coworkers in Heidelberg could demonstrate that the vast volume of nuclear spectroscopy data accumulated by that time fitted a different model for the nucleus remarkably well. This model resembled the customary picture of the electron cloud of an atom inasmuch as a nuclear particle comprises a definite range level of its own, essentially a static force-field which results from the presence of all other particles in the nucleus."

C. FORMER UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO STUDENTS WHO RECEIVED AWARDS

Ernest Orlando Lawrence (1939, physics): For the development of the cyclotron. Member of the physics faculty at the University of California from 1928 until his death in 1958. Lawrence spent a year as a predoctoral

student at the University of Chicago in 1923–24.

Clinton Joseph Davisson (1937, physics, with George Paget Thomson): For the experimental discovery of the interference phenomenon in crystals irradiated by electrons. A staff member with Bell Telephone Laboratories from 1917 to 1946, Davisson received his B.S. degree at Chicago in 1908.

Owen Chamberlain (1959, physics, with Emilio Segre): For the discovery of the antiproton. Chamberlain received his Ph. D. at the University of Chicago in 1949, under Enrico Fermi. Segre was associated with Fermi in Rome in the research that brought Fermi the Nobel Prize. Both Chamberlain and Segre are on the University of California faculty. Both worked with Fermi on the Manhattan project.

Chem Ning Yang and Tsung Dao Lee (1957, physics): For their research that overturned the principle of conservation of parity. Both were graduate students at Chicago. Yang, now at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, received his Ph. D. at Chicago in nuclear studies in 1948. Lee, now at Columbia University, received his Ph. D. in astrophysics at Chicago in 1950.

Edward Lawrie Tatum (1958, medicine or physiology, with George W. Beadle): A biochemist on the faculty of Stanford University from 1948 to 1956, and member of the Rockefeller Institute since 1957, Tatum is a graduate of the University of Chicago High School. He attended the college of the university but earned his degrees at the University of Wisconsin (A.B. 1931, M.S. 1932, Ph. D. 1934).

James Dewey Watson (1962, medicine): Watson was graduated from the college of the University of Chicago in 1947 with a bachelor of science degree. He also earned a bachelor of philosophy degree during his 4 years at Chicago. Watson entered the college of the University of Chicago as an early entrant from South Shore High School at the age of 15. He is a close friend of George Wells Beadle, president of the university and himself a Nobel Prize winner in medicine in 1958. Watson's citation reads: "Creator of our understanding of the molecular basis for heredity and evolution, welder of disciplines, prophet of the day when biology will be explained in the language of quantum mechanics." Watson shared the 1962 Nobel Prize for physiology or medicine with British scientists Francis Harry C. Crick and Maurice Hugh Frederick Wilkins. When Watson received an honorary doctorate in 1961 from the University of Chicago, his work was described this way: "Professor Watson's extraordinary fruitful achievement lies in the formulation of a model for the deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) molecule. This model is of great importance, since DNA is the molecular constituent which determines the hereditary characteristics of living cells."

D. RECEIVED AWARDS PRIOR TO THEIR APPOINTMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

James Franck (1925, physics, with Gustav Hertz): For their discovery of the laws governing the impact between an electron and an atom. He became professor of physical chemistry at the University of Chicago in 1938. He is now professor emeritus.

Harold Clayton Urey (1934, chemistry): Received the award for the isolation of heavy water. He was instrumental in developing the K-25 (diffusion) uranium separation process during the war. He came to Chicago after the war to become distinguished service professor in the university's institute for nuclear studies, which grew out of Chicago's wartime atomic research. He was appointed Martin A. Ryerson distinguished service professor at the university in 1952. He left Chicago in 1958, is now at the University of California as professor at large of chemistry.

Ehrico Fermi (1938, physics): For the discovery of new radioactive elements produced by neutron irradiation, and for the discovery of nuclear reaction brought about by slow electrons. Fermi, more than any other man, was responsible for bringing the atomic age to birth. He was the inventor of the uranium pile that produced the first controlled nuclear chain reaction under the west stands at the University of Chicago December 2, 1942. He became a member of the faculty at the newly formed postwar Institute for Nuclear Studies in 1945; he held the Charles H. Swift Distinguished Service Professorship from 1945 until his death in 1954. The research center he helped to found has been renamed in his honor the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies.

George Wells Beadle (1958, medicine, with Edward L. Tatum): For the chemistry of genes. The Nobel citation said, in part, that "the study of genetics by Beadle and Tatum who, through a daring and astute selection of experimental material, created a possibility for a chemical attack upon the field." He was inaugurated as chief academic officer of the University of Chicago May 4, 1961. (The title, originally chancellor, was later changed to president).

E. NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS WHO DID SOME STAFF WORK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Edward A. Doisy (1943, medicine, with Henrik Dam): Received the award for the discovery of the chemical nature of vitamin K. He has been professor of biochemistry at St. Louis University School of Medicine since 1923. He was at Chicago in 1940 as a lecturer in medicine; he was awarded an honorary degree (D.Sc.) at the University of Chicago in 1941.

Herman J. Muller (1946, physiology or medicine): For his discovery that X-rays may be used to produce mutations. Professor of zoology at Indiana University since 1945, and distinguished service professor since 1953, he was an associate professor at the University of Chicago in the summer of 1925; he was also a leading participant in the university's Darwin centennial celebration in 1960.

Glenn T. Seaborg (1951, chemistry, with Edwin M. McMillan): For the discovery of plutonium. Chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley since 1958, and a member of its chemistry faculty since 1937, Seaborg was at Chicago on leave of absence 1942–46 for work on the plutonium project at the university.

Eugene Paul Wigner (1963, physics): For his research on the theory of nuclei. Wigner showed that the forms which hold nuclear particles together are large, but limited in their range to only about one billionth of one millimeter. He discovered that symmetry properties dominate a great many phenomena in the theory of structure of matter by the use of quantum mechanics. Wigner is a professor of mathematical physics at Princeton University. He was part of the Enrico Fermi team which created the first self-sustaining atomic pile at the University of Chicago, where Wigner spent 3 years from 1942 to 1945 as a member of the Metallurgical Laboratory of the Manhattan Project. His citation said: "In present-day physics, the inner-most part of the atom, the nucleus, consists of protons and neutrons. Wigner gave substance to this picture 30 years ago when he showed that the forms which hold these nuclear particles together are indeed large, but limited in their range to only about one billionth of one millimeter. Wigner realized that, with the statistically founded discipline which quantum mechanics represents, symmetry proportion must dominate a great many phenomena in the theory of structure of matter."

Karl Ziegler (1963, chemistry, with Giulio Natta): For contributions to the science of macromolecular chemistry and for development of new high polymers, which made possible new products in plastics, and new developments in synthetic detergents and in antiknock mixtures for high octane engine fuels. Ziegler has been director of the Max Planck Institute for Coal Research in Muehlheim, Germany, for 20 years. In the winter of 1936 he was visiting professor of chemistry at the University of Chicago.

The Resurgence of the Railroads and Their Importance to Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since the railroad situation has been subject to legislation during the last session of Congress, it occurs to me that the following address by Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., delivered at the annual luncheon of the Institute of Life Insurance at the Waldorf Hotel in New York City on December 10, 1963, should receive wider circulation.

The address follows:

THE RESURGENCE OF THE RAILROADS AND THEIR IMPORTANCE TO ECONOMIC GROWTH

I am greatly honored to speak to this gathering of outstanding leaders of the insurance industry, and I appreciate very much this opportunity of participating in your program. I am proud of the fact that I can claim some association with your great industry.

I have known your president, Blake Newton, for many years—in fact, a long time ago both of us practiced law in Virginia and now we have turned into Yankees. When I asked Blake what I should talk about, he said, "The railroads." Well, that happens to be just about my favorite subject and I am particularly pleased to have this privilege of discussing some aspects of our business with such a distinguished group.

Every conscientious businessman likes to feel, I am sure, that his particular business or profession makes a worthwhile contribution to his country's well-being. This certainly can be said of you who are in the field of life insurance. Your thriving industry puts within the reach of millions a unique kind of security. It promotes thrift and individual estate-building for a vast number of people. At the same time, life insurance provides the economy with billions of dollars of investment capital which is the very lifeblood of our Nation's growth. You have every right to be proud of what you have achieved within the framework of our society.

And I feel the same way about the railroad business. This sort of justifiable pride in individual and concerted accomplishment is the inspirational factor which enables men to extend themselves, to stretch their talents very often beyond what they regarded as their capabilities. It seems, however, that people like this are too busy taking on the next task to pause for astonishment at what they have done.

SOME REASONS FOR A SPIRIT OF CONFIDENCE

If you consider the accelerating progress of the railroad industry in just the past 5 or 10 years, I think you must be impressed with what has been achieved. The results of these industrywide strides forward are really just beginning to unfold, but the patterns of unmistakable progress are increasingly evident. And perhaps most remarkable of all is the consideration that the railroads are doing these things in the face of considerable odds.

It appears now that 1963 will be for the railroad industry the best year in the past 6. The Nation's railroads should net about $650 million, as compared with $571 million for 1962. Net income for the first three quarters was $426 million or 36 percent above the $313 million for the first 9 months of 1962.

The revitalization of the railroads is evident in the fact that, although anticipated gross revenues of some $9,600 million will be up only 2 percent over 1962, net income will be about 14 percent greater. And this is a valid index of progress. Our industry is learning the difficult lessons of cost control while at the same time providing shippers a greater value for their transportation dollar. The industrywide return on investment for 1963 ought to be about 3 percent—still far too little but an encouraging improvement over the 2.74 percent of the previous year. Indeed, it will be the fourth straight year in which the return on investment has advanced upward.

THE DIVERSE FACTORS PROMOTING GROWTH

Many elements have combined to produce this improvement. Some of it is the result of Federal investment tax credits and revised depreciation guidelines—which seem to have produced quicker benefits for the railroads than for most other industries. The railroads will spend slightly over $1 billion this year on capital improvements, 23 percent more than the $833 million in this category for 1962. For new equipment, the figures are approximately $760 million this year against $593 million last year a rise of 28 percent. This boost, incidentally, is a great stimulus to the railway suppliers. Deliveries of new freight cars for October were double the total for October 1962. Their business is booming and a substantial backlog of orders has developed.

This year will be the first billion dollar year for railroad capital expenditures since 1957, when this figure reached $1,095 million. And I believe that the 1964 total will be even higher.

The payoff from all this new equipment is just beginning to come about. The 14 percent gain in net from only 2 percent increase in gross revenues shows how bigger freight cars, more efficient motive power, and improved operating techniques can produce greater earnings. The railroad industry is particularly sensitive to the almost geometric progression of profits possible after a break-even point is attained.

The railroads also reflect very quickly the fluctuations in the national economy. We are enjoying heavy traffic now because the economy is bustling, especially in several of our basic industries such as coal, steel, and automobile manufacture.

The Nation's coal industry is completing its best year since the Suez crisis. The National Coal Association is estimating a production total of 451 million tons, about 6 percent above the 426 million tons of 1962. If the mines continue to produce at the rate of 10 million tons a week—which they did last week—the industry may surpass the 451 million ton figure. The coal operators are optimistic about 1964, and are talking in terms of a 460- to 475-million-ton production. This is good news for the railroads, because about 25 percent of our tonnage comes from coal.

It appears that steel production for 1963 will be between 108 and 109 million tons. Iron Age magazine has reported a contraseasonal rise in orders which has caused predictions to be revised upward for the month, the fourth quarter and the year. On the basis of the improved rate of new orders, steelmakers now look for a very strong first quarter of next year. And all of us know the amazing production and sales of the automobile industry.

Similar conditions in other industries show that the business potential is there for the railroads, and with our capacity for absorbing vastly greater amounts of traffic, one of the biggest jobs ahead for us is in the area of merchandising our services.

A NEW COMPETITIVE OUTLOOK

It is encouraging that the railroads are beginning to sell themselves, to merchandise with new skill and effectiveness. They are beginning to employ marketing techniques which are basically no different than those used to sell any other industrial product, and they are becoming more and more successful. Of course, much of the momentum behind the industry's sales efforts is simply the result of their having new and more competitive services to sell. The new equipment, improved motive power, better schedules and more attractive rates are producing a service that for the first time in many years is really competitive with other modes.

At the same time, the railroads are using new concepts of ratemaking in order to attract new business. An example is the unitized train which is being employed to haul coal to large-volume consumers. This concept combines special trainload rates with large new hopper cars which unload in seconds. These new rates on a multiple-car basis are considerably lower than the charges for hauling individual cars. Likewise, in many other areas, the railroads are moving to establish incentive rates to attract and hold business. The principle of incentive rates can be carried over into many types of volume traffic—manufactured products as well as bulk commodities and raw materials.

As railroads become more competitive, many shippers are beginning to look not only at the prospect of all-rail shipments, but at the possibilities and advantages of using a combination of several modes. Traffic managers who for years have used one mode of shipment have become aware that a transportation mix often provides substantial savings in transit time and cost of distribution.

THE NEED FOR INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION

These new traffic patterns that are evolving are fresh evidence that the national economy not only needs, but must have the advantages of large integrated transport systems. Shippers should be able to choose between one of a combination of modes to suit their individual needs. For a number of years the railroads have been seeking the freedom to establish such diversified companies, but so far with little success. Under present law, railroads alone among all types of transport are severely circumscribed as to the other forms of transportation in which they can engage. Airlines can go into the railroad business, trucking companies can engage in any other form of shipping they choose. But the railroads in the main must stick to railroading.

This is particularly unfortunate because if these diversified transportation companies are to come into being, the impetus will have to come from the railroads which are the primary and basic mode. I am convinced that the progress of our national economy is being retarded by a transportation system which lacks the flexibility and the efficiency which business and industry must have. The pressure on delivered costs has become so great that many companies are reducing or trying to eliminate altogether their warehousing operation. Instead of constructing and maintaining regional warehouses and distribution points, these firms are beginning to ship direct from the plant to wholesaler or retailer. The future will accelerate this trend; the need for diversified companies able to offer an overall transportation service will undoubtedly become more acute.

We already have an excellent example of what integrated transportation companies could provide in improved, damage free service. This is the growing utilization of containers. The concept of containerization points the way toward the shipping patterns of the future. Containers will ultimately become standardized to certain dimensions and will be freely interchangeable between train, truck, aircraft, or ship. Containers reduce handling time, lower the cost of insurance, practically eliminate pilferage and damage in transit. Although the container is already a proven shipping technique, its true potential will not be realized until it can be routed, transported, and billed from origin to destination by a single service organization.

THE PROBLEM OF OVERREGULATION

The progress I have mentioned is being hobbled by overregulation and outmoded national transportation policies. Our rate of rejuvenation will be seriously jeopardized if the railroad industry is forced to continue operating under its present handicaps. The problems of the railroads need no emphasis or detailed explanation to this audience. For several years they have been very much in the news—the work rules controversy, the slow pace of the merger movement, the ratemaking restrictions which give our competitors unfair advantage in attracting traffic, to mention only a few. Unless these obstacles are removed and unless the American railroad industry is permitted to employ the inherent efficiencies of railroad transportation, the forward thrust of the national economy will be blunted.

There is, of course, a close interrelationship between transportation and our entire national economy. Indeed, our cycle of mass production, mass distribution and mass consumption is premised on an adequate transportation system. It is a paradox that this truth is appreciated by our enemies more than by people in this country—especially as it pertains to the need for a strong railroad system. Both China and Russia are building more railroads, while the United States is burdened with an excess in rail capacity.

Our Government apparently appreciates the necessity for strong railroads, but seems to be in no hurry to let the railroads work out their own solutions. Yet I am convinced that the large-scale railroad mergers which involve more than 60 percent of the Nation's rail mileage will proceed because they are absolutely essential if our railroads are to continue to operate as a part of our free enterprise system. The deadwood will eventually be trimmed away because the basic plant cannot experience regrowth unless this happens. The question, I believe, is not whether but when. This merger movement is one of the most important developments in American railroad history and is attracting growing support.

Similarly, there are other indications that our public officials and regulatory agencies are becoming more alert to our transportation problems and are willing to try to solve them. In the work rules controversy, for example, the Government has clearly demonstrated its awareness of the tremendous setback our economy would suffer if there were a nationwide rail strike. It appears that the new administration will continue to support the proposal of the late President Kennedy to give the railroads more freedom in establishing rates on agricultural and bulk commodities.

The railroads are repeating their pleas for expeditious relief not merely because they themselves must have it, but because they know that a healthy transport system is fundamental to a strong and vigorous national economy.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE NO. 1 PROBLEM

The lag in transportation efficiency is partly responsible for the lag in the national economy. As long as we have one, we will have the other.

Amidst the current wave of relatively good times in our land, it is difficult for us to realize that although our tempo of growth is quickening, it is still not fast enough. True, 70 million people are employed, but

that is not enough—our rate of unemployment is still a nagging and persistent 5½ percent. Our gross national product will soon exceed $600 billion—but that is not enough. Industrial production is up 22 percent since January 1961—and that is not enough.

We simply must relize that we actually are doing little more than treading water—keeping our economic heads above the rising tide of population explosion, increased productivity, international trade competition, and mounting costs of government.

I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that the fact our economy is not growing at a faster rate in the No. 1 problem of the world. This is so because we are the bulwark of Western power and influence. In an environment of protracted conflict, revolution and perpetual risk of nuclear war, our continuing challenge is to maintain our position of world leadership. In the equation of national power, strength or weakness in one segment generates corresponding effects in other areas. It is ominously true that, without economic power, we cannot create and maintain the military power that safeguards the survival of not only our Nation, but of our allies and many of the emerging nations throughout the world.

During the greater part of 1963, many of the most prominent business leaders of this country have advocated a cut in Federal taxes as a means of stimulating our economy to new heights of expansion. We have shared the conviction that, given the incentives and rewards of a tax reduction of at least $10 billion, the private sectors of business and industry could do much to bolster the rate of economic growth through increased investment and expansion. In doing so, we would circumvent the demand for economic relief through massive Government spending programs which always prove short term and unsound.

Perhaps the brightest spot in our outlook for 1964 is the prospect that this tax cut is in sight. In the heartening continuity which is taking place at the White House, President Johnson has brought about a compromise in the Senate's dispute and delay over the tax reduction issue.

There is now every asurance that the tax bill will have the highest priority after Congress reconvenes on January 3. The machinery already is in motion to bring this about.

The most optimistic advocates of tax reduction are predicting that the tax cut bill will pass before mid-February, retroactive to January 1. The Senate Finance Committee undoubtedly will hold up final action until it has a look at the new administration's 1965 economy budget.

The economy mindedness of President Johnson, as expressed in his determination to get "a dollar's value from every dollar we spend," is another bright ray on the economic horizon. Groups such as the Business Committee for Tax Reduction have strenuously urged more prudent control of Federal expenditures in order to prevent dissipation of the benefits of the tax cut in a wave inflation and increased deficits. The strong indications that the administration and Congress are in dead earnest in their efforts to limit the rise in Federal spending are most encouraging.

PRIVATE VERSUS GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Passage of the tax bill will be a vote of confidence by Government in our private enterprise system. It will be a sign that our national policy is to achieve growth through private enterprise rather than through Government-planned economic programs. This is, I think, highly significant, especially in light of the somewhat widely held Galbraithian viewpoint that greater Federal spending is the cure for unemployment.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the record since 1947 shows that in the three periods of economic expansion when that expansion was primarily in the government area—namely the 1947–49, 1950–52, and 1960–61 expansions—it took a $32,000 increase in gross national product on the average to employ one additional person. In the two periods of economic expansion when the expansion was principally in the private sector—the 1954–57 and 1959–60 periods—it took only $13,400 of gross national product increase to employ an additional person.

This results from the fact that a major part of Government expenditures are dead-ended. They don't start a chain. On the other hand, private expenditures multiply to a much greater degree. Moreover, corporate profits are higher in a consumer-motivated expansionary period and this encourages capital investment which in turn helps this multiplying effect.

Passage of the tax bill will focus new national attention on the mettle of private business and industry. We will have the responsibility of making good our predictions that free enterprise can do the job. We must resond with all the diligence, all the resourcefulness and ingenuity at our command.

Business and industry have pleaded for years for a chance to utilize their own resources and ability to stimulate economic growth. It looks as if we are going to get that chance—and we must give a good account of ourselves.

A TIME FOR UNITY AND FAITH

The economic system which is a manifestation of our entire philosophy of living is the major weapon in our arsenal of power. In the recent crisis of President Kennedy's tragic death, our Nation did not waver because our economy is stable. Crisis did not become chaos because our people had the spiritual resources of calmness and stability which accompany economic well-being. We kept our faith in our Government and our democracy. There was no panic, no faltering uncertainty. Instead, the diverse elements of our society—as incompatible as they often seem to be—rallied as one behind the new President.

The business community of the United States is faced with an unprecedented opportunity. The year ahead will be a time of rededication to the principles which underlie our society. It will be a time for cooperation with our Governument whose heavy burdens are global in scope. Above all it is a time for confidence in our country; for national unity despite the superficial and transient divisive influences of election year campaigning; for concentration on solution of our economic problems amidst the distracting march of national and international events.

I believe that our new President spoke for us all when, only 2 weeks ago, he said that no words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America. In a world where economic strength has become the primary—if not the ultimate—weapon, to follow any other course would be to default our responsibilities for world leadership. We must—and I am confident, we shall—respond successfully to the challenge.

Relationship of the Battle of New Orleans to World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Walter B. Hamlin, as an associate justice of the Louisiana State Supreme Court, is not only one of the State's most distinguished justices, but also one of Louisiana's outstanding historians.

Recently, at the annual observance of the Battle of New Orleans by the Louisiana State Historical Society, Justice Hamlin presented most interesting facts surrounding that great American victory on the field of Chalmette. Because of its historical importance, I have asked permission to bring his address to the attention of the Members of this body and I am sure as each of you read it you will have a better appreciation of what Andrew Jackson's great fight and victory meant to the future of the infant United States.

Of particular interest at the moment is the fact that Hugh M. Wilkinson, Sr., perhaps one of Louisiana's greatest lawyers, is president of the Louisiana State Historical Society. Mr. Wilkinson is the great grandson of Gen. James Wilkinson, one of the commissioners who received the Louisiana Territory from Spain, when that great area was purchased under instructions of President Jefferson for $15 million.

Here is Justice Hamlin's address:

RELATIONSHIP OF THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS TO WORLD AFFAIRS IN THE PERIOD

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, officers and members of the Louisiana Historical Society, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen first of all, I would like to assert that I esteem it a high honor and a great privilege to be invited, on this important occasion of the 149th anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans, to address the members and guests of this venerable and learned society.

A deep respect for this fine organization is inevitably inspired by one's realization that it was founded as long ago as within approximately 21 years after the Battle of New Orleans occurred; and that for more than a century and a quarter, with few interruptions, it regularly has conducted such a program as this, on each January 8, in commemoration of that historic event.

Men who had witnessed the stirring scenes attending the repulse of the British invasion in 1815—doubtless some who actually had fought in the battle—were included in the society's early members.

I am reminded—as one notable illustration—that a very eminent judge of Louisiana's supreme court (of which I now have the honor of being an associate justice), the Honorable Francois Xavier Martin, who afterward became the second president of the Louisiana Historical Society, played a somewhat conspicuous role in those lawsuits against Gen. Andrew Jackson which furnished a rather bizarre sequel to his victory on the battlefield of Chalmette.

As the incident happened, it was to Judge Martin—one of the greatest jurists in all Louisiana's history—that an application was made for a writ of habeas corpus to effect the release from imprisonment of one Louis Louaillier, a prominent member of the State legislature, who had been arrested by General Jackson on a charge of "exciting mutiny" by a published criticism of the fiery general for prolonging marital law in New Orleans after the retirement of the British forces to their fleet following the bloody encounter of January 8.

In a very able opinion which reviewed the law of habeas corpus as it was then understood, this future second president of the Louisiana Historical Society ruled that, as a State judge, he did not have the jurisdiction to interfere with General Jackson's military action; and it was then that the complainant applied for relief to Federal Judge Dominick Hall.

You will remember, I am sure, that when Judge Hall issued the writ of habeas corpus in Louaillier's behalf, General Jackson had Judge Hall summarily incarcerated on a charge of treason, and sent him to keep Louaillier company in the Army barracks prison.

Eventually, however, Judge Hall cited Andrew Jackson before his court for contempt, and fined him $1,000, which Jackson paid, and which Congress, 30 years later, refunded to him.

Except for Judge Martin's careful analysis of the law, history might today be remembering him, instead of Judge Hall, as the magistrate who slapped a thousands dollar fine on the turbulent-spirited victor of the Battle of New Orelans.

With tonight's ceremonies, as we have been reminded by eloquent speakers in this meeting, we are entering the sesquicentennial twelvemonth of the famous battle on the plain of Chalmette; and I am sure that the members of the Louisiana Historical Society, and every other citizen of Louisiana who is properly proud of our State's historical heritage, and particularly the personnel of the national sesquicentennial commission charged with arranging the commemorative program 1 year hence, are all looking forward confidently to a fitting and adequate itinerary, celebrating not only the victory, but also the century and a half of peace between the two nations which will have succeeded that conflict of 1815.

It is, therefore, an appropriate time, as we enter the sesquicentennial year, to take stock of the causes and the consequences of the Battle of New Orleans, to appraise and evaluate it in relation to the world affairs of the era, to comprehend its influence upon the course of our Nation's destiny, and finally to confirm that those tremendous sacrifices which in the heat of battle were made, on both sides, were not made in vain, but were sacrifices laid on the altar of an eternal divine purpose for advancement of the world's civilization and a striving toward universal peace—at has so well been exemplified by this battle's aftermath of nearly 150 years of amity between the English-speaking nations.

There is a deplorable tendency, I often think—and that even among poorly informed citizens of our own State—to minimize and to depreciate the full significance of the Battle of New Orleans in its impact upon national and international history. Jackson's astounding triumph, with a hasty and polyglot assembly of raw troops, over Sir Edward Pakenham's highly trained veterans of the Spanish Peninsular campaign in the Napoleonic wars, was so complete and so devastating, and the retirement of the survivors so precipitate, that most historians of the era appear to have forgotten to check up on what would have happened had the British won—instead of lost—the battle.

To treat lightly the possible political consequences of a defeat of Jackson, and a resulting occupation of New Orleans by Pakenham's army before the final terms of peace were agreed on, is to ignore the international situation which existed at the time and the conflicting international viewpoints regarding the validity of the sale of Louisiana by Napoleon Bonaparte to the United States a few years previously. There was a very definite purpose, we must believe, in the action of the British War Department in disptaching a fleet and army of from 10,000 to 15,000 men—a very sizable combat force in those times—way over here, through the Gulf of Mexico to the shores of Louisiana, to attack an unfortified city such as New Orleans. It was written by an Englishman in 1774, and published in London in the preface to Du-Pratz' history of Louisiana, that "they who are possessed of the Mississippi, will in time command that continent," and possession and control of the Mississippi River and its great valley was undoubtedly the immediate objective of Pakenham's invasion of Louisiana in 1814–15.

Let us go back in history a few years and comprehend the development of events which was to lead, inevitably, to Great Britain's attempt to seize Louisiana. A consideration of these events is necessary to a proper understanding of the causes and possible consequences of the battle itself; but it is a cardinal fault of our method of teaching history that we have been taught concerning an event itself, but not in the framework of related international events.

In the impact of their effects upon the course of international history, the three most important battles on the North American Continent have been, in chronological order, the capture of the citadel of Quebec from the French by British Gen. James Wolfe in 1759, the defeat of British Gen. John Burgoyne by the American Revolutionists at Saratoga, N.Y., in 1777, and the repulse of British General Pakenham at New Orleans in 1815. And, although years apart, one battle, it might be said, led to another.

First, as to the capture of Quebec: Throughout the long reign of Louis XIV of France, the grand monarch after whom Louisiana was named, that nation dominated European power politics; and, in America, by encirclement of the 13 English colonies, maintained a strategic line through the basin of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley, from Quebec to New Orleans, which threatened to pen the English colonists between the Allegheny Mountains and the Atlantic Ocean. Such strategy, to support a colonial empire for France in America under the Bourbon fleur-de-lis, had been a fond dream of the grand monarch.

But Wolfe's capture of Quebec ended that. It made Canada an English possession. And the Grand Monarch's weak successor, Louis XV, in a panic over his inability to support and defend Louisiana, donated the province outright, in 1762, to his Bourbon cousin, Charles III of Spain.

Thus was the flag of France expelled from continental North America, and the stage was, unwittingly, set for the American Revolution; because with her hereditary enemy, France, eliminated from Canada and Louisiana, England no longer needed to rely upon the good will of American colonists to protect her possessions in North America, and thought she could, with impunity, oppress them by taxation to help defray the expenses of the Seven Years' War—or French and Indian War, as it was called in America—which had just been concluded.

Out of this provocation developed the slogan of "no taxation without representation," fanning the spirit of revolution, and leading to our second important battle of Saratoga. The defeat there of General Burgoyne was important in its effect upon world history because it proved, for the first time, the ability of the Americans to successfully stand up to picked and trained troops of England. It was most important because this military success of the Americans served to encourage France, and then Spain, to come actively into the war against England; and with the aid, particularly of France, our War for Independence was won.

Its termination in 1781, however, was by no means the end of the American Revolution. As John Adams has expressed it: "The Revolution was effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the hearts and minds of the people." And the leading American historian of the era, Benson Lossing, referred to the War of 1812 as the "Second War for Independence." It is entirely reasonable to point out that our American Revolution was a political and social evolution of a half-century's duration, beginning with the close of the French and Indian War in 1763, and the final drama of which was played in the Battle of New Orleans on the fog-shrouded plain of Chalmette during the morning of January 8, 1815.

In the 30-odd years of our newly won independence, from 1783 to 1815, our fledgling Nation soon found itself without friends among the European powers. The Franco-American honeymoon between George Washington's government and that of King Louis XVI was short lived. After all, His Christion Majesty had not engaged in our War for Independence through love of us; we had helped push his nation off the North American Continent only a few years before. Only hatred of the English had brought the French into our fight. And revolution was the last thing a Bourbon king should have wanted to encourage. Within a decade, Louis XVI reaped in France the whirlwind he had helped sow in America, and died in Paris in 1793 on the guillotine. In the course of a few years more, Napoleon put down the French revolutionaries, and established himself in power, and that set the stage for Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

Meanwhile, we had soon become embroiled with our other ally in the War for Independence, Spain. When, after the close of the War for Independence, our people expanded westward over the mountains into Kentucky and Tennessee, their right to navigation of the Mississippi through Spain's province of Louisiana became a most troublesome question which almost continuously had the administrations of Presidents Adams and Jefferson on the brink of war with Spain.

As for England, up to the time of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, leading English statesmen had never quite accepted the verdict of Saratoga and Yorktown, and always had anticipated that, under the cross-pressures of European power politics, the prodigal sons in America would eventually come back home to the shelter of Father George's banner. Despite the bitterness growing out of the First War for Independence, as toward the three European maritime powers, sentiment in the masses of the people of the United States ever favored England over Spain and France; and it was quite logical that when President Jefferson learned in 1802 of the secret treaty of San Ildefonso, by which Spain had retroceded Louisiana to France, he should exclaim that, if Napoleon attempted to take possession of New Orleans "from that moment," declared President Jefferson, "we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation."

However, as we know, marriage to the British fleet and nation did not become necessary, because, in the following year, on April 30, 1803, Napoleon, needing money to carry on his wars against England, sold Louisiana to the United States, thereby doubling the territorial expanse of the young Nation. "By this increase in territory," Napoleon afterward declared, regarding himself as the founder of American greatness, "the power of the United States will be consolidated forever, and I have just given England a seafaring rival which, sooner or later, will humble her pride."

Napoleon proved a better prophet in this respect at least than did those Members of the U.S. Senate who voted against ratification of the treaty and denounced the Louisiana Purchase as "Jefferson's folly."

After the Louisiana Purchase—the greatest single event in our Nation's history other then independence itself—the British statesmen realized that if they had ever seriously looked for a reconciliation with the Americans, they had missed the boat—the prodigal sons were never coming home. With the addition of Louisiana, the United States had become too big and entirely self-dependent. For the ensuing 9 years, relations between the two nations steadily worsened, particularly because of English interference with with American ocean commerce and the impressment for British naval service of American seamen, until on June 18, 1812, in the administration of President Madison, a second war on England was declared.

It was a war, it has been said, that nobody wanted, and for the ensuing 2 years after its declaration, Napoleon kept the British armies so busy on the Continent of Europe that, except for several notable encounters at sea and sporadic fighting along the Canadian boundary, little happened.

It was faraway Russia, little known to the American public in those times, which, strange to relate, set the stage for the Battle of New Orleans. Napoleon, by 1812, had conquered virtually all of Europe except Russia, and just 6 days after President Madison's declaration of war against England, Napoleon's grand army invaded Russia. What the guns and bayonets of a dozen other major nations had not been able to do, Russia's fearsome cold accomplished. In the agony of that terrible retreat from Russia's holy city of Moscow, the "infantry of the snow and the cavalry of the wild blast" took so heavy a toll of Napoleon's potential of manpower that by April of 1814 he was obliged to abdicate as Emperor of France and was exiled to the island of Elba.

That released for other service the British Army which had been campaigning against the French in Spain, and an expedition against America was immediately launched, composed of those Spanish peninsular veterans, picked fighting men of the British Empire.

The first attack, as you doubtless remember, was made in August of 1814 against the city of Washington, which was captured, and the White House and other public buildings burned. Fort McHenry, at Baltimore, was bombarded, giving Francis Scott Key the inspiration to write the Star-Spangled Banner. The commander of the invading expedition was General Ross, who was killed in the assault on Baltimore. The Maryland landing, however, appears to have been a purely diversionary prelude to the expedition against New Orleans, because the beachhead established in Chesapeake Bay was not exploited and after bombarding Fort McHenry ineffectually the British Fleet embarked the invasion force and sailed away to its headquarters in the West Indies.

General Ross was killed at Baltimore on September 12, 1814. Meanwhile instructions for the New Orleans expedition had been sent to him under date of September 6. When news of his death arrived, Sir Edward Pakenham was sent out from England to succeed him, and was told to follow the instructions for the New Orleans campaign already forwarded to Ross.

To evaluate those orders, we must remember that Spain was an active ally of England in the Napoleonic wars, and that for a decade Spain had been vehemently protesting the illegality of Napoleon's sale of Louisiana to the United States. It was Spain's apparently very just contention that in 1802 Napoleon had persuaded the Spanish Government to retrocede Louisiana to France by the treaty of San Ildefonso, under the solemn promise that if France ever alienated Louisiana it would give the province back to Spain. Therefore, it was argued, Napoeon's sale to the United States had been illegal and invalid, and he had acted in the transaction with President Jefferson in his usual unscrupulous manner.

What, consequently, do you think, if Pakenham had taken New Orleans, Great Britain would have attempted to do with Louisiana as a conquered territory? The instructions of the British war ministry, issued to General Ross, and inherited by General Pakenham were explicit. The ultimate object in view, the instructions said, was not to be obtained against the will of the inhabitants, but "with their favor and cooperation, on the other hand" (and I am now quoting from the instructions as detained in Henry Adams' "History of the United States," vol. III, pp. 312-313) "we may expect to rescue the whole province of Louisiana from the United States. If, therefore, you shall find in the inhabitants a general and decided disposition to withdraw from their recent connection with the United States, either with a view of establishing themselves as an indepednent people or of returning under the dominion of the Spanish crown, you will give them every support in your power; you will furnish them with arms and clothing, and assist in forming and disciplining the several levies, provided you are fully satisfied of the loyalty of their intentions, which will be best evinced by their committing themselves in some act of decided hostility against the United States."

And so it is clear, from Pakenham's orders, that by the Battle of New Orleans, the whole province of Louisiana was to be rescued from the United States; and, if the inhabitants were disposed to do so, they were to be assisted, even with arms, to return under the dominion of Spain or to establish themselves as a people independent of the United States.

The loyalty of the Creoles of Louisiana to the American Government, under which they had lived for only a dozen years, seems to have been amply demonstrated by the participation of many in the defense of New Orleans. Nevertheless, had the tide of fortune flowed with the British, and actual occupation of Louisiana been accomplished, might not Pakenham have recruited a sufficient faction willing to oppose the American domination for him to have plausibly represented to his home government that the inhabitants favored returning to the rule of Spain?

We hear the often-cited argument against the importance of the Battle of New Orleans, as having been a useless and meaningless conflict, because 15 days before it occurred, on Christmas Eve, in the city of Ghent, in Belgium, an armistice, or preliminary treaty of peace, had been signed by representatives of Great Britain and the United States. It must be remembered, however, that this was but a tentative document, having no force or effect until ratified by the home governments. What bearing, even then, upon the British Government's complete compliance, without an interpretation favorable to itself of the tentative terms, General Pakenham's possession of New Orleans may have had, can only be left to conjecture.

With the conqueror's heel firmly planted on the soil of the Mississippi Valley, a very different picture might have been presented to the Prince Regent, later King George IV. He may well have considered it his duty to try to turn Louisiana back to England's ally, Spain, even at the cost of further prosecution of the war with the United States.

Unquestionably, the Treaty of Ghent provided for the restoration of "all territory, places and possessions whatsoever taken by either party from the other," but I emphasize the last three words—"taken by either party from the other"—and I wonder, had Pakenham captured our city, whether the Spanish claim of title might not have been interposed, and with some weight, under a diplomatic argument, predicated on these three words, against a peaceable British evacuation of New Orleans, and under the contention that Louisiana still lawfully belonged to Spain, and therefore was not a place captured from the United States. History, since ancient times, affords many examples of less adroit diplomatic rationalizing which have served to change the political maps of the world.

It is my considered opinion that the historical facts which I have had the privilege of presenting to you, in this address tonight, make out a case entirely favorable to my thesis that the Battle of New Orleans, in the impact of its effects upon the course of history, was one of the most important military events in the career of our Nation. The horrible loss of life in the conflict, particularly among the officers and subordinates of our gallant adversary, was most regrettable and unfortunate. But the consequences of a defeat which Gen. Andrew Jackson and his heroic citizen-soldiers faced that day were literally catastrophic, and, as red-blooded Americans, they rose to the emergency with courage, resolution and determination. Their victory settled, in powdersmoke and gunfire, the question of the Spanish title to Louisiana. It ended the American Revolution. It validated the Louisiana purchase. It settled for all time any skepticism as to the ability of Americans to defend their shores from European aggression. It marked the last time in nearly 150 years that a foreign aggressor has set foot on the soil of the continental United States. It began an unparalled era of peace between the English-speaking nations. Out of the smoke of battle that morning of January 8, 1815, on the plain of Chalmette, the United States of America, in the gaunt, fighting-faced image of Andrew Jackson, strode forward to take rank with the great nations of the world.

An important battle, you are asked? Was there ever one more important to the destiny of our country, or one more deserving of enthusiastic commemoration at its sesquicentennial a year hence? I leave the verdict in your hands.

However, I ask you to remember that the Battle of New Orleans unified the American people of the period and did much to make our land the meeting place of the world's finest ideas and ideals.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Poem: "Ask Not"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a constituent of mine, Miss Kay Magenheimer, was moved to express the feelings of grief and awe that moved our Nation when we lost our President. Her poem, "Ask Not," was printed in the Rosarian of the Queen of the Rosary Academy, in Amityville, N.Y. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this poem, "Ask Not," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASK NOT[1]

(In Memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy)

"No man while I live
And behold light on earth
Shall lay violent hands on thee"[2]
My country, my liberty.

Grieving unspeakably
For all creation;
For his country's sake, for dying liberty
And our children's unseen fate,

This man—this beacon for humanity—
With heart cast of oak and daring
Made his great resolve
And nailed his colors to the mast.

Above the thunder of the wild sea
Breaking against his bleak New England coast
His voice rose to shake the mighty halls of earth
To rouse men from their sleep.

So little time for Hera's charge;
So short, so short a time for glory
As if some great maternal Thetis
Had foretold this immortal story:

Our mighty Achilles lies dead
In the arms of his gallant Love;
Slain by some malignant spirit
Before the victory's claimed.

Rise up! Rise up, America!
Before it is too late.
His young, strong hand no longer
Shields us from an evil fate.

The only hand that can save us
Is the One he held—as his son held his.
America! America! Awake!
Before it is too late.

—KAY MAGENHEIMER.

(NOTE.—Achilles is the greatest hero of the Greeks who was killed in battle, just before the fall of Troy. His mother was Thetis. Hera, in Greek mythology, is the goddess-patroness of marriage.)

[1] From Mr. Kennedy's inaugural address: "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

[2] From the Iliad of Homer.

Written on the date of burial: Nov. 25, 1963.

Testimonial Honoring Charles N. Boyatis and Timothy A. Mantalos, of the Brockway Greek Orthodox Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time call to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress a news item that appeared in the Brockton Enterprise recently concerning two outstanding citizens of the city of Brockton, Mass. Mr. Charles N. Boyatis is a prominent businessman and a leader in the Greek-American community of Massachusetts. Attorney Timothy A. Mantalos has also distinguished himself on behalf of his neighbors and friends.

These two men have given unstintingly of their time and efforts for the Greek Orthodox Community Church in Brockton and they are ever ready to be of assistance to their fellowman.

America is richer because we are fortunate to have men like Charles N. Boyatis and Attorney Timothy A. Mantalos in our midst. Their contribution to our American way of life, their firm belief in God and country, their steady everyday acts of kindness has endeared them to all who know them. It is a great privilege for me to have this opportunity to commend these two men. The honor bestowed upon them is richly deserved. The news item is as follows:

ATTORNEY MANTALOS AND CHARLES BOYATIS ARE HONORED BY GREEK COMMUNITY

A testimonial honoring Charles N. Boyatis and Attorney Timothy A. Mantalos was held at Capeway Manor. The testimonial dinner was given by the board of directors and past members of the board of the Brockton Greek Orthodox Community who have worked with Mr. Boyatis and Mr. Mantalos through the years.

Mr. Boyatis was honored for his 45 years of service to his church and to the local Greek school, as past president, board member and school committee president. He also has distinguished himself in the field of public relations, having written hundreds of articles in Greek and American newspapers in this country and abroad. For these services he was commended by the Patriarch of Constantinople, King George II of Greece and ex-Premier Caramanlis.

Attorney Mantalos was honored for having served in a distinguished manner as president of the Greek Orthodox Community of Brockton for 3 consecutive years.

Toastmaster and chairman of the testimonial was James Jimoulis. E. Charles Giannaros, president of the community, presented the honored guests with gold watches symbolically engraved.

Vasilios Gioulis, past member of the school committee, spoke on the meaning of honoring men who work for high ideals.

Rev. Peter B. Koskores, pastor of the Greek Orthodox Church, concluded the testimonial, extolling Mr. Boyatis and Attorney Mantalos for their unselfish devotion to their church and their endeavors toward perpetuating everything good and fine inherited from their mother country to their beloved adopted country, the United States.

Temple Family Leads Lumber Industry Into New Dimensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Temple family founded the Southern Pines Lumber Co. 70 years ago in Texas. The company has gone through three wars and the resulting readjustment and through numerous depressions, and has survived them all, and grown with the years. It has undertaken a variety of new businesses and is now divided into new companies and enterprises, but still owns 400,000 acres of timberlands in 21 east Texas counties.

Arthur Temple, Jr., grandson of the founder, now directs the enterprises, ably assisted by another grandson of the founder, Mr. Latane Temple.

The activities of Arthur Temple, Jr., and the company, and some of their history was printed in a major front page article of the business section of the Dallas Morning News on Sunday, January 12, 1964.

Mr. Arthur Temple, Jr., and Mr. Latane Temple are two of the most farsighted, energetic, broadminded business leaders of Texas, the kind whose leadership, when accepted by the business community of Texas, will result in a more progressive government for Texas and a higher level of education and prosperity for all its people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today the article from the Sunday, January 12, 1964, Dallas Morning News entitled "Lumber-based Enterprises Keep Growing—Temples Built East Texas Empire."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUMBER-BASED ENTERPRISES KEEP GROWING—TEMPLES BUILD EAST TEXAS EMPIRE

(By Fred Pass)

DIBOLL, TEX.—In the deep east Texas timber region, where today often looks very much like yesterday, crews of painters and printers are at work changing signs on billboards, trees and autos, and resetting type for stationery letterheads.

Like makeup and costume artists working on a character actor in the theater, they are doing their part to change the image of a venerable timber company so that its new appearance will fit more closely the updated role it plays on the industrial stage today.

The firm is the 70-year-old Southern Pine Lumber Co. which now wears the new, all-encompassing name of Temple Industries, Inc., following action of stockholders last week.

Founded in 1894 by Thomas Lewis Latane Temple, the company for more than half a century devoted nearly all of its energies to making and selling lumber.

Today, under the leadership of a youthful, optimistic fast-stepping grandson, 43-year-old Arthur Temple, Jr., the company has branched into so many different enterprises that lumber company suits the firm's general title about as well as a top-hat suits a tree cutter.

Today the diverse interests of Temple Industries or of its president include office buildings, luxury hotels, shopping centers, housing developments, golf courses, lakeshore retreats, mortgage and loan companies, insurance businesses, gypsum mines, and railroads, among other things.

MANUFACTURING METHODS REFINED

These are in addition to companies making directly connected timber products, but with refined methods of manufacture, such as wood flour for phonograph records or Early American furniture.

And progressing in another direction are companies that build schools, churches, hotels, courthouses, special beams for buildings without pillars, special floors for railroad boxcars, or soil conditioners for flowers and shrubbery. All wear the Temple label.

Then, in the dreams drawer of the planning room are the partially assembled ideas for such things as a new $40 million paper-mill, or a Disneyland-type railroad ride for tourists into the backwoods, or sidings coated with a film so that they will not need paint for a quarter century, or a retirement center for the elderly overlooking Corpus Christi Bay on the gulf coast.

All of this is a long way from the sawmill that grandfather Temple brought to the wilderness when he purchased 6,000 acres from the Diboll family in 1894 and founded a town by that name.

By the time he died in 1935, T. L. L. Temple had acquired 300,000 acres. Under acquisitions of Arthur Temple, Sir., and now the younger Arthur Temple, the company owns 400,000 acres of timberlands in 21 east Texas counties.

And while the whirl of business carries Mr. Temple and his associates into almost every phase of business life today, the base of this industrial empire rests squarely on that land, covers more ground than any one of several States or a few foreign countries.

WORTH $80 TO $100 MILLION

Temple Industries, it has been estimated has a value of somewhere between $80 and $100 million dollars. Annual sales of products it and affiliated companies make run close to $50 million, it is reported, and are expected to touch $100 million before the decade is out.

The vigor and imagination which the firm seems to put forth with regularity surprises and, in some cases, shocks some who are used to seeing the timber and lumber industries in a state of decline, with old men left to run many of the businesses and with its future apparently behind it.

But Arthur Temple, Jr., who likes to puff on a cigar, throw a leg over the arm of a chair and talk about the many fronts of his industrial complex, explains his companys' operations in this way:

"If you want to have fun in your work, just get yourself involved with 400,000 acres of timberlad. It will open doors you never dreamed of. There will be a potential toward almost any kind of business—whether you like it or not. That's why we have to surround ourselves with experts on so many different things.

"We have the damnedest group of bright young fellows who are not looking for the country club in the afternoons. They want to stick around to see what's going to happen next. They're having too much fun here because none of us ever knows where the business will lead us."

FOUNDER PRACTICED CONSERVATION

Mr. Temple's grandfather, the company founder, seemed to get a similar kind of fun out of the business. But that was in the day when lumber was the only thing, and his pleasures came in buying up the land that adjoined land he already owned. As a result, he left behind some financial extensions when he died in 1935, and the country was in a depression.

Besides establishing the land nucleus for the company, T. L. L. Temple achieved yet another thing that was far ahead of its time. Either through his farsightedness or by accident—nobody knows quite which—he began a practice of selective cutting of his timber, always making sure to leave part of the stands for the tomorrows that were bound to come. He did this in a day when clear-cutting was generally practiced by the big companies in the belief that the country had more timber than it could ever possibly use.

Today, because of the grandfather's practice, the company has had to replant almost none of its vast acreage, and the tree-stands each year produce more wood than is removed.

When Arthur Temple, Sr., took over the company, he performed the role of conservator and undertook the job of liquidating debts. As his son describes it today, he sort of weeded the garden of things which had been accumulated and were not pertinent to the mainstream of business.

"My father's philosophy was to pull in and have a completely debt-free company," said Arthur Temple, Jr. "I like to think that I learned something from the good sides of the two extremes of my grandfather and my father.

"I believe, for a number of reasons, that we must have growth and expansion on a sound basis. Growth is necessary to maintain good stewardship on our lands, to create jobs for the people in the 21 counties where our lands are located to avoid wasting the products of the soil, and so that we can bear our fair share of school and government costs."

CAREFUL STUDY GOES INTO PRODUCTS

But despite the varied and sometimes revolutionary companies and business enterprises that are spawned by this base operation, Mr. Temple said each new project is long and carefully studied, and much of the way is paved for its success—such as finding markets—before the endeavor is ever launched.

"We start a lot of new plants for which people criticize us," Mr. Temple said. "Nobody realizes how much staff work and research goes into each one. We have 5 to 10 major projects under serious study at all times. If one looks like it is right, and the timing is right for it, we go into it."

Right now, Temple Industries is planning a 1,500-acre subdivision, complete with golf course, for south Lufkin. Mr. Temple hopes to start on this project in 1964.

A plant to make plywood should get into production in June. Temple Industries, in partnership with United States Plywood, plans to turn out 100 million feet of plywood a year, while most west coast mills average production of only half that amount.

They had planned to start production earlier. But the machinery available would leave cores of 5-inch diameters. They are waiting for another machine that will cut the tree for plywood and leave a core of only 4 inches. This would mean the remaining stick would be about the right size of a fence post, which then could be sold.

Plywood is the glamour product of the industry today. In 1951, said Mr. Temple, the national production of it was 2½ billion feet. This had grown to 11 billion feet last year. Mr. Temple's research shows that by 1975 the national plywood market will more that double, to about 30 billion feet per year. He believes the nearness of the Diboll plant to markets will give it a large share of this production.

Another industry utilizes wood that formerly was wasted. It is a $4 million fiberboard plant in Diboll.

A pulping process, much like making paper, is required for fiberboard production. This plant, in operation since 1958, makes 140 million feet of fiberboard products a year from material that formerly was the waste from making 80 million board feet of lumber.

Another Temple industry, developed to turn wast material into cash, is Love Wood Products Co. This company was created to develop a way to utilize wood waste and sawdust for generating steam which was used in the sawmill operation.

Later a turbine was hooked up, and the burned waste materials produced electricity so efficiently that not nearly all the wood wastes were consumed.

Through applied research, more waste materials were ground into a wood flour of various degrees of fineness. Some are so fine that they sift through screens with 300 openings per inch.

They sell wood flour to the phonograph record industry—it provides body for the plastic disks—and coarser flours are used in the manufacture of toilet seats. Another Temple company makes the toilet seats.

Still another Temple firm grinds another waste product—tree bark—and makes a mulch similar to peat moss.

Another Temple enterprise, Temple-White Co., uses what would be waste material from lumber production in manufacturing broom and mop handles and ships millions of them all over the world. The company, in fact, makes one-twelfth of all the world's broom and mop handles.

INVESTMENT COMPANIES AGGRESSIVE

A new particle board plant is scheduled to begin production at Pineland in February. This plant will use reconstituted wood—specially prepared shavings and chips coated with synthetic resins—to make particle boards of almost any weight, density or finish. Its uses are many.

Because lumber leads to homebuilding, and homebuilding leads to mortgages and insurance, Temple Industries owns controlling interest in the Lumberman's Investment Co. in Austin, which has two subsidiaries, for real estate development and for insurance sales. These companies are building a 36-story, high-rise apartment in Houston and other buildings across the Nation.

Another Temple investment company is Scotch Investment Co. This firm has an interest in building a $2 million luxury hotel on the Glasscock fill, in Corpus Christi Bay. The investment company will own the hotel, but Wilbur Clark, who operates a hotel in Las Vegas, Nev., will operate it.

The hotel will cover about 5 of 22 acres in the tract which Scotch Investment has acquired. Mr. Temple said he has conducted research on people who come from the Midwest to Corpus Christi for the winter, and this may lead to a retirement center for them.

Topaz Oil Co., another Temple firm, has mapped the subsurface geology of all the Temple lands, and has brought several pro-

ducing wells into being. It has grown in value from $10,000 to $750,000 in recent years.

STADIUM SEATS TO BEVERAGE CASES

The company has its own division for harvesting timber, another for hauling it, another for marketing the minerals. There is one for making furniture parts, and another company buys furniture parts and makes furniture.

Fleischel Lumber Co. of St. Louis, bought by Temple Industries, sells industrial wood products such as stadium seats, boxcar floors, and reel bats for harvester blades.

Tex-Lam Co. makes laminated beams and engineered roof systems for schools, churches, fancy residences, and large industrial buildings.

Texas Gypsum Co. of Dallas, just under 50 percent owned by Temple, makes gypsum board for construction and owns mines in New Mexico and Oklahoma. Another firm markets lumber and construction products in retail outlets over the State.

There is a division for making hardwood lumber, another for pine lumber, and still a third for making oak flooring. And Temple Manufacturing Co. of Dallas is one of the largest manufacturers of beverage cases.

The Texas & Southeastern Railroad operates from Diboll to Lufkin. It is owned by Temple Industries, and has figured in industrial developments in Lufkin that the firm platted and sold.

Temple also has leased the Texas State Railroad that runs between Rusk and Palestine. Site for a proposed steel mill, to be financed by the Government Area Redevelopment Administration, has been offered by Temple alongside the railroad.

This line may be used some day also to take tourists on a ride in cars pulled by steam locomotives, which now are stored in Temple shops in Diboll.

There are numerous other enterprises. Temple Associates, owned by Arthur Temple and others, is a general contracting firm that builds large buildings, such as courthouses, hotels, hospitals, highrise apartments, churches, and schools.

SHOPPING CENTERS, PLAYGROUNDS

Temple and two Waco associates built a large, modern shopping center in that city, the Lake Air Center. It was among the first to employ the concept of having malls instead of sidewalks and air conditioning them.

Diboll Development Co., a firm of Temple Associates, is concerned with developing recreational and playground areas around east Texas lakes.

Also included in the complex are the Angelina Free Press, a Diboll newspaper, and KSPL, a radio station there. The gulf coast Lumberman, published in Houston, also is owned by Temple Industries.

There are still others and, according to plans, there will be more. Mr. Temple said he is encouraged over progress his company has made in trying to put together a $40 million papermill for Diboll. It will not, he said, make newsprint, but some other kind of paper depending on market needs.

Research is under way on feasibility of a manufacturing plant which would make wood siding sprayed with colored plastic film so that paint would not be required on the wood for 25 years.

A luxury motel and restaurant will be built, probably this year in Diboll, since people from over the world come to do business with Temple Industries and "we need good quarters to go with our nice restaurant for them to use," said Mr. Temple.

Another possibility under consideration is a mill for making tissue paper.

LOG RECEIVING, PROCESSING PLANT

A development, which Mr. Temple believes will be the most progressive in the wood-using business in a long time, will be applied soon. The plant at Diboll is building a $1,250,000 receiving and processing plant for logs.

In it, trees will arrive from the forest and will be debarked. Then an expert observer, sitting in an advantageous spot, will examine the denuded tree and decide how it should be carved up for maximum dollar return.

In this Diboll operation, with so many different directions it can take, the trees may go into lumber, utility pole, fencepost, plywood or some of the other many uses.

The company has its own spray plane for applying chemicals to kill undesirable hardwood trees in pine stands. Mr. Temple said the company has no policy against buying more land, but land prices have limited more such purchases. The goal now, he said, is to get more return per acre of land already owned.

The company also has four transport planes which carry its key personnel around the Nation.

They set a fast pace, the men of Temple Industries. But they have to move fast if they are to do all the things that they believe need to be done.

Alcoa Moves To Lessen Dual Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the recent dual distribution hearings held by Subcommittee No. 4 of the Select Committee on Small Business, it was my privilege to serve as subcommittee chairman in conducting this broad survey of the problems encountered by the small businessman as a result of dual distribution and related practices.

One of the prime impressions received by the subcommittee was that voluntary solutions to these problems are always the best approach. Several of the Nation's larger manufacturing companies have adopted policies designed to eliminate some of the problems covered by the dual distribution hearings.

As you may recall, several weeks ago, General Motors, as a result of suggestions received from the subcommittee, indicated that it desired to adopt certain new policies with respect to the distribution of appliances. Recently, it has come to the attention of the subcommittee that one of the larger firms in another industry covered by our hearings is also adopting new distribution policies which should eliminate some of the problems existing in that industry.

The Aluminum Co. of America has announced that it will distribute more of its products through independent distributors. The decision was apparently made on the basis that, in this manner, the consumer would receive better service, and certain economies would result from utilizing the capabilities of independent distributors to a greater extent than in the past.

Portions of the testimony received by the subcommittee in 48 different industries were critical of the distribution policies of a number of larger manufacturing firms. This was part of the task of the subcommittee—to receive testimony concerning existing problems. Conversely, the subcommittee has a duty to commend those firms which adopt policies designed to lessen or eliminate problems resulting from dual distribution.

The aluminum industry historically has been a sector of the economy posing great difficulties to both the entry and survival of the small businessman. Although other problems remain, Alcoa's new distribution policies are clearly a step in the right direction from the point of view of both the consumer and the small businessman. I commend them for adopting this new policy. It is my hope that adoption of similar policies will be considered by other members of the metals industries.

Unanimous consent was received to insert in the RECORD at this point an abstract from the address of Frederick J. Close, executive vice president of the Aluminum Co. of America, delivered before the National Association of Aluminum Distributors in Phoenix, Ariz., on November 14, 1963, setting forth his company's new policies:

THE ROLE OF THE DISTRIBUTOR IN THE FUTURE GROWTH OF THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Mr. President, fellow members of the NAAD, guests, customers and competitors; it's a pleasure to be here. A long way to come, but a nice spot when you arrive.

We at Alcoa are particularly pleased to have this opportunity to talk to you, collectively, our best customers, on the future of the distributors in the aluminum industry. You can see we chose a pretty broad subject and we are here to tell you many things today, some of which we hope will please you and some of which are likely not to please you. We would like this talk to be off the record even though I must say, we at Alcoa consider my remarks to be good legal tender. We are going to discuss the philosophy of Alcoa with regard to the distributor, and some other broad subjects.

By coincidence, our first distributors were appointed the year I came with Alcoa, 1929; and it was our desire at that time to have the distributor buy in large quantities at our base price, bust up the packages, and sell in small quantities against our quantity extra schedules. That is all, in 1929, we ever conceived that the distributor would do. In 1929 and until recent years, we were a large job shop. We didn't get very big orders; we didn't make very big ingots, either. We didn't do too much in the way of coiled sheet. We didn't roll sheet very fast, or very flat, or with a very good finish. We didn't do very many things that were good as compared with a well run steel mill, and for a good reason, too—it wasn't a volume industry, and lacking volume there wasn't a great deal of sense in going to the tremendous capital expenditures necessary to duplicate the speeds, the furnace sizes, the handling equipment, etc., that went on in a good modern steel mill. But things have changed, and they've changed more in the last 6 or 7 years in the aluminum industry than they have since I've been in it. We've really grown up. We're taking out the girls. We're wearing long pants. And we're rigging our mills for real production.

Speaking only to those distributors that enjoy, and I hope they enjoy, selling Alcoa products, you're going to be called upon to really equip yourselves as a metal service center with cut-to-length lines, stretcher leveling equipment, perhaps painting equipment, anodizing equipment, and many of the functions that are now being performed by the

producers. We at Alcoa, on the other hand, are going to furnish whatever technical assistance in the form of layouts, suggestions as to the necessary equipment, electrical controls, etc. to help you be a real aluminum service center. I predict that in the not too distant future you'll be asked to handle 15,000- to 20,000-pound coils from which you will fill your orders. This matter of having well equipped aluminum service centers throughout the United States is vital for every aluminum producer, and we're going to have such a system of distribution. We at Alcoa much prefer the system we have today, with the independent distributor carrying the burden, but if the independent distributor doesn't see the future in this aluminum business and equip himself to a modern, up-to-date, hard hitting organization, then we will have to have another way and I suspect the only other way we have to go is the way that has been tried by some other people. I need say no more than that some of the steel companies operate a group of service centers. Let me emphasize that we have yet to take the first step along this line and we, in the present management, have no intention of doing this. To the contrary, we're about the job of trying to be as helpful to our distributors as we can, to make them stronger so that they can do a better job for us and for themselves. We appreciate our distributors and we thank them deeply for the job they have done for us. We hope that our actions, while sometimes maybe not quite understood, have been in the long pull good for your business because it seems to be that when your business is good, our business is good.

Now I wish to address myself to a subject that has been cussed and discussed for many years—commodity prices. We are completely aware of the problems that our commodity pricing policies have created for the aluminum distributor. Speaking solely for Alcoa, and that is all I can do, we propose to act to correct this situation. First, I think we have to define exactly the term "commodity prices," particularly as it relates to a distributor of aluminum products.

In the classic sense, a commodity price is a lower competitive price for a given commodity which is justified on the valid assumption that there is a volume market in the offing which can only be tapped by the commodity price and, that after the introductory stages, the cost of manufacture at the anticipated volume will justify the lower commodity price. This is an area which, by the very nature of the volume involved, is beyond the normal functions of a distributor. An outstanding example is our activities in can sheet or rigid containers.

Alcoa will continue to seek marketing outlets which will conform to this concept. Be prepared, therefore, for further forays in this area which, in our opinion, are far removed from the normal distributor's business orbit.

A second area of commodity price involves those markets where the particular specifications of a product are so special in nature, and the volume so relatively large, that we consider it a mill requirement rather than a distributor's responsibility. In this group might be found competitive pressures from other materials which dictate a competitive pricing policy. However, assuming mill minimum tonnages are kept on a realistically large basis, there should be no conflict with distributors' activities. Examples in this group might be siding sheet, lamp base stock, etc.

The third and most regrettable area of commodity prices is that in which the established price has no relation to anything except competition. Here commodity pricing is the reducing of the price on a given product for competitive reasons in a given market without sacrificing revenue for the same product in a less competitive market. This is the variety of commodity pricing which makes it most difficult for our distributors to perform their normal and primary function of relieving our mills of small production runs. We propose to try to correct this situation so far as Alcoa is concerned. At the moment we are making a comprehensive study of the possibilities of combining most of the commodity prices existent in this area into a comprehensive standard aluminum sheet schedule, which has as its purpose increasing Alcoa's participation in this market by making our distributors competitive. This schedule will be what we recognize to be today's market price for a particular product specification: 1100, 3003, 3050, 5052, etc. Our sales policies on these products to distributors, once they are established on schedule, will be the same as they are today on products normally handled by distributors.

I am sincere when I say that our company has always diligently sought to avoid destructive pricing techniques. In line with our philosophy and under this new concept, we have the same long-range intention. However, rather than inch down by one commodity schedule after another, we will, once having established a new schedule based upon product rather than commodity consideration, sell the product in all markets at this schedule. The moment it becomes obvious that we are being undersold in any market or segment thereof, and we consider it to be in the best interests of Alcoa and our distributors, our overall schedule of prices will be immediately revised to reflect this situation. This will not be confined to meeting a specific price or a specific product in a specific market, but will extend across the board, on a properly cost-related basis to all gages, types, and specifications sold on that standard or aluminum sheet schedule.

Now, I don't mean to imply that our sales activities will lessen. We will never give up our place at the selling front through our district, branch, and resident sales offices. We will, however, continue to increase the size of the item that we will run in our mill. Logically this size should be the recovery we get from our largest size ingot. We integrated producers will continue to seek new markets. We'll continue to advertise for our benefit and yours. And we will continue to work in your behalf, but only if at the same time you are working in our behalf to equip your plant and your selling organization with the most modern metal service centers in this country. This is not a one-way street, and perhaps many times you feel like reversing things and telling us it's not a one-way street. We must work together. We at Alcoa are trying and will continue our efforts to make the qualified metal service center of ever-increasing importance in our marketing plans.

Goldwater Responds to Life's Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in an editorial in the November 1, 1963, issue of Life magazine a challenge was posed to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, as a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, to clarify his views on foreign affairs. The Senator prepared a statement in response to that editorial challenge. This response is the first formal foreign policy statement of Senator GOLDWATER as an avowed candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency.

In view of the interest which all America has in the conduct of our foreign affairs because we all know that a world at peace depends in large part on our conduct of our foreign policy, I request permission that this article appearing in Life magazine for January 17, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDWATER RESPONDS TO LIFE'S EDITORIAL: "MY PROPOSALS FOR A 'CAN-WIN' FOREIGN POLICY"

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

The United States is the most powerful Nation on earth. We are living in a world torn by conflict. We are challenged to use our power to achieve freedom and peace throughout the world. We are failing to do it.

The foreign policy of the United States should be the sum of principles and purposes through which we shape our national destiny—a clear statement of our interests, a believable expression of the will to maintain these interests and a vision of the sort of world in which nations like ours can live.

Foreign policy should not be confused with foreign programs. Programs as such stem from policy; they do not form it. To debate programs is to beg the issue and avoid the confrontation with our national conscience which a real foreign policy requires.

It is not enough simply to say that war or peace is the only foreign policy issue. Peace has many complex requirements and war has many faces which we need to know more clearly. But first we need the statement and the vision.

The fundamentals of a decent public order are based upon a view of man as endowed with inherent, intrinsic worth and rights. His worth and his rights must be protected by the rule of law enforced by an impartial judiciary, respect for personal liberty and religion, a free press, diffusion of political and economic power, and emphasis on freedom of creativity for the individual. Since we hold that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, a world in which we can live safely by our principles must include both opportunity for all nations to live in the way prescribed by their people's convictions and the assurance that our system will enjoy a decent respect from other governments.

In present-day terms, the major objective of the U.S. foreign policy should be the reduction of Communist power to a level from which it cannot threaten the security of our Nation or the peace of the world. This will require full mobilization of the free world's resolve and its resources to undermine the power now held by Communists and to encourage their eviction from positions of control.

This does not mean war. It means the alternative to war; a way to win peace—to end threats to the Nation—without war. Together the advanced free nations hold the balance of world power. They greatly outproduce the Communist nations, whose economies, now deeply in trouble, would stagnate without constant infusions of Western productivity.

Psychologically, too, we have the advantage. Freedom is our century's most inspiring cry. The Western nations have more fredom than man has ever before enjoyed and have extended it. Communism demonstrably has been freedom's archenemy. But we have tended to hide freedom's light under a bushel of our own reticence. We must remove the bushel so that the light that is there will shine—brilliantly.

If we fail to exploit these other instruments of national power, there eventually will come a time when the military instrument alone will serve and only the alternative of war or surrender will be available.

Our present policy of coexistence has failed to alter communism's goal of destroying the political and social forms of the non-Communist world. It will continue to fail because it does not counter the aggressive dynamism of Communist expansion.

The Communists would like to present us with the one choice: either give in or face nuclear war. But hot war is not an essential ingredient of the campaign toward reducing Communist power and evicting Communist powerholders. It is the height of folly to equate a can-win policy—the desire to win—with a desire for war, just as it is foolish to suggest that a no-win policy will produce peace.

There is always a risk of war in a world in which possessors of great military power are committed to aggression. But war is a risk to the Communists as well as to us.

The Communists are deterred from risking war today by our preponderant military-technology advantage. That deterrence can last only so long as we keep an unflagging opposition to the total Communist enterprise.

Our present deterrent power was built almost entirely under the Eisenhower administration. There has been no significant addition to it since, and there are no plans for strengthening it. There are, indeed, plans to phase it down.

Easing the arms race will not ease tensions. It will enable a growing impunity for reckless Communist tactics.

We should not fall into the very trap which Communist strategy seeks to set for us—namely, that every time the free world exerts pressure against an exposed Communist salient or marginal position, it incurs the risk of all-out Communist retaliation. Communist leaders have shown themselves cautious strategists when it comes to risking the security of their heartland by opting for war. Thus one of the principal objectives of free world strategy should be to exploit those situations in which the Communists cannot afford to take risks larger than the stakes are worth.

Our weapons programs—the choice of the right programs, their coordination with one another, and the purposefulness of their execution—are, therefore, matters of crucial national concern, and their revitalization is a matter of grave national necessity.

Does this approach alone doom any hope for the reconciliation of our differences? No. That hope is doomed by communism's objectives and not by any bellicose disposition in the free world.

The Communists' undeviating pursuit of a Communist world is a fundamental fact of world politics here and now. An American foreign policy which does not come to grips with this fundamental fact is about as meaningful as a production of "Hamlet" without the Danish prince. A thousand foreign plans, programs, and proposals only waste our precious resources so long as their authors refuse to face the fact of Red determination.

The suggestion that Khrushchev is a "better" Communist for our purposes and therefore deserves support to prevent a "worse" Communist from taking his place is a Western-style notion. It couldn't get house room in Communist thinking. Communists think of communism in ideological, not personal, terms.

Western governments are concerned with the people's welfare here and now; a free electorate does not tolerate the sacrifice of the living generation—its own generation—for the sake of some utopian fancy. Government which seeks to attain practical goals and is responsive to the people—this is the kind of government with which most of us are familiar. Communist government is not based on these principles. Yet, good-naturedly and mistakenly, the democratic peoples are prone to credit these virtues to governments which spurn democracy and brag about it.

We must deal with what is the case and not with what we wish were the case. Demonstrably, the Communists themselves entertain no idea of real peace with their enemies. They consider themselves engaged in an epochal movement of history which, by historical necessity, will end the present age and destroy its society to usher in the new Socialist age.

The Communist conflict machine consists of many parts, any of these dangerous to the United States insofar as it is linked, by a community of purpose and world view, to a Communist power center capable of threatening the United States or other non-Communist nations. At present such a power center exists in the Soviet Union and one may well develop in Communist China. Others may develop in time.

Inner differences between the parts of communism do not remove the threat of any one of them to non-Communist nations so long as the overthrow of the present society remains their common goal. The antagonism between the Soviets and Red China is not based on any difference in ideas as to their enemy (the non-Communist nations, particularly the United States) and his assigned fate (destruction of his society). Thus we can take no comfort from their differences. In fact, the development of two Communist power centers could as easily double our problems as halve them.

Present U.S. foreign policy does not cope squarely with any of these situations. It is a series of unrelated programs, nervous reflexes and unwarranted asumptions. Foreign aid is used, at one and the same time, to strengthen nations against communism and to strengthen nations already dominated by Communists. In those latter cases it has not weakened Communist power but has, instead, eased internal difficulties by making up local commodity deficits.

Our nuclear policies now place more trust in our enemies than in our friends. We speak of an "interdependent" world and yet we deploy our strength so as to isolate ourselves. We are building, in short, the illusory walls of a new fortress America, in an age when such walls may be vaulted with ease. And, most alarmingly, our present policy has permitted our major alliances to decay.

As I see it, we have no realistic purpose around which policy may be formed and through which programs can be sensibly directed.

A determined enemy, faced with this jumbled array, knows that he can nibble away at one point and then another without risk. He is, in short, given assurances of immunity as he alternates between hot and cold, freeze and thaw. On our side, indecision immobilizes us, lack of overriding purpose confuses us and reaction—rather than action—restricts us.

In Latin America, for example, a dollar-stitched patchwork quilt of programs is being torn to shreds by a unified Communist drive to power. We seem to be heading toward acceptance of the substance of Communist rule under the guise of "progressive" nationalism. In Cuba the issue once was communism, but since has become simply the number of Soviet troops on the island.

Africa is said to be swept by what some call the revolution of rising expectations, easily exploitable by the Communists. Firm Western leadership could turn this turmoil in the direction of rising responsibility.

Southeast Asia shows the greatest confusion of purposes. The decision in Laos to conclude a worthless truce and accept a coalition including Communists laid open that country's long boundaries to Communist infiltration. Thailand, once a strong ally, has been left exposed, lonely and virtually forgotten. Cambodia, perceiving the meaning of our abandonment of Laos, now stands ready to hop on the Communits bandwagon. Our attempt to make a policy of concessions in Laos compatible with a policy of resistance in Vietnam was hopeless from the beginning.

There is nothing in these situations that can inspire the rallying together of the non-Communist world, that can strengthen its will or weapons, or reduce the power of the enemy. Instead, on every front there is encouragement for further Communist incursions—and encouragement also for dangerous miscalculations which could force nuclear war.

The present U.S. foreign policy does not encourage—or in some cases even permit—the use of free-world power, short of general war, to counter Communist strategy, undermine Communit power, or encourage the eviction of Communist power holders.

In the central struggle of our time, the power of the United States is crucial, but it does not stand alone.

The broad base of power which can confront, confound, and eventually overcome communism is the Atlantic community of nations, which collectively possesses the preponderant power of the earth and also shares a common cultural heritage. It is the present disarray in the Atlantic alliance which today most seriously weakens us and encourages the expansion of communism.

Our present foreign policy is conducive to this disunity. It has mishandled the delicate problem of relating a number of highly civilized and industrialized nations to U.S. leadership. It has fumbled the problem of sharing our nuclear know-how and weapons with our friends. It has, again and again, misjudged the requirements and sensitivities of our allies and evoked distrust and misunderstanding. Nor has the alliance been strengthened by our tendency to undercut our allies in the immensely complex process of decolonization.

There is a way out of the dilemma and away from the disaster it clearly foreshadows. We must rethink the purpose of the alliance, and the degree to which we are willing to concede to NATO certain prerogatives which we now reserve to ourselves.

As a matter of fact, some of these prerogatives already have been challenged so effectively by our allies that we now possess only their shadow. There is no use telling ourselves, for instance, that we still hold a nuclear monopoly in the alliance and will hold it in the future. Great Britain has such power. France is building it. There are no technological reasons to prevent others from doing the same.

Our allies may be wrong about a number of things, but they are quite right to mistrust our tendency to seek accommodations with communism through bilateral negotiations. France had some reason to look upon the test ban treaty as an agreement arrived at between the United States and the U.S.S.R. at her expense.

The answer which frequently is given to justify our current alliance-fracturing drive toward a détente with the Soviets is that it is difficult to obtain the unanimous consent of 15 allies. That begs the question. What is it that all 15 allies have unanimously agreed upon? They have agreed that they must defend one another, through NATO. If it is still their mutual defense that they are agreed upon and if they still can trust one another to come to each other's defense, they can also agree—as we can—upon the structural changes necessary to enable the alliance to cope with the issues of the times.

The crux of the alliance problem is the failure of the Democratic administration since 1960 to provide for the full participa-

tion of our allies in the planning and deployment of the most modern weapons systems, including appropriate nuclear weapons.

In this, the Democratic administration has been pursuing the most potentially disastrous course of isolationism in our history, and no responsible Western leader has failed to be alarmed by it. The American people should be, too.

All NATO forces stationed in Europe, regardless of nationality, should be equipped with and trained in the use of nuclear weapons, particularly of the so-called battlefield or tactical variety. So long as Europeans feel that the United States can veto the defense of their homes by the most modern weapons, they will have reason to view the NATO alliance half in hope and half in fear.

The question of nuclear sharing revolves, actually, on a question of trust. Do we, in nuclear matters, trust the Soviets more than we trust our allies?

I have suggested that the supreme commander in Europe be given authority over the tactical nuclear weapons appropriate to NATO's defenses. The best authorization ultimately must be worked out with NATO itself. I am convinced that it can be.

The Atlantic alliance could change the course of world affairs. Agreement on defense matters should be just a beginning.

The highly developed nations of the Atlantic Community are perfectly capable of working out common trade and political policies which could bring down the power of communism without war.

Other alliances, such as those of CENTO and SEATO, could be revived to join in pressures against communism in the Middle and Far East. Where are they today? Under the Democratic administration they have been barely remembered, much less encouraged and strengthened.

Common trade and political policies also could provide non-Communist answers to the developmental problems of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. No single nation has the resources to underpin these developments. Present programs, scattered and purposeless, only provide easily squandered money. Really needed are technological, administrative, and educational investments by the entire Atlantic community, lest it forever be the fate of the underdeveloped nations to build appetites without planting sustenance for decent entry into a world of advanced technologies.

Economic warfare against the problem-ridden Communist countries, waged from a base of Atlantic purpose, would be one means of undermining Communist power without shooting warfare. Yet the trade policies of the Western nations—particularly those of the United States, whose leadership is required to turn the tide—are supporting rather than eroding Communist power. Instead of being the arsenal of democracy, the West is becoming the warehouse of communism—enabling Communists to make up for economic shortfalls which otherwise would weaken their power an very probably destroy it eventually.

The policy of relaxing tensions by conciliatory exchanges was tried with Hitler. As a result of "business as usual," Hitler managed to plug th holes of the German economy and to fight the war in much better economic shape than he would have been in had the Western democracies embargoed trade with Germany.

Our current policies in this regard are almost perfect examples of everything we should not be doing. The wheat sale, on Soviet terms, is a case in point.

Does economic pressure to undermine Communist power mean that they would be driven to hot war? Hardly. Countries economically strapped and agriculturally sapped are ill-equipped to fight wars.

Psychological warfare, another tool of power short of shooting, must have purpose and direction as well. Bland is the toughest word that comes to mind for our present performance in this area.

We have now officially disavowed the attempts of others to change the status quo. We have abandoned even a discussion of it, and we also have dropped our opposition to some Communist regimes or their claims to legitimate control. Once our tendency to accept the status quo has carried us to the point of endorsing the entire Communist empire as a legitimate regime whose interests we are committed to respect, it stands to reason that we can no longer mobilize any psychological resistance to communism.

The United States should publicly and repeatedly proclaim its confident expectation that congenital troublemakers such as the Communists will not forever be tolerated to control civilized nations. Psychological warfare should drive home always this point. Communists are alien rulers even in their own countries. Blame for international crises should be placed squarely where it belongs, on the Communist leadership. When songs of freedom are sung, let them be sung about those who cherish freedom and let the anger of those songs be directed against those who in the world today deny freedom—the Communists.

In the Cuba blockade, we briefly experienced the psychological advantages that accrue to firm action—just as we had earlier in President Truman's actions in Greece and Korea, and in President Eisenhower's actions in Lebanon and in the China Straits. All too quickly in Cuba, however, we abandoned a strong course which even today, could be effective. We went back to the morale-enfeebling course of hat-in-hand diplomacy.

The first barbed wire of the Berlin wall offered an opportunity for decisive action, too. We could have, justifiably and securely, dismantled the crude barriers at the checkpoints. As it is, we have dangerously deferred decision and meekly stood by while communism called the shots.

We should, and morally can, seek to discredit both the Communist ideology and the Communist leadership in the eyes of their subjects, and try to drive wedges between them.

In countries not yet ruled by Communists we should engage in a systematic intellectual and organizational counterattack against the Communists, with the aim of denying them every position of influence.

We should revive the international discussion of issues damaging to the Communists—as, for instance, the Hungarian bloodletting.

No discussion of internal affairs in Western nations—South Africa, as an example—should be permitted without raising the issues of Communist oppression in Russia, China, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba, Outer Mongolia, Tibet—everywhere and anywhere it exists. There never should be discussion of Communist claims without discussion of freedom's counterclaims, which are designed to lift tyranny from suffering peoples.

Neutralism—an attitude of indifference in this struggle between communism and free societies—is repugnant to freedom. Free men should not support it. Communism, as an aggressive force, will ultimately not permit it. Rare cases of genuine neutrality, self-defended, such as that of Switzerland, are not the same as neutralism, or the attempt to play one side against the other.

Political power, which the West possesses so abundantly, should be wielded forthrightly to dissuade any non-Communist or nonalined nation from supporting communism in foreign policy. As in most areas of human relationships, the wisest and most honorable rule of conduct is to reward one's friends and to punish one's enemies. The Democratic administration, heartlessly and imprudently, stands this rule on its head.

International negotiations, to be sure, are a prime arena for political power. Communists negotiate only for their own practical and ideological purposes and never to achieve peace or genuine harmony. To negotiate with the Communists without a policy that recognizes these facts is always to give and never to gain.

There is an unfortunate tendency these days to use the United Nations as an excuse for not driving hard bargains with the Communists. Such difficulties as we have with the Communists, it is often said, can be ironed out in the U.N. This is not true and the history of the U.N. has proved it abundantly and clearly.

The U.N. is a discussion forum. Attempts to make more of it at this juncture actually weaken whatever good purposes it can serve. More to the point, the U.N. is a forum far different from the one we envisioned and voted for in 1945. Its debates are now devoted almost exclusively to declamations of anticolonialism. Its members are free from even the responsibility to pay their dues. Its charter commitments against internal interference have been critically violated in, for instance, the Congo. Its notion of voting by sovereign nations was falsified at the outset by the allocation of separate votes to political subdivisions of the U.S.S.R.

We should realize in determining our position toward the U.N. that it cannot, as such, bring peace. Its Communist membership prohibits that. The problem of peace with which it might some day be able to deal will be its reasonable province only after its membership is composed of nations genuinely interested in mutual respect and toleration.

In terms of forging peace, I view the NATO alliance—the Atlantic community—as a far more practical tool than the U.N.

The U.N. in the presence of aggressive Communism is, at best, a secondary instrument of international accord. It is useful to the West now for a special reason: it provides a forum in which to discuss Communist violations of the charter. If we will not so use it, its usefulness should be questioned in our Congress, where the most responsible decision regarding our membership can be made.

It is avoidance of responsibility and lack of purpose, not a lack of programs, that most gravely afflict our foreign policy today. The defects will not be cured by proposing more and more programs.

Our foreign economic aid program, for example, is an amalgam of many programs. What is its purpose? Careful study reveals no guiding doctrine for it. But an administration unable to keep together the most reasonable alliance in history—that of the Atlantic community—could scarcely be expected to provide purposeful direction. It obviously has none. Catch-as-catch-can may be an appropriate approach toward politics. It is not adequate for world politics.

The most effective approach to foreign policy now is to propose a purpose—a policy, if you will—not simply to propose new programs. Most Americans must sense this. Our allies surely do.

The programs evolving from an effective policy must be tailored to fit opportunity. Lacking purpose, they will, as now, just be knee-jerk reactions to Communist hammer taps.

One last word—about the style of our foreign policy. No nation can endure without self-respect. We need, as vitally as daily bread, the return of honor and dignity to our national conduct. We must end the trifling disregard with which our citizens have been treated in various parts of the world. Our Government must again speak and act with the distinction befitting one of history's great nations.

I have tried to propose here a standard which freemen can share and to which they can repair. The achievement of peace by the reduction of Communist power without all-out war should head the list of priorities. Only within the framework of this purpose can intelligent attention be given to the problems of grinding poverty, ignorance and disease.

The hope that freedom and communism can live peaceably, side by side, is a vain hope, for it takes two to live at peace. The Communists will not—and cannot—live at peace, hog tied as they are by their own militant ideology. Thus, merely to echo the Communist slogan of peaceful coexistence is simply to fall in with Communist propaganda. Most certainly, to accept the division of the world between free and slave does not measure up to worthy and sensible purpose in foreign policy.

Ending the Communist power to distort human life and disrupt world peace is the vision of victory that has the power to inspire and the inspration to win. It is the victory that would snuff the fuse of war and aggression, liberate peoples and assure ordered fulfillment of reasonable hopes everywhere.

Memorial Services in Tribute to John F. Kennedy, the Jewish Center of Highbridge, Bronx, New York, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very splendid eulogy to our beloved late President, John F. Kennedy, which was delivered by Attorney Louis L. Schwartz at the memorial services at the Jewish Center of Highbridge, 1178 Nelson Avenue, Bronx, New York, N.Y., on Monday, November 25, 1963. Mr. Schwartz, a longtime friend of mine, is the very able president of the Jewish Center of Highbridge, in my congressional district. Rabbi Nathan Taragin, also a very dear friend, is spiritual leader of the center and, in addition, is chaplain of the Lebanon and Morrisania City Hospitals. I am pleased to include the eulogy which follows:

MEMORIAL SERVICES IN TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, MONDAY, NOVEMBER, 25, 1963

(By Louis L. Schwartz, Esq.)

One hundred years ago, our Nation was torn asunder by ideological differences which were then being tested on the field of battle; hundreds of thousands were engaged to determine whether this Nation under God will survive.

It finally culminated in eventual success after a titanic struggle for the rebirth of a new Nation, dedicated to the proposition, among other things, that all men are created equal.

But as the Nation celebrated its rebirth of freedom and began its task of rebinding its wounds, an assassin's bullet cut down its leader, raising passions to new heights and making the task more difficult.

But the dead past buried its dead; the Nation's wounds were healed, and progress and prosperity rose our Nation to the greatest in world leadership.

As our Nation was torn asunder by two different ideologies over a century ago, so we find the entire world, at this time, gripped in violent passions of two schools of political and economic beliefs.

Into this world was thrust John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States; young (he was but 43 years of age when inaugurated), full of vigor, highly educated and from a family of great wealth, he soon met the challenge; he overcame the handicap that sometimes come to persons of extreme wealth and immediately sought to improve the lot of oppressed and economically deprived peoples all over the world. He inaugurated a worldwide system of self-help by sending thousands of our young people all over the four corners of the world as a Peace Corps army to train natives of economically backward countries to develop themselves and raise their standards of living, production, education, and sanitation.

On the domestic front, we will remember him well for his struggle to bring adequate medical care to all our elderly citizens in a broad program of social medical insurance.

We will always remember him for being one of the greatest champions of civil liberties, equality of opportunity in jobs, homes, education, and public places, for peoples of all faiths, national origin or color.

Himself the first President of the United States of a minority religious belief, he was soon put to the test of meeting issues in which his own religious followers differed from the construction of our constitutional separation of church and state, and he showed his greatness by adhering to the accepted principles of law enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States as being the last word on the subject.

In the great crisis of the internal affairs of the Vietnam Government, he was foremost in demanding that as a condition for further financial support from our Government, religious liberty be restored to the peoples of that unfortunate country.

For many months, he watched, in silence, the reports of the vast fleet of Russian ships entering Cuba, just 40 miles south of the Florida peninsula, for the so-called purpose of bringing in supplies to build a new seaport in Cuba. When the final acts of installations were completed and discovered to be the construction of missile bases to launch atomic weapons at the United States and the Panama Canal, he stood up to Khrushchev with the solemn warning that either these bases be dismantled and removed, or else face the fierce consequences of meeting the might of American power.

That he was solely devoted to bring peace to this troubled world is strongly borne out by the record; he knew war—its bitterness and consequences—for he, himself, was in the midst of it (almost at the cost of his own life).

At his inaugural he said:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

He had put full meaning into these words by looking for every avenue open, and to explore every opportunity in the cause of peace. In his crusade for peace he entered into negotiations that led to the eventual agreement banning nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, and the construction of a direct line of communications between the White House and the Kremlin to prevent an accidental war.

The test ban treaty was Mr. Kennedy's monumental achievement on the long road ahead of us toward peace and disarmament.

While it is a beacon in a stormy seat, his untimely passing ended his efforts to further calm the angry waters of discontent still manifest in the world today. The light of reason all over the world was extinguished by the sudden snap of a trigger, but search for everlasting peace must never end.

He was cut down in the prime of his life and far from giving us the greatest in him; he had known personal losses and tragedy—the loss of his brother in the service of our country—the serious illness of his father, and the recent loss of a newly born son; yet with all his personal sorrows, he kept those to himself and never let them interfere with the affairs of state; truly the mark of a great man, one of strength and character; he maintained his winning smile and his affability all during his personal trials and tribulations.

Now, we have met in the hour of our great loss and affliction, first to pay homage of love to the memory of our great leader and secondly to seek peace within our own souls; to see if we can find the solutions to the problems which bore so heavily on the shoulders of John F. Kennedy.

His words, uttered at his inaugural still resounds in the minds and memory of all of who witnessed the event on television:

"In the long history of the world only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it, and the glow from that fire can truly light the world. * * * Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

We, therefore, the Jewish Center of Highbridge, in mourning the tragic loss of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, assembled in public worship now pledge ourselves, in his honor and blessed memory, to carry his ideals on a new sense of purpose to the American people; to remove the shackles of hatred and violence that has poisoned the minds and hearts of some of our people; that the birth of freedom, gained 100 years ago on the field of battle shall inure to all of our peoples, of all faiths, national origin, cultures, and color, and that all men shall walk with their heads erect in the image of God.

Yeshivah Toreh V'Emunah in East Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most significant challenges facing our Nation today is that of educating our children that they may be equipped not only to build the future, but also to live up to their great heritage. Although we have made long strides in improving educational opportunities, we dare not forget the underprivileged children who, whether because of unfortunate home

situations or inaccessibility of adequate school facilities, are unable to enjoy the advantages to which they are entitled.

In this context we should remain mindful of the important contribution made by numerous private institutions, of teachers and sponsors who give so greatly of themselves to schoolchildren. These are men and women who are committed to the idea that imparting the wisdom and learning of Western civilization is a most vital task.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a school in New York that exemplifies this kind of dedication. The Yeshivah Torah V'Emunah is staffed with devoted teachers who value the welfare of their 400 pupils highly. Situated in the East Bronx of New York City, this Yeshivah is attended by many refugees from Cuba, Bolivia, Hungary, Poland, Czechslovakia, and Israel, by children of poor and comfortable homes alike. A full-day nursery and kindergarten is maintained so that the widowed or divorced mothers of these children may work to support themselves.

As this school is attempting to meet the all too familiar problem of overcrowding by construction a new building, I have asked the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to consider assistance under the National Defense Education Act. It is hoped that a loan can be considered to aid in equipping the laboratory projected for this new building, to make available to the students at this fine institution the equipment necessary to meet 20th century educational needs and challenges.

The Writing on the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a significant editorial appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of January 10, which reports on the stepped-up program of overall religious persecution in the Soviet Union. It bnce again serves a warning that we must continue to bear in mind when dealing with the Communists that religious and moral convictions will not persuade them to peaceful ways.

The editorial follows:

MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN

On December 22, 1963, we called attention on this page to the discrimination waged against those of the Jewish faith in Russia. Now Russia is waging an all-out campaign against all religions.

The latest report of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., an organization devoted to the close study of all aspects of Russian life, notes that despite 46 years of atheistic propaganda and administrative control measures aimed at abolishing religion in Russia, there is now a heavy ground swell of religious conviction throughout the whole Soviet population.

Russian leaders, disturbed at this trend, have launched a strong effort to throttle all evidence of religious leanings.

The Russian press has admitted that the closing of churches and synagogues has not been effective in combating the urge of man to acknowledge his Creator. In Moscow, in 1962, voluntary contributions to Moscow churches and synagogues exceeded 6,600,000 rubles.

Realizing that the destruction of a house of worship does not damage the edifice within a believer's heart, the Soviet officials are now attacking all forms of religion with a stepped-up program of scientific propaganda—atheism. But even in this area the Soviets are having trouble. Those who woodenly read these scientific pamphlets at meetings are vulnerable to the intellects of their listeners and there are reports in the Russian press of the purveyors of atheism on the lower level being converted to antiatheism by their scornful listeners.

The men who represent Russia in its dealings with the West are those who strive endlessly to create a godless world. They do not subscribe to any of the tenets held by men of religion, no matter what religion it might be.

It may very well be possible that the tensions that now rack the world can be eased, that alliances to forward world peace can be arrived at, but it should be remembered that it is better to come to conferences aimed at achieving these worthy causes armed not only with the strengths of religious conviction but also those of nuclear superiority.

Thy Kingdom Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely sermon by a brilliant young pastor of Mount Vernon, N.Y., entitled "Thy Kingdom Come."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THY KINGDOM COME

(By Rev. Harald Bredesen, pastor First Reformed Church, Mount Vernon, N.Y.)

Last month we celebrated Christ's first coming into our world. One thousand, nine hundred and sixty-three years after that first Christmas we still commemorate it in the most joyous of festivities. But the Bible tells us that a much bigger Christmas is on the way. To those who wait for it Christ's second coming will be far more thrilling than His first.

When his followers heard that Richard the Lion Hearted had landed on the coast of England in disguise, they were thrilled; but in the moment that he assumed the reigns of power, they rejoiced beyond measure.

Over 1,900 years ago a Prince landed on the shores of this planet. There was little to indicate in the circumstances of His birth, or in His manner of life that He was a king. So complete was the disguise that only the meek and lowly of heart penetrated it.

This Prince is returning, but not in disguise. "All the tribes of the earth shall see Him coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matthew 24: 31). "For as the lightening cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be" (Matthew 24: 27).

The difference between Christ's first coming and His second is the difference between the signing of the Declaration of Independence and Washington's acceptance of Cornwallis' surrneder. It is the difference between D-day and V-day. To bring it still closer, it is the difference between the anxious moment of the astronaut's blastoff and his triumphal progress up Pennsylvania Avenue.

In view of the relative importance of Christ's two comings, it is not strange that the preponderance of ancient Jewish prophecy was devoted to the second. It was on this, His coming in glory and His triumphant assumption of power that ancient Jews loved to dwell.

So complete was their preoccupation with the glory of His second advent, they were unprepared for the stigma of His first. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." (John 1: 11). It was not that there were no prophecies concerning the lowliness of His first advent. There were—plenty of them. His contemporaries were just not aware of them.

Today we are making the opposite mistake. No Christian can be ignorant of His first advent; but concerning His second, the average church member is quite oblivious. We, however, do not have as good an excuse for our ignorance as the ancient Jew. Our Saviour had more to say concerning His second advent and the kingdom He would establish than on any other subject. His constant refrain was, "Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." (Matthew 24: 42).

In His farewell discourse to His disciples the night before His crucifixion He comforts them: "I will come again." (John 14: 3). Even at His trial he informs the high priest, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of glory." (Matthew 26: 64).

To be a Christian is to believe in Christ.
To believe in Christ is to believe what He says.
Christ says He is coming back. I believe Him.

But can we take these words literally? We can. There are many things in the Bible we cannot, but the prophecies of Christ's return will be literally fulfilled. We know this, because the predictions of His first advent were literally fulfilled.

Let's look at them.

Isaiah foretold that He would be born of a Virgin; Micah, that He would be born in Bethlehem; Hosea, that He would be taken to Egypt for safety; David, that He would be betrayed by a friend; Zechariah, that He would be sold for thirty pieces of silver, and His disciples would forsake him. Isaiah foretold his unjust trial and death as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. David predicted that His hands and His feet would be pierced, but that not a bone should be broken; that they would give Him gall and vinegar to drink and cast lots for His robe.

Since all the prophecies of His first coming were literally fulfilled, why shouldn't we take literally the prophecies concerning His second. For example, this one spoken to His disciples right after His ascension. Let's read the account. "And when He had spoken these things, while they beheld, He was taken up and a cloud received Him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel. Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye here gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go." (Acts 1: 9–11).

He shall come as they saw Him go. His ascent was visible, physical, personal, and sudden. His descent will be visible, physical, personal, and sudden. Not only will it be sudden, it is imminent. In the third

verse of Matthew 24, Jesus' disciples asked Him. "Tell us what shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of His coming?" The rest of the chapter, 48 verses, comprises Jesus' answer. In them He enumerates a long list of things that are to occur before His return, and then He says, "When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors" (Matthew 24: 33). Since today we are seeing "all these things" His return must be near. Let us look at some of "these things" now.

In the seventh verse of this chapter, Jesus says, that in the period just before His return, "nation will rise against nation." Note the vertical thrust here. It is not "turn against" or merely "fight against" but "rise against."

In our time we have seen three vast colonial empires, England, France, and Holland liquidated. In recent years we have seen India, a whole subcontinent, freed by the stroke of a pen. Overnight, we have seen almost all of Africa, a whole continent, gain its sovereignty. What precipitated all this? Uprisings, and the threat of uprisings on an unprecedented scale. Though behind the Iron Curtain the Hungarian, East German, Tibetan, and Mohammedan-Chinese uprisings were brutally suppressed, we continue to hear reports of other uprisings in Russia and in Red China. This is the day beyond all other days when "nation is rising against nation."

In St. Luke's parallel discourse (Luke 21: 24) Jesus says that the Jews "will be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem will be trodden under foot until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Today for the first time in 2,000 years, one-half of Jerusalem is no longer "trodden down of the Gentiles." The liberation of the other half could occur just as suddenly. "The time of the Gentiles" is running out. God is keeping His oftrepeated promise to His people. "I will gather you out of all the countries and will bring you into your own land" (Ezekiel 36: 24). "And I will make of you one nation" (Ezekiel 7: 22).

Even the mode of transportation which the returning Jews would use was foreseen in prophecy. Isaiah describing their homeward trek says that they would fly as a cloud and as the dove.

In verse 14, Jesus tells us. "And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, unto all nations, and then shall the end come." By means of shortwave radio, is there any nation in the world to which the gospel is not being carried today? In verse 15, Jesus refers us to the prophet Daniel. He had much to say concerning the crucial times in which we live. In Daniel 12: 4 the angel Michael instructs the prophet. "But thou Daniel shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

At the time of the end many shall run "to and fro." Last week, commenting on that verse to a friend of mine, Chet Huntley, spoke of the billions of miles air travelers are chalking up each year. Fifty years ago the average man once he had settled in a community stayed put all the days of his life. Today every American changes his residence an average of every 5 years. Our automobile manufacturers gloating over ever higher production records will tell that Americans are running to and fro. So will the leaders of our billion dollar mobile home industry. We are a nation on wheels, the better to run to and fro. And speaking of wheels, how do you like this description by the prophet Nahum, of a modern traffic jam. "The chariots shall be with flaming torches in the day of his preparation. The chariots shall rage in the streets. They shall jostle one against another in the broad ways." (Can't you just see the dented fenders and the cursing taxi drivers.) "They shall seem like torches, they shall run like the lightnings."

Daniel also tells us that at the time of the end knowledge shall be increased. Commenting on this statement Chet Huntley had this to say. "Thomas Jefferson and Madison (he might also have included Benjamin Franklin) were in command of most of the available knowledge of their time, but there is certainly no man alive who can come anywhere near that claim today."

The reason is, of course, that knowledge is increasing at a cumulative rate the frontiers of knowledge are advancing so fast, that scientific textbooks are passé even before the print is dry. It has been estimated that in our day there are more scientific breakthroughs in the course of an hour than in all human history down to the invention of the steam engine.

This is the age of scientific breakthroughs; and Jesus tells us "iniquity shall abound." Ask J. Edgar Hoover about this one. Ask Sorokin, Harvard's great sociologist. They will cite facts and figures which indicate that our moral regress is at least as spectacular as our scientific progress.

The ethical fabric in society is disintegrating. The reason Look magazine can say, "We are ripening toward a new moral code" is, that we have all but abandoned the old. Yes, iniquity abounds and at a cumulative rate. Nevertheless, the moral and spiritual picture is not entirely a dark one. Billy Graham and a great many others note signs of a tremendous spiritual resurgence. In its desperation over its inability to cope with the situation, the Christian Church is rediscovering the Holy Spirit. His power and gifts are being manifested in ever increasing measure in some of our oldest denominations; and this too, is the fulfillment of prophecy.

I call to your attention to a statement of Harvard's Dr. Ernest Wright in his book "The Rule of God." He says that "just before the return of Christ the gifts of the Spirit will be manifested in unprecedented measure. In that day both leaders and people will be Spirit-filled and Spirit-empowered on a scale hitherto unknown."

Speaking on the same subject, Princeton's Seminary's president, Dr. McCord has this to say. "It is because our institutions are at stake that this must become the age of the Spirit; of God active in the world, shaking and shattering all of our forms and structures, and bring forth responses consonant with the gospel and the world's need. We who have stifled the Spirit of God now see it blazing up in other groups in judgment upon us; for God's Spirit refuses to be stifled, even by the church. No. Especially by the church. For judgment begins in the house of the Lord."

Let me call your attention to one more sign, described by Christ in the 15th verse. "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place * * * flee into the mountains." Going back to the Book of Daniel (Daniel 9: 27) and (Daniel 11: 36–38), we find that Christ is referring to a sacrilege committed by the antichrist whose sway shall precede the ushering in of His own kingdom.

There is remarkable unanimity among Protestant and Catholic scholars as to the manner in which the antichrist will come to power. Lt. Gen. William K. Harrison, senior truce delegate to Panmunjom, later commander in chief of the Caribbean command, has an article in the March 4, 1957, issue of Christianity Today. In it he makes some interesting predictions regarding the coming of the antichrist. "It seems clear that man can no longer think of himself as the master of his own destiny. Some naive or ambitious men may so consider themselves; but the mass of men believe themselves helpless in the midst of forces they are powerless to control. When such helpessness becomes apparent in man, they will discover the need for someone to save them from themselves. They must turn to someone, either to God or to some human leader. They reject God, therefore, they will welcome a man, putting security above freedom."

RISE OF THE TYRANT

The process of nations combining and surrendering their sovereignty to such a dictator seems most likely to occur first among countries which have highly industrialized civilization, which have a common great fear, and which, by combination of strength and unity, think they have a reasonable chance to resist or overcome that which causes their fear. These conditions are found today among the nations of western and southern Europe and in Turkey, which must live in close proximity to the great threat imposed by the materialistic power of the Soviet Union with its allies and sattelites. The shape of such a developing embryo of anti-Soviet federation under a single ruler is already in evidence among those countries. The hope in the hearts of men who bow to the great dictator will be "peace."

These developments appear to me to have a noticeable similarity to Biblical prophecies concerning the end of the age and the second coming of Christ. There have been many, and there still are many, who have taken all references to a coming superman, or the antichrist, as being of spiritual and not actual interpretation. But there is developing before our eyes a philosophy that can lay the ground work for just such a development. The one-world concept, the United Nations, the frantic desire for any collective organization or arrangement to prevent war—all could result in men surrendering their freedoms, even their national integrity to a brilliant and able leader who seems to offer peace and prosperity to a disrupted world.

Bishop Fulton Sheen holds precisely the same views, in an article which I discovered in an old Time magazine.

The Bible says that the antichrist will hold complete military, economic, and spiritual sway over the entire world. "Who shall make war against him?" it asks. The answer is, no one—that is no human being, for all instruments of war are in his hands. As to his economic control the Word says (Revelation 13: 16): "And He shall cause all, both high and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in the right hand or in their forehead, that no man might buy or sell save he that hath the mark and number of his name."

As to His spiritual sway it says, "He will cause the earth and them which dwell therein to worship Him." Such absolute control doesn't come about overnight. There has to be some preparation for it; but the almost universal trend toward centralization of government; the control of private business on a local as well as international scale by big government; the increasing tendency of the peoples of the world to surrender their national sovereignty to supranational authority, are setting the stage on which the antichrist may soon appear. As General Harrison says, "We cannot help feeling that we are in a dimly lighted theater watching the setting of the stage for the play that will shortly begin."

As Christ concluded His discourse:

"Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. Who then is a faithful servant, whom his

lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of; and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 24: 42–51).

The Late Reverend Thomas Tierney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of the Reverend Thomas J. Tierney, pastor of St. Joseph's and St. Richard's Churches in the Roxbury section of Boston, Mass. Father Tierney died suddenly this past Saturday at St. Joseph's rectory. Often referred to as the priest-fireman, Father Tierney has been acclaimed for his patriotism and humanitarianism. He had served as chaplain of the Cambridge, Mass., Fire Department and later as chaplain of the Quincy, Mass., Fire Department. Under unanimous consent, I include articles from the Quincy Patriot Ledger of January 11, 1964 and the Boston Sunday Globe of January 12, 1964, which relate the many achievements and experiences of the late Father Tierney's illustrious career:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Jan. 11, 1964]

REV. THOMAS TIERNEY, PARADE PRIEST, DIES

BOSTON.—The Reverend Thomas J. Tierney, 60, pastor of St. Joseph's and St. Richard's Churches in Roxbury, died unexpectedly early this morning. He was formerly curate of St. John's Church, Quincy, for 11 years.

The Reverend Father Tierney, longtime coordinator for Quincy parades, was found dead in his bed at St. Joseph's rectory. Cause of death has not yet been determined.

The Reverend Father Tierney, a native of Lowell, came to the two Roxbury churches from St. John's 2 years ago. At the time of his departure from Quincy, some 1,100 persons gathered to honor him at a farewell testimonial.

FIRE, POLICE CHAPLAIN

The former Quincy priest also had a long record of distinguished service as official chaplain of the Quincy Fire and Police Departments.

The Reverend Father Tierney who came to Quincy after 11 years service in Cambridge, was widely hailed for his heroism, patriotism and humanitarianism. In October 1960, Quincy Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa presented him with a scroll from the citizens of Quincy for "outstanding service to the community." Naming October 3, 1960, Father Thomas J. Tierney Day, the mayor said, showed "the deep affection and sincere appreciation" of the people of Quincy.

Although many were familiar with the growth of the Quincy Festival Parade under his leadership, as well as Easter, Memorial, and Veterans Day parades, fewer knew of his daily visits to Quincy City Hospital.

During these visits he brought comfort to patients of all faiths.

WIDELY PRAISED

His aid at fires also made him the subject of magazine articles entitled "The Priest-Fireman" in the Vincention, and "The Priest Who Rides Fire Trucks" in COR, a publication of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart.

In Cambridge he was also fire chaplain and was the first official fire department chaplain in the State. After his rescue work at the Coconut Grove holocaust in 1942 and a later attempt to rescue the six members of a Cambridge family who perished in a fire at their home in 1949, he was honored with the Kate Smith Award.

He received a special citation from President Franklin D. Roosevelt for his help in selling war bonds during World War II. He also helped to stage a huge bond rally at Boston Garden.

The Disabled American Veterans made the Reverend Father Tierney an honorary member for humanitarianism among wounded veterans.

BOSTON COLLEGE GRADUATE

The Reverend Father Tierney attended Lowell High School, graduated from Boston College with the class of 1927 and studied for the priesthood at St. John's Seminary in Brighton. He was ordained in 1931 at Holy Cross Cathedral by Cardinal O'Connell.

At the time of his departure from Quincy for Roxbury, he was given one of the largest testimonials held in this area and was praised by a wide range of State and city officials including a tribute from the office of President John F. Kennedy.

Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Milton, said that the Reverend Father Tierney's goal was to bring people closer together.

Quincy Police Chief William Ferrazzi called him a true man, good to both the living and the dying and then presented him a certificate of merit from the National Police Officers of America.

Quincy Fire Chief Thomas F. Gorman said the then Quincy curate was a friend of every fireman. He said he had extended himself beyond normal limits to become a leader in civic harmony.

Father Tierney replied in a speech to the 1,100 guests and friends. "Quincy is a wonderful place in which to work and my heart and soul wells in thanks to God who knows what is best to do."

The office of the dead will be chanted at St. Joseph's Church Tuesday at 3 p.m. A children's mass will be celebrated Wednesday at 8 a.m. by the assistant pastor of the church, the Reverend Francis X. Dufresne.

SOLEMN MASS WEDNESDAY

A solemn high mass of requiem will be celebrated at 10 a.m. Wednesday by the Right Reverend Arthur J. Riley, pastor of Our Lady of Good Counsel, Quincy.

Deacon will be the Reverend George H. Callahan, pastor of St. Leo's Church, Dorchester. Subdeacon will be the Reverend Joseph W. Sullivan, pastor of the Holy Rosary Church, Winthrop.

Eulogist will be the Reverend William S. Mullen, pastor of St. Michael's Church, Lowell. Burial will be in Holyhood Cemetery, Brookline.

Tentative plans are for the Reverend Father Tierney to lie in state at St. Joseph's Church tomorrow and Monday.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe, Jan. 12, 1964]

THE REVEREND THOMAS TIERNEY

Rev. Thomas Tierney, 60, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Roxbury, and widely known on the South Shore as a parade director, died Saturday at the rectory on Regent Street.

Father Tierney was the first priest of the Boston Archdiocese to be named chaplain of a municipal fire department. While stationed at Blessed Sacrament Parish, Cambridge, he served as chaplain to the Cambridge Fire Department and later as chaplain of the Quincy Fire Department during the 11 years he was an assistant at St. John's Parish.

He was a familiar sight at the scene of fires in the Greater Boston area and was one of the first clergymen to arrive at the Cocoanut Grove fire in 1942.

During his years of attending fires he was credited with many rescues. His fireman's helmet was always on the shelf behind the rear seat of his auto ready for use.

Born in Lowell, he was ordained in 1931 and assigned to Blessed Sacrament, Cambridge.

In 1950, he was transferred to Quincy. He was named pastor of the Roxbury Parish in 1961.

Even from Roxbury, he continued organizing and directing parades in Quincy. His most recent production was the Christmas festival parade 3 weeks ago. He also directed the Easter, Memorial, and Veterans' Day parades there.

In April of 1961 he was honored by the citizens of Quincy at a testimonial attended by 1,200 persons representing all three major faiths.

He was a daily visitor to Quincy City Hospital where he helped to console the sick and infirmed. Because of the frequency of his appearance there, Father Tierney was regarded by many as the unofficial chaplain of the hospital.

An all-faiths chaplains' room was dedicated at Quincy City Hospital in his honor in October 1961 because of his service to people from all walks of life.

Father Tierney was the subject of many magazine articles both in secular and religious publications.

He received a special citation from then-President Franklin D. Roosevelt for his work in selling war bonds during World War II.

He was given the Kate Smith Award for his rescue work at the Cocoanut Grove fire and for the attempted rescue of a Cambridge family who perished in their home in 1949.

Father Tierney will be waked in St. Joseph's Rectory, 85 Regent Street, Roxbury, Sunday and Monday.

The body will be moved to the church Tuesday when the Office of the Dead will be chanted at 4 p.m.

Rev. Francis Dufresne will say a children's mass at 8 a.m. Wednesday. Rt. Rev. Arthur J. Riley, pastor of Our Lady of Good Counsel Church, Quincy, will be celebrant of a solemn requiem mass at 10 a.m.

Rev. George H. Sullivan, pastor of St. Leo's Dorchester, will be deacon; Rev. Joseph W. Sullivan, pastor of Holy Rosary, Winthrop, subdeacon; and Rev. William A. Mullen, pastor of St. Michael's, Lowell, eulogist.

Burial will be in Holyhood Cemetery, Brookline.

Thought for Christmas 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Emmet Gribbin, Episcopal chaplain to students at the University of Alabama, wrote a poem reflecting on the death of our beloved President John F. Kennedy and sent it to friends

at Christmastime. It has earned widespread favorable comment throughout the South and to give my colleagues an opportunity to read and enjoy it, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

THOUGHTS FOR CHRISTMAS 1963

IN THE POST OFFICE

Cheerful students buy Christmas stamps
Showing a tree on the White House lawn.
Boxes yield cards, ads, from home perhaps a check.
"You going home for Christmas," "Sugar Bowl?"
Greetings are gay, voices vivacious, some smile, some laugh.
And yet—
Who can forget
Outside the flag is flying at half staff?

ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

The merrier Christmas sounds are heard again.
Gun play is in its seasonal decline.
Jingle bells. Buy this, or this, or that.
And deck the halls for several times twelve days.
Rudolph, Old Scrooge, and Santa Claus have come.
And yet—
Who can forget
That slow sad cadence of the muffled drum?

INSIDE OURSELVES

We've always known that each day someone dies,
But life goes on; new hope is born. Love survives
A tragic loss, a gentle death, our sorrow and our pain,
And life is often rich with happiness.
One death in Dallas seemed to overwhelm
And yet—
Who can forget
Death lost its sting after a birth in Bethlehem?

Federal Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telling and thoughtful communication to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which appeared in that paper on December 13, 1963, in the "Letters From the People" column entitled "Federal Price Fixing" in opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill.

Plainly that legislation is not in the public interest. The reasoning of the distinguished professors of law of Stanford University who wrote this fine letter, Messrs. William F. Baxter, Edwin M. Zimmerman, Gerald Gunther, Carl B. Spaeth, Marc A. Franklin, J. Keith Mann, John R. McDonough, Jr., and Joseph T. Sneed, is compelling and irrefutable.

Congress should summarily dispose of this iniquitous legislation so destructive to the interest of consumer and the economy as a whole alike.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL PRICE FIXING

A major injustice threatens the American consumer in a proposed congressional enactment, H.R. 3669, the so-called quality stabilization bill. This bill would legalize resale price fixing. There is a substantial likelihood that it will become law, largely because the retailers and manufacturers who support it are well organized to bring pressure on Congressmen while the consuming public is not.

Should the bill pass, consumers would pay higher prices for a wide range of products. These higher prices would increase inflationary pressures. Innovations in marketing that bring forth more efficient methods of distribution would be stifled. The survival of many low overhead, low price retail merchants would be threatened while the survival of efficient independent merchants would not be promoted.

The name, "quality stabilization" should mislead no one. This is merely fair trade under a new label, previously and more honestly called resale price maintenance, or the fixing of retail prices by manufacturers of branded goods.

Fair trade has been on the decline in this country and abroad. Although the McGuire Act now permits States to enact laws allowing manufacturers to fix resale prices of branded goods, these State fair trade laws are now largely unenforcible. The majority of State supreme courts have, in fact, held the State fair trade acts invalid under their State constitutions in those States that had such laws.

Therefore, pressure groups are engaged in what threatens to be a successful effort to revitalize fair trade under a new Federal statute. The proposed quality stabilization bill would, of itself and without the need for State fair trade legislation, allow a manufacturer to exercise private price control over the prices at which its wholesalers and retailers resell.

There is no plainer violation of the rule of competition, the spirit of free enterprise, or antitrust policy.

The bill will significantly reduce competitive pressures at the bottom, or retail end, of our distribution channels where the number of potential competitors is large and, hence, where competition can be most effective. These competitive pressures at the retail level stimulate competition at the manufacturing end of distribution channels, where the number of competitors may be very small and competition therefore is sluggish and comparatively ineffective.

A major effort must be made by the consuming public to defend itself against this pressure group legislation.

WILLIAM F. BAXTER,
EDWIN M. ZIMMERMAN,
GERALD GUNTHER,
CARL B. SPAETH,
MARC A. FRANKLIN,
J. KEITH MANN,
JOHN R. MCDONOUGH, Jr.
JOSEPH T. SNEED,
Professors of Law, School of Law, Stanford University.
STANFORD, CALIF.

Echoes From the Wheat Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the bus deal between the British and Castro's Cuba has dealt another blow to the economic boycott which we have declared against Cuba and which has been largely ineffective in the past. However, our own willingness to subsidize and assist the Soviet economy leaves us in no position to criticize.

The following Chicago American editorial of January 10 clearly states the case:

ECHOES FROM THE WHEAT SALE

The U.S. sale of wheat to Russia has produced an awkward, and evidently unforeseen, side result. Our allies are now acting very inconsiderately; they do as we do, not as we say.

A British firm, Leyland Motor Corp., recently announced arrangements to sell 400 buses to the Castro government, despite the U.S. attempts to shut off allied trade with Cuba. An official expression of regret from the State Department drew a frigidly polite reply from the British Government—which said it couldn't do anything—but the reaction in the British press was furious. Washington was accused of hypocrisy, using a double standard for itself and its allies, and even attempting to blackmail Britain.

Minus the angry rhetoric, the consensus was that we have no possible basis for complaint; if it's all right for American farmers to sell wheat to the Russians, it's jolly well all right for British manufacturers to sell buses to Cuba.

Spain meanwhile is going ahead with plans for increased trade with Cuba, including sale of 100 ships for about $500 million and is using the same rebuttal to American protests: While the United States is doing business with the Communists, it's in no position to criticize its allies for doing the same.

Of course there's more to it than that. The cases are different; a trade embargo could be a powerful weapon against the Castro regime, but would have very little effect against the enormous land mass of the Soviet Union and its satellites. So it's obviously more pressing to block trade with Castro than with the Soviet Union.

The argument may be logical, but it won't convince the allies. The wheat deal has put us in a contradictory spot. If trade with the Communists can be justified by its benefits to the seller—as we have justified the wheat sale—then the British have an equal claim to such benefits. If such trade is not justified, then we shouldn't be continuing it.

Our Best Wishes to President Segni and to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that His Excellency Antonio Segni, President of Italy, has accepted the invitation of President Johnson to visit the United States and that he will address the Congress tomorrow. We should not overlook this opportunity to pay tribute to a leading statesman and his nation. Both have been outstanding practitioners of democracy.

The friendly association of the United States with Italy is one of long duration, extending into the last century. The United States happily received millions of Italian immigrants through her portals, confident they would honor the principles of that Lady of Liberty which welcomed them ashore. They have not

disappointed anyone. Italian-Americans have made worthy citizens and successful contributors to every phase of American life. Americans of Italian origin are known and respected in every occupation from artist to Cabinet member.

Like every other country Italy has had difficult times. World War II was certainly one of the most difficult. No American was happy that so much destruction and hardship were brought to Italy. But we were glad to have been Italy's liberators along with our allies, and main contributors to her postwar economic development.

It was in the first years of the postwar period that the backbone of Italian democracy was formed around the Christian Democratic Party, of which President Segni is a member. The Christian Democratic Party has directed the Italian Government for the last 18 years, and is presently embarked on yet another year with a firm parliamentary majority and a progressive program. If Italy continues to escape the designs of international communism it will largely be due to the Christian Democratic Party and President Segni himself.

The party began to exert itself in the first constituent assembly called after the war to overcome the vestiges of fascism, the chaos of the war, and the strong-arm tactics of the Communist Party. Under the constitution which that assembly wrote, the Italian people have enjoyed every guarantee of democratic freedom, and governmental stability such as they have seldom known before.

The parliamentary governments formed under the constitution have in every case been directed by the Christian Democratic Party according to the principles of the constitution and democratic men everywhere. Magnificent economic progress has been made, often called a miracle, and a rich industrial Italy has already risen from the ashes of war. Liberal and progressive welfare, health, and education programs have given Italians a happier life than they could have imagined under an extremist government of either right or left.

Italy was an original signatory of the North Atlantic Treaty, and has significantly contributed to the mutual defense of America and Western Europe. The Christian Democratic Party has continued to trust and support Italy's friends, and abide by every international agreement, despite the severest pressure from the Communist Party.

President Segni has everywhere been in the fore of these important accomplishments of his country and his party. He is a man of liberal intelligence and firm principles. He believes in allied unity. In pursuit of that unity he has often spoken for Italy against those who disrupt the vital cooperation between Europe and America and within Europe itself.

President Segni was the Prime Minister of Italy during a time of crisis, but overcame that crisis. He was chosen President because of his dedication and his popularity with the Italian people.

When Italy called on him last year to carry the message of friendship to Germany and England he gladly accepted. When an electoral crisis brought the avaricious Communist Party about his head, he stood firm for freedom and helped to mold gradually the new government, which has as its basic program, loyalty to the Atlantic Alliance, and a better life for all Italians.

Italy is fortunate indeed to have so capable a head of state visit the United States. On the occasion of his visit we should acknowledge our gratitude and best wishes to President Segni and to Italy. May we always progress together in friendship.

Interview With Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an interview with the Honorable Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics entitled "What Hope for Narcotics Control?" published in the American Legion magazine of January 1964.

It was my good fortune to have secured the services of Mr. Giordano in 1955 as chief investigator of a subcommittee on narcotics of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was my privilege to have been chairman of this subcommittee. As a result of our investigation and hearing, the Boggs law was written which considerably strengthened our narcotics laws and particularly the penalties for narcotic violations.

Commissioner Giordano is one of the foremost authorities in the country on this subject. He is a very capable administrator and to him much credit is due for the fact that the situation in the narcotics field has been improving.

This article is a very enlightening article on one of our most vicious and demoralizing problems—narcotics. It explains in summary form the functions and methods of operation of the Bureau of Narcotics, comments on various narcotics and other drugs and their abuses and puts our narcotics problem in perspective. I hope that every Member of the House will have an opportunity to read this article.

The article follows:

WHAT HOPE FOR NARCOTICS CONTROL?

(By Pete Martin)

The American Legion magazine suggested that I conduct a question-and-answer interview with the U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, to learn firsthand something about dope addiction and control and pass it on to readers. Not much information about our Nation's dope problem seems to reach the public unless it's sensational stuff and I suspect that most people feel a real lack of knowledge on this dread subject.

Before visiting the Commissioner I did some homework, so that I and readers could have a little background.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics is part of the Treasury Department just down the hall from another Treasury Bureau with a vital interest in dope: the Bureau of Customs. Operating under a single department, the two Bureaus can cooperate more effectively than if each belonged to separate arms of the Federal executive.

The Narcotics Bureau was established in 1930 as part of the updating of the 1914 Harrison Act, America's first attempt to deal with a dope addiction problem that had been growing steadily since the invention of the hypodermic needle just before the Civil War. Many a Blue and Gray soldier, I learned, became addicted during wartime hospitalization; meanwhile, unscruplous patent medicine manufacturers "hooked" tens of thousands of civilians with medicine shows and clever advertising for quack remedies which frequently relied on habit-forming narcotics for success in curing practically everything.

By the early 1900's it was estimated that nearly a quarter of a million Americans were dope addicts. That's 1 out of every 400 citizens. And it was noted at that time that the greatest increases in addiction were occurring among women and teenagers. Teddy Roosevelt's determination helped put into law the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, and this was instrumental in eliminating patent medicines as a source of narcotics. But it wasn't until 1914 that Congress and the public were sufficiently aroused to push through the Harrison Act, which was delayed in its implementation for several years by World War I.

As early as 1919 the United States had some 50 city and State clinics in 40 locations to treat addicts on an outpatient or visiting basis. Though established with the most humane and worthy motives, they proved a complete failure. Clinics were a bonanza to addicts who apparently could name the dose and get it free or nearly so, and many of the patients were criminals with records. Others used the clinics as cheap sources for drugs that they transported and sold to addicts elsewhere. By mutual consent of the city, State, and Federal authorities involved, these clinics were discontinued in the mid-twenties on the basis of apparently overwhelming evidence. For instance, the number of addicted criminals admitted to Sing Sing prison skyrocketed 900 percent between 1920 and 1923. Since the clinic closed, the number of Federal prisoners who are addicts has declined slowly but steadily from a peak reached during the early twenties.

Strangely, during the era of the free clinics, narcotics peddling boomed. The quantity of illicit drugs seized in 1922 in New York State alone was equal to the total seized throughout the United States 30 years later. Small wonder that everyone involved in those days, including the American Medical Association, recommended the abolition of the clinics, and continues today to regard outpatient treatment of addicts with a jaundiced eye.

Armed with background information assembled from conversations with the former commissioner of police of one of our largest cities, and from reading a fair amount of literature on the subject, I was ready to interview the Commissioner of Narcotics, Henry L. Giordano.

I entered his office knowing that in a series of acts, Congress has given his Bureau both a tremendous responsibility and a vast authority in the devilish area of narcotics abuse. But, like the iceberg, eight-ninths of the narcotics problem was below the surface and invisible to a casual observer like me.

Henry Giordano was named Commissioner in August 1962, following 21 years service with the Bureau as agent, district supervisor, field supervisor, and assistant deputy commissioner. Today he's 49. He was barely 20 when he graduated from the University of California with his Ph. G. and began 7

years of practice as a registered pharmacist in San Francisco. During his outstanding career with the Bureau, he has also taken on special assignments with a congressional subcommittee on narcotics (as chief investigator), as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs in Geneva, and as our alternate representative to the U.N. Conference for the Adoption of a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. HENRY L. GIORDANO, COMMISSIONER OF THE BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

Mr. MARTIN. As a layman I feel that you are face to face with a formidable thing, a criminal cancer well worth trying to cut out of the body politic. Is that about right?

Mr. GIORDANO. Absolutely.

Mr. MARTIN. I'd like to begin by asking you about the difference between the American system and the English system of narcotics control. I understand that in England they have free clinics for addicts to get their daily shot; while in this country we discarded that system back in the twenties and are more inclined to grab the addicts and institutionalize them.

Mr. GIORDANO. The so-called British system has been discussed many times in this country—and tried as you mentioned—but there's really very little difference between the methods actually practiced today in England and those employed here. Dr. Granville W. Larimore and Dr. Henry Brill from New York State went over there to study British methods—one of them is the State deputy commissioner of health, the other the deputy commissioner of mental health. When they came back they said in effect that they could find very little difference between the control method used in England and here. Our regulations and our laws were predicated on the fact that when the Harrison Act was enacted in 1914 there were at least 200,000 addicts in the United States. That's what brought about our attempt to cope with the problem on a Federal basis.

Britain has never made a real census of drug addiction. For 3 years they've published figures, indicating that they had 350 addicts, 2 years ago 400, and the last year 500.

This seems unrealistic when not long ago they tried and convicted a doctor for selling drugs to hundreds of addicts among his "patients" alone. The only figures they have in the United Kingdom are when a doctor chooses to report them.

Mr. MARTIN. Five hundred seems a completely unrealistic figure to me. Just what is this British system?

Mr. GIORDANO. As far as we're concerned, there really isn't such a thing, even though everyone talks as if there is. The trouble is they seem to have ignored the problem, apparently have refused to acknowledge it. Now in British Hong Kong, where they have an accurate census, they admit having 200,000 to 250,000 addicts, and it's a serious, sizable problem. The British have a growing marijuana problem at home, too.

Mr. MARTIN. How do they treat addicts?

Mr. GIORDANO. My understanding is that in Hong Kong they use withdrawal such as we use. At our Federal hospitals in Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex., we don't use "sudden" withdrawal. Our two hospitals were built in the late 1920's to take care of Federal prisoners who were addicts. When they were established, an additional provision was made that any other addicts who wanted to apply for treatment could go there as long as there was room. As it works out, the hospitals take a lot of volunteers and their system of withdrawal involves transferring them from the drug they've been using to a synthetic drug which is then used to taper them off. The last stage of withdrawal is very mild.

Mr. MARTIN. When you say "drugs" you mean heroin in most cases, don't you?

Mr. GIORDANO. Yes, right now in the United States, 93 percent of the drug addicts use heroin. In talking about the narcotics problem, we usually mean heroin. When our Federal controls first went into effect nearly 50 years ago with the Harrison Act—although there had been some State laws before that—the estimate was that 1 out of every 400 in our country was addicted. Today it's 1 in 4,000.

Mr. MARTIN. That's a 90-percent drop. That's a drastic reduction in addiction. I thought the rate of our addiction was going up, not down.

Mr. GIORDANO. It won't seem dramatic when I tell you why. One of the main reasons for the decrease in addiction has been the passage of laws which make it possible for us to control the availability of narcotics and enforce this control.

Mr. MARTIN. You control the pusher rather than the users?

Mr. GIORDANO. Yes. Our effort is directed toward traffickers, the ones who sell it. If we can control and curtail the availability of the drug this will tend to decrease the addict problem. Other steps have to be taken, of course, such as treatment of the addict, but such measures are really in the health field. The Bureau of Narcotics responsibility is to keep the availability of the drugs to a minimum, because addiction is spread by addicts. One addict will spread it to another person who is susceptible.

Mr. MARTIN. It is not spread by traffickers then? I thought the peddlers were to blame.

Mr. GIORDANO. No, no, no. Not at all. The weakness of the proposal that the Government should supply doses for addicts, and thus destroy the business of the traffickers, lies in this little understood fact that it is addicts, not traffickers, who create most new addicts. That's why the free-dose method is a thing of the past in our Federal narcotics control work. One addict makes others.

Mr. MARTIN. Why should that be?

Mr. GIORDANO. We can't tell. But it appears that when a person whom the medical authorities describe as "susceptible to drug addiction" meets a person who is an addict, there's apparently a great urge to proselyte, to convert, to share the experience.

Mr. MARTIN. You mean, the addict can sense this weakness or kinship in another individual and gets some kind of a bang out of making a convert?

Mr. GIORDANO. As I said, we don't actually know for sure, but from the research that has been done among people who have become addicts, there's no question that they become addicted as a result of association with one or more persons who are already addicts—even though they had no idea of becoming addicts at the beginning of the association.

Mr. MARTIN. I couldn't have been more wrong in my thinking, and I'll bet most people are just as wrong. I thought most addicts were wooed by traffickers.

Mr. GIORDANO. I'm afraid you and quite a few others are dead wrong. That's why the availability of drugs is the key to our whole effort. An ad hoc panel prepared a progress report for the President as a guide to a White House Conference on Narcotics. The panel also studied the misuse of barbiturates and stimulants like Nembutal and Benzedrine. Barbiturates like Nembutal are sleeping pills and the panel in its study found that the abusive use of these substances is a growing problem, while the problem of narcotics was greatly improved because we have managed to make drugs like heroin less available. Because heroin is so much less available today than it was years ago, the panel found that by the time it reaches the street it has been cut to 3 to 5 percent, at most 6 percent, of the strength of the pure drug. In other words, it's adulterated way down with sugar or milk and the like.

Mr. MARTIN. Can an addict tell if it's been adulterated?

Mr. GIORDANO. To a varying degree, yes. Heroin is one drug which apparently can be adulterated more than others and still give the user some of the reaction he craves. However, we have also found that as a result of the extreme dilution practiced today, addicts coming into our hospitals for treatment suffer extremely mild withdrawals instead of the sweating, writhing agony that most people think they do. Few addicts experience the kind of classic withdrawal that those of 20 years ago had to suffer. The withdrawal symptoms today bear more resemblance to getting over a bad case of flu.

Mr. MARTIN. Tell me about some of the other drugs.

Mr. GIORDANO. When I talk about 93 percent of our drug addicts using heroin, I'm referring chiefly to those drugs to which people become addicted. These include morphine, demerol, and codeine. Cocaine is not a drug to which people become addicted. However, because it is subject to abuse like heroin and morphine it's included under the narcotics control bill. Since marijuana is not an addictive drug, it is under a separate control act. People acquire the habit for it, but when a person is taken off marijuana he doesn't suffer from withdrawal. Responsibility for administering the marijuana law is assigned to our Bureau because marijuana leads people on to the use of a stronger drug, generally heroin. Incidentally, while I'm at it, I'd like to clear up the confusion in the public's mind about our Bureau's basic responsibility: We are responsible for narcotics and marijuana only, we have no control over the use of pep-up pills and barbiturates. Those would come under the Food and Drug Act. By the same token, we are not involved in such things as glue sniffing or the use of hallucinatory drugs. My point is that much of what the public thinks is a narcotic drug problem falls into quite another category.

Mr. MARTIN. There used to be ether sniffing, too.

Mr. GIORDANO. Yes, but those things are drug-abuse problems, not narcotics. The use of barbiturates is being abused. The use of peyote which is similar in effect to L.S.D.—Indians use it in some of their tribal ceremonies—is an abuse of an hallucinatory drug, but it's not part of this Department's responsibility. That is one of the things that confuses people. There has been an improvement in our narcotics picture, but because other drugs are coming to the fore and are being written up in the newspapers or magazines, people think they are narcotics, too.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the use of marijuana destroy the user's ability to distinguish between right and wrong? Would he be more likely to commit a crime when using marijuana?

Mr. GIORDANO. That is a possibility. It varies with the individual, his background, emotional stability, drives, and other factors which we really know very little about. We have records of the most vicious crimes committed under the influence of marijuana, yet in some people it simply distorts time and space. Others have different reactions. As I said, there have been many vicious crimes committed under the influence of marijuana.

Mr. MARTIN. Why do so many heroin addicts turn to crime? Is it because of their need for money with which to purchase the drug?

Mr. GIORDANO. Some people have committed serious crimes under the influence of heroin, but generally heroin, which is deprived from opium, acts as a depressant. Again, heroin doesn't affect everyone the same way. However, it is an expensive habit, and its addicts suffer from a compulsion to get the money to sustain it anyway they can. Nevertheless, I want to make it clear that the majority of addicts, according to our own statistical evidence and that of many States such as California, have a prior criminal or

delinquency record before becoming addicts. So, while they engage in a criminal activity to get money by force to maintain their habit, it doesn't necessarily hold that this is the only reason they engage in criminal acts.

Mr. MARTIN. In other words, there's a likelihood they'd be criminals first and addicts second.

Mr. GIORDANO. Right. California ran a check on a study they made about a year or so ago. About 80 percent of the addicts treated under their new program had previous criminal or delinquency records. They were criminals before becoming addicts.

Mr. MARTIN. A former commissioner of police in a large eastern city told me that it's his belief that the stringent laws about the sale or pushing of narcotics—such penalties as 5 years for the first offense and many more years for a second offense—have had a tremendous influence in keeping down narcotics addiction. He has a point, I suppose.

Mr. GIORDANO. He has a point, but I don't think it's the largest single influence. Unless you have good enforcement to begin with, penalties can have no effect. I mean, if enforcement officers don't bring traffickers into court nothing will happen. But there is no question in my mind that the minimum penalties enacted in the Narcotics Control Act of 1956 have helped greatly in reducing the availability of drugs and, as a result, the number of traffickers. We know this is true because our undercover men have told us time after time about men formerly involved in the racket who told them, "Look, pal, get out of that business. There are easier ways to make a living." So it's fair to conclude that the heavier penalties have forced many of them into some other racket. On the other hand, a lot of misinformation has gotten out about the part played by our penalties. We have found that most people believe that the penalties are aimed at the addict. They're not. The penalty exists to punish the trafficker. I think this point is important.

If an addict happens to end up as a big trafficker, he should be responsible for his trafficking activity. As far as the addicts are concerned, we feel very strongly that attempts should be made to cure them, if possible. They should be hospitalized, then freed. This is one area where we have not really begun to solve our narcotics problem, although we know some of the guidelines that should be followed. While there are hospitals to treat addicts in certain areas, there are other areas in which there are none. As I've told you, we have Federal hospitals for this, but there is a need for more State and local hospital facilities to treat addicts. In New York, for instance, beds are set aside for withdrawal patients in hospitals, but they can be used for only very limited periods of time, and detoxification or gradual withdrawal may take a week or 2 weeks.

Mr. MARTIN. Do you really think that is long enough?

Mr. GIORDANO. It's long enough to get them off the drug, but that's not the real problem. The problem is after that, to keep them from getting back on it again. It's our followup that is lacking, and not much has been done about it. As a number of our foremost medical authorities have stated, the addict really needs at least 5 months, and may need as much as a year in an institution under close supervision, and then followup help for however long may be necessary after he's released. In some cases this may be for the rest of his life. This requires the same sort of trained staff as in social work of a parole type. When an addict comes out of a hospital, there should be someone there to help him get a job, to see that he doesn't fall back into the same environment. Some check on him every so often should be made to be sure he's not on drugs once more. And if he is, to see that he is put back into the hospital and detoxified all over again. It's a tremendous undertaking.

Mr. MARTIN. This is he nub of the whole question as I see it. What hope is there for narcotics control?

Mr. GIORDANO. There is sound hope. What we really need is a civil type of commitment, where addicts would be released on a straight, controlled period of perhaps 3 to 5 years. During this period they'd be checked on. If they need psychiatric treatment they'd be given that, and if they need some special training to help them get a job they'd be given that, too.

Mr. MARTIN. I should think having a job would be very important to them.

Mr. GIORDANO. Very. It's extremely difficult for them to get jobs if anybody knows they've been addicts. There is a great need for this kind of work. And while there are agencies in existence right now that could help, there really hasn't been such a program established anywhere, except in California. There should be a general program in every State. We in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics feel that this is primarily a State responsibility, possibly with Federal support, if and as needed. But at present, although California has such a followup program and New York is starting one, the rehabilitation aspects of narcotics cure are still in a sort of vacuum.

Mr. MARTIN. You make a strong case for the States taking over the rehabilitation problem.

Mr. GIORDANO. But first of all we must control the amount of drugs available in this country, so that they are not easily available to susceptible individuals.

Mr. MARTIN. That must mean stopping the stuff at the border?

Mr. GIORDANO. Yes. But it's very difficult stopping it at the border without prior information.

Mr. MARTIN. Then you need agents abroad?

Mr. GIORDANO. Exactly. For instance, we have a headquarters office in Rome. We also have offices in Paris, Marseilles, Istanbul, Beirut, Bangkok, Singapore, Mexico City, and Monterrey. The Bureau of Customs also operates in Hong Kong, and we work very closely with Customs. Our men abroad are constantly gathering information and funneling it here to help us make seizures at the borders and seaports. Our efforts to stop the importation of drugs into the United States are based on trying to stop their export at the source, so we work with foreign police and undercover. After locating growers and international traffickers, we have helped many local foreign police departments make some huge seizures.

Mr. MARTIN. Do any narcotics come in legally?

Mr. GIORDANO. None except what we authorize for our own medical needs. That is a very small proportion that we manage by import and export certificates so that we can know exactly what's supposed to come in. The only two drugs legally permitted to be imported are raw opium and coca leaf.

Mr. MARTIN. Coca leaf?

Mr. GIORDANO. We get cocaine from it.

Mr. MARTIN. Are certificates for importation issued by the Pure Food and Drug Department?

Mr. GIORDANO. No, by us. This is another reason why our efforts have been so effective. One Bureau handles all the controls on narcotics; it's not split up among different agencies. We handle the legal controls and regulate the legitimate flow of drugs for medical purposes, at the same time keeping our finger on where each and every grain comes through legally. This system eliminates the opportunity for illicit diversion.

Mr. MARTIN. I've been told that the Communists are trying to flood our country with narcotics to weaken our moral and physical stamina. Is that true?

Mr. GIORDANO. As far as the drugs coming out of the Far East are concerned, it's true. There's a terrific flow of drugs coming out of the Yunnan Province of China. That's one of the reasons we put an office in Bangkok. There's no question that in that particular area this is the aim of the Red Chinese. It should be apparent that if you could addict a population you would degrade a nation's moral fiber. Also, if they're able to sell drugs to us, they're going to get dollars back, and that kind of drain can weaken us financially, too.

Mr. MARTIN. So, it's not so fantastic then?

Mr. GIORDANO. Oh, no. Absolutely not.

Mr. MARTIN. I suppose there's a third use for Chinese narcotics. If there's a war they can hop up their soldiers so they'll come screaming over the field of battle. I've been told by some of our Korean veterans that the North Koreans were often hopped up to their eyeballs when they attacked our lines.

Mr. GIORDANO. I have no personal knowledge of this, but I do know they used it in another way. They saw to it that drugs were smuggled in to the South Korean civilian population to undermine the morale of the South Koreans.

Mr. MARTIN. What substance is there to stories that there's a crime syndicate that profits on drug pushing, among other rackets?

Mr. GIORDANO. Criminal syndicates do traffic in drugs as a part of the whole picture of organized crime. Many of the top echelons of the crime world engage in narcotics traffic.

Mr. MARTIN. It's pretty generally believed that the racketeer types prey upon high school kids primarily because they can create future customers that way. From what you say, that's not the story at all.

Mr. GIORDANO. We come right back to what I told you earlier. It's not the seller who creates the addicts, it's the addicts who convert other addicts through association. If you talked to a doctor about this, he would employ such terms as "susceptible individuals," "environment," and "low willpower threshold." First you have a person who is a "susceptible individual." Then you have an environment that makes addiction not only an accepted thing, but easy. Then you have the drug. When all of these elements come together, the situation is ripe for a person to become addicted. One of the physicians in our Lexington, Ky., hospital made the statement from his study that he felt that one addict is usually responsible for converting four more people to addiction. If that one addict had enough drugs for himself and was able to furnish the others with drugs, this would happen, but if he doesn't have enough for himself—and here is why availability is so important—he can't very well "hook" new addicts.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the source of most of our illegal narcotics?

Mr. GIORDANO. I've mentioned that herion is derived from opium. It comes into the United States from three sources: Two major ones and a third that isn't of much consequence except in the southwest. Most of our narcotics come from Europe and the Near East. Opium comes out of Turkey. Turkey is one of the world's legitimate producers, but in that area there's a certain amount of illegal diversion going on, so that instead of selling it to the Turkish Government, the producer sells it to the trafficker. The opium that is diverted then usually moves on into France. Along the way it's processed from raw opium and a morphine base to heroin. Then it comes into the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. It sounds almost as if the drug supply flows through a regular channel or funnel.

Mr. GIORDANO. The problem is that the channel or funnel shifts constantly. One year it's in Syria, another time in France. Sometimes it comes here directly, or it may

come via Mexico or Canada. Canada has a drug addiction problem that almost parallels that of the United States, though their percentage is about 1 in 5,000.

Mr. MARTIN. It seems as if dope is being routed by some pretty slippery characters.

Mr. GIORDANO. It is. We also have dope coming in from the Far East out of the Yunnan Province by way of Burma, Thailand, or down into Singapore and Hong Kong, each of which has a bad addiction problem of its own. To add to our troubles some cultivation of opium is done in Mexico. Heroin from this crop appears generally in our Southwest, but it's only a small portion of the total. However, most of the marijuana used in the United States comes from Mexico.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Mexican marijuano have more wallop?

Mr. GIORDANO. I don't know but that's where most of ours comes from. Local law enforcement has been very good about spotting and eradicating backlot marijuana in this country so the traffickers have had to go elsewhere.

Mr. MARTIN. Is our drug addiction spread evenly over the whole country?

Mr. GIORDANO. Narcotics addiction is generally a big-city problem. Over 80 percent of the U.S. addicts are concentrated in four States. New York has 46.4 percent of the country's addicts, and most of them live in New York City. California has 15.6 percent, mostly in Los Angeles. Illinois accounts for 14.8 percent, practically all in Chicago. The other drug center is Michigan with 3.8 percent, most of it centering in Detroit.

Mr. MARTIN. What accounts for the high percentage of addicts in cities?

Mr. GIORDANO. There are the obvious social and environmental factors that come into play in crowded cities, plus the fact that money is easier for an addict to get in big cities. Certainly if narcotics are going to be available, they're going to be in the major metropolitan areas. This big-city concentration is very helpful to us. It has made it possible for us to close 32 offices in the field in the past 10 years and shift the men to other areas where they are needed. It is obvious why New York City leads the rest of the country. It has all the needed factors and in addition is one of the Nation's major seaports. And Chicago is on the direct line of transit.

Mr. MARTIN. How many known addicts are there?

Mr. GIORDANO. In December 1962, there were some 47,489 active addicts reported, which is where we get the 1-in-4,000 figure. Even more significant is how many new addicts are being won over annually to drug use. If there's a reduction in new addicts, it means that each year we're going to have a lower percentage of addicts in our population, and that's exactly what is happening.

Mr. MARTIN. So far we've talked about the past and the present. What hope do we have for narcotics control in the future?

Mr. GIORDANO. The areas for better control are clearly marked out. One is the critical area of treating addicts and in following up their cure to make sure it's a lasting one. That's a rehabilitation problem. Second, we're working on expanding our oversea staff. Third, we have a training school with a 2-week course in which we train any State and local police officer who wishes to attend. We assume the cost of the training, but food, lodging, and transportation are paid for by the State or community. Since the school started in 1956, we've trained over 1,000 enforcement officers, and naturally their increased knowledge on the narcotics problem has helped. Most people don't know about this school, or about how the rate of addiction has dropped. Nor are they aware of the effectiveness of our oversea staff. Such accomplishments don't make shocking and sensational news stories. Also, it appears that some newswriters are sent out with instructions on how to report, or on how we need a whole new approach to the narcotics problem, instead of showing what has been accomplished.

Mr. MARTIN. I've read sensational articles about how horrible the whole thing is, but you make me think there is hope for the future because we've made so much solid progress up to now.

Mr. GIORDANO. I'm glad if I have, but on the other hand, I don't want you to get the impression that the battle is won. Far from it. We're still fighting, still trying to exert more and more pressure, and we'll go on fighting and exerting increased pressure to reduce that 1 addict in 4,000 to ever lower percentages.

State Senator Dorsey B. Hardeman's Tribute to Our Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a great many moving tributes have been paid our beloved late President; I believe the record would be incomplete, however, if the tribute paid by State Senator Dorsey B. Hardeman at the Park Heights Baptist Church on November 25, 1963, were not included.

Senator Hardeman has served long and ably in the Texas Senate and has distinguished himself to all Texans by his devotion to duty and steadfastness of purpose.

I offer for the consideration of our colleagues the remarks of Senator Hardeman:

In this trying hour, we are assembled to pay our tribute of respect to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy—American.

Words at my command are wholly inadequate. The lurid scenes of last Friday in Dallas need not be repeated. The tragedy, and its accompanying grief, have reached the flaming ramparts of the world.

Of President Kennedy's death it may be appropriately said that he has passed—

"Out of the strain of the doing
Into the peace of the done,
Out of the thirst of pursuing
Into the rapture of won."

Fulsome flattery would be distasteful to him, yet some broken sentences of veneration and love may be indulged to the sorrow which oppresses us.

Our late President, struck down in the maturity of his powers and his fame, with marked accomplishments and unmeasured opportunities for additional achievements apparently awaiting him, with great designs uncompleted, surrounded by the proud and affectionate solicitude of a great constituency, succumbed to the assassin's lethal messenger, which beckoned him to depart. His sun went down at noon, but it sank amid the prophetic splendors of an eternal dawn.

President Kennedy expressed the creed of patriots in the immortal words, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

No mortal has more to give for his country, and for the cause of freedom, than life itself. That, he gave. President Kennedy belonged to a breed of strong and resolute men to whom history has only been willing to entrust the care of freedom, and to which he was so valiantly dedicated.

I cannot attempt to grasp and sum up the aggregate of the service of his public life at such a moment as this; it is needless. His life requires no moralization. It conveys its own lesson. That we shall all cherish his memory there can be no doubt. May his death be the prelude of an America united, and let us treasure, even more, the compact which his faith made with the God of his fathers and with his allegiance to right and peace as he understood it.

As the gigantic figure that envelops men within the folds of his dark mantle, and even with the robe drawn about him, President Kennedy seems so unshrouded that—

"Nothing can cover his high fame but heaven;
No pyramids set off his memories
But the eternal substance of his greatness;
To which I leave him."

But midst the sadness of this dark and tragic event, with the sounds and emblems of mourning encircling the earth, there is assurance. We can feel secure, and confident for the future, as the leadership of our country passes into the capable and experienced hands of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

This occasion is our opportunity to offer our firm support and friendship to and for our President, as he moves to the monumental task awaiting him. He has my profound sympathy and he will continue to have my earnest support in all his efforts for the welfare and glory of our beloved country.

His legislative, diplomatic, political, and native abilities have provided him with the experience and valuable knowledge peculiar to the office of President, gained from his close association with Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and as the right arm of President Kennedy available in no other man on the American scene, to lead America in the enjoyment of her free institutions and to the full fruition of our ideals.

President Johnson, as he has solemnly requested, needs the help of God and the support and prayers of all Americans in the discharge of the tremendous burdens now devolving upon him. He asks no more; he deserves no less.

As this contribution to the service of respect for the slain John F. Kennedy, a victim of hate, is concluded, there comes to mind the words of the Master, himself a victim of hate, who declared, "They hated me without a cause" (John 15: 25).

Let us, therefore, in this hour of travail, find fresh bonds of brotherhood and of union in the treasured memory of our fallen leader and attempt to assuage the bitterness which too often marks unavoidable differences of opinion; let us resolve to banish from our midst the cruel hatred that is visited upon mankind through prejudice and bigotry.

Under the dynamic leadership of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson—American, Texan—let us go forward in unity for the greatness of America and the glory of God.

Coast and Geodetic Survey Publishes Navigation Charts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey is

one of our smaller agencies of Government, but its work has been of paramount importance to the economic well-being and security of our country. Headed by Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, it has been very active in such fields as oceanography, seismology, photogrammetry, geomagnetism, cartography, and gravimetry. The Nation's oldest scientific body, its ranks include some of the world's most distinguished scientists and technicians.

For many years this agency of the Department of Commerce has produced the country's finest nautical and aeronautical charts, 30 million in 1963 alone, which have guided the Nation's air and sea commerce. Recently, the Coast and Geodetic Survey came up with an innovation in its smallcraft chart which has been a great boon to the Nation's 9 million pleasure craft owners. Its folded, bellowslike arrangement makes it easier to handle in cramped ships' quarters, while still permitting the same scale in many instances as that used in the larger, more conventional charts.

Recognition of this effort is provided in an informative article written by Jack Wolliston, boating editor of the United Press International. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Wolliston's article:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY PUBLISHES NAVIGATION CHARTS

The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey has just announced publication of new editions of a number of nautical charts, bringing to mind that this little-publicized branch of the Federal Government is one of pleasure boating's greatest aids.

Anyone finding himself in strange waters is certain to find great comfort in the Survey's charts, which provide depths and directions and warn of dangerous waters.

In recent years, the Survey has begun publishing small craft charts which are a boon to the boatman whose space aboard is limited.

The charts fold out in a bellows arrangement which makes for easy handling but permits the same scale in many instances as used on the larger charts.

The small craft charts additionally contain such helpful information as locations of repair yards and supply houses in the area they cover.

They also include illustrations of whistle and fog signals, storm warning signals, rules of the road, and other helpful information.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey was the first technical bureau in the Federal Government, having been set up by an 1807 law which authorized a survey of the coast.

The cost of conducting all the soundings and other laborious work necessary to compiling the charts is borne by the Government.

In making these charts available to the boating public, the sale price now—as it was 150 years ago—is only as high as necessary to cover paper and printing costs.

This usually ranges between $1 and $2, sometimes less, depending on the size of the chart.

One of the new editions just published by the Survey is chart 303 covering the area from West Quoddy Head to Cross Island, Maine.

In describing chart 303, the Survey says:

"The charted relief provides a guide through an area known for its rocky shore, changeable weather, and strong tidal currents.

"Rough seas often build up quickly when wind and current oppose each other. Caution must be exercised, both along the coast and in coves and bays, for ledges rising abruptly from deep water and boulders lying singly or in clusters on a less undulating bottom.

"Chart 303 portrays the rocky coast and the lurking dangers on the ocean bottom in conventional chart colors with land areas printed in buff and dangerous water accentuated in blue tint from the shoreline to the 18-foot depth curve."

Other recent new editions are small craft charts 841–SC and 843–SC covering the Intracoastal Waterway from St. Simons Sound, Ga., to Eau Gallie, Fla.

A Long Walk in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute before this honorable body to a man who has served nearly half a century in the judicial system of the State of Michigan. His career has been one filled with resplendent accomplishments in the field of law. As he raps his gavel for the last time as a member of the State's supreme court, he leaves behind a judicial record which manifests his dedication to the service of his State and fellow citizens.

Recently, an editorial appeared in the Detroit News which I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress:

A LONG WALK IN HISTORY

The biggest member of the State's supreme court has rapped his gavel for the last time. Chief Justice Leland J. Carr, who is stepping down after spending nearly half a century on the bench, outdoes his colleagues in age, experience, and size.

Judge Carr's 80 years wind their way through Michigan's history.

He was assistant attorney general of Michigan before the First World War and had a career as a teacher and public official before he was named Ingram County circuit judge in 1921.

In 24 years as circuit judge he was known for the few reversals of his decisions by the supreme court and as the headmaster of an informal school for hundreds of studying lawyers that kept the lights burning late in the courthouse jury room.

Judge Carr was the one-man grand jury in the 1940's that brought indictments against a cellblock full of bribetaking State officials. He picked the colorful Kim Sigler as his prosecutor and Sigler went on to be Governor.

"The truth-seeking Goliath * * * a Gibralter of a man." These were the descriptions of Judge Carr in the 1940's.

But the venerable judge had yet another career in him. He was promoted to the State supreme court in 1945 and during the next 18 years was three times chief justice, the State's highest judicial office.

Lansing has come to know Judge Carr as a slightly rumpled giant, a 250-pound, stooped 6-foot-3 man, who slowly walked up the capitol drive from his nearby home. He greeted friendly "helloes" with a bemused smile and kept on going.

He has walked that way, slowly but surely, through half a century of Michigan's history.

Supreme Court's Decision on Bible Reading in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months I have received an overwhelming number of letters from my constituents expressing their objection to the Supreme Court's decision to ban the reading of the Bible and repeating the Lord's Prayer in our public schools. One such letter which impressed me particularly was from Mrs. Miriam Fabian, librarian, Fairview High School, Dayton, Ohio. In order that all may have an opportunity to read this, under unanimous consent I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The recent tragic events in Dallas placed our school in a perplexing dilemma. The Supreme Court says: No prayers, no readings from the Bible. Blunt, terrible words, unbelievable command.

How do you convince students and faculty that in sudden disaster such as the President's assassination there is no higher power to which they may turn for trust, consolation, relief?

It is ironic that in a nation where practically all the leaders of the world urged their people to turn to prayer that one atheist and her son should slam that prayer door in the face of millions. It simply does not make sense.

For years here at Fairview we have included prayers, readings, music, as part of our brief morning opening exercises. These prayers have included petitions for Pope John during his illness, for President Eisenhower when he had his heart attack, for the United Nations when Dag Hammarskold was killed, for our Presidents when they took their oath of office, for our country during times of peace and during times of conflict and unrest, for members of our student body who have lost a loved one; for our school—and yet, when the United States faced its most tragic and upsetting event in recent years we are forced to ignore the natural outpouring of our dismay and petitions simply because we happened to be in a building called a school when the tragedy struck on November 22.

I say, for shame, that leaders of our Government ignore the wishes of the many for the cry of discrimination of one family. What of the discrimination against those who need prayer? We are not so naive as to believe that there were not other powerful forces at work behind Mrs. Murray's case, but we do contend that no court—no Congress should squelch the freedom of countless people who try to teach respect for country, for our flag, for respect for the religions of the world.

I concur that no sect nor religion should be used as a means of persuasion to change one's belief. But I heartily endorse Arthur Fleming's assertion that it is the duty of school leaders to teach about religion if our next generation is to have a greater amount of tolerance than our generation has shown.

Please throw your weight for an amendment to permit prayer or scripture in schools if desired.

Sincerely,

MRS. MIRIAM FABIAN,
Librarian, Fairview High School.

Slandering Congress Is Slandering Our System of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most widely played indoor game in the United States is that of slandering the Congress. It is not a new game. It has been played with great fervor and spirit ever since we became a nation.

Usually, but not always, the tide of slander arises because Congress has refused to act as a rubberstamp for a popular President.

The torrent of abuse that is being poured out against the Congress today is not unprecedented, but it is serious and it is growing in its intensity. Newspaper cartoonists delight in picturing Members of the legislative branch either as egocentric clowns or as mindless sluggards. National columnists, ridicule the Congress unmercifully because we do not throw our doubts and our convictions out the window and vote instantly for measures of which the columnists personally approve. Since most newspapermen are somewhat more liberal in their politics than the average American, their scorn usually falls heaviest on legislators whom they consider to be conservative.

There is a dangerous tendency to judge a Congress merely by the amount of legislation it passes. Too many commentators are interested in quantity, not quality. If a Congress refuses to pass a flock of laws, regardless of their merit, it is inevitably tagged with the "do nothing" label, and the inference is that its leaders are weaklings and its Members timewasters.

Such people confuse progress with mere motion. When a man spins around in a revolving door, Mr. Speaker, he is not making progress. Neither is he making progress when he falls down a flight of stairs.

Because we have moved with deliberation in areas of enormous importance to the Nation and to the free world we have been accused of weakness. Our procedures have been a sign, not of weakness, but of strength. The Congress is a continuing body with roots sunk deep in every corner of the land. The Members of Congress collectively know far better than anyone else what the people of the country think and what they want and what they are saying. It is my considered opinion that the average American citizen is less liberal in his thinking than most of the columnists and commentators would like him to be. And I am absolutely certain that the average American citizen does not want his Congress to plunge the Nation swiftly into vast and continuing programs as a result of hysterical snap decisions made at the behest of the executive branch.

As we all know, our Government was founded on a system of checks and balances. The executive branch sometimes acts as a check on the impulsiveness of the legislative branch, and vice versa. During the past 2 years the 88th Congress has been a wholesome and restraining influence upon Executive exuberance.

By acting with thoughtful deliberation we are making certain that human rights are being preserved; that property is being properly protected, and that individual liberty is not being imperiled by expediency.

Over the centuries, Congress has built a structure of laws upon a foundation of precedence. Because we have built this structure with thoughtful deliberation, it is the soundest legislative structure in the world today.

Our critics, Mr. Speaker, make the claim that our refusal to act impulsively is proof that our legislative processes are not efficient. Although I deny the allegation, I also maintain that bloodless efficiency is not the sole aim, or even the principal aim, of Government. A representative democracy, such as ours, is not nearly as efficient according to your definition of efficient, as a Fascist or a Communist despotism, where the merest whims of the dictator have the iron effect of law. But who would exchange the comparatively inefficient freedom of this land of ours for the prisonlike efficiency of the slave state?

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the value of a Congress should not be measured merely by the number of bills it passes. In many cases, as we all know, it takes harder work and a great deal more courage to resist legislation than it does to ride complacently with the tide. It also takes courage to insist upon the thoughtful shaping and refinement of legislation so that it will achieve the maximum good for the maximum number of people, when the strident voices of the propagandists are demanding that we pass it instantly, without debate or deliberation. It takes courage, in short, "to keep one's head when all about are losing theirs, and blaming it on you."

This is not the spectacular brand of courage, but it is something immensely valuable to the Nation. It is the brand of courage that the 88th Congress has exhibited in abundance.

The fact that we have been able to do so, Mr. Speaker, is a tribute to your own firm and understanding leadership.

I am proud of being a Member of the 88th Congress and I deeply resent the libels and slanders that the irresponsible propagandists for instant legislation have been throwing at us.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to know that there is a growing segment of the Nation's press that is beginning to appreciate the value of the 88th Congress. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD two recent examples of such constructive thinking:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 3, 1964]

IN DEFENSE OF CONGRESS

Barely 30 hours before the end of the old year, Congress adjourned—if that's what you can call it. It might be more correct to say that Congress has recessed, since the 1st session of the 88th Congress set a peacetime longevity record and allowed only 8 days of vacation for the legislators before the 2d session is called to order January 7.

There has been a tremendous amount of criticism leveled against Congress lately for being slow and failing to enact legislation. Most of this criticism is unfair.

Americans for Democratic Action refers to Congress as the "iceberg on Capitol Hill," charging that it is run by a "reactionary-conservative" coalition. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP says Negroes are "disenchanted" with the whole legislative process.

Walter Lippmann, in a recent column, goes so far as to charge that the "88th Congress has been paralyzed by * * * a conspiracy to suspend representative government." He adds, referring to efforts by Congress to prohibit credit guarantees for sale of wheat to Red nations, that the legislative branch has been attempting to usurp the President's constitutional power to conduct our foreign relations."

Such charges are not altogether valid. With respect to the wheat deal, as one of our readers pointed out in a letter on this page Wednesday, article I, section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." How can Congress be engaged in "a conspiracy to suspend representative government" when it is essentially the most representative branch of government?

Congress is closer to the people than the President or the Court can ever be.

The fact that Congress has refused to grant certain Presidential requests or failed to act on others does not mean that we have a "do-nothing" Congress, as frequently charged. It might, and often does, mean that Congress thinks some of these requests are not in the best interest of the Nation. Or it might mean simply there have been too many requests.

Every year the President asks more of Congress, and in the last session the administration kept coming back with the same requests for second and third tries after initial attempts to win congressional approval failed.

Most of the people who attack the congressional seniority system, the power of committees and the rules of Congress have been extremely hypocritical.

When seniority, committee power, and the rules are used to promote liberal legislation, the liberal critics are not loud with their complaints. They make noise usually when these factors work against legislation they would like to have passed.

One thing is sure: The next session will be shorter. Though the number of requests in the President's program may be greater than ever before—with a civil rights bill and tax cut proposals left over, plus a revival of medicare and other issues to come up—Congressmen from both parties, both liberals and conservatives, will be anxious to adjourn early to go home for the primaries, the conventions and the politicking for next November.

CONGRESS AND THE AID PROGRAM—PASSMAN'S BATTLES BELIEVED REFLECTIONS OF PUBLIC REACTION TO WASTE SPENDING

(By Richard Wilson)

OTTO ERNEST PASSMAN, 63, is a Congressman from Louisiana. Annually, Mr. PASSMAN gets into a fight with the White House over spending for foreign aid. He is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which handles this troublesome item.

It is usually said that Mr. PASSMAN is trying to superimpose his judgment on that of four Presidents of the United States and any number of other outstanding personalities. This devastating remark is supposed to crush Mr. PASSMAN and hold him up to public

scorn as the wrecker of the foreign aid program.

The truth seems to be, however, that Mr. PASSMAN knows more about the foreign aid program than any President has had an opportunity to know for the simple reason that he has studied it longer and in more detail.

He has handled the foreign aid appropriation for 9 consecutive years. Mr. PASSMAN is not a liberal; he is a conventional Louisianian, but with a flair for rather rakish attire and an endless patience in coping with one of the really big practical problems of modern government.

It is only a slight exaggeration to say that officials of the foreign aid program would much prefer it if neither Congress nor the public knew much about its activities, except the puff stories on its great achievements which are not inconsiderable.

The official attitude about foreign aid is that it is an instrument of foreign policy used by the President under his constitutional authority to direct this policy. What flows from that conception is that Congress should not, indeed cannot under the Constitution, interfere.

This is an impractical concept, which Mr. PASSMAN annually demonstrates to be faulty. However, much of what is done under the foreign aid program is hidden from the public. There was a time when it was a secret how the money was divided up between various countries. Even now the secrecy label is so widely used that "it looks like a ticker tape parade when you see us lifting secret and classified stuff in the hearings."

Every now and then a little something leaks out, like Lebanese bulls with nine stalls apiece or extra wives for Kenyan Government officials, or air-conditioned Cadillacs for Middle Eastern potentates. A suffering public has become more or less conditioned to this kind of thing and would not abandon foreign aid for this alone. Nor is it likely that the public as a whole would end all foreign aid, however much annoyed it may become over waste and incomprehensible spending abroad when there is so much that needs improvement in this country.

But it is clear that a majority in Congress believes that the country wants to go slower on foreign aid, be more selective, be more certain that definite policy aims are being pursued toward a useful conclusion.

Every year for 9 years the clamor has come from the White House and the Department of State that any cutback will wreck our foreign policy. And any time there is a cut our foreign policy never seems to be demonstrably better or worse off.

A few facts are usful in this connection. In the last 8 years Congress has reduced the White House budget requests by more than $6.5 billion. Yet every year more money was appropriated than foreign aid officials could use. The so-called pipeline funds from past years which are committed to continuing projects now amount to more than $7 billion. Foreign aid could go on for several years without another penny of appropriation.

It is not uncommon for officials to make huge allocations of their funds in the last 2 or 3 days of a fiscal year so that they won't have any uncommitted money left, and can claim they are emptyhanded in meeting the world's challenges.

Last year the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Department all said our foreign policy was being wrecked by a billion-dollar cut. Yet these agencies finished the fiscal year with a total of $744 million of unobligated funds on their hands.

Basically, the facts do not support any contention that Congress has either wrecked the foreign aid program or really harmed it. Nor does the contention hold water any longer that the Russians are rushing in where we pull out. The Russians have had their own serious problems with foreign aid.

This appears to be one case where instinctive public reactions are right; that we have been spending too much on foreign aid and not getting enough out of it.

CIA Needs Watchdog Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, day by day the evidence mounts that a congressional watchdog committee on the Central Intelligence Agency is needed; and day by day public support grows for the creation of such a committee.

Created as a central agency to gather and analyze intelligence information, the CIA has, all too often, been guilty of formulating foreign policy.

Recently, former President Truman, under whom the CIA was first organized, expressed his belief that the CIA had strayed off course and should be made to adhere to the original purpose for which it was created.

I could not agree more. For the reasons set forth by President Truman and other constructive critics of the CIA, I have introduced legislation into every Congress since 1953 calling for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on the CIA.

My bill, House Concurrent Resolution 2, currently is pending before the House Rules Committee. I urge my colleagues on that committee to consider this resolution and companion bills as soon as possible.

Further, under permission granted, I include an editorial from the January 4 issue of the Milwaukee Journal calling on Congress to approve a committee such as that proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 2.

TRUMAN: CIA OFF TRACK

Former President Truman has added his doubts to many others about the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency. And he speaks with authority, for the CIA was organized during his presidency to serve the needs of his office.

As organized, Truman says, the CIA was to bring together intelligence information available to all branches of Government, valuate and interpret it for the President. It was never meant, Truman says, to "be injected into peacetime cloak and dagger operations." It was never meant to make policy.

CIA activities have frequently been embarrassing to this country in the last decade. In numerous instances the Agency actually has worked counter to our foreign policy. Certainly we need no agency to work to subvert foreign governments—yet the record indicates that the CIA has done that very thing.

Truman is quick to acknowledge the patriotism and the dedication of CIA officials. He just thinks they have been off the track. The Agency, he says, should return to its basic job of gathering and assessing intelligence for the use of the policymakers.

In connection with this, the proposal that the CIA be audited by a special committee of Congress, just as the Atomic Energy Commission is, deserves congressional approval. The CIA is too much a law unto itself. For its own good, and the country's, it should be curbed and put under constant check.

No Compromise on Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following Chicago Daily News editorial of January 13, which briefly but concisely analyzes the background of the Panama crisis and recommends a firm stand by the United States:

NO COMPROMISE ON CANAL

Facing the first international crisis of his administration, President Johnson was understandably eager to fill the role of peacemaker in Panama. We have some qualms, however, that his eagerness led him to concessions he may regret.

It was essential to seek an end to violence and bloodshed. It was also essential to deal with the political overtones that quickly came to the fore. But neither howling mobs nor demagogic politicians are likely to be deterred by weakness, and in Panama the United States has exhibited more weakness than strength.

Why should we adopt an almost apologetic attitude either in the United Nations or in the Organization of American States for trying to protect Americans from Panamanian attack? Nothing more than self-defense was involved, and the loss of American lives and the extensive destruction of U.S. property are ample evidence that we were more timid in exercising that right than the circumstances justified.

The mobs that stormed the U.S.-controlled Canal Zone were organized too well and too quickly to qualify as an accident. The Government of Panama has aroused the people against Americans in the Canal Zone year after year, for its own political benefit, and this is its harvest. There is good reason to believe that Castro-Communists joined the attacks, if they did not help instigate them in the first place.

Panama's quick break in diplomatic relations, and the immediate demand for control of the canal, seemed well rehearsed. And, as might have been predicted, the Soviet bloc plus the anti-American claque in the Latin republics joined in the howls against American "imperialism."

It is clearly true that the history of the Panama Canal is somewhat checkered, and that conditions have changed since the United States engineered both the canal and the creation of the Republic of Panama. But it is also true that in recent years the United States has made many concessions to appease the Panamanians.

If there are other negotiable grievances, they can be settled around the conference table when things quiet down again. But nothing should be conceded in an atmosphere of bloodshed and blackmail, for to do so is to invite more of the same not only in Panama but elsewhere.

In particular, U.S. ownership and control of the Panama Canal must not be regarded as negotiable. If it takes a show of strength to shut off the threats to the canal, let strength be shown. That, at least, is something everybody understands—and it is more likely to win respect than a willingness to be everybody's doormat.

Studebaker Helps Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian press reports on the first Canadian Studebakers shipped to United States, although South Bend factory abandoned by Studebaker Corp. as a car-production plant has a 3-month supply of unsold cars, the Studebaker Corp. has started its raid on the American car market by shipping its first truckloads of Canadian built cars into Pennsylvania, New York, New Hampshire, Chicago, and Dallas.

I believe the policy of shipping products into the United States without country of origin markings makes it possible for Studebaker to comingle new Canadian with old stock American cars and pawn the whole lot onto unsuspecting U.S. buyers who may or may not want to buy a foreign make car.

The Hamilton plant in Canada was shut down this week to allow for setting up new production levies and to bring in some of the latest machinery from the abandoned U.S. South Bend plants.

Studebaker plans to cut down its dealers from 1,900 to about 1,100 in the United States. Some dealers dropped their franchises when Studebaker announced its U.S. shutdown in favor of cheaper production in Canada.

Every labor dollar paid for our imported Studebaker is that much less for the U.S., doctor, lawyer, farmer, candlestick maker, and tax collector. Carried to its ultimate the trade policy of exporting jobs and dollars and importing unemployment and surplus will nail the coffin lid so tight on our economy that the only thing left to do will be to hold the formal funeral.

Headlines in Canadian newspapers proclaim the "buoyant growth of Canada's economy" which is heralded as growing faster than the United States.

These are the figures released by Canada, January 11:

Canada's industrial production crashed through the 200 percent level in late 1963, the first time in its history. By contrast the U.S. output for the last 6 months dropped down to a dangerously low 1-percent increase.

Employment in Canada had its greatest gain in its recorded history of labor statistics. New jobs totaled 235,000 or a gain of 3.8 percent as compared to 1.8 percent last year. U.S. employed gained only 1.3 percent.

Canadian unemployment dropped from 5.8 to 5.1 percent while United States gained from 5.8 to 5.9 percent in the same period.

Canadian pressures are being applied on American corporations with Canadian subsidiaries to produce more in Canada while compensating tariff increases are promised to all Canadian producers who gain a 20-percent share of the Canadian market.

This follows the Mexican plan which I warned about 4 years ago and which has reached the stage of being virtually an embargo on all competitive goods imported into Mexico.

The basic economic need in this country is an honest appraisal of our trade agreements before the Geneva stripping party gets into full swing.

Trade must be measured by manhours and commonsense rather than by dollars and cents.

I am convinced that if we applied the American foreign trade policy to our internal economy we would have the greatest dollar prosperity and the most disastrous personal poverty in this Nation's history.

No nation can survive buying products from its runaway industries, selling subsidized production below cost while paying premiums to industry by way of tax credits to automate production which already is in excess of our needs, producing as its main production, unemployment while running itself out of gold reserve chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the attached two Canadian source stories on Studebaker and the Canadian growth worthy of attention.

One of the unmentioned items in the Studebaker tale of woe is the answer to this question: "How much of the so-called $40 million loss in the last 5 years was siphoned from U.S. income by Studebaker to modernize, equip, and develop the Canadian plant, train workers, and market these Canadian-made cars?

If fresh capital was put into Canada then it is entirely possible that this capital could have modernized the South Bend plant and kept it competitive.

The articles follow:

CANADA'S BUOYANT ECONOMY HUSTLES FASTER THAN UNITED STATES

(By Dalton Robertson)

To judge by developments in production and employment, the Canadian economy is moving into 1964 with more forward thrust than U.S. business.

Canada's industrial production turned in three major advances in succession after a dip in July. By November, after a 1.2 percent rise in October, a 1.4 percent jump in September and a 1.2 percent gain in August, the national index of output where 1949 equals 100 crashed through the 200 level for the first time.

By contrast: U.S. output, which rose rapidly in the first half of 1963, only inched up 1 percent during the fall after its summer break.

Employment in Canada last year made its largest annual gain since the Bureau of Statistics first began to collect monthly statistics a decade ago. The rise in jobholders was 235,000 or 3.8 percent in 1963. In 1962, the gain was 1.8 percent (see page 8).

By contrast: The 1963 rise in U.S. employment, while bigger than a year earlier, was only 1.3 percent.

The faster pace of Canadian business activity had this encouraging result: The unemployment rate dropped during the year from 5.8 percent of the work force to 5.1 percent by November (seasonally adjusted) while in the United States it ended the year at 5.9 percent, little changed from 5.8 percent in January 1963.

There can be no doubt that Canadian dollar devaluation and big Canadian wheat sales abroad are the factors giving the Canadian economy its extra edge.

STUDEBAKER SURGES AHEAD, HIKES OUTPUT

(By Carlyle Dunbar)

HAMILTON.—Studebaker of Canada's 425 production-line workmen aren't working this week—the Hamilton car factory is being equipped to handle a big increase in production.

When the production line starts humming again the week after next, Studebaker will be able to assemble 8 to 10 cars hourly instead of six.

Meanwhile, the first 20 made-in-Canada Studebaker cars have been shipped to the U.S. market, less than a month after Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind., said it would concentrate its car production in Hamilton (FP, Dec. 14, 1963).

So far, Studebaker's decision to terminate 61 years of auto production in United States seems to have had a quiet impact on its American dealers.

Whether Studebaker succeeds on the U.S. market with a Canadian-assembled car depends to a great extent on the firm's much-criticized U.S. dealers. After the initial shock, U.S. sales increased. Retail sales in the second 10-day period of December were 1,458 cars against 1,240 in preceding period. The latest figure exceeds "many 10-day sales figures during the past year," one company official says.

A few U.S. dealers have a relinquished their franchise since the decision to stop assembling in the United States was announced. Some have come to Hamilton to see whether, in fact, Canadians could build cars. Many dealers, in interviews or letters to the U.S. auto trade press, say they are confident Studebaker will survive.

L. E. Minkel, who resigned this week as U.S. sales director and became sales consultant, plans to trim Studebaker's U.S. dealer force of 1,900 by perhaps one-third. Low-volume outlets will be dropped.

Studebaker's first problem is to restore dealer morale, he says. In the past year, he says, our dealers' morale was in some cases lower than the public's.

Skepticism about Studebaker's ability to survive as a carmaker and about its determination to stay in the auto business has not been shared by many U.S. dealers or the U.S. auto trade press.

"Some say the program is designed simply to run out the bits and pieces, to fade away gradually. But the plan has possibilities, if it is carried out with integrity, competence, and energy. It will take a lot of selling," Automotive News of Detroit says.

In Canada, Studebaker sales continue to follow the uptrend which began in 1961. In the first 20 days of December, sales were 20 percent higher than in same period, 1962.

As the Hamilton factory stood a week ago, it was capable of making 8 to 10 cars hourly, provided the paint section was expanded slightly. As part of a $250,000 program that begins this week, extra rustproofing, aluminizing, and paint-oven units will be installed.

Some equipment in the factory will be replaced by more efficient machines taken from the abandoned South Bend assembly plant.

At South Bend, work in the engine, stamping, and export-packaging factories resumes January 13.

Although the South Bend factory has a 3-month supply of 1964 model cars on hand, the Hamilton factory built 20 cars to fill special U.S. dealer orders before this week's shutdown.

The cars were trucked to dealers in New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Chicago, and Dallas.

Adieu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 15, 1963, I was privileged to participate in the annual blue and gold charter breakfast hosted by the parents committee of Cub Scout Pack No. 435 in my home district in Brooklyn.

The breakfast was held in the Oceanview Jewish Center and just before I presented the Scouter of the Year Award a poem in memory of our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was recited by the members of the troop and the poem's author, Mr. James Vincent.

It is a beautiful tribute and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

ADIEU

(By James Vincent)

A young man was sent our way with a winning smile, handsome face, and a vision for his Nation's future.
We must "look ahead," said he, our eyes set on new horizons, on new frontiers for the sixties—
How old must you be to love your country?

So young a man for so big a plan—how can leadership be given to such as he—who will follow this young man?
Will the ancients, so set in their way change for him?
This Nation must walk slowly and softly they say,
How old must you be to lead your country?

But his voice rang true, his dreams were great; a nation he loved answered his call.
For less than 3 years this noble man planned and guided the ocurse of his beloved land.
How old must you be to want greatness for your country?

At times the perils were great, with missiles, atoms, and a strange force so close to our gate.
The elders said to climb this mountain was wrong for you cannot come down—but a man went up and a giant returned and, this, made our Nation strong.
How old must you be to protect your country?

We say this is the land of the free—"not so," said he; not while we give some, second-class citizenry—
Not when these cannot earn their daily bread or find a school for their children or live in semislavery.
How old must you be to understand your country?

He would like to mingle with the average man; to learn of his thoughts, his fears and grasp his hand—
For after all, these are the many in our great land.
How old must you be to love the people in your country?

He fell among the many, on a bright November day; taken from us in one swift moment, to greet and smile no more.
How could this happen to such a man and in this land, and in this day and age.
How old must you be to die for your country?

To know men walk still among us, to whom life and love mean nil, is it but our neighbors that engendered this rage?
Each of us will have his part of the torch to bear.
How old must you be to cry for your country?

We will never know how far, how great, or how long would be the shadow this man cast;
Now we will wait for the historians and history to pass judgment on his deeds.
How old must you be to be remembered by your country?

For each to love one another was the Lord's plan; to live with all, in peace and harmony; to respect and care about your fellow man.
Adieu; rest ye well, fallen eagle; though there is a new captain at the helm, the ship of state sails on, following the course you charted.
Adieu. Adieu.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert the eulogy in memory of our late President, John F. Kennedy, delivered by Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, spiritual leader of the Beth Sholom Congregation of Washington, D.C., on November 25, 1963:

With bowed heads and broken hearts we join America in the recitation "Boruch Dayon Heemes" on the passing of a great and good leader, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

A sad and senseless national tragedy has come to pass, nurtured by a climate of derision, indifference, and hate that has become part of our contemporary scene.

This supreme loss echoes in our souls the incisive lament of the teachers of Israel—

"Oy Ledor Sheovad Manhigo"
"Oy L'sfisono Sheovad Karbonitoh"
—*Talmud (Baba Bathro) 91: B.*

"Woe to the world that has lost its leader and woe unto the ship that has lost its pilot."

President Kennedy was not only the leader of our generation but was the confident pilot who guided the distressed ship of a faltering humanity.

Our loss is incalculable even as this tragedy is unfathomable. Most trying times have come upon us.

God is the source of life and the author of history. His will prevails. He sets the times and raises up the men to live in these times. We cannot question His action, what remains for us is to reexamine our conduct.

In the book of Genesis we read, "And Jacob was left alone." A dreary night envelops him as he is overcome by a dismal loneliness; but the struggle for survival must go on.

Faith becomes his most potent defense against the onslaught of a mysterious adversary. He is stunned, he understands not why nor wherefore this comes to be, but he continues indomitably, battling for God, for himself, and for humanity. Though gravely hurt he carries on and vanquishes his adversary, as a new dawn emerges.

The time is today, the struggle is in the present. The anguish is ours as the mystery of these sorrowing happenings elude us, but we too must carry on until the light of a new dawn will reveal itself to us.

Great men become the fabric of a nation. Its martyrs set the tone of its ideals and dreams.

Through the life of John Kennedy we were given a glimpse of a world that could come to be; a world of dynamic vigor, adventure, discovery, hope, and worthiness, of children laughing and men working together in a harmony of decency, purpose, and fulfillment. A world that can cast aside cruelty, ugliness, and hatred as the inevitable pattern of man's life on earth.

A beautiful dream has been broken. The inspiring vision has been shattered and we have become poorer by his death, even as we were made richer by his life.

We have been taught that the righteous are not memorialized by words but by works, not by august monuments but by monumental actions, not by lamenting dirges but by lofty deeds.

The greatest of our goals and the noblest of our purposes have been sown in tears and born in agony. As the prophet, Jeremiah, cries out "Refrain thy voice from weeping and thine eyes from tears—for there is yet great reward in thine actions." Tears cannot bring John Kennedy back but he can continue to live with us and through us by our consecrated devotion and attainment of the great causes he served.

May the Comforter of all sustain and protect this great land and our new President and may He bestow His loving grace upon the valiant and courageous First Lady and her dear children and the family of our great President.

May He, who is the source of all strength and wisdom, embolden our resolve to make real in our lifetime, the yearnings, the hopes, and dedicated goals of our Lincolns and our Kennedys that from this anguish "This Nation, under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

"Were a star quenched on high
For ages would its light
Still traveling downward from the sky
Shine on our mortal sight
So, when a great man dies
For years beyond our ken
The light he leaves behind lies
Upon the path of men."
—*Longfellow.*

Price-Fixing Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial appearing in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star of Monday, November 11, 1963, entitled "Price-fixing Dangers," pointing out the hazards of the so-called quality stabilization bill now pending before the Senate:

PRICE-FIXING DANGERS

The Senate Commerce Committee has received an analysis of the so-called quality stabilization bill from the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council, said the analysis

shows that "not only the consumer, but also the retailer himself, would be served poorly by the enactment of this legislation."

The bill would permit any manufacturer to set the price on bran name merchandise and require all dealers to abide by this price. Thus the measure in reality is a price-fixing plan.

The analysis notes that the price would have to be fixed high enough for the marginal retailer to be attracted to the manufacturer's product. Thus most consumers would probably be paying a higher price for the product.

But then, the analysis warns, large stores and chain outlets would be encouraged to develop their own private brands. If these sold at lower prices, careful shoppers would be lured away from the name brands and from the smaller stores.

Price-fixing attempts usually run into trouble. The free enterprise system seems fairer to all concerned.

President Johnson's Message: The Challenge to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post on January 9 had an excellent editorial on President Johnson's state of the Union message, and I would urge all my colleagues to read it carefully, and to accept and to act favorably and promptly on the challenge which has been placed before us.

The article follows:

PESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE: THE CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

President Johnson's state of the Union message reinforced the image of a man who has risen resolutely to the tragic occasion under which he assumed office.

It was a message that affirmed and, in some areas, expanded the domestic programs of his predecessor.

It was a message that warmly renewed the spirit of conciliation and sanity Mr. Kennedy had tried so hard to impart to the perilous world scene.

In the thirties it fell to a patrician, Franklin D. Roosevelt, born to wealth and privilege, to summon the Nation to a struggle against economic privilege and injustice.

Yesterday it was a southerner, Lyndon B. Johnson, whose roots in Texas go back to the Alamo and the Confederacy, who challenged Congress to make this session one "that did more for civil rights than the last 100 sessions combined."

His appeal for civil rights legislation was part of a larger list of requests. But the President left no ambiguity about his commitment to the House committee's civil rights bill—including its strong public accommodations and FEPC sections.

Three times the President sounded the civil rights theme, climaxed by his solemn assertion that white and colored Americans who stand and die together on the battlefields of the world "can work and eat and travel side by side in their own country."

The President properly gave a high priority to the cause of equality.

But much of his message was dedicated to other concerns of the other America—of those of all races and creeds who are victims of our economic sluggishness, of inadequate schools and medical care, of slum housing.

As an immediate economic stimulant, he called for enactment of tax-cut legislation by February 11.

In larger terms he urged the declaration of unconditional war against poverty and reminded us of that one-fifth of a nation that lives on the outskirts of hope.

President Johnson has visibly endeavored to confound the rightwing congressional coalition by asserting that the program he has projected can be achieved with a simultaneous budget reduction.

The arithmetic of his argument may be subject to complicated dispute. But even the most ritualistic budget balancers cannot fail to be impressed by the boldness with which he and Defense Secretary McNamara have attacked the problem of waste in the Military Establishment.

Military budgets have long been treated as politically untouchable even when the clamor for economy in Government is at its peak. President Johnson, whose congressional service gave him special knowledge in this field, has served notice that a day of real reckoning for the Pentagon has arrived.

If excessive sums allocated for overkill, obsolescence, and other forms of military extravagance can be applied to positive social programs, the country can only be fundamentally stronger. And that seems to be Mr. Johnson's grand design.

Many of the foreign policy passages of the President's speech were an elaboration of his eloquent address to the U.N. He pledged anew that the United States would offer new disarmament proposals at Geneva. He reiterated the need for seeking new East-West agreements which "can enlarge the hopes of all while violating the rights of none." He reminded the reckless of our strength, but his appeal was for reason, and he avoided arrogance.

On the homefront, Mr. Johnson has challenged Congress to emerge from its rut of obstructionism and sloth.

In world affairs he has proclaimed his readiness to join in an honorable quest for peace.

It was an address from which Americans could derive pride and inspiration. We believe much of the world will take heart from the substance and tone of the message.

The great question remains:

Will Congress once again reject any large vision of our future and revert to business as usual?

Free-Enterprise Spokesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to include a very excellent letter to the editor of the Dallas Morning News recently printed expressing praise and appreciation for the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. We Texans are proud of Congressman BRUCE ALGER and we appreciate his firm stand and outstanding work for sound, responsible, and conservative principles in government.

The letter follows:

FREE-ENTERPRISE SPOKESMAN

SEATTLE, WASH.

This is a letter of praise and of deep appreciation to the city of Dallas. We've meant to write it for some time, but simply never got around to it. We'd like to express our sincere thanks to the people of Dallas County for your sending to Washington, D.C., the most articulate spokesman for the private-enterprise system in the entire House of Representatives, BRUCE ALGER.

He has been a guest speaker in our city twice in less than 2 years, each time he has left more admirers behind. He is a credit to your fair State and we hope to see his kind multiplied in the Congress of our country. We owe the Dallas-area citizens a debt of gratitude.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. JOBE.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

State Government and New Urban Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD an excellent speech given by Herbert J. Bingham, executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League before the 16th Annual Convention of the Maryland Municipal League on October 24 of this year entitled "Organizing Local Government To Serve Urban Growth." There are few Members of the House whose districts are not facing the problem of providing municipal services to suburban fringes of existing communities. My own Prince Georges County in Maryland, where some of you reside, is one of the most rapidly growing local governments in the entire country. Since coming to the Congress, one of my special endeavors has been to help improve the relationships among Federal, State, and local governments in the conduct of programs for, and affecting, the citizens of Maryland. Therefore, Mr. Bingham's speech was of particular interest to me.

The States have a vital role to play in assisting local government to meet these challenges of population growth. The record of legislative actions by the State of Tennessee over the last 10 years, described by Mr. Bingham, is a notable record. These legislative actions have done much to insure sound local government in urban areas and provide public services on a reasonably economical and efficient basis. This series of legislative actions to serve urban growth in Tennessee have included legislation to liberalize existing annexation laws, permit extraterritorial powers by municipalities with respect to subdivision control, expansion of regional planning powers, control of new incorporations adjacent to existing municipalities, granting of authority to counties to provide certain areawide functions such as water, sewer, and garbage services, and general authority for municipal and county government to provide jointly or contract with each other for public services.

It is interesting to note that this record of enactments closely parallels many of the recommended draft legislative proposals found in the State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission is a continuing national body set up by Congress in 1959 on which sit three of my distinguished colleagues—the Congresswoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN]—charged with the responsibility for continuing study and effort toward improving the effectiveness of our Federal system of government. For those interested in an adequate array of State legislation with which to preserve and strengthen responsible local government while meeting the demands of urban growth in an orderly and economical manner, I strongly recommend careful reading of this speech by Mr. Bingham which appeared in the Maryland Municipal News for November 1963, and examine the State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which is available upon request from the Commission here in Washington:

ORGANIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO SERVE URBAN GROWTH

(By Herbert J. Bingham)

The 1954 Annual Convention of the Tennessee Municipal League adopted the following declaration: "The problem of providing municipal services for suburban fringes of cities is the most difficult and critical problem affecting urban life in Tennessee."

From this statement of policy emerged a concentration—for 10 long years—on serving urban growth in Tennessee. It has produced what may be the most complete set of statutory authority to be found in any of the States, giving our cities an exclusive franchise to serve urbanizing areas beyond the current city boundaries. It also has produced laws intended to eliminate conflict and uncertainty over public service roles among adjacent or overlapping local units of government.

What is this set of laws for urban growth? How were they achieved? What have been the results? And what new problems have arisen to plague orderly urban development in Tennessee?

Back there in 1954, more than 400,000 people had accumulated in the suburban fringes of our cities, both large and small. They represented the urban expansion of a quarter-century or more. Antiquated annexation laws relying on petition and vote in the annexation area had stifled extension of municipal boundaries, and thus the extension of standard municipal services and facilities. Sprawling development was being abetted by the single-purpose water utility districts. The sprawl was not being served by county governments, which adhered to a program of limited services suitable only for rural areas.

The 220-volt electric line, the 2-inch water line, the two-party telephone line, the paved road, and various Federal programs for low downpayment home financing had spawned the "slurburb"—the suburban slum of tomorrow. It was the land of "no": The land of no storm drainage and no sewers—no curb and gutter, and no sidewalks—no parks, no playgrounds and no street lights—no fireplugs, no firehalls, and no firetrucks—no public garbage collection—no modern policing—no zoning or subdivision controls, except in the rare instances where counties had acted in one or two of these fields.

The first assignment was to establish a legal framework for an exclusive municipal franchise over suburban areas, to firmly establish the principle of "one municipal government for one urban community."

LEGAL TOOLS FOR GROWTH

The municipal powers of 1954 authorized cities to extend public facilities beyond corporate boundaries, and under certain conditions to exercise subdivision control powers 5 miles beyond corporate boundaries. To these powers we added the following:

1. In 1955, we placed at the top of our legislative agenda the passage of an annexation law, and it was done. The new law gave the city unquestioned authority, by simple ordinance of its governing body, to annex contiguous territory and take over all municipal and utility functions. This authority was subject to the right of any aggrieved citizens to procure a court test of reasonableness. Our courts have held they will not substitute judicial opinions for the city legislatures' judgment as to what is reasonable if the annexation is ever a debatable matter.

The unquestioned right of a city to make reasonable annexations is granted in the laws of at least 15 States, and by an additional 16 States for unincorporated lands of certain types. Annexation by vote in the territory has never worked satisfactorily. Not only will residents of small sections of a total urban community often act unwisely and selfishly, but lack of an exclusive franchise, which the power of annexation gives the city, makes it impossible to engage in the long-range planning, and the financing and construction efforts essential to provide the complex utilities and other facilities needed to serve newly developing urban territory.

Such unilatteral city annexation power is almost universally sought by municipalities in every State of the Union, and has been strongly endorsed in the national policies of the American Municipal Association.

2. Regional planning powers were expanded to authorize municipal control of zoning, as well as subdivision layout and service standards, for 5 miles beyond corporate limits.

3. A satellite city law prevented new incorporations within a specified distance of an existing city, unless the city was given 15 months in which to prevent the new incorporation by annexing 20 percent of the area or 35 percent of the people involved.

4. Utility laws were amended to provide that no utility district or other instrumentality could build utility facilities within a specified distance of a city until the city was given a reasonable period in which to provide them.

5. After long negotiation, counties were given authority to provide water, sewer, and garbage services, but only after the county had prepared engineering plans and given the city an opportunity to provide the public facilities in question.

6. Relying upon a new provision of the Tennessee constitution, a metropolitan government act was adopted by the legislature authorizing the abolition of the county and municipal government and the substitution of a new form of metropolitan government.

7. Statutory authority was expanded for municipal and county governments to provide jointly, or to contract with each other for, any public service or facilities which both were authorized to perform separately. These laws included new legislation author-

izing consolidation of municipal with county schools.

8. Financial inducements for annexation were provided by new laws assuring that cities would start getting all State-shared taxes and grants-in-aid due them on account of newly annexed areas at the first of the fiscal year following annexation.

9. The legislature gave both county and municipal governments new authority to levy a 17-percent wholesale beer tax and a 1-percent local retail sales tax, with statutory formulas governing division of these moneys between the county and its several municipalities. This opened up new local revenues exceeding $50 million annually.

10. And, through State-financed technical service agencies, we provided for a massive technical backup for municipal efforts to serve and grow. Our municipal technical advisory service, at the university, has made innumerable annexation studies, utility extension policy studies, and financial analyses. Our Tennessee State Planning Commission has provided a complete technical staff to assist not only in annexation studies but to serve as municipal staffs in carrying out comprehensive planning and the administration of subdivision and zoning controls.

How have Tennessee cities been able to secure favorable legislative consideration of the problems of urban growth? The results we have achieved seem to be based upon thorough research, close cooperation with counties and other units of government affected by municipal growth, and effective political action.

Through our municipal technical advisory service, and in some cases our State planning agency, all of our legislative proposals have been supported by exhaustive research examining the practices in all of the other States in a particular field, defining the problems in Tennessee which require a solution, and drafting acceptable and effective legislative cures.

JOINT CITY-COUNTY PROGRAM

But, surely the greatest contribution to success has been a workable plan of cooperation with the county officials through the Tennessee County Services Association. It is truly remarkable that our municipal league and our county association had joint legislative programs in four of the last five sessions of our State legislature, beginning in 1955. We are grateful for and greatly benefited by the fact that county officials formally endorsed virtually all of our urban growth legislative measures.

This cooperation has been a two-way street. Our league worked with our counties in devising and supporting the County Urban Facilities Act authorizing county provision of water, sewer and garbage facilities under certain conditions, and an act authorizing consolidation of municipal with county school systems.

Strenuous efforts in the 1961 legislature to repeal the annexation law exemplifies sound legislative tactics. We knew the onslaught was coming because numerous large annexations were in process. Surprisingly, the attack was led by two of the Nation's largest manufacturing firms desirous of avoiding our yearly city taxes on two Tennessee plants involved in annexations. We had secured commitments to maintain the law from all gubernatorial candidates, and many legislators during the State elections. Our county government friends stood firm (we had a joint legislative program). A continuous educational and publicity program was executed.

Nonetheless, it was a hot, close fight. How hot is illustrated by editorials supporting annexation which appeared in seven of our eight metropolitan newspapers. We reproduced and distributed them in quantity. Here are some titles of the editorials: "Cities in Tennessee Face Doom If New Annexing Ban Becomes Law"; "Don't Give a Narrow Few Exemption From Local Tax"; "Annexation Assault by Black Mail, Black List"; "Stop This Move to Strangle Cities"; "Saboteur at Work."

The legislature adopted amendments our cities sponsored and maintained a sound annexation procedure. No controversy developed in the 1963 session.

It was necessary to treat the Tennessee city's jurisdiction over the urbanizing fringe as part of a general plan to assign roles for various competing and normally conflicting units of government, and numerous important private interests. Time does not permit detailing these conflicts and the solutions achieved to some of them.

But, the county had the greatest stake and strongest claim for a sound accommodation of city-county government roles.

To give counties and cities well-defined roles and the capabilities to fill them required programs dealing with the basic State-local relationship encompassing far more than urban fringe jurisdiction. For the last 4 years and the last two sessions of our general assembly we have formalized our cooperative arrangement with county governments in continuing intergovernmental committee for improvement of local government, composed of 17 members each of our league and the county services association. With extensive research and long negotiating sessions, we undertook in Tennessee to develop legislative solutions that will help every one of our 95 counties and all of our 287 municipalities, permitting each to carry out successfully its legitimate and necessary operations.

This committee developed and we carried into this year's session of our State legislature a massive program of legislation called the local government platform. It involved increases in State grants to counties and cities of more than $34 million a year. This platform also included the opening up of a 1-percent local city-county sales tax; the provision by the State of a statewide system of area vocational-technical schools; a law requiring the State highway department to pay all of the cost of building and maintaining the State highways, by making it illegal for counties and cities to spend any money on State routes; and other favorable legislation.

And finally, our legislative success depended upon tactics. We have a habit of carrying municipal legislative programs and issues into the election of our State legislature and Governor. We believe that great public issues are settled in the give-and-take and debate of an election.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLATFORM

While the nature of our programs and the conditions alter methods used, I will give one example. The local government platform for the 1963 legislative session was fully developed and released 6 months before the gubernatorial and legislative elections. It was carried around the State in district meetings of city and county officials, and there were more than 1,100 in attendance who voted unanimously for it. It was presented to the candidates locally and statewide.

For example, we held in our State capital some 2 months prior to election day a local government convention, for the purpose of hearing the views of all gubernatorial candidates on the platform. More than 1,000 city and county officers filed into the meeting hall. The three candidates for Governor came to the platform, and behind them the 34-member intergovernmental committee. Weeks previously, the entire platform, including research reports and legislative bills, had been presented to the gubernatorial candidates, so it was not surprising that their substantial speeches endorsed it. But a question and answer period had been scheduled, and the press and radio were on hand. The intergovernmental committee retired into the wings to decide on what questions to ask and came back with one question: "Does your statement mean that you unqualifiedly endorse the local governmental platform as presented to you previously in detail?" "The answer from all candidates was: "Yes."

Seldom in the history of this Nation has there been such a complete meeting of the minds of local officials and candidates for the great office of Governor.

RESULTS OF LOCAL ACTION

What have been the results from use of our urban growth laws and action program?

In the years since 1955, 148 cities have annexed 406 times, bringing inside corporate limits 308,000 new citizens. And, the new metropolitan government of Nashville and Davidson County has brought some 150,000 more urban citizens under municipal-type jurisdiction. Thus, we will soon have more than a half million former residents of unserved urban fringe areas who now have adequate and standard municipal-type services, or who can expect them in the near future.

In most of our growing communities, we are rapidly achieving the objective of one municipal government for one urban community.

But, I would point out that a new problem is arising in a very critical form in Tennessee—boondock sprawl. Single-purpose water utility districts and cooperative associations are now being formed in essentially rural areas remote from cities to provide tapwater. For example, the magnificent new areawide metropolitan government of Nashville and Davidson County has springing up beyond its boundaries, in adjacent counties, some seven utility districts which are installing hundreds of miles of tapwater lines. These areas will soon be traversed by six legs of the Interstate Highway System. In the future a significant part of the increased population of this metropolitan community will be siphoned into these boondock developments based on cheap land and tapwater.

The boondock sprawl is being aided and abetted by our Federal Government, unfortunately and improperly. These districts are able to secure low-cost loans and, in many cases under the accelerated public works program, grants of one-half to two-thirds of the cost of these water facilities.

We believed the people lured into these semirural areas for country living need protection. In a shorter time than they know, there will be a house every hundred feet, and they will have lots of neighbors including filling stations and junk yards due to lack of zoning controls. We will have the slurburbs all over again—without the facilities and services which long experience has indicated that every urbanized area must have.

But Maryland, Tennessee, and the United States of America, with the ascending urban population of our time, will have the poorest served, and the ugliest, and the most expensive urban areas the world has ever seen unless we take measures to insure orderly and well-served growth and development. The most imperative objective is to serve the development as it occurs. We must insist upon optimum use of our land in order that areas growing into residential, commercial, industrial and other developments will have all the public services and facilities they will need, installed economically as urbanization occurs.

That Long Johnson Reach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in this day of scientific miracles, the Detroit

Free Press editorial pages have recorded one in which every politician should be interested:

A woman in Highland Park got the feeling. So did another in Grosse Point. And a man watching downtown had it, too. Probably it was true all over the country.

Somehow, while delivering his second message to Congress Tuesday, President Johnson managed to give his televiewers "the treatment" at the same time. Those who watched could feel an arm come out of one side of the set, circle around their shoulders, and pat them comfortingly.

Another arm shook their hands warmly and firmly. And meanwhile, the President looked them square in the eye, took them into his confidence, and pointed out exactly what it was that we all wanted to do. Didn't we?

Millions of heads probably nodded "yes" at the same time.

It wasn't what he said, which sort of came out as south Kansas, a combination of Ted Sorensen's Nebraska and Johnson's Texas. There were elements of both, but they blended well.

It certainly wasn't his looks. He looked like a nice average American, wearing his glasses to read a speech. And it wasn't how he said it, which won't put him in the annals of the world's great orators.

The only explanation is that those arms did come out of the television set.

The Government's Role and the Future of Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Max Tishler, president of Merck, Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, when he accepted the 1963 Chemical Industry Medal of the American Section, Society of Chemical Industry on September 26, 1963, in Houston, Tex. I believe this address raises some of the most important issues which face our society today.

The address follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE AND THE FUTURE OF DISCOVERY

(By Dr. Max Tishler, president, Merck, Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, Division of Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J.)

I am profoundly touched by the thought behind the medal that has just been conferred upon me. When one receives such an honor, he inevitably thinks of those who have made it possible. My own particular debt is far beyond my power to repay. It is owed primarily to a group of men and women as fine as those with whom any man has been privileged to work. This includes not only the scientists in our laboratories who, by their accomplishments, have earned whatever reputation I may now possess. It also includes our management and particularly our president, John T. Connor, who has played a major part in these scientific accomplishments himself by his understanding and support of our research through the years of bad weather as well as those of sunshine. And I also acknowledge the indebtedness I have to my wife, Elizabeth, who has graciously accepted the unacceptable—the sharing of her husband with his profession—and who, through it all, has understood that his devotion to his calling has never diminished his devotion to her.

I am delighted, as we all are, to have our British friends with us tonight. But I am a little surprised that Lord Hailsham let you out of school. From the way he has been talking about Britain's unfavorable balance of trade in scientists, one might suppose he would be afraid too many of you would bring along your degrees from those matchless British universities and bedazzle the less sophisticated Americans into making lucrative job offers. Of course, if any of you would like to talk with me after dinner, you will find me quite receptive. For years we have been allowing the United Kingdom to train some of our most productive scientists.

I am inclined to agree, however, with the member who asked in Parliament what was new about Lord Hailsham's complaint. Hadn't the British, he asked, been exporting some of their best people to America for over 300 years? Right here, in Texas we have a fine example of this. Among the greatest heroes in Texas history were the 183 men who died fighting for independence within the walls of the Alamo. Of these, 27 were born in Texas. But 25 were natives of Great Britain. So you see that the United States—and I include Texas—is not only grateful for British brains, but we are also indebted to you for Britain's love of freedom and for British courage.

Tonight I would like to discuss an aspect of science and public policy—a matter of keen interest to all of us, both as members of the chemical industry and as citizens. My thoughts flow out of developments in this country, but I believe that some of the issues are also pertinent to the United Kingdom.

Throughout most of man's history, the inquiring mind has had to labor uphill against the existing power structures and belief systems of the rest of society. This concept is so firmly inbedded in our minds that we have trouble seeing that it no longer fits reality, at least so far as the natural scientists are concerned. For they have already achieved a strategic position in our society and, with an assist from the public's imagination, have made over some of our belief systems in their own image.

This not inconsiderable feat has been accomplished not by conspiracy, but by consent. The scientists have not been seeking power; power has been thrust upon them. And the eagerness with which dollars have been pressed into their not-too-unwilling hands by the greatest patron in the history of science—the U.S. Government—has been almost unseemly.

Among the most remarkable features of Federal support for research and development has been the speed and magnitude of its growth following the close of World War II. In 1940 the Government spent only $74 million for research and development. By the first full fiscal year after the last World War, the figure had reached $900 million, or better than 12 times the prewar amount. Thereafter it rose steadily.

Since sputnik's dramatic orbit in 1957, the yearly increases have been even more spectacular. For the past 6 years, Federal obligations for research and development have been mounting at the average rate of almost $2 billion a year. The current budget calls for a total of $14.9 billion, which is 200 times the 1940 rate. This means that 15 cents out of every tax dollar is now devoted to this relatively new activity of Government. No item in the budget, except that for defense, is supported so generously by the American taxpayer.

Let us look at the manner in which these Federal funds have grown and transformed the character of research and development in the United States. In 1953, industry—which performs about three-quarters of the Nation's research and development—still controlled most of its own research. Over 60 cents of every dollar that industry spent in its laboratories came from corporate earnings. Today, when industry is performing about $13 billion worth of research and development work, the proportion has been reversed. It is the Government that is supplying the 60 cents. In those years corporate funds doubled, but they could not keep pace with those of the Government, which multiplied 4½ times. It should be noted—perhaps with some pride—that among the large research-oriented industries, chemicals and allied products are unique.

We spend more of our own money for research and development than any other industry group and are dependent on the Federal Government for little more than 20 percent of our total research and development budget.

The Federal research dollar looms even larger in the academic world. In 1940, the Government spent only about $15 million for this purpose in our academic institutions. By fiscal 1963 the Government's obligations for research and development in colleges and universities had multiplied more than 100-fold, to $1.6 billion.

I do not want to dwell on the effects of Government funds on the universities, since I have treated this subject elsewhere. But I would like to stress three points.

First, the problems created by this relationship do not arise from the classic kind of overt direction and control by a source outside the university. Aside from contracts with clearly defined, mission-oriented objectives, Government agencies have thus far been scrupulous in this regard. Outstanding have been the two I know most about—the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. The NIH, whose exploding budget has risen from a mere $2 million in 1945 to $980 million for the coming year—a multiplication of 490 times—has been able to administer this extraordinary expansion in research with great skill, understanding, and most of all, forbearance toward the motivations, needs, and freedoms of the men, women, and institutions in the health sciences. Much of the credit for this goes to the vision, wisdom, and leadership of James A. Shannon, the NIH Director. The same may be said of the National Science Foundation and its recently retired Director, Alan T. Waterman.

My second point is that the $1.6 billion in Federal funds now floating in through the windows of university laboratories has created problems that are far more subtle than the ancient one of outside dictation. They include the resulting imbalace between teaching and research, between basic and applied research, and between science and the humanities; the disproportionate growth of the physical sciences; and the rising quality of the best institutions, which are those most favored with funds, at the expense of the spreading mediocrity of the rest.

To this should be added the hard-to-measure effects of mission-oriented research. Although Federal agencies have in general tried to leave the initiative for projects in the hands of campus investigators, the fact is that tax money can be spent only to support projects that promise to further the purposes set forth by Congress. And it is marvelous to behold how much more adept the mind of man is at thinking up ideas in areas where support is plentiful than in those where support is scarce.

The third point is that notwithstanding the determination of universities to maintain independence and to resist demands inconsistent with this determination, they are in fact becoming financially dependent on the Federal Government. Twenty percent of the total expenditures for all activities carried out in institutions of higher learning now comes from Federal sources,

and about 75 percent of all academic research in the physical and life sciences is now being paid for with tax money.

Let us now turn from the universities and examine briefly the effect of the Federal research dollar on industry and its research. As in the universities, the character of research in industry is changing—again because the golden hand of Government has been laid upon it. Although a pattern and direction have not yet evolved, the relation between Government research and industry is becoming a matter of great concern. To understand the reasons for this concern, it is necessary first to glance at the evolution of industrial research in this country.

Although the scientific revolution is more than three centuries old, it was not until a little more than 50 years ago that a few pioneer corporations set out to organize their own search for new knowledge in the belief that this kind of risktaking might turn out to be profitable. By the time of Pearl Harbor, industrial laboratories had been seeded all across the country. World War II, as we all know, gave new impetus to this development. The victories that were won in the laboratories of Britain and the United States dramatically changed both the character and significance of research and development in the postwar world. In 1939, U.S. industry, Government, universities, and foundations spent altogether only $500 million on research and development. For the coming fiscal year it is expected that this figure will be above $20 billion. The industry that produces chemicals and allied products alone will be spending out of its own funds almost twice as much on research and development as the whole Nation spent on this activity only 25 years ago.

The concept that research can be harnessed for the benefit of industry and the economy is relatively new. Scientific research, long the exclusive province of the universities, has extended from the campus into the laboratories of industry. Scientists have learned that this new home can also be congenial and stimulating to the inquiring mind. In industry they find commensurate fulfillment and recognition, plus the new experience of translating the fruits of research into the satisfaction of human needs. On the side of industry, corporations have learned how to nurture the organized quest for knowledge for their own welfare and economy.

This growth of research in industry is neither accidental nor a whim of management. If research had not been productive, its increasing support by corporations would never have happened. In a free-enterprise, highly competitive society, industry cannot afford to maintain research without tangible returns to pay for it. Industry has learned the lesson that Sumner Slichter, the late economist, pointed out when he said:

"The discovery that an enormous amount of research can be carried out for profit is surely one of the most revolutionary discoveries of the last century."

There is no need for me to dwell on the impact of research on postwar economic growth. We have seen so many new things and so many technological advances during our lives that rapid change has become normalcy. Although society recognizes the role of research generally in this new way of life, it is less likely to recognize the part that industrial research has played in the accelerated pace of discovery. A good illustration is my own industry, which during the past 25 years has drastically altered the armamentarium of the physician. According to a recent report of the New York Academy of Medicine, it is estimated that 90 percent of present prescriptions are for drugs that were unknown as therapeutic agents 15 years ago."

The "industry of discovery," as Professor Slichter named it, is probably America's most valuable asset in the highly competitive struggle for world markets.

Again let me illustrate with my own industry. Prior to World War II, American pharmaceutical companies sold only negligible proportions of their output abroad and had little influence on the treatment of disease in foreign countries. But in the intervening years we have erected highly efficient research establishments that are turning out new and useful medicinal agents at an unprecedented rate—agents which, in terms of human lives and needs, recognize no national barriers. As a result of these developments, foreign sales by the research-oriented pharmaceutical companies, either through exports or subsidiary manufacturing in other countries, now amount to upward of a quarter of their total sales. Merck thinks of itself, for example, as a free world enterprise based in the United States.

Let us look now at the effect of Government research and development expenditures on this private dynamo for economic growth. I pointed out earlier that the Federal Government has long since become the dominant source of funds for industrial research and development. In the past fiscal year, according to National Science Foundation estimates, Washington obligated $8 billion to be spent in industrial laboratories. Nearly 99 percent of this money has been appropriated to support the missions of three agencies—Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy. Industrial research—once devoted exclusively to the promotion of economic growth—has become predominantly a Government-dominated institution for protecting the Nation's security and exploring the solar system.

The question is being asked with increasing persistence whether we are devoting a disproportionate amount of our scientific and technical resources to the Government's objectives. It has been pointed out that between 1954 and 1961 three-quarters of the increase in scientists and engineers engaged in research and development was absorbed by the defense and space programs, and that the programs on the drawing boards of these same agencies will require as many scientists during the next decade as all our institutions of higher learning will graduate during the same period. Yet it is reported that Switzerland, Sweden, Japan, and West Germany, unmotivated by sputnik and unburdened by the needs of defense, spend a higher percentage of their gross national product than we do on research and development not directed toward military needs. How far and how long can this situation progress without damaging our country's capacity to maintain its broad leadership in research?

The Defense Department and the space agency have countered these concerns with predictions of spinoffs for the civilian economy from developments financed by them. So far, the evidence for this contention is unpersuasive. Whether or not the prophecy will come true does not alter the unrelenting fact that too little attention is being paid to the long-range effect on the civilian economy and to the manner in which we have been using tax money to divert our scarce scientific and technical resources into such crash projects as the race to the moon. Our Government has been prone to act as if these resources are either unlimited or can be expanded indefinitely by appropriating dollars. Neither proposition is correct.

Federal expenditures for research are endangering the future of industrial research and development in another and unexpected way. They are doing this by weakening the incentives for private investment in corporate laboratories. Now that $3 out of $4 spent on research and development come from taxes, it is increasingly difficult to find a discovery untouched by public funds at some point during its development. If the Government takes the position that we cannot permit a private company to have property rights in any such discovery, no matter how much of its own money it risks in the research and development effort needed to turn it into a marketable product, we will surely find companies less and less interested in taking that risk. Clearly if all discoveries were in the public domain, there would be little incentive for private enterprise to make large investments for the development and commercialization of new products and for the support of the huge industrial laboratories that are among our most valued national assets.

Public funds have permeated so many areas of research that we can already see quite clearly the outlines of the national problem that this invasion is creating. In my own field of health research, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recently taken the position that scientific observations financed in whole or in part by the Government through a university grant should fall into the public domain and generally remain there. They hold this despite the long, risky, and expensive process and the inordinately high proportion of scientific and technical skills needed to turn an observation into a genuine discovery and subsequently into a new and useful drug.

The results of this policy as applied to NIH research grants can be devastating unless the situation is modified. The fruitful relationship between university scientists and those in our industry, which has produced so many of the landmarks of modern medicine, can be cut by this policy as cleanly as if it had been done with a sharp knife. And the incentives to industry to transform promising scientific observations made in university laboratories into new medicines for the control or cure of disease can be reduced to a danger point.

By taking this position, Government may feel it is serving the public interest. But, in my opinion, this is a very narrow view of where the public interest really lies. It does not lie in the destruction of the free interchange between university and industry laboratories, nor in the slowing down of the rate of developed discovery. It does lie, it seems to me, in speeding up the process whereby we have learned to turn new scientific knowledge into better health for all mankind.

Another aspect of the same problem exists in research carried out in industry with the financial support of the Government. Those of us in the pharmaceutical industry who have accepted Government contracts—they generally amount to less than 5 percent of our research and development budgets—must surround these projects with curtains of steel, lest one of the discoveries emanating from the "private sector" of research should inadvertently fall into the area of the public domain. This is foolish and unnecessary. Obviously, the entire resources of an experienced and productive research laboratory, irrespective of its source of funds, should be freely applied to projects financed by Government agencies and deemed by Congress to be of national import.

The broad problem is how to protect the public interest and, at the same time, maintain healthy incentives for the growth of private research and our free enterprise economy. In my opinion, a workable solution will not come from taking a doctrinaire position on either side of the developing argument, but from a creative compromise that recognizes both the public interest in the results of tax-supported research and the need for healthy, expanding, privately financed industrial research laboratories.

In this connection, it is pertinent to note Canada's recent policy of providing Government grants to industry for carrying out approved projects, with no strings attached, in industrial laboratories. Once the National Research Council has given the green

light to a project, the Government will pay a major share of the research expenditures. The important point here is that industry can get patents from this work. The Canadian action recognizes the power of industry research to create new industry and to foster economic growth. In a similar pattern, the synthetic rubber development begun in World War II went ahead by leaps and bounds when Government abdicated its control to industry and industry applied its own scientific resources to this field. And there are many who believe that the development of atomic energy as a source of power would have gone ahead much faster had the policies of the AEC been more liberal.

It would be one of the ultimate ironies of our times if we were to spend scores of billions of taxpayers' dollars to broaden the scientific base of our society only to find that in the process we had weakened our economic structure, damaged our competitive position in world trade, and thus impaired our national security.

The matters I have been discussing are only some of the problems that have arisen since U.S. Government funds have begun to dominate the U.S. scientific scene. There are many others. After a long honeymoon period, during which Federal appropriations for research and development had been rising at an astronomical rate with almost no audible dissent, it was inevitable that the point would come when the questions would begin to catch up with the applause. There is some evidence that we have reached this point. This summer, for example, Congress made a significant cut in the budget requested by the space agency. Both public and private bodies are now launching new studies of specific aspects of the Government's support of science. And only 2 weeks ago the House of Representatives voted unanimously to appoint a nine-man select committee to conduct a 15-month investigation that would probe all phases of the Government's role in the conduct and support of research.

Do not misunderstand me. In common with most members of the scientific community, I rejoice in the public's increasing support of the search for new knowledge, made manifest through the actions of Congress. I am also pleased that we are finally getting around to asking some searching questions about the direction in which this support is taking us. Nonetheless, there are some dangers in this new inquisitiveness, and I should like to point out three.

The first is the always present possibility that uninformed investigators with motives of their own can turn inquisitiveness into inquisition. There is no way to spend scores of billions of dollars without a certain amount of waste and duplication and a certain number of ill-conceived projects, all of them tempting targets for the headline seeker. Science is properly subject to the same scrutiny as the rest of our society, and scientists are just as accountable for the expenditure of public funds as are businessmen and Government officials. But let us hope that we can avoid demagogery rampaging through the domain of research.

The second danger derives from the fact that the questioning by Congress and the public seems to have arisen as a result of their concern over the size of Federal research appropriations. Since 15 cents out of every budget dollar is now being spent for this purpose, this is no surprise. We could not expect the taxpayer to go on spending at that rate for activities he does not really understand without eventually wanting to know what he has bought for his money.

Given the present state of public understanding of the scientific process, it is understandable that the layman expects tangible results. If he has supported the expenditure of several hundred million dollars looking for a cure for cancer, for example, and is told that we are still only following promising clues, having abandoned the trail of other equally promising clues that turned out to be disappointing, he might want to call off the search altogether. In such cases, basic research would certainly suffer.

The third danger has to do with the autonomy of science. Now that Government pays most of the bills, scientists may be in danger of losing their most sacred charter: The intellectual freedom to pursue their own paths into the unknown, wherever they may lead.

Science will inevitably be called upon to pay a price for its tax-supported affluence and power. The hand that giveth also taketh away. And the hand in this case belongs to the Congress, a body created by the Constitution in part for the purpose of cutting down to size any segment of our society whose power it thinks has become disproportionately large. In the process of cutting science down to size—a process whose beginnings one can already sense in this session of Congress—individuals, programs, and institutions may be hurt. But there is a deeper risk. Ever since Hiroshima, society has been uneasy about the power of science. This uneasiness has now spread to the life sciences. There are those who fear, for example, the consequences that may follow, in a world unprepared, when those scientists engaged in molecular biology and chemistry of the genes finally learn how to manipulate human genetics. Yet society has the right to question the basic precept on which science is founded: the pursuit of knowledge wherever it may take us, no matter how prepared or unprepared the world may be to cope with the truth scientists set before it.

We must remember that independence to explore the unknown has had a very short life in the history of man. It has burned brightly several times before, only to be smothered by those frightened by the consequences of truth. In modern times it has had some long and bitter struggles with both temporal and religious power. Its freedom today is not as secure as its present status might lead us to believe. It is once again running its historic risk—the risk that society may rebel against the enormous power of the discoveries it can unleash on mankind. But, for the first time in this country, it faces this risk having shed the traditional armor of its independence by making itself, at least in part, a hostage of Government and a servant of political power.

One of the ways to combat this danger is to meet the fear of the consequences of new knowledge with the defense of more knowledge. The present position of science is weakened by all the unawareness and even the mystery that now surround what it is doing at the behest of Government. As this mystery is lifted, science itself will not go unscathed and certain people and institutions—and not necessarily the worst ones—are sure to suffer.

But this may be a small price to pay for the outcome—a widespread understanding of the needs, purposes, and methods of independent scientific inquiry and of the proper roles of Government, private industry, and the universities in this endeavor.

As is so often true, Government domination of U.S. science has been the result of happenstance, not of plan. We have been busy for 18 years concentrating solely on what is right in front of our noses. Therefore, as a society, we are faced with the usual problem of building order out of the reality bequeathed us by chance. But there is nothing usual about the particular problem with which we are now confronted. It will be one of the most challenging assignments in our political history to devise a wise national policy for the future course of Federal support for research and development.

What I have in mind when I speak of national policy is not a formal document written by a committee. I am talking about a set of guiding principles that must emerge as we scrutinize and really begin to penetrate the complex questions raised by the irreversible trend toward deep Federal involvement in research. A number of highly competent Government and civil groups are actively appraising these issues. Inevitably, their findings and their attitudes will condition our future thinking. It is in this way that policy evolves. No one can predict what our national policy will be 10 years from now, much less 50 years from now. But we can predict, I feel certain, that substantial changes will occur in the relationship between science and society, and that scientists themselves must adjust to this change. For the moment, it seems to me, we would do well to pause and evaluate.

Here are some of the questions I believe we might fruitfully try to answer:

1. What have been the major effects on the universities of Federal spending for science?

2. Are we diverting the scientific resources of the Nation to what are termed public purposes at the expense of private research and development, the most dynamic force for growth in our economy?

3. At what rate can we continue to increase expenditures for research and still maintain quality at a level high enough to justify the use of the funds?

4. What are the extent and effects of the imbalances we have been creating between various branches of science, between science and the humanities, teaching and research, and between public and private research in industrial laboratories?

5. Are scientists becoming so affluent, in terms of support and status, that they are beginning to lose their sense of direction?

6. Is the nature of scientific inquiry such that any massive effort to control its direction will inevitably slow down its progress and thus invite serious long-run consequences for the society that attempts it?

Such questions as these focus upon science. As they are answered, the Nation will gain a better understanding of the issues associated with the Government's heavy participation in research. If questions of this kind are examined in depth—and there is no alternative—we will eventually come to grips with an issue of even greater magnitude, one that encompasses much that we have been talking about and a great deal more. Let me explain. We accept the premise that research and education are inseparable. We acknowldge that the Federal Government is not out of place when it acts to help provide the resources and funds required by today's citadels of scientific learning. But is this not merely part of the even greater problem of identifying, developing, and making the best use of our greatest asset, the intellectual capacity of our citizens? The ability to think and to know, in the long run, will determine the fate of our Nation. Seen in this light, the distinction between the sciences and the humanities disappears.

For the moment, however, our attention is on science. There is one overriding consideration that I would commend to the policymakers and to the public at large. It is this: The national interest will be best served if we keep continuously in mind that the direction of science never has been and never will be as important as its freedom. Let us remember that many of the great discoveries associated with such names as Newton, Einstein, Kekulé, Hertz, Thompson, Compton, and Fleming have not come from programs directed toward solving specific problems. But this overriding consideration does not and cannot absolve either science or society of the responsibility to use the fruits of this freedom of inquiry for the betterment rather than for the destruction of mankind.

The challenge we face has been summed up succinctly by George Wells Beadle, president of the University of Chicago and Nobel Laureate for his revolutionary work in genetics:

"Man's evolutionary future * * * is unlimited. But far more important, it lies within his own power to determine its direction * * * an opportunity never before presented to any species on earth. * * * To carry the human species on to a future of biological and cultural freedom, knowledge must be accompanied by collective wisdom and courage of an order not yet demonstrated by any society of man."

Wright Patman's Wrong on Interest, Says Treasury—United States Rejects Deposits Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 14, 1964]

WRIGHT PATMAN'S WRONG ON INTEREST, SAYS TREASURY—UNITED STATES REJECTS DEPOSITS DEMAND

(By Robert Dietsch)

The Treasury Department reacted coldly today to suggestions by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, that banks pay interest on Federal deposits and be permitted to pay interest on personal checking accounts.

Such accounts, said Representative PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, are raw materials representing $150 billion which banks are earning interest on but not paying to the depositors.

CHANGED

He forecast that "this inequitable arrangement will be changed, either by Congress or by the bankers themselves—that is, those who have vision and commonsense."

Actually it was Congress, in 1933, that barred banks from paying interest on checking accounts, also known as demand deposits. In the roaring twenties, bankers vied with each other to attract checking funds in and, as a result, engaged in an interest war.

DEPRESSION

Heavy demand-deposit interest payments were a major cause in the bank break which preceded the great depression.

Today, neither the Treasury nor the bankers themselves want to revive interest payments on demand deposits. Even eliminating the usual service charge on checking accounts is viewed as bad management—as attested by the recent failure of a Tulsa bank, which followed such policy.

Mr. PATMAN's other suggestion, that banks be required to pay interest on Federal deposits, revolves around Treasury funds which the commercial companies hold in "tax and loan accounts." Banks acquire the taxpayer money in two major ways:

When a bank buys Government securities, for itself or a customer, the money may be permitted to stay in a special account within the bank.

Income and other taxes withheld and collected by corporations are deposited in the banks and also are permitted to stay there instead of being turned over to the Treasury.

EARN INTEREST

All this money gives a bank additional demand deposits. When the Treasury's working cash balance gets too low, it demands its tax and loan funds. In the meantime, banks can use the tax and loan funds for their own purposes, and earn interest.

Mr. PATMAN, in a House speech, charged that 11,700 banks thus get a subsidy totaling $267 million a year.

MAKE PROFIT

The Treasury concedes banks may earn a profit on U.S. funds. It disputes Mr. PATMAN'S $267 million figure, however, and argues that the tax-and-loan-fund arrangement "minimizes the disruptive effects that Treasury operations—a dominent factor in money markets—would otherwise have on those markets."

But the Treasury is studying the issue, with a report due in July which may recommend a speedup of withdrawals from large banks which carry the bulk of tax and loan accounts.

Personally Speaking—Tale of Two Cities Written in Tears of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, every schoolboy has heard of the long conflict between Rome and Carthage and remembers the phrase "Carthage must be destroyed."

Our own situation in the United States was recently compared to the position of Carthage in an excellent article by Jameson G. Campaigne, editor of the Indianapolis Star.

The warning he sends must not fall on deaf ears. If we have had tendencies to be a modern-day Carthage, it is not too late to change our ways. We should be aware, however, of the dangerous end to which such attitudes can lead us.

PERSONALLY SPEAKING—TALE OF TWO CITIES WRITTEN IN TEARS OF APPEASEMENT

(By Jameson G. Campaigne)

"America Is Carthage." I thought of this statement, attributed to Gen. Charles de Gaulle by the Columnist Dorothy Thompson, while reading an article by Donald Armstrong taken from his recent book, "Cold War in a Toga."

"Twenty-one centuries ago," wrote Armstrong, "a certain nation so loved peace that no price to keep the peace was too exorbitant. It faced a ruthless enemy, but it abandoned war as an instrument of policy. It surrendered unconditionally when the enemy declared war. Finally on the enemy's demand it disarmed unilaterally.

"We might suppose that the millennium had arrived. Surely now the lion and the lamb would lie down together in peace and harmony. But what actually happened?"

The nation was Carthage. Its enemy was Rome. And there is a lesson in their story for us that we must learn if we are to avoid repeating its outcome.

The Greek Historian Polybius once said, "We should regard as the best discipline for actual life the experience that accrues from serious history; for this alone makes us, without inflicting any harm on us, the most competent judges of what is best at every time and in every circumstance." (The Histories, I, 35, 9–10.)

A CITY BUILT ON TRADE

Carthage was said to have been founded in 814 B.C.; Rome, about 60 years later. Carthage, located about where Tunis is in North Africa, grew rapidly rich and powerful—through trade.

Rome grew more slowly—through conquest. When Carthage had become a great, glittering metropolis, Rome was still a collection of mud huts on the Tiber. But the Romans moved slowly down the Italian peninsula, sometimes by outright war, sometimes by guile, sometimes by aiding one neighbor against another and then taking them both.

Rome reached Sicily in 264 B.C. and collided with Carthaginian cities. The Romans were fully prepared for war, not only on land but on the sea. The Carthaginians underestimated the boldness, the tenacity, and the implacable determination of the Romans. In the ensuing conflict Carthage lost its navy, its colonies and the war.

In 218 B.C. the great Carthaginian general, Hannibal, invaded Italy to rewin what had been lost and try to conquer Rome. He almost succeeded, but not quite. After that relatively inconclusive conflict Carthage, with Roman encouragement, decided to stick to trade, instead of seeking territory and before long became again prosperous and powerful.

CARTHAGO DELENDA EST

Then Rome began its program of gradual subversion and infiltration at the insistence of the Roman Senator Marcus Cato. After a trip to Carthage, Cato returned to Rome to repeat again and again the ancient equivalent of "We will bury you"—"Cathagó delenda est." Carthage must be destroyed.

Rome subsidized the Kingdom of Numidia, a neighbor of Carthage, and the Numidians, under Masinissa, kept slicing off more and more pieces of territory from Carthage. Rome stayed aloof, pretending to have nothing to do with these aggressions.

Still the Romans were not ready for all-out war. They thought they might win their way by further weakening Carthage. So they influenced the Carthaginian city of Utica, only 20 miles away, to become a Roman satellite. (Cuba is only 90 miles away from us.)

Then the Romans started negotiating with Carthage. They alternated promises with threats. The Roman Senate promised that if Carthage would accept their terms they would retain "freedom and their laws, besides their whole territory and all possessions both public and private."

COLD WAR WAGED BY ROME

The Carthaginians were overjoyed. Now they could live and trade in peace. They accepted the Roman terms and sent a mission to Rome to sign them. "For Rome the cold war had reached its last act. It had succeeded beyond any conceivable hope." Carthage was defenseless.

To the Carthaginian envoys the Roman Consul Censorinus said, "Your ready obedience up to this point, Carthaginians is worthy of all praise. But bear bravely the remaining command of the Senate. Yield Carthage to us, and betake yourselves where you like within your own territory at a distance of at least 10 miles from the sea, for we are resolved to raze your city to the ground."

Such were the fruits of appeasement. Angrily the Carthaginians refused, returned to their city and rearmed as swiftly as they could. They fought for their homes, their wealth, their city and their lives with a savage fury unsurpassed by any people at any time in histoy. But 3 years later Carthage was no more—its people massacred, its cities burned and in ruins, its history at an end.

A great civilization disappeared from the earth.

General de Gaulle's study of history causes him to say, "America is Carthage." Is he right?

In Defense of "Puritans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, with the new economic report just around the corner, I am pleased to draw the attention of this body to the Detroit News editorial in defense of "Puritans":

PURITANS

The sophisticated economics of Washington holds that we do not have to worry much about Federal deficits because the country is growing faster than its debt.

Defending this point of view in an article in the Atlantic Monthly, J. David Stern, a businessman and former newspaper publisher in Philadelphia and New York, argues that the Nation is in no peril even though the Federal debt still is rising in absolute terms.

His argument runs this way: The national debt in 1947 was $257 billion or 10 percent more than the gross national product, while in 1962 the debt of $295 billion was only 55 percent of the gross national product, or proportionately half of what it had been 15 years earlier.

Put another way, the national debt in 1947 was 151 percent of net disposable income, while in 1962 it was 80 percent of that figure. Put a third way, the population since 1947 has increased 29 percent, the national debt only 18 percent.

Thus he contends that debt, which has become respectable for the businessman and for the householder, ought to become respectable for the Government, too. Corporate debt has increased 204 percent in the last 15 years and personal debt, including home mortgages, has risen 389 percent in the comparable period. So why, asks Mr. Stern, should anyone become concerned about the Federal debt that has increased only about 18 percent in the same time?

The answer is that long-term business debt is incurred to finance a new plant or some other income-producing asset and thus is potentially self-liquidating. In fact, businesses have to prove they have a plan to pay off their debt at the time they contract it. The Federal Government's debt is something else again, for it is usually incurred to finance the Federal spending that is not met by Federal receipts. There seldom is any investment in any income-producing assets. There is, in short, no plan to pay off Federal debt.

Stern claims to see no direct relationship between Federal debt and Federal taxes. But he does concede possible peril in that "Federal, State, and local taxes take too large a percentage of national income and thus retard economic growth." Yet the growth of the Federal debt alone means that $10 billion a year now is being spent to pay the interest, to say nothing about any payments on the debt itself. And this $10 billion must come from taxes, just as do most of the Federal Government's other receipts.

In addition, whenever the Federal debt is financed through the Nation's banking system rather than by private individuals and businesses, it contributes to inflation. If unlimited Federal spending were permitted, the Federal Reserve would have to choose between promoting inflation or letting the Treasury Department encounter borrowing difficulties.

There still are people in Government who, like Stern, feel that Federal deficits are not important just so long as the Nation keeps growing faster than its debts. But if the Nation's debt keeps rising in good times, what grounds are there for the assumption that the Nation will be able to keep growing faster than its debt in the event of depression or war?

The attitude of Washington was expressed some months ago by Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who was astonished to hear objections to the proposed tax cut. He said, "It is quite remarkable that the basic Puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reduction * * * because of their fears of deficits and the additions to the national debt."

Yet if they didn't have such Puritan fears what brakes would there be on unlimited Federal spending and the inflation that inevitably would result?

The Meanings of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Sampson, Sr., of Westbury, Long Island, whom I have the honor to represent in Congress, has written a very fine article which appeared in the November-December 1963 New Cassel News.

Mr. Sampson, who thoroughly understands what it means to be a good citizen, has written:

Men eventually get the type of government and treatment they desire or deserve through their efforts or lack of it. Liberty, freedom, progress is not an inherited hand-me-down package. Requires daily responsibility and action from all of us from the cradle to the grave. The strength of the effort is the measure of the result.

His article follows:

THOUGHTS

(By Walter Sampson, Sr.)

Edison toiled for 5 days and 5 nights without sleep to produce the incadescent light. How much toil do you put in to brighten up this community? Search your heart, mind and soul—look at yourself in the mirror and come up with an honest answer.

Do you honestly think your efforts were enough? Are you satisfied with the present form of New Cassel with its evils as well as its virtues? Sincerely concerned, militant and active enough to make your community and school conditions for your child the very best humanly possible? Enough to work for it? New Cassel, a growing community as it expands, presents complex problems, both good and evil. We live in the tide of change—the tempo of call to today's needs. Change, change, change—there is nothing so constant as change. Change brings difficult challenges and people are measured by the way they respond.

We will always outgrow present ideals and ambitions thereby broadening our horizon to life as we advance. The economic and school boycott proved New Cassel has changed in tempo. "The old gray mare ain't what it used to be."

For 7 long weary years, through thick and thin, Progressive Civic has championed civic awareness through New Cassel News, various newspapers, flyers, loud speakers, movie projectors, special civic speakers and town officials. Our financial records are ample proof we practice full support of many worthy community activities. Even detractors cannot deny this.

Better streets and lighting—a battle cry that will never cease until all streets of New Cassel become equal to the rest of the community—this is our sacred pledge. We gratefully acknowledge the cooperative actions of our officials and valiant efforts of Mr. Hunter of the former action committee, the many fine men and women, that has resulted in this phase, giving New Cassel a new look. Look, see for yourself.

PCANC were founded, also, as an instrument of protection from unwarranted zone and variance abuses, which unless resisted would destroy our suburban residential usage and home value. Seek the advice, cooperation of your block captain on any problem or blight in your area. Do you know him or her?

We participated in voter registration, because it defeats the unwarranted lazy expression, "Oh, my vote does not count." In the greatest Christian country in the world, and the home of democracy, Medgar Evers was shot in the back. Men, women, and children injured, murdered on a Sunday morning in a Christian church because of their lawful desire to register and vote. Do you vote in school affairs, primary, local, and national elections? Look at yourself in the mirror one second for the honest answer. If the answer is "No," please straighten up and fly right.

There is perhaps nothing spectacular about PCANC, rather it is a movement kept by the determination, willpower, of an ever-growing number of members, friends, and well-wishers. We have gone far but not far enough. With your help we could and will march from the struggling line of serving the community with overworked members, to the many fully capable, talented men and women New Cassel is blessed with for real success.

The difference between failure and success is merely that of will. Willpower and energy applied in the right direction. Success without work is found only in the dictionary. We need workers not weepers, boosters not knockers; that's why we need you. See you at our regular meeting, second Thursday each month?

In Unity There Is Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from the great volume of articles evoked by President Kennedy's assassination, one particular editorial stands out in my mind. Written by Edward T. Austin, public relations manager of the Rohr Corp. in San Diego, Calif., it appeared in the 1963 winter edition of the company's magazine. I feel certain that my colleagues will want to review this article for it sets forth an observation of exceptional value to each of us:

THE LOGBOOK

Out of the tragedy that struck this country a few days ago there should have emerged a lesson that those who might hope to profit by our national distress should ponder: al-

though we may differ among ourselves on political philosophy, and we engage in strenuous, even bitter, campaigns, when catastrophe threatens we lay aside our differences and unite as a single, massive force.

Never has this unity been demonstrated more effectively than in the hour following the assassination of President Kennedy. The death of a President always is a shocking experience for the Nation, but this one was the more stunning because the blow came with the swiftness of a bullet. And yet, within minutes, an orderly transfer of administrative authority was accomplished; there was no interruption of Government.

In the last century four American Presidents have been assassinated, and four times the Nation, after a pause to express its grief and dry its tears, has moved on under the guidance of a man who, under our laws, stood ready to move into the Presidency. And in each case the assassin who had the idiotic idea that by destroying one man he could destroy a Government that his twisted mind impelled him to hate, has only succeeded in adding to its strength because his act, for at least a time, erased differences and brought the people closer together.

Nations, too, have made the mistake of assuming that we were torn by disunity, steeped in materialistic greed, a Nation too proud to fight. Both Japan and Germany miscalculated American unity and as a result spent years digging out of the rubble of a senseless, futile war they brought upon themselves.

One of America's sources of strength is its compassion for others less fortunate, so graphically demonstrated by our assistance to those whose miscalculations of our unity led them to defeat. Once the war ended we extended a helping hand to the vanquished and now, happily, both of our foes of 20 years ago are warm and understanding friends.

The wounds inflicted upon the American people by the crack of a rifle on a Dallas street may be slow in healing; all of us long will feel the pain inflicted upon us by a maniac whose twisted mind led him to believe that a bullet could solve his imaginary grievances.

As we recover from our shock and resume our normal activities, let it be hoped that from our sorrow and the tragedy we so recently suffered there will emerge a clearer understanding by all of us of the majesty and strength of our form of government, and that in unity there is strength to overcome those who would seek to disrupt or destroy our way of life.

Special Delivery From Heaven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I am pleased to include therein a splendid and touching poem entitled "Special Delivery From Heaven," written by a very fine young lady, Miss Barbara Jones, of Yonkers, N.Y., 15 years of age and a sophomore in Sacred Heart High School.

The beautiful thoughts of the young lady will touch everyone who reads her poem:

SPECIAL DELIVERY FROM HEAVEN

Sorry I had to leave right away,
I look down and smile at you every day.
Little Patrick asks to say "Hi,"
I love you, I'm happy, so please don't cry.

And Caroline I'd like to say,
How proud Daddy was of you that day.
When you stood like a lady and watched me go by,
And doing as Mommy did, you tried not to cry.

Little John, now you're the big man,
So take care of Mommy the best you can.
You were just like a soldier—that salute was so brave,
Thanks for the flag that you placed on my grave.

And Jackie, there was no time for goodbye,
But I'm sure you could read the "Farewell" in my eyes.
Watch over our children and love them for me,
I'll treasure your love through eternity.

So please carry on as you did before,
'Till all of us meet on Heaven's bright shore.
Remember I love you, remember I care,
I'll always be with you, though you don't see me there.
Love,

JACK.

Supreme Court Bars This Editorial From Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I am pleased to insert the following editorial by Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa, of November 17, 1963.

At the time the Supreme Court ruled out prayer in schools they must forgot that "Just as you bend the little twig so will the tree be when it is big," hence I was one of the very first to sign the Becker petition which appeals to the American people to recind that ungodly ruling.

The editorial follows:

SUPREME COURT BARS THIS EDITORIAL FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This editorial consists largely of quotations from one of the best known books ever published in the world's history. If you take the trouble to read the quotations you probably will find they are familiar to you, and you may have committed them to memory in your childhood:

"If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me."

"The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him in truth."

"The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?"

"Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; Thou are with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me."

"Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the House of the Lord forever."

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."

"The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil; He shall preserve thy soul."

"Let all those that put their trust in Thee rejoice; Let them forever shout for joy, because Thou defendest them; let them also that love Thy name be joyful in Thee."

"Man are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth them out of them all."

"My times are in Thy hand; deliver me from the hand of mine enemies, and from them that persecute them all."

"Cast Thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee; He shall never suffer the righteous to be moved."

"My soul, wait thou only upon God; for my expectation is from Him."

"They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint."

"Therefore, I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what shall ye put on. Is not life more than meat, and the body more than raiment?"

"Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not better than they?"

"You seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

You may search all literature from the beginning of time and find no assurances compared to these, except in the same book from which these were selected.

For thousands of years they have comforted and reassured men and women of many lands, who needed help in a world that sometimes became too much for them to endure.

They will help you if you take the time to read and ponder them.

If any of these verses are unfamiliar to you, your minister can tell you just where to find them.

Incredible as it may seem, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that they may not be read in the public schools, contending that reading them is a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution.

It might be a good idea to write your Senators and Congressman and sugest that another amendment correcting this misinterpretation be adopted and submitted to the States for ratification.

Smoking and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, Dr. Luther Terry, the Surgeon General of the United States, made public the report of a special Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health. The report was prepared over a 14-month period by 10 private scientists, all experts in their respective fields. In writing the report, the scientists reviewed over 8,000 existing studies on different

aspects of smoking and health. The Committee reached the conclusion:

In view of the continuing and mounting evidence from many sources, it is the judgment of the Committee that cigarette smoking contributes substantially to mortality from certain specific diseases and to the overall death rate.

They also concluded that the health hazard of smoking is of sufficient importance to warrant appropriate remedial action.

The findings of this report will, of course, be of great interest to every doctor in this country, and to the 70 million Americans who smoke regularly. In this country, roughly two-thirds of the men and almost one-third of the women over 18 smoke regularly.

There are many questions regarding what the effect of this report will be. The Tobacco Institute has suggested that there will be a temporary slowdown in cigarette consumption.

Regarding cigarette consumption, it is interesting to note that in the year 1900 the per-person consumption of cigarettes was about 50 a year. By 1963, it had risen to about 4,000 cigarettes per year per person.

In considering what the possible effects of the Government report will be, I think the experience in Great Britain is meaningful. In March of 1962, the Royal College of Surgeons made a report reaching conclusions similar to the Advisory Committee of the Surgeon General. Yet, cigarette consumption in England fell off only 3 percent in 1962, and set a record in 1963. This occurred despite Government efforts to educate the public regarding the hazard of smoking and restrictions on smoking advertisements aimed at young people.

U.S. Government officials concerned with health have a responsibility to put the facts on this issue before the public. Because this is such a strong and widespread habit, and, as the report stated, provides such a "psychological crutch" to Americans, it is unlikely that people will abruptly quit smoking, barring basic changes in the nature of us all.

Legislation will probably be considered by the Congress regarding the labeling of cigarettes, and cigarette advertising, but it seems to me that it would be unwise to try and legislate this habit out of existence and repeat the fiasco of our prohibition era.

What is definitely needed is intensified research on how tobacco products and tobacco smoke can be modified to reduce any harmful effects. There is a great deal more to be known about this subject. The tobacco industry, the Government, and private researchers must accelerate their efforts to identify and remove hazardous components. In the last 10 years, the tobacco industry has sponsored over $7½ million in research to accomplish this. The Federal Government spends about $1½ million each year on tobacco-related research. These efforts must be intensified. Experts in the field have indicated that the ultimate development of less harmful cigarettes is feasible.

Studies should also be made by the Government, the tobacco industry, and economists regarding the possible economic effects if there was a reduction in tobacco consumption. At the present time, tobacco is the Nation's fifth largest cash crop. It supports an $8 billion business. Over 700,000 farm families are engaged in tobacco production and tobacco factories employ almost 100,000 people. In addition, there is a huge retail and wholesale business supported by tobacco, and over 300,000 Americans hold stock in tobacco companies. The industry spends over $170 million a year on advertising, including $134 million in television alone.

In southern Maryland, over 6,000 farm families are engaged in tobacco production, and the $20 million tobacco crop is the No. 1 farm cash crop in Maryland, ranking ahead of soybeans, corn, and wheat. One possible economic answer is diversification within the tobacco industry. Phillip Morris, for example, is already doing this, with over 20 percent of its income coming from the production of razor blades, scissors, and packages. Last, but not least, a final important economic consideration cannot be overlooked. At the present time, the tobacco industry pays over $3 billion a year in taxes, $2 billion of which goes to the Federal Government, and $1 billion to the State. A drop in these revenues would certainly affect all citizens. It is clear that much more research is vitally needed, and the current Federal efforts in this field must be expanded.

Admiral Kirkpatrick Leaves the Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, my home town of Annapolis, Md., is proud to claim the U.S. Naval Academy as one of its most important institutions. Throughout the years that Annapolis has been the home of the Academy the city has had the honor to see many fine naval men come and, unfortunately, go. These men have always made fine contributions to the betterment of the community, and for that we civilians will ever be thankful.

One of the finest and most admired men ever to come to the Academy completed his assignment there last weekend. Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, after 2 years as Academy Superintendent, was relieved of his duties. His new post will be that of Chief of Naval Personnel; his new rank, vice admiral. The sadness left by the transfer of Admiral Kirkpatrick is softened only by the knowledge that his shoes are filled by a remarkably well qualified man, Capt. Charles S. Minter, Jr., who was moved up from his job as Academy Commandant of Midshipmen. The new Superintendent was also promoted to the rank of rear admiral.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD several articles from the Evening Capital, published in Annapolis, describing the transfer of command, along with an editorial describing Admiral Kirkpatrick's accomplishments during his tenure:

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Jan. 9, 1964]

KIRKPATRICK CITES ACADEMY INNOVATIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Vice Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, Superintendent of the Naval Academy, who will be succeeded in that post on Saturday by Rear Adm. Charles S. Minter, Jr., presently commandant of midshipmen, has been a vital administrator. The admiral, who has been promoted to the three-star rank of Chief of Naval Personnel, will leave behind him the groundwork for extensive and significant changes at the Academy. Admiral Kirkpatrick's evaluation of the curriculum, for example, the subject of a recently published work which he authored, characterizes the impact of the still-to-be completed revamping.)

"The recent history of change in curriculum at the U.S. Naval Academy is moving at a pace that threatens to outrun our understanding."

With that observation, then Rear Adm. Charles Kirkpatrick set the tone of his commentary—"Rhodes scholars? Yes, but naval officers first."

"In the past few years," he continued, "we have undertaken such revolutionary innovations as: a validation program, a system of elective courses and majors, the institution of the Office of Academic Dean, and the adoption of a letter grading system after over 100 years of the 4.0 marking method."

(A footnote explains that the change in the Academy's marking system became effective June 7, 1963.)

Summing up his introduction, Admiral Kirkpatrick said, "It is evident that major change is underway. The Academy is attempting to take a quantum leap forward in its academic program.

A statement and an explanation followed:

"Before we assess the academic record of our Academy, one thing must be made very clear: Rhodes scholars are desirable, naval officers are mandatory. The two are not necessarily incompatible, but it must be stressed and restressed that the primary mission of the Academy has been historically, and remains today, to prepare young men morally, mentally, and physically to become officers of the U.S. Navy."

Tracing the academic growth of the Academy from its first class, numbering 55, which entered training on October 16, 1845, was a task that led the admiral to recount the milestones which showed the way to fulfilling the the staggering demands on knowledge and training created by the world of today.

Stepped-up admission requirements, the advantages of validation, in which a midshipman need not repeat a course already mastered, and the introduction of elective subjects were discussed by the admiral with enthusiasm.

Noting the achievements of specific midshipmen, and the overall contributions to the Nation by Academy graduates, Admiral Kirkpatrick concluded by saying that, "Our academic changes are indeed revolutionary today. But we must never forget these impressive improvements have been made possible only by the constant building process which has been our heritage.

"Upon the early achievements of those who went before us, an outstanding academic record has been established and maintained. Our present efforts are the latest phase of this constant search for excellence which has enabled us to maintain the U.S. Naval

Academy in the forefront of the academic community."

And the admiral emphasized "constant search for excellence."

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Jan. 9, 1964]

ADMIRAL KIRKPATRICK PROVED A FINE SUPERINTENDENT

Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy, is one of those people who have the rare ability of making high office seem easy—of combining ability, talent, and efficiency with a warm attitude of friendliness and interest.

For these and many other reasons, "Uncle Charlie," as the admiral is affectionately known to the 4,000-member brigade of midshipmen, will be much missed when he is relieved of duty Saturday as Academy Superintendent.

Relieving him in the top Academy post will be Capt. Charles S. Minter, Jr., U.S. Navy, an able, upright young naval officer, who has moved up from his duty as Academy commandant of midshipmen. Minter will become a rear admiral on Saturday.

Admiral Kickpatrick, a lean 6-footer from Texas who distinguised himself as a wartime submarine commander, is being promoted to the rank of vice admiral and will take over the post of Chief of Naval Personnel fellowing a short vacation trip in the South.

The family of the admiral, who has always demonstrated his fondness for Annapolis, will continue living here until at least June, when they plan to move to Washington, where Admiral Kirkpatrick's new post is located.

While heading the Academy for 2 years, Admiral Kirkpatrick always extended a friendly hand between the Navy and its Annapolis civilian neighbors. He made a personal effort to attend local functions and to let it be known that Annapolis is truly the Academy's hometown.

The admiral, who won the Navy Cross 3 times and 13 other decorations, for the past 2 years has been a man dedicated to preparing the Academy midshipmen for their work in the Navy. He has directed major curriculum advances as Superintendent.

He also has taken a keen interest in that vital area so important to the Navy fightingman—morale and spirit. He has done much to let the midshipmen know they can do anything they set their minds to and have the spirit to carry through.

Realizing that sports are of great importance to service academies, he has taken the time to personally show an interest in the achievements great and small of Academy athletes.

Admiral Kirkpatrick's friendly attitude and qualities of leadership will long serve as an example to those who follow him. The local area has been fortunate because recent Superintendents, all of them rising young officers, have by their attainments, while here on duty, brought credit to the naval service.

We know that the community joins us in congratulating Admiral Kirkpatrick on a job well done and in wishing him equal success as Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Jan. 11, 1964]

MINTER 1ST ACADEMY COMMANDANT TO SUCCEED TO TOP POST—SUCCEEDS KIRKPATRICK AT CEREMONY TODAY

When Capt. Charles S. Minter, Jr., U.S. Navy, reads his latest naval orders this morning, he will become the Naval Academy's 43d Superintendent since its founding in 1845. He is the first to succeed to that post from duty as commandant of midshipmen.

At the same time the 48-year-old officer—one of the youngest in history to be selected Academy Superintendent—will become a rear admiral.

His immediate predecessor, Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy, likewise will read his new orders designating him Chief of Naval Personnel during change of command ceremonies beginning in the Naval Academy fieldhouse at 11:15 a.m.

This will be the first time a superintendency change of command has taken place in the fieldhouse. In 1961 Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, relieved Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, as chief of naval operations there.

When he goes to Washington, D.C., to take up his new responsibilities, Admiral Kirkpatrick will assume the rank of vice admiral.

Among the estimated 900 guests and dignitaries expected for the ceremonies is Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze, who will be welcomed by a 19-gun salute.

After Nitze addresses the gathering—which will include the approximately 4,000-man brigade of midshipmen—Admiral Kirkpatrick will deliver a farewell address.

Then the outgoing Superintendent will ask permission of the Secretary to lower his admiral's flag.

Officials accompanying Nitze for the change of command will be three Assistant Secretaries of the Navy—James H. Wakelin, Jr., research and development; Kenneth E. BeLieu, installations and logistics, and Victor M. Longstreet, financial management.

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg, III, U.S. Navy, a former Academy Superintendent, who is being succeeded by Admiral Kirkpatrick as Chief of Naval Personnel, and Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations, also will be on hand.

Other naval and military officials present will include Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy, (retired), president of the Naval Academy Alumni Association, and Maj. Gen. James B. Lampert, U.S. Army, Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

Also in the throng will be a host of city, State, and county figures, including Gov. J. Millard Tawes and Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Democrat, of Maryland.

Ensign Charles S. Minter III, U.S. Navy, son of the new Superintendent, who was graduated last June from the Academy as commanding officer of the color company, has journeyed to Annapolis from Norfolk, Va., home port of the U.S.S. *Samson*, a destroyer on which he is serving, to see his father take command of the Academy.

The invocation will be given by Capt. James E. Reaves, CHC, U.S. Navy, senior chaplain at the institution.

Santa Claus Is Fed Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Santa Claus is fed up. Personally I do not blame him. The following letter tells us why:

JANUARY 10, 1964.

DEAR MARTHA GRIFFITHS: Now that the holidays are past I can't help wondering how many children were disappointed with their TV toys. By TV toys, I'm trying to say, toys that were advertised on TV.

Having put forth hard-earned cash for a few of these TV toys, I feel I should call your attention to the fact, all that is pictured on the old TV ain't necessarily so.

My wife and I purchased one "Tiger Joe," billed as a toy tank that will move anywhere and shoot its cannon anywhere by remote control. My 5-year-old son thought this was the ultimate super toy, and Santa, the good old chap that he is, would get him one. My wife also thought Santa should get him one. I thought $14 was a lot of cash for Santa to shell out. But, after watching this marvel of marvels on TV, even I began to think maybe Santa could come up with the money.

So, lo and behold, Christmas morning arrived and sure enough there was "Tiger Joe." While Santa did come across, his elves must have been on a coffee break, because good old daddy had to assemble it himself.

Now, there were a couple of parts missing. This I didn't mind. The instructions for assembling were fairly clear. There was 80 cents worth of batteries to buy. This was OK. But, when this alleged supertoy was put into operation, the only thing that resembled the one watched on the old TV was the dimension. It did not move by remote control. It did not shoot its cannon by remote control. In short it wasn't anything like the one shown on television.

I know this is not an earth shattering matter, and is not a major crisis, but it does seem to me that Santa was took.

Isn't there some agency in our Government, that can protect poor old, gullible and naive Santas from these Madison Avenue vampires?

I hope so.

Sincerely yours,

ROY H. RASMUSSEN.

P.S.—I'm for civil rights and a tax cut this session—please.

Cordova Championship Football Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, night before last the citizens of Cordova, Ala., in my home county of Walker, gathered to honor the 28 young men of the 1963 Cordova Blue Devil football team and the men who coached them to the Alabama State championship. The members of this team effectively combined physical prowess, skill, determination, sportsmanship, and hard work to produce a football team that won 9 games and tied the 10th, scoring a total of 265 points to their opponents 58. This outstanding team was named Walker County Champion, Wal-Win Conference Champion, and the AA champion football team of the State of Alabama. The members of the team are: Frankie Brown, Mike Franks, Donny Cordell, Terrell Foster, Larry Fowler, Ed Gilchrist, Ralph Gurganus, Terry Howell, Benny Huggins, Larry Hunt, Chris Hyche, John Ingram, Tommy Jean, Dwight Kirkpatrick, Ernie Laird, Mike Moncrief, Phillip Morrow, Tim O'Neil, Richard Perrin, Ed Pickrell, Bobby Russell, David Sargent, Guy Tatum, Jr., Clarence VanHorn, James Williams, Jimmy Barrentine, Teddy Sargent, and Junior Johnson. The team is ably coached by Wayne Grubb and Maury Fowler.

Mr. Speaker, we have become increasingly alarmed in recent years at the low standards of physical fitness of many of our young people. The statistice on the number of young men rejected by our Armed Forces because of failure to meet physical standards has been shocking.

I am proud of the striking contrast to this trend that has been evidenced by these young men of Cordova. Cordova is a town of 3,000 people. The area is a coal mining center, and is classified as an economically depressed area because of chronic unemployment. The young men of Cordova have not, however, succumbed to the softness that has resulted in too many physically unfit young men. They have not let the temporary economic problems of their area dampen their enthusiasm or their determination to excel.

I am proud of the academic standards of Cordova High School and I am proud of its athletic achievements. I congratulate the fine teachers and coaches at Cordova for their success in building the minds and bodies of these young people, and I congratulate the members of the student body for their pursuit and attainment of excellence.

I believe my colleagues in the Congress share my great faith in the future of America, secure in the knowledge that the farms, towns, and cities can produce as Cordova has produced, educated, physically fit young Americans who are eager to challenge tomorrow and determined to meet all the challenges that tomorrow may bring.

J.F.K. Will Be Remembered for Revival of Conservation Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Conservation News of December 15, 1963, published by the National Wildlife Federation at 1412 16th Street NW., entitled "J.F.K. Will Be Remembered for Revival of Conservation Movement."

Much will be remembered by future generations of our beloved late President John F. Kennedy. Perhaps one of his most lasting and real monuments will be his conservation endeavor and the wonderful leadership which he gave to this most essential and perhaps least appreciated of our programs on the Federal level.

The article follows:

J.F.K. WILL BE REMEMBERED FOR REVIVAL OF CONSERVATION MOVEMENT

The late President John F. Kennedy, to use a judgment of Franklin D. Roosevelt made by then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 1963 annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation in Detroit, will perhaps be remembered as favorably and as affectionately because of the revival that he gave to the conservation movement in this country as he will be remembered for any of the other numerous things he did.

The proponent of a third wave of conservation in the United States, following that of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy during his tragically foreshortened tenure in the highest office in the land breathed new life into this vital field of endeavor by taking such personal and dramatic steps as:

Sending on March 1, 1962, a bold and farseeing special message to the Congress on conservation—a document termed by Interior Secretary Udall "an unprecedented charter for vigorous action, and a specific program for the future."

Proposing, and addressing on May 25, 1962, a White House Conference on Conservation—the first to be called since Theodore Roosevelt convened Governors of the States in 1908—which brought together some 280 leaders of national conservation policy in public and private life for an exchange of views.

Emphasizing the need for new programs of land stewardship in many of his speeches, especially those made during a September 1963, swing through 10 Western States when he made his call for a "third wave of conservation" and told audiences, "Conservation, in the real analysis, is the job of us all."

The late President indicated his awareness of conservation problems early in his administration. On March 3, 1961, while, dedicating the new headquarters building of the National Wildlife Federation in Washington, D.C., he quoted a poem read at his inauguration by the late Robert Frost which began, "The land was ours before we were the land's," interpreting this to mean that "this new land of ours sustained us before we were a nation, and although we are now the land's—a nation of people matched to a continent—we still draw our strength and sustenance * * * from the earth."

"It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down undiminished to those who come after us what was handed down to us by those who went before, the natural wealth and beauty which is ours," the late President said at the NWF building dedication ceremony, noting, "To do this will require constant attention and vigilance, sustained vigor and imagination."

These qualities—especially vigor and imagination—were brought to bear on the Nation's conservation problems by Mr. Kennedy and his able team of handpicked New Frontiersmen including Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. Some of the fruits of the Kennedy administration's labors:

The establishment of three new national seashores—Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Point Reyes in California, and Padre Island in Texas—and several new national wildlife refuges;

The creation of a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within the Department of the Interior to act as a needed focal point within the Federal Government for all outdoor recreation activities;

The strengthening of Federal water pollution control programs, especially in the areas of law enforcement and grants for waste treatment plant construction;

The authorization of a $105 million loan for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to initiate a crash program of wetlands acquisition;

The accelerated setting aside of wilderness areas within the national forests despite the failure of Congress to pass the administration-supported wilderness bill;

The adoption of a Department of Commerce regulation requiring coordination with State conservation agencies in the planning of highways built with Federal funds; and

The steps taken within the Federal establishment to lessen the potential threat of chemical pesticides to man and wildlife, through research, law enforcement, and education programs.

Bertrand Russell's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a timely article dealing with the problem of the arms race in the Middle East, entitled "Bertrand Russell's Challenge," which appears in the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 63, winter 1963–64, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019. This article is of particular significance because it demonstrates where the source of the war danger in the Middle East lies. The adamant stand of certain Arab States against the halting of the arms race is a danger which cannot be ignored. That is why this article is so timely.

The article follows:

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S CHALLENGE

Although one may seriously disagree at times with the tactics and/or approach of Bertrand Russell's struggle for world peace, the sincerity and dedication of the noted British philosopher is generally acknowledged. Thus one usually associated his activities with the main area of the cold war conflict, i.e., United States-Soviet relations. Lord Russell has also shown concern over the situation in the Middle East.

Last April, he addressed a letter to the President of Iraq, Field Marshal Arif, in which he expressed alarm over the treatment meted out to Arif's political opponents during the overthrow of the previous regime headed by General Kassem. Lord Russell took the opportunity to express his anxiety regarding the general developments in the Middle East. In particular he referred to the arms race and expressed the fear that "the forces of the cold war" would try to exploit the tense relations between Israel and neighboring Arab states. Lord Russell told the Iraqi President of his wish that every leader in the Middle East "would declare his desire to accept international control over nuclear installations and means of delivering rockets." He also urged that President Arif take the initiative to prod other Middle Eastern leaders to accept his proposal.

President Arif's reply was a mixture of condescension, evasion and downright misrepresentation. While the whole world had known that Arif's henchmen had inflicted brutal treatment on all who opposed his coup d'etat, he assured Lord Russell that this was not true. As to Lord Russell's pointed and concrete proposals to prevent the escalation of the arms race in the Middle East, Arif completely ignored this challenge.

But as if to cover up his tracks, the Iraqi President reached for the bottle of soothing sirup. "I wish to assure you," he told Lord Russell, "that the Arab people are a good and peaceful people. * * * They harbor no hostile intentions towards any people." Then, the qualifying statement to these professions of peace followed. Israel, Arif complained to Lord Russell, "was set up and it thrived on

aggression." Israel had evicted "one million" Arabs from its territory. To prove his allegation that Israel was aggressive he urged Lord Russell not "to forget the inscription placed over the door of the Israeli Parliament indicating that the land of Israel extends from the Nile to the Euphrates. * * *" Here, Arif declared, was the evidence that Israel harbored aggressive intentions making it necessary for the Arabs to arm themselves "in defense of their freedom."

If Lord Russell could find the time to make a trip to Israel, we would respectfully suggest that he go straight to the Israeli Parliament building and search for the inscription described by the present leader of Iraq. Of course, Lord Russell would find nothing which resembles in the remotest way this canard which is repeated over and over again by Arab propagandists. They repeat it because they assume—as someone in a day gone by once said—if you repeat a lie over and over again, it may become accepted as fact.

But what are the facts which Arif palmed off to Lord Russell? The establishment of Israel was not an aggressive action. On the contrary, it was established under the aegis of the United Nations and proved that important international problems could be solved by peaceful means. The real aggression stemmed from the invading Arab armies which refused to abide by the U.N. Charter and sought to tear up the U.N. decision by force of arms.

True, many of the Arab inhabitants left Israel at the time, but even the Arab leaders, as we have shown in the previous issues of Prevent World War III, admit that it was they who encouraged the exodus on the promise that the Arabs would eventually return under the protection of Arab bayonets. The number of Arabs who were compelled by their own leaders to leave, may have been several hundred thousand which in itself produced a needless tragedy. However, the figure of 1 million is a crude concoction which has been passed around in the same way as President Arif pretends that the door on the Israeli Parliament building carries a map outlining Israeli's expansionist aims.

The refugee problem, we repeat, is a tragic one. Yet, it could be solved if the Arabs would sit down and talk to Israel authorities on ways and means of arriving at an equitable agreement. However, the Arabs categorically reject this civilized way of handling the matter. They prefer to continue to exploit the misery of these refugees so that they can use them for their hate-inciting attacks, as President Arif does in his letter to Lord Russell.

Finally, what about the so-called defensive posture which Arif claims to be the sole reason for the Arab arms buildup? We would suggest that the answer can be found if one peruses the words and statements of Arab leaders and compares them with President Arif's innocent sounding phrases. For example, on August 21, one of President Arif's leading generals, Rashid Musilh, the Military Governor of Baghdad, publicly called for war against Israel. As reported by the Iraqi News Agency controlled by the Government, Musilh declared: "The Iraqi Government and people are now prepared to march on Israel in order to wipe it out."

During Arif's visit to Cairo the same month, the Iraqi leader delivered a major speech in which he reaffirmed the central aim of Arabism which is the achievement of Arab unity. Interpreting President Arif's remarks, the Cairo government's newspaper Al Jumhuriah asserted: "Another truth which Israel should know, is that, since untiy is one of the Arab aims, then the destruction of Israel" makes "it mandatory to hasten this unity. * * *" Returning from his conference with President Nasser, President Arif sent a message to the 12th Arab Student Conference held, of all places, in Colorado, United States of America. "Let us close our ranks," he urged, "and proceed to liberate Palestine. * * *" Toward the end of his speech he repeated his call to war when he said that Arab nationalism would remain in danger if Israel continues to exist and "is not humbled."

Here, then, is President Arif without the mask of peace and good will which he put on when he was obliged to reply to the challenging and pointed request of Lord Russell. Needless to say, President Arif is not the only Arab leader who speaks with many tongues. In espousing war as an instrument of Arab policy, he is merely emulating President Nasser whom he deeply admires. President Nasser himself told a press conference on October 1, that the Arabs face "aggression" from Israel because that country "wants to impose peace." This may appear to be Alice-in-Wonderland logic but it is Nasser's desperate excuse for telling this same press conference that Israel is doomed to destruction although "I cannot tell how this will happen."

Peace in the Middle East is indeed an imperative in our times. We applaud Lord Russell's efforts in this direction. Nevertheless, we must realistically assess the possibilities of bringing about better relations among the states in that area. We do not want to imply that peace would come automatically if the Nassers would relinquish the reins of leadership to others. Yet, by the same token, it cannot be denied that these demagogs who stir up hatred and tensions as a means of maintaining their own grip on the Arab peoples, are formidable opponents of a peaceful settlement. Their policies are the very antithesis of policies conducive to disarmament in the Middle East.

Bertrand Russell's plea to Field Marshal Arif was rebuffed in a dishonest manner which does not add credit to the pressent crop of Arab leaders. Yet, his call for peace seems to have been answered in a positive fashion by the Foreign Minister of Israel Golda Meir in her main address before the U.N. General Assembly on October 2, 1963. Mrs. Meir showed where the will to peace in the Middle East can be found. She called upon all the countries of the Middle East to adopt a six-point code governing their relations:

1. To respect the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states of the region.
2. Not to interfere in the internal affairs of any other state.
3. To renounce the threat or use of force.
4. To abandon policies and practices of belligerency, including boycott and blockade.
5. To settle all disputes by peaceful means.
6. To enter into negotiations with the object of achieving complete disarmament with mutual inspection, covering all types of weapons.

Here, then, is an echo of Lord Russell's pleas. It may be naive on our part to hope that perhaps Lord Russell can interest the Arab States to agree to this code of behavior.

A Stronger Gun Law Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, radio station WINS in New York City broadcast the following editorial on December 10, 1963, urging that rifles and shotguns be licensed in the city of New York. I commend the editorial to the attention of our colleagues because what he says there applies countrywide:

FOR SALE: RIFLES AND SHOTGUNS—NO LICENSE NEEDED

MARK OLDS (WINS general manager). I'm standing on a well-traveled street in New York directly in front of an arsenal of rifles and shotguns shined, oiled, and ready for sale. Among the weapons displayed, in broad daylight, a Swiss model rifle priced at $14.95. Next to it, an Argentine Mauser for $19.95, and below these (equipped with special sight) a U.S. Garand that sells for $89.95.

In this city, you don't need a license or special permission to buy a rifle or shotgun. Just put up the cash and it's yours.

WINS believes the unrestricted sale of rifles and shotguns should be curtailed now. This would deter the crackpots and malcontents who buy these lethal weapons and turn them on people. It would not affect skilled hunters, or other people with legitimate reasons to own them.

The right to bear arms had its place when lawless frontier conditions ruled. Today, this city has a force of 25,000 armed and trained policemen, to keep the peace and protect the public.

Stand with WINS and help us restrict the sale of shotguns and rifles in this city. Write to: Guns, care of WINS, New York 23, N.Y.

WINS will pass your comments on to the appropriate authorities.

Welcome to President Segni of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it was our pleasure to have as the guest of the American people the distinguished President of Italy, His Excellency Antonio Segni, who delivered an eloquent address at a joint session of the U.S. Congress. President Segni spoke from the heart and as a sincere friend of the United States.

The relations between our country and Italy have for many years now been most cordial and at the highest level of friendship. There exists excellent cooperation between our two countries in dealing with common world problems, and there is a growing solidarity in the thinking and actions of the two nations. The invitation extended to President Segni by President Johnson to visit the United States, is, therefore, very timely and proper.

Italy was one of the original signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and has on various occasions joined with the United States in proposing measures to strengthen this alliance. It has contributed significantly to the mutual defense of the free world in general, and Western Europe and the United States in particular.

President Segni has taken a leading part in the achievements of his country in recent years. He is a firm believer in democratic principles and in Western

unity, as evidenced by his address before Congress today. It was because of his dedication to such principles and his leadership ability that he was chosen to head the Republic of Italy and the people of Italy at this significant period in human events.

As such, we welcome President Segni as the distinguished spokesman of the Italian people and leading statesman of his nation. We want to assure him of our continued friendship and cooperation in every effort to attain world peace, economic prosperity and better understanding.

President Segni can well be proud of the millions of Italian immigrants who came to the United States, settled here, helped build our country to its present great heights of achievement, contributed to our economy and culture, and to the development of our democratic institutions. Americans of Italian origin have won the respect and esteem of all for their hard work, loyalty, and patriotism. They have helped to build this bridge of friendship with Italy which has brought both nations closer together.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a recent editorial published in Missiles and Rockets magazine by William J. Coughlin, praising the manner in which Secretary Zuckert is "in the process of tailoring a taut, effective Air Force which will be well equipped to assure the future well-being of the state of the Union" under policies and programs of President Johnson.

On Monday, January 13, 1964, I introduced into the RECORD Secretary Zuckert's speech before the meeting of the Harvard Business School delivered on January 8, 1964. This editorial by Mr. Coughlin analyzes and praises Mr. Zuckert's presentation as well as the programs that are reflected by his speech.

I know the Members of the House will want to read this fine editorial and introduce it in its entirety:

STATE OF THE UNION

(By William J. Coughlin)

Two reports concerned with the state of the Union were given in Washington last Tuesday. Most of the public attention, of course, was devoted to President Johnson's first state of the Union message to Congress. Of equal import for the industry, however, was a speech delivered that same night to the Harvard Business School Club by Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert.

President Johnson strongly reaffirmed the adminitration's determination to land a manned expedition on the moon in this decade. "We must assure our preeminence in the peaceful exploration of outer space," the President declared.

Mr. Johnson also asserted that the defense budget which he will send next week to Congress will maintain current U.S. military superiority.

With the national military and space postures as 2 of his 10 major points, President Johnson made it emphatically clear that he will support the areas of greatest interest as strongly as his predecessor.

Although not billed as such, Air Force Secretary Zuckert's speech was a significant preview of Project Forecast, the long-range study aimed at determining the areas of Air Force research and development interest over the next 10 years.

It was apparent from what Mr. Zuckert said that the Air Force has taken long strides toward bringing its objectives in line with the policies of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his staff.

The relationship between cost and requirements obviously has been thoroughly studied by the Project Forecast group. Mr. Zuckert did not say so, but Project Forecast took a close look at more than 40 major systems which might be required for Air Force needs in the 10 years ahead. Its recommendations for intiation of from three to five of these are carefully documented and are in accord with the cost effectiveness and building block technological views of the Department of Defense.

Ten areas stressed by Mr. Zuckert were: arms control, crisis management, deterrence, flexibility, controlled response, multiple options, survivability, damage limitation, threshold of negotiation, and termination capability.

"Those are not new concepts in themselves, but they are being brought together and used in a new way for the type of analysis that the Air Force is now making to determine what future forces might be like," Mr. Zuckert ponted out. These 10 areas thus provide a clue to what the Air Force is seeking in hardware:

Arms control—which, as described by the Secretary, now is a military requirement. "Military men are concerned with it not because it might make them technologically unemployed, but because it is a necessary part of the defense package," he said. Surveillance obviously was one of the things in mind. Mr. Zuckert also explained that current military planning must provide for forces not dependent upon nuclear testing or any other type of restrictions to which nations may agree.

Crisis management: This was described as the ability to keep even an intense and long-lasting international crisis from exploding into war, or a low-intensity conflict from escalating into higher dimensions of war. "It requires military forces with specific warning and response capabilities," the Secretary said. "It takes carefully tailored military power as well as sound nerves and good intelligence." Reconnaissance is brought to mind by the Secretary's words, as well as a force of long-endurance manned aircraft.

Deterrence: A primary national objective which includes all of the factors that go into the ability to discourage an aggressor, or preclude an attack by the obvious strength to crush it. This includes the capability to respond with something less than all-out nuclear response.

Flexibility: A special meaning in terms of the organization, equipment, and capability for rapid deployment of forces to cover the full range of crisis situations or war requirements. Airlift obviously is of major importance to such an objective, although the Secretary did not mention it in this context.

Controlled response: The ability to adapt the military response to the requirement and retain the initiative. "A choice of options is necessary," Mr. Zuckert declared. Multiple options must be built into the forces in terms of alternate target plans, ability to retarget, multiple delivery systems, selectivity of both strike characteristics and targets, and versatility of employment in both strategic and tactical missions.

Survivability: Covers prelaunch protection against nuclear attack, the ability to penetrate defenses, and immunity to sabotage, clandestine operations, and capture.

Damage limitation: Involves accuracy of targeting to limit damage to the enemy as well as promptly responding defensive systems which can neutralize enemy weapons at safe distances. Also includes accurate assessment of damage.

Threshold of negotiation: Reflects determination to stop war at the lowest point of intensity on favorable terms and acknowledgement that destruction of an enemy is not an objective.

Termination capability: The capability to stop a war, which includes all the other capabilities and requires the ability to counter escalation with increased power at each higher level of intensity.

It is apparent from the statements of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Zuckert that the administration is in the process of tailoring a taut, effective Air Force which will be well equipped to assure the future well-being of the state of the Union.

Who Favors Prayer Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the amendment on prayer is one which deserves a much more vigorous backing than it has received. This is well pointed up in a great editorial from the pen of Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr., editor emeritus, of the Florida Times-Union. This editorial appeared in the Saturday, January 11, edition of the Florida Times-Union:

WHO FAVORS PRAYER AMENDMENT?

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

("The cry grows louder and still louder for a constitutional amendment releasing God from the chains of the Supreme Court.")

If the citizens of the United States will stand up and fight they can restore the legal right to pray in their public schools, or anywhere else they choose to pray. It can be restored by constitutional amendment.

If they are not willing to do that, prayers are likely to be overruled wherever they are now legal. The hard-driving atheists will see to that.

But what we are thinking about at the moment is what has happened to all of those requests made by Members of Congress—both Senators and Representatives—immediately after the Supreme Court's infamous ruling?

The suggestion is made that the requests were made as gestures to pacify angry constituents, and left on the desk without intention to follow up and insist on action.

But Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, says he filed one of the requests and intends to work until he gets action and introduces his followup with an editorial from the well-known Catholic Free Press of Worcester, Mass., which contains an excellent analysis of the proposed amendment and methods for seeking its passage. The editorial reads:

"It would seem that the only way to stem the tide which threatens to banish any reference to God from American public life is the passage of an amendment to the Constitution clarifying the first amendment. It would also seem, however, that any amendment designed to state in unequivocal terms our belief in man's reliance upon God, while at the same time safeguarding the individual's right to his own religious belief—or disbelief—must be precisely worded, lest the cure be more disastrous than the disease.

"Similarly, it would seem that any campaign designed to secure passage of such an amendment must be well coordinated, lest its failure be decisive.

"We are not anxious to see the Constitution become a patchwork, amended each time a grievance cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction by the Supreme Court of the land.

"In this instance, however, the implications of the high Court's recent pronouncements on the relationship between church and state are so patently contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers that a clarification by the people seems in order.

"For that reason we applaud the activity of the newly formed Citizens for Public Prayer in Rutland and other similar groups across the country whose aim it is to assure that America continues to hold a revered place for God in public life.

"We applaud also the gesture of the several Senators and Congressmen who have filed resolutions in the Congress requesting that a prayer amendment be made to the Constitution.

"Past experience should have revealed, however, that some of those resolutions may have been filed simply as a gesture to placate indignant constituents back home, with the congressional sponsors caring little or not at all whether their proposals ever are acted upon.

"It should also be obvious that the congressional committee charged with the responsibility of clearing one of the more than twoscore resolutions for general debate, could decide—as has happened before—that it would be politically more prudent to sidetrack them all.

"We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of prayer amendment resolutions in the House will give serious consideration to the proposal of Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, that they meet and agree on the language of one resolution and then support a discharge petition to bring it to the floor of the House for debate.

"Proponents of a prayer amendment are all agreed on one basic principle—that the Founding Fathers never intended to identify the separation of church and state with the separation of God from the state.

"Fragmentation among these proponents, however, could result in inaction on the floor of Congress and frustration among members of groups like the Citizens for Public Prayer who are ready to work for the protection of our religious heritage back home."

The responsibility of Members of Congress to go strongly into action to see that the desired constitutional amendment is adopted hangs very heavily over the heads of our national lawmakers.

They know—everyone of them knows—quite well that it is their responsibility, and duty. They know, too, that they can pass the amendment if they will do their duty.

They also know that if prayer is ruled out any further that it will be due to their lack of handling their job as it should be handled.

They ought to be so reminded by the citizens who vote them into and out of office.

A Demonstration of Faultlessly Wretched Taste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, while I was in my congressional district during the period between sessions of the 88th Congress, I was very disturbed by an advertisement which appeared in a newspaper in the bay area of California.

This advertisement contained a shocking display of poor taste, fallacious reasoning, and propaganda of the worst kind.

The Morning News of San Leandro, Calif., published an editorial analyzing this advertisement. I believe that the comments made in this editorial sum up completely the thoughts of all of us who are concerned about activities of this nature:

A DEMONSTRATION OF FAULTLESSLY WRETCHED TASTE

Thanks to an advertisement that appears in another East Bay paper last week, we have found it necessary to revise somewhat our concept of the John Birch Society.

Up to that time we had felt, in common with the majority of thinking Americans, that the John Birchers formed little more than the prime example of fossilized thinking to be found on the American political scene. We had been led to that conclusion from a study of its official pronouncements and statements by its leading members. That study clearly revealed many interesting things about the John Birchers. The outstanding one we found—so we thought at the time—was their attitude on social progress. For according to them, the high-tide of social progress in the United States was apparently reached back in the 1800's, somewhere after the industrial revolution had got into high gear but definitely before the institution of slavery crashed into bloody ruin at the end of the Civil War.

In the course of that study we were several times tempted to feel that the John Bircher attitude on leading Americans such as former President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Earl Warren should be given precedence as the most interesting aspect of John Bircherism. After all, for the head of any society, especially the one that touts itself off as being the most patriotic, to declare Eisenhower a crypto-Communist and agitate for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren as being even worse, is a high-water mark in at least the field of vilification. However, we resisted that temptation.

Such manifestations, we decided, were merely symptoms of a fundamental mental illness which, for lack of a better term, we thought of as mass schizophrenia resulting from the John Birchers' back-to-the-womb yearnings in the field of social progress.

As a result of our analysis, we concluded that the Birchers were well on the way to fossilization—just like the Technocrats of the early 1930's who for a few months commanded tremendous publicity before their long plunge to obscurity.

But our thinking was somewhat off. In fact, we bluntly admit we made something of a mistake.

The mistake was that while we quite properly regarded the John Birchers as suffering from mass schizophrenia, we still felt that collectively they were possessed of a basic amount of common, ordinary, human decency.

We did not ever think for a moment that the John Birchers as a society would be willing to stoop to the point of seizing on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy as a means of raising money and increasing memberships.

But that is what they have done. In a demonstration of faultlessly wretched taste the John Birch Society has taken, in a series of metropolitan papers, full page advertisements that use the tragedy which befell us all on November 22 as a means of getting people to buy, for $5 or even for $1, packets of John Bircher propaganda, and also to contribute money to pay for even more such advertisements.

The advertisement is headed "The Time Has Come." Its opening paragraph is "The President of the United States has been murdered by a Marxist-Communist within the United States.

It goes on from there to erect on a basis of tragic fact a structure of distortions, using quotations from George Washington to J. Edgar Hoover, that leaves no comparison possible other than with the Tower of Babel.

As such it is nothing less than a presumptuous insult to the American people who have long since shown in countless ways that they do not need the advice of a candy maker and his followers on how to fight communism or anything else.

We have been a nation of fighters for nearly 200 years, and so long as we remain that way we have nothing to fear from any men or isms.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A Tribute to John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on November 24, 1963, at the Cathedral of the Pines, at Rindge, N.H., there occurred a most solemn and impressive tribute to the memory of President John F. Kennedy. The memorial remarks were delivered by the Reverend Robert W. Little, copastor of the United Church of Christ, Keene, N.H., and are especially moving.

I ask unanimous consent that the Reverend Mr. Little's remarks be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEMORIAL FOR JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Rev. Robert W. Little)

We have gathered here without regard to our racial, creedal, or political background to pay the tribute of our commonly held love and respect for the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America.

We gather with heavy hearts, filled with sorrow, and with minds that are shocked by the senseless tragedy which has visited us in the death of our President.

It would be preumptuous of me to assume the task of attempting to speak an adequate tribute on your behalf in this memorial service. I shall not attempt to do so. Your very presence here speaks more eloquently than any spoken word can do of the tribute you yourselves would pay if you were standing in my place.

Yet the very fact that we are here together speaks its own words of truth. Let me try to express, on your behalf, these words.

One word of truth your presence speaks is this: You care very much, or you would not be here in this bitter cold. You are here today to express the same feeling those who stood all night long outside of the White House on Friday night were expressing; the same feeling those who have been going in and out of churches across the land for prayer have been expressing; the same feeling those who placed lighted candles in their windows in Berlin were feeling. You feel the need to do something which says you care about what has happened to our President and to his family and his associates. It is the expression of love, or respect, of grief.

A second word of truth your presence speaks is part and parcel of the first. It is this: You care about what has happened to our President, for John F. Kennedy belonged to you. He belonged to all of the American people. He served and himself respected us all, whatever our faith or color or political persuasion.

Indeed, as the expressions which have flowed into Washington from all parts of the earth since the moment of his death testify, John F. Kennedy was also a world citizen, held high in the esteem of men of many nationalities. The whole world shares our grief and joins us in the tribute of love and respect.

It is right that a memorial service in his honor should be held in this place, dedicated to the worshipful use of all people, without restriction as to their race, or creed, or national origin. It is a proper reflection of the meaning of the life of President Kennedy that this service is being led by Christian and Jew, white man and Negro, Protestant and Roman Catholic.

So do we embody, in our physical presence, the word of truth you feel in your hearts that John F. Kennedy was our President, belonging equally to all. We are grateful to Dr. and Mrs. Douglas Sloane for this opportunity to express our common tribute as symbol of the truth which is felt this day the world around.

Our presence here together this day speaks a third word of truth. It is this word: John Fitzgerald Kennedy died on our behalf and in our place.

It is yet too soon to know for certain what misguided jungle of evil thoughts directed the mind of the man whose finger pulled the trigger of the weapon which ended so abruptly the President's life.

But I dare to speak for you the truth that his hatred did not center upon John F. Kennedy, the man. It was focused, rather, upon John F. Kennedy, the President, the living symbol of American hopes and aspirations. The hatred, then, is directed toward all of us together. The President is truly martyr, receiving into his own body on our behalf whatever revenge for real or fancied wrong the assassin sought from the American people.

Our grief is real, for we know that this martyrdom has been suffered in our own place. A man of great courage stood before the world and proclaimed the strength and fiber of the American dream of peace and freedom for every man. He stood there for you and for me. He died in our place.

We have no other choice than match his courage by our own, bringing to the cause of freedom, as he challenged us in his inaugural address, an energy, faith, and devotion which will light the Nation and set up a glow that can truly light the world.

The fact that we are free to gather here today speaks one further word of truth—hatred is a bitter passion which cannot win the victory its victim seeks to achieve.

Whatever we may eventually learn of the cause behind this senseless act, the destruction of the physical being of our President will not destroy the ideals which he and the American people hold in common.

There will be no anarchy, no abandonment of free government, no outcry from the citizens to compromise the American dream.

Even in the midst of shock and grief, we pledge our devotion and support to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson. The Government goes forward. Our people, as your presence here testifies, become all the more determined to carry forward to fulfillment our common hopes and aspirations of justice for all peoples.

Hatred cannot win the victory it sought. Let us heed well this truth which here our very presence speaks. Let none among us fall victim to hatred's bitter course, seeking to revenge our grief upon whatever cause, or whichever group, has already seemed unworthy in our sight. For then shall America lose the very victory for peace, and freedom, and justice which John F. Kennedy so vigorously sought, to which he devoted the splendid intellect of his mind, and for which he died.

May the soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy rest in peace.

May his family be supported by the comfort of Almighty God.

May our prayers for him, for them, and for our country be acceptable unto God.

May God give strength and wisdom to Lyndon B. Johnson, and to all leaders of our Government.

May each one of us so devote himself to the cause of liberty, justice and peace that the life we honor today shall not have been given in vain.

Behind the Berlin Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, just to remind us of the viciousness of Communism, the following letter, written by an escapee from communism, was distributed by the county commander of the Nassau County American Legion:

DEAR ——— AND FAMILY: A thousand thanks for your letter. I have been thinking of you very often and I was to start a letter, but we are by these days soon to change our living. At Oppenheim we are getting a newly finished house for living. There is a kitchen, a dining room, two sleeping rooms, and a bath. It may be that we will be moved in by Christmans. The living that we have at the moment is not the best. But we are happy that we get it and not standing on the street after our escape.

Would you like to know the reason why we left? I don't believe you can understand what is communism. At the end of the war when the Russians came over our country, it didn't start suddenly. At first you can vote between three or four parties, with different directions of the way of life. But later from time to time they conform them all. A man who has another idea of the way of living gets arrested. And so, most of the people from 45 to 50 years seem to be arrested. Then we could still vote for five or six parties, but they are all Communists with different names. And if it would be so very easy to leave the home, with all things and friends we would go much earlier. But all the years we are in the eastern zone, we wait and wait that also to our home will come freedom. And we and the whole people in the eastern zone had trust in the United States because they are the only country that writes on his colors, the liberty of all people in the world. And so we and many of our friends, still hope and hoped year to year, therefore when nothing happened, it gets worse from year to year. Liberty for the people in the eastern zone, is now no more than a word. Each day we heard by radio the voice of "Liberty Bell" from West Berlin. But the bell rings only without helping.

Some years ago I say at my haircutter, that I never will stop in hoping that we also will be free. Therefore, they arrested me by the State Secret Service. Only for what I said. The real reason was to force me to work for the State Secret Service. Therefore, when I didn't do it, they gave us from time to time less and less goods to sell for our dry goods store. At last, shortly before we leave they gave me only 7½ percent from the turnover, and from this we had to live and to pay all the costs. And so, knowing that shortly the wall will be put up, we leave at night our home, with what we could carry and put in our car.

Now if there is anyone who likes communism, tell him the best way would be that he go to the eastern zone and exchange for one of the missions of the other families which are forced to stay there. They would be happy to find a man who is silly enough to go behind the wall.

Why did they build the wall? On July 28, the day we escaped, in 24 hours, 1,300 people escaped, and in the last days before the wall, more than 2,000. In the years after the war, they left the eastern zone by 5 million people, and that from a land that has only 16 million inhabitants. That is to say that a town like the center of New York, all people old and young, men and women, would be gone. Think of New York as a town without people, then you will have an estimate of the whole escape after the war. And if they had not built the wall, it would only be a short time before 2 million more would be gone, and they wouldn't have anyone who works.

It is very easy to find communism a fine thing as long as anyone is not forced to live in it. They give the biggest promise for the future, but they never arrive at it. And then I would like to know what they would say if the state came and would say, that all they have don't belong no longer to themselves. Now it belongs to all: that means that they have to give, in other words, the state will take it, their houses, cars, grounds, for all. And the state says what they work, and where, and how long. As long as they have to help to build the socialist state, they have to work each Sunday 3 or 4 hours for no payment. That they call national help work. And the worst thing of all is that at each corner a man of the states secret service, is standing and listening for what the people are talking about. And if anyone says anything against the system then he is arrested. And at the end you don't know who is enemy or friend.

Oh, we are happy that all this is over. That we can go in the evening to bed, and we know that nobody will come and take you by night. Also in the democratic states everywhere is no sunshine. But is a thousand millions times better.

When we left home, they sealed our home in the morning by 8 o'clock. That is to say we had only 2½ hours time till they know that we have escaped. After 3 weeks, they sell all that was ours, furniture, dresses, household effects. All is away, "gone with the wind." But now we have much more than all that. We are now free. Our children can learn what they like and not what the state says. We can do and say what we like without fear that anyone will arrest us.

Now I have a good job at a motorcar garage, and so we can start for a new and better life. Now we say it would have been better if we had left long ago. And now after the wall, the life gets worse in the eastern zone, now no one can leave the socialist paradise.

We wish you all a very happy Christmas and a blessed New Year.

Sincerely yours,

(Name withheld).

Tribute to Conrad L. Wirth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "In Appreciation of 'Connie' Wirth," published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 30, 1963, being a tribute to Conrad L. Wirth, who voluntarily retired as director of the National Park Service on January 11, 1964.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN APPRECIATION OF "CONNIE" WIRTH

"One of the greatest, finest, best public servants anywhere in the world."

That is what Lyndon Johnson, only 2 months before he became President, said of Conrad L. Wirth, who voluntarily retires as Director of the National Park Service on January 11.

"I suspect there is no other single man in the United States who has done so much for the healthful recreation and pleasure of so many people, along with promoting conservation of our historic areas."

This was said of Wirth by a man noted for his conservatism, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.

Wirth was with the National Park Service for 33 of the 47 years of its existence, its Director for 12 years.

Early in his career he did a creative job in conservation by supervising the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in States, county, and metropolitan parks throughout the country. His administrative ability had a large part in proving what youth camps could do for conservation, and what this camp experience could do for youth.

When he became Director of National Parks in 1951, Wirth was confronted with a problem which only statesmanship could solve, and he brought statesmanship to the job. The problem was: How to accommodate the vast throngs that increased population was sending to the national parks, and yet preserve the wilderness character that gives them their unique value? The answer was a program that would add to the areas, expand and improve their facilities, imbue the personnel of the Park Service with renewed idealism and renewed dedication to the preservation of unspoiled nature, and establish such good relations with Congress, the administration, and the public that the seemingly conflicting needs of use and preservation would both be successfully met.

Since Wirth's imminent departure from the Park Service has become known, enthusiastic tributes have been paid to him at many meetings. On one such occasion Dan Beard, Jr., regional director of parks of the Southwest, said:

"He is 'Connie' to 10,000 people. He is the world's greatest authority on all park values and problems of administration."

On another such occasion, Frank Masland, manufacturer of Carlisle, Pa., who is former Chairman of the Advisory Board on National Parks, and in that capacity got a close up of Connie, said of him:

"Connie gave light to an ideal. He gave the Park Service purpose. Those on an 8-hour day gave a 14-hour day service."

Secretary Udall praised Wirth as an "outstanding public servant" who ranks "on the highest honor role of those * * * who have done the most to preserve a rich outdoor legacy for the American people."

But Secretary Udall's action has spoken louder than his words in showing esteem of the outgoing Director. He allowed Wirth to pick his successor. Wirth submitted a list of five career men whom he thought worthy; Udall selected one of them, George Hartzog. Those who know both men are confident that Hartzog will carry on both Wirth's ideals and his practical performance. This well-founded confidence is the true measure of Wirth's success.

What's Right With Dallas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on New Year's Day there appeared in the Dallas News a truly great piece of writing by the well-known Dallas merchant and civic leader, Stanley Marcus.

The treatise was entitled "What's Right With Dallas?" With considerable perception, Mr. Marcus writes of the spirit of Dallas and of the spirit that pervades American democracy.

As the Congressman from a neighboring and sometimes rival town, but as one who nevertheless appreciates the warm and tolerant spirit of many fine Dallas citizens and does not wish to see the innocent of an entire American community maligned for the irrational and undemocratic acts of a few, I earnestly commend this treatise to the careful study of the Members of Congress:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH DALLAS?

There has been a great deal of discussion about Dallas in recent weeks in both the domestic and foreign press. Some reporters have done a "quickie" on our city and others have stayed long enough to make less superficial studies. The truth of the matter is that no one can get to know a city in a day, a week, or a month. Those of us who have lived here for a lifetime are so close to the picture that we, too, sometimes fail to see either some of the pertinent details or the entire composition.

We think there's a lot right with Dallas. We think the dynamic growth of this city in the past 30 years has been no accident; that the factors that motivated this growth are still present and can continue to contribute to the development of Dallas as one of the major centers of distribution, banking, specialized manufacturing, insurance in the country. We think Dallas' leadership which has devoted itself unselfishly to community problems and needs is unique in the country. We think that our local government has been distinguished among all American cities by the integrity and honesty of its elected and appointed officials. We think that our citizens are friendly and kindhearted human

beings who extend genuinely warm welcomes to newcomers to our city.

All of this doesn't mean that there aren't things about Dallas that couldn't be improved. As Erik Jonsson, our distinguished fellow citizen, said recently, "I have always believed that individuals, corporations, and communities should have a regular stocktaking of what they are and what they are trying to be, and how they would accomplish their objectives. I do agree that this is a good time to do that stocktaking. It is yearend and this traditionally a time of reflection and introspection." We concur with Mr. Jonsson that a city, like individuals or business institutions, must take an honest look at its inventory and be willing to consider its faults as well as its assets. A city, like the individual or corporation, can't stand still—it must go ahead or fall behind.

Here seems to us to be some of the areas for community improvement—areas in which each of us as citizens, taxpayers, and voters can exercise both individual and collective influence. One, Dallas has a slum problem that it hasn't faced up to as yet. We've talked about it for years and we've done relatively little to improve blighted areas which won't disappear by wishful thinking. We have not solved the problem of low-cost housing. Two, this community has suffered from a spirit of absolutism in recent years. This was expressed most cogently in a recent editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

"What should concern Dallas and every other city is that the extremists of far right and far left have this common, that they alienate themselves from the mainstream of American democracy by an absolutism of political temper which is fundamentally hostile to our principles.

"It is the absolutist, whether of left or right, that democracy has to fear. This is the man who thinks that he alone possesses wisdom, patriotism, and virtue, who recognizes no obligation to accept community decisions with which he disagrees, who regards any means as justified by the end, who views the political process as a power struggle to impose conformity rather than a means of reconciling differences.

"Democracy is a method of reaching a consensus. Those who reject the consensus reject democracy."

The rejection of this spirit of "absolutism" and the acceptance and insistence by all citizens on toleration of differing points of view seem to us to be essential for the future health of our community. We believe our newspapers have an important contribution to make in regard to this matter and we hope they will lead the way by the presentation of balanced points of view on controversial issues.

Third, we are still a young city and much of our time and energy has been devoted to physical growth which has been phenomenal. Now, the time has come when more attention needs to be paid to the quality of our endeavors than the size of them. This applies to our schools and colleges, our symphonies, operas, and museums. It applies to the quality of support that we as citizens give them as well.

Finally, we think that Dallas should forget about its civic image as such. The best public relations comes from doing good things and by not doing bad things. Let's have more fairplay for legitimate differences of opinion, less coverup for our obvious deficiences, less boasting about our attainments, more moral indignation by all of us when we see human rights imposed upon. Then we won't have to worry about the Dallas image—it will take care of itself.

Happy new year.

STANLEY MARCUS.

Our Congress Did Nation a Service by Bottling Up Repulsive Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, free-swinging attacks on the Congress these days pound away at what remains of the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. The shrill accusations have become so intemperate that the underpinnings of our representative system itself are under attack.

If we are to satisfy the scolding critics we hear today, the Congress should be a pallid reflection of White House will, acquiescing and accommodating the wishes of the President, whatever they may be. The failure of Congress is measured by the volume of its disagreement. I emphatically reject that kind of measuring system which ignores the fact that Congress reflects the diversity of American opinion. The people of this country today and for the past 3 years are not so enamored with the White House's schemes as the torrent of hosannahs in much of the Nation's press would have us believe. This may be hard for the press to believe. Nevertheless, the temper fits of some molders of public opinion have yet to realize that the reticence of Congress to ride off on the bandwagon is, in fact, deep-rooted resistance by the American people themselves.

I wish to commend to the Congress the following editorial from the January 8 issue of the Daily Independent of Kannapolis, N.C., which adds some welcome perspective to this debate:

OUR CONGRESS DID NATION A SERVICE BY BOTTLING UP REPULSIVE LEGISLATION

The Nation's liberal press has set its sights on reducing the 88th Congress to a rubber-stamp for John Kennedy's ethereal program.

It is a matter of record that reporters and news analysts for press services, television networks and magazines, despite constant badgering of both House and Senate in 1963, failed miserably to achieve any degree of success with a national legislature the Saturday Evening Post has scornfully labeled the "Do Wrong" Congress.

The liberal salesmen are incensed, and a record outpouring of inuendo and subliminal salesmanship are due from pen, typewriter and television speaker. The welfare state pitchmen will clamor louder now for a drastic revision of our horse-and-buggy Congress.

Congress will be pictured not as a body of levelheaded legislators promoting progress and resolving problems within the framework of the Constitution, but as a group of pampered little kings with folded arms and jutting jaws, staging sitdown strikes to thwart executive leadership.

To justify their increasingly blatant liberal stand, newspaper chains will publish Gallup Polls and Louis Harris surveys which "prove" that Americans desperately want a President who will satisfy their desire for cradle-to-grave protection. Few substantive explanations will be published of how these surveys are obtained, or in what specific sections of the Nation.

The country will be told that it is liberal, as it was told by pollsters in 1948 that Thomas E. Dewey would be its next President.

It will be forgotten that every Congressman is elected by direct, popular vote and receives a clear majority of the votes cast in his State or district. It will also be forgotten that a majority of voters who trooped to the polls in 1960 did not want the leadership of John Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson. (Kennedy polled 34,227,096 votes out of a total of 68,838,005).

The weakness lies, not in the legislative branch, but in the executive. Far from doing wrong, the 1st session of the 88th Congress refused to pass key liberal-sanctioned measures which it considered fiscally unsound and politically loaded. Congressional activity during 1963 firmly repudiates the theory that, in electing John Kennedy, the Nation gave the liberals a mandate to govern.

What did this "do wrong" Congress do?

It passed an aid to education bill.

The administration demanded an $11 billion tax cut, at the same time saddling the Nation with a record budget of $98.8 billion. The capable HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, pigeonholed the tax cut bill—and rightly so. For the senior Senator from Virginia realizes a simple economic principle: There must be a dollar coming in for every dollar spent.

For standing firmly behind a sound fiscal policy, BYRD has been accused of everything from practicing obstructionist tactics to downright tyranny.

The House of Representatives, led by OTTO PASSMAN, of Louisiana, put the ax to Kennedy's staggering $4.9 billion foreign aid budget, cutting it down to a more respectable $3 billion. The result of this drive for economy: a national blackeye, created in large measure by cries of "19th century isolationism" and "obstruction" from a fawning, proadministration press.

In the final analysis, Congress must be judged as much on what it fails to do as on what it does do. It must often act as a brake on the executive. This is what is meant in the Constitution by a system of checks and balances.

What key legislation did Congress fail to pass last year? It did not enact a civil rights bill, whose public accommodations provision was attacked by critics as a thinly veiled executive power grab. A number of civil rights advocates were wary of supporting the bill because they saw in the accommodations section what the folks back home saw—an infringement on individual rights.

In a recent series of anticongressional dispatches by UPI, writer Harry Ferguson pictures the Congressman as a man who can behave like an absolute monarch, who can take the floor of either House or Senate and "attack anyone he chooses without fear of legal reprisal."

"He can," Ferguson states, "create a near panic in the Defense Department and all other agencies and departments of the Government by making a phone call and asking an embarrassing question."

Woe unto us all if we ever find ourselves represented by a Congressman who fails to have, or fails to exercise, the constitutional right to ask that embarrassing question.

With a Federal judiciary controlled by liberals, Congress—with all its ills and slowness to move—is the only bulwark against a pell-mell rush into an all-out welfare state in America.

Coddling the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, New-Frontier and liberal-palace-guard thinking around the President accepts the fact that if we coddle the Communists they will return our gesture in kind.

Nothing could be further from the truth, as David Lawrence points out in Tuesday's issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

The current problems in Panama stem in great part to Communist direction.

The article follows:

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS—THE COLLAPSE OF EUPHORIA: NEW RED-INSPIRED TURMOIL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Just a few weeks ago it was being predicted that 1964 would be a year of peace—because the Soviet Union was in economic trouble, because Castro Cuba was slowly disintegrating, and because Latin American problems were soon going to be solved by the Alliance for Progress. Indeed, it was widely assumed that communism was on the downgrade and that the world could look forward to an era of readjustment.

But the mood of "euphoria"—a word that emerged in the Pentagon vocabulary—has come to a sudden end.

1. Communist China has broken the truce and shelled Quemoy City and the Quemoy Islands.

2. Fidel Castro has gone to Moscow by invitation and has received the usual bear hug from Premier Khrushchev.

3. Zanzibar, one of the new independent states off the African East Coast, has been abruptly converted into a pro-Communist state by a revolution.

4. Ghana, in West Africa, another one of the ex-colonial states, has abolished the two-party system, as the President has assumed the power to remove supreme court justices at will and imitated the totalitarian system of the Communists.

5. Troubles in Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia have been intensified by the Communists.

6. Any thought that Red China and the Soviet Union are at the parting of the ways seems to have been dispelled by the unity displayed by Moscow and Peiping in denouncing the United States as an aggressor in the Canal Zone. Communist China, in unison with the Soviet Union, has pledged full support to the Panamanians. The newspapers of Communist North Korea have echoed the same line.

In the United States, United Press International reported last Sunday that the New York State Communist Party had called for a dissolution of the 1903 treaty between the United States and Panama.

Just what goes on behind the Iron Curtain is not too clear to the highest officials in Washington. For Premier Castro's trip to Moscow caught officials here and in other Western capitals by surprise. There is frank admission that Fidel Castro's influence extends beyond Cuba into other parts of Latin America.

Dean Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State, in a television interview last Sunday on ABC, called Issues and Answers, declared that Castro and his agents have been taking "a direct hand in this (the Panama situation) one way or another," and added that "he had some responsibility for this."

There seems no doubt that the student movements in many countries are directed, if not financed, by the Communist regime in Moscow through Castro. It is significant how many demonstrations occur simultaneously in various Latin American capitals whenever an event develops in which opposition to the United States can be expressed.

Meanwhile, Cuba is arranging for large shipments of machinery and other necessities from Western European countries. Dean Rusk said on this point:

"Castro himself has made it clear both in words and in action that he has designs to step up the terrorism and threats against his neighbors in this hemisphere. Now, we think that we—we not only think but hope that our friends abroad will take into account the attitude of all the countries of this hemisphere toward this particular threat aimed at people here in this part of the world, and that anything which seems to shore up the economy of Cuba, other than the basic humanitarian materials of, say, foodstuffs and medicine, increases Castro's capability to cause trouble for his neighbors."

The whole Panamanian trouble doubtless will be settled peacefully. But, as a propaganda project, it will be paying dividends to the Communists for a long time to come.

The flag episode itself is not important, but the memories of bitterness in the past which it reawakened cannot but have a damaging effect on U.S. relations with Central and South American countries in the immediate future.

The history of the establishment of Panama has been all but forgotten in this country, but not in Latin America. The United States for economic and military purposes, needed a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The voyage around the southern tip of South America was too long for naval ship movements as well as for commercial shipping. Several French groups had failed to build a canal through Colombia before 1900. The United States bought their rights and offered Colombia compensation for a Canal Zone.

Colombia refused to ratify the treaty in October 1903, and a month later a Province in northern Colombia revolted. When it was successful in seizing a strip of territory, President Theodore Roosevelt immediately extended recognition and made an agreement with the new Panama Republic to allow the canal to be built. It wasn't until 1921 that the United States paid an indemnity of $25 million to Colombia and formally expressed regret over the unfortunate episode.

Events of the last several days have accentuated the tensions that can suddenly arise and particularly have demonstrated how the insidious hand of Moscow moves throughout the world to cause trouble, even as Western countries are unwisely assisting the Soviet economic system to grow stronger and produce more and more armament for the future.

Peace in the world will not come as long as the Russians have a totalitarian government bent upon undermining, through subversive movements, free governments in all parts of the world.

Support for the Civil Rights Bill, H.R. 7152

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, Inc., which is headquarted in New York, has adopted the following policy statement in support of H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7152

The most important single issue before the Nation and the Congress at this time is the free exercise of the legal rights to which all Americans are entitled. The entitlement of the Negro people to equal rights can no longer be a matter of controversy. These rights are clearly established by our Constitution, the law of the land, and time and time again they have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Negro is not asking for special rights or privileges, he is asking that his rights as an American be effectively assured.

History has disclosed that the passage of time alone will not bring about the nationwide voluntary recognition of these rights. The Negro people have been waiting for almost a century; their patience is understandably strained. Effective action is needed by the Federal Government—now—not to grant new rights but to guarantee that established rights are fully protected.

The Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, as a Christian organization devoted to the cause of human welfare, has always recognized that the issue of civil rights is inextricably interwoven with problems relating to the welfare of all people. Not only is the work of improving the physical well-being of all underprivileged people acutely hampered by discrimination in all its forms, but the goals of welfare work are effectively thwarted. These goals do not involve bringing about the mere physical improvement of the individual's lot; they involve the establishment of an environment in which the moral and spiritual well-being of the individual can flourish. This cannot be achieved if legal rights are denied or are not effectively enforced.

The federation welcomed, therefore, the efforts of the late President Kennedy to bring about legislation that would do much to enforce recognition of the established rights of the Negro people. It welcomes the support President Johnson is giving to this legislation, and it strongly urges the speedy enactment of H.R. 7152 by the Congress.

The Price System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I wish to include in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Jeffersonian, Baltimore County's family newspaper, for January 3, entitled "The Price System," which summarized the core of a publication by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on this mechanism of our economic system. As the editorial so rightly states:

Yet its significance, like its day-to-day workings, is a mystery to millions of us.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to congratulate the editor for his contribution to the economic education of his readers:

THE PRICE SYSTEM

What is known as the price system—a somewhat forbidding, but accurate, term—is at the very heart of this country's economy. It makes that economy tick. Yet its significance, like its day-to-day workings, is a mystery to millions of us.

A publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States does a good job of defining the system, and of describing what it is designed to do. It says: "So important are the functions performed by the price system in an exchange economy, it has been observed that if the system had not evolved it would have been necessary to invent it.

"Stripped to its barest essentials the price system communicates the relative pressures of supply and demand through individual price changes that act as signals to producers and consumers. For consumers, the price system serves as an automatic rationing device inducing them to buy more or less of an item depending upon whether the price falls or rises as a result of changes in supply.

"Thus price changes bring about a reallocation of consumer spending among different products. * * * If a price system is to fulfill its basic functions * * * prices must be free to move both up and down in adjusting to changes in consumer preferences and incomes, methods of production, and changes in relative scarcities of productive resources."

What this means is that a price increase, or a price decrease for that matter, is not automatically good or bad. In a competitive economy such as ours, these are the natural and inevitable reflection of a myriad of natural forces.

As consumers, we see this personally and daily as we shop in retail stores of every kind. The stores must stock and offer what we want, or lose our patronage. The price charged for anything is set by competitive factors and, also, by the scope and dependability of the demand for it. So the price system is, among so many other things, a producer of abundance, and a satisfier of public needs and wants.

Four Score and Seven Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written in honor of Abraham Lincoln by Miss Marty Hale, "The Old Spinner," of Steubenville, Ohio:

FOUR SCORE AND SEVEN YEARS

The world will little note he said that day
nor long remember what we have to say;
Lincoln, with all his wisdom and his wit,
Did not foresee the depth and breadth of it.
Each boy and girl in school has learned to
say the message that he gave the world
that day.
It echoes down the vale and on the hill.
In years to come we'll hear their echoes still.
The years have passed but this man's words
live on.
A staff that we have learned to lean upon:
It is not ours to dedicate he said.
That's been done by the living and the
dead who hallowed this ground with
their bravery and gave their all to
keep this Nation free
His words live on with every freedom's son
who carry on the task these have
begun.
Our Nation lives and when each year has
past,
We feel more certain its ideals will last.
This great man did so much to give it birth.
By faith it shall not perish from the earth.
On these few words he had so much to give
next to God's word Abe Lincoln's
words will live.—MARTY HALE.

Better Times Ahead If We Rid Ourselves of Nostrums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by Ralph T. Moore, which appeared in the January 4, 1964, edition of the Oregon Voter. I commend it to the reading of every Member:

BETTER TIMES AHEAD—IF WE RID OURSELVES OF NOSTRUMS

(By Ralph T. Moore)

Harking back to the early days of the great depression of the 1930's, the elders among us, including this writer, can recall the political pattern of protectionism for the little fellow that was so popular at the time and which deliberately discriminated against the big and powerful.

There was the bright presumption that the intellect of talented men could somehow circumvent the immutable law of nature that the weak would perish and the strong survive. And this had immense political appeal because of its seeming justice and equity. It appeared to take competition in business out of the realm of warfare and place it in moralistic precincts more amenable to contemporary popular concepts. It separated businessmen into good guys and bad guys not in accord with their demonstrated managerial skills but in accord with the popularity of their attitudes and methods of operation. The importance of public relations grew into major proportions as Madison Avenue techniques gradually displaced customer service as the chief concern of management.

If you had a passable products of only mediocre value to the consuming public, you could deftly blow it up to giganticism by hiring some Madison Avenue firm to plug for it. The looseness in public thinking gave ample room for borderline distortions that tended to make black seem white. The easy-going American public tended to take things at face value and to refrain from putting forth the small exertion necessary to developing the real facts. This led to what has turned out to be almost a complete reversal in the present roles of the two major political parties. For, the Republicans have come to be the champions of the little fellow by merely sticking with their last, so to speak, and keeping their philosophy substantially the same through the years. The Democrats, by championing the big in everything, like big business, big labor unions, and big government, have grown to favor monopoly in business which is the inevitable result of such a philosophy.

So we have had endless mergers, huge public works, a shrinkage in the number of corporate entities, and a massing of labor into big employing units so as the better to control the individual worker. This was imperative in the socialistic structure which has proved a popular votegetter, but which departs rather far from the freethinking and the independence of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Now as we experience such startling developments as the cessation of the Studebaker manufactory of autos and its transfer to Canada, one wonders if our fondness for socialism's nostrums doesn't constitute our worst roadblock in the path to full employment. If we truly want the much publicized, added 5 million more jobs necessary to the achievement of reasonably full employment, we must put ourselves in the way of getting them by unleasing our free enterpirse.

Historians are bound to be puzzled by our persistent refusal to practice what we preach and to use the freedom of enterprise we so loudly proclaim. In fact there are few among us contemporaries who can give logical answer to this question.

Probably, the main reason for our almost stupid intransigence along this line is our infatuation with big government, assigning to the latter the responsibilities that are rightfully ours and for which democratic government is grossly miscast. Democratic government and big government are diametrically opposed, with the former requiring maximum freedom of the individual while the latter is the tool of empire and dictatorship. The two are completely incompatible in philosophy, democracy requiring minimum government regulation and big government requiring a huge bureaucracy and a centralized, sovereign power.

One senses that the realization of our present predicament begins to dawn as taxpayers slap down big spending and force a reappraisement in policy. Thrift bids fair to be enthroned once more as the people tire of having their savings sphoned off for bright schemes they know little of. We evidently approach a time of renaissance in American business wherein there will be more attention to the welfare of those who risk their captial and less to those who prey upon capital. The popularity of the Marxist doctrine slips as its failure to be able to feed the people becomes more obvious. If this be true, there are better times ahead, much better.

Has Congress Really Been Lethargic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the favorite indoor and outdoor exercise, at present, is lampooning the 1st session of the 88th Congress. James D. Corriell, editorial writer for the Boulder Daily Camera, has made some valid distinctions which have the ring of truth and merit consideration. Under unanimous consent, I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

HAS CONGRESS REALLY BEEN LETHARGIC?

Lampooning Congress seems to be a favorite pastime for some people who become impatient over the national legislature's apparent lethargy. The longest peacetime session on record has just ended, and several pieces of major legislation have not been disposed of.

Most of the major bills represent rather radical changes in Federal policy or national

life. The foreign aid bill, for instance, contained an amendment that changed a basic U.S. policy toward Communist nations, for it provided that the United States could underwrite sales of wheat to Soviet Russia. The civil rights bill represents important basic social and economic changes under Federal rule. The tax cut bill is a switch in the Democratic concept of economics.

These and other major bills could hardly be expected to sail through Congress without running into storms of controversy. And this is exactly what our American system of checks and balances is all about. The Congress, directly representing the people, is duty bound to thoroughly examine and debate the proposals that will strongly affect the national life.

There has been some deliberate stalling. Certain powerful committee heads have used delaying tactics. These actions are unacceptable insofar as they prevent debate and decision on issues.

But a great deal of the delay has been due to legitimate investigation and study of the measures before Congress. And this kind of action must not be confused with cheap political sidestepping.

It should be borne in mind that a deliberate, thoughtful pace in Congress is a healthy thing. It should be remembered that every President including Washington has upon occasion become impatient with Congress for delaying or trimming his legislative program down to size.

Such frustration is nothing new. Throughout most of our history it has been taken for granted as an accepted condition in our system of checks and balances.

But more recently, a new notion has grown up—particularly among those who like quick direct action—a notion that failure to pass promptly an administration's program means that our system somehow is inadequate for our modern society.

But it is not necessary for a legislative body to pass a great number of laws in order to show that it has been working. A Congress might distinguish itself just as notably for the bills it doesn't pass as for those it does.

A proposal is not necessarily good just because it is new or different. Turning down a proposal may be more statesmanlike than passing it. Or delaying decision may be more statesmanlike than ill-considered, hasty action.

It should also be remembered that the present Congress has one more session to go. It has only completed its first session. It would hardly seem reasonable to expect that it should dispose of all bills during the first. Otherwise why have two?

There is no good excuse for undue dallying over legislation. (And there has been some of it in the session just finished.) But it is equally important that there be careful congressional scrutiny of all legislation. Such action almost always improves legislative proposals so that they are as nearly acceptable to the people as possible. There have been many cases in which hasty action has had bitter results and has had to be undone later.

So when we hear the impatient ones slurring Congress in an overall condemnation for alleged inaction, let's remember that it is the duty of Congress to examine, debate and revise; that the number of bills passed is no proper measure of congressional activity; that congressional procedures properly used are vital in our system of checks and balances.

Criticism of Congress on individual issues is certainly justifiable, but blanket condemnation for not having disposed of certain major legislation at midpoint of the two sessions is hardly reasonable.

Press Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my remarks entitled "The True Facts Are Always a Complete Answer," which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 23, 1963, at page A7819, contained a letter from our distinguished majority leader to the publisher of the New York Post with reference to an article which it carried on December 12, 1963.

To date neither the letter nor any reference thereto has appeared in that newspaper, evidencing its desire to keep the truth from the public.

On December 30, 1963, the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America wrote a letter on the same subject to the editor of the New York Post. To date no copy of that letter nor any reference thereto has appeared, indicating to my mind, the complete irresponsibility of the newspaper, its publisher and its editor.

I am pleased to here set forth the complete text of that letter:

DECEMBER 30, 1963.

Mr. JAMES WECHSLER,
Editor, New York Post,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WECHSLER: We noticed in your December 12, 1963, issue an article by William V. Shannon entitled "D.C. Subway," which is extremely critical of Congressman MULTER from the 13th Congressional District in Brooklyn. We consider Mr. Shannon's article as inaccurate in a number of respects, and extremely unfair in its portrayal of Congressman MULTER.

The burden of the article is that Congressman MULTER was individually and solely responsible for the defeat by the House of Representatives of the bill providing for a subway in the city of Washington. The reader would never know that Mr. MULTER did not oppose the building of a subway as such. Rather he sought to have the legislation amended, not only with regard to the so-called private enterprise amendment, but also by proposing an amendment which would protect collective bargaining rights and would provide for employee protection for employees of existing transit companies who might be adversely affected by the construction and ultimate operation of the subway. Both of these proposals had merit. The private enterprise amendment passed. The employee protection amendment was defeated. The legislation providing for the subway was ultimately defeated, however, not because of Congressman MULTER alone, but because of a whole congeries of factors resulting in opposition to the legislation in the form in which it was proposed.

At this point it might well be pointed out that Mr. Shannon charges Mr. MULTER with ineffectiveness as a Congressman, suggesting that if he supports a position a substantial number of Congressmen will be against it for that reason alone. This charge contrasts sharply with the simultaneous allegation by the Post that Congressman MULTER alone was responsible for the defeat of the District of Columbia subway proposal. The legislation was recommitted by a vote of 278 to 76. Apparently, some other Congressmen voted with Congressman MULTER.

The Shannon article characterizes as absurd the notion of any role for private enterprise with regard to the construction or operation of the subway in Washington, D.C. Apparently, the Post is oblivious to history. The New York City subways themselves were built in part with public funds and in part with private funds, and were originally operated in the main by private companies. Indeed, the BNT and IRT subways remain designations which still persist with regard to Manhattan's transit system. In Philadelphia the city of Philadelphia owns the subway but it is leased to and operated by the Philadelphia Transportation Co., a private company. The Boston subway system, while originally built by the city, was leased to private companies and for many years was operated by the Boston Elevated Railway, a private company, and has only been publicly operated by the metropolitan transit authority since 1947. The U.S. Government and President Kennedy recently sponsored and established the Communications Satellite Corp., journalistically referred to as Comsat, and the Congress determined that the U.S. participation in the global system was to be in the form of a private corporation. In the declaration of policy in that act it was stated that the private corporation was to be established "to provide for the widest possible participation by private enterprise." Federal funds have been made available for scientific research conducted by private universities. Atomic energy and defense installations have often been built with public funds and operated by private companies. In the light of these few examples, it is difficult to understand why the Post should assail as somehow subversive of the public interest Congressman MULTER's suggestion that private enterprise be given an opportunity to participate, in some way, in either the construction or operation of the District of Columbia subway system.

Mr. Shannon's article indicates that he has read the Washington newspapers. Apparently he read only those things he wanted to read and has somehow overlooked those he did not. Both the news stories and the editorials in regard to the subway bill make it perfectly clear that among the reasons the subway bill was defeated was the opposition of labor to any bill which did not contain the kind of of protection provisions labor sought for employees, the alleged inadequacy of the arguments raised by the National Capital Transporation Agency with regard to the financing arrangements, and the lobbying efforts of O. Roy Chalk. In any event, the Washington newspapers do not attribute the defeat of the bill to Congressman MULTER.

The statement that the plan was backed by the Congressmen of both parties from the surrounding suburbs is misleading and inaccurate. Mr. Shannon must have taken cognizance of the vote to recommit the bill. There are five Congressmen who would be classified as from the surrounding suburbs. They are SICKLES, of Maryland; LANKFORD and MATHIAS, of Maryland; SMITH and BROYHILL, of Virginia. The Democrats, SICKLES, SMITH, and LANKFORD, voted to recommit. BROYHILL and MATHIAS voted against recommittal.

The statement is also made that the plan had been studied by experts for 10 years. The fact is that the so-called bobtailed subway plan submitted to the Congress was not the plan which had been submitted by the so-called experts. A reference to the Mass Transportation Survey Report of 1959 would show that the plan embodied in the bill differed from that proposed by the par-

ticular group of experts who prepared that study.

Finally, a more balanced judgment in regard to Congressman MULTER in his work as a Congressman is suggested. You suggest that his service on the House District Committee is to be criticized. The Shannon article implies that a northern Congressman has no place on that committee which is dominated by southerners. We suggest that more northern Congressmen, or at least Congressmen from areas other than the South, are badly needed on the House District Committee. New York, and indeed all America, has a vital interest in the Capital City. So long as Congress insists upon being the governing body for our Nation's Capital, it would be helpful to have the best minds and abilities in the Congress on the committees which deal with District affairs. Congressman MULTER is to be praised rather than attacked for his willingness to serve on a committee the members of which normally are strongly opposed to the liberal views which Congressman MULTER has expressed and followed since he first became a Congressman in 1947.

As a Congressman, Mr. MULTER has been an articulate spokesman for civil liberties, for more liberal immigration laws, and for small business. He was one of the leaders of the ultimately successful fight to obtain an additional judge for the Juvenile Court for the District of Columbia, which reactionary Southerners on the District Committee fought to block for a substantial period of time.

This letter is perhaps overly long, but Mr. Shannon's article was unduly derogatory of Congressman MULTER. It should be called to your attention that on June 13, 1963, Yashiva University presented Congressman MULTER with a degree of Doctor of Laws and cited him for his distinguished record in aid of civil liberties, and to the poor and the humble.

In closing, while Mr. Shannon mentions that most of the New York Congressmen also voted to recommit the bill, the Post attacked only Mr. MULTER. We hope that the Post will be more objective to appraising the work of one of the Nation's most liberal legislators in the future.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD CUSHMAN,
General Counsel.

Bailing Out the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President kept the House of Representatives in session almost until Christmas Eve in order to bail out the Soviet with credits for wheat and presumably, later, other materials. Raymond Moley in the Newsweek issue of January 20 tells us how foolish this policy is. I, too, think it is disgraceful.

The article follows:

BAILING OUT THE SOVIET

(By Raymond Moley)

Nothing better illustrates the lovable but at the same time lamentable nature of the liberal mind than the eager acceptance by the administration of the opportunity to sell some of our wheat surplus to the Soviet Union. Projected as it was with an array of assumed advantages, it had some appeal. But it was the projection of a hope, not a plan.

What this glorious adventure comes down to is not peaceful collaboration. It is an action by the greatest of capitalist nations rescuing the greatest of Communist countries from its own folly. Over the world we shall not be hailed as a savior. We shall still be known by Bernard Baruch's phrase, "Uncle Sap."

When President Kennedy proposed the wheat sale at a press conference on October 9, he claimed that:

It would ease United States-Soviet tensions; it would "advertise to the world as nothing else could the success of free American agriculture"; by inference, it would advertise the failure of communism to feed itself; it would dispose of a lot of our surplus wheat; it would reduce our gold shortage and help the balance-of-payments problem; it would be beneficial to the businesses involved in the transaction; it would help the American taxpayer; and it would provide employment for American seamen, for the wheat would be carried in available American ships. This, indeed, was a pretty package.

ABANDONED CONDITIONS

The President gave Congress certain assurances: "These sales would be concluded by private American grain dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial credit terms." But the banks refused to provide financing for the transactions. Then Government credit was permitted, after the pre-Christmas armtwisting by President Johnson.

Meanwhile, there was a complicated ploy in the Commerce Department. First, it was said, all the grain would be carried in our vessels. The Russians protested. Then 50 percent. Still there was trouble. And there were growls from our maritime unions. Then came the word "available." "Guideline" rates were set up which made most American vessels unavailable. These rates made the Russian cargoes undesirable business for most of the dry-cargo tramp fleet—the Liberty ships busy with foreign-aid cargoes. Tankers that sometimes enter the grain trade tend to return to profitable oil carrying when it's cold. And most vessels in liner service are held to schedules far from Russia. This big commercial transaction could never be a bonanza for a nonexistent fleet of hungry ships.

Nevertheless, the Russians grumbled about some U.S. vessels having a hand in the business. Khrushchev, echoing our maritime competitors, fumed about flag discrimination. And the Nation's press whipped American shipping for holding up the happy consummation of the deal.

BARGAIN FOR KHRUSHCHEV

Certainly Khrushchev couldn't hope to overthrow our cargo-preference law—the livelihood of U.S. tramps. But since he saw his victim, the American taxpayer, stuck for a subsidy on the wheat, why not make him pay the additional freight, too?

Why, in fact, isn't that reasonable? The Soviet Union is a leading underdeveloped nation, with lots of danger from empty-bellied Communists. By our own definition she is eminently qualified for the same shipping grant customarily given by the Agriculture Department for much less desirable beneficiaries.

And so when the Agriculture Department announced a remarkably high subsidy payment for the first Russian purchase, a lively mouse jumped out of the wheat bin. Through a gimmick in the agricultural subsidy structure, the Government had indeed finally maneuvered the taxpayers into paying to get the Russians to stop complaining about a few ships. And in that complicated deal, the Russians had to buy a lot of grain for making spaghetti and noodles rather than bread.

This whole imbroglio is a sample of the liberal pattern in program after program. Something is hastily entered into without careful planning. Then, as difficulties mount, money is poured out to show a simulacrum of success.

The Officeholders' Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the Appendix an editorial from the Aegis, published in Harford County. The editorial is a tribute to the late D. Paul McNabb, who until his death, was a county commissioner of Harford County, Md. Although the editorial mentions the bronze plaques attached to either side of the Courtland Street entrance to the new county office building, for the construction of which Paul McNabb was largely responsible, you may be sure that in the hearts of all who knew him his memory is more lasting than bronze:

THREE OFFICEHOLDERS' NAMES

Hardly noticed by the general public, and with no fanfare, two bronze plaques have been attached to either side of the Courtland Street entrance to the new county office building.

They simply read "Harford County Office Building, County Commissioners, 1963, D. Paul McNabb, Abe Davis, John H. O'Neill," plus the architect's and general contractor's names. For years such plaques have graced public buildings and other structures such as bridges, and usually carry the names of elected officials serving at the time.

After a few years these officials are no longer reelected, run for some other office, retire or die, but their names cling to the structure for the life of its use. Eventually the list of names means little or nothing to the next generation but may prove useful to historians or the person's family.

But politicians love to see their names in bronze and how well can be remembered the commotion raised by a short-term and recently defeated Baltimore mayor, when his name was left off such a decoration. He was told the building was authorized during Mayor Grady's administration.

Architect Alex Shaw solved this problem nicely by using the commissioners in office in 1963 when the building was constructed, thereby eliminating any argument, although the office building was considered, authorized, and financed by some different commissioners and members of the general assembly.

The edifice is built to last and probably will be here long after most Harford Countians have passed on, but in the meantime it is quite appropriate that the name of the late D. Paul McNabb will be in a conspicuous place. His name will be remembered long after many ordinary politicians have been forgotten.

Perhaps the nicest thing about the plaques is that they were planned and erected as the architect desired, without a great deal of previous publicity which may have caused everyone connected with the project to seek to have his name inscribed.

This possibly could have caused the building's side to have been bronze instead of brick.

VFW and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix I wish to insert an article which appeared in the V.F.W. magazine written by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), director, VFW national security and foreign affairs.

The article tells the story of how our distinguished and incomparable chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, saved the horses that drew the caisson that carried the late President John F. Kennedy to his final resting place. It is another indication of the farsightedness and humaneness of this great and distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee:

VFW AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle)

Government efficiency experts and budget slashers in early 1957 decided that horses and caissons were old fashioned, that they had no place in a modern military establishment—even for funerals at hallowed Arlington Cemetery.

These authoritative Pentagon and budget appraisers failed to reckon with Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, in making their computations.

Were it not for this venerable and honorable man there would have been no horses or caisson to carry the late President John F. Kennedy with valorous dignity to the final sleep of all warriors.

There is a little known, largely forgotten story of how Chairman VINSON, through a timely message to the Secretary of the Army, helped maintain the moral fibre of the Nation.

Were it not for the Honorable CARL VINSON, the dignity and solemnity of the final farewell to the late and great President John Fitzgerald Kennedy would not have been recorded in such noble fashion.

There was the artillery caisson—the fine gray horses and then the riderless mount with empty saddle, shiny boots reversed in the stirrups.

The tribute would not have been so correct were it not for the mind and heart of clear-thinking Chairman VINSON.

He wrote to the Secretary of the Army as follows:

"In these times of supersonic speed, guided missiles, nuclear submarines, I can understand the seeming incongruity of a horse-drawn funeral cortege, but had hoped that the pace of modern living might at least be retarded for our honored military dead. * * * Was the cost of a hearse compared with the value of the service performed to this country by the deceased? What price was used as a yardstick in determining the value of 'dignity,' 'tradition,' 'honor,' and 'glory,' compared to the initial tenancy? Do tradition and honor depreciate more rapidly than hearses?

"We can't purchase patriotism * * * but certainly we would be wrong in destroying a tiny symbol that gives proper recognition to the great men of the past, the present, and the future, who will, one day, rest in final glory in Arlington Cemetery. Can we not retain the 17 horses now serving at Fort Myer and let the world observe in our great zest for speed, efficiency, economy and accomplishment, we can still find the time to use and give proper tribute to some of our honored dead?"

The Pentagon reaction to Chairman VINSON's letter was quick. The funeral horses were kept.

As a result, our Nation continues to accord the proper, final tribute to its great leaders.

Because of the wisdom and determination of Chairman VINSON, our citizens, in mourning the tragic death of the late President Kennedy, could be thankful that his body was carried with traditional honor on the caisson drawn by horses.

Again, the Nation has been served well by Chairman VINSON, to whom no matter of national defense is too big nor too small for his personal attention—not even a few horses and a caisson.

Chairman VINSON has announced he will retire after over 50 years in the House, at the end of this term.

The armed services and the Nation will miss him.

Massachusetts Citizens for Prayer

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith "A Challenge to American Democracy," by the Massachusetts Citizens for Prayer in Public Schools. This is a bona fide organization of good solid American citizens and I am certain anyone reading this will be able to decide for themselves just what it is Americans want, and that they do not intend that Almighty God and prayer, be barred from our society, public and otherwise. This organization has been instrumental in calling discharge petition No. 3 to the attention of many of the Members of the House from Massachusetts as well as of other States. I commend this to your attention.

THE PRAYER AMENDMENT: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Once upon a time there was a country, a democracy, which had a Congress of several hundred Members. When the highest Court in that country banned prayer and Bible reading from its public schools, nearly 150 Congressmen filed proposals to amend the Constitution to return the longstanding practice of such prayer and to forestall further judicial inroads into other cherished instances of public reverence. This was a high percentage. At the same time many, though not all, of the religious leaders of the country denounced the Court's action as setting a dangerous precedent. Besides an opinion poll showed that that country's citizens were 3 to 1 opposed to the action.

One might have expected in this situation that something would happen in the Congress. But more than a year and a half after the Court's first prayer decision nothing had happened. Despite the fact that groups sprang up across the country in its churches, among its veterans' organizations, and elsewhere, to fight for amendment, very little appeared in the country's news media. Nor were any hearings scheduled in a committee whose chairman himself rose in the Congress to blast a fellow congressional chairman for blocking action on another bill.

It was not so much the opposition which troubled supporters of the prayer amendment. It was the silence, the apathy, the sheer disregard for the democratic process. It was the willingness of so many of their fellow citizens to accept without effective complaint such an apparent judicial termination of that public reverence which had once so distinguished their traditions as a people. It was also the inconsistency of some Congressmen which bothered those who cared. This inconsistency, they felt, consisted in filing an amendment proposal and stating that they, the Congressmen, were in favor of amendment and then doing nothing whatsoever to see that an amendment was voted on in Congress and referred out to the people for final action.

There were even some in the country who saw in the whole matter not a triumph but a very tragedy for democracy. These some questioned whether many Congressmen's proposals meant anything more than lip-service to principles for which they were unwilling to fight when the going got a little tough. They questioned, too, how so large a part of the news media in their country could ignore so serious an issue. They wondered, again, how that widespread cry of indignation which supported an effort to move one proposal in civil rights out of a recalcitrant committee ought not also to have moved prayer amendment proposals out of another recalcitrant committee. They wondered, finally, if anything would ever be done. Or if history would have to conclude that despite the 100-plus prayer amendment proposals and the great weight of popular feeling democracy was simply inadequate to the task of reversing a Court ruling which they knew in their hearts was wrong.

But this story, thanks be to God, is not yet finished. The American people can still reverse its incredible implications.

More than half the necessary 218 signatures are now fixed to Congressman FRANK J. BECKER's prayer amendment Discharge Petition No. 3. To secure the remainder requires continuing action by every American, however he feels on the substantive issue, to support the democratic process and let the people decide in their several States whether or not public reverence shall survive, free from judicial encroachment, in the Nation.

Here is the text of the consensus amendment agreed to by 60 Congressmen and precised by constitutional lawyers:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical scriptures, if participation therein is on voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

To move this amendment, one letter is not enough. One resolution is not enough. One sermon, one protest is not enough. A continuing barrage of protest must be mounted until the Congress releases it to the people for action in the States.

We recommended before and we recommend again:

1. Action at the local level: Every school board, school-affiliated organization, veterans' unit, council and board of selectmen in the United States should place itself on record at least for the right of the people, through their State legislatures, on a prayer amendment. Nor is one simple resolve sufficient. Again and again, local protestors must return to the fight until the Congress acts.

2. Action at the State level: Every State legislature in the United States should be petitioned by citizens of that State to put itself on record at least for the right of the people to vote, through it, on a prayer amendment. Once again, words are not enough. A constant effort must be maintained until the legislatures' resolution is translated into congressional action.

3. Action at the national level: Some Congressmen, understandably, are reluctant to sign a discharge petition. But this is no ordinary discharge petition. Already it bears the signatures of men of both parties and of various religious background. Congressmen who do not choose to sign are, in effect, saying to their constituents—we may agree with you, but there is nothing we can do. Americans in each congressional district must then ask—but we want you to do something. If you will not sign a discharge petition, how then will you secure to us in our State legislatures the right to make up our own minds on a prayer amendment?

Whatever you may think on the issue itself, the present status of prayer amendment proposals is a clear challenge to American democracy. Will you join us in the fight to meet that challenge?

CARL R. GRIFFIN, Jr.,
Chairman.
MRS. CHARLOTTE JUDKINS,
Cochairman.

Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, from reading the remarks of some of our liberal elite columnists one would think that the U.S. Constitution was a thing of the past and not in force any longer. We might remind these ivory tower dwellers that every Member of the Congress takes his oath to defend the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, it is most refreshing to submit herewith an excellent editorial by Barron's, from its January 6 issue, analyzing the whole subject matter and coming to the logical conclusion that Congress is here to stay:

SALUTE TO CONGRESS: THE RECORD IS BETTER THAN THE CRITICS PRETEND

The legislative branch of the U.S. Government, perennial whipping-boy of all who seek unbridled power for the Executive, has been getting its lumps again lately. Back in New Deal days, F.D.R. used to lash out at "Martin Barton, and Fish"; a decade later Harry Truman vented his wrath on the "do-nothing" 80th Congress. However, the 88th, which recessed briefly on Tuesday after winding up a wearisome first session, has suffered the most far-reaching abuse. From commanding positions on television and in the press, the whole liberal establishment has heaped scorn upon the Nation's lawmakers. According to one noted journalist, their reputation "has sunk lower than a snake's belly." The public's attitude toward Capitol Hill, added Stewart Alsop, "is a mixture of indifference, amusement, and contempt." Even the Ford Foundation subtly threw in its 2 cents worth when it disclosed last week a grant of $85,000 to the American Assembly of Columbia University, to finance a scholarly study of "An Effective Congress."

As the Ford Foundation seems to suspect, there is indeed a crying need for fresh enlightenment—chiefly among the strident critics cited above. Contrary to their misguided views (which, by the way, would have appalled the Founding Fathers and delighted George III), the U.S. Constitution has endowed the legislative branch, not the executive, with authority to make the Nation's laws. The White House may propose; Congress, in due course, disposes. In the session that has just drawn to a close, moreover, the process of deliberation, while frustrating to some observers, has scarcely proved a waste of time. For example, by carefully weighing pros and cons, the House Ways and Means Committee produced a tax reduction bill far superior to the original draft of the Treasury. In other cases protracted debate has prevented the hasty enactment of legislation which, on closer scrutiny and second thoughts, turned out to be ill conceived, unnecessary, and unwise. Across the board it has heightened public awareness of issues. The 88th Congress to date may not have passed many laws, but, within its own bailiwick, it has given the country tolerably good government.

Those who measure such things strictly in terms of quantity are not likely to agree. Probably not since 1932, when a Democratic Congress chose to balk a Republican President at every turn, has the legislative process moved at so slow and (at least to some) painful a pace. Despite heavy pressure from the administration, the lawmakers passed neither the civil rights nor the tax bill. The House Ways and Means Committee took no action on so-called medicare, the scheme to provide the aged with hospital and nursing home care through new payroll levies under social security. Federal aid to public schools remained a dead letter. Where Congress showed unexpected vigor, as in the case of foreign aid, the results were calculated to please neither the White House nor its spokesmen in the fourth estate.

Hence the shrill chorus of denunciation, which, in recent weeks, has echoed loud and long. A look at the record, however, suggests that Congress deserves something better. In terms of what they achieved, as well as what they balked at, the lawmakers have done well by their constituents. The tax bill is a case in point. Originally designed to restore confidence after the stock market crash of 1962, the measure took 18 months to clear the House Ways and Means Committee. While vexing to the executive, which repeatedly warned of the dangers of recession, the delay has had no visible effect on the stock market, or on employment, production, and trade, all of which lately have reached new highs. It has given Congress time to analyze, and to reject, some of the doctrine soak-the-rich proposals with which the Treasury version was loaded. What has emerged from the weighty deliberations of the committee is far from ideal—Barron's still leans to the view that budgets should be balanced before taxes are cut. However, both philosophically and fiscally, the new bill makes more sense than the old.

With respect to other pending measures, delay has proved equally salutary. Many months ago the White House telecast an emotional appeal for medicare, which, save for Chairman WILBUR MILLS and some equally levelheaded colleagues on Ways and Means, might have swept to passage long ago. Now that the Nation has had the opportunity to weigh alternatives—especially after recent hearings on Capitol Hill disclosed that the program will cost far more than the official estimates—the chances are that cooler heads will prevail. By the same token, despite recurrent pleas of impending crisis, Federal aid to public schools has failed to make much headway in Congress. Notwithstanding the absence of such assistance, State and local governments each year have managed to stave off the crisis, which, with the population explosion fizzling out, has grown increasingly remote.

No law, most people would agree, is preferable to bad law. By this yardstick alone, all the foregoing suggests, the legislative branch of government rates high marks. Moreover, though the political pundits somehow have failed to mention the fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD boasts a positive side. As a necessary part of the lawmaking process, Congress enjoys sweeping powers of investigation. In recent months it has put them to good use. The persistent probing of Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, helped shed some badly needed light on the murky origins of the TFX contract award; it also led to the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee months ago unmasked the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, with which Presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was somehow connected, as a Communist front in the pay of Havana. The Senate Rules Committee right now is delving into the tangled financial affairs of one-time secretary to the Senate majority Bobby Baker, an investigation which has rippled far and wide.

As for actual legislation, the 1st session of the 88th Congress did more than pass its customary quota of bills. Unlike any of its recent predecessors, it launched a determined effort to correct the excesses, and undo some of the damage of statutes already on the books. The bitter struggle waged by the House to curtail foreign aid succeeded in whittling the annual appropriation to the lowest level in years; it also underscored the scandalous fact that the program has become a grabbag proffered to nations which, in theory and practice alike, are hostile to the United States. For the first time in living memory, Congress also sought to crack down on the free-wheeling Rural Electrification Administration. Finally it flashed an overdue warning to the Federal Communications Commission and other overzealous regulatory bodies. So far, it told the FCC in effect, and no further.

Like the do-nothing 80th Congress, which endorsed the Truman doctrine, approved the Marshall plan, and cut taxes, the 88th thus is likely to deserve well of history. The same can hardly be said of its detractors, who, in their zeal to manipulate the future, have shown an unlovely bias toward the present and disdain of the past. "The less government we have the better," said Emerson well over a century ago. The truth of that statement has just been reaffirmed.

Salute to Anemostat Corp. of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Anemostat Corp. of America has a plant located in the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent. To all the many significant contributions this company has made toward the bet-

terment of our community comes a new honor. The U.S. Department of Commerce has today conferred upon the Anemostat Corp. the first Presidential "E" Award to be made to a company in northeastern Pennsylvania for its significant achievements in the field of exports. This, at a time when it is imperative we increase our exports, makes Anemostat's contribution even more significant.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD today remarks delivered by Mr. Henry Dempsey at the Scranton Chamber of Commerce in the salute to the Anemostat Corp.:

WORLD MARKETS OR HOME MARKETS, THE SALESMAN'S CHOICE

I am extremely pleased to be here today and to participate as a representative of Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, in the recognition of an outstanding Pennsylvania enterprise for its significant achievement in the field of exports. This is the first Presidentical "E" Award to a company in the northeastern area of Pennsylvania.

Most of you are, no doubt, familiar with the concern of the Federal Government with the problems of our international balance of payments. Probably at no time in our history has there been so much citizen interest in the gold reserves or in the general trade relations of this country with other world areas. Since March 1960, the Federal Government has been working with the private business community to stimulate greater awarenes of export opportunities overseas and of the practical contribution which can be made to this national problem by the aggressive sales activities of individual entrepreneurs.

Opportunities for increased business, which in turn means more jobs and more profit, are flowing into the Department of Commerce from many directions. This is due to two general reasons. First, in many areas of the world there is a better ability to buy the things which are wanted for individual use and for industrial and national development use. Secondly, the U.S. Government has strengthened the official commercial staffs located around the world. Related also to the second point is the steadily increasing activity of private business in cooperation with official programs. This is particularly important in the Trade Mission, Trade Fair, and Trade Center programs of the Department of Commerce.

The Anemostat Corp., which we are honoring here today, has been cited for its energetic and methodical approach to marketing overseas. The Presidential "E" Award is given primarily to call attention to the activities and successes of specific business organizations. It is an award to be proud of and it is one that is to be displayed and boasted about. Because in the ultimate it is hoped that other companies will take to heart the lessons taught and benefit by the experience of successful companies such as the Anemostat Corp.

What are the opportunities that exist today? To be fair, I think we ought to say that they will depend in no small measure to the receptivity of the producer and the seller. For while the Government and organizations such as the chamber of commerce, banks, transportation organizations, port authorities like the Delaware River Port Authority, can direct specific opportunities to potential suppliers, this is merely a part of the total area of opportunity. For it is the salesman's choice whether he limits his total business and profit opportunities or whether he seriously and effectively seeks out all of the markets which can be developed for his product. The Anemostat Corp. has proven that it is in the latter category. Today it joins a select group of other companies, several of them in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who have during the past few years increased their profits, increased their payrolls, and added prestige to their communities by choosing to go for the world market.

There are, of course, other firms in the Scranton area whose names are known around the world. They also adhere to the philosophy of expanded business through world marketing. I am confident that we shall see additional Presidential "E" Awards displayed in this area in the future. But we should also recognize today that there are other manufacturers in this area whose interest in export has not been aroused or whose efforts in the world market have not been given benefit of truly priority effort on the part of the company management. It is our earnest desire in the Department of Commerce, and I am confident that it is shared by the Scranton Chamber of Commerce and others in this room, that we can move ahead in this important field without delay. The mechanism to accomplish this was set in motion more than a year ago when it was decided to organize a world trade committee in the chamber of commerce. Such an organization is extremely important. It is essential to the success of export expansion in any area. For while marketing decisions are essentially individual and private ones, they must be made in the light of current dependable information and with the inspiration of dynamic and progressive business leadership. Export marketing programs on an area basis can only be sucessful where business organizations such as the chamber of commerce provide the climate in which the individual salesman can have access to the facts and can benefit through the experience of their neighbors and business associates.

In the next few months there will be inaugurated in this area another technique which has grown out of the national export expansion program. It was developed for the education in a very practical sense of businessmen who wanted to do more business in oversea markets. The initial program was tested in Philadelphia and comparable endeavors have been organized in many States. I speak of the basic course in export sales and management which will be held at Wilkes-Barre College in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., from April 1 to May 27, 1964. The Scranton Chamber of Commerce along with the chambers at Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton are sponsoring this course which I hope will, like the World Trade Committee at the Scranton Chamber, become an integral part of the business dynamics of this area.

I would like to comment briefly on the action programs of the Department of Commerce of particular importance to businessmen. Trade missions, consisting of selected business leaders under the direction of a Department of Commerce official, will be sent to more than 10 world areas during the coming year. This program has been in operation since 1954. The missions are sent to markets of highest business potential and direct their attention to the development of demand for American products. Among the missions scheduled for the next several months is an electronic mission to the United Kingdom. This mission will visit London, Birmingham, Manchester and Glasgow. A trade development mission will visit Finland in May. Areas of particular interest to U.S. exporters in the Finnish market include machine tools, industrial chemicals, plastics, packaging machinery and consumer goods. A trade and industrial mission is scheduled to visit Central America in the summer. A U.S. machinery and equipment mission will visit Australia and New Zealand in February and March.

Each of these missions will accept business proposals from U.S. firms interested in obtaining trade contacts in the countries to be visited. Anyone interested should communicate with the Philadelphia Field Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce operates four trade centers abroad in London, Frankfurt, Bangkok, and Tokyo. A fifth will open in Milan in the next few days. Plans for four more centers are being considered. In these trade centers, selected U.S. product lines are exhibited. These product lines are selected only after intensive market research indicates that there is a more than likely opportunity to sell. Over the past 2 years floor sales in these centers have run in the millions of dollars. The target of this sales effort is toward the distributors, not the ultimate consumer. This month the Frankfurt Trade Center is holding a show of advanced electronic components. In London, institutional catering equipment is featured. Small business machines is the subject of the Tokyo show. Milan will open on January 28 with an exhibit of automotive service and maintenance equipment. Autos, trucks and accessories will be featured in the Bangkok Trade Center from February 5 to March 6.

Commercial exhibits in 14 international trade fairs will be sponsored by the U.S. Department of Commerce in the coming year. These exhibits have a single purpose—to sell U.S. goods. Industry support for these exhibits has been growing, spurred by the successes of many firms whose export markets have been established and expanded through use of this facility.

These special efforts are the frosting on the cake. In every world market, every day, there are staffs of commercial officers actively cooperating with American business in presenting and promoting products and services available from U.S. companies. This important adjunct to private sales efforts can be used for individual profit while, at the same time, it is contributing to the achievement of our national objective of a balanced international payments account.

In view of all that I have said, I take particular pleasure in presenting to Mr. Walter Kurnik, marketing manager of Anemostat Corp. of America, the Presidential "E" Award for export expansion which bears the following citation: "Heavy export sales promotion has established the products of Anemostat Corp. of America in 65 markets abroad. The company used trade lists and market surveys, trained oversea representatives to be bilingual, developed advertising in appropriate languages, and provided product technical information through professional publications. By its methodical and energetic approach to marketing in other lands, the company has boosted export sales to 16.1 percent of total annual volume and has also made a significant contribution to the export expansion program of the United States."

Congratulations, Mr. Kurnik.

President Johnson's Credo as an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Baines Johnson has long been known for his dedication to the cause of liberty, and the free exercise of political, social and civil rights by all Americans. On April 3, 1962, President Johnson, then Vice President of the United States, was presented with the 1962 Stephen Wise Award by the Maryland Chapter

of the American Jewish Congress for his fight against discrimination and bigotry. On that occasion the President delivered the following speech in which he defined his credo as an American. The speech appeared in the September 16, 1963, edition of the Congress Biweekly.

The speech follows:

MY CREDO AS AN AMERICAN

(By Lyndon B. Johnson)

(On April 3, 1962, President Johnson, then Vice President of the United States, was presented with the 1962 Stephen Wise Award by the Maryland Chapter of the American Jewish Congress for his fight against discrimination and bigotry. In accepting the award, Mr. Johnson delivered the following speech in which he defined his credo as an American.)

I accept this honor with a reluctance that goes way beyond modesty. I remember so well the remark made to me many years ago by a wise old Texan. "Young man," he said, "just remember that how many awards and honors you have isn't the real sign of greatness. It's how many you deserve." I can't think of any honor I've ever wanted to deserve more than this one. I cherish the very thought that I have contributed in some measure to spreading liberty and opportunity to more of our citizens.

I accept this honor in good conscience only because I view it as a token of appreciation and encouragement to those Americans, including members of the American Jewish Congress, who have worked so long to make the American dream a thing of life. But I could never view this plaque as a tribute to me alone. You see, I got my reward for my efforts against discrimination long before tonight. My reward has been an increased understanding and appreciation of what my country stands for and must be. My profit has been a sharper awareness of what it is we offer when we Americans speak to the world.

In the last several months I have been in many countries on several continents. I have seen many faces in that great mass of mankind which is caught up in turbulent change. I have seen people who most of all need hope. I have seen people who are yearning to be free. I have seen people who are struggling to break the bonds of poverty, illness, and illiteracy.

You cannot work for long with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity without achieving a better understanding of the forces that are most powerful among these people in far distant lands. After all, the goal of our human rights organizations is to provide for our own citizens the hope and freedom that we hold forth as a goal to these masses in other lands.

Why should our Government be so concerned about racial injustice?

There are some hard, practical considerations that none of us can overlook: Our country and the whole free world is confronted with an immense challenge. It is a challenge that stretches from the rice paddies of Vietnam to the rain forests of Africa to the steamy villages of Latin America. To meet that challenge in triumph we shall need every resource this Nation can muster. We shall need the intellectual genius, moral strength, political astuteness, oratorical skill, mechanical know-how—all these and many things more we shall need.

We must remember, as Harry Emerson Fosdick once said, that "democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people." Whatever may be offered by a lad trapped in the slums of Harlem, or a youngster isolated on an Indian reservation, or a boy struggling along on a midwestern farm—whatever each can offer the Nation must receive.

One of the most moving tributes to democracy and human freedom that I ever read was the statement by Chaplain Roland B. Gittelsohn a few years ago when he dedicated the 5th Marine Division Cemetery on Iwo Jima. He said:

"Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet. * * * Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor. * * * Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. * * * Here no man prefers another because of his faith, or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Theirs is the highest and the purest democracy."

That is a statement which reflects brilliantly the principles of morality, of religion, of respect for human worth, on which this Nation was founded. Each generation has an obligation to keep those principles alive. Each generation is obligated to expand their impact, to make them more meaningful to more people.

You and I know what the obstacles are. John Stuart Mill once wrote that, "The despotism of custom is everywhere a standing hindrance to human advancement." We see the painful truth of this as we observe efforts to erase from our society the blot of racial and religious discrimination. And I say this with no holier-than-thou attitude. We all have been influenced by the ideas, the assumptions, the likes, the dislikes, of our fathers and grandfathers. Each of us is to some degree a victim of our environments. What we must do is free ourselves and help to free each other, from the ignorance, the outmoded notions that are incompatible with a free society in an age of nuclear weapons and space vehicles.

I am not prepared to accept the notion that racial or religious hatred and conflict are inevitable any more than our forefathers were prepared to accept muddy roads and horses and buggies as an inevitable part of life. We must have confidence that we can make ours a society in which men and women of all races, religions, and backgrounds can live under conditions of mutual respect and of true equality of opportunity. I believe that we can.

I came to Washington from Texas some 30 years ago. I remember what Washington was like then. I remember how difficult it was for a Negro to get a Government job of any importance or prestige. We have come a long way in those 30 years.

I got a sharp, personal reminder of what has been happening in this country recently when I went to San Antonio to urge the people to elect HENRY B. GONZALEZ to Congress. We made whistle stops all over town. Late in the day we stopped near a big supermarket. I was given an eloquent introduction by a Negro who has been a friend for many years. Then I got up and delivered what I hoped was a good speech. As the meeting broke up a middle-aged Negro gentleman stepped up to the pickup truck on which I stood and said:

"Mr. Vice President, I was born two blocks from this spot. And I've lived here all of a long life. But let me tell you that never in the wildest night did I dream that I'd live long enough to have a white Texan Vice President of the United States come to this corner, be introduced by a Negro, and get up and appeal to the people to vote for a man named GONZALEZ."

That was a sharply touching moment for me, because until that remark was made I was completely unaware of what really had taken place, or of how much it signified in the way of change. Yes, there's been a lot of change in the last 30 years. But there's room for a lot more. I pledge to you on behalf of the President that we're going to produce more progress in the first 4 Kennedy years than the country made in all those 30.

I am against bigotry and discrimination because I think they are wrong. I am for human understanding, for equal justice, for equality of opportunity because I think they are right.

May this country always be the kind where a man needs, and the people demand, no greater explanation than this.

Colorado Newspaper Opposes the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the extremists who believe that the passage of the palpably unconstitutional civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, is the answer to the problem which has been fomented by the professional agitators and Communist-front members of the NAACP, would like everyone to believe that race mixing is only opposed by southerners. They have had an increasingly difficult time of late explaining away the opposition that is being expressed in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Nevada, and all over the North.

One such expression against the civil rights bill was an editorial which appeared on December 30, 1963, in the Gunnison (Colo.) Courier. I am led to believe that Gunnison County does not have a single Negro resident, the only recent one having died at the age of 95 last year. So it cannot be said that the editor's opinion which is reprinted here is influenced by any problem he will have should this unconstitutional bill be railroaded through the Congress. Read what this Colorado editor has to say about H.R. 7152:

NO CAUSE FOR THOUGHT CONTROL

Man in his enthusiasm for an ideal sometimes lets that dedication cloud his better judgment or blind him to some very important side effects of the cause he champions.

This is exactly what we're afraid is happening to the supporters of H.R. 7152, the so-called civil rights bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee.

The minority report prepared by dissenting members of the committee points out two very real problems created by the proposal as currently written:

"Race, as the first criterion of employment, applies to newspapers, periodicals, radio and television under this bill, as well as to other elements of our commerce. If a job applicant can 'write' and there is an opening and if he is of the race called for to 'balance' the makeup of the staff, that person must be employed in preference to someone of another race."

The impact of such outside pressures could be damaging to almost any publisher's or broadcaster's programs. But it would be destructive to publications whose role is to promote the minority views so vital to a developing society and so clearly assured by the Constitution.

Lest we appear to be pleading an argument based on an assumed privileged position,

consider this interpretation, again from the minority report of the House Judiciary Committee:

"The bill grants the power to make it mandatory that the staff of a newspaper be thoroughly integrated, racially and religiously, else the owners are in violation of Federal law."

Substitute the name of your business—or of any business—for newspaper in the above statement and you begin to appreciate the powers being asked by administrative supporters of the bill.

Anyone who can control so thoroughly the availability of jobs and, therefore, of food is well on his way to absolute power.

It appears that in their zeal to produce an enforceable bill with enough teeth to do its intended job, the framers of this bill have overlooked and even trampled several rights we consider so basic.

But, as the report continues, this "destruction of the right of free choice, serious as it is, is not the most fearsome feature of this bill as it applies to the press."

Title II, section 203, says: "No person shall * * * incite or aid or abet any person to do any of the foregoing"; i.e., deny or attempt to deny any person any right or privilege described in the title.

Read that again. Anyway you read it, its says that should the bill become law, any criticism of the provisions or their enforcement becomes a violation of Federal law.

The minority report asks: "If a citizen takes a position in direct opposition to some provision of this bill and a newspaperman writes an editorial in support of that position, indeed, urges others to take similar stands, is that newspaper inciting, or aiding, or abetting?" It appears that it is.

And no citizen should forget that the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech are inseparably joined. If we can't comment editorially, you can't comment privately without violating Federal law.

Anyone who can gain final authority on who can be gainfully employed and the power to legally squelch all opposing voices has more power than a democracy can grant to any individual or group and still survive.

This is another argument that the end no matter how noble the cause does not justify the means—especially if the means involves such overtones of thought control.

Another Way To Look at the Wheat Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are very much disturbed about the Johnson administration policy of bailing out the Communists.

The following letter to the Long Island Daily Press, written by Mr. E. Monnia, of Hicksville, N.Y., indicates what is bothering our Nation:

ANOTHER WAY TO LOOK AT THAT WHEAT DEAL

I wonder if any of you readers who are lovers of the Russian wheat deal can help me out with a problem I have.

It seems that I have a neighbor that has threatened to kill me and my family and confiscate my property. At the moment he is unable to carry out these threats as he is so weak and suffering from malnutrition. I am fortunate enough to have large amounts of food stored in my basement.

My problem is: Shall I sell him the food he needs on a cash or credit basis?

Sound silly? Not at all. The brain boys now running the United States are doing the identical thing only on a much grander scale.

E. MONNIA.

HICKSVILLE.

The Limit Isn't Par

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Conservation Commission has distinguished itself as one of the finest organizations of its kind in the Nation through the development of an outstanding wildlife management program.

The attitude of commission officials toward the conservation of Missouri's natural game resources is typified by the following article, "The Limit Isn't Par," written by Dick Rotsch, administrative assistant to the director in Kansas City, which was printed in the December 1963, issue of the Missouri Conservationist:

THE LIMIT ISN'T PAR

(By Dick Rotsch)

We were tooling down the highway in the model T Jack had borrowed from his uncle. We were 16 years old and off to the Ozark hills for our first full-scale hunting trip away from our home stomping grounds around Carthage. We had made more plans for this trip than a couple of millionaires planning an African safari.

Sitting up in the back seat was old Mac, our bird dog, looking alert and eager as if he knew what was coming.

Now Mac was quite a bird dog, although his ancestry was questionable. He was not stanch to wing and shot nor did he hold his tail high on point in the approved field-trial manner. However, he had a couple of attributes befitting a bird dog—he found quail and he held them until you got there.

He was a mite indifferent about finding a down bird, but sometimes he would hunt for them like a good trooper, and other times he would gallop off in search of some singles. We wouldn't have traded him for a shiny-new shotgun, and he apparently thought we were pretty great hunters.

We drove way down in the hill country where we understood the quail were so thick they were practically a menace to crops.

Deep in the hills along a little stream was a cabin in which lived an old man who had spent all his life there, not going any farther than the county seat town, a dozen miles away. He allowed we could stay with him for a couple of days, and said the quail were "pretty plentiful hereabouts."

The old man told us an interesting story about the time he was missing some chickens. It seemed when he returned from a trip to town he would have two or three less chickens that when he left. He suspected some neighbor boys down the road a piece and decided to investigate.

He hitched up the spring wagon one day and left in the direction of town. He circled around and came back to his place by walking in from the back side. He hid down by the hen house with his old scattergun in hand. Sure enough, before long the two neighbor boys showed up and proceeded to stuff four of his chickens in a tow sack. From here on the story is his.

"I let 'em come out of the hen house and I raised up and shot twice right over their heads. They dropped the sack and tore out for home, and I ain't missed a chicken since."

The next morning he said he would like to go with us; apparently he wanted to see how you hunted quail with a dog. He was a little curious about why we didn't go after rabbits as they were plentiful and considerably larger.

There were some open fields that had been in cultivation and jack oaks surrounded most of them. Even with our limited hunting experience we could see that a quail wouldn't have far to go to be in the protection of a jack-oak thicket. We knew we would have to shoot fast and accurately or come in empty handed. Old Mac was working along a brush fencerow and when he came to the corner, he came down on a point of sorts. We walked up with the old gentleman at our heels and stepped in to flush the birds.

Apparently two or more coveys had gotten together, as at least 40 birds burst into the air and headed straight for the nearest thicket. Jack was shooting a pump, and I had a double barrel. We fired five shots and had seven birds down. We were so proud of our shooting that it really floored us when the old man drawled, "Do you fellers always let 'em fly before you shoot? I saw 'em on the ground right in front of where the dog was standing so still."

Looking back at this incident I can't help but think that from this simple statement by an old hill man, is a lesson that all of us could profit from.

This old gentleman was used to going hunting to put meat on the table, and the easiest and surest way to do this governed his actions. He was from the old school, from another era; an era when wildlife was a crop of the land. A crop to be used for food and one on which they depended.

When various species of wildlife began to dwindle, one of the first management tools used was seasons and limits. A limit was placed on a certain species to govern the take to keep the kill below a safe level and to protect the broodstock for the next year.

Game men tried to determine how much wildlife could be taken by hunters without endangering the species. Various methods were used to determine this number, and we are still experimenting with various means of censusing to determine what the population of a given species is. We have learned much, but wildlife management is a new science and there is still much to be learned.

New methods will be discovered, used, and improved upon, but the limit is probably here to stay. Webster says that limit means "to apply a limit to, or set a limit or bounds for." In other words, it is a point beyond which we must not go; not a goal which we must strive to reach.

When we come in from a hunt today, what is the first question which greets us from our friends and neighbors?

"Did you get your limit?"

Or conversely we may say, "I had a good hunt, but I didn't get my limit."

I have never had a bad hunt in my life, but I have had many when I didn't get the so-called limit.

Do we place too much emphasis on this imaginary goal which instead should be as its name implies, a limit beyond which we must not go.

Do we place enough emphasis on the joy of being out with some fellows we like, outdoors where we enjoy the many wonders of nature, where we are honestly tired from a very wholesome form of exercise. How about the fun we have kidding our companions, the hours we spend planning the hunt, and the hours we spend rehashing every phase of it when we return?

A few years ago, Bill Henry, Howard Baucher, and myself sat in a goose pit adjacent to the Squaw Creek refuge. It was a beautiful winter day with bright sunshine and a brisk northwest wind which foretold the coming of a storm.

When daylight broke, thousands of ducks and geese were pouring into the refuge area from the north, and other thousands were pouring out going south. There was not a single time during the entire day that we could not look up and see huge flocks, small flocks, or a scattering of waterfowl winging their way above us.

We called to them, rearranged our decoys, planned and schemed. We kidded each other about being a jinx. We drank coffee and told stories, and we didn't fire a shot.

Not a bird came in range of our blind, yet we all agreed that we had enjoyed a wonderful sight and had a lot of fun.

Now I am not suggesting that we leave our guns at home or that every trip in which we get no shooting is an enjoyable one. We all like to at least shoot at something, but it isn't absolutely necessary to burst a lot of caps to have an enjoyable time.

I reiterate, I have never had a bad hunt.

Today we must face up to reality. Our population is growing by leaps and bounds. There are more and more people going out after game. Our cities are spreading out miles from their former boundaries. Superhighways are eating up 25 to 30 acres of land per mile. The farms adjacent to our cities have been cleared until they look like golf courses. The fenceposts are painted white and they look like a picture postcard, but there is precious little game on them.

We are going to have to travel farther, seek out areas which are not so heavily hunted, and, believe me, in southern Missouri there are miles and miles of land that is hardly hunted.

Our numbers of deer have increased tremendously; we have millions of doves migrating through our State, but our rabbits and quail will be hard pressed to maintain their numbers.

Oh, there are some bright spots. Soilbank land may offer new homes for upland game. As our agricultural scientists continue to show us how we can produce more on less land, we may have additional land to produce wildlife.

State and federally owned areas will continue to supply some hunting, and last, but not least, our research with exotics may pay off with a new species of game bird which can survive in the environment we have created.

At present we are experimenting with pheasants from Iran and Korea. We have released them in their pure strain, and crossbred them with wildtrapped ringnecks, looking for a hybrid that will take hold in our State.

Our game biologists have worked on this project for several years and will work many more. Maybe they will succeed and find a bird that will provide hunting. If not, they will continue their search, and, maybe someday.

The fisherman is in a more envious position. We have more fish and more fishing opportunities than ever before in our history.

The reason for this is simple. We have more water than ever before. From the tremendous impoundments created by the Corps of Engineers which furnish millions of man-hours of fishing, to thousands of people who throng the city reservoirs, the commission-owned public fishing areas, the community lakes, to the small farm pond, we are constantly witnessing a tremendous increase in fishing waters within our boundaries.

Let's take the long look at ourselves and our sport. Are we placing too much emphasis on whether or not we get the limit, and not enough on the other joys we get from being in the field with companions of our choice, and the best bird dog in the State?

Let's look upon a limit for what it is, and quit thinking of it as a goal as par is in golf. Let's shoot a good game and enjoy it to the fullest whether or not we make par.

John F. Kennedy Memorial Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, among the many fine tributes paid to our late President was one contained in remarks delivered at a memorial service for John F. Kennedy on November 25, 1963 by Rabbi Ralph P. Kingsley of the Garden City Jewish Center in Garden City, N.Y.

I believe these words are of importance and would be of interest to the Members of Congress, and I therefore spread them on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS DELIVERED AT A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963

For 3 days now I have wept and cried, as have many of us. I have wept and cried not only because a human being has died—for all humans must ultimately meet with death. I have wept and cried because the symbol of a new America, a new America which is really the pristine America, which our biblically-inspired founders had conceived, has been, at least temporarily, removed. For John F. Kennedy embodied so much of what our Founding Fathers brought to this land. Most important perhaps, (and I quote here from the inaugural address) was "the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God." In other words, the state is the guarantor, not the giver of human rights. To the very end this was his concept—spelled out again in the quotation from Psalms with which he would have concluded his talk in Dallas on that fateful Friday afternoon:

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that built it: Except the Lord build the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

We have had many churgh-going Presidents, but it has been a long time since we have had such a deeply religious President, in the profoundest meaning of the word religious.

His every thought and act was pervaded by a commitment to a power which transcended the individual person, and even state. It was to this power we call God, that he pledged his allegiance. America (specifically, this generation of Americans), was in his eyes, to use the vocabulary of the Bible, God's instrument in bringing to pass the cherished dreams of the religious visionaries of the past. In like manner to the prophets of old, who spoke of Israel as being an אור לגוים John F. Kennedy spoke of America as being a light to the world. In speaking of our role as defenders of freedom, he said again in his inaugural address, "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world." This was a religious concept. America had a divinely ordained task.

More than anything else the life of this man, and all that he stood for, was pervaded by a deeply religious fervor and conviction which overflowed, and which made itself felt. He made me proud to be an American when much that happened here had made me ashamed. Through his leadership, through the framework of modern liberalism, he sought to achieve the dream of our Founding Fathers.

We have asked ourselves again and again: what if this man had been given length of days; what might he have done? We wonder why one so young, so courageous, so full of vision and energy, had to meet so untimely an end?

We answer, that history is not determined by what might have been, but by what was and is. We answer that not the length of days, but their fullness, not the amount of years, but the accomplishments during those years, are what matters. A colleague of mine has said: "A bullet can end a man's life, but not his philosophy." To this I add, a bullet can prevent a man from doing more. It cannot destroy what he has done.

The legacy that John Kennedy has given us is ours to keep. Surely it will not—we must not let it—follow him to the grave. While he lived, John F. Kennedy was filled with a deep faith—a faith in the full potential of American democracy; a faith in man's ability to bring about a world in which there is peace and liberty; a faith in the ultimate triumph of truth and justice over the forces of evil; a faith in man's reasoning capacity, to help him solve the problems facing our world.

In his death, that faith to which he was so deeply committed, falls to us—to you, to me, to uphold. Not by more violence, but through the process of law and order; not by disillusionment and despair, but by yet greater commitment and dedication to freedom and to the pursuit of peace; not by eyes blinded by distrust and fear, but by yet greater vision and hope, must we carry on the task he left us.

And so, we conclude with those same words he spoke so movingly less than 3 years ago:

Finally—whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

History To Judge Life of Eaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "History To Judge Life of Eaton," by Thomas Vail which appeared in the publisher's column of the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 5, 1964.

HISTORY TO JUDGE LIFE OF EATON

(By Thomas Vail)

For many years while Cyrus Eaton has been building up his bank account he has also been creating in this area what we might call a negative public image.

Being a tycoon in the grand manner, he has gone ahead building his financial empire, apparently not caring much of a damn what the general public thought about him.

In this he is not unlike a great number of American industrialists who made great contributions and great profits during previous generations when America was run by these empire builders.

Then, having made vast wealth, Eaton turned his rather profound intellectual gifts toward making friends with the Russians.

Being a tycoon is unpopular enough, but making friends with the Russians these past 10 years is something of which the public has taken a dim view.

All this performance has given Eaton a very bad press.

He has been pretty much vilified by usually responsible critics who have implied that he is a rich eccentric rather flamboyantly off base.

But has he really been off base?

In the last year the relations between Russia and the United States have changed rather remarkably.

We have a nuclear test ban treaty.

We are opening up trade with Russia.

Cultural exchange programs between the two super powers are increasing, not decreasing.

All along the line, in spite of occasional setbacks, we are moving toward more agreeable relations with the Soviet Union.

This is the approach on a political level which Mr. Eaton has been pursuing on a more intellectual level.

While he certainly will never be kissed on both cheeks by the old guard, established business community of Cleveland, it could be that the white-haired charmer of Arcadia Farms, as he passes his 80th birthday, may yet be vindicated by future events.

Time for Truth in Saigon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in last Tuesday's Washington Daily News a most revealing article appeared which gives reason for great concern about whether or not the American people have been given the truth on Vietnam. The article follows:

TIME FOR TRUTH IN SAIGON—OUT OF THE FRYING PAN INTO THE FIRE

Heavy Communist units now stand only 25 miles (and less) from Saigon. Not fully revealed, defeats in South Vietnam engulf our whole Southeast Asia position since the assassination of the brothers Ngo Dinh. But who would know it?

America promptly recognized as the government the officers who did the palace killing. But their fallings-out, as rivals, are more disillusioning than Washington admits and their first big military operation has been a total failure. The key clash—or lack of it—came on New Year's Eve in the Ben Suc region 15 miles farther back, a wooded salient writhing with Red tunnels and strongpoints. The result was disastrous.

DEBACLE

Cambodia, larger than Kansas, flanks this country for nearly 300 miles. Prince Norodom Sihanouk's bitter turnback of our foreign aid, his accusation that our Central Intelligence Agency was plotting against him, his expulsion of U.S. military advisers and all American newsmen were so loud we couldn't be deaf to this debacle to adjoining South Vietnam where we have 14,000 Americans, the cream of the U.S. Army.

But Thailand borders Cambodia and the death in Bangkok of Premier Sarit Thanarat, 57, Thailand's anti-Communist leader since 1957, went largely unsignaled. It was a black day for us in nearby South Vietnam and our security in all southeast Asia. Nevertheless, the Washington assurance mongers passed over it entirely.

NEVER TRUE

All sorts of voices claimed success in South Vietnam depended on eliminating the Ngo Dinh Diem regime. This never was true; a great oversimplification that buried much behind it. The faults in that anti-Communist government were entirely real, but they were not new. Yet the elimination demand was even expressed officially in total violation of fundamental diplomatic requirements pertaining to an ally.

The result? We've merely jumped out of the frying pan into the fire; except that millions abroad now consider it our fire, and with much justification. The die was cast in Laos, and that's the decisive action that was buried.

Throughout the past 2 years, we have been headed in South Vietnam toward a coexistence peace with northern Red enemy Ho Chi Minh, as in Laos and in the manner that cost the free world China just as it has cost the free world Laos.

SANCTUARY

No military man alive knows how we can contain the Communists in South Vietnam so long as we have given them a sanctuary in Laos.

Ho Chi Minh, himself trained in Moscow and dispatched throughout southeast Asia as a Communist terrorist, drills and equips Vietcong attackers on his neutral side of the border, using Korea veteran Red Chinese officers. He also utilizes thousands of guerilla instructors clear down to the Bing Duong Province, the fertile Mekong River Delta, and even within Saigon itself. Whenever his troops are tired or unduly pressed they need only melt back into Laos, then strike again.

The American people will never flinch from the truth and are entitled to get it. President Johnson can do a profound service by reversing the manipulated propaganda that communism is in retreat as a testimony to American policy. In retreat where?

Wisconsin's Gronouski Puts His Stamp on the Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski, a native son of Wisconsin, is rapidly gaining a national reputation for the fine job he has been doing as head of the Nation's biggest business, the Post Office Department.

Mr. Gronouski has gained widespread, deserved attention for his easy and homespun manners, his refreshing candidness and his keen mind. His style, while something new on the Washington scene, is well known in Wisconsin where he ably filled the post of tax commissioner.

As we well know, the Postmaster General has his work cut out for him. Cooperating with President Johnson's campaign to get a dollar's worth for a dollar spent in Government, he has pledged himself to efficiency and economy in operating the postal service.

Some of the decisions he will have to make in the interests of frugality may be politically difficult. But if we in Congress are truly dedicated to the principles of efficiency and economy we will support him in these efforts—even when our own districts are affected.

In last Sunday's Milwaukee Journal veteran Washington correspondent Lawrence "Con" Eklund described some of the problems facing Postmaster General Gronouski in administering his Department. I commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues:

POSTAL CHIEF ATTACKS BIG PROBLEMS—POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI TRIES TO CUT DEFICIT, IMPROVE EFFICIENCY WHILE AVOIDING POLITICAL PITFALLS

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Nudged by the new boss man in the White House, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski is in the process of lopping 5,000 employees from the postal service and reducing the postal deficit by $100 million for the new fiscal year.

The former Wisconsin tax commissioner, who with 595,000 persons on his payroll is the Nation's biggest civilian employer, has undertaken a formidable task, but the backing of President Johnson should help.

For instance, one of the economies outlined by Gronouski recently at the President's Texas ranch calls for the eventual saving of $3,700,000 annually through reduction of the number of data processing offices over the Nation from 14 to 6.

Congressmen from the affected districts naturally don't like this, but when Gronouski made it clear to Mr. Johnson that this was a sound business move he was given assurance he could proceed, despite the anguished howls that might arise.

"BEST JOB I'VE HAD"

Running this big Government-owned public utility is a demanding and thankless chore, but the pipe-smoking, genial Gronouski, in an interview in his walnut paneled office, described it as the best job he has ever had. He disagreed with a friend back in Madison who insisted he was wasting his talents on an assignment not primarily related to taxation.

It is of course not surprising that Gronouski should enjoy sitting in the biggest office in Washington in a job that carries with it a long black, chauffeured limosine equipped with a telephone, a private elevator to whisk him to his third floor domain, a private kitchen and other perquisites.

But what he most enjoys, he confided, is tackling the problem of managing this business which has 45,000 main post offices and branches in every community in the country.

Although he came here as the appointee of the late President Kennedy, of whom he was an early supporter, he appears to be hitting it off well with the new President. He has been in contact with Mr. Johnson repeatedly at Cabinet meetings, in private conferences, and over the telephone, mostly on matters relating to the new budget.

Another plus factor, so far as Gronouski is concerned, is that being Postmaster General gives him an opportunity to indulge in his favorite hobby—politics. He played an important role last week in dramatic last minute maneuvering behind the scenes resulting in the recess appointment of David Rabinovitz as Federal judge in the western district of Wisconsin.

Whether Rabinovitz, Democratic national committeeman for Wisconsin, would get the appointment was a nip and tuck affair right

up until an hour before Congress convened and ended its recess.

But despite his delight in politics, Gronouski has to spend most of his time—and he works long hours—on the infinite details of running a department that has a budget of almost $5 billion a year.

Gronouski was asked if the program of mechanizing the handling of mail would suffer as the result of his asking only $10 million instead of the $43 million appropriated for this fiscal year for extending and modernizing postal facilities.

The Postmaster General replied that new buildings, like the one planned for Milwaukee, will not be affected, that it is in those structures that the mechanization is scheduled.

Projects that will suffer as the result of the budget cutting, he conceded, are proposals for air conditioning old buildings and adding dock space and footage.

Some postal union leaders, notably E. C. Hallbeck, president of the AFL–CIO's postal clerks, are protesting that no important reductions in the jobs of career postal clerks can be justified.

Gronouski insisted no career employee will lose his job through the gradual elimination of 5,000 vacant jobs within the next 6 months. This will be accomplished, he said, by leaving vacated jobs unfilled. He noted there is an annual turnover, through retirements, deaths, and resignations, of 50,000 jobs a year.

Actually, said Gronouski, it will be necessary to continue to conduct civil service examinations and to hire new workers because of this turnover in order to keep the level of employment at the reduced figure of 590,000.

As for the curtailment of services, it is conceded the Post Office Department faces difficulties maintaining service while economies are being effected. Postal volume is growing at a current rate of 2 billion pieces annually with 72,200 million pieces of mail expected in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

Gronouski revealed he had created a task force composed of five Assistant Postmasters General to review and report to him on how the economies can be brought about. The chairman of this task force is Sidney W. Bishop, Deputy Postmaster General.

Better use of manpower, Gronouski admitted, will have to come through good management techniques. Some of these are far short of mechanization.

He told of the redesigning of the box used to sort mail by hand so that mail clerks don't have to reach so far to place mail in the cubbyholes of areas where there is the greatest concentration of mail. Having those particular cubbyholes in the center of the sorting box, within easy reach, saves manpower, he said. This sort of improvement can be made readily and cheaply, while the program of installing automatic machinery is costly and must proceed slowly as the budget permits and volume warrants.

Gronouski has great confidence in the ZIP code system begun by his predecessor, J. Edward Day, who never did get the public recognition and political support he deserved for his attempts to modernize the postal service.

Gronouski said use of the ZIP code, forerunner of mechanized mail sorting, will speed service and save labor by making it unnecessary to route mail through post offices in many instances.

POLITICAL BOOBYTRAPS

The Post Office Department employs 90,000 Negroes, the largest number in any department of the Government. Gronouski gave assurance that under his administration they will not be discriminated against because of their race.

The delicate issue of racial or national discrimination is only one of many political boobytraps in Gronouski's Cabinet job. Closing of an unneeded post office, shifting of a proposed new facility, trimming of unneeded manpower, raising of below cost rates to certain users, filling of appointive jobs—all are potential political explosives.

Panama's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune calls attention to the economic situation in Panama as the foundation of our troubles in that poverty-stricken area:

PANAMA IS A PROBLEM

The troublous situation in Panama undoubtedly has been worsened, as charged by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, by agents of Fidel Castro. The Secretary was careful, however, not to put original responsibility for the rioting on the Communists and it would be a serious mistake for any Americans to do so. Far more is involved than subversive activities encouraged from Cuba.

Before Castro, there were difficulties in Panama. These involved relations of the United States with that Republic, and also conditions within Panama itself. Castro can only take advantage of them.

Americans should endeavor to see the situation there as it appears to many outsiders. Officially, our Government has opposed a continuation of colonialism in the world—yet we must appear to others as maintaining a policy of colonialism in Panama.

There have been two main groups of Americans in the Panama Canal Zone. One has been made up of the military personnel stationed there for the defense of the canal. They have not created a problem. The other is the group of civilians who operate the canal, and their families.

This latter group has had a special sort of life, insulated from the Panama that the Canal Zone divides, paid on a much higher scale than Panamanians employed in the zone yet enabled to buy much cheaper at commissaries barred to Panama natives. It is quite in accord with the facts to say that they have "thrown their weight around" for a good many years.

Panama itself has been an example of what's generally wrong in Latin America. There has been a small, wealthy upper class, practically no middle class and a large peasant class living in extreme poverty and dismal squalor.

In Panama City at night, a visitor could stumble over homeless natives sleeping on sidewalks only a few paces away from brightly lighted shops displaying expensive goods imported from all parts of the earth. The possibilities for mischiefmaking by Communists have been excellent.

Little issues have been built into serious irritations. The Canal Zone is Panama territory, even though it is administered by the United States. It cuts clear through the nation. Yet until recently, no Panama flag was flown there. The flag question was the focal point in the 1960 rioting; it touched off the most recent conflict. But it would be a mistake to regard it as more than a symbol of the real difficulties.

Fortunately, in the present crisis leaders both in Washington and in Panama appear to be acting with restraint. The emphasis is on restoring order, and then maintaining it while the two Governments talk through to a solution of their problems. The solution, we should recognize, must take into account a world far different than it was in 1903 when we took over the Canal Zone.

Provide Medical Care for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, hospital care for our senior citizens is one of the most vital problems of our Nation today. It is my earnest hope that this session of Congress will recognize the health needs of our senior citizens, and pass necessary legislation to assist them. Following are my remarks before the Committee on Ways and Means which has this legislation under consideration:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am grateful that your committee is considering the King-Anderson bill, to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries. Ever since coming to Congress, I have introduced legislation to provide medical aid for senior citizens under the social security program. Early in this session of Congress, I introduced a bill identical with the King-Anderson bill, to show my strong support.

You have before you the report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly, of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. This shows that after 3 years of operation, the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program has proved to be at best an ineffective and piecemeal approach to the health problems of the Nation's 18 million older citizens. It is still not a national program. Stringent eligibility tests, recovery provisions, and responsible relative provisions have severely limited participation in the 28 States where it is in operation. Such provisions not only are disruptive of familial relationships, but also deter many proud people from seeking the care they need because they do not wish to involve their families.

The help provided by the King-Anderson bill constitutes the only intelligent, realistic, and responsible method of meeting the desperate medical need faced by our senior citizens. Reports show that our aged are unable to afford health insurance or are considered too poor a risk. Although a small percentage carry some hospital insurance, it usually falls far short of meeting the high costs of lengthy illnesses. The aged are forced to apply to public or private welfare agencies for payment of medical bills or to seek free care from hospitals and physicians. Rather than submit to either of these alternatives, many neglect their health and do not seek the care they desperately need. Our Nation is the richest on earth; how can we continue to force such indignities upon our senior citizens; how can we ignore the sufferings of those denied medical help?

Our fellow citizens do not wish to sit back and wait for sickness to strike and then have to ask for help through public assistance programs. They dread the thought of having to ask for charity. They are anxious to participate in a program which will assure them of their independence in dealing with the high costs of medical care. They prefer to earn the benefits which will safeguard them in their old age and keep them off the public assistance rolls. We

pride ourselves in this Nation on respect for the dignity of human beings; to tell our older citizens that we will take care of them, somehow, under welfare programs or the Kerr-Mills program which is meant to help only the "medically indigent" aged, is an insult to them and is inconsistent with our dedication to the improvement in the general welfare of all our citizens.

You have statistics before you which show that there are 18 million Americans aged 65 and up—8.7 percent of the population. These persons require three times as much hospital care as those who are younger, and health costs average twice that of younger persons. Yet their income is only about one-third of that of younger persons. Senior citizens today can barely afford the necessities of life; adequate medical care costs are prohibitive. Studies show clearly that most retired persons cannot pay hospital expenses from income, nor can they afford to buy adequate insurance. Those plans which are reasonable enough for any substantial number of the aged to afford, can provide only severely limited benefits. It is reported that nearly a million of our elderly people have had their life's savings wiped out by high medical and hospital costs.

The American Medical Association, this program's bitterest foe, continues to lobby vigorously against this legislation. I recognize that the battle we face to secure passage of this bill is a tough one, but I insist that it must be won.

Hospitalization is the costliest part of old-age medical care; therefore, a program that will bring medical care within reach of the aged, by covering most inhospital and related costs, is urgently needed. Under social security, people will be enabled to pay for their protection during the time they can best afford to contribute, while they are working. Necessity of a means test is avoided; benefits are available as a matter of right. Elderly persons would be assured of proper care, and a great burden would be lifted from their children.

There is overwhelming evidence before your committee to show that adequate health insurance protection could be provided for the aged more economically through social security than under any other plan or program.

I have received many hundreds of pathetic letters from my constituents in which they describe their great need for medical attention and their inability to secure it under existing conditions, or their reluctance to ask for help because of an embarrassing means test and the hardships which will be inflicted on their families. Others live in fear of the day when they will have to meet the problem. How sad it is that our senior citizens must spend their last years in this troubled and unhappy frame of mind, when they are entitled to retirement years filled with peace of mind.

How tragic it is that with the extensive proof which has been made available to your committee, showing the grave need which exists for the King-Anderson bill and proving the desirability of providing hospital care under the social security program, there has been so much delay in considering the bill. Millions of persons are begging for approval of the bill by your committee and passage by the Congress. I have been pleading for years to have the opportunity to vote on the measure, as have all other Members of Congress who have the interests of our senior citizens at heart.

I can no longer treat this major problem of our senior citizens with equanimity; I cannot dismiss their sufferings and hardships from my mind and make no effort to help them; I cannot, in answer to their pleas for desperately needed help, vaguely wave them in the direction of public welfare or financial ruin and further deprivations.

Congress must take favorable action on this grave problem now. Our senior citizens deserve this consideration. Millions of letters, thousands of editorials, speeches, reports, all point up the need for the King-Anderson bill, and our responsible citizens are demanding that Congress meet its responsibility without further delay and pass the bill.

I urge your committee to heed these requests and report the bill favorably, so that Congress may have the opportunity to take action in the near future. There has already been unconscionable delay in connection with this legislation and the promises made to senior citizens that they would be given this relief must now be fulfilled.

Looking for Scapegoats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will consider H.R. 8000, the interest equalization tax bill. Before considering this bill, it is well to look at the facts behind the apparent reason why the Johnson administration (and prior to this, the Kennedy administration) thinks it is absolutely necessary.

In the January 13 issue of Newsweek, Henry Hazlitt goes into the whole subject in depth:

LOOKING FOR SCAPEGOATS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

For 30 years, with minor intermissions, our Government has been following a policy of monetary inflation. The cost of living has more than doubled. Since the end of 1939, the money supply (demand deposits and currency outside banks) has been more than quadrupled—from $36 billion to $152 billion.

Since the end of 1957, the Government has been worrying about a "deficit" in the balance of payments. Measured from that date, this deficit has reached a total of nearly $19 billion—an annual rate of more than $3 billion.

During this period Government policy has increased the active money supply from $136 billion to $152 billion, or nearly 12 percent. It has increased total money supply (including time deposits) from $193 billion to $261 billion, or 35 percent. During this period, also, it has granted more than $24 billion, or $4 billion a year, in foreign aid. It has failed to cover this amount in its annual budgets, which have run a cumulative deficit in the period of more than $30 billion, or some $5 billion a year. And during this period, finally, our monetary authorities have by deliberate policy been holding down both short-term and long-term interest rates to encourage employment and economic growth.

BLAMING CITIZENS

In brief, the deficit in the balance of payments about which the Government professes to be so worried has been brought about by its own policies. It has been annually giving more money and goods away to foreign countries than the amount of this deficit. By inflating, it has raised prices and costs in this country and made us less competitive in foreign trade. By holding down interest rates, it has made it less attractive for foreigners to lend or invest their money here at the same time as it has encouraged Americans to invest their dollars abroad to get a comparatively better return.

But the Government refuses to acknowledge that this has been the result of its own policies. So it is looking for scapegoats. It puts the blame on its own citizens. It blames American investors. It is demanding an almost prohibitive penalty tax on the purchase of foreign securities. Nothing could be more absurd, because American investors, unlike the Government, are not giving their money away to foreigners. They are buying assets for it. They are earning a return on it. In fact, in the 5 years 1958 to 1962 the aggregate net outflow of $16.6 billion for new foreign investment was offset by $15.4 billion of income from previous investment. And in 1962 alone such income amounted to $3.8 billion compared with a net outflow for new investment of $3.3 billion.

MERCANTILISM

If an American investor who buys foreign assets is "hurting our balance of payments," isn't an American tourist who buys consumer goods abroad hurting it still more? "Indeed he is," replies the Government, "and that is why we have reduced the duty-free tourist allowance to $100." But why doesn't it also put a maximum limit on what each tourist can spend in travel, or even prohibit our citizens from traveling abroad at all? It is the logical next step. But what logic would there be in stopping even there? What about American purchases of German cars, of Japanese cameras, of Irish linen, of English tableware, of Scotch whisky, of French perfumes, of Brazilian coffee, of foreign anything? Why not put a prohibitive tariff on all of these things, and solve our "balance-of-payments problem" once for all?

But, someone may say: "This is mercantilism. This is madness. It would be, moreover, completely futile, because our exports depend upon our imports. It is only through selling to us that foreigners can get the dollars to buy from us. If we cut down our imports we must in the long run cut down our exports by the same amount." Precisely so. And in the same way we must cut down our exports by as much as we cut down our foreign investments.

The Government's proposed remedy is not only immediately harmful but in the long run futile. But it will not adopt the only solution, which is to halt its own inflation.

An Attack on the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United States must not yield an inch to the wild demands of rioters, agitators, and Communist subversives. In 1960, we contributed to this armed attack on the Canal Zone by yielding to mob violence and unreasonable demands that the Panamanian flag fly over our sovereign territory. Should the United States again yield, more and more demands will be made by the Communists and agitators until they control the canal.

This would set the stage for a demand that we yield Guantanamo, and possibly Alaska which Communist Russia still claims.

Appeasement of violence and aggression will lead to more aggression and violence, and set the stage for national disaster.

The following editorial from the Charleston, S.C., News & Courier is right to the point, and I commend this splendid editorial to the Congress and to the country:

ATTACK IN CANAL ZONE

Storming of the Panama Canal Zone by Panamanian rioters, followed by widespread attacks on U.S. citizens and property, fully warrants armed defense by U.S. troops.

A declaration by the President of Panama that he wants American soldiers to retire from the Canal Zone suggests that the incidents have a bold political purpose. Panamanians must be reminded that when they invade the Canal Zone, they invade the territory of the United States. An attack on the canal is as serious as an attack on Puerto Rico or Pearl Harbor.

Panama's declaration that it will take a protest to the Organization of American States and the United Nations is without logical foundation. Under the treaty of 1903, the United States has exclusive rights in perpetuity to the use, occupation and control of the Panama Canal Zone.

What brought on the outbreak, which has cost Panamanian and American lives, is the State Department's policy of appeasement toward extremist elements. Americans should be shocked at disclosure that under new regulations, the stars and stripes are not to be flown in the Canal Zone except alongside the Panamanian flag. It was left to American students to hoist their Nation's flag in front of their school buildings.

While the United States wants to be friendly with Panama, good will cannot be purchased by surrendering sovereign rights and strategic interests. The Panama Canal is the single most important strategic and economic artery in this hemisphere. For years world communism has sought to oust the United States from the Canal Zone. The United States cannot allow a takeover in the form of a Panamanian trojan horse.

Charles and Stella Guttman Building, Henry Street Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, who is the executive assistant to the mayor of the city of New York for education and industrial development, at a dedication of the Charles and Stella Guttman Building of the Henry Street Settlement held on January 9, 1964, spoke nostaligically of the scenes of the lower East Side and of the period of his boyhood. Inasmuch as Mr. Silver's talk presents a panoramic view of the lower East Side of almost half a century ago, I think it worthy of being brought to the attention of this body:

To me, this is more than a dedication—it is a homecoming.

To Charles Guttman and his beloved wife, Stella, this is the fulfillment of a lifetime dream. Here, in the heart of the lower East Side, we have returned to the scenes of our childhood. We know the Henry Street Settlement. The streets outside are those in which we played, hemmed in by the tenements, cramped, crowded, and dark, where our people lived like so many other families of immigrants—and the children of immigrants—who had come to seek a new life in a new world.

Not everything they found here was part of the pattern of their dreams. There were many disappointments. Even the struggle for daily existence was as much of a grim business for many as it had been in the lands they had fled. They feared for the future of their children in the unhealthy atmosphere to which they were exposed each day outside of their homes and classrooms.

But the Henry Street Settlement became their haven of hope, courage, and culture. They knew that within its doors their children found a wonderful, magical world of instruction, encouragement, and opportunity.

I wish that our generation could have lived to see how faithfully the Henry Street Settlement continues to serve in such impressive structures as the Stella and Charles Guttman Building—beautiful, functional, and fully equipped to meet the needs of a vastly expanding East Side.

I have said a great deal about the Henry Street Settlement today and on previous occasions, and this is deservedly so. For no one could offer sufficient praise or admiration for the immense task that is being performed by this unique and remarkable institution and its inspired director, Helen Hall.

The children of the East Side have grown up over the years—in their millions—to bring their golden gifts of wisdom, courage, yes, even greatness, to our democracy. They became great lawmakers, scientists, musicians, industralists, poets, dreamers, and doers.

They grew up out of poverty, ignorance and, sometimes, disease, to build a better world because the bright dream of a greater tomorrow had been planted in their hearts by such dedicated people as the Helen Halls, the Winslow Carltons and the Charles and Stella Guttmans of their day.

And now I would like to say a few words about a man who has asked me to say nothing in his behalf—and, actually, nothing need be said, because those who know Charles Guttman and his cherished wife, Stella, are aware that he is one of those rare, compassionate souls who really care.

They are not easy to find in this callous world.

But how often do you find a Charlie Guttman?

Here is a man born and bred only a few feet from this splendid building that now bears his name. His whole formal education was at Public School 20, which cradled many boys who grew to an illustrious manhood.

Charlie graduated at age of 13, and then he had to go out on his own to find a place in the world.

He says of the half million dollars he and his wife gave to the Henry Street Settlement:

"It doesn't begin to even the score. But, at least, it gives you an idea of my gratitude to a place that opened a poor boy's eyes to the rich possibilities of life and the pride of being an American."

Charlie, I hope that these modest ceremonies tonight give you some idea of America's pride in Charlie Guttman.

You rose from the handicaps and obscurity of the tenements to the topmost ranks of finance and industry—trusted and loved by your fellow men—internationally respected for your wisdom, fairness and integrity.

Few people have shown greater devotion and loyalty to the institutions which helped them find their way. Gratitude and generosity like yours are precious virtues—for which you have sought neither praise nor reward.

But we cannot thank you enough for the concern you have always shown for the welfare of our community. We honor you for the warmhearted compassion which has caused you to share the rewards of your great achievements with those that now need the same help that a young boy looked for—and found—within the walls of the Henry Street Settlement.

Such is the quality of Charles Guttman's philanthropy that he seeks neither thanks nor acclaim and even at this moment would probably prefer that his gift go unmentioned and unmarked.

I am humbly grateful that you have accorded me this opportunity of expressing the thoughts in my heart for my cherished friend, Charles Guttman, distinguished industrialist, devoted humanitarian.

Faithful to his Jewish heritage, proud of his American citizenship, Charles Guttman is all things to all men of every race and creed in the quality of his charity.

You, Charlie, are not merely a great man in the measure of your giving. You are a good man—and this is far more rare than greatness—blessed with understanding and consideration for the welfare of those less fortunate.

In furthering your personal goals of granting to others the means to create a better world for themselves, you have made much more than a good living for yourself.

Any industrious, well-meaning, honest, hard-working man of integrity can make a good living, but it is vastly more difficult to make a good life.

This has been your crowning achievement in the course of your daily labors, your companionship with your wife and family and the blessed philanthropic purpose which has made this building possible.

Charles Guttman has performed so many acts of kindness and generosity—he has been so indelibly unselfish in his concern for the ill, the needy and the underprivileged, he has done so much to widen the opportunities for youth—and bring hope to the aging—that if anyone were to tell me that ours is a city without heart, I could refute that claim with the inspiring example of Charles Guttman.

I might add that Charlie Guttman has expressed a desire to make it possible for us to install a cobalt machine at Beth Israel Hospital through a gift of $100,000 toward the unceasing battle against cancer.

The use of cobalt therapy is one of our strongest weapons against this ruthless killer. Now we will no longer have to send our people to other hospitals for this vital treatment.

And because Beth Israel also is responsible for the care of the ill and needy in the out-patient department of Gouverneur Hospital, the great hearts of Charles and Stella Guttman have again reached out a blessed hand of hope and mercy to the men, women and children of the lower East Side.

On behalf of our mayor and the citizens of New York, I thank you, Stella and Charles, for helping the Henry Street Settlement to reclaim and revitalize our community. The work it is doing was never more needed than now.

May your efforts grow—in strength and achievement, helping thousands, known and unknown, throughout generations yet unborn, to build a better America.

Here will stand, for years beyond years, an eternal monument to your success in making a better life—not only for yourself and your loved ones—but for all who shall come through these doors on the way to a greater tomorrow.

John Yoshino's Return From Rejection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great dramas of World War II and the years following the war involved more than 110,000 Japanese-Americans living along the west coast of the United States.

Due to the rapid developments following Pearl Harbor, many of these people experienced long months in retention camps as well as rejection by their fellow citizens. Thousands of young Nisei displayed great heroism and bravery on the part of our country in military service with the 100th battalion of the 442d combat team in Italy. Others served our country in separate units throughout the world.

One of these great Japanese-Americans is Mr. John Yoshino who is a resident of my congressional district. He continues to serve his Nation in a very special way and is doing everything he can to assist minority groups of all kinds through his efforts with the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the December 1963 issue of Country Beautiful magazine setting forth some of the things that make Mr. Yoshino "a man of value" for his Nation:

JOHN YOSHINO'S RETURN FROM REJECTION

(By Jerry Cahill)

There are many reasons why John Y. Yoshino believes it is insensible to deny a man the right to a decent livelihood because of the color of his skin. Hardheaded economic reasons, and lofty philosophic ones dealing with the essential dignity of man. Mr. Yoshino has used them all because, as Deputy Director of Field Services for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, that is his job.

For the most compelling of personal motivations, however, John Yoshino need look no further than his own experiences. He is a Nisei; a Japanese American born 53 years ago in California; a member of a minority group that was once the target of more than 500 restrictive Federal, State, and local laws, and was imprisoned because of its immigrant origins. In his quiet way, he summed it up in one sentence in a recent interview: "I come from a background in which I experienced discrimination in many ways."

Today, Mr. Yoshino is an accepted, indeed valued member of American society. As he goes about his job of chipping away at the barriers that deny a similar acceptance for other minorities, he cannot forget the experiences of his past. And none of the memories is more alive than the Government-enforced evacuation of 110,000 Japanese Americans from the west coast in the early days of World War II.

It was in his words, "the most severe form of rejection" that he had ever experienced, "a severe psychological blow."

Mr. Yoshino was 31 years old when the War broke out, the eldest of a family of four boys and six girls, and the operator of the family drycleaning establishment in Alameda, Calif. There had been rumors of an enforced evacuation, but most in the community, priding themselves on their loyalty to their adopted land, discounted them as inconceivable. Then, one day in 1942, a large convoy of buses pulled into Alameda.

"We realized then, that what couldn't happen had happened," Mr. Yoshino recalls.

Permitted to take only what they could carry, in many instances abandoning to the white majority their businesses, farms, homes and cars, the Japanese Americans were herded onto buses and taken over the mountains and into the desert.

Mr. Yoshino and his family were sent to Tanforan Assembly Center, then to a War Relocation Authority's camp in Utah, 160 miles south of Salt Lake City, in the middle of nowhere."

"It was called, ironically enough from our point of view, Camp Topaz, Jewel of the Desert," Mr. Yoshino recalls. "For all intents and purposes, it was a concentration camp, fenced in by barbed wire, complete with guard towers and machineguns."

How the Nisei emerged from the relocation experience into the mainstream of American life is by now a well-known story. More than 33,000 of them served in the Armed Forces after the War Department, bowing to repeated petitions from the Japanese Americans for a chance to prove their loyalty, finally agreed to accept enlistments in 1943.

They proved their loyalty with a vengeance, but the cost was fearsome. The famous all-Nisei 442d Regimental Combat Team suffered a 300-percent casualty rate in combat in Italy and France. In 11 months of combat the unit won almost 3,600 Purple Hearts, 343 Silver Stars, 48 Distinguished Service Crosses and 1 Medal of Honor. In terms of size and length of service it was the most decorated unit in American military history. Other Nisei served with equal distinction as language specialists in the Pacific war against the land of their ancestors.

Why did the Japanese American serve with such unswerving devotion? Mr. Yoshino, who served in the Pacific with a military intelligence group, says the young men behind the barbed wire of the relocation camps who volunteered by the hundreds wanted to affirm their faith in the United States, and win decent treatment for their families.

"We believed, even in the depths of mental and emotional depression during our internment, in the ultimate goodness of the country," he says. "We believed that the right would prevail after the emotions, the hysteria, subsided."

Mr. Yoshino's experiences in Camp Topaz—he was a liaison officer working with the camp administration and the evacuees—first awakened in him the desire for a career of helping people.

After the war, he enrolled at Roosevelt University in Chicago, graduating in 1948 with a degree in labor relations. There followed 3½ years as a social worker on Chicago's teeming West Side, where, laboring among Negroes, Jews, Italians, and Germans he saw once again "how difficult and terrible it is to be a member of a minority group."

A year in the personnel department of a steel tube manufacturing plant and a master's degree from Loyola University of Chicago came next, and then the American Friends Service Committee asked Mr. Yoshino to head up its job opportunities program in the Chicago area. His instructions were simple: to carry the concern of the Quakers into the business community, to ask employers as individuals to do what they could to end discriminatory hiring practices.

The Friends program was a small one involving just 300 employers; but Mr. Yoshino's work was not unnoticed. In 1956, he was called to Washington to serve on the President's Committee on Government Contracts. On March 6, 1961, under Executive order of President Kennedy, the Committee became a part of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

As Deputy Director of the Committee's field services, Mr. Yoshino is directly responsible for encouraging Federal agencies to adopt positive programs to insure equal opportunity for the Nation's 2,500,000 Government workers. He and his coworkers review reports on complaints of discrimination with almost a compulsive urgency, often working late at night and on weekends.

Justice delayed is justice denied; the Government has "a solemn obligation," in Mr. Yoshino's view, to dispense justice without delay to its own people.

Mr. Yoshino has carried this same message to communities and employers on speaking tours across the country. His persuasive talents are such that the White House in 1961 asked him to join a special State Department task force attempting to bring about the voluntary desegregation of restaurants on U.S. Route 40 near Washington, D.C., where exclusionary policies had caused acute embarrassment to Afro-Asian diplomats. The task force was largely successful.

Ignorance and apathy have been Mr. Yoshino's enemies in his personal campaign against discrimination. He says he has found a number of company presidents and board chairmen who are committed to the principle of equal opportunity, but ignorant of the practices followed by their own personnel departments.

Recognition in many forms has come to Mr. Yoshino because of his work. He is a board member of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials and is chairman of the Eastern District Council of the Japanese American Citizens League. Last year he was one of five persons honored by the league as "Nisei of the Biennium." A few months later Roosevelt University named him its 1962 alumnus of the year.

One gets the feeling, in talking to the man, that public acclaim is a secondary consideration. A devout Methodist and family man, Mr. Yoshino knows from his own experience and from observation what he terms "the crushing humiliation of being rejected because of an accidental characteristic."

In his work, he is trying to affirm the essential dignity of man. "Everything," Mr. Yoshino says, "stems from that."

Representation of Indigent Defendants

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7457) to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Missouri, the author of the amendment, what the effect of this amendment would be on a partnership in which a Member of Congress is one of the partners.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think it is very clear that all this amendment says is that no Member of Congress shall be appointed as counsel in any case covered by this act. I do not think it would apply to a partnership but to the individual himself, because I do not think the court would say that Smith, Jones, and Brown are appointed for this case. The court appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Smith, Mr.

Owens, or somebody else to defend in the case.

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman from Missouri is quite wrong. Under Federal court decisions the disqualification of one member of a law firm is imputed to the other members of the law firm, to his partners.

Mr. GOODELL. I do think in reference to this amendment that you are probably disqualifying any law firm in which a Member of Congress is a partner. If that is the case, I think it should be made clear what is sought to be accomplished.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not a lawyer, but I would take exception, I would argue, and I think other lawyers in this body would argue that the individual is the only one who is included in this amendment. Unless that individual was appointed, it would not affect the situation.

Mr. GOODELL. It is the gentleman's intention that if a Member of Congress is a partner in a law firm, the law partners of the Member of Congress and other attorneys working for that firm may be appointed but the Member of Congress himself may not be appointed?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That would be my intention. I am only attempting to hit at the Members of Congress.

We Must Destroy Poverty in Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson delivered in this Chamber his message on the state of the Union. Many of us were impressed with his emphasis on the need to eradicate the roots of poverty in this country.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of poverty in Washington, D.C., that appeared in the January 12, 1964, Sunday edition of the Washington Post. Portions of the article are poignant to read. However, the article by Eve Edstrom lucidly limns the plight of those enmeshed in the poverty on the doorstep of the Congress. It is worthwhile reading now and worth rereading during appropriation time.

The article follows:

"THEY'RE ALL SCUFFLIN'—LIKE ME"

(By Eve Edstrom)

The shame is that in the Capital City of the world's richest Nation, the mother meant it when she said her family was blessed:

Blessed because they had food—one-dish meals of grits or beans or fried potatoes.

Blessed because they had a place to stay—a tumbling-down hovel without heat but with rats.

Blessed because they had clothes—remnants fashioned into skirts; shoes purchased for 15 cents at Goodwill Industries.

"People ought to count their blessings," she told a health and welfare council worker. "I count mine every day. I look over what I haven't had and what I got now.

"I always lived hard. Many a morning I went to school without a bite but I knew that my mother was doing the best she could. It was just like I had a whole meal * * * since I understood it.

"I didn't get noway near as much as my children get. Sometimes we would come home and mama wouldn't have anything to give us for dinner but we would just go out and play and overlook it. I used to go to school in the winter practically half-barefoot and my children don't know nothing about that."

DESPERATION

But there still are hundreds of children in the Nation's Capital who go to school without a bite or don't go to school because they are without shoes.

And there also are those who literally do not have a place to stay.

Police and welfare workers tell you about them—the families who huddle in hallways until the building's occupants chase them out, the families who furtively slip into condemned houses until police rout them out.

They show up at 24-hour restaurants, pleading to remain until morning. In desperation, they go to the police women's bureau to seek a bed.

By the time they get there, the children are whimpering for food. Some of the youngsters are so sick that they can't keep food down and must be taken to the hospital.

This is the type of poverty that is eroding lives in every slum of every American city today.

LIVING BY "PICKINGS"

It is a poverty that has nothing to do with lacking some of the more civilized necessities of our society—an alarm clock so a child can be on time for school, an icebox so that food won't spoil, a bathroom so children can be kept clean.

It is a poverty that has everything to do with lacking the barest necessities for survival.

There are poor people in Washington who get water by carrying a bucketful from a gas station, who obtain light by running extension cords across an alley to a neighbor's home, who live like rats in enclosures under porches.

In the heart of the city, some of the poor try to make a living by "picking"—picking up discarded papers and bottles to be sold to the junkman, picking over gutter debris to see if last night's drunk lost any coins, picking at the slots of vending machines for a stray dime.

"Gimme a penny" is the street call of the young. Youngsters have been known to chase strangers for blocks in quest of "liberry books."

If there is any solace to be found in the slums of Washington, it is summed up by the inhabitant who said:

"Here, people are equals. They're all scufflin' just like me. Nobody thinks he's any better than anybody else."

MASS PHENOMENON

The fact that poverty persists in this land of plenty is an established fact long known to economists and welfare workers. But only recently, through numerous published studies, has the plight of the impoverished attracted the attention it deserves.

And for the first time since the 1930's, national leadership has stepped in to spur the battle against poverty. In his state of the Union address last week, President Johnson declared "unconditional war on poverty in America." He called for better schools, homes, health, training, and job opportunities.

But it still is difficult for most of affluent America to believe that poverty is a mass phenomenon afflicting almost 1 out of 4 of their fellow citizens. And, contrary to popular belief, most of the poor must fend for themselves; only about 1 in 6 is a beneficiary of public relief.

One reason why the poor have been ignored is that they are so submerged—buried on poverty-pocked hillsides or in the bowels of big cities—that the affluent don't know they exist.

How many Washington area residents, for example, know about the mother and three children who live in a basement room near the Simmons Elementary School, 1st and Pierce Sts. NW.?

The room has no heat and the only cooking apparatus is a hot plate. Eeach day, the mother leaves oatmeal on the hot plate when she goes to work at 7 a.m.

One recent bitter day, the "man-of-the-house"—a 7-year-old boy in the second grade at Simmons—attempted to heat the room. He removed the oatmeal and placed a large pan of water on the hot plate.

The pan was too heavy and both the pan and the hot plate fell on the boy. His clothes ignited and he was a flaming torch by the time he reached the street. Neighbors beat out the flames and the boy was admitted to Children's Hospital for third-degree burns all over his body.

SUNSHINE BRIDGE

Poverty sears the city's aged citizens as well.

Just two days before Christmas, The Washington Post received a letter from "just one of the old ladies who would like to live, but on what?"

Her monthly income is $85 and her monthly expenses, including medicines but not allowing for food, amount to $89.85.

"I earned $2 sewing today and that with $2 in a Christmas card will pay $3.50 again Monday for my blood tests," she wrote. "I've never had to accept help and none of the neighbors know how I eat.

"Sometimes I think it would be welcome for folks like me if there was a gas chamber to go into. It's too far to the sunshine bridge."

Probably the most graphic descriptions of what it means to be poor in Washington have been compiled by the Health and Welfare Council during the last 4 years.

The study, supported by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, was focused on child-rearing practices among low-income families in the Nation's Capital.

But through interviews with the families—such as the one with the mother who was "blessed"—and through the written experiences of staff members who lived in Washington's blighted areas, the stark picture of living conditions of the city's poor was recorded.

For example, one staff member, the late Roscoe Lewis, lived in a central Northwest Washington area where dwellings once housed single families and now contain as many as 9 families with 40 or more persons.

DETAILS OF MISERY

The following excerpts are from a report he wrote shortly before his death.

"Many of these houses now are mere shells. The front doors are gone from some. They are like Alabama 'shotgun' houses—you could shoot through front and back doors without touching the house.

"Apartments are dim since only the front and rear rooms have windows. Where walls are papered, the paper is faded, greasy, and sagging in spots.

"One small bulb hangs from each ceiling; at night it would be difficult to read—if there were anything to read.

"The personal possessions of many of these families are old, dilapidated, rickety, hardly usable. Stuffing is sticking from the arms of living room furniture; springs are free from their fastenings and pushing into covers. One sits gingerly on most chairs and settees. Beds are usually iron with only

occasional box springs; single sagging springs are the usual order. Of five apartments visited, there was found in one a single book. It was a school textbook, loaned to the student and overdue. No newspapers or magazines were seen.

"Kitchens lack refrigerators and modern stoves. It is apparent why so many restaurants in the vicinity advertise 'Carry out boxes'; many families have only a hotplate to cook on. It is clear also why many women shop every day rather than once a week; they have no way of preserving food.

STREETS A REFUGE

"Bathrooms, with their ancient fixtures, are odorous and unsanitary. Bathtubs, used sometimes to wash out clothes, at other times to store coal, are chipped and rusted. A dripping bowl faucet or toilet is frequently seen.

"In these so-called apartments, there is no place for children. The close quarters, the drabness, the lack of something to do drives these children into the street. Home for them is simply a place to sleep and sometimes to eat.

"I look from my bathroom window and see cans, boxes of trash, soggy, muddy newspapers, rotted watermelon rinds, beer cans, whisky and gin bottles, disordered piles of lumber, broken chairs, couches and tables, a refrigerator lying sidewise, shoes, a twisted bed, what was once a mattress, a baby's go-cart, broken chinaware and rusted cooking utensils, the remains of a tennis racket hanging on a fence, an alarm clock, an old-fashioned auto fender and ancient, rusted autos in various states of disrepair.

"This conglomeration of junk will remain where it lies indefinitely. Trashmen insist that whatever is to be carted away must be in trash cans. * * * They will not pick up a can even if it is only 2 feet away.

"Six in the morning is trash time and 5:30 is bottle time. There are plenty of bottles in this neighborhood. Men scour the streets for bottles each morning and little separate groups dump and assort them along the alley. The deposit bottles are carefully put aside; the no-deposit bottles—whisky, gin and others—are smashed. * * * For the broken glass they get 15 cents per hundred pounds."

When families are forced to live in this manner, it is no small wonder that they do not observe the niceties of middle-class living.

Take the mother who told of her struggle to support four children on $27.50 a week—$12 of which went to a baby-sitter.

"If a man has anything and offers to help you out, you don't say to him: 'But you'll have to marry me first,'" she said. "You take what he offers right off and offer what you have in return. Of course, you hope that some day he will want to make it legal. But beggars can't be choosers."

And it should surprise no one that this mother sometimes likes a drink of gin or a cigarette.

"I don't drink whisky but once in a while I'll get myself a half pint of gin," she said. "But that's about all I spend on myself. I ain't had a new dress for about 3 years. I'd rather have the gin once in awhile and the cigarettes. I don't go nowhere to need a new dress."

SOMEDAY

Yet this mother, who eventually received a monthly relief allotment of $154, wants a much better world for her children. She is typical of slum residents when she says:

"If there's one thing I want it's a backyard, fenced in, so my children don't have to play out in the street * * * I sure hope and pray that some day I can do better. But what can I do now?

"Rent and food alone take over $125. No matter how hard I try I seem to keep going backward instead of getting out of debt.

"Now look at this place. * * * It's clean, ain't it? * * * look in this bedroom. See where leaking water has just about ripped all the paper off the wall? Now look here in this closet. When it rains it pours in here so hard I have to remove all the children's clothes. Now look at this here toilet. The plumbers come and here's how they fixed it—stuck an old pencil in the mechanism to keep the water from running. How long do you thing that's going to last? * * * It seems like for $55 a month rent you ought to have some repairs.

"I tell you, I believe in bringing up my children in decent surroundings and that's why I want to get out of this dirty, foul-smelling dump. I want my children to be something and no matter what I tell them it doesn't do much good when they go downstairs and hear some of these rascals."

Despite the old saying that "ignorance is bliss," the poor are not happy over their lack of knowledge.

One mother told how hurt she is when her children bring home a difficult question from school and she cannot help them. She held up a piece of paper with four written words, including "president."

"My daughter, Bell, had to learn to spell them words," she said. "She asked me to listen to her. I could not spell 'president' by heart. It hurt me, but I would not show the hurt."

The poor also know why they are at the bottom of the economic heap.

"If you don't have no education," another mother said, "you can't get nowhere. You have to scrub floors or wash dishes. I don't know anything else to do but to iron and wash dishes."

Even those who do know how to do something else are ashamed of their lack of professional skills. Sonny, a semiliterate construction worker, told how he gets a sick feeling in his stomach "just thinking about people with an education and position."

"Suppose I like this girl," he said, "I go to her house and I meet her father. He starts talking about what he done today. He talks about operating on somebody and sewing them up and about surgery. I know he's a doctor 'cause of the way he talks. Then she starts talking about what she did. Maybe she's a boss or a supervisor. Maybe she's a lawyer and her father says to me: 'And what do you do?'"

Sonny was told that he had a skill, too, that he could help construct a building or pour a sidewalk.

"Maybe so," he said, "but when was the last time you saw anybody standing around talking about concrete?"

NO DESPAIR

But most of the poor do not despair. They are more like the mother who said she was blessed because her children were "20 times better off" than she had been in South Carolina before coming here in 1959.

"They can go to school," she said. "They can go to church. They don't have to stay out nary a single day. They have time to study. I used to want to go to church but if I had shoes I didn't have a dress or other things to wear. * * * But my children has these things to go.

"I have never been crazy about money as I've never had it to be crazy about. I'm crazy more about my family's welfare and happiness."

In his declaration of war on poverty in the state of the Union address last week, President Johnson promised to pursue "poverty wherever it exists."

This, he said, may be in city slums or small towns, sharecropper shacks, migrant worker camps, boom towns, depressed areas, Indian reservations, among whites as well as Negroes and the young as well as the aged.

Here is a picture of the poverty in a "city slum" as seen in Washington.

By conservative income standards, almost 1 in 10 of Washington's 178,695 families live in such "abject poverty" that they must do without bare necessities.

They include the city's 6,905 families who, according to 1960 census data, try to exist on less than $1,000 annually and the 9,372 families who try to make out on incomes of less than $2,000.

The lack of dollars in these families is tied to their other lacks.

While occasionally a college graduate may be found among them, their chief lack is schooling and marketable skills. The men in these impoverished households are likely to have less education than their wives.

The heads of these families also are apt to be unemployable because they suffer from a high incidence of mental and other disabling diseases. Some of their illnesses are directly connected to the conditions under which they must live.

They have no control over many of their difficulties. Most possess the wrong color skin and so they become "the last to be hired, first to be fired."

Others compound their economic difficulties by increasing their family year after year even though their income remains hopelessly static.

Besides those who are at the bottom of the economic heap, another 32,277 families—which adds up to more than one in four of the city's families—live on incomes ranging from $2,000 to $3,999.

Substantial portions of the accompanying article are based on hitherto unpublished interviews with Washington's low-income families which were conducted by field workers detailed to a special project here.

The 4-year project, which focused on child-rearing practices among the low-income families, began in September 1959, with financial support from the National Institute of Mental Health. It has been directed by Hylan Lewis for the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area.

Besides conducting countless interviews with the families and taping some of them, project workers actually lived in Washington's blighted areas and recorded their impressions. The raw material obtained is now being analyzed and compiled.

Other parts of the accompanying article are based on December 1963, police complaints investigated by the Women's Bureau and on interviews with District school and child welfare officials.

Representation of Indigent Defendants

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7457) to provide assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] this question. Do I understand that the purpose of his amendment is merely that a Member of Congress may not represent an indigent defendant?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, that is not the purpose at all. He could not be appointed. A Congressman may volunteer to serve without pay. Such a case would not be affected at all. But the amendment says that no Member shall

be appointed to serve as counsel and make himself eligible for this remuneration. If the gentleman would yield me a little time, since the chairman of this subcommittee wants to get a little rough, I would like to make a statement, too.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. I want to say merely this. This amendment, if that is what it does, is certainly well taken. I think there is a conflict of interest involved for a Member of the Federal Congress to practice in a Federal court in any case. It may or may not technically be legal but, as a matter of good practice, I have a great question as to the propriety of it.

The State of Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union message was the kickoff for his campaign and purely political in approach.

To bring the country to reality, David Lawrence, in the January 9 issue of the Evening Star, describes what the message intents—the arrival of the millenium.

The article follows:

ON THE STATE OF THE UNION—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE IS CALLED A DESCRIPTION OF A UTOPIAN STATE

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson has just delivered to Congress not so much a message on the state of the Union as an alluring description of a utopian state.

The President spoke of the "unprecedented progress of our free enterprise economy over the last 3 years," and said that wages, profits, and family income are "at their highest level in history." He nevertheless thought it necessary to declare "unconditional war on poverty in America."

Though speaking of the United States as "the richest nation on earth," Mr. Johnson, even more than his predecessor, emphasized poverty as a national problem. He did not define this explicitly, but in general terms. He said his purpose was "to help that one-fifth of all American families with incomes too small even to meet their basic needs."

The question remains, however, as to what are really the basic needs and what persons can accurately be described as poverty stricken. The President seems to think that the cause of the poverty is "in a lack of education and training, in a lack of medical care and housing, in a lack of decent communities in which to live and bring up their children." But, surprisingly enough, the President made no mention of weakness in individual character and, in many cases, an inherited incapacity to equal the achievements of one's average fellow man.

No doubt there are communities in which poverty occurs, just as there are distressed areas where some unemployment prevails, and relief should be provided. But it is regrettable that not enough emphasis has been placed upon individual responsibility and also on the most effective way to create jobs. The President rightly said:

"For the war against poverty will not be won here in Washington. It must be won in the field—in every private home, in every public office, from the courthouse to the White House."

But there was one omission. Mr. Johnson did not mention the need to remove the barriers that the private enterprise system faces every day in the creation of new jobs. About the only reference to job creation in the President's speech was the mention of the $11 billion tax reduction over the next 2 years. He spoke of it as providing investment incentives. But in the same address to Congress the President repeated an error which has often been noted in past administration policies; namely, a recommendation that laws be passed which cannot but have the effect of frustrating the development of the free enterprise system.

Mr. Johnson recommended legislation, for example, to authorize the creation of committees on an industry-by-industry basis which would have the authority to put into effect higher rates for overtime. The theory is that this would serve as a penalty for use of overtime and create more jobs. But to tell the managers of free enterprise in America that they must eliminate overtime in order to create new jobs is equivalent to telling them that they must accept Government dictation in work schedules or pay higher rates for unavoidable overtime.

There are many industries in which a few hours of overtime work is all that is necessary. In those cases where one or two shifts—with perhaps a small amount of overtime—can perform the required work, it seems incredible that any business would, on its own, choose to use large amounts of overtime at rates of time-and-a-half per hour when a new shift of employees can be put on at the regular wage rates.

But the proposal illustrates the tendency here to deal with questions on the basis of economic partisanship. For the increase of overtime rates is something which the unions have advocated, not necessarily to produce more jobs but to increase the income of the regular employees. In most instances, the effect probably would be to give higher incomes to the regular employees who work overtime rather than to create places for new workers.

There were many proposals in the President's address, nearly all couched in very general terms. The statement of the aims of the United States in foreign policy is in line with that of preceding administrations. There have always been proclamations of high purpose—to curtail and even abolish big armament, to enlarge world trade, and to strengthen the ability of free nations to raise their standard of living through an efficient foreign aid program. But the big difficulty is in the method and formula to be used to accomplish such high-sounding purposes. Thus, the President declared that the United States "must be constantly prepared for the worst and constantly acting for the best." He added that we "must be strong enough to win any war, and we must be wise enough to prevent one."

So there really was no new contribution to international policy. In fact, there was little new on the domestic side, either. For while the President promised "a progressive administration which is efficient and honest and frugal," the budget in the coming fiscal year will involve a deficit of $4.9 billion.

It is true that the earlier estimates were higher, but, unfortunately, a fiscal system is not measured by the size of the estimates or the theoretical economies achieved when estimates are finally cut down. The fact remains that America is to run on a deficit budget in the years to come, and not a single word in the President's message gave any indication of when a balanced budget will be achieved. So the people of the United States are asked to continue to accept the platitudes of hopefulness—that someday the millennium will arrive.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Tribute to Our Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, tributes to our late President have taken many sensitive and touching forms. We are, after all, a mature nation, and the loss of a Chief Executive strikes deeply at our national consciousness.

Those who composed some expression of their grief have contributed much to the heartbeat of America, this blessed land.

One such contributor to the dramatic narratives that welled up throughout America when our citizens learned of John F. Kennedy's death was the Honorable Folsom Everest, of Council Bluffs, a judge of the 15th Iowa judicial circuit, and a friend of mine for more than a quarter of a century.

To my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I commend this stirring eulogy to our late martyred President, and cite also Judge Everest's equally moving tribute to the genius of our form of government.

There will be fewer faint hearts about the future of this noble country if good people will strive to relearn and be fortified by the towering majesty of our Constitution as so earnestly illustrated by Jurge Everest. The eulogy follows:

A TRIBUTE TO OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

There are times when language is a totally inadequate method of expression. This is such an occasion. All over our country in places such as this men are trying to describe the gallant and admirable qualities of our murdered, martyred President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Few will succeed, and they, only because of a more intimate knowledge of him than can be gleaned from the columns of the press. This, coupled with true capacity to paint a word picture, may lead one or two toward the goal but for me to venture far in that area is to pretend to a knowledge I do not have and an eloquence I do not possess.

A few outstanding things all of us know. We understand that he possessed great physical courage. This he demonstrated through combat service in time of war and in facing up to excruciating pain and suffering since the war. These are qualities shared with many others. That he had a brilliant intellect is apparent from the manner in which he absorbed and digested facts about new and strange situations. Amazing qualities of leadership were essential to his success not only in his chosen field of politics but in his earlier Navy career. For a stranger to go further than to point out these obvious characteristics would be presumptuous indeed.

The shocking but dramatic manner of his passing has been sufficiently depicted by radio, television, and press. The utter futility of the act committed can hardly be overemphasized. The motivation of the accused assassin may be suspected but never really known, for he in turn has been gunned down by a foolish man who could not wait for the orderly processes of the law to exact payment for so foul a crime. Oswald never admitted committing the assassination much less the reasons why he did it but if it be assumed that he sought to modify in some degree or fashion the attitude of our country toward Castro's Cuba the only result has been a worsening rather than a lessening of the severity of our attitude in that respect. If he sought to create confusion in Government by murdering the Chief of State then he failed of the objective for the act served to unite rather than disrupt the people responsible for our policy. We have already seen the almost instant transference of authority to President Johnson who took the oath of office within less than 2 hours of the shooting of President Kennedy. We have witnessed the wisdom with which he sought and has obtained the allegiance and support of the leaders of both parties in the Senate and House and you may be sure that during the opening weeks of his Presidency he will be free from partisan criticism while feeling out the strength and weakness of the opposing leadership in the cold war. If it be assumed that the killer sought modification of attitude on the civil rights program of legislation the issues there are too well drawn for Presidential attitudes to change them in any important respect. The Legislature and the courts will make the decision which the Executive can do little more than implement.

Perhaps it is not amiss for a moment to dwell briefly on the strength of the form of government devised for us by the Founding Fathers and implemented through the Constitution which they wrote and persuaded the States to adopt. It was not perfect. Being drawn by mortals it partook of their mortality. Like all legislation it was the product of compromise but as it went before the people it expressed the fundamentals of separation of church and state; separation of powers of the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary; delegation of powers by the States to the Federal Government and government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It required almost immediate amendment through the adoption of the Bill of Rights which assured protection of the individual against the arbitrary exercise of power. Through the years it has not only been amended but interpreted and as a written document it is properly the subject of interpretation. Seldom has this been done without arousing passionate protest on the part of some and this was true in early days as well as modern times but the essential elements remain. Other nations have similar documents but ours alone has stood the test of time and stress. It accommodates itself to crises such as the assassination of Presidents or their sudden demise. In all the times this has happened there has never been the suggestion of other than an orderly transference of power. The ugly head of dictatorship has never reared itself nor has the military sought to interfere with civilian authority. These have been common corollaries in other lands and other places.

In all probability we shall never know the true motives of the assassin but the result is a senseless killing, a depraved expression of hatred—incapable of rationalization. We deplore the deed and the reflection it casts on our vaunted civilization. Those of us who have been exposed to the intensities and passions of the battlefield recognize that the veneer of civilization is thin and rubs off under such pressures but this act has no such excuse. We are tempted to regard such a killer as insane but the stupid act of another killer makes such a determination impossible and leaves only the field of speculation. The answer we may never know.

The words of John Masefield, poet laureate of England, appeared in the press this morning:

"All generous hearts lament the leader killed,
The young chief with the smiling, radiant face,
The winning way that turned a wondrous race
Into sublimer pathways, leading on.
Grant to us life that though this man be gone
The promise of his spirit be fulfilled."

International Farm Youth Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, for the purpose of disseminating information on the background and mechanics of the international farm youth exchange program—IFYE—which has contributed so commendably to international understanding, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of items which explain the program.

This information was supplied by Mr. C. C. Moseley of Wilson, Wyo., who has been instrumental in developing interest in the program through the Rocky Mountain West.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. IFYE DELEGATES CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION

This application is accepted subject to the following provisions required of all candidates:

(a) Participants must be mature young people with at least a high school education, and between 20 and 30 years of age. Age is considered as of January 1. Candidates must have passed their 20th birthday, but not their 31st birthday on January 1 of the year in which they will participate.

(b) Must be in excellent physical and mental health. A physician's certification will be required of accepted candidates.

(c) Must not be married, have dependents at home or other ties that would create separation problems.

(d) Must be willing and able to devote considerable time and energy to intensive advance study of the geography, history, culture, and agriculture of both the United States and the country to be visited.

(e) A language facility will be required of delegates who go to other than English speaking countries. Candidates who have obtained this ability will be given preferential consideration. Even in such cases, however, additional study will be necessary.

(f) Must be willing and able, on their return home, to devote considerable time to speaking and spreading the influence of their experience in other ways.

(g) Should have had previous travel and other experience away from home to insure against homesickness.

(h) Must be alert and have a sincere and friendly attitude. Should realize that there will be hardships and privations involved. Must exercise emotional restraint. This is definitely not a "joyride."

(i) Must have a background of farm life and work. Experience and knowledge of rural organizations and educational activities will be needed also.

(j) Should have sincere interest in understanding other people rather than enforcing ones own point of view.

(k) Under all circumstances delegates must adhere strictly to the program and schedule prepared for them. No extension of time or travel will be approved except that a maximum of 1 week will be permitted just prior to returning to the United States for those who wish to visit other nearby countries, relatives or friends at their own expense. The itinerary for this week must be approved by the officials supervising the program in the country concerned.

Objectives:

To help promote a better understanding between people of other countries and the United States.

To build toward world peace.

To provide opportunity for a living, working, and playing experience with a family.

Time in a country:

Approximately 3 weeks with each family.

Living experience with farm family:

The key to this program is living with a family, becoming a member, sharing the work and pleasures. This leads to fellowship and affection as a family member. A true understanding of another way of life is best achieved in this way. The home need not have the best equipment, facilities, and physical arrangements. It is the family relationships, the willingness to accept another person into the family circle that is important.

Second, this experience should give the IFYE opportunity to observe and take some active part in the community life, rural youth organizations, and countrywide 4-H events.

The family should:

(1) Accept the IFYE as you would want your boy or girl accepted by a family abroad.

(2) Accept the IFYE as a member of the family.

(3) Have children of 4-H Club age or the age of the exchangee, if possible.

(4) Realize the IFYE is anxious to learn but also has much to give.

(5) Be sympathetic and understanding. The IFYE may have difficulty in a strange country with different customs, a different language and in many instances different food.

(6) Remember that the IFYE's impressions of family life in the United States will be formed largely through living with families.

(7) Include the IFYE in community and county activities.

(8) Help the IFYE attend the church of his choice, if need arises.

(9) Give the IFYE opportunity to attend extension farm organization, community and county events, especially those concerning youth work.

(10) Make the IFYE feel that he can bring his problems to you.

(11) Let the IFYE know as soon as possible the farm and home routine and how he will fit into it. An early understanding is important.

(12) Consider the IFYE not as a guest nor as a hired hand but as a member of the family willing to do his share of the daily work and wanting to reap the everyday pleasures of rural life.

(13) Give the IFYE some time for his own, for letterwriting, reporting, and other personal activities.

(14) Complete the report on your IFYE and forward to the State 4-H office.

Finances:

(1) The host family will provide board and lodging.

(2) The county 4-H organization will provide spending money—$1 per day is recommended. IFYE's cannot bring much money with them to the United States. This will help the IFYE meet necessary personal expenses—film, stamps, letterwriting, laundry, supplies.

It will be detrimental to the program of promoting international understanding, if you are lavish or pay your IFYE.

Insurance:

Each IFYE has a health, accident and liability insurance policy. In case of any mishap, host families contact the extension agent immediately. He will in turn, contact the State 4-H Club office.

County extension agent:

(1) The family should feel free to call on the agent for advice and help.

(2) The agent and family should work out arrangements for scheduling speaking engagements and other events to prevent the IFYE from being overloaded, and so that he may receive a variety of experiences.

(3) The financial arrangements will be worked out by county extension agent.

(4) The extension agent will present orientation material to the host family on the exchangee and the IFYE program prior to exchangee's arrival.

The FTC: Living by Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of Chairman Paul Rand Dixon, the Federal Trade Commission has adopted new rules and methods designed to streamline the procedures applied by the agency in carrying out the many responsibilities imposed upon this Commission by the Congress. In recognition of the fact that Chairman Dixon and his colleagues have inaugurated these improvements, the Commission has been commended by Members of the Congress, members of the bar, and by leaders in business and industry.

Further praise was conferred upon FTC Chairman Dixon and the Commission just recently by an editorial in the Chattanooga Times in my State of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times, Dec. 20, 1963]

THE FTC: LIVING BY TRUTH

Persons listening to Rand Dixon these days will perhaps conceive of new dimensions for the terms "free enterprise" and "equal opportunity."

"Free enterprise" often brings to mind the protests of businessmen against what they consider to be undue governmental influence or interference.

As Chairman Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission said yesterday, it is the responsibility of the Commission not to "blow the whistle on business" simply for the sake of blowing. President Johnson has personally admonished all the agencies on this, he pointed out. Tennessean Dixon was eloquent in his exposition of and faith in the American system. It is also the 60-year-old responsibility of FTC, he said, to see that real free enterprise, free of unfair or illegal restraint, exists.

"Free opportunity" often brings civil rights to mind.

But it is refreshing to note Mr. Dixon's description of FTC as the guarantor of "an equal opportunity for every business to compete in a fair way."

To the ordinary citizen, the Federal Trade Commission is undoubtedly the least known of the major regulatory commissions. One special reason in the South is that, in decades past, most top FTC controversies have involved controlling interests that were resident elsewhere than in this region.

But business and industry executives know industry well; as witness the packed audience which heard Mr. Dixon yesterday at the Rotary Club.

Extemporaneously and with a fine, candid grasp, Rand Dixon traced the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890; the Clayton Antitrust Act in 1914, and Woodrow Wilson's recommendation that the FTC be established, also in that year.

Evoked in his hearers' minds were the days of the great Wilsonian reforms: the Underwood freer trade bill; the Federal Reserve System, with the bill written by Senator Carter Glass, and with a significant role played by Treasury Secretary William Gibbs McAdoo, a former Chattanooga lawyer; the Railway and Farm Loan Acts; the new and stronger pure food law and others.

There had never been anything like this body of action in the Nation before.

Today, 1,100 FTC employees, including 500 lawyers, means a lot of people; a lot of government; yet who would deny the solid and essential role of this agency in conserving the most effective and productive system human beings have ever known?

In its procedures—and particularly since the Dixon-instituted practice of giving businesses informal guidelines on request, without the expense of lawsuits—FTC is remarkable in its relative freedom from redtape.

For the first time anywhere, as the Chairman said, we have in this country not only a rule of law protecting businesses and individuals, but a watchful assurance that when the consumer sees or reads about a product, he has a right "not to be deceived or misled." And self-enforcement is the biggest single factor in the success of the American way.

In his discussion of these points, including such concepts as "truth in advertising," we liked both what he said and the way he said it when he reminded us with experience and conviction:

"It is good for us to live by truth."

Let Your Light Shine Before Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, among the many excellent articles and messages that it was my privilege to read during the past Christmas season, none was more poignant and appropriate than an editorial appearing in the Press Telegram of Long Beach, Calif., written by a noted Washington correspondent, Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly.

Although Mrs. Kelly's moving editorial was written in observance of the date of the birth of our Lord, the timeless truth and moral values that it expresses are appropriate at any season. I therefore, commend it to the readers of the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Long Beach Press-Telegram, Dec. 24, 1963]

LET YOUR LIGHT SHINE BEFORE MEN

(By Virginia Weldon Kelly)

Five hundred years before the first Christmas, Isaiah joyously prophesied the birth of the Messiah whose "name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

The angel of the Lord announced Jesus' birth to the Bethlehem shepherds as "good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people."

Angelic music, the glory of the Star of the East, beauty and joy attended the birth of the Christ Child.

Some may ask how people can be joyful with the United States emerging from national mourning for President Kennedy; with the free world menaced; with mankind threatened by atomic war. There is only one answer. Those who believe in God, and who look to Christ as their Redeemer, cannot fail to be spiritually radiant at Christmas.

Jesus loved the book of Isaiah which states that the Lord promises "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness * * * that He might be glorified."

No person can escape sorrow, but the love of God and Jesus make it possible for man to meet his destiny with nobility.

As Americans count their resplendent gifts of the spirit, we may be thankful for freedom in our constitutional republic of checks and balances; and that we have another dedicated Chief Executive, President Johnson.

Assassination, hatred, fear, bigotry and ignorance cannot withstand the miracle of Christmas which brings rebirth and hope. The Christ Child's day brings realization that all men are God's children beautiful with potential love, goodness and greatness of spirit and purpose.

In this Christmas season, we hope you have tranquility of spirit; that you are blessed with family and friends; that you walk in health and prosperity. But under any circumstances, Christ will throw His seamless cloak of comfort around us—if we will let Him. Age, health, finances—and above all, the past—do not matter. He is accustomed to dealing with pasts, with tragedy, and contrition.

Let us cast off the past to become as the little children Jesus loved. In this way only, can we hope to enter the kingdom of heaven.

Our Christmas wish is that you will remember Jesus' admonition, "Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

In God We Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, herewith a poem by Marvin L. Porter entitled "Who Is God?" It is from the hills of home in southwest Missouri where Mr. and Mrs. Porter live at 1746 South Main Street in the city of Carthage. I think it is particularly apropos at a time when many people are wondering about our Supreme Being, when this body is considering facing the Supreme Court Building with our traditional American legend "In God We Trust," and when we are especially involved in the problems of posterity and particularly the training of our youth. Surely the Supreme Being above will guide us in these hours, and I commend this deep and perceptive poem to all Members of both bodies careful review and timely reading:

WHO IS GOD?

(By Marvin L. Porter)

Who is the great God of heaven does any one know?
He who measures the vast waters in His hand,
He comprehendeth the measure and dust of earth
And meted out the heavens with only a span.

Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket
And counted as a small dust of the balance,
Of whom took He counsel, and who taught Him,
Who would dare His great wisdom to challenge?

To whom then will ye liken me saith the Holy One
He spreadeth out the great heavens as a curtain,
The inhabitants of the earth are as grasshoppers
And all His predictions are sure and certain.

Nations are counted less than nothing before Him
To whom then will we liken this great God?
It is He that sitteth on the circle of the earth
From which He made man out of the sod.

God's a consuming fire, let the lofty ones bow
Peradventure He'll hear your earnest petition,
Lest He humble you like Nebuchadnezzar of old,
And bring you down from your lofty position.

Nebuchadnezzar was at rest flourishing in pride
But his night vision came and made him afraid,
He summoned old Daniel his dream to make clear,
That left Nebuchadnezzar in a most dreaded fear.

His son Belshazzar and a thousand of his lords
Were defiling God's vessels both great and small
And in the same hour came forth fingers and wrote
As Belshazzar trembled at the writing on the wall.

It's not surprising that a heathen vaunt himself
But imagine a puny man in this gospel day of time,
Assuming God's Government is resting solely on him
It proves beyond question he's naked and blind.

Some folks act as if they had a corner on God
And a special claim on the great plan of salvation,
And knowest not that they are blind and needy
And their only posession is condemnation.

O that men and women would fall down before Him,
The great Jehovah that holds our life in His hand,
And adore Him as the only object of holy worship
Through His only son Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

Now do you think you will kick Him out?
I mean out of the public school
No, He is omnipresent, He is every place
Then who will be the silly fool.

Medical Care for the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials hails the public-private proposal relating to medical care for the aging, which I introduced last week, with my colleagues Senators CASE, COOPER, KEATING, KUCHEL, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH as cosponsors.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1964]

FIGHTING FOR MEDICAL CARE

Medical care for the aged, which threatens to become a hardy perennial in Congress, may yet bloom. President Johnson has pledged to wage a vigorous fight on behalf of the administration's plan to finance hospital care and nursing service through social security. Action also has been promised by six Republican Senators who have introduced a proposal based on the findings of the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, a private, bipartisan body that spent a year in studying the problem.

There is enough similarity in the two proposals to make possible an effective compro-

mise. Both would rely on increased social security payments to pay the costs of providing care for the Nation's 18 million elderly citizens. The Republican measure would seek even more extensive coverage by authorizing private insurance companies to pool their risks so that they will be able to provide additional health benefits at a cost within the reach of most older people, a measure that would require special exemption from antitrust legislation.

A combination of public and private insurance may be the best approach to assure the widest possible support for a program that is so sorely needed. The number of persons over 65 is increasing at a rapid pace, but many have no protection whatsoever and an equally large number have inadequate coverage. Providing them with hospital care will be expensive, yet the failure to act is proving even more costly, both in terms of human suffering and eventual economic cost.

But a working plan cannot be implemented without effective leadership. Mr. Johnson's observation that we have just begun to fight reveals that the administration has not yet made the necessary effort to assure a victory. If a bill is to be passed this year, Mr. Johnson will have to be prepared for a fight to the finish.

[From the New York Daily News, Jan. 20, 1964]

MEDICARE AGAIN, HO HUM

President Lyndon B. Johnson is trying to pump some new zip into medicare—the program for partial hospital care for some of the aged, which Congress consistently refused to give the late President John F. Kennedy.

It seems doubtful that L.B.J. will have much more luck that did J.F.K. in this matter. There never was a strong grassroots demand for medicare. Its cost, hitched to social security, would be enormous to begin with and grow bigger as time passed. It would cover millionaires as well as paupers—which is what the pro-medicare people refer to when they say proudly that this system would require no test of means.

JAVITS HAS SUBSTITUTE

The Kerr-Mills Act, under which States may qualify for Federal help in caring for their truly hard-up old people's hospital and medical needs, is far more soundly thought out than medicare, and is spreading among the States despite the efforts of the medicare fans to smear and belittle it.

If we must have some kind of medical care for the aged hooked in with social security, Congress should give attention to a compromise bill introduced last week by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, and five other Senators.

This plan would use social security, but it would also set up a nonprofit association of private insurance companies which would market a standard medical-surgical policy for persons over 65 at about a $2-a-week premium.

If private enterprise can be induced to enter this field, by all means let's bring it in, let Socialists scream though they will.

Hon. Howard H. Baker

SPEECH

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I share with other Members of the House a great sense of loss we all feel over the death of our colleague, HOWARD H. BAKER. He was a dedicated legislator and a valued friend.

Without question, HOWARD BAKER was an outstanding Representative of Tennessee's Second District, as the great margins of his six reelections to the House of Representatives bore witness. Both the country and the Congress are richer because of his 14 years as a lawmaker.

HOWARD BAKER's work on the Ways and Means Committee commanded the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle. As an expert in the fields of taxation and social security, he helped shape sound sensible laws, a legislative legacy that will benefit all the American people. He was coauthor of the Baker-Herlong bill to reduce income tax rates. Many of his suggestions are incorporated in the tax bill now before the Congress.

We will miss HOWARD BAKER's wise counsel and able service. I extend my sympathy to his family and my condolences to his many friends who mourn his passing.

Condemnation Provisions of Oregon Dunes Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor by Mr. Hugh Peyton, of McMinnville, Oreg., supporting the opposition I have taken with respect to the condemnation provisions of the Oregon Dunes bill pending on the calendar.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TICKET TO SERFDOM

To the EDITOR:

In a recent editorial (Journal, Dec. 7) you indicate that in the minds of the dunes supporters that he is making a mountain out of a molehill. It is just possible that Senator MORSE has taken time to read the bill and is aware of just what it portends.

In view of the fact that your publication appears to be in complete accord with this dunes project, it would seem to be only fair and proper that you publish House bill 5186 which seems to be favored version.

Your editorial states that the condemnation provisions have been watered down to a point where owners are granted occupancy rights through their lifetime plus continuing rights for their heirs. It might be well for you to inform your readers just how magnanimous these concessions are. All of section 4 and section 5 of this act spells out these exquisite and delightful freedoms that the unfortunate landowner will have under the provisions of this watered-down concession. Lord have mercy on us if the unwatered version should prevail. There are enough provisions in these two sections alone to wrap him in redtape until if he can breathe he will be lucky.

You are right, the landowner can live there. He can still pay taxes to Oregon. He can imagine that he is a citizen of Oregon, but he will get no help from that State. Oregon is selling him down the dunes. Of course he can always sell to some other person as provided, but just who wishes to buy into a place where he will be watched, harassed and eventually phased out by attrition? It is ridiculous to state that this so-called watered-down condemnation proviso is anything but a bureaucratic ticket to serfdom. The ghosts of Hitler and Stalin must chortle in ghoulish ecstacy as they gaze upon this minority group that is getting the business by this unholy legislation.

Senator MORSE is to be commended for throwing a lifeline to this unfortunate minority caught in the flood of this putrescent land grab.

* * * * *

HUGH PEYTON.

The United States Should Stand Firm in the Panama Canal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include my newsletter, "Capital Comments," of January 20, relating to the Panama Canal crisis, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD STAND FIRM IN THE PANAMA CANAL CRISIS

The Panama crisis which erupted last week, as a result of a flag-flying incident by high school students, continues to be of great concern and interest in Washington as in the rest of the Nation, with no quick or easy solution evident.

The U.S. Government has a strong and clearly stated right to control and operate the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, and we must not surrender nor bargain away this control. President Johnson has indicated that his administration will stand firm in order to maintain our national rights to the canal which were provided under the 1903 treaty between the United States and Panama.

"The United States tries to live by the policy of the good neighbor and expects others to do the same," President Johnson stated. He has further said: "The United States cannot allow the security of the Panama Canal to be imperiled. We have a recognized obligation to operate the canal efficiently and securely, and we intend to honor that obligation in the interest of all who depend on it."

The administration's stand in this international dispute has drawn general approval and support in Congress. Newspaper editorials and other expressions of public opinion indicate that the Nation as a whole approves of a firm stand on this issue.

During hearings last May, before the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON and members of the committee, including your Representative, questioned Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Governor of the Canal Zone and President of the Panama Canal Company, regarding U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone, and warned General Fleming that the United States must be firm and strong in its relations with the Panamanian Government.

Chairman CANNON stated at that time that we should have never yielded to Panamanian demands that their flag be flown coequally

with ours in the first instance, and the committee record shows that I stated my agreement with Chairman CANNON, as American sovereignty was being challenged.

General Fleming said that the grant of the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone strip, is a grant in perpetuity—thus giving the United States full rights and control over the area. The Governor further pointed out in response to my question that President Eisenhower made the first decision to fly the Panamanian flag at one place in the Canal Zone, equal with the United States, and that later President Kennedy instructed a commission of citizens from both countries to work out an agreement permitting the Panamanian flag to be flown at 14 additional locations—at city hall and public schools—in the Canal Zone.

These steps have no doubt in the long run encouraged Panamanian officials to make additional demands upon this country.

Members of our subcommittee pointed out to General Fleming that the United States built the canal, paid for it, operates the canal and that we must resist any attempt by the Panamanian Government to assert control or authority over the operation of this important seaway.

It should be remembered that Panama is now in the early stages of a presidential campaign and that some Government officials may be forced to make unreasonable demands in an effort to gain attention from the Panamanian people; but while realizing this possibility, we must also remain firm in our position of protecting and defending American possessions.

Forty-sixth Anniversary of Proclamation of Independence of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, next Wednesday, January 22, will be the 46th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine. This anniversary is being marked by many outstanding residents of Ukrainian descent in my State of North Dakota. Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., in a recent letter and news release, announced that they will hold special commemorative meetings and will present special radio broadcasts this week to focus local attention on this important day. I believe Dr. Zukowsky has very effectively expressed the feelings of these people about this anniversary.

We, as Americans, cannot forget these people living behind the Iron Curtain, for their desire to obtain freedom remains alive today in our difficult world situation. We must continue to support these people living in the Ukraine and in other Communist-controled countries and help them in any possible way to obtain their independence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Zukowsky's letter and the attached news release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 8, 1964.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: On January 22, 1964, Americans of Ukrainian descent will observe the 46th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine, which occurred on January 22, 1918, in Kiew, the capital of Ukraine and the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of the act of union on January 22, 1919, whereby Western Ukraine (Galicia, Bukovina, and Karpatho-Urkaine) united with the Ukrainian National Republic into one, sovereign and independent republic of the Ukrainian people. This day was a culmination of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation, which after two and a half centuries of foreign oppression, regained its freedom and national independence. It should be recalled that the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine were recognized by a number of states, including Soviet Russia. But, the latter, attacked Ukraine both by direct military aggression and by subversion and infiltration from within. After almost 3½ years of bloody and heroic struggle, Ukraine, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic assistance by the Western world, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia.

For the past 4½ decades Ukraine has remained under the Communist yoke of Moscow but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full freedom and national independence. During the period of enslavement the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their love of freedom and independence by a series of uprisings and large-scale resistance movements such as the underground warfare of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in World War II and after it. The Ukrainians paid a high price in this struggle for freedom, as they were decimiated by a manmade famine, ruthless deportations and executions. Khrushchev himself confessed at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in February 1956, that Stalin planned the total annihalation of the Ukrainian people for their resistance to Russian communism.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolutions which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and national independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to observe this memorable event—the 46th anniversary of Ukraine's independence—with appropriate ceremonies. Our national organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which has a State branch in our State, is now in the process of building a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., in honor of the 150th anniversary of his birthday. Taras Shevchenko was an outstanding Ukrainian poet and a freedom fighter and an ardent advocate of such a political system for Ukraine as the one established in the United States by George Washington.

Therefore, the 46th anniversary of the proclamation of Independence of Ukraine and and the 45th anniversary of the Act of Union of all Ukrainian lands into one sovereign and independent state of Ukrainian people, provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

We especially request that the U.S. Government issue a Schevchenko "Champion of Liberty" stamp in honor of this outstanding freedom fighter, as the first sign of support to the Ukrainian people, and to remove any and all obstacles in the way of erecting the statue of Taras Schevchenko in Washington, D.C., in accordance with Public Law 86–749.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President.

JANUARY 22 IS UKRAINIAN DAY

For many years now the 22d of January has been proclaimed and celebrated in our American cities and States from coast to coast as Ukrainian Day.

It is the day when all Americans join their fellow citizens of Ukrainian descent in marking the anniversary of the renewal of the independence of Ukraine which was solemnly proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament on January 22, 1918, in the capital of the Ukaine, Kiev.

Moreover, the 22d of January, 1964, is a double anniversary for Ukraine, and the rest of the world which the fate of Ukraine is today more than ever of crucial importance.

For on January 22, 1964, 45 years will have elapsed since that day in 1914 when the unification of all Ukrainian territories in one independent Ukrainian state was solemnly proclaimed by another act of the Ukrainian Parliament in the capital city of Kiev.

January 22, 1964, will, therefore, be Ukrainian Independence Day.

It should be recalled that the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine were recognized by a number of states, including Soviet Russia. But the latter attack Ukraine both by direct military aggression and by subversion and infiltration from within. After almost 3½ years of bloody and heroic struggle, Ukraine, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic assistance by the Western World, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia.

For the past 4½ decades Ukraine has remained under the Communist yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full national independence.

During the period of enslavement the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their love of freedom and independence by a series of uprisings and large-scale resistance movements such as the underground warfare of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in World War II and after it.

The Ukrainians paid a high price in this struggle for freedom, and Moscow has tried every way to destroy the spirit of the Ukrainian people, by persecuting the Ukrainian churches, arresting Ukrainian leaders and clergy, by forced collectivisation, mass deportations, executions, inhuman and crude genocide and many other inhuman methods. Khrushchev, himself, confessed at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party that Stalin planned the total annihilation of the Ukrainian people for the resistance to Russian communism.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and national independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to observe this memorable event with appropriate ceremonies. Our national organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which has State branch and local branches in our State, is now in the process

of building a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., in honor of the 150 anniversary of his birthday. Taras Shevchenko was an outstanding Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter and an ardent advocate of such political systems for Ukraine as the one established in the United States by George Washington.

The closeness of the Communist threat now in Cuba makes us realize much better the events of four decades in Ukraine and all the events since. It also makes us appreciate much more the unbroken spirit of freedom and the everlasting faith of the Ukrainian people.

And it is in the common spirit of liberty, faith, and justice that the American people join the Ukrainians all over the world in celebrating the anniversary of independence and reunification of Ukraine.

Special church services will be held in Belfield and Wilton, rallies and radio programs will be held on Sunday, January 26.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA.

SAC's Kissing Cousins, the RAF, and Missile Capabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening article on the future of our own Strategic Air Command's "kissing cousins," the Royal Air Force, is discussed by Richard Clayton Peet in an article published in the Air Force magazine of January 1964.

The role of the manned deterrent force and unmanned missiles is discussed in depth based upon information made available to Mr. Peet on a visit to Great Britain expressly for the purpose of gathering material for this article.

I include the article in the RECORD because I think it throws a lot of light on the unmanned versus manned capabilities of defense, particularly important at this time when the question of the degree of reliability of unmanned missiles has been raised. Of particular significance in this context is a quote from Patrick Gordon Walker, the Labor Party's "shadow foreign secretary," in discussing the Polaris, described it as "a small, second-strike weapon," and "it is relatively inadequate," he claims, and "wholly inadequate as the backbone of Britain's deterrent force."

I commend the article to my colleagues:

SAC'S KISSING COUSINS
(By Richard Clayton Peet)

The officer commanding, seated in the war room of his operational control center, reached for the red phone and spoke an order into it which energized his widely dispersed command. The order was a single word—"Scramble".

A small but superbly trained band of men sprang into action. With machine precision, they raced through prescribed checkout procedures, preparing their planes for flight. Jet engines began their roar. Seconds later, hundreds of aircraft were on the roll. In less than 2 minutes, a giant nuclear retaliatory armada was airborne.

Most Americans would immediately conclude that the situation described was taking place in our own Strategic Air Command. We have become accustomed to thinking in terms of SAC alone in the retaliatory role. We overlook the fact that, in the event of actual nuclear hostilities, the first manned strike on Soviet defenses will likely be spearheaded by someone else. Preceding SAC and its B–52's, and perhaps even blasting a path for it, will be the V-bomber force of the RAF—SAC's kissing cousin—Bomber Command.

Kissing cousin is an apt term for the relationship between these two elite organizations. There is a common, almost religious, bond between them. They train together, compete together, target together, and, if need be, are prepared to die together in the performance of their joint mission. Both firmly believe, however, that so long as a credible deterrent and the will to utilize it in defense of freedom are maintained by the West, the danger of nuclear conflagration is remote. In this sense, peace is truly their shared profession.

Bomber Command was assigned its deterrent role in 1957. A Defense white paper issued that year announced, "Britain must possess an appreciable element of nuclear deterrent power of her own."

Up until then she had none. Though her scientists had made significant early contributions to atomic theory (it was an Englishman who first split the atom) and had cooperated closely with scientists of this country in the development of the original atomic bomb, Britain did not embark on her own nuclear-weapons program until 1949. Progress thereafter was swift, however. On October 3, 1952, the British conducted their first atomic tests in the Monte Bello Islands, off Australia, and on October 11, 1956, the RAF air-dropped Britain's first operational atomic bomb over Maralinga, Southern Australia. And, a few months later, on May 15, 1957, Britain successfully tested her first H-bomb over Christmas Island in the Pacific.

But bombs alone do not make a deterrent. Effective delivery systems are also required. Knowing this, the British Government embarked upon a concurrent program to develop its own strategic medium bombers. The result was the V-bomber force of Valiants, Victors, and Vulcans which became operational in the mid-1950's.

First of the series was the Vickers Valiant. Entering squadron service in 1955, it was a Valiant that carried Britain's first air-dropped A- and H-bombs. Because of its lower performance it was phased out of the strike role some time ago, although it continues to render yeoman service as an aerial tanker and also serves as a tactical bomber for NATO.

Next came the Vulcan, the world's first large bomber of delta-wing configuration. Manufactured by Avro, the Vulcan B–1 entered squadron service in 1957 with the B–2 following along in 1960.

Third of the V-bombers was the Handley Page Victor. It became operational in 1959 with its B–2 model entering service in 1962. It was the biggest and heaviest, as well as the last, of the series. Victor features a readily identifiable crescent or cusp-shaped wing.

The average radius of action of the V-bombers is beyond 1,500 nautical-miles without in-flight refueling. This brings them within range of 70 percent of the important targets in the U.S.S.R. including most cities with more than 100,000 population.

Currently, the Mark I series of Victors and Vulcans is being replaced by more advanced models. New from the ground up and equipped with more powerful engines, the Mark 2 versions boost overall performance significantly. They are more maneuverable and can fly higher (as high as a U–2) and faster than our own B–52's.

Originally designed to carry free-falling bombs, the V-force is in the process of transition to the Blue Steel standoff air-to-surface missile. With a nuclear warhead in the megaton range, Blue Steel enables launching aircraft to attack targets without having to penetrate the close defenses surrounding them. Inertially guided, Blue Steel's liquid-fueled rocket engine propels it at more than twice the speed of sound. Range has not been released but is said to be in the neighborhood of 150 miles.

Is today's Bomber Command a viable force in the 1960's?

"Decidedly," asserts its new boss, Air Officer Commanding in Chief, Air Marshall Sir John Grandy. The air marshal's confidence appears to be solidly based. Through technical innovation and advance and a tremendously high state of crew proficiency, both ground and air, Bomber Command has kept its V-force of 180 of the world's most modern aircraft at least one step ahead of its competition. That is all it needs to be to perform its mission.

From its inception, Bomber Command built with viability in mind. "If the deterrent influence of the bomber force is to be effective," declared the Defense white paper of 1958, "it must not be thought capable of being knocked out on the ground." Acutely aware of its vulnerability, British planners concentrated on the problem of keeping the V-force alive in the event of hostilities.

Their thinking proceeded on certain assumptions. The chief of these was that, in the event of nuclear attack, the United Kingdom would not be the only target. The United States would also be assaulted. Interdependence in this sense was taken for granted.

Accordingly, joint procedures have been worked out to ensure that the retaliatory forces of both nations survive even a surprise nuclear assault. Although it is deemed highly unlikely that one could be launched without prior warning from political or intelligence sources, such a possibility has been taken into account. An elaborate electronic warning network has been constructed around the periphery of the U.S.S.R. BMEWS, the DEW line, and other early-warning devices assure both nations tactical warning of atomic attack. A minimum of 4 to 8 minutes notice, perhaps as much as 15, will be provided Britain by the system. For Bomber Command, that will be enough.

As with SAC, a portion of the V-force is always on quick reaction alert. It can be scrambled in a matter of minutes. Additionally, the flexibility of the readiness plan enables the AO CinC to quickly bring his whole command, or any part of it, to full alert condition. An immediate-link system enables him to communicate directly with crews on the ground or in the air. In times of rising international tension, the entire V-force can be scattered to bases throughout the United Kingdom. More than 50 of these bases are in a state of operational readiness. Such dispersal would pose severe targeting problems for a nuclear aggressor.

No more than four bombers would be assigned to any one base. The sites themselves are designed with survivability in mind. Aircraft are stationed on operational readiness platforms directly adjacent to runways which eliminates taxiing delays. Aircrews are housed in caravans (trailers) nearby. In times of crisis, crews are stationed at cockpit readiness. All four jet engines on V-bombers can be started simultaneously. Ground-servicing equipment automatically falls away as aircraft begin to roll. These features, plus tremendous aircrew proficiency, enable Bomber Command to react with remarkable agility. Its average four-element scramble time in 1963 was 1 minute, 30 seconds.

The V-bomber retaliatory force, which incidentally can deliver conventional as well as nuclear weapons, was assigned to SACEUR (Supreme Allied Commander, Europe) in May 1963. Although national control in peacetime is still maintained by Britain, the V-force in the event of war will follow SACEUR's nuclear, strike plan. After seeing his new command on exercise in Britain not long ago, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer called his visit "a very impressive experience."

Bomber Command's ability to reach the targets assigned it is equally impressive. To get there, it has a number of extremely difficult penetration problems to surmount—an elaborate early-warning net, an abundance of day fighters and all-weather interceptors armed with air-to-air missiles, ground-to-air antiaircraft missiles in profusion, plus the system of tactical controls which coordinates the lot. In typical fashion, it has set about finding counters for each. It has come up with a mixed bag of electronic countermeasures (ECM) calculated to confuse, upset, jam, or neutralize the defensive forces unleashed against it. Every V-bomber is equipped with ECM devices. So powerful is some of the equipment that the RAF has never been permitted to turn them all on at one time in any exercise over England for fear of causing a total communications blackout.

Other devices relied upon to assist target penetration include evasive routing of strike aircraft, the Blue Steel standoff weapon, the disruptive effect of that would be wrought on Russian defenses by U.S. ICBM's, and, last but certainly not least, retaliation from the deck up.

Both SAC and Bomber Command have turned to the multilevel pattern as Russian defenses against the high-level attack have improved. By coming in with a portion of their force at extremely low altitudes they hope to underfly Soviet early-warning radar. But hot-rodding Vulcans, Victors, and B-52's—which were designed to fly at 50,000 feet and higher—at 500 feet and lower is not without its problems. Fatigue increases markedly. Extensive structural beefing-up of all three aircraft has been required.

Air Marshal Grandy says, "Penetration by aircraft of Bomber Command of areas covered by the most modern and sophisticated air-defense systems could not be successfully prevented."

But how long will this ability last?

The immediate outlook is good. A new, longer-range, low-level version of Blue Steel is in the works. It should push viability beyond the mid-1960's. And that was the time the Skybolt was due to take its place in the lineup.

Slated to be carried by the Vulcan (one slung under each wing), Skybolt would have constituted a major addition to the British deterrent. Its 1,000-mile range from a highly mobile, nearly undetectable launching platform made it a near perfect weapon for the RAF. It could even be launched from points over Britain itself. There was a possibility that Skybolt would be wedded to a military version of the VC-10 long-range jet transport. Six missiles were to be carried by each aircraft. A fleet of 30 VC-10's were to be procured. The plan was for one-third of them to be airborne at all times. This would have brought Bomber Command close to its ideal of an invulnerable deterrent.

For these reasons, the RAF could not have been keener on Skybolt. Its cancellation was a severe blow.

Skybolt was only one of a series of disappointing decisions in recent years which tend to cloud the future of the British deterrent. The Statement of Defense in 1957 was the kickoff. It dashed RAF hopes to develop a supersonic bomber by substituting in its stead the Blue Streak missile. In 1960, Blue Streak, too, was canceled (partly, it is speculated, because of the Skybolt deal, executed that year, with the United States). The final blow in the series occurred at Nassau.

But Britain is not out of the deterrent business—not by a long shot. Scheduled to roll out early this year is a new aircraft, the TSR-2.

Designed to penetrate at ground level so as to skim under enemy radar, the TSR-2 is powered by two Bristol Siddeley Olympus Turbojets with each developing 33,000 pounds of thrust. These are the same engines that will be used in the Anglo-French Concorde SST. Possessing a short-field capability, TSR-2 will be able to fly at more than twice the speed of sound at altitude (60,000 feet) and at close to mach 1 on the deck. A sophisticated electronics system will enable it to hug the ground at high speeds in total darkness. Armament will consist of a short-range nuclear guided missile carried internally.

Announced ferry range is several thousand miles without in-flight refueling. Range at low level has not been released. It is a safe bet, however, that despite the fact that fuel consumption is reputed to be less than in comparable engines, the range penalty for low-level operations will be severe. The radius of operations on such missions is not expected to exceed 1,000 nautical miles.

The TSR-2 gives promise of being a highly versatile weapon system. While its initials indicate its mission is tactical strike reconnaissance, it is capable of another role. This was described by the Secretary of State for Air, Sir Hugh Fraser, in a recent speech:

"With its long range it can be employed, if need be, to attack strategic targets. Thus, the TSR-2 will not only help to close the so-called gap before the arrival in service of Polaris submarines, but, when the submarines are on station, it will be a most useful supplement for them in the deterrent role."

Current plans call for the procurement of a minimum of 50 aircraft.

The emergence of the TSR-2 as a strategic-delivery system has been followed with great interest in NATO circles. A "growing belief" is reported to exist that TSR-2's could form the nucleus of a far better MLF than the vaunted but vulnerable Polaris surface fleet.

Beyond TSR-2, prospects for Bomber Command look grim. At present, no successor aircraft are planned. British thinking on manned systems in recent years has closely paralleled our own. A fascination with missiles as an end-all in weaponry has prevailed. But just as over here, this outlook is slowly changing. There is a growing awareness that we may have jumped the gun in eliminating man from the strategic-weapons picture. Increasingly, the view expressed by Air Marshal Grandy that "there will always be a future for manned aircraft" is gaining acceptance. His reasoning that only manned systems provide the "degree of flexibility, discretion, choice of target and accuracy" needed in today's strategic arsenal has begun to make sense to even the most enamored of missile men.

And so, after a hiatus of several years, new manned systems are being seriously discussed again on both sides of the Atlantic. Pervading these conversations in Britain, however, is the realization that unless something radical occurs, Bomber Command's deterrent days are numbered. While its viability is vouchsafed through the 1960's, thereafter the major deterrent role shifts to the Royal Navy. Needless to say, the Admiralty looks forward to its impending prominence with pleasure. It has never liked being out of the deterrent picture. Deprived of its senior strategic status a decade ago by Bomber Command, it was delighted with the Nassau agreement which put it back in the picture again. When Polaris becomes operational, the Royal Navy will be top dog once more.

The RAF's attitude toward playing a backseat role is exemplary. One high-ranking officer summed it up in this way: "No one minds such a change, so long as there are sound military reasons for it."

But outside Whitehall, not everyone is happy with the Polaris decision. Some analysts feel that the submarine-delivery system, even with the advanced Polaris A-3, is overrated—not for today, but for the 1970's when the first of the British fleet is scheduled to enter service. One critic summed up his reservations thus:

"Polaris became operational in 1960. It will be extraordinary if, in this age of rapid fire technology, it is able to survive a decade without an effective counter.

"All through history, for each new weapons development, a successful counter has been found. I cannot bring myself to believe that the development of Polaris signaled the end of history."

Some Polaris detractors even question its viability today. Patrick Gordon Walker, the Labor Party's shadow Foreign Secretary, has described it as "a small second-strike weapon." It is relatively inaccurate, he claims, and "wholly inadequate" as the backbone of Britain's deterrent force.

Other critics point out that, since the seas are free and open to everyone, nothing could stop an aggressor from dispatching a fleet of killer subs to lie in wait at harbor entrances where Polaris submarines are serviced. When they put to sea, they could be followed. While nuclear subs would be required for the job, the awkward Polaris subs' shape assures that killers would have little trouble keeping up with them.

Even in peacetime, one or two vessels could be disposed of in this fashion. Who could question their disappearance? Who knows how the *Thresher* was lost? And you can't start a nuclear war on suspicion alone. Yet the loss of just two submarines in this way, they point out, would constitute the loss of half the British deterrent.

These arguments and others like them have opened up Pandora's box. Opponents have seized upon them to call into question the whole future of British deterrence. Some urge that the nuclear arsenal be scrapped immediately. Others, while more reasonable in their criticism, profess to see no future at all for the United Kingdom in the deterrent game.

Unfortunately, the controversy has been injected into politics. A Parliamentary election must be held sometime this year. As the campaign warms up, it appears that one of the most important issues, perhaps the major issue, will be the future of the deterrent. Championing the antiposition is the opposition Labor Party. It has always had a vocal minority which favored unilateral disarmament and banning the bomb. But responsible elements in the party take a more cautious view. They hold that an independent deterrent, while desirable, has become too expensive for a country of the United Kingdom's limited resources. They point out that, at present, 7 percent of the gross national product is allocated for defense purposes. Of this amount, roughly 10 percent is spent on the V-force. But the exploding cost of technology will require larger and larger outlays in the future, if credibility is to be maintained. In Labor's view, the United Kingdom simply cannot afford it. And so the party looks forward to easing Britain out of the deterrent business.

The Conservatives generally favor the retention of a deterrent capability. Despite the high esteem and genuine affection felt for the United States, they shudder at the idea of entrusting their destiny totally to us. They are convinced that if Britain is to continue to play a major role in world affairs, strategic nuclear forces must be maintained. They see them as the ticket to the conference table. Perhaps the most eloquent defense of the party's position was made by the aging but ageless Winston Churchill:

"Sometimes in the past we have committed the folly of throwing away our arms. Under

the mercy of providence and at great cost and sacrifice we have been able to recreate them when the need arose. But if we abandon our nuclear deterrent there will be no such second chance. To abandon it now would be to abandon it forever."

One of the most appealing arguments of the antis is that unilateral disarmament by Britain will tend to inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons. Proponents scoff at such claims. One prominent pro voiced his reservations in this way: "The fact that we pull our nuclear teeth will not make a whit of difference to France, India, Red China, Israel, or any other nation seeking to grow its own. Nuclear nationalism," he asserted, "is a virus that cannot be stopped by example alone. Furthermore," he added, "think of how humiliating it would be if, after our grandiose gesture, we ended up a simple pawn in a three-way nuclear chess game between the United States, Russia, and France."

As the British election draws nearer, the debate grows more heated. But heat does not necessarily generate light. Oftentimes, the proliferation of comment serves more to confuse and confound than it does to explain. Yet the controversy has brought out several points of great interest over here. They relate to aspects of the problem not generally appreciated or taken into account by us. They should be studied.

The first concerns the size of the British deterrent as suggested by Air Marshal Sir Dermot Boyle in a lecture last March:

"The size of a deterrent force must be related to the value to an enemy of the prize being protected. For example, suppose, I repeat, suppose Russian leaders were prepared to sacrifice half their country in exchange for the removal of the United States of America from the competitive scene. Then, for the American deterrent to be viable, it would have to be demonstrably capable of destroying far more than half Russia in retaliation. But Russia would not be prepared to accept anything like the same damage in exchange for the removal of the United Kingdom. Therefore, a much smaller retaliatory force can give us as much or greater security than the United States of America achieve with their vast nuclear capability."

Another factor worth heeding over here is the growing mistrust of the United States which is being manifested by both major parties. With Labor, this takes the form of a reluctance to rely on us as a supplier of weapons. Skybolt is cited to show that the only deterrent worth having is one that is of the homegrown variety.

A simmering mistrust of American intentions also permeates Conservative thinking. It furnishes the theme for a quite different hypothesis, however. It was summarized by the defense correspondent of the London Times recently:

"The official view, which bears a remarkable similarity in essence to that of General de Gaulle, is that the American guarantee of European security may possible lose, at least in Russian eyes, its force and effectiveness at some time in the future. Until effective political union can be achieved either in European or Atlantic terms—and British defense planners believe the latter, at least, to be some way off, national nuclear capabilities are regarded as valuable."

One final point. Underlying the mistrust of America's intentions is the belief, widely shared, that the United States wants Britain out of the nuclear business altogether. This has led to a suspicion in some quarters that we deliberately set about creating the current deterrent crisis. Rightly or wrongly, we are blamed for furnishing the antis with the only "intellectual" support they have. It is thought that not until Secretary McNamara's Ann Arbor speech formally adopting the doctrine of counterforce did they have a strategic leg to stand on. The counterforce doctrine gave them one. Although it may not be appreciated in this country, Britain is one big city as the H-bomb flies. Accordingly, counterforce has little application or appeal. Air Marshal Sir John Slessor's caustic comment perhaps best sums up British reaction to it. "Thermonuclear incineration," he wrote, "is a rose that smells no more sweet under the other name of counterforce retaliation."

The Ann Arbor speech tended to undermine British faith in the whole concept of deterrence. The shock of Skybolt's cancellation did not improve matters. Nor did our espousal of MLF. It is believed that from these acorns, the deterrent issue grew.

Advocates of an independent deterrent ask whether any nation, committed as we are to nuclear weapons, can legitimately aspire to inhibit the United Kingdom from possessing or maintaining them in its own national interest? Besides resentment, there is a strong feeling that such policies are dangerously shortsighted. A British deterrent compounds the problems of both offense and defense for the Soviet Union. In addition, it relieves this country of the sole moral responsibility for the possible use of nuclear weapons.

The trouble with any debate on deterrence is that it inevitably leads to an Alice in Wonderland of suppositions and hypotheses. One can never see with total clarity; nor does one ever emerge into a state of absolute certainty.

Yet, the quest for credibility must continue. It is a never-ending pursuit.

Whether or to what extent Britain will remain in the deterrent game is not yet clear. But what is certain is that the game will go on—with or without her.

Morse Has Backers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Reporter entitled "MORSE Has Backers," supporting the position I have taken in opposition to the unfortunate foreign aid bill that was passed in the last session of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE HAS BACKERS

Senator WAYNE MORSE is not alone in objecting to where U.S. foreign aid goes by the billions of dollars these days and in demanding that there should be a strict bookkeeper put in charge with instructions against extending credit to deadbeats.

The public has become acquainted with his criticism that military aid to Formosa, South Korea, and other countries is being wasted since, as he argues, their military forces "could be licked with 10 Boy Scout troops." He contends that the United States must backstop with its military forces and do the fighting against Communists despite the fact that it is putting out billions of dollars to foreign enemies of communism.

MORSE is saying in effect that the American taxpayer might as well keep foreign military aid in his own pocket, since he has to fight off the Communists anyway.

MORSE is also critical of foreign aid going to governments which have recovered economically and should be weaned. And MORSE is critical of the manner in which foreign aid is distributed to countries whose people get little or no benefit from American millions. It should be emphasized—this is forgotten in criticism of Senator MORSE by those who object to trimming military aid—that he is not opposed in the least, but on the contrary, supports foreign aid when it goes to building up democracy in underprivileged countries by improving the economy of all the people.

In demanding that American foreign aid reach the people, Senator MORSE has support on the receiving end of such benefits. What is surprising is that there are Americans on the receiving end in foreign countries who preach the same sermon, that American aid should go where it will do most good for democracy and against communism.

These Americans at the receiving end who want American dollars to bring the biggest dividends in democracy include the Maryknoll Fathers of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, the largest missionary body serving in South America at the present time. In an editorial in the September 1963 issue of its monthly publication Maryknoll, the Catholic society declares:

"* * * Many of our missionaries feel that one of the main reasons why so much of our aid has been ineffective is that it has been on a government to government level. Governments come and go. It is only the people who remain. If we do not have the people on our side, they will eventually topple any government that is on our side, and vice versa.

"Ultimately, it is the people—the small people—who develop a country. Development does not come from the top. The top can encourage but the people settle and develop * * * It is for this reason that our aid is urgently needed at the people's level * * *."

Those words from missionaries deep in South American poverty sound as if they came from the American Senator deep in foreign aid battling.

SBA Administrator Foley Paints Bright Picture for Small Business in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in a press release under date of January 8, 1964, Administrator Eugene P. Foley, of the SBA, points to encouraging signs that small business will have a good year in 1964.

In discussing the current economic expansion he mentions the need for passage of the proposed tax reduction and reform program and its effects on small business. He points out that the rate reduction for small firms would be greater and more immediate than for large corporations.

In this press release Mr. Foley also discusses the accomplishments of the Small Business Administration during the past year and advises small firms that they can look to SBA for increased assistance in the coming year.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I was especially interested in this release and desire to bring

it to the attention of my colleagues and others and under unanimous consent I insert this press release of January 8, 1964, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The release follows:

Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley said today that a continuing high level of economic activity in 1964 will help small businesses match or exceed the good year they enjoyed in 1963.

He said that prospects are good that the Nation's economy will continue to gain momentum in the months ahead, particularly if the proposed tax cut is speedily enacted.

Noting that we are starting the 35th month of continuing economic expansion, he cited these other encouraging signs for small firms: 1963 new business incorporations exceeded 1962 levels; there were fewer business failures in 1963 than in 1962; small businesses comprised most of the net gain of about 50,000 business firms in 1963; recent surveys indicate a continuing increase in personal consumption expenditures and business investment in plant and equipment; along with a rise in corporate profits, income of small unincorporated business and professional enterprises during 1963 showed the best year-to-year increase since 1956.

He cautioned, however, that unless the rate of economic expansion is stepped up, small firms' progress in the coming year could be somewhat slowed.

"We must continue to seek ways of accelerating our growth rate," Mr. Foley said. "One of the most immediate and effective ways of doing this is through the proposed $11 billion tax rate reduction and reform program now before the Congress."

Mr. Foley said that while the tax proposal would benefit both big and small businesses, the rate reduction for small firms would be greater and more immediate than that for large corporations. The proposal provides that the tax rates on the first $25,000 of corporate income be reduced about 27 percent for small firms compared with about 8 percent for large corporations. The reduction for small firms would be effective immediately while the reduction for large corporations would be phased out over a 2-year period.

"Perhaps the most significant aspect of the tax proposal on small firms would be increased income, profits and the other benefits they would derive from operating in a revitalized economy," Mr. Foley said.

He also pointed out that individual tax reductions and other provisions would greatly benefit the many unincorporated small businesses and partnerships, particularly in helping to meet their need for adequate capital to finance expansion.

Mr. Foley also noted that small firms could look to SBA for increased assistance in the coming year. He said that several recent actions taken by him will reduce to a minimum the redtape normally encountered in dealing with a Government agency and will permit SBA to provide greater and more expeditious service to small concerns.

In reviewing SBA activity over the past year, Mr. Foley cited these accomplishments:

During 1963, SBA approved nearly 4,900 business loans totaling about $249 million; licensed 61 new small business investment companies with capitalization of over $40 million for investment in small firms; in conjunction with educational institutions and civic organizations, cosponsored 628 administrative management courses for about 20,000 owners and managers of small firms to help them improve their management ability; approved 115 local development company loans totaling $18.1 million which created about 6,200 new jobs; and during the year, SBA, in cooperation with Government purchasing agencies, earmarked $2.3 billion in proposed Government purchases for exclusive bidding by small businesses.

The Measure of Military Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Dale O. Smith is one of the most articulate members of our Military Establishment, and because I would like my colleagues in the Congress to share this ability to express himself, I ask unanimous consent that an article of his, "The High Are the Mighty," appearing in Ordnance January–February 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

To those of my colleagues who somehow believe it is possible for us to give up air and space superiority, I suggest a reading of this very sensible and easily understood paper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH ARE THE MIGHTY

(Maj. Gen. Dale O. Smith)

(The talented military leader is one who understands his environment and his mission and who perceives that he who controls the high ground in space as well as on earth has a tactical advantage.)

An armchair strategist usually can be identified by the way he analyzes military advantage. If he measures it almost exclusively in terms of manpower and megatons, one can guess with some confidence that he has never read a military history or heard a shot fired in anger.

If, on the other hand, he considers more subtle and elusive aspects such as hostile intentions, doctrine, training, and weapons capabilities; if he is concerned with intelligence of the enemy, international politics, weapons development, enemy deployments and maneuvers; if he attempts to envisage from all this and more the enemy's next moves and, having some confidence in his own judgment, proposes friendly moves to counter, defeat, and prevail over these predicted enemy moves—then one can pretty well surmise that such a man is no armchair strategist but a professional military analyst.

This is not to imply that manpower and firepower are of minor consideration in war. On the contrary, they are crucial. But because manpower and firepower are the most easily measured, the most clearly discerned and discussed aspects of war, they too often are believed to be the final criteria of success.

Such raw criteria of power can be understood by almost anyone, even children: Just as boys are much more concerned with the obvious physical aspects of power such as muscle, weight, and age than with skill, conditioning, and knowledge, so armchair strategists are more concerned with numbers and degrees of bang. Military power is regarded primarily in terms of pure muscle.

The stature of a businessman usually is measured by his business ability. He is judged by his skill in trade more than by his bank balance which may have been inherited or acquired by a lucky break. It is submitted that by the same token a country's military strength should be measured primarily in terms of its overall military skill and capabilities.

A good businessman can earn money, even if broke. A country with good military talent and policies usually can provide an adequate Military Establishment and be able to employ it, if need be, with military success.

For simplicity, let us sum up the more subtle aspects of military effectiveness with the term "military talent." The effective military force first of all is well led. Leadership describes how we know and handle our own people in such a way as to achieve an optimum return from them in a predictable manner. It includes an accurate assessment of their capabilities and limitations in the endless and complex tasks of war. Training, of course, describes the intensive and extensive effort in preparing those people for their complicated roles.

Military talent implies that the leaders and the led have a comprehensive understanding of various weapons systems, their purposes, and the underlying tactical, strategic, and philosophical considerations associated with their use. It also implies a broad understanding of similar matters on the enemy side of the fence.

Military talent appreciates the vastly complex logistical considerations associated with warfare, the communications requirements, the organizational influences, the command and control features, and the human and personal idiosyncracies or predisposition which may have more influence on the outcome than 100 megatons of explosive power.

In the final analysis, the talented military leader is he who best understands his environment, his mission, and the actions he must take to advance his mission. Like successful men in all areas of endeavor, he is the one who can best predict and control the future by his knowledge and judgment of the past and present. He is the one who sees furthest. A nation can be analyzed similarly.

The symbols of rank worn by military men attest to this far-seeing idea as a measure of militray talent. In some ancient analogy, the lieutenant's single bar represented the first rail on a fence. The young subaltern, standing on the first rail, could see farther than his troops. The captain standing on the second rail could see still farther, so his symbol of rank was two bars. A major with leaves on his shoulders was conceived to be observing from the branches of a tree. The colonel wore eagles. He was able to survey great sweeps of territory. The final rank, general was obviously identified with the stars.

Today there are debates about the military role in space, and the lack of specific military requirements has led to what some people consider to be rather limited space developments for defense. There is a genuine concern that weaponus of mass destruction might be boosted into orbit, and the knowledge that the Soviets either have or soon will have boosters which could place a 50- to 100-megaton bomb into space—a bomb which they have demonstrated—leaves the world with a hauting fear

Nevertheless, this has not happened, and until it does we can argue that there is no military requirement to develop a space interceptor to destroy such a hypothetical satellite weapon.

A case can be made, moreover, that the Soviets never will place a bomb in orbit. As Deputy Secretary of Defense Rosewell L. Gilpatric has said, it is simply not a "rational" strategy since ICBM's are cheaper, more controllable, less vulnerable, and more accurate. Why, then, should any country go to all the trouble and extra expense of placing a megaton bomb in orbit?

Some analysts have suggested, however, that the terror effect of an orbiting H-bomb would trigger violent public reaction. It is possible that the people in New York City, for example, could become more concerned about a sword of Damocles which crosses overhead ever so often at just a few hundred miles' altitude than over a missile sitting on a Russian pad thousands of miles away.

Not everyone could be made to understand that the distant ICBM would be far more deadly. Knowledge of orbital physics is not widespread, and most people believe that "what goes up must come down." So an orbital nuclear weapon, combined with a propaganda campaign, might just possibly appear to the Soviets as a useful strategy, even though it does seem unlikely just now.

What is more to be feared is that the Soviets may develop a space bomb which is a better weapon than their ICBM's. One cannot throw out the possibility of technical breakthroughs which might lead to a less vulnerable, more accurate and reliable space weapon than is now in the Soviet inventory.

But, again, this is simply a possibility, not a probability, and certainly provides no specific requirement toward which we can develop a defensive space interceptor. Consequently we have decided to pursue our peaceful exploration of space and accept whatever military "fallout" may accrue from this great effort.

It is the laudable hope of our Government that space can remain peaceful, and every effort is being bent in that direction. Yet the ICBM's which the U.S.S.R. now has aimed at us have trajectories which will carry them well above the earth's atmosphere and into space.

It is conceivable that we might sometime develop a legitimate requirement for destroying these weapons while they cruise in space on their ballistic curves. To do this it might be necessary for us to orbit defensive weapons in space.

How can we tend to our defensive fences in space and yet keep space peaceful? If megaton ICBM warheads already are posed to traverse space, is the peaceful option still open to us? These are questions which require much soul searching.

Since the United States has stated that it has no intention of carrying the arms race into space, and by giving the major responsibility of peaceful space exploration to NASA, a civilian agency, the military mission in space seems rather truncated today.

Recently, however, the Air Force was assigned management responsibility for the national space station program. This will involve placing a manned laboratory in earth orbit using a Titan III booster.

One cannot help but be suspicious of Soviet military interests in space and their possible military use of space, in view of their deception over placing missiles in Cuba. Following a successful cosmonaut flight, Russian Minister of Defense, Rodion Malinovsky said, "Let our foes know what technology and what militants are in possession of Soviet power."

And in 1961, when the Soviets were preparing to detonate a 60-megaton bomb over Novaya Zemlya, Chairman Khrushchev stated, "The exploration of space is inseparable from the use of intercontinental ballistic missiles."

It appears that if adequate arrangements cannot be agreed to that would insure that space is reserved to peaceful uses, the United States would have to look after its own security and that of its allies. Dr. Alton Frye, writing in Space Digest, proposed that we develop an effective space interceptor, enlist the support of as many members of the United Nations as possible, and notify the Soviet Union that unless she provides us with adequate assurance that her space vehicles are harmless, we will be compelled to destroy them.

Dr. Frye believes that such a policy would not provoke war any more than has Soviet destruction of our U-2 and RB-47 aircraft. He recognizes that the Soviets undoubtedly would counter with a similar declaration and suggests a space stalemate with neither side operating in space.

This seems highly unlikely from a military viewpoint, since each side will first have to possess effective space interceptors to pursue such a policy. Would not the natural first target then be the opposing space interceptors instead of the orbiting unidentified object? And would this not lead to a form of border warfare in space?

We must keep in mind what Senator John F. Kennedy said in 1960 when campaigning for President: "If the Soviets control space they can control earth. We cannot run second in this vital race."

But too many analysts look upon the military role in space simply in terms of placing effective weapons in orbit. This again is an extension of the armchair strategy which examines warfare quantitatively as a function of megatons. An effective interception system might be far more significant.

Even in space the defensive sequence must be to detect, identify, intercept, and destroy. All of this would further require considerable military talent. It seems highly unlikely that this talent could be acquired without participating directly in the development and operation of space vehicles.

The lessons of World War II and Korea taught us that military talent not only was our most precious commodity but required the longest leadtime to develop. We could turn out weapons, technicians, and skilled operators on production lines during the war, but the military talent necessary for the command and management of successful combat had to be acquired through years of effort long before the war started.

Had we waited for a clear military requirement before developing our military talent, we would have faced certain defeat.

Warfare is far more than the process of mass murder as the armchair strategist sees it. It is fundamentally a struggle of wills, both individual, and collective. The most successful war is that won without fighting, when the enemy is either so terrified, so disheartened, so confused, or so dominated that he gives up before firing a shot.

Preparing the way for this condition is the peacetime strategy pursued by the Soviets and unwittingly assisted by some of our own Cassandras. A country weakened by threat and bluster may fight briefly and succumb. The measure of resistance is correlated with confidence, and confidence is gained largely from a bona fide military talent and our belief in it.

It has long been considered axiomatic that the high ground provides a distinct military advantage. This was understandable before the days of gunpowder because of the added momentum available to troops charging from high ground, as at Cannae. It was easier, too, to repel attackers who were exhausted from climbing.

But the high ground doctrine was weakened with the advent of gunpowder, since guns could shoot almost as well uphill as down, and rapid advance required large armies to stick to the valleys and line of communication.

In Korea, however, the doctrine was reaffirmed. Why? Could it have been that troops occupying high ground could see farther and better? From the hills was it not easier to see the enemy and guess what he was up to? An attack from the high ground could be launched with the assistance of gravity, while an assault by the enemy up the hill had to overcome gravity and climb in ignorance of hidden strong points. Yes, the high ground was a distinct asset in Korea.

This principle was never doubted in air warfare. Bombers climbed as high as they could to escape detection and avoid flak and fighters. Climbing still higher, fighters pounced on the bigger birds. Climbing higher yet, offensive fighters dived on the defensive interceptors. Altitude provided many elements of military advantage—speed, intelligence, security, surprise.

It was not necessary to carry bombs to the top level to dominate the sky, because each level of aircraft dominated the level below it. A determined and talented force, as at the Marianas Turkey Shoot, could sweep the sky clean c everything below it, but such an opportunity rarely presented itself.

Air victory always has been the more likely to him who could climb the highest. The history of air warfare is of a scramble for altitude. There appears to be no reason for this doctrine to change as we extend past the level of the atmosphere and into orbit. The medium of air had nothing to do with this doctrine of altitude except as it provided an element of power in air-breathing engines. With rockets, air is no longer required for motive power.

Nor is there anything about orbital velocity or weightlessness which might affect the military doctrine of superior altitude. Gravity and initiative are still on the side of him who climbs higher; security, too, for the higher craft will be harder to detect. Instead of hiding in the sun, as of yore, he may hide behind the sun to avoid radar detection.

But man lives on the earth's surface, and fighting will no doubt erupt in this level, the first layer of the cake. As war expands, the surface conflict no doubt will be carried into the next level of concern, which is the 50 miles of atmosphere.

This second atmospheric layer of war will be dominated by the aerospace craft above it in the third layer while they in turn will be at the mercy of the far-out spacecraft. Thus we will see a "layer-cake strategy" develop. That side which climbs to the frosting will control all the layers beneath it.

The point to keep in mind is that an enemy need not take his megaton bomb to the high ground in order to control everything below him. Megatons and numbers may never be the controlling elements of space war. Numbers were against us in mig alley, yet we dominated the sky with a 14 to 1 kill ratio.

If an aerospace craft is capable of intercepting and destroying space warheads and if it is capable of outclimbing enemy space fighters, it will no doubt, if employed with military talent, be able to prevent any nation from dominating space.

Of course, altitude does not provide the answer to every question of aerospace war, but if not the sine qua non, it at least promises such an advantage that any country of military talent would never debate the necessity of reaching the frosting on the layer cake of aerospace strategy. An improved ICBM may well become a requirement of secondary priority to the need for reaching the high ground with fighters. This may be the only way left to us for keeping space peaceful.

Hon. Howard Baker

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, may I join thousands of others who regret deeply the untimely loss of HOWARD BAKER. He was an able and forthright American and a true and loyal friend. His contribution to the Nation through his services in Congress will long stand as a memorial which all will recognize. In particular I would like to acknowledge his close association and support of my father, Robert A. Taft, over a period of many years in the U.S. Senate. We will sorely miss him.

Death of William "Bill" Stern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on January 1 William Stern, one of North Dakota's most colorful and outstanding citizens, passed away.

Bill Stern was probably one of North Dakota's best known and widely respected native sons. He was one of the founders of the American Legion and active in this great organization in all the years since. He was just as active in politics, having served North Dakota for a long while as national committeeman.

Bill Stern always had great respect and admiration for the Congress of the United States. I think it would be accurate to say that he was a personal friend of perhaps two-thirds of the Members of the U.S. Senate.

Bill Stern's passing was a tremendous loss to North Dakota and the entire Nation and I lost a good and helpful friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a most appropriate press release prepared by the Washington office of the American Legion at the time of the funeral services on January 3.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS FROM THE AMERICAN LEGION

FARGO, N. DAK.—Private funeral services were conducted January 3, here for William (Bill) Stern, 77, "dean" of The American Legion's National Executive Committee, who died January 1 at Rochester, Minn. One of the great elder statesmen of the Legion, Mr. Stern enjoyed the widespread esteem and admiration of thousands of Legionnaires throughout the organization.

After serving one term as national vice commander (1924–25), Legionnaire Stern was elected in 1926 by the Department of North Dakota as its representative on the National Executive Committee, an office he held until his death. In terms of years of service, he was the oldest member of the National Executive Committee.

Shortly after his discharge as a second lieutenant during World War, Mr. Stern was a delegate from North Dakota to the Legion's St. Louis Caucus in May 1919. He was a regularly elected delegate to every American Legion National Convention from that first stateside meeting through the 45th convention last September at Miami Beach, Fla., However, illness prevented his presence at the last reunion.

Upon his return from the St. Louis Caucus in 1919, he immediately proceeded to organize the Department of North Dakota. The first post chartered was the Gilbert C. Grafton Post 2 here in Fargo. On the occasion of his 70th birthday, the Post gratefully presented him with a life membership.

He was associated with the Dakota National Bank, Northwest Airlines, and was quite active in politics. In addition to hundreds of Legion comrades, he had a broad interest in people from all walks of life * * * from the bellmen in a Washington, D.C., hotel, a carnival man in Minnesota, to the highest business and political officials of the Nation. Legionnaire Stern was lunching with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo the day the General received word that he had been relieved of his command there.

At the National American Legion level, Mr. Stern was an Advisory Committee member to the National Commander from 1946–52 and again from 1956–63; a member of the Convention Commission Liaison Committee (1958–63); and a member of the Group Insurance Committee from 1958 until the present time.

Trifles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

TRIFLES

A grievous toll in the past weeks testifies to the importance of trifles. The theft of a religious relic, the failure to raise the proper flag, and an affront to ethnic sensibilities—these provocations have led to bloody riots in the subcontinent, Panama and Cyprus. But one must be careful in passing judgment, because an outsider can never fully gage the depth of feeling over what appear to be small symbolic acts. Today as yesterday, one man's trifle can be another's casus belli.

If Homer can be trusted, the Trojan war was prompted by the seduction of a woman. The War of the Roses was in the ultimate sense a quarrel over genealogy. During the Reformation, Europe was stained by blood in endless wars over the proper way to worship a Saviour who exhorted all men to love their enemies. In the 18th century, there was a war over Jenkin's Ear—small wonder that Swift, in Gulliver's Travels, savagely depicted a war fought over the proper way to crack an egg.

But the human race has come to take its infirmities for granted; even "Gulliver's Travels" has become a book for the amusement of children. The other fellow's wars often seem absurd. Thus Afro-Asians belittle our conflict with the Soviet Union while we, on our part, find it implausible that Hindu should hate Moslem, that Arab should hate Jew, that Turk should hate Greek, that Indonesian should hate Malay, that Cambodian should hate Thai (and in each case, vice versa).

The quarrels are old; what is new is that some nations have the power to destroy the entire world if a war should break out between them. Only a few months ago, the West found itself in tense confrontation with the Soviet Union in Berlin in a dispute that revolved, in part at least, over the height of a tailgate on a truck. To us, the issues seemed clear, but others can be forgiven if the tailgate question seemed about as momentous as Jenkin's ear.

The purpose of these reflections is not to deny the seriousness of trifles—quite the contrary. Great principles can rest on a hair, a piece of bunting, or a tailgate. But in conceding the importance of trifles, one can glimpse the perilous state of the human condition today. It is the incurable contentiousness of the species that makes control of nuclear weapons so grave an issue; the incidents in India, Cyprus, and Panama should give us all a queasy sense of the fearful precipice on which we stand.

In more idealistic times, President Wilson once sought to make the world safe for democracy. Disillusion has taught us to discard this noble purpose as infeasible. Our more modest goal today might well be to make the world safe for human contentiousness—safe enough so that what seems to be a quarrel over trifles does not end in a holocaust.

U.N. Finances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the financial problems facing the United Nations this year seriously impair its effectiveness and if left unsolved will threaten its existence. The U.N. bond sale has resulted in some slight improvement over the very critical situation 2 years ago, but the basic problem remains. This is in large part caused by the refusal of certain nations to contribute their share of the costs of U.N. peace-keeping activities. The rapid growth of the U.N. in recent years resulting from the large number of new nations who have acquired membership is a smaller part of the same problem. In any case a very special effort will have to be made this year if the U.N.'s financial problems are to be resolved and the organization placed on a firm basis.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial discussing the U.N.'s problems entitled, "Whither the U.N.?" which appeared in the Washington Post, January 15, 1964.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER THE U.N.?

What is the future of the United Nations? In tackling that subject in the second Dag Hammarskjold memorial lecture at Columbia University, Secretary of State Rusk (in a speech delivered for him by Assistant Secretary Cleveland) offered two thoughtful suggestions which merit analysis by all friends of the U.N. He does not regard the United Nations as a static organization, but he wants it to grow in ways that will strengthen, and not weaken, its peacekeeping function.

Actually the United Nations is a more indispensable agency now than it was at the time of its birth in San Francisco in 1945. Today there is agreement among all the great powers represented in the Security Council that nuclear war is utterly unacceptable as a means of settling international disputes. Chairman Khrushchev of the Soviet Union acknowledged in his New Year's message that war over territorial questions is intolerable and that nations should not be the target of direct or indirect aggression. If this generally accepted thesis is to be meaningful, said Mr. Rusk, the U.N. will have to be used as a substitute for war in the settlement of disputes.

From this viewpoint the peacekeeping functions of the U.N. are vital to every state and especially to the great powers. It serves, in the Secretary's words, "not as a rival system of order but as contributor to, and sometimes guarantor of, the common interest in survival." Even if some countries are disappointed by the consequences of a U.N. peacekeeping operation, they still profit greatly from it for the simple reason that

survival is better than the annihilation that would result from nuclear war.

This cogent reasoning has a special bearing upon a problem that looms large in the General Assembly in 1964. The Soviet Union has refused to pay its share of the expenses of keeping the peace in the Congo and in the Near East. If this policy persists, the U.S.S.R. will lose its vote in the Assembly and critically weaken the U.N. as an adjuster of disputes that otherwise might lead to war. Surely if the Soviet Union is realistic in its pursuit of insurance against nuclear war, it should be moving toward elimination of this threat to the usefulness of the U.N.

The other problem to which Secretary Rusk addressed himself arises from the growth of the U.N. from its original 51 members to its present 113. The onrush of small, new nations into the U.N. has made it theoretically possible for 10 percent of the world's population, who contribute only 5 percent of the U.N.'s assessed budget, to cast a two-thirds majority vote in the General Assembly. No such problem has arisen and Mr. Rusk is not fearful that it will, but he does emphasize the fact that "the United Nations simply cannot take significant action without the support of the members who supply it with resources and have the capacity to act."

This does not mean that he wants to shift all U.N. power back into the hands of the moribund Security Council. Nor does he look with favor on weighted voting in the General Assembly. But his remarks are suggestive of the direction in which the U.N. should be evolving. Nothing would be more certain to destroy its usefulness in the long run than the making of U.N. policy decisions in disregard of the chief centers of world peace.

Scranton Record Speaks for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the first year of Gov. William W. Scranton's term in Pennsylvania has resulted in a balanced budget while expanding new programs. His budget message for the coming year shows that there will be no standstill this year. Even though the proposed record budget is $59 million higher than the current one, there is no need for new taxes. This is an example of good management with government economy and programs to fill proven needs of people.

This is the type of record that Bill Scranton has produced that qualifies him for the position of President of the United States.

I place the following editorial from the Meadville Tribune, Meadville, Pa., and article from the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., in the RECORD to call attention to the Members of Congress to the outstanding record compiled by their former colleague.

[From the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune, Jan. 9, 1964]

RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

Good government is good politics.

If Gov. William W. Scranton's combined state of the Commonwealth and budget message Tuesday advances his position in national political circles, it is because his address constituted a report on good government, which is of paramount importance to Pennsylvanians.

It is refreshing to find Pennsylvania planning for a new fiscal year without facing financial crisis. There is no deficit which must be written off in the year ahead. There is no need for new taxes, even though the proposed record budget is $59 million higher than the current one. Pennsylvania's governmental affairs have been placed on an even keel, inviting confidence in the Commonwealth's administration, and Governor Scranton has charted a continuance of sound but progressive government for 1964–65.

There was no standing still during the past year. Unemployment dropped and general business activity increased. While Pennsylvania shared in the expanding national economy, a large part of the State's progress must be attributed to the climate of confidence instilled by the Scranton administration. Highway construction moved ahead appreciably, but probably the Commonwealth's greatest advance was in the field of education. Public school subsidies were increased, teacher salaries raised, forward strides were made toward expansion of educational TV and institution of community colleges, and the State board of education was established to provide direction for education at all levels.

The groundwork laid in the past year will enable Pennsylvania to continue moving ahead in economic development, education, and human services. The Governor proposes expansion of industrial development activities and tourist promotion. In the field of human services, increases are contemplated in payments for hospital care and for operation of State mental institutions and schools for the mentally retarded. Additional school subsidies have been mandated but increased funds also are planned for the 14 State colleges and for grants to local libraries. Education's share of the total budget moves from 49 percent in 1963–64 to 51 percent in the coming fiscal year.

To achieve these goals at an additional cost of $59 million without raising taxes is, indeed, significant. Governor Scranton offers only sound management, not fiscal magic. Expanded business activity should result in greater income. Foresight last year provided a tax program that will be adequate for the new budget. Government economy has reduced waste, allowing a greater percentage of appropriations to be applied to services because of a reduction in operational costs.

Democrats have described the Scranton message as a "trial balloon" for the 1964 Republican presidential nomination. The Governor probably was not unmindful of the effects his report might have on his political standing nationally. But his record last year and his plans for the coming year speak for themselves and, for Pennsylvanians, they tell a story of good government.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa..) Sunday Bulletin, Dec. 22, 1963]

PENNSYLVANIA TODAY—REVENUE IS UP, JOBLESS DOWN, IN SCRANTON'S FIRST YEAR IN OFFICE

HARRISBURG, December 21.—The returns are nearly in for Governor Scranton's first year in office.

Generally, they bear out his prediction that things would get better under his administration.

It was a bleak January 15 when Scranton, in his inaugural message, told the legislature:

"Don't tell me that Pennsylvania can't lick its problems because I know that it can."

The State still has some distance to go before getting out of the economic woods but most signs are encouraging.

BIG DROP IN JOBLESS TOTAL

Last January there were 430,000 Pennsylvanians out of jobs, a whopping 9.4 percent of the State's labor force.

Last month, the jobless total had dropped to 294,000 or 6.4 percent of the labor force with seasonal factors indicating an increase in unemployment in the next 2 months.

When Scranton took office, there were 467,904 Pennsylvanians on relief. Last month, this figure had declined to 423,930.

On the political front, things were bright and promising. The Governor got almost everything he wanted from one regular and two special sessions of the legislature.

A REASON FOR SUCCESS

Part of his sucess here stemmed from the possibility that he might be slated as the Republican presidential candidate and few people want trouble with a White House possibility.

If Scranton has any worries, money to navigate the ship of state isn't one of them.

Budget officials report that total State revenue for the first 11 months of 1963 totaled $1.5 billion, an increase of $99.2 million from the 1962 period.

A $6.58 MILLION INCREASE

The 1963 general fund revenue for the period comes to $1,120,991,000, up to $65.8 million.

The major increases are $44.9 million in sales taxes, $27.8 million in Federal health and welfare grants, and State college tuition fees, $12.6 million in cigarette taxes and $4.5 million in liquor taxes.

Only the first 6 months of last June's increase in sales, cigarette and liquor taxes are included in these totals.

The 1963 motor fund, largely used to finance highway construction, is reported as $446 million for the first 11 months of the year. This is $33.4 million ahead of 1962 figures.

AUTO LICENSE FEES

The major increase here is one of $17.4 million in auto license fees, about half of which stems from operators' cards being issued on a 2-year basis this year.

Gasoline taxes are up $2.5 million from a year ago and Federal highway grants have increased by $13 million.

Motor fund expenditures for the 1963 period are reported as $473.2 million. This is an increase of $29.5 million from the previous year.

FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHT MILES OF NEW ROADS

The highway department reports that it opened 588 miles of new roads this year, including 11 miles of interstate highways.

A total of 1,199 miles were reconstructed or resurfaced.

The department awarded $192 million in contracts for the construction of 540 miles of roads, including 109 miles of interstate highway.

The department said its program so far this year has cost $250 million, $50 million more than last year.

SEVENTY-THREE MILLION, ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS BOOST

General fund expenditures in the 1963 period were reported as $1,080,715,707 or $73.1 million more than a year ago.

If the legislature had enacted on schedule the $72 million package of appropriations to State-aided institutions, these expenditures would have been increased by $7.5 million.

Action on these bills came only this week after the regular session had adjourned in August without their enactment.

NOT MUCH FAT FOUND

Scranton's search for fat in the budget was not particularly productive.

Spending by executive departments was held to $89,045,612, a decrease of $1,079,877.

The economy drive made little headway in the first 6 months of the administration.

In the period from July through November, costs of the executive departments were cut by 2.8 percent, from $39.2 to $38.1 million.

The bulk of the saving came from a reduction of some 2,000 in the State payroll, now around 79,000.

DEPARTMENTAL FIRINGS

The highways department lopped some 2,000 people from its maintenance force. The revenue department is getting along with 500 fewer employees and the department of labor and industry has fired some 300.

On the other hand, the department of public welfare hired 1,300 more to staff its institutions. The department of public instruction added 600 employees, mostly to its State college staff.

Sinking fund requirements and authority rentals dropped by $1.2 million to $69.4 million this year.

All other State functions cost more in 1963.

GRANTS AND SUBSIDIES

Grants and subsidies rose by $62.9 million to $771 million with schools getting most of the increase.

Institutional costs increased by $11.3 million to $150 million.

Support of the judiciary rose by $393,888 to $5.3 million.

Legislative costs increased by $839,292 to $4.8 million.

The Governor's call last January for Pennsylvanians to ride out the economic storm was one of the administration's disappointments.

SLIGHT POPULATION RISE

The Commerce Department reported a continued "outmigration" of Pennsylvanians.

The Department said the State's population between July 1962 and July 1963 is estimated to have increased by only 42,000, or four-tenths of 1 percent.

This is at one-eighth the national rate.

The Department said Pennsylvania births exceed deaths yearly by better than 100,000.

Since the 1960 census, Pennsylvania's population through last July is estimated to have increased only 105,000 or nine-tenths of 1 percent.

FIVE AND ONE-TENTH PERCENT HIKE IN NEW JERSEY

In the same period, New Jersey is estimated to have added 404,000, an increase of 5.1 percent.

The State's labor force in October was reported as 4,578,800, down 10,700 from January.

The number of employed currently is estimated at 4,255,000.

The number of continued claims for unemployment compensation dropped from 245,500 to 162,441 in the second week of December.

Payroll taxes in the first 11 months came to $267 million with payouts $30 million less.

The unemployment compensation reserve fund balance this week stood at $162.4 million at the start of the year.

The fund last month paid off $25 million of its $192 million in loans and advances from the Federal Government for the jobless program.

Unemployment compensation reforms will be asked by the administration of the legislature early next year. A similar request was withdrawn in July for lack of support.

CUT IN RELIEF ROLLS SOUGHT

The administration is moving to get employables off the relief rolls.

This, plus an improved economic climate, has resulted in the decline from 467,904 persons on the rolls in January to 423,930 in November.

The January relief bill was $17.4 million against $16.1 million last month.

The relief bill for 11 months this year is $180.5 million against $16.1 million last month.

The relief bill for 11 months this year is $180.5 million against $183.9 million last year.

The saving here, however, has been more than offset by the cost of the medical care for the needy aged program.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

The MAA program has cost $17.2 million in the 11-month period this year against $10.6 million last year.

The State's industrial development program was being pressed by the administration.

The State invested $9.8 million in plant loans during the year in expectations of obtaining 7,599 new jobs with an annual payroll of $29.3 million.

The program, which began in 1956, now has loaned $44.8 million for 337 plants valued at $124.8 million.

The program is estimated to have created 49,406 jobs with a yearly payroll of $186.6 million.

The administration has recruited ranking industrialists and technicians to serve on councils of business and industry and science and technology to seek ways to expand existing industry and attract spaceage ventures.

A recruitment drive is underway to enlist 100,000 Pennsylvanians in the industrial development program.

The jobs of these volunteers will be a person-to-person effort to have Pennsylvania industry expand and attract out-of-State industry through personal or corporate contacts.

YEAR AHEAD LOOKS GOOD

The coming year appears to offer few of the problems which faced the Governor back in January.

The budget appears to be balanced and the likelihood of new taxes at the January legislative session is remote.

The national economy is on the rise and Pennsylvania appears likely to benefit from it.

Personal income in Pennsylvania this year is about 5 percent ahead of 1962 and close to the rise nationally.

WHERE MONEY COMES FROM

Here is where $99.2 million in added funds came from in the first 11 months of 1963, with figures for the same period last year:

GENERAL FUND

	1963	1962	Increase or (decrease)
Sales and use tax	$141,869,000	$366,934,000	$44,935,000
Corporate net including tax	137,768,000	147,070,000	(9,302,000)
Capital stock tax	58,047,000	63,272,000	(5,225,000)
Cigaret tax	76,556,000	63,866,000	12,690,000
Bear tax	19,282,000	19,465,000	(183,000)
Liquor tax	29,031,000	24,439,000	4,592,000
Realty transfer tax	18,750,000	18,449,000	301,000
Inheritance tax	47,101,000	47,726,000	(625,000)
Nontax revenue	91,506,000	91,877,000	(371,000)
Federal grants	132,194,240	118,515,673	13,678,567
State college tuition	17,549,112	15,267,627	2,281,485
Miscellaneous	10,182,394	10,792,123	(609,729)
Total revenue	1,120,991,000	1,055,171,000	65,820,000

MOTOR FUND

Liquid fuels tax	$207,122,489	$204,562,048	$2,560,441
Licenses and fees	100,906,434	83,434,040	17,472,000
Federal grants	128,888,468	115,793,834	13,094,634
Local contributions	5,202,919	4,563,449	639,470
Miscellaneous	3,895,508	4,251,979	(356,471)
Total revenue	446,015,818	412,605,350	33,410,462
Total (both funds)	1,567,006,000	1,467,776,000	99,230,000

Mrs. Willard Wirtz Aids the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest an article in the January 12 Washington Post discussing the work of Mrs. W. Willard Wirtz, wife of the Secretary of Labor, in pressing for employment of the handicapped.

In calling for support of VOICE, or Volunteers Oriented in Creating Employment for the Handicapped, Mrs. Wirtz asked 50 women to aid in creating an employment climate for qualified handicapped persons. I have long contended that creating employment opportunities for the handicapped is an important area which demands more public attention. Mrs. Wirtz is to be congratulated for her fine contribution. I sincerely hope that others will follow her example and lend their efforts to this important work.

Under unanimous consent, I place this article from the January 12 Washington Post, describing this project, in the RECORD:

MRS. WIRTZ ASKS AID TO DISABLED

Mrs. W. Willard Wirtz, wife of the Secretary of Labor, yesterday asked 50 women volunteer workers to help create an employment climate for qualified handicapped persons.

Mrs. Wirtz said that volunteers should act as "catalysts" in eradicating the "prejudices of unenlightened employers." She said that this prejudice coupled with "acute" competition for jobs in times of wide unemployment presents an almost insurmountable obstacle to the handicapped worker.

The women, who are members of the Washington Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs and B'nai B'rith, heard Mrs. Wirtz give her support to the "VOICE" for the handicapped program of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped at the departmental auditorium.

"VOICE," or Volunteers Oriented in Creating Employment for the Handicapped, is a professional volunteer team effort developed by the President's Committee to persuade employers to consider handicapped applicants solely on the basis of their abilities.

Another speaker at the conference, Norman W. Pierson, Director of the District's Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, said that the cost factor has never been faced. For instance, he said that last year in Washington 1,032 persons were rehabilitated and reintroduced into the labor market at a cost of $600,000. However, he explained this "investment" saved Washington taxpayers more than $1 million.

Pierson said this $1 million would be spent caring for these persons if they were not employed.

Sylvia Howard, liaison officer on the President's Committee, said that an employed handicapped person pays $7 to $10 in taxes for each dollar spent for vocational rehabilitation.

Bright Day in the Backwoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, although there are many and deep satisfactions embedded in the work of a Member of the Congress, it may be admitted generally that one of the minor vexations is the lack of appreciation for some jobs well done, so commonly experienced. So it is with a sense of discovery and pleasure that I have this tribute to my old friend and colleague Representative CARL ELLIOTT published in the RECORD. He did yeoman work to get a new industry where one was needed desperately. Applause came to him in the following editorial in the Decatur Daily, an alert newspaper of my own area:

BRIGHT DAY IN THE BACKWOODS

Sunday was a bright day in Alabama's backwoods. A $5 million papermill was announced for Cordova and a $1 million plant for Haleyville. This latter plant will produce "fifth wheels" which couple a truck tractor to a semitrailer.

Some 400 Walker countians assembled at the Cordova armory to hear Representative CARL ELLIOTT make the announcement that the reporter writing the story said, "many women wept with happiness." Walker County has been hard hit in recent years with the decline of the coal mining industry and the loss of a cotton mill.

You can see in what that reporter wrote what it means when hope returns to a community and the family breadwinner will once again have the opportunity to earn a living for his family.

Up here in the Tennessee Valley of Alabama you may have forgotten what it means to walk the streets day after day looking for a job that isn't to be had. Yet, even you with all your economic and spiritual blessings, must know that even in the Tennessee Valley there are those among us who can't find work either because there is no work, or because there are those who are not qualified to fill the jobs.

We can assure you that what is happening in Cordova and Haleyville is a blessing to those who live in those communities and to Alabama.

And these announcements bring to mind what Congressman ELLIOTT said not long ago. He said in substance that the appointment of one postmaster would bring about a hundred letters of protest, but the creation of a hundred jobs brought little response. Old CARL must have felt the warmth of his home folks when 400 people gathered to hear the plant announcement and women wept with happiness, for the hand of CARL ELLIOTT was very definitely in the location of the papermill which is dependent upon the approval of a $2.5 million loan through the Area Development Administration.

Sunday was a bright day in the backwoods of Alabama. May there be more of them from Ardmore to Mobile and all points in between.

John F. Kennedy: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, those who are fighting for civil rights legislation today have a rare kind of support from a wide variety of individuals and groups. I believe that no issue has called forth such selfless dedication on the part of so many people. It was not always so. Under permission I place in the RECORD a speech made by a gentleman who has been fighting for civil rights and civil liberties all of his adult life, Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.:

JOHN F. KENNEDY: CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES, ADDRESS BY JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR., BEFORE THE DETROIT AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, BILL OF RIGHTS DAY, DECEMBER 16, 1963

It would not seem inappropriate, on this first Bill of Rights Day since the assassination of President Kennedy, to try our hands at evaluating his role in the fields of civil rights and civil liberties. True, it is far too early to make adequate judgments concerning President Kennedy's lasting contributions to freedom and equality. True, also, ultimate judgments will have to come from objective historians rather than from those of us who have been engaged in the day-to-day struggles for democratic rights. But the difficulty of the task of evaluation hardly excuses us from making the effort—feeble though it may be.

If there is one word that can give expression to the theme of tonight's talk, "John F. Kennedy: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties," it is the word "growth." I hope no one will take it amiss if I suggest that President Kennedy did not commence his work in the area of civil freedom with the ideological reflexes of the liberals active in these fields. In 1953, at a time when liberal activity was largely centered around these issues, the then Senator Kennedy indicated that he did not feel "'comfortable" with the professional liberals of the ADA. To those who would look back in sorrow or in anger at this, I would suggest that President Kennedy's practical implementation during his White House years of many of the principles of those with whom he had earlier not felt "comfortable" was all the more acceptable and significant to the Nation because of the pragmatic basis for his actions.

To understand the extent of the President's growth in the field of civil liberties, one has only to look back to the year 1954. Only one Democratic Senator failed to vote for, or publicly announce for, the censuring of Joseph McCarthy. That, of course, was the then sick Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts whose constituency had not yet recovered from its sorry romance with McCarthy. But, again, to those who would look back in sorrow or in anger, I would suggest that President Kennedy's 3 years in the White House witnessed thoughtful leadership toward the elimination of those vestiges of McCarthyism which carried over from 1954 and still plagued the Nation at the time of the inauguration of the New Frontier.

Hardly had President Kennedy assumed office in 1961 than he gave evidence of his dedication to freedom to speak and freedom to hear or to read; he promptly terminated Post Office censorship over propaganda and other publications from behind the Iron Curtain. At almost the same time his administration restored Reed Harris, one of McCarthy's first victims, to a post in Ed Murrow's USIA from which Harris had been forced to resign; thus the man whom McCarthy had ousted from Government was returned to work under a man who successfully battled McCarthy. As the Kennedy administration opened with this symbolic expression of confidence in an early McCarthy victim, so it closed with President Kennedy's personal expression of confidence in J. Robert Oppenheimer, upon whom his administration bestowed the Enrico Fermi Award, our Nation's highest honor in the field of atomic energy.

President Kennedy's contribution to civil liberties was not limited to these symbolic acts. His pardon of Junius Scales just a year ago removed the last Smith Act defendant from the jails of the Nation; and this pardon was especially noteworthy for it was made over the opposition of the FBI, Scales having committed the cardinal sin of refusing to name his former associates after he had broken with the Communist Party. Under President Kennedy, Government security programs were operated with increasing understanding if not with perfection; there were few headlines setting forth lurid cases as there had been in earlier days. President Kennedy supported and signed into law a bill he had proposed as a Senator to remove the loyalty oaths previously required of college students receiving loans and grants. Always there seemed to be an effort, quiet though it was, to ring down the curtain on the excesses of McCarthyism.

All of these individual acts may have been less significant than President Kennedy's constant and eloquent reiteration that the Nation must reject the councils of fear and suspicion which threaten freedom. His own warmth for the intellectual community of the Nation helped redress the long period of hostility. His calm support of the seperation of church and state and especially of the Supreme Court's prayer decisions helped thwart the know-nothing attack on this major bastion of civil liberties. The firm dignity with which the President dealt with the radical right was a daily deminder that civil freedom is the real strength of our Nation, that freedom is a weapon in the cold war as much or more than missiles and H-bombs, that freedom and civil liberties, far from being incompatible with security, are vital to our national security. President Kennedy most certainly recognized that there could be no new frontiers unless and until we had a new frontier of freedom.

Turning to the other facet of civil freedom, a not inappropriate place to start might be the year 1957. The civil rights movement was embattled in an all-out effort to push through Congress the first civil rights bill in almost a century. Senator Kennedy, casting worried political glances about him, twice

voted against the civil rights groups: First, to send the bill to probable death in the hostile Eastland Judiciary Committee and, after that failed, to attach to the bill the then unpalatable jury trial amendment. Though he stood with the liberals in support of part III, he withheld total commitment from the civil rights cause.

But the procivil rights views of President Kennedy's White House years were not too long in evidencing themselves. In June 1960, President Kennedy assured a small group of liberals, of which I was one, that he favored "pledging the Democratic Party to congressional and Executive action in support of the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions"; on this basis we gave him our support and the pledge was made at the Democratic convention a month later in the broadest civil rights platform in history.

The Nation did not have to wait long for the new President to evidence his belief in equality. His only question concerning the inaugural parade concerned the lily-white Coast Guard contingent. His earliest appointments reflected his genuine interest in recognizing the merit and ability of our Negro citizens. His antidiscrimination Executive order on employment went far beyond earlier actions. The administration pressed the long moribund Interstate Commerce Commission into action against segregation at bus and railroad terminals. The Attorney General, ever his helpful partner, stepped up activity in the voting field. Delayed and partial as it was, the President issued an antidiscrimination housing Executive order though he, better than anyone else, was aware of the political backlash of such an order among suburban whites, who enjoy talking civil rights on the commuter train and living uncivil segregation at home.

Above all, the President in the last year of his life proposed the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in history—legislation which he knew was necessary for strength and dignity of the Nation but which created a serious political problem, possibly even endangering his own reelection. The action which President Kennedy thus took in the name of human rights in the last months of his life, his continuous pressing for a strong civil rights bill, his commitment to the issue beyond the bounds of practical politics, made him the leader of the liberals with whom he had once not felt comfortable.

As in the field of civil liberties, here, too, President Kennedy's most lasting contribution may well have been in his public statements. For the White House is a prime molder of public opinion and President Kennedy made clear over and over again his belief that civil rights is a moral issue demanding the total support of all men of good will. As the churches of America rise to the battle for civil rights at long last, they follow the lead of President Kennedy who spent 3 years educating the Nation that this great moral question demands the best of all of us.

Surely it must be conceded that more could have been done by President Kennedy. Liberals continuously demanded much more of the President in the areas of civil rights and civil liberties and more might well have been accomplished if the President had moved faster and further. Some resistance at least might have been shown to the deprivations of the Un-American Activities Committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the wiretapping bill might have been put aside; the housing Executive order might have been stronger; the Justice Department might have moved more vigorously to protect lives and limbs of southern Negroes; the civil rights bill might have been sent to Congress earlier and contained stronger provisions.

But these are not the major vistas on the Kennedy road. What is to be seen is the growth from the man who failed to meet the challenge of McCarthy and later helped rebuild civil freedom on the ruins of McCarthyism; from the man who was not quite sure about the Negro issue and later became the President who did more on civil rights in less than 3 years in the White House than any previous President in history.

Is this not why we grieve so deeply tonight? Do we not all feel that the gigantic loss to freedom in President Kennedy's assassination is as much for what might have been in the years to come as for what actually had already taken place? Much as we mourn the man and his accomplishments, even more are our hopes for the future shattered.

If one can guess what he would say to us tonight, I would suppose that President Kennedy would quietly state: "Dry your tears and get to work. There is much to be done." Yes, there is much to be done and it is much harder to do because he is no longer here to lead us.

And so it is appropriate, on Bill of Rights Day, to rededicate ourselves in President Kennedy's image to new frontiers of freedom and equality.

Let us liberals, who have always demanded so much of others, now give unsparingly of ourselves.

Let us quit talking about how far we have come these past years and build the surest and swiftest road to "freedom now."

Let us work so hard for the immediate enactment of the strongest possible civil rights bill that neither political party can resist our efforts.

Let us not only welcome Negro neighbors but let us go out and find them the places to live near our homes.

Let us stop having lunch in segregated clubs—one cannot spend the noon hour in areas restricted against Negroes and expect respect the rest of the day.

Let us quit turning our heads aside when we see discrimination in our churches or our unions.

Let us live every hour of our lives in dedication to freedom and equality.

And so, by rededicating ourselves to the task, let us make a freer and more equal America the living memorial to President Kennedy.

Let others name capes and airports after him; let others coin medals and print stamps. Let us grow the way he grew and fill the void which his death brings to humanity.

Poetic Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we all know that the tragic death of President Kennedy has stirred the entire Nation as nothing in recent history. The grief we have felt has been unlimited by class, color, creed, or age.

Among the outpourings and tributes which have come to me is one signed "Anonymous" which contained a poem composed by Peggy Anna Moore, 12 years of age, a resident of Georgetown, Ind. Because it illustrates the feelings of the young, paralleling those of their elders, I ask that this poem may be printed in the appendix of the RECORD. Peggy Anna Moore has titled it simply, "He Died."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE DIED

(By Peggy Anna Moore, age 12)

A soul was taken from us the other day,
To a much better place so far away.
He died to keep our Nation free,
He died for you, he died for me.
He helped to make our Nation grow,
Although he was killed in doing so.
He died so that our honored flag
May lead the nations and not lag.
He died so that the younger generation
May one day help to rule the Nation.
He died to give the "States" a key,
To keep us in true unity.
So let him not have died in vain,
Let not us use a crutch or cane,
To lean upon to avoid responsibility.
We dedicate this to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Bureau of Engraving and Printing Conversion Schedule To Incorporate the Motto "In God We Trust" on All U.S. Currency and Federal Reserve Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, of which I am chairman, has responsibility in the Committee on Banking and Currency not only for legislation of a consumer nature but also for bills dealing with coins and currency, on assignment from the chairman of the committee, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. In recent weeks the subcommittee has received inquiries from a number of Members of Congress about the status of a rumored proposal to remove the motto "In God We Trust" from our coins or currency. Apparently many people throughout the country have been led to believe that there is some move afoot in the Congress to do away with the motto which has appeared on all coins for many years and also on some issues of currency.

Of course, there is no bill pending to remove the words "In God We Trust" from the coins and currency on which they now appear. I doubt very much that any Member of Congress would seriously propose any such legislation. Even if it were proposed, I do not imagine there would be much support in the Congress for such a move. In fact, it was only as recently as 1955 that the Congress passed a new law making mandatory the previous practice of the Treasury in using the motto on all coins even though prior law had required it only on certain coins. In the 1955 act, we also made it mandatory to place the motto "In God We Trust" on all currency issues "at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted * * *."

ONLY $1 CERTIFICATES AND NOTES HAVE CARRIED MOTTO

Many Members of Congress, and many citizens, have expressed interest in the

fact that although the act of 1955 required the use of the motto on all future currency issues, the words "In God We Trust" have been found so far only on currency of the $1 denomination. Beginning in October 1957, the $1 silver certificate (of which nearly 5 billion were subsequently printed) carried the motto until silver certificates were discontinued in November 1963 and replaced with $1 Federal Reserve notes.

Nearly 160 million $1 Federal Reserve notes printed in November and December 1963, also bear the motto, as will all such notes printed this year and in the future.

But no other issue or denomination of currency now in circulation bears the motto. This is not an oversight on the part of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or defiance on their part of Public Law 140 of the 84th Congress, approved July 11, 1955, which states:

That at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription "In God We Trust" and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

The fact is that except for the $1 silver certificates and $1 Federal Reserve notes, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has not adopted new dies of the type referred to in Public Law 140 of the 84th Congress. However, such dies are now being prepared for seven additional denominations of currency and I have obtained from the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing the anticipated schedule of conversion of these denominations to include the national motto.

CONVERSION SCHEDULE FOR SEVEN ADDITIONAL DENOMINATIONS

I am delighted to announce that the $2 and $5 U.S. Notes should carry the words "In God We Trust" beginning in March 1964, and the $10 Federal Reserve Note in April of this year. The motto is to appear on the $20 Federal Reserve Notes beginning in September 1964, and on the $5 Federal Reserve Notes 2 months later. By January 1965, first deliveries are expected of $50 and $100 Federal Reserve Notes carrying the National motto.

The Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Mr. H. J. Holtzclaw, advises me that in the fiscal year 1963, the Bureau delivered nearly 900 million notes (actually 893 million) bearing the words "In God We Trust." This represents slightly more than 52 percent of our entire currency output. A contract has been awarded for four additional high-speed presses which will be utilized to produce currency carrying our National motto and these presses will be placed in operation as they become available.

FULL CONVERSION DATES ARE APPROXIMATE

Mr. Holtzclaw stated:

We anticipate that by June 30, 1965, approximately 77 percent of our total currency note production will carry the motto. However, because of the many intangibles associated with the currency program it is not possible to give a firm date for complete conversion of all denominations which will carry the motto "In God We Trust" * * * I am committed to the proposition of continuing to make technological improvements in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing but gearing them to manpower availability, taking care of surpluses through normal attrition, and no involuntary reductions. It is my sincere desire that this humanitarian policy be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith as part of my remarks a chart provided by Director Holtzclaw showing the status of the program to deliver U.S. currency and Federal Reserve Notes bearing the National motto, as follows:

Conversion schedule to incorporate the motto "In God We Trust" on all U.S. currency and Federal Reserve notes

Denomination	Date of 1st delivery	Number of notes delivered as of Dec. 31, 1963	Proposed delivery schedule		Estimated date of full conversion (fiscal year)
			Fiscal year	Number of notes to be delivered	
$1 silver certificates [1]	October 1957	4,983,920,000			
$5 silver certificates [2]					
$2 U.S. notes	March 1964		1964	7,680,000	1964
$5 U.S. notes	do		1964	36,480,000	1964
$1 Federal Reserve notes	November 1963	158,720,000	1964	606,880,000	1964
$5 Federal Reserve notes	November 1964		1965	83,840,000	1969
$10 Federal Reserve notes	April 1964		1964	50,640,000	1969
$20 Federal Reserve notes	September 1964		1965	49,920,000	1969
$50 Federal Reserve notes	January 1965		1965	1,536,000	1966
$100 Federal Reserve notes	do		1965	1,280,000	1966

[1] $1 silver certificates were discontinued in November 1963 and replaced with $1 Federal Reserve notes.
[2] No information has been received concerning the future requirements for this item.

Source: Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Who Dare Stand Idle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the tragic loss of the Nation's Commander in Chief last November has affected our people deeply. I have heard and read some stirring tributes.

One of the most sincere eulogies that I have read is contained in an editorial which appeared in the student newspaper, the Red and Gold, of New Britain Senior High School. It was written by Miss Deirdre Hickey, and I offer it for the RECORD:

WHO DARE STAND IDLE?

There was a loved man with insight and integrity, a man who worked unceasingly for the country and people he loved, who would not fall easily or give up. This man's life was taken from him.

That he should lose his life for this country is shocking to us. We are grieved and even feel partially responsible for this tragedy. It is right that we be grieved and that we feel responsible. Yet we have a greater need than to accept sadness and guilt. If we look at the life of this man, we see that he encountered—and overcame—dangers none of us have ever had to face. He made decisions that affected the lives of many people; decisions none of us have ever made. He did more in a day than most of us do in a week. He led a rigorous, demanding life—and with gratefulness accepted the challenge.

This man's life should uplift us, should give us new courage and strength. This man's death should nurture in each one of us a caring for that which is just and good. If we should not rededicate our lives to those purposes for which he lived, if we should deny by thought and action the principles of this tireless leader, are we not saying he sacrificed his life for nought? A callous people are not worthy of such a man.

Let us rise with zeal to the future. From the hand of Robert Louis Stevenson come these words: "Give us the strength to encounter that which is to come, that we may be brave in peril, constant in tribulation, temperate in wrath, and in all changes of fortune and down to the gates of death, loyal and loving one to another."

DEIRDRE HICKEY.

Response to WINS Editorial: Let's Have Legislation Restricting the Sale of Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. MULTER, Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1963, WINS radio in New York City broadcast an editorial urging the licensing of rifles and shotguns in New York City and urging its listeners to communicate their views on the matter to the station.

The response was in favor of such restriction on the sale of weapons by 4 to 1. WINS broadcast the results in the following editorial on December 23, 1963:

LISTENERS FAVOR FEWER GUNS

(By Mark Olds, WINS general manager)

Two weeks ago, a WINS editorial came out in favor of restricting the sale of rifles and shotguns. Many listeners responded. Here are some "nays."

A Brentwood gun club member: "Your eagerness to jump on the bandwagon of restrictive legislation amazes me * * * to side with those who wish to deprive millions of hunters of their constitutional right to bear arms."

A Brooklyn man wrote: "As an attorney, an American citizen, this campaign to restrict the sale of firearms, strikes me as an attempt to limit further, precious civil rights."

And from Monticello, an upstater said: "* * * any gun law will not stop the criminal * * * it will hinder only the law-abiding citizen."

But the "ayes" had the last word over the "nays."

From Dumont, N.J.: "Glad to hear you favor more supervision of firearms. Any legislation like this has my endorsement."

A Long Island teenager wrote: "Such legislation should be pasesd. I would like to see the streets and entire city safe from maniacs."

And from a Huntington housewife: "If the people who are so constitutional conscious were really interested, they would realize that this ban on guns would be a lifesaver."

Yes, four out of every five WINS listeners agreed with our editorial position. WINS continues to ask for legislation that will drastically tighten controls on the sale of rifles and shotguns, and curb the violence that continues to plague our city.

Administration Propaganda on Behalf of the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Treasury prepared a brochure entitled "The Tax Bill: Some Questions and Answers," which was released by the White House on December 15.

The brochure alleges to be for the information of the public. In fact, it is nothing but a slick propaganda effort on behalf of the administration's tax bill released at the very time that bill was under active consideration by the Senate Finance Committee. To read the loaded questions and the misleading answers one would think that nothing had been learned as a result of the economic debate which has taken place in the last year.

In the light of the administration's economy drive, I am particularly interested in the number of the pamphlets prepared, their total cost, the distribution of them, and whether printing and distribution is still continuing. I have writen Secretary Dillion requesting this information, and under unanimous consent I place a copy of my letter to him in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1964.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received and read with a great deal of interest a copy of the Treasury Department's brochure, "The Tax Bill: Some Questions and Answers," as well as a copy of the White House's related press release dated December 15.

The brochure, which is intended as an information pamphlet for the public, looks to me very much like a propaganda effort on behalf of the tax bill now under active consideration by the Senate Finance Committee. It would be an interesting exercise to discuss the validity of some of the replies to the questions which the Treasury poses in the brochure, but that is not my present purpose.

In the light of the administration's economy drive, I should like to know the number of brochures printed, the total cost, the distribution made of them, and whether they are still being printed and distributed.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Private Enterprise Aids School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal points out how private American business is helping to solve the school dropout problem. A small but growing band of corporations deeply concerned over teenage unemployment is taking direct action to combat it by hiring dropouts in increasing numbers. Some of the companies are developing plans where dropouts work part time and study part time. This is a development which other companies should emulate and under unanimous consent I place the Journal article in the RECORD:

JOBS FOR TEENAGERS—MORE COMPANIES HIRE SCHOOL DROPOUTS, GIVE THEM SPECIAL TRAINING—BIG CHICAGO RETAILER EMPLOYS 184 YOUTHS—PRUDENTIAL AIDS GIRLS IN LEARNING TO TYPE—SOME FIRMS FEAR PROBLEMS

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

A large New York insurance company recently hired 25 teenagers with the same unlikely job qualification—all were school dropouts.

Behind the move: A not entirely altruistic attempt to help solve the Nation's pressing problem of jobless teenagers. "We feel it's in our own long-range interests to do what we can about dropouts," says an official of the company, Equitable Life Assurance Society. "Equitable, as well as business generally, stands to benefit if these youths can be turned into productive, self-reliant members of society; if a corporation has the facilities to help, it should."

Equitable's effort typifies the action of a small but growing band of corporations so concerned over teenage unemployment that they are taking direct action to combat the problem. Some companies, such as Equitable, are hiring dropouts on an experimental basis. Other firms are working with schools to keep youths viewed as potential school leavers from abandoning their studies. Some corporations are teaching skills to dropouts who haven't been able to find work.

RISING JOBLESSNESS

The grim statistics prompting such corporate endavors are well known. Nearly one of every six teenagers in the United States who wants work can't find any; as recently as 5 years ago, the teenage unemployment rate was only about 1 in 10. And nearly half of today's 800,000 job-seeking teenagers are dropouts; the jobless rate among those unschooled, unskilled youths is close to 30 percent up from 12 percent just 5 years ago.

The statistics of teenage unemployment may soon get even grimmer. Last year, 2.8 million American youths reached 18; in 1965, nearly two decades after the post-World War II baby boom, 3.8 million will reach 18. And the number turning 18 will remain at about that high level through the rest of the 1960's, Census Bureau projections show.

"With the teenage job situation that's developing, businessmen simply can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines and let welfare groups carry the ball alone," declares Frederick W. Englund, a vice president of Carson Pirie Scott & Co. In a recently launched program, the large Chicago retailer has hired 184 dropouts, Mr. Englund reports, adding, "We've found a surprising number of these youngsters have considerable ability, given the opportunity to prove themselves."

An official of Bloomingdales, a big New York department store that recently hired some 30 dropouts for jobs ranging from sorting mail to bookkeeping, remarks, "We view these misdirected young people as potential customers; the action companies take today may keep many dropouts from becoming chronic relief cases and a big tax burden 10 years from now."

A SHAFT OF SUNLIGHT

Welfare workers eagerly welcome increasing corporate help in fighting the dropout problem. "The direct action some companies are beginning to take with regard to dropouts and teenage unemployment generally, provides a shaft of sunlight on an otherwise overcast horizon," says Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary of the National Committee on Employment of Youth, a nonprofit New York agency devoted to helping teenagers find jobs.

"Unless businessmen pitch in—and that means more than simply appearing on committees, paying taxes and giving occasionally to charity—I don't see how we can lick teenage unemployment," says a Federal social worker at the Youth Career Development Center in Newark, N.J., a Government-sponsored project aimed at finding new ways to combat teenage joblessness.

Equitable's decisions to hire 25 dropouts illustrates the experimental tack some companies are taking. "For each dropout we've hired, we've also selected another dropout of comparable intelligence and background who's still unemployed," explains an Equitable official. "We plan to follow the progress of both groups of dropouts over several years and see whether the dropouts we've hired turn out to be more successful citizens than their counterparts we haven't helped."

Equitable's dropouts have been assigned "regular jobs at regular pay," the official says, and are "mixed right in with our other office personnel." Typical jobs include sorting mail and filing. "We've only hired boys," the official adds, "because that seems the most pressing aspect of the problem." He says Equitable executives are considering expanding the project to cover some 50 dropouts and their unemployed counterparts.

WORKING WHILE STUDYING

In some cases, corporations are hiring dropouts part-time, on the condition they also return to the classroom. Carson Pirie hires dropouts 3 days weekly, at a starting salary of a dollar an hour, provided they spend 2 days a week studying. The Chicago school system supplies classroom space and teachers. The youths are drilled in such basic subjects as arithmetic and proper English, as well as such practical matters as typing.

Seventy of the 184 dropouts hired so far by Carson Pirie are still employed by the retailer, mostly in stock, clerical, and sales jobs. Of the rest, 58 quit voluntarily for such reasons as finding a better job or to return full-time to high school. The other 56 have been dropped because they were unable to perform their jobs adequately or unwilling to attend the classes. "We consider

the record to date most encouraging," Mr. Englund says.

Other Chicago-area firms hiring dropouts under similar conditions include, among others, The Fair, a retailing subsidiary of Montgomery Ward & Co.; Illinois Bell Telephone Co. and Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

A few weeks ago, several Kansas City, Mo., employers launched the same sort of program for dropouts in that area. So far, 30 youths have been hired. Among the firms participating are Hallmark Cards, Inc.; Old American Insurance Co. and the Muehlebach, a large Kansas City hotel. In Hartford, Conn., a group of companies recently agreed upon a joint project to provide part-time jobs for local dropouts willing to return to the classroom. The project, which gets underway late this month, initially will give employment to about 50 youths.

GE'S PROGRAM

Several companies are attempting to prevent would-be dropouts from leaving school. In Philadelphia, some 100 employees of General Electric's Missile and Space Division have recently started lecturing at local high schools. The guest speakers, ranging from space scientists to janitors, emphasize to the students how schooling has helped them obtain and adequately perform their jobs.

"Our aim is to make the students realize the importance of an education in the world of work," says a GE official. "We believe the message sometimes carries more weight when it's delivered by someone other than a teacher." He adds, "Without a high school diploma, it's difficult nowadays to land even a janitor's job."

The lectures, which GE provides free, already are producing results, educators say. At one school, the dropout rate among seniors has declined from about 20 percent to only 12 percent. An administrator at Philadelphia's Benjamin Franklin High School calls the project "an unqualified success."

Some corporations are setting up training facilities for dropouts who refuse to return to school but are willing to continue their studies in a nonacademic atmosphere. Prudential Insurance Co. of America a few weeks ago established a classroom for 11 girl dropouts using regular office space at its Newark headquarters. The 2-hour sessions, conducted 5 days a week by an experienced Prudential employee, drill the girls in such rudiments of office work as spelling, proper dress, and typing.

The girls may continue in the course until they find a job; Prudential only prepares them and hasn't actually hired any. When 1 girl leaves, another is admitted to keep the total at 11. The dropouts are assigned to the course by social workers at the Newark Youth Career Development Center, in cooperation with Prudential officials.

LINDA MONAHAN'S PROGRESS

Auburn-haired Linda Monahan, a recent enrollee, gives a typical student reaction to the course: "I'm learning a lot of things here that should help me get a job; I couldn't stand high school." Seventeen-year-old Linda, who quit high school after 2 years to take a sales job at a Woolworth store and then was laid off, can already type 30 words a minute, according to Mabel Wilson, the Prudential instructor. "We try to get the girls up to 40 words per minute," Miss Wilson says. "At that speed, their job prospects become pretty good."

Corporate efforts to aid dropouts will receive a big push if a program currently being drawn up by some specialists at a giant oil company wins management approval. Under the plan, which is still tentative and won't be submitted for final approval for several months, the company would hire hundreds of dropouts—equal to 1 percent of its entire employee force—to work part time in its service stations across the country. Then the concern would call upon all of the Nation's 100 largest corporations to hire dropouts also, in each instance equal to 1 percent of the particular corporation's work force.

"If the 100-company plan ever goes through, it would provide jobs for about 60,000 dropouts, and we'd be well along the road to solving the whole problem," says a social worker familiar with the plan. The cost to the companies, he adds, would be less than $1,500 per youth annually. "A Federal program accomplishing about the same thing would cost more than twice that much," he estimates.

SOME INDIFFERENCE

Despite the increasing help they're getting from some corporations, social workers complain too many executives remain indifferent to the dropout problem. Officials at Newark's Youth Career Development Center recently sent questionnaires to 900 New Jersey employers to find out what jobs were available for youths. "The initial response was less than 30 percent," recalls a social worker. "By followup letters and calls, we finally got the response up to nearly 50 percent; the others told us, in effect, they couldn't be bothered filling out the questionnaires and were under no legal obligation to do so."

Plans to aid dropouts occasionally founder because some businessmen simply don't wish to hire such youths. If they hire dropouts, many executives fear, they'll be at a competitive disadvantage; "Let's face it," says a steel company official, "You get more for your buck normally out of a kid with a diploma."

Some firms worry they may create ill feeling by hiring dropouts; "If we let it be known we're hiring dropouts and then have to turn down a youngster who's a high school graduate, how do we explain it to him?" frets the personnel officer of an insurance company.

Ford Motor Co. recently proposed that each of its 9,000 dealers provide part-time work for a dropout, if the youth would return to school. "The dealer reaction was pretty negative and the plan is in the deep freeze," a Ford official says. "I'm frankly disappointed—it would have helped 9,000 boys get back on the right track."

The Late Honorable Howard H. Baker

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I learned of the unexpected death of our late beloved colleague, Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER.

HOWARD BAKER served his district and his Nation for many years with honor and distinction. His influence, and the warmth of his friendship, extended far beyond the borders of his congressional district.

We shall feel his loss keenly in the years that lie ahead. His family can take comfort in the realization that, during his life on this earth, HOWARD BAKER lived a rich and full life, characterized by unselfish service to others.

Mrs. Whalley and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Baker and the children.

More About the Unwisdom of Rejecting Nuclear Power for the New Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, of interest to all lawmakers and all interested in strong national defense is the following editorial item from the January issue of Navy magazine:

THERE IS STILL TIME

The remarkable story of Defense Secretary McNamara's arbitrary rejection of pleas by the Navy, Atomic Energy Commission and Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy that the next aircraft carrier be nuclear powered now has been told. It all appears in the committee's new and highly informative report, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels."

Although the lawmakers were quite restrained as they and a host of witnesses demolished Mr. McNamara's arguments, they must have been taken aback by his lack of valid facts and figures and his inability to cite expert opinion to support his judgment. In fact, the committee report accused the Secretary of exaggerating the cost differential between nuclear and conventional propulsion and then indicated that the only person he could point to as agreeing with his decision was an unidentified high-ranking military man not of the naval service who was against the building of any new carrier, nuclear or conventional.

"The committee still does not know of any qualified technical person or group who recommended to the Defense Department that nuclear propulsion not be installed in the new aircraft carrier," the report declared.

There is no doubt that the committee feels that Mr. McNamara treated it rather shabbily. First, he failed to keep it informed between March and October 1963, of his plans for the utilization of nuclear propulsion in surface ships, although Chairman PASTORE specifically requested such information. Then the Secretary figuratively slammed the door in the committee's face by directing the Navy to proceed with the construction of a conventional carrier 2 days after he had been told that the committee would hold hearings on the subject within a week.

COST INFLATED

Nor did the committee appreciate Mr. McNamara adding the cost ($37 million) of an extra squadron of aircraft to the price differential between the nuclear carrier and a conventional one when the Navy had made it clear it planned to carry the same number of planes on either. And the lawmakers pointedly noted that: (1) Mr. McNamara was the only witness before it to testify against nuclear power for the carrier; and (2) they had been furnished no studies prepared by the Defense Department on the matter.

According to the committee, Mr. McNamara "underestimated" the outstanding military advantages of nuclear propulsion after having "overestimated" its costs. He thus wound up with a lopsided cost-effectiveness conclusion and an "incorrect" and "fundamentally illogical and wasteful" decision which may "commit the Navy to a future of planned obsolescence with grave implications for the national security."

These are strong words, but what may have concerned the committee even more is the McNamara concept which, it said, dictates that, in order to spend money to im-

prove our weapons, we must buy fewer weapons to pay for the improvement.

"LESS THAN THE BEST"

Does this mean that we are planning to forgo taking full advantage of our technology to give us superior weapons? The committee said it does.

Does it mean that our potential enemies, if they do not play the same kind of curious cost-effectiveness game, may confront us with weapons better than our own? Again, the committee found in the affirmative.

The McNamara "less-than-the-best" concept—building weapons systems inferior to those we have the technological and financial capacity to produce—presupposes that we know everything the enemy has in his arsenal and what he may be trying to build in secret. But our intelligence has never been complete of fully accurate in the past and there is no reason to believe it will be in the future. The committee concluded that the McNamara approach "could create an intolerable peril to our national security." We agree.

Mr. McNamara, in the 3 years you have been Secretary of Defense only one nuclear-powered surface ship—a frigate—has been started and that one because Congress forced it. But the Navy's going nuclear, sir, and we don't mean only the aircraft carriers. The process can be—alas, it has been—slowed, but it cannot be stopped.

Mr. McNamara, you will be judged ultimately not by the money you saved, but by the strength and modernity of the Nation's defense team when you turn over your stewardship. The Nation wants the best weapons systems available. It can afford them; it is willing to pay for them. We urge you, therefore, to turn your back on the forces of reaction and turn your talents to the promotion of progress. There is still time.

Hon. Howard H. Baker of Tennessee

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me in order that I may join with him and my associates in the House of Representatives in tribute of our late and beloved colleague, HOWARD H. BAKER.

It is difficult to adequately express your feelings when suddenly faced with such a loss as the passing of this great American. As a Member of Congress and a Representative from the great State of Tennessee, HOWARD BAKER enjoyed the respect, the admiration and the affection of every Member of the House, the people of his State and all who knew him.

HOWARD BAKER and I embarked on our service in this House at the same time and I know of no one during the intervening period who has made a greater contribution to the cause of good government. He was a devoted public servant and one who stood firm in his convictions and his determination to represent the people well.

HOWARD H. BAKER leaves a great heritage for those of us who have been privileged to serve with him. Because of HOWARD BAKER, our Nation is a better place in which to live.

I was proud to call him my friend, and Mrs. Ostertag joins with me in extending our profound sympathy to Mrs. Baker and her family in their great personal loss.

Methodist Bishops Support Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Methodist Council of Bishops issued a strong statement in support of racial integration at its semiannual meeting held recently in Detroit.

Their declaration puts the bishops squarely behind the pending civil rights bill.

It is gratifying to see the Methodist Church and other religious institutions in this country taking an active part in the cause of better race relations. The religious leaders of the Nation are playing a constructive role in the present racial crisis through their moral teachings and by their emphasis on the need for orderly change.

The following statement by the Methodist bishops is one of the best and most forthright I have seen. I commend them for it:

TEXT OF BISHOPS' MESSAGE

The Methodist Church stands for the equal rights of all racial, cultural, and religious groups. We confess with deep penitence that our performance as a church has not kept pace with our profession. The right to choose a place of residence, to enter a school, to secure employment, to vote or join a church, should in no way be limited by a person's race or culture.

The Methodist Church must build and demonstrate within its own organization and program a fellowship without racial barriers. The church must also work to change those community patterns in which racial segregation appears, including education, housing, voting, employment, and the use of public facilities. To insist that restaurants, schools, business establishments, and hotels provide equal accommodations for all peoples without regard to race or color, but to exempt the church from the same requirements is to be guilty of absurdity as well as sin.

We urge our pastors, upon whom rests the responsibility of receiving persons into the church, to receive all who are qualified and who desire to be received, without regard to race, color, or national origin, and we individually and collectively pledge them our support as they do so. The Methodist Church is an inclusive church.

We decry, on legal as well as Christian grounds, the denial to any person of any color or race the right of membership or the right to worship in any Methodist church. Further, to move to arrest any persons attempting to worship is to us an outrage.

We call upon all Methodist institutions where such has not been done, to bring their racial policies and practices in line with the Christian principles of racial inclusiveness to which we are committed.

We affirm the legality and right of those minorities who are oppressed anywhere in the world, to protest, to assemble in public, and to agitate for the redress of grievances, provided this is done in an orderly way. A public march as a vast petition for attention and justice is in line with the principles on which this Nation was founded. The recent march on Washington provided a spectacular and well-directed move of this kind.

We note with satisfaction the increasing appreciation in our land and over the world of a growing spirit of justice and goodwill which in time will enable our people, both as churchmen and as citizens, to resolve unbrotherly tensions. Much has been accomplished and much more will be accomplished as the months go by. Constructive, if unnoticed, work has been going on over our whole land, and our church has been among the foremost in calling for brotherhood and justice and for an end to long-entrenched evil. We rejoice that in community after community, city after city, State after State, good will and good laws have moved ahead with men and women of good intent working well together.

We call upon all of our pastors and members, and the people of our land and of all lands, to speak and live so as to deepen by word and deed the brotherhood of man and make this a reality instead of a hope.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 18, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, January 18, 1964)

FISCAL INCONSISTENCIES

Question. Are we actually cutting Federal spending? It is true that cutbacks are being made in the military because we are reducing our defenses. (The wisdom of this should be considered.) On the other hand, the administration has asked for tremendous increases in welfare programs. In considering claims of Federal savings, several points must be remembered:

1. The President's proposed $97.8 billion budget is the spending budget. "New obligational authority," that is spending for projects authorized will amount to $103.8 billion. The actual cash budget, or what we will spend in all categories including payments from the trust funds, will run much higher and could reach $125 billion or more.

2. Just one small example of the juggling of figures: It is reported the President has already asked for a 20-percent increase in expenditures for the Peace Corps.

3. The much publicized "war to end poverty through Federal programs" is open end. The cost of providing a "home for every man" is beyond estimating.

4. As is always the case the proposed budget will be augmented during the year several times through supplemental appropriations to pay the bills for projects and programs previously authorized, but for which no appropriation is requested in the first budget.

There is only one sure way to cut expenses: Stop authorizing new programs until we have balanced the budget and insured the purchasing power of the dollar.

Don't be surprised if my letters to you are signed in red ink. This is just a reminder to all of us that we are spending money we do not have and that the Federal Government must get back into the black.

HOUSE ACTS TO ASSIST CITIZENS

The representation of indigent dependents bill (H.R. 7457) passed the House handily. This bill provides legal help for those under Federal criminal charges who are proven to be unable to afford an attorney. The judge will appoint an attorney who will receive $15 per hour in court and $10 outside court, with a top limit of $500 for felony cases and $300 for misdemeanor. Affidavits filed by attorneys are intended to safeguard proper use of Federal funds. This bill is an interesting companion piece to countless bills wherein the Federal Government and the Federal Treasury, under force of a constantly increasing bureaucracy, sue U.S. citizens.

MEDICARE UP AGAIN

The Ways and Means Committee will resume hearings on the new version of medicare, now called hospital insurance, Monday January 20. (Remember, the Supreme Court has ruled that social security is not insurance, as such it would be unconstitutional.) The President has promised an all-out effort to push this legislation through this session of Congress. In doing so he contradicts his pledge to respect the integrity of Congress and the separation of powers. In his appeal to senior citizen organizations, labor, and other pressure groups to help him lobby Congress he clearly breaks down the constitutional separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches.

COMMITTEE ACTION PAYS DIVIDENDS

The effectiveness of the fight I was able to wage, with the help of some of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, to protect the oil and gas industry against tax discrimination in tax hearings and executive meetings, paid added dividends this year. We stopped the assault by the Secretary of the Treasury on the industry in committee and the House upheld our position. Now the Senate Finance Committee has turned down any effort to decrease depletion and Treasury has not made any further attempts to move in on the oil and gas industry.

PANAMA

While all the issues concerning the current trouble in Panama are not yet clear because we do not have all the facts and we don't know what deals are in the making, several points should be enumerated at this time:

1. Our treaty with Panama is a contract. As the world's leader we dare not allow contracts to be broken at the whim of one of the contracting parties, lest we invite the wholesale breaking of treaties and agreements.

2. Contrary to first reports, the incident was not instigated by overzealous students over the flying of the Panamanian flag, but rather Cuban based Communists played, and are continuing to play, an important part in fomenting the situation.

3. The United States must not be coerced into giving up any of our rights to the Canal, nor agree to negotiate under duress. To do so would be a signal for Communist inspired uprising all over Central and South America to complete the Soviet Union's grand design to encircle the United States.

4. The United States should secure the canal by whatever means necessary. Then we should discuss any differences regarding the contract with Panama at the same time warning Soviet Russia, Castro's Cuba, or other potential troublemakers to stay out.

5. We should not turn the solution of this problem over to the United Nations. If we do, we will lose the canal which will then by controlled by the Communists or those friendly to the Communists.

6. We should begin developing foreign policy in the self-interest of the United States and worry less about our image. For a change why cannot we proudly champion principle and by the rightness of our position compel others to conform? That is the test of leadership. We cannot win the war for freedom through weak and indecisive action in fear of the image we may create—an image manufactured and influenced by Communist propaganda.

America Has a Right To Know About the Otepka Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, our former colleague Donald L. Jackson discussed the Otepka case in his weekly telecast. Mr. Jackson posed serious questions about it as will be apparent from the reading of his following text:

REMARKS BY DONALD L. JACKSON, KCOP, CHANNEL 13, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JANUARY 12, 1964

This is broadcast No. 15 in the continuing series, "America Has a Right To Know." Tonight, it will be our purpose to pursue further the question of security in the Department of State, and to put several more respectful questions to the President of the United States. An employee of the Department of State was fired from his position for testifying before a committee of the Congress of the United States—the representatives of the American people—and America has the right to know. Why?

Mr. President, if you please, sir, two foundation questions.

1. Why did officials of the U.S. Department of State lie, under oath, to a duly constituted and legal committee of the U.S. Congress?

2. Who benefits by the firing from the U.S. Department of State of the security officer, Otto Otepka?

The Texarkana News, commenting editorially on the Otepka case, calls it a "stench" in the State Department. More than 100 American newspapers from border to border and from coast to coast have asked pointed and pertinent questions about the Otepka case, Mr. President, but to this time there has been no satisfactory explanation of the miasmic aura that shrouds the preemptory discharge of the State Department employee, whose crime appears to be that he told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to a committee of the U.S. Congress, and that his sworn testimony dealt with some off-the-record goings-on in that agency of Government—an agency, Mr. President, for which the Chief Executive has direct responsibility.

In this broadcast, sir, as in the past, we direct these questions of concern, not from memory, conjecture, nor any desire to frustrate or inhibit, but from official sources in Government—duly recorded and available readily to any citizen who knows where to go to find what he wants—admittedly, not an easy task in a government such as ours.

In the present instance—the firing of a State Department security officer—we go to a congressional source—Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, a ranking member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

On November 5, when the Department of State announced the dismissal of Security Officer, Otto Otepka (and now we are quoting):

"* * * because he gave the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee information concerning irregularities and probable illegalities affecting the security of the United States * * *."

The Senator from Connecticut presented, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the purging of the last of the old-line security officers to hold a top position in the Department's Office of Security.

We offer that presentation, as a matter of information, as printed on pages 2031 to 2033 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 178 for November 5, together with the comments of Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina. We do this as an integral part of the essential documentation necessary to a public understanding of the questions being asked by many Americans and by more than 100 American editors from coast to coast.

And, Mr. President, America has the right to know.

America has the right to know why none of these questions have been answered by an authoritative voice speaking from the highest levels of our Government.

We offer, sir, as basic documenation for our questions, the following: (1) The five-part hearings and report on State Department Security; (2) the William Weiland case; and (3) the new passport regulations, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in which appears the testimony of Mr. Otepka concerning alleged irregularities and illegalities in the State Department. These are, of course, sir, official documents of the Senate.

In addition to the foregoing official reports and testimony, we refer to Senator DODD's subsequent presentations to the Senate on the same subject, with particular reference to the Senator's report to his colleagues on the reaction of the American press to the firing of Otepka. These remarks can be found as printed on pages 24118 to 24142 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 211, of December 20, 1963. Official correspondence between Otto Otepka and his superiors in the Department of State was also included by Senator DODD, and is detailed on pages 24142 to 24148 of the same date.

Now, sir, we turn to some of the pertinent questions posed by the American press, and dealing with the State Department purge of Otto Otepka because he told the truth, under oath, to a committee of Congress, and ask you, most respectfully, Mr. President, if the American people are not entitled to an explanation from you, sir, about the facts of the matter.

The Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, in its issue of October 22, said, and we quote: "Otepka is getting fired because he thought that full security procedures should be followed in evaluating the cases of such prize State Department errors as Alger Hiss, William Arthur Weiland, and John Steward Service. Worse yet, he revealed the laxness to Senate investigators."

Is that charge correct, Mr. President?

The Monroe (La.) News-Star, of October 7, 1963, asked editorially, "What sort of cat was Otepka about to let out of the bag?"

The Chicago Tribune, on November 7, was more blunt. It said and we quote: "There can be no doubt that this case reflects an intention by the administration to conduct a purge of patriots."

Is this what is happening, Mr. President? Is that the intention? Is a public employee, who dares tell the truth to a committee of the U.S. Congress, to sacrifice his career—lose his livelihood—or be shunted off to the oblivion of lower Slobbovia?

America—and inquiring American editors have the right to know. They are entitled to answers to questions such as this one from the Perth Amboy (N.J.) News of No-

vember 8, and we quote: "The issue is simple. Can Government agencies work behind closed doors, hidden from the watchful eyes of Congress and the taxpayer?"

Can they, Mr. President? America wants to know * * * and this, sir, from the same editorial, and we quote again: "What does the Department have to hide? What is the Department afraid of Congress uncovering?"

Following the disclosures on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the Roswell (N. Mex.) Record on November 7, said, and we quote: "Why should any information be withheld from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? How can such a committee operate, unless it has all the facts in hand to judge any case of security violation?"

It is one thing, Mr. President, for labor racketeers, subversives, Communists, and gangsters to invoke the protection of the fifth amendment to prevent incrimination of themselves, but when the Department of State cloaks itself in silence respecting its activities and imposes reprisals against an employee courageous enough to risk the consequences by telling the truth to a committee of the U.S. Congress, the American people and substantial elements of the American press can be pardoned a feeling of concern and frustration.

The Evansville (Ind.) Press of November 13, commenting on the Otepka case, summed up the matter thus, and we quote: "It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress, and three others charged for snooping (on) the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress."

Is there an official answer, Mr. President, to the question asked by the Greenville (S.C.) News in the heading of an editorial on the Otepka case, under date of November 9, the News asked, and we quote: "When did this become a crime?"

When did it become a crime, sir, to tell the truth to a Senate subcommittee, under legal subpena and under the compulsion of an oath? In the same vein, the Roanoke (Va.) Times of November 11, captioned an editorial, "Loyalty to Whom," in which it was concluded, and I quote:

"In all this context the issue is not one of loyalty to country but loyalty to a branch of Government. If this is to be the case, then, as Vice Chairman DODD of the Senate committee charges, the American system of checks and balances in Government is at stake."

Just what did Senator DODD charge in the Otepka case, Mr. President? He charged, and I quote from his remarks: "Mr. Otepka could be dismissed because he had given honest testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, then it would become impossible, or at the best, very difficult, for any congressional committee in the future to obtain uninhibited testimony from executive employees and officials." "The Otepka case," Senator DODD said, "goes to the heart of security procedures in the Department of State. It has the greatest significance from the standpoint of relations between the legislative and executive branches."

Editorially, the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, on November 11, put the matter on the line when it charged, and I quote: "Officials lied to nail Otepka."

Mr. President, this flat charge is made against officials of the U.S. Department of State—officials who were given a job to do—by their superiors—of bugging Otepka's telephone and tapping his conversations—officials who later recanted their previous testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, changed the character of their testimony in letters remarkably alike, and then departed the State Department scene.

What further action is to be taken in this matter, Mr. President? Are the logical and relevant questions of press and public to be brushed aside by the State Department and a veil of official silence substituted for honest and forthright comment?

America has a right to know.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Until next week at this time, this has been your Capitol reporter, Donald L. Jackson, bringing you broadcast 15 in the series "America Has a Right To Know," an interrogatory, developed, researched, and produced by Americans who believe that a new and unique form of official fifth amendment usage should be nailed now.

National Society of Public Accountants Supports H.R. 9548

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter from the National Society of Public Accountants expressing its support for my bill H.R. 9548, which would prohibit banks from performing accounting and bookkeeping functions unrelated to the traditional concept of banking.

It is my hope that this bill can be scheduled for hearing by the Banking and Currency Committee in the near future.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1963.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MULTER: On behalf of the 11,000 members of the National Society of Public Accountants may I express our deep appreciation for your introduction on December 20 of H.R. 9548, a bill which would prohibit banks from performing certain accounting and related business services for its customers.

As you know, we have been quite concerned over this problem for some time now. Representatives from the national society have discussed this matter with you and you have recently received a copy of our statement on the matter of banks encroaching into the public accounting field. We are extremely gratified to note by your introduction of H.R. 9548 that you concur with the position expressed by our organization.

We believe that if banks continue to offer accounting and related business services the best interests of the business community will not be served. Our written statement presents ample justification for this position.

You are to be commended for your interest in this matter and for your willingness to initiate appropriate remedial legislation. This is a significant development and is evidence once again of your leadership on banking and other important matters.

We have written to Chairman PATMAN of the House Banking and Currency Committee to which this bill has been referred. We have urged that Chairman PATMAN schedule hearings on H.R. 9548 at the earliest possible time and, moreover, that the National Society of Public Accountants be extended an opportunity to testify in favor of the bill at such hearings.

Please be assured of the continued support of the National Society of Public Accountants. We stand ready and willing, together with our affiliated State societies and individual members, to do everything possible to have Congress adopt needed restrictions on continued bank activities in the public accounting field.

We look forward to cooperating with you toward the accomplishment of our common objectives.

Sincerely yours,

GUY S. BALSER,
Chairman, Committee on Bank Relations.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of January 11, 1964:

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

President Johnson's first state of the Union speech enumerated promises and hopes, more to be accomplished, at less cost. I shall help the President economize. Responsibly and constructively representing my constituents, remembering my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, I present this critique.

1. The Federal Government cannot constitutionally do much that the President suggests. His proposals comprise a welfare or socialist society.

2. While budget cutting is stressed, all too clear is the increased NOA (New Obligation Authority), of $103.8 billion which exceeds anticipated spending by approximately $6 billion, to be deferred spending. (There is little, if any, relationship between budgetary spending level given and the total cost of the President's staggering list of promises and hopes, by untold billions. Unmentioned but possible increased spending techniques will undoubtedly include, (a) increased outlays now before June 30 chargeable to present budget; (b) Government sale of assets, to be spent; (c) increased trust fund outflow, not in budget.)

3. The zealous effort to alleviate life's insecurities results in downgrading our country and our system. We now have the world's highest standard of living, not the characterized squalor, misery and poverty.

4. Congress is not engaged so much in senseless quarrels as idealogical differences reflecting the views of constituents. Surely, the President is not trying to stifle opposition, or is he?

5. "People's needs are expanding" is not true. Our needs are the same, but politicians' promises are expanding.

6. We are reminded that we are the richest nation, no reference to our having the greatest combined debt and taxes.

7. Gross materialism is implicit; money and Government control, are the central themes.

8. We devoutly want "a world without war," of course, but even more we want a world without slavery or government dictation. In other words freedom comes first, then peace. The unilateral disarmament, the trusting the Communists, the describ-

ing our military weapons as provocative, therefore reason for disarming, sound like sheer national suicide. Neither should we make deals nor give food and aid to the Communists.

9. How do we stimulate private investment abroad when U.S. property is expropriated with immunity.

10. The specific legislative recommendations are legitimately subject to criticism and opposition. Some appear to be self-defeating or improper solutions to the problems. We must await the further details.

The omissions are glaring: (1) Not once does the President mention communism although we are engaged in a worldwide life or death struggle and our President was assassinated by a Communist; (2) capitalism's virtues and socialism's pitfalls are strangely omitted; (3) the Monroe Doctrine is not mentioned nor any answer given to the President's recognition that men and arms are flowing from Cuba in Communist subversive efforts throughout this hemisphere.

The President says we must "prove success of our system." This is unquestioned. The United States is No. 1 in the world. Now, must we abandon the lessons of success, that is capitalism, for Government centralization which historically has always characterized the downfall of nations and societies? The President's statement could be that of one who either forgets or doesn't understand capitalism and socialism-communism. Yet, we know he knows. Surely, he must.

True, there must now be a disclosure of the details of the programs in the message. I shall aid every effort to economize and to free up and keep free our people and our capitalistic system. I pledge again to protect and preserve capitalism, U.S. sovereignty, and the republic form of government. To do this I shall use two yardsticks on each issue.

1. Is this a function of Federal Government?

2. Can we afford it?

All of last year's legislation is carried over into this 2d year of the 88th session, including the Alger bills. My basic constructive legislative program remains the same, as outlined throughout the year. I shall analyze the President's specific legislative requests as we receive them.

Medicare hearings resume January 20 before my committee, Ways and Means. I am now ranked sixth on the Republican side, due to the untimely death of Congressman Howard Baker this week.

The planned Cultural Center was renamed after John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Federal funds will now be used, contrary to the original plan of private contributions only.

Advice to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to supply important counsel and guidance to small business retail concerns, Mr. Larston D. Farrar, a well-known Washington correspondent, held interviews with Senator John J. Sparkman, distinguished chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Honorable John E. Horne, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, the report of my talk with Mr. Farrar also was included.

A recent edition of the Grocergram, the official publication of the Independent Grocers' Alliance of America, carried a description of these interviews as presented by Mr. Farrar and under unanimous consent, I ask that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

NOTED BUSINESS AND LEGISLATIVE LEADERS OFFER MANAGEMENT ADVICE

(By Larston D. Farrar)

Economic history during the past several decades has shown clearly that the Nation may be at the top of a growth period. Whether or not the economy goes along on a plateau, or trends upward or downward, remains to be seen in the coming months.

At the same time, the record reveals that during such a period as the present, when personal credit outstanding continues to go upward, money becomes slightly more difficult to borrow at commercial banks, and people generally are optimistic (overly optimistic, according to many observers), more small businessmen encounter economic troubles having to do with credit, obtaining labor at reasonable wages, and other management problems.

Because the Nation is in a peculiarly precarious period—economically—it is difficult for many small businessmen in the grocery business to see the forest for the trees. In an effort to help those businessmen who are planning ahead, and want every bit of worthwhile knowledge they can obtain, I went to four men who are noted in business and legislative circles for their knowledge of the Nation's economy. Each of these men, in one way or another, has special training, background, and insight to qualify him to give advice to small businessmen. They are:

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, a Wilmington, Del., banker in private life, and an articulate spokesman for the business community in his public role.

U.S. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, a former vice-presidential candidate on his party's ticket and for many years chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business.

U.S. Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and long a leading student of small business problems.

John E. Horne, former U.S. Small Business Administrator, who served in the post from February 1961 to August 1963 and proved that his interests lay in the direction of serving small businessmen without being inimical to the vital interests of the big businessmen in any field. Mr. Horne is now a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which regulates the affairs of the Federal Savings and Loan Associations.

I asked each of these men to answer the question: "What is your best advice to small businessmen in the grocery business today?" Here are their verbatim replies to my question:

Edwin P. Neilan: "My best advice to small businessmen today is:

"The small businessman must be a specialist in some sense in order to play a successful role in our economy. He may offer a neighborhood service, provide scarce technical know-how, perform numerous service functions, or produce specialized items. Experience has proved, and failures testify, that the successful small businessman must posses exceptional understanding of his role in the economy and have the talent to perform his chosen function.

"He should face up courageously to his costs and alternatives. He should charge himself realistically for his own labor, the capital and tools he provides, and the rent of any land which he owns. Before long, he must truthfully weigh the rewards he receives from being in business for himself against those he might gain from employment elsewhere.

"Exercising managerial responsibilities and the accumulation of capital are perhaps the two biggest problems confronting the small businessman. Although a specialist in the product or service he has chosen to provide, the small entrepreneur himself may have to carry out all managerial responsibilities—finance, purchasing, selling, personnel management, accounting, organization of production, etc.

"To help him perform these activities, he should use the services of voluntary business organizations, such as local, State, and National chambers of commerce and trade associations. Help also is available to him through other private specialists, business consultants, contract researchers, and data processing firms. In addition, he may utilize services of Government agencies, such as the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration.

"As soon as his growth permits, the small businessman should delegate managerial responsibilities, thus freeing himself from day-to-day administration to give far-ranging and creative thought to the future of his business and development of new product lines or services.

"Capital and access to capital are quite important to the small businessman in starting or expanding his business. While he may not have access to equity markets, private sources of capital are numerous. It should hardly be necessary to advise him to shop for the best bargain among suppliers of capital. Perhaps his best source of guidance is his local banker, who should be knowledgeable in all the areas of finance and business management. He may wish to fall back upon the SBA or a small business investment company loan to help him over a difficulty in capitalization. He should also be aware of all the managerial services which financial sources can furnish him.

"In view of the problem the small businessman faces in accumulating capital for expansion, he should be as articulate as possible in pressing for economies in Government and for tax reduction and reform to minimize the burden on small corporations.

"The small businessman who fails to keep abreast of developments within the total economy cannot utilize the advantages his smallness gives him—the ability to move quickly as changes occur in the particular function he performs, and the ease of shifting to a related function as the demand for his product or service changes."

U.S. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN: My best advice to small businessmen today is as follows:

"As a small businessman, you have an opportunity to increase your share in a trillion dollar market. According to the Internal Revenue Service's analysis of business tax returns for 1962, receipts of business concerns topped $1 trillion.

"Whether you, as a small businessman, are going to share in these record sales depends primarily on how expertly you manage your business. Experience has shown that consumers will flock to the attractively designed, progressively managed store or service establishment and will tend to avoid the down-at-the-heel establishments which reflect old-fashioned management.

"More than ever before, the key to sales and profits is management. Last year, close to 16,000 small concerns went bankrupt, according to Dun & Bradstreet. Most of these casualties were the victims of poor management.

"The only way for small businessmen to avoid the pitfalls of mismanagement and to

make reasonably certain that they will share in our tremendously expanding national sales volume, is to become better managers. Therefore, every owner of a small enterprise should look long and hard at his business methods. He should ask himself is he operating his business as smartly as is his competitor.

"If his personal management audit suggests that there is room for improvement, several sources of assistance are readily available. Suppliers and wholesalers can be counted on to furnish helpful suggestions. Also, trade associations, banks, accountants, lawyers, professional management consultants, and Government agencies can be relied upon to take a constructive interest in the problems of small businessmen.

"In fact, the Small Business Administration was created by Congress to assist small businessmen with their problems—including those of management. The SBA cosponsors many business management courses, conferences, and seminars for businessmen who are willing to admit that they don't 'know it all' and want to learn more about the most modern business techniques and methods.

"As everyone knows, there is no magic formula which guarantees success in business. Indeed, risk is the essence of our free enterprise system. However, in today's intensely competitive climate, there is no better insurance against unnecessary risk-taking and the ever-present possibility of declining sales than for small businessmen to keep step with the newest developments in business management."

U.S. Representative JOE L. EVINS: "My best advice to small businessmen today is as follows:

"The commanding position which big business occupies in much of America today has led many to write off the future of small business. As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I reject this philosophy. It is based on an inadequate understanding of the basic advantages and vitality of small business enterprises—a philosophy proved wrong by American experience.

"Several million small businesses live and grow in the very shadow of corporate giants. How do they do it and how can they do it better?

"I have no startling answers. My contacts with many successful small businessmen have taught me that there is one common thread running through the fabric of these resourceful entrepreneurs. It is that they have capitalized on the unique advantages associated with smallness. Just as there are advantages to bigness, so are there advantages to smallness. These include greater flexibility, the ability to cater to a special market, the ability to project directly the owner-manager's personality, the willingness to try new ways and new ideas because he doesn't have a vested interest in old ways, old ideas, or old methods. It is often the little businessman who produces new products and contrives new methods and procedures. He is anxious, willing, and ready to innovate. He is resourceful—the very essence of free enterprise.

"It is well for the small businessman to remember and to recognize that he has these advantages. And he should strive constantly to exploit them fully to his advantage in his day-to-day fight with his bigger competitors. The competitive vigor and survival of the small businessman depends in a great measure on more than his own initiative and creativity. His fate is determined in the marketplace. It is imperative, I believe, that the rules in the competitive game be fair. The House Small Business Committee is dedicated not only to helping small business, but also to promoting fair competition. The committee concluded in a recent report that competitive conditions and business practices make up perhaps the greatest factor in determining the fortunes of many small business enterprises. Since the antitrust laws (along with many other statutes) were enacted by Congress to preserve, promote, and assist small business, I believe that small businessmen should concern themselves with their enforcement and interpretation.

"I also believe that small businessmen should take a greater interest in our national affairs—in fiscal and monetary policies. Economic history teaches clearly that recessions take an awful toll of small business. Even the relatively mild postwar recessions of 1954, 1958, and 1960 had an exceedingly adverse effect on many small businesses. Business failures were pushed to new postwar highs, and there were deep cuts in the profits of those which did not fail. For example, in the recession of 1958, the profits of the average business with assets under $1 million were cut in half.

"Small business men in many sections of the country frequently do not become aware of the effects of major national actions that are intertwined so intimately with their own future. The small business man is not an island to himself. In the long run, his fortunes rise and fall with the overall turn of national economic events.

"Admittedly, debates over monetary policies and other subjects seem frequently to be far removed from Murfreesboro, Tenn., or Wichita, Kans. But these and other broad economic problems ultimately do have an effect up and down every Main Street in America. I would suggest, therefore, that every small businessman take an active interest in national affairs—to learn more about these problems and how the Congress and administrative agencies deal with them.

"Small businessmen must let their voices be heard. Our House Small Business Committee is working to help them in this way, and in other ways, to assure that their views are made known in the halls of the people."

John E. Horne: "My best advice to small businessmen today is—

"There may have been a time when sound management practices were not of such great importance, when the primary needs of a businessman were money, men, materials, and a bit of luck to make the grade. But today's sharply competitive business market demands shrewd professional management. Those businesses that think they can do without it, I am afraid, have only a short life expectancy. In fact, the lack of sound management practices constitutes the greatest single cause of small business failures.

"To sum it all up, although the Government is helping the small businessman to prosper and survive, the Government cannot do the job alone. It cannot legislate the small businessman into prosperity. It can only guide him.

"For this reason, the small businessman must assume the role of the driver, rather than the hitchhiker, in our vast new programs of space and technological advances, as well as in the everyday world of business.

"It has been my observation that the unique qualities which make the small businessman—his secret of success, if you will—are the qualities which make him a leader in his own town. He is the civic club member active in municipal affairs. He is the man with ideas for progress and innovation. He is the lifeblood of his community.

"Based on studies of small firms which have been successful, it is evident that there are several basic practices which have contributed to their success. These include:

"1. A continuous effort by top management to learn more about what is happening in the business world today, at both the manufacturing and distributive levels.

"2. Sound financial planning, with changes or expansion based on adequate capital which is readily available on terms that can be met without undue strain.

"3. An efficient recordkeeping system which permits a constant and easy check on each part of a business operation.

"4. Constant evaluation of market trends and customer demands to make sure that items being produced or sold, or services being provided, are those the ultimate consumer desires.

"5. A continuous advertising and promotional campaign directed at reaching the most people at the least cost.

"6. A method for keeping abreast of Federal, State, and local legislation affecting business and regulations to be observed.

"7. An employee relations program which encourages diligence and suggestions to improve the business, with appropriate recognition for outstanding accomplishments.

"The businessman who faithfully maintains such practices as these will undoubtedly be successful."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Memorial Services for Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1963, this honorable legislative body lost one of its most distinguished and warmly loved Members. Few men have been honored in their lifetime as much as was my distinguished predecessor, the Congressman from the 15th District of Pennsylvania, Representative Francis E. Walter.

I know that I do not need to remind any of you who knew him for so many years and worked with him so closely of his great and lasting distinction as a lawmaker, a statesman, and a human being. He was among the most brilliant Members this House has ever had. His work will be recorded in the annals of our history throughout the days of this magnificent Republic.

Because no one in this country could have known him or revered his memory more dearly than those who were closely associated with him at home, I beg permission to enter into this RECORD the proceedings of a memorial service held in honor of and out of respect to "Tad" Walter in the Court of Common Pleas of Northampton County, Pa., on the 2d day of December 1963, with the Honorable William G. Barthold, president judge, and the Honorable Carleton T. Woodring and the Honorable Clinton Budd Palmer, judges of the Northampton County third judicial district of Pennsylvania presiding.

In attendance at that memorial service were the distinguished members of the bar in Northampton County and many of those who had been associated with "Tad" Walter throughout his lifetime. It is in their words and in their memory that the true greatness of "Tad" Walter is best exemplified:

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, PA., IN RE MEMORIAL SERVICES IN HONOR OF AND RESPECT TO HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, DECEASED

Before the Honorable William G. Barthold, president judge, and the Honorable Carleton T. Woodring and the Honorable Clinton Budd Palmer, judges, Northampton County third judicial district, Pennsylvania, presiding especially for the memorial services of the Honorable Francis E. Walter, deceased, Monday morning, December 2, 1963, in courtroom No. 1, Northampton County Courthouse, Easton, Pa.

Judge BARTHOLD. The court recognizes Mr. McFadden, chairman of the resolutions committee.

Mr. MCFADDEN. If your honors please, in compliance with the request of Mr. Sigmon, and on behalf of the committee, I would like to offer the following resolution:

Francis E. Walter was born on May 26, 1894 at Easton, Northampton County, Pa., a son of Robley D. Walter, M.D., and Susie (Hess) Walter. Dr. Walter was a distinguished member of the medical profession and highly respected in Easton and throughout Northampton County.

Mr. Walter was educated in the Easton public schools, George Washington University and Georgetown University School of Law. He received the degree of A.B. from George Washington University, and LL.B. degree from Georgetown University School of Law and Honorary LL.D. degrees from Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., and Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pa.

He was admitted to the bar of Northampton County on March 13, 1922, and thereafter actively practiced law in the courts of Northampton County, as well as the Superior and Supreme Courts of Pennsylvania and the various Federal courts, individually and in association with the Honorable Carleton T. Woodring and Moses A. Strausburg, Esq., under the firm name of Walter, Woodring & Strausburg, until his heavy responsibilities as a Member of Congress impelled him to withdraw from active practice. Mr. Walter was elected to the 73d Congress in 1932 and remained a Member of Congress until his death.

During World War I, Mr. Walter answered the call of his country and served as a seaman and ensign. He was again commissioned in the U.S. Navy during World War II as a lieutenant commander.

In addition to his private practice of the law, Mr. Walter acted as solicitor to the commissioners of Northampton County and served as a member of the board of directors of the Easton National Bank & Trust Co. of Easton, Pa. and as a director and vice president of the Broad Street Trust Co. at Philadelphia, Pa.

Within a few years of his admission to the bar, Mr. Walter became an outstanding trial lawyer and participated in many important cases, bringing to the trial of these cases not only a deep understanding of human nature but remarkable resourcefulness and great capacity as an advocate.

There is no doubt, that Mr. Walter by entering public life as a distinguished, fearless and farsighted Member of Congress deprived the bar of Northampton County of one of its most able practitioners, and all of us who were privileged to follow his splendid career and enjoy his friendship mourn his passing.

If Your Honor please, I would move that when court adjourns today, it do so out of respect to the memory of our fellow member of the bar, the late Francis E. Walter.

Judge BARTHOLD. The court recognizes Judge Woodring to speak for the court.

Judge WOODRING. President Judge Barthold, Judge Palmer, Mrs. William L. Mack, daughter of our distinguished honoree, Miss Ruth Miskell, Mrs. Helen D. Sutton, and Miss Sandra Baurkot, members of the staff of Mr. Walter, my fellow members of the bar, ladies and gentlemen, if I may be permitted a personal privilege to talk informally just for a moment by way of introduction, you might be interested to know that on my return to Easton after graduation from the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania I had no plans, no intentions. I think I was not registered in any law office, and all I had was a diploma and some bad teeth, and I went to the Drake Building to see a dentist. On the way down from that office the elevator stopped at the second floor, and on the door I saw the name of Francis E. Walter, attorney at law.

I had grown up in the same block with Mr. Walter, where we knew him as "Tad," but I hadn't seen him for many years. I had been away at school, college, and then some other work for 4 years and then law school for 3 years, so I hadn't seen Mr. Walter for a long time; but when I saw the name, I thought, "I think I will go in and say hello to Mr. Walter"—I had nothing else to do. It was "depression days"; nobody had very much to do. I went in, and his secretary announced me.

Mr. Walter was the county solicitor. He was working on some very unusual law pertaining to the building of county roads. The county of Northampton had just built some concrete roads, which was an innovation in those days, and in the law it was rather unique for counties themselves to build the roads. He was looking up the law of land damages concerning these roads, and he came out, when I was announced, and he shook hands with me, and he said, "Come in and sit down. I've got some problems here." And I am still sitting in that office.

Last May, with one of my fellow members of the bar, I contemplated a trip. I knew that Mr. Walter was critically ill, and I took a trip to Washington to see him. After our too short visit he grasped me by the hand and, sick and weak as he was, he gave me a hearty handshake, and he said, "Carl."

Between those two handshakes has been a lifetime of most satisfactory friendship and loyalty and the kind of a relation that can't be expressed in words. It has to be lived and felt and appreciated.

REMARKS OF HON. CARLETON T. WOODRING

The life of the Hon. Francis E. Walter, Member of Congress, may be likened to innumerable facets of a mountain stream: rippling in the bright sunshine of its progress toward the sea, plunging headlong over the falls and rapids of adversity, flowing magnificently through the deep pools of accomplishments, inexorably carving its way through the granite walls of confinement and hardship. And, like the stream which was fashioned to serve man, Mr. Walter's life was steadfastly dedicated to that purpose. A man of deep humility, he was a true friend and a loyal servant.

My colleagues at the bar in their remarks and resolution have summarized his biography and legal career. It was my singular privilege to be associated with Mr. Walter as law clerk, partner, and office companion for more than 30 years. His law practice, at first principally in the criminal courts, was marked with outstanding success—a success built upon a thorough knowledge of the law, a practical understanding of logic and applied psychology, a rich humor, and a sincere devotion to a demanding profession. Attorney Walter's success included such goals of achievement and accomplishment as favorable verdicts in the trial courts, affirmances in the supreme and superior courts and retainers from leading citizens, foreign and domestic corporations and numerous municipalities, including the county of Northampton which he served as county solicitor for 5 years. He was a tough adversary, but one whose charming personality claimed every member of the bar as his close friend. He enjoyed an intimate, albeit respectful, relationship with the court.

Law, politics, and statesmanship: these were his areas of devoted action and all were marked with success of a high order and degree.

Mr. Walter's paternal grandfather, father, and two uncles were physicians and Democrats. From them Tad acquired two traits: (1) Service to mankind, and (2) a strong party loyalty. He believed sincerely in good governmental services; and when his party leaders recommended an unworthy candidate, one motivated by self-seeking rather than public welfare, Tad raised a loud voice in protest and bent every effort in opposition. His courage and forthrightness were not long unnoticed, and at the age of 34 he was elected a delegate to the Democratic national convention in Houston, Tex., where he cast his ballot for Alfred E. Smith. He represented the Commonwealth as a delegate at large at many other national conventions, and served as the presiding officer at several of them.

In 1932, Mr. Walter was elected to the Congress of the United States, and he was reelected to that high office each biennium thereafter until his death on May 31, 1963. in the Congress, Representative Walter gained the affection and esteem of Members on both sides of the House and Senate. He was a skilled parliamentarian, and a confidant and adviser of Presidents. He did not practice personal aggrandizement, however, and broke with Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, and with Harry S. Truman over executive objections to the Immigration Law. He was a master politician and rendered highly personalized representation to all the people in his district and, parenthetically, to numerous persons beyond the district. He was possessed of vast energies and a driving ambition.

In the Congress "Tad," on three occasions, was elected chairman of the Democratic caucus. He was elected Speaker pro tempore of the 81st Congress and was appointed Speaker pro tempore of the 87th Congress. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and chairman of the House patronage committee. On more than one occasion when the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole Mr. Walter was selected chairman because of his magnificent skill and impartiality. When he thus presided during the debate on the last civil rights bill, the House broke into a thunderous ovation in which opponents and proponents of the bill joined in tribute to a great Congressman.

Tad's legislative career evidenced a great versatility. At first much of his time was devoted to labor legislation. He performed monumental service in writing and working for 9 years for the enactment of the Administrative Procedures Act which protects the rights of individuals against an encroaching bureaucracy. He coauthored and was responsible for the enactment, over presidentical veto, of the McCarran-Walter immigration and nationality bill. He conceived and put through the Congress the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the first legislation which opened our doors to 420,000 displaced persons who had been driven from their homes in the Second World War. He was equally responsible for the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the emergency parole program for Hungarian refugees in 1956. Tad was the founder of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and served as the U.S. delegate at the semiannual meetings in Geneva, Switzerland, throughout the balance of his life.

These humanitarian efforts to help the poor, the weak, and the homeless whose lives were shattered by war and dictatorship have gained worldwide recognition. To merely list the major awards presented to Congressman Walter requires more time and space than these brief remarks afford. They include all of the national veterans' organizations, national service clubs, American Bar Association, patriotic societies, universities, the Japanese Government, the Order of Orange-Nassau presented by the Netherlands Government, the Cross of Commander in the Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy, the Captive European Nations Award, the Olivier Van Noor Medallion presented by the Board of Netherlands Migration Foundation, the Steuben Award by the Steuben Society of America, and a plaque by the Jewish Community Center of Easton which reads, in part: "Give me your tired, and your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore, send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me. * * *" Mr. Walter took upon himself the sufferings and needs of all these people. His service to them was a compulsion from which there was no escape.

Mr. Walter was a true patriot in the real sense of the word. He served in combat naval aviation in World Wars I and II; in the former as a seaman and ensign, and in the latter as a lieutenant commander. He evidenced a deep gratitude for the privilege of citizenship in a free nation. He was unflagging in his efforts to protect the United States of America from foes within as well as those without. Mr. Walter was a man of humility but, with pardonable pride in his family's service record, he has listed in his own hand—I might say on the back of an envelope—the name and rank of his grandfather's—Dr. Barnet C. Walter's—eight grandsons and great-grandsons. Seven of them, including Francis E. Walter, were officers in the U.S. Naval Reserves. The remaining one was a sergeant in the U.S. Army. Behind that name Mr. Walter has written "bad eyes."

Congressman Walter's legislative record was too extensive to recite at length. Two additional matters must be included, however: (1) He was one of the leading forces in the creation of a legislatively most unusual Federal-State Delaware River Basin Compact which will benefit millions of residents in Northeastern United States through flood control and more conservative use of the watersheds' land and water resources; (2) he was untiring in serving his constituents. No request was too menial or small for his prompt and courteous attention, nor was any request too large or difficult for his competent and able service.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 88th Congress, volume 109, Nos. 77 and 82, dated May 23 and June 3, 1963, record at considerable length the extended remarks of Mr. Walter's colleagues on the occasions of his birthday anniversary and his death. These are incorporated herein by reference as though more fully and at large set forth. To demonstrate the high regard in which he was held personally and professionally I would like to quote a few excerpts from those records:

Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK, minority leader of the Congress, said this, among other things: "He was highly capable; he backed his convictions with tremendous courage in the face of sometimes bitter opposition. * * * Not in my time have I known a more effective and unrelenting foe of the Communist conspiracy. I know of no single individual who has shown more sympathy and understanding for unhappy victims of that conspiracy from foreign lands. Literally thousands upon thousands of human beings owe their chances for a new life of freedom in America in large measure to the efforts of 'Tad' Walter. He was a stalwart patriot and a rugged champion of the downtrodden."

Mr. FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky, said this: "Francis Walter shall be missed as one of the best Congressmen who ever served in this legislative body," and then he gave a true definition, in my opinion, of Mr. Walter's traits, "Under a self-developed and disciplined air of so-called toughness, there beat a heart filled to the brim with compassion, sympathy, helpfulness, and understanding of all his fellow men."

Mr. HALE BOGGS, the majority whip in the Congress, said this: "I doubt that any man in this Congress, or in any other Congress, has ever personally touched with a helping hand more individual human lives."

Mr. Walter's death closes a chapter in my life. I was born and grew up in the block in which he lived. I have known him throughout my life. I have been closely associated with him in my practice of the law and my political activities. I shall miss him more than I can say. To me "Tad" Walter was a warm, kind, helpful, personal friend. The people of the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania have lost a humble, capable, devoted servant. The people of Pennsylvania and of the United States have lost a great patriot and splendid statesman.

Judge BARTHOLD. Thank you, Judge Woodring. The court joins in and heartily approves the beautiful eulogy delivered by Judge Woodring. The resolution submitted by the Bar Association of Northampton County is unanimously approved and adopted. The official court reporter is directed to transcribe these proceedings, so that they may be made a part of our court records. The court further directs that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Congressman Walter's achievements contained in volume 109, Nos. 77 and 82, dated May 23, and June 3, 1963, be attached to the minutes of these proceedings as physical exhibits, so that they will become not only a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which they presently are, but also will become a part of the records of Northampton County. The court further directs that the resolution of the Northampton County Bar Association and the eulogy delivered by Judge Woodring be printed in the Northampton County Reporter and that copies of the proceedings be forwarded to the members of the family and the staff of Mr Walter.

When this court adjourns, it will adjourn out of respect to and memory of the Honorable Francis E. Walter, able lawyer, distinguished statesman, dedicated Representative of this congressional district, and a truly great man.

The court will now be in recess in order that the members of the bar and other friends of the late Honorable Francis E. Walter may greet his family at this time.

Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. O. L. Wahlgren, of Elizabeth, Minn., has written me expressing concern over selling U.S. wheat to Russia. Mr. Wahlgren enclosed two clippings taken from the Wadena, Minn., Pioneer Journal that he requested be shared with my colleagues through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am pleased to comply with his request and the articles, in the form of letters to the editor, follow:

WHY SEND WHEAT TO DEDICATED ENEMIES?

WADENA, MINN.

EDITOR, JOURNAL:

I am very disappointed with the passage of the wheat deal with Russia. It is an outrage when an issue is continually voted on until it is passed. Then why vote at all?

At our recent Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation annual meeting we defeated a resolu-

tion to trade wheat to Russia—even for cash—mainly because it is morally wrong. That which is morally wrong can never be economically or politically right. Communism's greatest handicap is a lack of food; therefore it is just as essential to them as bullets. If we feed our dedicated enemy, then why do we spend $50 billion a year for defense?

How can we explain subsidizing our enemy and spill American blood to fight this enemy at the same time. I urge you to do everything possible to rescind this action, and to alert the American people to the dangers of it.

It's time that we put our spiritual values above our material values. Freedom is worth more than food; and with freedom the Russian people will acquire food.

DON RICHTER.

UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE ADVANTAGE OF RUSSIAN FOOD SHORTAGE

EDITOR, JOURNAL:

It looks as if Americans again have been lulled to sleep by their own apathy—I am referring to the sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

There are a few sleepy-eyed individuals who see only the dollar sign and who may actually think this sale may help the American economy. But the return the United States is getting for this wheat is at world discount prices. Furthermore, the Russian deal is so arranged that the U.S. Government is to subsidize shipping costs.

We have spent billions to combat communism; and thousands of our young men have died on foreign soil fighting communism.

Why do we not now take the opportunity to turn the Russian food crisis to our advantage? Surely there is the possibility of destruction of their system from within if the Russian Government had to return to food rationing. At least the Government would lose face with its people.

Undoubtedly there are Americans, who by their Christian beliefs, feel that we should "turn the other cheek"—those who would not deny food to any peoples regardless of their past transgressions against us or their potential treachery to us.

It is this belief, portrayed by actions, which has earned for the American people the adjectives generous, kind, and softhearted. But just because as a people we are softhearted does not mean we should be softheaded as well.

Why, in future negotiations with the U.S.S.R. concerning U.S. wheat, do we not demand concessions in Cuba, Berlin, or anywhere else that the Russian Bear has reduced human dignity to monstrous slavery?

Wheat valued at $90 million was sold to Russia last week, but perhaps it is not too late for the rest of the intended wheat sale to be blockaded—if we Americans would wake up long enough to write our Congressmen.

Mrs. H. M. BUTZLOFF.

Senator Goldwater Should Explain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a great many Americans were disturbed and shocked a few days ago to hear a prominent U.S. Senator who also serves as a major general in the Air Force cast doubt upon the reliability of the missiles which now are such a vital part of this Nation's defenses.

Since the Air Force has been entrusted with the major part of our missile network, and since the Air Force only recently has been asking increased funds for missile construction, this charge by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, an Air Force major general, was indeed most alarming.

One American whose concern was aroused by this statement was a newspaper editor in Senator GOLDWATER's own State, Mr. William R. Mathews of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson. In an editorial published last Thursday, January 16, Mr. Mathews notes that, by implication, Senator GOLDWATER "accuses his fellow officers of not only carrying out a program that he says is a failure, but of deceiving the people of the United States into believing in the Air Force missile program."

It happens that one of the largest missile installations in the United States encircles the city of Tucson, where Mr. Mathews' newspaper is published. The editor wonders if Senator GOLDWATER really means that these missiles will "fizzle out in various ways" before they reach their targets. He concludes:

It is up to Senator GOLDWATER to follow through and back up his charges. If he can prove their truth, he will have performed an historic service for his country. If he fails or refuses to back up his charges, he will leave a gap that will not increase confidence in him as a Senator, and certainly not as a possible future President.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I insert the editorial from the Arizona Daily Star at this point in the Appendix:

SENATOR GOLDWATER SHOULD EXPLAIN

When Senator BARRY GOLDWATER expressed publicly his lack of faith in what has become our growing missile complex, he made a charge so serious that it questions the reliability of those missiles to perform the mission for which they have been designed. That could be a fatal deficiency.

Such being the case, it is up to BARRY to give a reasonable explanation of how he has come to such a shocking conclusion. As a major general in the Air Force reserve, he surely has access to vital information that the public should know about.

Since the Air Force snatched the missile business away from the Army, what has been done—save for the Navy's own successful submarine missile development—has been done by the Air Force. Thus, by implication, he accuses his fellow officers of not only carrying out a program that he says is a failure, but of deceiving the people of the United States into believing in the Air Force missile program.

For instance, right here in a ring around Tucson we have 18 different missile sites, built at a cost of more than $100 million. The missiles have been installed, with crews of missile-trained airmen taking charge. These Titan II missiles have a range of more than 6,000 miles. They are loaded with their hydrogen bomb warheads, and soon will be ready to take off with the mere pushing of a button.

The gist of BARRY's statement amounts to his saying that a decisive number of these missiles will fizzle out in various ways before they reach their targets, and thus fail the Nation in a time of extreme peril. Therefore, he says, we should restore more faith in bombers, of which we are building no more long-range ones. The B-47's will be phased out by 1965, while the 600 B-52's and 80 B-58's will become obsolete by 1970.

There can be public concern about this prospective development, if these missiles fail to perform. How can we maintain our nuclear deterrent, unless we have a reliable way to carry our nuclear power into its target area? If the Navy can launch missiles that work from submarines under water, why does Air Force Major General GOLDWATER express publicly a complete lack of confidence in what the Air Force has done?

The public is entitled to know more of the truth about the feasibility of long-range bombers getting through defenses to reach their targets. Are bombers obsolete? Can enough of them get through to carry out their missions?

It is up to Senator GOLDWATER to follow through and back up his charges. If he can prove their truth, he will have performed an historic service for his country. If he fails or refuses to back up his charges, he will leave a gap that will not increase confidence in him as a Senator, and certainly not as a possible future President.

Sense on Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days our attention has been focused on the unfortunate and disturbing events which have taken place in the Canal Zone. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I was particularly interested in the editorial "Sense on Panama," which appeared in the January 19 edition of the Baltimore Sunday Sun.

Emphasizing that the Panamanian situation should not become a political football, the editorial quotes from several Members of Congress able to see a situation straight through the clouds of politics. I was pleased to note that among these is our respected colleague, CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR. The reference to Mr. MATHIAS is a tribute to his leadership and to his ability to give thoughtful consideration to the best interest of our country.

I believe my colleagues in the Congress will be interested in reading this editorial:

SENSE ON PANAMA

The Panama picture is clouded not only by the interaction of events day by day, but by politics as well, in the two countries. A Panamanian election is coming up, and it is axiomatic in Panama's politics that candidates must vie one against the other in nationalistic postures, standing up to the giant to the north. In the United States too, an election is coming up, and the thinking of many Democrats and many Republicans is strongly colored by that fact, with Democrats fearing a failure that would lose votes, and Republicans looking sharply for a chance to accuse the Democrats of losing Panama.

Not all Democrats are narrowly on the political defensive, and not all Republicans concerned only with partisan advantage. Senator MANSFIELD, for example, suggested straightforwardly last week that North Amer-

ican authority and responsibility in the Canal Zone badly need coordinating, that we must realize that the canal is well along toward obsolescence, that we should not get the interests of the United States mixed up with personal interpretations of those interests by residents of the zone nor ought we confuse our real objectives with questions of false pride or prestige or hypothetical considerations of the meaning of sovereignty. From the Republican side of the Senate, Senator JAVITS praised Mr. MANSFIELD'S statement as "temperate and constructive," though declaring that the United States cannot abandon the canal. And now from the Republican side of the House of Representatives another voice speaks in tones of temperance and sense.

Mr. MATHIAS, of Maryland, says with Mr. JAVITS that the United States has no choice but to stand firm in the present crisis—a proposition with which no one disagrees—but beyond that he joins Mr. MANSFIELD in the longer view, calling for a straightening out of authority, seeing the canal as an asset on the wane both strategically and economically and in particular putting his finger on the sorest of Panamanian spots, the difference in standards of life between the zone and the country. Of the hardship bonus for American personnel in the zone he says: "We've been kidding ourselves for years * * * the canal has not been a hardship post since they ran the mosquitoes out."

Mr. MATHIAS is right, as Mr. MANSFIELD is right. It is to thoughtful men like these, able to see a situation straight through the clouds of politics, that we need to listen as we work out a policy once the present crisis is past—trusting that in Panama, too, there are thoughtful men able to look beyond the moment and above politics.

Medicare's Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, quite a voluminous record has been built for and against H.R. 3920, which is often incorrectly called medicare. It should be noted that the present designation of the legislation is the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963.

It seems to me that to help complete the record the editorial contained in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News of January 17, 1964, is pertinent:

MEDICARE'S WEAKNESS

A weakness of the Kennedy administration's health insurance program was the fact that it did not include elderly persons not covered by social security. This omission has been successfully attacked, notably by the American Medical Association.

Nevertheless, President Johnson is committed to an all-out fight for the program as is. In his state of the Union message and later before representatives of the elderly and experts on aging, Mr. Johnson made moving pleas for dignified protection for persons of 65 and over.

Against the AMA's further argument that the program opened the door to socialized medicine, the President pointed out, as did his predecessor, that under the program patients would choose their own physicians and hospitals. The plan would be financed by an additional social security tax of one-fourth of 1 percent on employees and employers.

But the administration's plan still excludes elderly persons not under the social security umbrella, and not eligible to receive medicare under the 1960 Kerr-Mills law which requires a means test.

Not to includes this group will arm opponents who aim to keep the administration's plan bottled up in the House Ways and Means Committee. If, as Mr. Johnson promised, health insurance is "going to be the law of the land," all elderly persons will have to be considered.

Tobacco Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the Surgeon General's tobacco report, but before I do I think I should set the record straight. I represent a congressional district which produces $20 million worth of tobacco a year; I own and operate a tobacco farm in southern Anne Arundel County; and I smoke more than a pack of cigarettes a day.

We have known for some years that tobacco, and primarily cigarettes, have an adverse effect on health. The Surgeon General's report serves a very useful purpose because it reviews, condenses, and interprets all the research and information so far available on the effect of tobacco on health. But it is not a definitive report, nor does it pretend to be. There is much that has yet to be learned about this problem.

Unquestionably, the Federal Government has a responsibiltiy to publicize the known effects of tobacco on health. It also has a responsibility to sponsor continuing research into this problem, and as a Member of Congress I will direct my efforts to helping our Government live up to these responsibilities.

In studying the report and the other information that has been made available in recent days, I have been struck by several points. For instance, the study group was not able to make any sound conclusions with regard to the usefulness of filters in cutting down the hazards of smoking—filters may be helpful, but there is not enough information available on them yet. Lung cancer as a result of smoking cigars and pipes is much less likely than from smoking cigarettes. The quantity and length of time one has smoked is a very important factor in determining the likelihood of getting cancer or another disease. The conclusions in the report pertain almost exclusively to men; they are not fully applicable to women because as yet not enough information is available. The connection between lung cancer and tobacco may be due in part to a rare radioactive metal found on tobacco leaves. If this connection is established it may then be possible to filter this particular substance out of the smoke. And, in spite of the fact that so many of the conclusions on health and tobacco definitely established a relationship between smoking and various ailments, as yet not enough information is available to determine if smoking is positively the cause of the ailment. All this points up the fact that more research is badly needed.

There are, too, some other factors which indicate the impact of the tobacco industry on our economy and the involvement of our society with smoking which I think we should keep in mind during this debate. I mentioned the importance of tobacco production to my congressional district. On a nationwide basis tobacco is the fifth largest cash crop for which the consumer spends $8 billion annually. Production involves over 700,000 farm families and approximately 100,000 factory workers. The taxes on tobacco amount to $3.3 billion annually, about $2 billion of which goes to the Federal Government and $1 billion to State and local governments. There are 70 million smokers in the United States, or more than one-third of our total population.

In the coming months the debate on tobacco and health will gain considerable momentum. Various Federal agencies will, I am certain, exercise their responsibilities to the public either by implementing new regulations, or publicizing additional information, or both. Legislation has already been introduced in Congress designed to make sure the smoker is fully aware of the facts and the Federal Trade Commission has proposed a requirement that tobacco packaging contain a warning that smoking is injurious to health. This is largely a whole new area of governmental involvement for all of us and, therefore, I am sure that executive or congressional action will not come hastily or without very serious consideration of the impact of the proposals and the complications which they may bring. For my own part, as I said earlier, I will attempt to help in any way I can the Federal Government fulfill its responsibility of making all the facts known.

Is This the Best Way To Honor J.F.K.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the time that the House was debating the issue of building the National Cultural Center as a memorial to the late President Kennedy, I took the floor to urge caution and a little more deliberation in reaching a final decision on how to memorialize Mr. Kennedy. Since that time, there has been considerable comment, both pro and con, on my position, but I was pleased to note a thoughtful editorial from the January 10 issue of the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times,

which finds some reason and good judgment in the approach I recommended.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial, "Is This the Best Way To Honor J.F.K.?" in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

IS THIS THE BEST WAY TO HONOR J.F.K.?

Called upon to decide a case on its merits, Congress has just flunked another test.

With a whoop and a holler of a voice vote—and an overwhelming Democratic majority, the House decided $31 million in Federal funds should be spent toward building the National Cultural Center as a memorial to the late President Kennedy.

There was not much in the way of conflict in the Senate. A bill already passed there differed only in one word. It did not agree with the House version that this should be designated as the "sole" memorial to Mr. Kennedy in the Washington area.

The opposition to the spending of Federal money for this particular project, and it was mostly Republican, was not because of any reluctance to do honor to the late President. Rather, it was based upon a plea for more time to decide whether this promised the most appropriate tribute.

One of the leaders of the forces which urged less haste and more judicious deliberation was Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Davenport. He sought the creation of a congressional commission to consider suggestions for a memorial, and then to recommend one of them.

As one of Congress authorities upon history, SCHWENGEL cited the lapse of years which assured a truly great memorial for Abraham Lincoln.

"Like so many other indiscriminate tributes," it was pointed out by the New York Times, "this proposal has been rushed through the Senate—and now the House—out of a sense of grief, irrespective of its meaning or its appropriateness. While John F. Kennedy was a highly cultured and civilized man, his interest in the arts was only one of many pursuits."

Opponents to this particular project raised a question, too, whether the net effect of the appropriation might not be to bail out a project which had failed to win the popular support required for financing by public subscription.

Congressman WIDNALL, of New Jersey, argued further that the Government in effect was pledging itself to provide annual operating funds because a Presidential memorial could not be permitted to go bankrupt.

It may be a matter of lasting regret that Congress, ignoring sound and reasonable representations, chose to build a memorial to the martyred President upon such uncertain ground.

An Effective Quarantine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, every prudent American knows, or should know, of the threat posed to hemispheric solidarity by Castro's Cuba. Time after time we read of Cuban trained agents attempting to destroy the normal democratic processes of countries all over the world.

The Panamanian problem represents another trouble spot which has been irritated by Castro's exported agents.

Recently I conducted a poll in my district and found that while there was no great sentiment for direct military action against Cuba at this time, there was an overwhelming opinion that an economic quarantine should be imposed. Recent activities, including inconsistencies in our own foreign policy, makes me fear that we are not doing enough to combat the influence of those who would seek to destroy us.

I include for the RECORD today a fine editorial which appeared in the Scranton Tribune on January 11, 1964, on the Cuban bus deal:

CUBA'S BUS DEAL

The announcement that a British firm has agreed to sell Communist Cuba 400 buses underscores the failure of the 3-year-old U.S. policy of economic isolation formulated to bring about the downfall of Fidel Castro's regime.

Under the "isolation" policy, ships which deliver the buses to Cuba will be banned from U.S. ports, but the blacklisting obviously is no deterrent to British trade with Cuba. Vessels flying the British flag top the list of vessels serving Castro's ports. Unusually heavy ship unloading activity has been observed in Cuba the past month.

The U.S. State Department has criticized the transaction, valued at over $10 million, which calls for delivery of the buses and spare parts under a 5-year credit plan. The bus shipment will ease one of Castro's biggest problems. Transportation in Cuba has been in a desperate condition. The plight of Cuba's railroads has been alarming and, prior to the bus deal with the British, bus lines were abandoned because of lack of equipment.

Anti-Castro exile organizations are especially bitter about the bus agreement and are charging the British with putting commercial considerations above morality. The criticism may be unduly harsh and, in the British view at least, unjust. And there is a surprising factor in the deal because Castro only last month seized the funds of British insurance firms.

Washington reportedly has been reviewing policies concerning Cuba. The study was ordered by President Johnson 3 weeks after he took office and is certain to be accelerated by reaction to the bus deal.

In support of the evidence of a continued brisk shipping traffic into Cuba ports there is a report that in a recent single week 34 ships, carrying more than 76,000 tons of cargo, were unloaded. The statistics make the economic isolation of Castro look like a somewhat futile operation.

Safeguards To Reduce the Admitted Risks and Hazards of Test Ban Treaty Which Were Promised Have Not Been Established and No One Seems To Care Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when the limited test ban was before the other body for ratification a great to-do was made about the numerous risks and hazards involved in the pact. Not only were these risks and hazards admitted by the Kennedy administration to exist, but strenuous promises and protestations were made that all necessary steps would be taken to reduce them to the lowest feasible level.

Nothing much seems to be done about keeping these promises and no one seems to care much about it. No one has been designated at the White House level to see that the promises are kept. No appropriations of an order of magnitude I judge necessary after careful inquiry into the matter have been requested to finance the measures needed to keep the promises.

What of the national security? The most that I can gather is that no one seems to care much, at least as far as the test ban treaty safeguards are concerned.

What is the reason? Is it the euphoria that some predicted would follow the treaty? Is it just plain failure to "mind the store?". Or, is it something else, perhaps more sinister?

For the benefit of future students of our times who might, perhaps, be writing doctorial theses on some subject such as "Why the West Was Weak and Why Freedom Fell" I have asked permission to include below copies of my correspondence to the White House on the subject of the safeguards, together with such responses as it so far has elicited.

If my efforts in this matter bear no further fruit than that to date, at least they can be held forth as a prime example of an exercise in futility.

The correspondence, beginning September 24, the day of treaty ratification, is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Secretary Dean Rusk, Secretary Robert McNamara, Under Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, you, and others in your administration have conceded that there are risks and disadvantages in the limited test ban treaty. This concession is implicit from your assurances and promises to take steps to reduce the effects of these risks and disadvantages upon the national security.

The assurances and promises given have been instrumental in obtaining both Senate and public support for ratification of the treaty. In this sense, they constitute a solemn compact between you and the American people, which must be kept.

Among the steps to be taken, as outlined in separate communications each dated August 23, 1963, to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, from Under Secretary Gilpatric and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are the following:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities manned by topflight scientific personnel.

3. The maintenance of facilities and resources necessary for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of Soviet abrogation of the treaty or should the national security otherwise require.

4. The improvement of our capability to detect treaty violations and Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

Unfortunately, these assurances and promises have been only general in nature. What, specifically, in terms of personnel, material, and programs are needed to meet and keep them are yet to be determined. The Joint Chiefs' communication defined them as "criteria" and added that they were stated "necessarily in general language since additional study will be needed to determine specific standards and programs."

Obviously and regrettably, these specifics were not worked out before the treaty was negotiated. Had this been done, perhaps the treaty terms might have been written to make them less onerous and less expensive to carry out. In any event, the fundamental security of the country depends first, upon determining what they are, and, second, upon actually taking those actions specifically determined to be necessary to meet the criteria. Any error risking action less than the minimum necessary must be scrupulously avoided. Uncertainties always must be resolved positively, on the safe side, to make certain we adequately flesh-out all the necessary specifics of each of these skeletal general criteria.

Unfortunately, these specifics will involve a considerable effort because of the magnitude of the risks and disadvantages involved.

You, yourself, on February 7, 1962, described an atmospheric treaty without an adequate inspections system guarding against preparations for surprise abrogation as extremely vulnerable. The treaty at hand, of course, has no inspections system at all—adequate or inadequate.

Again, on March 2, 1962, you warned that if we are to maintain our scientific momentum and leadership, "our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves." The treaty at hand, of course, does fix such limitations.

At that time you also warned: "In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not only difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative and found it impossible of execution."

Thus, observing your assurances and promises respecting the treaty calls for doing the difficult, and, in addition, what you yourself have described as the impossible. It will surely call for a large expenditure and a large effort—much larger than Secretary McNamara indicated during his treaty testimony. For instance, his offhand estimate of the cost of maintaining a readiness-to-test posture was $200 million. My own calculations, detailed below, considerably enlarge this figure.

Unfortunately, also, there appears to be a line of resistance developing domestically against the taking of these vitally necessary actions at all. This was hinted in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times written by the scientist, Dr. Eugene P. Wigner. It was amplified in a letter to the editor of the New York Herald-Tribune by the scientist, Dr. Leo Szilard who argued that should the vigorous underground testing program be carried out, "then, rather than furthering the cause of peace, the test ban agreement would be likely to do just the opposite." Presumably his same reasoning also would apply in opposition to the other three categories of action to which you are committed. I note with apprehension that the thinking of even some of your official family seems to parallel that of Wigner and Szilard.

Thus, keeping your assurances and promises regarding steps to reduce the risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty will require, on your part, overcoming the resistance of some of the very people who work closely with you, as well as others who have given you strong and consistent political support.

In determining what, specifically, will have to be done to meet and keep your assurances and promises, certain fundamental considerations must be in mind. With respect to each of the criteria, these include:

UNDERGROUND TEST PROGRAM

Either a community must be built at the Nevada Test Site for personnel working there, or a rapid transit system from Las Vegas must be constructed in order to attract and keep topflight personnel on the work.

Due to the proximity of both the city of Las Vegas and the Hoover Dam to the Nevada site, there is a limitation on the yield of devices which can be tested underground there without unacceptable offsite seismic shock damage. It will be necessary to find and develop a second underground testing site for high-yield experiments.

Much greater discretion and flexibility in scheduling events and conducting tests will have to be given laboratory and test site personnel than was the case during our 1962 test series. At that time, I personally pointed out to Dr. Jerome Weisner, your science adviser, that his tendency, in your name, to act as test director from his office in Washington, remote from the Nevada and Pacific test sites, operated both to decrease the scientific data gained from the tests and increase the cost and difficulty of conducting them.

MAINTENANCE OF LABS AND RETENTION OF TOP FLIGHT SCIENTISTS

The test-site improvements and testing discretion at the laboratory and test-site levels discussed above also have a bearing on our ability to keep topflight scientists' interest in the nuclear weapons program under partial test-ban conditions.

The added difficulties of analyzing samples from underground experiments—contaminated with extraneous elements from the soil—requires added radio-chemistry facilities and personnel. Simulation facilities for other than underground environments and other limitations imposed by the treaty also require a boost in personnel and new laboratory physical facilities, equipment and instrumentation for diagnostic and extrapolation purposes.

The flow of qualified and capable new, young, topflight scientists into the nuclear weapons laboratories must be stimulated and encouraged by stepped-up activities at such nonweapons, but related facilities, as the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley.

The importance of immediate starts on new laboratory facilities—as encouraging physical evidence to our nuclear weapons scientists now working that their efforts are not devoted to a dead-end program—is most vital to prevent them from drifting away from the laboratories.

PROMPT READINESS FOR ATMOSPHERIC TESTING

This capability must include readiness to proof test weapons systems in stockpile, new experimental devices, and weapons effects in a variety of environments and under all operational conditions.

Since testing, if and when resumed, will be under emergency conditions, considerable redundancy in test hardware is necessary in order that tests may be conducted promptly and not suffer delay from the unavailability of standby equipment.

A complete missile range, including ICBM silos at both ends and operational anti-ICBM installations at one end must be in readiness for proof tests of both ICBM and anti-ICBM weapons, as well as to determine effects of nuclear explosions on the reliability and capabilities of each.

Johnstone Island, little larger than an aircraft carrier, is unsuitable for installing equipment which must obtain test data simultaneously from different directions. This triangulation problem must be solved. Proper readiness involves an ironclad agreement with the British for continuing access to and availability of Christmas Island facilities, installation of necessary testing equipment and facilities at Howland and Baker Islands, and construction of two, better three, unmanned floating test diagnostic ships, together with nuclear submarines which connect with these ships by underwater cable to protect test personnel safely underwater from the effects of weapons being tested.

Present aircraft available for collecting radioactive air samples at various vital altitudes are about worn out. They should be replaced by a new fleet of approximately 12 fully equipped aircraft.

A second fleet of three diagnostic aircraft should be provided in addition to the fleet of three aircraft now being readied. This will provide both a standby capability and a simultaneous testing capability for air-dropped experimental devices.

Both drop aircraft and rocket vehicles must be in readiness for the delivery of test devices.

Facilities should be provided for constantly updating and revising test schedules for instantaneous use in the event of test resumption—similar to procedures for keeping our strategic deterrent plans always current.

BROADENING AND IMPROVING DETECTION CAPABILITIES

Both the importance of, and difficulties regarding, this effort, plus a necessity for strict classification of equipment and installations, call for a relatively large effort and expenditure in this area.

The very fuzzy situation respecting both space-detection hardware and space-testing procedures requires prompt clarification.

My preliminary estimates of the capital expenditures required for hardware and facilities to meet your assurances and keep your promises to take the actions necessary for reducing the risks and disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty are as follows:

[In millions]

Underground testing program:	
Nevada Test Site improvements and additions	$50
Additional high yield test site	50
Total	100
Maintenance of labs and topflight scientists:	
Los Alamos Laboratory	25
Sandia Laboratory	25
Livermore Laboratory	50
DOD Laboratories	50
Education, training, and encouragement of topflight scientific personnel at weapons labs	10
Total	160
Readiness for atmospheric testing:	
Test range, silos, missiles, A-ICBM equipment, etc	150
3 pairs, surface/submarine effects tests units	300
Drop aircraft and rockets for launching experimental devices	20
2d standby diagnostic fleet (3 fully equipped jet aircraft)	25
3 aircraft for shuttling samples from test sites to labs for prompt analysis	10
Air sampling fleet (12 jet aircraft)	15

[In millions]

Readiness for atmospheric testing—Continued	
Johnstone/Howland/Baker/Christmas Island testing complex	$30
Rear base logistic facilities	10
Upper atmosphere and space diagnostic/detection equipment	50
Total	610
Detection system improvements: Classified items	80
Miscellaneous and contingencies	50
Grand total	1,000

In addition to the foregoing capital outlays, which should be made promptly if we are to have a readiness for testing, it is estimated that the cost of maintaining, improving, and keeping this capability in constant readiness to move on an emergency basis will involve operating outlays of approximately $250 million annually.

It is sincerely hoped that you are planning to call upon Congress forthwith for funds of the foregoing magnitude to take the actions necessary to forestall, to the maximum extent possible, the disadvantages and risks to U.S. national security and survival inherent in the partial test ban treaty. Under the circumstance I see no possible course for me but to support such a request vigorously.

Very respectfully,

CRAIG HOSMER.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1963.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives

DEAR CRAIG: The President forwarded to the Commission your letter of September 24 on the question of safeguards under the limited test ban treaty. We have held up our answer until we could provide you with specific information on the outcome of planning and a review of funding requirements.

As you know, our principal assignment has been the development, in coordination with the Department of Defense, of detailed plans, such as those referred to in your letter, to assure a vigorous program of weapons development through underground testing, the maintenance of strong weapons laboratories and the retention of topflight scientists, and, in addition, a program that will enable us to maintain and strengthen our capability to resume testing promptly, should it become necessary.

I am enclosing, for your information, a copy of the Presidents letter of October 16, 1963, to the Speaker of the House, forwarding a request for an amendment to the Commission's fiscal year 1964 plant and capital equipment budget. This increase will be used to construct facilities, mainly in the Commission's three weapons laboratories, as a part of the safeguards program.

You will note from the President's letter that most of the Commission's part of the program will be funded by savings in and reprograming of available and budgeted funds, and that this program will complement the measures being taken by the Department of Defense.

The President's request will undoubtedly be forwarded to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I assume there will be an opportunity in the Committee for further discussion of the safeguards program when the Commission meets with the committee in executive session on October 24.

Sincerely yours,

Glenn,
GLENN T. SEABORG.

OCTOBER 18, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My letter to you dated September 24, 1963, concerning the above-captioned matter has just been answered by Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Dr. Glenn Seaborg, under date of October 17, 1963.

Dr. Seaborg's letter states your administration is seeking authorization to make the following treaty safeguards expenditures during the balance of fiscal year 1964:

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico:	
Occupational health laboratory	$1,650,000
High temperature chemistry facility	1,435,000
Plutonium research support building	655,000
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.	
Radiochemistry building	5,900,000
Hazards control addition	1,000,000
Plant engineering and services building	1,400,000
West cafeteria addition	255,000
Craft shop addition	200,000
Sandia Base, New Mexico:	
Development laboratory	3,780,000
Explosive facilities	540,000
Classified technical reports building (addition)	500,000
Nevada test site:	
Control point additions	630,000
Total	17,945,000

Dr. Seaborg's letter also indicates that a request for appropriation of $5,945,000 will be made and that the remaining $12 million of the total sum of $17,945,000 will be obtained by reallocating money already appropriated for other purposes.

For the purposes of comparison, I have prepared the following table setting out the sums I have estimated are necessary to establish the treaty safeguards you have promised and sums you requested on October 16:

Action required by promised safeguards	Cost estimated in Sept. 24, 1963, letter to you	Your Oct. 16, 1963, request	Percent
Underground test site improvement and additions	$100,000,000	$630,000	0.63
Weapons Laboratory improvements and retention of top flight scientists	160,000,000	17,315,000	10.82
Readiness for atmospheric tests resumption capability	610,000,000	----------	0
Detection system improvements and miscellaneous	130,000,000	----------	0
Total	1,000,000,000	17,945,000	1.79

This table indicates a serious discrepancy between your views and mine as to the actions required to implement the safeguards, their costs and as to the permissible delay in implementing them. This discrepancy is further enlarged by my estimate that, in addition to the original investment, at least one-fourth billion dollars must be spent annually to maintain the safeguards in operational efficiency.

Inasmuch as statements by yourself and members of your administration raise no question as to the necessity for establishing the safeguards, the difference between my views and yours seem to lie in the following areas:

1. What actions are necessary to establish the safeguards?
2. How urgent is it to establish them without delay?
3. How much will they cost?

These are very grave questions concerning which I believe the American people are entitled to know your views in detail. I feel they also are entitled to reassurance that the $12 million reallocation above mentioned is not from items essential to the national security.

Dr. Seaborg's letter, I presume, indicated only a part of what you may have in mind relative to investments at the laboratories and for underground test site facilities. It was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the creation and maintenance of readiness for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing under emergency conditions. It also was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the improvement of our capability to detect possible violations of the treaty and to monitor Soviet nuclear weapons improvements.

I sincerely hope you will avail yourself of an opportunity to reveal to the Nation your thinking on these important matters, either in a comprehensive reply to this letter or otherwise.

I make this request because the amount you are presently seeking for implementation of the safeguards is such a small fraction of what many believe is needed that it raises doubts that the entire matter of the safeguards are being taken seriously by those who may be advising you in these matters.

I make this request also because there is no assurance that Soviet scientists have not already embarked on a clandestine program of secret developments aimed at overpowering U.S. capability in every category of nuclear weapons; there can be no assurance on this point until the promised safeguards are fully in being; and, until they are, an open invitation to the Kremlin is outstanding to get away with anything and everything we cannot detect or discover.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., November 5, 1963.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: In reply to your letter to the President dated October 18, in regard to the limited test ban treaty, I understand that the hearing last week before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the 1964 supplemental appropriations offered an opportunity for a full and lengthy exchange between you and the members and staff of the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to the questions you raised in your letter.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. JOHNSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wrote you relative to the above-captioned matter in detail

under date of September 24. This was the date the Senate voted its consent to the limited test ban treaty. My letter enumerated these following safeguards promised by you and members of your administration:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities manned by topflight scientific personnel.

3. The maintenance of facilities and resources necessary for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of Soviet abrogation of the treaty or should the national security otherwise require.

4. The improvement of our capability to detect treaty violations and Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities and achievements.

This letter estimated the bare cost of hardware to achieve these safeguards at $1 billion and the operating costs of maintaining them at one-quarter billion dollars annually.

Eventually, under date of October 17, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission wrote me what purported to be a reply to the September 26 letter. Dr. Seaborg indicated your administration's plan to spend $17,315,000 at the laboratories in pursurance of above-mentioned safeguard No. 2, and $630,000 for Nevada test site improvements in pursuance of safeguard No. 1. It made no reference whatever to safeguards No. 3 and No. 4.

Promptly on October 18, I wrote you again, pointing out that the safeguards expenditures proposed by you amounted only to 1.79 percent of the amount I estimated as the required minimum. I pointed out that this considerable discrepancy indicated a basic difference in viewpoint in the following areas:

1. What actions are necessary to establish the safeguards?

2. How urgent is it to establish them without delay?

3. How much will they cost?

I also pointed out that Dr. Seaborg's letter was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the creation and maintenance of readiness for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing under emergency conditions. I also pointed out the Seaborg letter was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the improvements of our capability to detect possible violations of the treaty and to monitor Soviet nuclear weapons improvements.

Additionally, the letter expressed my hope that "you will avail yourself of an opportunity to reveal to the Nation your thinking on these important matters" either in a comprehensive reply to my communication or otherwise.

Eventually, under date of November 5, I received a terse reply from Charles E. Johnson, of your staff, stating his understanding that Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hearings on the 1964 Supplemental Appropriations "offered an opportunity for a full and lengthy exchange between you and the members of the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to the questions you raised in your letter."

Mr. Johnson's understanding is quite incorrect.

The fact is that safeguard No. 2 was the subject of the hearings; safeguard No. 1 was touched only in passing; safeguard No. 3 was not within the scope of the hearings; and, neither was safeguard No. 4, although subsequently the committee on its own made a partial inspection of present detection facilities.

Realistically, I did not expect you would ever see either one of my letters, but I did expect they might be read and processed by someone on your White House staff who could be expected to have some understanding of what this mail involved. My letters have never been properly answered and I think they should be.

However, whether I get a reply or not is far less important than the alarm I feel over the apparent inability of anyone in your White House family to understand what one is talking about when he talks of the test ban treaty safeguards and what is being done to implement them. The Atomic Energy Commission has responsibilities pertaining to them, yes, but so does the Department of Defense—particularly in connection with safeguards No. 3 and No. 4. The safeguards are a group of related actions, each of which must be carried out competently and completely in order to reduce the admitted risks and hazards of the treaty and in order to protect the national security.

I can only gather from the history of this exchange of correspondence that nobody in the White House really is in charge of defining what these safeguards are and seeing to it they are carried out. Yet a very big thing was made of them in order to get the Senate's consent to the treaty.

My second letter to you stated that the amount of money sought to implement the safeguards is such a small fraction of what many believe is needed that "it raises doubts that the entire matter of the safeguards are being taken seriously by those who may be advising you in these matters." The naive partial and incomplete responsiveness of the Seaborg and Johnson replies to my letters only reinforces these doubts.

If, in fact, at this point no one of your staff has been delegated the overall responsibility of coordinating the effort to put these safeguards into effect and making sure it is done—and done adequately—I most respectfully and urgently recommend that it be done without delay. I hope you also will consider the advisability of my early recommendation that you reveal to the Nation your thinking on the important matter of the safeguards.

In any event, I would appreciate knowing the name of your assistant who is now, or may in the future be, assigned the overall safeguards responsibility.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER.

Understandably, Mr. Speaker, no reply was received to the November 12 letter due to President Kennedy's assassination shortly thereafter.

The following letter, taking up the matter with the new President, was written and mailed December 20, 1963:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1963.

Re reduction of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: On September 24, October 18, and November 12 I wrote the late President Kennedy relative to the above-captioned matter. The last letter, of course, was not answered. But replies to the first two indicated to me a matter of serious concern.

Apparent from the replies was the fact that no one on the White House staff appears to have responsibility for bringing together the important actions which both the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission must pursue if the necessary safeguards—which were promised—are to be carried out to reduce the admitted risks and disadvantages of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

These safeguards are the following:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities manned by topflight scientific personnel.

3. The maintenance of facilities and resources necessary for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of Soviet abrogation of the treaty or should the national security otherwise require.

4. The improvement of our capability to detect treaty violations and Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

I think it is quite safe to say that so far no comprehensive and coordinated steps have been taken to insure that the safeguards are implemented. Such few actions that have been taken to date in no way measure up to the promises made to the Senate and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to obtain their concurrence to the treaty.

As a matter of fact, it is understood that serious cuts in the fiscal year 1965 budget already are being contemplated for the underground testing program.

I need not point out that notwithstanding the treaty, the Soviets are still deadly serious in their intention to rule the world. Nor need I point out their consistent ability to make substantial nuclear progress behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain.

In order that you may be fully informed of my above-mentioned letters I am enclosing copies.

In order that the national security interests of the United States may be fully served, I am making the same recommendation to you that was made to the late President; namely, that a knowledgeable and interested member of your staff be delegated the overall responsibility for coordinating the effort to place into effect the foregoing safeguards—and making certain it is done.

With best wishes for the holiday season, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER.

Mr. Speaker, by January 20, 1964, no acknowledgement or reply having been received from President Johnson and the following letter was dispatched, and time alone will tell whether it, also, will be ignored:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1964.

Re reduction of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: On December 20, 1963, I wrote you concerning the above-captioned matter. The letter has neither been acknowledged, or has a reply been received thereto.

I am attaching a copy of the December 20 letter (less enclosures).

It is hoped that this matter will receive the serious attention the national security indicates it deserves.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER.

America Has the Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments by our former colleague, Donald L. Jackson, as contained in a news release issued by Mr. Jackson at Los Angeles, Calif., on January 13, 1964:

NEWS RELEASE FROM AMERICA HAS A RIGHT TO KNOW

(Remarks by Donald L. Jackson, Los Angeles, Calif., on Sunday, January 12, 1964)

This is Broadcast No. 15 in the continuing series, "America Has a Right To Know." Tonight, it will be our purpose to pursue further the question of security in the Department of State, and to put several more respectful questions to the President of the United States. An employee of the Department of State was fired from his position for testifying before a committee of the Congress of the United States—the representatives of the American people—and America has the right to know why.

Mr. President, if you please, sir, two foundation questions.

1. Why did officials of the U.S. Department of State lie, under oath, to a duly constituted and legal committee of the U.S. Congress?

2. Who benefits by the firing from the U.S. Department of State of the security officer, Otto Otepka?

The Texarkana News, commenting editorially on the Otepka case, calls it a stench in the State Department. More than 100 American newspapers from border to border and from coast to coast have asked pointed and pertinent questions about the Otepka case, Mr. President, but to this time there has been no satisfactory explanation of the miasmic aura that shrouds the preemptory discharge of the State Department employee, whose crime appears to be that he told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to a committee of the U.S. Congress, and that his sworn testimony dealt with some off-the-record goings-on in that agency of Government—an agency, Mr. President, for which the Chief Executive has direct responsibility.

In this broadcast, Sir, as in the past, we direct these questions of concern, not from memory, conjecture, nor any desire to frustrate or inhibit, but from official sources in Government—duly recorded and available readily to any citizen who knows where to go to find what he wants—admittedly, not an easy task in a Government such as ours.

In the present instance—the firing of a State Department security officer—we go to a congressional source, Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, a ranking member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

On November 5, when the Department of State announced the dismissal of Security Officer Otto Otepka (and now we are quoting):

"* * * because he gave the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee information concerning irregularities and probable illegalities affecting the security of the United States."

The Senator from Connecticut presented, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the purging of the last of the old-line security officers to hold a top position in the Department's Office of Security.

We offer that presentation, as a matter of information, as printed on pages 2031 to 2033 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 178 for November 5, together with the comments of Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina. We do this as an integral part of the essential documentation necessary to a public understanding of the questions being asked by many Americans and by more than 100 American editors from coast to coast.

And, Mr. President, America has the right to know.

America has the right to know why none of these questions have been answered by an authoritative voice speaking from the highest levels of our Government.

We offer, sir, as basic documentation for our questions, the following: (1) The five-part hearings and report on State Department Security, (2) the William Weiland case, and (3) the new passport regulations, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in which appears the testimony of Mr. Otepka concerning alleged irregularities and illegalities in the State Department. These are, of course, sir, official documents of the Senate.

In addition to the foregoing official reports and testimony, we refer to Senator DODD's subsequent presentations to the Senate on the same subject, with particular reference to the Senator's report to his colleagues on the reaction of the American press to the firing of Otepka. These remarks can be found as printed on pages 24118 to 24142 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 211, of December 20, 1963. Official correspondence between Otto Otepka and his superiors in the Department of State was also included by Senator DODD, and is detailed on pages 24142 to 24148 of the same date.

Now, sir, we turn to some of the pertinent questions posed by the American press, and dealing with the State Department purge of Otto Otepka because he told the truth, under oath, to a committee of Congress, and ask you, most respectfully, Mr. President, if the American people are not entitled to an explanation from you, sir, about the facts of the matter.

The Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, in its issue of October 22, said, and we quote: "Otepka is getting fired because he thought that full security procedures should be followed in evaluating the cases of such prize State Department errors as Alger Hiss, William Arthur Weiland, and John Steward Service. Worse yet, he revealed the laxness to Senate investigators."

Is that charge correct, Mr. President?

The Monroe (La.) News-Star, of October 7, 1963, asked editorially, "What sort of cat was Otepka about to let out of the bag?"

The Chicago Tribune, on November 7, was more blunt. It said, and we quote: "There can be no doubt that this case reflects an intention by the administration to conduct a purge of patriots."

Is this what is happening, Mr. President? Is that the intention? Is a public employee, who dares tell the truth to a committee of the U.S. Congress, to sacrifice his career—lose his livelihood—or be shunted off to the oblivion of lower Slobbovia?

America and enquiring American editors have the right to know. They are entitled to answers to questions such as this one from the Perth Amboy (N.J.) News of November 8, and we quote: "The issue is simple. Can Government agencies work behind closed doors, hidden from the watchful eyes of Congress and the taxpayer?"

Can they, Mr. President? America wants to know—and this, sir, from the same editorial, and we quote again—"What does the Department have to hide? What is the Department afraid of Congress uncovering?"

Following the disclosures on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the Roswell (N. Mex.) Record on November 7, said, and we quote: "Why should any information be withheld from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? How can such a committee operate, unless it has all the facts in hand to judge any case of security violation?"

It is one thing, Mr. President, for labor racketeers, subversives, Communists, and gangsters to invoke the protection of the fifth amendment to prevent incrimination of themselves, but when the Department of State cloaks itself in silence respecting its activities and imposes reprisals against an employee courageous enough to risk the consequences by telling the truth to a committee of the United States Congress, the American people and substantial elements of the American press can be pardoned a feeling of concern and frustration.

The Evansville (Ind.) Press of November 13, commenting on the Otepka case, summed up the matter thus, and we quote: "It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress, and three others charged for snooping (on) the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress."

Is there an official answer, Mr. President, to the question asked by the Greenville (S.C.) News in the heading of an editorial on the Otepka case, under date of November 9, the News asked, and we quote:

"When did this become a crime"

When did it become a crime, sir, to tell the truth to a Senate subcommittee, under legal subpena and under the compulsion of an oath? In the same vein, the Roanoke (Va.) Times of November 11, captioned an editorial, "Loyalty to Whom," in which it was concluded, and I quote:

"In all this context the issue is not one of loyalty to country but loyalty to a branch of government. If this is to be the case, then, as Vice Chairman DODD of the Senate Committee charges, the American system of checks and balances in Government is at stake."

Just what did Senator DODD charge in the Otepka case, Mr. President? He charged, and I quote from his remarks: "Mr. Otepka could be dismissed because he had given honest testimony before the Senate subcommittee on Internal Security, then it would become impossible, or at the best, very difficult, for any congressional committee in the future to obtain uninhibited testimony from executive employees and officials." "The Otepka case," Senator DODD said, "goes to the heart of security procedures in the Department of State. It has the greatest significance from the standpoint of relations between the legislative and executive branches."

Editorially, the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, on November 11, put the matter on the line when it charged, and I quote: "Officials lied to nail Otepka."

Mr. President, this flat charge is made against officials of the U.S. Department of State—officials who were given a job to do; by their superiors, of bugging Otepka's telephone and tapping his conversations—officials who later recanted their previous testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—changed the character of their testimony in letters remarkably alike, and then departed the State Department scene.

What further action is to be taken in this matter, Mr. President. Are the logical and relevant questions of press and public to be brushed aside by the State Department and a veil of official silence substituted for honest and forthright comment?

America has a right to know.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Until next week at this time, this has been your Capitol Reporter, Donald L. Jackson, bringing you broadcast 15 in the series "America Has a Right To Know," an interrogatory, developed, researched, and produced by Americans who believe that a new and unique form of official fifth amendment usage should be nailed now.

It Is Getting Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, edition of January 13, 1964:

IT IS GETTING EXPENSIVE

At the present time there are several bills before Congress for expansion of the social security program to include medical care for all persons over the age of 65.

If such expansion of the program is approved, the worker and employer taxes which support it are going to be much higher—and as we recently pointed out in these columns, they have been raised nine times since 1949 and are due for automatic further hikes in 1966 and 1968. Any expansion of the program will bring upward tax revisions even beyond those already scheduled.

The costly aspects of the program are becoming more and more apparent as compared with protective programs available through private insurance companies.

Someone has pointed out, for example, that a young man reaching the age of 21 must pay $174 per year at the present time in social security taxes. By 1966 he will pay at the rate of $198 a year, and by 1968 it will be $222. With the addition of more welfare schemes, the rate naturally will go even higher within the relatively near future.

This young man of whom we speak (he could be a son or neighbor right here in Shelby County) will pay this figure for the rest of his life or until he reaches the age of 65. While he is paying, his employer will pay a similar amount.

Now, we are told, if a young man at the age of 21 purchased a life insurance policy with a premium of $174 a year, he would get $11,000 worth of protection. It would provide daily protection throughout his life. In addition, he would have a cash value of $14,144 or $80 per month for life, whichever he chose, at age 65. With the employer's amount added, he could get $22,800 worth of life insurance with a cash value of $29,500 at age 65 or $180 per month.

Not only would this person have cash protection constantly for his family, he also would have a bankable asset in the policy that he could borrow against if he so desired.

As many predicted that it would, the social security program is now reaching far beyond the limits originally intended. Our young people who are going to pay the bill for the next 45 years should be the first to oppose any additional costs to this welfare program that has already become more expensive than many dreamed.

A Plea for Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, should health care for our senior citizens be an uncertainty or should it be a promise? Should it be a matter of charity or of earned right?

Statistics speak persuasively to the answer—that the need is urgent, that the mechanism is available, that health care financed through the tried and proven social security system is the just, sound, and equitable means of meeting an urgent problem.

But no argument is a persuasive, no statistics call so loudly for action, and action now, than the appeal of thoughtful, self-reliant, individual citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleagues attention to one such appeal I received recently from one of my constituents, Mrs. Ethel Engel, of Oakland, Calif. I have received many similar letters, but this is a good example. As a matter of fact, in a recent poll of my district, over 63 percent of those responding to a legislative questionnaire supported health care for our senior citizens under social security.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can heed these pleas; that we can consider this legislation this year; that we can take this major step toward meeting one of the great unmet needs of our time.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
January 9, 1964.

Hon. Congressman COHELAN: I am writing you to give you my view on medicare and why I think it should be passed immediately.

I am 67 years old and my husband 79, supposedly our golden years. You probably will say, "why didn't you prepare for your older years."

My husband and I have worked very hard during our lifetime. We were in the grocery business and still would have hung on to it, but my husband became very seriously ill, and as if this wasn't enough, a chain store opened at the corner, and that was the end of our business.

At one time we had a very thriving market and a building valued at $175,000, and we thought at that time we were secure, and along came the depression and just wiped us off our feet. We got back again and made a living, but we never were able to accumulate very much. In the meantime, we put our only son through law school. He is now trying to build a practice and raise a family and we don't want anything from him.

My husband had five operations which were very costly, and if, God forbid, another illness strikes us, we will have to sell an insurance policy, which we are holding onto in the event of death. We belong to Blue Cross and they have paid out a lot of money for these operations, but besides what they paid, we had to pay out a lot too.

I am writing a rather lengthy letter, but I just want to show you how necessary medicare is for people like us, and I am sure there are a great many more like us.

My husband cannot work any longer, but I would like to work. I have had quite a lot of experience in office work and was a very competent stenographer. I have recently taken a refresher course in typing and type very good. I have looked for a typing position to supplement what we are getting from social security, which is a blessing, but to no avail. These are our golden years—worrying what will happen to us.

So you see why I am for medicare and why I think, Congressman COHELAN, representing us from the wonderful State of California, should vote for medicare.

Hoping medicare will pass soon, and my very best wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

ETHEL ENGEL.

Los Angeles Presbytery Supports Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased recently to note the active leadership in the field of civil rights taken by the Los Angeles Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church. The Los Angeles Presbyterian is the official voice of the Presbyterian churches from Santa Barbara to San Diego and consists of a minister and one lay delegate from each church in this area.

I would like to call the attention of all of my colleagues to two resolutions passed recently by the Los Angeles Presbytery, as follows:

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Los Angeles, recognizing the urgent need for national civil rights legislation, recommend to its member churches and individual members of their congregations that they communicate with their congressional representatives to express their support of adequate and effective civil rights legislation.

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Los Angeles affirm its support of current civil rights legislation now in force in the State of California and view with alarm petitions seeking to amend the California State constitution in order to nullify this legislation. We do not deny the right of persons to seek such an amendment, but, in the light of our understanding of law and gospel we cannot agree with such efforts.

New Directions of National Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's inspiring and challenging state of the Union message dramatically outlines the broad objectives of national policy of the administration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commenting on the impact of the President's message:

NEW DIRECTIONS OF NATIONAL EFFORT

The key to President Johnson's program, as outlined in his state of the Union message, is his proposal for a major and historically significant shift from military to civilian welfare expenditures. His projected war on poverty is to be financed by a somewhat slower pace of the cold war. A markedly reduced defense budget, together with economies in some of the old-line activities of Government, is counted on to permit vigorous prosecution of the major elements of the Kennedy domestic program and yet to allow an impressive reduction of the deficit.

Some skepticism as to whether all these desirable objectives can be attained is only natural, but there can be no question that the objectives should be most welcome to the American people. Military spending has been rising fairly steadily ever since 1955, and its demands have placed a ceiling on what could be done to attack the urgent social and economic problems of our society, problems which President Johnson so movingly described in his message.

That a shift of effort from arms to welfare is now possible can only be applauded. The latest Soviet budget also projected such a shift of effort, and so the Johnson program must be regarded as one phase in the continuing process of disengagement, reduction of international tensions, moderation of the

cold war. The need for this turn in world affairs has been sharply evident since the nuclear confrontation over Cuba. It is gratifying that the need is now being reflected, not only in negotiated agreements, but in the national policies of the two antagonists.

President Johnson's defense budget of $49 billion remains higher than any of the Eisenhower budgets, and so we can be sure that he plans no stripping of our defenses. He told Congress his program will maintain that margin of military safety and superiority obtained through 3 years of steadily increasing the quality and quantity of our strategic, conventional and antiguerrilla forces. He pledged that in 1964 we will be better prepared than ever before to defend the cause of freedom. Congress and the Nation will expect him to document these assurances in detailed elaboration of his military plans.

Yet an end to the steady buildup of overkill capacity had to come some time, and if it can come now without sacrifice of national security we should all be grateful. The tasks of peace, of mending the dangerous gaps in our social fabric, clamor for attention. President Johnson catalogued them well. We must widen and equalize economic opportunity, improve education, attack the geographical pockets of poverty, put youth to work, cope with automation, expand housing and urban renewal and health care. "The riches nation on earth," as he reminded us, "can afford to win the war on poverty—and cannot afford to lose it."

The message completes a most remarkable transition from the Kennedy to the Johnson administration. In 7 short weeks President Johnson has fully taken charge, in a way to hearten the country, and is embarked on an energetic pursuit of objectives that deserve the support of Congress. He will, of course, have to fight for that support, and fight hard. Clearly he is committed to the fight.

Major changes in the direction and content of national effort require the greatest managerial skill, and we hope the President is equally aware of these demands. If jobs are to be eliminated in defense plants, they must quickly be opened up elsewhere. The Johnson program must be carried out within the framework of a fiscal policy that maintains overall economic growth at a healthy rate. It would be self-defeating if the President reduced the Government's contribution to total demand so drastically as to nullify the effects of the tax cut, which he sponsors as a means of stimulating the contribution of the private sector.

Presumably Mr. Johnson's economic advisers are convinced that a reduced deficit of around $5 billion will sustain economic growth in the circumstances projected for 1964. It must be hoped that they are right, and that if they turn out to be wrong the President will move quickly to adjust his program. A decade of experience in the 1950's showed that if the Government's contribution to demand is cut too much too soon, expansion of the private sector halts and contraction sets in. The current expansion is the longest since the war, and it must continue.

Though the message dealt mainly with domestic affairs, the President did not fail to recognize that social and economic goals can be attained only in a world at peace. His promise of new proposals for disarmament to come, like his decision to cut the production of weapon-making uranium, is welcome. Equally so is his expressed determination, while maintaining our military strength, to search for new East-West agreements which "can enlarge the hopes of all while violating the interests of none."

It was an inspiring message, and a hopeful one. What President Johnson has achieved since November 22 is the best ground for believing that he intends, with his seemingly endless resources of energy and political skill, to convert it from words to action.

An African Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, certainly the coup which overthrew the newly created government in Zanzibar is a matter of great concern. That new nation was in existence only 30 days when it was overthrown by forces inclined toward the communistic system. The sight of Russian-made weaponry and the reports of Cuban-trained agents should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that this grab for power is really another victory for the forces of communism. Equally significant is the fact that 7 days after Zanzibar became independent she was admitted to the United Nations. The Communist takeover means, in addition to all the other evils, that the Communists have secured for themselves another vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the Scranton Tribune on January 14, 1964, and commend it to the attention of the House and to the Nation:

ZANZIBAR

Not too long ago news reports of a revolt in so distant and small a land as Zanzibar would attract little attention. In the current state of world affairs, however, governmental change anywhere requires study and bloody coup Sunday which overthrew the month-old government in the former British protectorate rates closest study.

Zanzibar became independent December 9 and now apparently is in the control of forces friendly to Communist China. Diplomatic sources in Washington put two interpretations on the event, one taking a pessimistic line, the other being less alarming.

Some observers, concerned but not surprised by the revolt, reason that the United States will be forced to abandon a space tracking station in Zanzibar. They fear the coup will lead to the establishment of a "Cuba of Africa" off the east coast of Africa and advancement of Communist China's influence in Africa.

The more optimistic estimate is that the revolt was an outgrowth of minority Arab rule over a majority African population and that the United States might reasonably anticipate continuing friendly relations with the new state.

It is very probable that the revolution had racial aspects. The insurgent forces seemed to direct their campaign against the predominantly Moslem coalition government made up of the Zanzibar National People's Party and the Zanzibar and Zemba People's Party. The inception of the political strife dates back to elections last July preceding independence. The Afro-Shirazi Party won 54 percent of the popular vote, but gained only 13 of the 31 seats in the legislature because of the system of representation.

The ouster of a government only a month old probably establishes a record of some kind, but it is indicative of the governmental instability of so many of the emerging states that the coup did not come as a total surprise. Diplomatic reaction merely takes the line that the upheaval happened a little sooner than might have been expected.

Taxpayer Complains About Unequal Actions of the Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past year I have received thousands of letters from taxpayers who are critical of the Treasury Department's favored treatment of tax-exempt foundations. Here is one illustration of the Treasury's handling of a taxpayer compared with its treatment of a Du Pont foundation. Under unanimous consent, I include the taxpayer's letter and the accompanying article from the Peoria Journal Star of December 23, 1963, in the RECORD:

DECEMBER 26, 1963.

MR. PATMAN: Hurray. It is sure gratifying to know that someone is keeping an eye on the Internal Revenue Service,

I am a small businessman, and I got the same treatment as the man that made $6,000. Here is what happened. In the first place they took about 3 months of my time, and then after not finding any errors, the agent said I'll have to tax you $1,200 for the time that I put in. Sir, can you imagine that? My lawyer advised me to pay it, and then sue them for it. We did that and won the case, but was out the lawyer's fee, plus the time and harassment. I know of other cases of this type in my city, so there must be thousands throughout the Nation.

I am enclosing the clipping, but would like for you to return it to me, as I intend to make use of it.

Mr. PATMAN, please keep up this important work, we need someone like you very bad. I am 100 percent behind you, so if there is anything I can do, let me know. Thanking you for your efforts.

GEORGE ANTHONY.

PEORIA, ILL.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Dec. 23, 1963]

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT—LITTLE TAXPAYER JUST BETTER BEWARE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Woe to the taxpayer who fails to file an income return, but it's a very different story where a $122 million Du Pont Foundation is concerned.

The Internal Revenue Service is rough and tough in cracking down on negligent taxpayers, but it is a kindly and generous Santa Claus in dealing with equally remiss foundations.

Penalties for not filing tax returns are the same in both instances—fines up to $10,000 and jail terms. The big difference is the way the IRS treats them.

The taxpayer gets clobbered. The foundation goes scot free.

A graphic illustration of this remarkable backstage policy has come to light as a result of the extended probing by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, of more than 500 tax-free foundations and their complex financial and business operations and manipulations. The assets of these foundations, many of which are deeply engaged in business enterprises, run into billions of dollars.

PATMAN has ascertained that the Longwood Foundation, of the Du Pont family and headed by Henry B. Du Pont, did not file tax returns for the 4 years of 1955

through 1958. The Longwood Foundation, with $122 million in assets, had receipts of more than $32 million between 1951 and 1960.

In fact, this Du Pont Foundation filed returns only after PATMAN's investigation uncovered its failure to do so.

But this disregard of the law went unscathed. The IRS did nothing about it.

The foundation's president has admitted this in a letter to PATMAN. Henry Du Pont stated no penalties were imposed by the Revenue Service against the $112 million foundation for failing to file 4 years' tax returns.

"This is shocking and outrageous," declared PATMAN. "Foundations, like everyone else, must file tax returns and are subject to penalties for failure to do so. While uneducated sharecroppers are presumed to know the law and are held responsible for violations, many foundations we are examining and their well-paid and well-educated officials and advisers are apparently exempt from this rule. That is indefensible."

GETTING THE WORKS

In striking contrast to the Longwood Foundation's gentle treatment by IRS is what happened to a little taxpayer in Lake County, Calif.

He was literally hounded by the Revenue Service.

That's the irate account received by PATMAN in a letter from a neighbor of this taxpayer. Highlights are as follows:

"To show you why the IRS staff apparently does not have time to spend on foundations and their vast tax-free affairs, take the case of a self-employed friend of mine. His income for the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 averaged around $6,000. He is a rather outspoken son of parents born in county Mayo, and he wrote a Senator and offered some suggestions on legislation to protect low-bracket citizens from false claims filed against them by the IRS.

"The Senator turned the letter over to the IRS, and this taxpayer was promptly put on the blacklist. As a consequence, an audit was started of this taxpayer's records for the 3 years causing him a great deal of annoyance and harassment. The agent confided to the taxpayer that this action had been ordered by the regional IRS office.

"After much digging and examining, the agent was unable to find any errors in the reporting of this taxpayer's income, which mind you averaged only $6,000 per year. The agent admitted as much. Yet in the end, after 6 months, they came up with a claim for $660 in additional taxes, penalties and interest. That's the way they retaliated against this outspoken taxpayer."

In a report published in October, PATMAN charged that the Internal Revenue Service is making a mockery of enforcing the laws regulating the thousands of tax-exempt foundations with assets totaling billions of dollars. As a result the Government is annually losing tens of millions in taxes.

Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin was singled out for stinging criticism. PATMAN bluntly assailed him for doing a lot of talking but little law enforcing.

"Our findings show," said PATMAN, "that the Internal Revenue Service record, in terms of supervision of foundations, is a dud and a dismal failure. Signs are multiplying that (1) the Internal Revenue Service cannot meet its responsibilities through ringing statements by Commissioner Caplin, press agentry, and public relations gimmickry, and (2) fewer speeches by the Commissioner could conceivably enable him to answer his congressional mail in under 30 to 60 days."

What About Civil Rights for America's Workers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the struggle for civil rights for minority groups no voice has been raised for American men and women who make up the Nation's labor force. What about the right of every person to seek a job on the basis of merit and experience without paying tribute to or being disqualified by a union? What about the right of a person on the job with ambition, hustle and sweat to go as far as his ability, initiative, and talent permit him?

Mr. Speaker, these rights are being flagrantly violated every day by powerful labor bosses, in some cases racketeers, and often aided and abetted by Federal Government agencies. Yet we hear no pleas for justice for these people. We hear no sermons preached in their behalf. No Government-sponsored marches are organized to end the injustice practiced against them.

Is it not time we extend the guarantees under the Constitution to the workers of America, the unorganized as well as the organized? If we are sincere in our fight for justice for all Americans, is it not time we took steps to end the abuses against American working men and women by unethical and unrestrained union leaders?

A story in the Washington Evening Star, of January 20, 1964, cites a National Labor Relations Board decision agreeing that it is perfectly proper for a union to force its members to curtail production under threat of fine or the loss of their jobs. What kind of freedom is that? On what basis can members of a Federal body justify a decision which robs American citizens of their liberties and forces them to be subjected to the will of a boss-ridden labor union? If we continue such assaults upon the liberty of our people, I fear the day may come when the citizens of this land will rise in their wrath against such injustice with disastrous results for honest trade unionism and Members of Congress who support it. May I remind my colleagues that we are representatives of all the people not the labor unions, and that our duty is to protect the constitutional rights of all the people, not just the most powerful nor the most vocal.

The news article from the Star follows:

UNION FINING OF FOUR FOR EXTRA OUTPUT BACKED BY NLRB

The National Labor Relations Board said today that a United Automobile Workers local in Wisconsin did not violate any law when it fined members for consistently making extra money for extra production.

In a 4-to-1 ruling the NLRB said the fines levied by UAW Local 283 at West Allis, Wis., against four of its members was an internal union matter.

In a dissent, Board Member Boyd Leedom said the fines were a form of restraint and coercion in violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

The charges were brought by the four fined union members at the Wisconsin Motor Corp. in West Allis. The employer was not involved.

The dispute centered around a union policy allowing union members to take advantage of extra pay offered by the firm for doing extra piece work, but not to consistently exceed ceilings set by the union.

The fines were two $100 assessments, one of $75, and one of $50.

No Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a timely editorial that appeared in the January 12 edition of the Port Huron Times-Herald of Port Huron, Mich. The sentiments expressed in this editorial, I am certain, are shared by millions of Americans. If our Nation ever required firmness in its foreign policy, it is certainly now in this crisis with the Panama Government. To date, according to published reports, the administration is following a firm policy. I trust that it will not stray from this true course.

AMERICA MUST STAND FIRM IN PANAMA

The current squabble in Panama is no simple quarrel between high school pupils over a flagpole incident.

It is an hour of truth for the United States of America.

Unless the United States responds in a forthright and conclusive manner, the American citizen will from this time on be just "one of those stupid Yankees of the north."

He will have been shown up before all the world as an overfed, pampered parasite who is unwilling or unable to defend his rights.

If we withdraw in any way, if we give in to any unreasonable, unwarranted demand, it will be the end of American prestige in the Western Hemisphere, and indeed in the entire world.

Regardless of what State Department diplomacy may call it, the whole controversy in Panama is Communist inspired. It is Communist planned, and is actively directed by Communists. Despite the small number of recognized Communists in Panama, they are in a key position to inflame the populace against us.

Whether Castro, from his perch in the Caribbean, has anything personally to do with it is of small consequence. His people, and those who favor his views, are aiding and abetting the anti-American movement.

About 12 tons of Castro propaganda is confiscated each month in Panama. This is only a clue to how much is imported and is successfully circulated.

The United States built the canal. With blood, sweat, heartache, and cash we built it and for 50 years it has been a monument to American knowledge, skill, and perseverence.

It has been a showpiece of the American way.

We built it under treaties of 1903, and have fulfilled and overfulfilled our commitments to the Panamanian people. We have made one-sided concessions to them, not only in matters economic, but in matters of national pride. Maybe we have been too friendly.

Now Aquilino Boyd, Panama's representative to the United Nations, is complaining to the U.N. Security Council. He says the United States must stop the fighting, apologize, pay for the damage, and work out a new agreement.

Roberto Chiari, President of Panama, has broken off diplomatic relations. He has tossed the treaties in the wastebasket. He, in short, has started a movement to push the United States out of the Canal Zone.

It is as simple as that.

It is a crucial test of American mettle. We must not fail it.

We urge President Johnson and Congress to pursue a steadfast course, to protect our rights as we know they are right.

If the marines are needed, send them. We should be marshaling our forces because this is an American, not a Panamanian, emergency.

We should prepare, and act, so that no organized group of Communists can ever again make monkeys out of us as they have so often done before.

The time is now.

Hon. Howard H. Baker

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, with the tragic passing of Congressman HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, the House of Representatives and the people have lost a man of courage, determination, ability, and sound counsel.

It is hard to endure blows such as these which take from us hard-working men at the peak of their usefulness. As an expert in the tax field and in the wide sweep of activities affected by the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. BAKER had developed a knowledge that it would take another many years to hope to duplicate.

During his entire seven terms in Congress it was my pleasure to serve with him and in the most recent years to be his neighbor. My sense of deprivation is heightened by the fact that I have lost a friend.

My hometown newspaper, the Shawnee (Okla.) News-Star, eulogized Congressman BAKER in an editorial January 14, which I reproduce as follows:

TRIBUTE TO A FRIEND

America's domestic oil industry lost one of its most faithful and effective friends in the death of Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, earlier this month. Congressman BAKER, as a member of the tax-writing Committee on Ways and Means, was a stalwart fighter for curbs on foreign oil imports, for fair tax laws, and in all other matters which affected the petroleum industry.

In recent years he was a key figure in Congress in a number of important contests which the domestic oil industry won in Congress. One of his most recent activities was to defeat several burdensome tax amendments in the pending tax modification bill, and in the continuing fight led by Oklahoma Congressman TOM STEED to curtail importation of foreign oil.

He was an eight-term veteran and was held in highest esteem by members of both political parties. He had many friends in Oklahoma.

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ], has made an excellent condensation of a series of meetings concerning beef imports. The following are the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ]:

At the invitation of Secretary Freeman, representatives of the livestock producers came to Washington on January 8 to present the plight of that industry. They returned to their respective communities encouraged by the assurances that prospects for a satisfactory voluntary agreement limiting beef imports was in the making. But their hopes were shattered the following weekend when the Department revealed that the so-called negotiations were based not on average of beef imports from 1958 to 1962, but on the imports shipped into the United States in 1963. Since beef imports in 1963 reached an alltime high of 11 percent of our total beef consumption, the negotiations offered little or no relief to the livestock industry.

Secretary Orville Freeman, on January 16, invited approximately 50 Members of Congress to attend a briefing session conducted by him and two of his assistants, Dr. Winn Finner, staff economist, agricultural economics; and Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, director of agricultural economics.

Secretary Freeman assured the group that the Department and the President were concerned over the drop in beef prices. He pointed out that during the past 2 years the drop in beef prices has resulted in a loss of $170 million to the farmer. It was encouraging to note that the Secretary recognized that the United States is the only open market in the world for beef imports—that our so-called allies have established some sort of restriction or barrier to stop or limit the import of beef into their respective countries. It was discouraging to note that the Secretary and the administration are opposed to the adjustment of the tariff upward to give our farmers the same protection that other nations give their producers on the theory that while such action might stop the flow of beef from New Zealand and Australia, it would subject us to criticism by the Common Market countries who would claim we were now doing exactly the thing for which we criticized them. A Member of Congress pointed out that we export approximately $1½ billion worth of goods and products to the Common Market nations and approximately $500 million is already subject to variable fees (in effect a tariff) to protect the member countries, that the only thing that stops the European Economic Community (EEC) from establishing other variable fees today is not the charge of retaliation or the cry of discrimination by the United States but the fact that the member countries of EEC cannot agree among themselves.

Dr. Winn Finner pointed out that while production and imports have been increasing (production up 7 percent in 1963 over 1962—imports up 13 percent in 1963 over 1962), we have maintained a favorable balance of trade in agricultural products. He stated that during the year (July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963) our total agricultural exports were $5,084 million (wheat and flour, $1.158 million; feed grain, $977 million; oilseeds and products, $778 million; cotton, $492 million; fruit and vegetables, $442 million; tobacco, $378 million; livestock, $347 million; dairy and poultry, $257 million); whereas our imports totaled $3,911 million. What Dr. Finner forgot to say was that nearly one-third of our total exports were exported under the giveaway program provided by Public Law 480 and that about one-half of our total imports is in coffee. That means, of course, that we actually have an unfavorable balance of agricultural trade when we measure dollar imports and exports only. We should also bear in mind that many of our major crops are heavily subsidized in order for them to meet world prices.

Dr. Cochrane stated that in the judgment of the Department there will be an upturn in price in March or April but it will not equal the drop. If there was a decrease in imports, the price increase would be on canners and cutters and not dressed beef. He stated a move was now on foot to decrease beef imports. Primary thrust will be to limit imports of low grade cuts.

Secretary Freeman discussed the following possible actions that are now being considered:

1. GATT negotiations to liberalize European barriers for meat imports.
2. U.S. Tariff Commission action to raise duty on imported beef and veal.
3. Legislation in Congress.
4. Price supports and control on U.S. livestock production.
5. Section 32 purchases.
6. Voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand.

The Secretary's remarks indicated that the first five courses of action are either impractical or unacceptable. The Secretary felt that only a voluntary agreement remains as a practical solution. He pointed out that Congress can expect no assistance at this time from the Secretary or the administration if it attempts to remedy the situation by legislation.

The prospect of a voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand is uncertain. Looking at the issue from the standpoint of the Australians, why should they agree to limit on imports? There is no real barrier to their entry into the U.S. market now and the likelihood of future restrictions does not appear imminent.

Unless the Secretary's hand is strengthened by congressional legislative action or unless the Australians can be convinced that their long-range self-interest is impaired by a further decline in the U.S. market price or if some other benefits should be forthcoming, it does not seem logical to assume that they would accept a limit on their exports of beef and veal to the United States.

There is one approach which might be used that could be effective in bringing about a voluntary agreement with Australia outside legislative action. Australia sent to the United States 765 million pounds of beef in 1963. This represents 44 percent of all imports which totaled 1,750 million pounds. Overall imports of beef and veal were up 13 percent in 1963 over 1962 and represent 11 percent of domestic production.

Under the Sugar Act, Australia has a country quota of 43,339 short tons, raw ratio under the present law but she shipped an additional 180,367 tons under global purchase

making total Australian sales in the United States in 1963 223,706 tons. (We are not bound in any way to purchase the extra 180,000 tons from Australia.)

Although the domestic quotas were extended for 5 years in the 1962 act, the foreign quotas were extended for only 2 years. Therefore, legislation must be passed before December 31, 1964, to extend the authority for obtaining foreign sugar.

If the President should recommend, and the Congress should pass, sugar legislation granting Australia an increased sugar quota, it is hoped that nation might be more receptive to limiting its exports of beef and veal. If they are not receptive, we should then consider removing Australia's sugar quota.

A trade of this nature would, of course, be difficult to negotiate and would perhaps be contrary to the longstanding most-favored-nation philosophy of the U.S. State Department. A Presidential decision would seem necessary under these circumstances.

On January 20, 20 Members of the Congress, were invited to a conference by Gov. Christian A. Herter, special representative for trade negotiations at the State Department. We were cordially received, politely listened to, but accomplished nothing, learned nothing—except that this matter of beef imports is under consideration. Unfortunately our State Department apparently has assumed the attitude that the farmers and livestock producers are expendable pawn in the chess game of international politics. If the livestock producer is to get relief, it must come from pressure by Congress upon the executive department.

Cape Canaveral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Florida, especially those of the 11th Congressional District, are honored that President Johnson chose the Launch Operations Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to be named after our late President, John F. Kennedy. Some confusion has resulted, however, from the President's remarks relating to the land mass known for more than 450 years as Cape Canaveral.

The President has been requested to clarify his Executive order of November 29, 1963, in which he designated the John F. Kennedy Space Center, but made no reference to the cape.

I have received a copy of a resolution from the Florida Library and Historical Commission, an official branch of the government of the State of Florida, appealing to the President to consider the possibility of retaining the name, Cape Canaveral, as the geographic designation for the portion of the land mass on which the national space facility is not located.

This resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA LIBRARY AND HISTORICAL COMMISSION

The Florida Library and Historical Commission, a statutory body of the State of Florida, commends the President of the United States and the Governor of Florida in naming the complete missile complex in Brevard County, Fla., for the late President John F. Kennedy, deems it an honor that this Florida location should bear his name, and is in full accord with any official action in conferring this name; however, in view of the antiquity of the name, Cape Canaveral, and the fact that the name is established in world cartography: Be it

Resolved, That this commission respectfully request the President of the United States, the Governor of Florida, and the Board on Geographic Names to carefully consider the possibility of retaining the name, Cape Canaveral, as the geographic designation only of the easternmost tip of the land formation known as Cape Canaveral (that tip upon which no portion of the missle complex is located) thereby detracting none whatever from the widespread desire to honor our late President John F. Kennedy.

Double Standard in Communist Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a "do as we say and not as we do" attitude in the United States when it comes to viewing trade relations between our allies and Communist nations. I have long advocated a joint Western trade policy toward the Soviets and other Communist-bloc nations. I think such a trade policy is absolutely essential if the West is to realize the fullest potential of trade as a weapon in the cold war.

But until such a joint trade policy is developed—or at least until we have done our best to see such a trade policy evolve—little but further disarray between the allied nations of the West can be anticipated if we insist on setting a double standard. I think this point is clearly made by the following editorial, which appeared in the January 13, 1964, edition of the Austin (Minn.) Daily Herald:

OUR DOUBLE STANDARD IN COMMUNIST TRADE

Angry congressional criticism has been provoked by a British firm's sale of $11 million worth of buses to our enemy, Cuba. And the British, in turn, have become angry because they believe we are unreasonably angry.

The British have a point in their indignation since we are obviously applying a double standard when it comes to trade with Communists—one that says it is all right if we do it, but not other countries.

Our Government has approved sale of wheat to Soviet Russia because it feels it is good business. Certainly, the feeding of hungry Communists will do more to help bolster and preserve a Communist nation than saving Communist feet by providing buses. We have also been giving billions of dollars in foreign aid to Yugoslavia and other Communist nations to strengthen their economy and help communism survive.

As a matter of fact, we have never had a definite policy on trade with Communist nations. U.S. regulations prohibit American firms from selling anything but medical supplies and certain foods to Cuba. The United States has never been able to persuade our allies to observe such an embargo since they feel that if it is good business for the United States to trade with other Communist countries, it is good business for them to trade with Cuba.

It had been the hope that, through an embargo, we would weaken Cuba to the point that the people would rise and kick out both Castro and communism. The gesture has been futile—just as our entire policy toward Cuba has been futile—ever since the days of the fiasco in the Bay of Pigs.

At one time, the Kennedy administration considered a blockade of Cuba, which could have been effective in preventing communism from becoming entrenched on the island. But the administration backed away from such firmness and the opportunity was lost.

Until we have a firm policy on trade with Communist nations, and one that does not have a double standard to benefit ourselves, we can scarcely expect other nations to voluntarily give up their opportunities to trade with other Communist nations, including Cuba.

Fears of Flooding Labor Market Exaggerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article by George Shea in the January 20 Wall Street Journal points out that the fears about providing employment opportunities for the new adults begining to flood the labor market may have to be modified.

While acknowledging that the rise in the number of young adults seeking jobs is unquestionably rapid, Shea points out that this increase is going to be offset in a small part by a decline in the population in some of the older age groups. He also points out that the rise in the young adult population will be spread over a very large working-age population. He points out that from 1963 through 1970 the potential growth of the labor force will be about 1.7 percent a year at most. Allowing for a reduction in unemployment from present levels, the potential increase in the labor force will be a bit less than 2 percent annually.

At this rate of growth of the labor force, productivity must increase significantly if the United States is to continue at its postwar rate of economic growth. This puts a new perspective on the need for rapid technological advancement—frequently called automation—and its importance to economic growth. It also suggests that plans to reduce the work week may make all the more difficult the achievement of desirable rates of economic growth in the American economic system.

Under unanimous consent, I include George Shea's article from the January 20 Wall Street Journal at this point:

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS FINANCE

(By George Shea)

At the turn of the present decade, widespread optimism for the decade as a whole was based in part on projections of increases in population in the United States. More recently these hopes have been modified by fears that the flood of new adults resulting

from the high birth rates of the 1940's might not find sufficient employment opportunities. These fears may have to be modified too.

These fears are based on the combination of a rising population of young adults with constant progress in automation. They are also based on the fact that present unemployment is concentrated in the younger ages. In November teenage unemployment was put at more than 17 percent, compared with less than 6 percent for the labor force as a whole.

The prospective rise in the population of young adults is unquestionably rapid. The number of people 15 to 19 years old, which was 15.5 million in mid-1963, is expected to grow to 17 million in 1965 and to 18.9 million in 1970, up 21.7 percent from 1963. Even faster is the projected growth in the 20 to 24 groups, who were 12.6 million last year, are expected to be 13.5 million in 1965 and will jump to 17.1 million in 1970, up 35.6 percent from 1963. Also rapid is the growth in the 25 to 29 category, from 11 million last year and 11.2 million in 1965 to 13.7 million in 1970, up 24.7 percent from 1963. These projections, of course, are wholly dependable because they are based, not on any estimate of the birth rate, which can change substantially, but on the 1960 census of the actual population.

In regard to automation's effect, some horrifying figures are being publicized. Estimates of the number of workers currently being displaced by new and more efficient machines range from one of 4,000 people a week, or approximately 200,000 a year, to the extreme of 10 times that many. Thus the horrendous picture is drawn of a fast-rising population of would-be workers faced with a constantly declining need of workers for the Nation's output.

This picture, however, is wildly exaggerated on several counts. In the first place it overlooks the fact that the influx of new adults is going to be offset in small part by a decline in population of some of the older age groups. Its effect will also be spread over a very large working-age population.

If we take the working-age population, from which the labor force is recruited, as composed of people from the age of 15 to the age of 64, we find that in 1970 the number of people in this category will be up to 126.4 million from 112.7 million in 1963. That's a gain of 12.1 percent, which is the equivalent of an annual compounded rise of not quite 1.7 percent.

Taking the working ages as 18 to 64, the gain will be to 114.7 million from 102.3 million, or 12.2 percent, an annual rate of 1.7 percent. And taking the working ages as 20 to 64, the gain will be to 107.5 million from 97.2 million, or 10.6 percent, which is 1.5 percent a year.

Assuming the labor force will remain about the same proportion of the working-age population as today, the potential growth of the labor force is thus 1.7 percent a year at most. However, we must add something for the hope of reducing unemployment from its present nearly 6 percent of the labor force to below 4 percent. Doing so, we find a potential increase in the working force of a bit less than 2 percent annually.

This is not enough to continue the postwar rates of U.S. economic growth unless the productivity of the Nation's workers is reinforced with growing automation. Postwar economic growth has varied widely, but has not been as low as 2 percent by any correct method of calculation. The correct method, of course, is to compare boom top with boom top.

It is also necessary to make the comparisons by using figures for gross national production in constant dollars, to avoid distortion from price changes. Such comparisons have been made by William B. Franklin, a senior economist of the National Industrial Conference Board.

He finds that the growth was at the very high rate of 5.3 percent yearly between the boom top of 1948 and the boom top of 1953, undoubtedly because of the extra stimulating factor of rapidly rising Korean war expenditures. From 1953 to 1957 the rate fell to 2.3 percent annually and from 1957 to 1960 it was still only 2.7 percent. Since 1960, however, the rate has expanded again, to 3.6 percent from the 1960 top to the third quarter of 1963. A highly tentative estimate for the period from the 1960 top to the end of 1963 puts the rate even a bit higher at 3.7 percent.

Even the lowest of these figures, the 2.3 percent of 1953–57, wouldn't be achievable with a 2-percent annual gain in the working force. Extra people would have to enter the labor market or, as stated, the workers would need the help of automation.

None of the foregoing is intended to advance the claim that there is or will be no unemployment problem at all. A recession in business would increase joblessness above the present undesirably high rate. And pockets of heavy unemployment do need to be attended to. Undoubtedly, various approaches to the problem must be sought and put into effect, including the prevention of school dropouts and further education in today's needed skills.

But the foregoing figures do show that the frequently suggested scheme of reducing the workweek would simply make all the more difficult the achievement of desirable rates of growth in the American economic system. There is no flood of completely unemployable people in the Nation's future. On the contrary, the prospective expansion in the population of adults is needed, and automation will have its normal benefits, as supported by the evidence of all economic history, in making possible the substantial rates of general economic growth which we all desire.

The President Wants To Spend More, Not Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a quick glance at the President's budget request would give the uninformed the idea that he intends to spend less in fiscal year 1965 than will be spent in fiscal year 1964, but such is not the case.

The facts are, that the President is asking Congress to appropriate about $6 billion more in 1965 than Congress appropriated for 1964.

He is also asking the Congress to now appropriate $4 billion additional supplementals for fiscal year 1964 of the $6½ billion that Congress cut out of the 1964 budget request, which is a clever gimmick to make his Federal 1965 spending look just that much less.

Facts are, also, that the President is requesting of Congress the authority to spend $5,800 million more out of previous years' unexpended balances in fiscal year 1965, than Congress authorized to be spent in fiscal year 1964.

Mr. Speaker, our Republican budget-cutting task force will continue to operate effectively during this session of Congress, just as it did during the last session when the 1964 budget was cut by $6½ billion, in round figures, giving hope to the people that Congress is yet interested in keeping their money sound as a dollar.

"Lulled by the Moonlight Into Sweet Dreams of Peace"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those responsible for American foreign policy refuse to be awakened from their sweet dreams of peace to the cold reality of the Communist world conspiracy. Lulled by the moonlight of a belief that communism is just another political philosophy and that Soviet Russian leaders really do not mean to bury us, they refuse to admit that while the wily Khrushchev is calling for a nonaggression pact, the only aggression anywhere in the world is being directed from Moscow. Russian apologists ignore the Soviet buildup in Cuba, Soviet influence in the revolt in Zanzibar and Tanganyika, and Soviet exploitation of the crisis in Panama.

Just as a reminder of Khrushchev's hypocrisy, I would like to include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of January 20, 1964:

CUBA AND ZANZIBAR

Khrushchev threatened to beat his own world's record for hypocrisy in his statement on Panama.

"Thoughtful people in the United States," he said, "should understand that we live in an age when all people * * * want to govern their own countries, want to strengthen the independence of their states."

This from the man who sent the Russian tanks against the Hungarian freedom fighters and made a penitentiary out of East Germany by building the wall across Berlin.

Even as Khrushchev was talking, with an affectionate arm around Comrade Castro, a bloody power grab was being mopped up on the island of Zanzibar.

Zanzibar occupies a position with regard to the emerging states of east Africa somewhat comparable to that of Cuba regarding Latin America and particularly the Caribbean. Like Cuba, it can become a base for transshipment of arms and training in the methods of subversion. In Venezuela and now in Panama we have seen the high potential for troublemaking of this system.

This second case of island hopping suggests the deliberate development of a new technique for aggression and prompts concern for other small island countries with unstable governments. They can become ammunition depots, thousands of miles from the Russian headquarters.

Russian interest in Panama, plus quick recognition of the savage new regime in Zanzibar, disappoint hopes that the Communists, disturbed by internal troubles, may be ready to try some actual peaceful coexistence. These actions are further evidence that Soviet aims of world conquest haven't changed—their techniques merely have been revised to fit new opportunities.

The Golden Anniversary of the Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Bronx County. On January 1, 1914, the county came into existence, and the first group of county officials, who had been elected at the November 1913, election, took office.

The year 1914 did not by any means mark the beginning of the history of the Bronx. The area, known as Keskeskeck by the Indians, was purchased from them in 1639 by the Dutch West India Co. Two years later Jonas Bronck became the first white settler when he bought 500 acres between the Harlem River and the Aquahung, which became known as Bronck's River. Religious dissenters and other colonists from New England arrived over the following years, but their settlements were to a large extent unsuccessful. The Morris brothers, who purchased the Bronck estate in 1670 and gave their name to Morrisania, were more fortunate. The descendants of one of them included Lewis Morris, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and Governeur Morris, a member of the Constitutional Convention.

The Bronx remained a farming region through the colonial and early national periods. Urbanization began about 1840 and proceeded rapidly after the Civil War. New industries were established along the Harlem and East Rivers and railroads were built. In 1874 the western townships were added to New York City; in 1895 these were followed by the eastern township of Westchester and parts of Pelham and Eastchester. Under the Greater New York Charter of 1898 the Borough of the Bronx was constituted, consisting of the territory included in the two annexations. In 1914 the Bronx became a separate county, with its own courts and county officials.

In this Golden Jubilee Year the Bronx can look back with pride on its progress. Its population has increased from 200,507 in 1900 and 430,980 in 1910 to 1,424,815 in 1960. Pleasant woods and streams, its heritage from the days of Jonas Bronck, may still be found in its parks—Pelham Bay Park, Van Cortlandt Park, and Bronx Park. In the latter are the world-famous New York Zoological Park and the New York Botanical Garden. Other outstanding landmarks include Yankee Stadium, the Hall of Fame for Great Americans, and the Bronx County Building.

The Bronx is justly proud of its institutions of higher education, which include Fordham University, the Bronx Center of New York University, Manhattan College, a branch of Hunter College, Webb Institute of Naval Architecture, and the College of Mount St. Vincent. On the secondary level, Bronx High School of Science, established in 1938, is among those setting the pace in the contest for academic excellence in the United States.

On the material side, the 12,404 retail establishments in the Bronx in 1958 had sales of $1,173,300,000. The estimate of total sales for 1960 was $1,291,922,000. Although it is primarily a region of homes and apartments, the Bronx in 1958 had 2,081 manufacturing establishments employing 52,471 people.

Although problems remain to be solved, the county has made remarkable progress over the past 50 years. Heartened by a tradition of accomplishment, the people of the Bronx can point to the past with justifiable pride and face the future with hope and confidence.

The Library Services and Construction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Library Services and Construction Act because I feel it will help to correct a dangerous gap in our program of education.

An amendment to the Library Services Act as proposed in H.R. 4879, would make it possible for urban as well as rural public libraries in Washington State to obtain much needed benefits. Under the rural act, demonstrations of service have been inaugurated and urban libraries at a cost to themselves have been used as service centers. According to the present act, however, there could be no direct financial benefit to these urban areas.

In Washington State, the percent of unserved population has gone down from 10 percent in 1955 to 6 percent in 1962 under the impact of the Library Services Act. Although efforts will be continued to bring service to those without libraries, there is an even greater need to improve the quality of library services everywhere. According to the State librarian, no public library in the State meets the criteria for minimum adequacy. The State library commission has the goal of seeing that good library service for the entire State is achieved.

Library demonstrations which would ultimately achieve local support and direction of a fully integrated region have been a major part of Washington's Library Services Act plan. The first two such demonstrations received favorable support by the voters resulting in the establishment of two new district libraries. This is clear evidence of the stimulation upon a State and its localities by Federal grants. In north central Washington five counties have formed the North Central Regional Library, originally known as the Columbia River Regional Library Demonstration. Full library service has been provided through headquarters, participating community libraries, three bookmobiles, and the U.S. mails. In addition to books and periodicals, recordings and films, and a trained staff have been provided.

The second demonstration under the Library Services Act resulted in the establishment of the Sno-Isle Regional Library. Snohomish County extended service to unserved Island County. In current operation is the Timberland Library Demonstration to improve and extend service in the five counties of Lewis, Mason, Thurston, Grays Harbor, and Pacific.

The State of Washington has assumed responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the Library Services Act by providing almost twice the funds allotted by the Federal Government. During the period 1958–64, Federal funds amounted to $867,584 while State and local funds totaled $1,703,752.

Washington has a statewide plan for the development of regional district libraries and for the improvement of the quality of service to all citizens. The present Library Services Act has fulfilled its purpose of stimulating Washington and some of its localities to move ahead toward implementing a part of this orderly plan for library development. The expansion of the act to serve urban areas and to provide more funds will make it possible for Washington to accelerate its program and for the first time to benefit urban libraries.

The quality of service that a library provides to the community may be directly related to the adequacy of its building facilities. The present Library Services Act prohibits the use of funds for the purchase or erection of buildings or for the purchase of land.

Many public library buildings were erected in the early years of this century with Carnegie funds and these are now overcrowded and are no longer functional. It is estimated that the median age of public library buildings is nearly a half century.

The Library Services and Construction Act authorizes an appropriation of $20 million for construction of public library buildings, to be allotted on the basis of State plans and contingent upon State and local matching funds. For Washington, the maximum grant, based on population, would amount to $327,666. This modest sum would encourage and stimulate local support for the construction of much needed public library buildings.

Knowledge is expanding rapidly. It is the responsibility of the public library to keep pace and to assemble, organize, and retrieve knowledge in order that our citizens may be informed and intelligent. The enactment of H.R. 4879 will help insure that this responsibility can be assumed.

Shuttling Between Shame and Alarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we are completely taken in by the legerde-

main of an administration budget which promises more spending, tax cuts and less Federal expense all in one package, we should examine our fiscal policies.

Columnist Lyle C. Wilson, in an article in the Washington Daily News of January 20, 1964, reminds us that the present administration is already faced with deficit No. 1 with the full promise of others to follow. I am sure there is agreement that we just will not save money by spending it and that we cannot balance the budget by going further into debt, yet that is exactly what we are being told.

Perhaps we should recall, too, that the presentation of these strange economic theories are still being made by Dr. Walter Heller, whose policies have not been found practical and have not resulted in economic growth or stability.

Mr. Wilson points out, and I hope the country will pay some attention, that inflation is already at work, that we are now using a 49-cent dollar with a 25-cent dollar a distinct possibility. In spite of this, we are being told that more inflation, more welfare programs, more Federal spending will increase our economic health. I hope the Nation will not have to go into bankruptcy before we admit that Dr. Heller's theories are wrong.

What is needed now is fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility to actually cut Federal spending, not merely shift the figures.

The column by Lyle Wilson follows:

JOHNSON DEFICIT NO. 1

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

American citizens should be shuttling between shame and alarm this week as they hear from their President that the U.S. Government again must borrow billions to pay its bills.

The shame belongs mostly to politicians who have collaborated over the years in the reckless policy of defict financing. President Johnson will tell the Congress tomorrow that he expects a $4.9 billion deficit in the 1965 fiscal year. That will be Mr. Johnson's deficit No. 1.

The U.S. Government has been in the red in 26 of the past 33 years. There has been a Treasury surplus only six times since 1930. That is a shameful record. If the politicians and the voters lack the grace to be ashamed, they should have the wit at least to be frightened by this extraordinary record of loose living by the U.S. Government.

These repeated deficits have been a major factor in the rotting of the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar. The $2.50 haircut and the 25-cent bus ride have arrived. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported this week that the U.S. dollar had lost 55 cents of its purchasing power in the past 25 years. These were the years of deficit spending during which the public debt exploded from about $40 billion (in 1939) to $310 billion today.

The dollar you saved in 1939 is now worth just 45 cents in purchasing power. If you saved a dollar in the 1947–49 period and still have it in the bank, it will buy about 76 cents worth of groceries compared to its take when you salted that buck away.

Your dollar put in the bank in 1957–59 is worth a fraction of a cent more than 93 cents today. From October to November of last year the U.S. dollar shrank by two tenths of a cent. Not much, maybe. But over the years the shrinkage has been enormous. The country is well on the way to a two-bit dollar. Thereafter the buck could shrink some more. It could shrink to no value at all.

At that point we would be a nation of bankrupts in a bankrupt nation. The American way would have become an American memory. Another 30 years of spendorama Government could achieve all of that.

That is the direction in which the leaders of the United States are leading. Two of our recent Presidents never once achieved a Treasury surplus or, even, a balanced budget while in office. They were Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy piled up a spending deficit of nearly $18 billion during his brief time in office.

J.F.K. sent to Congress a 1963 fiscal year budget message predicting a surplus of about $463 millions. That fiscal year ended with a $6.2 billion deficit. The 1964 fiscal year deficit also will run into billions—and many of them.

The odds are against President Johnson scoring a budget balance in the 1, 5 or 9 years he may preside in the White House. L.B.J. is tied to a political party which is tied to pressure groups which are tied to big spending.

Dwight D. Eisenhower had 3 surplus years, 1956–57–60, and was proud of them. The Republican 80th Congress forced surpluses on Harry S. Truman in 1947–48 for which he apparently never forgave the legislators. H.S.T. also was in the black in fiscal 1951.

Now comes another Treasury deficit. Two-bit dollar, here we come.

Rapid Transit—Salvation for Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last year our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, submitted recommendations to Congress for the enactment of legislation to help solve the problems of mass transportation throughout the country.

These legislative proposals are concontained in S. 6, which passed the Senate last year and in H.R. 3881, which is now pending on the House Calendar. I think we are all becoming increasingly aware that the problems of mass transportation are a matter which demand action now; we can no longer delay.

The chairman of the Maryland Metropolitan Transit Authority, Mr. Philip Heller Sachs, recently delivered a speech before the American Retail Association Executives in which he explored some of these problems and their possible solution. Mr. Sachs' address is so important and timely that under unanimous consent I inserted it at this point in the RECORD for consideration by all the Members of Congress:

CLEAR THE TRACK FOR RAPID TRANSIT—SALVATION OF OUR CITIES—SPEECH BEFORE THE 1964 CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN RETAIL ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVES, AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 7, 1964, BY PHILIP HELLER SACHS, CHAIRMAN, METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY, BALTIMORE, MD.

How many of your fellow Americans working in the urban centers of the Nation have a headache at least twice a day, every working day? These headaches aren't cured by taking aspirin, they won't go away quickly, and they get worse day by day. I refer, of course, to the simple problem of going to work and coming back home each day, or, as Newsweek magazine phrased it in its isue of June 24th, 1963:

"* * * Inching through traffic jams in a blue haze of exhaust fumes and profanity, lurching through the suburbs on the squealing wheels of rusty railroad cars, or sneezing or sweltering on street corners waiting for buses, the American city worker spends untold centuries each year in the grinding process of getting from his home to his job—and coming back."

The traffic ordeal that the urban worker goes through each day is indeed a nerve-fraying, time-wasting, accident-breeding and pocketbook-flattening experience. The hardening of traffic arteries in and around our metropolitan centers discourages downtown shopping, promotes blight, causes an enormous waste of productive time and slows the movement of people and goods. One observer comments that our cities, which once went along with the everybody-drives-his-car philosophy, have decided, finally, that it won't work. The automobile, they've found, is everyman's magic carpet for off-peak hours, or for weekend driving. For rush-hour travel, even, or especially, on fine new expressways, the automobile can become a sort of rubber-tired jail cell. Kaiser Industries, studying the Los Angeles problem, found that despite Los Angeles' hundreds of miles of freeways, costing billions of dollars, the traffic jam has become a way of life. Traffic is, indeed, chaos.

Those of you who come from large cities may be aware, but many of you may not be cognizant, of some harsh facts of urban life in the United States. In the October 1963 issue of Architectural Forum magazine, published by Time, Inc., these statistics are noted:

"1. In the last decade, central city populations have risen only 10 percent, while suburban population has risen over 50 percent.

"2. In the same period 12 of the 13 largest core cities showed absolute population declines, while their suburbs grew steadily.

"3. By 1980, central cities will hold less than half of the populations of the largest metropolitan areas.

"4. Shifts in employment indicate that in another decade or so there will actually be more jobs in the suburbs than in the cities. New York City, which had 61 percent of its region's jobs in 1956, expects to have only 48 percent in 1985.

"5. Urban populations are consuming more land as they spread out. In 1950, every square mile of urban land contained 5,410 persons, but, by 1960, the figure had declined to 3,759 persons per square mile, and it continues to decline."

In the next 20 years, it is estimated, 43 cities will have more than a million inhabitants. The 1950 census showed only five cities in the United States with a population of more than a million—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Detroit. Metropolitan regions will grow proportionately more. For instance, it is estimated that the Baltimore metropolitan area, consisting of Baltimore City and five surrounding counties, will show a population increase of 80 percent in the next 20 years. The Washington metropolitan area, mushrooming as it has into adjacent Maryland and Virginia, will more than double its inhabitants by 1985. And so on throughout the country in greater or less degree: New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Memphis, Miami, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Houston, Kansas City, and many more.

The need is here; is there a solution? What, in effect, is going to be the "Blue Print for Survival"? The basic answer is the same in all large urban centers, even

though the means through which the answer is reached varies in detail from one community to another: Mass transportation systems built around rail rapid transit or high speed express buses, or both, operating on their exclusive or private rights of way, tied to feeder bus routes and suburban parking facilities. All of this coordinated with other forms of transportation, primarily the private automobile, is the only rational, efficient, economic answer.

But let's stop for a minute and take stock. What is today's national mass transit picture? What has been done up to now? Many large cities have a transit authority established either to regulate or operate mass transit carriers in its area. New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and Boston, to mention the larger ones, operate all or most of the facilities within its borders. These cities, together with Philadelphia (whose transportation system is privately owned but heavily subsidized by the city of Philadelphia, to the tune of about $2,500,000 a year) presently operate the only rail rapid-transit systems in the United States.

In Maryland, for example, the legislature in 1961 created a metropolitan transit authority to regulate all mass transit in the Baltimore metropolitan area, which has a present population of about 1,500,000. The statute creating the authority did not have an easy birth. Its period of gestation was about 4 years. But the obstacles that were put in its path by some of the smaller carriers, some of the unions, and others, were finally overcome, and the act, while far from perfect, seems to be well accepted by the public and all parties concerned. All the carriers under our jurisdiction are privately owned, but the authority is authorized to acquire, own, and operate any carrier which transports 5 million or more passengers in any one year, if in the authority's opinion it should become necessary to do so, but only after the authority has utilized its powers to create the most favorable conditions for the continued operation of private mass transportation companies within the area. At the present time, the internationally known engineering firm of Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade, and Douglas has been employed to conduct a study in the Baltimore metropolitan area, which will develop a plan for the overall transportation needs of the whole region looking ahead until at least 1985. The study, which will be completed in June 1965 is sorely needed and eagerly awaited.

What is being done in other cities? The most ambitious undertaking of all, of course, is in the San Francisco Bay area. There, construction will begin shortly on a 75-mile rail-rapid transit system, which will be financed with $115 million in bridge tolls and $792 million worth of bonds, which will be a general obligation on the taxpayers of San Francisco, Alameda, and Contra Costa Counties. The 75 miles will include 16 miles of subway, 31 miles of elevated lines, 24 miles of private right-of-way surface lines, and a 4-mile tunnel under the bay. Thirty-four miles of the network will use existing railroad right-of-way and 14 miles will be in median strips of freeways. This success did not happen quickly nor easily. The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, or BARTD as it is called, was created by the California Legislature in 1957, and its progress since then has been based largely on three things: organization, broad-scale planning, and a determination to succeed. The engineering firm of Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas, which is doing the Baltimore study, and two other engineering firms together with three other groups of outside consultants, were retained to prepare an engineering and a financing plan, to analyze the program's effect on bay area taxes, and to develop economic studies useful in determining the economic value of the rapid transit system when fully completed, which is scheduled to be in 1971. The final, composite report was completed in May 1962, 5 years after BARTD was established. Then came the last vital phase of the rapid transit story, which, if unsuccessful, would have wrecked the years of work and the millions of dollars already spent: the job of securing voter understanding of the immense project's value and getting 60 percent of the voters to approve the project at the polls. It was a gigantic task, because it meant asking the average homeowner to increase his property taxes by $27 per year, which represented an increase of 7 percent in the total property tax bill. In addition to its own public-information program, BARTD got massive support from many directions.

The California State Highway Division and the California State Automobile Association gave very important help, pointing out that freeways alone could not handle rush-hour congestion, and that the best way to meet the problem was with a balanced system of both freeways and rapid transit working together, each doing the job it is best suited to perform. In the final weeks before the balloting, support snowballed from many sources. City and State officials, business groups, a citizens committee, and large public-minded corporations, like the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., Bank of America, and Standard Oil of California (which conceivably could lose business by supporting rapid rail transit as against greater auto use), all rallied to the cause. The plan passed by a 61.2-percent vote from citizens who voluntarily increased their taxes to provide for coordinated transportation and to rid their area of creeping auto strangulation with a jet-age system of rapid transit. But there was one more hurdle to overcome. A taxpayer's suit was filed in court to declare the plan invalid. It failed to upset the vote, so the track was clear to move forward.

What, in effect, did the San Francisco voters buy for their tax dollars? They bought a system designed not just to compete with the private auto but to better auto performance in the critical area of urban transportation. Specifically, they bought progress in four ways:

1. Comfort and convenience: From the beginning, BARTD promised seats for all.
2. Speed: Average speeds, including stops, will be in the 45- to 50-mile-per-hour range.
3. Safety: There were 3,700 persons killed in auto accidents in California last year.
4. Economy: Bridge tolls, parking fees, auto cost and upkeep come high. Rapid transit will cost much less than equivalent highway facilities. It was estimated by one California official that to build freeways or highways to carry the people that the rapid transit system will serve would cost $3 billion; that is, if enough land could be found to build the roads.

But one observer pointed out that there was a greater and more overriding motivation than the immediate practical benefits, that two important far-reaching effects would be realized:

1. The stimulation of economic growth and employment, and,
2. The preservation of the region's livability and cultural attractiveness amid this growth.

The people of the bay area did not want to see their transportation arteries uselessly clogged by vehicles. They have seen a number of their parks and landmarks either threatened or buried under these facilities. By piercing the traffic jams with a really fast, convenient, and high-capacity rapid transit system, far greater volumes of traffic will move freely within the metropolitan area, permitting greater freedom of choice where businesses, plants, and workers can locate, and, specifically, stimulating major business and permitting cultural concentrations to flourish. It is estimated that the transit district will ultimately attract at least 100,000 more jobs than if the new system were not there.

Other cities are facing the problem with determination and appropriate action. New York, of course, with its huge concentration of population, has the biggest headache of all. Already operating 237 route miles of rapid transit, New York is pushing hard to improve its rapid transit capability. Last year the New York Transit Authority awarded contracts for 964 new subway cars, opened a $6½ million subway and a $6 million subway station that was rebuilt, and asked for a 6½ mile tax-financed $197 million express subway line between Manhattan and the Bronx. The New York City Transit Authority operates on a self-sustaining basis for operating expenses, has complete control of the city's vast transit plants and taps the city for capital costs (approval by the State legislature of a special bond issue gave new impetus to NYCTA's car-buying plan). Maxwell Lehman, deputy city administrator, describes the city's subsidy for capital costs as possibly the city's greatest bargain, and says: "It is kindergarten stuff to talk of preserving our mass-transit facilities. We must think of building transit systems of such magnitude as we have not dared hitherto to envision * * * everytime we have extended a subway line, real estate values along the route have risen. The city's tax revenues have risen as well, enabling us to provide more service." New York, already handling 4½ million passengers a day on its rapid transit system, knows all too well the futility of pouring untold millions into magnificent highways and entrances into the city. During the partial subway strike of a few years ago, surface transportation ground into bumper-to-bumper immobility, not to mention that provision for downtown municipal parking space in New York costs about $4,000 per car.

Los Angeles: Another tremendous headache. That area's increased auto congestion has all but destroyed Los Angeles' central business district despite—or possibly because of—the most extensive (and expensive) system of freeways in the world. The Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority has proposed a 58-mile system, extending from Long Beach on the south to North Hollywood on the north, and from El Monte on the east to Beverly Hills on the west—the price tag—$649 million. The chief stumbling block: How to pay for it. The LAMTA is proposing to finance it with $649 million in bonds backed by both fare revenues and a real estate tax in Los Angeles.

Chicago: A pioneer in construction of rail rapid transit in grade-separated rights-of-way in multilane expressways, the Chicago Transit Authority has operated its West Side subway in the median-strip of the Congress Street Expressway since 1958. More median-strip rapid transit is planned in other locations. By 1967 motorists will have access to a $1.4 billion 273-mile network of expressways within 30 miles of the Loop, which will complement the existing subway-elevated-surface rapid-transit system.

And so the story goes, and, as the need grows, answers must be found, and are being found, in Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and elsewhere. St. Louis started solving its problem in April of last year, when the Bi-State Development Agency, a public authority, acquired, by negotiation, certain physical properties of the St. Louis Public Service Co., which provided streetcar and bus service within the city and county of St. Louis, and 14 other operating companies serving, in all, the city of St. Louis and 3 Missouri and 3 Illinois counties. Communities being served will relieve the new transit system of all local taxes, adopt traffic regulations to provide transit vehicles with priority of movement, and include transit in plans for future highway construction and improvement.

A historic date in the changing urban scene was April 5, 1962. On that date, our late President delivered his message on transportation to the Congress of the United States. The President emphasized particularly the need for action on the transportation problems resulting from burgeoning urban growth. I quote briefly from his message:

"To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important, are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. In less than 20 years, we can expect well over half of our expanded population to be living in 40 great urban complexes. Many smaller places will also experience phenomenal growth. The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare, therefore, requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth. * * *

"Accordingly, I recommend that long-range Federal financial aid and technical assistance be provided to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vitally needed, not only to benefit local communities, but to assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs."

Simultaneous bills were introduced in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and Representative ABRAHAM MULTER, of New York, were the prime movers. I had the interesting experience of testifying, as did many others, before both the Senate and the House Committees on Banking and Currency. After many trials and tribulations, an amended and somewhat watered down bill finally passed the Senate. It is now resting peacefully in the files of a House committee, where, because of the rural mindedness of so many Representatives, it did not even come out of committee at the session just ended. But John F. Kennedy saw its far-reaching importance to the Nation's economy as a whole, and it is hoped that President Johnson, being the practical businessman that he is, will likewise see is worth, its value, its enormous potential, and will use the great power of his office for its enactment. I urge each of you, either in your capacity as members of a trade association, or as individual citizens, to communicate with your Congressmen and impress upon them the tremendous economic necessity and the measurable benefits to be gained from the passage of mass-transit legislation.

All that I have talked about are developments of the last decade. Ten years ago, America and its cities were not ready for mass transit despite its inevitability. We were too preoccupied with getting our highway program launched and our transit systems were forced to languish. But the unbalanced nature of our public transportation policies of the recent past is having the predictable effect of any program of excesses, a malady has occurred. Sound planners realize that the important word today in mass transportation thinking is "balance." Balance has to do with teamwork between road and rail, between bus and rail transit, between public transportation and the private automobile. But it also means the relation between need and the ability to pay, between revenue and public financing, and between what a city is and what it's likely to become. Balance also means coordination among city, county, State, and Federal officials and departments, between those solely road-minded and those whose prime concern is the mass movement of people, and, most important of all, balance among government, business, and the plain ordinary citizen, whose work, energy, determination, vision and faith for almost 200 years, have been the backbone of both our democratic system of government and the private enterprise system of American business, upon which the free world looks with pride and the slave world with envy.

When you go back to your communities, large or small, find out what your officials are doing, or failing to do, in the transportation field. Get into the act with them, think big as you do in your own businesses, plan wisely and soundly, act deliberately but expeditiously, awake the consciences of your cities and metropolitan areas to the urgent need for planning now for the tremendous tomorrows that are just a step ahead of us. Set your sights high, as high as you want the progress, the economic growth, a dynamic future, and the best of a jet and space world to be, on the threshhold of a population-exploding generation, a generation that will see the greatest advances in every phase of human activity and experience that the world has ever known.

If Cost Effectiveness Is Good for the Defense Department, It Is Good for the Civilian Departments and Agencies of Government Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on last Christmas Eve the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, tucked a package of hope for taxpayers under the tree in the form of an essay by Robert Haveman inserted in the RECORD of December 24 at page 24309.

The essay pleads for application to water resources projects of the cost effectiveness yardstick now used by the Department of Defense.

In his thesis, Haveman makes the point that vast amounts of our national wealth are being pork barreled away on marginal and submarginal water resource projects simply because of our refusal to apply proper criteria to the consideration and evaluation of projects when they are still in the proposal stage. His thesis is devastatingly accurate with respect to almost every project recently authorized and to almost every pending project.

In brief, the essay questions the validity of application of the benefit-cost ratio to water resource project proposals as the sole formula for determining their merits. Haveman is particularly concerned over the acceptance by Congress of benefit statistics without careful scrutiny of them which might reveal them as liabilities rather than benefits.

Haveman's thesis, however, deserves application not just to the relatively narrow field of water resources but to every last activity of the civilian departments and agencies of our Government. If cost effectiveness is good for the military departments, it is good for civilian departments as well.

It is interesting to note that Haveman's essay is liberally footnoted with references to a book by Roland McKean entitled "Efficiency in Government Through Systems Analysis, With Emphasis on Water Resources Development." McKean coauthored, with Charles Hitch, another book entitled "The Economics of Defense in the Nuclear Age." The latter is the bible of cost effectiveness in the McNamara era in the Pentagon and Mr. Hitch is now Defense Department Comptroller. Two of the chapters of the Hitch book were written by Alain C. Enthoeven, another top Defense official.

Perhaps, if President Johnson really wants to be frugal with Government dollars, he could arrange some kind of a lend-lease scheme to borrow Hitch, Enthoeven, and others, from McNamara for a while and turn them loose on Udall, Dillon, R. Kennedy, Rusk, Hodges, Celebreeze, Wirtz, and others.

As for the Congress, perhaps our authorization and Appropriations Committees of both Houses might well do a little staff recruiting at the Rand Corp., the high temple of cost effectiveness, and at some of its lesser temples.

As for myself, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am going to insist that every project coming before us be analyzed, and then approved or rejected, under the Hitch-Haveman formulas, notwithstanding the fact that my effort probably will be doomed beforehand as a quixotic exercise in futility and frustration.

At least, some editor up at the Wall Street Journal seems to like the idea, as witnessed by the following editorial in the January 17 issue:

A WATERY WASTE

Many in Congress are naturally quite sensitive about charges of pork-barrel waste. How can anyone, they say in effect, call it wasteful to spend money for such projects as water-resources development?

Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, a strong critic of the pork barrel, has now provided one interesting part of the answer to that question. He has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis by Prof. Robert Haveman, of Grinnell College, Iowa, which shows more than $1 billion of waste, or nearly 45 percent of the total under consideration, in Corps of Engineers programs.

The study embraces 147 water projects, in 10 selected States, underway between 1947 and 1962. Many of them are found to represent a misallocation of national resources.

As Mr. Haveman explains it, the existing investment criterion used by the Federal Government has been increasingly scrutinized in the work of professional economists. Some studies question the very concept of the benefit-cost ratio, the statistical formula which attempts to measure the particular undertaking's investment outlays against its probable returns to the Nation. Others raise doubts about some of the variables used in the benefit-cost formula.

All this is highly technical, but in brief what Mr. Haveman has done is subject the selected projects to other evaluation techniques which the economists believe are closer to reality than the Government's.

On the basis of one such test, 84 of the 147 projects should have been rejected. On the basis of another, 60 fail to pass the efficiency requirement; it is this evaluation which yields the nearly 45 percent of wastage of Federal funds.

Moreover, Senator PROXMIRE thinks the situation is even worse than that. The estimates assume that the additional lands brought into the production of surplus farm crops by these projects are of value to the Nation, whereas, in fact the taxpayer has to pay to take the crops off the market.

If the estimates, says the Senator, "had valued this crop production as worthless, which it certainly is, the overwhelming majority of these projects would have to be classified as wasted." Thus the waste of money is compounded by confusion of policy; with one hand the Government tries to curb farm surpluses while with the other it encourages them.

Doubtless the officials concerned would defend their cost and benefit computations, but the development of these other criteria raises questions about the validity and objectivity of present formulas. There is even a bill in one of the congressional committees which would revise the benefit-cost ratio; in Mr. PROXMIRE's view, it would leave less justification for all this seemingly indiscriminate spending.

Such criticism, after all, is not just a blanket charge of waste, but a scholarly examination of particulars. It is a fruitful area of investigation for those in Government who are seriously seeking ways to economize.

Until this sort of spending is curtailed, the taxpayer can be sure, as Mr. PROXMIRE puts it, that literally billions of his dollars will be squandered. And too much of the Nation's resources diverted into a watery waste.

The Truth About the Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Hon. Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of the State of Israel, which appeared in the December 1963 issue of the B'nai Zion Voice. Mrs. Meir presents the facts on the Arab refugees remaining in the Middle East and tells why they are still there after 15 years.

The article follows:

THE TRUTH ON ARAB REFUGEES

(By Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of the State of Israel)

With the renewed opening of the U.N. debate on Arab refugees the Arab delegations proclaim their theme: Israel must not exist.

In their speeches the Arab spokesmen are trying to assert that Israel is not a nation; that the Jews are not a people; that the Jews have no real connection with the Holy Land; that Zionism is a sinister, imperialist conspiracy; that the United Nations had no right to take the decision in 1947; that it was not the Arabs who had attacked Israel after that decision. This year, Arab representatives have treated the U.N. Committee to an innovation: an attempt to rewrite the Bible.

It is interesting to remember that those territories which are now independent Arab States have become such as a result of what the Arab delegations have described as "imperialist machinations." With the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, and only then, did Palestine become a separate political entity designated by the League of Nations in 1921 to contain the national home of the Jewish people. In the white paper of 1922, Mr. Churchill limited the territory to which the Jewish national home provisions of the mandate applied, to the land situated west of the Jordan River, i.e., to less than one-fourth of the original area of the mandate. In 1947 this latter area, by the resolution of the United Nations of November 29, was further partitioned. The State of Israel today has about 8,000 square miles; the area in the Middle East in which the Arab States have gained their independence since the end of the First World War covers 3 million square miles.

There were elements in the 1947 resolution that were painful to us—yet we accepted the compromise. Had the Arabs done likewise, the history of the Middle East would have taken an entirely different course—a course of cooperation, friendship and constructive development for all, without war and the destruction of life and property, and without refugees.

Even if the Arab governments are as yet unwilling or incapable of understanding the spiritual and moral sources of the aspirations of the Jewish people for the renewal of its statehood, they will have to accept the fact that that statehood will not be given up, even in the face of aggressive speeches or threats of force.

The Arab refugee problem is the only instance where out of political considerations, hundreds of thousands of people are compelled to remain refugees, denied natural acceptance by their own kinsman. How can one reconcile the outcry over the fate of the refugees living on international charity with the fierce opposition to any plan of constructive development, of resettlement, and of integration designed to rehabilitate these unfortunate people?

I should like to emphasize the fact that we in Israel have received since 1948 over 500,000 Jewish refugees from the Arab countries, that is, practically the same number as that of Arabs who left the area which is Israel.

These Jewish refugees from Arab States and their children comprise a very substantial part of Israel's total population. A striking indication of this lies in the fact that no less than 55 percent of the children of grade-school age in Israel are from families which came to Israel from the countries which are members of the Arab League.

Our approach to these refugees was that they were our brothers and sisters; they must be given full equality, not just in theory but in practice; they must be helped to take a productive part in our economy and our public life, and their children in particular, must be helped quickly to move upward on the educational ladder so that within as short a period as possible they would reach the general level.

The central aspect of the Arab presentations which we have heard during the debate this year, as on so many previous occasions, is that the refugee is used as a political instrument for the attainment of negative and destructive objectives which we have heard defined in this very Committee in terms diametrically opposed to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

I have no doubt what members of the United Nations think of these objectives or of the spirit which advances them. It breeds no peace but war. It is a spirit which does not solve refugee problems but which, if permitted to express itself in action, would create only additional human misery in the entire area.

In 1953, the Acting Director of UNRWA estimated that, given the cooperation of the host governments, 445,000 refugees could be made self-supporting in the host countries from 1954 to 1958, on the basis of the program agreements already concluded with these governments. This did not materialize because of political obstacles, and not because of the lack of absorptive capacity in these countries. In the meantime, substantial spontaneous integration into the economic life of the host countries is taking place in spite of all the difficulties.

There is no doubt about the present UNRWA rolls being inflated. There are not a million-odd bona fide refugees and there never were. On December 31, 1946, according to the figures supplied by the Government of Palestine to UNSCOP, the total number of Arabs in unpartitioned Palestine was 1,288,000. Of this number were resident in the former mandated territory, later annexed by Jordan, about 500,000. In the area later annexed by Egypt, namely, the Gaza strip, there were over 100,000. Furthermore, about 100,000 Arabs never left the area which is now Israel, and a further 40,000 returned to Israel. The total of Arabs, therefore, who left the area which is Israel could not have exceeded 540,000 to 550,000.

As the Commissioner-General has pointed out, at least 20 percent were immediately absorbed, and never became dependent on UNRWA. This should have left about 400,000 genuine refugees on the rolls. But, as United Nations documents indicate, the original lists of relief recipients in 1948–49 included not only refugees, but also a large proportion of impoverished local inhabitants.

The rectification of the rolls has come up repeatedly in annual reports and Assembly resolutions, but it has not been carried out due to the opposition of the Arab governments.

From the outset my Government offered to pay compensation for the property abandoned by the Arab refugees. In any negotiations about compensation, Israel has reserved the right to present claims for the properties of the half-a-million Jewish refugees from Arab countries, as well as the assets of Israel that were taken over or destroyed by Arab governments during the war in areas under Arab control.

If the Arab refugee problem were dealt with as any other refugee question, it would have been solved many years ago. The only obstruction to the solution of this refugee problem is the belligerent attitude and the policy of the Arab States. The position of my Government regarding compensation and all the other aspects has been made clear on past occasions, and we stand by that position despite the venomous attacks that were made upon us again. The solution to all issues outstanding between Israel and the Arab States can be brought about rapidly and effectively if the Arab governments accommodate themselves to the reality of Israel's existence. It is entirely up to them.

In Spring the New, Tender Mound Will Have a Coat of Irish Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Mr. Jim Oliphant, and published in the Spartanburg Journal:

IN SPRING THE NEW, TENDER MOUND WILL HAVE A COAT OF IRISH GREEN

(NOTE.—Herald State Editor Jim Oliphant traveled to Washington this week to report on President Kennedy's funeral. He returned to Spartanburg today. Here, in brief requiem, is his tribute to a man named Kennedy.)

(By Jim Oliphant)

ARLINGTON CEMETERY.—I would like to come again to this sloping hillside and gaze once more across the river to where he used to live, where there was a happy game on a wide, wide lawn and where there were smiles instead of tears.

I would choose springtime, not fall, to climb this hill and see where a man named Kennedy found a resting place.

Perhaps then the grief would not be so tight and the tender mound of earth that covers the man named Kennedy will carry a coat of Irish green.

I would choose a quiet Sabbath afternoon to wind through these drives past the olive-drab bell tower when the barren old oak just below this hallowed ground would once again show its color.

It would be good to come here when the sound of hoofbeats does not bring tears and a black riderless horse does not deepen the lump that is 2 days old in the throat.

I would like to mingle among the warriors resting here without being stifled with sorrow at the sound of a far-off bugle. Only a quiet visit would I want, just a little while and then go back down the hill and watch the river flow its endless route.

It would be good to walk along Washington streets—down Pennsylvania Avenue—and see people smile, not weep, and perhaps that time will come although it now seems so far away.

Give me a day when a little girl named Caroline and her brother John, a little older perhaps, can smile again as they walk in other places with a beautifully brave mother named Jacqueline.

Let me come back some day to listen again to the bird song in the trees when the boom of cannon doesn't slice the heart to shreds.

But don't let me forget a chill November afternoon when the six gray horses pulled the ancient caisson and its flag-covered casket to the foot of the hill and a widowed mother found relief in tears.

I would want to forget the reasons that brought him here, remembering rather the wonderful and vast throng that sorrowed as one and remained faithful to the end to the man they called their own.

Salute to a Man Who Got Things Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared on January 2, 1964, in the Augusta Herald, Augusta, Ga.

This editorial cites the retirement on January 1, 1964, of Lester S. Moody as secretary to the Augusta Chamber of Commerce since 1926. His record of achievements in the development of water resources in Georgia and the Southeast has not been paralleled.

The editorial follows:

SALUTE TO A MAN WHO GOT THINGS DONE

You should have been here back in 1926. Lester S. Moody was. What he found when he took a position as Augusta Chamber of Commerce secretary on September 19 in that year was a city on the banks of a stream which varied from trickles to floods, more used for angling for catfish than as the great artery of traffic it had been when Augusta was founded in colonial days. There was not a single paved road leading into the city, and it took 3 hours to drive from Aiken to Augusta.

A lot of water has flowed under the Savannah River bridges since that time. Lester Moody has remained with the chamber of commerce and with the development problems of this city and area, compiling in the process the longest continuous term of service as chamber of commerce executive in the Southeast, and the third longest in the Nation.

The new year will see him turn administration of the organization over to Millard A. Beckum as executive vice president, although still retaining—most appropriately—a connection through which his wide knowledge can benefit the organization to which he has given his professional life.

Lester Moody, in the process of fighting the battles of Augusta and the CSRA in Washington, became acquainted with Congressmen and national agency chiefs as have few men in this Nation. The development of a 9-foot channel for the Savannah River and of the Clark Hill and Hartwell Dams came as the result of the persistent work which he and others contributed over the years, despite obstacles, delays and discouragements.

Similar work contributed to the growth of Fort Gordon and other Federal installations here, and—on the State level—to a network of fine highways that radiate from Augusta.

He has received high honors for his services. Among these, he has been a director of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. In 1960 he was appointed an honorary member of the Augusta Port Authority. One of the top honors was the decoration for outstanding civilian service in 1960, authorized by the Secretary of the Army and presented by Maj. Gen. F. M. Albrecht, who said, "Were it not for the Clark Hill project, which he helped so much to obtain, the Savannah River Plant of the Atomic Energy Commission could not have been located in this area."

His interest in waterways has not been parochial, by any means. He performed a broad regional service through his membership of the Southeast Rivers Study Commission.

The direction of the chamber of commerce will be in good hands with the highly capable and conscientious Millard A. Beckum. Whatever may be accomplished in the future, however, will owe much to a splendid foundation of accommplishment during 38 years of guidance by Mr. Moody.

So long as the water of the Savannah River continues to bear the products of this area to the sea in barges, it will constitute a moving, living memorial to Lester S. Moody.

A Public Servant of Rare Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under the California Constitution the State board of equalization is one of the most important boards in our Golden State. Established in 1879 the State board of equalization determines the rules and regulations under which local county government may establish assessed valuations on real and personal property so that throughout the State we have uniformity of assessments.

In addition to the original and historic responsibilities of equalizing local property taxes, the State board of equalization has been given a responsibility of collecting State taxes. This has resulted in giving the five-man board the unique distinction of being the largest collector of tax revenue anywhere in the Nation for the board of equalization is responsible for California's sales, highway, fuel, motor vehicle and alcoholic beverage taxes. The board through the years has attained an outstanding reputation for honesty and fairness. This reputation has been largely due to the leadership of conscientious people such as the Honorable Paul R. Leake, who again has been elected chairman of the State board of equalization.

An editorial in the Chico State Enterprise Record outlines the tremendous work which Chairman Leake has performed since becoming a member of the board in 1952 and during three terms as its chairman. At this point I would like to submit the editorial:

A PUBLIC SERVANT OF RARE DEDICATION

"Paradoxical" Paul Leake this week was elected to serve again as chairman of the California State Board of Equalization.

This was not a new honor for "Paradoxical" Paul, because he has held the chairmanship on three previous occasions since he became a member of the State board in 1952.

But his election again to the board chairmanship is ample evidence of the regard and respect of his colleagues on the board and is a signal honor for a public servant of eminent degree.

We have long referred to Leake as "Paradoxical" Paul because he talks like a politician, but he doesn't act like one.

For example, shortly after his appointment to the State board by the then Gov. Earl Warren (now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court), Leake unleashed such an effective stream of fiery political talk that he inaugurated a liquor reform movement which resulted in a cleanup of a sordid situation which had existed for more than 20 years.

Thanks to Leake, the corrective liquor control amendment passed by the people in 1954 has made California's system a model for States throughout the Nation.

In the process, Leake made some powerful enemies, among them William Bonelli, the czar of southern California who had been a potent power on the equalization board for many years. After Leake finished with Bonelli, the latter flew the coop to Mexico to avoid prosecution. He still is in Mexico.

But six liquor agents and three members of the legislature did not escape as did Bonelli. They were prosecuted and sent to prison.

So Paul Leake made some powerful enemies. But he also made hundreds of thousands of friends among the grateful people of the State. His momentum of popularity was such, in fact, that we believe yet today that he could have had the Democratic nomination for Governor in 1954 if he had wanted it. But Leake shied off, and veteran political observers will remember that colorless Dick Graves finally ended up as the Democratic candidate, and eventual loser to Goodwin J. Knight.

As such, Paul Leake was then a political paradox. He proved himself an expert politician, yet he disdained the rewards that most politicians seek—public acclaim and higher office.

On the contrary, Leake settled down into his board of equalization post and continued to work for reforms and improvements. Here his political knowledge again proved valuable, but here again he declined the normal rewards.

For instance, the State board posts are elective and the terms run for 4 years. In 1954, 1958, and 1962, Leake had to run for reelection in his big district, which includes Butte and 24 other northern California counties.

It goes without saying that a man as popular and highly-respected as Paul Leake would have no trouble at all obtaining campaign help at election time. But Paul Leake would accept no help whatever, neither financially nor otherwise.

Rather, Leake took to the political trail by car and on foot and conducted, and financed, his own 25-county campaigns. The formula has been successful, because Leake has in each instance received landslide votes for reelection. But it is doubtful if any other political officeholder in California could do likewise.

As such, it is fitting and proper that "Paradoxical" Paul Leake should again be elected chairman of the State Board of Equalization. His sole interest is good government. He is a public servant of rare dedication.

U.S. Interests Involved in Arab-Israel Water Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic, indeed, for the Arab people that its leaders have chosen to disregard cruelly the welfare of their own people and have concentrated solely on their enmity toward Israel. The avowed purpose of the Nasser-inspired Arab military accord of 13 Arab States is the downfall of Israel. All efforts to resolve peaceably the Jordan River disputes have been unavailing. The Arab leaders remain intransigent, despite the fact that a plan has been worked out for the use of the water of the Jordan River which would bring decided economic advantages to both the people of the Arab States and to the people of Israel. It is obvious that the wish to hurt Israel takes precedence in the minds of the Arab politicians over concern for the well-being and economic development of the Arab people.

Moreover, grave dangers to the peace in the Middle East lurk in the accord reached by Arab heads of state to set up an allied military command with permanent headquarters and a separate staff and budget to deprive Israel of water from the Jordan.

The United States has a great interest in peace in the Middle East, and it would be most advantageous to our own self-interest were President Johnson to send his representative to Arab leaders to express the concern of the United States. In doing so, the President will be following an action parallel to that which he took when he gave Attorney General Kennedy his recent sensitive assignment.

Certainly the Arab leaders must be aware that Congress spoke most forcibly when enacting the foreign aid bill. The House report on foreign aid states:

Consideration should be given to the withholding of economic assistance from those countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparations for their execution.

The act itself states:

(1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

(1) the United States,

(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

No language can be clearer and no warning more specific.

It's Still Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of October 12, 1963, entitled "It's Still Price Fixing," pointing out the evils of the quality stabilization bill which is nothing more or less than legislation to destroy the last remaining independence in the hands of the little retailer and to eliminate the opportunity of the consumer to secure competitively price merchandise.

This excellent editorial sets forth still further reasons why this iniquitous legislation should not become law.

IT'S STILL PRICE FIXING

The price-fixing proposal that has been kicking around Congress for years is up again this session under the fancy name of quality stabilization. Apparently this has fooled some Congressmen. The talk around Washington is that the bill may slip through.

That would be a mistake. For, whether you call it quality stabilization or fair trade (an older tag), the measure remains a price-fixing gimmick and runs smack against the kind of economic system this country has long cherished.

Basically the bill's purpose is to make it impossible, legally and in practice, for any merchant to sell a nationally branded item to consumers at any price lower than that set by its manufacturer. This, the argument goes, would protect the little retailer against price cutting big chains and discount houses, give customers better service, and protect manufacturers' product reputations.

In effect, such a proposal would force significant changes in our economic landscape. It would abridge retailer freedom, reduce competition, eliminate bargains and possibly start a stampede away from brand name items to offbrand products.

The Department of Justice, which opposes the bill along with the Department of Agriculture, has said it could cost consumers as much as $1 billion a year. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), puts the figure even higher. A recent issue of the Air Force Times says the measure would "have such an inflationary effect" as to seriously "erode the value of the $1.2 billion military pay raise" just enacted. The FTC notes that the average business failure rate per 10,000 business concerns is higher in States with fair trade statutes than in those States with competitive pricing.

Congress should handle this ill-advised piece of legislation just as it has in the past—forget it.

Edward W. Brooke, Sr., 74

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, an outstanding lawyer who had devoted his professional life to the public service, Mr. Edward W. Brooke, Sr., died here in Washington. Mr. Brooke, who was the father of Massachusetts' distinguished attorney general, Edward W. Brooke, Jr., had served for more than 40 years as an attorney for the Veterans' Administration and its predecessor agencies. Awarded the Distinguished Service Award of the VA before his retirement in 1956, Mr. Brooke was legendary in the VA for his devotion to the public good and his loyalty to the highest standards of Federal service. Although I did not have the privilege of working with Mr. Brooke during my tour as Deputy Administrator of the VA, I knew him by reputation and it was an outstanding one. I extend my sincere sympathies to Attorney General Brooke, and to his mother and his sister and insert the article outlining the late Mr. Brooke's career in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article appeared in the Boston Herald on January 10:

EDWARD W. BROOKE, SR., 74, ATTORNEY GENERAL'S FATHER

Funeral services for Edward W. Brooke, Sr., 74, father of Attorney General Edward W. Brooke, Jr., will be held at St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., Saturday at 2 p.m.

The senior Brooke, who died at his home in Washington, was an attorney for the Veterans' Administration. He was responsible for reviewing and judging legal cases involving veterans in all 50 States.

He had been presented the Distinguished Service Award by the VA.

Born in Virginia, he had lived in Washington since 1903, and was a member of the District of Columbia bar almost 50 years. He was active in church affairs at St. Luke's Episcopal Church.

Besides the attorney general, the senior Brooke leaves his wife, Helen S., and a daughter, Mrs. Helen B. Amos, of Washington.

Old Florida Rum—A New Industry in Our Midst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, from Florida, a State beset with the enormous practical problems of relocating hundreds of thousands of displaced persons, comes a story which proves that our country still possesses that dynamism which brought it the unchallenged leadership of the free world.

This inspiring example of practical and realistic cooperation between American business and professional people and refugees from Castro's Communist Cuba culminated, on February 5, 1963, in the marketing of the first products of a new U.S. industry.

America achieved the highest standard of living that history has ever known through its dynamic capitalistic system, controlled by the democratic process religiously protected through the foresight of the authors of our Constitution. Our people have attained this high standard of living, not alone for the privileged few. In fact, all who dwell here and have the desire and the energy may reap great benefits and rewards.

Not only from Cuba, but from the far corners of the world, oppressed, freedom-loving people have flocked to the United States in time of stress and repression. They have left behind their possessions and often their loved ones—friends and family. America has opened its doors and its heart to these human beings who sought the freedom only the United States seemed able to provide.

With them, for two centuries, have come the brains and the skills of the world, enriching our country with those most precious of resources—human ability and aptitude—resources which can be fully developed only in an atmosphere permitting the freedom of choice in labor, in study, in play.

To those among us who may doubt that America any longer possesses that historic dynamism which resulted in bringing to our shores the genius of an Einstein and the voice of a Caruso, these remarks are directed.

In 1961, a small group of Florida business and professional men and women joined with two former Cuban distillers and laid the groundwork for a new industry in Florida.

These men and women adopted the traditional American way and asked the people of Florida to invest the funds to enable them to launch their infant enterprise. They pointed out that there had occurred a virtual explosion in the sugar industry in the United States and proposed that an American rum industry could rise phoenixlike from the ashes of the embargoed Cuban operation.

After all, Florida had the sugarcane, the water, the sunshine and, now, the people with the know-how to produce noble beverages in the tradition of the great rums of the Antilles.

To the everlasting credit of our Nation, the people of Florida responded to this challenge with spontaneous enthusiasm that can only bolster our faith in the democratic processes. More than 2,900 free Americans exhibited their faith in the skills and integrity of these pioneers. A new American industry was born—the Old Florida Rum Co. New payrolls were created. A new source of wealth and opportunity was developed in our midst.

The farm community benefits because Florida rum is created from Florida cane sugar grown in the Everglades-Okeechobee area, thus providing a growing market for this high-grade agricultural byproduct.

Initially the company's products were available only in Florida. But in less than 2 months orders and inquiries began coming in from Georgia, Tennessee, Texas, Indiana, Illinois, and other States as far away as Colorado and from the District of Columbia.

It is true that rum has been produced in the United States from earliest colonial days. But it is also true that the market for American-made rum dwindled in the 19th and 20th centuries to the point where it became a negligible factor in U.S. economy.

Now the ramifications of this expanding industry are almost beyond imagining. In its struggle to develop a more balanced economy, an economy less reliant, proportionately, on tourism, Florida, like some other States, is ardently exploring every possible way to attract a new clean industry to the State and to develop indigenous industry. The success of this campaign is vital to the continuing health of the State, especially in the face of the population explosion it is experiencing. And it is quite generally acknowledged that the addition of new payrolls alone is not enough. Certainly new service companies are more than welcome. New assembly and fabricating plants are sought after and warmly received. But a whole new industry, using the raw materials of Florida's fields and groves, as well as creating new payrolls, adds an additional dimension that is both rare and especially precious.

And, most fortuitously, even the fabled Florida tourism complex is helped by this new rum industry.

For example, industry leaders already are making advance explorations into the foreign market with the intention of carrying the name of the United States, through its rum, not only to Europe, but to the Near and Far East as well.

The cooperation of the U.S. Department of Commerce already is assured and a number of farsighted citizens are presently at work making important contacts in the foreign market.

It is anticipated that the permanent U.S. trade centers will be of immeasurable assistance in this connection as will the industry's participation in appropriate international trade fairs and expositions in many parts of the developed world.

Thus the name of Florida and the United States will be carried on the wings of one of its proudest products to every part of the globe. Certainly there exists no better ambassador of good will than a fine product, offered with dignity and respect to the people of foreign lands.

Freight Reduction Benefits Georgia Corn Users

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a study just released by agricultural economists at the University of Georgia points out how Georgia corn users are benefiting from the reduction in freight rates for grain.

I commend this study to my colleagues with the belief it will be of interest to them:

FREIGHT REDUCTION BENEFITS GEORGIA CORN USERS

ATHENS.—Georgia corn users are benefiting from the reduction in freight rates for grain begun last February, according to a study just released by agricultural economists of the University of Georgia.

Since Georgia annually uses about 30 million bushels more corn than it produces, Georgia corn prices are dependent upon corn prices in the Midwest plus transportation and handling charges. During the past 5 years, the difference in Georgia and Midwest corn prices has averaged about 18 cents per bushel higher for Georgia.

Because corn is the basic ingredient in feeds for cattle, swine, and poultry, Georgia's agricultural leaders consider that reducing this unfavorable price difference is essential to the economic advancement of the State's livestock and poultry industries.

That the reduction in freight rates has helped close the gap is documented in a study made by Dr. W. D. Eickhoff and Dr. J. H. Padgett of the college experiment station at Athens. It includes a comparison of monthly corn prices in Georgia and the Midwest since February 1962. This comparison shows that the difference definitely has become more favorable for Georgia corn users.

For example, in the 3-month period, June to August, a time of year when Georgia corn imports are high, the difference in corn prices at Gainesville, Athens, and Augusta and at Cincinnati, Ohio, averaged 6½ cents lower in 1963 than in 1962.

In their report, Drs. Eickhoff and Padgett said results of the study are encouraging for Georgians. They pointed out that the real effect of the freight reduction on corn prices in Georgia has not been apparent because the price of corn increased about 10 cents a bushel in 1963 over that of 1962.

"This was misleading," they explained, "because 1963 corn prices in the Midwest were higher, too. The real value of the freight reduction to Georgians is reflected, not in the price of corn in Georgia, but in the difference between what corn costs in Georgia and what it costs in the Midwest."

Dr. S. J. Brannen, chairman of the division of agricultural economics of the university's college of agriculture, said that since the freight reduction has been in effect for only

10 months, it is reasonable to assume that it has not yet had its full impact upon the corn market in Georgia.

Dr. Brannen explained that the reduction in freight charges for corn shipped into Georgia was initiated by the Southern Railroad when it began operation of its big economy size freight cars. These "Big Johns," especially designed for hauling grain, can carry nearly 100 tons of corn and can be loaded and unloaded automatically.

Dr. Eickhoff said that his discussion with Georgia grain handlers indicate that they are receiving more corn by rail than ever before. He added that, thus far, the effects of the reduced rail rates on Tennessee River movements of corn appear to be negligible.

Accessibility of Guns Should Be Restricted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of editorial opinion broadcast over station WABC-TV in New York on December 12, 13, and 14, 1963.

As the editorial points out no responsible citizen who wants to obtain firearms should be unwilling to show that he is responsible and does have the right to have guns. What WABC-TV asks for New York is in line with the intent of my bill, H.R. 9504, which would regulate interstate traffic in guns.

The editorial follows:

DALLAS AND NEW YORK

In October WABC-TV asked the New York Legislature to let New York City make its own firearms law. We said the city needed different kinds of firearms control than rural upstate areas. The killings in Dallas only make us feel more strongly that New York State should take an urgent and thorough look at the kind of restrictions that should be imposed on people who buy guns. It is too easy to buy guns in Dallas and too easy to buy them in New York City. And it is too easy to shoot them. Our editorial was criticized by many sportsmen who feel any tightening of weapons laws cuts into the constitutional guarantee that Americans can bear arms. They say honest citizens should be able to keep weapons to protect themselves from criminals. But WABC-TV thinks the self-protection of an armed citizenry is not the kind of protection this city needs. We think that if responsible men need weapons, they should be ready to prove their responsibility by registering their guns and themselves. The constitutional right to bear arms was never intended as a license to bear them irresponsibly. In the Congress, Senator DODD, of Connecticut, is working on a bill to restrict mail order shipment of firearms. He wants a man to get police permission before he can order a gun through the mail. But the DODD bill only will affect interstate shipment of weapons and firearms will be just as available in New York City as they have been. Now, while the memory of the Dallas sniper is still fresh in our minds, we think the New York State Legislature has an even stronger responsibility to allow the city to make laws that will force every gun buyer to register his weapons with the police. Who could say that the shots that were fired in Dallas could not have been fired here?

When Is an Offer an Offer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration has done one of the greatest jobs performed by any phase of the Federal Government. It has brought electricity to more than 90 percent of the rural homes, all of which were without it before the beginning of REA. It did not seem that an agency which has functioned so well would have too many problems. However, the REA is constantly confronted with difficulties of one kind or another, many of which are due to misunderstandings on the part of those who are not fully familiar with its operation.

Such a case was invited to my attention by the National Rural Electrification Association. An article on the subject explains the association's position and I place it in the RECORD so that Members of Congress and others interested may better evaluate the problem:

WHEN IS AN OFFER AN OFFER?—COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S CRITICISM OF REA STEMS FROM MISUNDERSTANDING OF "OFFER"

(By Charles A. Robinson, Jr., and Robert O. Marritz)

On November 22, 1963, the Comptroller General of the United States issued a report to the Congress critical of REA G. & T. loan policy. The Comptroller General heads the General Accounting Office, which is a watchdog agency, set up by Congress in 1921 to investigate and report upon "all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds" (31 U.S.C.A. 53).

The November 22 report of the Comptroller General urges that REA should fully consider "all offers by existing power suppliers" before making G. & T. loans. It cites the May 12, 1961, $14.7 million G. & T. loan to South Texas Electric Cooperative as a case in point "where REA did not thoroughly examine into the merits of an offer by an existing power supplier" before making such a loan.

It is interesting to observe in passing that of the $560 million of G. & T. loans made by REA in fiscal years 1960-63, inclusive, the Comptroller General cited only the South Texas case, involving 2.6 percent of all such loans, as illustrative of REA's failure to heed a power company offer before making a G. & T. loan.

More important, the Comptroller General, in his analysis, commits the same error as do many critics of the G. & T. program. He confuses an offer with an invitation to negotiate.

OFFER DEFINED

Black's Law Dictionary defines an "offer" as something "so definite in its terms * * * that the promises and performances to be rendered by each party are reasonably certain," and as "an act by one person whereby he gives to another the legal power of creating the obligation called contract."

In other words, a true offer contains a legally enforcible statement of all of the important promises, charges, terms, conditions, rights, duties, and liabilities surrounding a proposal by one party to perform a service for a second party.

All the second party need do is sign his name and the offer is, by that action alone, transformed into a contract.

Power companies upon learning of G. & T. loan applications, usually are careful to avoid true offers, and instead, write letters which (1) assert the adequacy of their generating capacity to supply cooperative loads, (2) express their desire to negotiate points in controversy, and (3) ask for copies of all financial feasibility details of the loan application. In addition, they may, in general terms, suggest rate adjustments or changes in conditions.

These letters are not offers, notwithstanding the fact that the companies frequently refer to them as such after the G. & T. loan is made. They are, in reality, nothing more than "invitations to negotiate," much like the slogans of the automobile dealer who attempts to demolish his competitors by such statements as "lowest prices in town," "big discounts on all models," etc. To these announcements, the consumer's reply is usually "try and get it." The same problem plagues the wholesale power business.

C.P. & L. RENEWAL OFFER

The South Texas G. & T. loan cited by the Comptroller General is a good example.

On August 11, 1958, Central Power & Light Co. submitted to the South Texas Electric Co-op group its offer to renew expiring wholesale power contracts. The company offer included a 30-percent rate increase, territorial restrictions and a dual rate provision. Later in August 1958, REA made a G. & T. loan to Medina Electric Cooperative of Hondo, Tex. The power company, thereupon, on November 11, 1958, revised its renewal offer to the South Texas group to include a smaller 18-percent rate increase. The dual rate and territorial restrictions remained.

This was the last true offer from the company. It came 2½ years before the G. & T. loan was made to South Texas. Neither the report of the Comptroller General nor the hearings of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, upon which the Comptroller General relies, contains evidence of any subsequent company offer.

Negotiations proceeded until February 1960, without success and South Texas applied for G. & T. funds on March 10, 1961.

On March 24, 1961, the company, according to the Comptroller General, began "efforts immediately preceding REA loan approval to negotiate contracts with REA cooperatives." These were indeed efforts to negotiate and no more. And for the Comptroller General to assert that, in declining to accept them, REA failed to consider offers, is erroneous and self-contradictory. Here is what happened.

On March 24, 1961, 2½ years after its last offer, and after the loan application was filed, the company wrote to REA, asserting that "the company had adequate generating capacity to supply the existing and future power requirements of the six cooperatives." On March 31, 1961, REA replied, advising the company to contact the affected cooperatives. On April 17, 1961, the company wrote to the cooperatives and requested detailed information on the feasibility of the proposed G. & T. loan.

The Comptroller General states that "according to a power company representative, the responses received from the cooperatives did not furnish the requested information."

On May 3, 1963, still without even making a new proposal to the cooperatives, much less an offer, company representatives met

with REA officials and explained that the company was now ready to relinquish the dual rate and territorial restrictions. REA again advised the company to convey such information to the cooperatives.

LOAN APPROVED

The company, however, never made a written offer to the cooperatives containing the new terms. In fact, not even a revised proposal was submitted.

The loan was approved May 12.

This is clearly not a case in which REA declined to consider an offer. This is rather a case in which the power supplier submitted no offer during 2½ years of negotiations before the G. & T. loan was made.

Even after the G. & T. application was filed, and its justification became apparent, the company extended no revised offer. Instead, its representatives sought to stop REA from approving the loan. Four days before the loan was made, the company did no more than seek a conference with cooperative representatives. If the company was acting in good faith why did it choose to not submit a bonafide written offer of wholesale service? This question the Comptroller General does not answer.

REA, in this case, did not yield to the brinksmanship tactics of Central Power & Light Co. REA was not confused or misled by power company tactics designed to prevent approval of the G. & T. loan rather than to offer an acceptable substitute. But, most certainly, no power company offer was ignored by anyone, because none was extended.

Overwhelming Support for a Gun Registration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9504, which would amend the Federal Firearms Act to provide stricter controls on the interstate shipment and delivery of firearms.

Public sentiment is obviously growing toward the enactment of sensible weapons control laws. The American Institute of Public Opinion recently polled a cross-section of the Nation and found that a majority of 8 out of 10 persons favored licensing of this trafficking in firearms. The results of the poll were reported in the January 16, 1964, edition of the Washington Post and I commend them to the attention of our colleagues:

THE GALLUP POLL—A MAJORITY FOR PERMIT TO BUY A GUN

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—The assassination of President Kennedy by a man using a mail-order carbine has stirred up the debate over greater control of firearms.

When the question was put to a representative sample of the American public, almost 8 in 10 persons said they favored a law that would require a police permit in order to buy a gun.

The following question was asked:

"Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?"

The findings:

	Percent
Favor	78
Oppose	17
No opinion	5

The results, by areas and groups:

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Men	71	26	3
Women	85	10	5
College	80	17	3
High school	81	17	2
Grade and no school	74	18	8
21 to 29 years	74	25	1
30 to 49 years	81	16	3
50 and over	78	15	7
East	90	8	2
Midwest	77	18	5
South	72	21	7
West	73	25	2

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, much time has necessarily been devoted to becoming acquainted with procedures and the Washington scene. I deem myself fortunate, however, in being able to draw heavily on my years of experience in the California State Legislature and many personal contacts to build a record and obtain benefits for my district.

I am pleased to have the privilege of inserting a few highlights of my activities on behalf of my constituents during the 1st session of the 88th Congress into the RECORD.

In another report I shall discuss legislation and my activities on the House Committee on Education and Labor. This report deals with office and community activities that often are overlooked as an essential part of a public official's duties.

The report follows:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

(From Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Washington, D.C., February 1, 1964)

The work of our offices locally and in Washington has included: (1) the development of programs; (2) the handling of cases (veterans, social security, civil service, housing, immigration); (3) dealing with employment problems; (4) providing information; and (5) attempts to rehabilitate, develop, and improve the district socially, economically, and politically. To facilitate and expedite our work we opened two new offices, one at 9512 South Central Avenue, and the other at 4251½ South Avalon Boulevard.

This report covers the last half of our work in 1963, and only our office and some of our community activities. Persons desiring our report on the first 6 months or on legislative activities should contact our district or Washington offices.

A. PROGRAMS

I. Employment

Our activity in finding employment has brought about tangible results. While our main emphasis has been on stimulating programs to create employment generally, we have not neglected opportunities to assist individuals seeking specific jobs. Out of some 2,500 persons interviewed for employment, more than 500 were placed. Others are now in training and should eventually find employment. None was turned away without at least a try.

In addition, our office refered over 400 applicants for full-time clerical jobs with the Post Office and Internal Revenue, most of whom were placed.

From these figures it is easy to observe that our offices have striven successfully to ease the unemployment problem.

One of our major goals this year will be to increase employment opportunities.

We initiated a pilot vocational guidance program for approximately 2 months, and interviewed 75 people. Of this number, we were successful in helping 47. This program wil be continued through 1964.

II. Training

In the realm of training programs, we were successful in initiating scholarships for 24 of the 28 requests.

Through our youth employment services we placed 400 in jobs in 1963 and many others in training under the manpower development and training program.

The building maintenance program, a trial project to train certain persons for maintenance jobs, is still struggling, but we were able to glean jobs, after completion of training, for 8 of the 14 applicants. This program will continue with greater emphasis this year.

Several trade schools and shops have offered us scholarships for 1964. We will recruit for these programs and solicit more. Although the hard core unemployed is a particularly difficult problem, through our training programs we hope to assist such persons to become qualified for employment even though they may have age or educational handicaps.

III. Miscellaneous

The Federal Small Business Administration aided our office in holding a small business development clinic, which was successful. Forty-two persons attended; Mr. Alvin Meyers, regional director, and Mr. Wilford White, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Management Assistance, were the main speakers. The persons attending agreed, generally, that the clinic was exceedingly helpful and should be more fully and specifically developed. The office is involved, therefore, in a questionnaire-survey with the participants to obtain a basis for submitting a concrete and meaningful program in this area.

Our mental health committee, in conjunction with the south central welfare planning council, succeeded in getting the county board of supervisors, through the county department of mental health, to approve a mental health program for the south central Los Angeles area; $25,000 is to be spent to initiate this program. Also, a grant of $900,000, requested by our mental health committee from the youth opportunities board, has been approved locally, and it is hoped this activity will become a part of the overall youth opportunities board program. The service will be individual out-patient psychiatric therapy. The family as a unit will be given consideration.

Obtaining Academy candidates for the Army, Navy, and Air Force Academies has been quite a problem. Although we were not successful in attracting qualified candidates for the class entering in 1963, we now have 11 good prospects for the 1964 class. An effort will be made to work more closely with the high schools in order to interest more citizens in this program.

The coordinating council on economic development and employment, which we organized to furnish overall planning for our area, has been working steadily to increase the efficiency of our various community sponsored committees and also to utilize the members of the advisory board more effectively. We now have 125 active members on the board.

The President's Committee on Equal Job Opportunities met in Los Angeles in November 1963 and we are happy to report that

our office was responsible for obtaining invitations for more than 150 persons.

We have an apprenticeship training consultant in the district office every Friday morning who works closely with the State bureau of apprenticeship standards.

We also have a person from the Federal Housing Authority to dispense information on all kinds of housing problems.

We started a special program with Harbor Junior College and the consultants from the college, as well as our Mrs. William Thomas, have been on hand in the district office to assist and interview applicants for specialized training.

The youth opportunities board program, scheduled for the south central Los Angeles area, has received the go-ahead signal. It will help to alleviate the school dropout and unemployment problems among youth, and will also reach those persons suffering from general depression and dependent poverty. This program reaches causes, in addition to effects, and will in its initial stages prepare and place on the job about 6,000 young people.

The Central City Citizens Committee was overwhelmingly successful in their first, of a now planned annual, buffet supper party. The group worked diligently, quietly, and efficiently to make it a success. The guests were more than pleased with the results.

B. COMMUNICATIONS

Our office has used every means of communication to let the constituents know what we are doing.

1. Press releases—newspaper and radio: This past year we issued 153 press releases. They covered a wide variety of subjects including announcements of legislation introduced by Congressman HAWKINS, reports of job availabilities, information on scholarships, voters' registration drive, the area redevelopment program, the Small Business Clinic, Federal activities of interest to our district, and items of general information.

2. Radio and television: Through our two radio programs we have been successful in getting additional news and information to our constituents. For a brief period we also had TV coverage on several channels. Currently, Congressman HAWKINS reports from Washington on the program "Know Your Congressman," over KGFJ-AM, 1340 on the dial, at 9:25 each Tuesday night. The other program, "Your Congressman at Work," originates locally on KTYM-FM, 103.9 on the dial, each Saturday night at 7 p.m.

3. Speeches: Throughout the year, our office handled (locally) more than 50 speaking engagements. We hope persons will become more interested in obtaining information about our community programs. There is always someone available to make an appearance, including Mr. HAWKINS when he is in the city.

4. Newsletters: We have mailed six separate newsletters to constituents in the 21st Congressional District, providing information on important issues before the Congress and discussing programs and activities of particular concern to our residents.

5. Reports: Our offices, locally and in Washington, jointly issued a monthly report on our activities throughout the year.

C. CASES

This past year the district office handled 2,216 constituents' problems and requests. Out of this number, the office succeeded in obtaining favorable results for at least 600. More than 100 special problems were handled in the Washington office. These included claims before the Veterans Appeals Board, servicemen seeking transfers, promotions and discharges, postal and civil service problems, and immigration matters.

The offices are available to assist every constituent, even if the only service we can perform is to refer them to the proper places to obtain the help they seek. During the year 166 persons were assisted by referral to the proper State agency, county supervisor, city councilman, assemblyman, or to other sources such as community centers, schools, and attorneys for appropriate assistance.

Federal agency cases

Department of Defense (Army, Navy, Air Force):	
Number of cases	76
Favorable disposition	23
Otherwise closed	13
Pending	40
Health, Education, and Welfare (social security):	
Number of cases	20
Favorable disposition	6
Otherwise closed	1
Pending	13
Justice and State Departments:	
Private immigration bills (pending)	5
Immigration cases	43
Favorable disposition	14
Otherwise closed	3
Pending	26
Post Office:	
Number of cases	21
Favorable disposition	9
Otherwise closed	1
Pending	11
Veterans' Administration:	
Number of cases	86
Favorable disposition	10
Otherwise closed	8
Pending	68
Civil Service Commission:	
Number of cases	8
Favorable disposition	2
Pending	6
Treasury Department (Internal Revenue):	
Number of cases	6
Favorable disposition	3
Pending	3
Interior Department:	
Number of cases	2
Pending	2
Department of Commerce:	
Number of cases	1
Pending	1

CONCLUSION

We have striven to rehabilitate, improve, and redevelop the district socially, economically, and politically. We have given a great deal of thought to rational planning in housing, education, social welfare, and business development.

The 21st Congressional District has been called a port of entry for newcomers to our city. Historically, the original residents have tended to move to the westside. Our programs are designed to assimilate these newcomers to our way of life, and to improve our communities so well that it will be unnecessary for older residents to move away to better their condition. We want the residents of our area to be so well served, to be so well housed, and provided with such fine economic and social opportunities that they will be proud and fortunate to live in our area of the county. We have made some progress. In 1964 we hope to make much more.

The Economic Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, our economy has completed a year which will stand up well by comparison with almost any other year in our history. It was a good year for the economy but not good enough.

This, as I read it, is the theme of the President's economic report. I commend it to the House.

In the year 1963, the United States left behind a number of significant economic milestones. Our gross national product passed $600 billion near the end of the year. In the 3 years since the late President Kennedy's inauguration, the gross national product has increased $100 billion or 20 percent. And very little of the increase in the value of our total output was the result of rising prices. In real terms, the output of our economy has expanded 16 percent since early 1961. This 3-year increase is greater than the total gross national product of every other country in the free world.

As we passed the $600 billion milestone, a number of other important markers of economic progress also went by—including record levels of weekly earnings for workers, of corporate profits, of total employment, and of residential construction.

We have good reason to take satisfaction in these gains. Our economy has been advancing for almost 36 months since the bottom of the 1960–61 recession. We have reversed the earlier postwar tendency for the time span between recessions to become shorter. And, if we enact the tax cut, we stand a good chance to extend this upswing to a record length.

But new records are not enough whether they be in length of unbroken advance or in level of GNP. As the President says in his report, we must measure our performance against our potential.

By this standard, we still have much to accomplish. Too many men and women are unemployed—5½ percent of the labor force. Too much factory capacity is idle—13 percent. It has been more than 6 years since unemployment has been even as low as 4 percent. It has been over 6 years since American industry has operated near its preferred rate of utilization. Full employment and full use of factory capacity are moving targets—the labor force grows continuously, workers are released by labor-saving machinery, and new investment increases the capacity of our factories. Thus we must move fast just to keep our distance from these targets from widening. To catch up with them, we need to grow even faster.

The tax reduction bill—passed by the House and now on its way through the Senate Finance Committee—is the best means we have to accelerate our economic expansion. This bill—with President Johnson's recommended cut in withholding rates to 14 percent—will give us a big push toward our goals. It will put $8.8 billion of additional usable income into the hands of consumers. It will put an additional $1½ billion into the hands of corporations. In fact, it will provide the greatest stimulus to production, employment, incomes, and profits in our peacetime history—as consumers and business go about spending their additional after-tax incomes.

Passage of the tax bill—and soon—will make the outlook for 1964 highly favorable. With the momentum our economy generated in 1963, the tax cut will help to accelerate our economic expansion instead of being used to counteract an existing recession. With unused resources and responsible price and wage decisions, our fine record of price stability—unmatched by any other major industrial country—will be maintained. And our balance of payments—already improving markedly—will benefit from more competitive exports and from a more attractive home demand for capital.

It is notable that the stimulus from the tax bill comes from an anticipated increase in private spending. By cutting taxes, we will unleash private demands—by consumers and business—and permit them to make the most of the resources our economy has the potential to produce.

President Johnson—in carrying forward and putting his own touch on the tax reduction program initiated under President Kennedy—is, in his own words, "combining efficiency with expansion, frugality with compassion."

He is submitting a budget that calls for a reduction in expenditures. At the same time, he is not only providing for a sizable fiscal stimulus to expansion through tax reduction, he is also launching new programs to meet human needs. The new poverty program represents a recognition that the forgotten fifth of our population needs more than an expanding economy to pull itself out of the vicious circle of inadequate income, insufficient education, poor health, and lack of skill.

It is recognized that these problems cannot be solved in Washington. They must be solved where they exist. But the Federal Government has a role to play—in shaping its own programs and in encouraging State and local governments and private groups to bring their efforts into focus in a concerted attack on poverty in America.

The President's program gives us an opportunity and a challenge—to use our economic resources to their full capacity, to mount an attack on poverty, and to adopt a lean budget without neglecting essential services that only the Federal Government can provide, at home and abroad. This program deserves our support, for it is in the best traditions of a dynamic economy that relies mainly on private initiative for its forward momentum.

The President's announcement that the Nation's output reached $600 billion in the fourth quarter of 1963 is welcome news to all of us. This represents a 20-percent rise during the period since the Democratic administration took office.

If this rate of expansion continues through 1964—and the President's message predicts that it will—the Nation's real output will have increased by nearly one-fourth in 4 years.

This record of solid achievement is a tribute to the strength of our free enterprise economy and to the wisdom and foresight of the economic policies of the Congress and the administration. Working together, the Government and private enterprise have moved America toward steadily growing prosperity.

But prosperity in general does not bring prosperity in particular. As the President so forcefully points out, many Americans are not receiving their just shares of the Nation's output.

At the end of 1963, 5½ percent of those seeking jobs were unable to find them, and many more were dissuaded from seeking employment because they knew it could not be found.

Even more shocking is the fact that one American family in five is now living on a yearly money income of $3,000 or less.

We know that the vast majority of those who are out of work do not wish to be idle. Many of them are experienced workers with families to support. All too many are teenagers who have yet to find their first jobs, who have yet to achieve the sense of self-respect that comes from self-sufficiency. Therefore the country urgently needs the expansion of private demand and job opportunities which will flow from enactment of the tax reduction in H.R. 8363.

We know too that the great bulk of the poor are not in poverty because they are stupid or lazy. They are the victims of a failure of American facts to match fully the American dream of equal opportunity for all. Until we are able to provide adequate education, good health, plentiful jobs, and freedom from discrimination for all Americans, that dream will not be a reality.

The President's war on poverty will mobilize private and public resources to insure that for more and more of our people, particularly our children, the door leading out of poverty will be opened.

The President's message is a program for Federal action, but not a call for greater centralization of authority in the Federal Government. The tax cut will bring a great stimulus to private demand and will provide expanding revenues for State and local government action.

The budget shows an actual reduction in Federal spending. The war on poverty will promote coordination of State, local, and private activities with Federal assistance.

While the economic message presents the President's overall strategy for attacking our economic problems, his chief reliance will be on the stimulation of private initiative and coordinated State-local-Federal efforts.

Eulogy for President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Miss Miriam Gilbert, 11-year-old daughter of my dear friend and colleague, Representative JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York, has written a beautiful poem in memory of our martyred President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The children of our Nation have also been greatly saddened by the tragedy of his death, and I feel certain that Miriam has expressed the grief and thoughts of her contemporaries in the lines she has composed. I am pleased to include her poem in the RECORD:

A EULOGY FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(By Miriam Gilbert)

The world died with him
On that cruel November day.
His memory in our hearts
Will forever stay.
He was the Naval hero of PT 109
For that he won a medal for his gesture so fine.
But then he was stricken with malaria and an injured back
Even then courage he did not lack.
He became a Member of Congress, then President of the Nation
But he never had this expectation.
The world died with him
On that cruel November day.
His memory in our hearts
Will forever stay.
He was a man of dignity, good will and determination.
He fought against all kinds of discrimination.
He fought for civil rights, his most important bill
It would please him most now if that wish we would fulfill.
The world died with him
On that cruel November day.
His memory in our hearts
Will forever stay.
He negotiated with the Communists, and soon they did find
He was a man with a very skillful mind.
He prevented us from a war against our greatest foe.
If he hadn't done that we'd have suffered a terrible blow.
The world died with him
On that cruel November day.
His memory in our hearts
Will forever stay.
In public, Jackie held back her tears of grief
While inside her there were cries of disbelief.
Why did this have to happen to me?
John-John standing there bewildered as can be—
Caroline might have know what it was about,
But even in her mind there was probably some doubt.
The world died with him
On that cruel November day.
His memory in our hearts
Will forever stay.
Be brave Jackie, John-John, and Caroline
Live your lives with zest.
For he has gone to God's Heaven
Where he will find eternal rest.

Motor Vehicle Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that government at every level places demands on our citizens. Good citizens respond, but very often too little is done to accommodate the convenience of the individual. Most States now require periodic motor vehicle inspection.

This, I am certain, is worth while and accounts for control of motor vehicle accidents. I am pleased to note that a recent survey of current motor vehicle inspection procedures in my State suggested steps not only to make the system more effective but also to better accommodate the owners of motor vehicles. Considerate government is good government. I believe editorial comment on that survey, made by a legislative committee and directed by Assemblyman J. Arnold Bressler of our community, Bayonne, N.J., would be of interest to many.

Assemblyman Bressler has tirelessly labored in this penetrating study. He has with those special talents of wisdom, understanding and perspicacity that made him an excellent jurist, rendered an outstanding service to the people of the State of New Jersey.

The editorials follow:

[From the Jersey Journal, Jan. 9, 1964]

GOOD NEWS

Assemblyman J. Arnold Bressler and his committee have completed their study of the motor vehicle inspection program.

If their recommendations are accepted, the average motorist will have good cause to cheer.

The Bayonne assemblyman and his colleagues have come up with a 71-page report after studying the system. Their recommendations follow generally the spreading belief that motor vehicle inspections are not quite the safety factors they once were believed to be.

The fact is that not too many accidents are the result of material failures. There are other factors which cause far more triffic casualities and get far less consideration.

So it is not surprising that a number of the recommendations call for reducing the number of inspections and the number of cars that need inspection.

For the average motorist, however, the key recommendations are those which eliminate needless inconvenience. For instance, think what a joy it would be to have a special lane for reinspection.

Every one of us has had the experience of getting all the way through the inspection line except for perhaps one maladjusted headlight or a somewhat defective windshield wiper.

Once this difficulty is corrected, however, the whole business of going to the inspection station and bucking the line has to be repeated. A special lane for reinspections could be like the express line in the supermarket—and let us hope it would be better observed.

Many other good recommendations are in the report. Promoting safety belts and other safety factors through the inspection system is a worthwhile one.

Spreading the inspection load so that neither the public nor the inspection stations will be rushed and crowded a few days a month while other days the stations work less than capacity is an excellent idea.

If this study leads to less inconvenience for the public with no reduction in safety factors, Assemblyman Bressler and his committee will have earned the thanks of every motorist in the State.

[From the Bayonne Times, Jan. 10, 1964]

CAR SENSE

The recommendations by the assembly subcommittee on transportation to retain the present State system of motor vehicle inspection make sense, particularly the one that would exempt preexamined new cars from inspections until they are 2 years old.

Assemblyman Bressler's panel also deserves credit for putting thumbs down on the substitution of an inspection program operated by privately owned garages. Among the disadvantages of such a system they listed the opportunity for unscrupulous garage personnel to take advantage of the motorist by making unnecessary repairs, the possible circumvention of inspection standards because of the difficulty of State supervision and enforcement, and the possibility of the State itself discriminating in the designation of the private official inspection stations.

In addition to its specific recommendations for improvement of the State-operated system, the subcommittee summarized the present deficiencies as follows: it is costly, often inconvenient to the motorist, and the assembly line inspection is insufficiently thorough.

Nevertheless, we agree that the State should continue to inspect motor vehicles as part of an overall traffic safety program. Statistics do not show any positive connection between highway safety and inspections, but it must be remembered that there is no way to determine how many accidents might have been recorded without periodic examinations.

The subcommittee did a commendable job, and we hope its results will be carefully studied in the proper quarters. We also hope that some consideration will be given to the building of an inspection station in Bayonne. The report did not recommend this, perhaps because the study group was dealing with the statewide scope of the problem rather than with the needs of specific localities. But a station is needed here to end the frustrating delays and congestion now the lot of the local motorist.

Alabama's Exemplary Family of 1964—The Freemans, of Sulligent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and satisfaction that I announce to you the selection of the Coy Freeman family, of Sulligent, Lamar County, Ala., as my State's Exemplary Family of 1964. Sulligent is located in the old Seventh Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing in Congress. The Freeman family—Coy, Evelyn, Lynda, Jeannette, and Wanda—was selected as Alabama's Exemplary Family of 1964 under a program sponsored by the Birmingham News and the Alabama Extension Service.

In nominating the Freemans for this high and deserved honor, their neighbors wrote:

The great influence and good which the Freeman family has done, is doing, and will continue to do in the community, county, and State can never be properly measured or valued. It will live on long after they have gone. Alabama and America need more like them.

I share this sentiment exactly, Mr. Speaker. The Freemans certainly typify all that is desirable and good in the family life of our Nation. I now offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a new article announcing the selection of the Freeman family as Alabama's Exemplary Family. This article appeared on page 1 on the Birmingham News for Sunday, January 19, 1964:

UNITY ITS QUALITY—ALABAMA'S EXEMPLARY 1964 FAMILY REVEALED

(By Alyce B. Walker)

We give you—

The Coy Freeman family, of Sulligent, Lamar County—Alabama's Exemplary Family of 1964.

The story of Coy and Evelyn Freeman, who started from scratch back in 1939 to build a life together, is in the great American tradition. In their own lives and through their three daughters, they have demonstrated that in the unity of purpose and principle—there is strength, in selfless service to their fellow man—there is happiness.

FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS

The Freemans were selected from nominees over the State in an annual program, sponsored by the Birmingham News and Auburn University Extension Service, to spotlight family life in Alabama. The selection was made by a panel of judges from written reports by friends and neighbors in Lamar County.

In April, when the cherry blossoms bloom in Washington, the Freemans will spend a week in the Nation's capital as guests of the News. Before this trip, however, News officials will go to Lamar County to hold open house in honor of these fine people whose lives are an inspiration to all who know them.

The Freemans are the second family honored by the two sponsors of this salute to "Families—the Alabama kind." The honor last year went to Mr. and Mrs. John Carter, Jr., of Laurel Hill Plantation near Shorter in Macon County.

Of this second "First Family" of Alabama, their neighbors wrote: "The great influence and good which the Freeman family has done, is doing and will continue to do in the community, county, and State can never be properly measured or valued. It will live on long after they have gone. Alabama and America need more like them."

THEIR STORY

Here is a capsule biography of each member of Alabama's 1964 Exemplary Family:

Mr. Freeman: He is a dairy farmer and artificial breeding technician for Lamar County. A steward of Flint Hill Methodist Church 21 years, he is Sunday School teacher and superintendent. Has been reelected 12 years a director of the county farm bureau; past president, Molloy Community Improvement Club, also its past vice president and agricultural chairman. Member, Vernon Masonic Lodge. Unit test demonstration farmer in Lamar County for many years. Member, Lamar County and Alabama Cattlemen's Association. First president, Lamar County Artificial Breeders Association. Member, board of directors, Lamar County 4-H and Dairy Calf Chain. Was one of 15 area chairmen in Lamar County this year on the 4-H Foundation Fund Drive. Appointed to Alabama State Militia and ranks as honorary Lieutenant Colonel.

Mrs. Freeman: Leader, teacher, and worker in Flint Hill Methodist Church many years; served on church building and improvement committee. Member of Home Demonstration Club since 1940. Was president of the club when it won first place in the booth exhibit at the county fair. Has also been vice president. Served as officer and committee chairman of Molloy Community Improvement Club. Does all family sewing. Freezes and cans garden vegetables and fruit for family food supply. Has taught three daughters the real values of life—spiritually, kindness and consideration to other people, self reliance and confidence, how to work (cooking, sewing, housekeeping, outside work on dairy farm), and the value of being thrifty—how to save money for a college education.

Lynda Betts Freeman Lamon: Twenty-one years old, the oldest daughter, married in August to Marion Lamon, a pharmacy student at Howard College. Graduate of Flor-

ence State College. On the dean's list every semester except one. Vice president of sophomore class, student government representative, counselor, 2 years' member of Alabama Student Education Association, hospitality committee, and Kappa Delta Pi. Plans to be a classroom teacher. Eight years in 4-H Club, held every office in local club and president of County 4-H Club Council. Secretary of state 4-H Club Council, 1958-59, at conference in Auburn. Family gave her a registered heifer calf in 1952, 10 years old. When she finished high school she owned 15 registered Jerseys. Won prize money every year from the county, district, and State dairy shows. Paid her own way through college. Won $25 bond for being best in English in high school and $250 scholarship from Future Teachers' Association. Received 8 trophies, 102 certificates of awards, 57 ribbons, and 49 medals in 4-H Club work. Won three trips to annual 4-H Leadership Camp at Auburn on project work and a trip to Chicago on dairy achievement and another to Livestock Exposition in Chicago for grand champion Jersey at district dairy show.

Served on the Farm Journal Teen-Advisory Board, 1956. Member of Honor Society, Beta Club, Glee Club, FHA, FTA, student council, hall of fame, who's who, and annual staff in high school. Was selected Good Citizenship Girl, class poet, member of homecoming court, and was in junior and senior plays.

Jeanette Freeman: In the 11th grade at Lamar County High School, 16 years old, member of Flint Hill Methodist Church, teacher of junior class, officer of MFY. Member of 4-H, 8 years. President of 4-H, 2 years, vice president and reporter of the county council. Has five dairy animals and won many prizes with dairy herd. District winner in showmanship, recipient of Brakefield Award. Has won 2 trophies, 25 certificates, 48 ribbons, and 15 medals in 4-H work. Attended State 4-H Leadership Conference 2 years. Attended 1 year as voting delegate and another as county dress revue winner. Won the county yeast bread contest 2 years.

Wanda Freeman: 13 years old, plays the piano for Sunday school and the youth fellowship of Flint Hill Methodist Church. A member of 4-H 4 years, has served as president, secretary, and song leader. Has seven dairy animals of her own and has won second place 2 years in the fitting and showmanship contest—defeated for first place by her older sister, Jeanette. Has received 25 ribbons, 1 trophy, 7 medals, 9 certificates, and $348.78 in prize money which she is saving toward her college education. Was chosen County Dairy Queen this year. A member of Lamar County 4-H dairy calf chain, is recipient of a fine registered dairy animal, part of the family dairy calf chain started by her uncle many years ago. This same uncle gave the oldest sister, Lynda Betts, her first dairy registered calf. She in turn gave one to Jeanette, who then gave another one to Wanda. Though loving dairying, this youngest daughter is more interested in domestic chores and does all the family cooking.

North Dakota's Medical Care Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include, following my remarks, a statement by the North Dakota Medical Association which I had the privilege of presenting before the House Ways and Means Committee this morning.

I call this statement to the attention of the Members of the House because it relates the experience of my State of North Dakota in applying the Kerr-Mills program of medical care for those over 65 years of age during the first 2 years of its operation.

It is appropriate to point out that these results have been achieved at a time when our State director of public welfare stated before a committee of our North Dakota Senate that no one in North Dakota was going without medical care because of inability to pay the costs.

North Dakota has an excellent record of meeting the problems of low income people in securing necessary medical care. I have personally tried to find a case of an individual in my State who was not receiving medical care because of his low income, but so far I have not found one. I think this, in itself, is positive proof of the adequacy of our medical care program and a sound argument that limited medical care for older people under social security is not needed.

I commend the following statement to your careful attention:

STATEMENT OF C. H. PETERS, M.D., SECRETARY OF THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman MILLS and members of the committee, the executive director of the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota stated before the North Dakota Senate Committee on Social Welfare, at the 1963 session, that "No one in North Dakota was going without medical care." This statement was made at the time the medical profession of North Dakota was attempting to broaden the income requirements as far as eligibility is concerned, as well as removing some of the inequities, of the North Dakota Kerr-Mills program—already considered one of the best in the Nation.

North Dakota is not noted for its wealth. In fact, based upon matching formulas developed by the Department of HEW for the medical-aid-for-the-aged program, we are one of the 10 poorest States in the Nation. Despite this, our State legislators have been willing to appropriate more than adequate funds to take care of the medically indigent in our State.

FINANCIAL STATUS OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED PROGRAM IN NORTH DAKOTA

1. The North Dakota State Legislature appropriated $2,660,794, which, with the Federal matching funds, totaled approximately $10,720,000. Available for the medical-aid-for-the-aged program during the 1961-63 biennium.

2. The total spent for medical aid for the aged for the biennium (State and Federal funds) amounted to approximately $3,886,785.

3. Sixty-two percent, or $1,650,835 of the appropriation by the North Dakota Legislature in the 1961 session for Kerr-Mills implementation was returned to the general fund in North Dakota in 1963.

4. Thus, it is easily determined that less than 38 percent of the State's appropriated funds were actually needed for medical aid for the aged in North Dakota, despite a very comprehensive program and the transfer of a large number of long-term patients from old-age assistance programs because of continuous nursing home care.

5. It has been claimed that the States are unwilling and unable to meet their own responsibilities for the care of the needy. We believe that the budgetary facts of North Dakota's total welfare program demonstrates the willingness of our legislators to appropriate sufficient funds to meet the medical needs of our citizens. The total budget for the 1961-63 biennium (counting State and Federal funds) for our entire welfare program amounted to $39,433,462. Of this amount, the State had appropriated $14,418,513. At the end of the 1961-63 biennium, the State public welfare board was able to return to the State's general fund $4,003,279, or approximately 27 percent of the State's appropriation for all welfare programs. This was accomplished despite the fact that all categories of assistance include comprehensive medical care programs.

6. It may be of interest to the committee to note the type of services being offered under the Kerr-Mills program in North Dakota. The program offers (a) inpatient hospital services; (b) skilled nursing home services; (c) physician services; (d) outpatient hospital or clinic services; (e) private duty nursing services; (f) dental services; (g) laboratory and X-ray services; (h) prescribed drugs; (i) diagnostic, screening, and preventative services, and (j) authorized physical therapy. The cost distribution for this program during the 1961-63 biennium is as follows: 60.7 percent went for nursing home care, 24.3 percent for hospital care, 6.8 percent for physicians' services, 6.3 percent for drugs, 0.2 percent for dental care, and 1.7 percent for miscellaneous services.

NORTH DAKOTA'S EXPERIENCE FOR THE 1961-63 BIENNIUM

1. We wish to cite some figures to demonstrate the shift from old-age assistance transferees to new cases.

	Biennium	1961-62	1962-63
Certified	2,304	1,455	849
Transferred from OAA	1,292	944	348
New	1,012	511	501

The above figures indicate a fairly drastic shift in the percentage of new cases, from about 34 percent in the first year to nearly 60 percent in the second year, related not to an increase in the number of new patients but to a large drop in the number transferred.

2. The following data relate some of the actual care provided for the fiscal year 1962.

The great majority (94.9 percent) of medical-aid-for-the-aged recipients are longtime North Dakotans, in the State 10 years or more. Less than half were receiving income from OASDI social security. Of the 1,237 receiving care, 1,027 (83 percent), received some physicians' services, 538 (43.5 percent) were hospitalized, 737 (59.6 percent) received aid in paying for nursing home care, 961 (77.7 percent) received prescription drugs, 37 (3 percent) received dental services, and 469 (37.9 percent) received other services. For those hospitalized, the average stay was 29.7 days, although 24 received 100 or more days of hospital care and 1 recipient was hospitalized more than 250 days.

3. Wide coverage through news media, TV, and radio, has been available to explain Kerr-Mills to our people and it has been a subject of political campaign debates, so the public is well informed that it is available, yet relatively few of the State's aged have inquired about it and still fewer have applied, or needed it.

POPULATION STATISTICS

For your information, the 1960 census revealed North Dakota's population to be about 632,000 individuals, of whom about 58,000 were in the Kerr-Mils age group—65 or older. Currently, some 5,800 or about 10 percent of these aged individuals, are on old age assistance rolls and eligible to receive comprehensive medical care under that program.

When North Dakota's medical-care-for-the-aged program was first contemplated, it was estimated that approximately 11,500 of the aged population would be eligible for care, and that approximately 8,000 would actually avail themselves of medical-care-for-the-aged services per biennium. In contrast, as we have already noted, only 2,750 aged applied for medical-care-for-the-aged and only 2,304 were certified as eligible for the entire biennium—and this included almost 1,300 who were already on the old age assistance rolls.

We believe that this provides clearcut evidence—especially in view of the widespread publicity given the program and the adequacy of appropriated funds—that the need for help in meeting medical expenses in this age group has been greatly exaggerated.

Indeed, the general official data on the financial status of the aged appear to contain obvious discrepancies—at least so far as North Dakota is concerned. According to the Department of Labor, 9,828 of the 58,000 over 65 individuals in the State in 1960 had no income and almost 20,000 had less than $1,000 income per year. This would seem to indicate that nearly 30,000 individuals—over half of the aged population—exist at or below the bare subsistence level. Yet, during this same period, there were only 7,200 receiving assistance in the State.

We cite these figures, and the figures on medical-aid-for-the-aged funds not used, as an indication that an estimate of the need existing within the older population based on such income reports must grossly underestimate their available resources and capability for self-support.

CONCLUSION

1. Kerr-Mills funds have definitely assisted North Dakota in providing medical services to its aged population—to the needy aged through old-age assistance and to the normally self-supporting aged through medical aid for the aged.

2. The need for assistance in paying for medical services among the lower income self-supporting aged is considerably smaller than has been claimed by proponents of compulsory social security hospital financing.

3. Early claims that the State legislatures either could not or would not appropriate sufficient funds for medical aid for the aged have been disproved, at least in North Dakota.

4. Kerr-Mills experience, especially with comprehensive plans such as North Dakota's, provides a far more realistic base for assessing the aged group's need for medical assistance than mere tabulations of income groups.

5. The gross overestimate of medical need in the lower income group demonstrates that expansion of medical aid for the aged to aid the middle-income aged, when faced with catastrophic expense, is also within State financial capabilities.

In summary, the physicians of North Dakota believe that the future strength and security of America and its citizens, young and old, lies not in greater dependence on the Federal Government, but in preservation, to the greatest degree possible of their independence through protection of their own efforts to provide for their old age by preventing inflationary reduction of the value of their income and savings, and through provision of needed help at the local level only when and if that help is needed.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Heroic American, "Stonewall" Jackson, Born 140 Years Ago in Clarksburg, in State Now West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is fitting that we recall the 140th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious sons of West Virginia and of our Nation. On January 21, 1824, Thomas Jonathan Jackson—later known to history as "Stonewall"—was born in Clarksburg, in what is now West Virginia.

It is a paradox that so devoted a Christian gentleman as Stonewall Jackson is remembered throughout the world for his brilliance as a general in our land's bloody and terrible Civil War. In that conflict, which pitted brother against brother, he earned the respect of his enemies, the love of his men, and the implicit trust of his commander.

On May 10, 1863, Stonewall Jackson died of wounds accidentally inflicted by his own troops during the confusion of the Battle of Chancellorsville. So widespread was the esteem in which he was held that a leading Union newspaper concluded an editorial eulogy with these words:

> Stonewall Jackson was a great general, a brave soldier, a noble Christian, and a pure man.

Not only the southern cause, but the entire Nation suffered a deep loss as the passing of this hero. West Virginia, which achieved statehood on June 20, 1863—scarcely a month after his death—might well have benefited by his many talents in the difficult years following the close of the war. However, this celebrated son of the Upper Monongahela Valley did leave to posterity the rich example of his truthfulness, self-abnegation, modesty in victory and courage in defeat. Thus the spirit of the man has transcended even the genius of the military strategist. His compassion and high moral qualities are accurately reflected in his words:

> We must think of the living and those who are to come after us and see that by God's blessing, we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.

How Good Is Industrial Advertising?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that most Members of this House realize the important part that trade magazines, or business papers if you will, play in the activities of the American economy. There are approximately 2,000 of these publications in America, and they cover every possible area of our economy. They are produced by dedicated men and highly articulate editors, who bring to the readers invaluable information, up-to-date techniques, product news, and other vital knowledge which enables American companies to outproduce the competitors in any other nation.

We are fortunate to have in Boston the Cahners Publishing Co., founded in 1946 by Norman L. Cahners, of Boston. Beginning with one magazine, his firm has grown to be the third largest industrial publishing house in the United States. Mr. Cahners is a vice chairman of National Business Publications, Inc., Washington, D.C., the leading association of business and specialized publication publishers. Mr. Cahners is an outstanding American businessman, being a trustee of Northeastern University, a vice president of the Museum of Science, a director of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, a director of Stop & Shop, Inc., a director of Information Handling Service, Denver, Colo., and a leading civic volunteer in more than a dozen prominent community and charitable organizations. His company publishes the following magazines:

Brick & Clay Record, Building Construction, Building Supply News, Ceramic Data Book, Ceramic Industry, Design News, Electrical Design News, Electric Light & Power, Metalworking, Modern Materials Handling, and Practical Builder.

At the recent Boston Conference on Distribution, Mr. Cahners made a very significant address entitled "How Good Is Industrial Advertising?" Because I believe that these remarks are important to all of those who would want to understand the communication aspects of the vital area of distribution, I am more than happy to insert them for the attention of my colleagues in the House:

HOW GOOD IS INDUSTRIAL ADVERTISING?

(By Norman L. Cahners)

How good is industrial advertising?

Does it really make a vital contribution to distribution? Can that contribution be improved—and how?

The questions are important at any time. They take increased weight from our national situation. It is obvious, for example, that if we are to speed productivity and improve our international competitive position, we must increase our capital goods expenditures—improve plant, property, and equipment.

Such capital improvements are pivotal to product improvement and increased consumer expenditures.

Concurrently, there is also the need to make some kind of orderly approach to the problems of automation, and the retraining and resettling of our industrial workforce.

So the question how good is industrial advertising—almost the primary communication tool of industrial management—is of immediate concern.

I'd like to make an important distinction at this point. In pointing out the current task of industrial advertising, encouraging investment and orderly progress in technology, I am clearly defining the role of industrial advertising. Industrial advertising, by and large, is directed to the attention of the men in industry, who buy and specify equipment processes and materials.

Because this role is simple, industrial advertising has largely escaped the social criticism aimed at consumer advertising. No one seriously asks the question: "Is industrial advertising socially useful? Does it lead people to buy things they don't want or don't need? Does it inhibit our need for a higher cultural level? Is there too much sex in industrial advertising? Does it give our world neighbors a false image of our culture?"

These criticisms of consumer advertising—emotionalized when they are aimed at radio, TV, and the mass magazines, are rarely even thought of when students think of industrial advertising.

As a Nation, as businessmen, as students of distribution, we accept as axiomatic that selling improved tools of production is as right as the setting of the sun and the rising of the moon. And as inevitable.

We have a long history in America of disseminating information on industrial processes. A good deal of the domestic travel of Thomas Jefferson, for example, was occupied with inquiries into better means of production. Franklin's correspondence from Europe included frequent and detailed descriptions of better ways to improve American production. Even lawyer John Adams pays in his voluminous papers tribute to men who were building better machines or better processes. And many of our earliest pieces of china are proudly inscribed with mottoes

like "Success to Our Manufacturers" and the like.

Our abiding national concern with spreading the news about better means of production is dramatically illustrated by the growth of industrial magazines. Give or take, we have about 2,370 business magazines being published regularly in the United States.

One of the industry's trade assocations reports that in 1950, such magazines reached 24 million readers monthly. In 1960, readers had risen to 51 million.

Pages of advertising had risen from 753,000 in 1950 to 1,125,000 in 1962. Total dollars invested in advertising had skyrocketed from $225 million in 1950 to $545 million in 1960.

In the period, circulation is up 41 percent, advertising dollars have increased some 72 percent, but the cost of reaching each thousand readers had risen but 22 percent. The cost of reaching the sharply increased audience of industrial magazines is well below what might be expected in view of generally inflated prices.

This last fact may be of great importance in understanding why industrial advertising has not gotten greater scrutiny from advertisers.

Unlike radio and TV, and perhaps even the mass magazines, industrial magazines have audiences that can be precisely pinpointed. Since their audiences are reachable, definable and measurable, industrial magazines have avoided the numbers game so characteristic of consumer media.

Quite adequate Government reference books—the Statistical Abstract, the decennial censuses, the census of manufacturers, the continuing studies of the labor forces—all have made the circulation pattern of industrial magazines understandable to buyers of advertising.

There is no need to clog the U.S. mails with brochures, pleas, messages, cultural appeals, special offers and bargain mailings to get circulation for the typical industrial magazine. I must confess that as a mail getter such consumer efforts irritate me—and as a publisher the probable costs appall me.

We who are industrial publishers are grateful that we're in a simple business. If Government sources assure us, as they do, that those U.S. plants, who employ 100 or more persons, buy 80 percent of all the equipment, processes and materials sold, it is a relatively easy job to go to those plants. Such a list will, by and large, total somewhere between 20 and 40 thousand names.

Industrial magazines do have gray areas. It is in the gray areas that one industrial magazine can achieve greater success than another serving the same industry.

For example, the best industrial magazines must prove by some method or other that they not only reach the right plants, but that they also reach the right men in the plants. We all prove this by some supportable method—and these methods of proof are quite properly the object of more intensive scrutiny by buyers of advertising, prodded by competing publishers and salesmen.

And finally, since the gross circulation is established by public sources and the specific men established by private resources, we must prove that industrial magazines are actually read by those who receive them.

In this area—the amount and quality of readership—industrial magazines must answer the question: how good are you?

It is also in this area that industrial magazines are most unlike consumer advertising media.

In the consumer medium, like TV and women's magazines, all of the expensive and often brilliant efforts to capture readers, with fiction and art and the artistry of the kitchen or the bathroom—all are designed to do one thing and only one thing. To force the reader to turn the pages or not turn the dial in order that he can be exposed to advertising.

And all of the advertising, with its brilliant artistry, is designed to pull the reader's mind away from the brilliant editorial content into the advertising message. There is a constant conflict of interest, which strangely we accept as the American or free enterprise way of doing things.

It is this conflict that generates most of the suspicion and disillusion and misunderstanding that advertising critics voice.

But industrial advertising has no such problem, because there is no conflict of interest between editorial and advertising.

Editorial material in industrial magazines is written and edited to inform and not to amuse. So industrial magazine editors are cautious, meticulous, conservative, and obsessed by accuracy.

Industrial advertising again is edited and written to inform and not to amuse. The advertising is cautious, meticulous, conservative, obsessed by accuracy and loaded to the gunwales with information. There's a lot more guts than glamour in both.

However unglamorous, some surprising results come from both industrial magazine editorial and advertising material. Both have as their primary function the giving of information. Both—and notice this very carefully—are equated by the reader in the same way.

Survey after survey, by both publishers and advertisers indicate that readers get their ideas from both advertising and editorial. Both advertising and editorial are believed. Both are acted upon. Both result in purchases by readers of the process, equipment or machine featured.

In short, both advertising and editorial work. There is a further dramatic proof of this. A good many industrial magazines feature what is known in the business as a bingo card. This is usually a one- or two-page insert on heavy, colored stock. It features the promotional literature offered by the advertiser in his advertising page. The interested reader circles the items he wants, ships the card off to the publisher, who then forwards the right cards to the advertiser. The advertiser ships off the sales literature and presumably then follows up on the prospect.

The results of these "bingo cards" are often fantastic. In at least one of our magazines, a bingo card will draw nearly a million responses a year. And this from a circulation of less than 50,000 readers.

Similarly, it is not extraordinary for an editorial feature, say for example, on the use of computers in engineering departments, to run up a total of 30,000 to 40,000 reprints. I am not implying that all editorial features start a flood of requests. But a flood doesn't surprise us.

So, if we get high readership, and if we deliver readers economically, can we answer the question "how good are industrial magazines" with loud hurrahs?

I think not.

I do think industrial magazines are better than they ever have been. In fulfilling their basic function—cutting the timelag between innovation and installation—they're doing a good job.

In terms of the economics of distribution, that is, in distributing capital goods cheaper than let's say total dependence on personal salesmanship, they're doing a sound job. A review of the annual reports of our largest industrial companies will quickly reveal that indsutrial sales costs compare very favorably with those of the largest consumer goods companies. In fact, the most recent study definitely shows that those industrial companies which devote a larger proportion of their sales budget to advertising have a lower selling cost as a percentage of sales.

Again, from the sales standpoint, we have further evidence. Increasingly sophisticated marketing studies are being done that indicate the vital role of industrial advertising. They seem to prove that there is a direct correlation between industrial advertising investment and sales. If advertising is increased, say the studies, sales tend to stabilize in an upward direction. When advertising is decreased, sales tend to move downward, despite other sales activity.

What then clouds this happy picture of general efficiency?

There are two misgivings I have about American industrial magazines generally.

Incidentally, we are not discussing industrial magazines in other parts of the world. With a view to expanding our oversea operations, our company has been studying magazines in other countries. We have reached the conclusion that foreign industrial magazines are about a decade behind us in advertising and editorial techniques. In developing countries like Russia, there is no comparison. Any Russian visitor, like myself, who brings along a supply of American industrial magazines, finds he is distributing the riches of the Empire when he offers a Russian an American trade magazine that costs less than 50 cents.

But I am seriously concerned with American industrial magazines on two counts—the lack of innovation and lack of real concern with creativity.

Let's take the first one first—lack of innovation. I don't mean here that industrial magazines are not presenting new products or processes or presenting them in new ways. Many magazines, like ours, use a whole battery of experts to improve magazine technique—in layout, in graphics, even in the basic job of writing better and more clearly. I do mean this: since the founding of the first industrial magazine, Railway & Mechanical Engineer, in 1832, we are still putting out magazines. They are still rectangular, still use only type and pictures, still use only paper, still are painfully written, edited, and mailed.

There is something odd about this.

Here is an industry whose stock in trade is the new, the exciting, and the different. Yet, we are still carrying on our information business as we have for 131 years.

Our business is dedicated to the job of encouraging executive readers to make huge investments in new technologies, new labor-saving devices, new cost-cutting tools—but magazines are the same as they were for hundreds of years.

One direct consequence of our failure to basically improve the informational tool we call a magazine is that we are daily creating a massive information retrieval problem.

We are all familiar with the fact that there are more scientists living today than existed previously in the history of man. But a corollary of this astonishing fact is that there is more scientific information generated in the last decade than existed in all the previous history of man.

So today's scientist may not be destroyed by the bomb. But he may well drown in the flood of information that pours in on him daily.

Let me illustrate. We publish a magazine in the metalworking field. We are but 1 of 13. If all 13 of those magazine (all of whom are presumably publishing vital information (were to be stacked upon an executive's desk, they would make a pile a foot high and weigh 8½ pounds. They would include more than 6,000 pages, and encompass more than 4½ million words of reading material—not to mention charts, diagrams, equations, isometrics, photos, cutaways, and so on.

It is interesting to note that if you were a metalworking engineer and able to read at the not inconsiderable rate of 500 words a minute, you could read these magazines in

slightly less than your total working time on the job. In short, it would take you 150 hours a month to read all the news about metalworking and your normal work month is 151.7 hours.

That in one indigestible nutshell is the problem of industrial magazines—of their editors and their advertisers. We must find—and soon—new and better ways of communicating information. As science proliferates, and as the informational load aggravates, we must get new methods of improving the informational network. There is too much must reading, and too little time to read it.

I have at the moment no idea what the total answer to this problem is. I think we have two problems: we must broaden our concept of magazines; and we must change the minds of the men who run them.

First, as to our concept of magazines. We cannot reasonably foresee that readers will be able to absorb more. The food industry, which faced the same glut, came up with instant foods. I think we're going to have to come up with instant communication. We're going to have to with new, different and hopefully revolutionary methods of publishing.

For example, we may well put some of our editorial and advertising material on prepunched cards to be fed into computers and retrieved when required by the engineer or purchasing agent or department head or executive. This will require new indexing techniques as part of editorial.

Again, we have learned how the learning process is improved when the ear as well as the eye is involved. We have already pioneered in adding to our magazines the dimension of sound in the form of plastic records. We'll go further. There are two possible values here. We can get an individual step up in comprehension and we may well find that group reading—so successful an industrial technique with the Russians—may be encouraged.

I have high hopes as well for peripheral editing, which will employ logicians and philosophers as well as editors. What I mean is this: we know that students learn more retentively when they can relate specifics to the general—instances to the principle. So I would look for a new breed of writer and editor, who is constantly aware of the need to relate the intricacies of the specialty to the total state of the art.

And speaking of editors, brings me to the second problem—and source of solution of the problem—the need to improve the minds of the men who run industrial magazines. I believe the most serious problem we face in industrial magazines is to step up creativity among those who communicate through them. I am making no distinction here between those who write advertising and those who write editorial.

We must make our people more creative.

Now, "creativity" is one of those fashionable words today, rather the way "total marketing concept" and "corporate image" were a few years ago. And like many appealing concepts, "creativity" is much easier to mouth than to achieve. It may even be true as Douglas McGregor of MIT says that the worst thing for creativity is to label it.

As a large publishing company, we have been working hard at the job of making people more creative. More than 5 years ago, we set deliberately about the job of creating a climate of excellence in our business. It was our theory then—and on balance, it is still largely correct—that every man is creative—and we could create an atmosphere in which he could do his very best work.

We aren't talking here about "genius." We aren't even relating our kind of creative people to giants like Beethoven or Shakespeare or Dante.

We are talking about the ordinary man who happens to be a writer or an editor. We wanted him to be the best writer or editor of which he was capable; and that meant constant improvement.

So we started to produce a climate of excellence in which the best people would feel able to produce their best work. We felt we had to meet three needs: The basic need for money, for security; then the psychological needs—of belonging, of doing a worthwhile job, of status; and finally, the need to provide recognition for outstanding performance.

By every test we know, we believe we have sharply improved our total performance—stepped up the total level of creativity in a company of more than 500 employees.

But we are acutely aware that we have found no magic formula to get people to give us their most creative efforts more frequently. We do not find a satisfied need is necessarily a stimulant to creative effort. A satisfied need can improve creativity; but it is no artistic benzedrine.

We have come to a basic conclusion: You can't let people be creative; you must force them to be creative.

We believe now that we are too much concerned with the end result of creativity—the idea—and too little concerned with its process. I think we are too often inclined to label a highly read advertisement or a well designed machine as a creative act. We are not enough concerned with how it got that way.

There is, as every businessman will testify, no shortage of ideas. There is a continuous shortage of ideas that are successful. We got a lot of ideas on how to improve our magazines—we got relatively few that worked.

We have spent the better part of 5 years trying to find out why and what to do about it. Because your problem in communicating better is my problem, you may be interested. Here in a word is our view now:

You can't let people create; you must teach them how to create effectively.

This poses a problem: before you can teach a subject, you ought to be able to define what it's all about.

We're not sure you can define creativity. But, to do something about it, we were forced into a definition. We think creativity involves three steps: (1) It is the ability to generate alternatives; (2) It is the ability to choose among the alternatives; and (3) It is the ability to implement the chosen alternative.

Now it may be that this definition simply mirrors our own belief; the only idea that's good is one that can be applied. But it has a further virtue—it is in effect a blueprint for creativity.

There is a real problem in the definition; one that grows out of our kind of society. Our schools, our social environment, even our larger businesses, all lay stress on conformity, on group thinking, on the value of status and the status quo. All of our institutions lay stress on the one right way, the one right kind of conduct. None, so far as we can see, lay stress on the fundamental fact of life: There is more than one way to get to heaven.

Now, if you're going to teach editors and writers that there are alternative solutions to any problem, they are not going to learn it overnight. They are going to have to practice getting alternative solutions, and hopefully they are going to have to practice it under the watchful eye of a coach.

To take a homely example: you can learn to swim by being flung off a dock. But this drastic practice is more likely to turn you into a nonsinker than a swimmer. But if you can learn the motions of swimming, if you can practice them, and practice them under the eye of a coach, you are more likely to be a good swimmer.

So, in an effort to make people more creative in communications problems, we are trying to teach them that there are alternative solutions, we are trying to get them to practice arriving at alternatives and we are using our top management in coaching them how to do it.

In the second step, choosing the better of the alternatives, we've been quite successful. Mostly, when we asked our people to be creative, they were creative on problems that interested them—that impinged on their job and their interest.

We quickly found they lacked an overview—that broader view of company or industry objectives. We had to teach them to develop ideas that affected industry- or companywide problems. By staging frequent and often painfully detailed meetings with our magazine managements, we were able to persuade them to create against problems that were of industrywide interest.

That brings us to the final stage, how do you implement a creative alternative, or in simpler words, an idea that can be applied?

In our view, ideas are like the children of a creator—beautiful, untouched by flaw, and unlikely to be wrong. Of course, the creator will do his homework. He will do the research, anticipate the objections, see clearly the successful results. But if implementing means getting it done, it means also that the creator must sell it to management.

And in this connection, we discovered again an age-old fact. The fact has been noted pithily by Crawford H. Greenewalt, of Du Pont. He points out that much of his company's success has come from rewarding men who had ideas. And then he adds, pointedly: "At Du Pont, we add a special bonus for the creator of ideas who has surmounted difficulties posed for its acceptance among people inside the company."

We find that even in our own company, which like Du Pont is dedicated to innovation, new ideas have certain predictable reactions. Ideas are uncomfortable because they mean change. Ideas are irritating because they come at the wrong times for the orderly processing of the day's trivia. Ideas, finally, are irritating because they are rarely yours.

So we had to teach the people who received ideas, our management, the care and handling of ideas and the people who produce them.

In one instance, we found that the flow of ideas in one of our magazines had virtually stopped. The editor was so busy with his own ideas, he rarely had time to listen.

So we provided him with an administrative assistant whose job was to take over the day-to-day detail. We were pleased to note that we now had a better business and a better editor, who now had time to listen to ideas, to reject them graciously, and to coach people on how to get more. I don't think it's necessary to add that the magazine is now more profitable.

All of this has been a long way round to answer the simple question: Does the industrial advertising communicate, or, how good is it? It's good, but we've indicated it can get better, a lot better.

It can get better if it improves creatively; that is, if the product—magazine advertisement—approaches its problems more creatively, and if the people who produce them can be made more creative.

A business cannot be successful unless it approaches its product creatively. If there is a second reason for a successful business, it must be that the business uses its basic asset—people—better.

We believe that people working at their best can outperform people working at a low level of competence. Working to develop people at their best seems to us the profitable business of management.

The industrial magazine business is performing well, its editorial and its advertising gets read and gets action. When action occurs, the distribution process is improved.

If the industrial magazine business can solve two problems—how to make magazines

communicate better, and how can the people who produce them be more creative—we believe they can produce important results for the industrial world and for the Nation.

In summary, industrial advertising, and the magazines which carry it, has been doing its job well. But competence is not enough in the face of new and greater challenge. We can in industrial advertising and industrial editing no longer be satisfied with anything less than individual and corporate excellence.

Somehow, the men who manage the communicators, must themselves communicate better. They must communicate to editors and writers of ads alike the rich personal, corporate, and national rewards that will follow upon giving each and every task the very best effort of which every man is capable.

Death of William Stern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, New Year's Day was saddened for many of us when we learned of the death of William Stern, one of North Dakota's most prominent and best loved citizens.

For me the loss was personal, because Bill was a close friend who lived next door to me in Fargo, N. Dak.

Bill and I had opposite political affiliations, but that fact did not dim my admiration or respect for him or impede our friendship in any way, for Bill had a broad understanding and tolerant attitude toward people and events that never failed.

Combined with this quality was a well-developed sense of humor that made him a sparkling, interesting personality.

Bill Stern made great contributions, including civic betterment and improved conditions for veterans. He will be greatly missed.

I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Fargo Forum of January 2, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL STERN DIES; RITES SET FRIDAY

William Stern, 77, of 1102 Ninth Street S., one of Fargo's most widely known citizens, died about 4:30 p.m. Wednesday in Methodist Hospital of Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn.

Mr. Stern, who had won national recognition in the Republican Party, in American Legion affairs, and as an officer of Northwest Airlines, had been hospitalized intermittently in Rochester and Fargo since mid-June 1963.

President of the Dakota National Bank, Mr. Stern was a director and executive assistant of Northwest Airlines, in addition to holding a number of other positions on boards of other firms and institutions.

A private funeral service will be at 3 o'clock Friday in Mr. Stern's home, Rabbi Saul M. Diament officiating.

Pallbearers, all directors of Dakota National Bank, will be O. J. Boyle, W. W. Wallwork, A. L. Netcher, J. L. McCormick, A. J. Daveau, Henry J. Gilbertson, W. R. Haggart, Croll Hunter, and A. M. Eriksmoen.

Arrangements are being made to carry the service to Temple Beth El by public address system for those who wish to attend a memorial service to be held at the same time as the funeral.

Possessed of unusual ability in the art of meeting people and in projecting his personality, Mr. Stern won scores of friends, among them Presidents and presidential candidates.

Although he frequently was offered inducements to go elsewhere, he chose to continue his residence in Fargo, declaring his attachment to his hometown was such he would never leave.

His duties as national committeeman of the Legion, Republican national committeeman, director and executive assistant of Northwest Airlines, positions he held for many years, kept him active in and out of the city.

As an airlines director, he flew thousands of miles and visited many lands.

In his hometown, his biggest job was being president of the Dakota National Bank, a post he assumed in 1934.

Other business connections which occupied his time included a directorship with the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co., Mason City, Iowa, dating back to 1930.

Hanford MacNider, former national commander of the American Legion, was president of the latter firm.

Mr. Stern was president of the Stern Realty Co. and vice president of the Fargo Real Estate Co., posts taken upon the death of his father, Alexander Stern, Fargo financier, in 1934.

In the same year, he also assumed the vice presidencies of the Fowler Realty Co., and Alex Stern & Co., the men's clothing firm his father founded in 1880.

In politics, he started in 1911 as a Republican precinct committeeman in Fargo's fifth ward. He was elected delegate to the State convention and was sent to represent the party at the convention in Cleveland that nominated Coolidge.

He became national committeeman in the first Hoover campaign and attended the Hoover, Landon, Wilkie, and Dewey nominating conventions, serving 12 years.

President Hoover in 1931 appointed him a member of the national advisory committee to assist Walter S. Gifford, national relief director, in preventing distress during the national depression.

He was North Dakota's representative at the Republican grassroots conference in Springfield, Ill., in 1935, a meeting called to map plans for returning agricultural States to the Republican column in the 1936 presidential election.

That year he also was a member of the rules committee functioning on preconvention matters for the Republican National Committee.

In 1940 he enlivened what was described as an otherwise dull meeting of the committee in Washington by jocularly inviting the next Republican convention to Fargo. The city received considerable publicity.

The same year he served as a member of Wendell Willkie's national campaign advisory committee, which sought to unite all factions behind the Republican candidate.

His connection with the committee ended in 1944.

Starting as one of the organizers of Gilbert C. Grafton Post of the American Legion, in Fargo in 1919, he rose until in 1946 he was referred to by Collier's magazine as one of 10 kingmakers in the national Legion organization.

He was credited with being one of the group said to have selected and promised Col. Paul H. Griffith of Pennsylvania that he would be elected national commander of the Legion in San Francisco in 1946. Griffith was elected.

Fargoans knew Mr. Stern was in the foreground in the movement which resulted in the election as national legion commander in 1941 of Lynn U. Stambaugh of Fargo, later a director of the Export-Import Bank, until his retirement.

In 1925, Mr. Stern served as a member of the Legion's National Rehabilitation Committee.

He served as Fargo post treasurer in 1919 and commander in 1924. In 1925 he became a national vice commander. Chosen a national committeeman of the Legion in 1926, he held the post many years.

Until recent years, he had regularly attended State and national Legion conventions.

For many years he served as a director and president of the North Dakota State Fair Association.

Active in many civic enterprises and campaigns, he was one of three men who selected the site of Hector Airport, the others being Dr. Frank Darrow and W. P. Chesnut.

He was a member of the Fargo Chamber of Commerce, Fargo Country Club, Elks Lodge, Shiloh Masonic Lodge, Scottish Rite bodies, El Zagal Temple of the Shrine, Eagles Lodge and Pioneer Mutual Life.

Born May 19, 1886, in an apartment over the Citizens National Bank, now the S. S. Kresge Co. store, at 54 Broadway, he was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alex Stern. In recent years he was fond of calling attention to the fact that his office as president of Dakota National Bank looked out on the building that was his birthplace. His father then owned a small store on the site of the Kresge store.

His father had come to Fargo in 1880 from Illinois, and before his death in 1934 had been a councilman, school board member, mayor, State legislator, NDSU trustee, bank president and a leader in many civic and charitable enterprises.

His mother, the former Bertha Aurora Kaufman, who died in 1930, was born in a frontier mining town, Aurora, Nev., and came to Fargo upon her marriage in 1883. She became a leader among Fargo women in social, educational and charitable work, one whose private charities gladdened Thanksgiving and Christmas in the homes of many needy families.

As a boy, William Stern first displayed business acumen by trapping frogs in Fargo's Big Slough and selling them to restaurants.

After attending grade school and 2 years of high school in Fargo, he went to St. John's Military Academy, Delafield, Wis., where he received his high school diploma.

Beginning work in his father's store, he advanced to a supervisory position and eventually became an officer of the company. In 1917 when his father and others organized the Dakota National Bank, he was named a director, and in 1925 he became the cashier and vice president. At this time he resigned his store post.

Upon his father's death he became president of the bank. For some years he served also as director of the Dakota Trust Co., which became the Northern and Dakota Trust Co., and later was liquidated.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army in 1917, serving in the Quartermaster Corps at Camp Meigs, Md., and later in France.

In 1936 he was elected to the board of Northwest Airlines. During World War II he was active in directing operations of the Northwest Aeronautical Corp., a subsidiary of Northwest Airlines, which manufactured gliders for the Army.

To his duties were added those of special assistant to the president of Northwest Airlines, Croll Hunter, former Fargoan, in 1944.

Among the almost innumerable appointments and posts received by Mr. Stern were those as a member of the National Republican Finance Committee; official observer at the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco in 1951, as appointed by President Truman.

He was appointed a member of an advisory committee to the U.S. Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by his longtime friend, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, in 1959; elected a director of American National Bank of St. Paul; named a member of the 1959 Assay Commission by President Eisenhower.

He leaves two brothers, Sam, former president of Alex Stern & Co., now a Rochester, Minn., resident, and Edward, director of public relations for Northwest Airlines in New York City.

The family prefers memorials be made to the North Dakota Cancer Society.

(Boulger and Hughes Funeral Home.)

Eulogy of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend of mine, Buffalo and Washington attorney, Vincent M. Gaughan, was the principal speaker at the interfaith memorial service for our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, held at the Trinity Episcopal Church in Hamburg, N.Y., on Sunday, December 22, 1963. The service was held in conjunction with the candlelight service, marking the end of the national mourning period at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., and addressed by President Lyndon B. Johnson on that same day.

Mr. Gaughan was a friend or our late President for the past 15 years and served as his advance man in the presidential campaign of 1960, and in the congressional campaign of 1962.

One of Mr. Gaughan's last assignments for President Kennedy was to serve as the special representative of the President at the independence ceremony held in Dahomey, Africa, last August.

On the President's last trip, Mr. Gaughan had preceded him to Texas, where he had worked on the arrangements in Austin. The President was scheduled to arrive in Austin on the night of November 22.

The deep sorrow which Mr. Gaughan felt at President Kennedy's death was expressed in these poignant words, which I think will be an inspiration to all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Gaughan's eulogy which follows:

EULOGY OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Vincent M. Gaughan)

We meet today in this holy place to honor our fallen captain. Our minds are troubled and our hearts are heavy because our captain was not only our leader who buoyed our courage in the heat of battle, he was also our loved and cherished friend, who walked and dwelt amongst us, giving freely of all he possessed.

He gave us counsel and understanding. He gave us a new dignity, a higher hope, a greater vision. And finally, with his last breath, he gave us the most priceless gift of all—his life.

Today, the shadow of the man falls long and dark across this Nation.

Be not sad, dear friends. It is altogether fitting that we meet this day to take down the black shrouds of mourning and death, to be replaced with the joyful boughs of evergreen, symbol of everlasting life.

The cool, crisp voice, the graceful laugh, the mortal man are gone. Yet he lives—he lives.

He lives forever in the hearts of all who love their God and serve their fellow man.

He will live in generations yet unborn, to whom he will be a towering inspiration, beckoning them through endless time to seek a fuller life and a better world.

Charles Dickens once wrote:

"When Death strikes down the innocent and young, for every fragile form from which he lets the struggling spirit free, a hundred virtues rise in shapes of mercy, charity, and love to walk the world and bless it."

This is a season of holiness. This is the season of Christmas joy that down through the ages has held out to mankind the promise of a new birth, through which the whole world is born again. Let us now, each in his own humble way, in the spirit of the Prince of Peace, firmly resolve to make the assassin's bullet that brought death and final ending to our martyred President bring new life and a new beginning to this Nation.

Let us resolve to replace unreasoning hate and distrust in our national life with love and understanding.

Let us resolve that no act or word of ours will ever encourage the bigot to transgress the rights and privileges of another human being, be he pauper or prince, black or white, Jew or gentile.

Let us resolve to continue the assault on poverty and quest for peace for which he so nobly lived and nobly died.

Let us resolve to continue the ecumenical spirit which brings me, a Catholic, to an Episcopalian pulpit.

No library, no eternal flame, no renaming of a space agency, no road name, or school name will be so appropriate a monument as this. No monument built of stone and mortar will last as long or mean as much as this monument of the heart and mind.

A commander has fallen. A new one steps in to fill the breach. The battle goes on.

But before we turn away from the flag-draped caisson, the empty saddle, the turned boots—before we turn our thoughts to the tasks at hand—let us consign his spirit to He who loves him best, with the prayerful plea:

"Dear God, please take care of your servant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy."

Reaction to Cyprus Varied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at widely separated free world strategic points Communist agitators are trying to force various governments into breaking or abrogating treaties in an effort to further the Communist cause.

Panama, Cyprus, Zanzibar, are key points in the headlines today where such activities can be pinpointed. All activities in these areas deserve our most careful study and considerations of the problems as they exist today and as to the development of a possible solution which will be firm and with some degree of permanency.

Recently there appeared in the Freedom Press of Los Angeles, Calif., an article entitled "Reaction to Cyprus Varied." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REACTION TO CYPRUS VARIED

WASHINGTON.—Comments on the proposal by Vice President Fasil Kutchuk of Cyprus to divide that island into two nations have brought mixed reaction here.

Cyprus has been strategically important since ancient times for its rich copper mines—so much so that we get the word copper from the name of the island.

More important now is the island's strategic location in the context of the struggle between the free world and communism. Control of the island of Cyprus, or part of it, by Communists would mean an additional threat aimed at the long southern shoreline of Turkey which already faces Communist Russia to the north.

Three-quarters of the population of Cyprus is Greek and 37 percent of the Greeks are Communists.

Viewpoints encountered in Washington vary. Some think the most important aspect is easing tensions. Others are primarily concerned with avoiding a worsening of the strategic balance for the free world.

Also figuring in the comments was the feeling that both the Greeks and Turks gave up something to bring about the existing autonomous government guaranteed jointly by Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey.

The feeling is that if this agreement can not stand up after only a few years, a new solution is not likely to either, and therefore now new provisions that could benefit the Communists should be put into effect.

The Panama Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the New York Times:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—The recent bloody rioting in Panama plus a series of other unexpected foreign developments serve to suggest that this year's presidential campaign could well be fought out on other than the domestic issues which are President Johnson's preference.

It is in this area of events outside our borders that Republicans consider Johnson likely to be most vulnerable. For example, if the so-called peace formula reached today in Panama comes unstuck, the issue of Communist infiltration out of Castro's Cuba could become politically explosive.

Especially as the chief negotiator in the Panama crisis has been the President's special adviser on inter-American affairs, Thomas C. Mann. Also on the U.S. team sent to Panama was an equally controversial State Department figure, Edwin M. Martin.

Mann stands very high with Johnson, but his astuteness as an expert on Latin American affairs has long been challenged by Republicans.

They have not forgotten that, as Assistant Secretary of State in April 1961 he was in on the high strategy discussions leading up

to the Bay of Pigs invasion fiasco. And in the showdown White House talks he spoke up for the operation.

It was not long thereafter the then President Kennedy switched Mann from his key State Department spot and named him Ambassador to Mexico.

Now, due to Johnson, Mann is Assistant Secretary of State again, and Martin, whom J.F.K. named to succeed Mann, is Johnson's Ambassador-designate to Argentina.

Martin, however, could be even more politically vulnerable than Mann if the Johnson "peace operation" in Panama goes haywire.

WHEN AN AMBASSADOR QUIT HIS JOB

The Republicans have in their party file quite a sizable folder on Martin, relating to Panama especially. It was Martin's handling at the State Department level of economic aid projects for Panama which incurred the wrath of former U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland and chiefly caused the popular envoy to resign his Panama post last August.

At that time Farland let it be known that he was fed up with the State Department bureaucracy for a wide range of reasons. It was brought out that he had for months, for example, been sending to the Department a series of reports warning of the development of anti-U.S. feeling, which Castro's Red agents were exploiting.

These Farland reports, if they ever reached Assistant Secretary Martin's desk, were apparently filed and forgotten, for the Ambassador said he never even received the courtesy of a reply.

Yet Martin was one of the chief troubleshooters rushed by the President to Panama the other day to undo the mischief which could well have been prevented if Farland's early warnings had been heeded.

STILL TRYING TO FILL AN IMPORTANT POST

What is even worse has been the slow-motion activity since last September in getting a replacement for Ambassador Farland. Kennedy had planned to name as Farland's successor former Representative Frank Coffin, Democrat, of Maine, who has been a deputy foreign aid director.

President Johnson never did get along with Coffin, and as of today he is still trying to figure out who should be named to a key post which should have been filled months ago.

All these aspects of how the Panamanian crisis was allowed to develop without much being done about it suggest the dimensions of the openings provided for GOP exploitation.

Richard M. Nixon, in an interview with United Press International published today, said the Panama mess reflected a "general sickness" in the Kennedy-Johnson administration's Latin American policy. The overall policies, particularly in this hemisphere and in southeast Asia, he charged, "are leading us down the road to one failure, one defeat, after another."

Not only Nixon but Governor Rockefeller and BARRY GOLDWATER have emphasized that they intend to mount their chief attacks on the Democratic administration in this foreign policy area.

The Aging American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, there has been a gratifying increase in recent years in the local and national attention given to America's elderly citizens. This is only right, especially in view of the fact these citizens are becoming an ever-increasing segment of our total population.

Of necessity, much of the attention is directed to the problems that aging produces or intensifies. Perhaps we do not stress enough the positive aspects and the contributions that elderly citizens make to our society.

This point was made recently by the National Council on Aging in commenting on a National Broadcasting Co. program on "The Aging American."

I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the National Council be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NCOA ASKS MORE CONSIDERATION FOR OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE AGING

NEW YORK.—Commendation of the National Broadcasting Co.'s program on "The Aging American" ("Today Show," Jan. 16, 1964) was expressed here today by the National Council on the Aging.

Commenting on the program, Mrs. Geneva Mathiasen, executive director of the Council, said, "We're happy that the National Broadcasting Co. devoted time to an area that concerns an increasing segment of our population.

"We're sorry, however, that more attention was given to the problems than to the opportunities and that the more affirmative aspects of aging were not stressed."

She added, "We should be careful to avoid reinforcing the false notion that all people over 65 are lonely, poverty stricken, and dependent upon Government programs for assistance.

"The fact is that the vast majority of people over 65 are self-sustaining members of society leading active, positive lives.

"For example, one-fourth of the members of the United States Senate are over that age, three members of the U.S. Supreme Court are over 65, many of the prominent heads of state in the world today are elder people and elder people are serving in the Peace Corps in difficult oversea posts."

She noted that the oldest man in the United States at 120 still runs his own business and that a woman of 101 is the chairman of the board of directors of three corporations and signs all the checks issued by those corporations.

Mrs. Mathiasen pointed out that centers for the aging need not be concerned with only "tea, ceramics, and sympathy" and cited one group in New York in which the members devote their time, in conjunction with teachers, to tutoring school children who are falling behind in their classroom work.

Other factors which the council said should be considered in assessing the situation are:

That the average age at which people start drawing social security benefits is 68 although they become eligible at age 62 or 65.

That the older person in the United States constitutes a $35 billion a year market for the economy, a figure that will rise to $55 billion by 1975.

That 75 percent of the people over 65 live in households with at least 1 family member. Only 20 percent are either alone or in a household with no family member.

That while the three-generation household is on the decline, three-generation families are maintaining their unity and there is no evidence to suggest an increasing estrangement between older people and members of their families.

That about 33 percent of men over 65 and 10 percent of the women over that age are still gainfully employed.

"NBC did, however, render a useful and valuable public service in bringing the attention of the public to this area," Mrs. Mathiasen said. "The council is hopeful that at some future date a more thorough examination of the needs and the work being done will be possible."

The National Council on the Aging is a nonprofit agency supported by foundations, business, and labor institutions and individual contributions. It provides national and community leadership consultation as well as conducting special projects, the maintenance of library services, and the issuance of publications.

NCOA works closely with such agencies as the Family Service Association, the Office of Aging, Bureau of Family Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Veterans' Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Legal Aid Society of America, the American Public Welfare Association, the U.S. Public Health Service, the Life Insurance Institute of America, church groups, and the U.S. Department of Labor.

Analysis of Attendance Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion in recent weeks of the activities of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, it would perhaps be of interest to analyze the so-called attendance record method of evaluating the diligence of Members of Congress.

The Congress usually adjourns in August or September, thus giving Members the opportunity to transact both the official business of Congress and the business of the district they represent during the months after adjournment. The 1st session of the 88th Congress did not adjourn, of course, until the end of December. Despite the fact that the Congress was in session, official business away from Washington had to continue. As a result, the attendance records of most Members of Congress has been lower than usual this year.

On one occasion, October 31, 1963, I missed the call of the roll three times because of a 7-hour absence from Washington honoring a commitment to address the Rotary Club of Barberton, Ohio. The commitment was made, incidentally, 8 months previously, at a time when no one dreamed that Congress would be in session at the end of October. The bill being considered at that time was a bill that had no direct bearing upon my own district.

In fact, at the time commitments of this nature were being made by Members, little did we realize that on the last vote of the session 80 of our Members would be caught in a snowstorm and unable to return to Washington.

But let us talk about attendance records. How do we measure it? Shall it be measured by the number of days a Representative was present while the House was in session? Or should we use the total opportunities a Member of Congress has to voice approval or disapproval of a measure on the floor of the House of

Representatives. Most political writers seem to prefer using as their guide the number of times a rollcall vote is taken in the House of Representatives. I cannot picture a more ridiculous method of computing attendance than this.

First of all, it is important to recognize that the House of Representatives does not have a rollcall vote every day. Weeks may pass with no rollcall, and then they may have seven in 1 day. In the 88th Congress, which opened January 9, 1963, there was a call of the roll four times the first day. These were the only rollcall votes in approximately the first 7 weeks of the session. If a Member missed this opening day but was present during the balance of the 7 weeks, voting conscientiously on other bills on which the roll was not called, he would have had an attendance record, up to this time, of 0 percent because the roll was not called from January 9 to February 27. In fact, the roll was called on only 108 of the 186 days the House was in session. So a Member could have been absent on the 78 days the roll was not called and still record a 100 percent attendance record. This is ridiculous.

During the first session of the 88th Congress, I answered 88 of the 119 yea and nay recorded votes in the House of Representatives. This statistic alone does not tell the story. In fact, it is very misleading. Members who have been in the Congress long enough to have attained seniority and a better than average knowledge of certain subjects are most often designated to represent the Congress at important functions away from Washington. Such designations may be made by the Speaker of the House or by a committee chairman. Such absences from Washington, even though on official business for the House of Representatives, are recorded when a rollcall vote is missed.

During the 88th Congress, I was designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to represent the Congress at a meeting of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, Switzerland. Because of this assignment, I was unable to respond to the call of the roll on 13 occasions. Despite this fact, the service I was able to render to my Nation, and consequently, my district was greater than it would have been had I been present and answering the roll during this period. As a result of my attendance at the International Labor Organization Conference, I was able to report thereon to the Congress and to alert United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson to the possibility of the United Nations General Assembly meeting being split asunder as the result of South Africa's position on apartheid and its resentment by the other 32 African nations. My report permitted Ambassador Stevenson to take corrective action, thus preventing a walkout in the United Nations by the African Nations similar to that that occurred in the ILO Conference. I am proud that my actions in this regard earned for me the thanks of my colleagues in the House of Representatives as well as those of United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

My report on the conference was presented to the House of Representatives on June 27, 1963. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the colloquy between Congressman PELLY of Washington and myself which followed the presentation of the report.

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Washintgon.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] with great interest. I may say, in all frankness, I have learned a great deal from the statements which the gentleman has made here today. Often I think, Mr. Speaker, the public is critical of Members of Congress who travel—even, I might say in my own case, I have looked askance at sending Members abroad to attend meetings of this sort. But I can only express my view today, Mr. Speaker, that if Members would be as conscientious as the gentleman from Ohio and report as promptly and in such detail, it is my opinion that much of this criticism would disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed hearing the gentleman; and I commend the gentleman for a very fine statement.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from Washington. As I said in my remarks, I hope the House in its wisdom will see fit to have representatives from this body attend all of these international conferences. There is no way in which one can get the exact information, that one can get the feel of what the Communists are doing throughout the world, other than to be there and witness their operations first hand. They are clever. We are in a fight, and we had better be there to see what is going on and set up the rules so that we at least have the opportunity to refute their misrepresentations in order that the weaker nations of the world will not be misled.

Let us examine this attendance based on votes from another angle. There were actually 934 measures passed by the House of Representatives in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I could have been present for the 119 recorded votes and been absent when 815 measures were passed and still have an attendance record of 100 percent. My attendance in relation to the 934 measures that passed the House in 1963 is 96.7 percent.

I mentioned the fact that the roll is not called every day, while on other days it is called several times. Any Member can request a call of the roll, even though the other 434 Members realize it will not affect the final vote. Had a Member been absent only on April 25, June 4, December 4, and December 10, a total of 4 days out of 186, his attendance record would have been the same as mine because on those 4 days alone, the roll was called 31 times. The roll was also called 31 times while I was away from Washington—12 times while in Geneva, 6 times while on assignment for the Committee on Education and Labor, and 6 times while fulfilling commitments and otherwise attending to the needs of my constituents.

Even though a Member of Congress may be absent on official business, procedures of the House of Representatives permit him to have his position on an issue recorded. This is accomplished by being paired with another absent Member espousing a contrary position. It is for this reason, that an equal number of Democrats and Republicans are usually assigned to official details that take them away from Washington.

An example of the ridiculousness of computing attendance records from the number of times a Member responds to the calling of his name is shown by rollcall No. 6 on January 14 of this year. The vote on this rollcall was 298 to 11 with 123 absentees. The absentees were, of course, paired with persons endorsing opposite views. Had all of the 123 absentees been present, and joined the 11 who voted against the bill, it would not have changed the result on final passage. Not a single one of my absences from a rollcall vote had any bearing on the results of the vote. In other words, the votes were so decisive that my one vote would not have changed the outcome in any respect.

During the entire 1st session of the 88th Congress I missed a vote because of official business on only one major bill and that was the vote on the depressed area bill. The vote here was 204 in favor and 209 opposed. Had Mr. Roosevelt and I, both paired and attending the ILO Conference, been present and voting, the result would have been a vote of 205 to 210.

If we are to get a true and honest attendance record, then, one must compare the days away from Washington with the days the House was in session. The House was in session 186 days. Because of official business and work in my district, I was not present on 24 days, when the roll was called 31 times. I was present in the House of Representatives each day I was not away from Washington. Therefore, taking the days the House was in session, 186, dividing into days I was present, 162, you will arrive at 87 percent, a far more honest manner to figure the attendance record for this year.

And this is still not the complete story, for, congressional duties are carried on during days when the House is not officially in session when committee meetings et cetera are being held. This year there were 100 congressional workdays in addition to the days the House was in session, bringing the total to 286 workdays. And even during congressional recesses, when any, I am usually busy handling problems of my constituents.

I am proud to be the Representative to Congress of Ohio's 14th District, and this has been the most unusual congressional session in 30 years.

For my 13 years' service, to date, my attendance, based on answering the call of the House, is 91.4 percent. And, based on the number of days I have been on the job in Washington in proportion to the days of House in session for this 13-year period my record is 97.2 percent.

It is a real pleasure to serve all of the people of our district and, to whatever degree, our Nation.

Anniversary of Birth of Robert Edward Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on last Saturday, January 18, in Statutory

Hall of our U.S. Capitol, the District of Columbia Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, celebrated the anniversary of the birth of Robert Edward Lee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prayers offered by Dr. Paul G. Wiley, of the Arlington Baptist Church; the introduction of the speaker by Dr. Ludwell Lee Montague, president, Society of the Lee's of Virginia; and the splendid address by Dr. Allen W. Moger, professor of history, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

There being no objection, the prayers, introduction, and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL OBSERVANCE OF THE BIRTHDAY OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE IN THE HALL OF STATUES OF THE CAPITOL OF THE UNITED STATES—PRAYERS BY REV. PAUL G. WILEY, PASTOR, ARLINGTON BAPTIST CHURCH, ARLINGTON, VA.

INVOCATION

Our Father, bless Thou these moments in this place with a consciousness in the heart of each one of the overshadowing presence of Thy spirit. Reveal Thyself and Thy continuing purposes to these Thy children. Open Thou the eyes of our spirits that, in remembering the one whom we honor today, we shall see clearly those elements of Christian character which not only made him a great soldier but, more, a great husband, a great father, a great educator, a great gentleman, and a great man of God. Help us to discern well the need for such men in our own day, and give us the individual will and the eternal power to move each day in that direction. This we pray in Thy blessed name. Amen.

BENEDICTION

Gratitude fills our hearts, our Father, for the privilege and inspiration of such a lifting experience. Go Thou, we pray Thee, from this hallowed place with each one into the daily obligations of life and service.

"Now to the one who can keep you from falling and set you in the presence of his glory, jubilant and above reproach, to the only God and Saviour, be glory and majesty, might and authority, through Jesus Christ our Lord, before all time, now, and for evermore, Amen."

INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKER BY DR. LUDWELL LEE MONTAGUE

Madam President, Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored to be invited to take part in your annual commemoration of the birth of Robert E. Lee—Cousin Robert, as my grandmother knew him.

This man whom we commemorate today is not just an heroic figure from a bygone age. His qualities of character have relevance in the complex world in which we live. Those who learn to know him, not as a bronze statue upon a pedestal, but as a human being called upon to act in the most complex and trying circumstances, can derive strength and reassurance from the very simplicity of the principles which governed his conduct and from his adherence to them regardless of the consequences to himself.

I am here to introduce Dr. Allen Moger, the speaker of this occasion. It gives me great pleasure to do so. Dr. Moger is today a distinguished professor of history at Washington and Lee University—but I knew him as a friend when he was a young instructor there and I was the same at VMI.

Since 1941 Dr. Moger has had charge of the Lee Archives at Washington and Lee. He is in consequence an authority on the life and works of General Lee after the war. He is presently collaborating with Coronet Films in the making of a film biography of General Lee for use in the schools. At the same time, he is working on a book to be entitled "Virginia in Transition, 1880–1918"—a long neglected phase of Virginia's history, which did not end in 1865, some empressions to the contrary notwithstanding.

Dr. Moger's subject is "General Lee's Influence After the War." That was an important and constructive influence, with great relevance to the problems of the present day.

GENERAL LEE'S INFLUENCE AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

(By Allen W. Moger)

My thanks for the privilege of being here today. And I am delighted to bring you the personal greetings of Dr. Fred C. Cole, the president of "General Lee's College," and from the faculty and students of Washington and Lee University.

My talk today is based largely on Lee's correspondence during the 5 years that he was president of Washington College preceding his death in 1870. This correspondence reveals him as the greatest single leader, counselor, and inspiration to the defeated South as it nursed its wounds and started on its halting and laborious journey toward reunion with the rest of the Nation.

The only group in American history which deserves to be known as the lost generation is the group which lived in the South during the years immediately after the Civil War. Four years of bitter strife had for them ended in failure and they did not feel at home in their country or in their time. Amid devastation and destruction business was insolvent, anarchy threatened, and disillusionment was everywhere. Many people were consumed with bitterness, and nearly all were in despair. Newspaper editors wrote of the dark, dark future. One said, "Our hopes have fled, and we sit in darkness. The nemesis of God had indeed involved us in a frightful vortex."

Amid such desolation and bewilderment the clearest voice of sanity and courage was that Robert E. Lee. With malice toward none and with love for all, this fallen leader of the lost cause gave the postwar generation the sublimest example of work and hope that this country has ever seen. His character and sense of values enabled him to accept his new position as president of a small college with serene faith and confidence—with no whimpering, no regret, no rationalization. Where others had malice he had love. "I have never cherished towards them (the northern people) bitter or vindictive feelings, and have never seen the day when I did not pray for them." Where others had despair he had confidence and hope. He counseled that "in the good providence of God apparent failure often proves a blessing." "It is history that teaches us to hope."

Contemporaries were well aware of the significance of Lee's decision to become president of a small provincial college. Posterity was to see that school develop into a great institution of learning—largely because of the influence and inspiration of the man who turned failure into victory. One of the most interesting letters to Lee was written by Judge John W. Brockenbrough on the deck of a packet boat of the James River and Kanawha Canal by which he was returning to Lexington after visiting Lee at Derwent in Powhatan County to offer him the presidency of Washington College. In seeking to reemphasize his appeal to Lee, the judge wrote:

"But it is precisely because we feel assured that in discharging the comparatively humble functions of president of our college new luster would be added to your fame, and your character would be presented in a new and more attractive light to your admiring countrymen that we presume to urge the acceptance of the office upon you with an importunity that else might seem indelicate. You would thereby evince a mind superior to despair and by this exhibition of moderation and goodness establish new claims to the admiration and affection of your countrymen. To make yourself useful to the State, to dedicate your fine scientific attainments to the service of its youth, to guide that youth in the paths of virtue, knowledge, and religion, not more by precept than by your great example—these my dear general are objects worthy of your ambition, and we desire to present to you the means of their accomplishment."

After reading the news account in the New York Herald of Lee's brief inauguration as president in October 1865, a high school principal in Louisville, Ken., wrote Lee: "I wish, sir, I could have witnessed that simple ceremony. As I dwell upon the scene in imagination, emotions well nigh sublime possess my soul. How impressively crowd upon the mind the world-renowned events of the last 4 years upon the classic soil of dear old Virginia. And now, one of the great chieftains whose name and character have won the respect of friend and foe in every civilized land, gracefully lays by his sword and accepts the unostentatious though important office of an educator of the young.

"Permit me to congratulate the venerable institution whose destiny you are to direct, for its bright prospect of success * * *."

Someone sent General Lee an editorial taken from the Daily Telegraph of London, England:

"At Lexington in the State of Virginia, there is a college, which bears the name of the most illustrious citizen ever born in the 'Old Dominion' * * * nor could Washington himself have wished that the college erected in his honor should have for its president a worthier chief than the one who quietly entered upon his duties just a fortnight ago." By doffing "the gray uniform for the garb of a peaceful professor" Robert Lee continues to follow his object "which is simply to render the best service he can to his native State. * * * To teach young lads their classics and mathematics may seem but a poor occupation for one whose word was lately the supreme law for a hundred thousand fighting men; yet there need be no sense of humiliation involved in the deliberate acceptance of such employment. * * * For a time the finest thing that Lee could do was to set an example of valor and virtue to the young manhood of the South; but not less pure is the glory of one who by honest and patient labor prepares the young for the longer conflict which fills the whole length and breadth of human life. * * * Many a bright sword is in its scabbard beside that of the great Virginian."

Letters came from all over the country inquiring about attending "General Lee's College," as it was frequently called. Letters were sent to Lynchburg and Charlottesville as well as Lexington, and Lee was addressed as president of the University of Virginia and of Washington College and as superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute. One wished his brother to attend "General Lee's College wherever it is situated." Another wrote what many implied: "The only reason I have for wishing to have my son educated at Washington College is that General Lee is the head of it." A colonel who applied for a position on Lee's faculty wrote: "I have noticed in the public prints, and heard from people that have recently traveled in Virginia, that Washington College under your administration has become one of the most flourishing, popular, and successful institutions in the South." Another wrote that "the citizens of Memphis feel a deep interest in the prosperity of Washington College and will pray for your success with as much devotion as when you commanded their armies in the noble and sacred, but 'lost cause.'" General Imboden, who had served under Lee said: "I need not say to you with what great pleasure I first learned

that my alma mater, Washington College, was to be presided over by you. The venerable college is doubly dear to me now."

A man from Oxford, Miss. expressed the hope that Washington College will ever remain "literary" rather than "military", and added: "I am so rejoiced that you are just where you are. Your sphere of usefullness to your country will be greater than when at the head of the army of Virginia. Your acceptance of that position will serve to dignify the profession of teaching. Happy the youths that are brought in contact with you." A veteran who had fought in the ranks before Appomattox wrote to introduce his brother and added the feelings of millions: "For though you never knew me, I knew you well and long, and like all your countrymen I now look up to you as a friend and adviser."

The attractions of General Lee were strengthened by the desire of many to have their sons educated in Virginia. This was especially true of some who had gone elsewhere to live. A father wrote that he and his wife had gone to "this far off home in Mississippi" and "My great wish for [my son] now is to see him a Virginian of the old school which gave you to the South when she called you, and now gives you to our whole country again."

Students came from all sections but primarily from the South, drawn by the lodestar of General Lee. The boys usually brought a letter or letters of introduction from parents or friends. Many of these letters were long and solicitous. The general, whose aversion to long letters was well known to Charles Marshall, his military secretary during the war, must have had a warm admiration for the fond mother in Tennessee who sent the briefest letter of introduction found in the Lee papers:

"To the watchful care and kind forbearance of General Lee, I commit my dear Walter.

His loving mother and,

Yours truly,

MARIANA STEPHENSON."

Truly General Lee rebuilt Washington College and, as Washington and Lee University, it has had a cosmopolitan reputation ever since his presidency. As one recent writer has said, "There was a university which was dead and he made it alive." By adding law, engineering, and journalism, and projecting a school of commerce he hoped that the school's curriculum would better prepare students to take their place in the rebuilding of the South and the Nation. Above all he imbued the college with his own gallant faith, lofty idealism, and his concept of a gentleman. Every boy was an object of his friendship and concern, and many a youngster would be influenced for the rest of life by the intimate sessions in the office of this good man. "We have no printed rules," he said to a new student, "We have but one rule here, and it is that evrey student must be a gentleman." A gentleman, he thought, should develop good habits of study and high moral standards. He should show reverence for God and follow regular habits of worship, and he should keep the peace. "As a general principle," he told a young professor, "you should not force young men to do their duty but let them do it voluntarily and thereby develop their character."

"Obedience to lawful authority is the foundation of manly character," he said. For a young man in a rebellious mood against the authority of parents and college he put a life rule in a simple sentence, "You cannot be a true man until you learn to obey."

Many parents received letters that their sons were loafing too much. Concerning such a son Lee wrote, "He is a very orderly young man, but seems very careful not to injure the health of his father's son."

Under Lee's inspiration and guidance a chapel for worship and a home for the president were constructed during Lee's time, and both are enduring monuments to his memory. The president's home was renovated and redecorated in 1960, and it is a home of beauty and dignity. The Daughters of the Confederacy everywhere are interested in the authentic restoration of Lee Chapel which was completed last year and formally rededicated on October 11. The quality of the restoration, made possible by a grant of $370,000 from the Ford Motor Co. Fund, has preserved this Lee Shrine and "symbol of the university's vast historical heritage" for centuries to come. Here tens of thousands each year pay homage and gain inspiration.

During the 1930's a former Commandant of the Marine Corps and much honored leader of men was superintendent of Virginia Military Institute, General Lejeune. Shortly before his death he told President Francis P. Gaines: "When I have a very difficult decision or a terrible problem, sometimes I leave my office and walk to your chapel and look in the face of Robert Lee and I say, 'What would you do?'" Many have undoubtedly pondered such a question.

During the last 5 years of his life Lee was more than a college president and molder of youthful character. His was the greatest single influence in the country that made for the removal of rancor and bitterness and the restoration of harmony and good will between the North and the South. Lee's influence during the 5 years after Appomattox made possible the reunion of the sections. "More than any other American, General Lee kept the tragedy of the war from being a continuing national calamity," is the conclusion of Dr. Freeman. The significance of his influence can perhaps best be grasped by speculation upon what the future would have been like if Lee had encouraged the despair and bitterness so often expressed in letters to him. Indeed the tact and calmness displayed in reply to many vindictive letters proves the truth of the proverb, "A quiet answer turneth away wrath." His advice was similar to privates and generals and Governors who asked his advice, and it can best be illustrated by quoting from a letter to Gov. John Letcher, of Virginia: The questions "having been decided against us, it is the part of wisdom to acquiesce in the result, and of candor to recognize the fact.

"The interests of the State are therefore the same as those of the United States. Its prosperity will rise and fall with the welfare of the country. The duty of its citizens, then, appears to me too plain to admit of doubt. All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of war, and to restore the blessings of peace. They should remain, if possible, in the country; promote harmony and good feelings, qualify themselves to vote; and to elect to the State and general legislature wise and patriotic men, who will devote their abilities to the interests of the country, and the healing of all dissensions."

The several thousand letters to General Lee which I have read show that he was the South's idol and the people's hero long before a legend had time to develop. Love and admiration since showered upon his memory have been a continuation of what had been so often felt and expressed during futile years of war and especially during the years at Washington College when Lee by example and hard work plucked victory from defeat. The 800 or 900 students who attended the college during the years of his presidency were inspired by his example and advice to rebuild the Southland in a reunited country. In returning to their homes they carried the inspiration of their great leader, and many of them became the leaders of the New South which Lee foresaw but did not live long enough to behold. In paraphrase of what a contemporary editor, Dr. Charles F. Deems, had written, General Lee and his colleagues at Washington College prepared multitudes of young men for great usefulness and thus powerfully reproduced himself in the next generation of thinkers and workers.

Some kind of reunion would have taken place without Lee's influence, and it is conceivable that the South would have survived without Lee as its idol, but it is safe to say that both the Nation and the section would have been different indeed without him and his memory. In later years his advice and example were forgotten by some and distorted by others. To some his memory became a sentimental thing which looked backward rather than forward, which encouraged sectionalism rather than understanding. But Lee's example, his advice, and his work served to heal the wounds of war and to strengthen the intellectual, moral, and material foundations for a prosperous South in a reunited Nation.

Those who have distorted Lee's example and advice have perhaps never really known either. I am confident that he would have been pained by those who in recent years have sought to use the flag under which he fought as a symbol of sectional and racial differences. Lee loved the Confederate flag and the principles for which it stood while he fought under it. He accepted his defeat, and his flag should not be used a hundred years later to extol bitterness and hate which he deplored. Better it is to reflect upon some of his precepts, such as the charge that Christ gave to his followers upon which Lee's life was built: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me." Or his statement in defeat, "There is a true glory and a true honor: the glory of duty done—the honor of integrity of principle." Or his words which reveal the simplicity of his Christian vision: "Truth and manliness are two qualities that will carry you through this world much better than policy, or tact, or expediency, or any other word that was ever devised to conceal or mystify a deviation from a straight line."

Panama Canal: Wake Up America, Your House Is on Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as a close observer in the Congress for many years of conduct of the foreign policies of the United States, I long ago noted that what may appear as a sudden crisis has usually been foreseen by others in our Government who have given timely warning with a view to its prevention. This has been notably true in questions affecting the Panama Canal, as repeatedly demonstrated in the objective analyses and accurate predictions by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

In his brilliant radio address over the Manion Forum on June 2, 1963, entitled "Wake Up America, Your House Is on Fire," he foresaw the danger at Panama and warned of the necessity for maintaining U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

The story of the January 9–10, 1964, Panamanian outbreak, aided, abetted, and directed by Castro-type Communist

agents from Cuba, is now a matter of history. It required the use of the U.S. Army to protect the Canal Zone against mob violence and the personal attention of the President of the United States. The loss of American lives and injuries to American citizens, all within the Canal Zone, the damage to American property in both Panama and the zone, and the attack on the U.S. Embassy in Panama city that forced its evacuation, combined to make the incident one of momentous consequence, comparable to a psychological Pearl Harbor. It emphasized the Panama Canal as the key target for communistic revolutionary conquest of the Western Hemisphere and stressed the necessity for our Government to clarify and make definite its policy of maintaining the untrammeled U.S. sovereignty over the American territory known as the Canal Zone.

Following a Presidential conference in the White House lasting until 2 a.m. on January 14, 1964, an executive press statement announced that the United States has a "recognized obligation to operate the canal efficiently and securely" and that our Government intends to honor that obligation. But this statement alone is not enough. It is only the first step.

The Congress, as the ultimate authority in matters of foreign policy, should support the President in this stand by prompt passage of House Concurrent Resolution 105, which is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to take such other steps as the situation requires.

Because the June 2, 1963, address by my colleague supplies ample justification for such actions by the Congress and reflects the vision that makes it a paper of historic importance, I quote it as part of my remarks and urge that this address be read by every Member of Congress, both House and Senate, as well as by every official in the executive departments concerned with Panama Canal policy questions.

The address follows:

WAKE UP AMERICA, YOUR HOUSE IS ON FIRE

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress for Pennsylvania)

Dean MANION. The iron hand of the Communist conquest presses down hard upon Cuba now but it does not rest there. The long fingers of this blood-red hand are constantly probing the Central American mainland and its index finger points ominously at the Panama Canal. There—and now within the reach of the rapacious Kremlin conspiracy—is the rich paydirt of U.S. territory.

How serious is this Red threat to Panama? With me here now is the person in Washington best qualified to answer this question. In Congress, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is known as the watchdog of the Panama Canal. This distinguished man has long had a passionately patriotic interest in this vital waterway which he keeps well informed and alerted by frequent visits to the isthmus. Nothing that you have ever heard on this program is more important than what he has to say to you now.

Congressman FLOOD, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Mr. FLOOD. Thank you, Dean Manion.

Wake up America, your house is on fire.

Indeed, the very foundation of your house—the Panama Canal Zone—is smoldering and every so often is spurting forth flames. For it is the Panama Canal which is the key target of the world revolutionary movement in the Caribbean.

Thus far, we have not taken the measures required to put out this fire. Instead, we have floundered from crisis to crisis making concession after concession to Panama, and Panama, in return, has continued with larger and larger demands.

Warnings of what was to come have been given time after time in the Halls of Congress, but these warnings fell on deaf ears. But in each case, the things I warned of came to pass. There was the attempt of Panamanian students to hoist the Panama flag at the Canal Zone Administration Building in 1958; the November 3, 1959, attempted invasion of the Canal Zone by a Panamanian mob which required the use of the U.S. Army to quell the uprising.

Then, there was the ill-advised action of the President of the United States, contrary to the mandate of Congress, in directing the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory as evidence of Panama's so-called titular sovereignty.

And, on October 29, 1962, on orders from the executive department of our Government, there was the formal raising of the Panamanian flag at the Canal Zone Administration Building alongside the U.S. flag and similar displays at other points in the zone, which was taken as increased recognition of Panama's claim of "titular sovereignty" over the zone and the Panama Canal.

This last action was taken by our Government despite the fact that on October 12, only 17 days previously, the ceremonies for the dedication of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa, attended by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, and other notables, was marred by Panamanian demonstrators, who used Communist tactics and claimed Panamanian sovereignty over the bridge.

And with all of the foregoing, we find evidence that Panamanian aspirations are aided by our own Department of State. The State Department's program has been one of aiding the piecemeal liquidation of our undeniable treaty rights in the Canal Zone.

President Chiari's Secretary of Finance, Gilberto Arias, only this March was quoted as say: "In the future, with God's help, we will achieve our objective; that the Panama Canal be the property of Panamanians, under full and absolute jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, maintained by Panamanians, operated by Panamanians, sanitated by Panamanians, and protected by Panamanians."

How can responsible officials of our Government knowingly collaborate with Panamanian radicals to surrender more of our authority to a country which, since 1955, when sanitation in the cities of Colón and Panamá was returned to it, has not even succeeded in collecting its garbage? It is incomprehensible.

Here I must emphasize that the Republic of Panama grew out of the movement for the Panama Canal, and not the reverse. The only advantage that Panama can claim as regards the canal is its geographical location, which it never ceases to exploit in advancing its demands for increased benefits and sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

To make sure there is no uncertainty as to what purpose the Panamanian Government is using all its energies to acquire, I shall quote its openly declared objectives, as stated in a report on September 20, 1960, to President Chiari by his Committee on International Politics. These demands include:

Raising the Panamanian flag in the zone; equal salary treatment and job opportunities for Panamanians with North Americans; raising the annuity to 20 percent of the gross income, with a guaranteed minimum of $5 million; mixed courts in the Canal Zone; complete supplying by Panama of the Zone market, including ships, and stopping of production activities in the zone; recognition of Canal Zone exequaturs granted by Panama to foreign consuls; use of Panamanian postage in the zone; liquidation of the Panama Railroad.

They also include establishment of Spanish as the official language of the zone; Panamanion jurisdiction in the zone over passengers and cargo coming into Panama and over ships flying the Panamanian flag; granting to Panama of dock and port facilities, and at U.S. expense; organization of Panama's civil defense at U.S. expense; corridors, under Panamanian jurisdiction, across the zone; opportunities for Panamanian products in U.S. markets. And, finally, acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between Panama and the United States.

Such demands are matters that would inevitably affect all interoceanic commerce that uses the Panama Canal and has to pay tolls. They present grave questions to which the merchant marine of all nations simply cannot afford to be indifferent. Moreover, it is significant that the flag of Panama's new Independent Revolutionary Party carries 10 stars, the 10th star representing the Canal Zone.

As to the flag question previously mentioned, it will be recalled that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in early 1960 in anticipation of difficulties with respect to the flag question, conducted hearings on United States-Panama relations when high executive officials and myself testified.

The unanimous recommendation of the full committee was for a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and Panama with reference to matters of territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty. After an animated debate on February 2, 1960, the House adopted this resolution by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, which should have prevailed over the the predilections of executive officials.

Although this bill died in the Senate, the magnitude of the House vote is significant, clearly reflecting the concern of our people for the security of the Canal Zone territory.

It also demonstrates to the international infiltrators in the Department of State and their collaborators that these influences can never succeed in perpetrating their schemes with respect to the Panama Canal through normal procedures. They realize they must bypass the Congress by means of a new canal treaty.

This, they no doubt feel, can be pushed through, as was the 1955 treaty, without adequate debate to continue the process of erosions that started with the 1936–39 treaty. And that is why Congress must keep alert.

We must guard U.S. vital interests. We must have control of the maritime approaches to the Panama Canal, both at the Atlantic and Pacific ends. We must maintain untrammeled sovereignty over the zone and meet our treaty obligations to maintain free and open transit for vessels of commerce for all nations on terms of equality with tolls that are just and equitable.

We must insist on civil protection of the Canal Zone from disorders and pestilence, originating in the terminal cities of Colon and Panama, as well as safeguard the summit-level water supply as required for lockages and maintaining channel depths. We must also assure military and naval defense of the Panama Canal from aggression.

By the fall of 1962, the process of erosion of our rights, power, and authority, symbolized by formal display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone wherever the U.S. flag is flown by civilian authorities as increased evidence of Panamanian sovereignty, has gone so far that our citizens in the zone decided to act,

and in a desperate effort to protect our country's interests, organized at their own expense court action to test the legality of the formal display of the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone territory of the United States.

A suit was filed against Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the zone and the Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. Vance, in an effort to end this symbol of surrender by the United States to the mob-ruled Panamanian Government. In retaliation to the suit, a Panamanian citizen, on January 9, 1963, filed a suit in the Supreme Court of Panama that aims to establish that the ratification of the 1903 treaty by executive decree of the Panamanian revolutionary junta was illegal and hence null and void.

If sustained by the Panamanian Supreme Court, it would logically follow that the 1903 revolution by which Panama gained its independence from Colombia was likewise null and void and that Panama is still a department of the Republic of Colombia, and that Colombia, not Panama, is the sovereign of the isthmus.

While in Panama last December, I visited the Canal Zone and found general alarm on the part of our citizens at the conduct of the Governor of the Canal Zone.

At a press conference held at the Tivoli Hotel, I learned about an address given by the Governor before the American Society of Civil Engineers, which includes Panamanian engineers among its membership.

Not only was his address the most disconcerting ever publicly uttered by a Governor, but he seems to have reveled in its flavor.

He reflected the philosophy of international socialist elements in and on the fringes of public affairs and advocated what amounts to a permanent state of social revolution, as well as belittling the constitutional foundations of our country and urged unconditional exercise by Federal agencies of power without regard to constitutional limitations.

He also condemned the past in our history without discriminating between what is great and that which is ephemeral, and failed to present our Constitution in its true light as the great contractural document under which the Thirteen Original States created three separate and independent agencies of government with limited powers.

His conclusion was an illiberal assault upon those who differ with his views as having "small minds" bent on preserving the "status quo" and thus, in effect, as being domestic enemies "as dangerous" to the United States as foreign enemies.

This, my friends, was a deliberate administrative attack against the present diplomatic and juridical foundation of the Panama Canal enterprise and, as an attempted public intimidation of those standing up for the sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over it. Thus, this shocking address served to invite further aggressions against the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone territory.

I say that Governor Fleming must be replaced. And that would be a beginning.

I would state that, since the birth of freedom, parliamentary bodies have preserved the just rights of a nation against the misguided exercise of executive power. In this present juncture, it seems that the legislative branch of our Government must similarly act to uphold and maintain the unalienable rights of our Nation in regards to the great Isthmian waterway.

Congress must act, and act now. You can help by sending thoughtful letters to your Senators and Representatives telling them of the dangers that confront us in the Caribbean.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, thank you very much my good friend, Congressman DAN FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

My friends, for Congress to act you must act first. Send this startling speech to your newspaper editor, to your minister and, of course, to your Senators and Congressman. If the United States is forced out of the Panama Canal Zone, the Red fist will close around the throat of the world's commerce and trade. Wake up and put out this Red fire.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, to my way of thinking one of the most significant accomplishments of this body in 1963 was the passage of legislation aimed at the problem of juvenile delinquency. There is far more that we here can do in this field, and I hope that we will. But, the basic solution must come from the home and in each local community.

I am happy to report that one community in Indiana is doing something about the problem, and is doing something effective. The challenging experiment in Terre Haute, led by Judge Harold R. Johnson, is one that might well be emulated in other areas. The plan was well described in an article in the January 20 issue of Newsweek magazine, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURTS: A JURY OF PEERS

Quietly the jurors filed last week into the small, gray-walled Terre Haute courtroom and heard a simple case: a defendant admitted shoplifting a 98-cent key chain in a department store. With the evidence and instructions from the court in hand, the panel repaired to an adjoining room to decide what punishment to recommend. Up to a point, it was strictly routine. But the trial was a milestone in Terre Haute's fight against juvenile delinquency. Each juror was only 17 years old, the same age as the defendant.

The idea of letting teenagers be judged by their peers was the nub of an all-out campaign by Vigo County Judge Harold Ralph Johnston to hold down teenage miscreancy in his Indiana bailiwick. When Johnston, an earnest, 37-year-old lawyer, took office a year ago, juvenile crime was increasing alarmingly—and nobody in the city of some 75,000 seemed to be doing anything about it.

NEW LOOK

Johnston set out to make changes. While engineering an $88,000 county appropriation for a new detention and rehabilitation center, he modernized the community's probation system, modified the policy of holding kids behind bars ("we cut detentions by 90 percent"), and began persuading civic leaders to finance a place for restless teen groups to gather after dark. But his boldest move was to bring teenagers into a general juvenile court as jurors for the first time.[1]

With encouragement from Terre Haute's school officials, 210 ordinary pupils volunteered for jury duty. "We do not want * * * the football stars and class leaders," Johnston says. "We want Joe Blow, the C student."

As the first jury of pupils—three boys and four girls—tried its first case last week, the youngsters were intently serious. "Sure wish I had a tranquilizer," Bob McGilvrey quipped nervously after being chosen as foreman. McGilvrey, a senior at Honey Creek High, led the jury to its verdict: the 17-year-old who filched the key chain should be put on probation until his 18th birthday, deprived of his learner's driving permit, and sent to night vocational school.

The decision—which under the law could be no more than a recommendation—was accepted and enforced by Juvenile Referee Herbert R. Gerdink. The verdict on the experiment itself was highly favorable. For the juvenile jury, McGilvrey said: "Adults are judged by their peers. Why should not teenagers be? We can understand the problems of teenagers. I think we will be fairly harsh, because we do not want adults to form the wrong idea of us." In his chambers, Judge Johnston gave his view: "In 4 years almost 1,000 students will have been trained and many of them will have sat as jurors * * * The idea is preventive * * * The mere emotional impact of sitting in court and seeing another of their age in trouble may impress them."

[1] Other cities—Jacksonville, Fla., and Frankfort, Ky., for instance—have successfully experimented with teenage juries in municipal and traffic courts.

Control of People's Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix a copy of the letter to the editor which was written by a good friend, Clyde E. Lewis, attorney of Delaware, Ohio. I feel that it correctly conveys a message which should be repeated time and time again. Many advocates of civil rights are among the first to seek what amounts to a censorship of the lawful and right conduct of Americans. I commend this thoughtful letter which appeared in the Delaware Gazette of January 18, 1964, to the Members of this body:

WHAT OUR READERS SAY—SAYS THOSE OPPOSING MINSTREL SEEK CONTROL OF PEOPLE'S ACTIONS

EDITOR, GAZETTE:

By reason of the actions of a vocal minority of Negroes and whites, and the application of pressure by the Delaware Ministerial Association, a minstrel show has been canceled. This cancellation was effected by the threat of the use of "all means within our power" by this minority to prevent the performance of the minstrel.

This is the first instance in Delaware County where the threat of picketing, physical intervention, or other disturbance of a peaceful assembly has been threatened. In essence, this was the threat to use physical action to prevent a lawful, peaceful assembly. The claim was made that a minstrel show would be offensive to certain persons in our community, and that these sensitivities were more important to the community than this peaceful assembly for charitable purposes.

There stands in Delaware more than a score of churches whose very presence is offensive

to the professed atheists in our community. To deny to the minister the right of peaceful assembly within his church free from disturbance by action of a vocal minority of atheists, would be the same right denied this week in the presentation of the minstrel show.

Throughout the United States the presence in classrooms of colleges in this Nation of professors whose remarks at least can be described as very liberal, is offensive to the many people of this community and others who believe in constitutional government and the right of free enterprise.

To prevent by disturbance, or other force, the peaceful conduct of a university by the presence of a vocal minority in the classroom would prevent the exercise of the right of academic freedom, and the right of peaceful assembly.

The presence of two Communist speakers in this community has been offensive to the great majority of the people of this community. Should the majority, by its conduct, physically interfere with the determination of the university officials to present these speakers would be the denial of a right of peaceful assembly.

It ill behooves those who believe their rights are being denied to deny the rights of others, unless their desire is retribution and conflict.

I do believe that the minority voice that canceled this minstrel show believes, or was motivated, by the feeling that the Negro was being ridiculed. Anyone who has ever attended a minstrel show can testify that it is not ridicule, but the representation of folklore created by the Negro himself. If imitation be the sincerest form of flattery, this would be flattery.

To carry this matter to its logical conclusion would be to say that such entertainers as Myron Cohen and Jackie Mason who are acknowledged members of the Jewish faith, could not engage in the good natured humor, in Yiddish dialect, that today they give to this Nation over radio and television.

To carry this matter further, it certainly could be considered offensive to the Irish or Scotch to tell a joke in brogue or dialect.

I believe the desire of the minority was to control the actions of people rather than effect a proper result. One of the greatest and most loved entertainers of past and present generations, Al Jolson, a man who himself was a member of a persecuted minority, throughout his theatrical career appeared in blackface, and his greatest appeal was the compassion he felt for the Negro, which was shared by the American people.

The odds are pretty good that Al Jolson is still singing Mammy, in blackface, for all those people who managed to slip through the pearly gates, and the Ministerial Association may have to bear this burden in the end.

The problem presented is not so much the loss of revenue for charitable purposes, and the inability of 1,500 or more, people to enjoy a home presentation and the fun of participation in a humorous show. The loss is that we have advanced one step closer to anarchy, to that point where without reflection on this matter we may one day be afraid to assemble because of a good, or bad, minority that wishes to exercise its will over the rights of others.

The minority has gained in this case a victory, supported neither by judgment nor by law, for which victory there has been a corresponding defeat. A defeat of freedom of action. A defeat of charitable purpose, and a grave loss of appreciation and understanding between the peoples of this community.

If you have convictions of purpose, guided by reason, charity and the law, which convictions you subvert because of fear, or favor, or lack of will, you will reach some day the point where your convictions are of no avail and you become a person who has no convctions at all.

Let us all reflect on the victory and defeat we have witnessed. Who won? Who lost? Did we all lose?

CLYDE E. LEWIS.

A Little Boy Named John-John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on Christmas Day last the Mount Sterling (Ill.) Democrat-Message published a moving comment on the character and work of the late President John F. Kennedy. This essay, written by Editor Sid Landfield, points out with deep understanding why the Nation's loss is so great.

I think it should be widely read now and in the future, for it is an impressive demonstration of the deep and lasting affection held for John F. Kennedy throughout the land.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LITTLE BOY NAMED JOHN-JOHN

"Tell me a story, Daddy," might be the most appropriate theme for Christmas, for after all, here is a holiday intended mainly for children. And what a nice Christmas present to be told a wonderful story by your father.

There are tens of thousands of little boys in our Nation who will not be able to say "Tell me a story, Daddy,"—these youngsters are without fathers and among them is a little fellow of 3 whose dad loved to call him John-John. This little boy, blessed in many ways, lost his great and his wonderful father on November 22, 1963.

If we were in the company of young John-John we would volunteer to tell this boy a story: a magnificent story and most of all a true story. We'd begin this way:

John-John, once upon a time there was a little boy who wanted to grow up to become President of the United States. Now there's nothing too unusual about that ambition, because thousands of young Americans cherish that hope. But our little boy realized his ambition and though he was to serve his country but a very short time, the impression he would leave would be indelible through the generations and all around the world. Now what do you suppose this little boy who grew up to become President possessed that made him so unusual and so vital?

Well, he had imagination. And he had humor. And he had understanding.

Each of these qualities is a wonderful possession, but to have all three, and the ability to use them together, would make a man as wise and as great as Abraham Lincoln. Our hero had the ability to use these three qualities as a unit.

As with Mr. Lincoln, people scoffed at this man. Some even hated him. When in tragedy he died, a few even applauded and cheered.

In life, they sneered at him, derided his family, castigated his most solemn principles. It was not disagreement, it was awful hate.

But like we said, this man had humor.

In life, they predicted he would wreck things, tear down institutions, weaken our structure.

But like we said, this man had imagination.

In life, they deplored his insistence on equality for all men. They used vile language and they used violence many ways.

But like we said, this man had understanding.

John-John, if this man could have lived but another 5 years, in order to serve out his full term as President and a second full term, then all the people of this Nation—and all the people of this great big world would have gained in stature and in compassion, for he was a once-in-a-hundred-years kind of a leader.

As you grow older, John-John, the idea one day might come to your mind that you would like to grow up to become President of the United States. This is a noble aspiration for any youngster to have. If this idea should come to your mind, who would your hero be? Who would you like to fashion yourself after?

Well, young man, the reason we brought the subject up, and the reason we tell you these things, is because we should like to suggest that you fashion yourself after this great President we are telling you about—that you allow that man to become your ever-present hero and inspiration.

At this time, people will little note that the President we refer to takes his place alongside Mr. Lincoln as the 1-2 of all Presidents. At this time, not enough people fully realize that here was a man who desired equality—and justice—for all men more than he wanted life even. You see, this man had money—great wealth; he had charm and exciting personal appeal; he had youth and he had health. This man could have lived the easy life. He could have been famous, and liked and loved by millions in many fields.

But this man had understanding. People were his job. Nothing else.

Dear little boy, this is an absolutely true story we tell you this Christmas. Will you remember all the time? Will you tell it and retell it to others as you grow up? Will you live it?

Now ask us some questions, John-John. Ask us anything.

Who was the man, you ask? What was his name?

Well his name was John, like yours. And Kennedy like yours. But then—that's a perfectly common name, isn't it? There are all kinds of people named John Kennedy.

Why did this man die, you ask?

Well, John-John: your religion teaches you beautifully why 2,000 years ago another man died. As you grow older and are better able to understand such things, you will be able the better to relate these two happenings.

Who killed him, you ask?

Well, the record says a man killed him—with a rifle. But really, it was like the story of the death 2,000 years ago: the people killed him.

Do you know the man real well, you ask?

No. You never got to know the man real well because you were so young. But—the man knew you real well. He knew all about you, John-John—all about you.

Did he love you, you ask.

Yes, he did, young man. Like a father. Like a President. As much as he loved life. No more questions now, John-John * * * it's Christmas time: time for happy thoughts and gayety because you're only 3 years old.

So * * * goodnight, John-John—and happy dreams.

Yes, we'll tell you some more stories about that great man and wonderful President at another time. Lots of people will tell you stories about him as the years go by. Your mother has much in store for you—she'll tell you the most happy things about this man,

as you grow older * * * and as you get imagination, and humor, and understanding.

Merry Christmas to John-John in the year of his Lord 1963.

Arizona's Water Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech entitled "Arizona's Water Problems," by Mr. Lawrence Mehren, chairman of the Central Arizona Project Association. I consider Mr. Mehren's speech to be a very fine outline of a very serious problem affecting the entire Pacific Southwest area of the United States. It was delivered at a meeting of the water and power and agricultural committees of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce on January 10, 1964.

The speech follows:

ARIZONA'S WATER PROBLEMS

(By Lawrence Mehren)

It is my pleasure to be here on a mission which I hope will be productive of real understanding by you businessmen of a problem which, unfortunately, has grown far beyond proper proportion between two neighboring States; we have an economic mutuality of interest which demands our most considered and coolest judgment. I intend to ask flatly for your support of the central Arizona project.

I would certainly not be so presumptuous were it not for the fact that there are those in this room who know that for the 7 years I served on the board of directors of Sunkist Growers I did my best in both Los Angeles and Washington to promote the interests of California agriculture as well as those of my own State. In the same spirit, I urge you today, with fairness and sound business judgment, to consider the problem I am about to unfold.

As a matter of fact, my personal ties with California are well-nigh inseparable. My current crop of citrus is moving to market through Sunkist; my cotton crop, just harvested, is being sold through Calcot; and my safflower, just planted, is under contract to Pacific Vegetable Oil Co. All my brothers and sister live here, as did my parents until their deaths early last year.

In correspondence with Fran Wilcox and Cal Bream regarding this talk I agreed to speak to you provided you understand that I have certain limitations. I am a banker and a farmer; I have no legal, engineering, political, hydrological, or technical training. Consequently, I cannot debate the fine points of those fields. Next, I have no business entering the field of California water problems as between north and south. Third, it is senseless to reargue the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on the division of mainstream water of the Colorado; this has become a fact from which there is no appeal to any higher authority.

Last, I can't settle matters of purely legislative or administrative nature. For instance, the Supreme Court directed the Secretary of the Interior to figure out how to divide the flow of the Colorado in case a period of shortage should develop in the mainstream in some year in the future. I don't have the faintest idea what the Secretary intends to do should such a situation develop.

Up to this time, perhaps most of the recent comments on the Colorado River matter and the Pacific Southwest water plan have been made by officials or official bodies in the two States. I feel strongly that the time has come when businessmen like ourselves should enter the picture, too, to work together on an intensely practical resolution of any possible differences. Certainly, no one benefits from long-rage potshots in newspapers by the two areas. I am a firm believer in eye-to-eye contact as the only means of thorough understanding.

After all, you and I as businessmen have a tremendous economic stake and a common interest in water. I cite only a few quick figures as evidence of our interlocking economy. We have been an area of fantastic population growth since World War II, far outstripping even your own State in percentage figures. The 1940 census showed 500,000 people in Arizona. Today there are 1,600,000; by 1970, there will be 2,200,000; by 1980, the forecast is for 3,400,000. Phoenix, which I knew first as a sleepy small town in 1931, is now a metropolis of almost 600,000 people, and by the time of the next census in 1970 it could well be one of the first dozen cities of the Nation in size.

This is your closest great export market. Our cars are assembled in your plants; our clothing comes from your factories; our appliances and building materials come largely from you; our foodstuffs are packaged here; and if it is of any interest to anyone, we bought 1,600,000 gallons of wine from you in 1962. The mutuality of interest extends in every direction; the bank for which I work, Valley National, has had the closest possible relationships for many, many years with your great financial institutions—the Bank of America, Security First Union, Wells Fargo, U.S. National, and many others.

And I would hate to see the desolation of your beaches at Santa Monica, Laguna, and and San Diego if the customary hordes of sweltering Arizonans didn't show up every summer for weeks and months of cooling off.

Your most valuable export to us, however, has been people. As of the 1960 census, we had in Arizona 47,000 native-born Californians; today, we have almost 90,000—almost double in less than 4 years—all lending their hand to the development of a greater Arizona.

With these things in mind, let's tie into the problem we face in Arizona today. I have had small maps of our State distributed to your tables, indicating cities, areas of cultivation, features of our irrigation projects, etc. Perhaps they will be of help to you as I mention names, since you may be as unfamiliar with sections of our State as I am with yours.

The magnitude of Arizona's water problem becomes more apparent and appalling when we move from the lingo of the farmer and technician, and start talking "gallons" of water in laymen's language instead of the term "acre-feet." We face two irrefutable facts:

1. We as Arizonans have the stupendous job of finding in as short a time as possible 717 billion gallons of water per year more than we have now—just to maintain our present status quo, without bringing one more acre of desert land into agricultural cultivation or urbanization.

2. Even when the proposed central Arizona project comes into being, the great central basin of which Phoenix and Tucson are the centers will still be short 326 billion gallons of water per year just to keep us going on our present basis.

Where to find all this water? Find it we must; find it we will—else we perish ultimately as the area we know and love.

During this past fall a succession of prominent Arizonans paraded before a Senate subcommittee painting a black picture of our future unless the central Arizona project comes into being. They weren't kidding or exaggerating for effect; they had the intestinal fortitude to bare the full facts of our water problem in the blinding glare of a congressional hearing without soft pedal or equivocation, despite the fact that what they said might scare the daylights out of potential residents or investors.

The central Arizona project area embraces basically Maricopa, Pinal, Pima, and Graham Counties—the section from the Phoenix vicinity running east and southeast, including Tucson, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Safford, and other cities. In this huge irrigated basin we currently use 4,500,000 acre-feet of water per year for all purposes—agricultural, municipal, industrial.

Our surface streams, the Salt, Verde, Gila, Agua Fria, San Pedro, and Santa Cruz Rivers, yield an annual average of only about 1 million acre-feet. The fact that surface water provides less than one-fourth of the total use in the area comes as quite a surprise to many Arizona laymen, just as it may to you.

The balance of our use—3,500,000 acre-feet—is pumped from underground. This is the reason, I guess, why it is so difficult to get the water problem across to the public, whether it be to Arizonans (most of whom are new to the State in the last 10 years) or to visitors, let us say from California. As long as people see some water in the lakes behind our dams as they go boating, fishing or water skiing, as long as the faucet at home or in the hotel runs a steady stream, they find it hard to believe that we have great problems. I am sure that you find this true in California, too.

Our real cancer is underground, hidden from view. The experts of the Geological Survey and other agencies tell us that the safe yield of groundwater in this great basin is no more than about 1,250,000 acre-feet per year. Simple arithmetic, then, tells us that we have been overpumping our safe supply by 2,250,000 acre-feet per year—we're drawing heavily on residual water that has accumulated below us over centuries.

How long can this go on? No one can say, exactly. But I can tell you for sure that there is a terminal point—the laws of nature and economics will take care of that. One man I know draws the best analogy I've heard. He likens us to the well-dressed man who came into a bank one day to borrow some money. The man owned a lovely home, had several expensive cars, belonged to a country club, and was considered to be a well-to-do stable figure in the community. The banker said, "Oh I'm sure we can handle the loan, but for the formalities we'd like a financial statement." The next day the man brought in his information and the banker gasped; the affluent-appearing gentleman had no source of income except a legacy from his parents and he had just about run through all of that. He was just plain broke, despite his stature, appearance, and mien. My friend's moral is that we can, for sure, look good up to the very day we go water broke in our area.

What has this overdraft of 2,250,000 acre-feet of ground water per year done to the water table below us? I can speak from personal experience. On my own ranch the sole water supply is from underground pumping; we are not in any surface water project. When we broke the desert in 1931, the water level stood at 98 feet below the surface. Today it stands at 400 feet. Most of the drop has been in the last 15 years, averaging 12 to 15 feet per year. But this summer we plunged 32 feet below the level of the previous year. And remember, in our desert, the meager rainfall is not a factor in supplying the 4½ acre-feet of water I need to grow my crops; I have to pull every gallon of it from underground.

The farmers in our agricultural empire face a brutal situation. It isn't just the extra cost of electrical energy to suck water from greater depths in large quantity; it's the murderous cost of deepening wells, re-equipping with heavier motors, transformers, etc. And when you get to the point that the old well and rig just won't do the deep pumping job any more, a new modern well and pump, fully equipped is about a $44,000 price tab. Moreover, at greater depths the salinity problem begins to rear its ugly head in a number of cases.

Listen to what the Bureau of Reclamation says on this situation in its report of June 1963, on the central Arizona project:

"It is estimated that there are approximately 1,202,000 acres of land developed for irrigation in the central Arizona project area. * * * Some 322,000 acres of (these) developed lands are currently out of production and include lands temporarily idle because of deficient surface water supplies, and also lands which have been abandoned as pumping costs have increased beyond the point of diminishing returns as a result of falling ground-water tables."

The attrition doesn't make headlines, but it's there—bit, by bit, by bit.

Now that I've probably convinced you that we are going to hell in a handbasket, let's turn the coin, go positive, and tell you how Arizona hopes to build for the future in a constructive fashion. What are we going to do about our predicament? Colorado River water is part of the answer. We propose to divert 1,200,000 acre-feet of the total 2,800,000 final allocation of the U.S. Supreme Court and bring it into central Arizona.

Remember, I said earlier that we have a deficiency of 2,250,000 acre-feet from overpumping. With the Colorado providing 1,200,000 acre-feet we would still be short the 1 million acre-feet I threw at you in gallonage figures at the outset—just to keep our present economy. So don't get the idea that the Colorado River source solves everything for us; it doesn't; it's only a partial solution. A bit later I want to say a few words about that other 1 million acre-feet. But now let's turn to the Colorado, see what has happened, where we stand, and where we go from here.

A few comments on the river itself may be helpful as background for those few of you who don't know this situation thoroughly. This magnificent river and its tributaries drain one-twelfth of the land area of the United States. Rising in Wyoming and Colorado, the river marches in varied mood and erratic strides across broad alluvial plains and through some of the most desolate yet fascinating canyon country in the world for a total run of 1,400 miles.

Despite its mysteries, moods, and meanderings, the Colorado is indispensable to life in our part of the world. Without it and its tributaries there would be no present adequate water supply for Los Angeles and neighboring communities, no irrigated wonderland in the Phoenix area, no hydroelectric power to turn a million wheels of industry from Torrance to Tucson.

Full well realizing the enormous potential of the river in irrigation and power development, men long ago began contending for its use. With an average annual water yield of 15, 16, or 17 million acre-feet—let the hydrologists argue the exact figure—and a tremendous drop from 9,300 feet to sea level for generating electric energy, the Colorado is an economic gold mine.

Modern history of the controversy over Colorado River rights dates back to 1922 when the basic and most famous river document was drafted. Known as the Santa Fe compact, the meeting at which it was born was called to determine the share of the river that should belong to the seven States comprising the Colorado River Basin. The compact established two divisions of the basin and made a rough division of the waters to each—leaving final determination of State amounts to agreements within the upper basin and the lower basin, the dividing point being Lees Ferry, just east of Grand Canyon.

The Santa Fe compact recognized that Mexico should receive a guaranteed amount of water (since ratified at 1.5 million acre-feet per year by international treaty). It then provided that, basically, the upper basin should release to the lower basin an average of 7.5 million acre-feet of water per year for use in the three States of California, Arizona, and Nevada.

In the lower basin we quickly ran into disagreement and countless complications, culminating in the Supreme Court case between Arizona and California.

Subsequent to the Santa Fe compact, Congress in 1928 passed the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized the construction of Hoover Dam. This act also provided for a division of the lower basin waters; it required California's legislature to pass its own law limiting you "irrevocably and unconditionally" to the use of 4.4 million acre-feet, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters which might be unapportioned. Your legislature passed this law in Sacramento in 1929, as you know. The Boulder Canyon Project Act then went on to allocate 2.8 million acre-feet to Arizona and 300,000 acre-feet to Nevada.

Arizona had plans for its 2.8 million acre-feet, and part of it was destined for the central Arizona project. Developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, the project is a broad program to provide supplemental water for much of the central area of our State.

Now I would like to stress, emphasize, spotlight, underline, highlight, stipulate—and do anything else I have to—to drive home a point which it seems absolutely impossible to get across in California. It is the simple fact that the central Arizona project will not bring 1 new acre of land into cultivation; the Bureau of Reclamation report insists time and again that the project provides supplemental water only, for the rescue and preservation of an existing economy. That was always the purpose of our project—the day it was first drafted, and today. Yet month after month we pick up references in your press and in statements on this side of the river that our share of the Colorado is going to be used to open vast new tracts of desert while Californians die of thirst. Now, really, gentlemen.

The basic structure of the central Arizona project is Bridge Canyon Dam, 117 miles upstream from Hoover Dam. This is a power dam. Then at Parker Dam, 1.2 million acre-feet of water will be diverted by means of a pump lift about the same height as your metropolitan aqueduct takeoff, using about one-third of Bridge Canyon's power.

From that point, water will flow by gravity through canals to a diversion dam which will make water available to the Maricopa County area—Phoenix and the surrounding territory. The canal, diversion, and exchange system continues southeastward into Pinal County, bringing water to the area near Casa Grande, Coolidge, Florence, and other communities.

Graham County—in the upper Gila Valley around Safford—is involved through Hooker Dam on the Gila, actually in New Mexico. Tucson will receive municipal supplies from Charleston Dam on the San Pedro of about 12,000 acre-feet, plus 100,000 acre-feet to be delivered to that city by pipeline from a reservoir in Pinal County. Tucson depends on underground water as its only source of municipal supply today.

Other areas of the State can also benefit. With authorization of the central Arizona project, certain water exchanges may be possible to relieve the shortage problem in some of the cities in the northern parts of the State—for municipal purposes only.

This sweeping program will cost $1,010 million. Repayment will be in 50 years; our present Salt River project in the Phoenix area was the first reclamation undertaking under the Reclamation Act of 1902; we are proud of the fact that it some years ago repaid all its original costs to Uncle Sam, and I am sure that the Nation can be assured that in this instance, too, Arizonians will respect their obligation. As I mentioned, about one-third of Bridge Canyon's power will be needed for water lift; the remaining two-thirds will be sold to help retire the cost of the project. Charges for water of about $10 per acre-foot for agricultural uses and about $40 per acre-foot for municipal purposes will provide the remainder of the revenue to amortize the debt.

The Bureau of Reclamation indicates that the benefit-cost ratio of our project is 3.03 to 1; the experts tell me that this is an extremely favorable figure for a reclamation project.

You may be wondering about the rest of the 2.8 million acre-feet of Arizona's share of the Colorado, since we have been talking only about the 1.2 million involved in the central Arizona project. The balance of the total is either in use at this moment in the Yuma and Wellton-Mohawk projects, on Indian and private lands along the river, or available for certain exchange possibilities for purely municipal purposes in other sections of the State.

So much for our plans for our share of the Colorado; bringing them to reality has been a different story. The central Arizona project has been before Congress for authorization several times and was passed by the Senate twice in 1950 and 1951. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (by one vote, incidentally) refused to clear the bill because your people insisted that, despite the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the rights to the flow of the river had not been settled. We were told to go to court, get the answers, and come back; we did, the court did, and now we're back. The day after the Supreme Court's opinion last June, our Senators, CARL HAYDEN and BARRY GOLDWATER, and our Representatives reintroduced the same bill that was under consideration by the Congress in 1951.

At this point I would like to quote Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation of the United States, in a talk he made a month ago in Las Vegas before the Colorado River Water Users Association. I need not remind you that Mr. Dominy's reputation, integrity, and impartiality as the head of the national reclamation agency are unquestioned. I need not remind you, either, that he has been a great and good friend of California reclamation through the years. Many of your projects are the result of his intensive work on your behalf. Mr. Dominy said in Las Vegas, in part:

"Arizona has stood aside for a matter of more than 12 years, while its rights to Colorado River water were fought through the Supreme Court. During that 12-year period, the estimated cost of its proposed central Arizona project has increased from $738,400,000 to $1,010 million. The increase would have been substantially more except for large savings realized from redesigning Bridge Canyon Dam." He then comments that Arizona is already paying a big penalty for the delay in its project.

Mr. Dominy later makes the statement:

"But Arizona is now ready and rightfully demanding to go ahead. It has the backing of the Supreme Court decision, and furthermore, it has an eminently qualified project which can be built entirely within the State as a Federal project under reclamation law."

Let me now comment briefly on the proposed Pacific Southwest water plan. You well know how broad and ambitious this program is. From the news stories I understand it has been the subject of considerable

controversy in California. As this talk is being written the plan is in the process of being redrafted, and I have no idea of how broad its scope will finally be when it reaches Congress, which the press stories say will be later this month.

Frankly, I have no basic quarrel with the broad philosophy of regional water planning. A master plan for the water resources of not only the southwest, but of the entire Nation, is highly desirable and inevitable to any man of vision and courage. Water supply is a great national problem; I have in my hand an envelope from a business firm in New York; the letter it carried had nothing to do with water, but was a routine banking matter. The significant thing about the envelope is that the New York City Post Office cancellation carries the admonition "save water." You and I are not alone in our troubles.

I do not know what the ultimate Pacific Southwest water plan should be. My sharp difference with the authors of the plan at this moment is one of timing. They purpose that a bill embodying the plan be pushed in Congress now, letting the central Arizona project come as one stage of the total development after the legislation is enacted. But no comprehensive plan of this type can possibly be settled on in a short period of time. I don't think there is a man in this room who will disagree with me that it will take years (and rightfully so) to do the careful job of planning and negotiation before the full proper formula is finalized. For instance, I don't think that any of you are going to tell me that you are going to settle all your problems with northern California in the next few months.

My point is that, since the central Arizona project is an undisputed and integral part of the Pacific Southwest water plan, and since it has behind it the full weight of Supreme Court adjudication and Bureau of Reclamation judgment, it should be enacted immediately to help relieve the desperate situation I described earlier. Integration of our project can readily be accomplished with the broad program when and if negotiations and deliberations between the States and within States produce a thoroughly acceptable solution.

A word, at this stage, to the prophets of doom who so glibly predict the drying up of southern California as a result of the Supreme Court decision. The central Arizona project will take 10 years to build. In other words, you will still be using for another decade what you are drawing from the Colorado today. If the ingenuity of the leadership of the Southwest and the Nation cannot have found the proper answers for California in that period of time, then I have misjudged the caliber of you men.

I might comment, and somewhat wryly perhaps, that during the years of congressional consideration and court litigation you have had the use of waters worth many hundreds of millions of dollars which the Supreme Court now says belonged to Arizona. No; we're not going to send you a bill tomorrow. But I might also comment that since 1948, reclamation expenditures in California have totaled approximately $1 billion, while we waited, and that the appropriations were endorsed, promoted, and handled in large part by one CARL HAYDEN, senior Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Before closing I must backtrack for a few minutes because I left dangling in midair a little thing like 1 million acre-feet of water—326 billion gallons that we in Arizona still have to find each year over and above the waters of the central Arizona project in order to keep our water use on even keel and preserve our present economy. Where to find it?

I think we have real possibilities of finding at least part of it. We Arizonians take pride in a record of trying to do some things for ourselves, and we certainly intend to do them and are doing them on this water problem. What are some of these sources of additional water? Here are a few:

Better watershed management to increase yields from rainfall.

Improved and more efficient farm irrigation practices.

Careful use of municipal supplies.

Reduction of evaporation from our reservoirs by film layers.

Reclamation and reuse of sewage effluent.

Complete lining of canal systems.

Clearance of water-consuming brush in stream beds.

Treatment of brackish waters in various sections of the State.

These items are not idle chatter. I can point with pride, for instance, to the little town of Buckeye, west of Phoenix, that had saline problems with its municipal groundwater supply. It floated its own bond issue, built its own desalinization plant, and solved its problem. I could tell you of Tucson's experimental program on the reuse of sewage effluent, of the filming work on Saguaro Lake, of the watershed work in the Tonto National Forest. But they are long stories.

There is much ahead in these fields in the wise and complete use of every drop of water. Our programs are being pushed vigorously on many fronts. And, I might add, we are not alone in this type of thing. A story in one of your California papers recently reports the general manager of the Imperial Irrigation District in El Centro as saying that starting January 1 "a man who has been getting 10 units will now get 9 for the same order. He may find he can get along on less by wasting less," he said, and added, "It's a conservation aspect."

How much of the missing 1 million acre-feet we can find by our own efforts within the State I do not know. For what we cannot develop, and also for additional waters for future growth of Arizona, we must look to regional planning. But, first things first, and in our book the central Arizona project and our own intrastate efforts are our immediate concern.

I am not unmindful of the problems you gentlemen in California face in water supply matters. They are fantastic in their magnitude and complexity. I am nonetheless confident that the vision and courage which built your empire can find the answers you need.

In concluding these comments on Arizona's water problems, I say to you that I come to Los Angeles in all sincerity to ask that your spirit of fairplay will result not only in an understanding of the facts I have laid before you, but also in support of our central Arizona project by you and your congressional delegation. I would not ask it were the cause not just and right.

Hon. Howard H. Baker

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad privilege to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our departed brother, HOWARD BAKER.

HOWARD was devoted to the very best interests of that beautiful country he was so proud to represent in eastern Tennessee. He appreciated the good that TVA had brought to the remote areas of his State and stood foursquare in defense of that development.

He was sound in his approaches to the problems coming before the Ways and Means Committee where he was a high ranking member when death came. It is so often true that the Grim Reaper arrives when a man is at the apex of his potential.

HOWARD BAKER was a pillar in his community and his State long before he came to Congress. As one reviews his life, the conclusion is inescapable that he was indeed a model of the men our Founding Fathers had in mind when this body was established: Men, deeply concerned for the good of their districts, yet of that breadth of vision that sees clearly what is in the national interest and who work diligently for every sound and proper adjustment to that end.

My wife and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Baker, their son, their two daughters and their families.

The Right To Bear Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of editorial opinion broadcast over station WABC-TV in New York on December 15, 16, and 17, 1963, urging sensible restrictions on the ownership of firearms. My bill H.R. 9504 would amend the Federal Firearms Act to restrict the interstate shipment and delivery of firearms by imposing certain licensing and identification procedures on those dealing in arms and those purchasing them. I hope that we will see action on this proposal in the near future.

The editorial follows:

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

For years now, the hunting and rifle associations in New York have lobbied successfully in Albany to prevent the New York State Legislature from tightening restrictions on firearms. In 1960, after Governor Rockefeller's own staff prepared a bill to allow New York City to make its own firearms restrictions, the bill was prevented from coming up for vote in the legislature. The arguments the opponents use are always the same. They say tighter gun laws will infringe on the second amendment to the Constitution. This amendment gives Americans the right to keep and bear arms. WABC-TV certainly does not oppose the right of any legitimate sportsmen to keep or bear arms. But we find it hard to understand how any responsible citizen would object to registering his guns with local police. After our editorial asking the New York State Legislature to tighten the State's firearms restrictions, we received a letter from a gun owner who opposed our position. He told us how he had shot a burglar from his apartment window in New York City, as the burglar escaped

from a nearby apartment onto a roof. He suggested that his gun gave him protection from burglars. WABC-TV feels strongly that this is exactly the kind of irresponsible approach to guns that we'd like to see tighter restrictions impede. There is enough violence in this city, in this country, without private citizens appointing themselves as sharpshooters for law enforcement. The second amendment to the Constitution was passed in 1789, and the right to keep and bear arms is certainly different in New York in 1963 than it was then. If it frightens you that a man can shoot a burglar from an apartment window; if it frightens you that Lee Oswalds can buy a mail-order rifle, or that people don't have to register firearms in New York City, we ask you to let your representative in Albany know right now.

A Tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Vukajlovich, of Jackson, Calif., a historic community in the mother lode area which I represent, has put down on paper his thoughts concerning the assassination of our beloved President. Mr. Vukajlovich, in spite of his youth, is a poet of some distinction. I think he expressed the thoughts of all of us in this tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I have conveyed this work to President Kennedy's courageous widow and at this point I insert the tribute into the RECORD:

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Robert Vukajlovich)

Well, here it is, near Christmas time,
And soon '64's bells will chime;
But first, before we start the new,
Let's look back on what just got thru.
Yes, lest we plunge on aimlessly,
Let's give a look at '63:

Happy today, sad tomorrow.
Filled with joy, yet filled with sorrow,
'63 began a mere
Model of the previous year.
But tho the start was fool and fuss,
Look what the ending brought to us.

Yes, this year's life was held at bay
On November's 22nd day.
For on that day was Heaven sent
A man more than a President;
A man a god in ev'ry way,
Affectionately known as J.F.K.

Oh! When the shots rang out so clear
And ceased what was a day of cheer,
The sound they made, the death they dealt,
Was not just simply heard, but felt.
The world was stunned in utter shock
And lifeless as a morbid rock.

What feeble form of man or beast,
Yes, feeble form, to say the least,
Could ever be so bad a seed
To stoop to such a tragic deed?
Just one inhuman beyond belief
Could ever crawl to bring such grief.

He took a husband from his wife;
From a boy and girl, their father's life;
And from the world, this demon sent
Our prayer for peace, our President.
But one big thing he left, you see,
He left Kennedy's memory.

He left what's ahead in '64,
What Kennedy lived his whole life for.
The mem'ry of his smiling face
Putting faith in fear's old place.

Yes, the assassin can shoot and shoot
And kill the flower, but not the root.
And from the root, I'm sure you know,
Another flower soon will grow.

Yes, his mem'ry lives and speaks its piece,
And no assassin can make it cease.
We've lost the flower, but gained the root
And like his son, I give salute.

He lived and died for peaceful life,
For an end to wars, and fear, and strife.
So like he'd want it, let it be;
Let this go down in history

Not as the end of a tragedy,
Nor as the end of '63,
But rather as the noted start
Of the life he held in his heart:

The first big step to opened doors,
The first big step to no more wars,
The first big step to freedom's floor,
The step that starts in '64.

Yes, so will live the U.S.A.
In salute to the greatest:
J.F.K.

Ukrainian Independence Through the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine in East Europe provides one of the saddest and yet most interesting tales in history. Its hardy people, intelligent and vigorous, have been seeking their freedom for centuries. Despite their great efforts Ukrainians have been the victims of a nearly unique geographical position—the name of their country means borderland—which lays them open to invasion from near neighbors on all four sides. Therefore, they have only once really enjoyed independence; that was between their official declaration of independence on January 22, 1918, and March 18, 1921. But January 22 through the ages has seen many other great events in a continuous struggle which must eventually end in victory for the Ukraine.

Ukrainian history begins to take shape in the early 16th century when the Cossacks, free peasant soldiers, formed the first united segment of Ukrainian society.

January 22, 1648, would have seen the leader, the Hetman, of the Cossacks defeating the Poles in the first liberation of Ukrainian soil. This man was Chmielnicki, and he returned to Kiev, the new capital of the Ukraine, as a liberator. But many Ukrainians were loyal to Poland in return for their privileged positions and landholdings. Thus, January 22, 1662, dawned with the Cossacks still not in control of all their territory. In May, the Ukrainian assembly, the Rada, asked the Russian Czar for aid against Poland. The assemblymen lived to regret it; the Russians defeated the Poles, but immediately imposed the harshest rule yet known in the Ukraine.

In January 1667, the Ukraine was partitioned between Poland and Russia, the first of many such arrangements. Five years later this already complicated situation was further complicated by the invasion of the Turks from the south. For awhile the Ukrainians were torn between these three powers, all competing with Sweden.

By January 22, 1776, while Americans were achieving their own independence, the Ukraine was crushed under an autocratic czar, its hopeful assembly banned, and its Cossacks permanently suppressed. In 1793 it became an integral part of Russia; its name and unity disappeared. A few Ukrainians, who realized their national heritage, remained underground, hoping for a future chance to revolt. These were mostly historians and authors, such as Taras Shevchenko, symbol of Ukrainian freedom. But for a century and a half Ukrainian nationalists had no opportunity to put their plans into effect. The proper moment only came with World War I.

January 1916 and January 1917 came and went with mounting hope and activity among Ukrainians for independence. Finally, in July 1917, a provisional government was formed around Volodymir Vinnichenko and Simon Petlyura. They summoned the first Rada to meet in the Ukraine in almost two centuries. It was this Rada which made January 22, 1918, a truly memorable day in Ukrainian history by declaring independence. The Ukraine should have been able to celebrate January 22 as independence day from then on. The Ukrainian people are distinct from their Polish, Russian, Turkish, and other neighbors in language, culture, physical characteristics, history, and religion. They fought against overwhelming odds for centuries to gain their freedom. They had shown their ability to organize an effective government and an army. They had made good use of their rich soil and forests, being for the most part richer than their Russian neighbors. Yet, they never were able to celebrate freely more than 3 independence days. By January 22, 1921, the Red army had nearly overrun the whole territory of the Ukraine. On March 18, the last struggling remnants of the Ukrainian Army were forced to capitulate. They had been fighting in isolation with almost no industrial base or outside aid for 3 years. They surely deserved the eternal gratitude of their people for a supreme effort.

Under the Soviet Union the Ukraine has never experienced a happy January 22. Any January in 1930, 1931, 1932, or 1933 appeared with the horrible specter of famine, created by Soviet seizures of food during the drive to break Ukrainian resistance to collectivization. Literally millions of Ukrainians are known to have starved to death. Any selected January 22 after that might have witnessed the Communist executions of thousands of Ukrainians by public hangings or firing squads. Executions were regular events for any Ukrainians, Communist, or not, who showed the slightest resistance.

Again after World War II Russians executed Ukrainians. This time those who had welcomed even the infamous Nazis as liberators were the victims. The ironic circumstance of location made the Ukraine the protective buffer behind which the Communists withdrew to collect their strength. The vassal Ukraine, which had never wanted Russian suzerainty in the first place, provided 10 million lives and its immense distances to protect Russia. The Ukraine was rewarded with new suppression and increased misery.

Today is again January 22. It marks the 46th anniversary of the most hopeful moment in Ukrainian history. It is hard to imagine that after such a brief freedom, and 46 years of known misery, the Ukrainians could still think of independence. This thought is constantly in the minds of the thousands of persons of Ukrainian ancestry who live in Mercer, Crawford, and Erie Counties. These industrious people play a significant role in the 24th District where they have contributed heavily to the culture and the economy of the area.

There is every evidence that patriots like Shevchenko, Petlyura, and Vinnichenko are arising every day in the Ukraine, aware of their great history, and determined to free their country. We must let them know that we sympathize with their desires. It is the duty of every American to encourage the patriots of the Ukraine. The people of the United States would be happy to greet a liberated Ukraine as a brother nation, following the same path to honor and progress which we trod ourselves, 188 years ago.

Hon. Howard H. Baker

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and regret that I learned of the passing of my good friend HOWARD BAKER. I considered him to be a real friend, and I will miss him.

HOWARD BAKER was a Member of Congress when I came to the Congress in 1953. He was one of the first Members to shake my hand and with whom I became acquainted. Since that time I have had many occasions to seek his counsel, and to compare ideas with him. His advice was always objective and succinct, but delivered with restraint and consideration.

HOWARD BAKER's service in Congress was noteworthy for many reasons, but his work as a member of the very important Ways and Means Committee was perhaps the most valuable service he gave. He was extremely knowledgeable in all phases of the jurisdiction of that great committee, and his reasoning was sound. The country and the business community are more healthy economically because of the service of HOWARD BAKER.

Tennessee, its history both past and present, and its people were the pride and focus of HOWARD's life. I had occasion at one time to make a speech for HOWARD in his district. I well remember the pride with which he showed me the wonders of east Tennessee, and told me of the virtues of his people. In his passing, his State and its citizens have lost a great champion.

To Mrs. Baker and to the Baker family I extend the deepest sympathy of Mrs. Rhodes and me. They will be comforted, I know, by the memories of a husband and father who was a fine upstanding individual, and by the pride they must feel in the accomplishments of his lifetime. May God rest his soul.

The 46th Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better tribute to the courageous Ukrainian people than to publish in full the following letter which I received from Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is the president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

The letter follows in full:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 17, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES S. JOELSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOELSON: January 22 marks the 46th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Of what importance is this to us as Americans? Why should we commemorate this event with addresses and statements in Congress, proclamations by State officials, and with observances across the Nation?

Well, just consider these few facts. With its 45 million population Ukraine was one of the first victims of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism and to this day has been the largest captive non-Russian nation both in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Had its independence been helped by the West in 1918–20, there certainly would have been no U.S.S.R. and thus no Soviet Russian menace to world freedom. In the incessant cold war we can now help ourselves by supporting the goal of national freedom on the part of this large nation that for decades has given the lie to any Soviet monolith.

Second, Ukraine represents one of the most powerful forces of patriotic nationalism in the U.S.S.R. Its invincible fight for national independence and freedom has forced imperialist Moscow to resort to the propaganda sham of masquerading Ukraine as an independent and free nation within the federal framework of the U.S.S.R. Strangely enough, even in our own interest we have done little to encourage this spirit of nationalism. Your support of this 46th anniversary can lead to such encouragement.

It would be foolhardy, indeed, to ignore our natural allies behind the Iron Curtain because Moscow is experiencing another time of troubles. In fact, this is the time to intensify our paramilitary efforts toward all the captive nations. And with Ukraine the opportunities are great. Your participation in this 46th anniversary will be a fitting answer to Khrushchev that we have no intention of abandoning our allies for freedom.

With grateful thanks and best wishes,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President.

Naval Shipyards Vital to U.S. Defense Function at Least Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the use of statistics in furtherance of a burning cause does not always constitute employment of an exact science. It would seem that, all too often, overzealous sponsors of such causes offer statistics to prove their merits which do not paint a true picture of the fiscal end results.

One gets to the point of suspicion where it seems the better part of caution to adopt the slogan: "Beware of statistics."

Thus it is with the statistics being offered and publicized by those who are out to get rid of the U.S. naval shipyards. While there can be no argument that these facilities should be operated as efficiently and economically as possible, neither can we except the figures being offered by those who would close down the Navy yards which purport to show that it would be more economical for repair, alteration and conversion of naval vessels to be carried on in private yards rather than naval yards.

These statistics are misleading. They do not tell the whole story because they fail to encompass indirect as well as direct costs to the government. Indirect cost factors as well as direct costs must be taken into consideration when any decisions are made regarding the future status of the existing naval installations.

Further, when comparisons are made between private and naval yard costs, particular care must be exercised to avoid confusion brought about by statistics covering new ship construction as distinguished from repairs and conversion of existing vessels. New ship construction, of course, takes place before crews are assigned to the vessels. Consequently, when we are talking about new ship construction, no consideration can properly be given to the interrelationship between a vessel's deployment or location and the costs of personnel, particularly those indirect costs arising from the failure of men to reenlist because of undue personal burdens occasioned by hardship deployment overseas or hardship assignment of a vessel for repairs or conversion to a shipyard away from the residences of a crew.

But under the latter (repair and conversion) conditions, the enormity of expense to the Government brought about by neglecting consideration of enlistee "dropout" costs can be rather simply de-

termined by taking as a base for determination figures included in a 1962 report by Arthur Anderson & Co. This report compares only direct costs for certain repair and conversion work as between private and naval shipyards. But the report's alleged savings from utilizing the former in preference to the latter are not true savings because they take no account of extra crew costs which come about when work is performed in private yards away from home ports.

This determination will readily be recognized from the folowing facts:

The cost of maintaining a naval vessel is the sum of the ship costs and the crew costs.

Savings on ship costs which increase crew costs by a greater sum result in a net loss to the Government.

Today's Navy is a married man's Navy—75 percent of its 72,000 officers and 39 percent of its 581,000 enlisted men are married. Naval wives and children number approximately 750,000 persons.

Today's peacetime Navy keeps much of its fleet deployed overseas for protracted periods, averaging 7 months, during which naval families are necessarily separated.

Even when back in the States, ships often are away from the home port where families reside and children are in school—approximately 7 of each 10 ship repairs presently are carried on away from home ports.

Maximizing stateside time in home port obviously will make Navy life more attractive and encourage reenlistment.

The cost of replacing a man who fails to reenlist is $7,000.

In the context of the foregoing, it is meaningful to look at reenlistment rates in relation to ship repair costs in private yards away from home ports.

Arthur Anderson & Co.'s report on 247 selected ship repairs over a 3-year period showed a hypothetical $437,703 savings to the Department of Defense from utilization of private shipyards in preference to naval shipyards.

Assume these ships averaged 100 enlisted crewmen, a total of 24,700 3-year enlistment men. The Navy's average overall 36.2-percent reenlistment rate for fiscal year 1964 should bring a total of 8,941 enlistments from this group.

Yet, the composite specific reenlistment rate for two west coast homeported ships frequently sent away from home ports for repair was only 21.7 percent—or just 5,360 reenlistments for the group. This is 3,581 short of the overall Navy norm.

The cost for replacement of these 3,581 who failed to reenlist at $7,000 each, totals $25,067,000, not even considering the additional cost of training them in many special skills such as engineering, electronics and so forth, which runs to more millions of dollars.

If, under this hypothesis, keeping ships at home in naval complexes for repairs at naval shipyards would have reunited families sufficiently to encourage only 63 more reenlistments, out of the group of 24,700 enlisted men, the saving from dispersing ships away from home port for private shipyard repair would be wiped out.

If home yard repairs at naval shipyards boosted reenlistments to the overall Navy average, the net saving to the Department of Defense would amount to $24½ million.

The spillover effect of ship repair policies here noted is far too large to be ignored when making Department of Defense decisions on cost effectiveness of public and private shipyards as they relate to ships in commission with crews aboard.

This factor also must be considered by Congress in its decisions stipulating a legal requirement for contracting 35 percent of ship repair, alteration, and conversion to private shipyards.

As a matter of fact, a recent necessity to send ships from the Pacific to the Atlantic in order to comply with the 35–65 split of ship repair work between private yards and navy yards, in addition to whatever extra cost it created by discouraging reenlistments, actually generated the following costs for transportation charges for dependents of naval personnel. These costs would not have been incurred except for the misguided attempt by Congress to economize on the theory that private yards could do the jobs cheaper and thus must have at least 35 percent of the work:

October 1962, U.S.S. *Mason* (DD–852) to Boston	$67,224
October 1962 U.S.S. *Tucker* (DDR–875) to Boston	42,736
October 1962, U.S.S. *MacKenzie* (DD–836) to New York	56,479
May 1963, U.S.S. *Rogers* (DDR–876) to Charleston	37,099
June 1963, U.S.S. *Rowan* (DD–782) to Philadelphia	35,938

The fact that some of the foregoing ships went to public yards on the east coast rather than private yards is immaterial. The material fact is that except for the difficulties mandatorily imposed by the legislatively dictated 35–65 split, the switch between coasts never would have become necessary.

For this good reason, it is my opinion that Congress should establish no such arbitrary ratios but that it should impose upon the Department of the Navy responsibility for determining, in each individual repair or conversion project, where such work can be most economically performed, taking into consideration not only all direct costs but also such other indirect costs as I have outlined.

To me, such an approach would be a practice of cost effectiveness at its best and would completely demolish the "statistical" case of those who would shut down the Navy shipyards with complete and highhanded disregard of all but their own mathematics.

Other related matters of importance on this general subject were covered in the following excellent article by Washington Columnist Virginia Kelly which appeared in numerous Ridder newspapers, including the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

NAVAL SHIPYARDS VITAL TO DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES

(By Virginia W. Kelly)

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, has ordered a staff study to be made of U.S. naval shipyards. He said the staff study is to determine what future course the committee will take. He has, he said, no preconceived ideas about naval shipyards.

Serving with Senator STENNIS on the Preparedness Subcommittee are Democratic Senators JACKSON, SYMINGTON, and THURMOND; and Republican Senators SALTONSTALL, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and GOLDWATER.

When he was majority leader of the Senate, President Johnson served as chairman of this influential and highly respect subcommittee. He will certainly give careful consideration to their views as he will to the House Armed Services Committee scrutiny.

The close examination by Congress is in the interest not only of all Americans but of the U.S. Navy.

President Johnson has named a committee to study naval shipyards. Chairmaned by Navy Secretary Nitze and members from the Defense Secretariat and the Navy Secretariat and officers headed by the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral McDonald, the Committee will report within 1 year. Many have feared that after the Nitze board reports, that Secretary McNamara will advise closing several Navy shipyards. President Johnson, of course, will make the final decision.

Some of Secretary McNamara's advisers believe the next war will be atomic and brief, and that Navy shipyards are not needed. The fragility of this philosophy is emphasized when one remembers that President. Truman closed the Long Beach, Calif., Naval Shipyard on the advice of Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, who was as famous as Secretary McNamara for "knocking heads together."

The shipyard closing brought severe unemployment to the thousands who had been working in the yard. Suddenly the Korean war developed. The Long Beach Naval Shipyard had to be reopened with much governmental expense.

The naval shipyards are an important bastion in national defense. In World War II, the Germans nearly defeated the United States with submarines in the Atlantic. The Japanese inflicted grave losses on our fleet in the Pacific. Every naval shipyard and private yard was vital to our survival.

Strategists believe that the Pearl Harbor yard is in no danger of closing. Nevertheless, Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Democrat, of Hawaii, made an important speech on shipyards in the Senate last October. He made these points:

The Anderson report was sponsored by the Department of Defense and the Navy's Bureau of Ships in a genuine effort to learn more about the comparative costs of private and naval shipyards in accomplishing naval ship work. The release of the Anderson report has generated misleading conclusions that private yards are vastly more economical and efficient than Navy yards. This has lead to the clamor that the operation of Navy yards be curtailed or that some or all be closed.

Warships and naval shipyards are instruments to preserve the freedom of the seas and the security and sovereignty of our Nation. In the time of cold wars and hot tensions, naval yards are more than ever vital to the organization of Navy military commanders. These commanders are in need of maximum logistical forces whether they be Navy shipyards or supply ships.

Without the assurance of a regular home yard to which Navy ships return at stated intervals, there would be an alarming turnover of Navy personnel. One quarter of Navy men separated at Norfolk said that long separations from families was the reason for not reenlisting.

To minimize naval personnel turnover, and in order to operate our intricate warships and complex Navy weapons systems,

it is imperative that Navy shipyards be maintained. Navy yards are geared to many military, technological, and scientific changes which are evolving.

Navy yards are staffed with skilled artisans, technicians, engineers, scientists, administrators and managers. Once scattered (by the closing of yards) these teams cannot be reassembled.

Government yards are better equipped and manned than certain private yards to complete complex fire control and electronics repairs.

Government workers in Navy yards cannot strike, whereas strikes in private yards have delayed construction by many months.

Government yards are Navy bases with medical training, and recreational installations for ship personnel, while ships are being overhauled.

Red China and the General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Walter Lippmann appeared in the Washington Post of January 21. What Mr. Lippmann writes may not please the powers that be but it will be very good for their souls and ours.

Our policy in Asia is not very logical, to put it mildly, and has created a vacuum which must and will be filled. General de Gaulle, who possesses the logic with which most Frenchmen are endowed, is perhaps the one to fill the vacuum and to come up with a comprehensive and clear policy that can be understood, not only in Europe but around the world.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—RED CHINA AND THE GENERAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is little reason to be surprised or mystified by the news that France and Red China will establish diplomatic relations. For a long time General de Gaulle has been saying that there would be a schism in the Communist world between Russia and China, and that when that happened it would be necessary to have diplomatic relations with both Communist states.

Until the Sino-Soviet break, it was possible to deal with China through its overlord in Moscow. After the break channels would have to be opened with Peking.

General de Gaulle, we must remember, does not share the American theory that diplomatic relations carry with them a kind of moral and political ratification. The French hold the traditional view, which used to be our own view as well, that diplomatic recognition is the recognition of a fact, that the Government recognized is in fact the Government. Most European, and indeed most other governments, take this factual and quite unemotional view of diplomatic recognition.

Nor is there any mystery as to why Paris and Peiping are resuming relations now, rather than a year ago or a year hence. Quite recently, presumably as result of the visit to China of M. Edgar Faure, the Peiping Government made the essential concession. Formerly it would have insisted that France must break relations with Formosa as the condition of resuming relations with mainland China. On this, Peiping has given way. General de Gaulle is no longer being asked to abandon Chiang Kai-shek in order to have relations with Mao Tse-tung. Almost immediately after this concession was made, General de Gaulle took his decision.

It marks a very significant turn in the relations between Red China and the non-Communist world. For it opens the door, or at least unlocks the door, to a general recognition of the realities in the Far East—that the Government of Peiping is in fact the Government of China and that the Government in Formosa is in fact the Government of Formosa. Certainly, as M. Faure has said, while it can be argued that Formosa belongs to China, it cannot be argued that China belongs to Formosa.

We have been in the habit of describing the result as a two-China policy. This turns out to be a misleading description of a good thing. For none of the Chinese, Red or white, will admit that there is more than one China. The accurate description of the real situation is to say that there is China, of which the capital is in Peiping, and that there is an independent Formosa, of which the capital is in Taipei. The problem of the future is to work out a relationship between these two entities—be it independent separation, internationally guaranteed neutralization of Formosa, or, eventually, uncoerced reunion.

Far from resenting General de Gaulle's initiative we must recognize—even if it is politically inconvenient to say so out loud—that he has already achieved an important gain. He has removed the insurmountable obstacles to an eventual settlement with China. No doubt we are nowhere near a settlement. But as long as the realities of the situation in China and Formosa are not recognized, no settlement will ever be possible.

We must now expect to see many practical results from the action taken by General de Gaulle. There is bound to come the acceptance of Peiping as the Government of China in the Security Council of the United Nations. The question then will be whether Nationalist China will still be granted and will accept a seat in the General Assembly. Much will depend on whether Chiang Kai-shek accepts the situation which General de Gaulle has created or in a mood of anger opposes it and breaks relations with France. If he does that nothing will give greater pleasure to Peiping.

Looking beyond the exchange of ambassadors, we can see now that more than a formality is intended. France is reentering the Far East as a great power. If we are wise, we shall welcome her, knowing that our solitary eminence and our isolated role in the Far East, which are the unplanned results of the Second World War, cannot endure forever. Our isolation in the Far East has fostered in this country a neurotic jingoism about any country which differs with us and does not keep in step. But the postwar period is ending in the Far East as it has ended in Europe, and Gaullist France will not be the last country to act accordingly. We must expect to see this in Japan.

In my view, we should welcome General de Gaulle's advice, his help, his influence which is greater than many of us realize, and his initiative. For without his help there is no prospect that we shall be able alone to extricate ourselves honorably from the entanglement in southeast Asia. General de Gaulle told President Kennedy when they met in Paris in 1961 that no military solution is possible and that it would be necessary to seek a political solution. This was the judgment of an old hand. For the French were in Indochina for about 80 years. They fought an 8-year war in Indochina. They are far from a stupid people and quite able to look at the facts. General de Gaulle is a military thinker of the very first rank.

No doubt the administration will go through the formalities of protesting against the French decision. But let it not allow itself to be angry and nurse a grievance about an achievement for which, because it takes the situation off dead center, we shall in the days to come be grateful.

Growthmanship—A la 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, many of us were amazed recently when the Central Intelligence Agency held a public press conference to announce some of its conclusions about the economy of the Soviet Union. I believe we were amazed, not only by the conclusions revealed, but by the methods used to make this information public.

It seems to me there is cause for concern in our country at the prospect of an organization such as CIA being used to influence public opinion, and this practice should not be continued. All of us remember the great manipulations of economic growth figures during the last presidential election campaign, and the CIA has no place in any renewal of a public debate on this issue.

The Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News has discussed this question thoroughly and appropriately in an editorial of January 18, 1964, and I would like to include a copy of this excellent editorial with my remarks.

GROWTHMANSHIP—A LA 1964

All during 1960, a political parlor game enjoyed by nearly every campaigning Democrat was called growthmanship. As described in one satirical speech by then Vice President Nixon—before he knew who his 1960 opponent would be—it was played by citing specious statistics to prove that the U.S. growth rate had slowed down even as the Soviet growth rate was speeding up. Thus, America must hurry, hurry, hurry to keep Russia from passing us and winning the growth race.

Well, now it's another presidential campaign year, and the stage is being set for a new game, growthmanship revisited, or growthmanship in reverse. And, of course, the object of this new game—since it is played by today's ins instead of, as in 1960, by the outs—will be to prove that everything is now happily reversed.

Thus, not our growth rate but Russia's is suddenly represented as having miraculously been slowed to a crawl while the U.S. economy surges forward at an ever-accelerating pace—thereby ending any danger of our being overtaken by Soviet production. Indeed, some of the more zealous players even show signs of getting carried away to the point of implying that Russia is in such a slow-growth mess in its domestic economy that it may soon offer no danger to us, period.

To lay the factual groundwork for such a 1964 reverse twist on 1960's game of growthmanship, we have been treated to an unprecedented special briefing by the Central Intelligence Agency. Never before has this traditionally supersilent service peered out from behind its cloak to brief the public on

anything. Why it did so now is open to varying conjecture—whether for reasons of its own or because the administration felt this appraisal of Russia's growth slowdown would be more impressive coming directly from CIA than from the usual White House, State Department or Pentagon sources.

The net of the CIA analysis of the Soviet economy, in any case, is that Russia is in the Communist equivalent of a moderately serious recession. Not only is it suffering from an obvious grain crop failure, says the CIA, but its economy is so out of kilter in other ways that its overall economic growth has declined from a rate of about 6 percent a year during the 1950's to 2½ percent in 1962.

But before anyone in Washington gets as carried away politically by this new estimate as some did in 1960 by the old ones, perhaps it is time to recall a famous line from the late Charlie Wilson when the same Congress that had panicked over the Soviet sputnik a year earlier wanted to cut his Defense Department budget: "I didn't think the Russians were 10 feet tall last year, and I don't think they're only 5 feet tall now." Just so, we didn't think they were economically 10 feet tall in 1960, and we doubt if they're economically only 5 feet tall in 1964.

Smoking and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there has been much said and written relating to the report on smoking and health issued by the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Some who probably have not ever read the report are practically calling for the prohibition of tabacco and tobacco products. Where the right of individuals and the stability of an important section of our economy is involved, it would be wise for us to look closer at all of the factors. In this light, I urge all my colleagues in the Congress to read these editorials which appeared in the Tuesday, January 21, editions of the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald and Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Jan. 21, 1964]

FROM HEALTH TO TOBACCO PROGRAM

Some Congressmen have already raised the implication of the report on smoking and health to the tobacco farm program. Representative ROUSH, Democrat, of Indiana, has included "immediately cutting off subsidies to the growers of tobacco" among the steps he thinks should be taken to implement the Surgeon General's report. Because the total farm program is falling into increasing disfavor with Congressmen from urban areas, tobacco people may expect an attempt to be made to eliminate the tobacco program as a step in cutting down the expense of the price support program.

That the tobacco program is operated by a farmers' cooperative, which pays back the money it borrows from the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance the price support program and pays interest on the loans, is ignored by those who would take this approach. But there are factors which make it much more to the public's and to the Government's interest to go more deeply into the matter than the Surgeon General's report has done than to undertake to eliminate tobacco on the basis of no more than statistical implications.

The place of tobacco in the Nation's economy is of such consequence that it justifies public spending on research to determine with as much accuracy as is possible what causal relationship there may be between the use of tobacco and health and also to find ways to eliminate whatever dangers may be ascertained to be in tobacco.

As the fifth largest cash crop in the Nation, tobacco has an important place in the Nation's agricultural economy. Millions of farmers in 21 States depend in whole or in part on tobacco for income. More millions of workers in the Nation's 578 processing plants, found in 30 States, depend on tobacco for a livelihood. Including the businesses and industries which supply the tobacco industry, approximately 17 million workers depend on tobacco—again in whole or in part—for a livelihood, and when their dependents are included, one-third the Nation's population has a stake in the tobacco economy.

But if no other factor than taxes were involved, the Government's revenue from tobacco products—last year $3,200 million—would justify an intensive research program at public expense. For if this revenue should be lost to Government, the loss would be made up from increases in personal and corporate income tax levies.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Jan. 21, 1964]

TOBACCO RESEARCH LABORATORY

North Carolina has the greatest interest and the heaviest stake of any State in the proposal, introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by our own Sixth District Congressman HORACE KORNEGAY, for establishment of a tobacco research laboratory which would concentrate upon finding and eliminating any connection between tobacco and lung cancer.

North Carolina is the center of tobacco production and processing, and any appreciable blow to the industry—from farm through factory—would have corresponding effect upon the State's economy and its whole pattern of public services. Other tobacco growing and processing States would also be hard hit.

And the effect upon revenue would catch both the U.S. Treasury, where the tobacco yield is third on the Federal list, and all States save three, including North Carolina, which levy a sizable tax on cigarettes. It cannot be reasoned that the laboratory proposed by Representative KORNEGAY and endorsed by other tobacco State legislators would be a pet project for North Carolina. Both the United States and 47 States have a direct stake in revenue yields. And over and above that is the lung cancer toll which is nationwide.

If or when such a laboratory is established, its logical locale would be North Carolina. We are not disposed to argue over the precise spot, although we feel that serious consideration should be given to proximity to and cooperation with growers and processors. The latter are already engaged in widespread research. North Carolina is fortunate in having a substantial portion of this research going forward within its borders. It has a research climate, fostered not only by industry but by the stimulation and personnel of its colleges and universities, and particularly its three medical schools. There is an obvious need to coordinate and step up tobacco research; and here is where Representative KORNEGAY's measure comes in.

North Carolina will be perfectly willing to have this laboratory located wherever a thorough study and objective survey show that it can do the best job and, through cooperation of all concerned, is most likely to save human lives, threatened revenue, and an endangered economy.

Alternate Proposal by Connecticut Bar Association on H.R. 8190

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, during House debate on H.R. 8190, I made reference to an alterative proposal recommended by the Connecticut Bar Association and also to corroborating charts. These documents follow:

H.R. —

A bill to fix certain fees payable to the Commissioner of Patents

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the items numbered 1 through 11 in subsection (a) of section 41 of title 35 of the United States Code are amended to read as follows:

"1. On filing each application for an original patent except in design cases, $60, and $5 for each claim in excess of twenty filed originally or pending and under consideration at any other time during prosecution.

"2. On issuing each original patent, except in design cases, $60, and $10 for each claim in excess of ten.

"3. In design cases:

"(A) On filing each design application, $20.

"(B) On issuing each design patent: for three years and six months, $10; for seven years, $20; and for fourteen years, $30.

"4. On every application for the reissue of a patent, $60, and $5 for each claim over and above the number of claims in the original patent.

"5. On filing each disclaimer, $15.

"6. On an appeal for the first time from the examiner to the Board of Appeals, $75. If the appeal is withdrawn prior to any consideration by the Board, or if an oral hearing is not requested prior to any consideration by the Board or if a request for an oral hearing is withdrawn more than thirty days before any consideration by the Board, $50 of the 75 fee shall be refunded.

"7. On filing each petition for the revival of an abandoned application for a patent or for the delayed payment of the fee for issuing each patent, $15.

"8. For certificate under section 255 or under section 256 of this title, $15.

"9. For uncertified printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents (except design patents), 50 cents per copy; for design patents, 20 cents per copy; special rates for libraries specified in section 13 of this title, $100 for patents issued in one year.

"10. For recording every assignment, agreement, or other paper, $20; for each additional patent or application included in one writing, where more than one is so included, $3 additional.

"11. For each certificate, $2."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding the following subsections:

"12. On the filing of every petition for the institution of public use proceedings, $100.

"13. After the preliminary statements have been received and approved and the motion period has been set, each applicant to an Interference shall pay a fee of $100.

"14. Upon filing every brief on final hearing before the Board of Patent Interference Examiners, $100.

"(c) The fees prescribed by or under this section shall apply to any other Government department or agency, or officer thereof, except that the Commissioner may waive the payment of any fee for services or materials in cases of occasional or incidental requests

by a Government department or agency, or officer thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 31 of the Act of July 5, 1946, entitled "An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes" (15 U.S.C. 1113) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The following fees shall be paid to the Commissioner of Patents under this Act:

"(1) On filing each original application for registration and each application for renewal in each class, $30; on filing each application for renewal in each class after expiration of a registration, an additional fee of $5.

"(2) Before issuing each registration of a mark in each class, $25.

"(3) On filing an affidavit under section 8(a) or section 8(b), $10.

"(4) On filing each petition for the revival of an abandoned application, $15.

"(5) On filing notice of opposion or application for cancellation, $50.

"(6) On appeal from an examiner in charge of the registration of marks to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, $25.

"(7) For issuance of a new certificate of registration following change of ownership of a mark or correction of a registrant's mistake, $15.

"(8) For certificate of correction of registrant's mistake or amendment after registration, $15.

"(9) For certifying in any case, $2.

"(10) For filing each disclaimer after registration, $15.

"(11) For printed copy of registered mark, 20 cents.

"(12) For recording every assignment or other paper, $20; for each additional registration or application included, or involved in one writing where more than one is so included or involved, $3 additional.

"(13) On filing notice of claim of benefits of this Act for a mark to be published under section 12(c) hereof, $10.

"(b) The Commissioner may establish charges for copies of records, publications, or services furnished by the Patent Office, not specified in subsection (a).

"(c) The Commissioner may refund any sum paid by mistake or in excess."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 266 of title 35 of the United States Code is repealed.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 27 of such title is amended by striking out

"266. Issue of patents without fees to Government employees."

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in the succeeding subsections of this section, the amendments and repeal made by this Act shall take effect three months after the date of enactment.

(b) The amendments to items 1, 3, and 4 of section 41(a) of title 35 of the United States Code shall not apply in further proceedings in applications filed prior to the effective date of such amendments.

(c) The amendment to item 2 of such section shall not apply in cases in which the notice of allowance of the application was sent, or in which a patent was issued, prior to the effective date of such amendment.

(d) The fee prescribed in paragraph 13 of of section 31(a) of the Act of July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1113), as amended by this Act shall apply only in the case of registrations issued and registrations published under the provisions of section 12(c) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 1062(c)) on or after the effective date of such amendment.

Annual major volume assumptions (1962 basis)

Patent filing, original patent	83,000 applications with average of 2 claims over 10 and 2 independent claims over 1.
Patent issue, original patent	52,000 patents, with average of 3.6 pages of specifications and 2 sheets of drawings.
Design filing	5,000 design applications.
Design issue	3,000 design patents: 5 percent for 3½ years; 10 percent for 7 years; 85 percent for 14 years.
Patent appeals	10,000 appeals: 30 percent considered with oral hearing; 10 percent considered without oral hearing; 60 percent withdrawn.
Recording patent assignments	80,000 items (patent, application, or any other paper) involved in 60,000 writings.
Trademark filing	23,500 applications.
Trademark issue (original)	17,024.
Trademark affidavit	15,000 affidavits.
Trademark renewals issued	3,133.
Recording trademark assignments	13,200 items (trademark registration or any other paper) involved in 3,300 writings.
Patent copies	11,436,000.
Trademark copies	308,000.
Patent maintenance	1st fee, 22,470 patents (50 percent of 1957 issuances of 44,939); 2d fee, 10,643 patents (25 percent of 1953 issuances of 42,571); 3d fee, 4,567 patents (15 percent of 1949 issuances of 30,446).
Patent interferences	640 (approximately), 10-year average, 1950–59.
Certification copies and title reports	90,599 (1961 basis).
Trademark oppositions and cancellations	1,185 (1961 basis).
Patent filing, original patent	4,315 applications with average of 28 (27.45) claims (1950, 1953, 1954) basis.
Patent issue, original patent	9,105 patents, with average of 16 (15.75) claims (1950, 1953, 1954) basis.

Fee income comparison based on attached volume assumption

Description	Present fee	H.R. 8190	Alternative (suggested) bill
Patent filing fee	[1] $2,490,000	[2] $6,042,000	[2] $5,152,620
Patent issue fee	[1] 1,560,000	[2] 6,188,000	[2] 3,666,000
Patent copies	2,859,000	2,859,000	5,718,000
Trademark filing fee	587,500	822,500	705,000
Trademark issue fee	None	None	503,925
Patent appeal fees	250,000	500,000	400,000
Patent assignment fees	190,000	1,600,000	1,260,000
Design filing fees	[3] 93,908	100,000	100,000
Design issue fees	None	84,000	84,000
Certification of copies and title reports fees	90,599	90,599	181,198
Trademark copies	30,800	30,800	61,600
Patent interference fees	None	None	256,000
Trademark assignment fees	14,850	264,000	95,700
Trademark affidavit fee	None	$150,000	$150,000
Trademark opposition and cancellation fees	$29,640	29,640	59,280
Drawings and corrections	[4] 61,908	[4] 61,908	[4] 61,908
Subscription service for copies	[4] 28,522	[4] 28,522	[4] 28,522
Reproduction of records	[4] 722,368	[4] 722,368	[4] 722,368
Special service on orders	[4] 96,639	[4] 96,639	[4] 96,639
Classified lists of patents	[4] 7,955	[4] 7,955	[4] 7,955
Other fees (approximately 40 in number) less than 10,000 each	[4] 79,444	[4] 79,444	[4] 79,444
Total	9,192,135	19,757,375	19,390,450
Maintenance fees (estimated)	None	2,872,850	None

[1] Excluding extra claims.
[2] Including extra claims.
[3] 1961 basis, including extended terms.
[4] 1961 basis.

Harry Darby: Mr. GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Darby who is widely recognized as one of our Nation's leading business and political figures, recently announced his resignation as Republican national committeeman for Kansas.

Mr. Darby has been a guiding force in the political affairs of Kansas and the Nation for many years, and gained the respect and admiration of thousands with whom he has come in contact. He will be remembered by many of my colleagues as "Senator Darby" because of having filled the unexpired term of the late Senator Clyde Reed.

I insert a tribute appearing in the Salina Journal of Salina, Kans., on January 19, 1964, in the RECORD at this point.

HARRY DARBY: MR. GOP

(NOTE.—A tribute to Harry Darby by the Hutchinson News is herewith reprinted with the Journal's endorsement.)

Since 1940 Harry Darby has been Republican national committeemen for Kansas. He has been a delegate to each of his party's nominating conventions through those 24 years and usually has been selected as the chairman of the State's delegation.

It would be no exaggeration to say that during this more than two decades he has been Mr. Republican for Kansas. He has had a usually guiding hand in most of his party's affairs in his own State, and to a considerable extent in the Nation. But he has not been, nor has he aspired to be a political boss as the late Dave Mulvane was.

Were the job specifications for the perfect national committeeman to be set down, Darby would come remarkably close to filling them. He has made liberal contributions of his time, money, and enthusiasm to his party.

He has done so because he enjoyed it and not from any desire for personal advantage. On the contrary, he never sought office, and while he did reluctantly accept an interim appointment to the Senate, where he served with distinction, he refused, when his term ended, to stand for election.

The Republican Party has been Harry Darby's second love. His first is his charming wife, and his third his highly successful business. He will continue to have that love but hereafter it will be from the ranks by his own volition and not in a top role.

The years roll relentlessly on. More wisely than many still serving in Congress and other governmental bodies, he has recognized them and the infirmities which come with them. He has presented his resignation as national committeeman. Fittingly, moreover, he has done so at a time to permit careful selection of his successor.

There is no indispensible man, of course. The Republicans of Kansas, however, will be hard put to find as qualified a successor to Harry Darby.

U.S. Prestige in Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorials by Mr. Ray Henle of NBC's news program, "Three-Star Extra." I think these editorials are particularly apropos at a time when many people are wondering about U.S. prestige in other countries.

"THREE-STAR EXTRA" EDITORIAL, JANUARY, 13, 1964

(By Ray Henle)

The talk tonight is of concessions to be made by the United States to settle the latest crisis in Panama and restore peace to the Canal Zone.

There is much doubt, in informed circles, as to how effective any concessions will be, no matter how far they go, in providing a lasting answer to the troubles in Panama. The latest riots, like those in 1959, appear to have been engineered by the leftist extremists. And it also seems beyond dispute that they don't want concessions. They want the canal.

If documentation is needed to support that conclusion, it was provided by Aquilina Boyd, Panama's extremist ambassador to the United Nations. Boyd took off from Panama City when the riots were only hours old, apparently assured they would be blown into a major international incident. He was in New York Friday morning, ready to make demands that the United Nations take sides against the United States in the canal situation. His first public statement was an accusation of aggression by the United States, and a demand that we get out of the Canal Zone.

Boyd was the leader of the 1959 riots. Then he wanted only that the Panamanian flag be flown alongside that of the United States in the Canal Zone. Now he has raised his sights, and by his own admission, he wants the canal. Concessions today, perhaps; but, eventually, the entire canal.

"THREE-STAR EXTRA" EDITORIAL, JANUARY 14, 1964

(By Ray Henle)

The photographs from Moscow tell the story: Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev, in joyful embrace—arms around each other, much patting of backs and shaking of hands—everything is eggs in the coffee as the saying goes.

Round the world go the pictures and around the world people see how pleased the leader of the world Communist movement is with his accomplishment in Cuba.

Khrushchev may have in his orbit a notorious Castro regime, steeped in economic and social failures—but he also has his jumping-off place for the announced Communist aim to subjugate all the Western Hemisphere, as a preliminary to the final prize—the United States.

Many are bound to wonder—why doesn't the free world's leadership embrace some individuals and some governments which are dedicated to overthrowing the world Communist movement?

Why don't we have photographs of President Johnson, and other free world leaders embracing Chancellor John Doe, head of a free government in absentina, of Hungary, or Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc.

We don't, of course, because there isn't anybody like that. The free world has been too busy coexisting with Communist regimes. The free world, including the United States, just keeps on being nice, exuding sweetness and light, embracing coexistence hoping one day—someday—the Communist will "see the error of their ways" and drop their aims of world conquest. Until then, we're advised, don't rock the boat, don't speak above a whisper, don't for heaven's sake say anything or do anything that will make Moscow mad. Meanwhile the world drifts slowly and steadily into the Communist orbit.

The so-called neutral or doubtful countries are inclined to back the winner, and they don't think that it is going to be us.

Dodd for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the current speculation about possible Vice President candidates, John Chamberlain, in a column which appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of January 21, 1964, suggested the name of Connecticut's senior Senator THOMAS J. DODD.

Certainly, Senator DODD ranks in stature and competence with many of the people who have been suggested and Mr. Chamberlain makes a strong case for the consideration of the Connecticut Democrat.

I am happy to include herewith the column of Mr. Chamberlain who is himself a Connecticut citizen, a resident of Cheshire.

THESE DAYS—DODD FOR VICE PRESIDENT

(By John Chamberlain)

Inasmuch as one does not have to belong to a political party in the United States to take part in the great game of proposing candidates for important office, I might as well give President Lyndon Johnson some wholly unsolicited advice about choosing a proper running mate.

I am quite aware that this sort of thing can be done by anybody who has watched a high-wire balancing act at the circus. Lyndon Johnson is a Texan, a southerner, a liberal-conservative (or conservative-liberal), a Protestant, a self-made man, a person who (like F.D.R.) picks brains by listening rather than by reading. So anyone can see that the Democratic candidate for Vice President ought to come from the Middle West (Senator Humphrey, Senator Eugene McCarthy, or Peace Corps boss, Sargent Shriver), or from California (Gov. Pat Brown), or from the Northeast (New York City's Mayor Wagner). Then there are the Kennedy cachet, money and organizing power to consider (Bobby Kennedy or Sargent Shriver as an in-law). There is religion (McCarthy, Wagner, Bobby Kennedy, and Shriver are Catholics, good for the big city vote where Catholics are in the majority); and Eugene McCarthy and Bobby Kennedy have both written books.

The desire for "balance" on a ticket is not to be decried, provided ability is not overlooked in prescribing the mixture. I do not for a moment doubt that the Messrs. Shriver, EUGENE MCCARTHY, et al., are all able men in their various ways. But if Lyndon Johnson wants balance and foresight, too, the best man in his own party happens to be the senior U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD.

To use that phrase beloved of the sport page, you can't fault TOM DODD on any of the mechanical qualifications needed for ticket balancing. He comes from the populous Northeast, he is a Catholic, he is a welfare stater without going hog wild about it in the ADA manner, he is a civil rights man, and he believes in legitimate labor unions. Thus, he both complements Lyndon Johnson and blends with him. In addition to all this, he is particularly beloved among various ethnic groups that have often resented the fact that the Democratic Party is associated with the post-Yalta loss of Eastern Europe to communism. The Poles, the Lithuanians, the Ukrainians, and the Hungarians of New England are overwhelmingly for TOM DODD, the anti-Communist, and his popularity among these groups in his home territory would certainly rub off in the voting booths of Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Chicago.

It is not my purpose, however, to praise TOM DODD merely because he would lend mechanical balance to the Democratic slate. What I like about him is his ability to foresee crises long before they have tumbled about our ears. I distinctly recall a speech he made back in September of 1962, when Democrats who should have known better were denying that Cuba represented any particular menace to the United States. DODD had his eye on Castro's machinations in Panama even then. The Castro-Soviet domination of Cuba, said DODD, "poses a distinct threat to the security of the United States in the sense that it gives Castro the military power to overthrow, or repeat his attempt to overthrow the Government of Panama, thus placing the Panama Canal under the direct control of Moscow. In doing so, Khrushchev and Castro would not stage a frontal attack on Panama; they would attack by proxy, using an indigenous extremist movement as a front, and pretending to the world that the entire action had been initiated by the Panamanian people."

In the light of what has recently happened in Panama, I find those words pretty prophetic. Or maybe "prescient" is the proper word for it. So, too, were DODD's words about Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana, whom he tabbed as a Marxist long before our State Department came to a similar conclusion. And, as I recall it, TOM DODD was reproved by the New York Times for saying some time ago that Ghana was the "first Marxist state in Africa." The Times later admitted that DODD was correct.

Could Lyndon Johnson have a better man at his elbow than one who can add X-ray eyes to all the other qualifications needed to balance a ticket?

First Lady Tours "Poverty Pocket"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson went to Pennsylvania last Saturday and took a good look at some of the things that are being done to help combat poverty. Many people also took a good look at Lady Bird and their reactions are most interesting. Here is one aspect of our Government which is not impersonal and institutional; here is respect, warmth, and deep personal regard.

The New York Times on January 12, 1964, reported as follows:

MRS. JOHNSON CHEERED IN "POVERTY POCKET" COAL TOWNS

(By Nan Robertson)

WILKES-BARRE, PA., January 11.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson visited today one of the "pockets of poverty" that President Johnson has declared war on—the Wilkes-Barre and Scranton area of Pennsylvania. It is part of that impoverished 10-State strip known as Appalachia. Here, in the anthracite coal area, the jobless rate is nearly double the Nation's average. On the way from Washington, Mrs. Johnson was briefed on the region, its problems and some of the solutions that have been found by two Pennsylvania Representatives. They were DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, cosponsor of the legislation that produced the Area Redevelopment Administration, and JOSEPH M. McDADE, Republican.

She spoke at the airport here, in the central squares of Scranton and Wilkes-Barre and at a new science research center at Wilkes College. She toured a vocational school that retrains miners thrown out of work and a textile plant helped by an ARA loan.

She shook the hands of crowds that pressed insistently around her everywhere. She talked with as many persons as she could. Sometimes she was ahead of schedule, but she never seemed rushed.

PUBLIC IS CHARMED

Today, the people away from what Mrs. Johnson calls the small world of Washington could get an intimation of the First Lady's style when she is with them—and they were charmed.

Mrs. Johnson does not come across on television and in photos as she does in person. Her forte is head-to-head conversation and a direct look into the eyes of whomever she is meeting.

She listened well, asked intelligent questions and did not flinch in an auto mechanic's shop when the director said:

"If you'll come right over here I'll show you how we make a complete overhaul."

This kind of invitation is calculated to bore any woman but Mrs. Johnson obediently peered under car hoods.

The outdoor crowds—more than 1,000 in Scranton, a Democratic stronghold with a Republican mayor—cheered Mrs. Johnson, showered her with roses yellow and red and gave her keys to the two cities. At Wilkes College, a poster hung from a dormitory proclaimed:

"Ashley Hall Welcomes Y'all."

Many in the crowds were women and children. Mrs. John Marks, wife of a plant foreman, grabbed Mrs. Johnson's hand outside the Wyoming Valley Technical Institute. "It's a great honor to shake your hand," she told the First Lady. "You're so much prettier in person than I ever dreamed."

Another woman said she was touched to tears by Mrs. Johnson's kind face and her "real interest in us."

"I shook her hand," shouted a matron in curlers. "I was just glad to see her," a companion said.

At the dedication of Wilkes College's scientific research center, Mrs. Johnson told her audience:

"Last Wednesday I sat in the gallery of the Congress and heard my husband declare war on poverty in this country. Today, I feel as if I have been standing on the first battlefield of that war.

"Preparing for this trip, I was told of the hard times you in this area have been having. The mine cavelns and fires have plagued life in this area along with the problems of a declining industry. But I know this is a part of our land that refuses to take defeat or decline.

"I have found today that these are phoenixlike, rising from the ashes of yesterday, to light the fires of your own industrial renaissance."

The First Lady said that she was grateful for today's trip "because you have taken me behind the cold statistics to the human needs, problems, and hopes of this area."

TALKS TO TRAINEES

At the vocational school, she talked to Joseph Stanitis, a 32-year-old trainee in auto mechanics. Mr. Stanitis, who hase three children, told Mrs. Johnson of how he had been unemployed for 2 years after his coal mine was shut down.

His case is characteristic in the hard coal region, where thousands of men have been thrown out of work because of new laborsaving machines and the turn to fuels such as oil and gas.

The director of the school, which also trains veterans, the physically handicapped, and those who can no longer take on some tasks because of age, said:

"We feel that a man is not through at age 55."

Mrs. Johnson's response brought a gale of laughter.

"I'm glad you said that," she remarked.

The President was 55 last August.

The Wilkes College Science Research Center was made possible by a $400,000 ARA grant that must be matched by $500,000 from private contributions. It will train men in new skills such as electronics and chemistry and attract new industries to the region.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a short poem written by Maureen Norton, of Baltimore, Md.

The death of President Kennedy touched the hearts of all Americans. Even the teenage generation felt the impact of that great loss. Quite by accident, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Norton, the parents of Maureen, came across this small ballad which their daughter had written. Maureen is a junior at the Institute of Notre Dame, and I feel this poem reflects both her own deep sentiments and the fine training she has received.

With scarlet red roses,
And a light pink suit,
Walked Mrs. Kennedy looking cute.
With a dark blue suit,
And a smile so gay,
Walked Mr. Kennedy through the day.
All during the day,
They walked with joy
To only one's dismay.
Though why we lost this great man
No one will fully understand.
God calls us when He sees fit
That is the answer, that is it.

After $3 Billion U.S. Aid, Tito Closer to U.S.S.R. Than Any Time Since Stalin's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch, senior staff member of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, delivered an address to the Commonwealth Club of California on January 10, 1964, on the subject "After $3 Billion U.S. Aid, Tito Closer to U.S.S.R. Than Any Time Since Stalin's Death."

Flashes from that address as published in the Commonwealth follow:

AFTER $3 BILLION U.S. AID, TITO CLOSER TO U.S.S.R. THAN ANY TIME SINCE STALIN'S DEATH

(Friday Flashes—Jan. 10, from address by Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch, Senior Staff Member of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.)

(By Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch)

The leaders of the victorious Communist revolution in Yugoslavia hope to introduce in Yugoslavia a political and economic system closely resembling that of the Soviet Union.

The Yugoslav Communists were in a certain sense more Stalinist than Stalin himself, both in their domestic and foreign policies.

It was not Tito who rebelled against Stalin, but the oversuspicious Stalin who rejected Tito in the miscalculated hope that Tito would disappear.

From that time on, Yugoslavia's foreign policy was basically determined by the interplay of these two factors: the willingness to preserve at any cost the monopoly of political power for the Communist Party within Yugoslavia, while trying to assure a privileged role within the Communist world, and an active role in the world at large.

REDS GLADLY ACCEPTED U.S. AID

The initial Titoist opening to the West came in 1949, when it became obvious that Stalin wanted no reconciliation with Tito; and when the Soviet economic blockade threatened Yugoslavia with starvation.

Yugoslav Communists gladly accepted American economic and military aid, delighted and probably astonished that no strings were attached. I strongly criticize that concept of aid without political concessions.

As long as Stalin lived, the conflict between Tito and the Cominform carried an

unusual degree of bitterness. It is highly significant to stress this mutual enmity between Tito and Stalin, to assess correctly the ulterior evolution of Yugoslavia's foreign policy, during the decade following Stalin's exit.

Yugoslav Communists introduced certain reforms in the economic life of Yugoslavia, and relaxed some other aspects of their initial Stalinist rule.

Distrustful of Stalin, they improved relations with Greece and Turkey, by signing defense agreements against aggression in the Balkans.

NO WESTERN ENTANGLEMENTS

Yugoslav rulers carefully avoided any direct institutional entanglement with the Western European and Atlantic organizations. Western powers granted them full freedom of maneuver which contributed to their new eastward shift which started soon after Stalin's death.

Since the fall of 1960, we are witnessing a third phase, increasing collaboration in practically all fields. During the Belgrade Conference of 25 nonalined nations, Tito's almost blanket endorsement of Soviet positions contributed heavily to the general pro-Soviet bias of the conference.

Tito was honored by the rare privilege of addressing the Supreme Soviet. From this speech and from another by Tito, there emerged three significant elements: (1) The identity or similarity of Soviet and Yugoslav foreign policy; (2) the common aim, namely the achievement of socialism and ultimately communism, of both Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union; and (3) Tito's bland denial that his brand of socialism had any nationalist characteristics.

In August 1963, Khrushchev declared that the Soviet Union regards Yugoslavia as Socialist and fraternal, he praised the Yugoslav system of workers' councils, formerly denounced by the Soviet Union as "revisionism" of Marxist-Leninist theory, and stated that he will join forces with Tito to bury capitalism.

TITO HELPING IN WORLD SUBVERSION

The foregoing does not mean that Yugoslavia has or will simply reintegrate the Soviet bloc. Khrushchev sees an advantage, at least temporarily, of having Yugoslavia on his side if not in his bloc. Tito is today assisting Khrushchev in his two-fold venture: to stall the Chinese factionalism within the Communist movement, and to subvert more efficiently the non-Communist world.

The reconciliation with Khrushchev was followed by a betterment of relations between Yugoslavia and other Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe.

Tito has certainly tried to increase his influence and prestige among the nonalined nations of Asia, Africa, as well as Latin America.

Finally, Tito is doing his best to maintain good relations with the United States for reasons of trade and eligibility for American loans or sale, under favorable conditions, of surplus commodities.

We are decidedly living again in a period when Communist regimes try to enlist capitalist support to alleviate their internal economic difficulties, tending of course, as good Leninists, to gain substantial advantages without making concessions.

There are three fundamental, official tenets of Titoist foreign policy: the concept of peaceful coexistence among the states with different social systems; the principle of Yugoslavia's nonalinement in present-day's cold war confrontation; and a doctrinal belief that inexorably and in a variety of ways, humanity is moving deep into the era of socialism.

ACCORDS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

As for peaceful coexistence, Tito's interpretation coincides with that of Nikita Khrushchev. As regards nonalinement, Yugoslav rulers have been willing to explain to careful readers that this concept should be understood dialectically—namely, that the world antagonistic blocs are only temporary, which will be overcome gradually through a process leading inescapably toward socialism.

TAKES U.S. AID, BUT MOVES TOWARD RUSSIA

After having received nearly $3 billion of aid, under various headings, from the United States, Tito is today closer to the Soviet Union than he ever was during the last 8 years. The concept of aid without counterconcessions seems to me largely responsible for Tito's eastward shifts which might even accelerate under his successors.

The key to Tito's regime, and incidentally to its foreign policy is—according to Milovan Djilas' competent analysis—the obsession and obstinacy of the new ruling class to maintain its exclusive power and control. It is therefore essential for Tito to appear as winner on several foreign fronts: in his subtle game with Khrushchev, in his outmaneuvering the Americans, in his fraternization with Sukarno, Nasser, and Nkrumah.

Logic requires him, moreover, to participate in undermining and weakening Western international positions and policies. For it is essential for all Communists to prevent the free world from taking the offensive in the cold war, an offensive which in our age of democracy and the rights of peoples to self-determination, could have catastrophic effects for Communist regimes, among which that in Yugoslavia is in many respects the most vulnerable.

Nobody knows better than Tito and his friendly or unfriendly comrades, that the free world will ultimately decide, by its action or inaction, the cardinal question of our time: whether communism, as we know it today, is destined to be the wave of the future, or to remain in the books of history as an unfortunate accident.

Stalin's death halted any further attempts to experiment with increasing political liberalization of Yugoslavia.

Tito's treatment of Djilas showed Moscow that Tito was determined to maintain the monopoly of Communist power in Yugoslavia, and that it was time to repair one of the greatest of Stalin's blunders.

In May 1955, Nikita Khrushchev arrived at Belgrade to extend a hand of reconciliation to Tito, which of course was accepted. A relieved Tito inaugurated his new policy of close relations with the emerging neutralist nations of Asia and Africa.

Tito's quarrel with Stalin enhanced his reputation among these nations, while Stalin's successors in Russia realized that Tito's respectability among the neutralists' could be turned into an asset in their own offensive to penetrate Asia and Africa.

INCREASING COLLABORATION WITH RUSSIA

One may distinguish three phases in the Moscow-Belgrade relations since May 1955. The first phase, formal reconciliation, reached a climax when a beaming Tito toured the Soviet Union, proclaiming in Stalingrad on June 11, 1956, in time of war as well as in time of peace, Yugoslavia marches shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet people toward the same goal—victory of socialism.

In the fall of 1956, the anti-Soviet near-rebellion in Poland and the full-fledged popular revolution in Hungary, shook the solidity of the Soviet Empire. Anxious to find a scapegoat, Khrushchev pointed an accusing finger at Tito. This second phase—the second Soviet-Yugoslav dispute—never was as violent as the Stalin-Tito feud.

Answers to written questions from floor:

Question. (Edwin D. Berl) Is our State Department unduly sympathetic to supporting Communist nations?

Answer. There is a dilemma: either (like State Department) you consider Tito a Trojan horse who undermines the Soviet system or else (like myself) you consider him an extremely subtle propagandist, eager to maintain monopolistic power at home while trying to Sovietize (in a way different from Russia or China) Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In this sense he is a Trojan horse of Moscow.

Question. (M. P. Evenson) How did Tito defeat and execute the popular leader Mikhailovitch?

Answer. Yugoslavia suffered the basic confrontation of the cold war. Mikhailovitch was first leader against Hitler and represented Western influence. Tito, representing Eastern influence, did not oppose Hitler during Hitler-Stalin pact or until Stalin asked Communists to rise. They collaborated briefly, until it was clear you could not have real collaboration between democracy and communism. Tito's victory was not result of people's will but because Red army, not the Allies, entered Yugoslavia.

The 1963 Anticrime Crusade by Indianapolis Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in Indianapolis a citywide organization of women, the anticrime crusade, is making some of the greatest advances of any private citizens group in the Nation in their fight against juvenile delinquency and related problems. Literally thousands of women take part in the organization, with 3,000 participating in only one of the 14 fields of their activities, serving as court watchers in observing 20,000 cases last year from speeding to rape.

This great civic-minded organization of women has set a pattern in its approach to the problem of school dropouts, with volunteers doing personal counseling which was responsible for the return to school of 157 boys and girls last year. The program is under consideration for recommendation to the 11 million members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

These and other aspects of the work they are doing were summed up by the Indianapolis News in its January 1 issue, with emphasis on the school dropout work.

Mr. President, because this problem is so acute in the entire Nation, and because the Indianapolis women have developed some remarkable methods of attack, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the Indianapolis News article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROPOUTS' RETURN TO SCHOOL A BIG FEAT FOR CRUSADE

(By Margaret Moore)

The return of almost 300 dropouts to Indianapolis schools, combating of crime with adequate street lighting and changes in some court procedures highlighted 1963 achievements of the anticrime crusade.

"We have even more extensive plans to combat crime in 1964," said Mrs. Marshall Lincoln, chairman of the crusade sponsored by the News.

National recognition has come to the Indianapolis women in some of the 14 fields of crime prevention on which they center attention. A backward and forward look is shown in the following summary:

1. Personal counseling by volunteer women prompted the return of 157 dropouts in September. In addition more than 100 other youths returned to classes as a result of personal letters written by the women.

Mrs. C. B. LaDine heads the stay-in-school committee of the crusade which already is working with other dropouts so they can return to school on January 20.

2. In employment, women of the crusade got 32 jobs for returning dropouts in 6 weeks.

3. As a means of keeping children in school (because potential dropouts can be spotted in beginning elementary grades) study tables have been set up in churches, YMCA's and community centers. Volunteer tutors and remedial reading teachers assist with this work.

4. Panels for parents have been set up by the juvenile committee of the crusade, headed by Mrs. Rufus Kuykendall. Many PTA and PTO groups have asked for panel programs during 1964.

5. In legislation the crusade is working with the commission created by the 1963 general assembly to formulate a statewide solution to combat the dropout problem. Dr. Rolla Pruit of the Department of Public Instruction and the commission, has asked for a stay-in-school report from the crusade to send to every school in Indiana.

The crusade's legislative study committee is working with the Indiana Psychology Association on the need of certification and licensing of psychologists.

6. More than 3,000 women court watchers have reported on more than 20,000 cases ranging from speeding and reckless driving to rape and murder. Clubs or individuals wishing to sit in court in 1964 should call Marie Stevens, 6102 Evanston.

7. A crusade affiliate, the Seventh District Federation of Clubs, took national prizes for lighting improvement in a contest sponsored by the General Federation of Clubs, Reader's Digest, and the National Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau. The prize money was used to purchase additional outdoor lighting at two community centers.

8. Weekly discussions on jobs, careers, practical hobbies and good grooming are sponsored by the crusade at the Indiana Girls School. Monthly programs and parties are sponsored at the Indiana Boys School and Girls School by the youth crusade, a teenage unit of the crusade, and the Indianapolis Church Federation.

9. John J. Barton, mayor of Indianapolis, has promised reduction in crime, cooperation with the crusade and integrity in government. Mrs. A. Fred Thomas, chairman of the public officials committee, will continue work with Barton and other public officials.

10. In slum clearance, the crusade, led by Phoebe Jane Huey of the mayor's slum clearance committee, sponsored successful spruce-up projects in three areas of Indianapolis—Harrison Street, Lockfield Gardens, and blocks near School No. 9 and Riley Center.

11. Homemaking projects have been cosponsored by the crusade and the Marion County Department of Welfare.

12. Crusade chairmen have been asked to testify before the House Committee on Education on the successful stay-in-school program.

Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, vice president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, came to Indianapolis to confer about the pattern of getting dropouts back in school for possible use by the entire federation of 11 million women.

William Davies and Albert Nellum, of the U.S. Department of Labor, conferred with the crusade stay-in-school committee and asked leaders to speak to their staffs in Washington and Chicago.

Vincent Riccio, who was a detached worker in New York for 5 years, asked for the crusade's stay-in-school pattern to use in his speeches throughout the Nation to social workers and teachers.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 5 published the story of the crusade's aid to dropouts and methods of keeping dropouts in school without public funds.

Mrs. Neville's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the true facts regarding recent events in Panama have been obscured by conflicting reports. One of my personal friends, Mrs. Craig S. Neville of Los Altos, Calif., was on the scene when the present difficulties started and was an eyewitness.

Mrs. Neville retired from a lifetime of government service in the Canal Zone, her parents went there in 1907 and her granddaughter still lives there as a fourth generation resident.

For the benefit of all Members of the House, I submit herewith, under leave to extend my remarks, a letter from Mrs. Neville dated January 13. It clearly refutes Panamanian claims that Americans desecrated the Panamanian flag.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 13, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: I arrived in the Canal Zone from my home in Los Altos, Calif., on January 3, to be with my mother and to attend memorial services for my youngest brother who died very suddenly.

Inasmuch as I have personal knowledge of some of the events leading up to the deplorable situation prevailing in the Canal Zone, and after listening to news reports on the Armed Forces radio station, statements by local Panamanians, and charges made by United Nations Representative Aquilino Boyd, I want to tell my story.

On Tuesday, January 7, a group of students from Balboa High School, on their own initiative and without the knowledge or consent of any of the school officials, raised an American flag on the standard in front of this U.S. school. All those participating were minors and they had nothing more in mind than demonstration of patriotism for their country. The students conducted themselves at all times in an orderly and admirable manner and there was no incident of any kind until Thursday afternoon, January 9, when, at approximately 4 p.m., a group of 40 students from the Panama National Institute, dressed in uniform, marched into the Canal Zone and requested permission to raise the Panamanian flag alongside the flag of the United States. By this time quite a number of American students had gathered and to avoid any unpleasant situation the Canal Zone police kept the two groups separated, but did invite a representative group of five of the Panamanian students to proceed to the flagpole under their escort and to present their mission to a representative of the U.S. student group. Two Panamanian students carried the flag and two carried a banner. Their mission was made known and politely rejected, they were escorted back to the rest of the group and quietly asked to return to Panama City. Refusing bus transportation, they proceeded up past the administration building at Balboa Heights and through Gorgas Hospital grounds, breaking street lights and overturning garbage cans on the way.

The important point is that the Panamanian flag in the above incident never left the hands of the Panamanian students, and at no time was it touched by a U.S. student or any other American citizen. The Panamanian report was that it was torn, trampled, and spat upon by the U.S. students. And this report was apparently used as an excuse to incite the anger of the Panamanian nations and to touch off the events which followed.

Our first knowledge of the trouble that was brewing came when my 18-year-old granddaughter drove the maid down to the Panamanian boundary line where she could catch a bus. There was no indication of trouble at the boundary, she dropped the maid off, and was proceeding along Fourth of July Avenue toward home when a group of Panamanians threw rocks and a piece of 4 by 4, which was 20 inches long, through the windows of the car. Fortunately, the front window escaped the missiles. A member of the Guardia Nacional was standing close by and he smiled in apparent approval. By the time Linda arrived at the police station in Balboa to report the incident, news of more violence had been received and cars belonging to Americans were being overturned and set on fire.

I was having dinner at the Tivoli Guest House, which overlooks Panama City and from where we witnessed the events that followed. When word was flashed that trouble had started we immediately tried to get into our cars and go home. But we were too late. Fortunately, the Canal Zone police around the Tivoli had been reinforced by this time, for, marching toward us on Tivoli Avenue, and within the Canal Zone border, was a large group of students from the University of Panama. These students are composed chiefly of older men and they were chanting as they marched and throwing rocks at people and cars along the way. The police were able to turn them back, but in the meantime thousands of Panamanians had gathered in the nearby park across the boundary line and they were excitedly shouting and hollering insults at the United States. I worried about how long the police could hold that mob back and prayed that the Army would soon arrive. It was a relief when it did. The infantrymen immediately took over in orderly fashion, they never crossed the border into Panamanian territor, and they were not given orders to return fire until after 3 U.S. soldiers had been killed and 34 wounded.

So it makes me furious to hear this broadcast as an "act of aggression on the part of the United States," and it would seem that it was about time that we were the aggressors.

My parents came to the Canal Zone in 1907 and my granddaughter, Linda Fawcett, is a fourth generation resident here. We therefore have a special interest in this area, and it is our earnest hope that the outcome of negotiations now underway will not sell the Canal Zone down the river.

Will you please pass the word along to those who may be working on the President's committee, or who may be personally interested in the matter?

Sincerely,

MRS. CRAIG S. NEVILLE.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman Addresses the Convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Wheat Growers held their annual convention in Amarillo, Tex., this month. The Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville L. Freeman, addressed the convention delegates on the evening of January 9. His address contained some very interesting information on the subject of wheat legislation, which I believe can be most valuable to Members of Congress in their deliberations on this problem.

The text of his address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS IN AMARILLO, TEX.

Wheat farmers throughout the world face the new year with problems and prospects not foreseen when I spoke to the National Association of Wheat Growers in Denver 1 year ago. In that year wheat producers in this country rejected marketing quotas for the first time for any major national commodity. In 1963, U.S. farmers harvested a good crop of wheat and sold it at prices generally above support levels. The wheat States of the Plains and the Northwest are generally prosperous. Crop prospects for 1964 are favorable.

Russia and Eastern Europe experienced a massive grain crop failure. We estimate that in Russia alone the production of grains was at least 25 percent—or 40 million tons—below 1962 levels. Farmers in Western Europe suffered from unfavorable harvesting conditions, and much of their wheat can be used only for animal feed. Canada and the United States have made subtsantial sales of wheat to Russia and Eastern European nations. As a result of these events, world wheat exports by all countries may reach 2 billion bushels this year—or 25 percent higher than in the previous marketing year.

The whole world has once more had a demonstration of the absolute necessity for carrying adequate stocks of wheat to meet domestic and world emergencies. Yesterday's surpluses again have proved to be today's silk purse.

Important as these events were, they have not solved the world's wheat problems. However, they have made their mark and we must take into consideration what has happened.

Nonetheless, the single most important fact in the world wheat economy remains unchanged. Wheat stocks in the free world continue to be too large. The United States will have in storage more than 1 year's commercial needs even if we export one billion bushels of wheat in the current crop year as we now expect. Canada will carry 1 full year's needs into the 1964 harvest, despite record export sales of over 550 million bushels. The failure of world wheat prices to rise significantly in the face of unprecedented demands in the past 6 months is a sobering reminder of the extent of surplus stocks of wheat in the world.

Stocks, however, are not really the heart of the problem. The world's capacity to produce grains continues to expand at a rate clearly faster than the expansion of commercial grain markets. Surpluses above commercial requirements for most grain may be in prospect for Europe in the near future. Surpluses continue to be the lot of all major grain exporters, barring further crop disasters.

With an intuition born of long experience with low and unstable prices, our wheat farmers have recognized the sobering facts of the long-range wheat situation. Wheat farmers from Texas to Washington voted in an unheralded referendum last September and October. The polling places were in the wheat fields. The ballots were grain drills and tractors. The result was a smashing vote for wheat programs in the future—programs to limit acreage and to support prices and incomes.

Last year, following the "no" vote on the referendum, it was expected that wheat farmers would ignore their acreage allotments when they planted wheat for 1964. Instead, they have so far largely planted within their allotments in order to preserve their wheat acreage allotments on their farms for the future. As a result, prospective winter wheat production this year is below early expectations. If spring wheat producers do not exceed their acreage allotments, and if 1964 exports are large, the 1964 crop could move into the market and allow our surplus wheat stocks to be further reduced. Should that happen we could well be down to about 600 million bushels, the lowest since 1953. This is a level that the Department of Agriculture considers necessary if we are to maintain adequate security and stabilization reserves.

However, a smaller crop than anticipated will not by itself prevent sharply lowered price and income prospects for wheat in 1964. Gross income levels, under foreseeable production levels for 1964, will not vary greatly. This is so because the improvement in price levels with each decline in production is substantially cancelled out because fewer acres mean fewer bushels produced. This means that unless a wheat bill is enacted which will provide a substantial improvement in price, wheat farmer income will drop about $600 million below 1963.

President Johnson is deeply concerned that in the absence of new legislation the wheat grower will suffer a serious loss. Also, a decline of this magnitude will adversely effect the entire economy, particularly in the major wheat-producing areas. There is no better illustration of what higher farm income can mean than to look at how farmers have spent the extra $8 billion in total income they have earned over the past 3 years—$8 billion they would not have had if 1960 income levels had prevailed.

Farmers invested $521 million more in tractors, $900 million more in autos and $310 million more in other farm machinery and equipment during the past 3 years than would have een possible with a 1960 style income. Some $2 billion more was spent on feed, fertilizer, and lime. Farm families, in addition, spent some $1.6 billion more for food, clothing, and household furnishings.

Thus it is clear that farm income is important not just to farmers, but to everyone up and down the line who does business with them. You know it, and I know it.

This administration is committed to improving farm income * * * and to reducing unneeded stocks and lowering the cost of farm programs. In the case of wheat, we believed that if two-thirds of the wheat producers voting in a referendum chose a program of marketing quotas, this would be the most effective way to achieve these goals. However, when the growers voted the program down, it was clear the farmers faced a substantial decline in farm income unless they could arrive at sufficient agreement on a wheat program that would further progress toward these three basic goals.

I am confident that we can develop wheat legislation that will improve the opportunity for increased farm income without a substantial increase in budget expenditures, and, at the same time, will continue the welcome reduction in wheat stocks still at surplus levels.

Two days ago I testified before the wheat subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee and told them what I am telling you now. I said there are several bills now before the Congress which would accomplish this. Bills by Senator MCGOVERN, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator CARLSON, and Senator YOUNG all contain elements which we support. I indicated that we stood ready to assist in drafting legislation which will maintain farm income, cut surpluses and hold down taxpayer costs.

These goals can be achieved by a program which incorporates the two-price certificate system, because that system will be the least costly to the taxpayer. It will maintain at present levels both consumer prices and the price of wheat received by the farmer.

Let me repeat: A voluntary certificate program can (1) insure stable consumer prices, for wheat users will pay approximately the same for wheat this year as they did in 1963; (2) insure that wheat farm income will be substantially higher than the level estimated for 1964 under current law; (3) hold the line on budget costs; and (4) accomplish another substantial reduction in the carryover supplies of wheat—in the neighborhood of 100 million bushels more than would otherwise be the case.

Action on wheat is essential. At a time when bread is still a scarce commodity to millions of people in this world, the American consumer has so abundant a supply that bread is scarcely given a passing thought. The achievement of the American family farm in providing a wealth of food and fiber is little short of magic. Yet, it is poorly appreciated and even more poorly rewarded. Instead, attention is more often focused on the cost of farm programs, and the disparity between farm and nonfarm returns for comparable effort is largely forgotten. Yet farm income per capita is less than 60 percent of the income of the nonfarm earner. Surpluses receive far more attention than the surprisingly low real cost of food in this country—about 19 percent of the average family budget. Yet no other nation has ever eaten so well for so small a part of the disposable income of its people as the United States.

Today, with less than 8 percent of our population engaged in farming, most Americans fail to recognize that farm commodity programs are as essential to their continued good fortune as they are to the family farmer. The consumer tends to forget that the family farmer deserves much of the credit for the high abundance of low-cost food we enjoy. Without the family farm system of agriculture, there would be no assurance of abundance; and without commodity programs, there is no assurance that the family farm system would survive.

The Communist countries—where scarcity rather than abundance is the problem—envy the productive ability of our agriculture. Yet they refuse to admit that the productivity which flows from the incentives and the flexibility and adaptability of free enterprise family farming will never be achieved under their system. And, as yet, no other system has been designed that can match the productive capabilities of our family farms.

Thus, so long as overproduction and low prices are the silent companions of abundance, commodity programs will be essential to the family farm system of agriculture. So long as agriculture is subject to the volatile effects of a massive scientific and technological revolution; so long as productivity per farm worker grows 6 percent and more each year; so long as we continue to produce more each year from

less land with fewer people, commodity programs will be necessary. They are not welfare programs, but essential tools of adjustment for the well-being of the family farmer as well as every single American citizen.

Let me repeat once again: this administration, as it has from the beginning 3 years ago, will support commodity programs directed toward the basic goals of reducing surplus stocks, holding down Government costs and strengthening farm income.

However, the support of the administration is not enough, nor is the availability of sound legislation enough to insure the enactment of a wheat program.

Wheat legislation is the toughest kind of legislation to pass; and a wheat program is no good to anyone unless it can be passed. Massive, united and effective support by the wheatgrower and those who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the wheatgrower and his family is necessary if wheat legislation is to be enacted for 1964.

Recently, all farm groups but one met at the invitation of the National Grange. There was broad, united agreement at this meeting for a voluntary program for wheat. I urge that this encouraging spirit of unity be carried forward vigorously now to the Congress to inspire the quick action which will mean better farm income.

Enactment of new wheat legislation will provide the base on which we can go forward to build a strong expanding wheat economy. Legislation, however, will not create markets, nor will it enable us to compete more actively for the commercial markets of the world. These things we must do ourselves.

This administration is determined to find new markets for wheat, and we will use every resource at our command—including trade and aid—to sell wheat. Last week the largest single commercial sale of wheat in U.S. history was made by Continental Grain Co. to the Soviet Union. It totaled 1 million metric tons of wheat; it brought us clear almost $65 million at world prices; and the Russians paid cash. I predict it is only the first of several sales we will make to the Soviet Union.

We paid an export subsidy on the total 37 million bushels of about $25 million—which is neither more nor less than we would have paid if any other nation had purchased the same quantity of wheat. We saved annual storage charges of $5 million—and some of that wheat would otherwise have remained in storage 6 to 8 years or longer. We have strengthened appreciably the Nation's critical balance-of-payments position, and countless additional jobs will be created as the wheat moves from the elevators on its journey to Russian seaports.

Strangely, we have heard some people say they would kill this sale if they had the power. Last December we saw a determined effort in the Congress to tie the hand of the President in any such negotiations with the Russians. You have seen these things as well as I have; and I ask you, Do you produce wheat in order to sit on it, or do you produce wheat in order to sell it?

Perhaps there are some who think we can sit on wheat and hatch prosperity, but I am not one of them. Prosperity comes with hard work and a determined effort to seek and find people who want to buy what we have to sell.

Competition for commercial markets of the world is getting tougher every day. Our trading partners have made it clear by action and by word that they intend to sell in world markets and that they will make new terms when necessary in order to sell wheat.

We have made it equally clear that the United States will not take second place in the grain markets of the world. If we are to get our share of the world commercial grain markets we must offer our grain of all kinds and qualities and at all our ports at prices competitive with those of other major grain exporters. This we can do, and we not only intend to maintain the current level of wheat exports but also we expect to increase that share in the years ahead.

One key element in the world commercial grain markets may have changed for the worse during the year. I refer to the question of access for efficient producers to the European grain markets. The United States is presently engaged in negotiations with the major grain importers and exporters of the world in the GATT cereals group. So far in these talks the European Economic Community has shown little disposition to negotiate. Instead, just prior to the November meeting of the GATT cereals group, the EEC Commission published proposals for arriving at a common grain price and for negotiating on agricultural matters at the Kennedy round which would jeopardize traditional markets of the United States and other grain exporters. The EEC has, in fact, shown a strong protectionist flavor at every point in our negotiations during the past year from chickens to grains. In this situation the United States has had and continues to have no choice but to insist that the traditional access to these markets by third country suppliers be maintained.

Of course, this is not a one way street. The United States is prepared to grant other countries which export to us the same rights we ask of the Common Market at this time. We are, for example, undertaking negotiations to assure those countries which export beef to the United States of a fair share of the growing U.S. beef market. We would base this fair share on the traditional exports of these countries. Similar arrangements, in all fairness, ought to be extended by the grain importing countries that make up the Common Market in the current GATT negotiations.

We are taking this strong position not only because we believe it is only fair to our economic interests and other third country suppliers; but also because we believe that to do otherwise would constitute a retreat back to the era of rivalry and scarcity. It would force a return to the inward-look protectionism which contributed to a worldwide depression and culminated in the horror of war itself as petty nationalism dominated the world. We believe that in liberal trade policies we can find the key to cooperation and abundance which will lift all people of the world to a higher level of prosperity and peace.

If we can learn to share and expand commercial markets for grain and livestock producers, then there also will be hope that, in time, we also can help the developing nations to become strong commercial trading partners in world markets.

It is in these developing areas, where people yearn to escape from the bonds of scarcity, that the great future markets for the American farmer will be found. But before these people can buy what they need from us, we will have to help them achieve a level of economic development high enough to create the demand we can find nowhere else.

Back home in Minnesota, our family always believed that if a hungry person came to the door we should feed him, and then find a job for him. He then could buy the food for himself and contribute more fully to the whole community. What we seek to do in the world is simply an extension of that philosophy.

The American wheatgrower recognized a decade ago that we must use our abundance as an instrument to first set the people of the world free of the bondage of hunger and then of the bondage of poverty. Through the market development program of the Wheat Associates, working through the food-for-peace program, millions of people have escaped starvation. In recent years, we have begun to use food as capital to build schools, roads, irrigation projects, and other public facilities; to open new lands and assist land reform, all necessary for economic growth. In South America I have seen the school-lunch projects sponsored by Wheat Associates where children go to school in order to eat and leave with the priceless gift of education. There is a school in Pakistan that, in many ways, is my proudest achievement as Secretary of Agriculture. In July of 1961 I promised a village leader there that we would supply the wheat for wages in order to build a school in that humble village. Wheat Associates helped me keep my word by arranging for the wheat to be delivered. Today the new school building is the only structure in town with running water.

These are but a few of the many examples of how we have begun the real task of putting our food abundance to work. What we have done falls far short of the need, for the disparity of income standards between the developed and the developing nations is widening today rather than closing. A recent estimate of the increase in value of product per individual placed the growth in the developing nations at an annual rate of $3.40 while in the developed nations it is increasing by $38.60, or 10 times as fast.

Our generation must do more, not less. We must use our abundance more fully and more generously. Thus far, we have locked ourselves into the perpetual dilemma of overproduction and low prices, and we have failed to recognize that overproduction, or abundance, can itself be the means by which we can escape our present confinement. The use of food abundance to accomplish economic development in dozens of needy nations not only can be our salvation, but also the salvation of other nations which face overproduction in agriculture.

Thus, if the relatively prosperous nations can reach beyond the short-range goals many seem to seek through protectionism and trade rivalry to the greater goal of expanding opportunity for all people, we could in the process substantially expand the volume of trade. It would be a level far above anything possible when trade is largely confined to the more fortunate nations.

In this regard, agriculture is increasingly pointing the way. I predict that the time is not too distant when all the developed nations of the world will be participating extensively in an international food-for-peace program. Food will be a key instrument as rapid economic progress takes place in nations which today are still chained to poverty. And, when this has been accomplished, wheatgrowers will be richly deserving of the accolade "They were the pioneers who led the way to a new frontier of using abundance to make abundance possible for all mankind."

To do this will require combined programs of trade and aid. It will require the firm support of all people, farmers and nonfarmers alike. But it can be done. Already we have seen, through the food-for-peace program, that food aid can result in substantial market gains. Japan, a former beneficiary of food for peace, is now the largest single commercial purchaser of American food products. Other countries, like Spain, Israel, Greece, and Formosa, are becoming cash customers. Already we can look with pride to more and more programs all over the world using food as capital.

A very discerning observer wrote not too long ago that "such efforts, pursued on the basis of equal contributions, could raise the Atlantic states above the present risk of deadlock—over agriculture, over balance of payments, over international lending; could revive confidence in the [underdeveloped] nations and could begin to provide some philosophical aim and justification for the flood of Atlantic wealth which so far surpasses society's ability to use it well."

This is the true challenge of our generation. We can pursue the elusive balance between what we produce and what we can consume and hope to provide a modest income level for the family farm. Or we can

transform the vast unmet needs of the world into a massive commercial demand for our food abundance.

I, for one, choose the latter; for it is the true road to world peace.

Sellout in Panama?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials from the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier continue to point out the dire threat to the U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

I particularly commend these editorials to the attention of the Congress as it mentions the prominent role played by our distinguished, courageous, and able colleague, DAN FLOOD, who blocked singlehanded a further sellout of U.S. interests.

PHASEOUT IN PANAMA

A press dispatch reporting agreement by U.S. officials to revision of the Panama Canal Treaty suggests that fears of a State Department sellout are not unfounded. Discussions with Panama are in order, but treaty revision would indicate restriction of U.S. rights in the Canal Zone.

Additional material pointing to betrayal of U.S. interests comes in the form of a dispatch from columnists Robert Allen and Paul Scott, published elsewhere on this page. It tells of a State Department plan to recall Gen. Andrew O'Meara, commander of U.S. forces in the Canal Zone, as a concession to the Panamanians. Messrs. Allen and Scott say that this act of appeasement was blocked by U.S. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who threatened a major upheaval in Congress.

The record of the U.S. State Department shows that it will bend before the slightest foreign pressure and yield American interests whenever they are challenged.

What the State Department may have in mind is suggested in a newspaper column by Walter Lippmann, whose thinking is close to that of officialdom.

Instead of arguing for outright internationalization of the Panama Canal, Mr. Lippmann says that one solution would be to negotiate for joint United States-Panamanian management of the canal.

This is the old phasing-out gambit, beloved by the State Department. U.S. public opinion, the State Department recognizes, wouldn't stand for overnight withdrawal from the canal, but might not catch on to the meaning of a gradual withdrawal until it was too late. Bit by bit, U.S. control and occupation of the Panama Canal Zone would be lessened until a few years hence the U.S. presence and direction would come to a complete end.

This kind of carefully timed sellout is a outrageous as immediate evacuation. What's needed, in our judgment, is a joint congressional resolution that would spell out the will of the national legislative that the United States retain full control of the Panama Canal in perpetuity as the treaty specifies. That would block the appeasers.

RED TRADEMARK

The Communist pattern emerged clearly in the disturbance at Panama. A fight among students over a flag—something that could happen almost anywhere in the world without making a headline—quickly blossomed into a shooting affair.

Automobiles and buildings were burned. Quarters of the U.S. Information Agency, a favorite target of demonstrators overseas, were destroyed.

These are the tactics of trained, organized Communist agents. Student riots are only sparks that set devastating fires in strategic spots on earth.

PLAN FOR PANAMA

One way to appease Panamanians is to take over the whole country, fly only the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone, double the pay of every Panamanian and let Americans do all the work.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 300 years ago Ukraine was made a part of the Russian empire.

In spite of the courageous opposition of the Ukrainian people, it is still today a part of the Russian empire under the Communist regime. During these many years the Russians have tried to eradicate Ukrainian nationalism and the ideals of freedom and liberty. And all this time the Ukrainians have bravely fought off Russia's attempts to liquidate them as an independent people.

The Ukraine's struggle against Russian domination has few parallels in history. For only a brief moment the people of Ukraine have had some freedom and liberty. In 1918 the abdication of the Czar Nicholas II enabled Ukraine to realize its dream of independence. On January 22 the Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed with joy and pride throughout the land.

However, the new Russian Government had no intention of giving up the rich resources of Ukraine. Communist Russia turned on the young republic and after 2 years of savage struggle succeeded in crushing the people's resistance. Thus came to an end Ukraine's brief experiment with independence. From this time on, more than 42 million Ukrainians have been held captive under the Russian Communist system. The spirit of the people of Ukraine, however, remains steadfast and strong and will not be extinguished until freedom is restored to their land.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 46th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. It provides us with an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom and liberty. The day is a poignant reminder to us that the struggle for these revered principles is a continuing one which requires strength and perseverence among the freedom-loving people of the world.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Seven-Day Hospital Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which just recently has come to my attention and which appeared in the Medical Times for November 1962. The importance of the subject matter, however, impels me to bring it to the attention of the House.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am pleased to see that the Veterans' Administration is seriously studying the problem of caring for our ailing veterans on Saturdays and Sundays as well as on weekdays.

I have not pursued every detail mentioned in the article but believe that all of the points are worthy of consideration and analyzation.

The author of the article, Dr. Earl C. Gluckman, is deputy, professional services, in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration headquarters here in Washington and was formerly Director of the veterans hospital at Coral Gables, Fla., where he supervised the development of a 7-day hospital operation.

AN APPROACH TO 7-DAY HOSPITAL OPERATION

(By Earl C. Gluckman, M.D.)

The story of what has happended to hospitals all over the country is by this time a fairly familiar one—the waiting lists for admission, the tight scheduling of operating rooms, the growing expense, the increasing scarcity of beds. Fundraising campaigns for the construction of new hospitals to meet the needs of an increasing population are a familiar tale. The needs of patients, an aging population, the newer skills and treatments, the increasing reliance of the medical profession on types of treatment and kinds of care available only in hospitals, have created a demand that current hospital beds are insufficient to meet.

Greater need for hospital beds would be inevitable even if population statistics remained static. The combination of greater demand and greater population has intensified the problem. Availability of hospital beds is today an important community need.

The question arises—if it is not possible to construct hospitals to meet the demand, perhaps a way can be found to use the hospital beds we do have on a more intensive basis. If a bed can be used by four patients instead of three in a given period of time we have increased bed capacity by 33 percent without adding a wing or putting up a new structure.

To a hospital with a long waiting list, any idle or watching time for patients means a waste of a valuable facility. A patient who is admitted late in the week and who spends the weekend just waiting until Monday for necessary laboratory tests to be performed is wasting a hospital bed unwittingly. A patient whose surgery must be postponed because the X-ray technician is unavailable on Saturday has reason to feel that psychologically and economically he has been penalized. The delays mount up until some patients never get into the hospital at all.

Here the glaring difference between hotel and hospital operation is almost embarrassing to the hospital administrator. A hotel patron paying sizable sums for his accommodations expects that all facilities will be available to him over the weekend; yet in a hospital, where in theory at least the need for service is more acute, it is normal for a skeleton staff to be on duty over the weekend. The patient frequently is marking time.

This is part of the rationale behind our approach to the 7-day hospital operation. If patients can be treated more rapidly, if planning for their discharge is begun when they are admitted, if all of the procedures involved in their care are studied to establish the most effective and efficient manner of providing necessary services, "peak and valley" workloads can be smoothed out, more patients can be treated in a given period of time. This can be done more efficiently, more economically, and in a manner which is more considerate of the patient's welfare.

Even more fundamentally, we may recognize that providing speedier care can mean providing better care. The patient who recovers more quickly can return more rapidly to home, family, and gainful employment.

It is perhaps not possible in any hospital to set up a program for complete 7-day operation at one swoop, but if one step is taken at a time and each problem is handled in order, the change may gradually take place and the overall costs will not be out of line. More important, the cost per patient treated will probably be lower.

Each problem must be handled as it comes up, but with some planning for the stage ahead. Everything does not need to be done at once. Not every part of every hospital must operate on a 7-day basis. Not every part of a hospital needs to operate around the clock even though some areas of necessity must always do so. And certainly not all 7-day operations are required at once. One program which has already proven its value was developed in five phases.

PHASE 1

Discharge planning: The first problem seems to be to free beds in order to relieve admission pressure and shorten the waiting list. A stepped-up program for discharge can include planning ahead of time for discharge by providing personnel to handle discharges over the weekend. A team approach on the part of all services causes nurses, doctors, social workers—every one from the laboratory technician to the dietitian to the maintenance staff—to be imbued with the same spirit. It is at this beginning point that the individual physician staff member is of utmost importance. It is he who establishes the hospital workload by the orders he writes, and it is he who develops in staff the sense of urgency which he in his professional capacity must feel for the welfare of his patients.

Equipment: Speedier care must also be planned for through automation in the operating rooms, recovery rooms, etc., the use of electronic monitoring whenever possible, enlargement of areas where extra loads develop, installation of piped oxygen and suction, improvement of trash removal, quick distribution of material from central sterile supply area to the wards.

Early in this phase the eye of management on problem areas can make a tremendous difference in the length of time needed for patient hospital stay without the addition of a single hospital staff member.

Medical service: It cannot be overemphasized that during the first phase of 7-day operation the physicians play a crucial role, since theirs is a profession which recognizes the need for service 24 hours a day 7 days a week. Patients are seen on Saturdays and Sundays as they would be on any other day of the week. Complete histories and physicals are done and all orders are written and carried out throughout the day and throughout the week.

The technical staff finds its workload, therefore, spread out. Certain mornings are no longer crowded and certain afternoons are no longer idle. The evening and weekend staffs now operate more efficiently because they have more to do than just cover for emergencies.

Surgical service: This operates in the same way as the medical service, but here we have another opportunity to reap the benefit of better scheduling. The operating room, which is actually the flywheel of the entire surgical service, is utilized more efficiently when operations are scheduled throughout the week.

PHASE 2

As the changes in scheduling take place, certain bottlenecks begin to appear. The physicians through their orders generate the workload for all other personnel and services.

When physicians' services are scheduled to cover a longer day and a 7-day week their orders can at first be taken care of by the rescheduling of other personnel. However, backup of cases will develop in a relatively short period of time as the tempo of the operation increases. Demands for more help will quickly be forthcoming, particularly from laboratory, X-ray, and nursing services. Some of these demands may be met by better scheduling, but others require reassignment of personnel, and in other cases the engaging of additional staff.

It is obviously impossible to run enough laboratory tests in a 5-day week or perform a sufficient number of X-ray procedures in a 5-day week to keep the steady flow of patients through the hospital when physicians are admitting, discharging, and treating patients on a 7-day basis. This holds true even if the workday is extended beyond the 8-hour day but not through the 7 days of the week. Backlogs develop very quickly and with the buildup of backlogs comes a marked decline in efficiency and further backlog.

Therefore, routine coverage—not emergency coverage of laboratory and X-ray—must be arranged for the weekends. At first it is not necessary to handle some of the more complicated programs over the weekend, but eventually as the program develops into a fullfledged 7-day operation it should be possible to carry out any test and procedure on any day.

In this phase additional employees are needed, but the increase is not as great as the increased operating time since the workload is spaced out over a longer week. The periods of peakload and extreme tension are

lessened and the group who cover on the weekends find themselves with enough to do rather than in a caretaking operation.

PHASE 3

Supplies: As the rescheduled staff and the increased staff go into high gear discharges are stepped up, more patients can be admitted and patient turnover is of course increased. Handling more patients of necessity means additional supplies—supplies required for the greater number of tests performed, X-ray film for the larger number of X-rays done, central service material for the larger number of patients, etc. It is in phase 3, therefore, that the greatest increase in supplies becomes necessary.

Procedure: Room assignments are arranged so that patients can be grouped for special care since it is not always possible to have the so-called intensive therapy units. With pharmaceutical distribution scheduled ahead of time and special tests arranged in advance, the routine is not slowed down.

Supplementation of nursing and medical coverage may be necessary in phase 3. While doctors and nurses are accustomed to providing service on a 7-day basis, it cannot be expected that they will work a regular 7-day week. Additional support becomes necessary.

PHASE 4

Clerical services: When patients start moving through the hospital faster the paperwork, of course, begins to mount up and a new bottleneck appears. The inauguration of phase 4 is at hand. As discharges increase in number additional personnel are required for preparing and filing records, professional and otherwise, handling discharges over weekends, etc.

Engineering department: When the hospital operates on a full-week basis, maintenance personnel cannot be specially called in for weekend emergencies. It is necessary to have housekeeping and engineering staff available, ready to deal with maintenance of plant and equipment, carrying on their regular weekly duties on the weekend as well. When the hospital gets more use (7 days rather than 5), breakdowns occur more frequently and they can occur at any time during the week. It is important that a breakdown not cause any greater disruption of service on a Saturday or Sunday than at any other time. Preventive maintenance must be carried on around the week.

It is not necessary to increase personnel greatly or to budget for tremendously increased costs. By scheduling the workweek for staggered 5-day periods, the expense of time-and-a-half and double-time expenditures is eliminated. Furthermore, since supervision must also be scheduled throughout the 7-day basis, supervision on the weekends now improves and with it efficiency also improves.

Supporting services: Social service, dealing with increased admissions and discharges, has to plan for more problems, more trial visits, more day care, more supervision, more of every service. Since discharge planning and arrangements for discharges must be more efficiently handled in the 7-day hospital in order to provide a smoother outflow as well as inflow of patients, social service must carry on a 7-day operation as well.

But this time, the registrar's office is undoubtedly pressing for more help. The registrar is deluged with increased paperwork that has resulted from the activities of other hospital personnel—more records, more transcriptions, more filing, more statistics, more final summaries, more medical records, etc. Ward secretaries for weekend coverage, more medical record librarian help and clerical help in that office and the correlation of the medical record librarian's role with that of the registrar fit very well into the program during this phase. Good cooperation here can be of great help in improving both the flow of ordinary paper and medical records.

PHASE 5

In our experience, the last programs to be phased into the 7-day hospital operation are: (1) dentistry; (2) outpatient clinics; (3) physical medicine and rehabilitation. It is perfectly possible that all of them can be geared to the full-week program, but some hospitals find it unnecessary to do this.

The offices of the supply, fiscal, and personnel divisions may need further help over the weekend, although it is quite possible that they may not be called upon at all to staff on a 7-day basis. Good management practices may permit them to arrange their workloads to provide for services.

CASE STUDY

This plan of approach to 7-day hospital operation is not merely a vue d'esprit or think piece on my part. It has actually been developed in practice at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Coral Gables, Fla.

In 1959 this hospital was faced to an extreme degree with the problems of population, pressure, and great need. Its 450 beds were filled to 100-percent capacity at all times. It had a waiting list of 600 to 800 people, fully eligible for hospitalization, for whom there was no room. There were probably other eligibles who did not apply because they knew their chances of admission were not good.

Phase 1 of the plan outlined above was put into effect in late 1959 and early 1960. The equipment changes, discharge planning, and rescheduling produced almost immediate results—without the addition of a single staff member. Scheduling practices proved particularly important.

The medical service took the lead by rescheduling the hours of its physicians to a somewhat longer day and longer week; that is, the service covered more hours per day, more heavily, and more days per week. This does not mean that personnel were overworked. Both the medical service and the nursing service had always operated on a 7-day schedule.

The surgical service, like the medical service, also found weekend and night or evening duty nothing unusual, but also started a broader scheduling program.

However, as through their orders the doctors generated increased workload in other services, pressures mounted, particularly in laboratories. The hours of technicians in X-ray and laboratory were rescheduled so that workload was spaced out and peaks and valleys were therefore smoothed out in part.

Phase 2: Early in 1961, additional staff, particularly in X-ray and laboratory, and in nursing service in part, made it possible to use all facilities every day.

During this period turnover rates had improved from 101.3 percent in medicine and surgery to 125 percent; average length of patients' stay had been reduced proportionately.

Phase 3 began in mid-1961. At this point any breakdown in plant or equipment proved a severe problem. The increased utilization of the buildings meant that preventive maintenance was even more important. Housekeeping services and engineering services required constant attention.

Phase 4 was introduced in January 1962. By this time the increased patient load, the increased admission and discharge rates, had produced too large a backlog in the registrar's work and it was necessary to improve staffing.

Phase 5 has not yet been introduced.

SIGNIFICANCE OF PROGRAM

The most significant factor in the 7-day hospital operation was pointed out by Dr. William S. Middleton, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, in June 1960 when he visited the Coral Gables Hospital and saw the programs then developing. He pointed out that the hospital, by moving in the direction of 7-day operation and giving patient care on a round-the-week basis, had actually provided a higher quality of care at the same time.

The patient, treated more quickly, could return to home and employment more rapidly. The patient scheduled for prompt treatment and prompt surgery was at a psychological advantage.

The second great asset of the program was its immediate utility and its economy. During 1961, the Coral Gables Hospital by a 3-percent increase in per diem cost, effected a 15-percent increase in the number of discharges.

PROS AND CONS

There are obvious advantages to be realized from this type of operation—(1) professional; (2) economic; (3) service; (4) personnel.

However, some possible disadvantages and cautions need to be stressed, also.

1. An occasional patient may feel that he is being rushed or processed through the hospital. This can be avoided through stressing good doctor-patient relationship.

2. Employees need to have it carefully explained that a 7-day hospital week does not mean a 7-day working week for individual employees.

3. Plant and maintenance constitute another difficulty. Since breakdowns in this type of operation are an impossible luxury, preventive maintenance and proper round-the-week staffing become the more important.

4. Management problems in handling a 7-day hospital are greater. Some of the considerations are:

(a) Deciding which services have to be maintained all week.

(b) Budgeting for increased operation on a regular basis.

(c) Coordination of services.

(d) Planning.

(e) Personnel.

Perhaps the most significant problem is that of the cultural environment. The habit of our society, governed by school, office, and community schedules, is Monday through Friday routine and a separate and different Saturday-Sunday routine. A straight line operation for 7 days on an equal basis did not develop in our operation and probably is unlikely.

Good supervision is a must, and the supervisor must make sure not only that patients and personnel do not feel unduly rushed and exploited, but also that the willing heart is not worked to death.

Since the problems have been mentioned it might be worth paying some attention to things that were not problems, although many thought they would be so:

1. There was never any problem in the professional services. The physicians and the nurses supported the program immediately, wholeheartedly, and made every effort to make it effective.

2. Recruitment of personnel proved to be no problem at all. Recruitment may even have improved. We found people who desired Saturday and Sunday work and liked to be free on weekdays.

3. Quality of care was never endangered; in fact, quality was improved. Doing it once, and doing it right, and doing it quickly became a maxim in the hospital, and everybody became imbued with the spirit.

SUMMARY

A gradual transition from 5-day to 7-day hospital operation is outlined and its application in a single hospital is used as an illustration for the changeover. Although the 7-day hospital is not in uniform operation throughout the week, it is as a result of these efforts far nearer a reality.

Pan-Macedonian Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me, written by the national president of the Pan-Macedonian Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAN-MACEDONIAN ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 30, 1963.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
Senator from Indiana,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: The attention of my associates in the National Council of the Pan-Macedonian Association and my own was caught by the memorandum of the Macedonian Patriotic Organization introduced by you in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 30, 1963.

Once again this group, which claims to speak on behalf of the purported "Macedonian nation" and asserts to represent such a "nation," professes the intention to seek the assistance and support of the United Nations.

We feel that a brief historical review would help to set the record straight in this respect. Macedonia never existed as an independent state and never was the cradle of a separate ethnic entity. More than 2,000 years ago, Macedonia was one of the many city-states, like Athens, Sparta, Thebes, etc., which, together, occupied a geographical area covering the one occupied today by modern Greece.

As a matter of fact, it is under the strong and enlightened leadership of Philip of Macedon and his son, Alexander the Great, that the Greek city-states united and launched the great venture that spread hellenic culture all over the then known world. The common medium of this culture was the Greek language, its substance was formed by the teachings of the Greek philosophers and scientists, its beauty derived from the high standards of the classical Greek age. This expansion of Greek culture gave birth to the Hellenistic era.

Subsequently, Macedonia shared the fate of other Greek provinces. First, the Roman conquest, then the Greek revival in the Eastern Byzantine Empire, of which one of the strongest and most illustrious dynasties was the Macedonian, and, finally, the subjugation to the Turks.

In the latest part of the long Turkish rule, a strong alien influence became evident in the Balkans. It was the Russian panslavistic expansionism, particularly in the form of a drive for an exit to the Aegian Sea. This drive led to the adoption of many subterfuges, among which the myth of the existence of a Macedonian nation played a significant role.

This same weapon has been refurbished for the Communist arsenal and has repeatedly been used against our Greek allies in the past two decades.

Those who, in this country, appear as representatives of a Macedonian nation, lend themselves as tools to Communist propaganda and tactics.

In view of the above we felt that our point shoud be made to you and, if possible, conveyed through you to the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who may have been misled by the allegations of the Macedonian Patriotic Organizations.

Sincerely,

VASSILIOS T. DANIELS,
National President.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukrainians is the story of a large group of gifted, industrious, and brave people who have not been allowed to enjoy the fruits of their labor during most of modern times. Through some unfortunate turn of history, these 40-odd million Ukrainians have not been masters of their fate, and for about 300 years, except for a brief period of 2 years, they have not known national political independence. In their historic homeland they have lived under alien despots and endured all sorts of hardships, privation, and misery, and yet they have retained their spirit of freedom. And freedom was at last attained at the end of the First World War. When Russia's czarist autocracy was overthrown by the Russian revolution, Ukrainians felt free, seized upon the opportunity and proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918.

That event, the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic, symbolizes the realization of a dream centuries old, and justly has become a landmark of great significance in Ukrainian history. Unfortunately the newborn and very weak state was under severe handicaps at its birth. The war-torn country was literally ravaged and the fertile Ukraine was a wasteland. Most of its inhabitants were uprooted from their homes, and the normal course of life was badly disrupted. These were grave problems for a new government to face, but even more serious was the Communist Russian threat to the independence of the country. Before the Ukraine Government had the chance to bring some order out of the existing chaos, it was attacked by the Red army, the country was overrun early in 1920, and independent Ukraine ceased to exist. Then the country was merged with the Soviet Union as one of its constituent republics.

Ukrainians have suffered more under the Soviet tyranny than under the autocratic czars. Today their fair land is practically sealed off from the free world, and there they live something like the people on the dark side of the moon. It is almost impossible to know their actual conditions, and just as difficult to understand their genuine feelings under such circumstances. Of one thing we are sure; we are positively certain that they have not given up their hope for freedom and independence. On the 46th anniversary celebration of their independence day we pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

William R. Sinkin Lends Leadership Genius to San Antonio HemisFair Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Wililam R. Sinkin of San Antonio is a highly regarded, highly honored businessman of San Antonio who is giving much of his energy, his ability, and his exceptional intelligence to the development of a HemisFair at San Antonio as a showplace for all of the Americas.

Bill Sinkin is my friend. I have worked with him on political and governmental matters for more than a decade. I think that San Antonio is fortunate that he is putting in so many of the best years of his life on this fine HemisFair.

Much will be heard about this HemisFair in San Antonio, in Texas, in Washington, and in the Nation, in the years to come. In the January 18, 1964, issue of the San Antonio Express, James McCrory wrote a fine vignette, a word portrait of Bill Sinkin.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, captioned "Sinkin Devotes Enthusiasm, Energy To Boosting HemisFair" be printed at this point in the Appendix:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINKIN DEVOTES ENTHUSIASM, ENERGY TO BOOSTING HEMISFAIR

(By James McCrory)

For the man who once faced up to the redoubtable task of selling Adlai Stevenson's presidential aspirations in a rockribbed Republican precinct, the job of selling the HemisFair isn't too formidable a task.

Certainly the odds in favor of San Antonio holding a HemisFair in 1968 are much more prepossessing than were William R. Sinkin's chances of convincing voters of Alamo Heights' Precinct 97 that Stevenson was the man for President in 1956.

Sinkin is president of San Antonio Fairs, Inc., the most expansive project ever entered into by the San Antonio business community. While San Antonio Fairs, Inc., is a private corporation, the success or failure of the HemisFair is predicated on passage of a $30 million public bond issue January 28, and the obtaining of a site under urban renewal.

At age 50, Sinkin brings to the HemisFair project the same energy and enthusiasm which made him a leader in local liberal Democratic circles, and a success in the wholesale and retail clothing business found by his father, Nathan Sinkin, in 1913.

The international scope of the proposed HemisFair and the variety of the entities in-

terested in promoting it for the economic benefit to the city has broadened Sinkin's views to encompass all points on the political spectrum.

Adorning a wall in his office at 300 East Market Street is a picture of U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, with a personal message from the Senator wishing Sinkin and San Antonio success in the fair. The occasion was the Senator's last visit to San Antonio late last year when Sinkin made him an honorary ambassador to the fair.

GOLDWATER thus joins such distinguished personages on Sinkin's office walls as Democrats Lyndon B. Johnson, Lady Bird Johnson, Maury Maverick, Sr. and Jr., Ralph Yarborough, the late President John F. Kennedy, and U.S. Representative Henry B. Gonzalez. Just outside his office in the entranceway is a picture of one of Sinkin's all-time favorites, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"I'm a little older now," Sinkin said in explaining his position. "My receiving apparatus works a little closer. I listen to other people's position and realize there are great areas of agreement if we seek them out. It does not mean a compromise of position or that I'm becoming a Pollyanna. It means I practice what every liberal really believes—that is, there is room for everyone except those who would destroy.

Sinkin reports in the 2 years since GONZALEZ asked him to organize the committee of businessmen for the fair he has made as many as five talks a week to various civic organizations. He estimates he's made over 150 speeches on HemisFair to over 15,000 people, and has spent more than 60 percent of his time on it.

Sinkin says of the HemisFair:

"It was the right idea at the right time for our community. We realized the military alone would not save our future economy, and that tourism, the third largest industry in the United States, was a part of our economic future. And we knew we had a dynamic Congressman to generate interest in national levels.

"It has been an exciting experience because all shades of difference have been left at the door. It's cut across political and ideological lines and brought the leadership of San Antonio together united in an effort and spirit of cooperation that has never been evidenced before."

He predicts the bond issue will carry by a substantial margin, and said, "If we don't have a successful bond issue we don't have a HemisFair." He reiterated the immediate effect would be 10,000 new jobs for 4 years, and a $176 million return in new retail sales. Sinkin serves as president without pay.

A native born San Antonian, Sinkin has one brother, Sam Sinkin, and a sister, Mrs. Joe D. Eisenberg, both of San Antonio.

He attended the old Main Avenue High School, San Antonio Junior College, and the University of Texas, where he received his degree in business administration in 1934.

After graduation he went to work as a salesman for his father in west Texas. After his father's death in 1942 he moved into the office, and is now president of a chain of stores. In 1947 he went to Mexico City to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization meeting as a representative of the American Ort, an organization dedicated to training refugees for work. Out of that grew his interest in a training center in connection with the fair.

In 1947 he was one of five businessmen who underwrote Goodwill Industries, was chairman of the fundraising drive which raised $12,000 to get it going, and served as the industries' first president.

He married Miss Fay Bloom of New York in 1942, and they have two sons, Lanny, a freshman at Harvard, and Dick, a junior at the University of Michigan. They also have a granddaughter, Patricia Jean, Mr. and Mrs. Dick Sinkin's daughter.

Between managing stores in San Antonio and Beeville and raising funds for the Democratic Party, Sinkin has been hard pressed in devoting all the time he has to the HemisFair. His political and business activities have had to take a sabbatical while he steamed ahead on HemisFair.

To those businessmen and residents whose offices and homes would be destroyed by the HemisFair in what has been called Urban Renewal Area No. 3, Sinkin can point to the fact that his office and warehouse at 300 East Market Street and that of his brother, Sam, at 333 East Market Street, are within the boundaries of the proposed fair and also will have to be sacrificed to progress.

Dispelling the Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a lead editorial from the Washington Evening Star and a column by David Lawrence, both from the issue of January 22, 1964.

These are meditations growing out of President Johnson's budget message.

The editorial points out that much of the message is based on hope—not to mention faith and charity.

The column calls attention to the meaninglessness of the gross national product in history.

In the same issue Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, calls for a $2 billion cut in the President's budget.

The gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, in an analytical discussion of the President's budget on January 21, 1964, said:

So, Mr. Speaker, it can be seen to be actively misleading—and it has been misleading—to lay undue store by the calculations of expenditures in any given year. When new obligational authority is increasing, a concurrent decrease in estimated disbursements—which is what they mean by the term "expenditures"—is little more than a momentary pause, often occasioned by undue optimism or temporarily fortuitous circumstances. Sales of mortgages and other papers held by several Government agencies—and there is a substantial anticipation of that in this budget—serve to offset expenditures rather than to be counted as income—strange to say. But those are limited and once sold, do not recur. So they tend to disguise the trend.

Even this morning's Washington Post had a cartoon by Herblock showing the President astride two horses named "Frugality" and "Welfare Programs." There is wide doubt that he can long stay in such a saddle.

We still face the prospect of our Uncle Sam as a Roman rider: one foot on a prancing steed with gaudy silks labeled "Tax Reduction" and the other foot on a measly beast with tattered colors labeld "Deficits." That is a precarious position for poor old Uncle Sam.

Indeed this is a day for fact searching, for dispelling the fog, for sound fiscal policies.

The two articles from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of January 22, 1964, follow:

FAITH, HOPE, AND CHARITY

No one, reading the President's budget and economic messages, could be left in the slightest doubt that this is an election year. The two add up to a masterful presentation, a truly impressive demonstration of the art of putting forward the best foot. Even the most cantankerous curmudgeon would hardly dispute this.

The budget message has something in it for everyone. Mr. Johnson says he believes it is a budget of economy and progress. For only the second time in 9 years, it calls for a reduction in administrative budget expenditures. It seeks a substantial reduction in total civilian employment (but with higher pay) in the executive branch. It cuts the deficit in half. And, says the President, it carries us a giant step toward the achievement of a balanced budget in a full-employment, full-prosperity economy. The Secretary of the Treasury expects that a balanced budget, barring some catastrophe, will be reached in fiscal 1967.

Could anyone ask for more? The answer evidently is "Yes." For the President went on to give assurance that his budget safeguards the peace by further strengthening the most formidable Defense Establishment the world has ever known. It recommends continued military assistance to nations menaced by Communist aggression. It provides for economic assistance to nations willing to guard their freedom through economic self-help. There is provision for funds necessary to advance our mastery of space toward the achievement of a manned lunar landing in this decade. In addition, funds are asked for sound management and development of our natural and agricultural resources, and there are appropriation requests for education, housing, manpower training, health, and employment opportunities for youth; in short, a combined request for more funds than ever before for fuller development of our Nation's most important resource, its people. Finally, this Johnson budget makes provision for initiation of a new and major effort to break the vicious circle of chronic poverty. (Details later.)

At this point there must be some who are wondering whether the budget is not really a prescription for our national bankruptcy. But the answer this time is "no." President Johnson assures us that the urgent and necessary program increases which he recommends will be financed out of the savings made possible by strict economy measures and by an exhaustive screening of existing programs. In a word, the taxpayers will not have to put up an additional dime. In fact, even after allowance for a temporary drop in Federal revenues resulting from a tax cut, if it is enacted this year, the President expects administrative budget receipts to rise in 1965 by $4.6 billion. This would result in an administrative budget deficit of $4.9 billion in fiscal 1965—$5.1 billion less than the estimated deficit for the current year.

There are, of course, the dissenters and the doubters. Some are disturbed by the irony of pressing for a tax cut in a boom year. One Senator has been heard to say: "If we can't balance our budget now, we will never balance it." This sounds as though it might have come from Virginia's Senator BYRD. But it didn't. It came from Wisconsin's Senator PROXMIRE, a Democrat, who is generally thought of as a liberal. Iowa's Senator MILLER is a Republican, and a conservative. But he is not given to loose talk, and thus some attention should be paid to him when he accuses the President of using fictitious figures in estimating the country's economic gain. Senator GOLDWATER, another conservative, has accused the President of being less than honest in his budget estimates. But Sen-

ator MILLER cites specific bases for his complaint; Senator GOLDWATER does not.

For our own part we contemplate these messages with mixed emotions. The Johnson recommendations seem to us to add up to a formula which raises at least a serious prospect of inflation, and we are not greatly reassured by his promise to draw public attention to price increases or wage demands that are excessive. For example, the United Automobile Workers are expected to submit new wage demands this summer. If they should prove to be excessive, and if the President in an election year proves content merely to draw public attention to them, a further shrinkage of the dollar will be a virtual certainty.

How, then, should one appraise this budget? Is the Utopia which it envisages really so close at hand? We hope very much that the President's optimistic expectations are realized. But we are skeptical.

Perhaps it might be said that this is a budget message which cries out for acceptance in a spirit of faith, hope and charity. If so, as has been said, the greatest of these is charity.

AN AVALANCHE OF FIGURES—STATISTICS WITH THE BUDGET ARE CALLED INCOMPLETE AND MEANINGLESS

(By David Lawrence)

For the last 3 days, the American people, and particularly the news correspondents in Washington, have been deluged with an avalanche of figures. This has been designed to prove that the United States from 1961 to 1963 has gone through a period of unexampled prosperity and that even better times are ahead for 1964. But the figures given are not complete and in many respects are meaningless, if not misleading.

Thus, the "gross national product"—the phrase supposed to describe the output of the whole economic system—is given in the President's Economic Report as reaching $623 billion in the year 1964. This is $259.9 billion above what it was in 1954, just a decade earlier.

But more than 40 percent of this rise is due to higher prices. If compared with the prices of goods and services in 1954 and the value of the dollar at that time, the gross national product this year would not be $623 billion. It would be $517.4 billion, which is $154.3 billion above what it was 10 years ago.

The President also points to corporate profits as having made a 44-percent rise in the last 3 years. This, however, is from a low point in 1961 and is not based on any annual figures. He says that a further rise will come with the tax cut. But a study of the fine print in the same volume of statistics handed to the press this week discloses that corporate profits are projected at 4.9 percent of the gross national product for 1964. This is less than what it has been in 11 of the 17 years since World War II. Corporate profits went up as high as 8 percent in those years. They were 6.2 percent in the 1949 recession year and stood at 4.6 percent in the economic setback of 1954, which is as high as they were in 1963 after 2 full years of expansion.

The sad truth is that corporate profits as a total figure are meaningless. The entire private enterprise system, even by the President's figures, will retain in 1964 only $30.5 billion after taxes. Profit margins are rarely examined in Government reports, and the fact remains that the narrowness of many of these margins prevents the investment of capital and discourages the expansion projects through which jobs can be created for the people who need them.

Much of the difficulty in creating jobs is due to psychological barriers. There can, for example, be little confidence in the economic future as long as the dollar itself is unsound. Budgets have remained unbalanced almost continuously for many years now, and the cost of living has risen as the purchasing power of the dollar has gone down.

The assertion is made by the President that a tax cut now is necessary to stimulate the economy. But the economic report in some sections gives the impression that the economy is really riding high and doesn't need a tax cut as a stimulus. These viewpoints are contradictory.

The President, incidentally, threw a scare into business in his latest economic report to Congress when he emphasized his intention to take action against businessmen if they raise prices, but he did not offer any hint of governmental action with respect to wage demands that could substantially increase the cost of operating businesses in America.

The President stated that he would not hesitate to draw public attention "to major actions by either business or labor that flout the public interest in noninflationary price and wage standards." But immediately thereafter, when he spoke of action, he made only the following comment:

"And I shall translate into action the view:

"A. That antitrust policy must remain keenly alert to illegal price fixing and other practices that impair competition.

"B. That we must resist new steps to legalize price fixing where competition should prevail."

Not a word is said about action to curb higher wage demands or concerted steps by unions that virtually fix prices by setting industry-wide wage rates.

Another statement which the President made and which is causing many worries in the business world was the announcement of his decision to ask Congress to pass a law delegating to a group of private citizens the right to impose penalties for overtime. This would be accomplished by authorizing higher overtime penalty rates on an industry-by-industry basis where tripartite industry committees determine that such rates could create more jobs without unduly raising costs. This is like the NRA scheme of New Deal days which was declared unconstitutional in 1935.

Such controls, moreover, could mean an increase in expenses not only in wages paid but for all the indirect benefits that are based upon the wage scales. It constitutes an interference with the free enterprise system which is reminiscent of the wage-and-hour controls which have been imposed in wartime.

But the most disconcerting factor in the whole economic picture is the continuing deficits in the Federal budget and the intention of the U.S. Treasury to keep on borrowing money to make up for the loss in revenue that will arise when taxes are reduced.

Poem in Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, since the tragic assassination of our late President, Americans young and old have tried to express their grief in various ways.

One such expression in the form of a poem has been composed by Miss Diane Love, the 16-year-old daughter of Dr. and Mrs. E. Justin Love, of Montgomery County, Md. Miss Love's poem, entitled "And in a Moment It Was No More," was published recently by her school newspaper, the Immaculata News.

I ask unanimous consent that this poem from the paper of the Immaculata High School, Washington, D.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND IN A MOMENT IT WAS NO MORE

(By Diane Love)

It came as lightning,
Swift and bold,
And held for men
A grief untold.
Bow your heads
And to God do pray
For our President
Has passed this way.
A bullet of hate
In a gun of fear
Took from us
A man, so dear.
Bow your heads
And to God do pray
For our President
Has passed this way.
He's gone from us
But leaves behind
The thoughts and ideals
Of his great mind.
So, in tribute to him
Let us do what we can
To strengthen peace
And the brotherhood of man.
Bow your heads
And to God do pray
For our President
Has passed away.

Cotton's Triple Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the utter nonsense embodied in the administration cotton bill now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is expressed clearly in two editorials appearing recently in New York:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 1963]

COTTON'S TRIPLE SUBSIDY

Eli Whitney, the practical inventor of the cotton gin, would have marveled at the ingenious scheme for eliminating the two-price system for cotton that the House has just approved. Until now one subsidy, in the form of price supports, has gone to cotton growers and another to cotton exporters, which enabled them to sell to foreign producers at the world market price. This two-price system has penalized domestic textile manufacturers, who have to pay the Government-supported price for the cotton they use. So the House has given its backing to an administration measure designed to give American producers the privilege of buying cotton at the world price by means of a new subsidy that will cost taxpayers a minimum of $250 million over the next 3 years.

Eliminating the two-price system through a susbidy that actually creates three wholly artificial prices for cotton is no solution to the cotton problem. It will not restrict

cotton farmers, who this year have achieved record yields, increasing the amount of stocks held by the Government. It will lead foreign producers to call for an end to the voluntary agreements restraining their sales in the United States. It will involve new expenses for policing without any assurance that the market will achieve equalization on prices.

The machinery for cotton pricing is bound to get more complicated and expensive until the administration and Congress begin dismantling the complicated subsidy program that was responsible for the two-price system in the first place. Mr. Whitney's simple invention provides the clue. Instead of pouring out money for a new subsidy, a start could be made by reducing the export subsidy and lowering price supports. The less efficient producers could be provided with direct payments to maintain their income while shifting out of cotton growing. The goal should be one price without the subsidies that have been so unfair to domestic manufacturers and so heavy a burden on taxpayers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 15, 1963]

THE ANTISUBSIDY SUBSIDY

Once upon a time the cotton farmers were very unhappy because the price they got for their cotton wasn't high enough. So the kindly old Congress passed a law, and began subsidizing the cotton farmers by guaranteeing a minimum price.

But this made the cotton exporters unhappy, because the artificial U.S. price was higher than the world market price, and therefore the exporters couldn't sell the subsidized cotton overseas.

So the kindly old Congress passed another law. It paid the exporters a subsidy, so they could sell the subsidized American cotton abroad at the lower world price.

But this made the textile manufacturers unhappy, because it meant their foreign competitors could buy the subsidized American cotton at a lower price than they could.

So the kindly old Congress began work on another law, which the House—after being prodded by President Johnson—has passed. It would have the Government subsidize the American manufacturers by giving them enough free subsidized cotton (from its surpluses) to match what the Government was paying the exporters in subsidies.

It's a simple concept, really, like the progression from missile to antimissile missile to anti-anti-missile-missile missile.

Death of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me, written by Mrs. Dorothy L. Douglas, corresponding secretary of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y., embodying a telegram to Mrs. John Kennedy, expressing condolences on the death of President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG ISLAND FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: At our December 6 executive board meeting, held at Carl Hopple's Restaurant in Baldwin, L.I., it was voted to send the following telegram to Mrs. John Kennedy, and to ask you if you would see that it is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"The executive board of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in session December 6, 1963, extend sincere sympathy to you on the loss of your beloved husband and our President."

Signed,

Miss Edythe Frost,
President.

Mrs. Dorothy L. Douglas,
Corresponding Secretary.

This request is also being made to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING.

Sincerely,

(MRS. H.) DOROTHY L. DOUGLAS,
Corresponding Secretary.

Flood Control in Indiana's Fifth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, an idea was born 30 years ago in the 73d Congress, one which finally received physical and financial impetus in 1959, is now reaching that stage of development where its proportions and scope can be appreciated by a great many people of the Fifth District of Indiana.

This year Congress is being asked to appropriate funds for the continuation of the Salamonie, Mississinewa, and Huntington Reservoir projects. The amount proposed is the largest annual request since these projects were initiated.

The total of $14.3 million is almost equal to the total of all the annual requests since planning funds were authorized by the 88th Congress in 1959. It represents almost 45 percent of the funds requested this year by the Corps of Army Engineers for the 20 flood control and navigation projects now underway in the State of Indiana.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for approval of these funds for the coming fiscal year which begins on July 1. The projects are now on schedule. Any move which would stretch out construction time would be the rankest kind of false economy. Millions and millions of dollars have been lost in the past decade because of the floods these projects are designed to combat. The total lost in this period is many times the overall cost of all three projects.

Any delay would have a serious effect on the benefits these projects will provide in addition to flood control. Past experience on similar programs elsewhere in the Nation has revealed the area can expect a substantial boost to its economy through the recreational opportunities which will result. Small business springs up to meet the service demands which evolve as our citizens take advantage of these opportunities. Land values in a wide area adjacent to such installations increase. The entire area becomes much more attractive to industries seeking new plant sites.

Approval of the funds requested for the coming fiscal year will advance construction on the Salamonie project to the two-thirds mark. The Mississinewa Reservoir will be half-completed with the funds proposed in the coming year and the Huntington project will advance to the one-third of completion level.

The Corps of Army Engineers has informed me the use of the Salamonie Reservoir will begin in 1966. This will be followed a year later by the Mississinewa Reservoir with its lake extending back almost 25 miles. The following year, in 1968, we will see the completion of the Huntington Reservoir.

These projects are capital investments by the Federal Government which will provide economic returns in the decades ahead many times the total amount of funds which will be expended. The farmer, the businessman, the industrialist and the hundreds of thousands of people who live in the area which surround the new lakes, and along the Wabash River as it moves down toward the Ohio River, all will reap benefits in the years ahead.

An idea born more than a quarter century ago, nourished and expanded through those years to its present state, will not be stopped, can not be delayed, must continue to receive the support it deserves. This must be done or we shall not keep faith with those in the past who fought for it, or we shall not keep faith with those in the present who can demonstrate the need for it. We must keep faith with those in the past, with ourselves in the present. We must accept our responsibility to provide a solid foundation for achievement to be recorded by the generations in the future.

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with a recent news release by the Suncoast News, Inc., a newspaper published in St. Petersburg, Fla. In this news release the Suncoast News sets forth with eloquence and logic its position in favor of adherence to constitutional government.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNCOAST NEWS—NEWS RELEASE

The Suncoast News takes the occasion of National Newspaper Week to point up the importance of adhering to the Constitution and the proper course of Congress during these critical times.

The Suncoast News is dedicated to the preservation of constitutional government in America.

We know that prior to 1787, the Thirteen Original States had full and complete sovereignty in every governmental field.

We know also that it was the intent and purpose of the several States, as evidenced by the 9th and 10th amendments, to reserve unto themselves exclusive jurisdiction over all matters not delegated to the Federal Government under the Constitution.

We know also that our Founding Fathers had no intent whatever to give to the Federal Government, under the interstate commerce clause, the vast and unlimited powers now sought to be ascribed to it. For it was their purpose to reserve unto the States full, complete, and exclusive jurisdiction in all local matters.

We know also that the States have never lost nor relinquished this complete jurisdiction in local fields. We accept as good basic constitutional law the construction of the 10th amendment by the Supreme Court in the case of *Gordon v. United States*, 117 U.S. 705, 72 L. Ed. 1352, which reads as follows: "The reservation to the States respectively can only mean the reservation of the rights of sovereignty which they respectively possessed before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and which they had not parted from by that instrument. And any legislation by Congress beyond the limits of the power delegated would be trespassing upon the rights of the States or the people, and would not be the supreme law of the land, but null and void."

We believe that all local matters should still be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the States according to the intent and purpose of the Constitution.

We view with complete disfavor the idea that, by court decree, the powers of the States, under the Constitution can be taken from them and vested in the Federal Government because of change in circumstances. This can only be done by a legally adopted amendment to the Constitution.

Our forefathers fought a great war against England because of the vast central powers claimed by it. After winning the war they continued to fear a vast central government. We, their sons, likewise fear the consequences of vesting great powers in a distant Federal Government over which the average citizen has no control.

We believe in the absolute ownership of private property and the right to its exclusive use and enjoyment by the owner, free from interference by outsiders.

We believe that majority groups and their properties have as great a right to protection under the Constitution as do minority groups and their desire to use and occupy such properties.

We believe that the rights of minority groups should be protected, but only in a lawful and constitutional way if we would continue to have constitutional government in America.

We believe that we should be governed by law and the Constitution and not by emotion or hysteria.

We believe that race relations have reached the greatest emotional pitch in American history due to the incitement and pressures by agitators. We also believe that many pressures have been applied by Communists, whose motto is divide and conquer.

We believe that race relations can never be solved by force or by the strong arm of the Federal Government, but can be solved only by mutual understanding, mutual respect, mutual confidence, tolerance and time.

We believe that this is a time of great stress and strain, and that efforts should be made to bring people together by appeals to friendship, mutual trust, and mutual understanding and not by intolerable governmental action, force, marches, sit-ins or disorders.

We believe that no law effecting race relations should be passed in haste or because of pressure. Our constitutional Government is too precious and valuable to warrant its being jeopardized or torn asunder by laws being rushed through Congress under great stress and with emotions rising to fever heat.

We believe that it is the duty of every public official to try in every way to bring our people together by kindly tolerance, real understanding of all problems, active aid in bringing about peaceful solutions to racial problems; and not by the use of armed forces, the encouragement of wild racial disorders and the use of strong pressures, without constitutional warranty, that can bring nothing but resentment, and stir up hatred and strife.

We believe that we should have unity in America, not dissension and division. We need statesmanship now, not the disordered forces of strong political ambitions. We want a united America, not one stirred by strife. We want to be known as the United States of America, not as the divided states of America.

Hon. William J. Green, Jr.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their expression of great personal loss on the death of our good and dear griend, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR. All who knew him were deeply shocked at his untimely passing.

Not only were BILL and I colleagues in the Congress, but we were personal friends. For the past 6 years we have many times traveled together back and forth from my district, as BILL and his family had a summer home at Longport, N.J., which is adjacent to duty of own town of Margate. I enjoyed his company immensely, as he had a dry sense of humor, a nice smile, and a characteristic willingness to listen in a quiet way, which endeared him to all who came in contact with him. He had a rare capacity for friendship, which is not often found, which is evidenced by the affection and esteem in which he was held by all the Members on both sides of the aisle. He served with competency and zeal, and fulfilled his responsibility to his constituents with a real spirit of dedication. BILL GREEN was indeed a capable Congressman, a fine friend, and a loving husband and father. His family can take pride in his splendid record of unselfish patriotic service and his devotion to duty. His passing leaves a great void in the hearts of his countless friends and I personally will sorely miss his friendship and our close association.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his wife and family in their great loss and it is my prayer that their knowledge of the fact that so many of us will also miss him, will aid them in the days ahead to bravely carry their burden.

Statement of Hon. Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana, Before the Rules Committee on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I shall extend in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, a ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, showing in detail the unconstitutional, unrealistic, and evil provisions in the pending civil rights bill. As the bill will shortly be on the floor for consideration, I urge the Members of the House to read this materful, well-considered, and devastating statement that should make all thoughtful Members question the advisability of the passage of this bill. I urge you to read this statement and enlighten yourselves on the effect it will have upon the vast majority of your constitutents, whose liberties are being tampered with, rather than with sole consideration for the freedoms that supposedly are to be conferred upon a small and favored minority:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE RULES COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, JANUARY 16, 1964

I will have something to say about many parts of the bill before you but I have been assigned the task of discussing titles I and II in particular. Other members of the Committee on the Judiciary, opposed to this legislation, will in turn undertake to discuss titles III to X in greater detail.

If that is your wish, I will be glad to answer questions as we go along but I think it would be better to give my views first. In that way I think we could save time because I suspect I might anticipate many of your questions in my general statement.

Before proceeding, however, I would like to say this. We live in an age of polls, labels, and slogans. In these polls, however, you and I are always the ratees and we are never given an opportunity to rate our raters. I assure you, however, that I don't mind this at all because I regard it as a small price to pay for the rewards that come with public service.

Every year we must be rated by various and sundry groups and organizations such as ADA, ACA, AFL-CIO, NAM, AMA, PTA, NEA, Farm Bureau, and so on and on. And the strange thing is that on identical bills one group might rate us as conservatives, while another might rate us as liberals, each according to their peculiar and rigid notions of the meaning of these relative terms.

I take the ratings as they come and can only draw some consolation from Robert Burns' lament, "O wad some power the giftie gie us, to see oursels as others see us."

And the same is true with reference to legislation. Bills are almost invariably given quickie labels to either pass or defeat them. For example, foreign aid is called the Mutual Security Act. An act to quiet the long-standing title of a State is called tidelands oil. The public works bill is called a pork barrel—and so ad nauseam.

But that's not all; sometimes one can choose between two labels. He can be for medical care for the aged or against social-

ized medicine. And if he has not read the bill, he can say that he is for medical care for the aged and against socialized medicine at the same time. But for us there is always a day of reckoning. Ultimately we must vote on merits and not on labels and take the consequences—and that, too, is a small price to pay for responsible representation.

Now, some call this legislation civil rights legislation while others call it civil wrongs legislation. But a rose is a rose by whatever name it is called. Therefore, let us consider the proposal not either as conservatives or liberals, or whatever, but as responsible Members and let us study it on the basis of content and not labels.

It is on that basis that I would like to present my views. But first a word about the broad provisions of the bill and how it got out of the Committee on the Judiciary.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION AND BILLS INTRODUCED

The history of this legislation shows that the proponents became bolder and bolder as time went on and wound up by employing tactics or procedures unprecedented during my period of service on the Committee on the Judiciary in bringing it out of that committee.

As usual, many members introduced various versions of civil rights bills during the last session of Congress. But the important bills to look at are the ones introduced by the Democratic chairman of the committee, Mr. CELLER, of New York, and the senior Republican member of the committee, Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

On January 31, 1963, Mr. MCCULLOCH, the senior Republican member on the committee, introduced H.R. 3139, containing four titles, as follows:

Title I: Making the Civil Rights Commission a Permanent Agency; Strengthening Equal Protection of the Laws in the Field of Education.

Title II: Equal Employment Opportunity by the Establishment of a Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment.

Title III: Assistance to States in the Field of Education.

Title IV: Literacy Tests, Establishing Presumption of Literacy in Federal Elections.

On April 4, 1963, Mr. CELLER, the Democratic chairman of the committee, introduced H.R. 5455, entitled "A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes, in the field of education only."

And, on the same date, he introduced H.R. 5456 to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights for 4 years.

Finally, on June 20, 1963, Mr. CELLER, the Democratic chairman of the committee, introduced H.R. 7152, containing eight titles, as follows:

Title I: Voting Rights.

Title II: Injunctive Relief Against Discrimination in Public Accommodations.

Title III: Desegregation of Public Education.

Title IV: Establishment of Community Relations Service.

Title V: Commission on Civil Rights.

Title VI: Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs.

Title VII: Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Title VIII: Miscellaneous.

HEARINGS AND PRELIMINARY ACTION OF THE COMMITTEE

To be sure, general hearings were held over quite a period of time, but the subcommittee came out with a complete substitute of its own going far beyond both the scope and coverage of the bills as introduced and the hearings thereon. The substitute then came up before the full committee for consideration in executive session. After some discussion even the most ardent supporters of civil rights legislation said or pretend to say that they could not stomach it. The Attorney General himself appeared before the committee in executive session and testified as follows:

"Title III would extend to claimed violations of constitutional rights in State criminal proceedings or in book or movie censorship; disputes involving church-state relations; economic questions such as allegedly confiscatory ratemaking or the constitutional requirement of just compensation in land acquisition cases; the propriety of incarceration in a mental hospital; searches and seizures; and controversies involving freedom of worship, or speech, or of the press.

"Obviously, the proposal injects Federal executive authority into some areas which are not its legitimate concern and vests the Attorney General with broad discretion in matters of great political and social concern.

"To illustrate: Which types of disputes should the Attorney General make a matter of Federal concern? Should he exempt disputes involving reading of the Bible in classrooms? If so, on what basis? What criteria should he adopt to determine whether to intervene in a particular case of an arrest for investigation, for example, or the banning of a movie as obscene, or a claim that the rate set by a State public utilities commission is unreasonably low?" (See p. 2658 of his testimony in executive session.)

It was agreed that a motion would be made to strike out title III when the time came for amendments of the subcommittee substitute.

And it was readily admitted by a number of the proponents that the section of the subcommittee substitute bill dealing with voting rights and providing that it would apply to both Federal and State elections was unconstitutional. The only question was who would offer the amendment when we reached the point when amendments would be offered to the subcommittee substitute.

I have been with the Committee on the Judiciary for over 15 years. I have great respect for all the members. I consider all of them to be close personal friends, and at the same time I think I know my way around a bit in the committee. And from what I heard and observed, I was completely satisfied that there would be important modifications made in executive session, including a modification of the title dealing with public accommodations and other provisions. It clearly appeared to me that we were making headway and that reason and calm deliberations were prevailing. But I must have been dreaming, because, in the words of the song of Governor Davis, "You Are My Sunshine"—"when I awoke I was mistaken."

FINAL COMMITTEE ACTION

On October 29, 1963, the proponents took over the proceedings in a grand style.

Chairman CELLER offered a brandnew 56-page mimeographed substitute bill which he described as an amendment and moved that the committee approve it. The chairman announced that he would recognize a member of the committee to move the previous question and if it were ordered that no amendments could be offered to his proposal; no debate had, and no questions asked or answered.

The bill was, upon order of the chairman, read hastily by the clerk, without pause or opportunity for amendment. Several members of the committee repeatedly requested to be permitted to ask questions, have an explanation of the bill, discuss it, consider its provisions, and offer amendments. The Chair refused to grant such requests or to recognize these members of the committee for any purpose. After the reading of the bill in the fashion hereinabove described, the chairman announced that he would allow himself 1 minute to discuss the bill, after which he would recognize for 1 minute the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio. This was an ostensible attempt to comply, technically, with the rules of the House but did not amount to debate, as debate is generally understood. Neither of these gentlemen discussed the bill for more than 1 minute; both of them refused to yield to any other member of the committee and neither of them debated the bill nor discussed it in any fashion other than to say that they favored it. They made no effort in the 2 minutes consumed by both together to even so much as explain the provisions of the bill. In short, there was no actual debate or even an opportunity for debate or to offer amendments. I doubt seriously that anyone really knew what he was voting on.

As stated in our minority report, in reciting these facts relating to the procedures employed in the full committee we do not do so in any captious spirit, but relate these facts to inform the Congress of the tactics employed to bring this bill before the House.

THE BILL REPORTED OUT

Now that we have had an opportunity to compare the bills as introduced, the subcommittee substitute and the full committee substitute, we can assert this. The subcommittee wrote a bill with little relation and less regard to the general hearings and then the full committee rewrote the final product with no hearings at all and with no opportunity for debate or to offer amendments.

There has been a lot of talk concerning the watering down of the subcommittee substitute by the full committee. About the only thing that can be said in this respect is that the full committee took out from and then put back in many important provisions in the subcommittee substitute. I desire to list just a few glaring examples:

1. As indicated by his own testimony in executive session, previously quoted, title III, in one fell swoop, would have permitted the Attorney General to file suits in the broad field of civil rights. This short sentence stared you in the face and it looked awful. It dug a glaring, deep penetration like a single rifle shot. So this title was removed by the full committee, but in shotgun fashion little titles III were inserted here and there in the reported bill.

And to be sure that the grab for power by the Attorney General is complete, title X provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to deny, impair or otherwise affect any right or authority the Attorney General already has—broad as those may be.

2. It has been generally reported that the full committee changed the subcommittee substitute so as to restrict this bill to Federal elections. But this is not so. Although the full committee substitute refers repeatedly to "any Federal election," in the body of the bill, section 101(c) defines a Federal election to mean "any general, special or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives." This means that the bill before you does apply to local and State elections in at least 46 States of the Union.

3. There was added in the bill reported out by the full committee in section 101(d) the unprecedented provision that, "In any proceeding instituted in any district court of the United States under this section the Attorney General may file with the clerk of such court a request that a court of three judges be convened to hear and determine the case." This provision giving the Attorney General the power to shop around for a forum and special judges did not appear in any previous version of the bill.

4. Section 602 makes it the mandatory duty of every Federal department or agency to utilize the funds provided for Federal financial assistance in every program or activity to enforce the civil rights requirement.

This mandatory requirement did not appear in the administration bill.

5. The full committee substitute added section 202. This section would make unlawful discrimination or segregation of any kind on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin at any establishment or place, if either purports to be required by any rule, order, etc., of any State or agency or political subdivision thereof. This section is not limited to public places or facilities and did not appear in any previous version of the bill.

6. Section 711(b) contains the following blanket and unlimited authority:

"The President is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate to prevent the committing or continuing of an unlawful employment practice by a person in connection with the performance of a contract with an agency or an instrumentality of the United States." This provision was not contained in the subcommittee proposal.

7. Under section 201(b)(c) an establishment is classified as engaging in interstate commerce if it "provides lodging to transient guests" or "if it serves or offers to serve interstate travelers." This broadens the coverage provided in the subcommittee proposal which made such classification if the accommodations, goods, and services "are provided to a substantial degree to interstate travelers" or if a substantial portion of the goods offered has "moved in interstate commerce." As to the latter requirements the wording of the bill is: "it serves or offers to serve interstate travelers or a substantial portion of the food which it serves, or gasoline or other products which it sells has moved in commerce." It will, therefore, be seen that the bill reported out of the full committee covers any establishment, offering lodging to transient guests, even though it does not have guests traveling in interstate commerce. The bill also covers an establishment which offers to serve interstate travelers even though a substantial portion of the food which it serves, or other products which it sells, has not moved in interstate commerce.

8. The House Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction over labor legislation. Accordingly, that committee reported out the so-called FEPC bill, H.R. 405. That bill is now pending before the Rules Committee.

A few witnesses appeared and suggested that it would be nice to tack the provision of that FEPC bill to the present one. But the administration had not asked for it; the Democratic chairman of the committee had not included it in his proposal, and the senior Republican member of the committee has not included such a FEPC proposal in his bill. And I can say as a fact that the committee members did not take the suggestion seriously—not at the time the suggestion was made anyway.

Yet, without having jurisdiction over the subject matter, without hearings, without as much as a by your leave, the FEPC provision of H.R. 405, reported out by another Committee and pending before the Rules Committee, was incorporated as title VII of the bill under discussion.

9. Under title IV the Commissioner of Education is granted broad new powers. Under title VI every agency and department of the Federal Government administering activities or programs involving Federal financial assistance is required to take ill-defined action, in addition to cutting out Federal funds. And, as previously pointed out, under section 711(b) the President is granted unlimited and blanket authority to take whatever action he deems appropriate concerning employment in such programs.

It is not my task to measure the depth and breadth of these provisions and other members will discuss their full impact. But it can be seen that a concerted exercise of a combination of these powers would bring about these results:

Public and private schools and colleges benefiting from any Federal financial program are placed under Federal control in the handling of pupils and the selection of faculty members insofar as they relate to race, color, or national origin and desegregation or discrimination in connection therewith.

I am quite sure that most if not all of the proponents would tell you that they do not intend such results, but there they are nevertheless.

Well, what do we do? We could recommit the bill, or we could defeat the bill, or we could and must at the very least amend it to take care of harsh and drastic situations and results, above outlined, among others.

RECOMMITTAL, DEFEAT, OR AMENDMENT

I do not think it can be denied by any serious-minded and responsible Member or person that the bill now before you is the most drastic and far-reaching proposal and grab for power ever to be reported out of a committee of the Congress in the history of our Republic.

I am quite certain that the foregoing and many other harsh, open-ended, and unlimited provisions would have been removed if the committee had been given an opportunity to debate and amend the bill in calm and deliberate executive session. And in my opinion, the right thing to do would be to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

If the bill is not recommitted, and if it is not defeated, however, I have outlined at least some of the kind of meaningful amendments that should be offered on the floor. And in resolving any course of action, I again appeal to the membership to vote on it on the basis of merit and content and not on the basis of sectionalism, prejudice, and label.

TITLE I

I shall now identify some of the major weaknesses of title I of the bill—the title on voting rights, starting with the provisions of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 101(a)(2) of the bill. These begin at pages 38, line 16. They impose prohibitions on State election officials in connection with so-called Federal elections.

Our Constitution provides for popular election of Senators and Representatives in Congress. It also provides for the election of electors who select the President and Vice President of the United States.

The right to vote for these Federal officials is a sacred one. It is protected by the 14th amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits the States from denying to any person the equal protection of the laws, and by the 15th amendment, which says that the rights of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

While article I, section 4 of the Constitution empowers Congress to "make or alter" regulations as to the "times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives," there is no similar provision with respect to elections of presidential electors.

Article II, section 1 merely provides that each State shall appoint its electors in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct.

What is more, and this is most important, the Constitution gives Congress no power to determine the qualifications of voters in elections of Federal officials but leaves this to the States.

Article I, section 2 provides that the electors of Representatives in Congress shall have the same qualifications as the electors of the lower ("most numerous") house of the State legislature. The 17th amendment provides the same qualification rule for electors of U.S. Senators. And article II, section 1 gives State legislatures control of the manner of election of presidential and vice-presidential electors. In practice, this has resulted in the same eligibility rules in each State for all elections of Federal officials.

To sum up a very simple situation—under the Constitution people who are qualified by State law to vote for members of the lower house of the State legislature are also qualified to vote for Representatives and Senators in Congress and for electors of the President and Vice President. States must not deny equal protection of the laws, or abridge the right to vote because of race or color. Congress can affect the "times, places, and manner" of holding congressional elections, but not of the election of presidential electors, and it has no power over qualifications to vote.

With this simple situation in mind, let us look at the bill. Subparagraph capital (A) of section 101(a)(2) says that no person acting under color of law shall "(A) in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law or laws to vote in any Federal election, apply any standard, practice, or procedure different from the standards, practices, or procedures applied under such law or laws to other individuals within the same county, parish, or similar political subdivision who have been found by State officials to be qualified to vote".

If this means that no State official shall deny or abridge the right of citizens to vote on account of race or color, or shall deny any person the equal protection of the laws, I am for it all the way. Because that is what the Constitution says in the 15th and 14th amendments. In other words, if subparagraph (A) means that no State officer shall discriminate with respect to voting rights by applying different voting qualifications to different persons because of their respective race or color, it is already the law. But the import of the subparagraph is to permit an encroachment on the constitutional power of the States to establish qualifications of voters.

The same is true of subparagraph capital (B) which begins at line 3 on page 41 of the bill. This subparagraph provides that no person acting under color of law shall "(B) deny the right of any individual to vote in any Federal election because of an error or omission of such individual on any record or paper relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting, if such error or omission is not material in determining whether such individual is qualified under State law to vote in such election".

Here again, no one, least of all I, wants an applicant for voting registration to be turned away on the pretext of an error or omission that is not material to his qualifications. But here, again, the question is one of qualification to vote under State law. And here, again, the bill takes the determination of the qualifications away from the States. The Constitution placed it in the States. How, in the absence of a violation of the 14th and 15th amendments, can it be taken away? Yet that is what the bill does.

There is no precise way of measuring how grave an error or omission must be before it is material to the qualifications of a voter. The Constitution gave the question of qualifications to the States. The bill would give it to the Federal courts, again without any showing that the purported immaterial error or omission was used as a pretext for discrimination because of race or color. Mere nonuniformity among registrars is made the legal equivalent of deliberate discrimination. What is more, there is no reason to believe, and the committee had no basis for assuming, that Federal judges will be wiser or more consistent in their appraisal of what is material than the local registrars.

Thirdly, I turn to subparagraph capital (C) at line 10 of page 39. This provides that no person acting under color of law shall "(C) employ any literacy test as a qualification for voting in any Federal election unless (i) such test is administered to each individual wholly in writing except where an individual requests and State law authorizes a test other than in writing, and (ii) a certified copy of the test whether written or oral and of the answers given by the individual is furnished to him within twenty-five days of the submission of his request made within the period of time during which records and papers are required to be retained and preserved pursuant to title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960."

Subparagraph capital (C) constitutes another unwarranted interference with the States with respect to their Constitutionally granted power to determine eligibility to vote. There can be no denial that the form and content of a literacy test is an element in the establishment of a voter's "qualifications" as that term is used in article I, section 2 and in the 17th amendment, which relate to electors of Representatives and Senators respectively. It is therefore a prerogative of the States and not of the Congress. Finally, this prohibition of oral literacy tests is made to apply without regard to whether the test is used to discriminate on account of race or color in violation of the 15th and 14th amendments. Here again the Judiciary Committee lacks sufficient factual basis to support the blanket interference that the mere use of oral literacy tests, in and of itself, with nothing more shown, violates the Constitutional injunction against discrimination in voting because of race or color.

These provisions of the bill, in my opinion, are unconstitutional substitutions of the judgment of Federal courts for the judgments of State officials. Their enactment would open a Pandora's box of further confusion in Federal-State relationships.

But the bill goes further than merely interfering with the right of the State legislatures to establish and administer their own qualifications for voting. In section 101(b) it establishes an affirmative test of its own. Section 101(b) (at p. 40, line 7) provides that in any voting suit a person who has completed the sixth grade shall be presumed to have sufficient literacy to vote in any Federal election.

Let me make myself entirely clear. I personally agree that such persons should be allowed to vote. The exercise of the franchise should be universal and any literacy bar to voting should be minimal indeed. But this cannot disguise the fact that the Federal presumption created by section 101(b) establishes a qualification for voting. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that the States and only the States have the right to establish voter qualifications. Usurpation of this right by act of Congress is clearly unconstitutional.

Nor can much comfort be found in the fact that this presumption of literacy is declared to be rebuttable. In a court case the State voting registrar would have the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that the voter applicant is illiterate. If the applicant can avoid a literacy test, this burden would be considerable.

Before leaving the unconstitutional requirements of sections 101 (a) and (b), I should like to revert to the ostensible limitation of these subparagraphs to "any Federal election." At first glance one would naturally think that this is a material limitation on their scope. But when it is recalled that "Federal election" is defined as "any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives," it is clear that most elections are included.

Forty-six of the States elect their own officials in elections at which Members of Congress and president and vice-president electors are also chosen. What is more, they qualify their voters only once, and registration applies for the election of all officials, both Federal and State. This means, as a practical matter, that virtually all regular elections are "Federal elections," within the meaning of the bill. To take advantage of the exemption which the bill ostensibly gives them with respect to State elections, the States would have to go to the considerable expense of a double registration system and the separation of the elections conducted for State offices from those conducted for Federal offices, a very impractical alternative. In effect, as I have stated, the provisions of section 101(a) amount to a congressional finding, unsupported by evidence, that the practices prohibited ipso facto involve discrimination in violation of the 14th and 15th amendments. In light of this, any State seeking to continue oral literacy tests, even in purely State elections, would be virtually courting charges of denial of equal protection of the laws.

Another innovation of title I is found in section 101(d) of the bill which authorizes the Attorney General, at his unreviewed discretion, to demand a three-judge court to hear and determine any voting suit. The chief judge of the circuit would have no choice but to comply with the Attorney General's request. Although one of the judges must be from the district in which the suit is instituted, the other two need not. This provision enables the Attorney General, when he has no confidence in a particular district judge, to convert that judge into a minority of a three-judge panel, if, indeed he is appointed to the panel at all.

It is difficult to understand why this provision, which did not appear in the administration bill nor in the subcommittee substitute, should now make its appearance. It is extremely difficult to perceive why, in this troubled field the Attorney General should have what amounts to a preemptory challenge to the district judge before whom the case would normally be tried. I seriously question whether such a flagrant form of forum shopping should be encouraged, least of all should it be provided as an exclusive privilege of the plaintiff Government.

TITLE II

Just like good engineers construct our highways with separate lanes of traffic, so our Founding Fathers erected constitutional walls separating the functions of our Government into three branches—the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch.

When a motorist drives out of his lane of traffic and occupies the lane of another someone is going to get hurt.

And when one branch invades the functions of another branch, not only individual rights, but the property rights of all the people will be impaired or destroyed.

As members of the legislative branch we are prone, in varying degrees, to condemn the other two branches, especially the judicial branch, for invading or intruding on our own functions. We insist that the function of the judicial branch is not to make laws but to interpret our laws in the light of the Constitution.

Yet, the legislative branch of our Government, in title II of this bill, undertakes to compel the courts to accept our interpretation of the Constitution, and especially the 14th amendment and the commerce clause, not only beyond and even contrary to the previous rulings of the courts, but beyond and contrary to the provisions of the Constitution itself. Let me give you two typical examples:

In the teeth of previous rulings of the courts to the contrary, title II undertakes to order that from here on the 14th amendment shall mean that the private owner of a place of business, such as a restaurant and many others, cannot choose his customers.

Despite previous court decisions, and beyond and contrary to the provisions of the commerce clause itself, title II undertakes to regulate intrastate commerce and to make a finding intended to be binding on the courts that the activities of the owner of a private establishment, such as a local hamburger stand, a local gasoline station, or a local grocery store constitutes interstate commerce.

Before discussing how and on what basis all of this is to be accomplished, let us consider certain fundamental provisions of the Constitution dealing with both civil rights and property rights.

We must and do respect all the provisions of the Constitution protecting the rights of the individual—the 5th amendment and other provisions of the Bill of Rights, the 14th amendment, and the 15th amendment, upon all of which civil rights are based.

But certainly without putting them above those dealing with individual rights, we must also respect and abide by the provisions of the Constitution dealing with property rights, upon all of which our system of free and competitive enterprise is based.

In fact, the 14th amendment protects the individual rights and property rights in the same sentence, which says: "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

And the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—sought to protect property rights as well as personal rights. The third amendment protects the houses of people. The fourth amendment protects the people as to their houses, papers and effects, as well as their persons. The fifth amendment protects life, liberty, and property, and specifically forbids the taking of private property for public use without just compensation. The seventh amendment protects the right of trial by jury in cases involving property, just as the sixth amendment does in cases involving life or liberty.

And then, in order to give full meaning to the foregoing, and to insure and preserve the stability of all private agreements and commercial transactions, the Constitution adds the clincher that no State shall make a law impairing the obligation of contracts. What contracts? Any and all, and even contracts freely and voluntarily entered into, verbally or in writing, written or spoken.

What is "property"? In its strict legal sense, "property" signifies that dominion or indefinite right of user, "control and disposition which one may lawfully exercise over particular things or objects. As so used, the word signified the sum of all the rights and powers incident to ownership. So defined, property is composed of certain constituent elements, including the unrestricted right of use, enjoyment, and disposal of the particular subject of property. Owners of real estate have the right under the Constitution to use, lease and dispose of it for all lawful purposes. The right of free and untrammeled use for legitimate purposes is fundamental and within the protection of the Federal Constitution.

The sum total of all of the foregoing constitutional provisions and the foregoing illustrations of the meaning of property and property rights is the foundation of our free and competitive enterprise system just as the sum total of the foregoing constitutional provisions dealing with individual rights is the foundation of all civil rights. And under our Constitution we can no more protect individual rights by impairing or destroying property rights than we can protect property rights by impairing or destroying individual rights. Nor can one freedom be advanced or

protected by impairing or destroying others.

Title II of the bill draws under Federal control inns, hotels, motels, and other lodging houses, restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms, soda fountains, gasoline stations, motion picture houses, concert halls, theaters, sports arenas, stadiums, and other places of exhibition and entertainment.

Having named these categories of private business establishments, the bill adds a catchall category. Any retail establishment in which one of the foregoing categories of business places is located, or any retail establishment located in any of these categories, is covered. Therefore, if a lunch counter is in a drug store or a department store, the entire store is covered. If a doctor or lawyer has an office in a hotel building, he is covered.

In executive session, the Attorney General expressed concern about the broad coverage of the subcommittee substitute. He said:

"What businesses are covered by this provision [in the subcommittee substitute] are unclear. I have no objection to broadening the bill's reliance on the 14th amendment or broadening its scope if the Congress so desires. But invoking the 14th amendment generally is no substitute for specifying the establishments which Congress, enacting national law to solve a national problem, intends to cover."

Yet, the full committee added a new section (sec. 202) covering "any establishment or place if segregation is required by law or by order of a State."

The provisions of section 202 were not included in the administration bil or the subcommittee substitute. Its inclusion in the reported bill marks the blanket character of this legislation.

And the same can be said of the provisions of section 201 (b) and (c) which, as I have shown, broaden the coverage of the measure to include establishments which provide lodging to transient guests (irrespective of their travel in interstate commerce) or if they "offer to serve" interstate travelers (irrespective of whether or not any substantial quantity of the food, gasoline, etc., has moved in interstate commerce).

Title II is said to be based on two concurrent constitutional provisions. The foregoing enumerated establishments are found by Congress to be "places of public accommodation" and are covered (1) if they affect interstate commerce, or (2) if segregation is "supported" by State action. The word "supported" is defined as meaning that segregation (1) "is carried on under color of law, statute, ordinance, regulations, custom or usage, or (2) is required, fostered or encouraged by action of a State."

The constitutional grounds utilized in title II reflect new extremes in the attempted application both of the commerce clause and of the 14th amendment.

In respect of "commerce" the title indulges the presumption that "transients" generate "commerce" and that offers to serve travelers affect "commerce." In the area of the 14th amendment and the concomitant requirement of some sort of "State action," it equates "custom and usage" to affirmative action by a State. In both respects, title II constittues a novel and dangerous experiment in political theory. Its adoption could work a revolutionary change in the existing balance of Federal-State relationships.

In my opinion, however, the attempted utilization of the 14th amendment and the commerce clause to support title II cannot be defended on constitutional grounds. You are well aware of the decision of the Supreme Court in *The Civil Rights Cases* (109 U.S. 3), which held squarely and unequivocally that the act of Congress of 1875, entitled "An act to protect all citizens in their civil and legal rights" and proposing to do exactly what is proposed to be done by title II, was unconstitutional and could not be supported under the 14th amendment.

Since my guess is as good anyone's, I venture to say that the reason no effort was made to base the 1875 statute on, or to justify it under, the commerce clause was because of the feeling that there was far less chance to support its constitutionality on the commerce clause than there was to have its constitutionality upheld under the 14th amendment.

One of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States reaffirming the principles announced in the Civil Rights cases is that of *Burton* v. *Wilmington Parking Authority* (365 U.S. 715, 6 L. Ed. 2d 45 (1961)), in which the Court said:

The *Civil Rights* cases (109 U.S. 3 (1833)), "embedded in our constitutional law" the principle "that the action inhibited by the first section (equal protection clause), of the 14th amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States. That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful."

As late as May 20, 1963, in *Peterson* v. *City of Greenville* (373 U.S. 244), the Supreme Court stated: "individual invasion of individual rights" is not within the purview of the 14th amendment, and "private conduct abridging individual rights does no violence to the equal protection clause." In his concurring opinion in the Peterson case, Mr. Justice Harlan said:

"Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference."

In 1959 the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of *Williams* v. *Howard Johnson* (268 Fed. 2d 845, 847), stated clearly this well-recognized rule when it said:

"This argument fails to observe the important distinction between activities that are required by the State and those which are carried out by voluntary choice and without compulsion by the people of the State in accordance with their own desires and social practices. Unless these actions are performed in obedience to some positive provision of State law they do not furnish a basis for the pending complaint. The license laws of Virginia do not fill the void."

It is clearly unconstitutional to bottom any claim of Federal control of State action upon "custom or usage" involving acts which constitute merely private conduct.

The attempt to base Federal regulation of public accommodations upon the interstate commerce clause is equally unconstitutional.

"The broken package doctrine" is succinctly stated by the Supreme Court in *Dahnke-Walker Co.* v. *Bondurant* (257 U.S. 282, 290), as follows:

"Where goods in one State are transported into another for purposes of sale the commerce does not end with the transportation, but embraces as well the sale of the goods after they reach their destination and while they are in the original packages."

The claim that the intrastate sale or renting of goods which have moved in interstate commerce is in itself interstate commerce is in the teeth of the long line of cases illustrated by the statement of Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Pacific States Box & Basket Co.* v. *White* (296 U.S. 176, 80 L. Ed. 138):

"The operation of the order is intrastate, beginning after the interstate movement of the containers has ceased, and after the original package has been broken."

That this basis used in this bill to attempt to transform intrastate commerce into interstate commerce is untenable is demonstrated by the decision of the Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit quoted above, *Williams* v. *Howard Johnson* (268 F. 2d 845 (1959)), as follows:

"We think, however, that the cases cited are not applicable because we do not find that a restaurant is engaged in interstate commerce merely because in the course of its business of furnishing accommodations to the general public it serves persons who are traveling from State to State. As an instrument of local commerce, the restaurant is not subject to the constitutional and statutory provisions discussed above and thus, is at liberty to deal with such persons as it may select."

See also *Elizabeth Hospital, Inc.* v. *Richardson* (269 F. 2d 167), decided by the Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit in 1959, which cites the decision of the Supreme Court supporting the rule as follows:

"We think that the plaintiff's operation of a hospital, to include rendition of hospital services to some persons who came from outside the State, is no more engaging in interstate commerce than was Dr. Riggall in rendering medical services to persons who likewise came from other States. The fact that some of the plaintiff's patients might travel in interstate commerce does not alter the local character of plaintiff's hospital. If the converse were true, every country store that obtains its goods from or serves customers residing outside of the State would be selling in interstate commerce. Uniformly, the courts have held to the contrary" (A.L.A. *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States*, 1935, 295 U.S. 495, 55 S Ct. 837, 79 L. Ed. 1570; *Lawson* v. *Woodmere*, 4 Cir., 1954, 217 F. 2d 148, 150; *Jewel Tea Co.* v. *Williams*, 10 Cir., 1941, 118 F. 2d 202, 207; *Lipson* v. *Socony-Vacuum Corp.*, 1 Cir., 1937, 87, F. 2d 265, 267, certiorari granted 300 U.S. 651, 57 S. Ct. 612, 81 L. Ed. 862, certiorari dismissed 301 U.S. 711, 57 S. Ct. 788, 81 L. Ed. 1364).

Congress cannot constitutionally enact a statute converting intrastate commerce into interstate commerce, as is here proposed, without upsetting every one of the original unbroken package cases and their long line of successors.

If Congress has the supposed power over hotels, motels, and lodging houses here sought to be asserted, then Congress has the right to regulate them in every respect even as to the rates they can charge for rooms. If Congress can say what guests they must take, then it can say what rates they must charge for their rooms, or even can tell them what they can put on their bill of fares, and maybe not to serve things that are objectionable to certain people.

If Congress can make a finding that the business of these private and independent operators constitutes "places of public accommodation," then we may as well make a finding that such private and independent businesses are "affected with a public interest" and regulate them like public utilities, guarantee them a return on their investment, or maybe just run them by the Government.

The President's Letter to Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. PILCHER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, in terms of international relations, the President's letter to Premier Khrushchev was refreshing. It was clear, unequivocal, to

the point, and in language which can be clearly understood.

The President did not hesitate to point out that this Nation is not going to sacrifice any of the free world's vital interests. But he did not waste words in belaboring the point. He made it and then went on to constructive points that might put some reality into the quest for peace.

We could, of course, as a nation, quibble endlessly over what should be done. The President did not set our feet on this course nor did he set our feet on a course that would lead to appeasement.

Instead, he reacted with dignity and with restraint and in a constructive tone. I believe that the free world can be reassured both as to its vital interests and as to the President's desire for peace.

Charles F. Carpentier: 40 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are engaged in the science of politics daily become aware of forces other than political which ofttimes guide our destiny. Like many other members of the Illinois delegation I was quite distressed to learn of the bad turn of events in the life of my close, personal friend, Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of the State of Illinois. My immediate concern is for his own personal welfare and that his illness will not be of long duration and that he may have a full and speedy recovery from the heart attack which he suffered. I wish at this time to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch under date of January 21, 1964, which best expresses my thoughts concerning this unfortunate circumstance:

SECRETARY CARPENTIER: 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

The withdrawal from the contest for Governor of Illinois of Charles F. Carpentier, of East Moline, for reasons of health possibly ends the 40-year political career of a remarkable personality.

We say "possibly" because fighting and winning is his habit. He may apply this habit to the current situation.

That career began in 1924 when he was elected alderman in East Moline. In 1929 he was elected mayor of East Moline and subsequently was reelected to four 2-year terms. He was elected to the State senate in 1938 and was reelected three times. He has been secretary of state since his election in 1952, with reelections in 1956 and 1960.

Fulfilling an ambition that has grown upon him over the years, Secretary Carpentier was now reaching for the State's top office.

But other than political forces deny him.

We find this a matter of regret for Mr. Carpentier and for the people of Illinois. His experience, his practical wisdom and his dedicated love of his State would have combined to make him an excellent Governor, had his quest succeeded.

At this moment of uncertainty about his future, we express to him and to his supporters our sadness at this turn of events and, on behalf of the people he has served, a gratitude for the years that have been allowed him.

Goldwater: Our Chance for a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of the House would be interested in the editorial contained in the Tallahassee Democrat on Sunday, January 5, 1964, entitled "GOLDWATER: Our Chance for a Choice."

The key sentence in this editorial which I call to the attention of my colleagues is, "The greatest service the Republican Party can do this Nation in 1964 is to subordinate its local political pressures and offer all the people a clear-cut choice between the Goldwater-type conservatism and the Johnson-type liberalism. Democrats should welcome the test."

I believe this editorial will be of interest to the Members of the House and I commend it to their attention.

I hereby submit the editorial for the RECORD:

GOLDWATER: OUR CHANCE FOR A CHOICE

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's resolute declaration of presidential candidacy gives the people of this Nation their best chance in a generation for a significant, representative decision on our course of government.

He stated it forthrightly when he announced that, in seeking the Republican nomination, he "will offer a choice, not an echo."

Americans of opposite political beliefs have long yearned for the kind of ballot choice the Arizona Senator would present as the Nation's most articulate and influential leader of conservative government. His position, backed up by years of generally consistent voting records and statements, was set forth plainly in his announcement:

"I have always stood for government that is limited and balanced against the ever-increasing concentrations of authority in Washington. I have always stood for individual responsibility and against regimentation. I believe we must now make a choice in this land and not continue drifting endlessly down and down toward a time when all of us, our lives, our hopes, and even our prayers, will become just eggs in a vast governmental machine." He vowed: "I will not change my beliefs to win votes."

Undoubtedly, millions of voters are ready to endorse this Goldwater position with their marks on the ballot. In 1960, there were 34,108,546 who preferred the timidly conservative Richard Nixon to the more liberal John F. Kennedy, who won by only 118,550 popular votes out of 68,325,642 cast. Millions of others didn't vote, partly because there seemed to be little choice between the two.

GOLDWATER's grassroots strength probably is as great as it was before the assassination of President Kennedy. We haven't heard or read of any genuine Goldwater believer changing his mind. His loss has been in the wishful utterances of those who wouldn't be for him under any circumstances; and among those professional politicians with candidates of their own, or who put political principle second to winning and have feared the South-West influence of President Johnson as an obstacle to the Southwest attraction of Senator GOLDWATER.

We'll hear much more of this geopolitical talk in the next 6 months—so much more that we'll have to watch closely to keep it from obscuring the principles involved in the campaign. This is so because Senator GOLDWATER must win the Republican Party nomination before the people get the choice they desire: between the kind of government he espouses, and the kind we have had for the past 30 years. All other apparent candidates for the Republican nomination offer little more than the sort of campaign the party has waged against Democrats in the past: "We wouldn't do things much differently, but we could do them better."

It won't be easy for GOLDWATER to win that Republican nomination, regardless of his strength among the voters. The power in the Republican National Convention—as in the Democratic Convention—is held in the big blocs of votes from the large cities and States which send delegates who want, first of all, a presidential candidate who can carry to victory their party's ticket of candidates for Governor, Senator, Congressmen and local officials. This means they will be trying to satisfy all the hometown and home State minority blocs and voting groups which play one party against the other—generally to extract the maximum governmental generosity.

The greatest service the Republican Party can do this Nation in 1964 is to subordinate its local political pressures and offer all the people a clear-cut choice between the Goldwater-type conservatism and the Johnson-type liberalism. Democrats should welcome the test.

Only after the ballots have been counted in such definitive poll can we recognize and weigh the sort of popular mandate which is supposed to be influential in our republican, or representative democratic form of government.

USIA Chief Carl Rowan, Native of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Carl T. Rowan, who was recently named by President Johnson to become Director of the U.S. Information Agency, is a native of McMinnville, Tenn., which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Ambassador Rowan certainly has made a distinguished career for himself and we in the Fourth District of Tennessee are justly proud of his latest achievement.

He has an outstanding record in the news and public affairs field having won several awards as a reporter. He is also the author of several books and has served previously as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and more recently as Ambassador of Finland.

His vast experience and training should certainly enable him to carry on the duties and program of the U.S. Information Agency in the finest tradition.

As Representative of the Fourth District of Tennessee, I want to congratulate Ambassador Rowan on this new honor and wish him well in this new endeavor as Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, with chief emphasis these days on peace—and we all want peace—the more important goal of universal freedom sometimes tends to become obscure. "Peace, peace," has been the cry of the ages, and it is being sounded more and more today. But there is no peace, that is, not universal peace. And there will not be universal peace until there is universal freedom.

There is no single or simple solution to the many-faceted problem of developing and carrying out a right and sound foreign policy. And such solution will continue to elude us until every U.S. effort at achieving peace becomes inexorably linked with an equal and avowed determination of the United States to do all it can to help the people of all enslaved nations win their freedom. Every step in what we think is the direction of peace, unless it is first a step in the direction of freedom for those in bondage, is a snare and a delusion.

Yesterday, January 22, was the 46th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, one of the larger countries in Eastern Europe, whose stouthearted inhabitants constitute the largest ethnic group in the region. But despite the size of their fertile land and their immense numbers, some 40 million Ukrainians have been submerged in the Russian continent since the mid-17th century. During all that time, for more than 250 years, Russians had done their worst to suppress and eradicate Ukrainian national feeling and all its attendant traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their readiness to sacrifice their all for the attainment of their national goal. But all the efforts of callous Russian authorities proved of no avail, and the Ukrainians clung firmly and steadfastly to their fine ideals. Toward the end of the First World War, when Russia's decrepit autocracy was overthrown, and Austria could no longer hold western Ukraine, Ukrainian leaders seized upon the occasion and proclaimed their national independence. That was done on January 22, 46 years ago.

Unfortunately the newborn Ukrainian National Republic was under terrible handicaps from the moment of its birth. It was frail and fragile, and there were no friends close by to aid it effectively. The country was in ruins and the fertile Ukraine was a wasteland. To cope with such grave problems was a gigantic task, but even more difficult was the task of warding off the deadly threat of Communist Russia. Early in 1920 the country was attacked and overrun by the Red army, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since then this once-free and youthful republic has been swallowed by the Soviet empire.

Even so, these hardy peasants and gallant fighters for their freedom have not given up hope for the realization of their ideals. These ideals still live in their hearts and souls, and await for the day when freedom and independence shall once more become part of life in the Ukraine.

On the 46th anniversary celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day let us all pray that the day of their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny is not far off. And let us determine that universal freedom is part of our foreign policy, and one of our Nation's goals.

Faith, Hope, and Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most realistic comments on the President's budget and economic messages which I have had the privilege of reading appeared as an editorial in the Evening Star on January 22, 1964.

I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial, for one cannot accept the President's budget and economic messages without expressing extreme charity.

FAITH, HOPE, AND CHARITY

No one, reading the President's budget and economic messages, could be left in the slightest doubt that this is an election year. The two add up to a masterful presentation—a truly impressive demonstration of the art of putting forward the best foot. Even the most cantankerous curmudgeon would hardly dispute this.

The budget message has something in it for everyone. Mr. Johnson says he believes it is a budget of economy and progress. For only the second time in 9 years, it calls for a reduction in administrative budget expenditures. It seeks a substantial reduction in total civilian employment (but with higher pay) in the executive branch. It cuts the deficit in half. And, says the President, it carries us a giant step toward the achievement of a balanced budget in a full-employment, full-prosperity economy. The Secretary of the Treasury expects that a balanced budget, barring some catastrophe, will be reached in fiscal 1967.

Could anyone ask for more? The answer evidently is "Yes." For the President went on to give assurance that his budget safeguards the peace by further strengthening the most formidable defense establishment the world has ever known. It recommends continued military assistance to nations menaced by Communist aggression. It provides for economic assistance to nations willing to guard their freedom through economic self-help. There is provision for funds necessary to advance our mastery of space toward the achievements of a manned lunar landing in this decade. In addition, funds are asked for sound management and development of our natural and agricultural resources, and there are appropriation requests for education, housing, manpower training, health, and employment opportunities for youth—in short, a combined request for more funds than ever before for fuller development of our Nation's most important resource—its people. Finally, this Johnson budget makes provision for initiation of a new and major effort to break the vicious circle of chronic poverty.

At this point there must be some who are wondering whether the budget is not really a prescription for our national bankruptcy. But the answer this time is "no." President Johnson assures us that the "urgent and necessary program increases" which he recommends "will be financed out of the savings made possible by strict economy measures and by an exhaustive screening of existing programs." In a word, the taxpayers will not have to put up an additional dime. In fact, even after allowance for a "temporary" drop in Federal revenues resulting from a tax cut, if it is enacted this year, the President expects administrative budget receipts to rise in 1965 by $4.6 billion. This would result in an administrative budget deficit of $4.9 billion in fiscal 1965—$5.1 billion less than the estimated deficit for the current year.

There are, of course, the dissenters and the doubters. Some are disturbed by the irony of pressing for a tax cut in a boom year. One Senator has been heard to say: "If we can't balance our budget now, we will never balance it." This sounds as though it might have come from Virginia's Senator BYRD. But it didn't. It came from Wisconsin's Senator PROXMIRE, a Democrat who is generally thought of as a liberal. Iowa's Senator MILLER is a Republican, and a conservative. But he is not given to loose talk, and thus some attention should be paid to him when he accuses the President of using fictitious figures in estimating the country's economic gain. Senator GOLDWATER, another conservative, has accused the President of being less than honest in his budget estimates. But Senator MILLER cites specific bases for his complaint; Senator GOLDWATER does not.

For our own part we contemplate these messages with mixed emotions. The Johnson recommendations seem to us to add up to a formula which raises at least a serious prospect of inflation, and we are not greatly reassured by his promise to "draw public attention" to price increases or wage demands that are excessive. For example, the United Automobile Workers are expected to submit new wage demands this summer. If they should prove to be excessive, and if the President in an election year proves content merely to draw public attention to them, a further shrinkage of the dollar will be a virtual certainty.

How, then, should one appraise this budget? Is the utopia which it envisages really so close at hand? We hope very much that the President's optimistic expectations are realized. But we are skeptical.

Perhaps it might be said that this is a budget message which cries out for acceptance in a spirit of faith, hope and charity. If so, as has been said, the greatest of these is charity.

Six White Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is a young, talented, 15-year-old

girl in my district who has stirred the hearts of all Detroiters through her sorrowful interpretation of the funeral tragedy as seen through the eyes of little John-John. Miss Candy Geer, of Grosse Pointe, Mich., deeply impressed with the reactions of the late President Kennedy's little son at the funeral proceedings, composed a poem in which she describes the bewilderment of a small boy who "wonders where his daddy has gone."

Her poem, which was printed in the Detroit News on January 21, has made the young and the old sadly recall those bleak November days; but this time, those days are recalled through the eyes of a brokenhearted little boy who no longer has his daddy.

I would like to have the Members of Congress and every American read this poem which has truly made Detroit cry again:

SIX WHITE HORSES

(By Candy Geer)

Six white horses came today
To take my Daddy far away.
Mommy said I must be good
And stand as big as Daddy would.
And now I am big, so I won't cry.
When I see my Daddy wave goodby.
'Cause Daddy is my special friend.
He always comes back soon again.
I cannot wave, I don't see why?
There's just a black box moving by.
But Mommy says I should be still.
I'm a big boy now, and so I will.
I hear some drums; they're awful loud!
My Mommy's sad and so's the crowd.
And everybody's dressed in black.
But Daddy soon will hurry back.
We're going to take a walk to mass.
Then maybe I'll see Daddy pass.
I wonder why we're only three?
He always comes to church with me.
Two men are talking, I can see.
They said they're very proud of me.
They said my Daddy's in that box—
The black one, with the six gold locks.
I have on a big boy's suit.
And now it's my turn to salute.
I do it just like big boys do
Because I have to be one, too.
They're going to stop and then just leave.
But in that box how will he breathe?
Though I do not understand
There's Mommy here to hold my hand.
He's going to leave and not come home!
We just can't leave him here alone.
I want to hear him laugh and say,
"John-John, come here so we can play."
I don't see Daddy anywhere.
I want to cry and I don't care!
He's in the ground—he cannot be.
He should be right here holding me!
But Mommy says I must be good—
So I'll just stand as Daddy would.

Competitive Bidding for the Storage of Government-Owned Stocks of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly today a relatively new policy of the Department of Agriculture which provides for a system of competitive bidding for the storage of at least a portion of Government-owned stocks of cotton and, in that connection, to mention something about an outstanding Louisiana citizen a distinguished resident of my own congressional district—who has been instrumental in the development of this procedure, which is resulting in substantial savings to the overburdened American taxpayer, which is in keeping with the fundamental principles of the American system of free enterprise and which is, in my opinion, proving to be in the best interests of the cotton farmer and the public as a whole.

The gentleman to whom I refer is Mr. J. Donald Lindsey, a lifelong resident of Bernice, Union Parish, La., who not only is one of the leading businessmen residing within the Fifth Congressional District, but is one of the outstanding citizens of our great State. He has been highly successful in his business endeavors, despite many obstacles and difficulties, and at the same time has consistently taken an active and effective interest in the general development of his home community and parish, the northeast Louisiana area, and our State as a whole.

A graduate of the Louisiana public school system and of Louisiana State University, from which he received a degree in business administration, Mr. Lindsey has been personally active in the warehousing of cotton continuously since about 1930, except for nearly 5 years of naval service during World War II. He is manager and part owner of the Lindsey Bonded Warehouse Co. at Bernice, which was founded 54 years ago by his late father and which has been engaged, without interruption, in the business of storing cotton since its establishment.

Mr. Speaker, before the competitive bidding warehousing policy was adopted by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Government-owned cotton was being handled on a negotiated basis at a rate of about 43 cents a bale monthly, plus handling charge fees for receiving and shipping. Not much more than a year ago, or thereabout, the Agriculture Department requested bids for this type of storage, and Mr. Lindsey's warehouse—one of the 10 licensed and bonded cotton warehouses situated in my congressional district—submitted a bid with a rate of 10 cents a bale monthly.

A controversy has developed within the warehousing industry since the new policy was announced and the Department began to implement it, but I am compelled by the facts of the matter to endorse this policy. And, in doing so, I feel confident that the inland cotton warehouses, including the 10 which are in my congressional district, can compete successfully in this type of free-enterprise operation, as one of them—Mr. Lindsey's—is already demonstrating it can do. In my mind, there is no doubt of the fact that the use of the competitive-bid basis is the more businesslike manner, the sounder and fairer procedure, for handling the storage of Government-owned reconcentrated cotton. There are no facts of record that I know of to refute the conclusion that the operation of the free-enterprise system, with competitive bidding on all Government contracts in cases where there has been ample time to establish the cost factor, is better for the community and the country than favoritism and glossed-over subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to submit, as an extension of my remarks, a statement dealing with this matter which was presented last week by Mr. Lindsey before a Department of Agriculture hearing held in New Orleans. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF J. D. LINDSEY, BERNICE, LA., BEFORE A HEARING BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON JANUARY 16 AND 17, 1964, IN NEW ORLEANS, LA.

My name is J. D. Lindsey and I am a resident of Bernice, La. I am manager and part owner of Lindsey Bonded Warehouse Co. at Bernice.

First for the sake of brevity of this statement, I would like to place in the record the statement I made in Washington at similar hearings held by the Department of Agriculture on March 7, 1963, as exhibit A. This statement refutes again the many continuing, misleading, and misstatements of facts about the operation of our company.

Briefly, our company was founded in 1910, 54 years ago by my late father to serve the cotton farmers in the trade area of Bernice, La., and has been in the business of storing cotton continuously since that time. We are probably one of the oldest cotton warehouse companies continuously serving the farmer in this country and are now also one of the larger storers of cotton having a capacity of over 160,000 bales. We have been licensed to warehouse cotton under the U.S. Warehouse Act since its inception in the early 1930's.

I came to this hearing not planning to enter a statement into the record because of my belief that the record of service of my company to farmers, to the cotton trade, and to the Government was beyond question. However, upon arrival here yesterday, I learned of derogatory statements made against my company by a representative of other warehouses in the Atlanta hearings this week and heard in the statement of Mr. Henry Ford, general manager of the National Compress and Warehouse Co., Inc. of Drew, Miss., a further unwarranted attack upon the judgment of CCC officials in shipping 150,000 bales of Government-acquired cotton to our plant for storage at an insured storage rate of 10 cents per bale per month. As a result, I feel compelled to make this statement and set the record straight.

We have now had an average of about 140,000 bales of Government-acquired cotton in storage for 12 months. If this cotton had been stored in Mr. Henry Ford's plant at Drew, Miss., at the uniform negotiated contract rate of 41 cents per bale per month which has been in effect since August 1, 1963, it would have cost the Government 31 cents per bale per month or $3.72 per bale for the last year more than it has cost for the Government to store at 10 cents per bale per month in our plant. Actually, the saving has been even greater because the negotiated rate prior to August 1, 1963, was 46 cents per bale per month. This would have cost the American taxpayers exactly $520,800 more in 1 single year than the CCC has had to pay because of competitive bidding. Even in the face of this fact, many of the warehouse companies testifying here yesterday and today have said that the present negotiated rate of 41 cents is too low. We do not believe that the American taxpayers are going to much longer allow any public official to not take full advantage of the large savings available to them through competitive bidding for the storage of all their acquired stocks of cotton. This is the only fair and time-honored system in awarding all Government business of this type. Our new President has called upon all Government departments to exert greater efforts

to effect more economy in the conduct of the Government's business. We believe the taxpayers are going to demand it.

To return to Mr. Ford's criticism of CCC official's actions in the case of my company, Mr. Ford complains that only one-tenth of our stock of 150,000 bales has been sold recently whereas nearly half of his 68,000 bales of acquired cotton has been sold by CCC. This fact is only further additional evidence of the very astute judgment made by CCC officials when they placed a type of cotton in our plant at by far the lowest rate available to them, which cotton they assumed would not be as likely to sell as quickly as more desirable cottons at this particular time. Their good judgment has now been fully vindicated by the passage of time. It is possible or even probable that the 140,000 bales in our plant could remain another year in which case the CCC will have saved for the American taxpayer an additional half million dollars. Thus, the one judgment made by the responsible CCC officials in the case of our company stands to save the American taxpayers over $1 million in 2 short years. In addition, they have through the competitive bid policy already saved several millions of dollars in storage charges from many other warehouse companies. These public officials should be publicly commended for their good management of the Government's business and for their courage in effecting these savings in the face of much harassment. For our part, we are proud that our company has had the ability and willingness to serve the Government so well.

It has been mentioned in these hearings that we may have built additional space recently. This is a fact. We did this at considerable financial risk because we were called upon unexpectedly by farmers some 80 miles away to store their cotton for them this season because their local compresses were full and unable to take their cotton and the farmer was faced with substantial losses if he could not get a warehouse receipt to get a loan on it. We had served many of these same farmers in 1953, 1954, and 1956, when the same conditions occurred. This season it is very likely that similar conditions would not have occurred as they did in many places all over the Mississippi Valley if the Government had offered all of their acquired stocks for storage at competitive bids. By providing this space for these farmers when they sorely needed it, our company has maintained its long tradition of 54 years' standing of never having refused to store a bale of cotton for a farmer when he requested it.

Much mention has been made at these hearings about the hardships that will occur in small farming towns, in the Farm Belt, if the Government offers its acquired cotton for competitive bids. Our plant is located in a country town of 1,500 population in the Farm Belt and not at a port. Our company and our employees have not found it necessary or desirable to plead for special favors from the Government when we could earn our way in the American tradition. All that our company and our employees ask here is that we be allowed the opportunity to offer our services to our Government on an equal basis with other businesses and citizens.

Thank you.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the executive chapter of the National Secretaries Association (International) is an outstanding organization and well known. It has been active over the years and has contributed much to the welfare of its members and the cause it espouses.

At their regular meeting October 22, 1963, Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg, retired, troop information officer, military district of Washington, U.S. Army, addressed this distinguished group on the subject "What Freedom Means to Me." Captain Breitenberg has since retired and established residence in Arkadelphia, Ark., in my district. He will do some teaching in Ouachita College there.

I would like to commend this interesting discussion of Captain Breitenberg, a member of our Armed Forces for over 20 years and, therefore, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg)

Madame President, Mrs. Amerine, other distinguished members, and guests of the executive chapter of the National Secretaries Association, I am honored to have the privilege of joining you tonight on the occasion of this meeting. I am thrilled to share the company of so many beautiful and charming ladies.

A gentleman asked me the other night at the award ceremony honoring the Armed Forces chess finalists why I served so frequently as guest speaker throughout the Washington area. My reply to him may clarify to you my presence here tonight. As expressed by the Honorable William McKinley, 25th President of the United States, "There is no art like the art of dissemination of useful information, of enlightening the public, of correcting false impressions."

Having read carefully the small pamphlet graciously mailed to me by Mrs. Amerine, I realize the unquestionable character and integrity required of members of this association, and the degree of intelligence possessed by each of you. Let my objective then be to provide you with some useful information if you will permit an Army captain to express a few deeply felt sentiments prior to his retirement from active duty in the near future. The subject of this talk is "What Freedom Means to Me."

Some 20 years ago I enlisted as a private in the U.S. Army. I kid you not—I was a green country boy. I'm still a country boy as General of the Armies John J. Pershing expressed so well: "I'm just a country boy who happens to be in the Army." Those 20 years have passed mighty fast, and some of you may know what I mean.

Yes; time passes very fast. It is true that life is but a fleeting shadow, a vapor that quickly disappears.

The swiftness in passage of time was recently witnessed by a little old man in California who caught a local airplane at San Francisco to travel to New York. He would say nothing to a seat companion, but observed all that happened on the trip. Each time the airplane stopped enroute, a little red truck would drive up to the airplane—this happened in Denver, in Chicago, and finally in New York. Determined to get a word out of our little friend, his companion of the trip remarked: "That was a mighty fast trip, wasn't it?" At this, our friend spoke up, "Yes, and let me tell you something, that little red truck didn't lose any time either."

Before I tell you what freedom means to me, permit me to pay a tribute to womanhood. A speaker is often inspired to go beyond his notes, depending upon his audience. I read your code of ethics "* * * To lend grace, charm, and sobriety to all our dealings, and to maintain poise and dignity under all conditions and circumstances; to keep our lives clean and wholesome, so our very presence may bring life and light to those about us; to encourage ambition, lend hope, and nourish faith, remembering that the eternal laws of God are the only ones under which we can truly succeed."

The letters on the NSA emblem, "BL," which speak well for you ladies, stand for "better learning, better letters, better living." Throughout the history of our country, organizations such as this one, the National Secretaries Association, have been moved by noble ideals. Today it is chiefly the principles of altruism and solidarity that motivates. In the face of pressing danger, we live in a free society which is not yet beseiged, but already seriously threatened. We have to do more to perpetuate the virtues of faith and hope. We must not permit our Nation to rest upon the self-indulgent satisfaction of what we have accomplished; we must muster a feeling of impatience to do even better.

I have read that a deep and hidden desire in woman is her desire for order, for she is the true natural artist.

The pages of history bear witness to the vital role played by women throughout the life of mankind to contribute to and to motivate—all to obtain the ultimate in happiness and progress.

The Easter season impresses upon each of us the faithfulness and concern of women—especially during the crucifixion, burial, and resurrection, as Christians believe, of Jesus Christ. We are aware today of the equal if not excelled position of women in the world in which we live. We recall the wives of past Presidents such as Dolly Madison, Mary Todd Lincoln, and Eleanor Roosevelt and how they made an impact on American history, not only as wives and mothers, but on their own account.

It is no accident that nature is called Mother, that nations are personified in the feminine gender, and that ships are thought of as queens. From the depths of civilized cultures, the feminine principle has almost the importance of an essence in their culture. The Greeks may have cloistered their own women, yet the basis of their religious concepts devolved upon the proper goddess.

It is not by chance that Christianity, which called to itself almost the whole human race and bore witness to the belief that God alone animated the world, calls its church on earth, "mother." The feminine nature has beauty and strength, intuition, and judgment, charm and grace, and beneath it all, the guiding principle. In women, this is a gift for life.

What order does woman desire? She wants a physical order, cleanliness, design, style, and health. She wants a moral order. She is not satisfied with only avoiding evil; she desires good. She is reviled by the spectacle of a conscience that blurs good and evil into a grey area. She wants justice for herself and others. She despises lust because it is a sordid revolt against reason. She will bear what she must because she knows the shape of life experience assumes the shape of the cross.

What does freedom mean to me? Freedom implies a cross—a burden. The same burden that some of you bear each day of life whether it be in the pursuit of your office work, in the home, or here tonight as your thoughts seek to resolve problems that we all have. Should be expect less? Was it not a burden that our ancestors bore to give us this great nation? Was it not a burden that Clara Barton carried that marked her as "The Angel of the Battlefield" during the American Civil War? Was it not a burden that motivated her to give up her clerical duties with the Patent Office right here in Washington, purchase her own supplies, and independently move among the wounded as a nurse during that noble war?

Was it not a burden that General of the Armies John J. Pershing carried to reach his

unparalleled rank after his wife and three small children burned to death in Army quarters early in his Army career? Was it not a heavy burden that Abraham Lincoln carried during the great American Civil War that played a major role in helping to unite our country into one great Nation?

It is not a burden that we bear today in these perilous times in which we live? We are told that if we trust those who would bury us we are fools, and yet if we don't trust them and make every effort to avoid the holocaust of a nuclear war, we are devils. Freedom means many things, but above all freedom implies burdens. Every living person must carry his share at some time during life's journey.

In March of this year, I made a trip to my native State to pay last respects to my wonderful brother Ernest who passed away at a relatively young age of 58. My brother was a fine, God-fearing man who was eulogized by his minister as a man who gave his life for his friends. In final farewell, I kissed the forehead of my dear brother as he lay in his coffin, and in that brief second I realized perhaps for the first time the truth of the scripture writing "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." I realized in that kiss that my brother's spirit had departed his earthly remains to be with God. Shortly after I returned to my home in Springfield, Va., I requested retirement from the Army to devote my life to God's calling to the teaching profession. It was then that I realized that burdens are sometimes hidden blessings and I resolved to utilize my talents to help others by teaching.

I faced the fact so well expressed in the Old Book of Life, that we all have "gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy, according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: Or he that teacheth on teaching. I was transformed by the renewing of my mind and I realized that I must not think of myself more highly than I ought to think.

Basically, freedom is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, accepting without equivocation that happiness is a state of mind. A teacher must keep faith with freedom, must teach the truth, must instill these basic concepts in the youth entrusted to him to mold a nation of the future, dedicated to uphold and preserve these inalienable rights for all mankind. A teacher's burden then becomes a shining light to show the way, to teach that men who gave their lives for freedom did not die in vain, but fell for those behind them who were slow footed and knew not the way and fell for those before them who, though faster and surer of foot removed not the stumbling blocks.

Freedom means to free ourselves from the shackles of harboring secretly in our hearts a newer and more dangerous division of our Nation.

We must keep faith within ourselves and in our fellow man.

We must take pride in our own heritage, race, religion, and our own person, beliefs, and then we shall remain free to develop our talents and bend our thoughts to meet the main requirement of life—to fight the good fight not deviating from freedom's purpose, and in due time we shall receive our just rewards.

Freedom is the right to choose which is exemplified by the young man who inquired, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" And when told to keep the commandments of God he replied "* * * All these I have observed from my youth." Then his Master said, "One more thing thou lackest: Go thy way, sell whatever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shall have treasure in heaven; and come take up the cross, and follow Me." And the young man was sad at that saying and went away grieved for he has great possessions, wealth, maybe pride, maybe prejudice—it appears that the cross was too heavy for him to carry.

I thank God for the past years of military service, for the opportunity of having been privileged to know and work with so many fine officers and men. I am thankful too for every opportunity to increase my knowledge and grow in stature as a citizen soldier. I am especially thankful for the last 3 years of service at the seat of government. I have learned that there is no differentiation in respect of persons with God. I have learned to examine myself and to prove myself. I have learned to carry my cross.

Mother, queen, goddess; yes, you are the salt of the earth. It may be that in your hands rest the destiny of this world. To my darling mother, still living, thank God, I close with deep respect and loving admiration for giving me life, liberty, and the opportunity to pursue happiness. To my wife, daughter, and son, I pay tribute for their love and devotion.

How fortunate that one of my last acts of public service as an officer on active duty should be the honor and privilege to speak to such a distinguished group as you. Thank you sincerely for your attention.

"Freedom, oh that precious sound that bind our hearts together. Should a burden come your way would you just remember. Give this life the best you have, fears dispelled forever."

A Tribute to President Kennedy by Nathaniel Spector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an eloquent tribute to the late President Kennedy. This tribute was presented to the joint board of the Millinery Workers Union by the union's manager Nathaniel Spector.

The tribute follows:

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF OUR MARTYRED PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Nathaniel Spector)

President Kennedy wanted to be President. He fought for it heroically—not for his own glory or power, but for the power of his office to advance the welfare and progress of the American people for disarmament and world peace.

With the rise of John F. Kennedy to the Presidency, new vigor, vitality and creativeness were brought into the life of our Nation. President Kennedy's assumption of leadership of our Nation was a breath of fresh air, a reawakening—like life in spring. His fresh, youthful spirit captivated not only the people of his generation, but most Americans; he revitalized, invigorated and gave new hope for a better life for all Americans.

He was a great liberal humanitarian and a true believer of democratic principles and practices. He took decisive action where and when necessary. He was unafraid of new ideas; of problems—national or international; he welcomed those that he thought could bring benefits to the American people and peace to the democratic people all over the world. He was the symbol of a better future; of a new approach to national and world problems. He was the promise of a better tomorrow, free of poverty, prejudice, unemployment, inequality, injustice, and ignorance.

On November 22, the day of his assassination, his death inscribed itself deep in the hearts of all Americans for all time.

The day of his arrival in Dallas, Tex., a page ad appeared in the Morning News, sponsored by the American Fact-Finding Committee, which had its purpose to arouse the people against the President.

Following the assassination of President Kennedy, a woman teacher wrote to the daily press, stating that the people of Dallas were responsible for the death of President Kennedy. She was dismissed. A traveling salesman was in a movie house when the assassination of President Kennedy was announced; the audience applauded. A priest stated that when the assassination of the President was announced in school, the children applauded.

The people in the South made it known now that they had no intention of voting for President Kennedy if he ran for office next year. They would rather vote for a Republican.

It is evident that the bloodstream of the people has been poisoned by bigotry prejudice, falsehood, and hatred.

President Kennedy was the captain of his soul. Courage and dedication do not die. Tonight we express our admiration, in sorrow, and pay homage to his lasting memory and, collectively, we pour our grief and tears in a common pool. Our leader is dead, but his leadership is with America—it shall never die.

To his courageous widow and his two lovely, fatherless children, our hearts go out.

The Panama Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that we must take a firm position in dealing with the Panama crisis. There may be differences which can be discussed, and perhaps adjusted, along such lines as payments to Panama, wages, and so forth, but I believe that these should not be negotiated under pressure or threats of violence.

Under leave granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Asheville-Citizen of January 21, 1964, which I think is statesmanlike and to the point:

UNITED STATES HAS FEW CHOICES IN THE PANAMA CRISIS

What would you do if you were President of the United States, confronted by the crisis in Panama?

Say that you're reasonably liberal, aware of all the social errors this country has committed in the Canal Zone, conscious of the poverty that has encouraged radical agents to lance a festering sore—what would you do?

We'd do this:

Issue a statement, free of qualifying phrases, that the United States will control the zone as long as it believes such control is necessary to assure an orderly operation.

Call for an end to violence, making it clear that violence will be quelled by forceful means if necessary.

Order more units of the U.S. fleet into waters off Panama.

Inform Khrushchev that this family quarrel is none of his affair.

Make clear to Castro that Cuba will be wrecked in the first wave if his troublemakers in Panama provoke a war.

Move several thousand airborne troops into the Canal Zone until the crisis is settled.

Offer again to talk about the issues.

This is a hard course of action. We, meaning the United States, may be responsible for much of the trouble in Panama; we have been, on occasion, stupid. But we are confronted by a situation that, whatever the equities, demands a firm stand. The posture of a nation is at stake in this piddling quarrel.

After it's over—and it will end—we can demonstrate all the charity of a victor, and that is proper. At the moment, however, we need to pull out the biggest stick we can requisition and wave it over Panama.

That is, for some of us, a reluctant conclusion. But, if U.S. prestige is to vanish in world affairs, we are not content to idly watch it drown in Panama.

A Tribute to Dr. St. Paul Epps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in inserting into the RECORD highlights from the life and accomplishments of the Reverend St. Paul Epps, of Los Angeles, I wish to acknowledge on behalf of a grateful community the inspiration and good that result from one man who truly cares for his fellow man.

Dr. Epps has been invited to become a member of the staff of the executive council of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. He will be secretary of the department of stewardship and interpretation, with offices at 475 Riverside Drive, New York City, beginning February 4, 1964.

Personally, and on behalf of our community, I want to wish him success in his new duties. It is our sincere hope we shall continue in some way to share his friendship and spiritual counsel.

When the Reverend Dr. Epps came to Los Angeles in 1946, to begin the work of the Bel-Vue Church, he said in a newspaper article:

> We want this to be a community church, where people of all evangelical faiths, regardless of race, can happily worship and find the best in Christian education. Our United Presbyterian Church has no significance except as it is, and continue to be a true and worthy branch of the great church of Christ. We welcome everyone.

All he had to work with were a manse and a two-car garage, which served as a church and meeting place, given him by his home missions board of the former United Presbyterian Church, N.A., and a field allocated by the community committee of Los Angeles Church Federation.

The 28 charter members, that accepted his kind invitation to join the church, labored with the Reverend Dr. Epps to bring the membership of the church to its present number of 700. The Sunday school has over 450 members. With the growth, it became necessary to enlarge the facilities. McCulloch Hall, a $60,000 educational unit, was dedicated in 1958. The combined value of the main building and the educational unit is about $200,000.

The Bel-Vue Nursery School was begun by the Reverend Dr. Epps and members in 1952, and now has an enrollment of 65 children, providing care for them while their parents are working.

Dr. Epps has worked diligently with the church and community. His services to the church include: Student pastor at the Bidwell Street Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh; his first charge was pastor, United Presbyterian Church, Henderson, N.C., and United Presbyterian charge, Townsville, N.C.—a dual charge. He has rendered the following services also: Moderator of Tennessee Presbytery; vice moderator, California Synod; director of high school summer conference; moderator, Los Angeles Presbytery; moderator, California Synod; member of special committee of consolidation; member of the board of church extensions and chairman of the special ministries committee.

In 1963, Dr. Epps was appointed to the executive council and to the Commission on Religion and Race of the United Presbyterian Church.

His community services are: president, Watts Health Council; member, board of directors of Health, Education and Venereal Diseases Council, Los Angeles; member of the board of directors of Southern Area Boys Club; member of Green Meadows District Committee, Boy Scouts of America; vice president of South Los Angeles Committee for Better Education; active member of the Urban League; member of NAACP; and member of board of directors of Westminster Neighborhood Association.

In addition to the above, Dr. Epps has served on many other committees in the community sponsored by our congressional office. The most prominent are: First, the Coordinating Committee on Economical Developments and Employment; second, the south central committee—a committee working on problems of urban renewal in the district; and third, the special mental health committee set up to develop programs in the area of mental hygiene.

Dr. Epps has an excellent educational background. He was an honor student at Virginia Union University; he was so outstanding at Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn., where he attended for 2 years; he was awarded a scholarship to the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary. He received his bachelor of theology degree there in 1942, majoring in sociology and history. His graduate work includes study at the University of Pittsburgh for 1 year; 1 year in Graduate School of Religion at University of Southern California; and 12 annual convocations at the School of Religion of University of Southern California. The degree of doctor of divinity was conferred on the Reverend Dr. Epps by Sterling College, Sterling, Kans., in 1957. In the summer of 1960, he toured the Holy Land and Europe, which greatly added to his understanding and appreciation for the kind of work the church is doing and must continue to do. The aim of his service is still the integration of the church and community life.

The 95th Anniversary Banquet and Annual Meeting of the New England Shoe & Leather Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House information with reference to the 95th anniversary banquet and annual meeting by the New England Shoe & Leather Association held at the Sheraton-Plaza Ballroom, Boston, Mass., on January 22, 1964. The Honorable William Bates, of Salem, Mass., and myself, were head table guests. The shoe industry was warm in their praise for the 10-man congressional committee who were of great assistance to the industry during the past year.

I include a program with a report by Robert E. Wall, president of the association:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE & LEATHER ASSOCIATION—THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET AND ANNUAL MEETING, THE SHERATON-PLAZA BALLROOM, BOSTON, MASS., JANUARY 22, 1964

Program: President's address, Robert E. Wall; nominating committee report, Saul L. Katz, chairman; installation of officers and directors; greetings extended by His Excellency, Endicott Peabody, Governor of Massachusetts; address by Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; Toastmaster, Robert E. Wall, President.

To Members:

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three was a successful year of great activity.

The regulations by the Federal Trade Commission requiring labeling of shoes by manufacturers; the pressing import problem and the successful promotion of two big nationals, as a solution to the shoe show problem, highlighted the year's activities.

Membership rolls have declined from a year ago, due primarily to liquidations and mergers among shoe manufacturers. Currently membership totals 391 companies made up of 243 shoe manufacturing members, 54 leather firms, and 94 companies in allied trades.

Your association is in a sound financial position to carry out its membership services and programs in the future.

In this report we shall highlight only the principal services and accomplishments of major programs, rendered to the membership by our executive vice president and staff, in accordance with policies and directives approved by officers and directors. The detailed facts as to these services and programs are recorded in the bulletins to members issued regularly during the year.

SHOE SHOW OPERATIONS

There is no more important function and service rendered by your association than its

cosponsorship and operation of shoe shows. Your association, in cooperation with the National Shoe Manufacturers Association, the National Shoe Retailers Association, and the National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, sponsors the National Shoe Fairs of America in New York in April and in Chicago during October, plus the New York Shoe Show in November and the Miami Beach Shoe Show in September.

Beginning in 1964, the show operated by the St. Louis Shoe Manufacturers Association, will be promoted as a regional show and its dates will no longer coincide with the national shoe fairs in New York in April. This coordinated effort on the part of all shoe associations has solved all major problems involving shoe shows, so that all members should benefit from the proper timing and better operations of shoe shows in the future. Such cooperation is an excellent example of how our industry is working together to solve common problems. We wish to express public appreciation to Joseph Bloom, chairman of the administrative committee of National Shoes Fairs of America, and association vice president, for his leadership in achieving these accomplishments.

Your association will continue to sponsor in 1964 two Boston advance market weeks for members and others who require a preshowing each season. They are operated on a nonprofit basis as a service to exhibitors and their customers.

SHOE INDUSTRY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The year 1963 witnessed the initiation of guides for shoe content labeling and advertising as promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission. These rulings became effective for shoes or slippers cut on or after January 12, 1963.

The industry coordinating committee, representing all shoe associations, issued two reference manuals, the revised edition being released on January 7, 1963. Most questions on labeling were answered in this manual which was prepared with the assistance of our members on this committee and our legal counsel. Your association continues to be a clearinghouse of information on problems concerning shoe labeling.

FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE FOR THE SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Without a doubt, this has been the most active and important committee in our industry during 1963. The committee is made up of representatives of our association, the National Shoe Manufacturers Association and the St. Louis Shoe Manufacturers Association. Director Alan H. Goldstein has given much of his time and effort in ably representing the association as vice chairman of this committee.

The major effort by this committee is to curtail the flood of imports that have taken away many millions of pairs of footwear from domestic producers annually. The greatest quantities of these imports are from nations where wages are a fraction of those in this country—especially in Japan and Italy.

Major accomplishments of this committee in 1963 included:

1. A joint industry agreement on a program of action.

2. Publication of pamphlet "Impact of Imports," with facts on shoe imports, which has received wide distribution.

3. Two congressional petitions—one signed by 259 Representatives and the other by 35 Senators—were presented to the President, urging him to provide relief from the flood of shoe imports by establishing voluntary quota arrangements.

4. White House conferences were held by leading Senators urging the President to take such action.

5. Another White House conference was held during October by a delegation of shoe leaders, accompanied by those Senators and Congressmen who have been the greatest leaders and supporters of the shoe industry.

The President clearly demonstrated a personal sympathetic understanding of the shoe imports problem. He agreed immediately to three of the five-point program presented to him as follows:

(a) Establishing 90 categories to collect statistics on imports and production. Government funds totaling $200,000, to pay the annual cost of this project.

(b) Appointment of a shoe industry advisory committee to the Government's Interagency Shoe Committee.

(c) Authorize State Department to arrange informal conferences, with Government officials participating, between U.S. shoe industry representatives and their counterparts in Italy and Japan.

On the two remaining points, and these are the major ones, the President stated that he could not take action at this time. These are:

(d) Placing shoes on the restrictive list—so present duties won't be subject to cuts in the next round of GATT negotiations.

(e) Government negotiation of a voluntary quota agreement limiting shoe imports.

This is the story on imports to date. All developments and events in the future will be published as they occur.

INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT BUREAU

The industrial management committee and Industrial Management Bureau were very active in 1963. These activities were concentrated on the presentation of seminars, workshops and conferences for members' information and study of the newest developments in the field of factory management. Presentations were for the benefit of operating and top management personnel of member companies. All these programs were conducted on a self-sustaining basis.

This was the fourth year that the committee has had a full-time manager, Mark L. Feeney, Jr., to carry out the program and operate the Industrial Management Bureau. Ably assisting the committee is Prof. Herbert F. Goodwin, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the association's management consultant. Currently, a new foreman development program is being sponsored with 83 foremen in attendance. In the 1961-62 period, 10 groups, amounting to 138 foremen, completed these courses. It is the intent of the committee to continue to offer these foremen development seminars as long as there continues to be a demand.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

The associations' technical committee met jointly with the National Shoe Manufacturers Association Technical Committee for a 2-day technical conference in Boston on November 12-13, 1963, visiting the three major shoe machinery companies. A joint report by both associations will be distributed to shoe members as a permanent record of the technical committee activities.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS BUREAU

The industrial relations committee determines the policies for operations of this bureau, which is managed by association secretary, Edward L. Davis.

During the year, the bureau conducted separate surveys among shoe members of wages, fringe benefits and salaries paid to shoe factory superintendents and foremen. The bureau also worked closely with Federal and State agencies to promote more training programs for shoe workers under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The bureau also published its annual analysis of unemployment compensation payments and as a result of continued effort, more members are enjoying the merit rating provisions of the laws in their States.

TRANSPORTATION BUREAU

Your association, as always, maintains a close watch on requests for increases in motor carrier rates by truckers and acts to protect members' interests in this matter. Your association is on record in opposition to docket No. 50, a proposal by the New England Motor Rate Bureau to raise all trucking rates between New England points and Boston by 8½ percent.

COMPUTER USERS COMMITTEE

The computer users committee completed the first phase of an integrated data processing system study in 1963. This group, composed of 10 member companies, defrayed the cost of this first phase by collective action independent of your association. The long-range objective of this project is to facilitate the availability to all shoe manufacturers in New England, in accordance with their individual requirements, of the most advanced integrated data processing system.

NATIONAL SHOE INSTITUTE

Your association is a cosponsor of the National Shoe Institute, the public relations agency for the shoe industry. Its budget of approximately $90,000 is financed by five sponsoring associations, as well as voluntary contributions from individual shoe and allied companies.

During 1963, Bernard S. Shapiro, a vice president of your association, served as chairman of the board of trustees. Maxwell Field, our able executive vice president, served as liaison officer. They both have earned our commendation for achieving a better integrated operation of the institute. The institute deserves the support of everyone in the trade.

CONCLUSION

The year just passed has been a momentous one for our industry, as well as our Nation. Your association has rendered many valuable services to its members.

Your association continues as a strong voice and the official representative of the New England shoe industry with all Government agencies. Its achievements are many and the benefits accruing to affected members are most substantial.

It has been a satifying and rewarding one for me as your president.

My personal appreciation is extended to my fellow officers and directors for their loyal and active support. To all members who have served on the several standing committees, I extend thanks on behalf of the directors. Finally, to our able and hard working executive vice president, Maxwell Field, my compliments for his most successful management of association affairs during 1963 and for his many loyal services rendered during the past 25 years. My appreciation is also extended to the staff for their fine work during my term of office.

To all members, my personal best wishes for your continued success and profitable operations in the future.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT E. WALL,
President.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, delivered the major speech of the evening to the New England Shoe & Leather Association. Senator KENNEDY reviewed the progress being made by industry and congressional leaders on the problem of mounting shoe imports. Senator KENNEDY reaffirmed his pledge to support the industry in its efforts to achieve an orderly market against sharp and disruptive floods of imports, and announced that he is aranging a meeting between Senators MUSKIE, PASTORE, Members of the U.S. House including Congressmen BURKE and BATES, with President Johnson.

Other highlights of the speeech included:

The latest import figures for 1963, which show another rise, to 13.9 percent of domestic production, more than double what they were 2 years ago.

A review of the progress being made under the four-point shoe program announced last October by President Kennedy.

Emphasized the significance of the developments being made by the Government in the investigation of import effects which the industry had requested.

Advanced new approaches for taking advantage of President Kennedy's order that the State Department help the industry to discuss with Japan and Italy the possibility of voluntary self-restraint on imports.

Commented on the constructiveness and effectiveness of the industry's efforts in Washington.

Announced that he would request President Johnson's strongest support and action to carry through the administration's program to help the industry help itself and for the President's "most sympathetic consideration for the industry's efforts against the impact of imports."

The New England Shoe & Leather Association, by unanimous vote, nominated and elected the following officers to serve during the current year for:

President: Bernard S. Shapiro, American Girl Shoe Co., Boston.

Vice presidents: Joseph Bloom, A. Sandler Co., Boston; Robert N. Bass, G. H. Bass & Co., Wilton, Maine; Richard N. Sears, Bates Shoe Co., Webster.

Treasurer: Helmer C. Johanson, Eagle Shoe Mfg. Co., Inc., Everett.

Executive vice president: Maxwell Field, Swampscott.

Secretary: Edward L. Davis, Newton.

Nominated for reelection all eligible directors as follows:

Harold P. Berk, Harman Shoes, Inc., Raymond, N.H.; Eliot L. Bernstein, American Biltrite Rubber Co., Chelsea; William P. Ellison, Proctor Ellison Co., Boston; DeFred G. Folts. Jr., Shain & Co., Inc., Boston; William S. Fraser, Jr., Commonwealth Shoe and Leather Co., Whitman; Paul E. Gardent, Jr., Garlin & Co., Inc., Boston; Harold D. Geilich, Geilich Tanning Co., Taunton; Harold R. Goldberg, Evangeline Shoe Corp., Manchester, N.H.; Alan H. Goldstein, Plymouth Shoe Co., Middleboro; Howard H. Grayson, Norrwock Shoe Co., Norridgewock, Maine; Milton Isenberg, Continental Shoe Corp., Portsmouth, N.H.; Norman Izenstatt, B. E. Cole Co., Norway, Maine; J. S. Kamborian, International Shoe Machine Corp., Boston; Martin M. Landay, the Green Shoe Manufacturing Co., Boston; Melvin S. Ornsteen, Ornsteen Shoe Co., Inc., Haverhill; Myer Saxe, Kesslen Shoe Co., Kennebunk, Maine; Winthrop A. Short, Knapp Bros. Shoe Manufacturing Corp., Brockton; Richard W. Shriner, French, Shriner & Urner Mfg. Co., Boston; Robert Siff, B-W Footwear Co., Inc., Webster.

Proposed and elected to the board of directors to replace Manuel Alter, Helmer C. Johanson, Joseph Miller, Simon Shain, G. Elliot Stickney and Richard N. Tarlow, all of whom have served loyally for 4 consecutive years and under the bylaws are not eligible for reelection, the following members:

David N. Borkum, Dartmouth Shoe Co., Brockton; F. Keats Boyd, B. A. Corbin & Son Co., Marlboro; Paul A. Crane, Roberts-Hart, Inc., Keene, N.H.; James R. McGinnity, Mrs. Day's Ideal Baby Shoe Co., Inc., Danvers; George Porter, Porter Shoe Co., Milford.

In addition, a former treasurer, Sidney Spiegel, of Bruce Shoe Co., Inc., Biddeford, Maine, was elected as a director.

Patent Office Fees

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8190) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me. I certainly do not intend to take the full 5 minutes. First of all I want to say I think the committee has done a very excellent job in preparing and bringing out this bill as well as in explaining it. Certainly I do not intend to go over the ground that has been so well covered by the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]. However, as a former practitioner of patent law, I would like to make very clear my enthusiastic support for this bill. A good many of the points made in opposition to the bill, of course, I am sure are motivated by the highest possible motives, but if I may say so, I think from an insider's view that they lack force in the face of two qualities of the bill that I want to emphasize.

First of all is the fact that this is a bill designed to meet the responsibilities that are imposed on the Congress to be financially responsible. This is a bill which fits in, I think, with the very admirable general principle that when special benefits accrue to identifiable recipents above and beyond those which accrue to the public at large, those recipients ought to support the services to a reasonable extent. Certainly this bill does that. It raises the level of the support for the Patent Office provided by those who receive special benefits from the Patent Office from about 30 percent of operating costs to about 75 percent. While one might quibble with the exact amounts of the fees imposed, one, I think, is almost compelled to recognize this principle and to recognize that the committee has done a careful job in arriving at the figures.

If you want to argue with the committee you will get into a numbers game, but I think with very little profit.

Second, I want to point out that this business of the relative positions of the small inventor and the big inventor, which has been touched upon a number of times this afternoon, has already been given very careful consideration by the committee. I think the committee has designed a fee structure both with respect to application fees and issuance fees as well as with respect to this business of the maintenance fees with that very much in mind. I think it is obvious to a person who gives it thought that with Patent Office operating costs having gone up as they have since 1932, and returns in terms of dollars to those who acquire patents having gone up as surely they must have and obviously have since 1932, the beneficiary of a static fee system is the large corporation or the wealthy inventor when compared with the small business competitor or the individual inventor. So when you raise fees in accordance with the rise in costs and benefits, you are attempting, as the committee has obviously done, to equalize the competitive situation of those two classes of inventors with respect to each other.

Furthermore, of course, the difference between the application fee which is increased a small amount and the issuance fee which is increased relatively more, favors the small inventor, gives him his day in court with a minimum of burden. So that I think the committee has, contrary to suggestions that have been made, given careful thought to this situation.

I want to say in conclusion that fees traditionally have covered the costs in the Patent Office and the patent system has flourished. All other costs and fees have gone up; returns have gone up. I think it is an excellent bill. It meets our financial responsibilities and I hope it will pass by a very heavy majority.

The "Pass Along" School—Education's Biggest Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 16, 1964:

THE "PASS ALONG" SCHOOL—EDUCATION'S BIGGEST CHALLENGE

(By Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education)

The scene was a symptom. In front of a grade school last year in a great Midwestern city, parents walked in a curious picket line. They carried placards declaring: "Teach our kids to read"—teach them before you pass them along.

Here, in one city, was a strident attack against a practice of discarding standards, of passing children along from grade to grade whether or not they were qualified. What triggered the picket line was a guarded record sheet of reading achievements which had somehow reached the parents of an eighth grade class. It showed that out of the entire graduating class, more than half the children were rated from fifth grade down to second grade level; that 80 percent had failed to reach standards of eighth-grade reading. And yet all these children were quietly passed along.

The school where this took place was in the heart of the great city and the children were Negroes. But the line that set them apart was not color alone. Elsewhere in the city are white children who are no less lacking

in basic academic skills, who are similarly passed along. Elsewhere across the country are other cities, other schools like this.

The "pass along" school brings to focus a little acknowledged but dangerous flaw in American education. In such schools we are failing to meet the challenge of young Americans who, on one hand, are difficult to teach and, on the other, are most in need of educational opportunity.

These are the youngsters of poverty, of the compacted slum areas of our cities, who are living part from and outside of the most prosperous period of American life. At a time when education and skills are indispensable to economic and social achievement, they become high school dropouts because they find neither success nor stimulus in our elementary and secondary schools. Moreover, while their numbers are large and increasing, our efforts to improve their lot remain largely ineffective.

One reason for our failure to come to grips with the "pass along" generation, I believe, is our habit of applying vague and general labels to these children. We call them "culturally disadvantaged" and "deprived," "socially underprivileged" and "handicaped."

These sweeping terms of reference, however well they may describe the social and economic backgrounds of these children, are of little use in solving the problem of educating the children as we find them. All too often, they merely blur our vision by offering excuses for educational neglect. They lead many people, including some educators, to say that these children are not merely difficult to teach, but that they are virtually unteachable.

A second reason for our neglect of the substandard schools is our failure to develop and use meaningful comparative criteria of achievement. We need to measure the achievement of our schools on a broad basis, from city to city and State to State. We need to bring these criteria into the open if we hope to succeed in raising the quality of education where the needs are greatest. Without such criteria, our combined efforts—Federal, State, and local—will continue to be uncertain and unsure.

And third is our failure to apply effectively to the slum school the knowledge we already have. The educational community has been exploring specific means for improvement—a higher quality of teaching in these schools; educational materials designed for use in these classrooms; particular attention to the need of deprived children for excellent teaching. There is no need for these children to remain uneducated. But if we mean to succeed, we must begin to employ our knowledge through concerted funds and purpose.

Clearly, this effort will call for a new degree of candor on the part of the Nation's school systems. Today there are few cities where the facts have been made available. And without facts, there is little prospect of finding solutions.

One city, however, has recently and commendably removed the cloak of silence from this area of acute need. The New York City Board of Education has boldly opened the records of achievement in central Harlem schools to public scrutiny. Among those who have examined the record is a study group called Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited. The results of its study, which will be shortly published, reveal a picture of intolerable educational neglect which can be duplicated in most of our largest cities.

Consider, for example, these findings in the elementary and junior high schools of central Harlem:

In the third grade, central Harlem pupils are fully 1 year behind the achievement levels of other New York City pupils. By the sixth grade they have fallen nearly 2 years behind; by the eighth grade they are about 2½ years behind.

Approximately three-fourths of the pupils in the central Harlem junior high schools are performing below grade level in both reading comprehension and word knowledge. In no junior high school here is the proportion of under achievers less than 70 percent—and in some schools it is more than 80 percent.

The pattern of test and IQ scores shows that education in central Harlem is marked by massive educational deterioration. The longer pupils are in school, the greater is the proportion who fail to meet established and comparative norms of academic competence. By the eighth grade, the gross damage has been done and acceptable grade levels thereafter are never attained.

From its extensive study of test results, the Harlem organization adds fresh coals to the growing controversy over substandard schools. It counters one popular view, advanced by those who emphasize the cultural disadvantages of students, that the problem of education in the slums is a problem of social environment outside the schools. When children of poverty go to school, it is held, they are already so handicapped that no school system can bring them up to standards.

The Harlem youth study, however, places far less stress on the economic and social environment of the child and far more on the educational environment he finds in the school itself. In central Harlem, the study observes, schoolteachers are the least experienced of any in the New York public school system. And they are particularly inexperienced in coping with the particular problems of the disadvantaged. If the weakest teachers are sent to teach the most deprived, it is argued, how can one hope for better educational achievement?

This argument is now receiving increasing support in many quarters—that the education of slum children today confronts the Nation with a clear and present emergency; that the challenge, now unmet by the cities and States, calls for specific Federal action.

William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System, recently asked for Federal action in a speech in which he pointed out that in 1960 8 percent of our population more than 25 years old had not gone beyond fifth grade; that 40 percent had not gone beyond eighth grade; that less than half had finished secondary school; and that nearly 4 million children between 13 and 17 years of age were in no school at all.

Aroused by the failings of metropolitan education, Mr. Paley advocated that the Federal Government should employ Federal funds to raise educational achievement, even if it meant diverting funds allotted to States for other purposes.

John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard professor, former Ambassador to India, and author of "The Affluent Society," has called for "an attack on proverty by what I would judge to be the most effective single step that could be taken."

Professor Galbraith provocatively suggested that an emergency education program be undertaken in 1964:

"Why don't we select * * * the hundred lowest income counties (or in the case of urban slums more limited areas of equal population) and designate them as special educational districts. They would then be equipped * * * with a truly excellent and comprehensive school plant, including both primary and secondary schools. * * *

"Then, in the manner of the Peace Corps, but with ample pay, an elite body of young teachers would be assembled, * * * tough and well trained enough to take on the worst slums, proud to go to Harlan County or to Harlem. In the year following, we would proceed to the next most abysmal areas * * *."

Professor Galbraith's solution, one among many possibilities, may sound extreme. But it may well take measures as bold as these to clear the atmosphere of delay and excuses—and to get on with the major business of raising the level of education in our neglected city slums.

Unless we do, the problem will surely get worse. In the past, perhaps, the poorly educated could hope that by hard work they could earn a living. Today, in our advancing, automated economy, the poorly educated increasingly find the doors of employment closed.

If we fail to act—to live up to our ideals of universal education and equal opportunity—today's growing emergency will become an explosive social problem endangering our society for generations to come.

Millions Flow From Zone Into Panama's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is of paramount importance that all Americans understand the amount of money flowing from the activities of the Panama Canal Zone into the Panamanian economy. This figure is established at $82,465,000, according to the Comptroller General of the Republic of Panama in reply to a request by the U.S. Embassy to the Minister of Foreign Relations of the Republic for such information in April of 1963. This figure is in addition to foreign aid funds which are estimated at $111.1 million during the program and are estimated at $9 million for this year.

I think a summarization of the breakdown of these figures is interesting and enlightening and I submit them for the RECORD.

MILLIONS FLOW FROM ZONE INTO PANAMA'S ECONOMY

In dollars, $82,465,000 was paid out from the Canal Zone to Panamanians in salaries, retirement, and disability payments, and through purchases of goods and services during 1962. These figures were submitted in April 1963 by the Embassy of the United States of America to the Ministry of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Panama in response to a request for statistics by the Comptroller General of the Republic. The $82,465,000 paid from the Canal Zone to Panama does not include the Canal Zone annuity of $1,930,000 which the United States pays to Panama.

Salaries to non-U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone accounted for $33,025,000 of the $82,465,000. The net payments of salaries to non-U.S. citizens, the report shows, rose from $25,258,000 in 1960 to $29,750,000 in 1961 and then to $33,025,000 in 1962. This figure includes estimated net payments to all non-U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone by U.S. agencies, contractors, and private organizations such as shipipng agents, clubs, churches, oil companies, banks, and employee associations.

Retirement and disability payments by the Panama Canal organization to Panama residents rose from $2,925,000 in 1960 to $3,469,000 at the time of the report.

Direct purchases by U.S. Government agencies in the Republic of Panama totaled $11,781,000 in 1962. Purchases of goods in Panama by U.S. Government agencies brought $10,479,000 into the Republic and purchases of services furnished the Republic of Panama an additional $1,302,000.

Purchases of goods in Panama by private organizations in the Canal Zone added another $4,400,000 to the sums that went into the Republic of Panama from the Canal Zone.

Contractors' purchases in Panama of goods and services for Canal Zone projects increased to $10,668,000 in 1962 from $8,400,000 in 1960.

U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone spent $19,155,000 in the Republic of Panama in the period covered by the U.S. Embassy report. Expenditures by the U.S.-citizen employees of the Canal Zone showed an increase of $6,165,000 since 1960. The figure for that year totaled $12,990,000. In 1961 the U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone spent $15,675,000 in Panama and their purchases increased the following year to $19,155,000.

Behind the Scenes in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an excellent editorial on the Panama situation which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, the newspaper serving the home of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, DAN FLOOD, who has been a leader in the effort to warn America of the consequences of our policies in Panama. I think it will prove enlightening to all who read it:

BEHIND THE SCENES IN PANAMA

At 3:40 p.m. on Monday, January 13, eavesdroppers on the shortwave radio maintained by the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba in Washington, D.C., overheard Fidel Castro's man "Che" Guevara announce to the Latin American world that the "Panama dead and wounded represent only a small sample of what will be done to the people of the Americas. The Sierra Maestra is now all along the continent of South America." (The Sierra Maestra, of course, refers to Castro's guerrilla hideout in Batista's Cuba.)

In plain words, Guevara was telling Castro's operatives everywhere from Panama to Uruguay that the crunch of revolution had come. Significantly, at this very moment, Fidel Castro was hobnobbing in Moscow with Khrushchev.

So who has been had in the Panamanian crisis? The United States, of course, has been made to look bad in the eyes of the world.

But in accepting the propaganda that now is the time to tell the gringos to get out, Panama's President Roberto Chiari has put himself in the position of serving as a catspaw for the Castroites. He may be sure that, as a "liberal" politico who is devoted to parliamentary institutions, his own days are numbered by the manipulators of the hour and minute hands on the Castroite clock.

Why did Chiari elect to play patsy for Fidel? The answer could be that the Panamanian Government had to do something to cover its failure to carry out its own commitment to the Alliance for Progress.

The comparative dollar figures in the case are extremely instructive. One of President Chiari's gripes is that the United States hasn't been paying enough for canal use—the amount of rent money that went to Panama in 1963 was $1.9 million. Taken by itself, this payment could be said to err on the niggardly side, since the canal take for the United States is $60 million. But, in addition to the $1.9 million rent, the residual benefits to Panama, in the form of payrolls and other hidden accruals, come to an annual sum of $11 million.

President Chiari might still argue that this is little enough. But in addition to canal money, Panama, in 1963, could have availed itself of $41 million of U.S. money allocated to it under Alliance for Progress programs.

The sad truth is that, of this projected $41 million, Panama could only manage to use $16 million. Of the $2.9 million available to help Panamanian farmers, only $65,000 had been used through October of 1963. The United States had earmarked $4 million for rural electrification—but only $150,000 of this had been spent. Out of $10 million ticketed for the construction of low-cost houses and schools, only $2 million had been turned into buildings or the purchase of building materials.

What this failure to make use of Alliance for Progress money means is that the Panama Government has yet to work out the forms that are necessary to lift the local population out of poverty.

The scapegoating of the United States by President Chiari's government has played directly into Castro's hands. And the evidence is clear that Castro planned it that way. The whole Panamanian business clicks neatly into place with Che Guevara's timetable for Latin American subversion.

The Cuban assault on Latin America as a whole began in April 1959, with a bold, brutal military invasion of Panama by Castroites. This was a little too much for a sovereign Latin American nation to stomach, and there was an appeal to the Organization of American States to stop it.

So Castro and Che Guevara took one step backward in order to take two steps forward. There followed the paramilitary infiltration of countries such as Panama.

In January of 1963, Panamanian subversives trained by Russians in Cuba's 10 guerrilla camps began receiving arms from fishing vessels which put in at the Peninsula del Toro and at the Beach of Chariguen at the Costa Rican border. Meanwhile, Victor Avila, the secretary of the Panamanian Student Federation, announced:

"This country, like all of Latin America, will inevitably follow the road taken by Fidel Castro to communism."

With the subversives and the students well coached, the fact that incidents happened spontaneously at places far distant from each other along the Canal Zone borders is easily explained. Che Guevara, a Trotskyite type of Napoleon, knows what he is doing.

And the liberals in Panama have been had.

Shipyards and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., December 30, 1963, concerning our naval shipyards.

The editorial is one of the few that has shown the other side of the coin in connection with the proposed shutting down of our naval shipyards. It is a challenging editorial and it presents points that the Secretary of Defense and, indeed, the entire administration and eventually the Congress must answer. The U.S. fleet is, in fact, growing obsolete; we are not replacing our ships at a sufficient pace to maintain our naval supremacy.

If there is no need for naval shipyards, then there is no question that they should be shut down. But I am afraid that too much attention has been paid to pure economy and too little attention paid to the need for national security.

We could economize in many ways—by abolishing the Army, or the Navy, or the Air Force, and the taxpayers, for a brief period, might see a rather substantial example of economy. But such action might also have a more permanent effect; namely, the elimination of our form of government.

Before we close down any naval shipyard, we must be satisfied that what we are doing is consistent with national security, and not solely in the interest of economy. It won't do us much good to say, when it is too late, that we should have kept that naval shipyard while we had it.

I assure the editors of the News and Courier that I intend to explore this matter at the appropriate time with the Secretary of Defense. I also intend to go into the question of bomber production and many other items affecting our national security. Economy is something we all applaud, but not at the expense of our survival.

I would like to increase the purchasing power of our dollars, but not at the expense of having to first convert them into rubles.

The editorial follows:

SHIPYARDS AND SECURITY

Anyone who thinks that Secretary of Defense McNamara's study of naval shipyards, with an eye to closing some, is simply an economy measure hasn't paid attention to the overall effort to reduce the Nation's de-

This effort can be seen in a number of ways by those who study the composition, construction program and deployment of the Armed Forces.

First the shipyards. If no need existed for naval shipyards, it would be understandable that closings should be planned. But the U.S. fleet is growing obsolete. Jane's Fighting Ships, the most authoritative annual report on the navies of the world, said only a few days ago that the U.S. Navy is full of aging surface craft, while the Soviet Union and pro-Communist countries are building modern warships.

The bulk of U.S. ships, which provide security for the United States from Cuba to South Vietnam, were built during World War II. These ships need to be replaced by modern vessels. Mr. McNamara is not pressing a replacement program. Instead, many observers conclude that he has decided to scrap the surface fleet on a step-by-step basis.

If Americans were told by Mr. McNamara that he intended to scuttle a large portion of the fleet, he wouldn't stay in office a week.

But scuttling can be accomplished by indirect means, simply by not building ships to replace those that have worn out. This appears to be the McNamara plan. He is doing little to give the country the new com-

batant surface ships the Navy must have to carry out its global missions.

Not only is Mr. McNamara failing to request a sufficient number of new ships, but he is opposing the modernization that nuclear power represents. Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover and others in the Navy have worked heroically to give the country a lead in nuclear power at sea. But Mr. McNamara refused to allow this kind of powerplant to go into the next aircraft carrier, which it is reported is the last he will approve. The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy rightly said in recent days that Mr. McNamara was wrong in refusing to approve a nuclear carrier.

To return to the shipyard question, it is obvious that a normal program of ship replacement would mean work for the shipyards.

The shipyard study is a crude trick, in our opinion. First, Mr. McNamara doesn't give the shipyards the work they should have. Then he orders a study to determine if they have sufficient work. Having found the conditions he created, no doubt it will be easy for him to say that no need exists for the shipyards.

The News and Courier hopes that Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS will thoroughly explore this business when the House Armed Services Committee conducts its hearings on military posture next month.

But it isn't naval shipping alone that suffers. Mr. McNamara has declined to allow the Air Force to proceed with new bombers that it believes will be useful in the years ahead. Then came a report that the Defense Department has drafted long-term requirements for the U.S. nuclear arsenal that call for a substantial cutback in the production of atomic weapons in the coming decade. Mr. McNamara apparently is turning to the leftwing line that the Nation possesses an "overkill" capacity in nuclear weapons.

The pattern of Mr. McNamara's thinking is too clear to misread. He is cutting away the muscle on which the security and freedom of the United States depend.

Reds Foment Political Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article by Holmes Alexander. There have been implications that only the extreme rightwing practices and disseminates hatred, obscenities, and profanity. In his article of January 8, Holmes Alexander sets forth a situation which demonstrates very clearly that extremism behaves in a predictable pattern no matter what its orientation. The article follows:

AS I SEE IT—REDS FOMENT POLITICAL HATE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—On the afternoon of November 22, a Negro nurse's aid in the fashionable Connecticut Avenue office of Dr. Melchior Savarese answered the telephone, and then, in horror and disgust, held the instrument at arm's length.

Over the wire came a torrent of hatred, obscenity, profanity, and threats to kill Dr. Savarese, his wife, and three children. For the next 2 hours, other nurses at the office, and persons in the doctor's home, were on the receiving end of these vicious, revolting diatribes—then, suddenly, they ceased. Word had come from Dallas that the alleged assassin of President Kennedy was not a rightwinger, but a professed Marxist, a supporter of the Communist Castro regime in Red Cuba.

Behind this ordeal to which Dr. Savarese, his staff, and his household were submitted is a continued story. It will have its conclusion written on a nationwide script in the months of political strife that lie ahead. Because the sole reason for what happened to this 39-year-old, 6-foot-4 gynecologist—a prominent Catholic layman in Washington, a graduate of Yale University in 1946, and Georgetown University Medical School in 1949—was political.

Dr. Savarese is a member of the District of Columbia Republican Central Committee. He is also a member of the John Birch Society. The day of the Dallas tragedy was, by chance, also the climax of a press-television-radio blitz (spearheaded by the Washington Post) to force Dr. Savarese to resign either from the GOP committee, or from the Birch Society.

Much of the doctor's adult reading was from papal encyclicals which stressed the irreconcilability of catholicism and communism. Some of the reading was the work of Communist leaders and spokesmen who stressed the irreconcilability of communism and capitalism. The most direct, uncompromising anti-Communist literature he discovered was that which was put out or promoted by the John Birch Society. Among the many books which he devoured was "Tito: Moscow's Trojan Horse" written by Slobodan Draskovich, published by the Henry Regnery Co. The author, but not the publisher, was a Birch member.

Then, Dr. Savarese met Draskovich, a Yugoslav-American lawyer from the Chicago area. Draskovich's father had been assassinated in the 1920's, as President Kennedy would be in the 1960's, by a Communist. Draskovich himself was devoting his life to writing, speaking and organizing toward the liberation of his native homeland from the Communist conspiracy. Since every anti-Communist organization is a force in the worldwide struggle, Draskovich had joined the Birch Society. Dr. Savarese, after deep conversations with Draskovich decided to do the same thing.

There were no hocus-pocus ceremonies of initiation. Dr. Savarese made his application by mail and agreed to pay the $2 a month dues. He became a member in January 1961. Since the membership was a matter of conscientious affirmation with him, Dr. Savarese kept it no secret. He allowed his name to be used as an endorser of the society. Also, when he was solicited by a Republican friend for nomination to the Republican central committee, Dr. Savarese gladly consented.

By February 13, 1963, he was both a Birch Society chapter leader and a Republican Party official. His troubles started.

Address by Gov. Edmund G. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 years it has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve in Congress with the Honorable JEFFERY COHELAN. Not only do I consider him to be a friend but I also admire his many achievements as an outstanding legislator.

We work closely on matters pertaining to our home county of Alameda in California. The people of his district, our State, and our Nation can be very proud of the distinguished leadership being provided by Mr. COHELAN.

Congressman COHELAN's tireless efforts in pursuit of the highest example of public service make it only fitting that a testimonial dinner be given in his honor. On the occasion of this dinner the Governor of California, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, delivered a moving tribute to JEFF.

In view of this, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the fine remarks of the Governor, delivered in Oakland, Calif., on January 15, 1964.

ADDRESS BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR CONGRESSMAN JEFF COHELAN, GOODMAN HALL, JACK LONDON SQUARE, OAKLAND, JANUARY 15, 1964

We are here tonight to honor a great Congressman and a great citizen of this community. More than that we are here to honor—and share in—those things JEFF COHELAN believes in and has been fighting for all of his life.

For this is the true secret of the viability and strength of our free society—that all share in the decisions of those we select in the elective process.

The great outpouring of grief at the death of President Kennedy demonstrated that basic truth. We mourned not just the man but his faith in America, his democratic ideals and his abiding belief in the future of our country and its people.

We admired his youth, his courage, his strength and his intelligence but we knew these were secondary to the man's philosophy and beliefs.

So too it is that tonight we honor JEFF COHELAN. We see in him a partner of President Kennedy and President Johnson—a fighter for civil rights, for economic and social justice, for jobs, medicare and peace.

The death of President Kennedy demonstrated another basic truth—that the torch of freedom and democracy is not carried by a single man, but by many.

Today the torch is held high by Lyndon Johnson. In his magnificent state of the Union message a week ago he called again for equal opportunity for all, for an end to poverty and unemployment and for peace in the world.

And we are here tonight to tell President Johnson, JEFF COHELAN, and the people of this State that we shall answer the trumpet's call to help build a nation "that is free from want, and a world that is free from hate."

We will accomplish this through the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments in a partnership of democracy that, I believe, is entering a new era in California.

Let me now review with you our involvement in that partnership in five key areas mentioned by the President in his state of the Union message.

Of first priority at home and nationally is civil rights. No other issue is as demanding of solution, as urgent, as long standing.

Nowhere is that need greater than right here in the seventh district. And no other district in California has a Congressman who has shown more concern for civil rights than JEFF COHELAN. He has cosponsored the administration's omnibus civil rights bill and he has introduced legislation to create a permanent civil rights commission and a Federal fair employment practice commission.

I say here tonight let us give JEFF COHELAN this fighting pledge to take back to Washington to President Johnson and the Congress—California wants civil rights legislation and it wants it now.

Let us tell the Nation that California has laws forbidding discrimination in public accommodations, employment, and housing and that our citizens in traveling to other States are entitled to the same decent treatment they legally enjoy here.

But let us also be reminded that civil rights are never safe from attack. The author of our fair housing law in the last session of the State legislature, Byron Rumford, can tell you that.

The real estate industry of this State would legalize bigotry and breed new racial conflicts with its initiative measure to destroy the Rumford Act. I pray that they will not succeed. I ask you to help me see that they do not.

If our civil rights are never safe from attack, let us also remember that we have not secured them for all. Discrimination is legally forbidden but there is covert discrimination of all kinds.

There is de facto segregation in our schools. And our ghettoes are growing larger, not smaller. We need Federal, State, and local programs to tear down ghetto walls and provide all of our citizens an equal opportunity to share in the economic and social benefits of this great Nation.

President Johnson's second legislative priority is to cut income taxes by $11 billion. Let me tell you what this tax cut will do for California.

First, it would add some $4.5 billion to California's personal income—an average of $250 for every man, woman, and child—each year through new economic activity and from the tax reduction itself. Second, it would bring in an immediate increase of $150 million in State revenue without a single change in tax rates.

The tax cut will be a massive step toward achieving another important objective which we share with the Federal Government—easing of poverty and reduction of unemployment.

President Johnson has said one-fifth of the Nation is living on the outskirts of hope, on the edge of despair born of poverty and joblessness. Ladies and gentlemen of Oakland and all Californians, let me tell you we have our one-fifth, too.

Within a few blocks of this hall there are families living with that despair. And the condition is not peculiar to Oakland. A report to our welfare study commission shows that a half-million Californians live on less than $2,000 per year per family of four. Another 1.5 million are living on less than $4,000 per year per family of four.

Poverty cuts across all lines—the aged, the minorities, the disabled, the illiterates, the sick, farmworkers, and those unskilled workers for whom there are no jobs.

It is time to take our heads out of the sand; face poverty in California; and fight it wherever we find it.

In our cars, over our freeways, and into our suburbs we flee from the slums and ghettoes which hide the sordid facts of the failure of our society.

As a member of the Berkeley Welfare Commission and city councilman, JEFF COHELAN learned where poverty is and what it means.

He can tell you how it stunts and warps and corrodes a child; how its despair eats into the aged; how it slowly destroys the spirit of a mother and father.

As district attorney in San Franscisco I saw crime bred in the slums. As attorney general I saw the cost of that crime. Now, as Governor, I can testify to its enormous social waste.

Unemployment alone is costing us $2.5 billion annually in lost personal income and another $3 or $4 billion in lost production.

Hundreds of millions more are lost in paying for the social diseases of poverty—crime, mental illness, welfare payments, and disease.

Must the poor always be with us? I do not think so. Nor do the President and JEFF COHELAN.

In California we have begun the attack on poverty and unemployment through these programs:

A new commission on manpower, automation, and technology to undertake a massive study of problems of unemployment, manpower training and skill needs and develop programs to solve the problems.

Youth training and rehabilitation programs with Federal, State, and local assistance to get dropouts back into school and save boys and girls who have been swept aside in the slums.

A pilot youth conservation and training camp program combining outdoor conservation work and education for high school dropouts.

A program of compensatory education for culturally deprived children whose home environment has stunted their intellectual and social growth.

It's slow work, fighting poverty, illiteracy, and delinquency. Its roots are deep and ancient—partly economic, partly social, partly cultural. Discrimination and segregation have slowed the fight. So have language difficulties and unemployment.

But a beginning has been made once again. With the will, with energy, and with wit, we shall overcome it.

Hand in hand with poverty go illiteracy and a paucity of educational skills. In education we have developed the know-how, the plant and the skills to do a job. And it is here we are making the best progress.

For in California we have made education available to all on a scale not matched by any other State or nation in the world.

We spend more teaching our children than 43 other States spend on their total budgets. We have the greatest number of children in schools and in our universities and colleges. We have the highest paid teachers. We have the most comprehensive system of tuition-free higher education in the world.

Still we are not keeping up with modern needs. Some 25 percent of our youngsters drop out of school.

That is below the national average but it is still too high.

However great our effort, I think we must face up to two situations with respect to increasing and paying for education.

First, local property taxpayers cannot take on more of the burden. The property tax already is overworked. And great inequities have risen in taxing for schools.

In Alameda County, for example, we have the case of a $1.68 tax rate in highly industrialized Emeryville and a $3.89 tax in Albany. At the high school level each Emeryville child is backed by $316,000 of assessed valuation compared with $23,000 in Albany.

To correct such inequities we need a system of countywide school tax equalization with rich districts and poor districts equally sharing the burden of education.

I intend to ask the legislature for such legislation next month in a special call.

Second, we need substantially greater help from the Federal Government in education. The current Congress has made a start with its aid-to-education bill. President Johnson correctly points out that this Congress has done more for education than any since post-World War II.

But when you consider that California alone is spending more for education than the Federal Government is spending for all the States, you have a measure of the imbalance which has been created through years of neglect.

California is paying for that Federal neglect in social costs created by immigrants from other States whose educational attainments are so inadequate that they cannot sustain themselves here. There is a direct and high correlation between unemployment and poverty and lack of educational skills.

To break that chain, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith has called for a massive assault on poverty through intensive and sustained educational programs in our depressed areas—the slums and rural pockets of poverty. The Federal Government has the resources for the job. I ask JEFF COHELAN to carry the message back to Washington that California would welcome and support such a program.

I would like to close now with one final reference to another program in which JEFF has been active and which is close to our hearts in California—medical care for the aged. JEFF has asked for creation of a House Committee on Problems of the Aged.

He has cosponsored the administration's medicare bill.

Here again we have an example of the need for close Federal-State-local cooperation. California has one of the largest Kerr-Mills medical aid programs in the Nation. But I can tell you tonight that it has been found to be totally and tragically inadequate. No longer can the facts of its inadequacies be hidden—no matter how hard the American Medical Association wishes them away.

We are not properly taking care of our aged sick.

We cannot do it under Kerr-Mills.

We need a Federal system of social security deductions to provide a comprehensive program of medical aid for the aged. Let us not turn our backs on the men and women who helped provide us with the greatest prosperity this country has ever known. Let us give future generations the chance to help themselves in their old age and not force them into shameful poverty before providing help.

Medicare, education, poverty, civil rights * * * those are some of the priorities. There are many others—disarmament, peace, foreign aid, transit, housing, and crime. The list is long, my friends, and the road ahead is long.

Selfish, narrow interest will block the road. Prejudice and ignorance will thwart us. Partisanship will be used to delay and diminish the effort.

Nor can we expect to achieve those goals in 100 days or 1,000. But we have made a start. And the people are with us.

Here tonight we have the ingredients for progress and success—an able representative in Congress, a commitment for progress at the State level, and local leadership to translate program into action.

Those are the dynamics of our democracy; those are the elements of the new partnership for progress that we shall forge in 1964 to carry on the struggle begun by John Fitzgerald Kennedy and taken up by President Johnson against "the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

The National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art:

FEBRUARY 1964, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Gallery hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m., to 5 p.m.; Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is

free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Ground floor, central gallery, galleries G–7 through G–15. Through March 22.

Recent publication: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Exhibition catalog; 100 pages, 9 by 10¾ inches, with preface by John Walker, foreward by René d'Harnoncourt, and introduction by Alfred H. Barr, Jr., 13 color plates, 141 black-and-white illustrations, reproducing all of the 153 paintings in the exhibition; $2.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: 11- by 14-inch color reproductions. Berthe Morisot, "In the Dining Room"; Petrus Christus, "The Nativity"; 25 cents each, postpaid.

Sunday lectures: The series of lectures on modern art, begun in January, will continue through March 1.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m.; Sunday, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

TOURS, LECTURES, AND CONCERTS—NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 2

Painting of the week: [1] Velasquez, "Pope Innocent X" (Mellon collection). Gallery 51, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art—social comment. Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30. Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Matisse and the Fauves." Guest speaker: Gordon B. Washburn, director, Asia House Gallery, New York; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Hyman Bress, violinist; Donal Nold, pianist; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 9

Painting of the week: [1] Delacroix, "Columbus and His Son at La Rábida" (Chester Dale collection). Gallery 90, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art—realist and romantic. Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30. Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Surrealism, Dadaism, and the Arts of Free Association." Guest speaker: Emily Genauer, art critic, New York Herald Tribune; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Dolores Holtz, pianist, east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737-4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 16

Painting of the week: [1] Eakins, "The Biglen Brothers Racing" (gift of Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney). Gallery 71, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the Week: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art—fantastic and surrealist. Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30. Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Origins of Abstract Art." Guest speaker: Peter Selz, curator, the Museum of Modern Art. New York; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: John Magnus, bass-baritone; George Manos, pianist; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 23

Painting of the Week: [1] Vermeer, "The Girl with a Red Hat" (Mellon collection). Gallery 44, Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art—survey of the exhibition. Central lobby, Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30. Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Friday 1; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The German Expressionists: A Generation in Revolt." Guest speaker: Bernard Myers, author, New York; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Raymond Jackson, pianist; east garden court, 8.

Footnotes at end of table.

[1] 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale this week, 15 cents. (If mailed, 25 cents regular price.)

Smoking and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, since the release of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee's report on smoking and health, there has been a great deal of discussion in the press and on radio and television regarding this controversial subject. While there is apparently a wide area of disagreement on the findings of the Advisory Committee, as to any connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, these discussions have served to better enlighten the public on the issues involved.

In the Sunday, January 19 edition of the Richmond Times-Dispatch there appeared a splendid article entitled "Smoking and Health: Other Side of the Report." This article was written by Mr. Alan S. Donnahoe, executive vice president and assistant publisher of the Times-Dispatch and Richmond News Leader. Mr. Donnahoe has a wide background in research work and has published a number of fine articles. He has lectured in statistics at the University of Richmond and served on advisory committees in the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the American Statistical Association.

He has written a most timely and well-informed article and I commend this to the reading of the Members of the House:

SMOKING AND HEALTH—OTHER SIDE OF THE REPORT

(By Alan S. Donnahoe)

The recent report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee is based largely on statistics of highly questionable nature, and is shot through with inconsistencies and contradictions.

If we are to accept the major conclusion that cigarette smoking is a major cause of lung cancer, we must also accept other illogical and sometimes downright ridiculous conclusions that evolve from the same statistical evidence.

In this analysis, no attempt will be made to review all of the evidence in the lengthy report. Rather, an effort will be made to review some of the more glaring contradictions in this evidence, which up to this time have received little emphasis or publicity.

This discussion will be confined to the report itself. No attempt will be made to consider any other evidence, outside the report, even though some of this is quite dramatic in its apparent refutation of the Committee's main conclusion.

The Advisory Committee included eight doctors, one chemist, and one statistician. In view of the fact that most of the available evidence was statistical, it is unfortunate that more statisticians were not included on the Committee.

This is particularly important, it would seem, inasmuch as the committee did not undertake any original research but rather confined itself to a review and evaluation of research conducted by others. Such a review of statistical work performed by others is especially difficult for anyone other than a highly competent statistician.

The major evidence before the Committee evolved from seven statistical surveys, sponsored by a variety of agencies. In terms of basic methodology, by the Committee's own admission, these surveys leave much to be desired. Here is the description applied by the Committee itself:

"Various reasons dictated the choices made of the seven study populations, considerations of feasibility playing an important role. None of the populations was designed, in particular, to be representative of the U.S. male population. An answer to the question 'to what general population of men can the results be applied?' must involve an element of unverifiable judgment. The seven studies differ considerably in size. They vary also in the extent to which they are free from methodological weakness."

What this means, in nontechnical language, is that the findings of these various surveys, as a matter of sound statistical procedure, cannot be considered as representative of any known population of any kind. Statistically speaking, this is a serious indictment of any survey.

On this subject, a further comment by the Committee, dealing with the percentage of individuals who failed to respond to survey questionnaires, is quite significant:

"In the two American Cancer Society studies it is not possible to present meaningful percentages, since each research volunteer selected her own small part of the study population from among her own acquaintances."

One need not be a statistician to recognize the dangers involved in selecting any sample from among one's own acquaintances. It would be difficult to suggest a more unscientific sampling procedure.

But this is not all. The Committee goes on to say:

"In all five studies that had a clearly defined target population, sizable proportions of the population were omitted. The major reason was failure to answer the questionnaire; in addition, certain replies were rejected as too incomplete."

Individuals who failed to respond in point of fact, represented 15, 32, 32, 43, and 44 percent in the five studies. This, again, is a major statistical deficiency, raising the possibility of serious bias in the results. This possibility, at least in part, is acknowledged by the Committee.

When we consider both of these factors: (1) The fact that respondents were selected on a haphazard or volunteer basis, and hence were not representative of any known population; and (2) the large percentage of nonresponse encountered—the result is a statistical melange of unknown and unknowable reliability.

This may account for some of the strange and unexplainable results produced by these surveys. In most instances, for example, the mortality rate after adjustment for age is far below the national average—not only for non-smokers, but often for heavy cigarette smokers as well. In three of the seven studies, the age-adjusted mortality rate of heavy cigarette smokers was lower than the average for all males in the United States population, and in one survey was almost 30 percent lower than the national average.

The committee comments on this as follows:

"It is clear that the seven * * * studies involve populations which are healthier than U.S. males as a whole. Secondly, the low death rates for non-smokers suggest the possibility that the studies recruited unusually healthy groups of non-smokers."

After pointing out that the exclusion of hospitalized and seriously ill individuals might account for some of this variation, the committee admits that "the sizes of the differences appear surprising." All things considered, this would seem to be a rather remarkable understatement.

There are other oddities in the statistical evidence, such as one finding that men from 80 to 89 who are heavy cigarette smokers have about 40 percent less mortality than non-smokers, and still another finding in one of the surveys that men smoking less than 15 years have a slightly lower mortality rate than non-smokers.

It is possible that these freakish results evolve from the use of small samples in these sub-categories; but this cannot account for another and far more significant paradox.

If the statistical evidence before the committee is to be accepted and believed in full, then we must conclude that cigarette smoking not only causes lung cancer, but is also a major cause of almost every other type of death from all diseases of all kinds.

The astonishing fact—if we are to believe the statistical evidence cited by the committee—is that lung cancer accounts for only 15 to 20 percent of the excess deaths attributable to cigarette smoking. About half of the excess is to be found in heart disease, and another quarter of the excess in other chronic diseases of various kinds.

Altogether, if projected to the United States population, this would mean that some 250,000 people die every year from some disease induced by cigarette smoking, and that this occurs without a single one of these deaths being noted as such by clinical test of any kind. As one statistician puts it: only by their numbers are they known.

This rather staggers the imagination, and particularly so when the committee finds no causal connection between these various diseases and cigarette smoking.

The Committee does consider some hypotheses that have been offered on the subject—that smokers differ physically from nosmokers, or perhaps that cigarettes have a generally debilitating effect—but it passes no judgment on any of these.

The statistical evidence is equally paradoxical on the matter of pipe smoking. Here is what the Committee has to say on this subject:

"Death rates for current pipe smokers were little if at all higher than for non-smokers, even with men smoking 10 or more pipefuls per day and with all men who had smoked pipes for more than 30 years. Ex-pipe smokers, on the other hand, showed higher death rates than both nonsmokers and current smokers in four out of five studies. The epidemio-logical studies on ex-cigar and ex-pipe smokers are inadequate to explain this puzzling phenomenon."

In other words, the statistical evidence would indicate that it is quite safe to smoke a pipe, but highly dangerous to discontinue the practice. This is indeed a puzzling phenomenon, but if we are to accept the other statistical findings in the report, we must accept this one as well.

Another curious finding in the report shows the relative mortality from all causes, in relation to cigarette smoking and other factors. While such smoking would appear to raise the mortality rate in every instance, the other factors also appear quite potent.

For example, cigarette smokers who take heavy exercise have a lower mortality rate than nonsmokers who take none. Similarly, cigarette smokers among married men have just about the same mortality rate as non-smokers who are single. If cigarette smokers are so fortunate as to have long-lived parents and grandparents, their mortality rate is about the same as for nonsmokers with short-lived ancestors.

From other data shown in the commission report, it appears that the incidence of certain types of cancer tends to vary from one region of the country to another, and even by individual city, and is inversely related to income level. Among males in the lowest income class, for example, the lung cancer rate is double that of high income males. None of this would seem to have any relationship to cigarette smoking. Other instances cited in the commission report:

Bartenders, waiters, and others engaged in the alcoholic beverage trade have double the average mortality rate for lung cancer. This, presumably, has nothing to do with their consumption of cigarettes.

Among American citizens, men and women born in Ireland have high death rates from oral and esophageal cancers. Polish-born Americans have pronounced excess mortality for esophageal and gastric cancers, and Polish males rank first in lung cancer. Russian-born individuals show high death rates for stomach and (among women only) esophageal cancer. English-born Americans have above-average lung cancer risks.

Whereas none of this would deny a possible relationship with cigarette smoking, it does clearly indicate that the causes of cancer are complex in their origin, and that we are still far from any real understanding of the subject.

Perhaps more significant in terms of the report under discussion, are its findings with respect to the incidence of lung cancer in other countries. Although the findings is that there is some correlation with cigarette smoking, the data might well justify the opposite interpretation.

For example, the report shows that Holland, Switzerland, Finland, and great Britain have a lower per capita consumption of cigarettes than the United States, but that all have higher mortality from lung cancer. Indeed, in the case of Great Britain, the mortality rate is more than double that of the United States. Similarly, Canada, Australia, and Denmark all have about one-half the U.S. per capita consumption of cigarettes, but show the same mortality rate from lung cancer.

Finally, the report is not impressive in the evidence presented to supplement its statistical findings. One would think that the best evidence would be obtained by direct experimentation. In other words, to ascertain the effect of cigarette smoking, experimental animals would be subjected to such smoke for extended periods of time, to see if cancer were induced.

On this subject, the committee's report is succinct and to the point:

"Few attempts have been made to produce bronchogenic carcinoma in experimental animals with tobacco extracts, smoke or smoke condensates. With one possible exception, none has been successful.

"The production of bronchogenic carcinomas has not been reported by any investigator exposing experimental animals to tobacco smoke."

In view of the fact that perhaps a billion dollars has been spent on cancer research in the last decade, this would seem to be an astonishing statement. Why have there been so "few attempts" at what would seem to be the most direct experimental approach to the subject?

A possible explanation for this strange lack of effort in what would seem to be the most logical, direct, and persuasive form of research may be found in a statement attributed to Einstein. He is quoted as having once remarked that the only way to discover what scientists really believe is not by what they say, but by what they do.

Certainly any scientist who could offer experimental proof of the causal effect of cigarette smoking on any type of cancer would doubtless win a brace of Nobel prizes. Why, then, so little effort in this particular experimental field? The apparent answer: Scientists do not believe they can establish any such relationship, and hence are not willing to waste their time in this type of effort.

This may or may not be true, but it is surprising that the Advisory Committee made no significant comment on the question, and offered no adequate explanation of why more work had not been done in this more relevant and highly important research area.

The reader who has had the hardihood to follow this discussion in full may now well inquire: What does it all mean? The only honest answer would seem to be that no one can say precisely what it all means, which perhaps is the most significant conclusion of all.

Surely this report raises a strong inference that cigarette smoking has an adverse influence on health; but at this stage, it is simply that: an inference, no more and no less, and this it must remain until it can be verified experimentally.

By the nature of public statements, it is to be expected that the major conclusions of the Advisory Committee would be heavily publicized and widely noted. By the same token, it is to be expected that little attention would be given to the oddities and paradoxes in the report, even though these are quite astonishing in many surprising ways, and yet must be accepted in full if we are to accept the remainder of the report.

It is doubtful that the public will be aware, for example, that one of the most distinguished medical statisticians in the Nation, Dr. Joseph Berkson of the Mayo Clinic, has raised many of the questions discussed here, as well as others, and expressed serious doubt about the statistical evidence on the effects of cigarette smoking, in various articles published by the American Statistical Association.

If, for example, we are willing to assume that nonsmokers tend to differ physically and otherwise from smokers—in such ways, for example, as self-protective instinct; and we are further willing to assume certain biases among those who responded and failed to respond to these surveys; then the same type of survey findings could be obtained without any true correlation whatsoever between smoking and health.

In other words, these factors are sufficient to generate the appearance of correlation, although none in fact exists.

In many ways, this is a more plausible hypothesis and is more consistent with much of the evidence available than the one adopted in the Advisory Committee report.

It at least avoids the collateral inference that cigarette smoking is adversely related to almost every known type of disease: a fantastic assumption which cannot be supported by the slightest shred of clinical or experimental evidence of any kind.

In any case, these are things that should be considered, to arrive at any proper perspective on the report issued by the Advisory Committee. It would be a tragedy if, on the basis of this report, the public were to decide that the issue had been resolved when, in point of fact, the report raises more questions than it answers.

Two immediate steps would seem to be in order. First, an official request to the American Statistical Association to appoint a committee of distinguished statisticians to review and evaluate all statistical evidence on the subject. This committee should also be asked to suggest the framework for all future studies, to insure cogency, significance, and reliability of results.

Second, increased emphasis by all interested agencies, supported by such funds as may be required, on experimental research of all kinds, and particularly on the effects of continuous exposure to tobacco smoke on the lungs of animals: the type of research where, in the words of the committee, there have been "few attempts" up to now. In this, as in all medical areas of knowledge, there can be no certainty until hypotheses have been verified by actual experimentation or clinical test.

In the history of science, many theories have been created and fully accepted for long periods, only to be abandoned, sometimes centuries later, on the basis of new and contradictory evidence. In this light, it may be appropriate to suggest that the final word has not yet been written by the Surgeon General's Committee or otherwise on the subject of smoking and health.

Changes To Come in the Next Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 19, 1964, it was my privilege to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Letter Carriers Association. Jerome Keating, the distinguished president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, who has done so much to earn the respect and friendship of postal workers, addressed the meeting.

This is an organization of postal workers whose outstanding record of achievement has brought honor to a hard-working branch of the Federal service.

I ask that my remarks be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECADE OF CHANGE AHEAD

(The following is an excerpt from an address by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH to the Dallas Letter Carriers Association on Saturday, January 19, 1964 beginning at 6:30 p.m. at the Holiday Inn in Dallas.)

Here in this city which so recently witnessed so tremendous a change in Government in a matter of minutes, it is fitting today to take a long, thoughtful look at the years ahead.

It is a matter of genuine relief to me, as I know it is to you, that after a shock so great and a crime so awful this saddened country has rallied to give our fellow Texan, President Lyndon Johnson, an unspoken but heartfelt vote of confidence, unmatched in the history of the United States for a new President who has come to power with no time to prepare the people for a swift and unexpected change.

From North to South, from East to West, from the union halls to Wall Street, from the skyscrapers to the cornfields, every indication is that the people of the United States are prepared to move forward under the administration of President Johnson with confidence in his experience, with the confidence that he will maintain a strong nation concerned with the idividual and with mankind, as John F. Kennedy had before him.

This trust, necessary in times of national emergency in a democracy, is a quality of greatness in a people. And a leader shall certainly draw greatness from it.

Having seen the near miracle of the very rapid and efficient transition in national leadership, even in the face of such terrible events, we may well give serious thought to where this Nation is going in relation to other world powers, where leaderships have recently changed, or can be expected to change in the foreseeable future. Now that the transition is completed, the new administration firmly seated, the helm firmly grasped, we should lift our gaze outward from our inner grief, to look ahead at the shoals that await our Ship of State with its new firm helmsman.

It seems such a short time ago that giants like President Kennedy, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Great Britain, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany, and Pope John XXIII were leading players on the world stage. They dealt in foreign affairs in a quest for peace and the advancement of civilization on a person-to-person basis.

Today President Johnson, Prime Minister Home of Great Britain, and West German Chancellor Erhardt, new minds, new personalities, new backgrounds, new training must form new relationships, review policies, maintain confidence of the folks back home, maintain a stable alliance.

The warm, kindly influential personality of Pope John is gone and Pope Paul VI steps forward with a fresh and more youthful vigor. The impact of these changes will affect the lives and hopes and dreams of people all over the world.

Such is the power and such is the awesome responsibility upon the great men of our day.

Ours is the responsibility to be sensitive to change, to apply our energies to broaden the horizon of civilization.

Not too long ago the great Communist combine of the Soviet Union and Red China, in the days of Joseph Stalin, threatened and frightened the free world to the point of uneasy brinkmanship, a state of fear and indecision, but with its resulting danger of rash action. Now that Communist combine has been weakened to the advantage of the free world by the death of Stalin and the changes that followed in Russia where Premier Khrushchev emerged as the new leader.

Stalin was a hardline, combat-ready Communist, perfectly attuned to the equally hardline philosophy of the Red Chinese. Khrushchev, after twice testing the United States in Berlin and in Cuba, and finding it ready to face up to him, presented a less warlike attitude that enabled President Kennedy to bring about the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty. This signing of the test ban treaty widened the rift between the Soviet Union and Red China, weakening a Communist combine that had threatened Asia and Europe an infinitum, and had threatened also to impoverish us with unlimited military expenses and bottomless costs of shoring up small weak neighbors on the periphery of the Communist combine.

Today we must look to our balance of power in the free world. We must maintain unbreakable alliances.

Today we have a Great Britain that looks with historically understandable suspicion on West Germany, and with disturbed feelings about its growing bond with the United States.

We have a West Germany that frets about our defense of West Berlin if the Soviet Union starts trouble again, and insists that we keep all of the expensive army in West Germany that is now located there.

We have a France led by 74-year-old General de Gaulle who has outlasted Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, Eisenhower, Truman, Kennedy, and other contemporaries and who has very strong ambitions of his own, ambitions for a grand France, grand and powerful in Europe as in the days of Napoleon.

We have a France that wants a nuclear bomb, a France looking toward a European economic solidarity that could shut us out; we have the France of old that loves personal liberty, along with a love for greatness, a France that is our traditionally ally, and whose friendship we want to keep.

We have an ally of old in Chiang Kai-shek, who is 76 years old, in Nationalist China, the small island left to him.

There will be changes in the next decade. We have a neutral on the side of peace in Prime Minister Nehru of India, who is 72. In the next decade there will be changes. We have troubled areas in Panama, Cuba, South Vietnam.

As we move into a new year we move also into a new era of world affairs, the shape of which is yet to be molded. Trying to see into the next decade is like looking out the window before dawn. You feel new light will come momentarily, and you wonder if it's cloudy, and hope for sunshine.

We know only that the world has moved haltingly but hopefully toward a lasting peace, toward a day when the energies and minds of all people can be turned to the problems common to mankind—disease, poverty, ignorance. This is a goal worth working for.

We pray that the changes to come will bring improvement which can only be achieved in a state of peace. I hope the world will long remember President Kennedy's statement on the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty when he said:

"A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchev warned the Communist Chinese, would envy the dead. For they would inherit a world so devastated by the explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of all of its horrors. So let us make the most of this opportunity, and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous nuclear arms race, and to check the world's slide to final annihilation."

What will the world be like 10 years from now?

It will be largely like we help shape it, if we have the wisdom and vision to help shape it to meet the rising hopes and aspirations of mankind.

Absent nuclear war, this world 10 years from now will be a world of 3,860 million, up 21 percent from today. In America, our population will be 235 million, up 23 percent

from today. In Latin America the total population will be up to 303 million, an increase of 32 percent.

The demand for food, medicine, clothes, homes, hospitals, and books and buildings for schools, to name only some of the necessities, will be so enormously enhanced that the energies of mankind can be fully utilized in the supplying of these needs, without the necessity to devote man's energies to building war machines, in order to obtain full employment.

We will see great forward strides in education at home, with 8 million students in college in American in 10 years, going to school in more than twice as many college classrooms as now exist in America.

With great new shipping demands, we will have a new interoceanic canal in Central America in 10 years linking the Atlantic and Pacific possibly in Nicaragua, but more likely through Columbia. It will probably be dug rapidly, with earth moved by atomic blasts. When completed, it will lighten somewhat the great demand on the Panama Canal, and ease tensions with Panama. In another decade, airfreight will exceed air passenger travel in ton volume transported.

In another decade you can travel by giant plane twice the speed of sound from New York to Paris in 2 hours.

In 10 years, man will have ridden the rockets to the stars; he will have walked on the moon and have come back to mother earth to describe her barren terrain.

In another decade, our agricultural know-how, shared with the world, will result in more nations with a surplus food supply, but hunger and poverty, unrest and revolution, buoyed up by high birth rates, will still be rampant in the world.

In another decade, there will be fewer nations than now, as some of the small, weak manifestly unviable among the newly emerging nations are driven to seek larger union with their neighbors, to avoid bankruptcy, hunger, and chaos.

In another decade the United Nations will be stronger than now either in its present or under some new or drastically revised charter, as new problems make changes inevitable.

In another decade worldwide instantaneous communication through vehicles in space will be commonplace.

In another decade, Europe will be drawn closer together in an expanded Common Market. Russia, caught in a squeeze between Communist China and the European Common Market, might seek increasingly for an accommodation with the Western World.

There will be wars and rumors of wars; trade competition will heighten between nations; tensions will rise and fall; international problems will multiply with booming populations, expanding technocracy and automation, and speedier communications and transportation. Trade wars will certainly ensue. We will need an educated and enlightened citizenry for the world of competition, of growth, of zest, and of peril in which we will most likely be living in 1974.

It will be a year worth watching for. Homes may be built on 40-year mortgages now; 1974, just a decade away, is closer than you think.

We have goals, we have a future worthy of a great Nation, a great State, a great democratic heritage.

Truly we are approaching the day that Walter Lippmann described in these words: "America has always been not only a country but a dream. There has always been a general and unquestioned belief that here on this soil there would be demonstrated to mankind the blessings of freedom; as the shackles and servitude of the past were put away, there would arise a great and glorious society."

Spinal Cord Injury Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Paralyzed Veterans of America Association at its convention in Miami in 1963, adopted a proposal which has led to the spinal cord injury essay contest.

The contest is open to senior medical school students and there will be three first prizes of $300 each and three second prizes of $200 each. In addition, it is hoped that the best essays will be published in recognized medical journals. The purpose of the PVA is to stimulate interest in spinal cord injury problems among young medical students.

It is encouraging to see the positive attitude adopted by this organization as evidenced by the spinal cord injury essay contest, as well as the grants which are made to the National Paraplegia Foundation, and grants in the names of individual PVA chapters. In the past 2 years a total of $43,000 has been spent in this fashion.

In this connection the House will recall that last October 21 it passed H.R. 8677, which I introduced at the request of the Paralyzed Veterans Association, and this bill, which is now pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, seeks to set aside the comparatively small amount of $100,000 for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases. I hope that it will be enacted before the 88th oCngress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include press releases and other data on the spinal cord essay contest at this point:

SPINAL CORD INJURY ESSAY CONTEST

At the PVA Miami convention of 1963 the spinal cord research rehabilitation and education committee recommended and the convention adopted an outline for a spinal cord injury essay contest. Since the convention, the preparatory work has proceeded in a most heartening manner.

The executive committee has taken on the continuing responsibility of the spinal cord research, rehabilitation, and education committee. They recommended and President Farkas appointed William P. Green temporary research director in order that the program be instigated without delay.

Dr. Herbert Talbot, Dr. Ernest Bors, and Dr. A. T. Jousse were requested to serve as the board of judges for the contest. Administrative assistance will be provided by Alan Jarabin (California), William P. Green (New England), and G. K. Langford (Canadian Para Association). It is most gratifying to note the ready enthusiastic response from all who have been requested to work in this project.

The participation of Dr. A. T. Jousse of Canada and the Canadian Paraplegic Association, G. K. Langford, managing director, makes this project an international endeavor. We know that paraplegia is not limited by artificial boundaries and the knowledge to improve treatment will come from many places. It is hoped that this cooperation can be continued and expanded.

The contest is open to senior medical school students. They must write an essay on any phase of spinal cord injury. The papers will be coded to insure the identification of the student and schools be secret. The judges will award three first prizes of $300 each and three second prizes of $200 each. In addition, efforts will be made to have the best essays published in recognized journals.

Our purpose in promoting this contest is to stimulate an interest in spinal cord problems among the young medical students. The problem of recruiting doctors to work in paraplegia centers is becoming acute because other fields have presented a more attractive challenging image. We believe our problems can also provide a stimulating challenge to doctors and interest them in working in this field.

Possibly a word should be said as to the program of the Paralyzed Veterans of America under the spinal cord research, rehabilitation and education committee. The program consists of (a) the spinal cord essay contest, (b) a grant to the National Paraplegia Foundation for a study of paraplegia needs, (c) a grant for the Dr. Bors's projects, (d) grants in the name of chapters based on membership to their designated projects, and (e) aid in publishing material on paraplegia. In this 2-year period a total of $43,000 will be spent by PVA.

Other plans are being formulated that will be designed to expand the programs and give continuity to our efforts to provide better treatment for all patients suffering from spinal cord injury or disease. The most disturbing question in every paraplegia's repertoire of embarrassing questions is "What is being done to solve our problems?" The effort outlined here is clearly designed to attract new people and new ideas to supplement and continue the efforts of the dedicated individuals already working in the area of spinal cord treatment.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC.,
December 20, 1963.

Dr. JOHN Q. SAMPLE,
Dean, Sample University,
School of Medicine,
Anytown, U.S.A.

DEAR DR. SAMPLE; Enclosed are several copies of the announcement of a prize essay contest being conducted by the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc. We hope that you may see fit to call it to the attention of your 4th-year students. Its terms are self-explanatory; our purpose, frankly, is to stimulate interest in spinal cord injury among young physicians.

Relatively little attention is paid to this subject during undergraduate courses. The care of spinal cord injury patients, however, and research into many aspects of the problem have attracted increasing attention throughout the world in recent years. There are many references in the literature, an international society has been established and meets annually, and a new journal, Paraplegia, is being published.

The judges are men of great experience in the field. Although they cannot correspond with contestants until the judging has been completed, they will be glad to communicate with you, should you have any questions about the contest or its purposes.

We bespeak your cooperation in this enterprise.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM P. GREEN,
Research Director.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC.

ANNOUNCEMENT: PRIZE CONTEST FOR ESSAYS ON SPINAL CORD INJURY BY SENIOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

I. The Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., announces a prize contest, open to

members of the class of 1964 in the medical schools of the United States and Canada, for essays describing original work, clinical or experimental, on any subject bearing upon the study of spinal cord injury or the treatment or rehabilitation of spinal cord injury patients.

II. The prizes will be three first prizes of $300 each; three second prizes of $200 each.

II. The prizes will be: three first prizes of originality, scientific validity, clarity of expression, and such other criteria as the committee of judges may establish. The decisions of this Committee will be final and it may withhold any or all of the prizes if, in its opinion, the essays are not of sufficient excellence to merit award.

IV. All essays will be submitted anonymously, each copy distinguished by a legend. Within an accompanying sealed envelope, marked with the legend, will be the author's name, address, medical school and class, certified by an appropriate official of the school. Mention within the body of the essays of the names of schools, hospitals, or other institutions should be avoided. These may be added later for publication.

V. The judges will attempt to arrange publication of suitable essays, whether prize winners or not. They will also be available to advise contestants who may be interested in further work in the field of spinal cord injury.

VI. The committee of judges will be as follows: Dr. H. S. Talbot, Dr. Ernest Bors, and Dr. A. T. Jousse.

VII. Essays should be written in English or French and not exceed 5,000 words in length. They should be type, double-spaced, on one side of letter-size paper, and submitted in triplicate, along with the identifying envelope to: Paralyzed Veterans of America, New England Chapter, VA Hospital, West Roxbury, Mass.

VIII. The closing date for receipt of entries will be December 31, 1964.

IX. All contestants will be notified of the results as soon as possible after completion of the judging.

A paraplegic is an individual.

(The paralyzed Veterans of America is an organization formed by and for the most seriously disabled in the world. It is devoting its life and effort to every problem of each paraplegic regardless of race, creed, or color. These problems are many, for a paraplegic has suffered a spinal cord injury resulting in paralysis: (1) inability to walk; (2) loss of control over internal functions; (3) loss of sensation below level of injury; (4) permanent confinement to a wheelchair.)

The Federal Government, Science, and the Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations, last month presented a most useful paper on the subject of the Federal Government's relationship to the universities through its investment in various science programs at the annual meeting in Cleveland of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. Goldberg spoke from broad experience and considerable work in this field, and I believe our colleagues will be especially interested in the important information he has pulled together and in the thoughtful observations he has expressed:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, SCIENCE, AND THE UNIVERSITIES—A CONGRESSIONAL VIEW

(By Delphis C. Goldberg)

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to join with panel participants from other professions and organizations in a discussion of the Government's relationships with the universities in science programs. I should like to make clear that the views I express this morning are my own and do not necessarily represent those of the committee, the subcommittee or its members.

CONGRESS AND THE SUPPORT OF SCIENCE

The sharp rise in Federal expenditures for science during the past decade represents an extraordinary development that has only recently caused serious concern in the Congress. Federal spending for research and development is now at an annual rate of approximately $15 billion, and additional sums are spent for science education. The Government, through its various programs, presently supports over two-thirds of the research and development of the Nation.

Of the amount obligated by the Federal Government for research and development in the past fiscal year, it is estimated that approximately $4.4 billion was used for research, including $1.5 billion for basic research, and about $1.6 billion supported work performed in educational institutions.

It is understandable that the Congress should have become concerned about the Government's large investment in science as the growing size and importance of the research and development component of the Federal budget became more visible. But other factors have also contributed to this new awareness. The public airing of differences among scientists on questions of scientific merit, as in Project Mohole and to some extent in the Apollo program, has helped dispel the notion that such matters can be left to the scientists and kept out of political bounds. While scientific disputes had developed in earlier programs, as, for example, in cancer chemotherapy, the agencies concerned succeeded in keeping these from public view. Other factors which have likely stimulated congressional interest in research and development expenditures include the disclosure of unsatisfactory administration in some science programs, and a growing appreciation of the multiple economic benefits to a locality from large science facilities and activities financed by Federal funds.

Over the past quarter century, social and economic forces have led to the Federal Government's increasing involvement in a great variety of complex problems and activities, most of which require special knowledge for legislative as well as for administrative purposes. Because of the volume, variety, and specialized nature of legislative work, the Congress must of necessity operate through committees. Moreover, Congressmen are able to devote only limited time to legislative matters, including committee work, due to the numerous services expected of them by their constituents.

Congress has a constitutional role to legislate, to determine policy independently of the President. Its effective performance of this creative role has varied mainly with the times and the urgency for governmental action, the character of Presidential leadership, and the adequacy of its own staff resources.

Even in highly technical areas it is the responsibility of the Congress to pass judgment on proposals originating in the executive agencies and elsewhere. In weighing agency proposals and alternative policies, the Congress obviously cannot and should not be dependent upon the evidence and analysis furnished by the administrators. A responsible legislative body must have adequate staff resources of its own, and hence the need for permanent professional staffs to serve the standing committees of Congress.

What are the staffing needs of congressional committees? In my judgment, their primary need is for the broadly educated person possessing special training in a relevant field such as law, government, or science who can function as a generalist. The need is for the person with superior analytical ability and a questioning mind who is capable of locating the best sources of technical information on any problem and of framing the proper questions for sharpening issues and otherwise assisting the committee to make rational choices. Certain committees may, in addition, find it valuable to have their own highly trained science specialists, as several committees presently do. But, in general, the Congress already has access to outstanding scientists both in and out of Government as witnesses and consultants, and it could scarcely accomplish more by tying up productive scientists on its full-time payroll. If committees are inadequately staffed to take full advantage of available sources of scientific information and advice, this is a matter which can be remedied without new institutional arrangements. A more serious and growing problem for committees is that of securing disinterested advice from outside Government as scientists in the universities and elsewhere become more and more dependent upon Federal agencies for their support.

With the specialization of committees has come the disposition of Members of Congress to follow committee recommendations when voting on bills that are not highly controversial and do not involve strict party discipline or conflict with the member's personal views. A committee's recommendations will also tend to carry great weight in proportion to the confidence that members have in its chairman and in his knowledge of the subject.

THE FEDERAL STRUCTURE FOR SCIENCE

Science programs are administered by a great many departments and agencies of the Federal Government. Proposals for unifying the major science programs in a single department have not been favorably received by the scientific community, and would not appear to be feasible in any event because of the direct science needs of numerous Federal departments and agencies. Likewise, it is improbable that Congress would give Cabinet status to an agency collecting the smaller science programs of existing departments, as has also been proposed. I believe that a more realistic arrangement would be the establishment of a strong Department of Science and Education to include principally the activities of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. The attractiveness of such a department to the Congress would depend, in large measure, on the willingness of the Federal agencies and the interest groups affected to support an organization of this kind.

In view of the distribution of science responsibilities among many Government agencies, the principal need has been for an effective coordinating mechanism within the Executive Office of the President. An important step was taken in this direction last year with the creation of the Office of Science and Technology. Whether this Office will succeed in obtaining improved coordination of Federal science programs and policies remains to be seen. It is to be hoped that the Office of Science and Technology will bring order into the unnecessarily varied grant arrangements between Federal agencies and the universities. With respect to facilitating the enactment of laws establishing uni-

fied national science policies, the opportunities of the Office may be less promising due to the internal structure of the Congress.

Congress is by its very nature a pluralistic institution. Within each house of the legislative body there is a much greater diffusion of authority than in the executive branch, where the President is one of only two popularly elected officials and is personally clothed with great constitutional powers.

The consideration of science legislation is divided in the House and Senate among a number of separate committees in much the same way as the administration of science programs is distributed among mission-related agencies. In addition, science programs are subject to congressional scrutiny by different kinds of committees concerned with legislative authorization, the appropriation of funds, and the review of expenditures.

The partial overlapping of responsibilities among committees which deal with the same executive agencies provides some added prospect that agency proposals and operations will be critically reviewed. For example, each standing committee of the House is required to "exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee.[1] The Appropriations Committee, in addition, is specifically authorized by the House rules to conduct studies of the organization and operation of any executive department or agency as it may deem necessary to assist in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction. And the House Government Operations Committee is charged with the duty of studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Because of the committee structure of the Congress, opportunities exist for the development of countervailing forces on particular matters. The House Rules Committee may temporarily block bills reported favorably by legislative committees, and the Appropriations Committee may recommend less money than the Congress has authorized for a program—or more than proposed by the President if the authorizing legislation sets no limitation on funds.

The legislative process may appear cumbersome and perhaps frustrating to those who favor quick approval of the measures they advocate. The Congress is not without its critics and a persuasive case can be made for improving congressional machinery. However, we should not lose sight of the essential legislative role performed by the Congress in our system of government. Criticism of the Congress for inaction often signifies that the critic's concept of the public interest is not shared by a majority of the people's elected representatives. In some instances, inaction may reflect an inadequate job of justifying and communicating the objective sought by the proponents of a measure.

The performance of Congress often looks disorganized not only because the Congress is a pluralistic political body, but also because its actions are constantly open to public view. Decisionmaking in executive agencies is frequently disorderly too, but the public sees only the end result and not the process.

METHODS OF SUPPORT

Both grants and contracts are used by Federal agencies to finance research performed in universities, while grants and fellowships are used to support training activities. Although the contract is employed principally to procure research services required by an agency for the solution of specific problems, some agencies use contracts also to support projects, including basic research, proposed by university investigators.

The grant, however, is the predominant Federal method of financing research in universities. Research grant support has been extended in recent years by some agencies beyond the traditional type of project, involving an investigator working alone or with the assistance of a few close associates, to include support for broad programs of research organizations and center-type programs in educational institutions. Grants for the general support of institutional research activities, presently used in differing forms by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, represent another recent development.

The tremendous increase in the number of grantees supported by NIH and certain other Federal agencies has been accompanied by new and more difficult management responsibilities. In meeting these responsibilities, a granting agency can endeavor to deal directly with a vastly enlarged clientele, or it can move in the direction of a more wholesale type of operation in which it develops suitable arrangements for effective university participation in the selection and/or management of research projects.

There is much to be said for disbursing a substantial portion of research project funds through universities as a partial substitute for the selection of individual grantees at the Federal level. However, I would doubt the political feasibility and wisdom of allocating very large sums to institutions to be expended for research activities completely at their discretion. Instead, I would propose that Federal agencies set standards for university project review committees and require approval of the grant management policies and procedures of an institution as a condition to its eligibility for distributing Federal research funds. I see no reason why local committees, if soundly constituted, could not function in as competent and objective a manner as national advisory panels. While a university committee would not possess the same degree of technical expertise for many research proposals as a highly specialized review panel in Washington, it should have the important advantages of familiarity with local resources and the capability of judging the merit of proposals in a larger context than the self-interest of a single discipline or a segment of it.

As the funds available for science and for each of its major components become more scarce relative to demand, Federal agencies will be increasingly confronted with the necessity of making hard choices in the allocation of money between research fields as well as between competing projects within each specialized field. The multidisciplinary committee, consequently, will likely become a valuable device in helping to determine priorities for Federal science expenditures as the pressure for efficient resource allocation grows. The university project review committee, which included representation from a variety of disciplines and specialties, might serve in this capacity at the local level.

The suggestion is sometimes made that the Federal Government award block grants to universities to be used at their discretion for research and educational purposes. Despite congressional authorization of the NSF and NIH institutional-type grants, the prospects are not bright that Congress would approve the extensive use of block grants. Federal grants to educational institutions, like grants to State and local governments, have been confined as a rule to specific limited-purpose programs, rather than awarded for the general support of the recipient's activities in the tradition of Great Britain and some other countries. I think it unlikely that our historical pattern of grant support will be sighificantly altered in the near future.

POLICYMAKING AND ADMINISTRATION

The separation of powers established by the Federal Constitution provides a less sharp line between the enactment of laws and their execution than is generally recognized. In practice, the executive branch participates actively in the performance of legislative functions and the Congress in the administration of the laws.

In technical fields of Government activity, notably in science, the Congress has necessarily delegated broad discretion to executive agencies for determining policy in the implementation of legislative objectives. The law authorizing some programs is little more than a general statement of objectives and the designation of an organization for program administration. At times the legislative intent is unclear, thereby allowing agencies great latitude for creative administration within the bounds of prevailing congressional sentiment. Because the statutory authority granted Federal science agencies is so broad, Congress has an obligation to maintain control of program content through periodic examination of agency policies and operations. This the Congress seeks to accomplish by annual appropriation hearings, and in some programs authorization hearings as well, on requests for funds, and at times by intensive study of an agency's administrative performance.

SOME FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

It is not enough for Federal administrators to believe deeply in their agency's mission and to trust those who do research under Government grants or contracts. Although administrators may identify closely with the interests of their grantees or contractors, they have an equal responsibility to actively represent the Government's interest as a supporter or purchaser of research. It is to be expected that Federal agencies will have adequate and practicable arrangements for obtaining the optimum use of public funds, even when the Federal interest is broadly interpreted and research productivity can be measured imperfectly at best.

A Federal agency assumes a special responsibility when it relies heavily in the adminisrative process on outside consultants who are themselves beneficiaries of its programs. In this circumstance, the agency has a clear obligation to structure its internal operations so as to obtain maximum objectivity in its decisions and to prevent any special advantage from accruing to its advisors.

I have heard differing views expressed on whether the well-known investigator normally commands NIH research project support wholly on the basis of his reputation and institutional affiliation, irrespective of the merits of the project he proposes. I believe that most members of Congress, if properly informed, would not object to the awarding of modest-sized grants for the general support of a gifted scientist's personal research in fields of importance to an agency's mission. The difficulty arises when the project no longer represents the investigator's personal efforts, but, instead, is intended to be large-scale financing for farmed-out research, or even worse, for training and other nonresearch purposes. If review panels indeed make their determinations largely or wholly on the basis of an applicant's reputation, I would submit that it is the granting agency's duty to determine that the applicant will personally commit a major portion of his research time to the project. To do otherwise distorts the concept of the research project and invites cynicism and public distrust.

[1] Sec. 736 of the Rules of the House of Representatives which implements sec. 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812).

Standing at the pinnacle of our educational system, the university has become more than ever before directly involved in the affairs of society and a vital instrument for achieving national objectives. Many other social institutions can also be viewed as important contributors to the national welfare, but such recognition in itself offers no guidance on how these institutions might best be supported. The question of Federal support must be decided in the light of pertinent political and other considerations.

The argument is compelling that higher education will require increasingly greater sustenance if our Nation is to achieve quality education for a larger proportion of a growing population. It is probable that the traditional sources will be incapable of contributing to the support of educational institutions to the same degree as in the past. The Federal Government, consequently, looms as the most important potential source of such financial assistance. The most appropriate form and character of Federal aid, however, is another matter.

Federal aid for higher education today is largely a byproduct of programs for the support of scientific research. The executive branch, which should have the planning resources, has not provided notable leadership in developing a comprehensive national program for strengthening higher education, and the Congress itself is not well equipped to fashion a coherent plan. The present centrifugal tendencies are illustrated by the disparate graduate training programs that have emerged independently in many Federal agencies. While opinions may differ on whether the programs which provide financial support for graduate and postgraduate science training have reached the point of diminishing returns, I believe there is substantial agreement among educators that there is a relatively greater need and justification for Government assistance at the undergraduate level.

If Federal assistance for higher education is a desirable national policy, let us discuss this matter openly in the political forum. If those who speak for higher education have a persuasive case for Federal support, let them present this case on its merits to the Congress and to the public. Education is much too important a matter to be left to the indirect and sometimes suspect nourishment from sponsored research and special-purpose training programs. Indeed such arrangements raise practical as well as ethical considerations. These include such familiar questions as: Should the strongest institutions receive a disproportionate share of Federal support for education as a byproduct of the ability of their faculties to attract large research funds? Is it in the national interest that the strongest institutions be further aided in cornering the market of potential science talent, both research and teaching, as a result of the research activities and expensive facilities and equipment acquired with Federal funds? And should research grants be expressly used as a form of support for the training of graduate students? A less familiar question relates to the merit of using several Federal agencies to administer separate programs of graduate training assistance in the same fields with a variety of stipends, selection procedures, reporting forms, and cost of education allowances.

I believe the time has come for a conscious and rational plan for the Federal support of higher education. Such support is now substantial and is likely to increase. However, diverse and sometimes confused objectives characterize many of the existing programs which have not been developed as a matter of affirmative and coherent national policy. Moreover, the present programs collectively do not constitute a well-rounded Federal effort for science education, to say nothing of higher education as a whole. A sound plan, in my judgment, is not achieved by retaining the existing patterns and programs while calling upon the Federal Government for additional forms of assistance. The universities must expect not only to give up some current types of support in return for enlarged Federal assistance, but they must also demonstrate a willingness to shoulder an equitable share of their total educational and research costs. Only then will their appeals for Federal aid command widespread respect and attention.

The Desperate Drive To Cut Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "The Desparate Drive To Cut Defense Spending," by Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy, which appeared in the January 1964 edition of Fortune magaizne.

Mr. Speaker, this is unquestionably the finest, sharpest and most thoughtful article on the subject that I have ever seen, and Mr. Murphy is to be commended for the outstanding job he has done. He has done a great service to the public.

The essence of the article is in these two paragraphs:

There is no way of proving the statement, but it does seem, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the intense, costly buildup of the U.S. conventional forces was probably overdone. The supposed "conventional gap," as an index of a critical deficiency in the American capacity for effective action, appears to have been as much a product of a state of mind as the bomber and missile "gaps." The conventional buildup has added enormously to the cost of national defense; there can be no considerable reductions in this cost while it continues. Alongside such expenditures, the savings from closing down airfields and depots will produce little more than minor passing jiggles in the spending curve.

A more serious consequence of the preoccupation with conventional options has been the increasingly cautious investment in the more speculative military technologies. The capital investment on the side of the technological advantage, which is to say in advanced systems—a form of indirect economic pressure the adversary finds most difficult to meet over the long pull—has begun to decline, while the investment in people has been rising both relatively and absolutely. If there is to be a substantial drop in defense costs it can come only through a shift in the investment allocations, and this would mean, for Johnson, a thoroughgoing reappraisal of the economic and military validity of the Kennedy-McNamara strategy assumptions.

I respectfully urge each and every one of my colleagues in the Congress to read the article in full.

THE DESPERATE DRIVE TO CUT DEFENSE SPENDING

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

(NOTE.—Despite efforts by the President, Congress, and Secretary McNamara, the military budget will approach $52 billion this year, borne on heavy requirements for stepped-up conventional forces. Before sizable cuts can be made, Johnson will have to reexamine strategy.)

Ever since President Johnson proclaimed thrift and frugality as the watchwords of his administration, the Pentagon has been ablaze with light well into the midnight watch. In the past such a glow along the Potomac has been interpreted by Washingtonians as a signal that international trouble was brewing. This time, however, the emergency was of an entirely different kind. It was, as they say there, "an in-house flap" produced by the President's rapid decision to halt the prolonged upsurge in defense costs.

The total fiscal outlook had become a matter of special concern to Johnson immediately after his succession to office. Since defense in the aggregate (including nuclear weaponry) is taking 60 percent of the entire Federal revenue, and since the volume of defense spending has been rising faster than have outlays in the civilian sectors of the budget (excluding space), it was obvious to him that any significant curtailment of Government expenditures had to begin with a rollback at the Pentagon.

Unlike Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower at the outset of their administrations, Johnson needed no introduction to his Secretary of Defense. In past months Johnson had listened respectfully, even admiringly, while Robert S. McNamara ran through the countdown of the now famous cost-reduction programs, incentive contracts, and the techniques of systems analysis that he has put in train throughout his vast Department. Johnson has also long been familiar with the Secretary's impressive tables and graphs testifying to his persistent efforts to extract an ever higher military content from every dollar of the billions that flow through his hands. Yet, when seen in the perspective of the spending rate itself, all the charts and all the careful projections were in fact little more than evidence of McNamara's desperate struggle against a rising tide of costs that had begun to engulf him, as in the past it engulfed his predecessors.

Johnson had sensed the rising emergency well before he entered the White House. And McNamara himself, as early as the autumn, had become worried over the upward trend, as well as over the stiffening resistance in Congress to the increasing costs of his programs. Thus in close cooperation he and the President moved to come down hard on the side of retrenchment. This was what caused the lights to go on so fast at the Pentagon. The new budgetary requests go forward at midmonthh, and during recent weeks thousands of programs have been reviewed and hundreds recast in a near frantic effort to hold spending through the current and next fiscal years at or close to $52 billion, a level that McNamara, who was headed well past it, will be hard pressed to hold.

If McNamara can manage this, it will be a real tour de force. The tenseness in his situation was revealed when Johnson was persuaded to take the extraordinary step, during his first days in office, of dispatching letters to some 7,500 defense contractors, urging them one and all to cut production costs to the bone. Considering how modest the profit margins on military business already tend to be, and how taut the accounting surveillance from Washington and the procurement centers, this was almost a case of trying to squeeze blood from a stone.

Actually, Johnson and McNamara had little room for maneuver. The intricate Pentagon budget for fiscal 1965—beginning in July—had just about been put together when the executive power passed so suddenly in November. While the final figures had not been precisely fixed when this article went to press, the President and his advisers were agreed in principle that the Kennedy-McNamara force levels and programs should be sus-

tained for the time being. They had no alternative: the costly defense programs that were set in motion under the strategical conceptions of the Kennedy administration are, in a very real sense, at their point of flood; the money to keep them going has already been obligated by the military services to the contractors. In the 10 months that remain to President Johnson before the election, little can be done by him to swing the costs sharply down, except at the risk of throwing awry the Kennedy-McNamara force structure and strategical doctrines.

Here it is important to note that the confrontation of Johnson and the defense budget was more than a passing encounter between a personality and columns of figures. The new President was actually taking a closer look at defense concepts and strategies that did not necessarily express his own views. Thus these views were likely to be as influential in setting the guidelines for his programs of defense spending—and cuts—as his better advertised commitment to frugality.

A RESPECT FOR PROFESSIONALS

There has never been any question about Johnson's stand where U.S. military power is concerned. He has steadily been for and continues to be for—as he emphatically reiterated in his November address to Congress—"military strength second to none." Practically everybody is for that, of course. Still, when Johnson uses the term, he means something beyond the timeworn platitude. By strength second to none he means strength that the professional military leadership—and not only the civilian planners in the Pentagon—will certify as such. He has entered the White House, moreover, after an education in the political ends of high strategy and the means and doctrines of force that no other President in the 20th century, save Gen. Dwight Eisenhower and, in a much simpler world, Theodore Roosevelt, even began to match.

As a Senator, he was a member of the Armed Services Committee and chairman of the influential Senate Preparedness Subcommittee that was created, during the Korean war, to act as watchdog over the military procurement process. As Vice President, he was outranked only by Kennedy on the National Security Council and he presided over the National Aeronautics and Space Council. By reason of these overlapping experiences and responsibilities, he was already very much at home, before he moved into the White House, with the highly specialized, highly secret matters that bear so heavily on the national security. In fact, valuing as he does experience in the management of forces, his visible respect and liking for the military professionals has at times surpassed his enthusiasm for the procession of Defense Secretaries—there have been seven altogether, not counting McNamara—who passed before his legislative eye.

Johnson has not always felt at home with the policies, let alone the policymakers, that he now commands. In the New Frontier's remarkable 3-year encounter with world affairs, the policy advisers ranged around President Kennedy were divided into several contending factions. One consisted of the hard-nosed, skeptical individuals of conservative bent, who were opposed, by and large, to attempting business with the Soviet Union unless the terms were brassbound and copper riveted. Another faction was made up of self-styled "rationalists." By and large, they were convinced that a détente with Russia could be brought off with mollifying, even though somewhat hazardous, concessions in the power position of the West. Somewhere in between were the real decisionmakers, grouped around Kennedy himself, who called themselves pragmatists. They thought of action in the world struggle as a sequence of limited chess moves, and their action words were "flexibility," "options," "wider choice," and a U.S. response to challenge that would be "measured," or "controlled," or "graduated." Among these factions Lyndon Johnson was known as a hardliner.

WHEN JOHNSON STOOD FIRM

His position came dramatically into view during the historic debate around Kennedy over the course of action to be taken after the discovery of Soviet rockets in Cuba in Octber 1962. The debate went on for nearly a week. and Johnson, on a campaigning assignment in Hawaii during the first days of discussion, was late getting into it. When he was made privy to the gravity of the Soviet action, he spoke up for a decisive response. Not only the rockets, but the Soviet troops as well, had to be removed, and by force if necessary—so ran Johnson's advice. The American people, he argued, would never accept anything less. But the rationalists pulled harder, for a while, on Kennedy than was generally appreciated. There was serious deliberation over the question of a quid pro quo with Khrushchev. Should the demand for his retreat from Cuba be linked with an offer to open political talks on other matters at issue, including Berlin? Wouldn't the United States have a better case before world opinion if, in return for the withdrawal of Soviet rockets from Cuba, American rockets were pulled out of Italy and Turkey?

Gradually, the middle-course counsel of the men who stayed on as Johnson's principal instruments in the struggle with Soviet power—most conspicously Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Defense Secretary McNamara—shaped the decision. The practical consequence of the decision was the partial blockade of Cuba, combined with a great show of force as for the invasion of Cuba, and Kennedy's own partly stern, partly conciliatory private diplomacy with Premier Khrushchev.

For his part, Johnson never wavered from his original conviction. The apprehensions among some of Kennedy's closest advisers that Russia would counter a U.S. blow against Cuba with a salvo of rockets against the United States seemed to him to be groundless. His confidence in the American capacity for decisive and salutary action—a confidence that was based on his direct knowledge of the forces in being—remained unshaken. By his lights, the migration of Soviet military power into the Western Hemisphere could not be tolerated. Johnson took his stand on the historic meaning of the Monroe Doctrine, holding that its breaching, if condoned, would undermine the new Alliance for Progress and damage U.S. prestige throughout the world. And he was further troubled by a settlement that would leave Fidel Castro in unscathed command of Cuba.

Johnson was not alone in believing these things. Although Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was inclined to the McNamara-Rusk middle course, the other service chiefs saw eye to eye with Johnson. So did the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, John A. McCone. They were a minority, however, and after the die had been cast for the middle course, one of the Kennedy men, in an aside directed at the Johnson position, made a cold remark that sensitive memories have tended to blur since the change at the White House. According to one who was within earshot, it was to the effect that, in the rational shaping of policy, "Courage is not substitute for intelligence." This was the kind of gliding, epigrammatic half-insult that Johnson is ill equipped to parry. When he heard of it, he froze.

Johnson's attitude in the October crisis is, today, significant. His courage under pressure has been certified, and his sense of power relationships made clear. While agreeing that an exit had to be provided through which Khrushchev could back out of Cuba without a fight, nevertheless he was insisting that the U.S. Government should make sure that Khrushchev was maneuvered toward an exit that would close behind him. As matters turned out, the supposed exit became a revolving door; Soviet forces continue to come and go in Cuba and the Castro-inspired terror has continued to reach into Latin America, most deeply (and recently) into Venezuela. As for the rockets in Italy and Turkey, they were presently dismantled and withdrawn. True, these particular weapons were somewhat obsolescent in comparison with what they might have been replaced with, but they were not replaced. Instead Washington announced that U.S. Polaris submarines had been assigned to the Mediterranean. As regards the intermediate-range capability of the allied forces in Europe, however, the departure of the land-based missiles represented a net loss to the NATO order of battle.

It is no secret that the Kennedy men, and most noticeably the inner group of political and social scientists at State and Defense who were closely linked to the White House, were then indifferent to, even scornful of, Johnson's competence in their fields of expertise. The truth is that he was all but a stranger to many of them during the 3 years that the direction of national security policies and actions was being gathered into the White House. Drawn into Kennedy's centripetalism and exhilarated by the intimacy of the connection, the Kennedy men, for the most part, had little time for Johnson.

Secretary Rusk was one exception. Perhaps because he, too, was at times a lonely man, but also because he valued Johnson's knowledge of the ways of Congress, Rusk remained amiable, attentive, and informative. He was solicitous in his briefing of Johnson on political matters before Johnson set out on his foreign excursions, and was faithful in sounding out Johnson's views afterward. McNamara also got along well with Johnson, without ever achieving quite the same degree of warmness. McNamara was punctilious about keeping Johnson informed of the Defense Department's actions and contingency plans during periods of tension, and he made a practice of seeking the Vice President's counsel whenever he faced a difficult test with Congress. It is fairly obvious, nevertheless, that the policyforming circuits from the White House into State and Defense will before long be subject to a fair amount of rejiggering.

THE FAR FROM FINISHED BUSINESS

It could conceivably take some weeks for the President to absorb the kind of detail he must have in order to deal authoritatively with a number of difficult and dangerous situations. Foremost among these is the war in South Vietnam. Secretary McNamara and General Taylor 3 months ago assured the Nation that the war there will be militarily under control next year. That assurance, in the view of those closer to the shooting, is at best dubious. In NATO Europe the divergences from U.S. policy are deep and numerous. The optimism released by the intimations of the tenuous U.S. détente with the Soviet Union is giving encouragement in much of Western Europe to a mood of accommodation with the Communists.

In addition to acquiring a clear insight into these and other decidely worrisome international issues, Johnson must also get to the bottom of the case for the controversial strategy embodied in the huge budget that McNamara has handed to him. By far the largest part of the Kennedy-McNamara additions to defense costs has been generated by the rapid enlargement of the conventional forces for the purpose of providing, so the case goes, more political and military flexibility to the United States at the outset of a war situation. The crux of the controversy

is concerned with the question of whether these added costs can be justified over the long pull. For it is self-evident that there can be no substantial lowering of defense costs so long as this additional cushion for wider choice and less risky nonnuclear options is desired at the margin.

THE KENNEDY-M'NAMARA WATERSHED

The military budget for fiscal 1965 is the fourth and the last to bear a clear Kennedy imprint. It is a crystallization of the Kennedy administration's judgment relating to military forces and strategical doctrines, and both in dollar terms and in the new balance and composition of forces it modifies certain concepts developed by Dwight Eisenhower. In this respect, the budget for fiscal 1965 represents a watershed in the postwar evolution of U.S. military forces and policies.

Measured simply in money terms, the watershed is a high one. As indicated by the chart on page 97, the total Kennedy drafts on the defense account kept rising every year. By the end of fiscal 1963, last June, the Kennedy-McNamara defense expenditures (including foreign military assistance) had risen to about $50 billion, an increase of some $6.3 billion over the level of cost that Eisenhower had come to, with great reluctance, in his last year in office, fiscal 1961.

For the 1964 fiscal year (ending next June 30), McNamara originally asked Congress for $53.7 billion in new money. Added to the carryover of unexpended balances from the previous year's appropriations, this sum would have given him a total obligational authority of $55.2 billion for his needs through the current year, and for the funding of programs the full impact of which would not be felt until later years. Congress, however, struck some $1.8 billion from his main money bill. While certain items still were in suspense as this article went to press, the indications were strong that McNamara's supply of new money for fiscal 1964 would stop at about $51 billion. This would leave him about $2.7 billion short of the amount he first asked for. On the strength of this deficiency he could have decided to tighten the spending drastically in the remaining 6 months of the current fiscal year and stretch some payments into fiscal 1965. But since it is to Johnson's public advantage to show a relatively tight budget in fiscal 1965, the decision was made to crowd certain costs into the Kennedy account for fiscal 1964 and so avoid a rise in the new Johnson budget. The prospect is that, with the help of some bookkeeping sleight-of-hand, spending in the current year will come to around $52 billion, and will hold there through June 1965.

At this level, some of McNamara's original plans will have to be flattened out. As recently as last summer, before the Pentagon felt the chill winds from Capitol Hill, indications were strong that the momentum of his programs would carry spending close to $55 billion a year. An outlay of that magnitude was needed to bring to a rapid climax his long-range programs for restructuring the military forces. The $55-billion level would, for example, have just about completed the capital funding of the huge new strategic nuclear systems (notably the Polaris fleet and the Minuteman rocket force) that were started in Eisenhower's administration. The additional infusion also was calculated to bring the Army within striking distance of the huge reserves of battle stocks it would need for major conventional campaigns.

Once these major investments were largely behind him, McNamara, was confident that between then and 1968–69 the annual running costs of the Military Establishment could be reduced by at least 10 percent. His ultimate goal, in other words, was gradually to bend the military spending curve downward to a plateau represented by an annual cost on the order of $50 billion, perhaps even a little less. Instead, circumstances have forced upon him an immediate leveling off between $51 billion and $52 billion annually.

THE BASIC KENNEDY PROPOSITION

Secretary McNamara, it should be noted, was not the author of the politico-military premises that have produced the swollen costs that are a principal cause of President Johnson's fiscal embarrassment. When McNamara went to Washington from the presidency of the Ford Motor Co., he was almost as innocent of experience in the issues relating to strategy as was his much-abused predecessor from Detroit, "Engine Charlie" Wilson, Eisenhower's first Defense Secretary. The strategical premises were constructed in large measure by Kennedy and his advisers during the preparations for the presidency. The main point of departure between the governing strategic concepts of the Eisenhower administration and those of the Kennedy advisers—the one that has had the utmost influence on the military economics—was the Kennedy challenge to certain basic assumptions about the value of nuclear weaponry in war deterrence and war waging.

The Kennedy proposition, in simplified terms, went something like this: The emergence of Soviet Russia as a nuclear power, well equipped with warheads for both general and limited wars, had produced a nuclear stalemate or, in any event, a balance in the capacity for thermonuclear retaliation so close that one side could not rationally expect to introduce such weapons without inviting from the other a catastrophic blow—to which it could respond only by extending catastrophe. An exchange of nuclear rockets between the United States and the U.S.S.R. had therefore ceased to be a credible assumption in the planning of forces. Concurrently, as the Kennedy advisers saw it, the Eisenhower plan for the nuclear defense of Europe had lost validity, inasmuch as even a relatively small-scale nuclear action there would in all probability escalate uncontrollably into full-scale war.

On this reasoning, then, the Kennedy men concluded that a major Soviet military aggression, if and when undertaken, would revert to conventional warfare of the World War II standard, utilizing masses of infantry, armor, and tactical aircraft. Restoring the American capability of the TNT side of the equation inevitably led to a substantial expansion of the Army and the tactical Air Force, along with their supporting apparatus.

This was a thoroughly respectable proposition. For many Americans, perhaps even a majority, the mere thought of resorting again to nuclear weapons had become morally repugnant. The pervasive uneasiness might well inhibit the American will to act whenever the nuclear risk might seem high. The proposition was also politically attractive to many in Europe. Finally, it was given plausibility by Khrushchev's famous disquisition on strategy in January 1961, the month Kennedy came into power. The Russian leader announced that the Kremlin was ruling out nuclear warfare as an instrument of policy. He proclaimed the Communist expansion would proceed by means of "wars of liberation"—through civil warfare, that is, rather than the clash of nations.

WHY EISENHOWER REDUCED THE FORCE LEVELS

Eisenhower had not been ignorant of, or indifferent to, the moral and political disabilities attaching to a nuclear strategy. Indeed, on a number of occasions he said that general nuclear war was unthinkable. Yet his judgment of the considerations bearing on the world balance of power led him to a rather different line of policy from Kennedy's. During the Korean war, the U.S. military forces were swelled until they numbered nearly 3,700,000 men and women. After that challenge subsided, Eisenhower was faced with the problem of reshaping this huge establishment for a prolonged test of endurance.

Before long the rising impact of the revolution in military technologies that had started under Truman forced Eisenhower into a series of decisions regarding capital allocations that radically altered the traditional roles and missions of the services. The invention of the thermonuclear weapon gave rise first to the B–52 and B–58 jet bomber forces, then the Atlas and Titan intercontinental rockets, then the Polaris fleet, then the Minuteman force, and then the B–70 concept. Each system required in its turn huge outlays for research and development, for hardware, and for training of specialists in unprecedented numbers. The same technological advances opened equally revolutionary possibilities on the side of the defense—enormous electronic systems for warning, surveillance, and command, as well as costly air-defense systems utilizing both supersonic interceptors and rockets. And then in 1957, 3 years before Eisenhower left the White House, the Soviet space successes called for programs of a whole new order. By Eisenhower's last year, the capital allocations for R. & D. had risen in 4 years from about $2 billion a year to about $6 billion; and for procurement, chiefly in the form of advanced weapon systems for the Air Force and Navy, the figure was approaching $12 billion annually.

In pursuit of the technological advantage, Eisenhower was progressively compelled, in the allocation of capital, to throw his weight against the doctrines in which he had been bred and from the application of which had come his fame. The Korea-swollen Army consisted of 1,500,000 men and 20 divisions when he became President. When he left, it was down to 14 divisions and about 900,000 men. He brought the Air Force Tactical Air Command down from 55 wings, organized to support the Army in battle, to only 32. Altogether, Eisenhower reduced the uniformed strength by nearly one-third, from 3,600,000 persons to less han 2,500,000. It is no secret that he wanted to cut even deeper. If he had had his way, the Army's ready strength would have been still further diluted by the withdrawal and disbanding of at least 2 of the 5 divisions and 4 regiments deployed in Europe, and the Navy would have been limited to perhaps 12 attack carriers instead of 15.

As Eisenhower read the future, the military advantage in a trial of endurance would rest with the side that held the technological upper hand. To him, this meant a contest between the American supply of capital and technical skills and the Soviet supply. Rather than strain American human and capital resources by trying to maintain two different kinds of military establishments simultaneously, one equipped predominantly for conventional warfare and the other shaped around the nuclear technology, he chose to concentrate the investment on the side of strategic technological advantage. He believed that this would prove to be the surest deterrent to war.

By no means did this mean that he was limiting his options to "massive retaliation" alone. Right down to his last year in office, upward of two-thirds of the budget was being devoted to the support of an Army, Navy, and Air Force whose essential function was to fight "brush fire" or "limited" campaigns in conventional style. It was Eisenhower's firm conviction that 14 Army divisions (3 of which were training divisions), plus 3 Marine divisions, plus their supporting tactical air forces, were quite enough to cope with any limited war that it might be in the American interest to fight. He rejected the idea that the United States would ever again send great armies abroad to fight wars of attrition. He reasoned that superior military technologies, broadly based on tactical nuclear capabilities, would enable the United

States to control the ground battle, if one were to develop on a serious scale. His insistence on this point led in 1959 to the breach between him and the then Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who reemerged in the Kennedy administration as the senior military adviser to the President.

Eisenhower protected the Nation with much more foresight and imagination than is generally realized. The great new systems, offensive and defensive, were all well in hand when he left Washington. It is also a matter of historical record that he weathered the Red Chinese threat at Quemoy and Matsu, and menacing Soviet moves at Berlin and in the Middle East without having to call up the Reserves.

THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

When it fell to McNamara to reverse the investment priorities, he was inevitably drawn into the money bind that Eisenhower had tried to evade. The Kennedy thesis that the nuclear retaliatory power had lost credibility as a prime factor in a deterrent strategy was at least an arguable proposition. But once believed it carried with it a costly corollary: to be certain that the Russians, too, would believe in the nuclear stalemate U.S. nuclear power must be made strong enough to withstand a Soviet surprise first blow. To the Kennedy advisers this meant that the American strategic retaliatory forces must be converted at all possible speed to "second strike" posture.

Thus before McNamara was even well launched on the business of rebuilding the conventional forces, he was compelled to enlarge the ready strategic nuclear forces at a pace considerably faster than Eisenhower had deemed necessary. Among other actions, he more than doubled the output of Polaris submarines (from 5 to 12 a year), doubled the output of the Minuteman (from 30 missiles to 60 a month), set about positioning the Titan missiles in hardened sites at all possible speed, and increased the fraction of the Strategic Air Command in round-the-clock air alert.

The stepped-up outlays on the strategic side, however, represent only between a quarter and a third of the total dollar increase in the Kennedy-McNamara budgets. The rest is accounted for chiefly by the much heavier investment in conventional forces, especially the Army. The Army has been raised to 16 divisions, 2 more than before; of these the 3 divisions that previously had functioned merely as grinding mills for trainees have been transformed, at no mean cost, into ready forces. Also, various specialized battle groups have been reinforced and brought to a high degree of readiness, and something quite new has been added—the Special Forces created for coping with guerilla warfare.

To support the Army in conventional warfare, the number of fighter-bomber wings in the Tactical Air Command has been raised from 16 to 22; the troop-carrier wings have been fleshed out; and more than half a billion dollars worth of nonnuclear munitions have been stockpiled, over and above previous requirements. Six divisions in the Army Reserve are in the process of being manned and equipped for rapid deployment overseas. The airlift capacity has also been doubled, as was dramatized by the "Big Lift" operation in October. And there are 15,000 more men in the Marine Corps than Eisenhower allowed. One of the fundamental Kennedy premises was that the United States should be able to cope with two large-scale conventional wars of the Korean type simultaneously in different parts of the world. This concept was, of course, one that Eisenhower rejected.

By reason of the intense preoccupation with conventional means of warfare, the number of people in uniform exceeded 2,800,000 at one point in the Kennedy-McNamara buildup, nearly 335,000 more than Eisenhower tolerated. The number now stands at about 2,700,000. As the chart on page 97 shows, the funds allocated to the "General-purpose forces" category—i.e., conventional—had risen from $14.5 billion annually under Eisenhower to $18.1 billion in fiscal 1963 and still are rising.

THE DEVOURING FACTOR

This is only part of the continuing investment in conventional means, however. The annual cost of the air-sea lift, represented largely by capital outlays for faster and bigger air transports, is $500 million more than it was. The yearly costs charged to general support of the entire military establishment also are $2 billion higher, and the larger part of this increase must be charged to the conventional side of the military ledger. It appears that between $5 billion and $6 billion of the $8 billion that the Kennedy-McNamara strategy had added to the annual cost of defense is represented by the search for more nonnuclear options.

What Old Soldier Eisenhower knew all along, and what the newcomers to military economics first brushed aside, was that the devouring factor in a military organization is not hardware but "bodies"—the people and their dependents who must be housed, fed, clothed, trained, paid, moved about, and cared for when ill. At present the annual outlays for R. & D., military construction, and the procurement of weapons and other equipment add up to about $24 billion. But the upkeep of the forces, including family housing and retired pay, runs to about $26 billion a year. This averages out at about $10,000 a year for each man, apart from the cost of putting a weapon in his hand or giving him a truck to drive. It is the additional bodies McNamara has "taken aboard" (as they say at the Pentagon) that have helped to inflate defense costs so fast and that will become by far the major element in future costs.

The total effect looks like this: The Kennedy military budgets, including the one going forward in mid-January, add up to a total spending of about $202 billion for 4 years. This compares with a total of about $172 billion for the last 4 Eisenhower years. These figures, incidentally, do not include the cost of developing and manufacturing nuclear weapons. The Atomic Energy Commission bears this cost, which is on the order of $2 billion a year.

A NEW AUDIT OF FORCES AND STRATEGY?

The hauling and pulling in Congress over the fiscal 1964 budget, while leading to temporary stretchouts and deferments rather than to major amputations of program, nevertheless signaled a rising skepticism about the high level of defense spending. It was to mollify this mood of questioning that President Johnson encouraged McNamara to proclaim a number of long-evaded shutdowns, such as the suspension of the Air Force's Dynasoar space program (McNamara had been gunning for that for more than a year) and the closing down of inefficient and worthless bases, shipyards, and the like. McNamara believes that upward of $5 billion a year can be trimmed from defense spending simply through subjecting the forces and the Pentagon's own contracting procedures to sterner managerial disciplines.

So far so good, but is not a far more serious audit of forces and strategy justified, considering the basic causes of recent increases in defense expenditures? McNamara himself seemed to invite just such a national questioning in November when, only a few days before Kennedy's death, he addressed the Economic Club of New York on the topic, among other matters, of the U.S. power position. He was extraordinarily explicit. He certified the clear superiority of our strategic nuclear forces over those of the Soviet Union. He held that the conventional forces already in being in the West could be a match for the like forces that Russia was presently capable of deploying in Europe. This advantageous situation, he all but guaranteed, should last through the next decade.

The inference was clear enough: McNamara, on the strength of his analysis of the U.S. intelligence estimates of the Soviet potential, was ruling out the possibility of any effective major military action by the U.S.S.R. in the foreseeable future. This was how Eisenhower had read the future, too, in a period when Senator Kennedy, in a famous and melancholy speech in 1958, was casting our country in the role of underdog, its peril being likened to that of Britain in the 16th century, after the loss of its continental stronghold at Calais.

No doubt McNamara's new confidence is as well founded as was Eisenhower's. Ever since the U-2's started to operate over the U.S.S.R. and Red China nearly a decade ago, the United States has been able to track, with a precision never before available to intelligence techniques, the physical evidence of Soviet deployments of forces and machines. The reconnaissance airplane has been succeeded by the reconnaissance space machine, and its photographic gleanings are being amplified by a steady flow of intelligence from other sources—cryptography, economic analysis, electronic eavesdropping, radar tracking, and (one assumes) plain, ordinary espionage.

It is widely agreed that the capabilities of the Soviet strategic forces in being have been established with reasonable exactitude. Little mystery attaches to the deployments of the greater part of the Soviet air and rocket forces; a good deal appears to be known about their separate rates of growth, and from this and other information it is possible to form certain persuasive deductions about the rate, scale, and nature of the Soviet capital allocations to the military.

One could wonder, on the face of his November analysis, whether McNamara, on long second thought, has come privately to agree with Eisenhower—and, incidentally, with President Charles de Gaulle—that the outcome of the struggle for military advantage is being governed by the relative technological positions, and here the pace has taxed the adversary. In any event, the expected reconstruction of the Soviet military machine around conventional means has simply failed to materialize. On the contrary, the ready frontline strength of the Red Army, although being continuously modernized, remains between 60 and 80 divisions, a range of estimates that goes back nearly a decade. In the meantime, the major Soviet capital investments on the military account have been methodically plowed, through the Kennedy years as in the Eisenhower, into strategic and tactical rocket systems, into air and missile defenses, and into the advanced electronic systems that are required by both.

AN OVERDONE BUILDUP

While the evidence is convincing that the existing Soviet strategic forces, both rocket and bomber, are markedly inferior to our own, the same evidence also strongly suggests that the Russians are proceeding toward an ICBM force that will eventually number many hundreds of weapons. It is further well established that the hundreds of medium-range rockets that they have already deployed in the direction of Europe leave the continent itself, apart from the distant U.S. strategic power, in hostage to close-in Soviet power.

There is no way of proving the statement, but it does seem, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the intense, costly buildup of the U.S. conventional forces was probably overdone. The supposed "conventional gap" as an index of a critical deficiency in the American capacity for effective action, appears to have been as much a product of a state of mind as the bomber and missile

"gaps." The conventional buildup has added enormously to the cost of national defense; there can be no considerable reductions in this cost while it continues. Alongside such expenditures, the savings from closing down airfields and depots will produce little more than minor passing jiggles in the spending curve.

A more serious consequence of the preoccupation with conventional options has been the increasingly cautious investment in the more speculative military technologies. The capital investment on the side of the technological advantage, which is to say in advanced systems—a form of indirect economic pressure the adversary finds most difficult to meet over the long pull—has begun to decline, while the investment in people has been rising both relatively and absolutely. If there is to be a substantial drop in defense costs it can come only through a shift in the investment allocations, and this would mean, for Johnson, a thoroughgoing reappraisal of the economic and military validity of the Kennedy-McNamara strategy assumptions.

New Technique in Optometry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD a paper on a new technique in optometry, coauthored by one of my valued constituents, George J. Wertheim, O.D., of Glen Cove, N.Y.:

A TECHNIQUE FOR THE USE OF THE SCHIOTZ TONOMETER ON THE SCLERA

(By Merrill J. Allen, Ph. D.[1] and George J. Wertheim, O.D.

The purpose of this paper is to describe in detail an improved method of using the Schiotz corneal tonometer on the superior lateral sclera to discuss some of the problems of tonometer sterilization and to present new scleral data in comparison with some of the corneal data found in the literature.

The technique described was developed by one of the authors in his office in New York. That it has great merit is shown by the high incidence (97 percent) of successful patient applications without anesthesia and by the greater similarity of the distribution of scleral measurements to corneal measurements than was found in an earlier study by Carter[2] using a somewhat different examiner position to make the same superior lateral scleral readings.

STERILIZATION PROCEDURES

The first step in any tonometer work is to establish personal cleanliness by washing the hands thoroughly with a surgical soap such as Phisohex or other soap containing hexachlorophene. The tonometer must be cleaned (Phisohex works nicely) of any organic residues by disassembling it as per the instruction booklet.[3] It is then reassembled and sterilized[4] before using on the patient's eye.

Flaming with an open alcohol flame is effective as a means of destroying pathogenic bacteria.

The Sklar electric sterilizer is both convenient and effective. A built-in timer permits the tonometer to cool automatically after 7 minutes of heating. The tonometer, cooled at least 2 minutes in air and then tested by touching the back of the footplate, is ready for use without rinsing or other treatment.

The Stirne ultraviolet sterilizer, sterilizes by direct ultraviolet radiation and by the chemical action of ozone. It has the additional advantage of keeping the tonometer warm and ready for use without further treatment.

The Gulden tonometer sterilizer provides a fluid cup in which the tonometer is suspended and sterilization is accomplished by chemical means. All traces of chemical must be rinsed away and the tonometer foot blotted dry before it is used on the eye without anesthesia. Such additional treatment may destroy the sterility of the tonometer.

Fluid sterilizer solutions such as benzalkonium chloride should always include a rust inhibitor; nevertheless, excessive exposure of some tonometers to such solutions still may cause ruinous corrosion.

PATIENT POSITION

It is essential that the patient be partially reclining with his head tilted back so his face is upward and nearly parallel to the floor.

The refracting chair is ideally suited for this purpose and the back of the chair should be reclined gently to the desired angle. The refracting stool should be available for the examiner to position himself beside the patient and slightly above the patient's face plane.

The patient fixates the examiner's nose and tilts his head slightly toward the examiner so that the remote eye, the eye to be tested, is slightly higher.

EXAMINER'S POSITION

Figure 5 [not printed in RECORD] shows the manner of holding the tonometer. Note that the index and middle fingers hold one wing of the handle sufficiently firmly that the thumb could be moved away without dropping the instrument. This gives assurance that the tonometer won't be dropped and provides greater control in positioning the footplate on the eye. It is extremely important that the fingers contact the tonometer only on the handle.

The right hand is used to hold the tonometer while the left hand lifts the the eyelid in the manner shown in figures 3, 4, 6, and 7 [not printed in RECORD]. Note that the lid is lifted up and held against the orbital rim leaving an air gap between the upper lid and the sclera. Note also that this raises the lower lid and covers the patient's pupil which prevents his seeing the tonometer.

Figure 3 [not printed in RECORD] shows the position for measuring the left eye and figure 4 [not printed in RECORD] the position for the right eye. (Some data were taken on both eyes from the same position of the examiner but with the patient shifting his gaze appropriately. The results were not consistent, and indicated that an error in alinement of the footplate probably was occurring in the measure on the near eye.) The examiner always measures the far eye as shown so that the superior lateral sclera is being used.

Figure 6 [not printed in RECORD] shows the view almost the way the examiner sees it at the time of taking a measurement of the left eye. Critical attention is paid to see that the tonometer footplate fits like a contact lens on the eye, neither tilted nor off center from the uppermost point on the sclera. With the tonometer standing on the sclera and the handle between the upper and lower limits of travel, the indicated Schiotz number is read from the scale.

Figure 7 [not printed in RECORD] shows the tonometer and hand positions for measuring the right eye while the patient fixates the examiner's nose. The patient's forehead provides a rest for the heel of the examiner's hand holding the tonometer. Figure 6 [not printed in RECORD] shows the use of the patient's forehead and cheek for steadying the tonometer hand. Such a steady support is most helpful in maintaining an accurate alinement of the tonometer on the eye. Failure to be alined properly will give large-scale readings indicating a falsely low intraocular pressure. Hence, if a range of pressures result from quickly repeated measurements, the lowest scale readings are likely to be the true readings (highest intraocular pressure) provided no inadvertent lid or finger pressure was applied to the eye during the reading with the tonometer.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS

Almost the only sensation a patient has is temperature when the tonometer is placed on the sclera, provided the tonometer is clean and dry. A drop of alcohol, benzalkonium chloride, etc., or even distilled water left on the tonometer, will immediately spread over the eye, cause discomfort and a desire to blink that is difficult to resist. The superior lateral sclera appears to be the position best suited anatomically to scleral tonometry. This has been substantiated by as yet unpublished studies at Indiana University.

The 5.5-gram weight should be used routinely because the effects of the ocular rigidity are minimized by using the lightest weight. If a high pressure reading results, or if a question arises as to the accuracy of a pressure reading even when within normal limits, a second measure using a heavier weight should be taken. If this scale reading, referred to the calibration curve for the heavier weight, indicates the same pressure as that obtained with the lighter 5.5-gram weight, the ocular rigidity would be normal and the pressure reading probably would be correct.

However, if the heavier weight indicates a higher pressure, the ocular rigidity would be high and the true intraocular pressure would be lower than indicated by either tonometer reading. Similarly when the heavier weight gives a lower intraocular pressure reading, the ocular rigidity is low and the true intraocular pressure is higher than either tonometer reading. Certainly one must not take the average of the readings with the two weights.

Figure 8 [not printed in RECORD] is a nomogram for determining the true intraocular pressure when two tonometer readings, each with a different weight, are used.[6] As an example of how one would use this chart, observe that the line at 27.5 millimeters of mercury intersects first the 5.5-gram "ladder" at the scale reading of 5 for a corneal radius of 8. This line continued also intersects the second ladder at the scale reading of 13, corneal radius 8. The ordinate value 27.5-millimeters of mercury is the predicted intraocular pressure without a tonometer sitting on the eye.

If the standard calibration chart is consulted one finds that the No. 5 Schiotz reading with the 5.5-gram weight gives a pressure reading of about 17-millimeters of mercury while the No. 13 Schiotz scale reading with a 10-gram weight is about 9.5-millimeters of mercury. Without the nomogram, this eye would be classified as having a normal intraocular pressure with either of the weights used. (Normal pressure may be taken as any pressure below about 23-millimeters of mercury.)

Figure 9 [not printed in RECORD] shows the distribution of the results of intraocular pressure measurements taken with the Schiotz tonometer using a 5.5-gram weight on the cornea and on the sclera. The data are plotted as the frequency (percent of eyes) against the pressure readings in millimeters of mercury. Lydhecker's[5] data are for 10,000 nonglaucomatous eyes measured on the cornea. The data of Carter are from the superior lateral sclera of college students who are probably free of glaucoma. The lower

Footnotes at end of speech.

peak value of Carter's data and the greater lateral spread compared to Leydhecker indicate that some factor or factors other than intraocular pressure are involved; e.g., the radius of the sclera, variations in technique and conjunctival folds.

The data of Wertheim on the superior lateral sclera were obtained using the techniques described in this paper. That this may be a better technique is indicated by the fact that Wertheim's data lie nearer to Leydhecker's than do Carter's.

Carter's results were obtained by standing above the patient to make the measure of pressure while the patient fixates his own thumb. Wertheim's data show a greater incidence of high pressures than does Carter's or Leydhecker's data. Since Wertheim's population sample does not include anyone under 40 years of age, his sample probably includes a small group of glaucoma or preglaucomatous patients.

The following should be kept in mind:

(1) Intraocular pressure readings with a single weight may not indicate true intraocular pressures because the ocular rigidity may not be normal.

(2) Intraocular pressures may vary significantly from hour to hour especially in the glaucomatous eye, and the readings taken at only one time of day may be misleadingly low. (Normal diurnal variation is much less than 6 millimeters of mercury.)

(3) Normal intraocular pressure may be high in some people without any evidence of glaucomatous field losses. Similarly, vision loss may be progressive even though no pressure abnormality is demonstrable.

(4) The technique used in tonometry must be good to avoid errors due to improper contact of the footplate against the eye. Practice and careful visual inspection for proper tonometer positioning on the eye are essential.

(5) Tonometry, the tangent screen and the ophthalmoscope offer an excellent battery of tests for detecting glaucoma. Failure on one out of the three is adequate justification for referral of the patient to an ophthalmologist.

---

[1] Professor of optometry, Division of Optometry, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

[2] John H. Carter, O.D., Ph. D., professor, Pennsylvania State College of Optometry, Philadelphia, Pa.; formerly at Indiana University.

[3] The Pilling tonometer, according to the manufacturer, does not need to be disassembled because its open construction permits adequate flushing with running water.

[4] Wood, R. M. "Prevention of infection during tonometry," Arch Ophth., Vol. 68, p. 202, 1962.

[5] Leydhecker, Wolfgang. "Glaukoen, Ein Handbuch," Springer Verlag, Berlin, Gottingen, Heidelberg, 1960, p. 3.

[6] American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, Standardization of Tonometers—Decennial Report of the Committe on Standardization of Tonometers, American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, 1954.

The Outlook for Savings and Loans in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to establish the International Home Loan Bank, and as the Representative in Congress of Westfield, N.J., which numbers among its prominent citizens Mr. Robert S. Messersmith, president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, I was doubly pleased to read the excellent address delivered by my constituent on January 20 before the Second Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference which was held in Santiago, Chile.

Mr. Messersmith projects a most encouraging picture of the possibilities for vastly increasing individual homeownership throughout Latin America, and he interprets the role of the proposed International Home Loan Bank in a particularly meaningful way.

I commend his important address to those of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, who are interested in encouraging social and economic developments of lasting value in the countries to our south and who may be concerned about the limitations of our present foreign-aid program in this regard.

I hope that all our colleagues will have an opportunity this year to vote on an International Home Loan Bank bill. Reading Mr. Messersmith's speech will suggest why this bill is so important:

THE OUTLOOK FOR SAVINGS AND LOANS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Robert S. Messersmith)

Good morning, gentlemen. It certainly is a pleasure to be here this morning to welcome you to the Second Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference. On behalf of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, I want to extent to each and every one of you congratulations on the excellent job you are doing in providing thrift and home financing on an ever-increasing scale.

The number of delegations here today attests to the growing strength of your savings and loan movement in Latin America. We hope that during the next several years even more of your countries will adopt this type of institution because we believe its flexibility will permit it to contribute substantially to each of your countries. Wherever savings and loans exist today, more homes are being provided than ever before and at considerably less expense to the home buyer. Our goal is always to reach as many people as possible, and in this you are succeeding.

In my own country, our savings and loan industry recently passed the $100 billion level in assets. We are proud of this, of course, but of even greater importance to us is the fact that this growth signifies that we have been successful in reaching many millions of people and providing them with the means for owning their own home.

We at the national league have been working very hard during the last year to establish the proposed International Home Loan Bank. In August, we participated actively in 2 days of public hearings and discussions about this new Bank before one of our principal congressional committees in Washington—the House Banking and Currency Committee under the able chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. The reactions of the Congressmen who attended the hearings were overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed Bank.

Mr. David E. Bell, who is in charge of the Agency for International Development (AID) in Washington, was called before this same committee in September to present the views of his Agency and the administration in general. Mr. Bell testified in favor of the general idea for such a Bank because he realized the need for its creation. Members of the national league were very much encouraged by the support thus indicated by our own Government through such individuals as Mr. Bell.

We are now involved in the process of redrafting a legislative bill which will probably be brought up for further discussion in our Congress later this year.

If we are all patient a while longer, there can be developed in cooperation with you, this new Bank which will not be controlled by any government and which will provide those additional resources which are now needed to accelerate the splendid development of your own savings and loan associations throughout Latin America.

We want to help you equal the record of savings and loans in the United States. Your opportunities are enormous because together your many countries possess great potential wealth and vast opportunities for development. Your demand for housing is so great that you can look forward to an entire generation of fantastic challenge and growth. The International Home Loan Bank can help you meet this challenge, and I would like to take a moment to describe how this new Bank might operate.

It would start out as a small institution which would make no promises to anyone. It would operate for a profit. It would not claim that it was going to eliminate the housing deficit in your countries and it would not be a charity or any other form of giveaway. The stockholders would be savings and loans in the United States which would have to invest their money cautiously in order to protect their own depositors. They would have to receive an adequate return on their investment or their holding in the Bank could not be justified to their depositors. Under the proposed legislation for this Bank, there would be a potential $1 billion available for loans and investments in your countries and elsewhere. For many years to come, the principal efforts of this Bank would be directed toward the nations of this hemisphere.

The Bank would not just lend money to savings and loan systems in Latin America and elsewhere at 5½ to 6 percent. It would also, whenever possible, invest its considerable funds in the outright purchase of mortgages, or a portion thereof, and thus assume a portion of the risk which your savings and loans incurred when they made the original loans.

For example, the Bank might buy outright a 50 percent interest in $2 million worth of mortgages held by the Caja Central here in Chile, or the Banco Ecuatoriano de la Vivienda in Ecuador, or the Banco de la Vivienda del Peru. Or the Bank might purchase such an interest directly from the individual savings and loan which made the loan—if such direct contact between the Bank and your individual associations was desired by yourselves.

The Bank would immediately pay cash for its 50-percent participation. The servicing of the mortgages would remain in the association which was performing that function at the time of the purchase. Thereafter, for the balance of the term of the mortgage, the monthly amortization payments of principal and interest on the group of mortgages concerned would be split equally between the Bank and the local association, or whoever held the mortgage at that time. The portion of principal and interest accruing to the Bank would be repatriated or reinvested locally in additional mortgages depending on the needs and demands at the time of both the Bank and your own system.

The type of participation purchase just discussed would provide an important supplementary source of funds for home financing. Participations have worked well in the United States and should be explored in Latin America. This type of participation arrangement could also be entered into by yourselves and other business or financial institutions within your respective countries.

To give a more specific example, if a mythical savings and loan known as El Interamericano held a series of 200 mortgages which averaged $3,000 each, the International Bank might pay $300,000 for a 50-percent interest in that portfolio of mortgages. The terms of the purchase would be immediate cash, not 60-, 90-, or 180-day notes. El Interamericano would then have $300,000 available to lend out the day the sale was consummated. The Bank would receive back its investment over the term of the mortgages at the interest rates stated in the mortgages.

The Bank will obviously want to examine the mortgages carefully before it purchases any. It will be particularly careful to ascertain if adequate collateral, i.e., the land and house, stands behind the mortgage. In addition, it will seek proof that payments are being made regularly on each mortgage and that none are delinquent. In other words, these mortgage participation purchases would be commercial transactions entered into by businessmen and bankers and therefore subject to the type of criteria which are normal in all business communities. These transactions would not be the type of governmental or quasi-governmental undertaking which so often involves a subsidy.

In effect, all we are really discussing is an expansion of the existing secondary mortgage market operations which are now developing between your individual institutions and the central home loan banks of your savings and loan systems. At present El Interamericano, our mythical savings and loan, sells or discounts its mortgages to the central home loan bank on a 2-to-1, 3-to-1, or even 6-to-1 basis as in Ecuador. However, we all know that such ratios are possible only because of Government or foreign seed capital loans which cannot be expected to continue forever. Such loans were made available in the beginning merely to help start a new idea. Now that the idea has established itself so firmly in the form of approximately 65 associations throughout your countries, we must develop additional ideas to mobilize internal and external private resources.

Aside from private foreign sources of investment capital such as the proposed International Home Loan Bank, there are available in Latin American the need and the necessary institutions which in combination could form the basis for an effective secondary mortgage market. The need is readily apparent. About that none of us will disagree. The institutions also exist. They are the insurance companies, utilities, social security agencies, large corporations, small businesses, banks, and the private individuals—these represent the potential purchasers of the mortgages which are being generated by the savings and loans.

If you will attach to the mortgage instrument itself the anti-inflation mechanism which is known in Chile as the "reajuste," then the net return of 6½ to 8 percent will automatically make such a mortgage an attractive investment medium for the variety of institutions, businesses, individuals, etc., suggested above. The need can then be meet by existing institutions and individuals if a proper type of mortgage instrument is developed. And you, not us, possess the unique knowledge and ingenuity needed to accomplish this.

The sale of mortgage bonds by your central home loan banks is, of course, another method but perhaps such sales will find only a limited market. The market might be so limited because the mortgage instrument or bond being sold is constituted in such a way that it primarily attracts only large investors. Perhaps more thought could be given to developing a mortgage instrument which could be marketed in the same manner that stocks of corporations are now actively traded in your securities exchanges, i.e., the small investor would be attracted not only by the relative ease with which he could become an owner, but also by the reasonably small capital outlay needed to purchase the instrument. By thus broadening the market for mortgages so that the small investor was attracted, a substantial contribution would have been made toward establishing an effective secondary market operation which was able to tap the resources of your countries at all levels. You would thereby be multiplying manyfold and in a short time the capital available to your savings and loans to expand their lending activities. And obviously, the value of capital lies to a greater or lesser extent in the rapidity with which it can be turned over.

Our economic historians in the United States now tell us that we did not begin to experience rapid growth until our financial community began to concentrate on attracting the small savings and capital of the average man in the street. It was the accumulation of the many small accounts that made possible the conglomerations of capital needed to finance modern industrial growth as we know it today. And remember that such growth requires a parallel expansion in residential construction. Today in the United States, the savings and loans holds 45 percent of all one- to four-family nonfarm mortgages, but it took our industry 130 years to reach this level. Given a continuation of your present growth—which is a clear reflection of your own energy, competence, and imagination—the savings and loan systems in Latin America should equal or even exceed the existing percentage of home mortgages held by our own savings and loans.

We estimate that by the middle 1970's your dynamic savings and loans will be financing at least 60 percent of all one- to four-family nonfarm housing in your respective countries. It will probably be only a short time, therefore, before you will have exceeded your North American counterparts in this particular category—but in the meantime, you will probably have to double your present efforts to develop internal secondary mortgage markets in order to generate the necessary capital. Without the internal capital markets and mechanisms, there can be no progress in this direction.

Aside from your efforts to create effective internal secondary markets for the purchase or sale of mortgages, your attention should always be directed toward attracting more and more deposits. Such new deposits should continue to be the principal source of capital for your growing institutions. Our own experience has proven that once any of us in the United States relaxes in his efforts to attract new deposits, we quickly lose our position relative to that of our competitors whether they be savings and loans or other types of banking institutions. We must therefore be forever alert to our relationship with out customers, to new advertising techniques, our participation in community activities and, of course, to the rates on deposits and mortgages offered by competitors.

We have received a number of inquiries in recent months concerning the future role of savings and loans in Latin America. Many of these inquiries have originated from among those of you who have asked if the growth of savings and loans thus far in Latin America was substantial, i.e., was the job being done a commendable one in comparison with what had been accomplished by savings and loans in the United States at a comparable period in their growth. Brief reference to this has already been made, but let me repeat again in unqualified terms that your record to date proportionately exceeds anything and everything we have been able to do in the United States. It will not be long before we shall be learning from you about new ideas and techniques which we can apply in the United States. You have already introduced us to the condominium type of apartment. It was previously unknown in my country. And someday, if we should have a serious inflation we can turn to Chile and learn how to implement your readjustment mechanism which is tied to the index of wages and salaries. Your ingenuity in developing methods for disbursing construction loans in periods of constant inflation has been an indication of the excellence which prevails in your systems.

We would like to think a bit now about the future and give you our predictions about the role of savings and loans in your countries 10 years from now. We know the facts of the present and they are encouraging ones to all of us who are here today and deeply interested in this growing savings and loan movement. We know less about the future, but we believe that a series of responsible and accurate predictions are possible.

Today there are approximately 65 associations operating in 5 Latin American countries. We are speaking principally of associations which use the free savings plan as opposed to the contracutal plan because this latter type is actuarially unsound and inevitably fails unless the government grants a subsidy. We join you in believing that the savings and loan idea works best when it is firmly established in the private sector and does not have to rely on Government subsidy. Certainly this has been one of the basic reasons for your outstanding successes to date.

Ten years from now there will be at least 500 associations and branches operating in 15 of your countries. Whereas today your 65 associations are financing new homes at an annual rate of 12,000 to 13,000 units. It is possible that in 10 years your 500 associations and branches will be financing 900,000 to 1 million units each year and this should be your objection. If we calculate an average salesprice of $4,000, this means that savings and loans in your countries will be lending on a scale of $4 billion each year for the construction or purchase of new housing units. And all but a small percentage, perhaps 10 percent at the most, will have been generated locally through your own associations and their secondary mortgage market operations.

The volume of deposits which you are now attracting into your 65 associations is doubling every 6 months. For example, at the end of June 1963, you held the equivalent of $16 million in deposits. By the end of December—less than a month ago—you had succeeded in more than doubling this figure to about $35 million. This is an incredible performance and one which we have never been able to approach during the 130 years that we have been operating in the United States.

Although you obviously cannot expect to continue indefinitely with such a remarkable rate of growth, there is every reason to believe that in the middle 1970's, 10 years from now, your projected 500 associations and branches will have deposits in the amount of $15 to $18 billion. If you are lending at a minimum annual rate of $4 billion, you can probably expect that your income from mortgage repayments alone will have exceeded an annual rate of $1.5 billion.

We have projected these statistics conservatively. I personally believe that you will surpass each and every figure within 7 years, not 10 years.

Thus, without making extreme statements we have briefly explored with you what lies ahead in these exciting years.

You have been given the enormous and frightening task of mobilizing the capital necessary to house many millions of families. Even at this early date in your development the challenge has begun with an accumulated housing deficit of more than 15 million units. At our current building rate in the United States we would need at least 10 years to erase just this backlog alone, much

less create the additional new units required each year by an expanding population.

So then you must provide the driving force which carries with it the energy and courage to face this problem. There is no other way to meet this challenge. Governments alone are not competent to assume this responsibility. Governments cannot act with the speed and agility which are the great strength of the private sector and which are also so desperately needed at this moment.

We are quite frankly in a moment of crisis which will make maximum demands upon all of us. But historically, progress has only resulted when there was an effective response to crisis, and we have in our savings and loan movement in this hemisphere the effective response needed.

Hopefully, there will be one day a community of nations in our hemisphere which will permit a continuous interchange of help among ourselves. However, our community of nations cannot be brought into being by the efforts of our governments. They are too impersonal in their changing relationships with one another. It is only through groups such as ourselves that the future way to understanding is open. Our problems are mutual, our objectives similar, our personal careers and aspirations identical. Independent governments must inevitably differ and clash. We as individuals involved in the same cause need not. There is no history of misunderstanding among us or between us.

Let us continue therefore to work ever closer and closer. Let us learn from you in these years which lie before us. You can teach us much.

Estamos a sus órdenes.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Resolutions of South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the president and secretary of the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association have just furnished me with copies of the resolutions adopted at their 26th annual convention January 9, 1964, at Huron, S. Dak.

This group is made up of some of our State's leading citizens who have long been active in conservation work. I have had the pleasure of working with many of the members through the years. Their interest has always been to work for the improvement of reclamation and water conservation not only in South Dakota but in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA RECLAMATION & WATER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 1. ADEQUATE STATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Whereas South Dakota is on the verge of realizing its greatest benefits from the gigantic Missouri River Basin development in the form of irrigation projects and related purposes with water from the Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dams on the Missouri River; and

Whereas South Dakota people have accomplished the difficult tasks of creating the South Dakota Conservancy District and four conservancy subdistricts to help sponsor such irrigation projects and all other types of water resources development; and

Whereas creation of irrigation districts are imminent in support of irrigation development; and

Whereas the conservancy subdistricts have difficult jobs ahead in coordinating irrigation projects with other types of purposes in the same area, such as those for flood control, watershed development, pollution control, recreation, fish, wildlife, and others, which coordination requires technical services; and

Whereas the conservancy subdistricts are not in a position to finance such technical services individually but can do it collectively, with State government assistance; and

Whereas State Government of South Dakota, as well as conservancy subdistricts, has vital interests in the development of water projects for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association vigorously request that the South Dakota Legislature provide funds to the South Dakota Conservancy District for the purpose of establishing a technical staff whose services may be made available to conservancy subdistricts needed, upon payment therefore by the conservancy subdistricts, in order that the conservancy subdistricts can have sound technical advice in the coordination of the various programs and proposals by Federal and State agencies so that the best possible water projects will be developed in accordance with the wishes of the people concerned; such support of the State legislature is vitally necessary to insure the vast economic potential in South Dakota which will be the result of well planned, coordinated water resources development in the State and which legislative support is urgent right now because major construction of parts of these developments is imminent, and these parts must fit the future parts of the total development; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the various interested committees of the South Dakota State Legislature now in session.

RESOLUTION 2. CANAL RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Whereas it has been proposed that the enactment of legislation requiring the payment of compensation including damages for acquisition of canal rights-of-way on all projects or division of projects entering the construction stage after January 1, 1961, notwithstanding the reservation of rights-of-way on patents pursuant to act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 37; U.S.C. 945): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association urges Congress to enact legislation requiring the payment of compensation, including damages for acquisition of canal rights-of-way on all projects or division of projects entering the construction stages after January 1, 1961, notwithstanding the reservation of rights-of-way in patent pursuant to act of August 30, 1890; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the South Dakota congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 3. COMPLIANCE BY ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES WITH STATE WATER LAWS

Whereas the principle of supremacy of State water laws in deriving rights to the ownership, distribution and use of ground and surface waters has been recognized in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th principal meridian by both Federal law, State law, and the enabling acts by which many of the States were admitted to the Union; and

Whereas the stability of the economy, the property values, and the continued peace, prosperity, and development of much of the whole United States is dependent on a continued recognition of the supremacy of State water laws and the property rights which have been derived and settled thereunder; and

Whereas acts of some of the departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government and even decisions of the judicial branch of the Federal Government have thrown doubt upon the sancity of these principles and the property and human rights protected thereby; and

Whereas application of the principle of preservation of existing and potential beneficial uses of water by reference to application of State law is beneficial throughout the Nation; and

Whereas application of authority to control interstate commerce or other claimed constitutional authority ought not to be used by any branch of the Federal Government to impair or destroy the supremacy of State water laws and the property and human values based thereon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association, That the Congress should, at once, enact a law so clear and unambiguous as to be incapable of evasion by either Executive order or judicial interpretation and requiring every agency, permittee, licensee, and employee of the Federal Government, as a condition precedent to the taking or use of any water, to acquire a right to the use thereof in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of such water; and defining the water affected by such legislation to include all water originating on federally owned or controlled lands which contribute to flowing or moving surface or ground waters.

RESOLUTION 4. DEFINITION OF NONREIMBURSABLES

Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursable; and

Whereas many water development and reclamation projects provide recreational, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health, promotion of national defense and fulfillment of international obligation benefits which are of substantial value to a river basin and the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas such aditional features in water development and reclamation projects are of the same character and of equal benefit as those now authorized by law as nonreimbursables and the costs thereof should be met at a national rather than local level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association favors the authorization by Congress of (1) recreational, (2) general salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) quality control, (5) public transportation, (6) protection of public health, and (7) promotion of national defense as nonreimbursables on Federal water projects to the full extent of the national interest.

RESOLUTION 5. ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR WATER DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the objective of the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association is the complete development of the land and water resources of the State; and

Whereas such reclamation development, being a distinct benefit to the whole Nation, has been a Federal policy for more than half a century; and

Whereas a sound reclamation program is dependent in large measure on continued and coordinated investigation, planning, research and construction programs of the several Federal agencies concerned with water resources development; and

Whereas the accomplishment of these programs calls for adequate appropriations by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

That—

1. The South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association hereby directs its officers to support before the Congress requests for sufficient appropriations to (a) permit the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to continue progressive

and uninterrupted investigations, planning and construction programs in consonance with the needs therefor; (b) support acceleration of the Forest Service program of revegetation, watershed restoration, range improvements, and physical improvements of national forests, which will improve water production and control erosion; (c) permit prompt and continuing acquisition, publication, and distribution by the Geological Survey of basic data respecting both streamflow and ground water resources throughout the State; (d) permit completion of standard topographic mapping of South Dakota, if possible, by the year 1970; (e) support research, investigation, and action programs in soil and water conservation, basic and essential to the sound development and full continued care of the Nation's land and water resources, basinwide and in harmony with multiple-use projects development; (f) support collection and dissemination of basic meteorological data by the U.S. Weather Bureau; (g) provide for the control and eradication of noxious weeds in insects on federally controlled lands.

2. The various departments and agencies affected should devise standards and procedures such as will eliminate or minimize duplication of investigations, research, and the basic work common to more than one department or agency.

3. Information developed by the Federal Government shall be made available, at reasonable cost, to all citizens who desire its use.

4. That Federal agencies conducting cooperative programs with the States charge administrative expense for such programs, only to the extent of the amount specified by agreement or in proportion to its contribution to such program; and that the work to be undertaken by such Federal agencies in the name of cooperative programs be restricted to those specified by the cooperating agreement.

RESOLUTION 6. TAX DEDUCTION OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Whereas in some areas of the West, Federal Internal Revenue agents are requiring landowners in districts which are political subdivisions of a State to distinguish between assessments paid for operation and maintenance and those paid for the construction of the facilities to collect and distribute water, holding that the latter are not deductible as operating expenses for Federal income tax purposes, but must be treated as nondepreciable capital expenditures; and

Whereas all taxes and assessments paid by landowners to districts to secure a water supply are in the nature of operating expenses; and

Whereas landowners do not acquire any right of ownership by payment of such taxes or assessments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Relcamation & Water Development Association support amendment of the Internal Revenue Code, allowing the deduction, as an operating expense for income tax purposes, of all assessments or taxes paid to districts which are political subdivisions of a State for water or the construction of water-use facilities.

RESOLUTION 7. WATER FACILITY RELOCATION COSTS

Whereas water facilities owned or controlled by distributing entities are often so located that Federal and State highway authorities may force their relocation at the ultimate expense of the water users rather than at the expense of the highway users: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association urges and supports the enactment of Federal and State legislation which will require that the relocation of water facilities made necessary by Federal or federally assisted highway improvement programs be paid for as a part of the cost of such improvements.

RESOLUTION 8. LAND LIMITATION LEGISLATION

Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitations are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods; and

Whereas the present farm acreage that one man can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one man can handle; and

Whereas the present methods of agricultural production call for mechanization and use of power equipment that cannot be justified on small acreages; and

Whereas present acreages will not permit farmers in many of our irrigated areas to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act of 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in many areas, the acreage allowed in a single holding often must be greater than 160 acres; and

Whereas the development of an economic and practical agriculture in many areas embracing both public and private lands will be seriously handicapped or made impossible unless a workable acreage program can be found: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association as follows:

1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act be modernized and to that end legislation be supported by the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association, which would recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and which would provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for feasible and economic farm units.

2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

3. That such legislation provide that the limiting acreage for a farm unit be determined for each project or unit of a project by the Secretary of the Interior, and the State, through its authorized officer or agency, and the agency contracting to repay the project costs.

4. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions.

RESOLUTION 9. RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Whereas Federal agencies have and are constructing a large number of reservoirs in South Dakota under various Federal laws; and

Whereas it is essential that access roads to reservoir areas, and basic facilities for the use of the public be established, in order to permit public use, enjoyment, and development of the recreational potentialities created by such reservoirs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association request the South Dakota congressional members to support legislation favorable to the development of maximum basic recreational facilities in connection with Federal reservoir construction projects.

RESOLUTION 10. WEATHER MODIFICATION

Whereas the Senate Committee on National Water Resources in their final report listed weather modification as a means of increasing water supply; and

Whereas South Dakota is in a deficit water area; and

Whereas South Dakota offers ideal conditions and real opportunities for increasing water supplies by this method; and

Whereas the South Dakota School of Mines & Technology at Rapid City is now conducting research in this field through Federal sponsorship and financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association, That this organization recognize the potentials of weather modification and offer its assistance in every possible way to State and Federal agencies working in this field.

RESOLUTION 11. BASIC WATER RESEARCH

Whereas the constantly increasing demand upon the Nation's water resources, together with the impairment of water quality incident to many uses necessitates an immediate and pronounced acceleration of basic research toward securing the preservation and improvement of water quality for necessary successive uses; and

Whereas there is urgent and immediate need for such research activitity and for avoidance of duplication of effort and diffusion of responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation Water Development Association urges (1) the adoption of high priority of adequate financing and activity in the field of basic soil and water research; including adequate funds for expenditure by existing Federal agencies, the State universities, and the land grant colleges to establish and carry through an effective, fully coordinated, basic soil and water research program; (2) the request for and immediate appropriation of adequate funds to implement the findings of Senate Document No. 59, 86th Congress, 1st session.

RESOLUTION 12. INTEGRITY OF STATE WATER LAWS

Whereas there has been a gradual encroachment by the Federal Government into the field of water rights, an area which has always been considered as belonging to the States; and

Whereas if this situation is allowed to continue, it could mean detrimental consequences to our whole social and economic structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation Water Development Association continue its support of Federal legislation designed to recognize the integrity of State water laws and requiring compliance with such laws by all Federal agencies engaged in the conservation, development, and use of water; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 13. FULL UTILIZATION OF STORED WATER URGED

Whereas the construction and development of water storage reservoirs for multiple use have been progressing in a satisfactory manner; and

Whereas the demand for this stored water in South Dakota has not kept pace with the potentials available; and

Whereas much of the water use may be expended to areas outside the boundaries of the State, if it is not utilized by South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association urge our congressional delegation and our State-elected officers to continue working for legislation favorable for the fullest possible utilization of water stored within the State

which inundate vast areas of South Dakota land.

RESOLUTION NO. 14. APPRECIATION

Whereas the city of Huron, the Huron Chamber of Commerce, and others and the various speakers who appeared on the program have contributed much toward the success of the 26th annual convention of South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association convey its sincere appreciation and thanks to these men and to the various groups and committees for their part in contributing toward the advancement of water resource development in South Dakota, and express our appreciation to those many firms that contributed the very fine door prizes and banquet favors; and be it further

Resolved, That the South Dakota Reclamation & Water Development Association express its appreciation to the South Dakota Land Improvement Contractors Association, its officers and all others who cooperated in the 26th annual meeting and thus contributed to its success.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
ARTHUR SVENDBY.
RAYMOND LUND.
HARRY MARTENS.

Closing the Job Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk lately about whether or not the Area Redevelopment Act is working. There is only one real way to settle this question. Is the unemployment rate going down in the depressed areas faster than it is in the Nation as a whole? The answer to this question is, "Yes." I am happy to note that in my own district of Luzerne County, Pa., the unemployment rate is going down twice as fast as it is in the rest of the country.

We have made a triumphant start on licking the depressed area problem, but we have a long way to go. That is why the Area Redevelopment Act must be expanded and continued by this Congress.

For the benefit of the entire House, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, remarks by Harold W. Williams, Deputy Area Redevelopment Administrator, before the Rotary Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which explains how ARA is helping to close the job gap:

CLOSING THE JOB GAP

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson called for an unconditional war on poverty. Ten days ago the gracious First Lady of our land came here to Wilkes-Barre, as one reporter put it, "to fire the first salvo in that battle."

It is important that we all understand the true significance and meaning for northeastern Pennsylvania of the President's message and the First Lady's visit.

It would certainly be wrong to assume that Mrs. Johnson came to Wilkes-Barre because it is the most poverty-stricken area in the United States or even that poverty is the most important fact about Wilkes-Barre.

What has happened to northeastern Pennsylvania and what is happening in northeastern Pennsylvania is much more symbolic than that. In fact, Mrs. Johnson commented and so did many of the Nation's press who accompanied her, on the fact that the Wyoming Valley did not at all look "depressed"—and did not at all act "depressed."

The true meaning of Mrs. Johnson's trip was best expressed in the opening paragraphs of her speech at Wilkes College. "I want you to know," she said, "that we in the White House are * * * aware that this area of the country was once prosperous; that you have been economically hard hit; and that you, by your own efforts and with the help of your State and Federal Government, are on the road back to prosperity."

It was not poverty that northeastern Pennsylvania symbolized, but the fact that what northeastern Pennsylvania is doing is dramatic proof of the fact that if we all work together—local, State, and Federal Government—unemployment and poverty can be licked.

"What an exciting place to be—here in Wilkes-Barre—on the threshold of a new era." These words from Mrs. Johnson's speech typify the theme of her visit.

And I agree. It is exciting to be here and to catch the spirit of renaissance.

But it is one thing not to be depressed—and it is another not to be complacent.

You are proud of your accomplishments—but there is still a long way to go.

We in the Area Redevelopment Administration have measured our task in terms of the numbers of new jobs which have to be created in the designated redevelopment areas to bring their unemployment rates down to the national average.

This seems a modest enough goal, since the national average is already too high.

On a national basis, this means that the "job gap" amounts to about 600,000 new jobs needed in depressed areas. Already, ARA has approved 426 projects which, when fully operating, will create an estimated 100,000 new jobs, and involve an investment of $200 million, most of it in the form of repayable loans.

ARA is not the only tool which is being used by the Johnson administration to close the job gap. We have the accelerated public works program, under which 7,500 needed public works have been accelerated or initiated. By the time they are completed, they will have generated some 220,000 man-years of employment on-site and in the production of materials and supplies for construction of the projects. There is the Manpower Development and Training Act, which is training thousands of workers in skills which make it possible for them to move from the ranks of the jobless to the ranks of the employed.

Luzerne County has benefited greatly from all these programs. In Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton together, ARA has approved five projects for financial assistance involving loans for $1,181,000 and grants of $558,000. These projects, when fully operating, are expected to produce 1,120 direct and directly related jobs, and an additional 700 indirect jobs for a total of 1,800 new jobs. In addition over 400 additional persons are enrolled or have completed training courses under ARA or under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Virtually all of these 400 persons have been or will be placed in employment—so that we can justifiably claim that the projects already approved for Luzerne County will be responsible for removing about 2,000 persons from the unemployed ranks—permanently.

In addition, we have approved 36 projects under the accelerated public works program in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton area. These have required grants of $2,458,000, and they have been matched by $2,084,000 local funds for a total of $4,542,000 of public construction accelerated under the program in this area. These will produce over 3,000 man-months of employment on the sites.

Of course, these are not the only efforts. Your local industrial development program has brought new industry into Wyoming Valley without any Federal help. That is magnificent. You are making extensive use of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority and the Small Business Administration to finance new job-creating facilities. That, too, is all to the good.

In fact, all of us working together, can take credit for the dramatic upturn which is taking place.

In 1961, the year when ARA was born, there was an average of 17,400 persons unemployed in this labor market, with an unemployment rate of 13 percent. Contrast this with the average unemployment rate for the 12 months ending November 1963, which was 10 percent with an average total unemployed during this period of 13,200.

Here in Luzerne County, the job gap, that is the number needed to bring the unemployment rate down to 5.6 percent was 9,900 in 1961 and only 5,800 in 1963—a drop of over 4,000 in 2 years. At this rate, Luzerne County will lose its so-called depressed status in only 3 more years.

You are doing twice as good as the rest of the country. The unemployment rate for the country as a whole has dropped by 10 percent in the past 2 years. Your unemployment rate has dropped by over 20 percent.

In fact, with the help of ARA and the other national programs, we have made an inspiring start on solving the depressed area problem. In the past 2 years, the national unemployment rate has dropped by one percentage point. The unemployment rate for all depressed areas has dropped by two points.

Certainly, this is dramatic proof that we are on the road to success.

But we haven't reached our goal. A national job gap of 500,000 in the depressed areas is nothing to be happy about. And a job gap of over 5,000 here in Luzerne County means that you cannot rest on your laurels.

The unemployment rate here is 10 percent, and that is almost twice the national average.

There is much that remains to be done.

We in the Area Redevelopment Administration hope that you in Luzerne County will be able to make increasing use of our programs in order to finish the job.

I am now on a tour of ARA projects in northeastern Pennsylvania. Yesterday I went to Berwick and I saw where we had helped save the ACF plant for industrial use and put part of it to use immediately thereby cushioning the impact of the ACF closedown.

I saw other projects in Schuylkill County—a plant making materials for welding in Mount Carmel, a plant making trailers in Shamokin, even a mine turned into a profitable tourist attraction in Ashland. I saw where Hazleton is beginning to use ARA for industrial development with its new plastics plant, plans for opening up a new section of its industrial park, and other exciting projects in the works—all of them involving considerable local and State effort—but none of them possible without ARA help, too. This afternoon I hope to see more in Scranton.

I would be less than human if I did not confess disappointment because there is not more to be seen in Wilkes-Barre.

There is much more to be done here—with ARA help. I am not recommending that you use ARA to help finance projects which you can finance with your own resources and with the help of the State and Small Business Administration.

I am recommending that you become familiar with the ability of ARA to help fi-

nance and create projects which would otherwise be impossible. We, in ARA, are a "bank of last resort," but as such we can help make new jobs possible.

What are some of the things which are possible with ARA and which are not possible through other sources?

We can lend money on machinery and equipment, which the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority will not do.

We can lend money up to 25 years (although we do not go this long on machinery and equipment).

We can, if necessary, take a second mortgage.

We have liberal concepts of security, we require reasonable assurance of repayment. But in satisfaction of the requirement we look more to the ideas and capacities of the individuals and businesses involved than to the collateral security.

We can provide technical assistance to make feasibility studies or to provide other types of information necessary to the creation of new businesses.

We can help provide credit for public facilities necessary to the creation of new employment. If our legislation is passed this year—and we are confident that it will be—we may again be able to provide grants, where necessary, for public facilities of this type.

There is much to be gained for Luzerne County from an appreciation of how the Area Redevelopment Act works and how it can be used here—in conjunction with other forms of assistance—to help you close the job gap.

I have been working with ARA now for almost 3 years, and I have seen what it can do. I believe in it—not only because it is effective, but because it is built upon three solid principles—principles which every person in this room would support.

First, ARA believes in solving the unemployment problem by the free, private enterprise system. Everything we do is pointed toward making it possible for businessmen to create more jobs by taking advantage of opportunities to make more legitimate profits. We want the businessmen of this area to make more profits—and we want to help them make more profits if they will create more good jobs in the process.

Second, ARA is based upon local initiative. We do not force ARA help upon you. We didn't come waving a check for the Wilkes College Research Center. You came to us. And we made sure that you raised more money locally than you got from the Federal Government. Everything we do, every action we take, is rooted in the letter of the law that requires local initiative before Federal help is available. Everyone of us in ARA believes that communities must be stronger because of what we do—not weaker. And everyone of us believes that we must work at all times as if we were trying to work ourselves out of a job. That means we must strengthen State and local programs for economic development and that means that we must do everything possible to help the private sector of our economy make its full contribution to area redevelopment.

And third, ARA is based upon sound, repayable investments. Most of our expenditures are made in the form of loans which are repayable with interest. But what we get back in the form of loan repayments are dwarfed by the tremendous return to local, State, and Federal Governments in the form of increased taxes on property, on the profits of the new and expanded businesses, and on the incomes of the new wage earners. When you add to this, the huge savings in welfare and unemployment compensation benefits, you can see why the ARA program merits the support of every prudent person, especially if he is concerned about the cost of public programs.

I fail to see how anyone can really quarrel with a program like ARA, based as it is upon promotion of private enterprise, encouragement of local initiative, and use of repayable investments in economic growth.

I submit, therefore, that as citizens interested in the public welfare—you give your support to the area redevelopment program. Even more important, as resident, businessmen, and taxpayers in Luzerne County, you find out more about how this program can be used with increasing effectiveness in the future to help you close your job gap.

You can count on our cooperation.

"The Sleeping Prince"—Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Larston Farrar, a Washington writer, described the tragic circumstances of November 22 in a dramatic and colorful way.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute written by Mr. Farrar be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SLEEPING PRINCE—A TRIBUTE

(By Larston D. Farrar)

There lies today, in deep repose beside a flaming torch, a prince among the people of the earth.

There is restlessness in the land. Grief is evident everywhere.

Many minds think sad thoughts—of sympathy and condolence. Others think terrible thoughts of revenge.

All men wonder.

Hearts are heavy with the burden, and with questions. How can a prince fall so quickly? Why couldn't he grapple with his adversary? What cruel fate kept him from a chance to strike back?

He had been a fighter all the years we knew him.

At first, he was fighting on the football field. He tested his flesh and his drive against those who stood in his way, or strove to stop him. He could not be stopped.

Then he fought a war of ideas—with himself and with others. Some were good ideas; others could not stand the heat of argument. In the crucible and fire of time and debate, many ideas were winnowed out, like dross falling from pounded metal. Some proved not to be of steel. Yet, others lived, and stood out—gleaming and sharp.

Then he fought a war of weapons. He learned about boats and bayonets and bullets. Hot metal and cold steel.

He never flinched.

But he was not impregnable. Or impervious to pain. He fought a war against injury and illness. It never ended.

Later, he entered into the perennial war of words. He won it against some of the sharpest adversaries, on battlefields from East to West. The steel became stronger and more tempered. He learned how to sharpen and harden words, so that they could both pierce and glitter. The prince had many swords.

Then, the greatest test of all, he led us in our war of nerves. He chose to be out front—on the firing line, all the time—against enemies foreign and domestic. Or did we shove him there? No matter. This was the true test. In it, he excelled as he had never excelled before. He did not falter. He had been the prince of a family, the brightest of the clan, the best of the litter. Now, he became a true prince of the people.

He met every challenge that mattered. The others he scorned.

This prince was many men. He was a tender and devoted father. A handsome and loving husband. A slave to duty and responsibility. A Spartan in spirit, inside. He was beautiful in body and lithe of limb. He moved with purpose and sureness. He spoke with confidence and strength and sincerity. He smiled a smile with a hint of sadness. People believed him, and believed in him, because he believed both in his words and in himself. And in them. He was a prince who knew what to say, and how to say it, and said it.

This prince of many moods was blessed to find a princess strong and courageous. Another Spartan. She was beautiful and proud and desirable. And yet she was humble and thoughtful and kind. She loved children. She was devoted to him, and she believed in him. Their faith moved mountains.

The end came like lightning out of the blue. There were no clouds. No thunder. And yet, blood was flowing, and he was falling into her tender arms. The incredible became credible. The unbelievable became reality. She was holding him, while he fought for his life. But even a prince must perish. We live our lives like a tale that is told.

He is stretched out. There is no pulse. Anguish fills her heart, but she is strong. She takes off the sacred wedding band, puts it in his lifeless hand and kisses it tenderly.

The price is asleep. It is time for him to rest. There is no more hope—on earth—for him. There is only hope for the country, for the people, for life, and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The dream is ended. This is the awakening. But the prince sleeps on.

What frantic and feverish brain could plan such a monstrous and savage act? The policemen ran here and there. Minds began to work. Distances were measured. People contributed bits of information. The pieces began to fall into place. The man who would deliver such a blow could not do it out of one morning's plans. He had to have a background of nursing grievances and thwarted vengeance.

It came from hate.

He hated himself because he did not understand and he hated others because they would not or could not stop to help him understand. He was lost before he was born. He was the victor and the victim. The prince had been struck down. But this tortured mind could not feel triumph. The dark and devious plan had worked. Yet, the victor could not beat his breast and scream his defiance.

The prince was cut down without a chance to strike back. He had no premonition, no inkling, no chance. He never even saw his challenger.

This was the swift and terrible hand of fate at work. The time, the place, the killer, the opportunity, the trip, the unused hardtop, the slowness of the car, the deadly accuracy of the rifle, the speed of the bullet, the brightness of the sunshine, the clearness of the target, the bitter determination behind the finger that pulled the trigger, the sharp eyes, the half-used mind that could not see things in focus, the shift of the prince's head at the right moment.

All meant that the hand of fate was at work.

No one could bring it back and replay the scene. No one could talk to the killer and help him to see straight. No one could stop that deadly trickle of blood. No one could retrace a step.

The moving finger had written.

The great void was not a void. The prince had not been hurt. He had gone to sleep, after living his life. The restless heart is at rest. The backache is gone. The rocker is stilled in its swing.

The victory is his.

He had done what he had lived to do. He worked to become the prince of the people. In the manner of his death, he won every heart. This was the last full measure of devotion. Greater love hath no man—no prince—than this, that he lay down his life for his friends, his countrymen.

A prince should not be craven before the people. He could not be a prince, hidden under a bubbletop. If the prince were to live in fear, how could he be a brave leader, a prince? He had to move in the open and face the people.

They wanted to see him.

He wanted to see them.

He had to die, as he did die, a hero's death. There was no other way.

That is why the prince now can rest so beautifully in repose. He can sleep in peace. He proved that a man can live like a prince, marry a true princess, and then die like a prince, and all the time be a man.

This was no spectacular, staged in Hollywood. The script had not been polished and repolished. The prince was no make-believe actor, repeating rehearsals until he was perfect. He was schooled and trained to lead—by fate, through men. He wore the mantle of his offices proudly from the first.

He never flinched. He could not flinch, even when he fell in the lap of his beautiful princess. He had to live as he did live. And he had to die as he did die.

And all of his life led to his death.

The prince is asleep. He has served every moment of his time. He now can rest in peace. The wars are all over for him. No more bruising battles. No more icy waters. No more intellectual joustings. No more cares. No more tears.

The prince is asleep.

Address of President Woodrow Wilson Which Led to the Creation of the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week one of America's most brilliant statesmen, Woodrow Wilson, who became the 28th President of our country, delivered a most stirring address at a joint session of the Congress of the United States. This historic address called for action by the Congress to create an Interstate Commission on Trade and Commerce—and led directly to the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission.

Notwithstanding enactment of the Sherman Antitrust Act, it was then recognized that mergers and consolidations had continued unabated; unfair trade practices were rife; many small businesses were ruthlessly being trampled underfoot and attempts made by barons of corporate wealth to eliminate competition. The time was ripe for the creation of a commission charged with the responsibility of promoting free, fair, and honest competition.

Woodrow Wilson, in his "New Freedom," urged that an attempt be made to restore competitive conditions in business so that the little man could rise up the economic ladder.

The idealism of this brilliant man was motivated by a profound and deep feeling for the great mass of America's population. Few men in modern times had the vision, the foresight, and the intellectual ability of that truly great statesman.

Soon after President Wilson's magnificent speech was delivered appropriate bills were introduced in the House by Representative Henry L. Clayton, of Alabama, who was chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and in the Senate by Senator Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, who was chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. After extensive hearings and at the urging of President Wilson, the Federal Trade Commission was authorized by Congress and came into being.

The basic objective of the Federal Trade Commission is the maintenance of free competitive enterprise as the keystone of the American economic system. Although the duties of the Commission are many and varied, under the statutes, the foundation of public policy underlying all the statutes advocated by the Commission are to prevent the free enterprise system from being stifled or fettered by monopoly or corrupted by unfair or deceptive trade practices. Fair competition is to be promoted, the consumer and the public interest protected.

Inasmuch as I have the honor of serving as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business and, also, because I once served on the staff of the Federal Trade Commission, I feel that I can appreciate the invaluable services rendered over the years by this great Commission.

Since small business comprises more than 95 percent of the U.S. total business population, its problems perforce merit special attention. Without the instrumentality of the FTC the small-business segment of our economy would be in far more serious plight than it finds itself today.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the creation of President Woodrow Wilson's Commission to protect and promote our American free enterprise system, it is appropriate that we salute this great agency of our Government—the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary date I wish to insert President Wilson's speech of January 1914 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 20, 1914]

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON

The PRESIDENT. Gentleman of the Congress, in my report on the state of the Union, which I had the privilege of reading to you on the 2d of December last, I ventured to reserve for discussion at a later date the subject of additional legislation regarding the very difficult and intricate matter of trusts and monopolies. The time now seems opportune to turn to that great question; not only because the currency legislation, which absorbed your attention and the attention of the country in December, is now disposed of, but also because opinion seems to be clearing about us with singular rapidity in this other great field of action. In the matter of the currency it cleared suddenly and very happily after the much-debated act was passed; in respect of the monopolies which have multiplied about us and in regard to the various means by which they have been organized and maintained it seems to be coming to a clear and all but universal agreement in anticipation of our action, as if by way of preparation, making the way easier to see and easier to set out upon with confidence and without confusion of counsel.

Legislation has its atmosphere like everying else, and the atmosphere of accommodation and mutual understanding which we now breathe with so much refreshment is matter of sincere congratulation. It ought to make our task very much less difficult and embarrassing than it would have been had we been obliged to continue to act amidst the atmosphere of suspicion and antagonism which has so long made it impossible to approach such questions with dispassionate fairness. Constructive legislation, when successful, is always the embodiment of convincing experience, and of the mature public opinion which finally springs out of that experience. Legislation is a business of interpretation, not of origination; and it is now plain what the opinion is to which we must give effect in this matter. It is not recent or hasty opinion. It springs out of the experience of a whole generation. It has clarified itself by long contest, and those who for a long time battled with it and sought to change it are now frankly and honorably yielding to it and seeking to conform their actions to it.

The great businessmen who organized and financed monopoly and those who administered it in actual everyday transactions have year after year, until now, either denied its existence or justified it as necessary for the effective maintenance and development of the vast business processes of the country in the modern circumstances of trade and manufacture and finance; but all the while opinion has made head against them. The average businessman is convinced that the ways of liberty are also the ways of peace and the ways of success as well; and at last the masters of business on the great scale have begun to yield their preference and purpose, perhaps their judgment also, in honorable surrender.

What we are purposing to do, therefore, is, happily, not to hamper or interfere with business as enlightened businessmen prefer to do it, or in any sense to put it under the ban. The antagonism between business and Government is over. We are now about to give expression to the best business judgment of America, to what we know to be the business conscience and honor of the land. The Government and businesssmen are ready to meet each other halfway in a common effort to square business methods with both public opinion and the law. The best informed men of the business world condemn the methods and processes and consequences of monopoly as we condemn them; and the instinctive judgment of the vast majority of businessmen everywhere goes with them. We shall now be their spokesmen. That is the strength of our position and the sure prophecy of what will ensue when our reasonable work is done.

When serious contest ends, when men unite in opinion and purpose, those who are to change their ways of business joining with those who ask for the change, it is possible to effect it in the way in which prudent and thoughtful and patriotic men would wish to see it brought about, with as few, as slight, as easy and simple business readjustments as possible in the circumstances, nothing essential disturbed, nothing torn up by the roots, no parts rent asunder which can be left in wholesome combination.

Fortunately, no measures of sweeping or novel change are necessary. It will be understood that our object is not to unsettle business or anywhere seriously to break its established courses athwart. On the contrary, we desire the laws we are now about to pass to be the bulwarks and safeguards of industry against the forces who have disturbed it. What we have to do can be done in a new spirit, in thoughtful moderation, without revolution of any untoward kind.

We are all agreed that private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable and our program is founded upon that conviction. It will be a comprehensive but not a radical or unacceptable program and these are its items, the changes which opinion deliberately sanctions and for which business waits:

It waits with acquiescence, in the first place, for laws which will effectually prohibit and prevent such interlockings of the personnel of the directorates of great corporations—banks and railroads, industrial, commercial, and public service bodies—as in effect result in making those who borrow and those who lend practically one and the same, those who sell and those who buy but the same persons trading with one another under different names and in different combinations, and those who affect to compete in fact partners and masters of some whole field of business. Sufficient time should be allowed, of course, in which to effect these changes of organization without inconvenience or confusion.

Such a prohibition will work much more than a mere negative good by correcting the serious evils which have arisen because, for example, the men who have been the directing spirits of the great investment banks have usurped the place which belongs to independent industrial management working in its own behoof. It will bring new men, new energies, a new spirit of initiative, new blood into the management of our great business enterprises. It will open the field of industrial development and origination to scores of men who have been obliged to serve when their abilities entitled them to direct. It will immensely hearten the young men coming on and will greatly enrich the business activities of the whole country.

In the second place, business men as well as those who direct public affairs now recognize, and recognize with painful clearness, the great harm and injustice which has been done to many, if not all, of the great railroad systems of the country by the way in which they have been financed and their own distinctive interests subordinated to the interests of the men who financed them and of other business enterprises which those men wished to promote. The country is ready, therefore, to accept, and accept with relief as well as approval, a law which will confer upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to superintend and regulate the financial operations by which the railroads are henceforth to be supplied with the money they need for their proper development to meet the rapidly growing requirements of the country for increased and improved facilities of transportation. We cannot postpone action in this matter without leaving the railroads exposed to many serious handicaps and hazards; and the prosperity of the railroads and the prosperity of the country are inseparably connected. Upon this question those who are chiefly responsible for the actual management and operation of the railroads have spoken very plainly and very earnestly, with a purpose we ought to be quick to accept. It will be one step, and a very important one, toward the necessary separation of the business of production from the business of transportation.

The business of the country awaits also, has long awaited, and has suffered because it could not obtain, further and more explicit legislative definition of the policy and meaning of the existing antitrust law. Nothing hampers business like uncertainty. Nothing daunts or discourages it like the necessity to take chances, to run the risk of falling under the condemnation of the law before it can make sure just what the law is. Surely we are sufficiently familiar with the actual processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make definition possible, at any rate up to the limits of what experience has disclosed. These practices, being now abundantly disclosed, can be explicitly and item by item forbidden by statute in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty, the law itself and the penalty being made equally plain.

And the businessmen of the country desire something more than that the menace of legal process in these matters be made explicit and intelligible. They desire the advice, the definite guidance and information which can be supplied by an administrative body, an interstate trade commission.

The opinion of the country would instantly approve of such a commission. It would not wish to see it empowered to make terms with monopoly or in any sort to assume control of business, as if the Government made itself responsible. It demands such a commission only as an indispenable instrument of information and publicity, as a clearinghouse for the facts by which both the public mind and the managers of great business undertakings should be guided, and as an instrumentality for doing justice to business where the processes of the courts or the natural forces of correction outside the courts are inadequate to adjust the remedy to the wrong in a way that will meet all the equities and circumstances of the case.

Producing industries, for example, which have passed the point up to which combination may be consistent with the public interest and the freedom of trade, cannot always be dissected into their component units as readily as railroad companies or similar organizations can be. Their dissolution by ordinary legal process may oftentimes involve financial consequences likely to overwhelm the security market and bring upon it breakdown and confusion. There ought to be an administrative commission capable of directing and shaping such corrective processes, not only in aid of the courts but also by independent suggestion, if necessary.

Inasmuch as our object and the spirit of our action in these matters is to meet business half way in its processes of self-correction and disturb its legitimate course as little as possible, we ought to see to it, and the judgment of practical and sagacious men of affairs everywhere would applaud us if we did see to it, that penalties and punishments should fall not upon business itself, to its confusion and interruption, but upon the individuals who use the instrumentalities of business to do things which public policy and sound business practice condemn. Every act of business is done at the command or upon the initiative of some ascertainable person or group of persons. These should be held individually responsible and the punishment should fall upon them, not upon the business organization of which they make illegal use. It should be one of the main objects of our legislation to divest such persons of their corporate cloak and deal with them as with those who do not represent their corporations, but merely by deliberate intention break the law. Businessmen the country through would, I am sure, applaud us if we were to take effectual steps to see that the officers and directors of great business bodies were prevented from bringing them and the business of the country into disrepute and danger.

Other questions remain which will need very thoughtful and practical treatment. Enterprises in these modern days of great individual fortunes are oftentimes interlocked, not by being under the control of the same directors but by the fact that the greater part of their corporate stock is owned by a single person or group of persons who are in some way intimately related in interest. We are agreed, I take it, that holding companies should be prohibited, but what of the controlling private ownership of individuals or actually cooperative groups of individuals? Shall the private owners of capital stock be suffered to be themselves in effect holding companies? We do not wish, I suppose, to forbid the purchase of stocks by any person who pleases to buy them in such quantities as he can afford, or in any way arbitrarily to limit the sale of stocks to bona fide purchasers. Shall we require the owners of stock, when their voting power in several companies which ought to be independent of one another would constitute actual control, to make election in which of them they will exercise their right to vote? This question I venture for your consideration.

There is another matter in which imperative considerations of justice and fairplay suggest thoughtful remedial action. Not only do many of the combinations effected or sought to be effected in the industrial world work an injustice upon the public in general; they also directly and seriously injure the individuals who are put out of business in one unfair way or another by the many dislodging and exterminating forces of combination. I hope that we shall agree in giving private individuals who claim to have been injured by these processes the right to found their suits for redress upon the facts and judgments proved and entered in suits by the Government where the Government has upon its own initiative sued the combinations complained of and won its suit, and that the statute of limitations shall be suffered to run against such litigants only from the date of the conclusion of the Government's action. It is not fair that the private litigant should be obliged to set up and establish again the facts which the Government has proved. He cannot afford, he has not the power, to make use of such processes of inquiry as the Government has command of. Thus shall individual justice be done while the processes of business are rectified and squared with the general conscience.

I have laid the case before you, no doubt, as it lies in your own mind, as it lies in the thought of the country. What must every candid man say of the suggestions I have laid before you, of the plain obligations of which I have reminded you? That these are new things for which the country is not prepared? No; but that they are old things, now familiar, and must of course be undertaken if we are to square our laws with the thought and desire of the country. Until these things are done, conscientious businessmen the country over will be unsatisfied. They are in these things our mentors and colleagues. We are now about to write the additional articles of our constitution of peace, the peace that is honor and freedom and prosperity.

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Montana Farmers Union, as well as other farmer and rancher organizations in Montana, has long been concerned with the problems of beef imports into this country.

Recently, the board of directors of the Montana Farmers Union adopted a statement concerning beef imports which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of the Montana Farmers Union concerning beef imports was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEEF PRICES

(The following appeal adopted by the board of directors of the Montana Farmers Union meeting in Great Falls, Mont., January 7, 1964, was sent to Hon. Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator Lee Metcalf, Congressman Arnold Olsen, and Congressman James Battin:)

We are alarmed by the depressing income situation facing many Montana small livestock growers.

We believe it is time for a full investigation of the causes of the unusually low prices received by producers of cattle in the United States. We are aware of the possible effect excessive imports would have on domestic cattle prices, and we urge appropriate action in that area, if necessary, to restore a wholesome condition in export-import trade. While we are mindful of the danger of injury to economies abroad, we feel it is unfair for American family ranchers to bear an undue burden of international operations without compensating income.

We urge also in such investigation consideration of all factors that might depress beef prices. For example: Who is importing beef? What is the impact of chainstore pricing practices? What is the role played by the big packers? Does the integrated poultry industry relate itself to the beef situation? Is the substantial spread between the price producers get and consumers pay justified? Is there overproduction or underconsumption of beef?

We note that the decline in beef prices on the range and in the feedlots has not been reflected in lower prices over the retail counters. We are concerned about consumer needs.

The continuing loss of income, jeopardizing farmer, and rancher welfare, is drying up agricultural purchasing power which historically bolsters job opportunities and business activities. These conditions now call for efforts to see what is wrong and to make whatever adjustments are needed to relieve growers of the pressures of the current recession.

Roosevelt Campobello International Park

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce a bill to establish the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and for other purposes, as envisioned by the treaty signed yesterday between Canada and the United States. My colleagues from the State of Maine, Mr. TUPPER and Mr. MCINTIRE, have joined me in introducing the bill in the House, and I am pleased that a similar measure is being introduced in the Senate by Senator MUSKIE.

This bill, of course, is one in which I have a very warm and personal interest. Campobello Island is where I spent many wonderful hours as a boy, where my father taught me to swim and how to sail a boat, where I met my first North American Indian; all this being when Campobello was a true haven from the cares of the world, for there was no telephone and no electricity to or from the mainland. These inadequacies, if such they were, have been remedied in more recent years, but the beauty of nature, especially in summer, was in no way spoiled.

As a park, I am sure Campobello will bring much enjoyment to many American visitors as well as to our friends from Canada. It represents another symbol of the closeness of the people of Canada and our country. Even when I was a boy the formalities of the border were at a minimum, and understanding and friendship between our two peoples has been maintained at all times.

I can think of no finer words than those exchanged yesterday by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson at the signing of the international park agreement in the Treaty Room of the White House, and I am happy to include them, not only for the historical record, but for all those who realize that in the relations between Canada and the United States, there is an example for all the world to follow.

The remarks follows:

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND PRIME MINISTER LESTER B. PEARSON, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA, UPON SIGNING OF ROOSEVELT CAMPOBELLO INTERNATIONAL PARK AGREEMENT IN THE TREATY ROOM

President JOHNSON. Mr. Prime Minister and distinguished guests, President Roosevelt would have approved of what we are doing here today. He approved of anything that advanced, however small, the general well being of human beings. So it cheers me to join with Prime Minister Pearson in taking the first step toward establishing Franklin Roosevelt's summer home as a memorial park.

I want to publicly thank Dr. Armand Hammer, Harry Hammer, and Victor Hammer for their most generous contribution in President Roosevelt's memory, and to his deeply held love for the Canadian people. I think that President Roosevelt would be pleased that this is a new and special project. It is, as you know, the first jointly owned United States-Canadian park. This is ample evidence of a close tie between the United States and Canada.

This involves land and people. This is the heart of human concern and national kinship. Canada and the United States are not only good neighbors, but we are good partners. We are going to stay good partners. Each will help the other to stay strong, to stay solvent, to stay stable, and to stay compassionate.

We have no problems that cannot be solved. We have no difficulties that cannot be settled. We have no future that cannot be shared. That is why I am happy, in concert with the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Pearson, to sign this agreement.

I hope that Campobello Park will live eternally as a symbol of our friendship that cannot be shaken or diverted. President Roosevelt would want it this way.

Prime Minister PEARSON. Mr. President, may I tell you how deeply I appreciate the privilege of joining you today in signing the agrement which will make possible the establishment of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Campobello International Park.

I recall last May when I was in Hyannis Port when this idea was advanced and we were able to proceed with it at that time through the generosity of Dr. Hammer and his brothers, and through the understanding support and cooperation of the members of the Roosevelt family, the process which began then has now come to the stage of completion insofar as the signing of this agreement is concerned. I am very happy, indeed, to be a part of it.

As you say, Mr. President, this is something of which Mr. Roosevelt would have approved. We cherish this action in Canada not only because it will establish another link in the friendship between our two peoples across our border, that border which is so easily crossed, but also because it will be an eternal memorial to one of the great and towering figures of our age, a man who had done so much for human freedom and one who's memory is as imperishable in Canada, a country which he loved, and in which he spent so much of his time, who's memory will be as imperishable in Canada as it is in the United States.

My colleagues and I are very proud, Mr. President, to be able to take part in this ceremony today.

President JOHNSON. To some of you here for the first time I would like to point out the beauty of this room is made possible because of the great, dedicated efforts of Mrs. Kennedy. She had just completed the decoration of it. It is known as the Treaty Room. The Indian Treaty was signed here, a number of other treaties. We have had two agreements and one treaty signed since November ourselves.

President Andrew Johnson's first Cabinet met in this room for the first time. It has many things of historical importance here, including its chandelier that hung in my office in the Capitol for a number of years. It had originally been in the White House. But when President Theodore Roosevelt became President, in days before air conditioning, he would have to open the windows in the evening to let the breeze in to keep cool, and the chandelier glass would tingle and keep him awake. So he told the butler one evening to get that chandelier out of here and take it down to the Capitol. The frustrated butler said, "Where do we take it?" He said, "Take it to the Vice President. We need something to keep him awake." So it stayed there, Mr. Prime Minister, for many years, and I guess Mrs. Kennedy finally concluded that I was wide awake and she told me she wanted that chandelier brought back to the White House where it belonged, and her wish was my command.

A Look Ahead at Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has raised hopes for ending Castroism in Cuba by promising to take a new look at the entire Cuban situation and our policy toward Cuba. A television editorial over WTVJ, Channel 4, Miami, takes a good look at the developments of the past year and projects on the future of Castroism in Cuba. I would like to insert a copy of that editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

A LOOK AHEAD AT THE CUBAN SITUATION

It was just 1 year ago that a giant airlift brought more than a thousand Bay of Pigs

invasion prisoners from their Cuban jails to freedom in Miami.

During the waning days of 1962, we expressed here the hope that "Cuba would be made free in 1963."

President Kennedy, in a speech at the Orange Bowl, struck a similar chord by promising the prisoners their flag would be returned to them in a "free Havana." One year later, Fidel Castro's Communist reign on the island seems more entrenched than ever.

But with the bad, we can see some glimmer of good.

Internal conditions within Cuba are getting worse daily with most people getting but one meal a day. Hurricane Flora and a poor sugar crop further hurt the economy. There are indications that some of Castro's middle-level officials are getting disillusioned by the Russian takeover of their revolution.

It's difficult to predict any internal uprising or disintegration within Cuba, but the worse things get, the better for our side. Certainly, increased isolation of Cuba will put a greater squeeze on Castro.

Venezuela is pressing hard within the OAS for an air and naval blockade, citing aggression and intervention by Cuba into Venezuelan affairs. Castro's effort to cause revolution elsewhere in the hemisphere should evoke some retaliatory actions.

But, as we approach the New Year, perhaps the most heartening sign is the action of President Johnson in taking a new look at Cuba and Latin America. He has put in top command, Thomas Mann, a practical veteran of Latin affairs who last distinguished himself as Ambassador to Mexico.

Mann carries the elevated title of Under Secretary of State and Special Adviser to the President.

We have felt that Dick Goodwin and Edwin Martin and the others who evolved United States, Cuban, and Latin policy in past months were not practical men. We look differently upon Mr. Mann.

We still hope for Cuba to be at freedom's door in 1964.

Perjury Is the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star on January 26, 1964:

PERJURY IS THE ISSUE

In a frivolous response to a pertinent question, Chairman JORDAN, of the Senate Rules Committee, told a reporter: "We are not investigating tinware."

Of course not. No one thinks the subcommittee should. But unless Senator JORDAN and his colleagues are ready to forfeit public respect and confidence, they had better investigate the issue of perjury which has cropped up during the pussyfooting probe of the Bobby Baker mess.

Don. B. Reynolds, the Silver Spring insurance man who paid for a hi-fi set given to Lyndon Johnson, told the Jordan committee that he had talked with Walter Jenkins about buying advertising time on the LBJ Co.'s Texas television station. Mr. Reynolds was testifying under oath. Mr. Jenkins is administrative assistant to Mr. Johnson. In a sworn statement, he denied any knowledge of the advertising matter. Thus, it seems probable that one of the two men committed perjury.

Mr. Reynolds has said that the TV time, which he agreed to buy in connection with a life insurance sale to Mr. Johnson, was of no value to him. So he made a deal under which it would be used by Albert G. Young, head of a Silver Spring firm which sells cooking utensils nationally. Mr. Young has told newsmen that he discussed this advertising transaction by phone with a man who said he was Mr. Jenkins. And the reporters naturally wanted to know whether Senator JORDAN intended to call Mr. Young as a witness. The "tinware" comment was the result.

Normally an investigating committee would try to get to the bottom of such a conflict of testimony. It would put Mr. Young on the stand and get his sworn story. It would follow through by examining the records of the TV company and interrogating the people there with whom Mr. Young must have dealt.

Apparently the Senate committee does not intend to do this. It is trying to clamp the lid on what could be a very explosive (though legitimate) aspect of its inquiry. If it does, it can expect a vote of "no confidence" from the American people. And this vote should come through loud and clear.

Space Contracts for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Government procurements associated with our space program are increasing in dollar value, which development makes it doubly important that small business concerns participate to the greatest degree possible.

A brief article designed to provide helpful advice and guidance to small business firms interested in obtaining such prime contracts—or subcontracts—appeared in a recent issue of the Bulletin of the American Council of Independent Laboratories. It was written by Mr. Spencer Beresford, an able attorney and former counsel to the House Science and Astronautics Committee.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

DOES SMALL BUSINESS HAVE ROOM IN SPACE?

(By Spencer M. Beresford)

It's entirely possible for small business concerns to get space contracts—but it isn't easy.

There are a few simple rules to follow. They can be listed quickly, but are often ignored.

An even bigger stumbling block is attitude. Paradoxically, many businessmen take a political rather than a businesslike view of the Government, even when doing business with it. What needs to be stressed is that they would do better to treat the Government like a prospective customer—and a demanding one, at that. It's dangerous to expect Government contracts on a silver platter. Government business is not a handout. It does differ in many ways from doing business with private companies, but it imposes similar requirements as to sales effort, cost, and quality. Government contract procedures and standards are intended not only to "keep everybody honest" but to serve as a substitute for market competition and enforce efficiency.

If you have a small business—and you may, even with more than 500 employees—you're not likely to get a NASA prime contract unless your company is highly qualified and specialized in some field of NASA interest. But you stand a good chance of getting a NASA (or Air Force) subcontract if your personnel, facilities, and financial performance in one of these fields are better than average. Here are the rules—the A B C's:

Rule 1: Get on the bidders' lists at NASA centers. This means the NASA field center nearest you, but includes others doing work in which you have an interest. The NASA centers have authority to make contract awards up to $5 million, and to make tentative awards for larger amounts subject to headquarters approval.

Rule 2: Get the Department of Commerce Business Daily, and make it your bible. It lists requests for bids, contract awards (so you'll know who the prime contractors are) and setasides for small business.

Rule 3: Make your company and its capabilities and interests known to the nearest office of the Small Business Administration, and keep in touch with that office.

Rule 4: Approach prime contractors directly. Knock on their doors.

Rule 5: Try to specialize in some field of Government interest. Develop it. Sell it. Don't try to be all things to all men. Rather, be specific in bidding and selling.

Your problems have only begun when you find a contract you can bid on. Then you have to make the all-important decision to bid or not to bid. And before you bid, not after your bid is accepted, be ready to start by having done already the little things that take time, such as up-to-date financial reports and security clearances.

If you follow the foregoing rules, and treat the Government like a customer, you'll greatly improve your chances of getting some Government business. The woods are full of small companies that have done it.

Snow Couldn't Close Friendship Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, during the severe snowstorm of this month, almost all means of air travel within a 400-mile radius of Washington was closed down with the single exception of Baltimore's Friendship Airport. The main reason for the availability of service during this period can be attributed to the hardworking ground crews at Friendship whose efforts made continued service possible. With your permission, I should like to insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Baltimore News-American on January 16, 1964, praising the efforts of these men.

The editorial follows:

SNOW COULDN'T CLOSE FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT

We hope Federal aviation officials will take serious note of the fact that Baltimore's Friendship International Airport was fully operative and open to traffic during the late snowstorm, even though other major airports within a 400-mile radius were forced

to close down, some of them for as much as 48 hours.

Because Friendship was in business at a time the other airports were socked in, close to 1,000 air passengers arrived there in planes which were originally scheduled to land elsewhere. The airlines moved these passengers to their destinations via railways or buses.

That Friendship was enabled to remain open was due in part to its favorable location with respect to fog-producing bodies of water—but only in part. The principal reason why our airport functioned when others were closed is the devotion and hard work of Friendship's ground crews, snow-removal personnel, and airport officials.

Battling the snow around the clock, these men cleared runways so effectively that jet airliners were able to land and take off with a minimum of difficulty. Quoting Col. John F. R. Scott, Jr., the assistant airport director, "those men really worked their hearts out."

Federal aviation people have been beating the drums for the big, new Dulles Airport near Washington, and have consistently downgraded Friendship. Maybe they'll change their tune now. They should.

Especially since Dulles, the Government's $110 million boondoggle, was one of the airports that had to close down during the storm.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, During October and November of 1963 legislative questionnaires were sent to more than 85,000 residents of the Seventh California District.

With many of these issues still before Congress I believe our colleagues will find the tabulation of the nearly 12,000 questionnaires returned of interest:

Results of the 1963 questionnaire poll conducted by Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN, 7th District of California

	Percent			
	Yes	No	Undecided	Blank
1. Do you favor legislation now before the Senate making general reductions in personal and corporate income taxes?	66.6	22.0	8.4	3.0
2. Should Congress pass the President's omnibus civil rights bill?	57.6	28.4	6.4	7.6
If your answer is "yes"—				
(a) Should the section prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations be retained in the bill?	54.8	15.9	3.8	25.5
(b) Would you favor establishing a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission?	48.5	20.3	6.2	25.0
3. Do you favor Federal assistance for public school construction and teacher's salaries?	49.5	42.6	6.4	1.6
4. Should Congress amend the college aid program to provide scholarships for qualified needy students?	65.2	26.4	6.8	1.6
5. Should legislation be enacted providing insured health and hospital care for our senior citizens under social security?	63.3	29.1	6.2	1.3
6. Would you favor a Youth Conservation Corps providing public service employment and job training for unemployed young people?	72.6	20.5	5.7	1.1
7. Do you favor establishing a National Service Corps, modeled after the Peace Corps, to work in local communities, where requested, in such areas of need as migrants, Indians, school dropouts, and the mentally retarded?	57.7	32.2	8.7	1.4
8. Should Congress establish a national wilderness preservation system?	73.5	13.7	10.6	2.2
9. Should Congress make grants and loans to assist local communities develop mass transportation systems	40.1	43.5	13.8	2.5
10. Would you favor Federal legislation enabling manufacturers to prohibit the sale of their products below designated prices	12.1	75.8	10.2	1.9
11. Do you believe the Senate should restore the foreign aid cuts made by the House, as recommended by President Kennedy and General Clay	28.6	56.4	13.1	1.8
12. Should the $150,000,000 cut made in the Alliance for Progress be restored	25.1	51.0	20.6	3.2
13. Should the U.S. Disarmament Agency, established in 1961, be made a permanent agency of our Government	34.9	36.0	25.5	3.6
14. Do you approve of the limited nuclear test ban treaty recently ratified by the Senate	70.5	20.2	8.1	1.2

Seven-Year Itch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, January 16, 1964, and an editorial entitled "Seven-Year Itch," appearing in the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 17, 1964.

The article explains why Britain seeks to bar price fixing; the editorial points out the evils of price-fixing laws regardless of where they may happen to be.

Certainly, in this time when Great Britain and other nations around the world are moving to junk fair trade, the United States must in its own interest, through its Congress, repudiate the iniquitous quality stabilization bill now pending before the Congress.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 16, 1964]

BRITAIN SEEKS TO BAR MOST PRICE SETTING
TIGHTEN MONOPOLY LAWS TO FIGHT INFLATION

LONDON.—The British Government announced plans to outlaw most commercial agreements that allow manufacturers to set retail prices for their goods.

Edward Heath, Minister for Trade and Industry, also said the Conservative government will ask Parliament to tighten the nation's antimonopoly laws and prohibit competing companies from sharing pricelists and contract terms.

Mr. Heath, in a statement to the House of Commons, said the enabling legislation will be introduced in the current session of Parliament.

The broad program is designed to prevent inflation from marring the United Kingdom's industrial growth, Reginald Maudling, Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, had warned recently that wage demands are raising the specter of inflation. The Government believes that increased business competition will result in lower prices and that these, in turn, will lead British unions to reduce their demands for pay increases.

Mr. Heath said retail price-fixing "is in General incompatible" with the Government's objective of "encouraging effective competition and keeping down costs and prices." The ban on "resale price maintenance," as the practice is called in Britain, would affect a wide range of products, including electrical appliances, automobiles and chocolate products.

PRICE-FIXING PREVALENT

Such agreements have been prevalent in Great Britain for many years: Retailers can't get the desired goods until they agree to abide by the prices that the manufacturers set. And, under present national law, manufacturers can enforce their price schedules through the civil courts.

Mr. Heath said the Government wouldn't propose a ban on all agreements. He said a judicial tribunal would be empowered to grant exemptions to specific companies.

Some retailers immediately praised the Government's plan. Jack Cohen, chairman of the Tesco chain of stores, told United Press International that the end of price fixing "will be the green light for the most intensive retail development this country has seen."

Some retailers also noted that an end to price maintenance would bolster the outlook for the newly emerging trading stamp industry in Britain. Some manufacturers have been maintaining that trading stamps are illegal because they are, in effect, discounts from fixed prices.

AIM IS TO BOLSTER ECONOMY

Mr. Heath said the Government's planned assault on monopolies and other restrictive practices is designed to "strengthen the economy to the benefit of all sections of the community and to the advantage of our competitive position in international trade."

Mr. Heath said the Government will move against certain consolidations by strengthening the monopolies commission, and by giving the Government added powers to enforce the Commission's rulings, particularly on mergers.

The Minister emphasized that the Government doesn't plan to block mergers that help the economy by creating stronger units with more effective sales organizations. Nor, he added, does the Government "wish to place any obstacles in the way of the greater number of mergers whose effects on the economy aren't significant.

But Mr. Heath added: "There is a small minority of mergers that may lead to monopoly conditions damaging to public interest." He said the Government plans to act against "this type of case."

The Government will also seek legislation that would, in effect, restrict exchange agreements among competing manufacturers. Under such accords, rivals sometimes exchange information on prices and contract provisions. Mr. Heath declared that truly competitive conditions are essential to the nation's economic growth.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 17, 1964]

SEVEN-YEAR ITCH

Proponents of so-called fair-trade laws ought to take a long and thoughtful look across the Atlantic. The British Cabinet is going to seek to end the similar form of

price fixing with which the public has been saddled for 7 years.

The British law requires the maintenance of resale prices; under it manufacturers can go to court to try to prevent retailers from cutting prices on brand-name goods. Thus the setup is very much like the various laws that have been tried in the United States and the proposed new Federal fair-trade law which parades under the appealing label of quality stabilization.

What is especially interesting about the British move to junk fair trade is the reception it's getting. Are consumers up in arms, demanding that legalized price fixing be retained? They are not. They are itching for its demise, which would lower prices significantly on the one-third of retail goods affected by the act.

The lesson could hardly be plainer, whether or not the fans of fair trade are capable of grasping it. Such laws do not stabilize quality or prices. They just make things cost more.

A Tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter and enclosure from Janet Hess, age 15, of 406 Meadow Lane, Falls Church, Va. The style of the letter and the literary skill demonstrated by this young lady in composing the enclosures is of such significant magnitude that I would like to share this refreshing young talent with my colleagues in the Houes of Representatives. Janet was obviously and sincerely moved by the tragic death of our late President. So touching was her tribute, I commend it to you without further comment:

IN APPRECIATION

A wave stopped short,
A red rose bent,
A gifted man,
A life half spent.

A shock of hair,
An infectious grin,
A battle hard fought
But no time to win.

A saddened woman,
A darkened face,
A determined courage,
A religious grace.

A brave little girl,
A confused little man,
A salute to his father,
Who guided our land.

A flag flying low,
A head held high,
Showing John F. Kennedy
Never can die.

[From the Falls Church High School Jaguar Journal, Dec. 19. 1963]

An eerie gray haze filtered through the expansive windows in the upper Cherry Street lobby. This was a Friday afternoon, by tradition the time for students to prepare for the fun of the upcoming 2 days. This was the weekend of the frolicking junior-student powderpuff game. This was the weekend the Falls Church auditorium was to echo with laughter from the first play of the year.

But these things were not to be. The halls were crowded but silent as students left the building, stunned beyond comprehension. This was not the day for laughing. This was the day for mourning.

This was the day John Fitzgerald Kennedy died.

On the never-ending calendar of time, a span of 46 years would seem insignificant and, in most instances, is so. But John Kennedy was not an insignificant man. In his short life on this earth, he became the youngest man ever elected President—and the youngest ever to die President. Ironically, it was exactly 13 months before his death that he went before the American people and the people of the world to describe, in a crisp but reassuring voice, the crisis in Cuba which at any moment could have exploded into nuclear holocaust.

Most of us changed our connotation of him after that memorable October day. Before, he was a dynamic politician with an attractive family. Afterwards, he was a man of maturity and wisdom. We realized the burdens he bore, not only as leader of the world but as the bulwark insuring the future of our generation and country.

The assassination of President Kennedy is deplorable enough, but coupled with that of his accused assassin, it would seem to make a mockery of everything he stood for. It's our responsibility to show the lack of validity in such a position. President Kennedy said, "Let us begin."

Lyndon Johnson said, "Let us continue." We say, "Let us know what the youth of America can do, and we shall do it."

This is the least we can do for our country and for its late President.

Johnson Policy May Overheat Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when these hearings opened last week, I made the observation that the administration's economic policy mix could very well overstimulate the economy this year and contribute importantly to a decline in activity sometime next year. I also pointed out that I believe the program which the administration presented could have inflationary consequences this year.

I was pleased to note that the lead editorial in the New York Times Sunday took esentially the same position. The editorial said that the President's economic policy "is taking a big gamble." According to the Times, the President "sacrifices moderation and runs the risk of destabilization that is associated with lofty heights." The result, says the Times, could be "a long, hard, drop."

Today's Washington Post contained an article by their financial columnist, Harold B. Dorsey, which also points out that the President's program poses inflationary risks as well as a danger of overheating the economy this year followed by a dropoff in activity in 1965. Mr. Dorsey points out that the immediate drop in the withholding rate to 14 percent this year moves up from 1965 much of the stimulation to consumer purchasing that had been planned for that year. The administration's plan is simply encouraging consumers to spend this year that part of the lower tax rate that does not become applicable until next year. As Mr. Dorsey says, the extra shot in the arm might be a little too strong for the patient and cause a subsequent relapse.

Finally, an article in Sunday's Washington Post by Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at MIT, points out that the withholding change adds to the last half of this calendar year some of the spending power that people would otherwise have had 6 months after next November's elections. Professor Samuelson points out:

It will take a burst of private consumption and investment spending next year to offset the destabilizing effect of the withholding tax change.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent I place the three articles to which I refer in the RECORD.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 26, 1964]

RISKS IN THE ECONOMY

President Johnson's election-year budget manages to contain something for everybody; tax cuts for consumers and businessmen, lower spending for conservatives, an antipoverty program for liberals. In his anxiety to fashion a package that could gain quick acceptance and enable the economy to scale new peaks, the President is taking a big gamble. He sacrifices moderation and runs the risk of destabilization that is associated with lofty heights.

There is no immediate threat of a fall. With the pace of business activity quickening, the one big danger lies in rushing ahead too fast. Mr. Johnson proposes tax cuts for 1964 that are the biggest single reduction in history. His economic projections assume that this immoderate dose can only benefit the economy. Without it he warns of a recession; with it he sees the upsurge reaching new high ground but still a long way from real trouble.

Presidents have been all too fallible as economic prophets. The rise in business activity last year, for example, exceeded the upper limits of the forecast made by the White House, which had anticipated a tax cut in its projection. Mr. Johnson gives himself an even wider margin for error, but his range of predictions fails to take into account that the tax cuts could produce inflationary pressures and other excesses.

The President counseled against unwarranted wage or price increases. But there is a definite conflict between his plan to relax the tax brake holding down the private sector and his desire for restraint. Mr. Johnson appears to have ruled out the use of a more restrictive monetary policy unless the situation is clearly out of hand; similarly, he is unlikely to resort to the tactics used by his predecessor in dealing with the steel industry in 1962, which proved so unsettling. So if the altitude provokes dizziness, the administration is without a safety belt.

The economy may somehow sit through 1964 unscathed, but then the budget calls for a rapid withdrawal of stimulants. The expansionary impact of tax reductions will be fading just when spending is scheduled to be cut back. If that happened when the economy needed a second wind, it could result in a long, hard drop.

Aggressive risks are called for when the economy is in the throes of a recession or if it is afflicted with serious imbalance. Neither situation applies today. The climb toward new noninflationary peaks demands prudence, and good timing in reducing spending and taxes alike.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1964]

INVESTMENT VIEW—TOO MUCH TAX CUT MIGHT BE HARMFUL

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, January 26.—The rise in stock prices in the past 4 or 5 months has just about paralleled the rise in estimates of business activity and corporate earnings for the ensuing 6 to 9 months. However, the judgments reflected by the market probably do not include the effects of the Senate Finance Committee's changes in the tax reduction legislation.

The House version of this tax legislation would reduce the withholding rate on personal income from 18 to 15 percent. The Senate version reduces it another point to 14 percent. The effect of this single point change would increase the annual rate of personal income after taxes as extra $2.4 billion on top of the earlier indicated approximately $6 billion.

Under the House version it had been anticipated that personal income after taxes would increase by about 1.6 percent as a result of the tax reduction. If the Senate version prevails the overnight increase in take-home pay would be about 2.1 percent. In effect, we would be anticipating immediately upon the determined effective date, say March 1, almost all of the rise in personal purchasing power that was to have become effective in two steps, i.e., two-thirds of the total tax reduction effective January 1, 1964, and the remaining one-third effective January 1, 1965.

Meanwhile, it seems unlikely that the contemplated reduction in Government expenditures will become effective for the balance of the current fiscal year ending June 30. Between now and that date, therefore, the economy will be feeling the effects not only of the continued high Government expenditures but also a greater increase in personal purchasing power than was indicated only a couple of weeks ago—assuming that the House and the Senate agree upon the Senate Finance Committee's version of the withholding tax rate.

On this assumption, the optimistic estimates of 1964 business activity, employment and corporate earnings that had been projected by this column are probably going to be too low. Under these circumstances there would be greater pressures for higher costs and prices because the demand for goods and services would then be squeezing against the human and physical capacities to produce and distribute goods and services. With these manifestations of inflation pressures present, the monetary authorities would certainly be derelict in their duty if they did not tighten credit policies in an effort to maintain a sound but more moderate rate of expansion.

Again assuming that the lower withholding rate for personal taxes becomes the law within the next few weeks, we will already have spent much of the additional stimulation to personal purchasing that had been indicated for 1965. When we get into the spring of that year, people who underaccumulate their tax liabilities by reason of the lower withholding tax rate would then have to pay up the difference to the Government. And people who characteristically overaccumulated their tax liabilities and get a refund in the following year, would get less refund from the Government. At about the same time the economy would be feeling the effects of the contemplated reduction in Government expenditures.

The degree of adverse impact on business activity would be influenced by the degree of maladjustment that had been encouraged in 1964, i.e., the rate of inventory accumulation, the degree of excessive debt expansion, the amount of overbuying in anticipation of higher prices, and the possible contraction of profit margins as payroll costs might rise in excess of sales growth.

In my judgment it would be a mistake to reduce the withholding tax rate by the additional 1 percentage point so that the personal sector would be encouraged to spend this year that part of the lower tax rate that doesn't become applicable until next year. I don't believe that the economy needs that extra stimulation to accelerate the growth trends to a level that will absorb the working force and reduce the present rate of unemployment. The extra shot in the arm might be a little bit too strong for the patient and cause a subsequent relapse.

If the Senate Finance Committee's version of the tax reduction legislation becomes law—especially the lower rate of withholding from current payrolls—the excellent upward trends in business activity, employment, and earnings that had been expected for this year will probably be even sharper, with more danger that inflation pressures will be created. Such a pattern would arouse more concern about the 1965 prospects than has been justified by the economic fundamentals up to this point.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1964]

L.B.J. UNDER SCRUTINY OF THE HIGH ROAD

(By Paul A. Samuelson)

President Johnson has emphasized in word and deed his determination to continue the policies of President Kennedy. But as time passes, it will become harder and harder to know what adherence to that goal means; and, in consequence, it will become harder to identify divergences from the Kennedy programs.

This is inevitable, for President Kennedy could not himself know what his own economic policies would be 6 months later.

Still, it is inevitable that we should scrutinize each act of President Johnson to see whether it is along the main road of the New Frontier or represents a striking out in novel directions. I believe that 1964 has brought one definite departure from the Kennedy high road.

President Johnson has proposed a cutback in the total of Government spending. His proposal to stay below fiscal 1964's $98 billion came as a surprise to everybody.

President Johnson has also promised to cut the fiscal 1965 budget deficit in half. In itself, it does not differ from the Kennedy fiscal style, for the late President regarded deficits as an evil—albeit a necessary evil when American growth lagged badly enough to produce high unemployed.

Without passing judgment of approval or disapproval, how must we appraise the economics of an expenditure reduction?

Taken for itself and not as part of some package, a cut of $2 billion in public spending must be expected to result in about twice that much loss in fiscal 1965's gross national product.

This can be translated into a failure of almost half a million new jobs to develop, which means that the percentage of the labor force unemployed a year from now might be something like 5¼ percent rather than 5 percent.

It entails a drop in total taxable profit, compared to the heights it would otherwise have reached, of perhaps a billion dollars.

I hope not to be misunderstood.

The 1964 reduction in taxes will so outweigh the reduction in expenditure as virtually to guarantee that the expansion will continue to election day and beyond, making the recovery since February 1961 one of the longest in our peacetime history.

If expenditure had to be cut in some year, 1964 is the time when the economy is least likely to be sent into a recession. (Frugality next year will not come so cheap in terms of human prosperity.)

Actually, there is another surprise in the Johnson budget. Along with the drop in expenditure, the President has proposed an immediate drop in withholding tax rates to 14 percent rather than the 15 percent the House bill had proposed. This will add to people's calendar 1964 after-tax income more than the expenditure cut will take away from them in 1964 itself. No wonder then that, after reading the new budget, I stepped upward rather than downward my estimates for this calendar year.

Here is a pretty paradox. How can frugality end in enhanced billions of spending? Very easily.

(1) Kennedy's last budget (fiscal 1964) has its deficit increased by the lowering of withholding rates in the first half of this year.

(2) This same withholding change adds to the last half of this calendar year some of the spending power that people would otherwise have had 6 months after next November's election. Unless the winning candidate prevails on the citizenry to accept the sacrifice of a still further tax cut after 1964, or spends elsewhere the efficiency savings from the defense program, it will take a burst of private consumption and investment spending next year to offset the destabilizing effect of the withholding tax change.

Turning finally to the more controversial field of policy, what advice should we have to give the President if he said, "Come let us reason together about desirable public expenditure policy." I suggest at least the following.

(1) Never confuse "frugality" with "efficiency" in Government. Nobody wants a uranium make-work program. There is no economic need to keep high-cost shipyards open in Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco; or waste money on supersonic airplane development of little security worth or civilian commercial promise. Every hundred million dollars that McNamara and his Whiz-kids can save without impairing security is that much to the good.

Reducing inefficiency of Government expenditure has nothing directly to do with reducing the scope of desirable sound expenditure on security; on education and welfare; on water, air, and urban problems. President Johnson's attack on poverty is a welcome departure from the wrong kind of frugality in Government.

(2) And when the American people reason together on true fiscal prudence, we must be sure to remember this:

The reductions in cost of defense and space that lessened cold war tension may permit should not be wasted on unemployment and excess capacity. Just as part of the resources released should be devoted by the electorate to satisfy the social needs they consider pressing, the remaining part must be permitted to go into family consumption and new capital formation by planning a mix of budget deficits and easy money sufficiently expansionary to prevent development of a deflationary gap.

As Pascal failed to say, Reason has reasons that fiscal orthodoxy will never know.

President Johnson's Budget of Economy and Progress Reflects Faith in the Nation's Growing Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean, a great newspaper of my State, has commended editorially President Johnson's budget message to the Congress, calling the President's

"budget of economy and progress," a budget which reflects faith in our growing economy.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

JOHNSON BUDGET REFLECTS FAITH IN GROWING ECONOMY

President Johnson has submitted his 1965 budget of economy and progress to the Congress as the second budget in 9 years to call for reduction in Federal expenditures.

These expenditures are estimated at $97.9 billion—$900 million less than was requested in the budget last year, and $500 million less than Mr. Johnson expects will be spent in fiscal 1964. He saw a deficit of $4.9 billion—$5.1 billion below the currently estimated figure.

The President said that an austere budget should not be a standstill budget. While he called for substantial reductions in spending, he also noted that it provides for a secure defense, development of natural resources and human resources. Mr. Johnson called for the initiation of a "new and major effort to break the vicious circle of chronic poverty * * *"

Regardless of some critics' gloomy forecasts, there is no reason to doubt that with wise administrative leadership the country can move and spending can be trimmed.

President Johnson underscored two major points: his pledge to economize and the fact the Government is able to carry out its responsibilities for less than $100 billion a year.

The budget gives great impetus to a tax cut now pending in Congress. In fact, President Johnson has come close to suggesting that a future balanced budget may be contingent on the tax cut. On expected Federal income the President was somewhat conservative. He said Government receipts are expected to increase to $93 billion, $4.6 billion over 1964—and noted this takes into account estimated revenue losses from new tax rates.

Nevertheless, the business outlook is favorable. The pledge to reduce Government spending plus prospects of the tax cut almost certainly will give business a psychological boost. The gross national product has already gone over $600 billion. Expectations are for a gross national product increasing by some $40 billion more.

Mr. Johnson said new programs and necessary increases in old ones, can be financed out of savings made possible by strict economy and exhaustive screening of procedures.

The budget has gone another step in setting the tone of the Johnson administration. The country wants frugality in Government spending and it was the Chief Executive's pledge. It wants war on poverty and unemployment and it is going to get that. It wants prosperity, and this Mr. Johnson is confident the Nation will have. The instrument by which he expects to accomplish these things is the economy, which he feels can sustain a much larger growth.

President Johnson has tremendous faith in the vitality and potential of the economy and his budget is another step in trying to translate the faith into solid results.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently a Montana woman wrote me concerning what she called John Birch smear tactics in Montana. She enclosed with her letter two newspaper clippings which reported that a Montana Farm Bureau Federation official was attacking the pending civil rights measure.

I asked the Department of Justice to comment upon this concerned citizen's letter and the newspaper clippings she had enclosed. I received a reply early this month.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two newspaper clippings, one from the October 21, 1963, Missoulian, and one from the October 21, 1963, Daily Ravalli Republican, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD to be followed by the reply from the Justice Department, Civil Rights Division, Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, which I received concerning them.

There being no objection, the two newspaper articles and the Justice Department letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missoulian (Montana) Oct. 21, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL CRITICIZED

HAMILTON.—Keith Williams, Bozeman, secretary of the Montana Farm Bureau Federation, spoke at the meeting of the Ravalli County Farm Bureau last week in the armory.

Williams talked on farm bureau activities and explained the new milk inspection rules and the need to be well informed on current issues.

He discussed the civil rights bill now proposed in Congress and read excerpts from a letter to him from John C. Satterfield, a past president of the American Bar Association.

"Do you know that under the proposed civil rights legislation Federal inspectors will determine who farmers hire, fire, become members of farm organizations, and how they may be served by the organization, to whom and what manner farm organizations will sell the products of their members for which they manufacture or purchase?" the letter said.

"Do you realize that under this legislation every agricultural producer, every man who raises livestock, every farmer who owns his farm, in short, every member of every farmer organization in the United States will be forced to follow the dictates of Federal personnel concerning who they choose as tenants, who drives their tractors, who dusts their crops, who gathers their wheat, to whom they sell or lease their farm if this legislation, H.R. 7152 and S. 1731, pending in Congress is enacted? It would have a devastating effect at least 100 times greater than the wheat control," the letter said.

Officers for the year were elected as follows: William A. Wetzsteon, Sula, president, Marion Gregg, Corvallis, vice president, and Ed Hill, Corvallis, secretary-treasurer; board of directors: Clifford Wallace, Stevensville, Einer Kalberg, Corvallis, and Burns Finlayson, Darby.

Policies to be presented at the State convention in Missoula November 19–22 were discussed.

Delegates named to attend the convention are Einer Kalberg, Fred Wetzsteon and Fay Burrell, and alternates are Mrs. Harry Twogood, Marion Gregg, and Mrs. Einer Kalberg.

[From the Hamilton (Mont.) Daily Ravalli Republican, Oct. 21, 1963]

WORSE THAN WHEAT CONTROLS?—FARM BUREAU OFFICIAL ATTACKS PENDING CIVIL RIGHTS MEASURE

Keith Williams of Bozeman, secretary of the Montana Farm Bureau Federation, spoke at the meeting of the Ravalli County Farm Bureau Thursday evening in the Hamilton Armory building.

Williams talked on farm bureau activities and explained the reasons for the new milk inspection rules and the need to be well informed on current issues.

He then discussed the civil rights bill now proposed in Congress and read excerpts from a letter from John C. Satterfield, a past president of the American Bar Association.

In strong language, the letter outlined Satterfield's belief that civil rights legislation would lead to Federal interference in farm hiring, membership in farm organizations, and farm products marketing.

"It would have a devastating effect 100 times greater than the wheat control," the writer said.

New officers for the year were elected as follows: William A. Wetzsteon, Sula, president, Marion Gregg, Corvallis, vice president, and Ed Hill, Corvallis, secretary and treasurer; board of directors: Clifford Wallace, Stevensville, Einer Kalberg, Corvallis, and Burns Finlayson, Darby.

Policies to be presented at the State convention in Missoula November 19–22 were discussed.

Delegates named to attend the convention are Einer Kalberg, Fred Wetzsteon and Fay Burrell, and alternates are Mrs. Harry Twogood, Marion Gregg, and Mrs. Einer Kalberg.

A membership drive is being conducted in the county and Keith Williams, Norman Downing of Dillon, and Pat McDonald of Philipsburg helped the membership committee members, Max Henault, Ray Grube, Fay Burrell, and Vern Stephens in contacting farm people.

JANUARY 8, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in reply to your letter of October 26, 1963, enclosing a letter from Mrs. Shirley R. Bishop, of Victor, Mont. Mrs. Bishop desired an answer to certain charges about the pending civil rights bill appearing in enclosed newspaper clippings.

Both of the enclosed clippings repeat charges made by John C. Satterfield. The true effect of the civil rights bill is quite different from this distorted interpretation.

Title VII of H.R. 7152, as reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, prohibits employment discrimination by farmers who during the first year after the bill is enacted employ 100 or more persons; during the second year, 50 or more persons; and after that, 25 or more persons. In short, the bill would affect only large-scale farmers. The bill will not, however, affect any farmer's right to choose his employees. It will forbid hiring decisions which are based upon race, color, religion or national origin. A farmer is therefore free to select employees on any other basis whatsoever.

Moreover, there is nothing in this bill which would affect how farmers "may be served by [a farm] organization [,] to whom and what manner farm organizations will sell the products of their members," etc., as charged in the clipping.

What the bill prohibits is clearly spelled out in section 704(a) (1) and (2), as follows:

"It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

"(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges or employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion or national origin; or

"(2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employ-

ment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin."

It is also not true that the bill would affect the sale or rent of farms; it plainly would not.

Sincerely,

BURKE MARSHALL,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

Using the Military To Force Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall, I am sure, the debate held last year here in the House in which Member after Member rose to denounce the use of our military forces to force integration on the civilian sector. A news blackout prevented the Nation from learning of the discussion which took place for almost 6 hours on the floor and so, the word is slow in reaching the people, but it will not be kept from them no matter how hard the liberal press and television try to suppress it.

Several months after that debate, the news that the Gesell report, which was ordered into effect without any consultation with the Congress, contained the authority to use the armed services of this country to carry out the political motivations of the race-mixers by forcing integration outside Military Establishments, came to the attention of the editor of the Las Vegas (Nev.) Review Journal. In an editorial, he helped tell the truth to his readers and it is a summation well worth the attention of all Members. I insert it herewith for their serious study:

A SERIOUS MISTAKE

The word that Nellis Air Force Base's famed Thunderbirds—the world's only supersonic precision flying team—will be barred from participating in public events where racial discrimination is practiced makes it clear that the Kennedy administration is intent upon utilizing the military as an instrument of its civil rights policy.

The Pentagon has decreed that the Thunderbirds will not be allowed to perform for any crowd seated on a segregated basis.

At the heart of this ruling may very well be the controversial Gesel committee report on how the military should be used in fighting segregation.

This is the report that recommends that military base commanders should use the fullest possible persuasion to eliminate practices of segregation against military personnel in off-base communities.

It states further, that in areas where persuasion fails, public facilities which practice segregation should be declared "off limits."

The Gesel report also urged that military units not be allowed to participate in off-base activities where there is discrimination. This would include service teams playing against segregated teams or units such as the Thunderbirds demonstrating their skills before segregated crowds.

Interestingly enough, this special report to the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara recommends that local base commanders should appoint biracial committees of off-base and community representatives and should lead in efforts to have local communities end segregation where it affects service personnel.

Still a matter of dispute—and one of great concern to military officers—is whether their actions on the integration front will be made a part of their efficiency reports, and thus be a factor in the promotional system.

The Defense Department has said no, but added that when a commander does a particularly outstanding job in the field of equal rights it will be noted.

The most controversial point is the authority to make off limits those establishments in any off-base community which discriminate against Negro servicemen. The Gesel committee recommends using this sanction, whereas McNamara, in a previous memorandum to the President, said he hoped the use of the off-limits sanction wouldn't be necessary anywhere, but he though it should be available.

Our own view is that there is a fine line of individual rights here wherein the military, if it should carry out an off-limits ban because of segregation, may very well be guilty of violating the civil rights of all servicemen.

This means that the military is being given the right to enforce a possible economic hardship on segregated establishments which, no matter how much we may disagree with them, operate according to the social code of a large segment of our society.

Support as we have the Kennedy administration's efforts in the field of equal rights, we believe a serious mistake has been made by injecting the military into this complex social issue in an effort to influence local conditions.

The off-limits ban would make it possible for the military to violate the civil rights of white servicemen in the same manner it is deploring discrimination against Negroes, and also give it the power of economic reprisal against those business establishments which held different social viewpoints than the national administration. We think that is treading on dangerous ground.

North Dakota Newspaper Defends Rural Areas Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the positive good that has resulted from the first rural areas development loan in the Nation was described in an editorial in the January 11 edition of the Mandan (N. Dak.) Pioneer.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIDING OUR OWN

It wasn't brought out in the interminable debate over foreign aid appropriations in the first session of this Congress, but it is hoped that there is some sentiment among the learned lawmakers for implementing a policy of equal treatment for Americans.

Making sharp reductions of the foreign aid amounts asked by both Presidents Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, it is reasonable to expect that Congress will turn its attention to some much needed and long neglected aid for our own economy.

According to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, the Johnson administration will soon announce new and enlarged programs to combat rural proverty. The program, the Cabinet member has said, will be aimed at rural renewal, better rural housing, improved water systems, and other community facilities. The efforts will be channeled toward bringing rural America into the mainstream of American prosperity.

The mechanics for such a program already exist in the law, through rural areas redevelopment administration legislation. These programs were well intentioned, but too often got sidetracked by the hysterical criticism of the political far right which called them giveaways.

North Dakota has been the beneficiary of a few of these loans, but too few. This is the kind of State, with its overabundance of agricultural production, and its seasonal unemployment, which can best utilize Government loans to help promote local industry for both income and employment replacement.

One such loan in North Dakota, channeled through a rural electric cooperative at Velva, N. Dak., was singled out for sharp criticism in a recent Reader's Digest magazine.

This was the first rural areas development loan in the Nation. It was for $25,000, made through the Rural Electrification Administration, to a small gravel company which wanted to expand into a gravel washing and grading operation, and to get into the ready-mix concrete business. The loan constituted absolutely no risk to the Government because it was guaranteed by the cooperative.

The company owner could not obtain the credit he needed from local lending institutions and there his ambition and his foresightedness was halted. But he was able to obtain the money through a Federal source.

In less than 2 years, the man has established a thriving, successful business in this small North Dakota city. He has a peak payroll of 27 people, and a yearly payroll of $100,000. He is repaying his loan, with interest, and, ironically, can now obtain all the financing he needs.

Can anyone suggest better use of funds which have been appropriated by the Congress?

Yet, loans of this nature are being stymied all over the Nation by a wave of criticism which suggests something un-American is involved.

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Banking Committe, in defense of RAD, ARA, and what are known as section 5 loans in the REA program, recently told his fellow Congressmen that "just about everybody gets foreign aid except some Communists and all Americans."

He concluded that loans are being made to most of the nations of the world by agencies financed almost wholly by the United States and that Americans deserve equal treatment.

We agree completely and hope that Congress develops the courage to put into practice what it so wisely has put into theory.

Ed Murrow's Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star on January 26, 1964:

ED MURROW'S SUCCESSOR

It is too bad that Edward R. Murrow has resigned as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. This is an important post. If its job is to be done successfully, the man at the top must be endowed with tact, wisdom and good judgment. If he lacks these qualities the story of the United States will suffer in the telling.

Ed Murrow had the requisite qualities. Unfortunately, he must now step aside so as to rest and recuperate from his lung cancer operation.

As Mr. Murrow's replacement, President Johnson has picked Carl T. Rowan, a Negro, who has served as Ambassador to Finland and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. We are not at all sure that Mr. Rowan, despite his many talents, is qualified for the job.

In December 1961, he prepared a brash speech for delivery to a Philadelphia audience. In that speech, as released for publication, he paid his respects to Americans who did not agree with our official Congo policy. In this country, he said, "we have a conglomeration of archconservatives: People who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation; opponents of fluoridation; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation," and so on. The inference, we suppose, is that if you were for Moise Tshombe you were against fluoridation, or against the court. It has been said that the speech was toned down before delivery. But as written, it reflected something less than good judgment.

On January 29, 1963, the Saturday Evening Post published an article by Mr. Rowan. In our opinion, it was notable chiefly for extravagance and intemperance. This is a sample: "I am inclined to think that in our affluent society a rash of phonies and sharpies on school boards and city councils is a far more dangerous symptom of social illness than large numbers of people who openly resist the court ruling out of ignorance, time-encrusted fear or admitted bigotry." Or this: "Only dishonorable intent, a sleazy contempt for law and a disregard for justice permit a community to use a 'pupil-placement' law to put two Negroes in a white school and thus cloak policies that cheat 20,000 other colored kids."

Our doubts about Mr. Rowan's qualifications for his new post are not rooted in any thought that he should not hold his own opinions. He has every right to think as he wants to think, and to speak as he wants to speak. He does not sound to us, however, like a man who can be depended on to tell the American story to its best advantage in these complex and difficult days. Mr. Murrow deserves a surer successor.

Maryland Gets New Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like to insert into the RECORD an article by Don Otenasek, entitled "Maryland Gets New Industries," which appeared in the December 29, 1963, edition of the Baltimore Sunday American.

Maryland industry has been growing quite rapidly approaching a rate of one new manufacturing plant every other working day. The nature of these plants varies from box factories to Chinese food plants. This is an indication of strength and diversity of the Maryland economy.

The article follows:

MARYLAND GETS NEW INDUSTRIES

(By Don Otenasek)

The State's natural resources, plus the byproducts and semifinished materials produced in long established Maryland mills and factories, are attracting satellite plants to the port of Baltimore and other industrial complexes across the State.

George W. Hubley, Jr., director of the Maryland Department of Economic Development, says that current industrial expansion in Maryland is approaching a rate of one new manufacturing plant every other working day.

Sher-wood Products, Inc., is building a plant near Oakland which will use waste from the hardwood products industry to manufacture bowling pins by a newly patented process in a $350,000 facility.

At Luke, the Cumberland Charcoal Co. is building a $750,000 plant to process charcoal from the bark removed from cordwood at the nearby mill of West Virginia Pulp & Paper.

Sylvania Manufacturing Co. is building a factory in Oakland to manufacture hardwood products.

The building industry is taking advantage of valuable deposits of sandstone, limestone, and shale. Pittsburgh Plate Glass is building a multimillion dollar flat-glass plant next to its Cumberland facility.

In Woodsboro, Frederick County, Lehigh Portland Cement is building a plant to take advantage of vast shale deposits.

Solite Corp. will manufacture a lightweight aggregate from slate quarried on its land near Whiteford in Harford County.

In Caroline County, the Caroline Supply Co. is manufacturing fertilizers in its Preston plant using limestone as one of the ingredients.

Products and byproducts of cement are attracting satellite industries for the manufacture of products containing cement.

For example, Concrete Structures, Inc., of Richmond, Va., is building in Anne Arundel County a plant for the production of prestressed concrete structural units.

Poultry products and vegetables of the Eastern Shore will go into the manufacture of products of the new $700,000 factory of the Chun King Corp.

Sterling Processing Corp. is enlarging its Oakland poultry processing plant while Smith Kline & French Laboratories and Truslow Farms, Inc., are jointly building a research lab at Kingston using Maryland poultry.

The State's dairy products will be processed in the new $700,000 plant of Sealtest Foods in Baltimore. They will also be used by the new facilities of Infant Formula Service and Meadow-Gold Ice Cream Co., of Baltimore.

The $1,500,000 plant of Recipe Foods, Inc., in Rosedale, will process eggs and orchard products.

Another natural resource, Chesapeake Bay clams, are to be processed in a $330,000 factory of the Chesapeake Clamchip Corp. at Cambridge and the Tidewater Clam Co. has built a packing plant in McDaniel.

Tomatoes from the Eastern Shore will be processed in a new packinghouse of the Firehouse Foods Division of Arnold Bakers, Inc.

Schluderberg-Kurdle's $1 million packing plant will process beef and pork from Maryland farms.

The State's box industry is also developing rapidly.

Connelly Containers, Inc., is building a container factory at Cambridge for $1.5 million. Other companies expanding in this field are Baltimore Box Co., Crisfield; Albemarle Container Corp., Odenton; Maryland Paper Box Co. and Corning Fibre Box Co., both of Frederick and Delmarva Containers, Inc., of Salisbury.

Another Maryland natural resource—peat moss—is being dredged, processed, and marketed by Garrett County Processing & Packing Corp.

Let the People Decide What Law They Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the January 21 edition of the Florida Times-Union contains the following very thoughtful and true editorial, which points up the fact that constitutional amendments should be used to change the Constitution when a change is actually being made in that document. I share with that excellent publication the feeling that devices of passing unconstitutional statutes and having them approved by the Supreme Court as "consistent with changed circumstances" repudiates every sound principle of constitutional government and basic concepts of contractual relationships between States and persons. If the present trend of disregarding the U.S. Constitution continues, there will be no protection in the future against the tyranny of those who have the power in the Supreme Court to distort and repudiate the Constitution. These people are not elected to office and are not subject to any popular selection. Tyranny in their hands would be as dangerous a thing as I can imagine in our governmental framework. Most tyrants in history have condoned their flaunting of the wishes of the public on the theory that they were doing what was morally right. The truth is that the public is a much better guardian of morals than is any small group of politically powerful public servants. The editorial reads as follows:

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE WHAT LAW THEY WANT

The favorable reception being given by the various State legislatures to the proposed antipoll tax amendment is a good argument to use against those persons who say that political and social reforms must be made by the Central Government.

Specifically the amendment takes from any State the right to charge a fee to any citizen before allowing him to vote in any Federal election.

But the widespread acceptance of the proposed change shows that the members of the several legislatures are quite capable of deciding for themselves what is and what is not good for the Nation and their State without being forced into action by Executive order or judicial fiat.

The amendment process is the surest way of determining the will of the people on any touchy or controversial subject. It also provides broadly based support for any actions taken as a result of the amendment's submission to the people while at the same

time preserving the system of checks and balances within our Government.

Many reforms for social and political life in our Nation have been proposed and opposed within the past dozen years. Perhaps their submission to the people as an amendment would show what is really desired.

Number of Charity Cases Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it seems that all the results of the spread of health insurance have not, contrary to expectations, been good ones. The December 27, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal contains a report that the increased ability of the American people to afford health care has led to a rise in the number of people receiving private care and a decline in the number receiving free public care. Regardless of whether this is an ennobling consequence, it seems to have created a rather serious lack of charity patients who have traditionally been the main source of training cases for young doctors. Indeed, some teaching hospitals now have to recruit charity patients in order to adequately train their students. One never knows the latent functions which are possible in every social development.

Certainly these developments should cause some of the zealots who are depicting the plight of our older people as one that is deteriorating, to take heed and see that what is really happening under our nose is that the older people in our society are continuing to improve their financial status and at a rate of improvement greater than that of other age groups in our society.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 12, 1963]

PATIENT PINCH: CHARITY CASE DECLINE POSES MAJOR PROBLEMS IN EDUCATING DOCTORS—SPREAD OF HEALTH INSURANCE SPURS PRIVATE CARE, CURBS FREE CASES FOR TEACHING—SHARING OF PATIENTS GROWS

(By Richard D. James)

The charity patient, long a familiar sight in crowded U.S. hospital wards, is rapidly becoming a vanishing American.

Paradoxically, the growing shortage of charity patients poses a serious problem. While hospital administrators are delighted that more patients now can pay their bills, medical educators worry that the empty charity wards are hampering instruction of interns and resident physicians.

The number of hospital patients receiving some free care totals no more than 1 in 5 patients this year, or about 5.3 million Americans, according to the U.S. Public Health Service. This continues a steady decline in charity cases over the past two decades, attributable largely to the rise in health insurance coverage. As recently as 1958, 1 out of every 3 U.S. patients, or 7.1 million people, received some free care, the Health Information Foundation of the University of Chicago estimates.

RECRUITING A PATIENT

Concern over declining charity cases was evident recently when a penniless, itinerant farm worker, shot in a barroom brawl in Sikeston, Mo., was taken 140 miles to Jewish Hospital in St. Louis. He's 1 of about 300 charity cases this year which have been "recruited" by the hospital from doctors as far away as 200 miles.

A sampling of hospitals from coast to coast points up the magnitude of the decline in charity patients. At Los Angeles Children's Hospital, one-third of all cases in 1962 received free care, down from about one-half in 1955 and 78 percent in 1940. New York's Montefiore Hospital reports that free patients last year dropped to a fourth of all cases, down from about one-half in 1947. At Jewish Hospital in St. Louis, charity patients are only 13 percent of total cases, down from 30 percent a decade ago.

The need for indigent patients arises because they are the best means by which a hospital is able to provide on-the-job training for its residents and interns. Paying patients, including those covered by health insurance, normally have their own private doctor. Residents and interns can provide some care for private patients, but charity cases traditionally have been the way that doctors in training gain invaluable experience by taking full charge.

"Inevitably, in using private patients (for teaching), the patient's own physician must have full authority," notes Dr. Thomas B. Turner, dean of Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. "Therefore, the resident can't have the full responsibility which he needs in his training."

MORE DOCTORS IN TRAINING

While charity patients are dwindling, the number of residents and interns is growing. The total rose to 38,044 last year from 26,894 a decade ago. Most doctors graduating from a medical school serve a year's internship at a hospital before going into private practice. For those who want to specialize, such as surgeons, up to 7 additional years of hospital residency are required, under supervision of qualified physicians.

Not all the Nation's hospitals, of course, are teaching hospitals. About 22 percent of the 7,028 U.S. hospitals train residents and interns. But these hospitals account for half of all general hospital beds and they're usually the largest and best equipped in a community.

To fill the need for patients for teaching purposes, hospitals are turning to a variety of programs. In Chicago, about 23 voluntary nonprofit hospitals are working out an agreement with Cook County Hospital involving expectant mothers.

The plan at present is for Cook County Hospital to share 5,000 of its 19,000 annual deliveries of welfare cases with these hospitals. The hospitals would be reimbursed from State welfare funds for the deliveries and the patients would provide added teaching experience for interns and residents, as well as ease the overload of obstetrical cases at Cook County, says Howard Cook, executive director of the Chicago Hospital Council.

NEW YORK AGREEMENT

New York's Montefiore Hospital agreed in July 1962 to provide care for patients at Morrisania City Hospital. All of Montefiore's 160 residents now work at the city hospital during part of their training, giving Montefiore nearly 460 additional charity beds for its doctors. "This is a rich source of teaching material," notes Dr. Martin Cherkasky, director of Montefiore. The city pays Montefiore $2.7 million a year for services of the hospital's residents.

Still other hospitals affiliate with outpatient clinics in their search for charity cases. St. Joseph's Hospital in Houston began sending its 16 residents to San Jose Clinic a year ago. The clinic is operated for indigent persons by the United Fund and a local Roman Catholic diocese. Patients needing hospital treatment are referred to St. Joseph's. "We try to provide 200 major charity cases a year for our senior resident in surgery," says Robert E. DeBacker, assistant hospital administrator. "Last year (ending June 30) we had only 140, but with the clinic affiliation we'll get at least 200 this year and maybe more."

Other hospitals are attempting to use private patients for training. Hartford (Conn.) Hospital has succeeded in convincing many private patients and surgeons to allow residents to perform operations.

"A patient's private surgeon always is scrubbed and present for an operation," notes Dr. John C. Leonard, Hartford's medical education director. "But the private patient is told his doctor will be part of a team along with the residents and that the team will perform the operation. Depending on the case, the resident may perform all or part of the work." Despite a decline in ward cases, Hartford has succeeded in nearly tripling the number of "teaching beds" since 1950, Dr. Leonard says.

Not all hospitals have been as successful in increasing patients available for teaching. Albany (N.Y.) Medical Center Hospital for 3 years has attempted to persuade patients to allow residents to perform surgery. But only 45 operations have resulted from the program. "We'd like to have about 80 a year," says Dr. Thomas Hale. One problem at Albany and some other hospitals: If a patient's physician turns over a case to a resident surgeon, the fee, including insurance, may be paid in some cases to the hospital rather than the patient's doctor. Residents and interns receive salaries from the hospital and cannot charge fees for their work.

In at least one instance, unions are helping a hospital find patients for teaching purposes. St. Louis Jewish Hospital, besides scouting the countryside for charity cases, established a plan last January with locals of 5 hotel workers unions, covering 16,000 people. The hospital agreed to accept the union's limited health insurance as full payment for care, explains David A. Gee, acting hospital director. In return, the union agreed that most of its members would participate in the teaching program when hospitalized.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 each year is marked by many Members of Congress as the day on which to recall that 40 million people in the Ukraine are still held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

Forty-six years ago today the Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed despite the bitter opposition of the revolutionary government in Russia. The Republic was popularly constituted and had the backing of the great majority of the Ukrainian people. But fate and time dealt poorly with the Ukraine, despite every hope. It now languishes, suppressed and exploited, the major colony in the Soviet empire.

We should take this chance to emphasize to the world that the Ukraine was captured by the Communists against its will and is held by force. No country in the world ever received such treatment

from the United States or ever will. We are here to proclaim that the Ukraine has as much right to its freedom, and to a government of the people, as any other country. Every American looks forward to the day when communism is defeated in the Ukraine and democracy allowed to flourish.

Reds Guide British Guiana of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it has been pretty common knowledge that the Communists have made substantial inroads in British Guiana and that the freeing of that nation at this time would result in the Government being turned over to the Communists, particularly under the guidance of Cheddi Jagan.

It is well known that Mrs. Jagan is a Castro admirer and a frequent visitor to Red China and was an enthusiastic worker in behalf of the Communist cause in the United States before she renounced her citizenship.

It is not so well know, however, the extent to which the Communists have infiltrated the country and are concentrating on youth organizations, education, and government activities. This and other matters relating to the shakey future of British Guiana are reported factually by Charles Keely of the Copley News Service in three articles published on December 16, 1963, entitled "Reds Guide Guiana of Future," on December 18 entitled "Tension Takes Over," and on December 24 entitled "Guiana Politics a Mess."

I commend these articles to my colleagues as must reading for those who desire to have a clearer insight into the very serious threat offered by the Communists in British Guiana:

PAN AMERICAN REPORT: REDS GUIDE GUIANA OF FUTURE

(By Charles Keely)

GEORGETOWN, BRITISH GUIANA.—Cuban and United States Communists are guiding British Guiana toward independence under Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan.

They have been given key positions in the People's Progressive Party (PPP) government and could turn a well-trained Red machine over to Jagan once the British pull out at some indefinite date in a year or so.

Following traditional Communist patterns, the foreign Reds are concentrating on youth organization and education in this English-speaking enclave on South America's north coast.

Five U.S. "professors" make up most of the small faculty at Jagan's new University of Guyana. They include a former director of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, a New York City grammar school teacher, and a former Harvard University professor.

"They all have far-leftwing backgrounds," says U.S. Consul Everett Melby, "and at least a few are Communist Party members."

The power behind the colony's only institution of higher learning is Dr. Harold Drayton, a Guianese whom Melby calls "a longtime Communist." Another faculty member is Neville Dawes, a Jamaican and Oxford scholar who is a member of the Communist Party.

Informed officials believe Jagan's Chicago-born wife, Janet, recruited the U.S. teachers for the so-called workingman's university. A Castro admirer and frequent visitor to Red China, Mrs. Jagan was an enthusiastic worker on behalf of the Communist cause in the United States before she married and renounced her citizenship.

The University of Guyana is a night school for about 120 students. It meets in the Government's Queen's College, a boys' high school, from 6:30 to 10:30. The Marxist PPP has provided at least 20 scholarships, as has Jagan's Rice Marketing Board which controls the colony's trade, mostly with Cuba.

While Americans are tutoring the college-age youths, Cuban experts are turning the PPP's youth organization, the PYO, into an armed militia which it is feared could replace the British-trained police after independence.

Last July, Cuban pilots began technical work for the colony's Guyana Airways Corp. They have examined landing strips throughout the country. At least one Cuban operates the PPP's printing press, confiscated from the United States in Cuba, which turns out the party's Communist newspaper Thunder and other Red propaganda.

The PYO, however, is the organization most dangerous in the eyes of U.S. observers. It has an estimated membership of 6,000 and there are well-founded reports that the Cubans have trained PYO members in guerrilla tactics and the use of arms.

The PYO's leader is Moses Baghwan, a Jagan lieutenant, who, Melby says, is a Communist who has often visited Cuba. Castro has given at least 300 PYO members scholarships to study in Cuba.

Castro's leading agent in British Guiana at present is Clinton Lloyd Adlum, 26. The soft-spoken Cuban, of Jamaican heritage, has been in British Guiana for more than 5 months. Another Cuban, Francisco Valdez, 21, is a member of Castro's Young Communist League and has studied in Moscow.

The Cubans, whose work is often secret, live openly at the downtown Woodbine Hotel. The number of Cubans in the hotel varies from 20 to 2 or 3 at a time.

Castro's agents operate out of Freedom House, PPP headquarters in Georgetown. PPP floods the colony's rural areas with Communist literature printed in New York, Peiping, and Moscow.

BRITISH GUIANA REPORT: TENSION TAKES OVER

(By Charles Keely)

BUXTON, BRITISH GUIANA.—Church bells, conch shells, and DDT tell the grim tale of this explosive colony's headlong plunge toward becoming South America's first Red satellite.

The ringing of bells in this small rural village is a warning to its Negro inhabitants that they are under attack by East Indian farmers from neighboring Annandale.

And when the conch shell is blown in Annandale, its citizens take to the dirt streets to battle the Buxton invaders.

These alarms of war signal a bitter racist struggle which Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan hopes will soon yield a Communist victory on the South American continent.

For, if through violence, Jagan can successfully postpone new, British-imposed elections, Communist strategists predict the colony's so-called DDT population will again sweep him into office and independence with a commanding majority.

On October 31, the British turned down Jagan's plea for independence and instead called for elections based on a system of proportional representation. By this scheme, they hope a Negro-Portuguese coalition will topple Jagan's Marxist Peoples Progressive Party, PPP.

But thanks to the virtual elimination of malaria with DDT after World War II, Jagan's East Indian rural supporters are increasing daily at a 4-to-1 ratio over their opponents. The colony's population is expected to double by 1975. There are now an estimated 600,000 people here.

Politics in "BG," as it is called here, is summed up in one Indian word—Apaanjhat," or vote for your own kind. Jagan smells the short-term defeat he says the British plotted at United States insistence. So he has wrapped his Marxist slogans in an "Apaanjhat" banner to insure a long-term victory.

The British turned down Jagan's request for an 18-year-old voting age law last October. This would have given the PPP the overwhelming reinforcement of the DDT population which has swelled that age bracket.

But whether they vote now, or in 3 years at 21, Jagan seems confident of eventual victory.

"We have everything to gain by getting out as quickly as possible," British Colonial Secretary Duncan Sandys said recently. "But if we had launched British Guiana into independence with the present tension, stress and fear, the only certainly would have been chaos."

Fifteen hundred British soldiers are stationed throughout BG to guard against this chaos. Only their presence prevents the Annandales and Buxtons from exploding into a full-scale civil war.

Although East Indians make up about 47 percent of the colony's population, Jagan has steadily been losing votes to the Negro-oriented Peoples National Congress, PNC, and the Portuguese United Force (UF) Party.

With independence around the corner, informed observers believe he can regain this support only through promoting militant racism.

The U.S.-trained dentist, and his Chicago-born wife, Janet, are hard at work toward this goal since the recent British decision.

"They will push the British to the extreme of throwing them out of office to consolidate the Indians," says Hugh Cholmondeley, a PCN leader.

Ann Jardim, a United Force senator, says Jagan is preaching race hatred instead of socialism since Sandys postponed independence and called for new voting.

The Jagans do both. Standing under a banner of the hammer and sickle, Cheddi told a crowd, "We have to show them we are ready to fight." Janet tuned up the conch shell, adding, "If they don't give us what is ours we will take it."

The PCN tolled its bells. "If he wants a fight we won't take it lying down," Cholmondeley replied.

The mayor of the capital of Georgetown summed up: "Business is going to get better," Claude Merriman, who also is an undertaker, predicted wryly.

PAN AMERICAN REPORT: GUIANA POLITICS A MESS

(By Charles Keely)

GEORGETOWN, BRITISH GUIANA.—Politics in British Guiana is like its weather—hot and getting hotter.

One of the more spirited politicians is Sidney King. A self-taught intellectual, and a former Cabinet minister under pro-Communist Premier Cheddi Jagan, King could easily find a home with the Black Muslims in the United States.

He has become one of Jagan's most outspoken opponents, and his plan for "B.G.," as it is called, is simple:

"Partition it," he told me in the thatched-roof schoolroom where he teaches. "Give us

Africans half, give Jagan's East Indians half, and make Georgetown a free zone."

Racial bitterness between the colony's Negroes and Indians has become so acute, fanned by the fiery words of politicians, that British Colonial Secretary Duncan Sandys recently thought it worthwhile to visit King.

He went to the little school, about 9 miles from the capital, and asked King if he wouldn't walk with him to the "no man's border" of the neighboring East Indian village and shake hands with the town leader.

King did. But now he can't remember the Indian's name. "I haven't seen him again," he explains in his deceivingly soft voice.

Later, Sandys postponed B.G.'s independence. "Racialism is the curse of British Guiana today," he said. Sandys pointed out that it takes two British battalions to hold the races at arm's length.

The United States was pleased with Sandys' decision. It is felt independence under Jagan would result in another Soviet satellite in South America.

Before next August, when Sandys has called for new elections, the British hope new political parties, mainly East Indian defections from Jagan's People's Progressive Party (PPP), will spring up. An unholy alliance of the opposition People's National Congress (PNC), a Socialist African party, and the conservative Portuguese Party, the United Force (UF), hopes to unseat Jagan through a new proportional representation voting system.

All this may be wishful thinking. No popular Indian alternative to Jagan has stepped forward. There probably are none, except perhaps the colorless head of the civil service, Dr. Balwant Singh.

Jagan, meanwhile, increase his anti-Negro tirades.

"Violence further consolidates the races," explains Carl Blackman, an astute editor of the Daily Graphic.

The British have bought time. But is there enough?

Only Sidney King ventures an answer—partition.

Pass the Cooley Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the House passed cotton legislation that we know as the Cooley bill. We certainly hope that the other body will likewise pass this legislation to protect the cotton industry of this Nation.

There appeared an editorial in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, in which they heartily endorse the Cooley bill. The editorial is so outstanding I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

PASS THE COOLEY BILL

Ever since President Kennedy on September 6, 1962, directed that some single-price system be devised for cotton which would end the inequities between the prices paid by foreign mills and domestic mills, the cotton industry has been striving to reach a solution.

The export market for American cotton has been sustained by granting price concessions to foreign buyers in order to meet the competition of world prices. Domestic mills, on the other hand, have been required to pay the domestic price, which is the amount of the export subsidy, or 8.5 cents, higher than the world price.

This disparity in pricing, coupled with cheaper foreign labor, has permitted the foreign mills to sell yarns, textiles and textile products in the United States at prices cheaper than they can be produced in this country. These goods are not necessarily made from American cottons, but may have been manufactured from cottons from the Sudan, from Syria, from Brazil or Mexico.

Trade agreements have been ineffective in limiting the imports and the flow of cotton yarns and textiles has been at the rate of 600,000 bales of cotton equivalent a year recently—and growing.

The high domestic price also has encouraged the use of rayon and other fibers in place of cotton as a means of meeting the price competition. The result has been an upsurge in the use of manmade fibers, while cotton has lost ground in a booming textile industry.

There seems to be general agreement on the objective—the establishment of a single-price system under which foreign and domestic mills can buy cotton at prices that are competitive, not only with the cottons of each country, but with the rayons and other substitutes which are available worldwide.

The stumbling block has been the approach. Should the farmers have their income sustained by a loan level that is above the world price, with payments made to make their product competitive in all markets as it now is in world markets? Or should the support price be at the world price level and farm income be sustained by payments to the farmers themselves?

There are arguments for both approaches. They have been centered about two bills that have been offered to Congress. The Cooley bill, which has passed the House, employs the higher loan and authorizes that the payment be made to someone other than the grower. It calls for the farmer to share in the cost of protecting his marketing by reducing his price support in 1964 to 30 cents a pound, with a contemplated price of 29 cents in 1966.

The Talmadge bill, which employs low supports, direct payments to farmers, is in the Senate Agriculture Committee and will come up for discussion next week, along with the Cooley bill.

This matter of payment may well be the key to the success or failure of the legislation. It is a matter which affects the producer above all others. It is something which the producer should have the preference, if it is possible for him to have a choice.

With that in mind, the Commercial Appeal, on January 13, asked 60 cotton groups from California to the Carolinas to express the views of their membership. Two-thirds of them have replied. The answers have a broad enough base to give the views of the major farm organizations, such as the Farm Bureau and the National Grange, the cooperatives, and the independent cotton groups which represent a number of States or a part of single States.

Of those responding to the poll, only two expressed a desire for the world price support, compensation to farmers approach. The rest were unanimous for a basic loan which would support farm income. Most wanted payments to bring about a single price system, with the payments made to someone other than the farmer. There were some who were opposed to payments of any sort to make cotton competitive domestically, preferring to reach the single price system through gradual price support reductions.

There is merit, also, in the argument that payments should be made to the first buyer and thus encouraging a free market. The producer would be relieved of the payment plan and would get the money eventually in price paid by the merchant. On the whole, however, the producer appears to want a program which will make cotton competitive at home and abroad—immediately. He wants no part of payments directly to him.

With the overwhelming sentiment in favor of such an approach, passage of the Talmadge bill seems impossible.

The Cooley bill, on the other hand, provides the higher support levels, the one-price system, and payments to someone other than the farmer. It has been passed in the House with the support of the administration which told House Members that that was the bill it wanted.

There should be no quibbling over details in the Senate. The Cooley bill should be passed and cotton should be liberated from the artificial pricing chains that bind it. It contains the provisions of gradual price support reductions, which some of the farm groups want and it makes cotton competitive at once, not at some long distant date.

No one claims that the Cooley bill is perfect. But it achieves an objective that can liberate cotton. It should be passed—and expeditiously.

"Song for a Friend"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, November 22 was a day of infamy for all Americans when the assassin's bullet took the life of our beloved President. That night, deep in sorrow and confusion over the loss of such a great man, a young recording artist sat quietly in his room and drafted the lyrics of a song to show in his own way the depth of the tragedy he felt.

John Stewart, a member of the Kingston Trio, deserves our praise for giving his generation a "Song for a Friend," in memory of John F. Kennedy.

The lyrics are as follows:

SONG FOR A FRIEND

When you sit and wonder why things
Have gone so wrong,
And you wish someone would tell us
Where our friend has gone.

Look then to the hills when there's
Courage in the wind,
And in the face of freedom and those
Who looked to him.

And search within the heart of
Every young man with a song,
Then I think we'll know
Where our friend has gone.

Summer takes the winter as
The good years take the pain.
There will be laughter in the land again,
But hearts won't be the same.

And I know I'll remember when
A chill wind takes the sky,
And speak of years he gave us hope
For they will never die.

And as we gaze at brave young men
When yesterday's grow long,
Then I think we'll know just
Where our friend has gone.

When you sit and wonder why things
Have gone so wrong,
It's then that we'll remember
Where our friend has gone.

—JOHN STEWART.

American Bar Association Recommendations Regarding Issue of Determining Presidential Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Congress is being directed more and more to the need for clarification of section I, article 2 of our Constitution which becomes operative if the President should become critically ill or injured and unable to perform his complex and burdensome duties.

The current issue of the American Bar Association Journal includes an article which sets forth the view that upon taking office, the President should create a nine-man Commission selected from Members of the House, Senate, Supreme Court, and Cabinet that would act in case such a situation should arise.

I believe that this article is worthy of the consideration of the Constitutional Subcommittees of both Houses of Congress, the entire membership, and others and therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY: A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED NOW

(By Samuel H. Hofstadter, justice of the Supreme Court of New York; Jacob M. Dinnes of the New York bar, New York City)

For 175 years the American people have depended upon a benign providence to protect them from executive paralysis should a President suddenly become disabled and find himself unable to perform his complex duties. The Constitution fails to specify who shall certify when a Presidential inability begins, so that the Vice President may act in his place, or when the inability ends, so that the President may resume his responsibilities.

The application of the provision in the Constitution dealing with the death of a President was effectively resolved in 1841 when President William Henry Harrison died. Despite the view of many that the meaning of the Constitution was that in such an event the Vice President was to become Acting President until a new President was elected, Vice President Tyler took the oath and assumed the office of President—not its powers and duties alone. Having been recognized by Congress as de jure President, the practice was followed by seven other Vice Presidents who found themselves in a similar situation. Thus, it became "the supreme law of the land" by the custom of the Constitution, in Cardozo's phrase. The Constitution was as effectively amended—if amendment were needed—by custom as if a formal amendment had been adopted.

What is to happen, however, when a President does not die but becomes disabled, has not yet been definitively or authoritatively established. Does the Vice President become President, as in the case of death, or does he merely assume the duties of the Presidency during the Chief Executive's inability to function? How is inability determined? Who determines its onset and its end?

SUCCESSION CLAUSE IS DECEPTIVELY SIMPLE

Though deceptively simple, the succession clause—the fifth of section I of article II of the Constitution—offers no clue. It reads: "In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Do the words "the same" modify "the powers and duties of the said office" or do they modify only the words "the said office"? To put it differently, did the Founding Fathers have in mind that the Vice President take over "the powers and duties" or the "office" of President? Moreover, the word "inability" and the word "disability" do not necessarily mean the same thing. For a person may be disabled yet able to carry on his duties; and it is only in the case of presidential "inability" that the Vice President may take over. When is disability sufficiently extensive to make the President inable? Who shall decide? Death and resignation are finalities, but people often recover from even the most severe illness. And though inability may in fact exist, yet grave doubt of its being a fact may be engendered. If the Vice President replaces the President when he dies or resigns, why is this not true when the President is removed or becomes inable, since all contingencies affecting the Chief Executive were grouped together?

We cannot find the answers in the debates of the Constitutional Convention. In an interesting study made in 1888 by Henry E. Davis, entitled "Inability of the President" (reprinted as S. Doc. No. 308—Dec. 5, 1918), the author observes: "The provision in question is matter of detail purely; no principle is involved in it, and the debates of the Federal Convention, as also of the States in considering the Constitution, show an absence of any discussion of it whatever." And he remarks that, though the subject was broached by John Dickinson, of Delaware, who inquired: "What is the extent of the term 'disability' [that being the form originally used], and who is to be the judge of it?, nothing followed the inquiry; and in the State conventions the inquiry was not even put.

The result is that we have in times past suffered from the lack of clear guidance in the matter of Presidential illness and resulting disability. After President Garfield was shot, the entire Cabinet agreed on the desirability of having Vice President Arthur act as President; but four of its seven members thought that Arthur's exercise of the power would make him President and thereby oust Garfield from office. As a consequence for the 80 days that Garfield lingered before his death (between July 2 and September 19, 1881) the Nation was without a competent Executive. And when Secretary of State Lansing asked Vice President Thomas R. Marshall to perform President Wilson's duties following Wilson's paralytic stroke, the latter's friend, also fearing that Marshall would thereupon automatically become President, viewed Marshall as a possible usurper.

President Wilson collapsed in September of 1919 and his term expired on March 4, 1921, almost a year and a half later. In the interval he failed to pass on 28 acts submitted to him by the Congress and they automatically became law. During this same interval, the Senate debated the Versailles Treaty, and sought, in vain, information concerning another important matter, the Shantung settlement. On the executive level, 21 Cabinet meetings were called by the Secretary of State to keep the Government operating. Lansing's forced resignation because of this action may have resulted from impairment of the judgment of this brilliant President upon his return to activity. It may be that physically and mentally he was not in fact well enough to return. Yet there was no clear provision of the Constitution or statute which would have empowered an authoritative, objective inquiry on this subject.

President Roosevelt died of a massive cerebral hemorrhage during the very climax of World War II. What would have happened had the stroke caused paralysis, not death? Would the disability, however, severe, have been kept confidential by the Vice President and the Cabinet in fear that knowledge of the fact might result in an ouster of the President from office? Would an emergency makeshift have been adopted? And would this have been sufficient in a time of such grave peril to the Nation?

EISENHOWER, KENNEDY REACH EXTRALEGAL SOLUTION

The ailments of President Eisenhower were normal for a man of his years; indeed, similar ailments have afflicted younger men. Their occurrence in future Presidents must be anticipated, and the possibility if not the probability of such a recurrence may not be ignored. President Eisenhower and President Kennedy sought to deal with the problem under discussion as best they could by the extralegal, informal agreement each made with his Vice President. It will be recalled that the agreement between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, made public on March 3, 1958, was adopted by President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson on August 10, 1961.

The procedures set forth in these compacts are as follows:

1. In the event of inability the President would—if possible—so inform the Vice President, and the Vice President would serve as Acting President, exercising the powers and duties of the office until the inability had ended.

2. In the event of an inability which would prevent the President from so communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President, after such consultation as seemed to him appropriate under the circumstances, would decide upon the devolution of the powers and duties of the office and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended.

3. The President, in either event, would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the office.

Under these procedures a disabled President can still decide that he is sufficiently recovered to resume the reins of office, although this be contrary to the fact.

This is not sound. The formidable pronouncement of judgment of inability and recovery should not be left to the patient alone when the welfare of the whole people hangs in the balance. The hazards of an atomic age and the anxieties of a time of continuing crisis do not brook partial solutions. The need for prompt adoption of a plenary, self-implementing amendment to the Constitution to fill a dangerous void in our governmental system is plain.

As a solution to the perplexing and unanswered questions which the problem of a President's grave illness has posed over the years, we offer a simple formula to be embodied in a constitutional amendment. We believe it would resolve many difficulties—including protection against usurpation of power by a Vice President or others, and make provision for the contingency of the President's recovery.

1. Within 10 days after his inauguration, the President would appoint nine members by name to a Commission on Inability, to hold office at his pleasure. This suggestion differs from other proposals heretofore made, for all the members of the Commission would be chosen by the President himself; three from the Cabinet, two from the Senate, two from the House of Representatives and two

from the Supreme Court. The Commission's sole function would be to certify the President's inability, and in due course, his ability to resume his duties.

2. The matter of the inability of the President may be submitted to the Commission by the Vice President or the Secretary of State or by joint congressional resolution. A finding of inability would require six votes, to include those of at least two of the Cabinet members and one each of the Members of the Senate, House, and judiciary.

3. Action for Presidential resumption of his duties may be initiated by the Vice President, the Secretary of State, joint resolution or the President; the Commission by majority vote may declare the disability ended.

4. The President himself, of course, may always declare his inability and in such case he may determine the end of the disability. (In the latter event, however, when the circumstances warrant, the Commission may be called into play.)

This proposal assures a tribunal friendly to the executive yet objective and representative, since each branch of our triune Federal Government is included. The Vice President is spared the impossible burden of announcing his own succession. Potential bias against the President is eliminated by fixing the term of the members of the Commission at the pleasure of the President. In this matter, so vital to the orderly functioning of government, it is eminently right that all the branches of government should participate. The principle of separation of powers is not applicable here.

The doctrine of separation of powers, adopted in our country, was set forth Montesquieu's "Spirit of the Laws." Its adoption was due in large part of the usurpations complained of in the Declaration of Independence. The Founding Fathers recognized that the central problem of free institutions was to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of society represented by his Government.

The genius of the men who established the foundations for our democratic complex was in devising a system in which government was restrained from its own excesses. They held that there could be no freedom without restraint; and their chief expedient to implement their view was the separation of powers. As Mr. Justice Brandeis carefully pointed out: "The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency, but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy." (*Meyers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 291.)

SEPARATAION OF POWERS IS NOT ABSOLUTE

The coordinate branches of government serve the American people best—and function best in relation to each other—when they respect their own and observe each other's rightful province and competence; and when they measure, correctly, the needful distance to be kept between themselves—sometimes further apart and sometimes closer together. There are times, however, when they must identify themselves by fusing their powers in joint functioning. Indeed, they need not move in proud isolation—in Cardozo's phrase. For, each of the three departments is in some measure dependent on the others, and each has power to exercise, in some respects, functions in their nature legislative, executive, and judicial. It was not contemplated that there must always be a complete separation. The imperative of national necessity qualifies the principle of separate powers.

The power of veto vested in the President "is distinctly legislative, as is also the treaty-making power and the right to advise Congress. The pardon power is judicial. The Senate shares in both the appointing and treaty power, possessing, in this respect, the character of a council. * * * As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the President may make rules and regulations for the Government of these forces. Such regulations have the force of law." ("The Story of the Constitution," U.S. Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, pp. 37–38). While the judicial branch is an independent and coequal department of the Government, the Senate has the power to try impeachments. And when the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice presides. Thus, the Constitution bears clear and compelling internal evidence that the Founding Fathers contemplated that all powers should mesh in effective action when the general welfare dictated. They did not intend them to be "separate pebbles in alien juxtaposition."

Various proposals in the area under discussion have been made. All but two of those introduced in Congress call for a constitutional amendment, without, however, complete agreement on its scope. The American Bar Association and the New York State Bar Association reach the same conclusion, in effect, as that expressed in a resolution adopted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, last year, that though an amendment is necessary, "the establishment of the procedure for determining when inability commences and the system of restoration would best be left to enactment by Congress, subject to the veto power of the President contained in clause 2 of section 7 of article 1 of the Constitution."

We agree that an amendment is desirable, though we incline to the view of some who have studied the matter that it is within the competence of the Congress to enact the requisite legislation under existing constitutional provisions. It is not at all likely that the painstaking framers of our organic law intentionally or inadverently suffered an abortive provision in a matter of so fundamental importance. Doubtless, they contemplated that there would be implementing action by the Congress.

However, we also concur in the apprehension felt by a former Attorney General that legislation now might be subjected to attack on constitutional grounds at the very time when it would become necessary to invoke it. The failure of Congress to act up to this time would lend support to such an assault. In any event, congressional inaction in the past does not augur well for action now.

Hence, we favor an amendment to the Constitution to clarify the matter authoritatively and definitively. We strongly dissent, however, from the view that such an amendment should be general in nature with implementation in detail of procedure by legislative action. In the light of the history of legislative default for 175 years, this would not be a sound course to follow. The vis inertia which has bedeviled the matter up to now may persist.

Indeed, if Congress has possessed competence to legislate under the existing succession clause and failed to do so, or if there has been a vice in it which the National Legislature has ignored by failing to initiate action to amend the Constitution, the conclusion is the same. To assure an effective reformulation, a new amendment must be self-executing and must provide specifically the procedure to be followed.

Moreover, leaving the matter to implementing legislation not only sidesteps the issue but opens the gates to potentially dangerous action—as well as inaction. During a period of bitterness between Congress and the President or Vice President—such as occurred during Andrew Johnson's administration—control of succession by legislation might be highly unfortunate. Whatever the procedure, it belongs in the Constitution.

The stop-gap measures taken by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy to fill that void, while helpful, do not suffice. And the formula we have outlined, we believe, provides a practical solution which is fair to the President and to the Nation. We should favor any other which meets the problem. But the time to act is now.

The foregoing was written before the assassination of President Kennedy. That tragic event has pointed up an additional problem. For, when the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, there is no Vice President. To provide for the event that the new President also might die, legislation—authorized by the Constitution—has been adopted providing for a succession. Under the amendments enacted during the Truman administration, the Speaker of the House would become President. Congress has grappled several times with this problem now again in the public concern. We believe that the existing law of succession is adequate—since we must accept the impossibility of perfection in this as in other areas of legislation.

The same procedures we have outlined in the event of the inability of a President should apply when the Vice President has become President and the Speaker is in line of succession.

Secret Service Men Used as Flunkies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the very enlightening article by Merriman Smith, in yesterday's Long Island Press, indicates that the Secret Service, which is supposed to protect the President of the United States, is being used for menial jobs such as errand boys, message carriers, dog walkers, and hat and coat getters.

The Congress has been quite generous in providing additional Secret Service men but if the President, who has the power to do so, does not put a stop to this kind of nonsense, I think the Congress should.

The article follows:

IS THE SECRET SERVICE GETTING TOO MANY EXTRA ERRANDS?

(By Merriman Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Backstairs at the White House:

For some years, a recurrent subject of conversation among White House insiders has been the extent Secret Service agents were used for duties far afield of their main assignment of protecting the President.

The situation was described publicly this week by a former agent, John Walker.

Writing in a magazine, Walker calls for a number of laws which might improve protection of the Chief Executive. He believes these legal reforms "might well outlaw other abuses that have grown up in the relationship of Presidents and Vice Presidents to the Secret Service."

Walker continues:

"Outside a small circle of White House staffers and newspapermen, it is not known that Secret Service men frequently are used as errand boys. They are asked to carry

messages, mind the kids, keep memorandums of appointments and, at times, even fetch groceries or gifts."

The former agent also points out that such practices not only are unrelated to protection of the President, but even worse, they distract agents from this vital assignment.

In truth, Walker has stated the situation rather mildly and politely. At times in the past, agents have been pressed into duty as adjuncts of the White House press office: Assigned to fetch hats and coats for guests of a President; walk dogs and keep track of gifts received by a President while traveling.

It is quite common for agents to devote much needed manpower and effort to see that members of a President's entourage are led to their proper automobiles in a procession. This has absolutely nothing to do with the protection of a Chief Executive. It is a protocol job at best.

These men, assigned by Congress to protect the life of a President, should be doing just that; not serving as glorified ushers and car dispatchers. Why should one of these highly trained investigators, marksmen or judo experts be handed the utterly secretarial task of sorting out Presidential gifts or seeing to it that bouquets for the First Lady are cared for properly?

Action by Congress is not required to halt this demanding and inefficient practice. Any time a President does not want agents employed in this manner, all he has to do is say so.

A President also has it within his power to correct another situation that bothers the agents. This is the presence of completely unessential staff members in the Secret Service followup car. This vehicle is the hub of all Presidential protection when a Chief Executive is motoring through a city. This is the usually open car which follows the President's vehicle by only a few feet.

William Green

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Representative WILLIAM J. GREEN of Pennsylvania, was a great loss to the people of that State, especially to those of its Fifth Congressional District whom he served so well for nearly 18 years as a Member of this House. He is mourned as a friend and as a dedicated public servant.

His colleagues, you and I, will miss him for we, perhaps even more so than his constituents, recognized his legislative ability, his dedication to the cause of sound democratic government and his political leadership. As we respected him for his ability and his accomplishments, we treasured his friendship which knew no political boundaries.

If we were to search for a single deed or characteristic that stood out and would perhaps be worthy of special note on this occasion, our search would be in vain for his accomplishments were many and he was a composite of great talents, good character, strength, and kindness. He was an able political leader, perhaps one of the most accomplished of this era. He recognized that politics was the cornerstone of sound free government to which he contributed so much in his nine terms in the Congress. He was a good citizen, as is attested to by his many contributions to the civic and community accomplishments of his native city. He was a loving and much loved father and husband.

We shall long remember BILL GREEN for what he was—outstanding political leader, a knowledgeable and dedicated legislator, a good citizen, and above all else to us, a kind and understanding friend.

On 46th Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago this month the Ukrainian National Republic declared her independence after centuries of subjugation under the yoke of Mongols and the Russian czars. The independence and liberty of the freedom-loving Ukrainians was almost immediately stamped out by the Soviet Communist dictatorship, but the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people survives despite the purges, repressions, and cruelties of the Communist dictators. The flame of liberty still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Ukraine represents one of the most powerful forces of patriotic nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Its invincible fight for national independence and freedom has forced Moscow to resort to a masquerade of Ukraine as an "independent" and "free" nation within the "federal" framework of the U.S.S.R.

As Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, points out, we must offer our best in encouraging this spirit of nationalism in that captive nation. As he says, it would be foolhardy, indeed, to ignore our natural allies behind the Iron Curtain because Moscow is experiencing another "time of troubles."

With its 45 million population Ukraine was one of the first victims of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism and to this day has been the largest captive non-Russian nation both in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Professor Dobriansky points out.

I am honored to pay tribute to this freedom-loving nation for her inspiring example in continuing the unabated struggle for recovery of the liberty which is rightfully hers. It is the sincere hope of America and the entire free world that soon the Ukraine will join them in the family of free nations.

It is fitting here that we also offer tribute on this occasion to all Ukrainian-Americans and to the Ukranian Congress Committee of America, Inc, whose moral support and assistance in so many ways helps the people of the captive Ukraine to keep alive the spark of freedom and to maintain faith in their ultimate liberation. Again, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this gallant, freedom-loving nation. We earnestly hope they will gain their goal of liberty.

To What Extent Can Our National Security Rely Upon Transport Trucking in Future Wars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. R. J. Warrington, has written and published a most interesting article concerning the possibility of utilizing nuclear power in the service transportation industry and thereby eliminating the military hazard of depending upon fuels which are stored in tanks above ground.

Because of the interesting proposal in this article, I submit it for the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

TO WHAT EXTENT CAN OUR NATIONAL SECURITY RELY UPON TRANSPORT TRUCKING IN FUTURE WARS?

(By R. J. Warrington)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author sees a very weak link in our defense system. He is deeply concerned over the hazards of storage tanks, above ground, on which we depend for fuel needed to maintain and supply mobile vehicles on land, the planes in the air, and a large part of the waterborne shipping, not yet converted to nuclear power. He adds, "A concerted effort by industry to convert trucks, buses, and locomotives to a more economical and reliable source of power is indicated. Nuclear power is practical now and each nuclear powered truck or tractor will have a completely separate fuel pipe and power unit as a standby, ready for use at the turn of a switch and a valve."

(During the next several issues of Shipper 'n' Carrier the subject will be treated from the many angles and reflections with which our author has had intensive study and experience. At the end of each article a brief résumé of our author's activities and qualifications will be found.

(We present to you the following studies and forecasts in the design of tractors and trailers suited for further development in nuclear power, and invite your considered comment and constructive criticism.)

A great new opportunity is open to the transport trucking industry. It encompasses, among other things, national defense and welfare. In many ways, if properly and aggressively handled, it will answer the question asked in the title hereof, "To what extent can our national security rely upon existing facilities in the transport trucking industry?" Do not expect the petroleum industry to be enthused about changing the heavy hauling facilities of the country to nuclear power, but one of the group has made great strides in processing the fuel, and operates its own reactor.

The conditions to be met, in order that a given goal may be achieved are as follows; of price importance is:

1. We must, in the near future, arrange the storage and distribution of our nuclear fuel underground, nationwide, to take the place, in the not too distant future, of the many vulnerable and oftentimes unsightly oil tanks above ground, which we now have and which might be wiped out in any national conflagration, civil riot, sabotage or war. We are well equipped in this nuclear fuel storage field in certain geographical areas, but we need to expand our development into the means of carrying the fuel in a dormant pile, contained in powerplant enclosures which can be exchanged with the spent fuel subassemblies in vehicles above ground in duly sealed and enclosed fuel stations, automatically operated. All operations of this kind may be accomplished via remote controls, pneumatic and mechanical largely, in well-secured stations. The integrity requirements of the future standard units of nuclear power, is a well-known science today. Next in importance is:

2. Let us not delay a bit longer than necessary, the conversion of industrial fuel requirements from our natural resources, such as coal, oil, wood, and cotton or other fibers. Stop burning them up and turn toward the use of these vital materials for our more permanent needs. Then too, they may be conserved for use by future generations in a more heavily populated world. Remember, mineral oil can be made into good pipe for water and chemicals (thus saving steel and copper). Also, fabrics and finishes for automobiles, furniture, and machinery, etc. Clothing in the future will be made largely from coal and oil. We can then pay the miners and producers, better wages and profits and collect higher taxes in return. When we tax a gallon of oil and burn it up, there is no further source of government or private income from that gallon. Let us make our oils and coal into more permanent commodities such as dishes, hardware, medicine, blankets, dyes, utensils and appliances. They can then be taxed at all the various levels of manufacture, wholesalers and retailers activities, and consumers, and thus prolong the useful life of our natural resources. It would give the trucks more merchandise to haul. The man-hours required for producing the various items from chemicals is approximately that which is required of other materials, and the product is often more attractive and durable. Next in importance is:

3. Let us clean up the air we breathe. The time may not be far in the future when highway traffic such as pleasure travel and touring will diminish in volume because of the heavier discharge of gases from diesel power plants in locomotives, buses and trucks. Even our over-the-road drivers, who sit up high in a cab, above the heavier gases, may need protection if the incidence of lung cancer continues to increase.

New tire and trailer designs are now on the drawing boards for delivery and use in 1966. They will make possible, larger and heavier loads with increased safety factors. Therefore, the larger diesel motors required to propel the heavier loads should be replaced with dual nuclear power plants with about a 3-percent burnup of enriched uranium in a fast breeder reactor, thus making the transport trucking industry a source for part of our future plutonium requirements. The national distribution to underground storage of nuclear fuel would also be accomplished in a safe and orderly manner without the use of special containers and additional shipping expense, by this method.

Our immediate needs for plutonium are well met and provided for by reactors operated by the Atomic Energy Commission through contractors for this express purpose, but which, in the course of time will be wearing out, or after 20 years of service become obsolete and in need of redesign and reconstruction; or a new system of production.

Unless the trucking industry is used in the near future as a means of converting uranium to plutonium and storing it in strategic locations, we are not making the best use of our natural resources and national facilities. Plutonium is a manmade element (only available source) and is becoming more useful as new equipment is designed. It is probably the cleanest fuel known to man today and can well be used for power in a properly designed reactor.

Nuclear fuel, intelligently utilized, is a very healthy influence in its proper environment, as shown by its use for power in the *Nautilus* and subsequently constructed submarines. As Commander Rosenthal of the *Nautilus* jokingly said in a talk with members of the Engineering Society of Detroit some years ago, "All we needed was a double handful of fuel, to cruise around the world for 3 long years, but we had to finally come up to let the men reenlist." In 1952, W. E. Blewett, president of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers said, "We need power and fuel enough to drive a ship around the world without refueling," but it is doubtful whether he expected it to come true so soon. It used to take up to 480 pounds of gunpowder to launch a heavy bomber plane from the deck of an aircraft carrier, and we had frequent fires from unburned powder. Now we do it with nuclear-powered steam, safely and effectively, and its been years since a Navy catapult has had a fire.

We should expect to refuel transport trucks after a round trip coast to coast, but intermediate stations for servicing the power requirements of a tractor where a nuclear unit may be remotely disconnected from the chassis, lowered through vacuum locks and inert gas-filled chambers and safely stored. It would then be replaced in like manner, with another packaged nuclear unit, which will be made to go critical (active) when needed, just as you have a reserve supply of gasoline available when you open a valve, etc. In a later article, the probable processes for this operation will be covered more in detail.

Beside cleaning up the air we breathe in a positive manner, another benefit to be derived by converting to nuclear power is that the only significant noise to be heard from this modern equipment will be the over-the-road load rattle and the tire-to-pavement sing. This may even be diminished by further design and attention to suspension details.

In his purely personal, admittedly biased opinion, the writer feels that the suggested program, as outlined in this and following articles, is more important than placing a man on the moon. Also that the program must be effected at once by private industry with private capital, but that the Atomic Energy Commission should freely license their patents, release pertinent classified information to competent and interested development people who are established in this transportation equipment field, and could use this new source of power to lessen in some degree, the rather high taxes on transport trucks which now serve their country so well. The growth of this healthy and desirable new industry depends upon the encouragement of initiative by private capital. Few people realize that from $3,000 to $5,000 in taxes is paid each year by a single over-the-road rig, every year, in addition to the initial investment which seems high and is getting higher.

You will note the absence of technical terms and mathematical equations in this and ensuing articles. This may best be explained by stating that sketches, layouts, and design parameters are first studied and calculations for required performance factors are made. Then, in rewriting to a readily understandable theme in laymen's terms, we may lose some of the engineering logic but please be assured that the concept, as it will be presented, can well be achieved in the stated time if a concerted effort by the industry is forthcoming.

EDITOR'S ADDENDA. A 5-year program, to result in the operation of over-the-road nuclear powered trucks and tractors has been set as possible by Mr. Warrington, a semi-retired consulting engineer of Minneapolis, Chicago, and Detroit. He was in the employ of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. for 7 years. About 20 years were spent as a design and engineering consultant to the countries top-ranking automobile, truck, marine and machine tool engineering firms, among them Pioneer Engineering Co., Barnes and Reinecke; Giffels and Valletti; Smith, Hinchman and Grylls; University of California, Berkeley—Guarlnick Naval Architects and recently on the staff of Stanford University as mechanical engineer, he developed the means of keeping the many sections of the 2-mile linear accelerator level at all times. His eminent disciplines as known to his associates are: No. 1, complex circuitry of nuclear, hydraulic, pneumatic, mechanical, and electrical controls; No. 2, the study of failures in all manner of mechanisms, products and components (the reason for such failure), and No. 3, writing complete process sheets to insure reliability control.

(A 1945 charter member American Society for Quality Control; 1953 member Engineering Society of Detroit; 1957 member American Nuclear Society; studied electrical and mechanical engineering, Armour & N. W.)

Sound Economic Policy Subject to Political Manipulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent New York Times editorial goes to the essence of the matter when it points out that President Johnson's budget has been buffeted around by political considerations until it runs the risk of overstimulating the economy and inducing inflation. Increasing the amount of immediate tax relief by cutting the withholding rates to 14 percent from 15 percent may decrease the size of next year's deficit but it may also flood the carburetor.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1964]

LOADING THE TAX PACKAGE

The Senate Finance Committee is responding to President Johnson's demand for action on taxes by hacking away at the few remaining reforms left in the bill. With the election a few months away, it appears intent on adding to the total amount of the tax reduction package.

It has cut out a proposal banning deductions of State and local gasoline taxes, automobile fees and driver licenses, which involves a loss of $330 million to the Treasury. It has also pared revenues by liberalizing the tax credit to businesses investing in new plant and equipment and by giving extra tax relief to utilities. So far, its actions have increased the amount of reductions from $11 to $11.6 billion, and still other revenue-producing proposals may yet suffer from its handiwork.

Mr. Johnson is evidently prepared to accept an increase in tax reductions without

protest. His state of the Union message failed to mention the need for tax law reform. Instead, he concentrated on altering the tax package to insure that the bulk of the proposed reductions will be made effective before election day rather than in two separate stages spread out over a period of 2 years.

The President has sought to speed up and increase the amount of tax relief by requesting a cut in withholding rates to 14 percent from the 15 percent proposed by the Kennedy administration. This would add another $200 million a month to taxpayer purchasing power and would also increase the deficit for the current fiscal year while cutting down the deficit in the new budget.

Mr. Johnson may gain politically by shifting practically all of the promised tax cuts into 1964 and getting credit for reducing the size of next year's deficit. But there is little economic justification for this shot in the arm. Business is good and the outlook is for continued improvement. Thus, while a moderate reduction in taxes could help to accelerate and sustain the expansion, too big a dose in too short a time could be overstimulating.

The danger is intensified by Congress indiscriminate lopping off of reforms, which reduces revenues, adding another extra and unneeded stimulus. The Nation wants action on taxes, but there is as much of a risk in politically loading the tax package—through gutting reforms and overgenerous reductions—as in providing too little too late.

Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there must be no further capitulation by the United States in Panama.

I submit for printing in the RECORD two very good articles on this subject; one by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., in the Washington Daily News of January 20, 1964, and the other by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., in the Hazleton (Pa.) Standard-Speaker of the date of January 17, 1964.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 20, 1964]

IKE PAVED THE WAY

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

I must confess I am just mean enough, if I were a Senator, to write a letter to General Eisenhower asking him what he would do in the Panamanian crisis.

The crisis for which he is considerably responsible; for there is no doubting that his agreement, given in 1959, to permit Panamanian flags to fly over canal territory is responsible for undermining the traditional legal position of the United States respecting the Canal Zone; namely, that it is for all intents and purposes U.S. property.

The words of the treaty commit Panama to granting us "all the rights, power, and authority within the Canal Zone" "as if (the United States) were the sovereign of the territory * * * to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority."

One would think such language would satisfy even a Philadelphia lawyer. But there arose in the heart of Panamanian nationalism the notion that the words "as if it were the sovereign" suggest that after all the United States is not sovereign, and that therefore the Panamanian flag should fly alongside our own. Representations to that effect were made to good old obliging Ike, who, against the dire warnings of many legislators, went on to give the OK; although, presuambly to emphasize that the Panamanians should be kept in their place, he more or less segregated the Panamanian flag to a ghetto of the Canal Zone known as the Shalter Triangle.

It didn't take too long for the Panamanians to cross over to the other side of the tracks. In June of 1961 President Chiari went to President Kennedy and asked for a little upward mobility for the Panamanian flag, to which of course President Kennedy acceded; and on October 29, 1962, the Panamanian flag was finally hoisted right up to the level of our own, in the center of the principal quadrangle of the zone authority. That kept the Panamanians satisfied for 2 whole months. Then in January they asked that their flag be flown every single place ours was. Request granted.

Well, we've been in messes before. What is there to be done? It will be a good test of Mr. Johnson's ability to shake off the mortal coils of liberal sentimentality and stand up for the legal rights and strategic requirements of this country, even if it means to offend Ceylon, Afghanistan, and Nyasaland.

Granted the situation was made harder for him by the mawkish conciliations of his two predecessors, what now might he do?

(1) He can capitulate—as the English and French did in Suez; as, indeed, they were forced to do there, largely by ourselves. The result of capitulation would be to encourage in Latin America a rampant anti-American nationalism that would severely diminish the power of those of our friends there who work for stability and progress. Just as the withdrawal of the British from Suez launched Africa into an incontinent nationalism.

Or (2) Mr. Johnson can be firm. And firmness is absolutely all it would take. If we can hold Guantanamo Bay as an enclave in Cuba itself, we can certainly hold the Panama Canal against a ragtag army of Panamanian students—and let our Navy see to it that arms are not smuggled to Panama from Cuba. Moreover, let us instantly impound revenues destined for Panama from the operation of the canal (about $72 million per year) against which we will charge indemnities for damage done to American life and property.

That is all it would take. If we are right, our actions are just. And the proposition that we are right has this time all the t's crossed, and i's dotted; we have a solid treaty, we pay handsomely for the rights we exercise, and we are the nation on which all the world depends for what freedom it has left. We must therefore remain strong. Capitulation in Panama would amount to an act of aggression against the entire free world.

[From the Hazleton (Pa.) Standard-Speaker, Jan. 17, 1964]

SOVIET DRIVE TO OUST UNITED STATES FROM PANAMA BEGAN IN 1946

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet drive to oust Uncle Sam from Panama opened in early 1946.

Alger Hiss, a State Department official who would later be accused as a Soviet agent and convicted of perjury, sent to the United Nations an official report in which he listed the Canal Zone as an occupied area.

The tall, debonair State Department specialist conveniently overlooked a treaty drafted in 1903 that "grants to the United States in perpetuity, the use, occupation, and control of the (Canal) Zone."

The Hiss report was a "monstrous aggression against a valid and unblemished title to our territorial domain," charged DAN FLOOD, the Pennsylvania Democrat who would become Congress' chief expert on the situation in Panama.

Called on the State Department carpet, Hiss smiled and then apologized for his mistake. The mistakes continued.

A year later, orders from Washington shut down more than 100 U.S. bases in Panama. The directives followed bloody, Communist-led rioting.

As the demonstrations continued, so did the American retreat. The 1903 treaty was revised in 1955 to give the Panamanians railroad properties valued at $25 million.

Congress objected, and then objected again as the State Department laid plans to recognize Panama's titular sovereignty over the zone.

Congressmen FLOOD and A. I. SELDEN, the latter chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin America, led the fight against appeasement. On February 2, 1960, the House voted by an overwhelming vote (380 to 12) to warn the President against any further concessions.

The Chief Executive was specifically warned not to permit flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. Matters of territorial sovereignty, the House said, could be altered only with the consent of the legislative branch.

Within 8 months, however, President Eisenhower had ordered the Panamanian flag flown alongside the Stars and Stripes in the zone.

The decision was assailed by Representative FLOOD, who called it a major victory for international communism and said that "impeachment of American Presidents has been urged for far less than this."

Representative SELDEN called the move a long-range blunder. He said, prophetically, "there is a grave danger that future generations of Panamanians will look back on this day as a major step in the surrender of treaty rights."

The Eisenhower move failed to placate the Panamanians. Then President Ernesto de la Guardia refused to attend the flag-raising ceremonies. A group of far-left students chanted "Yankee go home." An American broadcaster was stabbed.

In recent years the hate-America campaign has been run by Thelma King, a leather-lunged leftist who has made frequent trips to Havana. Miss King has called for "very violent revolution * * * accompanied by firing squads" to drive the imperialists from Panama. A member of the National Assembly and thus immune from arrest, she helped touch off the crisis of last week with inflammatory broadcasts over a national radio.

Note: The present Canal Zone Governor, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., has come under heavy congressional attack for ridiculing those who oppose further retreat (those who claim "blind adherence to a treaty signed 60 years ago").

U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson has been quoted as telling the Panamanians that "the logical future of this canal may be some sort of internationalization."

Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago in the great city of Kiev an independent Ukraine Republic was proclaimed.

Released at last from Moscow's yoke, a proud people anticipated the blessings of liberty and self-government, but in less than 3 years the Red army brutally restored Kremlin tyranny in the Ukraine, obliterating the blazing fires of full nationhood. The Ukraine joined the long list of nations made captive by Russia imperialism. Recollection of their heroic resistance to Soviet oppression rekindles hope for eventual independence and continues to inspire freedom-loving people throughout the world. Not only must we preserve the memories of their struggle by annual recognition in the Congress, but this body should establish a Captive Nations' Committee to better focus national and international attention on the menace of Red imperialism. Even though we cannot lift the Iron Curtain by force, we can proclaim the truth that we know will eventually free the multitude of peoples who currently inhabit the Russian prisonhouse of nations.

Governor Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, Applies a Double Standard in His Promise To Politic for the Democrats in the United States in the Coming Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention a most enlightening editorial in the San Juan Star of Friday, January 3, relating to Governor Muñoz-Marín who very pointedly and, I think, very erroneously accused President Eisenhower of interfering with the political life of Puerto Rico when he gave Republican gubernatorial candidate Luis A. Ferre a ride to Washington in his airplane, and this sanctimonious political attitude is compared with the information exposed in this editorial to the effect that John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, told a reporter of the San Juan Star that San Juan Mayor Gautier had offered to help the stateside Democrats in this year's campaign as she had in the past, and also that Governor Muñoz had offered to help fight the stateside Democratic battles coming up in the months ahead.

Thus, it appears that according to Governor Muñoz' standards, it is perfectly alright for him to actively participate in political campaigns in the United States but he becomes very irate and improperly so when the President of the United States merely shows a courtesy to one of the outstanding citizens of Puerto Rico. This is typical of the double standard that Governor Muñoz continues to preach in Puerto Rico which is a part of his effort to de-Americanize Puerto Rico and to preach anti-U.S. propaganda.

I include a copy of the editorial for the information of my colleagues:

AN UNLIKELY PROSPECT

John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, told a reporter for this paper yesterday that San Juan Mayor Doña Felisa Rincon de Gautier had offered to help the stateside Democrats in this year's campaign as she has in the past. This isn't news, of course, because Doña Felisa has been an effective campaigner for the Democrats in New York for some time.

But Mr. Bailey also said that Governor Muñoz had offered to help fight the stateside Democratic battles coming up in the months ahead, and that is news.

Everybody in Puerto Rico knows that Governor Muñoz would never interfere in politics outside Puerto Rico. He made his feelings clear about interference by outsiders in local politics in the last election campaign when the then President Eisenhower gave Republican gubernatorial candidate Luis A. Ferre a ride to Washington in his flying machine.

The Governor was so incensed by that interference in local politics that he had the legislature approve a resolution censuring President Eisenhower. That's how unlikely it is that the Governor will interfere in local politics on the mainland and we hope Mr. Bailey will not be too disappointed.

Either Mr. Bailey has been misinformed or Governor Muñoz has had a change of heart, which we think is quite improbable. Having the legislature pass a vote of censure against a President of the United States is an act of such serious proportions that it could have been motivated only by a sincere and deep conviction that interference in anyone's local politics is a very improper thing to do.

Did President Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the victory won by the President when Congress came back to guarantee credit to Russia for wheat purchased in this country is pretty much of an empty victory, in the opinion of the Waseca (Minn.) Herald. I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DID PRESIDENT WIN?

President Lyndon B. Johnson is said to have won a victory in Congress the day before Christmas, but did he? He was given the right to order the Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit to Russia for wheat purchased in this country.

Why did the President insist upon this authority? The Russians have not asked for credit. Must we do things for the Russians that they do not expect of us to do? How soft can we be on communism?

Before his untimely death the late President Kennedy went to great length to point out that the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer in the world market who is willing and able to pay cash or gold.

President Kennedy was honest in his explanation to the people. He sold the wheat deal on its merits and one of the strong points was the balancing of the gold payments. Those who have followed him have not been so honest. They have forgotten what he said about payment in cash or gold and they have fought the Congress to give credit to Russia if need be.

To a nation that can spend billions on space projects and to a nation which already owes the United States $1.5 billion in lend-lease aid, credit should be the last thing we think of giving.

We do not expect that they will ask it. This credit idea is just ammunition some people are storing up for the day when they can make Communist nations look good.

If President Johnson scored a victory it is the emptiest one he will ever count. It may be one he will have a hard time living down.

Communist System Simply Cannot Produce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the self-interest of the United States has been weakened over the past years because we have tried to tailor both our foreign and domestic policies to create a better image before the world. The liberals believe that we can win the world struggle against communism by adopting many of their methods in spite of the fact that, in no instance has communism been able to compete with capitalism.

The continued failure of Soviet Russia to grow enough food and fiber for her own people; the annual failures of Russian industry to produce consumer goods have never convinced the social planners that human beings just will not work as hard for a master, be that master government or individual, than they will for themselves. Repeatedly the record has proved that freedom works, but we still have economists close to the administration insisting that more socialization is needed here to improve our image as compared to the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I have just one question: Why do we not give our own free enterprise system full opportunity to work? It has already produced the highest standard of living for more people than any other system.

The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, reminds us of Communist failures. Perhaps it is time we heed the lesson:

HUNGRY REDS

Add cattle and hogs to the significant shortages of wheat and feed grains that have been disclosed in the Soviet Union in recent months. An official Soviet report discloses the Communists have slaughtered 30 million head of livestock, including more than a million and a half cattle, because of a feed shortage this winter. Coming on top of the big drop in wheat production, these new food losses would appear to be little short of sensational, particularly in a country which has always been short of animal protein by U.S. standards.

A new study of Soviet agriculture by a team of American scientists points out that livestock products, such as beef, pork, milk, and butter, are inefficiently produced and high priced in Russia. There are formidable problems of management of feed and livestock enterprises. Moreover, inadequacies of Soviet systems of marketing, processing, and distribution are retarding efforts to increase output of livestock products.

Cuba is another example of how the Communist system depresses food output. The Cubans have been hungry ever since Fidel Castro took over the island. Sugar production has slumped alarmingly under his agrarian reform policies. Many breeding herds of cattle and hogs were decimated by being slaughtered for food instead of saved to increase output of animal products. Only the other day Cuba bought 13,000 Holstein bulls from Canada. They will be used in an effort to increase output of milk and butterfat.

In Red China agriculture again in 1963 failed to keep pace with population growth. Increased grain imports, much of them from Canada, will ease but not relieve the continued tight food situation in Red China, according to our own foreign agricultural service.

The Communists like to emphasize adverse weather as a major cause of their difficulties, but even Khrushchev has admitted the system is considerably less effective than it should be in regard to agriculture. Communist dogma prevents the Reds from facing up to the fact that lack of the incentives of individual ownership and initiative will continue to hinder their efforts to feed their peoples.

For overwhelming proof of the effectiveness of such incentives, they need look no further than the American family farm.

Business and Retraining, No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that radio station KQV, of Pittsburgh, broadcast on January 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22.

This is proof of how the Manpower Development and Training Act—or Government—and management and labor can cooperate and work together for the benefit of not only themselves but the community and the people residing there.

I believe Mr. John D. Gibbs, vice president of KQV, is to be commended for his efforts to acquaint the public with the opportunities available and the possibilities now within reach:

BUSINESS AND RETRAINING, No. 1

This is a success story, the story of a cabinetmaking firm near Pittsburgh.

Six months ago this firm was in a dilemma. The company wanted to expand its business into new markets. It had the know-how and the financial resources. But the company couldn't find the trained personnel it needed to make the product. Cabinetmakers, it seems, are in short supply in the local labor market.

The company turned to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and learned that Federal funds are available for on-the-job training programs. With union cooperation and a $14,000 grant, the company began to train 12 unemployed persons. Now in its fifth month of training, this company has found out that the program is paying big dividends in training personnel and expanding business. In fact, the firm plans a major expansion in the near future.

What makes this a success story? The fact that this is the only firm in the Pittsburgh labor market that is taking advantage of the on-the-job training provisions of the Manpower Act.

This act provides funds to broaden training programs already in existence, and to start new programs where none existed before. Purposes of the act are to help in reducing unemployment, train the unskilled worker, or retrain the employee who becomes the victim of automation or finds his skills on the job unneeded because his employer starts manufacturing a different product.

Most of the local retraining programs we hear about are the so-called institutional type—sponsored by schools, the board of education, and the State and Federal Government. But there are any number of small- and medium-sized firms in the Pittsburgh area who are in desperate need of special skills for their own particular product, according to area labor department officials. We would expect that more firms, and trade organizations, would be taking advantage of this program. This is not the case.

Business active participation in the retraining program is paramount to its success. We hope that more businessmen will take a new look at the Manpower Act as it may serve them directly.

We think the U.S. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, which supervises the on-the-job training program, should make an all-out effort to better inform the local business community of the provisions of the Manpower Act. If this department needs strengthening to carry out an effective program, this should be done. KQV-Radio thinks on-the-job training holds a big potential for cutting into the local unemployment situation, and we think more emphasis should be put in this area in the future.

Support for a Delay in Lunar Landing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 257 to express the sense of Congress with respect to extending the time fixed as the goal for accomplishing a manned flight to the moon and safe return to 1975. The present goal is to accomplish this before 1970.

As stated in my resolution the extended date is for three purposes as follows:

First. In order to provide the flexibility needed to assure the selection of a launching date which will to the maximum extent practicable avoid all known natural hazards encountered in a manned flight to the moon and return; and

Second. In order to provide the flexibility needed by the scientists, engineers, and others engaged in working out the complex details of the preparations for a successful manned flight to the moon and safe return; and

Third. In order to lessen the tremendous impact on the budgeting requirements of the Federal Government which can occur in cases of so-called crash programs to meet an artificial deadline.

Under unanimous consent to include extraneous material I submit an editorial which appeared in the January 17 New York Times. This editorial supports my view, except that I would never delay this project to make it an international effort as the New York Times suggests—at least not if such an arrangement for international cooperation included the Soviet Union. After all, there is testimony stating that 80 to 90 percent of the technology is militarily strategic, but otherwise the arguments for postponement make sense and support the passage of my resolution.

The editorial follows:

NEEDED: LUNAR SANITY

There are growng signs that official Washington may be gathering up its courage for a badly needed decision to free this country from the conviction that a man must be landed on the moon by 1969. President Johnson's proposed 1965 civilian space budget of $5.3 billion is $600 million less than the amount requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The best that NASA Administrator James E. Webb can say now is that we still have a fighting chance of achieving the objective this decade, though he admits we have lost all our leeway. Meanwhile, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON has called attention to a serious danger manned space travel will face at the end of this decade. At that time, the sun will be near the maximum point of the solar storm cycle with consequently high probability of intense radiation. There are already enough hazards in the enterprise without courting this particular one whose risks would be minimized if the attempt were made in the mid-1970's instead of several years earlier.

The case for the 1969 target date is even less defensible now than it was when President Kennedy first proposed it. The likelihood that the Soviet Union is shooting for a manned lunar landing this decade has been reduced by Premier Khrushchev's own statement, by the Central Intelligence Agency's estimate of Soviet economic difficulties, and by the latest evidence of major Soviet domestic capital investment cutbacks. Moreover, since the goal was first proclaimed, there has been enough slippage in the Nation's lunar program and enough technical difficulties have been encountered to make it dubious that the project can be achieved on schedule, even if all the funds requested were to be granted.

Washington may be deterred from a frank change in target date by fear of the consequences to the Nation's prestige abroad. We are much more impressed by the possible consequences to American prestige of an attempt mounted in hurried frenzy and ending disastrously for the men directly involved.

A delay, too, may increase the chance that the project of landing a man on the moon will become an international effort, mobilizing all the resources of world technology. That certainly would be most appropriate for man's first landing in the cosmos beyond this tiny planet.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a timely WKRC-radio and WKRC-TV

editorial, Cincinnati, Ohio. I hope that all the Members may read it with profit.

The editorial is as follows:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

No one can deny the words "civil rights" are among the most used, if least understood, in the American language. Dictionary definitions don't help, because in the last analysis, everyone claims his civil rights to be what he wants them to be, irrespective of the conflicting opinions of others.

So it is with the hotly contested civil rights bill, or House Resolution 7152, causing such a ruckus in the 88th Congress.

According to accepted political convention, to be in favor of the bill is to be compassionate; to be a friend of all minorities; to be just, and to walk in the shadow of Jefferson, Marshall, and Abraham Lincoln. To be against the bill is to be a racist; to be bigoted; and to yearn for a return of slavery, or at best to a form of aristocracy and peasantry.

We believe this is pure nonsense. It just isn't that simple. There is no question that discriminatory practices are intolerable in the conduct of any public business. There is likewise no question that our Constitution and our existing body of law forbids the willful denial of rights to any citizen based upon racial, religious, or other personal discrimination.

The key question, as we see it, is how many civil rights must be relinquished upon the part of the majority in order to assure other rights to a minority. In short, how much freedom should be surrendered in order to guarantee freedom?

Forty years ago this Nation went through a painful and costly lesson in the morality and efficacy of trying to enforce morality through law. The prohibition amendment, approved overwhelmingly by the people, was a total disaster. It is our sober view that such a measure as this proposed public accommodation law, the U.S. Office of Education, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will have the same disastrous results. If passed, they will inevitably discriminate against the freedom of choice of the overwhelming majority of our citizens.

Editorial Questions Wisdom of Tax Cut at This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, just so we may be reminded that there are two sides to the question of a tax cut, I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, "It's Time To Ask Why":

IT'S TIME TO ASK WHY

As the tax cut bill goes before the U.S. Senate, Members of that body can look about them and see an unprecedented degree of prosperity.

The administration's own experts tell us that the gross national product is setting new records. Personal income is higher than ever before. The stock market has been setting new records almost daily. Even profits, though lagging proportionally, are at new peaks. Only in unemployment are the figures less than rosy—and here, we are told (rightly or wrongly), our troubles are the result of automation, not of a sagging economy.

The Senators should restrain their eagerness to play Santa Claus to the taxpayers and ask themselves just what this tax cut is supposed to achieve, and why it is necessary now.

Why, in the midst of prosperity, is it necessary to vote a tax cut which was designed to revive what Mr. Kennedy's advisers regarded at that time as a sluggish economy? In the face of the business improvement which has accompanied 2 years of delay in enacting the tax cut, how can Mr. Johnson say that "each day's delay" is damaging business? What is to be gained by adding to our staggering deficits when inflation is already threatening again and when even the Keynesians warned against deficits in good times?

No doubt some Senators will try to quote Dr. Walter Heller, the President's economic adviser and chief architect of the tax cut. By cutting taxes, he says, we will raise tax revenues. By increasing our deficits, we will ultimately reduce them.

We wonder how many Senators understand or honestly believe Dr. Heller's arguments. How many can explain the "multiplier effect," which is supposed to convert a reduction in taxes into a rise in production so great that the resulting taxes offset the tax cut. How many of them can expound intelligibly on why the "accelerator effect" should stimulate inventories and thus put idle plants to work?

The tax cut was imperative, we were once told, because Russia's annual rate of growth was 6 or 7 percent, or more than double ours. Russia was gaining on us. We had to get the economy moving again. There was no time to lose.

Yet the tax cut has been put off and put off and now the CIA informs us that, in fact, Russia's growth rate is barely 3 percent and ours is higher. We are increasing our lead over the Soviet Union.

Naturally we would all like to see our taxes cut. A shift of some spending from the Government to private hands would mean more risk taking, more improvements, more efficiency, and a rising standard of living. But a shift of spending isn't what the administration proposes. It wants to keep on spending as much as it already is spending (and no doubt more). If Dr. Heller's theory is right, under such conditions, then why not abolish all taxes and watch both the economy and the Government's revenue soar? It just doesn't make sense.

True, failure to cut taxes now after talking about it for so long would disappoint some taxpayers, especially investors. But the Senators should consider carefully which is the greater risk; this temporary disappointment, or the many graver dangers and uncertainties (of which our balance-of-payments problems have been a mere preview) which we would invite by piling new deficits on top of old ones. Representative CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, rightly calls this gambling with the Nation's economic health.

As the tax cut debate gets underway, every one of the 100 Senators should also, in a figurative sense, be "from Missouri."

The Young Country Discovers Its Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the efforts of our colleague the gentleman from Iowa, FRED SCHWENGEL, in his work on the book, "We the People," will be long remembered. As one of his associates in the House of Representatives I have appreciated his efforts in bringing to the public's attention some of the historical background of our Capitol and I felt this document was so interesting and so well done that I sent several copies to my relatives in Denmark. Recently I observed a story in Jyllands-Posten, Denmark, making reference to this publication, and I herewith attach, for the interest of my colleagues, a translation of the article:

ON A JOURNEY OF DISCOVERY UNDERNEATH THE CITY OF WASHINGTON—THE YOUNG COUNTRY DISCOVERS ITS PAST

FRED SCHWENGEL is 2 meters tall and 56 years old and elected as Republican Congressman in the farmer State of Iowa. He has an unusual hobby. He wants to know all about the Capitol in Washington.

"This building fascinated me when I, a few years ago, first came here as a freshman Congressman," he states. "I am still not quite acquainted with it."

Well if SCHWENGEL is not acquainted with it, then no one is.

At every opportunity does he crawl down in the sewers under the building to inspect it from underground.

He has put the result of his investigations in a book which has just been published and is entitled "We the People." It is sold as fast as hot cakes.

On the occasion of the publishing of the book, the author showed the Capitol over and above the tourist's usual rounds. The tour underneath the building can be compared with a tour through the old castle catacombs (this is referring to the ancient castle in Copenhagen over which the newer castle Christiansborg is built, and which is now the seat of the Danish Government) or the dark catacombs in Paris. Underneath the Capitol SCHWENGEL has discovered an oven, which the soldiers used for baking bread during the Civil War well over 100 years ago, and not far from there has he found a luxury marble bathroom which the Senators used in the previous century.

In the catacombs also exist machinery dating from 1880 but despite all technical progress they are still used to air condition the Senate.

Charleston Air Force Base Personnel: Angels of Mercy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, thinking Americans were stunned and shocked with the recent eruption of bloody violence in the Panama Canal Zone.

The pathos and tragedy of women and little children fleeing their homes brought home sharply the ever growing menace being exported from Castro's Cuba. In my First Congressional District, the Air Force base at Charleston became a key point for the quickest and safest evacuation of these Americans.

The men and women at Charleston Air Force Base did an outstanding job under hectic conditions. Officers, enlisted men, and their wives became a

team, working round the clock. Their performance was well above and beyond the call of duty, as they strove to bring a measure of comfort to these refugees from Panama, many of whom arrived with only the clothes on their backs. Truly, the base personnel could be called Angels of Mercy.

Mr. Speaker, this is only another example of the great dedication exemplified by our Armed Forces. They once again proved—as they have proven so many times in the past—that they can operate at top efficiency on a moment's notice.

In the Airlift Dispatch, a base newspaper, several articles modestly report the base's role in the evacuation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert these articles so the entire Congress will know of the fine work resulting from teamwork and dedication at Charleston Air Force Base:

TOP WORD

(By Col. Paul A. Jones)

Mere words are inadequate to express my deep pride in what you have done during the past week. I watched as frightened children reached for your extended hand and I saw their fear replaced by confidence. I saw bewildered women accept your friendly assistance, and replace their lost look with a cheerful smile.

You had no need to rehearse the processing of the evacuees; from your own commonsense and your own wealth of brotherly love you created the smoothest operation I have ever witnessed. From the moment the planes landed at Charleston AFB, you made sure that each incoming person found a friend when they most needed one.

As the long hours wore on, your enthusiasm did not waver. In fact, your spirit was contagious as the hundreds of weary people processed through the necessary stages of coming home you were there to give comfort and assistance. Volunteers from base squadrons, the chaplain's organizations, gray ladies, family service, wives clubs, Red Cross, base service activities, and other agencies joined forces to create this great humanitarian effort.

To me, the men have never stood prouder than they did while giving this help, our ladies were their loveliest as they dried tears and clothed and fed small children. It is impossible in this small space to give credit to each individual, or even to each group. It was an effort by the personnel of this base. You all worked together and you accomplished a great humanitarian feat. Each effort freely given was its own best reward.

You have shown that you can handle emergencies, no matter how large, and that you can do it with enduring enthusiasm.

I am proud of the members of this base. The evacuees shared my gratitude and said so.

DEPENDENTS ARRIVE FROM PANAMA—WIVES, MOTHERS, CHILDREN RECEIVE HELPING HAND

(By S. Sgt. Herbert W. Vaughn)

Charleston AFB became a haven for dependents of military personnel being airlifted out of riot-torn Panama last week. From 9:30 p.m. Wednesday until late Monday afternoon, when the last C-118 touched down here with the final evacuees and MATS control team, some 1,100 persons were airlifted out of Panama to Charleston.

Almost immediately after being alerted of the possible evacuation of some military dependents out of the Central American country, the base became a hub of activity. Extensive preparations were started to insure that the women and children would be taken care of properly and sent to their destinations as soon as possible. Preparations were made to take care of all their needs from medical services to transportation.

Among the first groups to get into action were the base chaplains and ladies organizations of the chapel. Under the direction of Lt. Col. Leonard S. Edmonds, base chaplain, a drive was started to collect warm clothing for the evacuees, as many of them had to leave Panama with very few of their personal belongings. In some cases the women and children arrived here with only the clothes they were wearing. Warm clothing was a must for the evacuees as they arrived from the warm, humid temperatures of Panama and were greeted by near freezing temperatures here.

By the time the first aircraft arrived, approximately 35 large cardboard boxes of clothing had been collected from families living in the area. Charleston merchants also came to the aid of the travelers by sending boxes of clothing to the base for distribution.

Other agencies also swung into action to provide aid for the evacuees. Members of the 1608th Air Terminal Squadron, commanded by Lt. Col. Robert E. Dales, began preparing the terminal area for the great influx of passengers. Volunteers to escort the evacuees were organized by Staff M. Sgt. R. H. Kirkpatrick, Terminal Square first sergeant, and the Red Cross, Gray Ladies, Family Services, and other groups began preparing to aid the dependents.

When the first aircraft arrived all preparations had been completed. As the women and children came off the aircraft they were quickly ushered into the passenger terminal briefing room where they were told of the procedures required before they could be on the way to their destinations in the United States.

After the first arrival the operation became almost routine. Young airmen—who probably had never held babies before—were getting lessons from the women on taking care of youngsters, feeding babies, and generally babysitting for the mothers while travel requests were completed and mothers called relatives to let them know that they were safe in Charleston and would be home soon. Several hundred telephone calls were made by the evacuees to relatives throughout the country. This service was provided by the Red Cross.

In most cases by the time one aircraftload of evacuees, generally 60 persons, were processed and ready to be on their way, another aircraft arrived. As each aircraft arrived with the women and children, they were greeted by escorts, cleared through customs, fitted with warm clothing, helped to find lodging on the base—if necessary—and transportation to their destination was arranged.

The first aircraft touched down here at 9:30 p.m. January 15. By late afternoon, January 20, the 19th mission had landed and some 1,100 people were safe in the United States. Of this number approximately 475 were women, 610 were children, and the remainder were military personnel who were allowed to accompany their families home because their military tours in Panama were completed.

Dependents, who were evacuated through the Charleston aerial port of embarkation, were people who went to Panama with their husbands and fathers, but who did not have government housing when the rioting broke out. When the rioting began, they made a dash for safety and, in their haste, left most of their clothing and other possessions behind.

The C-118 aircraft flown in the evacuation were from the 1611th Air Transport Wing, McGuire AFB, N.J. A team of 10 maintenance specialists from McGuire were flown to Charleston to assist in providing turnaround maintenance on the aircraft.

According to many veteran officials of the base, the entire operation was handled very smoothly and there were no significant difficulties during the airlift.

VOLUNTEERS ASSIST EVACUEES

(By T. Sgt. Milton J. Sheely)

Say what you may or what you might think, but according to this writer the big news story of the week took place here when the Military Air Transport Service brought the dependents of Armed Forces personnel from Panama to Charleston AFB.

Last Wednesday night, a C-118 aircraft screeched to a final stop in front of the 1608th Air Passenger Terminal and after clearing U.S. Customs and Immigration, began the procedure of off-loading the volunteer returnees from Panama.

Stepping out from the aircraft into the cold, bitter night air at Charleston AFB, the dependents were greeted by the terminal personnel and received help with their children from volunteer airmen who carried the youngsters down the steep steps and into the warm shelter of the terminal briefing room. The wives and kids were lightly dressed, many of the women were pregnant, and looked as though they could use help, hot coffee, warm clothes and a friendly smile.

More than that actually greeted them after they completed their processing through the Charleston AFB Port of Entry. Once they were through with the formality of getting back into the United States of America, they were on their own. After getting their commercial rail, bus or air line tickets, the dependents were guided into the main passenger terminal where they were greeted by numerous volunteer workers from Charleston AFB.

I had the opportunity to cover the entire passenger terminal and see just how smoothly an operation such as this can be carried out.

I saw an air policeman on duty directing passenger traffic holding a large, two-month-old boy. The man told me that the youngster wouldn't let anyone eles hold him, so he took over the job. Needless to say, the young lad fell asleep on the AP's shoulder and was later placed in a nursery crib.

Red Cross, Gray Ladies, and Family Service volunteers were seen everywhere, carrying babies, or holding on the younger children, taking them to the restrooms, to the nursery or television room or making them comfortable so they could sleep. And many a young airman, during this busy night, had his first crack at changing a diaper on one of the chidlren in the nursery. Other volunteers took the mothers to the rear of the terminal to fit them with clothing provided through the efforts of the base chaplain and other base services through the base-wide clothing drives.

Early in the evening I saw our general's wife slip through the crowd and take her position behind the Red Cross desk and begin the job of assisting the dependents to complete forms, place long-distance phone calls to relatives and answer many questions the people had to ask. Also included were the young Jango volunteers who wore the floors smooth with their long hours of assistance to the dependents and babies in the nursery.

This was one of the best examples of "teamwork" between people that I have ever seen at any one time. Everything went like clockwork * * * no snags, no confusion, and no one standing around wondering what to do next. Every person taking a part in the helping hand had a personal dedication in making life a bit more comfortable and easier for the dependents.

A long line of Air Force blue snaked from the U.S. Customs area back through the commercial ticket section of the terminal. I spoke to the 40 airmen and asked them, "How about it fellows, are all of you volun-

teers? Are you sure you weren't placed on a list and told you would be at such and such a place to render assistance tonight?" Every one of the airmen definitely stated that they wanted to help; this was a chance to really do something worthwhile, leaving each one of them with a feeling of personal satisfaction, of warmhearted accomplishment. Not only did they help carry the small children off the aircraft, but also carried luggage and purchased tickets for the dependents.

Not many people visited the nursery. I imagine, but Family Services and Red Cross volunteers really received a workout there. Babies and older kids needed clothing or a couple of diaper changes, food and comfort and the volunteers certainly took care of this operation. The mothers didn't have to worry about their children and were free to make necessary arrangements for their departure from Charleston Air Force Base.

The one thing that impressed me more than anything else is this: If I should be overseas and have to send my wife and three children home with practically nothing in the way of clothes, money or other personal items, I now know that somewhere, and especially at Charleston Air Force Base, that they will receive the attention they will need in the way of moral support, clothing, housing, food, transportation, and medical assistance.

When we all take a long, hard look at ourselves we know that we will help those people who are less fortunate than ourselves. And to me, as it may be to you, this is a comforting feeling.

Problems in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which was recently delivered by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN.

His speech is concerned with the problems facing the beef industry and the whole general area of agriculture. It is important that we all become aware of the problems posed by foreign competition in agriculture because it directly or indirectly affects each one of us and it certainly has a telling effect on the national economy and prosperity of the American farmer. Mr. NELSEN speaks from personal experience and I am pleased to commend him for his discussion of this vital area of concern.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN ANCHER NELSEN ON JANUARY 21, 1964, BEFORE THE MINNESOTA STATE MEETING OF NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION AT OLIVIA, MINN.

This was a most welcome invitation. It gave me the opportunity to come back to the farm this weekend and also gives me the opportunity to visit in Renville County—the county in which I was born.

For months we have heard much talk about the tremendous losses that cattle feeders have suffered and likewise we take note of the fact that farm parity of income, according to USDA analyses, is the lowest since 1939. For these reasons I think it very pertinent that farm folks get together and discuss the plight we are in with the hope that some resolution to the problem may be reached. We all realize that agriculture cannot remain in a slump without the entire economy of our country suffering by a recession and finally a depression.

Those of us who really operate farms find that we are constantly faced with tax increases, and cost of equipment rises while income declines. At the same time we have long been treated to the wild promises of smooth politicians who have practiced good politics but poor economics.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING NEEDED

Through the years I have watched with interest political trends and tactics, and looking back, we observe many things and among them the admonition of the philosopher who once said, "Let us look backward so that we may better be able to look forward."

Looking backward we are forced to admit that among many farm leaders in the past, one stands out as exemplary. This man has been sound; he has been courageous. And the man to whom I refer is U.S. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a Democrat and former Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator ANDERSON, way back in 1947 came to the conclusion that some long-range farm program was necessary. He felt that we needed a program that would establish some sort of a floor under agricultural prices, but such a program should not interfere with the functions of our systems above this floor. This would permit the normal processes of marketing, merchandising, and competition to work in the best interest of our country.

In 1948 both political parties endorsed the Anderson theory; but in 1949 the Brannan plan came into the picture and from that day on, a battle continued in the Congress of the United States: high supports versus low supports, and politicians trying to outpromise one another. As a result, there has been no uniformity of policy over a long enough period to prove anything, and in my judgment, the farmer has been the victim of mistakes that have been made through political motivation, and agriculture has suffered because of it.

In our farming operation at Hutchinson we are not in the cattle feeding business. My son and I have a dairy herd and have about 125 head of Holsteins on our farm, but we are concerned about cattle prices because, as you know, when you maintain a herd of milk cows there is a great turnover in animals that go off to slaughter. The problems of agriculture are all related, whether you be a wheat farmer, a dairy farmer, or a cattle feeder.

Over a period of many years we have all worked with farm organizations to develop marketing facilities. We have struggled to keep our competitive marketing facilities going, and we have organized farm cooperatives in the hope that these competitive facilities in our free enterprise system could improve the position of the farmer.

We have worked with farm organizations in the hope that programs could be developed not with the idea of a subsidy from the taxpayer, but with the hope that farm income could be stabilized in the best interests of our country as well as the farmer. It is easy to understand why we are a bit discouraged at this point with parity at 77 percent, beef prices low, hog prices down, taxes up, family farms decreasing.

CAUSE FOR CONCERN

When circumstances like this develop, we immediately start looking for the cause. We all know that a big factor as far as livestock is concerned has been imports, which have been increasing rapidly in late years—and I intend to touch on that later. But first, I think we need to review the handling of farm programs by the Department of Agriculture where, in my judgment, a great contributing factor to the present circumstances rests.

Reviewing legislation and policy since I have been in Congress, I would like to point out that in 1960 when the first feed grain bill came to the committee for consideration, we found to our surprise that the high-support theory had been dropped, and instead, a support level of 74 percent of parity resulted from Department decision, with a provision in the bill allowing the Secretary to sell Commodity Credit surpluses substantially below support prices. The theory of the superplanners was that if Government prices were higher than market prices, the noncooperating farmer would be punished with low prices and would be driven into the program because of this price differential. Such an arrangement, of course, would tend to make support prices the ceiling price, and the story is well known that Commodity Credit dumped grain on the market in excessive amounts. For example, in the year 1962–63, October 1 to September 30, over 700 million bushels of corn were dumped. In the year 1961–62, 900 million bushels of corn were sold. In addition to that, in the 2-year period, 365 million hundredweights of grain sorghum was sold. All of this adds up to the equivalent of 2 billion bushels of corn. This was approximately equal to the total carryover of corn in 1961.

In turn, this depressed the price of corn, which, of course, encouraged the producer to move into the livestock feeding program, having in mind the old statement that cheap feed means cheap livestock. As a result of this dumping of corn, Commodity Credit corn was available in the market at figures as low as 80 cents a bushel.

Listen, for example, to what one of our best known farm leaders has to say. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, told its annual meeting last month:

"Since January 1961, the Federal Government has taken over a large part of the grain business. In that time it has sold the stupendous total of 3.5 billion bushels. That's between one-third and one-half of all the grain moving in commercial channels. This has been accomplished through a vast organization that has offices in almost every county, unlimited finances, giant central computers and arbitrary control over all the rules.

"Millions of dollars of income that should have sustained the private enterprise marketing system which is essential year in and year out to your marketing service, are building this vast Government machine. This must end. Either farmers must get out of the business of grain marketing, or the Government must get out."

The next serious error that I would like to mention was the fact that a large number of States were declared to be feed deficit areas and a preferred freight rate, not available to the cooperative elevators and the private grain trade, was established, known as the section 22 freight rate provision.

Great amounts of feed grain moved into the South. This stimulated the poultry industry to vast proportions which, of course, becomes a competitive meat product.

We have recently heard much talk of the chicken war in the world market. I refer to the August 19 edition of the Farmers Union Herald, on page 9, where an article remarks that "chickens come home to roost." This article points out that the sale of Commodity Credit grain at bargain rates stimulated the Common Market countries into a realization of the competition they would have in their domestic market so they adjusted their import levies on feed grain.

Next, the southern broiler producers, who were favored with bargain freight rates and

bargain grain, found they could compete in the European market with broilers because of their favored position, until these countries levied high tariffs that started the chicken war.

For many months last year we in this country were engaged in the "chicken war," as the countries of the European Common Market went about the business of deciding that they did not need much of our American-grown poultry. We were losing a great and growing market of substantial importance to some segments of American agriculture, and it was rapidly becoming an important factor in the future of our trade relations and our whole foreign trade. You will remember what happened—we reached a point where it became necessary to threaten retaliation if our American produce was to be cut off. So what did we do? We raised our tariff on French brandy as our big club to win concessions for our chickens.

Well, I don't believe you and I have missed our brandy much, but our poultry producers have missed a tremendously important market, especially as our European friends raised their poultry tariff again recently after we had already been forced into accepting a settlement which nobody could claim was very good for us.

I mention the chicken story for two reasons—one, I'm sure we haven't heard the last of it; and two, I wonder what our Yankee traders will offer to save the livestock industry from collapse—if we trade chickens for brandy, will we trade beef for kangaroo tails?

Is America so rich and so great that it can give endlessly in bad deals, by permitting a billion pounds of beef to be imported without stirring a bureaucratic muscle, by letting ourselves be traded out of position every time we meet with friend or foe?

You and I are deeply concerned about what's happening to our livestock industry, an industry which has managed to feed us well without support prices or controls, an industry which represents $23 out of every $100 in sales of agricultural products, an industry whose declining income not only threatens it with disaster but has been the major factor in driving our farm parity income to its lowest level in 25 years.

FOREIGN TRADE AND TARIFF

Let's start, however, with the realization that we cannot and do not want to eliminate foreign trade, whether it be imports or exports. After all, this country ships some $6 billion in farm products abroad each year, a big 25 percent of our export trade. We sell soybeans and poultry and wheat and cotton and a lot of other basic products of our farms to the peoples of the world, to their great gain and to the advantage of our own economy, and certainly we do not want to cut that vital business from our annual transactions. And we heard a great deal a couple of years ago, when we were debating the new trade agreements act, that new negotiations and new deals would open many doors to many new products and a vast expansion of our foreign trade.

But I well recall how many of us were concerned then, and expressed it over and over again, that our farmers would be left holding the sack when the trading began. And that's the way it is looking, I'm afraid, as we prepare for the spring round of negotiations which have been designated as the "Kennedy round." What is going to happen when these prosperous European countries build their tariff walls higher and decide they don't need our farm products? What will be our fate if the Nations down under, which have found the United States to be their best market—having been cut off to some extent from their old channels of trade—persist in flooding us with beef and veal—and who protect their own agriculture 100 percent.

There is no comfort in the comment recently of Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, respected voice of agriculture and one of our most international-minded Senators, when he said, "American agriculture is being traded off for the benefit of our industries."

And there is no comfort in the attitude of our own Secretary of Agriculture who persisted in saying all last year that beef imports were having little or no effect on beef prices. This in spite of the fact that in 1963 our beef imports represented 11 percent of our own production, compared to less than 4 percent a scant 6 years ago. Obviously we can use some imports to match our needs, and perhaps 4 or 5 percent of production is fair enough, but one would have to be blind indeed to contend that letting a billion pounds of beef into the ocuntry in a year is having no effect on our own prices.

It is true, of course, that our own livestock population is gaining steadily, as we Americans are now eating twice as much beef per capita as we did a few years ago, and as prices have been attractive. But, as Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, said in the Senate the other day, "When the number of cattle has increased only 4 percent, it is hard to account for a 25 percent decrease in price."

And then bear this in mind, as Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, said recently: "Our trade representatives will go to the forthcoming negotiations armed with authority to reduce the present tariff on these meat products by 50 percent, or even to zero."

Well, we've tried—goodness knows, we've tried. We have had to fight the argument that most Australian beef becomes American hamburger, and therefore does not compete with our high quality cuts—silly argument, isn't it, especially when we remember that 30 percent of any fed beef carcass goes into hamburger, whether that beef has talked with an Australian or an American accent.

USDA APATHY

Months ago I pleaded with Secretary Freeman to do something about it. I quoted chapter and verse of the problem, and got no response. I tried again a month later, and got another burst of silence. So next, shortly before we quit to go home for Christmas, I wrote Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee. I told him of the inability to get action or even response from the Secretary; I reminded him of the sharp increase in imports and the sharp decline in prices; I reminded him of the tremendous importance of the livestock industry to the Nation and to the economy.

I can't pretend to guess what will come of it, but I am glad to report that 2 weeks ago one of Mr. COOLEY's subcommittees held the first of a series of hearings, finally delving into this whole subject. Several of your friends from the national organizations were present and took an active part in the discussions. It was my privilege to listen to them, and to join them in subsequent discussions.

So possibly we are on the way to some sort of action. Whether the Congress should insist on applying quotas to livestock imports as the surest way to put the brakes on is hard to predict as yet; I'm sure that if we wait for the slow motion of the Tariff Commission the livestock industry will be as dead as the carcasses you ship to market. But maybe some deals can be made—if our traders will do a better job than they have so far in Europe. Maybe we can get agreements to put voluntary limits on imports which would be adjustable to our needs; and maybe we could even make use of the fact that Australia and same other countries are glad to have quotas of our sugar production and could be talked into a settlement which would be good for everyone.

At any rate, it would seem now, at long last, that our combined efforts are beginning to show some results in the attention the Department of Agriculture is finally giving the problem. Just last week a considerable group of Members of Congress—both Representatives and Senators—met with Secretary Freeman and threshed out a lot of angles of the problem. It is evident that it is now being taken seriously, and perhaps we can hope for sensible action.

Experiences of a Volunteer Hospital Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by a constituent of mine, Arthur M. Aibinder, which appeared in the January 19, 1964, edition of Pictorial Living, the New York Journal American Sunday magazine. The article is a sensitive and eloquent exposition of Mr. Aibinder's experience as a volunteer hospital worker. The article follows:

THE VOLUNTEER'S STORY

(By Arthur M. Aibinder)

For the last 10 years I've spent every minute of my spare time as a hospital volunteer. They tell me I've logged 12,816 hours so far, but it's hard to believe—the time went so fast. If I am a success at my work, there is only one factor I can attribute it to—I'm a terrible checker player. Any 8-year-old can beat me easily.

I spend much of my time in the pediatric wards because I love children. Financially, there's no reward. But there is the smile from an ailing child. Spiritually, a volunteer in any hospital becomes a millionaire many times over.

There was Rickey. He was only 2 years old when he was admitted to Metropolitan Hospital for malnutrition. One day, Rickey's doctor offered me a challenge. Rickey could neither walk nor talk. He explained that only with affection could the child make any progress at all. Would I help?

Walking was no problem. At first I held Rickey's hand as we took a few steps together. Gradually, the steps increased until Rickey felt confident to run into my arms by himself.

Trying to teach Rickey to talk was not so easy. Each night when I visited him, I turned on his bedlight several times, saying the word "light." He said nothing for about a month.

Then one evening, one I'll never forget, I approached his bed. He gave me his usual broad smile. In a clear voice, like the sound of an angel's trumpet, he uttered the word "light."

Andy had just arrived from Puerto Rico when he was hospitalized. He had an orthopedic problem which kept him bedridden for about a year. This 10-year-old would not permit himself to become discouraged or depressed. He cultivated his priceless talent for art. His pictures became a treasure to hospital personnel. He also learned the English language. He did so well that before he was discharged he was able to hold his own in a challenging game of scrabble.

The years pass quickly for a hospital volunteer. I realized this one day when I visited an 8-year-old girl who shared a room with a little baby. The infant's mother said, "Artie, you don't remember me." I asked the young woman if she had an older child who

was hospitalized. Perhaps he was one of the patients I worked with. The mother surprised me by saying "I was the child." When I arrived home I looked in the mirror for gray hairs—and found them.

I have been on volunteer service at six hospitals and can sincerely say that at each I never felt I was giving, but getting an inner satisfaction which cannot be expressed in mere words. I am now connected with two New York hospitals, St. Luke's and the Hospital for Joint Diseases.

Working with children is so rewarding. When I meet a new patient, I convey that though I do not know him yet I like him. Language is no barrier when I meet a child who cannot converse in English. A smile and a game of checkers can strike up a genuine friendship.

The children expect a volunteer on the days he is scheduled to serve. Recently, I was detained because of an emergency visit to the dentist. When I arrived at the hospital I explained to the children about the emergency. One little girl said, "Artie, forget the dentist—let's play."

It is so important that the volunteer reach out to the patients he meets at the hospital. He must try, as best he can, to put himself in the patient's place. He must use his heart as well as his head. He must really like people to qualify for the rewards of hospital service.

The volunteer can offer so much to hospitalized patients. He can, for example, participate in the pediatric or adult recreation programs. He can teach an adult patient an interesting subject, or lead a group in arts and crafts activities. He can sit at a bedside and offer sincere words of encouragement to a lonely fellow human being in need of a friend. He can do all this and so much more.

The Junior Red Cross volunteer, the coed, the lowliest employee to the business executive, church and synagogue members, men and women in all walks of life, are members of the volunteer service family.

The family will continue to expand as more people join us. It is my feeling that we will never have enough volunteers until each patient has his very own.

As a volunteer, you may find, as I have, that the best part about leaving the hospital at the end of an evening is that there is always tomorrow, when you will be able to return.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 25, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Jan. 25, 1964)

KEY ISSUES IN 1964

Five key issues face Congress and the American people in 1964. The President and leaders of the Democratic Party have clearly drawn the line making these five key issues the basic differences between the two parties. They also spell out the most vital areas of concern to the people in both domestic and foreign policy.

Foreign policy

Foreign policy must take first place. The struggle in the world today is between capitalism and freedom as against communism and slavery. How we conduct ourselves as a nation, the kind of leadership we give the world, will mean the difference between victory and defeat in a war which is already in progress. Two legislative issues in foreign policy are paramount as the basis for a more effective overall foreign policy.

1. Aid to communism: This will come up again, as it does every year, in the Mutual Security bill. This question will be, should we aid and finance communism? We are doing so now in:

(a) The wheat deal demanded by the administration in the closing days of the last session. In the first sale alone we gave Russia a direct subsidy of $25 million, plus a shipping subsidy of $1 million. Actually, Russia will pay less for our wheat than the American housewife pays when buying bread at the corner grocery and we will help them finance the deal.

(b) We continue to make deals with Russia in spite of the fact they have broken 51 of 53 treaties and agreements and are even now fomenting revolution and violence and anti-Americanism everywhere in the world—Latin America, Africa, Asia, and even among our so-called allies.

2. Aid to those helping the Communists. This is the second part of the two-part blueprint for national suicide. We continue to give aid to Communist countries—Poland and Yugoslavia—to neutrals and allies who help the Communists. On a crucial vote last year which would have denied U.S. aid to those countries shipping goods to Cuba the House split 162 to 162 and 1 vote decided aaginst the self-interest of the United States (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 23, 1963).

Domestic

On the domestic front three issues will be decided within the next few weeks.

1. The tax bill was approved by the Senate Finance Committee and now goes to the Senate. Many of the reforms hammered out by the Ways and Means Committee and approved by the House have already been knocked out of the bill. Further attacks on the middle-income group, the overwhelming majority of taxpayers, will surely be made. My voting record has been entirely consistent—no real tax cut will be effective unless we cut Federal spending, balance the budget, and reduce the debt. A tax cut must be earned through fiscal discipline and responsibility. It cannot be done by merely juggling figures in a phony exercise in economy. To do less will cause Government-sponsored inflation, that is the devaluing of our money so that your dollar buys less. Inflation of the past has already caused a 50-percent decline in the purchasing power of our money.

Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, this week exposed the fallacy of the President's statements on the budget. CANNON said, in part: "Contrary to impressions, this budget is higher, not lower than the current year. It calls for higher, not lower, appropriations—the budget calls for new obligational authority. Contrary to impressions, this budget is above, not below the magic mark of $100 billion. * * * This budget does not point to any lasting reversal of the upward trend of Federal spending. This budget sows the seeds of increased spending in the future. * * * The President urges supplemental obligational authority for the current fiscal year 1964 which * * * would in total more than cancel out the entire cut made in the last session."

2. Civil rights: The civil rights bill, with its public accommodations section, seriously threatens private property ownership. It discriminates against white to give special privilege to Negroes. It is being debated under the pressure of riots and the violence of last summer and the threat of increased violence and violation of the law if all the demands of its proponents are not met. My position has been consistent in this field—I believe in and have supported equality before the law for all our citizens. I have opposed the destruction of the right to own and manage private property and the freedom of association. The world struggle, and the New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier radicalism, directs its assault on the individual's right of property ownership.

3. Medicare: The Ways and Means Committee is now considering the new version of medicare—"hospital insurance for all persons over 65." Proponents, urged by the President to put the heat on Congress to pass the bill, ignore the facts:

(1) The actuarial imbalance of the program. Chairman MILLS of Ways and Means, has pointed out that in previous bills the increased tax asked was only one-half enough to meet the cost.

(2) It is not insurance, but a gratuity as the Supreme Court has ruled that social security cannot be insurance under the Constitution.

(3) The concept of this bill that many persons receive benefits who have never paid into the fund, violates the original concept of the social security program that a person would draw benefits in relation to the amount paid in.

(4) The injustice to new workers now entering the labor force. The new worker will (a) pay in for 45 years before drawing partial benefits for hospital coverage while millions over 65, including the very wealthy, have paid in nothing; (b) he must pay for 45 years on other insurance to supplement his annuity when he reaches 65; (c) he must pay current insurance premiums for protection for himself and his family during his working years; (d) he must pick up the unfunded indebtedness of the social security program amounting to $331 billion.

WILL SEEK YOUR OPINION

These are my views as your Representative, on the issues we face this year. Within a few days I will use all the available news media in Dallas County, to pose these questions to all the people of the Fifth District so that there may be a clear understanding of how you feel. Everyone is involved. You must make the choice on the kind of Nation and world we will have tomorrow. The choice will be made with or without you.

Diverted Acreage Plan for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Agriculture proposed a diverted acreage plan for cotton, and those of us from cotton-producing States are greatly concerned over the devastating effect of such a plan on the cotton industry. While I am sure my colleagues representing cotton-producing areas know of this proposal and have expressed their opposition, I would like to again call attention to the effect of such a proposal by including in my remarks a letter which I have just written the Secretary of Agriculture.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 25, 1964.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I protest as strongly as I know how the proposed diverted

acreage plan for cotton. From all information which has been submitted to me, this plan would have a devastating effect on the cotton producers of this country, especially those in Texas.

Since February 4 is the final release date in Texas under the release and reapportionment program, it is imperative that you instruct State ASCS offices to comply with the release and reapportionment law. Unless the Department of Agriculture makes clear its position immediately, Texas alone stands to lose at least $100 million income and approximately 700,000 history acres in 1964.

For example, in a sample cotton district in Texas, which includes most of the 10 counties in my congressional district, approximately 46,000 acres were released for redistribution in 1963; and with the deadline only 2 weeks away only 6,400 acres have been released this year. In Williamson County, which is the largest cotton-producing county in my district, 17,000 acres were released from 549 farms last year, and this year only 2,771 acres have been released from 100 farms.

A diverted acreage program which you propose, with time allotted for acceptance, would kill the cotton industry in my district. It would destroy or greatly weaken the family farms. It is unfair to those farmers who have already released and to those farmers who have invested in soil fertilization and preparation during last fall only to be faced with the diverted acreage program in the past 30 days. The worse problem facing farmers is that they are left each year at the end of their turn rows wondering what is the next policy. This diverted acreage program is an example of late, last-minute inference of legislation and leaves our farmers confused. There is little or no chance to pass the diverted acreage program in this Congress, so the release and reapportionment program must be immediately stressed.

Therefore, it is extremely important that it be made clear that participation in the release and reapportionment program will not result in the loss of acreage history or the privilege to participate under the diverted acreage plan should it be enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. PICKLE.

Distortion of Statements by Senator Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, many people have been concerned over the tendency of certain members of the press to distort utterances and statements made by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. Mr. Lloyd Waring, chairman of the Massachusetts Goldwater for President Committee, issued a very important statement on this matter concerning the handling of Senator GOLDWATER's speech on January 15 before the Economic Club of New York City. Mr. Waring's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. LLOYD WARING

GOLDWATER is being smeared by slanted and misleading reports of his statements.

Reports and discussions of that speech focused on a few controversial remarks, which really related to side issues, and failed to communicate the real point and substance of his speech. The public is entitled to a chance to make a fair appraisal of Senator GOLDWATER's policies.

In a speech in New York last Wednesday, GOLDWATER outlined his views on the proper role of the Federal Government in stimulating employment and overcoming poverty. He backed individual and local initiative as against a Federal cure-all. He was critical of "the Santa Claus of the Government handout," and the idea that the Government should "sacrifice the liberties of the many in order to cater to the demands of the few."

He said that "men and women working and investing in thousands of industries can build the wealth that best fights poverty. America for most of its years has waged a war on poverty. And wherever it has waged that war in factories, in laboratories, in shops, over counters, and under the enterprise system, it has won that war." But he opposed the idea that "the bureaucracy in Washington can end poverty and create prosperity."

He recognized that society should help those in trouble through no fault of their own, and said he had proposed tax credits to make it easier to go to college. But he believes it wrong for Government to "reduce the incentives for enterprise and abolish the consequences of inertia."

GOLDWATER's views are entitled to fair consideration and appraisal. They did not get it. They did not get it because the newspaper reports and subsequent discussions scarcely mentioned the real points of his speech. They just focused on certain isolated and more controversial passages. These were his suggestion that "as an essential safeguard on public welfare programs, those who are physically able to work should be put to work to earn their benefits," and his remarks as to an individual's responsibility for failure to secure education and skills. For most, the reason for the failure, he said, was lack of ambition and intelligence.

Reporters pounced on these more controversial statements and scarcely touched on the real substance of GOLDWATER's views. The cynical headline about the speech in one paper was "BARRY's Aid Plan: Put Them to Work."

The public is entitled to a chance to make a fair appraisal of GOLDWATER's views. They must be fairly reported without slanting and distortion.

I have enough confidence in the voters to believe that given the true facts, they will make a wise decision. They cannot make a wise decision on the basis of distorted facts.

Our democratic system of Government depends on frank and free discussion. The Scriptures tell us "the truth shall make you free." The converse is also true. Misrepresentations and distortions of the truth will make us slaves.

Glencoe First Grade Is Joy to Teenage Pakistani

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, for a renewed sense of value, I ask my colleagues to read the story of a Minnesota schoolteacher, a Pakistani teenager, and a thirst for knowledge and learning, as told in the attached article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of January 12, 1964. I found the story to be a touching one and deserving of attention:

GLENCOE FIRST GRADE IS JOY TO TEENAGE PAKISTANI

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

GLENCOE, MINN.—Teacher Donald Demeules fixes the meals these days for the youth who was his houseboy for 18 months in Pakistan.

"Don pretty good houseboy," grins Zar Said, the erstwhile servant, speaking of the man he used to call "Professor Sahib," and using the brand of English he is substituting with increasing fluency for his native Urdu.

It is one of the many jokes about his temporary new American life—as part-time first grader, part-time teenager—that draw Zar Said's flashing smile.

The young Pakistani came to Demeules in Pakistan as a penniless but cheerful illiterate, eager to find work to help him rise above his lowly status in Dagi village in the State of Swat.

Because no records are kept for Pakistanis of his class, Zar Said's age is unknown—18 or 19 is Demeules' best guess.

Demeules, 37, again teaching junior high school English after 2 years of teaching Pakistanis on a Fulbright fellowship, took a liking to his industrious young houseboy and admired his practical native intelligence.

"Besides, he understood my Urdu, which many others couldn't," Demeules recalls laughingly.

When he learned, after returning to the United States, that Zar Said had become the cat's paw in a family feud that called for at least six deaths—Zar Said's probably among them—Demeules decided to bring the youth to this country for schooling.

With the aid of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Demeules obtained a 4-month visitor's visa and Zar Said (it means "gold-holy person") arrived in Glencoe November 4.

Although he confounded airline hostesses by telling them he spoke "Pakistani English" (he thought "English" meant language), Zar Said's English 2 months ago was limited largely to "Don Demeules" and "Glencoe, Minn."

Today—although "come-on" is his all-purpose verb ("I come-on car")—there are few ideas he won't try to get across in his new language—with mixed success.

Upon arrival in this McLeod County town of 3,500 residents, Zar Said found helping hands everywhere.

School Supt. George Hoppe fitted him in as part-time student under two teachers: Mrs. Vernon Hoysler in first grade, where Zar Said goes each morning to learn to read and figure, and Winifred Murray, senior high school English teacher, who devotes her morning free period to teaching him spoken English.

The faculty gave a shower for Zar Said ("clothes come on many people"), so Demeules, after putting up $1,200 for Zar Said's air passage, largely has been spared the expense of outfitting him. Zar Said's wardrobe on arrival consisted largely of several pairs of outside baggy white cotton trousers.

As they did in Demeules' bachelor quarters in Karachi, he and Zar Said live in a three-room upstairs apartment here. But while Demeules sleeps in a regular bed, Zar Said has spread his Pakistani blankets on the exposed springs of the Army surplus bunk that school authorities found for him.

If he can obtain a 4-month visa extension, or convert it to an exchange student visa with longer visiting privileges, Demeules would like Zar Said to learn auto mechanics at a trade school. The training would enable the young Pakistani, determined to return home eventually to get a job with pay and status.

A typical day starts for Zar Said at 7 a.m. with the first of his five-a-day, 10-minute prayer sessions.

Demeules determined that Mecca is roughly southeast of Glencoe, so Zar Said, a devout Moslem, points his prayer-rug toward a southeast window. Then, barefoot but wearing a Minnesota-style stocking cap, and after careful washing, he performs the devotions of Islam.

"When I prayer, don't speaking," he cautioned visitors last week.

His prayers are murmered while standing, kneeling, holding hands on knees, squatting, and touching his forehead to the floor.

Zar Said, who first found it incredible that Minnesota should have no mosques, came to accept the idea that private prayer would satisfy the dictates of his faith, according to Demeules.

So he rejected Demeules' offer to send back home photographs showing him at prayer as proof to those who said Americans would try to Christianize him: "God knows I pray and that's all that's necessary," Zar Said told Demeules.

Demeules usually fixes breakfast and dinner for them both because, although Zar Said cooked expertly in his native land, he is unused to the apartment's electric range.

From 8 to 10:30 a.m., Zar Said is in Mrs. Hoysler's first grade at Helen Baker Grade School, where he reads with "Jay's Group" and Shirley Super, 6, is his special helper.

With 25 first graders to worry about, Mrs. Hoysler can't give much time to her teenage pupil. But, she says, "the children know more than he does and think it's great fun to help him with his letters, words, and numbers."

Meanwhile, Glencoe probably has the State's only first graders with some knowledge of words in Urdu.

From 10:30 until lunch, Zar Said works at the high school with Miss Murray, a 24-year teaching veteran, on vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure.

"He's very alert and eager," she reports, "and very humble about learning from a first-grade reader (Dick and Jane.")

But when Zar Said makes a mistake typical of the reader taught by word memorization—such as reading "help" for "look"—Miss Murray reflects aloud, "I sometimes wonder—if we used phonics (letter sounds), I think I could move faster."

Lunch with Supt. Hoppe's office staff, headed by Mrs. Margaret Jumer, is next on the schedule. These quiet meals on trays in the office with three secretaries proved less disturbing and more instructional to Zar Said than eating in the crowded men's lounge with Glencoe's men teachers.

Zar Said spends afternoons in study, more prayers, cleaning the apartment, and simple shopping for the two-bachelor household (he can follow Demeules' shopping lists) and visits with his many school friends.

Demeules expected diet to be a major problem. It hasn't been. Skeptics at home warned Zar Said the American heathen would force him to drink liquor and eat forbidden "haram" foods, but he quickly learned otherwise.

Now he eats everything but pork and depends on Demeules' assurance that a dish is "hallal"—the Urdu equivalent of kosher.

This is but one of many major adjustments Demeules finds Zar Said has made with amazing success. Another is his ability to get along with the opposite sex—both school friends and older women—despite coming from a land where women over 10 are kept both veiled and hidden.

Weekends the two usually spend at Demeules' family home at 6031 West River Road, Brooklyn Center, when Demeules' mother, Mrs. H. Z. Demeules, cooks for them and does their laundry.

Not one to keep an opinion to himself for long, Zar Said has definite likes and dislikes.

Among the former: TV westerns, hamburgers, and French fries, telephoning (he holds the receiver away from his ear and puzzles, "What shall I say?") and Glencoe basketball games.

Among the dislikes: all TV except the shoot-'em-ups, football ("Not good—all people jump on one person"), cheering ("No like 'go-go'—too much speak-speak"), Demeules' driving ("Too fast go" and couples who neck while driving ("Could be accident.").

And of his entire American experience, Zar Said's opinion is brief, enthusiastic but probably not quite up to Miss Murray's speech standards: "Too much lucky, yes."

Vital Wildlife Refuge Menaced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle details in vivid terms the importance and necessity of preserving the Tule Lake-Klamath Waterfowl Refuge on the California-Oregon border.

Section eight of the House bill—a section which would allow either California or Oregon to set aside the provisions of the act—should be deleted. Otherwise this is a good bill and it should be approved without delay.

The above-mentioned editorial is as follows:

WILDLIFE REFUGE AGAIN MENACED

In their multitudinous annual migrations to and from their breeding grounds in Canada and Alaska, waterfowl of this region follow what is known as the Pacific flyway—a complex of branching routes through Washington, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Oregon, and Nevada, almost all of which funnel into the Tule Lake-Lower Klamath area.

At this hub of the migrations, the Federal Government has established refuges of prime importance, not only to sportsmen but also to California's farmers. This is, according to California's Fish and Game Commission, "perhaps the greatest concentration point for waterfowl in the entire Nation." Some 7 million ducks a year are estimated to use this stopovre and the fish and game commission observes: "From there comes the tremendous movement down the central valleys of California."

Not only does the Tule Lake-Klamath refuge provide food and a resting place for migratory waterfowl, to the obvious advantage of the State's numerous hunters, but it also serves to protect vast acreages of rice and other forage crops from depredations that would inevitably occur in the absence of the refuge. The Tule Lake-Lower Klamath refuge is worth millions to farmers.

Informed opinion holds that disappearance or substantial shrinkage of the Tule Lake-Klamath refugee would of necessity send migrating waterfowl far inland—probably to the Salt Lake area—and leave the coastal areas barren of ducks, except for strays that would feed on rice and other grain fields.

Despite its substantial and diverse benefits to recreation and agriculture, the refuge has been and remains under constant threat from those who would reclaim more of its dwindling acreage for farming purposes, and from those who would drain away its waters for irrigation and thereby destroy its usefulness as a resting and feeding place for waterfowl.

To safeguard this invaluable asset from further incursions, Senator KUCHEL and others have brought forward a bill that has been properly called one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation of the times. In brief, it would set aside the Tule Lake-Klamath refuge as a conservation area first, making its agricultural usage secondary. Without interfering with the farms already on the site, it would prevent additions thereto. It would likewise provide that the water level must not be permitted to fall below that required for the support of migratory birds.

This bill has received overwhelming approval in the Senate. In its passage toward House consideration, it has gained committee approval, but has been so vitiated by amendments as to become impotent and utterly unacceptable to its sponsors in the Senate. One amendment, for example, would permit either the California or Oregon Legislature to set its provisions aside and completely defeat its purpose.

The legislation is essential to the continued existence and usefulness of the Tule Lake-Klamath refuge. Its importance to California's agriculture, sportsmen, and scenic and recreation assets cannot be overestimated. It is the plain duty of California's Representatives in the House to delete the crippling amendments and support this protective measure as approved by the Senate.

Ed Murrow's Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I respectfully submit without comment on my part the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on January 26.

The editorial is as follows:

ED MURROW'S SUCCESSOR

It is too bad that Edward R. Murrow has resigned as Director of the U.S Information Agency. This is an important post. If its job is to be done successfully, the man at the top must be endowed with tact, wisdom, and good judgment. If he lacks these qualities the story of the United States will suffer in the telling.

Ed Murrow had the requisite qualities. Unfortunately, he must now step aside so as to rest and recuperate from his lung cancer operation.

As Mr. Murrow's replacement, President Johnson has picked Carl T. Rowan, a Negro, who has served as Ambassador to Finland and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. We are not at all sure that Mr. Rowan, despite his many talents, is qualified for the job.

In December 1961, he prepared a brash speech for delivery to a Philadelphia audience. In that speech, as released for publication, he paid his respects to Americans who did not agree with our official Congo policy. In this country, he said, "we have a conglomeration of arch conservatives: People who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation; opponents of fluoridation; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation," and so on. The inference, we suppose, is that if you were for Moise Tshombe you were against fluoridation, or against the Court. It has been said

that the speech was toned down before delivery. But as written it reflected something less than good judgment.

On January 29, 1963, the Saturday Evening Post published an article by Mr. Rowan. In our opinion it was notable chiefly for extravagance and intemperance. This is a sample: "I am inclined to think that in our affluent society a rash of phonies and sharpies on school boards and city councils is a far more dangerous symptom of social illness than large numbers of people who openly resist the Court ruling out of ignorance, time-encrusted fear or admitted bigotry." Or this: "Only dishonorable intent, a sleazy contempt for law and a disregard for justice permit a community to use a pupil-placement law to put two Negroes in a white school and thus cloak policies that cheat 20,000 other colored kids."

Our doubts about Mr. Rowan's qualifications for his new post are not rooted in any thought that he should not hold his own opinions. He has every right to think as he wants to think, and to speak as he wants to speak. He does not sound to us, however, like a man who can be depended on to tell the American story to its best advantage in these complex and difficult days. Mr. Murrow deserves a surer successor.

Library Services Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4879) to amend the Library Services Act to increase Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I heartily commend and compliment the very able and distinguished committee upon its fine work in behalf of the pending library services bill. There is no question but that the bill will pass the House by a substantial margin, as it should, and that its provisions will permit a long-sought and very desirable extension of these valuable library services to the American people of every age and station.

Public enlightenment and the dissemination of information, learning, and culture has been a primary objective of American Government, local and State and Federal, since the founding of the Nation—yes, and since the earliest colonial times.

We can all take special pride that in so many ways and respects this lofty objective has been generally realized to a degree that makes it possible for people who live in our country today to have available wider and better opportunities for enlightenment, reading, acquiring information, book learning and education than is enjoyed by any other people on the face of the earth.

But it is up to the Congress to realize that, while the high level we have now reached is commendable as well as heartening, much remains to be done in this and related fields of general education.

The American people, generally speaking, are well read and well informed as they must be in a great democracy, like ours, where effective selection of public officials and the efficient functioning of government at every level is so dependent upon a well-informed, responsible citizenry.

To the extent that this gratifying picture is blurred by some illiteracy and some areas where books, news media and written materials are not readily available, we of the Congress must be concerned, and we must act constructively and remedially as we now propose to do.

As we do so, we cannot be certain that the valuable necessary services we here provide will adequately do the educational, enlightening work that has to be done, or afford adequate opportunities for all those who want and need reading materials to get them. More will be needed.

Nor can we be sure these days that some of the materials reaching the people this bill aims to reach will not contain some slanted, distorted viewpoints, or even undesirable or dangerous propaganda.

While we have laws that forbid the circulation of improper or indecent written materials and books, under our system, it is not permissible or practicable for the Congress to set up a general censorship over what the American people in our several States may read.

But we know, from long experience, the vital importance and value of public libraries and the means they provide for enlightenment, learning and the spread of information and awareness.

Of special value, and of special benefit, is the encouragement and assistance these library services afford for our young people. Who could predict at this time the number of young people in many sections of the country to which these services will be carried, the benefits and inspirations they may bring to countless American youth, for whom in many cases for the first time, the doors to the written treasures of the past and present may be opened, the broad vistas of enlightenment and learning explored, and lofty aspirations shaped. Who can know where a young Lincoln may be waiting.

Viewed in that light, as an immeasurable broadening of opportunity for the young, as well as the old, and the enriching of the culture and the incentive spirit of the Nation, this bill has far deeper significance than may appear on the surface.

It is, above all, a firm step forward to higher goals of national enlightenment, learning and opportunity. It marks, perhaps, the beginning of the final drive to banish every vestige of illiteracy from the Nation.

While this bill cannot reach or benefit those who for some reason are unable to learn—and this is a very serious problem which in larger measure requires our attention—or those who are not willing to learn, it none the less will bring new avenues and new tools to many not enjoying them now, and in that sense can and will appreciably add to our great American potential and the spreading of knowledge, learning, and culture throughout our great country.

I worked for and strongly supported the original Library Services Act in 1956 and was pleased to support in 1960 legislation to extend this beneficial library program for another 5 years. Today the House has the chance to perfect and improve the program so that not only our smaller libraries may benefit further from this Federal contribution to the Nation's educational effort, but also larger communities may participate in this necessary development of our library system.

This is a step forward in the important library services program which is now in its seventh year of remarkable progress in improving the Nation's rural libraries and I am sure that the House will endorse by an overwhelming margin the good work already accomplished by making library assistance benefits available to the larger centers of population. In addition, the House can remedy an important omission in the original act by permitting the use of Federal funds for the construction of library buildings and the purchase of land.

In my own State of Massachusetts, the library services program has benefited more than 1 million residents of rural areas and, in addition, has been an important incentive toward the development of a regional library system.

I am proud to say that one of the communities in my district has pioneered in the establishment of a regional library, largely through the effective interest and efforts of Mrs. George R. Wallace, of Fitchburg, Mass., and her associates who were instrumental in setting up the first regional library in the Commonwealth.

In the fall of 1962, the Fitchburg Public Library became the first regional library center in the Commonwealth, serving nearly 70 communities in the central Massachusetts area. The Fitchburg Library now provides film services to 68 communities in an area extending from the New Hampshire border to the Connecticut line and vitally needed book, reference, and professional advisory services to some 20 libraries in northern Worcester County.

Among the participating libraries in my district are Ashburnham, Ashby, Ayer, Barre, Berlin, Bolton, Dudley, Gardner, Groton, Harvard, Hopedale, Hubbardston, Hudson, Lancaster, Leicester, Leominster, Lunenburg, Mendon, Milford, New Braintree, Northbridge, Oakham, Oxford, Paxton, Pepperell, Princeton, Rutland, Shirley, Southbridge, Spencer, Sterling, Townsend, Upton, Uxbridge, Webster, Westminster, and Winchendon.

The benefits of the Fitchburg Regional Library have already helped these small communities in many ways and other communities in the central Massachusetts area are considering participation in the plan.

I am very proud to have such an outstanding leader as Mrs. Wallace in my district whose sustained efforts have made possible this educational landmark in the history of the Massachusetts library system. An esteemed friend and valued constituent, she has given dedicated service to the Fitchburg Public

Library, of which she is chairman of the board of trustees. In addition, she is serving as a member of the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners.

Under the provisions of this bill, many more Massachusetts libraries will be able to benefit from the library services program and I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the great progress which is being made in my own district in helping to meet the library needs of our citizens.

I strongly favor this wise, well-conceived, well-prepared and timely bill and thank the distinguished committee chairman and members for their vision, diligence, and splendid contributions in bringing this fine measure to the floor for passage.

The Seeds of Our Surrender in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the background of our present difficulties in Panama was discussed in a recent broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion, and I am happy to note that he paid appropriate tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] who have been so alert with regard to this issue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the Manion statement, as follows:

THE SEEDS OF OUR SURRENDER IN PANAMA

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

Those who have listened regularly to the radio and television programs of the "Manion Forum" were not surprised at the recent violence and bloodshed in Panama. Consistently on these programs we have viewed Castro's conquest of Cuba in the perspective of Communist plans to conquer the world. Consequently, those who have listened to us knew long ago that the long index finger of the heavy Red hand impressed upon Cuba was pointed toward the Panama Canal.

For years, the best-informed man in Washington on the subject of Panama has been Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. The Communist interest in the canal was explained and documented by Congressman FLOOD when he first discussed the subject over this microphone in June (12) of 1960. ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 298.)

Congressman FLOOD recalled that in November of 1959, Panamanian mobs had attempted two invasions of the Canal Zone, which were repelled by Canal Zone police and U.S. troops. The purpose of the mob then—as now—was to plant the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone as a symbol of Panamanian sovereignty over that vital strip of American territory.

The Government of the United States was expected to issue a stern warning then against any such future violation of its established treaty rights and responsibilities. Instead, said Congressman FLOOD, our Government "sent a diplomatic emissary to Panama to appease those stirring up the trouble.

"This emissary, with the approval of his superiors in the State Department, issued a public statement recognizing Panama as titular sovereign over the Canal Zone and, according to Panamanian sources, agreed that that the flags of Panama might be displayed in the Canal Zone to show such sovereignty."

Shortly afterward the President (Eisenhower) publicly expressed the belief that Panama should be allowed to fly her flag in the Canal Zone to show her titular sovereignty. "These declarations," said Congressman FLOOD, "made without the consent either of the Congress or the treatymaking power, reflect a credulity and naivete on the part of U.S. officials that are simply unbelievable. The hoisting of the Panama flag would be the symbol of complete surrender and would be so hailed by Panama and universally so interpreted."

The fact that the whole House of Representatives shared Congressman FLOOD's views on this vital matter had been evidenced on February 2, 1960, when that body passed a resolution by a vote of 381 to 12 expressing the sense of Congress that no variation in the traditional interpretation of our 1903, 1936, and 1955 treaties with Panama should be made, except pursuant to the provisions of another treaty.

The flying of the Panamanian flag on the Canal Zone certainly was such a variation and it was the particular variation at which the House resolution was aimed. Nevertheless, on October 29, 1962, President Kennedy directed the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone as evidence of Panama's "titular sovereignty" over the zone and over the canal.

When Congressman FLOOD was back on our program last June ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 453), he had this to say about this formal flag raising: "This last action was taken by our Government despite the fact that on October 12, only 17 days, previously, the ceremonies for the dedication of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa, attended by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, and other notables was marred by Panamanian demonstrators who used Communist tactics and claimed Panamanian sovereignty over the bridge.

"With all of the foregoing," he continued, "we find evidence that Panamanian aspirations are aided by our own Department of State. The State Department's program has been one of aiding the piecemeal liquidation of our undeniable treaty rights in the Canal Zone."

Congressman FLOOD believes that the attitude of Congress, emphatically expressed by committee action and on the floor of the House, "demonstrates to the international infiltrators in the Department of State and their collaborators that these influences can never succeed in perpetrating their schemes with respect to the Panama Canal through normal procedure.

"They realize that they must bypass Congress by means of a new canal treaty, which they believe can be pushed through as was the 1955 treaty without adequate debate to continue the process of erosions that started with the 1936–39 treaty."

One of the provisions of any proposed new treaty with Panama will require the United States to accept jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between Panama and this country. Panamanian agitators have always put this objective high up on their agenda of demands and, of course, the internationalists in our State Department will welcome it as an opening wedge to put us under the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in all controversies with all nations.

ARBITRATION WOULD SET DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The Panamanian controversy is not an international dispute that would be appropriate for settlement by international arbitration. On the contrary, it is a direct assault which challenges the basic right and duty of the United States to defend its property and its people against attack by anybody from inside or outside of this country.

We are in the Panama Canal Zone by virtue of the same kind of solemn treaty right that we exercise in Cuba at Guantanamo, or in the occupation of Florida, for that matter—which we acquired by treaty with Spain in 1819.

It is not merely our sovereignty in the Canal Zone that is under attack by Panamanians now, but our sovereignty and independence as a free nation that is under attack elsewhere, and anywhere, and upon any pretext by the agents of the advancing Communist conquest. Panamanian disturbances are symptoms merely of the violent Red revolution that the directors of our floundering diplomacy are trying so desperately to appease.

On January 11, 1964, Congress FLOOD wired me as follows:

"Whatever investigations may reveal as to individuals concerned among Panamanian agitators who invaded American territory, the background of the plot is unmistakably the work of international communistic agents of the Castro type. Its ultimate purpose is wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States.

"When faced with a most crucial situation, the commander of our Armed Forces on the isthmus acted with intelligence and restraint, using no more force than necessary to defend the Canal Zone against the force and violence of a mob invasion. * * * The Canal Zone territory was honorably acquired under treaty by international law.

"Its sovereign control was indispensable for the construction and operation of the canal which was the ideal of the entire Panamanian population. Our country has increased its annuity beyond that in the original treaty as a gesture of good will. Wages paid to Panamanians working in the zone are greater than those paid for comparable services in Panama. Canal Zone organizations supply the largest source of revenue for Panama.

"The Canal Zone is as definitely U.S. territory as Alaska, which was likewise acquired by treaty under international law. It would be as absurd to discuss surrendering the Canal Zone to Panama as to propose the return of the Louisiana Purchase territory to France, or Alaska to Russia."

The Congressman's diagnosis of the current Panama violence as the explosion of a Communist plot is borne out by the spontaneous reaction of Communist agents throughout the world. The Moscow radio was quick to accuse the U.S. Military Command in Panama of "repression, lying, and deceit." It called the American defense of its canal territory "a bloody act of repression" against Panamanians.

Havana headlines called it "a Yankee massacre in Panama" and Castro took off for Moscow for personal conferences with Khrushchev. (Chicago Tribune, Jan. 11.)

An on-the-spot report from Panama City reads, "The situation here is still made to order for the Communists. They have made the greatest gains that one can imagine. And it is frought with serious danger for the present as well as the future. (The Communists) have put on a show for all of Latin America as well as for the world." (Jules Dubois, Chicago Tribune, Jan. 13.)

In Panama, as elsewhere, the Communists get their victories over this country at bargain prices—a shouting handful of agitators attacking our Embassy and other American territory provokes an incident which is reverberated around the world through the Red chain of command until it becomes "a massacre of innocent people by brutal American imperialists."

CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC CAN PRESERVE OUR RIGHTS

In our desperation to appease the unappeasable Communists, we submit our sover-

eign rights to international arbitration in which the agitators have everything to gain and we are destined only to lose another portion of our vested sovereign rights, and more and more of the international respect that we have surrendered to the Communists with servile continuity for 20 years.

Retired Army Gen. Robert E. Wood one of the builders of the Panama Canal and one who has maintained a continuously informed interest in the Canal Zone ever since, says that the United States "will be finished in Latin America if it permits arbitration of its treaty rights in the Canal Zone as the result of this rioting" (Chicago Tribune, Jan. 13), and indeed it certainly will.

It becomes more and more evident every day that our State Department is directing our foreign policy toward the complete surrender of our national sovereignty, not merely in the Panama Canal Zone but everywhere and for all purposes.

Millions of Americans—the overwhelming majority of our people who wish to preserve our proper sovereign power, prestige and national independence—must now turn quickly to Congress for protection against Internationalists who have infiltrated the directorate of our diplomacy and who appear deliberately to promote and ultimately to welcome disturbances such as the current one in Panama as an excuse for a further retreat from our rights as a sovereign nation.

There is now pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives a resolution introduced by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. That resolution would reassert our sovereignty in the canal, oppose the flying of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone, and positively reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine.

In his message to me of January 11, Congressman FLOOD says: "To protect the best interests of the United States of America, I urge the prompt adoption of the Cannon resolution." And so do I. And so should you, and so should every American who wishes his country and its Constitution to be respected, and protected here, and throughout the world. This is House Concurrent Resolution 105. Wire your Congressman to support that resolution now.

REPRINTED HERE ARE PROPHETIC EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD'S ADDRESS OVER THE MANION FORUM NETWORK JUNE 2, 1963

Wake up, America. Your house is on fire. Indeed, the very foundation of your house—the Panama Canal Zone—is smoldering and every so often is spurting forth flames. For it is the Panama Canal which is the key target of the world revolutionary movement in the Caribbean.

Thus far, we have not taken the measures required to put out this fire. Instead, we have floundered from crisis to crisis making concession after concession to Panama, and Panama, in return, has continued with larger and larger demands.

Warnings of what was to come have been given time after time in the Halls of Congress, but these warnings fell on deaf ears. But in each case, the things I warned of came to pass.

President Chiari's Secretary of Finance, Gilberto Arias, only this March was quoted as saying: "In the future, with God's help, we will achieve our objective; that the Panama Canal be the property of Panamanians, under full and absolute jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, maintained by Panamanians, operated by Panamanians, sanitated by Panamanians, and protected by Panamanians."

How can responsible officials of our Government knowingly collaborate with Panamanian radicals to surrender more of our authority to a country which, since 1955, when sanitation in the cities of Colon and Panama was returned to it, has not even succeeded in collecting its garbage? It is incomprehensible.

Here I must emphasize that the Republic of Panama grew out of the movement for the Panama Canal, and not the reverse. The only advantage that Panama can claim as regards the canal is its geographical location, which it never ceases to exploit in advancing its demands for increased benefits and sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

While in Panama last December, I visited the Canal Zone and found general alarm on the part of our citizens at the conduct of the Governor of the Canal Zone.

At a press conference held at the Tivoli Hotel, I learned about an address given by the Governor before the American Society of Civil Engineers, which includes Panamanian engineers among its membership.

Not only was his address the most disconcerting ever publicly uttered by a Governor, but he seems to have reveled in its flavor.

He reflected the philosophy of international socialist elements in and on the fringes of public affairs and advocated what amounts to a permanent state of social revolution, as well as belittling the constitutional foundations of our country and urged unconditional exercise by Federal agencies of power without regard to constitutional limitations.

He also condemned the past in our history without discriminating between what is great and that which is ephemeral, and failed to present our Constitution in its true light as the great contractual document under which the Thirteen Original States created three separate and independent agencies of Government with limited powers.

His conclusion was an illiberal assault upon those who differ with his views as having small minds bent on preserving the status quo and thus, in effect, as being domestic enemies as dangerous to the United States as foreign enemies.

This, my friends, was a deliberate administrative attack against the present diplomatic and juridical foundation of the Panama Canal enterprise and, as an attempted public intimidation of those standing up for the sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over it. Thus, this shocking address served to invite further aggressions against the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone territory.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

United Nations in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, acting on behalf of the gentleman from California, Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, and myself, I have filed in the House of Representatives our joint report on the 18th session of the United Nations General Assembly, entitled "United Nations in Crisis."

The gentleman from California, Congressman MAILLIARD, and I, had the honor of serving as members of the U.S. delegation to the 18th session of the General Assembly. We sincerely hope that our findings and recommendations relating both to the record of that session and to the overall posture of the United States in the United Nations, will prove of interest to the Members of the House.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the summary of our findings and recommendations which appears on pages 1 through 4 of our report:

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. THE 18TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. The 18th session was more noteworthy for the atmosphere of restraint in which the debates were conducted than for the import of its achievements. It was essentially a "holding operation" which produced few tangible accomplishments and did not advance the solution of any of the basic problems confronting the United Nations (pp. 7–8).

2. On the positive side, the General Assembly approved two precedent-setting resolutions aimed at the expansion and strengthening of peaceful cooperation in the exploration of outer space; provided for the financing, in 1964, of U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East on terms generally acceptable to the United States; adopted a sweeping declaration on racial discrimination; authorized the establishment of a U.N. Training and Research Institute; and generally followed a policy of "containment and consolidation" in approving the budget for 1964 (pp. 7–8).

3. Although the United States and its major allies no longer command an automatic majority in the General Assembly, the record of the 18th session shows a definite absence of any developments injurious to the vital interests of our country and of the other Western Powers (p. 8).

II. THE UNITED NATIONS IN CRISIS

In at least four major areas, the necessity for making hard decisions which will shape the future of the United Nations continues to confront the Organization. Unless these basic problems are resolved, the United Nations may soon become an international debating society completely devoid of capacity to act (p. 9).

A. The crisis in U.N. financing

1. The rising cost of operations; the high cost of the major peacekeeping operations; and the refusal of some members to pay their assessments, have created major financial problems for the United Nations. The last two developments have brought the Organization to the brink of bankruptcy (p. 9).

2. If the United Nations cannot carry out its primary function of peacekeeping because of financial insolvency and the refusal of member states to pay their legally assessed obligations, the value of the U.N. will be seriously reduced (p. 11).

3. The obligation of the U.N. members to pay assessments legitimately imposed upon them cannot be compromised. Members who fail to pay their assessments must be made subject to the penalty envisioned in Article 19 of the U.N. Charter: the loss of vote in the General Assembly (pp. 10–11).

B. The future of U.N. peacekeeping operations

1. The value of U.N. peacekeeping operations should not be underestimated. They have performed valuable service to the cause of peace in the world (p. 12).

2. The manner in which the United Nations has handled the financing of the peacekeeping operations has never been fully satisfactory. It has become even less so with each passing year (p. 12).

3. At a minimum, the United Nations ought to adopt some basic criteria for the financing of future peacekeeping operations—and do it now before any new operation is authorized (p. 13).

4. An opportunity to arrive at a decision on this subject will be presented when the Working Group of 21 member states meets early this year. We trust that the U.S. delegation to that Working Group will be in a position to propose a well-thought-out financing plan which will avoid for the future the major problems which have arisen in the past (p. 13).

C. Streamlining U.N. machinery and procedures

1. For almost two decades, the United Nations has been in a process of rapid growth. Structural and procedural reforms, necessary to improve the lagging efficiency of the Organization, are overdue (pp. 13–14).

2. Minor progress in the direction of reform was achieved during the 18th session (p. 14).

3. We have questioned the advisability of enlarging the U.N. Security Council as proposed in the resolution approved by the 18th General Assembly (p. 14).

D. The ascendancy of the newer members

1. The ascendancy to power within the United Nations of the newer members has not been accompanied at all times by a parallel increase in their sense of responsibility (pp. 14–15).

2. The developing countries, in particular, will have to strive to strike a better balance between their expecatations of the United Nations and the ability of the Organization to respond to them (p. 16).

3. If the U.N. is to continue to grow in success in serving its basic purposes, the newer members will have to show willingness to reestablish within the Organization closer relationships between decisionmaking and the capacity of individual members to contribute to the carrying out of U.N. decisions. Also, they will have to bring their collective weight to bear—as they did on several occasions in recent past—on the entire question of financial responsibility of U.N. membership (p. 16).

III. STRENGTHENING U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

A. The U.S. mission to the United Nations

1. We were impressed by the quality, and the dedication, of the personnel of the U.S. mission. They do their job well in spite of certain serious handicaps (p. 17).

2. The permanent U.S. representative in the United Nations should be given more flexibility in allocating work among the five principal officers of the U.S. mission (pp. 17–18).

3. The assignment to the U.S. mission, on a permanent basis, of our or five additional political officers—requested by the executive branch—appears to warrant sympathetic consideration (p. 18).

4. It is a sad reflection on our system of government that personal wealth, rather than merit and ability has of necessity become a consideration in the assignment of personnel to the higher jobs at the U.S. mission. The Congress should rectify this situation by providing to a limited number of officers at the mission, who are assigned to representational duties, an allowance comparable to that which is currently paid to Foreign Service personnel performing similar duties abroad (pp. 18–19).

B. Relations between the U.S. mission and the Department of State

1. The manner in which the State Department exercises its control over the U.S. mission is unbearably cumbersome and picayune. Frequently it deprives the mission of meaningful participation in the formulation and execution of U.S. policy with respect to the United Nations. Quite often, it relegates policymaking to second- and third-echelon personnel in the Department and in the mission (p. 19).

2. There are obvious shortcoming in forward policy planning—particularly decisionmaking—with respect to U.N. issues (p. 20).

3. Lines of communication between the U.S. mission and the Department of State, and levels at which policy is developed, are not clearly established (p. 20).

4. The U.S. mission is allowed virtually no latitude not only with respect to minor policy decisions, but also—and more importantly—with respect to strategy and tactics (pp. 20–21).

5. The permanent U.S. representative in the United Nations must be kept fully informed on all major foreign policy matters since all of them have implications for U.S. posture in that Organization. He should have more latitude with respect to policy formulation and execution within the broad framework of policy made in Washington. He and his staff, and the U.S. delegations to the sessions of the General Assembly, should be accorded considerably more flexibility with respect to strategy and tactics employed to implement U.S. policy in the United Nations (pp. 20–21).

6. The United Nations offers unusual opportunities for the advancement of U.S. interests which may be outside the range of immediate U.N. issues. The U.S. representative in the United Nations should be entrusted with greater responsibility for utilizing all opportunities available at the U.N. for advancing our Nation's interests (p. 21).

C. Congressional participation in U.S. delegations to sessions of the General Assembly

1. The practice of including two Members of Congress on the U.S. delegation to each

session of the General Assembly should be continued (p. 21).

2. Congressional members of U.S. delegations should be selected and nominated well in advance of the beginning of each session. They should be given opportunity to prepare thoroughly for these assignments (p. 22).

3. Greater effort must be exerted within the U.S. mission, at the beginning of each session, to integrate congressional delegates into the U.S. team—to assist them in becoming effective, and working, members of the U.S. delegations (p. 22).

D. The question of U.N. personnel

1. The quality and competence of the personnel of the U.N. Secretariat plays an important role in the affairs of the United Nations and directly affects the Organization's ability to fulfill its complex responsibilities (p. 22).

2. The U.S. Government was shortsighted in not having had a positive policy and program for the staffing of international organizations (pp. 22–23).

3. The initial steps taken recently to correct this situation should be continued and expanded in the future (p. 23).

E. Improving the relations between the host community and the United Nations

1. The presence of the United Nations Headquarters in the United States gives us an unparalleled opportunity to tell our story to the representatives of other countries—the men and women who either already are, or are likely to become, the leaders of their nations (p. 23).

2. The United States does not appear to be taking full advantage of this opportunity (p. 23).

3. American industry, private individuals and organizations should provide greater support for the voluntary, nongovernmental programs designed to assist foreign delegates, to broaden the opportunities available to them for learning more about our country and our people, and for exposing false Communist propaganda about the United States (p. 24).

Economic and Social Impact of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the economic and social impact of automation upon our Nation is undergoing increasingly intense scrutiny at this time. The Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Hartford made a notable contribution to this public discussion by sponsoring a national essay contest on the subject "Preserving the Individual in an Age of Automation." The company and its distinguished president, Charles J. Zimmerman, are to be commended for focusing attention on this important industrial development and providing a forum for discussion of the challenges it poses. More than 2,500 persons took part in the essay competition, a manifestation of the interest and concern aroused by this topic. The winning essay was written by Mrs. Robert M. Grummon, of Jaffrey, N.H. I ask unanimous consent that this essay, which carries the provocative title, "A Parent Tangles With Automation," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARENT TANGLES WITH AUTOMATION

(By Mrs. Robert M. Grummon)

If faced squarely, danger adds zest and tang to life. Pioneer parents taught their children to walk warily in the forest—alert to the snap of a twig, the rustle of a leaf. At night the mother tucked her children into their trundle beds with deep thanksgiving in her heart. The Lord had guarded them through another day. Danger was an accepted fact, along with cold weather and hard work.

Warring Indians have disappeared, together with rattlesnakes and diphtheria. The space age has brought its own hazards. Fear of automation was my underlying reason for entering this contest.

For months newspapers and television have predicted that unemployment will grow steadily worse as machines supplant men on farms, in factories, even in time-encrusted post offices. Because of automation, will our six children find work in the world or will they simply be dumped on a stockpile marked "Human Surplus"?

In the old book, "Pilgrim's Progress," the hero, after much hesitation, walks up to the lions which are barring his path, only to discover them chained and toothless. In trying to write an article on "Automation and the Individual," I would have to look automation straight in the eye—find out what it is, what it can do, and most important, what it cannot do. I wondered whether automation would prove a friend or an enemy to our children. After weeks of cogitation as I ironed or vacuumed or helped my husband in his greenhouses, I have become firmly convinced that automation is exactly the type of danger or challenge which straightens a man's back and puts spring into a woman's step. The trick is to raise youngsters with enough energy and imagination so that they race out to meet automation as if it were Fury, the wild stallion.

All very fine but not specific. Actually, what is automation? Vaguely I realize that electronic brains are now able to compute, to analyze tons of data for the astronauts, for the stock market, for insurance companies. Do I personally know something automatic? Yes—my dishwasher and my laundromatic. With these two blessed inventions life on a farm (with swarms of children, pets, and guests from the city) has not only been bearable but downright enjoyable. Machines did the dull, routine jobs—leaving me free to jump into the never-ending unexpecteds. But admittedly, these two machines have displaced a full-time housekeeper whom we had kept for months because she was a little better than no help at all.

We had come to New Hampshire with four children under 8, just after the war. We planned to raise our own food and never again be dependent on ration points. My husband and I were going to do this heavy work, shoulder to shoulder. Unexpectedly, a fifth baby arrived—then another announced its approach. We advertised and got an extraordinary grandmother with a wild glint in her eye and a swing to her hips. In our innocence and desperation, we kept her until the machines came. Had Mrs. Le Brun been Susie, no machine could have replaced her.

Back in New Jersey Susie had used her head, her heart, and her hands, all at once. Her official title was "cleaning woman three times a week" but she was our rock and our salvation. Whenever there was a crisis she would appear. "But, Susie, how did you know the baby was sick? I needed you so badly but you have no telephone." "My mind done told me," Susie would reply as she peeled off her coat. "Mr. Bob—you look half dead—here is a cup of coffee. Miss Louise, just give me that baby and go upstairs for awhile." Soon Susie would be rocking the baby, singing songs for the children grouped in the doorway and, miraculously, something good would be cooking on the stove.

No; a machine could never replace Susie. And yet, Susie, helped by machines, could have accomplished untold marvels.

Perhaps a factory or a large office is very like a home. There is always a mass of routine work to be assigned, plus the never-ending problem of how to keep people working together in harmony. The manager of a factory or an office would need people like Susie, as well as the latest IBM machine. Perhaps if my husband and I could raise children with Susie's qualities, they need never fear machines.

A PARENT TANGLES WITH AUTOMATION

The more I think about it, the more I realize that this whole experiment of moving from city to farm has been made possible thanks largely to labor saving devices, which is the essence of automation. Indoors at least, gadgets have kept me on top of my housework. Out in the fields Bob had first bought a horse to plow, to cut and rake up hay. We had both felt that a horse would be more fun. But the horse proved as flighty as our galivanting housekeeper. Soon Kitten the charger was replaced by a tractor with many attachments. Bob rode it like a centaur. It became a part of him. As the need arose, Bob found a machine. An irrigation system fights the drought in summer and the frosts in spring. A furnace with automatic thermostat and automatic alarm system keeps our greenhouses as safe as science can make them. Bob still needs a man on the Gray Goose Farm, but a thinking man who can take responsibility—someone who is strong and healthy and not afraid to get his hands dirty. Such a man is hard to find.

Daniel Maurice was such a man—an agricultural trainee from France, 23, built as solid as an oak stump, with a grin to melt a glacier. He had left his father's large farm to gain experience in America. Practical experience he'd had on his own place—technical and scientific knowledge he had gained in a French university. He loved the land and the seasons. As he plowed, he would whistle and sing. He tackled farming as he would go into a wrestling match, eager but wary. Planting, harvesting, marketing—a farmer competes with the weather, with soil, insects, animals, transportation, his neighbor down the road, and world prices if he raises wheat or livestock. Daniel had specialized in tractor maintenance. If anything broke, he could fix it. He never wasted time bewailing his luck. He was descended from a long line of valiant farmers. We hated to have him go back to France.

During these past few years I have become increasingly depressed by unemployment in the coal mines, in printing shops. Even the telephone operator went out with the dial. Those dreadful robots run by electricity—accurate, tireless, without mercy. But how much safer to rent a robot than to hire a personality.

Such were my gloomy thoughts as I drove along Route 202, just over the Massachusetts line. Being the dead of winter, every roadside restaurant was boarded up. I was cold and hungry. Suddenly I noticed an Esso station with a coffee shack just behind. Apparently it was open for business. Half dead I stumbled in. A wizened sparrow of a lady hurried over. Yes, she had hot coffee. What about some homemade apple pie? I accepted her suggestion. The pie was homemade and oven fresh. The coffee was perfect. I had forgotten that such things could

be. The tiny shop took on the rosy hue of heaven.

From wrinkled Hebe's conversation, I soon learned that I was not the only appreciative customer. Every Friday night a Boston car stops for coffee, picks up a pie wrapped ready and waiting, and continues on to Vermont for the weekend. Sunday night it is the same routine in reverse. No pie or coffee in Boston or Vermont can match what is served in this gas station shack. Needless to say, I have added the little old lady to my list, along with Susie and Daniel Maurice.

Over my second cup of coffee the lady switched her conversation from her present business to her late husband, and then on to social security. That very morning she had driven 18 miles to Gardner to see about social security and income tax—it being her first year without her husband to handle such matters. She had been all nerved up and afraid that the Government man would be impatient and cross. Why, he was nothing of the kind. He explained everything, took all the time in the world—didn't laugh at my questions. The old lady had decided to write to the Government people to thank them for hiring such a pleasant, capable young man.

By this time I was all attention. Probably no other Government agency is so important to the individual as that of social security. Its redtape, its forms, blanks, files, if stacked together might reach from here to eternity. But machines can handle the smother of statistics, leaving trained men and women free to answer questions, to reassure frightened widows, to explain, explain, explain. No tape recorder could have reassured my restaurant lady. She needed just the right human touch. Tact and patience and kindness plus training—this was a formula we could follow in raising our children. Develop these traits and find their individual bent and we could laugh at automation.

Driving home to Jaffrey I was too busy analyzing job qualifications to worry about unemployment. As my panic about automation subsided, I did what I should have done in the first place. I looked straight at our six children with the cold eyes of a prospective employer.

Our eldest, age 25, will be a full doctor in June with an internship in surgery lined up in St. Louis. As he wrote when he applied to prep school, "Shaking out wet hay I used to hate—but for the past year I have done it to earn tuition for Mount Hermon, so it does not seem so bad anymore."

Our next, a daughter, a B.S. and an RN, combined marriage and pregnancy with education. So it was a race between a diploma and the stork. Although she is not working professionally, her education is making her home a happy one. If the wolf should howl, she could always earn her living.

Our third child, almost 21, might give an employer some uneasy moments because she is dreamy and sometimes a crusader. But if she can survive another 2 years, she will have a teaching certificate in French and Russian to bolster and steady a very generous, friendly personalty.

The fourth, a son, is a law unto himself. He became a mechanic by instinct and dedication before he was 4. At 6 he was operating tractors. At 16 he was flying airplanes and earning the money to fly by being a short-order cook at an ice cream stand. No matter how loud the hue and cry from the crowd, he is calmly deaf to all advice about liberal arts education. Luckily, at a Quaker school he has absorbed much history and a lively interest in the world, plus a passion for reading—luckily because this may be the last year of formal education. Out at Northrup Institute, Los Angeles, he will be immersed in his beloved jet engines. Aeronautics maintenance is his obsession. A desk job removed from grease and whir of motors is his idea of death by strangulation. We can do nothing—and he may be right. I am quite sure that he will never starve, for he has served as plumber's assistant, as gardner, as well as mechanic and cook.

The last two are daughters, born in New Hampshire with a native's self-assurance. At 14, still a freshman in high school, Carol flew into Ithaca by herself and registered at the Hotel Management School at Cornell. Cooking has been to Carol what airplanes have been to Dan. At 8 she was basting the Christmas turkey at 4 a.m. She asked for cookbooks as gifts, instead of dolls.

My ineptness as a baker apparently inspired her. It has been years since I had to produce a pie or a cake. When and if she is accepted by Cornell in the fall of 1965, it will culminate 10 years of planning. Our good friends own and operate an inn nearby. The Woodbound Inn has been the object of her closest attention. She will be a waitress there this summer, and she has often pinch hit in other capacities.

Finally, there is Frances. From the time she was born she was in complete control of any situation. All the rest of us are inclined toward shyness and introspection. Not Frances. If she is happy, she laughs. If she is sad or disappointed, she howls—then grits her teeth and gets to work. She is so busy making friends that so far she has missed the agonies of self-doubt and loneliness that the rest of us have endured. Inner confidence will steady her all her life.

These six youngsters are indeed employable and so are many of their friends. It is astonishing to see how well the young people are doing. Automation is a fact and a challenge, but there are as many ways to skin a cat as there are cats. There is no one formula to meet automation.

An advanced degree from MIT is one way. George Gordon has another. With Gordon Services, Inc., he is doing any odd job for anybody in the area—from fixing a leaky roof to landscaping a garden. At 24 he has his own business, is hiring every handyman he can muster, and is making a very comfortable living and having the time of his life.

In "The Republic" Plato envisioned an ideal society—but it was based on slavery. The great mass of human beings were doomed to toil endlessly in order that the elite might flower physically, intellectually, spiritually. Sheer drudgery, day after day, month after month, is not ennobling. Just try it to be sure.

Automation could do in the 20th century what slavery did for the men of Athens. For some of the men of Athens. There were plenty then, as always, who could turn liberty into license, leisure into laziness, the cult of beauty into an erotic orgy.

Today more of us have a chance than ever before to lead interesting lives—not easy lives. With plenty of imagination and hard work, almost anything is possible, if we close our minds and hearts to all this chatter about social status, lifelong financial security, the fastest car, and the softest mink coat.

If we are parents, the best thing we can do for our children is to have confidence in them and in their future. They need as much time as we can give them when they are very young, and as much cash as we can scrabble together for their education as they grow older. But most of all they need—as children have always needed since the days of poor old Adam and Eve worrying over Cain and Abel—faith, hope, and love. Plus all the hard work and all the laughter a family can gather together. The rest is out of our hands.

Of course there is danger in automation. Danger will keep us lean and on our toes. It is simply the survival of the fittest, and as parents our job is to make our children as fit as we can—then sit back and let them fly as high and as far as they will. Straight to the moon if they must.

Policy Toward Cuba, Indonesia, etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days there is a great deal of confusion and, I think, lack of understanding as we try to sort out and place in proper perspective the facts relative to our national policy toward Cuba, Indonesia, and other countries currently in the news. An illuminating column upon this point written by Mr. Clifford B. Ward recently appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel. I include it herewith:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Bobby Kennedy on behalf of the administration has warned Sukarno, of Indonesia, that the United States will fight if he moves aggressively against Malaysia. To fight in this instance means we will go to war. For suggesting that we fight or go to war, if necessary, to remove Castroism from Cuba, BARRY GOLDWATER and others who share his views, are pictured as reckless advocates of what has been called brinksmanship.

The United States is selling wheat to Russia on credit guaranteed by our Government, but England is rebuked for selling secondhand buses to Cuba. Spain is being rebuked unofficially for considering the sale of ships to Cuba. Is it any wonder that a London newspaper, in reporting our distaste for the English sale of the buses, in the face of our sale of wheat to Russia, published a headline reading, "Oh, for the Love of Pete."

And while we are treating the Panamanians and the Cubans with kid gloves, lest war break out, we are at the very same time waging a war in South Vietnam against the Communists there. Although that war is not costing us thousands of men, it is costing us men, and who can say that the deaths of only a few men in a war is of no consequence, but that the deaths of many more, is consequential? When did we start a quantitative appraisal of either war or death?

PROVIDE REDS WITH FOOD

It is apparent to all who read that Khrushchev and Castro are working together not only in Cuba, but in Zanzibar and Panama. While they work to try burying us, we are providing the Russians with food, which in all likelihood will permit more food supplies to Cuba. The late President Kennedy was murdered by a pro-Castro Communist, and British intelligence suspects a conspiracy, but our Government agencies, long before they had a chance to intelligently study the President's assassination rushed into print denying that any Communist conspiracy was involved. Why the rush?

If any government has shown the unique ability to ride off in all directions simultaneously, our Government has done it. We are for war, we are against war, we are for helping the Communists, we are for not helping them, we are for a strong military defense, we are against a strong military expense, we are for spending profligately, we are for not spending profligately. We are for God, Satan, salvation, damnation, good, evil, and what-

ever else you have. If it is possible for anyone to be all things to all people, Uncle Sam is trying hard to be that man.

BRINGS EXPRESSIONS OF HORROR

GOLDWATER, for saying that he would use our present recognition of Russia as a bit of bargaining power with the Reds, has caused expressions of horror from the confused persons who want to be for communism and against communism at one and the same time. If Russia conspires with Cuba, as apparently she is doing to subvert Central and South America, why shouldn't we let it be known that we may withdraw recognition of Russia and stop all the goodies going to the Communists? Even little Panama with no power behind it had the courage to break off diplomatic relations with the United States for what seem to us minor reasons. It is ironical that we fear to do in effect to another what the Panamanians have done to us.

With pacifists, who fear any war, one might be able to go along. But it is pretty hard to go along with those who are both pacifists and war advocates.

U.N.'s Secret Report on Vietnam Revealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the overthrow of the Diem government in South Vietnam and the assassination of President Diem is a historical fact. Nothing that can now be said or done can change it. Prior to this event, however, the Diem government had been widely accused of religious persecutions. The charges were of such great import that the United Nations sent to South Vietnam a factfinding mission to investigate the charges against the South Vietnamese Government. It appears that the United Nations has decided that the report of its factfinding mission will not be made public on the basis that the Diem government is no longer in existence. Nevertheless, it appears a report of some type was prepared by the factfinding mission of the United Nations and has been and is being circulated. According to press reports, the report shows that the factfinding mission found that the charges made in the United Nations against the Diem government were not sustained. Since it is quite obvious that the charges of religious persecution made against the Diem government were widely accepted both in official and unofficial circles in the United States, the release of the United Nation's factfinding mission's report would surely be to the interest of free peoples, for it would serve as a warning that all of the press reports on conditions in foreign lands cannot be accepted at face value. It would also be instructive as to the proficiency of propaganda campaigns.

I ask unanimous consent that the copy of an article entitled "U.N.'s Secret Report on Vietnam Revealed," which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 10, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WAS THIS SUPPRESSED?—U.N. SECRET REPORT ON VIETNAM REVEALED

(By William T. Buckley, Jr.)

Its code number is A/5630; it is dated December 7; it is over 300 pages long; it is titled "The Violation of Human Rights in South Vietnam"; it is issued as Report of the United Nations Factfinding Mission to South Vietnam.

I have no right to a copy of it.

It has never been distributed to the press—because on December 13, 1963, the General Assembly told the mission that "in the light of recent events that took place (in South Vietnam, i.e., the coup d'etat) it would not be useful to discuss the matter (whether the Diem government had been guilty of repressive action against the Buddhists) and no further action by the Assembly was required."

A little bit like saying, it seems to me, that since President Kennedy is dead, there is no need to investigate the reasons why he was killed.

WHAT IT SAID

I take it there are readers of this newspaper with a keener interest in posthumous justice and historical integrity than those who made the decision of the General Assembly to suppress the results of the investigation. Therefore, I am disclosing some of the secrets of the hidden report.

First of all, although that is what the authors themselves called it, it is not exactly a report. What is does contain, however, is the raw material on the basis of which a report would have been written.

And at that, not all the raw material, because it had been understood that responsible members of the Diem government would be given the opportunity to reply to residual allegations against the conduct of the regime before the mission drew its conclusions.

LAST WORD NEVER SAID

But the very day the Diem government was supposed to present its surrebuttal, the Government, so to speak, suffered a violent death.

So now as the report stands, it consists of the allegations against the Diem government, procedures followed by the United Nations mission, preliminary interviews with government officials, the reports of several dozen witnesses, friendly and unfriendly.

ONE CONCLUSION

What, on the basis of the raw material might one conclude?

Here is what the Costa Rican member of the Committee, who had gone to Vietnam predisposed to accept the guilt of the Diem government, has concluded.

"The charges made in the General Assembly against the Diem government were not sustained. * * * There was no religious discrimination or persecution, no encroachment of freedom of religion. * * * There is no other way to see it. The clash between a part—not all—of the Buddhist community and the Diem regime was on political grounds. * * * I have the feeling that the majority of the mission members (Afghanistan, Brazil, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Morocco, and Nepal) considered it a political question, not a religious question."

Witnesses were heard representing every point of view, and the Diem government, in the expressed opinion of the mission, behaved impeccably, cooperating with the mission with the kind of zeal that tends to be shown by men confident of vindication.

POLITICAL ABUSES

The upshot of the witnesses' testimony suggests, as the Costa Rican member stated:

That the root difficulty was political, not religious, but that there had been a cynical abuse of the presumption in favor of religious liberty for all non-Russian-dominated states of the United Nations—sufficient to manufacture an international cause celebre and undermine a government that had been the key to American policy in southeast Asia.

WHAT ONE MONK SAID

But what about the gruesome self-immolations?

Consider the testimony of witness No. 8, a 19-year-old monk:

While at a pagoda in Saigon "I heard about the atrocities perpetrated by the government against the Buddhists. I heard for example that Buddhist monks and nuns were beaten, that their hands were broken, that they were drowned, that they had their stomachs ripped open."

SELLING A SUICIDE

In due course this young monk was approached by a member of the "suicide promotion group" and asked if he would sacrifice himself.

"I accepted because I felt so upset about the news I had heard earlier about the government's treatment of monks," he said.

The monk was given, on the day before the projected suicide, three letters.

The first, addressed to the President of the Republic, demanded religious freedom, an end to torture, etc., etc.

The second, addressed to a high-ruling opposition monk, charged a progovernment monk with betraying monks, nuns and Buddhists.

The third, addressed to the U.N. mission, gave the reasons why he was committing suicide. "These letters had been prepared ahead of time for me and they asked me to sign them. I did not hesitate."

FRIEND'S TIP SAVES

Fortunately, a friend of the sacrificial victim tipped off the police, who saved him from himself in the nick of time; and, having convinced himself of the falsity of the allegations, he took his story to the U.N. mission.

What is involved here is not merely an academic piece of historical rectification, but essential information we need in order to guard against future such ventures in the highjacking of world opinion.

CHANCE FOR CONGRESS

A congressional committee could look into the evidence amassed by the U.N. mission, and make it available to students of that intriguing episode.

If U Thant refuses to give Members of Congress a copy of the report, I'd be glad to lend them mine.

NO PERSECUTION BY DIEM, 20 TO 5

Following is a verbatim quote from page 248 of the U.N. Factfinding Mission Report (document A/5630, Dec. 7, 1963):

"The (U.N.) mission took note of the names of Buddhist monks, leaders and students who had allegedly been arrested, kidnaped or killed. Later it (the mission) was able to interview Thich Tri Tu, Thich Quang Lien, Thich Tam Giao, and Thich Tien Minh who, in some communications, were said to have been killed."

The mission also took note (pp. 247, 248) of allegations in communications sent to it concerning alleged Diem government persecution of Buddhists and reported objectively on their import. Of a total of 25 communications, the U.N. mission says:

"In five of these communications, the authors allege that such persecutions (of Buddhists) were the result of a deliberate policy of the (Diem) government.

"In four communications, the persecutions were regarded as being essentially the acts of anti-Buddhist elements in the population or of local authorities, and the Central Government is held responsible only for

not paying enough attention to Buddhist grievances.

"The authors of 12 communications deny that the Buddhist community was ever the victim of discrimination and persecution by the (Diem) government.

"It is stressed in four communications that, under the Diem government, the Buddhist community had grown larger and that numerous pagodas had been built or repaired with the financial help of the (Diem) government authorities."

Therefore, out of 25 communications to the U.N. factfinding mission, the score was 20 to 5 against the allegation of direct Diem government persecution of Buddhists; concerning Diem government action, the score was 16 to 9 in favor of the government, with 4 adverse opinions critical of the Diem government.

Burning of Jets Just the Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of January 17, 1964:

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: BURNING OF JETS JUST THE BEGINNING

The Johnson administration's skylighting proposal to destroy those B-47 jet bombers is only part of the disarmament package U.S. officials are preparing to offer the Russians.

The controversial plan, which is being vigorously opposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, calls for the United States and Russia jointly to destroy mortars, tanks, and atomic-firing cannons.

The giant 280-millimeter nuclear field pieces now used by U.S. forces in West Germany and Korea, but considered obsolete, are being added to the disarmament proposal to give it an atomic image.

Still under backstage consideration is whether the package should include a State Department plan providing that the United States offer to dismantle a small number of atomic bombs on a 2-for-1 basis with the Soviet.

This unpublished proposal and the exact number of jet bombers and other military equipment to be destroyed are being hotly debated by President Johnson's military, intelligence, and foreign policy advisers.

Secretary of State Rusk, who hopes to have the new arms control package ready to offer the Russians at the East-West talks that open in Geneva on January 21, favors the big bonfire plan.

He is seeking Presidential approval to propose that a match be put to 200 medium range B-47 bombers and a comparable number of Soviet Badgers—similar to the bombers Premier Khrushchev secretly shipped into Cuba in 1962.

If the Russians agree to this, according to Rusk, the accord will keep these Soviet bombers out of the hands of African and Asian nations seeking Russian arms.

The Joint Chiefs, who have fought the whole idea, have made a counterproposal that the number of bombers to be destroyed be limited to 20 or fewer.

They argue that destruction of more of the B-47's would not be in the national interest. Although the bombers are slowly being phased out by the Air Force, the Joint Chiefs point out that they will continue to be one of the Strategic Air Command's top nuclear bomb carriers during the 1960's.

Should either a major or brushfire war break out before 1970, these military advisers claim that all the B-47's in the Air Force's 1,200 inventory would be needed. They stress that the bomber's capabilities for low-level penetration of Soviet defenses are still unsurpassed.

On direct orders from Defense Secretary McNamara, the Joint Chiefs are preparing a report on the number of other arms that will become obsolete within the next 5 years.

The President's military advisers plan to include in their report a warning that any disarmament agreement providing for large-scale destruction of conventional arms will work to the disadvantage of the United States at this time.

Criticism of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Mobile (Ala.) Register, entitled, "Do-Nothing Criticism Credit to Congress."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO-NOTHING CRITICISM CREDIT TO CONGRESS

Everything he can rake and scrape together is being used by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to give Congress a black eye because it has not thrown caution to the wind and run wild in enacting new left-wing Federal meddling social legislation.

For good measure, the rip-roaring senatorial liberal contributes a few choice pieces of fault-finding of his own: "* * * During the previous session, Congress was quite incapable of attending to the public business. * * * We are a long way from fulfilling our responsibility in Congress."

As seen through the political eyes of Senator CLARK, its enactment of hodge-podge on so-called civil rights, medicare, aid to education and the like is necessary for Congress to fulfill its responsibility.

One thing he has dredged up to downgrade the present Congress is a Louis Harris poll, of which he says: "This poll makes it clear that the rating of the 88th Congress by the people of the United States is very bad, indeed."

Another thing over which the Senator enthused is a Walter Lippmann article he came across in the Washington Post.

Mr. Lippmann, who impresses us as seldom underestimating his own wisdom in national and world affairs, would have Congress dilute its independence as one of the three constitutional branches of the Federal Government.

In the article Senator CLARK introduced in evidence against the existing manner of its functioning, Walter Lippmann wrote of Congress: "* * * If the trouble from which we suffer is that the Legislature [Congress] paralyzes the Executive [the President], then the remedy is * * * clear. It is also simple. Let each House of the Congress pass a rule that any measure proposed by the President and certified as important must be put to a vote by some specified date or within some specified time."

That sort of rule might be perfectly hunky-dory for the promoters of Federal meddling in whatever way a President declared important.

But it may be debatable whether Mr. Lippmann has convinced any except himself and Senator CLARK that such a dilution of congressional independence would be hunky-dory for the national interest.

In the thoroughness of his search for faultfinding with Congress, Senator CLARK no more overlooked the New York Times than he overlooked the Louis Harris poll and Walter Lippmann.

In consulting the New York Times, he was rewarded by the discovery of an editorial complaining of a "slow-motion record" in Congress by "nonlegislating legislators."

It would appear that we have arrived at an unheard-of day in American history when there is abroad in the land a school of thought which holds that Congress does not qualify for public respect and confidence unless it enacts, or at least railroads to a vote, every fantastic and forbidding proposal that can be dreamed up to speed up Federal encroachment into the lives and affairs of the people.

Congress could end the do-nothing criticism heaped on it today in tidal wave volume.

It would need only surrender lock, stock, and barrel to the Federal meddling demands of the faultfinders.

But the price of that surrender would be prohibitively high for a people "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among them "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Nowhere on earth at any time have any people had much opportunity for liberty and the pursuit of happiness in a totalitarian straitjacket.

This should be lesson and warning to the American people every time another Federal meddling bill is introduced in Congress or recommended to it.

The kind of do-nothing criticism being leveled at Congress these days is actually a credit to it.

Gene Dawson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor recently appeared in the Washington Post. Many people like myself who knew Gene Dawson will agree with the sentiments expressed therein and want to pay tribute to his efforts with respect to the prayer amendment:

GENE DAWSON

The tragic and untimely death of Gene Dawson, congressional aid to Representative FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, is a cause of great sadness not only to his many friends in the Capital, but also to many like myself, who never met him personally, but who worked closely with him in an effort to restore prayer and Bible reading to our public schools through discharge petition No. 3.

When the history of the struggle for the prayer amendment is written, no one will merit greater credit for the enactment of said amendment than Gene Dawson. His untiring and selfless dedication to this cause will never be forgotten by his many friends and acquaintances.

ROBERT L. MAURO.

LONG BRANCH, N.J.

The Pending Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and more has been written on the pending tax bill than I could hope to remember. Each and every day since President Kennedy sent his recommendations to the Congress on January 24, 1963, I have received various articles outlining the pros and cons of this legislation.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial written by Mr. Angelo Scott, editor of the Iola (Kans.) Register. I feel this is one article that makes good sense. I hope every Member of this body will take the time to read Mr. Scott's erudite views.

CAN'T HAVE BOTH

It's impossible to keep track of all the items that go in and out of the big tax reduction bill as it continues to work its way through the Senate Finance Committee these days.

Everybody has his own idea of where and how the cuts should be made. Some of them gain committee approval, others bite the dust. But what happened yesterday points up a fact that all of us should keep clearly in mind as we watch these procedures.

Two measures were proposed. One would give tax relief on the costs of college education, the other on facilities built for the purpose of air and water pollution control.

Now everybody is in favor of giving a boost to higher education and we all recognize the pressing need for encouragement to pollution control. Yet both proposals were defeated.

Why? For the simple reason that they would cost the Treasury so much money that in order to keep within the $11 billion total reduction planned, income tax rate reductions would have to be cut back. In other words, we can have rate reductions or more special exceptions but not both.

We keep forgetting this. And more than anything else, we keep forgetting that the purpose of taxation is to raise money—not subsidize college educations, stimulate pollution control, cut down on alcoholism, share the wealth, or any of the other thousand and one social and economic ideas that keep getting mixed up in our tax bills.

It is true that once the tax money is raised, a thousand and one uses may be found for it, all of them perfectly legitimate. But the taxing is one thing and the spending is another. Ideally they should be kept entirely apart.

We should tax according to ability to pay a just sharing of the total burden among all the people. That and no more. We should spend according to our needs and our income.

It is because we have forgotten or ignored these fundamentals that we have a tax reduction bill in Congress today. We have piled so many of our special exception and reform ideas into our tax structure that both the rate and the structure have become intolerable.

But the main thing that is intolerable is the rate. And we certainly can't reduce it if we keep piling more exceptions into the structure.

That is the whole meaning of the Senate Finance Committee votes yesterday.

We Must Not Turn Our Backs on Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, can there be any doubt that Castro made his sudden trip to Moscow to get Khrushchev's backing for intensifying and stirring up more Communist-style trouble in the Carribbean area at a time when the United States was preoccupied with an explosive situation in Panama?

Castro did not have to wait to discuss the matter with Khrushchev before having his agents take part in the Panama riots. And even our own Government officials have attested to Communist participation in those riots.

What then? Richard Fryklund writing in the January 23 Washington Star presents a logical answer. Attributing the answer to "Government analysts" Mr. Fryklund interprets the analysts' warning to "watch for trouble in Guantanamo" when Castro returns from his Kremlin conference.

To add an important dimension to our study and deliberations of the Panama problem I include Mr. Fryklund's report at this point in the RECORD:

TRIP STIRS GUANTANAMO FEAR

(By Richard Fryklund)

When Fidel Castro returns from Russia, watch for trouble in Guantanamo.

This is the warning from Government analysts who were told to find out why Cuba's leader made his sudden, unscheduled trip to Moscow.

No one except Mr. Castro and Premier Khrushchev can be positive about the reason for the trip. But the analysts say it was not only for sledding, drinking, trade agreements, and the public pledges of undying loyalty.

Rather, it is now believed here, Mr. Castro wanted to clear a proposal with Mr. Khrushchev to take advantage of the Panama riots by creating incidents at Guantanamo, the American naval base on the southeast coast of Cuba.

ESTIMATE OF TRIP

Here is the analysts' estimate of the Castro trip:

Reaction to the Panama riots convinced Mr. Castro that most of Latin America—and much of the world—was on the side of the rioters (egged on by Castro agents) and against the Yankee imperialists.

He decided to attempt to use this wave of emotion to gain sympathy for Cuban harassment of the United States and Guantanamo. Naturally he wanted the backing of his protector, Russia.

The Guantanamo base is under lease to the United States. America is for all pratical purposes sovereign on the base, as is the case in the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. Castro has threatened many times to throw the Yankees out, but he lacks the physical power to try and—so far—the permission of Mr. Khrushchev to start war-risking harassment.

NO WARNING GIVEN

The Panama riots started January 9. Three days later Mr. Castro left for Moscow, reportedly without any advance warning even to the Kremlin.

In Moscow, he is believed to have asked Mr. Khrushchev's moral support for a new anti-Guantanamo campaign. Whether the permission was given is not known.

There are a number of things Mr. Castro could do in Guantanamo short of an armed assault.

He could order sabotage by some of the 3,724 Cuban citizens who work there—or demonstrations on the base against "gringo oppressors." He could stop the Cuban workers from entering the base; cut off the water supply, which comes from Cuban reservoirs, ring the base with snipers or create incidents along the fence.

While stirring up violence, Mr. Castro and the Communist bloc could propagandize the world and appeal to the United Nations.

HOPES FOR SYMPATHY

The Castro hope would be that the excitment over Panama could create sympathy for the Cuban campaign.

If any of these things are done, the United States would call on standby plans to restore order and hold on to the base.

A roster of substitute civilian workers has already been drawn up, and enough men to carry on vital functions could be flown quickly to Gauntanamo. Water could be tanked in; the 3,307 American sailors and marines normally on the base could defend it against harrassment.

Will any of these things happen? The best bet now is that Mr. Khrushchev would not like to risk war in Cuba during his present peace offensive. Small harrassments would not significantly change relations betwen the United States and Russia; large-scale rioting, carrying with it the threat of war, would.

Goldwater and the ICBM's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis News of January 17, 1964:

GOLDWATER AND THE ICBM'S

(By Stan Evans)

Current debate on the dependability of U.S. long-range missiles as a means of national defense features a seemingly ironic reversal of positions.

Four years ago at this time, Democratic spokesmen were in full cry against the Eisenhower administration concerning the so-called missile gap. Among those saying America was behind the Soviet Union in the race for missile defenses were Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, the recently deceased President, and Senator Lyndon Johnson, who succeeded him in the Nation's highest office.

These Senators were joined by numerous others including Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democratic, of Missouri, and Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, in proclaiming the frailties of American defense. We were, it was suggested, virtually at the mercy of the vast Soviet arsenal.

Now the roles are reversed. It is Republican Senator BARRY GOLDWATER who challenges the reliability of American missiles, and Democratic spokesmen who reply that it just isn't so. Most prominently, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who has occupied his strategic post under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, says Gold-

water's remarks are damaging to America's posture in the cold war struggle with communism.

In its current issue, Newsweek magazine quotes McNamara as charging GOLDWATER had harmed the national security, and reports that "GOLDWATER had called into question the very credibility on which the United States rests its strategy through deterrence."

That rebuttal, on the face of it, should be somewhat embarrassing to both McNamara and Newsweek. The Defense Secretary, after all, owes his office in good part to the missile gap cry raised by Messrs. Kennedy and Johnson, an accusation quickly withdrawn once the Democratic regime took power. It was all too apparent in those days that repeated assertions of American inferiority were gravely damaging to the credibility of our deterrent force.

At that time, neither McNamara nor Newsweek spoke out against the allegation that America was inferior to the Soviet Union. Indeed, Newsweek was one of the chief journalistic promoters of this line—which was and is, by the way, vigorously contested by the Indianapolis News.

What are the facts, so far as the public can know them, about America's defenses? The truth is that America was not in 1960 and is not now inferior to the Soviet Union in the production of long-range missiles. Nor is it inferior in other categories of military production, including the ability to produce manned aircraft. Assertions to the contrary in 1960 were false, as the sponsors of them subsequently conceded. Assertions to the contrary in 1964 would be equally false.

Senator GOLDWATER, however, has not said American performance in the ICBM area is inferior to that of the Soviet Union. He has not said we are becoming a second-class power. He has not proclaimed a mythical missile gap.

What he has said is that long-range missiles are not in themselves sufficiently reliable for America to stake her entire defense upon them. They have, at best, a performance record of about 80 percent. They have never been tested in actual combat conditions. We are unable to test them with live warheads, under the limited nuclear test ban treaty. They are too inflexible to deal with limited or ambiguous situations.

Senator GOLDWATER's position, in short, is that we should not get rid of our manned aircraft—as the McNamara regime is doing—and rest our entire case on the uncertain potencies of missiles alone. He is not downgrading America in the eyes of the world, but simply stating the facts about the necessity for a balanced defense.

The true irony of the situation is that Secretary McNamara and Newsweek magazine, both linked to the false missile gap cry of 1960, should now label Senator GOLDWATER's well-reasoned warning as irresponsible. At such time as GOLDWATER repeats the liberal performance of 4 years ago, then and only then would their accusation be correct.

Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, it was my distinct privilege to introduce H.R. 9379, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. In my judgment, this fine organization, now in its 68th year of activity and service, merits the granting of a Federal charter.

Organized in 1896 by veterans of the Civil War, the Jewish War Veterans is now our Nation's oldest active war veterans organization. From its inception, when it spoke out in behalf of the 8,000 Union veterans of the Jewish faith, it has served as an inspiring example of the American ex-serviceman committed to the highest standard of patriotism and dedicated as well to the precepts of Judaism. Among its membership today are veterans of military actions from the Spanish-American War through the Korean conflict.

From my own knowledge of the JWV Bronx Council, and the department of New York, I am well aware of its substantial veterans service program through which any veteran, regardless of race or religion, may be helped. In addition to its well earned reputation for promoting patriotic programs in over 300 communities, the JWV is actively engaged in carrying on activities designed to foster good relations between diverse elements and groups such as we have in the Bronx.

Eight years of service in the Congress have afforded me an opportunity to be much impressed by JWV legislative activities. While working to create better understanding of government for its members, it has interpreted to the Congress the uppermost concerns of American veterans of whom over 1 million are of the Jewish faith.

As a longtime vigilant fighter against the extremes of communism and fascism and as an outspoken enemy of all prejudice and bigotry, the Jewish War Veterans deserves the prestige and recognition implicit in a Federal charter. The enactment by this body of my bill, H.R. 9379, will be a tangible recognition of a job well done for 68 years. Since introducing it, I have received a large number of letters from residents of my congressional district, thanking me and expressing their hope that the bill will be approved by Congress.

Civil Rights: The Time Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine and member of the faculty at a fine Catholic college in Pittsburgh—Mount Mercy College—has written an excellent article in the December 13, 1963, issue of the Commonweal magazine.

In view of the impending debate on the civil rights bill, I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

THE TIME IS NOW

(By Donald Louis Anderson)

In the fall of 1956, I sat in the British House of Commons and listened to a debate over proposed self-determination for the island of Cyprus. The policies of three governments were involved: Turkey, because of Cyprus' geographical position and the Turkish minority; Greece, because of the racial affinity existing between the Cypriot majority and the Greece; and Britain, because of her sovereignty over the island. In the debate, Mr. Allan Lennox-Boyd, then Colonial Secretary, summed up the attitudes of the three countries toward self-determination for Cyprus: "Greece says 'now'; Turkeys says 'never'; and we say 'sometime.'"

Within 5 years of that debate, Cyprus was an independent nation. That she became free was due, in part, to the violence of terrorists; but also, in part, to the enlightened policy of the British Government and its capability of adjusting to a world which had changed. This is a rare capability, and one not often demonstrated in the United States, but one which is obviously recommended by the racial crisis that now confronts us.

It is natural that the writer, as a Negro, prefers a government with a vast tolerance for change. The party I would most likely support must be similar to that which the Economist, in its April 21, 1962 issue, indicated it desired to see in power: the political party "most likely to 'foster the reformer's zeal, to be willing to probe down to the roots of every stalk of the national life and to cut and graft wherever an improvement can be seen'; its whole impulse is to favor the party which is the enemy of 'passive tranquillity,' and which comes nearest to having 'nothing timid or tepid, nothing cautious and not too much that is merely judicious' in its policies. It prefers a government that is willing to be audacious in accepting and welcoming and pursuing change."

I am aware that adopting the spirit of these words as guideposts for action puts me in opposition to a large part of public opinion in this country. Much of the public is startled by what they feel to be a sudden impatience on the part of the Negro, unaware of generations of discontent and unhappiness. But persons so far away from the heart of the current struggle can give only the passionless logician's analysis as to what ought or ought not be done, leaving out human needs, human desires, and human attitudes altogether.

The current attitude of impatience on the part of Negroes is not really new; it has only recently been converted into action. Most Negroes would admit that their degraded status is a subject which has always dominated their conversations at the dinner table, in the barbershops, and on street corners. Impatience is an attitude nearly unanimous among Negroes, and one not like to be given up as the result of logical argument. And this attitude is made all the more intense by the Negro's realization that he is not keeping up with a fast changing world.

A look at history will indicate that such an attitude is only to be expected under the circumstances. The American Negro, like the rest of mankind, is displaying one aspect of human nature that is decisive: He will not be ruled or degraded. Here the actions of Negroes follow the same pattern as those of the founders of this Nation. Indeed, they could speak with the same words:

"But where, some say, is the king of America? I'll tell you, friend, He reigns above, and doth not make havoc of mankind like the royal brute of Britain. Yet that we may not appear set apart for proclaiming the charter; let it be brought forth placed on the divine law, the word of God; let a crown be placed thereon, by which the world may know, that so far as we approve of monarchy, that in America, the law is king." ("Common Sense," Thomas Paine, 1776.)

"Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded. * * * In vain after these

things may we indulge in the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. * * * Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope?" (Patrick Henry, 1775.)

There is a striking parallel between the Negro's feelings and those of the Founding Fathers—of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton—because people in a degraded position, lacking privileges which affect every aspect of their lives, react in the same way. In the cycle of human affairs, Negroes are in the same position which these men occupied when they acted as the spokesmen of a revolution.

When the revolutionary spirit of the Founding Fathers is expressed today, however, it does not really have general pubic support. As I see it, the reason why many today do not accept Jefferson's argument in the Declaration of Independence is that they have not had the same experiences he had and they therefore do not feel the things he felt. The Negro's experiences, on the other hand, are similar to Jefferson's and the other Founding Fathers.

There are those who object to the Negro's insistence on the immediate realization of his legal rights, envisioning instead a neat solution "in due time"—although it is not clear how they arrive at their leisurely timetable. The Negro, however, cannot follow prescriptions that offer mere assurances without a guarantee, and Negro leaders have made it clear that they intend to live on promises no longer.

This should hardly surprise anyone, in view of the Negro's experience, nor is it surprising that people who view things from a comfortable and privileged perch favor a timetable of freedom which the Negroes cannot count on and will not tolerate. We believe that the argument of the Declaration of Independence had validity at the time it was made, and that it has validity now. It is our experience which tells us this—just as it is our experience which allows us to perceive the similarity between the Boston Massacre and the Birmingham riots.

The insistence of the Negro for a change in policies now is often met by the contention that such a transformation is impossible to bring about; that things can't happen overnight; that you can't change men's minds by legislation. These evasive verbal formulas only promote argument at cross-purposes. The things which Negroes wish to change immediately involve the realization of legal rights which are constitutionally guaranteed. What the Negroes want is to stand equal before the law; what many think the Negroes want immediately are the consequences—usually social—which flow from equal status.

The rights which the Negro wants are specific; the consequences of denying them are severe. The Negro seeks, for example, the right to vote. To refuse this right is an unconstitutional act; to base its acquisition on custom is not only contrary to the Constitution, but also affronts the legal concepts of rights, which are not postponable. The vote is always an essential safeguard against abuse of power by any political faction which has the control of government. When the faction in power can disregard the desires and security of its opponents, there is no restraint upon excesses, and the 1961 Civil Rights Commission report recorded incident after incident of such abuse of power in the South.

The Negro seeks an end to enforced segregation in the schools. Education is an important right, and for Negro children attending bad schools time is of the essence. "Once a child becomes a remedial reading case," says Dr. Calvin E. Gross, superintendent of the schools of New York City, "it may take years to repair the damage, or it may be too late forever." To ask Negroes to delay in this matter so that others may adjust to a change in their sacred "way of life" is like asking us to sacrifice our children to pagan gods.

The Negro seeks equal access to housing. Without the right to live where one wants, there is no relief from the day-to-day discomfort and misery of the slums. Furthermore, it should be remembered that when the Negro is confined to a slum or a ghetto, it is the slum or ghetto which sets his goals and his hopes for achievement. How then can progress be expected?

The Negro seeks equal opportunity for employment. This is clearly of crucial importance, in itself and because the denial of this right ties in with the denial of all the rights sought by the Negro. Without equal opportunity for employment, a Negro cannot stand on his own two feet. Without it a Negro father cannot provide an adequate home, cultural advantages or a completed education for himself or for his children.

The Negro seeks equal access to public accommodation. This right is important, not only because of the convenience which would result from having it, but also because the denial of this right works on the minds of those who are excluded and on the minds of those who do the excluding. The former feels degraded, as any Negro who has ever been turned away from a restaurant or hotel will testify; the latter gains a basis for an unwarranted feeling of superiority.

All of these are rights to which the Negro is legally and morally entitled. To state that the Negro is too impatient is to show undue tolerance for the intransigent white population; to ask for time is not only to tolerate prejudice but to demand an act of heroic charity on the Negro's part. In reality the Negro is being asked to restrain himself in order to accommodate the sensibilities of the white supremacist. How can such a request be justified?

Prejudice is the inability to recognize individual differences, the tendency to generalize about humans, to attribute to the individual the qualities one feels are possessed by an entire group—a fatal habit when appraising human beings who are motivated by a multiple of complicated emotions which in turn give rise to varied and unpredictable results. It is prejudice which is at the heart of the racial crisis. Yet if this is so, public attention should be directed not to calming the impatience of the Negro but to bringing about those situations which are most suited to put an end to prejudice.

There is plenty of evidence to show that the only solution to this problem of prejudice is interpersonal experience, and in the long run only an end to segregation will make this experience possible on a wide scale. Postponing the end of segregation, therefore, only postpones the cure.

Farmers Object to Decision Outlawing Prayer in Schools and Favor Free Market for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Prairie Farmer magazine has released some significant information representing the attitude of operating farmers in Illinois and Indiana. The information, released by Editor James C. Thomson, shows farmer objection to the Supreme Court decision outlawing prayer in schools, and farmer support for returning American agriculture to a free market system. The text of the releases appear below:

FARMERS OBJECT TO DECISION OUTLAWING PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

Strong disagreement with the U.S. Supreme Court decision banishing prayer and Bible reading in the public schools is expressed in a recent poll of Indiana and Illinois farmers by Prairie Farmer.

The opinion of farmers in every county in each of the States is included in the poll.

Here is how they answered the question: "Recently the U.S. Supreme Court decided it was against the Constitution to have Bible reading and the saying of prayers in public schools. Do you agree with this decision?"

	Indiana	Illinois
I agree	9.5	16.8
I disagree	83.5	73.1
No opinion	7.0	10.1

DO FARMERS WANT TO RETURN TO THE FREE MARKET?

More and more the free-market philosophy of the Farm Bureau is being heard as the answer to what ails agriculture. But what do farmers really think?

In a recent Prairie Farmer poll we asked more than 2,000 farmers in every county in Illinois and Indiana the following question: "President Charles B. Shuman of the American Farm Bureau Federation has often expressed the view of Farm Bureau that farmers would be better off if they moved gradually back to a free market. He speaks of supports at around 50 percent of parity as disaster insurance only. Do you agree with this point of view?"

Here is how they answered:

	Indiana	Illinois
Yes, it makes sense	36.9	34.2
No, I want high supports	11.5	12.2
It's good idea if everyone else goes to a free market	35.0	35.0
I'm not sure	16.9	19.2

The 1965 Budget Coupled With Tax Cut Will Provide a Sound and Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the 1965 budget is an expansionary budget. It is designed to speed the rate of economic advance—to increase the markets for our farms and factories—to add $30 billion to our gross national product—and to help provide 2 to 3 million additional jobs for our unemployed workers and for the young people coming into our labor market.

Many of my colleagues may ask how this is possible in a budget which reduces Federal spending and which cuts the deficit in half. Mr. Speaker, the answer is plain. This budget relies not upon a vast increase in total Federal spending to accomplish these important aims.

Rather, it makes available, through an $11 billion tax reduction, the funds and the incentives to individual consumers and private business firms to fuel a major economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, a strongly expanding economy is the surest means of ending budget deficits. And when we take the proposed tax reduction into account, this budget provides the largest year-to-year economic stimulus of any budget ever submitted in peacetime.

In 1964, the drop in withholding taxes which this budget proposes will put $8 billion additional dollars directly into the pockets of American families. Reductions in corporate taxes will raise corporate profits. And this extra spending power—as it circulates through the economy—will yield an increase in markets and jobs several times as great as the initial stimulus. With incomes rising more rapidly, Federal revenues will begin to increase sharply. Very quickly, a large part of the initial loss in revenues from tax reductions will be made up, and in a short time Federal revenues under the new tax program will be higher than they would have been under the old one.

Deficit reduction through expenditure control, tax reduction, and economic expansion—that is the fiscal strategy of the 1965 budget.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, is not only a fiscally expansionary budget—it is a socially progressive one. Total expenditures are reduced from 1964 to 1965 by $500 million. But frugality has not been practiced solely for frugality's sake. The savings which more efficient management and rigorous pruning of low priority programs made possible are proposed to be used in constructive ways to help the American people—and particularly to help the millions of Americans living in poverty to help themselves. This budget provides for major increases in appropriations to furnish work and training for the unemployed, and education and job opportunities for youth: $160 million for youth employment opportunities; a $250 million increase for manpower training, and a $100 million increase for vocational education and rehabilitation; more than $700 million for major new education programs; and $50 million for community work and training. Over and above this, it provides $500 million in special new funds for a joint Federal-State and local effort which will strike at the roots of poverty in America, and some $250 million in new funds for an Appalachian development program.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have been given clear evidence that a tight budget need not be a stagnant budget. Fiscal expansion and social progress do not require Federal extravagance. Out of the savings which tightfisted review of Federal spending has made possible, President Johnson has fashioned a compassionate budget—one which responds to the needs and hopes of individual people.

The Grand Old Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond News Leader entitled "The Grand Old Flag."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAND OLD FLAG

Today was a proud day for Americans in Panama. Not since Iwo Jima has the flag of our country taken on such symbolic meaning. But there is a shadow cast over the whole affair, and not only by the organized rioting which erupted in Panama when American students flew the flag they love. The shadow is cast because the students were forced to defy their Governor and the President of the United States.

The point is that the flag is the symbol of sovereignty. The American flag has flown over the Canal Zone since 1903 by virtue of the treaties by which we built the canal. In recent years there has been a concerted drive by the leftist President of Panama, Roberto Chiari, to take sovereignty and control over the canal. The State Department, with its usual strategy, has been encouraging him with piecemeal concessions both real and symbolic. The United States has even financed an economic plan to integrate the functions of the canal with the Panamanian economy.

The situation has produced a constant tug-of-war between Congress and the Executive since 1960, when President Eisenhower signed the first order allowing the Panamanian flag to be flown equally with the American in the Canal Zone. The House objected to this by passing a resolution recommending that any changes be made by treaty. In other legislation, Congress also forbade the use of any U.S. funds to display the two flags together. Nevertheless, the directive was signed, but not clearly implemented until the fall of 1962 on orders of President Kennedy. The Governor of the Canal Zone, Robert J. Fleming, siding with the Panamanians, boldly proclaimed that he proposed to "slaughter some sacred cows." He began by taking down his own flagpole to avoid flying the American flag alone.

Last year a group of American citizens, led by Canal Company Engineer Gerald A. Doyle, filed suit to rescind the Eisenhower-Kennedy flag order. In July the U.S. district court handed down its decision: It agreed with Mr. Doyle that the dual flag arrangement was an ambiguous recognition of dual sovereignty, but for that very reason the court decided it had no power to decide a question that was in the domain of treaty.

Citing this as a victory, Governor Fleming and the State Department have proceeded to erect dual flagpoles in many places in the zone, at the same time forbidding anyone to fly the U.S. flag in public. This morning he called for citizens to recognize the valid commitment of the Government.

But the anger began in December. Congress passed the foreign aid appropriation bill, but inserted an amendment requiring the approval of congressional committees for any change in the properties of the Canal Company. When President Johnson signed the bill, he announced that he did not intend to enforce the canal safeguards—even though the President does not have such an item veto. The threat to the canal did not go unnoticed in the zone, where efforts by U.S. citizens to fly the flag began January 7. Citizens were especially shocked when U.S. authorities removed the usual American flags from the U.S. district court building and the World War I and II memorials.

It is a mistake to view these events simply as outrageous conduct by rioting Panamanians. It is the outrageous conduct of the executive branch of the U.S. Government, in trying to abrogate treaties without the concurrence of the legislative branch, that set off the latent sparks of American patriotism. The giveaway theory of the State Department has led Panamanians to misinterpret their real rights to the vital Panama Canal. It is a dark day when American citizens have to battle their own leaders to keep their own flag flying high.

A Tribute to Utahans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ogden Standard-Examiner, Ogden, Utah, dated January 16, 1964:

TOUGH JOBS ASSIGNED TO OGDEN

Today's editorial was, in effect, written by Maj. Gen. Donald L. Hardy, of the U.S. Air Force, Executive Director of Supply Operations for the Defense Supply Agency.

Only when General Hardy originated these words he didn't know they'd become an editorial in the Standard-Examiner.

The career Air Force officer was speaking a few days ago at ceremonies marking the transfer of the old Utah Army Depot, now Defense Depot Ogden, from Army command to direction of the combined services' Defense Supply Agency.

The visitor brought greetings from his own boss, Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, commander of the DSA, whose message detailed progress being made toward accomplishment of the Agency's goals of "support to operating forces in war and peace" at "the lowest feasible cost."

Then General Hardy recalled how "a couple of years ago I had the good fortune to be rather intimately connected with your good neighbor to the south, the Ogden Air Materiel Area."

Continued General Hardy:

"The thing that struck me in the work that I did (at Hill AFB) was the spirit of the people, their willingness to do.

"The people were such fine people. But I came to realize that this was not a thing unique at the Ogden Air Materiel Area. It was something that belonged to the people of this community. It was widespread throughout the community.

"The way you people live, the way you did things was a joy to yourself and a joy to behold.

"It seemed to me that you followed the ancient Greek precept that really brought about the golden age of Greece and was the precept that our late President followed precisely—and that was to use all of your powers and to use each one of them in achieving excellence.

"In the logistic command of the Air Force, because of the kind of people you are, when we had a real tough job to be assigned to an air materiel area, believe me that it most often went to Ogden.

"I have a feeling that when we have a real tough distribution job in the Defense Supply Agency, because of the kind of people you are, it will come to Ogden.

"What you people did as the Utah Army Depot for the Army and for your country is a matter of record and a superb one. What you people of the Utah Army Depot, and now Defense Depot Ogden did and are doing for your community is also a matter of record, and also a superb one.

"What you will do in the future, I know, will make a record of which you will be very proud. You have met every challenge in the past and all that we can offer you are new challenges. I know how you will accept them and I know what you will do with them."

What made General Hardy's complimentary remarks particularly warming to the Utahans who listened was that the general was not reading a script prepared for him by a publicityminded public relations officer.

General Hardy spoke from experience—and from his heart.

Bailing Out the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, there is an obvious disposition on the part of the liberal press to drop the matter of wheat sales to Communist countries as a newsworthy topic. I would observe that those who so strongly urged the extension of credit to Russia through our Export-Import Bank would prefer that the spotlight of public attention be shifted elsewhere.

Raymond Moley, in his column in the January 20, 1964, issue of Newsweek, has some comments on this subject that should be called to the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's column be inserted following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

Since the dispute over details of the wheat sale to Russia has shifted from credit arrangements to transportation in American ships, we should keep in mind that some of the Russian ships that will be carrying part, and in the end probably most, of our wheat were—for all practical purposes—given to the Soviet Union by the United States. According to a State Department memorandum of general information on the question of a lend-lease settlement with the U.S.S.R., 84 merchant ships were furnished to Russia under our lend-lease program during World War II. These were a part of the assistance, totaling more than $11 billion, extended to the U.S.S.R. during and for 3 years following World War II—for which the United States has never been able to secure satisfactory settlement.

So far as the ships themselves are concerned, no payment has been received since the ships were to be dealt with as a separate part of the overall negotiations. According to the State Department, no settlement offer has been received from the U.S.S.R.

The column follows:

BAILING OUT THE SOVIET

(By Raymond Moley)

Nothing better illustrates the lovable but at the same time lamentable nature of the liberal mind than the eager acceptance by the administration of the opportunity to sell some of our wheat surplus to the Soviet Union. Projected as it was with an array of assumed advantages, it had some appeal. But it was the projection of a hope, not a plan.

What this glorious adventure comes down to is not peaceful collaboration. It is an action by the greatest of capitalist nations rescuing the greatest of Communist countries from its own folly. Over the world we shall not be hailed as a savior. We shall still be known by Bernard Baruch's phrase, "Uncle Sap."

When President Kennedy proposed the wheat sale at a press conference on October 9, he claimed that:

It would ease United States-Soviet tensions; it would "advertise to the world as nothing else could the success of free American agriculture"; by inference, it would advertise the failure of communism to feed itself; it would dispose of a lot of our surplus wheat; it would reduce our gold shortage and help the balance-of-payments problem; it would be beneficial to the businesses involved in the transaction; it would help the American taxpayer; and it would provide employment for American seamen, for the wheat would be carried in available American ships. This, indeed, was a pretty package.

ABANDONED CONDITIONS

The President gave Congress certain assurances: "These sales would be concluded by private American grain dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial cedit terms." But the banks refused to provide financing for the transactions. Then Government credit was permitted, after the pre-Christmas armtwisting by President Johnson.

Meanwhile, there was a complicated ploy in the Commerce Department. First, it was said, all the grain would be carried in our vessels. The Russians protested. Then 50 percent. Still there was trouble. And there were growls from our maritime unions. Then came the word "available." Guideline rates were set up which made most American vessels unavailable. These rates made the Russian cargoes undesirable business for most of the dry-cargo tramp fleet—the Liberty ships busy with foreign aid cargoes. Tankers that sometimes enter the grain trade tend to return to profitable oil carrying when it's cold. And most vessels in liner service are held to schedules far from Russia. This big commercial transaction could never be a bonanza for a nonexistent fleet of hungry ships.

Nevertheless, the Russians grumbled about some U.S. vessels having a hand in the business. Khrushchev, echoing our maritime competitors, fumed about "flag discrimination." And the nation's press whipped American shipping for holding up the happy consummation of the deal.

BARGAIN FOR KHRUSHCHEV

Certainly Khrushchev couldn't hope to overthrow our cargo-preference law—the livelihood of U.S. tramps. But since he saw his victim, the American taxpayer, stuck for a subsidy on the wheat, why not make him pay the additional freight, too?

Why, in fact, isn't that reasonable? The Soviet Union is a leading underdeveloped nation, with lots of danger from empty-bellied Communists. By our own definition she is eminently qualified for the same shipping grant customarily given by the Agriculture Department for much less desirable beneficiaries.

And so when the Agriculture Department announced a remarkably high subsidy payment for the first Russian purchase, a lively mouse jumped out of the wheat bin. Through a gimmick in the agricultural subsidy structure, the Government had indeed finally maneuvered the taxpayers into paying to get the Russians to stop complaining about a few ships. And in that complicated deal, the Russians had to buy a lot of grain for making spaghetti and noodles rather than bread.

This whole imbroglio is a sample of the liberal pattern in program after program. Something is hastily entered into without careful planning. Then, as difficulties mount, money is poured out to show a simulacrum of success.

Air Pollution Control in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, enactment of the clean air bill in the last session marks the beginning of a truly national effort to prevent and control the dangerous problem of air pollution.

The goal of the legislation—the establishment of a national research and development program of air pollution control—can be realized only with the full cooperation of State and local agencies, private industry, and civic groups working together in concerted action. Adoption at the State level of strong pollution control programs must be realized.

I am pleased to report that the State of Connecticut took such a step in the last session of the State legislature with the enactment of Public Act No. 216, "An act concerning the provision of technical assistance in air pollution control."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Air Pollution Control in Connecticut," written by Charles Kurker, Jr., of the Connecticut Health Department, which appeared in the December issue of the Connecticut Health Bulletin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL IN CONNECTICUT

(By Charles Kurker, Jr., B.S., air pollution control engineer, sanitary engineering division)

Air pollution is a nationwide public health problem that is growing with population and industrial expansion. This has been acknowledged by the Connecticut public through its voice in the State general assembly. During the recent legislative session, Public Act No. 216 (house bill No. 2192) was passed. This act, entitled "An act con-

cerning the provision of technical assistance in air pollution control," reads as follows:

"As used in this Act, 'air pollution' means the presence in the outdoor atmosphere of one or more air contaminants or combinations thereof in such quantities and of such duration as are or may tend to be injurious to human, plant or animal life or property or as unreasonably and repeatedly to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property. The commissioner of health is authorized to: (a) Provide services for the study, prevention and abatement of air pollution; (b) advise, consult and cooperate with other State agencies, political subdivisions of this State, interstate agencies, the Federal Government, industries and other affected agencies or groups in matters relating to air pollution; (c) collect and disseminate the results of studies relating to air pollution; (d) accept and administer Federal grants-in-aid or gifts or donations made to the department of health for the purpose of carrying out any of the provisions of this Act, in accordance with section 1910 of the general statutes."

This law defines air pollution and gives the State department of health authority to make studies of air pollution problems and to cooperate with other agencies or groups in such matters. It acknowledges the fact that air pollution is a public health problem.

It should be pointed out that this law does not give enforcement authority to the State department of health. It allows this department to advise local officials. Enforcement of recommendations made for controlling air pollution remains with the local officials. Many Connecticut cities and towns presently have no air pollution ordinances. Consideration might be given to the adoption of such an ordinance. The purpose of having an ordinance of this type should be twofold:

(1) To control sources of air pollution where new building is planned.

(2) To correct existing air pollution problems, when deemed necessary.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

1. Air pollution surveys: Six townwide air pollution surveys have been completed in cooperation with the local health departments. Inspections were made of industries, businesses and public buildings to determine actual, probable and potential sources of air pollution. Recommendations for control were made wherever it was found necessary. High volume air samples (24 hours each) were collected for 1-week periods during each season of the year to determine the concentration of suspended particulates in the atmosphere. Dustfall samples (30 days each) were collected to determine the quantity of settleable solids. The results of all samples may be used as a baseline for comparison with samples collected in the future to indicate a trend (as to whether the concentrations are increasing, decreasing or remaining stable).

2. Advise local officials: Investigation of complaints of air pollution are made by this department upon request from the local director of health or from the local official responsible for air pollution control in the city or town. Recommendations are made for correcting all sources of air pollution noted during the investigation of the suggested cause for complaints.

3. Survey of refuse disposal areas: In a statewide air pollution study carried on by the U.S. Public Health Service in cooperation with the State department of health in 1956, it was found that open burning at refuse disposal areas was a major source of air pollution in Connecticut.

During the period from July 1958 to June 1959, a survey was conducted of all public refuse disposal areas in Connecticut. The main purpose of the survey was to reduce air pollution from these sources by encouraging the use of either the sanitary landfill method of disposal or high temperature incineration. Either method of disposal is satisfactory and will create no nuisances or health problems when properly operated. Normally, high temperature incineration is recommended in areas where the population served is sufficient to warrant the cost of such installation and in areas where sufficient land is not available for refuse disposal. The sanitary landfill method of operation is also recommended for disposal of ashes, tin cans, bottles and other materials which cannot be burned at the incinerator.

In cities and towns where sufficient land is available for refuse disposal and the population being served is not excessive, the sanitary landfill method is recommended. This involves the use of a crawler tractor with a bucket loader for spreading, compacting, and covering all refuse dumped daily. Burning is not permitted at a proper sanitary landfill.

Meetings and demonstrations of this method of refuse disposal have been held for participation by local officials. These meetings have been beneficial in that the simplicity of the operations involved are emphasized and also because time has been provided for questions and exchange of ideas and experiences. As a result of the survey and meetings, many operations have been improved and more towns have converted to the sanitary landfill method of refuse disposal.

4. Radiological air sampling: The State department of health has been cooperating with the U.S. Public Health Service in the National Radiation Surveillance Network by collecting continuous air precipitation samples at the laboratory in Hartford. During the period when the United States and Russia were conducting nuclear tests, the State department of health made arrangements with the Stamford and Waterbury Health Departments to collect additional radiological air samples in Connecticut. These were analyzed for gross beta and gamma radiation and compared with the samples collected in Hartford. The effects of nuclear tests were clearly indicated in the air samples, although none were ever considered dangerously high. As a result of the nuclear tests, the background level of radioactivity in the atmosphere has been increased somewhat. The level of radioactivity collected simultaneously in the three towns showed very little variations between stations.

Section 19-408 of the general statutes directs the State department of health to initiate and to pursue continuing studies in the radiation field as to air pollution. Industries with atmospheric discharges resulting from the use of radioactive materials routinely collect samples to check their own discharges. In addition to those samples, the State department of health collects periodic air samples, both on and off site, in the environment around these installations. There have been no samples collected which indicate excessive discharge of radioactivity in the atmosphere from the installations being checked. Many of these installations have provided efficient filters through which ventilated air is passed prior to being discharged to the environment.

5. Participation in the National Air Sampling Network: In 1953 the U.S. Public Health Service started a program of collecting a high volume air sample every 2 weeks at stations scattered throughout the country. These samples are analyzed for total suspended particulates which consist of dust, smoke, fumes, and droplets of liquids. Chemical analyses also made to determine the presence of specific types of chemical compounds and radioactivity. Connecticut has participated in this program and as of December 1962, Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, Stamford, Waterbury, and New Britain each had sampling stations. In January 1963, the city of Norwich also joined this sampling program making a total of seven sampling stations in Connecticut. Hartford and New Haven collect samples every 2 weeks each year. Stamford and Bridgeport collect samples every 2 weeks during the even numbered years and the remaining towns collect samples during the odd-numbered years. Gas sampling has also been added to the Hartford and New Haven program.

6. Notification of forecast alerts for high air pollution potential: Upon being alerted by forecast from the U.S. Weather Bureau of any prolonged (minimum of 36 hours) temperature inversion and stagnant air mass which could result in a high air pollution potential over any sector of Connecticut, steps have been taken to measure the effect of the inversion on the concentration of suspended particulates in the air. State health department laboratory personnel immediately proceed to collect high volume air samples in Hartford and arrangements are made to have comparable samples collected by local health department personnel in Middletown and Stamford, Conn.

Since November 1962, this department has been notified and collected samples during three such alerts. High volume air samples were collected during the forecasted period of inversion and for a least 1 day after the inversion was dispersed. Franklin M. Foote, M.D., D.P.H., commissioner of health, has issued warnings to the public through newspaper, radio, and television news releases, asking that all open burning in Connecticut be banned during these periods of prolonged inversions. It is hoped that responsible city and town officials will cooperate by refusing the issuance of permits to burn. In towns where no permits are needed, local officials should emphasize the warnings issued and discourage all open burning.

The graphs in figures 1 and 2 [not printed in the RECORD] contain data collected prior to, during, and following forecast alerts. Some of the data reported prior to the inversions were collected as part of the National Air Sampling Network.

In figure 1, results of high volume samples collected in Hartford during the periods of forecasted alerts are shown. Comparable samples collected as part of the National Air Sampling Network, during 1962, had an arithmetic mean concentration of 126 micrograms per cubic meter. The concentration of air samples collected during the inversion periods ranged from 1.5 to 3.5 times greater than the arithmetic mean for 1962.

Figure 2, shows the results of high volume air samples collected at two locations in Wethersfield during the period of July 23 through July 29, 1963. These data were collected as part of an air pollution survey. Coincidentally, the State department of health was alerted that high air pollution potential was forecast starting around noon on July 25 and the alert was called off about 6 p.m. July 26, 1963. These data indicate clearly the increase and decrease in the concentration of suspended particulates with the maximum occurring during the period of the forecast alert.

The arithmetic mean concentration of suspended particulates resulting from high-volume air samples collected for a 1-week period (January 7, 1959, to January 13, 1959) as part of an air pollution survey in Middletown, Conn., was approximately 40 micrograms per cubic meter. The arithmetic mean concentration of samples collected in Stamford, Conn., during 1962, when the health department participated in the National Air Sampling Network Program, was 65 micrograms per cubic meter.

Results of 24 hours high-volume air samples (suspended particulates) collected in Middletown and Stamford, Conn., during and following forecasted alerts

Date sampler started, 1962	Concentration in micrograms per cubic meter, Middletown	Date sampler started, 1963	Concentration in micrograms per cubic meter	
			Middletown	Stamford
Nov. 30 [1]	315	July 26 [1]	159	126
Dec. 1 [1]	209	July 27 [1]	101	89
Dec. 2 [1]	165	July 28	120	116
Dec. 3 [1]	258			
Dec. 4 [1]	131			
Dec. 5	51			
Dec. 6	59	Oct. 25 [1]	163	139
Dec. 7	17	Oct. 26 [1]	167	229
		Oct. 27 [1]	131	
		Oct. 28	32	
		Oct. 29		46

[1] Date on which inversion prevailed.

Comparison of these arithmetic mean figures with data tabulated for each town indicates that a marked increase in the concentrations of suspended particulates prevailed during the inversion periods.

GREATER PUBLIC INTEREST

Air pollution is a nationwide problem and greater public interest has been more evident in recent years. During the 1963 legislative session, a law was passed giving the State department of health authority to make studies of air pollution problems and to cooperate with other agencies in such matters.

Many activities pertaining to air pollution in Connecticut are presently being carried on by the State department of health. Results of air samples collected have clearly shown the buildup in the concentration of suspended particles when certain climatic conditions prevail. The need of cooperation by all, especially during periods of long-term inversions, cannot be overemphasized.

With everyone's cooperation, air pollution in Connecticut may be kept at a minimum and result in a cleaner and healthier State in which to live.

Our National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a gentlewoman living here on Capitol Hill, Miss Margo Cairns, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C., who is sometimes referred to as the "Corn Tassel Lady," I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD her discussion of a suitable national floral emblem for our country. She writes well and has given considerable thought to this subject. Her written article is as follows:

THE MARIGOLD: OUR NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM?

An accepted definition of a floral emblem is: "A plant or flower recognized as symbolic of a nation, State, territory, or the like."

A national floral emblem, therefore, must by symbolic of a nation; be a part of its history, its traditions, its development; it must be woven into the warp and woof of its being.

Can the marigold qualify as a candidate for the exalted honor as the national floral symbol of the United States? Let us see: a small cheery flower, the marigold was found in Central America and Mexico. Its strong-scented foliage doomed it to obscurity for about three centuries after the discovery of the New World, then gardeners, attracted by its golden color, began experimentations. The seed performed well. Blooming at a distance the flowers brightened gardens, but the lingering odor of its foliage was offensive.

Removing that odor apparently became a challenge to one nurseryman—David Burpee. In an article in Time magazine (June 1960) a glimpse is given of his efforts and experiences:

"Sweet peas used to be the root of the Burpee business. When their sales fell off in the 1930's, Burpee decided that the public wanted marigolds. There was one big problem: they all smelled bad. One day he received a letter from a missionary offering for $25 an ounce Tibetan marigold seeds that did not smell. Burpee accepted, found the plants had no smell, but unfortunately had runty blossoms, only one good bloom. Realizing that the bloom was a mutation, he put his employees to work at his Floradale Farms, sniffing at 554,000 growing marigold plants for other mutations. One student found a whole row of odorless plants."

According to this personal interview story, the new marigold is grown in the United States but is of faroff Tibetan origin. Moreover, the sunny flower that was given the name "marigold," so bright and gay in rockeries and borders, has been superseded by a tall stranger in pastel shades ranging from lime to pale yellow—an alien flower, masquerading as a marigold, a development scarcely a decade old.

How can such a candidate symbolize the United States of America? It is a reflection on every courageous settler on the Atlantic coast, on every pioneer who struggled through the Appalachian passes, on every Boone and Lincoln, every Lewis and Clark fighting weather, forests, floods, thickets, insects, hornets, snakes, and Indians to push the borders of the infant Nation from the Atlantic coast to the present day Floradale Farms in California and beyond to the Pacific Ocean, each depending on corn for survival.

It is the history, amazing and vital, of this Nation of ours that a floral emblem must exemplify, and that history is inextricably, irrevocably and eternally bound to our great American plant corn, symbolized by its flower—the corn tassel.

As American as the land itself, the plant corn was feeding the human family in our own vast Southwest long before the Christian era, testifying to its integrity as honestly American.

The corn tassel cannot be adopted or selected or chosen. It is already ours. It needs only to be officially designated. It has waved from coast to coast for centuries. Its fruit is the national treasure of the United States of America.

MARGO CAIRNS,
The "Corn Tassel Lady."

UNICEF Drugs Rotting at Pier; Neglect Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a while back I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material from a Brazilian magazine indicating misuse of our foreign aid foods there.

The following news article from the Manila Times of January 22, 1964, indicates that UNICEF drugs are rotting at the pier in the Philippine Islands—and I believe this article should be reprinted for the information of the Members of the House:

SLOW TO ACT—UNICEF DRUGS ROTTING AT PIER; NEGLECT SEEN

(By Alberto Rous)

The United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) appealed to the Health Department yesterday to expedite removal of some $104,920.55 worth of drugs, and medical supplies and equipment, which have been piling up in the piers since April last year.

Removal of the UNICEF-donated goods has been delayed by the protracted pier strike which ended last November, but they should have been transferred to the Health Department's bodegas last month.

VITAMINS SPOILED

Among the piled-up UNICEF drugs are $22,516 worth of vitamins A and D capsules (71 cases) which arrived July 30, 1963. Easily affected by heat, they are probably spoiled by now, a UNICEF official said.

Other shipments gathering dust and probably rusting in the piers are 105 cases of drugs and medical preparations worth $15,926.13; 183 cartons of coolers, $2,854.60; 13 cases of laboratory equipment, $5,891.60; 5 boxes of auto spare parts, $1,030.42; a case of medical supplies, $1,365; 87 cases of INH tablets for TB treatment, $9,282; 2 cases of physiotherapy equipment, $1,127.

Various supplies and equipment (383 cases), $4,275; 10 cases of drugs, $2,503.40; 121 cases of drugs, $10,491.05; 2 Volkswagen vehicles, $2,862; 6 Volkswagen sedans, $7-148.25; etc.

DABU SETS QUIZ

Health Secretary Floro V. Dabu is expected to question a new UNICEF liaison officer of the Health Department today on the piled-up shipment.

A newly created property inspection unit may visit the pier area today to inspect the UNICEF goods and expedite their release for immediate distribution to the rural areas.

Fanny Adarna, UNICEF assistant, said the entire staff of the local UNICEF office conferred with ranking Health Department officials last Friday on the UNICEF goods in the waterfront.

LIAISON MAN SLOW

However, failure of the UNICEF liaison man to act immediately prompted the UNICEF to appeal once more about the stockpiled goods in the pier bodegas.

It was learned that, on several occasions prior to last Friday, Paul Edwards, local UNICEF chief, had notified ranking officials of the Health Department to remove the goods from the piers and had received prompt promises of compliance from a bureau director.

We Cannot Surrender Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Panama continues as a thorn in our side. The San Diego Union on January 22, 1964, published an article written by Ira

C. Eaker entitled "We Cannot Surrender Canal." Because the general is so succinct in his observations, I enclose the article as an extension of my remarks for today:

IRA C. EAKER SAYS: WE CANNOT SURRENDER CANAL

The many comments on the recent riots in Panama remind me of the ancient Chinese proverb: "There are three sides to every question, my side, your side, and the right side."

The tragic incidents there also revived my own memories of conditions in Panama observed during 30 years of military service.

In November 1926, our Government dispatched the Pan American good will flight of 5 planes on a tour of the 26 countries of Central and South America and the islands of the Caribbean. As a pilot on that flight, I had an opportunity during the ensuing 5 months to visit every capital and principal city, and make many landings in each of the countries south of the border.

I then noted that Panama was particularly fortunate and favored over her neighbors. The standard of living was higher there, illiteracy was lower, health was better, and her people seemed happier, and for understandable reasons. On many visits during the next 25 years I learned that all the reasons for this condition flower directly from the benefits derived from the Panama Canal.

In 1930, I piloted an Assistant Secretary of War on an inspection trip to Panama. The evening of our arrival, the Governor General of the Canal Zone, and the general commanding our troops there, gave a dinner for the Secretary. Present were several Panamanians, leaders in government and business. As an aide, at the foot of the table, I was privileged to hear this interesting exchange which bears directly on conditions prevailing in Panama today.

Our Secretary explained that one of the reasons for his visit was to investigate pressures being brought on our Government to raise the level of wages of Panamanians working in the Canal Zone to that paid U.S. citizens working for the canal and the railroad. The Panamanian leaders pointed out that it was already difficult to keep labor on the plantations, ranches, and in the shops, because of the higher wages and better hours and conditions prevailing in the zone. "Our problems," they said, "flow not from the fact that your wages are too low but because they are too high."

I have noted a tendency on the part of some of our citizens for national flagellation or hari-kari, flowing apparently from fancied wrongs to the Panamanians. The trouble in Panama is largely due to the fact that Panamanian leaders have not always spent the money we paid them for the benefit of all the people.

We have not wronged the Panamanians. We provided sanitation, schools, roads, communications, hospitals, a thriving economy, and examples of justice and decency.

The Army deserves great credit for building the Panama Canal and for the administration of the Canal Zone for nearly 60 years, with efficiency and economy and without graft or scandal.

The canal was a great saving to shipping and therefore a great stimulus to world trade. It has been a vital link in the security of the Western Hemisphere and the whole free world, as dramatically demonstrated in three wars.

The Panama Canal Zone, like West Berlin, stands out like a lighthouse in a fog, as an example of what honest government and sound economy can do for a free people. That may be the prime reason why it is the new target of the Communists.

Recently some have suggested that since the locks of the Panama Canal are vulnerable to bombs and sabotage, and some of our carriers and tankers cannot pass through it, perhaps we should give it to the Panamanians as a generous gesture and build a sea-level canal in Nicaragua or Yucatan. This solution may have little appeal for our people and their Congress. Both will realize that the Red agitators, flushed with success in Panama, would merely move north to the new canal and begin the exercise all over again.

Our patient leaders seem to feel there is merit, for diplomatic reasons, in permitting the Organization of American States to investigate the situation in Panama. I do not believe our leaders have or will agree beforehand to abide by all solutions which may be proposed. To do so might be like my saying to Mr. Rockefeller, "I claim your wealth, and I insist that my brother arbitrate our differences."

In an earlier column I predicted the Reds would sooner or later test President Johnson as they tested his predecessor in Cuba. Panama may be that test. If so, President Johnson is again demonstrating, as did the late President Kennedy in Cuba, that firmness is the key to successful dealing with communism.

The first act in the Panama tragedy is concluded. The curtain may not rise on the second act until Castro implements the instructions he got in Moscow.

This appears valid now, however: If we surrender the Panama Canal we had better double our defense budget, for our next test, the new Korea, will not be far away.

Proper Legislation Called the Key to Success of 1964 Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, shortly my colleagues and I will have an opportunity to consider a new housing bill for this country which will have far-reaching effect on our construction industry, on employment in the construction trades, and on the producers of building materials. In fact, no piece of legislation will bring more benefits to our people and our economy than the housing bill we will be called upon to enact very shortly, I hope, in this session of the 88th Congress.

Recently, I had called to my attention an article which appeared in the Daily Pacific Builder, an influential newspaper dealing almost exclusively with news of the construction industry on the west coast and a publication read with considerable interest by builders in my 15th Congressional District of California. The article, a sober and reflective one, was written by the Honorable Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration. Mrs. McGuire heads this important branch of our national housing effort, under the general supervision of Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In her article, which I will incorporate shortly in my remarks, Mrs. McGuire describes the job already done by the Public Housing Administration in its nearly 27 years of existence, but even more importantly, she also describes the vast job which remains to be done in providing decent homes for the many millions of Americans, who because of any one or a number of reasons—physical handicaps, old age, little education, chronic illness, or inability to obtain suitable and remunerative employment—are unable to afford anything but a slum or a shack on the outskirts of America's affluence.

The housing bill Congress will begin drafting within a matter of weeks will include, I hope, new and more vigorous efforts in this area. Right now, the Public Housing Administration is nearing the end of the funds Congress authorized, in 1961, to bring low-rent housing to the Nation's low-income families.

In my own district, for example, I have inspected personally many of the more than 1,400 dwelling units of federally aided low-rent housing. These make up part of the more than 29,000 such low-rent dwellings in California that are owned, managed, and maintained by communities and localities without Federal interference. The need in my State is very great. Indeed, there are some 605,000 Californians today over 65 whose incomes are less than $1,000 a year. If all of them were to apply now for low-rent housing, their number would exceed the total of public housing in the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I would like to incorporate the excellent article by Commisisoner McGuire, which appeared in the January 13, 1964, edition of the Daily Pacific Builder:

PROPER LEGISLATION CALLED THE KEY TO SUCCESS OF 1964 HOUSING PROGRAM

(By Marie C. McGuire)

Hundreds of communities anticipating Federal help in the construction of apartments to house their low-income families will have to cancel their plans unless new legislative action is taken in 1964.

By midyear 1964, the authorization under which the Public Housing Administration is operating will be exhausted. The authorization calls for construction of 100,000 dwelling units for low-income familes. Construction has been started or planned on nearly 90,000 of these units, with the remaining little more than 10,000 actively reserved.

More than half the agency's authorization is for units especially designed for elderly low-income families.

Meanwhile, applications received by PHA exceed the authorization as of October 31 by 33 percent and by year's end the excess will be 40 percent. This indicates the tremendous interest communities have in this program.

With PHA authorization running out, enormous needs are yet to be filled. A decision must be reached on whether it is more costly to communities to have millions of their citizens in substandard housing, throttling economic and civic development, or to tear down slums and invest in decent dwellings for those of low income who must be displaced to make way for current and future progress.

Over the years, more than 7 million families, unable to afford privately owned standard housing, have occupied the federally subsidized housing for varying periods of time. As their incomes improved, they became customers of privately owned housing. Statistics indicate that about 15 percent of the tenants move out every year, many becoming homeowners, others renters in the private sector. At present the program has

assisted nearly 2,000 communities to build, own, and operate some 550,000 units which are housing more than 2 million people, half of them children, comprising about 550,000 families.

The 10 months ending October 31, 1963, saw 20,930 new dwelling units completed, construction started on another 19,652 units, and 34,899 units placed under annual contributions contracts. Of the total units completed, 5,404 were designed for elderly occupancy and another 7,395 units for them were started.

In various areas, activities increased both quantitatively and qualitatively with stepped-up efforts for closer collaboration with other Federal agencies in coordinating related local public and private services for maximum benefit to whole communities, for better planning and improved design.

Site planning and architectural design received increased attention during 1963. Special architectural panels were organized in each of PHA's seven regions to advise and counsel both PHA regional staffs and local housing authority staffs. Their aim? To increase beauty without cost and to seek advantages of new materials and techniques hopefully better to adapt public housing architecture to community needs and neighborhood physical environments.

By year's end, a series of regional architectural seminars also was in full swing in which PHA consultants and local architects might exchange views and techniques leading to more acceptable low-rent design.

Gov. George Romney Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1964, in Salt Lake City, Utah, 1,300 Utahans paid $50 a plate to attend a dinner honoring a great Republican, Gov. George Romney, of Michigan.

Governor Romney is descended from distinguished Utah families and spent many years as a resident of our State.

Because of his prominence in the affairs of our Nation, I think his comments on that occasion will be of interest to my colleagues, and under unanimous consent I wish to insert them at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN

It's good to be home again. People think of home in different ways. One anonymous wit defined it as the place where half the family waits for the other half to come back with the car. I'm fond of the definition provided by Oliver Wendell Holmes—"Where we love is home, home that our feet may leave, but not our hearts."

I've come up with a definition especially designed for Republican Governors visiting the scenes of their childhood: Home is where not even the Democrats can vote against you.

Anyway, there's a theory that home is the place where a man can say anything he pleases because no one pays the slightest attention to him.

It seems to me that America is headed toward a point of no return, a point at which it must decide whether to continue along its present path or return to the inspired path which was charted by its founders.

Our country stands today at a zenith of power. Our military might is unsurpassed. We have unmatched economic strength, and the promise of future growth. In the field of space activities, we have applied prodigious efforts to catch up with the Russians and surpass them. While our schools need enormous doses of money and public attention, they have improved phenomenally since the Russians' first sputnik shocked the country into caring about the state of public education. Our scientists continue to win Nobel Prizes for their accomplishments, and our universities are performing near miracles in research and its application to industry.

Yet, in the face of this gigantic strength, much of the world regards our country suspiciously as vacillating, worthy only of distrust and scorn. Paradoxically, we are considered as materialists while our Communist adversaries are considered idealists.

Now, why is this so? I believe there are two basic reasons:

First, too many are not familiar with our basic ideals and principles.

Second, the success from their partial realization has made us so rich and powerful we have ceased to acquaint others with the ideals and principles that underlie our material accomplishments.

Even though the founders were confident they were establishing a new order for the ages, there are now those who talk about the need for a new morality and who point to other countries as examples for us to follow. Since World War I, too many Americans have lost belief in the universal, eternal character of our ideals and principles.

Lincoln recognized the Declaration of Independence as a unique expression of basic ideals intended for others as well as ourselves. He said as much in a speech at Independence Hall in 1861, and I want to read you what he said:

"I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the Declaration of Independence. I have often inquired of myself what great principle it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the Colonies from the motherland, but something in that declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I would rather be assassinated on the spot than surrender it."

What made the Declaration of Independence unique, what made it a document for the ages and not merely for the times in which it was written, is the fact that it recognized that man's responsibility lies ultimately with God, and not with any government.

The Declaration and Constitution said that government's role was to guarantee this mans' right.

What has been the prime source of our national strength? Not our unique social system, nor our unique economic system—neither of those things.

The inviolate freedom of the individual to pursue his destiny, so long as that pursuit is consistent with the common good—that is the basis of our society and source of our strength. While we recognize the interdependence of men, their mutual obligations to each other, we believe that man's obligation to his God is of paramount importance.

With this freedom, men have not only achieved more individually but also in cooperation with each other.

The source of our national strength was made possible by a divinely inspired political system. A system relying primarily on the division of government power to protect and preserve individual freedom and responsibility. This division of power and individual freedom is increasingly jeopardized by growing Federal and private power.

Today, the source of our strength is threatened from within and without.

The Communists see man as a mosaic which the state will arrange according to the grand designs of Marx and Lenin. The state establishes morals, the state sets the standards, man as an individual is abolished in favor of mass man. And what is the end of this society? Not the development and happiness of individual man but the successful fashioning of a human mass which will serve as a perfect instrument for the ends of the state.

What our founders sought, and what we should be seeking more diligently today, is a society where man is free to pursue happiness as he perceives happiness. And his concept of the road to happiness is a matter between him and his God.

There is growing talk about need for a new morality. This is dangerous talk. This Nation was founded on the morality of the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount.

Their moral principles are God given and eternal. They have not been repealed. They are not subject to changes of circumstances. What we need is a greater willingness and ability to live them, not new governmental or manmade substitutes. To adopt a new morality would deny the unique character of our revolution, a revolution which firmly rejected the moralities of kings and governments and of mortal men. To the extent that we do this, we remake ourselves in the image of the Communists, and of all of history's tyrannies.

This trend must be reversed. I believe the Republican Party has the opportunity to play the crucial role in rebuilding faith in the authentic American Revolution both at home and abroad.

To do this, I believe the Republican Party must work without respite, must dedicate itself with unalloyed devotion, to the task of securing equal rights for all Americans.

There can be no equivocation on this point. If the Republican Party tries to buy the White House with the rights of others, it will become the greatest white elephant in the history of party politics. If the Republican Party mounts a white horse and carries a white standard into the 1964 campaign, it may win an election but it will lose forever its claim to Lincoln.

Let me make my position completely and crystal clear. I support the bipartisan civil rights legislation that has been reported favorably by the House Judiciady Committee and that is now in the House Rules Committee. But beyond that, the American Revolution so bravely begun in 1766 cannot be completed until every American—whatever his race, his color, his creed, or his national origin—can enjoy unimpeded his full rights as an American and as a child of God.

Some of these rights are:

The right to vote and to have the ballot honestly counted.

The right to enter the occupation of one's choice, and to compete fairly for employment and for advancement to the limit of personal ability.

The right to acquire and enjoy decent housing in the neighborhood of one's choice.

The right to equal access to all public facilities.

The right to enjoy equal treatment and services from all business establishments open to the public.

The right to send one's children to public schools and colleges to which admission is granted without reference to race, color, creed, or national origin.

The right to associate in peaceful protest against evils—real or imaginary.

The right to worship in the manner of one's choosing, side by side with those sharing one's faith.

The right to effective governmental protection against those who would seek to interfere with the free exercise of legal rights.

The right to be judged on personal character and virtues by one's fellow man.

Let me emphasize again, the Republican Party must not exploit racial or religious prejudices in order to gain a victory at the polls. To do so, would be to disavow the heritage of Abraham Lincoln, to destroy part of the heritage of America, and to renounce the spiritual heritage of the Judeo-Christian world.

Now I believe that Michigan has set an example for other States in guaranteeing equal rights to all of its citizens.

A major part of the civil rights bill now in the House Rules Committee is a provision which assures every American that he will not be denied the use of public accommodations because of his race or religion.

We in Michigan believe it is tragic that this has to be a highly contested issue in Congress nearly two centuries after the Constitution was adopted—a Constitution which guaranteed such rights.

I am proud to tell you that Michigan has had an equal accommodations law on the books since 1885, and we have enforced it.

In other words, Michigan recognized its constitutional obligations in this field some 79 years before Congress is even seriously considering recognizing its own. Let that fact stand in opposition to those who argue that the States are incapable of meeting their responsibilities.

But we in Michigan have done much more to carry out the high intentions of those who wrote that Michigan law long before the turn of the century. We have written a new constitution which contains the strongest, clearest and most complete statement on civil rights in the Nation.

This new constitution went into effect on January 1. As a result, Michigan has a new civil rights commission with enormous powers to do all government can do to end discrimination in housing, in employment, in education and in all areas of life in which it still survives within the boundaries of our State.

Our proud accomplishments in the field of civil rights are not those of government alone.

Much of the credit for our enviable record in civil rights should be accorded the thousands of individual Michigan citizens who have accepted their responsibility to live and work peacefully together with those of different races and religions.

Michigan has very large minority groups, but it has not had a serious racial disturbance since World War II.

And this brings me to a point at which I think the Republican Party should and does stand in distinct contrast to its opposition.

We are a party of individuals who believe in the God-given power and the God-given duties of the individual. We must not forfeit our powers and our responsibilities to any special interest group.

We are a party of individuals. We believe that the government of a democracy must be built from the bottom up, not from the top down. We believe that government begins in the schools, spreads out to the town and city council, to the State capitols and then—and only then—to Washington. We conceive of government as a pyramid whose base stretches from Maine to California. Too many Democrats visualize it as an inverted pyramid whose base rests on the banks of the Potomac.

In the sense that we believe in individual responsibility, we Republicans are more responsive than the Democrats are to the admonition of the late President Kennedy: "Ask not what your country will do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

We Republicans are now, and have historically been, prepared to accept the literal meaning of those words. We have demonstrated this readiness by our historic refusal to regard the Federal Government as a gigantic vending machine from which all of life's bounties flow in inexhaustible supply.

That brings me to a second matter of great concern to the Republican Party. As the party which recognizes, respects and seeks to advance the rights of individuals, we must also be sure that we profess a sound respect for and recognition of the responsibilities of individuals.

Just as some have misused the banner of States rights, we are also confronted in America today with some who would confuse individualism with irresponsibility—and liberty with license. Without concern for the facts, they sow the seeds of hate, of suspicion, of violence. They make wild charges of disloyalty about those who disagree with them.

To broadcast their charges, such fanatics often form groups, frequently with patriotic names, and almost always with an appealing objective, such as "fighting communism." This cloak of patriotism enables them to attract some reasonable people as members, providing an aura of respectability. The reasonable membership may greatly outnumber the core group of irresponsible extremists, but it is the latter who are heard.

These forces, by whatever names they call themselves, stand in favor of resurgent nationalism, or isolationism, of racism, and of social and economic retrogression. Waving the banners of Americanism, they deny the principles of America. Shouting the praises of individualism, they pledge allegiance to rigid creeds and dictatorial leaders. Theirs is a heritage of brown shirts and of black shirts, of massed flags and massed drums. They offer no constructive solutions to the problems of our Nation. They destroy faith in our proven institutions, pit class against class, inflame suspicions, and multiply fear.

In America, fortunately, the numerical strength of such groups is anemic. In order to gain any appreciable visibility, they must attach themselves—or attempt to attach themselves, like any other parasite—to one or another of our major political parties. Such attempts invariably blossom in the course of a political campaign. It is then that such a secret cult may believe a political party, or some local segment of a political party, to be most vulnerable.

Such efforts at infiltration, either individually or in force, should be, in my firm opinion, rebuffed promptly and without equivocation or temporizing by the Republican Party.

The Republican Party must also take the lead in removing the basic conflict between principles of competition embodied in our antitrust laws and the principles of monopoly involved in our collective bargaining laws.

The Republican Party must take the lead in a national movement to restore the vitality of State and local governments, in order to reduce the growing concentration of power in Washington.

Finally, the Republican Party must work to restore not only the integrity of the American dollar, but the integrity of the American word, both at home and abroad.

Above all, I believe that Republicans—that all Americans—must work to prevent the gradual erosion of America's religious and moral foundation. If we are to prove to the world that ours is the good society, we must work to make it good.

We must dare to be good in an age when goodness has become square, when cynicism and sophistication are the orders of the day.

Let the Communists laugh at our naivete. We will give to the world something vastly more valuable than money and goods. We will give it the unique ideals of our American Revolution and a world in which the individual is free to pursue virtue and happiness as he conceives them, and not as the state conceives them.

Public Affairs and the Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly impressed with a speech entitled "Public Affairs and the Businessman," recently delivered by Richard G. Capen, Jr., to a sizable group of San Diego, Calif., businessmen.

So that my colleagues may have the opportunity of sharing this timely and well thought out message, I include it as a portion of my remarks:

PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND THE BUSINESSMAN—A TALK BY RICHARD G. CAPEN, JR., DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, THE COPLEY NEWSPAPERS, LA JOLLA, CALIF.

This is a time for reflection.

It is a time for rededication—as Americans—to the principles which have made our country great.

Our Republic has withstood a national crisis with a smooth, immediate transformation of leadership to our new President—without revolution, bloodshed, delay or uncertainty. And the United States has closed ranks behind its new leader with a renewed sense of unity in facing the challenges ahead.

Nevertheless, many problems continue to confront us. There is Cuba. There is Berlin and Vietnam. The Middle East is uneasy. Governments are changing in Europe. Castro has made inroads in Latin America and still reportedly hosts Soviet troops 90 miles from our shores. Several Latin American governments are dangerously close to falling into Communist control.

We have signed a test ban treaty in good faith with memories of Russian missiles in Cuba and Khrushchev's shoe pounding still all too fresh in our minds.

While we negotiate wheat sales to the Soviets, they continue, at will, blocking our access rights to Berlin.

We have given more than $84 billion in foreign aid since the end of World War II. Much of this has been granted to nations who claim neutrality. They are pleased to take our money but refuse to call themselves our friends in time of crisis.

On the domestic front, we find ourselves with a Federal budget which will surpass $100 billion in 1964—a figure almost beyond human comprehension. In fact, if our legislators gave 1 hour's consideration to each $1 million in this budget, they would consume all their working time until about A.D. 2000.

Perhaps some of you recall the settlement received by the steelworkers in early 1963, which included 13-week vacations every 5 years for senior workers. It is no wonder that we see so many "made in Japan" and "made in Western Germany" labels, to name a few importing countries. We are pricing ourselves right out of the market with rising labor costs in excess of productivity. And now the steelworkers are asking for

Government protection from foreign and steel imports.

Too many people, who depend on the fruits of our great free enterprise system, know virtually nothing of its principles. Some groups seem to think that profit is what is left over after a business transaction has been completed. They never seem to understand that profit is what makes the whole transaction possible, encouraging investment, creating jobs, a tax base, and, thus, our Government itself.

Yes; our problems can become overwhelming. Perhaps you shrug it all off with the thought that the trends are inevitable and that, after all, what can one person do, anyway.

But my purpose in reviewing some of these challenging problems is not to completely discourage you but, rather, to increase our desire to seek practical solutions. In many of these critical areas, the business and professional communities have the most at stake and yet are the last to sound off forcefully in their own defense.

It is civic responsibility that I want to discuss with you today—specifically those obligations of the business and professional community in the very preservation of our American way of life under a free enterprise system.

A study made by the University of Michigan in 1960 revealed some appalling statistics. Of the total adult population of this country, only 12 percent gave financial assistance to any candidate or political organization and only 8 percent attended any political meetings. Only 6 percent worked for a party or candidate during campaigns and about 3 percent belonged to a political organization.

How will it be possible for our country to withstand socialism and communism if able and competent members of the business community choose to stand by idly, denying our political system the benefit of their support and leadership?

The average businessman complains that Government is a headache—a nuisance infringing on his prerogative in running his affairs. He often looks upon politics with disdain, exclaiming, "Don't get mixed up in politics; it's controversial and may be just a little bit shady."

The real problem today is not so much with those who are in politics as it is with those who are not.

Unless we make politics an essential part of our business, we are going to find it increasingly difficult to do business at all. For this reason, business has come to recognize Government relations as a proper and essential management function.

In the last decade, more and more businessmen have turned from idle verbal criticism to constructive civic activity. Ten years ago, no major company in the United States had what we now call a civic or public affairs program. Today more than 300 companies maintain such activities.

Communications programs and get-out-the-vote campaigns within corporations have resulted in a better informed, more responsible electorate. Bipartisan, in-plant, political fundraising drives have succeeded in broadening the base of political financing.

But the surface has only been scratched. Any public affairs program must be continuous and ever expanding. It must go beyond a purely corporate effort to that of a personal, day-to-day responsibility of every citizen—your civic responsibility.

The challenge is great, but there are some encouraging signs. Let me cite a few.

Until recently, virtually nothing had been done by business and professional people to counter the thoroughly effective efforts of the Committee on Political Education—the political arm of the AFL-CIO. COPE, as it is commonly known, reported spending nearly $1 million in 1962 alone toward the election of labor-oriented candidates.

Early this year, two organizations were formed filling this critical void. The American Medical Political Action Committee (AMPAC) and the Business Industry Political Action Committee (BIPAC) now serve as similar political vehicles for the business and medical professions, raising campaign funds, supporting candidates and backing issues of their choice.

Certainly no group has more at stake with the passage of any medical care program financed under the social security system than the doctors, dentists and insurance salesmen. And yet, until recently, they sat back and did almost nothing to protect their interests.

Another encouraging action was the rejection last May of the strict wheat production control plan by the wheat farmers in a national referendum. For the first time, they voted for less money in exchange for more freedom.

In 1960 both major parties spent more than $175 million for all purposes at all levels of political activity. This was an increase of 30 percent over 1952. The two major parties, on the national level alone, spent more than $20 million—more than double the amount spent in 1952.

Increased efforts are being made to relate the impact of our Federal budget to each citizen's pocketbook—in language that can be readily understood. It is impossible for the average taxpayer to comprehend the millions and billions involved in Federal spending and, thus, it is looked upon as some vague myth that really doesn't affect any one individual.

For this reason, Congressman PELLY, of Washington, reduced the staggering figures to more direct terms. According to his calculations, the 1964 budget averages $2,133 per family or $178 a month. Each family owes $6,480 toward the national debt of more than $300 billion.

Imagine the reaction if we were to receive bills for these amounts with periodic special assessments for each newly added Federal program. Perhaps then we would realize the costs of Washington's so-called "unlimited" funds. We should commend efforts, like those of Mr. PELLY, in relating the costs of Government to our daily lives.

These few examples, while favorable to business and rights of the individual, are of limited consequence. Much remains to be done.

What can you do? I think a great deal.

First and foremost, register and vote.

Contribute to the candidates and party of your choice. They desperately need your dollars and your time.

Support worthy charities. If local organizations and individuals do not assume such leadership, we will soon find the Boy Scouts and little leagues controlled by a Federal youth conservation corps or the like.

We will find Federal medicare replacing individual contributions to local medical organizations. And donations to your old alma mater will be replaced by Federal aid to education.

Set the record straight when a politician votes for more Federal services to your community beyond what is required or can be afforded. Let him know that you are not willing to accept more programs at the risk of mounting debt and inflation. How much Federal aid did the Pilgrims get? They were in a depressed area.

Relate past campaign promises to actual performance by your legislators. The extensive use of television in campaigning today has clouded the issues.

Too much emphasis is placed upon the candidate's dress, mannerisms, and demeanor rather than upon his position on important issues.

When deciding on Federal, State, and local programs, let's select from among them, in order of priority, and not just vote for them all.

We must care for ourselves and give our great free enterprise system a chance. Know what makes it work. Defend it and live by its principles.

Your business or professional organization must be prepared to work with government when it is right and to resist it when it is wrong. You may be called upon to testify before a legislative committee. Accept this privilege, for it is an essential part of our legislative process.

Within your business or profession, set up a system for learning what legislation is pending and for analyzing the effects of such on your organization.

Encourage your employees to serve on governmental committees and even to run for public office.

But, most important among suggestions of what you can do civically, keep informed on all major local, national and international issues so that you may intelligently articulate your views to friends, family, and legislators. Take the time each day to read your newspaper so that you may better understand the import of these issues.

Your thoughts must be simple and direct to be convincing and remembered. Use some of the sales techniques in your civic life that you use in business.

While these suggestions are not meant to be all inclusive, hopefully they can provide a starting point for your increased personal participation in civic and public affairs, as business and professional men.

Continued begrudgement of growing Government and "anti" attitudes, without positive personal action, are not in the American way and will not serve any useful purpose.

Each additional registered vote, each newly added well-informed civic voice, each voluntary charitable contribution will bring us closer to protecting the rights of the individual and providing an improved business climate within which to operate.

No public task is so large—or so small—that it can afford to have us sitting on the sidelines.

So the civic responsibility is ours.

Thank you.

Popularity of the President in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently 12 Texans were made the subject of a popularity contest among: First, likely Democratic primary voters in the State of Texas; and second, all Texas voters—an entire statewide cross section. This survey, made by a reputable and professional sampling agency significantly illustrates the great ground swell of popularity enjoyed by President Johnson and by Governor Connally among Texans. The following tables are arranged to show the percentage of voters who reported they knew something about each man—labeled "Total Aware"; percentages who gave him the highest possible rating (+3); the lowest rating (−3); total favorable ratings to some degree (+1, +2, or +3); total unfavorable ratings to some degree (−1, −2, or −3); and no rating—because of indecision or a feeling of not knowing enough to make a judgment:

TABLE 1.—*Likely Democratic primary voters*

	Highest rating +3	Lowest rating −3	Total favorable +1+2+3	Total unfavorable −1−2−3	No rating	Total aware
Lyndon B. Johnson	66	2	92	5	3	100
John Connally	53	1	91	5	3	99
Ralph Yarborough	21	13	63	25	7	95
John Tower	8	11	34	31	17	82
Barry Goldwater	9	16	40	37	15	92
Richard Nixon	10	23	46	48	5	99
Jim Wright	9	----------	33	8	22	63
Joe Kilgore	6	2	18	6	22	46
George H. W. Bush	----------	1	4	4	18	26
Jack Cox	4	10	24	31	21	76
Don Yarborough	7	8	38	22	18	78
Allan Shivers	18	12	53	30	12	95

TABLE 2.—*All voters—Entire statewide cross section (including Republicans and others who do not expect to vote in the Democratic primary)*

	Highest rating +3	Lowest rating −3	Total Favorable +1+2+3	Total Unfavorable −1−2−3	No rating	Total aware
Lyndon B. Johnson	54	3	89	8	3	100
John Connally	45	2	89	6	4	99
Ralph Yarborough	16	16	56	31	8	95
John Tower	13	8	42	24	17	83
Barry Goldwater	14	12	49	30	14	93
Richard Nixon	15	19	53	41	5	99
Jim Wright	8	1	30	10	22	62
Joe Kilgore	6	2	19	7	22	48
George H. W. Bush	----------	1	7	4	17	28
Jack Cox	6	8	32	24	20	76
Don Yarborough	5	9	32	23	20	75
Allan Shivers	20	10	55	25	13	93

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES

Voters were also asked to choose between prospective candidates for President—Lyndon Johnson as Democratic nominee against BARRY GOLDWATER as Republican nominee, and then between Johnson and Richard Nixon.

Divisions of preferences by the full cross section of voters, statewide, were as follows:

	Percent
Johnson	70
Goldwater	16
Undecided	14
Total	100
Johnson	71
Nixon	17
Undecided	12
Total	100

About two of every three—63 percent—selected Johnson against both Goldwater and Nixon. About one of every nine—11 percent—preferred the Republican nominee both times. Mixed choices were registered by 18 percent, and no preferences were expressed by 8 percent.

In a similar statewide survey 5 months ago, GOLDWATER was found to be preferred over Kennedy, 45 to 41, with 14 percent undecided. The latest measurement reflects the wholesale shift from GOLDWATER to Texas' favorite son, Lyndon Johnson. Analysis indicates the shift was greatest among self-styled independent voters, who in recent years have tended to prefer the Republican nominee for President over the Democratic nominee. This shift may foreshadow a revitalization of the Democratic Party in Texas, with fewer independents inclined to move toward participation in Republican primaries.

A Washington Post Editorial on William C. Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that the 18-nation Disarmament Conference convened again last week. All of us are equally aware of the new U.S. initiatives proposed by the President in his message to the Conference on January 21. And, I think we all share the hopes of the President that the Geneva Conference, and our new initiatives there, may lead us farther along the path to a safeguarded peace.

Every Member of this body, however, may not be well acquainted with the man who heads the American delegation to the Conference and who also spearheads the U.S. effort to develop sound arms control policies. That man is William C. Foster, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

On January 26, the Washington Post carried on its editorial page a written profile on William C. Foster. In order that all Members of this body may know a little more about this effective and devoted public servant, the excellent editorial follows:

FOSTER'S PATIENCE FITS ARMS TALKS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

GENEVA.—The soft-spoken, unassuming man who heads the American delegation to the Disarmament Conference here has what colleagues describe as a consuming interest in a war against war. But William C. Foster is no unrealistic visionary approaching an unattainable ideal. Few Americans have so detailed a background in the requirements of defense and national security combined with the patience required to make even small mutual gains with the Soviet Union.

Foster, who at a handsome 66 looks fully 10 years younger, has an unusual career behind him. During World War I he was an Army pilot. Between the wars he was in the pressed steel business. As an internationally minded Republican he came to Washington during World War II to assist the War Department in procurement.

As Under Secretary of Commerce in the Truman administration Foster recruited such eminent men as David K. E. Bruce back into the public service. He was deputy to Paul Hoffman in the Marshall plan and then himself became director of the Economic Cooperation Administration. During the Korean war he was back in the Pentagon as Deputy Secretary of Defense under another Republican, Robert A. Lovett.

At first the Eisenhower administration disregarded him, and Foster went back to private industry. But after the first Soviet sputnik he was asked to serve on a panel evaluating American defenses. He became the guiding spirit of the Gaither report because of the illness and death of the nominal chairman. Later he was chairman of the American delegation at the Conference on Safeguards Against Surprise Attack. Neither service brought him much thanks.

In 1961, President Kennedy asked Foster to become Director of the reconstituted Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He attended the protracted beginning of the present Disarmament Conference in March 1962. Thus in addition to his technical knowledge he has acquired considerable experience in diplomatic confrontation with the Russians.

Despite his service to Democratic administrations and his personal admiration for the way in which President Johnson has taken over executive leadership, Foster remains by preference a Republican. It is paradoxical that the strongest attacks on him and on the work of the Disarmament Agency come from the far right.

Some of this may represent the lingering effect of a coincidence of names. William Z. Foster was at one time chairman of the Communist Party of the United States. Even the French Communist newspaper L'Humanite fell into the trap when it exulted about a prominent Communist being named to the Marshall plan. Foster concedes that although he wished no evil for William Z., the latter's death brought him a certain relief.

But there is a pattern in the attacks, many of which unhappily come from Texas. Persons of extreme rightwing views tend to regard any negotiations with the Soviet Union as tantamount to treason and to indicate that in even discussing arms control Foster is likely to give away the crown jewels. Nevertheless, polls conducted during the Kennedy administration showed that the nuclear test ban treaty enjoys overwhelming popular approval.

Foster takes it philosophically, concluding merely that he is here to do a job to the best of his ability. He is mildly encouraged by the initial absence of polemics in the presentation by his Soviet counterpart, Semyon K. Tsarapkin, whom he finds at times personally agreeable. He thinks it interesting that the Soviet Union has restored the question of NATO-Warsaw Pact observer posts to the discussion even though this is coupled with a demand for a denuclearized zone in West and East Germany.

He also sees eventual possibility of agreement to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and to end production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. Successful inspection of facilities already shut down might

make it easier for the Soviet Union to accept inspection of a freeze on nuclear missiles.

But as a superbly rational man Foster has no illusions about arms control which is the necessary prerequisite for any measure of substantive disarmament. He knows that it is likely to be a long and tedious business—even though when the Soviet Union is ready to move, as on the test ban, agreement can come quickly and he must be prepared for every opportunity.

Elephants Are Eaten One Bite at a Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the Florida Times Union of Jacksonville, Fla., on Saturday, January 18, 1964, in which it was pointed out that while the activities in Panama and Zanzibar may be considered small in the overall international picture, these actions are dangerous to the cause of freemen everywhere. I am herewith reprinting this fine editorial which pointed out the remarks of my able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Congressman BOB SIKES, who has been warning this country of the very same thing this editorial so ably expresses:

ELEPHANTS ARE EATEN ONE BITE AT A TIME

The events surrounding the arrest of the U.S. consul in Zanzibar and his third secretary by a Cuban-trained rebel, who toppled the lawful Arab government, present an opportunity to consider the merits of gunboat diplomacy versus foreign relations as now conducted by the State Department.

Many Americans are asking why the United States did not take immediate action designed to safeguard our nationals in Zanzibar by ordering an offshore destroyer into the harbor, and, perhaps, dispatching marines to the island nation.

Times were when the arrest of a U.S. consul or an insult to Americans would have brought just such a swift action, but it appears those days are now gone forever; replaced by a policy of "kowtowing" to anyone who insults us, even a two-bit dictator.

In connection with the situation in Panama, many Americans, including Congressman BOB SIKES, of Florida, are demanding the adoption of a hard line concerning the Panama Canal and negotiations surrounding it. Chances are that many rights and privileges earned by this Nation by virtue of blood, sweat, and tears will be bargained away for a supposed world opinion advantage.

The trend toward gradual appeasement of all who dare throw rocks at this Nation began long ago. It developed significantly with the adoption of "status of forces" treaties which allow our servicemen to be tried by foreign nations according to laws not countenanced by our Constitution. This means Americans can be denied their rights and the protection of their flag with often serious consequences for minor law violations.

As Congressman SIKES pointed out this week, this Nation failed to kick Castro out of Cuba, it did not stand with its friends in the Suez crisis, and now it is reaping the results.

Much is said about so-called gunboat diplomacy. Many feel that it is unbecoming a large nation or damaging to our international image and should not be used. Persons following this line of reasoning often encourage "negotiations" or "disengagement" or some other fancy name for "surrender" and "retreat."

Persons advocating such a course of action cry for peace and gentleness, little realizing the lesson which can be learned from the action of water on rocks and earth which eventually erodes away great boulders and digs deep canyons where once stood fertile ground.

The national dignity and strength of this Nation can be eroded away by a policy of retreat which takes the initiative from us. Panama and Zanzibar are small but the actions are erosive. An ant may eat an elephant one bite at a time and world events could destroy this Nation the same way—a bite at a time.

Air Commandos Have Busy Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the December 21 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register carries a very fine article on the work of the Special Air Warfare Center at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., in my district. I am glad to request that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AIR COMMANDOS HAVE BUSY YEAR

Tactical Air Command's Special Air Warfare Center and 1st Air Commando Wing members at Hurlburt Field, Fla., during 1963 have been awarded 23 DFC's; 2 Airman's Medals, 6 Bronze Stars; 1 Joint Service Commendation Medal; 7 Air Force Commendation Medals; 16 Purple Hearts; and 175 Air Medals.

Of these, 11 DFC's, 10 Purple Hearts, and 1 Air Medal were awarded posthumously.

The decorations were earned primarily by commandos serving as instructors and advisers to the Vietnam Air Force. In carrying out that mission in southeast Asia, nine air commandos lost their lives in 1963. Although not in combat, these men were lost as a result of Vietcong gunfire.

In addition to Vietnam, air commandos carried their training and advising role to Mali in Africa; Greece in Europe and Panama, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Venezuela, Peru, and El Salvador in Central and South America.

Commandos play a prominent role in civic actions carried among our neighboring nations to the south. In this area, along with other agencies of the United States and the cooperating government, air commandos have been instrumental in bringing some of the better things in life to villages in remote areas.

Doctors and medical technicians have been flown to many remote villages by the commandos to treat the ill and injured. In one village the arrival of the air commando aircraft marked the first time a doctor had been to the village in 4 years. Commandos have transported teachers, doctors, dentists, home economists, engineers, and agronomists to these remote villages to help the villagers to help themselves. Disease and sickness have been reduced; basic sanitation facilities have been constructed; wells have been dug. As the standard of living in the villages is raised in the name of the central government, the poverty and dissatisfaction upon which communism feeds is reduced.

"I consider the civic action role of the air commandos to be one of our most important undertakings," says Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Pritchard, commander of the Special Air Warfare Center. "We have made a beginning during 1963 and plan to continue. If we can train allied air forces to use tactical airpower as a nation building or civic action vehicle, we may never have to train them to drop bombs or fire rockets or machineguns. I firmly believe that, through civic actions and given enough time, Communist subversion can be stopped before it gets to the shooting stage."

Federal Expenditures Expected To Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a special article in the Wall Street Journal of January 23, 1964, Howard Merry points out that the first Johnson budget contains abundant evidence that any lowering of expenditure levels may be short lived.

The budget contains many new programs which call for relatively small outlays in the coming fiscal year, but are certain to require much larger expenditures in later years. Furthermore, the lower Federal spending plan estimated for fiscal 1965 depends heavily upon tactics which cannot be continued much longer.

Because the article is of value to those interested in the analysis of the President's budget, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DESPITE BUDGET CUT, MANY SIGNS POINT TO FUTURE RISE

(By Howard Merry)

WASHINGTON.—When President Johnson sent to Congress earlier this week his budget for the fiscal year beginning next July 1, he termed it a budget of economy and progress—economy because it called for a reduction in expenditures from the current year, and progress because it continued basic Government programs of national defense, space exploration and public welfare while simultaneously launching a massive effort to obliterate poverty in the United States.

Mr. Johnson's stress on Federal frugality is motivated by politics as well as principle. Economy-minded conservatives in Congress repeatedly have expressed opposition to tax reductions without some accompanying restraint in spending. There have been complaints from many quarters that the $10 billion estimated Government deficit for the current fiscal year is inflationary and even irresponsible. By reducing expenditures and halving the deficit for fiscal 1965, the President has, authorities agree, probably assured passage of tax-cutting legislation at an early date.

But if the Johnson budget projects an image of economy it also contains abundant evidence that any lowering of Federal spending levels may be short lived. For the budget lists many new Government programs which, though they call for relatively small outlays in the coming fiscal year, are likely to require

much larger expenditures in later years. Equally important, the lower Federal spending budgeted for fiscal 1965 depends in large measure on tactics which simply cannot be continued forever.

SALE OF LOANS

The principal such device is the sale of loans from the portfolios of Federal agencies to private lenders. This sell-off of assets by the Government first had an important impact in the budget for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, when such sales amounted to $1.1 billion, considerably more than for any previous year. In fiscal 1964 these sales will reach an estimated $1.6 billion and in the coming year are estimated at slightly under $2.3 billion. Because of the way in which these sales are handled in the budget, they have the effect of reducing expenditures rather than increasing income. Thus, spending in the Johnson budget is $2.3 billion lower than it would be without this program.

Loans being sold come from three main sources—the Export-Import Bank, the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Veterans' Administration.

The Export-Import Bank lends to foreigners to enable them to purchase U.S. exports. In 1965, the bank is expected to have net receipts of $856 million, about $200 million more than in 1964, reflecting primarily an increase to about $900 million from about $700 million in the sale to private buyers of certificates of participation in its loan portfolio.

A $191 million anticipated increase from fiscal 1964 in the sale to private sources of loans owned by the Veterans' Administration and a $317 million increase in sales of loans by the Federal National Mortgage Association also contribute substantially to the budgetary picture of economy in fiscal 1965. All told, the Government expects to sell $1 billion of mortgages from its loan portfolio in fiscal 1965.

The higher the interest rate the easier a mortgage is to sell. Thus, in the past few years the Government has been steadily selling off its higher interest rate loans and is becoming increasingly burdened with loans that will be more and more difficult to unload. There also is a limit, of course, to the Government's holdings of loans. At some point sales will have to decline and spending will show a corresponding rise in the budget.

POOLS OF LOANS

A tipoff that the Government may already have encountered trouble in selling its loans is the administration's request that Congress authorize it to sell certificates of participation in pools of loans owned by the VA and FNMA. If it could sell an interest in a cluster of loans, the Government could wrap up a package that would include some high-rate loans and some less desirable loans. The fiscal 1965 budget anticipates approval of the administration's request; of the $1.3 billion of mortgage loans expected to be sold next year, $300 million would be in pool participations.

This is not to say there aren't some lasting benefits in the Government's efforts to substitute private for public credit. A reduction of $152 million in estimated expenditures for the Farmers Home Administration would result, for instance, from proposed legislation which would largely replace direct Federal loans with insured private credit in the financing of programs to aid rural areas. This would be a recurring saving.

However, the 1965 budget points to larger outlays ahead in other significant ways. There is, for one thing, the persistent rise in the Government's new fiscal commitments—the new obligational authority, or NOA in budgetary language. NOA usually takes the form of appropriations; it enables Government agencies to incur obligations which require either immediate or future payment of money. NOA is sometimes granted for one fiscal year, sometimes for longer periods and sometimes with a time limit on its use.

THE TOTAL RISES

NOA in the fiscal 1965 budget amounts to $103.8 billion, or $5.9 billion more than expenditures. And while, according to budget estimates, spending will go down next year, the new commitments will represent a rise from $102.6 billion. (It should be noted, however, that the NOA asked by President Johnson for next year is significantly less than the $107.9 billion originally, sought by President Kennedy for fiscal 1964. Trimming of appropriations bills by Congress and some revisions by the Kennedy administration resulted in the 1964 NOA being cut by $5.3 billion.)

Of the new obligational authority recommended to Congress for 1965, $70.5 billion is to be used next year and the rest is to be carried over to future years. The budget estimates that at the end of fiscal 1965 unspent authorizations will amount to $95 billion, up from an estimated $90.4 billion at the end of the current fiscal year. These ever-mounting carryover authorizations are an irresistible upward force under expenditures, for rarely are they allowed to go unused. For instance, the fiscal 1965 budget shows only $1.3 billion of commitments that will expire or be canceled during the year.

Another portent of higher spending is the relentless climb in the Federal debt and the rising cost of carrying it. For all its emphasis on economy, the fiscal 1965 budget does show a deficit of $4.9 billion, leaving the public debt at the end of the year at $317 billion. The 1965 budget estimates an increase of $400 million in the amount needed to carry this debt, due both to the higher debt and to somewhat higher interest rates.

BALANCE BY 1967?

The cost of carrying the debt seems sure to get worse before it gets better. Whatever happens to interest rates, the Government undoubtedly will operate at a deficit at least through fiscal 1966, though at a news briefing the other day Secretary of the Treasury Dillon stated his belief that a balanced budget might be attained for fiscal 1967.

Throughout the 1965 budget there are new Government programs calling for relatively little spending now but providing indications of much more to come. For one new education project the budget includes new obligational authority of $718 million but expenditures of only $118 million. Proposed legislation to assist urban mass transportation systems would authorize Federal grants, direct loans and loan guarantees involving new obligational authority totaling $375 million over a 3-year period. Only $75 million in NOA and $10 million of expenditures shows up in the 1965 budget, so spending unquestionably would go up later on.

These programs are all relatively minor beside some others proposed but not yet enacted and not fully included either among budget expenditures or commitments for 1965. President Johnson's war on poverty, for instance, will involve outlays of untold millions of dollars. It will draw from some programs already in existence but seems sure to add substantially to Federal spending in coming years.

In his budget message to Congress the President also urged enactment of legislation to "provide urgently needed health insurance for aged persons through the social security system." He noted that benefits would be paid from administrative budget funds to those not eligible for social security. Again, evidence of considerably heavier outlays ahead.

It's no coincidence that the upward spending trend is most marked in health, education and welfare. National defense and space, which together accounted for most of the increase in the 1964 budget from the previous year, actually are getting less money in the 1965 budget and new commitments for these purposes are up only slightly. Spending for health, education, labor, and welfare, on the other hand, rises by $900 million in the Johnson budget and new obligational authority in this area mounts by $2.6 billion.

There is no certainty, of course, that the Government's expenditures will rise next year or even the year after. A year ago the 1964 budget seemed to point unmistakably to higher spending in 1965, but a sharp cut in defense outlays and some fiscal maneuvering managed at least to delay an increase. Presumably it could be done again. However, there is plenty of proof that the upward pressure is growing.

Republicans Must Give Nation a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this year the American people must be given a chance to decide on what kind of government we want. For 30 years we have been slowly changing our system by hacking away at basic constitutional principles. By giving the people small doses of socialism, we have moved a long way down the road to a totalitarian government. The movement in the past few years has been accelerated, and 1964 may well be the year of decision.

If we are going to exchange our capitalistic system for a Socialist state, the people ought to know it and have a voice in making the change. Socialism should not be sold to them under the guise of welfare programs, and other panaceas supposed to cure unemployment, take care of all our basic needs, or furnish recreation through Federal flat out of some unknown source of Federal funds.

The 1964 campaign must be conducted on the issues and the people must know where the candidates and the parties stand. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has already issued the challenge when he stated he "offered the American people a choice, not an echo." This must be the role of the Republican Party in this critical period of history. Because the Democratic Party has chosen for itself the course of radical liberalism to foster big government, big spending, increased bureaucratic influence over the lives of the people, the Republican Party must offer the choice by sponsoring conservatism, reduced spending, fiscal responsibility, more freedom for the people.

The following editorial from the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., for January 13, 1964, "To Be or Not To Be Conservative or Liberal?" sums up Republican responsibility in the coming campaigns:

TO BE OR NOT TO BE—CONSERVATIVE OR LIBERAL?

The rise of conservatism is the most significant factor in our national life today.

The middleway may no longer be the politically safe place of the past. It has been an axiom of national politics that the road to the White House always must lead exactly along the center.

This has come to mean finding the largest area of inert political acceptance. Unfortunately, this all too often meant not leadership but trying to be all things to all men.

The legislative and political vacuum that this inevitably brought about had its reflection in the last Congress. A majority of Representatives and Senators refused to act upon many major proposals, either to accept or reject them, lacking any clear indication of the peoples' true desires.

All they knew was that nobody was knocking at their doors.

The growing conservative movement has narrowed the middle road to a point where there may not be enough room for all candidates or enough voters to guarantee election.

This is not to say that the people of the country are abandoning traditional moderation in politics. Far from it. But the issue that so many have tried to ignore all these years, and that is where government intervention in the lives and fortunes of the people is to end, is now at last up for full debate and decision.

The myths and dogma of radical liberalism are being questioned as never before. The rise of conservatism has brought this about. The people want to know the right way.

Everybody is against recessions and unemployment. It's like being against sin. But whether they can best be contained and eliminated by direct government intervention, and the national growth promoted, or through the encouragement of our traditional system of free enterprise, will separate the radical liberals from the conservatives.

The hottest trick of the year now is to see how far to the left one can still stay and at the same time appear to be leaning toward the right. But, conservative strength is certain to make it impossible to stand with one foot in each camp.

The conservatives have thus revitalized the two-party system.

Given a strong Republican campaign based on conservative principles, the Democratic leadership will have only one way to go, left, or blow the trumpet of a great political retreat.

And as for Republican candidates, they won't beat Democrats by looking like Democrats. So let the great debate begin.

Address by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, to Association of California Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last month, our distinguished and widely respected colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan, Mr. HART, gave an important address before the convention of the Association of California Consumers in San Francisco.

In the course of his remarks, Senator HART, whose continuing efforts on behalf of the American consumer are known to all of us, proposed that President Johnson appoint a Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs. I rise today to join Senator HART in his support of the historic step taken by President Johnson on January 3 when he announced the appointment of a distinguished public servant, Mrs. Esther Peterson, to the post of Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs.

Our late President Kennedy showed his deep concern for the protection of consumers' rights when he appointed the Consumer Advisory Council. President Kennedy and Johnson have given us a foundation upon which we can now build to be sure that the consumer's voice is heard—and heard clearly—in the framing of national policies.

As Senator HART said in his San Francisco speech, the Consumer Advisory Council is composed of very high caliber people, but we have not given the Council the money nor the staff assistance it needs to do the big job of watching out for the consumer's interest. The Council is hampered in still another way. It has been able to meet only a few times a year.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of a Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs will represent an important step toward giving the American consumer the strong voice to which he is entitled. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the remarks by Senator HART. Under unanimous consent, I include the speech by Senator HART at the convention of the Association of California Consumers in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HART

Coming to California makes me realize just how Alice must have felt when she stepped through that looking glass.

Back in Washington, consumer legislation is still a dream.

It's a dream to which I, and many others, have devoted hundreds of hours attempting to make it come true. We worked hard because we are convinced it is good, needed, and therefore can be passed. But at the risk of appearing a faltering champion of our cause, I must admit that often in recent months I have felt like the King of Siam in the musical—"Sometimes not sure of the things I absolutely know."

Opposition has been such that there have been days when I began to doubt if such legislation could be adopted—anywhere.

Now, here in California, I have walked into the "never-never land."

Here you have a State where consumers are treated with due respect, an impressive information program is in operation, State executives and legislators are aware of the consumer interest and—the frosting on the cake for me—here much of truth in packaging is in operation. And apparently you have given the lie to the charges made against these same sections in Washington—that they would kill the free enterprise system, shoot consumer costs sky high and encourage communism.

Much of the credit, of course, must go to your State consumer counsel, Helen Nelson. Courageously supported by Governor Brown, she has accomplished more than anyone had a right to expect. Miss Nelson's admittedly superior abilities are not the only reason your State has been able to make so much progress. Fortunately, all authority was centralized in one official, rather than having it diffused through a committee. This permitted Miss Nelson to waste no time in getting her program underway and in proceeding swiftly and efficiently.

In doing so, California has set new standards in consumer protection for the State and the Nation. It has provided an inspiring example of what can be done and given proof that a vigorous, forward-looking program can gain the support of the State legislature in providing the necessary legal underpinning.

But I did not come here simply to carry bouquets of praise. You are much too mature an audience to want that—and I am too aware of how much you can help on this issue to waste the time with pretty words.

Instead, I would like to discuss with you battles past and battles future, to outline a new strategy and, hopefully, to summon new troops to be sent to the front to aid any who are suffering a bit from battle fatigue.

What of battles past? I risk boring you with facts you may know well in order to emphasize the nature and strength of our opponents.

We have now in the legislative mill, as you know, three bills which are considered out-and-out consumer oriented. Senator Kefauver first introduced a bill calling for a Department of Consumers in 1959. He reintroduced it in the 87th and 88th Congresses. It has never been acted on by a subcommittee.

The second was Senator DOUGLAS' truth-in-lending bill—a simple request that installment buyers be told how much interest they are paying on loans. It has been introduced also in the last three Congresses. Extensive hearings have been held. No committee action has been taken.

The third bill—my truth-in-packaging proposal—began its weary way in June of 1961 when exploratory hearings were held out of which grew the bill.

In June this year, 1963, it received a favorable vote in the Antitrust Subcommittee. Since then we have been trying to get the bill out of the Judiciary Committee.

To illustrate why progress on consumer legislation in Congress is so difficult and time consuming, I would like to give you a few highlights of the events kicked off by the introduction of truth in packaging.

There is no need, I think, to go into the hearings and the testimony as you are no doubt aware of the niff-naffing that went on with industry spokesmen there.

However, I think when all the smoke cleared there were three basic arguments worthy of consideration: that present law is adequate, that truth in packaging is an infringement on free enterprise and that it would increase production costs which would, in turn, increase consumer costs.

You know the rebuttals for these. However, I find an article in the November 23, 1963, Business Week magazine most interesting along these lines. It reports changes that manufacturers have been making recently in their packaging and labeling, and I quote:

"Ever since HART started stirring things up a couple of years ago, executives of companies manufacturing products found on supermarket shelves have been running to Washington to protest the bill. But at the same time, they have been busily changing packaging that HART might object to."

There are some who would point to these changes and say they prove that truth in packaging is not necessary—that the industry can do the right things voluntarily.

However, surely history would back me up when I say that as soon as the so-called threat of the Hart bill disappeared—ideally by the disappearance of HART, I suppose the manufacturers would feel—so would many of the reforms.

Also, I am intrigued by how these manufacturers have managed to adjust these changes with their ideas of free enterprise—and more especially—why there has not been the dreaded skyrocketing of grocery prices because of them.

Surely, if these alterations in labeling and packaging are a good idea that some of the industry has adopted, it would make good sense to have the same standards for all.

But let's get back to the opposition that is represented in that phrase in the Business Week article, "executives of companies manufacturing products found on supermarket shelves have been running to Washington to protest the bill." "Protest" is an understatement.

Bear in mind that the industries opposing truth in packaging represent a minimun yearly sales of $100 billion, or approximately one-fifth of the gross national product.

In this case money is power. In the front ranks is the pressure such industries exert on Congressmen representing the States which are home base for their plants. I'm sure each member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee knows now some men and women he didn't know before we voted on truth in packaging. These are the industry spokesmen.

Each industry representative pointed out the economic ramifications—as they chose to see them—if truth in packaging were passed.

Each Senator was bombarded also by letters from officials and employees of the industries at the direction of company heads and because of scare articles in trade and company magazines.

I'd estimate millions of sheets of paper were consumed in press releases and special reports sent to anyone industry thought could be convinced T in P was frightful legislation.

One group of business home economists were told to get out and work against truth in packaging or they might lose their jobs.

There are editorial services in Washington supported by business, which sent out editorials against truth in packaging which were used by small weekly newspapers across the Nation which must rely on canned editorials.

This is the type of barrage being laid down against just one consumer bill.

So what weapons have we had on our side?

Certainly, hard-working consumer groups, such as yours—and you have done nobly.

And we have support of the major unions, National Consumers League, Cooperative League, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, National Federation of Independent Businesses, National Retired Teachers Association, and American Association of Retired Persons, among others.

But this has been a part-time campaign while the opponents have highly skilled, highly paid forces working consistently and full time against us.

And what national forum do we have? Granted three major national publications have carried fair, factual stories on truth in packaging. But they are of the select circulation category—Harper's, Progressive, and Nation.

Two others, among those with the highest circulation in the Nation, have hired and retained writers to do stories on truth in packaging. But the stories, somehow, have never seen print.

Granted also, I have appeared on a few television shows to help tell the truth in packaging story. But three times when appearances were arranged they were canceled out—and I was told, off the record, it was because advertisers had protested.

Those are the battles past and more of the same lie in the future. For at each step—consideration by the full Senate Judiciary Committee, consideration by the full Senate, consideration by the House subcommittee, consideration by the full House committee, and the full House—all offer new opportunities for battle and delay by the opponents.

And this—without a concentrated, forceful effort somewhat near that exerted by the opposition—is what all consumer legislation can expect.

This is why we need to sound the alarm for fresh forces. This is why we must make each American realize he is a consumer and has a direct interest in such legislation.

Frankly, I suspect it was such a realization that aided in gaining favorable action on truth in packaging in the subcommittee. Often, someone would opine that things the bill would guard against were in reality isolated incidents. "No, no," would be the reply from a colleague. "Just the other day I got stung with one of these misleading labels."

And what of the new strategy? Part of it, of course, would be organization of consumers so that their voice could be heard over the din drummed up by the hucksters.

Part of it is the continued support and even increased efforts we proponents of consumer legislation must exert in Congress.

Action is needed in another area. As we all know, the only formal weapon available to the consumer at the executive level is the President's Consumer Advisory Council. This Council was a unique idea given life by President Kennedy who understood clearly the need for action in the consumer field. When history writes its verdict, included will be specific mention of the fact that he was the first President in history to send a special Consumer Advisory Message to the Congress.

The members of this Consumer Advisory Council are of high caliber. But it has only a tiny staff, a very small budget, and is able to meet but a few times a year. As a minimum, this Council should be provided with more money and wider authority in order to effectively carry its important burdens.

The Federal executive machinery needs additional overhauling in the interest of the consumers. And I intend to make a specific suggestion to President Johnson.

Right now, the first considerations of the President clearly must be civil rights, the tax reduction, and foreign policy. In the coming weeks, however, I intend to recommend to the President that he appoint a special assistant for consumers' affairs. This special assistant would have the ear of the President, would work on programs benefiting the consumers of America, would be the liaison with Government agencies on consumer matters, and, on a continuing basis, would advise the President on issues of consumer interest. This special assistant could and, I hope, would criticize policies and programs by Government agencies themselves in instances when consumer interest is overlooked. Indeed, legislation pending before the Congress could be analyzed.

In short, this special assistant would provide the President a continuing consumer voice in his intimate official family. Let us not forget that by tradition and instinct, experience and performance, President Johnson is a consumer-conscious public servant. He has never forgotten those years of his youth—shoeshine boy and laborer—those years of his young manhood—schoolteacher—all years which required the most careful family budgeting, years when consumer problems had a 24-hour-a-day immediate significance.

Indeed, even the establishment of a special assistant for consumer affairs should be regarded as an interim step. Certainly most desirable would be the creation of a full-fledged consumer council at the executive level.

Given the office of a special assistant for consumer affairs, I think we could say that consumers for the first time would have their own identifiable "Man in Washington."

Then all Americans would understand how Alice felt in Wonderland.

Danville's Attorney Receives Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, Danville in my congressional district was one of the major trouble spots of the Nation during the racial strife which dominated the news last year. That is one reason that I take especial pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Register of that city, one of Virginia's most important newspapers, on January 21.

This editorial comments on the choice of Mr. James A. H. Freguson, youthful city attorney of Danville, as the recipient for the outstanding young citizen's award presented annually by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce of that city. It cites him for "his voluntary endeavors above and beyond the call of duty" and praises him, alongside the Honorable John W. Carter, local attorney, and the Honorable T. Edward Temple, city manager, as one of a trio who sustained the orderly processes despite annoyance and attack from outsiders.

The editorial follows:

GOOD WORKS RECOGNIZED

In what surely caught him completely by surprise, as he acknowledged, James A. H. Ferguson, the youthful city attorney, last night was awarded the young citizen's award of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce for Danville.

It is not often that a municipal counsel would even be considered for such recognition for community services, but Jimmy—to speak of him as to all his friends—did not receive the coveted shield-shaped plaque for the routine work of his public office. He got it for his voluntary endeavors above and beyond the call of duty as the legal counsel of the city of Danville, and as a citizen of the community. Details of his career may be found in the story of the award presentation in the news columns.

Those who look for symbols can find one in the choice of Jimmy Ferguson for the Jaycee award. It is the adorning of his brow with the garland of community accolade as a stouthearted defender of law and order. Jimmy did more than his share of it, and with more than ordinary success, over the past year. His work has been cited as an example for other communities faced with massive assaults from without upon constituted authority and upon law and order. His endeavors, outside his normal duties, have made the way clearer and surer for citizens here and elsewhere as they have tried to reconcile their personal views with the laws of the land; and he has done even more for public officials charged with specific responsibilities in coping with situations arising from manifestations of racial unrest.

Considerably more than his defense of the community entered into his choice for the Jaycee award but that was not overlooked, nor could it have been, because it was so important to so many.

It may not have been coincidence that three community awards have gone to people so involved in the situation here. First, the veterans award went to Attorney John

W. Carter. The Kiwanis award went to City Manager T. Edward Temple. And now, the Jaycee award was presented to Ferguson.

This trio stood, as the Roman trio stood at the bridge, and defeated the horde trying to sack Danville. Just which was Horatio may be open to argument, but surely they formed the triumvirate which sustained orderly process as well as law and order. The gate to Danville is closed to no one, and we hope it never shall be necessary to have any actual door to the city, but all who come are expected to conduct themselves in an orderly manner so that they will not dishonor the courtesy traditionally extended to all who come into our midst.

The outstanding young citizen of 1963 helped mightily in assuring a continuance of an orderly community into which visitors—white and Negro—may come with an assured welcome and enjoy their stay in peace and security.

Coeur d'Alene Basketball Team Named Northern Idaho Team of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, last week, at the second annual Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, Press Sports Banquet, the Coeur d'Alene Vikings basketball team was named northern Idaho's team of the year.

The banquet was highlighted by the appearance of such sports world celebrities as Vernon Law, Pittsburgh Pirates pitcher; Frank "Lefty" O'Doul, highest lifetime batting average of all ballplayers living; Joe DiMaggio, greatest of all Yankee centerfielders; Dee Andros, highly successful University of Idaho grid coach; and Larry Jackson, Chicago Cubs pitcher.

Needless to say, how memorable this event will be in the minds of those in attendance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in today's RECORD, a news story which appeared in the Coeur d'Alene Press regarding this commendable occasion and reminding us all of the importance of both physical fitness and competitive sports:

VIKING CAGERS NAMED AS TEAM OF THE YEAR

The Coeur d'Alene Vikings basketball team of 1963, class AAA State champions, were named the Team of the Year last night at the second annual Coeur d'Alene Press Sports Banquet.

The announcement was made by Pat King, publisher of the Press, before an overflow crowd of sports fans that numbered over 900.

The award was presented to Frank Reber, Quarterback Club president. The Quarterback Club had nominated the Vikings for the award.

The team was selected from a list of top teams—including the Kootenai High School eight-man football team, Sandpoint football team, Atlas Tie baseball team, Post Falls basketball team, Hohman softball team, NIJC basketball team—by a selection board of representatives from each of the five northern counties.

The banquet was highlighted by the appearance of Joe DiMaggio, Lefty O'Doul, Vernon Law, Larry Jackson, Spencer Harris and Dee Andros.

O'Doul was the featured speaker who thrilled the fans with many stories of his long and colorful career in the major leagues. O'Doul is the only living baseball player with the highest batting average of .349.

O'Doul also told of some of the places that he had visited, great players he had played with and of some of the wonderful memories that he had from the game of baseball.

DiMaggio told the fans he enjoyed his first visit to Coeur d'Alene. He had come through the efforts of O'Doul and hopes that he can come back in future years in order to try his luck on some of the fishing lakes in the area.

DiMaggio has traveled from Los Angeles by plane, meeting O'Doul in San Francisco and then continuing on to Coeur d'Alene by way of Portland and Spokane.

Vernon Law, former Idaho baseball star grew up on the sandlots in the Boise area, told that he had just returned his signed contract to the Pittsburgh Pirates. Law said that he had signed the contract with the provision that he could take a regular turn on the mound to give his arm a complete test and show that he would be ready to pitch.

Law, an employee of the Idaho First National Bank in his offseason, said that he was very glad to be returning to Coeur d' Alene after he had helped get the first Press Sports Banquet off the ground.

Larry Jackson, ace pitcher for the Chicago Cubs, made his first appearance in Coeur d' Alene and said that he was impressed with the city and its great group of fans from north Idaho who had turned out to honor the athletic teams.

Jackson also paid tribute to Dee Andros and the Idaho Vandal football team of last fall and wished them much luck in the coming season. Jackson is a former University of Idaho and Boise Junior College athlete. Jackson works for the Boise Cascade Corp. with his office located in Boise.

Spencer Harris, president and general manager of the Spokane Indians baseball club, told of the wonderful support of the north Idaho fans for Pacific Coast League baseball and how happy he was to be making his second appearance at the annual banquet.

Harris made a special presentation, for the Pacific Coast League directors, to Duane Hagadone, president of the Coeur d'Alene Press Co., for the support and boosting of baseball in north Idaho and surrounding areas. Pat King, publisher of the Press, accepted the award for Hagadone, whose business commitments elsewhere made it impossible for him to attend.

Perry Christianson, president of North Idaho Junior College, and Russell Thompson, student body president, welcomed the many fans to the banquet. Russell told of the support that was building for the fine NIJC basketball team.

Each of the coaches of teams in north Idaho was introduced to the fans and special guests from the various communities and organizations throughout the Inland Empire were introduced. Delegations were present from the Spokane Jets hockey club, Athletic Round Table of Spokane, and Coeur d'Alene, Spokane GSSA, Spokane Indians baseball club, Idaho First National Bank, Vandal Boosters, University of Idaho, and WSU.

Each of the communities of north Idaho had a table reserved for its fans.

The banquet was catered by Bill Webster of the Brunswick Cafe and assisted by Wes Hatch of the NIJC Student Union. Members of the Vikettes Drill Team of Coeur d'Alene high school served the meal which featured fried chicken.

Athletic Director J. Neil "Skip" Stahley of the University of Idaho was one of the special guests present and he announced that it was the first time that the complete athletic coaching staff for the Vandals had been present for such an occasion.

The group included John Easterbrook, Dick Monroe, Bud Riley, and Steve Musseau, football coaches; Jim Goddard, basketball coach; Wayne Anderson, baseball coach, and Tom Hartley, public relations director.

The Vikings team was represented by Charlie Nipp, Mike Wicks, Jim Dreschel, last year's players and now attending college.

Bob Maker, sports editor of the Press, was master of ceremonies.

Andros pointed his remarks to the young fans in the audience. He said he hoped that each of the youngsters present could work toward a goal of having a great desire to accomplish anything that they take up as their life's work.

Andros, who coached the Vandals to its most successful season in 25 years, told of his goal of providing some interesting football for the Idaho fans and said that with a little bit of luck and lots of hard work, the Vandals could come up with a winning ball club in 1964.

John Richards and Art Hanson of Coeur d'Alene and Mrs. Art Sheldon of Kellogg were presented with special certificates honoring their many years of devotion, time, and aid to the promotion and support of athletics in north Idaho. Don Haines accepted the award for Mrs. Sheldon.

Bill Giesa, Coeur d'Alene, was presented with a special humorous compass to aid in some of his golf course navigation projects.

Harry Arnold, editor of the Press, introduced the teams nominated for the "Team of the Year" award and gave a sketch of each team, its sponsor and summary of the highlights of each team's season.

Arnold Halpern represented the Atlas Tie baseball team, Cliff Hohman represented the Hohman softball team, Gene Littlefield represented the Sandpoint football team, Oscar Reynolds represented the Post Falls Kiwanis club, Bud Ford represented the NIJC boosters, Hilton Lockhart represented the Kootenai boosters and Reber represented the Quarterback Club.

The invocation was given by Rev. Lyman Winkle in a special prayer that was dedicated to the world of sport and the competition it provides.

An entertaining concert of stirring music was presented by the NIJC band under Jim Burns. The band played before and during the dinner and gave special fanfare salutes to the head table guests as they were paraded down the aisle to their seats.

The band saluted each of the teams nominated for the special award with a special rendition of the school's fight song.

In a salute to DiMaggio and O'Doul, Janice Compton, Miss Coeur d'Alene, sang "I Left My Heart in San Francisco." The band also played "Here We Have Idaho," in a salute to all the fans present.

Volunteer Praises Peace Corps Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the very finest features of the Peace Corps, launched by our late President Kennedy, is that it elicits the

natural energies and enthusiasm of America's young people and helps to direct those excellent qualities toward the achievement of our highest individual and national ideals.

The relatively brief history of the Peace Corps is aglow with reports from its participants on the immeasurable personal satisfaction they derive from doing jobs that need desperately to be done in some of the loneliest outposts of the world.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the demand continues and the evidence mounts up—evidence that thousands of our bright young people are not just willing, but are positively eager, to respond to our late President's call for unselfish service to our country.

The commendable enthusiasm with which Peace Corps candidates approach their responsibilities is illustrated by an article on Donald Haines' impending assignment to Nigeria. This article appeared in the Port Huron Times Herald of Port Huron, Mich., on January 5, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

VOLUNTEER PRAISES PEACE CORPS PROGRAM

(By Eileen Alexander)

"A much saner method of foreign aid" is Donald Haines' description of the Peace Corps program.

Donald has given the matter much thought, for by this spring he will have completed training at Columbia University, New York, N.Y., and be on his way to Nigeria as a Peace Corps volunteer.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Haines, Elmwood Drive, Don received his B.A. in English this semester from the University of Michigan, and expects that he will be assigned to teaching when he arrives at his post.

What motivates a Peace Corps volunteer? In this case, Don began thinking seriously about applying for the program when a "big campaign" was waged in Ann Arbor encouraging graduates in June of 1963 to join.

"I made out the application and took the test in Ann Arbor," he says adding that an applicant must have 6 preferably 10 recommendations from instructors and other persons who know him well and is subjected to a battery of tests designed to test skills such as ability to learn a foreign language.

On February 6 Don will leave for Columbia where he will spend a minimum of 3 months learning a language, taking physical fitness courses, receiving instruction in Nigerian politics and economics and generally preparing for the cultural climate.

Then after a 10-day vacation he will leave the country for what is normally 2 years of service. However this may change somewhat for if a volunteer's term is finished in the middle of a school session he is usually requested to stay on to finish the school year.

"I like the idea of getting in on the ground floor of things," says Don in explaining why he requested assignment in Africa which he feels is one of the last frontiers left on earth.

However, "The more I look at Nigeria the more it seems the most advanced and settled country in Africa" he adds.

As someone who will be involved with the educational system of the country, Don has learned that Nigeria boasts five universities, and its schools are patterned after the British system.

"I don't even know what part of Nigeria I'll be going to," he says. He might live in a city, under "fairly plush" conditions. "That doesn't mean I couldn't be sent into 'the Bush,' and live in a village."

Generally, Peace Corps volunteers live under conditions similar to those under which their counterparts in the country live. This means that if Donald is assigned to a village, he will live under the same conditions under which a Nigerian teacher in the village would live.

Volunteers are also paid according to the living standards of the country. Donald estimates that the salary for Nigerian teachers is approximately 1,000 pounds a year, or $2,800.

Volunteers receive an allowance with which they must buy food, shelter, and clothing and meet other expenses, and the rest of their salary is placed in a bank in the United States, to be taken out when they complete their service.

Most Nigerian teachers do not have degrees, Don explains. The Nigerian Government is attempting to replace those teachers with college-trained persons from other countries, who can keep the educational system going while the Nigerian teachers are at colleges and universities earning degrees.

"The Peace Corps is meant to be for the young people of the United States as much as it is for the people of other countries," Don says, for he feels that the Americans who serve in the Corps learn much about themselves and their own country as well as foreign lands.

He considers the Peace Corps "one of the finest programs Kennedy introduced."

Young people who joined when the Peace Corps was first organized are now completing their service and arriving home. Replacements are needed for these volunteers, as well as to enable the program to expand into still more countries.

"Most kids, after the first shock of newness wears off, seem to be so enthusiastic, and never have enough time to accomplish everything they want to do," Don says. "It's a very creative job, and you're left a lot on your own."

"In an article I read," he continues, "it pointed out that this is about the best program we could arrange, for instinctively American youth will use democratic means in carrying out their projects. We're not going there to teach them democracy, Americanism, or anything like that, but some of our culture will rub off."

Memorial Tribute to Our Late President John F. Kennedy by Rev. Raymond Shelvin, Assistant Pastor of St. Francis Xavier R.C. Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to place in the RECORD a sermon by Rev. Raymond Shelvin, assistant pastor at St. Francis Xavier R.C. Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., delivered on the occasion of a solemn month's mind Mass for President John F. Kennedy on December 21, 1963.

This memorial Mass was attended by thousands of residents of the Brooklyn area and was arranged by the Democratic organizations of the third and eighth assembly districts.

Fittingly, it was attended by public figures and citizens of all political beliefs.

I believe that Father Shelvin's moving and meaningful words are an impressive tribute to our departed friend and late President:

If there is anything that arouses the sympathy of people it is when a great and good person suffers an injustice. Some of the most lovable personalities of history have been men and women who have suffered much. The human heart has an instinct for justice and the human mind finds its greatest joy in honor.

Thus on November 22 when the news of President Kennedy's assassination was broadcast throughout our Nation, every American rebelled with righteous indignation at the thought of this injustice. Here was a man who typified all the traditional ideals of every American. Whether we subscribed to his political thinking or not, everyone felt that this is the way every American should be: Genuinely loyal to his country, sincerely conscientious in his duties to his family, and firmly devout in the practice of his religion.

Who has not marveled at his spirit of dedication to the American cause. On how many different occasions did he challenge his countrymen to come forth and give honest, efficient service to their country. "Ask not what your country can do for you * * *." Speaking to a group of teenagers who had assembled at a CYO convention in New York, he said: "I hope that all of you will serve * * * serve not only your families, your church but also your country. Our country has been very generous to us and we must be generous in return to it."

And then as a father, it was obvious that he delighted to be with his family. In these days when men seem to be indifferent about family unity, his devotion to his family and to his home was exemplary. In spite of a heavy workload of huge responsibilities, his family was very important to him and in return he was very important to his family. By giving attention to them, he received attention from them. By giving affection to them, he received affection from them.

And all this flowed from his sense of duty to his God. A person conscientious in his duties to his God can't help but be a good citizen and a good father. Here was a man who had the burdens of a great nation on his mind and yet regardless of where he was or what he was doing, he would always fulfill his Catholic obligation of going to mass on Sundays. He recognized himself as a creature of God and thus he had the obligation of giving service to God.

We have lost a great man. America has suffered a great tragedy. But instead of this being a great loss to us, it might turn about to be a considerable profit. Tragedy is often the mother of character—it is often the seeds of great virtue. So perhaps as America looks at this man and looks at his personal qualities, America might acquire more loyal Americans; American homes might profit by having more conscientious parents; and, finally, America might become stronger by having greater respect and devotion to God.

Extremism and Responsible Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of extremism versus deep faith in the fundamental processes of American

democracy is probably one of the most talked about subjects in this country during the last few weeks. One of the best articles on the subject is the one written by National Commander Daniel Foley in the American Legion magazine. He effectively puts the case for what he calls the "spirit and tradition of real responsible Americanism."

The Minneapolis Star published this article on January 9, and accompanied it with an editorial saying that "Commander Foley's exposition wins from us the highest accolade honest writers can bestow. We wish we had written that".

The article follows:

LEGION'S COMMANDER HITS EXTREMISM

(By Daniel Foley)

At a time of rapid change and recurring crisis in national affairs, one factor remains constant. The loudest noise and the most confused counsel continue to come from extremists.

By extremists I mean those individuals who would save America by forsaking its free institutions. I mean not just Communist and neo-Fascists who openly assail our system but, more especially, those who, in the conviction that theirs is the only right view, have lost sight of—and faith in—the fundamental processes of self-government.

You know the type as well as I do. They claim to have the one true answer to every problem. They talk of setting aside the law when the law offends them. They are quick to cry treason, slow to admit error, and indifferent to arguments and facts that do not support their beliefs. They are not really leftists or rightists—but simply modern anarchists—though many of them would be shocked at the idea.

There are two basic flaws in their brand of extremism.

It violates the spirit and traditions of real Americanism.

It seeks a course of action that is bound to fail.

As Legionaires we bow to no one in our concern and zeal for the future security and greatness of America. Because we are Legionaires we share a special responsibility to observe and uphold the institutions which alone can be the means of realizing that future.

Now, more than ever before, Americans need to keep their values in clear focus. Our resort must be to reason, not to emotion; to persuasion, not to violence; to perseverance, not to panic. It isn't necessary or desirable that we all think alike. It is essential that we espouse our differences reasonably with good will and due regard for other opinions.

Honest disagreement honorably expressed cannot divide Americans. But disagreement waged with weapons of fear and hate and bad faith can cost us not only our unity but our character and purpose as a free people.

Abraham Lincoln in a previous era of strong feeling said, "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law." By the same token, there is no grievance now that cannot be voiced and fairly met within the tested channels of the democratic system.

I often wonder if those who advocate extremism really understand the enormity of their disservice to their country.

Nikita Khrushchev is fond of stating, as he did recently in the presence of visiting American businessmen, that the capitalist system is headed for an early collapse. He's not basing that hope altogether on the thrust of Communist military and economic power. The Communists believe as an article of faith that human beings are incapable of governing themselves—that a free society such as ours inevitably will generate excesses and frictions that will destroy it.

The citizen who defies the law or falsely demeans the motives and authority of governmental institutions is helping Khrushchev's cause—not America's. The citizen who seeks recourse to hatred or violence as the answer to the Nation's problems is turning away from an acceptable and workable American solution.

The American Legion has always asserted its right to speak out vigorously and candidly on public issues. We've never shied away from controversy or from criticism of policies we believe to be wrong—and I am confident we will continue on that course. At the same time, I assure you that our criticism will be constructive and responsible.

The U.S. Supreme Court in recent years has rendered decisions specifically in the areas of law enforcement and religious expressions in schools, with which the American Legion strongly disagrees. We formulated our position in the democratic way—through discussion at the local, State, and national levels. We've stated our views plainly and with force, but without impugning the motives of those who disagree or attacking the authority and prestige of the courts.

We believe the national interest warrants increased American efforts to neutralize and eliminate the Communist regime in Cuba. But while insisting upon a new policy, we question the wisdom of our present policy, not the character and good faith of its architects.

We champion the needs of disabled and aging war veterans whose past services are too soon forgotten by many of their countrymen. But our difference with those who oppose us is one of judgment, not of patriotism; and the best hope for our cause lies in education and persuasion, not vindictiveness.

This is the American way. It's the only way that works in a free society.

By practicing responsible Americanism this American Legion of ours has served as a stabilizing force in the Nation's life. We stand today as a buffer against extremism of both the left and the right. This is a position in which every Legionnaire may take pride and which every Legionnaire should consciously seek to strengthen.

We neither need nor want rigid conformity. Nor can we permit a few overzealous and unreasoning individuals to overbalace the common sense and judgment of the people.

Ours is a big country with big and perplexing problems. The answers do not come easily. They will not come at all if substantial numbers of Americans permit themselves to be led into extravagances of hate and fear.

Public School Spending Up 5 Percent in Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very highly respected publication, School Management, edited by Mr. Paul Abramson, has prepared an excellent analysis of the cost of American public school education. This analysis appears in the magazine's January 1964 issue.

I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a brief analysis of this article, which I think should be of interest and concern to all of us here in Congress.

I should like to particularly call the attention of my colleagues to the wide range of local effort exerted in the field of public education.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the figures showing the continuing rise in cost of public education can be applied, and perhaps even more so, to the cost of private education in this country.

The increasing cost of public education is being passed on to local taxpayers and I believe an analysis of this article will clearly demonstrate why local taxes, by the very nature of things, continue to keep going up. While it is true that the public school passes on this increased cost to the taxpayer, I think it quite appropriate that we ask, Where can the private school obtain its additional revenue?

Private schools today absorb more than 7½ million grade school and high school students at an annual operating cost estimated in excess of $2 billion. This does not include capital outlay nor capital investment in buildings.

I think this excellent article in School Management should serve as a base for those of us interested in education, both public and private, for intelligent discussion of what can be done to assist the local communities in meeting this ever-increasing burden.

The article follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOL SPENDING UP 5 PERCENT IN YEAR

GREENWICH, CONN.—The average cost of educating a public school student in the United States rose 5 percent in the last year—from $335 to $352.

Of the $17 increase, only $7 will be spent for better education, more efficient teaching tools and improved teachers' salaries. The other $10 will be spent simply to offset the effects of inflation.

Since the 3-year period of 1957–59, the base period used by the U.S. Government for its price indexes, the average school district has increased its per pupil expenditures by 36 percent, or $94. However, only $41 of this sum has gone for educational improvement; the other $53 has been spent to offset inflation.

These are some of the statistics reported in the 1963–64 Cost of Education Index published in the January issue of School Management magazine.

As the Nation's largest publication serving public school administrators, School Management produces this nationally recognized guide to school financial planning each year. It is directed by Dr. Orlando F. Furno, director of research for the Baltimore City Schools.

Dr. Furno estimates public schools throughout the United States will spend a total of $20,250 million for the current school year, including the cost of providing school transportation, building and equipping new schools and paying off school debts.

The average cost of providing bus transportation, per student, will be $16, and school districts will spend $47 per student for new school construction, including additions and modernizations, for the current September through June school year. (These costs are in addition to average $352 per pupil expenditure.) The magazine uses a standard pupil unit for its computations, taking into account the different costs of schooling elementary and high school students.

School debts, mostly long-term bonds for school construction, totalled $388 per student, in the average school district as of September 1, 1963. Almost 10 percent of the school districts in the country were in debt $1,000 for each pupil enrolled.

Again, as in past years, the Middle Atlantic States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, are spending the most per pupil, $482, about 42 percent above the national average. The second highest spending region was the west coast, California, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, and Alaska, with an average per pupil expenditure of $390, 11 percent above the national average.

Only one of the Nation's nine geographic areas spent less this year than during last year. This was the South Central region of Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky. Average per pupil expenditures were $200 versus $204 last year. Again, as last year, this was the lowest per pupil expenditure of any region.

A region-by-region comparison of per pupil expenditures during the last 2 years shows the following:

YEARLY COMPARISON CHART

On a region-by-region basis, the Cost of Education Index shows the following comparison between per pupil expenditures for 1963–64 and last year:

Region	School year		Net increase
	1963–64	1962–63	
			Percent
Middle Atlantic (New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)	$482	$469	2.8
West coast (California, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, Alaska)	390	382	2.1
New England (New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut)	367	357	2.8
Mountain States (Montana, Colorado, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada)	371	347	6.9
Midwestern States (Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin)	376	345	9.0
Plains States (Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)	350	323	8.4
Southwestern States (Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas)	278	271	2.6
Southeastern States (Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, District of Columbia)	252	240	5.0
South Central States (Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky)	200	204	[1] (2.0)
National average, all States	352	335	5.1

[1] Decrease.

The continued low state of teachers' salaries was one of the major points highlighted by the Cost of Education Index.

According to the magazine, the average starting salary for a teacher with a college degree but without experience is $4,600. Teachers on the west coast can expect to start in at about $5,000, while those in the South will receive a salary of about $4,000.

The average teacher will earn $5,837 this year. This is an increase of 24.7 percent since 1957–59. Since inflation has taken a 22.6 percent bit, the real increase is less than $100 per man.

The average maximum salary for a classroom teacher, no matter how much education or experience he or she has, is $7,307. Only 10 percent of the Nation's school districts have salary scales which make it possible for classroom teachers to earn more than $9,500.

Commenting on the current state of teachers' salaries, Paul Abramson, editor of School Management, said, "Compared with the starting salaries of college graduates in industry, business, and government, the starting salaries of teachers are not drastically low. It is only in the long term that the salary scales are tragically out of line.

"After 14 years of teaching, the average classroom teacher can expect to earn $7,300. In the South, he would earn $6,000.

"Compare this with the wage scale of advertising copywriters, missile engineers, or senior garbage men. Is it any wonder that, after a few years, the bright, ambitious young teachers, our Nation's most important resource for educating future generations, turn to more lucrative areas to earn a living to support their families?"

State Department Continues To Ignore Communist Goal as Africa Slowly Slips Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Zanzibar is fast becoming the Cuba of Africa. While the apologists for the Soviet Union continue to insist that the Communists are not responsible for the current uprisings in Africa, they ignore the fact that the leader of the revolution in Zanzibar is a self-avowed Communist who was trained in Cuba for the part he played in the terror in Zanzibar and for seizing control of that island.

Dr. Robert Morris, writer, lecturer, and longtime authority on the Communist conspiracy, points out some pertinent facts in his newspaper column of January 22, 1964, "And Now Zanzibar."

Dr. Morris' column follows:

AND NOW ZANZIBAR

(By Robert Morris)

Field Marshal John Okello, new dictator of the "Peoples Republic of Zanzibar," has declared that he agrees with Khrushchev that "capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism should be buried." He is quoted as saying "the grave is ready for them." Obviously, another Soviet satellite is being set up in the strategic islands of Zanzibar and Pemba.

Zanzibar, the 103d nation of the United Nations, with a vote in the General Assembly equal to the United States, is made up of the former British Island of Zanzibar with an area of 640 square miles, and Pemba, to the north, with an insular area of 380 miles. The population is about 300,000. Zanzibar is only 23 miles from the east coast of Africa, most strategically located, flanking the heavily traversed water route between the Cape of Good Hope, the Mozambique Channel, and the Gulf of Aden that leads to the Red Sea and Suez Canal.

Zanzibar has properly been called the Cuba of Africa, and we can expect that the Communists will arm it in the fashion of Fidel Castro's bastion. Any geopolitician can look at a map of the world and see what Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are doing. The great Communist strides in Yemen, Somalia, and now Zanzibar, put in bold relief the program of conquest being executed. Not only are the strategic waterways and airstrips being taken over but Africa is being set for conquest from east to west so that the distances that proved such a hindrance for the Soviets in their Congo operation will be eliminated.

During the last fortnight, the drift of strategic Algeria and Ghana to Soviet hegemony became more pronounced. It must be remembered that the Soviet conquest of continental Africa calls for gradualism. The West is to be driven out, the nationalist movements that create the vacuum are to be infiltrated, but the fangs of conquest are to be concealed as much as possible. Hence, Khrushchev can work things so that the United States or the United Nations finances the transition. This is also true in such places as the French Congo, in Mali, and in Guinea.

Part of this picture, too, is the once beautiful and prosperous Belgian Congo, which has been reduced to shambles by U Thant and by Harlan Cleveland and Jessie McKnight, of the State Department. It was only a little more than a year ago that we heard from these international politicians that the revenue from Katanga had to be made available to the Central Government of the Congo to reduce the gaping deficit that the U.N.-ruled Léopoldville was creating. Under U Thant, the capital has been reduced to chaos.

Then the United Nations, the Organization that was brought into being to save "suceeding generations from the scourge of war," resorted to cruel and sanguinary war to force Katanga under the domination of the central government. Instead of adding the revenue of free-enterprise Katanga to Léopoldville, U Thant simply subjugated Katanga, added to the overall deficit and spread chaos where order had prevailed. Yet he continues to receive the plaudits of the civilized world.

It is, indeed, fortunate for Western civilization that Africans do not readily adapt themselves to communism. Under the euphemism of "decolonialization," U Thant, Khrushchev, and Harlan Cleveland have set in motion forces that are pushing strategic

Africa farther and farther from Western civilization.

Still, the confident men in the State Department either applaud their own African efforts or shrug away the sweeping gains of Khrushchev, who recently assured Mao Tse-tung: "We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

Accomplishments of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation, Founded in 1946 To Memorialize Brother of Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy: Senator Hill and Congressman Fogarty To Receive "Raphael" Awards by Kennedy Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, President Johnson will present the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation "Raphael" Awards for 1962 to five outstanding men who have made the most significant contributions and accomplishments in the field of mental health during the last year. Two of these distinguished gentlemen serve with us in the Congress, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; and Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Health, Education, and Welfare. The awards are presented by the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation, founded in 1946 by the Kennedy family as a memorial to the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy's brother, Navy Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., who was killed in an air attack on a German rocket installation during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Sunday Republican of January 26, 1964, printed a most interesting story on the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation and its accomplishments. I ask permission to have this article printed with my remarks in the RECORD:

KENNEDY FOUNDATION GIVES NEW HOPE TO MENTALLY ILL—PRESIDENT JOHNSON WILL PRESENT AWARDS FEBRUARY 5—THREE DOCTORS AND THREE PUBLIC SERVANTS TO BE HONORED BY MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

At a special training center for children of limited ability, a young girl of 10 sits at a piano in front of a most unusual piece of music—a sheet containing oversized notes coordinated to numbered keys on the piano. Within minutes, a smile of satisfaction spreads across the youngster's face as she hears the recognizable melody of a nursery rhyme being created by her fingers—and more important, by her mind.

LEARN NEW SKILLS

Throughout the Nation, at dozens of such training centers, many of the Nation's mentally retarded—the five million who were once considered hopelessly lost from society—are learning new skills, including the most vital one of belonging.

Children of 40 and 50 IQ's are learning their alphabet and for them, such difficult and satisfying techniques as how to dial and speak on a telephone. Youngsters of 60 and 70 IQ's are learning valuable trade skills that will enable them to earn a respectable living—the green thumb of a nurseryman, the creative art of mosaic tablemaking, bicycle repairing, electric wiring, the making of aluminum storm windows, poultry raising, truck farming, animal husbandry, and even such cerebral tasks as operating an automated banking machine. Learning the tasks others take for granted, such as how to wait on tables, house painting, and how to be a successful gas station attendant, open entire new horizons to the mentally handicapped.

The extent of the problem of mental retardation is best illustrated by two statistics: the retarded and their families add up to some 10 percent of the entire American population; and 126,000 mentally retarded infants are born each year—one every 5 minutes. Retardation strikes families randomly: 1 in every 4 cases is the result of known brain damage, whether caused by infectious childhood diseases, or infection of a mother during pregnancy. Authorities believe the remainder of the cases may be caused by psychological situations, neglect, and other causes that research is only beginning to uncover.

BIG STUMBLING BLOCK

A large stumbling block to any concerted public effort toward meeting the problem has been the widespread confusion of mental retardation with mental illness. Actually, the vast majority of the mentally retarded are not mentally ill. Their affliction is simply that they lag behind the normal in development of their mental and physical processes. While they cannot hope to keep up in the race with the rest of the normal population, placed in a situation they can cope with, they can live relatively normal lives while making useful contributions to society and retaining dignity as human beings.

Mental retardation has been with us ever since the Nation's founding, but only recently—as exemplified by the $631 million worth of legislation passed last year—have we began serious investigation and attack. One of the most significant postwar contributions was the creation, in 1946, of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation—a memorial to the late President's brother, Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., who was killed in an air attack on a German rocket installation. Since then, the foundation has distributed more than $16,500,000 to 14 new institutions for the care and treatment of mentally retarded children, including hospitals, residential facilities, day care centers, and various research projects at such leading institutions as Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Stanford, and the University of Wisconsin. In addition, it founded Kennedy Child Study Centers in New York, Washington, D.C., Santa Monica, Calif., Hanover, Mass., and Pallas Park near Chicago. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY is president of the foundation and Sargent Shriver and his wife (the former Eunice Kennedy) administer it.

PROGRESS ACCELERATING

In recent years, the progress has been accelerating, especially since October 1961 when the late John F. Kennedy appointed a Presidential Panel on Mental Retardation whose basic recommendations are now being implemented. These include research into the cause and care of retardation; preventive health measures for pregnant women and newborn infants, especially the susceptible premature; special educational programs in regular schools, and a new legal concept for the retarded which will safeguard their civil liberties.

In the field of medical research, which the Kennedy Foundation and the new Federal programs support, science has made breakthroughs in early diagnosis of the retaded, in surgery, diet, and other factors.

In education, great strides have been made for the retarded child who lives at home. Today, more than 3,500 public school districts have special classes for the retarded; however, the present staff of 20,000 special teachers is less than half of those needed. Some State governments have set up special departments concerned with rehabilitation of the retarded, but as of today, their vocational agencies help only a small fraction of those in need.

What has this effort meant for the retarded person and his family? It means that he is increasingly being able to take a productive part in society and that expert professional advice and assistance is becoming more available to his family.

Sargent Shriver has said that by the end of 1964:

At least 10 new major mental retardation centers will be located in the United States.

At least 20 great universities will have affiliated with them new mental and physical service centers for the retarded.

All 50 States will put into motion new plans for the comprehensive care of parents and children.

Everywhere there will be dramatic increases in the vocational training and physical rehabilitation of mental retardation victims.

To honor the outstanding men who have made the most significant accomplishments in the field, the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation established the "Raphael" Awards in 1962. These are beautiful crystal trophies carrying the image of the Seraph Raphael, the angel of healing, and substantial cash grants to help the awardees carry on their work.

GLASS AWARD

This year, on February 5, at a dinner to be held at the Americana Hotel in New York, President Lyndon B. Johnson will give the sculptured glass award to six outstanding men who have brought solution to the problem somewhat closer.

In accepting the invitation to preside at the awards dinner, Mr. Johnson commented on the "great pioneering" job done under President Kennedy's administration in developing for the first time in the Nation's history a national program to combat retardation.

"This program will in due course affect the lives and happiness of millions of Americans," President Johnson said. "I'm proud to be associated with this venture for all the American people."

The honored winners of the 1963 Kennedy Foundation Awards are:

Dr. Grover Francis Powers, professor emeritus of pediatrics at Yale University; Dr. Lionel S. Penrose, professor of eugenics at University College in London; Dr. Robert P. L. Lafon, professor of neuropsychiatry, University of Montpellier, France; U.S. Senator Lister Hill of Alabama; Bert T. Combs, former Governor of Kentucky; and U.S. Representative John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island.

The next decade will undoubtedly see numerous innovations that will offer hope—and more—to the retarded and their families. As President John F. Kennedy, who was especially interested in the subject, said: "Throughout the Nation, there is a greater understanding of the enormous waste of human resources and a greater appreciation of the benefits that can flow from better care and treatment of the retarded. All levels of State and Federal Government and many voluntary organizations are today making their common cause new hope for the mentally retarded."

Are the Liberal Economists Overlooking Something?—By Maurice H. Stans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include excerpts from a recent address by Mr. Maurice H. Stans.

Mr. Stans was a Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the Eisenhower administration and, as such, he served the American people in an able, statesmanlike manner.

In this speech Mr. Stans specifically points out that constant Federal deficits like ours bring only spiraling living costs to the people and Federal economic ruin in its wake. At the request of the Republican House budget-cutting task force, Mr. Stans came to Washington early in the last session and greatly assisted us in cutting the 1964 fiscal year budget $7½ billion.

His speech, which should be read by every American citizen, follows:

ARE THE LIBERAL ECONOMISTS OVERLOOKING SOMETHING?

(By Maurice H. Stans)

INTRODUCTION

The practice of challenging accepted beliefs permeates the doctrines of our own Government, too. What has survived for centuries or decades as a pillar of one of our institutions may be decried today by advocates of change as an outmoded antiquity or a myth carried over from a dark age.

EXPERIMENTATION IN NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

There is, in fact, under way in our seat of Government the biggest economic experiment the world has ever seen. It is important that each of us understand clearly what it is and what it seeks to achieve, and what risks are involved, for our personal fortunes and our national future are at stake on the outcome.

The national economic policy which is now so aggressively being tested is not designed as a temporary expedient to meet a momentary difficulty. It is an avowed way of life. If it succeeds, it will be a major turning point in the economics of government. Historians will record it as a complete reversal in direction in the science of political management. If it fails, it will be an equally historic event that may forever shatter the strength of our free democratic processes.

WHAT IS A LIBERAL ECONOMIST?

These wide-scale economic experiments are the brainchildren of a present generation of liberal economists holding considerable influence in Government affairs. They do not comprise a compact group, and their ideas are not uniform, but in general they endorse and support these propositions of governmental economics:

1. That a government can spend a nation into prosperity and thereby assure full employment of manpower and resources—a process of pump priming the economy through planned deficits;

2. That a limited amount of inflation is good for the country—or at least does no harm;

3. That national budgets can be based on compensatory fiscal policy—hopefully, a balancing of income and outgo over a cycle period;

4. That a tax cut, when a deficit exists, will stimulate the economy and thereby enhance total revenues—enough to achieve future surpluses;

5. That the national debt need never be reduced—and should, in fact, be increased as the national output grows.

Behind the principles is the confident belief that the future of a nation can be successfully assured only through closely designed economic blueprints, enforced by a system of central control valves that regulate the economic stream to accomplish desired social objectives. In short, Government should intervene more in economic planning and management. Only then can we gain a satisfactory annual rate of growth and a suitable level of living.

All this is usually described as the "new economics." To the advocates of these precepts, anything else is an incantation from the forgotten past, an ancient cliche, a worn-out tradition.

QUESTIONS THEY POSE

There are immediate questions that these propositions bring to mind:

Can a government deliberately cast out the long-accepted tenet that to be financially strong it must live within its income?

Will unbridled deficit spending really provide enough steam to iron out the wrinkles and gaps in employment of manpower and resources?

To what extent and for how long can annual deficits be suffered and national debt be accumulated without imposing severe inflation, with its consequent loss of values and of security, especially harsh for those on fixed incomes?

Can the budget really be balanced over a period of years if deliberate deficits are undertaken in some of them?

Can a small degree of inflation be encouraged without serious risk that it will get out of control?

As part of all this, how safe is it for a government to offer its people the attractive carrot of sizable tax reduction when there is already an existing substantial gap between revenues and expenses?

It does not suffice to answer these questions in platitudes or generalities, for the policies which they test are advanced with great fervor by their advocates.

THE CASE OF BRAZIL

José Pereira, down in São Paulo, Brazil, doesn't know much about the theories of economics. Except for the complaints he hears from his fellow workmen in the glass factory about the stupidity of the politicians way off in Brasilia, he doesn't understand much about his government's affairs. And he wouldn't recognize a fiscal policy at any distance.

But José knows some things about his own income and outgo. He knows that when his wife, María, goes to the market she needs almost twice as much money to fill her basket with groceries as she did a year ago. He knows that the medicines he needs when the doctor comes are 10 times as expensive as they were 5 years ago. He knows that the huaraches that cost him 20 cruzeiros in 1953 have gone to 70 cruzeiros in 1955 to 200 cruzeiros in 1960 to 1,100 cruzeiros today.

José has had increases in his pay during all this time but they never seem to catch up. What good is a 60-percent increase in pay when living costs have gone up 75 percent since the last one, less than a year ago? There is nothing left to save now, and the 2,000 cruzeiros he put away in the big bank for a nest egg 10 years ago is hardly worth going after. It will barely pay for one piano lesson now for little Marquita, and he and María had once had such hope that some day it would grow to buy a piano for her so her musical talents could be developed. To José, his meager pay must be spent quickly before it loses its value, saving is useless, and the future is dark and foreboding.

There are some things we could tell José that might make him understand his plight:

1. In the last 10 years the cruzeiro has dropped from 18½ to the dollar to 1,100 to the dollar. It has lost more than 98 percent of its buying power.

2. In the same period the Government of Brazil has consistently operated with large deficits, financed with borrowed and printed money. The national debt is astronomical and foreign obligations cannot be met even with large amounts of new aid.

3. Meanwhile, the cost of living has been spiraling. It increased 52 percent in 1959, 23 percent in 1960, 43 percent in 1961, 52 percent in 1962, and about 75 percent in the first 9 months of this year.

4. Brazil is virtually bankrupt. It can't pay its internal or external debts. Its gold reserves are gone. The savings of the people have been progressively wiped out. Strikes are rampant, general bank closings have occurred, unrest prevails, martial law is threatened, and communism is readying to take over.

The successive governments of Brazil have been following exactly the same new economic philosophy that is being urged on us today. It started when a President of the country called the traditional economics fuddy-duddy and set out to use deficits and inflation as a purposeful economic device. He promised 50 years of progress in 5. But in the words of one expert: "He achieved 40 years of inflation in 4. Today, the only thing behind the cruzeiro is the printing press. Fiscal irresponsibility is at the root of Brazil's present problems."

ELSEWHERE, TOO

Is this a typical case or is it unusual? Does this prove that our present fiscal policies will have the same consequences?

Perhaps not, standing alone. But there are other places we can look, too, for evidence. Bolivia and Chile have had equally large budget deficits and equally disastrous doses of inflation in the last decade or so. Argentina's peso has declined 80 percent in the last 2 years. Other Latin American countries have suffered in lesser degrees.

France has had an increase of 25 percent in the cost of living in the last 5 years. In Italy the cost of living will be up 10 percent or more this year. Denmark and Sweden are fighting inflationary spirals. Indonesia's money has fallen in value 50 percent in the past year. South Korea's inflation this year is about 40 percent. In India and the Philippines, a rising cost of living is bringing bitterness, frustration, and insecurity.

All around the world are nations struggling with the consequences of a course of deficit spending, increasing debt, inflation, and rising costs. Fiscal irresponsibility is taking its toll in country after country. In each of them the people of least wealth, like José Pereira in Brazil, are suffering the most. And the development of a strong middle class, on which nations must depend for political and economic stability, is prevented because the masses are unable to rise above the level of primitive poverty.

WHAT IS BEING OVERLOOKED?

Certainly in these experiences, and many others around the globe, there are grounds for doubting the optimistic and confident assurances of the liberal economists. The evidence is that they may well be overlooking or minimizing some imposing risks involved in their propositions.

Among the risks of the new economics are these:

1. The risk of failure—with a high penalty in accumulated debt, loss of value of our currency, disastrous inflation, and loss of our position of world leadership.

2. The risk of success—which might, paradoxically, bring about an epidemic of failures in weaker nations tempted by the sweet smell of our achievement, but unable to keep their programs in bounds; and might also tempt us to demand too much of a good thing.

3. The risk of degradation of the national purpose and spirit—which would be an inevitable accompaniment of a reversal of the deep-seated traditions of thrift, self-responsibility, freedom of choice, and driving ambition that built a great nation out of a mixture of insecure racial and ethnic strains.

4. The risk of loss of personal freedoms—a price which most surely would have to be paid for the all-powerful Central Government that the concomitant long-range economic planning and controls would bring and high spending would create.

In the absence of proof that the new theories are workable, these risks need careful evaluation. If upon analysis they loom too large, there is valid reason for a conclusion that the liberal economic philosophies should be abandoned without further trial because the odds, over time, are too heavily weighted against enduring success.

Internally, inflation would be a vicious tax on savings, insurance and pensions and would fall heaviest on those least able to pay. Externally, it is would destroy our capacity to hold down the Communist menace by bringing to a crisis the billions of foreign debts accumulated over the years.

The day of reckoning for our economic sins might not be immediate, but by all experience it would be inevitable. And if one of these years an unintended recession should be imposed on a planned deficit, the Government could easily go in the red $25 or $30 billion and the downfall would be accelerated.

But even if inflation were not such a hazard, there would still remain the moral question of the right of one generation to pile up debts to be paid by those that follow. We all work 1 week a year on the average now just to pay interest on the national debt. The debt itself increases year by year.

The total of all present debts, commitments and accrued liabilities of the Federal Government—such as would appear on the financial statement of a business—is now in excess of one trillion dollars. This is about $21,000 for every family of four in the country. Is it right to add to this each year for the sake of testing will-of-the-wisp experiments that include semantic absurdities like calling a present deficit "a downpayment on future surpluses"? Or is former President Eisenhower right in saying that "we are stealing from our grandchildren in order to satisfy our desires of today," and that it is "downright robbery for my Government to decide on policies that are merely certain to shorten progressively the monetary yardstick so that when I received my annuity or savings I would get dollarettes—worth only half or a fourth as much as today's dollars"?

Even deeper than its impact on today's living costs or tomorrow's debts and taxes is the potential danger of weakening the national ability to fight communism. Khrushchev has repeatedly said that he will "bury us." We may be playing right into his hands by extravagant fiscal policies that carry such overwhelming risks. How do we preserve the flexibility and reserve strength to meet emergencies if we constantly pursue a course of fiscal brinkmanship, of Government by credit card?

The chances for successful use of the new economics depend on finding a delicate thin line of overspending that nevertheless does not tip the balance to disaster. No country has ever found that formula.

THE RISK OF SUCCESS

Paradoxically, there would be a substantial risk to all human society if the new economics were to succeed in our country for a time.

Imagine all the other countries of the world, troubled by problems of meeting the demands of their peoples and of facing international competition, if they were suddenly to observe that the United States had found a formula for success and growth, and that the formula involved the very pleasant medicine of overspending the Government's resources. Few of them would need a gold-plated invitation to follow the example. Most are already drinking the same brew.

THE RISK OF DESTRUCTION OF OUR NATIONAL SPIRIT

The proponents of the new economics specifically deny the validity of the American traditions. They characterize our national beliefs in frugality, thrift, and self-responsibility as archaic, primitive, and Puritan. A balanced budget, they tell us, is an old cliche.

But these roots are deep in American history. Our country was founded by people who left troubled European societies in the hope of finding personal economic and political freedoms. They constructed here a system that was an almost-perfect blending of the instincts that motivate the human mind. It was a system that melded the inborn desires for equality of opportunity and for freedom with the inherent traits of competitiveness and acquisitiveness. The Constitution they provided for themselves achieved a near miracle in the diffusion of public power. It was a Federal structure that distinctly avoided a strong central government. This combination of free enterprise and political checks and balances grew until it outproduced every other form of society.

In their Government, the American people adopted a principle of frugality and sought to avoid the accumulation of debt. This was not a casual policy. It was expressed as the national will by every President from Washington to Eisenhower. And it was effectively carried out for 155 years after independence. The early debt of the Revolution was paid in full in 1834. The new debts incurred in later wars were progressively reduced.

Despite the massive expenditures of World War I, the national debt by 1930 had been brought down to a mere $16 billion. (It is only since then that we have defaulted in our direction; since 1930 we have paid our bills only six times and have added to the debt in the other 28 fiscal years.)

This tradition of thrift in Government was paralleled in the personal lives of our people. We were taught to be thrifty, to be self-reliant, to provide for our future. The savings of individuals became the capital that built the vast industrial complex that carried us safely through our wars and brought us from a primitive rural economy to the world's most advanced. Until the recent decades, we heard no economic "principles" in conflict with this kind of progress.

All of this we are now asked to abandon. All of this, we are told, is an illusion, a repetition of stale phrases, an inheritance of truism and stereotype, a hoary tradition to be buried. There is an easier way, and we have missed it all along.

But even today, after 30 years of the new economics, the American people haven't bought it. The proof is that in every straw poll they vote against accepting a tax cut unless the budget is balanced or spending is reduced. They suspect the proposition that deficit-building tax reductions will insure prosperity; if that were a magic formula, they wonder, why not eliminate all taxes and create an ever-prosperous Utopia? Of course, they want to see taxes lowered, but they know it would be conscienceless to do this merely by postponing the load to another generation.

The new economics dismisses all this as mythology. It asks the Nation to give up its moral legacy from the past. In offering the primrose path, it risks the destruction of the American spirit that built American greatness.

THE RISK OF PERSONAL FREEDOMS

Perhaps most serious of all, the liberal economists, right or wrong, are risking the loss of our personal freedoms in advancing their new policies. Of all the instruments which subvert personal freedoms, inflation is the worst. Millions of people today know this lesson. But almost as bad are the controls that would be necessary to hold us together if the new economics became the new order.

Where does the new economic planning stop? We know that it includes deliberate expenditures to stir up the economy, that it includes tax cuts regardless of deficits, that it includes artificially supported interest rates, that it includes a growing national debt, and that it includes some "acceptable" inflation. We know also that, sooner or later, it necessarily involves Government influence or control over prices or wages, over conditions of work, over investment and investment returns, over business policies and practices, over the flow of money and credit, and over economic education. And we know that the control mechanisms themselves, and the bureaucracies that grow to superintend the flow of spending, add up to ever-enlarging Central Government, with ever-enlarging power over the lives and actions of the people.

Certainly not all Government growth or Government control is to be condemned. The population explosion and an accelerating pace of existence require more agencies to protect rights and balance out opportunities. National defense in a threatening world requires manpower and money. These are proper Government functions.

But where is the limit on encroachment on personal freedoms? Is there any certain line of guarantee against undue usurpation of central power?

Unfortunately, the trend of the last 30 years of growing Government gives little comfort. A proliferation of laws, regulations, bureaucracies, and controls has removed more and more responsibility from our local communities to Washington, into the hands of the economic and social planners. And there is no indication that they are satisfied.

As more economic decisions are made in Washington more power will centralize in the politicians and bureaucrats. Plans, directives, and edicts will replace the composite daily judgments of millions of businessmen, shopkeepers, farmers, and laborers that traditionally have guided our endeavors. And more and more our free market system will slip away.

If our Nation were to worship at the altar of these new economic gods, it would risk the personal freedom of its people. That has been the price in every other nation that has succumbed to the blandishments of the easy economics.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the new economic theories have the attractions of promising much, providing a pleasant euphoria of irresponsibility, and postponing the reckoning to another generation. But the evidence of experience in our own country and elsewhere shows they have little chance of success.

The case for the "new economics" has never been proved. It rests on a sandy foundation that has never, in history, supported a nation's long-term progress. It has failed under every test. It is failing right now in Brazil and in many other countries.

Yes, the liberal economists are overlooking some things in advocating this course. They are overlooking the likely risks of failure and its disastrous consequences. They are overlooking the intoxicating pitfalls of temporary success. They are overlooking the deep-seated beliefs of the American people in fiscal integrity, both in government and in their personal affairs, and the loss of na-

tional character that will ensue if these beliefs are brainwashed. More importantly, they are overlooking the danger that by pursuing their course they may build over us a dictatorship of economic planners and of central bureaucratic government, destroy our freedoms, and make us easy victims of communism.

Well, what's the alternative? It's not so glamorous, perhaps, but it's built for endurance, for security, for strength. It is a return to first beliefs and first principles—a recognition that the privilege of being a free people involves assuming responsibilities. It is disciplined government which doesn't consider thrift a discredited word. It is government that can recognize danger signs and avoid financial brinkwalking.

It is Government that won't get in the way of sound economic growth, but will achieve it by encouraging the free market system. It is Government that believes, like Lincoln, that it should do for the people only those things that they can't do as well for themselves, not in the centralization of all problems in Washington. It is Government that believes in sound money, that debts must be paid, that the budget should be balanced, that the Public Treasury is a trust, that rate of material growth is less important than sustained strength and character.

There is still time for the American people to choose one way or another. And in that choice this is important to remember: While economic soundness by itself doesn't guarantee a nation greatness, no nation has ever been great without it.

Khrushchev has made a promise to this generation. He expects us to fail and go down, not on the battlefield but through our own weaknesses. We who believe in the American system certainly cannot ignore that prediction. But we can—and must—reaffirm our own values and find the discipline, the dedication, and the determination that free men have always had. Then and only then will we meet our responsibilities as a free people. Then and only then will we achieve our potential for national growth. Then and only then will we marshal our full resources to meet the Soviet challenge. Then and only then will we prove to Khrushchev that, when all is counted, our system is the best.

Minnesota Swine Producers Object to Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the price-depressing effects of a continuing increase in the levels of meat imports have been the concern of many of us during the past year, and there has been much talk of the competition from the imports of beef and beef products. As is true with many aspects of our agricultural economy, however, policies which effect one sector have their ramifications in other areas, and now I have received word of the concern in the swine industry over the high levels of imports of meat and meat products.

I ask that a letter I have received from Mr. Lyle Lamphere, chairman of the Resolutions Committee of the Minnesota Swine Producers' Association, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. Mr. Lamphere's letter transmits a resolution adopted at the Swine Producers' Association annual meeting asking for restrictions on the imports of red meat and petitioning that no further concessions on livestock and livestock products be granted by our trade negotiators at the Geneva trade talks:

MINNESOTA SWINE PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
January 22, 1964.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: At the annual meeting of the Minnesota Swine Producers' Association held in Peters Hall Auditorium at the University of Minnesota, Thursday, January 16, and attended by approximately 300 of the leading commercial and purebred swine producers of the State, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Livestock constitutes the largest and most important segment of the agricultural economy of the United States. Current high levels of imports of beef and lamb, at a time when our domestic production of red meat is at an alltime high and livestock producers are experiencing severe financial losses on their operations, and also at a time when cold storage stocks of beef and pork are excessive, are exerting an extremely adverse economic impact on our domestic red meat industry.

"Therefore, we respectfully petition the representatives of our Nation at the Geneva trade talks that no further tariff concessions be granted on livestock, meat, and other livestock products.

"Further, we firmly believe that the Congress of the United States should enact legislation which would impose quotas, based on moving 5-year averages of red meat imports, and after such quotas are exceeded, tariffs on such imports should be substantially increased."

We respectfully call this matter to your attention and we will greatly appreciate your support to bring some protection to a livestock industry that has suffered tremendously from ever-increasing competition from the importation of foreign meats.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE LAMPHERE,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

President Johnson's Demand for Action in State of Union Address Praised in Editorial by Boston Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union address to Congress has received the praise and applause of many large newspapers in the United States. One of these favorable editorials was published by the Boston Globe on January 9, 1964, and signed by the famous editorialist, Uncle Dudley. Under permission granted, I include the editorial, entitled "Demand for Action," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEMAND FOR ACTION

President Johnson's mother was not only good at elocution; her advice on it was much sought by the children of Johnson City. Had she been able to hear her son deliver his first state of the Union address Wednesday, she would have applauded it as much as Congress did.

This address, one of the briefest in years, was not only eloquent; it reinforced the impressions of energy, determination, and political skill that have marked the President's course since he assumed office. He has focused national attention on the two gravest problems besetting our otherwise thriving country today: The poverty that cripples the lives of more than 20 percent of the American people, and the evil of race discrimination which deprives millions of citizens of their economic, political, and constitutional birthright.

This is an election year, and President Johnson has applied polite but maximum pressure to the most laggard Federal Legislature in recent memory. That point came with a sharp reminder that its tasks can be completed "before summer" if it can find the will.

His surprise announcement that the budget for 1965 will be set at but $97.9 billion, or $500 million below the figure for the current fiscal year, should help weaken the obstructionists in both parties. But the assignment given Capitol Hill nevertheless remains formidable.

By setting February 1 as the deadline for passage of the $11 billion tax cut, President Johnson gives this measure the highest priority. It also occupies a central role in his sweeping plans for revitalization of the national economy.

Though the tax cut bill was stripped by the House of the long overdue reforms urged originally by the late President Kennedy, and has been properly stigmatized as "a rich man's tax bill," President Johnson obviously views it as the best that can be had now.

The President's wide-ranging program for reducing poverty, like most other items, reflects the pattern sketched by his predecessor. Mr. Johnson's commitment to end racial discrimination is stronger than any he has hitherto made.

The vigorous approach was equally present in the President's discussion of the administration's foreign policies, and in his handling of the problem of national defense. Coupled with an unqualified pledge to maintain adequate security, was a challenge to the Soviet Union to assist in curbing the nuclear peril by reducing the production of nuclear materials used for war and by preparing for a matching reduction of armament at the forthcoming Geneva conference.

In homekeeping matters and this Nation's interests abroad, this was a strong, constructive, and hopeful message. Perhaps not without coincidence, it also spelled out a campaign platform.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Columnist Says Goldwater's Policy Could Save the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in many years there is a strong and refreshing voice in the land calling attention to America's greatness and challenging our people to meet the prob-

lems of the sixties in the same indomitable spirit which has set the American character apart through the last 300 years. The voice is the voice of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. His words are stirring words, calling Americans to action.

Senator GOLDWATER is reminding us of our pride as individuals, of the achievements we have made as a nation. He is saying things that have been left unsaid and the people are responding in great numbers.

The distinguished columnist, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, recently wrote of BARRY GOLDWATER's contribution to history in his current campaign and I take pleasure in including Mr. Mowrer's column as a part of these remarks:

HAILS GOLDWATER'S POLICY FOR THE NATION

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has, in my judgment, carved out a distinguished place for himself in history, not as a conservative but as an American. The chances of his becoming President of the United States are, it seems to me, only fair. He may not even be nominated as the Republican candidate. But if the United States does not succumb to the creeping pacifism that has resulted in steady retreat since 1944, GOLDWATER may well be honored as the public figure who produced the saving foreign policy.

This can be called a beyond containment or in the Senator's words, a "can win" policy. Challenged by Life magazine to spell out how he would achieve victory over advancing communism, GOLDWATER came right back with a detailed plan. It is not a conservative plan. It should appeal to labor leaders like George Meany, Marx Lewis and Arthur McDowell and to a liberal Marxist like Sidney Hook just as much as to the members of the American Security Council.

Moreover, it is a foreign policy on which the Republican Party might unite to fight the next election. For it is essenitally the policy of liberation upon which General Eisenhower rode to the Presidency in 1952, and then abandoned successively in Korea, Hungary, and Cuba. Unless I am very much mistaken, the Goldwater formulation will appeal to a great many stiffer-spined Democrats, sick of the current policy of whimper, yield, and nationalize.

In his Life article, Senator GOLDWATER starts at the beginning, a denial of the pacifist argument that we must choose between nuclear war and peace. Since the United States has been involved since 1945 (or, if you like, since November 1917) in a conflict which is neither major war nor peace, and which communism has been winning, it is easy to explode the pacifist myth.

There is no more reason why our effort to win should spark a nuclear war than that of Senator GOLDWATER outlines in detail how this can be done.

Not by easing the arms race, which makes it easier for Communists to start new little wars of "liberation."

Not by bailing out bankrupt Communist regimes since they will start to retreat only when they must.

No wheat to ease Russia's internal difficulties. Or Poland's. Or Yugoslavia's.

No more silly neutralizations of allies, even when weak.

No promise of immunity to Communists. They should never be told how far we are prepared to go to stop them.

Above all no new isolationism or "Fortress America." Senator GOLDWATER is ready to go much further than the Kennedy or Johnson administrations in granting to our NATO allies "full participation in the planning and deployment of the most modern weapons systems, including the appropriate nuclear weapons" and in the formulation of common political and economic policies against communism. He would pull out of the U.N. only if the new irresponsible countries insist on letting Red China in.

And behind it all would be the firm determination to make no peace with our self-declared enemies until we have won the right of self-determination for the peoples under Communist oppression "wherever that exists."

Space limitations preclude presentation of further details.

For in my mind, the Senator has offered a program which would indeed "get our country moving again," not backward, as it has been going over most of the last 20 years, but forward to essential victory.

Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a clear and present foreign policy problem confronts our Nation as a result of the recent unrest in Panama, both in and out of the Canal Zone.

The crisis has prompted a profusion of suggestions on how best the United States should proceed to deal with the problem. At the extremes, we are urged to boldly put down any resistance to our rights or supinely yield to every petty Panamian grievance, be it real or imagined. Hopefully, the correct course of further action lies somewhere between these proposals.

Among the best analyses of the situation it has been my opportunity to examine is an editorial expression by the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle. Editor Clifford E. Carpenter has drawn on his vast reservoir of first-hand knowledge and experience of Panama and other Latin American countries and provided the newspaper's readers with a careful critique of Panama, past and present.

Mr. Carpenter's background of extensive travel through Central and South America and his wealth of personal contact with the peoples of these Latin American nations amply qualify him to comment on the matter and make such comment especially valuable.

I take pleasure in sharing his editorial from the Democrat and Chronicle of Sunday, January 26, with my colleagues in the House.

The editorial follows:

LET'S ADOPT A PANAMA POSTURE BASED ON HONESTY AND FACTS

The truth about Panama is somewhere between the extremes of the oratory of the jingoists who say America is 101 percent right, and the wailing of the soft-hearted and soft-headed among us who say we are guilty of our own brand of imperialism.

This situation is not nearly as complicated as some of the overnight experts say it is.

Let us back track, and try to salvage some truths from the mess. These truths help to lead to the conclusion that President Johnson is right in offering to sit down to a "full and frank" review of the problem with Panamanians, yet make no concessions whatsoever at this time to any Panamanian demands.

It was a bone-headed stunt by well-meaning American students in the Canal Zone—a form of nationalism—that triggered the violence. They resented a 1963 agreement that the United States and Panamanian flags should be flown side by side inside the zone, and hoisted Old Glory only. Panamanian students exploded, Castro-trained Communist agents moved in quickly to keep the trouble boiling, and we were in it up to our necks.

Also it should be conceded that there should be negotiations (as there have been in the past) giving Panamanians more of the "take" from canal revenue when this is possible.

And perhaps in the long run, when the world is in a more peaceful orbit, some form of international control of the canal may be a serious discussion point.

Having made those acknowledgements, let us look at some grim facts * * * and facts they are.

The United States has twice revised the treaty of 1903 in Panama's favor. The annual payments to Panama have moved upward from the original $250,000 to $1,930,000. Added to the latter figure, we have ceded to Panama property worth between $20 and $30 millions.

Also in fiscal 1962 and 1963, to name but the last 2 years, the U.S. assistance program to Panama amounted to upward of $20 millions in technical cooperation, AID loans, and economic and social development programs.

In 1960 President Eisenhower approved a nine-point program to work out improvements in the Canal Zone, a project later endorsed by President Kennedy. Panama couldn't support her trade deficit without the canal. But it is one of the best known open secrets of the Western Hemisphere that Panamanians have neglected their mineral resources and their agriculture. A third of the population of 1.1 million lives in the cities of Panama and Colon, next to the canal.

The often-miserable masses of Panama represent a condition for which the United States takes the rap unfairly. Behind the scenes is the same condition that exists in so many Latin American countries—a little group of extremely wealthy and powerful Panamanians (guessed at no more than 50 families) who for practical purposes run the country like a feudal fief.

They won't believe that eventually Communists will smash them if they don't adopt enlightened practices; they ignore any except the least of the American proddings for reform; they make the United States the whipping boy for their own ambitions; and they have, for years, nourished unrest by repeating the cry (which they acknowledge privately is unsound) "We are entitled to enough from the canal to give everybody a better standard of living * * * we want more of what is ours."

As an oligarchy running the country, these Panamanians bottle up needed legislation.

The editor of this newspaper while in Panama heard the chief of a task force of geologists from an American university say what has been said before and since. Panama has untapped wealth in mineral resources, and no effort is made to reach it.

America would do well to cease both its angry roaring and its soft-headed weeping and go along with President Johnson. Openly negotiate any and all differences. Concede nothing until after negotiations. This is the course of pride and honesty, not self-abnegation. Uncle Sam should be publicly sorry for what he does that is wrong; and publicly unflinchingly strong when he knows he is right.

Memorial Service for the Late President, John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two eulogies for our late President John F. Kennedy that were delivered and printed in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania shortly after the tragic passing of our President.

The November 28 issue of the Greek Catholic Union Messenger, published in Homestead, Pa., was dedicated to President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The editor, Michael Roman, was the author of the eulogy which I believe expresses fully the innermost feelings of the Greek Catholic community and their intent to carry forward the ideals of our late President.

At the memorial services held at St. John's Byzantine Catholic Cathedral in Munhall, Pa., on November 25, the Very Reverend Monsignor Basil N. Smochko, S.T.D., delivered a noteworthy review of John Kennedy's life and his contribution—during his short stay in this world—to all of mankind regardless of color, of creed, of nationality. His words show the great respect and great love the people of the Byzantine Catholic community have for John Kennedy—and for the Office of the Presidency by their prayers for the new President which are offered in sincerity and high esteem.

MAY ALMIGHTY GOD GRANT PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ETERNAL REST AND BLISSFUL REPOSE

(Text of eulogy delivered on November 25, 1963, by Very Rev. Monsignor Basil N. Smochko, STD, vicar general of Pittsburgh diocese.)

My dear friends in Christ, at this hour of national grief over the tragic death of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it is befitting to draw inspiration from the words of our Blessed Savior, when He said, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven."

John F. Kennedy, the first Catholic President of the United States of America, will go down in history as the peacemaker of humanity. In the acceptance and fulfillment of his office as President, he molded his noble ideals of faith and devotion to the responsibility in the realization of openness of heart to all men and faced the ills of the world with courage and conviction.

We have gathered together today in this cathedral church to pay homage to and to offer our prayers for one who was a great American and world leader, the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. And President in a certain sense embodies these very United States of America and all its citizens within himself and any harmful blow to that President cannot help but affect each and every American as well; and because of the position of this country as the leader of the free nations throughout the world, such a tragic blow cannot help but have its effect on the entire world as well. This is precisely what we have experienced during the past 4 days. President Kennedy's untimely and meaningless assassination has left the United States and the rest of the world in a state of shock and confusion. So many Americans have commented: "I just can't believe it." How can America—so great, rich, wonderful, the envy of civilization—still have within itself a streak of instability and violence capable of so brutal an action? Our hearts today bleed with sorrow and compassion for Mrs. Kennedy, her children and the entire Kennedy family.

Though not all of us may have agreed with all of his political proposals or ventures, nevertheless, we respected and admired our late President for many reasons, among them his keen intelligence, his remarkable eloquence, and his wit. But of all of President Kennedy's many qualities, there were three in particular which enabled him to win the hearts of people the world over. The first of these was his basic openness toward people, which indicated not merely a political politeness but rather a true sincerity. This openness toward others was not limited to national and world leaders nor to socialites, but was unselfishly given to the common man, woman, and child as well. He was a personable President and he will long be remembered for this trait.

Secondly, President Kennedy's life can indeed be called a profile in courage. His heroic experiences as a naval officer, the calmness he displayed through dangerous operations in hospitals, and the manner in which he faced the important issues of his various political offices, all indicated a courage second to none. In the end, he sacrificed himself for the freedom upon which this country was founded. He was as much a martyr to his country as any soldier on the field of battle.

And finally, President Kennedy was a man dedicated to the service of God, his country, and his family. His dedication was clearly exemplified in all of his efforts as Representative, Senator, and President. His untiring zeal for justice, freedom, and peace were completely in accord with what our late and beloved Holy Father, Pope John XXIII, presented in his two social encyclical letters, entitled "Mother and Teacher" (Mater et Magistra) and "Peace on Earth" (Pacem in Terris). The year 1963 will be remembered in history for the loss of two great men, who, although they have left this world physically, their deeds shine as guiding stars for present and future generations—our Holy Father of blessed memory, Pope John XXIII, the Pope of goodness, and John F. Kennedy, the President of peace, who have given to the young and old a refreshing purposeness of life and have brought joy and dedication to the lives of men in this atomic and space age.

The similarity of the ideals of these two great men in history is evident from a comment of President Kennedy on Pope John's encyclical "Pacem in Terris," of which he said, "This document clearly shows that on the basis of one great faith and its traditions there can be developed a council on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic, I am proud of it, and as an American, I have learned from it."

This example of dedication the tomb cannot hide, this spirit of sacrifice the tomb cannot hold and this spirit of courageous responsibility, which our late President instilled in our age, the death of the body cannot suffocate. May we all join with our gloriously reigning holy father, Pope Paul VI, who said, "We pray God that the sacrifice of John F. Kennedy may assist the cause promoted and defended by him for the liberty of all peoples and peace in the world."

When a loved one dies, we can turn in only one direction to receive the consolation which we seek. That direction is heavenward, in the Person of our Heavenly Father. Only faith and trust in our Personal, Loving, and Merciful Father can soothe our sorrow and give us the stability to go on. In the words of our Divine Saviour: "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, even if he die, shall live; and whoever lives and believes in me, shall never die." (John 11:25-26.) And the book of the Apocalypse tells us that in Heaven, "God will wipe away every tear from their eyes. And death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain anymore, for the former things have passed away." Apocalypse 21:4.) May Almighty God grant to President Kennedy eternal rest and peace.

But, my dear friends in Christ, our present sorrow cannot allow us to stop; we must push on. Our faith and trust that Almighty God continue to bless and guide this Nation must be combined with our best efforts as responsible citizens. As Pope Paul VI remarked just 2 days ago: "We deplore with all our heart this event. We express the hope that the death of this great statesman does not bring harm to the American people but reinforces its moral and civil sense and strengthens its sentiments of nobility and concord." America needs strong leadership backed by a strong people. Indeed, we must place the welfare of our Nation above our position and personal considerations so that we may give our loyal support to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, as he undertakes the tremendous burdens of the White House. May God always bless him and guide him.

In conclusion in behalf of our beloved Bishop Nicholas, the priests, religious, seminarians, and faithful of our Eparchy of Pittsburgh, we express to Mrs. John Kennedy and the bereaved family of the President, our heartfelt sympathy and assure them of our prayers for the repose of his soul. May Almighty God accept the soul of this great peacemaker into His Heavenly Kingdom and eternal joy.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE MARTYRED PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Like all loyal Americans, we of the Greek Catholic Union were deeply saddened by the assassination of our beloved President, the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy of happy memory.

We were saddened, stunned, and perplexed because our young and vibrant leader was stricken down in his prime, slain by a cowardly assassin who without warning swooped down upon his prey.

Yes, a courageous hero who miraculously escaped death in World War II, met an untimely demise while receiving the plaudits of his fellow countrymen.

It was hard to believe, to comprehend, but it did happen and he has gone to his eternal reward.

But his death will not be in vain if we shall take lessons from his exemplary life as a courageous leader, a loyal American, a loyal member of his church, a devoted husband, father, and son.

It will not be in vain if we, too, learn to bear our burdens and tragedies in such majestic fashion as did his faithful wife in these recent trying days.

Likewise, his death will not be in vain if we follow in the footsteps of the leaders of our Nation and of the world who—despite their religious and political beliefs—came to pay final and deserving tribute to a martyred President.

On this Thanksgiving Day we should also express our gratitude to God for allowing us the privilege, even though it was brief, of having John Fitzgerald Kennedy as our President. We should also dedicate ourselves to labor unceasingly—as he did—for a stronger and better America and for a peaceful world.

It is our fervent belief that we can show no better final tribute than this.

May Almighty God comfort the bereaved and may He grant eternal rest and blissful repose to our departed President.

"Mr. Sam" Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I was privileged to read the remarks of the Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Endicott Peabody, delivered to the annual dinner of the Touchdown Club of Washington in January.

Governor Peabody made a most eloquent statement in recollection of the man for whom he accepted the great "Mr. Sam" award of the club. That man was our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and I believe it fitting that the memories which Governor Peabody recalled should be printed in the RECORD so that they may be available to all.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF GOV. ENDICOTT PEABODY, ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER OF THE TOUCHDOWN CLUB OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1964

It is with the most profound sense of humility and gratitude that I accept this trophy—the "Mr. Sam" award which the Touchdown Club bestows posthumously on our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Certainly there has never been, nor ever will be, a moment in my life so filled with sadness and pride as when this trophy rested in my hands a few minutes ago.

It was a moment filled with sadness because it recalled the great loss we have suffered. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a courageous leader whom we respected. He was a vigorous sportsman whom we admired. He was a friend whom we loved, and we would have wished him to be with us tonight.

But this was also a moment filled with pride—the pride that wells up in your throat when a teammate wins a laurel well-deserved.

I will take this trophy back to Massachusetts, back to the State he loved, the State of which he said—on the eve of his inauguration scarcely 3 years ago: "For 43 years * * * whether I was in London, Washington, the South Pacific or elsewhere * * * this has been my home; and, God willing, wherever I serve, this shall remain my home."

I am here, then, tonight to take the "Mr. Sam" award home for John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It was just a little over two decades ago—in 1941—that I took home another trophy from the Touchdown Club banquet. It was the Knute Rockne Memorial Trophy and it was awarded to me, a lineman on the Harvard team. I believe I was the third recipient of this award.

I remember I flew down especially for the dinner and to accept the award. What a proud night it was. Mr. Sam, the Speaker of the House, and JOE MARTIN, minority leader, were present, along with many football greats. On the plane back to Boston, I held the trophy on my lap, I recall, and a man in the seat next to me started a conversation about football, and about sports in general. He complimented me on achieving excellence in athletic prowess and emphasized the necessity of a strong body to support a vigorous mind in a democratic society.

He told me that he had had sons at Harvard and that he had always brought them up to participate in athletics of all kinds.

Gentlemen, by historic coincidence, this man in the next seat that night in 1941 was Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy.

Now, I have come to Washington again, to the Touchdown Club dinner—and tomorrow I will take this trophy back to Massachusetts, where it will rest in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Library.

There, among all the awards and honors bestowed on this great statesman during a full lifetime, the "Mr. Sam" award will rest as a symbol of something we all admired so much in John Fitzgerald Kennedy—his enthusiastic love of sports, his dedication to the vigorous life, his unflagging interest in the health and fitness of all his fellow citizens, but, most particularly, of the youth.

Just a few weeks before his inauguration, before he ascended to what he called "that high and lonely office," our late, beloved President wrote an article for a national magazine, an article in which he expressed in clear and challenging terms a new standard for fitness in America.

Tonight, I would like to read part of this article. There is much in it to give us thought as we seek to pay tribute to him. He wrote, in part:

"The physical vigor of our citizens is one of America's most precious resources. If we waste and neglect this resource, if we allow it to dwindle and grow soft, then we will destroy much of our ability to meet the great and vital challenges which confront our people. We will be unable to realize our full potential as a nation."

"Physical fitness," he wrote, "is not only one of the most important keys to a healthy body. It is the basis of dynamic and creative intellectual activity.

"The relationship between the soundness of the body and the activities of the mind is subtle and complex. Much is not yet understood. But we do know what the Greeks knew: that intelligence and skill can only function at the peak of their capacity when the body is healthy and strong: that hardy spirits and tough minds usually inhabit strong bodies.

"In this sense," the young President-elect states, "physical fitness is the basis of all the activities of our society."

But John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not let us sink into complacent agreement while we waddled from the dinner table to the television. He challenged us to assume responsibility for the future of our society by making us face up to our responsibility for our own physical fitness.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy—like all men who love the sea—had a long view of the horizon. There is in his words a sharp sense of the future as he writes:

"We do not live in a regimented society where men are forced to live their lives in the interests of the state. We are, all of us, as free to direct the activities of our bodies as we are to pursue the objects of our thought.

"But if we are to retain this freedom, for ourselves and for generations yet to come, then we must be willing to work for the physical toughness on which the courage and intelligence and skill of man so largely depend.

"All of us must consider our own responsibilities for the physical vigor of our children and of the young men and women of our community.

"We do not want our children to become a generation of spectators. Rather, we want each of them to be a participant in the vigorous life."

Tonight, the Touchdown Club has honored the man who, of all men of our times, was truly and completely "a participant in the vigorous life."

For this we praise him, for this we give him the victor's greenest laurel. For this, above all, we love him for the example he has set.

We best honor his memory if we strive as a nation to follow this example.

Unemployment High but Jobs Go Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, many people concerned with the problem of unemployment, myself included, have been impressed with the job demands which appear every day in every newspaper in the country. The curious aspect of unemployment is that the demand for jobs really exceeds the supply. The problem, therefore, is not one of quantity but of quality: the unemployed simply do not have the necessary skills to meet the needs of employers.

As our economy becomes more complex, the nature of jobs changes, the functions of workers become more diversified, old skills become outmoded and new skills are required to perform new tasks. Retraining of workers is one remedy and in recognition of this Congress passed the 1962 Federal Manpower Development and Training Act. In the January 6, 1964, issue of the New York Times there appeared a report on a significant attempt by business, labor, State, and Federal Governments to upgrade the skill of the labor force. Unemployed persons who are willing to learn needed trades are being taught by qualified instructors, under the Training Act, so that they may be equipped to perform needed services.

Retraining of the unemployed makes both economic and humanitarian good sense. By reducing the number of unemployed people we not only increase the gross national product and decrease the cost of public welfare expenses, but we also restore to the individual his inherent human dignity and pride in performing socially valuable functions which contribute to the common good.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1964]

TRAINING ACT AIDS STATE UNSKILLED—COURSES SUBSIDIZED BY UNITED STATES WON JOBS FOR 3,000

(By Natalie Jaffe)

Twenty unskilled, unemployed young men will start learning the house-painting trade today as the result of a practical new partnership between business and the State and Federal Governments.

The first year of that partnership, dating from the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, brought 17 free training courses to about 5,000 New Yorkers, most of them in the city, and jobs to nearly 3,000.

The development of today's course was typical. Painters discovered they needed helpers. The State division of employment, to whom the painters had applied for helpers, administers the $9 million appropriated under the Training Act for the State last year. Within weeks, the new course was organized to reduce further the number of unskilled unemployed, as well as to fill the painters' vacancies.

Ben Cooper, the area director of the program, said courses were organized only for trades where there is a demonstrated need for trained workers. The purpose, he said,

is to upgrade the skills of those who are displaced by automation or consolidation, and to train those with no skills at all.

HOW IT WORKS

For example, elevator operators and porters, displaced by large cleaning companies, would be qualified for the 20-week course in maintenance mechanics.

The unskilled might take the 28-week stenographers' course, the 40-week program for hospital orderlies or the meatcutters' course. The latter was organized in cooperation with the union in Brooklyn, Queens and Nassau.

If a trainee does not receive unemployment insurance, he is paid $38 a week as head of a household. Family heads under 21 years of age, if trained as a group, receive $19 a week. The painter trainees are all 18 to 21.

The painter training consists of 30 hours of shop and class work a week for 5 weeks. Five successive sections with 20 trainees in each class will meet at the board of education's adult training center, 45 Rivington Street, where most of the other courses are given.

The trainees enrolled in the new course are mainly high school dropouts with a history of short-term work on unskilled jobs, Mr. Cooper said. Those interested in later sections of the course may apply at one of the State's employment offices.

Trainees are referred to the employment offices by the Youth Employment Service, Mobilization for Youth, the new Job Orientation in the Neighborhoods and religious and community agencies.

The city department of labor announced last month that it had requested funds for a similar program under the Training Act. Mr. Cooper said the State expected a larger appropriation for its program next year.

Happy Birthday, Ben Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to call the Members' attention to an editorial which recently appeared in the Rockford, Ill., newspaper, the Rockford Morning Star.

This editorial serves to remind us of the birth date of one of the greatest American statesmen, Benjamin Franklin, a man who devoted his life to the creation and development of this great Nation.

The editorial follows:

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star]

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, BEN FRANKLIN

Today is Benjamin Franklin's birthday.

Happy birthday, Ben.

We're sorry that you were accorded such sorry treatment during the past few months, but we imagine that you would have viewed the entire half-dollar affair with wry amusement.

Though your image no longer will appear on the U.S. 50-cent piece, millions of Americans will forever respect your memory.

Your accomplishments can never be erased from history. Politicians, bowing under extreme pressures, may have succeeded in rubbing your likeness from our 50-cent pieces, but no one in any high place in government can blot out the role you played in the founding of this Nation.

Historians have called you one of the first great Americans. Many of them have termed you the principal founder of the U.S. Government as we know it today.

Your name has ever been synonymous with American liberty. You devoted your lifetime to the service of a fledging Nation ready to spread its wings.

It was your statesmanship that persuaded England to repeal its Stamp Act on the American Colonies. You persuaded France to help the United States in its fight for independence.

You were a member of the committee that drafted the Declaration of Independence and you were one of its signers. Your signature also appears on the Constitution of the United States.

Your last public act was to affix your signature to a memorial to the State legislature as president of the Pennsylvania society for the abolition of Negro slavery.

We're sure that there are a number of Members of the U.S. Senate and House who today rue their hasty action in bumping your likeness off the American half dollar.

We're equally sure that if you were around today you would brush off belated apologies.

You laid no claims to fame and sought no public accolade. Your chief interest was in forming a government on the principles of democracy.

Yours was a guiding force in the achievement of that goal.

Happy birthday, Ben. You were one of the greatest of all great Americans. Every citizen owes you a debt of gratitude. You will never be forgotten.

An Insurance Executive Looks at Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to a statement by Michael H. Levy, president of the Standard Security Life Insurance Co. of New York in favor of the administration's medicare proposal. Mr. Levy, as a member of the New York business community, states that:

There are certain problems which are either too complex or too great for solution by anyone or anything other than the representative of all of the people—the Federal Government. That is why I am in favor of medicare under social security.

I believe that Mr. Levy's statement should be read by all of us.

The statement follows:

WHY I, AS AN INSURANCE MAN, AM IN FAVOR OF MEDICARE

(Statement by Michael H. Levy, president, Standard Security Life Insurance Co. of New York at Mayor Wagner's public hearing on medicare, January 18, 1964)

Mayor Wagner and all of you who, like myself, are interested in one of the major problems of senior citizens, the life and health insurance industry has been particularly vocal in its opposition to what is popularly known as medicare. By medicare, I am referring to the financing of hospital care within the framework of the old-age survivors and disability insurance system.

I am one of a very minute group of insurance company presidents supporting the social security medicare approach. I do so for two reasons.

First, the humanitarian approach and, second, the business approach.

The problem with which we are confronted is a problem of humanity and not of profits. The primary consideration of everyone in this situation must be the providing of minimal basic hospital care to the senior citizens whose resources are inadequate. If this is the case, we have alternatives.

One is to provide protection through the private insurance industry. The other is to provide it through the Federal or State Governments. Although many of the great life and casualty companies of America have demonstrated a willingness to create policies specifically designed for the over-65 group, approximately 8 million in that group remain uninsured by private companies as of now. Evidently the few dollars of monthly premium required are more than those people can afford.

Kerr-Mills has provided an unsatisfactory solution to the problem because only four States (Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota) have comprehensive programs. The benefits in the other 24 States and the 4 other jurisdictions where the program operates has been poignantly pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. PAT MCNAMARA, as being "either nominal, inadequate, or nonexistent."

If, because of lack of funds, people cannot afford to buy from the private companies, if the medical assistance to the aging program has proven inadequate or inequitable, then we must turn to the Federal Government through a medicare program within the framework of the old-age survivors and disability insurance system—social security.

I do not agree with my confreres in the industry or with the highly respected members of the medical profession who claim that medicare under social security would either sign the death knell for private enterprise in the United States or affect either the economy or well-being of the insurance industry, the medical profession, or the insurance-buying public. To the contrary, I believe that, as with the original social security concept for retirement, the providing of basic hospital care financed under a social security system of medicare would enable the insurance industry to create supplemental coverages for those who could afford such, would assure hospitals of nonindigent patients and guarantee to physicians that their patients would be able to pay a hospital bill.

I have heard some of my honorable colleagues state that medicare under social security would be a camel with his nose under the tent for Federal domination of the insurance industry. Realistically, I think that the camel put his head and neck under the tent years ago and, frankly, I am not afraid of that hobgoblin. Insofar as the medical profession's professed fear of socialistic medicine—several rereadings of the act would seem to indicate absolutely nothing whatsoever to indicate the validity of such apprehension.

I am convinced that the Members of Congress at this time are not moving toward socialized medicine in the United States or, for that matter, socialization of the insurance industry.

I would like to conclude by once again emphasizing my preoccupation with the need as compared to the method. Millions of people need some kind of basic hospital coverage. The question is how best to give it to all of them. I am firmly convinced that although many desirable choices have been offered, no one seems to command enough backing from a practical point of view to warrant serious consideration and, therefore, I turn to what seems to be the only reason-

able alternative—medicare under social security.

May I add a postscript before I close. The private insurance industry, whether through programs of the individual companies such as Continental Casualty or through the cooperative efforts of companies in programs such as NY-65, has made Herculean efforts to resolve this formidable problem. The failure of their efforts has been through no fault of their own because too many millions of those over 65 do not have the dollars needed to put those programs on a universal basis. Only through a widespread tax program such as social security or through the general revenues of the Federal Government itself can such a program embracing coverage for millions of people be successfully consummated.

Let me include by stating that I believe unqualifiedly in the American free enterprise system as opposed to the welfare state. However, there are certain problems which are either too complex or too great for solution by anyone or anything other than the representative of all of the people, the Federal Government. That is why I am in favor of medicare under social security.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a supporter of urban renewal legislation both in Congress and in the Washington State Legislature, as have many of you. It is a pleasure to share this tangible evidence of the program's effectiveness.

While attending a luncheon in this same community last year, one of the leading industrialists said to me:

Hoquiam needs a new look. When seeking employees it is often the appearance of a city that is important to an employee's determination to settle in the area.

This, I think, is important in the competitive field of employment, particularly those branches where trained technical staffs are necessary for industrial expansion and is but one interesting facet of the need existing for efficient, forward looking urban renewal programs.

The following article from the Western City magazine reflects the urban renewal program in Hoquiam, Wash.:

[From Wetsern City Magazine, Oct. 1963]

HOQUIAM'S URBIE SELLS URBAN RENEWAL THROUGH AID OF CITIZEN'S VOLUNTEER COMMITTEE

Urbie, an eager-beaver sort of little character with pencil and plan, is the mascot and oft-times spokesman of the Hoquiam, Wash., Citizens Urban Renewal Committee, who has proven that the cartoon advertising technique can be effectively adapted to do a selling job in community public relations. Hoquiam citizens are generally more informed about urban renewal and the city's local project than is normally the case.

Brainchild and handiwork of Lane Fletcher, commercial artist and member of the Hoquiam citizens committee, Urbie came into being during one of the group's meetings when discussion turned toward securing public awareness of the need for renewal. Fletcher suggested that some type of design or figure be developed to give continuity and identity to any printed materials that the committee released. As the meeting continued Fletcher sketched on his notepaper, and before the meeting was over Urbie had been created.

Urbie is a friendly, busy appearing little fellow. His coloring is light brown with yellow ear, teeth, tail and soles of feet. He has big white wide-awake eyes and wears a white shirt with large red letters UR on it. His picture is in stores, waiting rooms, children's scrapbooks and homes throughout the city. He's on billboards and on TV announcing public service telecasts relative to civic improvement.

Hoquiam is a smaller size city located in Grays Harbor County on the south central coast of Washington. Founded in 1889, Hoquiam grew to a population of 12,000 in 1920; however, with the decline of the lumber industries of the area, population decreased to its present-day 11,000

About 5 years ago citizens became concerned that the city was increasingly deteriorating. Old vacated buildings were not being reoccupied or rehabilitated. Shoppers were deserting the old rundown downtown to shop outside the city limits.

In 1959 former Mayor Harry Elway, Jr., organized a Citizen's Urban Renewal Committee to determine what could be done to revitalize the business district and reverse the trend from further deterioration. The citizen's committee took a serious interest in their assignment and within 2 years had completely reviewed the structural conditions of the entire city. Findings were submitted to the city council recommending urban renewal in the central business district. A market analysis survey made by Fred Darnell & Co. of Seattle determined that over $5 million a year in local salaries is being spent outside Hoquiam. His opinion was that adequate shopping facilities would correct this.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

The city council submitted application to the HHFA for a proposed 15-block renewal project, but the request was turned back with a suggestion that it be resubmitted on a smaller area. Revised application was prepared and the HHFA in July of 1962 approved survey and planning funds for the present five block project. Under the "701" program Clark-Coleman & Associates, consultants, made population and economy analyses, land use and comprehensive planning studies. New building codes, electrical, plumbing and housing codes were passed by the council. To direct the city's urban renewal project, the council and Mayor Rolland Youmans employed Ray Baker, formerly with Seattle Urban Renewal Enterprises.

Public meetings were held to give citizens an opportunity to express their views. There were few objections to the project. Those who had questions were chiefly concerned with costs involved. A questionnaire was sent to every registered voter in the city asking whether the renewal project should be continued. Urbie and the committee had done their job well—the general public response was 3 to 1 in favor of proceeding. Last June all studies and findings were submitted to the HHFA for review.

In the 5-block project area only 7 of the present 59 buildings will remain. Up to $25,000 will be made available to businesses who will have to move, and up to $200 to residents with moving expenses.

The project is financed three-fourths by the Federal Government and one-fourth by the city, who will pay their share by installing new streets, sidewalks, sewers, waterlines and underground wiring. Project scheduling anticipates that property acquisition will be completed early in 1964 and that the city's renewal of streets and utilities will be finished next summer.

Plans call for the site to be used for department stores, restaurant facilities and business and professional offices, each with off-street parking. Completion target date: 29 months, or early 1966. When the property is resold to private builders and is developed, taxes from the area are estimated to be around $10,000 annually as compared to $3,289 collected in 1961.

Tacoma, Vancouver and Seattle are also currently working on urban renewal projects and plans. Vancouver and Tacoma initiated their projects a few years ahead of Hoquiam; however, they were interrupted, as were all urban renewal activities, while the constitutionality of the State's Urban Renewal Enabling Act was tested in the courts.

Last February the State supreme court in the case of *Miller* v. *Tacoma* (161 Wash. Dec. 373 (1963)) held that the urban renewal law is not violative of the State constitution. The court concluded in a 5 to 4 decision that the taking of private property for urban renewal constitutes a "public use" within the meaning of the eminent domain provision of the State constitution, and hence the expenditure of public funds is for a "public purpose." Other points in question were determined and urban renewal was given the go-ahead.

Following the court decision, Tacoma with two projects and Vancouver with one project immediately resumed renewal activities and both are well into land acquisition and clearance. Tacoma is now considering a third project; Seattle has held hearings on two.

Some 15 other Washington cities are investigating, or at least inquiring into, the possibilities of participating in the HHFA urban renewal program—among these are Anacortes, Arlington, Camas, Ellensburg, Everett, Goldendale, Kelso, Orting, Pasco, Snohomish, Sumner, Walla Walla and Yakima.

Texas Doing OK Without Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial broadcast by Radio Station KVIL in Dallas. John Coyle, president of KVIL, points out that the President's proposal for "hospitalization insurance," the new approach to medicare, is unnecessary, costly, and will not provide better medical care.

Mr. Coyle's editorial follows:

The President again recommends medicare to Congress. Under this, old age hospitalization and treatment would be federally furnished at higher social security cost. We respectfully suggest that Lyndon Johnson should cast an appraising eye on his own State's plan for this problem.

The American Medical Association opposes medicare. Doctors join in the Texas plan, based on the Federal Kerr-Mills Act. Their voluntary agreement with private insurance furnishes the necessary service to the aged at reasonable cost.

Thus Texans on old-age assistance can finance their own medical needs. Last year the plan was widened to include all persons who have reached 65. The system has proved financially sound, as Dr. Robert M. Tenery, president of the Texas Medical Association, told the annual meeting of the Dallas County Medical Society. Now Texans seem

certain to approve this year a proposed constitutional amendment which will authorize means to make the plan even better. Other States are studying the program.

Here is a far better solution than medicare. It is free from all risk of socialized medicine and political control. And what's more, it is getting the job done in Texas.

New Minuteman Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation thrives on, relies on, and was built on diversity of interests and diversity of opinions. Every public official must expect some measure of disagreement with his views and with his decisions. He must be prepared to expect criticism which is even unfounded or unfair, but there are limits beyond which no group or individual should go. In this regard I submit, under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Detroit News dated January 20, 1964. The editorial is as follows:

NEW MINUTEMAN MADNESS

There comes a time to take a look at any far out group and decide whether it has crossed the thin line that separates a public nuisance from a public hazard. That time seems at hand with respect to the self-styled "Minutemen."

Organized a few years ago with the notion of becoming guerrilla fighters should the Nation be invaded and occupied by you-know-who, the Minutemen, in scattered bands across the country, squirrel away arms and supplies, engage in maneuvers, and round out their patriotic activities in routine ultra-right worry about internal subversion.

They popped into the news briefly 2 years ago when a southern Illinois sheriff tried to take away some of their toys, which included 8-millimeter mortars and recoilless artillery. They've become news again on complaint of U.S. Representative HENRY GONZALES, of Texas.

GONZALES exhibits a copy of the Minutemen's publication, "On Target," which lists him and 19 other Congressmen who voted against a fund increase for the House Un-American Activities Committee as "the Judases who seem willing not only to sell out their country for 30 pieces of silver but to go on the record and brag about it."

This by itself could perhaps be taken care of by a simple lawsuit. But the list, says GONZALES, is bordered in black and headed "In Memoriam." Elsewhere the publication says, he reports, "Traitors beware. Even now the crosshairs are on the back of your necks."

GONZALES confesses himself "decidedly more sensitive" about stuff like this since the assassination of President Kennedy.

He has reason to be. The immediate danger is not that the Minutemen are about to try to take over the Government; they see themselves only as ready to do so should invasion or missile attack wipe out duly constituted authority. And their leader has denied that his outfit's list of "American Communists" is a list of "suspect citizens who would be subject to arrest if the organization decided an emergency exists." (He has also been quoted as saying that "A lot of people in this country are Communists without knowing it themselves.")

The immediate danger is that some individual member may be moved to wonder why his leaders refrain from doing something about these "Judases who * * *" and decide the time has come to rectify their mistake on his own.

Then there's the danger that some local band may mistake an explosion at the gas works for a sign that the Roosians are coming and set out to cleanse the county of its local "Communists" before it's too late.

And beyond all that, there's the danger of what these scattered bands may wreak, in the name of patriotism, should a genuine national emergency arise.

Maybe they're harmless, but, heroic fantasy, conspiratorial views of history, rigid intolerance of lawful dissent, and loaded weapons are not a reassuring combination.

Reports on Three Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following three reports on the amendments to the Constitution proposed by the Council of State Governments which appeared in the December 1963 issue of the New York State Bar Journal.

They consist of the report of the New York Bar Association's committee on the Federal Constitution; excerpts from the report of the committees of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and an article by William G. Fennell which discusses the important aspects of these proposals.

The three amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments would enable the State legislatures to propose constitutional amendments without any action by Congress; would remove the constitutional protections from the apportionment of representation in State legislatures and would set up a so-called Court of the Union consisting of the 50 chief justices to reverse any judgment of the Supreme Court.

The reports follow:

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION: REPORTS ON THREE AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

(Report on three amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments)

The Council of State Governments[1] has proposed three amendments of the U.S. Constitution, which would (1) enable the State legislatures to propose constitutional amendments without action by Congress or any national convention, (2) remove all protections of the Constitution from the apportionment of representation in State legislatures and (3) enable the States, through a "Court of the Union" consisting of their 50 chief justices, to reverse any judgment of the Supreme Court upholding the exercise of any power or jurisdiction granted to the United States under the Constitution. (See appendix.)

The proposal of these amendments must be taken seriously: one or more of them has been approved by one or both houses of the legislatures of 18 States.[2]

The proponents of the amendments assert a strong shift toward the extension of Federal powers and the restraint of State powers, and believe that "grave imbalance now exists * * *. The basic difficulty is that the Supreme Court's decisions concerning the balance between Federal and State power are final and can be changed in practice only if the States can muster sufficient interest in Congress, backed by a three-fourths majority of the States themselves to amend the Constitution."[3]

Balance between Federal and State power is always a proper subject for concern, as indeed is balance between the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary. A constitution of built-in checks and balances is ipso facto a constitution of built-in conflicts. The resolution of these problems is not easy, and indeed reasonable differences of opinion exist among thoughtful men, but the fact that such problems exist falls far short, in our opinion, of justifying the proposed amendments. The issue which the amendments raise is whether the American people will be better off in their constitutional life with our present Federal system in which the National Government is supreme in its field, or with a structure in which the final arbiter is 50 State governments (or sometimes a majority, or two-thirds, or three-quarters of them).

The amendment changing the amending process

This proposed amendment would add a new method for proposing constitutional amendments, by direct action of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States. Thereby the entire process of amending the Constitution could be accomplished solely by State legislatures, requiring only proposal of the amendment by 34 State legislatures and ratification by 38. The present alternative of proposal by two-thirds votes of the House and Senate would be retained.[4]

It is hard to see any purpose to this additional method of proposing amendments other than (a) to remove the protection afforded to more populous States by the requirement of a two-thirds vote in the House,[5] and (b) to eliminate the necessity of consideration and action on all amendments by a national forum (congressional hearings and floor debates, national publicity, etc.).[6] These purposes seem to us unsound. The proposed amendment would destroy the present balance in amending the Constitution, and permit revising the National Charter purely by a series of local actions.[7]

The apportionment amendment

This would provide that no provision of the Constitution or any amendment thereto shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature, and that the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

This proposed amendment would forbid the application of the Constitution and Federal judicial power to the apportionment of representation in State legislatures. It would thus forbid application to apportionment of the right of any person to "the equal protection of the laws," of the Federal guarantee to every State of a "Republican form of government," and of the right of citizens to vote notwithstanding race or color.[8]

These rights guaranteed by the Constitution are indeed fundamental. We would be loath to see their application curtailed in any way; and the proposed amendment would forbid their application to apportion-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ment for all time, and no matter how egregious or wilful the malapportionment might be. While many of us are concerned by the possibility of extreme applications of Baker v. Carr,[9] and believe that the development of decisions under it should be watched with care, we do not believe that this is the time for an amendment or that the proper method is complete reversal of the decision, resulting in perpetual exemption of malapportionment, no matter how flagrant, from constitutional limitations designed to protect our rights.[10]

The amendment for reversing the Supreme Court by State judges

Under this proposed amendment, briefly, upon demand of five State legislatures within 2 years after any Supreme Court judgment relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a "Court of the Union" composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of all the States. The sole issue shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under the Constitution. A majority of such court may reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. Decisions of such court shall be final and shall not be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of the Constitution.

Thus the function of this amendment is to reverse the Supreme Court in any case where the chief justices of 26 States vote that the particular "power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States" is not "a power granted" to the United States under the Constitution. By the Constitution the people created a Federal Government of granted powers (and also expressly denied certain powers to the States). In this Federal Government every act of its executive, legislative, and judicial branches can be valid only if the power thereby sought to be exercised is a power granted under the Constitution. Thus the scope of what this amendment could invalidate would extend back through the Supreme Court's decisions to every act of every branch of the Federal Government.

The proposed "Court of the Union" would be a court in little more than name. Its 50 judges would be selected, paid, and removed by their respective States. From the very nature of the revisionary duty thrown upon them, their functioning would be legislative rather than judicial. This machinery for sectional and nonjudicial determination of all constitutional issues contrasts sadly with the wisdom of what it would replace—an independent Federal judiciary. Our Federal judges are appointed by the President, who is elected by the people of the Nation; they are confirmed by the Senate, which is elected by the people of the several States. They hold office for life or good behavior, and their compensation cannot be reduced.

The duty of the "Court of the Union" to decide issues as the representative of the several States is not only frankly admitted, but claimed on behalf of this proposal as a merit. "This procedure would make the States the final arbiter of disputes of major importance that relate to the rights or powers reserved to the States or the people." Again, the required vote is characterized as "at least 26 of the 50 States, speaking through their judicial branches of government." Finally, "* * * under this procedure the States themselves would be the final arbiters of the extent of their reserved rights and powers." [11]

The Articles of Confederation did not create any Federal judiciary, but did at least provide that "the articles of this confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State." [12] The "Court of the Union" amendment would subjugate our Federal judiciary to the States, and turn the supremacy clause of our Constitution [13] upside down.

Conclusion

The purpose and effect of the three proposed amendments is to make our country's Government much like what it was under the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union. There the States severally entered into "a firm league of friendship with each other" [14]—which lasted 8 years.

It is the opinion of this committee, without dissent, that each of the proposed amendments should be emphatically rejected.[15]

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION: Martin Taylor, Chairman, New York; Theodore Pearson, Secretary, New York; Ernest Angell, New York; William C. Breed, Jr., New York; Bruce Bromley, New York; Porter R. Chandler, New York; William Tucker Dean, Ithaca; Howard M. Holtzmann, New York; R. Keith Kane, New York; Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., New York; Ernest D. Leet, Jamestown; George Lindsay, Jr., New York; John E. Lockwood, New York; Henry S. Manley, Strykersville; Willis L. M. Reese, New York; William J. Rennert, New York; Harrison Tweed, New York; Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., New York.

JULY 30, 1963.

Appendix

The action of the General Assembly of the States (see note 1, supra) took the form of recommending three resolutions for adoption by State legislatures without change and in such form as not to require approval or veto by the Governors. In each of the resolutions, the legislature petitions Congress "to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article" as an amendment to the Constitution. Following are the texts of the three articles thus proposed (omitting in each case the usual final section declaring the article inoperative unless ratified in 7 years):

(Amendment changing the amending process)

SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

(Apportionment amendment)

SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

("Court of the Union" amendment)

SECTION. 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States, to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the Justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK CONCERNED WITH FEDERAL LEGISLATION

(Three amendments to U.S. Constitution proposed by the Council of State Governments)

Introduction

The Council of State Governments, meeting in Chicago in December 1962, approved three resolutions for action by State legislatures petitioning Congress to call a convention to propose three amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which may be summarized as follows:

1. To provide that if two-thirds of the State legislatures approve identical texts of a proposed constitutional amendment, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives must so certify and such amendment shall be deemed to have been proposed without further action by Congress and when ratified by legislatures of three-fourths of the States shall become a part of the Constitution.

2. To provide for the establishment of a "Court of the Union," composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of each of the States which would have authority to reverse the U.S. Supreme Court in matters relating to the rights reserved by the Constitution to the States or to the people.

3. To provide that no provision of the Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature and that the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit or any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

Considering the far-reaching character of the proposed amendments, they have made remarkably successful, but until recently unnoticed, progress in State legislatures since they were proposed by the council last December.

Based on the information available, 11 States, i.e., Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming have passed the first resolution proposing the amendment giving the States power to amend the Constitution, and it has been passed by 1 house of the State legislatures in 8 other States; namely, Colorado, In-

Footnotes at end of speech.

diana, Iowa, Mississippi, New Jersey (but later rescinded), New Mexico, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

Four States, i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming have passed the second resolution proposing the "Court of the Union" amendment, and it has been passed by one house of the State legislatures in six other States; namely, Mississippi, New Jersey (but later rescinded), New Mexico, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Fourteen Sates, i.e., Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska (but vetoed by the Governor), Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, have passed the third resolution proposing the "apportionment" amendment and it has been passed by one house of the State legislatures in six other States; namely, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi, New Jersey (but later rescinded), and Oregon.

Advanced by their sponsors purportedly in support of the principle of States rights and to correct what they believe to be a presently existing grave imbalance in the division of the powers of government between the Nation and the States, the proposals are in fact accurately described by Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., of Yale Law School, as "radical in the extreme." In an analysis of the three proposals, Professor Black has stated:

"They aim not at the preservation but at the subversion of that balance in Federal-State relations which has, in the words of the [Council of State Governments] report, enabled us to escape 'the evils of depotism and totalitarianism.' * * * They constitute, collectively, one more attempt, so late in the day, at converting the United States into a confederation. * * * The wisdom of peace and the sacrifices of war alike warn against starting down that ruinous road."

Taken collectively, the three proposals would result in (1) placing the power to amend the National Constitution in the control of State legislatures, (2) placing the final construction of the Constitution in the hands of judges whose offices are created and whose salaries are paid by State legislatures, and (3) exempting State legislatures from any effective policing by the U.S. Supreme Court or Congress of their representative character.

Conclusion

Advanced by their sponsors in the name of convervatism and the tradition of States rights, the full impact of these three proposals, when viewed in the light of our constitutional history, is radical in the extreme. It is not overstating to say that should these amendments to the Constitution be adopted it would revolutionize our form of government and turn the clock back to the Articles of Confederation of 1777—which proved to be a failure and which were replaced 10 years later by the Federal Constitution.

Recommendation

The executive committee of the association of the bar of the city of New York believes that it is the duty of the organized bar to speak out publicly and emphatically against the adoption of these ill-conceived amendments and to take steps to educate the public as to their real significance. Accordingly, the executive committee recommends to citizens, to State legislatures, and to Congress that the three amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments (as set forth in appendixes A, B, and C to this report) be rejected.

THE STATES' RIGHTS AMENDMENTS—DEBATES OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS CAST DOUBTS ON CURRENT PROPOSALS

(By William G. Fennell [16])

That the United States of America should have to take time from space exploration, free world leadership, and concern with communism to debate issues which most Americans had thought were settled by the Constitutional Convention a century and three-quarters ago may seem disconcerting. If the United States is to continue to be a leader in these other fields, however, it must continue to be a strong nation, and the fact that we are strong today is due in no small measure to the results of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 which transformed the United States from a weak confederation of States into a union of States with a strong National Government.

Three proposals for amending the Constitution put forward by the Council of State Governments [17] are discussed and rejected in a report of the association's committee on Federal Constitution which appears elsewhere in this issue of the Journal. These proposals have the potential of reversing the results of the Constitutional Convention and turning the clock back to confederation. They have been critized by President Kennedy and other national leaders.[18] Bar associations have gone on record opposing them.[19] Chief Justice Warren has said that the proposals "could radically change the character of our institutions" and has called for a "great national debate" regarding them.[20]

The first proposal would permit the States to amend the Constitution without approval by Congress or by a national convention. Two-thirds or 34 of the States, acting through their legislatures, might propose an amendment, and then three-fourths or 38 of the States again acting through their legislatures, adopt it.

The second would establish a "supercourt" made up of the chief justices of the 50 States with authority to reverse Supreme Court decisions in the area of Federal-State relations.

The third would give the States a completely free hand in apportioning their legislative districts, striking down the Supreme Court's 1962 decision in *Baker* v. *Carr* [21] which held that State legislative districts were subject to scrutiny by Federal and State courts and to constitutional standards of fairness.

Collectively, the three proposals would place the power to amend the Federal Constitution in the control of the State legislatures, commit final construction of the Constitution in the vital area of Federal-State relationships to State judges whose offices are created and whose salaries are paid by State legislatures and exempt State legislatures from any effective policing by the Supreme Court or Congress of their representative character.

Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., of Yale Law School has characterized the impact of the proposal as follows:

"I cannot forebear my astonishment that such proposals should emanate from sources to which the honored word conservative is often applied. The proposals are radical in the extreme. They aim not at the preservation but at the subversion of that balance in Federal-State relations which has, in the words of the (Council of State Governments) report, enabled us to escape the evils of despotism and totalitarianism. They negate one of the best authenticated master principles of our American political being, the principle that we are a unified Nation, having a unitary interest in the maintenance of our Federal Constitution, and expressing that interest through national deliberations and decisions, and (since we are a people attached to law) through our national courts. They constitute, collectively, one more attempt, so late in the day, at converting the United States into a confederation. * * * The wisdom of peace and the sacrifices of war alike warn against starting down that ruinous road." [22]

The principal motivation for the proposals stems from dissatisfaction with Supreme Court decisions, particularly the Court's reapportionment decision mentioned earlier. In a statement of principles the Council of State Governments accuses the Supreme Court of "strong bias on the Federal side," and states that to "stop the continuing drift toward more complete Federal domination," the three proposed amendments—which the council itself recognizes would work a "fundamental and far-reaching change in the Federal Constitution"—are necessary "to preserve and protect the States." [23]

Although practically unnoticed by the bar, Federal officials and the public until Chief Justice Warren forcibly called attention to them at the annual meeting of the American Law Institute in Washington late in May, the council's proposals made remarkably successful progress in the 1963 State legislatures.

Twelve States approved the proposal to change the amending process; namely, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. The same proposal was approved by one house of the legislature in eight other States, including the New Jersey Senate which, at the behest of Governor Hughes and Senator CASE, later revised its approval of this and the apportionment amendment.

The Court of the Union amendment was approved by five States; i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, South Carolina, and Wyoming, and by one house of the legislature in five other States.

The apportionment amendment was approved by 13 States: Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, and, in a slightly different form, in Utah and Washington, and was passed by one house of the legislature in five other States.[24]

After the significance of the proposed amendments was pointed out by Chief Justice Warren and later by President Kennedy and leading bar associations, the successful march through the legislatures was slowed. In June the amendments were defeated in the North Carolina Legislature, although by narrow margins.[25]

Council of State governments' plan for securing adoption

The procedure which the Council of State Governments has followed to secure adoption of the amendments is by resolutions of State legislatures memorializing Congress to call a convention to propose the amendments. However, it is apparent from the council's releases that it hopes, should a sufficient number of States file identical amendments, that Congress will itself be induced to propose them.

The council invokes the alternative convention route of amending the Constitution of article V which has never been used before. All previous constitutional amendments have been adopted by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and ratified by legisaltures of three-fourths of the States. Accordingly, there is a great deal about the convention alternative for amending the Constitution which is obscure. For example, article V provides that on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments.[26]

Should the unhappy day arrive when Congress was faced with resolutions from 34 of the States proposing 1 or more of the 3 amendments, Congress would be confronted with unprecedented questions: Could the resolution properly be considered to be an "application" within the meaning of article V of the Constitution? Must Congress call a convention simply to vote yes or no on the amendment proposed or does the phrase, "a convention for proposing amendments," contemplate a convention like the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and a mandate to seek solutions to certain problems, perhaps limited to a certain area, e.g., Federal-State relations? Another problem would be the makeup of the convention. It seems clear,

Footnotes at end of speech.

since article V gives Congress the authority upon proper application to call a convention, that Congress under the necessary and proper clause of the Constitution (which gives Congress power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States) has authority to determine such matters as qualifications of delegates, how and from what constituencies delegates to the convention are to be elected, what majority of delegates is necessary to propose an amendment, and other details.

At present, any amendment becomes effective when ratified by legislatures or conventions in three-fourths of the States. The Constitution leaves it to Congress to determine whether ratification shall be by State legislatures or by conventions called for the purpose.

The resolutions proposed by the Council of State Governments provide for ratification of each proposed amendment by State legislatures. In view of the provisions of article V of the Constitution just referred to, it seems clear that Congress cannot be foreclosed and that it has the authority, if it chooses, to require ratification by State conventions.[27]

The proposal to change the amending process

This proposal would permit amendment of the Constitution (1) by filing with Congress of applications from legislatures of two-thirds of the States containing identical texts of a proposed amendment, (2) certification of such filing (a purely ministerial act) by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and (3) ratification of the proposed amendment by legislatures of three-fourths of the States. In addition, the proposal would abolish the convention method both for proposing and ratifying amendments. The result would be to shift the ultimate power of changing the Constitution from a national consensus to the States.

In the debate of this proposal to date, it has apparently been overlooked that the Constitutional Convention in 1787 rejected a proposal in essence, the same as that which the Council of State Governments has put forward.

The Virginia plan offered by Randolph at the outset of the convention (and which became the "blueprint" for many provisions of the Constitution as finally adopted) proposed that "provision ought to be made for amendment * * * whenever it shall seem necessary; and that assent of the National Legislature (Congress) ought not to be required thereto." The Committee on Detail modified this provision of the Virginia plan to provide:

"On application of the legislatures of two thirds of the States in the Union for amendment of this Constitution, the Legislature of the United States (i.e. Congress) shall call a convention for that purpose."[28]

As a result of debate, that provision was changed so that amendments might be proposed by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, if they deemed it necessary, or if two-thirds of the State legislature requested it, and that such amendments would become part of the Constitution when they had been ratified by the legislatures, or by conventions, in three-fourths of the States.[29]

That action, of course, brought Congress into the amending process—in recognition of the desirability of providing for national deliberation and to bring a national consensus to bear on any proposed amendment; but it also was open to the interpretation that Congress was required to propose any amendment whenever two-thirds of the States requested it, and that such amendment would become a part of the Constitution if ratified by three-fourths of the States.

In the end, as Carl Van Doren points out in "The Great Rehearsal," the Convention rejected the concept that the Constitution might be amended solely by State action and provided that when two-thirds of the State legislatures called for constitutional changes, amendments should be proposed by a national convention.[30]

Thus it is clear that the Constitutional Convention covered the ground which the Council of States Governments' proposal now raises for national debate and ended by rejecting what the council now proposes. The Convention started with the proposition that the national government be left completely out of the amending process; it ended by placing on the national legislature (Congress) responsibility for proposing amendments or calling a national convention for proposing amendments in the event that two-thirds of the States made the requisite application.

COURT OF THE UNION PROPOSAL

The proposal to create a supercourt composed of the chief judges of the 50 States with authority to overrule decisions of the Supreme Court in the area of Federal-State relations has been termed "so patently absurd that it will probably sink without a trace."[31] Yet it cannot be ignored if for no other reason than that it has been seriously proposed and has already gained the approval of five State legislatures and of one house of the legislature in five other States.

Here, again, one may go back to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 for guidance. While significantly there appears to have been little argument in the Convention as to the desirability of a Supreme Court—appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate—there was much discussion regarding the proposal to create inferior Federal courts, a point which was compromised by giving Congress authority to create them.[32] Opponents urged that Federal questions should be decided by the existing State courts with appeals to the Supreme Court. Answering these critics, Alexander Hamilton in "The Federalist" (No. 81) said:

"State judges, holding their office during pleasure, or from year to year, will be too little independent to be relied upon for an inflexible execution of the national laws."[33]

Hamilton's objection equally applies to the proposal to vest in a supertribunal of State judges the ultimate interpretation of the Federal Constitution.

There are, in addition, practical objections to the Court of the Union proposal: The cumbersomeness of a Court of 50 Judges, the fact that a Judge of that Court would have a part-time job on that Court and a full-time job on his own State bench, the burden on litigants required to wait 2 years before knowing whether a Supreme Court decision was final as to their rights, the likelihood of a losing litigant shopping around to prevail upon the legislatures of five States to make the demand necessary to convene the Court of the Union to reconsider the Supreme Court decision in question, the inability of the litigants themselves to terminate the litigation, since it would be open to the States to bring the issue to the Court of the Union.

Perhaps worst of all is the prospect of constitutional paralysis. The Supreme Court can reverse its own decisions and often does so. The Court of the Union apparently would be without power to reconsider and reverse its own decisions, giving them a greater finality than decisions of the Supreme Court, since the only way a decision of the Court of the Union could be reversed would be by an amendment of the Constitution—the process for effecting which, as we have seen, the Council of State Governments proposes to entrench in the States. Such finality would, in all probability, stifle constitutional growth.

THE APPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT

This proposal is directed at overruling a specific Supreme Court decision, that in the Tennessee apportionment case.[34] There the Court held that representation in State legislatures is subject to judicial scrutiny and has to meet constitutional standards of fairness.

As a result of that decision, State legislative apportionments have been held unconstitutional by lower Federal and State courts in many States.

However, one need not agree with the Supreme Court's decision in *Baker* v. *Carr* to be opposed to this proposed amendment.

If adopted, it will be the first time in our history that a Federal constitutional guarantee under the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment has been diminished.

Moreover, the Council's proposal goes beyond the 14th amendment: it declares that "no provision of the Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature."[35]

This could mean that a State might redistrict its legislature so that only real property owners might vote, or so that Negroes could not vote, or to deny, or curtail, the voting rights of Catholics or other religious groups. Several years ago the Alabama Legislature tried something like this by redrawing the boundaries of the city of Tuskegee to exclude Negro voters. The Supreme Court held the legislative action unconstitutional.[36] If the council of State Governments has its way, the Supreme Court will no longer have the power to protect minorities from the tyranny of a majority.

The apportionment proposal is also objectionable because it would nullify the constitutional provision by which the United States guarantees "to every State in the Union a republican form of government."[37] There was little debate in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 regarding this provision, which appeared in the original Virginia plan[38] and was carried forward (with changes only in style) into the final document. Madison argued cogently in favor of it in "The Federalist" (No. 43) stating,[39]

"The superintending government ought clearly to possess authority to defend the system against aristocratic and monarchial innovations. * * * where else could the remedy be deposited than where it is deposited by the Constitution?"

It is ironic that these proposals have been advanced by an organization calling itself "conservative." "The amendments would effect a States' rights counterrevolution of dismaying dimensions."[40] Moreover, as this article has pointed out, the proposals in the aggregate raise issues which in broad scope were considered, debated and determined by the Constitutional Convention 176 years ago. In particular, the amendment giving the States power, acting alone and without action on the national level, to amend the Constitution was considered, debated and rejected by the Convention. The threat to our institutions posed by this counterrevolution of the right is as real and as dangerous as the threat of communism. Perhaps, as the New York Times suggested, "Our congressional committees concerned with guarding against subversion of the American governmental system might profitably explore the threat these proposals present and the way they are being promoted."[41]

---

[1] The Council of State Governments is a joint governmental agency of all the States organized in 1933. It conducts biennially a General Assembly of the States, in which the principal representation is from the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation or similar statutory bodies of the several States.

At the assembly held Dec. 6, 1962, at which 46 States were represented, the votes on the 3 proposed amendments were as follows:

	For	Against	Abstaining
Changing the amending process	37	4	4
Apportionment	26	10	10
"Court of the Union"	21	20	5

The New York delegation voted for the proposal to change the amending process, and against the two other proposals.

Action of the Assembly is reported in "Amending the United States Constitution to Strengthen the States in the Federal System," 36 State Gov't 10 (1963). This also contains the "Statement of Principles" reported to the Assembly by the National Legislative Conference Committee on Federal-State Relations.

[2] Shanahan, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments: They Will Strengthen Federal-State Relations," 49 ABA Journal 631 (July 1963), note 4.

[3] "Statement of Principles," supra, note 1.

[4] In addition to adding a new method for proposing amendments, the proposed amendment would delete both of the present provisions for conventions—(1) that on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments, and (2) that amendments may be ratified (if Congress so proposes) by conventions in three-fourths of the States.

The convention method of proposing amendments has never been used; it is the method sought to be availed of by the Council of State Government proposals. The convention method of ratifying amendments has been used once (amendment XXI).

The validity of the resolutions which the Council proposes for use by State legislatures has been questioned. Black, "The Proposed Amendment of Article V: A Threatened Disaster," 72 Yale L.J. 957 (April 1963).

[5] It has been calculated that under this proposed amendment legislators representing about 15 percent of the American people could amend the Constitution, i.e., 38 percent of 40 percent (the 38 least populous States have about 40 percent of the Nation's population, and in those States on the average 38 percent of the people form constituencies sufficient to control the legislature). Black, supra, Note 4, at 960.

[6] As creating a league of sovereign States rather than a nation, the Articles of Confederation quite naturally required unanimous consent for amendment. Even so, they recognized that amendments of the league should originate with and be worked out by the league's legislature. Thus article XIII provided that no alternation shall be made unless it be agreed to in a Congress of the United States "and be afterwards" confirmed by the legislatures of every State.

[7] This proposal has a deceptive appearance of harmlessness. At the General Assembly of the States it attracted the votes of 37 of the 46 States represented, while the apportionment amendment received a bare majority of 26 and the "Court of the Union" amendment a minority of 21. Evidently it is hard to realize that once the lid to the amending process is lifted, other less appealing changes will fly out easily.

[8] XIV amendment, sec. 1; art. IV, sec. 4; XV amendment, sec. 1.

[9] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[10] See the 73 page Comment *Baker* v. *Carr* and Legislative Apportionments: A Problem of Standards, 72 Yale L.J. 968 (April 1963), including discussion of the situation in New York at pages 1019–1027.

[11] Shanahan, supra, note 2, at 635.

[12] Art. XIII.

[13] Art. VI, clause 2. "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

[14] Art. III.

[15] Our discussion has been confined to the effects of the proposed amendments. For a highly critical analysis of the proponents' motives, see Commager, "To Form a Much Less Perfect Union," the New York Times magazine, July 14, 1963, page 5, charging that the proponents are not genuinely concerned with the powers of the States and that "the ambition which animates them is not to strengthen the States, but to paralyze the Nation."

[16] Member of the Committee on Bill of Rights, formerly member of the Committee on Federal Legislation, Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

[17] The text of the proposals appears in the appendix to the report of the Committee on Federal Constitution.

[18] New York Times editorial, "Who's for the Constitution?" May 10, 1963; Attorney General Kennedy, Governor Hughes and Senator Case, New Jersey, Governor Rockefeller, New York, among others.

[19] In addition to the action of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association opposed the proposals at its meeting last August. New York Times, Aug. 13, 1963. The Executive Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, in a report dated June 4, 1963, opposed the amendments, Reports of Committees Concerned With Federal Legislation, vol. 2, bull. No. 2, July 1963. Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., Yale Law School, has been particularly outspoken against the proposals. See Black, "The Proposed Amendment of Article V: A Threatened Disaster," 72 Yale L.J. 957 (April 1963) and Black, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments: They Would Return Us to Confederacy," 49 American Bar Association Journal 637 (July 1963). For reasons advanced in favor of the proposals, see National Legislative Conference Committee on Federal-State Relations, Report to the General Assembly of States, Dec. 6, 1962, Statement of Principles, obtainable from the Northeastern Regional Office of the Council of State Governments, 1201 Bar Building, 36 West 44th St., New York, N.Y., and Shanahan, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments: They Will Strengthen Federal-State Relations," 49 American Bar Association Journal 631 (July 1963).

[20] New York Times, May 23, 1963.

[21] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[22] Professor Black to Arthur J. Freund, Dec. 28, 1962, quoted in part in an article by Anthony Lewis in New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963.

[23] Note 3 supra.

[24] Information from northeastern regional office of the Council of State Governments, note 3 supra, and other sources.

[25] Anthony Lewis, New York Times, June 26, 1963.

[26] It may be helpful to the reader to set forth the text of present article V, omitting only a proviso which became obsolete in 1808: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that * * * no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The Council of State Governments' proposal for amending article V is contained in the appendix to the report of the Committee on Federal Constitution found elsewhere in this issue of the Journal.

[27] For a full discussion of the problems raised under this topic, see Black, note 3 supra 72 Yale L.J. 957 at 961.

[28] A convenient source for the constitutional documents referred to is Carl Van Doren, "The Great Rehearsal," Viking Press, 1948, app. 4, 268 at 270. The Virginia plan as reported by the Committee of the Whole, June 13, 1787; app. 7, 278 at 287, "The Constitution as Reported by the Committee on Detail," Aug. 6, 1787.

[29] Id. at 162.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Black, note 3 supra, 72 Yale L.J. 957.

[32] Op. cit. note 12 supra at 64–65. Both the Virginia plan and the New Jersey plan provided for a "supreme tribunal." They differed in that the Virginia plan (as reported by the Committee of the Whole) provided for appointment of the tribunal by the "second Branch of the National Legislature," the New Jersey plan, by the Executive (op. cit. note 12 supra at app. 4, 269, app. 5, 272). The difference was compromised by providing that the President appoint members of the Supreme Court with advice and consent of the Senate (Constitution, art. II, sec. 2).

[33] The Federalist, 43 Great Books of the Western World 240 (1952). The Federalist is also available in a revised edition published in 1901 by the Roxburghe Press, New York and London, and in an abridged edition, "The Enduring Federalist," edited and analyzed by Charles A. Beard, Doubleday, 1948.

[34] Note 5 supra.

[35] The proposal would apparently give sanction to contravening the 15th amendment which provides that the right of U.S. citizens "to vote shall not be denied or abridged * * * by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude" and empowers Congress to adopt enforcing legislation.

[36] *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot*, 364 U.S. 339 (1960).

[37] Con. art. IV, sec. 4.

[38] Op. cit. note 12 supra at appendix 3, 266.

[39] Note 17 supra Great Books edition at 141.

[40] New York Times editorial, "Upsetting the Constitution," April 15, 1963.

[41] Ibid.

Dr. Harry B. Lee, Distinguished Graduate and Professor of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Receives an Outstanding Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the honor that has been bestowed upon Dr. Harry B. Lee, assistant professor, Department of Electrical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. Lee is the recipient of the Browder J. Thompson Memorial Prize for 1964 awarded by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, the largest professional society in the world.

This award is given annually by the institute to the individual under 30 who publishes the most outstanding work in its journals. Dr. Lee received this award, consisting of a certificate and $1,000, as author of the paper entitled "A New Canonic Realization Procedure," which appeared in volume 10, No. 1, March, 1963, Transactions of the Professional Technical Group on Circuit Theory. Dr. Lee is nephew of my distinguished colleague, Congressman JIMMY MORRISON of the Sixth District of Louisiana.

Our congratulations are extended to Dr. Lee for his achievement.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

U.S. Travel Service Brings the Dollars Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the "Travel and Resorts" section of the Washington Post for Sunday, January 26, Mr. William McPherson, Post travel editor, has an extremely informative and well-written article on the achievements made to date by the U.S. Travel Service.

From expenditure of $3.5 million last year by USTS this country attracted 734,993 business and pleasure travelers from overseas, a gain of 42.4 percent over 1961 when the Visit U.S.A. program was first established, these visitors spending more than $275 million while here. Certainly that is a good return on our investment.

Mr. McPherson notes that the appropriation for USTS for fiscal 1964 was reduced from the $3.5 million of the previous year to $2.6 million. This has resulted in cutbacks in USTS operations overseas, particularly in Latin America, Asia, and Australia. It also means that plans to establish a U.S. Travel Office to service prospective visitors from the Scandinavian countries in Scandinavia and the Benelux countries have had to be postponed.

Such offices, I am sure, would be extremely welcome in those areas and result in many more visitors to the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE BRINGS THE DOLLARS HOME BUT BUDGET TRIMS STYLE

(By William McPherson)

It may come as a surprise to you—as it did to us—that one of "several really significant factors" in bringing dollars home last year was a foreign visitor who didn't spend a cent.

She was Da Vinci's Mona Lisa. Not that Europeans forsook the Louvre for the National Gallery, but "the fact that she came and was so enthusiastically greeted helped the world realize that the United States has a deep esthetic sense," said Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service.

It used to be that if you built a better mousetrap the world would beat a path to your door. Times have changed. Everybody's crying for culture.

"Myths are being exploded. Visitors are realizing that we do have a sense of history, an appreciation of civilization," Gilmore said during an interview the other day. "After all, we are spending $2 billion on cultural centers right now in this country."

An esthetic sense is no doubt grand, but the Travel Service would still like to have a little more money to foster travel.

A survey in Scandinavia indicated that Scandinavians believe the United States is "a highly technical, materialistic country where everyone chases the dollar."

Yet it is the country that most Scandinavians would most like to visit.

Encourage visits, Gilmore believes, and esthetics will take care of itself.

Unfortunately, Gilmore has only $2.6 million to promote foreign travel to the United States of America this year. He had requested $4.2 million. The current appropriation is a 22-percent reduction from the $3.5 million of last year.

Under this reduction, advertising and related Visit U.S.A. promotions abroad will be sharply reduced. Newspaper advertising will be discontinued in Latin America, Asia, and Australia. A proposed Visit U.S.A. film will not be made, despite the "urgent need for a film oriented directly to travel to the United States of America." There will be no more surveys of travel markets abroad.

Eliminated, too, are the development of travel center offices in São Paulo and Rome, where Embassy-connected offices now operate, and the establishment of Embassy-based offices in Scandinavia, the Benelux, and lower South America.

It is in South America that Gilmore plans "a big stump tour" this spring. Now South America is Europe oriented. To change that, Gilmore said, "we've got to get the pacesetters, the fashionable people" coming to the United States.

"We want the rank and file, but the blue chip man spends 10 to 1. He spends the money and starts the trend," said Gilmore. "The others follow."

Consider former First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy. After her two trips to Greece, other Americans followed in droves.

But the converse was also true: more Greeks came here, due in large part to Mrs. Kennedy's influence. And not only Greeks, but oversea visitors in general came to the United States in unprecedented numbers in 1963, dropping more than $275 million while here, $49 million more than in 1962.

The figure does not include an estimated $100 million in air fares paid to U.S. carriers for transporting visitors.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service counted 734,993 business and pleasure travelers from overseas last year, an increase of 21.7 percent over 1962 and 42.4 percent over 1961, when the Visit U.S.A. program was established. Seven out of ten want to come back.

Visitors from Mexico (where reciprocal free-of-charge visa arrangements have just been implemented for business and in-transit travel) and Canada are not included in the 734,993 figure.

Any year now Gilmore expects to report a million oversea visitors to the United States. For this year he's predicting ("modestly") a 20-percent increase. Inasmuch as each visitor spends an average of $375, that's nothing to sneer at, when multiplied by 150,000.

On the other hand, a McGraw-Hill survey estimates that Americans spent nearly $3 billion abroad last year. By 1973, the publishing company's economists estimate that the figure will grow to $7 billion.

All that money may not be very esthetic, but in the race for the international traveler's dollar it's not sneered at either. And perhaps the Mona Lisa was smiling all along at her net worth to our balance-of-payments problem. After all, Gilmore said it was considerable.

The Recent Pilgrimage of His Holiness Pope Paul VI to the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening last I had the privilege of attending the 64th annual dinner of the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn held at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N.Y., and tendered to my good friend, William A. Shea, after whom the new stadium in New York City for the Mets baseball team, which opens in April, has been named. The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, was so kind as to wire his personal greetings to the audience of over 1,000 men of all faiths prominent in the professional, political, and business life of the borough of Brooklyn.

His Excellency, the Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart, D.D., bishop of Brooklyn, was the principal speaker on this occasion, and I have the privilege under the permission heretofore granted me by unanmious consent of the House to include herewith his brilliant and inspiring address on that evening concerning the recent pilgrimage of His Holiness Pope Paul VI to the Holy Land:

History is being made so rapidly these days that we hardly know how to keep up with it. No sooner does one act surprise us on the stage of life, when another occurs to bid for our attention.

Recently there was an event of such far-reaching significance that I would like to spend a few moments to think about it this evening. It was the pilgrimage of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, to the Holy Land.

I call this event far-reaching because it extends our gaze in two distant directions at once: one, backward—to the ancient past, to a moment in time 2,000 years ago. For, it was then, by the birth of Christ, that the eternal word of God was spoken in human terms. And the other, forward—to that undefined and far-off future when all men will understand that word, and know His truth, and share His love and His divine life.

By drawing the attention of the world to the crib at Bethlehem, Pope Paul focused our eyes on the central act of human history. It was the pivotal point in the long succession of events that started with the creation of the world and will end only with its final judgment.

God, the Creator, stepped into time, not by the prophets and the patriarchs who prepared His way, but by His divine Son. God became man. "The word was made flesh and dwelt among us." It was a divine interference in the disordered affairs of men: to

redeem men; to save them; to set them straight on a path that will lead them back to their Father's house.

The world could never be the same as it was. Men, who had been slaves to Satan, were now free to become sons of God. Men, who were divided in their woeful state, were now called together to an intimate union with God, their Father, through Christ, their brother.

This is the faith that we affirm and the Gospel that we preach: Christ has come into the world to save the world. He has loved all men, and He has lived and died, and He has risen again to save all men. He is, indeed, "mankind's Good Shepherd."

Pope Paul, at Bethlehem, referred to the present time as "the historic hour" in which the church must correspond with the wish of Jesus Christ "that they may be perfected in unity, and that the world may know that Thou hast sent me, and that Thou hast loved them even as Thou hast loved me."

These are the words of Christ, and the work is His. We are no more than stewards, and teachers, and laborers in His vineyard.

It is His mission that we, His followers and representatives, seek to fulfill. In the strong and simple phrases of His Holiness: "We are certain that the cause we promote comes from God; we are the disciples, the apostles, the missionaries of Jesus, Son of God and Son of Mary, the Messiah, the Christ."

His mission is one of love for all mankind and, therefore, our mission as Christians must be one of love for all mankind. His desire is to obtain only good for the world, and our desire, as His disciples, must be to strive to achieve that good for the world. By laying down His life, He willed to save every man born on this earth, and by the lives we live, as members of His church, we must hope to extend that salvation to all.

Unhappily, the unity for which Christ prayed is far from our immediate experience. Among those who call themselves His followers, there are age-old tensions and historic troubles. Disagreement and even distrust appear in some measure on all sides. Fidelity to His word differs, sometimes sharply, according to the interpretation of His meaning. Yet, Christ meant it to be the same for everyone.

And, there are many who stand outside of the Christian way of life, some believing in God and others not. Christ died for them all; that all men might live. No one was excluded from His prayer on the cross: "Father, forgive them." Equally responsible as sinners for His death, we all became the beneficiaries of His redemption.

No single nation, or people, or race is to be blamed for His death, or held less worthy to share the fruits of His sacrifice.

Separation and division are the harsh facts of history; and how remote they are from the desire of Christ. In taking note of them on his pilgrimage, His Holiness turns our eyes to a bright, if distant, future. The time has come, he tells us, for the problem of unity to be explored.

In the spirit of Pope John, and in imitation of Christ, Pope Paul has opened wide his heart and ours with love and understanding, with friendship and respect for all men everywhere. In consequence of this, the time will come when that unity will be realized. All men will be brothers; and "there will be one fold and one shepherd."

I feel that this event this evening prefigures that blessed time. Represented here tonight are the differences that divide us, as I have already lamented.

But, in a positive way, good will has put them aside for the moment and brought us together. We share more than a common table; we have come a step closer to one another in mutual regard and friendship, and, I trust, in understanding. It is a small beginning for so great a task; but a journey of a thousand miles is begun by one step.

I ask you to join me this evening in pledging to continue this spirit of concord and generosity with high motives and genuine regard for one another. Then, on each occasion that this scene is reenacted, at other times and in other places, that far-off dream of Bethlehem will come nearer to reality.

Panama and Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Panama is indebted to the United States for its very existence. No nation in the history of the world has done more for another nation than has the United States for Panama.

The Panamanian Government's demand for so-called moral and legal rights is one of the most incredible demands in the history of the world by one nation upon another.

Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 21, very ably points out that Panama's fantastic demands may lead to counterclaims by the Republic of Colombia. I commend this article to the attention of every Member of Congress and to the Panamanian Government:

TURNING BACK THE CLOCK—COLOMBIA MAY HAVE AN INTEREST IN SETTLEMENT OF CANAL ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

When you start to turn the clock back, how far back do you go?

This is a question that the Government of Panama might well examine. When it insists that the existing treaty, signed in 1903, granting the United States rights "in perpetuity" to the Canal Zone be revised because the Republic of Panama wants to regain its "moral and legal rights," the point can be raised as to whether the Government of Colombia doesn't also have to be consulted.

Since the Panamanian Government now has chosen to break off diplomatic relations with the United States, this means that the Washington Government is no longer under obligation to recognize the sovereignty of Panama. It affords an opportunity for Colombia to put in its claim for the recovery of the Canal Zone, which it originally owned.

Few people may realize it, but not only the Canal Zone but all of Panama was once a part of Colombia. As far back as 1878, it granted a French company exclusive rights to construct a canal. But the French projects failed again and again. Finally, on January 22, 1903, the United States concluded a treaty with Colombia which provided for the acquisition by the United States of the Canal Zone area. The Senate here ratified the treaty, but the Senate of Colombia rejected it.

Then, not long afterward—on November 3 of the same year—a revolution broke out in Colombia, and Panama declared itself independent. The U.S. Government within 72 hours granted diplomatic recognition. On November 18, a treaty was signed with the new government, granting the United States "in perpetuity" the use of a zone 5 miles wide on either side of a future canal.

Colombia promptly revised its policy and pledged herself on November 30 to ratify the treaty it had earlier that same year rejected. But the United States declined. Colombia's grievance continued thereafter to cause ill feeling in Latin America, and in 1914 a treaty was signed by the United States granting $25 million compensation to Colombia, largely because of the work Colombia had already paid for on the canal. This treaty, however, was not ratified by the U.S. Senate and Colombian Congress until 1921.

President Theodore Roosevelt's action in recognizing Panama, thus helping to bring about the secession of Panama from Colombia, became a campaign issue inside the United States in 1904. Mr. Roosevelt insisted that he was looking out solely for the interests of the United States, and said:

"If, without detriment to the interests of the people of Panama, it could again become a state under Colombia and desires to do so—why well and good."

Mr. Roosevelt argued that he had been acting in strict compliance with the wishes of Congress and added:

"Had not Panama been promptly recognized, and the transit across the isthmus kept open, in accordance with our treaty rights and obligations, there would have ensued endless guerrilla warfare and possibly foreign complications; while all chance of building the canal would have been deferred, certainly for years, perhaps for a generation or more."

The history of pan-American relations contains many a fuzzy chapter in connection with the creation of the Panama Republic itself. Strictly speaking, there are no treaties "in perpetuity" anywhere in the world. Nations may abrogate treaties if they wish, and Panama could tear up the existing treaty if it desired to do so. But Colombia could intervene, too, and could readily point to the fact that it originally owned Panama and would probably still be in possession had it not been for the sudden diplomatic recognition by the United States accompanied, as it was, by the presence of U.S. Navy gunboats at the scene.

Naturally, there are people in the Republic of Panama who want to get back the land now known as the Canal Zone, but to stir up ambitions inside Panama is also to stir up ambitions outside of Panama. The Panamanian Ambassador to the United States says his Government wants to carry the issue to the United Nations because the existing 1903 treaty is not only obsolete but repugnant to international law. Yet it might be argued that the circumstances surrounding the formation of the Panamanian Republic itself involved violations of international law. Strictly speaking, the United States was bound to wait longer than it did for the ratification of the 1903 treaty by the Colombian Senate.

But all such arguments on the basis of international law do not take into account the realistic facts of today. Panama is too small a country to live in isolation and needs the friendship and economic support of the United States. Malcontents within Panama are stirring up trouble. This can only lead to a revival of ambitions in Colombia to reacquire Panama.

To go to the United Nations and to brush aside negotiations directly between the United States and Panama will be to offend the Washington Government, which Panama, in the long run, cannot well afford to do. Those who have stirred up violence and trouble in the Canal Zone will not cease their efforts as long as they have the acquiescence or encouragement of the Panamanian Government itself. The sooner the Republic of Panama gets down to quiet diplomatic negotiations with the United States the quicker the whole problem will be resolved.

Details of Scandal Should Be Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is always unfortunate when reports of scandal in high places of Government are circulated because it tends to dispel the confidence of American citizens in their Government, which is the best type of government ever devised by the mind of man.

Accordingly, I hope there will be a full investigation of all facts brought out in the so-called Bobby Baker affair, and under unanimous consent I include an editorial from the Spokesman-Review of January 24, 1964, on this subject.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, Jan. 24, 1964]

ONCE AGAIN PAYOLA REARS ITS HEAD

President Lyndon B. Johnson's acceptance of a free stereo set from an insurance man, at a time when the latter was selling Johnson, then Democratic leader of the Senate, $200,000 in insurance, should concern every American.

The situation is further compounded by the insurance agent's testimony that he also bought $1,200 in unneeded advertising from the Texas radio-television station owned by the Johnson family because he was led to believe "it was expected of me."

The scandal was uncovered by the probe into the affairs of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, longtime protege of Johnson and former Senate aid. Disclosure of the favors accepted by Johnson came from Don B. Reynolds, Washington insurance agency owner. In addition in the Baker matter: The FBI now has begun an investigation to determine whether there were irregularities in congressional passage of a bill authorizing the $14 million District of Columbia Athletic Stadium; Reynolds has testified that Teamsters Union President James Hoffa said he kept a double set of books, one for the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee; and the Senate Rules Committee has announced it will now examine Baker's financial records in its public hearings.

Baker, who has resigned since the investigation began, is irretrievably tied to Johnson.

White House defense is that Johnson in 1957, as Senate Democratic floor leader, believed the stereo set was a gift from Baker. Johnson, after years of experience in a responsible position in the Senate, is scarcely so naived. He long has known enough to ask from whence a gift comes. Such an alibi only makes Johnson look incredibly stupid, and he is not. But take it a step further and even assume that the gift had come from Baker. In view of current testimony about Baker, that makes the gift even more objectionable. Nor does it whitewash the radio-television advertising which Reynolds says he was asked to buy by Walter Jenkins, the President's confidential assistant. Jenkins denies this.

This is not the first time scandal has touched the White House. Mink coats and deep freezes were accepted by officials and marred the Truman administration. A vicuna coat and an expensive rug taken by Sherman Adams from Bernard Goldfine caused Adams' resignation as President Eisenhower's top assistant.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, is right. It was he who denounced Adams' gift-taking and brought open embarrassment to his own party. And it is he, again, who now denounces Johnson for a similar lapse.

The speech Senator WILLIAMS once made against Adams concluded: "There can be but one code for public officials. Mr. Adams' resignation is in order." The Senator yesterday inserted his Adams speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of his remarks about Johnson. The recent speech ended in striking similarity with the words: "There can be but one code for public officials."

It is regrettable whenever scandal besmirches our Government, but it is admirable that when it does, honest Americans expose it.

Project Hope Moves Forward in Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reports from Ecuador indicate that the SS *Hope* is scoring another important victory for good will and progress in Latin America. At anchor off Guayaquil, the ship is saluted daily as a "familiar white beacon of American good will and understanding."

Across the Guayas River at Duran, a newly established public health center operated by Hope is taking modern training methods and technological assistance to the mainland.

One of America's outstanding columnists, Bob Considine, recently had this to say about Project Hope:

PROJECT HOPE MOVES FORWARD IN ECUADOR

I don't know of any charity, in our time, which has as much impact of its beneficiaries as Project Hope. This great Nation's humanitarianism, from the time of the Marshall plan, has been bound up in and often eclipsed by our fundamental restraint, our commendable refusal to toot our horn of plenty. We have stood by patiently while labels indicating the American origin of desperately needed goods and services to underprivileged countries were either erased or altered to make the afflicted peoples believe that these were gifts from the Soviet Union or from local puppet governments that enslaved them.

With the SS *Hope* it is different. It is impossible to erase a 15,000-ton ship in a friendly harbor. It is impossible to deny a dazzling white vessel filled with magnificently dedicated U.S. doctors and nurses expertly caring for thousands of men, women and children who cannot speak the language of the Americans but clearly comprehend their compassion.

Without really meaning to do so, as is our national trait, we have projected to all peoples a wonderful image of America's goodness of heart, soul and spirit through this vessel and the people who serve in it.

For decades beyond our own, for perhaps tens of decades, the folklore of many lands will be laced with the saga of the visit of the SS *Hope* and its good people. On its very first trip, for example, its American personnel not only treated 18,000 Indonesians, terribly in need of medical service, but also trained 200 Indonesian doctors and 300 nurses.

The sheer reaction from the latter will spread through that part of Asia in succeeding years and generations. It will be the United States of America, maligned elsewhere as imperialistic and selfish, that these people and their children and their children's children will remember.

SS *Hope's* next major expedition was to South America, to Peru specifically. Once again it was hailed as a savior of hosts of human beings who otherwise might have perished. The training of local doctors and nurses went forward.

It will continue in that role, this ship, doing more good intrinsically for the United States than almost any diplomatic emissary we have ever had, only so long as good-hearted souls such as yourself contribute to its support (tax deductible, as you know). If enough of you dismiss SS *Hope* as "just another charity," it will surely sink to the bottom of the sea. Other charities have foundered too. But if this one succumbs to indifference then there will also pass from the face of the earth, the most effective means I have ever known of dramatizing the fact that we are not a bad lot at all, we Americans, no matter what Moscow, Peiping and Havana have been saying about us.

Congressman Ed Foreman

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in congratulating our friend from Texas, ED FOREMAN, on being named one of the 10 outstanding young men in America by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

This is a great honor for one so young. However, his life, thus far, has been filled with equally outstanding achievements. Therefore, it is not surprising that ED has been such a success so early in his congressional career for, though he is only 30 years old, he has attained the pinnacle of success in his every endeavor.

ED, a farm boy, worked his way through school and graduated at the top of his class. And then entering business he immediately prospered due to his hard work, imaginative solutions, and individual independence. During these active business years he did not neglect his responsibility to his community and, in fact, his hard work and dedicated service caused him to be the recipient of many community awards, including being named one of the five outstanding young men of Texas just 2 years ago.

We in Congress know ED as an articulate spokesman for sound and conservative, but responsible Government. His membership on the important Armed Services Committee has given this unusual young man an excellent post in which to demonstrate his outstanding abilities, and as we would expect, he has already made a remarkable record. This committee assignment has permitted him to continue to work for individual liberty by attempting to reduce Federal control. It is a rare Congressman who

turns down Federal money for his own district, but let us hope that we will see more Ed Foremans in the future who talk and practice this kind of economy in Government.

The junior chamber of commerce has presented this award to ED FOREMAN because of his outstanding service to his community and the Nation. However, let us remember that he has just begun what will be, I am sure, a long and ever increasingly effective career as a public servant. In the years ahead we will expect even more of this man and, knowing of his habit for success, I am confident that the Nation will not be disappointed.

Pasture-Livestock Program Geared to Small Farms in Appalachia Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix an editorial by Mr. Earl W. Kinner, editor and publisher of the Licking Valley Courier, West Liberty, Ky., dated January 23, 1964, entitled "Pasture-Livestock Program Geared to Small Farms in Appalachia Needed":

PASTURE-LIVESTOCK PROGRAM GEARED TO SMALL FARMS IN APPALACHIA NEEDED

Nearly every small farmer in an upland foothills county could supplement his income by establishing a few more acres of pasture and meadow—and in a year, or few years, maybe pull above a marginal living standard. Livestock on good hill pastures bringing in a few hundred extra dollars a year can mean the difference between a marginal or submarginal existence and a desired standard that provides hope and offers a future to a rural family and their children.

But so many small farmers now find it takes all income, even some with part-time jobs, just to exist—and they never get around to improving their idle hill land, the part that could pull them above the marginal living standard if they had it in grass supporting a few extra head of livestock.

We understand the President's Appalachian Regional Commission is giving special attention to the agricultural potential of the Appalachian area. The Commission will make recommendations to the President in February, and the President shortly thereafter will recommend his program to the Congress on what the Federal Government can and should do to alleviate the acute economic conditions of Appalachia.

We feel the Government, through an expanded Agriculture Soil Conservation Service program, can and should give special consideration to the small farmer. A special program geared to the small farm to help establish a few extra acres of pasture and buy livestock—such a program would, we believe, help thousands of marginal rural families to pull above the marginal living standard. And it would not be just for the moment—it could be lasting, this helping the little farmer "over the hump," so to speak.

There are scores of counties in the Appalachian area, particularly outside the coal mining sections, whose economy is geared almost totally to agriculture. This and nearby hill counties are similar in topography, and our people depend on farm income to clothe, feed and shelter our families, to educate our children. Our farmers are doing a good job with specialized crops and some with pastures and livestock and even a few grade A dairys. But we recognize this area must do better in the future. We must find ways to increase our income if our children are to be properly educated, if our people are to be adequately housed, clothed, and fed, and if we are to receive adequate medical care.

The agribusiness in any upland county will expand if the small farms are improved in potential. It is the small farmer who has not availed himself of existing programs to build pastures, etc.—most of them not because they did not want to but because in most instances, they could not find the extra money to cost-share.

Take Morgan County as an example of the great number of small farms. Of a total of 1,952 farms, approximately 60 percent of these are 100 acres or less. Twenty-eight percent are 50 acres or less. Cropland is limited in most cases. But we feel the potential for developing and improving pastures and meadows for livestock production is great, all the small farms considered.

However, present farm income on most of the small farms is not sufficient to meet family financial needs and at the same time establish needed pastureland. Eighty percent of the county's farmers have incomes of $2,500 and less, and 50 percent of these farmers have income of $1,000 and less a year. Cash income is from burley for the most part.

The Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Committee is doing a fine job administering the agricultural conservation program in the county. Morgan farmers through their use of the ACP have salvaged hundreds of acres of badly eroded land and returned it to usefulness and productivity. However, many farmers do not participate in the program because they do not have the extra money above subsistence needs to meet their portion of the costs of carrying out the needed practices.

We would suggest, and recommend strongly, that the cost-sharing formula be changed, at least for the small farmers, those with limited incomes, in order to help with a pasture-building program on their own land. Cost sharing at 80 percent, or even at the 100-percent level in some cases, would be justifiable in helping a stable family advance above the marginal level of living. Such action would require increased allotments to our county Agriculture Soil Conservation Service committees. Present allocations are not sufficient to meet the additional costs of reaching the many small farmers with limited incomes if such a program is to help them.

Widely used in Appalachian counties, 80-20 money to build pastures on small farms would serve to bring many areas out of a depressed economy and put many rural families on solid footing. The potential in helping small farmers with a special program is great.

Congressman Ed Foreman

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many fine and capable men and ladies are now serving their districts as a Member of the 88th Congress. No finer, abler, and personable person is now a Member of this Congress than EDGAR FRANKLIN FOREMAN, of Odessa, Tex.

It does not seem possible that a person only 30 years of age could in such a short period of time achieve so much and obtain such outstanding recognition as Congressman FOREMAN has. When one meets this young man and talks with him and has the pleasure of serving with him, it it easy to understand why he has received such outstanding honors and such sensational success. When you meet him he greets you with such a genuine and warm greeting that you cannot help but say to yourself that here is a wonderful man.

ED is loved, honored, respected, and looked up to by all Members of the Congress and the citizens of the 16th District of Texas are to be congratulated for having the wisdom and good judgment to send this exceptional man here to represent them.

When I first came to Congress on November 27, 1963, nobody could have been finer and more gracious and kind to me than was ED FOREMAN.

That is the way he does things and he is to be congratulated upon this outstanding honor.

Kansas Legislature Wants Wheat Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the need for immediate action on wheat legislation is further demonstrated by recent action of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas and the Senate of the State of Kansas.

On Monday of this week, by a vote of 76 to 19, the Kansas House of Representatives approved House Concurrent Resolution 12. This resolution urges the Congress to "provide a voluntary type wheat program for the wheat producers of the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, Kansas has long been known as the Wheat State, and we can rest assured that this action by the representatives of the people of that State indicates the desire of Kansans for immediate action on our part to provide a wheat program this year.

The full text of the Kansas resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to provide for a voluntary type wheat program which will improve the economic conditions of wheat producers in the United States

Whereas the production of Hard Red Winter wheat of superior breadmaking quality is the largest agricultural industry of the State of Kansas, and is one of the basic industries of our Nation; and

Whereas the economy of the State of Kansas is largely dependent upon the prosperity of the wheat industry; and

Whereas many businesses such as transportation, milling, storage and merchandising, baking, wholesaling, and retaining firms, and all working people, as well as a vast field of agribusinesses are affected adversely by losses of income in the wheat industry; and

Whereas any adverse effect in our economy will affect State budgets and revenues and prevent accomplishment of the will of the people through governmental activities; and

Whereas a similar situation exists in all major wheat-producing States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide a voluntary type wheat program for the wheat producers of the Nation. Any new legislation recommended and passed should provide for the maintenance and improvement of income and also allow some of our wheat production to be competitive in the markets of the world: be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Day of Wrath, That Dreadful Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all Members of Congress and every American will long remember those fateful days last November. Many of us were asking, "Why?" Many of us were asking, "What is this that has pierced me?" And many of us experienced a feeling of inadequacy in our attempts to properly express our feelings at that time.

We have all been privileged to hear, and to read, numerous tributes to our late President. To me, none is more eloquent than a poem written by one of my constituents, Mrs. Edna Leal Williams, the night of November 25th.

Mrs. Williams, highly talented housewife, is the wife of one of the Northwest's most experienced labor leaders. It is my understanding from the information that came to me that she was so upset by the tragedy that beset us all that she could not sleep and that she composed this remarkable tribute during the period of 1 night. Of course, I am going to see that a suitable copy of this tribute is personally delivered to Mrs. Kennedy.

Entitled "Dies Irae, Dies Illa," "Day of Wrath, That Dreadful Day," it is my humble privilege to ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Williams' poetic tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that it may be preserved for all time, and so that others may also have an opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIES IRAE, DIES ILLA

What is this that has pierced me?
Oh, no, please God, no.
Our gay and gentle knight is hurt.
His love holds on, the grasp grows weak,
He is gone.
With leaden heart we watch as home he soars.
We weep, we weep.
His love goes with him
That he be not alone.
The box is sealed, the flag unfurled.
Our knight pauses yet a while
That all may say farewell.
His love comes in. Oh, tears, oh, tears.
The lament wails round the world.
The great file by.
And now we hear the roll of the caisson.
His love is there that he go not alone.
The black steed prances.
Why this containment? Where is my master?
We must away, there is much to do.
The caisson rolls and his love follows.
The bells toll, weary,
The muffled beat of drums is heard.
The step heavy.
Trees weep, leaves softly drift to earth.
Our knight again pauses in his farewell.
Oh, love.
All night they come, and on into the morn
His flock, with mournful eye.
There is not time enow
That all who love come by.
Time grows more dear
And his love comes near.
The caisson rolls, midst resplendent accompaniment.
He pauses to make ready for his Master.
His great and good friend with sacred vessel greets him
His love is there with him, to enter.
The organ sounds, sweet voice the Ave Maria intones.
His great and good friend chants the Requiem.
Dear Lord, sweet Lord, I am not worthy.
And his love receives her Lord.
Sweet knight, we cannot tarry.
Time is dear, time is dear.
And so, with heavy heart all proceed
Accompanied by muted drum and dirge.
And yet his love is strong.
Now, all is done. No more is left.
Save that our knight again pause briefly.
Then, to rest.
The bagpipes wail, the cannon roars,
The rifles crack out in triad.
And, o'er the sky, our knight's winged friends come by
For one last sweet salute.
His eagle dips low.
The taps sound out.
Oh, dear heart.
The flag is folded, and, with each fold the end draws nigh.
His love clasps it to her heart.
Farewell, farewell.
But lo, wait, not all is lost.
A torch appears with flame eternal.
Quickly, his great and good friend consecrates the fire.
Our knight be not forgotten.
His flame burns on and on
In heart, in spirit, in love.

EPILOG

Awake, awake, oh Nation ours
Lest all be lost!
The foe we seek is not without
But gnaws instead within.
Arise ye legions who love
And sound the cry that fells the enemy.
We love, we love, we love.

An Interview With John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, recently there was published an interview with John L. Lewis, president emeritus, United Mine Workers of America, a man who even in retirement continues to exercise a strong influence on the development of many facets of our national economy. While we are all familiar with the story of John L. Lewis, the labor leader, I think the human side of the man has lacked attention because of his continuous involvemment in great controversial issues. For this reason, I feel sure my colleagues would profit from this published interview written by John Herling of the Washington Daily News and I commend it to your attention:

IMPRESSIONS OF VISIT TO JOHN L. LEWIS BY WASHINGTON LABOR WRITER JOHN HERLING

An audience with John L. Lewis is like an audience with the Pope. You ask for it and really don't expect it. It is hard to come by. When the word comes that Mr. Lewis will see you, you begin to wonder whether such a trip was really necessary. Even after all these years, you are still scared. You ask yourself why you should want to interview Mr. Lewis, and then you acknowledge that you go to see him for the same reason that one climbs Mount Everest. Because it's there and he's there.

Any sense of previous awe quickly melts like snow when under an electric lamp. You wait for him not more than a minute in his upstairs sitting room in the Mine Workers headquarters here, which still has about it the solid air of the old university club these premises once were. As he enters he comes at you steadily with hand extended. His look is sharp and seems to fold back on itself. He looks you over and, as you return the look, he seems to be trying to guess your thoughts about him.

"It must be a dull day on the rialto that brings you to this humble abode," he rumbles softly. It's an old line of his and he utters it with relish. Then he settles back in an armchair. He stares at you and you stare back, faintheartedly. His eyes, always deep, now seem more cavernous. His eyebrows grow hugely. They flare out luxuriantly. He picks up a long cigar, bites the end, lights up, and waves it like a scepter.

WE TRADED EXTRAVAGANCES

"How are all your heros?" he says derisively. "Heroes?" I reply defensively, bristling a little. "Whom do you mean?" Then he mockingly intones the names of several great and near great—in and out of the labor movement. After he gets through with this elephantine caper, I say: "Mr. Lewis, you do yourself an injustice. You know, sir, even those who are reluctant to admit it consider you something rather special. They are only great. You are most great, you are maximus." We are trading extravagances. His eyes light up.

"Aha," says Mr. Lewis, "we know you as being most gracious, even though you are not always perceptive." To which I reply, "On this subject of yourself, you can hardly be objective. By profession, I can only tell the truth."

He waves, as if granting that this round must end somewhere. And then, as is his wont, he interviews you. He asks you a question, and doesn't always wait for your inadequate answer. Most of his questions are rhetorical. They punctuate the reality around you and the world beyond. This talk is filled not only with generalizations about men and motives, but like a cigar wrapper, it encloses layers and layers of detail.

But the details though sometimes wondrous and varied in hue are not yet for telling halfway through, he recalls that our talk is for "background" only. Now that's one of the great frustrations. A talk with John Lewis, and not for quotation.

But the reason for his reticence is admirable, though annoying. He points out that he is no longer the President of the United Mine Workers, that it would ill behoove him to make observations on subjects which were now the province and jurisdiction of Tony Boyle, the new president. So let it be. So let it be.

But most everything he touches on, he adorns with his speech. Those organ tones of his voice resound. Yet when he makes a flat, dry statement of disdain, he wastes no breath, but spits it out with the tobacco. When I recalled a Christmas spent in the coal hills of West Virginia, he gazed at me fixedly. Then he nods slowly, "Oh, those starvation creeks." Silence for almost a minute. Suddenly, the warrier bends over to investigate the end of his cigar.

"Mr. Lewis," I say, "don't you feel you have an obligation to make others feel a renewed sense of urgency?"

"I?" he asks, "I?" He moves his great head, and its gray mane back and forth. "The arena and the welkin are now for others." Then he says abruptly: "Mr. Herling, how many blocks of 7 years do you think one man has to give?" He sits back, his eyes two challenging flames. Even in repose—in repose?—he seems like a man who could never stop giving.

After Defense Cuts, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of our most energetic and constructive colleagues in the House is the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative SILVIO O. CONTE. On many occasions Mr. CONTE has taken the lead in facing up to tough issues and difficult problems. All of us in the House are familiar with our colleague's most recent efforts to create a National Economic Conversion Commission which is designed to lay plans and take steps for the economic protection of communities around the country in the fortunate event that the military-industrial complex, of which President Eisenhower spoke in his last days in office, should be unwound.

A great many communities in the United States rely upon defense contracts for their economic well-being. In part Congressman CONTE's district is of that kind. He has always made a vigorous effort to see to it that his community and district received its fair share of Government service and Government supplied work. Mr. CONTE, however, is a farsighted Congressman and he wishes to prepare for the day that there might be a defense expenditure cutback, as we hope there will be.

On January 18 of this year the North Adams Transcript, an excellent Massachusetts newspaper, editorialized at some length on Mr. CONTE's bill to create such a commission. The editorial sums up the problem and it states the case for Mr. CONTE's bill. It is a fine recognition for a fine piece of work.

The editorial follows:

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript, Jan. 18, 1964]

AFTER DEFENSE CUTS, WHAT?

How to cut defense spending without adding to unemployment is a problem the country must start facing up to.

Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE's bill to create a National Economic Conversion Commission hits directly at this problem which is of sharp concern to Berkshire County jobholders and the Nation as a whole.

The concern results from the Nation's reliance on defense spending to keep the economy rolling. Former President Eisenhower indicated the extent of dependence in a September 1961 address. He said that between 1958 and 1961 the military budget accounted for about 10 percent of all goods and services in the United States and required the employment of 11 percent of the labor force.

There is no reason to believe that these figures have changed markedly since 1961. The question then is, what happens to the economy when defense expenditures are reduced? It is particularly pertinent this year as President Johnson has trimmed $9.5 billion from defense requests, paring the defense budget down to $49.8 billion.

The reduced budget will undoubtedly affect Massachusetts, which normally handles about 5 percent of the Nation's defense business. In our own backyard it has been estimated that roughly 35 percent of the Sprague Electric Co.'s work, mostly of a subcontracting nature, is related to defense spending. And in Pittsfield, it has been estimated that 40 percent of General Electric's work is connected with defense, a higher percentage than most of the GE plants. A headline in the Transcript last week, "GE May Not Get Key Navy Contract It Needs for Jobs," underscored the problem.

Yet a reduction of tensions between counties and ideologies remains an ultimate hope for mankind. A small beginning was made last year with the signing of the limited test ban treaty, an action that hopefully will begin a general movement toward arms reduction.

But the reduction of tensions, while earnestly desired, will have serious implications for the American economy unless plans are made to convert weapons productivity to society's more general peacetime needs. The problem becomes more complicated since there is not a shortage in consumer goods and services, such as existed after World War II, to take up the slack of a weapons cutback. The Nation is now producing all the goods and services that are profitable to private industry, and yet it still has a serious unemployment problem. This is why a commission along the lines Representative CONTE has proposed is so important.

The Berkshire Congressman conceives of the Commission as an agency to develop plans for economic adjustments to changes or reductions in defense expenditures. His legislation, he says, offers ways through which the people of the United States can "safely embrace reasonable opportunities for converting the instruments of war to the instruments of peace."

There are many opportunities and there is much that needs to be done in the areas of better schools, hospitals, housing, water supply (such as converting ocean water to drinking water), public transportation, new fuels and medical research to name only a few. Additionally, the Nation has a tremendous responsibility, if it will but accept it, to assist the economically dispossessed throughout the world in a demonstration that economic prosperity and democracy can go hand in hand.

The problems of a conversion from defense spending are many but the challenges offer an exciting potential. A national program extending down to the local level, is essential to coordinate the task. The formation of an Economic Conversion Commission would be a good start.

Making Our Country Safe for the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party of the United States is the agent of an enemy country. It is engaged in subversion, spying, and is an integral part of the worldwide Communist conspiracy to destroy the United States and the free world. President Kennedy was murdered by a self-avowed Communist who had obvious connections with the Communist Party organizations here and in Russia.

Are we doing anything about these enemies of the United States? Unbelievable as it seems, we are doing our best to help the Communists destroy us.

Months ago the Communist Party was declared to be serving as an agent of an enemy country and ordered to register. The Justice Department made no effort to enforce this decision and Communist Party members laughingly ignored the order.

While these enemy agents continued to flaunt our laws and to increase their subversion, the President was assassinated by one of them.

Now, the court of appeals has ruled that the Communist Party does not have to register and so it will be allowed to continue its efforts to destroy us. And the Communists are taking full advantage by stepping up their efforts in behalf of Cuba, in support of Khrushchev's campaign of hate, subversion, and outright revolution and anti-Americanism throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, is not it time we stand up for America? Is not it time we quit kidding ourselves that the Communists are just members of another political party? Is not it time we deal with these enemies as we should and put an end to the ridiculous situation where we are helping the bandits who are attempting to burn down our house and murder us?

How the court decision is helping the Communist Party is told in the following news article by Victor Reisel in the Washington World of February 3, 1964:

U.S. REDS PUSH FOR RECOGNITION OF CASTRO'S CUBA

(By Victor Reisel)

Apparently the Communist Party (U.S.A.) is having no difficulty staying out of the red—financially. Its national headquarters, operated smoothly out of a proletarian building in Washington, is about to launch new coast-to-coast drives on the political, industrial, and literary fronts.

The party, like all shrewd strategists, has both an immediate major objective and a series of minor tactical goals.

Its prime objective is the creation of an atmosphere that would make possible the unleashing of front organizations which, in turn, would fight for the recognition of Communist Cuba by the United States.

The party's lesser objective is the exploitation of Chairman Khrushchev's new soft line—the new coexistence—brought on by the feeling in some quarters that the United States should back the Soviets in their conflict with Communist China.

Not one bit of this strategy is haphazard. There have been a series of Communist high command meetings in New York and Chicago under the guidance of Gus Hall—who calls Castro "comrade"—and Arnold Johnson, the Communists' public relations director.

POLITICAL DRIVE

Plans made at these sessions developed in detail a political drive in some 40 States. Early in January the Community Party dispatched letters to the secretaries of state and the attorneys general of all States asking for full explanations of the regional election laws. There was special interest in the possibility of write-in votes in States where the election requirements would prevent getting on the ballot this year.

Most of this activity began after the Court of Appeals in Washington ruled that the Communist Party was not guilty of having failed to register as a Moscow-controlled Communist action group. This decision came from a three-judge bench.

Recently, the Justice Department, through its Internal Security Division, asked the court of appeals to sit "en banc" to review the three-man ruling which left the party free to operate. "En banc" means a sitting of all nine judges of the Appeals Court.

If history repeats itself, and the Justice Department wins again, the Communists will have to register as "Moscow controlled." This would cripple them.

If not, it all goes to the Supreme Court for a final decision. That process will take years. In the meantime the party will make lots of propaganda hay.

Ed Foreman

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, ED FOREMAN, has his office directly across the hall from mine. I have come to know him well and derive great satisfaction from working with him in the Congress. ED'S dynamic drive, his persistent adherence to duty and devotion to principle, number him among the leaders of our time. I am proud to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues and add sincerest congratulations to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce for selecting ED one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year.

Thinkers, Doers, and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, before consideration of the civil rights bill next week, I recommend that each Member of this House read the following column.

This article was written by Bill Hamilton, a student at Clemson College, and a columnist for the Clemson College Tiger. This is a superb and timely article.

THINKERS, DOERS, AND CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Bill Hamilton)

Humanity down through the ages, for some reason, has always tended to divide itself into two categories: the thinkers and doers. The thinkers are people who work with abstractions, and the doers are people who work with things. Thinkers, as a rule, come from families with strong mother influences, weak father influences, or both, and doers, likewise as a rule, spring from strong fathers, weak mothers, or both. Thinkers are sensitive and outspoken though in practical applications often inept, and doers are naturally inclined to be toughened and reticent, though very efficient and down to earth. But what, really, does this have to do with anything at all in the modern scene?

For one thing, radicals, revolutionaries, and avant-garde reformers tend to come mainly from the thinker group, a fact illustrated in recent civil rights movements. If you asked a Negro or white intellectual what the Negro really wanted, you would probably get answers like "God-given rights" or "human dignity" or "freedom" from civil rights leaders such as Martin Luther King or James Baldwin. But these words are abstractions, vague, with different meanings for different people. These are the words of the thinkers, the words of men who spend their lives working with ideas; but do they have any meaning for people who work with things, for ordinary 40-hour-a-week people, or for the unemployed Negroes whose hearts leap up at the sound of them but whose stomachs growl because they haven't had much to eat lately? It's doubtful.

The thinkers on the race situation are articulate and outspoken, dedicated, energetic, and sincere, but are the brain children of these thinkers, the nonviolent demonstrations (which invariably result in violence for some reason), the marches on the Capital, or the tear-jerking sermons and books really the things which bring human dignity and God-given rights? (Only God and Martin Luther King can put their finger on these, and I'm not even sure of Martin Luther King.) The problem of the American Negro seems to be that he is, as a whole (but with notable exceptions), intellectually, socially, and economically behind the rest of the population; and the thinker approach to the problem has been to weep great tears in lamentation of a lack of opportunity. However, sharply contrasted to this is the more practical doer approach of taking fuller advantage of existing opportunities. You don't hear too much from these doer Negroes, though: they're generally working too hard improving themselves and their people to have time to shed big tears before sentimental audiences. These are the kind of Negroes who don't bother whether they can eat in white restaurants; they build their own restaurants and serve whomever they please. These are the Negro doctors, lawyers, businessmen, scientists, skilled welders, plumbers and masons, the George Washington Carvers and the Booker T. Washingtons, the men who really give dignity to the Negro race. An energetic Negro of this doer set was interviewed several months back in U.S. News & World Report. He is S. B. Fuller, self-made businessman and founder of the $10 million a year Fuller Products Co.

In order to improve his condition, Fuller advises the young Negro to get a good education. "It's not up to the teacher," he says. "It's up to the student." Come out of school with a something to offer, he continues, a talent to sell. Fuller sees the main Negro problem as unemployment. But the Negro is unemployed not so much because of discrimination as for the fact that he is unskilled. He points out that when Negroes get skills that employers want, they will be hired.

"The minute that they (the Negroes) can develop themselves so they excel in whatever they do—then they are going to find they don't have any real problem." To down-to-earth people this is a reasonable statement. If an engineering firm, for example, were required by law (the kind of law the civil righters are calling for) to make 35 percent of its personnel Negro in this State (South Carolina is approximately 35 percent Negro), the firm would have a tougher time finding 35 qualified Negro engineers than it would 65 qualified white engineers. However, if 35 percent of this State's best engineers were Negroes, the firm would commit economic suicide if it refused to hire certain engineers because of color.

In the final analysis, the question of civil rights boils down to this: Does dignity follow achievement, or does achievement follow dignity? Negro leaders, do-gooders, radicals, intellectuals, and members of the thinker category up to this point have taken it as axiomatic that if the Negro had dignity, he would naturally begin to excel in everything. But to the more practical doers, dignity and self-respect are things to be earned through hard work and self-discipline, not legislated by Congress or set down in Supreme Court decrees.

Details on Gift Should Be Made Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial calls for the full facts in connection with gifts and other matters that have come to light in the Bobby Baker affair.

This editorial, appearing in the Spokesman Review on January 25, 1964, calls for the answers to questions which heretofore have not been explained and which the American people justifiably demand be answered before passing judgment on those high Government officials who are involved.

The editorial reads:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman Review, Jan. 25, 1964]

MORE EXPLANATION NEEDED ON GIFT

President Johnson must certainly know the difference between the exchange of token gifts among friends and the acceptance of a $580 stereo set from a subordinate on the public payroll who may have sought to curry favor with his boss.

Mr. Johnson's explanation this week of his acceptance of the stereo set leaves something to be desired. There apparently is some conflict among the reports as to the

original source of the gift and the reason for its presentation. The President is still insisting that there was merely a simple exchange of presents between the Johnson family and that of Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the Democratic Senate majority.

The revelations made before a Senate committee now investigating the case of Bobby Baker continue to imply that there was considerable influence peddling within the Government during that period when Mr. Johnson was the Senate leader of the Democratic majority.

President Johnson was wise in volunteering a bit of information about the "exchange of presents" with Mr. Baker. The public will be awaiting further explanations before a firm judgment is rendered in regard to Mr. Johnson's one-time protege in regard to the President himself.

Chamber of Commerce President Fires Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who seems to be a victim of the malady described here as "foot-in-mouth disease," has just been called to order on another misleading statement.

The correction does not come from a politician in this instance, but rather from the able president of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Mr. E. R. Albert, Jr., in a letter dated January 24, 1964.

Because the subject matter is of keen interest to the Members of the House, I am making available the complete text of Mr. Albert's letter to Mr. Neilan, as follows:

TULSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tulsa, Okla., January 24, 1964.

Mr. EDWIN P. NEILAN,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Bank of Delaware, Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. NEILAN: A most disturbing newspaper clipping was sent to me last week by the mayor of Bay City, Tex., Mr. R. C. Gusman. You will undoubtedly remember this occasion when you met Mayor Gusman as well as Col. James S. Maxwell, district engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston, Tex., and others of his guests when you were there.

In your speech at this time you refer to the justification of the Arkansas Basin Development in terms of the 438 citizens of Catoosa, Okla. The January 15, 1964, issue of the Gulf Coast Sentinel, Bay City, Tex., quotes you as saying "Everything is a need. The people of Catoosa, Okla., population 438, live 500 miles from salt water; they need a seaport. The late Senator Kerr told them so. More than a billion dollars is going into this project to bring barge traffic to Catoosa. Sure a wide area will be served by the project, of course, but looking at it strictly from the viewpoint of the 438 people of Catoosa, it's a subsidy of about $2.5 million a person. That's a lot of subsidy for anybody, but, the politicians say, such needs must be filled."

We object very strenuously to the incorrect connotation you are placing upon the Arkansas River navigation program. There are considerably more than 438 persons to be benefited by the Arkansas basin project. A little reasoning and commonsense would tell you that. In the first place Catoosa is within the urban limits of Tulsa. The Tulsa city population is 283,000. The Tulsa County population is 370,000. The Tulsa standard metropolitan statistical area population is 442,250. Justifiable benefits of the projects also include the entire State of Oklahoma whose population is 2,328,284, while the river passes through the State of Arkansas which has a population of 1,786,272.

Mr. Neilan, directly attributable benefits will accrue to more than 8 million people in the following seven States: Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. However, I believe I have made my point. This is a considerably different total than the 438 persons to which you refer.

For many years we have deplored Federal spending in projects which should logically be supported from local finances. If I am correctly informed, at your annual meeting last year there was some modification of the national chamber's policy declaration on water resources project justification. Among other things I believe that the statement as to the ratio between benefits and average annual cost was softened from its previous wording. It had suggested that values were to be "materially" in excess of the cost, whereas as the word "materially" has now been taken out. Applying the yardstick of the national chamber's own policy statement to the Arkansas Basin development we can report to you that according to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers it has been estimated that the annual benefits which would result from the construction of the Arkansas River plan would be as follows:

Savings in transportation charges	$40,470,000
Flood control benefit	6,336,900
Power value	10,921,000
Water supply	800,000
Channel stabilization	6,575,000
Fish and wildlife conservation	637,000
Annual total	65,739,900

In other words for the entire Arkansas Basin program, the annual direct benefits will be about $65.7 million, or $6 million per year more than is required to amortize the project in 50 years.

By the way, a recent report of the U.S. Army Engineer Division regarding similar projects in your home State of Delaware shows millions of dollars have been authorized or expended in past years. We believe that the same project justification criteria were used by the Corps of Engineers for the programs located in both of our great States. If so, and I'm sure it was, did you or your organization oppose these projects?

While one of your more important projects—an inland waterway from the Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay—was originally constructed in the early 19th century by private interests, we note that this was taken over by the U.S. Government in 1919 and we presume this was for the reason which is well stated in the first project justification of the chamber's policy: "The project cannot better be accomplished by non-Federal means or by joint development by private interests and the Government."

We are quite interested, also, to note that among surveys underway in Delaware, there is a basinwide study as to the needs of the Delaware River Basin "for flood control, water supply, recreation, hydroelectric power, navigation, and irrigation."

Mr. Neilan, I just received your letter of January 21 regretting your inability to accept our invitation to be a speaker at one of our forum luncheons. We would like to have given you the opportunity of seeing Catoosa—and also the great potential industrial area to be created when the Arkansas is navigable. In fact, our raw materials and our natural resources give a promise of its being even greater than the Ohio River Valley By the way, I don't recall where I have read of your criticism of the Ohio River development with Federal funds.

It is important to us that we correct the misleading text which you used in your talk at Bay City, Tex., and we know not where else. And before you say, "Those people in Tulsa were for me until I started talking about their project," let me again remind you that not only was there economic justification for the project in the first place, but also during the past 8 years over $400 million has been invested in this program which can be finished by the end of this decade.

I hope to see you in Oklahoma City in February and at the annual meeting in Washington.

Sincerely,

E. R. ALBERT, Jr.,
President.

National Origin System in Immigration Law Must Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Monday, January 13, 1964. My statement follows:

I welcome, indeed, the privilege of appearing before you and having this opportunity to talk on our immigration policy. I appreciate fully the difficult task undertaken by you, a like task which the House committee will undertake soon.

I propose to address myself to Senator HART's bill, S. 1932, which is identical to the bill I introduced in the House, H.R. 7700, a proposal submitted to the Congress in a special message by the late President Kennedy and supported by President Johnson in his state of the Union message.

Since the enactment, in 1924, of the law which enunciated the restrictive ideology of the national origins theory imbedded in that act and carried forward in the act of 1952, the criticism has been both acute and unceasing. Historians, social philosophers, demographers have pointed again and again to the fallacious reasoning which led to the adoption of the national origins formula.

Forty years of testing have proven that the pattern of discrimination has not only produced imbalances, but that Congress itself, through various acts, has been forced by the realities of a changing world to modify this formula so that today it remains on the books primarily as an expression of gratuitous condescension. In fact, it applies now to only 33 percent of our total annual immigration and even with regard to that 33 percent it is splintered time and time again by legislative patchwork attempting to prop up a crumbling structure. This committee, as is the House committee, is familiar with the vast number of private immigration bills enacted by every Congress, again emphasizing the unworkability of an anachronistic formula.

I am firmly convinced that this formula would have been changed years ago had a workable substitute been found. In S. 1932 we now have a fair, a realistic and flexible formula which in our own national self-interest literally begs for adoption.

It is no secret to you, nor for that matter to anyone in Congress, that I have been highly vocal in decrying the national origins system of immigration selection. I have sponsored some and followed closely each Act of Congress which fractured the untenable ratio of selectivity that allots annually some 65,000 quota numbers to Great Britain and some 300 to Greece and 250 to Spain.

Congress recognized well what it was doing when it adopted these one-shot acts. Our respective committees were well aware of the legitimate attacks upon that system, but whatever the reason, we chose not to call a spade a spade. In a sense, then, each of the acts of Congress I am about to enumerate has been an act of redemption, the slow retreat from the fears and failures of 1924.

As soon as Nazi Germany's surrender silenced the guns of World War II, the free world awoke to face the overwhelming task of resettling over 1.5 million victims of Nazi and Communist terror, the liberated inmates of concentration camps and Hitler's slave laborers; in short, the mass of humanity stamped "displaced persons." The United States decided to offer hospitality to what was deemed to be her fair share of the unfortunates. However, the national origins formula of the 1924 law remained an unsurmountable obstacle to what the people of the United States wanted to do; namely, to accept the responsibility which the U.S. position of leadership in the world had imposed.

In 1948, the 80th Congress passed the first Displaced Persons Act. Woefully inadequate as that law was, it permitted the entry of 200,000 displaced persons outside of the national origins quota limitation, but in spite of the objections of many, myself included, that law imposed an unfair mortgage of the immigration quotas.

The 81st Congress passed the second Displaced Persons Act, sponsored by myself. Once again, the Congress recognized that the national origins quota system must be disregarded if this country were to respond to the public demand and discharge its moral and humanitarian obligations. As a compromise, the unfortunate mortgage feature of the 1948 law was retained.

In 1957, however, under a bill sponsored in the Senate by the late President Kennedy and in the House by my late friend and colleague, Mr. Walter, the mortgage provision was stricken from the statute books in obvious recognition of the fact that the situation created by the simultaneous operation of the national origins system plus the mortgage, had become untenable. Congress knew that the doors to the United States could no longer stay tightly shut for immigrants born in some 11 countries of Eastern Europe which suffered most under Hitler's and Stalin's rule.

The ink was hardly dry on the basic act of 1952 when, early in 1953, the Congress recognized that while the displaced persons and refugees resettlement problems have not yet been solved, the new law, by carrying forward the national origins formula, left this country without any instrumentality to cope with its responsibilities and the emergent needs of the homeless. A new refugee admission law was proposed and quickly passed. It is known as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. It brought to these shores over 220,000 refugees outside of the quota system, outside of the national origins formula and even without the pitiful expediency of the mortgage used in the 1948 and the 1950 enactments.

Just as the two Displaced Persons Acts constituted the first loud and public admission of the obsolescence and the unworkability of the national origins formula of the 1924 law, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, enacted only 8 months after the 1952 act became effective, remains an equally convincing piece of evidence of the bankruptcy of the system so very unfortunately incorporated in the statute now in effect.

Since 1957 every Congress, without exception, has been called upon to pass and did, indeed, pass a law further bending, chipping off, and whittling away the national origins formula.

Under pressure of inescapable facts, the 85th Congress passed the Act of September 11, 1957, converting into nonquota status many thousands of immigrants in the first, second, and third preferences, the highly skilled aliens whose services were urgently needed in this country and the relatives of U.S. citizens and immigrants. Under the same law all unused numbers remaining from the Refugee Relief Act allocations were authorized to be used—again without regard to national origin of the applicants.

The Hungarian emergency caught the United States again unprepared to cope with the crying and most urgent need for offering asylum to the victims of Soviet terror. A broad interpretation of the law was used and the doors were open but the Congress had to act fast to redress the situation and the same 85th Congress enacted on August 8, 1958, the law granting permanent residence to upwards of 40,000 Hungarian refugees. The principle of national origins received another body blow.

From 1957 on, this trend of congressional action in the field of immigration became obvious—and permanent. Every year, without exception, brought new laws admitting outside of the national origins system highly skilled specialists, relatives of U.S. citizens and permanetly residing aliens as well as refugees; always, however, on a piecemeal basis, never reaching the core of the problem.

In 1958, the Congress passed four such laws, the acts of July 25, August 8, August 21, and September 2. The last one, Public Law 85-892, had an additional significance as it selected just nationals of two countries for relief, the Portuguese victims of the earthquake which took place on the Azores and the Dutch expelled from Indonesia—a truly convincing admission of the inadequacy of the national origins quota system, as the quota for the Netherlands is relatively large, while the Portuguese quota is very small—both equally inadequate to achieve congressional intent to help.

The 86th Congress acted twice along the same lines. The act of September 22, 1959, granted nonquota status to relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents who had already experienced a waiting period on the consular registers exceeding 10 to 15 years. The act of July 14, 1960, admitted more Portuguese and more Dutchmen as well as authorized the paroling of refugees with the built-in provision permitting the Attorney General to adjust their status to that of permanent residence after they had spent 2 years in the United States. National origin was again totally disregarded.

The 87th Congress did not deviate from this, now almost traditional, course of action. Again, under the Act of September 26, 1961, the reuniting of immigrant families was expedited by exempting large numbers of registrants from the national origin restrictions. Following that, under the act of October 24, 1962, the Congress has enlarged on the categories of relatives permitted to enter on a nonquota basis and for the fourth time since 1957 has extricated first preference applicants, the skilled specialists, from the national origins straitjacket.

Thus, year after year the Congress continued to tear away bits and pieces of the national origins system until a situation was created where that system, as of fiscal year 1963, governs the admission of only 33 percent of our total immigration intake while the onus of it remains nailed down to our entire immigration code.

In view of this history can we honestly say that we are now faced with a radical proposal? Are we really suddenly and dramatically departing from that which we presumably had held sacred for 40 years? Obviously not. Instead of clean surgery we have indulged ourselves in operations of occasional blood infusion into a moribund system.

In S. 1932 and H.R. 7700 careful provision is made for proper transition. For 5 years each quota allotment will be reduced 20 percent until at the end of that period there will be no national allotments. The unallotted numbers will be placed into a general pool and issued in chronological order within statutorily defined preferences favoring highly skilled specialists and uniting of families. Special provisions are made for emergency situations, thus eliminating the need for emergency legislation which we have been called upon to pass over the years.

At this point I want to make it clear, since every discussion surrounding immigration changes is obscured by arguments about our unemployment, our lack of classrooms, our housing, etc., that these arguments are totally irrelevant since the bill before you in no way significantly increases the basic numbers of immigrants to be permitted entry. We are not talking about increased immigration; we are talking about equality of opportunity for all peoples to reach this promised land. We freely acknowledge the fact that we are a land of immigrants, that this amalgam of blood has given us the richness, the diversity, the creativity that no other country in history has been able to achieve. From the builder of tunnels to the atomic scientist, we have drawn from the pool of world talent and have created a pluralistic society which—and I do not exaggerate—remains the wonder of all living historians.

In this complex age, therefore, shall not we as a nation have the means whereby we can choose freely from all corners of the earth the talents and the skills we need and not limit our own choice because one man of genius was born 5 miles east or south of the wrong boundary. This is the beauty of this proposal, this flexibility, this acknowledgment that talent does not repose in only a few chosen spots of land areas.

It is now 40 years, almost to the day, since the 1924 national origins law was enacted. Throughout all these years, as a Member of Congress, I fought for change. I do not want to wait another 40 years.

I respectfully submit that the fears and phobias of four decades ago have no place in our society in 1964. I respectfully submit that the days of patching are behind us. Is it not time our surgery were direct, clean, and straightforward?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Competing for Our Own Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, thoughtful citizens today can hardly avoid concern over the ever-changing international scene. But it is the rare citizen who has the resources, the skills, and the dedication to win public attention and respect for his analysis of events.

Such a citizen, however, is Mr. A. N. Spanel, of Princeton, N.J., founder and chairman of International Latex Corp. Since 1939, he and his company have carried on a tireless public service campaign in behalf of the free world's ideals.

All of you, I am sure, have seen Mr. Spanel's moving messages which appear in the press as advertisements. But they are advertisements, distinguished and distinct, because they deal not in products but in propositions. And Mr. Spanel's basic proposition is that the democratic nations of the world can make their way of live prevail.

The crisis in Panama seems to make Mr. Spanel's most recent statement particularly worthy of attention. Titled "Competing for Our Own Destruction," it appeared in the Washington Post and the New York Times on January 20, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPETING FOR OUR OWN DESTRUCTION

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

The one thing crystal clear in our time of confusion is that thermonuclear war is something only madmen could want or plan. It would make a shambles of this planet. The "victors," if they could be identified, would merely inherit the poisoned rubble of a depopulated world in its death throes.

There should be an end, therefore, to the malicious hurling of the epithet "warmonger" against those with whom we disagree. What's involved in honest political debate on world affairs is simply differing views on how best to avoid a world war, short of surrender to communism.

A nuclear showdown would be like curing a headache by cutting off the head. Nobody wants it. And that includes the Communists. They may be fantastic and ruthless, but they are not mad, and decidedly have no relish for suicide.

This, however, does not mean that they have abandoned their unswerving commitment to total victory through the destruction of our civilization. The exclusion of nuclear conflict does not exclude deadly aggression by other means—the means which have already imprisoned a third of the human race in their slave world.

THE LURE

The code word or slogan for their inflexible challenge, in recent years, has been "peaceful coexistence." At first we saw through it as a semantic hoax. But gradually—for such is the power of wishful hoping and massive propaganda—our understanding became confused. Those who make free world policies, unfortunately, have begun to treat the slogan as if it meant to them what it means to us.

But it doesn't. The Communists have made it clear in words and acts that to them peaceful coexistence is not the same as peace. On the contrary, it creates favorable conditions for their intensified attack by all means short of war—including violence, as we can see in Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, Venezuela, and now Panama.

The coexistence lure did not deter Soviet Russia from sneaking missiles into Cuba. It does not deter them today from pouring high-octane gasoline on the flames in Panama through their propaganda. (Secretary of State Rusk has said that Castro agents have taken a direct hand in the Panamanian crisis.)

Despite their beguiling slogan, the Communists continue to speak and act in terms of victory over our world. Peaceful coexistence, Khrushchev explained last August 19, is not a cessation of hostilities, "but an active and intensive struggle, in the course of which socialism irresistibly attacks, while capitalism suffers one defeat after another."

On June 21, 1963, he told his Central Committee: "We want—not only want but have dug—quite a deep hole, and shall exert efforts to dig this hole deeper and bury the capitalist system forever."

A statement featured by the Soviet press on July 14, 1963, declared: "We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished by class struggle as soon as possible."

OUR BLINDNESS

In this Communist "Mein Kampf" one finds full confirmation that they have not retreated one inch from Lenin's goal of Communist world dominion. They don't practice coexistence but wage it. The Kremlin has repeatedly announced its readiness to support with arms all just wars, wars of liberation—meaning wars they approve or have themselves fomented.

Unless we recognize these truths, unless free nations forswear bickering among themselves to confront the common menace, our world is doomed. If, as Khrushchev insists, the extinction of our freedoms is inevitable, it will be because we have failed to pool our moral, economic, and political strengths through genuine unity.

But, unhappily, we are today engaged in a species of competition for our own destruction. How heartbreaking to watch one free world ally playing with China while another plays with Russia. How heartbreaking to watch allies undermining the position of the United States in its own hemisphere by defying the American embargo on Cuba. While American forces are fighting and dying to save South Vietnam (as Frenchmen fought and died—alone—to save Indochina from falling into Communist hands), an ally now proposes its neutralization through unification with North Vietnam—the surest road to an all-Communist southeast Asia.

These are but a few examples of the babel of policies which opens paths to Communist victory. This suicidal competition in the camp of freedom derives from a failure or refusal to face up to the reality of the Communist challenge. Deliberately, as if propelled by a Freudian death wish, we drug ourselves with soporific slogans, and illusions that "the cold war is over."

OUR INDIVISIBLE INTERESTS

Recently we had occasion to write in these columns about a European statesman who proclaimed a century ago: "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual." It made cynical Realpolitik for the simpler time. But in today's complex world, threatened by total annihilation, it has become a self-defeating fallacy, because the overriding interests of all free nations are now indivisible.

Yet nearly all Western statesmen continue to place their national interests above the major common interest. Thereby they fragment the free world power and resolution which are indispensable to stave off the common danger. If the common danger be denied, why the bankrupting nuclear buildup? Since it is real, our divisiveness is deadly folly.

The unwary and deluded, echoing the Communists, attempt to misrepresent firm and unified policy vis-a-vis communism as "warmongering." By this time the Communists, being no fools, surely have no doubt that the free nations desperately seek peace. Indeed, the Kremlin constantly exploits our eagerness to "reduce tensions" in order to wring more concessions from us—piecemeal surrenders that whittle down the areas of freedom. They have ample cause for laughter over our euphoric excitement about marginal treaties despite the clear Communist record of treaty violations.

There are those who defend passivity and appeasement by comparing the life-and-death contest between freedom and communism with the historic struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism. That religious conflict, they argue, ended in true coexistence, as underlined by the recent ecumenical congresses in the Vatican. So why not relax and wait for a similar resolution of the current ideological struggle?

The analogy is both false and dangerous. The religious struggle mainly involved one side of life, the spiritual and its authority but with the teachings of Jesus proclaimed as the common denominator; the present contest is totalitarian, involving all aspects of human existence. The schism in Christianity was fought through centuries, allowing time for passions to subside and an adjustment to shape up. Today the pace is so rapid that there are no margins of time for such adjustment. The great decisions are being made in our own lifetimes. To wait for the long processes of evolution would give the right-of-way to the revolutionary enemy. Communism, committed by its faith to absolute world hegemony, can never settle for a world half-free half-slave.

The Catholic-Protestant analogy is a piece of wishful thinking that can only confuse and disarm us, insuring our annihilation. It may apply to the schism within the Communist world, between Red Russia and Red China, but not to the struggle between freedom and communism.

PREVENTING NUCLEAR WAR

The free world has no alternative but to confront these truths with open eyes and clear minds. All sane men, we repeat, want to avoid nuclear holocaust. But the surest

way to bring about the war nobody wants is to delude ourselves about the fixed goals of communism.

Every symptom of softness, jitters and disunity tempts our enemy to risk adventures that can provoke the awesome showdown: Cuba in October 1962 stands as the classic proof of this fact.

As freemen, we can in the long run make our way of life prevail over the common enemy's, without a world holocaust, if we bring into our international household: order, logic, genuine partnership and all-embracing communications on a continuous basis. The greatest immediate need is for a moratorium on the competition for self-destruction; for an end to strangling divisiveness.

Only a unity in depth and in breadth will enable freedom on earth to flourish and thus give the free world the aggregate strength it needs not only to save itself, but also this threatened planet, from destruction.

Government Employees Union Praises Postmaster General Gronouski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial by John F. Griner, national president, American Federation of Government Employees, which appeared in the January 24 issue of the Government Standard. The editorial, entitled "Job Uncertainty Hurts Morale," praises the Postmaster General for his understanding of the human side of personnel management:

Many Government employees are understandably concerned about their future. Their concern stems from reports of forthcoming cuts in agency payrolls. Unfortunately, very few management officials have seen fit to keep their employees informed on what changes are planned and how these changes will affect the work force.

One exception to this is Postmaster General John Gronouski. Mr. Gronouski obviously understands that nothing upsets morale more than for employees to be kept guessing about whether they will have a job next week, next month, or next year. Mr. Gronouski wrote a personal article to Post Office employees explaining what the economy move would mean to them.

Mr. Gronouski told employees the economy steps do not pose any threats to their job security. And he explained that the Department has set up a task force to work with union officers "to cut jobs—not livelihoods."

While reassuring employees on future job security, Mr. Gronouski did not gloss over the fact that the budget cutting would have a noticeable impact on the Department's activities. "We must expect some periods of trial in the months ahead as we meet our goals," Mr. Gronouski said, acknowledging that the increasing workload "will put constant pressures on us."

The Postmaster General's actions have demonstrated that he realizes there is a human side of personnel management. His resolve "to cut jobs—not livelihoods" is a recognition of the fact that there is nothing beneficial in an economy drive that puts loyal employees on the rolls of the unemployed.

In seeking the views and assistance of union leaders, Mr. Gronouski acted in keeping with the true spirit of President Kennedy's Executive order on employee management relations in the Federal service.

All of the actions taken by Mr. Gronouski in handling the job reduction program can be accurately described as good management. It certainly is poor management to keep employees in the dark about their agency's future operations and plans. This inevitably leads to rumors which upset employees and prevent them from doing their best work.

It also is poor management when workloads cannot be planned in such a manner as to avoid the necessity of laying off career employees. We do not believe that President Johnson's efforts to run the Government as economically as possible are intended to aggravate the unemployment problem by putting out of work civil servants who have given years of loyal and dedicated service to their country.

Postmaster General Gronouski has shown that the problem of job reductions can be handled effectively and at the same time compassionately. Other Government agencies can achieve the same results, if they adopt the enlightened and progressive approach that this serious situation demands.

Difficulties Besetting the Cause of Freedom in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have recently had called to my attention a very informative, objective, and outstanding address by a former Foreign Service officer of the United States, Mr. Elliott Taylor, who has retired from his work with the State Department. On December 10, Mr. Taylor made an address before the Rotary Club in Greenville, S.C., and at that time he gave his assessment of the difficulties which are besetting the cause of freedom on the continent of Africa. In view of the fact that Africa is again in the forefront of the news, I think his remarks would be of particular interest to the Members of the Congress.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taylor's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members of the Greenville Rotary Club, gentlemen, I am complimented by your invitation to be with you today and to share some thoughts with you, although I do not profess to be an authority in government relations.

When we serve with the U.S. Government and its various departments either in Washington or abroad, we quite rightfully have obligations and responsibilities to dedicate ourselves to the well-being of our Government and to support the particular administration—whether Democrat or Republican—which happens to be in power. One learns to subjugate his own opinions and inclinations and to adhere to the policies as enunciated by the administration. In my remarks to you today, I will not reveal any security information nor violate the trust of having been a Government official. However, the basis for my thoughts are publicly known, and it is a good feeling to exercise our American principle of free speech today as a citizen.

During the national elections compaign in 1960, you will recall that the issue of whether the American image abroad was good or had been impaired came up again and again between the two presidential candidates. One candidate declared that the U.S. image in foreign countries had suffered immeasurably under the Republican administration and declared his intentions and policies of doing something about it.

I have learned from my assignments over the years in the Orient, in Europe, in Africa, and in Washington that the U.S. image abroad is something like the stock market. On good days, our stock goes up—on other days, the situation may suffer a reverse and the stock goes down. It doesn't seem to matter whether there is a Republican or a Democrat occupying the White House. Generally speaking, people in other countries of the world have tremendous respect and admiration for the United States, for the American people, and especially for the American way of life. There are many misconceptions and false impressions about the United States in foreign lands, but these can be corrected. Basically, the respect we are accorded is constant. We have our bad days, and we receive probably more than our share of criticism, but other countries are always seeking our good will and friendship and understanding. They are always ready and waiting with their hands out to receive more American dollars and support and more U.S. foreign aid assistance.

Shortly after the national elections in 1960, Mr. G. Mennen Williams, formerly Governor of Michigan—known as "Soapy" Williams to his intimates—was named Assistant Secretary of State for Africa in the Department of State. His was a Presidential appointment. Mr. Williams made a hurried trip to several African countries to acquire knowledge of an area for which he was supposed to be an expert. Somewhere during his trip, he mounted his soapbox and beat the drums declaring our U.S. policy as being: "Africa for the Africans."

Now in Africa, when you speak of the "African," you are referring to the black man. The millions of white settlers and Asians in various countries of Africa countered with loud cries of protest. Although their skins are not black, they too claim the privilege of living in Africa and being first-class citizens. Mr. Williams attempted to get himself and the U.S. Government out of a bad spot by declaring he did not mean just the black man as Africans when he used the term, but that he was referring to all of the peoples of Africa. It was a likely beginning for the uninitiated politician. His idle remark—made in passing—hurt the U.S. image. The people in various parts of Africa still haven't forgotten. They will remember "Soapy" Williams for many years to come.

Another instance concerning the U.S. image occurred just this time a year ago when one of our distinguished Senators from Louisiana toured several African countries to look into U.S. Government programs and operations. At the airport in Salisbury, Rhodesia, Senator ALLEN ELLENDER told a group of newspaper reporters that the "black man in Africa would need the help and assistance of the white man for many decades to come." He said, in effect, that nowhere during his trip had he seen anything of any consequence developed by the African himself—without the assistance of the white man.

Our friend, Senator ELLENDER, was declared a nondesirable immigrant and persona non grata by three East African countries next

on his schedule and he was not permitted to enter these areas, except for plane refueling stops. By the time he got to Nairobi, Kenya, last December, he was a puzzled and bewildered gentleman. He said he was only trying to do his job and to save the American taxpayer some money. He decried the waste and mismanagement of the foreign aid program—and his facts and findings were later published by the Senate in a special report. After a 2-hour stop in Nairobi, Senator ELLENDER continued on his way, but he made headlines in the African newspapers for weeks. Several months later, when Senator ELLENDER spoke at the University of Maryland, the newspapers in Nairobi—8,000 miles away—headlined his remarks on the front page, reading "Senator ELLENDER Does It Again."

I don't know what the reaction in the United States was to his remarks on Africa, but you may be interested to know that there were many Africans and white men in Africa—along with American officials—who agreed with Senator ELLENDER. They said he was entirely right. His only mistake may have been in making his statements in Africa instead of in Washington. But the fact that a Member of the Congress could be openly critical of some of our policies abroad—especially in the handling of our foreign aid program—was healthy, and it certainly pinpointed our American principle of freedom of speech. You might wish to ask yourselves how critical the opposition can be of the Government in many foreign countries. For me, it is interesting to speculate on how long the opposition will last in Kenya, under Jomo Kenyatta, who will become president of that newly independent country on Thursday. He won't tolerate criticism in any form.

Senator ELLENDER's 800 page report on this particular trip makes mighty interesting reading. You might ask one of our South Carolina Senators to send you a copy.

Another more recent instance involving the U.S. image abroad was the handling and reporting of the Birmingham racial demonstrations as reflected in the press of Africa. One Sunday morning last spring, I picked up the two English tabloids in Nairobi and was shocked to learn from the headlines that "Race Riots Break Out in United States." The subheading read: "Infants Carted Off to Jail." Televised newscasts that evening showed a 2-minute film clip of Birmingham policemen using fire hose and dogs to dispel Negro demonstrators. Except for the policemen, there seemed to be no whites involved. Yet the headlines would have given the impression that the United States was engaged internally in turmoil and violence.

The situation in Birmingham was deplorable and affected, of course, the U.S. image abroad. However, the statements being prepared in Washington by the Attorney General and others and sent abroad for dissemination by the U.S. Information Service to target audiences failed to improve our U.S. image. To my knowledge, many people in Nairobi wondered at the audacity and plausibility of such autocratic pronouncements and statements coming from Washington. Our administration seemed intent on justifying the Government's official position on civil rights at the expense of the entire South. Little attention or credit was being given to those areas—particularly in the South—where more understanding and tolerance was being accorded the racial picture. The joint efforts of the white and Negro leaders to help solve the problems received scant notice. In my opinion, the overall picture was not presented in its true light. By neglecting to do so, more serious harm was done to our U.S. image abroad. It appeared that a bad situation was being made worse.

In my work in Kenya, I found that many African leaders wish to associate themselves with the American Negro, not only on grounds of color, but in his aspirations, hopes, and social progress. They cannot understand, when the American Negro visits in Africa, that he regards himself as an American and that he has little, if anything, in common with the African. The Africans seek to employ bonds of color as a source for unity. They are nonplussed when they find their efforts are rebuffed.

I spoke earlier of Prime Minister Jomo Kenyatta. Many of you will associate his name with the Mau Mau terrorist movement in Kenya about a decade ago. Jomo Kenyatta has the background and reputation of being a racist in the extreme. He has worked all his life to rid Kenya of the white man. He spent 7 years in prison in connection with the Mau Mau movement. And yet—surprisingly enough—this same Jomo Kenyatta, rising to political and national prominence in Kenya, had the audacity to send a telegram to the late President Kennedy in late May urging that the U.S. Government give special attention and exercise safeguards to help and protect the Negro citizens in the United States. This telegram was widely publicized in the African press and was sent to Washington during the time of the elections in Kenya. Kenyatta undoubtedly wished to make political capital from his appeal to President Kennedy. He demonstrated his wish to affiliate himself with the American Negro and to depict himself—somewhat self-righteously—as being a champion against racial wrongs. When the reply to Mr. Kenyatta was received from Washington and published in Nairobi, it was signed by Mr. G. Mennen Williams—not by the President to whom Kenyatta had sent his telegram.

When many of us think of Africa, we have in mind the "Dark Continent." But the continent is no longer "dark." It has become an awakening giant. Until you have flown over parts of Africa, it is impossible to have any idea of its beauty and its vastness and its potentialities. We can compare the less developed regions of Africa today with our own frontier days in the American West. If the peoples of Africa can exercise patience and tolerance and restraint, the possibilities for its development are comparatively unlimited.

Kenya, which lies along the equator in East Africa, stretches from the Indian Ocean westward to Lake Victoria. On the north, it is bordered by Ethiopia and the Sudan, and on the south by the new Republic of Tanganyika. From the flat coastal region around the old port city of Mombasa, the terrain becomes gradually hilly bush country where elephants and other wild animals still ramble. Continuing inland, you reach the Rift Valley and the mountains, which are capped by the snow-covered pinnacles of Mount Kenya, 17,000 feet high. Just to the south of Nairobi, along the Tanganyika border, is Mount Kilimanjaro, with an altitude of 19,000 feet.

Nairobi, today a modern progressive city of about 200,000 persons, was a workcamp about 50 years ago for the workers building the railroad to Lake Victoria.

The population of Kenya is about 8 million. Of these, 7½ million are Africans. The largest tribe is the Kikuyu, with a membership of 1½ million. It was the Kikuyu tribe which gave birth to the Mau Mau movement in the 1950's with the intention to drive the white man out. The Kikuyu have perhaps benefited more from the white man's assistance than any other tribe in Kenya. They are better educated, more intelligent, and have made more progress. And yet you find greater hatreds and rivalry among the Kikuyu than you find with any other group.

The remaining African population in Kenya is divided into about 60 other tribes, scattered throughout the country. Most of these tribes have shown little interest in social, economic, or political development. The average African is content to engage in subsistence agriculture—tilling a small plot of ground with a stick to raise corn. The African still counts his wealth by the number of wives, children, and cows he has. Brides are still purchased by the young man. As an example, our house boy-cook, who was educated at a Quaker mission school near Lake Victoria, paid 12 cows and 1,000 shillings for his wife. He's still paying for her.

Through sheer patience, hard work, and perserverance, the Asians and white settlers, usually referred to as the Europeans, have cleared, developed and enriched bush country so that it has become profitable land. Good beef is produced, milk production is high, and coffee adds greatly to the country's economy.

Protestant and Catholic missions have long given medical and educational assistance, along with religious instruction, to the Africans, and foreign commercial interests have contributed to the country's development. The white man and Asians have helped the country to prosper—against disease and against poverty—but they are continually faced with racial resentment. Relatively few Africans have tried to help themselves or their people. They wait for the other man—usually the European and the Asian—to do the planning and work, and then they gather around with outstretched palms to reap the benefits.

The minority groups in Kenya, which consist of 300,000 Asians and about 60,000 Europeans, have great reservations about their future in a land led by Jomo Kenyatta. They live in fear and intimidation, which are very real. Preceding the elections last May, great effort was required on the part of the Government and police authorities to bring the land freedom army, an underground movement, and youth groups under control. The land freedom army was engaged secretly in making homemade guns and weapons, and its members were resorting to the oath-taking business reminiscent of the Mau Mau.

A large segment of Kenya's white population consider their days are numbered. Many thousands of Europeans have left the country. This past spring, reports indicated that as many as 600 white families were leaving Kenya each month for a more secure future elsewhere.

Today you will find deserted farms and lands which were, until a year ago, thriving and prosperous regions. Some of the farms have been chopped up into small plots for the Africans under the land resettlement program, financed by the British Government. Other areas have quickly returned to bush.

Freedom and independence to the average African—who is ill informed in political matters—means taking over what the white man has. Not long ago, in Nakuru, police arrested several Africans who were taking a few shillings from illiterate Africans and pointing to a given European's car on the street, saying: "When we get Uhuru, that car belongs to you."

Uhuru comes on Thursday.

There is little doubt that when the Marshall plan was conceived in the late 1940's our Government's foreign aid program was a much-needed and invaluable instrument of our foreign policy. To a large extent, U.S. aid promoted the recovery of Europe from the destruction of war. It was instrumental in saving the Balkan countries, Greece and Turkey, from communism. (The people of Greece still remember this and are grateful.) But as the program has developed in recent years, and as more and more newly independent nations—including those in Africa—have made demands upon the United States, a lot of us have had serious

misgivings about foreign aid and the manner in which the program is administered.

To promote friendship and understanding abroad, our Government has seemed to be overly generous in meeting various and sundry requests from foreign nations for funds and special projects. All too often, I fear a country predicates its request for a new project on the fact that the United States financed this or that in the neighboring country. In some cases, it seems we don't wish to risk offending the nation. In other instances, we may want to cultivate the favor and support of some political figure. Needless to say, the foreign aid program has become an expensive and endless proposition. The drain on our dollars to develop projects abroad decreases the funds available by the Congress for appropriations to meet some of the pressing housing, educational, and medical needs in our own country. We have serious problems in the United States which deserve more attention.

One of the drawbacks to the foreign aid program—as I see it—is that we unwittingly are creating and furthering an untenable situation within foreign countries. If our friends abroad feel they can always turn to the United States for funds, they will be less and less inclined to rely on their own incentive, initiative, and ability to work and solve some of their problems.

In Kenya, the U.S. aid representatives were engaged in helping to finance and build 10 new schools—and these school buildings were needed. However, instead of constructing simple, one-floor, spread-out buildings which are suitable to the African way of life and climatic conditions, our U.S. aid people were sponsoring much more elaborate and expensive facilities designed after the American type of school. Many mission and African teachers conduct classes out of doors under the trees. You can make your own comparison.

Two years ago in Kenya, a flood destroyed food crops and many tribes were on the verge of starvation. The United States immediately sent gifts of food and supplies and helped overcome the threats of famine. Now, this type of assistance could be understood and appreciated by the Africans. During my travels throughout the country, many Africans expressed their gratitude to the people of the United States. They could not grasp all of the complexities of the foreign aid program or receive immediate benefit from it, but they certainly got the picture of our helping hand when they needed help the most.

Since returning home, it has been reassuring to learn that our Representatives in Congress are giving a harder, closer, and more realistic look at Uncle Sam's foreign aid program. Maybe some good will come from Senator ELLENDER's embarrassment in Africa. And perhaps we can hope that the day is not too far off when the foreign aid program will be brought down to more worthwhile and manageable size.

Although I cannot claim to be an authority on Africa, there are other observations and experiences which I might share with you if time permitted. Some of you would perhaps be interested in private investment possibilities in East Africa—some would appreciate an account of the "flying doctor," as he makes his rounds over the "land of the safari" to care for patients out in the bush or to patch up some unfortunate soul who may have ben mauled by wild animals. Others might appreciate a comparison of inadequate medical facilities in East Africa with our modern, up-to-date hospital and medical facilities available at the Greenville General Hospital system here. Others might find particular interest in the decimation of wildlife by the natives and the efforts being taken by the governments to safeguard and preserve the animals.

But, you are busy gentlemen, and these stories can wait until another time.

I appreciate your invitation to be with you today and am grateful for your kind attention.

Thank you.

Commendation of Station WNEW, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most important factors in the continued success of our democracy is an informed citizenry. Deprive the citizenry of the knowledge of our governmental activities and our system will fail. The primary force for informing the public is the press. It stands to reason that the United States should pride itself in the quality of the press corps, for it does an amazingly thorough job. But we should not be content with anything less than expert press coverage of the activities in our governmental centers.

WNEW radio in New York City has taken this responsibility seriously. Last year they sponsored for the first time a news workshop to train newsmen in the basic orientation of the radio news operation and to give them an insight into radio newswriting. The workshop was conceived by Lee Hanna, news director of WNEW radio. The station received enthusiastic cooperation from Columbia, Fordham, Rutgers, Long Island University, and New York University.

According to Hanna the workshop was established "to implement our belief that the broadcasting industry has a continuing responsibility to strengthen journalism."

The workshop gave students the opportunity to participate in on-the-job training at the station under the supervision of the WNEW radio news staff.

The students who participated in the first session of the workshop were Terrence Montgomery and Barry Kramer, Columbia; Ruth Kohn and Stephen Sheppard, New York University; John Halligan and L. Michael McCartney, Fordham; Steven Shifman and Joan Rosenstein, Long Island University; and Carolyn Tanton and John Armstrong, Rutgers. The students were selected by the heads of the departments at the various universities.

Members of the workshop's board of directors are: Chairman, John Van Buren Sullivan, vice president and general manager of WNEW radio; Edward W. Barrett, dean of the Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia; Prof. Hillier Krieghbaum, chairman of the Department of Journalism, New York University; Rev. William K. Trivett, S.J., chairman of the Department of Communication Arts, Fordham; Dr. Frederic E. Merwin, chairman of the Department of Journalism, Rutgers; Prof. Jacob H. Jaffe, chairman of the Department of Journalism, Long Island University; and Miss Evelyn Burkey of the Writer's Guild of America, east.

I would like to commend station WNEW in New York for its dedication to responsible journalism.

New Cities and Old Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "New Cities and Old Problems," with which I am in full accord.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CITIES AND OLD PROBLEMS

The President's extensive and expensive new housing proposals can be sensibly viewed only in the light of the current state of public housing and federally assisted private housing.

Among many other things, Mr. Johnson recommends that the Federal Government foster the creation of entire new cities; Federal insurance and purchase of loans would be used to help builders start new towns and subdivisions. The housing program as a whole is estimated to require more than $1.6 billion in new spending authority over the next 4 years.

Yet before anyone gets too enthusiastic about the vista of new cities and more money, it is well to realize that all the Federal housing aid so far for cities and individuals has had highly questionable results.

With regard to individuals, many undoubtedly have been led to buy homes because of the Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration programs, plus the Government-sponsored low downpayment and long repayment provisions. Too many people, it would seem; the foreclosure rate is high, and it is much higher on homes with Government-backed mortgages than on others.

The FHA, as Mr. Janssen reported in this newspaper the other day, is the owner or mortgageholder of around 100,000 houses and apartment units; the VA has almost 20,000. Both agencies are making determined efforts to sell the mounting accumulation of foreclosed dwellings, but it isn't easy. Often they are in glutted areas; the Government has contributed to overbuilding as well as to defaults.

All this is the thoroughly predictable fruit of imprudence. In its eagerness to make everybody a homeowner, the Government has encouraged people to get in over their heads. Instead of reassessing this attitude, the officials now want to do more of the same.

A similar sort of thinking animates the vast urban-renewal programs in the cities. With all the money the Government has poured into this effort over the years, you would think the cities would be things of beauty and contentment. But of course many of them, like New York, are worse off than ever.

Part of the reason is that a lot of the renewal hasn't even taken place. In Mr.

Penn's article on the subject this week, some striking statistics appear: Of the 22,000 acres purchased by cities with Federal aid since 1949, only 6,800 have been resold to redevelopers.

Why? The article notes: "Redtape, politics, inexperience, and construction finance difficulties are a few of the factors bogging down projects. And many tenants and small businessmen in blighted areas are aggravating delays by resisting the cities' efforts to relocate them."

Where renewal has taken place, it has demonstrated it can indeed disrupt neighborhoods and dislocate people but by no means necessarily improve the urban scene or the people on it. A lot of public housing is an architectural fright to begin with; a lot of it degenerates into new slums. In many cases crime rates are high.

A fairly basic misconception has helped produce these unhappy conditions: The assumption that better housing, when it actually is that, will automatically make better people. Some it will undoubtedly help; a good many others, unfortunately not.

Any community has an obligation to try to avoid blight and help those who can be helped, just as any individual should have an opportunity to buy a home on reasonable terms. But whatever Federal role may be appropriate in these matters, the evidence—and here we are talking about results, not theories—indicates the Government has tried to do too much, with too little clear thinking.

That is why we consider it unfortunate when a President proposes new additions and expansions without attempting to assess the present derelict state of the Federal housing structure.

Hays to Rutgers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, when Brooks Hays left the White House to teach at New Jersey's State University, all of us felt somewhat diminished. His record in Congress and later in the executive branch sparkled with contributions to our Nation's welfare, and while his loss will be keenly felt, I think it is to Rutger's credit that they were able to attract such a man. I, of course, can find a positive side to his departure, for I know what a treat is in store for Rutgers students. While it is not easy to sum up the qualities of a man like Brooks Hays, an editorial in the January 18 edition of the Washington Post comes close. It is as pithy and to the point as the man in question, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAYS TO RUTGERS

The first of President Kennedy's men to leave the White House is one of the gentlest spirits in this hard-boiled town. Rutgers University will not be easily forgiven for abducting Brooks Hays from us, even though he will be getting the mouth-filling title of Arthur Vanderbilt professor and lecturer at the Eagleton Institute of Politics.

Mr. Hays first came to town as Congressman from Little Rock in 1943, and he remained in the House until his determined opposition to racial fanaticism cost him his seat after the battle over Central High. Since 1961, he has been one of the pleasantest and most unsung of the special assistants to the President—an aid whose formal job was to advise on Federal-State relations, but who also was able, as an eminent Baptist layman, to advise a Catholic President on touchy aspects of church-state relations.

His office has been next to that of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., in the East Wing—he has tried, as he once put it, to offer an answer from an Arkansas cornfield to the cerebral questions that preoccupied the President's staff. A year ago, a documentary record on wit in Washington was issued, and excerpts were contained from the speeches of two White House officials. One of course was John F. Kennedy; the other was Brooks Hays. We envy the students of Rutgers their opportunity to enjoy Mr. Hays' rare and rewarding qualities.

Transportation Association of America Sponsors Significant Meeting To Discuss Implications of Advancing Technology—Dr. George P. Baker Brings Challenging Message—J. L. Burke Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Transportation Association of America sponsored on January 15 the National Transportation Institute, a day-long series of discussions and messages by responsible leaders in the various transport industries. Held in New York City, this year's meeting had as its theme "Forecasting Tomorrow's Transport."

The institute was opened by the general chairman, A. L. Nickerson, chairman of the board of Socony Mobil Oil Co. Presiding was Charles H. Beard, general traffic manager of the Union Carbide Corp., who led a panel presentation of the advances achieved in the technological revolution. Participants included W. Irving Osborne, Jr., president, Pullman, Inc.; Harold A. Strickland, Jr., vice president, General Electrict Co.; and W. P. Gwinn, president, United Aircraft Corp. These experienced executives explored mechanization in the skies, on the rails, over the highways, in seafaring, and through the pipelines.

A thought-provoking address before approximately 800 persons was brought by Dr. George P. Baker, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and chairman of the board of the Transportation Association of America.

Dr. Baker spoke on "The Problems of Progress" pointing out that our successes since the turn of the century have been attended by challenges. He correctly indicated that in the economy of today, the fortunes of industries are interdependent, and it is possible for the entire marketplace to be affected by a single technological change or advance.

However, by way of solution Dr. Baker stated:

I believe that we can and should develop new attitudes of cooperation and statesmanship—attitudes which are essential if we are to solve satisfactorily the inevitable problems which confront us as we move faster and deeper into the current technological revolution. But to do this, more business groups need to realize that there are mutual long-run advantages in jointly trying to solve pressing national problems—for no one segment of the economy is an island unto itself.

Another significant part of the program was the presentation of the Seley Transportation Awards to J. L. Burke, president of the Service Pipe Line Co. The honor brings to the winner a gold medal, a $1,000 transportation scholarship to the university he may designate—plus an additional $1,000 for use as the chosen institution sees fit.

Mr. Burke, a TAA director of long standing, was a unanimous choice to receive the honor the basis of his outstanding contributions to transportation.

Presiding at the final session—"Challenges and Choices Ahead"—was T. Carl Wedel, vice president of the CIT Financial Corp. It was my privilege at that time to discuss "Adjusting Society to Automation" from the viewpoint of one engaged in public service.

Henry E. Seyfarth, senior partner in the legal firm of Seyfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson, addressed himself to "The Changing Labor Scene." His skilled presentation was favorably received.

Concluding speaker was Kenneth L. Vore, vice president, traffic, United States Steel Co. "A Shipper Views Tomorrow's Transport" was the subject of Mr. Vore's message, and he ably explored areas of technological innovation which could prove to be revolutionary in the transportation field.

The Transportation Association of America is deserving of commendation for sponsoring this worthwhile National Transportation Institute. Success of this day of high-level meetings was due in large measure to the tireless efforts of Association President Harold F. Hammond, and his efficient staff.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address of Dr. Baker be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEMS OF PROGRESS

(Excerpt from an address by Dr. George P. Baker at the National Transportation Institute of the Transportation Association of America, Jan. 15, 1964)

The title of this speech—"The Problems of Progress"—is very flexible. Problems are a hallmark of progress. We must expect problems as we try to implement progress. The words "problems" and "progress" are thus almost interchangeable.

The scene is not recorded in history, but we know that the invention of the wheel immediately presented the inventors with the problems of clearing paths for the wheels to roll on, and employment of people who had been engaged in carrying the things which now would be transported by the wheel.

We can't have progress without having problems.

Knowing this, it is our responsibility to accept the problems, since we know from

history that we cannot prevent them from arising.

We are warned by philosophers that those who do not learn the failures of history are doomed to repeat the failures.

I do not believe that our economy and our country—in this age of vital challenge from within and from without—has the time, energy, and money to be able to afford to repeat very many major mistakes.

We have built—on the foundation of our free enterprise system—the greatest society for people that mankind has ever known.

The challenge today is: Are we intelligent to preserve and improve this society in an age of challenges ahead at home and abroad?

I believe that we are—that we do have the determination, and the capability, to perform this monumental task. What we have to be concerned about, as we face the challenge, is that we do not bury the advances which are increasingly pouring from the new technology we have encouraged by failing to accept the need to modify or abolish old concepts which are clearly outdated.

For example, the Government of the United States issues from 45,000 patents each year. New concepts and tools flow endlessly into our knowledge and all involve a potential change in the existing order—and, therefore, some change in human and business affairs.

We must learn to live with and fully utilize new machines—and the techniques and methods needed to go along with them and we must truly realize that the birth of the new goes with the inevitable death of the old.

In recent years, I believe that much of American industry, labor, and the public is just discovering what the transportation industry has realized for some time. The close interrelationships of all business and industry.

Our economy overall, and in its individual segments, is heavily interdependent—and change anywhere affects more than the place where the change occurs.

If a new machine is invented, the old methods—and the workers who worked with the old methods—are confronted with a problem.

If one competitor gains, another loses.

I believe that we can and should develop a new attitude of cooperation and statesmanship—attitudes which are essential if we are to solve satisfactorily the inevitable problems which confront us as we move faster and deeper into the current technological revolution. But to do this, more business groups need to realize that there are mutual long-run advantages, in jointly trying to solve pressing national problems for no one segment of the economy is an island unto itself.

Only in this way can we really get down to meaningful work on critical problem areas such as those on which business and labor should concentrate in the 1960's.

There is nothing easy about this. But it can be done and the 28-year history of the TAA shows it can be done. What it takes is: (1) leaders of the various interest groups who know that long-run self-interests of many diverse groups very often coincide even if their short-run interests do not, (2) leaders who are leaders in the sense that others will, in fact, follow them, (3) realization that change is certain and the maintenance of the exact status quo is, in fact, impossible—however desirable it may seem, (4) deep belief in the "democratic" way of life—which involves not "loving thy neighbor as thyself"—fine as that may be—but the expectation that men will speak out in their self-interest and be listened to by their representatives—and that a mixed babel of voices makes constructive change to match the changing times impossible, (5) realization that the clutching of the old ways very often means stagnation and foregoes the rewarding dividends of new ways which reflect an ever changing world, and (6) realization that progress in our society requires compromise.

If we can increase the number of interest group leaders who have this attitude, then we can get to work on:

Improved labor-management relations. One of our most critical problems is to find a way to improve labor-management relations. It will intensify as technological advances dictate new requirements in the skills and size of the work force, and as this country's competitive position is challenged by other nations moving aggressively into the international trade arena.

The adjustments required by these changes should be—and must be—worked out within the private enterprise system, but we are not going to achieve this if the adversary parties remain forever preoccupied with old positions and the strategy of disputes. A fresh and constructive approach to problem solving is necessary and urgent, for there can be no doubt that the Federal Government albeit reluctantly will feel obliged to move into any stalemate created by a lack of leadership and foresight by either management or labor.

I believe our TAA pattern of bringing diverse management group into a single group to find points of common interest and then to act constructively on them, provides a pattern which other groups would find equally helpful. Had it been possible to use the same approach with management labor groups in the transport industry, we might well not now be faced in the rail, air, and even possibly in the highway transport industry with situations which seem to make compulsory arbitration the only practical "out" developed promptly among the younger industries in this country. A new approach might help to deal effectively with some of the basic issues before they become frozen and acute. There is no sound reason why today's scientific innovation should outstrip our ability to manage effectively the organizational changes which must come with it.

You must have noted, that a few companies have begun, with their unions, a series of meetings in which imaginative new efforts are being made to resolve at least some of the problems they face. Both sides have shown a desire to make the plan work, and, thus far, they have had considerable success. The unions involved have raised their sights beyond the parochial concepts of simply seeking "more and more and more." The companies involved have discovered that a deep understanding of their problems can come only by imparting accurately all information about those problems to their employees and the union. Both parties, in these few cases of innovation, have learned to discover by joint discussion what is right and are less concerned about who is right.

The decade ahead will determine whether these few beginnings will stimulate others to be similarly creative. Something of this sort seems to be important if the basic issues are to be resolved without resort to Government intervention.

Technology: We are constantly striving, of course, to increase the standard of living of our entire population, which now totals about 190 million people and is increasing by more than 3 million each year. In other words, just to stand still, we must increase our total output of goods and services by almost 2 percent a year. Any significant gains thus must come about by a sharp increase in total output—which calls for the intelligent use of the best combination of manpower and technology. If we are to achieve this goal in time to prevent an unemployment crisis which would bring the Government strongly into the picture, as it did in 1933, we can accomplish it only if the diverse groups involved act quickly and vigorously—probably as voluntary groups.

Research: Technological research has far outstripped the advances made in any other field in the last two decades. In fact, one of the greatest problems we face today is to find ways of helping man to accommodate himself to the new world which science has created. Chance threatens to overwhelm us unless we learn how to manage it.

We can look ahead hopefully, however, if we will recognize the strides which the social sciences are making in analyzing, measuring, and interpreting the impact on individuals, groups, and large-scale organizations of today's changed way of living. The human sciences will not provide a bag of tricks to foster the capacity of one leader to assert control over another. Rather, the one consistent theme from the growing knowledge about man as an individual and as a member of an organization is the need for self-understanding as a prerequisite for intelligent action in human affairs. One great hope today, as we visualize more forums like our own, may well be based on the knowledge that a growing group of union leaders as well as the representatives of management are turning to a study of the human sciences and of the results of their laboratory research.

Education: We must constantly evaluate our education system at all levels to make certain that it is capable of performing its twin roles of educating a new generation for the new world ahead and of continuing the education of the present generation, where necessary, to adjust to the changing needs of today. The heavy demand will continue for skilled specialists, but we also must concentrate on educating general business leaders with broad knowledge to handle the increasing complexities of modern business.

Market development: Today, we sit in the midst of plenty in the United States. Our factories and our farms, in fact, are able to produce far more than they can sell, and our service industries—including our transport industry—can handle more business than they have been able to develop. This indicates clearly that it is indeed wasteful for technology to increase production output and efficiency if the fruits of the progress cannot be distributed and sold.

One of the most critical problems standing in the way of further progress for all of us then is to find some new pattern of thinking which will help us to plan the expansion of our markets as effectively as we have increased our ability to produce goods both faster and more cheaply.

Another of my Harvard colleagues, Mr. Theodore Levitt, believes he has the key to this problem. It is to reorient management thinking so that it no longer thinks of itself as producing products but as providing customer-creating value satisfactions. Another, Gen. George Doriot, believes that to match the competitive effects of joint industry-government planning in European countries and not have our Government play an equivalent role—industry should join in formal arrangements with a group of universities to develop broad and effective plans.

VII. CONCLUSION

All of these problems are difficult.

We have built the greatest economy, the highest living standard, and the most personal security that the world has ever known.

I believe it will take more working together by many very diverse groups, to keep it that way—and make it even better.

The Source of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the January 21, 1964, issue of Christian Economics has published a very eloquent article on the subject of "The Source of Freedom," which the authors of the article quite appropriately attribute to faith in God. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article by Fred G. Clark and R. S. Rimanoczy, of the American Economic Foundation, in New York, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOURCE OF FREEDOM

(By Fred G. Clark and R. S. Rimanoczy, American Economic Foundation, New York)

In our modern world of breathtaking scientific achievements we have come to regard as old fashioned what the Founding Fathers called "the laws of nature and nature's God."

Fascinated by our revolutionary newfound powers over the forces of physical nature we have gotten the idea that science can also revolutionize human nature.

This has given many people a new (and false) sense of freedom from such burdensome restrictions as the Ten Commandments and the need for thrift, honest work, and personal responsibilities.

As a matter of fact, down through the ages, freedom from these burdens (the idea is not new) has always led to human bondage, for the simple reason that only people who are self-disciplined by these moral values can long practice personal freedom.

To paraphrase an old adage: "Men who cannot discipline themselves will soon be disciplined by others."

And, it naturally follows, they will soon be miserable.

If this is true, to preserve our freedom we must look for the source of these moral values and self-disciplines.

They come from faith in the divine proposition that man is more than a superior animal and that he has personal responsibility to, and a charter of liberty from, an authority higher than himself or that of any other mortal man.

Freedom, then, begins with faith in God.

Faith makes a man more than a man, because it gives him extra strength which, while it is always present, can be energized only by the divine spark which flows from God to man, if the way is kept clear.

Faith in God gives man faith in himself.

It gives man the courage to be free because he is no longer afraid to stand on his own two feet.

The tyrant can no longer terrorize him.

Freedom becomes something that man is willing to die for.

Readers who know that the interests of the authors are centered on man's economic life, may be wondering what this has to do with economics.

It has everything to do with economics because economic freedom is the driving force that abolishes poverty and improves man's material welfare.

Science and the mechanical marvels of science are not substitutes for freedom—they are the servants of freedom, new tools that can enormously strengthen the power and effectiveness of freedom.

There are many people who stoutly defend economic freedom but see no connection between it and the freedom that comes from putting God first.

These people, without knowing it, do put God first because they do not put the state first.

Man, by his nature, must worship some higher authority and the choice lies between God and the state.

Where the state is put first, man becomes its servant.

Where God is put first, the state must be the servant of man and protect, rather than limit, his freedom.

One objection to this latter situation is that freedom can become license, and government can become a shambles.

Obviously, if anarchy is to be avoided, such freedom must be used wisely and with restraint, and that will be the case where men voluntarily accept the restraints put upon them by a God-given sense of honesty, fairness, generosity, justice, and charity.

These qualities come from faith in God.

Freedom, therefore, comes from faith in God.

Honoring the Memory of a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard many words in praise of our late President and have seen many memorials established in his memory; yet most of these memorials have been initiated by public officials. The private citizen, equally grief stricken, has wondered to himself what he can do to memorialize the greatness of President Kennedy.

I have found, however, the efforts of a company in New Jersey particularly gratifying. In view of President Kennedy's unending interest in the education of all the citizens of the United States, Dubrow Electronic Industries, Inc., of Burlington, has established a John F. Kennedy Memorial Scholarship Fund. The fund will be to the amount of $10,000 and will be available to students attending Drexel Institute of Technology in Philadelphia who otherwise would be unable to afford such an education. While there is no discrimination in the granting of the scholarships, Dubrow has indicated that they would prefer students of minority groups who might be prey to discrimination in other financial aid programs.

Mr. President, I think this is a particularly commendable program and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO HONOR THE MEMORY OF A GREAT AMERICAN

Since November 22 many words of sorrow and respect have been spoken and written. They express the feeling of all of us.

We of Dubrow management also have been giving much thought as to how we could most fittingly show our respect and feeling for this great American who not only spoke vigorously for the American way of life, equality, and freedom of man but, even more important, took very strong practical measures to have these principles evolve more and more into actual accomplishments.

Most of us do not give as much thought as we should to these matters, the reason partly being that we are too caught up in our personal pressures and interests. It takes a shocking tragedy to bring home the fact that a great and good man who had much to contribute was allegedly murdered by a misguided person with a warped sense of hatred that prevails in many extremist groups. Most of us are so far removed from these groups that we do not have a real understanding of why or how they function. What we do know, however, is that they thrive on bigotry, hate, and ignorance.

As we earnestly strive to ensure that President Kennedy's efforts and supreme sacrifice were not in vain, we think he would have desired most that we do all that we can to help carry forward the things he, and really all true Americans stand for.

One of his most cherished aims was to foster educational opportunities for deserving students of all races and creeds, especially in those areas of education which would increase employment opportunities for the underprivileged.

We believe our company might fittingly do its part by establishing a fund in memory of John F. Kennedy, to provide scholarships for deserving and capable students in the engineering field, with preference to be given to those minority groups which have heretofore been denied equality of educational and economic opportunity. We do this because we think the most important way to eliminate the hatred, bigotry and prejudice which our late President fought so hard to eradicate, is to improve the spirit of free communication and understanding among all Americans, by providing opportunities for education and improvement of economic status to those hitherto denied them.

To carry out this program we have made arrangements with Drexel Institute of Technology, one of the Nation's leading engineering colleges, to establish and administer a scholarship fund of $10,000. We trust that this will be one of many efforts by industry and the public generally to take similar action of a practical nature. In this manner we may show our deep regard and gratitude for the work which our late President began but, sadly, was not destined to finish.

WALTER DUBROW,
President, Dubrow Electronic Industries, Inc.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Jefferson County (W. Va.) Jaycees Applaud Spirited Message of Hon. Daniel B. Brewster at Distinguished Service Award Dinner—Marvin A. Brooks Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 29, 1964, the Jefferson County, W. Va., Jaycees sponsored their 11th annual Distinguished Service Award dinner at the Citizens Fire Co., Charles Town. This important event was attended by local representatives of the chamber of commerce, Lions, Ruritan, Kiwanis, and other organizations.

Each year, a young man from Jefferson County is selected on the basis of his contributions to the well-being of the county and its citizens. The recipient of this year's award was Marvin A. Brooks, who was chosen by an impartial panel of businessmen because of his tireless efforts in a number of worthwhile civic projects.

Principal speaker was the junior Senator from Maryland, DANIEL B. BREWSTER, who brought a challenging message on the problems and progress of our Nation. To an attentive audience of approximately 200, Senator BREWSTER declared that although the economy is booming at present, "it must expand at an even faster pace."

He further emphasized:

We cannot afford to rest on our laurels and smugly contemplate what has been accomplished. America is on the move, but we must keep her moving. We must step up the pace of our march toward maximum possible employment, and maximum use of our productivity and purchasing power within a free, competitive economic framework.

Harold Kisner, past president of the Jaycees, acted as toastmaster. The Reverend Richard E. Neal, pastor of the St. Thomas Lutheran Church, gave the invocation. A welcome was offered by Paige W. Jenkins, Jaycee president. The Distinguished Service Award for 1963 was presented by Roger R. Ramey, last year's winner.

Senator BREWSTER was introduced by Norman E. Kisner, program chairman, and a past vice president of the West Virginia State Jaycee organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA ON THE MARCH—REMARKS OF DANIEL B. BREWSTER, U.S. SENATOR FROM MARYLAND, AT THE 11TH ANNUAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD DINNER OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY (W. VA.) JAYCEES, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1964, IN CHARLESTOWN, W. VA.

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Neal, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege for me to join you tonight in paying tribute to Marvin Brooks, winner of this year's Distinguished Service Award.

Maryland and West Virginia share many interests and face many of the same problems, particularly in those areas of our States which are part of Appalacia. Your Senators and Maryland's have worked for increased employment; we have recognized the need for a great Highland Scenic Highway which would create new recreational possibilities; we have supported manpower retraining and depressed areas legislation; we know that our States together can see a new day when the significant potentials of our respective mountain communities are again utilized.

West Virginia is fortunate to be represented in the Senate by men like JENNINGS RANDOLPH and BOB BYRD, and in the House by your own Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS. I am privileged to serve with JENNINGS RANDOLPH on the Senate Public Works and Post Office and Civil Service Committees. I can assure you that West Virginia's interests are ably represented on these committees.

Maryland's congressional delegation is indebted to Congressman STAGGERS and your two Senators for their assistance in our joint effort to have the Air Force renegotiate its rental contract for the Government-owned portion of the Fairchild Stratos plant in Hagerstown, Md. The new formula will enable the Fairchild Co. to continue production of the F-27 aircraft in Hagerstown. This will certainly provide additional employment opportunities for both Marylanders and West Virginians.

Turning now to the national picture, let present you this report.

Our country is the most powerful Nation in the history of the world—but our place in the forefront of the farflung fight against international communism requires that we increase our strength—and that we use that strength wisely.

In President Johnson's words, "We must be strong enough to win a war and wise enough to prevent one. We shall neither act as aggressors nor tolerate acts of aggression. We intend to bury no one—and we do not intend to be buried."

Here at home the picture is bright. Our economy is booming—setting new records—reaching new heights every day, but it must expand at an even faster pace.

Slightly over 3 years ago a forceful intense young man from the industrial east traveled back and forth across this country urging citizens from all walks of life to join him in an effort to get America moving again. Our people listened and they went to work. The results of their efforts have been phenomenal. Since early in 1961 we have added $100 billion to our gross national product which now stands at an alltime record of almost $600 billion. This growth rate is unparallelled in our Nation's economic history.

Today, a tall, somewhat older, but equally forceful Texan from our Nation's flourishing Southwest stands where the intense young man stood a little over 3 years ago. He has said to you and I and our fellow citizens that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels and smugly contemplate what has been accomplished. America is on the move, but we must keep her moving. We must step up the pace of our march toward maximum possible employment, and maximum use of our productivity and purchasing power within a free competitive economic framework.

The first 3 years of this decade, which has been referred to as the "golden sixties," have been marked by convincing performance in our Nation's economic expansion. The years ahead hold even greater promise.

Figures released by the National Planning Association show that by 1970 we can expect to see:

1. A total gross national product of $750 billion.
2. Industrial production two-thirds higher than 1959—the peak year of the 1950's.
3. A population increase of 25 million to around 210 million people.
4. Total employment of over 80 million—an increase of 10 million jobs.

Today slightly more than 70 million Americans are gainfully employed—an all time high in our history, but this figure is not high enough because almost 6 percent of our total labor force is still unemployed. This means that almost 4 million wage earners are without gainful employment and are therefore unable to provide for their dependants.

All of us are aware of the tremendous burden which this places on the individuals involved, but we must not be unmindful of the burden which this situation places on our society as a whole. In terms of lost manhours the effect of this unemployment is equivalent to completely shutting down our Nation's entire productive capacity for a period of over 3 weeks. In the decade ahead over 26 million young workers will enter the labor market. At the same time, while our labor market is being called on to absorb these new workers, automation and improved manufacturing techniques will constantly reduce our requirements for production workers.

The logical answer to this paradox is an acceleration in our economic growth rate through additional incentive for private investment in the form of wider markets and larger benefits and increased participation in world markets.

The European Common Market is a firm and vital reality. It presents us with a tremendous economic challenge. This new world economic force can either be our fiercest competitor or it can be our best customer. The choice is largely up to us.

To meet this challenge, our industry must become increasingly more efficient. We must constantly reexamine the roles of business, labor and Government in our economy. We must not fear new developments; we cannot be preoccupied with job security; we cannot blindly adhere to the programs and prac-

tices of the past in either management, or in labor, or in Government.

Increased automation need not necessarily be a curse, but the effects of its application must be carefully studied. To this end the President has proposed the establishment of a high-level commission to determine how we can best gain the benefits of automation, while at the same time minimize its human costs.

We must continue our efforts to eliminate waste and uneconomical duplication wherever it is found. The Federal Government, as our Nation's largest employer, must take the lead in eliminating wasteful practices. We cannot enviegh against the practice of featherbedding in industry unless we eliminate featherbedding in Government.

All of us applaud President Johnson's determination to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

This can be accomplished without curtailing any of the essential services which our people must have. In the President's own words, "There is no inconsistency in being prudent and frugal and in being sensitive and sympathetic to the unfilled needs of the people."

For example, in his state of the Union message the President made particular mention of the acute problems faced by the people of Appalachia. Nowhere in your State or mine do we find conditions which parallel the dismal poverty which exists in the mountain areas of eastern Kentucky, but we do find conditions in our States which must be eradicated. I know that your Senators join me in support of the President's determination to institute forceful steps to revitalize the economic life of the Appalachian region.

The President has outlined a bold program to enable us to achieve the goal of matching our potential with our performance. The keystone of this multifaceted program is the proposed $11½ billion tax cut now pending in Congress. I confidently predict passage of this vital measure within the next few days.

Passage of this measure will provide an immediate stimulus to our economy.

When the full effect of this tax cut is felt in 1965, it will result in the diversion of over $11 billion annually into the channels of private enterprise. The expected increased purchasing by consumers and the accompanying increase in new plant investment by businessmen will increase the benefits many times over.

It will add between $35 and $45 billion to our annual gross national product. It will make possible from $25 to $30 billion annually in consumer purchases. It will add between $5 to $7 billion in profits for our Nation's businessmen.

These gains coupled with concurrent economies and reduction in Federal expenditures can lead us at long last to that illusive goal of a balanced budget and a full economy.

People often say to me, what would happen to us if suddenly world tensions eased to the point where we could drastically cut our tremendous defense related expenditures. They direly predict that our economy would collapse.

To these men of little faith, I say, give us the opportunity to show what we can do, if we are ever fortunate enough to live in a world at peace.

We need have no fear of a truly peacetime economy. Drastic cuts in military spending could and would be replaced by tremendously increased demands for consumer goods and services and we would then be in a position to fill our Nation's great unmet needs—for decent housing, better education—modern transportation networks—improved health care for our citizens—conservation of our water and other natural resources—and increased recreational opportunities for our people.

Now, as never before in our history, America is on the march—moving with quickening pace toward a better and fuller life for all our people—hopefully in a world which is freer from tensions and the specter of man-made holocaust.

Our job—yours and mine—is to keep that momentum up—to convert our frustrations and anger, over conditions of poverty and all other attacks on human dignity, into action. We must be unwilling to accept half a loaf or second best in any of our national endeavors.

Our President has issued a challenge to the Congress and to our people. He has challenged the Congress to meet its obligations by working to its full capacity. He has challenged our people to recognize and live up to their full potential. I am confident that the Congress and the American people will meet his challenge.

Panama Riots Were a Put-Up Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to those Americans who apparently delight in blaming their own country for all the difficulties we may have abroad, John T. O'Rourke in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, January 22, 1964, made a very clear explanation of what really happened in Panama:

ON EVIDENCE AND PAST PERFORMANCE—THOSE PANAMANIAN RIOTS WERE A PUT-UP JOB

(By John T. O'Rourke)

How did so much public comment about the Panamanian riots get so completely off the track? It must baffle even the most charitable mind.

How, indeed, could such a trivial circumstance trigger such crazy behavior? It makes one reach for Dr. Freud's witchbook on symbolism and compulsions.

IT WAS PLANNED

The real answer is, of course, it was manufactured, and that is what so many reporters missed.

No one, of course, expected anything but lies from Panama's radio and press, or from Moscow, Cuba, or anti-American news media in South America.

WHERE'S THE GUILT?

But how does one explain the self-starting guilt feeling, or whatever it was, that obviously inspired various pundits and commentators (and those who parrot them) which caused them to swallow the propaganda whole, and blame nonviolent flag-raising schoolchildren and their parents for the organized and deliberate violence and destruction by invading mobs?

News reports, when they stuck to facts, were accurate enough to make actual events clear. The zone was invaded.

But, almost immediately, interpreters began interpreting, predigesters of opinion began masticating, and newspaper readers and TV and radio listeners all over the country were being told that it was all due to the "colonialism" of the threatened Canal Zone residents, as if they or the canal took money out of Panama, instead of putting money into it. The fact is, far from exploiting the country, the canal brings, directly and indirectly, an amount about equal to the entire Panamanian Republic's annual budget.

BERLIN WALL

One so-called special correspondent (not this newspaper's) wrote a juicy lead about the "fiery student leader" crying "There is our Berlin wall" as he pointed to the fence along the Canal Zone border.

This dim bulb failed to report that peaceful Panamanians, of course, never have trouble walking into the zone at all; in fact, even the first demonstrators marched in, unmolested, only to then attack, burn, and destroy.

And later, of course, to kill.

BACKGROUND

There is a background to this tragic event which should at least be roughly sketched in, if newspaper readers are to be able to put it in focus, and to sense the atmosphere in which it occurred.

To start with, this riot was planned. A minute-by-minute record of the real attack shows that it started in several strategic places, practically simultaneously.

MOB STEERED

It was coordinated with sound trucks inciting and directing the mob, and with radio broadcasts on stations owned by both left-wing politicians and the oligarchists.

Panama's radio MIA network began to build up the story even before the attack.

IT'S TRADITIONAL

There's nothing new in all this. Mobs have been used, deliberately and cynically, by the handful of family dynasties which own and run (badly) Panama ever since the country was founded.

Rioters against the completely legal presence of the United States in the Canal Zone are hired by local politicians during election campaigns to provide a scapegoat for the people they govern, whose poverty they are either unwilling or unable to alleviate. This is despite the fact that Panama is the second highest recipient of U.S. aid to Latin America.

There is not the slightest reason to suppose, with election day only 4 months away, that these riots were, for the first time in Panama's history, a spontaneous reaction to a flag being raised by schoolchildren at a school (built by U.S. taxpayers) inside the Canal Zone. That was the excuse for the riot; not the reason.

Hal Hendrix, Scripps-Howard's seasoned reporter on Latin America, quoted an expert witness that it was the best organized spontaneous riot he ever saw.

SLOGANS

In addition to traditional anti-American riots mentioned above, regularly paid for by politicians, the Panamanian background includes equally well organized campaigns of sloganeering. Walls of buildings are kept bright by "students" with paintpots, smearing "The Canal Is Ours," and denunciations of "Yankee Imperialist Dogs." They get paid for the paint job.

U.S. Canal Zone kids read these signs. They are also taught in school the canal's actual status. They know who built it, who paid for it, and who pays the yearly fee to Panama.

WHO'S A DOG?

They also know that the "imperialist Yankee dogs" referred to means their pop, who perhaps runs one of the locomotives that tow the ships, or who works at the commissary. They don't see pop as an imperialist dog.

Then there is mother. She, for instance, used to be able to buy good, cheap New Zealand and Australian beef in the Canal Zone. But a couple of years ago, the U.S. Government agreed to buy Panamanian beef instead, which is poorer and costs more.

Is this colonialism? Whose colonialism? At any rate, mother doesn't feel a bit like an imperialist. Probably she has sounded

off at the dinner table when the meat was tougher than usual, and cost more.

MITIGATES

Perhaps, in this atmosphere, a bit of resentfulness can be understood. Mind you, these U.S. children didn't tear up the Panamanian flag, which is the usual fate of U.S. flags at the hands of Panamanian and other Latin students.

All they did was hoist their own at their school. They shouldn't have done it; granted.

But it was a foregone conclusion, when they did, that young Panamanians would march on it. After all, they have been organized (and paid) to do just that sort of thing for years.

The radio was building up the ruckus even before it started. However, it is safe to say that if the flag raising had not been used as a trigger, something else would have been found soon.

THEY'RE CHEAP

Riots like these do not cost much to start—a couple of years ago, a demonstrator could be hired all day for a dollar and perhaps beer and sandwiches at midday. Once it is going, loafers will join the melee just for the beer and sandwiches, and hope for a dollar.

But, while the students first threw rocks and burned automobiles, the real fireworks came later in the evening and to assume that it was spontaneous is to display a naivete equal to adult belief in Santa Claus.

INSURRECTION

There was the radio station owned by Panama's woman deputy Thelma King, who travels regularly to Castro's Cuba, shouting to people to march on the zone to defend Panama's holy soil, and calling on them to take the guns away from their own National Guard and use them, unless the guards joined them in the attack.

There was the conservative party radio station, screaming that the only good gringo was a dead gringo.

Although it wasn't reported at first, it is now well known that defending canal police used their weapons only after they ran out of tear gas, and that the U.S. troops were never called out until 7:59 p.m. on Thursday, January 9, after the burning and destroying had been going on inside the Canal Zone for more than 3 hours. (The first batch of students entered the zone at 4:40 p.m.)

LYING PROPAGANDA

When snipers fired on the U.S. troops they returned the fire.

This is what President Chiari told his people over the radio was a "cowardly U.S. attack"; this is what Panama's Ambassador to the United Nations said was "bloody aggression." They knew, when they said these things, what actually was going on. They knew they were lying.

Scripps-Howard's Reporter Hendrix managed to get into the riddled Tivoli Hotel (in the zone but near the border) by Sunday afternoon. U.S. troops were using it as an observation post. It was still under attack. About 850 rounds were fired at it, and 10 Molotov cocktails. All the windows on the fire side were smashed by bullets. Trained U.S. marksmen had been posted in the hotel, and directed careful fire at the snipers. Who's attacking whom?

IT SURPRISED

Nevertheless, the fact that U.S. soldiery returns fire with fire was undoubtedly a profound shock, not only in Panama, but all over South America. It's understandable; let's look at the background again.

In the last big demonstration against the canal, in 1959, U.S. troops stood fast and held their fire, as commanded, while the Panamanian mob stoned them. Although soldiers were felled as they held their ranks, not a cartridge was exploded.

HATE STUFF

Nevertheless, the next day, a newspaper owned and operated by the son of a former President of Panama, carried a page 1 cartoon showing the face of President Eisenhower with the body of a monster, his claws disemboweling a brave Panamanian youth, and Mr. Eisenhower's bloody fangs tearing into the hero's entrails.

Apparently, many comparatively recent events have convinced South Americans and others that U.S. troops are, by policy, paper tigers.

For instance, in Venezuela, both U.S. soldiers and officers have been stripped of their uniforms down to their drawers, degraded, and kidnaped by armed gangs, without firing a shot.

EVEN THE MARINES

No rifle even cracked when, a few years ago, a whole file of U.S. marines were kidnaped and held for ransom by Raul Castro. And these were Leathernecks. Perhaps that incident may have started the notion that the U.S. military were harmless.

You can readily see why it comes as a surprise to many Latins and others when it turns out our guns actually will shoot.

NO REDS

Two days ago, Panamanian Ambassador Aguilino Boyd denied the one important new ingredient that made this most recent outbreak different from earlier ones, and more sinister. He said there was no Communist-Castro influence.

This ignores the fact that leftwing Deputy Thelma King, screaming for blood on her radio, had been to Havana.

It ignores the fact that 200 or 300 Panamanian students had recently been put through Che Guevara's school for guerrillas.

It ignores the fact that one student killed in the riot was one Arosemena. He was 28, married, had two children, and had just been in Havana for 3 weeks.

A STUDENT?

If these are mere coincidences and Ambassador Boyd is right, then only Panama's leading politicians are left to be responsible for the whole thing.

Ambassador Boyd also said his Government had instructed him to say that nothing short of a new treaty, with a view to Panamanian control of the canal, would satisfy.

One resident of Panama City asked our reporter: "How can they expect to run the canal when they can't even collect their own garbage? Look up that street."

And sure enough, the street was filthy with garbage.

THAT PAY FUSS

Another issue called "burning" in the news dispatches is the pay and job differentials between Panamanians and U.S. citizens hired in the zone. Pay has been largely equalized by now, but job opportunity differentials still "burn."

But most readers do not know that while it has been corrected in the zone, Panamanians themselves still operate not on two differentials, but three; one for Americans, one for Panamanians, and a third for nonnationals who get less than Panamanians for doing the same labor. These are largely Negroes from the Caribbean Islands who have smuggled themselves in to try to earn a living.

In the country illegally, they dare not complain or organize against their own exploitation; they're warned that if they do, they'll be shipped out to the islands where the pickings are even slimmer.

WHOSE MONEY?

Panamanian financial idealism applies strictly to money from the Yankees; not to their own.

Several years ago, this writer had a conversation with Dr. Harmodio Arias, rich, distinguished lawyer, publisher, former President of Panama, and known all over the world as the legal father of the Panamanian merchant marine, whereby cargo ship owners of other nationalities, seeking to escape unionization and taxes, are allowed to lawfully fly the Panamanian flag—for a fee which Panama collects.

At this time, Dr. Arias' newspaper was publishing passionate editorials on the iniquity of the Canal Zone authorities paying U.S. citizens more than Panaman citizens for doing tha same work.

AID SAME THING

A moment later he admitted that he was doing the same thing; that in his own composing room, he was paying American printers more than he was paying Panamanian printers.

"They're more efficient," he explained blandly.

Needless, to say, this would have been no satisfactory defense if the Canal Zone authorities had used it.

The ambivalence of Dr. Arias can be shown in practically every political position Panama's leaders assume.

WHAT'S BEHIND IT

In the upcoming election, incumbent President Chiari and his party are running scared; so are the leaders of the other dozen or so parties. The reason is that Arnulfo Aria, a rich demagogic political wildman, is out in front with poverty-ridden masses.

Dr. Arnulfo Arias has been President twice before, and was kicked out twice before his term was up. Last time around, he nationalized all private businesses, by decree. At the outset of the war, he was pro-Nazi. He admired Mussolini. He says anything.

The result is, everybody's rabble rousing, crying to catch up with Arias because no one knows what might happen if he gets in again.

And so the rabble was roused on January 9 and now everybody wants to tear up the treaty and run the canal some other way.

MORE FEES

A strong argument can be made for increased canal fees, with more income for Panama and the United States too. (The original investment has never been paid off.) But it is doubtful if increased canal income to Panama would benefit the country's poor; the politicians would more likely raise their own pay. However, increased rates might make a second canal economically attractive to build somewhere else.

It is, of course, impossible in one article to explore the whole canal issue; the purpose here is merely to show the climate—the ambiencia as the Latins call it—in which this recent storm blew up.

Misconceptions launched by propaganda and faulty interpretation of events have already caused many well-meaning persons to think that somehow the United States was wrong and caused this whole thing.

It didn't.

U.S. Eagle Takes on a Meek Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, our national symbol, the American eagle has taken quite a beating lately. Everything from arrows to lightning bolts has been hurled at it. The eagle's feathers have been singed in Panama, immersed in the swamps of Vietnam, and almost clamped

into the schism between Moscow and Red China.

As Columnist Leo Monsky noted in a recent editorial:

It's open season for eagle baiting these days, and it's beginning to look as though our once fierce and proud emblem has taken on a meek and apologetic look.

Monsky continues:

Everybody from Arabia to Patagonia knows it's safe to jerk feathers from the U.S. eagle's tail * * * the bird acts mighty tame. Won't use his beak or talons or inconvenience you in any way.

We have, Monsky states, arrived at the ironic point where we can face down a Khrushchev but do not dare strike down a Castro.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these rather caustic but very creditable observations of Columnist Monsky be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. EAGLE TAKES ON A MEEK LOOK

(By Leo Monsky)

It's open season for eagle baiting these days, and it's beginning to look as though our once fierce and proud emblem has taken on a meek and apologetic look.

Think back to less than 20 years ago. Could you have conceived then that U.S. citizens could be kidnaped and held hostage in backward Bolivia—without tough action by the United States?

Unbelievable then. But it happened not many weeks ago. The Americans were in Bolivia to help its people, but that country's Commy-leaning vice president used them as pawns in his tin miners' arm twist of their government.

Why not? Everybody from Arabia to Patagonia knows it's safe to jerk feathers from the U.S. eagle's tail. Step right up—Algerians, Indonesians, Ghanians or whoever you are—the bird acts mighty tame. Won't use his beak or talons or inconvenience you in any way.

Think back again two decades. Can you imagine this week's bloody riot against Americans in the Panama Canal Zone having happened in those days without fear on the part of Panamanians? Great strength is ours, but is there any upstart dictator—no matter how pigsqueak—who fears our strength when he knows we won't use it against him?

Exactly how did we get this way? Eighteen years ago the United States stood—armed as no nation ever had before dreamed of being—astride a globe we had rescued from a monstrous assault on everything humanity considers decent. No nation or group of nations could have lifted a feeble arm to strike us—even in the back.

Then U.S. idealism was turned against us.

We were told American strength must be shared; what kind of big bullies were we if we used it?

We were told it was our humane duty—that's right, duty—to help every spot on earth become as sturdy and self-sufficient as we were. It had to be a duty—the mere gift from the heart was sneered at.

The noble ally which sloganeers had tagged the Soviet (just because it got stuck fighting on the same side as we were, against its will) began to slug us everywhere we weren't looking, from Berlin to Iran. Gratitude for the food and tools with which we had kept them alive? It was selfish and naive to expect that, we were told.

Western Europe was threatened with communism and we gave it the sinews to resist. Well, well, how long has this been going on—asked all the new little chiefs of new or resurrected states. It looked like the softest touch ever. All they had to do was yell: "Help. We're being bitten by communism"—and the United States sent money to rescue them.

New twists developed. Leering smoothies like the Egyptian and Indian brands showed the jungle developments they didn't even have to be threatened by communism. They could threaten to go Red of their own will. Or just act anti-American. That got more dollars than anything.

So by stages of abdication of power, we have arrived at the ironic point where we can face down a Khrushchev but do not dare strike down a Castro. We might be accused of hitting someone weaker than we are.

Since everybody is weaker than we are, that works out as their ability to strike us with impunity, while we may not hit back. That thing called world opinion or one of the umpty-ump international organizations might disapprove of us.

What price strength?

An Analysis of Foreign Aid Funds Spent in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a thought-provoking letter from a well-informed gentleman in California. I believe the letter speaks for itself and I am including it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Under a Washington, D.C., dateline of June 2, 1963, the Los Angeles Times ran a long, 2-column story by Carroll Kirkpatrick, an exclusive to the Times from the leftwing Washington Post. This article was headed "Most Foreign Aid Now Spent With U.S. Firms—Orders From Abroad Help Business, Labor at Home, Make Program Less Unpopular." This article was deliberate, blatant propaganda, full of doubletalk and just plain hokum. The true facts are available for anyone who is interested enough to read.

The true facts show that total global foreign economic aid spent in the United States was as follows:

	[Percent]
1959	14.0
1960	12.0
1961	10.5
1962	10.0

If the above percentage proves that most foreign aid now spent with U.S. firms—it's about time we taxpayers urged the Government to get some statisticians who can add.

Spending our dollars for foreign aid is out of our control and should be corrected. One example—no direct contracts are given by the agency for foreign development for purchases in the United States, instead, they authorize loans to foreign countries that will probably never be repaid. These loans are mostly for 40 years with a 10-year moratorium before the recipient is supposed to start paying anything at all. Then, at the ridiculous rate of 1 percent per annum on repayment of the principal with no interest charge. How about that? But, there is more to come, so get set—when, as, and if any repayments are ever made, they are not returned to the U.S. Treasury but are put right back into the foreign aid program for further loans—God help us. Next, with hat in hand, the Agency requests recipient countries to please buy materials for their aid projects in the United States as far as possible. Working through middlemen, the recipient country makes awards to individual suppliers in the United States. The middleman probably gets a handsome cut. Perhaps, Congress should investigate this facet of our great giveaway.

As a result of our foreign aid over the past 10 years, U.S. gold reserves have been reduced from $23 billion to approximately $15 billion. Simultaneously, free world countries have increased their short-term dollar credits from less than $11 billion to approximately $25 billion. The United States has about $5 or $6 billion free gold over our reserve to cover this. This is somewhat similar to having $5,000 in the bank and writing checks for $25,000. Our country is overdrawn in a big way.

This next may sound like insanity, and it probably is, in the year 1963, the United States (you and I) is giving economic aid to at least 73 countries and 7 entities, and, fantastic as it may seem, military assistance to 70 countries.

Some foreign aid has been so ludicrous, it is unbelievable. Believe it or not, the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriation hearings in 1962 found that foreign aid funds were actually used to:

1. Buy suits for undertakers in Greece.
2. Erect a stockbreeding farm in Lebanon with nine stalls for each bull.
3. Buy a $3,100,000 air-conditioned yacht for the Emperor of Ethiopia (with gold wallpaper).
4. Ship millions of dollars worth of navigational equipment to countries completely incapable of using it.
5. Buy 1,000 23-inch TV sets for use in community education in underdeveloped countries overseas at a cost of $400,000 for areas with no electric power.
6. Buy extra wives for government officials in Kenya.

Thus, our foreign aid program is literally shot through with waste, extravagance, foolish planning, unsound operations and an abundance of ineffective results. Moreover, military funds have been transferred into the contingency fund and then further transferred to economic programs which is downright dishonest.

Brother, you had better divest yourself quickly of the myth being propagandized that most foreign aid is being spent in this country and the foreign aid boys are not giving our tax money away but are making loans instead. This is one of the biggest hoaxes in history.

The time has come to face the cold, true facts. This massive outpouring of our gold under the phoney guise of an effort to resist communism is just plain hogwash. There were only 200,000 people under Communist enslavement when the United Nations was formed in 1945, now there are millions. No one has ever bought a real friend with money.

The whole foreign aid program is ill-conceived, badly executed, unrealistic, and enormously wasteful. It is bleeding our country of its gold, and at its present outflow, it is estimated that our "free" gold will be exhausted in about September 1964. All our foreign creditors holding a call on our gold know that we have piled up the incomprehensible sum of $1,051 billion of debt. They know our balance of payments is worsening. At any time, they can call our free gold for the short-term dollar credits they hold.

It is obvious that unless we stop our enormous foreign aid "giveaway" of gifts and

loans and halt the outflow of gold, we are apt to go broke along about next fall 1964. The writing is on the wall for all to plainly read. About 6 months ago in Switzerland, the annual report on world economy by the Bank of International Settlements commented: "The economy of the United States during the past year has continued to be afflicted by a serious balance-of-payments deficit without significant improvement. Designing schemes will not solve the problem. The situation calls for more vigorous measures." There it is in a nutshell.

The balance-of-payments deficit for 1963 is estimated to be $3.3 billion. Why not cut foreign aid giveaway by $3.3 billion? This would arrest the flight of gold and come close to balancing our fiscal 1964 budget. Additional cuts in other Government domestic spending could balance the budget.

A token effort has recently been made to stop the outflow of gold and to help the dangerous balance-of-payments deficit by raising the rediscount rate to 3½ percent. This is a joke. It has been estimated that the rediscount rate must be raised to at least 6 percent to be effective.

And let's hear no more about "most foreign aid now spent with U.S. firms"; this is just not true.

It appears that only a roar from home will convince our Representatives and Senators that we are sick and tired of waste and are not prepared to stand by and see our country commit slow suicide. Why it has not been forthcoming already remains a mystery to me.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

U.S. foreign aid from 1945 through mid-1962

[In thousands of dollars]

France	9,438,000
Britain	8,713,200
Italy	5,755,800
Korea	5,433,600
West Germany	4,999,400
Nationalist China	4,428,300
India	3,952,000
Turkey	3,869,300
Japan	3,693,800
Greece	3,387,600
Netherlands	2,481,400
Vietnam	2,441,700
Yugoslavia	2,396,900
Belgium-Luxembourg	1,995,900
Brazil	1,952,700
Pakistan	1,889,600
Philippines	1,753,200
Spain	1,711,300
Indochina region	1,535,200
Iran	1,310,200
Austria	1,173,800
Norway	1,146,800
Denmark	905,600
Israel	877,700
Mexico	766,900
Thailand	753,900
Chile	737,800
Indonesia	670,900
Argentina	640,500
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	628,600
Poland	522,600
Portugal	488,700
Peru	470,700
Laos	461,000
Colombia	408,500
Morocco	352,000
Jordan	349,300
Cambodia	334,500
Tunisia	293,300
Venezuela	273,800
Bolivia	258,400
Afghanistan	219,600
Libya	191,700
Ethiopia	185,300
Guatemala	162,600
Ghana	156,500
Ireland	146,200
Ecuador	138,300
Liberia	131,500
West Berlin	131,000

U.S. foreign aid from 1945 through mid-1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Sweden	108,900
Haiti	100,800
Panama	100,800
Burma	95,400
Congo (Brazzeville)	94,600
Costa Rica	89,900
Lebanon	89,000
Uruguay	88,200
Ceylon	79,700
Syria	75,800
Iceland	70,200
Nicaragua	68,900
Iraq	67,700
Sudan	65,000
Paraguay	59,300
Cuba	52,100
Nepal	48,400
Saudi Arabia	46,600
Dominican Republic	45,400
Honduras	45,300
Nigeria	43,600
El Salvador	40,700
Rhodesia-Nyasaland	36,100
Indus Basin	33,800
Hong Kong	30,400
Cento	27,400
Somali	27,400
Malaya	23,200
Yemen	22,900
West Indies	22,500
Kenya	18,500
Tanganyika	17,600
Cyprus	16,900
Cameroon	15,600
Algeria	15,000
Guinea	14,300
Jamaica	8,800
Mali	6,100
Rwanda-Burundi	6,100
Togoland	5,800
Dahomey	5,600
Uganda	5,200
Senegal	4,600
Ivory Coast	4,600
British Guiana	3,500
Sierra Leone	3,500
Surinam	3,400
Niger	3,200
Upper Volta	3,200
British Honduras	2,400
Seato	1,800
Mauritania	1,600
Malagasy	1,300
Gabon	500
Chad	400
Central African Republic	200
Zanzibar	100

Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, one of the earmarks of personal freedom is the right to own and to use sporting firearms. The American colonists were so dependent upon firearms for their survival in the wilderness, and so conscious of the superiority in the Revolutionary War, of the long rifle over the British smoothbore musket, that they wrote into the new Constitution the right to the possession of firearms.

The willingness of millions of those who use sporting firearms or who wish to have the right to possess them in their homes as an essential element of self-defense, to accept reasonable Federal control over the sale of firearms, was well expressed on January 24 by Hon. C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute, before the Senate Committee on Commerce having consideration of S. 1975 and S. 2345. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief excerpt from that testimony, in which Mr. Gutermuth, on behalf of a large group of sportsmen, endorsed the provisions of S. 1975 as originally introduced but expressed determined opposition to the subsequent proposed amendments.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE ON S. 1975 AND S. 2345, JANUARY 24, 1964

Mr. Chairman, I am C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, with headquarters in Washington, D.C. The institute is one of the older national conservation organizations, and its program has been devoted to the restoration and improved management of natural resources in the broad public interest since 1911.

Before commenting on the proposals under consideration, I first want to commend Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and Senator HOWARD G. CANNON, the chairman of this special committee, for their excellent statements issued last December at the start of this hearing. Their well-reasoned calls for calm and thorough deliberations, and their refusal to be stampeded by the tragic events in Dallas, have been assuring to the millions of Americans who own and use sporting firearms of all kinds for traditional recreational purposes. I do not distort the situation when I say that Americans in every part of the country were apprehensive that good judgment might yield to emotion in the aftermath of President Kennedy's untimely death.

Senator MAGNUSON and Senator CANNON helped to quiet that fear by their realistic appraisal of the problem and by their discussion of the aspects involved. Their statements point to the pitfalls of superficial legislation. They recognize the paramount rights and responsibilities of the millions of law-abiding people who must be considered. They recognize, too, that firearms can be misused by the criminally inclined, by incompetents and malcontents, and by uninstructed juveniles. They are aware of the need for a solution. But in seeking that solution, they want to avoid the inequity of penalizing and burdening the multitudes for the misdeeds and indifference of a few. It is hoped that this sound advice will be heeded by the Congress and by State and local legislative and regulatory bodies.

In earlier sessions before this committee, a number of Senators and Representatives expressed conviction that there is reasonable need and opportunity for correcting existing firearms legislation as it pertains to the interstate commerce of pistols and revolvers in violation of State and local laws. This outlook is shared by millions of Americans who own and use firearms for sport and other legitimate purposes. Hunters, skeet, trap, and target shooters, as well as those who possess firearms for defense of home, business, and property, are appalled by the violent and irrational act of the mentally disturbed, the criminally inclined, addicts, and other undesirables. They, too, like other well-intentioned persons everywhere, desire to rid our society of criminal acts of all kinds.

Like any other citizen or group of citizens, however, hunters and other firearms users have a right to request and a right to expect

that applicable laws, rules, and regulations hold the certainty of effective and equitable enforcement. Unworkable and impractical laws provide no more deterrent to the use of firearms in crime than inadequate laws provide relief or corrective action in any other situation. We know from long experience in areas where such ineffective laws have been enacted in the past that the criminal use of firearms cannot and will not be deterred. It would be absurd for the Congress to take steps that would penalize the law-abiding citizen and yet make no effective contribution toward the reduction of armed crime.

Say No to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recognition of Red China by the French Government is of deep concern, I am sure, to all thoughtful Americans. A significant editorial in the January 28 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, which should have the attention of all Members of Congress, points out some of the dangers implicit in this action.

Free men everywhere deplore this recognition of a government that has violated every principle of morality, law, and order and continues to foment hatred of the people of the United States. I am hopeful that our Government will meet this challenge with stronger determination to use every resource at its disposal to uphold and further the cause of freedom and justice throughout the world.

The editorial follows:

SAY NO TO RED CHINA

President Charles de Gaulle's decision to extend diplomatic recognition to Red China is bound to have extensive repercussions. The impact on the United States will be felt in at least two areas: the U.S. effort to stem communism in southeast Asia and the possibility that Red China will be admitted to the United Nations.

Since 1950 the U.N. General Assembly has voted against the admission of Red China 14 times. The margin of negative votes has gradually decreased as the U.N. has grown. France's recognition may be the final influence needed to admit Red China to the U.N. this year or next year.

As a member of the U.N., Red China would take its seat as the "representative government" of the people of China. The status of "representative government" was the justification Great Britain used in voting for the admission of Red China to the U.N. in 1962 and in 1963.

As a government "representative" of the people of China the Red Chinese could launch an assault against Formosa and the government of Nationalist China on the grounds that such an attack would not be international aggression—it would merely be an attempt to "bring back" an area that had strayed away. Such an attack would imperil the defense structure of the United States and some of the Western Powers in the Far East.

De Gaulle's recognition of Red China also poses an immediate threat to the position the United States has taken in southeast Asia. Last August De Gaulle said that the fighting in South Vietnam should stop, that France could stop it by mediation and by establishing South Vietnam as a neutral zone. The predictable result of this so-called neutrality would be the overrun of all southeast Asia by the Red Chinese. The pattern of neutrality dominated by Red China has already been established in Laos and is being formulated in Cambodia.

Red China is an aggressor nation. It advocates nuclear holocaust as a means of settling the ideological dispute between the Communist nations and the West. It has made war against member nations of the U.N. and it is still making war.

To welcome a government, its hands dripping with the blood of its neighbors, into the United Nations is a refutation of that organization's ideals. It is wrong. And to those nations that have put forth the proposal that Red China would "reform" if admitted, we say—let Red China reform first.

Reviewer Pans Udall Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, the present Secretary of the Interior, wrote a book last year. Unfortunately its publication date was around the time of the late President Kennedy's regrettable assassination. As a consequence the book escaped the public attention it might otherwise have received. Therefore I feel it appropriate even at this late date to present the following review of "The Quiet Crisis," which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on November 24, 1963:

UDALL ON CONSERVATION

"The quiet crisis" finally emerges as the erosion of the countryside, most recently largely by the expansion of our urban centers. Anyone who has witnessed one of these titanic reorderings of the countryside by mechanical behemoths might question the quietness, but this is a minor point. Mr. Udall is concerned with the abuse of the land, the disappearance of wild lands and wildlife, and he sees these losses as vital to humanity.

The form of the book is historical: birth of land policy in colonial times, the role of the frontiersmen, Thoreau and the naturalists such as Audubon, the period of "raiding the resources," and the reaction, with attention focused on such towering figures as George Perkins Marsh, Carl Schurz, John Wesley Powell, John Muir, and others. There is a section on the role of the Government and another on the action of philanthropists in setting aside forest reserves and wildlife sanctuaries and parks. The problem of cities is discussed, and comments are made on conservation and land ethics for tomorrow.

The plan is good, the men discussed are important, a lot of valuable material is presented, and there are some beautiful illustrations, many in color.

DISAPPOINTING IN DETAIL

In detail, the book is disappointing. The Indians are alleged to have left the land undefiled except for mere scratches in the cornfield clearings. In reality they often changed the land mightily, principally by burning everything in sight annually. To an astonishing degree the land as we receved it was as the Indians had made it: with great increases of grassland and with great decreases of animal life. For example, the Indians exterminated the American elephants and horses and nearly all of the camels, to name a few examples. We are not unique in our impact.

At times Mr. Udall explains things through simple physical environmental determinism. The South was as it was because of the climate and soil; and New England correspondingly different. This is so simplistic as to be totally erroneous. Elsewhere he fails to understand the changes that come with time. What is good conservation today would have been folly in the colonial era. This is best illustrated by Mr. Udall's quoting Jefferson on wise land use and commenting that Jefferson lacked any understanding of soil fertility. On the contrary, it is Mr. Udall that lacks appreciation of the colonial production problem, and the sensible shifting of land, labor, and capital to meet the problem of the time.

SELF-CONTRADICTIONS

Mr. Udall also quotes extravagant figures for the land given to the railroad to support their western construction. That the railroads made our settlement of the West possible, that scholarly research shows the land giveaway to have been grossly exaggerated and the Government to have profited from the deal, is seemingly unknown to Mr. Udall. On one page the myth that science can continue to give us new resources is attacked, and on the next page it is espoused. Teddy Roosevelt's vetoing of the development of the power in the Tennessee Valley is noted approvingly, and shortly thereafter F.D.R.'s TVA is justified because private industry had not gone ahead with the development of power in the area.

Not unexpectedly, there is a strong political bias in the book. The introduction is by John F. Kennedy, and Mr. Udall is of course our Secretary of the Interior. He accepts wholeheartedly the concentration of power in Washington, and the New Deal, and all its works. Laissez faire is a whipping boy, private enterprise is presented in the robber baron stereotype, and the good is seen as governmental control. Setting up of forest reserves and national parks is considered so desirable an end that the fact that it was sometimes done by subterfuge is reported with gusto and approval; one assumes in total innocence of the fact that this is approving the doctrine that the end justifies the means.

EMOTION WON'T DO

Throughout the book there is the feeling that things have not been thought out, the contradictions not seen, and few things defined. There are many catchy phases such as "a habitat that will each day renew the meaning of human enterprise," whatever that may mean. Elsewhere fear is expressed that cities may "frustrate man's highest and most specifically human attributes," but we are not told what these attributes are. The passage suggests that they are a desire for open space and serenity. More is intended, one supposes, but just what and just how cities and suburbs are frustrating this is not made clear.

Just as everyone is again sin, so everyone is for conservation, and for man's attaining his "highest and most specifically human attributes." The trouble is that such problems need sharp definition, and then must be seen in a very broad context and preferably with real understanding of historical settings. Here outpourings of emotion won't do. Mr. Udall's book suffers from lack of sharpness of definition with emotionalism too often substituting for thought.

GEORGE F. CARTER,
Professor of Geography, Johns Hopkins University.

Panama Canal: Buzzards Coming Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful article by William S. White in the January 21, 1964, issue of the News of Lynchburg, Va., supplies some highly pertinent discussion of the Panama Canal question.

In comparing the situations at the Suez Canal in 1956 with that at Panama today, it must never be overlooked that they are entirely different. The Suez Canal Co. was an Egyptian corporation started by private commercial interests. The Panama Canal enterprise is an agency of our Government under the President in Canal Zone, over which the United States was granted complete sovereignty and in which all land and property was purchased by our country from individual owners. Our country is obligated by treaties and bound by law to the principle of the perpetual operation of the Panama Canal.

The article follows:

BUZZARDS COMING HOME TO ROOST

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Some unpleasantly buzzardlike chickens are coming home to roost, with Panama as their current roosting ground, from the United Nations decision of 1956 to condemn an attempt to halt the seizure, in the name of "anticolonialism," of another international canal.

To its lasting shame, the U.S. Government, under Republican President Eisenhower but with no effective protest from the Democrats, then joined the Soviet Union in branding as "aggression" the effort of the British, French, and Israelis to strike the throttling hands of Nasser Egypt from the Suez Canal.

But, far worse, the U.N. definition of "aggression" thus adopted and embedded as historic precedent was so oversimplified as positively to invite similar international thefts—so long as the real aggressor, the grabber of the property of others, could claim to be acting under the sacred banner of anticolonialism.

For the U.N. said, in effect, that when one power crossed the frontiers of another, moving only against unarguable, imminent and mortal peril to itself, it was automatically wrong even though it could only hope to save its life or vital interests precisely by moving first.

This in substance destroyed the basic doctrine of national self-defense as a valid plea in the United Nations—so long as the country or countries offering that plea were less popular than their antagonists. Self-defense is a sour fiction if one must knowingly wait until he has been destroyed before taking the one action that might have saved himself.

Now, there is, of course, no imminent threat of a seizure of the Panama Canal, which is the property of the United States under a treaty in existence for six decades. All current signs indicate that the crisis there may be, for the time being, surmounted by our agreement to allow Panamanian guards to police the boundaries of the Canal Zone. It was a generous offer on our part—but it waived not one of our basic rights or interests.

All the same, the greatest real problem of the Johnson administration in this difficulty with Panama does not involve the slightest lack of right on our side. We are demonstrably in the right on any rational reading of the facts.

The real problem, instead, is the old stereotype going back to Suez, which is now a worldwide impression that when a large power takes honest steps to defend its honest rights it is somehow defending bad old "colonial interests" against clear-eyed believers in "democracy." It is a silly stereotype, apart from the simple fact that there is not a chemical trace of American "colonialism" in Panama. But to say that it is not an entrenched stereotype would be to speak nonsense.

Not surprisingly, much of the European press—notably that of Britain and France, which also still remember our self-righteousness over Suez—raises a clamor of "colonialism" against us over Panama. So do some American commentators, with sentimental sighs about the poor Panamanians so hard pressed by the wicked giant to the north, the United States.

It can only be hoped that the present Panamanian settlement will not come finally unstuck. If it does, we shall face an ugly dilemma: How to defend what in honor and in commonsense must be defeated, without at the same time coming into collision course with a U.N. precedent we helped so much to set.

Hon. Ed Foreman

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend to our distinguished colleague, ED FOREMAN, my personal congratulations upon his being named by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the 10 outstanding young men in the country.

Knowing him as we do from the contribution has has been making during his first term of service in the Congress, that this honor should be bestowed upon him is no surprise. His work as a Representative from the State of Texas has been outstanding.

As the senior Republican member in service on the Armed Services Committee, I am able to testify to the superior performance—truly outstanding—of our most junior member of the committee, both in years and in service. From his grasp of the various defense problems, however, he is by no means nor in any respect a junior. He has demonstrated an understanding and a maturity of judgment in Armed Services Committee matters just as he demonstrated in all his undertakings before coming to Congress. We are certainly glad to have him on our committee.

ED FOREMAN was named one of America's outstanding young men not because he was one of the youngest men elected to Congress. Nor was he selected for this honor because of his unusual success in business before coming to Congress. This honor has come to him because of the kind of a man he is, because of his ability and his character. His success in business and in public life merely bespeaks the quality of ED FOREMAN.

He is one of the best in all respects. He is outstanding in all respects. And I am sure the fine people he represents appreciate the high-quality representation he has given them.

End of a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one hardly needs to be a foreign policy expert to realize that we are in serious jeopardy in southeast Asia today. In fact we have growing trouble spots in almost every area; but we must give primary consideration to the situation in Vietnam because we have staked so much on the outcome there.

We have committed U.S. forces there; ostensibly they are there on training missions, but the training in that area unfortunately includes a high casualty rate.

We were much less than subtle in our disapproval of the Diem regime and our welcome of its successor. Yet we find the war against the Communists is going worse than before.

Having made so much of the defense of Vietnam, if we now abandon it, we will suffer irreparably elsewhere.

For these reasons I found the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of interest:

END OF A POLICY

American policy in southeast Asia has not been a complete failure—yet.

The portents are, however, ominous. Most discouraging of all was the admission by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara that the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam are more active now than before the end of the Diem regime. The United States actively connived in the revolt that threw out Diem and his relatives. The avowed purpose of this American-sponsored coup was to get more popular support for a stronger campaign against the Red Vietcong.

To date, the Washington planners and American reformers in Saigon have little but the assassination of Diem to show for their pains.

The populace of Vietnam may be friendlier. Buddhist monks are no longer immolating themselves in the streets, or if they do so, their motives are now said to be religious. However, the Vietcong operates with impunity only a few miles from Saigon, and the rice bowl area of the Mekong River Delta is said to be fairly infested with Reds.

More American servicemen have died in fighting against this elusive enemy, and more Americans are coming to admit that there is a war in progress in southeast Asia. There is no pleasure in saying "We told you so." The Star argued some time ago that the facts could not be denied.

Unlike virtue, a revolution is not its own reward. To be acceptable, it must achieve the goals for which it was begun. The

American revolution in South Vietnam is, thus far, a most unmoral spectacle.

The Diem regime, which cannot be resurrected, was said to be dictatorial, practicing such unpleasant things as press censorship. The present governing clique which rests on pure military force in South Vietnam also has resorted to closing newspapers that criticize its actions, or inactions. Whether this lesson has been lost on the liberal calamity howlers is not yet clear.

Will the State Department, and some of its unofficial policymakers, now decide that an other revolution will be good for South Vietnam? Diem couldn't win the war against the Reds. The present military dictatorship has an even worse record of wins and losses in southeast Asian competition. Will President Johnson call for some new faces in Saigon, as former President Kennedy did?

The time for making a far-reaching decision seems to be drawing closer. Will the United States defend southeast Asia against Communist expansion, even at the expense of a major effort involving American troops, or will this Nation quietly withdraw? One thing is clear. Present policy has a sorry past and a dim future.

Dr. Franz Michael's Analysis: The Sino-Soviet "Split" Is From the Common Book of Communist Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an extraordinary amount of speculation concerning the origins and causes of the Sino-Soviet split, but a great deal of it has taken on a sensational nature. For example, in the last year we have repeatedly heard that the split had become irrevocable, and that nothing the two powers could do would bring them back together again. While it is probably true that relations between China and the Soviet Union will never again be the same as in past years, it would be a grave and dangerous mistake to conclude that for the same reason their goals have also become antagonistic and mutually exclusive.

While Khrushchev boasted at a New Year's reception that the only difference the Soviets had with China was over how to bury the West, not whether to bury it, we seem to indicate that we prefer Khrushchev's strategy. Mr. Speaker, we will not be less defeated if we are taken over by the Khrushchev strategy as opposed to the Maoist variety.

Dr. Franz Michael, professor of Far Eastern history and government at the University of Washington, recently visiting professor at the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at George Washington University, and a distinguished expert on Communist affairs, has written in the fall 1963 University of Washington Alumnus one of the most penetrating analyses of the Sino-Soviet struggle which I have ever read. Dr. Michael points out:

The fact that on given situations the Chinese Communist and Soviet policies do not always agree does not necessarily weaken the effectiveness of the overall Communist effort. In fact, it may make it more formidable.

Dr. Michael then clearly states his basic view:

In my view, we face then not conflicting policies of rival totalitarian states, but the much more complex interrelationships of different strategies of attack all taken from the common book of Communist warfare. If the Communist attack is to become more sweeping, our defense must be equally broad.

I commend this outstanding analysis to my colleagues.

Tribute to Edwin W. Tiedeman, Pioneer Dairy Farm Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the February issue of Popkess' Dairyman's Journal is a tribute to the late Edwin W. Tiedeman, pioneer dairy leader, one of the most remarkable men of I have known.

Born near O'Fallon, Ill., Ed Tiedeman went on to distinguish himself as a leading spokesman, locally and nationally, for the dairy farmer. His efforts in behalf of the dairymen will never be forgotten.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this tribute:

EDWIN W. TIEDEMAN

Edwin W. Tiedeman, 71, St. Clair County, Ill., pioneer dairy leader, whose activities reached and helped dairy farmers throughout the United States, passed to his eternal reward, suddenly, in Washington, D.C., on December 28, 1963. Services were held in St. Louis as the year was closing.

Tiedeman was born near O'Fallon, Ill., and spent his early life on the farm. His schooling included attendance at the University of Illinois, where he took various agricultural courses. He married in 1915, and launched his assiduous pioneering spirit when he established a homestead in Texas. During the World War I years, he fought a winning battle against drought and sand in the pioneering days of Texas, where the seeds were sown for a life of leadership in agriculture.

Tiedeman returned to Illinois with his family late in the 1920's, and settled on a dairy farm south of Belleville, Ill., which he operated himself, shipping on the St. Louis market.

Dairy farmers of the St. Louis milkshed were in dire need of leadership at the time, as a loosely knit group had operated in the territory for two decades. Various co-ops had been formed. Little had been accomplished. Dairy farmers themselves had lost thousands of dollars in the cooperative ventures.

HEADS PRODUCERS

Tiedeman was elected head of the milk producers of St. Clair County. He was later the unanimous choice for president of Sanitary Milk Producers at its inception in 1930. He led SMP, and the dairy farmers of several other cooperatives in the St. Louis milkshed, in the formulation of sales plans which brought recognition to the dairy farmers resulting in several decades of improved farm dairy prices.

Tiedeman had led the dairy farmers in the St. Louis district through the bitter days of the St. Louis milk strike in 1930. He directed the organization of the St. Louis Consumers Milk Commission, a group of city residents who carried on an investigation of the system of pricing of milk to farmers which took the leaders to the dairy farms where they held meetings under shade trees and verified the claims of the dairy farmers that they were receiving insufficient returns for their labor.

Early in the campaign to lead dairymen to success, Tiedeman obtained the support of Speaker of the House of Representatives, James T. Rainey, of Carrollton, Ill., in getting the U.S. Department of Agriculture to approve a marketing agreement and license for the St. Louis market. This marketing agreement established classification for milk and minimum prices which dairy operators were required to pay farmers. This agreement was issued under the old Triple A Act, enacted early in 1933. A portion of this act was later amended and then reenacted as the Marketing Agreement Act which is the enabling legislation under which the Federal milk order program now operates in the St. Louis market as well as some 80 markets in the United States.

Tiedeman was not only responsible for obtaining the first marketing agreement for the St. Louis market but was also the leader in continuing the Federal milk marketing program in the St. Louis market which has come to be the oldest Federal order in the United States.

WENT TO WISCONSIN

As the World War II clouds were gathering in 1942, Tiedeman left the St. Louis area and went to Appleton, Wisc., where he led a group of dairy farmers, including seven local co-operative organizations, into a central sales agency. Offices were opened in Chicago. Wisconsin dairymen received millions of dollars of increased benefits as a result of the sales group.

Shortly after leaving as manager of Central Sales Agency, Tiedeman was appointed director of the Dairy Branch of the Office of Price Stabilization, a war agency during the Korean war. Following the war years and his work with the Government, he was appointed director of dairy marketing of the American Farm Bureau Federation where he led in the establishment of the dairy program of the largest farmers' organization in the United States. Upon retirement from the American Farm Bureau, Tiedeman was appointed to the staff of the Dairy Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in this assignment he had the responsibility of checking qualifications of cooperatives which operate under the Federal milk market program. He continued this activity until his death.

Tiedeman served many years as a member of the board of the National Milk Producers Federation and as a board member and chairman of the National Dairy Council.

Ed Tiedeman was the most determined and diligent dairy farm leader who developed in the St. Louis milk shed in the past half century. His principles and preachings were sound. The results of his untiring effort in behalf of the dairy farmers of the midwest and the United States will live forever.

A farm boy with ambition, and knowledge, and leadership, and determination, and ability, and humility, has returned millions of dollars to dairy farmers of the Nation. It can be truly said that Ed spent his life in the service of his fellow dairymen.

Ed Tiedeman will be missed in the industry. His name and accomplishments will live forever in the pages of agricultural history.

Holifield Warns Test Ban Pact Bars New Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has warned those taking euphoric views about a second interocean canal somewhere in Central America to get realistic. No new canal can be built without the use of nuclear explosives. No one nation, nor any combination of nations, is rich enough to build such a canal using only conventional earthmoving means. Yet, under the terms of the recently negotiated nuclear test ban treaty, Mr. Khrushchev's permission must be obtained for the use of nuclear explosives for this purpose. Any benevolent understanding on his part in this regard is highly unlikely. Deprivation of the free world's access to a second canal comes as no surprise. I pointed out this consequence over and over again before the treaty was ratified. So did many others. When this and other costs to the West for this ill-starred venture in diplomacy with the Reds is finally totaled, the aggregate will be startling. It should be sufficient to dispel the euphoria of even the treaty's most starry-eyed supporters.

The following interesting editorial comments regarding Mr. HOLIFIELD's statements appeared in the Washington Star on January 29:

CANAL AND ATOM

Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, has voiced a good and knowing word of caution regarding talk about building a sea-level Atlantic-Pacific canal to replace, or supplement, the one in Panama. The talk puts special stress on the idea of using nuclear explosives to bring the projected waterway into being at bargain-basement prices.

There is little doubt, of course, that such a project will have to be undertaken in the years immediately ahead. The prospective increase in seagoing commercial traffic and the larger dimensions of our new warships plainly indicate that the controversial Panama Canal is already obsolescent. As a result, it faces a future in which it will play only a secondary and constantly diminishing role.

As for the new sea-level canal, a prime question has to do with the problem of digging it. Atomic devices could make the job relative easy and inexpensive, but the limited test-ban treaty constitutes an obstacle. This is so because the treaty—which, of course, excludes underground detonations—commits every signatory "not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control."

Mr. HOLIFIELD, former chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee and one of America's most educated men in the nuclear field, feels certain that this commitment would rule out an atomic-dug canal unless the detonations could be so masked as to avoid fallout or some special agreement could be worked out with the other signatories—particularly the Russians—to permit the use of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. Without such an agreement, or the masking possibility, the task of nonatomic excavation would be costly in the extreme.

In that respect, the possibility of building a new canal in Panama, or Colombia or Mexico, will remain problematical unless or until the Russians take an affirmative view of it. Always, alas, we must reckon with their nay-saying and studied procrastination.

Maine Fishing Industry Cannot Take Tariff Slash and Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, New England is disturbed at the prospect of reductions in tariffs on fisheries products.

Yesterday I submitted a brief to the U.S. Tariff Commission expressing my strong opposition to such a move.

At a time when Congress should be taking steps to immediately help the domestic fishing industry replace obsolete fishing boats and rehabilitate the commercial fishing industry in the United States, it is no time to harm further this beleaguered industry.

An editorial from the Portland, Maine, Press Herald, should be of interest to the Members of this House:

MAINE FISHING INDUSTRY CANNOT TAKE TARIFF SLASH AND SURVIVE

If world trade could be fashioned on textbook principles, with each nation producing the manufacturers and other goods for which it was best fitted to do by economic reasons, we would not have protective tariffs and quotas and other barriers to the free flow of trade.

And we would not have Commissioner Ronald Green of Maine Sea and Shore Fisheries, and President Roderick Littlefield of the Associated Fisheries of Maine, forced to travel to Washington and protest, as they will today before the U.S. Tariff Commission, a proposal to cut in half existing duties on imports of fish products into this country.

There is a vast difference, we have always felt, between fishing and the making of automobiles and chemicals and paper and machinery and a thousand other manufactures. Like the farmer, the fisherman is not the master of his destiny. The sea is, at the same time, a friend and an implacable enemy. And if it may be claimed that every nation's fishermen experience maritime hazards, all the way from screaming North Atlantic gales to the mysterious groundfish migrations that make the occupation a costly gamble, this is only part of the story.

The New England industry, in particular, is faced by higher boat costs, higher wages, higher insurance rates, and higher operating and processing costs, than any of its foreign competitors. Present tariff protection is barely adequate, and the current low rate of income to Maine fishermen is reflected in the depressed economic situation of dozens of seacoast towns.

These are the harsh facts of life that Commissioner Green and Mr. Littlefield will relate to the Tariff Commission today. If the United States must horsetrade tariff rates with Western European countries at Geneva in May, let's not bargain away the virtual livelihood of New Englanders who are barely making a living from the sea—and often at great cost.

Should National Brand Merchandise Be Sabotaged To Promote the Sale of Private Brand Merchandise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, three recent articles in Home Furnishings Daily point up the contradictions inherent in the chief arguments made by opponents of the quality stabilization bill.

One article, on January 14, 1964, relates to a large national mass merchandiser's reliance on the use of private brand names in merchandising its products. According to the president of Montgomery Ward & Co., Mr. Robert E. Brooker, that company will this year rely on private label brand names for 90 percent of its total sales.

Along the same line, another story in the same edition of Home Furnishings Daily tells of the National Association of Mass Merchandisers adoption of a so-called certified quality program "to enable member-discount organizations to carry a limited number of approved store-branded items."

And in the January 28 issue of the same publication, a top-level spokesman for the May Co. department store chain states that between 5–10 percent of May's total volume—estimated at $720–725 million in fiscal 1963—is now produced by exclusively branded goods.

Says Mr. Lincoln Gries, executive vice president of the May Co.: With our own brand we can protect our profit, we have seen too many nationally-branded items get footballed. Also we find we can develop prestige for our own products on a local basis.

To my mind, these articles are prime exhibits substantiating the case of those of us who advocate quality stabilization legislation. Here, from their own lips, we hear admissions by mass merchandising spokesmen that the brand name on manufactured goods is a valuable asset to its producer and an invaluable guide to the modern American consumer. As Mr. Roger Courtland of the NAMM is quoted as saying, brand name products have "better consumer acceptance," and are considered quality products.

That is exactly the principle upon which the case for quality stabilization rests. And there is yet another important question to consider about these admissions by leading national mass merchandisers. As manufacturers of label goods, do they not possess the same control over the retail price of these goods which they seek to deny their independent competitors by opposing quality stabilization? Is it logical or fair to raise straw price-fixing charges against independent maufacturers and retailers when they ask only to be permitted equal treatment with Montgomery Ward, NAMM members and others who manufacture and market their own private

label goods at prices which they determine?

These are questions to be considered in weighing the relative merits of arguments for and against quality stabilization—and I believe their answers clearly weigh in favor of proponents of the bill.

With unanimous consent I ask that two of the articles referred to be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And I would ask all those interested in preserving a free, independent retail system to read these articles and reflect on their true meaning to the Nation's economy.

The articles follow:

[From Home Furnishings Daily, Jan. 15, 1964]

WARD'S PLANS STEP UP OF PRIVATE LABEL LINES

CHICAGO.—Montgomery Ward & Co. plans to step up its percentage of private label merchandise this year.

"Eighty percent of our total sales now are accounted for by goods which are offered under our brand name," according to Robert E. Brooker, Ward's president, "and this will be increased to approximately 90 percent in 1964."

Mr. Brooker also noted, in a lengthy progress report to the chain's employees, that Ward's had given great attention to packaging of goods under its various private labels the past year. Buyers and designers concentrated on developing label information which encourages customer self-selection and on designing attractive packages which encourage impulse purchases.

Ward's house labels include Signature appliances, Airline home entertainment equipment and Powr-Kraft tools; Carol Brent, Miss Brent, Brent, Brent University, Brent Junior, Brentshire, Brentshire Young Junior, Brent Prep, and other labels for women's, men's, and children's apparel; and Style House and other brands for curtains, draperies, and fabrics.

Mr. Brooker also introduced a sad note in his statement.

"We have made few organizational and systems changes in the catalog portion of our business during 1963," he said, "and I regret to report that we have not kept pace with competition. While catalog industry sales have increased 9 percent, our sales through the various catalog forms of selling have advanced an estimated 2 percent through December. Consequently, we have lost position—our share of the market has declined."

Mr. Brooker went on to say that Ward's has experienced people "to compete favorably in catalog selling, and this important part of our total sales deserves the attention of each unit manager to assure recovery of our lost position.

Elsewhere in his statement, the official reported that early results of Ward's conversion of the Fair Store in northwest suburban Mount Prospect (Randhurst shopping center), Ill., have "exceeded our expectations." It gave Ward full-line retail representation in the Chicago market.

The newest timetable for conversion of four other units calls for completion by next September. Stores in Evergreen Park and Oak Park will be changed to Ward's prior to Easter, State Street by mid-1964, and Old Orchard in time for the back-to-school season.

The metropolitan district responsibility for the Chicago market includes stores in Gary and Hammond, Ind., and La Grange. Chicago Heights, Blue Island, Waukegan, Joliet, and Aurora and all catalog stores within a 50-mile radius of downtown Chicago.

[From Home Furnishings Daily, Jan. 15, 1964]

NAMM ADOPTS PROGRAM TO OK STORE BRANDS

WASHINGTON.—The National Association of Mass Merchandisers has adopted a certified quality program to enable member-discount organizations to carry a limited number of approved store-branded items.

So far, said Roger Courtland, NAMM executive secretary, the program covers a line of pharmaceuticals (vitamins and about 60 sundries). It is to be broadened gradually, usually by about one item per store department. As of now, no hard goods are included, but it is an area that may be explored.

Mr. Courtland said tests have proved the consumer favors a product bearing the store name and quality seal. He said this provided a brand name identity and store identification. Since quality is pretested and price is lower (because of avoiding manufacturer ad costs), the store has a higher profit factor and better consumer acceptance, Mr. Courtland declared.

The manufacturer who wants to participate in the NAMM store-brand program is required to have tests made of his product and two or three comparable name brand products at a testing lab acceptable to NAMM. The tests are required by NAMM, for participation, to show that the product's quality is as good as or better than the name brands. Price also must be lower than the brand name merchandise, but how much lower depends on the product and other circumstances.

Panama Canal: Time for Showing Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the San Diego, (Calif.) Union, with the heading as shown below:

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 23, 1964]

LET'S SAY NO AND MEAN IT: TIME FOR SHOW OF STRENGTH

There is no gratitude in diplomacy. Panama virtually owes its existence as a free nation to the desire of the United States to build the Panama Canal.

Now, Panama is unhappy and talks loosely and grandiosely of assuming complete jurisdiction and operation of the canal to preserve the dignity of its independence.

We would be willing to wager that few of the people in the provinces of Panama are much concerned whether Panama's dignity is upheld, and that the discontent is largely if not all in the political centers.

The pretensions of small nations often are out of proportion to their importance. The factor in regard to the Panama Canal, other than the safeguarding of American interests, is in the historic obligation of the United States to operate it as an international waterway, for the benefit of Panama and everybody else, as this country has done.

Panama is one of the smaller Latin countries. After the Spanish colonies in the New World had rebelled, Panama became a province of Colombia, then known as New Granada. It never was more than a province, though it did enjoy some measure of autonomy at times, until the United States—and the commercial world—felt the great need of a waterway through the isthmus.

When the United States and Colombia were unable to reach agreement on a treaty, Panama broke away and signed up, and the canal was built. That was in 1903. Ever since, the canal has been an important factor in the economy of Panama.

But the child has become a diplomatic delinquent. Violence is substituted for commonsense and reason.

We believe it is a time for a show of strength in Panama as well as elsewhere. This is not being imperialistic. The United States wants no territory, nor does it want to destroy the integrity of any country.

But the United States invested money in Panama, and built the canal and opened it to all, in good faith and in confidence that Panama too would meet its treaty obligations. It is Panama, not the United States, that would change the rules of the game.

Panama wants to turn back the clock and abrogate the treaty that brought it independence. Does it also want to go back 60 years to its former state as a captive Province of Colombia?

We ought to close the door, probably, in mentioning the phrase "gunboat diplomacy." But, in truth, we are practicing "gunboat diplomacy" in many parts of the world, in the Formosa Straits, for example, and now in the Indian Ocean.

The 7th Fleet is sending a powerful task force into the Indian Ocean, and you can be sure there will be howls of protest from Indian Socialists and others. But a show of strength, if it keeps the peace, is better than the use of force.

The United States has kept the peace in the Western Pacific. We feel the Navy can maintain the peace in the distant Indian Ocean area. The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Joseph J. Lombardo, now has suggested we establish a naval patrol between Red Cuba and the Panama Canal. This would seem a wise precaution. Fidel Castro will make the most of the situation in Panama.

Even more important than a show of force, at this moment, is a show of determination. Say "No" and show we mean it.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a tribute of sympathy from the Second District Democratic Club, Baltimore County, to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, upon the loss of her beloved husband, the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is a tribute which expresses the feelings of all American citizens upon the untimely death of President Kennedy. It is with great pride, and a joining of my own personal sympathy with that of the Second District Democratic Club, that I insert the club's official resolution of sympathy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my high privilege, as well, to transmit an official copy of this resolution, under the seal of the club and signed by the club president in the name of all the members, to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it is with profound regret and the deepest sorrow that the Second District Democratic Club, Inc., records the untimely demise of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, on November 22, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three; and

Whereas the said John Fitzgerald Kennedy did faithfully serve our beloved Nation in war and in peace, and who by his heroic action in the time of war saved the lives of many of his countrymen, and in the time of peace gave his life in the service of his Country; and

Whereas by his political activities he became the leader of our Democratic Party, and as a legislator and as President of this great Republic, had sponsored many important pieces of legislation for the benefit of this Nation and for mankind in general; and

Whereas in his passing this Nation has lost one of its most beloved and respected citizens, and we the individual citizens have lost a true and trusted friend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Second District Democratic Club, Inc., on this 16th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1963, That this expression of sorrow be spread on the minutes of this club and that the secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, the widow of our late beloved President.

As witness my hand and seal of the club this 16th day of December 1963.

CHARLES C. GLOS,
President.

New Manpower Act Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Port Huron (Mich.) Times Herald, in its December 24, 1963, edition carried an editorial headlined "New Manpower Act Is Good Busness," which I believe many Members of Congress will find interesting.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Times Herald has a reputation as a newspaper with a vigorous editorial policy. It is a paper which does not mince words, but emphatically says what it thinks.

Although I frequently disagree with the newspaper's editorial point of view, I have always admired the forcefulness with which it spoke—even though it has on occasion caused me some discomfort. The Times Herald and I usually are on opposite sides of the political fence, but this time we couldn't agree more.

The editorial, I think, accurately summarizes the feelings of most Members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—about the MDTA program which was recently expanded and improved as a result of congressional approval of needed amendments to the act of 1962.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the Times Herald editorial, "New Manpower Act Is Good Business," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEW MANPOWER ACT IS GOOD BUSINESS

The Manpower Training Act, which President Johnson signed last week, sounds like workable and worthwhile legislation.

It extends both the time and scope of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. It includes changes which place special emphasis on training and placing jobless youths, but it also covers older persons who are too little educated to find jobs. It will also help people move to new locations when they have a promise of full-time work but no way to get to it.

America will doubtless always have a hard core of unemployables, those who can't work, and those who won't. These will make up a perennial welfare load. But there are many others who could and would work if they knew how and had a chance.

Untrained youths are on their way into lifelong welfare status as the Nation becomes more mechanized, specialized, and automated. Many of them could become contributing members of the community if taught a marketable skill.

It is good business for the Nation to promote this skill as an alternative to a lifetime of welfare checks.

Many older workers have been let out when their particular skills were no longer in demand. They can be retrained for new jobs, and at small expense compared to the alternative.

Some of the unemployed, including almost every age bracket, need a basic education before they can be trained. We demand that children attend school, why should we deny the benefits of at least minimum learning to older people?

The Port Huron Area School District and the local office of the Michigan Employment Security Commission operated a pilot program here in 1962 to train men for possible employment by the Howard Spring Co.

There were 3 units of about 25 men each. They were taught in classrooms and shops a new skill which the company needed.

Results were termed excellent, with the joint benefit of many men employed, and a pool of skilled workers available for a potential employer.

A new program, to which younger people would also be admitted, is in the planning stage. It will accent other skills.

But even here, people are found who do not qualify for training. A man may be able to pass a literacy test, and still not be able to read well enough for technical training.

Some objections were made in Congress to the new Training Act, although the measure passed without amendment through both Houses on voice vote. One Congressman called it a business of "piling one program on top of another with all sorts of duplication and overlapping."

Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, warned the House not to be overcome with the Christmas spirit with unnecessary expansion of a working program.

But this is not just Christmas spirit. It is good business. If there is some overlapping, it will be small inconvenience compared to the benefits to be gained.

Manpower is an essential national resource. We cannot afford to let part of it lie fallow when it is possible to turn it to productive effort.

The 46th Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1964, marks the 46th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. This is an anniversary that cannot really be celebrated because the 45 million citizens in the Ukraine live today under the cloak of Communist tyranny. Theirs is not a free and independent country.

With the rise of communism in Russia in the dark days of 1917 and 1918, the Ukraine became one of the first sovereign states to be overwhelmed by the colonialism of the Soviets. The darkness of Communist domination has covered the Ukraine from that day to this.

Within the breast of the people of the Ukraine, a constant yearning for freedom has burned ever brightly.

As a result, the Soviet Union has been forced to turn to a masquerade, wherein the Ukraine is held up to the free world as an independent and free nation within the federal framework of the U.S.S.R. Those who are conversant with the facts know just how independent the Ukraine is. The day will come, however, when this independence will become a reality. Until that day arrives, I am proud to salute the Ukraine and its people on this 46th anniversary of their independence, knowing full well that some day it will take its rightful place in the family of free nations.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars Leader Becomes a Truth Squad Checking Up on the Chamber of Commerce Head, Ed Neilan, Who Recently Stabbed the Veterans in the Back in a National Magazine Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Ed Neilan, the "Scrooge" of Wilmington, who presently heads the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and who stabbed the American veterans in the back in a recent national magazine article, was the subject of some remarks of mine on Monday, January 27. Since then there has come to my attention a steady stream of statements by responsible people, each one giving a lie to some untruth or cluster of untruths by the wholly irresponsible banker and chamber of commerce leader from Wilmington, Del.

Perhaps the chamber should appoint a truth squad to follow Neilan around the country to correct the downright falsehoods that he has been spreading wherever he goes.

I am sure he is doing the great business organization he heads and the banking profession generally no good. Pending action by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American people can rely upon such worthy citizens as Joseph J. Lombardo, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to correct some of the erroneous information Neilan is disseminating. We are grateful to National Commander Lombardo for keeping the record straight. The following statement was sent to me by the Atterbury Post No. 26, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wilmington, Del., on January 23, 1964:

REMARKS BY COMMANDER IN CHIEF JOSEPH J. LOMBARDO

Periodically some headline-hunting individual decides he will make his mark upon the Nation by attacking this Nations' veterans' program. Invariably the attacker will be a man with a good war record and a good bank account. And, invariably, he will get his headlines not by any statement of fact, but rather by the use of deceit and distortion.

In recent weeks we have witnessed another such attack. Predictably, the attacker, Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is a banker. Predictably, he used the Communist approach by substituting fiction for fact. His opinions he is entitled to, but to distort the facts is to perform a great disservice to our Nation's veterans and to our Nation as a whole.

With the help of Norman Jones, our director of rehabilitation; Cooper Holt, director of our Washington office; and John Gleason, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, we have gathered together the facts that refute the fiction. Now let's take a look at some of the wild charges.

Congressmen are "vote hungry," and the veterans' program is "vast and incredible." Veterans' benefits constitute a "blatant and outrageous maneuver," and are a "scandal." Veterans' legislation is "very loosely written," and past Congresses "have already tipped the cornucopia of welfarism to provide for veterans." Veterans' benefits are pathway to "bizarre and ruinous alteration of our economy," and, therefore, this "creeping, demoralizing monster of governmental paternalism" must be halted.

The authority for such slick-phrased, sweeping generalities? The author and the authority are one and the same. The quotes are Mr. Neilan's; not attributions to any recognized expert in the field of veterans' affairs.

We know that the veterans' program will survive. But make no mistake, this unsubstantiated onslaught can cause damage unless the record is set straight. Fortunately, each sweeping statement and the unsupported allegation can be answered factually.

For example, the article says: "Loose language is the rule in the legislation that does pass. To get free treatment for a non-service-connected ailment at veterans' hospitals, an ex-serviceman must swear that he can't afford to pay. So perjury becomes routine, and because the law is badly written, cheaters are seldom prosecuted. Hence 85 percent of the VA patients have nonservice disabilities."

The hospitalization law is clear, and no intelligent reader of the statute could have the slightest doubt as to its meaning. Presumably, therefore, any law with which the author does not happen to agree is badly written.

It is true, as the author says, that veterans seeking hospital care for non-service connected ailments must state under oath that they are unable to pay. Unfettered by even an iota of intervening proof, the author hops from this truth to his conclusion—"So perjury becomes routine." Using the same unique reasoning, it could be said with equal merit that "witnesses in court are sworn to tell the truth, so perjury becomes routine," or "bankers are sworn to safeguard deposits, so embezzlement becomes routine."

Having declared—without offering one shred of proof—that "perjury is routine," that "cheaters are seldom prosecuted," and the "law is badly written," Mr. Neilan then seems to say that because of these things "85 percent of the VA patients have nonservice disabilities."

But in fact, even this lone statistic is misleading. Each year VA conducts an actual census of patients in its hospitals. The latest head count of more than 100,000 VA patients shows that 40.2 percent had service-connected disabilities. The overwhelming majority of the rest were either long-term patients with mental illness, tuberculosis, or other chronic disabilities, or they had applied for or are in receipt of a veterans' pension. By Mr. Neilan's own admission veterans receiving pension under the present law must pass a "strict test of need."

The article fails to mention that due in large measure to a comparatively new law supported by the VFW the VA is for the first time authorized to provide prehospital and posthospital care in its outpatient clinics for certain non-service-connected patients. This puts VA partially on the same footing as a private hospital where the patient can be examined, given laboratory tests, and diagnosed all before entering a hospital, and can have followup examinations in his doctor's office or at home instead of in the hospital after his discharge.

Due to this new law and improved treatment methods, the VA during the last fiscal year treated 71,000 more patients than it did in 1960 with essentially the same facilities, and the improved turnover is continuing, for in the first quarter of the current fiscal year 10,000 more patients were treated than were treated in the comparable period of last year.

In claiming the alleged existence of "more empty beds than patients in VA hospitals" and attributing it in part to an allegation that "most of the patients are ambulatory," the article is shamefully wrong.

VA hospitals have a high rate of occupancy of about 91 percent; anything higher would, by accepted medical standards, indicate overcrowding. Indeed, we have at the moment a list of more than 16,000 eligible veterans waiting for an available bed.

We are proud of the fact that many VA patients are ambulatory. This should merit praise rather than criticism. In the modern practice of medicine, early ambulation is encouraged for medical and surgical patients. The VA also has more than 50,000 psychiatric patients in its hospitals. Would the author have up strap these mental patients to their beds to keep them from walking around?

The author is again insulting to veterans, and to VA medical staffs, and is just as consistently inaccurate as ever, in his charge that VA hospitals openly harbor malingerers who come in "to rest up, dry out, or merely find company." Does the fact that out of 962,000 applicants for admission to VA hospitals in 1 year, one-third, or 328,000, were rejected, sound like a policy of encouraging "malingerers"?

He smears as "malingerers" a patient population, which on any one day includes many thousands of mentally ill veterans, and other thousands with tuberculosis, cancer, heart disease, and the gamut of general medical and surgical disorders, and in which about 1 out of 3 is in the "geriatric group," age 65 or older.

Leaving the field of medicine, the article turns its attention to pensions and compensation, and mentions a "damaging" claims review that "resulted in cutting off of 83,695 payments."

Here are the omitted, but pertinent, facts about this study made by VA.

The purpose was to doublecheck the accuracy of awards made during the floodtide of the greatest demobilization in American history when World War II servicemen were being discharged at the rate of a million a month. At the time VA was receiving nearly a quarter-million claims each month, and trying to recruit and train thousands of new employees to handle the rush of applications.

The review, begun in 1954 and completed for the most part in 1962, covered 1,694,926 cases.

Of this total, adjustment was needed in less than 10 percent, or 165,926 cases. In 16,803 cases, increases were granted because the disability had worsened. In 65,428 cases, decreases were made because the disability had improved.

And there were 83,695 terminations of payment—55,349 because the disability had improved to a degree where payments were no longer indicated, and 28,346 because of error—or only 1.7 percent of the total cases under scrutiny.

And now let's look at costs. An examination of the current costs of veterans' benefits reveals that, contrary to its detractors, the program, in proporation to the number of veterans and the national income, is costing much less today than in the past. For example, it took a much larger slice, percentage wise, of the national income in the 1890's to pay the cost of these fundamental veterans' benefits compared to their cost today, notwithstanding the fact that the number of veterans in those earlier years was less than 3 percent of the total population while veterans today account for approximately 12 percent.

The facts are that the cost of the veterans' benefits program is now much less than during several periods in the past despite the fact that the number of veterans in civilian life after the Korean conflict then exceeded and still exceeds the number during any other period in American history.

It should be emphasized that the VA direct loan program has made a profit for the Federal Government and increased Federal income taxes paid by veterans who have received VA education and training benefits will eventually more than pay the cost of this program.

The statement in the article that "as a group, however, veterans have no God-given right to special consideration" is intriguing. The VFW has never proclaimed any special right or consideration of veterans emanating from the Almighty. This could be correctly stated with reference to special consideration accorded many other groups. These groups include the very bank of which Mr. Neilan is president. On January 13, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN stated that Mr. Neilan's bank was at that time listed with $8,137,873 in Government funds which it was free to loan out at the going rate of interest but on which it paid the Government no interest. So here we see the man who would deny our Nation's veterans hospitalization and pensions is one of those standing at the head of the line for his own form of Government subsidy. But, of course, that is different because the shoe is on his foot.

In conclusion, let me say that it is my opinion that veterans do rate special consideration and this is exactly the way Washington and Lincoln thought and it is also the way that Pericles thought as long ago as 430 B.C. Each and every Congress has recognized the same special consideration. The Veterans of Foreign Wars shall continue to expose the phonies who would deny us such consideration.

William C. Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have had many differences of opinion with the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and take a dim view of many of the schemes it has espoused at the negotiating table and elsewhere. As a matter of fact, Ihave legislation pending which would reshape that Agency to a con-

siderable degree. Nonetheless, in the Agency's Administrator, Mr. William C. Foster, I have found a man for whom I have the greatest personal respect, despite these differences of opinion as to the course, direction and organization of his Agency.

The following article by Robert H. Estabrook, appearing recently in the Washington Post, contains interesting biographical data and opinions regarding Mr. Foster:

FOSTER'S PATIENCE FITS ARMS TALKS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

GENEVA.—The soft-spoken, unassuming man who heads the American delegation to the disarmament conference here has what colleagues describe as a consuming interest in a war against war. But William C. Foster is no unrealistic visionary approaching an unattainable ideal. Few Americans have so detailed a background in the requirements of defense and national security combined with the patience required to make even small mutual gains with the Soviet Union.

Foster, who at a handsome 66 looks fully 10 years younger, has an unusual career behind him. During World War I he was an Army pilot. Between the wars he was in the pressed steel business. As an internationally minded Republican he came to Washington during World War II to assist the War Department in procurement.

As Under Secretary of Commerce in the Truman administration Foster recruited such eminent men as David K. E. Bruce back into the public service. He was deputy to Paul Hoffman in the Marshall plan and then himself became Director of the Economic Cooperation Administration. During the Korean war he was back in the Pentagon as Deputy Secretary of Defense under another Republican, Robert A. Lovett.

At first the Eisenhower administration disregarded him, and Foster went back to private industry. But after the first Soviet sputnik he was asked to serve on a panel evaluating American defenses. He became the guiding spirit of the Gaither report because of the illness and death of the nominal chairman. Later he was chairman of the American delegation at the conference on safeguards against surprise attack. Neither service brought him much thanks.

In 1961 President Kennedy asked Foster to become Director of the reconstituted Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He attended the protracted beginning of the present disarmament conference in March 1962. Thus in addition to his technical knowledge he has acquired considerable experience in diplomatic confrontation with the Russians.

Despite his service to Democratic administrations and his personal admiration for the way in which President Johnson has taken over executive leadership, Foster remains by preference a Republican. It is paradoxical that the strongest attacks on him and on the work of the Disarmament Agency come from the far right.

Some of this may represent the lingering effect of a coincidence of names. William Z. Foster was at one time chairman of the Communist Party of the United States. Even the French Communist newspaper L'Humanité fell into the trap when it exulted about a prominent Communist being named to the Marshall plan. Foster concedes that although he wished no evil for William Z., the latter's death brought him a certain relief.

But there is a pattern in the attacks, many of which unhappily come from Texas. Persons of extreme rightwing views tend to regard any negotiations with the Soviet Union as tantamount to treason and to indicate that in even discussing arms control Foster is likely to give away the crown jewels. Nevertheless, polls conducted during the Kennedy administration showed that the nuclear test ban treaty enjoys overwhelming popular approval.

Foster takes it philosophically, concluding merely that he is here to do a job to the best of his ability. He is mildly encouraged by the initial absence of polemics in the presentation by his Soviet counterpart, Semyon K. Tsarapkin, whom he finds at times personally agreeable. He thinks it interesting that the Soviet Union has restored the question of NATO-Warsaw Pact observer posts to the discussion even though this is coupled with a demand for a denuclearized zone in West and East Germany.

He also sees eventual possibility of agreement to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and to end production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. Successful inspection of facilities already shut down might make it easier for the Soviet Union to accept inspection of a freeze on nuclear missiles.

But as a superbly rational man Foster has no illusions about arms control which is the necessary prerequisite for any measure of substantive disarmament. He knows that it is likely to be a long and tedious business—even though when the Soviet Union is ready to move, as on the test ban, agreement can come quickly and he must be prepared for every opportunity.

Texan, "Tiger" Teague, a Key Man in Space Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call my colleagues' attention to an editorial that the Waco, Tex., Tribune-Herald of January 18, 1964, carried in connection with my good friend, OLIN "TIGER" TEAGUE.

I believe the Waco Tribune-Herald is to be commended in its effort to acquaint the public with the problems facing the space and defense programs and how one Member of Congress has met these problems head-on. The article speaks for itself:

TEXAN, "TIGER" TEAGUE, A KEY MAN IN SPACE PROGRAMS

One of the problems connected with space and defense programs is the lack of knowledge by many Congressmen of the varied complexities of the subjects, which need the best information attainable to be dealt with in the legislative field.

Many Congressmen seem, with every good intent on their part, to have cut themselves off from accepting the experts that appear before them in hearings apparently believing they have dark or dubious motives for their position, among which is the advancement of their power and access to the Treasury.

Britain ran into the same problem some time ago. Parliament was accused of not knowing what it was doing in various important fields having to do with a wisely enunciated policy because it had no one in the membership who could qualify as an expert, and the suspicion was that even if he did qualify, his viewpoint would not be accepted. Thus such an anomaly as a huge appropriation for railroad improvement was made at the very same time a decision had been taken to retrench and reduce unneeded services.

Proposal has been made that congressional committees set up their own teams of scientific experts who could give explanations to some of the baffling semantics that emerge from the mouths of scientists perfectly familiar with the subject, but unable to get their messages across. But this would take away experts from posts where they are vitally needed.

Now an attempted solution is in sight with the signing of agreement with the National Academy of Scientists to help Congress comprehend the scientific and technical problems with which they are faced. This may work out to advantage. But it, too, will fail, if a sufficient number of Congress refuse to accept this advice and explanation because of a belief that scientists are concerned mainly with perpetuating their functions on Federal space and technological subjects.

One of the Congressmen who does understand realities and opportunities in the space program is Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of the Sixth Texas District. "TIGER" TEAGUE'S contributions of brains and courage in the work of the House Science and Astronautics Committe are major ones. Long the efficient and humane watchdog chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Representative TEAGUE now carries a a double responsibility and carries it well. It must be a matter of pride among the voters of the central Texas district he represents that their Congressman has risen to such high stature in the vital business of the world's most powerful nation.

Farm Organizations Support Voluntary Wheat Certificate Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 21 a group of representatives from almost all the major farm organizations in the Nation met to discuss the need for new wheat legislation. They voiced, following their meeting, unanimous agreement that there is an urgent need for wheat legislation at this time.

These farmer representatives further agreed that the best approach to a new wheat program is the voluntary certificate type of program. This is the same view shared by those of us in the Congress who are working now for prompt enactment of this type of legislation.

A bill which I introduced on January 28—H.R. 9780—would provide the type of program these groups say is needed now. This bill has been reported by the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. I am hopeful that the full committee will report the bill within a very few days, and that the House can take prompt action in this vital field.

Following are a letter of transmittal from the National Grange, and a copy of the statement issued by the farm organizations which met on January 21:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1964.

To All Members of House Agriculture Committee and Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

The executive committee of the National Grange today gave emphatic approval to the efforts of National Master Herschel D. New-

som and his staff to work with other farm organizations to secure prompt passage of wheat legislation, to avert a serious situation which will undoubtedly develop if present legislation (the act of 1962) is not amended.

We are, therefore, submitting to all members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the revised statement which we gave to some Members of the House of Representatives who informally met with us on January 21.

Organizations represented were: the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Farmers Organization, the National Farmers Union, the U.S. Corn Growers Association, and the National Grange.

Telegrams of support came from: Grain Sorghum Producers Association, and Missouri Farmers Association.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY L. GRAHAM,
Legislative Assistant to Master.

URGENCY OF WHEAT LEGISLATION

The farm organizations and producers' representatives here personally (or by statement) are united in their desire for quick passage of a voluntary wheat certificate program, which will maintain and improve farm income, by preserving the stability of the market, removing the threat to other farm programs, and reducing the problems which threaten chaos in world markets, by reason of the difficulty of preventing U.S. violation of the International Wheat Agreement in the absence of any new effective wheat legislation in 1964.

Any program to apply to the 1964 crop must be enacted prior to March 1, in order to be effective before harvesttime.

Growing evidence is apparent that the price of wheat will drop close to the price of the 50 percent of parity level, with an additional income loss of roughly $600 million in 1964, without such legislation.

The adverse effect of this economic loss on our total economy would substantially reduce the beneficial results of any tax reduction that may be forthcoming, as well as all other efforts to stimulate the economy and generate further employment.

It is, therefore, the responsibility of farm groups and responsible rural leadership, as well as of the Congress, to prevent such disastrous loss in farm income; threatening, as it would, to terminate the period of unparalleled prosperity in other segments of the economy; as we firmly believe the disastrous drop in farm income would do, and as it has done in the past.

The political problems of regaining the previous level of income would be very difficult ones; hence, there is real urgency of acting now to prevent further drop in either income or prices, as a very minimum objective.

The effect of no legislation would be to scuttle the feed grains program, and terminate its desirable effects.

The gains of the past 3 years, in increased income, reduced stocks, and diminished Government storage costs, as well as in expanded markets, would be lost without such legislation.

Reports from the field, our respective members, and from meetings of the various organizations here represented, indicate strong support for a voluntary but attractive and effective program, to maintain and increase farm income. Even those who opposed the referendum on the compulsory or mandatory certificate program submitted for referendum last spring, held out the promise of new and effective legislation in the event of the failure of the referendum.

The reports that over 75 percent of winter wheat producers planted within their acreage allotments, thus protecting their allotments, indicate that farmers expect (and want) a wheat program, and that they intend to participate in one.

Failure to enact legislation will seriously jeopardize our whole international effort to advance the cause of increasing economic cooperation between the non-Communist segments of the world; diminish our attempts to further expand market potential for U.S. agriculture, and indeed, be a serious obstacle to reasonable U.S. success in connection with the forthcoming Kennedy round of negotiations in the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and will substantially lessen the prospect of stabilizing our own American market for agricultural markets in general, including meat products.

The urgency seems so complete and universal that it is difficult to understand why there is any difference of opinion on the necessity of legislation, even though we concede that there are several differences of opinion as to the most desirable combination of legislative provisions. Under such circumstances, however, the compelling necessity of recognizing the fundamental soundness of the traditional American concept of arriving at legislative decision through full discussion and reasonable concession and compromise on points of difference has dictated this renewed joint effort on the part of those of us here today to underscore the compulsion of effective action; to present to this committee our wide areas of agreement on purposes and objectives; to give you anew our collective, though somewhat different, opinions, as to the best ways of obtaining those objectives and finally, to assure this committee of the Congress of our abiding faith in the American system, to the effect that we will, in all probability, give support to the collective judgment of this committee, as to the ways in which these objectives should be approached, in legislation early in this session, reserving, as we feel that Americans not only have the right to do, but have the responsibility to do, a subsequent right, then, to seek further improvement and any correction that may be necessary, at a later date.

Let us, therefore, make further leigslative progress now, and dedicate ourselves, individually and collectively, to continuing efforts in the future.

Hot Money Hideaway Booming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article published in the weekly newspaper, Labor, on February 1 indicates another loophole by which those individuals who have accumulated wealth by taking advantage of the opportunities offered in our free economy now seek to avoid their fair burden of maintaining that economy. This poses a legal and an ethical problem for which I hope we can find at least a legal solution:

LURES THE CASH OF TAX EVADERS AND UNDERWORLD

Labor has frequently reported on various foreign havens including the British Bahama Islands, in which rich men hide huge funds to avoid U.S. and other taxes. New details on the fastest growing tax refuge, that of the Bahamas, have just been published in the Miami (Fla.) Herald in an article written from Nassau, the capital city.

The article says "Nassau has suddenly become one of the world's most important repositories for hot money—cash stashed for concealment from tax collectors. Over the past 14 months, bank deposits in Nassau have nearly tripled.

"Today, as trouble flares around the world, Nassau is receiving bales of bank notes from every point of the compass," the article adds. It names some of the countries from which it comes, and then declares: "Now there's trouble in Panama, long one of the world's tax havens, and Nassau bankers predict that substantial capital from Panama will be sent here."

UNDERWORLD MONEY

"There's mounting evidence," the article continues, "that substantial hot cash from the United States is flowing into the vaults here, too. It is known that numerous bank accounts in the Bahamas have been set up by tax-shy members of the U.S. underworld."

The article points out that "almost anyone can open a bank in the Bahamas," and scores of banks there are simply "tax screens" which "perform no real bank operations." Moreover, because of the vast amounts of tax-dodging money flowing into Nassau, many big United States and Canadian banks have established branches in the Bahamas.

AIDED BY U.S. LOOPHOLE

The article explains that there are two main reasons why the Nassau tax haven is flourishing. First, there are no income taxes in the Bahamas. Second, because of a loophole in the U.S. tax laws, "banks owned by U.S. persons operating abroad may accumulate capital without paying a penny to the U.S. Treasury until a profit or a liquidation is declared.

"Nothing in the U.S. tax law says these tax-allergic banks must declare a profit, and naturally they hardly ever do. And if one of them ever liquidates at a profit—which is unlikely since Uncle Sam has no jurisdiction over their books—the profit would go back to the United States at the preferential 25-percent capital gains tax rate."

Acceptance of U.N. Medals by the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make brief remarks concerning a House joint resolution introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT]. It provides that the military conform to the U.S. Constitution which requires that military personnel have congressional consent before accepting medals from the United Nations. President Johnson, by Executive order, has reversed the traditional constitutional review of foreign military honors. This is another step away from preserving the identity and national pride of our U.S. forces. It is simply deemphasizing patriotism in exchange for some vague honor conferred by a world group.

The Constitution says:

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

In my opinion, the President's recent Executive order is unlawful, and the Congress must protect its rights in this matter.

Presidents Do Not Underestimate Miss Margaret Hickey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the women's editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jane Clark, has written an excellent article about one of the outstanding citizens of St. Louis, Miss Margaret Hickey, who has recently been appointed by President Johnson as Chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. This is the organization of private citizens appointed by President Kennedy on November 1, 1963, to stimulate public interest in the far-reaching recommendations of the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

The Advisory Council was also given the assignment by President Kennedy of advising the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women, which is headed by the Secretary of Labor and consists of six other Cabinet members and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Both the Advisory Council and the Interdepartmental Committee have as their objective the greater utilization of the brainpower of American women in every field of national endeavor.

As Vice President, Lyndon Johnson had been a strong supporter of the work of the President's Commission on the Status of W~men. When he became President, he immediately initiated a series of steps to implement the Commission recommendations in the field of Government employment. As a further mark of his genuine interest in the work of the Advisory Council, he selected Miss Hickey, who had headed the Committee on Federal Employment of the Commission, as the Council's first Chairman.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDITOR OF LADIES' HOME JOURNAL

Miss Hickey, who founded Miss Hickey's School for Secretaries in St. Louis in 1933, and who was honored by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat as a Woman of Achievement in 1956, has been public affairs editor of the Ladies' Home Journal since 1946. It was most appropriate, therefore, for Globe-Democrat Women's Editor Jane Clark to use as the lead sentence of her feature article on Miss Hickey the famous slogan of the Journal, "Never underestimate the power of a woman." No one in St. Louis underestimates the influence and effectiveness of Miss Margaret Hickey in any worthwhile cause. The Globe-Democrat headline over the article points out the "Presidents Don't Underestimate Her" either.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure, and also pride as a St. Louisan who has long admired her, to submit for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of my remarks, this excellent article by Jane Clark in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Monday, January 27, as follows:

MISS MARGARET HICKEY: PRESIDENTS DON'T UNDERESTIMATE HER

(By Jane Clark)

"Never underestimate the power of a woman."

This slogan proclaimed far and wide by the Ladies' Home Journal might also serve as the credo of one of that magazine's editors.

Miss Margaret Hickey, editor of the Journal's public affairs department since 1946, founder (1933) and director of Miss Hickey's School for Secretaries, and Globe-Democrat Woman of Achievement in 1956, has long insisted that women can do a lot more than has been asked of them.

But one thing is sure—nobody underestimates Miss Hickey—especially Presidents of the United States.

In December 1961, she was appointed to the 31-member President's Commission on the Status of Women by President Kennedy and on November 1 of last year by him to serve on the Commission's successor body, the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

PRESIDENT'S CHOICE

And this month President Lyndon Johnson asked the University City resident and wife of Attorney Joseph T. Strubinger to take the post of Chairman of the Council established by a directive of his predecessor.

Seated in her cozy, feminine office at the school, 560 North Skinker Boulevard, Miss Hickey talked easily and enthusiastically of her past duties on the Commission and the future challenges with the Council.

"The Citizens' Council," she explained, "will be advisory to the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women. This Committee is composed of the Secretary of Labor, who will serve as Chairman; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense; the Attorney General; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

TWO THEMES

"At the first meeting on February 12, we will determine the priorities of concern in carrying out recommendations made in the report which the Commission on the Status of Women submitted to President Kennedy on October 11, 1963. We must select those that need immediate attention.

Although she, as Chairman of the Council, must allow the 16 other members to formulate their own opinions, Miss Hickey has two main themes which she personally regards as urgent for improving the status of women.

"There are two areas of work I would like Council members to establish as priorities of concern," she said, having given a great deal of thought to the subject over the past years.

"First is the greatest use of the brainpower of American women. Terrifically few of even the most talented women in this country are exercising their skills and leadership in the community, Nation, and world, either as volunteers or in high-level professional positions."

She pointed out that while men are known for their leadership qualities as shown in business and in the professions, women acquire their own competence through volunteer work and through the management of their homes.

SHE SEEKS TALENT

"Women have the high motivation, tact, and self-discipline necessary for high-level political or administrative posts," she avowed. "But they aren't given credit for the leadership they bring to the community and for the expert management of their homes."

Miss Hickey, who keeps as a constant companion a copy of "Who's Who of American Women," would like to see a talent survey made to search the skilled women who could contribute a great deal to American life.

Pointing to the book she said, "There are 20,000 names in here. On every page you can find women who are highly qualified to fill important public posts."

"I don't think there is overt discrimination when it comes to filling high-level positions," Miss Hickey said. "But many of these women are not known to appointing officers."

WOMEN WAIT

In addition, she pointed out, women are not subjected to social pressure to seek financial success or fame as men are. "And either from natural disposition or from social attitudes which they pick up most women will not advance themselves as candidates for positions. They wait to be asked."

The charming, gray-haired woman with the warm and ready smile went on to state her belief that "scientific and technological leadership is the most important thing we as a nation had to consider.

"We cannot forget that we must constantly push back the frontiers of knowledge. Women must have a role in this."

But her studies reveal that there's quite a difference between what is and what should be.

Miss Hickey asserts that women have been playing a declining role in public life.

WOMEN SLIPPED

"In a study of 18 universities," she told us, "women represent 120 percent of all facilities and only 4 percent of the full professorships.

"In America 67 percent of the boys qualified to go to college elect to go. Only 42 percent of the girls do."

Miss Hickey also pointed out that women are slipping in their listings in "Who's Who." "In 1902, 8.5 percent of the distinguished people listed were women. In 1958 only 4 percent were women."

The second area for deliberation which Miss Hickey hopes the new Council will consider is "the great necessity for us to work in behalf of the woman who suffers from a tragic inferiority of status."

She went on to say that in 1960 there were 4 million adult women who had less than 5 years of schooling and that less than half the women 25 years old and over are high school graduates.

"These women must take the lowest paying jobs," she said. "They compete here with men for the unskilled work which is becoming scarcer.

"And 2 million of these women are in the nonwhite minority group so that they are doubly discriminated against."

As Miss Hickey put it, "The women who live on Poverty Street are wonderful women. They are working long hours trying to earn a living.

"But they need vocational training and literacy training. They need home demonstration projects and 4-H programs for children which could be just as successful in the cities as they have been in rural areas."

Though the Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women has no regulatory powers, Miss Hickey prefers it that way. "From my long experience in working on committees, I have found that in our form of government a persuasive committee can be very inspiring and effective."

"Our real goal is to change attitudes toward the betterment of women."

Panama Canal Zone: Balboa High School Students and the U.S. Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the Panamanian outbreak on January 9, 1964, liberal publicists, commentators, and editors in various parts of the Nation have made illiberal attacks on Balboa High School students who, following traditional daily practice at schools all over the United States, insisted upon hoisting the U.S. flag on American territory on January 7, 1964, in front of this Canal Zone school. In some of these distorted effusions, the patriotic action of hoisting the U.S. flag is being credited as having started outbreak.

To help clear away widespread misconceptions caused by inadequate and inaccurate reporting of the incident in the press of our country and to supply future historians with facts as presented in Panamanian newspapers, I quote two news stories about the January 7 raising of the U.S. flag at the Balboa High School:

[From the Panama American, Panama, R.P., Tuesday, Jan. 7, 1964]

STUDENTS DEFY CANAL ZONE GOVERNOR—COLLEGIANS HOIST 'OLD GLORY' ON BALBOA HIGH SCHOOL STAFF

A group of five Canal Zone junior college students today defiantly ran up the U.S. flag to the top of the flagpole in front of Balboa High School.

One hour later, the flag was lowered and confiscated by Civil Affairs Director Bernard I. Everson and Balboa High School Principal David A. Speir, Jr., amid loud protests from hundreds of students and adults who had gathered outside the school.

But half an hour later the same group of students ran up a smaller flag to halfstaff on the pole while the students bowed their heads and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

This might have gone on all day, but a decision reportedly was reached to allow the second flag to remain, following a meeting between high school and Panama Canal officials.

However, reliable sources said Panama Canal officials had decided early today to remove the flagpole and that it would be demolished "sometime today."

Today's flag incident stems from the latest decision to fly the Panama flag along with the Stars and Stripes at several more places in the Canal Zone.

It has been claimed that the Panama Canal has been lowering the U.S. flag in several areas to avoid having to erect a second flag staff to carry the Panamanian banner.

The students raised the first flag at 7:15 a.m. By 8:15 it had been taken down, only to be put back up again and which was still flying at noon.

As students waited outside the high school for their first classes of the day, a petition to the President of the United States, requesting that the flag be allowed to fly in front of the zone schools, was circulated.

This is the second petition prepared by a group of high school students this week. The first, which also urged that the flag be reinstated, was confiscated by a high school official and later returned by the office of the Civil Affairs Director, according to the student who drafted the petition.

This same student helped in raising Old Glory in front of the high school today. "As long as the flag stays down I won't go back to school and there are others who feel the same way," the student said.

But Speir and Dr. Charles L. Latimer, dean of the Canal Zone Junior College came out of the high school building at 10 a.m. and took down the names of all the students standing outside. Latimer told the students they had been warned before not to trespass on the high school grounds. "If you have classes then go to them. If not then get off the grounds," Latimer told the students.

Several of the students claimed they had been called into Speir's office this morning where they were confronted by a school board official and told that they were trespassing and placing our parents' jobs in jeopardy, as one student put it.

"It's great. Now you can't even raise your own flag without getting into trouble," a student said.

"We have close to 400 names on that petition but a lot of the kids are scared to sign because of rumors that our parents will lose their jobs," another student said.

Yet another claimed "it's about time somebody did something. We all feel the U.S. flag should be up there not just hanging on the wall inside which the Panama Canal uses as an excuse."

In reply to questions from the Panama American the Balboa Heights Information Office said "the flag was taken down by Balboa High School authorities on direction of the Panama Canal Civil Affairs Bureau Director (Everson), in accordance with the directive issued by the Canal Zone Governor that no flag fly officially unless the Panama and U.S. flags are displayed together."

Word of the flag raising spread swifty in the zone and dozens of adults made their way to the high school area, several of them encouraging the students to keep the flag flying.

Shortly after it was learned that the flag had been taken down by senior officials, an adult drove his car up to the waiting students and handed one of them a paper sack containing a flag he had just brought in the Panama Canal Commissary.

Several other motorists stopped their vehicles and gave encouragement to the students including a well-known local union leader and an officer in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Dozens of Panama Canal employees at the Balboa Heights Administration Building left their offices and watched the flag-raising proceedings from vantage points on the balcony.

The Panama Canal report said "the students experienced difficulty in first raising the flag because the halyards were locked in place, and they always are whether the flag is on high or not."

But sources said a maintenance division work crew removed locks barring use of the halyards early this morning before the students arrived to raise the flag. "The locks were the only legal question involved," one source said. "If the youths had broken those then they could face charges of damaging Government property."

The locks were ignored by the students, one of them clambered up the pole and tied the flag to the staff. At one stage the flag slipped from his hands but it was caught before it hit the ground and passed back up to him.

A number of students said that school officials were displeased over the flag raising but no official comments were made.

It was reported that a decision was reached today to have the flagpole removed by maintenance division workmen. "They had better not try it while the flag is up," one student said. "We only have to say the word and there are over 2,000 patriotic students who will be here within 10 minutes to halt any such action."

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Jan. 8, 1964]

CANAL ZONE STUDENTS KEEP VIGIL AT FLAG POLE AFTER RAISING U.S. BANNER

Balboa High School and Canal Zone College students kept a vigil far into the night at the high school flagpole where they raised the U.S. flag and kept it there throughout the day yesterday in defiance of official orders.

The students planned to raise the flag again today in front of the high school and also at the Canal Zone College, where a lamp post will be used in lieu of a pole, reliable sources reported last night.

If officials order the flags taken down, the students plan to quit classes, it was reported.

Yesterday's incident was the latest in the issue of the joint display of Panama and United States flags in the Canal Zone. In January 1963, the two Governments announced an agreement under which the Panamanian flag will be flown together with the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone wherever the stars and stripes is displayed by U.S. civilian authorities.

Implementing this agreement, Canal Zone Governor Robert J. Fleming, Jr., announced December 31 that the joint display of the flags would be conducted at 16 sites, effective January 2. One of the locations, at which the flying of the U.S. flag was discontinued is the pole on the front lawn of Balboa High School.

Yesterday morning, prior to the opening of classes, a group of from 15 to 20 high school students succeeded in raising a small U.S. flag on the pole. At about 8:15 a.m., the flag was taken down by school officials at the direction of Civil Affairs Director B. I. Everson. This action, according to Balboa Heights, was "in accordance with the directive issued by the Canal Zone Governor that no flag fly officially unless the Panama and United States flags are displayed together."

About 2 hours later, however, a group of Canal Zone College students raised another flag on the high school staff.

This time, there was no further interference by school officials and the flag stayed up.

At noon, high school students brought a larger flag with which they replaced the smaller banner that had been flying since midmorning.

This flag remained on the pole until 6 p.m. when the students lowered it.

Then the vigil at the flagpole continued into the night as rumors circulated that the administration was waiting for dark to remove the staff. But no such move developed.

About one hundred high school and college students were at all times at or near the flagpole. During the course of the day, scores of spectators—both students and adults—stood on Roosevelt Avenue, opposite the school. Many of the adults openly encouraged the students in their stand.

In addition to the flag at the main pole, smaller U.S. flags were planted in the hedges about the school or were carried by students. One small flag appeared atop one of the two lightning rods on the school building and remained there throughout the night.

In the meantime, a petition to the President of the United States was circulated among students of the high school. By yesterday afternoon, the petition—which started making the rounds a week ago—had about 500 signatures. The petition is understood to request specific legislation to keep the U.S. flag flying in front of the school.

(Balboa Heights said there is no change in the display of the U.S. flag inside the school. A U.S. flag is in every classroom and a large flag is on display in the Activities Building.)

Last night, a collection was taken up among students and adults for sending a telegram to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Demo-

crat, of Georgia, informing him of the day's events.

No disciplinary action has been taken in connection with yesterday's flagraising, Balboa Heights said. "The students have been orderly and there have been no incidents whatsoever," an official statement said.

Portugal Was Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the lesson should be abundantly clear now—after Cuba, Vietnam, Zanizbar, and the many other costly examples of the cold war. International communism goes doggedly on toward a singleminded goal, despite the occasional smiles and handshakes of the Red leaders.

Their open and repeatedly avowed aim remains nothing less than the total subversion and subjugation of the free world; the ultimate destruction of our way of life. Yet, we seem to forget this in our desire to live at peace in the world.

Communist tactics are nearly always the same. Why then does it seem that we so consistently fail to recognize them before it is too late? Before our interests and world position have been compromised? First there is the propaganda. Then anti-American or anti-Western demonstrations in the streets. Terrorists bomb and murder to breed confusion and fear, and, in more difficult cases, guerrilla bands are formed and supplied with arms, ammunition, training, and money from Moscow, Havana, or Peiping—either directly or indirectly. These methods are always variations on the central theme, the spread of communism throughout the world.

Portugal's mounting frustration with our failure to recognize this aspect of the Angola question—for a case in point—and our consequent failure to support the Portuguese in the face of blindly nationalistic Afro-Asian attacks—always supported by the Communist bloc—in the United Nations, can be blamed in part, at least, for her threats now to recognize Red China in the wake of the French capitulation. Another reason for the disenchantment of this longtime NATO ally, of course, is the complete failure of her Western friends to effectively protest the Indian invasion and conquest of Goa, Damoa, and Diu.

Recent events in Africa have dramatized the fact that this developing continent is a prime target for Communist liberators. The sham nationalist uprising in Angola 2½ years ago and the subsequent guerrilla activity in the Angola interior has been a classic, textbook study of Red methods of propaganda, agitation, and terrorism aimed at subverting a free people.

It is a prime example of the ugly use of racism and of phony anticolonialism, a simple formula that seems to unfailingly stupify Western diplomats.

Despite the rather obvious nature of the Red thrust in west Africa, there has been a stubborn insistence on the part of many people, including an influential and otherwise astute segment of the American press, to discount reports that the rebellion was inspired and is supported by the Communist bloc, not the people of Angola.

For this reason, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial from the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., which details and examines the recent admission by the insurgent leader, Holden Roberto, that, after being supplied with Russian arms through Ghana, he is now turning to Red China for help in waging his war against the people and the lawful Government of Angola.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 10, 1964]

PORTUGAL WAS RIGHT

Guerrilla warfare has been going on in northern Angola since early 1961. From the beginning, the Government of Portugal has maintained that this subversive fighting was not a genuine nationalist movement. Lisbon has further stated, in the United Nations and on other occasions, that the Angolan liberation movement is Communist inspired, supported, or oriented.

On July 25, 1963, addressing the U.N. Security Council, Portuguese Foreign Minister Alberto Franco Nogueria declared, "It is no longer possible to deny there is a vast network of foreign interests * * * endeavoring to disturb the peace in Angola.

"I am wondering how the Soviet delegate reconciles his Government's definition of aggression and the facts I have pointed out (supplying of Russian arms to liberation fighters in Angola via Ghana)."

Although only stony silence greeted Dr. Nogueira's charges in the hallowed halls of the U.N. on that occasion, the best possible source now has come forward to prove Nogueira was right: International communism is trying to free Angola.

Holden Roberto, chief of the guerrilla fighters in Angola, announced in Leopoldville that he has decided to accept the "help of Communist China and other Communist countries."

Thus it is now historic fact that foreign parties, specifically Communist nations, have a direct hand in the violence perpetrated in Angola. It has been so charged by the Portuguese Government on the basis of evidence; it is now admitted by the leader of the insurgents.

This being the case, has it suddenly become lawful for members of the United Nations, the "other Communist countries" to which Roberto referred, to supply "arms and money" to be used against a fellow member, Portugal?

Even if this were a genuine nationalist movement, that sort of subversion is supposed to be against the U.N. Charter, and to come under the heading of aggression, or at the very least, interference in the domestic affairs of another nation.

As for Communist China, it was labeled an aggressor February 1, 1951, by the U.N. General Assembly for its activities in Korea. Roberto is sending a delegation to Peiping within a month; he has acknowledged he is unable to wage war against Portugal without Red China's help. Surely this calls for another U.N. vote criticizing the Mao government for aggressive acts.

But there will be no such action from the U.N., which operates with a double standard of morality. It is lawful for some nations to send volunteers against Angola, and the U.N. remains silent; if Portugal pursued the same tactic, the volunteers would be called mercenaries (as were Tshombe's in the Congo) and that would be unlawful.

In any event, the evidence is now overwhelming that the Angola rebellion is Red oriented. Let there be no confusion about that.

Mrs. Katherine E. Foulkes Expresses Her Views on the Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Mrs. Katherine E. Foulkes, presenting her views as an American citizen in the Canal Zone. I have had other letters from friends in the Canal Zone confirming this situation which has too long been withheld from the knowledge of the public by the administration and the news media.

GAMBOA, C.Z.,
January 20, 1964.

Hon. JAMES B. UTT,
Member of Congress,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. UTT: Please give your immediate attention to correcting misinformation appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the U.S. newspapers regarding the conditions of Americans in the Canal Zone. We here are more than a little disturbed at being at the whipping post for our fellow citizens and for our Government when many of the conditions which exist here, and which are being unfavorably exploited to bring embarrassment onto all America, are not the fault of the American citizen in the Canal Zone.

1. Panama Canal employees, and civilian employees of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone are not tax exempt. We pay U.S. income tax to the International Operations Division of the Internal Revenue Service in Washington, D.C. We pay $5 a year for an automobile license plate—many States in the United States require a lesser tariff for the privilege of driving, and maintain the roads with the income derived. We pay for fishing, boating, marriage, dog, etc., licenses. These are comparable to taxes in the States. We do not support a State with the money; however, we support the Panama Canal Company. In the case of income tax, the tax money goes into the same coffer as that of Americans living in the States.

2. We have no voting rights, although we are subject to taxation. How can Canal Zone residents be "politically powerful" as was recently written in the U.S. newspapers? We have no Congressman, no Senator, no locally elected officials, no school board to direct our education; no say, in fact, as to matters which vitally affect our everyday lives.

3. We receive a 25-percent differential and a tax factor over and above the base salary for jobs with the Panama Canal. The tropical differential is standard for certain areas outside the continental limits and is paid not only in Panama. The tax factor is supposed to compensate for the fact the Americans pay a 22-percent income tax and Panamanians pay a 10-percent tax to their Government. Are we going to equalize the pay

so the Panamanian employees pocket the additional 12 percent? Naturally, the figures appear to have a very great variation between non-U.S. pay and U.S. citizen pay for the same graded job. But the circumstances of the employees are different. The non-U.S. citizens are home. They do not have the expense and logistical problem of rotating a family to the "homeland" every year or two to get a needed change in climate—and, more importantly, a needed change in viewpoint.

4. We do not live luxuriously. I am living in a frame duplex which was built in 1935 and rented at that time for $16 a month, with no charge for utilities. I now pay $17 a week and about $15 a month for electricity. The house is still unfinished. Two rooms have a shiplap siding for walls—the remainder have the exterior wall with supporting studs and beams exposed. No American in the United States in my income bracket ($7,000 a year) would live in such a place if given a choice. I am given no choice. It is the type of quarters to which my service with the Panama Canal Company entitles me. It is true there are new masonry quarters but since all quarters are assigned on the basis of length of service, it takes upward of 15 years with the canal to obtain an assignment to the limited number of quarters which can realistically be called houses.

5. Even though the quarters are old, cheaply and flimsily built and look the worse for encrusted insect debris and mildewed paint, there are really no slums in the Canal Zone. Of course not. It's a U.S. Government reservation. No one is allowed to reside on the Canal Zone if he is not employed. The homes are owned by the Government, rented to the employees. Go off the payroll, and you go out of the zone. Panama has slums, yes; what large city does not? The difference here, though, is that the wealthy Panamanian people in power and in Government, and holding the purse strings of the country, own the slum and tenement buildings which are rented to the natives at exhorbitant cost and have no facilities other than walls, doors, and windows. The newest and most luxurious apartments in Panama City are not equipped with hot water heaters. This is an item of furniture to be furnished by the tenant. The beautiful homes of Panama City's wealthy are located far from the border so visiting inspection teams standing on the Canal Zone do not see them—they see the slums deliberately left on the border for the psychological value of their contrast—and, of course, for the revenue they provide the owners. It is unfair to Canal Zone residents to compare the living conditions provided them by their Government with the slum conditions provided the poor Panamanian people by their country.

6. The average per capita yearly income in Panama is around $350. Most Canal Zone residents who employ Panamanian domestics pay them double that amount in a year. Although the minimum wage in Panama is about $0.40 an hour, Panama demands that the Panamanians working for the Canal Zone receive equal wages with the U.S. citizens. This variation of wage scale between the Canal Zone and Panama is actually harming the Panamanian economy. The Panama Canal cannot hire and house every Panamanian citizen. Why the constant comparison of middle-class Americans in the zone and the slum-ridden Panamanian unemployed? In Panama, the rich get richer and the poor become poorer. Panamanian wealth is invested in other countries than Panama, or banked in secret bank accounts. So long as the United States and other foreign investors can be induced to carry Panama's financial and social burdens, they will never take up the yoke of responsibility.

7. A common complaint in Panama is that items are sold cheaper in Canal Zone commissaries than they are in Panama. Contrabanding is rampant. Panamanian officials are guilty as well as the common man of procuring goods across the border. Panama Canal employees do not have military commissary and post exchange privileges. Panama Canal commissary prices are based on the New Orleans cost of living. In Panama, a can of Bartlett pears will cost as much as $1.35 for a No. 2 can. But who imposed the high import tax on foodstuffs in Panama? Certainly not the United States. Americans do not normally pay tax on food to be prepared at home—it is a necessity of life. No wonder the staple diet is rice, beans, and dried cod. So long as the wealthy and influential Panamanians can keep the common man in suffering and want, they can blame the American "imperialist" monster across the border. Isn't it amazing that the United States can "colonize" for 60 years and yet have no more success than it has in helping set up a democracy rather than an oligarchy in this country? The new "middle class" is struggling to emerge in Panama but they are far outnumbered by those who are kept uneducated, unfed (except for American handouts) and in misery on whom the Panamanian politicians count for purchased votes at election time.

8. What has happened in the Canal Zone in the last 2 weeks? Americans, displaced persons situated in an American-controlled zone of a foreign country, deprived of their rights and privileges as American citizens, have made known their dislike for their way of life. In essence, this was a revolt which manifested itself in the outpouring of feelings over the forbidding of flying the U.S. flag over schools in the Canal Zone so that the Panamanian flag would not have to fly there also. We would rather see the Panamanian flag than not see our own! Let all Americans look to the Panama Canal Zone and learn a good lesson from what happened to American citizens required to live in a socialistic state with no say in their local or national governments. We are governed by the man who reached his status by virtue of a military assignment in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Yet he is required to be a diplomat, a politician, a labor manager, a U.S. tourist agency director, a leader of men and controller of civilians, in addition to being President of a Government-owned corporation which must be self-supporting so as not to cost the U.S. taxpayers (except employees of the Panama Canal) a cent. No one man, however competent, can successfully wear all those hats.

9. Since the incorporation of the Panama Canal Company under congressional act, the canal has supported itself by sale of goods and services to shipping and its employees. Shipping and employees—the only customers. We financially support the canal and pay each other's salaries. And we are told that if we don't like conditions there are boats leaving every day. We are threatened with loss of our jobs and deportation if we rebel against the implementation of "gentlemen's agreements" between nations and reminded that we have no rights.

10. If Americans, employees of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal Zone, were given an opportunity to have a vote and voice in their local and national Government, instead of being dictated to as employees of the canal, if we were burdened with some responsibility of government ourselves; if we had some means of receiving information other than from reading biased Panamanian newspapers, mostly anti-American, America would have a more intelligent group of people representing it in this country. The enclosed edition of the Spillway is the first and only one of its kind. I am confident that such a means of contacting the employees of the canal, if it had been undertaken before the implementation of the flag-flying agreement, would have positively elicited the support of the American citizens and avoided the demonstrations which touched off the current crises. Our Governor has told us that we must "see the big picture." This is the first time anyone has painted it for us.

Yes, it is time that Congress and America looked at the American citizen in the Canal Zone. But please, do not look at us with contempt. Look at us with some compassion, too. Picture a group of Americans cut off from country, the marvelous communications and news media of the United States, devouring stale news that has been suitably watered down for our consumption, and ask yourselves how you could be any different than we are under the circumstances?

I thank you for your interest and concern in the past and hope to be able to count on it in the future. Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. KATHERINE E. FOULKES.

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and reported on the recent troublesome affair in the Panama Canal Zone. As a member of the Panama Canal Subcommittee, I have been very much concerned with the distorted variations of the occurrences during those fretful days commencing with the incident by students on whose flag should fly where.

I was amazed at the distortion of the course of events by Panamanian officials, which I surmised was definitely not true, also, I was chagrined that we did not have better facilities for the reporting of the true events by the American press, and that it has taken until this late date to hear what actually happened. In fact, a very fine report has recently been received by residents of my district, Mr. and Mrs. Morgan Gilbert, of Linwood, N.J., who were concerned with the welfare of the Reverend Mainert J. Peterson, his wife, and family—relatives of Mrs. Gilbert. Reverend Dr. Peterson, who has been in the Canal Zone since 1947, is now dean of the Cathedral of St. Luke in Ancon, but had formerly been the rector of the Church of the Epiphany in Ventnor City, N.J.

The safety of the Peterson family was assured in a letter dated January 13 which was received by Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert, and this letter is a very fine recitation of the true facts.

I am pleased that the Atlantic City Press, realized as I did that the original reports emanating from the Republic of Panama just did not ring true and saw fit to run a complete story and with Reverend Dr. Peterson's letter in full.

In order to have another eyewitness report in the RECORD to counteract the boldfaced lies by the Panamanian officials in attempting to give the world a distorted view of the incident which touched off the troubles between the

United States and the Republic of Panama, I repeat here the letter in full:

We are sure that you have been concerned for our safety here on the border between Panama and the Canal Zone because of the events of the past few days. Thank God, we can say that we are all well, and that we have remained in the deanery with the other families of the hillside. All is quiet now and we are trying to get on an even keel with our work and activities.

We are thoroughly dismayed that there has been such an international misrepresentation of the events that have taken place here on the isthmus. To be branded as assassins and aggressors in the face of mob rule and Castroism is a bitter pill to swallow. But we hope that after the situation has been thoroughly examined that the truth will be known. Here is a brief synopsis of the events of the past few days:

By Executive order, the United States and the Panamanian flags were permitted to fly together on the Canal Zone. A commission of both sides was given official sanction to determine where these flags should be flown. Many sites were set for the two flags, but by agreement, no flags were to be flown in front of the schools, the courts, or the police stations of the Canal Zone. On Monday, January 6, the students in many of the schools brought flags and raised them on the flag poles, against the will of their teachers. This continued through the week.

On Thursday afternoon, a large group of Panamanian students from the Instituto Nacional de Panama, which is immediately opposite our cathedral center, walked peacefully up Gorgas Road to protest to the Governor and to seek to have their Panamanian flag fly at Balboa High School. They were permitted to walk to the administration building, a distance of about 1 mile, and a delegation proceeded to the school where they asked to have their flag fly. The Balboa students (North Americans) surrounded the flag pole and refused them permission, saying that their conflict was with the Governor of the Canal Zone.

There was no violence at this point, and the Panamanian students retired from the spot and were escorted by Canal Zone police back down Gorgas Road to the border. On the way they stoned windows, broke street lights and overturned garbage cans. In contradiction to the Panamanian claim that their flag was torn by the North American students, we saw the flag being carried by these students as they passed the Cathedral on their way back to the border.

When they arrived on the border, they were met by groups of other Panamanians, who tried to cross over the border into the Canal Zone, but were repulsed by the police. Violence then broke out at many places and the police called upon the assistance of the Armed Forces of the United States. At about 8 p.m., martial law came into effect, and all authority passed into the hands of the Armed Forces, under General O'Meara, commanding general of the southern command.

Violence then broke out at many places and mobs of Panamanians on both sides of the Isthmus tried to force their way into the Canal Zone, not for the purpose of planting their flag, for flags were already flying, but to burn and pillage. They were met by gunfire and tear gas and repulsed. Raging mobs then burned cars, burned and pillaged many buildings and business establishments, and set up sniper nests.

At no point did our soldiers enter Panama, but defended the border from those who had only violence in mind. This went on Thursday night, all day Friday and Saturday. It subsided on Sunday and we were able to hold services at the Cathedral at the regular hours, although not too many persons came out.

A great deal of damage has been done in Panama by the mobs of unruly citizens. Things are at a standstill, and we don't know how they are going to get fed and return to normal. Looting and breakage is incalculable, and a North American cannot go across the border for fear of bodily injury. The borders are open for normal access into the Canal Zone. The employees at the cathedral came across peacefully and were not even asked for identification.

I mention all this in the face of the bold face lies that have been internationally spread by both the Panamanian Government and other sources. What our police and armed forces have tried to do was to protect people and property from mob violence. Unfortunately, this is being used to promote Panamanian nationalism, and will probably end up as international blackmail. We are distressed at such a turn of events, for we have worked hard for peaceful coexistence. We often read about it in other places, and say to ourselves, It can't happen here. But it has happened, and the events are being twisted out of shape for political purposes. Truth is not the basis for world opinion in this case.

We are convinced that the student march across the border on Thursday was used by the Castro revolutionists to touch off mob violence. It broke out almost simultaneously in Panama, Colon, and in the interior, hundreds of miles away. The entire installation of the United Fruit Co. in western Panama has been burned and pillaged. This had nothing to do with the conflict here, but is the result of a deliberate attempt to paralyze the country, thus leaving it open to Communist rule. This is not tossing the red herring but facing the events as we saw them on the border.

We ask you to pray for us, and for our leaders, that sanity and peace will prevail. We are well taken care of at the moment, although more than 2,500 North Americans have been evacuated out of Panama. Our bishop and his family are safe in their house which is directly in the line of fire. But you may be sure that if we are in great danger, we shall be asked to move. We are grateful that all is quiet for the moment, and hope that the Panamanian National Guard will be able to control the mob rule that has caused so much damage and death during the past few days.

If Cost Effective Methodology Is Good for the Defense Department It Is Good for Civilian Agencies of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I addressed the House on the subject of Defense Secretary McNamara's so-called cost-effective methodology for decisionmaking in the Defense Department. It was then stated that if the system is any good there, it ought to be applied to other Government departments and agencies too. If we are to be frugal with defense dollars, we also should be frugal with other Government dollars. Recently the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram editorially commented on this thesis as follows:

THE MAGIC FORMULA

An examination of the budget proposals by President Lyndon Johnson uncovers a notable fact and an exciting possibility.

The fact: Most of the $2.5 billion saving is furnished by reductions in Department of Defense budget requests.

The possibility: The Nation's spending might be reduced by more billions if other departments applied the methods used by the Defense Department in its budgeting.

Because of the terms used to describe it, the Defense Department method seems to have defied congressional efforts to understand it and use it to good advantage elsewhere. The process, known variously as cost effectiveness, system analysis, and program analysis, has somehow been cloaked in an aura of mystery and magic, deepened by the inscrutable efficiency of Secretary McNamara and his clicking computers.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, determined to find the props behind the magic, recently delved into the Defense Department method and discovered that it is nothing more than a variation of the elementary system of logic employed by scientists and researchers. Under the camouflage of Defense Department terminology, the system has merely become difficult to identify.

Working with an orderly, logical method, the Defense Department has been able, when asked, to suggest certain definite reductions in its budget requests. As a penalty for its efficiency, the Defense Department has had its budget requests sharply cut while other departments have suffered only superficial wounds.

HOSMER's question: If we're going to be frugal with the tax dollar, why not be frugal throughout Government by applying the Defense Department logic to other departments?

If this were done, conceivably some Defense Department items—vital shipyard for example—which are threatened by McNamara's economies would be saved by the cutting, instead, of expendable pork barrel items in the various civilian departments of Government.

National security comes first, and HOSMER's main thesis is difficult to dispute: The spending in the civilian agencies of the Federal Government should be subjected to at least equal scrutiny by the economizers.

President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy as a young man turned away from other careers and chose one of public service. In this career he attained excellence. His hope was peace and toward this end he selflessly devoted his fine intellect, his vast energies—in a word, his life. An assassin's bullet snuffed out this young life and shocked and saddened the world. That this sorrow was universally shared without regard to political philosophy, national origin, or creed is the best measure of the reality he was able to give his hope for peace in the few years permitted him.

The tragic events of November 22 will be written indelibly into our history books. Beyond this, I hope, will be preserved the memory of his example as a son, as a husband, as a father, and as a public servant.

It was my privilege to know him and my honor to serve under him.

Free World, Polish and Yugoslav Vessels Plying Trade With Cuba During 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who have the mistaken idea that we have some effective blockade against Cuban shipping I have asked to have included in the RECORD pages 1625 and 1626 of the Federal Register for Friday, January 31, 1964, setting forth a list of free world, Polish, and Yugoslav vessels plying trade with Cuba during 1963 as set forth by the Deputy Maritime Administrator:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION (REPT. No. 25)

LIST OF FREE WORLD AND POLISH-FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN CUBA SINCE JANUARY 1, 1963

SECTION 1. The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate departments the following list of vessels which have arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through January 17, 1964, exclusive of those vessels that called at Cuba on U.S. Government-approved noncommercial voyages and those listed in section 2. Pursuant to established U.S. Government policy, the listed vessels are ineligible to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States:

Flag of registry name of ship	*Gross tonnage*
Total—All flags (199 ships)	1,491,007
British (60 ships)	513,770
Ardgem	6,981
Ardmore	4,664
Ardrowan	7,300
Arlington Court	9,662
Athelcrown (tanker)	11,149
Atheldukе (tanker)	9,089
Athelmere (tanker)	7,524
Athelmonarch (tanker)	11,182
Athelsultan (tanker)	9,149
Avisfaith	7,868
Baxtergate	8,813
Beech Hill	7,150
Cedar Hill	7,156
Chipbee	7,271
Cosmo Trader[2] (trip to Cuba under ex-name, *Ivy Fair*—British flag)	
Dairen	4,939
East Breeze	8,708
Fir Hill	7,119
Grosvenor Mariner	7,026
Hazelmoor	7,907
Hemisphere	8,718
Ho Fung	7,121
Inchstaffa	5,255
Ivy Fair[2] (now *Cosmo Trader*—British flag)	7,201
Kirriemoor	5,923
Linkmoor	8,236
London Glory (tanker)	10,081
London Harmony (tanker)	13,157
London Majesty (tanker)	12,132
London Prestige (tanker)	16,194
London Pride (tanker)	10,776

Footnotes at end of table.

Flag of registry name of ship—Continued

British (60 ships)—Continued	*Gross tonnage*
London Spirit (tanker)	10,176
London Splendour (tanker)	16,195
London Valour (tanker)	16,268
Lord Gladstone	11,299
Maratha Enterprise	7,166
Mulberry Hill[1]	7,121
Newgate	6,743
Newlane	7,043
Oak Hill[1]	7,139
Oceantramp	6,185
Oceantravel	10,477
Overseas Explorer (tanker)	16,267
Overseas Pioneer (tanker)	16,267
Redbrook	7,388
Ruthy Ann	7,361
Santa Granada[1]	7,229
Shienfoon	7,127
Silverforce	8,058
Silverlake[2] (now *Jalaganga*—Indian flag)	8,058
Stanwear	8,108
Suva Breeze	4,970
Sycamore Hill	7,124
Thames Breeze	7,878
Timios Stavros[2] (previous trips to Cuba under Greek flag)	5,269
Vercharmian	7,265
Vergmont	7,381
West Breeze	8,718
Yungfutary	5,388
Yunglutaton	5,414
Zela M	7,237
Greek (52 ships)	404,931
Agios Therapon	5,617
Akastos	7,331
Aldebaran (tanker)	12,897
Alice	7,189
Ambassade[2] (sold Hong Kong ship breakers)	8,600
Americana	7,104
Anacreon	7,359
Anatoli	7,178
Antonia	5,171
Apollon	9,744
Armathia	7,091
Athanassios K	7,216
Barbarino	7,084
Calliopi Michalos	7,249
Capetan Petros	7,291
Despoina	5,006
Efcharis	7,249
Eftychia	7,223
Embassy[2] (broken up)	8,418
Everest	7,031
Flora M	7,244
Galini	7,266
Gloria	7,128
Irena	7,232
Istros II	7,275
Kapetan Kostis	5,032
Kostis	7,264
Kyra Hariklia	6,888
Maria de Lourdes	7,219
Maria Santa	7,217
Maria Theresa	7,245
Marigo	7,147
Maroudio	7,369
Mastro-Stelios II	7,282
Nicolaos Frangistas	7,199
North Empress	10,904
North Queen	9,341
Pamit[2] (now *Christos*—Lebanese flag)	3,929
Pantanassa	7,131
Paxoi	7,144
Penelope	6,712
Perseus (Tanker)	15,852
Polyzeni	7,143
Presvia[2] (broken up)	10,820
Propontis	7,128
Redestos	5,911

Footnotes at end of table.

Flag of registry name of ship—Continued

Greek (52 ships)—Continued	*Gross tonnage*
Seirlos[2] (sold Japanese ship breakers)	7,239
Sirius (Tanker)	16,241
Stylianos N. Vlassopulos	7,244
Timios Stavros[2] (now British flag)	
Tina	7,362
Vassiliki (tanker)	10,507
Western Trader	9,268
Lebanese (44 ships)	293,973
Aiolos II	7,256
Ais Giannis	6,997
Akamas	7,285
Alaska	6,989
Anthas	7,044
Antonis	6,259
Areti	7,176
Aristefs	6,995
Astir	5,324
Athamas	4,729
Ares	4,557
Carnation	4,884
Christos[1] (trips to Cuba under ex-name, *Pamit*—Greek flag)	
Cris[1]	6,032
Dimos	7,187
Free Trader	7,067
Giorgos Tsakiroglou	7,240
Granikos	7,282
Ilena	5,925
Ioannis Aspiotis	7,297
Kalliopi D. Lemos	5,103
Leftric	7,176
Malou	7,145
Mantric	7,255
Mersinidi	6,782
Mousse	6,984
Noelle	7,251
Noemi	7,070
Olga	7,199
Panagos	7,133
Parmarina	6,721
Razani (broken up)	7,253
Rio	7,194
St. Anthony	5,349
St. Nicolas	7,165
San John	5,172
San Spyridon	7,260
Stevo	7,066
Tertric	7,045
Theologos	6,529
Toula	4,561
Vassiliki	7,192
Vastric	6,453
Vergolivada	6,339
Yanxilas	10,051
Italian (8 ships)	59,648
Achille	6,950
Airone	6,969
Annalisa	2,479
Aspromonte	7,154
Cannaregio	7,184
Nazareno	7,173
San Nicola (tanker)	12,461
San Lucia	9,278
Polish (10 ships)	66,190
Baltyk	6,963
Bialystok	7,173
Bytom	5,967
Chopin	6,987
Chorzow	7,237
Huta Florian	7,258
Kopalnia Miechowice	7,223
Kopalnia Siemianowice	7,165

Footnotes at end of table.

Flag of registry name of ship—Continued

	Gross tonnage
Polish (10 ships)—Continued	
Kopalnia Wujek	7,033
Piast	3,184
Yugoslav (6 ships)	42,801
Bar	7,233
Cavtat	7,266
Cetinje	7,200
Dugi Otok	6,997
Promina	6,960
Trebisnjica	7,145
Norwegian (4 ships)	34,503
Lovdal (tanker)	12,764
Ole Bratt	5,252
Polyclipper (tanker)	11,737
Tine[2] (now *Jezreel*—Panamanian flag)	4,750
French (4 ships)	10,028
Circe	2,874
Enee	1,232
Guinee[2] (now *Comfort*, Chinese Formosa flag)	3,048
Nelee	2,874
Moroccan (4 ships)	32,614
Atlas	10,392
Banora	3,082
Mauritanie	10,392
Toubkal	8,748
Spanish (4 ships)	6,563
Castillo Ampudia	3,566
Escorpion[1]	999
Sierra Madre	999
Sierre Maria	999
Swedish (2 ships)	14,295
Atlantic Friend	7,805
Dagmar	6,490
Finnish (1 ship)	11,691
Valny (tanker)	11,691

Indian:
Jalaganga[2] (trip to Cuba under ex-name, *Silverlake*—British flag).
Chinese (Formosa):
Comfort[2] (trip to Cuba under ex-name, *Guinee*—French flag).
Panamanian:
Jezreel[2] (trip to Cuba under ex-name, *Tine*—Norwegian flag).

[1] Added to Rept. No. 24 appearing in the Federal Register issue of Jan. 17, 1964.

[2] Ships appearing on the list that have been scrapped or have had changes in name and/or flags of registry.

SEC. 2. In accordance with approved procedures, the vessels listed below which called at Cuba after January 1, 1963, have reacquired eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance.

(a) That such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the Cuba trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade; and

(b) That no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the Cuba trade, except as provided in paragraph (c); and

(c) That vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to December 16, 1963, requiring their employment in the Cuba trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

FLAG OF REGISTRY AND NAME OF SHIP

(a) Since last report:

	Gross tonnage
British (2 ships):	
London Confidence (tanker)	21,699
London Independence (tanker)	22,643
Greek (1 ship): *Hydraios III*	5,239
Norwegian (1 ship): *Kongsgaard* (tanker)	19,999

(b) Previous reports:

Flag of registry:	Number of ships
British	4
Danish	1
German (West)	1
Greek	5
Italian	2
Japanese	1
Norwegian	1

SEC. 3. The ships listed in sections 1 and 2 have made the following number of trips to Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through January 17, 1964:

Flag of registry	Number of trips											
	1963										1964—Jan.	Total
	Jan.-Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.		
British	21	17	13	15	14	11	8	10	12	12	6	139
Greek	18	8	17	12	17	7	8	8	2	2	1	100
Lebanese	3	8	8	9	8	3	4	10	5	6	2	66
Norwegian	6		1	2	1	2	1			1	1	15
Italian	3	2	3	2	2	2		1	1			16
Yugoslav	4	1	1		1	1	2		2			12
Spanish	2				1	1	1		1	2		8
Danish	1											1
Finnish				1								1
French							5	1		2		8
German (West)			1									1
Japanese	1											1
Moroccan	1			1	1	1	1	2	1	1		9
Swedish		1		1		1						3
Subtotal	60	37	44	43	45	29	30	32	24	26	10	380
Polish	4	2	2	2	1	1		2	3	1		18
Grand total	64	39	46	45	46	30	30	34	27	27	10	398

NOTE.—Trip totals in this section exceed ship totals in secs. 1 and 2 because some of the ships made more than 1 trip to Cuba.

Dated: January 24, 1964.

J. W. GULICK,
Deputy Maritime Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 64-994; Filed, Jan. 30, 1964; 8:48 a.m.]

Red Fishing Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, reports have recently been published to the effect that Spain is contemplating the purchasing of Cuban sugar in exchange for fishing boats. It is extremely unfortunate, of course, whenever we find one of our Western allies actively trading with the Communists—particularly in the case of Cuba, where we have tried as a national policy to isolate this political cancer by stifling its trade and its island economy. Our efforts have always been halfhearted in this regard, but effective to some extent.

But, can we criticize Spain, which has its own economic problems and is competiting for a share of the world trade dollar, when this country has abandoned its own longstanding policy in the sale of wheat to Russia and other Iron Curtain countries?

As far as the effect of this proposed trade on our own fishing industry, that would be difficult to estimate. American fishermen have many more serious problems than increased competition from Cuba, but it will mean just that much more of a drain on diminishing fishery resources in the Atlantic. I do not think we want to see Cuba become a major fishing base, either on her own or for the Russian fleet, which it already is to some extent.

This capitulation we have made in the selling of wheat to Russia is obviously going to have far-reaching effects. I have long maintained that the cold war—the struggle against world communism—is an all-out fight and one that will be decided as significantly on the economic front as on the political or military fronts. The Soviets have recognized this and are doing everything possible to exploit such resources as fish. Ravenous Russian fleets are at work in every ocean of the world, and the benefits are being felt by their domestic economy. For example, they have curtailed fish imports and are now exporting fish valued at $40 million a year—nearly three times as much as in 1955. According to the recent report of the Senate Commerce Committee, Soviet fish exports now exceed imports by a ratio of 5 to 1. This has a very favorable impact, of course, on their balance of trade and takes the pressure off in other areas of the economy, such

as agriculture, which has been doing poorly.

I know we would all hate to see Castro successfully following this lead, while fish resources diminish and the United States falls steadily behind other nations in the pursuit of this valuable natural resource and important source of food, which could have strategic ramifications in the cold war.

In this same connection, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., on the dramatic growth of the Soviet fishing industry and the potential crisis it presents to our domestic fishing industry. The editorial is based on the issuance of a special report by the Senate Committee on Commerce, under the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON, on the postwar expansion of Russia's fishing industry. This document is a valuable contribution to our understanding of the problem and a significant report from the cold war's embattled economic front:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Times, Jan. 26, 1964]

RED FISHING THREAT

Thanks to the persistent investigation of Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and his Senate Commerce Committee, U.S. fishing interests have a clear, grim picture of their own particular cold war prospects.

The Russians, with the world's largest fleet of modern fishing vessels, constitute a peril to the American industry and a threat to the available supply of fish.

The Soviet Government is investing an average of $320 million yearly in its fishing industry, 10 times the budget of the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Within 2 years, Russia expects to have more than 750 new, oceangoing trawlers, with facilities for canning and freezing aboard.

In 10 years, from 1952 to 1962, the Russian catch nearly doubled, and now is in excess of 4,100,000 tons annually.

In encroaching on traditional American fishing grounds, including Georges Bank, the Russian vessels have ignored conservation programs, employed gear that is illegal under existing treaties, destroyed equipment of U.S. fishermen, and physically crowded out American vessels, on occasion by colliding with them.

These revelations by a congressional committee, based in large measure on statistics emanating from the Soviet Union itself, obviously define a potential crisis. Involved to critical degree in this situation are those New England, Gulf and West Coast ports—including New Bedford—whose economy is buttressed by millions of fishing-industry dollars.

The Senate report should stimulate action, principally governmental, since there is little that private interests can do about this problem except worry.

Washington might start by prying loose a handful of fishing-industry bills, including a subsidy measure for vessel construction, which now languish in a House committee. After that, it wouldn't hurt to hold broadscope hearings, inviting labor, management, skippers, processors, and buyers to offer their ideas on what the Federal Government ought to do to keep the Soviets from wrecking the fisheries.

In the meantime, let's have more men and money for our own Government fisheries scientists, who very likely can clarify the problem and point to U.S. courses of action if we give them the chance.

Testimonial to Hubbard S. Russell, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a memorial testimonial to Mr. Hubbard S. Russell, Sr., one of America's foremost patriots. I have known "Hub" Russell personally over the past 20 years, and have always admired his loyalty to high moral and political principles. His death was a great personal loss to me, as well as to the State of California and to the Nation.

The testimonial follows:

"HUB" RUSSELL: WE SHALL REMEMBER—A GIANT AMONG MEN, HE LEFT A CHALLENGE WHICH WILL NOT FADE, AN INSPIRATION WHICH WILL NOT FAIL

(By Raymond S. Richmond)

Hubbard Searles Russell, Sr., known to thousands the country over as "Hub," has slipped away from us. Legions of good Americans are truly bereft.

We had no chance to say goodby to Hub. The heart attack that ended fatally less than 3 days after he suffered it on his Rancho Cuyama came with such devastating suddenness as a prelude to his passing in a Taft hospital that the great majority of his friends did not even know his life was in jeopardy.

We will, therefore, always remember Hub as he was—brimming with vitality, driving himself hard, filled with love of his country, full of plans for tomorrow, filled with distaste for men and ideologies he felt were making a mockery of the Constitution or sacrificing our national sovereignty, and filled with compassion for his less fortunate fellow Americans.

The fact that such a man deeply loved all members of his family and had great pride in them, young and old, need not be underlined. There was ample room in his great heart for all good things and, to Hub, his family was one of the really good things his Creator had given him.

Although he died at 78 years of age, it is not out of order or a misstatement to say that Hub was removed from us at the very prime of his life. His years rested very lightly on him. He cheerfully and zestily assumed the burdens and chores of a man 20 years younger. It was obvious to all that he never contemplated a carpet-slipper stage in his life. Each day pointed up too many things to do and too many challenges to meet for him to yield to the mere fact that he was 78 years old. He was up, about, and doing before the dawn.

He rode his range to the last. In late years he rode it in his automobile or in a working truck. It was only a few years ago, with great reluctance, that he gave up making his rounds on horseback. But when he was on the ranch, up to the moment of his seizure, he was in his work clothes—levis, old boots, and a battered hat. He helped bulldoze roads, remove boulders, open range-type gates that would try the strength of any man. The heart attack came while he was looking over some of his white-faced Herefords in one of his fields some miles from the main ranchhouse where he lived.

MUCH TO BE DONE

Heed admonitions to slow down that come from doctors, family and friends? Not Hub. There was too much to be done. What he did on and for the ranch was a labor of love. What he did away from the ranch—and in late years he spent fully half of his time away from it—was for deep love of country.

It is difficult to write objectively about this great and good man. None who knew him at all well could entertain any objective thoughts about him. In varying degrees they either loved, admired or respected him. It is difficult to portray with accuracy the many facets in the character of this fallen giant. His interests ranged over so many topics, even to higher enthusiasm over the Los Angeles Dodgers.

One of those who eulogized Hub at the services held in the Wee Kirk of the Heather at Forest Lawn cemetery prior to his interment was Joel McCrea, the well-known motion picture actor. Joel was a long-time friend who often sought Hub's advice on cattle and ranching.

Joel McCrea said, and this is not an exact quote, "Many people loved him. Many admired him. Many disagreed with him in things he stood for and fought for. But, I never met a man who didn't respect Hub Russell."

STEADFAST

Hub knew and enjoyed men in all walks of life. With the easy naturalness that was characteristic of him he talked with Herbert Hoover, his long-time idol; his warm friend Senator Bob Taft, and his latest idol of recent years, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. He talked with them with the same warmth and outspokenness he gave to the humblest cowhand on his ranch. He was not all things to all men: he was the same man to all.

Men of high and low station gave Hub their confidence. He never abused or betrayed it. I believed that in his files will be found letters from Herbert Hoover in which "The Chief" wrote confidentially on important matters. He enjoyed the complete confidence of Bob Taft who, when he was nearing death, gave Hub his version of why and how he was denied the nomination for President in 1952.

Hub's idol of recent years, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, trusted him implicity. The correspondence between the two men was never casual. Senator BARRY, as Hub called him, did not hesitate to reveal some of his inmost thoughts involving the future of the country and his own viewpoints and activities.

Hub carried important bits of contemporary history with him to his grave.

The Hoovers, the Tafts, the Goldwaters, numerous Senators and Congressmen, Governors and others in high station could look to Hub for forthright, "no-punches-pulled" advice. Although they knew him to be a last-ditch and partisan fighter they knew they could get from him a calm, well-reasoned appraisal of the facts they sought, as he saw them.

By the same token, a friend, a neighbor, or an employee always found the door to Hub's heart wide open. He counseled these folk with the same care he employed in presenting his viewpoints to men and women whose names are household words in the Nation. He was truly, to employ Herbert Hoover's words, an uncommon man. It was one of his chief glories that he had the common touch.

MANY GOOD WORKS

While Hub was continuously busy in his never-ending fight against the leftist-leaning bureaucracies of both Federal and State governments, his heart and head were not always in the turbulent clouds of politics and economics. A little known fact about him—little known because he was averse to letting people know of his private good works—was his constant reconditioning and rehabilitating of people who came directly over his horizon whom he felt needed his help.

He was an abstemious man—a nondrinker. He made no effort to impose his abstemiousness on others. At a meeting, large or small, attended by Hub when some user of the "cup that cheers" turned that cheer into raucous, ribald or obscene mouthings, Hub quietly disappeared from the scene. He uttered no denunciations, no reproaches. He just quietly withdrew and, if the offense was repeated, he withdrew from the offender's life.

The writer is not trying to paint a picture of a prude. Hub cussed occasionally when deeply stirred over something he didn't like. When he did, his words had pungency and force; they had impact. But he did not tell off-color stories and when someone else did he was obviously uneasy.

The other side of the drinking coin was that when liquor got a man down and when he found his life in ruins because of his inability to control his appetites, he invariably found Hub interested in helping him. Over a period of many years Hub was directly responsible for the rehabilitation of many men. If they happened to be employees they got a second and third chance.

The record shows—he never compromised on principle. All he needed to know was that the man was trying. I do not doubt there will be some reading this feeble tribute who were helped out of chronic alcoholism and restored to useful and proud citizenship.

Once a man had achieved the reasonably straight and narrow, without serious or prolonged relapse. Hub sang his praises loudly. Those who knew him well learned to know not to talk about a man's past errors. To his last day he was a firm believer in redemption.

HUB'S "FIRSTS"

Hub had many "firsts" to his credit—probably more than anyone knew.

He was proud that he was one of the first 21 subscribers to Human Events. This original subscription list of that great nationally-distributed conservative publication has become an unofficial roll of honor of pioneer conservatives who were alarmed by the fallacies inherent in the New Deal-Fair Deal and resisted them.

He was one of the organizers of For America, a national political action organization, along with his close friends, Gen. Robert E. Wood, Col. Robert McCormick of the Chicago Tribune, Dean Clarence Manion, Robert M. Harriss of New York and J. Evetts Haley of Texas.

He was a pioneer in the fight for the repeal of the 16th (income tax) amendment. For a time he served as president of the original national organization that brought the iniquities of this Karl Marx type of taxation to the attention of the American public.

Cattlemen the country over have for years hailed Hub as the instigator of numerous programs that prevented their industry from being brought under complete Federal control.

It is a matter of personal knowledge that he was first, or always among the first, to give financial support to organizations and men who espoused principles for which he stood. Conservative and constitutionalist candidates for the Senate and House did not have to appeal to Hub for moral and financial support. Somehow or other he always knew about them and sensed their needs. Many men now in the House and Senate received substantial support from him, regardless of State lines. He felt deeply that in helping them he was helping the country.

Something happened in the last few months of his life that gave him great happiness and encouragement. That was the organization of the United Republicans of California. Only last March he met with a determined group of 40 Republican conservatives, drawn in common cause from all sections of California, in a historic meeting in Bakersfield. The topics discussed, in all their ramifications during a 2-day session, were how to rebuild a Republican Party in California that would shake off "me-toolsm" and how to return the party to the grass roots with the wresting of control from the small group of self-anointed, self-appointed "king-makers."

"LET'S GET BUSY"

Discussions were spirited and frank. They ended with the organization of the United Republicans of California (UROC). The minutes will show that it was Hub who made the motion that gave the fledgling organization its name. When organization had been completed, Hub asked the temporary chairman, Bruce Reagan, for the floor: said he simply, "What you have done here today has given me the happiest day I have known in 30 years. Now let's get busy." UROC got busy. Hub was chosen immediately as UROC's finance chairman.

A few weeks later UROC was incorporated in Sacramento with appropriate ceremonies. A beaming Hub was there to help Executive Secretary Rus Walton see that all went well and that the birth of UROC would be as official as law could make it.

The growth and success of UROC engrossed Hub in his final days. Not only had he instituted the formation of powerful, enthusiastic units in his own community and county but only a few weeks ago he exercised his great influence in the formation of the first San Francisco Unit—Herbert Hoover unit No. 1. Earlier units had been named after his good friends Bob Taft and General Douglas MacArthur. The growth of UROC to nearly 200 units throughout the State, with a paid-up membership of approximately 6,000 members in a matter of a few months was a source of unbounded delight to Hub.

One day soon a book will be written about Hub's life and his political and economic philosophies. Such a book will have to recite that although he knew, as a deep student of history, that compromise is often necessary, he fought always against compromises on principle. He preferred to fight on—alone if necessary—rather than to give lipservice to programs and candidates in which he couldn't believe. There is no record anywhere in his life that he compromised on principle. It turned out he didn't have to fight alone. His deep convictions, his unrelenting war on what he believed was wrong for the United States and the individual citizen, attracted an ever-increasing flow of fighting recruits to the causes he espoused.

THE TENDER SIDE

On his ranch no employee was permitted to maltreat an animal. He insisted that the dumb creatures under his control be treated as gently and painlessly as possible. Woe to the employee he caught maltreating a horse or using unnecessary roughness on a steer.

Horses that had served him well over the years were never sold off in their dotage to pet food or glue manfuacturers. They lived out their spans in spacious enclosures where the grass was good and the water plentiful. Rancho Cuyama was a horse heaven on earth.

The ranch house is located near the Cuyama River. Along its banks for miles there is excellent cover for quail and other birds. The quail concentration is intensive. His affection for all birds, and especially for quail, was deep. He was never too busy to watch these birds in flight or consorting as families. The writer has been an eye witness more than once to concentrations of quail, numbering 500 or more, busy making a living picking up grains and seeds in the horse corrals. Hub's ire was aroused a year or so ago when one of the big oil companies, in a page advertisement in national magazines, pictured that part of the Cuyama Valley that was on the Russell brothers' property as a quail paradise. He feared it would attract gunners. Fortunately it did not because people for miles around knew of Hub's protective feeling for the birds and wisely decided not to fire away within earshot of the ranch home.

Every wild thing, including the usually-hated jackrabbit, had a friend in Hub. To him, they were God's creatures, and a part of the divine plan. "They are here for a reason," he said. "I know they help keep nature in balance."

Although the writer never discussed theology with Hub, he knew him to be a godly man. Hub believed in the spiritual, moral, and ethical values of all religions. He was raised in the Methodist Church and in memory of his dearly-beloved mother and father he and his brothers financed the cost of the sanctuary in the New Cuyama Community Methodist Church.

A MORAL GIANT

So, we are left with this picture of a mental and moral giant—a man who loved a last-ditch fight for principle and a man who bound-up the wounds of the fallen and the unfortunate. He had no hesitation in jousting with the mighty and crossing swords with the powerful. He engaged constantly in the rehabilitation of less fortunate fellow humans. He was tender and protective toward all animal life, domestic and wild. A contradiction? Not at all. Oftimes the strongest men are the tenderest.

Hub is gone. There is nothing we can do about it. He was taken at a time when he was confident we were approaching the Gettysburg in the long drawn out war against state socialism, big coercive government and the assorted ills they spawn.

Hub will live on—vibrant and unbeatable—in the hearts and minds of all who knew him or knew of his works.

When Bob Taft died, it was a severe shock to Hub. He said: "Bob Taft is gone but we are here. If we really believed in him and what he fought for we will carry on his fight."

Hub Russell is dead. But we are here. If we are truly devoted to the memory of Hub we will see that his dauntless, never-say-die spirit flames high in us and requires of us that we shoulder determinedly a real share of the heavy load he so cheerfully bore.

Tax Deduction for Parents, or the Forgotten Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, back in January of last year, as in previous years of the Congress, I have introduced legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to allow an individual a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred by him for his education of his spouse or any of his dependents.

I have consistently fought for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, on its own merits, and also as part of other legislation. I thought, for example, that the provision should be inserted into the historic tax bill which passed the House and is now being considered in the other body.

There are forgotten men in the middle and lower income groups who would greatly benefit from this legislation, and it is my sincere hope that the other body will consider the provision so that it can be voted upon by Members of Congress.

A recent editorial stated the issue quite plainly, and I am happy to make it part of the RECORD.

It appeared in the Boston Traveler on Friday, January 24:

FORGOTTEN FATHERS

No one wants the $11 billion tax cut delayed unduly. But when the full Senate gets the bill next week it should take time for a close look at an amendment, rejected by its Finance Committee, that would give special, small relief to parents of college students.

With college tuitions, alone, running as high as $1,500 and $1,700 a year, the proposed annual tax credit of $325 per student doesn't seem out of line. Not when the Nation needs so many college-trained specialists.

And especially not when present tax law permits workers to deduct the cost of education, books, and special equipment that will increase their job efficiency.

Objections to tax credits for college costs, based on the argument that Federal aid to students should come solely through grants and loans, are unfair. Only low-income families qualify for that kind of help.

Certainly, the middle-income father—the forgotten man—deserves and needs the small break the amendment would provide.

Understanding the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important new changes in the Alliance for Progress is its emphasis on multilateral participation by the Latin American nations. Decisions will rest on the collective judgment of all its members. I was pleased and impressed by the Washington Post editorial on the subject which dealt with Mr. Teodoro Moscoso's new post as the U.S. representative on the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress.

Following is the editorial:

MOSCOSO'S NEW POST

Teodoro Moscoso, who has served with distinction as coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, has moved on to a new job of great potential importance. He will be serving as U.S. representative on the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. This body, known as CIAP (the initials of the name in Spanish) is a major innovation agreed upon at last fall's hemisphere meeting in São Paulo. The purpose of CIAP is to strengthen the multilateral aspects of the Alliance.

No one as yet is certain how the system will work, and the man who will head CIAP remains to be appointed. But few question that there is a need for what President Johnson has called "an effective multilateral organ to provide guidance and greater momentum to the Alliance."

Mr. Moscoso is deeply committed to the multilateral concept—in other words, to the proposition that our neighbors must share on a collective basis in the decisions of the Alliance. From this country's viewpoint, it is preferable that pressure for controversial domestic reforms come from a Latin American body rather than from the United States. Mr. Moscoso should prove an able adjutant at CIAP, providing he gets the understanding and support he deserves from the White House and the State Department.

Budget Juggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, according to the lead article in the Wall Street Journal of January 22 by that paper's respected reporter, Alan L. Otten, President Johnson's first budget "is as filled with gimmicks as a Rube Goldberg invention." Although Mr. Otten says that some real savings have been made in the budget, the overall effect is to make the projected spending and deficits look smaller than the actual outcome probably will be. The article outlines some of the gimmicks used in the budget.

Under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD at this point:

BUDGET JUGGLING—SOME JOHNSON DEVICES MAKE SPENDING SEEM LESS THAN IS EXPECTED—A FEW OUTLAYS SHIFTED TO 1964; CONGRESS IS COOL TO LAWS NEEDED FOR FARM FUND CUT—SOME REAL, SIZABLE SAVINGS

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—President Lyndon Johnson's first budget, dispatched to Congress yesterday, is as filled with gimmicks as a Rube Goldberg invention.

The effect: To make projected spending and deficits look smaller than the actual outcome probably will be.

Yet the gimmicks might have been greater. Mr. Johnson for the most part used traditional budget sleight of hand, and resisted what one official calls the hairiest schemes for making the new budget look still smaller. There have been some real and substantial savings, too. And it's barely possible, assuming continuing economy pressure from the White House and cooperation from Congress, that the final spending figures for the fiscal year starting next July may not be too far off from the present projections.

"Almost certainly we'll wind up above the $97.9 billion spending estimate," says a White House man intimately involved in the budget process. "But I'll bet we'll be well below $100 billion. There's no question that there's a new economy mood around this town, and that's bound to have an impact if it lasts."

There's really no way of figuring out exactly how much higher the fiscal 1965 spending estimates would be or how much lower the revenue estimate would be were it not for the gimmicks. Consider, however, the impact of a few of the more easily identifiable ones:

Asset sales: Mr. Johnson counts on selling private investors $2.3 billion worth of Government-held home mortgages and Export-Import Bank loans next fiscal year, well above the $1.6 billion expected this year. Since these sales are counted as reducing net spending rather than increasing revenues, the effect would be to cut outlays by $700 million. But the high 1965 sales projections depend on two far-from-sure assumptions: That interest rates won't rise from mid-December levels and make other investments more attractive, and that Congress will authorize the Government to pool mortgages and sell investors participations in these pools. If these assumptions fail to work out, spending will be higher. "There's no doubt we maximized asset sales," an administration man privately concedes.

Farm cuts: Some $610 million in spending reductions depends on proposed legislation for which Congress shows little enthusiasm; some of the changes have been proposed in past years with no success. The legislation calls for new cotton and dairy programs, higher meat and grain inspection fees, having the Government insure privately made farm housing loans rather than making the loans itself, and permitting the Rural Electrification Administration to make new loans with money repaid on old ones.

Shift in years: Despite official denials, some spending that normally would have come in fiscal 1965 was moved up into the current year. This makes it easier to cut 1965 spending. As late as mid-November, administration officials were predicting outlays of $97.8 billion for the current year; now they estimate $98.4 billion. One reason: Some $550 million in military purchases are being pushed ahead into fiscal 1964.

Revenue forecasts: The budget's estimates of Federal income may prove to be on the optimistic side, even if the economy booms as predicted. Each month beyond February 1 that Congress delays the lower tax withholding rate sought by the administration will reduce fiscal 1965 revenues and increase that year's projected $4.9 billion deficit by $800 million (though increasing fiscal 1964 revenues and cutting this years' deficit by the same amount). The estimates also assume new income of $264 million from various proposed "user charges," or special fees and taxes; Congress has balked at many of these for years.

Miscellaneous: Some $165 million of spending would be saved next year by ending a requirement that various agencies pay the Treasury interest on money borrowed to expand production during the Korean war; since the money merely goes out of one Government pocket and into another, the change doesn't save the taxpayer anything.

Too, the budget simply omits $65 million that ordinarily would have been paid into the retirement fund for civil service workers. A number of new health and welfare programs are budgeted at what seem unrealistically low levels. Budget Bureau officials themselves doubt space spending can be held as low as the $4.9 billion proposed.

At least 1 administration-backed program isn't budgeted for at all; there's no money to hire the 40 to 60 extra lawyers the Justice Department will need to enforce the civil rights bill Congress is expected to pass. The President himself warned he might need more foreign aid funds should "opportunities arise" for the United States to take swift advantage of some changed foreign situation.

The budget makes no allowance for possible weakening of the administration's economy zeal as the 1964 election draws near. "I wonder," muses one White House man, "whether we'll still be cutting back defense spending and holding down farm outlays this fall. I heard Ike talk that way, too, and then as the 1956 elections approached he ordered a speedup in spending." An election-minded Congress could vote new programs the administration isn't counting on. The budget makes no allowance for extension of the accelerated public works program so popular in many congressional districts. The lawmakers might make a new Federal pay raise more generous than the $544 million Mr. Johnson figures on for next year.

But it must be noted that there's lots of budget gimmickery every year. "I doubt the

Fraud Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission would pass this budget," says a Budget Bureal official, "but then all Federal budgets and corporate balance sheets are a little fraudulent. Eisenhower did the same thing."

Mr. Johnson's budget does include sizable sums for programs some of his critics had expected him to omit or estimate at lower levels: The Federal pay raise, the new war on poverty, a start on liquidating the Government's obligation to the social security trust fund for retirement credit given persons on military service.

Too, he vetoed Mr. McNamara's plans to switch even more fiscal 1965 defense buying into the 1964 year, and rejected other wild "economy" schemes floating around the White House. Example: To give military men an extra month's pay this fiscal year and a month's less next year by advancing pay dates from July 1964 into June 1964.

CUTBACK IN PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH

Many of Mr. Johnson's savings are entirely legitimate. Though part of the scheduled $1.1 billion drop in Defense Department spending will come from shifting fiscal 1965 purchases into 1964, most of it results from a real cutback in procurement and research, as the Pentagon achieves what it considers a secure level of strategic retaliatory strength and conventional war capacity. The decision to cut back production of nuclear weapons material, at a $50 million saving next year, is one that Mr. Kennedy had at least twice declined to make.

Administration officials insist that even if Congress should enact a new wheat control and price-support law, it wouldn't have major budget impact. They figure fiscal 1965 spending on wheat programs would still be some $565 million lower than this year; a scheduled cut in wheat price-support rates is expected to reduce the Government's outlays for support operations, export subsidies, and food-for-peace shipments.

Mr. Johnson not only OK'd most Budget Bureau proposals for cutting agency requests but even ordered a few reductions in items the Bureau had approved. Thus he cut back money and manpower increases that had been OK'd for the Internal Revenue Service and U.S. Information Agency. "I've been in a lot of tax centers," he told Bureau officials, "and there's always a crowd around the Coke machine. Those people could work harder." Many agencies were made to absorb the cost of a recent pay increase, rather than being allowed as usual to seek extra appropriations.

DELAY IN PAYMENTS

A $350 million saving—available only in fiscal 1965 and not in later years—stems from a decision to delay some payments to States, universities, and other groups under various public assistance, education, and research grant programs. The administration found many grants were being paid out long before they were needed by the recipients.

The general economy atmosphere will work to produce additional savings, officials believe. They say agencies are hoping to carry out economy directives. Yesterday's budget message predicts executive branch civilian employment will drop by 1,200 during the coming fiscal year—from 2,512,400 at the beginning of the year to 2,511,200 at the end. But Budget Director Kermit Gordon said these figures are already out of date, with reports from individual agencies showing an anticipated drop of at least several thousand more. When Washington was buried under a heavy snowfall one day last week, Government workers anxiously awaited the usual order to go home early. It never came; officials estimated that each hour of early dismissal would have cost the taxpayers $950,000.

Even if Congress votes some spending Mr. Johnson doesn't want, it will almost certainly vote budget cuts that will hold down next year's outlays. Officials estimate that the new budget would probably be almost $2 billion higher if Congress last year hadn't rejected so many administration spending schemes and cut appropriations bills so deeply.

The Up-Beater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure and a great deal of hope that I noted the appointment of Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaría as chairman of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress.

I have watched Dr. Sanz de Santamaría's accomplishments and his efforts as Colombian Ambassador to the United States and recently as the Minister of Finance and Public Credit in Colombia. I am very much impressed with his ability to analyze problems, plan on how to overcome them and then carry these plans to successful fruition.

The latest edition of Newsweek magazine recently carried an article about the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, as well as information about Dr. Sanz de Santamaría and his accomplishments, an article which I think you will find interesting.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek magazine]

THE UP-BEATER

In São Paulo last November, representatives of 20 hemisphere nations decided to put a Latin American beat into the Alliance for Progress. To do so, they created the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP), gave it the power to review and coordinate Alliance projects, and stipulated that only one of its seven members could come from the United States. Though CIAP will not have formal power to force the United States to accept its views on Alliance loans, it will presumably be heard with respect in Washington and its chairman could easily become one of Latin America's most influential statesmen.

Now after a continentwide search, Latin America's diplomats think they have found just the man for the job. This week, at a special meeting, the Organization of American States is expected to name as chairman of CIAP, Carlos Sanz de Santamaría, Colombia's capable Minister of Finance and Public Credit. A cheerful aristocrat who, in his youth, spent much of his time playing polo throughout Latin America, Santamaría graduated from Colombia's National University as a civil engineer in 1928 and in 1931 founded his own construction firm. During the next decade, he built water systems all across Colombia—and the Santamaría bullring stadium in Bogotá. Elected mayor of Bogotá in 1942, he won widespread popularity with campaigns to wipe out illiteracy and to improve the city's public utilities without running his budgets into the red. After that, he could command almost any government post; indeed, he has served in four cabinets, was twice Ambassador to the United States (1946–47 and 1960–62) and once to Brazil (1958–60).

As Finance Minister in Conservative President Guillermo León Valencia's current Cabinet, stubby Carlos Santamaría, 58, a liberal, has imposed an overdue austerity program on Colombia's economy despite outcries from rich and poor alike. In 1962, he devaluated the peso from 6.70 to the dollar to the more relaistic 9 to the dollar even though the resulting inflation was bound to hurt the masses. Then he upped income taxes 20 percent despite congressional opposition and forced coffee producers to pay export duty. "He's very tough," says U.S. Ambassador to CIAP Teodoro Moscoso admiringly. "We, too, are more than pleased to support him."

Meat Imports and Integrated Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I requested that a resolution of the Minnesota Swine Producers' Association be printed in the RECORD since it was addressed to the vital question of competition from high levels of imports of livestock products from abroad.

I have now received from Mr. J. A. McGinness of Mankato, copies of two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Livestock Feeders Association, asking for congressional recognition of the plight of the livestock feeders who have been the victims of a squeeze between imports and competition from integrated operators. The present oversupply of red meats in this country can be attributed not only to the heavy imports but also to cheap-feed policies of the Department of Agriculture making available to integrated operators CCC stocks at a price below what it costs the family farmer to produce his own feed.

I ask that the resolutions of the Minnesota Livestock Feeders Association be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

ANTITRUST LAWS

Whereas the chainstores are marketing the major portion of the Nation's red meat; and,

Whereas they have become giants with power that at times has been used in a manner we consider detrimental to livestock producers; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the appropriate unit of Government initiate action to determine whether antitrust laws are being violated and to recommend legislation to protect the livestock producer from monopolistic price-fixing practices by the chainstores in violation of fair trade; be it further

Resolved, That the elected representatives of the State of Minnesota be informed of the recommendation of the Minnesota Livestock Feeders Association and that they be respectfully requested to act immediately in behalf of the Minnesota livestock producers.

Whereas control of production, slaughter, and retail by large corporations permits them to have monopolistic control of the livestock market; therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be requested to enact legislation that will prohibit packers and retailers of livestock products from engaging in livestock production; be it further

Resolved, That Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota be informed of the recommendations of the Minnesota Livestock Feeders Association, and be respectfully re-

quested to support legislation that will adequately protect the livestock producer.

MEAT IMPORTS

Livestock constitutes the largest and most important segment of the agricultural economy of the United States.

Current high levels of imports of beef and lamb, at a time when our domestic production of red meat is at an alltime high and livestock producers are experiencing severe financial losses on their operations, and also at a time when cold storage stocks of beef and pork are excessive, are exerting an extremely adverse economic impact on our domestic red meat industry.

Therefore, we respectfully petition the representatives of our Nation at the Geneva trade talks that no further tariff concessions be granted on livestock, meat, and other livestock products.

Further, we firmly believe that the Congress of the United States should enact legislation which would impose quotas, based on moving 5-year averages of red meat imports, and after such quotas are exceeded, tariffs on such imports would be substantially increased.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I am submitting today to the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with its current hearings on medical aid for the aged. The statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views on the proposal to provide medical care for our elderly citizens under the social security system.

The problem of providing medical care for the aged is one of major national importance. This problem is not going to get smaller but will increase with each year as the number of our aged citizens increases. The solution of this problem cannot be delayed much longer. It is one that requires top priority attention, and it is right here in this committee and in the Congress where the full responsibility rests for solving this problem.

To me, it is inconceivable that we should continue to ignore the hardships encountered by the elderly people of this country because of their inability to pay for adequate medical care in their declining years. We hear a great deal in recent days about plans for a war on poverty, and I want to commend President Johnson and his administration for initiating steps to eradicate poverty from our midst. A good place to begin is with our senior citizens, since it is estimated that about 8 million people over the age of 65—or about half of our aged population in this category—live in abject poverty.

The average per capita income of those over 65 is estimated at about $1,000 per year, or about $20 per week. If we take into consideration the huge increases in medical costs, hospitalization, group hospitalization premiums, and similar expenses, which have in some instances almost doubled in the past decade, it is impossible to understand how these people manage to get along. With the high cost of food, rent, and other necessities, they probably have no other alternative but to deny themselves the necessary medical care.

According to statistics issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the number of persons receiving monthly benefits under the social security system at the end of 1962 was 18.1 million. This total was comprised as follows: 12.7 million were retired workers and their dependents; 4.1 million were survivors of deceased workers; and 1.3 million were disabled workers and their dependents. In recent years the average annual increase in the number of beneficiaries in all groups is about 1.5 million, so that by now we have about 19.5 million people receiving social security benefits.

In my own State of Connecticut a total of 257,154 persons were beneficiaries under the social security system at the end of 1962. In the four counties comprising the Second Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, the number of social security beneficiaries was as follows: New London, 16,626; Middlesex, 8,901; Windham, 8,433; Tolland, 5,221. The total for my district was 39,181. This is approximately 10 percent of the population of the district.

The problem of the aged is often described as a human problem. President Johnson spoke of it in such terms when he renewed his request for a program of medical care for aged under social security in his state of the Union address at the opening of the current session of Congress. Today it is generally agreed that the aged become ill more often, that they are sick for longer periods of time, that they require more institutional care, and that they possess less resources to meet the cost of medical care.

Of all the plans and proposals advanced so far, the King-Anderson bill supported previously by President Kennedy and now by President Johnson seems to make the most sense and comes closest to a solution of the problem. The King-Anderson proposal would be financed from a separate health insurance trust fund by an increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the social security tax on both workers and employers. It would provide the following benefits: 45 days hospital care with no cost to the patient, or 90 days hospital care with a maximum deduction of $90, or 180 days hospital care with certain deductions; nursing home care up to 180 days; outpatient hospital diagnostic services; and home health services, including nursing care and therapy, up to 240 visits during the year. It should be noted that this bill does not provide for payment of doctors' bills.

Thus, the King-Anderson proposal would provide primarily hospitalization or institutional care and, as such, is actually a limited medical care program. I believe that this is the least we can do for our elderly people. Under this plan, they would have the health care needed to live in the twilight of life with dignity and self-respect. They do not want to be on relief, nor are they interested in living on a Government dole. Old-age assistance and similar welfare programs are not the solution to this problem, nor is the Kerr-Mills program which to date has been accepted by only about half of the States and where only about 7 out of every 1,000 persons in the country are receiving any assistance.

The difference between these welfare programs and the King-Anderson proposal for hospital care for the aged may be summed up as follows: the welfare programs would deal with the problem of poverty after it has occurred, while the King-Anderson medicare plan would establish a system of social insurance to prevent poverty among the aged. In view of our efforts to combat poverty in the Nation, there is no doubt as to which of these proposals or ways of approach is more desirable.

Mr. Chairman, in the King-Anderson proposal we have a self-paying plan not only to provide medical care for our aged citizens, but also the opportunity to help prevent and forestall poverty in this age group as brought on by health costs. Let us extend this medical care to those who have earned their retirement after a lifetime of labor, so that they may have the opportunity to spend their declining years in good health, fewer medical bills, less worries, and most of all the reassuring feeling that they are not forgotten nor ignored.

For these reasons, I appeal to the members of this committee to deal effectively with this problem and to take early and favorable action on the King-Anderson proposal to provide medical care for our elderly citizens.

Sharing Our Know-How With The Developing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of a bigger stumbling block in the way of the less-developed countries and their progress than their lack of know-how. In many a country, foreign aid and credit loans are quickly absorbed by these parched countries without producing the required results, because there were not the technically trained hands, especially in the highly skilled crafts, to make the best use of them.

I am happy to see that certain private institutions in the United States have had the foresight and constructive imagination to predict such a problem and prepare for it years ago. Particularly impressive is the record of the Dunwoody Industrial Institute of Minneapolis, Minn., which is helping to shape a better future in countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The alumni of the institute include 600 international craftsmen, technicians, teachers, and administrators from more than 60 countries in the world.

Through the help of the Ford Foundation and AID, the institute is also helping countries like Indonesia, Burma, and Sudan establish their own technical institutes at home, to produce what an industrialist has called, "the second lieutenants in industry."

In the following paragraphs, the admirable work of Dunwoody Institute in international development is outlined:

SHARED KNOW-HOW—DUNWOODY ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The most valued resource of a country is its people. Progress in this technological age depends upon the skill and knowledge of the people that make up a country's work force. The rapidly developing countries of the world recognize that the most critical manpower shortages exist in the segment of highly skilled craftsmen, the industrial and engineering technicians, and generally in the middle-level of the manpower spectrum. A large number of, what an industrialist has called, the second lieutenants in industry are needed to move the wheels of industry and keep them moving.

It is in this vital area of human resource development that Dunwoody is serving several of the developing countries of the world. First called to serve in Asia by the Ford Foundation, Dunwoody Institute assisted the Government of Indonesia in the establishment of the Indonesian Technical Teacher Training Institute in Bandung, and subsequently participated in a nationwide survey of technical education programs. This project hailed as a highly successful program of technical assistance involved the services of 11 advisers from Dunwoody and the training of 44 Indonesian teachers at Dunwoody Institute in Minneapolis.

In Burma, also under the sponsorship of the Ford Foundation, Dunwoody Institute assisted the Government Technical Institute, Insein, in modernizing its facilities and in refashioning the curriculum to meet the new development needs of Burma. At the Rangoon Technical High School, the first high school of its kind in Burma, Dunwoody advisers, in cooperation with Burmese educators, developed a unique program of instruction to prepare skilled Burmese young men for Burma's industries. Seventeen Dunwoody advisers served in Burma and 47 Burmese attended Dunwoody under this program.

Under the sponsorship of the U.S. Government's Agency for International Development (AID), seven Dunwoody advisers are now assisting the Ministry of Labor and Employment of the Government of India in the operation of the Central Training Institute for Instructors and Craftsmen at Bombay, India. Formally inaugurated by Prime Minister Nehru, the institute is one of several being opened in India to meet the critical shortage of skilled craftsmen and instructors.

The Khartoum Senior Trade School in the Sudan is Dunwoody's first project in Africa and the largest single project that the institute has so far undertaken. When fully operative, the project will have the benefit of the skills and knowledge of 16 advisers from Dunwoody and an investment of approximately $1.5 million by the U.S. Agency for International Development. Planned as a central institution, this school is expected to be a pacesetter for similar institutional development in the Sudan and in other parts of rapidly developing Africa.

Initial surveys are now being undertaken to assess some of the manpower needs of our Latin American neighbors and when opportunities for service in this hemisphere come to the institute, Dunwoody will have gone full circle around the globe with technical assistance projects.

For a private institution such as Dunwoody these opportunities for service abroad present both an opportunity and a challenge. The 600 international alumni of Dunwoody Institute include craftsmen, technicians, teachers, and administrators from more than 60 countries of the world. By means of their contributions they spread the message of service and a practical philosophy of education embodied in the saying "Education for work and not away from it."

Dollar Gap Must Be Closed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have commented on various phases of the dollar gap problem.

Since I regard this problem as being of special urgency to the financial stability of this country and the free world, I am pleased to note the recent, moderate improvement in international dollar balances.

Perhaps it would be too much to hope for that the gold outflow can be stopped entirely during this year, since the basic cause—excess dollars in foreign hands—is with us, and is likely to remain with us for some time to come.

We should not look complacently upon the fact that the U.S. Treasury's monetary gold stock dropped $465 million in 1963 to $15.5 billion, roughly what it was when World War II started in 1939. This can be measured off against U.S. peak reserves of about $24.8 billion in August 1949.

In the interim, other nations rebuilding their own reserves with our help, in some cases from our continuing deficit in the balance of payments, have brought our gold reserve down to a figure which is certainly grounds for grave apprehension.

Whether it is international, cooperative methods and measures of attacking the problem, substantial amounts of new gold mined outside of the Communist bloc, purchase of grain surpluses by the Soviet, or the collapse of speculative onslaughts against the dollar, or other factors our international balances are somewhat better.

Our monetary reserves are made up of a combination of gold and the currencies of other nations. European countries like to keep most of their reserves in gold.

American citizens cannot turn in their dollars for gold, but central banks of other nations can use dollars to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury.

It is significant that at the end of 1963 Great Britain's gold holdings were about 92 percent of total reserves of $2.6 billion. West Germany's gold holdings late in the year were $3.8 billion. France was the leading purchaser of U.S. gold in 1963 and built its stock to more than $3 billion. Switzerland's gold stock is about 93 percent of its total reserves.

Gold holdings of all the non-Communist nations, save the United States, are now around $24 billion. So the $15.5 billion U.S. Treasury stock is considered by many in financial circles as a favorable percentage, about the same ratio as before World War II shook international monetary balances.

The problem is now to keep the outflow and inflow of U.S. dollars in better balance so that any further gold drain is stopped, or at least held to modest amounts.

This may be difficult for us to do, even though it must be done, if we are to avoid economic peril.

We must keep it in mind that import-export balances are the principal determining factor of the gold level. To the extent that our balance has been affected by foreign aid and expenditures for military and security purposes overseas, our balances are vulnerable, unless we preserve import-export ratios and effectively prevent cheap imports from swamping our economy. Reductions in foreign aid and our military expenditures abroad could greatly improve our international monetary balances and do much to close the dollar gap.

I realize that this and related problems are not for the determination of politicians, but rather for the monetary experts, but it is the obvious duty of Members of Congress to keep ourselves well informed in this field where awkward or unsound financial policies might continue to combine with unrealistic political policies to forestall the solution of the dollar-gap problem, or even cause it to become worse and more threatening than it is.

I hope the administration will continue to move very vigorously across the broadest possible front, and with reference to all, not just some, of the factors involved in accentuating the dollar gap, so that we can make further progress toward eliminating the substantial drop in our gold reserves that has occasioned a great deal of concern among informed, financial leaders and served to increase the magnitude and seriousness of our foreign affairs as well as our own challenging domestic economic problems.

I am glad also to note that several well-informed press commentators, like Sam Dawson, are giving the American public the benefit of their information and views, and I think this is extremely helpful to our thinking on the problem and to all those interested in finding satisfactory answers.

President Recognizes the Importance of Dairy Farmers and Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have read with a great deal of interest the President's message on agriculture, and I am pleased and encouraged by his thorough and working knowledge of the complex and many-sided problems of our farmers. His message does not simply look at the farmer on the farm. It outlines the important role which is played by our farmers in city life and world affairs.

No man is an island unto himself, and in today's complex world, no farmer is a producer of food and fiber just for his own family. As the President pointed out, one American farmer today provides 25 domestic consumers and 4 people overseas with their total food and fiber needs. He also noted an important but frequently overlooked fact—that prosperity on the farm gives impetus to prosperity in the city.

As a Representative of a dairy district in the great dairy State of Wisconsin, and as chairman of the House Dairy Subcommittee, I was particularly pleased that the President stressed the need for

comprehensive dairy legislation and included dairy products among the five commodities requiring immediate attention. Specifically, he recommended legislation to first, provide incentive payments to dairy farmers to reduce surplus production and; second, permit producers in Federal milk marketing order areas, through a base excess plan, to reduce their production of milk without reducing their share of the class I market.

Mr. Speaker, both of these provisions are contained in the dairy bill which I introduced in the House during the 1st session of the current Congress. Hearings on this measure have already been held by the House Dairy Subcommittee, but no action has been taken.

My measure authorizes a 2-year program of direct payments to producers outside Federal milk marketing orders who voluntarily agree not to expand their production beyond that of the base year, or a percentage of the base year. Direct payments would be made on their marketings at a rate not to exceed 50 cents per hundred pounds of milk or milk equivalent. The bill retains the present floor of 75 percent of parity for dairy price supports.

In milk marketing order areas, the proposed legislation provides for producer allotments based on the market requirements in the highest use classification, plus essential reserves. Instead of receiving a uniform blend price, producers would get a higher return on milk covered by allotments and a lower price for milk in excess of allotments. The bill also includes payments for surplus reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee currently has before it a Senate-passed dairy bill which is restricted to Federal milk markets. Well over 600,000 farmers sell their milk outside Federal order areas, as compared with 187,000 producers operating under the Federal milk orders. I have made no secret of my opposition to the Senate bill, for I do not believe the benefits of a dairy program should be confined to the minority of our dairymen who, because of a lucky geographical accident, are already benefiting from the higher price provision of Federal milk marketing orders.

I am hopeful that President Johnson's dairy recommendations will be of help to those of us in Congress who are working for a comprehensive dairy program for both manufacturing milk and Federal market order dairymen The Senate-approved class I base excess dairy plan could easily be changed into an overall dairy program by adding my provisions for surplus reduction payments for manufacturing milk producers.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call the attention of my colleagues to the President's views on the necessity for strengthening our cooperatives to enable them to better meet the needs of our rural people.

Our cooperatives have done a magnificent job not only for farmers, but for consumers as well. However, they need to have the right to grow so they can compete on equal terms with the large business concerns that handle their products.

The President recognizes this. He is not asking for special treatment for cooperatives but for equal treatment. The President also recognizes that farmers need additional financial assistance to develop the kinds of cooperatives required to meet present-day needs. A little help along this line will enable farmers to do more things for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the President's proposals strike me as being in the public interest. If we are going to help farmers improve their economic position, we can best do it by helping them strengthen their cooperatives.

I would like to emphasize that cooperatives are the one means by which farmers can help improve their own position. I have observed that the benefits of cooperatives go immediately and directly to those who use them. In fact, I know of no more effective way to assist farmers in working out solutions to their own problems than to provide them with the tools that are available through stronger and more effective cooperatives.

Over the years, cooperatives have demonstrated that they can greatly improve the economic and social conditions of farm people. However, to make their influence better felt in rural areas, they need just the type of assistance called for in the President's message.

The Portuguese Way in Africa—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I brought to the attention of the House, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one of the first eyewitness accounts by an American correspondent of the troubled situation in Angola, Portugal's large province in West Africa.

This series of stories was written by Robert Estabrook, distinguished editorial-page editor of the Washington Post. His accounts were fair and objective estimates of the situation in Angola—a subject about which column upon column of contradiction had been written after the outbreak of violence there in March of 1961.

Today, with troubling reports coming out of Africa from Zanzibar, the Congo, Uganda, and Kenya, and with Portugal, in her frustration with United States policy, reportedly considering the recognition of Red China, the future of Angola must be viewed with renewed concern by the free world.

Our virtual abandonment of Portugal has driven this longtime NATO ally and traditionally stanch foe of communism to the point of threatening recognition of Red China. I know there are other factors influencing this course, but I am sure that what may become a deciding factor is our failure to suport Portugal in the United Nations in the face of bloody, Communist-inspired, terrorism in Angola. Our position, or lack of it, has stemmed, in part at least, from our failure to understand the true situation in this important area of the world—an area which is experiencing a concentration of effort by Moscow, Peiping, and Havana.

In the January issue of Fortune magazine there is a brilliant interpretive report on Angola by Hugh Kay, a widely read editor of the Catholic Herald of London. Mr. Kay was one of the first foreign correspondents to enter Angola after the horrible massacres of March 15, 1961. He returned 2 years later to estimate the progress of the Portuguese multiracial society there. He has observed the Portuguese people closely for many years, and has been one of the few foreign journalists in recent years to interview Antonio Salazar, the reticent prime minister of Portugal.

Mr. Kay's article, "The Portuguese Way in Africa," is preceded by the magazine's own comment on the author and his story.

Recent events in Africa make this subject one that should be of vital concern to every Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because of the length of this fine article, I am inserting it in the RECORD in two installments. Tomorrow I will submit the conclusion.

The article follows:

THE PORTUGUESE WAY IN AFRICA—I

(By Hugh Kay)

"An integrated multiracial society drawing on the moral values of all races and of all peoples"—this, in the words of Foreign Minister Franco Nogueira, is Portugal's aim for its African territories, Angola and Mozambique. And, after four centuries in Africa, it has come far toward this goal, says the British journalist who wrote this article.

In March of 1961 a group calling itself the Union of the Peoples of Angola arose in what it claimed was spontaneous rebellion by Angolan Africans to free themselves from their white oppressors. The author, who visited the area shortly afterward, offers evidence that the group murdered and tortured blacks and whites alike, that it was backed by Communist powers, and that it invaded Angola from Congo headquarters. He warns that similar terrorist tactics may soon again be used.

Since the 1961 troubles, Portuguese authorities have vastly speeded action to reclaim the area through educational and welfare projects, and their attainments have been notable. But the efforts need more sympathy in the U.N. and in Washington. The author believes that successful integration in Angola and Mozambique could be the crucial experiment that might save the world from division along racial lines.

Should Portugal keep its vast African territories? Almost everybody answers "No." But this writer, describing the theory and practice of Portugal's attempt to construct a truly multiracial society, gives an eloquent "Yes."

We live at a stage of history where the world is trying to rediscover its own center. A massive centripetal movement is underway. In religion there is ecumenism. In politics, federations are in fashion. United Europe struggles to free itself from prolonged gestation. There is talk of an ultimate world authority. A new dialog has begun between humanist and scientist, between the two cultures of C. P. Snow. A new social sense has emerged, a sense that we are our brother's keepers after all, that the wealthy nations must know how the other half lives and help it to better standards.

Yet from all this absorbing adventure, this search for a common ground between differ-

ent peoples rooted in a common human nature, there must, it seems, be one exception. The sages seem to agree that the Iberian Peninsula has nothing to contribute to the new quest for unity.

And yet it is in Spain and Portugal that Europe and Africa and Latin America meet in the bonds of history, in the tangle of ethnic roots, and in the interaction of cultures. If ever there were a natural theater for world councils, it is here. But, detached from historical perspective, their political regimes are indicted at the bar of world opinion. When the case for the defense opens, the U.N. delegates start thinking about lunch. For Khrushchev and Castro, Tito and Nasser, there must be fair play. Franco and Salazar need only be written off.

The trouble with this approach is that any attempt to ignore the Iberian Peninsula and its influence throughout the world must involve the West in the gravest risks. In the case of Spain this is being gradually, if reluctantly, recognized by the United States itself. In the case of Portugal there is desperate need for a thoroughgoing reappraisal of policy and what is at stake. Only a few years ago Dr. António de Oliveria Salazar, considered a benevolent dictator of an unimportant country, was seldom in the news. But today Salazar, who has challenged the whole colonial mythos of our times, must be taken seriously. Portugal is not just a poor country making its way by the sale of sardines, olives, cork, wine, and wolfram. It is the master of some of the most fertile and strategic reaches of Africa—the great buffer territories of Angola and Mozambique, lying between the Congo jungle and South Africa. From these territories neither Salazar nor his people have any intention of being swept by artificially fostered winds of change. A wind, they will tell you, may fell a tree; it will not unravel a tangle of intertwining roots. For the Portuguese, the choice is simple. They may be pushed out by invaders; but while they are there they will continue to build the multiracial society they see as their African mission. They cannot be written off.

A RIOT OF HYBRIDS

That Portugal will eventually have to leave Africa is taken for granted in the United Nations, often with tacit U.S. concurrence. Since 1961, when terrorists from the Congo struck at Angola, Portugal has been under fire as the archoppressor of the anticolonial age, while the so-called nationalists now regrouped across the Congo border are viewed as heroic liberators. I shall presently seek to establish that this is nonsense. For the moment, suffice it to say that, despite present threats of renewed invasion, social conditions in Angola have rapidly moved from strength to strength. The International Labor Organization's report in April 1962, noted the freedom of expression enjoyed by white and black alike, gave the labor setup a clean bill of health, and discredited the charges of oppression leveled by the delegation of Ghana to the ILO. In a dramatic generation of economic upsurge, industry has played a substantial part in creating a network of social services. The number of students in schools is now increasing by 15 percent per annum, and in 1963 new universities opened in Luanda and Lourenço Marques. A generation of young and dedicated administrators has taken over, powerfully aided by the Army's "psychosocial services," tasks similar to those performed elsewhere by the U.S. Peace Corps. At long last some reality is emerging from the traditional sense of mission the Iberian peoples have always claimed since the days when the flag and the cross went out with the discovery.

The Portuguese will thunder about their sense of mission to the utter exhaustion of all within earshot. The language at times is glutinous. But until the West faces the plain fact that the Portuguese at least believe in what they say, we shall be wholly unable to influence events toward constructive ends. More than a decade ago Salazar gave form to a centuries-old concept when he declared that the oversea territories' status was that of "Portugal overseas." They are not, he asserted, mere colonies, but extensions of Portuguese oil, whose people have lived there, not for a few decades like the British colonists, but for more than four centuries. They are part of Portugal, and Portugal is part of them.

That is the legal key to Portuguese thinking, and one that unlocks a more significant door. Within this legal structure, Portugal aims at a future of immense hope when compared with South African apartheid on the one hand, or the newly formed African States on the other. It aims to create what Foreign Minister Franco Nogueira has called an integrated multiracial society drawing on the moral values of all races and of all peoples. For him this has nothing to do with mere racial coexistence. He means a community or communities where all ethnic groups are closely integrated, knitted together, with a deep feeling of oneness. "We feel," he went on to say, "that history substantiates this view; nations formed by more than one race have been and are great nations; those nations that close themselves to any racial contacts convey an impression of happiness, but the fact is that no progress has been made, and they become dormant and stagnant communities."

Behind this high-sounding theory is a simple fact. The Portuguese, a riot of hybrids in their own blood, mix easily. Brazil, of course, is the best example of this, but even in Angola and Mozambique one is astonished at the complete absence of color bar. Differences between whites and blacks are economic, and thus often social, but never racial. In the Angolan population of nearly 5 million, there are no more than 5 percent of exclusively Portuguese origin. In Luanda, the capital, some 40 percent of the administration is African or mulatto. There can be no doubt of the genuineness of the attempt to weld a society based not on the color of a man's skin but on personal merit.

NEITHER BLACK NOR WHITE

The Portuguese are substantially Catholic in outlook, despite much laxity and skepticism in practice. At first sight, however, the Portuguese pattern in Africa seems to run counter to the Catholic Church's modern missionary method, the adaptation approach. In this context, adaptation means that you do not seek to impose, say, a European character on non-European peoples, but rather to baptize their indigenous cultures, effecting a marriage between the best those cultures have to offer and the richness of Christian civilization. The resultant is predominantly local in character, though living by universal truths. The Portuguese, on the other hand, has apparently always worked on the basis that, to make the African a Christian, you must turn him into a good little Portuguese. To this end, it seems, he is provided with a heavily slanted education. He learns Portuguese history (to the point, I should think, of crashing boredom). The missionaries must, as far as possible, come from the mother country. And so on.

But in fact the Portuguese theory is more subtle than it seems. You cannot, they argue, compare Africa with India or China, which, long before Christ, had their own philosophies, many of which find loud echoes on the wavelength of the Christian dispensation. Moslem, Jew, and Christian find much in common in their traditions. Affinities can be detected between the Hindu mystics, the writings of Averroës, and the poetry of St. John of the Cross. The mission territories of the East know art forms, theologies, and even a scientific tradition. Hence the idea of adaptation arose easily in the days when Jesuits Matteo Ricci in China and Roberto de Nobili in India got into hot water with their superiors over the use of local rites. Most black (as opposed to brown) Africans, however, were never involved in highly systematized cultures. What they offer for baptism is rather a way of life; certain habits of mind and social orientation arising from the tribal system; a facility for understanding the interplay of nature and supernature; a great, if not always coherent, capacity for God; a potential awaiting cross-fertilization. For a philosophy they have to draw on other continents. Their intuitive perceptions can be rationalized only by an alien intellectual discipline. In the end they must become part, not of a strictly Portuguese society, nor of an African enclave accepting Christianity into its minds, but of a thoroughly integrated interracial community. The Christ they worship must be neither white nor black, but a mulatto.

Because the essential mainspring of this ideal community will be Portuguese, the integrating factor will also be Portuguese, starting with a lingua franca transcending a myriad of tribal boundaries. To the modern liberal this is stark heresy. To the Portuguese it is realism. For him the African must be slowly incorporated into the European ethos, retaining the best of his own tradition and enhancing his European brethren with it, but acquiring a share in a Christian civilization that is, whether you like it or not, Judaeo-Greco-Roman, and hence European. This approach sees Europe not as an imperialist power but as the ideological center comparable to that Rome which the nomadic tribes of the north once sought to conquer—not to destroy but to be part of it; the Rome that transcended and survived the purely political Roman structure. The process must depend, neither on the theories of an imported democracy, which cannot take root as it stands in African soil, nor on Western concepts of nationalism, which mean little as yet to peoples whose basic social unit is the tribe, but on personal merit. It is an integrated man, an individual, that the Portuguese concept cherishes, not an amorphous mass, and not a system. And it is precisely because the Portuguese have dared to introduce this kind of ethical judgment into their political thinking that they have pulled down on their heads the invective and hatred of those who, starting from a mechanical concept of democracy, would, in the words of G. Mennen Williams, leave "Africa for the Africans."

The Portuguese will not settle for that, and if they did the result would be another gaping vacuum in the African Continent. That is the reality that needs to be faced by U.S. and U.N. policymakers alike. In recognizing this reality it is not necessary to believe that Portugal has always lived up to its theories. There have been plenty of exploiting settlers, and much past brutality can be ascribed to malcontents, political exiles, and failures who joined the flow to the oversea provinces. But in the main the worst fault of the Portuguese is paradoxically that he is an easygoing sort of person. The Portuguese enthusiast for reform earns from his compatriots the rebuke of parece mal (bad form), while the exuberant foreigner is seen as a kind of oddity (tem graça). Hence the slow tempo of development. For this temperament it is enough to conceive a noble ideal. Working the detail out in action is something that can take its time. Yet the Portuguese sense of mission is more than sounding brass. Stern critics of Portugal will tell you they once believed that it stood a chance of pulling something off in Africa that nobody else could. I believe, even today, that this still holds good if they can win the race against time, and that recent events have proved it.

U.S. Panama Canal Policy: Why Hold Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, much has been published since the January 9, 1964, outbreak at Panama and much more will be published before the geopolitical conflict now centered on the Panama Canal is resolved.

Soon after the Isthmian violence in which Communist revolutionary agents trained in Cuba and elsewhere participated, Premier Castro showed up in Moscow. After his return to Havana, he denied that the Cuban Government was involved in the Panama Canal violence but did express willingness to give economic aid to Panama. He cannot deny the participation of Communist revolutionary agents trained in Cuba, for some were actually arrested by Panamanian authorities.

An able discussion of the conduct of our policy on the Canal Zone territory and other strategic points, published in an editorial in the January 16, 1964, issue of the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, emphasizes the plot behind the recent Panamanian outbreaks, interprets the significance of Castro's visit to Moscow, and shows the inevitable future results of failure on part of the United States to act: international Communist leaders will continue to advance their program for conquest through making the world peaceful for subversion.

The editorial follows:

WHY HOLD BACK?

The long dalliance with Fidel Castro has at last put the United States in a box. On one front, the economic blockade has just about disintegrated. On another, the Communist military subversion has become blatant, not only in Venezuela, but in Zanzibar and Panama, too. Finally, Castro himself has resumed a leading role in the Communist world; he is patching up his relations with the Kremlin and evidently is taking on new assignments for troublemaking in the Southern Hemisphere.

The economic blockade was the answer to the missile crisis but, of course, it was never complete because the Soviet Union continued major support for the Cuban economy and massive aid in Cuban subversion. We scarcely can object to the English bus deal, because if England had not gone ahead, then West Germany or Spain would have filled the order. In other words, the Western alliance has come to the conclusion that the United States has no real policy on Cuba, or no determination to oppose communism. The English were not being cynical in remarking that "the Americans had a surplus of wheat, and we had a surplus of buses." The epigram provides a realistic comment on the hypocrisy of the U.S. policy on trade with the Communist foe.

Although Cuba's economy is near disaster, Castro has been emboldened by the American paralysis. The Organization of American States has indisputable proof that Castro's agents have smuggled arms and men into Venezuela; but the OAS has been held back by the lack of forcible American support. The Dominican Republic has captured Castro's gunrunners redhanded, but our only response was grudging diplomatic recognition, with no aid or support. An American officer on duty was kidnapped by Castroites, in Caracas, but we didn't exert nearly the effort to get him back that we put out for Frank Sinatra, Jr. The Zanzibar coup was led by well-trained Cubans who spoke no Swahili; and now the Castro virus has been transplanted to an African island, as the News Leader warned editorially on June 27.

But the most provocative incident has been Castro's direct manipulation of the Panama crisis. There would have been no rioting or disorder, if it had not been planned by Castro. Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. Vance has reported that the snipers who were captured were Panamanians trained in Cuba; in fact, they entered Panama only 2 days before the riots began. Since the flag protests by American citizens began well before the first of the year, there can be little doubt that the mob violence was carefully plotted in order to precipitate an international crisis.

But Castro has plotted well in the whole picture. Last November, his position seemed hopeless. The Soviets were fed up with his sheer incompetence in running the country, and they were disposed to dispense with him. As Soviet aid dwindled, Castro began to play off the Chinese against them. When an American Castroite assassinated President Kennedy, and there was no public or diplomatic cry of concern, Castro rightly concluded that America would react to no provocation, however great.

Castro's red-carpet welcome in Moscow means that Khrushchev has decided that Cuba may be an asset after all. It means that the Soviet policy of making the world peaceful for subversion will move forward rapidly. When the United States will not act, and the OAS will not act, then there is no reason for the leaders of world communism to hold back. If our allies come to this conclusion, can Khrushchev be far behind?

"Dear John" Letters From Insurance Companies Make People Turn to Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, support for hospital insurance under social security comes from many people who have had the experience of losing their accident and health insurance either because their insurance company cancelled them out or because they could no longer afford to pay the high premiums.

The other day I received a very touching letter from a citizen of my district—Minneapolis, Minn. He enclosed the "Dear John" letter that he had received from his insurance company cancelling him out. I have deleted his name and address and his insurance policy number, but am presenting the entire letter just as he received it:

THE NORTH AMERICAN CO.,
FOR LIFE, ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE,

January 17, 1964.

During the past several years North American has been privileged to serve your hospital and surgical insurance needs.

The policy you now hold contains a certain provision of age qualification. Our records indicate that you have now reached the age of termination and we will be unable to accept any further premiums for the above policy.

It has been a pleasure to have been of service to you during the time you were insured under this policy.

Yours very truly,

Miss H. SMOCK,
Supervisor of Health Policyholders' Service.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent made these comments about the letter from the insurance company canceling his insurance:

The enclosed letter speaks for itself. How many of the older folks get letters like this. I have had this policy for over 40 years and have used it very little. I was perhaps one of the first few to take out a policy of this kind. Let's go all out for hospitalization through social security.

FHA and VA Housing Foreclosures Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of January 27 carried a lengthy article detailing the fact that the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration are taking over an increasing number of houses as lenders more often find it necessary to foreclose. This is a warning sign of the economy and in order to focus greater attention on it, I am inserting the Journal article in the RECORD:

FHA, VA PUSH EFFORT TO REDUCE THEIR GLUT OF FORECLOSED HOMES—DEFAULTS ON MORTGAGES SADDLE AGENCIES WITH 120,000 UNITS; ADS, EASIER CREDIT LIFT SALES

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—The Government is striving with some success to get rid of thousands of homes it is acquiring each month as more owners default on their mortgages.

Under their mortgage-insuring programs, both the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration are taking over an increasing number of houses as lenders more often find it necessary to foreclose. The FHA is the owner or mortgage holder of around 100,000 houses and apartment units, and the VA has almost 20,000 on its hands.

The situation is arousing concern in Congress, as it has among real estate men. Today Democratic Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama, is to start 2 days of hearings by his Senate housing subcommittee to determine if new legislation is needed or if fresh administrative efforts would help turn the tide.

Housing officials don't expect any major improvement this year in the high foreclosure rate. But sales of the dwellings taken over are picking up as the Government engages in flashier advertising and becomes a bit less fussy about the credit potential of new buyers. Officials are renting out more houses they can't sell very quickly and destroying some they've lost all hope of ever selling. Private lenders are being urged not to foreclose too quickly and to lighten the FHA's financial load by making loans to new buyers after a foreclosure.

In its budget for the fiscal year starting next July the FHA estimates it will sell 47,790 units, up from 35,242 this fiscal year and 23,587 the previous one. In the last few months the gap between its takeovers and sales of single-family homes alone has narrowed to around 600 a month from 1,000 earlier. The apartment houses sell more slowly because of the complexities of the deals and because many of them simply aren't nearly as attractive to investors or tenants as when they were built soon after World War II, the agency says.

AN UPHILL BATTLE

Still, the FHA is fighting an uphill battle. It took over 42,242 houses and apartment units in the last fiscal year. It figures on an increase to 51,746 in the current year, and to 52,977 in the next fiscal year. By mid-1965, the agency expects to be managing an inventory of 120,845 units, up from 115,658 this coming June 30 and 99,154 a year earlier. (In most instances the FHA becomes the owner of a house after paying off the lender in 20-year debentures he can sell for ready cash if he wants. In some cases, it's letting the original occupants remain by taking over the mortgage rather than the property, a method frequently used with apartments.)

The VA which, a spokesman emphasizes, "wants to get out of the real estate business," has already reached the turning point. Its inventory of houses jumped from about 8,000 at the end of 1960 to nearly 26,000 a year ago but now has shrunk to around 19,400. In the last 6 months local real estate brokers have sold $162 million worth of its houses, the agency says. While VA planners are braced for foreclosures to "continue high," they're budgeting for their loan guarantee program to produce net receipts of $63 million in fiscal 1965 after a $10 million net outflow this year.

It's clear that foreclosures are much more common on houses sold with Government-backed mortgages than on others. During the 12 months ended last September 30, savings and loan associations foreclosed on 12.4 of every 1,000 FHA mortgages they held, the Federal Home Loan Bank board reports. The figure was 7.7 for VA loans and only 4.1 for conventional, non-Government-backed ones. This is only natural, contends FHA Commissioner Philip Brownstein, since the FHA "is in the insurance business to take risks." The idea is that FHA insurance induces lenders to broaden homeownership by making some loans they would otherwise consider too risky.

NO CAUSE FOR ALARM

The agency is certainly concerned about the roughly threefold jump in the default rate on its mortgages in the last 6 or 7 years, Mr. Brownstein says. But he asserts there is "no cause to be alarmed." The FHA was "abnormally" fortunate in most of the post-World War II period, he reasons, becausse pentup demand kept prices of houses going up even as they aged; a homeowner in financial trouble could usually sell at a profit and pay off the mortgage. "This is no longer the case," says Mr. Brownstein.

Foreclosures are touched off primarily by local overbuilding of houses and special circumstances such as illness, long unemployment, and shutdown of a major factory or military base that harms a whole community's economy, officials say. Those who bought houses with the lower downpayments possible under Government programs are more vulnerable to such a setback than those who have a bigger equity in their home, an FHA man concedes. But he argues that there's no evidence they are any less eager to keep their homes and that the benefits to the great bulk of successful borrowers and to the Nation's economy outweigh the risks. The FHA's basic program allows a 3-percent downpayment on the first $15,000 value of a house.

Despite their zeal to sell, FHA men figure the obvious avenue of slashing prices isn't open to them. The Government can't unload houses "as firesale merchandise, because this would be extremely disruptive to the local real estate market," Mr. Brownstein says.

Many FHA houses are tough to sell, anyway, because they're in a glutted local market. One such area is Florida, where 9,000 of the FHA's 50,000 single-family homes are located (see story above). Tailoring its effort to the situation, the Agency went beyond the fine print of local classified columns and burst forth with splashy ads in Detroit, Cleveland, and Boston newspapers to lure northerners to the cozy warmth of a foreclosed Florida home. The ads and ensuing publicity have attracted several thousand inquiries in recent weeks, and the Agency plans to pour more sales personnel into the State. Florida, Texas, Louisiana, and Michigan together account for half the FHA's inventory of individual homes.

Its own finickiness about the credit of prospective buyers may have prevented some sales, the FHA believes. So it has reminded field offices by letter that in making the credit review "consideration should be given to the fact that we want to accelerate the sale of acquired properties." It advises that borderline cases will generally be resolved by approving the credit of a purchaser instead of disapproving, especially where the sales problem has been particularly tough.

To ease its workload and increase its income, the FHA is trying to interest more private lenders in providing the mortgages for new buyers of its houses. Usually the FHA extends the credit itself and gets repaid over 30 years or so. But if a private source makes the loan, the FHA gets paid off in one quick chunk. With substantial help from this practice, just getting started nationally in the last few months, budget makers figure FHA will produce net income of $173 million in the next fiscal year, after a $57 million drain this year. To encourage this new approach, the FHA offers to pay the lender's fee and other closing costs.

Officials are tempted to whittle down the inventory list by physically destroying some of the more hopeless houses. Already being demolished, in fact, are about 160 houses built in the early 1950's in Blackville and Williston, S.C., to house employees at the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River plant; instead, they were rented temporarily by construction workers. The modest frame houses, originally worth about $7,000 each, never attracted many regular employees of the plant, and most have been vacant and exposed to vandalism for years.

Field offices are being encouraged to find renters for houses when sales prospects are remote. This keeps them in much better condition than when they stand empty and provides revenue to the FHA to at least offset its maintenance and local property tax outlays. About 5,100 houses are rented now, some 1,800 more than last June.

The FHA is preparing to stave off new foreclosures that could follow planned closings of military bases. The agency already has men studying the possible housing difficulties that might result, and it quickly sent a team to South Bend, Ind., where the Studebaker Corp.'s halt to domestic auto output is ending many jobs. Trying to encourage mortgage holders there to be lenient FHA promised them it would approve any forebearance arrangements they might work out with the homeowners.

Generally, forbearance means the lender agrees to postponed or reduced payments during a time of temporary hardship for the borrowers, with the homeowner pledging to make up the difference later. Lenders might be more willing to do this if the FHA could reimburse them for interest missed during their voluntary forbearance when foreclosure results anyway, officials figure, and they are considering asking Congress for authority to do this. Too often, some Government housing men figure, lenders start foreclosing more or less automatically when data-processing machines tell them a certain number of payments have been missed.

Happy Birthday Bronx County!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month Bronx County was established—the last of New York City's five boroughs to become a county. It is with pride that I join my fellow citizens of the Bronx as we celebrate our county's 50th birthday. I was born in the Bronx 5 years before it became a county and have lived there since—a witness to its many changes, growth, and progress.

In 1914, the Bronx had a population of 600,000; today we are a heterogeneous population of 1,425,000. We have 2,081 manufacturing plants, employing 53,900 people, and turning out $362 million worth of products which include furniture, paper goods, hardware, glassware, plastics, upholstery, paints, varnishes, rotary presses, and electrical equipment. We have a borough of many fine homes and large apartment buildings, hospitals, churches and synagogues. We have an abundance of schools of higher learning, and we can boast that the Bronx is the home of Yankee Stadium, the famous Bronx Zoo, the unsurpassed New York Botanical Gardens, and the New York University Hall of Fame. Orchard Beach, which attracts up to 100,000 on a summer weekend, our large boating center at City Island, and our spacious and beautiful parks all add to the joy of living in the Bronx.

It is easy to see why the Bronx is often called the Borough of Colleges, for we have Fordham University, Yeshiva University's Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Manhattan College, Hunter College, the Bronx Community College, the College of Mount St. Vincent, and New York University's School of Engineering and Science and College of Arts and Sciences. We have such outstanding secondary schools as the Bronx High School of Science, well known throughout the country for its many young students who win honors in science.

The county's area of 42 square miles has 80 miles of frontage on the Hudson, Harlem, and East Rivers and Long Island Sound, and yet it is the only part of New York City that is on the mainland of the United States.

Bronx County was created by an act of the New York Legislature in 1912, which provided for a referendum to the people of the locality as to whether they wished to separate from New York County. The vote in the general election was overwhelmingly in favor of separation; the bill became law and the

new county came into existence. The first county officers were chosen in the first general election of 1913, and they took office and the county government started to function on January 1, 1914. The territory originally was part of Westchester County. It was separated from Westchester and attached to New York County by two separate acts. One passed in 1874 attached that part of what was west of the Bronx River to New York County; and in 1894 that part east of the Bronx River was attached to New York County. Under the Greater New York Charter of 1898 the Borough of the Bronx was constituted, consisting of the territory included in the two annexations, but the Bronx did not become a separate county with its own courts and county officials until 1914.

The territory remained rural for many years and was mainly a farmland until about the turn of the present century. The settlements were in the form of villages, such as Morrisania, West Farms, Fordham, Highbridge, Riverdale, Westchester Village, and Tremont.

After the new county was created, the area had a tremendous growth, mainly in the period from 1914 to the midforties. Shortly after World War I, the greatest building boom of all times took place, and areas which were rural were turned into rows of apartment houses. Many of us remember when our Grand Boulevard and Concourse, recognized as one of the most beautiful thoroughfares in the United States, had only one or two apartment buildings before World War I, and 10 years later the whole Concourse was built up solidly.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I want to speak briefly about the early history of the Bronx, which produced its share of famous early Americans. Its first white settler, Jonas Bronck, from whom the borough got its name, arrived from Holland in 1641. The south end of what is now the Bronx—a tract of about 500 acres—was granted to him by the Dutch colonial governors. The land was between the Harlem and the Aquahung Rivers. The Aquahung later became the Broncks River; it was shortened to "Bronx," and eventually the whole area became known as the Bronx. Jonas Bronck built a house opposite Harlem, which was on the Manhattan side of the Harlem River, and rented farmland to various tenants. After his death, the property was conveyed to Governor Morris, the first of this large West Indies family to come to the Colonies, and the territory later became known as Morrisania. The Morris family was the most prominent family in the territory. In addition to being one of New York's first Governors, descendents included a signer of the Declaration of Independence and a member of the Constitutional Convention. Lewis Morris, who signed the Declaration of Independence, went before the U.S. Congress, meeting in New York in 1790, and urged that the Bronx be the location of our Nation's Capital.

During the Revolutionary War a small but important battle was fought in the Pelham Parkway area of the Bronx. It is sometimes referred to as the Battle of Pell's Point and it proved to be a significant turning point of the war for the patriots. A large force of the British under Howe, and Hessians under his command, attempted to land behind Washington's army stationed on the northern heights of Manhattan Island after its retreat from Long Island. If Howe's maneuver had succeeded, Washington's army would have been overwhelmed, but this small detachment of soldiers, mainly fishermen from Marblehead, Mass., fought a delaying action which held the British and Hessians for 2 days. This gave Washington time to regroup for the victories that followed.

The Bronx is known as the birthplace of freedom of the press. The trial of John Peter Zenger in 1735 arose out of an incident when one of the Morris family, then a judge, decided in an action brought before him, that Governor Cosby was not entitled to his salary as Colonial Governor from the date he left England, but only from the time he arrived in the Colonies For making this decision, Morris was removed from office and he then ran for the colonial assembly. Cosby tried by many political maneuvers to have him defeated. Included was the edict preventing the Quakers from voting and many arbitrary rules which Zenger attacked in his journal, the New York Weekly. The election was held in Eastchester Village in what is now the Bronx, and when Morris was elected, Zenger was imprisoned and charged with criminal libel. From this trial, resulted the great American precept of freedom of the press.

And so, Mr. Speaker—although the architects of the new Nation chose this beautiful location on the Potomac River for the National Capital, rather than an equally beautiful location overlooking the Harlem River—nevertheless we are very proud of the part that our Bronx played in the making of our great Nation.

We look back with pride all the way to the beginning of the Bronx's history, but this year we reflect especially on its progress and achievements of the last 50 years, as we say "Happy Birthday Bronx County," and look forward to building an even better borough in the future.

The Donkey Looked Too Self-Righteous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter written to the editor of the Long Island Daily Press on January 6, 1964.

I think this has been done with a great deal of thought and while I do not know the individual, I would like to express my appreciation for an excellent analysis and a job well done.

The letter follows:

[From the Long Island Press, Jan. 6, 1964]

THE DONKEY LOOKED TOO SELF-RIGHTEOUS

In the hope that I am not sounding too presumptuous, may I say that I think there is just a little need for clarification of Al Liederman's editorial cartoon entitled "Victory for Freedom." In it we see a very self-righteous looking donkey sauntering away, foreign aid bill in hand, from a badly beat up and bewildered elephant.

Come now, gentlemen, I have to confess that even after giving the subject a good bit of thought, I cannot possibly imagine how President Johnson's newly delegated power to lend American credit in wheat trade with the Communist world is a victory for freedom. If I have misunderstood the intent here, and the foreign aid appropriation itself is this victory, then I apologize. But that would imply that the Republican Party is carrying out an organized and open campaign to curtail foreign aid, a statement indeed contrary to fact.

Perhaps it is too late during this particular political round, the warnings of a whole chorus of economic experts (non-Harvardian) and Iron Curtain refugees, that trading with the Communist world has virtually saved it from economic collapse. This contention may be suspected but not proven, granted. However, by the same token, I cannot believe that the slight benefit the United States would gain in ridding itself of its excess wheat would offset the disadvantages of one, strengthening the Communist economic system by supplying them with these articles (the lack of which tends to dramatize the economic inferiority of their system and ours) and, secondly, weakens our own currency through this condoning of granting them credit.

Lastly, this business about "taming Congress," as was stated in your editorial, deserves mention. Is this not precisely what Hitler did to the Reichstag? One of the sources of strength of the American system of government is its division of power into three separate functions. Would Johnson's failure to harness Congress and to make it the puppet of his personal political whims present the image of a weak Presidency or a weak and indecisive America? In the past, it has not.

I submit, with all due respect, that this kind of talk of "freedom" (and at best it is not freedom; it is expediency) is simply a masterpiece of Orwellian "double think." It is maliciously partisan and a very cheap brand of politics, one which does not very well conform to the image called for by the all too common and "sincere" pleas for mutual unity and understanding we hear in this alleged hour of national introspection.

MYRON A. SMITH.

EAST NORTHPORT.

Behind Big Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke is one of the outstanding military men of our generation. Although retired last year he is still keenly interested in development and maintenance of our defense program. General Clarke has had a vital hand in developing our present concept of mechanized warfare. He commanded Fort Hood, the

focal point of military training. He has commanded our forces in Europe and he commanded the Continental Army of the United States.

The January issue of Army magazine printed an article which I think will be of interest to everyone who is interested in getting maximum defense at minimum cost:

BEHIND BIG LIFT

(NOTE.—The former Commander in Chief, U.S. Army, Europe, tells us about how it all began in 1961 and adds a few cautionary words about its meaning and future.)

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke)

During the Berlin crisis of 1961 I took every opportunity to balance the U.S. Army in Europe tactically and logistically. I first asked for and obtained about a 45,000-man increase. About half of the increase was in logistics units, but some were in tactical units such as the 3d Cavalry Regiment. The latter was needed to provide a measure of rear area security west of the Rhine River. This need still exists. The remainder of the increase served two purposes: First, to replace the so-called "line deletions" in units which had gone on for many years. In fact, during the time I commanded the Seventh Army, 1956-58, it lost about 12,000 spaces causing us to make many "line deletions" in T.O. & E.'s. Secondly, more men were needed to mechanize the 3d, 8th, and 24th Infantry Divisions.

These augmentations increased the U.S. Army, Europe, to over 250,000, its all-time peak. It was balanced both tactically and logistically. It had adequate tactical and logistical mobility. It had offensive and defensive capabilities. It could give a large measure of support to our allies in critical areas. It was capable of sustained combat. It was capable of sustaining a conventional or a nuclear attack by the Soviets without being destroyed. It was capable of receiving and supporting at least two reenforcing divisions.

As the crisis wore on there were considerations for further reenforcing the U.S. Army, Europe. These generally involved another corps (III) of two divisions: The 2d Armored and the 4th Infantry Divisions.

The moving of two more divisions to Europe would have caused problems in location, housing, training areas, and disposition. There was no surplus troop housing space in Germany. The training areas were crowded. It would take several weeks to move the equipment for two divisions to Europe since most of it would have to come by surface lift. Also, as soon as such a possibility became known in allied circles there were strong bids to put the new corps in the NORTHAG area. This concept I strongly resisted for many reasons. Also, if they had been actually sent to Europe, returning them later would have created a political problem.

During the discussions attending these tentative plans, the thought was advanced that if we had the equipment for the two extra divisions positioned in Germany, the troops could be flown over and married up with their equipment in a relatively short time. I do not recall who originated the thought but I give credit to Gen. Lauris Norstad, CINCEUR, because he adopted it and got it approved on the Washington level. It was then implemented with little delay as a priority project.

Once approved, our problem was to implement it in Europe as the equipment arrived or as it was taken from the communications zone depots. The job was given to the 7th Army, who in turn, placed Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Adams of the 7th Army Support Command in charge.

The USAREUR directive was that the equipment had to be all placed west of the Rhine River with the 2d Armored Division's equipment mostly in Germany and as far west of the Rhine as we could find space for it. The reason for this was to insure that the personnel would have the time and space to arrive and marry-up with their equipment in case of an emergency.

I insisted it had to be placed in tactical unit packages for quick issue; it also had to be capable of being dispersed quickly by tactical units to cut down the peacetime heavy equipment concentrations; in case of a tense situation these undoubtedly would become Soviet targets.

EARLY TESTS OF BIG LIFT

We insisted also that personnel from the parent divisions be assigned to look after and maintain the equipment. I believed they would be better motivated to do a good job of maintenance and to keep a high state of readiness for their own people than would a detail from the 7th Army.

Soon after the equipment was pre-positioned, we started to test our ability to bring over units to marry up with their equipment. Several groups of less than division strength from the 4th Infantry Division were flown from Fort Lewis, Wash., in what was known as the Long Thrust exercises. They were all successful and taught both Army and Air Force participants much.

By the time I retired as commander in chief, USAREUR, May 1, 1962, the flying over of all or a portion of the 2d Armored Division as one of the Long Thrust exercises was being considered. I am happy to see that operation Big Lift was finally played and was so successful.

Operation Big Lift is now history. It was a fine, valuable operation from which much training value was derived. It showed that the Army's efforts over the years to get the Air Force to increase its troop airlift capabilities had paid off. The question now is: Would we have had enough airlift for Big Lift in case it had taken place during a real emergency when there were many other demands for airlift?

I am sure it heartened the people of Western Europe to know that we can augment the U.S. 7th Army with two divisions in a hurry. hurry.

ELEMENTS OF LONG-DISTANCE TROOP REENFORCEMENT

However, before we consider this technique to be the answer to all our military efforts worldwide, we should understand certain basic factors that are involved in such an operation and are also involved in our military position in Western Europe.

The equipment for two divisions was positioned in Europe 2 years ago and has been maintained there since in a high readiness state.

It was moved there by surface lift over a period of several weeks.

Exercise Big Lift flew far less than 5 percent of the total tonnage needed for combat readiness of the 2d Armored Division.

Adequate secure landing fields for large jets are needed in the marry-up area.

The equipment, parked in large concentrations in Germany because of peacetime real estate conditions, would be a lucrative target to an enemy making a surprise attack.

The marry-up area must have sufficient frontal protection on the ground to protect the marrying-up operations. It would need air cover as well.

This quick reenforcing technique requires two basic major national level and timely decisions for each proposed area of employment: First, to pre-position the proper equipment well in advance and at the proper time; second, to move the troops at the proper time to marry-up with their equipment.

It will be some time before NATO nations who live where they can be overrun quickly by existing Soviet ground troops will have confidence in this reenforcing technique for their basic protection. They will accept it for reenforcing purposes, however.

The level of U.S. troop strength in Germany cannot be substantially pared down without great apprehension on the part of the people of Western Europe.

In considering the level of U.S. Army strength that should be maintained in Western Europe and to insure that the United States is adequately represented in the NATO organization, there are several factors that apply. It must basically be strong enough to insure that the 7th U.S. Army cannot be quickly destroyed by a surprise attack. It is now the backbone of the NATO ground command; to reduce it is to reduce the U.S. position in Europe and might cause a move to replace the next SACEUR commander, who is now an American, with another nationality.

INACCURATE BOOKKEEPING

It may prove awkward later to claim that the troops we have now in Germany to be the equivalent of six divisions as has recently been done. This type of inaccurate military bookkeeping can be practiced by our allies also, to the disadvantage of NATO. The U.S. troops in Berlin, Italy, and France have special missions. What we have in Germany now is a balanced five-division force tailored for the military conditions we are likely to face there.

Equipment positioned over a long period presents problems due to deterioration, pilferage, and obsolescence whereby troops in the United States who are to marry-up are being trained on other equipment. It is most desirable that positioned equipment be of the same quality and type as that in the hands of operation units in the area. Rearranging due to changes in organizations, maintenance and cost of extra divisional slices of equipment are also problems.

Preposition of equipment alone is not enough. There must be at hand when the troops arrive basic loads of rations, POL, ammunition, spare parts, maps, SOP's, and SOI's, as well as preliminary disposition plans.

However, if we are to move rapidly overseas an armored or mechanized force of the Army against a sizable, relatively modern enemy threat, we have few alternatives but to preposition equipment.

All of the factors listed were apparent to us in 1961. In spite of them I was strongly in favor of the prepositioning of the equipment for two divisions in Germany at that time. I have not changed my mind since. Exercise Big Lift has added to my conviction that it was a sound move. However, Germany is a special case. To use this technique elsewhere requires a special estimate of the situation and special arrangements to fit the case.

Mr. Lynn Townsend Speaks Out on Discrimination in Hiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 22, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities convened for a 2-day meeting here in Washington.

At a dinner that evening, Mr. Lynn A. Townsend, Chrysler Corp. president, was the keynote speaker.

Because of the timeliness of the subject matter, I am inserting the complete text of the speech made by Mr. Townsend at this "annual plans for progress" seminar. I feel that the Members of this honorable body will benefit from reading his excellent remarks made that evening.

The text of Mr. Townsend's speech follows:

REMARKS BY LYNN A. TOWNSEND, PRESIDENT, CHRYSLER CORP.

It is a great honor to be invited to meet here tonight with people who have a common interest in the plans-for-progress program. I think we all agree that this program is a sensible and constructive approach to an extremely difficult problem.

And this meeting is bound to be helpful to all of us, whether we are businessmen or Government officials, as a way of exchanging views on the objectives of the program and on ways of reaching those objectives.

Getting together like this, in a friendly and informal atmosphere, to talk about our common problems is bound to help in reducing the friction that tends to develop in contacts between Washington and the business community.

Without frequent contact and communication it is altogether too easy for businessmen and Government officials to develop stereotyped ideas about one another's ways of thinking. And these stereotypes aren't always too flattering to either of us.

One thing is certain. Everyone here tonight—whether he lives and works in Washington or Detroit or Los Angeles—finds his own fortunes and his own potential for useful activity affected and limited by the size of a budget. This we all have in common.

And another thing is certain. The size of your budget and my budget and everyone else's budget is affected very strongly and directly by the size of Luther Hodges' very good friend, the gross national product.

And if we can't agree on anything else, I'm sure we can all agree enthusiastically in wanting to see the gross national product grow steadily—year after year—provided that growth is not accompanied by inflation.

How the gross national product is divided between Government and business and other sectors of the economy will continue to be decided in the usual way—through the healthy tensions and the deliberative procedures of our representative democracy.

And I can only say that it is very reassuring indeed to us in the business sector to hear of the administration's intention to get the most out of every tax dollar and to restrain the natural inborn tendency of Government budgets—a tendency they have in common with all other budgets—to expand.

And along with this dedication to efficiency and economy in Government there is a clear indication of desire in Washington to give greater encouragement to the private sector of the national economy.

CONSENSUS ON TAX REDUCTION

Nothing that has happened in many years is more encouraging to business than the strong consensus that has been developing for some time now concerning the need for reductions in Federal income taxes so as to encourage spending and investment by consumers and businessmen. And the sooner the tax bill gets enacted into law the better we are going to like it.

We think it will provide a powerful stimulus for the entire economy. We think it will encourage companies and individuals to take the very substantial risks that go with investment in new and untried products.

This in turn will improve the country's chances of making something like the progress it should be making in translating the scientific and technological gains of our time into faster economic growth, a more satisfying life for our people, and above all, more and better employment opportunities.

From the standpoint of government people, not only those here in Washington, but those who conduct the affairs of State and local governments, the great potential benefist of the tax bill is the broadening and deepening of the base of income which provides tax revenues.

We all know that the needs of government, particularly in the field of education, are going to increase in the years immediately ahead.

And in my opinion, the soundest way to provide the revenues for the expanding needs of education in this technological age is to make sure we in business and you in government do everything possible to expand the economy.

The tax bill is the most important encouragement to private investment—the greatest single stimulant to the business imagination—that any of us have seen in many years. And I might say that with the tax bill enacted into law, the businessman will be presented with a challenge to perform as he has never performed before.

That doesn't scare us a bit. We like it. And we have every reason to believe that with the added stimulus of tax reductions we will be in a position to sustain and increase the momentum that the private economy has developed over the past 2 years.

NEW PRODUCTS NEEDED

There has been a tendency for some Americans to think of our economy as having reached the top of the grade—with nothing ahead except an easy run.

The truth is we have a long, long way to go before we run out of new products to invent and develop—old products and processes to improve—and new markets to open up.

And, as a matter of fact, our country needs more of nearly all the goods and services we are now producing. With the accelerating growth that can result from a fully energized free economy, we can support without undue strain an ever-improving system of private and public education.

What we need is the combination of full-throttle private investment in research and development of new products and social investment in the education that provides trained minds to generate new ideas.

The kind of dynamic growth that will result from that combination is fundamental to the subject we are here to discuss tonight. We are talking about equality of opportunity for all of our people—regardless of their race, creed, or national origin.

But unless an adequate number of job opportunities are provided as the result of vigorous growth in the private sector of our economy, the phrase "equality of opportunity" could have a very hollow ring.

During the past year the American people moved a long way ahead in their understanding and appreciation of the kind of constructive interplay between Government and business the country needs in order to realize more fully its great economic potential.

This was one of the gains that helped to take just a little of the bitterness out of the memory of a year that was so full of tragedy and disappointment. Another thing that helped us over a difficult period was the poise with which our country came through the period following November 22 and the way our Government accomplished the transfer of power to a new President.

This strong and dignified transition built worldwide respect for the stability and continuity of our free institutions.

THAW IN COLD WAR

There were other gains during 1963: On the international scene we experienced what seemed to be the start of a thaw in the cold war. In the perspective of another 10 years we may look back upon the test ban treaty, for example, as having been the first clear tipoff to the willingness of the Russians to permit some relaxation of international tensions.

Certainly we now have considerably stronger reasons for hoping that the world will be able to devote more of its attention and resources to peaceful and humanitarian activities—though in these matters we must, of course, continue to temper our optimism with caution.

There was another gain of an entirely different kind—and in the long run it may be the most important of all. It is a gain of a type that is too intangible, too much a matter of heart and mind and spirit, to be subject to conclusive proof by the citation of concrete evidence. And when I present my thoughts on this matter for your consideration I am simply going to have to ask you to consult your own reactions and intuitions and then decide whether or not you agree with me, and to what extent you agree.

In my opinion the year 1963 may come in future years to be looked back upon as something of a turning point in the spiritual life of the American people. I believe it will be seen as a year in which we made definite progress in appreciating the humane values our country stands for.

Even more important than that, I believe 1963 will be remembered as a year in which the inner meaning of the Judeo-Christian religious tradition upon which our country is based began to have a deeper and more vital worth to our people.

I may be wrong—and it is easy to be wrong about these things—but it seems to me that in recent weeks there has been a definite improvement in the willingness of people to try to understand the cause of others and to try to be just a little more fair.

In other words there has been a real gain in tolerance. It is easily possible that in the months ahead—even considering the fact that this is an election year—there will be a somewhat greater tendency to reason together and less of a tendency for people to assume virtue and right thinking for themselves and sin and wrong thinking for others. Let's hope so.

One reason for this intangible but very real change in attitude is that we have all been reminded, more forcefully and more brutally than we would have chosen to be reminded, of the frailty and brevity of human life.

And one sure result of this reminder—whatever our own personal creed may be—is to become just a little more humble, and a little more serious about the values we subscribe to.

And another result is to make us a little kinder in the way we deal with others. The old familiar saying that we pass this way but once has suddenly taken on a new and fresh meaning.

Life is short, and it is surely better to spend our years trying to live and work effectively with others and trying to understand the beliefs and feelings and motivations of others, than to close off our minds, coddle our own prejudices, and enjoy our own inflexible and unchanging personal likes and dislikes on through to the end of our brief stay on earth.

CHANGED ATTITUDE TOWARD NEGROES

Nothing indicates more clearly the change of mind and heart that has taken place here in America than the change in attitude toward the Negro. Here I want to avoid looking too hard for the silver lining and arriving at an overly optimistic conclusion on the basis of what amounts as yet only to a modest start in the right direction. But I do feel strongly that a change has taken place—or perhaps it would be better to say a change is taking place.

In my own discussions with others on this subject, I find that people no longer talk about whether or not the lot of the Negro needs improving.

They don't talk about whether or not something should be done to give him and his children the opportunities for self-improvement open to people of other races. They don't talk about whether or not the Negro deserves the rights inherent in being a citizen of the United States.

What people are more likely to talk about today is how the lot of the Negro can be improved—what can be done to give him greater encouragement to take advantage of his opportunities—and when or how soon we can free our country of the burden of prejudice that has handicapped the Negro, put a brake on our economy, and for altogether too long placed a crippling load of guilt upon the conscience of the Nation.

If it is true—as I believe it is—that we as a people have made a small but immensely important step forward in the direction of greater compassion and toward realizing the brotherhood that should be the proudest achievement of American civilization, the task now is to be as practical as possible about moving toward an even fuller realization.

And to be even more specific, our task is to do what we can to help the Negro—as well as every other American, regardless of his race or creed or national origin—experience a full measure of dignity as a participating, first-class citizen.

As a businessman, I believe one of the most practical steps taken toward that end is the plans-for-progress program.

As we all know, this program was undertaken about 2½ years ago in an effort to provide leadership and encouragement to private business organizations in searching out members of minority groups qualified for job openings. From its beginning this program has been pushed with characteristic energy by the man who is now President of the United States.

And as of the first of January 1964, more than a hundred American companies had signed agreements concerning equal employment opportunities as part of the program.

It is well to remember, when we use the words "minority group," that it includes many others besides Negroes. Prejudice is directed at different groups in different parts of the country.

It is directed at Puerto Ricans in New York—at Cubans in Flordia—at Mexicans in Los Angeles—and it is the same evil with the same destructive consequences wherever it is found.

LYNDON JOHNSON'S VIEWS

We at Chrysler believe with the President that the plans-for-progress program is a start in the direction of providing equality of opportunity for all Americans in their search for employment—a start toward the time when no qualified man will be barred from any job because of the color of his skin, the way in which he worships God, or the part of the world where he was born.

We believe as he does that the only way to make sound progress in that direction is to make sure that the member of the minority group seeking employment or seeking promotion to a better job is judged strictly on the basis of his qualifications.

And this means that an employer should be just as careful to avoid placing people in jobs for which they are unqualified as he is careful to give genuinely qualified people full and equal consideration.

We believe with him that the program must rely upon the voluntary efforts of private employers who participate in the program because they are convinced it is in their own best interests as well as the best interests of the country.

In the President's own words, "the problem will not be solved by a police agency waving a nightstick at Americans. The solution demands openhearted discussion and a united resolve to action."

And finally, we believe that all other arguments for the program are secondary to the simple, elementary proposition that, again in the President's words, "treating people alike—as we would have them treat us—is the right thing to do."

INCENTIVE FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT

One thing that impresses me about the Plans for Progress program is the way it generates incentive for self-improvement. Those who see their friends getting good jobs because they have worked hard to qualify themselves for good jobs are more inclined to prepare themselves for similar opportunities.

It may well be that this encouragement toward self-improvement is the most important contribution of the Plans for Progress program to the improvement of opportunity for Negroes and other minority groups.

To make further progress toward the goal of realizing full equality of opportunity, our country is going to need a united effort.

Government is going to have to continue to provide the ground rules, the guidelines, the leadership, and the encouragement that will keep the whole program moving forward with confidence and direction.

Employers are going to have to continue working at the task of making their own sector of the national economy grow so as to provide an increasing number of employment opportunities—and at the same time provide leadership to their own organizations for the purpose of keeping the doors of opportunity opened wide for all qualified applicants.

And the employees or prospective employees themselves—even those who until now have been too discouraged to try—are going to have to do what they can as individuals to qualify themselves for jobs or to improve themselves so as to be ready for job advancement.

Success in this effort will not be the result of some big impersonal force, some tide or current of history.

It will result from the contributions of individual men—in government, in business, and in the ranks of those employed or those seeking employment. And those contributions, in turn, will be the result of motivations that arise in the minds and hearts of those individual men.

In the end it is the quality of the spiritual life of the individual that moves the world. It is his self-respect along his compassion for others—his ability to look with faith beyond the discouragements of today—and his willingness to put to best use the talents he has been given—it is these things that create the gains, however small, that we frail and fallible human beings somehow manage to make year after year.

And it is our responsibility to do what we can as individuals to make further gains in the years ahead.

Food for Peace—Direct Public Participation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive aspects of our food-for-peace program is that in which the American people have direct participation. It is handled by CARE, the Catholic Relief Fund, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and 16 other nonprofit volunteer agencies.

This people-to-people phase of food for peace is described in a picture story of the program made available to newspapers and magazines, in response to their requests, by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The report on the food-for-peace program also is informative in outlining the roles played by the Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development and the Director of Food for Peace, as well as in explaining the four titles of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit the text of this picture story:

FOOD FOR PEACE—FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Against a backdrop of hunger in much of the world, the food for peace program stands as a symbol of the generosity of American people—a tribute to a free people giving freely of their abundance.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, provides for Food for Peace shipments to friendly foreign nations. Export programs of various kinds are authorized in Public Law 480's four main sections, or titles. Title I provides for sales for foreign currencies. Title II: Emergency Relief and Economic Development. Title: Donations to the Needy Through Charitable Organizations and Barter. Title IV: Credit Sales for Dollars.

America helped its friends with food even before Public Law 480. But under food for peace, the program has evolved into a coordinated effort to use food to achieve one of America's foremost foreign policy goals—strengthening the free world. Through it, about 100 million people in 115 countries benefit directly from the creative use of American farm abundance.

In day-to-day operations under the food-for-peace program, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) determines what type and quantity of commodities are available for use overseas. It supervises the processing, packing, transporting and handling of food to the port of embarkation.

The Agency for International Development (AID) administers the oversea operations of the program, including integration of food aid with other economic assistance extended by the United States to underdeveloped nations. AID also supervises use of food for emergency and disaster relief through foreign governments and voluntary agencies. The Director of Food for Peace, appointed by the President, coordinates all programs.

HOW FOOD FOR PEACE WORKS

Te greatest share of food-for-peace shipments is accounted for by sales for foreign currencies. Foreign money from these sales is used to pay such things as expenses of U.S. programs overseas (including market development) and for maintaining our embassies and military units abroad. Part of it is loaned to private U.S. businesses overseas, and part is set aside for loans or grants to the receiving country for economic development, which makes these countries better cash customers in the future. A growing number of nations is using long-term dollar credit provisions of Public Law 480 to purchase part of their needed food.

Under the barter provisions of the law, contracts are entered into with private U.S. firms for the exchange of American surplus food and fiber for needed materials, such as tin from Bolivia or chromite from Turkey.

The phase of food for peace in which the American public participates most directly is handled by CARE, the Catholic Relief Fund, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and 16 other nonprofit volunteer agencies. One dollar to CARE, for instance, will send a needy family in Greece 4½ pounds of milk powder, 5 pounds of pasta (made from wheat), 5 pounds of cornmeal, 5 pounds of flour, and 6 pounds of butter. So much can be sent for so little because all foods are donated by the people of America through programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The dollar, less 11 cents for administrative overhead, covers packaging and shipping.

Under these various authorities, some $2.2 billion worth of American farm commodities were shipped overseas in 1962.

Some significant results can be cited:

In fiscal 1962, for example, the United States sold $549 million worth of food and fiber to Pakistan for local currencies. A sizeable portion of this currency was used to develop canals and other irrigation works in the Indus River project (comparable in concept to the TVA system), which irrigates about 80 percent of Pakistan's cultivated land—a boost to food production.

In September 1963, Hurricane Flora devastated parts of some Caribbean countries. Food-for-peace commodities were airlifted to Haiti, Martinique, and other countries within hours of the disaster. As a result, aftereffects, which normally do more damage than the hurricane itself, were minimized.

INCREASES SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Child feeding programs have produced encouraging results. Forty million schoolchildren now receive food donated by the United States. In many cases they come to school only because they get something to eat. While they are there they are gaining knowledge which will make them more productive citizens.

In Bolivia, for example, where 200,000 schoolchildren participate in the food-for-peace school lunch program, absenteeism has dropped from 38 to 2 percent since the program began in areas where records are kept. Increased school attendance is also reported in Peru, where 400,000 children get U.S. commodities in school lunches every day.

As part of a food-for-peace effort to improve local diets, U.S. feed grain is sent to build up livestock herds, creating more high protein foods. In Korea, feed grains are being sent to a cooperative on Chaeju Island. The co-op repays the United States in pigs, some from each litter. A chain reaction of good will is set off when the United States lends those pigs, in addition to feed grain, to other Korean hog producers who repay in pigs to be loaned to others.

U.S. food furnished under this program has provided the incentive for self-help community projects throughout the world. Food-for-wages programs underway in 19 countries give employment to 585,000 workers.

Following the recent Algerian civil war, nearly 100,000 former soldiers were put to work planting trees in a great reforestation project to help rebuild the battered country's natural resources. The workers were paid partially with U.S. food.

THE PROGRAM HELPS OUR ECONOMY

Food for peace not only helps our friends but it boosts the U.S. economy as well. Food sold under Public Law 480 in fiscal 1963 generated foreign currencies to pay more than $250 million of America's oversea expenses and reduce our balance-of-payments deficit.

In the same year, $13 million in foreign currencies acquired as a result of food-for-peace operations was used in a cooperative program with industry to develop greater dollar markets abroad for U.S. farm commodities.

Of most long-range importance, food for peace is stimulating economic development in many nations, creating new prosperity and potential future markets for the abundant production of American agriculture.

Food for peace is the aid of today that will become the trade of tomorrow.

Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article is excellent, timely and a very appropriate reply to those seeking to destroy Congress:

SALUTE TO CONGRESS—THE RECORD IS BETTER THAN THE CRITICS PRETEND

The legislative branch of the U.S. Government, perennial whipping-boy of all who seek unbridled power for the executive, has been getting its lumps again lately. Back in New Deal days, FDR used to lash out at "Martin, Barton and Fish"; a decade later Harry Truman vented his wrath on the "do-nothing" 80th Congress. However, the 88th, which recessed briefly on Tuesday after winding up a wearisome first session, has suffered the most far-reaching abuse. From commanding positions on television and in the press, the whole liberal establishment has heaped scorn upon the Nation's lawmakers. According to one noted journalist, their reputation "has sunk lower than a snake's belly." The public's attitude toward Capitol Hill, added Stewart Alsop, "is a mixture of indifference, amusement, and contempt." Even the Ford Foundation subtly threw in its two cents worth when it disclosed last week a grant of $85,000 to the American Assembly of Columbia University, to finance a scholarly study of "An Effective Congress."

As the Ford Foundation seems to suspect, there is indeed a crying need for fresh enlightenment—chiefly among the strident critics cited above. Contrary to their misguided views (which, by the way, would have appalled the Founding Fathers and delighted George III), the U.S. Constitution has endowed the legislative branch, not the executive, with authority to make the Nation's laws. The White House may propose; Congress, in due course, disposes. In the session that has just drawn to a close, moreover, the process of deliberation, while frustrating to some observers, has scarcely proved a waste of time. For example, by carefully weighing pros and cons, the House Ways and Means Committee produced a tax reduction bill far superior to the original draft of the Treasury. In other cases protracted debate has prevented the hasty enactment of legislation which, on closer scrutiny and second thoughts, turned out to be ill-conceived, unnecessary, and unwise. Across-the-board it has heightened public awareness of issues. The 88th Congress to date may not have passed many laws, but, within its own bailiwick, it has given the country tolerably good government.

Those who measure such things strictly in terms of quantity are not likely to agree. Probably not since 1932, when a Democratic Congress chose to balk a Republican President at every turn, has the legislative process moved at so slow and (at least to some) painful a pace. Despite heavy pressure from the administration, the lawmakers passed neither the civil rights nor the tax bill. The House Ways and Means Committee took no action on so-called medicare, the scheme to provide the aged with hospital and nursing home care through new payroll levies under social security. Federal aid to public schools remained a dead letter. Where Congress showed unexpected vigor, as in the case of foreign aid, the results were calculated to please neither the White House nor its spokesmen in the fourth estate.

Hence the shrill chorus of denunciation, which, in recent weeks, has echoed loud and long. A look at the record, however, suggests that Congress deserves something better. In terms of what they achieved, as well as what they balked at, the lawmakers have done well by their constituents. The tax bill is a case in point. Originally designed to restore confidence after the stock market crash of 1962, the measure took 18 months to clear the House Ways and Means Committee. While vexing to the executive, which repeatedly warned of the dangers of recession, the delay has had no visible effect on the stock market, or on employment, production and trade, all of which lately have reached new highs. It has given Congress time to analyze, and to reject, some of the doctrinaire soak-the-rich proposals with which the Treasury version was loaded. What has emerged from the weighty deliberations of the committee is far from ideal—Barron's still leans to the view that budgets should be balanced before taxes are cut. However, both philosophically and fiscally, the new bill makes more sense than the old.

With respect to other pending measures, delay has proved equally salutary. Many months ago the White House telecast an emotional appeal for medicare, which, save for Chairman WILBUR MILLS and some equally levelheaded colleagues on Ways and Means, might have swept to passage long ago. Now that the Nation has had the opportunity to weigh alternatives—especially after recent hearings on Capitol Hill disclosed that the program will cost far more than the official estimates—the chances are that cooler heads will prevail. By the same token, despite recurrent pleas of impending crisis, Federal aid to public schools has failed to make much headway in Congress. Notwithstanding the absence of such assistance, State and local governments each year have managed to stave off the crisis, which, with the population explosion fizzling out has grown increasingly remote.

No law, most people would agree, is preferable to bad law. By this yardstick alone, all the foregoing suggests, the legislative branch of Government rates high marks. Moreover, though the political pundits somehow have failed to mention the fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD boasts a positive side. As a necessary part of the lawmaking process, Congress enjoys sweeping powers of investigation. In recent months it has put them to good use. The persistent probing of Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Alabama, helped shed some badly needed light on the murky origins of the TFX contract award; it also led to the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee months ago unmasked the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, with which Presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was somehow connected, as a Communist front in the pay of Havana. The Senate Rules Committee right now is delving into the tangled financial affairs of one-time Secretary to the Senate Majority Bobby Baker, an investigation which has rippled far and wide.

As for actual legislation the 1st session of the 88th Congress did more than pass its customary quota of bills. Unlike any of its recent predecessors, it launched a determined effort to correct the excesses, and undo some of the damage, of statutes already on the books. The bitter struggle waged by the

House to curtail foreign aid succeeded in whittling the annual appropriation to the lowest level in years; it also underscored the scandalous fact that the program has become a grabbag proffered to nations which, in theory and practice alike, are hostile to the United States. For the first time in living memory, Congress also sought to crack down on the freewheeling Rural Electrification Administration. Finally, it flashed an overdue warning to the Federal Communications Commission and other overzealous regulatory bodies. So far, it told the FCC in effect, and no further.

Like the "do-nothing" 80th Congress, which endorsed the Truman doctrine, approved the Marshall plan and cut taxes, the 88th thus is likely to deserve well of history. The same can hardly be said of its detractors, who, in their zeal to manipulate the future, have shown an unlovely bias toward the present and disdain of the past. "The less government we have the better," said Emerson well over a century ago. The truth of that statement has just been reaffirmed.

Act of Hostility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the collapse of U.S. foreign policy throughout the world is especially evident when we analyze the situation in Europe where an unprovoked attack on an Air Force plane took place as the administration rushes frantically to subsidize the Soviet Union and its satellites.

An analysis of the situation was very appropriately made in an editorial in this morning's Chicago Sun-Times, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

ACT OF HOSTILITY

The downing of an unarmed American jet trainer over East Germany resulting in the death of three U.S. flyers is a reminder that the cold war still is being waged despite talk of easing tensions with the Communists and the growing willingness of many Western countries to do business with them. The U.S. State Department described the destruction of the plane as an "inexcusable, brutal act of violence."

It is quite possible, as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, an Air Force Reserve major general, has observed, that the downed flyers were at fault in allowing their plane to go over Communist territory. One seldom if ever reads of Soviet planes flying by mistake over Western territory. Still the Russian fighter plane pilots who intercepted and presumably shot down the American plane should have been aware from radio signals and other evidence that the invasion of East German airspace was neither deliberate nor a hostile act.

The Russians say that the "intruder plane" did not respond to conventional signals to land, did not respond to warning fire, and that a Russian fighter plane was forced to take measures "which are known to the American command." The Soviets do not acknowledge that the U.S. plane was forthwith shot down. The attitude of the Soviets since the incident has been downright hostile, whereas the circumstances would warrant an attempt at amelioration.

The incident and the subsequent developments show that Russia fundamentally is still an unfriendly country. A number of Congressmen, including Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, have cited the downing of the plane as one more argument against the sale of subsidized U.S. wheat to Russia.

The 1961 Agriculture Act put Congress on record against the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to other than "friendly nations," specifically Russia or nations controlled by the world Communist movement. Despite this, the sale of subsidized wheat to Russia was authorized by the White House. The record, however, continues to show that Congress was right in labeling Russia an "unfriendly country."

Economic Program Revives Inflationary Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in his column in the New York Times on January 20, Murray J. Rossant notes that the Johnson administration's economic policy might not only lift economic activity beyond the high levels being predicted by forecasters but could lead to a revival of inflationary pressures.

Forecasters have continually underestimated the strength of our private economy. Last year the Council of Economic Advisers predicted—with a tax cut—a gross national product ranging from $573 to $583 billion. In fact, without a tax cut, the economy achieved a gross national product of $585 billion. Many administration spokesmen last year were hinting we would have a recession if the tax bill were not passed.

The Rossant column follows:

BUSINESS FORECASTS—ECONOMISTS SEE CAUSE FOR GREATER OPTIMISM IN SHORT-TERM OUTLOOK

(By M. J. Rossant)

Business forecasters are making further upward revisions in their appraisals of this year's business outlook as a result of the shifts in tax and spending policy proclaimed by President Johnson.

A sampling of economic forecasters disclosed that the majority expect business activity to increase at a faster pace than they had been assuming just prior to the President's state of the Union message. The consensus had been for a gross national product of $615 to $620 billion in 1964, but now they expect that the Nation's output of goods and services will rise well above $620 billion. Some now forecast an increase to $630 billion or better.

At the same time, there is more pessimism about the longer range outlook. Economists point out that if the Johnson program is approved, the stimulus provided by a tax cut will be largely spent just when the restraint imposed by declining Government spending will be making itself felt.

The latest revision is part of a catching up process that has been going on for more than 6 months. Most economists remained skeptical about the strength of business activity until well into 1963, but the expansion itself served to convince them. Now they see cause for greater optimism in the Johnson program, at least for the short term.

Economists have been revising their predictions even though they acknowledge that the President's program which calls for both an increase and a speedup in tax reductions combined with a decline in Government spending will not go through as planned.

Tax cuts, for example, will not be approved by February 1, the date assumed by Mr. Johnson. On the spending side, it is doubtful that Congress will approve all of the cuts in outlays that he is seeking for the coming fiscal year that begins in July.

Nevertheless, most economists think that enough of the package will be enacted to bring about an acceleration in the pace of business during the next 12 months. Their heightened optimism is based on the expectation that the amount of tax reductions that will be effective for this year is far bigger than they originally anticipated even if Congress delays action for a month or two.

They also cite the extremely favorable impression that Mr. Johnson has made in business circles. While the impact of the intangible element of business confidence cannot be measured, some economists believe that the President's desire for improving relations, plus his efforts to get action on tax cuts, may induce an era of good feeling that will encourage businessmen to be much more liberal in their inventory and capital spending.

If businessmen take more advantage of the investment incentives devised by the Kennedy administration than they did last year the pace of economic activity can quicken considerably. For capital spending has not provided much of the steam to the expansion that began almost 3 years ago.

With Government spending continuing to climb, at least over the near term, and consumers having more money to spend as a result of tax cuts, a sizable upsurge in business spending might not only lift activity well above the high levels being predicted by forecasters but could lead to a revival of inflationary pressure.

Forecasters have consistently underestimated the strength of the expansion. When they were compiling their projections for the 1963 outlook over a year ago, most of them made the assumption that President John F. Kennedy's request for tax reductions would be enacted. Even so, the standard forecast called for a very moderate increase in gross national product.

Those who did not assume a tax cut generally predicted a decline, a view that the late President expressed on more than one occasion.

But last year's rise in gross national product far exceeded the predictions of most forecasters even though tax cuts were not forthcoming and other Government moves were not of a stimulating nature.

In fact, both social security payments and postage rates went up last year. These represent a form of taxation, so that the Treasury's bit increased rather than lessened in 1963.

CREDIT SHIFT NOTED

While Government spending during 1963 continued to expand, there was a slowdown in the rate of the rise compared to the preceding year; and there was a definite shift in credit policy away from the easy conditions that had prevailed in the earlier stages of the recovery.

The assumptions that forecasters made last year about the Government's economic policy were so strong that it can be argued that any shifts made by Washington do not have a major influence on business. If this is the case, forecasters should not be making any major changes in their judgments about the outlook.

But their own hectic revisions indicate that forecasters were at fault in their diagnosis of the economy. They are now acknowledging the strength of the economic expansion, but even their latest readings may not fully assess the impact that tax cuts will provide.

Annual Nelson Football Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the annual Nelson Football Award was conferred on Saturday, January 4, 1964, at Boston upon Bob Cappadona, a fine young football player of Northeastern University, for his "sportsmanship and extraordinary, loyal, school spirit and teamwork."

The Nelson Award is one of the most cherished awards of its kind in American sports. It is given annually by the Gridiron Club at Boston in honor of my very dear friend, Mr. N. V. "Swede" Nelson, famous Harvard football star, sports figure, raconteur par excellence and distinguished business, civic and humanitarian leader.

The award is predicated on sportsmanship and leadership—qualities so conspicuously demonstrated by Swede Nelson in his own life and career. It is wisely designed to select boys who have made contributions over and above the purely athletic or competitive phases of college athletics, exemplifying high traits of character, dedication and altruistic performance.

Throughout the years, the recipients of this celebrated award have been boys who have reflected exceptional credit upon themselves, their families, their respective colleges, and the thrilling American game of intercollegiate football.

Without exception, all the boys selected for this enviable honor have been most worthy of the award by reason of their high-minded qualities, honorable, competitive standards and willingness to go out of their way to act unselfishly in terms of considering and helping others. This years selection of Bob Cappadona is in its very best tradition.

It has been said that when the good Lord created the great Swede Nelson that he destroyed the mold, and that is very true. This celebrated American combines natural, competitive, athletic instincts and excellence of achievement with the adorning virtues of unexcelled patriotism and lofty civic spirit. His inspiring loyalty to American institutions, unselfish zeal for serving the people, young and old alike, and his gracious zeal in giving so very much of himself to the worthy tasks of encouraging and assisting the young generation, and advancing so many good human causes, mark Swede Nelson as one of the most dedicated leaders and sports figures of our times. Legions of people gratefully laud his outstanding contributions to our youth and to the building of high-minded, loyal and informed citizenship.

It is most appropriate that our American youth should have Swede Nelson's high example before them as a source of stimulation, encouragement and purpose to give their best to everything they undertake, to work and serve without the consuming, all-prevading thought of self, and with that broader interest in others, in the human problems of our society and in the preservation of its precious values.

It is a great honor and pleasure for me to extend my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for the future to this fine young man, Bob Cappadona, who has so worthily achieved this year's Nelson Award, and also to congratulate his proud family, the famous Gridiron Club of Boston, Mass., which made this award possible, and my dear, esteemed, valued friend, the inimitable Swede Nelson, his charming wife and devoted family.

May this dedicated, vital, warm-hearted American, Nils V. "Swede" Nelson, continue for many years to come to labor unselfishly in the vineyards of democracy, to radiate the warming charm and graces of his bouyant spirit to the people, and to set high example and inspiration for Americans of every age, class and station as we firmly pledge anew our faith in God and country and strive to make this great free land better and stronger for ourselves and those who come after us.

True Aim of Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for months a virtual Niagara of misleading statements has been pouring from the propaganda mills of special interest opponents of quality stabilization. The primary aim of these opposition arguments has been to create a fog of misunderstanding around the true issue involved in the bipartisan effort to enact this vital legislation.

False issues have been raised and misconceptions created by these opponents of quality stabilization. They do not debate the merits of the bill, but rather the evils of a straw bill of their own propaganda invention.

The principal special interest opponents of quality stabilization constitute a relatively limited number of the new-type merchandising giants. These burgeoning would-be monopolists of the American retail system fear enactment of quality stabilization because they fear free and open competition. They do not seek to compete with the independent retailer—they want only to swallow him up.

The opponents know that independent merchants throughout the country are urging this Congress to enact quality stabilization into law, because it fosters fair competition between all retailers. Discounters will no longer be able to use brand name merchandise for bait-and-switch purposes and, as a result, consumers will be assured of the same quality and price in all stores.

These opponents know that quality stabilization, once it becomes law, will stand in the way of their plans eventually to monopolize the entire American retail market.

Yet these opponents, by unrelenting propaganda effort, have succeeded in misleading many otherwise well-informed people regarding the quality stabilization issue.

Recently, Mr. Nicholas B. O'Connell, Jr., the assistant attorney general of my own great State of Washington, wrote me concerning the quality stabilization bill. As I have previously pointed out in discussing this bill, the independent retail operators of the State of Washington have been hard-hit by the economic assault of the bait-and-switch merchandisers. Therefore, I might have hoped that Mr. O'Connell, who heads the Antitrust and Consumer Protection Division of the Washington State Attorney General's Office, would appreciate the true aims of quality stabilization sponsors.

Regrettably, Mr. O'Connell's understanding of quality stabilization is largely based on the misleading statements set up by the opponents of the measure. This is to say that when Mr. O'Connell argues that quality stabilization would not—and I quote:

> Give any rights or protection whatsoever to small business * * * that all rights and privileges created by the proposed bill are reserved exclusively for those large business enterprises which own brands, names or trademarks.

When Mr. O'Connell says this, he may be referring to some other legislation, but he is not talking about the quality stabilization bill pending in this Congress.

The fact of the matter is that the benefits this bill will confer on all merchants—large and small alike—are now held only by large, wealthy chains for their own private brands, which are sheltered under prices set by their owners. Only the small retailer has no such price protection. He must depend for his living on nationally-advertised brands. In other words, the "large business enterprises which own brands, names or trademarks" now exercise rights in the marketplace which we want to extend to the small or medium-sized independent operator.

Quality stabilization is no economic panacea—but it will strengthen the hand of the independent operator in his competition with the giant mass merchandiser.

I am sure that upon further analysis, Mr. O'Connell will recognize that quality stabilization is intended to protect manufacturers in order to protect the small merchant against retail predators. These cutthroat merchandisers make a practice of selfishly exploiting nationally known trademarks, brands, and names for which the small merchant has done so much to create a public demand.

As assistant State attorney general responsible for consumer protection, Mr. O'Connell might well be concerned with the caveat emptor philosophy of these predatory merchandisers. They believe that there is nothing wrong in selling a manufacturer's trademarked brand at a

loss if they can lure people into their store and then foist off cheap foreign and domestic goods on customers at markups as high as 1,000 percent.

Having traveled our State of Washington extensively, I am somewhat baffled at Mr. O'Connell's statement to me that "a majority of small businessmen themselves appear to be opposed to such legislation." I might suggest that he talk to some of his and my Washington State merchants, as I have, or visit some of the downtown areas in our great cities, where store after store has been boarded up, the owners driven out of business by bait-and-switch merchandisers.

I deeply regret that Mr. O'Connell has seen fit to take an adverse position to a measure I so strongly believe is needed to save our marketplace and the hundreds of thousands of jobs it provides. My reply to Mr. O'Connell's letter sets forth in detail the background and reasons behind the bipartisan, nationwide effort to enact quality stabilization.

I will continue to do everything in my power to bring H.R. 3669 and S. 774—the quality stabilization measures—to fruition at this session of Congress. My reply to Mr. O'Connell follows:

JANUARY 21, 1964.

Mr. NICHOLAS B. O'CONNELL, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General, State of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. O'CONNELL: In accordance with your request, I have been restudying the quality stabilization bill.

As a result of this reevaluation, I am even more for the enactment of this bill because it is in the public interest.

I cannot see how you could take such an unequivocable position as you did in your letter of January 9.

For example, you state, "This legislation would, if enacted, eliminate the right of Washington and its sister States to determine their own policy in the resale price maintenance field."

Yet, if you had read the bill as reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in June of last year, you would have known that paragraph (13) of the bill provides "If any State, by any provision of its constitution adopted, or by any law enacted, after this paragraph takes effect, prohibits resale price maintenance in such State through the exercise of paragraphs (7) to (17), inclusive, of this subsection, then, while such provision or law is in effect, such paragraphs shall not authorize the establishment or enforcement of any resale price or resale price range with respect to any resale in such State of any goods if such goods so resold are to be delivered from a place in such State to a purchaser in such State and are not to be resold again for delivery to a purchaser outside of such State."

For example, you say "this bill is but another of the repeated attempts to lend Federal sanction to vertical price fixing, a practice condemned as you know, as long ago as 1911 in the *Dr. Miles* case (*Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *John D. Park & Sons Co.*, 220 U.S. 373 (1911)."

Yet, you fail to mention that 25 years after the *Dr. Miles* case the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously approved of resale price maintenance on its merits in the *Old Dearborn* decision (299 U.S. 183).

For example, you state (the bill) "is deleterious to those who are its asserted intended beneficiaries, the small business community."

Yet, more than 75 national associations have reached the opposite conclusion and represent a collective judgment of hundreds of thousands of the small businesses fighting for their survival. Certainly supporters of quality stabilization won the judgment of the 33-man House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which recommended enactment of the quality stabilization bill. This committee reported that "the bill is essential to the survival of hundreds of thousands of small, independent, businessmen—the corner druggist, the jeweler, the hardware merchant, the electric appliance dealer, the bookstore dealer, etc."

For example, you state, "Projecting an average price increase of 20 percent for all sales that may be covered by the operation of a national price maintenance law (which this bill would establish) shows that it would cost the American consumer billions of dollars and have a powerful inflationary effect."

Obviously, you have never been in the retail business. One discounter testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that some merchants selling national brands at loss-leader prices recoupt those losses with a 1,000 percent markup on other merchandise.

A careful reading of the testimony on this subject matter would have informed you that the Department of Justice was responsible for the erroneous contention that legislation here would result in higher prices of 19 to 27 percent. The truth is that the Department of Justice has admitted it put the FBI to work to look for saving opportunities on selected items in eight cities. In other words, a pick-and-choose survey to find saving opporunities. But the Department of Justice later confessed: "However, it has not been our contention that savings of 27 percent were possible on all items within the retail outlets surveyed. The survey merely disclosed that such savings were available on the specific items surveyed to those prudent consumers interested in best buys." (P. 300 of Senate Commerce hearings of 1959 on national fair trade legislation.)

For example, you characterize this measure as vertical price fixing, a statutory scheme "to insulate distributors and dealers from the rigors of price competition."

If a careful objective evaluation of the prior testimony on this bill had been made, it would have been revealed to you that the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in charge its Antitrust Division, conceded:

"Price fixing is essentially an epithet, and I suppose the witnesses who have been reluctant to admit the term have been correct in saying you simply should not use names of this sort." (P. 83 of 1963 hearings by House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.)

I have not heard, nor seen, any objection by those who oppose this bill, regarding the fact that Sears, Roebuck, J. C. Penney, or A. & P. insulate its dealers from the rigors of price competition by using private-label products.

I have heard no protest from them that the price is printed on a postage stamp, nor about fixed prices in rents, unionized wages, insurance, electricity, the telephone, farm legislation, etc.

I note particularly complete omission by them that this bill is optional, with no manufacturer required to use it, no reseller required to handle any product stabilized under it, and no consumer required to purchase any product.

I am appalled that they give so little credit to the intelligence of the Members of Congress that have either introduced or are supporting vigorously this bill. The number is impressive, and they come from both parties, from both Houses, and they are both liberal and conservative.

I am appalled that the assistant attorney general of the State of Washington and the head of its antitrust and consumer protection division would charge that these distinguished Members of Congress are supporting legislation that would turn the clock back 30 years to depression days and inject an unnecessary, undesirable, and perhaps dangerous rigidity into our free, competitive enterprise system.

I respect views that differ from mine. But I also respect the judgment of the Members of this Congress and its committees. They give an objective study to the measures before this Congress. Chairman Harris of the 33-man House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recently said:

"In recent years, our committee has held 24 days of hearings, covering almost 2,500 pages of a printed record, has heard well over 150 different witnesses, has received almost 500 supplemental statements and memoranda, and has held numerous executive sessions during which the bill has been thoroughly analyzed, considered word by word, and, in short, gone over as thoroughly as has been the case with any bill that has ever come out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in my entire experience on the committee. In my opinion, this bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation presently before Congress."

And all of the above makes me wonder if we are discussing the same quality stabilization bill.

Sincerely,

THOMAS N. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

Resolution Adopted Pledging Opposition to Civil Rights Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, January 30, some 60 Members of the House from all of the Southern States caucused and discussed strategy in opposition to the extremely obnoxious miscalled civil rights bill now pending in this body.

The caucus, over which I had the high honor to preside, unanimously adopted, at the conclusion of the meeting, a resolution pledging themselves to oppose this iniquitous, sinister, and unconstitutional proposal.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that not only the Members present, but many other Members, not only from the South but other sections of the country as well, have indicated that they, too, will oppose this assault upon the Constitution of the United States under the misleading title of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives will be called upon in the next few days to consider the mislabeled civil rights bill; and

Whereas this proposed legislation is extremely obnoxious to an overwhelming majority of the constituents whom we are charged with the responsibility of representing here in the Congress, as well as to millions of other freedom-loving citizens of other sections of our common country; and

Whereas it is our considered judgment that the bill, H.R. 7152, is not only an invasion of the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of the several States of the Union, but in fact is a violation of the Constitution itself; and

Whereas this proposed legislation is not in the best interests of those citizens whom the proponents profess to assist thereby; and

Whereas the threat of further demonstrations unless this bill is passed amounts to blackmail of the Congress; and

Whereas the bill would grant powers in this area to the executive department of the Government and particularly the Attorney General which have heretofore never been even seriously considered by the Congress; and

Whereas the proposed bill constitutes a dragnet embracing seven distinct bills which the Congress has repeatedly refused to enact; and

Whereas an ingenious attempt has been made by the proponents to mislead the Congress and the country by designating this as a moderate or watered down bill when in fact it is neither moderate nor watered down, and the Congress is being asked to legislate by labels; and

Whereas this bill, like a loaded pistol, may be aimed at our particular section of the country, we call attention to the fact that because of the broad powers it both specifies and delegates to the various Federal bureaucracies, it adversely affects the rights, liberties and privileges of the people of all other sections of the United States in that every citizen of the United States whether he be laborer, banker, farmer, innkeeper or merchant is caught in the tentacles of regimentation by the provisions of this proposal:

Therefore we, Members of the House of Representatives, in caucus assembled, conscious of our oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, who have the honor to oppose this most reprehensible assault upon the Constitution of the United States, and who believe in the rights and privileges of the majority as well as the minority of our citizens, hereby renew with determined vigor our pledge to our constituents and all freedom-loving Americans to oppose this iniquitous, sinister, and unconstitutional proposal; and

We further invite and urge every Member of like mind, regardless of party affiliation, in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate where the rules of procedure are more flexible, to join with us to this end.

Plight of the Connecticut Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have called to the attention of Congress the plight of the poultry and egg industry in New England, and particularly in the State of Connecticut. The people of this industry are very much concerned over the competitive disadvantages which the industry is facing as a result of cuts in freight rates for corn shipped to other parts of the country.

This industry is very vital to the economy of New England. Unless similar cuts in freight rates are provided for this industry, it is doubtful whether it can long survive. A plan of rate reductions to be extended by the railroads serving New England has recently been proposed, which would enable the poultry and egg industry to compete on a fair basis. On January 30, 1964, the Traffic Executive Association-Eastern Railroads held a public hearing in Chicago on proposals suggesting rate revisions.

I wish to insert into the RECORD testimony submitted at that hearing by Joseph N. Gill, Connecticut State commissioner of agriculture; Emanuel Hirth, general manager of the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association; and a letter from the Connecticut Poultry Association. Following are the statements:

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH N. GILL

I am the commissioner of agriculture and natural resources for the State of Connecticut, and appear before you today in my capacity as secretary of the Northeastern Association of State Departments of Agriculture, to present the views of this association on the proposals to lower rail rates on corn from Ohio to the Northeast. At our annual convention on December 17, 1963, it was resolved that our association should request this hearing in order to impress upon your committee the vital need for immediate rate relief.

Gentlemen, this is the first time to my knowledge that our association has requested a hearing before your committee and has appeared and presented a formal statement of position. May the extent of our participation here today be the measure of our concern.

There are presently several proposals before your committee relating to grain rates to various Middle Atlantic and Northeastern States. Representatives of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey have data to present in exhibit form in justification of the proposals affecting their specific area. The case for New England, I believe, has already been adequately covered by the evidence of Wirthmore Co.

Thus, speaking for the 11 northeastern departments of agriculture, I shall try to avoid duplication of evidence to be submitted by representatives of the individual States. Likewise, I have no intention of rehashing in detail the voluminous economic data which is already a part of the record in this case. Your committee is well able to analyze such evidence. However, we feel that we can make a contribution to these proceedings by submitting our collective judgment as to the effect on northeastern agriculture if this rate relief is not granted. In a word, the effect will be disastrous.

At the time of our September 10, 1963, hearing on this matter, northeastern agriculture in general and poultry producers in particular were at a serious competitive disadvantage for the sale of its products in its natural markets. This disadvantage was attributable to recent ICC approval of reduced rates on grain to the South. This infortunate and inequitable situation has since been compounded by further reductions affecting Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

Thus our New England producers are now faced with a disadvantage of about $4 to $5 per ton from Delaware and $9 per ton from the Southeast. When you consider that grain costs make up the principal item of expense in poultry production it is clear that nothing less is involved here than the survival of a viable poultry industry in the Northeast. The present level of rates on grain to the South and Southeast permit producers in these areas to reduce feed costs to such an extent that they can now make up their geographical disadvantage, absorb transportation costs to such centers as New York City, and still sell profitably at a price which will soon eliminate our northeastern producers from their natural markets. Thus, the rate relief to Delmarva and the South has destroyed the historic rate relationship with the Northeast and constitutes an unfair competitive advanage. The price of this inequity is the survival of northeastern poultry industry. If you think we overstate the case, consider what happened to the broiler industry in my own State of Connecticut.

This industry was already in a precarious position when reduced freight rates to the South created an impossible competitive situation. Prof. Thomas C. Morrison of the University of Connecticut has pointed out that the broiler industry has been almost eliminated from Connecticut, having declined from $24.8 to $11.3 million in 1961. The further decline to an estimated $7 million estimated for 1963 can be largely attributed to the competitive effect of the southern rate reductions.

However, the merits of this case go beyond the irreparable injury to the northeastern poultry industry. In my own State of Connecticut, one of the principal customers of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. is the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association which receives from Ohio approximately 120,000 tons of grain annually, or over 200 carloads a month. The failure to act promptly in the instant case will cause a decline in poultry production resulting in cutbacks in grain orders and diminished revenues to the railroads.

Decisions such as are made by your association do not take place in a vacuum—the rejection of rate relief today will surely result in diminished rail revenues tomorrow as northeastern poultry enters its inexorable decline.

It is our position that all of the requests for rate relief are in the public interest and should be approved on those grounds alone. But in addition, it is in the self-interest of every northeastern road to protect this very valuable source of revenue. Hardly a week passes that does not bring some new reminder of the plight of the railroads in the Northeast. As you might expect, with offices in Hartford, I hear more than a few such cries. At this very time the Governor of Connecticut is considering the recommendations of the Connecticut Transportation Association which has urged an outright subsidy for the New Haven. Clearly, continuation of private rail service in the Northeast requires that the roads retain their present freight traffic, the backbone of its business. As was pointed out in ICC docket No. 33,332, November 21, 1960, the loss of freight revenues was a critical element in the ills of the New Haven.

The Commission states at page 17 of its recommended order that "Perhaps the best way to explain the railroad's severe financial crisis is to say that since the freight revenues have declined to such an extent it is no longer possible for that service to absorb any substantial part of the losses related to passenger operations."

Those words are of relevance today in the present atmosphere of rail mergers, subsidies, and other recommended nostrums. You gentlemen know better than others that while these measures may be advisable, if not necessary, the northeastern roads must still cherish every article of freight traffic. In the opinion of our association, the northeastern railroads also have an important interest to protect by immediate approval of the reduced grain rates. A railroad simply cannot afford to be cavalier in the treatment of such needed customers. The instant rate proposals present the eastern railroads with a unique opportunity to act in the public interest by preserving our poultry industry through a restoration of equitable competitive conditions and at the same time preserving their own sources of freight revenue.

In conclusion then let me urge that your association issue an immediate decision on this matter. Each day's delay further prejudices our poultry industry. A decision in the future may be too late. In our opinion, the record amply demonstrates that the rate

proposals are just and compensatory and are necessary to protect our poultry producers and your railroads from inequitable competition in natural markets. These proposals are clearly in the public interest. We urge that your decision be favorable and that it be timely.

STATEMENT OF TESTIMONY OF EMANUEL HIRTH

My name is Emanuel Hirth. I am general manager of the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association, Inc., 10 Apel Place, Manchester, Conn., and a member of the New England Agricultural Industry Grain & Grain Products Transportation Committee.

I appeared before this committee 3 years ago in Chicago with reference to I. & S. docket Nos. 7874 and 7874 (Sub. No. 1). I also had the pleasure of appearing before you in Buffalo on September 10, 1963.

If my appearances are becoming monotonous to some of you, rest assured, that it is no picnic for me to come and take your valuable time to repeat, continuously, the same tale of woe.

Unfortunately, our situation has not improved during the past several years; on the contrary, it has recently become more drastic for two reasons:

1. The reduction in freight rates on corn shipped to the South.

2. The most recent, independent publication of lower rates on corn of $4 to $5.20 per ton by the Baltimore & Ohio and the Pennsylvania Railroads to points in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

Gentlemen, I sincerely hope, I can bring across to you today a full understanding of the gravity of the situation confronting the New England poultry industry. That I can make you realize to what an extent the fate of thousands of individual poultry farmers depends on your immediate decision. And, if there is repetition it is not with the intent to lull you with monotony, but, to impress upon you most forcefully the facts that have bearing on this situation.

We are entirely dependent on the northeastern market for the final disposition of our end product: eggs and poultry.

The natural advantages the South had, such as climate, cost of labor, proximity to a certain amount of homegrown ingredients, etc.; we were able to live with and to a certain extent offset by regional advantages peculiar to New England; but, there is no way for us to meet the competition resulting from lower freight rates.

The South, and the Delmarva Peninsula daily flood our natural markets in New York and Boston with trailer loads of eggs and poultry at prices that are physically and practically impossible for us to match. And, the only reason that they are able to do this is that they have a price advantage afforded to them by lower freight rates.

Gentlemen, you have heard from our commissioner of agriculture, Joseph Gill, as to what happened to the Connecticut broiler industry in the last several years. A similar fate awaits the egg industry, and much more rapidly, unless it can be put on a more equal footing with the South and Delmarva.

I am one of those more fortunate general managers, who is in charge of purchasing, freight traffic, and the marketing of the end product; in our case, eggs. And, I speak of the bitter experience which I meet and live with daily; of being told that my customer is getting a trailer load of eggs at such a price that I can only meet it by cutting my throat.

How can our people survive under such circumstances? And, how can the industry in New England survive?

And, gentlemen, how will some of the railroads, who are represented here, be able to stand the loss of revenue that would be the result if such a disaster would strike the poultry industry?

There is no doubt in my mind, if there is no immediate relief, that this is exactly what is going to happen. I wish to stress the word "immediate." Not a year hence, but now, or at the most, 1 or 2 months from now.

Gentlemen, mine is not a voice in the wilderness. Others, perhaps more qualified than I, recognize the gravity of the situation and they recognize it for what it is; a threat to the entire economy of New England. Their concern has been attested to in a resolution by the Governors of the six New England States, which was presented to you by the Honorable Governor Reid of Maine on September 10, 1963, in Buffalo before the TEA and by letters in your files from the various Members of the House and Senate who represent the New England States.

It would be well for you to note, and I speak for my organization as well as many of the others with whom I have spoken; we will not take this lying down. We intend to put up a fight. We will try anything—barges, trucks, or what have you, to keep the industry alive and it could only be to the detriment of the railroads.

In conclusion, I would like to express the support of my organization for the proposal made by Mr. Bressette. The so-called New England proposal which is on file. In view of the fact that the Baltimore & Ohio and the Pennsylvania Railroads published rates which represents a deduction of ($4 to $5.20 per ton of corn, we must have a matching cut in freight rates that will equalize our competitive position and give us a fighting chance for survival.

We would also like to go on record as favoring the reduction in grain and grain products proposed by several eastern carriers and reproduced as TEA 585–26.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, may I thank you again for the opportunity enabling me to appear before you today, to express the gravity and seriousness of the situation in our industry in New England; and, I hope that you will find it necessary to take a favorable and immediate action in this matter.

JANUARY 17, 1964.

R. C. GILL,
Chairman, Traffic Executives Association, Eastern Railroads, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It had been our intention to send a delegate to the public hearing of the Traffic Executives Association of Eastern Railroads to be held in Chicago on January 30. In view of the fact that the agenda of the committee is crowded and that several highly competent representatives of the feed industry from New England are scheduled to present our point of view, we have decided, instead, to file with you our strong endorsement and support of the statements being presented to you by Joseph Gill, commissioner of agriculture, by Mr. Emanuel Hirth, of Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers, and Mr. Bressette of the Wirthmore Co.

However, we do want in your files, and for your consideration, a statement by us, the farmers. Those thousands of us who are grouped under the anonymity of the term "poultry industry." We are the human element; blood and sweat of the industry. We and our wives and children, the communities where we live and the businesses who live because of our sweat. Their fate can be decided by the decision you make.

We are the Connecticut Poultry Association, an organization of poultry farmers. We want you to be aware of us, the poultry industry as alive and palpitating with humanity, that, like the vast majority of Americans, are scratching for a livelihood. And, all me want is the means of continuing to scratch. Just in the same manner and under conditions no more adverse than the farmers in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

We ask no unfair advantage over them, neither do we want to compete under unequal conditions. The railroads have contributed to a situation that has created an unbalance and has put the Connecticut farmer at a disastrous disadvantage in what has been and has to be our natural marketing area. We ask the consideration of our plight and the redress which is ours by right.

We offer no statistics. They are as cold and as impersonal as the term "poultry industry." We have the statistics and can make them available, but we are sure you have them also; they have been presented to you by competent economists.

We, unequivocally, endorse the statements being presented to you by our own commissioner of agriculture, Joseph Gill; and by Mr. Emanuel Hirth of the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association.

We give our wholehearted and unqualified endorsement of the proposal for a freight cut that will match the freight rate reduction afforded to the Southern States and to the Delmarva area as proposed to your committee by Mr. John Bressette of Wirthmore Feeds.

Respectfully yours,
CONNECTICUT POULTRY ASSOCIATION.

No Adequate Explanation on Baker Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a recent editorial from the Spokesman Review of Spokane, Wash., points out, there is as yet no adequate explanation on Robert Baker's gift to the President. In the interest of public confidence in our system of government, I hope the facts will be forthcoming.

The editorial follows:

THE BAKER CASE INVOLVES JOHNSON

Sometime within the next few days the Rules Committee of the U.S. Senate will have to decide whether it will require Robert G. Baker to testify on some of the big deals that led to his forced resignation last year.

Mr. Baker, the protege of Lyndon B. Johnson, had to quit his job as secretary to the Senate Democratic majority just prior to the death of President Kennedy. As the former Democratic Senate majority leader and as Vice President, Mr. Johnson depended upon Mr. Baker to help run the Senate machinery.

Since the latest scandals in Washington came to public attention, Mr. Baker has been discreetly silent, and he has not demanded a hearing. Yet his presence before the Senate committee is being sought, because he may be able to clear up some of the details of the deals which brought him to general public notice.

President Johnson is undoubtedly bothered by the varied ramifications of the Baker case, especially his own 1959 acceptance of an expensive stereo set as a gift which, he says, came from the Baker family.

The public criticism that has arisen in this case is not due solely to Republican politicians, for Mr. Johnson is involved in a situation for which there has yet been no adequate explanation from the White House. The Baker situation and the GOP criticism is certainly not as amusing as Mr. Johnson would make out.

Should the Senate Rules Committee require the presence of Mr. Baker during the forthcoming hearings, the public may have

the opportunity to learn many more facts about the Baker operations and the Baker influence during the period when Mr. Johnson was an influential figure on Capitol Hill.

Action on Beef Imports Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed today to find that President Johnson made no mention of the problem of beef imports in his agriculture message. This in spite of many recent statements by high administration officials of sympathy and assurance of steps being taken to help the situation.

The sharp decline in livestock prices during 1963 and the relation of beef imports to the price decline has been the subject of much concern among cattlemen and by Members of this House. Members of Congress from livestock-producing areas of the Nation have introduced legislation to provide legal authority for restraining imports when domestic cattle prices were depressed. On April 9, 1963, I introduced H.R. 5560, a bill designed to accomplish this objective; and other Members of the House and Senate have introduced identical or similar legislation.

Members of Congress and cattlemen were surprised and discouraged when the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State reported adversely on the bills that would give livestock producers some relief during periods of depressed domestic prices. It is well to keep in mind that the Congressmen have not suggested and the ranchers have not advocated any beef import restrictions when prices were at reasonable levels. When imports from Australia increase from less than 18 million pounds in 1958 to 517 million pounds in 1963, there would seem to be obvious evidence of reason for concern. There is a particularly real reason when during 1963 utility cow prices declined 3 cents per pound and fed steer prices dropped 5 to 7 cents per pound.

The failure of the President to mention beef prices as a matter for concern in our agricultural economy possibly indicates that the Department of State and Department of Agriculture were actually indicating administration policy. How else should we interpret the President's message?

I would hope that the remarks of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Roland R. Renne before the 67th Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association in Memphis, Tenn., on January 28, would be more indicative of administration policy. Dr. Renne, in his opening paragraph of a speech on the subject of beef imports, said:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture and the administration recognize this and are taking prompt steps to improve the situation.

He does not identify in his prepared remarks what he would do to improve the situation but I am informed he urged the cattlemen to agree to a voluntary quota arrangement with Australia. Quotas would have been set at the average of the 1962–63 import level, but this was not endorsed by the cattlemen. Since during these 2 years, imports from Australia were at an alltime high, the cattlemen concluded the arrangement would provide little or no real relief. Also, the cattlemen do not want to put fixed quotas into effect. They have no objection to imports except as they aggravate prices already depressed by our cyclical production increases. The ranchers and feeders of the Nation feel they have a responsibility to provide the consuming public with a dependable supply of high quality beef. They also believe that they are not being unreasonable in seeking some limited protection from competition from foreign countries where production costs are a fraction of those in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to include with my remarks the text of the speech I have referred to that was given by Dr. Renne in Memphis on January 28. It provides some important background statistical material on the current beef import situation and I commend it to the attention of all Members of the House.

The speech follows:

BEEF IMPORTS AND THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

(Summary of remarks by Roland R. Renne, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs, 67th Annual Convention of American National Cattlemen's Association, Memphis, Tenn., January 28, 1964)

Imports are an important factor influencing current beef prices. The U.S. Department of Agriculture and the administration recognize this and are taking prompt steps to improve the situation.

The main approach in finding a solution has been our negotiation with chief suppliers (Australia and New Zealand) to secure voluntary agreement for them to limit their exports to the United States to the level of a recent period. Results to date, although short of reaching final agreement, are encouraging.

The basic principle of market sharing is sound. Other nations that have had access to our markets under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) have certain access rights just as we have such rights of access to other markets for the sale of our products. If agreement can be reached voluntarily concerning a given amount of access, then both importer and exporter have a firm basis on which to operate. The importer is protected against disastrous flooding of the market and the exporter is assured of a market for a specified amount of his product.

The main problem in negotiating market sharing is agreement on the basis on which the share to be allotted is determined. In the case of beef imports our largest supplier is Australia and her exports have increased phenomenally since 1958, from less than 18 million pounds to 517 million pounds in 1963. Obviously, Australians would like to have the most recent year or years used as a basis for determining her share of our beef market. In addition, since the U.S. beef market is growing as a result of both an increase in our population and a rising per capita consumption of beef, Australia would like to share in this growth, and we agree that they should. We are insisting on this right for ourselves in dealing with nations to whom we export agricultural products. The key question is how much should Australia or any other country share in the growth of our beef market? One suggestion is to renegotiate periodically on the basis of what is happening to our population numbers, income levels, and livestock prices.

A further factor which should be kept in mind in negotiating market shares is the quality of the product. In the case of beef, if a certain proportion of the imports were made up of primal cuts during the base period, then this should be considered in the share allotment for future years or until a renegotiation of the market share is undertaken.

The current beef import situation in the United States illustrates the modern complexities and interdependence of international trade relationships among major nations. The U.S. share in world beef imports increased from one-fourth (26 percent) in 1950 to over one-half (51 percent) in 1962. Further increased imports in 1963 raised the U.S. percentage of the total world import figure still higher.

This great increase in beef imports has been encouraged by the increase in import restrictions in other major markets. Today the United States is the only major market without any quantitative restrictions and with a very nominal fixed import duty.

More than 1 billion pounds of beef and veal (product weight) were imported by the United States in 1963. This was equivalent to 1¾ billion pounds (carcass weight). This was an increase of 20 percent over 1962 and represented 11 percent of U.S. production in 1963. This is in sharp contrast to a few years earlier (1956) when imports were equal to only 1.6 percent of U.S. production.

Not only have beef imports increased at a faster rate than domestic production since 1956, but they have increased more in absolute terms. Imports in 1962 were more than 1 billion pounds over the amount imported in 1957, whereas domestic production in 1962 was only 583 million pounds more than in 1957. However, in 1963 domestic production increased by about 1 billion pounds over the 1962 level while imports increased only 311 million pounds.

Imports of live animals (feeder cattle) in sharp contrast to imports of meat, were lower in 1963 than in 1962 by some 23 percent. Moreover there has been no marked trend in the increase of imports of feeder cattle over the years.

Almost without exception an increase in the production of beef has meant a price decline. On an average a 10 percent change in the production of fed beef has been accomanied by a price change of 13 to 14 percent in the opposite direction. In other words, if production of fed beef increases 10 percent there will be an accompanying price decline of 13 to 14 percent. The production of fed beef increased by over 11 percent in the United States in 1963 over 1962 and would cause a significant decline in American beef cattle prices.

When to this heavy increase in domestic production of beef during 1963 is added the increase in imports (311 million pounds) it is clear why beef cattle prices were appreciably lower in 1963 than in 1962.

The decline in domestic production of cow beef since the middle 1950's has been largely offset by increases in imports of cow meat. The decline in cow beef production resulted from holding back beef cows from slaughter and building up herds. The number of cattle and calves on farms January 1, 1964 is estimated at 107 million compared with about 104 million the year before, 100 million January 1, 1962, and 91 million January 1, 1958.

Utility cow prices (Chicago market) have been quite stable until this past fall and averaged between $15 and $16 per hundred-

weight in each year since 1960. However, between August and December of 1963 utility cow prices broke by about $3 per hundredweight declining from an average of $15.65 in August to $12.71 in December. Since much of the imported meat is cow meat, it is believed that increased imports along with increased domestic slaughter in 1963 accounted for the sharp decline in utility cow prices last fall.

There is evidence that beef prices are turning upward from their recent lows. On Friday, January 27, prices of choice slaughter steers in Chicago ranged from $22 to $23.75 and averaged $22.88. This is 59 cents above the average for December 1963. Utility cow prices ranged from $12 to $13.75 and averaged $12.88. This is 17 cents per hundredweight above the December figure.

The meat price situation is further complicated by the heavy U.S. supplies of meats other than beef. In 1963 beef and veal production reached an alltime high; broiler production reached an alltime high; pork production was larger than in any previous year since 1944, and total meat showed a major increase over 1962 and reached an alltime high. Total U.S. meat production was 37.7 billion pounds (carcass weight) in 1963 compared with 36.1 billion in 1962. This is an increase of about 4½ percent in total meat production. In 1964 total meat production is estimated at 38.1 billion pounds or a further increase of 1 percent over 1963 and about 5½ percent above 1962. Beef and veal production are largest with about 18 billion pounds, pork second with some 12 billion pounds, poultry third with about 7½ billion pounds, and lamb and mutton last with 750 million pounds.

Australia is the leading shipper of beef to the United States and accounted in 1963 for nearly half of total beef imports (44 percent), New Zealand one-fourth (23 percent), with Ireland, Argentina, and Mexico each supplying about 6 percent, and Canada, Brazil, Denmark, West Germany, Poland, the Netherlands and other countries supplying the remaining 15 percent.

Although the United States is the world's largest importer of meat ($360 million) our exports of livestock and meat products were almost as large as imports. We exported $347 million worth of livestock and meat products in 1963 or only $13 million less than our imports. Wheat and flour are our largest export item ($1.2 billion in 1963) with feed grains ranking second with nearly a billion dollars ($977 million) followed by oil seeds and oil seed products, cotton, fruits, and vegetables, and tobacco, all exceeding in value our total livestock and meat product exports.

Navy's Largest Shore Facility Includes an Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to an article in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register of November 30, 1963, which tells the story of the world's most important naval training center, the Naval Air Training Command in Pensacola, Fla.:

NAVY'S LARGEST SHORE FACILITY INCLUDES AN AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The Navy's largest shore establishment, the Naval Air Training Command, is worth more than $642 million, and has under its operational control the aircraft carrier *Lexington*.

Commanded by Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, with headquarters at Pensacola, Fla., NATC celebrated a 20th anniversary in December. Its mission is to train new naval aviators and naval aviation officers, including marines, technical and medical personnel, as well as training and maintaining a Ready Naval Air Reserve.

Assisting Admiral Lee in carrying out these tasks are five functional commanders. They are: Rear Adm. Daniel F. Smith, Jr., Chief of Naval Air Basic Training; Rear Adm. F. A. Brandley, Chief of Naval Air Advanced Training; Rear Adm. Allen Smith Jr., Chief of Naval Air Technical Training; Rear Adm. George P. Koch, Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training and Rear Adm. L. C. Newman, Commanding Officer of the Naval Aviation Medical Center.

Admirals Daniel Smith and Newman maintain headquarters at NAS, Pensacola, Admiral Brandley is at Corpus Christi, Tex., Adm. Allen Smith at Memphis, Tenn., and Admiral Koch at Glenview, Ill.

The NATC inventory includes more than 2,200 aircraft based at 16 naval air stations and 6 auxiliary air stations.

Other facilities include two naval air technical training centers, four technical training units, six Naval Air Reserve training units, one mobile air training group, a training publications center and a printshop.

Admiral Lee also has under his operational control the training aircraft carrier *Lexington*, 4 Marine air detachments, the School of Aviation Medicine, 20 separate training squadrons, the Naval Pre-Flight School and the Naval Aviation Museum.

It costs more than $96.9 million annually to operate the facilities and aircraft of the air training complex.

Approximately 95,000 Navy men and Marines, including 45,000 students are assigned to the command. NATC employs 10,300 civilians.

An average of 2,550 new naval aviators and 60,000 aviation technicians and 160 flight surgeons and examiners are trained each year by NATC units.

New Threats to Patent Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the American pharmaceutical industry has been under heavy attack from many sources. It has been called to my attention that some foreign governments, notably Canada, India, Colombia, South Africa, Brazil, New Zealand, and others are considering retrictions on international patent rights by making it illegal to identify a drug with the company producing it. But the elimination of disease and the promotion of good health cannot be obtained by destroying the patent system. Indeed, without patents to safeguard investments, the American pharmaceutical industry which, like all other industry, is subject to the laws of the marketplace, will be forced to abandon basic research projects.

The following remarks of Mr. E. G. Hesse, managing director of Cyanamid International Division, call attention to the grave dangers inherent in weakening patent rights.

THE INTERNATIONAL PATENT CRISIS AND ITS MEANING TO AMERICAN BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

(Remarks of E. G. Hesse, managing director, Cyanamid International, before the International Economic Affairs Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, October 15, 1963)

I appreciate this opportunity to speak for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association on the subject of "The International Patent Crisis and Its Meaning to American Business Management."

I know you are all aware that the pharmaceutical industry has been under heavy attack during the past 4 years from several quarters. This attack was spearheaded by public hearings of the U.S. Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the late Senator Kefauver. The attack was picked up by the daily press in this country and abroad, and additional fuel has been added periodically to the flames.

Our critics began by accusing us of excessive prices and profits. Now they are demanding the abolition of all pharmaceutical trademarks and patents.

These demands are being made in many parts of the world. The position is, in effect, that the pharmaceutical industry has a continuing responsibility to invest in research and development of new products, but must share with all comers the results of that research.

I don't believe that even the most passionate critic of the pharmaceutical industry would question the quality of its research and products. If so, there would be no international hue and cry to erode, to abandon, to destroy patent rights in the pharmaceutical industry.

It is because the laboratories of our industry have done such an effective job that we are in trouble around the world.

THE ATTACK IS WORLDWIDE

Here are a few examples of the problem:

A Restrictive Trade Practices Commission was organized by the Canadian Government to study the patent situation in the pharmaceutical industry. Its report advocated the abolition of all pharmaceutical patents.

The Government of India has extended its emergency powers to include the takeover of any and all drug patents at arbitrarily set compensation with no recourse to the courts. The Indian Parliament may consider a bill later this year designed to ban specifically the issuance of any new food and drug patents.

The Colombian Congress is considering a bill to confer on the holder of a new drug patent no rights other than the collection of a nominal royalty and for only 5 years. The bill would also eliminate extension of all existing drug patents.

The Snyman Commission in South Africa has recommended that the period of validity of drug patents be reduced from the present 17 years to only 5 years. The commission urged that only the generic name—not the brand name—of the product be protected.

Similar moves have been considered in Brazil, New Zealand, and other countries.

Turkey already has, in effect, abolished drug patents.

The question is, Why?—and the next question is, What will happen if this mass movement succeeds?

The pharmaceutical industry can understand why. Former President Lleras Camargo, of Colombia, stated his country's position quite simply in a quote published in the New York Herald Tribune:

"I can understand," he said, "why my people cannot have new cars, television sets, and other luxuries, and can only eat meat

at infrequent intervals; but I cannot understand why they should be deprived of lifesavings drugs; because these are priced out of the reach of more than 80 percent of the Colombian people".

Mr. Lleras Camargo is quite right—80 percent of the Colombian people cannot afford to purchase patented pharmaceuticals. This is why the Colombian Government and other governments are proposing sweeping restrictions on pharmaceutical prices and patents. But the pharmaceutical industry's concern over this problem is no less than that of Mr. Lleras Camargo.

PEOPLE, NOT STATISTICS, OUR CONCERN

We are concerned because we are human beings and because many of us have spent our entire working lives fighting the suffering and the deprivations caused by disease. An epidemic, to us, is not a group of statistics. We are fully aware of the lifesaving properties of our products and our ultimate concern is for people.

But the pharmaceutical industry's ability to cope with this problem is limited by the same economics which limit a nation's ability to feed, house, and clothe its people. And Colombia is a nation which cannot afford to feed, house, and clothe 80 percent of its people. Providing them with lifesaving drugs is only part of this vast problem.

According to the World Health Organization, for every child who dies of malnutrition in the United States, 300 die in certain Latin American countries. The WHO labels this disease hidden hunger and conservatively estimates its victims at 100 million children—all suffering from what the experts call protein-calorie undernutrition.

DRUGS NO ANSWER FOR HUNGER

Mr. Lleras Camargo says he can understand why his people can only eat meat at infrequent intervals. If he can understand and accept that, then he has condemned them to the most devastating of all forms of hunger—the hunger for protein foods.

Under such conditions, lifesaving drugs are no answer at all.

A drug is a very special thing to be used against a specific ailment on the advice of a competent physician.

For the 80 percent of the people in Colombia, is the problem really the cost of drugs? Or is it a shortage of proper food, clothing or shelter? Is it a shortage of doctors, of hospitals, of clinics or nurses? Is it a lack of sanitary conditions, of pure water, of mosquito and insect control?

Can we solve the problem of the 80 percent of the people in Colombia, indeed, the 80 percent of the people in any deprived area of the world, by eliminating patents as a means of forcing drug prices down?

Or are the proposals to control drug prices, reduce patent protection, or eliminate trade names an illusory panacea? By focusing attention on drug patents, can the governments of these countries evade the fact that four out of every five deaths can be traced to malnutrition or starvation? Can they then ignore the need for a healthful environment, an environment free from the conditions which cause disease, suffering and death?

Can they, with any hope of success, lay that responsibility at the door of the pharmaceutical industry—indeed, at the door of the few foreign pharmaceutical companies which hold drug patents and sell their products by trade name?

Apparently they can, for this appears to be the answer these governments have found. And this, basically, is what they are trying to do—to pass laws making it illegal to prescribe a drug by trade name or in any way to identify the drug with the company which produces it. They are trying to pass laws either to force companies to license their patented products to any and all comers or to eliminate patent rights entirely.

And this, gentlemen, is the international patent crisis.

VIOLATING ONE, VIOLATES ALL

I don't think anyone can interfere with the patent rights of one industry without opening the door to interference with all patents. If drug patents are violated with impunity, there is no reason why some nation could not decide that pesticides are necessary to human existence and therefore all pesticide patents must be abrogated.

The next step might be farm machinery to insure more food, textile fibers for more clothing, automobile parts for better transportation, or television sets for improved communication.

If drug patents are eliminated without challenge, there is no reason why any patent should be allowed to exist. We are facing here what might be called the greatest threat in history to the patent system. It is a threat because nearly a dozen nations in all parts of the world—nations in which little or no research is done—are considering measures to eliminate patents.

It is a threat because the issue is beclouded by other issues which are just as important, but far more dramatic. When the Colombian newspaper El Tiempo calls the fight to eliminate drug patents "the high price of death," it is almost impossible to distinguish the real issues from the illusion.

REALITY VERSUS ILLUSION

For it is an illusion to believe that you can eliminate disease, suffering, and death in any depressed or deprived area of the world by wrecking the patent system. Good health demands a healthful environment; it demands a balanced diet, clothing, and shelter. It demands hospitals, doctors, and nurses to do their jobs.

Good health also demands schools and teachers—in fact, a complete change in the way of life of many of the people. It is not simply a matter of passing out tablets or giving injections.

If this were just an illusion, we could probably find a way to live with it.

But it is a dangerous illusion because it has diverted attention from the real problems which face the developing nations, massive, complex problems which demand massive, complex solutions.

It is a dangerous illusion because it has led to the public denunciation of U.S. companies which developed these drugs, a denunciation which affects the atmosphere in which all U.S. firms do business in Latin America and elsewhere abroad. A denunciation which feeds the vultures of anti-Americanism around the world.

It is a dangerous illusion because many persons in the United States itself have begun to accept it as reality. It is dangerous because we are letting it eat away the fibre from which the pattern of this Nation was woven.

And it is dangerous for its direct and almost immediate effects on the pharmaceutical industry, which could be forced out of the research business.

The expectation that patent protection can be obtained for any new product or improved process that they are industrious enough and fortunate enough to discover, encourages companies in the pharmaceutical industry to gamble nearly $300 million each year in research.

All the new synthetic steroid hormones, many important vitamins and all the broad-spectrum antibiotics are patented, as are the newer penicillins.

PATENTS PROD INCENTIVE

The incentive value of patents in drug development is confirmed by the fact that nearly all important new compounds introduced since 1939 were discovered in the United States, Germany, or Switzerland, all countries with patent laws many years old.

There is no question about the incentive value of patents. In Italy, where Mussolini abolished pharmaceutical process patents, there have been no important advances in the field.

My own company, Cyanamid, holds some 2,400 U.S. patents on products, processes, and equipment related to overall activities in the pharmaceutical, chemical, plastics, agricultural, and fibres fields and adds about 200 new patents every year. It could not long survive as a research-oriented organization without the 17-year protection of these patents.

Without patents to safeguard our investments, Cyanamid and all the other companies engaged in research would be forced, by economic necessity, to abandon, one by one, all of their promising research projects. Industrial research, which turns out most of the new developments in the drug field, would wither and fade away, leaving the task to government groups which have neither the incentive nor the ability to turn out a commercially feasible product, to get it to the physician fast, and to guide him as quickly as possible in its appropriate use.

REPUTATIONS REST ON PATENTS

Without patented products and their trade names to identify them, pharmaceutical companies would be forced to abandon their carefully built up reputations for quality and purity and rely upon the minimum standards Government requires.

For what is a patent right? However intangible, it is basically industrial property. It is as much a part of your worth as your manufacturing plant. And to stand idly by, watching the slow erosion of these property rights is no different than viewing without complaint the wanton destruction of your industrial plant.

To believe that only pharmaceuticals are involved is to live in false security. When the Indian Government discusses later this year a bill to ban new patents, they will be talking about drugs, but already food and food processing equipment have been added for discussion.

What is at stake here is not the pharmaceutical industry's right to own patents. It is the right of any industrial concern, actually the right of any man or woman, to own property, to develop an idea or technology or product and to enjoy its fruits.

Once this right has been violated, no man's property is safe.

And the consequence is to halt the progress of science and technology which works for the benefit, for the convenience, and for the pleasure of us all.

Think of what a patentless, generic world would hold for us:

We still might be cranking our cars and our telephones, because no one had the incentive to develop the self-starter or automatic dialing.

We might be spending our evenings listening to the old-fashioned wireless because radio had not been perfected and because GE and RCA couldn't take the risk of investigating that newfangled thing called television.

We would do our shipping, not at Macy's, Gimbel's, or Sears, but in a store—a plain, ordinary generic store. We would wash with soap, not Ivory; drink soda, not Coca-Cola; ride in automobiles, not Fords; and we probably would never have heard of Juan Valdez. Coffee would be just plain coffee, whether it was grown in Colombia or not.

The key to the future would not fit a Yale lock.

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY A BIRTHRIGHT

The United States achieved greatness because it was woven with the threads of individual liberty, with the right to think independently, to work independently, and to make an individual contribution to society.

The result is a technology and a know-how which surpasses that of all nations, and a distribution of the benefits of that technology to a larger percentage of its people than that of any other country.

The wealth of this Nation came from individual initiative and we have shared this wealth with practically every country in the world.

Nations rich as ours can afford to share their wealth.

What they cannot do, and survive, is to give away the drive and the incentive that made that wealth possible.

And we cannot let other nations take it away without a struggle.

The abrogation of patents in Canada, Colombia, New Zealand, South Africa, or anywhere not only will destroy the fabric of progress in the United States, but will cancel out any chance these nations may have for their own development.

WHO WILL DO RESEARCH?

What private company or group in these countries would invest its time, money, or effort in research in the pharmaceutical or any other field in which patents are banned? What of their future scientists and engineers? Will they dedicate themselves to the manufacture of someone else's discovery, or will they leave home, not only to study abroad, but to work abroad, seeking an atmosphere which recognizes and rewards creative effort?

If we here in the United States sit back; if we as individuals, as companies or organizations, or even as a nation, fail to stand up for our convictions based on our successful experience under a patent system, then we not only will let ourselves be stripped of strength, but we will fail these other nations as well.

And if we join the effort to weaken the basis of industrial property and give it our blessing, as the Kefauver staff has done, then we are more than blind, for a blind man need not be a fool.

The battle to protect patents now is being fought by the pharmaceutical industry. But let no one here think that it is not his fight.

Thus far, too few in industry have recognized the potential danger of the international patent crisis.

But the pharmaceutical industry need not—must not stand alone.

I speak to you as an individual among his peers. We need your support, we need it urgently, we need it now.

American industry stands in the front line of attack in this most backward-looking campaign to abolish patent protection. We can no longer afford to walk alone, leaving each among us to answer the particular attacks which may be directed against his company or industry at a given time.

We must mount a counterattack that will reach and alert our own people, our own labor movement, our own legislatures and the executive branch of the Federal Government. For only by clarifying the picture in our own country can we hope to lead peoples and their governments overseas to a clear view of the role of patents as a path to progress.

As the first step toward this end, let us communicate with our colleagues in management, the workers in our plants and their unions, communicate with our customers, suppliers, the legislators who represent us, the many segments of the public with whom we come in contact.

Let us make it crystal clear that the heritage of American individual initiative must and will be protected.

Thus far, except in a few instances, the pharmaceutical industry stands alone. The question is, "How long will we stand at all?"

Distinguished Leader Lauds the Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein the very fine and commendable remarks of Miss Florence Birmingham, president of the Massachusetts Women's Political Club of Massachusetts, a great nonpartisan, nonsectarian organization in my State, setting forth her and the club's admiring views of our illustrious Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Miss Birmingham is a courageous leader and thinker of great ability, and her views so strongly and eloquently expressing her admiration, pride, and confidence in our beloved Speaker are overwhelmingly approved in the State of Massachusetts—indeed they are shared preponderantly by millions and millions of our fellow Americans.

I would like to take this opportunity of commending and thanking Miss Birmingham for her very appropriate, impressive commentary on the life, character, and noteworthy, historic contributions of our great Speaker.

Let no one be so naive, imprudent, or blind as to doubt the very high measure of respect, confidence, and affection that is felt for Speaker MCCORMACK by his colleagues and the country.

To those who have served with him, Speaker MCCORMACK is honored for the dignity, just and impartial manner in which he presides over the House, for his political sagacity, his genius in the fine arts of statecraft, and for the great ability, vigor, understanding, and humane feeling which mark his conduct of public affairs.

Miss Birmingham's moving speech admirably voices the high regard in which Speaker MCCORMACK is held by the House and the American people and the confidence they have in this great American, who so wisely, ably, and impressively presides over the House, and furnishes such superb leadership to the Nation in these challenging days.

The speech follows:

SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK

"The Congress of the United States is in deep trouble," wails Stewart Alsop, in the December issue of the Saturday Evening Post. "The Hill has gone to hell," says an old hand on Capitol Hill, since the Speaker died and Lyndon left." Sam Rayburn, of Texas, was the Speaker. His successor is JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, "an elderly, earnest man who looks like an exhausted monk," so says the writer, Stewart Alsop.

Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK is dedicated to his congressional duties and has never become a part of the whirl of social events in Washington. The Saturday Evening Post, once a dignified, dependable weekly, now scoffs, now forgets the dignity inherent in a human being. Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a great, beloved statesman.

It has been said, "This is our America and whenever this country becomes so contacted with subversive and destructive doctrines of a misguided, chaotic world that it cannot see the center, the heart and soul of this spiritual source of power, when we fail to make personalities that can be trusted, we fail to make an American."

The article continued, "When Rayburn died the thing just fell apart."

Speaker MCCORMACK is a hard-working Member of the Congress, devoted to his religious beliefs. He is like a monk in that he gives to individuals who come to him for help assistance and comfort while asking nothing in return.

Speaker MCCORMACK should be tired. For many years he carried a double burden of work, for, while he was majority leader he carried on his own work with scrupulous care, and also took over the double load of Speaker Rayburn who for a long time was suffering from a painful, incurable cancer. While Members of the Congress may not have been aware of this sad situation, the fact remains that the majority leader, now the Speaker, watched over the ailing Speaker Rayburn with loving solicitude until his death.

While Speaker MCCORMACK works endlessly himself, he stops by the wayside to help others. His attitude is: I expect to pass through this world but once. Any good, therefore, that I can do, or any kindness that I can show my fellow creature, let me do it now. Let me not defer, nor neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again.

The Speaker also says: "There is, after all, no sane interpretation of life save through a belief in immortality."

In his religious faith appears the noblest side of Speaker MCCORMACK's nature. He has high regard for all religions and individuals, as well as sectional and economic rights.

Speaker MCCORMACK is devoted to his duties. He thrives on his work. It is his life. He keeps fit and is hale and hearty. Because of his long service in the Congress, he has become well known to Presidents, Democratic and Republican.

There are in the Congress of the United States 100 Senators and 435 Congressmen and women. Many of them are 69, 70 and 80 years young. All are alert in mind and body. Why, then, is Congressman MCCORMACK singled out for attack because he has reached 70?

Certainly no man has a right to ridicule any individual because of age. Quoting from The Right of Men in America, the Catholic weekly, "More than the policemen and the politicians, the jurists and the philosophers here are insisting that the inalienable rights of the individuals in this country, as the Founding Fathers insisted, come not from the state but from their Creator, and that nobody has the right to take them away."

Correspondent James Reston in Washington quoted words written years ago by another highly respected journalist and author, Walter Lippmann, who said:

"The decay of decency in the modern age * * * the treatment of human beings as things, as the mere instruments of power and ambition, is without doubt the consequence of the decay of the belief in man as something more than an animal animated by highly conditioned reflexes and chemical reactions.

"For, unless man is something more than that, he has no rights that anyone is bound to obey. This is the forgotten foundation of democracy in the only sense in which it can hope to endure. The liberties we talk about defending today were established by

men who took their conception of man from the great central religious tradition of Western civilization, and the liberties we inherit can almost certainly not survive the abandonment of that tradition."

In a radio address on April 18, 1937, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, opposed criticism of the Supreme Court and in his argument upheld the members of the Supreme Court. It was argued that because there were only nine judges there was tremendous delay in getting cases decided. Facts were produced and it was found that the Court was abreast of its work. Then this argument was dropped.

"It was declared that a man past 70 was reactionary and useless. That long list of useful and liberal-minded men, all well over 70 years of age, was brought to public attention, and no longer do we hear much of that argument. Indeed, the truth is that we need not pay much attention to the question of how old in years or how young in years a man may be. What counts is the kind of man he is. You cannot measure a man's worth by looking at his birth certificate."

One of our great colleges in the United States will hire no teachers or instructors unless they have reached the age of 65, preferably 70.

John Adams, second President of the United States, was born in Massachusetts in 1735. He graduated from Harvard. When Washington retired, John Adams was elected President. Always active, he died on the 50th anniversary of American Independence, July 4, 1826. His political rival, Thomas Jefferson, expired on the same day at the age of 91.

We cannot forget Mr. Baruch, and the long list of outstanding men like him, not only holding places of public trust, but active in industry and finance. What a ponderous book one could write about citizens past 65 who are as agile and active as those of 40.

The swarm of world leaders who poured out through the White House gates to march to President John F. Kennedy's funeral on November 25 made an impressive sight. It was also a highly significant spectacle, whose meaning was not lost on people of other lands. "It was the world's tribute to the power of the American Presidency."

The world recognizes that the industrial and military might of the United States makes our President the most important political figure on earth. That is why the head of every state outside the Chinese Communist bloc was present at the funeral in person or through a representative.

Because the matter of age has been made an issue by some, it was of interest to read the age of heads of state from other lands, for instance:

De Gaulle 71 years of age, Adenauer 84, Erhardt 69, Churchill 79–80 while still working for his government—now retired at 90.

A brief biography of Speaker John W. McCormack of the 12th District, Suffolk County, city of Boston, wards 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. Population (1950), 332,581.

John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Dorchester, born in South Boston; lawyer; educated in the Boston Public Schools; married to M. Harriet Joyce of South Boston; member of the Constitutional Convention, 1917–18, member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives 1920–22, and the Massachusetts Senate 1923–26, the last 2 years Democratic leader; Member 70th Congress, filling unexpired term of the late James A. Gallivan. Member of the 71st, 72d, 73d, 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, and 79th Congresses; majority leader; Member 83d Congress, Democratic whip; Member of 84th, 85th, 86th, and 1st session 87th Congresses; majority leader; World War I veteran; awarded honorary degrees of LL.D by Boston University, Boston, Mass.; Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.; Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.; Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.; Tufts College, Medford, Mass.; Providence College; R.I.; Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass.; Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Suffolk University, Boston, Mass., and Staley College, Brookline, Mass.; member of Order of Malta, First Class; awarded Peace Medal of the Third Order of Saint Francis; Knight Commander, Order of St. Gregory the Great with star; Commander, Legion of Honor, Republic of the Phillipines; Ballarmine Medal, Ballarmine College, 1957, Ballarmine College, Louisville, Ky.; member, Knights of Columbus; elected speaker, 2d session 87th Congress. The Lantern presented by Citizens of the Year, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the constant requests and invitations from outstanding clubs, universities, and anxious patriots all over the Nation asking that they may receive from him his views, opinions, and his interesting discussions and oratory.

U.S. exports have bounced back up, after sagging dismally at the turn of the year. They now appear headed for a gain this year of at least $1.3 billion over last year's record $20.5 billion in merchandise shipments.

Certainly, all the signs and portents point to a prosperous year for 1964, and, despite the Saturday Evening Post and its pessimism, the Congress seems to be steaming along full speed ahead.

We women in the Massachusetts Women's Political Club, nonpartisan, nonsectarian, of which I am president, look forward to the future with serenity, for all the signs and portents forecast a bright new year.

Miss FLORENCE BIRMINGHAM,
President, Massachusetts Women's Political Club.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A New Wheat Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a wheat bill which is identical to the bill introduced recently by Congressman MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota, in the House, and in the Senate by Senators FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, and MILT YOUNG, of North Dakota.

Iowa, of course, is not one of the leading wheat-producing States of the Union, but we do produce millions of bushels of wheat annually, and because the need is so great for an increased income for our Iowa farmers I feel dutybound to introduce this bill, after making a thorough study of the bill introduced by my colleagues in both Houses of Congress.

On Last December 4 when the gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman ANDREWS, introduced his bill H.R. 9344, he said in part in explaining his bill—see page 2221:

> The plan we are suggesting would amend the present law to make it voluntary. There would be no referendum. The act would be far easier to administer than any of the wheat plans that have been promoted by the Department of Agriculture. Actually our bill is closely akin to the principles of the old McNary-Haugen farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I agree and I am sure a great majority of our farmers will agree with the gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman ANDREWS, when he said:

> I believe sincerely that both taxes and Government expenditures must be cut and that other wheat legislation before Congress could cost the taxpayers up to $2 billion annually, while our program would be self-supporting if the President chose to have processors acquire the marketing certificates.

The gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman ANDREWS, went on to explain that our bill would—

First. It preserves the cherished American tradition of freedom of choice. Those farmers wanting no program at all could stay out. Those who feel they need price supports could participate.

Second. It provides full parity for that wheat produced for domestic consumption.

Third. It is a much less complicated program and can be administered with a minimum of cost to the taxpayer and a minimum of interference with the farmer.

Fourth. There would be an interchangeability feature by which a farmer could substitute his feed grain acres for wheat and vice versa.

Fifth. It would allow freer export of American wheat, giving us the opportunity of using our God-given abundance as a positive weapon for peace in the world.

And lastly, the price for wheat would be set in the marketplace, with the result that we in North Dakota would get more for our quality wheat.

The Secretary of Agriculture, of course, would determine each year what amount of wheat we need to meet both domestic and export requirements. The amount set could be not less than 1 billion bushels. Each year the Secretary would announce what acreage was needed to meet the necessary annual production goal. The State, county, and farm allotment would be determined with the national allotment in the same manner as allotments are now determined.

The national allotment for next year using this formula which would require the production of approximately 1.2 billion bushels would be about 50 million acres.

It now appears entirely possible that present export levels could be maintained or even increased. In the event of an increase, of course, acreage allotments would be somewhat higher. A minimum export level would be set by the Secretary as provided under existing law which the Secretary has announced at $1.30 per bushel. The individual farmer would receive, however, 100 percent of parity, which is currently $2.51 per bushel, for that portion of his wheat consumed in the United States—approximately 500 million bushels. This would give a blended price of about $1.80 per bushel to the participating farmer for all of his wheat.

The market price would be set entirely by the demand for that particular type of wheat sold, and if the farmer were raising wheat which has always commanded a premium, or if expected heavy exports materialize, the farmer would, of course, receive a higher blended price.

Besides the assured blended price of at least $1.80 a bushel, farmers complying with the program who reduced their acreage would receive diversion payments the same as we have had under wheat and feed grain programs for several years.

The President of the United States would have discretionary authority under the provisions of this bill to make wheat certificate payments directly through the Commodity Credit Corporation as is done under the present wheat and feed grain program. Or he could elect, by requiring the domestic processors to purchase the wheat certificates as is presently required under the wheat-certificate law, to make the program largely self-financing.

The elimination of most, if not all, Government storage payments would be another great saving. The repeal of wheat marketing quotas and marketing penalties would be a part of this new wheat price support proposal.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Douglas H. McGarrity, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, to David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, January 15, 1964.

DAVID LAWRENCE,
Editor, U.S. News & World Report,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAWRENCE: As spokesman for the Disabled American Veterans, I wish to point out what I consider a very misleading article in the January 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report. I am referring to a story on page 62, entitled "How Much More of a Welfare State for United States?"

Federal spending for veterans' benefits are blatantly included among welfare projects reviewed in the story. First of all, expenditures for veterans' benefits are not, and should not be classified as or identified with, welfare payments made by Federal, State and local governments. These benefits are undeniably a direct cost of war, even though payments are protracted and delayed. They are, in fact, equally as much a part of war as the cost of manufacturing bullets, tanks, airplanes, and rockets.

As you are much more aware of the fantasic cost of war, or preparation for war, than the average citizen, and also realize the huge waste involved in many instances because of required expediency, I believe you should realize and convey to your readers the fact that veterans' benefits are a very small part of the total cost of war. If this Nation commits itself to war, then it is obligated to pay the cost. It is difficult indeed, to evaluate the cost to disabled war veterans, their widows and dependents, in terms of long-term suffering as a result of physical disabilities directly attributed to combat service. The DAV is a very patriotic organization, and believes in the justness of our Nation's cause in past wars, and the need for present defense spending. But we strongly object to terming veterans' benefits as welfare projects.

Another point concerning your story, which I wish to review and be more specific on, is the fact that there was absolutely no explanation of the difference between benefits paid to wartime, service-connected disabled veterans, and those allowed to other veterans. The RAV is a single-purpose organization, devoted to the principle of serving the wartime disabled, his survivors and dependents. You say in the article that

"pensions and compensation payments are the largest program for veterans' adding up to $4 billion this year." But you don't explain the difference between "pension" and "compensation."

In my opinion, the general public should be fully aware of the difference. Compensation, as the word implies, is payment that compensates the veteran or his dependents for injuries sustained as a direct result of military service during time of war. From our organization's standpoint, it is grossly unfair to create the impression that all veterans' benefits are the same, or that justification for payment of these benefits is identical.

This same principle holds true for all benefits, not just compensation or pension. Others include hospital or medical care, insurance, housing, education, and employment preference. You will recall, for instance, that Public Law 16 provided special (separate and apart from the GI bill) education and job training benefits, designed to overcome the particular war-incurred disability, and make the veteran a useful, productive, taxpaying citizen. This is just one example of many.

I would appreciate your comment on the subject matter of this letter. Also, it is my belief that some type of article would be desirable to clarify the situation and pinpoint the fact that veterans' benefits, particularly those for wartime, service connected, should never be identified as welfare or relief projects.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS H. MCGARRITY,
National Commander.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us are thrilled at the terrific speech which has just been made by my very esteemed colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]. It certainly would be a presumption on my part to imagine for a moment I could even attract your attention, let alone measure up to the job he has done. I am grateful to the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me 10 minutes. I did not expect this to come until tomorrow, but I am delighted to have the opportunity and welcome the privilege of saying a word or two concerning this matter which I feel so very strongly about.

Let me say that notwithstanding the accusations which have been made in other places that we of the Southland have put these people of the Negro race under subjugation, that we have treated them wrongly, that we are hatemongers, may I just remind you, Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes that over the past 100 years we have been the true friends of the Negro race.

Notwithstanding our defeat, and being in ashes 100 years ago, when we southerners ate, everybody ate. When we had clothes everybody had clothes. To be sure, we had varying standards of living down there, just as you have them from one end of the States to the other, but we were continually helping the Negro although our means were very limited. I wonder where were all of these bleeding hearts back over the past 100 years when we of the South were trying to give an education to these people who were unable to pay for it themselves, and most of them were unable to pay any taxes whatsoever. Where were all of these bleeding hearts who want to come out today and say, "Let me be a Moses, let me lead you to the promised land?" Let there be no mistake about it, we in the Southland believe in opportunities for all. We have not had the wealth that many of you in other sections of the Nation have had and therefore we have not been able to make the progress we would have made in lifting the standard of living for all of our people; but at the same time, notwithstanding the heavier burden that we had, we did the best we could.

I think it is just short of treason now that we have so many from other sections of the country that are running down South and stirring up trouble and dividing people who have lived together so well in harmony. Do not think for a moment that it is not easy to create animosity and dissension in every section of the United States, to run over and try to pit this race against another race, and it will work everywhere.

Do you think there is any particular problem in running out there and saying, "Look on the other side of the street, John. Are you not as good as he? Do you have that home, do you have that nice car?" But again let me ask you, Where were all of these bleeding hearts for these folks who were supposedly suffering so much? Where have they been over the past 100 years when we of the Southland were trying to give better educational and economic opportunities for all of our people?

Another thing, let me point out to you, the passage of a law is ineffective in dealing with this very delicate problem. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], said we have 30 States with statutes on their books forbidding discrimination, and 25 forbidding discrimination in employment. Yet at the same time some of those States have been plagued with riots, demonstrations, and disorders not even known to our Southland. I refer to the State of Ohio, in Cleveland. They had demonstrations last year and some 40 were injured. They are having serious racial trouble now. Perhaps you saw on television last night, the Cleveland disorders, demonstrations we have never seen in the Southland notwithstanding the agitation by outsiders who want to run down there and use our people and divide them for the sake of getting some money or some publicity. But do you realize the fact that the State of Ohio has had a law against discrimination I believe since 1955, yet is it effective in putting down or preventing these demonstrations and riots?

I am not trying to oversimplify this thing, but I think you must conclude one of two things. You look at Ohio, you look at Pennsylvania, you look at Colorado. I am not just singling out these States because most of our States have suffered these same problems. If you pass this bill all of the States will suffer this problem. You are agitating, you are asking for trouble, you are deluding, you are perpetrating a fraud on the people you purport to help, because you purport to open the doors of oportunity throughout the United States and you are not taking care of the basic need; that is, better education and economic oportunity for all of our people. That is what we are doing today in the Southland. That will solve the racial problems more than the passage of an unconstitutional and unworkable law.

If we look at these Northern States or other areas that are having trouble, most of which have laws forbidding discrimination on their books, we can either say that the law is ineffective in dealing with this very delicate personal problem of associations or else you must say that these States are not enforcing their civil rights laws. Do not say for a moment that I got up here and said that Ohio, Pennsylvania, Colorado or any of the other States or New Jersey are not enforcing their laws so far as civil rights are concerned. They are doing the very best they can. But it shows you that even a law on a State level is ineffective to deal with this very delicate personal problem.

Let us quit trying to deceive all of the people into believing that you can solve this problem with the wave of a magic legislative wand. All you are doing is asking for more trouble. History will show you—even recent history will show you—we have had more disorders and demonstrations and racial unrest since the advent of the Civil Rights Commission than we ever had before.

I am privileged to serve on the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. There was presented to us last year in testimony by the director of the so-called division of equal employment opportunities of the Post Office Department that they have had more complaints in the past 2 years since they introduced or set up this division than they had in the 6 years immediately preceding its establishment.

All you are doing is asking for trouble by the passage of this bill. It has been pointed out so effectively and clearly by Judge Willis and others that the bill is clearly unconstitutional. Certainly, you are going to have to face up to the fact that we need something in America upon which we have to cling and must preserve and respect as one of the most sacred documents that has ever been

written—the Constitution. There is a way to amend the Constitution. To be sure, the framers of the Constitution made it difficult to amend—that is one of the things that has made our Constitution survive when other constitutions have crumbled—the fact that it is difficult of amendment. But, yet, the amendment process is easy enough, and if the amendment is necessary, then it will be passed. I would plead with the gentleman from the Committee on the Judiciary and, indeed, with all of you—if this is needed so much and if the people are so much for it, then why do you not follow the orderly process of amending the Constitution by the provisions set forth in the Constitution rather than trying to amend it here by the passage of a bill such as this on the floor of the Congress.

Let me say again, and I believe I speak for everyone down South—when you say this is an emotional issue—we do feel very strongly about it because we yield to no one in our patriotism and our love of country and our love of the Constitution. This is a very emotional prob'em. We want to preserve our Constitution. We want to give all of our citizens equal rights and equal opportunities. We do not want to deceive any of our citizens into believing that the passage of this law will give them better jobs or will open the doors to all of these areas to them. You are going to find this bill will drive further the wedge of racial dissension and animosity not only in the Southland but throughout the country. Let us be fair with all of the people. I believe in respecting the rights of the minorities as much as any man or woman in this body. But at the same time, I believe in respecting the rights of the majority. You cannot give one excessive rights without in turn trampling upon the rights of others.

This is a serious matter. In fact, it is the most important piece of legislation that we have considered not only in the brief span that I have been privileged to serve here, but I dare say it will be the most important matter that we shall have to consider in this or any other Congress. I do not want to be a fatalist, but if this measure is passed, I predict it will live to curse this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Safety in Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, recently, an editorial appeared in the Denver Post concerning the amazing safety record compiled by the Atomic Energy Commission's weapons production plant at Rocky Flats, Colo. This plant is operated under contract with the AEC by Dow Chemical Co.

The Rocky Flats plant, as of July 1, 1963, had the amazing record of more than 22 million man-hours of work without a lost-time injury. In fact, the plant had recorded no lost-time injuries since September 1957.

This outstanding safety record is only one important part of a larger brilliant safety record on the part of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors. As the Post editorial reports:

In 20 years, 1943 through 1962, the AEC and its forerunner, the Manhattan Engineer District, had 7,081 lost-time injuries. Only 35 of them, or one-half of 1 percent, were caused by nuclear radiation.

As a result of this fine record, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors have received the Award of Honor of the National Safety Council for 1962.

This record is the product of a team effort among researchers, engineers, labor, industry, and the Federal Government. It is a striking example of the statement that, in atomic energy, safety is no accident.

The editorial follows:

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 31, 1963]

SAFETY IN DANGER?

Danger begets safety. The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors again have won the top prize of the National Safety Council—the Award of Honor for 1962.

The best contractor safety record in the huge AEC complex, and one of the four best records for U.S. industrial plants of all kinds, is held by the Rocky Flats plant, operated northwest of Denver by Dow Chemical Co.

Rocky Flats as of July 1 had recorded more than 22 million man-hours of work without a lost-time injury. It had recorded no lost-time injuries since September 1957.

Atomic plants are anything but safe by nature. They abound in hideous hazards which until a few years ago were utterly unknown. They work with poisons that make snake farming seem like a no-risk business. When such materials are being handled the smallest slip can be fatal.

Such a slip at Rocky Flats, June 15, 1957, brought about official admission that this top secret plant in the atomic weapons complex handles plutonium. Two employees, Leonard Homan and R. M. Simmons, suffered skin cuts from shattered laboratory glassware and were treated for plutonium in their bloodstreams.

Fortunately the mishap wasn't very serious, but the only way to run an atomic safety program is to forestall slips before they happen. This demands unrelenting precautions and elaborate testing. At Rocky Flats the amount of time, equipment, and skilled labor devoted to health safety is almost fantastic. But it pays off.

Safety around such a plant isn't just a slogan topic. It's a way of life. Workers who need goggles wear 'em. Hard hats never go out of style.

AEC has some 7,000 employees. Its contractors employ about 120,000 persons. In 1962, AEC had 501 lost-time injuries. The accident frequency rate was 1.92 million man-hours worked. Compare this with 5.99 per million reported by the National Safety Council for all industries, and you'll find an AEC employee is better than three times as accident free as the average industrial worker.

In 20 years, 1943 through 1962, the AEC and its forerunner, the Manhattan Engineer District, had 7,081 lost-time injuries. Only 35 of them, or one-half of 1 percent, were caused by nuclear radiation.

On a wet, slippery night, police often record a lifesaving fact of human nature. Poor driving conditions tend to make motorists extra careful. Fewer accidents happen, and these are usually minor ones. Danger begets safety, in traffic as in atomic plants. But look out for clear, sunny days when visibility is unlimited. That's when we need the AEC brand of caution most.

The Destabilizing Effect of the Withholding Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker the proposed immediate reduction in the withholding rate to 14 percent is bound to have an important economic effect in the coming years. An article in the Wall Street Journal of January 31 discusses the destabilizing effect which this change is likely to have, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 31, 1964]

TRICKY TAX CUT: NEW WITHHOLDING RATES WILL CAUSE MANY TO PAY EXTRA CASH AT YEAREND—BUT FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS, REFUNDS WILL RISE FOR 1965 FOLLOWING DECLINE AT FIRST—A DRAG ON EXPECTED STIMULUS?

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—The forthcoming Federal tax cut promises to have a profound impact not only on the amount of tax most Americans pay, but also on the way they pay it.

The biggest change will involve the refunds received or extra cash payment required to match up a taxpayer's final liability with funds kept back from his paycheck under the pay-as-you-go withholding system. Unless they plan ahead, some taxpayers face the weird probability of making out checks to the Treasury early next year for amounts almost as big as their 1964 net tax cut.

"Unless there's some forewarning," muses a Treasury official, "some people are in for a shock."

The Senate yesterday started debate on the big $11 billion-plus tax cutting bill. But while work on the measure isn't finished yet, Congress already appears to have made most of the necessary decisions about the tax cut's actual mechanics. The bill as it finally reaches President Johnson's desk is likely to have this impact on the Nation's tax collection system:

More white-collar employees will find themselves coughing up additional cash after the end of a taxable year to cover withholding deficiencies. The extra cash requirement will be especially heavy on this year's income, but will continue to a lesser extent in future years.

Blue-collar workers in the lowest income brackets will in many cases get a smaller-than-usual refund on this year's over-withholding, but the refunds in future years will be fatter as the tax cut becomes fully effective.

More people will join the 6 million-odd taxpayers who now must file "estimated" tax returns and pay quarterly installments to the Treasury. Rules require such payments when, among other tests, the amount of taxes

withheld falls more than $40 short of the taxpayer's final bill.

If substantial numbers of taxpayers use the officially sanctioned method of escaping the estimated-tax requirement—that of boosting the amount of taxes withheld by understating dependents—it will dampen the extra business stimulus which Federal economists expect from the tax cut this year.

TAX CUT ARITHMETIC

The arithmetic of how taxes will be cut is fairly clear. Both the House and the Senate Finance Committee have agreed on an identical two-step reduction in the percentage tax rates that determine a person's final liability to Uncle Sam. The rates which now range from 20 percent at the bottom income bracket to 91 percent at the top would be brought to a new range of 16 to 77 percent for this year's income. A further reduction to a range of 14 to 70 percent would occur next year.

Aggravating the complexity of a two-stage tax cut is the bill's delay in clearing Congress. The rate at which tax is withheld from wages and salaries under the pay-as-you-go system now stands at 18 percent for all employees, rich or poor. The withholding rate originally was supposed to make a two-step drop paralleling the decline in tax rates; 15 percent of an employee's pay would have been held back this year, and 14 percent next year.

Congress now is likely to let the withholding rate drop all the way to 14 percent upon enactment of the bill, about March 1 or a little earlier. This would be intended to give the economy an extra jolt of consumer purchasing power, but it also promises to pull the withholding system out of step with the decline in final tax liabilities.

Even under present law, the withholding system collects only a rough approximation of the final sum owed by taxpayers as a whole; too much is withheld, requiring refunds running about $5 billion a year. The tax bill in its present form will tend to reduce total refunds, but this will mask some diverse consequences for individual groups of taxpayers.

TOO BIG OR TOO SMALL

It appears, for example, that the reduction in the withholding rate will be too big for many taxpayers with above-average incomes. That means some of the overgenerous withholding cut will have to be paid back by the taxpayer at the end of the year. Many low-income taxpayers, on the other hand, won't get a withholding reduction big enough to keep step with the second-stage drop in tax liability in 1965, so from 1966 on they will get bigger end-of-the-year refunds.

How this will work can be illustrated with several examples, assuming no last-minute change is made in the bill's tax rate schedule. The examples assume the net withholding plan becomes effective around the current target date of March 1. In each case, the hypothetical taxpayers are married and have two children.

First, consider an office manager whose sole income is his $200 weekly paycheck, bringing him an annual salary of $10,400. Using the maximum standard deduction and claiming four $600 personal exemptions, his final tax on 1963 income at present rates is $1,460. If he lists all four exemptions with his payroll office for withholding purposes, $26.80 is withheld from his check every week.

The year's total withholding falls $66.40 short of his final tax. Under the rules, he should be filing an "estimated" tax return and making up the deficiency in quarterly installments of $16.60 each.

Now see what happens this year under the first-stage tax cut. The 1964 schedule of rates would reduce his final tax to $1,280, for a net cut of $180 from present tax. But the cut will be received in a way that the taxpayer may consider strange.

Withholding must continue at the old $26.80 weekly level during January and February of this year, before dropping around March 1 to the new 14-percent level of $20.80 for this man. At that point his take-home pay is fattened by $6 a week, and Washington's economists hope he spends it.

But a $6 weekly cut in tax withheld is too much compared with his reduction in 1964 liability. The combination of withholding at 18 percent for the first 8 weeks of this year and 14 percent for the remaining weeks takes a total of $1,129 out of his annual salary. This is $151 short of what he owes—almost equal to the $180 net tax cut itself. On this basis, his quarterly payments of estimated tax would rise to $37.75.

The imbalance between withholding and final tax will be only partly corrected next year, when tax rates take their drop. Next year's rate schedule would produce a final tax of $1,190 for this office manager, or a total cut of $270 compared with the levy under present law.

YEAR 1965 AND BEYOND

Withholding during 1965 will continue all year at the $20.80 weekly level in this example, so the employee won't enjoy another boost in take-home pay. This time, however, the full year's withholding of $1,082 is a bit closer to his final tax. He'll wind up owing $108, to be paid in quarterly installments of $27 each. Thus, the amount he must give back will be less than for 1964, but permanently more than he was coughing up under the tax system for 1963 and prior years.

By some deft juggling of his children, however, our tax cut beneficiary can avoid much of the threatened increase in his checks to the Treasury. On March 1 or so, he can tell the payroll office to lop off two of his dependents listed for withholding purposes. This would produce a new weekly withholding level of $24.40 when the tax cut becomes effective, or a boost of only $2.40 in take-home pay. But it would bring the year's total withholding to $7 more than his reduced final tax liability for 1964. Instead of paying the Government quarterly checks, he'd get a $7 refund.

In 1965, the office manager could ask the payroll office to restore one of his dependents to the withholding list. This would reduce his withholding to a level $15 below his final tax. He'd have to write a check for this amount but as it would be less than the law's arbitrary minimum of $40, it wouldn't require the filing of an estimated tax return or payment in quarterly installments.

The Internal Revenue Service for years has been urging taxpayers who are "underwithheld" to lop from their withholding records some of the dependents they're entitled to claim. The IRS doesn't know how many of the 52 million taxpayers in the withholding system already do this, but the number is believed to be large. If, as expected, the new withholding cut is too deep for many taxpayers with above-average incomes, the practice could become still more common.

As this example shows, however, dropping one or more exemptions would scale back the generous increase in take-home pay that's coming around March 1. It's this big injection of cash—estimated at $800 million a month—that President Johnson has said will give the economy an extra lift and compensate for the lateness of the tax bill. Voluntary action by any sizable number of taxpayers to keep their 1964 withholding level in line with this year's lower tax liability would limit the extra bulge in consumer spending power.

There's also evidence that the planned new withholding rate of 14 percent could mean a delay in full benefits for people with low incomes. Partly because of the tax bill's new formula for a bigger standard deduction for low-income people, the 14-percent withholding rate in many cases won't be low enough to conform to their actual cut in tax liabilities. That means much of the tax reduction coming in the low brackets won't be fully reflected in higher take-home pay, but must await refunds. (The bill permits each taxpayer a minimum standard deduction of $300 plus $100 for each additional exemption claimed on his tax return up to the $1000 maximum standard deduction.)

A married factory worker with two children now pays a tax of $564 on an annual wage of $5,800. The withholding system keeps back $11 a week from his paycheck, producing an $8 refund after the end of the year.

This worker's final tax in 1964 will drop to $465, for a cut of $99. The March 1 withholding reduction would increase his weekly take-home pay by $2.40. The new withholding level applied to the remaining 10 months of this year will bring total withholdings to within $1 of his final tax. But because of the further drop in 1965 tax liability, the new withholding level next year will be $29 more than his final tax. Not until the year's tax return is filed in spring of 1966, therefore, would the worker get the remainder of his tax cut in the form of a $29 refund.

This effect is even more pronounced for a worker making $4,000 a year. A withholding bite which now almost exactly matches his tax would, when everything is effective by 1965, be providing almost half of his net $100 tax cut through the refund route. While the Treasury hasn't made an extensive study, the same phenomenon of a permanently higher refund level seems to occur in examples involving low-income single taxpayers with no dependents.

IMPACT ON RICHER PEOPLE

Withholding changes also will affect richer folk, but they become less important to the taxpayer as income rises because more payments are made under the quarterly "estimated" tax system.

Consider, for example, a moderately well fixed junior executive whose salary of $20,000 is augmented by $200 of interest, $500 of dividends, and $1,000 of capital gains from stock held 1 year. Assuming itemized deductions of $3,000, his tax now comes to $3,814. The 18 percent withholding rate now keeps back $60.10 a week, a level which at the end of the year still leaves him owing $689.

This executive will get a $13.40 increase in weekly take-home pay around March 1 because of the withholding drop. But this is too far out of line with his $374 reduction in final tax for 1964, and his yearend cash debt to the Treasury will jump to $904. The added reduction in liability next year will bring the amount owed back down to $782, but this is still more than his cash requirement under present law.

Even if this executive told his payroll office to erase all his exemptions for withholding purposes, his 1965 underpayment would total $407, well above the requirement for filing an estimated tax return and paying quarterly installments.

Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in this season leading up to our important national elections it is well for us to have in mind the spirit

of sportsmanship. Bob Price, a versatile and alert sports writer for the Florida Times-Union, published in my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., reminds us of the objectives of sportsmanship as presented by the Florida High School Activities Association in his column of Sunday, January 26, 1964. Whether we are athletes, businessmen or politicians it is important to remember that wholesome competition is the cornerstone of a free competitive society. The column reads as follows:

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jan. 26, 1964]

SPORTSMANSHIP IN SPOTLIGHT

(By Bob Price)

Sportsmanship.

One would think there would be little need for a reminder to what comes naturally to most participants, and especially those in the high school ranks.

However, it never hurts to keep the objectives of sportsmanship before the youngsters.

And the Florida High School Activities Association has selected Friday for its annual Sportsmanship Day.

The FHSAA hopes the youngsters will understand:

1. That wholesome competition is the cornerstone of a free, competitive society.
2. That the other team is your worthy opponent, not your deadly enemy.
3. That athletic opponents should be treated with courtesy, not disdain.
4. That game officials should be treated as your guests.
5. That games are, after all, designed to determine the relative skills of teams in athletic contests and are not matters of life and death.
6. That respect for the rules of the game is essential.
7. That the inherent values are in playing the game.
8. That a true sportsman is humble in victory and steadfast in defeat.

This is a worthwhile program and the FHSAA hopes all of its 322 members will participate with a special program of some type.

The Role of Captive Nations Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to our colleagues' attention a recent address by the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., on the subject of current United States policy and attitudes toward captive nations.

In his remarks before the Assembly of Captive Nations in New York City, Congressman TAFT very accurately defined present U.S. policy as "confused." He cited recent policy declarations as underlining the confusion that exists not only within top echelons of our Government, but also among our people. Without in any way suggesting a radical departure in U.S. policy, Mr. TAFT astutely called attention to the dangers inherent in a policy of abandoning our former strong position against the continued existence of captive nations in the name of pragmatic diplomacy.

Congressman TAFT's address follows:

THE ROLE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS GROUPS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN 1964

(Address of ROBERT TAFT, JR., to Assembly of Captive European Nations, on occasion of commemoration of Asian peoples Freedom Day)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and your guests. It is appropriate that we meet here today to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Anti-Communist Freedom Day of the Peoples of Asia. As you probably know, the chairman of this assembly is today participating in observances in Taipei. While this organization has by its nature been concerned primarily with the captive European nations, the problems with which you have been dealing and the purposes to which you are dedicated are far wider in scope. During the last year we have seen the invidious spread of Communist activity from Cuba into Central America and, particularly in recent days, into Panama, Brazil, and Venezuela; from China into Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia; and, most recently, from as yet undetermined sources into Zanzibar and Tanganyika. Certainly this is no time for complacency or relaxation of our efforts or lowering our guard against the dangers. It is to the credit of your group that you will not allow this to happen.

At the outset I would like to make it clear that I consider myself no expert in the areas we discuss today. But I do welcome the opportunity to visit and talk with you because I feel that your problems are ones that should deeply concern all good Americans. Our heritage, beliefs, and interests are deeply involved with Eastern Europe and with the tradition of individual freedom there and throughout the world.

Somewhat symbolically, my personal connections with the problem began with my father's activities in the food administration with Mr. Hoover after World War II and extend even today to my son of the same name, who is working in the Peace Corps in Tanganyika.

The subject I have chosen today is "What Should Be the Role of Captive Nations Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy?" It is my belief that the primary role should be to demand and obtain a clarification of the thinking of this country on the broad problem of our attitude toward the captive nations. This clarification should come from the President and from the Secretary of State and should be examined and tested in the crucible of public opinion throughout the country. The broader the debate the more likely are we to be united and firm in the courses that we decide to pursue. The inherent strength of our democratic form of government has been its requirement and ability to establish a consensus of opinion on matters of national policy. Only as we understand the issues and establish a preponderance of public opinion can we, as a nation, best use our abilities, resources, and efforts toward the objectives and aspirations of ourselves and of those who share with us the goal of a free world.

One of the most serious problems we face today in dealing with the threat of international communism is confusion. Perhaps some degree of confusion is inevitable in a presidential election year, but I think it should be particularly noted that there has come from the leadership of our administration no clear statement of our direction and of our policy in the cold war, particularly on the fate and plans for the captive nations. The American people and the world are confused as to whether the United States has not abandoned a policy of standing on principle for freedom and self-determination for all peoples throughout the world for a policy of coexistence and expediency. In 1952 President Eisenhower pledged,

"To aid by every peaceful means, but only by peaceful means, the right to live in freedom. The containing of communism is largely physical and by itself an inadequate approach to our task. There is also need to bring hope and every peaceful aid to the world's enslaved peoples."

Later Secretary of State Dulles made our position even clearer.

"The captive peoples should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations. They must know that they can draw upon our abundance to tide themselves over the period of economic adjustment which is inevitable as they rededicate their productive efforts to the service of their own people, rather than of exploiting masters."

Yet, in the discussions during 1963 and this year, there have been no reassurances from U.S. leadership that these policies remain our primary objectives. To the contrary, President Kennedy, in discussing the nuclear test ban on July 27, 1963, stated,

"Under Secretary Harriman made it clear that any nonaggression arrangements across the division of Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests."

The implication, which correctly or incorrectly has been drawn from this statement and others, is that our only reservation in entering a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw powers would be the reluctance of our allies. A clear statement of policy on this point should be made and should reassure those who continue bravely to hope and aspire for freedom. Without such a statement the danger is that those in Europe and elsewhere, who seek and rely on the United States for moral backing against Communist tyranny, will lose their hope. While some hope sprang again from the Cuban confrontation in 1962, it vanished in disillusionment from the failure to follow up. Panama today only adds to the impression of confusion and weakness.

In examining what the role of organizations such as yours should be in the U.S. policy, we should first recognize that the President is primarily responsible for the formation of policy. Yet, even the executive branch is usually responsive to public opinion. The demands of East-European Americans have in the past been of invaluable assistance to the Executive in discrediting phony claims of the Communists and for generating diffusion and illusions within the Communist bloc. However, in periods when the United States seemed to be seeking a detente with the Soviet Union, such weapons have tended to be put on the shelf. The present period seems to be such a one. Today executive policy depends on three factors. First is a balance of nuclear terror approach. Secondly, there is the factor that the overall prevailing state of Soviet-American relations generally determines the nature of Eastern European-American relations. Probably this is inevitable because the political structure of the Soviet bloc and Russia's completely dominating power in it means that U.S. relations with Eastern Europe will be governed by the line established in Moscow. Thirdly, there remains the factor that in American policy there is a desire to continue to take advantage, where possible without affecting overall American-Soviet relations, of any political ferment existing in the area. Captive nation groups have been most helpful in this.

Based on these factors, our East European policy continues to be that outlined by Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs William R. Tyler in 1962, as follows:

"The systematic expansion of contacts and activity which would tend to maximize United States and Western influence in that

area, demonstrate our interest in the people's welfare, help to sustain their national traditions and aspirations, keep them in touch with Western thought, and help them preserve a true perspective on world developments in all fields of human endeavor and achievement."

This is all very well if we do not in pursuit of other policy reasons such as the nuclear threat and the desire for a detente lose sight of our overall goal and principles. In seeking improved relations and increased trade we should and must continue to demand and charge the price of increased autonomy for national groups and recognition of human rights and dignity within those nations. Your voice and the voices of all who understand the present weakening trends may be essential to prevent the Executive overlooking principles and relying on vain promises in the allout quest for reduced international tension.

Nor should your efforts be limited to the executive. The function of Congress in foreign policy is secondary, it is true, but it is extremely important. It is particularly important to groups such as yours, for our history has shown that the Congress, as the constitutionally designated voice for the people, has naturally been the main focal point of ethnic pressures seeking particular goals. The most improtant function of the Congress in foreign policy problems has been that of a consensus builder, and this has been particularly true with regard to Eastern European problems. Beyond this public-opinion-forming function there are also specific powers of Congress relating to Senate consent of treaties, appropriations for military and foreign aid purposes, and the power to trade through embargos, tariffs, and the like. An example of how the Congress can get into areas such as this one can be found in the recent wheat sale discussions. The guarantee of credits now made possible for almost all bloc nations will almost certainly be an issue in the coming elections. The attitude of groups such as yours in opinion forming throughout the country can be an important one and may well determine the future course of trade policies and financing policies with regard to the Soviet and its satellites. On issues such as these you should and can take the lead.

Beyond specific policy questions your continued efforts for the preservation and, hopefully, the strengthening of the traditions of Captive Nations Week and your backing of a Select House Committee To Study the Captive Nations with particular reference to moral and legal status of Red control and the means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight, are both objectives that should be pushed and can with support be successfully adopted.

Nor should you drop your efforts or support for the proposal of a Freedom Academy, a measure in which I am an author in the present session, so that we may have in policy positions those who are trained to understand the true nature of communism.

But most of all, as I indicated, it is important that you continue to insist that increased contact, trade, and recognition, if given to the Communist-dominated governments of the captive nations, be with a guarantee of increased liberties and independence. We must make it clear once again that there will be no sacrifice of principle for expediency and no bartering for freedom for temporary false security.

These are the tasks for which you are particularly suited to do service for this Nation and for the world. You are a catalyst that can force this clarification of our thinking and our policies.

Statement of the Honorable William M. McCulloch of Ohio, Before the Rules Committee on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary delivered an excellent statement in behalf of H.R. 7152 the civil rights bill before the Committee on Rules on January 15, 1964. I am happy to bring his statement to the attention of my colleagues.

The text follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT OF OHIO, BEFORE RULES COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, H.R. 7152, JANUARY 15, 1964

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee on Rules, I appear today in support of the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, as amended.

The bill now before the Rules Committee is comprehensive in scope but moderate in application. There are no primary criminal sanctions provided in the legislation. A sincere effort has been made to eliminate from this bill all provisions which improperly invade personal liberties and the rights of States and localities. Similarly, efforts have been made to surround each title with judicial safeguards and administrative limitations in order that fundamental rights and liberties be protected. Undoubtedly, other amendments or limitations could be made from the vantage point of hindsight. Perhaps such amendments or limitations will be in order in the House or in the other body. but the bill before you is basically a good bill and a bill that faces a pressing need for enactment.

There is considerable agitation for civil rights legislation from certain quarters on the ground that unless legislation is enacted there will be rioting in the streets, heightened racial unrest, and the further shedding of blood. This kind of activity, in my mind, is improper behavior and could do much to retard the enactment of effective civil rights legislation.

After the tragic death of President Kennedy, one would assume that certain uncontrolled groups would recognize the futility of riotous behavior.

No people can gain liberty and equality through storm troop or anarchistic methods. Legislation under threat is basically not legislation at all. In the long run, behavior of this type will lead to a total undermining of society where equality and civil rights will mean nothing.

Behavior of this type also creates the false sense of hope that once legislation is enacted, all burdens of life will dissolve. No statutory enactment can accomplish that. Intelligent work and vigilance by members of all races will be required for many years before inequality completely disappears. To create hope of immediate and complete success can only promote conflict and brooding despair.

Not force or fear, then, but belief in the inherent quality of man induces me to support this legislation.

I believe in the right of each individual to have guaranteed his constitutional rights and to shoulder the burdens of citizenship. But I also believe in the obligation society owes to each citizen to afford him equality of opportunity.

I believe in the right and duty of State and local authority to be primarily responsible for the conduct of all but limited areas of governmental activities which it cannot do alone. But I also believe in the obligations of State and local governments to ever work for the common good.

I believe in the effective separation of powers and in a workable Federal system whereby State authority is not needlessly usurped by a centralized Government. But I also believe that an obligation rests with the National Government to see that the citizens of every State are treated equally without regard to their race or color.

Where, then, individuals or governmental authorities fail to shoulder their obligations, and only stress their rights, it is the duty of the Congress, under constitutional authority, to correct that wrong. To do otherwise would be to forgo our responsibility as national legislators and as human beings who honor the principles of liberty and justice.

No one would suggest that the Negro receives equality of treatment and equality of opportunity in many fields of activity, today. Well-informed persons, everywhere, admit that in all sections of the country—North, South, East, and West—the Negro continues to face the barriers of racial intolerance and discrimination. Hundreds of thousands of citizens are denied the basic right to vote. Thousands of school districts remain segregated. Decent hotel and eating accommodations frequently lie hundreds of miles apart for the Negro traveler. Parks, playgrounds, and golf courses continue to be off limits to Negroes whose tax moneys go to support them. Surplus agricultural supplies, State employment agencies and vocational training programs continue to be operated in a discriminatory manner. These, and many more facts, point the way toward the need for additional legislation.

I have prepared a short analysis of H.R. 7152 which I have distributed to the members of this committee. I need not, then, dwell on the contents of the bill. But I do wish to stress that what we seek to accomplish through enactment of this bill is a legal and moral climate of fairness and first-class citizenship for all Americans.

In voting, the foundations of our Republic are enhanced by a free elective franchise. In public accommodations, the economy of our country and the enjoyment of its people are bolstered. In equal protection of our laws, the principle of justice is secured. In education, the superiority of our citizens and of our Nation is assured. In employment and Federal assistance, the opportunity and well-being of each individual is advanced and the taproot of the country's economy is strengthened. In every one of these categories, we will be doing ourselves, as well as our Nation, a lasting service by enacting H.R. 7152.

I recognize that arguments have been raised concerning the constitutionality of certain titles of this bill. Whether we all concur or not in the evolution of the law as it has developed at each step, I believe the Constitution, as presently interpreted by the courts, supports each title. Congress has already acted in the field of voting. The Supreme Court has already stricken down segregation in public education and publicly operated facilities. The enactment and court interpretations of the Sherman, Taft-Hartley, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic, and Fair Labor Standards Acts, among others, has pro-

vided the legal support for the public accommodations and equal job opportunity titles under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. And, the Federal Government, through Congress, readily has the authority pursuant to the 14th amendment to withhold Federal financial assistance where such assistance is extended in a discriminatory manner. The fact, moreover, that some 32 States have enacted public accommodations laws (frequently broader in scope than title II), 25 States have enacted fair employment legislation, and many States have enacted other sweeping civil rights provisions clearly demonstrates that Congress will not be invading privacy, overturning the sanctity of private property, destroying personal liberties, or in other ways acting in an illegal manner.

Certain provisions in the bill, as introduced or as reported by the House Judiciary Subcommittee, exceeded constitutional authority. The permission of persons to vote, for example, on the mere word of the Attorney General was an illegal provision of this nature. So, too, were the provisions concerning the elimination of racial imbalance in education and the control over private institutions such as banks and mortgage companies merely because they were insured by the Federal Government. Other provisions were similarly of an objectionable nature and they were eliminated.

The bill that was favorably reported to the House and which the committee is considering is moderate and, in my opinion, constitutional. Admittedly, changes have been made which were not fully debated in the Judiciary Committee. But, the committee did spend months and months taking testimony and amending language on the principal titles, either as they now stand or in a closely related fashion.

Therefore, I urge this committee to grant a rule on H.R. 7152 in order that it may be enacted in an orderly fashion.

The Saturn Shot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post under date of February 1 about the Saturn shot that was so successfully accomplished this past week and an article entitled "The Moon Race," by Roscoe Drummond that appeared in the same paper.

Both of these articles point up the fact that we must continue on the well-planned and orderly program effectively adopted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the direction of the dynamic Mr. James Webb. The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1964]

SATURN SHOT

The orbiting of the heaviest payload in history by a Saturn rocket, itself the most powerful spacecraft and the first hydrogen engine ever known to fly, is a stunning achievement which brings credit to those responsible for it and thrills to the rest of us. Its immediate significance is that for the first time in the space age the United States has a lead over the Soviet Union in a category—weight lifting—which is vital for sending a man to the moon.

There is no assurance, of course, that the lead will last. But whatever accretions of pride and advantages of propaganda are conferred by space leadership, they belong for

The Saturn success, representing the manned-flight side of the American space program, should not obscure the concurrent launchings of two other vehicles on the research side. They are the Ranger VI, headed on a photographic mission to the moon, and the Echo balloon satellite. The country can take pride in these shots too, even though they are of the sort which often seem to be riding on the coattails of the more glamorous manned-flight exercises.

This Echo satellite was intended to be the first used for a joint space project by the Russians. They have not yet used it, although they still may. The history of difficulties and delays which mark this effort to work together on a small project, one may note, hardly builds up hopes for a joint Soviet-American moonshot. Indeed, with each successful step that the two countries take alone on the way to the moon, the incentive and opportunity to go there together probably fall.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1964]

THE MOON RACE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

TIME TO BEAR DOWN

After a long hurtful delay in getting going after the first Russian sputnik, the successful launching of the Saturn I rocket puts the United States even with—perhaps ahead of—the Soviet Union.

What counts now is that we keep going in the steady, orderly mastery of outer space and not be put off by the soporific words of Premier Khrushchev who has blandly remarked that no Soviet astronaut is scheduled to go to the moon "in the near future."

Of course not. "Near future" is not the target. But nothing could be more wishful than to deflect the U.S. space program on the say-so of Moscow or to assume that Mr. K is scratching the Kremlin from the race.

The Saturn shot is especially significant because at this point it puts us ahead where we have lagged most in the past—the development of sufficient rocket thrust to put heavy satellites into orbit. Saturn I has now hurled 38,000 pounds into space. The latest Soviet satellite weighed 14,292 pounds.

The next step in the U.S. moon probe can now be undertaken in a few months. This 16-story, 2-stage, Saturn booster now has proved its fitness to be used for the first unmanned orbital flights of the 3-man capsules designed for the Apollo mission to the moon. It confirms the usefulness of liquid fuel which provides more than one-third better performance than solid fuel.

This means that the major advantage which the Soviets have had so long and which has yielded them their principal space spectaculars—the long Russian lead in rocket power—is now a thing of the past. Saturn I was heavier than six railroad diesel engines and it did its job. It lofted the nose cone smoothly and accurately into orbit. Those who have been working with such dedication and skill to make it possible can now breath a sigh of relief—and turn to the next task with confidence.

There should be no minimizing what the Soviets have already done. They have attained pioneering successes in space. We can't afford to assume that they will willingly dissipate any of their competitive advantages. They have made more attempts to probe the planets than the United States. They have more pilot flying time in space. They have put much larger spacecraft into earth orbit.

But the United States accomplishments have been more diverse. We have put almost four times as many spacecraft into orbit as the Soviets. We have made far more progress in the application of space technology in communications, weather, and navigation. We both have compiled a large volume of scientific data about outer space and neither is significantly ahead.

As Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, puts it, "the space race continues and it will be a long one."

The Soviets are not going to rest on their launching pads. Mr. Khrushchev has never said that the U.S.S.R. has no interest or intention of going to the moon. He hedged his not-so-casual statements by stating that the Soviet astronauts were not going to be sent to the moon "without adequate preparation." Neither are ours.

All I am suggesting is that there is no basis for relaxing our efforts and certainly no reason whatsoever to shape our space program to fit Mr. K's let's-take-it-easy comments.

They are not binding on him and they had better not be binding on us. He is not our best adviser.

The moon landing is not the prime objective. The prime objective must be to travel the highways of outer space so thoroughly that no nation can deny their freedom to the United States.

Workers Set a Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to submit the following editorial for the RECORD. It gives highly deserved praise to the E. I. du Pont de Nemours corporation, which has a plant in my district, for the company's superb record of industrial safety. Du Pont is to be congratulated and its efforts should be studied and copied by other companies across the country.

WORKERS SET A RECORD

The E. I. du Pont de Nemours corporation, which has a plant in Fairfield, is noted for the many things the company produces throughout the country. But the company is also nationally noted for its safety records.

For many years the Du Pont Co. has been a leader in safety in industry, and always seems proud to boast of the records set by its employees. A current statement by the company says a two-way safety record was set in 1963, and that employees were 22 times safer at work than when off the job.

The previous best safety rate was beaten by about 10 percent, and for the first time in the company history, not a single person died while on the job. The company employs approximately 100,000 persons, who went through the year with only 54 time-losing injuries, at the rate of approximately 0.28 million man-hours, compared with 0.31 for 1962.

With the new low rate, the company was pleased to have broken through the statistical plateau it had been on the last 10 years. The company admits its puzzlement,

because it works on the principle that there should never be any injury to any employee.

However, in the last decade the injury rate got stuck between 0.30 and 0.40. It was lowered in 1963 and now the company is determined to get it even lower. Average injury rate in the chemical industry is 3.31 and in all industry it stands at 6.19.

The Du Pont people also report a decline in off-the-job injuries to employees in 1963. These are from accidents which can happen to anybody—falls at home, tangling with a lawnmower, mishaps while swimming or engaging in other sports, auto accidents, and so forth. Although the 1963 rate was far above the one for accidents at work, it dropped from 6.24 million hours of exposure in 1962 to 6.03 in 1963.

This mighty fine record should be an inspiration to workers in all industrial plants. The most significant feature of the Du Pont safety program, the company discloses, "is not the record we make but the lives we save."

Price Rise in 1963 Biggest in 5 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the consumer price index increased 1.7 percent from the end of 1962 to the end of 1963. It was the largest increase in the index in the past 5 years. Particularly notable is the fact that that 0.2 increase in December was highly unusual since in most years, prices in that month have remained stable or declined slightly.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of January 30, describing the 1963 price record be included in the RECORD at this point:

PRICE RISE IN 1963 BIGGEST IN 5 YEARS—CONSUMER INDEX UP 1.7 PERCENT—FRUIT AND VEGETABLES LED INCREASE FOR ALL ITEMS

(By Edwin L. Dale)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—The consumer price index rose by two-tenths of 1 percent in December, bringing the increase during the year 1963 to 1.7 percent, the Department of Labor reported today.

The 1.7 percent advance from the end of 1962 remained well below the typical experience of the postwar years up until 1958, when the sharp rise in prices stopped. However, the 1963 increase was the largest of any in the recent 5 years of relative stability.

The rise in December was unusual. In most years prices in December have remained stable or declined slightly.

The most important single cause of the rise in the consumer price index, both in December and in the year, was a steep increase in prices of fruits and vegetables. This was partly caused by the severe freezes in the South.

The price rise for the year was concentrated in the last 7 months, with the first notable increase coming in June.

Because the upward movement came in the latter part of the year, the average for the year as a whole rose only 1.2 percent from the average of the year 1962, although the rise from yearend to yearend was 1.7 percent.

The yearly average is the average of the 12 monthly indexes. The consumer price index for December was 107.6, with average prices for the 1957–59 period taken as 100. This meant that goods and services costing $100 in 1957–59 cost $107.60 last December.

Prices of most goods and services rose slightly during 1963, and for a few, such as sugar and frozen orange juice, prices rose substantially. But there were also some declines, including beef and gasoline prices.

When quality improvements are allowed for, new-car prices also declined slightly. The index showed this drop as one-half of 1 percent over the year.

MEDICAL CARE RISE DECLINES

A noteworthy development in 1963, according to officials of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, came in the cost of medical care. While it rose as usual, the rise was less than in any recent year.

Partly because of a gradual stabilization in the price of drugs—with quality improvements taken into account—the increase in the broad category of medical care was 1.9 percent. This compared with 4.6 percent in 1958. The increase has become gradually less each year.

The rise during December, together with other recent increases in the index, brought 1-cent or 2-cent hourly wage increases to about 86,000 workers with cost-of-living escalator contracts.

Despite the somewhat higher consumer prices in 1963, the rise in the earnings of factory workers was great enough to bring a 1.5 percent gain in real earnings during the year. Real net spendable earnings—after-tax pay adjusted for the rise in consumer prices—averaged out in December to $83.20 for a worker with three dependents, compared with $81.97 a year earlier.

President Johnson's Invitation to a Fiscal Happy Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the recent remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., before a Republican gathering in Westminster, Md.

Congressman TAFT'S remarks follow:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INVITATION TO A FISCAL HAPPY HOUR

At the outset of his administration, the late President John F. Kennedy called for a willingness on the part of all Americans to sacrifice for the welfare of the Nation. Speaking from the point of view of the fiscal management of the affairs of the country, the budget and spending records for 1963 and 1964 then proceeded to rise to a new level and to promise to all a more liberal dispensation of Federal benefits and a higher level of Federal spending, coming not from increased taxation but from increased borrowing and an increase in the national debt. President Johnson, in submitting the 1965 budget, in interesting contrast has now invited the American people to join him in what might be called "a happy hour" which is intended to last until next November, without any cutback in the planned programs to be started and carried on by the Federal Government. Somehow we are to believe that just a little bit better housekeeping is going to result in our being able to cut back on planned expenditures, reduce taxes in larger amounts with earlier dates, and enjoy the greatest prosperity and growth this Nation has ever had. In the second place, if this can be done, why was not the Kennedy administration doing it. The suspicion grows, unfortunately, that it is to be a monumental juggling act to keep all the balls in the air for at least the next 9 months and then to scramble for cover in one direction or another. Perhaps this can be pulled off and perhaps the country will not get wise to what is going on, but there are several signs that might be pointed out for study.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while the President acts in cutting back on a few armed services depots, the actual spending rate of the Nation has risen. As few of us realize, this actual spending rate is solely up to the President and is controlled by the Congress in only the most remote manner by its action to approve expenditure programs, an approval which often lasts over several years and gives a great deal of flexibility to the Executive. Looking at this actual spending level, we find that the last report by the Kennedy administration in November was that the rate of spending of this fiscal year would be at $97.8 billion. Now we learn from President Johnson that his expected rate of expenditures for this same fiscal year is $98.4, or an increase of over $600 million. At the same time, in order to finance this spending rate, the President has asked for supplemental appropriations in 1964 of $2.2 billion. Quite a lot of this is to restore some $535 million that was cut by the Congress from the fiscal 1964 budget during the appropriating process. There are those who wonder whether the cuts claimed by the President for the 1965 budget are not merely shifts being made back into fiscal 1964 or forward into fiscal 1966.

In other words, the claim that we will operate at a smaller deficit is subject to serious question, except perhaps as a temporary expedient by a speeding up or a postponing of expenditures.

It is also questionable because many of the figure estimates for both revenues and exenditures are subject to doubt. A tremendous amount of faith is put by the President in the prospect of a great boom in the economy and the tremendous impetus which is supposed to come from the tax cut if and when it occurs. Some of the cuts are in defense items because of an actual claim to relaxation of the tension with Russia, but there is little in the international picture today, other than words, which seems to justify such an approach.

Perhaps we can find some hope in the fact that the President seems, at least on the surface, to be abandoning the theory of deficit spending as a stimulant to the economy. Mr. Johnson can hardly take credit for this change. The American people demanded it and have forced it. At the outset of 1963, it was clear that the Kennedy administration, under the leadership of Mr. Heller, was convinced that what the economy truly needed for stimulation was a cut in revenues and an increase in expenditures. In other words, massive deficit spending was to be the cure-all. This was to be accomplished not only by increasing Federal programs but also by the tax cut proposal. A flood of mail to Congressmen on both sides of the aisle, opposing the tax cut in the absence of a cutback in expenditures, led to a reversal of this position by President Kennedy by the time the tax cut bill came to the floor in August of 1963. While no actual change in plans for spending occurred at that time, lipservice at least was given to the idea that if the tax cut was to have the favorable effect desired, it would be necessary not to increase expenditures but perhaps to level them off or decrease them. Congress, through its hard work on the appropriations bills, at that time had already

succeeded in cuttting some $3.5 billion out of the new obligational authority asked by the administration, and this gave just enough hope of improvement to justify the House in passing the tax bill. Actually, the record of the House and the Senate, when finally completed, resulted in a cutback in the appropriations requested of almost $6.5 billion. Obviously President Johnson read the handwriting on the wall as to public sentiment on the spending issue. This is all very well, and certainly a change in attitude on spending, if one has indeed occurred, is most welcome. But, unfortunately, what the current administration is failing to level with the American people on is the fact that it is unwilling to pay the price. While there has been a little corner cutting and minor penny pinching where it would squeak loudly, the overall plans of the current administration are pretty clearly for continuing and expanding various Federal programs that over the years are going to cost many more billions of dollars. What has been lost sight of is that the figures show that in 5 years Federal expenditures will have gone from a level of $76,500 million to $98 (plus) billion, or an increase of almost 33⅓ percent. In other words the comparisons to which the President is referring are the immediate past ones and at that are not to the actual level of expenditures, but rather are as compared to the recommended expenditure level of his predecessor, levels that the American people, through the Congress, have already indicatd that they are not disposed to accept.

Out of the maze of flying figures that are sure to cloud the atmosphere in the next few months, surely this fact must stand out—those who would increase almost every Federal program and would add many new ones at the same time they are advocating reduction in taxes are playing a fast and loose game with the future soundness of our economy, the soundness upon which our growth, full employment, as well as our national security are based.

H.R. 7152, the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, we must recognize the civil, individual and property rights of all people, regardless of race, color or creed. I am proud to represent the progressive area of west Texas where, within our own local communities, we have and are, solving our own differences.

I do not believe new Federal laws can legislate social equality. This is a matter that only the people themselves—in our churches, civic clubs, schools, libraries, public meeting places, and so forth—can, must, and will solve.

Two titles of this proposed legislation; H.R. 7152, "Title II—Injunctive Relief Against Dicrimination in Places of Public Accommodations," and "Title VII—Equal Employment Opportunities," concern me greatly, because in them, I find discrimination against the private property rights of all people, including colored and white.

We must clearly understand that there can be no distinction between property rights and human rights. There are no rights but human rights, and what are spoken of as property rights are only the human rights of individuals to property.

The Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution recognizes no distinction between property rights and other human rights. The ban against unreasonable search and seizure covers "persons, houses, papers and effects," without discrimination.

The Founding Fathers realized what some present-day politicans seem to have forgotten: A man without property rights—without the right to the product of his labor—is not a free man. Unless people can feel secure in their abilities to retain the fruits of their labor, there is little incentive to save to expand the fund of capital—the tools and equipment for production and for better living.

I would like to briefly discuss the so-called human rights that are represented as superior to property rights. By these, I mean the "right" to a job, the "right" to a standard of living, the "right" to a minimum wage or a maximum workweek, the "right" to a "fair" price, the "right" to bargain collectively, the "right" to security against the adversities and hazards of life, such as disability and old age.

Those who wrote our Constitution would have been surprised to hear these things spoken of as rights. They are not immunities from government compulsion; on the contrary, they are demands immunities from governmental compulsion. They are not claims to the product of one's own labor; they are, in some if not in most cases, claims to the products of other people's labor.

These "human rights" are indeed different from property rights. They are not freedoms or immunities assured to all persons alike. They are special privileges conferred upon some persons at the expense of others. The real distinction is not between property rights and human rights, but between equality of protection from governmental compulsion on the one hand and demands for the exercise of such compulsion for the benefit of favored groups on the other.

This, then, gentlemen of the Congress, I believe, should be the light and the guidelines by which we reach our decision on this legislation, or for that matter, any legislation with which we may be confronted. We must exercise care not to violate the rights of all Americans in our efforts to secure social equality for some. Thank you.

How About Our Problems?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium:

HOW ABOUT OUR PROBLEMS?

Our New Frontiersmen have a penchant for running around over the world sticking their noses into other people's affairs, but they do nothing about the Communist menace in Cuba at our very doorstep.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy has been across the sea on a Malaysian peace mission.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is in Tokyo for another United States-Japanese conference on trade and economic affairs.

These affairs no doubt have their place in the problem of improving international relations, but why don't our officials take some firm steps to rid our country of the threat which exists 24 hours a day from Cuba, just a scant few miles from Florida?

Congressman RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana's 10th District, points this out.

"Last year at this time it was Cuba; this year it is Panama, and still Cuba. What will it be next year? It is evident from what occurred in Panama that Castro has not lessened his drive to infiltrate all of Latin America with his agents, stooges, and the chaos they import."

Castro, of course, must continually keep looking back over his shoulder to see that big brother, Nikita Khrushchev of Soviet Russia, is still backing him up. He would not dare act entirely on his own. He must dance as Khrushchev pulls the strings.

Khrushchev and Red China's Mao apparently have no fear of what our country may do. Exploiting confusion and instability are their chief stock in trade.

They have our New Frontiersmen running here and there while Castro, Khrushchev's pal, continues to take potshots at us and what we stand for, apparently completely sure that we will continue to take it, and possibly turn the other cheek.

Therapy for the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent national debate over foreign aid made one thing abundantly clear: much of the confusion about foreign aid is traceable to the lack of a consensus on precisely what it is we expect to accomplish through foreign aid assistance. Since a purposeless program is sure to be a bad one, I submit the following speech by Mr. Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank and a member of the Clay Commission, in which he thoughtfully and soberly analyzes the functions which foreign aid should perform and, perhaps more important, can perform.

The text of the debate follows:

FOREIGN AID

(Text of an address by Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank, director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, before the New York Chamber of Commerce, November 12, 1963)

Mr. Champion, gentlemen, when I retired from the World Bank last January, I solemnly resolved that I would retire from

making public speeches at the same time. For the first 40 or 50 years of my life I got along very well without making any public speeches, and, on leaving the World Bank I had hoped to return to this comfortable state of affairs. But I didn't figure on George Champion's insidious persuasiveness. He undermined my good resolutions, and he did so by appealing to the all-too-obvious need for those of us once connected with that business called foreign aid to speak out occasionally * * * to remind people that there is a problem, a very important problem, and that we have to learn to live with the problem just as surely as every new June bride has to learn to live with her mother-in-law.

The open season on foreign aid in Congress is exceptionally late and violent this year; the Appropriations Committees still have to reach their separate verdicts and the House-Senate conference, as usual, will have a job of compromising to do. In these circumstances, I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as a lack of support for foreign aid. I believe in foreign aid. More important in the present circumstances, I think David Bell, the man charged with making the Agency for International Development work well, deserves from Congress a chance to show his mettle. Working with Mr. Bell on the Clay Committee, I was very impressed with his grasp of the complexities of his job and with the toughness of his mind.

In fact, if I could wish Mr. Bell one thing, I would wish him a clearcut contract for at least 5 years in order that he might have a decent opportunity to put into effect some of the changes I know he wants to make. In the 15 years since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA, and now AID. There have been 11 different foreign aid administrators, including Mr. Bell. That's an average tenure in office of less than 18 months. For a business that can't by its nature succeed in the short run, that is a formula for ineffectiveness if ever there was one.

I would also wish him some relief from his constant, and for long periods, total preoccupation with congressional reviews. Foreign aid is the only major program in the Federal budget which, in addition to the normal and necessary reviews of the Appropriations Committees, has to be authorized all over again each year in the House and Senate. In addition to that part of the foreign aid budget concerned with what I would call economic development, there is a large military aid budget which Mr. Bell must defend, yet which logically belongs in the regular military budget because after all, an important justification for giving arms and other forms of military support to foreign nations is that we thereby economize on our own military commitments and expenditures. Aid must absorb an enormous and I think quite unnecessary administrative overhead because it has four congressional hurdles to clear anew each year, and a bill to defend which covers an unnecessarily wide variety of subjects. Mr. Bell deserves to be relieved of some of these chores, which for so much of the year effectively prevent him from doing the job that he was hired to do.

I do hope Mr. Bell has a chance to do the job I think he can do; I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as opposing the pending legislation, or in favor of substantial cuts in the amount requested. But I do not hesitate to say that I think the way our Government has administered foreign aid in the past has been seriously remiss in several important respects. In fact, I think it is clear now that there is a large consensus on this score in Congress, in AID itself, and among interested outsiders like my colleagues on the Clay Committee.

The recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflected this growing consensus in several important respects. First, the committee stressed the need to introduce more stability into the administration of foreign aid; second, the committee underscored the importance of persuading other nations, particularly former beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, to carry more of the financial burden. Finally, and I think most important, the committee made an appeal for more attention to the quality of the assistance that we give. Let me for a few minutes give my own variations on these three themes.

The Senators said that they were "unenthusiastic about aid programs * * * whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid." Now here I think they put their fingers on one of the prime causes of instability in the administration of foreign aid in the past and of public disillusionment with foreign aid in the present. I have frequently argued that we ought to be very skeptical about crediting or debiting foreign aid for dramatic changes in the political atmosphere. It has been my experience that foreign aid has rarely gotten us anywhere in the short run. Foreign aid can be—should be—a most effective agent against communism in the long run by encouraging those policies and practices in other nations which lead to lasting economic growth. But it cannot be effective if it is turned on and off like a faucet in response to unreasonable political expectations.

I have been most interested of late to see how the Russians themselves appear to be painfully discovering the fact that foreign aid is not a very useful weapon for political skirmishes. I have over the years confidently predicted that the Soviets would find foreign aid an unrewarding business from the point of view of their political interests. Now it would seem that they are beginning to think so too.

The Soviets have a vested interest in everybody else's troubles. Buttressed by their naive belief in communism as the wave of the future, they are out to create political and economic instability as a prelude to communism. To them foreign aid is definitely a temporary business, designed to secure windfall economic and political profits.

Let's take a look at the record. No doubt some will regard Cuba as their shining success. But Russian foreign aid did not create Castro or bring him to power. Russian foreign aid only came after he was in power. The question is, "Will Russian foreign aid keep Castro in power?" This must be an embarrassing question to the Soviets; Cuba's bill which the Soviets have to pay is currently running at $1.5 million a day. Perhaps $2 billion worth of ruble aid has already gone to Cuba. Recent evidence in the newspapers suggest that the Soviets are very unhappy at this continuing drain. It would seem that the Soviets face the choice of reducing the drain by assuming ever more directly the functions of the Cuban Government or of gradually backing away. Cuba, after all, is a relatively rich country, and this the Soviets know. Russian foreign aid to Cuba is almost certain to be a temporary business and so far it has clearly not been a very successful business.

What about the other countries to which the Russians have sent foreign aid in search of windfall profits? The list includes India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and Burma in south Asia; Syria, Iraq and Egypt in the Middle East; Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia in Africa; Cambodia and Indonesia in the Far East; and Brazil and Argentina in Latin America. These are the countries to which the Soviets have given or lent each $50 million or more which is hardly a large sum by the standards of U.S. aid, or as a matter of fact, by World Bank standards. What about the windfall profits achieved?

In Iraq, a major recipient of Soviet aid, the Communist-backed Prime Minister, Kassem, lacked staying power, he was assassinated, and the Communist Party was outlawed under the succeeding regime. In Egypt, despite the Aswan Dam and considerable military assistance, the Communist Party remains outlawed—and the Egyptian Government last year decided to adhere to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the bulwark of the West's multilateral trading system. India, despite a billion dollars in Soviet aid, remains the world's largest working democracy and is clearly not alined with the Communists.

If the Soviets have failed to show much in the way of windfall profits out of their foreign aid, their often obviously temporary and troublemaking interest in the business has been brought home forcibly to many countries. Burma has experienced the ill effects of having its rice shipped to Russia and resold on the world market; Egypt has had the same experience with its cotton. Guinea, until recently exclusively dependent on Soviet bloc aid, has learned what it is to wait while promised Soviet delivery dates slip by and, in company with other countries, has experienced the illusion of the Soviet terms of aid, which are characteristically low in interest charges and high in the price of the goods shipped. Also, the goods have frequently been quite inferior, and there have been lots of difficulties with spare parts.

Our own foreign aid program has been similarly unsuccessful insofar as it has been used as an instrument for bartering against the Communists for the favor of the governments of the underdeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid just is not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversions from that political religion. Yet despite Mr. Bell's several references to the long-term problems to which foreign aid must be addressed, we still hear promises of economic and political windfall profits held out as arguments for increasing or maintaining the level of foreign aid. And recently these arguments have taken a new twist; we now hear urgent pleas to stop foreign aid when a coup d'etat is staged in a country we have been helping, and a less tolerant ruler replaces a more tolerant one, and I'm afraid that here again we are pursuing unreasonable political expectations in the name of foreign aid.

Instead of trying to identify foreign aid with unrealistic political expectations, we ought to have been identifying it with high priority development projects—projects which are well engineered, well planned financially and which promise to produce things these countries want and need to earn their way in the world. Foreign aid in these countries ought to be identified with fiscal policies which offer some hope that local savings will flow into serious developments and not flee the country or disappear in inflation. Foreign aid ought to be identified, not with promises by countries of what they may do in the future, but with the first tangible steps toward action necessary to make economic growth a reality. Foreign aid ought to be identified with tax collection, not tax evasion; it ought to be identified with a healthy investment climate for foreign capital and not with the expropriation of foreign properties.

Here again there is a growing consensus, shared by the Senate committee and I know by Mr. Bell himself, that the major trouble with our foreign aid programs in the past has been too much concern over quantity and packaging, and too little concern over the quality of the product itself. I have said that a lot of the labels we have put on the foreign aid package in the past have been seriously misleading. I might add that

I think there has been too much excitement over the quantities involved. Foreign aid has always been a stimulant to American exports; it is more directly now a stimulant than ever before. The Senate committee estimated that only 10 percent of current foreign aid expenditures represent a drain on the balance of payments. In view of this I cannot get very excited about the argument that foreign aid is a serious drain on our balance of payments.

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general, we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately, there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings, as recent changes indicate.

Congress has tried in some cases to build into the foreign aid legislation some of the necessary conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective in terms of economic growth. There is for example the Hickenlooper amendment which would bar aid to countries which expropriate American property without prompt and adequate compensation. As a matter of fact, there is a new amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment which is being discussed now. That amendment goes even further than the original one and says that if any contracts or concessions are canceled by a foreign government, that no aid should be given to the country that canceled these contracts or concessions until adequate compensation has been paid, and paid in convertible currency. I'd like to say I am highly in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment, and his new one. Congress has also opposed using foreign aid to support government-owned industries. I certainly favor this legislative limitation. In both cases the climate for private investment is at stake. Not only should we, as a matter of course, use our aid in every way possible to improve the climate of our own and other foreign private investments; we should also avoid encouraging the governments of these new nations to expand their operations into areas where other forms of finance and enterprise can be encouraged. There is no government now receiving foreign aid which does not have more now on its administrative plate than it can digest. So, to condone with, or aid the acquisition of foreign industrial properties or to use aid to foster Government-owned industries cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the name of promoting economic growth.

But most of the conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective cannot be legislated. As a matter of fact, attempts to do so would only compound further the already very difficult administrative problem which the AID Administrator faces. The tests of success in any foreign aid program are easy to state in generalities; is the program identified with high priority projects which are producing a higher standard of living? Is the agency insisting on reasonable fiscal policies as a prior condition for its help? Does the program encourage reforms needed for economic growth? But there is no way that Congress, through legislation, can insure that any foreign aid program will pass these tests. In spite of the fact that whole libraries of books have been written attempting to define some fiscal policies, there is in practice no substitute for careful and mature personal judgment in deciding when fiscal conditions are ripe for aid and when they are not. Nor is there any reliable substitute for personal judgment when it comes to choosing among projects—when it comes to deciding what is of high priority and what is not. Our Congress cannot legislate reforms for other nations; they have to be negotiated. So, on all of these counts the AID Administrator's lot is not an easy one. He must adopt standards, deliberately; he must set conditions, consciously; and he must do these things without leaving the legitimate preserve of economic development and wandering into the purely political preserve.

Since the line between these two preserves is often very unclear, anybody who undertakes to administer foreign aid is, by definition, living dangerously. I have always thought that an international organization could offer certain protections which are particularly valuable in the administration of foreign aid—provided, that is, that the international organization is like the World Bank or the Monetary Fund, itself governed by financial principles and not simply an organization to allow a lot of recipient nations to divide up the contributions of a few donor nations. I think, as a matter of fact I know, it is somewhat easier for an international organization to ask for, to demand, and to receive the assurances and conditions necessary for effective aid without being accused of undue interference in the international affairs of the recipient countries or of trying to get some political advantage. I was therefore interested to see the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pick up this argument and lend its own endorsement in its recent report. I personally believe that the balance between bilateral and multilateral aid should be redressed in favor of multilateral aid. I would even make a guess that it will be redressed as time goes on. And as it becomes more evident that foreign aid can only be effective if it is identified with projects and programs that are in fact producing lasting economic wealth.

I do not look for or recommend any radical shift away from bilateral aid in favor of multilateral aid, but I do look for a gradual shift. I don't think bilateral aid can ever be completely free from the political pressures of the moment; to some extent it is bound to be wasted in efforts to put out political fires. In the long run, I think foreign aid will come to be accepted most readily where it is administered by organizations, like the World Bank and the Monetary Fund organizations whose primary objective is economic development and not to gain some political or commercial benefits.

But the problems besetting our foreign aid program are not basically institutional. Whether foreign aid is administered internationally, regionally, or bilaterally, the important thing is the quality of the product—the conditions asked and the standards set.

I'd like to leave you with these three thoughts:

Some say that if the threat of communism were to disappear tomorrow, Congress would immediately cut off all foreign aid. I think this is a cynical argument. We don't need foreign aid because the Communists make it necessary. We malign the power and impact of our own heritage when we couple foreign aid with the twists and turns of Communist policy. We give foreign aid because it is both imperative and unavoidable that we participate in the development of those countries which, largely because of their many-sided encounters with Western civilization, are desperately seeking some escape from their poverty. We have foreign aid because the achievements of our way of life in the past have made it a matter of self-respect in other nations to ameliorate their mass poverty. The presence or absence of the threat of communism in no way alters this fact. If we are to remain a great nation in the Western tradition—if we are to remain true not just to our humanitarian tradition, not just to our economic precepts which are built on the fact that prosperity flourishes only when the maximum number of people and nations share in it—if we are to remain true to our own heritage and if we are to accept the responsibilities history has thrust on us, then we will continue foreign aid.

Second, I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to action, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in economic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts. Can we not say of our own experience that it is by concentrating on economic development that we have most successfully ameliorated our own political problems? Should we not say of foreign aid that economic development is what we are after in the realistic hope that it will yield political byproducts consistent with our own security and prosperity? We've tried putting the political byproducts first; now I think we should try putting economic development first.

Finally, I agree with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that more effort and thought should be given to ways and means of internationalizing our aid effort. The challenge of development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America affects all Western nations because all Western nations have contributed so much to the kind of world we live in today—a world divided increasingly by the gap in wealth between those who have practiced economic development and those who are only just now learning how. It makes political sense, but more important it makes economic sense to pool the resources and talents of the Western nations in organizations which have no other purpose than promoting development. This is the best way, I submit, to gain acceptance for the conditions which must be met before foreign aid can do its work.

The question, then, is not: "Should we continue foreign aid?" Of course we should and we can afford every penny which is administered effectively. The question is: "How can we improve the quality of the products?" Foreign aid is one business where it should be a matter of pride to produce a quality product. And if we insist on this I predict that the growing opposition to foreign aid by Congress and others will disappear as it should.

Consumers Should Oppose Budget Proposal for User Charges for Meat and Poultry Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Bureau for years has been proposing user charges for a variety of Federal services to business or industry reflecting the actual cost to the Government of providing these services. I be-

lieve that the Hoover Commission's proposed increases in the fees charged, or the institution of fees where none were charged, to cover such Federal costs. Congress has enacted some of the specific proposals of this nature, but many of them have been extremely controversial, and have been rejected. One such proposal, I remember, would have instituted a form of tolls for river navigation. There have been others proposed by President Eisenhower and also, in his budget recommendations, by President Kennedy.

The first Johnson budget, I find, not only renews some of the proposals made by President Kennedy and President Eisenhower in their budget messages for user charges—for commercial and general aviation and for transportation on inland waterways, and for patents—but indicates the intention of striking out into a new area: user charges to cover the complete cost to the Federal Government of meat and poultry inspection by the Department of Agriculture.

A STEP BACKWARD IN CONSUMER PROTECTION

This would be a great step backward. Poultry inspection, prior to the passage of the 1957 act for compulsory inspection of all poultry in interstate commerce, used to be on a voluntary, fee-for-service basis. It was inadequate as a consumer protection and we abandoned it in 1957 when we placed the costs of the compulsory service on the Department of Agriculture just as we had done for years in the case of meat inspection.

We have had meat inspection since 1906 and I think all the costs of this service have been paid by the Federal Government except for 1 year—1948—following which we went back to the previous arrangement.

Poultry inspection as originally set up—as a voluntary, fee-for-service program—was intended primarily as a marketing promotion idea to push the sale of poultry by educating the public to the fact that federally inspected poultry was wholesome poultry. Processors, in many cases, were willing to pay the fees for the inspection service because of the sales promotion value of the "U.S. Inspected for Wholesomeness" stamp. Competitively speaking, it was worth the cost to the processor to have this stamp on his product.

CONCERN IS NOT FOR PROCESSOR, WHO WILL PASS CHARGES ON

We discovered in the mid-1950's however, that a great deal of poultry being sold in interstate commerce without Federal inspection was unfit to eat and constituted a health hazard for the public and also for the employees of the uninspected plant. That is why I introduced the first poultry inspection bill, proposing the idea of compulsory Federal inspection which we finally enacted in 1957. We recognized that poultry inspection was more important as a consumer protection than as an industry marketing aid. That is why the costs of poultry inspection are assessed against all the taxpayers rather than against the processors. As a public health program, it should be paid for by the entire public through taxes levied on the basis of ability to pay. The very same thing has always been true on meat inspection, except for the 1 year when the costs were assessed on the industry.

Mr. Speaker, my concern over this proposal in the budget to transfer meat and poultry inspection costs from Government to industry is not based on any crocodile tears for the "poor" producers or processors. My concern is strictly for the consumer. The processors are required by law to have interstate shipments of meat and poultry continuously inspected for wholesomeness by the Federal Government. Charging them for this service now provided free by the Government would mean two things:

First of all, it would mean an automatic pass-through of this added cost to the consumer, by the processor. True, the consumer is now paying for this service through his income taxes. But his income tax is based on his ability to pay. A processing fee for a compulsory service rendered by the Federal Government would, in effect, be a Federal sales tax on the consumer at the retail level on meat and poultry. Therefore, the lowest income families would pay a disproportionately high share of the cost of Federal inspection. That is completely unfair and I am sure it is not President Johnson's intention.

DANGER OF PROCESSOR CONTROL

The second serious consequence of transferring the cost of compulsory Federal inspection of meat and poultry from the Government to the processors would be more subtle but no less significant, from a consumer standpoint. When poultry processors were paying the costs of Federal inspection of their product, many of them insisted upon—and obtained—what amounted to a form of hire-and-fire control over the personnel who did the inspecting. Inspectors were transferred because processors complained about the toughness of their decisons in rejecting shipments or individual birds. When you place the financing of a Federal service in the cash registers of private businesses, you run the risk of pressures which are heard to resist. After all, if the businessman is paying for this service, he is going to insist on a stronger voice in the manner in which the service is rendered. I can foresee consumers losing faith in the integrity of the stamp "U.S. Inspected for Wholesomeness" if the inspection service should be redirected in philosophy from a public health service for consumers into a service for business for which business pays the cost.

REVERSAL OF KENNEDY CONSUMER MESSAGE

Mr. Speaker, the proposal in President Johnson's budget for user charges for meat and poultry inspection runs exactly counter to the recommendation of President Kennedy in his historic consumer message of March 15, 1962, when he recommended expansion of meat inspection to include much of the meat sold only in intrastate commerce. On that same day, I introduced a bill to expand the meat inspection service to cover all meat shipped into designated major consuming areas whether across State lines or not. One of the main talking points in support of this idea was the fact that under it the small processors operating only in intrastate commerce could obtain the Federal inspection service on the same free basis as interstate processors, once they installed the required sanitation equipment and facilities. If we establish a user charge, the small processor who does not now have Feedral inspection will certainly have no incentive to obtain it.

From all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to reconsider this proposal and order the Budget Bureau to withdraw it. In an attempt to save a comparatively tiny fraction of the Federal budget—$49 million out of nearly $100 billion—this proposal would jeopardize two of the most successful consumer programs of the Federal Government. I have called to the attention of the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, the dangers I feel are inherent in the budget proposal to place meat and poultry inspection on a fee-for-service basis. The processor will only pass on the charges to consumers in the form of higher prices, falling unevenly on lower income families which now have difficulty enough in finding the money to afford a decent diet.

President Johnson Names Carl T. Rowan Director of the U.S. Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent editorial published in the January 27, 1964, issue of the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus hailing President Johnson's appointment of C. T. Rowan as Director of the U.S. Information Agency to succeed Edward R. Murrow, who contributed so much to our country by his fine record in that difficult position.

The text of the editorial follows:

ROWAN APPOINTED

As Edward R. Murrow steps down from the post of Director of the U.S. Information Agency he goes with a solid record of achievement behind him. During the 3 years he headed the USIA, Morrow by reorganizing its personnel and operations raised the effectiveness of the Agency by several levels. He made it more useful generally in broadcasts, in film, in books, and in its reporting service. His service will be missed by his countrymen and in many corners of the world.

But President Johnson in naming Carl T. Rowan as Murrow's successor has chosen a man skilled in the communications arts and one with a substantial background in Government service. Rowan becomes the first Negro who will sit in sessions of the President's Cabinet and in National Security Council meetings.

Rowan is a many-sided individual. A native of Tennessee, he joined the Navy

after 1 year in college and at 19 became one of the first Negroes in history to be a naval officer. Later he studied at three universities, earning a master's degree in journalism. For 12 years he was on the news staff of the Minneapolis Tribune where he won varied honors. He is an author, a lecturer, and more recently has been U.S. Ambassador to Finland where he did an outstanding job and was well thought of by the Finns.

His experience includes serving as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State from 1961 until named Ambassador last year. He has traveled extensively in Africa and Asia. His relationship with President Johnson is a close and understanding one, the two having traveled around the world together in 1961 when Rowan held his State Department position.

Rowan at 38 has long since made his adjustments to racial discrimination. Possessing a quiet confidence in his abilities and dedicated to serving his country as best he can, incidents of discrimination do not disturb him, he has told friends. Having worked his way to the top, Rowan can look with something akin to pity on those Americans who draw color lines and treat fellow Americans with dark skins as second class citizens.

The Johnson appointment will, of course, affront some of the diehards in the South, the complete segregationists for whom such an appointment is anathema. But the President by selecting the man most eminently qualified for the post has shown how far removed he is from any racial prejudice, how convincingly he aims to serve as the leader of all the American people, white or black.

F-100 a Safer Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents recently called my attention to an article which appeared in the Air Force Times of the current issue describing an ingenious suggestion which promises to improve the performance of our F-100 aircraft.

The suggestion was made by Capt. Melvin J. Anderson, the wing quality control officer of the 345th Tactical Fighter Wing. He designed an improvement and safeguard for the landing gear mechanism, submitted it through channels for consideration, and it has been adopted. He himself flew a flight test of the equipment.

In more than 6 months, no further problems in this particular area have developed, since installation of the Anderson improvement on planes across the world. The total damage in only two crashes prior to this change was estimated at more than a million dollars, so it is evident that this initiative has a potential of saving the taxpayers a great deal of money, as well as protecting the lives of highly skilled pilots. I believe the Air Force Times account deserves the attention of the Members, and I offer it for the RECORD:

MECHANICAL MISSING LINK MAKES F-100 A SAFER BIRD

MYRTLE BEACH, S.C.—A missing link, invented by a Myrtle Beach pilot, has made the F-100 a safer plane and also is saving the Air Force millions each year.

Like so many successful ideas, the device is quite simple, yet, so far at least, it has corrected what was proving to be a dangerous and costly weakness in the F-100 landing gear.

Twice within a year, Supersabres of the 345th Tactical Fighter Wing here have crash landed. In each case, though the nosewheel and one main gear lowered without trouble, the other main wheel remained locked in its well. Both pilots elected to stay with their planes. Both escaped serious injury, but the total damage to the planes was estimated at nearly a million dollars.

Five similar crashes had been reported in the preceding year at various points throughout the world.

The problem particularly concerned Capt. Melvin J. Anderson, the wing quality control officer, and also the F-100 test pilot at Myrtle Beach. He had seen both crashes and had examined the damage. He pinpointed the trouble in the bellcrank assemblies of the main landing gear door.

The breaks in both cases were identical. The frustrating thing was that when either bellcrank assembly in each of the main gear doors fails, the wheel is locked in the well and the manual emergency gear-lowering system becomes inoperative. The pilot has the choice of ejecting or burning out his fuel and riding the bird in and risking a groundloop.

Captain Anderson, who had been trained in engineering, was convinced he had an answer. He designed two stainless steel links, similar to a bicycle chain link only, much larger, to fit over and under the bellcrank assembly. These links, costing about 25 cents each, would act as an alternate support to the assembly housing should it fail in normal, in-flight gear lowering.

He put his theory and recommendations in writing and sent the proposal to the director of material at Tactical Air Command Headquarters, Langley AFB, Va. Promptly he received the go-ahead for local testing.

Anderson's first test was to see if the links could be installed into healthy F-100 bellcrank assemblies without interferring with normal landing gear retraction and extension. An aircraft was set on jacks in the wing maintenance hanger and the links, designed and made on base, were installed.

Gear up and down cycles were performed under normal system pressures. Everything A-OK. One of the healthy gear door bellcrank assemblies was then deliberately hacksawed to coincide with the identical breaks found on the two crashed Supersabre units, and reinstalled with the "Anderson links." The aircraft was still on jacks and again, under normal system pressures, its landing gear was raised and lowered continuously for about 30 minutes. It functioned normally each time.

It was time for flight test. Captain Anderson himself took an F-100 upstairs under normal gear stress in inflight retracting and lowering. There proved to be no problem.

After 10 gear cycles of raising and lowering the landing gear in flight at normal landing and takeoff altitudes, speeds and attitudes the links were ruled noninterfering.

Should the assembly break, the reinforcing links would take over and the gear could be lowered.

Captain Anderson sent a blueprint, photographs of his design and a sample link to Tactical Air Command, which ordered immediate installation of the links in all wing's F-100's. Later, orders were issued to install the Anderson links in F-100's everywhere.

Since that time last summer, only one F-100 bellcrank failure crash landing has been reported. It happened in the Far East to a plane that had not yet been modified.

Asked about the effect of his missing link on the Air Force, Anderson said, "There have been no crashes since the modification, and I feel great."

Long Debate on Rights, but No Mention of Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Worthington (Minn.) Daily Globe which points up the benefits of proposed Berry amendment to the civil rights bill. The editorial is as follows:

LONG DEBATE ON RIGHTS, BUT NO MENTION OF INDIANS

South Dakota Representative E. Y. BERRY made a presentation before the House Rules Committee last weekend which warrants serious consideration. BERRY asked that some special programs for Indians be included in the civil rights bill still pending before the Congress. He particularly urged an amendment that would allow a Federal tax exemption for any industry that would locate on an Indian reservation and provide training and jobs for Indians.

There is an obvious and cruel irony in the fact that the American Indian has been ignored in the greatest civil rights debate which America has undertaken in a century. The Nation's Indians have fewer civil rights than any other persons living under the U.S. flag. Even worse, their prospects for equality are dimmer than those of any other racial group.

The Indian population of the Nation is estimated to be 650,000. Their rate of unemployment is 49 percent. Their life expectancy is 42 years, compared with 62 years for the rest of the population.

Robert Burdette, executive director at the National Congress of American Indians, said in Washington last week that, "If it were not for Government surplus food most of our people would starve." And he added, "The trouble is the food runs mostly to corn meal, flour, rice, beans, lard, and some cheese; a lot of Indians are paunchy but not healthy."

BERRY pointed out that, in regard to education, the key to self-improvement, the Government itself has established and maintained segregated schools for the Indians. And Burdette noted that Indian students typically cannot even get clothes to go to college, let alone money.

BERRY also emphasized that, "The Government * * * declares the Indian to be incompetent to handle his own property, and every regulation of the Indian Department further discourages him from leaving the reservation to integrate himself in non-Indian society."

Burdette said one special desire of the Indians is to get credits to develop their lands, great tracts of which are presently leased to non-Indians.

The plight of the Indian people has lately been winning more important attention than it has for many years. President Johnson made a pledge to leaders of the Indian

Congress that he would give special consideration to their needs in his war on pockets of poverty.

BERRY's proposed amendment might afford an important opportunity in this regard. Policies of the Indian Department aside, integration into the non-Indian society is particularly difficult to achieve under present circumstances. Indians can be taken from their own lands and brought to urban centers where there are opportunities for employment. But their poverty, their lack of education, and the mores of their former society blight both their hopes for employment and for integration. This is not true in every instance, of course. Great numbers of Indians have integrated in communities outside the reservations and have become valued and contributing members of their new society. Some have achieved this with their intellect and skills. Some have had rare good fortune. But these factors cannot be depended upon to resolve the overall problem.

If industry could be enticed to the Indian lands, which have the disadvantage of being far removed from most major markets and sources of raw materials, it could bring education, employment, and a degree of affluence to the Indian people which would ease their problems in due time.

Actually the problems are more complex; merely establishing industry is not a panacea. But this is a worthy proposal and a long step forward. The tax exemption which BERRY proposes would be a small price for the Nation to pay. Properly, it should be counted an obligation of the Nation.

Overstimulating the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the New York Times of January 31 reports that the First National City Bank of New York, in its February economic letter, suggests that changes in the tax bill could add too much stimulus too soon to an already healthy expansion and lead to future economic problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the January 31 New York Times be included in the RECORD at this point:

RESTRAINT URGED IN TAX CUTTING

The February economic letter of the First National City Bank, out today, suggests that changes in the tax-cut bill could add too much stimulus too soon to an already healthy expansion.

Tracing the proposal from the original three-stage cut in individual income taxes from mid-1963 to 1965, to the latest version, which calls for a drop immediately to 14 percent instead of next January 1, the letter pointed out that this would "concentrate virtually all the effect on people's paychecks in the initial 1964 reduction.

"Thus, current proposals forego the opportunity for a second-step boost to the economy next year," it added.

The letter also warned that with planned cutbacks in defense spending scheduled to start in fiscal 1965, "even a vigorous boom may not overcome localized problems of reconversion."

It also pointed out that this was an important year for wage negotiations, starting with the agreement between the trucking industry and the teamsters—a settlement that averages out to about a 4-percent annual increase in wages and fringe benefits. Other groups that have new contract talks due include the 500,000 autoworkers and those in apparel, machinery, communications, and transportation industries.

One bit of advice from the First National City: "With the boost that demand will be getting from the tax cut, a further stimulus from easy money scarcely seems wise. If we are not to develop an unsustainable rate of expansion and borrow business from 1965, a monetary policy of judicious restraint may well be needed to create a climate in which price stability can be achieved."

Peace Does Not Follow Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following editorial from the January 30 issue of the Bloomington (Minn.) Sun-Suburbanite. Of all the newspaper comment I have read from around the country, this editorial best states why it would be folly for the United States to negotiate at the point of a gun:

PEACE DOES NOT FOLLOW APPEASEMENT

Some liberal legislators in Washington are suggesting the only way out of the current controversy with Panama is to begin planning for the construction of a new canal, either through Colombia, Nicaragua, or Panama at a cost of some $2.5 billion to American taxpayers.

The argument is that once we initiate such plans the leftist elements in the Republic of Panama, now clamoring to kick the United States out of the Canal Zone and turn operation of the canal over to Panama itself, would cool down.

Meanwhile some liberal pundits are intoning their solemn conclusion that we simply must reach some understanding with the Panamanians, must compromise the issue, must give a little and ultimately surrender operation and control of the canal itself to avoid an open break with Panama.

Rarely has the difference between conservative and liberal logic been demonstrated so clearly as in this situation.

Does anyone really think the turmoil in Panama, heated by a steaming political campaign and stirred by a dedicated little band of skilled Castro agents, will be satisfied with half measures?

Does anyone really think, if we build a new canal across the isthmus, that these same elements in some other country won't begin a comparable campaign there?

After all, didn't Egypt get away with it? Why not Panama? Why not Nicaragua? Why not Colombia?

And as long as tweaking Uncle Sam's nose with impunity is a popular sport in Central America (see how Castro parlayed that technique into something important?) every irresponsible little Latin American politician who sticks his head above the horizon can be counted on to follow suit.

The conservative position is that you can't compromise with Communists. Compromise, to the dedicated Communist mind, means weakness, and so, when your opponent gives a little, you only push the harder. The only thing the Communist understands is power, and he's the first to quiet down when he recognizes firmness, backed with strength.

Most historians today agree, if the world had been firm when Hitler and Mussolini (dictators of the right rather than the left, but still motivated by the same reasoning) first reached out for power, there would have been no World War II.

If the United States had let Communist China understand its determination to defend South Korea well in advance, there would have been no Korean war. There's some evidence, if the United States had not intervened when Britain moved to defend her rights in the Suez Canal controversy, Suez would still be under international control, and there would be no controversy in Panama.

Had the United States stood firm when the Communists backed away from Cuba during the missile scare there, there would be no Castro government there today, and the revolutionary poison now spreading to all Central America would have dried up at its source.

The conservative course, as State Secretary Rusk has emphasized, is to make it quietly known that the Canal Zone Treaty is not now negotiable; that we won't be pressured into concessions there, and if someone tries to use force, we'll reply in kind.

If we need a new canal because the one already built won't handle the traffic, that's one thing. But we should know by now that such a course will not solve our political problems in Panama. Peace does not follow appeasement.

Cuba Bus Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the news media report the growing problems or perhaps it is just as well to say "confusion" in our foreign policy, basic facts tend to be obscured.

The question of inconsistency in our foreign policy is often raised, and never more clearly than seen in Secretary Rusk's denunciation of the British for selling buses to Cuba, while we feverishly negotiate to sell wheat and other commodities to the Soviet Union.

Mr. John M. Johnston, editor emeritus of the Chicago Daily News, recently discussed this subject in a most penetrating fashion, and I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members:

OUR SUEZ ROLE RECALLED—FOOD FOR THOUGHT IN CUBA BUS DEAL

(By John M. Johnston)

Aristophanes must be chuckling in heaven at the squawks of the U.S. State Department over Britain's sale of 400 buses to Cuba. Aristophanes was a Greek playwright with an acute sense of the ridiculous and ironic.

He would be remembering the time in 1956 when the United States shifted into high dudgeon at Britain's effort to burn off a pestiferous growth, one Gamal Abdel Nasser. Nasser had grabbed the Suez Canal, to the dismay of its British and French owners.

Joining with Israel, to whom Nasser is an habitual threat, the two powers launched a small but noble war on behalf of justice, permanent peace, and their own interest. But with the help of a little bomb rattling by the Soviets, President Eisenhower persuaded the trio to call it off.

Castro's overt offense was worse than Nasser's. He confiscated American property worth a billion dollars. But where Nasser arranged to pay for the canal out of tolls, Castro gave only the vaguest suggestions that he might, sometime, pay.

Looking down, Aristophanes might even profess to understand why, after the Bay of Pigs, Castro decided to take all the arms he could get from Khrushchev. If that meant the risk of storing offensive missiles, the price was acceptable, but it is debatable whether Castro preferred it that way.

In any event, Washington's hopes of undermining Castro's regime into economic collapse were jolted first by Canada's bland announcement that $33 million in wheat would be sent to Cuba, and now by the sale of British buses.

The British, still smarting from their 1956 debacle, observed wryly that their selling surplus buses to Cuba was hardly a greater crime than U.S. sales of surplus wheat to the Soviet.

The grumbling of the State Department over the British defection is based on the fact that the mere existence of a Communist regime in Cuba corrodes our whole political and economic position in this hemisphere. It makes reforms projected under the Alliance for Progress appear to be the slowest and most expensive means of dispossessing the haves.

Thus there are two sharp edges to our problem of Cuba. One is that for years and many billions of dollars we have been contending that hunger and a draggy economy drive people to communism. So when somebody relieves the hunger and economic pinch, we complain that this will strengthen communism.

The other edge is that we remain unable to find a nice, pious, high-sounding, moral reason for swatting Castro that will keep the rest of the world from sounding like the United States in defense of Nasser.

That is what Aristophanes was giggling about.

Vietnam Crisis

SPEECH

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the overthrow by a military junta of the military junta which overthrew the Diem regime in South Vietnam dramatizes once again the deteriorating situation in southeast Asia and points up more sharply the need for hard data about the progress of the war.

Whether out of confusion or design the administration has issued this week alone no less than three conflicting accounts of the Vietnam crisis. On Monday the Secretary of Defense reported gloomily to the House Armed Services Committee that the Vietcong Communist guerrillas have made considerable progress since the fall of the Diem regime. On Tuesday, the Secretary told a press conference that there has been a very noticeable improvement in the operations.

At this point in the review, the Washington Post called the administration statements a retreat from candor and called for an end to the verbal ambiguity on Vietnam.

Not to be deterred, however, the Secretary told the Armed Services Committee Wednesday:

The new Government * * * has considerably more popular support than its predecessor and the military revolutionary committee is beginning to take action to intensify military operations and to improve civil administration.

At that very moment, the military revolutionary committee was being ousted by military dissidents who accused the ruling generals of negotiating with France to neutralize Vietnam. I am confused by this turn of events and I think the American people are also confused. As the Washington Post suggested in its editorial:

Isn't it time for the administration to show more faith in the intelligence and good sense of the American people?

We know that some 15,500 American military troops and advisors and technicians are in South Vietnam. Beyond that we know little. The highly touted strategic hamlet defense system is generally agreed to be in shambles. The Vietcong have made military advances in recent weeks and have killed and wounded more men and captured more weapons than the anti-Communist forces.

James Reston put the matter well this week when he wrote that the "first casualty in every war is truth" and commented that the official statements on Vietnam are "so confusing that nobody can quite make out what the official view of the war actually is." I think that the Congress and the people of the United States must be told the facts about the situation in Vietnam. If the administration, as it increasingly appears, does not know what is going on, we must be told why we do not know. With all the Americans present in the country, with a direct line from Saigon to Washington, someone must have the facts and they should be presented clearly and objectively if the administration expects to retain support for its operations in Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Post editorial of Wednesday, January 29, and the column of James Reston which appeared in the New York Times and the Boston Herald-Traveler of the same date in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 29, 1964]

RETREAT FROM CANDOR

On Monday, Secretary of Defense McNamara told the House Armed Services Committee that the situation in South Vietnam remains grave and added: "I must report that they [the Communists] have made considerable progress since the coup." But on Tuesday, at a press conference, Mr. McNamara seemed to nullify his earlier comments by stressing that there "has been a very noticeable improvement" in the conduct of the war and that he was "encouraged by the progress of the last 2 weeks."

Verbal ambiguity is an old story on Vietnam. Americans, it seems, must be told that the war in that country is hard and difficult—but that it is getting better. This is an old story; the French generals in Indochina made comments that sound very much the same.

As late as 1960, it was insisted that there was no guerrilla problem in South Vietnam, even though village chiefs were being slaughtered daily. A year ago, the Diem regime was praised as the shining hope of freedom and the strategic hamlet program was extolled as a cure-all for the guerrilla disease. Now we know that the Diem regime was widely detested, and Mr. McNamara concedes that in the vital delta area the hamlet program was overextended.

Throughout, there is the impression that the administration is reluctant to tell the American people the undiluted truth—that the Vietnam war is being fought on terrain favorable to the guerrillas and that the outlook for clear-cut military victory is bleak. Thus every pessimistic report must be followed, as Mr. McNamara demonstrated with his Tuesday remarks, by optimistic exhortations.

Isn't it time for the administration to show more faith in the intelligence and good sense of the American people?

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald-Traveler, Jan. 29, 1964]

MCNAMARA ADDS TO VIET CONFUSION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The first casualty in every war is truth, and the war in Vietnam has been no exception. Only now is the Pentagon confirming the gloomy newspaper reports it was denying last autumn, but its official statements are still so confusing that nobody can quite make out what the official view of the war actually is.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, for example, said Tuesday at a news conference that he was encouraged by the progress of the last 2 weeks.

POLICY IN DOUBT

Monday, however, McNamara told the House Armed Services Committee that the situation in Vietnam continues grave and "I must report that they [the Communists] have made considerable progress since the coup" against the Diem government last November.

These two statements are not necessarily contradictory, but the rest of Secretary McNamara's written statement to the committee not only illustrates the change in the official line since last fall, but also leaves doubt about whether the Johnson administration is preparing to pull out of Vietnam or step up the pace of the war.

Last fall, the Kennedy administration was both trying to bring down the Diem government and complaining about reports that newspaper correspondents there on its efforts to bring that government down.

The official complaint then was that the reporters, particularly David Halberstam, of the New York Times, and Neil Sheehan, of United Press International, were concentrating on the political events in the capital of Saigon and ignoring the fact that the war was going well out in the country.

DIFFERENT TUNE

Monday, in contrast, Secretary McNamara said "the Vietcong [Communists] was quick to take advantage of the growing opposition to the Diem government and the period of uncertainty after its overthrow. Vietcong activities were already increasing in September and continued to increase at an accelerated rate in October and November, particularly in the delta area. And I must report that they have made considerable progress since the coup."

Despite this analysis, the White House announced last October 2, after Secretary McNamara's return from Saigon, "the military program in South Vietnam has made progress and is sound in principle, though improvements are being energetically sought.

The White House statement added that 1,000 U.S. military personnel were being withdrawn by the end of 1963 and that "the

major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel."

WAIT DRY SEASON

Monday, however, McNamara, while defending this statement, both hoped that the Vietnamese could win the war by themselves and indicated that the United States might have to intervene with all necessary measures within our capability.

"We hope that," he said, "with our full support, the new government can take hold and eventually suppress the Vietcong insurrection. The dry season will give us a firmer basis for this judgment. However, the survival of an independent government in South Vietnam is so important to the security of all of southeast Asia and to the free world, that I can conceive of no alternative other than to take all necessary measures within our capability to prevent a Communist victory."

It may be that so many official statements on Vietnam have been so misleading in the past that observers here are seeing contradictions in McNamara's testimony that don't exist. But if the situation is grave and the Secretary of Defense can talk openly about even the possibility of taking all necessary measures within our capability, then the time has come for a much wider inquiry into the government's intentions.

If the situation is grave why are troops being withdrawn? If the Secretary of Defense is encouraged by the progress of the last 2 weeks, why is he talking about taking all measures within our capability.

This would amount to a wholly new policy. Gradually, the United States has got sucked deeper and deeper into the bog in South Vietnam. First, we were training the Vietnamese, then flying them in combat, usually without any clear knowledge among the American people about what was going on.

President Johnson has said nothing about this, and neither has Secretary of State Rusk, but it would be nice to know if any new intervention is now being considered.

Modern Warfare: Nonnuclear Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, while the dreadful capacity for destruction inherent in nuclear warfare has contributed to our shaky preservation, so far, from the holocaust of a global contest of arms, the ugly pockmarks of localized war testify grimly that the danger of a catastrophic escalation into nuclear battle has not deterred aggressors against freedom from resort to deadly combat with modernized versions of conventional weapons and tactics.

The war we fear most is nuclear war, but while we invest heavily in nuclear deterrent capacity, it is important that we keep in mind that the wars now being fought, and those in danger of flaring up in a score of locations around the globe, can be bloody, protracted, costly in lives and materiel.

Counterguerrilla warfare, as in Vietnam, presents problems of peculiar difficulty. They have been under continuing study by Dr. James D. Atkinson of Georgetown University. He has set down some of his observations in the January–February 1964 issue of Ordnance, the journal of the American Ordnance Association.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Dr. Atkinson's article, as follows:

COUNTERGUERRILLA WARFARE

(By Dr. James D. Atkinson)

In the coming decade it may be expected that the world will continue to be faced with neither peace nor war, but with a mixture of both peace and war. This is underscored by the testimony of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on January 30, 1963.

Secretary McNamara pointed out that "there has been no change in the policy of the Soviet Union to encourage what Mr. Khrushchev calls wars of national liberation or popular revolts, and which we know as covert armed aggression, guerrilla warfare, and subversion."

The Secretary of Defense was no less emphatic with reference to specific areas of the world. Thus he noted that the pattern of guerrilla warfare in southeast Asia was a long-term problem. He indicated that "the situation in Laos is still quite precarious. We have withdrawn our military advisers and training missions but we have as yet no assurance that the other side has done the same."

And the situation in Vietnam also was one, he said, that probably would not yield to short-term solutions, for "victory over the Vietcong will most likely take many years."

The careful assessment of the Secretary of Defense would seem to indicate that a broad approach to the subject of guerrilla warfare is necessary. Guerrilla war is not simply a political or a military problem. It is, instead, a psychopolitical, a military, an economic, and a technological problem of a serious nature.

It would be fatuous to attemp to deemphasize the importance of the individual person in guerrilla warfare. The Communist cadre, for example, would refute this no less than the dedicated freedom fighter in the non-Communist ranks.

Equally, however, it would be rash to disregard the signficance of the application of technology to particular problems. Those nations or those societies which do this more quickly and more surely than their opposite numbers inevitably will obtain an ascendancy over the course of events in world politics.

Dr. L. V. Berkner, president of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, indicated the far-reaching importance of today's technological revolution when he stated that "nations that fail to capture the spirit and needs of revolutionary times have been submerged by peoples who are in tune with the forces of progress."

The attempt to apply technology to guerrilla warfare is not new. During the 1920's the British experimented with aircraft and wheeled vehicles (armored cars and trucks) in irregular warfare in Nejed and Iraq. Then, too, technology played a not unimportant part in the guerrilla and resistance warfare that took place during the Second World War.

But it was not until what might be called the quantum jump in technology that occurred in the post-World War II period that technological advances offered so much promise for application to guerrilla warfare.

Many advanced ground and amphibian vehicles (for example, the plenum air track vehicle, the Gamma Goat, etc.) are under development, but the limitations of space preclude a discussion of land vehicles or amphibians in this article.

The almost bewildering varieties of technological applications are such that I should like to discuss in this paper—and then only in an exploratory way—three aspects of technological application to guerrilla warfare: (1) Aircraft and air-cushion vehicles, (2) intelligence, and (3) chemical agents.

Air-cushion vehicles, with the capability of skimming over land or water surfaces, offer highly promising advantages for operations in roadless areas.

Helicopters already have been employed with much success in today's guerrilla warfare, but their potential is far from being realized. Technological advances are such that during the next few years we can expect helicopters to have an average cruise speed of about 200 knots, a payload of 8,000 pounds, and an operating radius of 150 nautical miles.

The advanced fighter (or support) helicopter also would appear to offer some decided advantages in counterguerrilla operations. Heavier payloads will permit the mounting of 7.62-millimeter machineguns and rockets and the carrying of napalm bombs. New metals, plastic, and techniques can be expected to provide protection for personnel and vital parts in attack helicopters.

In a confrontation of a small air-mobile counterguerrilla force with a large number of guerrillas, for example, the employment of rockets and napalm bombs could be expected to render many of the guerrillas harmless and also have a considerable psychological impact on the survivors' further will to resist.

VTOL's and STOL's also are on the threshold of significant advances in capabilities. The state of the art is such that a 10,000-pound payload should be feasible by 1966–67. This would, of course, confer decided advantages in ferrying missions, close-support operation, reconnaissance, and search and rescue missions.

It is not suggested that there is a conflict between helicopters and vertical takeoff and landing and short takeoff and landing aircraft. Rather they can be employed in complementary fashion.

Possibly the most important task in countering guerrillas is to strike at their bases and headquarters. This is more than ever true as regards Communist guerillas since the cadres (who provide the command, control, and psychopolitical stimulation) are the keys to the Communist guerrilla movements.

Guerrilla bases and headquarters or command and control centers must be attacked repeatedly and with celerity. Higher speeds, greater ranges, and greater payloads all combine to place more close-support fire and more counterguerrilla forces and their weapons on the target area within a shorter time span. The result is that the reaction-dispersal time of the guerrillas will be considerably reduced.

One has only to study guerrilla case histories of the Second World War, of postwar Greece and Malaya, and of today's Viet Cong to appreciate how vital is the cutting of this reaction time.

The experience of the French in Indo-China has shown that mobility alone is not sufficient in counterguerrilla operations. The desideratum is intelligence-directed mobility. While information may be collected in a number of ways, improved types of helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft offer significant advantages in acquiring data on counterguerrilla operations. Aerial reconnaissance and surveillance can be used both to provide original information and to verify intelligence from other sources.

Further developments in aerial photography and in sensing devices can be expected to have great value in counterguerrilla operations. Thus, for example, the continued development of heat-sensing devices might be employed to locate guerrilla

bands or guerrilla bases through the fires kindled for cooking food.

A well-known analyst of military affairs has pointed out the utility of chemical agents in unconventional warfare. Anthony Harrigan argues that "a single helicopter equipped with a gas dispenser could flush out an entire band of guerrillas in a few minutes of work." He goes on to say that "gas also is effective on rough terrain where guerrillas hide in caves and tall grass and where counterguerrillas cannot go except at high cost in human life."

Mr. Harrigan quotes Army Brig. Gen. J. H. Rothschild as having stated that "neglect of nonlethal chemicals is nothing short of tragic. Man is now confronted with the possibility that he can, in some important measure, eliminate death from warfare."

Perhaps the most significant aspect of chemical agents is the broad spectrum of choices which they offer. Aircraft may be used, for example, to spray nontoxic but long-lasting dyes on rioters or guerrillas and thus furnish later identification as well as create a kind of low-level psychological deterrence. Chemical agents also can be used to defoliate trees and underbrush which offer concealment for guerrillas or to lay waste to crops which provide sustenance for bands of terrorists. At yet another part of the spectrum, nonlethal chemical agents can be used to render terrorists temporarily harmless.

Defoliants (weed killers) have been used in Vietnam in order to destroy underbrush and scrub timber which Communist guerrillas were using for concealment. Even though such chemical agents have been used on a small scale only, the results would appear to have been surprisingly good.

This is especially true if measured by the Communist propaganda reaction, normally a quite effective test. Thus Radio Hanoi (in broadcasts in January and February 1963) made frequent references to the spraying of chemicals and to chemicals being used "to destroy the people's (i.e., the guerrillas) economic resources."

The official newspaper of the Soviet armed forces, Red Star, was almost incoherrent as it raged against the use of chemical agents in Vietnam. A Red Star article of March 9, 1963, so much resembled the Korean war propaganda that it may well have been written by germ-war propagandists of that period. Said Red Star:

"The world has witnessed another monstrous crime. The American interventionists have again used poisonous substances in South Vietnam. Hundreds of people have perished. A great number of cattle have been poisoned and thousands of hectares of planted crops have been destroyed."

Red Star went on to mouth the usual cliches of factories of death in the Rocky Mountains and of "Bonn revanchists * * * stepping up preparations for chemical and bacteriological war."

The words of Red Star provide a thought-provoking conclusion to a survey of the technological aspects of guerrilla warfare. They serve to remind us of the intimate relationship of propaganda and political warfare not only with the technological but also with all aspects of unconventional warfare.

The Communists understand quite well that the non-Communist world possesses superior technological capabilities if it has the will to employ them fully.

The Marxists-Leninists believe, however, that they can deploy superior propaganda and political warfare capabilities and thus neutralize the technological assets of their enemies. This is illustrated by the propaganda against the use of chemical agents.

Equally interesting is the Communst belief that negotiation can be used as a weapon to neutralize possibility of non-Communist ascendancy in Vietnam.

We would do well, therefore, to emphasize that technological advances—however significant—remain sterile without man's resolution and will to use them.

Civil Rights Bill: Voice of Esau, Hand of Jacob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and able colleague, BASIL WHITENER, is rendering this Nation outstanding service as a Member of this Congress from the great State of North Carolina.

I am pleased and happy that his hometown newspaper, the Gastonia Gazette, is bringing to the attention of his people Mr. WHITENER's superb efforts to expose the drastic effects of the far-reaching legislation now before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues and to the country the following editorial which appeared in the Gastonia Gazette:

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL: VOICE OF ESAU, HAND OF JACOB

It is a fine technique of the Communists to take two steps forward and one step back.

This technique has enabled communism to move steadily across the surface of the earth while many of its opponents were being lulled into believing that nothing was changed.

The Communists do not have a patent on this type of procedure. It is sometimes used in this country.

The administration is employing it, in fact, to try to push across its so-called civil rights bill which is now pending in Congress.

The administration has sought to sell the idea that this bill—the bill now before Congress—is weaker than the original. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The two-step forward, one-step backward process was invoked in this process. The administration sent up the original bill (one step forward), and then drafted the "loaded" bill (two steps forward) in the House Judiciary Subcommittee as a replacement for the original.

Now, they are pretending to take a step backward, when, in effect, it is no step backward at all. They are urging the modified or softer bill which, in truth, is one of the harshest and most punitive civil-rights measures ever placed before the Congress.

As one statement out of Washington said: "It is the hand of Esau but the voice of Jacob."

This is not a civil rights bill. It is a Federal-control bill. It is Federal control over all people—business, labor, schools, professions, the whole scope. A close investigation of this bill leaves one with fright.

Congressman BASIL WHITENER is a member of the subcommittee which drafted the bill and sent it on toward the House floor. It went over his strong objections, however. It was, in fact, railroaded, with no one being given opportunity to debate—a practice unheard of in Washington where debate is supposed to be as visible as a weathervane. Unable to testify before his own committee, WHITENER followed the bill to the Rules Committee where last Thursday he was allowed to testify.

This, in part, is what he said:

"I shall undertake to deal with the general nature of the legislation and its effect upon individuals in the United States. It will be my purpose to point out that the legislation will destroy more of the civil rights of the American people than it will protect. This destructive force will be applicable to minority groups with the same intensity as it will apply to majority groups. If this legislation is enacted into law, the Federal Government will be granted the power to seriously impair the following civil rights of those who fall within the scope of the various titles of this bill:

1. The right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press concerning "discrimination of segregation of any kind at any establishment or place," as delineated in the bill (secs. 202–203).

2. The right of homeowners to rent, lease, or sell their homes as free individuals (secs. 601–602).

3. The right of realtors and developers of residential property to act as free agents (secs. 601–602).

4. The right of banks, savings and loan associations and other financial institutions to make loans and extend credits in accordance with their best judgment (secs. 601–602).

5. The right of employers "to hire or discharge any individual" and to determine "his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment" (title VII).

6. The seniority rights of employees in corporate and other employment (title VII, title VI via sec. 711 (b)).

7. The seniority rights of all persons under the Federal civil service (sec. 711 (a)).

8. The seniority rights of labor union members within their locals and in their apprenticeship programs (title VII, via sec. 711(b)).

9. The right of labor unions to choose their members, to determine the rights accorded to their mmebers, and to determine the relationship of their members to each other (title VII, title VI via sec. 711(b)).

10. The right of farmers to freely choose their tenants and employees (title VI and title VII).

11. The right of farm organizations to choose their members to determine the rights accorded to their members, and the relationship of their members to each other (title VI and title VII).

12. The right of boards of trustees of public and private schools and colleges to determine the handling of students and teaching staffs (title IV, title V, title VI).

13. The right of owners of inns, hotels, motels, restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms, soda fountains, motion picture houses, theaters, concert halls, sports arenas, stadiums and other places of entertainment to freely carry on their businesses in the service of their customers (title II, title, VI, and title VII).

14. The right of the State to determine the qualifications of voters in all Federal elections and many State elections (title I).

15. The right of litigants to receive even-handed justice in the Federal courts; this legislation places civil rights litigants (particularly the attorney general) in a special category with preferences and advantages not afforded parties in any other form of litigation (sec. 101(d), title IX).

This is an ominous bill. But it is being presented in the light of morality. It is far from that. It even was suggested by President Johnson that it be adopted "in memory of President Kennedy."

This kind of legislation should not be adopted "in memory" of anybody.

What it does is try to guarantee to one group at the expense of another.

But let the minority not forget that when those in the majority lose their rights and privileges, those of the minority—everyone—is just as certain to fall heir to the same loss.

Appointment of Carl Rowan To Head USIA Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I place a statement in the body of the RECORD commending the appointment of Carl Rowan to head the U.S. Information Agency. Several editorials from newspapers in my district, where Carl Rowan worked as a journalist, attest to the high regard with which he is held. A number of commendatory editorials from the national press have already been placed in the RECORD by Senator HUMPHREY, including editorials from the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Christian Science Monitor, and an article by Columnist James Reston.

The fact that the work of USIA is international in scope makes this appointment newsworthy throughout the world, and the appointment indeed has received worldwide attention.

Following are two editorials from my own district, and additional national and oversea comments:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Jan. 23, 1964]

ROWAN TO USIA

We have watched the rise of Carl Rowan in the councils of government with special interest and particular pride. Our pride in Rowan's advance, of course, comes from the fact that for 12 years he was on the Minneapolis Tribune staff, where his talents became quickly apparent.

Reporter, author, diplomat, and champion of racial equality, Rowan is eminently fitted for the post just assigned to him by President Johnson, that of Director of the U.S. Information Agency. He has served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and steps out as Ambassador to Finland to succeed Edward R. Murrow as USIA Director.

Rowan will be the highest ranking Negro in the administration and the first of his race to sit regularly with the National Security Council. The new assignment will test his ability, administrative capacity, patience, and tolerance, but we are confident that his performance will reflect credit on his country and race.

[From the Lake Harriet Courier, Jan. 30, 1964]

THAT ROWAN APPOINTMENT

The Twin Cities share with the Minneapolis Tribune some pride in the appointment of Carl Rowan, former Tribune writer, as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, succeeding Edward R. Murrow.

Rowan thus becomes the first Negro to sit in on National Security Council meetings. He is the highest ranking member of his race in the Federal Government.

More importantly, he is one man who eminently deserves every advancement he has received. Able, alert, and almost universally admired in newspaper and political ranks, he has brought more distinction to his race than a dozen pressure groups. And Minnesota, which gave him the opportunity to demonstrate his talents, has a right to be proud of his achievements.

[From the Buffalo Criterion, Jan. 18, 1964]

CONGRATULATIONS, CARL ROWAN

The appointment of Ambassador to Finland, Carl T. Rowan as Director of the U.S. Information Agency by President Johnson, to succeed Edward R. Murrow, thus placing him in a Cabinet status is commendable.

Mr. Rowan, an experienced writer and noted author, becomes the highest-ranking Negro in Government, at a salary of $21,000 per year. Before his appointment as Ambassador to Finland, 38-year-old Mr. Rowan was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. He will be the first member of our race ever to sit in on meetings of the National Security Council, but will not have formal membership in the Council, and he will also sit in on all Cabinet meetings.

Termed by President Johnson as "a perceptor of world affairs, who is most eminently qualified to supervise the important program of telling America's side abroad," Mr. Rowan's appointment shows how far and high all Americans can rise regardless of race, color, or religion, and should be a great inspiration to all Negroes, regardless of their station in life, for as we look back over the record, it was just a few years back, say the middle 1940's when the attitude toward the Negro in the daily press, radio, and TV was not nearly as liberal as it is today.

In earlier days anything appearing about our people in the dailies was labeled with the identification "Negro" and in most items the slant could have been interpreted as "anti." Pictures published of race members were a real rarity, except on a very special occasion. The recognition today of our group by the big daily press has been a common routine for the Negro press over the years.

After reviewing these facts it is easy to see why we can feel proud that Mr. Rowan has been placed in the top spot of telling other nations, of all races and creeds, America's side of the issues, and he can do it with a clear conscience, knowing that facts about the abuses, contributions, and making of news concerning Negroes are getting through to the general public and world on larger scales and on much fairer basis.

This paper congratulates Mr. Rowan upon his appointment and wishes him total success in heading this vital Agency.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 22, 1964]

HIS "NO" MEANT NO

Legend has it that Carl T. Rowan once said "no" to Lyndon B. Johnson and got away with it.

Around Washington, that's more of a distinction these days than all the other honors the Negro ex-newspaperman can claim.

The little tiff was supposed to have occurred while Mr. Johnson, then Vice President, was on an official trip to Asia in 1961. Rowan, who was sent along by the State Department, objected to a passage in a speech the Vice President was about to deliver.

As neither man is known for meekness, there was a mutual display of temper. The controversial passage, however, was dropped, and Mr. Johnson has had a warm respect for Rowan ever since.

Of such stuff are Presidential appointments made, and President Johnson, who has been casting about for a higher administration job for Rowan, found one on Tuesday, Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

As Edward R. Murrow's sucessor, Rowan will be able to put to work his old talent as a reporter and his more recently acquired skill as a diplomat to wage the propaganda war with the Communist world.

Among other things, the appointment is a psychological coup for the Johnson administration, coming at a time when the Communists make propaganda capital out of racial strife in the United States.

Rowan (pronounced Row-an) has managed to be outspoken and softspoken at the same time about racial segregation in this country. In his latest Government stint—as Ambassador to Finland—he has startled foreign newsmen by calling segregation a national "disgrace." But he also has been quick to point out that the Federal Government is working to eliminate it.

Rowan knew segregation as a youngster in Tennesee and he wrote about it with passionate conviction later as a reporter for the Minneapolis Tribune.

The late President John F. Kennedy brought Rowan to Washington as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. When the Capital's exclusive Cosmos Club rejected Rowan's membership application, he confined his ironic comment to the presumption that it had been a purely "intellectual" judgment, since the club is considered a preserve of distinguished intellectuals.

At 38, Rowan has a string of accomplishments behind him: A naval officer in the Second World War; the only person to win three successive annual Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity awards; one of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce 10 outstanding men of 1954.

Rowan holds a bachelor's degree from Oberlin (Ohio) College, and a master's in journalism from the University of Minnesota. He and his wife, Vivien, have two sons and a daughter.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 23, 1964]

NEW DIRECTOR OF USIA

By the standards of any race, color or creed, Carl T. Rowan is admirably equipped for the assignment just given him by President Johnson.

He brings his new job as head of the U.S. Information Agency a masters degree in journalism from the University of Minnesota, 13 years as a prize-winning reporter for The Minneapolis Tribune, and 3 years' experience in the State Department, including an Ambassadorship.

With this appointment he has risen to one of the highest posts in Government ever achieved by an American Negro and, to the extent that race is any factor, this gives him added incentive to succeed.

As successor to Edward R. Murrow, he takes on one of the touchiest, toughest duties in the whole administration—the interpretation of U.S. aims and policies to the rest of the world.

It is no certainty he will be able to perform to the satisfaction of Congress and the country. Good men have failed at this task before and, whatever the qualifications, it isn't possible to tell in advance what anyone will do under fire in sensitive public office. But Carl Rowan has a lot going for him and we certainly wish him well.

Following are early foreign press reactions to the appointment of Carl T. Rowan as Director of the U.S. Information Agency:

The Indian Express in an editorial said:

Those in this country who have met or known Mr. Carl Rowan will be delighted over his new appointment * * *. Others should be no less pleased, since the conferment of

this special honor on an enlightened member of the Negro community is an event of some consequence. It proves that President Lyndon Johnson is determined to carry on with his predecessor's liberal policies and not to deny recognition to men of merit, irrespective of the color of their complexion.

In Germany, the national daily Die Welt stressed in an article "that Rowan had not been appointed because of his race, but because he was eminently well qualified for this position as an outstanding journalist and proven diplomat." The Rheinische Post of Duesseldorf commented that the appointment "represented a bold move on the part of President Johnson," reflecting his confidence in Mr. Rowan and the "will of Americans to end racial discrimination."

Most Dutch newspapers front-paged the news of the appointment. The Haagsche Courant editorialized that the appointment was "the first Presidential decision which brings a truly new element," in that an American Negro for the first time in history will sit in on Cabinet and National Security Council meetings. The editorial added:

The fact that Rowan was made Chief of this Service is the best proof that the Washington Government will put an end to all racial discrimination.

In Nigeria, the Lagos Daily Times declared that President Johnson had paid the memory of President Kennedy the greatest tribute by appointing a Negro as head of the U.S. Information Agency. It was comforting, said the editorial, that Johnson "had found the guts to continue the Kennedy program."

A Spanish language broadcast over the Lima Radio America network said that "President Johnson has just given a lesson of liberty, honesty, democracy and justice" by appointing Mr. Rowan, "a Negro of singular virtues and exceptional qualities of intelligence," to the post.

Congressman Ed Foreman

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I gladly take this opportunity of joining with my colleagues in heartily congratulating my able and distinguished friend and colleague of the House Armed Services Committee, Congressman ED FOREMAN, upon his designation by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the 10 outstanding young men in America for 1963.

To be named one of the 10 outstanding young men of America by a great nationwide business organization is certainly a great tribute and honor of which ED, his family, and friends may well be proud.

I wish for ED and his dear ones continued good health, well-being, and happiness in the time to come.

Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. Leads the Way to Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present to my colleagues a very fine article in the January 25, 1964, issue of Business Week magazine on the great progress made over the past 40 years by America's leading shipping company, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.

Headquartered in my home town of New Orleans, Lykes Bros. has been a leader among the world's steamship companies since its founding in 1922. Its splendid progress through the years is due, in no small measure, to the first-rate executive leadership provided by the founders of the company, the Lykes brothers, and now carried on by Mr. Solon B. Turman, chairman of the board of Lykes, and Joseph T. Lykes, Jr., president of the company.

These two top officers of Lykes, along with other company executives, are making a great contribution today toward the growth and progressive development of America's merchant fleet by pioneering work to fully mechanize our Nation's merchant ships. I am proud of their leadership in strengthening our country's merchant fleet, and I would like to recommend to my colleagues in the House and the Senate that they read this feature article on Lykes Bros.

The article follows:

PIPING ALL HANDS TO THE PUSHBUTTONS—LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO. LEADS THE WAY TO AUTOMATION AT SEA BY LAYING KEEL OF FIRST OF A FLEET OF 12 CARGO FREIGHTERS WITH FULLY MECHANIZED ENGINE ROOMS

Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., of New Orleans, though an old-line family business, has long been a trailblazer in American shipping. Last week it maintained that reputation by opening up a new chapter in the shipping industry's modernization.

This happened when President Johnson, pressing a button in the White House, set off the keel laying for the SS *Louise Lykes* at Avondale Shipyards, Inc., New Orleans.

Though Lykes is already outfitting ships with some pace-setting automatic features the new 11,000-ton cargo freighter *Louise Lykes* will be the first American ship with a fully mechanized engine room to be built from the bottom up for the subsidized liner trade. It will employ a crew of 32 instead of the 45 usually carried on vessels of this size.

What's more, the ship is the first in a series of 12, $10 million freighters to be built for Lykes, as part of the company's $500 million ship replacement program.

Biggest

With 50 vessels totaling nearly 600,000 deadweight tons, Lykes today is the biggest cargo liner operation under the U.S. flag, topping the cargo operation of U.S. Lines Co. by a few thousand tons. Together, the two giant fleets account for about one-third of the total tonnage in the U.S.-flag liner trade.

"Though I don't like admitting it," says a top executive in a rival company, "Lykes has always been a leader in the shipping industry. This has been particularly true in the recent drive toward a mechanization agreement with the unions." This resulted in an agreement last month between the National Maritime Union and the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association and the American Merchant Marine Institute.

Overdue

Spearheading Lykes' mechanization strategy over the last few years has been courtly, cigar-chomping Chairman Solon B. Turman. As Turman sees it, mechanization of the U.S. merchant fleet has long been overdue.

At present, the U.S. Government is subsidizing the American liner trade to the tune of over $200 million annually; 90 percent of this goes to help operators bridge the gap between foreign and domestic wage scales. Even so, the percentage of U.S. international trade carried in American bottoms dropped from 68 percent in 1945 to a mere 10.4 percent in 1961.

"Mechanization means more efficient ships, and that means a bigger slice of desirable cargoes," says Turman. Lykes figures that each of its 12 new mechanized ships of the Gulf Clipper class will save about $3 million in costs over the vessel's 25-year depreciation period.

Three-part system

Basically, mechanization comes in three places on the new ships. A central control station in the engine room contains several banks of panels with control devices, gages, and indicator lights; these will enable one man to monitor functions normally performed by a watch of three.

This station is connected to a data logger immediately overhead, which relieves crew members of such logging chores as noting speed, directions, and maintenance cycles. Finally, the bridge control station enables the officer of the watch to regulate the ship's engines by direct control.

Westinghouse Electric Corp. is doing the electronics on Lykes' engine rooms. Total cost of mechanization, according to Lykes, is an extra $600,000 per ship.

Rivals

Besides Lykes, many other U.S. companies in the subsidized liner trade are moving to mechanize. Grace Line, Inc., will shortly start building six mechanized 10,000-ton freighters for the South American trade. U.S. Lines is planning five new mechanized freighters.

Though this new-hatched drive for shipboard mechanization is unlikely to salvage the U.S. merchant marine overnight, it does represent, says Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., "the first vital step in the struggle against rising costs and marine obsolescence."

I. HEART OF AN EMPIRE

Of the companies caught up in the mechanization drive, Lykes has so far made the heaviest commitments.

Launched in 1922, Lykes shipping forms part of the loosely strung financial empire of the colorful Lykes family. Under the aegis of Lykes Bros., Inc., this empire now takes in some 600,000 acres of ranchland in Florida and Texas, 4,000 acres of Florida citrus fruit orchards, two meatpacking plants, a stevedoring outfit, a sand and gravel mine, an insurance company, a small electronics company, a reforestation project, a hotel, and a cattle-feeding operation.

Central

The shipping operation, though, is still the central property. By law it is managed independently of other enterprises linked only by a complex structure of interlocking directorships between Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. and Lykes Bros., Inc., the holding company for all other family interests.

The shipping operation employs 5,000 of the family's 7,000-man labor force. In 1962 it had gross revenues of $62 million, and net of more than $8 million. Neither figure, however, gives an accurate picture of Lykes' success, since its finances are so closely interwoven with Government regulation subsidies.

Probably the best indicators are the increase in the company's net worth from $127 million in 1953 to $220 million today, and its good record with Government operating subsidies. As a safety valve against profiteering, the Government now recaptures one-half of all shipline profits over 10 percent. The shipowner keeps the other half, but can use it only for ship replacement. Lykes has repaid $52 million—or 48 percent—of the $109 million it received in subsidies from the time the program began to 1957, when the last contract period ended. Average industry repayment is 19.8 percent.

Keys

Much of Lykes success stems from its gulf coast location. Its six world-girdling divisions—the Africa Line, the United Kingdom Line, the Caribbean Line, the Mediterranean Line, the Orient Line, and the Continent Line—all trade out of the gulf. The Mississippi provides a great artery of cheap transportation into the U.S. heartland, and the South's emergent industry boosts gulf trade.

But perhaps most important is Lykes' possession of grandfather rights to many of the world's great trade routes. "Lykes got in on the ground floor when government regulation first came up in 1936 and has been ahead of the pack ever since," says a competitor.

Another key factor is family ownership. Though the company went on the New York Stock Exchange in 1958, the family still controls well over 50 percent of its stock. Led by a succession of Lykes patriarchs, it enforces a policy of minuscule dividends and heavy plowback of profits. With book value at about $55, dividends come to a spare 80 cents per share; this frugality is reflected in a stock price close to $20.

II. AHEAD OF NEW YORK

Much as in tribal life, the senior active member of the clan rules as chairman of the shipping company. Today this is the 63-year-old Turman, oldest of the third-generation Lykes and son of the former Matilda McKay Lykes (now 88), whose seven brothers founded the Lykes financial empire at the turn of the century.

Turman rules from his spacious 13th floor office at Gravier and Baronne Streets in downtown New Orleans, close by the comfortable Boston Club and the historic French Quarter.

Room for initiative

Behind Turman's florid brow and inevitable Perfecto Gracia cigar lurks an imaginative and original mind, with a broad knowhow in shipping. "The key operating decisions in liner shipping," he says, "hinge upon how you deploy your fleet over your various trade routes, to correspond with traffic demand, and the kind of cargo you manage to put in them on those routes."

At the moment, Lykes has subsidy contracts requiring at least 200 voyages a year, and equipment capable of about 250 voyages. The extra 50 sailings provide scope for initiative in seeking profitable trade.

Earlybird

Such decisions require first-rate information and a delicate market sense. Turman usually climbs from bed at 4 a.m. to brief himself on world conditions from newspapers, financial magazines, and information from Lykes' 29 worldwide offices. A tip from a family member may change a vessel's course in midocean. At 6:50 a.m., he leaves his baronial, plantation-type house for the office cafeteria to discuss strategy with top executives over coffee and a kipper.

"New York is 1 hour, and sometimes 2, ahead of us," Turman says. "If we get up early, they can't pull anything on us. If there is a sudden crop failure in, say Brazil or Australia, we can completely revise our schedules for maximum advantage within 24 hours."

III. FAMILY SAGA

Over the years, Lykes has often managed to stay well ahead of its rivals. Founder of the dynasty was Dr. Howell Tyson Lykes, a Florida physician who took to cattle raising and shipping, then developed an export-import business with numerous sidelines. His seven sons (and one daughter) followed their own stars into ranching, shipping, or oil wildcatting, but remained closely united.

Eventually the third son, James Lykes, decided to acquire his own ships and so laid the foundation for what was to become, in 1922, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. Later, it signed up under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act; for its Government subsidy, it had to guarantee regular sailings—even with empty ships—and provide $30 million for replacement.

Inside and outside

Through its existence, Lykes has been able to attract skillful management personnel, both from the family and outside. When a founding brother, Joseph T. Lykes, Sr., stepped down as chairman a couple of years ago, Turman moved into his job and Joseph T. Lykes, Jr., became president. But the company is never afraid to recruit an able outsider. Financial executive vice president, Frank A. Nemec, in no way related to the family, joined the Lykes organization in 1945.

The family, as majority stockholder, retains absolute control of all appointments. Any disagreements are adjudicated by the most senior responsible member—now Turman. As a last resort belligerents can go to "the patriarch," 76-year-old Joseph T. Lykes, Sr., now semiretired as chairman of Lykes Bros., Inc. But dissension is rare; the clan—now well over 100—hashes out problems at twice-a-year meetings in Tampa.

IV. NEST EGG FOR SHIPS

Two consistent management policies stand Lykes in good stead as it moves into mechanization. Its attitude of realistic moderation has been carried over into labor relations. Says one union official: "Lykes is a damn fine outfit. Unlike some operations, you can reach the man who can straighten out your problem directly, and not spend 3 weeks tangled in outer-office redtape."

Lykes, in return, is proud of its labor record. "We think labor relations are problem No. 1 for the industry, and we handle it that way," says one Lykes executive.

Piling it up

Lykes' traditional frugality, common to all aspects of the family's farflung confederacy, is also paying off. No family member, Turman included, can draw more than $25,000 salary. "It's been that way since I entered the company in 1919," says Turman. "If we paid them more the wives would begin to splurge and the men would take their minds off the job."

For nonfamily executives there's a bonus system, which sometimes doubles the $25,000 ceiling.

This frugality has resulted in fantastic reserves of cash. Of the shipping company's total net worth of $220 million, about $170 million—nearly 80 percent—is in retained earnings invested in Government bonds, municipals, blue chips, and such.

A shipowner must build up reserves to meet huge lump sum costs of fleet replacement. The problem comes, says Nemec, "when rising costs and technical improvements require you to spend $250 million replacing a fleet that cost $50 million." So Lykes, in lieu of large dividends, makes additional voluntary payments into its replacement fund beyond government depreciation requirements.

In one decade (1948–57), these voluntary deposits exceeded $44 million; the total from 1936 to 1958 came to $56 million. Most of Lykes' rivals, without such close-knit stockholders, could not indulge in such stringent self-denial.

As a result, Lykes can finance its entire fleet replacement program—and its new mechanized ships—out of retained earnings. "We haven't borrowed money from a bank since 1933," says Turman proudly.

Remarks of Congressman William M. Tuck at the Annual Ruritan National Convention at New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Ruritan National, one of the great civic organizations of today, was formed in Holland, Va., in my congressional district, about 36 years ago. I have seen this organization grow by leaps and bounds and have noted with interest the great good it has done and is doing, not only in my section but in many areas of our Nation.

On January 27, 1964, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK addressed the Ruritan National Convention meeting in New Orleans. Congressman TUCK, a former Governor of Virginia, is not only a close personal friend of mine but also a statesman whom I admire and who has done and is doing much to preserve the American way of life and to prevent the Communist influence from taking over this Nation of ours.

Mr. TUCK pointed out cogently in his address the perilous situation in which we now find ourselves. Realizing the importance of the matters brought out in this splendid address, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Congressman TUCK's address and commend it to all the Members of this House.

The address is as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, AT THE ANNUAL RURITAN NATIONAL CONVENTION AT NEW ORLEANS, JANUARY 27, 1964

Fellow Ruritans, I consider myself highly honored to be invited to New Orleans, this extremely important and large southern city, to speak to the Ruritan National on the occasion of its annual convention.

I take particular pride in addressing you. As a lifelong Virginian, I appreciate the fact that Ruritan National was formed just 36 years ago in my home State. In this short span it has grown to be one of the most useful and widely known service organizations in the Nation and now ranks among these sixth in size.

But the growth of Ruritan National, which has as its purpose the strengthening of the bond of friendship and understanding between business and rural people of a community, is not the only important thing about the organization. More laudatory is

the great good it does for our young people, our handicapped, and other groups throughout the country.

In view of what I have to say to you today, it is quite appropriate that we should be meeting in New Orleans. It was in this city, you recall, that once lived the hate-crazed, soul-warped assassin who so recently took the life of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is needless for me to add that the individual to whom I am referring was not a product of New Orleans and was in no way representative of the wonderful type of citizenship residing here.

We have a great nation. It was founded by our forefathers who braved the turbulent and hazardous waters of the Atlantic in in search of freedom—in search of the right to live and work and worship as they chose and to discard the yoke of tyranny imposed upon them by the despots of Europe. They managed to attain this goal and, in so doing, established a country that is now a model for the rest of the world. It has become so fine a model that our enemies would tear it down and destroy it by whatever means is required.

We Americans have a common fault. We have a tendency to ignore an old proverb that told us to be forewarned is to be forearmed. We do not pay enough heed to these daily proclamations of danger. Instead, we enjoy our freedom under a policy of live and let live, granting an open-door attitude to those with whom we come in contact. For example, consider Pearl Harbor. We could not believe that the Japanese would spurn our friendship and attack us at a moment when we had our guards down and when their emissaries, clothed in the habiliments of peace, were in Washington engaged in lulling us into a sense of false security. We are lenient and tolerant to a point of inunderstandable carelessness that amounts to recklessness.

The most recent instance in which we have suffered from this common fault was the loss of that estimable, distinguished and beloved gentleman, the 35th President of the United States. That gentleman might be alive today had more attention been given evidence produced time and time again by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives. I have the honor to be a member of this committee.

The committee to which I refer is a standing committee of the House of Representatives consisting of nine Members of Congress, five of whom are from the majority party and four from the minority party. Let me hasten to add that, despite the disparity in party labels, there is no partisanship among the membership of the committee. It is a highly controversial committee, made so by its enemies and by the extreme left-wingers and so-called do-gooders, and many who pose as intellectuals, some of whom are college professors and others of whom are even ministers of the gospel. But there is no controversy within the committee itself. All of the members of the committee are dedicated Americans and are determined to stand upon the watchtowers of liberty and, whenever it is necessary, to inform the American people of the dangers we face.

The chairman of the committee is the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana. He is an outstanding lawyer, an able Representative, highly respected by all his colleagues in the Congress.

The director of our staff is Francis J. McNamara. He is a college graduate, a man of the highest character, who rendered meritorious and distinguished service as a major in military intelligence in World War II. The gentleman who has been the committee counsel for many years is the Honorable Frank S. Tavenner, of Shenendoah County, Va. He is well known among the judiciary and the bar, as well as the people of Virginia, not only as one of the most outstanding lawyers of our State, but as a fine citizen.

There is a movement to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is supported by some Americans who are well meaning and of high standing, but the movement is actually inspired and directed by the Communists and emanates from Moscow. We have positive evidence that the Soviets have as one of their prime objects the destruction of the Committee on Un-American Activities because this committee is one of the most effective anti-Communist forces that the United States has put forth in its war against subversion.

It is obvious that the overwhelming desire of the American people is as it should be to remain friendly with other nations and to further world peace. In doing so, we must not fail to be cognizant of the infiltration and evil designs of our enemies.

Months ago the Committee on Un-American Activities, in hearings in Washington and elsewhere concerning illegal travel to Cuba, pointed up the danger of a pro-Castro group known as the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It has not been long, you will remember, since our congressional committee was having certain witnesses physically ejected from our hearing room in Washington. They were young people, most of them, students who had violated our passport regulations and flown to Cuba. While our hearings were in progress, a Communist-inspired clamor against our actions flared up in the press and over the air. I was present at these hearings and witnessed the flaunting of the Congress by an element of our population that has little regard for our American greatness and our American freedom.

Through these hearings, the Committee knew well the kind of lawbreaking fanatics, radicals, Communists, and advocates and practitioners of violence in the United States who were attracted to Castro's cause and to fronts set up to aid him. For this reason, we were not startled to learn that Lee Harvey Oswald, the President's assassin, was a local leader of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

What Oswald was and what he did shows the kind of people attracted to and connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and other Communist fronts, as well as the Communist Party itself—fanatics who would kill because of their belief in communism, Marxism, and Castroism.

What Oswald did also illustrates the danger in the reams of viciously anti-American propaganda being turned out by various Communist groups in the United States every day. Oswald was a reader of this type of literature. There is no doubt in my mind that some of the vicious attacks made on President Kennedy in relation to our Cuban policy in these propaganda publications were responsible in part at least for what Oswald did.

"Oh, it is only some more Communist propaganda," some people say smugly. "It is nothing to be worried or concerned about." Now we know only too well what horrendous and tragic effect this hate-American propaganda can have on unstable persons in the Communist movement.

During its hearings, the House committee was able to get a strong indication of the real nature of these people connected with the Fair Play Committee. The open hearings and the subsequent reports of testimony were clearly indicative of their disregard for our laws and the welfare of our Nation. But somehow or other, not enough attention was given to the evidence thus produced. Instead, those who were guarding the President looked more for the threat to his life to come from rightwingers than leftwingers. And that is a lesson we should not soon forget.

The turning of the spotlight on the rightwingers in the Dallas area prior to the assassination opened the way for a killer to perfect his evil design. Who turned this spotlight on the rightwingers? Primarily it was the so-called liberals and leading opinionmakers in our country, aping as they so often do the Communist Party line. These people are horrified even at the thought of a conservative or anti-Communist or rightwinger. They see one under every bed, though they could not see a Communist if he flashed his party membership card in their faces.

The official organs of the Communist Party took a line identical to the liberals concerning the political motivations of Oswald, saying over and over that Kennedy was assassinated by "extreme rightwing elements."

Certainly the evidence of recent hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee and of many of its past hearings indicated that, if anyone posed a danger to our country and our President, it was the leftists and pro-Castroites rather than the rightwingers.

The reason why this evidence was not more closely sifted may again be due to the influence of the Communists and the help they had gotten from the so-called liberals. For years, as pointed out, they have been largely responsible for the unreasonable, unfounded and bitter attacks made upon the House Un-American Activities Committee. These attacks not only have been aimed at the purposes of the House committee, but upon its membership as well. We have been hooted at, jeered at, and openly insulted during some of our hearings.

These scamps and scoundrels who would destroy America and its institutions and everything that we hold dear do not hesitate to impede the work and impugn the character of the membership of this committee and its staff.

We must face up to the danger of communism. The peril or threat is probably more from within than from without. Certainly there has been no greater blow from our leftist enemies than the one struck from within at Dallas on November 22. The history of the advance of communism demonstrates this truth. The method used by the Communists is to infiltrate and destroy from within. That was the method employed by Oswald.

My frequent and extended reference to this notorious and infamous character is for the purpose only of illustrating the laxity of our various governmental agencies charged with the duties of promoting and protecting the public interest. Just as in other great moments in history when our enemies have struck, we had our warning.

Prior to the assassination, our governmental agencies knew that Oswald had defected to Russia. In addition, they could or should have known that he was incorrigible as a youth. When he was 13 years old, a psychiatrist under whose care he came diagnosed prophetically: "His tendencies and his thinking represent a serious danger to himself and others."

Even as a young teenager, he was an avid reader of Karl Marx.

We took him into the Marines. His behavior as a member of the military was of such a nature that the Marine Corps granted him a hardship discharge, which was later changed to an undesirable discharge.

Oswald was allowed to leave the Marines because his aging mother filed a plea for financial help, citing her son as the only immediate source of additional income. But once free of his duties as a Marine, he did not come to the aid of his mother. Instead, without telling her, he left for Russia.

In Russia, Oswald held a press conference. During this interview, he told that he was a Marxist, that he wanted to renounce his American citizenship and become a citizen of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet permitted him to stay, but it would not confer citizenship upon him. Sixteen months later he initiated efforts to return to the United States, and 2 months later he married a Russian girl. In May 1962, the State Department provided him with $435.71, a sum sufficient to enable him to return to the United States.

A year later he was living at 4911 Magazine Street in this city. It was not many weeks after he came here before he was distributing, on a corner of Canal Street, Communist and pro-Castro literature. Anti-Castro Cuban exiles got in a fist fight with him, the police arrested him, and he was fined for creating a disturbance.

Oswald claimed to be secretary of the New Orleans branch of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In September he moved to Dallas, still a member of the Fair Play Committee.

While Oswald was so busy in Castro's behalf in these two cities, the House Un-American Activities Committee was holding its hearings on illegal travel to Cuba. We had witness after witness connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee before us, and they demonstrated their devotion to Castro and Cuba and their hatred for America and the principles for which we stand.

Some of these witnesses had gone to Cuba and had returned to the United States to lecture and to show slides as a part of a propaganda forum for Castro. One of this latter group was Vincent Theodore Lee, reputedly the national director of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. He was on the stand before our House Committee several hours. Eighty-one times, in answer to direct questions concerning his activities, he replied: "I decline to answer that question, and invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment to the Constitution." Over and over he said it, so often that it became highly monotonous. But the House members and the committee counsel continued with the investigation, not once allowing themselves to become frustrated and losing their tempers.

We had as another witness Mrs. Melitta del Villar, a Cuban-born U.S. citizen whose real name is Mrs. Louis J. Amster, a New York City singer and entertainer. She provided additional evidence about the kind of people in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The hearing revealed that on one occasion she sent a telegram to Albert S. Baker, identified as a subscriber to the Castro cause, and signed it "Pat O'Morte." The House committee took note of the striking similarity between the alias Pat O'Morte and a slogan popular in revolutionary Cuba, "Patria O Muerte," meaning "Country or Death." We suspect that Patria O Muerte was actually signed to the original telegram and that the telegraph operator who transmitted it became confused and misspelled it "Pat O'Morte."

While these hearings were in progress, telegrams protesting them were received. Many of the names signed were recognized as those of people with Communist connections, Communist Party membership, and Communist-front records.

Following are some additional examples of the nature of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and its officers, members, and supporters:

A new ultra-radical Communist publication called "Revolution" was started by a group of Communists who advocate the violent line of Red China in Paris in October 1962. Its subject matter concerns Africa, Latin America, and Europe. This magazine glorifies Communist guerrilla warfare. It holds Castro's violent seizure of power up as a model to be followed by others.

What connection is there between this magazine and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee? Here are several examples of the ties between the two:

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee has taken full-page ads in several issues of the magazine. In these ads it announces to Communists and radicals everywhere—because this is an international publication—that they can order copies of the violent, revolutionary speeches of Castro and Che Guevara by writing to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee headquarters in New York City.

One issue of the magazine Revolution included articles by Carlton Beals, one of the two founding cochairmen of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, who wrote a scurrilous piece accusing the United States of cold war designs and of the "rape" of Cuba.

Another article in Revolution was by Robert Taber, also a founder and the first executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, an exconvict who served time for armed robbery, auto theft and kidnaping. An advertisement on the back page listed writings and speeches about Cuba available in English. All but two of them were by Castro.

We have other evidence against the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. When an article in a New York newspaper charged that communism was being forced upon the Cuban people, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee put an advertisement in the New York Times that said: "False. Not a shred of evidence has been produced to support such allegations." This advertisement was paid for in part with money that came directly from the Cuban Government. It appeared a few months after the Communists had by violence taken over the Cuban Federation of Labor and the National Newspaper Guild, thus putting an end there to collective bargaining and freedom of the press.

Where Oswald got his idea of assassinating the President still has to be established, but in the meantime the Cuban Student Directorate in Exile has given us some interesting information. It tells us that at a reception at the Brazilian Embassy in Havana the first week of last September, Castro talked to a group of foreign ambassadors and threatened to kill major figures in the U.S. Government in reprisal for any attempt to overthrow his regime.

There is another mystery surrounding Oswald that so far has not been cleared up publicly. Shortly before he pulled the trigger at Dallas, he disappeared on a trip to Mexico. While there we know that he appeared in the office of the Cuban consul. We do not know why he went there, or whether or not it was while there that he finally made up his mind about the assassination.

It must have been a shocking and chilling experience to have heard Lee Harvey Oswald maintain last August, in a radio debate here in New Orleans in which he was invited to take part after his brush with the anti-Castro Cuban exiles, that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was not a subversive organization. The evidence compiled by the House Un-American Activities Committee, as well as the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, showed otherwise.

As a further condemnation, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee office in New York denied, at the time of the assassination, that it had ever heard of Oswald. This was a deliberate distortion of the truth, as evidenced early in December when Vincent Theodore Lee, the chairman of the committee and the same witness who took the fifth amendment 81 times in a single appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee, released a series of letters written by Oswald to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

We have reason, in view of reports and evidence accumulated since November, to believe that Oswald was connected with the pickets who protested the Adlai Stevenson rally at Dallas and with the attempted assassination of former Gen. Edwin Walker. These two gentlemen, as well as Mr. Kennedy, had spoken out against Castro.

The case against the Fair Play for Cuba Committee goes on and on. One of its earmarks is the teaching of extreme hatred and contempt, something that is characteristic of the left-wing Communists.

This vicious and disreputable organization was so bold that in 1961 it committed John F. Kennedy to historical oblivion. It was reported in a Senate Judiciary Committee document which quoted the Fair Play Committee as follows: "Fidel has made it. Kennedy has muffed it. If Fidel Castro were to pass out of the picture tomorrow, it would not change this die. It has been cast. Throughout South America people will be building statues honoring Fidel Castro long after Kennedy has become the brand name for somebody's baked cookies or a new kind of Swiss cheese."

Despite all this array of evidence marking the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as a vicious organization plotting against the United States, word went out when the late President announced his plans to visit Dallas that the rightwing extremists were the element most to be feared. It is reliably reported that first among the six subjects to be studied by Chief Justice Warren, head of the assassination inquiry, is the influence of hate movements in the Dallas community. If I understand Mr. Warren, and I believe I do, the hate movements include only rightwing groups.

It is too late to undo what has been done at Dallas. But it is not too late to take proper cognizance of the very real danger that the Communists and their fellow-traveling radicals and left extremists pose to the United States.

The death of this assassin does not end the story. Oswald was not the only one connected with the Fair Play Committee. There are others, free in our land in spite of all the evidence compiled, who are just as strong believers in communism as he was.

I am in favor of a stringent law that will invoke severe penalties upon these traitors and traducers who would subvert us and destroy our country, our women, and our children by delivering us, lock, stock, and barrel, to the Communist conspiracy and to the rule of the Kremlin.

Castro must be deposed. Communism must be banished from our land and all the Americas. It should be done by diplomacy or by embargo, or by the employment of other methods of a similar nature, if possible, but if necessary it must be done by force. The Communists understand only the language of force. I am in favor, if necessary, of giving them a full dose of force and power, the only language they understand.

The longer we delay firm and resolute action, the more the situation worsens. The Panamanian situation should be handled with a firm and resolute hand. We should not surrender an inch to this Communist-inspired uprising. Our rights in the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Zone are established and are as old as the independence of Panama, which was brought about by the naval aid and firmness of a great American President.

We must not wait until communism makes further and more deadly inroads into our society and into our Government before acting to uphold our cherished way of life.

The Monroe Doctrine is more important to us today than it was when it was proclaimed during the administration of President Monroe almost 150 years ago. The Monroe Doctrine must be upheld, and America must be freed from the devastating influences of communism—of the Oswalds and the others who place more value upon Marxism and

Khrushchevism and Castroism than they do upon American freedom.

Despite the bleak and somber picture before us, we in this country can still live in hope, rather than despair. There is much for which to be thankful. Although the public indebtedness of the United States exceeds by $25 billion the public indebtedness of all the other countries of the world combined, we nevertheless remain the most powerful nation.

We are blessed with unbounded natural resources. In many instances, our natural resources exceed those of all the other nations combined. Our constitutional system of government as handed down to us by our forefathers cannot be matched by any other nation. It is to be hoped that we will preserve it in its pristine glory.

The people are patriotic, and when they recognize the flagitious forces tearing at the vitals of our form of government which we cherish, they will rise up and destroy our oppressors and secure our liberties and our feedoms. They will return our government to the form and type established by those men and women who loved liberty so dearly that they crossed an ocean and started a new nation to gain it.

In short, we need, and I believe we have, the manhood and the womanhood to uphold our cherished American principles which have been handed down to us through the sacrifices made by our citizens of this and previous generations who have shed their blood on the battlefields and battle seas of the world.

National Childern's Dental Health Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to the Congress that February 2 to February 10 is National Children's Dental Health Week. This celebration is used as a means of promoting interest in the care and preservation of the primary and the young permanent teeth, not only from the ravages of decay but also from poorly equipped participants of contact sports.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report of print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

David J. Galter Memorial Chapel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, David J. Galter was a distinguished journalist who made a deep impression on those who knew him and those who read his writings. He was honored last week when the David J. Galter Memorial Chapel was dedicated at Gratz College, Philadelphia. Since Mr. Galter's works had a strong influence not only in Pennsylvania but throughout the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report from the Jewish Exponent of January 24, 1964, on the dedication ceremony.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID GALTER'S MANY CONTRIBUTIONS NOTED AT GRATZ CHAPEL DEDICATION

The contributions of David J. Galter, late editor of the Jewish Exponent, to this community, the United States and the Jewish people, were commemorated by the dedication last Sunday of the Galter Memorial Chapel at Gratz College.

At dedication exercises at the college, 10th Street and Tabor Road, representatives of the Governments of the United States and Israel joined their praise to that of leaders in journalism, education, and civic and philanthropic services, in tribute to Galter who, as speakers declared, frequently served as the voice and conscience of the Philadelphia Jewish community for many years up to the time of his death in 1962.

Dr. Solomon Grayzel, editor of the Jewish Publication Society, depicted Galter as a brave and effective fighter against "the vulgarization of Jewish life and the flight from Jewishness—if not from Judaism—that characterized the second quarter of this century."

"A community of Jews in America was built and David Galter, through his work on the Exponent and elsewhere, helped substantially in its building," Dr. Grayzel said.

"He recognized the immense power of the forces that made for secularization and spiritual devaluation. He did not live in an ivory tower and he knew what the Jews of our day were up against.

"He often expressed admiration for the men who, with zeal and sincerity, labored in the community's behalf. He knew the importance of getting the Jews of America to do their duty by the Jewish people.

"Nevertheless, the image of Jewish life was somehow wrong and its wrongness was to him a constant source of irritation. The negativism of antidefamation was too prominent in Jewish life. The definition of philanthropy was too physical and therefore too narrow.

"The idea of Zionism was marred by too much organizational politics. He was especially critical of religious leadership, not because he disliked religious leaders or their cause, but because he was convinced that rabbis and synagogues did not exert themselves to provide a sufficient balancing emphasis on the devotional and the cultural.

"He criticized everything in Jewish life, frequently and sometimes bitingly. Yet he spoke of the old Rabbi Levinthal, his teacher in his youth, with affection; he addressed all rabbis with respect, he never failed to give aid to the institutions through which Jewish life functioned and to the men who led them."

Galter was "not merely a good journalist, but a good Jewish journalist," Dr. Grayzel added, declaring that this required that "in addition to being skillful in the art of presenting news, a Jewish journalist must know how to interpret it in terms of Jewishness.

"Newspaper readers are grateful for news that entertains, but thoroughly dislike the slightest suspicion of being guided. Yet what else is a Jewish newspaper for? If it is to save itself from disintegrating into a mirror of a social ghetto, it must strive to articulate the distinctiveness of the group which it serves, and express that which gives it stature and makes it deserve to survive."

Myer Feinstein, chairman of the building committee for the chapel, presiding at the ceremony, presented the key to the chapel to Mitchell Panzer, president of the college.

"Many of us may not realize how far his voice reached beyond the immediate boundaries of our community." Feinstein said of Galter. "But the U.S. Government has not forgotten, nor has the Government of Israel."

He cited messages from U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT and from Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, praising Galter's services to the Nation during World War I as a reporter with the "Red, White, and Blue Caravan" that toured the country on behalf of the war effort.

He also read a tribute from Israel Ambassador Avraham Harman, recalling Galter's services to Zionism and to the welfare of Jews throughout the world.

Judge Nochem S. Winnet, Federation of Jewish Agencies president, spoke of Galter's contribution toward the development of "our Jewish community's civil service."

Winnet pointed out that the community's health, welfare and other services, while basically voluntary in nature, depend heavily on the work of "high caliber professional staff. Galter, he said, was "an example par excellence of the very highest type of community civil servant."

"One of his important and lasting contributions," the federation president declared, "was the strengthening of this vitally important civil service, raising its standards, educating the public as to its value, and inspiring the people of our agency staffs with a sense of their mission, worth, and responsibility."

Participants in the dedication exercises included Rabbi Max D. Klein, rabbi emeritus of Congregation Adath Jeshurun, who offered the memorial prayer; Rabbi Elias Charry, of Germantown Jewish Center, who gave the benediction; Dr. Elazar Goelman, dean of Gratz College; Benson M. Schambelan, president of the college alumni association; Marc Orner, president of the student association; Mrs. William B. Lakritz, a daughter of Galter, and Baruch Bricklin, a son-in-law.

MANY PRAISE ACHIEVEMENT

The following were among messages received at the dedication of the David J. Galter Memorial Chapel at Gratz College:

U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania:

David J. Galter left a heritage that is indeed worthy of this chapel. He was a good man, and the children and grandchildren who survive him bear testimony to that.

He was a distinguished journalist, a reporter, and editor whose writings had a great impact on readers of the Jewish Exponent and other publications.

But he was also a man of vision, and, as Edward R. Murrow said, the guiding minds of men like Mr. Galter helped shape the U.S. information policies of today.

It will be my privilege to insert this letter and all other statements made at the dedication ceremony into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of the Senate and House have an opportunity to read of the good and great works of David J. Galter.

Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency:

For the ceremonies honoring the late David J. Galter, I am pleased with the opportunity to provide an expression of esteem on the part of the Government he so well served.

Our great task today—the work of the men and women of the U.S. Information Agency serving in more than 200 posts around the world—is made no easier merely because communication is swifter and easier than those in David Galter's days with the Creel Committee of World War I.

But it is made more noble by the wisdom and devotion of such men as David Galter who helped pioneer America's first modern international information effort.

The guiding minds of such men as he laid the groundwork so that truth, clarity, and good conscience could support the building stones upon which America's present international information program and the USIA has grown.

We are truly indebted to men like him so that we may today serve this profession honorably and with pride.

From Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel to the United States:

We in Israel well recall the distinguished and dedicated service of Mr. Galter to Israel's cause and it is indeed fitting that the name of someone who devoted so much time and energy in the interest of the Jewish people should be perpetuated in this way.

From Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, publisher, the New York Times:

It is fitting that a college chapel be dedicated to a journalist. For both callings are dedicated, education and journalism, to the enlightenment of mankind. It is only through knowledge that man can be free.

As a journalist, David J. Galter contributed to man's knowledge and thus to his freedom and the enjoyment thereof. In honoring him, the Jewish community of Philadelphia honors itself.

From Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Brooklyn Jewish Center:

I was privileged to have known and to have enjoyed the friendship of David Galter, of blessed memory, since our boyhood days. He was a frequent visitor in our home and came

under the spiritual influence of my sainted father.

It is good to know that his name and memory will be perpetuated in such a fitting way in such a fine institution as Gratz College. The chapel and the college symbolize the two principal aspects of his life—a love for his people's faith and a love for his people's culture.

From Sanford Solender, executive vice president, National Jewish Welfare Board:

David Galter was not only a journalist and editor of rare capacity but a committed Jew who brought to bear his Jewish understanding and knowledge as editor of the Jewish Exponent and interpreter of a host of important Jewish agencies, including the National Jewish Welfare Board.

His unique role in giving status to the profession of Jewish journalism and his lifelong dedication to Jewish literature and culture made him one of the finest exponents of American Jewish life.

Other messages were received from U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK; Rabbi Leon H. Elmaleh, minister emeritus of Congregation Mikveh Israel; and John J. Steck, president, the Poor Richard Club.

Why Not Kiki Cuyler for Baseball's Hall of Fame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, today, a committee of baseball veterans meets to select from one to six great baseball stars of the past for the 1964 addition to baseball's Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y. In my opinion one of baseball's outstanding players has long been overlooked for this honor.

I refer to the late Hazen "Kiki" Cuyler, of Harrisville, Mich. Last year Kiki was posthumously named to the Michigan Hall of Fame and certainly he ranks head and shoulders above some of the candidates mentioned in the first go-around of nominees for the Cooperstown classic.

Kiki was truly one of the great major league players of his era. He was a great outfielder. In 4 different years of his career his batting average was over .350 and he was fleet as a deer around the bases. During his 16 years with the majors he played for 4 teams—the Pirates, the Cubs, the Cincinnati Reds, and the Brooklyn Dodgers.

During his major career he piled up a record of 102 runs batted in, twice got 4 long hits in a single game, was credited with making 43 double plays in the 1923 season, and in the same year led his league in 3-base hits with 26 to his credit. He had 158 triple plays to his credit in the big leagues.

Kiki died in 1950 at the age of 50, the victim of a heart attack. He had retired to his home in Harrisville, Mich., which is in my congressional district.

In Frederick Lieb's book, "The Pittsburgh Pirates," Lieb said:

Young Cuyler fairly sizzled, and became the talk of the league. He was third among the 100-game players, with .357, scored 144 runs, collected 220 hits for 366 total bases, which included 43 doubles, 26 triples, and 17 home runs. He also stole 41 bases. On September 18, 19, and 21, he bashed out 10 consecutive hits, tying an ancient National League mark by Ed Delahanty and Jake Gettman.

Mr. Merrill Weber, publisher of one of the newspapers in Kiki's home county, the Alcona County, Mich., Herald, is one of the leaders in having Kiki Cuyler's name placed in the Cooperstown Memorial along with other baseball greats.

Mr. Weber's account of the recent action in naming Cuyler to Michigan's Hall of Fame, appearing in the Alcona County Herald, follows:

KIKI CUYLER GOES IN MICHIGAN'S HALL OF FAME

Misty eyed but with a full heart, "Mike" stood before a group of sports fans a while ago and accepted a Michigan Hall of Fame plaque.

"Mike" is the term of endearment used by the late Hazen (Kiki) Cuyler when speaking of his wife, Bertha, and speak of her often he did.

As a matter of fact, the last time this writer ever had a lengthy conversation with Kiki he spoke about "Mike." He gave her complete credit for whatever success he enjoyed as one of the greatest baseball players the major leagues has ever seen.

This conversation took place in the cramped cab of a long since retired Lincoln fire truck. We sat there with heater going to escape the bitter cold the night of December 30, 1949, while the old Greenbush Tavern was swept by fire.

Equally curious regarding events around us, we met by chance that night and as was so often the case when Kiki and I got together we forgot our surroundings and the people and things involved in them, losing ourselves in talk, good man talk. He told how easy it was during his heyday to come home with a feeling of great personal importance and, as he called it, a "swelled head" after a good day at the ball park.

Ki said many, many times he'd arrive home walking on air, his ears tuned to the cheers of thousands after he had banged out three hits in five times at bat and stolen a couple of bases.

He'd look to "Mike" for a continuation of that hero worship. But she would calmly say, "What happened the other two trips to the plate?" That was all it ever took, Ki said, to get his feet back on the ground and his head out of the clouds. " 'Mike' was my balance wheel," Ki said. "If it hadn't been for her I'm sure my modest success would have been far less."

And "Mike" was Kiki's voice at the hall of fame ceremonies. She prepared a nice little speech of acceptance but when called to the rostrum she forgot it and brought down the house with the simple statement, "If I could only speak as well as my husband could hit, then I might be able to tell all of you how much we appreciate this honor."

Kiki was posthumously named to the Michigan Hall of Fame this year, along with Tommy Bridges, former great Detroit Tiger pitcher, and Guy Houston, retired coach at Flint Northern High School. The ceremonies were conducted at Detroit recently with Bridges and Houston on hand to accept their awards personally while "Mike" accepted for her late husband.

Now the big push is on by sports writers all over the United States to have Kiki enshrined in the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y., where he would join such contemporary greats at Ty Cobb, Babe Ruth, Mickey Cochrane, et al.

Bellamay Award Address by John Habig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, probably few persons in this country know the name of the author of the Pledge of Allegiance. It was composed by Francis Bellamay, and it is for him that the annual Bellamay award is named. This honor is bestowed each year upon an outstanding high school, and delegates from other high schools attend the ceremony. This year Indiana was represented at the award presentation by John Habig, a student of Arsenal Technical High School in Indianapolis.

John Habig is a senior at Arsenal Tech and was chosen by a committee for the trip to Chattanooga last October on the basis of citizenship, patriotism and the American way of life. He is a member of the Madrigal Singers at Tech, treasurer of the Techoir, secretary of senior roll room 153, and a member of the senior scholarship committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of John Habig on that occasion be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., OCTOBER 11, 1963

Whenever anyone mentions Arsenal Technical High School, the comment is usually something like, "Oh, yes, that is the big school in Indianapolis." If a more inquisitive person should ask, "How big is it?" any Tech Titan will be glad to boast that 4,600 students attend regular school. In addition, the evening school has 3,200 enrollees and the summer school had 1,600 pupils. In 1939 and 1940, before Indianapolis had as many schools as it does today, Tech squeezed over 7,700 students onto the 76-acre campus. This makes Tech, both past and present, one of the largest in the Bellamy award family of schools.

Of course, the mere size of a school is not a measure of its worth. I must mention that Tech has won the largest number of Freedom Foundation Awards of any school in the Nation—24 in all. Much credit for this goes to Miss Ella Sengenberger, retired Tech teacher and member of the Bellamy advisory board.

Tech is also known for her colorful background. The site of Tech, once a Civil War arsenal, has many buildings left from its military past, including the barracks, the artillery building, the arsenal itself, and even the barn which now contains music classes instead of horses.

In 1962 Arsenal Technical High School celebrated its 50th anniversary as a high school. During that time four principals, hundreds of teachers and thousands of students have come through the gates of Tech. Each one is fortunate to have been associated with one of the schools that make up what Mr. Roy F. Miller, the student chairman of the National Bellamy Award, said was one of the most outstanding groups of schools in the Nation—the Bellamy award family of schools.

Indianapolis has another Bellamy distinction. Elementary Public School 102, only recently dedicated, has the official name, the Francis Bellamy School. At the dedication, Miss Margarette S. Miller, director of the National Bellamy Award, presented a portrait of Bellamy to this school, a gift from the Bellamy schools. There are only two schools in the Nation with the honor of this name: one in Rome, N.Y., Bellamy's home city, and the other in Indianapolis.

Our school publication, the Arsenal Cannon, reflects our historic past. With great pride I present The Cannon 1963 yearbook.

The Elimination of Poverty: A Primary Goal of Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 23, 1964, Georgetown University, as part of its 175th anniversary celebration, held a conference entitled "Poverty in Plenty: The Poor in Our Affluent Society." This topic is of consuming interest because of the focus placed upon it by President Johnson. However, it is interesting to note that this seminar was planned last fall, well before the current national discussion. This prescience is in keeping with the spirit of this great university which literally grew up with the country, having been founded in 1789, and whose motto for the anniversary year is appropriately enough, "Wisdom and discovery for a dynamic world."

The discussion at the seminar was wide ranging and served to focus attention on the major social and economic aspects of the vital national problem. It is essential that the problem of poverty be brought out in the open—that we acknowledge the existence of poverty and resolve to do something about it.

Among the participants at the Georgetown University conference was Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who gave an excellent speech entitled: "The Elimination of Poverty: A Primary Goal of Public Policy." Mr. Cohen is not new to the subject, for as early as 1960 he was working on studies which ultimately evolved into a definitive study, "Income and Welfare in the United States." Mr. Cohen's speech pointed out the large mass of Americans who live in poverty, the problems they face, and the measures needed to get millions of Americans off "the perpetual cycle of poverty." In order that all Members be afforded the opportunity to read Mr. Cohen's fine speech, I offer it in its entirety:

THE ELIMINATION OF POVERTY: A PRIMARY GOAL OF PUBLIC POLICY

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

President Johnson in his state of the Union message earlier this month pledged the administration to "unconditional war on poverty in America." In his budget message last Tuesday the President reiterated this objective and recommended over $1 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal year 1965 to begin an "all-out attack on the problem of poverty in the United States." Today I should like to discuss the reasons why the administration has undertaken an all-out attack on poverty and outline its broad dimensions.

The paradox of millions of Americans living in poverty and deprivation in the midst of the general prosperity enjoyed by the majority of citizens has long been a blot on our economic and social institutions. Our schools and newspapers point out that we believe in the principle of freedom of opportunity, yet for many Americans caught in the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty, we have not done all that is possible to provide exits from the ranks of the poor and disadvantaged.

The findings of the President's Task Force on Manpower Conservation, released earlier this month, point to the shocking toll that poverty exacts of our Nation's manpower resources. The task force found that one-third of the Nation's youth would, on examination, be found unqualified on the basis of standards set up for military service. Moreover, poverty is the principal reason why these young men fail to meet those physical and mental standards. Four out of five of those rejected on mental grounds were school dropouts; one out of five came from families that had been on public assistance in the past 5 years; almost a third came from homes broken by divorce or separation. The fathers of more than half of the mental rejectees never completed grade school.

These findings are dramatic evidence that the problem of poverty is still very much with us, and that its social and economic costs are heavy.

Unlike many undeveloped nations throughout the world, the United States has the productive capacity to provide an adequate level of living for all of its citizens. Moreover, raising every individual and family now living at below subsistence levels to at least a level of subsistence could be accomplished without any basic changes in our economic system. And when we consider that 4 million workers and 13 percent of our industrial capacity are not being utilized it is apparent that this country has the capacity and the opportunity to face the problem of poverty and its attendant social evils squarely and to attack it.

Throughout most of history, until the technological advances of the 20th century made abundance a reality, a real scarcity of goods made the elimination of mass poverty an unreachable goal. Therefore, poverty was rationalized by whatever philosophy was convenient—thus the "social Darwinists" of the latter part of the 19th century labeled the poor as those least fit in the survival of the fittest. Today, we reject such thinking. Still the notion that poverty is a spur to progress and is a penalty for laziness, error or failure persists as an almost unconditional hangover of attitudes conditioned by a wholly different set of economic facts.

The fact is, of course, that poverty is costly not only to individuals but also to society. Physical and mental disease, delinquency and crime, high infant mortality, loss of productive capacity—all of these are part of the environment of poverty.

But the most fundamental reason for declaring war on poverty is a moral one. This Nation and its institutions are founded upon the belief that each individual should have the opportunity to develop his capacity to the fullest. Those who are born into the world of poverty are not only deprived of most of the material comforts of life, but are also stunted in their emotional, intellectual, and social development, and thus effectively prevented from realizing their human potentialities.

To say that poverty and inequality of opportunity (which is both a cause and effect of poverty and deprivation) is morally wrong is only a beginning. Sound public policy must be based on facts in addition to moral fervor. Thus it is essential to know how much poverty exists today, what causes it, and what may be the problems of eliminating it in the future.

The question of how many people live in poverty depends, of course, upon a definition of poverty. This is not an altogether easy definition to arrive at, as various studies on poverty and the characteristics of the poor will readily testify. There are two primary sources of income data that are cited in most studies: the Current Population Reports, Consumer Income Series, prepared by the Bureau of the Census derived from household surveys; and the personal income series developed by the Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, based primarily on data from the consolidated Federal individual income tax returns and from the Census Income Series. The census data include money income only, while the Office of Business Economics series includes some nonmoney income sources. However, the census data, although limited to money income, provides a wide range of breakdowns of family income by size and type of family and therefore can furnish useful data on the characteristics of low-income families.

The exact point that separates adequate incomes from inadequate ones is necessarily a matter of judgment. Starting with the premise that the poor are those whose basic and irreducible needs exceed their means to satisfy them, we must determine the total of goods and services that constitute these basic needs and the amount of income necessary to purchase these goods and services. Various minimum family budgets have been determined by welfare agencies, public and private, for use in establishing eligibility for assistance payments to the needy. The Bureau of Labor Statistics periodically computes a citywide family budget representing a modest but adequate living for a family of 4 for 20 large cities in the United States. In 1959 this annual budget cost ranged from a low of $5,370 to a high of $6,567, inclusive of taxes. Most income studies use a cutoff point to separate poor families from those with adequate incomes that is somewhere between the minimum State welfare budget and the BLS city worker's budget.

Since budgetary needs vary among different geographic areas and among families of different sizes and age composition, the use of some cutoff point such as $3,000 annual income for any family as a demarcation of the poverty group provides at best only a rough approximation of the numbers of poor families.

Today I should like to cite some data on poor families from a study of family income by the Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.[1] This study, based on a national sample of 2,800 families taken in 1960, obtained, by means of a rather extensive questionnaire, a more complete measure of income than either the Census Money Income Series or the Office of Business Economic Personal Income Series. Since detailed information was obtained for each family in the sample, it was possible to estimate closely the budgetary needs of each household on the basis of size and composition of the family, adjusted for differences in food, clothing, and other requirements of persons of different ages and employment status.

[1] James N. Morgan, Martin H. David, Wilbur J. Cohen, and Harvey E. Brazer, "Income and Welfare in the United States," McGraw Hill Co., 1962.

The budgetary standard was adapted from one developed by the Community Council of Greater New York. The budget was $1,716 for an aged or disabled person and $4,330 for a family of four. Because of price differentials in rural areas the University of Michigan study designated a family as poor only if its income failed to meet 90 percent of its basic needs as determined by the New York council standards and if its liquid assets were less than $5,000. The median budget requirement for all poor families was $3,676.

By this standard, 10.4 million families, or 20 percent of American families, were poor in 1959.

I do not want to belabor the question of numbers or percentages. Absolute numbers are arbitrary, but all studies show that the number of poor is substantial enough to constitute a national problem. Setting a standard of need higher or lower than that used in the University of Michigan study would modify the dimensions of the problem but would not alter basically the findings as to the incidence of poverty among various groups and the characteristics of those living in poverty; nor would it affect the kinds of programs needed to attack the problem.

Of the 10.4 million families classified as poor by the University of Michigan study, over one-fourth were headed by a person aged 65 or over; over one-fourth were nonwhite; about one out of six was headed by a disabled person; about one out of eight was headed by a single parent—usually a mother—with children. Unemployed persons headed about one out of nine families. Many of these categories overlap, of course. For example, nearly one-third of the poor aged heads were also disabled. Nonwhites comprised over two-fifths of the broken families, and almost 30 percent of the unemployed living in poverty, although nonwhites made up about 11 percent of the population in 1959.

Yet a sizable proportion of the poor—almost one-fourth—could not be classified into any of the above categories. This sizable group includes unskilled seasonal workers, widows, and single females under 65, students, and household workers. Many of these people have low levels of educational attainment and no employment skills. Typical of such families is one headed by a 32-year-old man employed as a dishwasher. Although he worked steadily during 1959, he earned only slightly over $2,000. His wife earned $300 more, but their combined incomes are not enough to support themselves and their three children. This man sees little prospect of increasing his earning power or of moving out of the ranks of the poor.

Low earning power may result from temporary circumstances, such as short-term unemployment, or illness, or it may be the result of longrun factors less susceptible of change. It is true that whatever definition of poverty is used, there will be included among the ranks of the poor some families who may later move out of poverty. However, one of the most interesting and significant outcomes of the University of Michigan study is that it furnishes statistical evidence that there is indeed a hard core of poor families who have little prospect of moving out of poverty and for whom low incomes are chronic.

A variety of findings support this conclusion. Data on the past earnings of heads of poor families show chronically low earnings. Their meager assets result from low incomes, financial disasters, or poor financial management in the past. Data on health insurance coverage and pension rights show that they have had little protection from risks against poor health and involuntary retirement. In many poor families the breadwinner has never earned enough to cover the costs of their maintenance budget. The heads of poor families reported that they earned an average of $2,949 in the year in which they earned the most. Yet the present needs of these families cost an average of $3,676.

Variations in the distribution of assets among poor families in the University of Michigan study reflected differences in income history. Among families in different categories the nonwhite and single parents with children had accumulated the least reserves from past incomes. As might be expected, aged persons and farmers had the highest levels of assets, but even these amounts were small. In part, of course, the accumulation of assets depends on the age of the family head. For example, one-third of single parents and nearly one-half of the unemployed—whose asset holdings were low—were under age 35. Poor nonwhite families, however, regardless of age, reported less savings than other groups. No doubt this results in large part from lack of income in past years, but in any case most nonwhite families have almost no contingency reserves to meet future crises.

Lack of assets and loss of earning power are not the sole economic problems of poor families. They also have inadequate protection against those contingencies which are likely to curtail their incomes in the future. In 1959 only one-third of poor families had hospitalization insurance covering all members. Three-fifths had no insurance whatsoever. This contrasts with 63 percent of the total population who had hospitalization coverage for all members of the family.

Social insurance programs are an important part of an antipoverty program, yet poor families are less likely than others to have such coverage. Among all families 93 percent of the heads are covered by social security or other Government pensions in contrast to 84 percent of poor families. The Michigan study also showed that 40 percent of all families were covered by a private pension and annuities as contrasted with only 11 percent of poor families.

Contrary to what might be expected, less than one-fourth of the poor families received public assistance during 1959. This is a most significant finding. It is possible to argue that the proportion should be higher or lower. The proportion among the categories of poor families that did receive public assistance varied from 40 percent among the disabled to 6 percent for the able-bodied self-employed. No doubt these differences reflected the wide range in eligibility for assistance among different groups of poor families, differences in their asset holdings, and in all likelihood in differences in State and eligibility standards and in willingness in which poor families apply for and accept public aid.

The poor do not usually have only one problem—the lack of money. They usually have many other problems. Many of the poor may be classified as multiple-problem families and to raise them above the poverty level we must attack these multiple causes. But we should not overlook the fact that many of the poor have important assets upon which to build a new life and new hope. In the University of Michigan study we found that about 70 percent of the poor felt they were not able to plan ahead but about 30 percent—despite their poverty—felt they were able to plan ahead. This proportion rose to over 40 percent for those just above the poverty line and to about 60 percent for those with modest incomes. There are poor people with ability to plan, with motivation, pride, and ambition; with appropriate and timely aid they can be helped to leave the ranks of the poor. How to find these people, how to work with them, and how to make available the services they need to help them become self-supporting is the challenge ahead of us.

From the standpoint of formulating public policy for the elimination of poverty, an important question arises as to whether the long-term causative factors of poverty result in the transmission of poverty between generations. Terminology such as the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty is often used. To what extent do statistical data on the characteristics of the poor validate this description? Taking two indexes of economic status: education and occupation, the 1959 University of Michigan data show that the majority of those now in the ranks of the poor failed to go beyond the educational level of their fathers and that the poor family heads show much less upward occupational mobility than the general population. In fact the data indicate that a number of heads of poor families have moved into less skilled jobs than their fathers had.

The level of education expected by poor families for their children still in school and the educational attainment of their children who have finished school suggest that children of poor families to some extent inherit the inadequate education of their parents. Poor families have substantially lower aspirations for sending their children to college than is true for the national cross section; 31 percent of poor families expected their sons to go on to college as compared to 66 percent of all families. Similarly, only 45 percent of the children of poor families completed high school or more, while 65 percent of the children of all families achieved this level of education. Moreover, more than one-third of the children of poor families have less than a grade school education and will probably perpetuate the poverty of their parents.

Two generalizations about poverty—that low incomes and low earning power are usually chronic and that there is a strong tendency for poverty and dependency to perpetuate itself between generations—clearly show that stopgap or crash programs do no more than alleviate poverty. The causes of poverty can be eliminated only by a concentrated and simultaneous attack on all aspects of poverty. As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, "Our aim is not only to relieve the symptoms of poverty but to cure it—and above all to prevent it."

During the past 25 years the extent of low incomes in the United States has been diminished considerably. The social and economic reforms such as social insurance, public assistance and minimum wage enacted in the New Deal era and the high rate of economic growth during the 1940's and early 1950's have played important roles in the reduction of poverty. Yet in the midst of our affluent society, millions of Americans still live in poverty. It is clear that a high rate of economic growth with a resulting high level of employment is a necessary basis of a public policy aimed at the elimination of poverty.

But economic growth will not in itself eradicate poverty; it will not insure income to the retired aged or disabled, nor eliminate discrimination against nonwhite, nor assure a productive role in our increasingly complex technology for the unskilled and uneducated. What is needed is a broadscale attack on poverty and its causes from many different directions. Such an attack should include a broad program of education; income maintenance to meet basic needs; expanded health and housing programs and other services to improve the physical and social environment; an equitable and efficient tax system; and a constant effort to achieve and maintain optimum use of resources and manpower.

In a forthcoming special message to the Congress, President Johnson will outline the nature of the administration's attack on poverty and propose specific programs to implement this attack. Time does not per-

mit a discussion of the specific kinds of measures that will be presented later. I will instead suggest some of the main currents of the overall antipoverty policy of this administration.

The wide array of existing antipoverty programs will be an important part of the attack on poverty, as will those programs which have been proposed during the past 3 years and are still awaiting consideration by Congress. The task now before us is to strengthen and refocus existing programs and coordinate them with some new ones into a comprehensive and purposive policy aimed at eliminating poverty, dependency, and ignorance in the United States.

The President proposes to establish a means of bringing together these separate programs—Federal, State, and local—in an effort to achieve a unified and intensified approach to this complex problem, in which each separate element reinforces the others. Under the President's proposal, locally initiated, comprehensive community action programs would be developed, to focus the various available resources on the roots of poverty in urban and rural areas.

Increased economic growth, which will create more jobs and raise productivity, must have high priority in this policy. For this reason, President Johnson has urged prompt enactment of a tax reduction as an immediate stimulus to economic growth. In addition to the immediate effect of creating more jobs, the tax cut will subsequently increase Government revenues for the support of public programs to attack poverty.

Of course, more than just tax reform is involved in the problem of increasing economic growth and more than economic growth is involved in the problem of dependency. However, the two problems interact closely because the high rate of growth with the resultant increased output of goods and services is bound to be reflected in improved living standards for at least some of those persons who now live in poverty. On the other hand, measures which seek to remedy the causes of poverty and dependency through rehabilitation and training, for example, represent an investment in human resources which will in turn be reflected in increased levels of economic well-being.

Of all the measures that may have a long-run effect in overcoming poverty and dependency, education is probably the most crucial. The University of Michigan study that I cited earlier found that over half of the heads of poor families were unskilled laborers or farmers. Today's rapidly changing technology requires more and more of the highly skilled and educated. Levels of skills that were sufficient for yesterday's labor market are marginal today.

A nation's most important resource is its people. Investment in education bears dividends in the form of increased productivity and national growth. Professor Schultz, of the University of Chicago, has estimated that about 40 percent of the Nation's economic growth in recent years may be attributed to education. On the other hand, failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: delinquency, unemployment, loss of productive power and purchasing power, and an increase in tax-supported assistance payments are examples. The loss of only 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy, it is poor economics.

In the long run, it is only by stimulating interest in learning among the culturally and economically deprived youth in slum areas, in depressed rural areas, and in other areas of hard-core poverty, and by removing existing financial barriers to continuing education beyond the high school level that the cycle of self-perpetuating poverty can be broken. In order to do this, the Nation must be prepared to invest much more than it is now investing in education.

Special education efforts must be made for the children of poor and deprived families and such education not only requires special techniques, but is more costly than for children from homes that are economically and socially more secure. Yet for most children at the bottom of the economic ladder, educational opportunities are inadequate and school buildings and instruction are grossly inferior to those available to children in higher income areas.

In addition to improved educational opportunities, the children of poor families need improved job and educational counseling and youth-oriented employment services. Children raised in the bleak and unpromising world of poverty are surrounded by adults whose hopes have been destroyed or never kindled—these young people need to be stimulated and motivated and given the opportunity to participate in meaningful work experience. The administration's proposed Youth Employment Act is one such measure.

When we speak of the poor we should not assume that all are equally poor. There is a wide variation in the economic status of the poor. To paraphrase George Orwell, while all of them are poor some are more poor than others. At the bottom of the heap is the broken family with children. Considering these six different groups among the poor—the aged, the disabled, the broken family, the unemployed, the nonwhite, the self-employed—the budgetary needs of broken families is the highest and the gap between their need and the highest prior earned income is also the largest of any of the six groups. The mean budget requirement of broken families was $4,359 yet the highest income these families ever earned was $1,673 (table 1).

Earnings history of poor families

[Percent of poor families]

Highest income head ever earned:	
$1 to $949	14
$950 to $1,949	18
$1,950 to $2,949	18
$2,950 to $4,949	21
$4,950 to $7,449	9
$7,450 or more	3
Not ascertained	17
Total	100
Percent who never worked	12
Number of families	755

Characteristic of head	Mean highest income ever earned	Mean budget requirement	Mean deficit
Aged	$2,230	$2,401	$171
Disabled	2,833	3,801	968
Single parent	1,673	4,359	2,686
Unemployed	3,066	4,161	1,095
Nonwhite	2,490	4,144	1,654
Self-employed or farmer	4,143	4,446	303
Not 1 to 6	3,474	4,033	559
All poor families	2,949	3,676	727

Source: Morgan, David, Cohen and Brazer, "Income and Welfare in the United States" (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962).

About one-third of all poor persons are children under the age of 18. Among the poor, children are nearly twice as numerous as are aged persons. About one-fifth of all children in the country are starting life in a condition of inherited poverty.

Recognizing that early and preventive action is vital in preventing the perpetuation of poverty, there must be greater emphasis on adequate prenatal care and on the medical care and nutritional needs of the young. Protection of children in low-income families must begin with adequate prenatal care for mothers to reduce infant mortality and prematurity. New and expanded programs for school health and school luncheon will contribute to both better health and better education. Policies aimed at improving the general health and welfare of poor families are needed to strengthen the home and family situations for underprivileged youth.

With the increasing participation of women in the labor force, there is a growing need to provide substitute care for the children of working mothers. The incidence of poverty is high among families headed by a woman. The great majority of children of working mothers without husbands are in low-income families. Forty-four percent of these children have mothers with incomes of less than $2,000 a year, and an additional 39 percent have mothers whose income is between $2,000 and $4,000 a year. Greater availability of day care facilities would not only be of great direct benefit to the children involved but would also make it possible for some mothers who now receive public assistance to be trained for employment and thus become self-supporting.

The bleak physical environment of poverty—whether in congested city slums or in depressed rural areas such as Appalachia—affects the feelings, aspirations, and behavior of its inhabitants. Poor physical environment is associated with poor health and lack of drive and energy. The slum dweller feels helpless to change his physical environment and this frustration translates itself into a generally pessimistic outlook on life. Better housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, and improved recreational opportunities can all help to raise aspirations and improve motivation, particularly among the youth. For it is among the youth of today that our greatest effort must be made to break the cycle of poverty and dependency.

More than physical buildings are needed to change the environment of proverty. Imaginative new approaches are called for to bring needed health, education, and welfare services to low-income families to help them overcome the effects of poverty and deprivation. The administration's proposed National Service Corps would be a significant step in the direction of helping provide urgently needed services to hard-hit slum or rural poverty areas.

Poverty is neither an urban nor a rural phenomenon. The University of Michigan study found that standard metropolitan areas, including suburban areas, contained about two-fifths of all poor families—about the same number that lived in outlying areas. The remaining one-fifth of the poor were in areas adjacent to metropolitan areas.

However, although poverty is widely dispersed, there are some areas and communities that are harder hit than others. About one-third of all families are in the South, but half of all poor families were concentrated in this region in 1959. Similarly, the chances of being poor are greater for those living outside of metropolitan areas—while these families made up only one-fifth of all families in 1959, they comprised two-fifths of all poor families. Lack of employment opportunities undoubtedly contributes heavily to the poverty of such areas.

Of the poor families living in standard metropolitan areas, over two-thirds were concentrated in the central cities of such areas. Recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics has compiled some data from the 1960 census on income, education, and unemployment in 38 large cities. These data are broken down by census tract and show some startling differences between incomes and living conditions in different sections of cities. The data clearly show that the poverty stricken and disadvantaged are concentrated in certain neighborhoods. Median income data and

unemployment rates for a city or metropolitan area often mask tremendous variations in economic well-being within a city or community.

The Area Redevelopment Administration has designated over 900 urban and rural areas as depressed and eligible for Federal financial assistance under the ARA program because of persistently high levels of unemployment. This indicates the size and scope of the problem of concentrations of poverty.

The problem of the so-called pockets of poverty presents a considerable challenge. Here efforts to improve environment are complicated by population decline, outmigration of leaders, and an exodus of physical capital. Strengthening of the economic base of such regions and communities is essential to efforts to raise the level of living of the inhabitants. Federal assistance to areas of severe and chronic unemployment has been provided under the area redevelopment program initiated in 1961. Expansion of this program will be a part of the administration's antipoverty drive.

The inhabitants of depressed rural areas and the urban slum dweller share the handicap of lack of education and skills. Education and training, even basic literacy training, are needed before the able-bodied adult poor can find gainful employment in increasingly complex technology.

An important part of the overall effort to eliminate poverty are the retraining programs initiated under the Area Redevelopment Act and made available on a more general scale under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Special efforts must be made to reach, through these programs, the large body of "problem" unemployed—nonwhites, older workers, teenagers, and those with low educational attainment. The 1963 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act makes possible the training of more young people by reducing the age limit for training allowances from 19 to 17 and by increasing the allocation of training allowances for youths under age 22. In addition, the new law provides for up to 20 weeks of basic education to enable functionally illiterate workers to obtain the basic skills that are essential if they are to qualify for and benefit from any occupational training. Of special significance to the problem of pockets of poverty is the provision of up to $4 million for special labor mobility demonstration projects. These projects will be designed to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. I might add here that the special study of selective service rejectees which I mentioned earlier found that two-thirds of the rejectees were willing to move away from home to obtain job training.

Needs other than occupational training must be met before many of the chronically unemployed can be placed in jobs—and sometimes even before they can be trained. These needs may include mental health, psychiatric treatment or therapeutic counseling, physical rehabilitation, treatment for severe emotional and social maladjustments and basic education in reading, mathematics and science. The social services and community work and training programs being developed under the public welfare amendments of 1962 and the initiation by the Department of Labor of a series of special projects concerned with the handicapped worker and the mentally retarded are examples of the kinds of programs that are needed to bring many of the chronically unemployed to the point where they can benefit from vocational training.

Other measures that are needed to prevent or alleviate poverty among the working age population include strengthening and modernization of the unemployment insurance program and extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide minimum wage and related protection for additional groups of workers, particularly those in major service industries.

In any discussion of the relationship between unemployment, underemployment and poverty, the situation of the nonwhite deserves special attention.

The burden of poverty falls to a disproportionate degree on the nonwhite population. Median income of nonwhite families averaged $3,330 in 1962, as compared to $6,237 for white families. About 45 percent of the nonwhite families had incomes below $3,000 a year. Low earning power, unemployment and underemployment are far more prevalent among nonwhites than whites.

Negroes suffer from both direct and indirect economic effects of racial discrimination. The Negro's vulnerability to unemployment is due in part to the heavy concentration of Negroes in occupations particularly susceptible to unemployment—unskilled farm and nonfarm labor, semiskilled production jobs, and service occupations. It is estimated that about half the racial difference in unemployment rates is due to the heavy concentration of nonwhite workers in occupations such as these, where there is a great deal of unemployment. Nevertheless, within each of these occupational groups, there is a higher rate of unemployment for nonwhites, partly because these workers tend to be near the bottom of the skill ladder for their occupational group. A similar pattern prevails within all the major industry groups, reflecting earlier layoffs of unskilled and more recently hired workers, categories in which nonwhite workers fall in larger proportions than whites.

Racial discrimination is an obvious factor in this picture, accounting at least in part for the limited access of nonwhite workers to the skilled and professional occupations and for their restricted upward movement even within the occupational groups in which they are widely employed. This discrimination in employment is reinforced and its elimination made more difficult by discrimination in other areas, particularly education.

Even if all bars to the employment of Negroes could be wiped out overnight, there would still remain the barrier of the inadequate education and training of a large number of unemployed Negroes. The median number of school years completed for nonwhite persons aged 25 and over is 8.2 compared to 10.9 for the white population of this age group. About 47 percent of adult nonwhites have had less than 8 years of schooling, compared to about 17 percent of white adults. Clearly, the effects of 100 years of discrimination, segregation, and lack of opportunity cannot be overcome at once, but the time has come for the Nation to make a massive effort to open all doors of economic and educational opportunity to the Negro so that he may break the bonds of his poverty and become what should be the heritage of every American, a first-class citizen.

Passage of the Civil Rights Act is an essential step in combating poverty among nonwhites. The guaranteeing of fundamental civil and human rights, while it will not solve the Negro's economic problems, will do much to create a more healthy atmosphere in which such problems can be worked out.

Beyond this, a massive national effort must be made to train the unskilled and upgrade the skills of the semiskilled and skilled Negro workers whose jobs have been displaced by automation and technological change; as indeed, such an effort must be made on behalf of all workers since these problems are not confined to Negroes alone.

There is a high incidence of poverty among the aged and disabled who are unable to compete in the labor market and are dependent on types of income other than earnings. For these persons, the adequacy of income maintenance programs is crucial. The President has urged passage of the hospital insurance bill as a means of meeting a serious threat to the financial security of older persons—the high cost of serious illness. This measure is an important part of the antipoverty campaign.

Like other groups living in poverty, the elderly have difficulty in securing decent housing. As part of the expansion and improvement of public housing programs, the administration will pay special heed to the needs of lower income elderly.

In summary, at least one-fifth of the Nation's families live in poverty, yet the poor are not a homogeneous group. They are made up of young and old, disabled and able bodied, white and nonwhite, urban and rural dwellers. Although many are concentrated in specific geographic areas, the poor are also found in nearly every community of significant size. Generally, they are the unemployed, underemployed, and seasonal workers. Many, of course, are too old, too sick or disabled to work. Greater economic growth would undoubtedly put many of the unemployed to work. But great numbers of unemployed are totally unfit to compete in today's labor market without education and training. Disabling physical and mental conditions of many of the poor must be combated by provision of social, medical, rehabilitative, and other services required before they can become self-supporting members of society.

The antipoverty program of the administration is designed to lift people out of conditions of poverty and raise their educational, health, and skill levels to increase their opportunities. The war against poverty, while a national effort, will be carried out through community action. This will call not only for coordination and cooperation among the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, but also participation of State agencies and especially full participation by the private sector of the community.

The many health, education, welfare, and income maintenance programs, both public and private, that already exist in this country must be focused on the problem of eliminating poverty. The expansion and redirection of these programs under national leadership can make it possible to overcome the problem of poverty and dependency in the United States.

Doubts Over Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Doubts Over Tax Cut."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBTS OVER TAX CUT—SOME MISGIVINGS ARE BEING AIRED BY BOTH LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE CAMPS

(By M. J. Rossant)

Some of the most fervent supporters of tax reductions are expressing concern that the Texas-size package proposed by President Johnson may be too much of a good thing. Their fear is based on the extra punch in purchasing power that would result from the President's request to immediately re-

duce the individual withholding rate to 14 percent. President Kennedy had sought a two-stage reduction, with a 15-percent rate for 1964 and a further cut, to 14 percent, next year.

According to those economists having second thoughts, packing most of the proposed tax relief into the current year can provide too great a stimulus now, making it more difficult to maintain economic stability later.

The growing uneasiness concerning the reductions in taxes and spending sought by the administration was not quelled by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon's statement made last week before the Congress Joint Economic Committee, that the program is designed to mesh, so that there is a proper mixture of stimulus and restraint over the next 2 years.

SOME DOUBT EXPRESSED

Economists hope that this is the case, but they are not at all sure. This doubt is shared by both liberals and conservatives who achieved a surprising degree of unanimity in agreeing on the need for tax reductions. They are now airing similar misgivings, although they disagree over what policies are required to cope with potential trouble.

Prof. Paul A. Samuelson of MIT, who serves as consultant to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is a leading worrier among those tax supporters in the liberal ranks.

In a recent article, Professor Samuelson stated that he had "stepped upward rather than downward my estimates for this calendar year" because or the additional income that would be released by the proposed change in the tax rate, adding that "it will take a burst of private consumption and investment spending next year to offset the destabilizing effect of the withholding tax change."

The February issue of the economic letter published by the First National City Bank of New York makes plain that conservatives favoring tax reductions have taken to biting their fingernails. Commenting on the President's tax plan, the bank's letter noted that it "should insure a vigorous and prosperous 1964," but runs the risk of adding "too much stimulus too soon to an already healthy expansion."

Anxiety in both liberal and conservative camps may well increase when the final size of the reductions are known. Like Topsy, it has been growing.

ESTIMATE BASED ON 1963

The administration estimate, which most economists have used in their own forecasts, puts the total amount of tax reduction at $11.1 billion. But this figure is based on an estimate of 1963 incomes, which were bigger than expected. In addition, it does not take into account Congress refusal to approve some $500 million revenue-raising reforms contained in the administration's package.

Congress is not expected to give its approval to the bill as quickly as the President had assumed. This means that the stimulus will be deferred a month or even two. There is little question, though, that the amount of the stimulant will be a lot bigger than the estimate of $11.6 billion in the bill passed by the Senate Finance Committee.

The increased amount of reductions reinforces National City's belief that "the impetus of the tax cut is likely to push production and distribution closer to capacity," which could lead to mounting inflationary pressure. In its view, some restraint is required this year. It warns that, "If we are not to develop an unsustainable rate of expansion and borrow business from 1965, a monetary policy of judicious restraint may well be needed to create a climate in which price stability can be achieved."

This is where Professor Samuelson and liberals in general part company with the conservative bloc. He is more concerned about the brake exerted by a decline in Government spending once the stimulus of taxation fades. He argues for "planning a mix of budget deficits and easy money sufficiently expansionary to prevent development of a deflationary gap."

There can be no certainty about the outlook because it is impossible to measure how consumers and businessmen will react to the stimulus of tax reductions. Nor is it certain that Government spending will turn down in the coming fiscal year.

The difficulty in assessing the impact of shifts in policy was emphasized by Fortune magazine's business roundup almost a year ago. It stressed "the importance but uncertainty of timing in economic affairs," and went on to suggest that the outlook contained "risks both of too much stimulation and too much restraint."

These observations are now being applied by both liberals and conservatives in reappraising the present business outlook. They are obviously hoping that the expansion continues on a smooth upward course, but they recognize that if tax reductions prove overstimulating it will be difficult to avoid resort to a policy of overrestraint.

But at this late stage, with the tax cut that they have sought just about to be made effective, there is little that they can do aside from crossing the fingers of one hand while biting the nails of the other.

William R. Woodfield Citizen of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Committee of Anne Arundel County recently chose William R. Woodfield Citizen of the Year for 1963. They could not have made a wiser choice.

A native of Anne Arundel County, Bill Woodfield has made numerous distinguished contributions to the community and State during his life. I know that the county is deeply in debt to him for his services and that he has set an inspiring example for the rest of us who live there to follow.

I would be at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to enumerate Bill Woodfield's many contributions, but the following editorial from the Annapolis Evening Capital describes some of them, and, therefore I would like to append the editorial to my remarks:

WOODFIELD OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF YEAR

The Citizens Committee of Anne Arundel County has picked the right man in naming William R. Woodfield as Citizen of the Year for 1963.

We can think of no one more deserving of this high honor than this Galesville native who has performed outstanding services in so many community and church activities.

A leading county businessman, Woodfield is coowner and senior partner in the Woodfield Fish & Oyster Co. at Galesville.

He has served as president of the Maryland Oyster Growers & Dealers Association and is currently vice president and director of the Chesapeake Bay Seafood Packers.

To name all of his community and church activities would require a long listing, but to mention a few:

He currently serves as president of the county Community Chest, a post he has held for three terms, some years ago. He served as a Community Chest director for 12 years and spent 2 years on the organization's board of directors.

He has served as grand jury foreman, as treasurer, trustee, and chairman of the building committee of the Annapolis and Anne Arundel County Public Library Association, as secretary of the Galesville Volunteer Fire Department.

Appointed by three Governors, he has served on the Sunday blue law committee, the Bowman commission to study laws pertaining to the State's natural resources, and on the advisory committee of the State tidewater fisheries commission.

He has served as chairman of the county port development committee and is presently serving on the county planning and zoning commission.

Woodfield also served for 4 years as chairman of the Christian businessmen's committee.

In religious work, he has served as chairman of the board and as a lay leader of the Galesville Methodist Church. The Washington East District of the Methodist Church honored him as Layman of the Year in 1956 at a dinner attended by 400 persons.

He has been a Bible class teacher and currently serves on the board of managers of the Methodist Church Camp at Churchton. He has been chosen by the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Church to be a delegate to a jurisdictional conference at Pittsburgh in April.

As Citizen of the Year, Woodfield will receive a plaque at a banquet to be given in his honor at Carvel Hall on February 12.

We commend the citizens committee for so honoring an outstanding countian and we congratulate Woodfield for being selected for this high award.

Memo to President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that unemployment is our major domestic problem. During the next few months, numerous proposals will be offered to deal with this problem. Most of these proposals, I am sure, will contemplate new Federal programs.

Mr. President, I believe we must recognize the fact that the problem of unemployment in the United States cannot be solved by the Federal Government alone. This problem requires the full efforts and cooperation of private enterprise. In this regard, I was pleased to notice an item in the Hagerstown, Md., Daily Mail, pledging the cooperation of Mack Trucks, Inc., in the efforts to reduce unemployment. This ad in the form of a memorandum to President Johnson recognizes the need for expanded efforts by the private sector against unemployment.

I commend Mack Trucks, Inc., for the fine job they have done in Hagerstown, Md., and hope that their efforts will set an example for businesses throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum to President Johnson contained in the Hagerstown Daily Mail be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memo was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACK TRUCKS, INC., MEMO TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON—WE STAND READY TO DO OUR PART

"President Johnson told Congress this week that the Nation's No. 1 economic problem is persistent unemployment in his economic report. Johnson said unemployment—which edged up to 5.7 percent of the labor force in 1963—belongs 'near the top of any list of ills afflicting our society.'" (Business Week, current issue.)

This is a challenge to all of us in the Nation, in the State of Maryland and, in particular, in Hagerstown which remains in the so-called distressed area of Appalachia.

There can be only one practical and real answer to unemployment—more jobs.

Mack Trucks stands ready to do its part.

Since we joined the Hagerstown community in 1961, we already have created more than 3,000 jobs. Mack Trucks stands ready to make every effort to utilize its capacity for expansion right here in Hagerstown. Mack Trucks might be able to help further by expanding—by entering new fields, including the European markets.

Mack Trucks stands ready to help solve the unemployment problem in the only practical manner—through new and more jobs which can be economically justified.

But—to do so—it is imperative that we maintain a competitive posture, not only in the United States but in Europe. Europe's wage standards are far lower than those in the United States; specifically, in Hagerstown. We propose to pay American wage standards.

The answer lies in American efficiency, American teamwork, American know-how and in the traditional American determination to work together with common purpose. By increasing our productivity, we can be competitive.

We are proud of our role in helping to restore Hagerstown as a solid job town. At the same time, all who wish to help solve this serious unemployment problem of the Nation, of the State, and of this community similarly have a part to play. We believe that all will do their part, as well. We can all succeed if we all work together for the good of all. That is the American way.

Mack Trucks can speak only for itself. We stand ready to do our part.

C. RHOADES MACBRIDE,
Chairman and President.

Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Dean of Boston College Law School, on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, of the many outstanding spokesmen for civil rights in America, I have been most deeply moved by recent statements made by a former teacher of mine at Boston College Law School.

Dean Drinan speaks with the kind of conviction and perspective that is characteristic of our best progressive traditions. His humanity, his learning, and his concern for equality of all men is characteristic of the late and great Jesuit priest and author, Father John LaFarge, whose death last year culminated a lifetime of greatness in dedication to the cause for reaffirming the essential dignity of man.

Dean Drinan speaks for all men, and one of his most brilliant statements was given on August 7, at the Hotel Commander, Cambridge, Mass., and was titled "The Northern Negro and the White Conscience."

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am gratified with the opportunity to include the full text of this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE NORTHERN NEGRO AND THE WHITE CONSCIENCE

(Excerpts from an address by the Reverend Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of the Boston College Law School, to the Cambridge Kiwanis, Cambridge, Mass., August 7, 1963)

Many if not most Americans probably have the unexpressed hope that demonstrations by Negroes will fade away after the massive protest meeting on August 28 in Washington. It has been a summer of near violence in which the enormous dimensions and the overwhelming urgency of the Negro problem have been appreciated, almost perhaps for the first time, by large numbers of white persons in the North. At the same time these white citizens and many others hope that their admittedly disturbed consciences may be allowed to return to normal with the advent of fall and the hoped for cessation of demonstrations.

These same white persons will concede, however, that the Negro community would be acting against its own best interests by canceling further demonstrations. The reason, of course, is the fact that the Negro in America has within the last 3 months attracted the attention and disturbed the conscience of the white community more than at any other time in recent years—possibly more than at any time in the past 100 years.

Although demonstrations by Negroes may diminish somewhat in number and abate in vigor it seems clear that widespread, persistent, and urgent demonstrations on behalf of Negro rights will be a permanent part of American life for the foreseeable future.

The only way to prevent this eventuality is to have a massive awakening and a campaign of action by white citizens and officials to understand and satisfy the rightful demands of the Negro minority. Past performance by the white majority does not unfortunately indicate that Negroes can afford to cease to press their claims in as militant a manner as is necessary even to get the attention of white citizens and officials.

It is well to recall that Negroes have achieved some of their greatest victories by demonstrations or by the threat of them. It was a planned massive march on Washington by Negroes which impelled Congress in 1943 to enact the first and only Federal Fair Employment Practices Act—a law promptly repealed by southern Congressmen immediately after World War II. It was another threatened march on Washington which prompted the Truman administration in the late forties to order the total desegregation of the Armed Forces—a victory of momentous consequence for the Negro community.

Demonstrations, therefore, can be expected to continue. White persons humble enough to admit it will confess that such demonstrations should be deemed a grace of God because they remind us of society's sins and keep our consciences awake when otherwise we would, as we have done so often in the past, forget about the entire problem of the nonwhite person in America. At the same time everyone must admit that by now all of us should have had enough shock to our consciences. Surely Negroes should not be required to undergo more humiliations and shame simply to keep our consciences alive. Sometimes there must be such a permanent awakening of the white conscience that it will be the white community which will carry on spontaneous demonstrations to express its concern for the Negro in America. Such demonstrations would be for both white and Negro a reassuring sign of the good faith of the white majority and of its determination to redress the grievances of the 10 percent of this Nation's population who are the descendants of slaves brought to these shores by our ancestors.

The overwhelming majority of the 90 percent of the Nation's citizens who are white seem truly persuaded that the grievances over which Negroes now demonstrate should be corrected. The only widespread qualification on this nearly universal persuasion is the frequently expressed sentiment that some Negroes want too much too soon. Not infrequently those who express this latter feeling seem to think that the Negroes like every other ethnic or racial minority must patiently await its day.

There are, however, two serious difficulties with this ultragradualist or time-will-heal-all viewpoint:

1. The fact is that in housing, education, and employment the condition of the northern Negro continues to run substantially behind that of similarly situated persons. In other words, the present economic and educational disparity between Negroes and whites in the North is not decreasing but rather increasing. A concrete example can be seen in the fact that whereas the average Negro wage earner in 1951 subsisted on 62 percent of what his white counterpart was earning the percentage fell to 55 percent by 1962.

2. Even if, however, the Negro minority were advancing in the same proportion as is the white majority the disparity between these groups can never be closed without an enormous effort being made at every level of society to overcome the handicap which now burdens the Negro community.

The situation therefore calls for imaginative initiative on the part of the white majority with respect to the 10 million nonwhite citizens who dwell in our Northern cities. This group's opportunities in housing, employment, and education cannot be equalized unless the ingenuity and resourcefulness of all private and public agencies are extended to achieve this desirable equalization. The details of a bold and resourceful new program will gradually emerge as soon as the Nation—and particularly the citizens of Northern cities—come to the conviction that a plan as sweeping as the Marshall plan is urgently needed to equalize the opportunities of the millions of Negroes who have in recent years taken up residence in the most deteriorated sections of Northern cities in the heart of most of America's most important urban complexes.

It may be that such a plan is owed to the Negro community out of restitution or indemnification for what America has done to Negroes during the last century. But such a plan is certainly due out of brotherhood to our fellow citizens and, to be pragmatic, out of a legitimately selfish interest to renew the fact of America's northern cities.

A summer of Negro discontent will soon be over. But a winter of disillusion will be upon us if the conscience of white Americans is allowed to return to its previous state of inaction and apathy about the rights of Negroes.

And who would dare to predict what violence and revolution might follow in the spring following such a winter?

Wall Street Journal Article Stresses Constructive Role of Business Schools in Post-High School Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, an interesting article analyzing the constructive role of the business school as a major factor in education at the post-high school level appeared on the front page of the Thursday, January 23, 1964, edition of the Wall Street Journal. It is titled "Business Schools Lift Enrollments as Office Work Field Expands."

The independent, nontax supported business schools of this Nation include some institutions more than 100 years old. In their realistic response to the educational demands for changing needs in secretarial and office education they continue to expand their role as a legitimate sector in the higher education complex of our Nation.

Last October 26, 1963, I addressed the 51st annual convention in San Francisco, Calif., of the United Business Schools Association, the national organization of private business schools in which some 500 schools hold membership. I also serve as a member of the national advisory committee of the United Business Schools Association.

As part of their effort to upgrade the standards of secretarial and office education, the United Business Schools Association founded, in 1953, the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools. The work of this professionally independent commission was reviewed by the U.S. Office of Education and in 1956 the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools was designated by the Commissioner as a "nationally recognized accrediting agency" in accordance with the list of such groups maintained by the commission under Public Law 82-550 and Public Law 85-864. There are now more than 220 business schools accredited by the commission.

Mr. President, this article points out, with substantiating facts and statistics, trends in this area of higher education. Other areas of service by independent business schools include training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act and cooperation with the Small Business Administration for its management counseling services.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provides for programs of vocational education in public schools and under contract with private schools. This important educational measure should prove to be a new challenge to the private business schools. Through it, they can once more illustrate their capacity to respond to the varying needs of our citizens for additional and imaginative vocational education in the national effort to erase pockets of poverty.

I recall the testimony of UBSA President Robert W. Sneden of the Davenport Institute, Grand Rapids, Mich., in the 1962 hearings before the Select Committee on Small Business of which I am a member. The report of the committee, No. 2270 of the 87 Congress, 2d session, commended the work of the junior colleges of business in cooperating with Small Business Administration in its program to combat small business failures through management counseling.

I ask unanimous consent that this article in the Wall Street Journal by Vernon I. Griffin be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS SCHOOLS LIFT ENROLLMENTS AS OFFICE WORK FIELD EXPANDS—EXECUTIVE SECRETARIES STUDY ETHICS; JACKSONVILLE SCHOOL OFFERS STUDENTS POOL, PATIO

(By Vernon I. Griffin)

Tall, attractive Sherrie Luttrell enrolled in Draughon's Business College in Dallas last February, a few months after dropping out of Arlington State College in Arlington, Tex.

Miss Luttrell wanted to be a legal secretary. "In college," she explains, "the closest courses to what I wanted were prelaw." At Draughton's, on the other hand, she has been taking courses in legal terminology and business law in addition to typing and shorthand.

Miss Luttrell's experience helps explain why Draughton's and many other business schools around the country are flourishing. Such schools offer practical training, often unavailable at regular colleges, aimed at preparing young men and women for careers in the expanding office work field.

Most business schools offer programs that last for 1 or 2 years and charge tuition fees ranging from about $500 to $1,000 a year. Most of their students are fresh out of high school, but a growing number, such as Miss Luttrell, are transfers from regular colleges.

250,000 STUDENTS

Indeed, enrollment at business schools may be growing faster than at regular colleges. About 250,000 students now attend the Nation's 1,300 business schools, a 34-percent increase since 1958, according to South-Western Publishing Co., Cincinnati publisher of business school textbooks. That compares with a 30-percent gain in regular college enrollment during that period.

Business school enrollments have increased partly because some colleges have dropped many courses for officeworkers. About 30 years ago almost all business departments in regular colleges offered such courses. By contrast, a survey conducted 4 years ago found such courses listed by only about 60 percent of some 250 colleges surveyed.

"Universities are fine for the crown princes of commerce, but not everyone can become a prince," says Richard A. Fulton, executive director of the United Business Schools Association, a trade group.

To prepare their students for office careers most business schools continue to rely heavily on such traditional subjects as typing and shorthand. But with automation eliminating some routine office chores, many schools have been introducing new subjects.

ETHICS AND ELECTRONICS

Some have added specialized courses for legal, medical, and executive secretaries. The Washington School for Secretaries, for example, offers a 2-year program for executive secretaries which costs $1,380 and includes such subjects as ethics and human relations. A number of schools have entered such technical fields as computer programing, keypunch operation, drafting, and electronics.

"We decided we had a tremendous job potential here with the Manned Spacecraft Center," says W. L. Strawn, president of Massey Business College, Houston, Tex., which 2 years ago added a 2-year course to train electronic technicians. Mr. Strawn says enrollment in the course jumped to 75 students last fall, up from 6 when it was introduced. "I could place 100 graduates right now," he says.

School officials claim the quality of their students has improved as their courses have grown more demanding. "Students today are as different as day and night from students a few years ago," says H. E. Cannon, manager of Draughon's Business College. "We used to be able to take a student, teach him a little typing and accounting and he could find a job. But students have to be better today."

"We've had as many as 40 high school salutatorians and valedictorians at one time," says Glen F. Trefren, a director of Kinman Business University, Spokane, Wash. He estimates that one-half of Kinman's students come from the top third of their high school classes.

While business school enrollment has been rising, the number of schools has been dropping, mainly because weaker schools have been closing down in face of competition from stronger schools. "There aren't nearly as many fly-by-night schools as there used to be," notes one business school man. "The schools that rushed in after World War II and didn't do a good job were weeded out after the veterans' boom."

Nevertheless, some unethical schools continue to operate. Mrs. Virginia Lovett, trade practice consultant for the Better Business Bureau in Los Angeles, tells of a Los Angeles business school that advertised it was "approved." "When I asked the school owner who approved the school," Mrs. Lovett recalls, "he said his wife had. She also had written the course."

Another school recently advertised "48 unique budget plans for paying tuition," says Mrs. Lovett. "When I asked the school operator to write all 48 down he told me he just thought there should be about 48 ways of paying tuition," she says.

Such schools damage the reputation of the entire field, business educators complain. Last summer the United Business Schools Association sent representatives to five big corporations in hopes of increasing their hiring of business school graduates. "In a nice way, each firm indicated some parts of our industry are below standard," says an official of the association.

"To the average man a business school means an upstairs school where short courses in typewriting are taught," says Jack H. Jones, chairman of trustees of Jones College, a business school in Jacksonville, Fla.

Last spring Jones College, which had been renting 14,000 square feet of office space, moved into larger quarters providing about 15,000 square feet for classroom and administrative office space and about 35,000 square feet in dormitory space for 210 students. The school's new lease also permits use of a large swimming pool and patio.

Mr. Jones expects the current enrollment of 645 to increase by 20 percent next fall and 60 percent by 1968. "We may not be Ivy League yet," he says, "but we're a far cry from what we used to be."

About 215 schools are accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, an agency formed in 1952 by about 100 business schools to help establish standards for the field. The commission takes into consideration such things as curriculum, admission policies, faculty, library, and equipment. Requirements vary for the type of school and generally are stiffer for 2-year schools than for 1-year schools.

Resolution on Civil Rights Approved by the Board of Trustees of the Jewish Community Council of Essex County, January 16, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the thoughtful resolutions on civil rights, Jews of the Soviet Union, immigration, and public welfare approved by the board of trustees of Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N.J., on January 16, 1964. These resolutions were adopted at the 32d General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

This great organization is to be commended for its farsighted and humanitarian outlook. The resolutions deserve the consideration of the Congress, and I should like to insert them in full below:

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL RIGHTS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF ESSEX COUNTY, N.J., JANUARY 16, 1964

A. JEWISH ROLE

The ideal of individual dignity and worth is rooted in Jewish tradition, and stems from a profound commitment to democratic freedoms reinforced by centuries of Jewish experience and history.

Our history as a people gives us a special understanding of the struggle of Negroes and other minority groups for full civil rights and liberties, and places every Jewish organization under obligation to advance the cause of equality by all means appropriate to it as a sectarian agency. The organizations should therefore review their policies and practices on employment, their services when offered to the general public, and other aspects of their operations in order to assure that they are fully consistent with these principles.

They should strive to place their patronage, including the holding of public functions, only with companies and places that practice nondiscrimination.

B. GOVERNMENT ACTION

It is the obligation of government in a democracy to protect all citizens in the enjoyment of the rights which have been guaranteed by the Constitution. We commend the President for his legislative proposals to the Congress to guarantee the realization of these rights.

The bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee represents a significant forward step.

We call upon both political parties to join in bipartisan action to assure the earliest possible enactment by the Congress of comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation.

RESOLUTION ON JEWS OF THE SOVIET UNION APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF ESSEX COUNTY, JANUARY 16, 1964

We are gravely concerned and dismayed by the continued and intensive assaults in the Soviet Union on Jews and on all aspects of distinctive Jewish life.

In recent months there have been vituperative attacks in the controlled press against synagogues.

Synagogues have been closed, prayer books could not be printed, and religious and cultural practices and organization which are permitted other ethnic and religious groups have been denied to Jews.

The baking of matzoth for Passover has been prohibited.

Jews have been singled out for severe sentences, including death, for so-called economic crimes.

The documentation of these practices is full and irrefutable. They have been exposed in the United Nations and confirmed by the State Department of the United States.

We join with others in the appeal to the conscience of the world to press the Soviet Union for the early and full removal of these discriminations and we urge coordinated participation of the Jewish community in appropriate actions for these objectives.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF ESSEX COUNTY, JANUARY 16, 1964

We commend the President for his proposals submitted to the Congress to enact legislation which would replace the national origins quota system with a more equitable, nondiscriminatory formula for the admission of those seeking to enter the United States as immigrants.

The need for such reform has been long established by testimony in congressional hearings and by numerous studies and accumulated experience.

We call for early action by the Congress to enact an immigration code as recommended by the President, fulfilling American principles of equality and human dignity, and consistent with our national interests.

RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC WELFARE APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF ESSEX COUNTY, JANUARY 16, 1964.

A. INTERDEPENDENCE OF GOVERNMENTAL AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

This assembly has affirmed that "all citizens have a deep and profound stake in the health and welfare standards and services of the Nation. For the voluntary agencies serving these needs, there is a special concern and interdependence with the scope and quality of governmental programs. This concern and interdependence grow in importance."

B. PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS

The assembly has expressed its gratification with passage of the Federal public welfare amendments in 1962, which have made possible major gains in restoring dependent people to self-support. In order to achieve these gains, greater Federal appropriations by the Congress are required. Especially critical is the need for Federal training grants, since there is currently only 1 trained worker for each 23,000 recipients of public assistance, and skilled personnel is essential in order to carry out the rehabilitation programs which have been authorized.

Likewise required is action by the individual States to enact the legislation, appropriate the necessary funds, and undertake administrative changes to put into effect the liberalized Federal provisions and matching funds, including greater provisions for professional training through State programs.

C. FURTHER FEDERAL ACTION

We urge that the Congress should:

1. Enact medical care for the aged through the mechanism of the old-age and survivors insurance program, while making adequate provision for those persons not so covered.

2. Extend Federal participation to assure public assistance financing and services for all needy persons not now covered under Federal law.

3. Extend retraining programs for economically deteriorated areas, including youth employment programs to deal with the 1 million youth between the ages of 16 to 21 who have dropped out of school or have completed high school but are unemployed, by enacting programs for urban youth and for rural youth conservation corps.

4. Complete legislative action to establish a National Service Corps to encourage greater numbers of men and women of all ages, working under local direction, to help meet urgent domestic human needs.

5. Revise Federal legislative requirements and incentives to encourage the States to remove residence and citizenship restrictions which are paradoxical in an economy dependent upon mobility of labor and which serve to prolong dependency.

D. COMMUNITY FEDERATIONS RESPONSIBILITY

We urge community federations, in cooperation with their affiliated agencies and with sectarian and nonsectarian organizations, to continue to give greater year-round attention to public welfare and health needs and services, bringing the benefits of their special knowledge and experience to guide public policies, standards, administration, and financing.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in a time when we are consumed with the great issues of war and peace and the vastness of the Federal budget, we are sometime prone to overlook private programs which, though little publicized, give real meaning to our belief in the brotherhood of man. One such program is Project Hope, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Erie Times of Erie, Pa., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE FOR FUTURE

The hospital ship, SS *Hope*, has started its third voyage—a medical mission to Guayaquil, Ecuador.

The *Hope* was once a U.S. Navy hospital ship. Now it is an instrument by which the American people, through voluntary contributions, carry the message of better health to other nations around the world.

Project Hope is a nonprofit organization with headquarters in Washington, D.C. In the three nations visited since the project was started in 1958, the SS *Hope's* volunteer physicians, dentists, nurses, and paramedical personnel have trained some 1,700 local doctors and nurses, have performed more than 4,000 major operations, and have examined and immunized nearly 500,000 persons.

The *Hope's* work is a demonstration of the willingness of the people of the United States to teach the concept of self-help to those who are willing to help themselves.

It is also a demonstration of the multiplier effect which brings changes in hospital organization, administration, and teaching techniques, resulting eventually in a better health and economy for the nations visited by the *Hope*.

A Tribute to Fred Conn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the January 30, 1963, edition of the Denison (Tex.) Herald, is a tribute to Fred Conn, publisher of the Denison Herald for the past 19 years, who resigned effective last month to assume the position of publisher of the San Angelo Standard Times.

Fred Conn served the north Texas area with over 24 years of service with the Herald, and his past performances and new position reflect most adequately his record of service to Denison and the people of north Texas.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the Herald's tribute to Fred Conn:

HERALD'S FAREWELL TO PUBLISHER

The Denison Herald personnel share with the community as a whole, perhaps in a more personal and direct way, the loss of a leader and friend that came yesterday when Fred Conn said his farewells and left for a new home and new field at San Angelo.

Conn had been linked with the Herald management for 24 years, as publisher for the last 19 years. His record of achievement here is underscored in many ways, but in no instance more positively than by his stepping up to the considerably larger challenge as publisher of the San Angelo Standard-Times.

Much has been said during the last few days in the way of farewells to Mr. Conn and his family about his outstanding service to Denison and this area. And much more could have been said, as we who were closely associated with him here on the Herald realize.

We were in a position to fully appreciate his dogged determination in championing what he believed was best for Denison. We saw at close range the earnestness of conviction and purpose that motivated his efforts in behalf of the community.

We also saw that same dedication to clearly defined goals in his administration of Herald affairs, large and small. The ultimate decision inevitably lay in what was the best for the newspaper and the public it served. Mr. Conn built into the Herald a new depth of influence and value as a community asset, which is the final justification for any newspaper's existence.

We on the Herald are proud to accept this responsibility that now passes to us—although we, quite frankly, are sobered by the realization of its weight. We pledge our adherence to the same policy of serving Denison and this area as industriously, as faithfully, and as unselfishly as possible.

Leaving Denison was no easy decision for Mr. Conn—not after he had so intimately identified himself with this community's welfare through the years. He earnestly believed that "the citizenship and leadership here is of the highest type" and that this area is destined for as great a future as its unity and cooperation will accommodate.

Mr. Conn took to San Angelo with him the earnest wishes of the entire Herald organization—as well as the community as a whole—for newer and greater successes. And we underscore that wish with the assurance that all of us on the Herald will strive to carry on in a worthy manner.

Lutherans Support U.S. Policy on Cuban Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the resettlement of Cuban refugees is a problem to which many of our church denominations have given much attention and assistance. Among these are the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America, working through the National Lutheran Council, and the Board of World Relief of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, which is my own denomination.

I recently received a statement on Cuban refugees from the office of Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director of the National Lutheran Council, dealing with the Cuban refugee resettlement problem. The contents of that news release are of sufficient importance that they should be noted by those who have a concern for its solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the National Lutheran Council on its support for Government efforts to speed resettlement of Cuban refugees be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUTHERAN LEADER BACKS U.S. POLICY ON CUBAN REFUGEES

NEW YORK.—Efforts by the U.S. Government to hasten the resettlement of Cuban refugees received strong support here from a Lutheran Church leader.

Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director of the National Lutheran Council, said the council welcomes the Government's recent policy statement on the $72-million-a-year relief program instituted by the late President Kennedy in 1961.

It was announced that Federal aid to employable Cuban refugees in Miami will be cut off next March 31 if they refuse to relocate in cities where work is available.

By that date, all 100,000 registered at the U.S. Cuban Refugee Center in Miami will be interviewed and efforts made to place them. Some 70,000 refugees have already been resettled and it is estimated that half those remaining should be relocated.

"The choice of a Cuban refugee to resettle to an opportunity offered to him elsewhere, or to remain in Miami without public assistance, is a free choice," declared John F. Thomas, director of the U.S. Cuban Refugee program under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"It is a choice which must be made by each individual and family," he added. "It is exactly the same choice which faces an American citizen who becomes unemployed here."

Dr. Empie said the National Lutheran Council is cooperating with the Lutheran Immigration Service in a 2-year, $160,000 program in 1963 and 1964 to help Cuban refugees in their efforts to resettle and/or integrate "in a wholesome fashion" during their stay in this country.

Participating in the special project are the two member bodies of the NLC, the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America, and the Board of World Relief of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. The board's director, the Reverend Werner Kuntz of Detroit, endorsed the views expressed here by Dr. Empie.

Announcement of the Government's aims was made in Miami on December 12 by Mr. Thomas in a statement which, he said, "indicates no change in program policy, but rather a restatement of policy, in view of the present stage of the refugee program."

"The goal of the Federal Government will be to continue to be as helpful as possible to every refugee to become a self-supporting and contributing member of our society during his exile," Mr. Thomas said.

"Together with the religious and nonsectarian resettlement agencies we shall continue to place before each refugee, as his turn for interview comes up, the opportunities for resettlement in the area outside Miami. If a person refuses and has no valid reason for refusal he will be denied eligibility for economic aid in Miami."

Mr. Thomas added that "this policy is merely designed to encourage the refugee who is caught in a vicious web of uncertainty, dependency, and propaganda to face the realities of life."

Dr. Empie noted that Mr. Thomas explicitly stated that there are no punitive motives in this policy, the setting of a target date for the completion of interviewing does not mean the closing of the Cuban Refugee Center by March 31, and it applies only to those who are not prevented from accepting a resettlement opportunity by reasons of bad health or physical handicaps.

"We believe," the Lutheran churchman said, "that with appropriate flexibility in dealing with exceptional cases and with a sympathetic approach to the problem, these safeguards should be ample protection for those Cuban refugees who have valid reasons for remaining in the Miami area."

Dr. Empie said he recognized the close relation "between the goal of helping a refugee to become self-supporting and a contributing member of society and the necessity of refusing to give him public aid if, without a valid reason, he refuses to accept an opportunity for self-support outside the Miami area."

He also said "we can understand and sympathize with the natural desire" of the Cuban refugees to stay in an area where their language is commonly spoken, where the climate is similar to that of their homeland, and where, by telephone and radio, they can keep in touch with developments in their native country.

"At the same time, our experience in other refugee programs leads us to the conviction that the perpetuation of economic relief to persons who are able to support themselves and refuse to do so inevitably leads to moral and social deterioration," Dr. Empie stressed.

"The experience of over 70,000 Cuban refugees who have been resettled successfully in other parts of the United States and who love their country with undiminished devotion and continue to speak on her behalf wherever they may be, provides ample evidence to support the judgment that the policy stated by the director of the Cuban Refugee program is both reasonable and constructive."

Dr. Empie asserted that "in view of the political factors which surround the Cuban refugee situation," the statement issued by Mr. Thomas "required a great deal of courage on his part" when "the easier thing

would have been to let the matter drift to avoid the recriminations which surely will be heaped upon him."

The Lutheran leader voiced the belief that Mr. Thomas "has demonstrated the competence and responsible leadership which we expect of our Government officials" and commended him for "facing up to his responsibilities with such intelligence and integrity."

"His statement gives us both incentive and encouragement to continue to assist the Cuban refugees to the extent of our available resources in the period during which the program will continue," Dr. Emple concluded.

Israel Shows the Way to Regional Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the heads of the 13 Arab States met in Cairo and when they concluded their 3-day summit meeting they released a communique replete with invective against the State of Israel.

What was this so-called dangerous and ominous act of aggression on the part of Israel which brought together such enemies as Yemen's President Sallal and Saudi Arabia's King Saud, Algeria's Ben Bella and King Hassan of Morocco, Jordan's King Hussein, and Gamal Abdel Nasser? It was the imminent completion of Israel's Jordan River development project. Because of their irrational hatred of Israel, the Arabs have adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward Israel's water program. They fight it and inveigh against it, even though it would do them no harm. Israel will gain much-needed water for irrigation. The Arabs will lose not one drop because of it.

Actually, the Middle East does not lack for water. It has, in some areas, plenty of rainfall. Four of its rivers—the Euphrates, the Orontes, the Litani and the Jordan—hold more than 30 billion cubic meters of water. But most of it is wasted. The water runs, unused, into the sea. In the rainy season, torrents of water flood northern Israel, but, uncontrolled, they drain wastefully away.

Many American statesmen and engineers have long been interested in putting these waters to work. In 1918, when the mandates for Palestine and Syria were being negotiated, President Woodrow Wilson proposed that Palestine's northern border include the Litani River. His recommendation was not accepted and so today most of the Litani River water, allocated to Lebanon, is wasted.

But Britain's Prime Minister Lloyd George insisted that the Jordan River and its sources be within Palestine's borders. "The waters of Palestine," he said, "are essential to its existence. Without these waters Palestine would be a wilderness. On the other hand, these waters are of no use to anyone holding Syria." And so the international frontier of Palestine was fixed east of the Jordan and Lake Tiberias.

Israel is already using 80 percent of its total water supply to irrigate cultivated land. Almost all of the remaining 20 percent comes from the Jordan. But in the southern Negev, which is arable, there is no water. To irrigate this land, Israel must move its northern water to the south—by canals, tunnels, and pipes. This is the system that will be put into operation this spring. It is completely within the guidelines of what is known as the Johnston plan.

This is not a new scheme. The eminent American conservationist, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, proposed a Jordan Valley Authority—something like our own TVA—in 1939, to use the Jordan for both power and irrigation. But the Arabs went to war against Israel and the plan had to be dropped. In 1953, however, Israel began work on its own and started to build a canal which would lead to a hydroelectric plant and then move the water through a pipeline to the south. The work was begun at Bnot Yaakov, which is in a "demilitarized zone" and Syria protested the canal's construction with gunfire. The issue went to the U.N. Security Council. The work was stopped while the United Nations studied ways of mollifying the Syrians.

In 1953, President Eisenhower sent Ambassador Eric Johnston to the Middle East. After 2 years of negotiations, Mr. Johnston was able to secure the agreement of Israel and Arab technicians to a unified plan. Syria and Lebanon, which need very little of the Jordan River waters, were allotted the small percentage they requested. Jordan was given all the water it needed to irrigate the irrigable land on its side of the river—about 120,000 acres. Israel was allotted what was left.

That meant that 61 percent of the water would go to the three Arab countries and Israel would get about 39 percent. In addition, Israel was to bank about 300 million cubic meters of water to Jordan's account in the Sea of Galilee, releasing it in the dry season to be conveyed to Jordanian lands east of the Jordan River.

Despite the fact that the figures had been suggested by the Arab technicians and Israel accepted them only because of her eagerness for an overall agreement, Arab politicians refused to ratify the plan. They would enter into no agreement that would benefit Israel in any way.

But even without an overall agreement, both Israel and Jordan have gone ahead with separate plans consistent with Mr. Johnston's original proposal.

Jordan has nearly completed its East Ghor Canal, utilizing most of the Yarmuk waters. This $25 million project—the United States is contributing $19 million of it—will irrigate 30,000 acres and Jordan will increase its acreage by 25 percent, resettling 3,000 families.

The route Israel is taking to draw water from Lake Tiberias to irrigate the Negev avoids the problems which would arise if the project went through the demilitarized zone. But the problems presented by the new plan are costly. The original plan would have drawn water which was virtually salt free. But, because of the salt springs on the floor of Lake Tiberias, the water that Israel will now draw from the Jordan has high salinity and must be mixed with ground water from the coastal plain to make it suitable for irrigation.

One thing should be kept clearly in mind. Israel will not draw any more water from the Jordan than was allotted to her under the Johnston plan. In fact, she will draw less. Israel will use only 1 percent of the 30 billion cubic meters of water available to the Arab States. But this fact does not seem to impress the Arabs. They now threaten to divert the headwaters of the Jordan, cutting the flow of the river to a trickle. Even though such a diversion would be one of the most expensive and surely the most impracticable engineering feat in history, they came to the astounding conclusion at the Cairo meeting that this would be their answer to Israel's lifegiving program. And the worst of this bizarre scheme is that the diverted waters would, after all, again flow wastefully into the sea.

Recently, Deputy Under Secretary of State U. Alexis Johnson said that the United States will come speedily to the aid of "any intended victim of any would-be aggressor" in the Middle East. Mr. Johnson also said that one of our foremost goals in the region is "an accommodation between Israel and its Arab neighbors." I am very glad to hear this and I hope our Government loses no time in trying to implement this goal. I am convinced that if we can get the Arabs to sit with Israel and negotiate with her, the whole region would benefit to an extraordinary degree. With peace, there could be not only regional water plans—but regional cooperation in technology, medicine, and education—a real meeting of people's minds and an end to the arms race. There is a great potential in the Middle East that is now being wasted—not only water.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution, House Resolution 447, proposes that the U.S. House of Representatives urge that the U.S. delegation to the U.N. support a resolution for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States as "an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation and the settlement of all outstanding disputes between them."

I urge our Government to work for regional understanding—an end to boycotts, blockades, threats, and the building up of aggressive arsenals. It would seem that the Arab leaders decided at Cairo that the time to attack Israel is not now but I think it would be premature for us to breathe a collective sigh of relief. If, when they feel strong enough, they make any move toward action against Israel, our Government must make it clear that we will stand by our commitment to keep the peace in the Middle East.

"In Whom Do We Trust, Anyhow?"—Address by Harllee Branch, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a very important and eloquent address which was delivered at the annual dinner of the Athens, Ga., Chamber of Commerce, on January 9, 1964. The address is entitled "In Whom Do We Trust, Anyhow?" and was delivered by Mr. Harllee Branch, Jr., president of the Southern Co., of Atlanta, Ga. In the address Mr. Branch discusses the adverse impact of the recent Supreme Court decisions against prayers and Bible reading in our school systems. I believe, Mr. President, that the points made by Mr. Branch in this address will be of interest to all the Members of this body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Remarks of Harllee Branch, Jr., president, the Southern Co., Atlanta, Ga., at annual dinner, Athens (Ga.) Chamber of Commerce, January 9, 1964)

IN WHOM DO WE TRUST ANYHOW?

It is generally expected that a businessman, invited to address a chamber of commerce gathering such as this, will focus his comments on economic concerns.

I hope you will pardon me if I depart from that tradition tonight.

We pause at the threshold of a new year, looking backward to the year just past for clues as to how we can best meet the uncertainties of the future. It seemed appropriate to me that, in this situation, we ought to be concerned with matters less transient than the rise or fall of such economic indices as gross national product, per capita income, corporate profits, employment, and the like.

We need to think on things much more basic to our individual and national well-being; and one of them, if a businessman who makes no pretense of piety may be permitted to say so, is religion.

Two events in 1963 dramatically pointed up the need for a reexamination of the unique role that religion has played in the development of our national institutions and in the preservation of our individual freedoms.

You will recall that early in 1963 the Supreme Court felt called upon to reiterate its ban against prayers and religious exercises in the public schools and, impliedly at least, in other institutions supported by local, State, and Federal Governments.

Then as the year drew to a close, a somber, shocked citizenry learned of the assassination of our President while en route to a meeting where he had intended to invoke divine blessing upon the purposes and programs of the Nation. He was struck down, so the police said, by another young man who, in his own words, had turned at age 15 to the purely materialistic philosophy of Karl Marx as "a very religious man opening the Bible for the first time"; and who, a few years later, sought to exchange his American heritage for citizenship in atheistic Russia.

Please understand, I do not mean to imply a casual relationship between these two events. But I do suggest that in the President's apparent assassin we had a dramatic illustration of how a youthful and sensitive mind may be warped by intensive study unleavened by faith in a supreme being. For, if police reports are to be believed, the mind of this strange and withdrawn boy had been totally absorbed in early youth by the cancerous ideas of communism. It seemed to me that there is a real lesson to be learned here of how indispensable prayer and religious instruction are to the development of a generous and humane citizenry, without which the American dream can never be sustained.

It should be pointed out also that, in their anguish and bewilderment over the President's death and in their search for divine guidance in a time of national crisis, Americans of all ages instinctively turned to prayer—not only in their homes and churches but also in the Halls of Congress, in the rotunda of the National Capitol, and in other governmentally maintained facilities—all this in spite of the Supreme Court's suggestion that prayers in such an evironment might transgress the constitutional requirement for a separation of church and state.

It may just be that the religious instincts of common men are more trustworthy in a time of national extremity than judicial sophistication—and that 20th century Americans were being reminded again in 1963 that a nation like ours—dedicated to freedom and individual rights—can not endure except as it places its dependence in God.

That was certainly the conviction of our Founding Fathers, who, in the Declaration of Independence, dared to assert that their "right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" rested upon natural and divine law; that these rights were the gift of the Creator, not the object of concession by begrudging monarchs; and that governments existed only to protect and secure, not to abolish or to alter these unalienable rights.

Theirs was not a new theory. As Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out, the principle of divine law was "older than the earth itself." It is a universal, unchanging truth "arising out of a discourse on the nature and purpose of man which began in Greece nearly 2,000 years ago." But until 1776, only Locke and Rousseau and a few other political philosophers and religionists had ever talked much about it. Never before had a whole people dared to stake their lives and their futures on the truth of this assertion.

The really significant thing about this Nation is that its laws and institutions, its hopes and dreams, have been made to depend on faith in a divine Creator. This is a fact that needs reiteration—constant and determined reiteration—in a time when our Highest Court, with an unmatched judicial absolutism parading under the beguiling label of neutralism, seems determined to eliminate God and religion from the curriculums of our public educational institutions.

"Religion and morality are our indispensable supports," the Founding Fathers declared, and they added: "Whoever shall subvert these great pillars of human happiness shall not be entitled to claim the tribute of patriotism."

George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson—all of them—acknowledged that only religion can establish the principles upon which freedom and popular government must stand. "The liberties of a nation cannot be thought secure," they said, "if we remove the only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God." Benjamin Franklin—the oldest, and in many ways the wisest, of the men who formulated our Declaration of Independence and our National Constitution—put it this way when he arose in the Philadelphia Convention to counsel his younger colleagues:

"I have lived, sirs, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sirs, in the sacred writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest."

Mind you, Dr. Franklin was not a religionist, not even a churchman in the usual sense of the word.

It is no longer fashionable to talk in words such as those used by Franklin and Adams, and Washington and Jefferson. Virtue and faith and commitment to principle—even patriotism itself—are scoffed at in many quarters. We have become soft and smug and self-satisfied. We speak of ours as an age of sophistication. We are beguiled by politicians and professors who exhort us to abandon the "cliches" of our political, social, and economic pasts, forgetting that sophistication is frequently the product of conceit, cynicism, and shallowness; and that a new "cliche" may be even more dangerous than an older one.

Fortunately our forefathers were not afraid of "cliches" nor were they afraid to be called unsophisticated. They were completely willing to embrace change where change was warranted—indeed, they risked their lives in one of the most dramatic assaults on the status quo the world has ever witnessed. But they never sneered at the tried and the true merely because it was old.

We moderns are vastly more knowledgeable than the Founding Fathers, even the most educated of them. Indeed, the sum total of man's knowledge has doubled in the last 10 years alone, and it is estimated that it will double again in the next 5. But knowledge is not wisdom, and one of the greatest threats to our way of life is that we may rely for leadership upon politicians and judges who know more than they understand. Knowledge—mere factual knowledge, unleavened by spiritual truths—can be a snare and a delusion.

Today, the great threat to our way of life is posed by atheistic and materialistic men, symbolized by the communistic hordes of the East and typified by the first Soviet cosmonaut, Titov, who declared on his return to earth from space: "Some people say there is a God out there but, in my travels around the earth all day long, I looked around and did not see Him. I saw no God or angels. I do not believe in God. I believe in man, his strength, his possibilities, and his reason."

How silly can man get? Who ever suggested that God was such an entity as could be seen by an earthling like Titov?

But we must not become bemused by the idea that the Titovs of this world are men of ignorance. They are as knowledgeable as we in purely physical aspects of the universe and, in some areas, their technology is believed to exceed our own. The one—the only—resource we have that the Soviet man does not possess is the resource of spiritual strength which is derived from our recognition of the fatherhood and supremacy of God and our dependence upon Him. Abandon this resource, allow it to become tarnished by sophistication and by conceit over

our own assumed prowess, and we shall lose our individual freedoms and our individual dignity as surely as have the slaves of the Soviet super-state.

"Know the truth," said the lowly Nazarene, "and the truth will make you free." Not facts, not scientific formula, not physical abstractions, not beguiling political theories—but the truth as revealed by God.

This was the truth to which the Founding Fathers repaired in their time of national and individual crisis—this was the source of the principles upon which they founded this Nation—notwithstanding the sneers of those who in that day called themselves "rationalists."

Now again the rationalists and atheists and the materialists are clamoring for acceptance—in America and elsewhere. Only a few weeks ago, a prominent American scholar suggested that, since science has reduced the area of the unknown and since technology has increased our ability to use our environment, the relationship between God and man no longer applies. This is sheer philosophical poppycock, the sort of poppycock that is responsible for much of the "sickness" of our times.

For mankind, with all his knowledge, has not replaced God, nor will he do so. The greatest of our scientific discoveries, properly correlated and evaluated, confirm rather than deny the existence of a divine order and man's dependence upon it.

Those who founded this Republic sought, with God's guidance, to create here a governmental system built on confidence in divine law and the principles of individual freedom, dignity and responsibility which depend upon that law and not upon human actions and assurances.

It is a tragic thing, I repeat, that their progeny, if enrolled in a public school, may no longer invoke, even in voluntary classroom prayer, the guidance and blessings of the very God upon whom the founders of the Nation so singularly relied. Religious freedom is a cherished heritage of all Americans, but it does seem strange that the principle of separation of church and State should now be tortured into a separation of the State from God—for the two principles are certainly not the same. What we need to do is bring God more vividly into our school exercises, and into our governmental and private affairs as well for, as Justice Frankfurter in a scholarly opinion observed: "The ultimate foundation of a free society is the binding tie of cohesive sentiment. Such a sentiment is fostered by all those agencies of the mind and spirit which may serve to gather up the traditions of a people, transmit them from generation to generation, and thereby create that continuity of a treasured common life which constitutes a civilization.'"

It is not enough to say that our Supreme Court has still left the individual the right to pray in private and outside the precincts of his State-supported institutions. The individual has that right in Russia, too. But religion cannot be just personal. If it is real, it must be present in all we do in public and in private, and if we take God from our public institutions, we are left with no foundation upon which to build.

We may produce as many and as excellent gadgets as we will (automobiles, missiles, telephones, radios, television sets, electronic computers, and what have you) but, America and the Western World will not survive unless it also develops excellent men—men of faith, of humility, of truth, of moral stature, of strength, and resourcefulness of mind, (of pregnant ideas), of courtesy, of universal sympathy and friendship and love. Men such as these cannot be produced in a laboratory. They are produced only in good homes, good churches, good schools where the presence of God is ever apparent.

In closing, I would like to pass on to you a work of kindly caution from one who, although not a native of the Western World, has shown an extraordinary regard for its institutions. He is Dr. Charles Malik, distinguished teacher and philosopher and former Lebanese Minister to the United States. Dr. Malik has warned that: "If the West thinks that it is going to win or even hold its own without the living God who made it and has sustained its excellence, it is simply mistaken. * * * Not by cleverness, nor by humanism, nor by sentimentalism, nor by the manipulation of force, nor by reliance on reason and genius, nor by the supplying of loaves and the giving of machines—not by any or all of these things alone—is the West going to succeed in defending and extending truth and light and freedom, but by the humble return to the living source of all truth, all light, and all freedom."

Misguided Idealists Put Brotherhood of Man Ahead of Fatherhood of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as one of the coauthors of the so-called prayer amendment to the Constitution, I find much interest in an article in Guideposts, a monthly magazine telling how men and women of all religious faiths are finding new happiness in their personal and business lives through the power of their beliefs. This article is by Dr. Bella Dodd, former Hunter College professor and presently a practicing attorney in New York.

A former Communist, Dr. Dodd, in her forceful article inquiring whether there is a conspiracy against God, admits she was among the misguided idealists led astray by the Red propagandists. Her realization of the true aims of the Communist movement finally "drove me back to God," as she puts it.

Her article follows:

A CONSPIRACY AGAINST GOD?

The day the U.S. Supreme Court decided that the use of the regents' prayer in New York schools was unconstitutional, I was in a New York court on other matters. News of the decision passed through the room in excited whispers. Sitting next to me was a young lawyer, obviously fresh out of law school.

"Good," he muttered. Then he pointed to the words on a plaque over the judge's bench—"In God We Trust"—and he added: "That's the next thing that has to go."

I was stunned. "Young man," I said, "I'm old enough to be your grandmother, and you can take my word for it: when that sign comes down your career will be over because there will be no real law for you to practice."

This, I believe, is the heart of the matter. This is the great danger which faces America if we pursue our present course of removing the acknowledgment of God from our daily lives. Without God, I am convinced, we will have no law and order, no morality, no conscience.

Since that day the momentum of our drive in this direction has rapidly increased. Here are examples:

A Maryland atheist who says "My child shall not pray" has brought about a Supreme Court decision that your child and mine shall not pray in school either. This same person has since started a school for atheism in Kansas which is to include a university, radio station, and printing plant.

A Pennsylvanian who opposes Bible-reading in classrooms has been able to have this Bible exercise eliminated from every classroom in the country.

A court case is pending in California to remove the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance.

Under attack are the motto "In God We Trust" on our coins, the use of chaplains in the armed services and prayers before Government and public gatherings. The objective: to make America officially a godless nation.

It is disheartening to see the submissiveness of school authorities, teachers and public officials who are going even beyond the Supreme Court edict in removing all reference to the Deity. The New York State education commissioner, for example, declared that the recitation of the fourth stanza of "America"—which refers to God—cannot be used as a part of the opening school exercise.

In Sacramento County, Calif., it was ruled unconstitutional for school children to say this grace with their milk and cookies: "God is great. God is good. Let us thank Him for our food."

Behind the scenes are forces at work whose purpose is to remove God as an important influence in the life of our Nation. Billy Graham was right when in his recent Los Angeles crusade he said, "The effort to remove God and moral teachings from our schools is a diabolical scheme."

For several years, I was a member of this anti-God crusade myself. Like many misguided idealists, I went through a period when I put the brotherhood of man above the fatherhood of God, and, as so often happens, this led me into the Communist Party. As early as 1936, I was a disciplined Communist; between 1944 and 1949, I was in the top echelon of the Communist Party of the United States.

I thought I was fighting for social justice, but eventually I discovered that the party did not even have a file on various social reforms. The Communist Party exists not to improve conditions in America but to control them, and not to control them for the people but the benefit of the party. It was this realization that finally drove me from communism and, after years of seeking back to God.

Even in those days there was a well-organized campaign to eliminate God from our education. I was active in this area: I had been a college professor and an organizer of teachers' unions. I know from experience that students look to their teachers for personal guidance more often than to their parents, and for this reason I labored to recruit as many teachers to communism as I could.

These days, as then, it is not the Communist Party alone which seeks to remove from schools all incidents of a religious nature, whether prayer, Bible reading or the reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance. But whatever they call themselves these groups have the same goal: the displacement of the law of God by the law of man.

It is not surprising that those against God should aim their biggest weapons at our schools. Our school years are our most impressionable. Eliminating the concept of God from education leaves the student with no basis for determining right from wrong.

Therefore, I feel that the argument presented by some political and religious leaders that the Court's decisions put religion back where it belongs—in the church and the home—is unrealistic. American youngsters

between 7 and 21 spend more waking hours at school and school activities than they do at home and church combined. They need more—not less—emphasis on spiritual values in school.

The instigators of the school controversy, moreover, have not fought their cause on the basis of religion but rather on the basis of constitutional rights. They have won in the precise area where they should have lost.

In 6,000 years of recorded history, the American Constitution is the only document of government to be based on the law of God as defined in "Natural Law, the Decalogue and Divine Revelation." Its authors were believers: their faith is evident in the guarantees for individual freedom which they wrote into the Constitution. Furthermore, by their checks and balances on the three Government branches (executive, legislative, judicial), they assured that no branch should overpower the others and that, while protecting the rights of minorities, government should remain in the hands of the majority of the people. This is the freedom of religion which the authors of the Constitution had in mind.

Constitutionally, no American can be forced to act against his conscience. In war, we respect the rights of conscientious objectors who refuse to bear arms. This same principle applies to activities in schools.

If parents, acting in conscience, decide they don't want their child to participate in religious observances, the Pledge to the Flag, or, say, competitive athletics, they have the right to ask for him to be excused. The question is—do these minorities have the right to impose their judgment on all the other children?

The answer is an obvious no. Yet this has happened. Every parents, indeed every citizen, should ask: "What can we do about it?"

As a start, parents must reclaim control of their school boards, making their wants known and heeded, assuring that government in our country remains from the grassroots up instead of being imposed from the top down. By failing to speak out, parents are allowing a small vocal minority to establish the educational philosophy under which their children shall be trained.

Furthermore, Americans who wish to retain our God-centered civilization must themselves become more vocal in all areas of this controversy.

Members of Congress are now working on a constitutional amendment which would restate the first amendment to the Constitution to allow prayer and Bible reading in schools on a voluntary, nonsectarian basis. The amendment would also head off suits now pending to eliminate God from the pledge of allegiance and our coins.

I believe the great majority of American people are behind this action and should say so to their Congressmen in no uncertain words.

Meanwhile, the situation which was created by Court action can be corrected by Court action. Those who have made the long, difficult, complicated, expensive journey to the U.S. Supreme Court to eliminate God from our schools traveled with the aid of organizations and individuals who shared their goal. Others who share opposite goals must be willing to travel a similar arduous road if they wish to regain what they treasure.

Actually the Court decision can become a challenge for a new spiritual creativity in schools and public life. From school board to the principals to the teachers there could be a rethinking of ways to teach children our basic concepts of morality and God. We are not concerned here merely with a legal debate on whether religion in the schools violates the words of the first amendment. We are concerned with a way of life, a philosophy and the spiritual character of our culture. We must decide what that character is, then take a stand on it before we have nothing left to stand on.

The human need to seek God, to know God, to love God, and to obey God is older than Abraham, and the effort since Abraham for men to live together under God for their spiritual salvation and the common good is both natural and necessary. This suddenly cannot be outdated and superfluous; men cannot suddenly become purer moralists than God, although even before Abraham there were men who thought they could.

Time and again throughout history, men driven by a lust for power or money have sought to destroy in others the natural response to divine law—the individual conscience, and the result has been complete chaos. Americans who believe in God are now the prey of such forces, and we shall be their victims unless we do something now to prevent it.

Often I think of the young lawyer who wanted to have our national motto—"In God We Trust"—removed from our courtrooms. When we stop trusting in God, when we reject the principle that we are His creatures, subject to His laws, when we switch from morality under God to morality by government committees on ethics, we will witness more than the end of law and order in our country. We will witness the end of our country itself. This is a challenge to every one of us who loves freedom—and God.

President Johnson's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD of a resolution, adopted by the Democratic State Committee of Indiana, commending the manner in which President Johnson has so capably assumed the guidance of the Nation. This short statement is couched in language and reflects the sentiments appropriate to the dynamic leadership of our new national leader. I commend it to the reading of all Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE INDIANA DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE

In the light of the eternal flame, the torch of freedom, liberty, and peace has quietly passed from the brilliant hand of the enlightened President John F. Kennedy to the masterful hand of the dynamic President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Our courageous new President has continued to advance the program set forth by President Kennedy.

He has shown great skill and judgment in assuming the mantle of leadership in a world half free and half slave.

Within a few short weeks President Johnson has demonstrated to the people of the United States and to the world a titanic capacity for the office by virtue of being the best trained and most experienced leader ever called upon by the people.

He has already earned the respect and admiration of America and the world.

We, the members of the Indiana Democratic State Committee extend to President Johnson our unqualified commendation and pledge to him our full and active support in leading this great Nation forward and in holding high the torch of freedom, liberty, and peace in a complex world.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 20, 1964.*

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of February 1, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, FEBRUARY 1, 1964

HOW DO YOU VOTE ON THE KEY ISSUES OF 1964?

The Government of the United States is a republic in which the people govern themselves through elected representatives. In order to better represent the people of the fifth district, I send out each year a questionnaire on the most vital issues facing the Nation so that I will be constantly abreast of your thinking.

This year, because of the importance of the key issues, I am making every effort to make it possible for every citizen of Dallas County to express an opinion. In the past I have sent the questionnaire to all those on the poll tax list, but am not using this system now because—

1. The Constitution has now been amended to rule out the collection of poll taxes in Federal elections. Because the office of Congressman is a Federal office, I do not believe I should confine future mailings to those paying the State poll tax. Also, I represent everyone, even those who won't vote.

2. The speedup in congressional activity will result in three of the five key issues being settled within the next few weeks, and I think it only proper that you have the opportunity to express your views while the issues are still pending.

I am asking your help in taking an active part in your Government. Everyone is involved. You will make the choice of what kind of a Nation and what kind of a world we will have tomorrow, or it will be made for you. I believe every citizen should be contacted on these issues. After all, I represent all the people of Dallas County, those who don't vote in the elections as well as those who do. I wish every citizen would accept the responsibility of voting for those who represent you in Government, but whether you vote or not, your views will be considered when I study the legislation before Congress. Also, I am not merely seeking the views of those who support me or who agree with me. In a truly democratic effort I want the views of all the people, including those who may even use the poll against me. Questions and opinions other than those covered by this questionnaire are certainly in order.

Regardless of the results of this poll, or regardless of the criticism I am bound to receive, as there are always those who criticize whatever a public official does, I believe your vote in this survey is important and I want you to have the opportunity to let me know how you feel.

Therefore, I am using every available news media in Dallas County to get this message across. I have personally contacted every newspaper, daily and weekly, in the city of Dallas and throughout the county, inviting

them to join in this effort to get the views of the most people. I am happy to say the response of many of the publishers has been excellent and the ballot will appear in a number of publications. Fill it out and mail it to me. Urge your friends to fill out a questionnaire. Talk it up in your social clubs, civic organizations, and church groups. I hope that each of you who receive this newsletter will become a committee of one to circulate it, by either duplicating it yourself or securing extra copies from my Dallas office, 408 Federal Building, Bryan and Ervay Streets, or call Riverside 1-1041.

CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER QUESTIONNAIRE

FOREIGN POLICY

The struggle in the world today is between capitalism and communism. We must decide on an effective policy to win the war which is already in progress to preserve our freedoms and our national security.

1. Should we give financial aid to Soviet Russia and other Communist countries through our foreign aid program, subsidies to permit them to purchase our goods, or loans to help them stabilize their economy? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Should we give aid to countries who openly side with the Communists or who do business with the Communists when it is against American policy? Yes ☐ No ☐

DOMESTIC POLICY

3. Should we cut taxes (without regard to spending) during periods of deficit financing, before actual cuts in Federal spending are accomplished? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Should we pass civil rights legislation that will limit the right of ownership and management of private property? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Should we pass the "hospital insurance" (medicare) bill and establish the principle that the Federal Government has a duty to provide medical aid for all the people, paid for by a compulsory payroll tax, regardless of need? Yes ☐ No ☐

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
Precinct _____

It is not necessary to sign the ballot if you do not care to do so.

Return to Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 408 Federal Building, Dallas, Tex., 75201.

Editorial Tributes to Dr. John L. Plyler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dr. John L. Plyler has announced his retirement as president of Furman University, at Greenville, S.C., after leading this great educational institution to new heights of progress during the past quarter of a century. Before becoming president of Furman University, Dr. Plyler had already distinguished himself as a lawyer, scholar, teacher, and judge; so his services at Furman University have capped a dedicated career of service to God and to his fellow men.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to call to the attention of my colleagues two editorials—from the Greenville News of January 30, 1964, and the Greenville Piedmont of January 30, 1964—which pay high tribute to Dr. Plyler on reaching this milestone in life. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 30, 1964]

JOHN PLYLER RETIRES AT ZENITH

"Who, then, is free? The wise who can command his passions, who fears not want, death, nor chains, firmly resisting his appetites and despising the honors of the world, who relies wholly on himself, whose angular points of character have been rounded off and polished."—Horace, in his "Satires," 25 B.C.

These words of the ancient Greek poet could well be used to define a truly educated man or woman, the completely mature personality. This is the objective of higher learning. They, especially the phrase, "whose anguar points of character have been rounded off and polished," apply to John Laney Plyler.

They describe much of what he has been trying to do during the last 25 years at Furman University. He has led Furman to the threshold of greatness as a church-supported college firmly founded in Christian principles and operated according to the highest standards of scholarship and ethics.

Unlike institutions, men do not go on forever or indefinitely, and perhaps we should not have been shocked to learn that Dr. Plyler was 70. He has served 2 years past the mandatory retirement age and finally has obtained the consent of the board of trustees to step aside from active leadership.

But more years than any of us realized have passed and the perennially youthful John Plyler has served as president more than a quarter-century, going on 26 years of the most turbulent in the history of the State, the world, and the institution.

When Dr. Plyler accepted the office in 1939, he had distinguished himself as a lawyer, scholar, teacher, and judge. The angular points of his character had been rounded off and polished. The Greenville County youth in whose family Furman was a beloved tradition and who loved the school and its locale was an ideal choice for the position.

He had urbanity without pseudo-sophistication; wisdom without false pride of intellect; administrative ability without the tendency to expect more of others than he gave of himself; the gift of being equally at ease with men of large affairs like foundation chairmen and corporation presidents and the humblest Baptist layman or university freshman. What some occasionally mistook for personal timidity was an almost unshakable calm under stress.

In 1939 Furman had begun to reap the benefits of the efforts of men like Dr. Ben Geer and others who had worked to channel into Furman large sums of money in the form of unrestricted gifts, operational funds, and special grants. It was firmly wedded to and proud of its role as a church-supported, independent college. Yet it was ready to assume also the role of a great small university.

Furman and the Woman's College were being united into a coeducational school. Plans were being formed in the minds of men like Dr. Plyler, Alester Furman, Jr., and others of the board of trustees for a fine, large, modern campus in a new location capable of expansion.

The present physical plant, the high standards of the faculty, the record of Furman scholars and the projected 10-year plan of further improvement speak for the wisdom of their vision.

During these years, Furman has not changed its original and fundamental role as a Baptist college. It has merely expanded it to fulfill still other roles and to meet the requirements of the space age for more men and women with a broad basic education in the liberal arts, undergirded by a strong faith in God.

They have not been easy years for Dr. Plyler, his family, his associates or friends. Many a time he has had to walk a tight rope to avoid controversy over the university or to minimize the damage which could have been done the institution by the inevitable controversies. He has had to make new friends for the school in high places and low while at the same time fending off the detrimental if well-intended interference of some old friends.

But John Plyler has weathered well the many storms and the beatings he has taken himself rather than allow the blows to fall on the institution. He is still the strikingly handsome, young-hearted president who, with his beautiful and gracious wife, the former Beatrice Dennis of Berkeley County, has presided over campus affairs and lent an extraordinary grace and charm to student and faculty life.

Dr. Plyler enters well-earned retirement at the height of his powers. He has prepared well the path for his successor, whoever he is. We wish the trustees well in their search for that man and to him we pledge in advance our support and esteem just as we know John Plyler will his.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Jan. 30, 1964]

DR. JOHN L. PLYLER ENDS A DISTINGUISHED CAREER

The retirement of a college president of eminence after long service most often is pictured in a frame of reference to the physical and scholastic accomplishments of his tenure, and properly so.

The works bespeak the man.

On that basis, the works of Dr. John Laney Plyler during his 25 years as president of Furman University are monumental.

In that time, the university was uprooted from a too small but revered hill in the heart of Greenville and transplated to a new campus in the country 5 miles away (current value $17 million and more to come), its endowment was coaxed upward to $7,477,000, its faculty attained a 60-percent doctoral level, its curriculum constantly swept outward in keeping with the times, and its students increased so that they often taxed the current capacity of the expanding campus.

Those are prideful things and their imprint is deep on the whole of southern Christian and secular education.

They overlay and encompass the heart of the matter, the character and pervasive influence of a modest, gentle, scholarly man who stayed at Furman 2 years beyond the mandatory retirement age because his trustees asked it, and who now, at 70, will leave the presidency to another yet to be selected.

Dr. Plyler has been associated with Furman for 39 years, as a student, a faculty member, a law school dean, and president.

As he prepares to leave, he can look backward, with a realization of responsibility met and duty done, on a university that has grown in greatness and influence, on a university which has produced educated men and women whose lives he has touched by the many thousands. The bricks and stones of Furman are there for all to see. Those lives are an even more meaningful monument.

Exposing the Price Fixers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald of January 31, 1964, entitled "Exposing the Price Fixers."

This excellent editorial points out that the so-called quality stabilization bill, S. 774, is nothing more or less than authorization for plunder by private unregulated interests of the general consuming public for the benefit of no one but price fixers exercising authorities under this legislation.

Certainly at a time when Britain and other nations around the world are getting away from price fixing and price maintenance it would be unwise in the extreme for the United States to enact a Federal law authorizing price fixing which would raise consumer prices by as much as $11 billion a year if passed.

Legislation of this kind would eat up the benefits of President Johnson's tax cut legislation which the Congress is passing and would leave the economy in precisely the same state as it was before enactment of such tax cut legislation to stimulate the economy.

The editorial follows:

EXPOSING THE PRICE FIXERS

When President Johnson in his economic message warned that "we must resist new steps to legalize price fixing where competition should prevail," he was referring to the so-called Quality Stabilization Act (S. 774). It is a devious measure which would establish a federally enforced system of resale price maintenance under the guise of protecting the consumer. The President's remarks and those of his Council of Economic Advisers have now been amplified by the splendid testimony of Assistant Attorney General William H. Orrick, Jr., before the Senate Commerce Committee.

"Put simply," Mr. Orrick told the committee, "S. 774 legalizes price fixing by and for unregulated private interests." He then proceeded to document his assertion. In approximately half of the 150 pending antitrust cases involving price fixing, the collusive practices in which the defendants are alleged to have engaged would become legal if the so-called Quality Stabilization Act were passed.

The effects of resale price maintenance legislation were illustrated with price comparisons for identical items in States which enforce fair trade laws and those which do not. Prices in areas where retail trade is unfettered by price-fixing regulations were lower by margins ranging from 3 to more than 40 percent.

After years of experience with resale price maintenance the British Government is now seeking its abolition because, in the words of Trade Minister Edward Heath, the practice is incompatible with the objective of "encouraging effective competition and keeping down costs and prices." Elsewhere in Europe there is a strong interest in increasing the efficiency of retail distribution by eliminating restrictive practices. There would be a crowning bit of irony if competition were abandoned in the United States at a time when other countries are discovering its virtues.

Postmaster General Adopts Humane Personnel Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General Gronouski has done a great many things since arriving in Washington to establish a good name with the public and the farflung operation he is charged with directing. In complying with President Johnson's request for economy, Postmaster General Gronouski has, as the American Federation of Government Employees notes, realized "there is a human side of personnel management."

"Postmaster General Gronouski has shown that the problem of job reduction can be handled effectively and at the same time compassionately," according to John F. Griner, national president of the AFGE, who writes in a recent issue of the Government Standard, a publication of this union of Government workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Postmaster General Gronouski dated January 10, 1964, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

POSTMASTER GENERAL WRITES PERSONAL ARTICLE TO REASSURE EMPLOYEES ON ECONOMY MOVE

(By John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General)

It will be important now and during the next several months for our employees to understand that the Post Office Department's current economy steps do not pose any threats to their job security.

Immediately after conferring with President Johnson in Texas on January 2—even before I announced our determination to do our part in his program to spend less and get more—I called Washington and asked my staff to get the word out quickly: that we will save without scrimping, cut without clobbering and manage to do better without making things worse.

We have set up a task force, headed by Deputy Postmaster General Sidney W. Bishop, and including our five Assistant Postmasters General, to work with your officers to cut jobs—not livelihoods.

This force will have started its meetings with your leaders, in an atmosphere of friendship and cooperation, by the time most of you read this. I met with them on January 8, and was gratified to receive their offers of help and their constructive suggestions.

Of course, it's not possible to see most of you personally to enjoy the same personal relationship with you that I have with your leaders—a relationship that is one of the many landmark legacies from our late great President and his programs for improved employee-management relations in the Federal Government. And so I readily accepted a suggestion that I write for you my own sincere conviction that, with intelligent planning and cooperation, we will have more if we will get by on just a little less in the postal service.

President Johnson's program makes plenty of economic sense for all of us individually. We all know that tightening the belt a little can often mean fattening the wallet a lot.

I am reminded of the story about the man driving along in an economy car when a smart-aleck friend in an expensive job raced alongside and yelled, "what's that clanking noise in your car?" "That," replied the other driver, "is the $5,000 in small change I carry around."

As the President said on January 8 in his state of the Union message when he announced his plans for governmentwide savings of more than $500 million in his new budget compared with the outgoing budget—while waging war against poverty: "This budget—and this year's legislative program—are designed to help each and every American citizen fulfill his basic hopes."

This give-a-little-gain-a-lot program means our postal people stand to share in a tax cut, their children to benefit from the schools and libraries, their teenagers to have better education and job opportunities, and they and their fellow citizens to enjoy unprecedented benefits now as well as protection in old age.

I would like to recap the exact points which were brought out in my meeting with your own organization leaders on January 8:

1. We will achieve economies through imaginative management. Given the present organizational structure, our employees accomplish as much as they can in a regular work day. Therefore, management must develop better use of our work force through improved planning, more rapid implementation of our ZIP code program, better scheduling of manpower, smoother workflow, increased patron cooperation and similar programs.

2. We will work out the program through full cooperation with employees and will give full attention to the needs and problems of employees at all times.

3. At least 75,000 job turnover vacancies can be anticipated annually on the basis of past experience. Therefore, we can get down to our target (to 590,000 from 595,000) and still fill essential jobs.

4. Employee organizations are invited to submit specific instances to the task force where they feel the economy program is not working properly, and prompt, corrective consideration will be in order.

5. Every effort will be made to make certain no curtailment of essential employee facilities is made.

While we are determined that the steps I have discussed will be followed carefully and there will be no loss of career jobs or essential benefits, we must expect some periods of trial in the months ahead as we meet our goals. Our mail volume and service problems will put constant pressures on us. For example, since last July alone, we have extended city delivery to more than 700,000 families and business firms. And, we expect such pressures to continue and to increase.

However, we are equal to the challenge. Though I have been in my position only a few months, I have been greatly impressed by the ability of postal employees to do the seemingly impossible and to meet virtually any challenge. I know we can do this job—even in the face of our growing work volume. And, we can do it without fear of loss—in fact, we will do it with the knowledge that we have much to gain.

How To Spot False Budget Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the February 1, 1964, issue of Nation's Business is an excellent article written by the very able news reporter, Vincent J. Burke, entitled "How To Spot False Budget Cuts." Although the article is directed to the general public I think many Congressmen could benefit from reading it.

I might further point out that the executive branch of the Government is as adept as certain Congressmen in making budget cuts seem real when in truth they are nonexistent. The 1965 budget presented by President Johnson regrettably falls into the category of an increased budget posing as an austere one. Publicity gimmicks like turning out the lights in the White House will not help to hide its true nature.

The article follows:

HOW TO SPOT FALSE BUDGET CUTS—POSES OF ECONOMY-MINDEDNESS IN CONGRESS OFTEN HIDE INCREASES IN FEDERAL SPENDING

With sentiment for economy now running high in Washington it's a safe bet that Congress will make some bogus cuts in President Johnson's budget—as well as genuine reductions.

Lawmakers were put on the spot by the Johnson budget, which projects spending for the coming fiscal year at less than expenditures this year.

Members of Congress want some of the credit for economizing. But they know voters object if expected public services or benefits are curtailed.

So the House and Senate Appropriations Committees will undoubtedly be searching for new ways to add to their past practices aimed at impressing voters that they are slashing proposed Presidential spending. As a businessman who pays heavy taxes, you have an interest in this maneuvering.

Bogus budget cutting is sometimes defended as a childish game of pretense which makes the voter feel better, makes Congress look better, and harms no one.

However, a case can be made that any sham economies are in reality antieconomy moves that indirectly tend to boost Government spending. In the first place, to the extent that voters are deluded, grassroots pressure for economy is diminished. In the second place, some sham budget cuts are devised to help appropriations subcommittee chairmen increase expenditures for their pet projects.

Before looking at some phony cuts which may be made this year, consider the remarkably repetitive pattern in the annual battle of the budget.

The budget, which the President sends to Congress every January, is for the fiscal year that will start the following July.

Almost always, Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Chairman CARL HAYDEN of the Senate Appropriations unit, along with many of their colleagues, begin looking for and predicting ways Congress can cut spending.

Every spring and summer news reports from Washington announce that Congress is, indeed, whacking the President's budget.

However, when the Treasury closes its books for the fiscal year, spending usually equals, and often exceeds, the original budget estimate submitted 18 months earlier.

Does this mean that all congressional economizing is phony?

By no means.

In fact, if Congress during the past 3 years had made all of the spending commitments and granted all of the spending authority requested, President Johnson's new spending budget would be billions of dollars higher.

Better than any previous Chief Executive, President Johnson knows how the game of bogus budget cutting is played. His gamesmanship as majority leader of a Democratic Senate used to infuriate the Eisenhower administration, which found itself repeatedly trying to explain that the bills Senator Johnson was putting through Congress were more costly than the administration's proposals, though the price tag often seemed little, if any, bigger.

A case in point was a public works appropriations bill, the only measure enacted over an Eisenhower veto. It included funds to start more than half a dozen unbudgeted projects which eventually would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. However, total money in the bill was no larger than President Eisenhower had requested. The extra funds for starting the disputed projects were offset by trimming annual allotments for other projects already underway. The latter resulted in no long-run saving, since the deleted funds would have to be provided eventually.

EVERYBODY PLAYS THE GAME

Both parties have embraced imaginary budget cuts. When the Republicans controlled Congress, they, too, played the game with zeal and skill.

In 1947, for example, the Republican 80th Congress fortified its economy record against President Truman by denying $800 million needed to pay income tax refunds the following spring. When the President again requested the money early in 1948, the Republicans rushed it to him to avoid the wrath of taxpayers who were entitled to refunds. But in Congress budgetary books that action did not erase the $800 million saving recorded in 1947. A budget is a prediction of what will be spent to pay past and present bills that come due during a particular fiscal year.

New Federal programs generally cost relatively little in the first year of operation. Their impact on Treasury spending rises gradually. Similarly, a large share of the funds for defense, space, and foreign aid programs does not actually flow out of the Treasury until several years after Congress approves their expenditure.

Contracts for construction of a nuclear submarine, a missile, or a dam cannot be let until money has been appropriated to pay the bills. Then it takes a long time before the project is completed and the final payment made from the Treasury.

Few voters understand the complicated budgetary process. And no wonder. It is poorly understood in Congress and badly reported to the public. The word "budget" is used interchangeably by lawmakers and by the press to describe: First, the President's spending budget; and second, appropriations of money made by Congress. The two are quite different.

Each year most Washington correspondents write that the President is asking Congress to approve his new spending budget.

It would be more accurate to say that the President is telling Congress how much he thinks it will cost to pay all Government bills due in the 12-month period starting July 1.

Even if you assume the President has not deliberately underestimated his expectations for political reasons, the accuracy of his forecast will depend on many factors.

Unless Congress is willing to cancel some existing spending commitments, a radical step which has seldom been taken, the lawmakers can expect to play a relatively minor role in influencing the size of spending in the year immediately ahead.

In the first place, much more than one-half of the money the President intends to spend either is already in his hands (appropriated by prior Congresses) or is not subject to refusal by Congress, unless Congress changes or repeals laws requiring its expenditure.

In the second place, developments over which neither Congress nor the President has any control will help determine whether more or less than the President's budgeted estimate is spent.

The cost of carrying out farm price-support commitments will depend on the size of the harvest, which, in turn, is heavily dependent on the weather. The amount budgeted for interest on the public debt was revised upward by $500 million last July, when monetary authorities raised the discount rate to combat a gold-draining flow of short-term investment funds abroad.

THREE CATEGORIES

The appropriations requests to Congress generally fall into three categories:

1. Funds earmarked for spending in the current year, and which can be denied without violating legal commitments. Salaries are an example. Congress can cut the President's spending budget by forcing him to fire one or two White House gardeners or by denying funds for additional Justice Department attorneys, for example.

2. Funds which the executive branch wants to commit now, but which will not actually be paid out of the Treasury for several years. Denying these funds will result in a saving, but not immediately. For example, several years ago Congress slashed appropriations for the foreign aid program $800 million below the amount requested by the President. However, because of previously appropriated funds already in the pipeline, foreign aid spending that year climbed $1 billion above the amount first budgeted.

3. Funds earmarked to meet payments required under existing laws. These include veterans' benefits, unemployment compensation to Federal employees who lose their jobs, subsidies to ship operators and shipbuilders, and a wide variety of Federal grant programs under which the Treasury is obligated to match funds provided by State or local governments for various activities.

Among the leading architects of some economy maneuvers are Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island Democrat, and Senator LISTER HILL, Alabama Democrat. They are chairmen, respectively, of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees which draft the money bill carrying funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

At the prodding of Messrs. FOGARTY and HILL, Congress for a decade shoveled extra money at a rapid rate into the Department's National Institutes of Health. Research by the Institutes mushroomed. After complaints of waste and inefficiency erupted, the House last year set up a special committee to investigate alleged duplication in Federal research and Messrs. FOGARTY and HILL decided against adding unbudgeted funds to the 1963 bill. In a report accompanying the 1963 money bill, Representative FOGARTY asserted, however, that he had no apologies for enlarging research faster than the Eisenhower or Kennedy administrations had recommended.

The Fogarty and Hill subcommittees managed to expand spending for research while holding total funds in their appropriation bill at, or close to, the amount requested by the executive branch. They accomplished this by making a bogus saving in another

HEW program—Federal tax funds to help States finance their relief rolls.

There is perhaps no activity so immune from a real cutback. Congress frequently changes this public assistance program, but only to liberalize it, usually in election years. The last change, made in the fall of 1962, raised the Federal contribution to each State for each needy person on the State's relief rolls who is disabled, blind or over 65. This revision, which the administration did not request, raised Federal costs about $100 million a year.

As a result, the administration estimated last January that it would need $2.9 billion for public assistance during the current fiscal year. At the recommendation of Messrs. FOGARTY and HILL, who said the administration had overestimated the need, Congress appropriated only $2,750 million.

Actually, this $175 million money cut did not save the taxpayers a penny. The program's cost depends on the actual number of relief recipients, not advance estimates. If the administration's forecast was correct, the funds will last only 49 weeks, instead of 52. Congress, at the President's request, will provide the rest this spring. (If the original estimate was high, the surplus would remain in the Treasury because it could not be spent for any other purpose.)

FARM SAVINGS THWARTED

The same kind of ersatz thrift is engineered by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi Democrat, who heads the House Appropriations Subcommittee which drafts the money bill for the farm program.

With the help of rural lawmakers of both parties, Congressman WHITTEN has compelled Presidents for more than a decade to spend an extra $100 million a year for the agricultural conservation program.

This program reimburses farmers for part of such out-of-pocket expenses as building ponds on their own farms and spreading lime on their soil—in some cases to help grow more surplus crops. It operated at a level of $250 million a year under the Truman administration. The Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations tried to cut it to $150 million, but each year Representative WHITTEN thwarted the move by putting a directive into the farm money bill ordering the administration to spend $250 million on the program.

Because the directive forced the President to request the extra money, the budget-boosting action was attributed to him, rather than to Congress.

In fact, the maneuvers of Mr. WHITTEN and his colleagues have managed to delude those city Congressmen and news reporters who are untutored in the complexities of financing farm programs. They have been led to believe that Congress each year subtracts from, instead of adding to, farm spending budgeted by the President.

Farm price supports are financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which loses several billion dollars a year in its subsidy operations. The losses reduce the agency's $15 billion drawing account at the Treasury. Each year the President asks Congress to make up the loss by adding cash to the agency's account.

Since the amount requested would provide a big surplus above anticipated needs for the next 12 months, Mr. WHITTEN's subcommittee denies part of the new cash each year. The maneuver last year enabled Congress to claim a budget savings of $100 million.

Actually, there was no saving whatever. Should the agency unexpectedly run short of cash needed to meet its price support commitments, the President could be counted upon to request extra funds, which Congress would grant. This happened last spring.

Like the Fogarty-Hill tactics, this illustrates a key ingredient that Congress uses in serving up false economy to the voters: It compels the President to ask twice for the same money. Congress grants the money to him only once, thereby establishing a record of denying Presidential requests for money.

This is one of the reasons you cannot accept at face value all the proud records of the House Appropriations Committee, which show that Congress during the 8-year period 1955–62 denied more than $23 billion in Presidential requests. Actual spending during those years soared $19 billion above the amounts originally budgeted by the President.

TRICKIER THAN USUAL?

When the tax-cutting drive produced public pressure for economy last year, Congress resorted to more than its usual amount of budget-cutting legerdemain.

Without making sharp cuts in the defense program, the lawmakers managed to slash $1.8 billion from the defense funds requested. This feat was performed by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia Democrat, and Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas Democrat, who preside over the Defense Appropriations Subcommittees.

One stratagem was to deny some of the requested funds and then negate the denial by granting the Pentagon authority to use, instead, surplus funds placed in its checking accounts by previous Congresses. Another ploy was to withhold a significant percentage of the money request for the military payroll in the current fiscal year, but forbid the Pentagon to reduce the size of the Armed Forces. It was as though a corporation's board of directors told the plant manager to cut the payroll cost without reducing the number of workers or their wages.

Why haven't Republicans protested more vigorously against the budget-cutting pretensions of the present Democratic Congress?

One reason is the belief among legislators that phony budget cuts benefit incumbents of both parties by shifting blame for big spending from Congress to the President.

The budgetary process is so complicated that nobody can tell you at the end of a congressional session precisely what impact Congress has had on the President's spending budget. To make even a stab at it, you would need a computing machine, a big staff of budget experts, and access to top-secret military information.

But you can count on one thing. When the gavel falls at the session's end, all of the requested funds which Congress has denied—the real, the counterfeit, and the economies which will not show up for several years—will be lumped together into one gigantic total by the staff of the House Appropriations Committee.

Then Chairman CANNON will announce the exact total which the lawmakers have saved—in billions, millions, thousands, hundreds and tens of dollars, and pennies.

Many Members will seize upon the statistic as proof of their thrift.

To which informed citizens might well reply: "Oh, yeah?"

Rev. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the anniversary of Dr. Bernard Braskamp's 15 years of service as our Chaplain, I should like not only to congratulate him but to congratulate ourselves upon having this dedicated servant of God to guide and counsel us.

Over the years he has opened each day's session of the House with a verse from the Bible and a prayer. These few words of his, based on a short passage from the Good Book, are timely chosen to give us renewed strength and renewed courage as we are about to consider some specific problem. Each day he leaves with us an inspirational thought upon which we cannot but reflect from time to time during the day's deliberations.

Dr. Braskamp enjoys our confidence and respect not just because he is a distinguished theologian, nor because of his great wealth of knowledge, but rather because he himself, as a man, in his every word and deed, in the tone of his voice and every gesture, is the embodiment of wisdom and goodness.

We are deeply grateful to Dr. Braskamp for all he has done for us. He has enriched the lives of all of us and has made our burdens lighter. My prayer is that it will be God's will that he serve with us for many, many years.

Our Own Medals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, September 14, 1964, will mark the 150th anniversary of the writing of our national anthem. The story of Francis Scott Key, a native of Frederick County, Md., composing "The Star-Spangled Banner" during a heavy bombardment of Fort McHenry is part of our American history.

In honor of this sesquicentennial anniversary, the Francis Scott Key Memorial Foundation has caused a commemorative medal to be struck. It has been adopted as the official Key Medal for the Maryland Pavilion at the New York World's Fair and will be of especial interest to commemorative collectors.

Because of its significance to all Americans, I include in my remarks an item which appeared in the Baltimore News-Post on December 3, 1963, under the title of "Our Own Medals":

OUR OWN MEDALS

Commemorative medals, honoring the 150th anniversary of Francis Scott Key's composition of "The Star-Spangled Banner," went on sale throughout the Nation yesterday. These are the official medals of the Maryland Commission for the New York World's Fair.

For that reason, and also because—as every schoolchild knows—Francis Scott Key was a native Marylander and a Baltimore attorney, these medals should have a special appeal to the residents of this State.

Furthermore, the Francis Scott Key Memorial Foundation proposes to use funds from sale of the medals for erecting a permanent memorial to house mementos of Key and other nationally famous sons of Maryland.

Therefore we of Maryland have an obligation to buy these medals in generous numbers. We can hope, too, that they are purchased in great quantity throughout the Nation. The cost is only 50 cents. At least one of these medals should be the prized possession of every family in this State.

Florida Court Puts Law Above Speculation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times-Union of Jacksonville, Fla., last week carried an editorial which is food for thought. It deals with a subject in which I am very much interested and concerned about, the reading of the Bible and prayer in our public schools. I am inserting it here for the information of the Members of the Congress:

FLORIDA COURT PUTS LAW ABOVE SPECULATION

The decision of Florida public school superintendents to continue compliance with State law requiring daily Bible reading in classrooms until specifically directed otherwise by a competent court is given new and strong support by the State supreme court decision upholding for the second time the law's constitutionality.

The State high court's decision was rendered under a mandate of the U.S. Supreme Court which returned the earlier ruling for further consideration in the light of the Federal court's decision upsetting similar, but not exactly parallel, laws in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

The State supreme court, in a unanimous decision written by Justice Millard Caldwell, reiterated its opinion that the Florida statute is constitutional. The opinion held there was no fatal conflict between the Florida law and U.S. Supreme Court decisions, since the law was clearly aimed at instilling moral training and teaching good citizenship, and that accommodation of religious belief was secondary.

The State court took the eminently sensible and judicious position that since the U.S. Court's philosophy in the field was still somewhat confused and contradictory, it was not the State tribunal's function to attempt to speculate or expand on that philosophy.

Whatever the ultimate outcome may be, the State court acted in the highest judicial tradition by ruling on the law as it interpreted it, without attempting to follow imprecise Supreme Court guideposts down blind alleys of speculation.

The ruling takes on added significance in the fact that it was written by a man whose judgment has been tempered by years of service in all three branches of State government and in the Federal legislative and executive branches. Justice Caldwell summed up his philosophy in a talk here last month in which he criticized U.S. Supreme Court usurpation of reserved State powers, and noted that only the judicial branch of the Federal Government is exempt from direct responsibility to the voters at the ballot box.

Judicial legislation is therefore much more destructive of State and individual rights than acts of Congress, he said, since the latter may be changed by Congress under pressure from voters, but the former is subject only to the passing fancy of the courts.

By choosing to stand on solid legal principle rather than attempting to read the minds of the present occupants of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Florida tribunal has pointed out the way to a return to sanity in the interpretation of law and the administration of justice.

Prejudice Causes Death of Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Pioneer, the school paper of Parkville Senior High School, Md. This article is entitled "Prejudice Causes Death of Leader," and was written by Jim Morrison, who is the editor in chief of the paper. I am sure you will agree with me that it is another demonstration of the mature look at life which is far more common among our young people than we might believe:

PREJUDICE CAUSES DEATH OF LEADER

(By Jim Morrison)

The assassination of President Kennedy was not the product of an organized political movement; but rather, it came as a result of the irrational workings of a festered human mind. The mind engendered its perverted deed with the indirect, but effective, help of the forces of prejudice, bigotry, and blind hate.

Lee Harvey Oswald was an extremist. Like most extremists, his actions relied more upon emotion than reason; and his act was set off by influences which, although they may not have had Oswald's purposes in mind, succeeded in unbalancing his already warped sense of reason. All bigots, by their very nature, are made of the same material; and their intolerance is equally desperate no matter what their political leanings.

OSWALD NOT SOLELY RESPONSIBLE

Oswald, therefore, was not the only man who pulled the fatal trigger. The racists, the religious bigots, the political screwballs, the men whose ambition surpasses their humanity—all these people symbolically pulled the trigger when the President slumped into his wife's lap, never to rise again.

For President Kennedy was the target of an unprecedented barrage of baseless criticism, prejudiced opposition, and even open hatred. When the atmosphere of a country is subjected to such a cloud of vile smoke, it is no wonder that the unbalanced are moved to violent action. The thousands of people and the many world figures who paid homage to the dead President showed that the forces of hate have cast a disproportionate influence upon the wishes of the people, and demonstrated what can happen when intolerance is allowed to breed unchecked.

DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY TRUE COMMEMORATION

Doubtless, there will be many people who will wish to commemorate the President with monuments. We feel that the greatest tribute the country can pay to him is to create a new society—one in which the ideals of tolerance, understanding, courage, wisdom, humanitarianism, and all the others for which President Kennedy strived will make it possible for the country and the world to reach a higher plane of humanity, and to produce a truly democratic way of life.

The death of John F. Kennedy is one which will demonstrate to all humanity that there are men whose ideals are more important than their welfare; and that the higher goals of man are more precious than life itself.

What Next, Bobby Baker et al.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, scarcely a day passes but what there are new and startling revelations of the activities of Robert G. "Bobby Baker and those who have associated with him, directly or indirectly, in various enterprises.

Baker, former secretary to the Democrat majority in the U.S. Senate, is a protege of President Johnson.

In an article appearing in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of February 2, 1964, there is the revelation that a Florida hotel firm, in which the Teamsters Union is also interested, holds a contract to build a $3,250,000, eight-story luxury hotel on Federal property at the Dulles International Airport near Washington, D.C.

The Globe-Democrat article follows:

(By Edward W. O'Brien and Erwin Knoll)

WASHINGTON.—A Florida-based hotel firm which figures in the current Senate investigation of Robert G. "Bobby" Baker and in a Justice Department investigation of the Central States Teamster pension fund holds a 40-year Federal Government contract to build and operate a hotel at Washington's new jet-age airport.

The company, International Airport Hotel System, Inc., was set up about 5 years ago to operate the hotel in the terminal building of Miami, Fla., International Airport. It also operates new hotels at airports in Houston, Tex., and Birmingham, Ala., and will run the hotel now nearing completion at Los Angeles International Airport.

Loans totaling $3 million from the Central States Teamster pension fund played a prominent part in financing the Miami and Birmingham hotel operations. The loans were cited last summer in a 28-count mail and wire fraud indictment of Teamster boss James Riddle Hoffa and seven other men involved with the pension fund.

EMBARRASSED

International Airport Hotel System's contract with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)—or with "The United States of America," as the company likes to describe it—is now a source of some embarrassment to Government officials.

The contract was negotiated late in 1960, during the Eisenhower administration, and was formally signed in February 1961 during the Kennedy administration.

It calls for construction of a $3,250,000, eight-story luxury hotel on Federal property at Dulles International Airport, which opened recently as the Nation's showcase of jet transportation.

A stock prospectus for International Airport Hotel System notes that "the agreement confers on the company the exclusive privilege of operating a hotel at the airport,

and grants it the right to use, for such purposes, a 17.5-acre site." The contract is to run through year 2002.

FAA officials stress that no political pressures or irregularities of any kind were involved in awarding the hotel contract. They say that the Agency was unaware of any questions about the company or its organizers and stockholders. And they note that the contract was awarded on the basis of a bid by the Miami concern that was extremely favorable to the Government.

"It wasn't hard to select this company because their bid was so much better," FAA Administrator Najeeb Halaby said Friday.

"Even if we had known everything then that we know now, I don't know that we could have done anything else."

VENDING FIRM

Last Tuesday, George M. Simon, executive vice president and chairman of the executive committee of the hotel company, appeared before the Senate Rules Committee as a witness in the investigation of Mr. Baker, the former Senate aid whose farflung financial operations are under close scrutiny.

Mr. Simon said he and several business associates invested $91,000 in the Serv-U Corp., a west coast vending machine firm in which Mr. Baker, according to Rules Committee testimony, was a principal stockholder. The company has lucrative vending contracts with major defense firms.

Among the associates who invested in Serv-U, Mr. Simon testified, was Jack B. Cooper, of Miami, whose name has been in the news in connection with windfall profits and tax evasion.

Ten years ago, the Federal Housing Administration charged that a Cooper apartment enterprise in New Haven, Conn., had netted a windfall profit of more than $50,000.

On February 12, 1961—12 days before the Dulles contract was signed—Cooper was found guilty of evading payment of $259,218 in Federal income taxes. The case grew out of a $744,000 transaction with the Government of the late dictator, Rafael Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, for whom Cooper arranged the purchase of 42 fighter planes.

In an appeal from the conviction, Cooper's attorneys maintained that their client had actually received only $69,000 in the deal with Trujillo, and that the rest of the money had been embezzled by the dictator's son, Rafael, Jr. On January 6 of this year the Supreme Court denied a writ of certiorari for appeal—refusing review.

Cooper is not listed as an officer or stockholder of International Airport Hotel System, Inc., but a stock prospectus on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission lists him among seven founders who may be considered promoters of the company.

The SEC files show considerable stockholdings held in trust by Mr. Simon for Cooper's wife, Gertrude. The files also show a payment of $75,000 to Cooper "for services rendered in connection with the obtaining of the lease and arranging for financing and costruction of the Miami hotel."

In his testimony to the Senate committee, Mr. Simon said Cooper "used to be in the banana business" in the Dominican Republic. He said Cooper had also been associated with the West Flagler Kennel Club, a dog track in Miami.

VEGAS GAMBLER

Mr. Simon testified that he, Cooper, and other unidentified associates had invested in the Serv-U Corp. at the suggestion of Edward Levinson, a Las Vegas gambling figure who had been previously identified as a Serv-U shareholder.

Mr. Levinson and Benny Sigelbaum, another Serv-U shareholder, had formerly been stockowners in the International Airport Hotel System, Mr. Simon said, but had divested themselves of their holdings when the hotel company decided to offer stock to the public.

Mr. Simon said Mr. Sigelbaum and Mr. Levinson left the company because "the underwriters (of the stock issue) did not feel that they wanted the association with the Las Vegas gambling interests involved in a publicly held corporation that they would be associated with."

Last April, Mr. Simon testified, Cooper and Mr. Levinson accompanied Mr. Baker on a trip to the Dominican Republic "to look over some hotel properties down there."

About 3 months after they invested $91,000 in Serv-U, Mr. Simon said, he and Cooper went to Washington to meet with Mr. Baker, Aviation Lobbyist Fred Black, Mr. Levinson, and other principals in the vending machine firm. Cooper and Mr. Simon were offered $100,000 for their interest in Serv-U and accepted. As far as he knows, Mr. Simon added, Mr. Sigelbaum and Mr. Levinson still own shares in Serv-U.

In addition to Mr. Simon, officers of International Airport Hotel System, Inc., include Saul S. Cohen, president; Bryant R. Burton, vice president; Solomon Levine, treasurer; Burton M. Cohen, secretary, and Maxwell M. Rabb, chairman of the board.

Mr. Rabb was Secretary to the Cabinet during the Eisenhower administration and served as a special assistant to Sherman Adams. He previously served as an aid to former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Burton, a Los Angeles attorney, has represented various Las Vegas interests. He and Mr. Levinson were signers for a $4 million loan obtained by the Fremont Hotel of Las Vegas from the Central States Teamster Pension Fund.

Justice Department sources confirm that International Airport Hotel System, Inc., obtained a $2 million loan from the Central States Teamster pension fund against the Miami airport hotel. The loan was channeled through Midwest Mortgage Co., a St. Louis firm.

In December 1961, a direct loan of $1 million was obtained from the Central States Teamster pension fund against the Birmingham airport hotel.

In 1962, the Miami group was the most favorable bidder for construction of a projected hotel at Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport in St. Louis. However, questions about the company's background were raised, and local authorities decided to award the contract to another firm.

About a year after the Miami firm's contract with the Federal Government was signed, the Justice Department informally discussed with FAA the possibility that the hotel at the Capital's jet airport might be financed by Teamster pension fund money.

FAA officials are satisfied, it is understood, that this will not be the source of financing for the Dulles Airport hotel. They said Friday that 140 hotel firms were invited to bid for the Dulles facility, and that 7 companies submitted offers.

The Miami firm promised the Government a return about three times higher than the next closest bidder.

A regular check of the applicants disclosed no derogatory information, FAA officials stressed. The check consisted of interviews with the Miami bank where the hotel firm's principals have accounts, and with the management of the Miami airport.

DELAY GRANTED

The original contract called for completion of the hotel at Dulles by April 1, 1963. However, disagreements arose between the company and Government officials about the quality of construction materials and design for the hotel.

In February 1962, an FAA official granted the company a postponement of construction until all disagreements were resolved. The company now faces an October 1964 deadline but construction has not yet started, and another request for delay is under consideration, FAA officials said.

Unless another delay is authorized, the company will have to begin paying the Government a guaranteed minimum rental of $92,000 a year on June 1—whether or not the hotel is built and in operation.

FAA Director Najeeb E. Halaby said Friday that he knew of "no justification for further delay," and that his "instinct" at this time was to deny the request.

Too Many Hands in U.S. Road-Fund Till

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Too Many Hands in U.S. Road-Fund Till," which appeared in the January 30 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville.

The editorial is as follows:

TOO MANY HANDS IN U.S. ROAD-FUND TILL

One of the hard facts of modern-day big Government is the shrinkage of every tax dollar that goes through Washington bureaus.

In virtually every field of Government service, administrative costs in the National Capital drain off a sizable percentage of the tax receipts before they are put to work back in the grassroots where the taxpayer lives.

This situation in itself is bad enough. But when you look at highway-user taxes and compare them with the Federal money that is channeled back into the great Interstate Highway program, it is downright sickening.

The truth—and it has long been one of our pet peeves—is that large portions of Federal highway taxes are diverted to uses wholly unrelated to highways or the construction thereof.

To its everlasting credit, the Commonwealth of Kentucky does not follow this Federal pattern, but puts its highway taxes into a separate fund earmarked for building and maintaining its extensive highway system.

It is too bad that the Federals don't do the same.

We are reminded just how bad it is by Kentucky Petroleum Council, which has figures to show that fully 35 percent of the Federal highway taxes paid by Kentuckians since the start of the interstate highway program in 1956 was not spent on highways.

It's not a case of Kentucky failing to get its share while some other States are getting more. Fact is, Kentucky, through its two big road-bond issues, has been able to take the greatest advantage of interstate 9-to-1 money and has fared as well as any of the 50 States, if not better.

The national percentage of diversion of Federal highway tax money to nonhighway uses is 40, says the petroleum council, and U.S. motorists have paid $11 billion more in road taxes than has been spent on the highways by Uncle Sam.

In Kentucky, the Federal road taxes that were doubled back in 1956 have since brought in $353 million but only $230 million of this has come back to us in Federal-aid highway money. The remaining $123 million has been diverted by the folks in

Washington to projects not in any way connected with roads.

By 1972, when the interstate highway program is due for completion, Kentuckians will have paid more than $340 million in road-user taxes to the Federal Government that will have been diverted to nonhighway projects.

We all have to face the fact that any dollar sent to Washington shrinks before it gets back here. But to lop off 35 or 40 cents of it seems to us more than even the most complacent, long-suffering taxpayer ought to bear.

Fact is, we could have 35 or 40 percent more superhighways—or get 'em 35 or 40 percent sooner—if the Federal road fund was handled the way Kentucky's road fund is administered.

We can't expect too much, big Government being what it is today. But the motorist ought to be able to reasonably expect that 80 or 90 percent of his gasoline and other highway-use taxes would be spent in building better roads for him to travel.

Center for Chanceries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post entitled "Center for Chanceries."

I do, however, feel this editorial should have appeared in 1959 in support of private industry when it tried unsuccessfully to locate such a center next to the State Department. The location of such a center was blocked by the National Capital Planning Commission as being in competition with downtown Washington.

It is unusual to see the editor of the Washington Post cross swords with the National Capital Planning Commission who opposed the location of such a center for chanceries next to the State Department. But perhaps this disagreement could be in the public interest as it highlights the inadequacies of the thinking the so-called planners at the National Capital Planning Commission.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

CENTER FOR CHANCERIES

A certain urgency attends the suggestion of a center for foreign governments' chanceries. Several large missions are currently looking for sites into which to expand. If a center is to be established by Congress, it needs to be done in time for these tenants.

Senator MCINTYRE's bill for this purpose is warmly regarded by the State Department, and for good reason. The chanceries, with their air of commerce and their parking difficulties, are not welcomed in Washington's residential neighborhoods. Their intrusions have proved a source of continued local friction, trivial but by no means negligible. Senator FULBRIGHT's bill, passed last year by the Senate, would prohibit any new chanceries in residential zones. Senator MCINTYRE now proposes to authorize a 30-acre site, under the District's urban renewal program, for a spacious and well-designed new center in which foreign governments could find quarters.

Before Congress passes the bill, it will demand the answer to one obvious question: Where is the chancery center to be? If the National Capital Planning Commission can bring itself to make a recommendation promptly, the McIntyre bill may yet be enacted in time to serve the diplomats, and to save the neighborhoods into which their chanceries would otherwise have moved.

Of course, no chancery center will meet all the office needs of foreign diplomats. For this reason further action on the Fulbright bill is also important. Before it goes any further, however, it should be amended so as to ease the restrictions on the location of chanceries. If Congress is unwilling to lay down guidelines for the Board of Zoning Adjustment in granting exceptions for the location of chanceries in residential neighborhoods, it should at least keep the door open for such facilities in apartment zones.

The Naked Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota's Poet Laureate, C. A. Waldron (Dakota Cal), has just written another poem expressing his views of the current world situation, entitled "The Naked Edge."

I commend this work of my good friend to the attention of the Members of the House, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE NAKED EDGE

The naked edge of nowhere
Isn't good enough for me
But that is where we're headin'
In a land we label free.

We wage the war, Korea, fight to
Get into Berlin.
Then abandon Castro's Cuba, letting
Commies stay to win.

We let 'em stir up Panama—
Invade the country south
Then turn about and send 'em wheat
To feed the Moscow mouth.

An army on its belly moves
And we supply their food
So they can conquer Vietnam
And raise their hellion brood.

We pour out billions for defense
Against their ghastly plan—
Then turn around and "buy" expense
To "help them" where we can.

There is no logic or excuse—
No "diplomatic" stand
That justifies such stupid use
Of resources at command.

A "policy" that leads to naught—
In circling staggers goes—
That buys, then sells the thing it bought,
To build up deadly foes.

A policy that rakes De Gaulle
For playing with the Red
E'en as we climb the Commie wall
And crawl into their bed.

And so we play a witless game
With no straightforward look
The naked edge of nowhere has
Impaled us on its hook.

—DAKOTA CAL.
(C. A. Waldron)

Draft Law Wastes Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been concerned with the inequities inherent in the existing Selective Service System. I have pointed out numerous times, before congressional committees, in public statements, and elsewhere, that the manpower needs of the military are primarily qualitative, not quantitative. The draft law has been perverted from a system of satisfying the emergency manpower needs of the military in wartime into an inefficient, wasteful program of universal military training in peacetime. At long last the administration and some of the press are coming to the same conclusions. They are a little late, many billions of dollars late, but perhaps now we can set to work on devising a system which balances the civilian skill needs with the skill needs of the military. If we would transfer just a portion of the billions in the military departments' annual budgets for manpower training into the civilian sector we would end up doing a better job of procuring trained manpower for the military, of training and retraining the skilled manpower so badly needed in our private economy and we would end up with reduced unemployment, increased economic growth, a stronger defense, and a sizable reduction in Federal governmental expenditures.

Under unanimous consent, I include a recent series of articles in the Washington Post in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to draw the attention of my colleagues to a problem which demands prompt remedial action.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 12, 1964]

NUMBER AVOIDING SERVICE IS SMALL, BUT GROWING—ENLISTMENTS, HIGH REJECTION, KEEP MILITARY DRAFT QUOTA LOW

(By B. D. Ayres, Jr.)

(First of a series)

There was a time when the letter was little more than a bad joke, one in which the punchline was given away at the start.

"Greeting * * *" it began. The reader knew instantly his exact status with Uncle Sam and the draft.

Today, the letter still comes. It retains its classic opening. But it is not so often looked upon as a joke, not even a bad one.

Every day this year, more than 1,000 young Americans will receive copies of that letter.

On the average, 4 of the letters will go to Washington residents, another 14 to Maryland men, and 24 more to young Virginians.

High service rejection rates and last-minute enlistments will cut those eventually drafted from each group of 1,000 to slightly more than 275. From almost every one of the 275 will come that old GI question that must first have been asked way back when Moses instituted a draft among the children of Israel (Numbers 1: 1–2 and 46):

Is this trip necessary?

To Congress, the Defense Department, and numerous service-associated groups, the trip is absolutely necessary if the freedom of the

United States and its allies is to be maintained. But to many of the draftees and to many farm, labor, religious, and educational groups the trip is absolutely unnecessary—a waste of time, money, and manpower.

These opposing views of the draft have been offered—except during wartime—since compulsory service in the Armed Forces entered the American mainstream of life.

Every major amendment or reenactment of the draft has brought forth a rehashing of the issues. But recent draft bills have stirred less controversy than earlier bills, and in this lessening controversy many die-hard opponents of conscription have found their strongest alarm. U.S. citizens, they say, are growing accustomed to a way of life traditionally alien to an America at peace—however tenuous that peace.

The draft, until just before Pearl Harbor, had always been a wartime measure. But on September 16, 1940—15 months before the sneak attack—Congress passed the Selective Service and Training Act. That act, through periodic amendment and reenactment, eventually became the Selective Service Act and then the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

In the almost two dozen years since initial passage, American youths have been continuously subject to compulsory service in the Armed Forces except for a 15-month period during 1947-48, when the law was permitted to expire.

The most recent action on the law—a standard 4-year extension—took place last spring in as perfunctory a setting as the issue ever has known.

Committees in both the Senate and the House reported the measure unanimously. It sailed through the House, 387 to 3, and passed the Senate by voice vote after 10 minutes of debate.

President Kennedy signed the bill into law on March 29, thus leaving UMT—as the Universal Military Training and Service Act is more generally known—hovering over the lives of young Americans until at least July 1, 1967.

UMT is a misnomer. Strictly speaking, there is almost nothing universal about the draft except the requirement that all men register with the Selective Service when they become 18.

In fact, UMT is becoming steadily less universal as the Nation's military manpower need remains constant at about 2.7 million, while the pool of draft-age men grows by a third every 6 to 7 years. Such growth demands special manipulation of manpower pools by conscription authorities if a semblance of fairness is to be maintained.

Currently, the draft-liable age runs from 18½ to 26 and the liability is for 2 years of service. Men 26 and older are considered too old for economical training under today's tightened cold war service requirements, though by law the maximum drafting age can go to 35 in an emergency.

Most of today's draftees are between 22 and 23. This age level is the result of a selection system that spurs high school graduates to enlist, pulls eligibles from the top of the below-26 list, gives liberal deferments to students in higher education and permits still more liberal and lasting deferments among married men and men in certain critical, or defense-oriented occupations.

UMT, defense authorities readily admit, is not so much a program for conscripting men as it is a program for spurring men to enlist because they feel they will probably be drafted anyway. Enlistees become qualified for the better—but longer—assignments. Several Defense Department surveys disclose that about 4 of every 10 volunteers enlist with a fear of the draft in their minds.

An example of the spur effect of the draft can be found in the turnover rate among the 2.7 million men in uniform.

Currently, about 550,000 men a year leave the armed service, 80 to 85 percent of them volunteers. The remaining 15 to 20 percent—or from about 90,000 to 100,000 men—are draftees for the Army, the only service unable to fill its needs with enlistees.

But whatever the ratio of draftees to enlistees, the key question about the longrun effectiveness of UMT is:

How many of today's young men eventually shoulder weapons?

About 6 out of 10.

Studies indicate that of the 1,110,000 men who became 26 in 1962 about 58 percent—or a total of 640,000—already had served in the military or were then in uniform. Of the remaining 42 percent, a total of some 300,000, or 27 percent, were rejectees; 11 percent, or 130,000, were fathers and thus far down the callup list, and most of the remaining 4 percent, about 40,000, held deferments.

How many simply escape the draft by holding onto the more temporary deferments until reaching 26?

Selective Service figures indicate that the number is relatively small, though growing.

For example, by mid-1962 there were about 2.2 million men between 18½ and 35 who were subject to immediate callup, but only 123,000 were past the cutoff age of 26 and thus unlikely to be drafted. Still, there are indications that this particular above-26 group is beginning to increase by about 15,000 men each year.

Careful study of the foregoing draft figures will disclose that America's military manpower pool is subject to three pressure points that not only control the pool's size but also give UMT what many consider a pragmatic sort of fairness. These points are:

1. The draft, and the threat of the draft.
2. Deferments, which are controlled by the Selective Service.
3. Military qualifications, which are administered by the Department of Defense.

This, then, is the general makeup of the draft as it stands today after more than two decades of continuous use, most of it in a cold peace.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 13, 1964]

MAY LEAD TO LIBERALIZED DEFERMENTS—MANPOWER EXCESS SEEN CAUSING STRESS IN NATION'S DRAFT SYSTEM

(By B. D. Ayres, Jr.)

(Second in a series)

In its 23d year of almost continuous use in the United States, the draft appears to have been accepted by most Americans as an unpleasant necessity.

Only a few persons seriously question its need, fewer still its methods. It comes to national attention but once every 4 years when, as the Universal Military Training and Service Act, it is extended. These extensions are usually granted amid little controversy.

Such extensions cannot interminably remain so run-of-mill or so perfunctory. There are forces at work that could inject new life into future UMT hearings should the present number of Americans in uniform remain steady, as is expected.

Among these forces are UMT critics, rising service standards that are causing more rejections and rising service benefits that are creating more enlistments.

DRAFT POOL GROWS

Perhaps the most important force of all, however, is the continuing growth of the Nation's pool of draft-age men.

Between now and 1970, the number of 18-year-olds entering this pool each year will average about 1.7 million, or about 36 percent more than the average number that turned eligible for the 1957-64 period. During the 1964-70 period, the U.S. military manpower level is expected to hover around its current peak of 2.7 million men—if no emergencies occur.

If all qualified men are drafted, the service manpower limit will be exceeded. If some are bypassed any pretense of universality in the law will become a mockery.

This is what is likely to happen, if a look at past experience has any value:

Before the men reach the state of being draft eligible the slack will be taken up through a further liberalization of deferments.

This, in effect, is what happened last fall when President Kennedy exempted married men.

Before the exemption order, about 3 of every 10 draftees were married. By exempting those three, the pool of men being called was cut to a point where demand and supply were again closely alined.

As long as conscriptions, enlistments, deferments, and rejections can be carefully balanced to control the manpower pool so that there is at least general "universality" in the draft, UMT critics are likely to remain a minority. But if the number of men entering the draft pool becomes so great that the deferment system cannot reasonably be stretched to handle the load, draft escapees will become numerous and UMT could become a hot issue.

That point is not likely to be reached within the next few years, however fast the draftee pool grows or however constant the service-manpower level remains.

STILL FLEXIBLE

A key facet of the Selective Service System is its flexibility. Even after 23 years there is considerable flexibility in the deferment field. Besides, there is always the Department of Defense alternative of raising mental and medical standards to realine the manpower pool.

The percentage of men serving is steadily falling. In 1959, for example, 7 of every 10 men 26 years old or more had served or were then serving. Today, that ratio has fallen to 6 of 10, and is still falling.

It can be seen that any attack on UMT must finally center on these questions:

Is the draft really necessary, since more men are available than are needed?

If the draft is necessary, is its system of deferments fair?

Proponents of conscription say that its most profitable use today is as a "spur" for enlistments. Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, said during hearings last spring that led to the draft's most recent extension:

"In the absence of the induction authority, all services would experience serious difficulties in maintaining their numerical strengths and would experience intensified shortages of high-quality personnel in their technical and combat leadership skills."

Other defense authorities have since said that U.S. military manpower would have to be cut by one-third if service branches were filled only with volunteers. Even though the number of enlistees continues to increase slightly each year, studies show that 4 of every 10 enlistees sign up with fear of being drafted in their minds.

Military men hold no doubts that the draft has been a prime factor in creating the all-volunteer ranks of the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Only the Army has been unable to muster enough appeal to become all volunteer, though about 80 percent of its men are enlistees.

The draft also has been cited as a spur for enlistments in the Reserve Officers Training Corps and for enlistments in other college military programs leading to commissions in branches needing scientific, technological and health specialists. There is evidence that many noncollege men enlist to receive the special technical training—so useful later in civilian life—that is not offered draftees.

Reserve and National Guard authorities say the draft spurs thousands of men into their ranks. But perhaps the most telling point proponents of the draft can summon is this:

Only once in the past 23 years has the draft act been permitted to expire. That was on March 31, 1947, when the strength of the Armed Forces was about 3 million.

By early 1948, without conscription, the number of men in uniform had fallen to 1.4 million and the condition was considered critical. Congress, forced to move quickly, passed a new draft law on June 24 of that year. The immediate callup of 250,000 men was authorized.

But it was necessary to call only 35,000. The day the first calls went out, enlistments leaped.

Drafting was not again necessary until the Korean war.

DRAFT OPPOSED

Such arguments, of course, have little effect on opponents of conscription.

Their goal remains 100-percent volunteer service branches and their reasoning is that if pay scales and fringe benefits were increased sufficiently, more than enough career servicemen could be obtained.

With this line of thinking goes a demand that civilians be hired to take over certain "housekeeping," or rear rank, tasks currently handled primarily by servicemen. Only 20 percent of the men in uniform see action in time of war, draft opponents say.

The entire system of conscription is seen by its adversaries as a waste of time, money, and effort. Draftees, it is said, are forced into uniform against their will and thus assume poor attitudes; they are trained for 2 years at great cost; then, just as they become useful at tasks that more and more demand highly trained, long-term specialists, they are released.

DEFERMENTS ATTACKED

Opponents of conscription also have a number of complaints on deferments.

They view the entire system as discriminatory. For proof, they point to the rich boy who escapes military service by remaining in school past the callup age of 26 and to the electronics expert who escapes by remaining hunched over his slide rule in critical work.

Instances are recalled in which lives and jobs were interrupted—unnecessarily it is said—by draft notices. Instances are cited in which men could not get jobs because the draft obligation remained. Employers shy away from hiring men with unfulfilled military obligations, draft opponents argue.

Other instances are cited in which young men were left uncertain of their draft status for long periods by local selective service boards.

And, of late, opponents of conscription have been pointing to the thousands of married men who are escaping the draft. To many, this is the least defensible deferment of all.

In what way does the deferred married man serve his country, it is asked?

One answer can be found in the opening paragraphs of the Universal Military Training Act. These read, in part:

"In a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"Adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

It can be seen from these few words why the Selective Service system is considered flexible. The defense of the married man's deferment lies in the phrase consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy. The electronics expert may be defended by the phrase "the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific and other critical manpower resources."

To proponents of conscription, service to country in the cold war has very broad meaning. Recently, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, told a Senate committee investigating manpower use:

"There is a great need for more understanding as to what constitutes service in this age * * *. The most that we can mean when we talk of equity (in the draft) is that those the Nation can use most effectively, the ones selected, have been taken by rules made in the interest of no particular individual."

General Hershey, who does not foresee a day in the near future when America will be without conscription, often has pointed out that the draft does more than just determine who will serve in uniform and who in some other capacity. The General says the draft "channels" men into the "critical" fields, where there are not only deferments but also job openings that must be filled if the United States is to remain safe for freedom.

Finally, in any far-reaching discussion of UMT the very philosophy of conscription must be considered.

To its opponents, the draft is a negative view toward peace and disarmament and—until 1940—a way of life traditionally alien to an America at peace.

To its proponents, the draft is a measure designed to meet a need. It is a necessity of the cold war and a declaration to both friend and foe of America's determination to remain free by remaining strong.

It seems that few of the arguments about manpower pools, deferments or the philosophy of conscription are likely to lose or gain emphasis in the next few years, so long as the cold war continues at its present intensity.

That being the case, letters beginning "Greetings * * *" will continue to summon young Americans to arms.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 14, 1964]

REJECTEES COUNSELED IN DRIVE TO CUT UNEMPLOYMENT—ONE OF EVERY THREE YOUTHS REGISTERING FOR DRAFT IS UNFIT

(By B. D. Ayres, Jr.)

(Last of a series)

If every American male who turns 18 today were examined this afternoon for induction into the Armed Forces, 1 of every 3 would be rejected—about half for medical reasons and the remainder for psychological or educational shortcomings.

In Washington, Virginia, and Maryland, the rejections probably would run slightly more than one in three, on the basis of past rates. And in certain sections of the South, the rate might approach two in five.

These are disturbing figures. They say, in effect, that at the threshold of adulthood one of every six youths in this country is likely to be suffering from some physical ailment, and another one of every six is mentally deficient or badly educated.

LINKED TO UNEMPLOYMENT

These are not new figures, however. They have been widely discussed among certain circles in the Military Establishment and among labor conservation men for several years. Yet it was not until early this month that they were brought to national attention by a special 90-page report linking them to the ever-present unemployment problems plaguing America.

After studying the report, President Johnson ordered a counseling program set up for the voluntary rehabilitation of all men who fail the tests for entering the Armed Services. He also ordered that the testing—though not the induction—take place near the selective service registration age of 18 rather than the current draft age of about 22.

Some side benefits are expected from the program.

Armed Forces recruiters predict increased enlistments by men who learn at 18 that they are fit for service. And the program is seen by recruiters as a worksaver, since men who have learned at 18 that they cannot pass service tests, will not take up enlistment officers' time.

Selective service officials say the program also will make their work easier. Not only will they know exactly where to go to get fit men in an emergency, but as the program takes effect the pool of fit men is expected to grow faster than it has been.

This task-force report is likely to prove a handy weapon in the hands of those seeking more Federal aid to fight poverty, for a main point of the work is that poverty and rejectees too often go hand in hand.

It was President Kennedy who first moved decisively to solve the problem created by rejectees. Last September 30, he set up the task force after learning that the induction tests do not measure intelligence and general health as much as they measure trainability and fitness.

He concluded that a man who cannot qualify to become a soldier, sailor, or airman probably cannot hold, or will have difficulty holding, a job. Thus, in the order setting up the study group, he noted:

"Today's military rejects include tomorrow's hard-core unemployed."

The rate of rejections does not affect service manpower. A growing pool of draft-age men—1.4 million will turn 18 this year—provides more than enough manpower for the annual turnover of about 550,000 active servicemen, plus about 100,000 reservists and National Guardsmen.

But whether or not rejectees provide a problem for the Defense Department, the outlook is for even more to be rejected in the coming half decade if no steps are taken. For example, by 1969 the number of men turning 18 each year will have risen to 1.7 million, compared to the 1.4 million of the current year.

NOT A PRETTY PICTURE

The portrait of rejectees painted by the task force is not pretty. Included in it are the questionnaires of 2,500 men who failed to meet the qualifications of the armed services.

Rejectees, the study shows, come from every section of the United States. But those rejected for medical reasons are spread considerably more evenly geographically than those rejected for mental reasons.

Most of the States with higher rates of mental failure are in the Southeastern United States, whereas those with the lower rates tend to be in the Far West, the Great Plains, and the Rockies.

The Defense Department has not yet compiled exact figures for the overall rates of rejection of both draftees and enlistees. However, rates are available for draftees only and it is felt that the general pattern of rejections among them also holds true among enlistees, though to a lesser degree.

The differential between the two groups is laid to "self-selection." That is, men who are reasonably certain they cannot qualify for the draft do not attempt to volunteer. Thus, these men never show up in the enlistee rejection figures. But once they are called for the draft and are summarily rejected, they show up in draftee rejection figures.

It was with this differential in mind that the task force estimated the overall rejectee rate for the Nation to be about one in three. On the other hand, the rejection rate for

draftees is running predictably higher, at about one of every two.

The task force made this observation about the regional variations of the rejectee rates:

"In part, these variations appear to be correlated with such social and economic factors as per capita educational investment, per capita income, and the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the populations of the various States."

What are some other factors? Perhaps the most important is family background. In the case of the average rejectee this usually means a background of poverty.

Rejectees often come from abnormally large families, families broken by divorce or separation, and families getting public assistance. The heads of these families often are poorly educated, and many are unemployed or earn wages at jobs requiring little skill.

Such a family life offers little, if any, stability. Young men see themselves caught in a vicious circle, with nowhere to look for guidance.

Thus, 1 of every 10 rejectees has a police record and 4 of 5 are school dropouts. Many never enter high school though most young men their age have completed 12 grades.

Because of scanty education, rejectees find it difficult to find work. About a third are unemployed—a rate four times that found among others in the 20-to-24 age group.

EARN $56 A WEEK

When rejectees do find work, 3 of 4 must labor at the lesser paying jobs requiring lesser skills, and in fields and industries subject to unemployment. The average rejectee who works makes about $56 a week—nonwhite rejectees make about a third less—and among all rejectees the average yearly income is about $1,850.

By contrast, 1 of every 2 Americans in the 20-to-24 age group works at tasks requiring the higher skills and earns an average yearly wage of about $2,656.

In view of these background figures, the task force authors noted that "it would be a conservative judgment that the rate of poverty among the rejectees is at least twice the national incidence."

Then the authors concluded:

"A major proportion of these young men are the products of poverty. They have inherited their situations from their parents and unless the cycle is broken, they will almost surely transmit it to their children."

Though no exact racial breakdown on rejectees is available there are indications that at least half are nonwhites. The 2,500 men studied by the task force were from the 3,000 most recently rejected in certain sample areas and the breakdown was 1,164 whites and 1,336 nonwhites.

Two findings in the survey led the task force to urge President Johnson to take action. They were:

Three of every four medical rejectees have ailments that can be treated, with about 1 in 10 having fully curable ailments.

Four of five mental rejectees are willing to take special education or job-training courses, even if it means leaving home areas for the schooling.

Current estimates are that slightly less than a third of the rejectees offered counseling and aid in the coming year will accept. It is likely that a more-than-proportionate number of those accepting will be nonwhites, for the task force found evidence that this group appears more anxious to better its lot than the white rejectees—to the extent that nonwhite rejectees usually remain in school a year longer than do most white rejectees.

It should be noted again, in conclusion, that rejection rates reflect more than the mere mental and physical health of the Nation's youth. They also reflect the demands and requirements of today's Defense Establishment—in which there are now more electronic specialists than infantrymen.

Thus, while the overall rejection rate is climbing to the point where two in five will fail, it should be remembered that a considerable drop would occur were an emergency to arise that called for large numbers of recruits.

Broadcasting Industry Polices Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the broadcasting industry for the action it has taken to place restrictions on the depiction of cigarette smoking.

The Television Board of the National Association of Broadcasters recently approved two recommendations from its Television Code Review Board which are a credit to the industry.

First, it is stated with respect to TV programs that "care should be exercised so that cigarette smoking will not be depicted in a manner to impress the youth of our country as a desirable habit and worthy of imitation."

With respect to commercial announcements, the code will have a new provision stating that "the advertising of cigarettes should not be presented in a manner to convey the impression that cigarette smoking promotes health or is important to personal development of the youth of our country."

In addition, the director of the code authority, Howard H. Bell, reported that these actions do not represent the end of the TV industry's review and study of the matter. Both the radio and the television code review boards have appointed special committees to determine what future steps should be taken in the light of further information and developments.

In the meantime, the Radio Code Board urges code subscribers and all licensees to scrutinize carefully all cigarette advertising copy to determine whether or not its broadcast is in the public interest.

This positive action is a fine example of the sense of public responsibility and self-regulation exercised by broadcasters through their radio and television codes.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I am most pleased with this action of the industry.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I have had a considerable interest in the radio and television media and have introduced legislation to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from deintermixing and taking VHF from certain areas of the country. As a result legislation was enacted to require all-channel tuners on sets manufactured after May of this year, thus enabling viewers to receive both VHF and UHF.

I also introduced legislation to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from carrying out its proposal to limit the time and frequency of commercials. As a result of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, of which my distinguished colleague from Texas, WALTER ROGERS, is chairman, the Commission withdrew its proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the action taken by the industry in this case certainly very clearly points out the desire of the media to police itself in order that the highest standards of broadcasting can be maintained without undue and unnecessary interference by agencies of the Government.

I wish to congratulate the industry for the affirmative action it has taken in the public interest and I am hopeful that the Federal Communications Commission will take proper note of the efforts the industry is taking on its own initiative.

The Brooklyn Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in our generation the most famous bridge in the world has always been the Brooklyn Bridge. Its architectural beauty, sound construction and immense size have astounded all world visitors to New York City since its construction in 1883.

The Brooklyn Bridge is so well known that the U.S. Department of Interior has designated it as a national historic landmark. To citizens of Brooklyn and points west, it has been an unofficial landmark for 80 years.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger, Newark, N.J., February 3, 1964, saluting the Brooklyn Bridge.

A BELATED HONOR

A charming link to the gracious years of the early 1900's which spanned a delightful period in the United States, is the old saw about the con man peddling the Brooklyn Bridge to a country cousin.

If legend is believed, that span has been sold innumerable times and the buyer invariably was a rustic character. That's the legend, anyway.

But now the legend is in danger of being dispelled * * * irrevocably.

The Brooklyn Bridge has come on new fame and glory. It has been designated by the U.S. Department of Interior as a national historic landmark, fully registered.

The designation was announced by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who issued similar landmark honors for the Sandy Hook Lighthouse and the Villa Fontana in Morristown.

As for the Brooklyn Bridge, it was designed in 1867 and opened in 1883. Its other distinction, besides being the most peddled bridge in the world, is that Steve Brodie leaped from it and lived.

It's surprising, in fact, that someone hadn't thought of designating the fabled bridge as a national landmark long before this. This has to be an oversight of national consequence.

The Panama Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following resolution by the National Security Commission, American Legion, which met at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Tex., February 1, and of which I approve:

Whereas, the agreement by and between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama in 1903 resulted in the outright purchase of the Canal Zone for $10 million together with a guaranteed annuity of $250,000 which was not to be construed as a rental fee; but was a guarantee of revenue permanently to keep the Republic of Panama alive and the contract further gave to the United States full and complete ownership and sovereignty, by grant in perpetuity, making the control of the Canal Zone United States Territory forever; and

Whereas the Treaty of 1903 further gave to the United States the right to acquire any property in Panama that might be needed for operation, sanitation, or defense of the Canal Zone; and

Whereas in 1936 the United States increased our annuity to the Republic of Panama from $250,000 to $430,000, and in 1955 voluntarily increased the annuity to $1,930,000 in addition to the $52 million per annum payroll which is spent in Panama to the direct benefit of the Panamanians—all of which does not include the $121 million in direct foreign aid since 1946 to the Republic of Panama; and

Whereas under these circumstances the Republic of Panama, without an investment of any kind, and with no responsibility for operating, maintaining or with the defense of the Canal Zone gets the major portion of the net profits from the operation of the canal which is estimated at $87 million per year in gross revenue; and

Whereas the Government and the people of the United States over the years have understood and respected the Republic of Panama and its people now find ourselves dismayed at the action by citizens of the Republic of Panama undertaking to perform the Castro inspired Communist agitation, and we observe with increasing concern the deteriorating situation involving the Canal Zone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Security Commission of the American Legion, Department of Texas, takes the firm position that the treaty with the Republic of Panama in giving the United States exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity is not negotiable and further that multiple national conventions of the American Legion have expressed their firm beliefs that any dilution of the provisions of the existing treaties which would limit in any degree the sovereign control of the Canal Zone by the United States would seriously endanger the vital interests of our Nation; and further,

Resolved, That regardless of what position might be taken by the Republic of Panama and whatever agitation may be engendered as a result of that position through the subversive activities of the Communists of Central America convinces us that the position of this country in the Canal Zone must be maintained at all costs and through the employment of whatever means may be necessary.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS.

Spending Can Be Controlled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Hanover (Pa.) Evening Sun.

The Evening Sun serves many of my constituents in the northern portion of Maryland's Second Congressional District. The Sun's editorial, entitled "Spending Can Be Controlled," reflects the satisfaction of citizens of my district with the strong approach of President Johnson toward Federal spending. I am delighted to include it in the RECORD:

SPENDING CAN BE CONTROLLED

President Johnson's bold strikes with a new financial broom have reassured money capitals here and abroad. New York, London, Paris, and Rome are equally impressed with this Chief Executive who says spending can be controlled and takes steps to prove it.

There now is a brighter prospect for correcting the imbalance of payments depleting U.S. gold reserves. There is a brighter prospect for stopping a lengthening era of deficit financing, a brighter prospect for stabilizing the purchasing power of American dollars. Investments will pick up. Values will be saved.

Though it remains to be seen whether the new President can keep his promises to shrink Federal employment, cut back military spending, and get more value out of taxpayers' dollars, he has made the promises—and that, itself, is a radical departure from recent custom.

Further reassurance is gained from the fact he has laid hands on the Department of Defense, the only place in the Federal Government where large sums can be saved.

Still further reassurance is gained by the cooperation of Secretary of Defense McNamara, who has had the courage to point out places where money can be saved without impairing national defense.

The United States can afford to spend public funds at a prodigal rate and plunge ever deeper into debt, apologists for spenders always point out. They say the country is living well within its means and its indebtedness is not unwieldy. Therefore, no one should be worried.

But the reason for worry never has been the country's ability to pay its way in present circumstances. It has been its apparent inability to control its spending. The United States has been like a potential alcoholic who refuses to think of future danger and keeps on drinking.

Unless it could show determination to avert disaster by pulling up short, it was rushing headlong to meet disaster halfway.

President Johnson has evinced a strong intention to stop the headlong rush.

Unfortunately, he has offset this plus-effect with the minus-effect of promises that would cost more than could be saved. But he has declared that U.S. spending can be controlled, and for that he has earned praises wherever people had been made uneasy by doubts that spending could be checked short of disaster.

The Sun Has Burst Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the subject of mental retardation has properly been brought into sharp focus in recent years, and our Nation's resources are now mobilized in efforts to help those so afflicted and prevent those yet unborn from ever so being.

One who has contributed in great measure to the awareness of our Nation and to the efforts to assist the mentally retarded is the very lovely and gracious lady, a sister of our great and beloved late President, the wife of a man long distinguished for his own humanitarian works, Mrs. Sargent Shriver.

Mrs. Shriver has written an inspiring article on the subject which appeared in yesterday's supplement to many newspapers across the Nation, Parade magazine. And I commend her writing to all my colleagues and to all who read this RECORD.

Brighter days are indeed ahead for the retarded, but they still need our understanding.

The article referred to follows:

(This Wednesday, the Nation's attention will be focused on progress in the fight against mental retardation. At a banquet in New York City, attended by President Johnson, the Joseph P. Kennedy International Awards in Mental Retardation will be presented to those who have contributed most in scientific achievement, service and leadership in this field in 1963. Among those honored will be Representative JOHN FOGARTY and Senator LISTER HILL, who helped guide to passage a Federal bill to provide $229 million for research and facilities in retardation and mental illness, signed by President Kennedy just before his death. The need to aid the handicapped is still acute. The following article, by the late President's sister, points up that need.)

You may not be a member of the one in three families experiencing the tragedy of mental retardation. But if you are a parent or expect to become one, if you love children, the subject should concern you. Please take 15 minutes to read this article. It may save you many years of anguish.

I know. My sister, Rosemary, is retarded. But I cannot help her with pity—or serve with sorrow the 5½ million others like her.

Only by facing the facts and resolving to meet the challenge head-on can something be done. Only if we broaden our understanding can we help the mentally retarded to escape into the sunlight of useful living. Even more important, we can prevent millions yet unborn from ever becoming mentally retarded.

First, I want to shatter the notion that the birth of a retarded child implies some kind of social stigma, something to be hidden and ashamed of. Retarded children are born to the healthiest and the wealthiest,

to the brilliant as well as the meek. They have been born to actors, generals, tycoons, statesmen and Nobel Prize winners.

TWO HUNDRED DIFFERENT CAUSES

Second, we need to understand mental retardation for what it really is. It is an affliction, not some witch's curse. It can be traced to over 200 different causes. More people are affected by mental retardation than by blindness, paralytic polio, cerebral palsy and rheumatic heart disease combined. That it takes such an appalling toll can be blamed largely on the stupid and persistent supersititions that have long surrounded the subject.

Even today, many retarded are shut away, child and adult, in squalid institutions to waste their lives, staring blankly at the emptiness around them. In my work with the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation, fighting mental retardation by seeking its causes through research, I have seen sights that will haunt me all my life. If I had not seen them myself, I would never have believed that such conditions could exist in modern America, within sight of skyscrapers, suburbia, and freeways glittering with cars. I recall institutions in wealthy States where adults and children existed in crowded, bleak, foul-smelling, barracklike wards, their unwashed clothes and blankets in rags.

If I paint the picture in its darkest hues, it is not to depress you or to arouse your interest through an alarm which will fade in a few days. Rather, it is to plead that most of these broken lives can be mended, if only partially, and with your help.

Third, I want to sound a note of hope. Twenty years ago, when my family was struggling to help Rosemary, we found little but cynical despair. Even 10 years ago not a single university was focusing on mental retardation. Scientists cared little about it, doctors regarded it as hopeless, the public confused it with mental illness. But now the sun has burst through the dismal shroud that for years has shut out the retarded from the rest of humanity. The bright and the talented are now working in the field. Medical, psychological, and educational advances have given cause for hope based on reality. Such brain-searing diseases as jaundice, phenylketonuria (PKU), meninigitis, measles, and maple syrup disease need no longer condemn children to lifelong care in institutions.

PKU, for example, can fortunately be detected by means of a very simple test soon after a baby is born. A change in diet is prescribed, and lifelong retardation is prevented.

Such complete cures are exceptional at the present time, but with the help of special education and the right treatment, a dramatic 75 to 85 percent of the retarded can become useful citizens. Another 10 to 20 percent can learn to do little jobs which can give enormous satisfaction and pride to their being.

A SALVAGED LIFE

I know this is true. I have seen it. I will never forget the retarded child from the slums, unwanted by his parents and locked out of his home, who collected stray animals and slept with them in a deserted cellar. A wise social worker decided that the boy should have a job working with animals. Today he works in the local animal shelter, accepted and needed for the first time in his life, and is earning $55 a week.

A few months ago, I received a transitor radio put together by a 17-year-old retarded boy. Others like him can be trained to operate the cash registers in supermarkets, to operate deposit and withdrawal tabulators in banks. Retarded people often show skill and steadiness in routine work such as that required in the shoe industry, hatmaking, even electronics. Instead of becoming bored on a production line, they take delight in showing that they, too, can be useful.

Residential schools are also being developed. Recently I visited one, the Southbury Training Center near Waterbury, Conn. There, some 2,000 adults and children live in picturesque cottages on Southbury's 1,540 acres, where they work and play much as they would in the outside world. They run a farm, bakery, cafeteria, shoe repair shop, clothing store, beauty and barber shops. Southbury has a "Main Street" atmosphere. A team of first-rate doctors and pyschologists seek to prepare the pupils for a return to normal life.

How can you keep mental retardation from striking your family? If it should occur, how can you cope with it? Here is advice to parents from Eunice Kennedy Shriver, based on the accumulated knowledge of experts.

Go to your doctor or clinic as soon as you suspect you are pregnant, insist upon thorough examinations during your pregnancy.

Make sure a doctor knows you are pregnant before he prescribes any medicine, and don't take a drug that he hasn't prescribed.

Let your doctor or dentist know you're pregnant before you receive X-rays.

After your baby is born, if you think he is not developing normally, consult a physician, child psychologist, or child welfare agency. (Danger signs: Failure to sit up by 9 months, talk by 24 months, use the toilet by 36 months.)

Should you have a mentally handicapped child, don't ignore the condition. Don't excuse him as "going through a stage," scold him for being lazy or underestimate his potential.

Have your physician or public health nurse arrange for the child to be properly evaluated, medically and educationally.

Encourage him to take part in everyday activities. Provide success experiences for him. Set up realistic goals he can reach.

Help the child to help himself (button his shirts, zip his pants, tie shoes, brush teeth, set the table, etc.).

Reward small success; tolerate persistent error or loss of ability to repeat a previous accomplishment.

Don't isolate him from other children. Be proud of him as a member of the family. Give him love, love, love.

Supervised work training groups for the retarded, called shelter workshops, are achieving minor miracles in therapy and showing excellent profits. One group raised their earnings from $70,000 to $2.5 million in 4 years—proof that supposed tax burdens can become tax bearers.

A study following up 163 mentally retarded with special educational training found 67 percent employed. Twelve owned their own homes.

All these advances are taking place around us. And we can also now strike at the causes of retardation. For example, it is becoming increasingly clear that the origin of retardation often lies in pregnancy. Thus prenatal care for mothers—their examination, their diet—assumes vast importance. We could cut down significantly the number of retarded babies caused by prematurity if we would apply the knowledge already available to prevent prematurity.

Still the big battle is against deep-rooted prejudice. I ask you with all my heart to believe me when I tell you it simply is not true that the mentally retarded cannot learn, cannot be sociable, cannot be of help to society. They have feelings and emotions, hopes and affections, personal dreams and sufferings. The retarded should not be shunned and ridiculed, treated as outcasts. They should and must be helped. We of the bright, real world must reach out our hands into the shadows, not with trembling emotion but with sure-footed, levelheaded assistance.

Whether you have a retarded child or not, you can help in your own community, through medical prevention, education, job training and recreation programs—and in a hundred other ways.

If you are the mother of a retarded child, you can find a world of comfort and solace in two new inspiring books. They were written by dedicated women who have given their lives to the cause of he retarded: "The Challenge of the Retarded Child," by Sister Mary Theodore, O.S.F. (Bruce Publishing Co., 1963), and "When a Child Is Different," by Dr. Maria Egg (John Day Co., 1963).

WE MUST SHIELD THEM

And Dr. Egg perhaps sums up best the plight of the retarded and their need for help:

"The blind had their Helen Keller. They had many other famous people in their ranks. The deaf had Beethoven and other outstanding personalities. Among the feebleminded, there is none who, through his achievements, could demonstrate to the public his value and the value of those afflicted like him. It is up to us, then, to uphold the value of these human beings. It is up to us to help extend respect for human dignity to those creatures also. It is up to us who live with them and who love them. For we know what they need and we know what they can give us.

"There is not one among the feebleminded whose worth is revealed to mankind like a tall, burning flame, licking to high heaven, like those great personalities who overcome their handicaps. Despite all our efforts, the feebleminded will always remain little flames. These little flames we must shield with our hands—for these little flames radiate warmth and quiet joy; they shine on the road that leads to the wisdom of the heart, to human maturity, and to true wealth."

This World We Live In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have all watched with some dismay the development of the determination of General de Gaulle to commit his nation to the recognition of Red China.

The reactions to this have been many and varied, but one very common viewpoint has been well expressed in an editorial appearing on Wednesday, January 29, 1964, in the Morning Call of Allentown, Pa., a leading newspaper in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire leave to include the aforesaid editorial, which is as follows:

DE GAULLE GETS THE WORD

General de Gaulle, who quite obviously covets a place in history as a peculiar kind of diplomatic strategist who can hop fences without picking up painful splinters, apparently is due for some major surprises.

In dealings leading to the resumption of diplomatic relations with Red China, the conniving French President committed the indefensible blunder of believing a Communist. If he had any idea that Mao Tse-tung was any different than Khrushchev or his predecessors in the Kremlin, he already has had his first rude awakening.

While the negotiations were underway, it might have been politic for the Red Chinese to let the French President noise it around that they were amenable toward some sort of two-China arrangement. If he fell for it, Peiping lost no time in telling him and the rest of the world what a sucker he was.

Meanwhile, of course, whatever friendship he had left with America hasn't been strengthened. This, too, is precisely the way the Reds in Moscow and Peiping like it.

New Narcotics Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse recently submitted a report of its nearly 2 years of study of this problem. I have long considered the illegal traffic in narcotics and drug abuse to be a master of national concern. I was the cosponsor of a joint resolution in 1961 urging a Presidential commission be appointed to study the problem. I believe the Commission report worthy of full study and I hope that many of its recommendations will be implemented.

The Commission report is the subject of an editorial which appeared in the Newark, N.J., Evening News on January 27. The opinions therein expressed are worthy of consideration and I include them in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

NEW NARCOTICS PLAN

A major overhaul of Federal narcotics laws, new controls over tranquilizers, barbiturates, and pep pills, and absorption by the Department of Justice of the Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics, is recommended by a Presidential advisory commission.

The psychotic and antisocial, and sometimes fatal, effects of tranquilizers and other dangerous drugs has been established. There can be no doubt that the "alarming increase" in their misuse warrants action.

Also meriting careful congressional consideration is the Commission's recommendation that Federal courts be given discretion in imposing sentences for narcotics offenses. It would permit addicts and smalltime peddlers to be treated differently from the hardened criminals, themselves seldom addicted, who reap vast and shameful profits from the drug traffic.

The Commission would continue mandatory prison sentences without parole for "big-time racketeers," but for their victims it would stress rehabilitation rather than punishment.

The Commission takes a firm stand against adoption of the British system, under which physicians are permitted to "maintain" addicts permanently by administering legally acquired, low-priced drugs. This system, designed to take the profit out of the illicit drug traffic, has nevertheless been declared "medically unsound" by study groups of the American Medical Association and the National Research Council. The Commission agrees.

But to facilitate rehabilitation, it proposes that Federal regulations be amended to make it clear that the medical profession should determine what constitutes "legitimate medical use" of drugs, including withdrawal treatment for addicts.

The Commission's recommendations concerning the Bureau have little chance of adoption. Its argument that investigations of the illicit traffic in drugs belongs in the department charged with law enforcement, rather than in one concerned with fiscal matters, is logical. But logic is not always a controlling influence in Congress. The Bureau has been under frequent attack by physicians and the courts, but earlier recommendations that it be reorganized and reassigned have met overwhelming opposition in Congress.

The question of who should be responsible for combating the drug traffic should not, however, obscure other parts of the Commission's program. Most of it should command the support of all who are concerned with the narcotics problem and the grave threat it presents to the Nation's youth.

Mrs. Eunice Shriver, Sister of Late Beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Writes About Brighter Days Ahead for Mentally Retarded on Eve of Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation International Awards in Mental Retardation will be presented in New York City to those who have contributed most in scientific achievement, service and leadership in this field in 1963, including two Members of Congress, Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. President Lyndon Johnson will attend the event. Yesterday, Parade magazine, the Sunday newspaper supplement, printed a story about the mentally retarded by Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver, sister of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, entitled "The Sun Has Burst Through." Under unanimous consent I place this article with my remarks in the Appendix:

THE SUN HAS BURST THROUGH—BRIGHTER DAYS ARE AHEAD FOR THE RETARDED—BUT THEY STILL NEED YOUR UNDERSTANDING

(By Mrs. Sargent Shriver)

This Wednesday, the Nation's attention will be focused on progress in the fight against mental retardation. At a banquet in New York City, attended by President Johnson, the Joseph P. Kennedy International Awards in Mental Retardation will be presented to those who have contributed most in scientific achievement, service, and leadership in this field in 1963. Among those honored will be Representative JOHN FOGARTY and Senator LISTER HILL, who helped guide to passage a Federal bill to provide $229 million for research and facilities in retardation and mental illness, signed by President Kennedy just before his death. The need to aid the handicapped is still acute. The following article, by the late President's sister, points up that need.

You may not be a member of the one in three families experiencing the tragedy of mental retardation. But if you are a parent or expect to become one, if you love children, the subject should concern you. Please take 15 minutes to read this article. It may save you many years of anguish.

I know. My sister, Rosemary, is retarded. But I cannot help her with pity—or serve with sorrow the 5½ million others like her.

Only by facing the facts and resolving to meet the challenge head on can something be done. Only if we broaden our understanding can we help the mentally retarded to escape into the sunlight of useful living. Even more important, we can prevent millions yet unborn from ever becoming mentally retarded.

First, I want to shatter the notion that the birth of a retarded child implies some kind of social stigma, something to be hidden and ashamed of. Retarded children are born to the healthiest and the wealthiest, to the brilliant as well as the meek. They have been born to actors, generals, tycoons, statesmen and Nobel Prize winners.

TWO HUNDRED DIFFERENT CAUSES

Second, we need to understand mental retardation for what it really is. It is an affliction, not some witch's curse. It can be traced to over 200 different causes. More people are affected by mental retardation than by blindness, paralytic polio, cerebral palsy and rheumatic heart disease combined. That it takes such an appalling toll can be blamed largely on the stupid and persistent superstitions that have long surrounded the subject.

Even today, many retarded are shut away, child and adult, in squalid institutions to waste their lives, staring blankly at the emptiness around them. In my work with the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, fighting mental retardation by seeking its causes through research, I have seen sights that will haunt me all my life. If I had not seen them myself, I would never have believed that such conditions could exist in modern America, within sight of skyscrapers, suburbia and freeways glittering with cars. I recall institutions in wealthy States where adults and children existed in crowded, bleak, foul-smelling, barracklike wards, their unwashed clothes and blankets in rags.

If I paint the picture in its darkest hues, it is not to depress you or to arouse your interest through an alarm which will fade in a few days. Rather, it is to plead that most of these broken lives can be mended, if only partially, and with your help.

Third, I want to sound a note of hope. Twenty years ago, when my family was struggling to help Rosemary, we found little but cynical despair. Even 10 years ago not a single university was focusing on mental retardation. Scientists cared little about it, doctors regarded it as hopeless, the public confused it with mental illness. But now the sun has burst through the dismal shroud that for years has shut out the retarded from the rest of humanity. The bright and the talented are now working in the field. Medical, psychological, and educational advances have given cause for hope based on reality. Such brain-searing diseases as jaundice, phenylketonuria (PKU), meningitis, measles, and maple sirup disease need no longer condemn children to lifelong care in institutions.

PKU, for example, can fortunately be detected by means of a very simple test soon after a baby is born. A change in diet is prescribed, and lifelong retardation is prevented.

Such complete "cures" are exceptional at the present time, but with the help of special education and the right treatment, a dramatic 75 to 85 percent of the retarded can become useful citizens. Another 10 to 20 percent can learn to do little jobs which can give enormous satisfaction and pride to their being.

A SALVAGED LIFE

I know this is true. I have seen it. I will never forget the retarded child from the slums, unwanted by his parents and locked out of his home, who collected stray animals and slept with them in a deserted cellar. A wise social worker decided that the boy should have a job working with animals.

Today he works in the local animal shelter, accepted and needed for the first time in his life, and is earning $55 a week.

A few months ago, I received a transistor radio put together by a 17-year-old retarded boy. Others like him can be trained to operate the cash registers in supermarkets, to operate deposit and withdrawal tabulators in banks. Retarded people often show skill and steadiness in routine work such as that required in the shoe industry, hatmaking, even electronics. Instead of becoming bored on a production line, they take delight in showing that they, too, can be useful.

Residential schools are also being developed. Recently I visited one, the Southbury Training Center near Waterbury, Conn. There, some 2,000 adults and children live in picturesque cottages on Southbury's 1,540 acres, where they work and play much as they would in the outside world. They run a farm, bakery, cafeteria, shoe repair shop, clothing store, beauty and barber shops. Southbury has a "Main Street" atmosphere. A team of first-rate doctors and psychologists seeks to prepare the pupils for a return to normal life.

How can you keep mental retardation from striking your family? If it should occur, how can you cope with it? Here is advice to parents from Eunice Kennedy Shriver, based on the accumulated knowledge of experts.

Go to your doctor or clinic as soon as you suspect you are pregnant. Insist upon thorough examinations during your pregnancy.

Make sure a doctor knows you are pregnant before he prescribes any medicine, and don't take a drug that he hasn't prescribed.

Let your doctor or dentist know you're pregnant before you receive X-rays.

After your baby is born, if you think he is not developing normally, consult a physician, child psycholoigst, or child welfare agency. (Danger signs: failure to sit up by 9 months, talk by 24 months, use the toilet by 36 months.)

Should you have a mentally handicapped child, don't ignore the condition. Don't excuse him as "going through a stage," scold him for being lazy, or underestimate his potential.

Have your physician or public health nurse arrange for the child to be properly evaluated, medically and educationally.

Encourage him to take part in everyday activities. Provide success experiences for him. Set up realistic goals he can reach.

Help the child to help himself (button his shirts, zip his pants, tie shoes, bruth teeth, set the tables, etc.).

Reward small success; tolerate persistent error or loss of ability to repeat a previous accomplishment.

Don't isolate him from other children. Be proud of him as a member of the family. Give him love, love, love.

Supervised work training groups for the retarded, called shelter-workshops, are achieving minor miracles in therapy and showing excellent profits. One group raised their earnings from $70,000 to $2.5 million in 4 years—proof that supposed tax burdens can become tax bearers.

A study following up 163 mentally retarded with special educational training found 67 percent employed. Twelve owned their own homes.

All these advances are taking place around us. And we can also now strike at the causes of retardation. For example, it is becoming increasingly clear that the origin of retardation often lies in pregnancy. Thus prenatal care for mothers—their examination, their diet—assumes vast importance. We could cut down significantly the number of retarded babies caused by prematurity if we would apply the knowledge already available to prevent prematurity.

Still the big battle is against deep-rooted prejudice. I ask you with all my heart to believe me when I tell you it simply is not true that the mentally retarded cannot learn, cannot be sociable, cannot be of help to society. They have feelings and emotions, hopes and affections, personal dreams and sufferings. The retarded should not be shunned and ridiculed, treated as outcasts. They should and must be helped. We of the bright, real world must reach out our hands into the shadows, not with trembling emotion but with sure-footed, levelheaded assistance.

Whether you have a retarded child or not, you can help in your own community, through medical prevention, education, job training, and recreation programs—and in a hundred other ways.

If you are the mother of a retarded child, you can find a world of comfort and solace in two new inspiring books. They were written by dedicated women who have given their lives to the cause of the retarded: "The Challenge of the Retarded Child," by Sister Mary Theordore, O.S.F. (Bruce Publishing Co., 1963), and "When a Child Is Different," by Dr. Maria Egg (John Day Co., 1963).

WE MUST SHIELD THEM

And Dr. Egg perhaps sums up best the plight of the retarded and their need for help:

"The blind had their Helen Keller. They had many other famous people in their ranks. The deaf had Beethoven and other outstanding personalities. Among the feeble minded, there is none who, through his achievements, could demonstrate to the public his value and the value of those afflicted like him. It is up to us, then, to uphold the value of these human beings. It is up to us to help extend respect for human dignity to those creatures also. It is up to us who live with them and who love them. For we know what they need and we know what they can give us.

"There is not one among the feeble-minded whose work is revealed to mankind like a tall, burning flame, licking to high heaven, like those great personalities who overcome their handicaps. Despite all our efforts, the feeble minded will always remain little flames. These little flames we must shield with our hands—for these little flames radiate warmth and quiet joy; they shine on the road that leads to the wisdom of the heart, to human maturity, and to true wealth."

The Reverend Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the first gentlemen I met upon coming to Congress was the quiet, unassuming Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Since that day my respect and admiration for him has grown and I find daily inspiration in listening to the prayers he gives at the opening of each day's session.

Dr. Braskamp is a conscientious and devoted man of God, one who is respected by every Member of this body. He is warmhearted, understanding, and patient.

I am sure the words of praise from my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Mr. HOEVEN, the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders truly bespeak the thoughts of each Member of the House.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in saying to Dr. Braskamp, congratulations and best wishes. May your service in the House continue for many years to come.

Words of Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I recently was honored to act as a judge in a contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the topic of which was "The Challenge of American Citizenship." This contest was held at the Sacred Heart Academy in Hempstead, N.Y., and one of the winners was Regina Welborn. Although the purpose of this contest was to judge the best radio presentation, I felt that the words spoken here were of such significance that they should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The words were as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

(By Regina Wellborn, Sacred Heart Academy)

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in time of crises, shrink from the service of his country, but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of men and women."

The crucial winter of 1776–77 found Tom Paine in the camp of the Continental Army composing the lines I have just read. He tells us that any man can be a patriot in the summer of a crises but the true hero endures the winter and faces the challenges of the situation.

So it is with modern Americans. We have heard the story of the winter torture endured by the men of Washington, the same torture endured by the men of Grant and Pershing and Eisenhower—not one of coldness but of war. We have witnessed the spring of prosperity and peace. But the citizens of the 20th century are now relaxing in the comfortable clime of Indian summer. The leaves of the tree of freedom are turning color from the spirit of '76 to the lethargy of '64 and some of them are falling to the ground below. Of these I shall enumerate but a few.

1. The spirit of brotherhood that was the cornerstone of our country is slowly crumbling before the very eyes of 15 million American Negro citizens.

2. The spirit of religious tolerance which was primary in the minds and hearts of many of our Nations fathers is exemplified in our time by a Supreme Court ruling calling God out of order in our public schools.

3. The spirit of civic duty whereby men of the past gave their homes, their careers, and often their lives to exercise their God-given rights is being abused by more than one-third of a nation of American citizens who refuse to vote.

4. The spirit of patriotism, the only reason why there is a United Stats of America, is completely forgotten by the thousands who tear up traffic tickets and cheat on income tax returns.

The challenge of American citizenship—to awaken the summer soldier, to instill in him the spirit that is America. The spirits of brotherhood, religious tolerance, civic duty, and patriotism—the spirit that is America.

When Thomas Paine wrote the letter, a portion of which I have read to you, he searched the camp for suitable stationery on which to write. Finding none and

realizing its importance, he inscribed it on the taut skin parchment of a drumhead. He did not procrastinate until it was convenient; he stepped forth immediately to put down his beliefs in writing. His famous letter was said to inflame the very soul of a young America and was a contributing factor to her acquisiliton of freedom.

These are the times that try men's souls, the era when the sunshine patriot must meet and conquer the challenge of his American citizenship. For if he does not, we shall never survive the winter.

Pension Funds: Up 2,000 Percent Since 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great post-World War II advancements has been in the increased retirement incomes of our older people. Indeed, people over age 65 have improved their financial situation greater than any other age group.

Much has been said of the part played by the maturing of the social security system in bringing this about. Not enough has been said about the part played by the private pension plans.

I am setting out a recent article appearing in the January 29, 1964, Wall Street Journal which discusses the great growth of private pension plans.

PENSION FUNDS ASSETS HIT RECORD $66 BILLION, UP 2,000 PERCENT SINCE 1945—25 MILLION PERSONS COVERED BY PRIVATE PLANS—INSURERS MOVE TO MANAGE PORTFOLIOS—HOW SEARS RETIREES PROSPER

(By Peter Vanderwicken)

The pension fund, a relative adolescent in the financial field, is growing huskier each year. As its power swells, so does its economic influence.

Pension funds had a humble start in the early 1900's as rather informal tools through which companies could help retired employees. Today, with assets of $66.8 billion—or more than the $63 billion gross national product of France—U.S. pension funds have become a prime source of investment capital, an important new means of personal saving and the subject of fierce competition between other financial institutions who want to manage them.

By any yardstick, their growth has been phenomenal. Since World War II their assets have grown 22 times over and the number of workers they cover has nearly quintupled. The table shows the assets of private (nongovernmental) pension funds in billions of dollars and the number of workers, in millions, they protect.

	Assets	*Coverage*
1945	$3.0	5.6
1950	11.7	8.6
1955	26.6	13.0
1960	49.9	21.6
1963 (estimated)	66.8	26.0

This growth shows no sign of abating. The National Bureau of Economic Research, a nonprofit group which analyzes business trends, predicts that pension fund assets will zoom to $234 billion by 1980 and the number of workers covered will top 41 million.

Perhaps most important to fund participants, payments also are expected to show dramatic growth. Today, 1 of every 10 Americans over 65 collects checks from private pension funds, payments totaling about $2 billion annually. By 1980, forecasts the NBER, these old age benefits will climb to $8 billion a year and will go to 3 of every 10 persons over 65.

The size and success of pension funds vary widely, of course, but the experience of the Sears, Roebuck & Co. fund shows what benefits a participant can sometimes look forward to. A study of Sears employees who retired in 1962 showed that those with 25 to 30 years' experience had contributed an average of $5,657 to the fund but were able to leave with an average of $113,816. Since the plan was started in 1916, the Sears funds has distributed some $1,175 million in benefits to participants.

But the impact of the private pension fund is not limited to those on the receiving end of the benefit checks. The sharp climb in assets has made them a force to be reckoned with in the stock market and financing field.

TWO BILLION DOLLARS IN NEW MONEY

The Nation's 33,000 private pension funds in 1962 alone invested about $2 billion of new money in common stocks, a sum more than 50 percent greater than the $1.3 billion in new stocks offered by all U.S. companies that year. When, over a period of time, demand for stocks by pension funds, other institutional investors, and individuals far exceeds the supply of new stocks being offered, there's an upward pressure on stock prices.

"Because the funds buy large amounts of stock for long-term investment, they exert a significant stabilizing influence on stock prices," says Roger F. Murray, Columbia University Business School professor who guided the recent NBER study. No overall figures on private pension fund stockholdings are available, but corporate funds alone held $18.7 billion in stocks at the end of 1962, or nearly 6 percent of the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

Besides stocks, corporate pension funds have about $17 billion invested in corporate bonds, $2.7 billion in high-interest mortgages and directly owned real estate, and $2.2 billion in U.S. Government securities.

"Common stocks are nearly half our trust investments but we've also been putting money into mortgages, sale-leasebacks of buildings and such things as oil production loans," says James J. O'Brien, senior vice president for investments at Chase Manhattan Bank, which manages several large pension funds.

MOST MANAGED BY BANKS

Trust departments of large banks now manage most pension fund investments, though a few companies supervise their own funds' portfolios. But the swift growth of the pension funds has another group—the insurance companies—casting covetous eyes on the lucrative management contracts offered by the funds.

Recently, in fact, insurance companies have launched a determined effort to capture the pension fund business—due primarily to a 1962 change in Securities and Exchange Commission regulations. Before then insurance firms were practically barred from the pension fund management field by Government restrictions limiting the amount of reserves they could put in common stocks. But after pleas from the industry, the SEC opened the way for insurance firms to manage pension funds by permitting them to segregate pension fund assets from general insurance assets.

Much of the battle centers around pension funds' desire for big yields on their investments. In trying to win away the pension funds, some insurance companies have offered them guarantees of high returns on their investments. "The insurance people are trying to move in on us in a big way," reports one New York banker. "One went to all our pension fund customers and offered them a 5¼ percent return on their investments, a full percentage point higher than the going rate."

So far the insurance effort has been far from successful. Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, for example, has been able to attract the pension funds of only two major companies—an auto equipment maker and a public utility. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the world's largest, hasn't signed any yet, "but we certainly hope to have one or two soon," says a spokesman.

FAMILIARITY WITH TREASURERS

One problem, notes an insurance man, is that the banks maintain a tight hold on pension fund business because of their familiarity with company treasurers. The treasurers often need to borrow money and they like to keep the banks happy by providing pension trust business, he charges.

The insurance companies, however, remain undeterred. "Pension funds are basically an insurance function," claims James F. Oates, Jr., Equitable chairman. "We're doing everything we can to let American business corporations know we're now in the business of managing pension funds."

The principal governmental control over pension funds rests with the Internal Revenue Service which is mainly concerned with companies' methods of accounting for their contributions to the funds. Insurance companies which manage funds are subject to both State insurance regulation and the SEC-administered Investment Company Act, but otherwise there are no other agencies supervising the funds.

One point of concern to some pension fund critics involves the purchase by a pension fund of its own company's stock. They charge that a pension fund may not always be able to exercise an unbiased judgment in dealings in such stock. To head off such criticism, some companies prohibit their funds from purchasing their stock.

AN UNWRITTEN AGREEMENT

"We have an unwritten agreement with the two banks managing our fund that they shouldn't buy our stock," says Charles B. Delafield, financial vice president of New York's Consolidated Edison Co.

Comments a banker: "Many of our customers specifically forbid any investment in their own stock. One company treasurer says we wouldn't have the courage to sell it."

A few funds, however, actively buy the stock of their parent company. The Sears fund owns more than 25 percent of Sears stock; this stock accounts for 85 percent of the fund's $1.7 billion assets. The Sears fund is by far the largest owner of its parent's stock. At the end of 1962, of the $18.7 billion of stocks held by corporate pension funds, $16.2 billion was stocks of other companies and only $2.5 billion that of the fund's own company.

Open Season on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Representative of South Carolina, addressed the Alexander, Va., Chamber of Commerce at its 57th annual banquet on Saturday, February 1, 1964.

Representative DORN chose as his subject "Open Season on Congress," and in a short but clear and concise speech an-

swered the efforts of those who are engaging in a campaign of abuse of the Congress of the United States. This campaign to abuse and vilify Congress is simultaneously engaged in by those who intentionally would destroy representative government and also by those who do not intend to do so but nevertheless effectively support such efforts.

Since Congress is composed of men and women, it is subject to human errors just as any other group or institution made up of people. Notwithstanding its human frailties, the Congress of the United States is the only vote in government directly responsible and amenable to the will of the people. As Congressman DORN points out, "the attack on Congress is an attack on individual liberty, the private enterprise system, and our representative form of government. It is an attack upon the Constitution of the United States and the role of the Congress under that Constitution."

I recommend the reading of his splendid address to all, and it is with pleasure that I include his address as an extension of my remarks.

The address follows:

OPEN SEASON ON CONGRESS

(Excerpts of address of Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, before 57th annual banquet of Alexandria, Va., Chamber of Commerce at Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel)

Congress is being abused and vilified as never before in our history. It is "open season" on Congress. There is a sinister campaign now underway to discredit and destroy Congress as a coequal branch of the Federal Government, and as a great traditional American institution. Many, oblivious to the grand design, are unwitting peddlers of distortion and half-truths about the Congress and its individual Members.

Benito Mussolini, the Fascist dictator, is reported as having referred to the American Congress as "parliamentary charlatans." Echoing Mussolini's contempt for representative government, like a Hitlerian voice from the grave, the current propagandists are blasting Congress, thus the people's ability to select their representatives. One famous journalist said the prestige of Congress "has sunk lower than a snake's belly."

This campaign is not only an attack upon Congress, but an attack on individual liberty, the private enterprise system and our representative form of government—it is a vote of no confidence in the people. It is an attack upon the Constitution of the United States and the role of the Congress under that Constitution.

Before the Constitution was even considered there was a Congress. The Continental Congress, acting for the people, created the United States as a free nation. The first article in the Constitution itself and the first words following the preamble deal with the creation of the Congress with a House and a Senate.

The Congress is today simply guilty of representing the American people as provided in the Constitution. Congress is only performing its duty, under a solemn oath taken to uphold and preserve the Constitution. The Constitution has endowed Congress with the authority to make the Nation's laws.

Congress has been criticized for staying in session too long. It is being lambasted for its seniority system. Every activity of Congress has been raked over the coals. Both barrels have been leveled at the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The first session of the 88th Congress, ending during the Christmas holidays, was a great and fruitful session of the Congress. It represented the wishes of a majority of the American people. The American people were willing and are today anxious for the Congress to remain in session as long as necessary, not only to consider good legislation but, what is more important, to prevent the passage of bad legislation. The American people want this Congress to preserve their Constitution.

The last session of this Congress exhibited a courage and stamina beyond the call of duty. It withstood all pressure, ridicule, and abuse to remain in session and preserve the integrity of the Congress as a coequal branch of the Government and to directly represent the American people.

Through calm, cool, exhaustive study and discussion by this Congress, the American people will get a vastly improved tax bill—a bill which affects every man, woman, and child in this Republic. After days and even months of deliberations and thorough consideration, I believe the Nation will get a better civil rights bill which will affect the very foundation stones of the Nation for the next 100 years. By prolonged study, the entire free world will have an improved foreign aid bill. Congress has gone over the $50 billion military expenditure with a fine-toothed comb. The very security of this country and freedom everywhere, throughout the globe, depend upon this appropriation and careful scrutiny by the Congress. Congress ushered in the age of atomic power, astronautics, and space. The stock market and current economic trends emphasize the wisdom of Congress in staying in session and doing its duty. Prosperity indexes continue to spiral almost daily.

The United States has reached its exalted position as the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of the free world under our representative form of government. We have the highest standard of living in all the history of the world. The American people enjoy more luxury, the highest wages, the best roads, the finest working conditions, equal rights for men and women largely as a result of wise legislation by the Congress over the years. We manufacture over half of the world's automobiles, television and radio sets and, yes, a great percentage of the world's instrumentalities of science and culture. We have a great portion of the world's libraries, public schools, hospitals, colleges, churches, daily newspapers, and periodicals. The Congress played no small role in these fantastic accomplishments not only for the American people but we have shared them with the world. Congress helped create this palladium of religious freedom and material and cultural plenty by rejecting unwise legislation as well as enacting good laws.

The American people should look into the associations and the background of those who constantly attack their Congress. What is the purpose of this chorus of detractors? Whose bread do they eat? Why? What is the source of their retainers? How much and from whom?

We should resist these calculated efforts to stampede Congress into ill-conceived and hasty reforms. There are those who want to reform Congress out of existence. There are those who are trying to nibble it to death.

Lately the Members of Congress have been flooded with questionnaires from students, study groups, professors, and foundations. Polls, inquiries, and fantastic suggestions are pouring in—all implying the need of reform and suggesting that our representative government is outmoded.

Many of the more vicious attacks on Congress result from the repudiation by the Congress of selfish interests legislation and pet schemes of certain cliques and groups. Had their personal projects and programs been passed, in rubberstamp fashion, they would be praising the Congress as Hitler praised the Reichstag and Tojo the Japanese Diet. Had their idealistic brainstorms been railroaded through by the Congress, then their chorus of abuse would have been changed to a song of praise.

The Congress must not be intimidated and pressured by selfish interests. The Congress must legislate for all of the American people. We must continue to be the citizen's contact with his Federal Government. Our door must always be open to him. Public office is a trust bestowed by the people and I believe this Congress has kept that trust. We have kept a firm and critical reign over the people's bank account—the public treasury. We are the avenue—and sometimes the only avenue—through which the people can reach the executive agencies and departments of the Government, supported by their own tax money. As servants of the people, the Congress is the guardian of their liberty and the trustees of their treasury.

May I remind you, my fellow Americans, of the destruction of great representative institutions and individual liberty in the ancient world. The Greek Republic, with its forums and public discussions, was destroyed through unjust criticism of its representative champions and lethargy by the people. The magnificent power of the Roman Senate, with its championship of Roman liberty, law, and order, was gradually whittled away by bureaucracy and indifference. The great Republic of Cicero, with its individual liberty, became the Roman Empire with its dictatorship, liquidation, and persecution. The world soon lapsed into the Dark Ages where civilization and freedom were buried under a thousand years of deterioration.

I do not believe the American people have ever elected a more conscientious Congress than the 88th. I have been associated, over the years, with many organizations and legislative bodies, but I have never been affiliated with a more dedicated, determined, courageous and patriotic group of men and women. I have confidence in its leadership, its committee chairmen and its individual Members; and I can assure you that they will keep their sacred covenant with the American people and uphold their oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

Ed Foreman: Credit to Texas and the Nation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as a fellow freshman Member of the 88th Congress, it is a pleasure to congratulate my colleague Representative ED FOREMAN, of Texas, who recently was selected one of the 10 outstanding young men in America by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. In both business and politics ED FOREMAN is an outstanding and successful self-made man. There is always a need for forthright and articulate expression of opinion. As the youngest Member of the 88th Congress, ED FOREMAN possesses these qualities and has used them well. Known for being an outspoken defender of individual freedom, ED has taken an active and effective part on the Armed Services Committee. His hardworking energy stands as a fine example to the youth of our country at a time when there is a need for leadership in politics by energetic young men.

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, kangaroo meat, horsemeat, and lower grades in beef have been found in circulation in the United States recently. As a result, cattle prices are falling and the largest and healthiest segment of our farm economy, the livestock industry, is being threatened.

The American people and the farmer do not want the livestock industry to become subject to price supports, Federal Government control, and restricted production. The American taxpayer and American consumer do not want Government control of cattle.

The General Assembly of South Carolina, recognizing the threat to our cattle industry by imports of foreign beef, unanimously adopted a timely resolution opposing these unjustified imports. The resolution is an excellent one and I commend the General Assembly of South Carolina. I recommend each Member of Congress and the country to join in acting upon this recommendation.

The resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO INVESTIGATE THE IMPORTING OF FOREIGN BEEF LOOKING TO LIMITING THE QUANTITY ALLOWED TO ENTER THE COUNTRY AND TO IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF THAT WHICH DOES REACH OUR MARKETS

Whereas the raising of cattle for beef purposes has increased in all parts of the State during recent years in such proportion that it has now become one of the major factors in our agricultural economy and produces a sizable part of the farm income; and

Whereas the general assembly is informed that this important segment of our economy is seriously threatened by the influx of large quantities of imported beef which is far below the standard that is demanded of local producers; and

Whereas a large part of the imported beef is produced in distant lands where living standards and labor standards are low and the scale of wages is still lower; and

Whereas these facts make fair competition impossible, and places our cattle industry at a distinct financial disadvantage which is felt throughout the entire business structure of the State; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the adverse effect which this import is having in South Carolina has reached other areas of the United States, and at a time when the President of the United States has voiced a determination to improve business conditions throughout the Nation and has made a general declaration of war against poverty throughout the length and breadth of the land; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that attention should be given to this important problem by the Congress and that stricter regulations should be imposed and serious consideration should be given to limiting the annual introduction of foreign beef into the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress is memorialized to investigate the importing of foreign beef into the United States looking to limiting the quantity allowed to enter the country, and to improving the quality of that which does reach our markets; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress, to each of the U.S. Senators from South Carolina, and to each member of the delegation from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

Address of Bronx Attorney Howard E. Goldfluss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent address by Attorney Howard E. Goldfluss, of my congressional district, made before the Bronx, N.Y., Rotary Club on January 28, 1964.

So many countries are under totalitarian forms of government, in which the rights of the individual are negligible, that it is refreshing to know we here in America are guaranteed protection from police state methods by an independent judiciary. Mr. Goldfluss' speech concerning the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Mapp case bears out this fact so well. I am sure my colleagues in the House of Representatives will find his address, which follows, most interesting.

SPEECH OF ATTORNEY HOWARD E. GOLDFLUSS, BEFORE BRONX ROTARY CLUB, JANUARY 28, 1964

On June 19, 1961, a decision was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court which had repercussions all over this country. The title of the case was Mapp against the State of Ohio, and it set forth a rule of conduct that police and prosecution officers throughout the United States were obliged to follow.

This decision caused a flurry of hand wringing and dark predictions of disaster among the "good guys"; my name for the attorney general's office, the district attorney's office, the county prosecutor's office, and the combined police department throughout this land. There were dark prognostications about a crimewave hitting the United States, and we heard a police captain say that now it will be impossible to make a lawful arrest, and we will all be living in a jungle. The press all throughout the country were alerted to this possibility, and the Supreme Court was castigated in the press, as well as local judges who followed the law and the Constitution, for their adherence to the Mapp decision.

And what caused this consternation? Nothing—nothing that was not plainly in our Constitution to begin with and which was merely reaffirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court. The decision merely stated that the fourth amendment of the Constitution of the United States applies to the protection of all the citizens of the United States, whether the said citizen be charged with a crime under Federal jurisdiction or State jurisdiction.

What is the fourth amendment? Essentially, the fourth amendment puts the courts and officials, in the exercise of their power, under limitation and restraints, and forever secured the people, their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against all unreasonable searches and seizures under the guise of law.

Before the Mapp case was decided, State courts, although agreeing that the act of unlawfully seizing evidence is not to be condoned, indeed, is even to be frowned upon, nevertheless admitted into evidence articles seized as a result of their unlawful search and seizure.

This is, and was, tortured reasoning and also nonsense. Justice Douglas in the Mapp case discussed the theoretical remedies that the accused had, although he was convicted by unlawfully seized evidence. One was disciplinary action within the heirarchy of the police system, including prosecution of the police officer for a crime. But as Mr. Justice Murphy said in a prior case: "Self-scrutiny is a lofty ideal, but its exaltation reaches new heights if we expect a district attorney to prosecute himself or his associates for well-meaning violations of the search and seizure clause during a raid the district attorney or his associates has ordered."

Before the Mapp case, if in a State court counsel objected to the admission of evidence under these circumstances, the objection was denied with a faint smile from the district attorney's table, and a similar smile from the bench. To object to such an offer of evidence painted the lawyer as some kind of fool. But some judges did not smirk. They were just whispers in the wind of their times, but the district attorney did not dare smile if such an objection was made before one judge that I can remember, and I think some of you will remember him too. I refer to Frank Oliver. Judge Oliver served the Bronx in Congress and on the bench for many years, and was an outstanding conscientious and competent legislator and judge. He resisted the times; he resented the trend toward convicting the guilty if we are convinced he is guilty while closing our eyes to safeguards even the guilty are provided with under our laws. Judge Oliver ruled thusly in the late 1940's, and guess he was considered eccentric too until the Supreme Court, more than a decade later, reaffirmed his belief that the Constitution and its amendments comprises more than a piece of parchment; it is a standard; and once we deviate from it, we open the door to its destruction.

We came by the Constitution the hard way. Judge Tom Clark, in the Mapp case, and quoting from a previous Supreme Court decision, stated the whole principle quite concisely: "If his letters and private documents can thus be seized and held and used in evidence against a citizen accused of an offense, the protection of the fourth amendment declaring his right to be secure against such searches and seizures is of no value, and so far as those thus placed are concerned, might as well be stricken from the Constitution. The efforts of the courts and their officials to bring the guilty to punishment, praiseworthy as they are, are not to be aided by the sacrifice of those great principles established by years of endeavor and suffering which have resulted in their embodiment in the fundamental law of the land."

Now, does this mean that the "good guys" can never use this evidence? Of course not. The amendment says unreasonable searches and seizures. For a good cause shown, a police officer may secure a search warrant from a court of competent jurisdiction, and the police officer may even break down a door or a window to secure the evidence if he is barred from entry after stating his purpose and authority. No lawyer quarrels with this. Contrary to what you may hear, we bad guys are not anxious to set barbarous criminals free in our streets. What we are interested in is a government by law, with no variances; with no exceptions.

Since 1961, the hue and cry of the good guys has come to nothing. The police officers are doing now what they should have been compelled to do all these years: securing a warrant before violating the sanctity of a man's home. The elder Pitt in England described this principle perfectly in the 18th century: "The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake;

the winds may blow through it; the storm may enter; the rain may enter—but the king of England cannot enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

The fact that the inhabitant of this ruined tenement is the worst example of humanity is not important. The fact that he is a known criminal and is antisocial and is a blight on society is not important. He is not important. But you and I are important. Because we will suffer no effort to destroy our rights by depriving this wretched man of his. He is just not worth it.

We must always be aware of one fact: that we in this country are unique. Our system of government based on law is the ultimate example of freedom at work. Let down these guarantees for the guilty, and we are sowing the seeds of destruction of our own guarantees, because the precedent will be set. If we compromise for the sake of expediency, then we make ourselves expendable. All the freedoms in our Constitution are interrelated; a man cannot be 30 percent free; or 50 percent free. If he is not 100 percent free, then something has gone wrong.

Statistics show that since the Mapp case there has been no significant proportional change in the amount of convictions nationwide. The search warrants have been acquired, and the convictions have been had in the same proportion to the arrests. Indeed, the Federal Government has been adhering to this rule of constitutional safeguard from the inception of Federal law enforcement in this country, and many States, including California, had for many years seen the necessity of enforcing the fourth amendment to the letter. The FBI has always adhered to it. I don't believe J. Edgar Hoover, being the American he is, would have it any other way.

It is understandable, for the average citizen who is secure in his home and business and wishes to stay this way, to succumb to the temptation of waiving a technical right for the apparent guilty party. Even the eminent Judge Cardozo, in the Defore case in 1926, ridiculed the situation where "the criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered." This in effect condoned the waiver of a technical right on behalf of the guilty.

But the Supreme Court in the ensuing years became alarmed about this principle, and the decisions reflected it. Finally, in the Mapp case, Justice Clark stated: "The ignoble shortcut to conviction left open to the State tends to destroy the entire system of constitutional restraints on which the liberty of the people rest. Having once recognized that the right to privacy embodied in the fourth amendments is enforcible against the States, and that the right to be secure against rude invasions of privacy by State officers is therefore constitutional in origin, we can no longer permit that right to remain an empty promise. Because it is enforceable in the same manner, and to like effect as to the basic rights secured by the due process clause, we can no longer permit it to be revokable at the whim of any police officer who in the name of law enforcement chooses to suspend its enjoyment. Our decision, founded on reason and truth, gives to the individual no more than that which the Constitution guarantees him; to the police officer, no less than that which honest law enforcement is entitled; and to the court, that judicial integrity so necessary to the true administration of justice."

This country was founded, and the Constitution and its amendments were written, by men with dreams. They dreamed of liberties which the world had never known, and they expressed these dreams in the Constitution which is the most perfect documentation of the dignity of man that the world has ever known. On these people and on this document, the true spirit of man was born. The foresight of the Founders of this Nation is amazing, and their rules for the preservation of God given human rights applied then, applies now, and will apply till the end of time.

How To Save $2 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Pittsburgh Press dated January 26, 1964:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 26, 1964]

HOW TO SAVE $2 BILLION

President Johnson's order for an exhaustive screening of Federal spending should result in the saving of millions of dollars for U.S. taxpayers. And one of the first places where Mr. Johnson can wield his economy ax is the proposed "billion-dollar ditch," the Lake Erie to Ohio River canal.

This canal plan, one of the most horrible examples of bureaucratic attempts to waste taxpayers' money, actually could cost more than $2 billion when all the interest charges are added up.

Although it might help some industries near the canal route, it would inevitably inflict serious damage and increase unemployment in depressed areas of western Pennsylvania and elsewhere. The Nation as a whole would receive no benefits.

President Johnson's economy campaign will achieve a fast start if it eliminates this giant boondoggle. Even in these days of massive Federal budgets, a saving of $2 billion will be a notable triumph.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 26, 1964]

ECONOMY DRIVE CITED—NEW REPORT SLICES "BIG DITCH" CHANCES

U.S. Army Engineers are wrapping up their final report on the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River canal, but its prospects may be dimmer than they were a year ago.

The Engineers expect to submit their recommendation before spring on a project sometimes tagged the "billion-dollar ditch" because its construction and amortization costs are estimated to equal that figure.

The latest survey in a series of more than a dozen over the past half-century was conducted with a $500,000 appropriation voted by Congress 2 years ago.

Some observers here feel now, however, that circumstances have diminished the project's chances. One is President Lyndon B. Johnson's governmental economy program.

Another was the recent Panamanian incident, reviving suggestions that another canal be considered to link the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The assumption is that the Nation couldn't afford two canal projects of such massive proportions; and, in any comparison, a second isthmus canal would receive priority.

The Lake Erie-Ohio River canal would cost more than the original outlay for the Panama Canal, even when inflated values are taken into consideration.

The waterway would extend 108 miles from Rochester, Pa., on the Ohio, to near Ashtabula, on Lake Erie, and require 15 locks and dams to carry cargo over the hump.

The project is favored chiefly by steel and other industrial interests in the Youngstown area.

The railroads, assisted by Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania industrialists, politicians and labor leaders, have protested the proposal as a bid for cheap water transportation, at subsidized rates, for the Youngstown district.

The Honorable Mr. Groundhog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 2, 1964, was Groundhog Day and the groundhog emerged from his burrow on Gobbler's Knob in Punxsutawney, Pa., at 7:29 a.m. Unfortunately he saw his shadow and by reason of this incident we can look forward to 6 more weeks of winter.

The entire Nation these days is talking about civil rights and it is the subject before the Congress this very week. It was pointed out at the annual banquet of the Punxsutawney Groundhog Club that no creature has had to fight for his rights or his place in the sun harder than the Punxsutawney groundhog.

In the first place, he has had to fight off imposters such as Quarryville, Pa.'s, alleged weather prophet, and that imitator from Sun Prairie, Wis.

It has been successfully proven that the Punxsutawney groundhog is the only true and pure groundhog in the world and the only one that can claim the distinction of being the infallible weather prophet. Despite those who would proselyte the King of Gobbler's Knob he continues to reign supreme.

Much is being said these days about housing and other accommodations. In this field the Punxsutawney groundhog has his troubles. Of all those wanting equal shelter rights no one has to work harder than he. He works and slaves and digs a nice home under the sod only to have it invaded by skunks, rabbits, foxes, weasels and even raccoons have been known to try to dispossess him. If he makes a nice home out in the middle of a golf course in keeping with his aristocratic blood lineage, someone comes along with a tractor and it is no more.

As a weather prophet he also has his troubles and is the subject of discrimination. No other topic these days on radio and television receives as much prominence as the forecasting of the weather. If the Punxsutawney groundhog sees his shadow and goes back into his warm bed for 6 more weeks you can rest assured we will have 6 more weeks of winter. But despite this trustworthy forecast the weathermen say spring is just around the corner and ignore the advice of Mr. Groundhog.

Despite the fact the groundhog saw his shadow immediately and was impelled to make a rapid retreat to his burrow he took time out to intone the following well-known song:

Me and my shadow
All alone out in the snow.
Me and my shadow
Trying to decide just where to go.
And as the world outside
Watches my day
The cold north wind
Drives sunshine away.
Then, me and my shadow
Disappear 6 weeks from view.

Appendix

The New Era: Promises and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at the November annual meeting of the National Association for Mental Health held in Washington, D.C., an excellent keynote address was delivered by Robert H. Felix, M.D., Director of the National Institute of Mental Health.

Excerpts from his remarks follow:

THE NEW ERA: PROMISES AND PROBLEMS

The events of the past year mark our emergence from an era in the history of our care of the mentally ill.

Less than 12 months ago the Cabinet Committee appointed by President John F. Kennedy to analyze the recommendations in the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health and to develop courses of action which would be appropriate for the Federal Government submitted its report to the President. Those recommendations which could be implemented under existing law were included in the President's budget, submitted to Congress 9 months ago. Others contained in his Message on Mental Illness and Mental Retardation which was sent to the Congress last February were introduced as new legislation.

And now, 8 months later, the Congress of the United States has expressed the common will of our Nation to create new facilities and new programs for the mentally ill.

When the President signed this legislation into law less than a month ago, the opening volley was fired in our struggle to make the new era in the treatment of the mentally ill a reality.

In the future, if we prevail in our struggle, in communities throughout the land, we will develop a broad range of mental health services to prevent the mental illnesses where possible, to diagnose them promptly and treat them effectively when they do occur, and to rehabilitate those who have suffered from these disorders.

* * * * *

Changes in the mental health field in the last decade or two have been extraordinary. Today our medical knowledge and social insights are such that all but a small proportion of the mentally ill can be so successfully treated that they can achieve a constructive and workable social adjustment.

Until recent advances in medical science made it possible to modify the disturbing behavior of the severely mentally ill, those suffering from the major mental illnesses were looked upon by many with dread. Without the medical and social means at hand to deal constructively with their behavior, society felt it necessary to isolate these unfortunate people—first in jails and poorhouses—later, as a result of social reforms in the mid-19th century, in small hospitals built especially for the treatment of these patients.

As time passed, our society, content to isolate the mentally ill, moved forward in other areas of our national life. Beset by the financial problems created by our expanding population and economy, State and local governments built and operated highways, schools, general hospitals, water and sewage works, and other widely needed public facilities.

And the mental hospital, originally a benevolent village of 1 to 500 patients, grew to cities of 1, 2, 3, 5, 10—in one case 15,000 sick inhabitants.

In the 20th century, through work spearheaded by this association and its predecessor, the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, improvements were made in the State mental hospitals and patients began to be treated in extramural settings.

It was not until the mid-1950's, however, when the psychoactive drugs were discovered and introduced into the State mental hospitals, that the frightening trend of the growing number of hospital patients was reversed.

Today there are 56 fewer persons in our public mental hospitals per 100,000 population than there were in 1950, and we have increased the number of psychiatric outpatient clinics by almost 400 percent in the last 16 years—from about 470 to more than 1,600.

Today, as many patients are admitted to outpatient clinics as to public and private mental hospitals combined, and the admissions of patients with psychiatric diagnoses to general hospitals exceed the number of patients admitted to public mental hospitals.

We have greatly increased the number of trained professional persons available to work in the mental health field. Since 1950, we have more than doubled the number of trained psychiatrists, and almost tripled the number of clinical psychologists. The number of trained psychiatric workers has increased by 250 percent, and the number of trained psychiatric nurses by 150 percent.

The rapid evolution of community mental health concepts, and the real advances we have made in the last decade or two, vividly demonstrate man's unique capacity both to initiate and to respond to changes in the world of the mind, and in the world of physical reality.

* * * * *

The events of the past 10 or 15 years—and in particular, the events of the past year—indicate that the frontier of community psychiatry has been won, and that the time has come when the colonist and the organizers in the new territory can begin to function effectively. We are in transition from an era of primarily custodial care for many of our mentally ill, to an era of treatment that is both comprehensive at any particular point in the patient's illness, and available over whatever period of time the patient needs it—whether short, continuous, or intermittent.

We are now concerned with a framework of service which admits to no separation of prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. This is the crux of the new concept of community medicine. It focuses on the social functions of medicine as well as on the specific actions intended to prevent or cure disease in the individual patient. It implies that all organized services in the mental health field are mutually dependent one upon the other, and that care in any one setting—the home, the private practitioner's office, the public clinic, the hospital, or other institution—is not an isolated experience.

These medical and social changes, plus the continued determination of many groups in the country—notable among which are the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local associations have made possible the development, on the national level, of the new national mental health program. The program is designed to stimulate State, local, and private action. It is based on the belief and upon the firm reality of our recent advances, that it is possible to reduce substantially the number of patients who receive only custodial care when they could benefit from other forms of treatment.

Central to the program is the community mental health center, of which, if present legislation is fully implemented, there will be approximately 145 in only a few years time. And, since many of you will, I am sure, be closely involved in their development in your communities, I would like to describe to you, very briefly, how they have been conceptualized. The center would be more broadly based than either the traditional outpatient clinic or the usual institution, and it would be the pivot of future mental health activities within the community.

It would be close to the patient's home, and would provide preventive services, diagnostic services, outpatient, and inpatient treatment, transitional, and rehabilitation services.

Thus it would encompass the following broad spectrum of services and programs:

A general diagnostic and evaluation service (precare); an acute inpatient service; an outpatient service; a day-care service; a night-care service; an emergency service available around the clock; rehabilitation services; consultation services; public information and education services; supervision of foster homes; research and training.

As one thinks of this array of services functioning as an interrelated whole in the community, he sees that continuity of care is possible, and that it would have enormous advantage to the patient. As his needs change, the patient in such a center would move quickly to other appropriate services. Basically, he would be able to proceed from diagnosis to cure and rehabilitation, and back to treatment if the need arose.

Other essential services provided by the center would be consultative, educational and informational services to the public and to professional persons. Skilled staff would be available to help physicians, teachers, clergymen, police, and probation officers, lawyers and social agency personnel—all those who deal with the mental health problems of those they face in their day-to-day work.

The community's medical practitioners would participate directly in the community mental health center operation, and, in many communities, the center would, for the first time, provide a large proportion of private practitioners with treatment privileges in a facility directly and quickly available for outpatient and inpatient care of their patients.

Since each community is unique, each center will be unique. And it is expected that they will function under a variety of auspices: State, voluntary, municipal, private, within a group practice or any combination of these.

Physically, it is expected that these centers will exist under a variety or organizational arrangements, and may provide a variety of services. * * * While they would be primarily designed to serve the mental health needs of the community, they would also be available to provide assistance to those of the mentally retarded whose emotional and psychiatric problems cannot be met in other community resources.

Closely integrated with the newly enacted community mental health centers legislation are the appropriations made by Congress this year and last—over $8 million in all—for planning grants to facilitate the preparation of community and statewide plans for the new community based, comprehensive programs of which the community mental health centers will serve as a pivot.

For the first time in the history of our country, through these special grant-in-aid funds for planning, each of our States will be able to formulate a comprehensive community approach to the problems of the mental illnesses as they affect the citizens of that State. And while it may be years before the full effect of such comprehensive planning is felt, it is of extraordinary significance that we are trying to plan now to meet the mental health needs of all our citizens.

Even more significant, however, is the fact that this is the first time such a total planning effort has been made in any health area. Thus the mental health field, which for so long lagged behind other health areas, has an opportunity to demonstrate, on a national scale, the value of comprehensive, long-term planning in a broad medical-social problem area.

* * * * *

Before moving on to a discussion of some of the problems we will face in fulfilling the promises of the new era, it would be helpful to mention briefly two final important parts of the new national mental health programs.

The importance of improving the quality of care in existing State mental institutions, which was one of the major emphases on the final report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, has been recognized by Congress and funds have been appropriated to begin a program of demonstration projects for inpatient programs. This assistance will help State mental hospitals strengthen their therapeutic services and integrate their programs with those in the community.

Finally, an additional $15.3 million was appropriated for training grants in fiscal year 1964 over fiscal year 1963. These increased funds include a $3.3 million appropriation for a new program for inservice training of personnel in State mental hospitals and institutions for the mentally retarded. In addition, the training grants include funds for the development within States of programs involving such groups as clergymen, physicians, nurses, medical students, lawyers, law enforcement officials, teachers, and members of other groups whose professional work involved contact or work with the mentally ill, or with those whose mental health is threatened.

Meanwhile the National Institute of Mental Health is pushing forward in its regular training program, and it is expected that the current supply of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers, and psychiatric nurses will be doubled in this decade—from about 45,000 in 1960, to approximately 85,000 by 1970.

With the addition, on the national level, of these new activities to our already well developed national programs of research, training, and grants-in-aid, and to the tremendous surge of activity taking place in the mental health field at the State and community level, the rate at which changes are occurring in the mental health field should accelerate.

Within the next decade or two we should be well into the area of community-centered comprehensive mental health services, for the new era holds many promises.

* * * * *

The new programs we have are, first and foremost, programs of the people and for the people. They must be implemented by the people. Each community and State represented here must push forward to see that the mental health needs of all the people in your communities and States will be met.

You are the people who, by a system of self-selection, have been especially singled out to see to it that these programs are fully implemented.

And because I know that the problems involved in fulfilling the promises of the new era will be great, I would recall to your mind a statement made many years ago by Mr. Justice Holmes. "At the peril of being judged not to have lived," he said, "it is required that a man should take part in the actions and passions of his times."

In a very real sense the cause of the mentally ill is one of the "actions and passions" of our time.

* * * * *

In short, the problems ahead—to implement these new programs and new concepts—are difficult. While they appear simple to state in general terms, they do represent many problems which will have to be given careful consideration.

For example, before a community mental health center is established in a community, it will be necessary for the community to know itself. It will need to know its present characteristics, and what direction it is taking or will be apt to take during the next several years. It will need to understand the problems already faced by people in the community, and the problems they are apt to face in the future.

These factors must be reviewed, and in the light of the total social and psychological needs of people as they now live and will be living, plans must be formulated for a mental health program that will respond to the needs of all the people in the community. Furthermore, as a center and its program is developing, its effectiveness must be continually evaluated. This kind of research is rooted in the community itself, involves all of the groups and forces in the community, and takes into account the needs, goals, and aspirations of the community. It takes into account, for example, the community's efforts to prevent mental illness, for, from the standpoint of public and community health, this is in many ways the most important element of all.

The concept of preventive activities implies the extension of professional efforts and skill to the primary point in the cycle of health or social disability; that is, to the point before disability develops. It means making available to all elements in the population, services which traditionally have been established to serve only the more vulnerable. Present knowledge and skills can be used to reinforce the healthy development which is crucial to good mental health by concentrating on critical periods or transition points in the life of the individual. Such periods as entrance into school, adolescence, marriage, birth of children, retirement, and old age are convenient points of attack for a program of preventive intervention.

Next, it must be kept in mind that, under the new program, there is no intention of supporting facilities or services which duplicate (though they may augment and extend) those already existing in a community. Therefore, it will be necessary to develop techniques for utilizing present resources and for coordinating new developments with what is already available. If the community mental health center is to be effective, it will have to be able to provide a wide variety of services, but there may be difficulties in developing all of these resources within a short period of time. It will be necessary, therefore, to cope with the problem of developing these services over an abbreviated span of time in such a way that the lack of a total program does not negate the value of the newly developed activities. A tremendous amount of administrative resourcefulness and community cooperation must, therefore, be developed. It will be necessary to gain cooperation not only from the medical resources of the community, but from social agencies, educational institutions, enforcement agencies, churches, and a wide variety of community groups, if these new developments are to be effective.

In obtaining this goal, there will need to be an open system of discussion and interaction, characterized by good will and good faith, but also characterized by disagreement and proof of position. Finally, this interchange must be characterized also by flexibility, cooperation, compromise, and continuing change.

In addition to developing administrative resourcefulness and a concensus within the community of how the community programs should be developed, we need to know a great deal more about the epidemiology of the mental illnesses—knowledge upon which plans of operation can be built—and we need to know a great deal more about the distribution of services and facilities of all types, and their effectiveness with various types of patients. We must collect data from all treatment resources in the community and learn more about the characteristics of their patients. Furthermore, the information secured from this wide variety of facilities must be properly analyzed, cross-checked, coordinated, and reported.

It will become increasingly important to know the sequence of treatment experiences that any one person has and his psychosocial history during the periods in his life when he has no treatment.

In our study of the logistics involved in providing mental health services, there are few issues that will be more important than knowing the number of trained professionals there are to work in this field, and how their skills are to be used.

Of this we can be sure—there are not now, nor will there be in the foreseeable future, enough psychiatrists to enable them to be the sole medical practioners dealing with the psychiatric illnesses. Thus if the treatment of the medical aspects of the psychiatric illnesses are to be in the hands of those medically trained, the nonpsychiatric physician must become competent to deal with many of the psychiatric problems of his patients.

In the realinement of professional roles among physicians that will inevitably follow the development of greater competence among all physicians in dealing with psychiatric problems, the role of the psychiatrist will increasingly become one demanding a high degree of skill as specialist-leader, and as a specialized consultant.

At the same time, we must continue to evaluate, explore, and consider what aspects of the mental health problems present in our communities can be handled by other trained professionals, who these professionals are, and what special training in mental health concepts and skills they require to deal with maximal effectiveness with the mental health problems they encounter as they fulfill their primary roles as psychologists, social workers, nurses, clergymen, teachers, probation officers, etc.

The task ahead demands that we solve many other problems. For example, the problem of financing. Mental health programs and services affect the budgets of the patients and their families, of course. But these programs also compete for public funds, affect the distribution of public funds, and have an impact upon the national economy.

Here we need to feed a great many more facts into the public stream of consciousness. The public needs to know, for example, that mental illness costs the taxpayer a great deal of money—$2.4 billion a year in tax funds. However, only 91 million of this sum is spent for community mental health programs, and, nationally, less than 2 percent of per capita general expenditures by State and local governments are used to support public mental hospitals and community mental health programs. More needs to be known about what can be done with available funds. As an example, the results of one study of the vocational rehabilitation of mental patients showed that a program costing $53,000 yielded reduced hospital costs of $449,000, and the production of annual wages by the released patients of $256,000.

Furthermore, if the major focus of our mental health programs moves out of the State hospital and into the community, it can be expected that the cost of caring for the mentally ill will be met to an increasing extent by the private sector of our economy, through individual fees for service, individual and group insurance, and other third party payments and voluntary and private contributions.

Finally, the future will demand major alterations in the attitudes of many groups of people toward the mental illnesses. Some of these changes will occur as the natural result of a changed reality. As more people receive help in their own communities for all degrees of mental illness, the attitudes of the patients, their families, and the communities will gradually become more realistic, less based on out-moded negative stereotypes on the one hand and falsely optimistic hopes on the other. Other changes will be brought about partially, at least, through carefully thought out information and education programs.

* * * * *

To those of us for whom the cause of the mentally ill and of mental health is one of the principal actions and passions of our time, the new era holds much promise, and many problems.

As we share both the promise and the problems, it is well to remember that if we are to achieve full humanity, we must regard others as not less than ourselves; that, life being brief at best, and tomorrow altogether uncertain, we must act today. This is a heavy charge, indeed, but one that we cannot escape.

Congress and the Future of Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 11, 1963, Norman Kraeft, national agricultural editor of the American Broadcasting Co., addressed the 1963 Annual Convention of the National Milk Producers Federation in Miami Beach, Fla. Mr. Kraeft spoke on "Congress and the Future of Farm Legislation."

There is an obvious growing concern among our mass media to better understand and inform the American public on agriculture and life in rural America. Our newspapers, radio, and television are meeting their responsibility in this area rather well. There is an understanding here that this can be mutually beneficial to both rural and urban residents. For the consumer is dependent on the farmer for his food and fiber and the farmer is dependent on the consumer for his economic livelihood.

Mr. President, only through a proper presentation of the facts and intelligent discussion of them can the problems of agriculture—the problems of abundance through technology—be solved. Mr. Kraeft, a respected farm editor of a major network, is performing a valuable service by helping to bring about, through his daily radio broadcasts and his public speeches, a better understanding among farmers and city dwellers. He and his colleagues should be encouraged in this endeavor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Kraeft's speech before the annual convention of the National Milk Producers Federation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND THE FUTURE OF FARM LEGISLATION—A SPEECH BY NORMAN KRAEFT, NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL EDITOR, AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO., BEFORE THE 1963 ANNUAL CONVENTION, NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., DECEMBER 11, 1963

Have the production adjustment and price support programs that were developed in the thirties, refined in the forties and modified in the fifties become obsolete in the sixties? Is Congress becoming fed up with farm programs generally? Does the trend toward fewer farms mean that Congress in turn is taking less interest in agriculture and in agricultural programs?

Democratic Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota, who serves as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee does not think so. In a speech on the Senate floor last October 9 he said, "I believe it is misleading to refer to a farm bloc, since there is no such organized bloc in Congress." Senator MCCARTHY continued, "the record of Congress over the past 25 years shows that many important pieces of farm legislation were enacted with the active support of Members of the Congress from urban districts and urban States. Farm legislation," said Senator MCCARTHY, "was not put over by adding up a farm bloc of sufficient votes to pass its legislation, or placed on the statute books by a kind of log-rolling operation. Rather, it was in response to recognition by a majority of the Members of Congress of a justification and a need for this type of legislation, even though it applied primarily to the agricultural sector of our economy and to farmers." Senator MCCARTHY expressed the view that Congress should take problems as they come and review them and determine whether legislation is needed. "The judgment," he said, "should be based ultimately on whether legislation is in the national interest, and what is demanded by justice."

Will Congress proceed in this manner? I think there is ample evidence that it will. The general view in Washington in recent months has been that the pending civil rights legislation has slowed down the legislative process on nearly all legislative fronts. Nevertheless, taking wheat as an example, there has been a bee-hive of activity on wheat legislation in Congress ever since the referendum last May. Dozens of Congressmen and Senators of both parties have introduced at least five different wheat bills since May, and the wheat subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture has held hearings a number of times since then. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee is holding hearings on new wheat legislation today and tomorrow. President Johnson—echoing what many Congressmen and Senators have been saying ever since the wheat referendum—told Secretary Freeman last week that he (President Johnson) is calling for renewed action to try to develop a wheat program to ward off a potential drop in income for wheat producers.

Although my remarks today are primarily concerned with Congress, I want to pause long enough to observe that President Johnson has a considerable agricultural background. During President Johnson's first week in office, I interviewed one of the President's Texas friends, Congressman BOB POAGE, who is vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, on the subject of Lyndon Johnson's background in agriculture. Mr. POAGE said that President Johnson has been a consistent supporter of farm programs ever since he first came to Congress in 1937. Mr. POAGE mentioned an interesting sidelight. He said that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt asked Lyndon Johnson to serve as the first REA Administrator. POAGE said, "Lyndon would have made a good one, but I'm glad he didn't take the job, because he might still be REA Administrator today, rather than President."

Tribute to President Johnson's familiarity with agriculture was paid last week by Republican Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota, who said: "President Johnson is more knowledgeable and understanding of farm problems—particularly price supports—than any of the five Presidents I have served under."

I think there is abundant testimony that Congress—in spite of the relatively few Members who represent areas that are primarily agricultural—is working constructively in the field of agricultural legislation. You and I may agree or disagree on the merit of specific farm bills passed by the Congress. That is our high privilege in this democracy. But—Congress is working on farm legislation. One of the few major bills passed by Congress this year is a 2-year extension of the voluntary feed grain program. The Senate has passed the Proxmire bill containing the Dairyman's Class I Base Plan, espoused by the National Milk Producers Federation, and this measure has important bipartisan support in the House. The Senate this year has also passed a bill extending the conservation reserve and raising from $10 to $20 million the amount of money available for the Cropland Conversion program. Then, of course, the House last week passed a controversial cotton bill which, frankly, this farm editor has difficulty viewing as a "farm bill," inasmuch as supporters of the measure found it necessary to adopt an amendment which lowers prices and income to cotton farmers while the bill provides a substantial subsidy to nonfarm segments of the cotton industry. But these examples should suffice to make the point that Congress shows few signs of bypassing agriculture and its problems.

It should be remarked here that the history of recent years has shown that, unless major farm bills have the active support of the administration in power, such measures stand little chance of enactment. In spite of all that Congress may do in this area, then, a major share of responsibility here lies with the executive branch.

Two of the biggest stories of the year have been the chicken war with the European Common Market—which is still far from settled, at least in its implications for agricultural commodities other than poultry—and the proposed sales of U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union. The chicken war has thrown new light on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and the proposed wheat sales to Communist bloc nations have prompted Senate

consideration of at least one piece of legislation: Senator MUNDT's bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank or other Government agencies from guaranteeing credit of the Communist nations.

While Congress has concerned itself—in one way or another—with exports of U.S. poultry and wheat (as well as many other agricultural commodities), Congress has been equally watchful over the agricultural import picture. Some half-dozen bills have been introduced in recent months which would in some fashion limit imports of—or impose other restrictions on—products of the farm, particularly livestock and dairy products. The National Milk Producers Federation, as you know, has been especially active in this field.

Agriculture is of major—and I think increasing importance in a variety of international affairs. We export the production of one out of every five agricultural acres in the United States. Our agricultural exports have been running in excess of $5 billion annually in recent years. These factors will be front and center when and as the so-called Kennedy round begins next year in GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. During these negotiations, in which an attempt will be made to divide the pie of international trade equitably among member nations of GATT, the United States will insist that agriculture and industry be considered as a single package. I don't think it takes any special wisdom to forecast that the U.S. Congress will be keeping an eagle eye on these negotiations.

Next year we will observe the 10th anniversary of Public Law 480, better known as the food-for-peace program, a program under which we feed hungry people abroad through donations which are administered by church and other charitable agencies and through concessional sales, such as sales for foreign currencies, through which we hope to encourage economic development so that recipient countries can become cash customers for U.S. agricultural—and industrial—products. This program has—through the years—enjoyed bipartisan support. Though few claim it is a perfect program, most informed observers see Public Law 480 as a workable, if temporary, vehicle for constructive utilization of our agricultural abundance. The food-for-peace program will undoubtedly continue to claim the attention of Congress for some time to come.

On the domestic front, farmers are in trouble and farm programs are in trouble. The farmer's parity ratio is lower today than it has been at any time since the depression years of the 1930's. USDA has recently forecast a drop of 5 percent or more in net farm income for 1964. We are hearing more and more from businessmen—bankers in particular—from America's small towns and rural areas. Agriculture is in trouble, they're saying, and Main Street is drying up.

At the same time, America's farmers apparently don't like the proposals that have been advanced recently by the administration in the field of farm programs. Farmers turned down a proposed marketing order for turkeys; they defeated the certificate plan for wheat. Congress—which, after all, represents the people who elect it every 2 years—rejected a national quota program for dairy; and voted down the proposed mandatory feed grain program. Cotton and tobacco are in deep trouble. Stocks of both commodities are perilously high and are piling still higher. The threat to cotton from synthetics is becoming more serious all the time, and the tobacco world wonders why an increasing amount of tobacco is going into the Stabilization Corporation rather than into the market. There was strong controversy in a recent hearing of the Tobacco Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture as to whether a new tobacco program is called for.

And that—it seems to me—is the key question in this discussion of Congress and the future of farm legislation. Are brandnew programs called for?

Agriculture is changing. Republican Senator GEORGE AIKEN of Vermont, ranking minority member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, says: "The 5 to 10 cow herd is not going to support the farm family anymore. Heavy capitalization is required in today's farming. Farmers are chafing under the heavy load of Government rules and regulations under which they must operate." Senator AIKEN said: "As farms become fewer, I have detected a greater demand for independence. There is less demand for Government hand-outs. In the past 2 or 3 years, farmers aren't writing their Congressmen like they used to. At the same time," said Senator AIKEN, "I am not opposed to farm programs set up on a voluntary basis, that are going to help farm people. We cannot dispense with this whole structure immediately."

Senate Majority Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, put it this way: "We've got to take a fresh look at this whole picture of farm programs. What we built in the thirties is out of date in the sixties. It's like trying to take the battleship *Maine* and make a modern, nuclear-powered carrier out of her. The nuts and bolts won't fit * * * and I think the crew may be getting a little old, too." Senator HUMPHREY proposed creation of a Blue-Ribbon Commission to take a fresh look at farm programs and begin to devise programs designed for the agriculture of today. Republican Senator CALEB BOGGS of Delaware, a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has made a similar proposal. Many Senators and Congressmen are talking this language. Among the most recent to express themselves on the subject are Republican Senator KEATING of New York and Democratic Senator BREWSTER of Maryland, both of whom have also called for a complete overhaul of agriculture legislation.

Congressman POAGE has said "The basic problem of all agriculture is low net income," and I feel sure Congress will continue to deal constructively with that problem.

The temper of Congress on the subject of farm legislation, as this farm editor interprets it, is not to throw out the baby with the bath—that is, not to end farm programs summarily and immediately. Rather, the intent seems to be to devise fresh farm legislation that fits conditions as they exist in today's agriculture, rather than to add more bits and pieces to the patchwork quilt that was started in the 1930's. Congress is quite aware of the significance of the defeat of the certificate plan for wheat last May. That action by American farmers is perhaps the most dramatic expression of a fact that is growing clearer all the time. Some put it this way: American agriculture is growing up.

Farmers today don't have to—and don't want to—lean on the Government as many farmers of a previous generation felt was necessary. Can farmers go it alone? Some think they can. Some think a basic program of production adjustment and price help is desirable, as long as it is structured on a voluntary basis.

This one point, it is felt in Washington, has been firmly established. Farmers will not accept new farm programs that are mandatory. They must be voluntary.

For the past 3 years I have been privileged to watch farm legislation in the making. I have seen the 35 members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the 17 members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in action. I have attended their hearings on proposed farm legislation. I have been favorably impressed with the understanding and concern that have gone into their detailed questioning of witnesses who have appeared before the full committees and before the appropriate subcommittees. We hear much criticism of Congress and the farm programs the Congress has produced. It has occurred to me that because the members of these committees represent every geographical region of the United States and every major commodity or commodity group, it is a wonder that out of the deliberations of these committees has come farm legislation that, for its time, was as useful as it has been. The committees, after all, reflect the thinking of the areas the members represent and the testimony that is presented to the committees in hearings. If politics appears to stand in the way of better legislation, perhaps that is one of the prices we pay for representative government. I am sure we all agree that, even with its shortcomings, our system is far preferable to one in which an agricultural commissar dictates agricultural programs for the nation. Congress, I believe, does the best it can. And, of course, in this country, we have the means, at least every 2 years, of making it do even better.

Chairman HAROLD D. COLLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture, titled a recent speech: "Farm Programs: Requiem or Reveille." He said: "Either we enact workable farm programs on a bipartisan basis, or we may see the whole business go up in smoke." Many other Members of Congress feel the need for more bipartisanship in farm programs.

We must remember that agriculture is big business. The value of farm products sold every year is in the neighborhood of $40 billion. Four out of every ten jobs in this Nation are related to agriculture. It has been said that "He who controls a nation's food supply may next control the nation." Congress, it seems to me, is our last, best hope for guarding the independence of agriculture. It does a pretty good job of responding to the wishes of the people. But the people must make their wishes known to the Congress. In a democracy, Congress is the creature of the people. It is the people. And the people must speak. The challenge is ours.

A democracy, after all, is not any stronger or weaker, any better or worse, than the people who comprise it. Congress, therefore, is no stronger or weaker, better or worse, than the people who elect it. When we criticize Congress, then, we are—in a very real sense—criticizing ourselves. Don't let your Congressman guess what you want. Tell him. Write to him. Wire him. Phone him. You would be surprised at the influence on a Senator or Congressman of a single letter, individually written. (Members of Congress can spot letterwriting campaigns rather easily.) So, if you want a particular bill passed—or not passed—let your representatives in Congress know your wishes. If your representatives don't respond to the desires of a majority of their constituents, the ballot box at election time is a mighty potent weapon in the hands of the people in this democracy. That fact is not lost on your representatives in both Houses of Congress.

Civil Rights Act of 1963 in the Committee of the Whole

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce

the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, time will not permit anything like a full discussion of this iniquitous legislation. The bill is so broad; it covers the whole waterfront and then some; it would take weeks and weeks to point out only some of its major fallacies.

It has been said by some that the best way to defeat this bill is to just pass it as it is, and then the Senate will be sure to defeat it. I think there is some merit in this thinking because the country, as a whole, might be at last awakened to the evils and other terrible injustices to be visited upon a whole nation. On the other hand, such a legal monstrosity, with so many illogical and unreasonable provisions as this, must be defeated, or, at least, greatly amended. I expect—as do others—to offer sound amendments in an effort to make it as constitutional, fair and equitable as possible.

It is said that this is a moderate bill; this is not true. I have at least a smattering of law. I sometimes say that the Supreme Court has repealed all the law that I have ever learned; however, be that as it may, I have studied this bill night after night for several weeks, and it grows more disturbing to me each time I read it. I have read thousands of pages of testimony given before the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee.

This measure is fraught with danger. It is the most one-sided, packed piece of legislation ever presented to Congress. Everything in it is in favor of the Government agency—what a mockery of justice. This is a civil rights measure versus individual rights.

The Federal Government is authorized to fix voter qualifications and take over elections; nowhere in the Constitution, including the oft-quoted 15th amendment, is the power given to fix voter qualifications. On the other hand, this power is expressly reserved to the several States.

There are statutes in every State for the protection of the right of franchise; but you now have before you a new remedy.

Just take a look at the FEPC section. I have said it many times, and I say again that when the day comes that this all-powerful Government tells an employer whom he can and whom he cannot employ, then the day is coming when that same all-powerful, benevolent Government is going to say for whom a person can and must work. When that day comes, tell me what improvement we will have over a Communist or even a Socialist government? The laboring man, the union member, had better watch out for this type legislation. When this comes, I say a thousand times that you will not be a free man.

The absurdity of this FEPC section is borne out by the answers given by one of the leading proponents of this measure when he was asked by a Member of the Judiciary Committee:

> Suppose I run a motel. I have a restaurant in connection with the motel. Suppose I decide that I want to hire all red-headed girls. I like red-headed girls and want to hire red-headed waitresses. I couldn't do it, could I?

The answer—and note that this answer is by one of the two men who ramrodded this legislation through the committee:

> I am not sure of that. If you can prove that you like nobody but red-headed girls and that you have refrained from hiring other kinds of girls solely by reason of the fact that they don't have red hair and not because of their race or religion, then, in my opinion, you would not be guilty of discrimination under the law.

This puts the burden all on the employer. What a tragedy of so-called judicial tyranny.

Perhaps the leaders of this force bill—the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking minority member—would be more effective with their crocodile tears for the "mistreated" people of the South, if they would take into account what is happening in their own home districts. For only today, we see pictures of clashes in Ohio between individuals and police where some are demanding that Negro pupils be sent by bus away from their own section to schools in other parts of the city which are predominantly white. And, alas, in New York, in the chairman's own hometown, a mass holiday, without the permission of the school authorities, is being staged for the same purpose. Half a million children are to be denied their day in school because goons and troublemakers are picketing the school to keep them out, and 8,000 policemen are being called into service.

Holy writ admonishes "first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

In the past on the floor of this House, I have paid my respects to the Civil Rights Commission; this Commission has gone far afield in its meddling—so far, I believe that even the originators and the proponents of this legislation will see that it should be discontinued. What earthly reason could this Commission have for spending the taxpayers' money in looking into the membership policies and requirements of the Masonic Order, the Kiwanis clubs, and college fraternities? I only name these specifically because these organizations were mentioned in the hearings before the Rules Committee.

Members of this House have had complaints from many other fraternal groups and organizations about this meddling by the Civil Rights Commission. Such applies equally to Elks, Woodmen, Moose, Knights of Columbus, and all other secret—as well as nonsecret organizations. Some church organizations are concerned that they will not be exempted from such meddling; there are religious organizations which feel that only members of their particular church should belong to their own group, organization, or lodge, however they may refer to it.

There are fine college organizations which limit their membership to certain races and religious faiths—one of them being Acacia of Masonic background and another is Phi Kappa Theta, which limits its membership to Catholics. Do you want to destroy such fine organizations as these? It would appear that the Civil Rights Commission would have enough to do without meddling in the affairs of good organizations such as these.

I am a member of the Masons, Kiwanis, Woodmen, Elks, Moose, and a Greek-letter college fraternity. I will fight to the bitter end for the right of all fraternal organizations to be just as selective as they wish to be about membership requirements.

In this legislation, you go into every phase of American life. If you have the power to investigate fraternal organizations, you have the same power as to churches.

I believe that all Members of this body recognize that this is one of the most—if not the most—far-reaching pieces of legislation ever considered by this body. Legislation allowing the Federal Government to go into every nook and corner of private life and affairs of the individual is more than serious.

If this legislation or any part of it passes, they certainly will not have time, unless they employ thousands and thousands of new employees. I expect to offer an amendment which will say to this power-grabbing outfit "Hands off these organizations."

Do you realize that all private clubs and organizations—regardless of what they might be—if they are protected by State law, they are, by this legislation, brought under Federal law and control and all are subject to the provisions of this bill? I expect to present an amendment taking them out of the jurisdiction of this bill, and I ask all Members of the House to support this amendment.

There is a lot of talk about the constitutional rights of the minority—then, what about the rights of the majority?

This is an unconscionable bill; it is a dastardly bill. The Judiciary Committee has gone far afield. You cannot put this legislation off on the late President. Note what he said in regard to the unwarranted power conferred by title VI which penalizes innocent people and makes them victims of an autocratic bureaucrat. He said:

> I don't have the power to cut off aid in a general way as was proposed by the Civil Rights Commission, and I would think it would probably be unwise to give the President of the United States that kind of power.

Simply, this section means that a town, district, or State receiving Federal funds as a matter of right or even an individual who is receiving a Government check of any kind can have this cut off, if he practices discrimination. Where did this infamous thing come from?

And, do you know how much time was consumed by the committee acting on it? Exactly 2 minutes. One minute was used by the chairman and 1 minute by the ranking minority member. These were the tactics employed by the representatives of both major political

parties—both of these gentlemen refused to yield to any other member of the committee, and neither discussed it in any fashion—other than to say that they favored it. Then, to stand before this body and say there is no "politics" in this bill is more than absurd.

All of the agitation stemming from this subject of civil rights has given rise to high-sounding, catch-phrase organizations. Somebody is making a lot of money out of these demonstrations.

To those members of the Judiciary Committee who are so interested in measures of this type, let me appeal to and beseech you to give some attention to crime over the Nation, and especially here in the District of Columbia. Some rave about civil rights and then see poor, defenseless women right here on the Capitol grounds, robbed, knocked down, and assaulted, and fail to bring out legislation to help some of us who are interested in law enforcement clear up this sorry mess.

Now, a word or two about the public accommodations section. In 1875, there was ramrodded through Congress a public accommodations measure. Eight years later in 1883, this statute was declared unconstitutional. It may be a moot question as to accommodations on public conveyances or tax-supported institutions, but to take a barber shop, beauty shop, or manicurist shop, and to say that because they are located on the premises of a hotel or motel that this section applies and that they have to accommodate everyone who seeks their services, everyone knows the application of this section will soon be all embracing to include everything and everybody.

Some of the Members supporting this legislation, in order to bring in every argument for its passage, talk about our image before the rest of the world—what we have not done being used against us all over the world, et cetera. I, as one Member of this House, am getting sick and tired of being told that we must pass practically every piece of legislation that comes before this body because if we do not, it will create a bad image all over the world. If, after spending billions upon billions and, I add, more billions, we have been unable to create a favorable picture, it is high time that we stopped.

How is it that this Nation has become the greatest in the world—one that almost every foreigner in the would would move to if given the opportunity, has grown and prospered like no other nation on earth, when we are keeping up the greater part of the world, and then our policies are misunderstood and our representatives are mistreated even by our neighbors in South America? Do you mean to tell me that this is all because of the lack of this civil rights legislation? It is ridiculous on its face to even suggest such.

The States are, in this bill, surrendering their sovereignty to the Federal Government. At the same time, the Federal Government has its "experts" at the United Nations working on a proposed international treaty which includes far-ranging measures that would supposedly eradicate racial discrimination over the world.

Listen at this: the Soviet Union and the United States are leaders in this effort. The recommendations will be passed on, in turn by the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations General Assembly before such treaty can be ratified.

I noticed in the press a few months ago where the Russians told some African students, attending school in Russia, that if they did not like the way things are being run there, to get out of the country. I, for one, am not willing to turn these matters over to the Federal Government, and certainly not over to the United Nations. Just how far are we going in this matter? We had better stop, look, and listen.

This civil rights legislation is ill advised, punitive and will, in the final analysis, defeat its alleged purposes. It is not the proper approach to better race relations. In the long run, it will bring hate and strife. It will not lead to conciliation. The approach of a national election is not sufficient justification, by any means, for either political party to support this crash program.

Do-Nothing Congress or Guardian of Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by a splendid former professor of Roanoke College, Dr. Charles R. Brown, whom I have been privileged to know for a number of years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO-NOTHING CONGRESS OR GUARDIAN OF FREEDOM?

(By Dr. Charles R. Brown)

(NOTE.—The author is a retired Roanoke College faculty member and former head of the history department.)

When the 1964 national election campaign gets under way some of the candidates will be shouting here and there that the 88th Congress was a "Do-nothing Congress." In my opinion that designation of the longest Congress in peace times will be improper, unfortunate and untrue. In fact the 88th Congress was not only a busy Congress, but one that was definitely aware of a trend in this Nation that should be challenged and checked in keeping with constitutional principles.

The reference is to the trend that permits the executive department and its courts to make the laws that should be emerging from the legislative department empowered by the "fathers" to legislate for the needs of all the people all the time. The struggle that went on in the 88th Congress was not an inept desire to block legislation but a courageous desire to prove to itself and the people that too much of the legislation in the last 30 years has been set up by the Chief Executive or handed down by the Nation's high courts, the membership of which the President appoints and in a large measure controls. In short, the Congress has grown tired of receiving the bills to be passed instead of creating them according to its best judgment. The legislators in both House and Senate were elected by the people to formulate the necessary laws for the guidance of "We the people" and not to simply receive and stamp them as they flow in from the White House and the courts—hence the rebellion of the 88th Congress soon to be called a "Do-nothing Congress."

The 88th Congress also concluded that our people—a too much governed people—needed a rest from numerous regulations, having the force of law, now flowing in from almost every branch of the executive department. No doubt some one alerted this Congress to remember Thomas Jefferson, the great Democrat who believed in and advocated a minimum of legislation for a Democratic society. Jefferson had great faith in the people's judgment as to what constitutes proper legislation and judicial activity in a government of and by the people. Whether a bill sent in will have the proper effect on human liberties and well-being should be of great concern to any Congress.

Therefore, instead of calling the 88th Congress as "Do-nothing body," the American people should recall that the Founding Fathers carefully considered the need for a separation of powers and gave the lawmaking power to the Congress—not to the executive department and its branches. This Congress, therefore, did much to check the growing power of the executive which seems determined to turn this land into a welfare state in which the people would no longer use their judgment, but be forced by spurious laws to follow the Chief Executive into a leveling-off process where the rich would feed the poor and all the peoples everywhere would be graded as equals; in our old fashioned and highly competitive economy which has made this Nation great and the envy of the less fortunate peoples in other parts of the world, that sort of life would be exceedingly dreary.

This Congress, instead of doing nothing, has asked some very pertinent questions about the policy of this Nation's federalized bureaucratic regime to continue the practice of trying to buy friendships from those peoples around the world who refuse to accept our way of life—only our money—with the conclusion that if we continue to spend our money to revive our enemies the more we will wreck our own integrity and our will to resist those foreign principles and interests that would drag us down to their level.

The final conclusion, therefore, would seem to be that the 88th Congress should be complemented as a thoughtful and courageous Congress for throwing a roadblock against those executive philosophies and forces that are leading the American people away from their constitutional rights of yesteryear into a life of compromise, weakness, and indecision—with glorious promises to succor all people everywhere who may be in trouble whether they profess to be friend or foe. No wonder the do-nothing Congress (soon to be so labeled) refused to honor a package of bills calculated to lead us away from our constitutional moorings.

We shall live to thank the 88th Congress for its timely intervention in behalf of our constitutional rights as free men and women.

Watching the Mud Go By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we are all painfully aware that we have been enjoying one of the cyclical periods of criticism for Congress. A little of the current comment is constructively critical. Some of the uncomplimentary conversation is from citizens seeking a popular outlet for modern day frustrations. But all too much of the scathing attacks are from people of supposedly informed sectors of society. To hear from these persons intemperate, ill-considered, and irresponsible statements is disappointing in the extreme.

Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, present president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is a prime example of this latter category. Using the podium of his office and the otherwise respectability of the organization, Neilan has reached some new lows in demagoguery. His stance of vitriolic, uninformed, uncritical, and unjustified attack marks him as a prime problem of bringing responsible government to an irresponsible governed. One wonders if Mr. Neilan would flay about so wildly and generally were the subject matter the problem of the alarming rise in bank frauds and embezzlements. Would he conclude so quickly and righteously that this condemned all bankers and all banking?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point the excellent critique of the Indianapolis Times editorial following a performance by Mr. Neilan at the local chamber of that fair city:

WATCHING THE MUD GO BY

If Edwin P. Neilan, Delaware banker and president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, is ever out of work, he needn't worry. He can hire on as consulting mudslinger for both political parties.

He can really sling it. Enough for all.

When he was through his speech for the local chamber last night, you couldn't see the targets for the mud. It was fun, though. Neilan has a gift for eloquent name calling.

He talked about "the sordid brand of corruption that has eaten into this Nation's urban renewal and public housing programs." Without dwelling on specific corruption.

He talked about "political pigs who have pushed their snouts into the public trough and are gorging themselves on human misery." He didn't say who they are, except that they "mask" themselves as humanitarians and civic improvers."

Does this mean that all people who work for humanitarian and civic improvement are political pigs? Or just some of them? The Congressmen who passed urban renewal and public housing legislation, the officials who carry it out, local officials who cooperate with it, private people who call for it? Neilan didn't say.

For a banker he was dreadfully imprecise. He lumped together a posh resort hotel and a jail as equally undeserving. Can't he tell the difference?

He purported to prove that urban renewal and public housing have gone to wealthier rather than poorer areas. He didn't say what he meant by an area, but later on he made clear he meant a State. He can't tell the difference between densely packed New Jersey and underpopulated Wyoming.

He called programs in New York City and Newark vote buying. He didn't say how this works.

He should have complained about malapportioned legislatures whose shortchanging of these big cities sends them looking to Washington for help. But he didn't.

Neilan's technique is like hunting a crook in a crowd with a machinegun, like killing weeds by plowing the garden under, like discarding the baby instead of the diapers.

If Neilan wants to prune the tree of dead branches, parasites and cancerous growths, we are for it. If he wants to pull it out by the roots, let him look elsewhere for support.

Federal aid has been used for a lot of foolish things, while worthy Indianapolis projects like urban renewal and flood control have gone without, all to satisfy slogans of people like Neilan.

That didn't save us taxes. It cost us extra taxes. It didn't cut the national debt. The money—our money—just went elsewhere.

Indianapolis has wretched slums and nasty floods and 5,000 families getting evicted by highways and sky-high property taxes. Neilan doesn't seem to give a damn.

Tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the great courage, skill and devotion with which President Lyndon B. Johnson has assumed his duties as Chief Executive have been an inspiration to all the people of the United States. In my own State of Indiana, as elsewhere, there has been a spontaneous and consistent expression of gratification at the smoothness in the transition to the new administration following the national tragedy on November 22.

Recently, the Indiana Democratic State Committee, at the suggestion of the Honorable Alexander Campbell, national committeeman from Indiana, unanimously adopted a resolution setting forth its confidence and pledging its support to our new President. It is a privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues this fine tribute to President Johnson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE INDIANA DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF THE COMMITTEE, SUGGESTED BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN FROM INDIANA

In the light of the eternal flame the torch of freedom, liberty and peace has quietly passed from the brilliant hand of the enlightened President John F. Kennedy to the masterful hand of the dynamic President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Our courageous new President has continued to advance the program set forth by President Kennedy.

He has shown great skill and judgment in assuming the mantle of leadership in a world half free and half slave.

Within a few short weeks President Johnson has demonstrated to the people of the United States and to the world a titanic capacity for the office by virtue of being the best trained and most experienced leader ever called upon by the people.

He has already earned the respect and admiration of America and the world.

We, the members of the Indiana Democratic State Committee extend to President Johnson our unqualified commendation and pledge to him our full and active support in leading this great Nation forward and in holding high the torch of freedom, liberty, and peace in a complex world.

William Jennings Bryan and Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Vermont Royster, distinguished editor of the Wall Street Journal, points out the striking parallels between the current "war on poverty" and the basic approach of William Jennings Bryan to the economic and social problems of his time. I include Mr. Royster's column "Thinking Things Over" from this morning's Journal:

BACK TO BRYAN

(By Vermont Royster)

We only remember William Jennings Bryan as an old man wrestling with the devil and Clarence Darrow. We wish we could have known him in the days of his glory, when as editor of the Omaha World Herald he was wrestling with the crown of golden thorns, the horns of William McKinley and the shades of Adam Smith.

For it always struck us that Bryan had the simplest, most straightforward and logically irrefutable diagnosis of poverty we ever heard of. Poverty, Bryan argued, is when people don't have enough money—an observation that surely ranks in acuteness with Cal Coolidge's remark that unemployment arises when people don't have jobs.

Moreover, Bryant had a straightforward program to cure poverty that was simplicity itself. Since poverty is not having enough money, and since one of the sovereign powers of government is the authority to create money, Bryant reasoned that if the Government would just stop being so miserly and would coin enough money then poverty would be easily abolished.

Bryan's trouble was that he was a man ahead of his time. Today he would find himself right at home on the Council of Economic Advisers and his ideas echoed in the Johnson administration's current "poverty program."

Not all the Johnson poverty program, to be sure, is a throwback to the 19th century. Some of it, like the proposed revival of Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps, is only about 30 years old. Others are just current projects wrapped in a new package: Federal money for urban and area development; Federal aid to handy and worthy causes like schools, libraries, and hospitals; the medicare plan; expanded minimum wage coverage and unemployment insurance.

But the real aim of the poverty program is not to urge these things on their individual merits, of which perhaps there are some, but rather to use them as an excuse for creating more Government-made money and as devices for spreading that money around. A library is a good thing in itself, and can be a comfort to the poor equally with the rich, but nobody pretends that reading a good book cures hunger pangs.

The essential point, in the new economics, is that the Government must spend more in total than it takes in from taxes. Even the proposed tax cut, which certainly has merits on its own, is part of the plan for making the Government's deficit larger than it would otherwise be. And if President Johnson doesn't promise a deficit quite as large as President Kennedy might have offered, it's still not small.

With all these spending programs, plus the tax cut, Mr. Johnson plans to spend a minimum of $5 billion more than the expenditures in the last fiscal year. For fiscal 1964 and 1965 combined the deficit will be not less than $15 billion. A small part of this may be borrowed from the real savings of people, as in the savings bond program, but most of it—and this is the actual idea—will be simply created by the Government.

True, there have been some technical advances since Bryan's day. The great commoner was still imprisoned by the idea that money needed to be backed up by something so that it would represent at least something of value. Thus while he was impatient with the restrictiveness of the gold standard, he could think of nothing better than to base the money on both gold and silver.

This bimetallism would have increased the money stock considerably. Yet it would have had its limitations. In time the rising prices from the cheapening of the money would have meant that again there would not be enough money to meet the demand, and the poor—though having more dollars—would be poor again. The Bryan plan was up against the fact that the quantity of silver, while more plentiful than gold, is still finite.

The new economics suffers no such deficiency. Walter Heller wouldn't dream of advocating bimetallism. The current doctrine is nonmetallism. A dollar now is just a piece of paper; even the Treasury's silver certificates are being withdrawn. The beauty of this is that the supply of paper is practically infinite. You can print up all the dollars you wish, and with a little ingenuity you can put them in the hands of the poor by the bales.

It's not very fashionable to point out that this won't cure poverty any more than incantations will cure cancer. Senator GOLDWATER, poor fellow, tried to point it out and all he got for his pains was a public pillorying as a heartless fellow "soft on poverty." And today any economist who challenges the fashionable view risks being read out of the fraternity, or at best being kindly tolerated as a museum piece.

Yet some people, we suspect, have a few nagging doubts. The war on poverty has been the long occupation of mankind and the worthy aim of every economic thinker from Adam Smith to Karl Marx. But there is no instance on record of poverty being abolished by kings clipping coins or parliaments printing up money. It has come closest to being abolished in those lands, like the United States, where people have the most economic freedom to lift themselves from poverty and where the Government has done the least damage to the money for which the poor labor in order to escape poverty.

Those doubts, just possibly, explain why Bryan was twice defeated for the Presidency by William McKinley. The commonsense of the people may have suggested to them if it were all so simply done just by minting coins and handing them to the poor then the heartbreaking battle would have been won long ago.

That double defeat, which blocked that wonderful poverty program, may also explain why McKinley has got such a bad name. What it doesn't explain is why it's reactionary to want to turn the clock back to McKinley but forward looking to turn it back to Bryan.

Poem Written by Emma Lee McLeod, of Los Alamos, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Emma Lee McLeod, a teacher in the schools at Los Alamos, N. Mex., during the days when the country was filled with grief because of the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, wrote a tribute. Friends of hers have suggested that it ought to be put in our permanent record and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the tribute be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS DAY

(By Emma Lee McLeod)

Death drove in through doors
That had been opened by the hearts
Of men. These doors were hinged with
The faith that gives another breath
To the dying—that gives another
Note to the symphony—that gives
Another prayer to the mourning.
These were the eternal doors whose hinges
Open only inward.
And today they have opened again.
The promised glories were waiting,
The angels and saints—those
Who had been the earth's big and little
And those who had been divided by class
And race and religion—those
Who had known poverty and hatred and
Persecution—those who had been
Members of a minority were here together.
The victories of the heavens
Enveloped the newcomer.
Here was peace—peace—
Eternal peace—at last,
But yet too soon
For those who still breathe
Fear and hatred.
Could their hearts be less bitter today?
Could their minds be less warped?
For if such is so,
The race was finished well.
The price of victory was paid
The reward of eternal life has been given
And a new star [1] has risen in the heavens
To proclaim this day.

---

[1] Discovery of a new star was announced at Palomar Observatory on Nov. 25, 1963. Although the star will be assigned its technical number, it will be named "The John F. Kennedy Star."

An Inspiring Example of Youthful Determination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an inspiring example of courage and determination in the face of a physical handicap has come to my attention through an article written by Mr. Tommy Bryant of the sports staff of the Amarillo Daily News, a newspaper in the district I have the honor to represent.

The article concerns young Jerry McCuistion of Miami, Tex., a fine city in the Texas Panhandle. Because of his outstanding record as a high school athlete—a record made despite the fact that he lost the lower portion of his left arm in a farm accident—young Jerry McCuistion has been named the recipient of an award for the most courageous athlete of the year in the Panhandle area.

I know every American will be interested in the example of fortitude presented by Jerry McCuistion, and accordingly I respectfully submit Mr. Bryant's article for incorporation in the RECORD:

(By Tommy Bryant)

In Miami, Jerry McCuiston is an average boy.

Outside the city limits, he's about as average as any boy who makes the starting varsity football team—with one arm—as a freshman.

The 160-pound bundle of determination has been selected as the third recipient of the Dee Henry Memorial Award.

Friends of the late Austin Junior High School football and YMCA baseball coach present the award each year at the Panhandle Sports Hall of Fame installation to the most courageous athlete of the year.

The ceremonies will be at 2 p.m. Sunday, February 2, in the Amarillo YMCA. The event is sponsored by the Y Men's Club.

By midyear of this past season Jerry was able to take over a starting guard position. He has also played baseball and basketball and plans to compete in track this spring.

As the stocky youth lost the lower portion of his left arm at 2 years of age in a farm accident, residents of Miami have become accustomed to seeing McCuistion with one arm.

It's only the strangers who are amazed at what Jerry does.

"There were many questions in our minds as to the worth of his play," says head football coach Bill Hines, "until we got the know him."

No drill is too tough for the bespectacled hitter. He does push ups with the best. By looping a rope to his upper arm, Jerry is able to take isometric weight exercises.

"If McCuistion misses an assignment in football, he comes in for his share of chewing," says Hines. "He's no different than any other football player, except that he's a good one."

Opposing coaches of Miami feel the same way.

Groom's Jack York says he would like to have five or six players of Jerry's caliber. "Taking nothing into consideration, he's a good, tough football player. Considering his arms, he's amazing."

Grady Burnett of Wheeler calls McCuistion a good blocker and tough competition.

Miami basketball coach Lawrence Overcast had Jerry on his eighth grade basketball team. The 5-foot-9-inch dynamo was an above-average dribbler and defender. Shooting took longer, but was as accurate as any of the players.

"We played a little softball in school last spring and Jerry sparkled," recalls Lawrence. "He wears a right-handed glove. It doesn't take him long to remove the glove and throw. It's a chore to strike him out. No one let up on him."

Jerry takes little credit for being an outstanding athlete and says only, " I try hard."

McCuistion joins Dwayne Tidwell and Dale Sexton as winner of the Dee Henry Award.

Tidwell dislocated a shoulder between his junior and senior years at Amarillo High School and that injury knocked him out of any contact football work. He volunteered to kick extra points and had an outstanding season.

Memphis High's Sexton cut off four of his fingers 2 days before football practice started in the season of 1962. The 6-foot-4-inch 230-pounder returned to action and was a second-team all-district selection.

W. A. (Gus) Miller will be installed as the sixth member of the Panhandle Sports Hall of Fame.

Miller's basketball teams at West Texas State won 176 games, while losing 128. At Texas Wesleyan College his clubs won 106 and lost 19.

Other members of the Panhandle Sports Hall of Fame are Joe Fortenberry, West Texas All-America basketball player; Blair Cheery, Amarillo High School and University of Texas football coach; Bob Seeds, major league baseball player; Cal Farley, wrestling champion; and Frank Kimbrough, athletic director and former head football coach of West Texas.

There won't be a banquet with the ceremonies. There is no charge. All men and women sports followers are invited.

Coaches and athletes of the year in football, basketball, baseball, track, and tennis will also be honored.

Panama Canal: Conquest by Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as all students of U.S. history know, it was President Theodore Roosevelt whose courageous actions brought about the acquisition of the Canal Zone and construction of the Panama Canal.

Among the many points that I have stressed in the course of many addresses to this body is that the long-range Soviet drive for wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States traces back to 1917, when John Reed, the notorious Communist who was buried in the Kremlin, discussed the matter with the Reds in Petrograd.

It is, indeed, significant that former President Theodore Roosevelt in the very next year on December 2, 1918, warned our country against the threat of internationalization.

The latest contribution on the canal question by the distinguished granddaughter of President Theodore Roosevelt quotes his specific warning in an article published in the January 26, 1964, issue of the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin.

The indicated news story follows:

CONQUEST BY NEGOTIATION—ARE ZONIANS BEING CONDITIONED TO ACCEPT "SUEZ SOLUTION"?

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The vulnerable locks of the Panama Canal are caught in a squeeze play. On the one side are Egyptian advisers experienced in the Suez venture, Castro agents and Panamanian ultranationalists. On the other, apparently pushing for the same ultimate objectives, are key State Department and other U.S. officials.

Conspicuous among those Americans furthering what Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, calls "conquest by negotiation" is none other than Robert J. Fleming, Jr. He is Panama Canal Zone Governor. On March 17, last year, the Republic of Panama Sunday American reported that he denounced "blind adherence to a treaty signed 60 years ago" and "strictly legalistic interpretations of its provisions."

ADDRESS OF 1962

Governor Fleming followed the familiar pattern of Owen Lattimore in China, and William Wieland in Cuba, as he spoke to select groups on "guided change" in contrast with the "status quo" and the "reactionary." His words were sensationally reported in Panama's Spanish language press, which has all along seized on any quotation from an American official that would inflame Panamanian nationalist passions.

On December 10, 1962, in an address before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Governor Fleming derided the "folklores stemming from the era of the rugged individualist and of the pioneer," adding that "oversimplified slogans like 'States Rights' and '100 Percent Americanism' become platitudes that support, not principles, but vague and cloudy dreams of things that never existed."

Our pioneer stock and the families who pushed westward, however, did exist. Governor Fleming's derision of them only helps to destroy the U.S. image. How can foreign nationals, loyal to their own kind, respect the United States when its own officials downgrade its heritage and traditions?

The Panama Canal is one of the outstanding symbols of our national dynamism. Yet Governor Fleming is dismantling it.

GOVERNOR FLEMING "BLAMED"

In an interview with Jules DuBois, published in the Chicago Tribune, January 13, Ramon Mendez, pastor of the First Christian Church of Christ, Panama City, blamed Governor Fleming for touching off the riots. The Governor provoked the disturbances, Mendez said, by his refusal to allow American flags to be raised over American schools and by removing the flagstaff from his official residence—all in the Canal Zone itself.

Governor Fleming could hardly have expressed these views at a time when Washington was enforcing a one-voice approach without their being State Department policy. These officials, it seems to me have been conducting operations to erode U.S. power in the zone ever since 1946, when Alger Hiss, head of the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs, filed an administrative report with the United Nations listing the zone as an "occupied area."

RIOT LEADER DECORATED

More recently, Representaitve FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, pointed out on the floor, January 13, that more than a year ago "this Government through the recommendation of the State Department decorated with an American medal one Thelma King, a well-known Communist in Panama and once an associate of Fidel Castro." This was the same Thelma King who was heard on Radio Tribuna inciting the Panamanians to action in the zone in the synchronized anti-American rioting that started January 9.

Should they take her advice to engage in "very violent revolution," it would, of course, force a riposte by the United States. Thus the State Department prefers, in accordance with its policy of "guided change," that the zone will fall without looking as though it had been pushed.

VISITOR FROM SUEZ

One of the Department's maneuvers was revealed by Edwin McDowell, writing from Panama City, in the Arizona Republic of June 18, last year. McDowell said the State Department invited to the Canal Zone, Abdel Hamid Abubakr, Secretary General of the Suez Canal Authority. At a luncheon attended by employees of the zone government, the United Arab Republic spokesman enthusiastically described how Egypt seized the Suez Canal during a 55-hour period in 1956.

The day after his speech a Panama City newspaper displayed a front-page picture of the United Arab Republic official handing the flag of the expropriated Suez Canal to Gov. Robert Fleming.

Understandably, this gesture jolted U.S. citizens in the zone. When another United Arab Republic delegate arrived, also a guest of the State Department, in Washington, his appearance was hushed up.

T.R.'S WARNING

Fears by U.S. citizens in the zone that they are being conditioned to accept the Suez Canal seizure as a precedent are not far-fetched. It is recalled that after Nasser seized the Suez Canal, the United States joined with Soviet Russia in demanding it be internationalized by the United Nations.

Significantly, the man who ordered the canal built, President Theodore Roosevelt, warned against internationalization of the Panama Canal Zone as a threat to U.S. security. In the Kansas City Star, December 2, 1918, he wrote:

"The Panama Canal must not be internationalized. It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it, and we will protect it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it in war. In time of peace, all nations shall use it alike but in time of war our interest at once becomes dominant."

Resolution Endorsing Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while this House is engaged in a serious debate on civil rights legislation, I am happy to note that the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, has, by resolution, endorsed and given its full support to this measure.

President Lt. Mario Biaggi, in addressing 300 delegates representing 80,000 members, Americans of Italian heritage, in city, State, and Federal departments, said:

That this Nation, under God, was founded by men of many nations and backgrounds; it was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and that the rights of all

men are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened.

That it is for our sense of decency, for our conscience, and for human dignity—our own and our neighbor's that this legislation be passed.

That beyond personal feelings, there is a special obligation for our legislators to make the basic documents upon which our Government rests—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—a reality for all men.

That we are confronted primarily with a moral issue which is as old as the Scriptures and is clear as the American Constitution. That the heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities; and whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated.

The resolution, pledging the full support of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, was unanimously adopted.

A New Johnson Rainbow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the farm message delivered by President Johnson was very similar to the state of the Union message and likewise his budget message.

In order to appreciate the full import of these, one should use rose-colored glasses while reading them because it is quite evident there were glaring inconsistencies.

In addition we must view them with unusual skepticism because once again we get promises of more benefits at greatly reduced costs.

He announced no retreat from Government controls with more subsidies, yet with a reduced budget, or as more aptly put by the editorial writer of the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus on February 1, 1964—"A New Johnson Rainbow."

I recommend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues.

A NEW JOHNSON RAINBOW

President Johnson's farm program, in which he announced no retreat from the New Frontier's controls and subsidies, contains the same kind of allurement that he offered in his state of the Union message—more benefits, yet a reduced budget.

He says the total cost will be from $1 billion to $1.1 billion below spendings for the current year, which will end next June 30. Yet farm-aid spendings will be shaved only from $1.9 to $1.7 billion—a slice of $200 million.

How is this magic to be performed? The savings, he said, will come from planned reduction in the surpluses. In other words, he hopes to sell more of the surpluses than previous administrations have been able to do.

This is a good resolution. The surplus problem offers a tremendous challenge. Other administrations have tackled it with confidence as well as zest, only to find their hopes unfulfilled. In some instances there have been objections abroad even to outright gifts because of interference with local markets.

We hope that Mr. Johnson succeeds. But even if he does, it will be improper to describe the proceeds from such sales as administration economies. The surpluses were accumulated through Government subsidy programs, at a greater cost than their present value. Selling them at a discount will be no economy miracle, though it may be good business. The way to economize is to cut down on the multitude of Government operations seeking to control farm supplies and prices, but which produce surpluses.

Kennedy Memorial Services in Hue, Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Mary Mills is a nurse serving overseas with AID as a public health nursing advisor and instructor. She has been in the service of her country many (18) years, has spent some time in Liberia, Beirut, and Cambodia. She is now in Hue, Vietnam.

In writing me recently she enclosed a copy of her account of the memorial services for the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It seems to me this respect paid by our American citizens abroad to our assassinated President must have had great meaning, not only to the Americans over there but also to the citizens of that war-torn country. I would like to share with you the account by Mary Mills:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963, HUE, VIETNAM

Yes, there was something we could do in Hue, Vietnam: Representatives from the Consulate and our military headquarters came by the house on Sunday evening to tell me that there would be a memorial service for our late President on Monday morning at 11 (11 at night there). By morning I knew what to do. I had the driver cut some sprigs of boxwood from the garden, and armed with the big brass punchbowl, I was off for our military headquarters. The officer on duty was not certain if flowers would be used since it was to be a military ceremony but that he would find out and let me know. Leaving his office I ran into the commanding officer who not only welcomed the idea but insisted that I remain and have breakfast with him which I politely refused because I did not have the time. He did insist that I at least have a cup of tea with him. From there I went to the market to buy flowers. En route to the school I passed by my French teacher's to give them the information about the ceremony. Back at school I suggested that a student representation of one student from each of the four classes prepare themselves to accompany me to the ceremony at 10:45. The instructors and the administrative assistant along with my immediate staff were invited to accompany us. It was suggested that we all go in uniform.

I stopped and gathered some fern and a beautiful little running flower with delicate white blossoms from the Sisters' residence which is near our school. My driver helped me with the floral arrangement. In the main entrance of the military headquarters through which the guests passed, on a table beneath a large draped picture of the President, I did the most beautiful (I think) arrangement I have ever done. Never have I given the care and attention to such an arrangement. The table was covered with a white tablecloth and on either side of the huge copper punchbowl were tall candelabra. To the right of the picture was the American flag. The part of the cloth which hung over the table was garlanded in black. The flowers consisted of lilies, a delicate white flower, a few pale pink roses, and the boxwood and fern. Those were the only flowers used since the service was strictly military and held out of doors. Even the rains were kind to us; it was a heavenly morning.

At 10:45 two cars took us, in a group, to the military headquarters. Surprisingly, there was a special seat for me with my name pinned on it, but most important of all there was the place of honor reserved for my staff and students. It so happened that with us appearing in uniform and our group representing the only Vietnamese appearing in a small group, quite an impression was made on both the Vietnamese and some of the others.

It was a touching and most impressive ceremony; in 20 minutes it was all over. The chaplain had performed what must have been for him, as was true for others throughout the world, a painful but honored duty. The Vietnamese Band (military) played the Funeral Dirge, Taps, and our National Anthem. During our minutes of silent prayers following the chaplain's eulogy and prayer, certainly there must have been unisonous in silence that united us in his honor and memory; that we would reaffirm our faith and rededicate our efforts and our lives to help carry out the mission begun by him and yet common to us all, the continuing search for the fulfillment of a just and lasting peace, that we would come to recognize the true worth of all mankind irrespective of the differences that may separate us, and that human dignity and freedom would become our symbol and a reality not only for our own country but for mankind. If we can so bind up our wounds and suffering for this great loss through such a dedication, then his short life and tragic loss would not have been in vain. Some people finish their work on this earth in a much shorter period of time than is necessary for some of us who spend most of our lives trying to destroy others while at the same time not realizing that the tragic loss is that of our own lives. And so, while there is still time, let us put forth an all-out effort to become men of good will.

MARY MILLS.

HUE, VIETNAM.

Independence of Ceylon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, after more than 400 years as a colony of European powers, Ceylon became an independent and sovereign state on February 4, 1948. Today marks the 16th anniversary of that historic moment and I take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency the Governor-General of Ceylon, William Gopallawa; and His Excellency, the Ceylonese Ambassador to the United States, M. F. de S. Jayaratne.

Ceylon is a small island paradise just off the southeastern tip of the Indian subcontinent. It has some of the most enchanting scenery in the world and its praises have been sung by visitors for centuries. As long as ships have sailed the Indian Ocean, Ceylon has been an important link in trade with the Orient. It was famous in earlier days for its rich and abundant spices, especially cinnamon, and for its many precious stones. However, the country is better known to us today for its exports of black tea and natural rubber and for the fact that its Prime Minister is the first woman in modern history to head a government.

A visitor who is familiar with living conditions in other Asian countries will be pleasantly surprised by the relative prosperity in Ceylon. The people live simply but well, and there is little or no evidence of poverty and misery in the villages. Three-fourths of all Ceylonese are able to read and write, as compared to the rest of Asia's one-fourth, and education is free from kindergarten to university.

Mr. Speaker, today the independence of Ceylon is being celebrated by the people of that country, and we share their joy and pride on this important occasion. The continued evolution of Ceylon as a free and independent democratic state is important to the United States. Our country has always respected the Ceylon Government's policy of "friendly relations with all nations and noninvolvement with any power bloc." And over the many years the relations between the United States and Ceylon have been friendly. Our trade relations have been mutually satisfactory, and there has been increasing cultural exchange. It is true that the close bond between the United States and Ceylon has been under strain in recent months due to unresolved differences over American property nationalized in Ceylon. But it seems to me that, given mutual understanding and respect for the ideals of each other, it should be possible to restore normal and friendly relations. I personally look forward to the time when we will move once more to such a rewarding friendship.

Decision Should Be Reached on Question of Airport Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Civil Aeronautics Board will begin final consideration of a matter of utmost importance to the future of air transportation in eastern North Carolina. The matter has stimulated enormous public interest in the area, and I would like to place in the RECORD a brief editorial which appeared in the January 30, 1964, edition of the Nashville Graphic which is published in my hometown of Nashville, N.C. This editorial reflects the views of thousands of people living in the area where better air transportation is so badly needed in the eastern part of our State. The editorial is as follows:

DECISION SHOULD BE REACHED ON QUESTION OF AIRPORT SITE

Another hearing is scheduled before the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D.C., next Wednesday in connection with the proposal to build a new airport in the area of Town Creek, approximately halfway between Rocky Mount and Wilson.

It is our understanding, and our hope, that the airport location question will be settled once and for all at this hearing.

The controversy has extended over a long period of time. Rocky Mount and Wilson, with the moral and financial support of the three counties of Nash, Edgecombe, and Wilson, have battled persistently for the Town Creek location. A group from the Greenville area has fought no less diligently for a location near Toddy, in Pitt County.

There are arguments, of course, in favor of both locations. The major difference is that the Town Creek location is based on the proposition that the new airport can hope to serve only a limited area, while the Toddy location envisions a regional airport facility that would serve a major part of eastern Carolina.

The regional concept is weak, it seems to us, for the simple reason that the region's population is too small and too sparse to support a major airport. For Nash, and other counties in this immediate area, the Raleigh-Durham Airport is almost as close as the Toddy Airport would be, and Raleigh-Durham offers service which an airport facility at Toddy could not hope to match in the foreseeable future.

This means that passenger traffic and air freight shipments for the Toddy Airport would be limited largely to areas east of Rocky Mount and Wilson, where travel distances would place extreme restrictions on use of the airport for much of the widely scattered population.

The Town Creek location, on the other hand, could expect to generate traffic from both the Rocky Mount and Wilson areas, Piedmont Airlines is already serving Rocky Mount on a profitable basis, and it is reasonable to assume that its air transportation business would expand as a result of added patronage from the Wilson area.

In addition, matching funds in the amount of $700,000 have already been pledged toward construction of the Town Creek Airport by the three counties of Nash, Wilson, and Edgecombe, and by the cities of Rocky Mount and Wilson.

From a practical standpoint, therefore, it seems logical that the Civil Aeronautics Board should approve the Town Creek site and the concept of an airport that will serve a limited area successfully, rather than a regional airport that has little hope of generating enough traffic to justify its existence.

The Baker Affair a Midge to L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is the duty of all of us to try and understand President Johnson's motives and methods. Mr. Marquis Childs, in his column in the Washington Post of February 3, has given us quite an insight into various phases of the President's activities.

His column follows:

THE BAKER AFFAIR A MIDGE TO L.B.J.

(By Marquis Childs)

Since he was old enough to know what life was about, Lyndon Baines Johnson has been running as hard and as fast as he could. And now occupying the highest office in the land with present prospects of staying there for some time to come, he can't stop running.

The picture of a driving taskmaster who pushes himself twice as hard as anyone around him emerges from his first 2 months in the Presidency. But this is an oversimplification, for the President is more complicated than a superficial impression would indicate.

A Texan who has known Mr. Johnson through his entire career was asked what he thought would be the effect on the President of the disclosures in the Bobby Baker case. His answer was:

"He'll work twice as long. He'll be like a man clearing out swampland, digging harder than ever and meanwhile brushing off the midges swarming around. Lyndon can't believe anything he does is wrong."

That is an apt figure of speech. The complexities of the Johnson character go down to his origins and his background. As a young man growing up in a part of the country where the frontier tradition was still strong, he was a "have not" and he set out with all his great capacity and phenomenal energy to become a "have."

His political outlook was shaped by this same background. By instinct, predilection and early conditioning, Lyndon Johnson was a Jacksonian Democrat. This was against not so much the Hamiltonian tradition of aristocratic rule as against the Adams concept of government as an austere obligation to do good and promote the general welfare.

Andrew Jackson believed that the public lands in the empty continent were there to be taken by the people. When he defeated John Quincy Adams for reelection to the Presidency, the Adams clan felt that the cloven hoof was stamped on government with a carnival of corruption to follow. Out of those public lands some of the greatest American fortunes were amassed.

This Jacksonian conviction has carried over into a more complicated day. Whether it is television franchises or contracts running into hundreds of millions of dollars, for the Jacksonians, government is a legitimate source of enrichment. And for a have-not it is not merely a privilege but a duty to take what he can before it falls to the haves.

In this same context, distorted and paradoxical as it appears, the private defenders of Bobby Baker see the boy from Pickens, S.C. Baker is a Jacksonian in the era of the quick buck, a Horatio Alger of the fast deal pulled off with Government mirrors. A question touching the morals of our day is whether the public attitude toward this instant millionaire is one more of envy than of censure.

The Johnson paradox is that he can in all sincerity propose a war on poverty using every weapon of Government and yet not impair his solid standing with the establishment in Texas.

In a sense this is the paradox of Texas and the President is first a Texan and then a southerner or a westerner. In his New Yorker series that angered many Texans, John Bainbridge pointed out that while "social security" and "Federal aid" are dirty words to Texas millionaires, that State, sixth in population and seventh in the amount of Federal taxes paid, ranks third in the volume of help it gets from the Federal Government.

More than any of his predecessors in this century, the President resembles Harry S. Truman. Truman is a Jacksonian Democrat who came of political age in Kansas City where self-help through government took on astonishing proportions.

The President's gross income for 1963 is said to have been more than $190,000 which included his salary up to November 22 as Vice President, $40,000 a year, plus an allowance also subject to Federal income tax of $10,000, the sale of cattle and the sale of certain ranch lands. He can certify his standing as a have.

Imagine you are President of the United States. A call comes just before midnight to say the Turks are reported moving in force on the island of Cyprus. Twenty hours later you are on the phone to Vietnam learning whether the coup there is disastrous or helpful. Through the day the stalemate of Panama has been on your desk. If the midges swarm about your head, you brush them aside impatiently.

Road to Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the free world should have by now realized that there is no such thing as neutrality with the Communist world. The following editorial in the Washington Star of Sunday, February 2, 1964, is an excellant commentary on this matter:

ROAD TO SURRENDER

Ten years ago the French, defeated after a long and bitter war, tossed in the sponge in Indochina. General de Gaulle now wants a repeat performance—this time without so much as the firing of a single shot by France.

Of course, he did not put it in these words in his rambling Friday press conference. General de Gaulle said he was advocating a treaty to "neutralize" the former French possessions in southeast Asia—Cambodia, Laos, and the two Vietnams. Communist China would be a party to this treaty. And the agreement would enjoy an international guarantee—a guarantee which would exclude armed action between the covered states as well as "foreign intervention." To cap off his remarks, the French President said "neutrality appears to be the only situation compatible with the peaceful life and progress of the populations."

Another "situation" suggests itself to us. This is that the Communists cease their aggression in southeast Asia, thereby assuring the peaceful life and progress of the populations.

But the Communists, of course, are not going to do this—as everyone except General de Gaulle must understand. Nor is there any visible merit in his proposed treaty, with Communist China as a party. How is this treaty to be enforced? Is De Gaulle's France, which has refused to meet its NATO commitments in Europe, ready to contribute arms and troops to the maintenance of a treaty in southeast Asia? Nothing in General de Gaulle's remarks indicate that it is.

After the defeat in 1954, France negotiated an agreement with Communist China. This was supposed to preserve the integrity of the area. But within a few years the Communists renewed their guerrilla war—a war which has led step by step, but nonetheless directly, to the crisis which confronts the world today. General de Gaulle's proposals, if accepted, could only mean another eventual surrender. For the guarantees which he so vaguely mentions are worthless.

There should be no self-deception in this matter. It is possible that the Communists, with or without the help of fuzzy, defeatist recommendations from General de Gaulle, will win the war in South Vietnam. This may even be probable unless the United States intervene militarily on a much larger scale than is the case today. If Vietnam goes, however, the rest of southeast Asia might just as well be written off—notwithstanding all talk of neutrality.

At the moment General Khanh, who has taken power in Siagon, bitterly rejects the advice from Paris and proposes to press on with the war. If General Khanh's deeds support his words, the United States, or so it seems to us, must stay with the struggle. Meanwhile, one can only hope that President de Gaulle, if merely for the sake of change, will mind his own business.

Canal Zone—Panama Relations: Zonians Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, following the January 9, 1964, Panamanian assault on the Canal Zone, I have received letters, telegrams, newspaper clippings, and telephone calls from many parts of the Nation. Without a single exception, all such communications have approved the views that I have consistently presented on the Panama Canal sovereignty and perpetuity questions.

A recent letter from a Balboa, C.Z., schoolteacher, speaks out with a refreshing degree of candor and is commended for reading by all Members of the Congress.

The indicated letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The relationship between the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama is critical and needs your immediate attention. The press reports which I have seen have been in most respects both erroneous and distorted. To think that the American students' attempt to fly the American flag at the Balboa High School was the cause of the present flareup is to be naive.

The presentation of a Panamanian flag to President Roberto Chiari and the OAS, supposedly torn and bloodied by the North American students, is an example of their many lies.

Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, commander in chief, U.S. Southern Command, has categorically denied that this was done by North American students and has backed his denial with a 16-millimeter film of the incident.

The phenomenal destruction of property in Panama by their own citizens was disgraceful. Is this their way of showing patriotism for their flag? Or is this an indication of the many subversive elements that operate in Panama?

Our appeasements in the Canal Zone over many years, particularly since the 1959 rioting, have brought nothing more than scorn, greater demands, and more sacrifice by the U.S. taxpayers.

The past publicity of Operation Friendship and the activities of the State Department have presented a false picture of great accomplishment. The all-out efforts of the military and civilian populace of the Canal Zone to improve conditions have been in most cases resented.

The Panamanians complain that we have so much more than they, and yet they do nothing to improve their economy.

The North Americans in general have been and still are disliked throughout Latin America, and we were respected only momentarily when the United States took a firm stand during the Cuban crisis. We must take a firm stand now, before we are lost.

In Panama itself, as in many other Latin American countries, there are luxurious suburbs containing some of the wealthiest people in the world. Yet these wealthy people want more and expect the U.S. taxpayer to take care of their problems.

In Panama the needy are contrasted with the people of the Canal Zone. To contrast the two presents a false picture, as no unemployment could possibly exist in the zone. The economic condition of the Zonians, which is often called luxurious, is not equivalent to that of people of the United States of the same means. As an example, most housing is substandard.

One of the present requests of the Panamanian Government is for a new treaty. With the instability in government that often exists in Panama we would have to write a new treaty with each new family that comes into power. It is impossible to have a rational understanding with such unstable conditions. History will verify that revolution is not uncommon.

Millions of dollars are being channeled into this area and with what returns?

The residents in the Canal Zone feel it is our responsibility to let the other U.S. citizens and our friends of the world know the truth and importance of the present situation. We invite your personal investigation.

Sincerely yours,

A BALBOA, C.Z., SCHOOLTEACHER.

Amendments to the Antidumping Act of 1921

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this session of the 88th Congress act upon amendments to the Antidumping Act of 1921. As the act now stands it is not only possible, but incredibly easy for a foreign manufacturer to bring his goods to this country and dump them on the market at prices substantially below what he is charging for identical manufactured goods in his own country.

This is patently unfair, not only to American manufacturers, but also to American workers and consumers. Because of this, the proposed amendments to the antidumping laws which I have introduced—and amendments introduced by 49 other Members of this House, both Democratic and Republican—have the full and wholehearted support of both organized labor and management.

This is a matter which cuts through economic and social strata. It is not a partisan political issue. It is not proposed legislation for the sake of special interests on either side.

It is designed to fight unemployment, for when the profits of our cement industry in my own district are substantially cut back by unfair dumping practices, there can and will be only one result: the loss of large numbers of jobs for the people in my area.

The problem is particularly critical in my district and it affects the lives of nearly every Pennsylvanian who lives or works or depends upon heavy industry for his subsistence.

American steel has been particularly hard pressed by these unfair practices. Bethlehem Steel—the world's second largest producer of steel products and steel for industrial uses—finds itself consistently undersold by foreign producers who are permitted to dump indiscriminately on our markets.

Just a few days ago, Mr. Talbot Shelton, representing Bethlehem Steel Co., which employs 120,000 workers, many of them right in my own native city of Bethlehem, appeared before representatives of the U.S. Treasury Department to clarify and reaffirm the company's opposition to foreign dumping. In his testimony, Mr. Shelton made a number of cogent observations on the use of loss leaders by foreign producers to cut an unfair corner in the American market.

Mr. Shelton—and the company—take specifically strong exception to the Department's practice of making decisions on dumping cases without giving American producers an opportunity to be heard and participate in the discussion leading up to the Department's decision.

Mr. Shelton said:

It is too easy under these circumstances for the Treasury to be misled into accepting misleading or false information or data that is not typical of arm's length transactions at any particular time. To provide an accurate, fair and expeditious administration of the Antidumping Act, the Treasury should not reach decisions in camera but should hold public hearings. Experience in the wire rod proceedings indicates such hearings would be in the overall public interest. Because there is a strong economic incentive to dump and the effects can be so adverse to American industry and labor, a finding of dumping or no dumping by the Treasury is too serious a matter to be decided without hearings.

This is a problem which affects many economic and industrial fields and it knows no geographical boundaries.

When foreign producers are allowed to invade American markets with preposterously lowered, cutrate prices which are far below their own market levels at home, we are making second-class producers of our aluminum, cement, chemical, copper and brass, electrical and electronics, pharmaceutical, steel, synthetic fabric, textiles, wire and cable and many other industrial producers representing the mainstream of American consumer-industrial production.

We must act—and act now—to close the loopholes in existing antidumping legislation. We must do it, not only for the sake of a substantial portion of our manufacturing community, but for the thousands of Americans who are being forced into unfair competition with a foreign labor market.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of action in this field. Pennsylvania's cement industry—most of which is concentrated in my own district and in the Lehigh Valley—has suffered serious and severe economic loss through the indiscriminate dumping of foreign-produced materials on the American market.

With employment in cement lagging—and with further serious cutbacks threatened in steel and other major industries—the continued permissiveness of the Antidumping Act of 1921 is a dagger at the throat of progress for American industry.

It is inconceivable that the men who sponsored and fought for the original bill, or for its amendment in past years, would have been able to foresee the drastic increase in dumping by foreign producers which has occurred in recent years. The aim of the act is not—and should not be—to penalize American producers or American consumers. But that is precisely the effect it is now having.

Early action on the amendments now before the distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee is clearly in the best interest of all Americans, no matter where they live or work.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include extraneous matter at this point:

STATEMENT OF MR. SHELTON, OF BETHLEHEM STEEL CO., BEFORE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT IN CONNECTION WITH TREASURY'S REVIEW OF ITS REGULATIONS UNDER THE ANTIDUMPING ACT, JANUARY 23, 1964

My name is Talbot Shelton and I am assistant financial vice president and a member of the board of directors of Bethlehem Steel Co. Bethlehem is in the business of manufacturing a broad range of iron and steel products, fabricating and erecting structural steel, and building and repairing ships. We furnish employment to approximately 120,000 people and our gross receipts approximate $2 billion annually. On December 19, 1963, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury James A. Reed sent out a letter welcoming comments relevant to a review of the Treasury's regulations under the Antidumping Act. This review, I believe, was stimulated in part by the specific recommendations to amend such regulations made by Mr. Merrill Russell, assistant general solicitor of United States Steel Corp., in his letter of October 30, 1963, to Mr. Belin, General Counsel of the Treasury Department.

My company is generally in favor of revisions in the regulations and in the areas suggested by Mr. Russell.

It is not my purpose today to suggest specific regulation changes nor to review in detail the specific recommendations already submitted. Rather, I believe I may be helpful in reviewing the areas in which my company has experienced difficulties with the administration of the Antidumping Act and in pointing out some places where such administration might be improved.

The chaotic conditions and damage to an importing country's employment and industry which result when another country's producers engage in dumping have caused most nations to condemn this practice and to adopt laws or regulations to prevent it. The right of each country to do so is specifically recognized in article VI of the general agreement on tariffs and trade (GATT) to which all of the major free world producing nations are parties. Most of my discussion will relate to the experiences Bethlehem and seven other complainant steel-producing companies in the United States encountered in an attempt to prove dumping of wire rods by producers in five foreign countries.

In order properly to introduce this discussion it is worthwhile to look briefly at two things: (1) the current world supply-demand balance in steel and (2) the economics of dumping from the dumper's point of view.

First, the world's ability or capacity to supply steel is currently well in excess of demand and the gap is growing. Estimates recently made in Luxembourg were that unused world capacity (excluding any in the United States), was about 28 million net tons in 1962 or equal to approximately 75 percent of total world steel exports or trade by all countries in that year. There are powerful incentives for this foreign unused capacity to be used.

Now to the economics. Every steel producer has certain fixed costs and certain variable costs. The fixed costs, which do not vary with production, include depreciation, interest on borrowed capital, real estate, and personal property taxes, and many general administrative and home office sales expenses. The usual variable costs, which are expected to vary with production, are materials and labor. Note, however, that in some countries like Japan and Belgium, by law or custom, the bulk of a producer's labor force once hired is in effect employed until retirement age. This has the effect of transferring most labor costs from the variable to the fixed category.

Tying the two factors together, if a major steel-producing country is selling the bulk of its output in the home market, as they almost all do, the industry which has some unused capacity can add to its profits by selling an increment of production in export for any amount above its incremental variable costs. This, as we have seen, may be little more than material costs. In other words, a country which is the victim of dumping cannot look for any built-in protection from the dumping country's average costs acting as a floor under export price reductions.

With this introduction, let us turn to our experiences in the proceedings under the American antidumping act against foreign producers in Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, and Japan selling carbon steel wire rods in the United States.

Wire rods are a round, semifinished, hot-rolled product designed to be drawn into wire which, in turn, is fabricated into a wide variety of end products including nails, nuts and bolts, welded wire fabric, garment hangers, etc. Foreign imports of wire rods increased from 54,000 net tons in 1957 to approximately 810,000 tons in 1963, or roughly 75 percent of domestic mill shipments of 1,110,000 tons.

The increasing imports of wire rods into the United States at what we believed to be dumping prices caused Bethlehem Steel Co. and the other domestic producers which ultimately became complainants to initiate economic studies of the home market prices and selling prices in the United States of the various foreign producers in the spring of 1962.

What did those studies consists of? First, we obtained copies of the official price lists of the European producers as filed with the high authority of the coal and steel community. Under the terms of the treaty creating the community, these published prices are the prices at which sales must be made subject to certain exceptions. We also reviewed Japanese wire rod prices which had been agreed to by the major Japanese producers under the collective open sales system. This Japanese agreement had official Government recognition—in fact, Government representatives had participated in it. In addition, it was publicly praised in the

Japanese press by industry spokesmen for the order it had brought to domestic price levels.

Second, all foreign trade journals available in the United States were reviewed. In many instances translations were required. Where price quotations either in the respective home markets or in the United States were reported, these were noted and compared with official price lists and other data. Actual invoices were secured when they were available.

Third, an independent organization of international repute was hired to study and report upon market prices of steel wire rods in Japan. Even though the collective open sales system in Japan was widely and officially described as representing cost plus reasonable profit, we had indications that the going price in Japan was slightly below the Japanese agreed-upon price. The report of this organization, prepared in some detail following approximately 2 months of study, largely confirmed our other information about domestic Japanese price levels.

The Japanese representatives of this independent organization were not advised of the purpose of the study they were asked to conduct in order to provide for a completely objective analysis of domestic pricing of wire rods in Japan. This lack of knowledge, coupled with the competence and reputation of the organization—the identity of which is known to the Treasury Department—gave us assurance of the accuracy of the report later submitted.

All of the studies, including review of foreign trade papers, were made before any foreign steel authorities had reason to suspect that a dumping action was contemplated by American producers. For this reason, the information which was then available was more likely to be accurate and complete than either information available since the filing of the complaints or the statements made on behalf of Japanese exporters.

Fourth, studies were also made of other selling factors such as transportation costs from point of production to major consumer centers, including conference and nonconference rates to the United States, credit arrangements, and the like to reach an accurate net mill return for foreign producers on both home market sales and on sales in the United States.

Finally, invoices and quotations were secured from domestic purchasers of foreign wire rods to establish the selling prices of foreign manufacturers in the United States. In fact, the invoices reflected sales by the importer to his customers so we knew the level at which the foreign producer was selling to the importer was probably below and certainly no higher than the importer's resale price.

Based upon many months' preparation, six U.S. wire rod producers (later joined by two others) filed through counsel what we considered to be a well-documented complaint in September of 1962. The dumping margins shown in the complaint, which had been deliberately understated, were substantial.

In the case of the West German producers, indicated dumping margins were shown to be $16.15 per net ton in November of 1961 and $22.05 in September of 1962. For the French producers, indicated dumping margins increased from $3.95 per net ton in Novembr of 1961 to $15.14 in September of 1962. The Belgian and Luxembourg producers were selling in the United States at indicated dumping margins in September of 1962 of $24.95 per net ton for open-hearth quality and $18.60 per net ton of Thomas quality.

The Japanese producers were little different from their European counterparts in wire rod sales in the United States. Indicated dumping margins for Japanese producers in Otcober of 1961 amounted to $6.96 and increased by August of 1962 to $20.84 per net ton.

Parenthetically, it appears that the reason for the increasing foreign dumping margins was that it became necessary for the foreign producers progressively to reduce their prices on exports to the United States in order to secure the additional sales they sought Such foreign producers apparently were selling at whatever price levels were necessary to secure business from customers formerly supplied by U.S. producers and/or to offer a better price than that of another foreign producer.

In due course, the Treasury, having reason to believe or suspect sales below fair value, withheld appraisement of wire rod imports from European producers, eventually found there were such sales by the European producers, and referred the cases to the Tariff Commission for a finding on the question of injury as required by the Antidumping Act. Housing, the margins of selling below fair value found by Treasury were very substantially below the margins indicated in the complaint.

During conferences with representatives of the Treasury, particularly the Bureau of Customs, the domestic producers were advised in general terms of the nature of some of the numerous adjustments being made by them in order to determine foreign market values lower than shown in the complaint. Counsel for the domestic industry believed, as do I, that many of these adjustments were without adequate foundation. This belief is admittedly based on incomplete knowledge because we were only given fragmentary information by the Treasury officials.

An example of one such adjustment claimed and allowed to a foreign producer to reflect an alleged difference in circumstances of sale was the claim of increased cost for home market sales because of the added loading costs of loading trucks rather than barges. Such information as we developed showed there was very little truck movement by this particular producer. Further, an examination of our records at Bethlehem disclosed almost identical costs for both types of loading.

Most surprising and damaging to the whole case was the final determination of the Treasury Department that the Japanese producers had not sold wire rods in the United States below "fair value." This apparently stemmed from two Treasury conclusions.

The first such conclusion of which we were advised was that our information as to domestic Japanese wire rod prices was wrong and that they were substantially lower. To this day we do not know what proof was offered by the Japanese, how it was authenticated, what the alleged Japanese market value actually was, whether the lower price was charged in the first instance, or adjusted by rebates or discounts, and if the latter, when they took place. We do not know, for example, whether rebates were paid after our complaint with respect to the period covered by the complaint.

We do, however, know that we supplied a large amount of detailed, mutually supporting information establishing the foreign market value, the prices at which wire rods were bought and sold in Japan concurrently with the sales complained of in the United States. We also know that our data was rejected in favor of something provided on behalf of the exporters.

We did one more thing with respect to the first conclusion of the Treasury. We analyzed the published profit and loss and overall cost figures of some of the major Japanese wire rod producers. And efficient as they may be, it is difficult to see how the Japanese could sell wire rods at $92 a ton, delivered at gulf ports with duty paid (as testified to by one importer) and be selling in the home market at this price—diminished by the cost of ocean transportation and the U.S. tariff—without operating at a loss. We know that Japanese steel producers have steadily reported profits. It might be said that wire rods were a loss leader in Japan, which would be hard to believe about any major steel product. In addition we have learned informally that the Bureau of Customs is about to determine that Japan is not dumping either steel sheets or standard welded pipe on the basis of analyses similar to that made in wire rods, except that the dumping margins found originally by the complainants were even larger. It is plain that all these products cannot be loss leaders.

The second Treasury conclusion was an apparent willingness to make price adjustments to reflect claimed differences in circumstances of sale. Most of the differences were only referred to in general terms and many seemed unjustified.

One such difference in circumstances of sale was the claimed lower cost in selling in the United States because sales were allegedly made on a cash basis and therefore no credit risk was experienced by the Japanese producer. On the other hand, we were reliably advised that in Japan the producer was paid in cash by the trading house which extended any short-term credit available to the consumer and financed this out of its commissions. Also on sales in the United States, customers testified that the Japanese provided liberal and extended payment terms.

Our industry was never afforded an opportunity to confront any foreign producer (and I do not mean the American counsel of a foreign producer) to question the ex parte statements made by those producers to Treasury. Equally as frustrating, the domestic industry did not even know the nature of the statements or documentation being supplied by the foreign producers to rebut the complaint.

This history of the wire rod dumping proceeding before Treasury indicates the importance of revisions in Treasury's regulations.

While adjustments reflecting important and real differences in circumstances of sale should be permitted, the Treasury seems willing to accept many requested adjustments that we feel are not warranted. The Treasury's present regulations therefore require strengthening to reflect accurately the congressional intent of the Antidumping Act to prevent disruptive dumping.

Furthermore, domestic industry should be given an opportunity to know in detail the nature of the defenses raised by the foreign exporters and to cross-examine and answer those defenses. As pointed out in Mr. Russell's letter, the Treasury has treated as confidential much information that simply could not be confidential. Selling prices of foreign producers are certainly known to their customers and in the European Coal and Steel Community deviations from posted price lists of the various producers must be reported to the high authority.

In the wire rod proceeding, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury suggested that the complainants allow Treasury to give copies of the complaint to the importer. This we agreed to do, expecting that we would in turn be furnished with the documentation supporting the foreign producers defenses. Actually we were not even informed of the nature of all of the defenses raised and, of course, were not supplied with any supporting documenfation for any defense. It is too easy under these circumstances for the Treasury to be misled into accepting misleading or false information or data that is not typical of arm's length transactions at any particular time.

To provide an accurate, fair and expeditious administration of the Antidumping Act, the Treasury should not reach decisions in camera but should hold public hearings. Experience in the wire rod proceedings indicates such hearings would be in the overall public interest. Because there is a strong economic incentive to dump and the effects

can be so adverse to American industry and labor, a finding of dumping or no dumping by the Treasury is too serious a matter to be decided without hearings.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you today and hope that what I have said will prove useful in your further deliberations.

The Future of Local Transportation in Eastern North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board will begin final consideration this week of a matter of great importance to the future of local air transportation in eastern North Carolina. This matter has stimulated enormous public interest in the area and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith three editorials from newspapers in the three largest cities in my congressional district. The editorials are "CAB Must Consider Public Convenience," Kinston Daily Free Press, Kinston, N.C., January 20, 1964; "CAB To Consider Future Airport Service," Wilson Daily Times, Wilson, N.C., February 1, 1964; and "Let's End Airport Feuding," the Evening Telegram, Rocky Mount, N.C., February 2, 1964.

The editorials follow:

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press, Jan. 20, 1964]

CAB MUST CONSIDER PUBLIC CONVENIENCE

In its impending review of Examiner Russell A. Potter's findings of several weeks ago regarding eastern Carolina's commercial air service, the Civil Aeronautics Board should not overlook any of the vital factors, including public convenience.

Public convenience is the reason such air service now enjoys a Federal subsidy. Another factor deals with the traffic-generating appeal of the present pattern, which has had only about 18 months to prove its value. Finally, the matter of economy should be given full consideration in light of the taxpayers needs in this area and throughout the Nation.

In reference to public convenience, the proposed facility at Toddy, 4 miles from Farmville in a remote area of Pitt County, would seriously hamper it if service were channeled to Toddy. The cost of travel would go up for 80 percent of the present roster of passengers, in the view of Potter. This is not improving the public's convenience in any sense of the word.

The north-south service inaugurated in Kinston in June of 1962 has already shown considerable traffic-generating possibilities. To move it to a remote area in Pitt County would cost the Piedmont Airlines many passengers, who might prefer to drive to Raleigh-Durham Airport, or use other means of travel.

The proposed Toddy airport would not be a jet airport. It would be a $1,500,000 facility which would not compare favorably with some of the airports already in service—especially those at Kinston and Goldsboro. The Town Creek project between Rocky Mount and Wilson, which is already well along in its planning, would be a far more logical facility for the traffic in that area, than would the remote Pitt County site.

Examiner Potter has pointed out that the so-called centrally located facility at Toddy would lose at least one-third of the present traffic, and would cost Piedmont Airlines some $70,423 yearly. It would not improve the public convenience, but would tend to do the opposite. Potter has urged that the proceedings be terminated.

The CAB will do well to follow its examiner's advice. The Pitt County proposal does not offer a single improvement in the present pattern, and would bring hazards to the present volume of passengers which should not be permitted. Eastern Carolina is far too broad an area to secure effective service from such an airport as that proposed at Toddy. The present pattern will continue to grow and provide better service at less cost to the taxpayers.

This costly probe should be terminated without further delay.

[From the Wilson (N.C.) Daily Times, Feb. 1, 1964]

CAB TO CONSIDER FUTURE AIRPORT SERVICE

The meeting of the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington on February 5, is of vital concern to Wilson and Wilson County. The Board has ordered arguments on a proposal by Greenville to build a so-called "area" airport near Toddy in Pitt County.

Representatives from Wilson and Wilson County with representatives from Rocky Mount, Goldsboro and Kinston will appear before the CAB to present reasons and facts against the location of the "area" airport at Toddy.

The hearing is a very important one as future airport development in eastern North Carolina is at stake.

Greenville's proposal would require Kinston, Goldsboro, Wilson, and Rocky Mount passengers to travel varying distances, up to 38 miles, to use Piedmont Airlines' service. Hearings were held on this proposal, and the proposal of Wilson and Rocky Mount to build their new airport near Town Creek, about half way between Rocky Mount and Wilson. The examiner who heard the case has handed down a decision against the Greenville proposal, and in favor of the Town Creek location.

The Greenville proposal is not realistic, and we believe the Civil Aeronautics Board should reject the project. The basic flaw in the Greenville argument is that an airport located at Toddy would not be an "area" airport. It would be an airport only for Greenville passengers, who would have to travel about 20 miles to the proposed site, while the preponderance of the population in the area, from which Piedmont would draw passenger trade, would have to travel up to twice that distance.

Passengers from Wilson, Goldsboro, and Rocky Mount would obviously face the inconvenience that would be required to travel to the Toddy Airport. We fear, and with good reason, that passengers from Wilson, Goldsboro, and Rocky Mount would travel the extra distance to Raleigh-Durham Airport, or find other means of transportation.

On the other hand, the joint airport proposed by Wilson and Rocky Mount would make sense and provide convenient air service. There are now about 70,000 people living within 10 miles of the Town Creek site. An airport at this location would have the traffic support of the largest population concentration in eastern North Carolina.

About 10,000 passengers a year now use the Rocky Mount Municipal Airport. Traffic experts feel, however that this figure could be higher, if Wilson traffic could be attracted to local service.

Much of Wilson's traffic, at present, is still using Raleigh-Durham Airport. Therefore, when the Town Creek airport brings local service within 10 miles of Wilson, there is every reason to believe that the new airport will become one of the strongest traffic points in the area.

[From the Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram, Feb. 2, 1964]

LET'S END AIRPORT FEUDING

While Americans have thrilled over space shots to the moon, there are few who see much practical benefit for this generation from lunar traffic. We have no quarrel with space probes either, but we are quite disturbed over this section's great opportunity and need to enjoy practical air traffic—an opportunity and a need which have been blocked by constant haggling over airport construction.

Next Wednesday in Washington another in the long series of hearings relative to eastern Carolina air service has been scheduled before the Civil Aeronautics Board. This hearing will deal directly with the proposal to construct a new airport in the Town Creek area, between Rocky Mount and Wilson.

It must be remembered that Congress is currently in the final stages of considering extending the life of the Federal Airport Act under which grants of matching funds are made available to local communities to build or improve airport facilities. It will be through this legislation that Rocky Mount and Wilson, and the surrounding counties will receive Federal assistance to construct the new Town Creek Airport.

The area battle is familiar. Last year an application was filed by Rocky Mount and Wilson with the Federal Aviation Agency requesting the funds to begin construction of the new airport. The project had the full support of Rocky Mount, Wilson and Nash, Edgecombe, and Wilson Counties. Representatives of each of these governmental units provided financial support, in matching funds, of $700,000 pledged toward construction of the Town Creek Airport. Officials of these units already have testified that local funds were available and already budgeted.

However, action on the request was withheld while the CAB considered Greenville's contentions that an area airport should be built near Toddy. A CAB examiner later ruled, though, against Greenville and the CAB itself is soon to hear the matter before final decision. True the Toddy proposal includes a greater area—like the moon shot—but the region's population is too sparse and the airport would be so far away from the potential users that it would be entirely impractical and in all probability would not be used at all by the chief potential users. Also Greenville has been unable to muster any financial support for Toddy like that pledged for Town Creek. Moreover, the CAB examiner himself has held that an airport at Greenville would be inconvenient for most of the potential air passengers from this area.

The struggle for improved air transportation service to eastern Carolina has been a long one. In 1962, it will be remembered, the CAB authorized Piedmont Airlines to schedule flights to Rocky Mount, Goldsboro, and Kinston, and that arrangement for serving the area has developed substantial patronage. In fact, the Rocky Mount Airport consistently goes far beyond the limits established by the CAB in its "use it or lose it" formula. About 30,000 air travelers a year now use this service. A Town Creek Airport would strengthen Piedmont's service, permitting the scheduling of flights with more modern equipment that cannot be used at the Rocky Mount Airport. It also would include Wilson in the focus of service, insuring additional traffic.

Let's hope the Civil Aeronautics Board approves the Town Creek site so that a more compact area will be available to air service rather than a hodgepodge regional airport that is close to no population center and does not have the pledged support that has been provided for the Town Creek site. After all, in approving the Town Creek Airport, the CAB would simply be affirming the decision of its qualified examiner—and this long, useless squabble would be over.

Why the Knights of Pythias Commemorative 50-Cent Coin and Other Commemorative Coin Bills Have Not Been Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress from almost every State have been receiving letters from constituents active in the Knights of Pythias urging approval of legislation to authorize the striking of a special 50-cent coin commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of their organization. The Members, in turn, have conscientiously been contacting my subcommitte of the Committee on Banking and Currency to ask about the status of the bill.

Because of the many letters received by Members, and in view of the fact that no action has been taken or is scheduled on the Knights of Pythias 50-cent commemorative coin proposal, I am placing this explanation in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to assist Members of the House and Senate in responding to the mail they are receiving on this matter.

The purposes for which the Knights of Pythias organization requests the approval of this commemorative coin are indeed altruistic. Under the legislation, 95 percent of all receipts from sale of the coin would be used for advancing the cause of research into cystic fibrosis, a dread disease affecting some children.

MINTS HAVE BEEN WORKING AROUND THE CLOCK

However, as the national officers of the organization were advised some months ago, and as many of the State and local officials of the organization have since been advised by me or by the committee staff, legislation to authorize the striking of commemorative 50-cent coins for fundraising purposes by public or nonprofit private organizations just cannot be considered at this time.

Commemorative coins, minted in limited quantities for disposition at a profit by sponsoring organizations, could be manufactured at this time only at the expense of production of regular coins. Yet, as the Congress knows, the mints this fiscal year have been frequently working around the clock, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, trying desperately but unsuccessfully to catch up to the tremendous demand for regular coins for commercial needs.

In the last session, the Congress authorized the expenditure of $30 million for construction of new mint facilities at Philadelphia as the only hope for fulfilling expanding requirements for coins in the economy, but the money has not yet been appropriated and the new building has not been started. Hence, it will be years before we can expect to see any idle capacity for coin production at the mints.

OTHER BILLS PASSED OVER

Long before the bill for the Knights of Pythias coin was introduced, our subcommittee held hearings on similar bills proposing the striking of special 50-cent coins for other worthwhile causes. One would have commemorated the life and perpetuated the ideals and principles of our beloved leader for so many years, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, and funds raised by such a coin could have helped to build the Rayburn Library; another would have commemorated the Centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and helped to finance and enlarge its observance last November under the auspices of a Pennsylvania State commission of which former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was honorary chairman. Certainly both coins, if approved, would have served useful and important purposes. So it is in no sense a depreciation of cystic fibrosis research, or of the sponsoring organization, that the Knights of Pythias 50-cent commemorative coin proposal has received the same treatment as the Sam Rayburn commemorative coin and the Lincoln's Gettysburg Address coin proposals.

The subcommittee last year also had referred to it a number of bills to strike a 50-cent coin commemorating a century of Negro progress. Nearly every Member of Congress received letters urging enactment of this legislation, but it, likewise, could not be considered for the same reasons which blocked the other bills.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS WERE APPROVED

The national officers of the Knights of Pythias have been advised of the numerous bills we have approved, however, authorizing the striking of commemorative medals for public and nonprofit private organizations observing significant anniversaries of events of a national character. National medals were approved last year commemorating the following: the Centennial of Nevada Statehood; the Sesquicentennial of Indiana Statehood; the 250th anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra; and the 50th anniversary of the founding by the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union of the first union health center in the United States.

So far this year, Congress has completed action on two additional national medal bills: one honoring three of our great historic Federal shrines in New York City, and the other commemorating the 200th anniversary of the founding of my city of St. Louis.

This is not to say that all bills proposing the striking of commemorative national medals are, or would be, automatically approved. But it is obvious from these facts that commemorative medals bills have a much better chance of favorable consideration than bills proposing the striking of commemorative coins, which have no chance at all under present circumstances. Production of medals does not interfere with regular coinage operations. Different equipment is used.

TESTIMONY BY MISS EVA ADAMS

Mr. Speaker, in our hearings last May in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs we went into the whole question of medals and coins very extensively, taking testimony from coin bill supporters as well as from Treasury witnesses who appeared in opposition. I submit herewith the oral testimony at that time of Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, who explained why the Treasury feels so strongly on this matter. Miss Adams submitted a great deal of documentation, but I am including only her spoken testimony, following my introductory statement, as follows:

[Excerpt from hearing of Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Committee on Banking and Currency, May 20, 1963]

COIN: COMMEMORATIVE 50-CENT PIECES

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We will now turn to the three bills on our calendar dealing with the issuance of commemorative 50-cent pieces. The bills include H.R. 1611 by Congressman GOODLING, of Pennsylvania, to commemorate the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; H.R. 2621 by our colleague on the subcommittee, Mr. RAINS, to commemorate the life and ideals of the late Honorable Sam Rayburn, one of the greatest Americans any of us have been privileged to know; and H.R. 6026, a later bill introduced by Mr. RAINS, to authorize the future issuance of such coins to honor any former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congres of the United States following his death.

As I announced at the start of the hearings, these bills are controversial in that the Treasury Department consistently opposes all such commemorative coin issues without exception, and every President in the past 25 or 30 years or more has opposed or vetoed such bills, although a great many such coins were issued in the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

But his predecesor, President Hoover, vetoed such bills and so did President Roosevelt, also Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. Mr. Kennedy, I believe, opposes them, too.

Incidentally, I note from our old committee calendars that, while a Member of the House, Mr. Kennedy once sponsored such a bill, himself, to issue a special 25-cent piece, not a half dollar, as most of these bills call for, but a quarter, commemorating the 300th anniversary of the pine tree shilling of colonial days. However, it never saw the light of day in the Committee on Banking and Currency, a fate which was shared by many such bills over the years, and those which were approved were generally vetoed.

Both Mr. GOODLING and Mr. RAINS have expressed a great deal of interest in the whole philosophy of commemorative coins, and they question the Treasury's rigid position.

So, first, we are going to hear from the Honorable Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, and from Mr. Belin, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, and have them explain why the Department takes the position it does, and give us the background on previous commemorative issues—what happened to lead to the present law strictly limiting new coin issues, and to a 1939 act which prohibited any further mintings of commemorative coins previously authorized.

Then we shall hear from the bills' sponsors.

I might say that the author of the 1939 act, the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, who made an extensive personal investigtaion of the commemorative coin situation at that time, was a predecessor of mine from St. Louis, the late Honorable John Cochran, and was a close personal friend and a wonderful, dedicated man, but a tough man in the legislative battles and very blunt in language. In

his report, he called these commemorative coins a "racket." But I am sure that there is no racket of any kind intended in any of the bills before us.

The bills are intended, I believe, to help raise money in a rather painless manner for worthwhile causes in the public interest.

The question is whether a coin issue intended for sale at a premium is an appropriate way in which to raise money.

A further question arises, however, and I hope the Terasury witnesses will discuss it, also. It is this: Should our regular coin issues continue to be rigidly restricted to 25-year intervals?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We will now hear Miss Adams and Mr. Belin.

STATEMENT OF HON. EVA ADAMS, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT; ACCOMPANIED BY FREDERICK TATE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR; AND G. D'ANDELOT BELIN, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY

Miss ADAMS. Thank you, Chairman SULLIVAN, and members of the subcommittee. It is a pleasure to appear before this subcommittee to present information in connection with legislation which has been submitted for various commemorative coins and medals.

The coinage system of the United States was established to provide a medium of exchange, and to facilitate trade. The basic function for which the mint was established was to produce domestic coins in the denominations and quantities required for business transactions throughout the Nation. It is the responsibility of the Treasury Department to maintain the integrity of our coinage system, and, for this reason, the Department has for many years opposed legislation which authorizes the minting of special or commemorative coins.

Some years ago, measures were passed which permitted the issuance of large numbers of commemorative coins. For example, during the period from 1934 through 1936, 26 new half-dollar coins were authorized. Many of these were open-end issues, meaning that the coins could be manufactured and sold year after year. During the calendar year 1936, 17 separate issues of special coins were manufactured. It was soon found that the issuance of special coins for various commemorations introduces confusion into our coinage system. Actual results have shown that such coins are not looked upon with favor by the general public. They are seldom absorbed into general circulation, and, in many instances, have been refused in trade because the public is not familiar with them.

Another objectionable feature associated with the issuance of commemorative coins related to the exploitation of these coins for private gain. The practice of disposing of these coins by the interested organization through the use of agents or dealers soon became widespread. Commemorative coins have been sold by these agents or dealers at exorbitant profits with the largest percentage of the profits inuring to the benefit of the individual merchants. It was obviously the intention of the Congress, as reflected by the wording of the bills authorizing the commemorative coins, that such coins could be sold at a reasonable profit, with the profit being applied toward the cost of the memorial or celebration being commemorated.

The Congress soon became aware of this unsatisfactory situation, and held extensive hearings on the objectionable practices and abuses related to the issuance of special coins. Following these investigations, House Report No. 101 was issued on this subject on February 27, 1939, and the Congress passed a bill (Public Law 278, 76th Cong., approved August 5, 1939) stopping the issue of all commemorative coins which had already been approved.

Since the enactment of Public Law 278, referred to above, no further commemorative coins have been authorized except for two provided for in acts signed on August 7, 1946, and an amendment to one of these in 1951.

In addition to the opposition of the Congress to commemorative coins, as referred to above, the longstanding objection of the Treasury Department to these issues, you will be interested to know that a number of bills for special coins have been vetoed by various Presidents. I would like to present for the record a copy of a statement on commemorative coins. This statement contains additional information on the abuses related to commemorative coins, and the congressional investigation of these abuses.

Does this meet with your approval?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Without objection, it will be included at this point in the record.

* * * * *

Miss ADAMS. The statement also includes a collection of significant messages by Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, Roosevelt, and Hoover in opposition to bills authorizing the issuance of commemorative coins.

In addition to the attitude of the Treasury Department that these commemorative coins violate the principle for which our coinage system was established, there are a number of other practical reasons why the Department opposes special coinage issues. Of primary importance is the fact that the issuance of large numbers of coins introduces confusion into our coinage system, and makes counterfeiting much easier. In addition, the striking of commemorative coins imposes an unnecessary strain on the facilities of the overburdened mints. These special coins divert the use of machinery and manpower from the regular channels of operation when every facility of the mints is needed to produce the regular denominations required for the business needs of the country.

The cost of manufacturing commemorative coins is usually higher than the cost of regular coinage. This is due in part to the practice which was followed by some of the sponsoring organizations of purposely ordering small quantities of coins from each mint. These small orders disrupt regular coinage operations, require special setting up of coin presses and other equipment, and, in general, call for special handling. The cost of these operations, and the cost of silver wastage when unissued coins go back into the melting pot, are paid from the mint's regular operating funds.

The most recent commemorative coins made by the mint were the Booker T. Washington-George Washington Carver coins. This was in 1946, as referred to above. The cost of manufacturing these special coins amounted to approximately $20 per thousand pieces, as compared with about $7 per thousand for regular issues. A total of 5.6 million of these commemorative coins were manufactured at the 3 mints over a period of 9 years, but 2.7 million of these coins were not issued and went back into the melting pot.

The Department's opposition to commemorative coins is not, believe me, based upon a lack of appreciation of the importance of events proposed to be commemorated. However, it would be very difficult for the Department to take a position that one commemorative issue should be approved, but another should not. Experience has shown that the authorization of a single issue brings forth a flood of requests for special coins to commemorate events of importance. In each case, the sponsors feel that the event they wish to commemorate is equally as important as other similar events. If one issue is authorized, pressure will be exerted from many sources for the issue of other coins.

The Treasury Department has long favored medals, instead of coins, for commemorative purposes. A medal lends itself more readily to an artistic design, because the relief of a medal does not have to be restricted as it does on a coin. The manufacture of commemorative medals does not interfere with our domestic coinage operations, and all manufacturing costs are paid by the sponsoring organization.

I would like to point out that there are many private manufacturers who are capable of turning out fine medals for commemorative purposes, and the mint has no desire to compete with these firms for this work. Of course, the mint stands ready to execute any medals which the Congress deems to be of a national character and significance.

Jacob Stroud, Founder of Stroudsburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I represent four counties in Pennsylvania—Northampton, Monroe, Carbon, and Pike Counties—which have each, in their own way, contributed richly to the proud historic heritage of our Nation.

One of these counties—Monroe—was named after the fifth President of the United States, James Monroe. It lies at the heart of one of the greatest and most beautiful vacation resort areas in our country, the Pocono Mountains.

July recently, Dr. Alfred D. Sumberg, a distinguished member of the faculty at East Stroudsburg State College and president of the Monroe County Historical Society, began preparation of a series of historical pamphlets on the unique contributions the county and its first citizens made to American culture, industrial and educational progress.

The first of these publications is now off the press and I ask permission to insert the text in this RECORD. It concerns the life and times of Jacob Stroud, founder of the borough of Stroudsburg and it is an interesting documentary comment on one of Pennsylvania's pioneers.

I would like also to commend Dr. Sumberg's associates in this endeavor, Mrs. Horace G. Walters, who has been for many years the dedicated and distinguished curator of the archives maintained by the Monroe County Historical Society, and Dr. John C. Appel, past president of the society who is also a member of the faculty at East Stroudsburg State College. I should mention, also, that the interest of Monroe County residents and Pennsylvanians, in general, in the proud history of their past has been remarkably increased and sustained, over the years, by Dr. LeRoy J. Koehler, historian and president of the college in East Stroudsburg. Financial aid and other material encouragement has been provided by the Woman's Club of the Stroudsburgs for many years and the club retains its leadership in this respect.

Under unanimous consent the publication follows:

JACOB STROUD, FOUNDER OF STROUDSBURG

(NOTE.—This brochure has been prepared by Dr. Alfred D. Sumberg, professor of his-

tory, East Stroudsburg State College, with the assistance of Mrs. Horace G. Walters and Dr. John C. Appel.)

Jacob Stroud, founder of Stroudsburg, symbolized the frontier spirit of the 18th century and the versatility of the men who led America from colonialism to nationhood. Born in Amwell, Hunterdon County, N.J., on January 15, 1735, he moved with his parents, Bernard and Keziah Harker Stroud, and his four brothers and three sisters to Lower Smithfield Township of Northampton County (now Monroe County), at an early age. He became an apprentice to Nicholas Depui, the earliest permanent settler in the area of present Monroe County. The young Jacob served Depui until he was 21 and then he and three of his brothers enlisted in the Colonial English Army in order to fight in the French and Indian War. Jacob was stationed at Fort William Henry and he was present at the English victory at Quebec on September 13, 1759. He reportedly was one of the men who carried his mortally wounded leader, General Wolfe, from the battlefield.

Following the war, Stroud returned to Pennsylvania and on April 6, 1761, married Elizabeth McDowell, granddaughter of Nicholas Depui. He soon obtained a contract for transporting government supplies to Fort Pitt. But the contract apparently proved unprofitable because he later told his youngest grandson that "people despised him for his poverty, and he despised it as much a they did." Stroud was determined to prove himself successful.

Stroud soon made an agreement with Abel James, a prominent Philadelphia merchant, to carry provisions through the area north of Stroud's home in Dansbury (now Stroudsburg) to Shohola. His business relationship with James proved profitable because in February, 1769, he borrowed sufficient money from James to purchase 300 acres of land west of Dansbury, on which were already established a grist mill, a residence, and other dwellings. Stroud now settled down to the life of a frontier farmer and operator of a grist mill, saw mill, blacksmith shop, and general store.

Jacob and Elizabeth Stroud raised their large family on the Pennsylvania frontier. They had 12 children, 9 girls (Hannah, Jane, Sarah, Rachel, Ann, Jemima, Deborah, Elizabeth, and Rebecca) and 3 boys (John, Daniel, and Jacob). Stroud's estate grew slowly but he evidently prospered. At the outbreak of the American Revolution he was both prosperous and prominent.

Jacob Stroud fought in the American Revolution on both the military and political fronts. Records indicate that on May 22, 1775, the Lower Smithfield Company, a volunteer military company, was formed with Stroud as captain. At the meeting of the Standing Committee of Correspondence for Northampton County on October 3 he was elected a colonel, a rank he held throughout the war. Stroud was responsible for the building of Fort Penn. He was placed in charge of the fort, which he found difficult to defend in the face of marauding Indians and Tories as well as a shortage of supplies and ammunition.

As a patriot, Stroud also participated in the political revolution. He was elected on July 8, 1776, as a delegate to the First Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention, which met in Philadelphia on July 15. The task of the convention was to abolish William Penn's Charter of Privileges (1701) and to write a modern constitution more suitable to the needs of the new State. Convention records indicate that on the third day of the meeting Stroud was appointed to a committee of 11 "to make an essay for a declaration of rights for this State." The committee reported a draft on July 25 and after considerable debate the declaration of rights was approved on August 16. After further consideration of the frame of government and the preamble the new constitution was completed and the convention adjourned on September 28.

Stroud continued to serve as a political leader during the Revolution. In 1777 he was appointed one of the Pennsylvania commissioners to meet with the representatives of other States at New Haven, Conn., for the purpose of regulating the prices of commodities. In December 1777, he was appointed by the Pennsylvania General Assembly to take subscriptions for a loan offered by the Continental Congress. In 1781, 1782, and 1783, Jacob Stroud served as a representative in the general assembly.

With the Revolution over, Stroud spent his remaining years developing his landholdings and his several businesses. By 1788 Stroud owned 1,400 acres and at the time of his death in 1806 he owned 4,000 acres. In addition, he owned a string of fine saddle horses. A surveyor who visited Stroud in 1787 reported that Stroud owned a store, tavern, grist mill, saw mill, and several boats. He reported that he saw the most helpers he had ever seen in one place and that he was treated very kindly. As his children matured and then married, Stroud built homes for those who remained in the area of Stroudsburg. The home which he built for Daniel Stroud is today the headquarters of the Monroe County Historical Society at the corners of Ninth and Main Streets, Stroudsburg. John Stroud's home is presently the clubhouse of the Glenbrook Country Club and the home built for Hannah Stroud Starbird remains a private residence located at 186 Washington Street, East Stroudsburg. Other homes are located on Dreher Avenue, Stroudsburg (Sarah Stroud Hollingshead) and Burson Street, East Stroudsburg (Deborah Stroud Burson).

On October 17, 1799, Stroud published an advertisement in the American Eagle of Easton. He reported that he had laid out a number of town lots measuring 50 feet front by 221 feet deep, which he wished to sell at "very reasonable terms to mechanics and others, who will build upon them." Stroud placed one condition on his sales. The purchaser had to construct a building within 3 years. "Therefore," he said, "no person need apply for a lot unless he is determined to become an improver of the town, which will henceforward be called Stroudsburg." Both Jacob Stroud and his son Daniel were responsible for the growth of Stroudsburg. Streets named Sarah, Ann, Thomas, Elizabeth (now Main Street), Jacob (now Sixth Street), Colbert, Burson, and Starbird as well as Stroud Township serve to remind the residents of Monroe County of the early prominence of the Stroud family.

Jacob Stroud has been described as a man of medium height and size, with fair complexion, clear blue eyes and light hair. He lacked formal education except for that available from itinerant teachers. He was sociable with an excellent wit. Yet, he had unusual abilities as a businessman. A contemporary described him as "the greatest businessman north of the mountains" following the Revolution.

Jacob Stroud died on July 14, 1806, as a result of an accident in which he was thrown from the buggy in which he was riding. His estate included land, buildings, and an inventory of goods. By all standards, he died a wealthy man. He and other members of the Stroud family are buried in the old Dansbury cemetery, located on lower Main Street, Stroudsburg.

Jacob Stroud's estate included not only material goods but also a heritage. His pioneer spirit was manifested in his roles as frontiersman, soldier, and patriot. He symbolized the spirit of democracy which permeated the period of the Revolution. In a life span of 71½ years, he saw America cross the boundary between colonialism and nationhood. The borough of Stroudsburg remains as an eternal reminder of the ideals and aspirations to which Jacob Stroud dedicated himself.

Airlift—An Instrument of National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our Military Air Transport Service is now truly an instrument of national policy.

Utilizing 500- to 600-mile-an-hour aircraft, capable of flying 5,000 to 6,000 miles nonstop with combat troops or essential battle cargo, the United States can now deploy the U.S.-based strength of tactical air and combat ground forces to any part of the world in significant numbers in 72 hours or less.

The major segment of this remarkable airlift capability—developed since World War II—is centered in the U.S. Air Force's Military Air Transport Service.

Mr. Speaker, in the fourth-quarter issue of the Sperryscope, Gen. Curtis LeMay, USAF, Chief of Staff, tells the dramatic role this vital arm of our national defense plays should war or natural disaster strike.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby include General LeMay's remarks for the information of the Congress:

AIRLIFT—AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

(By Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, USAF, Chief of Staff)

More than 25 years ago a prototype of the twin-engine piston-driven Douglas C-47 was introduced into the Air Force as a primary duty transport aircraft. Last summer, the Lockheed C-141 Starlifter, the Nation's first all-jet cargo transport, was accepted by the Air Force for initial testing.

Where military men once thought of mass transport aviation as a means of airlifting small units of men or supplies to areas 200 or 300 miles away, today's technology and operational techniques have made truly long-range airlift a practical reality. This ability to airlift men and battle equipment long distances at great speed was dramatically illustrated in the deployment of Exercise Big Lift forces to Europe in October 1963. In just 63 hours and 5 minutes, almost 15,000 soldiers of the U.S. Army were airlifted 5,600 miles from Texas to West Germany. In even less time, a complete Tactical Air Command strike force of fighters, bombers, and reconnaissance aircraft was deployed to the European continent in a complementary exercise of Air Force striking power. The implications inherent in this strong and growing airlift resource of the U.S. Air Force to our potential enemies are obvious.

The combination of modern aircraft and a global command and control system, plus expanded global responsibilities, has resulted in increased reliance on airlift as an essential instrument of national policy.

Airlift is not a new creation. The first and most important operation of this type was the Berlin Airlift of 1948–49. It was that airlift, more than any other in history, that demonstrated the concept of mass military

transport in support of U.S. national policy. In just 15 months, airmen of the combined USAF-RAF airlift task force airlifted more than 2,400,000 tons of food and fuel across a 275-mile airbridge to keep a city the size of Philadelphia supplied with the means to resist Soviet encroachment. At that time, MATS was scarcely a month old. The principles of airlift observed then have been used and perfected by the U.S. Air Force ever since.

MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The urgent need to modernize MATS aircraft and mission was emphasized to Congress in 1958 in a basic report by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. To meet the situation, the Air Force, along with a vigorous and farsighted group of Congressmen, planned a two-step program. Step one called for interim modernization by replacing some of the aging aircraft with more up-to-date jet models directly available from the aircraft industry. Step two was a long-range program calling for the procurement of a new jet aircraft designed to meet the Air Force mission of airlifting military equipment and combat troops.

For step one, the Boeing C-135 Stratolifter and the Lockheed C-130E Hercules were selected. For step two, the Air Force planned development and procurement of an entirely new jet cargo aircraft. This aircraft, the C-141 Starlifter, was planned primarily for use as a military aircraft, but with consideration given to performance needs for possible use by civil airlines.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara stated recently that the C-141 may open up entirely new vistas of troop carrier operations. For example, it might prove practical to load troops and their equipment in the United States and fly them directly to battle areas overseas. Thus, the line of demarcation between the classic long-range airlift mission and the troop carrier or assault mission may have to be reexamined.

There are indications that the long-range capabilities of jet-type aircraft, such as the C-141, may eliminate the need for a number of en route bases presently required by the Air Force for purposes of refueling and maintenance. As a result, it is entirely feasible that operations at some of these bases may be reduced or eliminated, with a consequent saving of manpower and money.

The C-141 will fit most of the requirements of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marines; but the Air Force has need of a jet transport that can carry outsize cargo and even greater loads than the C-141. Such an aircraft would be extremely large and have a more-than-4,600-statute-mile range, with more than a 100,000-pound payload. The need for development of such an aircraft has been stressed by Air Force planners for some time. Several of our larger aircraft companies have already voluntarily submitted preliminary studies on what an aircraft of this type would be like. Labeled the CX-4HLS (heavy logistic support), this aircraft would be a 400- to 500-mile-an-hour, four- to six-turbofan aircraft, and larger than any known airplane today. It would have a cargo floor 16 to 19 feet wide and about 100 feet long. Cargo capabilities anywhere from 75 to more than 100 tons have been proposed, and the aircraft would probably have aerial drop delivery capability.

An aircraft of this size could lift combat troops and virtually all types of military equipment to any potential trouble spot on the earth and land on modest airfields.

In the cargo-handling field, MATS, along with other commands and services, is developing as part of the 463L materials handling support system, the necessary ground and airborne equipment to support airdrop and airlandings of combat forces and their follow-on equipment and supplies. A dual-purpose rail and roller system for the C-130E and the C-141 is being developed to satisfy both airdrop and logistic needs. Tests are also underway on a C-130E ramp kit designed to support 5-minute ground time for off-loading 463L pallets of combat equipment during the initial development of an airhead. The same type equipment and techniques are being researched for C-141 application.

Meanwhile, other work is centered on development of a mobile air terminal to handle large volumes of war supplies at combat airheads. The basic unit of the terminal is a quick-assembly, truckbed-height, rollerized dock to handle and break down as necessary the palletized loads for speedy distribution to the combat forces. The remaining units of the terminals consist of rough terrain loaders, forklifts, and trailers to quickly offload palletized cargo.

The phased-out C-97 transports have been transformed into the Air National Guard, which now has 16 transport squadrons. These units serve as a combat-ready addition to the airlift forces in any emergency. The C-121's have been assigned to Air National Guard aeromedical transport units, and the C-124's are being assigned to Air Reserve troop carrier squadrons on the same D-day-ready basis.

CHANGING OPERATIONS

Just as the aircraft inventory is being modernized, MATS operations have been changing since 1960.

Historically, the MATS airlift mission has been the operation of effective global airlift forces and maintenance of en route bases and military air routes to meet emergency requirements of the Department of Defense. Specific airlift requirements are in three general categories according to priorities established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. First are exercises and joint airborne training. Second are special assignment airlifts, which include on a nonscheduled basis outsize and sensitive airlift missions. Third are scheduled channel traffic missions performed by military and commercial airlift.

These specific airlift requirements were redefined more than 3 years ago. The results were a virtual mandate to reshape MATS into a hardcore global military airlift system concerned primarily with military airlift, in military aircraft, manned by military crews. In this airlift category are military deployments involving nuclear retaliatory forces, Strategic and Tactical Air Command requirements, and movements of missiles and atomic warheads. At the same time MATS has decreased its scheduled, fixed-route traffic in favor of contracts with civil carriers. In consequence, MATS now applies more and more of its aircraft and flying hours to purely military requirements, in "special assignment" airlift missions, and in test exercises. At the same time, civil carriers have received an increasing share of the Department of Defense airlift dollar.

As a part of MATS current joint training, the Air Force provides the U.S. Army—indeed all the U.S. services—with greater mobility by means of its Air Force aircraft. And emphasis on joint training exercises will continue. There are 26 exercises planned during fiscal year 1964, compared with 13 in fiscal year 1963. The Marine Corps will be part of these, along with Army airlift training.

Unlike the special assignment airlift which is done almost wholly with military aircraft, channel traffic is carried both by military and civil aircraft. In fiscal year 1963, a total of 1,157,704 people and 184,359 tons of cargo were carried in MATS international airlift; of this amount, commercial carriers accounted for 768,201 passengers and 69,077 tons of cargo.

Whether for war readiness training, special airlift tasks, or routine channel traffic, MATS emphasizes the system nature of its operations. Airlift requirements in an emergency are fluid. Missions and priorities change, and airlift capabilities must be flexible and quickly able to adapt. For these reasons, training is rigorous, readiness high, and global command and control of airlift resources must be effective.

The activities of October and the first 2 weeks of November 1962—the period of the Cuban crisis—dramatically highlight the scope of airlift tasks to which MATS must be responsive. When the crisis ended, MATS aircraft had been deployed to almost every part of the globe.

In the United States, more than 5 million miles were flown in massive airlifts to the Carolinas, Florida, and Guantanamo Bay Naval Station in support of the joint military buildup for Cuba. As part of this activity MATS, in 4-days time, flew 3,600 marines and 3,200 tons of their battle equipment from California to Guantanamo and the east coast. MATS air rescue units flew special search missions over the Caribbean; MATS air weather units provided special weather reconnaissance service in the Cuba area; and MATS air photographic and charting service cameramen flew photo reconnaissance missions over the Atlantic, and documented vast operations of all defense forces.

CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET

MATS must be prepared to respond immediately to general or limited war, while simultaneously participating in cold war, counterinsurgency, and special operations. It can also call upon the civil reserve air fleet (CRAF) for emergency augmentation. CRAF, established in 1952, consists of civil air carriers whose aircraft and crews, by contract, would become available to the Department of Defense as augmentation airlift for emergencies and would operate under MATS operational control during a national emergency. CRAF membership varies, but currently stands at 24 airlines. The actual number of aircraft allotted for emergencies is around 345. These include both passenger and cargo.

In recognition of MATS work in contracting with civil carriers, the Department of the Air Force awarded to the command the Brig. Gen. Nelson S. Talbott Procurement Management Efficiency Trophy in 1963, the first time a major air command has received this honor. The award cited MATS for developing commercial augmentation airlift and procurement policies, tailored specifically to Department of Defense long-range requirements for all levels of emergency conditions. Previously, activation of the civil reserve air fleet was an all-or-nothing arrangement. But, consistent with the Nation's need for a flexible military response capability, MATS worked out a phased system to use only as much civil air augmentation as a specific military situation might require.

Phase 1 is based on a peacetime situation in which MATS would ask civil carriers to perform services specified and provide additional services on a mandatory basis during an airlift emergency declared by the Secretary of Defense. Phase 2 is based on an airlift emergency declared by the President. This would be a situation short of general war, such as limited war, a counterinsurgency operation, or a state of preparation for either. Phase 3 would occur when a general war is imminent or in progress. CRAF would be activated and directed to respond to general war plans.

It is a fact that MATS has, and will continue to have, a vital military role which cannot be replaced or supplanted by civil carriers. Natural disasters and manmade conflicts appear and reappear with dismaying frequency and severity, and the United States must have in being under military command and control an efficient, flexible airlift force ready to respond to distress and other emergency calls in remote and dangerous areas when our national interest demands it.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, the symbolic wearing of the white carnation in the buttonhole of the lapel by my colleagues today in reverent memory of our beloved President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is a most fitting symbol to his greatness. White has always signified hope and he gave that hope back to the American citizen only days after he had been inaugurated as the 32d President of our free Nation. He entered the White House at a time when the Nation was fraught with many economic troubles. Many individuals had given up all hope of any kind of economic stability being attained during their lifetime. However, as history has so well recorded, a voice reached the American people from their radio sets throughout the land that carried with it a challenge and also the vibrant warmth of sincerity and purpose that was received by the people as a call to reassert themselves to become a part of the rebirth of the traditional American dream, a chance to be the breadwinner of the family and move the Nation forward to a new and greater horizon. This was the beginning of a new and revitalized era in American history, this was the birth of the New Deal.

As great a symbol as the white carnation was in the past, it is fitting that the legislation concerning the civil rights that was such an important part in the program of the New Frontier courageously fought for by our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, should be brought to the floor for consideration on F.D.R.'s birthday. It is but another link in the rich chain of heritage that has been forged in the past by great Democratic Presidents and shall be added to in the future by those that follow.

The American people are very sentimental about many things, but not, as a general rule, about political matters. That is to say, a man who will forgive his friends, and neighbors for many shortcomings is seldom so generous with respect to the record of a political leader. Moreover, a man who will mourn the loss of a friend, with deep feeling, may very well shrug off the demise of any politician—even one in whose principles he deeply believes.

It is therefore most unusual for the American people to become deeply attached, emotionally, to a political figure—even to a President—and to remember him with great fondness for years and years following his departure from the scene. That this should be the fate of any man must be regarded as the greatest kind of tribute. Indeed, it is a tribute accorded very few. One so honored is Franklin D. Roosevelt, 32d President of the United States and undisputed champion of the common man.

It was the fate of Mr. Roosevelt to come to power in a period fraught with National problems, both foreign, and domestic. It was his responsibility to cope with the great depression, and then, to rouse, and lead the Nation in the titanic battle for the preservation of democracy, in World War II. Both of these responsibilities, each of earth-shaking magnitude, Franklin D. Roosevelt fulfilled, with the most remarkable display of energy, foresight, ability, and fortitude imaginable.

And yet, while this was happening within the vision of the American public, Franklin D. Roosevelt did not appear as some kind of power figure, but as a friend, doing battle in the name of decency and right.

As the father of the New Deal program, Roosevelt put bread in the mouths of the hungry, secured jobs for many thousands of unemployed, and transmitted to all a sense of self-importance. The whole New Deal, in fact, was based upon the overall belief that dignity—to which every man is fully entitled—cannot exist under uncertain economic conditions. To promote the national sense of dignity therefore, the New Deal established many programs providing work, itself, and methods of encouraging work. The so-called "alphabet-soup agencies"—the WPA, the PWA, CWA, CCC, FERA, and so forth—all were responsible for providing jobs and all were invaluable in reviving the national economy. Certain persons who happened to be less hard hit by the depression could see no reason for the sweeping New Deal reforms; but the depression victims—who were many—were grateful beyond words.

Once F. D. Roosevelt was reelected, in tribute to his economic achievements. His second reelection, in 1940, was a tribute to something else again: His overall leadership, which the American people wanted, in the approaching international holocaust. Then, after 4 years of war—in which Roosevelt the reformer had proved himself an equally outstanding military chieftan—the people once again returned him to office, in the hopes that he could somehow work another miracle, in the postwar struggle for international dominance. Death, of course, deprived him of this opportunity.

In all these undertakings, F. D. Roosevelt appeared before the people as a man of the people—concerned not with self, but with the Nation, civilization, and the democratic tradition. That is why, I suppose, you can find his picture still hanging in the homes of many American families, to whom the Democratic Party will forever be remembered as "the party of Mr. Roosevelt."

Methodist Youth Support Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the often heated debate on the civil rights bill, we may tend to forget the moral and religious principles on which this proposal is based. For this reason, I wish to call attention to the following statement adopted by the Council of the National Conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship at its recent meeting in Nashville, Tenn. This excellent statement strongly supports the civil rights bill:

As Christians we believe that because all men are equal in the sight of God, they should stand equally before the law. We affirm that the right to choose a place of residence, to enter a school, to secure employment, to vote, and to enter a place of business serving the public should in no way be limited by race, culture, or creed.

Believing that law is needed to protect the rights of all citizens, we therefore urge the Congress of the United States to enact needed civil rights legislation. Specifically, we support the passage of all provisions of the present civil rights bill.

White House Announcement on John F. Kennedy Half Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members have been inquiring about the availability of the new John F. Kennedy 50-cent coin now being prepared by the mints for general circulation as the standard half dollar, replacing the Franklin half dollar minted from 1948 through 1963. The legislation authorizing the change in the design of the half dollar was signed into law by President Johnson on December 30, 1963, and everyone has been awaiting with much interest the first appearance of the new half dollars.

The White House today announced that the first John F. Kennedy half dollars for general circulation purposes will be struck at the Philadelphia and Denver Mints a week from today, on February 11. However, it will be late March or early April before sufficient coins have been minted so that they can be made available simultaneously throughout the country.

BILL INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN

Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, said 90 million of the new coins honoring the late President Kennedy will be produced during 1964. The coin was authorized under legislation proposed by President Johnson on December 10 and introduced on that same day by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, as H.R. 9413. The bill was approved unanimously by the committee on December 12, was reported on December 13, and passed by the House under suspension of the rules on December 17. The following day it was taken from the desk of the President pro tempore of the Senate, passed and sent to the White House, where it was subsequently approved as Public Law 88–256.

Because of the widespread interest among Members of Congress and the general public in this new coin, which represents the first change in the design of a major denomination of coins since 1948, I submit the official announcement from the White House today for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[Immediate release, Feb. 4, 1964, office of the White House Press Secretary]

THE WHITE HOUSE

The first of the new John F. Kennedy half dollars for general circulation purposes will be struck at the mints in Philadelphia and Denver on February 11, 1964.

Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, said the mint will produce 90 million of the new half dollars during 1964. When 26 million have been made they will be distributed through the Federal Reserve banks to banks throughout the country and released to the public at face value in late March or early April. Thereafter, the new coins will be placed in circulation on a continuous basis as they are produced at the mints.

The John F. Kennedy half dollar was authorized by Congress in Public Law No. 88-256, approved by President Johnson on December 30, 1963. The face of the coin bears a portrait of the late President, facing left. Above and around the border is the word "Liberty." Beneath, and around the border is the date. Above the date and below the head is the motto "In God We Trust." The reverse of the coin contains a replica of the Presidential Coat of Arms. Above, and around the border are the words "United States of America." Below and around the border "Half Dollar." On the ribbon above the eagle's head are the words "E Pluribus Unum" (One Out of Many).

The models for both sides of the coin were prepared by the U.S. Mint. The Presidential likeness was done by Gilroy Roberts, chief sculptor of the mint at Philadelphia, and the Presidential Coat of Arms was executed by his assistant, Frank Gasparro.

Individual specimens of the coin are not available from the mints or the Federal Reserve banks. They can be obtained by the public only through local banking sources.

FUSLA: Friends of the United States of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to bring to the attention of this body some outstanding work in the field of foreign service being done by a private organization with headquarters in Washington, D.C. It is known as "Friends of the United States of Latin America," or FUSLA, for short.

FUSLA is headed by a dynamic attorney named Stanley Posner. Mr. Posner still devotes a great deal of his abundant energy and talent to this nonprofit, charitable organization—despite the fact that he has suffered a heart attack and has been warned by his doctors to curtail his activities as much as possible. For 23 years Mr. Posner has been general counsel for the National Institute of Diaper Services and for a number of other trade associations, including the Linen Supply Association and the National Institute of Industrial Launderers. Among the firms he has represented in Washington, D.C., are three in the largest city in my congressional district, the Northwest Industrial Laundry, the American Linen Service, and Eugene Linen Supply Co., all of Eugene, Oreg. In addition, he has served for 16 years as president of FUSLA. He has committed himself heavily, in both time and money, to the success of the organization.

Many of my colleagues have read, I am sure, the articles in the press in the past few days about the relief expedition which Mr. Posner and his coworkers have organized and sent to Costa Rica. For those who have not, I am including, under the leave to extend my remarks, two items from last Sunday's editions of the Washington Post and the Washington Star. I am proud that one of the ambulances in the caravan is being driven by, and the convoy is being led by, a former employee of mine, the wife of my administrative assistant, Mrs. Jack L. Billings.

Gloria Billings and her 7-year-old son, Jason, will arrive in Miami today. They and the four ambulances and a truck loaded with medical supplies and equipment will travel by ship from Miami to Guatemala City. From there, the vehicles will be driven over the Inter-American Highway to San Jose, Costa Rica, where they will be presented to hospitals. Some of the supplies will be used for the relief of many who have been left homeless by the eruption of a volcano in that country.

President Johnson very kindly sent a telegram of congratulations to Mr. Posner and to FUSLA over the weekend. By unanimous consent, I am also including the text of that telegram following the two newspaper items.

I am pleased to join with President Johnson in commending this worthy organization for its efforts to improve our relations in Central America, where good relations are so important to us. Mr. Posner and FUSLA are responding nobly to President Johnson's call in December for more private aid in Latin America in cooperation with the Department of State and the Alliance for Progress.

Following the telegram, I have included, for the information of those who would like to know more about this project, some of the material from a general press release issued last week by FUSLA. The various items referred to follow:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Feb. 2, 1964]

COSTA RICANS TO GET RELIEF—GIFT OF U.S. GROUP

Four ambulances and a panel truck, piled high with blankets, clothing and medicine, were to leave Washington at dawn today on a 5,000-mile trek to the little Central American Republic of Costa Rica.

The gift of an organization known as FUSLA (Friends of the United States of Latin America), the ambulances and equipment are destined for Costa Rican hospitals and for the relief of persons whose homes were destroyed in recent volcanic eruptions.

Three District residents—Gloria and Jason Billings of 3810 T Street NW. and Zelig Robinson of the George Washington Inn—were among the nine who volunteered for the trip.

THREE CHILDREN INVOLVED

The other six adults and three children who were to go were from Baltimore, Pikesville, and Frederick, Md.

President Johnson, in a telegram to Stanley I. Posner, FUSLA president, cited the organization for its "past accomplishments" and wished "abundant success" for the caravan.

FUSLA calls itself a voluntary, nonprofit, foreign service organization.

Mr. Posner pointed out that when President Johnson appointed Thomas C. Mann his Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, he urged Mr. Mann "to work closely with private U.S. groups and institutions carrying out activities in Latin America."

"This is the first step in that direction," said Mr. Posner.

The motorcade, which is expected to arrive in Costa Rica February 15, will go first to Miami where it will be ferried down across the Gulf of Mexico, taking to the road again in Guatemala.

All of the vehicles in the motorcade are used and reconditioned. They were purchased through contributions made to FUSLA, Mr. Posner said.

ONE MILLION DOLLARS IN SUPPLIES

He said that this year FUSLA will make available to the Costa Rican public health authorities more than $1 million worth of supplies.

"Why Costa Rica?" he says. "Because first of all we know the supplies are going to get to the people who need them. There is no graft in Costa Rica. And second, these people are our friends. They have great respect for the United States and for the American people."

Getting the caravan on the road and safely to its destination is the result of teamwork and kindness of a great many individuals and business firms, Mr. Posner said.

The drivers of the ambulances and their wives were guests of honor last night at a reception tendered by Gonzalo J. Facio, Costa Rican Ambassador to the United States.

Also honored were Dr. and Mrs. Jose Figueres. Dr. Figueres, a director of FUSLA, is the former president of Costa Rica.

His American-born wife, Mrs. Karen Olsen Figueres, will direct the distribution of the supplies when the motorcade reaches Costa Rica.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1964]

MERCY TRIP TO COSTA RICA STARTS TODAY

Four used ambulances are to leave Washington this morning for San José, Costa Rica, where they will be used to aid volcano victims.

The expedition has been mounted by the Friends of the United States of Latin America, a nonprofit organization based in Washington.

FUSLA has spent the past 6 months gathering funds for ambulances and medical supplies.

The ambulances will be driven to Miami, where they will be shipped to Guatemala while their drivers fly to Guatemala City. They will then be driven the rest of the way to San José, the capital of Costa Rica, where they will be turned over to local hospitals.

The volcano, Mount Irazu, first erupted in September 1962 and has yet to quiet down. Entire villages in the 5-mile zone surrounding it have been evacuated, and lava ash has fallen on San José, 25 miles away.

The drivers in the caravan include Gloria Billings of 3810 T Street NW. and Zelig Robinson of the George Washington Inn; Dr. Vincent Lopez, Nathan Mash, and Leon Zeller, of Baltimore; Mr. and Mrs. Rubin Waranch, of Pikesville, Md.; and Dr. Thomas Michael, of Frederick.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1964.

STANLEY I. POSNER,
President, FUSLA,
Washington, D.C.:

I am happy to greet members of the Friends of the United States of Latin America, Inc., and all those participating in the caravan of ambulances to Costa Rica.

During the past 15 years, your organization has played a significant part in the promotion of hemispheric friendship and solidarity.

I warmly commend your past accomplishments and in your future endeavors I wish you abundant success.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

COSTA RICAN RELIEF CARAVAN DEPARTS WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR SAN JOSE, AT DAWN, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1964—WILL CARRY HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT, MEDICINES, CLOTHING FOR VICTIMS OF COSTA RICAN VOLCANO

Seven men and two women, driving a caravan of four ambulances and one panel truck will depart from the Plaza of the Organization of American States, 17th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C., about 7 a.m., Sunday, February 2. The drivers are a group of business and professional men, doctors and a lawyer, plus two American housewives who have volunteered to undertake the long and possibly hazardous trip to demonstrate the friendship of the American people for the people of Costa Rica. These volunteers will pay their own expenses and, in addition, have contributed the money necessary to buy two of the ambulances.

The caravan has been in the planning stage for about 6 months as a project of FUSLA (Friends of the United States of Latin America), a nonprofit organization which has been active in encouraging the Central American common market, giving scholarships and special relief projects, as well as wide dissemination of information in Washington concerning the Central American countries. The officers and directors of the organization are a blue-ribbon group including university professors, the president of the American University of Washington, D.C., eminent physicians, and some distinguished diplomats including His Excellency Jose Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

FUSLA has undertaken to assist the entire hospital system of Costa Rica by gathering from hospitals, business firms and individuals in the United States used and surplus equipment of all kinds, medicines, diapers, nurses' uniforms, sheets, blankets—in fact, almost anything which can be used by the impoverished hospitals in the small Central American republic. The Costa Rican project is intended as a demonstration project which, if successful, can be copied by any of the other Latin American republics.

Originally it was planned to drive a few ambulances to Costa Rica over the inter-American Highway as a symbol of the program. The ambulances were to carry signs: "To the People of Costa Rica from the People of the United States." However, 3 weeks ago an appeal was received from Costa Rica to load the ambulances with blankets, clothing and medicines for the 1,500 persons whose homes were destroyed or made uninhabitable as a result of the volcano which is now in active eruption. A group of FUSLA members in Baltimore enlisted the active support of Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin who has issued an appeal to the people of that city to participate in the program. Similar programs are rapidly being organized in New York and Boston. It will be too cumbersome to handle individual contributions of used clothing which might require repair, sterilizing, etc. Therefore, the program is concentrating its appeal on the commercial launderers, drycleaners, linen supply companies and industrial launderers in five major east coast cities—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington. Many laundries and drycleaners have on hand large quantities of unclaimed clothing which is already repaired, cleaned and packaged. Linen suppliers have large quantities of needed sheets, towels, nurses' and doctors' uniforms. Industrial launderers have huge quantities of work shirts and work pants worn by the typical factory worker, gasoline station attendant and truckdriver which are ideal for this relief project. These garments are in excellent condition but are on the shelves of the laundries due to employee turnover in the factories and other enterprises where they are worn. In similar drives of the past, FUSLA has collected thousands of such garments as well as diapers for the hospitals of Costa Rica.

Members of the National Institute of Diaper Services in all parts of the United States have been assisting FUSLA in its work with all 37 hospitals of Costa Rica since May 1963 when the joint program "Operation Baby Bootstrap" was initiated in Puerto Rico. Each of the diaper service companies have adopted one of the hospitals in Costa Rica and is regularly engaged in collecting usable hospital equipment, baby clothing, etc., in its home community, frequently from its own customers.

The drivers and their wives will be honored on Saturday evening, February 1, at a dinner reception to be given by the Ambassador of Costa Rica to the United States, His Excellency Gonzalo J. Facio and Mrs. Facio. They will also honor Dr. and Mrs. Jose Figueres, a director of FUSLA, is the former President of Costa Rica, well known as one of the outstanding liberals of the hemisphere. Mrs. Karen Olsen de Figueres, his American-born wife, is directing the distribution of these supplies in Costa Rica. In a recent speech to the Pan American Society of New England she told a group of distinguished Bostonians, "You may be sure that every diaper, every ounce of medicine which you send to us will go to the hospitals and the people who need them. There will be no black market in Costa Rica."

The caravan may bring back memories of the covered wagon of American history. There will be several family groups on the trip. Rubin Waranch, president of FUSLA de Baltimore, will be accompanied by his wife and three sons, Mark, Isaac and James. Mrs. Waranch and the two older boys are drivers. Jimmie, age 11, refused to stay home when all the rest of the family were going on this exciting trip, and his school gave him leave of absence to join in this educational adventure. Mrs. Gloria Billings, who is the volunteer transportation director of FUSLA, will serve as convoy leader. She has already made four round trips from Washington to Eugene, Oreg., in a Volkswagen, since her husband is administrative assistant to Congressman DUNCAN from that city. She will be accompanied by her 7-year-old son, Jason, who has been excused from Sidwell Friends School for the educational advantages of the trip.

The present shipment of ambulances and their contents which are badly needed in Costa Rica at this time are only a small part of the continuing program which FUSLA is carrying out in Costa Rica. Already more than $100,000 worth of clothing, laundry machinery, hospital equipment has been delivered to San Jose, made up in major part by gifts from several Washington hospitals and delivered free of charge by the United Fruit Co. During 1964, FUSLA will make available to the beleaguered Costa Rican public health authorities more than $1 million worth of badly needed supplies. The program is in every sense a people-to-people program such as President Johnson has called for when he appointed Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. President Johnson instructed Mr. Mann on December 16: "I want you to work closely with private United States groups and institutions carrying out activities in Latin America. These include, but are not limited to, the AFL–CIO, religious and charitable groups, cooperatives and the private business sector, which can make the significant contributions envisaged in the Punta del Este charter." The caravan of ambulances is real evidence of North American cooperation by the individuals who are driving the ambulances and the many business firms, large and small, who have contributed the goods, supplies and equipment which make the trip possible. For example, the U.S. Freight Co., one of the lragest freight forwarders and consolidators in the world, is providing free ocean transportation from Miami to Guatemala for the ambulances through its affiliate, the Coordinated Caribbean Transport Co. In addition, the U.S. Freight Co., through its branch warehouses and terminals throughout the country, is picking up other contributions of clothing, hospital equipment and textiles from members of the National Institute of Diaper Services throughout the United States. About 10 days after the ambulances leave Washington, the U.S. Freight Co. will transport from New York City 40,000 pounds of relief supplies for the victims of the Irazu volcano, consolidating the contributions from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington.

The international affiliate of the Esso Standard Oil Co. is providing all the gasoline and lubricants for the trip. The Cadillac Motor Car Division of General Motors repaired the four ambulances and put them into first-class operation condition for their 3,000-mile drive. Mr. H. O. Balls, president of the Nashville Auto Diesel College, Nashville, Tenn., rebuilt the panel truck. He has also contributed scholarships in the value of $25,000 for a group of young Costa Ricans who will learn automobile and diesel engine repair, welding, soldering at his school. Later, these technicians will receive supplementary training from other American firms who manufacture laundry equipment, X-rays, and other modern appliances which so frequently become useless through breakdown which could be corrected by simple repairs. Many others, individuals and business enterprises, have contributed crating, free transportation, tires, medicines, too much to list individually. Mr. Posner, president of FUSLA, stated, "These many contributors to whom we cannot give individual recognition will nevertheless find their complete satisfaction from the knowledge that their contributions will comfort and help many worthy citizens of this truly democratic country which has time after time demonstrated its friendship and help for the United States. Actually, at this moment it is Costa Rica who represents the United States in Panama.

A request has been made by Mrs. Billings to the metropolitan police and to the State police of each State enroute to provide an escort for the convoy so that they may meet the requirements of their itinerary in safety and without alarming the public who may feel that there has been some terrible accident if they see these ambulances traveling on the road. Radio and TV stations are urged to make appropriate announcements of the time when the ambulances will be passing through their area. A copy of the itinerary is attached.

Fifteen directors and officers of FUSLA will hold their annual meeting at the School of International Service, the American University, Washington, D.C., at 2 p.m., Saturday, February 1. There are two especially important items on a very crowded agenda. The directors must consider whether it is more useful to use the scholarships available at the Nashville Auto Diesel College to train teachers who will then return to Costa

Rica and teach these crafts or to use the training to prepare technicians pledged to work in Costa Rica for a number of years but free to establish themselves as businessmen in their country which needs these skills. The other major item is a decision of the most effective way to raise the 1964 budget of approximately $100,000 necessary to carry out FUSLA's many activities. The officers will present to the directors the alternatives of utilizing professional fund raisers or direct solicitation.

FUSLA CARAVAN COUNTDOWN—ITINERARY AND SCHEDULE

Caravan of four ambulances leaves Washington, D.C., February 2, 1964, and arrives in San Jose, Costa Rica, February 14 or 15, 1964.

Sunday, February 2: Leave Washington, D.C., 7 a.m. from Organization of American States, 17th and Constitution Avenue NW., arrive Summerton, S.C.—Spend night Windsor Motel. (Driving time approximately 10½ hours.)

Monday, February 3: Leave Summerton, S.C., arrive Daytona Beach, Fla.—Spend night Mid-Town Motel. (Driving time approximately 9 hours and 40 minutes.

Tuesday, February 4: Leave Daytona Beach, Fla., arrive Miami, Fla.—Everglades Hotel. (Driving time approximately 7 hours and 30 minutes. Arrival in Miami must be no later than 4 p.m. in order to complete arrangements for shipping ambulances. Ambulances will be loaded and sail from Miami either February 5 or 6.) Mrs. Billings and her son will accompany the ambulances to Guatemala on the ship.

Wednesday, February 5: Leave Miami, Fla.—Pan Am flight No. 503, 8 a.m., arrive Guatemala City—10 a.m. Drivers will be met at airport by Mr. Sam Greene and will spend the day at his home at Lake Atitlan. Drivers will be in Guatemala City until departure on February 11—Palace Hotel.

Monday, February 10: Part of the drivers will be taken from Guatemala City to Matias de Galvez to pick up the ambulances and drive them back to Guatemala City.

Tuesday, February 11: Leave Guatemala City, Guatemala. Arrive San Salvador, El Salvador—Spend night at Hotel El Salvador Intercontinental. (Departure from Guatemala City must be early enough so that caravan reaches border before midday closing. It will be necessary each day to arrange departure times to coincide with open hours of border crossings.)

Wednesday, February 12: Leave San Salvador, El Salvador. Arrive Tegucigalpa, Honduras—Spend night Gran Hotel Lincoln.

Thursday, February 13: Leave Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Arrive Managua, Nicaragua—Spend night Gran Hotel.

Friday, February 14: Leave Managua, Nicaragua. If possible caravan will reach its destination of San Jose, Costa Rica. If not, caravan will stop for night at Puntarenas, Costa Rica, and on February 15 will leave for San Jose, arriving about noon. In San Jose, contact may be made through V. James Furniss, FUSLA de Costa Rica, Post Office Box 301, Telephone 4595 or J-3023 (telephone communication very unsatisfactory). Cable address: FUSLA, San Jose.

The following are contacts through which drivers can be reached during the caravan trip to Costa Rica.

Until drivers arrive in Miami, call 233-9200 in Baltimore. This is the office of Mr. Nathan Mash which he will contact each day at noon up to and including Tuesday, February 4. After that use cable addresses listed below:

Miami: Mr. Charles B. Whitney, Coordinated Caribbean Transport, Inc., 3400 NW. 62d Street, phone: Oxford 6-5450.

Agents for Coordinated Caribbean Transport in Central America:

Cable address of each agent listed below is: COORDCARIB plus applicable city and country. For example, "Billings COORDCARIB Guatemala City, Guatemala" or "Waranch COORDCARIB San Jose, Costa Rica."

Henry Suarez, Avenue La Reforma 6-30 Zona 4, Guatemala City, Guatemala (Post Office Box 1527), phone 60597.

Mario Gonzalez, 5a Calle No. 303, Managua, Nicaragua, phone 2752.

Orlando Delgadillo, Calle Arce 1155, San Salvador, El Salvador (Post Office Box 669), phone 4257.

Jose L. Odio, Post Office Box 3763, San Jose, Costa Rica, phone 5485-4724.

To send cables, call Western Union and specify "Via Tropical Radio."

Names and addresses—drivers—caravan to Costa Rica, February 1964:

Gloria Billings (group leader), 3810 T Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20007.

Jason Billings, 3810 T Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20007 (passenger).

Rubin Waranch (assistant group leader) and Mrs. Waranch, 7915 Ivy Lane, Pikesville, Md.

Mark Waranch, 7915 Ivy Lane, Pikesville, Md.

James Waranch, 7915 Ivy Lane, Pikesville, Md.

Isaac Waranch, 7915 Ivy Lane, Pikesville, Md. (passenger).

Dr. Vincent Lopez (group medical officer), 3900 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.

Nathan Mash, 3405 Winterset Court, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Thomas Michael, Frederick, Md.

Leon Zeller, 941 North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md.

Zelig Robinson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D.C.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as an attorney I have some question whether it would be appropriate at this time to take the floor, but I will do so and risk the wrath of the lay Members.

I respect the differences of opinion and the reasons behind them about this bill. I respect the men who have those differences of opinion. I may not agree with them on many of the points but I do think they certainly have a right to be heard, and often have sound reasons backing up their arguments. However, I have a hard time seeing how that applies to this section.

This section relates to voting. It seems to me that if we look at it with regard to what the section involved and attempted to be stricken by this amendment does, it merely is an expediting provision. I call to your attention the laws of your own States. I have not made any survey of them. I do not know exactly how many this applies to. But I believe that in a great many States of the Union today (and I know that in the laws of Ohio) there are such provisions for expediting voting cases, and there are good reasons for those laws. They exist because, as has been mentioned, once you lose the right to vote, it is gone forever. This is because when a man is elected in an election, somebody has to take over the office involved. So there are in the States many laws that have given recognition to these points.

In many courts, for instance in the State of Ohio, you have an original right to file a voting case right in the Supreme Court of Ohio. It seems to me the only thing involved here is whether or not you are going to try to cut down this voting type of case to two determinations rather than three in your regular Federal court system. There are very good reasons for attempting to cut it down to two. Again, if you are going to cut it down to two, is it not fair and logical to start with a three-judge court rather than starting with a one-judge court?

That is involved in this section. I do not see any reason for making an issue of it relating to the general differences that may exist with regard to other points.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if he would be willing to provide the same privilege to the defendant in a case?

Mr. TAFT. I would be willing to accord the same privilege, but I do not know that it is particularly pertinent in this case. The need is in the person who has not been voting. This statute is modeled on the antitrust statute, which gives to the Attorney General (where the Government is involved) the right to make this kind of determination. In a case of this importance it should be up to the person who is involved in the enforcement of the law, the Attorney General to make the original decision to say whether the case needs to be speeded up or not.

People, Not Laws, Will Eliminate Prejudice

SPEECH

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, individuals, not laws—Federal, State, or lo-

cal—will be the force or guiding light which eliminates discrimination and prejudice.

An important, dramatic example of this truism is the Defense Language Institute, West Coast Branch, at the Presidio of Monterey in California.

Presently there are four races involved: Negroid, caucasian, brown, and yellow.

There are seven religions: Christian, Judaism, Buddhism, Moslem, Taoism, Confucianism, and Hindu.

There are 56 different nations or separate principalities involved.

Here many persons of varying race, color, religion, and state of national origin, within the present U.S. Civil Service regulations, live and operate in an atmosphere of remarkable harmony and compatibility.

With the passage of the civil rights bill, I prayerfully hope that those stanch, vocal, prepassage civil libertarians will not rest on their laurels, but will personally work as conscientiously and assiduously to eliminate prejudice and discrimination as they did to pass another law.

Restrictive Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of Sunday, January 5, 1964, by my good friend and the distinguished conservation editor of that newspaper, Mr. Jack Van Coevering, in opposition to the antigun legislation now pending in Congress.

I also insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the January 19 edition of that same fine newspaper, an article in which a distinguished economist, Prof. Ross J. Wilhelm, points out the evils of the restrictive firearms legislation now pending in the Congress.

The articles follow:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Jan. 5, 1964]

WOODS AND WATERS

(By Jack Van Coevering)

Now that the period of mourning for President Kennedy is over, it is time to examine the antigun feeling which swept much of the Nation immediately after the tragic assassination.

For those unfamiliar with guns, the rifle was a readymade scapegoat to be blamed for the crime.

There will continue to be hysterical demands for firearms registration in controversion of constitutional guarantees. There also will be charges that those guarantees are outmoded and belong to another age. All this must now be given a hard and intelligent look.

The real question is this: Would stricter control of firearms, and the sale or registration of all firearms prevent repetition of what happened? Those who are unfamiliar with guns will chant yes. But don't be too sure.

We have laws all over the place against human wickedness. People continue to break them.

The State of Texas has a law against murder and even the city of Dallas has a law against the discharge of firearms within its limits. Both were broken by a man who had no regard for them.

It is just at this point that registration of firearms becomes so meaningless. Recently there was a hearing on a bill which would have made it a crime to own certain types of weapons in Washington, D.C. At the hearing Robert V. Murray, the superintendent of police there, testified:

"If I felt that we could take the guns out of the hands of the criminals with this bill or any other bill, I would be 100 percent for it. But if a criminal is going to hold up a place or assault somebody with a gun, the law against carrying a gun is not going to deter him.

"He is a criminal anyhow, and he cannot lawfully possess a gun. So a law on the books that he cannot have a gun in his possession is not going to deter him."

Putting the whole firearms fury into a nutshell: You can disarm the honest person, but not the criminal.

At this writing, there is national legislation proposed to prohibit the sale of firearms to persons convicted of crimes of violence, mental incompetents and minors without parental consent. All this is only commonsense.

To compel registration of all firearms, to require a license to possess a firearm, to levy punitive taxes or fees for the ownership of firearms is something else again.

The framers of the Constitution were not out of date when they guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms in the second amendment.

When the late President was the junior Senator from Massachusetts, he said this: "The amendment remains an important declaration of our basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important."

The time for mourning—and hysteria—is over. The time has come to examine calmly and logically the areas in which we may achieve effective legislation to discourage misuse and ownership of firearms by criminals and other undesirables. It is also time to be alert against the erosion of our liberties for which our forefathers fought and died.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Jan. 19, 1964]

"WON'T DETER CRIME"—ECONOMIST HITS GUN RESTRICTIONS

ANN ARBOR.—Restrictive gun legislation, now pending in Congress, would neither prevent assassinations nor help the economy, in the opinion of a University of Michigan economist.

"Crime rates in States that have 'tough gun laws' are not significantly lower than in other States," said Asst. Prof. Ross J. Wilhelm.

"The gun is not the cause of the crime. To expect to control crime and violence by controlling guns is an error, just as to attempt to control liquor consumption via prohibition laws was an error," he said.

Professor Wilhelm, who teaches business economics in the University of Michigan Graduate School in Business Administration leveled on a proposed amendment to the Dodd bill which would require that any person wishing to purchase a weapon by mail must first obtain a certificate from his local police chief.

"The great danger in granting such authority to the local police chief is that he might use a political test to restrict the purchasers," he said.

He also objected to a provision to raise the gun dealer license from $1 to $10.

"The gun trade and sporting goods business is one where many people have been able to start a business of their own on a shoestring. The raising of the fee for a Federal firearms license will make it more difficult for a little fellow to get started and this seems undesirable," he said.

Carl Rowan to USIA Is Excellent Appointment, Says Minneapolis Spokesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Carl T. Rowan to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency has been enthusiastically received by my home State of Minnesota. Everyone who knows Carl Rowan believes President Johnson could not have picked a better successor to Edward R. Murrow.

In an editorial prepared for the February 13 issue of the Minneapolis Spokesman, Publisher Cecil Newman speaks for many of us when he calls Rowan's appointment "a fortunate selection." Carl Rowan worked for the Spokesman when he went to college.

Following is Mr. Newman's editorial:

ROWAN SELECTION FOR USIA DIRECTOR EXCELLENT JOHNSON APPOINTMENT

The appointment of U.S. Ambassador to Finland Carl Thomas Rowan, of Minnesota, to the post of Director of the U.S. Information Agency by President Lyndon B. Johnson was indeed a fortunate selection.

Mr. Rowan was appointed to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of top-flight radio and TV newsman and executive, Edward R. Murrow, whose work at USIA has been handicapped by his serious illness.

Rowan's appointment was a happy choice because he has the background in ability, training, and experience at home and abroad which the USIA needs for such a difficult job.

Practically every Minnesotan who reads newspapers is familiar with Rowan's great work as a reporter and staff writer for the Minneapolis Tribune. Nationally his work has appeared in such publications as Reader's Digest, the Saturday Evening Post, Red Book, and Ebony magazine. The four books of diverse subjects he authored were widely read and applauded.

Rowan's lectures which took him to practically every State in the Union have made his name a household word in the American Negro community and that part of the white community which is intellectually or otherwise interested in the progress of the Negro, as a part of the Nation's population.

Rowan is liked and trusted by the Asian nations like India. He is regarded by the African nations as an American of African ancestry who can be trusted. In Europe he is known for his forthright defense of America when he has accompanied the Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the then Vice President Lyndon Johnson to Paris, Geneva, and other European capitals as Deputy Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

In one swoop the Rowan appointment by President Johnson invalidated the Communist propaganda line which understandably grossly exaggerates the U.S. race problem.

A reply to Soviet and Peiping propaganda on the race problem by a USIA directed by an American Negro of the caliber and stature of Rowan is apt to be accepted at face value by world neutrals whereas the reverse has been true with the Agency under such an outstanding individual as Murrow whose views on race have always been fair and decent and under fire from the Nation's white supremacy crowd and the southern segregationists.

Rowan has something else going for him in his determination to do a job. He is among the few Negroes, and whites, too, who were sought by the Kennedy administration without regard to their prior political activity or interest. His was not a strictly political appointment. When Rowan accepted the post in the State Department he left a career which was bringing him an income estimated at over $40,000 per year to take a job paying less than $19,000. There have been dozens of white fellow Americans like, for example, Robert S. McNamara, who have made such sacrifices, but Rowan is the only one of the large number of Negroes who took Government posts at such a sacrifice.

The same situation prevailed when Rowan accepted the ambassadorship of Finland. He had to make a big financial sacrifice in order to prove that an American Negro who was not a career diplomat could make good as envoy from the United States. He will probably deny that he was motivated by such a factor but those who know him recognize his strong desire to see his people get the opportunity to prove themselves in all areas of American life. Whenever he has had opportunity to serve as an example he has accepted the responsibility even if it cost him financial losses.

Aside from all of the other factors which make the Rowan appointment outstanding and worth while is the fact that Rowan is a competent newsman and analyst of what makes the United States and the world tick. President Johnson could not have found a better man than Carl T. Rowan to do the job at USIA.

It's Better To Give

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD the following by Columnist Art Buchwald, which was printed in the New York Herald Tribune of February 4, 1964:

ART BUCHWALD AT HOME

WASHINGTON.—We have this aid who works for us and we must say he's becoming quite a problem.

Just the other day we said, "Bobby, take these photographs down to the post office and mail them for me."

"Yes, sir," he said, "but before I go, I would like to give you and Mrs. Buchwald this beautiful hi-fi stereo for your lovely house."

"That's very nice of you, Bobby, but it isn't Christmas."

"I know, sir, but working for you means so much to me I don't know how to repay you."

"Well, thank you very much, I'm sure Mrs. Buchwald will be thrilled."

A few days later we said, "Bobby, go out and get me a cup of coffee and a doughnut."

He took the quarter, but when he returned he was struggling with a large crate which was almost bigger than he was.

"Sir, I know all you wanted was coffee and a doughnut, but I would like you to have this electric barbecue pit as a token of my esteem," he groaned breathlessly.

"Bobby," we said gently, "I appreciate the gesture, but are you sure you can afford something like this on your $40-a-week salary?"

"Certainly, sir. You're the finest person I ever worked for and you'll hurt my feelings if you don't take it."

A week went by and one day Bobby came into the office and said he was finished filing all our old columns, and asked if we would take a drive with him.

We were very annoyed, but he was persistent. Bobby drove us out to our house and, lo, right in the backyard was a new swimming pool.

Bobby smiled.

"What's going on?" we demanded.

"Sir, the last person I worked for was mean and cruel and always yelled at me. You've never raised your voice and I appreciate it. The only way I can demonstrate how much this means to me is to present you with this Olympic-size heated swimming pool."

"Thank you so much, Bobby. I'm terribly moved. Now you'd better get back to the office and fill the water cooler.

For a month Bobby worked very hard and we didn't see too much of him, though occasionally we found a gift from him on our desk. One time it was 50 shares of A.T. & T. Another time it was a gift certificate from Tiffany's for Mrs. Buchwald. A third time it was a gocart for the children. But we thought nothing of it.

After all, we had exchanged gifts with Bobby for years. Once we gave him a ballpoint pen, another time we presented him with two tickets to a Washington Senators game, and only a few weeks ago we had bought him a keychain with a likeness of the Capitol in silverplate dangling from a link.

But we did get worried last week. We had just come back from being examined for an insurance policy when we found Bobby waiting excitedly at the door of the office.

He said, "I know I'm just an office boy around here, but I've learned a great deal from you and I have to show you how much I appreciate all you've done for me."

"You don't have to do that, Bobby."

"There are some bosses you hate," he said, "and others you'd die for. You're in the second category. And to show you how I feel, I'd like you to have this."

He handed us a sheet of paper.

"What is it?" we asked him.

"It's the deed to Disneyland. You now own it."

"Bobby, you shouldn't have."

"Sir," he said with tears in his eyes, "the pleasure is all mine."

High Prices Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 28 on the so-called quality stabilization bill.

HIGH PRICES BILL

There is no more persistent clique in Congress than that little group of Senators which keeps trying to foist a retail price-fixing bill on the American public under the deceiving label of "quality stabilization."

Year after year this sorry legislation manages to gain a stature it doesn't deserve through full-fledged congressional hearings. This year's sessions before a Senate Commerce Subcommittee are earlier than usual—no doubt in order to give this bill's proponents more time to maneuver.

There is nothing significantly new in the latest arguments in support of the quality stabilization bill. Once again its proponents contend that both consumers and small businessmen would benefit if manufacturers of brand-name products were only allowed to specify retail prices. And once again the Justice Department has effectively demolished these arguments. As Assistant Attorney General William H. Orrick, Jr., testified the other day:

"The bill has nothing to do with quality. It is instead designed to legalize resale price fixing on a nationwide scale. * * * This is not the American way. By legislative fiat the bill would utterly destroy intrabrand price competition among distributors and retailers selling branded products. The result of such legislation would be charging of higher prices to the consuming public. The bill might more aptly be named the 'Consumer High Price Act.'"

That sums up the case against the Quality Stabilization Act succinctly and precisely. The only mystery is how on earth its sponsors think they can ever sell it as being in the public interest.

Saying YES to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the face of justifiable concern about juvenile delinquency, school dropouts, the lack of motivation and related problems involving many of our young people today, it is refreshing and encouraging to learn about community efforts to provide opportunity and incentive to its youth.

Such a community is Cranford, N.J., one of the most alert and progressive in Union County, the Sixth Congressional District. Under the leadership of Mr. Norman A. Kline, who serves as president of the nonprofit organization, a number of imaginative Cranford citizens joined to form the Youth Employment Service of Cranford, Inc. The story of this generous and valuable endeavor is told in a brief brochure describing YES and in three news articles which appeared in the Cranford Citizen and Chronicle during the early stages of the program.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this material in the hope that it will inspire others to

look within themselves and their own communities for some of the human resources required to meet one of the major social problems of our time:

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OF CRANFORD, INC.

Announcing a free community service, Youth Employment Service (YES), a nonprofit volunteer service for Cranford, to serve householders, business, and industry.

WHY A YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE?

The Youth Employment Service of Cranford, Inc., has been established to fill the needs of two groups in our community: employers—whether householders, businessmen, or plant managers who can use part-time or temporary help—and the many able, interested, and qualified young people who earnestly want some income and job experience.

YES is an independent, nonprofit organization. It is endorsed by our schools, churches, service clubs, and civic organizations. It has the full cooperation and guidance of the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry.

IF YOU CAN USE A QUALIFIED YOUNG EMPLOYEE

At home: For yardwork, to babysit, to paint, to clean, to help with a party, to cut grass, to wash your car, to help you for an hour or two in almost any fashion.

In your office: To type, to file, to run errands, to help with the mail, to answer the phone, to collate, to fill in during busy periods or emergencies.

In your store: To sell, to deliver, to pick up, to wrap, to sort stock, to unpack, to clean up.

In your restaurant: To set up, to serve, to clean up, to deliver.

In your plant: To expedite, to keep records, to help your skilled employees.

On your farm: To pick, to plant, to sort, to help you in your peak periods.

CALL YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AT BR 6-2233

YES will attempt to fill your job needs promptly by referring to you several qualified young people. The Youth Employment office is open from 9:30 a.m. until 12 noon, Monday through Friday, during the school vacation period. Hours for the balance of the year are to be announced.

It is up to you to choose the employee who best fulfills your requirements. You establish your own wage rates; YES serves as a clearinghouse for you to obtain responsible employees. There is no charge to you or to the applicant for this service. We suggest you register as a potential employer as soon as possible.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE AN INTERESTING JOB

After school or during vacation, and you are at least 14 years of age through the high school age bracket and you live in Cranford—register now with YES at 34 Alden Street, Cranford.

The kind of work you seek is up to you. YES will do its best to help you find it. Schoolwork comes first, so you should discuss with your parents your desire to find employment. YES must have their approval before it can help you. There is no charge to you for the job placement. Your only obligation is to (1) complete any interviews you request, and (2) perform any job you accept to the best of your ability.

A WORD TO PARENTS

YES will do its best to assure that all jobs it offers meet the laws of the State and the standards of our community. However, YES cannot assume your responsibilities as a parent for the safety and well-being of your child. YES urges you to take a direct interest in any job or employer to which we refer your child. Above all, remember schoolwork comes first.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FINDS OFFICE AT TELEPHONE CO.

The New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. this week gave its approval for use of office space in its Alden Street business office to Youth Employment Service, Inc., it was announced yesterday by Norman A. Kline, president of YES.

Charles T. Reilly, manager of the local telephone office, said his company has seen the worth and good in YES and desires to support it. Office space, he said, is being made available temporarily to help the agency get started and until permanent quarters are located.

Commenting on the Bell Telephone space announcement, Mr. Kline stated: "The Bell system always has been noted for its excellent service, topflight personnel, and its civic-mindedness. This latest gesture represents to us the finest example of community pride and spirit. We all are overwhelmed by the heartwarming generosity and we wish to express our thanks to the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. through our local manager, Mr. Reilly, for what it has done in active support of the YES program."

A ribbon-cutting ceremony at the telephone company office will be held at 1:45 p.m. next Thursday following a Rotary Club luncheon to which YES volunteers, directors, and the advisory staff have been invited. Also participating in the formal opening ceremonies will be Mayor Nicholas S. LaCorte and other township officials.

Mr. Kline announced that next Thursday and Friday, July 11 and 12, will be used by YES volunteers to become acquainted with their new air-conditioned quarters and the office will go into full operation on Monday, July 15.

Cranford youth, age 14 through high school, have been invited to register for employment at the office beginning July 15. Mr. Kline reported that the advertisement in last week's Citizen and Chronicle, designed to attract employment opportunities from local residents and business firms, drew a large response from local young people desiring jobs.

"It must be pointed out that YES can only fill jobs when it has jobs to fill," Mr. Kline declared. Residents of Cranford have been noted for their community-mindedness and it is hoped, the president added, that this project will become just as much a project of civic pride here as it has in Princeton and elsewhere.

At Princeton, he pointed out, businessmen and homeowners have used their imagination to the extent that many jobs have been filled by Princeton young people. These included such employment as teaching a woman to drive (whose husband became too exasperated), dog walker, helper at a birthday party, pool tender, pianist for a party, caddy, silver polisher, floor waxer, dressmaker, ironing, assist shut-ins, volunteer services, and many more not usually thought of pursuits.

Until next Thursday, Mr. Kline said that all job opening requests should be mailed to YES, Post Office Box 84, Cranford. After next Thursday, employers will be able to contact the YES office by telephone.

The Youth Employment Service, the chairman said, is set up to assist Cranford youth only and has the active support and cooperation of school officials. The function YES does will complement the fine work already being done in the employment field by the school guidance personnel.

TEENAGER REMEMBERS YES WITH DONATION FROM PAY

A $10 donation of which they are especially proud was received by officials of the new Youth Employment Service this week. One of the first teenagers to secure a position through YES made the contribution from her earnings.

Referrals have been made to a total of 66 jobs, Mrs. Henry L. Smithers, chairman of staff volunteers, reported. She noted that the organization is aiming for a total of 100 jobs by the end of August and urged local homeowners and businessmen to help YES reach this goal by calling in their needs.

One suggestion she had was that any homeowner tired by now of keeping up with mowing and weeding could turn these tasks over to one of the youngsters registered with YES.

Norman L. Kline, YES president, had a suggestion aimed at service station owners in the area. After a talk with William J. Clark, director of the wages and hours division of the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, he found that current laws permit boys 14 years of age and over to work in service stations and pump gas. YES can supply boys to work at peak or odd hours when extra help might be needed, he said.

Calls received this week included such jobs as caring for a pet, receptionist for a doctor's office, ironing, stock work helper, companion to an older person, and baby sitting.

The YES office at the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. building at 34 Alden Street is open from 9:30 a.m. to noon every weekday to process calls from prospective employers and accept registrations. The YES telephone number is Bridge 6-2233.

LARGE YES REGISTRATION PROVIDES VARIED POOL OF YOUTHFUL TALENTS

An estimated 500 local boys and girls from 14 years through high school age registered themselves as available for temporary or part-time work as Cranford's new Youth Employment Service, Inc., opened for business this week in office space provided by the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. in its business office at 34 Alden Street and at Cranford High School.

Adult volunteer workers from various local organizations began registering and interviewing the young people at both locations on Monday morning, and registration cards and parental permission slips were distributed for each applicant to complete.

Interviews are now being conducted at the high school on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings, and the YES headquarters in the telephone company building is open from 9:30 a.m. to noon every weekday to accept calls from prospective employers. The YES telephone number is BRidge 6-2233.

A number of jobs already have been filled through YES as a result of requests such as those of a householder who wanted two boys to help paint his home, a man who wanted a boy or girl to teach his daughters, 8 and 9 years old, to play tennis, and an architects' office in search of qualified typists. There also have been a number of calls filled for babysitters.

In an appeal this week to local residents and business concerns to take advantage of the services offered by YES, Norman A. Kline, president of the nonprofit organization, pointed out that the large registration of young people provides a pool of widely varied talent available to employers—householders, businessmen or plant managers—who can use part-time or temporary help.

Mrs. Henry L. Smithers, chairman of staff volunteers, pointed out that YES has avail-

able young people who are interested not only in steady jobs providing a set number of hours per week but also in one-shot projects such as helping to clean up a house, yard, cellar or garage, wash a car, paint a fence, assist at a party for younger children or any one of a number of such possible aids to a householder or businessman.

The laws governing the employment of teenagers were explained by William J. Clark, director of the Wages and Hours Bureau, Division of the Department of Labor, at a general meeting of those interested in Cranford's Youth Employment Service at Union Junior College last Thursday night.

Mr. Clark praised the local project and expressed the belief that it will do much for the welfare of the community by providing valuable assistance to homeowners and businessmen and helping to keep young people gainfully employed in their spare time.

All interested young people and potential employers are invited by YES to register at its office. There is no charge made to either party for the service.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report of print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Small Business Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the National Federation of Independent Business conducts polls of its members to determine their position on legislative proposals and other governmental matters. The federation represents smaller, independent business and independent professional people and has a membership of over 193,000 individuals.

In his statement before the Senate Committee on Finance on November 15, 1963, Mr. George J. Burger presented the problem of small business tax relief and summarized the results of polls of members on the tax bill. He stated that by a margin of 2 to 1, the members considered tax reduction the No. 1 business before Congress and that by a margin of almost 3 to 1 they favored the general outline of the administration's approach to tax reduction for individuals and unincorporated businesses. He also summarized their views regarding other aspects of the tax bill and on Government spending. I ask unanimous consent that his statement to the committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. We are a national organization composed solely of smaller, independent business and independent professional people. Our home office is San Mateo, Calif. I am in charge of the Washington, D.C., office.

Presently we have over 193,000 individual, directly supporting and participating members throughout all 50 States. This number is increasing every week. From the standpoint of number of directly supporting and participating members, we are the largest business-professional organization in the country.

Our main function is one of encouraging these independent enterprisers—who are the admitted backbone of our free enterprise system, and who are one of the strong pillars supporting our very liberties—to take a continuing, active, informed interest in government affairs—State and national—and of providing them with programs to do so in an intelligent, effective manner.

I will not describe our method of operation. Most, if not all, the members of this committee have become familiar with the federation over the 20 years of our Washington activities. I will say only that in the federation, members speak directly for themselves—in their statements, officers voice only the opinion of the membership. Through our Mandate polls (regular reports on which have been furnished to you) we determine the majority position of the membership. This sets the federation's course. Through our special factfindings surveys ("How's Business With You?"—1962; "Let's Take Care of Our Business—Government"—1963) we make it possible for members to tell us, and through us all in Government, the factual basis behind the many problems which are attacked by bills presented for vote in various issues of the Mandate.

First, we would like to say that the rate-reduction and income-averaging provisions of the tax bill as passed by the House under the leadership of the Honorable WILBUR MILLS are right in line with the sense of our membership as expressed in surveys and polls. As we will point out later, it could be changed for the better in some respects. Still, it is a solid step in the right direction.

Second, we want to congratulate your committee on these hearings. Reading reports and listening to information as we do, we had feared that there might be delay. We are happy to see the signs are otherwise. The fact is, as we will point out later, that the smaller, independent business and professional people of this country regard action for lower tax rates as one of critical importance to their futures. We are able to make this broad a statement because comparison of our survey and poll results with those made by Congressmen of their constituents in all walks of life show a startling identity in percentages.

Now, in our December 1962 Mandate No. 280 (app. A), 62 percent of our members insisted that Congress make consideration of tax reduction its first order of business in 1963. Further, in our special factfinding 1962 "How's Business With You?" survey (sample copy and yearend tabular report on file with your committee), to which we received 56,486 signed responses, we questioned members of the desirability of tax reductions, action against unfair competition, imports, etc. By far the largest number of respondents, some 41,445, checked tax reduction as their most pressing need.

Interestingly, in the tax area we asked members what they thought was most needed: Lower tax rates, faster depreciations, plowback allowances, or self-employed retirement plans. We found the following: (1) 20,679 respondents checked "Self-employed retirement plans"; (2) 18,208 respondents checked "Lower rates"; (3) 16,216 respondents checked "Plowback allowances"; and (4) 11,496 respondents checked "Faster depreciation."

As you know, Congress in 1962 moved a great distance to meet the No. 1 need expressed by our members by enactment of H.R. 10, S. 59, the private retirement program bills. Furthermore, Congress and the administration moved a great distance toward meeting the Nos. 3 and 4 needs in the enactment of H.R. 10650 (which provides an additional 7-percent tax credit to assist in the replacement of equipment and machinery) and in announcement of a $1.5 billion increase in depreciation allowances.

This, of course, leaves the No. 2 "Lower rates," need still up in the air.

Now, how do our members, who are a bona fide cross section of all smaller, independent business and professional people in our country (incidentally, the largest such cross section in any single business organization in the land), feel about action toward lower rates?

To put it bluntly, our members stand foursquare that tax rates must be reduced, with due consideration to the needs in small, independent business and independently operated professional vocations. They strongly prefer that these reductions be accompanied by matching reductions in Government spending. However, just how they would choose if they were faced with making the hard choice of accepting a tax reduction without matching spending cuts is a question that no one can answer.

Let's look at the record:

First, as to the administration's tax proposals, in our February 1963 Mandate No. 281 (app. B), we found that 66 percent of our members favored the proposal for a three-stage tax cut, 70 percent of our members favored the administration's proposals for reduction of personal income tax rates, and 53 percent of our members favored the administration's proposals to reduce corporate income tax rates.

In any case, as to the question of tailoring these bills to those in smaller, independent business and the professions in the Mandate No. 281, we also asked our members to express themselves on the Senate Small Business Committee's November-December recommendation on corporate tax reduction. We found that 59 percent favored this recommendation, against 53 percent who favored the administration's corporate tax revision plan.

We have made almost the same finding in our 1963 "Let's Take Care of Our Business—Government" special, factfinding survey (sample copy and first 2-month tabular report attached). In the first 8 months of this particular survey (which will require a full year for entire membership coverage), on the basis of 42,417 signed responses received from members throughout the entire 50 States, we have found a 7 to 1 preference (22,845 "Yes" to 3,882 "No") expressed for the Senate Small Business Committee's November-December corporate tax reduction recommendation to the administration, against an approximate 10 to 8 rejection (8,422 "Yes" to 10,132 "No") of an alternative proposition that corporation tax rates be reduced by 5 percentage points all along the line, regardless of size of corporate income. Interestingly, support for the Senate Small Business Committee plan has grown with the passing of time.

As to the preference expressed for the Senate Small Business Committee corporate tax reduction plan, as you know, all businessmen aspire to grow. This is part of the very nature of our freedom of opportunity and competitive economy system. Historically, the most severe growing pains are experienced in the transition between small and large business. A number of our members are in this stage. Our membership is limited to independently operated and owned firms which are not dominant in their lines. They are experiencing the difficulties in the early surtax area. Others hoping to grow behind them anticipate this difficulty. Therefore, clearly they would prefer a plan that would reverse the tax rates and expand the 22-percent levy to a $50,000 cutoff, to a plan that would reverse the normal tax rates, keep the present $25,000 cutoff, and effec-

tively increase the present surtax by 3 percentage points.

Further, we are asking members in this same special survey whether they prefer to have individual income taxes reduced evenly all along the line regardless of size of income, or to have the larger reductions made in the lower income brackets. To date the margins are running 2 to 1 (18,340 "Yes" to 8,965 "No") in favor of the former, but 3 to 1 in favor of the latter (18,900 "Yes" to 6,884 "No"). These particular tax rates apply equally, of course, to unincorporated business and porfessional operations the same as to individuals. Interestingly, these ratios have held steady throughout 1963 to date.

We have told you that we do not know how our members would feel about the question of having taxes cut without offsetting Federal spending reductions.

We might have answered this question "Yes" during 1962. In a bluntly worded poll in our July 1962 mandate No. 277 (app. C attached) we asked members: "Should Congress cut personal and corporate tax rates across the board this year? (Some business and labor groups suggest this to strengthen the economy, even if it results in an increased national debt)." The result, a vote of 50 percent "For," 47 percent "Against," and 3 percent "No opinion." Additionally, in our 1962 special survey we asked: "Do you think Congress should make tax reductions now? Our 56,486 responses broke down as follows: 73 percent (41,445) "For," 18 percent (10,079) "Against," and 9 percent (4,962) "No opinion."

Today, however, the mood seems one of much uncertainty, if not of opposition to tax cuts without matching spending cuts. In our February 1963 Mandate No. 281 we asked: "Do you believe that Congress should match tax cuts by Federal spending cuts on a dollar-for-dollar basis, before finally enacting tax reductions?" The result, a vote of 83 percent "For," 14 percent "Against," and 3 percent "No opinion." This would seem clear enough, except for one consideration: our findings to date in the 1963 special survey. One of our questions is: "Should Congress cut taxes this year?" Of the 42,417 replies to date, 48 percent (20,378) favor such cuts, 20 percent (8,694) oppose the cuts, and 32 percent (13,345) express no opinion.

Why this switch to uncertainty? We believe that three factors are responsible. First, the poll was taken and the survey is being taken during a period of exceptionally intense, sometimes quite bitter, and widely publicized debate over the question whether taxes should be reduced if such reduction contributes to a greater deficit. This, it seems, might well encourage a negative reaction. (As a matter of fact, when congressional debate heated up once more over the deficit-creating potential in the tax bill just before House action on same, we observed, in our survey, a reduction of 6 percentage points in support for cutting taxes this year; it is interesting to note, however, only 2 of these percentage points shifted to the "I'm against tax cuts in 1963" category, and that four of these percentage points shifted to the "I don't know" or "I do not care to express an opinion," the undecided category.) Second, and on the other hand, there would seem no question that people generally realize that any increase of the deficit under these circumstances would be different from many others in past years, in that this time the increase would be caused by the transfer of the income involved from the hands of Uncle Sam at Washington to those of individuals and private enterprise. This, it seems, might encourage a favorable reaction. Third, our studies and membership contacts convince us that many people are unaware of the provisions of the legislation. For instance, some are still under the impression that the measure would eliminate entirely deductions for such items as interest on mortgages and charitable contributions, provisions that are about as far from being in the tax bill as the sun is from being in the earth.

Second, as is well known, small business sales and profits tend to be much more volatile than those of their big business competitors. For instance, as Mr. John Horne, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, pointed out, earnings of small manufacturers increased by 44 percent as between the first three quarters of 1961 and the first three quarters of 1962, while the earnings of large manufacturers increased by 22 percent. Also, the Treasury Department points out, under the 1963 proposals small corporations will achieve reductions of about 27 percent compared with 4-percent reductions for their giant competitors. To the extent that smaller corporations are able to retain more of their earnings during periods of profit increases than are their larger competitors, it is clear that their position is nothing but strengthened.

While on this subject, we would like to point out that we have polled our members in various mandates, over a long period of years, on the question of income averaging such as is proposed in the administration's tax revision proposals. In each and every case we have received a favorable response.

Frankly, we are much intrigued by the thought that to the extent that these tax reductions might very well make it possible for the Small Business Administration to do a far more comprehensive job in its financial assistance operations. To the extent that reductions improve the financial position of small units, to that very extent this agency, which has been and is doing an excellent job, will be able to get more mileage, so to speak, out of each and every one of its lending assistance dollars. That can be nothing other than a further step in the right direction.

It is most important for Congress to act in this tax area. The more than 4.5 million small firms in the United States comprise about 95 percent of all business in the Nation. They employ 30 million persons (almost 50 percent of our entire work force) and account for 40 percent of all business activity. As a matter of fact, reports by your own committee some years ago indicated that in some lines of trade, particularly retailing, small firms account for as much as 80 percent of business activity, and employ as much as 70 percent of all the gainfully employed.

In any case, as to the polls and surveys, two factors stand out: First, the change in vote between mandate No. 277 and mandate No. 281—from 47-percent opposition to tax cuts that might increase deficits, to 86-percent opposition to enacting tax cuts without offsetting tax reductions. Second, the change in response between the 1962 and 1963 special surveys, which is not appreciable in the category of opposition to tax cuts, but which is heavily in the "I don't know," or "I don't care to express an opinion" category.

For this reason, we do hope it will be possible for the administration and the Congress to effect the maximum reasonable economies in spending programs, because smaller independent business and professional people do need, and can very much use, tax reductions this year. We are indeed encouraged by House action which, according to Representative CLARENCE CANNON, indicates a possibility that Congress may effect upward of $3.5 billion reduction in spending requests this year.

As to the question how such reductions would affect small firms there can be one answer only: The reductions, while perhaps not the most desirable, would be helpful. For instance, Treasury estimates they would effect a tax savings of $233 million a year for corporations earning under $25,000. This saving, when added to savings made possible under the 1958 $260 million Small Business First Step Tax Revision Act, the 1962 depreciation revisions, and the 1962 7-percent tax incentive, can do nothing but further strengthen the financial position of smaller business units—proprietorships, partnerships, as well as corporations. All of this is an addition to the fact that basically small and growing businesses are the units which emphasize the competitive aspects of our economy, and by their very act of being and succeeding are concrete evidence that the basic freedom of opportunity in our country, which is so vital a part of the mix that goes into bulwarking our individual freedoms.

In short, small business is vital to our Nation, both from the standpoint of the part played economically and from the standpoint of social significance. The level of taxation is a most important factor influencing its chances for success. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss this subject today, and hope that in the months ahead, you will continue the good work done in past years, in pressing for enactment of further needed and justified tax relief for this segment of our economy.

Get Back to Governing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, many of us are concerned at the apparent tendency of government, particularly the Federal Government, to spread into more and more areas formerly the responsibility of local governments or of private activities. This condition is pointed up very well in a recent editorial in the Berne Witness, Berne, Ind., which I include herewith:

GET BACK TO GOVERNING

The way it looks in President Johnson's economic message, the country is on the verge of either recession or inflation, and only the wisdom of the White House can keep us from falling victim of one or the other, or maybe both.

There must be a tax cut right away, the President told Congress. Otherwise the glowing prospect for speeded-up prosperity in 1964 will be shattered. And Congress will be to blame.

There also are omens of an inflationary price-wage spiral, he said. But there need be no fear of this if business and labor will stand ready to heed Presidential advice. An early warning system to detect advance signs of this peril is being set up in Federal agencies, so that the road to inflation can be barred by Government vigilance. A hint has been dropped that corporations are making too much money and should share it.

How did America ever survive before the economic wisdom of the ages was daily distilled by a staff of White House advisers into directions for Government action to avert disaster?

We would feel a lot more confidence in America's economic future if the President and his advisers were not so sure they know exactly what to do for it. The Federal Government, spending each year an amount equal to more than 15 percent of the calculated gross national product, does have some power to affect the course of economic affairs. Government meddling in the economy is not likely to be more infallible than

the humans who devise the schemes. Wrong judgment is as likely to bring on disaster as right judgment is to avert it.

Particularly in the realm of budgeting and taxes, Government should stick to the business of governing. The amount of taxes should not be determined on the basis of whims to manipulate public prosperity. It should be no more and no less than the amount needed to finance the necessary operations of Government. The operations of Government should be no more and no less than the activities required by sound public policy.

Public policy aimed at manipulating the flow of commerce is not sound. For generations it has been considered bad for private speculators to use their power to try to start or check booms to serve their own interests. If this is bad for private manipulators, it is much worse for Government manipulators, who have a great deal more power to play with and who gamble not with their own personal fortunes but with the fortunes of all the people.

Congress should go through the budget and see that it represents the services and security needed by the people. It should fix a tax rate adequate to support the budget. This would be the best way to help the economy, by leaving room for the needs and wants of the people to be the controlling influence in the marketplace.

An Unknown Side of Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. JACKSON. On Tuesday, February 4, a column by Eric Sevareid was published, entitled "An Unknown Side of Truman." I wish to call this column to the special attention of my colleagues. Mr. Sevareid says some wise things about the character and qualities of Harry Truman, that are well worth reflecting on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this column by Mr. Sevareid.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNKNOWN SIDE OF TRUMAN—PUBLIC SCOLDING OF STUDENT REVEALS SENSITIVITY OF FORMER PRESIDENT

(By Eric Sevareid)

The devoted students of Sherlock Holmes are as divisive as they are numerous, but they must surely agree that there was a certain respect as well as affection implicit in Holmes' exclamation, "Good old Watson, you are the one fixed point in a changing age."

This must be the sentiment of many Americans, at least those of middle age or more, as they see the news films of Harry Truman striding out on his morning walk, each foot firmly planted, each crisp pronouncement—on Panama, Lyndon Johnson, BARRY GOLDWATER—delivered with the finality of a man who has no regrets, who relishes his enemies as much as his friends, and who enjoys the final freedom: contentment with life and no fear of death.

It is a good and inspiring thing to witness, this evening of a life that was full to the brim and never seriously marred. A man's character is his fate, said the ancient Greeks. Chance, in good part, took Harry Truman to the presidency, but it was his character that kept him there and determined his historical fate: He is, without any doubt, destined to live in the books as one of the strongest and most decisive of the American Presidents.

It was Dean Acheson, Mr. Truman's Secretary of State, who said once, in musing about the presidency: "If a President will make decisions, you're in luck. That is the essential quality. And if he has a high batting average in the correctness of his decisions, then you're in clover."

About this quality of Truman's there was never any doubt from the beginning, in the minds of those of us who covered his Presidency all the way through. His simplicity, his honesty and his self-discipline were so obvious as to be nonarguable, however much we disagreed about some of his actions and appointments. We were aware of his sensitivity about the institution of the Presidency—"This is the most honorable office a man can hold," he used to say—and aware of his relative lack of sensitivity to criticism of himself. What we were not aware of, at least not I, was his sensitivity about the feelings of other people.

This has been a sadly belated discovery of recent days for this reporter. It was made during private and therefore, privileged conversations, but I think he will not mind if I extract the small portion of the talk that illustrates my theme. The talk had wandered back a dozen years or so, and an aid remarked that Mr. Truman should have fired so and so. The man who had occupied the most powerful office in the world immediately said, "No, no. That would not have been right. There were other ways to do it. What you don't understand is the power of a President to hurt."

An American President has the power to build, to set fateful events in motion, to destroy an enemy civilization, to win or lose a vast personal following. But the power of a President to hurt the feelings of another human being—this, I think, had scarcely occurred to me, and still less had it occurred to me that a President in office would have the time and the need to be aware of this particular power among so many others.

Mr. Truman went on to observe that a word, a harsh glance, a preemptory motion by a President of the United States could so injure another man's pride that it would remain a scar in his emotional system all his life.

He recalled a painful episode during one of the lectures he loves to make to student audiences about the story and the art of governing America. A college boy stood up to ask the former President what he thought of the State's Governor, whom he described as "our local yokel." Mr. Truman told the boy he should be ashamed of himself for his lack of respect toward the high office of Governor. The boy turned pale and sat down. Later, Mr. Truman made it a point to seek out the shaken, apologetic lad and to reassure him. He did much more. He had the boy's dean send him frequent reports on the lad's progress in school and followed his later career with the interest of a friend. What this interest by a former President must have done for the boy's pride and self-respect may be imagined.

The simple point here is that Mr. Truman had instantly realized how a public scolding by a former President could mark and mar the boy's inner life and his standing in the community.

I feel gratified to have heard this story. It has given me an insight to the responsibilities of a President that I did not have, and it has immeasurably added to my own residue of memories about the man from Missouri. He is nearly 80 now. He may live to be a 100—his is a strong stock—but this, I know, is the specific memory that will return to me when his time does come.

Nickels for Nikita

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, regardless of what some U.S. citizens may think of our trading with a ruthless, relentless enemy—one which will introduce intercontinental missiles 90 miles from our shores, aimed at us; and one which will shoot down and kill three American airmen, known to be on an innocent mission; and one which works evangelistically to subjugate us to communism, with its negation of the individual, family, religion, and free enterprise—many citizens have expressed dismay with the dramatic deviations from the President's original Executive agreement to sell surplus wheat to Russia at the world prices, on our ships, for gold on the barrelhead. Now the United States is financing the deal.

One who has spoken with clarity and thoughtfulness is Col. Allen Griffin in his editorial in the Monterey Peninsula Herald of January 20, 1964. I insert verbatim the editorial for the benefit of my colleagues and constituents:

THERE ARE GOOD GROUNDS TO HOLD BACK THE WHEAT

It is doubtful if there would be a mighty roar of protest in the United States if President Johnson announced that the Government was canceling its agreement to sell wheat to Russia.

Since this country in its wishful thinking decided to show increased peace-loving (it is their word) attitudes toward Soviet Russia in the hope that this would further thaw the cold war, Nikita Khrushchev and his spokesmen and official organs have reiterated their undiminished enmity toward all capitalistic and imperialistic countries. Most recently they have voiced their enthusiastic support of Panama in opposition to the United States and gave further blessing to President Karume of Zanzibar in gratitude for his cursing all things American.

Whatever the spark that set off the Panama crisis, it has been Soviet Russia that has poured oil on the flames. Whatever the indignation of Panamanians against the United States, it has been Cuban and other Communist opportunists on the spot that have rushed to exploit the opportunity to add a new embarrassment, potentially a desperately serious injury, to the United States.

These avowed enemies who wheedle one moment and curse the next show their Leninist contempt of the United States. After all, Lenin did say that the capitalists, greedy to the last dollar, would assist the Communists in destroying them. The bread we stuff into their mouths will not lessen the curses and the threats, nor will it lessen their support of our enemies.

The average American, having been told that the Russians are going to pay cash for the wheat, thinks that the Russians are going to pay for the wheat.

The fact of the matter is, the Russians are only going to pay for part of the cost because the American Government is subsidizing the sale.

Who is paying the difference between the cost of American shipping and the cost of European shipping? It amounts to so many millions that Khrushchev himself repeatedly declared that he would refuse to buy our

wheat at its delivered price in American bottoms. And did we then tell him to jump in the lake? Indeed not. True to the predictions of Lenin, we begged his negotiators to stay on, while we subsidized the American shippers with money out of the pockets of the readers of this newspaper.

Once the deal was made, what further price is being exacted from the American people? They are already paying through the housewife's shopping pocketbook. Millions of dollars in increasing prices for eggs, chickens, pork, beef, dairy products. That is because the price of all grains is being affected by the sale at one fell swoop of 100 million bushels of wheat.

Therefore, even this soon, the readers of this newspaper are paying their pennies for Nikita.

Trouble in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a timely article dealing with the Middle East crisis, entitled "The Real World of the Middle East," which appears in the latest isue of Prevent World War III, No. 63, winter 1963–64, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. This article is of particular significance in that it evaluates a number of the assumptions guiding U.S. policy in the Middle East and how these assumptions square with the realities in that area. The role of the Nasser government in encouraging instability and tension in the Middle East and the dangers which Egypt's policies pose toward U.S. interests, is well documented and deserves the careful consideration of all security-minded Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL WORLD OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Last April, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs took testimony from leading State Department officials in regard to the U.S. program for foreign assistance in 1963. Since this aid must ultimately come out of the taxpayers' pockets, it was to be expected that those who would testify would endeavor to impress upon the Congressman the effectiveness and importance of U.S. aid.

U.S. POLICYMAKERS TESTIFY

James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, was one of the first officials to provide detailed information. He listed a number of developments during the past year which he regarded as highly favorable and claimed that U.S. assistance programs were partially responsible for the satisfactory results. "In many instances," he said, "our foreign assistance has proven to be the catalytic agent or a necessary contributing fact." With an eye on appropriations for the current year, he appealed to members of the committee that it was necessary to continue this aid "with firmness and patience."

We have no doubt that U.S. assistance in 1962 made a positive contribution in many areas of the world. That is why the society in principle has supported the general program. However, Mr. Grant dwelt on the favorable aspects. Would it not have been helpful to our Congressmen if they had been presented with the entire picture? For example, what about U.S. aid to Middle Eastern countries and its impact on U.S. foreign policy in that area? To this question Mr. Grant made the following statement: "In our day-to-day relations with the states of this area we seek to maintain a strictly objective and impartial posture, to avoid, insofar as possible, becoming involved in inter-Arab disputes and to use our influence in support of U.N. efforts to maintain the peace in the Arab-Israel conflict."

An impartial and objective posture has no significant meaning unless it is examined in the context of a given situation where it is purportedly practiced. To be specific: what is the effect of our "impartiality" when some countries in the Middle East have publicly declared that they are preparing as a matter of official policy to physically destroy neighboring Middle Eastern States? If the United States is impartial in such a situation, then the word becomes a mockery. Indeed, one is justified in stating that such impartiality is tantamount to lending aid and comfort to the would-be aggressors.

Mr. Grant tried to impress his listeners with the State Department impartiality by alleging that it has used its influence in support of U.N. efforts to maintain peace between Israel and some of her Arab neighbors. He did not spell out how this is done. However, we know this much that, when a number of U.N. member states called upon the United Nations to initiate direct peace talks between the two sides, our Government succeeded in blocking the passage of this resolution. Is this not a strange way to bring about peaceful relations in the Middle East?

Throughout his testimony Mr. Grant appeared to put the best possible face on U.S. policy. Is that the function of our policymakers when Congress wants the unadulterated facts? For example, in response to Congressman FARBSTEIN's question as to whether the Egyptian army was still in Yemen, Mr. Grant conceded that there was a substantial Egyptian force there, but declared that the State Department expected those forces to begin withdrawal "in a matter of a relatively few days." We intend to deal with this rosy evaluation of Egyptian intentions in Yemen. However, at this point we should like to call attention to Mr. Grant's admission that his office was one "of the principal sources of information" that the President depends on in order to make policy. This should be borne in mind as we examine more closely the information imparted to the congressional committee by Mr. Grant.

Another optimistic note was struck by Mr. Grant when he alleged that Egypt had no intention to commit aggression "as of this time" and that relations with Israel were now "in the icebox." Yet, in this same testimony he admitted that there was an arms race in the Middle East. He admitted, too, that the State Department was deeply concerned over the "longrun arms picture in the Middle East." In the past few years, Mr. Grant told the committee, there has been "an escalation of the sophistication of weapons. Both sides have been getting more and more weapons." Can one by any stretch of logic reconcile Mr. Grant's complacency concerning relations between Nasser and Israel with his subsequent admission that the future looks bleak and that the arms race is accelerating?

Mr. Grant testified that the central problem in the Near East is the cold war with the Soviet Union and the ways and means of dealing with this threat. Unfortunately, Mr. Grant did not discuss the circumstances surrounding the Soviet Union's entry into the Middle East. We have no doubt, however, that informed Congressmen know very well that it was none other than the Arab States, particularly Egypt, which virtually rolled out the red carpet for Moscow. If the problem of the cold war with the Soviets is central, would it not be a good idea for our State Department to study how this dangerous situation came about, who were the culprits, and how to handle them?

Mr. Frank M. Coffin, Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, was equally optimistic when he testified. He told the committee that Egypt had come "quite a way from the days after Suez." Mr. Coffin alleged that President Nasser and his government show restraint and moderation. True, Nasser "continues to be a problem," Mr. Coffin said, but there are "many things that have happened that are on the plus side of the picture and we ought to know about them before we make a final decision on our relations with them." What these plusses are, Mr. Coffin never specified. And so, the testimony went and the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee listened.

The remainder of this article is intended to bring the question down to earth. It is the hope that all Members of Congress will compare the real world of the Middle East with the cozy dreams and fantasies of our "experts."

THE YEMEN STORY

Let us begin with the Yemen story. The Society has dealt with this problem in detail in previous issues of Prevent World War III. Therefore, we shall only recapitulate basic facts which need to be borne in mind as we examine the current situation. Egypt is in Yemen with a force which numbers approximately 25,000 troops. It is estimated, the cost for maintaining this military concentration is about $1 million a day. After a certain amount of diplomatic maneuverings by our special Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, agreement was reached in early 1963 providing for the withdrawal of all foreign forces in Yemen. As noted above, Mr. Grant assured the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that the withdrawal of Egyptian troops would take place in a few days. Actually, the Egyptians increased their forces in Yemen.

When Senator HICKENLOOPER, the ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee complained to Secretary Rusk, July 16, 1963, that the Egyptians had failed to leave, he received further assurances by Assistant Secretary of State Phillips Talbot that the State Department was hopeful that Egypt would fulfill "its part of the agreement." As if to confirm this hope, the New York Times (Aug. 9, 1963) reported that Nasser's right hand man, Field Marshal Amer, declared that "military operations in Yemen were completed." The Times dispatch gave the definite impression that the Egyptians were on their way out. However, 1 month later, U.N. Secretary General U Thant made public his first report on the situation in Yemen. The essence of the report revealed that U.N. peacemaking efforts had failed thus far "and that the United Arab Republic was still sending fresh troops into that Red Sea country" (New York Times, Sept. 5, 1963). In this connection, the Yemenite opposition to Nasser declared they were never consulted by the United Nations on the disengagement agreement, that Egyptian military aid continues, that Egyptian troops number 29,000 and that their appeal for U.N. observers to survey the territory under their control had been ignored (London Times, Sept. 5, 1963).

FAILURE

Secretary General U Thant's discouraging report was given further credence by the New York Times expert on Middle Eastern affairs, Dana Adams Schmidt. In a dispatch directly from Yemen (New York Times, Sept.

13, 1963), Schmidt reported that the departure of Egyptians from Yemen appears to be "remote." He further stated that some diplomates (unnamed) believe that despite Egypt's formal commitment to withdraw, "Washington will not attempt for some years to hasten Egyptian departure from Yemen." Mr. Schmidt observed that Cairo's burden of maintaining such a huge armed force in Yemen was not "unbearable so long as Western and Soviet bloc aid to the United Arab Republic continues." In a previous report confirmed by other press dispatches Schmidt pointed out that Yemen is virtually an occupied country. The Egyptians, he wrote, are everywhere and they control all government departments as advisers. Meanwhile, there are as many as 1,000 Russian experts who are devoting much of their know-how to building up of military airfields.

Whereas Messrs. Talbot, Grant, and Coffin were quite positive about how the situation would finally resolve itself, Mr. Schmidt reported that rumors and suspicions are rife. "Nobody knows and everybody talks," he wrote. Regardless of the uncertainties which still exist, it is as clear as daylight that the fighting in Yemen is not basically concerned with the independence of that country. The conflict serves as a convenient camouflage behind which sinister forces are working day and night to convert Yemen into a major military base.

Apparently, the United States was so anxious to prove its good faith to Nasser that it quickly recognized the revolutionary regime in Yemen. That regime managed to survive, thanks to the direct support of Nasser's armed forces with an added assist from Moscow. However, we would be falsifying the picture if we did not point to the role of the United States. It has been our economic aid to Egypt, now totaling over $800 million, which has also enabled Cairo to divert its meager resources for the military operations in Yemen. Furthermore, our political support is an asset to the revolutionary regime.

Nevertheless, despite our generosity and our desire to help, the revolutionary government of Yemen is by no means impressed. Indeed, if one judges the continuous stream of propaganda which it spreads among the people, then one cannot help but conclude that the regime is endeavoring to portray the United State as an enemy of Yemen. For example, the Yemen Radio on September 12, 1963, told the people that the country was endangered by the "enemies of the Arabs." The enemies were spelled out in no uncertain terms: the English, the Americans, said the broadcast, were threatening the people of the Arabian Peninsula. The leader of the Government, Abdallah as-Sallal delivered a speech on the occasion of the first anniversary of the revolt. The Cairo Radio gave full play to the talk. In that speech he declared that, were it not for the support of Egypt and in particular Nasser, "the pioneer of Arabism" * * * "reaction and imperialism would have assassinated the revolution." One week later September 27, 1963 as-Sallal delivered another talk, this time hailing the Soviets "who have helped us very much and have supported our revolution." Thus, the enemy is "imperialism," specifically Britain and the United States, and the friends of the Yemeni people are the Egyptians and the Russians. This vicious propaganda reflects the true character of the so-called revolutionary regime which our State Department continues to support.

At this writing the situation with regard to the conflict in Yemen is as follows: Secretary General U Thant announced that the U.N. mission had failed in Yemen. According to the New York Herald Tribune (Oct. 30, 1963), Mr. Thant's latest report "clearly gives the impression that Egypt's unwillingness to withdraw its troops from Yemen, was the major cause" of the U.N.'s "lack of success." Yet, through the efforts of our State Department in particular the U.N. mission will continue for the time being.

SUBVERTING SYRIA

It is ironical that, while our own officials continue to stress Nasser's conversion, neighboring Arab States are straining every muscle to prevent the Nasserites from subverting their independence. In the early part of 1963, it appeared as though there would be unity at last among the major Middle Eastern states; i.e., Syria, Iraq, and Egypt. However, as the months wore on, Syria's leaders found out that Nasser's concept of unity was too strong a medicine to take. When the Syrian leadership began discussions in Cairo on a "renewed" United Arab Republic, they discovered that Nasser had not given up his dream to absorb Syria without leaving any important traces of independence. It was President Nasser's insatiable appetite which had compelled the Syrians to break with Egypt in the past. Obviously, they were not prepared to put their head in the noose again.

The Syrians proposed an entente but their Premier Salah Al-Bitar said that the Syrians could not accept Egypt's political standards (Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 11, 1963). When the Syrian Government maintained its position, the Nasserites went to work. President Nasser himself denounced the Syrian Government as made up of "Fascist butchers," but as usual, Nasser not only poured out venomous attacks but staged an unsuccessful coup d'etat. Nasser's attempt to overthrow the Syrian Government through his agents was effectively smashed. Premier Al-Bitar in a veiled reference to Nasser, said "that the time of strongmen has passed." Furthermore, he declared the Syrians were determined "to banish from our revolution all cult of personality" (New York Times, July 24, 1963).

That Nasser was behind the attempted coup was proven conclusively during the trial of the ringleaders. Thus, a former Syrian Army officer, Mohammed Nabhan, testified that Nasser had even promised to send the Egyptian Air Force to Damascus to help the rebellion. The revelations of the trial unmasked Nasser's tactics and treachery.

MORE INCITEMENTS

Cairo seizes every opportunity to subvert other Arab states. Thus, when the Arab League convened in September 1963, Egypt tried to put across a resolution calling for the establishment of a "Palestine entity." This resolution, while ostensibly directed against Israel, was also meant for Jordan which has a sizable portion of the former territory of Palestine. However, the long-range objective of this resolution is to establish a precedent by which Egypt could claim to be the overlord of this so-called Palestine entity. Needless to say, the Jordanian delegate vigorously opposed this maneuver, but Cairo was not deterred. One of Nasser's fervent supporters, the notorious Ahmed Shukairy, informed the Arab League members that he had appointed himself to represent the cause of the "Palestinian people." Speaking in Cairo on October 2, Shukairy announced that he would be coming to the United Nations as the representative of "all the Palestinians." It is significant that the United Arab Republic is now training a Palestine infantry unit in the Gaza Strip which adjoins Israel. In connection with his announcement, Shukairy has called for direct action and the recruitment of military units from Arab refugees. Obviously, Shukairy does not come to this country with the olive branch of peace.

Shukairy has had a remarkable history. As has been revealed in the pages of Prevent World War III, he worked with the Nazis in the Middle East and was a henchman of the notorious Mufti of Jerusalem who advised Hitler on ways and means of exterminating Jews. His next major assignment was to represent Saudi Arabia at the United Nations but in due time, even the Saudi Arabians could not stomach this man and he was expelled from that country. He does fine in Cairo, and perhaps this is only natural for few Arabs can match Shukairy in his fanatical hatred of the United States. The records of the U.N. debates in the past contain his lengthy diatribes against the United States. This man has stooped to every kind of insult defaming our country, its leadership, and institutions. In one speech before the United Nations, he said that the Arab refugees were the victims of U.S. policy which "has made not a holy land but a land of massacre and destruction and humiliation." Ostensibly, Shukairy will now be speaking for the "Palestinian entity," but in reality he will be representing his master in Cairo.

HATE THE UNITED STATES

The idea that Nasser has mellowed toward the United States may be the "line" of some of our policymakers but it hardly squares with the facts. How can one dare to maintain that Nasser is beginning to see the light when his propaganda machine continues its steady barrage of war incitements. One of Egypt's leading newspapers, Al Jumhuriyah, typifies this relentless campaign. Thus, in a leading editorial entitled "No Peace With Israel" (Aug. 18, 1963), we read the following: "The existence of Israel itself in the heart of Arab States is a problem whose only solution is its elimination." (Such warlike cries merely echo Nasser's own views. A week before the editorial, Nasser made a speech in which he said,) "We must prepare ourselves to face Israel and the imperialists."

When Nasser speaks about "imperialists" he means, above all, the United States. This may be seen in the latest activities of the so-called Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization. Recently, its Permanent Secretariat attacked the U.S. "imperialists" for their aggressive actions against Cuba. The statement urged all the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to come to the defense of Castro's Cuba against the United States. This same organization recently set up a committee to rally opposition throughout Asia and Africa against the United States in South Vietnam. The Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization has its headquarters in Cairo. The top members of the staff of this organization, including its secretary general, are Egyptians. Certainly, the organization and the Egyptian officials running it could not operate in Egypt without the approval of the Cairo government.

CONGRESS ON THE ALERT

Fortunately many Members of Congress have not been taken in by the smooth talk of the experts. Senator KENNETH KEATING has consistently drawn attention to the aggressive anti-U.S. character of the Nasser regime and in this connection he advocated that it was "high time that the Congress of the United States * * * make clear that U.S. foreign aid should not be used directly or indirectly for military equipment, subversion, or propaganda against other nations receiving U.S. aid" (June 30, 1963). Senator KEATING's sentiments are shared by other Members of Congress regardless of party label. Senators HICKENLOOPER, MORSE, GRUENING, JAVITS, SCOTT, DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and many others have all expressed their alarm and dismay over our Middle East policy.

In the House of Representatives, too, one finds many distinguished voices of protest, including Congressmen HAYS, ROOSEVELT, FARBSTEIN, CELLER, HALPERN, KELLY, expressing deep concern. During the debates on foreign aid in the House, Congressman RYAN, of New York, delivered a cogent exposé of Nasser's policy (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 21, 1963). In considering the problem of aid to Egypt, Congressman RYAN had the following to say:

"Nasser has not halted his aggressive designs in the Middle East. Nasser's determination to destroy the democracy of Israel is

adamant. His attack on the Government of Jordan continues. A large Egyptian force remains in Yemen. Nasser's action in Yemen is of particular concern since he has not yet lived up to the agreement negotiated on April 8, 1963, by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. According to the agreement between the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia, and the Secretary General of the United Nations, Nasser agreed to withdraw his troops. Nasser has also been a disrupting force in Africa. In recent years in the Congo, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, United Arab Republic diplomats have been asked to leave.

"Nasser's various activities have created great unrest and increased tensions in a critical area of the world. The arms buildup in Egypt, however, is perhaps the most menacing."

Moreover, RYAN pointed out the huge military support which Egypt received from the Soviet Union as well as the current activities of German scientists "working in Egypt on missile and nuclear warhead development." In this connection, Congressman RYAN referred to the report "that Egypt had brought $1 million worth of fissionable materials, including deadly cobalt. And yet, the United States, Congressman RYAN declared, continues to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into Egypt.

Here, then, is the real world of the Middle East which our policymakers either ignore or do not want to understand. In either case, it will be the American people who will have to pay the penalty for a policy which does not correspond to the realities of the Middle East and, therefore, cannot further the interests of our own country in that area.

Panamanian Outbreak, January 9, 1964: Former Zonians Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the welter of words in the press of our country following the January 9, 1964, outbreak at Panama has repeated the grossest distortions originated by look and run reporters on the isthmus and have thereby misled many of our citizens.

Especially obnoxious to patriots all over the Nation was the contemptible effort of many publicists, following the Communist tactics of blaming the assassination of President Kennedy by a Communist agent on American patriots, to place responsibility for the January 9–11 disorders on Canal Zone citizens, including Balboa High School students.

As usual in such cases of attempted character assassination, these journalist assaults misfired and did not fool informed persons, especially those who have lived in the Canal Zone, and know the situation. Some of them have written thoughtful letters to the editors of papers that are refreshing to read for their obvious sincerity, comprehension and patriotism. Two such letters, one by a 1963 graduate of Balboa High School and another by a former resident who had lived 13 years in the zone, follow. They are commended for reading by all who wish to know how Canal Zone students and parents feel about the latest violent aggression on the rights, power and authority of the United States over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone.

The indicated letters follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1964]

BLOODSHED IN PANAMA

As a 1963 graduate of Balboa High School in the Canal Zone, I would like to comment on your editorial of January 11 concerning the action of the students of the American high school in setting off the Panama riots.

Without for a minute approving the "reckless provocation," I suggest that your editorial considerations include these factors:

The Canal Zone students have, for as long as they have been attending the high school, patriotically raised the flag of the United States over the school as does every other U.S. public high school. The Government-operated school is geared to educating U.S. youths growing up outside of the continental United States to be loyal U.S. citizens—citizens capable of going to school with, socializing with and living with citizens of another country. An exemplary high school ROTC unit at Balboa High School has for years ceremoniously raised and lowered the U.S. flag daily with well-grounded pride.

Students so trained for years suddenly were ordered to eliminate their country's flag as a part of their way of life. They were denied a long given tradition which has served as a daily reminder of their Nation's glorious fight for freedom and for their Nation's continuing fight to preserve freedom on the Isthmus of Panama and in the world.

These same students of Balboa High School which teaches peace and the need for a unified world and the peaceful means for achieving this peace, have for years witnessed that dramatic expressions of disagreement by Panamanian students "across the street" is the proven way to success in getting action from the U.S. Government in behalf of Panama.

Yes, students—United States and Panamanian—apparently sparked this week's violence. The smoldering fire which they sparked, however, certainly was not the outgrowth of dissatisfaction which students have caused nor which students through all these years have not faced up to solving.

BILL AREY.

BETHESDA.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 22, 1964]

A FORMER ZONIAN SPEAKS UP

I have been carefully following the Star coverage of the situation in Panama. The editorial "Far Cry From Suez" was the first fair appraisal of that aspect of the situation that I had read. George Sherman's articles have been very good. At this point I feel that a more positive American approach is overdue. I feel that the Panama views have been highlighted by all of our news media and although some of the points I will make have been previously reported they seem to me to have been played down.

Cyrus Vance has stated that there were Communist agitators involved. I would like to see this aspect explored more fully.

I lived in Panama for 13 years and have a sister still living there with her husband and family. Her letters this past week have been very enlightening since she was an eye witness to the flag incident. This incident was not the cause of anything. It was used as an excuse and distorted for effect. Our press has helped in this distortion.

Our U.S. students and adults protesting the Governor's order that the U.S. flag was not to be flown. They were not protesting the flying of the Panama flag. These were peaceful demonstrations from a group of citizens who have little voice, if any. All the Governor had to do was put up another flagpole and fly both flags—which is now being done. At any rate, the actions were certainly not cause for riots. It is true that most Zonians, as well as Congress, were opposed to the agreement to fly both flags. The reason was that they felt it would be a stepping stone to more demands. Our students did not defile the Panamanian flag nor in any way try to prevent them from planting it. There have been many flag plantings in the zone in the past without trouble. Panamanian defile our flag and we do not riot. Not because we don't love our flag but because we love peace. The Panamanians actually tore their own flag in a dispute over where to put it. There were no riots at the school. There were a few agitators trying to make trouble but they were controlled by the police. The trouble actually came later that night after distorted stories fanned the flames of hate. The majority of the dead were caused by the rioting Panamanians not from any actions of Zonians, police, or U.S. troops. The Panamanians did all of the rioting damage—no U.S. people were involved in this. Our troops and police protected the U.S. citizens which was their job. Panama must bear the blame for the dead.

I was amazed to hear ex-Ambassador Farland explain, on TV, what love the Panamanians have for their flag. This supposedly excuses their actions. He didn't defend the U.S. students' love of their flag though.

Whether any news media ever voices it or not, the basic problem is and always has been money, not pride or anything else. Couple this with the power drive of the Communists and you have the existing situation.

Many comparisons have been made in the last week of the tremendous difference between the slums of Panama and the so-called luxury housing in the Zone. Panama's slums are not caused by the United States nor by the Zonians. The United States does more to help the poor people in Panama than the Panama Government does. It would be far more informative to compare the fabulous homes the rich Panamanians live in to the slums—and then to suggest that Panama could do much more for their poor than they are now doing. Something more than just demand more money from the United States. As long as the rich Panamanians can keep the poor people's discontent aimed at the United States they can continue to pocket the money that should be used to help raise the standard of living.

Does the fact that we have bases in a country mean that we are responsible for their slums and that the U.S. citizens in these countries should not live in the manner that they are accustomed to in their own country? Does it follow too that the poor people in the U.S. slums have a right to riot and burn buildings because our Government hasn't solved their problems?

I have no desire to return to Panama for many reasons. I can and do own a home in the United States; I couldn't there. My children have many more benefits here—we can visit relatives at will—I can shop where and when I please, and find what I want. Above all I can vote. In short, I can be an American and not be worried that someone will distort my love for my country and her flag. I have lived in the D.C. area for 10 years—it isn't utopia, but it is the closest thing to it that this world has to offer as far as I am concerned.

When I lived in the Zone it was not in luxury houses, believe me. In 1952–53 I lived in houses built by the French at the turn of the century—frame, termite-infested houses. They finally tore these down. My sister, until 2 years ago, lived in quarters built in the early 1940's.

The Zonians are proud to be Americans and are doing a job for their country but people seem to forget this.

I feel also that we owe our troops a tremendous debt of gratitude for their conduct

under such trying circumstances. The label of assassin is the most unfair charge possible. The label of aggressor against the United States is also unfair. We must stand for our beliefs and not constantly back down in the face of blackmail.

BARBARA SCREEN.

People-to-People Diplomacy Between America and India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the mutual friendship of the people of India and the people of the United States is well illustrated in an article I wish to offer for the Appendix of the RECORD. It was written by Mr. Selden Menefee, of Fair Oaks, Calif., who has won national honors as a weekly newspaper publisher and some renoun as a world traveler.

Mr. and Mrs. Menefee some months ago went to the village of Tiptur, State of Mysore, in southern India, to live there and teach for a year at Kalpataru College, under private auspices. Although retired as publisher of the San Juan Record, Mr. Menefee still writes a weekly column for the paper entitled "Just for the Record." His articles from Tiptur have revealed a fascinating story of real people-to-people diplomacy and friendship.

This one also shows, incidentally, that the common people of India know our country much better than we know theirs. They loved President Kennedy. They have confidence in President Johnson. We need more Peace Corps contacts of this kind.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Menefee's column in the San Juan Record of January 23, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRESPONDENCE OF AN AMERICAN ABROAD

(By Selden Menefee)

TIPTUR, INDIA.—Ever since it was announced in the papers here that I had arrived to teach and to study village communications, every day's mail has brought interesting letters from Indian people of all walks of life—and many callers, too.

One old lady, who spoke not a word of English, turned up at our doorstep yesterday, and according to our cook (who doubles as translator) she wanted us, as rich Americans, to give her some money so she could find a suitable husband for her daughter. Sorry, we told her. Not rich.

I have had invitations to address eight different Rotary Clubs outside the Tiptur Club, to which I belong. I hope to accept all of them, combining them with two sightseeing loops around this part of India.

But what I really want to share with you is a thoughtful letter I received from a former member of the Mysore State Legislative Assembly, T. D. Maranna of the village of Thattakere, near Bangalore, shortly after the death of President Kennedy. Mr. Maranna wrote:

"I was wonderstruck by the recent Kennedy blow and sent my deepest sympathy to the American Embassy at New Delhi.

"The unfortunate death of President Kennedy reminds me of President Lincoln's killing on April 14, 1865, a Friday, just as President Kennedy was assassinated on Friday, November 22, almost a hundred years later.

"General Robert E. Lee surrended to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomatox Courthouse on April 9, 1865. On April 13 Washington celebrated Lee's surrender, and on the 14th Lincoln was assassinated.

"Robert E. Lee, the hero of the Southerners' lost cause, after his surrender urged his people to be loyal partners of their late enemies. But 100 years after that, another Lee (Oswald) of the South assassinated Kennedy during his visit to Texas, a Southern State.

"Kennedy's unpopularity within the United States is a puzzle to me * * *. Can one say that his assassination was due to the mixed heritage of good and evil results of the Civil War, and lack of spiritual reconciliation between North and South in the United States?

"The Civil War and the bitterness it engendered is one of the great tragedies of American history. Maybe a small number of Southern States which had a long tradition of racial segregation might have become passionate as a result of Kennedy's school integration scheme.

"Whatever else, it was the inhuman, senseless act of a crazed fanatic. I hope the American leaders will withstand this terrible blow and carry their Nation with them in pursuing the long-cherished policies of America.

"President Lyndon B. Johnson said on November 27, 'John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the mind and memories of mankind * * *. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began * * *. This Nation will keep its commitments * * *. We will be unceasing in the search for peace.' These are the pledges of President Johnson.

"Indo-American friendship seems to have been somewhat strained in recent days, as witness the Voice of America deal * * * I am of the opinion that this is mainly due to lack of clarity in our national goals * * *. Some rethinking on the part of Indian leadership is necessary in future."

This thoughtful letter, from a resident of an Indian village, shows what soul-searching took place even in far-off India after the assassination.

I wonder how many American residents of small towns could write such an understanding letter about India?

An Expert Discusses Reliability of U.S. Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Steffan T. Possony, of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, is an acknowledged expert in the area of national defense. Therefore, his thoughts relative to the current debate on reliability of U.S. missiles should be given attention. They were disclosed, in part at least, in the following letter Dr. Possony wrote to the editor of the San Francisco Examiner which was printed January 21:

U.S. MISSILE PROGRAM

To the EXAMINER:

Security questions are of the highest importance to the welfare of the Nation. But unfortunately, if it were not for presidential elections, they might never be discussed at all.

In 1960, the Soviets had gained a substantial lead time in missile development; there was distinct danger that they would be deploying these weapons more rapidly than the United States. For some as yet unknown reason the Soviet ICBM program fell behind and the United States was able to overtake the Soviet missile program.

This was a fortuitous break and a setback for the Soviets which they tried to correct by strengthening their firepower in Cuba. President Kennedy was able to frustrate the deployment of Soviet MRBM's against the Southern United States because, among other reasons, Senator KENNEDY's warnings about the danger of a missile gap had resulted in timely corrective action.

Senator GOLDWATER's warning that our missiles lack dependability is substantiated by considerable evidence.

1. The missile abort rate, while dramatically reduced, continues to be high; unmanned systems are intrinsically less dependable than manned systems.

2. No reentry vehicle has yet been tested together with its warhead. With the exception of a few not overly successful Polaris high altitude shots, no U.S. missile has been tested from launch to explosion-on-target.

3. The capability of the electric-electronic systems in our missiles (and other equipment) to withstand some critical effects of high yield nuclear blasts is not accurately known.

4. The capability of our hardened launch sites to project missiles underground against nuclear hits and near-misses is not accurately known.

5. The effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the initial Soviet antiballistic missile and its followup system is not accurately known.

These uncertainties were not invented by Senator GOLDWATER. They were set forth at length by the most qualified witnesses testifying before Congress.

The meritorious Frank Conniff could do better than talk about "another election-year brouhaha * * * over an alleged American shortage in military hardware." This description distorts Senator GOLDWATER's warning. Mr. Considine alleged that Senator GOLDWATER made the "somewhat ludicrous statement that our missiles are largely duds." Considine proceeded to suggest that we find out by shooting off all "800 missiles that we possess." Is this informed reporting, being cute, or playing politics?

STEFAN T. POSSONY,
Hoover Institution, Stanford.

Courage and Devotion of Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a young man from Indiana, Jim Crandel, who volunteered for the Peace Corps, has now

completed a year of service in Africa. Recently, he wrote me about his experiences, describing in a most interesting fashion his life in Nigeria. No one can read this intriguing story of success and failure, of hope and disappointment, and of hard work, simple living, and desperate need, without being impressed by the courage and devotion displayed by Peace Corps volunteers such as Jim Crandel. Because his letter so clearly reveals many of the problems confronting our young persons who are now serving abroad and will be helpful in understanding these difficulties, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The end of another busy and eventful year has passed and I hope that 1963 held many fine things in store for you and yours and with wishes for 1964 to be even more prosperous and rewarding. Nineteen hundred and sixty-three for me proved very interesting and educational and will be a year that I'll always remember as it was spent in training and service in the field in a strange and foreign country of Niger, Africa.

Yes, the Peace Corps has offered Americans a chance to live, work, and understand people of many lands and these people a chance to do the same with Americans. A program that a troubled old world has needed for a long time.

The end of 1963 finds our host country of Niger in a serious border dispute with her neighbor country of Dahomey and has led to the leaving of Niger of some 16,000 Dahomeans by government order and the closing of the frontier between the two countries and both countries are arming for possible conflict.

Actually, we don't look for any conflict as a meeting has been set up for early 1964 by several of the neighboring countries trying to settle the dispute. I'm stationed in what is probably one of the most underdeveloped countries in Africa. There are no known natural minerals, no factories, and no good roads. The 3 million people of this country, located just to the south of the Sahara Desert, earn a meager living off of the land during the 4 months of the rainy season. There are many nomadic herders of large herds of cattle, sheep, and goats in one of the few tsetse fly free areas of Africa. Niger's few exports include cotton, peanuts, onions, and livestock that is walked many miles to markets. Having no navigable rivers to the ocean, bad roads and no train connections make exports and transportation quite difficult and expensive.

The main interest of the Peace Corps in Niger has been in the field of agricultural work and soil conservation. The past year has seen many rewarding moments and some disappointment, but the experience gained of a private poultry project as my biggest disappointment but the experience gained here has been a big help to me at my present job at a poultry and goat experimental station. There are several very bad poultry diseases here and vaccine isn't readily available to combat them but must be ordered from France and the time lapse of a couple of weeks can wipe out any such project.

The year 1964 should prove to be a lot more rewarding and busy. The first week of 1964 should find us receiving some 1,500 baby chicks from France and more throughout the year. A vast program to introduce new and better breeds of chickens is underway in Niger. Along with this program will have to be an education program to show the people how to take care of poultry properly and to show them that poultry raising can be beneficial and profitable.

The mixing and grinding of strange and unusual feed of African origin into a balanced ration is proving to be very interesting and educational. Not being able to go to a feedstore and buy already mixed minerals and vitamins, but having to measure these out on our own under the watchful eye of a very reliable and educated vet, is another good experience.

Other than putting some 38 hours a week at the poultry station, I'm helping a vocational education volunteer with a couple of gym classes and have a couple of classes of my own at a boys' trade school. It really makes one feel good to see these boys improve their ability in sports.

Language proved a problem at first as we found that many of the terms taught in training weren't usable here but it didn't take too long for us to adapt new terms needed for our work. We speak a mixture of French, Haussa, the local language, and English, depending on who we are with. There are several students here who are studying English and a mixture of French and English is used. Very few of the local population of 16,000 of Maradi speak French and a usable vocabulary of Haussa has come in very handy. I'm far from being fluent but can usually make myself understood, and can barter for fresh fruits, vegetables, and goods in the local language.

I've come to respect the Moslem religion and can compare it with Christianity in many respects. In fact, in many cases I think they are stronger in their faith than most Christians. They have a working religion that is used every day and not just put on for Sunday and forgotten the rest of the week. Prayers are said five times daily, starting at 4:30 a.m. They always wash before saying prayers. Drinking and smoking is prohibited and the people are quite honest but, of course, there are exceptions in all peoples.

It's quite funny to see how false some of our first fears were. At first we wouldn't walk in the village after dark and now know that it's safer here in Africa than it is in the so-called civilized cities of the United States. You never hear of a robbery or mugging here as they just don't happen. It's good not to hear of constant car accidents and fires, as there are few cars and those mud brick bunco houses just don't burn.

I'm living in what they call a compound, which includes three houses enclosed by a mud brick wall. One neighbor is a very good Moslem man who, like so many of the men of Niger and Africa, is living in one village and his wife and family live in another. Due to work and family ties, you'll seldom find a complete family leaving the home village. We have a lot of fun teasing each other and we have some serious talks. The other family is quite unusual for Moslem Niger as they are in the less than 1 percent Christian minority. The woman was abandoned as a child and raised by missionaries and the guy lived at a mission farm school and later worked for a missionary as a houseboy. They have three very typical children that can be heard laughing, crying, and playing throughout the day.

I have no electricity or running water and use kerosene lamps, and the water is carried in daily by porters. I have a kerosene refrigerator that doesn't work and parts for repairing aren't available, so water is kept cool in earthen crocks. All furniture is native made and is very inexpensive as it is made out of scrap lumber and boxes.

My house is sort of a social center and there is a constant flow of students and guests coming in to listen to the radio, read books and literature, or just to talk. I like having guests but occasionally the load gets too much for me and all I have to do when things seem too burdensome is visit with some of the American missionaries at the farm school and my problems seem so small and meaningless with what they are responsible for.

A private project has been started with the help of F. C. Rural Youth, Indiana Rural Youth Farm Bureau, and private donations. Funds have been raised and turned over to the director of the farm school and will enable a couple of farmers to clear land and buy improved seed and fertilizer. In a country where the average farm income is only $60, it is quite difficult for farmers to better their lot. A practical mission farm school has been in operation here for a few years and is just now getting through to the farmers in this area as to how the use of improved seeds, fertilizers and methods can increase their farm income. Farmers are beginning to ask for help and information. We are starting a couple of young men under a program that doesn't include an outright gift, but a majority of the money must be repaid into a fund so other young farmers can benefit from the program. These people seem quite pleased to see the interest of Americans in their welfare. The average student has a surprisingly good knowledge of the United States and the functions of our Government, and many times I believe they know more about our way of life than most Americans. This past year has given me a chance to see America and the American way of life as others see it. The picture many times has been an ugly one. The treatment of the Negroes in the United States and denial of their basic civil rights has more than once disgusted us. How do you explain to an African when he asks why do Americans kill their President, a man that meant so much to so many different people? What can you say that will satisfy them? We find it very difficult.

National Teenage Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be especially appropriate to recognize officially the many meaningful contributions that our teenage youth are making to this Nation's life.

It is all too easy to dwell negatively on the undeniably serious challenges youth must face these days and we lament the front page reports of our newspapers on problems in which teenagers may be involved.

The busy daily routine of many Americans makes it difficult to offer adequate personal encouragement to the vast majority of our teenage citizens who are making positive contributions to our national welfare. Often we do not give enough of a boost to teenagers who are living useful and decent lives, who are working hard for their own educational advancement, who are protecting the national security by service in the Armed Forces, and who participate in many civic activities.

The U.S. Government class, summer 1963, at Brown Military Academy, Glendora, Calif., has suggested an effective way of giving encouragement to teenagers through establishment of a na-

tional teenage day. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 898, for this purpose.

As most residents of southern California know, the Brown Military Academy has been a moving force in the development of fine teenage citizens since 1910. Judging by its suggestion, the academy's class in government seems to be no exception to this rule.

I believe that if a national teenage day is proclaimed by the President, this country's wonderful youth groups such as the Scouts, farm organizations, church groups, schools, and various urban activities can focus nationwide attention on their vital and often unsung youth undertakings. I hope that a national day for teenagers will highlight what the individual American teenager has done and is doing for his country.

The text of House Joint Resolution 898 follows:

H.J. RES. 988

Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Teenage Day

Whereas far the greater majority of our teenage population are good citizens who lead useful and wholesome lives; and

Whereas our teenagers make important contributions to their families, communities, States, and Nation through participation in educational, religious, vocational, service, civic, and related activities; and

Whereas teenagers throughout our history have contributed to our national welfare and security through service in the Armed Forces and have on many occasions given their lives in defense of their country; and

Whereas our teenage population represents a vital element in our society from which the leaders of tomorrow will emerge; and

Whereas it is in the interest of our Nation as a whole to recognize fully the significance of our teenage population in our society and their many outstanding contributions, to know and understand the problems they face, and their need for proper education, guidance, and encouragement in developing strong minds and bodies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first Sunday of October of each year is hereby designated as National Teenage Day, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Hyman G. Rickover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 4, 1964, which pays tribute to Adm. Hyman G. Rickover for his contributions in the nuclear field. The editorial correctly calls Admiral Rickover "a rare asset."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICKOVER'S NEW CAREER

Hyman G. Rickover, the Navy's unique vice admiral, is now vice admiral, retired. He had overstayed the legal retirement age by 2 years, and the law can't be stretched any further.

But Navy Secretary Nitze immediately invoked a gimmick which permits a Navy officer to be summoned back to duty when needed. So this tough, pint-sized officer will go on being assistant chief of nuclear reactors for the Atomic Energy Commission.

It would be wrong to have it any other way. For the "Rickover team" has developed a pioneer reactor which gives exciting promise of becoming a tremendous economic asset. According to Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg of the AEC, the Rickover reactor is designed to generate electrical power, on an economical basis, for 10 years without refueling. Coupled with it is a reactor which could run 3 to 4 years between fuelings but would produce more fissionable fuel than it consumes.

These are highly significant developments in the nuclear field and the admiral's extraordinary talent should be kept busy on his projects, even if he sometimes makes himself unpopular by calling a spade a spade. He is a rare asset.

What Your Dimes Can Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Democrat Advocate of Westminster, Md.

This editorial, "What Your Dimes Can Buy," recalls forcibly to our minds the vast good which the March of Dimes has done and can do. When Franklin D. Roosevelt made it the important community project that it has become, the chief target of all our dimes was polio. In time and with the aid of these funds, the Salk vaccine was developed. The money now collected is used for new research projects, and I am sure that the same success will reward each new effort made. I am proud to include this wisely stated editorial in support of the annual March of Dimes:

WHAT YOUR DIMES CAN BUY

What is more pitiful than a child born with some crippling defect? What is more worthwhile than a cause whose purpose is to prevent and to find cures for the 600 kinds of environmental and hereditary defects of the central nervous system and skeletal structure which are known to exist?

These questions, and their obvious answers, are most pertinent now. For, during January, The National Foundation—March of Dimes is conducting its annual drive for funds. The organization is still concerned with the polio problem which was the reason for its creation. But now, due to the wonders of the vaccines, that problem has been largely solved. So the emphasis has been shifted to birth defects—and its overall philosophy is found in the telling phrase "human rescue."

What do your dimes buy? The list is impressive. For one thing, they help to pay for research and special-treatment centers, 70 in number, which are located in more than 60 of the Nation's 85 medical schools—some of the schools have 2. For another, the Salk Institute for Biological Studies was recently opened in San Diego and is in the process of completion. For a third, there is a very real hope that research and experiment will, perhaps fairly soon, produce an omnibus vaccine that will protect against all the viruses.

To give one more statistic, there are 11 million cases of arthritis and rheumatism, crippling and agonizing, among the people of this country. And your dimes go to help fight this scourge.

So give your dimes—give them, if you can, by the handful.

Panama Outbreak: Englishman Urges Support to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in many addresses to the House, I have repeatedly emphasized the necessity for the United States to stand by its treaty obligations with respect to the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

It was, therefore, highly gratifying to read in the Washington Daily News of January 20, 1964, a realistic appraisal of the Panama situation by Robert Pitman of the London Express in which he urges support of the United States and warns that it is to the interest of Great Britain as well as to the United States not to tear the 1903 Panama CaLal Treaty to shreds.

The article follows:

ONE ENGLISHMAN'S VIEW OF PANAMA: "THE FLAG WAS MADE IN WASHINGTON"

(By Robert Pitman)

What should be the attitude of the British public to the sudden crisis in Panama? There can be only one answer: Support the Americans.

We must not allow the momentarily demented people of the isthmus to interfere with the free traffic of ships between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans—and in particular with the free traffic of American warships on which our own safety depends.

We must not support the Panamanian demands for a revision of the Canal Treaty.

For let this be plain: There is nothing patriotic or independence-loving about these demands.

The Republic of Panama is the creation of the United States just as much as the canal is the creation of the United States.

ASKED FOR IT

The present fury does not rise from any ancient, deep-seated patriotism. Only 61 years ago there was no Panama Republic to be patriotic about.

The villagers of Panama, afflicted by poverty and disease, were then citizens of Colombia.

But they know that the United States was proposing to drive a canal either through Panama or through the neighboring State of Nicaragua.

And when their own Government turned down a treaty with the United States for a canal at Panama, they rose in revolt. For they wanted the canal. They desperately wanted to prevent Nicaragua from getting it.

Thus in 1903 they became renegades from their own country of Colombia at the instigation of President Theodore Roosevelt.

They were not forced to become pensioners of the United States. They fought and clamored for the privilege.

That was how the Republic of Panama began. It was built upon America's canal concessions—which were bought with huge sums of money.

So let us not be influenced by any talk of Panamanian patriotism.

The rioters beneath the Panama flag are not the William Tells of the New World. The flag was made in Washington, so was the wealth in which the flagpost is planted.

RESENTMENT

Equally let us not be influenced by any talk of Suez, where Britain faced an almost identical crisis in 1956.

True, we have strong cause for resentment over America's role at Suez. In Cairo the American Ambassador did everything he could to provoke the crisis. He gave fervent support to Nasser's spurious claims.

And even Eisenhower sprang to Nasser's aid when Anthony Eden launched his attack on the canal—even though the West would have benefited immeasurably if the campaign had gone on as planned.

But our resentment and our sense of irony must not prevent us from sticking to our principles.

We must stand by the sanctity of international treaties. We live by them.

The Panama Treaty of 1903 was a binding contract—and it is in our interest, just as much as America's, that it should not wantonly be torn to shreds.

THE LESSON

What of the Americans themselves? What should we say to them?

We should remind them of a simple fact. It is in the nature of man that if he is beaten once, he is beaten twice. It may be said that the Americans have already been beaten once in Cuba. Just so.

And the lesson they should learn is to be firm when lawless hands seek to grab the means of wealth which either they or their allies have built up.

The Americans must restrain their desire to be regarded as the whole world's generous and kindly uncle. That only breeds future trouble.

A Republican Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of my Jersey City constituents, William Berry, has written what I consider to be a very acute observation of a great man who represented his party to the best of his ability—John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I believe Mr. Berry's observations to be especially worthwhile, since he admittedly is not a Democrat. I feel it is commendable that truth is not always so biased that it cannot be told and I herewith include his remarks, which appeared in the Hudson Dispatch in a letter to the editor. The Hudson Dispatch is one of the leading newspapers in my district in Union City, N.J.

A REPUBLICAN SPEAKS

JERSEY CITY, *December 27, 1963.*

EDITOR, HUDSON DISPATCH:

In 1952 in Boston, my wife (Democrat) and I (Republican), were fortunate to have met and spent 30 minutes with a man who made himself available to all Americans. Though I remained a Taft Republican, I did feel the greatness of my country more deeply. It didn't bother him that I was a Republican in direction but happy that I was a voter. And he said, should you send me to the Senate, I shall represent you to the fullest of my abilities. He asked us to write as we said goodby, and I told my wife to write him in care of U.S. Senate because that's where he was going.

Later we came to New Jersey and suddenly it was 1960. I was shocked. I knew he was going places, but so soon. This time I voted one lever—Democratic, and all others Republican. Though I did not agree with all he did, the only reason I can find for being sorry I voted for him is I know he was a great American and my vote helped put him in Dallas on November 22.

I only hope our 1964 resolutions include calm, thoughtful attitudes toward all people, even when they disagree with our views. For if any American President ever expanded this view on humanity with honest sincerity, John F. Kennedy did.

WILLIAM BERRY.

A Call to Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1964 issue of Reader's Digest, there appears a condensation of an article by Norman Vincent Peale, D.D., entitled "The Power of the Positive 'No.'"

Among other things, the article points out that our ancestors, in a few decades, tamed a wilderness and built the mightiest Nation the world has ever seen. The article states:

And how did they do it? Largely by saying "No" to the things that might have stopped them: "No" to fear, "No" to softness, "No" to decadence—"No!"

Mr. Charles L. Dancey in the January 28, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star feels "as the self-proclaimed leaders of the world, we aren't doing so well these days." I believe Mr. Dancey's editorial is a call to positive action with a "No" to those who wish to promote softness and fear.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

LEADER OF THE WORLD?

As the self-proclaimed leaders of the world, we aren't doing too well these days.

In southeast Asia, Cambodia has thrown us out, and the new regime we backed in South Vietnam is admittedly not even doing as well against the Reds as the one we sold out. We are mediating between Indonesia and Malaysia, where we have discovered that our earlier mediation in favor of Indonesian imperialism against Papua only whetted their appetites and added to their arrogance.

In the midst of all this, our friend, Charles de Gaulle, recognizes Red China and arranges for an exchange of ambassadors, spitting in our eye as he does so.

In the power vacuum of Africa, which we did so much to create, Communist agitators are on the move, taking over Zanzibar in a bloody coup, and sowing the seeds of revolt in the native armies of a handful of east African states. The situation has been ripe for such action because there are no sources of democratic power, and the only power most regimes have is that of a small native army. Such "praetorian guards" come to realize that they are the only source of order in the land, and then they begin to decide who runs things, or else to demand blackmail for their continued allegiance.

There is both powerful irony and powerful significance in the act of Jomo Kenyatta, of all people, the old "Burning Spear" of the Mau Mau movement, asking for British troops to come back and maintain order in his country.

Here again, troubled Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, and others in their hour of peril did not call upon the United Nations, and certainly not upon the United States. They called upon the former "colonial power," England.

And the British, with a tiny volunteer army, have responded more effectively than has previously been the case when the U.N. or the United States was summoned.

On the other coast, Ghana has just formally acted to set up a one-party "socialist" state. In the Congo, guerrillas are butchering missionary women and priests.

In Europe, only Germany even bothers to pretend to continue to have respect for U.S. policy.

And, here, in our own backyard, it is no longer possible to hide the fact that our so-called quarantine policy against Castro is a fraud. It has neither managed to keep Castro's arms and agents out of Latin America as promised, nor kept European countries from shipping goods to Fidel. France is even loaning him money.

And, Panama, the tiny country where we have the greatest interest, where we spend the most money, and have had the closest ties and the most incentive and opportunity to develop a model state, has just exploded in our face.

Can it be possible, just barely possible, that our beautifully logical reasons for pursuing a "soft" foreign policy had a flaw somewhere?

Have we been wrong, in spite of all the honeyed words and haughty "explanations" of the wisdom of U.S. policy?

If not, all we can say is: If this is what happens when we're right, God help us when we do make a mistake.

C. L. DANCEY.

Foreign Policy a Shambles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 4, 1964, showing the developing chaos in our present hit-and-miss foreign policy.

Yesterday the American Embassy in Cyprus was bombed in an anti-American demonstration. Why we ever became involved in the Cyprus situation is a complete mystery. The only result of indicating that we would use U.S. troops there was to turn a dispute between two peoples friendly to the United States into an excuse for more hate America propaganda and involving us in a situation in which we have no responsibility.

Our inept handling of Asian affairs has now reached the point where we may be drawn, according to the Attorney General, into a shooting war over the Indonesia-Malaysia dispute.

Communist-inspired revolution in Zanzibar created more anti-American attacks. While in Ghana, where we have poured millions of dollars in foreign aid and will continue to do so, a mob egged on by the government of Kwame Nkrumah, tore down the American flag and attacked our Embassy.

Mr. Speaker, American prestige under our present leadership is slipping so rapidly that we are not certain that by tomorrow we will have a single ally left upon whom we can depend. We must institute now a firm, understandable foreign policy which puts the self-interest of the United States above a lovable image or the appeasement of the Communists.

The editorial from the Wall Street Journal and an article from the Washington Post detailing the mob action in Ghana, follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

TOO MUCH ALL OVER

The various crises erupting around the world should, as President Johnson says, "be viewed in the perspective of history and not headlines." He is obviously doing what he can to calm flaring foreign tempers and damp down any crisis psychology at home.

Yet this approach leaves unanswered some exceedingly tough questions about America's involvements abroad.

In trouble spots like east Africa we can hardly expect, in the President's words, to control events. Regarding the Congo, where turmoil is chronic, the United States seems to have chosen to put itself at the mercy of the United Nations, though it is not at all clear what, if anything, that organization could do about the latest outbreaks.

The relative exclusion of U.S. power or influence in some of these areas, plus our deep commitment in others, makes it appear rather odd that the Government should seek out new involvements. The United States, for example, has never played a direct role in Cyprus, where Greek and Turkish communities are at loggerheads. Now, though, there is the proposal to send in American troops, as part of an international force, to try to keep peace.

It is perhaps true that this plan could be defended in terms of the NATO Alliance. But it is difficult to see what U.S. troops would accomplish, when the British in particular are directly concerned with Cyprus. It is even harder to comprehend why the United States should be expected to take over the unpromising care of this unlovely baby.

In a somewhat similar way, Attorney General Kennedy warns on his return from talks in the Far East that the United States could get pulled into a shooting war if Indonesia and Malaysia fail to reach peaceful settlements. Indonesia's leftist dictator Sukarno has vowed to crush the newly formed Federation of Malaysia, and it remains to be seen whether Mr. Kennedy's mission will deter war.

Undoubtedly such exercise of diplomacy is proper for the United States in the circumstances. Indeed, if our diplomacy had been firmer in the past, Sukarno might not be so sure he can get everything he wants; the United States was instrumental in turning over West New Guinea to him, a former Dutch area to which he has not a shred of justifiable claim.

In any case, there is a great difference between a diplomatic effort on behalf of peace and talk of actually going to war. Do we have to get into everything?

It's not as though the United States didn't have enough on its hands as it is, even apart from the continuing military threat from Russia. We seem to be getting nowhere with Panama, since the Panamanian authorities evidently believe they can hold us up if they keep yelling "aggression" often and loudly enough.

By no means least is the gravely disquieting condition of South Vietnam. Though it has its pseudocomic aspects in the musical chairs of the generals, there is nothing at all comic in our increasingly heavy involvement in a war which many observers think cannot be won on the present basis.

Perhaps Mr. Johnson is correct when he says there is no alternative to the present course; certainly General de Gaulle's ideas of neutralizing all of North and South Vietnam sound unrealistic at this time. But the admitted fact is that the war is going badly, and there is no clear answer to the question of how it is possible to halt guerrillas operating from a privileged sanctuary in the north.

The United States, then, may be confronting a decision either to expand the war or abandon it. So far as the public knows, however, the Government might not even be aware that such a decision could be forced on it. All that is evident is a mounting toll of casualties and a dangerous drift of policy.

We agree that all these problems should be viewed in the perspective of history. But what history strongly suggests is trouble for nations, however well intentioned, that try to do too much in the world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

GHANAIAN MOB ATTACKS AMERICAN EMBASSY, HAULS DOWN U.S. FLAG

ACCRA, February 4.—Mobs of Ghanaians, egged on by government party loudspeaker trucks, marched on the U.S. Embassy today, hauled down the American flag and threatened to storm the building.

One crowd of several hundred demonstrators fell back when Emerson Player of Denver, a Negro Embassy official, rushed out, seized the rope and ran the banner up the staff.

Police and leaders of President Kwame Nkrumah's Convention People's Party stopped another mob short of storming the Embassy during a second demonstration directed against what the mob called filthy American imperialism.

U.S. Ambassador William P. Mahoney said the demonstrations were an unfriendly act by the Ghana Government of a flagrant nature.

U.S. PROTEST MADE

He drove to the foreign office, as the demonstrations continued, to register a strong oral protest with Foreign Minister Kojo Botsio. The Embassy followed it with a formal note of protest.

American officials said that while they took a serious view of the demonstrations, they had no plans at present to warn U.S. nationals to remain off the streets or take other precautions.

The first police arrived on the scene about the time that the first demonstration erupted. After the assault on the flagpole, police formed a ring around it and no further attempt was made against the flag.

Early today, before the incidents, trucks circulated through the streets with loudspeakers blaring: "There are rumors two soldiers have been killed and Nkrumah has been arrested. These rumors are not true. American imperialists started the rumors. They have sent money into Ghana to start rumors and trouble."

The people were urged to march on the U.S. Embassy. A mob of several hundred responded.

"GHANA YES, YANKEES NO"

Outside the Embassy, T. D. Bafoe, editor of the Ghanaian Times, shouted: "Ghana yes, Yankees no. Yankees go home.

"You killed President Kennedy," he yelled toward the Embassy. "You cannot kill Kwame Nkrumah. American imperialism is a filthy civilization."

Another shouting mob that included members of the worker's brigade—an organization of the unemployed attached to the army—stormed part of the way up the stairs leading to the Embassy entrance before police and leaders held them back.

Nkrumah, in a nationwide radio speech following the announcement that he had won 99 percent approval in a referendum to make Ghana a one-party state, denounced malicious rumors "formented by evil men and neocolonialist agents amongst us."

He did not specify what the rumors were. Neither did the Evening News in an anti-American editorial.

"We suspect American imperialists and their clique of lackeys of originating and spreading certain wild, fantastic rumors concerning the person of the people's leader and emancipator, Osagyefo (Redeemer) Dr. Kwame Nkrumah," the newspaper said.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. It has been my privilege in the past to represent my State in some criminal matters and to attempt to sustain the State's position in the appellate courts.

In the light of that experience, I think it would be a great burden to attempt to sustain the additional requirements which would be placed by the amendment now before the House upon the prosecution in any one of these cases.

First, a completely new and collateral issue would be laid before the court, before it would be possible to get to the merits of the case. The preliminary question which would be brought up for determination would be the issue as to whether or not the Attorney General had correctly delimited the area of competition. I do not know how an Attorney General would attempt to make such a definition, but whatever he did would be subject to attack. That question might have to go all the way up the line of the courts and come all the way down before it would be possible to get to the merits of the case.

I believe the gentleman from California has a meritorious principle in

mind, in proposing the amendment, but I visualize that the amendment could boomerang. Instead of relieving a proprietor of a business of litigation and the harassment which the gentleman envisions, it might actually enmesh him in additional litigation.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Is it not a fact that all afternoon and throughout all the debate the chairman has called upon the antitrust laws to sustain his position, and that within those laws there is defined the same area about which I am talking? Is that not a fact? Is that not true?

Mr. MATHIAS. It is not an analogous situation.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Do they not have to define the area of competition?

Mr. MATHIAS. I do not think it is analogous to this particular situation.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Well, it is so close that it has great relevance to it.

Mr. MATHIAS. I would like to point out to my friend from California in the antitrust laws the defining of the area which is involved is not fundamental to initiating the action. I think that is what makes the difference.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Is it not necessarily true where a defendant seeks to be separate because his defense is separate, because it involves a separate cause of action, that can be done?

Mr. MATHIAS. That is right.

Mr. RODINO. This, in my judgment, is a punitive action section just to becloud the entire issue.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Has the gentleman ever tried any lawsuits?

Mr. RODINO. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Then, I think you know what I am talking about.

Mr. RODINO. Yes, I do. This is the very reason why I tell you once again that this is an area that cannot possibly work.

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield back the balance of my time.

TV Debate Ban Would Be Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, while I was opposed to the suspension of equal time on TV for the presidential election of 1964 unless the resolution provided for real debates not interviews like those of the 1960 election, but now since it looks as if the only known presidential candidate at this time wants the Congress to kill the suspension resolution after it has passed both bodies, I find myself in favor of sending the resolution to conference and complete the legislative action. Certainly I am in sympathy with the editorial in the Chicago Daily News of February 4 which follows:

TV DEBATE BAN WOULD BE UNFAIR

Democrats in Congress are reported to be stalling on a bill which would suspend the equal time law and clear the way for TV debates between presidential candidates of the two major parties.

The action is needed, as it was in 1960, to rule out many minority candidates who would otherwise demand equal time and create an intolerable network jamup.

House Republicans believe the Democrats want to bottle up the bill because, they say, President Johnson does not choose to engage in a debate series patterned after the Kennedy-Nixon TV appearances.

Regardless of what any nominee's strategy might turn out to be, we do not believe either party has the right to decide whether a particular communications medium should be made available at campaign time.

If any candidate wants to bypass TV debating after the opportunity has been offered, he has every right to do so. Congress should pass the equal time suspension bill.

Farragut, Idaho, Selected Site for 1965 Girl Scout Senior Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 Idaho will have the distinct privilege of being host to the International Girl Scout Senior Roundup—the largest encampment for girls in the Western World.

The purpose of the encampment is to provide an opportunity to which all Girl Scouts may aspire; provide added interest and stimulation to ongoing programs in troops and camps; provide those attending with experience in living and working with girls from many different backgrounds and from all parts of the Nation and many parts of the world; give the girls a sense of belonging to a strong and unified movement; give each an opportunity for practical experience in self direction and resourcefulness, technical skills, and personal adaptability, and to increase public understanding of Girl Scouting through a large-scale demonstration of the Girl Scout program in action.

The interest and success of the previous encampments can be best related by the participants themselves. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the words of an Indiana girl who attended the 1962 Senior Roundup in Vermont.

Here are some of her impressions:

BUTTON BAY: THE 1962 GIRL SCOUT SENIOR ROUNDUP

I'd like to thank my trainers and everyone who helped send the girls from Hoosier Capital to Roundup. It was well worth all the effort that you put out, believe me. No girl that was really a part of Roundup will ever be the same.

I did some thinking before attempting this report. I've tried to think of as many suggestions and as many of my reactions to Roundup as I could and I've tried to express these things as clearly as I could.

I have come face to face with the realization that I cannot possibly give you a complete and detailed report of Roundup. I didn't see all of Roundup and there weren't enough hours in the day to do all the activities offered at Roundup. I can't even give you a complete and detailed report of everything I did. I would still be writing at the end of September if I even tried to tell you everything I did. The best I can do is to try and give you a glimpse of the things I saw and did. Wonderful, swell, terrific, stimulating, exciting, an experience of a lifetime, exhausting, inspiring, sharp, fun, impressive, marvelous, and stupendous are only a few of the words I have heard used to describe Roundup. Really, I was impressed beyond words with it.

There's no doubt in my mind. Roundup is an experience that is so valuable that it must continue. I can think of no other way in which to gain this experience.

It's a very stirring experience to live with girls from so many backgrounds. It's very enlightening to brush your teeth with a girl from Pennsylvania, or wash laundry with a girl from Alabama.

The whole atmosphere of Roundup is hard to explain. There's excitement of living with so many girls from so many places, the excitement of learning and exchanging new ideas and ideals, the excitement of whole new worlds opened up and the excitement of discovering the surrounding world.

I can't explain the friendliness of Roundup. I just lived it. Visitors remarked about it and found themselves drawn into it. Everyone was greeted by "Hi," or "Where're you from?" There were no foreigners at Roundup, only strangers, and the strangers soon became friends. The common language at Roundup was a smile, and smiles don't have accents.

There's a common bond at Roundup, a bond between girls of vasty different backgrounds, because they have shared the same discomforts, goals, and fun in singing and swapping.

To me, though, the most wonderful thing about Roundup was the people. There were adults with such depths of understanding, such wisdom and so marvelous in their sense of humor that 12 more days would not have given me enough time to ask all the questions I wanted to ask.

I had, to some extent, expected the leadership to be of a high caliber but the girls were beyond my expectations. It was really wonderful to find other girls interested in the same things I was. There were girls who were aware of the world about them, and who were eager to learn, discuss, and absorb all that they could.

Just the fact that these girls were doing some thinking didn't prevent cutting up. I think we (all 8,500 of us) managed to dig up every bit of clean fun to be had in that camp. We pulled all the old tricks and probably invented some new ones. In our high schools we are limited to knowing a small number of people. It is nearly impossible for teenage girls to get the variety of opinion, talent, and ability that we were exposed to the minute we boarded the Roundup Special. For this reason, if no other, Roundup was valuable as a broadening experience.

After attending an event like Roundup, you can't help gaining a greater idea of the

scope of our organization, worldwide as well as national. I think that too many times we forget that we are part of a national organization and that it takes a Roundup to bring the picture back into focus.

When I returned from Roundup, a friend of our family inquired about the camping I had done. He was quite surprised to find that we hadn't eaten wild berries, taken any all-day hikes or done a lot of other things connected with primitive camping. He hadn't understood that to do primitive camping was not the aim of Roundup. Primitive camping skills were important, though. We had to have our skills down so pat that we didn't have to think about them and so we could spend as little time as possible in campkeeping. Our pre-Roundup training was invaluable in this area. In training we perfected our skills and learned to work as a patrol. This really made things bearable when we came up against cold, rainy weather, fires that kept going out, and leaky tents. We felt capable to handle all the situations we met because of the pre-Roundup training.

On July 17 through July 26, 1965, more than 6,000 tents will rise on the shores of Lake Pend Oreille, midway between Coeur d'Alene and Sandpoint, Idaho. The 5,000-acre reserve at Farragut is currently used as a wildlife management area. During World War II, it was a naval training station.

Since Girl Scouts from every State will attend this encampment, I would also like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article pertaining to this site. Perhaps it will be of assistance in answering inquiries from constituents. From the January–February 1955 issue of the Idaho Wildlife Review, the following article appeared:

THE FARRAGUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA

The lands now included within the boundaries of the Farragut Wildlife Management Area are a portion of those lands acquired from private owners, Kootenai County, and a railway company, under terms of a declaration of taking, dated Septemebr 19, 1942, for the purpose of establishing a naval training base.

Several years after hostilities ended, the area was declared surplus, and equipment, buildings and lands were made available through the General Services Administration—War Assets.

As it appeared the area had values for wildlife, research study and public recreation, the Idaho Fish and Game Department made formal application to secure the property on September 30, 1948.

After due process and negotiation, the following terms were agreed upon:

(1) The transfer of 3,816 acres together with all roads, all of the perimeter fence, 13 buildings, pumphouse No. 8 with equipment, and the underground utilities at the married officers quarters, to the State of Idaho, without any payment or transfer of funds.

(2) The purchase of 95.5 acres of land in six parcels by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game for the price of $49,985.

(3) The purchase of 37.9 acres of land by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game for the price of $9,695,000.

The Idaho State Legislature meeting in Boise for its first extraordinary session in February 1950, approved an act stating in part "There is hereby appropriated out of the Fish and Game Fund to the Fish and Game Commission for capital outlay, the sum of $59,680 to restore in the operating budget of such commission, funds spent for the purchase of lands at Farragut Naval Training Station.

LOCATION AND TERRAIN

This property is located at the extreme south end of Lake Pend Oreille, and is on the west shore. Most of the south boundary of the area is bordered by the lake, with portions adjoining the lake on the east.

It lies approximately 23 miles north of Coeur d'Alene. The main approach is from a junction at U.S. highway 10 alternate, approximately halfway between Coeur d'Alene and Sandpoint. An oiled road leads east from this junction to the main entrance of the area.

Most of the area is semiflat land, with wooded knolls and slopes leading downward to the lakeshore. Evergreen trees are predominant, with open glades and grassy meadows dotting the area. Dense undergrowth and brush occurs in a few areas, mainly in wooded sections along the lakeshore on the southwest portion of the area.

A main oiled road bisects the area on a diagonal from the west entrance to the town of Bayview. Another oiled road leaves the main drive near the eastern end of the area, circling the extreme eastern portion, ending at Bayview. Another road leaves this drive providing access to the fish and game department public dock and camping area. There is a total of 47 miles of blacktop road in the area.

REFUGE

The Farragut Wildlife Refuge was first created by the Idaho Fish and Game Commission in October 1942. It included lands adjacent to what is the present management area, providing a "buffer" strip around three sides of the naval training station, and including the station.

The order made it "unlawful to hunt, discharge firearms or carry uncased firearms for the purpose of hunting within the boundaries of the refuge."

The same restriction is still in effect, but the commission acted in April 1948, amending the boundaries to reduce the former refuge area. The present refuge includes the area within the metal fence which borders the refuge on three sides. The lakeshore is the boundary line connecting the fences on the east end of the property.

PURPOSE

The proposed use of the area included several objectives. For example, the original application stated in part: "The area within the perimeter fence to be set aside as a refuge * * * whitetailed deer and upland game birds primary species to be benefited * * * possible educational and research studies * * * trapping of surplus deer to secure breeding stocks of these animals for other areas * * * public recreational and scenic values and locations for nature studies and conservation practices by youth groups."

The recreational values of the region were apparently in the minds of many people years before as the Idaho Legislature passed a law in 1927 which included areas such as this. The law states in part: "The lands belonging to the State of Idaho between high and low water mark of (Priest, Pend Oreille, and Coeur d'Alene Lakes), as well as other lands of the State adjacent to these lakes * * * are hereby declared to be devoted to a public use in connection with the preservation of said lakes in their present condition as a health resort and recreation place for the inhabitants of the State and said public use is hereby declared to be a more necessary use than the use of such lands as a storage reservoir for irrigation and power purposes."

IMPROVEMENTS

The first Federal aid in wildlife restoration program was initiated on the area in 1951 when plans were proposed to rebuild, and relocate, certain sections of the existing boundary fence. This was to confine deer and facilitate management of wildlife, mainly whitetailed deer.

It was proposed that a camp ground and boat dock be built on the shore of Pend Oreille Lake, for public use and recreation.

Cattle guards were installed along with the fence changes. As contractors removed surplus buildings throughout the area it left cement basements in many places. One wall of each of these was pushed in to permit escapement of animals which might enter the cavities. Rocks were removed from field areas where improvement planting was anticipated.

Many of the access roads leading from the main drive were blocked to prevent traffic in the wildlife area and to eliminate chances of fires being started.

DEVELOPMENT

A full-time refuge manager was stationed on the area starting October 1, 1952. Prior to that time refuge operations were handled on a part-time basis.

His duties included maintenance of fences and other property; repair and upkeep of buildings; storage and safekeeping of salvage materials obtained from the former naval training station; planning crop production programs; shrub and plant care; planning wildlife management of the area, and general supervision of the property.

A major part of the work includes law enforcement patrol and checking of widely scattered property and game on the area. As deer roam every portion of the area, are reasonably tame, and feed in open areas at night, they present tempting targets for poachers.

The public camp area requires servicing and cleanup as several hundred people may use the facilities over a weekend.

There are approximately 250 acres of alfalfa hay lands within the area. Plans call for production of 35 to 50 tons of hay each year for department needs. The balance will be left to provide feed and cover for wildlife. Approximately 65 acres of barley were raised in 1953. The harvested grain was used at bird refuges and game farms.

A total of 85 acres was seeded to grass in 1954. This is a permanent type grass mixture containing manchar smooth brome, red clover, intermediate wheat grass, alta fescue, hard fescue and orchard grass.

WILDLIFE USE

The main wildlife use on the area is by whitetailed deer. A few male deer have been observed. Deer numbers have varied from 300 to 500 head depending upon the time of year. Some deer are livetrapped from time to time, and transported to other parts of the State in an attempt to reestablish this species in suitable habitat.

There are a few Chinese peasants living on the area. Ruffed grouse are often seen and a few coyotes and bobcats visit the area.

COOPERATION

Habitat improvement work was carried on in connection with National Wildlife Week in March 1954, when 114 persons from the Coeur d'Alene and Farragut area gathered on the refuge one day to plant 4,000 trees and shrubs.

Object of the work was twofold: (1) to screen off unsightly foundations remaining from the former Naval training station, and, (2) provide additional game bird cover and supplementary feed for wildlife.

Scouts, campfire girls, the Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation and the CDA chapter of the Idaho Outdoor Association joined with fish and game department personnel planting trees, erecting protective fencing and consuming countless hot dogs and hamburgers donated by local business firms.

The game department emphasizes one thing above everything else in connection with the area. "Everybody is welcome—and it's free." Several words of caution. Drive

carefully—there are deer in all portions of the grounds—also people. Keep camping areas clean and protected with regard to fires. Use only the permitted travel lanes and camping spots.

Panama Canal: Guilty Feeling Becoming American Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who know that our country is great, I have always taken pride in one of its most notable achievements—the acquisition of the Canal Zone and building the Panama Canal.

In the course of this great work on the isthmus, the United States transformed an area that was one of the worst pest holes in the world into a showplace for health and sanitation and constructed one of the greatest works of man. No thoughtful citizens of our country who makes a transit of the Panama Canal on board ship, crosses Gatun Lake and views the artificial gorge now known as Gaillard Cut, fails to feel proud of the American people.

Despite the evidence on the isthmus for all writers and journalists to see, our country has been "fed" for many years un-American propoganda that would belittle the magnitude of this great achievement and would create a sense of guilt on the part of our people for their bringing into being what was the dream of four centuries. I can think of no greater disservice to our country and the entire world that some of our publicists have committed than their advancement of the long-range Soviet objective of undermining the status of the United States as sovereign of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read in the January 21, 1964, issue of the News of Lynchburg, Va., a thoughtful article by Holmes Alexander in which he, in effect, exposes the subversive type of journalism that has infected the mass news media of the United States.

The indicated article follows:

GUILTY FEELING BECOMING AMERICAN WAY?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—"There's something in the American air that wasn't here before," said the returning traveler, who'd returned about the time of the Panamanian crisis. "What could it be?"

Oh, that would be the guilty feeling, he was told. In America these days we always point the finger of shame at ourselves when anything goes wrong.

"Yes," said the returning traveler. "I've been reading that we are as guilty in Panama as the French were in Algeria, the Belgians in the Congo, the British in Suez. But it's difficult to follow those analogies. I can't find when we were ever as cruel to the Panamanians as the French have been to North Africans and Southeast Asians. Or that we ever exploited Panama as the Belgians did central Africa. Or that we ever had an imperialistic history that would hold a pale candle to the British. We must enjoy making ourselves suffer by drawing these absurd comparisons."

Gunboat diplomacy, he was told.

"Hardly a Panamanian is now alive who ever saw us practice gunboat diplomacy," observed the traveler.

The big stick, he was reminded.

"Theodore Roosevelt has been dead longer than the German Kaiser," the returning traveler stubbornly declared. "The only big stick we've carried in this generation is one with foreign aid in its prong. Long before those Panamanian high school boys who started the riots were born, the Yankee Dollar has been going out to uplift the world, including Panama, in a very big way."

A nation of haters.

"The way I heard it," said the returning traveler, "it's been the Panamanian politicians who've been preaching hate. I can see why Americans in Panama are envied for being rich and mighty, but that should make the Panamanians more wrong than it makes us. I can see how the Panama Canal gives us a big headache, but why a guilt complex? We ought to be proud of it."

Now the returning traveler was talking like an extreme nationalist. Next, he'd be saying that we've paid for the canal several times over, that we've been more than generous toward the Panamanians, and that the only way we've failed has been in firmness.

"I was just trying to understand the guilty feeling," he insisted.

Well, the guilty feeling, he was told, is something like the cigarette habit. Americans must know that it's bad for them, but they get pleasure from it, too. A psychological crutch, the scientists call it. Some people think it started at Hiroshima.

"The guilty feeling of Americans must be quite a lift for the Communists, too," observed the returning traveler. "It helps them to prove in their propaganda that Americans really are warmongers, imperialists, racists, and gangsters. You wouldn't suppose that the Communists helped plant that guilty feeling among us, would you?"

The traveler must have been away from America a long while, he was acidly told. Otherwise, he'd understand that we're taught not to hate Communists any longer. Instead, we're taught to hate ourselves.

"I see," said the returning traveler sadly, for now it was quite clear to him why the guilty feeling had become such a part of the American way.

Citizenship Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues two prize-winning essays on the "Challenge of Citizenship," which appeared in the most recent issue of the Revere Journal. The essays, written by Miss Mary Ann Goddard, a senior at the Immaculate Conception High School, and Paul Kane, a junior at Revere High School, were the local winners of the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by Post 940 VFW.

Both essays carry a very significant message as we debate the provisions of H.R. 7152, the first truly comprehensive civil rights bill in our Nation's history. Paul Kane states, in simple yet eloquent terms, the basic issue before the Congress today:

I have learned to recognize the rights of all people, but, unfortunately, through faulty education, certain of our citizens are racial bigots and have put our Nation to the shadow of shame before the world. I consider it my responsibility as an American to support the vast wave of protest against injustice.

Mary Ann Goddard forcefully voices a call to action which we might well heed in our present deliberations:

Now, this minute, this day each of us must not only face the truth about himself, but he must conquer the evils he sees within his own soul as well as in his beloved homeland. Apathy, and indifference, godlessness, bigotry, racism, ignorance, and illiteracy are all too common within the structure of this world, and within the confines of this, our Nation. They have become a web, thrown over the ideals of democracy, truth, brotherhood, liberty, unity, alertness, and even over a ceaseless and never ending love of country and fellow man.

Under leave to revise and extend, I wish to insert these two essays at this time:

CITIZENSHIP CHALLENGE

(By Paul Kane)

A beloved friend, whom we shall never forget, immortalized the words of Plato in saying, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." Therefore, I ask myself, "Exactly what can I do? Am I in an appropriate position to affect the course of my country? Will my voice be heard over 180 million others? Does this country, the greatest power on earth, need the untiring support of every one of its citizens?" It certainly does.

The existence of a system such as ours is entirely dependent on the continuing cooperation and harmony of its participants. In order to maintain this cooperation and harmony, every individual within this country must make the necessary adjustments to improve himself in every aspect. As our country moves ahead, so must the intelligence of the citizens increase. We must be aware of our problems and be prepared to face them. We must recognize our country's neighbors on this planet and treat them with respect. We must perpetuate the ideals of our famous predecessors in keeping our Nation the leader of the world. And finally, we, as individuals, must be able to seek the true meaning of our existence by upholding our right of religious freedom. We can only accomplish these objectives if we have proper education.

I can only advance in this world through my education. I cherish my right to an education, and I try to assimilate into my mind as much learning as possible. I have learned to recognize the rights of all people, but, unfortunately, through faulty education, certain of our citizens are racial bigots and have put our Nation in the shadow of shame before the world. I consider it my responsibility as an American to support the vast wave of protest against this injustice. If my America can claim to protect other nations from tyranny, it must first prove to me that it protects its own citizens. This problem can only be solved by reeducation. All Americans realize that men's minds cannot be changed in a day, but American people are pleading for that change to start now, and they deserve it. This change, if started now, will not become effective for many generations, but even its initiation will prove America's intentions to the world. The responsibility of every true

American should not be, "Love thy neighbor," but, first, "Free thy neighbor."

Although this Nation appears to be controlled by a small group of men in Washington, it was so designed to give the actual power to the populace, thus bringing heavy responsibility upon the American family. The family is perhaps the most cherished right of all free people. It is then the close unity of the family which accounts for the close unity of our Government. If the American family system abruptly ends, so ends individual freedom and thus our entire concept of Government. I, therefore, consider loyalty to my family as a responsibility of being an American. It is the families which contain the voters, and it is the voters who control the country; therefore, it is necessary to have a close understanding in the family before attempting to reach accord in any governmental matter.

Another duty of an American is to express opinion. America has often been improved as a result of expressed views and debate. When I express a political opinion, I need not ask myself, "What can I do for my country?" I have done it. I have continued the long tradition of freedom of speech established 187 years ago. The noise of free speech is the music of the free world. Naturally, to those who are qualified, the right to vote is the pinnacle of freedom. The vote is the individual's voice, and it is often heard thousands of miles away. The citizen in the voting booth need not ask himself what he can do for his country, for he has done it too.

This entire concept of my or any citizen's responsibility as an American is based upon proper education. Patriotism, racial equality, family harmony, public opinion—these things must all be learned, whether at school or in the home. But education is a voluntary act. A person can accept or reject any idea he wishes. Whether or not to improve oneself and one's country is completely at the individual's discretion. Therefore, I must constantly ask why I seek to better syself. "Ask not what your country can do to help you, but ask what you can do to help your country—and yourself."

CITIZENSHIP CHALLENGE

(By Mary Ann Goddard)

Today, more forcefully than at any other time, the future beckons each one of us to her. She presents a challenge such as no other generation has faced at any time in history. These problems of the moment may not be unique, but they do differ in that they belong to us alone. We may, as our forefathers have in the past, look back to history, in order to solve these dilemmas, but even though the answers may present themselves, it is for us to take up the standard, each man can do this for himself—only for himself alone.

We are told by our elders, the growing peril of communism is to be feared, but the truth remains, this is not our greatest obstacle. Shakespeare once said, "To thy self alone be true." This statement has crossed the barriers of time and space, and remains with us today as a flickering spark in the black desolation of night. Now, this minute, this day each of us must not only face the truth about himself, but he must conquer the evils he sees within his own soul, as well as in his beloved homeland. Apathy, and indifference, godlessness, bigotry, racism, ignorance, and illiteracy are all too common within the structure of this world, and within the confines of this, our Nation. They have become a web, thrown over the ideals of democracy, truth, brotherhood, liberty, unity, alertness, and even over a ceaseless and never ending love of country and fellowman. We need only to look within ourselves. Our native soil shall never be conquered by an aggressor, but could be overcome from within by a slow crumbling of values and ideals so cherished by our ancestors, unless we, as enlightened citizens, take up the banner and hold it high. Our predecessors who entrusted us with this challenge left their various homes, gave up time-honored customs, spoke a different language, left friends and relatives, fought and eventually shed their blood on a foreign shore. These are the citizens who created this heritage of ours out of the wilderness and passed on to us, this the greatest gift of all, the privilege of belonging to the family of these United States.

Fellow Americans, let each man as he comes here today to stand before his God and his flag, say unto himself, I have come here physically strong, mentally alert, and spiritually alive, ready to face the future's obstacles. Let him resolve to serve his Creator who made us to live, work, pray, and love one another in a land dedicated to peace and equality for each of His children. Let him stand straight in the shadow of the democracy he cherishes, the greatest ideal which has yet crossed the face of the earth and touched the heart of mankind.

Action directs the torch bearer, the individual of today and all the todays of the future. Reflection, debate, and choice will define the goal. An imperative decision awaits the steadfast and the time is now for you and me, citizens by birth or by choice of this great republic to stand united in this common effort. Together we can, we must, we will meet the challenge to citizenship.

President Johnson's War on Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert at this point a news release issued by Sam Lefrak, president of the Lefrak Organization, in New York—one of the country's leading builders—urging support for President Johnson's housing and urban renewal programs.

The article follows:

BUILDER LEFRAK URGES CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY'S SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WAR ON SLUMS

NEW YORK, January 28.—A leading builder here today called on the American construction industry to give dynamic support to President Johnson's housing and urban renewal program, and hailed it as a major blow against slums and decay.

Samuel J. Lefrak, president of the Lefrak Organization, said the Johnson program was a milestone in seeking a solution to the Nation's housing problems and a clarion call to the entire construction industry. He pledged his support in lending the fullest assistance to Government agencies charged with drawing up the Johnson program and putting it into motion, should it become law at this session of Congress.

In telegrams to officials of the National Association of Home Builders and the National Real Estate Board, Mr. Lefrak urged their active leadership to assure that the Johnson housing plan becomes reality.

Mr. Lefrak said it should be clearly demonstrated where the housing industry stands in regard to President Johnson's pioneer program to aid major cities. The program calls for Federal assistance in the development of complete communities which will contain new homes, industry, commercial establishments, public facilities, and other requirements for community life.

In his telegram, Mr. Lefrak recommended that each segment of construction should immediately form action committees to map out local programs of support for the President's proposed bill. These committees could provide the Government with important assistance concerning urban renewal and community development in local areas.

The builder, whose company is constructing Lefrak City, a $150 million apartment community development near the New York World's Fair in Forest Hills, Queens, N.Y., said: "We should all realize that the Johnson program is a bold, new concept providing construction with an official major role in the health and future of our economy. For the first time housing is assigned the top priority it deserves in keeping with its position in our economic life."

Equally important, Mr. Lefrak said, is the concept of assistance to developers and hard pressed local governments. He noted that the program is designed to help local builders obtain favorable terms of credit and other aid. The Lefrak Organization utilizes private funds exclusively in financing its middle-income apartment communities.

Mr. Lefrak predicted that the industry could look forward to a high rate of housing and apartment starts and full labor employment for years if the Johnson program is enacted in the coming session of Congress.

"The program marks a significant departure for the industry because it seeks to use all the forces at the Nation's command—industry, labor, Government—to strengthen our cities, beautify our lands, and provide decent housing for our citizens.

"President Johnson and Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver should be heartily commended for continuing and extending the Kennedy housing program at a time when this problem is reaching critical proportions."

Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Honored by Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, I am privileged to have some association with one of the local chapters of that august fraternity. Recently they initiated my distinguished colleague Congressman MATHIAS into the fraternity and I am submitting for your attention the introductory remarks given on that occasion in his honor:

INTRODUCTION OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., BY CARL G. LOVE, ESQ., ON THE OCCASION OF HIS HONORARY INITIATION INTO THE PHI ALPHA DELTA LAW FRATERNITY, ON DECEMBER 14, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, no other address given this evening, nor perhaps before any other function of this fraternity, has ever been given with more pleasure or greater sincerity than these remarks I have in the way of a simple factual account of the man to whom we give honor tonight.

As we all know Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., is the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. I might add that this is one of the largest congressional districts in the entire country, both as to population with some 700,000 con-

stituents and as to dimension. I am told that Congressman McC. MATHIAS has frequently been envied by his fellow Congressmen who come from more remote districts in that it is so easy for him to go home and maintain his contact with the people of his district.

Such envy would, I think, be reconsidered once it is recognized that the county seat of Garrett County at the far reaches of the sixth district is as distant from Washington as New York City, and is not accessible by train, plane or divided 4-lane toll road. It is an actual fact that it is far more easy for a Congressman from New York to meet with his constituents than it is for Mr. MATHIAS.

Moreover, as those of us from this area well know, MAC—as he is almost always called—represents a district so varied in its make up—ranging from the sophisticated cosmopolitan area of Montgomery County, through the beautiful rural rolling countryside of Frederick and Allegheny Counties to some truly backwoodsy and less-developed sections of Garrett and Washington Counties—as to constitute a region which in a way represents the full spectrum of the variety our Nation as a whole.

I mention the above facts only by way of emphasizing to you that Congressman MATHIAS—or MAC—fills one of the most difficult positions in the United States in his particular congressional seat.

In his election in 1962 by the largest plurality ever given a Maryland Republican Congressman candidate (and that was acquired in a district where Democrats outregister Republicans by a 3-2 margin), he demonstrated that the people appreciate the way he has conducted and discharged his difficult assignment. I say appreciate—I wonder sometimes if on his bad days—and we all have bad days—he does not feel that he may have been resentenced instead of being reelected.

His abilities as a Congressman, which have received unusual recognition for a man who is only in his second term on the Hill are undoubtedly an outgrowth of his earlier and long experience in public service. Prior to his first election to Congress in November of 1960, Mr. MATHIAS had served as a delegate to the Maryland General Assembly, and prior to that he had served as both an Assistant Attorney General of Maryland and as city attorney of his hometown of Frederick, Md. These activities in public life follow a Mathias family tradition, for his father, who is also a most wonderful man, had also served an elective office.

Mr. MATHIAS attended Yale University and Haverford College, receiving his A.B. in 1944. He served also in World War II in the Pacific theater with the U.S. Navy, distinguishing himself as a gunnery officer, and this association with the U.S. Navy continues today where is is a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve, and as an active member, having participated in some of the actual aerial surveillance, off Cuba in the fall of 1962.

Following World War II MAC lost no time in acquiring his L.L.B. in 1949 from the Law School of the University of Maryland preparing himself for the practice of law in his father's firm in Frederick, Md.

He has acquired a strong understanding of many community problems, which he demonstrates in his legislative work now on the Hill, through his active work in a multitude of civic organizations. He has served as an officer of the Childrens Aid Society of Frederick County, as trustee of the Episcopal Free School and Orphan House, as vestryman of Frederick All Saints Church, as president of the Historical Society of Frederick County, as an officer of the Maryland State Junior Chamber of Commerce, and on the executive committee of the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission—to name only a few.

In the Congress of the United States, Mr. MATHIAS serves as a member of the House Committee for District of Columbia affairs, and on the very important House Judiciary Committee. Fortunately for lawyers in my specialty, Congressman MATHIAS also serves on Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee dealing with legislation affecting patent, trademark and copyright law. While this is a highly technical and specialized area which is very frequently quite remote from Mr. MATHIAS' previous experience and training, I can testify from personal experience that he has nevertheless worked hard and acquired an exceptional grasp of the central philosophy and key issues in this area, and has been an effective legislative proponent and supporter of the patent system.

Mr. MATHIAS' legislative activity demonstrates not only his energy, but the wide spectrum of public affairs which captures his deep interest. In just this year Mr. MATHIAS has sponsored legislation for studies in agriculture including soil uses and wheat and feed production; he has introduced legislation to establish a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, so that this area would at least have a voice to speak on its behalf in the House of Representatives while the more knotty problem of self-government is ironed out over a probably longer period of time. He has further sponsored legislation to revise the District of Columbia income tax structure, a bill to further protection in coal mine accidents, a bill to create a Chesapeake & Ohio National Historical Park, legislation in the area of the very serious and growing problem of water pollution, and a bill to prohibit interference by the Government with the free exercise of religion.

He has also sponsored legislation to permit a 6-hour subpena of a witness for requiring the giving of evidence of any crimes committed in the District of Columbia. In connection with the questioning of witnesses in the investigation of crimes, we had an administrative order by the District of Columbia Commissioners terminating the practice, up to then, of investigative arrests by the police department. As to that practice Mr. MATHIAS stated in a speech to the House:

"I do not condone it and do not mourn it. Every reasonable man must be concerned, however, with the legal void created when the suspension of investigative arrest was not coordinated with the substitution of some constitutional alternative."

While other legislative proposals were under what appeared to be a time-consuming scrutiny of various constitutionality arguments in the Department of Justice—Mr. MATHIAS proposed, with some merit I believe, that within Congress there were also many able lawyers likewise able to tussle with such complex and difficult issues.

His interests range from that kind of dedicated concern for the safety and welfare of people in this city without representation, to deep concern with the development and utilization of the Potomac River Basin. Not long ago MAC established what may well have been a first when he hurried back from up district inspection trip of dam and park sites to join his more soberly garbed colleagues, on the floor of the House, in answer to an important call for the yeas and nays, dressed in woolen plaid shirt and hunting boots.

His interest in water development and uses, which may be allied to his continuing interest in the Navy, is not limited to rivers, but extends as broadly and deeply as the oceans themselves. As he put it in a speech last October, "Man has rather thoroughly unclothed the continents" in the exercise of his restless curiosity for exploration. We are now engaged in a massive exploration of outer space, but remaining largely untapped, and in an area of almost astonishing human ignorance, is that vast volume of our planet which lies in and under the seas. Being fully aware of the intense interest by the Soviets in oceanography, and the fact that the Soviet oceanographic researchers surpass those of all the rest of the free world combind, Mr. MATHIAS has asked the incisive question "Do we need a sputnik from the sea?" As he has said:

"In space we have a vacuum—or a lack of pressure. Beneath the sea there is an excess of pressure. In both cases, we have to take our atmosphere along with us. The problems of subsisting man in either outer space or the inner space beneath the sea are in many ways identical to the modern engineer. We have only to decide to do one and not the other. The time has come when we should reexamine our ambitions and devote proper attention to the frontiers of our planet."

I think that if MAC had not become a Congressman, and had not been before that a successful lawyer, he would have found a great contented personal happiness in being a teacher. Time and time again, as one reads his speeches which he has delivered in Congress and elsewhere, one becomes impressed with his scholarship and erudition. He seems fascinated by the operation of government and the historical developments of the interplay of the forces of government and the freedom of the individual. For instance, he addressed the House of Representatives earlier this year on the subject of multinational governments. Congressman MATHIAS related the development of the concept of international organizations commencing with the councils and leagues of ancient Greece which were lineal ancestors of the confederations of the Swiss Cantons of Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, etc., which led to the nucleus of the Swiss nation in 1915, and in turn to the Congress of Westphalia at the end of the 30-Year War, and the number of other international congresses of the 18th century which preceded in turn the Congress of Vienna of 1814, which formed to put back together what Napoleon had rent asunder. All of these contained the developing kernel of the concept of the League of Nations of the first generation of this century, which itself constituted, as Mr. MATHIAS pointed out, in spite of its defects, a most significant advance on the road to international law. As he stated it:

"Even the blasts of derision leveled at the military impotency of Geneva in later years could not alter the fact that no other international organization had ever united to condemn and punish a major state for violating its covenants to keep the peace."

Thus, our honored guest tonight makes us see that in our generation we have seen the culmination of a century's long struggle for the United Nations which, in spite of its drawbacks for which it may justly be constructively criticized, has nevertheless "successfully driven every State, large or small, to the bar of world opinion."

Mac remains concerned with international politics and he has consistently advocated a hard line with the Soviets. I can recall no better example than an incident at the height of the initial intense discussion created by the proposed state sale of wheat to Russia, when everyone was debating whether they were for or against this transaction and what the political, economic and moral implications were, and why. I happened by chance to have been meeting with Mac that day and as we were driving out of the House Office Building, he was queried by a newspaper reporter on the sidewalk who called out asking Mac what his position was as to how we should solve this moral and political question of such great moment. Traffic compelled us to move on, but undaunted by the lack of time, Mac gave a strong wave of his hand and called out his simple and direct answer, "Let them eat cake."

It may come to be, perhaps, that in years to come, Congressman MATHIAS will remain most proud of some of his activities which have taken place this very year in Congress. I refer particularly to his outstanding and exceptionally effective leadership in the bipartisan fight for a civil rights bill. The contribution he has been able to make testifies also to the distinction with which this man is regarded. It was early this year, and long before any other administration bill was introduced, that our honorary initiate tonight, along with three colleagues, Congressmen LINDSAY, MACGREGOR and CAHILL, introduced an omnibus civil rights bill. That bill will never be enacted—such is the political nature of things in our Government. But the civil rights legislation which will be enacted will bear the imprint of that earlier bill in a very recognizable way. Not the least of these may well turn out to be the use of the 14th amendment as to constitutional basis for the public accommodations section, the so-called title III, of the civil rights bill. This may well be a major contribution I say, for a statute improperly based and unconstitutionally constructed and conceived in this area of civil rights, so that it would be struck down by the courts as a matter of law, would constitute a far more dangerous catalyst of public disturbance than the absence of any civil rights legislation at all.

We remain this evening in the period of national mourning decreed for the death of President Kennedy. In words of classic simplicity and stark truth, Congressman MATHIAS described that even as an act medieval in its horror. In his own tribute to the President, he observed:

"I believe that the greatest monument that any President can have reared to his memory is that the Constitution passes intact from his hands to his successors, and, I believe the greatest act of memoriam any citizen can render is to resolve anew that the life and work and greatness of the Republic shall continue."

For Congressman MATHIAS, our honorary initiate of this evening, I believe that resolution and his dedication thereto, was made long ago and he has been given the ability to give it reality. It is his hallmark that he follows a fundamental principle of responsible, responsive, representation. His voting record is and will be responsible in his own honest sincere judgment, and it will also be responsive to the desires and wishes of his constituency whom it is his duty to represent.

We seek tonight to honor you, Congressman MATHIAS, but we do so in full consciousness of the fact that in accepting our invitation to become a brother of Phi Alpha Delta, you honor us and our institution. The phrase "humble pride," has become somewhat hackneyed through overuse, but I can think of no other which would more accurately describe our sentiment on this occasion.

Private Peace Corps South of the Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark Star-Ledger, February 3, 1964, "Private Peace Corps South of the Border," by Joseph M. Hochstein:

PRIVATE PEACE CORPS SOUTH OF THE BORDER

(By Joseph M. Hochstein))

CARACAS.—An unofficial peace corps financed by private business is trying to spark a quiet revolution in Venezuela's political life.

The group, which calls itself "Accion" from the Spanish word for action, has picked the key South American nation for a test program in teaching poverty-stricken Venezuelans to band together for common goals.

One of Accion's features is that its volunteers live among the people they are trying to influence—a practice that has caused the group to be contrasted to Communist organizers who use a similar technique but seek different ends.

Accion began in late 1961 and operates today with some 30 U.S. volunteers and about as many Venezuelans in nine population centers.

Like Communist organizers in many parts of the world, Accion's workers in Venezuela settle in local communities and live under harsh conditions while trying to win the confidence of the residents.

After establishing trust and respect, each Accion worker tries to persuade the leaders in his neighborhood to mobilize the community in a self-help project such as erecting a school or building a water system.

Unlike Communist workers seeking to attain political objectives, Accion volunteers then step into the background and try to stay as far as possible from politics.

Once local leadership has taken over, the Accion worker remains as an adviser and go-between, directing the community to the right government agencies for help and obtaining gifts of supplies and cash from businesses that support the program.

In one shack village at Maracaibo, some six dozen men turned out on a recent weekend to build a street with donated tools and clear a plot on which the community had decided to erect a school.

At a Caracas shanty town, where 86 men worked for 13 hours as Sunday volunteers on an Accion-instigated project, a water tank that soon will be part of a homemade system bears the motto: "Water is the problem of all of us. Cooperate with the village committee to solve it."

In another Caracas shack town, Accion has arranged to separate gifts of supplies and services from 28 businesses, 10 government agencies, nine private groups and one U.S. agency. The cash value would be more than $15,000. At the same time, some 200 residents of the village have given several thousand man-hours of labor.

Unlike Communist fieldworkers, Accion's volunteers say they are promoting no-political objectives.

Cooperative action is an end in itself for Accion. The thinking behind Accion's efforts is that people can be taught by example to take matters into their own hands instead of waiting for paternalistic officials or politicians to solve their problems.

Hon. William J. Green, Jr.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of my good friend and able colleague, WILLIAM J. GREEN, of Pennsylvania, has saddened me greatly. He was in the prime of life. His passing was most untimely. BILL GREEN was a good friend of mine of long standing. We differed radically in our political beliefs but we shared a deep love for the State of Pennsylvania and a desire to do everything we could for its benefit. Political disagreements never marred our friendship. On many occasions, Bill helped me with problems connected with the 16th District. He was particularly helpful a few years ago when the Air Force was considering moving the petroleum section from the Olmstead Air Force Base at Middletown to Washington. There was a big argument on this. BILL worked wholeheartedly with me. He helped a lot in making my efforts to retain the petroleum section successful—even writing a long, strong letter to President Kennedy on the subject. This was only one instance of many. Occasionally I was able to give him a hand with matters of benefit to Philadelphia. I will miss him. With his great ability, friendliness, and charm, it is most unfortunate for his congressional district, the State of Pennsylvania, and the Nation, that he no longer is with us. His countless friends will mourn him.

This has been a sad year for the State of Pennsylvania. We have lost influence in the Congress through the loss of Bill Green, Francis Walter, and Leon Gavin, all of whom occupied key positions in Congress through their seniority, ability, and hard work.

My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Green and BILL's family in this time of sorrow.

The Portuguese Way in Africa—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I submitted for the consideration of my colleagues the first half of a fine article on Angola by Hugh Kay, writing in the January issue of Fortune magazine.

Mr. Kay's article is essential reading, in my opinion, for those of us concerned with the future of Africa and disturbed by mounting reports of Red activity in this important area of the world.

The following is the conclusion of Mr. Kay's excellent interpretive report:

THE PORTUGUESE WAY IN AFRICA—II

WHEN THE TERROR STRUCK

In 1961, I became the second British journalist to enter Angola after the March uprising of that year. My reports contrasted sharply with much that was appearing in the British and American press at the time and are relevant today when rebel forces, operating from the sanctuary of the Congo, are once more threatening an invasion of Angola and indeed may have launched it before this article appears. My main theme then was that the terrorists who struck in 1961 did not represent a spontaneous rebellion of oppressed Angolan Africans against their white oppressors. The invasion was the work of the Union of the Peoples of Angola under Holden Roberto, an Angolan adventurer. The Bacongo tribe straddles the Congo-Angolan border, and from his Congo headquarters Roberto sent into Angola a

highly trained core of 400 militants, prepared for sophisticated war. Following the Algerian and Malayan patterns, they made local recruits by intimidation, and by exploiting a mixture of fetishism, witchcraft, and Christian symbolism. They murdered hundreds of whites and blacks alike in a day, with an orgy of torture and mutilation undreamed of by the Mau Mau. Outraged and terrified, the settlers struck back, the image of crucified and blinded women and children in their eyes. Thousands of Africans died. In all Angola at this time the number of soldiers and police together totaled only 8,000, most of them African. This hardly suggests a regime of savage repression.

Nor could this small force have launched campaigns of systematic genocide, as some foreign observers have charged. Reinforcements from Portugal arrived slowly. As they did so, the army not only cleaned up the terrorists but restrained the white civilians as well. It then set to work to reclaim the area through educational and welfare schemes conducted by soldiers in psychosocial units. I saw them at work. Despite the terrorists' recruitment methods, less than 1 percent of the entire Angolan population was involved in the uprising, and less than one-fourteenth of the country's area. I also asserted in dispatches at the time that the revolutionary Angolan groups, especially Roberto's Union of the Peoples of Angola and the popular movement for the liberation of Angola headed by the half-caste poet, Mário de Andrade, were backed by Communist powers. This view has now been vindicated beyond dispute. The plain facts are summarized in Africa's Red Harvest by the distinguished journalist, Pieter Lessing. The uprising was preceded by months of heavy propaganda, beamed to Africa from several of the Iron Curtain capitals. It was even heralded in the Peiping People's Daily 3 months before it happened. Lessing describes the Communist affiliations of Roberto and Andrade over the years, and the arms supply linkup through Solod, the Russian Ambassador in Conakry.

RECONCILIATION AND REBUILDING

In the event, the invasion and uprising of 1961 failed of its purpose, and when I returned to Angola in January 1963, I found it calm, busy, and purposeful, an oasis of comparative quiet in a turbulent continent. In some areas the terror had unhappily left lingering suspicion between whites and blacks that was not there before. But mutual trust plainly existed between the Africans and the Portuguese Army. In Carmona, a hot spot of the terror, and still on guard against snipers in the grass and the hills, 237,000 Africans returning partly from the Congo and mainly from the bush were being resettled in 119 senzalas (villages) of 3,000 people each. These strong pockets of resistance to renewed outbreaks have their own schools, churches, and medical services. The Africans build their houses; the Government brings up water supplies and other services.

By the end of January the government contribution was already complete in 58 villages. It watched the army officers saluting the African chiefs, the relaxed discussions and informal planning they entered into together, the crash program for proliferating young African teachers in the villages, the Carmona Orphanage where the children of murdered whites and black terrorists are growing up in a united family.

But this kind of special rehabilitation project is only part of a much larger economic and political development. In the next 10 years Angola's population of nearly 5 million is expected to double, swelled not only from the inside but from large immigration from Portugal, Cape Verde, and the Azores. Half the 40,000 Portuguese troops now in Angola have settled or are expected to settle there, a leaven in the social mass. They may also serve as a stabilizing influence, a sort of permanent civil defense corps. New villages are being laid out in the fertile center and south, and the sparsely inhabited east. Families are given free land, farm equipment, and advice by government agronomists. All the communities will be multiracial.

THE RESTLESS WHITES

So much nonsense has been written about conditions in Angola that I feel bound to use part of this article to set the record straight. The real unrest there is on the part of the whites, a boredom with remote, paternalistic control from Lisbon. They cherish their origins, and do not want to break with their mother country, but they also want to feel a separate, if interwoven, Angolan identity. They want freedom for instance, to run their own finances without having to refer back 5,000 miles for leave to spend an escudo.

The dynamic development plans of Governor-General Deslandes received a sharp setback when, to the fury of the Angolan Portuguese, he was sacked by Oversea Minister Moreira, the man who had virtually created him, for trying to run too fast. Now Moreira, in his turn, has also been put into cold storage by Salazar. Their Angolan policies continue to operate up to a point, and the universities, which provided the last straw in the Moreira-Deslandes dispute, are an accomplished fact. But it is precisely this sort of thing that riles the Angolan community, now working all the hours God made to build the country up. They point out, somewhat wryly, that Salazar has never been to Africa, and is not in a position to know best.

The Africans themselves, of course, are still for the most part on the circumference, rather than at the center, of the overall political development, and the prosperous urban centers are plainly the white man's show, although the African lives there with him. But the African's material conditions have of recent years improved sufficiently to draw a tribute even from the bishop of Beira, who had sternly condemned exploitation of the Africans and whose longstanding plea for African universities is now to be fulfilled. In some respects, he told me last year, the Portuguese African's conditions are substantially better than corresponding standards in other African territories. This statement is bound to fall gratingly on skeptical ears, and I feel I cannot avoid something of a factual litany to make the position clear. It has to be remembered, after all, that Portuguese Africa has been painted in quite hideous colors, and public opinion abroad has been heavily affected by this when trying the wider question of multiracialism versus nationalism. On the credit side, then, let it be said that some African workers really do earn more than their counterparts in metropolitan Portugal.

The illiterate Portuguese emigrant may learn to read and write in Angola under an African teacher, and often does. The African small farmer frequently does better than his white colleagues. There are pure African mayors, government officials, and doctors; administartors drawn from the natives of Cape Verde; a former Governor General of Angola was a Goan; and the large numbers of people of mixed blood include some of the most intelligent and prosperous people in the country.

COMPANY WELFARISM

Critical accounts of these countries indict the inadequacy of the government welfare services. What they fail to add is that a substantial contribution in this field is made by private industries employing thousands of Africans. Salazar's abhorrence of anything that looks remotely like socialism contains less of a sting when one accepts, in place of the welfare state, a natural partnership between government and private enterprise in this field. After all, the concept of an allowance based on family size paid by employers to workers has partly revolutionized workers' conditions in the Western sectors of the European Continent and also in Italy. In Angola, one thinks of the Benguela Railway Co.'s schools, hospitals, antenatal clinics, day nurseries, insurance schemes, clubs, sports grounds, and workers' housing. The hospital of the Diamond Co. of Angola serves an area containing 95,000 people, many of whom are not even the company's employees. Other examples include the CADA coffee and the Cassaquele sugar plantations. In all, Angola has 1 doctor for every 13,000 people, while in Cameroun 1 doctor has to serve 29,000, in Tanganyika 19,000, in Ghana 25,000, in Sierra Leone 66,000, in Ethiopia 105,000.

Production has mounted dramatically since the war in corn, coffee, wheat, sisal, cattle raising, fish industries, diamonds, petroleum, and a wide range of minerals including tin, tungsten, copper, manganese, and iron ore. The Cambambe Dam is the second largest on the African Continent. Railways are being extended and minerals further developed by a consortium of Portuguese, German, and Danish firms. In 1961–62, 116 new industrial undertakings were started, and 128 authorized. The figures for 1962 now show a record crop of coffee, cotton, and sisal; 470,000 tons of crude oil were produced; processing industries expanded by degrees varying from 35 to 70 percent. A favorable trade balance was struck, though this was 40 percent below 1961 (a year of abnormal progress in spite of the uprising). But the 1962 drop is due to a substantial increase in textile and motor vehicle imports, the latter being essential to current industrial expansion. It would be easy to be tendentious about all this, as also about the feeding in of Government money for roads, bridges, airfields, ports, electrical services, loans for farmers, and low-cost housing. As we shall see, government aid is only a fraction of what is really needed, and the indefinite prolongation of this sort of help is dubious. But credit must be given for what has in fact been done.

FAST GROWING SCHOOLS

Angola's chronic inadequacy of labor has been at least partly offset by the eradication of smallpox and sleeping sickness and the progress against leprosy, successes much praised by the World Health Organization. The country's infant mortality rate is 12 percent, but this is less than half the average rate for the whole continent. Plans include 160 new residential areas in the north, with civic centers, hospitals, schools, and agricultural services. Fleets of tractors are being hired out to small farmers. Seven years ago only 2 percent of the population was being educated. In 1960 there were only 100,000 children in formal schooling (17.8 percent of the relevant age group). By the end of 1962, however, 2,900 educational establishments served nearly 300,000 pupils—apart from uncharted missionary services on the most elementary level, which, by some estimates, would serve to double the total figure of children receiving at least some education. But even in terms of formal schooling the present rate of increase is expected to lead to education for 60 percent of the school-age population in 1965. (This percentage had already been attained by 1962 in Mozambique.) Multiracial technical and secondary schools are increasing, and the examples of these in Nova Lisboa and Benguela are of the same competence and quality as one would expect to meet in the best British and Belgian establishments.

Much importance is attached to the multiracial settlements, or cooperative communities, in both Angola and Mozambique, each again with its own educational, religious,

and welfare setups, each supervised by government experts, who seem to work a 14-hour day, 7 days a week. It is too early to say whether these are going to be an economic success, but the concept is of the highest social significance. Seven years ago the Limpopo Valley in Mozambique was a swamp. In 1963 1,200 families, white, black, and mulatto, were living in a network of integrated communities. Many individuals were prospering as they had never hoped to do. Some 500,000 acres had been turned over to grazing; 77,500 acres were under irrigation. Psychosocial services are teaching farming methods, sanitation, diet, hygiene, and child care by radio. As an American colleague said to me in the midst of all this: "God help anyone who tries to mess this up." What has been aptly called a "disembodied metaphysical principle" has at last found at least the beginnings of a valid and viable incarnation.

THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE

But the economic future is very far from assured. Today Portugal puts more into Angola than it takes out, what with public investment, development plans, loans, and the maintenance of the army. But Portugal itself, in the view of its 36-year-old Ecomonics Minister, Dr. Teixeira de Pinto, ought to be producing at home three times the present output. Portugal has not yet constructed a welfare society for itself. If it attempts this, if the common man's needs are ever accepted as paramount in a society still dominated by a small elite of disproportionately wealthy men with little social sense, the aid the mother country can supply to the oversea provinces will be fractional indeed. The situation is analyzed, sympathetically but with somewhat pessimistic conclusions, by Richard J. Hammond, in a paper written for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. As he sees it, the solution for the African territories lies with foreign capital and increased exports, and the Americans, Germans, Dutch, Belgians, Scandinavians, and Japanese are there already. The strict bookkeeping approaches of Salazar do not commend themselves to him as the right touch for countries desperately in deed of multiplying production. He thus anticipates ultimate independence as the only reasonable outcome. But he testifies that the sudden withdrawal of Portugal from its African provinces would plunge them into economic disintegration. Portugal gives them a lingua franca, unifying a complex of fragmented societies in a vast but sparsely populated land. It has contributed an authentic urban society and a whole class of European artisans and skilled workers perhaps unique in the African Continent.

My own belief is that the best of both worlds—namely, local autonomy for the provinces plus a continuing link with Portugal—many yet be achieved provided that Portugal lives up to the ideals it professes and furthermore provided that the outside world comes to see that these ideals have merit and discontinues its tactics of constant harassment.

Much depends, of course, on developments in Portugal itself, where new influences are shaping up. The Lisbon opposition groups frankly admit that the Portuguese temperament does not lend itself to British or American prototypes of government. What they are seeking is to free the present monolithic social struture through broadening the influence of various groups—commercial, professional, trade union, and the church. This is important. Salazar is now well into his seventies. The succession problem is acute. When he steps down it need not be a case of "aprés moi le déluge." But the organization of a consultative opposition is an immediate urgency.

A PORTUGESE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS?

What one asks from Portugal is not a surrender but a fulfillment. The multiracial ideal need not be abandoned provided that Portugal continues to work toward more home rule in Africa, and second that it considers the subsequent possibilities of a Portuguese Commonwealth of Nations, each independent, all united in everything that the Portuguese mystique has to offer, with the fullest scope for an interracial cross fertilization of cultures. This would incidentally loosen the provinces economically from the tight leash now held by Lisbon, and leave them free to tackle the world markets on their own account. This long-range solution appeals to some of the best minds in Portugal, in Angola, and in Mozambique.

But whether this or any other solution is to work depends to no little degree on outside world opinion and its understanding of the issues. There can be little doubt in the mind of any serious thinker that the world's understanding of the application of democracy requires an agonizing reappraisal. This is true in the case of judgment of Portugal, where as noted even the opopsition to Salazar has its doubts about simply importing forms of government from the outside. It is much more evident in the case of Africa and other underdeveloped areas, where nominal democracy has all too often turned into a new form of tyranny. It has long been plain that many African and Latin American countries require a new form of democracy, something that belongs to their special characters, combining parliamentary forms with needed and basic stability and authority. U.S. policy, though the product of a nation whose own democracy contains many authoritarian and bureaucratic features, is perhaps the worst offender at fostering the free-for-all in Africa. All too often the confusion simply leads to one-man rule—Nyerere, Ben Bella, Nkrumah, Sékou Touré. When compared with some of these results, the Portuguese experiment in Africa still looks hopeful.

But the crucial question posed by events in Africa and the Portuguese presence there is simply whether or not we want the world to divide on racial lines. Maj. Patrick Wall recently urged in the House of Commons the "appalling dangers" of a world divided by race. "This," he said "is the nightmare, the appalling thought." He went on: "There was a chance that the races might live together in the Central African Federation and so exert its influence to the north and to the south. But now that experiment has broken down, we shall have a barrier of race on the Zambezi, with African-controlled states to the north, and white government to the south. I only put this to the House in order to show the dangers inherent in the racial approach to world politics." The entire evolution of the human race, biological, historical, and philosophical, is the story of nature's aptitude for enrichment through the spawning hybrid, constantly fanning itself out through mergers and marriages and mixtures.

INSTEAD OF A WORLD DIVIDED BY RACE

As Salazar put it to me last summer, we have to ask ourselves which is the more honest: to state the case for multiracialism as Portugal does, or to profess an anticolonial policy that is really a disguise for neocolonial domination of Africa from outside through control of finance, the unions, and big business? Nothing was gained when Lenin turned the concept of colonization into its dirtier form of colonialism. But all men have rights to the use of the fruits of the earth and these rights may limit the rights even of private property. The whole human race has an equitable easement over the whole of the world. Local rights cannot be driven to the point where national sovereignty barriers and the modern nationalist heresies dam up the flow of an interracial and international dialog and cooperation geared to the benefit of all mankind. No one can deny that the whole human race was entitled to some sort of stake in the vast, untilled spaces of the American Continent. The methods employed by the settlers, and the degree of respect afforded to the equally valid local rights of the Indian peoples already there, may come in for much valid criticism. But the world would be a sorry place today had an exaggerated view of the rights of American Indians denied to human history the vast wonders of the greatest multiracial experiement of all time, now incarnate in the United States, or to the whole human race some share in the immeasurable material fruits of the northern subcontinent. And one must ask: Is the whole history of the United States from now until the end of time to be one vast act of penitence for its very existence?

One thing is plain. Portuguese Africa today is throbbing with a new vitality and social sense. If Portugal goes, who takes over? A nearly bankrupt United Nations? Adoula's harboring of Angolian rebels does not prevent him from warning them privately not to go too far. He knows that if war does break out, it will be a long one. The Portuguese whites would fight to the death. The result would be either an embittered white minority government in Angola and Mozambique, or an extremist African nationalism in the saddle with intertribal conflicts rocking huge areas of the southern half of the continent. This is surely a time, not for disbanding, but for the encouragement of a gradually unfolding system that, with all its defects, contains a promise of worldwide significance, a new and very much greater uhuru for all men of all colors who care to invest in it and export it.

Under the New Order Is It a Crime To Own Property?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, have we now reached the point in our 30-year march down the road to socialism that it is a crime to own property?

This is not a facetious question. Recent Federal orders taking away the rights of the owners of private property to manage their own affairs coupled with some strange rulings of the courts make it apparent that it is going to become increasingly difficult to own and manage your personal property.

New York courts have upheld rent strikes and have made it legal for tenants to refuse to pay rent when, in the tenant's opinion, satisfactory repairs or sufficient heat is not furnished. A story from the New York Times of February 4 recites the case of a 57-year-old woman being sentenced to 90 days in the workhouse for failing to supply heat to her tenants. Certainly people who rent should be protected from inhuman or unreasonable treatment, but what of the property owner? Has he no right under the law? Is the administration's war on poverty to mean an all-out assault on private enterprise? All too often this is what the New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier programs have meant.

In much of the legislation this session of Congress is working on, or is to be asked to consider, the right to own and manage one's property is under attack.

This is so in title II of the civil rights bill. It is true in much of the housing legislation demanded by the administration wherein local communities and private citizens must conform to Federal standards and the ideas for social reform as promulgated by bureaucrats bent on reshaping the Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I warn that unless we soon demand an end to these assaults on the rights and freedom of our people, we will destroy the capitalist system and the United States as we have known it.

To conclude these remarks I would like to include an article from the Wall Street Journal of February 4, 1964, "The Rights of Landlords," which sets forth court rulings to put the rights of tenants above the rights of property owners; and the news item previously referred to from the New York Times of February 4, "Weeping Landlady Gets 90-Day Term for Lack of Heat."

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 4, 1964]

THE RIGHTS OF LANDLORDS—ARE THEY THREATENED BY DRIVE AGAINST SLUM PROPERTY?

(By Laurence G. O'Donnell)

NEW YORK.—Are the historic rights of landlords being threatened in New York by the concerted efforts of slum-dwelling tenants to improve their housing conditions?

Many reputable property owners here, while sympathetic with the tenants' aims, are plainly worried that such may be the case. In particular they are fretting about a series of rulings by a Brooklyn judge and about certain legislative proposals which all have one common legal approach: In varying degrees they permit aggrieved tenants to stay in their apartments—without paying rent—if it can be shown that the landlords failed to provide services or maintenance in such a way as to make the apartments a threat to life, health and safety.

The landlords believe this rent abatement technique to be an open invitation to abuses. The approach, they argue, is much tougher on landlords than traditional remedies available to tenants in such cases. Under normal circumstances, if a tenant feels he isn't getting proper services or the so-called beneficial use of his rented quarters he can simply move. He probably wouldn't be held liable for any unpaid rent and the landlord would end up with a vacancy—not an occupied, unpaid-for apartment.

When apartments are scarce, as low-rent quarters currently are in New York City, the tenant can go on a rent strike, an approach that is gaining popularity, especially among civil rights groups. In a rent strike, the tenant usually pays his rent to a third party who holds the funds until repairs are made or services restored. Even the rent strike doesn't overly concern reputable landlords for it only defers rent payments.

But rent abatement strikes a sensitive nerve. "This is pretty serious," says an official of one property owners' group. "It's something you cant get back because the tenant has lived there free."

RAMIFICATIONS ARE TREMENDOUS

Protests an official of a realty firm: "Now the tenant becomes the judge and the jury. Who sets the standards for abatement? It is the tenant. The ramifications are tremendous."

Advocates of the rent abatement technique insist the fears of landlords are groundless. First of all, they argue, most tenants don't want to cheat building owners of their rent. What's more, they assert, landlords are protected in one way or another under the various formulas that have been proposed. Either the tenant must notify the landlord of his complaint or the existence of violations of city housing or health ordinances must be proven. One proposal would give landlords 6 months to make repairs.

Finally, the proabatement argument goes, withholding rents from slumlords helps good landlords because the direct financial pressure puts the slumlord out of business.

Yet none of these arguments allays the fears of landlords that the rent abatement technique will be abused by tenants with small complaints. One attorney for a major New York property owner puts it this way: "As a tenant you can easily build up your grievance to a point where you don't pay rent. It is physically impossible to find any apartment house in New York City where an inspector couldn't find a violation. If the tenant can get this violation found, he can stop paying rents."

Actually, some landlords see rent abatement as only the latest in a series of encroachments on their prerogatives. They're irate over the continuance in New York City of rent control—a wartime restriction on rent increases—long after it has been dropped in other cities. They contend that rent control helps create slums, since it makes it harder to recoup the cost of improvements through rent increases. And although property owners provide the biggest chunk of the city's revenues through realty taxes, they complain that, apparently for political reasons, there's more official concern about the rights of tenants than of landlords.

Backers of the various forms of rent abatement counter that landlords are badly misreading the situation. A special committee on housing of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York contends that "from the days of Peter Stuyvesant to the present we have never had, or at least availed ourselves of, an adequate means of enforcing building standards."

PROSPECTS FOR REDRESS

It's generally conceded that slum tenants can't expect much help from city hall because city agencies in the housing field are generally overworked and understaffed. And the bar association's committee finds prospects for tenants' redress through the courts not much better.

In supporting the rent abatement method of crackdown on slumlords, the bar association committee calls it "the most likely to succeed and to provide the least radical change in existing law." The committee believes that rent abatement, far from involving any new philosophy, "is but a logical extension of the ancient, honored rule of 'partial eviction.'"

To explain "partial eviction," it quotes an 1854 New York court decision. "If the landlord enter wrongfully upon or prevents the tenant from the enjoyment of a part of the demised premises, the whole rent is suspended until possession is restored." The philosophy of this approach, the committee says, was further explained by Judge Benjamin Cardozo, later an associate Supreme Court justice, in a 1917 ruling: "If such an action though partial only is the act of the landlord, it suspends the entire rent because the landlord is not permitted to apportion his own wrong."

JUDGE MORITT'S RULINGS

The same line of reasoning has been employed by Fred G. Moritt, the Brooklyn judge who has upheld the right of tenants to withhold their rents and continue to live in their apartments until major repairs are made and services, such as heat, restored. To other tenants with similar complaints, he has returned rents that had been placed in escrow with the court under earlier rulings of other judges. He bases all of these decisions on the concept of "partial" eviction, associates say.

Judge Moritt's decisions, more than anything else, have stirred a legal dispute about the various forms of eviction and their legal remedies. Real estate lawyers generally believe that slum tenants most often are victims of "constructive eviction"—that is, they are "wrongfully deprived of the beneficial enjoyment" of their apartments—but that their only remedy is to move out. Only in cases of "actual eviction" where part of the apartment is physically taken away from the tenant can he continue to occupy his remaining quarters rent free, most attorneys for real estate interests say.

"Moritt's decision is unprecedented," says one.

Judge Moritt, 58, a flamboyant former legislator and an acknowledged crusader against slumlords, heatedly denounces his growing horde of critics. Leaning across the bench in his dingy courtroom, he dismisses the notion that the principles of his decisions are novel. "It's pure Cardozo," he insists.

AVOIDING APPEALS

Although many property owners are steamed up over Judge Moritt's decisions, they don't intend to join in any appeals. "We'd be on the unpopular side," says a spokesman for one property owners' group. "Our stand might be taken as condoning substandard living." Most real estate lawyers are confident Judge Moritt's decisions will be overturned anyhow.

But such a reversal, if it should come, wouldn't end the wrangling over the rent abatement technique, encroachment of landlord's rights and the legal definitions of eviction. One Manhattan assemblyman, Paul J. Curran, already has introduced a bill in Albany incorporating the important features of Judge Moritt's decisions. Its legal basis, Mr. Curran says, is "partial constructive eviction." It's know that other bills, similarly aimed at protecting tenants from slumlords, are being drafted.

It may be too soon to know whether the forebodings of New York's landlords are exaggerated. But urban apartment owners across the country who may be wondering what impact battles against slumlords may have in their communities, can watch New York for clues. It's certain to be the testing ground of the rent abatement technique.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1964]

WEEPING LANDLADY GETS 90-DAY TERM FOR LACK OF HEAT

A sobbing landlady was sentenced to 90 days in the workhouse yesterday an hour after she had appeared before the city council to denounce rent controls.

"In the name of God," she shouted at the councilmen, "in the name of our former President Kennedy, do not destroy and ruin the small-property owners."

Then Mrs. Lilly Harris walked the 50 yards or so to the old criminal courthouse behind city hall and was sentenced at about 5:30 p.m. by Judge Manuel A. Gomez for failing to supply heat to her tenants at 129 Rivington Street. Judge Gomez had held his court open all day for Mrs. Harris's appearance despite the fact that he had disposed of all his other cases before noon.

In addition to the 90-day sentence, Judge Gomez ordered that Mrs. Harris pay a $200 fine or be jailed for 30 more days. Mrs. Harris began to cry.

Her lawyer, Arnold Schildhaus, said he would seek bail for his client this morning in supreme court and appeal her case later.

In pronouncing the maximum sentence, Judge Gomez said Mrs. Harris, who is 57 years old, had "no feeling for human beings." Mr. Schildhaus retaliated that Judge Gomez was "not a fair and impartial judge."

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 1, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, it is imperative to have a sound civil rights bill placed on the statute books in the immediate future. After Congress enacts legislation clarifying the situation throughout the Nation, then much of the turmoil and confusion will begin to subside. When people know their legal rights and remedies, the need and temptation for other types of action will be removed.

It is now 100 years since the Civil War. It is a long time since the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution were added. There is no question in my mind but that these amendments were intended to insure equal opportunity in every field for every citizen of the United States. Every citizen is entitled to the same chance for advancement and for the right to do the same things that other citizens are entitled to do just so long as they behave in an orderly and legal fashion.

The bill is an extension of authority by the Federal Government. But that authority is limited by the terms of the proposed legislation. The civil rights legislation now in force in Pennsylvania (and it has been on the statute books in our State for some years) is quite similar to the bill now pending before the House. A number of other States have similar legislation. In my opinion, it would have been far better if we had had more progress along this line in the past. We must take this opportunity to insure that everyone, regardless of color, race, creed, or national origin, shall be treated alike and have the same rights, privileges, and immunities throughout the Nation.

I am delighted that this bill came before the House under a rule from the Rules Committee. If it should have come up by means of a discharge petition, the bill would have been subject to points of order. It might have been thrown out entirely. As it is, the rule waived all points of order, thereby insuring a vote on the bill. Also, the hearings before the Rules Committee provided valuable information for my colleagues and me to consider in connection with the bill and the amendments which will be offered to it.

Since an orderly procedure has been followed, that fact will certainly be helpful in securing votes in favor of limiting debate when the Senate reaches the final showdown. All of us know that vote will really be the key vote on this whole matter. If the House had not followed this method, Members of the other body, who oppose cloture on principle, would certainly have used the House's departure from custom as a strong additional reason to vote against the imposition of cloture. No doubt some Senators would have been influenced by such an argument. Every vote will be needed when cloture is at issue, for two-thirds vote is required. As it is, I look forward with confidence to the passage of this bill by both Houses. I firmly believe that this measure, in basically its present form, will be enacted into law.

I have advocated civil rights legislation for many, many years. Progress has been slow, but I am happy that the final goal is now in sight.

Let me give this one word of warning. Legislation in itself is not the final cure. The final solution to the problem will take time, adjustment, and effort. In the last analysis, the answer can only be found in the hearts of men and women. May we all direct our thoughts to the great Christian principle of the equality of man. May the Divine Spirit instill in everyone the realization that their neighbors are all equal before God.

Reason and Emotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a current comment coming from the office of Life Line explains the difference between reason and emotion and makes the point why we should depend more upon the latter than we do upon the former.

I found the essay particularly readable and hereby insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The essay follows:

REASON AND EMOTION

(By Bob White)

There are two ways, among others, to approach any real problem or issue in our own personal lives or in the life of our country. Often we try them both, at different times; but we need to understand them thoroughly, their prospects and their pitfalls, if we are to live and act wisely.

One of those ways is reason, or commonsense; the other is emotion, or feeling.

Neither is good or bad in itself; both can be well used or misused. But all history shows, and our own personal experience can tell us, that response to feeling more often leads us astray, especially when we cut it off from reason and place feeling in direct opposition to reason. This is especially true in dealing with any great public question, where each side already has its full quota of emotion and someone has to put commonsense to work in sorting out truth from nonsense.

Feeling can of course be noble and wonderful, and unjustily criticized. The feeling most Americans have, or used to have on seeing our flag or hearing the national anthem is a perfect example. It is wholly constructive; it helps to build the best that is in us; it is not at war with reason but allied to it, since reason tells us emphatically that no people in all history had better cause to revere and bless their country than we have.

But other feelings are not so good, and if unchecked by reason and good sense can soon get us and America into serious trouble.

It is easy to feel anger, or pity, or prejudice, or personal dislike; little effort is involved. It is often much harder to reason matters out so as to get at the truth although every man, once he has done that, has the right to feel himself more truly and fully a human being for having done so. This is because detailed and logical reasoning is the one thing man can do that no other living creature can. This ability raises us above the level of the brute and the beast and enables us to see the brightest goals mankind can reach.

All around us today, as through all of man's history, are those who seek to stir up our emotions and cloud our reason for their own purposes, to win us over to their side and their ends not by reasoned argument but by arousing feelings we cannot control and do not try to analyze. Sometimes these attempts can best be resisted by stirring up strong feelings on the other side, the right side. But this is dangerous; it is playing with fire. Strong feelings can so easily get out of hand. The best way to resist attempts to persuade us by emotion of something we do not now believe—and have good reason for not believing—is to stick as closely and as tightly as we can to good old-fashioned commonsense.

Reason is actually nothing more than commonsense used in a pattern of thinking. The word "reason" may have a far-off abstract ring, as though only a professor of philosophy would know how to use it. Actually many professors of philosophy today shy away from reason and are not sure they really approve of it. (Perhaps this is because so few of the ideas they accept can be justified by reason.) The commonsense of most Americans and the sound thinking of our most dedicated constructives are the true examples of reason in action today. Our country itself was founded on the principles of reason; Thomas Jefferson is generally considered one of the greatest thinkers of what has been called the age of reason, and the Declaration of Independence which he wrote is one of its finest products.

Most of us know a fine and constructive feeling when we simply hear the words of Thomas Jefferson's magnificent declaration that all men have the inalienable rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." But this declaration is founded first of all upon reason—in Jefferson's words upon "the law of nature and of nature's God" as understood and applied by men. These rights are not the creation of propaganda or mere rootless emotion. They are the rights which reason tells us a man must enjoy if his existence is to have any meaning, make any sense in a universe ruled by natural and divine law.

Note the contrast between these rights and the new, artificial, so-called rights which some are now trying to foist upon us—alleged rights to a guaranteed income, to live in a certain kind of house and to be hired for certain kinds of jobs whether qualified or not. These are not natural rights. They are not based upon reason. Those who assert them sidestep or refuse to answer the question of who is to provide the income to be guaranteed, who is to pay for the housing and furnish the jobs, and by what right and standard such persons are to be forced to do these things. It may be desirable to help those in real need. It may be a moral duty. But it is not a right anyone can claim in reason. Rights are given by

nature and by nature's God, not by the demand or the request of any one man to another.

National economic policy is above all no place for emotion; yet all too many rely on little else in presenting their economic ideas ot the public.

Now let's look at some examples of how emotion can mislead us and reason lead us rightly in the discussion of public issues. We'll start with two seemingly magic words, "peace" and "welfare."

It would be hard to find a single sane American actually and sincerely opposed to either peace or welfare. Everybody is for them. The great question is simply how both are to be achieved.

Reason and experience tell us that peace cannot be achieved by the mere wish of a man or a country. Reason and experience, carried further, show us that in fact attempts to win peace by mere wishing have actually made war more likely. Wishing only convinces would-be aggressors that their ambitions would not be resisted in the only language they can understand: force. Reason and experience tell us that in a dangerous world stalked by tyranny, whatever peace we have can be kept only by strength and deterrence. No one has ever successfully challenged this reasoning on its own terms.

Yet still we have a constant agitation for seeking peace by disarmament, by weakening ourselves instead of strengthening ourselves, by wishing harder and hoping harder and begging our foes to join us.

Not a single reasonable, commonsense argument can be found in support of this program. It was all tried just a generation ago and led directly to the most terrible war in history. The advocates of peace by disarmament and weakness have nothing left to do but ring all the emotional changes on that magic word "peace" trying to drown reason, commonsense and history alike in a sea of futile wishing and pointless feeling.

It is the same with that other magic word "welfare." Reason and experience tell us that there is no real and lasting welfare without human dignity, and that human dignity demands that a man support himself and live his own life free of bureaucratic control. Commonsense tells us that the man who is free, though without a penny in his pocket, can claim more real welfare for himself than the man in jail who is certain of food, clothing, and shelter—so long as he remains behind bars. Reason and experience show us that the freest nations throughout history have been the most prosperous and created the highest standard of living for their citizens.

Yet still the attempt is made to put freedom and welfare in opposition to each other, to claim that welfare requires the restriction of freedom and that we must give up freedom for welfare's sake. No reasonable, commonsense argument can be advanced to prove this. So those who assert it fall back once again upon emotion, on our pity for the unfortunate and on uglier feelings such as envy and resentment, calling upon us to demand that our most productive citizens be penalized for the sake of our needy—losing sight of the fact that an even higher level of productivity is the only lasting cure for need and want anywhere.

More recently, in a moment of tragedy for our Nation, an extraordinary attempt was made to use sheer emotion as a weapon against American constructiveness, by implying that they had a hand in the cruel murder of our President even though every fact in evidence showed that the deed was done by an avowed pro-Communist. Reason left little room for doubt as to the killer and his true background. Yet emotion was used to cloud the issue and bring into disfavor active patriots who had criticized certain Washington policies.

The American people owe it to themselves and the future of their country to demand of every man who comes before them to urge an idea of a program that he make sense about it, that he face up to reality, that he give reasons why it should be adopted or why his point of view is correct. Once this has been done, then feeling may join with reason in support of that idea or program, just as constructives join feeling with reason in their soundly based patriotism. But reason must come first. We must be sure that what we are first makes sense. Otherwise we will be easy prey for every agitator who would lead us and the country astray for his own purposes.

Patriots and constructives everywhere should make a special effort to learn the reasonable basis for all of their own beliefs and programs, so that they may not only preach reason but practice it. We should know not only what we are for but why we are for it. The founders of this Nation knew both with a thoroughness unmatched since their time. Their success stands as an example for what we can do. Freedom and reasaon are allies. One cannot exist without the other.

Tax Relief for College Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as I was driving home last night, I heard Edward Morgan announce that the administration had won a narrow victory in the other body, and so I listened to learn the nature of that victory, and I found that the other body had decided, 48 to 45, to deny a tax deduction for colleges expenses proposed by the junior Senator from Connecticut.

The administration had won a victory against higher education.

An administration devoted to education, or so we were led to believe in the state of the Union message, had strained every resource to deny college students and their parents the modest encouragement and assistance that could stem from deducting college expenses.

And the AFL–CIO commentator said that opponents of this relief believed it would help those who need help least.

Need help least? Who are they talking about?

I have many case histories in my files. Consider the parents of three above-average students, all of college age, who have put a new mortgage on their home, drive a 10-year-old car, deny themselves new clothing and all entertainment, work at two jobs to try to keep these youngsters in school, and the children are working too. Need it least? I cannot think of anyone who needs the modest relief this amendment would have offered more than a couple like this one, and there are millions of them.

How about the working widow with a college son who is also working, risking the loss of a scholarship because he cannot keep up his grades while working full time? Who thinks these people do not need tax relief?

For that matter, how about the young man working his way through college, or perhaps with a wife who is working, while trying to rear little children. The senior Senator from New Hampshire proposed an exemption for this young couple. It was rejected as well. The administration said "No."

No relief. No help for higher education unless it is through Federal Government controlled scholarships and loans, Federal control, Federal handouts, Federal subsidies, Federal programs—but not one bit of relief from Federal taxation.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what the administration may say hereafter about higher education, no matter what promises or programs may be offered, all will have a hollow ring of hypocrisy because this administration strong armed the members of its party into defeating the most simple, effective, easily administered and readily available kind of assistance that the Federal Government has it in its power to offer.

I am the author of a House bill far more generous, I believe, than the proposed Senate amendment. I propose a tax deduction covering all expenses of a college education, and I propose that it be available to any parent or student or any benefactor who may wish to pay the expenses of a student. If we truly wish to encourage higher education, let us do so. College expenses, like most everything else, are a burden because the Federal Government takes too large a share of everyone's earnings. The administration proposes tax relief to encourage spending and investment. The administration proposes tax relief to spur the economy. How can the administration oppose tax relief to encourage education?

I am sorely distressed and I think I speak for millions of American parents and students when I say that no more cruel blow has been struck against the ambitions, the aspirations, the hopes, and the futures of those young Americans to whom this small concession might mean the difference between going to college and staying at home to join the ranks of the undereducated unemployed about whom this administration so hypocritically pretends to be concerned.

J. Raiford Watson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1964, Mississippi lost one of its most outstanding and useful citizens, John Raiford Watson, of Jackson.

At the time of his death, Mr. Watson was executive director of the Mississippi Railroad Association. Previously, he had rendered notable public service as assistant secretary of the Mississippi State Senate.

Mr. Watson was well known to the Mississippi delegation in Congress and

Members from other States. He was extremely well liked because of his charm, intelligence, and gracious bearing. Raiford Watson was a gentleman, and will be greatly missed by all who knew him. I shall especially miss his sage counsel, his helpful spirit, and his friendship which was manifested in many ways.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Mississippi State Legislature honoring his memory. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION HONORING J. RAIFORD WATSON, OF MISSISSIPPI

Whereas, our Almighty Creator, in his all-knowing and infinite wisdom has called home one of his faithful servants, J. Raiford Watson; and

Whereas, Mr. Watson, son of the late Senator John Stewart Watson, Sr., of Lexington, was well known and highly respected in the public affairs of his State, having served it with distinction as assistant secretary of state for 5 years, as secretary of the senate during the first administration of Gov. Hugh White, and as a member of the executive committee of the agricultural and industrial board for 8 years; and

Whereas, at the time of his death, Mr. Watson was the executive director of the Mississippi Railroad Association; and

Whereas his host of friends throughout the State will miss his helpful and intelligent counsel, his unfailing courtesy, his gentle wit and his outstanding contribution to the progress of his community and his State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby commend the public and private life of J. Raiford Watson and express publicly our deep regret at his untimely death and extend our sincere sympathy to his family, his associates and his many friends.

RIAS Shutdown Is Appeasement of Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the powerful longwave broadcast transmitter of RIAS—Radio in the American Sector—beamed from Munich to listeners through central Europe was shut down by the U.S. Government.

Barron's Weekly, an old and respectable financial publication has charged that the shutdown of this effective propaganda weapon is part of a secret bargain made last summer, under which the Kremlin has stopped jamming Voice of America broadcasts in Russian.

During last summer's negotiation on the Moscow test ban treaty the charge was explicitly denied that any secret side agreement was discussed or arrived at. Is Barron's Weekly right? Or, does the RIAS shutdown represent a significant separate concession to the Soviets? The American people are entitled to a statement from their Government on this point.

Since the loyalty of Moscow's satellite subjects, to which RIAS was beamed is far shakier than that of native Russians, to which Voice of America broadcasts in Russian are beamed, the United States appears to have made a very bad deal. The American people are entitled to a statement from their Government on this point.

Both explanations assume particular importance because of reports that most Germans regard the RIAS shutdown as a prime example of U.S. appeasement of the Communists in the name of "relaxation of tensions."

An indication of how little substance there is to that term was provided last week when the Soviet Air Force shot down an unarmed U.S. Air Force T-39 trainer which inadverently strayed across the East German border. Three American officers lost their lives to this example of "relaxation of tensions" and "peaceful coexistence" as the Russians define these terms. I believe most Americans agree with my belief that bargaining on such terms is the height of senseless futility.

KDKA Supports Coal Mine Safety Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the bills which I have sponsored, H.R. 4459, to extend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, is similar to legislation which my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman JOHN H. DENT, has successfully steered through the Committee on Education and Labor. It is now on the Union Calendar awaiting a rule.

In this regard, I submit the following editorial by Pittsburgh radio and television station KDKA urging Congress to enact this much-needed legislation:

Lost in the battles over civil rights and other major legislation during the 1963 session of Congress were a number of small, but nonetheless important bills. One of these would place small coal mines under Federal safety regulations.

The lack of Federal inspection in mines employing less than 15 men is the greatest safety hazard in mining today. The grim tragedy of three men trapped in a Hazleton, Pa., mine last summer—one of whom died—was a shocking example. But this is an oft-repeated tragedy. One-third of the mining deaths occur in these small mining pits, although they produce only about one-ninth of the Nation's coal tonnage.

To halt this senseless and unnecessary loss of lives, Pittsburgh district Congressman JOHN DENT introduced a bill that would put small mines under Federal safety regulations, just as the big mines are regulated. This legislation is bottled up in the House Rules Committee. Mining officials claim it would put many small mining pits out of business.

Well, if this is so, it would be a good thing. Coal should be produced only in mines that take proper safeguards to protect the lives of the men working in the dangerous underground pits.

Now that a new session of Congress is beginning, the House Rules Committee should give the small mines safety bill a full hearing. It is up to the chairman, HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, to set a date for the hearing and expedite this legislation for a vote by Congress.

Every day lost increases the hazard of unnecessary death in the small mining pits. We cannot afford any more Hazleton tragedies.

Congress Slow? Sure, and Be Glad of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 2, 1964, my hometown daily newspaper, the Gastonia Gazette, carried a very fine editorial entitled "Congress Slow? Sure and Be Glad of It."

The editorial is a very splendid answer to those who so glibly criticize the Congress for its deliberative approach to legislative matters. The words of the editorial should be brought to the attention of all of our people.

Under unanimous consent I place the editorial in the Appendix:

CONGRESS SLOW? SURE, AND BE GLAD OF IT

There are many fine sports today which are being enjoyed by spectators that hardly knew spectators before.

Television has brought the man in the den a bird's-eye view of outstanding Olympic events, golf matches, tennis matches, bowling, etc.

We sometimes get excited over barrel jumping or discus throwing or pole vaulting, whereas before we might have had to pause and look up the game in the encyclopedia.

Football is running wild. There are some who will argue endlessly that this sport has taken over from baseball as our national pastime.

But, the real sport of the proletariat is older than most of these sports, and even now it seems to be picking up momentum like it has never known before.

This sport is knocking Congress.

Seldom in history has that body been under such attack. It's not the U.S. Congress any more; it's the do-nothing Congress, whether one is referring to the 87th or 88th or any other of recent vintage.

The sad thing is that so many people these days take it for granted that the constitutional purpose of Congress is mainly to criticize the President (whoever he might be) and keep him from grabbing too much power, and to pass only those laws which one side is able to jam through with main force, or slip by on the grease slopped over from the ever-normal pork barrel.

Aside from this basic function, the popular impression goes, Congressmen divide their time between endless hearings on gangsters and other seamy citizens and holding interviews with reporters in which they discuss what legislation is going to be considered in the current session, when it will go through, how it will be gotten through, how it will be changed before it gets through, or why it won't go through at all.

True, a romatic picture of Congressmen still survives among the young—a picture of white-maned, floppy-tied solons debating hotly in the aisles of Senate or House.

Actually, most speeches printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were never delivered.

Those that were, were read during an off hour when page boys outnumbered the Congressmen present.

Just about everyone has a grievance against Congress. Those who jump on Congress, however, because it didn't rush immediately through the administration's foreign aid or medicare or civil rights bills are on shaky ground.

Congress is about like the old woman who lived in a shoe. Its got so many committees it doesn't know what to do.

But it does deliberate. This is its function. This is the best guarantee of wise legislation.

The fact that some bills get bogged down in committees has been enough for some people to call for a vast shuffling of Congress. New laws. New procedures. New rules for committees.

These people would streamline Congress, they say. This means that they would make it much easier for good legislation to get through both Houses.

Before anyone goes off halfcocked, let them consider that what they refer to as good legislation might not mean that it is for everyone. And, if the slide has been greased, what's to prevent bad legislation from taking the easy route?

Congress was designed to be a slow and deliberative body. This is one of the built-in checks and balances.

It seems of late that Congress hasn't been doing anything because it has kept some of the prime bills in the stable. These are prime because the promoters say they are prime. These are bills that would affect history.

Medicare, civil rights, mass transit, others.

If Congress were not a slowly deliberating body, if, indeed, it didn't consider such bills and then go back to consider them again, and again our country would have been entirely in the Socialist camp before now, instead of only part of the way.

With these thoughts in mind, thank the Lord for a slow-moving Congress.

Now, back to the favorite pastime of cussin' the Congressman.

Judge Daniel A. Covelli's Tribute to the American Committee on Italian Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the American Committee on Italian Migration sponsored a huge rally in Chicago urging changes in our present immigration law which seriously discriminates against those who want to emigrate to America from many nations including Italy.

The rally was held in huge McCormick Palace and more than 5,000 Americans of Italian descent participated.

Mr. Speaker, this huge success was in no small measure brought about by the untiring efforts of Mr. Frank Annunzio, chairman of the rally, who is among the most active and highly respected leaders of the American-Italian community in Chicago.

One of Chicago's most highly respected jurists, Judge Daniel A. Covelli of the superior court, was among the principal speakers.

Because of the depth of understanding which Judge Covelli gave this subject, Mr. Speaker, I am requesting that his entire speech be placed in the RECORD at this time.

There can be no question that our present immigration laws help perpetuate the separation of families. President Johnson has stated that he hopes our immigration laws will be amended to permit families to be reunited. I strongly support this concept.

Judge Covelli's excellent remarks follow:

AMERICA—THE LAND BEQUEATHED TO THE WORLD

My fellow Americans of Italian ancestry, our challenge is at hand. The time of our trial is too long prolonged. Now is the hour of our decision, of our determination and of our commitment. Shall we accept it?

Few times in the history of America has an integrated immigrant group been faced with so patent an injustice, of inequity and discrimination, as the one which brings us together today.

Presently the innocent victims of an unjust, unscientific, discriminatory immigration law, we are in a position to show our united strength and resolve to come out of the shroud of injustice and stereotype of which our immigrant ancestors and we have been the scapegoats. It is difficult to imagine that in a God-fearing and democratic republic such as ours, which has been born of the talent and sacrifice, yes, the very blood of the immigrant could wallow in a prejudice of late 19th century vintage. But today, in this country, in these United States, this prejudice and discrimination has been sanctified in the form of a law of the land. This cannot be, we say; but it is so.

What are we asking of the Congress of the United States? Very simply, we are asking for an equalization of immigration laws, the equal disribution of quotas in the immigration to all countries, regardless of the national origin of the immigrants themselves. The national origins section of the present immigration law does not equally distribute quotas to all countries because of a prejudice which has been fed by lies and halftruths to our legislators about persons from Southern Europe. As a result, for example, Northern European countries may send 75,000 persons to the United States per year. This is one-half of the entire quota of 150,000. Italy may send only 5,600. Not only, but these countries use just about one-fourth of their quota, while Italians and others have to wait. The present law will not allow countries who have overdrawn their quota to make use of this unused portion of the quota. This means in simple terms that there are 260,000 Italians waiting to enter the United States, and under the present law this would take 40 years.

But what are the reasons why Italians have been given such a low quota in the immigration law of 1952, called the McCarran-Walter Act? Some typical reasons circulated at the beginning of this century are:

1. Speaking of the typical Italian immigrant, one American penologist said: "The knife with which he cuts his bread, he also uses to lop off another Dago's ear * * * he is quite familiar with the sight of human blood as with the sight of the food he eats."

2. An American newspaper once said this about Italians: "The disposition to assassinate in revenge for a fancied wrong is a marked trait in the character of this impulsive and inexorable race."

3. Senator Pat McCarran himself, when advocating the passage of his bill in 1952 warned that there may be 5 million aliens in the United States "including militant Communists, Sicilian bandits and other criminals at large."

Are these reasons logical? Are they scientific? Are they democratic? Are they just? Are they a worthy reward for the contribution of the immigrants to American culture and life from the revolutionary days to the present? Names like Mazzuchelli, Kino, Tonti, Fermi, are part of American history and culture. We must take advantage of our chance to have these laws based on the national origins system of distribution repealed.

President Truman during his administration in 1952, vetoed the McCarran-Walter Act, but the forces of hate and prejudice, supported by the very Congress of the United States, upheld the act despite the pleas of millions of Americans of Italian extraction. Whether for political expediency or advantage, or because of the fact that Members of the Congress thought Italians just would not care. Who knows? But the time has come for us to rally to our cause in demanding the repeal of this outdated and prejudicial system.

Today, many Congressmen inspired by the illumined leadership of our beloved and late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, are willing to support the cause we have fought for over a decade to bring back to public scrutiny. Some of those illustrious Senators and Congressmen are seated on this stage this afternoon.

If the reasons which motivated Members of the Congress to adopt the prejudicial McCarran-Walter Act were unfounded and illogical, the motives which the late President had, to introduce this revision of the immigration laws and the abolition of the national origins portion of them, are solid and founded on the firm belief in the contribution of the immigrant to America and her way of life. In his statement of introduction, President Kennedy said on July 23 of this year:

"The use of the national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations such a system is an anachorism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth."

Senator HART, cosponsor of the bill together with Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, said on the same day:

"No provision of national law has been more repugnant to many peoples throughout the world * * * than judging a man's worth for immigration to our Nation on the basis of birth or the racial necessity of his parents. This meanness of spirit of our law is alien and apart from the great traditions of this Nation. We are morally committed * * * to seek a national policy which will make the simple truth of the words of St. Paul—'God * * * hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth.' "

Now let's get down to the facts. What does this proposed law mean to Italians? It means basically:

1. Parents of U.S. citizens would enter the United States as nonquota immigrants.

2. Italy would receive 16,478 quota visas per year instead of a mere 5,600.

3. Parents of resident aliens would be included in the fourth preference category for quotas, instead of waiting out-of-quota. This would cut down the waiting list of thousands of Italians who are waiting to come to America to join loved ones and relatives.

These reasons are solid. They are not based on a nationalism categorically in opposition to our American way of life.

My fellow citizens of Italian extraction, we are at a crossroads, and the decision is ours. Why should we 25 million Americans of Italian extraction sit muted and disgraced, second-class citizens because of the villainy of a few who bear Italian names and have betrayed the sacred religious and cultural tradition which has been ours for centuries? We must make our voices heard and appreciated and respected. We must keep ever before the minds of our country, of our President, and our Congressman and Senators, yes, of the world, this urgent plea for self-respect and honor. There is practically no chance that this legislation (S. 1932) will get to the floor of the Congress before the end of the year because another bill for civil rights has now demanded the attention of the Nation and of the world. But we shall wait in pregnant silence until the 89th session of Congress when we pray to God this bill shall be heard and passed.

Few words spoken by any man within the last 75 years in America have had more meaning than those spoken by the humble Bishop of Piacenza, Italy. When visiting the United States and speaking to President Theodore Roosevelt in 1901, Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini, saintly founder of the Scalabrini Fathers, so aptly embodied within his prophetic words our own thoughts and sentiments:

"America, and I say this with heartfelt emotion, is the land bequeathed to the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, the promised land of the Catholic Church. Here, some day, if quiescence and self-satisfaction and ignorance do not lead people astray from the divine plan, all of the national groups within this fortunate land will bring forth numerous and rich, contented, moral and religious generations which, although clinging still to their own national characteristics, will be closely knit into an integral whole."

I thank you.

Capitalism Best Argument Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, our own system of private enterprise which has achieved the greatest advances for mankind in the history of the world is the best argument against the Communist philosophy. Unfortunately, instead of our leaders extolling the capitalist system and pointing out its accomplishments as against communism's failures, they seem to be doing all possible to liquidate private enterprise and try to defeat the slave philosophy by adopting Socialist-Communist programs.

I think it is time we stand up for our own greatness, point out the standard of living enjoyed by all in this country as compared to the plight of the average citizen of Soviet Russia and other Communist nations. Indeed, if we did not insist on bailing the Communists out every time their system failed, their people would long ago have starved to death or would have thrown off the chains of communism which enslaved them.

The following article by Frank Langston, news analyst of the Dallas Times Herald, reminds us that "Capitalism Itself Is Best Argument."

CAPITALISM ITSELF IS BEST ARGUMENT

(By Frank Langston, news analyst)

Too many persons in the United States are spending too much time worrying about the Communist threat and doing too little about it.

They look at the gains communism has made and worry about Red promises to millions of people everywhere. Some even are inclined to go on the defensive and to apologize for our system of capitalism, which has become a sort of dirty word in many areas.

Too many people talk about the threat of Premier Nikita Khrushchev to bury us without realizing that we in the United States have the one ideological weapon with which to defeat communism.

That weapon is share ownership. What is needed is to use it as a weapon for the West in the war of ideas.

The Communists make much of people's republics, people's ownership, people's governments and the like. And at the same time they talk about capitalism as a small group of powerful individuals in Wall Street who own and control the entire United States.

OWNERSHIP IS SPREADING

That concept of capitalism is nearly a century out of date—if it ever was accurate.

The truth of the matter is that more than 17 million individuals in the United States now own at least one share of one public corporation and that nearly 64 percent of all shareowners have annual household incomes under $10,000.

That is one out of every six adult Americans.

And the picture of the average stockholder certainly is not that of a fatman with a big cigar in Wall Street squeezing the life out of less fortunate Americans.

Furthermore, the trend toward individual stock ownership is growing. From 1952 to 1962, most recent census of shareowners, individual ownership rose from 6½ to 17 million.

And these figures include only direct ownership of public corporation shares. They do not include those persons who own family businesses or closed corporations or of the millions who have an equity in other concerns through their holdings of life insurance.

"Perhaps the most powerful of all incentives, to people in all nations, is the prospect of a higher standard of living," Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, recently told the Men's Dinner Club in Oklahoma City.

"But once people are able to acquire a decent share of the necessities of life and can afford some of the extras, then it becomes increasingly important for them to recognize that they have a deep personal stake in the economic system which makes those things possible."

Properly handled, he asserted, share ownership can be a potent weapon for the West in the ideological war.

IT'S THE BEST INCENTIVE

He noted that many European business leaders, including some economic planners behind the Iron Curtain, have devoted considerable study to American capital markets, seeking to learn how they can be adapted to meet specific problems in other countries. Their aim is to find a way of establishing a broad base of individual ownership.

Last November Mr. Funston and a group of American businessmen visiting the Soviet Union held three meetings with Khrushchev.

"I came away from the three meetings with a deepened conviction that, although the Soviet leader is indeed a powerful and deadly antagonist, both he and the system he represents are perhaps even more vulnerable than Americans generally realize," Mr. Funston said.

He gave these reasons for believing that capitalism will defeat communism.

Capitalism recognizes the all-powerful force of individual incentive and, hence, is consistent with human nature, while communism seeks vainly to suppress that force.

Capitalism recognizes that people will work hardest only when they know that they will reap directly most of the benefits of their work and can pass on those benefits to those who are closest to them.

In America anyone can own shares of almost any public corporation and eventually, as individual ownership broadens and grows stronger, American industrial enterprises will be owned by the mass of the American people.

The American system works, he told Khrushchev, because it is consistent with human nature, while the Communist system, which fails to reward individual contribution, must fail for lack of adequate individual incentives.

And as a proof of his thesis, he cited the problems the Communists are having with their agriculture, which lags far behind that of the West.

Statements of James E. Webb, Administrator, and Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator, NASA, Before Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics today began full committee hearings on H.R. 9641, the fiscal year 1965 NASA authorization bill.

The two witnesses appearing on behalf of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, and Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator.

I believe that the statements of these two top officials of the Space Administration will be of interest to all Members of Congress and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include them herewith:

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to be here today to present President Johnson's recommendations for the authorization of funds for the program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1965.

It is generally recognized that we are at a turning point in the U.S. space effort, one which requires that it be examined from a new perspective. Five years ago, in the infancy of this program, and in the context of a clear Soviet superiority in space, and with our own failures driving home the complexities of the requirements for success, the concern of Congress and the Nation was this:

"How much was the United States able to do, and how fast could it be done, to regain the leadership which had been lost and which was being exploited by the Soviets all around the world?"

Then, and throughout the first years of the NASA space effort, this committee and our engineers participated together in a struggle to adapt existing rocket systems to enable the Nation's scientists to loft limited, but sophisticated instrumented payloads into space. We did what we could with what we had and what we could improvise, and had we been capable of doing more, there would have been few willing to place a limit because of cost.

In the circumstances as they existed, after the early sputniks, and the vostoks, the country had no other choice. But not so today. With clearly understood military missile superiority and 5 years of solid civilian accomplishment behind us including, the successful launch last week of the fifth Saturn I, a rocket more powerful than any the Soviet Union is known to possess, it is possible and essential to consider not only what we are able to do, but also what it is wise to do, in view of our greatly increased scientific and technical ability.

This is what we in NASA have done in preparing the program which is the basis for the fiscal year 1965 authorization request. This, I am sure, is what this committee will do in considering that request.

Our situation has also changed in another sense. After 5 years of driving effort, with much of the support and impetus stemming from this committee and from the Congress, we have moved from a period of preparation toward a period of fruition. We are still deeply concerned, of course, with developing the technology, building the facilities, acquiring the scientific knowledge, and gaining the operational experience, which will give us real capability and flexibility in space. But we are also at the point when all of this effort, and this investment, are beginning to produce tangible results. Most of the foundation has been laid. The portents of space exploration and utilization as a boon to mankind are beginning to become apparent.

How effectively and how thoroughly the United States can exploit this opportunity in the years immediately ahead will be profoundly affected by your action on the authorization request which is before you today.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, since we are at a turning point when our judgment of the future may be sharpened by an assessment of the past, it might be appropriate to review briefly some of the achievements of our first 5 years in space. What resources has the United States developed? What skills have been acquired? What benefits have accrued? Do the results obtained support continuation of a major investment in this newly opened arena—space?

More than two-thirds of the 200 satellites and interplanetary probes launched in space have been the product of U.S. scientists and engineers. The scientific data collected by these space vehicles is greatly extending many of the natural sciences, bringing answers to questions which have perplexed mankind from the earliest days of human existence on earth. The first U.S. satellite confirmed the existence of the great radiation belt which surrounds the earth and the characteristics of this belt have been further defined by many subsequent vehicles. Another early satellite discovered that the Earth, rather than being an oblate spheroid as had been supposed, is actually slightly flattered at the poles. Subsequently, it was also discovered that a slight bulge eixsts at the Equator giving the Earth a pear shape. Not only did these discoveries have great scientific significance but they are of extreme importance to the military in plotting flights and targets, to the cartographers, and in space navigation.

Satellite observations of the ionosphere, not only by this country's scientists but by those of Canada and Great Britain, have explained many of the mysteries regarding this great band of thin ionized gases at the top of the atmosphere, which profoundly affects radio transmission. This knowledge has led to a project which involves the mapping of the ionosphere through at least one complete 11-year solar cycle to gain knowledge of value not only for civilian and scientific purposes but to the military agencies, as well.

Satellites have also detected the presence of a layer of helium which surrounds the Earth in a band nearly 1,000 miles deep beginning at an altitude of about 600 miles and the possibility of a huge ring of hydrogen extending out to some 6,000 miles. Within this area a concentration of cosmic dust has been discovered which scientists believe may be related to periods of heavy rainfall on Earth.

Other space phenomena detected by satellite observations include measurements of the solar wind, of solar flares, of micrometeorite activity and numerous other observations which continue to be revealed in some 40 miles of magnetic tape which record satellite observations at the Goddard Space Flight Center each day. Some of the information returned, particularly that gathered in intergalactic space, gives promise of answering fundamental questions about the origin and development of the universe, and providing a basis from which to predict the future.

Perhaps the most exciting and profitable scientific venture in space to date was the flight of Mariner II in late 1962. This remarkable spacecraft transmitted more than 65 million bits of information to Earth, operating to a record distance of nearly 54 million miles from the Earth. En route to Venus it affirmed the concentration of cosmic dust near the Earth, and found that the amount of radiation encountered was significantly less than had been anticipated. It registered an 800° surface temperature on Venus—too high to sustain life as we know it—detected no water vapor and no cosmic dust. It also determined that the planet has no apparent rotation or magnetic field.

These are but a few of the scientific results obtained in the first years of the Nation's effort in space. Reviewing their worth, the current issue of Fortune magazine had this to say:

"New knowledge is a dukedom whose great wealth and resources cannot even begin to be estimated or exhausted. Already the new knowledge acquired in space exceeds by far the value of funds so far spent. For knowledge, more than guns and butter, is the true power of modern states." And the technological balance of power is increasingly the major concern of the leaders of both weak and strong nations.

The early years of the space program have brought tangible results in more practical areas, as well. You are all familiar with the work of the applications satellites in communications and meteorology. The Telstar and Relay vehicles have demonstrated the feasibility of satellite communications of all sorts, including the transmission of television broadcasts on a worldwide basis. The Syncom satellite, placed in a nearly stationary orbit in what was the most complex demonstration of guidance yet achieved, proved the feasibility of a satellite communications systems which could virtually cover the globe with only three spacecraft in orbit.

The Tiros meteorological satellites have been so successful that their value is well known throughout the world, and we have become accustomed to rely on weather data based upon their operations. The Weather Bureau is now moving toward operational use of these satellites, and a new automatic picture transmission system has been devised which will permit any nation or unit of our Armed Forces to obtain photographs of the cloud cover over its own area as the satellite passes overhead.

The Nation's space investment during the past 5 years has produced a substantial structure of basic resources which will be available to meet military needs and serve civilian purposes in the years ahead. In addition to the building of very large boosters and spacecraft for experimental manned operations, we have developed the operational system which will permit their extensive use, when and as needed, and have made the capital investment in large engineering complexes for their assembly, test, and launching. We have developed and are installing the large environmental chambers, centrifuges, and simulators for astronaut preparation and training, as well as a worldwide tracking and data acquisition network feeding into an integrated mission control center through which a number of flights can be controlled simultaneously.

Meanwhile, we have acquired operational experience which is teaching us how to use space, not only with instrumented spacecraft, but with manned craft as well. This experience included some 55 hours of manned flight in the Mercury program, and will encompass about 2,000 hours of space flight in the Gemini and Apollo programs before the first astronauts depart for the Moon.

Some of our most stubborn problems and some of our greatest successes are related to the fact that it has been necessary to develop entirely new means of organizing large-scale research and development efforts devoted to the same areas which have provided our industrial strength and which, now more than ever, underlie future economic growth for this Nation—the use of energy in both large and small amounts under close control; advanced electronics, guidance, and control systems; the use of the most advanced new materials, fabrics, lubricants, etc.; the integration of research in the physical sciences with that in the life sciences; and the organization of the entire effort through systems management concepts based on knowledge gained from previous large programs such as the Polaris and other ballistic missile programs.

The success of much of this work depends on highly imaginative scientific research in the physical sciences such as physics and chemistry, in mathematics, in biology, and on the rapid translation into utilization of this knowledge through advanced industrial technological applications and engineering. Large parts of this work, both scientific and technical, cut across the lines of many disciplines. In a growing number of cases, success seems best assured if it is carried out in university laboratories in connection with graduate programs, or by industry working in close association with broad university multidisciplinary participation.

These, then are the specific resources which are being developed. But not to be overlooked are many other factors which will undergird U.S. space power and position in the technological balance of power in the years ahead.

These include the framework of policy and action to carry out this effort, such as the building and proper utilization of stronger scientific research capabilities and facilities in the Nation's universities, the widespread very advanced industrial capability which is being developed, the widest possible utilization of those technological developments which can improve either the capability or the efficiency of industry, and the governmental framework required to manage this greatest and most challenging enterprise in this history of mankind.

And, beyond this, one must consider the residual value to the Nation in the experi-

enced and trained labor force stemming from this great industrial effort; the increased value of our educational plant and organization, including both faculty and graduate students, resulting from the extensive research and training conducted for NASA in the universities; the value of such operating systems as communications and weather satellites; and the value to our military services and to national security in the basic structure which is being built to provide space power. And based on all of this is the image of a "can do" nation that creates its prestige among the nations by demonstrating, openly, on the television screens of all the world, its capacity to take measurements of Venus, or launch the largest weight ever put in orbit by man, or link the peoples of the world with Telstar, Relay, and Syncom, or launch and recover six astronauts, or provide all nations with satellite weather data from our spacecraft as they pass overhead.

With this brief review in mind, Mr. Chairman, let me turn now to the recommended authorization for fiscal year 1965. With your permission, because it is essential to intelligent evaluation of the request for 1965, I will also include some reference to President Johnson's request for a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1964.

During my testimony last year, when the fiscal year 1964 authorization was before the committee, I indicated that the amount requested by President Kennedy was required to maintain a balanced effort in space, and the momentum needed to insure that the national goal of lunar exploration would be achieved within this decade. I testified further that, unless the requested funds were authorized and appropriated, our target dates could not be maintained as realistic goals and it would be impossible to complete, with some margin for error, the various phases of the Gemini and Apollo programs in time to provide the tests and data needed for the crucial decisions as to the later phases of the program.

As you know, $5,350 million was authorized for fiscal year 1964, a reduction of $362 million in the amount requested by President Kennedy, and only $5.1 billion was actually appropriated, some $600 million less than the original request. As a consequence, we have found it necessary to curtail and realine our activities in every program area, to sacrifice the remaining insurance or margin for error which had been built into the program as a hedge against unforeseeable or intractable technical problems, and to accept later target dates for the crucial experimental flights in both Gemini and Apollo.

I do not suggest that these delays result entirely from congressional action on our funds for fiscal year 1964. From the outset, in planning a program which would give the United States preeminence in space, it was foreseen that accurate forecasting and cost estimating for a specific segment or fiscal year would be a difficult business, at best.

The Nation was dealing with a new medium—space—in which there was no past experience to serve as a guide, and one which required new technology as yet undeveloped and scientific knowledge yet to be gained. Just as in long range economic forecasting, our overall estimates of both completion dates and costs have proven much more accurate than those for the individual segments of the program. The early program had to be designed with considerable redundancy, and with a substantial degree of flexibility with respect to target dates. We have more accurate information now.

Overall, we are still able to set the important target dates within a range which we believe can be met, and which gives us a fighting chance to complete the 2,000 hours of manned space flight experience which we need and then proceed immediately to the lunar exploration in this decade. We hope Congress will give us this fighting chance. At the levels requested by President Johnson, we will have it, and the costs will be substantially less than if there are further stretchouts.

In the tight budget situation faced by the President for fiscal year 1965 it was necessary to stress with him and the Bureau of the Budget that unless the full $5.3 billion authorization requested for fiscal year 1965, and the supplemental appropriation of $141 million requested for fiscal year 1964 are approved, the manned space flight program will encounter further delays. It will then not be possible to achieve the national goal of exploring the Moon with men within this decade.

There may be some inclination to assume that the adjustment of our program to the reductions imposed for fiscal year 1964 indicates that this will likewise be possible in the event of reductions in the request which is before you at this time. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this is not the case.

In adjusting our program to compensate for the reductions made in the appropriation for fiscal year 1964, we have already sacrificed the margins and early target dates which were needed, and which in reality are still needed, in our effort to achieve the goals which have been set for us. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we are not able to maintain a reasonably balanced program, and accommodate the entire reduction, with any strong assurance that we can meet the 1970 lunar target date. The best we can say is that we have a fighting chance.

To sum up our situation in a sentence, if we do not receive the funds which the President has requested, there is nothing left to sacrifice except the national goal itself.

I have placed a great deal of emphasis, in these remarks, upon this national goal of lunar exploration in this decade, because that is the objective which President Kennedy, with the approval of the Congress, set before this agency, and which we have been striving to achieve. I will not, however, urge your support for this authorization request, or for the supplemental appropriation, simply because the funds are necessary if the Nation is to do what it has told the world it would do. I am well aware that there are those who ask, "What is magic about the 1970 target date?" or, "What will be lost if the lunar landing slips into the next decade?"

It is not possible to assert here today that we must reach the Moon by 1970 in order to beat the Russians there. I do not know, nor can anyone in this room know, what the Soviets can or will do. Neither, however, and for the same reason, can I say that it is not necessary to do so, if Americans are to be the first to explore our nearest neighbor in space and to achieve the world leadership in space that the Russians captured in 1957.

What can be said, however, is that the 1970 date was selected, after careful study, because it appeared to be the date by which we could reach the Moon with reasonable assurance that we would be first, and in the process could develop the scientific knowledge, technical knowledge, industrial base, engineering and launch installations, and worldwide tracking and control networks. There has developed no later evidence to indicate that this decision, recommended by President Kennedy and approved by the Congress, was unsound.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, President Johnson has made cuts in what we should have to do the job with reasonable margin, but he has sent up to you enough to avoid, I believe, fulfillment of the prediction attributed to Dr. Edward Teller some years ago, when he was asked what we would find on the Moon, and he replied, "Russians."

However, whether it is agreed or not that international considerations and national security factors require that we hold to the present pace of the space program, the fact is that prudence and economy will be served. Even if economy alone were to be the guiding consideration in the evaluation of the NASA request for fiscal year 1965, the cost of establishing and maintaining superiority in space will be less if we maintain the pace, the momentum, which the supplemental appropriation and this authorization request will provide.

You will recall that at the time the Congress was considering President Kennedy's recommendation that we drive toward a lunar landing by 1970, NASA officials reported to you that the cost would probably run from $20 to $40 billion. Despite the difficulties which have been experienced, we can still put two American explorers on the Moon in this decade, and we can do it within the lower of those two figures—for less than $20 billion.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to say that, if the program is further curtailed, if the momentum is lost, if the Apollo program is stretched into the next decade, the cost will not be under $20 billion, it will be several billions more. The ultimate cost will increase for each year in which achievement of our goal is delayed.

The Office of Manned Space Flight has made a careful study of the effects of a stretched out lunar program, and prepared cost estimates involving the extension of the landing date for a period of up to 6 years. Dr. Mueller will go into this in more detail, but I would like to summarize the results.

This study indicates that the cost of the lunar exploration would increase by approximately $1 billion for each year that the landing is delayed. A 3-year delay would cost $3 billion, a 6-year delay $6 billion, with no corresponding improvement in the benefits obtained.

This increased expense arises because the cost of a major research and development program is roughly the sum of three factors: (1) A constant factor that designates work that must be done and facilities that must be constructed, regardless of the pace at which the program is conducted, and with most of this going to pay the people in contractor plants working on the program; (2) an operating burden, which covers costs that must be incurred at a relatively fixed level while the program is underway, and, therefore, accumulate in almost direct proportion to the time required for completion of the program; and (3) a timesaving factor, which includes funds expended for such purposes as overtime, parallel paths of development, the purchase of hardware and facilities beyond those which would be required for a slower-paced program, and the provision of duplicate personnel complements for launch preparations and associated efforts.

A minimum-cost program is one in which the amounts expended on operating burdens and timesaving factors are relatively in balance, and that is the case with our program as it was presented last year. The stretchout to the very last of this decade, which is the basis of the 1965 budget, involves some increase in costs over the level which could have been attained. But we have not planned, either for 1964 or 1965, premium overtime and inefficient multishift operations in order to save time. Neither, however, have we been forced to establish a pace so slow that the operating burden absorbs an exorbitant share of the total expenditure.

If the lunar landing date is delayed further, the operating burden will begin to consume an unreasonable share of the funds provided. The costs to which I refer include the support of thousands of skilled engineers, scientists, and technicians who must be on hand to support the flight and ground test activity that continues throughout the total development program, whether the ground tests are on 3- or 6-month centers. This includes the propulsion, electronics, structures, thermodynamics, astrodynamics, guidance, control, and launch specialists and the supporting technicians, to name but a few, as

well as the clerical and management staffs required by each industrial contractor to do business.

Let me repeat, this cost base exists whether we are flying once in 3 months or once in 6 months. As a result, the cost associated with each event in the program increases as the program is delayed. For this reason, if economy is to be the watchword, and if we are to meet the stated national goal of lunar exploration within this decade, both the supplemental appropriation and this authorization are required.

Let me turn now to the manner in which the Nation's civilian space effort is being managed. When we last appeared before you to initiate a budget cycle, the top management of this agency had agreed that in the ensuing year we must have a hard look inward while continuing to look outward and ahead. Following the years of rapid expansion, we knew it was time for a special effort to sharpen our management tools, make necessary adjustments in our organization, make it more cohesive, and strengthen our management processes. This we have done.

During the year, we have added muscle to our management team by assigning more responsibility to those who had proven they could carry it and by bringing into NASA a number of topflight, experienced executives from industry and universities. At our annual management meeting last October, we found that 13 out of 46 attendees from headquarters and the field centers were new faces since the previous meeting. With these additions, there has been a net increase in our management resources in terms of numbers, talent, and experience in the aerospace field. However, all of our vacancies in key management billets have not yet been filled, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit and hold topflight management-executive types because of the salary differential between Government and industry.

On November 1, 1963, after much thought and study, we placed into effect a new organization which has done these things:

(a) Strengthened the centralized control and direction of the total effort.

(b) Provided better integration and mutual support of the various segments of the total program.

(c) Sharpened the delineation of responsibilities and authorities at the various echelons.

(d) Shortened lines of communication and administration.

(e) Centralized in the headquarters organization the necessary services and direction in specialized functional areas.

(f) Placed greater emphasis on policy planning.

(g) Established improved machinery for the integration and review of study plans and efforts.

(h) Through the appointment of deputies and the delegation of authorities thereto, relieved top management officials of some of the less urgent demands on their time so as to permit attention in greater depth to the major policy decisions of the agency.

(i) Emphasized the application of the fruits of our reesarch and development efforts to meet the security needs of our country, to contribute to economic growth, and to enrich our national life.

As an important adjunct to this new organization, new and improved procedures for the control and direction of procurement have been instituted. These procedures are expected to result not only in better and more reliable equipment at less cost but improved working relationships with contractors as well. Dr. Seamans will explore these questions in greater detail.

The year 1963 has seen a steady strengthening of understanding, coordination, and mutual support between the DOD and NASA. The Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board, as the principal medium of DOD–NASA interactions, has been revitalized. It has expanded its active monitorship to cover nearly every segment of the national space program. Under the aegis of this Board, we have jointly reviewed the requests for new facilities related to the aerospace R. & D. effort in the two agencies. This review has uncovered several instances where facilities would have resulted in duplication. Through corrective action in such cases, real economies have resulted. An important milepost was passed when, as insisted on by the committees of Congress, the DOD and NASA jointly arrived at an arrangement for pooling the instrumentation ship resources required to meet the needs of both agences. This also will save the Government money.

A comprehensive joint review recently completed had the objectives of delineating the minimum space program to meet the needs of the country and examining the programs of the two agencies for possible consolidations. The recommendations stemming from that review are now being acted upon.

Since the announcement by the Secretary of Defense of the decision to embark upon a manned orbital laboratory project, NASA has moved rapidly to gear its organization to assist the Air Force in every way possible in this undertaking. The Gemini-B/MOL program was needed by the DOD to make an early determination of the utility of a man in space in connection with certain potential defensive systems. The DOD will be able to move ahead rapidly with plans to make this determination within the desired time frame by virtue of the fact that the necessary basic technology and capacity to provide the hardware and to conduct such an operation have been developed by NASA and are available, just as the availability of scientific knowledge and basic space technology enabled the administration in 1961 to establish the manned lunar landing as a national goal to be achieved by the end of the present decade.

The DOD/MOL program will be accomplished using for the most part component systems and operational techniques which will have been developed and proven by NASA. Necessary supporting facilities established by NASA will be made available and fully utilized. In providing this assistance, NASA will be fulfilling its proper role under the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. At the same time, NASA will take full advantage of the opportunities presented by the MOL to further its research and development effort. Thus, the DOD and NASA will join forces to realize the maximum return from this expenditure of national resources.

During the course of this statement, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I have endeavored to indicate that the program which is being proposed in the President's authorization request is one which will serve the Nation's needs, and which will realize our national objectives in space at the minimum cost to the public.

In considering this request, it is important that it be viewed not only in terms of its direct benefits to the United States, but also as a force for progress in international cooperation during the years ahead. It has been noted that space is one of the few areas in which it has been possible for the East and West to find areas of common interest which can be cooperatively developed. The potential of these beginnings as the first step toward further cooperation in other fields, is not to be overlooked.

Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the Deputy Administrator of NASA who is well known to you for his wisdom, and his long experience in governmental research and development efforts, is here today. He will elaborate on the international aspects of the U.S. space program in greater detail, and discuss the future potential of space research and development from a perspective which has deep and firm roots in the past.

That completes my statement. I thank you again for the opportunity to be here.

STATEMENT OF HUGH L. DRYDEN, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Mr. Webb has alluded to the fact that the national space effort, at the end of 5 years of broadly organized activity, has moved from a period of preparation to one of fruition. That this is the case was vividly demonstrated by the events of the past week.

Six years ago, before the Nation began to take space exploration seriously, and before NASA was formed to counter a grave Soviet threat, those of us who were directly concerned with such problems counted ourselves fortunate when the Nation managed, with a crash effort, to put a very small spacecraft with limited capability into orbit. It is comforting to contrast that, and the concern we all felt then, with the situation today. Within the last week, because you and the other Members of the Congress have taken space exploration seriously, and have provided strong support for a vigorous effort in space research, this Nation was able to display to the world the most powerful rocket known to exist, overtaking, for the first time, the advantage in launch vehicle thrust so long held by the Soviet Union.

However, I would broaden Mr. Webb's statement to note that we are not only moving into a period of fruition, but one in which we must look to the refinement of the technology already developed and the scientific knowledge already gained. And most important, it is imperative that we look ahead to the things we must do now, or soon, to prepare for the space missions which the future will demand of us if we are to maintain leadership in space.

If I may be permitted the luxury of drawing upon some years of experience in federally sponsored research and development activity, and granted the advantage of hindsight in making some observations, I think it would be useful to consider our present position in space research in the light of some now historic facts. I recall reading a quotation, "The past is only the present become invisible and mute; and because it is invisible and mute, its memorized glances and its murmurs are infinitely precious. We are tomorrow's past."

That the author of that statement was named Mary Webb is purely coincidental.

In taking some memoried glances at the milestones of growth in federally sponsored research and development activity, I am also reminded of another quotation—this one from Mrs. Malaprop—who remarked that, "Our ancestors are very good kind of folks; but they are the last people I should choose to have a visiting acquaintance with." Some of the events in the history which I will recall are such that I regret even a visiting acquaintance with them.

The history of Federal participation in research and development is one of repeated preoccupation with the current requirements of the Nation at the expense of or to the neglect of the basic, long-range efforts needed by any nation which hopes to maintain leadership in the vital areas of science and technology.

Because of the initiative and the daring of the Wright brothers, this Nation gave man the capacity for powered flight, freeing him forever from the bonds which for thousands of years of human existence had confined his activities to land and sea. The United States became the first country in the world

to possess a military airplane when, in 1908, the Army Signal Corps contracted for a Wright biplane.

Yet, prior to World War I this Nation was still so preoccupied with conventional weapons systems that it totally neglected the development of aeronautics—the force which was to dominate warfare for the next quarter century. In 1914, the United States possessed fewer military aircraft and of inferior types than the six leading aeronautical nations (including Mexico). The United States in 1914 was the only major nation in the world not to possess an aeronautical laboratory with an up-to-date wind tunnel. By November 1918, not one aircraft of American design and manufacture had entered combat operations during World War I.

In the thirties we were so preoccupied with refinement of conventional piston-driven aeronautical systems that we made little progress in jet propulsion. Meanwhile, the Germans set out to build a bigger and better NACA and to a large extent, they did, developing jet-propelled military aircraft and 5½-ton V-2 rockets which almost spelled disaster in World War II.

In the late 1940's, despite the fact that Robert Goddard had demonstrated the feasibility of a liquid-fueled rocket engine in this country in 1926, and despite the memory of the V-2's raining on London during the blitz, we were so preoccupied with mating jet carriers to our exclusively held atomic bomb capability that we neglected missilery while other nations forged ahead. And finally, in the 1950's, our A-bomb advantage gone, we were so preoccupied with the development of our ballistic missile program that we neglected a clear opportunity to become first in space.

Today, the Nation faces, we all face, this question: Have we learned enough from the often bitter and always costly experience of the last half century not only to carry out with determination this effort to meet the requirements of the present in space research and exploration, but to exercise the vision which is demanded if we are not, once again, to find ourselves lagging in the next phase of this most challenging effort?

It must be hoped that we have learned enough from the sequence of events which I have just described to put aside for all time any feelings of comfortable assurance that science and technology are areas in which the United States will remain firmly and forever supreme. It is not surprising that we should have felt such assurance in the past, for we did, as a Nation, establish an early technological ascendancy over the other countries of the world. But it is equally clear that many other nations have overcome our early lead and that future leadership in this competition, which has such great economic, military, and political significance, will not be easily held or won.

Thus, while we may all glow with pride over the Nation's recent accomplishments in space, and our part in making them possible, we must not delude ourselves or the Nation with any thought that leadership in this fast-moving age can be maintained with anything less than determined, wholehearted, sustained effort.

I recall that as early as 1945 the Navy proposed the launching of an earth satellite. Subsequently, in 1946, Project Rand in an engineering report to the U.S. Army Air Force outlined the basis for rocket development which would have permitted the United States to place an earth satellite in orbit in 1951—6 years ahead of the Soviet Union. I think the mere recollection of that fact makes a point which needs not be labored.

The present gap in manned flight activity is a direct consequence of a postponement of the decision to proceed beyond Project Mercury from September 1960, until May 1961, when President Kennedy recommended the present manned lunar landing project as a national goal.

The decisions which confront us today are those which will determine whether this kind of history will repeat itself a few years hence and whether we will once again experience a bitter awakening to the fact that others have seized the initiative in the more advanced space missions of the future.

Let me tell you of some of the things which I believe must concern us now or in the near future if we are to have any assurance that the United States will retain the posture of leadership which we have gained through the difficult, demanding, and costly effort put into this program in its first 5 years.

In the scientific areas, we must begin looking forward to objectives in the next decade in three major areas: The lunar program, the planetary program, and the program for the study of the environment of space. The landing of men on the Moon is not an end in itself, but merely the beginning of an effort to extend man's knowledge of the planets, the solar system, and ultimately, the universe, and to relate what is learned to our existence here on Earth.

For example, we should in this decade establish priorities for scientific efforts to determine the geodetic properties of the Moon, for completion of topographic map coverage at reduced scales, and for preliminary geological exploration of the Kepler-Copernicus region by manned surface activities. Also in the offing are the establishment of a long lived passive seismometer network on the Moon, in order to determine its internal structure, efforts to determine the chemical and mineral composition of major lunar rock types, and studies to determine the feasibility of a manned lunar astronomical observatory.

In the years ahead we should also be looking toward a detailed study of the Sun and solar terrestrial relations; to increasing our knowledge and understanding of the stellar process, and the evolution of the universe, through astronomical observations above the atmosphere; to determination of the figure of the Earth, and measurement of its gravitational field, and to the mapping of interplanetary plasma and magnetic fields and the monitoring of radiation levels in space.

In the planetary program, the study of Mars offers great challenges. These include the study of the physical, meteorological and topographic features of the planet and the investigation of the chemistry of the Martian surface and subsurface in relation to the evolution, metabolism, and survival of living forms.

If these efforts determine that life exists elsewhere in the solar system it will be the most profound and far-reaching discovery in the history of the human race.

In moving on to these objectives, we must also drive forward with the technology which will make their achievement possible. This involves achieving a higher order of reliability in the existing operational vehicles, surpassing the near-perfect record of the past 2 years. It involves increasing existing vehicle performance through the use of a fluorine-oxygen combination, and the reduction of vehicle costs. It requires that the Atlas/Centaur be brought to operational status. And farther in the future, it demands the development of a universal high performance upper stage for application to existing booster systems, and of a vehicle system capable of performing missions requiring solar escape.

Like its predecessor, NACA, the space agency is a research and development organization which performs operational missions only to the extent that they acquire needed scientific knowledge or develop technology of value to the Nation.

If one looks at the history of NACA, it is apparent that the aeronautical research conducted by that agency not only brought this country to a position of leadership in civil aviation, but in military airpower as well. I well recall the statement of Frank Knox, the Secretary of the Navy in 1943, which pointed up the NACA contribution to airpower, and which I am convinced, will apply with equal force to the NASA contribution to defensive strength in space. He said at that time:

"New ideas are weapons of immense significance. The U.S. Navy was the first to develop aircraft capable of vertical dive bombing; this was made possible by the prosecution of a program of scientific research by the NACA. The Navy's famous fighters—the Corsair, Wildcat, and Hellcat—are possible only because they were based on fundamentals developed by the NACA. All of them use NACA wing sections, NACA cooling methods, NACA high-lift devices. The great sea victories that have broken Japan's expanding grip in the Pacific would not have been possible without the contributions of the NACA."

Within recent weeks we have seen the first major example of the application of NASA research to military use, with the decision to employ Gemini technology in the Air Force MOL project. But this is merely the forerunner of similar applications not only in manned operations, but in navigation, communications, and meteorology, as well.

NASA's own objectives in these latter fields include the establishment of the requirements for and a national program to develop the use of satellites for air-sea traffic control and navigation. In communications, they include development of such potentials as the provision of emergency communications to remote areas via satellites and small, highly transportable ground stations.

In meteorology, working with the Weather Bureau, we are looking toward an operational satellite system for global coverage on a daily basis. This would include developing a capability for continuous detail viewing of shortlived meteorological phenomenon, such as thunderstorms and tornados. Again, while NASA's objectives relate to the civilian application of such knowledge, its military value is obvious.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is simply this: The NASA effort is not confined, as so many seem to assume, to a single objective such as landing men on the moon. Rather, as was the case with NACA, it is a broad-based research and development effort which is designed to meet the needs of any agency of the Government having work to do in space. And the vigor with which we pursue this activity will determine how effectively those agencies can meet their responsibilities, and cope with their problems in space, in the years ahead.

Let me turn now to NASA's activities in the field of international cooperation, which are conducted pursuant to policies set down in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, moved further into what might be called by our engineers "second generation" programs. At this time last year I reported that during 1962 the first substantial fruits of our initial programs were realized. Cooperation in the literal sense of the word contributed materially to the U.S. space program by opening channels for contributions from the best minds abroad, by providing access for us to foreign locations of interest for scientific and operational requirements, and by making possible a modest sharing of the burdens of space research.

The further progress made during 1963 is quickly summarized:

IN THE SATELLITE CATEGORY

Six new international satellites, to be built and financed by three other nations, were programed as contributions to the NASA scientific satellite effort over the next 6 years, bringing to 10 the number of such coopera-

tive satellite projects completed, in process, or agreed.

Seven foreign experiments were selected in competition with domestic proposals for flight principally on NASA observatory satellites during the next 3 years.

IN THE SOUNDING ROCKET CATEGORY

Nineteeen sounding rockets carrying scientific payloads were launched here or abroad in joint projects with nine countries, raising to 46 the total of such launchings to date.

New agreements were concluded with India and Pakistan under which both countries will join the United Kingdom and Australia in a yearlong test of meteorological sounding rocket systems. These tests will supplement the meteorological research of the International Indian Ocean Expedition.

The new international sounding rocket range on the geogagnetic equator at Thumba, India, was successfully inaugurated with a joint launching in December.

IN THE GROUND-BASED EXPERIMENTS CATEGORY

Cooperative use of weather satellites was expanded by the addition of an automatic picture transmission subsystem to the Tiros VIII satellite, permitting other countries to receive local cloud cover data directly.

Experimental testing of the communications satellites Relay and Telstar continued on an intercontinental basis, utilizing ground terminals provided by six cooperating nations; agreements were reached with four additional nations during the year for their future participation in this program.

Experimenters in 23 nations completed preparations for the necessary ground observation and measurement of signals from NASA's ionosphere beacon satellite, S-66, to be launched later this spring. Another 14 countries will be sounding the ionosphere from the ground in experiments coordinated with the NASA ionosphere sounding satellite, S-48, also to be launched this spring.

IN THE TRACKING AND DATA ACQUISITION CATEGORY

Five new oversea facilities were negotiated for NASA's global tracking and data acquisition network. Agreements with three countries were renewed to provide for their continuing accommodation of stations in the manned space flight network.

WITH REGARD TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The two European organizations, Eldo and Esro, devoted to launcher development and space research respectively, moved toward their final ratification (expected in February). NASA was in close contact with both in view of their potential for greatly enhancing cooperative space activity.

NASA continued support of the Department of State, in the work of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences in the work of the International Committee on Space Research (Cospar).

IN THE TRAINING CATEGORY

Forty-one foreign graduate students were given theoretical and experimental training in space sciences at 20 U.S. universities under the NASA International University Fellowship program; 66 senior scientists from 23 countries pursued advanced research at NASA centers as part of the NASA resident research associate program; and 114 technicians were given specific on-the-job training in NASA centers in connection with cooperative projects, their expenses being paid by the cooperating countries.

A MORE DETAILED SURVEY OF THIS ACTIVITY FOLLOWS

Figure 1 illustrates our joint satellite projects with four other countries. The first international satellite, the United Kingdom's Ariel, launched in 1962, is still in orbit, having provided valuable ionospheric and solar data. The second United Kingdom satellite will be launched from Wallops Island this spring.

The four new satellites in the ISIS series represent a second-generation program with Canada growing out of experience with the highly successful Alouette Topside Sounder, also launched in 1962. ISIS is an acronym for international satellite for ionospheric studies. With the United Kingdom and French satellites, the ISIS satellites will constitute the core of NASA's own ionospheric satellite program during the next 5 or 6 years. The Canadians will supply all four spacecraft, a commitment for which they have indicated an initial funding of some $8 million. Although ISIS originated as a bilateral program, it has already become multilateral; as with Alouette, the United Kingdom will help to acquire and analyze the data; four other countries—Australia, Brazil, India, and Japan—have already expressed interest in conducting the necessary groundbased studies; additional foreign participation may well extend to actual flight hardware through competition for the satellite space reserved for secondary experiments. This is an example of the manner in which bilateral agreements may provide a flexible framework for broader cooperation without complex administrative machinery.

Figure 2 lists the seven scientific experiments—five British and two French—which have been selected in competition with U.S. proposals for flight, principally on the large NASA "streetcar" satellites. The equipment for these experiments will be financed by the sponsoring foreign space organizations. This program offers opportunities for outstanding scientists abroad to extend their research work into space even if their own national capabilities do not yet provide orbital or satellite engineering possibilities.

Figure 3 shows the international cooperative sounding rocket projects already carried out from foreign launching sites as well as those scheduled for this year. Particularly noteworthy here are the launchings from the new range at Thumba, constructed by the Government of India on the geomagnetic Equator as part of the joint program between NASA and the Indian Committee for Space Research. The Government of India has applied for United Nations sponsorship of the Thumba Range as an international sounding rocket launching facility available for use by all member nations on a cost-sharing basis. A six-man team representing the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space visited the range early in January and is understood to be reporting that it qualifies in every respect for United Nations sponsorship. The Thumba Range will represent the first such international range to be brought into being since adoption of a U.S. proposal that the United Nations encourage the establishment of such facilities.

Figure 4 gives similar information on launchings from Wallops Island and the White Sands Missile Range. The joint launchings with Japan, Norway, and Sweden represent a continuation in depth of cooperative projects commenced earlier with these countries.

Figure 5 indicates the very broad participation of other countries in various groundbased activities which make possible or enhance orbiting experiments. Thus far, seven foreign civilian groups have installed equipments for direct reception of local weather data from the automatic picture transmission subsystem (APT) incorporated in the metorological satellite Tiros VIII, launched by NASA on December 21, 1963.

APT receiving sets such as that illustrated in figure 6, were purchased by France and India in the United States; those in Australia, Canada, Denmark, Hong Kong, and the United Kingdom were assembled locally on the basis of NASA-supplied information.

Figure 7 illustrates the 10 countries with which NASA has arrangements for the experimental testing of active repeater communications satellites. Agreements were reached this past year with the Scandinavian Committee for Satellite Telecommunications, representing the telecommunications authorities of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and with the Canadian Department of Transport, under which they will utilize ground stations of their own for satellite communications tests. As shown in figure 8, six of these countries participated during 1963 in tests of NASA's Relay and the A.T. & T.'s Telstar. Although not shown here, the Government of Nigeria supported us in the first intercontinental testing of a synchronous orbit communications satellite. Using facilities abroad the USNS *Kingsport* in Lagos Harbor as the African terminal, the Prime Minister of Nigeria exchanged greetings with President Kennedy in the inaugural demonstration of Syncom on August 23.

During 1963, agreements were concluded with Australia for the location of four new NASA tracking and data acquisition stations in that country—a new deep space instrumentation facility at Canberra to augment the facility at Woomera, a new manned space flight tracking station at Carnarvon, a wideband data acquisition station at Canberra, and a mobile data acquisition station at Darwin. Agreement was also reached with the Malagasy Republic for the location of a NASA orbital injection monitoring station on the island of Madagascar off the East Coast of Africa. During the year, we renewed agreements with Mexico, Spain, and the United Kingdom providing for the continued operation over the next several years of the manned space flight ground facilities on their territories.

We have followed closely the development of the two new European regional space organizations, Esro and Eldo. Final steps in the ratification process for both organizations are expected early this year. Esro has consulted NASA in the preparation of its program of scientific space research, and in December submitted preliminary proposals for a cooperative program entailing two joint satellites. These proposals are now under discussion in order to maximize their mutual interest.

Figure 9 shows the increasing number of foreign graduate students, senior scientists and technicians working at American universities or at NASA centers under programs which, except for the senior scientists, require that subsistence and travel be defrayed by the sponsoring foreign country. These programs were established to help provide the basic background and capabilities abroad which are essential to cooperative programs and thus of direct benefit to NASA, and to provide on-the-job training and know-how directly relating to NASA cooperative projects. The resident research associateships provide to senior investigators of unusual ability and promise an opportunity for research in the creative environment of NASA centers in the various areas of space science and technology.

Figure 10 summarizes graphically NASA's international programs to date. An interesting side effect is that we are stimulating markets abroad for American aerospace hardware and even beginning to bring dollars in a small amount to the United States. We estimate that over the past 3 years foreign nations have spent over $16 million in this country on procurement of sounding rockets, payloads, electronic equipment, communications ground terminals, test and other facilities, solar cells, power and telemetry packs, and other space hardware.

I have left until last comment upon the bilateral agreement on space cooperation with the Soviet Union. As you know, I met with Academician Blagonravov in Rome and Geneva last spring with technical teams to

work out a memorandum of understanding setting forth the technical details and arrangments necessary for implementation of the three coordinated projects agreed to earlier (fig. 11).

According to this memorandum, NASA and the Soviet Academy of Sciences are to share their experience in the development of meteorological satellites by exchanging, on a reciprocal basis and within hours of receipt, cloud cover photographs and weather analyses from their respective satellites. For this purpose, a full-time, two-way facsimile quality communications link is to be set up between the U.S. Weather Bureau's satellite weather station at Suitland, Md., near here, and the corresponding Soviet facility at Moscow. Costs of the link are to be shared equally by the United States and U.S.S.R., although other national weather bureaus wishing to receive this information will be asked to pay a share of the cost of this service. The memorandum also provides for the two countries to coordinate the launchings of future operational meteorological satellites in order to optimize coverage of the world's weather.

In the field of satellite telecommunications, the memorandum spells out arrangements for joint testing of long-distance telecommunications using NASA's passive reflector satellite Echo II. The Soviets will use their observatory at the State University of Gorky. We will use the facilities of the University of Manchester at Jodrell Bank in England. Provisions is made for future discussions of the possibility of joint experimentation with active communications satellites.

In the scientific satellite field, during 1965, each country is to launch a satellite equipped to measure the earth's magnetic field, as part of the extensive worldwide research being planned for the International Year of the Quiet Sun.

After final approval of the memorandum of understanding by the Soviet Academy of Sciences on August 1, I wrote on August 23 to Academician Blagonravov, Chairman of the Commission on Exploration and Use of Outer Space of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., listing the actions required to implement these projects according to agreed time schedules. Correspondence has been maintained, although the Soviet side has so far not met the time schedules on most agreed action items. However, the Soviet Academy of Sciences has now conducted optical observations of the Echo II satellite as agreed, and is engaged in substantive discussions with us to arrange final details for proceeding with the communications experiments between the U.S.S.R. and the Jodrell Bank Observatory in Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to be here today. Permit me to conclude by repeating a few lines from a statement which I made while Congress was considering the enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which I believe still has pertinence today:

"We must understand that the kind and magnitude of space program that our national interest requires will cost hundreds of millions of dollars each year for many years to come. I know that some knowledgable people fear that although we might be willing to spend a couple of billions for space technology in 1958, because we still remember the humiliation caused by the appearance of the first sputnik last October, next year we will be so preoccupied by color television, or new style cars, or the beginning of another national election campaign that we'll be unwilling to pay another year's installment on our space conquest bill. For that to happen—well, I'd just as soon we didn't start.

"Fortunately, for the sake of our children's future if not for the protection of our own skins, I don't think we're that grasshopper-minded. This past week I was privileged to appear before the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives. Repeatedly the members of that committee reflected the wish that I am sure is that of the entire Nation, that we determine what is necessary to do to reach our goals in space and then get on with the job.

"As a nation, we have the scientific and technical competence. We have the resources to pay the bill. We can and we must succeed in finding our destiny in space."

(NOTE.—Figs. 1–11 are not printed in RECORD.)

The Tax Cut Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will soon act on one of the most important bills that has been before this Congress—the tax cut bill.

Based on income levels estimated for 1963, the bill as passed by the House last September is calculated to reduce tax liabilities by about $11.1 billion—$2.3 billion in corporate income taxes and $8.8 billion in individual income taxes over a 2-year period (1964–65). For the individual, the tax rate would be reduced from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to rates ranging from 14 to 70 percent. For the year 1964, the rates would range between 16 and 77 percent, and the full reduction would be effective in 1965. The maximum tax rate for corporations would be reduced from 52 to 50 percent in 1964, and to 48 percent in 1965. Small businesses would receive relief by a reduction in the rate applicable to the first $25,000 of corporate income from the present 30 to 22 percent.

A number of structural changes are contained in the bill which either limit or exclude certain deductions the taxpayer has been allowed under present law.

There has been a great deal of public discussion on the subject of tax reduction, and while there is an area of general agreement on the need for a cut to allow the economy of our Nation to operate at a higher level, we have a number of differing opinions as to how this should be accomplished.

It has been my theory that the best way to accomplish a realistic tax cut for the American taxpayer is through an increase in personal exemptions. To me, this is a more sound and by far the most fair method of effecting a tax cut which will really benefit the little taxpayer who needs it the most. It is true that this method would result in less revenue for the Federal Government than under the House-passed tax cut bill. But to offset this loss, all we have to do is to abolish the highly preferential legislation we now have for the vast oil interests. By reducing the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance so generously provided by Uncle Sam over the years to 15 percent, it is estimated that this would add millions and millions of dollars annually to our Treasury.

These amounts, in the hands of a relatively few oil millionnaires, will not boost our national economy. But, in the hands of the little taxpayer, it can mean a great deal in bolstering our lagging economy.

Even though there has been much discussion of the tax cut bill, I still feel that too few people are aware of its provisions and just what it will mean to them individually. Many who are supposed to be in the know have been shadowboxing. Our labor unions have heralded the House-passed tax measure and urged swift passage. Business, too, has been on the bandwagon for the tax cut bill. John Q. Public, by and large, favors relief from our heavy tax burden and has indicated support for this bill.

But just what does the tax cut, as proposed in the pending legislation, really mean to the man in the street? To quote from a recent AFL–CIO publication—

> In terms of hard money, the average worker would receive a tax cut equivalent to 7½ cents an hour added to purchasing power.

The 7½ cents an hour is $3 a week, or about $150 a year. Some will even gain less under the proposed bill, but the more prosperous couple with a taxable income of $300,000 will gain $42,660. Percentagewise, this would mean an extra 6.3 percent to a couple earning $3,000 a year, but an extra 55.9 percent to the couple earning $300,000 a year. For those with even higher incomes, the gain could be more than 100 percent in take-home pay.

I am pleased to note that the U.A.W. has shown an awakening, and I quote from its Washington Report, dated January 20, 1964:

> While the labor movement and liberals generally support the $11 billion tax cut, they are alarmed by the fantastic special privileges still in the tax laws and additional privileges which slick tax lawyers in Washington have managed to slip into the already sorry situation.

This is exactly why I am not satisfied with this legislation. The small wage earners of this country, who provide 87½ percent of the income tax revenue, are the ones who need relief the most, and who will spur our economy the most. As has been true of previous tax reduction measures, enacted during other administrations, the wealthy taxpayer gets the most relief and the special privileges apply to him alone.

Last year, after considerable research work on the subject, I was astonished to find how the giant oil industry has thrived on the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance that has been so generously provided by the American public for years, and which continues to flourish. Under this depletion allowance and the fact that from 70 to 90 percent of costs under the intangible drilling and development cost provision can be written off in the first year, plus the capital gains provisions for oil and gas, and the loss carryover provisions, along with other loopholes in our tax structure, we find millionaire oil operators paying little or no taxes. Is this not fantastic? And every effort to decrease or to do away

with the depletion allowance has been in vain.

When the tax bill, passed by the House last September, was first proposed by the administration, it contained a recommendation to reduce the 27½-percent rate. But this recommendation was quickly buried in committee. It is no secret that the tax-writing committees of Congress have eye-winking friendships with this special interest group. If it were not so, this depletion allowance would no longer be in existence today, or at least substantially reduced.

Certainly the oil industry is entitled to various tax deductions. It is given a deduction for operating expenses, and rightfully so. But, in addition, it can write off the cost of dry holes against the income from successful drillings. It gets another advantage not enjoyed by other industries by being able to write off 75 to 90 percent of the exploration, drilling, and development costs—tangible and intangible—in the first year. I understand this item alone amounts to about $2 billion. Then they can get credit of 27½ percent of gross income, up to 50 percent of net income, which is completely free from taxation.

These special tax benefits are among the most gaping loopholes in our tax structure today. Big oil companies are allowed to take tax deductions far above their operating costs. As a consequence, some of these ultrarich oil companies are taxed at a lower rate than a family man with a $5,000 taxable income. A big Oklahoma company paid less than 5-percent tax for many years while other firms not engaged in the oil industry paid taxes at the rate of 52 percent. I find that this same Oklahoma company paid no taxes at all on a profit of $5,378,973 in 1958. Another oil operation had an income in excess of $28 million in 1960, on which it paid nothing in income tax to our Federal Government, whereas a man with a $100 a week salary, having a wife and two children, would pay approximately $400. This is ridiculous and a fraud on the American taxpayer.

As I have pointed out before in the pages of this RECORD, the total tax deductions in 1957 for U.S. corporations under depletion provisions was $3 billion, of which the oil and gas industry alone accounted for $2 billion. The oil industry spent approximately $5 billion annually for exploration and development, with $1 billion lost down dry holes each year. Thus, our Government provided $1 billion or more annually in tax relief to the oil industry under the heading of depletion allowances—for no other reason except pure unadulterated favoritism.

I laud the efforts of those Senators in the Senate Finance Committee who have been hitting hard at these tax loopholes which help the rich and hurt the poor. But once again, a proposal to raise $420 million in revenue by putting steeper taxes on gas and oil producers was defeated in the committee by a vote of 13 to 4. Only an irate and completely aroused nation can change the picture as it has emerged over the years. Those who hail from Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, will continue to guard zealously the tax bonanza that our country has bestowed upon the oil interests. They may allow a slight tap on the wrist, but nothing like the trouncing this deserves. But I appeal to them, in fairness to all Americans, to consider the welfare of our country first rather than the special interest groups that no longer need these preferential tax benefits except to fatten their own pocketbooks.

As the Representative of a highly industrialized area, which has suffered and continues to suffer from critical unemployment, I must agree with my constituents who tell me they foresee little that they will be able to add to our national economy on the basis of the tax break they will receive on their weekly wages running from a low of $40 to a high of $125 a week.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation to increase the personal income tax exemption, and also to reduce the percentage depletion rate for oil and gas wells from 27½ to 12½ percent. This depletion allowance is one of the greatest sources of privilege in our entire tax structure. Not only the oil interests but some of the most power-laden economic groups in the country, including those who own shares and stock in oil properties, are opposed to reducing the rate. They are most powerful, and indeed, well entrenched.

I intend to continue, with every means at my command, to focus attention on this oil tax loophole in an effort to arouse the American public. If enough taxpayers sound the alarm, we will succeed in eliminating one of the worst abuses that exists in our tax structure.

The Power of the Positive "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading in the February Reader's Digest a condensed version of a stimulating article by a distinguished clergyman, Norman Vincent Peale, D.D., pastor of Marble Collegiate Church in New York. In the article which appeared originally in Guideposts and which is entitled "The Power of the Positive 'No.'" Dr. Peale authoritatively makes the case for the absolute negative.

A year and a half ago I delivered a speech which I entitled "The Positive 'No.'" The import of my message was identical with that of Dr. Peale's but its application was exclusively to those positive "no" votes I had cast here in Congress. I pointed out that my votes against deficit Federal spending for unnecessary and questionable projects were votes for fiscal soundness and integrity; that my votes against encroachment by the executive branch on the legislative branch were votes for constitutional government; that my votes against excessive control by the Federal Government of the Nation's business and industry were votes for the free enterprise system; that my votes against raising the national debt were votes for future generations; that my votes to hold down taxes were votes for the workers who have to pay them; that my votes against inflationary schemes were votes for our senior citizens in their retirement years; that my votes against the swelling tendencies of an already obese Federal Government were votes for the individual freedoms of all our citizens.

An analogy can fairly be drawn, I believe, between Dr. Peale's admonition to parents to say "no" to their children when what they want is not good for them, and the fortitude it takes sometimes to say "no" when pressure groups make demands for support of extravagant and dubious legislation.

Dr. Peale's message is one of the best I have ever read on the subject, and I very seriously urge all Members to read it.

The articles follows:

THE POWER OF THE POSITIVE "NO!"

(By Norman Vincent Peale, D.D.)

I am frequently approached by people who are deeply troubled about the times in which we live. What is happening to our moral standards? they ask me. Why is there so much crime and dishonesty among us? Why are children so difficult nowadays?

No man has the final answer to these questions. I do know one thing that is wrong, however. We Americans have misplaced one of the most important words in our language. It is a short word, but a tremendous one. That word is "No."

All my life I have preached and written about the value of positive thinking. And I still believe that affirmative attitudes are supremely important in successful living. But affirmatives alone are not enough. This world is full of hope and joy, but it is also beset by evil, immorality, and sin. You can't say "Yes" to these things, or even "Maybe." You have to say "No," and you have to make it stick.

In too many areas of living this is precisely what we Americans are not doing. As parents, we shrink from the word for fear of displeasing our children. As voters, we support politicians who promise us handouts or special favors, instead of crying "No" and throwing the rascals out. As buyers of entertainment, we condone standards so depraved that even our Communist enemies are revolted by them.

These are things our ancestors didn't do. They believed in the reality of sin, and in man's capacity and obligation—with the help of God—to root it out of his life. They believed that times might change, but that morality doesn't. They were tremendous people: in a few decades they tamed a wilderness and built the mightiest nation the world has ever seen. And how did they do it? Largely by saying "No" to the things that might have stopped them: "No" to fear, "No" to softness, "No" to decadence—"No."

This capacity for a ringing negative is something we must regain if America's greatness is to endure. I think there are three critical areas in which we must regain it.

First, we must learn to say no to our children. The ironic fact is that they often want us to say no. They are confused by weak compromises. They want desperately to hitch their allegiance to something solid. They may seem cocky and assured on the surface, but when it comes to fundamental questions of morals or behavior, they don't trust their own judgment.

Do you think that the teenagers who wrecked a Long Island home after a party last September were really happy about it?

I don't. I think that even as they went on their senseless rampage they were hoping that someone in authority would step in and say "No!" And I imagine that the youngsters were so unaccustomed to hearing a positive no that they didn't know how to apply one to themselves.

There is the key point: if we are going to raise a tougher, hardier breed of American to survive in this tooth-and-claw atomic world, we parents must learn to utter a positive no more often. "No, I won't drive you over to Susie's—ride your bike!" "No, you can't watch television—read a book!"

If this makes life a bit more difficult for our youngsters, so much the better. One of the great problems of our age is how to counteract the effecs on the next generation of a civilization dedicated to the pursuit of luxury and the avoidance of effort. A hundred years ago there was kindling to be chopped; there was water to be carried; there were animals to be fed. Not any more. We are in danger of robbing our children of what may be their greatest heritage—the heritage of struggle.

The second area where we must regain the capacity to say no is in the society in which we live. If we see something going wrong, we must speak out against it. Over a century ago William Lloyd Garrison was waging his lonely and unpopular fight again slavery. What was his reply when people told him to let bad enoug alone? "I will not equivocate; I will not excuse; I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard!" Three tremendous negatives followed by a magnificent positive—and finally slavery fell.

This is the spirit we must recapture. We have plenty of reasons for indignation. Just one is the insidious but growing campaign to push the concept of God—the concept on which this Nation was founded—out of all phases of public life. But do we stand up as a people and shout "No"? I'm afraid that most of us don't even mumble the word.

Not long ago, late at night, an executive I know called me. He had been walking the streets for hours, he said, wrestling with a problem. Could he see me?

He came. I have rarely seen a man more upset. His problem concerned the discovery that one of his star salesmen had been heavily padding his expense accounts. But when my friend called the culprit on the carpet, the man defied him. He admitted padding his expenses, but he said that everyone did it, that it was now the American way of life.

"I've been trying to convince myself," my friend said wearily, "that if I myself don't cheat, I can afford to look the other way where this fellow is concerned."

"Bill," I said, "your career is based on self-confidence and self-respect. Tennyson said, 'Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control—these three alone lead life to sovereign power.' What's going to happen to your self-respect if you condone wrongdoing in your department?"

"You mean," he said glumly," "I should fire the man?"

"Not this time," I said. "He'd just cheat somewhere else. Call him in again, tell him that his dishonesty is making you dishonest, and that you won't stand for it. Tell him that if he pads one more expense account, you will fire him immediately. Give him an absolute no, and stick to it."

My friend did this, and just the other day he told me that the salesman not only accepted his ultimatum but eventually came back and thanked him for making him say no to his own dishonesty.

The third area where we must rediscover the value of the positive no is in the conduct of our own lives. The morality of a nation is nothing more than the sum of the moralities of its individual citizens. It is time to stop rationalizing about wrongdoing, excusing it (as the salesman did) on the ground that "everybody is doing it." We must say no to temptation.

But it must be a positive no. In my 37 years as a minister I have seen hundreds of cases where a hesitant no ultimately led to disaster. Recently a young girl came to see me, lonely and unhappy. Her father, she said, was in jail for embezzlement. Her mother had had to find a job. Her home was haunted by bitterness and insecurity. The girl still loved her father. She wanted to know if I thought he was a wicked man beyond all forgiveness.

From what she told me, it was evident that her father had been tempted to embezzle funds mainly to keep up with his wife's insatiable demands for "the good life." I told the girl that, in my opinion, her father was not a wicked man but a weak one. I was sure that when the thought of borrowing company funds first crossed his mind, he rejected it. But his no was not a positive one. Temptation returned. In the end he destroyed his family's happiness, partly because he could not say no to the temptation to steal, but mainly because he could not say no to his demanding wife.

A good way to learn how to say no to the major temptations of life is to practice saying it to the minor ones. Most of us, for example, have a cheerful tendency to excuse certain faults in our character because we have decided that such failings are simply a part of our nature. "I shouldn't have been so cross," we say, "but you know how I am before I've had my morning coffee." Or, "I shouldn't have been so rude, but that topic always irritates me."

We should stop excusing ourselves. Such small exercises in self-discipline may seem trivial, but they are not. As we employ them successfully we begin to see that we can use the same weapon—the word "no"—to win large battles as well as small ones. What, after all, is prejudice but the failure to say no to ingrained and twisted habits of thought? What is cowardice but the failure to say no to fear?

There is something triumphantly final about a positive "No." It clicks into place in the mind like a great lock turning, shutting out doubts and hesitancies, barring forever the weaker alternatives. Thunderous negatives have played a dramatic part in our Nation's history. "No taxation without representation." "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." Again and again "No!" has been the battle cry of free men: no to compromise, no to injustice, no to tyranny.

This spirit is not lost, but it is sleeping. Let us, then, awaken it and use it to stamp out the softness and self-indulgence that threaten us.

President Proposing Vast New Housing Programs in Spite of Failure of Federal Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the frantic rush of the administration to win votes through a something for everyone program, the President is proposing vast new Federal housing programs without ever recognizing the failures of the many urban renewal, public housing, and other federally financed programs already in existence.

Would not it be just commonsense to take a look at the weaknesses of these programs before insisting on more billions for new projects?

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 30, 1964, is well worth reading and I call it to your attention in the hope it may be seen by some of the social planners in the White House:

NEW CITIES AND OLD PROBLEMS

The President's extensive and expensive new housing proposals can be sensibly viewed only in the light of the current state of public housing and federally assisted private housing.

Among many other things, Mr. Johnson recommends that the Federal Government foster the creation of entire new cities; Federal insurance and purchase of loans would be used to help builders start new towns and subdivisions. The housing program as a whole is estimated to require more than $1.6 billion in new spending authority over the next 4 years.

Yet before anyone gets too enthusiastic about the vista of new cities and more money, it is well to realize that all the Federal housing aid so far for cities and individuals has had highly questionable results.

With regard to individuals, many undoubtedly have been led to buy homes because of the Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration programs, plus the Government-sponsored low downpayment and long repayment provisions. To many people, it would seem, the foreclosure rate is high, and it is much higher on homes with Government-backed mortgages than on others.

The FHA, as Mr. Janssen reported in this newspaper the other day, is the owner or mortgage-holder of around 100,000 houses and apartment units; the VA has almost 20,000. Both agencies are making determined efforts to sell the mounting accumulation of foreclosed dwellings, but it isn't easy. Often they are in glutted areas; the Government has contributed to overbuilding as well as to defaults.

All this is the thoroughly predictable fruit of imprudence. In its eagerness to make everybody a homeowner, the Government has encouraged people to get in over their heads. Instead of reassessing this attitude, the officials now want to do more of the same.

A similar sort of thinking animates the vast urban-renewal programs in the cities. With all the money the Government has poured into this effort over the years, you would think the cities would be things of beauty and contentment. But of course many of them, like New York, are worse off than ever.

Part of the reason is that a lot of the renewal hasn't even taken place. In Mr. Penn's article on the subject this week, some striking statistics appear: Of the 22,000 acres purchased by cities with Federal aid since 1949, only 6,800 have been resold to redevelopers.

Why? The article notes: "Redtape, politics, inexperience, and construction finance difficulties are a few of the factors bogging down projects. And many tenants and small businessmen in blighted areas are aggravating delays by resisting the cities' efforts to relocate them."

Where renewal has taken place, it has demonstrated it can indeed disrupt neighborhoods and dislocate people but by no means necessarily improve the urban scene or the people on it. A lot of public housing is an architectural fright to begin with; a lot of it degenerates into new slums. In many cases crime rates are high.

A fairly basic misconception has helped produce these unhappy conditions: The assumption that better housing, when it ac-

tually is that, will automatically make better people. Some it will undoubtedly help; a good many others, unfortunately not.

Any community has an obligation to try to avoid blight and help those who can be helped, just as any individual should have an opportunity to buy a home on reasonable terms. But whatever Federal role may be appropriate in these matters, the evidence—and here we are talking about results, not theories—indicates the Government has tried to do too much with too little clear thinking.

That is why we consider it unfortunate when a President proposes new additions and expansions without attempting to assess the present derelict state of the Federal housing structure.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report of print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Mr. W. W. Campbell, Chairman of the Board of the First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wick Temple, the Associated Press bureau chief in Arkansas, has written a splendid article about my good friend, Mr. W. W. Campbell, chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas, that will be of interest to the Members.

"Mr. Will," as he is known by countless thousands of people in Arkansas, is characterized by Mr. Temple as "the man at the bank who, in 53 years, has never foreclosed a mortgage." But, Mr. Will is more than just that—he has been one of the leaders in the industrialization of Arkansas and in the development of the dollarshed program. He has created employment opportunities for Arkansas and has developed programs to change the agricultural economy of eastern Arkansas.

Mr. Temple's fine article follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK'S "MR. WILL" FEATURED IN WIRE STORY SUNDAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following story was released by the Associated Press on its national wire Sunday. In an interview with the Times-Herald today, Mr. Will said none of these things could have been done without the courage, vision, and cooperation of residents of the city and county, and from throughout Arkansas.)

FORREST CITY, ARK., January 25.—In the Mississippi Delta he is known as Mr. Will, the man at the bank, who in 53 years has never foreclosed a mortgage.

His full name is William W. Campbell. He is chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas.

But more than that he is the force behind the first big economic change in this cotton country since Reconstruction.

Campbell saw the handwriting on the land. He saw the small cotton farmer squeezed out of a livelihood by mechanization and chemicals. And he saw the tiredness in the land itself.

He began lending money and talking farmers into planting new crops. He provided them jobs in industry.

For the land, he stressed soil conservation and modern methods.

Now, white-haired and 74, Campbell looks out the windows of his bank in Forrest City and sees a new era being born in the delta.

Campbell, 6 feet tall and erect as a farm boy, is lean like his pioneer ancestors. His hunger is for progress, and for keeping people on the land.

And he knows his people. He knows them so well that often a farmer's signature is his collateral for an agricultural loan.

Mr. Will was born on a farm atop Crowley's Ridge, a natural levee pushed up by the Mississippi River thousands of years ago. He has lived all his life on the ridge and in Forrest City, which nestles on its west side.

Years ago Campbell and his bank pioneered peaches on the ridge. He pioneered rice west of the ridge where the soil will hold water. He formed the first soil conservation district and pushed modern agricultural thinking.

Then the big cotton farmer turned to tractors for planting, machines for picking, and chemicals for killing weeds. The small farmer and the farm laborer were swept from the picture.

The exodus began—to the cities, to the welfare rolls.

Campbell took up the banner of the little man.

He visited industrial leaders in dozens of cities and told them in his soft southern drawl about the bright prospects of his area. In less than a decade he helped attract 1,500 industrial jobs to Forrest City. By next April Warwick Electronics, Inc., will put another 1,000 to work building television sets for Sears, Roebuck & Co.

That is 2,500 industrial jobs in a city of 12,500. But many of the workers will come from tenant houses and small farms on the ridge and in the delta.

With industry secured, Campbell moved toward the soil. He showed small farmers how they could grow potatoes, okra, greens, carrots, and peas in the rich land that for more than a century had known only cotton.

He called representatives of large food processing companies to meetings, and they assured farmers that they would pick up vegetable crops at collection points. This removed a roadblock for the farmers, who feared they could not market such crops, and for processors, who had been hauling vegetables from as far away as Arizona to Arkansas plants.

Now a modern farm family is taking shape in the delta, Campbell says. It grows a relatively small vegetable crop to bring in perhaps $2,000 to $3,000 a year while one member of the family works in industry to bring in another $3,000 or $4,000.

"These people can have a rich life," Campbell said. "They have television, modern conveniences, consolidated schools. And they can stay on the land. They were raised on the land. They like the freedom of space."

The new look of the delta applies to both white and Negro. Members of the races work side by side in a school Warwick Industries is conducting to train supervisory personnel.

At a meeting of small Negro farmers in Campbell's bank, a spokesman said, "There ain't nowhere for us to go but to the vegetable patch. You tell them to get some more nuts and bolts for their (packaging) machines, because we're going to get them some vegetables."

Several good vegetable crops came in this year but the real impact of the new program won't be known until next fall.

Despite all his outside work, Campbell has been a good banker. The Agriculture Department's publication, Soil Conservation, describes him as "one of the most successful country bankers in America."

His methods and techniques, which stem from his genial personality, have brought deposits in his bank from $808,548 when he took over as president in 1923 to $14,057,118 today.

The bank has paid a dividend every year since it was established in 1886. Campbell began as a bookkeeper in 1909 and worked up to cashier in 1920. In 1954 he moved from president to chairman of the board and his son, William M. Campbell, became president.

During the 1930's when banks were failing, "our losses were so small there was nothing to worry about," Campbell said. "When other banks were foreclosing, we worked with people and eventually they paid." There were no extraordinary withdrawals.

His record of never foreclosing a mortgage is important to Campbell. It is an example of his philosophy.

"Bankers have the greatest opportunity to help people," he said. "We don't want a man's land. We want him to work on it and make a living."

Campbell also is proud of the history of his region. He tells how Confederate Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest brought 1,000 men from Memphis in 1866 and cut a 4-mile gap through Crowley's Ridge for a railroad. Forrest's camp on the west side of the ridge, 30 miles from the Mississippi River, became Forrest City.

Christian Principles in the Political Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, one of our most distinguished former colleagues, the Honorable Price Daniel, recently addressed the annual assembly of the YMCA Hi-Y youth and government banquet in Austin, Tex.

Price Daniel has carved out an enviable record for himself as attorney general, U.S. Senator, and Governor of the great State of Texas. His stature lends particular significance to his analysis of the tragic act which occurred in Dallas on November 22.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS

It is an honor to speak again to this annual assembly of young men and women engaged in studying the governmental processes under the Christian auspices of the YMCA and its youth affiliates.

I am especially honored to substitute on this program for President Lyndon B. Johnson, who had accepted prior to the recent tragedy which left him with his present awesome duties and responsibilities. He regrets that he could not be with you. I bring

you his greetings, his best wishes, and his encouragement that you continue to prepare for good citizenship and active interest in the affairs of our State and Nation. Beyond that, obviously, I cannot and do not speak for the President. The thoughts which I have put together since accepting this invitation yesterday are entirely my own.

My remarks shall be based on two of the objectives stated in your official youth and government program, as follows: (a) "to inspire the use of basic Christian principles in the measurement of discussions, decisions, and acts," and (b) "to implement the concept of brotherhood and the golden rule in the political process."

These objectives, always important to the success of our personal and public endeavors, are even more essential in this time of assessment and recovery from the tragic assassination of our late President, and the march forward under new leadership.

Our future success as individuals and as a nation depends on what we put first in our lives—the principles by which we measure our discussions, decisions, and acts. We have many rights as American citizens, but the corresponding duties, the order in which we place them, and the manner in which we exercise them, are of paramount importance.

Our Government and many of our basic documents and laws are based on the Christian concept of the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the infinite worth of every individual human being, and the freedom and ability of our people to govern themselves. This Christian concept teaches that man's first duty is to God and his fellow men; next is his duty to his country, State, and community; and finally comes his duty to himself and his own success and happiness.

Many of us who subscribe to this concept and its principles of freedom, equality, justice, and self-government have not been perfect in our application of its tenets. In the years ahead, all who are willing to move forward shall have added inspiration from the memory of one who devoted his life to these causes.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be remembered as a great leader because he placed faith in God and love of his fellow men above all other considerations. He was not ashamed to pray for God's guidance and to acknowledge and apply his spiritual faith and the principles of our Christian religion as he worked for a stronger nation and a peaceful world.

At the annual Presidential prayer breakfast in 1962, President Kennedy said:

"We need the faith with which our Founding Fathers proudly proclaimed the independence of this country to what seemed at that time an almost hopeless struggle, pledging their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence. We need the faith which has sustained and guided this Nation for 175 long and short years.

"We are all builders of the future, and whether we build as public servants or private citizens, whether we build at the national or local level, whether we build in foreign or domestic affairs, we know the truth of the ancient Psalm, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

This great man's assassin will be remembered as one who had made a complete failure of his life because he placed himself and his personal economic and political ideas above his Creator, his fellow men and his country. Like most Communists, Lee Harvey Oswald had no place for God in his life. He had no recognition of the value of the life of every human being, including those with whom he disagreed. Human life to him was cheap. He had studied and accepted an alien indoctrination that murder is an acceptable means to a political end.

Oswald recognized no duty to his country or its laws, having once renounced his American citizenship and aligned himself with the philosophies of Russian and Cuban communism.

He put last things first—that which he thought best for his own economic security and his own political convictions, having no room in his mind or heart for those who disagreed and no respect or tolerance for their right to express and work for ideals which differed from his.

President Kennedy fell as a martyr to the unselfish Christian, human and patriotic causes which he espoused, and those who blame his assassination on all the American people, a State or a single city are doing a great disservice to our country.

It is a sad thing to say, but John F. Kennedy and his causes will be stronger in death than in life. It has been true of all martyrs who really stood for great causes. It will be true in his case because:

1. His tragic death has caused the people of America and throughout the world to look more objectively and sympathetically upon what he advocated, especially in the field of human rights. There will not be complete agreement with all proposed solutions, but his basic premise will be accepted and this will lead to greater progress for all mankind.

2. His successor, President Johnson, has the knowledge, dedication, and zeal necessary to carry on the unfinished work. In his own right, President Johnson has the experience, ability, and source of strength which will make him one of our greatest Presidents. He, too, puts his faith and duties in the order essential to success. At the 1963 Presidential prayer breakfast, the then Vice President said:

"Since the United States first stood on its feet among the nations of the earth, the men who have guided her destiny have had the strength for their tasks by going to their knees. * * * The men and women of this Capital who bear the heavy responsibilities of public trust pray not for favor upon missions of conquest and dominion, but for guidance that their discharge of responsibilities toward fellow human beings may be both worthy and wise and just."

3. The recent tragedy ultimately will bring a greater degree of unity, cooperation, tolerance and understanding among the people of our country. This, in spite of the fact that for a while some will continue to stir ill will by blaming the assassination on areas or groups with whom they have political differences, instead of putting the blame for this heinous act squarely where it belongs.

In this latter connection, our country sorely needs truth and tolerance on the part of those who attempt to assess the blame. I have tolerance but no patience for those who blame this assassin's bullets on all the American people, a State, a city, or a group which had nothing whatever to do with the act or the climate or indoctrination which spawned the crime. Radio Moscow was the first to fix the blame with an immediate broadcast, repeated over American stations, that "the assassin is understood to be a rightwing extremist." Even after learning that the assassin was a professed Marxist who had lived in Russia after renouncing his own country and seeking Russian citizenship, and who only a few months before was distributing pro-Castro literature in New Orleans, Moscow continues to associate him with a rightwing plot.

Worse than that are articles by otherwise respectable writers in our own country who say the same thing, some of whom associate Oswald's act with the intolerance of white supremacy extremists in other States. Thus far, there is not the slightest evidence that any American extremist group, right or left, advocated personal violence on the President, or that Oswald had any association whatever with any group of otherwise loyal American citizens. Certainly he had no white supremacy connections, and this group is hardly known in this State or in Dallas, where integration has proceeded more peacefully than in any State or large city in the South.

To cap the climax, the most extreme smear of all comes from Texas University associate professor of sociology, Reece McGee, in the December issue of The Nation, in which he says that once the fate of the President was ordained, the crime "had to be in Texas and * * * in Dallas," because of the background and attitudes of the people of this State and city. Here are some typical quotes from this article:

"Texas is still a harsh and violent land, in climate and culture not so far removed from the savage wilderness it was only 130 years ago * * *

"A hundred years ago the immigrants wrote home that Texas was hell on women and dogs. It still is.

"The old certainties of their traditional religious securities are patently absurd; * * *

"Americans are a violent people and they live in, and have created, a violent society * * *

"A series of censuses of my classes has revealed that, on the average, about half the boys and perhaps a third of the girls have weapons with them at the university.

"Unlikely as it first appeared (in Dallas), it may be that the President's assassin was a leftist: in its mute frustration, the left there may have no other recourse than violence.

"Given the madness abounding in our lunatic society, it could have occurred anywhere; but where it did—where, in the nemesis of hindsight, somehow it had to—was in Texas."

I think the sociologist is wrong in blaming any geographical area for this man's crime, but, if he simply had to do so, why did he overlook Russia? During the past 10 years, Oswald spent more time in Russia than in Texas. Library records show that his reading material was pro-Communist. He certainly was not a product of Dallas, having lived there less than 2 months, a far shorter time than in New York, New Orleans, San Diego, Moscow, and Minsk.

It does not seem possible that an objective sociological study of the influence of this man's environment would have been confined to a city where he resided for such a few weeks. Surely there would have been some mention of the fact that within the preceding 5 months Oswald was hailing himself as a Marxist on a television program and distributing Communist literature in New Orleans, and that only 2 months before the crime he was in Mexico City seeking a visa for return to Russia via Cuba. The professor mentioned none of these things. Obviously he had other scapegoats in mind. He conceded, with a note of disappointment, that "it may be that the President's assassin was a leftist," but wasted not another word in disassociating the assassin from those whom he was determined to condemn through guilt by geographical association.

I ask you, how extreme can the self-appointed opponents of extremism become? Those who oppose intolerance should do so with tolerance and truth. Otherwise, they become a new set of extremists, especially when they indict a State with 9 million people and a city of a million for the depraved act of one man.

I have dwelled on this phase of my remarks at length, because it is important to our subject. Also, I note from your speeches yesterday that many of you are concerned about the image of Texas which this tragedy will leave in the minds of other people. There is cause for worry so long as extreme and emotional writers present a false picture to the world, but even now they are

being answered in leading newspapers and magazines, and in the Halls of Congress. Eventually the truth will be known and the fairness and justice within the hearts and minds of a majority of the American people will fix the blame on the man who committed the assassination and the influence of the Marxist doctrines which he embraced, and not on the place where it occurred, or the American system which he denounced.

The truth is that in Texas President Kennedy had received the biggest and friendliest welcome ever given a President of the United States. I saw him in Houston, where as Governor last year I had ridden with him in a parade from the airport. His crowds this time were far larger and more enthusiastic. He was highly pleased with his San Antonio, Fort Worth, and Houston receptions, and the so-called rightwing minority in Dallas should be credited with having refrained from any of the disrespect or indecent treatment which it had displayed this year toward Ambassador Stevenson and in 1960 toward then Senator and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. President Kennedy had commented favorably on the hundreds of thousands who gave him a friendly welcome in Dallas just before being stricken by the bullets fired by the one man who was bent on destroying him and the Governor of our State.

We cannot deny that there are minority groups of extremists, right and left, in this country who sow seeds of disunity, intolerance, prejudice, and hatred, and they should be held accountable for the wrongs they commit. But it is demagoguery and injustice of the worst sort to blame them for a crime committed by a depraved Communist, who had no more use for them than any other group of otherwise loyal American citizens.

I hope that all young people like you who are preparing for future leadership in our State and Nation will practice tolerance and respect for the opinions of others. You can disagree without being disagreeable. Remember the statement attributed to Voltaire:

"I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

When you place God and your fellow men first in your discussions, decisions, and actions, you will have love and charity toward all mankind. There will be no room for hatred. Hatred is a Communist doctrine, expressed once by a former Russian Commissioner of Education in a paper entitled "Why We Should Not Believe in God," in these words:

"We hate Christianity and Christians. Even the best of them must be regarded as our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbors and pity, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is a hindrance to the development of the revolution. Down with the love of one's neighbors. What we want is hatred: We must know how to hate, for only at this price can we conquer the universe."

We hope and pray that this anti-Christian philosophy will be abolished some day even in Russia. Certainly it must be restricted to its present small minorities here at home and be displaced eventually by the respect and love which most Americans share for their fellow men.

There are other suggestions which I could make to you tonight in connection with your study of the political processes of our State and Nation, but our time is limited. Therefore, I have put first things first, speaking only of the Christian principles which are necessary for the success of our political institutions. Lest I be misunderstood, we do have separation of church and state as one of the fundamental safeguards of freedom, but we have never advocated separation of church and statesmen. Except for statesmen guided by the principles of the Judaeo-Christian religions, we would not have the system of government and basic laws which assure justice and freedom in this land. As President Johnson said in a speech early this year:

"Our Constitution separates church and state. We know that separation is a source of our system's strength, but the conscience of our Nation does not call for separation between men of state and faith in the Supreme Being.

"This private unity of public men and their God is an enduring source of strength for our Nation and for our cause."

Not only are these principles essential for the strength of our Nation, but for peace and understanding throughout the world. The hope of the world lies in our ability to present the true image of our spiritual and moral convictions and the true image of American ideals to those who seek the course of justice and freedom in other lands. In the words of the Scripture, we shall succeed, "Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve as a member of the important Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives which approved the civil rights bill now being considered by the Congress. I took a very active part in the debate on the bill which took place in the House of Representatives and emphasized that it is important that the Congress pass the bill in its present form and that these are the minimum benefits we should provide; any watering down of this bill would be entirely unacceptable to me.

Civil rights and the elimination of all discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, have always been matters of major concern to me during my years of service in the New York State Legislature and ever since coming to Congress. I have introduced numerous bills to eliminate discrimination and to secure constitutional rights and protection for Negroes and members of other minority groups; many of the provisions of this civil rights bill are similar to those contained in bills I introduced in the past. Following are some of the statements I made during the debate in the House of Representatives:

This is one of the most gratifying and thrilling moments of my life. I am grateful and proud to be a Member of this Congress, the greatest deliberative body in the world, which now has the privilege and duty of assuring to Negroes and members of other minority groups in our country their constitutional rights, so long denied them. By passing this bill, the most far reaching and comprehensive civil rights bill ever considered by the Congress of the United States, we shall achieve an honored place in the history of our Nation. The opportunity to give renewed hope, a brighter future, dignity, equality, and freedom, to millions of people, does not come our way often; I am thankful that I have been accorded that opportunity.

I have used the word "opportunity," because I have been working faithfully toward this moment during all my years of service in the New York State Legislature and since coming to Congress. But let me say to the opponents of this bill, that it is the duty of this Congress to pass the bill; that failure to do our duty will invite terrible consequences too awful to contemplate. The most powerful social revolution in our history is gaining in momentum; the Negro is demanding his constitutional rights now; we must recognize the unshakeable determination of the Negro to escape from second-class status. The bill is entirely reasonable—it grants no special favors or privileges; it merely assures to Negroes and others now wrongfully discriminated against, the same rights and privileges which other citizens have forever taken for granted.

One hundred years have passed since the issuance of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. One hundred years is a long time to suffer under the evils of discrimination, to be denied opportunities in education and employment, to be denied the right to vote, a decent place to live. One hundred years is also a long time to give human decency, moral persuasion, tolerance, love for one's fellow man, religious teachings, the chance to eliminate and to overcome the discrimination and injustices directed against generations of Negroes. Now patience is at an end; a strong law is needed.

This Nation has been pleased to assist people of other nations when they have thrown off the oppressive yoke of a dictator, and when they have sought a democratic form of government. Let us face the truth. Right here in our own country we have permitted a dictator called discrimination to inflict cruelties, death of spirit, and inhumane treatment upon millions of our people for a hundred years; they have been denied the rights guaranteed them under our democratic form of government. The image we present to the world's family of nations is not very attractive at this point; we cannot expect to have our words and pleas in behalf of democracy accepted abroad when we live a lie here.

The conscience of every right-thinking American has now been aroused. State and city officials, religious leaders, civic groups of all kinds, business organizations, labor leaders, educational leaders, millions of individuals, have given us a mandate to pass this civil rights bill. We, the representatives of the people, must obey that mandate.

This bill would secure for Negroes and members of other minority groups their rights regarding voting, public accommodations, desegregation of public facilities, school desegregation, nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs, equal employment opportunity; it also contains other important and helpful provisions. Although the bill before us will not accomplish all our aims, it will go far toward correcting present glaring injustices, and it represents a good start toward our final goal.

Think of this scene. A white father looks upon his new born son. He is proud of his beautiful baby and says: "He'll be President someday." Now think of this. A Negro father sees his son for the first time and is equally proud of him. But immediately fears and doubts come to his mind. He knows that as things now stand, his son will not have good schooling, he will not be able to achieve his full potential in education or in employment, he will be insulted when he tries to find lodging while on a journey, he will be prevented from voting, his ambitions and hopes will die, he will be prevented from establishing a home of his choice, he will forever suffer under the scourge of discrimination because of the color of his skin. These evils of discrimination exist throughout our Nation. Negroes today say that for many of them, the benefits provided by the bill before us come too late to change their

lives to a great degree. But they demand, now, that this law be passed and its provisions faithfully carried out. They want their children to have the opportunities provided by the bill and the protection and true freedom and equality they have never known themselves. They want to know that their children will be able to find work commensurate with their ability, and to enjoy the dignity of equality with their neighbors. They want their children to face the world with hope and courage, not heartache and despair.

One of the gravest problems of the Negro today is job discrimination. Reports show that the income, per capita, of U.S. Negroes is $1,100, of U.S. whites $2,450. We know that Negroes are nearly always last to be hired and the first to be fired. Also, most of the employed Negroes in this country are in the unskilled or semiskilled service trades, because they have been denied educational and training advantages enjoyed by the whites. This bill seeks to provide equal employment opportunity. The public accommodations section of the bill will give to Negroes all over the United States a measure of assurance against the ugly, cruel, destructive and humiliating refusals of service which have made interstate travel a terrible experience for them.

It is an indisputable fact that the future and well-being of our Nation depend upon enactment of this civil rights bill. I sincerely hope and pray that this Congress will meet its responsibility and that we will now, finally, establish here in our Nation the true democracy of which we have boasted, and that all our citizens will be enabled to enjoy the equality and rights guaranteed them by our Constitution.

A Century of the Lincoln Saga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from a speech by the distinguished Rabbi Martin M. Weitz, a friend of mine for many years, formerly of Atlantic City, N.J., now of Syosset, N.Y. His address entitled "A Century of the Lincoln Saga," was originally delivered before a convocation of Lincoln University in Pennsylvania to mark the 100th year of the Emancipation Proclamation. The speech is equally appropriate at this time as we prepare to observe the 155th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CENTURY OF THE LINCOLN SAGA

(By Rabbi Martin M. Weitz)

Abraham Lincoln is magic for millions across the lost horizon. He disarmed more enemies by his death than his generals won in disputed battle. That was the strange alchemy that bound his country and made him one of the world's elect, simple-hearted, strong-minded symbol of America—free from geography and genealogy.

Greatest of all modern barometers on the Lincoln life and legend, is a microfilm collection with 20,000 documents in 194 volumes that was preserved for research and revelation by Robert Todd Lincoln, to be opened for the public 21 years after his death. This surviving son of Abraham Lincoln died July 26, 1926, and 1 minute after midnight, the entire collection was opened from the past for the present and the future. This collection presented by the son of Lincoln to the Library of Congress in 1925, is still being surveyed.

Warren Wheelock, in 1925, whittled out masterpieces in wood of Abraham Lincoln. They were miniatures in size, but of spiritual stature beyond any dimension. One was the intellectual Lincoln; another the meditative Lincoln; and a third the tragic Lincoln. * * * If we were to survey his saga in terms of the collection which affords new insight and provides new outlook, we should summarize and simplify his life pattern as a threefold benediction. First of these, in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation: The Lincoln that lived in the America of the 1860's was indeed a counselor at law. He entered the Illinois Bar March 1, 1837. He practiced in Illinois 23 years, and extended that legal practice beyond 4 years in the White House. His early conferees were Stuart and Herndon.

Second great facet of Lincoln in our commemorative profile is "Lincoln—the storyteller." Many are the witnesses from all sources who relate this facet of the Lincoln saga with greatest affection and profoundest admiration. There is the ride with Swett, who recalls the childhood stories, the conversations with Judds, who remembers porch-talk and through it how Lincoln seemed as a man devoted to the far things, a man for the days to come * * * how he glowed with the suns beyond our sun, and who generated belief that with men all things are possible. Even incidents at home portray him with nonchalant yet gallant naivete, as when his wife told him, "You are a very bright man," after he had come in from the rain and deposited his coat on her just-starched gowns which she placed on the bannister. When poor Abe asked, "What have I done now?" she answered promptly, "Your wet coat is on my starched gowns." Then our Abe in simplicity said, "Don't be cross, dear. First I will hang up my coat, and then I will even hang your gowns over it."

Third dimension of the Lincoln saga was "Lincoln—the Man Alone." Living witnesses beheld him thus in his spiritual splendor on days they saw him. A Stuart said: "I saw Lincoln sitting around alone in a corner of the bar, remote, wrapped in abstraction and gloom. He seemed to be pursuing some painful subject and his sad face would assume, at times, the deeper phases of grief." Harken to a Whitney: "He had no system or method. He preserved a memo by throwing it in his hat. All was anarchy outside his mind but within it all was symmetry. His mind was a workshop." Listen to a Birch: "His chair was against the wall for hours while his feet were drawn up and knees and chair were level. His hat tipped to shield his face. His eyes were sad with no merriment. His hands were clasped. No one could break this spell with speech, for it was a barrier none could enter."

As we observe the 100 years of the Emancipation Proclamation, we observe Lincoln as he lived a century ago. They say that Lincoln's soul is not at rest. His spirit walks through the land, through the quiet countryside and the crowded cities, through the thick forests and the green figelds. His calm and kindly eyes are full of pain. His step is not as light as it once was. His heart is burdened with many fears. Why is Lincoln's soul so perturbed?

"The things he sees will not give him rest. The voices he hears disturb his sleep. He cannot forget the people he loved, in whom he believed. His spirit seeks out those who remembered him. Through the length and width of the country, through the mines, the factories and the offices * * * his restless spirit moves. He meets the people, the common, ordinary people, the sons and daughters of the soil, the factory and the city. They stop him as he walks by and speak to him—even now."

He is the sad, sweet song of America—the melody of freedom and of faith in man. The slow, sombre strains of a Gettysburg Address and of the Emancipation Proclamation, not unheard, but, as yet, unheeded.

Panama Clears Red Killers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful Members of the Congress, who have been following the execution of the program for the piecemeal liquidation of U.S. control of the Panama Canal, long ago sensed the suppression of reliable news in the mass media of the United States about betrayals of our legitimate vital interests on the isthmus.

For authoritative information on the many angles of the interoceanic canal problems, I would commend for serious study the series of brilliant addresses of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, who now has the barren satisfaction of having been right.

The latest information on the suppression of news is to the effect that the Department of State is withholding sensational disclosures about the Red infiltrated Panama Government, as reported in an article in the January 31, 1964, issue of the Philadelphia Daily News by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott.

The article follows:

PANAMA CLEARS RED KILLERS

Some two score Communist snipers and agitators, in the forefront of the destructive rioting and slaying of four U.S. soldiers in Panama, have been quietly allowed to leave that country.

They include eight professional Red killers who were seized and jailed by Panama National Guardsmen during the costly violence.

The Communist guerrillas—Panamanians, Cubans, Mexicans, and other Latins, some of them veterans of the recent Red terrorist operations in Venezuela—were flown to Mexico. From there, a number have gone to Cuba.

Directly involved in this secret exodus are two top Panamanian officials—Education Minister Solis Palma and Eloy Benedetti, legal adviser to the Foreign Minister.

A detailed intelligence report charges that the two leftist Panamanian officials not only cleared the way for the surreptitious departure of the trained Red guerrillas and snipers, but arranged for their coming to Panama and were in constant touch with them during the murderous demonstrations.

Benedetti particularly is credited with being in close contact with the imported Communist goons. He was especially active in getting those jailed released.

These sensational disclosures are being withheld from the U.S. public at the insistence of the State Department—on the

ground that their publication might further complicate the tortuous and uncertain deliberations with the leftist-tinged regime of President Roberto Chiari.

Chiari's government is said to be so extensively infiltrated with Reds and fellow travelers that in order to stay in office, he will have to submit to the extremist demands of Palma and Benedetti.

The two leftist leaders are claiming that only direct U.S. armed intervention can block Communist seizure of Panama.

Communist forces in Panama are operating both underground and in the open.

Avowed aim of all the leftwing elements is to create the utmost dissension with the United States over the canal and the Panama Zone issues.

The Departments of Education and Agriculture are heavily Communist infiltrated, as are the schools of law, journalism and education of the University of Panama. The university is the headquarters of the Communist underground, and middle-aged "permanent students," actually paid Red agitators, hold key places on the campus.

Thelma King, a pro-Castro leader in the Socialist Party and member of the Panamanian Congress, is a forefront figure of the aboveground apparatus. Significantly, she returned from a visit to Cuba just before the rioting and killing. She made the trip by way of Mexico—as virtually all the leftists do.

Downtown Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on January 29, 1964, Mr. Robert H. Levi, vice president of the National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc., spoke at the fourth annual meeting of the committee, presenting a review of downtown progress.

We can all be proud of the progress which has been made in revitalizing the downtown area in our Nation's Capital. Downtown progress has contributed to the phenomenal development in Washington. The progress made thus far has required a vast investment of capital and manpower and the future of our Nation's Capital depends on continued investment by the private sector.

However, we in Congress have an obligation to provide the necessary tools to make possible the achievement of the goals which have been set.

In July of 1963, the Senate passed S. 628, to permit the District of Columbia to use the urban renewal program in downtown Washington. Participation in this program is enjoyed by every major American city. It should not be denied to our Nation's Capital. I sincerely hope that the House will act promptly and favorably upon this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Levi's remarks, entitled "Review of Downtown Progress," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF DOWNTOWN PROGRESS

(By Robert H. Levi, vice president, National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc.)

At this, our fourth annual meeting, I look back with amazement and with pride at how far we have moved toward the goal of downtown revitalization, in what surely must be the most administratively amorphous and politically frustrating area in the United States.

We set out in 1960 with a clear idea of some of the problems of downtown Washington, and with only hazy concepts of what we might do to solve these problems and what might be made of this area with the most exciting location in the world, between the White House and the Capitol.

We have succeeded in making a clear statement of how the problems can be solved and what the potential is for downtown revitalization, in the action plan for downtown.

We have succeeded in gaining general agreement among hundreds of individuals representing public agencies and private organizations with national and local areas of interest and with specific economic, aesthetic, social and political points of view, on what downtown Washington should be like.

We have helped to stimulate new private construction, and developer and investor interest which will result in additional construction, in an area which had lain dormant for nearly a decade, despite its incomparable location in the heart of the Nation's Capital.

We have assisted public agencies to clarify their plans and to make decisions on important public works, such as the center leg freeway and the proposed new downtown library, which will have positive effects both on downtown and on the entire metropolitan area.

And we have helped set an example for future progress in Washington, as well as for other cities, of how private business and Government can work together in the public interest, by the way in which we helped create the minibus.

Like the proverbial iceberg, only a small portion of the physical results of the efforts of our excellent staff and our standing committees is visible. The minibuses are operating successfully on downtown F and Seventh Streets, and 17 private buildings or major additions, at an estimated cost of more than $30 million, have gotten underway since downtown progress began operations.

Obviously, the minibuses were not brought into being by our organization alone, nor do we claim credit for all of the new construction in the past 3 years; but we do believe that we have been instrumental in creating a new image for the old downtown, and for backing this image up with substantial facts and with substantial cash, so that much action has been taken which otherwise might never have occurred.

Our amazement and pride on looking back turn to determination and hope when we look to the future. We have set a minimum goal of $500 million worth of new private and public construction in downtown by 1980, to be stimulated and shaped by a framework of public actions, guided by an urban renewal plan.

We must make progress in many areas to achieve this goal. We believe that we have come a long way in providing a sound base for the public and private decisions that must be made to accomplish the many actions necessary to revitalize an area as complex as downtown Washington.

When this goal is achieved, in addition to the improved conditions that will be created for people and for business, the tax base of the District of Columbia will be strengthened through added revenues from new construction and from increased business activities in downtown.

We intend to continue to work in every way we can to stimulate additional private development appropriate for the new downtown and to assist public agencies in the preparation of plans and in the accomplishment of actions needed to initiate and carry forward a positive downtown urban renewal program.

We have the essential ingredients for success: A dedicated and competent staff; an influential and interested executive committee and board; and the interest and the cooperation of public agencies and private organizations concerned with the future of downtown, with the future of the metropolitan area, and with the importance of setting an example in our Nation's Capital of what our centers of urban life should be.

And now, from amazement and pride, and determination and hope, let me turn in conclusion to prophecy.

I look forward in 1964 to the approval of legislation to permit the District of Columbia to use the urban renewal program in downtown Washington; this is a right which every other major American city already enjoys.

I look forward to the amelioration of the transportation controversies that have occupied so much time, talent, and effort during the past year; and to the utilization of these remarkable resources in cooperation rather than in conflict to produce plans and action so that all of us may have the choice and freedom of movement that we can afford and that we can build.

And, finally, in anticipation of and with the assistance of these public actions, I see the development by private initiative of the new office buildings, hotels, apartments, stores, and cultural and entertainment activities that will accomplish the revitalization of downtown Washington.

What Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "What Foreign Policy?" which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, January 29, 1964:

WHAT FOREIGN POLICY?

The perfect foreign policy will make a country loved and respected. It will also advance its interests.

Few nations ever achieve a perfect foreign policy. But it is a rare country that can develop a foreign policy that fails in all three respects. The United States has.

Look at the shambles. After months of optimistic statements about our progress in Vietnam it is now admitted by Defense Secretary McNamara that the situation is grave if not desperate.

Charles de Gaulle has not only gravely weakened NATO but he has made hash of our contain-Red China policy by offering to recognize Peping. The Chinese Reds may yet overplay their hand through their insistence that France break diplomatic relations with Chiang, but our grand plan in the Orient is falling apart.

Khrushchev has firmly established Cuba as a base for the training of revolutionaries to topple the governments of Latin America. And now he has a new Cuba on the island of Zanzibar to do the same job for Africa.

The Communist technique calls for making an aggressive move, threatening the world with atomic holocaust if the anti-Communist nations should dare make any countermove, digesting the latest conquest while talking of disarmament and peace, then leaping forward again and making the atomic war threat once again.

This has reduced the United States to blubbering idiocy. The Nation rushes from one brush fire to another, slapping with a wet sack here, pouring a little water on there, but doing nothing about the laughing gentlemen with the torches who run ahead of it.

It is possible, as some writers have darkly hinted, that there is treason somewhere in high places. It is also possible the Central Intelligence is infiltrated. But what is more likely is that the State Department is suffering from overcivilization.

The overcivilized man is a poor poker player. He is too decent to be brutal, too honest to bluff wisely. Up against an opponent unhampered by scruples and endowed with primitive guile the overcivilized man loses his shirt.

So this great and powerful country of ours flops around like a stranded whale, waggling its flippers in confusion. The enemy doesn't have our strength. The economic condition of Communist countries is chaotic. While they remain dedicated to burying us they have recently persuaded us to give them food on credit. They have fallen so far short of satisfying their own citizens that all the devices of the police state have to be maintained including restrictions on free speech and free movement.

Yet all over the world Communist agents have Uncle Sam on the defensive. They foment a riot in Panama and we promise negotiations if they will only take a long enough recess from throwing bricks to permit us to sweep up the glass. Uncle Sam has, in general, behaved like a good-natured, rich, village fat boy upon whom everybody imposes but whom no one either respects or likes.

America has had enough foreign policy designed by gentlemen-scholars who look splendidly in tailored striped trousers. What the State Department needs are a few crude, direct, courageous men who are willing to give blow for blow in the cause of American self-interest and international order, and to hell with trying to be loved.

ORT's Role in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the essential part played by voluntary agencies in programs of assistance to the developing nations is often lost sight of in the discussion on the much larger Government program. Some of them have a long history of many decades in this work, and they help to reflect a well-rounded picture of the American people and their concern for other peoples. The American Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training—ORT—which pioneered in vocational training and economic reconstruction more than 80 years ago, when it devoted its efforts to immigrant Jews, today is conducting a number of technical assistance projects in west Africa in cooperation with the AID program. The experience and techniques of instruction developed in ORT schools for training unskilled persons to become artisans and craftsmen are now being applied as part of the American aid program in African countries.

These projects are discussed in an address by Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of AID. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Water's address delivered at the National Conference of the American ORT Federation in New York on January 19.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HERBERT J. WATERS, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR MATERIAL RESOURCES, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The proud history of ORT's accomplishments reflects the constancy of your dedication and the consistency of your efforts—while simultaneously depicting your flexibility in adapting different techniques to keep pace with changing times and the vicissitudes of history.

This is in the best American tradition, for the service of the American people to distressed humanity is historic and traditional. It is based on our unalterable belief in the dignity of man. Down through the years, much of this service to suffering humanity has been performed by private, nonprofit voluntary agencies who have provided—among other services—food to the hungry, medical service to the sick, shelter and clothing to the refugee, vocational training to the unskilled.

All Americans are indebted to the voluntary agencies for their initiative, for their energy and for their devotion to the alleviation of the problems that beset the needy, the distressed, the sick and the unskilled millions who are striving for a better life for themselves and their children.

But our Government, too, must share in this moral responsibility—if we hope to project to the world the true image of our people and our free society. We can't just "let George do it." A successful democratic government must reflect, collectively, the true spirit of the people it represents and serves.

That is why there is need for both public and private efforts to help underdeveloped areas of the world, just as there is continuing need for both public and private efforts to help the underprivileged in our own country.

Reflecting the mood of the American people, Congress, in the basic foreign aid legislation, directed the President to use, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of voluntary nonprofit organizations registered with, and approved by, the AID Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.

And, so, through the Agency for International Development, a firm and growing partnership between the voluntary organizations and Government has been fostered. While scrupulously observing the nature and independence of these private groups, substantial Government resources have been made available to further their activities abroad.

This partnership has a quality that Government aid alone cannot achieve. It is a force of enduring strength and fellowship that binds together our people and the friendly peoples of other countries, while furthering and strengthening the peaceful objectives of the free world.

As Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of AID, the implementation of this partnership between the voluntary organizations and AID is one of my responsibilities.

In this capacity I have learned of ORT's activities, and its contributions toward satisfying the aspirations of the people of the newly developing nations.

Last May, for example, Paul Bernick—on behalf of American ORT, and I, for AID—signed an historic agreement. Under its terms, ORT was authorized to acquire—without charge—$750,000 worth of excess Government property—machine tools, for the most part—to be used in the technical instruction of about 30,000 students in 450 ORT-operated schools in Iran, Israel, Tunisia, and Morocco. This was a significant landmark—for it was the initial excess property agreement between AID and a registered American voluntary agency for multicountry projects. With this authority, your organization has already acquired and shipped to 30 Israeli ORT-operated vocational schools almost $200,000 worth of milling machines, lathes, drill presses, and other machine tools.

But, this was not the first trail blazing agreement between ORT and the U.S. Government.

In June 1961, under the terms of a contract between ICA—AID's predecessor—and your organization—ORT agreed to survey the vocational education needs of eight underdeveloped African countries. This was a pioneering effort—for it was the first time a voluntary agency has been selected to perform this kind of service for the Government.

ORT was selected to undertake this precedent-setting project because of its considerable experience—experience gained while conducting similar surveys in other underdeveloped areas.

Under the extremely capable leadership of your Director-General—Mr. Max Braude—the survey teams performed their tasks—and I quote from our record: "quickly and most satisfactorily."

ORT's recommendations were such that the AID mission directors for Guinea and Mali urged speed in their implemention—and further—that the contracts for these projects be entered into with ORT because—and again I quote from official records: [of ORT's demonstrated ability to move rapidly] [its] international experience, and [its ability to] staff the projects with qualified technicians."

In mid-1962—AID, ORT, and Guinea signed the contract under the terms of which ORT would organize a technical vocational school in Conakry. Later that same year, a similar contract with Mali was signed. Under its terms, ORT agreed to organize a science laboratory and technical center in Bamako.

These mutual undertakings between AID, a foreign government and an American voluntary agency are indicative of the esteem and respect enjoyed by ORT—not only here in America, but even in remote areas of the world.

Last year, I had an occasion to see for myself ORT's impressive accomplishments in Guinea and north Africa.

Let me emphasize to you the deep impression made upon me by visits to ORT training centers in Tunisia, Morocco, Guinea, and elsewhere. No one can look into the complex problems of newly emerging nations without being confronted with the vast need for skilled hands as well as trained minds—with the tremendous need for just the type of vocational training in which ORT excels. And so one can watch the young boys of all creeds and colors learning such skills under capable ORT instructors without seeing new hope blossoming for the generations ahead.

What impressed me most, perhaps, was the extent to which ORT supervisors have instilled a deep desire to learn, and a deep pride in learning, such technical skills, among youth in other lands.

In Conakry, for example, I saw students who still came to school on a holiday, voluntarily, avidly eager not to lose any time in upgrading their knowledge and skills.

Can you imagine, for example, that happening very often here in our own country—among our own children?

How much better it is to witness the channeling of the nationalistic spirit and pride of youth into determination to improve themselves and their future ability to serve their new nations, than it is to see the restlessness and impatience of youth erupt into misguided flagwaving demonstrations and violence, serving no constructive purpose, in some other areas of the world.

ORT offers a good example to young people, here at home as well as abroad, that willingness to acquire knowledge and skills for constructive purposes is a far better exemplification of patriotic dedication than public demonstrations with sticks and stones.

The reports we receive of ORT's accomplishments in Conakry and Bamako are equally impressive. These indicate an increasing awareness by the Governments of Guinea and Mali of the value of the instruction being given—an awareness that led both Governments to request that new agreements be signed with ORT to broaden the scope of its activities in each of these two countries.

And so, on December 19—just a month ago today—new contracts were signed. Under these new agreements, ORT will conduct intensive, out-of-school, inservice courses for employees of government and quasi-government entities of Guinea and Mali.

These most recent tributes to ORT's competence and ability are worthy of a place in the proud history of its 84 years of humanitarian achievement.

These projects are also indicative of the kinds of programs American voluntary agencies are capable of performing. And, we are tapping this reservoir of talent and expertise. These capabilities are being increasingly applied to the problems that beset the multitudes yearning for social, economic and political progress. More and more the resources and experience of American voluntary agencies are being brought into active play to assist in achieving our Nation's programs in the developing countries.

Let me illustrate.

The specter of hunger haunts one-third of the world's population. To combat this threat, we are converting our agricultural abundance—an abundance unprecedented in history—away from a surplus disposal problem into a broader and brighter objective: the elimination of human hardship and suffering through the food-for-peace program.

During the past fiscal year alone over 100 million undernourished people have shared in our agricultural abundance. They included refugees fleeing persecution, and disaster victims, uprooted by flood, earthquake and drought. They included 40 million million schoolchildren, many of whom were too hungry previously to attend classes—children who last year consumed approximately 1.5 million tons of American food in classrooms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

And, American voluntary agencies played a major role in administering these people-to-people programs right in the villages and towns where the recipients lived.

Food-for-peace commodities were also used by American voluntary agencies to conduct community development projects—projects that ranged from school construction to road building—from land reclamation to rural resettlement.

The conquest of disease is another area in which American voluntary agencies are making a significant contribution. From Hong Kong to Afghanistan, from Latin America to Africa, American voluntary agencies conducted health programs ranging from the establishment of potable water sources, to child health centers—from the training of nurses, to the teaching of basic sanitation.

Since most of the people in the developing nations are farmers, a great deal of attention is given to the development of the agricultural sector. American voluntary agencies, operating from Ecuador to Pakistan, direct programs ranging from the introduction of better farm implements to the improvement of animal strains.

Many of these projects are carried on using surplus food to replace many of the dollar costs involved.

The success of these programs augers well for the future—for the even greater use of voluntary organizations during the year ahead. We hope to encourage an increased partnership between AID and American voluntary organizations in the conduct of people-to-people development programs. We believe that we should first seek to achieve our development objectives, wherever feasible, by encouraging the elements of the American private enterprise system to do their part before undertaking direct governmental action. We want to work through private organizations, wherever possible, in a continuing effort to export—not only the fruits of our knowledge and experience, but also one of our greatest assets, our system of private enterprise. The foreign aid program presents a tremendous opportunity for the voluntary organizations to expand their programs, not only on behalf of AID, but for humanity.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and tempers are a bit short. That is the inevitable and unfortunate result when the leadership on both sides collaborate in an effort to wear down the opposition by way of extra long hours. We have been in session much too long today. Members are tired, and some are even hungry. But the pressure stays on until the opposition is beaten down. Such does not make for the best.

Considering the mental attitude of the Members of the House—what it is now, or even if we were all in the best of humor—I believe one of the greatest mistakes we could make would be to attempt to legislate in the field of religion.

There are several predominant faiths in this country. I have friends among all of them. I am associated with and am firmly dedicated to the teachings and principles of one—the Protestant faith. We have Catholic, Jew, and other faiths and they all live together in near perfect harmony.

The subject of religion is so sensitive that it is exceedingly difficult to discuss, particularly in a debate, and more particularly when the debate takes place in the Congress.

Throughout this bill there are references to discrimination because of religion. And the bill proposes to throw some people in jail—I know not who—because it is charged they discriminate against people of other faiths. Sponsors of the bill speak up frankly in behalf of the Negro, who they say the bill is designed to help. But it is a carefully guarded secret whom they are endeavoring to assist in the field of religion.

When debate opened on last Friday, I asked the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who had addressed the House on the subject of discrimination, including religious discrimination, if his committee had received any testimony of any kind from any witness or from any source that any people of a particular faith were being discriminated against; and, if so, then of what faith, and who was doing the discriminating. He stated that the word "religion" was mentioned, but that there was no reference to people of any particular faith having been discriminated against. In other words not a sentence of testimony is in the record to the effect that Protestant, Catholic, Jew or whatnot has been discriminated against. Now if there has been such discrimination, I cannot understand why it is being kept such a secret by sponsors of this bill, or why those claiming to be the victims of discrimination do not speak up.

For many many years now, we have considered legislation in the field of so-called civil rights designed, among other things, to make it unlawful to discriminate against people because of their religious faith. In the bill before us numerous references are made to discrimination because of "race, color, religion, or national origin." If there is discrimination against citizens because of their faith, then let us lay it out on the table for all to see. Who are the victims? Who are the guilty?

Let us think back to 1949. Some of you were here then.

An FEPC bill had been reported to the House. It was designed to make an attack on discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. I hold in my hand a copy of the committee report which accompanied the bill. Let us read from it:

> Discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion or national origin is practiced by the Government and by business.

It also says:

> Today the fear of discriminatory discharges from employment weighs heavily upon all who have known the frustration and bitterness of job discrimination—

I respectfully urge Members to listen further. I continue to read from the report:

upon all who have known the frustration and bitterness of job discrimination; notably upon the approximately 26 million Catholics, 15 million Negroes, 5 million Jews—

This is a report from a committee of the Congress—

3 million American Mexicans, 11 million foreign born and 23 million children of foreign born.

What is the aggregate of those groups? The aggregate is 83 million.

What was the population at that time? According to the latest census at that time the population was 131,669,275.

So, according to the report, the discriminators were among the remaining 48,669,275 people. The report contends that two-thirds of the people of the Nation were the objects of discrimination and the discriminators were among the remaining one-third. So the bill which accompanied the report designed to stop the minority of 48 million from discriminating against the majority of 83 million.

Who were these discriminators? They could only have been of one race, the white race. And almost all of them could only have been of one faith, the Protestant faith.

So, since I was among this group, I presume the bill was directed at me, and others of like race and faith. Now, wasn't that absurd? That entire mess was nothing more than a bunch of politics, just as is this bill before us.

But when the roll was called on the bill there was strong opposition—177 nay votes. You may be surprised to know who many were that failed to be impressed and voted "nay" when the roll was called.

You might go back and check. I will not refer to them by name; but thank God for their fairness and courage. Many members associated with the various faiths mentioned in the report as being the objects of discrimination by people like me, when their names were called responded with a resounding "No." And they did the right thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Listen further, my friends: I have been around here a pretty good while. This is my 22d year in the House. We are treading in a field of some very sensitive and explosive areas. Over the years I have watched it grow, and grow, and grow. Each year we march a bit closer to the brink of legislating in the field of religion. Those who push it, whoever they are, are creating a situation that could explode with damaging effect to themselves and to our country. We are making trouble for the people in this country when we attempt to pass laws allegedly charging others with religious discrimination, more particularly when the record clearly shows that this committee did not take one single sentence of testimony that anyone of any faith, because of his faith, was discriminated against.

Now, I am not being critical. So help me, I am not. I am only trying to say that which each and every one of you know ought to be said, and which up to now has been so sensitive that no one dared discuss it. I am not sensitive over the fact that people of my color and faith have been singled out in a report of the Congress as being guilty of religious discrimination. Now, the subject is before us again. But this time no one sponsoring the bill has identified the faith of those being discriminated against, nor those who are guilty of such. Then why attempt to pass laws in that field? What do you have to cover up? If you mean what you say, open up the identity of the oppressed and the guilty. I have friends in this House of all faiths, good friends. The best friend I have in this town is of a faith different from mine. There is room for all of us in these United States. This field is much too sensitive for us to be legislating in—passing laws to hail people of one faith into court and put them in jail. Let us be careful. We had better stop, look and listen before this sort of thing explodes to the damage and detriment of us all.

I did not offer this amendment with the design of belittling or criticizing anyone. I offered it sincerely from my heart in an effort to smooth some troubled waters. We ought to take all language about religion out of this bill. I hope you will do so. I hope the chairman will accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has said:

Duty, honor, country: Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you want to be, what you can be, what you will be.

No man knows their meaning better than he, nor has any man shown to his country greater duty or honor than has General MacArthur.

I am privileged, today, to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation, written by Dr. R. Gordon Hoxie, president of C. W. Post College, and presented to General MacArthur on the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree of doctor of letters from Long Island University on Friday, January 10:

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY PRESENTS CITATION HONORING DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SOLDIER, STATESMAN, CORPORATE HEAD, AUTHOR

Brilliant son of a distinguished military leader, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, and a remarkable, inspiring mother, Mary MacArthur; reared in the courageous traditions of frontier military posts, graduating with one of the highest records in the annals of the U.S. Military Academy; then, auguring future events, sent 60 years ago to the Philippines, Korea, and Japan before serving as aide to President Theodore Roosevelt; in World War I his bravery and gallantry with the Rainbow Division in the St. Mihiel, Essey, Pannes, Meuse-Argonne, and Sedan offensives inspired the allied cause at a climactic time, and he was named the Nation's youngest divisional commander.

Following World War I, as the youngest Superintendent in West Point history, he broadly raised the curriculum to collegiate stature; named by President Hoover as Chief of the General Staff and reappointed by President Franklin Roosevelt, for 5 crucial years, while the Nation was being deluded to disarm, this thorough student of history remainded America: "Let us be prepared, lest we, too, perish." His annual reports were classics, both of style and military wisdom; he organized the air arm, mechanized the Army, and laid the plans for industrial and manpower mobilization vital in World War II; in 1935, at the request of President Manuel Quezon, he returned to the Philippines to build the Commonwealth's defenses. When the Japanese struck 6 years later his small Philippine and American force at Bataan and Corregidor bought the Allies precious time, and he promised: "I shall return."

That which followed is unparalleled in modern history. Thousands of miles from his sources of supply and with only a handful of troops, his was envisioned as a holding operation in central Australia while the war was waged in Europe. Instead, with a trickle of supplies and troops he kept his promise: New Guinea, New Britain, New Georgia, with their heroic victories, were steppingstones back to the Philippines. Then he mounted the attack on the Japanese homeland, secured the surrender, and directed the occupation. At age 70 he was back on the fighting front—his third war as a general officer—driving the Communist enemy back to the 38th parallel, before returning home to unprecedented national honors. Returning to private life after 50 years of military service he declined political opportunities, upholding his principle of civilian, rather than military, political dominance. Accepting the leadership of major corporate enterprises, he has effectively epitomized the responsible free enterprise system.

From his memoirs future generations will be inspired by his breadth and depth of perspective, his lucidity, his championing of freedom, his sense of eternal vigilance; his incisive recognition of our friends and our enemies, our fundamental strengths and weaknesses, our past accomplishments, and our future opportunities; his religious beliefs and his moral convictions set forth in his superb prose reaffirm and rededicate a precious part of our heritage. His love of patria, his sense of duty and honor, place him forever close to the hearts of his countrymen. Nor is this feeling in the United States alone. In the Philippines he will always be remembered as: defender-liberator; in Japan, as the builder of human rights and individual freedom; in Korea, as the indomitable spirit perceiving there is no substitute for victory.

Wherever there is youth, wherever there is good sportsmanship, his name will be there. Guiding the U.S. Olympic teams in 1928 and again in 1964, his person as well as his words remind the Nation and the world "that youth is not entirely a time of life—it is a state of mind." He concludes that "in the central place of every heart there is a recording chamber; so long as it receives messages of beauty, hope, cheer, and courage, so long are you young." Such is the quality of the writing and the heart of the man for whom this citation for the doctor of letters honorary degree is written. Little can be added here except the warm regard, the abiding affection of the university and its colleges here represented.

Congress: The People's Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House and Senate are rightfully struggling to set the record clear in regard to the legislative progress in the legislative branch of Government, and try to direct the attention of their constituents to a proper appraisal of the role of the legislative branch.

I was especially pleased to see an editorial dealing with the Congress which appeared in the January 30 edition of the Harvey Tribune of Harvey, Ill. The editorial effectively dramatizes the voice of the people in the role of Congress and it is reassuring to me to note this sound grassroots appraisal of our legislative branch.

Realizing Members of Congress' keen interest in this subject, and knowing they will derive encouragement from this editorial, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS—THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

The so-called intelligentsia, eggheads if you will, enjoy the pastime of lambasting the legislative arm of our National Government, projecting idealistic philosophies that they incorporate in the seventh-heaven books they write. Perhaps some of their criticisms are in order, but not all, by any means.

Actually, some of their statements carry an ominous tone and many, who believe them, vision the death of our system of government.

It is being said by some of the brilliant minds of our time that unless certain changes are made in the legislature structure that a new type of government might become necessary. These words are not only alarming but surprising in view of the fact that the present system has brought us more security and greater wealth than any major nation in the world.

In the immediate future a new civil rights bill and another providing for a tax cut will be enacted. The future looks bright and certainly our democratic system of government does not look unpromising.

The truth is that the executive branch of the Government has been gaining in power at the expense of its counterpart, the legislative, and it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Congress to control the gigantic operations and the expenditures of the executive branch. To refuse the demands of the executive branch would approximate rebellion, the eggheads would have us believe.

The executive branch is enjoying a heretofore unapproached degree of immunity. It doesn't have to answer questions on its actions, even in official committee sessions. It decides what the Nation's press can broadcast, all on the premise that public knowledge might endanger public security. The doctrine of executive privilege is, in this newspaper's opinion, being blatantly abused. The people still have the right to know.

But Congress will survive this attempted invasion of its rights. It is the closest branch of Government to the people, therefore, the safest and most democratically representative of the three branches which constitute the American system. Every Member must be elected, can be eliminated legally from office. Every Member has his own constituency to answer to. The collective view of the 535 people who constitute the body is the view of these constituents and without public approval their terms of office can be brought to an abrupt end.

This, then, is the system of government which has proven effective for more than 200 years. Congress is still doing the bidding of the people which is so necessary if those who are governed are to maintain a faith in the system.

Every American citizens can be thankful for the Congress for, despite some of its weaknesses, it remains his only means of thwarting threats on his welfare by either or both of the other branches which form our Government. Congress is here to stay.

Do We Get Full Value From Research Dollars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, an attorney, serving his first term in the House of Representatives from the Second District of New Hampshire. Although a native of Montclair, N.J., he has been a longtime resident of New London, N.H. He is a member of the House Public Works Committee in addition to having been named to the Select Committee on Government Research. The Washington World magazine states in connection with this article:

Mushrooming of the Federal Government's research activities is a prime concern of Representative CLEVELAND. He finds that $14 to $15 billion of the taxpayer's money is going into these programs this year, as compared to only $2 billion a decade ago. He wants all of them to be coordinated and subject to rigorous scrutiny. Thus he welcomes his assignment to the Select Committee on Government Research, set up to see whether the taxpayers are getting their money's worth.

Representative CLEVELAND's article is excellent and should be called to the attention of the American people.

DO WE GET FULL VALUE FROM RESEARCH DOLLARS?

(By Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire)

The massiveness of the Federal Government's involvement in scientific research and development is certainly cause for thoughful study. Consider these facts:

Fourteen to fifteen billion dollars of the taxpayer's money is going into R. & D. this year. The figure was only $2 billion 10 years ago.

More than 30 different departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government conduct research or have it conducted for them, often in the same fields.

Many business concerns owe their very existence to R. & D. contracts, and would fail immediately if this source of revenue were taken away.

Some universities depend on Fedearl research funds for as much as 50 to 75 percent of their operating budgets.

Such facts explain the existence of a new committee of the House of Representatives which was created last September by a unanimous rollcall vote to look into the entire Government research and development effort. This is the nine-man Select Committee on Government Research, whose chairman is Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, on which it is my good fortune to serve. Our initial hearings have just been concluded.

THE QUESTION

We can all agree that scientific research is a basic necessity in a growing society, and that the United States must never lose its recently won leadership in technology, which is the product of research.

But the question arises: How well is the burgeoning research and development effort being managed? Are we getting value received for such dollar spent?

Whenever a Federal spending program increases with such rapidity, there is always a suspicion, at least, that duplication and just plain waste will occur. I hope our committee will explore these areas to the end that reasonable economy and better coordination may be assured.

A breakdown of Federal research and development spending shows that five organizations account for 90 percent of it. These are the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. About 70 percent of these funds support military research and development. About 10 percent of the total funds is channeled to colleges and universities.

I was impressed by the statement given to our committee by the eminent scientist, Dr. Vannevar Bush. He told us that, in his opinion, the broad program of Government-supported research and development which was started after World War II on his recommendation, "has been overextended, and is still rapidly growing." He expressed the hope, however, that if the committee's study "indicates that we should now apply the brakes, we will not commit the converse error, and cut back on really worthwhile efforts."

EDUCATION'S PART

Some of the really worthwhile projects, in my opinion, are being conducted on college campuses. I have discussed this with President J. Sloan Dickey, of Dartmouth College, which is in my district. Dartmouth, like many other colleges, derives benefits from Federal research funds in the form of contracts and grants. In turn, the Government benefits from the work performed at these schools. Dr. Dickey has given me a very good insight into the far-reaching effects that Government-supported research has on college campuses. In the training of scientists, engineers, doctors, and other professional people, research is indispensable and almost inseparable from good education. Similar thoughts have been expressed to our committee by Dr. John W. McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire, who pointed out that research "has led not only to an increased contribution to our national store of knowledge," but it has also led to "the development and training of young scientists and engineers who will perform the research and development of tomorrow."

I view with concern any program originating with big government which results in big universities growing larger at the expense of small universities which grow comparatively smaller. Some research, of course, requires exceedingly expensive equipment and must be performed by the larger universities. I do not imply to subsidize mediocrity, but do urge encouraging the improvement of research facilities in smaller centers of learning.

There is also the problem of in-house Government research versus research that is contracted out to industries or institutions.. I am inclined to believe there is a greater possibility of unwarranted empire building and/or misdirection when Government bureaus keep the research within their own facilities instead of assigning some of it to outside groups. Once a Government bureau establishes a program, it often tends to justify it even after the need has passed.

Finally, an extremely interesting point was made by James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which bears repeating. Webb pointed out that, not only must we encourage research, we must be alert to capitalize on the results of research. Citing the example of Dr. Robert H. Goddard's basic research in the 1920's which established the practicability of the liquid-fuel rocket, Webb reminded our committee that it was the Germans and Russians who seized on the research and thus took a commanding and dangerous lead in rocketry. Legislation which I have introduced with former Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, to commemorate Dr. Goddard's achievements should also serve as an important reminder that we must always be ready to vigorously utilize the results of our massive research programs.

I am not against Federal support of research. As a matter of fact I am strongly for it. Research advances human knowledge, from which we all benefit, and Government has a legitimate role in furthering it.

I am concerned, however, that Federal research programs be thoughtfully coordinated and directed and subject to rigorous application of priorities and sensible criteria. To help bring this about is, in my opinion, the primary purpose of the Select Committee on Government Research.

Recollection of Last Summer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Richard P. Burke:

THE MARCH

(By Richard P. Burke)

In the Nation's Capital on August 28, 1963,
There took place one of the most stirring events a man could see:
The dike of humanity opened and let through a flood of 200,000 strong
Here was a tide not to be denied
for they were there to right a wrong.
They had come by foot, by bus, by air, by car, and by train.
To pour themselves into this refrain.
Said Josephine Baker, from across the sea,
"It's a salt and pepper crowd the way it looks to me."
They surged forward, straight and proud with dignity supreme.
Martin Luther stated,
"I had a dream."
The papers lauded across this great land.
There was a crowd with respect and a demand.
We demand our rights.
Give us a place to spend our nights.
When we're hungry, tired, and beat,
Give us a restaurant in which we can eat.
Give us schools for good education.
Give us this chance to help better our Nation.
Let us be first-class citizens.
No one wins from sit-ins.
Man, search your soul, your conscience, your heart.
For here all prayer does start.
Pray that the politicians across the land will give us the chance that we demand.

Pursuit of Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the radio program, Life Line, this week had an interesting discussion entitled "The Pursuit of Happiness," which I am including at this point in the RECORD as I found it to be an interesting commentary on the present matter pending before Congress.

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

It is often possible to find, by a close and thoughtful examination, a tremendous scope of meaning in the most commonplace and familiar phrases. From the better and more complete understanding thus gained, we can build our own lives more productively and act for America more constructively.

Let's look at one of the most famous phrases of all, a phrase which is entwined in the very essence of America and all the splendid history that has made America what she is: the words of Thomas Jefferson written in the Declaration of Independence to describe the primary rights of man, to which the new American Nation should forever dedicate itself—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Let's concentrate especially on the last four words, "the pursuit of happiness." The meaning of "life" and of "liberty" is fairly clear to all of us, even though the means for preserving both as basic human rights may not always be so clear; but to understand what Thomas Jefferson meant by adding to these two "the pursuit of happiness" we must pause, and look more deeply.

By inserting the phrase "the pursuit of happiness" in his declaration of basic human rights immediately after "life" and "liberty," Thomas Jefferson was changing on his own a formula which had become almost standard in other declarations of rights by the American colonists before the final act of independence. The usual way of stating these rights was "life, liberty, and property." That same usage was retained in the Constitution, and nearly a century later in the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Some have said, and more have tried to imply in various ways, that by changing "property" to "the pursuit of happiness" Jefferson was indicating a dislike for the idea of property as a human right. Nothing that he ever said or did gives any support to this theory; nor can it be logically derived from the words he used. But much that he said and did tends to disprove it.

Property is not a narrow idea. It includes everything a man has beyond his life and his personal freedom from restrain—everything he owns, everything he can rightfully claim, even the value of his own labor. A wild deer in the forest has life and liberty; but he does not have property, or know how to get it. Only man has property; to that extent, property is the measure of our humanity.

However, it is true that down through the years many people have misunderstood property and used the word in too narrow a sense. It has been misused even more than "liberty," and far more than "life." Some of this misunderstanding was common even in Jefferson's day. There were those who tried to present the whole grand clash between the Britain of George the Third and her American colonies as a petty squabble over how much ought to be paid for a cup of tea. Such persons were too small of mind and mean of spirit to appreciate that the very destiny of man and the central hope of human progress and achievement in freedom was at stake in America's reaching for independence, just as it has been at stake ever since in America's survival.

It was to do away with this confusion, to show to his countrymen and to the world the real issues and the true values at stake, that Thomas Jefferson removed the term "property" from the Declaration of Independence and put in its place the noblest and truest synonym it has ever received: The pursuit of happiness.

Because man is man and not an animal, mere life is not enough for him; pigs in their troughs have life. Even liberty is not enough. Fish in the sea have liberty—but what value is it to them? They are just as happy, and perhaps happier, in a gold fish bowl. Only man of all living creatures, and as a specially favored child of God, knows how to pursue his happiness to win it instead of merely hoping for it to come to him. It is man's possession of property which makes this kind of pursuit of happiness possible.

Through all he earns and owns, whether in material things or in ideas and creations of the mind or in the labor of his body, man acquires the means for a more promising pursuit of a higher kind of happiness, for himself and for others.

These are some of the truths Thomas Jefferson must have recognized, when he included in the basic charter of our national independence the claim (for the first time in history) to "the pursuit of happiness" as a fundamental human right. No nation could be called free and righteous, Jefferson is telling us, unless it provides not only life and liberty to its citizens, but safety and promise in the means for achieving a better and a happier life.

Almost as important as what Thomas Jefferson did say in his famous phrase "the pursuit of happiness" is what he did not say. A full awareness of this helps to clear up many misunderstandings about the American way of life and the goals our Nation ought to seek.

Thomas Jefferson, like most of the great men of his time, was a rationalist—a man who lives and thinks and writes by reason. A rationalist is an artist in the use of the word. He says exactly what he means—no more, no less. So it was no accident that Thomas Jefferson did not write into the Declaration of Independence that "happiness" is fundamental human right. The right, he told us, is only in its pursuit.

It is a fact known from human experience going back to the most ancient times that some men and women can never be happy even with perfect health, unlimited opportunity and all the riches of a nation at their disposal. There is a weakness or a block in the nature of some which prevents them from ever finding and keeping happiness. There are others who fail to find and keep it because of any one of almost countless injustices in the treatment of man by his fellow man—injustices as old as Cain and Abel. Not the best government in the world, not

all the love and good will of rational philosophers and ministers of the gospel, can prevent all of these injustices from occurring, or prevent much of the suffering which they cause. Much can be done to control or alleviate them. But, because man is not divine and cannot become divine, they will always be with us.

Nevertheless there are a number of Americans today who seem sincerely to believe that there is such a thing as a fundamental human right to happiness, and that if anyone is unhappy all the rest of us are somehow to blame for having deprived him of his rights. Some may be a fault, or none; but the blame is general only if we have allowed government, or organized society in any form, to restrain that person unjustly and deprive him of his chance for happiness. The right Thomas Jefferson saw for all of us in "nature and nature's God" is not a right to happiness, but simply to its pursuit. Not all who pursue it will find it. Not all who begin the race will finish. But every American and every human being has a right to his place at the starting line.

There is no way on earth that government, or organized society as a whole, can guarantee happiness to every one of its members and citizens. It has never been done; it will never be done. To promise it is only to inflict cruel disappointment; from disappointment comes anger; and from anger often comes littleness and even sordidness. Those are some of the reasons why, in the name of the impossible project of guaranteeing a fictitious right of happiness to all, governments and social blocs have so often ended by taking away the happiness and the right to the pursuit of further happiness from those who have it, as a kind of secondary satisfaction for those who had their chance and failed.

One of the deepest taproots of tyranny is envy. One of the Ten Commandments which most often needs to be repeated in our day is "thou shalt not covet."

Far from giving an automatic right to happiness, the concept of a right to the pursuit of happiness requires that every man and woman be fully protected in that pursuit (so long as it is carried on legally and justly) and in the happiness which is won as a result of it. To take from the winners and give to the losers is not to grant to either, but to destroy them. Every just human success is in its own way an inspiration. We all gain renewed hope from the example of one who has not only pursued happiness but found it. But if we do not allow anyone to find and keep it, what hope is there for any of us?

There is hope and there will be hope if we will work to understand what human rights really mean in America, how personal they are, how individual, how rational and how true. There is much confusion in our thinking and our way of life today. But the rocks of truth and righteousness on which this Nation still stands are as sound as they ever were. All we have to do is to remember that they are there, and not step away from them.

No nation in all the history of the world has found so much happiness for so many of its people as America. Just as no other set up "the pursuit of happiness" as a fundamental human right, so no other has proved so splendidly how far and how high that pursuit can take us. Now is the time not to change or twist the meaning of that glorious phrase, but to see it for what it really is and always has been since Thomas Jefferson first wrote it, and pledged to it with all his brethren their "lives, fortunes and sacred honor."

To Tell the Truth: Will the Real L.B.J. Please Stand Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the not so subtle schizophrenic quality of President Lyndon Johnson's politics is receiving more exposure from day to day.

Having had long years of wheeling and dealing in the political arena, he could not resist the patent demagoguery of being and promising all things to all people in an election year. And since there was a moratorium on partisanship, he almost got away with it.

But the honeymoon is over.

The gross and irreconcilable positions of being against medicare in 1950 and its champion in 1964; of opposing civil rights for two decades and espousing it now; of voting for the poll tax but opposing it now; are but a few of the shocking inconsistencies of a history of political opportunism which are filtering down to a disillusioned American public.

Indicative of this disappointment over our ultraconservative liberal and ultraliberal conservative President's views is this article in today's Washington Post:

NAM ATTACK INDICATES COOLING OF L.B.J. BACKING

(By Frank C. Porter)

The National Association of Manufacturers let loose a fusillade at President Johnson's economic program yesterday, adding to evidence that business enthusiasm for the new White House occupant may be wearing thin.

Filed with the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, the NAM's 19-page statement directed most of its fire at the Council of Economic Advisers rather than the President himself.

It took sharp issue with administration philosophy underlying the projected tax cut, with what it called threats of intervention in price and wage determination, and with Mr. Johnson's proposal for selective higher overtime penalties.

FIRST INDICATIONS

The business community's first real disenchantment with the Johnson administration set in after the President delivered his state of the Union economic and budget messages to Congress last month.

It was mildly shocked to discover that in some ways Mr. Johnson's program appeared more hostile to business than had his predecessor's.

President Kennedy had acquired his antibusiness label largely as the result of his angry reaction to the steel price increase of April 1962, and his successful effort to have it rescinded.

But President Johnson made it clear last month he will take an equally firm stance on prices. Not only did the economic advisers give new stress to the controversial wage-price guideposts (and under White House orders) but they warned the administration "will not hesitate to call public attention to major private decisions—by either business or labor—that seriously overstep noninflationary price and wage standards."

FEARS SUMMED UP

The NAM summed up business fears thus yesterday: "This threat of extralegal economic intervention could be seriously destructive of individual freedom and of business confidence."

Corporate apprehension was also heightened by the Council's pointed suggestion that "it is appropriate to focus special attention this year on price reductions." Even more alarming was Council Chairman Walter W. Heller's specific mention of the auto industry when asked about likely industries for price reductions.

Labor costs rather than pricing policy, the NAM declared yesterday, should be the proper concern of the administration.

But business received another rude jolt in the state of the Union message when Mr. Johnson unexpectedly proposed higher overtime payments in selected industries to help absorb unemployed workers.

DEPARTURE FROM J.F.K.

Never had Mr. Kennedy ventured such a prolabor proposal.

This would only add to labor costs and "open up a Pandora's box of new sources of labor-management contention," the NAM complained.

While agreeing on the need for a tax cut, the association called the administration's emphasis on stimulating consumer demand "both futile and dangerous." Instead, tax reduction should be designed primarily to "improve incentives and raise the profit attractiveness of business operations for growth," it said.

Some associates of both Presidents have been insisting that Mr. Johnson is basically more liberal in economic matters than Mr. Kennedy was.

But this thesis apparently has been lost on the business community until recently.

Now corporate leaders have fixed the cordial Texan with a more critical eye. New York business analyst Eliot Janeway, an old associate and friend of Johnson, states flatly that "the honeymoon is over."

"Soapy" Williams' Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday's Associated Press dispatch reports that Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, feels the situation in Zanzibar is "somewhat unfocused and confusing." This statement from him is par for the course.

The only thing Assistant Secretary Williams has done well is to wear polkadot ties and in view of his spotty performance in the past it is very fitting that he continue wearing these cravats. The Associated Press story follows:

WILLIAMS SAYS ZANZIBAR VEXING

WASHINGTON.—G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, said Monday he is satisfied that African nationalism was the primary cause for the Zanzibar uprising which enoed in the ouster of Sultan Seyyid Jamshid din Abdullah.

"There were obvious Communist influences among the forces that took over the Zanzibar Government," Williams said. "We feel, however, that dissatisfaction by the African majority against the ruling Arab minority was inevitable and the primary cause of the overthrow."

Speaking at the Sixth International Affairs Conference for College Editors, Williams said the coup is "somewhat unfocused and confusing," as African nationalists and pro-Communist elements in the Government are apparently fighting for power.

Falk Professorship Established at Pitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are always pleased when knowledge in American politics is increased through its dissemination among future college teachers.

Through the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation this will be possible in the Pittsburgh area under a new $500,000 endowment to the University of Pittsburgh. The university will undertake a national search for a distinguished scholar in American politics to occupy the first chair in the department of political science. Primarily the duties of the holder of the new chair will be to prepare doctoral candidates to teach politics at the undergraduate college level and to conduct research in American politics.

This is not the first contribution by the Falk Foundation to the political scene. For more than a decade, it has supported a number of programs in colleges and universities about the United States to further education in politics. Emphasis has been on supervised practical experience in party operations, elections and campaigns as a part of classroom instruction. I myself had the good fortune to have intelligent and beautiful girls from Chatham College and University of Pittsburgh help in my campaigning.

I include the press release sent out by the University of Pittsburgh in my remarks so that those interested may learn in more detail some of the aspects of this program.

The article follows:

FALK PROFESSORSHIP ESTABLISHED AT PITT

An endowed chair which will emphasize the training of future college and university teachers of American politics has been established at the University of Pittsburgh through a $500,000 endowment from the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation.

The Maurice Falk Professorship of Politics was announced today by Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield, who called the professorship "a magnificent contribution to the higher education of thousands of young men and women." It has been established in the department of political science.

The occupant of the chair, as yet unnamed, will prepare doctoral candidates to teach politics at the undergraduate college level.

In addition, the chairholder will conduct research in American politics and contribute to Pitt's ongoing undergraduate program in practical political education.

"Through the training of teachers the professorship will have a built-in multiplier effect which will increase and widen the learning opportunities in American politics," the chancellor said.

To illustrate the effects, he called attention to 50 Pitt political science graduates who are now teaching undergraduates in 15 States. The great majority of Pitt graduate students in political science plan teaching careers. In some instances these teachers will be employed by schools lacking political science programs, he pointed out.

"This endowed chair," the chancellor said, "recognizes the critical need for expanding the education of young people in politics.

"To thrive, this rapidly changing free society requires a greater abundance of enlightened citizens who have a thorough understanding of our political system and who will actively participate as responsible citizens or as candidates for office in the competitive politics that make representative government work."

The existing undergraduate program in political education at Pitt was launched in 1953 with the support of the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation. In 1961, the foundation made possible the establishment of a center for politics at the university. Since the inception of the undergraduate program, more than 3,000 Pitt students have been involved in practical field experiences in American politics.

The new professorship, with its emphasis on the training of teachers of politics, will add a graduate dimension to this program. It is expected also that the incumbent will enrich the undergraduate program.

Education in politics has been a central concern of the foundation for more than a decade. Since 1952, the foundation has made grants to 23 colleges and universities to support undergraduate programs in political education. Emphasis has been placed on supervised practical experience in party operations, elections, and campaigns to augment classroom teaching. Students work with the party or political group of their choice.

In recent years, the foundation has made grants to a few universities, including Yale, the Universities of California, Chicago, and North Carolina, and now Pitt, to strengthen and expand programs for the training of teachers of American politics.

In reviewing its support for political education programs, the foundation emphasized the basic purpose to be achieved as "to give students a thorough, realistic, and unbiased understanding of how our political system works, and to motivate him for constructive participation, on an avocational basis, in the affairs of the party of his choice in his community of residence after graduation in fulfillment of the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship in a free society."

Dr. Litchfield also noted that the chairholder's research would add to our store of knowledge about politics.

"One could prepare an endless list of questions about American politics that need to be explained by systematic research," he commented. "The Pittsburgh metropolitan area alone would provide a man with important research questions and data which would consume a lifetime of scholarship."

Research, he observed, often has a practical application in helping to reach solutions to public problems. "By learning more about the way we behave politically, it is possible to deal more systematically and imaginatively with issues of public policy and with problems of citizen participation in political life."

The Maurice Falk professorship of politics is the first endowed chair in the department of political science at Pitt. The department was established in 1912 and has been training graduate students since the early 1920's. More than a thousand undergraduates at Pitt are enrolled each year in political science courses.

The university has launched the search for a distinguished scholar of American politics to fill the chair on a regular tenure basis.

Who Will Succeed J. Edgar Hoover?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Someday, of course, J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, will be replaced. Claude N. Swanson of the Fairmont, (Minn.) Sentinel who served a stint in the FBI, is disturbed by rumors about the possible replacement of the famous FBI Chief, and believes Mr. Hoover should have a voice in his successor when the time comes. Mr. Swanson's comments are made in a Sentinel editorial which I request be placed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

STILL AT IT

(By Claude N. Swanson)

There's a rumble emanating from the Nation's Capital. It is ominous in sound and portent. It concerns the possible replacement of J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

For nearly four decades, Hoover has had an unblemished record as head of the FBI. And this under Democratic and Republican administrations. He has discharged his duties without fear or favor and never has his actions been seriously questioned.

Even the politically ambitious F.D.R. didn't see fit to meddle in Hoover's domain. Nor did the fiery, hot-tempered Truman or any of the other Presidents under whom Hoover served his country faithfully and well.

Whether there actually is a move on to oust Hoover we don't know. But we do know that eventually, Father Time will see to it that he is replaced. And when that happens let us hope that Mr. Hoover himself will be permitted to choose someone he has trained, someone he knows, to take over the FBI.

We have heard only one person named as a possible successor. That person, it is said, is the descendant of a long line of Communists; obviously, for security reasons alone, not a prime replacement for one of Hoover's unquestioned loyalty and capabilities.

Could our people make a choice, it is doubtful beyond the point of question that they would like to see a "Hoffa man," a Reuther kingpin, a National Association of Manufacturers man, a Republican or Democrat whose prime interest is party, take over the job. That is where Hoover's chance to make a selection would come in.

Hoover, we have every reason to believe, would pick the best man for the job; a man who could probably come closest to giving this Nation and our people the service we have had for four decades.

Certainly, in the tested ranks of the FBI, there are several people who could qualify and who would be willing to serve. Let Hoover pick one or two or three—or even

more. But let Hoover make the selection and let the powers that be, pick his successr from that group. With Hoover's stamp of approval on him, those making the selection can't possibly go wrong.

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past session of the 88th Congress we passed a bill to provide additional money for expanding the public housing program for our elderly citizens.

Today I am proud to report to you about efforts being made on the local level in my district, in the city of Dearborn, to see that our older, retired people have decent, suitable housing available to them at reasonable prices.

At the time the city approached the Public Housing Administration for assistance in 1960, its plans for this type of housing were unique and there was some difficulty in obtaining the agency's approval. The city officials came to me for advice on the matter, and I had a number of conferences with the housing officials, the comptroller general and others to see if a solution could be found to the problem. It was, for eventually the Housing Act was expanded and the project became eligibile for financial assistance. Work on it commenced in 1962 and it was completed in July 1963.

The following article by the Honorable Orville L. Hubbard, mayor of Dearborn, which appeared in the January 1964 issue of the Michigan Municipal Review, tells of the city's efforts to meet the housing needs of its elderly citizens:

DEARBORN MEETS A NEED

(By Orville L. Hubbard, mayor of Dearborn)

Townsend Towers is Dearborn's first apartment house built and designed for senior citizens. It will not be the last. In fact, it has already been tabbed the pilot model for a second multistoried building soon to get underway in "West" Dearborn.

Six stories high, Townsend Towers contains 79 apartment units and spacious community lounge areas. It sits on a previously vacant 1.77-acre plot of city-owned land and is a good looking building by any standards.

Although financed through the PHA at a tight budget construction cost of $1,081,425, every effort was bent to make the building appealing as well as functional. In particular, we worked to avoid the "institutional" look usually associated with public housing projects. Rents were set at 22 percent of annual income and range from $45 to $95 per month.

While we considered the need for low-rent housing for pensioners for years, the public interest and enthusiasm it aroused exceeded our expectations. During its month-long "open house" (August-September 1963), a staggering total of 18,000 people turned out to see the building.

The psychological impact of Townsend Towers was, and continues to be, even more pronounced than the building's physical appeal. Before the building was anywhere near completed, hundreds of retired residents descended on the housing bureau with calls demanding more information and ultimately, application forms. We processed enough applications to fill five buildings.

During the open house, we were surprised at the number of people in their thirties and forties who turned out to tour the building. One young woman explained she was shopping around for her parents who were due to retire in a few years. Several middle-aged couples expressed a desire to sign up on the spot so they would be "at the top of the list" when they retired 10 or 15 years hence.

PREPARATION

In preparing to construct Townsend Towers, nearly 600 pounds of paperwork was submitted to the Federal Government. Because the project was a new venture into a special type of public housing, to a great extent initial planning was "played by ear."

Surveys and questionnaires to determine housing needs of Dearborn's older citizens were conducted in several "pleasant hours groups" and the advice of a professional architectural firm were drawn heavily upon.

The project actually got off the ground in the spring of 1960 when the PHA approved our application for a $10,000 preliminary loan for development studies. As a result, the city determined to proceed with the project pending PHA relaxation of certain stringent specifications.

We wanted more floor space set aside for community activity areas than PHA guidelines permitted. We also wanted to construct individual balconies off each second-through-sixth floor apartment—considered a luxury for low-cost public housing in northern climates. We met part way: PHA agreed to more lounge area, and in return, the city footed the bill for the balconies and donated the building site.

CONSTRUCTION

In March 1962, the general contract for construction was awarded. One month later, ground-breaking ceremonies took place, and, despite weather and labor problems, the building proceeded ahead of schedule until it was completed in July 1963.

Stanchly against the building when the site location was originally announced, fearful and apprehensive neighbors worried about the mushrooming of a "six-story monster" in their immediate neighborhood. Today that reaction has turned about almost full-circle. Nearby residents have expressed pride in the attractive addition and, moreover, have been observed sprucing up their own premises.

Primarily, Townsend Towers' design called for the use of high-quality building components economically utilized in the most practical fashion.

Specially designed panels of white quartz aggregate highlight exterior walls while expanses of color-coordinated face brick and windows walls of clear and obscure glass, steel and insulated porcelain enamel make up the balance of the exterior.

Concrete floor slabs serve a twofold purpose: as a floor on one level and as a ceiling treated to appear as painted plaster on the level below. In addition to obvious economical value, this type of dual floor/ceiling also provides excellent sound insulation between floors.

FURNISHINGS

First-floor community lounge areas are colorful and spacious. Large areas of window wall admit swaths of natural light while a wide variety of interior wall materials—including Philippine mahogany paneling, textured vinyl fabrics, and face brick—create interesting contrasts. Ceilings are sound cushioned with acoustical tile; floors are surfaced with durable asphalt tile. Other first-floor features include a snackbar, complete with food preparation and serving facilities, and private/semipublic restrooms.

Apartment layouts provide compact yet roomy total living area and give an almost extravagant amount of combined closet and storage space. The kitchenettes are all-in-one units with electric range, refrigerator, vent fan, garbage disposal, and stainless-steel counter and sink built in for cleaning ease.

Special features which cater to the safety and comfort of elderly occupants include sturdy grab bars in all bathrooms, electrical outlets installed at knee level, a built-in combination vanity/wardrobe in each bedroom, and doorways kept unobstructed and level with hallways.

The building is served by two central elevators and wide stairways at the rear entrance and north end of the building . One of the elevators is a hospital-car model with both front and rear access in case of emergency.

A full basement houses all utilities and services necessary to keep a 79-unit building running: ventilating and steam-heating plant, tenant storage space, and a laundry room amply equipped with washers and dryers. Left over is approximately 8,000 square feet of floorspace to be used for recreational activities, hobbies, and crafts.

Fully landscaped promenade terraces set off two sides of the building while a large rear lot provides ample parking space. Concrete roads and walks are on all sides of the building. Nearness to existing shopping areas and metropolitan transportation played an important role in the site selection; Townsend Towers is within a two-block walking radius of these basic services.

PURPOSE

When we planned Townsend Towers, we wanted to provide more than a low-rent "warehouse for human storage." There is no institutional look about the building and the apartments are furnished with new furniture. We hoped elderly tenants would get a new lease on life from the day they moved in. At least one lighthearted widower, 81, has made a good start: Although registered as a "bachelor" on his application, he arrived to take up residence with his new 60-year-old bride.

Madill Record Says It is Time To Think Small

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared a most refreshing editorial in the Madill Record of Madill, Okla., which is in my congressional district.

Herbert J. Pate and Jim Pate, the publishers of the Madill Record, urge us to think small as a way of arresting our attention in behalf of the smaller people, interests, and enterprises in our country.

I commend this fine editorial to all my colleagues:

TIME TO THINK SMALL

There's been so much talk in recent years about thinking big that it's about time for us to do a little thinking that isn't on the grand scale.

We've become worshipers at the shrine of bigness. We've come to believe that if anything is big, it is per se good. And anything that is small is undesirable and to be scorned.

Big business is fine. But it's time to stop and consider whether or not the continued

consolidations and mergers are wholly desirable. We need small manufacturers as well as big ones.

Big stores are fine. It would be a sad day, though, if the ultimate should be achieved and all small merchants should be forced out of business.

There's nothing wrong with big farms. If the present trend continues, however, it is conceivable that all farms in the State might some day be owned by one giant corporation.

Government is growing in size. The Federal Government gets bigger every day, as does State government. Big cities are doing their best to encompass more and more acres.

We'd like to say a word in behalf of the small manufacturer, the small merchant, the small farmer, the small county, and the small city, town, and village. We think they more nearly exemplify the spirit of this Nation than do the giant enterprises.

Thinking big is a fine thing. But it also would be a good thing for us to take time for some thinking on the small side, too.

Lapeer County Press and Lapeer County Courthouse Observe 125th Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to salute two of the most venerable institutions in Lapeer County, Mich.—the Lapeer County Press and the county courthouse. Each has made an indelible mark on the growth, vitality and progress of the county.

The County Press and the courthouse, both of which are celebrating their 125th birthdays, have another thing in common. They can be traced back to the same man, A. N. Hart, who founded the newspaper and built the courthouse. I wish to call this occasion to the attention of my colleagues.

The Press and the courthouse have witnessed many changes in Lapeer County and in Michigan in their 125 years of existence. The courthouse is Michigan's oldest. The Press prides itself as America's largest rural weekly. It is also one of the best weekly newspapers in America.

In 1839, when the Press and the courthouse first opened their doors, our Nation was only 63 years old. Our westward expansion had barely begun; Martin Van Buren was our President; Michigan had been a State for only 2 years, and its population numbered about 212,000.

Lapeer County, which supposedly takes its name from the French words, "LaPierre," was organized in 1835—just 4 years before the Press published its first edition and the courthouse was built.

Today Michigan ranks seventh among the States in population with nearly 8 million residents. It is one of the most progressive of all the 50 States. And with our State's growth and progress have come growth and progress to Lapeer County.

The courthouse and the Press each has played important parts in this progress. The courthouse is aging, but the Lapeer County Press seems ageless. It has changed with the changing times and continues to be a vibrant, effective, responsible and fairminded voice for the county and its people. It has been and continues to be a dynamic force for good in the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting and proper that these two great institutions be given the recognition they deserve on the occasion of their 125th anniversary.

The Late Rear Admiral David Potter, U.S. Navy, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, in memoriam to the late Rear Admiral David Potter, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, retired, and his distinguished record of service in the Navy, I wish to take this opportunity of inserting in the RECORD today a biography and other tributes to his outstanding performance of duty.

Rear Admiral Potter died on December 13, 1962, at the age of 88. In a brochure entitled "Rear Adm. David Potter Who Sailed the Seven Seas for His Country but Who Never Forgot the Friends and Scenes of His Boyhood," compiled and edited by Francis A. Stanger, Jr., of Greenwich, N.J., member of the New Jersey bar, and president of the Cumberland County Historical Society, the following tribute is made to Admiral Potter:

Rich in heredity and environment, endowed with natural brilliance and courage, honored and loved, David Potter was never boastfully proud nor uncultured. Truly he was one who could and did "talk with crowds and keep his virtue, and walk with kings, nor lose the common touch." Attainments were considered by him humbly as incidents arising from the performance of duty, while honors and praise were gratefully accepted by him as inspirations to greater service.

The Secretary of the Navy also paid tribute to Admiral Potter in a letter written to Mrs. Potter, shortly after the admiral's death. The Secretary said:

Your husband's record of military service is a distinguished account of more than four decades of naval progress. Loyalty, honesty, and extreme dedication to the highest standards of the Navy are the hallmarks of his life—a life which provides an outstanding example for all who wish to follow. I hope the knowledge of his distinguished achievements, and the deep appreciation of a grateful people, will bring some measure of consolation to you in your bereavement.

A short biography on this fine gentleman and dedicated naval officer follows:

Rear Adm. David Potter, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, retired.

David Potter was born on December 19, 1874, at Bridgeton, N.J., son of William Elmer Potter, counselor at law, major of Twelfth Regiment of New Jersey Volunteers, Army of the Potomac, 1862–65, and Mrs. Alice Eddy Potter. He attended Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., where he was active in athletics; a member of the Elm Club and the Monday Night Club, Whig Hall; an editor of Nassau Literary magazine; and historian of the class of 1896. He was graduated with a bachelor of arts degree in 1896, and the next year became attorney at law and master of the court of chancery of New Jersey.

Appointed assistant paymaster with rank of ensign on February 18, 1898, he took the oath of office on February 25. He subsequently rose to the rank of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy, on November 24, 1937. He was transferred to the retired list of the Navy on January 1, 1939.

Upon acceptance of appointment as assistant paymaster in 1898, he was assigned to the U.S.S. *Katahdin*, and after continuous sea duty in that vessel and others for 3 years during the War with Spain, 1898, and the Philippines campaign in 1899–1900, during which period he participated in the affair at Zapote River in Luzon, June 13, 1899; at Cape Melville lighthouse in Balabac on July 13, 1899; at San Fabian, Luzon, November 7, and Zamboanga, Mindanao, November 16 of the same year; at Cagayan, Mindanao, March 29, 1900; and at Oroquieta, Mindanao, October 1, 1900.

Other naval vessels in which he served were: U.S.S. *Buffalo*; U.S.S. *Boston*; U.S.S. *Manila*; U.S.S. *Hancock*; U.S.S. *Illinois*; U.S.S. *Kearsarge*; U.S.S. *Mississippi*; U.S.S. *Minnesota*; and U.S.S. *Pennsylvania* He participated as fiscal officer of customs during the American occupation of Vera Cruz, Mexico, in July and August 1914; and during that year attended the Naval War College. During World War I in 1917–18, as a member of the Navy Compensation Board, he handled matters of the costs of naval vessels built at civilian shipyards (until 1919).

He was fleet paymaster of the Atlantic Fleet from 1919 to 1921, and in the rank of rear admiral he served as paymaster general of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts from 1921 to 1925, during which period he was a member of the Board for Settlement of Claims arising from Treaty Limiting Naval Armament, 1923. From 1926 to 1930, he was a member of the Naval War Claims Board, and for 4 years thereafter was general inspector of the Supply Corps for the west coast. He relinquished the latter position in March 1934, ultimately to establish and remain in charge of the Finance and Supply School located at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, concluding that duty in 1938.

After temporary duty at headquarters, 12th Naval District, San Francisco, Calif., he was transferred to the retired list of the Navy on January 1, 1939.

He has the Spanish Campaign Medal (1898); the Philippine Campaign Medal (1899–1900); the Mexican Service Medal (1914); and the Victory Medal (1918).

Admiral Potter has long been a member of the Army and Navy Clubs of Washington, D.C., and Manila, Philippine Islands; the Princeton Club of New York; and the Shoemaker Post of the American Legion of Bridgeton, N.J. He is the author of monographs concerning the financial and supply affairs of the Navy, and has lectured on such matters at various colleges.

His wife was the former Jane Grey, daughter of Vice Chancellor Martin Phillip Grey of New Jersey, to whom he was married at Salem, N.J., on April 23, 1904.

Mr. Stanger's brochure on Admiral Potter, dedicated to the Cumberland County Historical Society, sets forth the distinguished Potter family genealogy.

It contains five articles written by Admiral Potter and published in news media circulated in Bridgeton, N.J., which concern his boyhood and early days of manhood in Cumberland County, N.J. It tells of his outstanding service to the city of

Bridgeton Chamber of Commerce and of the orations delivered by him in his native city. It also gives an account of Admiral Potter's literary achievements, which include six books of fiction, four novelettes, and one moving picture. Admiral Potter also wrote a volume of memoirs, one biographical volume "New Jersey Men in the U.S. Navy," 20 poems and 75 special articles. He also prepared and delivered many lectures and addresses.

Adm. David Potter's record as a citizen and as an officer in the U.S. Navy will long constitute a standard of patriotism for adults and a guide to patriotic service for all American youth.

Hon. James A. Farley Says No Reward for the Goof-off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, former Postmaster General James A. Farley expresses a belief that:

Wherever a human being is accorded the opportunity to express himself as an individual with dignity, he will strive to give the best that's in him.

The General in his article states that the experience gained by a youngster who delivers newspapers imparts to him at an early age the lessons of self-reliance, integrity, and responsibility.

Mr. Farley, here as always, advances a timely object lesson on how to shoulder the responsibilities of life in our times. His wisdom is always enlightening and I commend it to my colleagues at this hour when the dignity of the individual human being is the major concern before the House:

NO REWARD FOR THE "GOOF-OFF"

(By James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.)

There has been a considerable amount of comment lately about what is now termed "the era of the 'goof-off.'" It is said that nowadays nearly everyone is lazy and nobody anymore has much regard for doing a job well. We hear loud protests directed against the servant who won't serve, the plumber who won't plumb, the worker who won't work and so on through a long list. This bothers me. It makes me wonder if it isn't just becoming fashionable to be supercritical of the other fellow without looking for reasons or solutions. If you read your daily newspapers regularly as I have done for the last 60 years or so, you see these things repeated over and over again. Labor says that it's the fault of management. Employers say that it is all labor's fault. The truth is that both sides lose sight of the true culprit—the individual.

Something may indeed be happening to rob the individual of pride in his own accomplishments. Perhaps it is the rapid expansion of a mechanized society where button-pushing is becoming a rather sought-after profession. Perhaps it is the natural result of men working for others their whole lives. More likely it is a little bit of both. The fact is that there are hundreds of thousands—indeed, millions—of men and women who do take great pride in the work they do.

For a number of years I have been active in the international business world. In traveling to all corners of this rapidly shrinking world we live in to talk to people about Coca-Cola, I am constantly learning new things about people. Although there are certainly great differences among the world's peoples—differences in languages, customs, traditions, values—there are, at the same time, profound similarities.

One characteristic I observe everywhere is that wherever a human being is accorded the opportunity to express himself as an individual with dignity, he will strive to give the best that's in him.

This is why I believe so deeply in the chance for young people to have the opportunity early for standing on their own two feet and accepting as much responsibility as they can bear.

The thousands of boys all over America who deliver the daily newspaper, sell it to new customers, collect their money and settle their own accounts, are living proof not only in the value of the individual, but also of the great lessons inherent in our free society. These truths will encourage loyalty, self-reliance, integrity, and responsibility. They will guide the boy throughout his life.

In my judgment, this will do much to still the clamor about the "era of the goof-off," and help each person to see the truth inherent in his dignity as an individual of value.

Panama Canal: The Guilt Fixation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in many addresses of mine, in and out of the Congress, I have severely criticized the efforts of certain sections of the mass news media, then commentators, editors, journalists, and writers, to create on the part of the American people a sense of guilt for having acquired the Canal Zone, constructed the Panama Canal, and having operated it successfully, instead of endeavoring to treat objectively with those great achievements on which our country takes just pride. I can think of no greater disservice than spreading such fallacious and harmful propaganda.

It was, therefore, with much interest that I read the following editorial by Thurman Sensing in the January 30, 1964, issue of Sensing the News issued by the Southern States Industrial Council, which merits reading by every Member of the Congress:

THE GUILT FIXATION

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern States Industrial Council)

The danger to the United States is not so much that it will be overwhelmed by an aggressor as it is that the Nation will commit suicide. This danger can be most clearly discerned in the pattern of liberal reaction to the revolutionary pressures on the Panama Canal Zone. It also can be detected in the current uproar over alleged poverty in the United States.

No sooner is the United States threatened at some point overseas than a chorus of liberals, in Government and the leftwing press, begin to accuse their own country of being guilty. So it is in the Panama question. If one reads the liberal pundits, one finds the accusation that the trouble lies with the American residents of the Canal Zone—the so-called Zonians. They are described as ruled by prejudice and hatred of the Panamanians. "It's all their fault," say the pundits, referring to their fellow citizens. The Communist line that all Westerners overseas are antihuman imperialists finds a ready echo even in supposedly respectable journals.

It was the same situation in Cuba. When Castro's Red revolution broke out, the liberals said that the cause of unrest lay with the American companies that allegedly didn't share enough with their Cuban employes. As a matter of fact, the U.S. companies in Cuba paid the highest wages in the country. In Panama, U.S. Government installations provide employment opportunities for which the Panamanians should be thankful. But instead of being grateful, they are ruled by envy. The truth is that the Panamanians don't want opportunities; they want special privileges to which they are not entitled. Uncle Sam already is being much more than generous, but generosity isn't appreciated.

Meanwhile, the liberals at home hammer away at the theme that Americans are responsible. We must feel guilty, say these pundits, because we aren't doing more for the Panamanians and because their feelings may be hurt in some way. We are told to wake up to the fact of Panamanian nationalism and respect it.

No country on earth has been as generous as the United States, nor so considerate of foreign lands. Panama would be a pest-ridden jungle were it not for America, and it is time that the United States get over guilt feelings and speak the truth. The United States doesn't owe Panama a thing, but Panama owes the United States plenty.

At home, we see the same guilt fixation with respect to alleged poverty. The Johnson administration suggests that we have let down a section of the Nation's population because some citizens are not enjoying prosperity. Indeed throughout the mass of liberal writing one finds the notion spread that the lot of the have-nots is the faults of the haves. The American middle class, one judges, is supposed to feel guilty for not having made everyone in the Nation very prosperous. This is as wrong as the idea that the United States is guilty in the Panama dispute.

Poverty has existed since the beginning of history. In the United States, it has been alleviated as nowhere else. Charity has been carried to incredible lengths, in the private as well as in the public realm. Hardly a day passes that a citizen doesn't put a coin in some sort of collection container to contribute to the fight against various diseases. Thousands of communities conduct united fund campaigns to help the poor and the sick and the helpless.

All good citizens want to continue such good works of charity. But this doesn't mean that the productive citizen, whether a farmer, industrial worker, white-collar employee or professional man is responsible for such poverty as exists in the Nation. It is a fact of human nature that some people are shiftless and prefer to live as drones. Some people spend their money for liquor instead of food for their children. Some people are lazy and won't make a maximum effort. There may be total equality of opportunity, but there is no such thing as total equality of enterprise, initiative, determination and hard work.

The man who works hard and supports his family shouldn't be held responsible for the parasite who prefers to live at public expense. Each citizen is responsible for what he makes of his life. It is time that Americans get over the guilt fixation with respect to the domestic economy as well as to foreign policy.

Political Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is going to cough up more millions in subsidies to grow more peanuts when we already have a surplus of goobers that nobody wants and nobody can use. Fifty million dollars in subsidies to peanut growers is not peanuts, but it makes a good campaign issue for the administration in using the Department of Agriculture to get votes in peanut-growing areas.

The only losers are the American taxpayers who must continue to shell out to keep a Democratic administration in office.

The following editorials, "Goober Goof," from the Wall Street Journal, and "Peanuts," from the Chicago Tribune, point up the ridiculous situation that develops when we play politics with subsidies:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

GOOBER GOOF

If you are paying a little more for peanuts than you did a year ago, don't blame it on any shortage of goobers. For there isn't any shortage. There's a surplus.

How come, then, the price has gone up? Isn't there an economic law which says that when a commodity is scarce prices rise, and when it is abundant prices go down? Well, there is; the trouble is that it doesn't seem to work very well when the Government tries to tinker with it.

In the case of the peanuts, the Government last year increased its price support by $3.60 a ton to a total of $224. Thus encouraged, growers did what you'd expect anybody with a guaranteed market to do. They grew more peanuts.

So many more, in fact, that the Government is preparing to take over an estimated 25 percent of the crop, or about 500 million pounds. Which is a lot of peanuts. Yet because the Federal planners pushed up the price, you as a consumer are getting no benefits and some penalties from the increased production.

To some people all this may appear to be effective agricultural policy. To others it has a striking resemblance to peanut politics.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

PEANUTS

Taxpayers in the next few months are going to find themselves stuck with $50 million worth of surplus peanuts, which nobody else wants to buy. The taxpayers are being called on to buy them through the Department of Agriculture in order to guarantee high prices to growers. The goober surplus amounts to about 425 million pounds, which is a fourth of last year's crop and the quantity left over after all needs for food, seed, and livestock feed have been filled at prices set by the Government.

It may be recalled that in 1962 farmers produced more peanuts than were needed. Yet in 1963 Secretary of Agriculture Freeman ordered an increase in price supports, presumably to curry favor with Congressmen representing peanut growing areas. Farmers responded promptly by growing an even bigger crop.

It is curious that in the atmosphere of frugality in Government spending that prevails in Washington not one murmur of protest over this waste comes from any official source. Perhaps that's because an administration that is spending close to $7 billion on agriculture this year regards a mere 50 million as peanuts.

Steel Export Rate Impact Held "Zero"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, despite charges and news stories to the effect that American steel products cannot compete on the open market in Europe because of ocean freight rates, the truth is that U.S. steel items could not compete even if shipping lines moved those products entirely free of charge. Earlier stories completely ignored testimony to that effect by shipping line spokesmen before the Joint Economic Committee for the Congress. But now steel exporters and Government witnesses have so testified at hearings before the Federal Maritime Commission. Thus far the press generally has not corrected their earlier erroneous stories. However, the Journal of Commerce in several articles has sought to reveal the true facts. I include herewith an article appearing in its January 15, 1964, issue:

STEEL EXPORT RATE IMPACT HELD ZERO

(By George Panitz)

The charges by congressional critics that high ocean freight tariffs are hurting foreign sales of U.S. steel products were countered yesterday at a Federal probe into export and import rates of the steamship industry.

A Government witness told Federal Maritime Commission Examiner C. W. Robinson that higher priced American steel items could not compete on the open market in Europe even if the ship lines moved these products free of charge.

The testimony by Ernst Wimpfheimer, head of two New York firms that import and export steel and also past president of the American Institute for Imported Steel, supports the view of shipping industry officials. A number of leaders in Congress have contended that rate disparities in ocean transport for similar items moving inbound and outbound are factors damaging expansion of U.S. trade abroad.

DOUGLAS COMMITTEE PROBE

Charges along these lines last year by the Joint Economic Committee for the Congress headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS sparked the current inquiry by the Commission. According to Senator DOUGLAS and others on the committee, the practice of steamship freight conferences in charging higher rates on American export cargoes than similar items brought here from abroad discriminates against U.S. manufacturers.

Although this has been denied by the shipping industry and American steel firms have generally given it little support, the Commission is investigating steel rates in transatlantic and transpacific sea trades as well as rates between foreign ports on steel items.

The issue has led to separate disputes involving the ship regulatory agency with foreign governments over production of documents used in setting rates, and also set the stage for possible legal action over FMC demands that eight U.S.-based ship conferences equalize their inbound and outbound rates on key cargoes.

NO BEARING

In the hearing here yesterday, Mr. Wimpfheimer testified under cross-examination by Burton H. White, counsel for three of the conferences ordered to equalize the rate structures, that ocean freight rates have no bearing on U.S. steel sales abroad. "U.S. steel prices are so high that even if ocean freight rates were zero the steel would be too costly to compete in Europe," he said. Shipping industry officials made the same claim before the Douglas commitee last November.

The testimony of Mr. Wimpfheimer would appear to be highly significant in the current rate investigation under Mr. Robinson for at least two reasons. First, he is not a spokesman for the shipping industry, and second, his appearance was at the request of FMC hearing counsel, whose role in the present inquiry will be generally opposed to the steamship lines.

Far from being an apologist for the shipping industry and its rate practices, Mr. Wimpfheimer testified that as former head of the steel importers' association he encountered little success with either conferences or individual ship lines on requests for rate cuts for moving foreign steel to the United States.

HITTING STONE WALL

The Steel Import Institute represents some 40 companies in the United States that import the product from Europe and Japan for sale in this country. Under questioning by Frank Gormley, one of two FMC hearing counsel at the inquiry, Mr. Wimpfheimer described his efforts at gaining rate cuts on the imports like "hitting one's head against a stone wall."

He said that unlike exported steel, which is not affected by shipping rates and finds a market abroad only under special circumstances, imported steel is keyed to the level of the ocean freight tariffs. In some cases, he testified, failure to secure a lower freight rate has resulted in loss of sales here of the imported foreign-made steel.

FREIGHT COSTS HELD FACTOR

Mr. Wimpfheimer said that lower priced foreign steel items such as wire rods have a good market in the United States because in most instances, the total cost of landing the product here is still lower than the price of the same item made by the domestic industry.

He added that the only time that U.S. steel products find a market in Europe is during emergencies in those markets resulting from labor strikes or other temporary disruption in supplies.

Three transatlantic ship conferences, groups of steamship lines legally permitted to set common ocean freight rates on specified routes, are taking part in the current hearings. They are the North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference, the North Atlantic United Kingdom Freight Conference, and the North Atlantic French Atlantic Freight Conference.

The Far East Conference, the Japan Iron & Steel Exporters Association, the Port of New York Authority and several individual steamship lines are also participating in the hearings.

Overtime Rates and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of our colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the January 11, 1964, edition of the Washington Post. The editorial, headlined "Overtime Rates and Jobs," commented upon President Johnson's suggestion that investigation committees be established to look into the effects of overtime pay on unemployment.

I agree with the editorial writer who believes President Johnson "made an eminently sensible proposal for determining whether increases in the statutory penalty rate for overtime work will create more full-time jobs."

More than a year ago, I introduced a bill (H.R. 1680) which would increase the penalty rate for overtime in those industries covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. My purpose in offering this legislation was to stimulate serious discussion and study of the question as to whether an increase in the penalty rate for overtime pay in some industries would in fact lead to more job opportunities. Last week, I introduced H.R. 9802 embodying President Johnson's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President has advocated the proper approach to this question. I am hopeful that a majority of our colleagues will give his proposal serious consideration and then conclude that investigations of the probable effect of increasing the penalty rate in certain industries would be worthwhile.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Overtime Rates and Jobs," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OVERTIME RATES AND JOBS

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson made an eminently sensible proposal for determining whether increases in the statutory penalty rate for overtime work will create more full-time jobs.

The average worker in manufacturing industries is now working 2.8 hours of overtime a week which is the equivalent of more than 900 thousand full-time jobs. No one is so sanguine as to believe that more than a fraction of the total overtime work can be eliminated. Much of it is in response to emergencies and the difficulties of scheduling production for uncertain markets. But the present time and a half penalty rate for overtime was established under the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, and it is now time, as Labor Secretary Wirtz suggested, to determine whether it is still the "correct" one.

In order to answer the question of whether a higher overtime rate will create more full-time jobs, one must first determine the point at which the higher, penalty-rate wage cost will equal or exceed the fringe benefits and administrative costs of taking on a full-time worker. The overtime rates at which these costs would be balanced will vary; hence the President's recommendation that the issue be explored "on an industry-by-industry basis."

The employment effects of increases in overtime rates will be largely determined by the nature of productive operations and the state of the labor markets on which the various industries rely. Where production operations are highly coordinated, the costs of breaking in an inexperienced worker are high. But it may be substantially reduced where management is able to draw upon pools of the experienced unemployed. So where there is unemployment, it is possible that modest advances in overtime rates would lead to the accession of additional full-time workers. But in tight labor markets, where there are no reserves of the experienced unemployed, advances in overtime rates might lead only to increases in labor costs.

The President's request for legislation authorizing the creation of tripartite industry investigating committees suggests that he is well aware of the complexities of the overtime-rate issue. Congress, we trust, will cooperate when a specific proposal reaches Capitol Hill.

Boisfeuillet Jones: Health Man at the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from the recent article in the Medical World News on Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Labor for health and medical affairs:

To Washington insiders, one of the most important developments at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is something that has never hit the headlines. Indeed, it hasn't even appeared in the fine print. In a quiet but fundamental revolution, a genial, tough-minded Georgian has taken over as the top decisionmaker in the Federal health field.

He is Boisfeuillet Jones, now beginning his fourth year as the HEW Secretary's Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs. Technically only an adviser, with no direct authority over any of the HEW agencies, "Bo" Jones is now calling most of the tunes.

For the first time in the history of the job, the special assistant has been given responsibility for most of the "H" in HEW. Neither a physician nor a scientist, but considered a superb administrator, Mr. Jones now personally oversees policymaking for the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, and other health agencies. With increasing regularity, their operations bear the imprint of his thinking.

In tapping Mr. Jones for the position in December 1960, the new HEW Secretary ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, said: "We want to make this job significant or abolish it." Mr. Jones quickly set out to make it significant. Among other accomplishments, he launched a series of skillful maneuvers that, in 1963, helped pass the historic Federal-aid program for medical schools.

The FDA crisis was still in full swing. The long wrangle over new drug controls was coming to a climax; Congress and the general public were in an uproar over thalidomide; FDA was torn by internal dissensions and under fire from outside critics. Someone in the administration had to take charge, and, in a precedent-setting memorandum, Secretary Celebrezze picked Mr. Jones. He gave the veteran Emory University administrator general authority over FDA policies and problems.

At the same time, Secretary Celebrezze also indicated that Mr. Jones would oversee the policymaking for PHS, including the independent-minded NIH. All at once, the Georgian had more personal authority than his predecessors ever enjoyed.

He took charge confidently. Mr. Jones exudes southern charm and his soft drawl is tuned to persuasion more than command. He is gentle in manner and professional in appearance. He moves deliberately and cautiously in attacking a problem, often displaying a Jobian patience with balky officials and slow-moving solutions. But he has a clear, tough mind. When he decides something is right, he fights for it with surprising stubbornness. And he not only understands power, he isn't afraid to use it.

Mr. Jones has driven relentlessly toward his objective of giving the FDA scientific competence and prestige comparable to that of NIH, and prodding it away from a policeman's approach to drug control. He feels strongly that consumer protection is better served by high-quality science, and by prevention through education, communication, and broad scientific study.

Mr. Jones encouraged both FDA and NIH to set up a formal system for exchanging drug information. And he personally presided over the Krebiozen dispute, conducting the correspondence with Drs. Stevan Durovic and Andrew C. Ivy and even addressing a protest meeting of Krebiozen patients.

Inevitably, Mr. Jones made enemies. Some old-line FDA officials resented his taking over and taking credit. Some sharply criticized the apparent deemphasis of enforcement, charging that this would undermine FDA's basic mission. Still other critics, in and out of FDA, privately rapped Mr. Jones for moving too slowly. Some of the President's top science advisers, for example, were reported to be critical of delays in key reforms and in the naming of a top scientist and a medical director to spark the scientific buildup.

Still another case of Mr. Jones' sticking to his guns is the new mental health program. He headed the Government task force that drafted proposals calling for the development of community mental health centers across the Nation.

To assure the center's success, the group said, the Government should provide initial staffing grants.

Some key administration officials strongly opposed this provision, but Mr. Jones, backed by mental health leaders, fought for it and finally won official administration support. He also met privately with members of the AMA Council on Mental Health, and sold it to them. The Senate voted its approval. Only later, when the AMA swung around in opposition, was the provision knocked out of the final bill.

Last year's medical school aid bill was another beneficiary of Mr. Jones' efforts. While many forces combined to carry this program safely through Congress after more than a decade of setbacks, Mr. Jones played a significant, though little-known, role in the successful result.

Everything Mr. Jones has done has been in keeping with a distinctive pattern of thinking about the Nation's needs and problems—a vision of what the future should be. If there is a central theme to his philosophy, it is a conviction that health is not the province just of the medical profession but of society as a whole.

"Medicine has no meaning except in the context of society," he once told a group of medical school graduates. "Aristide Briand is supposed to have said that war is too important a business to be left to the generals. I believe that health is too important a business to be left to the doctors—alone."

In an era of growing complexity and increasing disciplinary interdependence, Mr. Jones feels that the Nation must make the final decisions on the patterns of health education, research, protection, and care. And he is candidly critical of the AMA for resisting what he believes to be the forward thrust of progress.

The medical profession, he says, "has been quicker to adjust to scientific progress than to social advance. There has been a tremendous gain of knowledge without a parallel gain in distribution of the fruits of knowledge. In a sense we are trying to apply 21st century science with 19th century economics."

In an effort to defend its position, he charges, organized medicine has engaged in "overselling and irrelevant arguments." As an example, he says, people know that how they pay their hospital bills has nothing to do with the patient-physician relationship, "unless the physician himself injects it."

Mr. Jones thinks that the AMA is doing itself a disservice in fighting social security financing for hospital care for the aged. He was disappointed that it opposed Federal scholarships and even Federal loans for medical students. He insisted that the mental health bill was an effort to desocialize medicine rather than socialize it, and could not understand why the AMA opposed the initial staffing grants.

As a longtime medical school administrator, Mr. Jones also feels strongly that organized medicine should encourage, not resist, the new patterns of medical education and service that, he feels, are needed to meet the challenge posed by the flood of new scientific knowledge, which among other things has set off an "explosion of specialization." He feels that referral from individual practitioner to practitioner "is no longer effective either practically or economically"; the inevitable result is a trend toward new care patterns such as group practice.

Mr. Jones also believes that the teachers and practitioners of medicine should be partners rather than rivals, exchanging knowledge and service and serving the community as a whole rather than narrower professional or personal goals.

Strengthening medical communications, education, and service is one of the major challenges of the future in Mr. Jones' view. Allied to this is the issue of effective financing and distribution of care. Also looming large, he says, is the great problem of health protection—protection of individuals against personal hazards such as unsafe drugs (FDA) and protection of the Nation against environmental hazards such as air pollution (Environmental Health Center). At the same time, he wants to continue pushing large-scale Government support for medical research.

In announcing the appointment, President Kennedy called Mr. Jones a "nationally renowned figure in the field of health and medicine."

Three years later, Boisfeuillet Jones is still nationally renowned. He is also nationally influential.

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York Supports Medical Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee is presently considering medical care legislation. As one of the sponsors of this proposal, I am deeply interested and I am hopeful it will be approved by Congress this year.

Mr. Caspar W. Rittenberg, a trustee of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, presented an excellent statement before the committee on January 21, 1964, in behalf of this legislation. With permission, I wish to insert his testimony in the RECORD. Mr. Rittenberg is a member of the federation's committee on social legislation, and is also chairman of the functional committee on the care of the aged, and a former president of the Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged.

His statement follows:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY MR. CASPAR W. RITTENBERG TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 21, 1964, IN BEHALF OF THE FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF NEW YORK

I am Caspar W. Rittenberg, a trustee of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, a member of its committee on social legislation and chairman of its functional committee on care of the aged. I am accompanied by Dr. Morris Hinemburg, our medical care consultant, and Mr. Milton D. Levine, secretary to the committee.

On behalf of federation, I wish to thank you for this privilege of testifying on the subject of health services for the aged.

Federation is the communal representative of 116 health and welfare agencies in Greater New York, whose services are used annually by close to a million people of all races and religions. Its hospital and medical care agencies are amongst the largest and finest in New York. Its first hospital, Mount Sinai, was founded 111 years ago. Our facilities for the aged include 3 large homes, with a capacity of approximately 1,800 beds, and a nursing home for the chronically sick, for 500, mostly aged people. Our family casework agencies sponsor home care programs, offer counseling and other social services, and our community centers and camps offer broad programs for older people.

We are presently assaying potential benefits of community planning, by a demonstration project of home services, through a $1 million grant from the Hirshman Foundation. The program provides "complete services to a selected group of aging people, so that they may continue to remain in the community, living at home, using their own resources to their full potential, assisted by a broad range of medical and community services, when these are needed."

The research findings of this project should supply data for better community planning; for more precise determinations of the institutional bed needs of the aged; and the degree to which extra—and intramural services can be coordinated. The value of home care programs has been established and, we believe, should be included in the legislation you are considering. This concept is highlighted in a recent federation study of the Jewish aged in New York City, which I have made available as an addendum to this statement.

As to hospital services, aged persons have a higher incidence of illness and are sick for longer periods than the rest of the population, and their average stay in hospitals is twice as long. A large majority of them, with earning power and income at substantially reduced levels, is unable to meet the steadily rising cost of this care. Social security benefits, small pensions, and modest savings, enable some aged to meet the regular, ongoing costs of daily living, but when sickness occurs, these resources are often quickly exhausted and indigency takes over.

The high incidence of illness and the social and economic limitations confronting the aged in our society, are among the factors which motivated the enactment of the Kerr-Mills Act. Concerning that law, and our New York Metcalf-McCloskey Act, its implementation instrument, the experience of our agencies indicates that these laws deal with dependency after it occurs instead of providing the necessary services before the person's funds are exhausted, or nearly exhausted. Experience we have had in New York State in the implementation of these acts, further shows that too many older people refuse essential hospitalization, because they do not wish to involve their children in the required investigative procedures.

We are in agreement with those who assert that the Kerr-Mills program has failed to broaden the base of care for the medically indigent aged. It has instead, shifted the main source of payment for services, from the local and State, to the Federal Government.

With reference to voluntary insurance programs, experience to date shows that they cannot meet fully the requirements of health care of the aged. However, a plan whereby private and public insurance could be coordinated in a dual program, as suggested in the recent report of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged, might serve effectively. Our committee has not met since this report was issued. It warrants and will have our serious consideration.

On February 8, 1961, federation's board of trustees adopted a resolution endorsing the principle of providing medical care for the aged through the social security mechanism. We now reaffirm this position and declare our support, in principle, for legislation based on this premise. We believe that a Federal plan, financed by contributions of the employee and the employer, and providing stated benefits as a matter of right, would be better by far, than a system based on relief, supported by general tax revenues.

We have seen that the accrued benefits of the social security program, have enabled recipients to maintain self-dependent status, and have kept many off the public relief rolls. Hence, the use of social security as the instrument to bring health services to our aged, as a matter of right, would fulfill the responsibility of our society to make it possible for all the aged to obtain these vital services when they are needed.

We strongly urge consideration of the following as additional provisions in this legislation:

1. Permit admissions directly to nursing homes rather than only via hospitals, so that persons who are too sick to remain in their homes, but not eligible for hospital care, will not be denied service. Direct admission to a qualified facility such as the skilled nursing home, can be clinically more effective and less costly.

2. Include in the category of skilled nursing homes, qualified homes for the aged, many of which are today, accredited hospitals.

3. The limitation of 180 days of skilled nursing home service raises the question of responsibility for the patient's care after that period has expired. We believe that the limitation of any specified number of days of nursing home service, without clear provision for post institutional care, can create serious dislocations, detrimental to the patient.

Our purpose in presenting this statement to the committee, was to bring before you the considered judgment of volunteer and professional leaders, long experienced in the field of the aged, who earnestly believe that an effective program for their care can best be developed through the joint efforts of the Federal Government and voluntary agencies, working cooperatively, to achieve this essential objective.

Thank you.

Panama Canal: Red Revolutionary Leadership of January 9, 1964, Attack Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions when addressing this House of the Congress, I have emphasized the communistic revolutionary leadership in isthmian agitations, demonstrations, violence and bloodshed. Though my analyses, conclusions and predications in these regards may have seemed fantastic to those who have not followed the steady erosion of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, the stark realities of the situation erupted with apparent suddenness on January 9, 1964, and with such violence that our Government, in the exercise of its solemn obligations, had to defend the Panama Canal against lawlessness and disorder by the use of force as contemplated under the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain.

Though the facts about Red revolutionary operations on the isthmus have long been well-known to discerning observers and our intelligence agencies, the mass news media in the United States, through failure to report facts objectively, had misled our people into a false sense of security concerning the safety of our strategic outpost in the Canal Zone. The result was that they were generally confused and shocked to a degree not equaled since the assault on the legation compound by the Chinese in the 1900 Boxer insurrection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of the significant facts underlying the January 9 Red-led Panamanian mob assault on the Canal Zone are coming to light, with identification of key leaders, many of whom were, trained in Communist Cuba or elsewhere.

The Washington Daily News, in its city edition on January 31, 1964, on the front page, published pictures of the following Reds: Victor Avila, Eligio Salas, and Floyd Britton, with Avila shown addressing the mob in front of the Presidencia in Panama City.

In view of the general denial of such elemental facts to our Nation by the controlled press and their publicists, it was indeed gratifying to read in the January 31 issue of the News an illuminating article by Francis L. McCarthy giving the names of leaders for the January 9 outbreak at Panama and other significant details on the background of the Red-instigated outbreak.

In order that the indicated exposure of the Red-led January 9 Panamanian attacks may be readily available for study by all intelligence agencies of our Government and others concerned with Panama Canal policy questions, I quote it as part of my remarks and urge that it be read not only by every Member of the Congress but also by the staffs of committees with cognizance over canal matters.

The article follows:

CANAL RIOT REDS ARE NAMED—FREQUENT VISITORS TO RUSSIA, CUBA, AND CHINA

(By Francis L. McCarthy)

NEW YORK, January 31.—Communists and Castroites helped organize the anti-American rioting in Panama in which 21 persons were killed and several hundred wounded earlier this month, authoritative sources told the United Press International today.

These sources supplied identifications of participants.

About 70 known Communists and Fidelistas seized on an incident to spark and develop the outbreaks. Some 40 of these were said to have been recent visitors to Cuba, Russia, and Red China.

ARMED

The Reds who led the demonstrations all were armed.

Panama authorities were reported to have arrested some of the better known subversives after American complaints. These were reported to have been released quickly because of their leading roles in student affairs and government fears of adverse public reaction in Panama. (A palace guard spokesman in Panama said he did not know anything about the arrests.)

The sources said a flag-raising incident at the Balboa High School in the Canal Zone, for which American students were to blame, gave the Communists and Castroites the incident they long had been seeking.

ORDERS

Their subsequent actions responded to appeals from Havana for riots and disorders throughout Latin America.

United Press International's sources traced organized agitation in the days immediately preceding and following the flag-raising incident as follows:

On January 9, Communist speakers interrupted a student rally at the National Institute in Panama City to announce a march on the Balboa High School. The Communist orators at this rally were identified as Floyd Britton, Carlos Nunez and the leader of a women's affiliate, Virginia Ramirez.

SPARKPLUG

Britton, 26, was described as the sparkplug at the January 9 rally. He instigated demonstrations against the U.S. Embassy in Panama City in 1955, participated in the Cuban-sponsored guerrilla activity in the Panamanian interior in 1959, and in student riots against the Panama Canal.

He was a Castro guest in Cuba in late 1961 and early 1962.

On January 10, following a night of rioting, Panamanian Communist leaders appeared at the National Institute to distribute arms to demonstrators. Identified and reported to the Panamanian National Guard were Cleto Souza, Ruben Dario Souza, Jorge Turner, and Cesar Carrasquilla.

Carrasquilla, the ringleader, was identified as a Communist cell leader in the science faculty at Panama University.

URGED TO KILL

Speakers were heard urging the crowd to "kill Americans" and keep up the disorders "until all Americans have left Panama."

Later the same day, a deputy in the National Assembly, Thelma King, a close friend of Castro and a frequent visitor to Communist Cuba, personally led a mob of about 1,000 persons to national guard headquarters to demand weapons.

A subsequent meeting at Panama University, which led to further violence, was organized by Victor Avila, 24, Communist student leader. He was described as a Communist since 1960.

Avila, like Britton, was trained in Cuba. After the meeting Britton was observed leading the demonstrations along the zone border.

LINKED

Other Panamanian Communists linked to achieve roles in the 4 days of anti-American sniping, rioting, looting, and sabotage, were said to include David Turner, Samuel Gutierrez, and Alvaro Menendez Franco. They were photographed provoking violence.

The sources also identified Andres Galvan Lorenzo, a leader of the Communist group, National Action Vanguard. He was seen during the Colon fighting with several other armed members of the party. They were among those arrested and released by the Panama National Guard.

Galvan Lorenzo trained for 6 months in Cuba in 1962.

Other known radicals identified in photographs by the sources included Alberto Calvo, 25, and Eligio Salas, Communist leaders in the law school, Augusto Arosemena, 23, who visited Cuba in 1960.

Also Humberto Bruggiay, 22, a militant Communist in the school of sciences, and Pedro Rivera, a Communist student leader.

Case for Shocking Ocean Rate Disparities in Steel Proving Dud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, some reporters covering a congressional committee hearing last year on ocean freight rates failed to report the full facts. Their stories repeated only the unfounded charges that U.S. exporters were losing business to foreign competitors because rates on cargoes shipped from the United States were higher than the rates which foreigners had to pay. The stories played up steel products as an example. They neglected to mention the refutation of the charges. Fortunately, the Journal of Commerce has published the other side of the situation in several articles. One was published on January 20, 1964, which I include with these remarks:

AFTER WEEK OF TESTIMONY: CASE FOR "SHOCKING" OCEAN RATE DISPARITIES IN STEEL PROVING DUD

(By George Panitz)

The week-old Government probe into ocean rates for shipping steel is proving to be a dud in uncovering support for congressional charges that tariff differentials favor foreign suppliers and damage American export trade.

None of the first seven witnesses at the Federal Maritime Commission investigation here into steamship rate structures for steel products has given any backing to the complaints. Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and WILLIAM PROXMIRE raised the issue last year in claiming that American steel exporters are discriminated in making sales to West Europe and Japan by disparities in rates on similar cargo moving between the United States and these foreign areas.

The steamship industry and particularly the ocean freight conferences that govern shipping rates have been unsuccessful thus far in altering congressional ire over the rates, which generally are higher on outbound than on inbound cargoes. Senator PROXMIRE has already introduced legislation

to curb "shocking" rate differentials and remove discrimination in ocean freight tariffs that may work against U.S. exporters.

DISPARITIES NO FACTOR

However, witnesses at the FMC inquiry, which resumes today before Examiner C. W. Robinson, have clearly indicated that the disparities in shipping rates are no factor in their trade. Each of the witnesses, who include industry officials in both steel import and export trades, stressed that from time to time they have had problems with the steamship conferences in seeking a lower rate for shipments—a normal business problem in transportation.

But they made plain that the shipping rate on the same item moving in the opposite direction had no impact on their sales.

One witness testified that American exports of certain basic steel forms could not find a market in Europe, regardless of ocean shipping rate, because the foreign product can be made much cheaper. Another, a scrap exporter to Japan, said that the low ship rate for importing rerolling scrap from the Far East has not created a market here although the higher outbound rate still sustains a good market for American scrap in Japan.

In raising their charges against the rate practices of the ship industry, the U.S. Senators cited published tariffs showing that it costs $31.25 a ton to ship steel girders from North Atlantic ports to Hamburg while the same foreign-made girders were imported at the same ports at a rate of $19.75 a ton. They noted, too, that steel rods from San Francisco to Tokyo move at a rate of $28.25 a ton while the imported item is charged only $15.50 per ton.

William E. Hitchcock, Jr., president of the Atlantic Wire Co., said that the import of steel rods from Japan and Europe for his firm's operations were in no way affected by the outbound steamship rates for American steel rods. The problem for American steel rod exports, he said, is the estimated $40 a ton difference in the basic cost of production between United States and foreign mills.

Paul Hubert, president of the international division of Crucible Steel Co. of America, testified that his firm is making a determined effort to develop foreign sales of tool steel, stainless steel, and alloy steel, and that ocean freight rates are a factor in the trade.

He said that Crucible lost business in Europe as a result of a decision not to meet a competitive price in some instances.

NOT DOMINANT FACTOR

He added, however, "I don't think that I can go on the record as saying that the ocean freight by itself has been the dominant factor in our ability or inability to meet a quotation."

Crucible, said Mr. Hubert, is interested in expanding its tool steel market but that this is a highly specialized commodity that needs skilled engineers and that sales are not made in the same manner as for the sheet steel, but require an offshore marketing effort.

"Selling tool steel to independent distributors at world prices would probably be completely unprofitable for a company exporting from the United States where our production costs are high," he told Mr. Robinson.

Another witness, Albert E. Zwicker, formerly in the traffic department of Luria Bros., reported on an unsuccessful effort to negotiate a lower rate for scrap steel to Japan with the Far East Conference.

He added, however, that the conference had been very cooperative in many other instances in adjusting rates so that export shipments could be made. Mr. Zwicker also said that the differences in inbound and outbound rates on scrap steel had no effect on American exporters.

Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we know that the tributes paid to our late President have come from all parts of the world. One such which has come to my attention is the tribute of Jose Maria de Areilza, formerly his country's Ambassador to Washington and presently Ambassador to France. This moving paper was published in the newspaper A B C, one of the significant Spanish newspapers. The approach of Ambassador Areilza is most impressive, and I would like to have it recorded along with the countless many other fine expressions of sympathy that have been made. The Ambassador adds much by reason of his personal friendship with the late President by whom, I know, he was held in high esteem:

A CRIME AGAINST THE YOUTH OF THE WORLD

Kennedy's death can be judged from various angles, according to whether one considers the origin of the crime, the repercussions of his disappearance from the political scene, the profile of his successor, or the outlook for the next U.S. election campaign. I would not want to take up any of these aspects here without another more direct, and at the same time remote aspect which may not have been sufficiently emphasized and which seems to me, however, rather suggestive.

When a public figure, a political leader, meets with violent death, people try afterward to form an idea of the symbol which he represented. The crime emotionally focuses attention on that person and his outstanding feature in the interest of evaluating the crime and appraising the loss. Abraham Lincoln thus was transformed into the man responsible for the emancipation of the slaves and for the government of the people for the people; Garcia Moreno, into the Catholic governor persecuted by the sects; Canovas, into the peacemaker in our 18th century discords; Jaures was the Socialist who hated war; Canalejas, the stubborn liberal, who fought for freedom; Calvo Sotelo, the implacable prosecutor responsible for the gradual disintegration of the Popular Front; Jose Antonio, the prohpet and definer of a renewed patriotism.

What relevant symbol did the assassinated President represent? In my opinion, and in addition to other qualities, his political image was the visible incarnation of youth, not only of the physical strength of his young years—in his case damaged by the serious injury suffered during the war in the Pacific—but of the generous, open, and bold spirit which is so much a part of the American mentality.

J.F.K.—to use the popular sigla of his initials, had known the supreme tests of adolescence—first, university student, then, soldier. He felt on his body, torn by the machinegun bullet, the brutal impact of the war which rocked the world between 1939 and 1945. He returned to his home and to politics, with a maturity attained through pain and sacrifice. His best known book is "Profiles in Courage," and it is an excellent account of historic personalities whose outstanding quality was valor—courage.

He was the youngest member of the U.S. Senate when he entered the upper Chamber in 1953 as representative of the State of Massachusetts. But, in spite of his previous brief political career in the House of Representatives, he was not a greenhorn in public affairs.

He conveyed his boundless eagerness to learn in the intense interrogatory to which he subjected his questioners. His desire was to be informed, to accumulate information, to make up, with firsthand data, for his youth in contrast with the greater age of his distinguished senatorial colleagues.

Kennedy's entire campaign for his nomination as democratic candidate for the presidency, and later, for his election as President, was conducted under the symbol of youth. Although his opponent, Nixon, was also young, as he was, he did not succeed in accentuating that freshness and exuberance which Kennedy managed to put into his speeches, his propaganda, and his person.

The generosity, tradition, and idealism in his makeup were not incompatible with an effective pragmatism and a coldness of steel in nerve-racking moments requiring stable nerves. The man who had mobilized his country's Armed Forces—including the nuclear forces—to support his demand for withdrawal of the Russian missiles from Cuba, had no trouble in negotiating with Russia, a few months later, an agreement for the suspension of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, thus clearing the way for a reduction of East-West tensions and holding out the promise of future solutions.

That is to say, his position was firm, but tolerant; aware of danger, but open to discussion; an enemy of communism, but opposed to the foolishness of the "antis." And that constructive understanding of human affirmation, which made him call out in a speech: "There are no indispensable persons. Only peace and justice are indispensable in this world," was what aroused in the hearts of his listeners, inside and outside the United States, expectation and enthusiasm, coupled with illusions—excessive, if you will—in a world laden with threatening clouds and prophetic omens.

"Merchant of hope" is what Napoleon called the statesman and the governor. Kennedy was one of the *n*th degree, and his words and his deeds had the capacity to project themselves into a tomorrow of promising horizons.

I believe that the youth of the world fully understood his simple and direct language; that is, not only the youth of the United States and of the West, but also the youth of the third world, that of the Socialist countries of the East and of the Soviet Union itself. Above—or below—the conflicting ideologies and doctrinal antagonisms which divide people, there was, when listening to him, a universal sensibility particularly, in the intuition of masses of young people for whom the figure of the assassinated President was a permanent focus of shining hope.

The impressive increase in the number of young people, as shown in the population statistics of different countries, is a well-known phenomenon. In the United States, in France, in the Soviet Union, in Spain, the number of persons under 30 years of age has become an increasingly important factor—so decisive, in fact, that the experts in public opinion and publicity—are giving serious consideration to this new circumstance. The majority likes and dislikes, the customs, the demand, and the consumer market are showing more and more a predominantly juvenile imprint. And the youth of today—rebellious and nonconformist and cut loose from the older generations—is ardently searching for channels through which the destiny of human events may be charted. The young people do not want any more

hecatombs. They prefer facts and realizations to doctrines and abstractions.

Kennedy was a visible and universal symbol of that wish. He knew how to give shape and expression to general anxiety, and to bring about a climate of confidence which made it necessary for many governments, reluctantly, to yield to that irresistible policy of dialog in the interest of peace and harmony among nations.

Many people and many interests rose up against him and against what he represented: Inevitably those who opposed the future and things to come; those who continued to look back into the past, like Lot's wife; and those who stirred up hatred and fanaticism which would subsequently engender fighting, tragedy, and death.

To find out whether the deadly bullet was fired by a loner with an unbalanced mind, or by an executioner in the service of a conspiracy of one kind or another, has, in my opinion, relative rather than historical interest. And for understandable political reasons, it is unlikely that this whole question may [ever] be cleared up.

What is important is to record the enormous shock which the death of the President produced in the most remote corners of the globe, precisely because his message had been heard by large masses of the earth's population. It is also true—though it may be sad to say so—that the assassination was received with satisfaction by more than one group, sector, or party inside and outside the United States, which would only confirm what has been said above.

I think that I could condense my thinking on the subject into one phrase: The death of Kennedy was a crime against the youth of the world.

JOSE MARIA DE AREILZA.

Fumbling of Foreign Policy Basic Issue, Says Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the problems confronting the United States throughout the world mutiply daily as the administration seems more and more unable to cope with them, it is good to know that we do have a national leader who is speaking out for a firm policy in defense of freedom. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER at a luncheon meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 3, 1964. Senator GOLDWATER makes sense. He is speaking for the American people and I am confident the overwhelming majority of them agree with him.

Senator GOLDWATER's address follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA

There is a new coup in Vietnam and the war there is drifting toward disaster.

Where is the administration? Still off making promises to buy votes at home, while the world smolders and burns.

Where is our foreign policy? Caught napping again.

And how can we expect the same administration, the same foreign policy fumblers who neutralized Laos—how can we expect them to do better in Vietnam?

This new coup was a protest against plans to neutralize Vietnam. But who invented the idea in Laos? The foreign policy advisers of this administration.

Can anyone be sure that we will not forsake southeast Asia again? Will words alone suffice to reassure the besieged Vietnamese and the threatened peoples of Thailand and Malaysia? I say they will not. They cannot if they come from the same mouths that let Laos die and still permit the agony of indecisive battle to continue in Vietnam.

This Nation has a great and fateful decision to make in Vietnam. It cannot make it while its eyes are fixed on the hypnotic gimmickry of vast new domestic spending programs and political promises. It cannot make it under leadership that whistles past the graveyard of its past mistakes, refusing to face the hard facts of a hard and cold world.

Panama shows this, too. Cuba shows it. An entire hemisphere, troubled and pierced by Communist subversion, shows it.

Where has Lyndon been while Panama burned? Fiddling with his political promises, telling the Nation that Republican criticism amuses him—or maybe listening to his Bobby Baker stero set.

In Panama we didn't even have an Ambassador on hand when the shooting started. We'd had warnings, but there was no one to listen. And where does the situation stand today? Stuck in the mud of indecision, as usual.

What has happened to the wall around Cuba that was supposed to keep it from exporting murder and subversion throughout Latin America? The wall crumbled even as it was being built. Today it's not even a chicken-wire fence.

Maybe this administration thinks that a public housing program for Castro would solve all the problemms. Or more trade. Or more patience.

Patience is a virtue. But when patience becomes procrastination, it is a deadly vice. I say that this Nation has put off its foreign policy decisions long enough.

Now it is time to put up. Now it is time to produce, not just promise. I do not say that I have, or that any one man has, all the answers or even most of the answers.

But I say, and I think that most Americans, most free men everywhere, say that we have got to have those answers before it is too late.

This is the great issue of our time. Can we and will we leade in the cause of freedom? Or will we fall, will we fumble, will we fail?

I charge that this administration is fumbling, is falling. I charge that freedom is falling around the world.

Let America's conscience, in the time we have, be tested on this great issue. Let us say to the world and to the politicians who have brought us here, that we will not be bought a way with pie in the sky. Let us put freedom into our skies and into the skies of the world. Let us debate this great issue with the administration which is responsible for the failures and the fumbles.

Your life, the life of freedom, the freedom of the world, and the world of your children depends on this great issue more than on any other.

We cannot wait and wait. We must start. and we must win.

Civil Rights for the Indian Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding the Indian situation, by Purl Willis, counselor for the Mission Indian Federation, Inc., of California, entitled "Civil Rights for the Indian Race."

The article is as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE INDIAN RACE

It is well that Congress and the whole Nation are so concerned over the application of civil rights to all citizens. But really is this sudden awakening to insure that immediately the colored race must be guaranteed attention in his demands or else? Well, he has the votes, and they are organized and packaged, and getting front page attention in most of the press across the country. Publicity can be a compelling factor politically—it can also be abused.

What about halting this crusade long enough to compare about civil rights to the American Indian—for instance right here in California? The noble Indian race of decades ago proved that he had no superior in the basic principles of honor and ability, though denied the full rights of citizenship and arbitrarily made a ward of the Indian Bureau, as incompetent. Across the century, the American Indian has shown that he is fully competent to handle all of his own affairs of responsibility; yet, the Indian is almost universally treated as a child. He belongs to the state. It is time to halt this crusade until friends of the American Indian is given back not only his civil rights but even his more basic constitutional rights. The Constitution of the United States does not classify or even hint that the Indian was, when this Nation was founded, an incompetent ward—it says only:

"Congress shall have authority to regulate commerce * * * with the Indian tribes." In my humble opinion based on some 30 or more years of most intimate association with the Indian race and his every problem; defending them before committees of Congress and the officials of the Interior Department, and its Indian Bureau, the Indian would have long ago been destroyed as a race, if he did not have superior qualities. And yet, instead of relaxing in this Bureau control of the Indian's life and his property, this great people—and basically he has no superior in ability or honor or loyalty to the Nation, is being used as an incompetent ward, solely to keep the some 15,000 Bureau employees secure in their jobs.

Mr. Congressman, I write you at this time, since you have shown across the years that you are a true friend of the Indian race. Let me appeal to you at this critical hour to now make your greatest effort in restoring to the American Indian the real freedom that once was his. There are many other Members of the Congress, like you, who are vitally concerned about the power of the Indian Bureau to build its autocratic power of the Indian race, until today it defies the Congress, its ability to get ever larger and larger annual budgets from Congress, with increased limitations on the rights of Indians as responsible citizens. Let us here put this comparison before the Congress.

WHAT IF IMMIGRANTS WERE TREATED LIKE THE INDIAN RACE?

It is inconceivable that if the general public actually knew the real condition which the Indian race is compelled to live under the iron heel of the Indian Bureau—even here in San Diego County—there would be an overwhelming demand for legislation immediately to correct the degrading conditions which prevail. Congress has been advised that when California was admitted into statehood on September 9, 1850, its constitution carried no provision, as was the custom, reserving to Congress jurisdiction over the Indians. Yes, California, like the Thirteen Original States, and Colorado, therefore, has jurisdiction over its Indian citizens. (Decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, *United States* v. *McBratney*, 104 U.S. 621.)

In order to make clear the present deplorable situation of the Indian minority, let us picture other national or racial minority groups treated in the same way the Indian is being treated.

Let the immigrant groups who came to this country serve as examples of what could happen to people who are arbitrarily placed in positions of wardship. Just suppose the Federal Government had set up a bureau for each nationality of immigrants who seek America as their future homes. There would be an English immigrant bureau, a Swedish immigrant bureau, an Italian immigrant bureau, and so on. The members of each nationality would be provided with village reservations where they could use the land to the exclusion of anyone else, under the head of the bureau—his authority is supreme, his regulation is law. On the pretense of protecting these immigrants they would be kept more and more isolated from other people. These immigrants could not sell their "reservation lands," neither could they buy only with permission of the bureau agent. Each immigrant community would be allowed a chief and a council, all under control of the bureau. All funds received from rented or leased lands would be impounded and expended by the bureau boss. They must live community life, and they soon learn they must conform to the will of their master, the bureau agent and his own police force. If any immigrant group is allowed to bring suit, the bureau agent first approves his attorney. And if they win a judgment at court, the bureau agent impounds the award, and expends it for the immigrants.

In fact, everything is being done that is humanly possible by the immigrant bureaus to make these immigrant nationalities more comfortable and happy as immigrants, than they have ever been before. These immigrant groups are never taught in their bureau-operated schools that they should live like other peoples, who have the burden of paying taxes; they must not be encouraged to want to be American citizens. Special hospitals are provided by the bureau for the immigrant groups. These immigrant groups are granted charters of incorporations by the Interior Department. The immigrants are allowed to set up their own local courts to punish their own members. They are granted special loans of public funds, all under control of their bureau agent.

Treaty rights become an important part of the life of these immigrant colonies—treaties with the nations from which they come. The Irish Bureau, the Italian Bureau, and the Swedish Bureau, and so forth, are constantly discovering old obligations involved in treaty rights. Then they have an Italian Claims Act and an Irish Claims Act, and so forth, and the members bring suit against the Government under old treaties, and a judgment is awarded, usually out of court, and the money is not given to the immigrant group, but deposited under control of the Government bureau, but the attorneys, a lot of them, get rich representing the immigrants. The incentive to work for one's self has been removed, the Government has utterly destroyed all individual ambition—and this kind of life as permanent wards has become tragic and so degrading, that these immigrants become helpless.

The foregoing description is not just an imaginary dream. This is but a true recitation of the condition in which we have forced the Indian race under the Federal Indian Bureau. The Negro race since his emancipation has not been denied his vital constitutional rights, as is, and continues to be, the life of the great and worthy American Indian. There are shining examples where an Indian leaves his "reservation prison" as a ward, and competes with the white man in school and on to higher learning, and advances to the very top of his chosen profession. We have not allowed the Indians to become reliable, responsible citizens. It is not the fault of the Indian—he has the ability, and he has proven it in every instance when given an equal opportunity.

Just so long as we keep the Bureau in its control of even a limited part of the life of the great Indian race—segregated and separate from other citizens, more certain we will destroy this once great race of people. Every Senate or House investigating committee of Congress across the years, have arrived at the same conclusion—as reported by the great Utah Senator, as recorded in Public Document No. 214, the speech of Senator William H. King on February 8, 1933, when he said:

"The Indian Bureau is a petrified, crystallized machine, indifferent to criticism, hostile to reforms, ambitious for authority, demanding increased appropriations and a rapidly expanding personnel."

What Senator King said in defining the shameful Indian Bureau record back in 1933, remains true today—the policy of the Bureau is to perpetuate its authority and power—it bypasses the will and policymaking authority of the Congress. If given the opportunity to appear before the Appropriation Subcommittee of the House to show the great waste and injustice of the rule of the Bureau in California, a competent Indian delegation stands ready to make the trip, to show as they did in 1950, when the subcommittee cut off the whole of the budget demands for the year after hearing the testimony of the Indians. They are anxious to give their reasons why Congress should immediately abolish the Indian Bureau, repeal the Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934, and thus make "people of the Indians."

Our Government owes the American Indian the exact treatment which we owe to every other loyal American citizen. The Indian asks no special privilege, but they do justly demand the same rights as we grant to the thousands of immigrants coming to our shores annually. The hour has arrived to meet that duty by this Congress.

In our opinion and in all due respect to this Congress, we submit that it is the sacred obligation of Congress to now release and emancipate the American Indian from this century old, dark age, segregated, wardship, inhuman control of the life and property of the worthy Indian race. Only when the Congress does this, can we face the world in honor and respect.

Castro Turns Off Our Water While President Johnson Turns Out Our Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1964 issue of Reader's Digest, I read an article by Gonzalo J. Facio, Ambassador from Costa Rica to the United States, entitled "Castro Must Go." Mr. Facio points out that Latin American peoples and governments are in danger from Cuba. He states:

For example: every year there is a steady flow of Latin Americans to Cuba for ideological and paramilitary training. The number totaled 1,500 in 1962 alone. These "students" are taught all types of subversive techniques, then returned to their homelands to foment disorder and chaos aimed at the overthrow of legitimate democratic governments and the establishment of Castro-like regimes.

There is no doubt of the intention of our enemies: it is to destroy law and order in Latin America and to work toward the day when Russian communism is in complete control.

Mr. Speaker, today, when we received word here on the House floor that Castro had turned off the water for our base at Guantanamo, Mr. Facio's statements immediately came to mind. His words are also echoed in the Peoria Journal Star in articles concerning the situation in Panama. The first is the Allen-Scott report followed by an editorial by Mr. Charles L. Dancey, both appearing in the February 4, 1964, issue. Under unanimous consent, the articles follow:

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: DIRKSEN TELLS L.B.J. TO PROTECT CANAL

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is on blunt notice that he faces a bruising bipartisan fight in Congress if crucial concessions are made to Panama on continued U.S. control and operation of the canal.

This blunt warning was conveyed at the meeting of 16 Democratic and Republican congressional leaders hurriedly convened by the President late Wednesday afternoon. Also present were Under Secretary of State George Ball, Assistant Secretary Thomas Mann, and Ellsworth Bunker, delegate to the Organization of American States.

The emphatic insistence that the U.S. stand firm against Panamanian demands was voiced chiefly by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois; Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, JR., Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin America.

Dirksen and Hickenlooper threw down the gauntlet after hearing Ambassador Bunker's account of his tortuous efforts to reach an understanding with Miguel Moreno, top Panamanian representative.

Bunker disclosed that under one proposal tentatively agreed on, the United States, in effect, would have been committed to negotiate extensive revision of the canal treaty. The draft did not actually say that, but that would have been the practical effect. It was defended on the ground "some recasting of the treaty is unavoidable."

This was vigorously challenged by DIRKSEN and HICKENLOOPER.

"I am flatly opposed to anything that in any way affects our continued full control and operation of the Panama Canal," asserted DIRKSEN. "I want to make that very clear. I won't stand for that and will fight it to the end. The American people are fed up with constantly giving ground to foreign elements who have no basis for complaints except gall and greed.

"There are absolutely no bases for making any concessions regarding the canal to Panama. We know they cannot operate that waterway, and if it were turned over to them, it would be in the hands of the Communists in a short time. We have one Cuba 90 miles off our shores, and we don't want another at the strategically vital Panama Canal."

This ringing pronouncement was echoed with equal force by HICKENLOOPER:

"To me, that proposal savors strongly of appeasement," said the Iowan. "I am against it and, like Senator DIRKSEN, will do every-

thing I can to fight it if anything comes of it. The thing for us to do is be fair and reasonable in dealing with Panama but to stand on our legal rights and not give an inch on extremist and politically inspired demands."

This charged atmosphere was further electrified by Senator RUSSELL's vigorously seconding the two Republican leaders.

"The time has come to draw the line," said the powerful Georgian. "I don't know of a better time to do it than on this issue. We have a treaty and have leaned over backward to be fair and square. We are willing to consider legitimate grievances and problems. But no further. Any attempt to do more than that is certain of congressional rejection."

Representative SELDEN heartily supported these views. He asserted that a majority of his committee is against reopening the Panama Treaty in a way that might lead to transfer of the canal to Panama.

"This country won't stand for that," warned SELDEN. "Any move in that direction will cause a tremendous explosion."

President Johnson listened intently to these forthright pronouncements, but made no comment. Secretaries Ball and Mann told the congressional leaders that failure to come to terms with Panama would throw the controversy into the OAS where the United States would be at a disadvantage politically.

The President finally ended the discussion, but gave no hint of what he may do.

COMING EVENTS

A Senate report with political ramification will soon be released on the Billie Sol Estes investigation and the involvement of Agriculture Under Secretary Charles Murphy, a political lieutenant of President Johnson in 1960. Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, is circulating the report among members for their comments and approval. The Texas promoter has been convicted of fraud. The report was delayed by MCCLELLAN because of the Justice Department's legal proceedings.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has decided to build its $50 million electronics research center in the Boston area. That's what NASA Administrator James Webb will report to the House Space Committee when it opens hearings on the administration's $5.3 billion space budget this week. Efforts to change the site are expected to be made by committee members, but it is doubtful that they will succeed.

WHY WERE PANAMA FACTS SUPPRESSED?

(By C. L. Dancey)

The truth about Panama has come out, in spite of its suppression by the leftwing leader of Panama, and in spite of the strange suppression as well by the Government of the United States.

The Allen-Scott report first spelled out what really happened there, and this has now been confirmed by a major news service, the United Press International, and supported by other news services complete with photographs of identifiable Red agents, fresh from Cuba, at work on the riot-scene.

It is now quite clear that a bevy of Reds planned this operation in Cuba, arrived in Panama, and promptly put it into action, starting with a minor children's fuss involving only a couple of hundred people.

Then, with three or four people inflaming the original incident to a minor clash with police, the ready agents began spreading exaggerated yarns and whipping up a mob. They were strategically located and equipped with microphones for this organized purpose.

With an excited mob for cover, a little looting, and the usual burning of a couple of cars, they then salted the situation with a few well-chosen Red agents, armed to open fire on U.S. soldiers.

These terrorists operated in the open. Many were photographed and identified. Some were arrested. But all have been freed and spirited away by the present Government of Panama.

And instead of telling the truth about the incident, they are charging us with aggression.

It appears that this was carried out with the cooperation, if not the connivance, of highly placed persons in the Government of Panama. These may well be persons, like Castro himself, who pretend to be ardent "democrats" when they are secretly Communist.

After all, that is how Castro accomplished his revolution.

The shocking thing is that we, the victims of the double-shuffle, and the country that has pledged not to tolerate the export of Castroism to the mainland, have also suppressed the facts our Government apparently has in its possession.

The American people are being cheated. Our Government is not telling us, officially, the vital facts about the Panama incident.

Why?

What in the world is going on in Washington, that the American people have been shoved outside and the door locked?

These are all vital facts that the people of this free land are entitled to know, and that are certainly known already to the Communists.

So what is the excuse for secrecy? Why manage the truth out of existence?

Can it be that there is a purely political motive for covering up the miserable, shocking failure of our Government to deal effectively with Cuba as a base for subverting all Latin America?

Can it be a vicious coverup of the total bankruptcy of the soft on Cuba policies, and of the broken promises of the Government of these United States?

What reason can possibly be offered for shortchanging the American people of the vital information they need in which to make critical decisions that belong to the people of the United States?

The people of this country have not forfeited their rights nor abdicated from their role in a democratic system, nor surrendered the power of knowledge and decision to a little coterie of experts.

If such power has been seized by such a group, though it be in the name of "national interest," it is, in fact, traitorous to democracy, itself, and to the Republic, as such.

The Peace Corps: Most Powerful Idea of Recent Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1964, Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver was awarded an honorary doctorate from Chulalongkorn University, Bankok, Thailand.

On that occasion a statement of welcome was delivered by His Excellency, Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand, in which this noted statesman refers to the Peace Corps as "the most powerful idea in recent times."

Foreign Minister Thanat's remarks are a glowing testimony to the success of the Peace Corps under the leadership of Mr. Shriver. Further, they should serve to remind us wherein the real greatness of our Nation lies.

In order to bring this fine speech to the attention of my colleagues, I am inserting it in the RECORD and earnestly commend consideration of it.

I am also including a copy of a news story from the Bangkok World which outlines the remarks made by Mr. Shriver upon the occasion of the bestowing of the doctorate. This honor from the Chulalongkorn University, it would be noted, was the first such given to an American since 1934.

The articles follow:

STATEMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THANAT KHOMAN, FOREIGN MINISTER, THAILAND, CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY, JANUARY 28, 1964

I wish to welcome Mr. Shriver on behalf of the World Affairs Council which has been privileged to hear some of the experience of this great idea conceived by the late President John F. Kennedy who in his life was given to make his country and the world at large a safe place to live in. Although his life has been taken away his memory has remained. He represents a personality animated by ideas and ideals and by the strength of his conviction that the world has to live in freedom, has to live with hope as a decent place for all of us.

Even though I do not have much connection with the Peace Corps I have been privileged to have conversations with Mr. Shriver when he came here to approach the Government about sending Peace Corps members here. I had the honor and pleasure of telling him that the idea was appealing and attractive. I spoke on my own behalf as an individual, as a person, but I had the conviction then that the Thai Government also was pleased with the idea. And at the present time, there are many members of the Peace Corps here amongst us. There will be more. They came here with the refreshing lightness of youth. With the strength of their convictions and ideas they came here to know our people and to live with our people, and in many places to work with our people. In our minds they represent ambassadors of good will from the United States, that great country that has known the strength of ideas and problems. They came here as ambassadors of good will without diplomatic privileges and immunity, but I must say that they have had, and still have and will have the privilege of having a place in the hearts of many Thai people. And I think, I'm sure, as a matter of fact, that the members of the Peace Corps will appreciate this even more than the diplomatic privilege or immunity.

We have been struck and inspired by this idea of youth coming to meet with youth which is in accordance with our belief here in Thailand that peace, goodwill, and understanding can prevail and remain in this world only if they start from the grassroots. You, ladies and gentlemen of the Peace Corps, you come from the grassroots. You come to work with the grassroots of our country. That is the basis of future progress in the world so much divided today.

I do not have to wish you success because I know you have already achieved success. Many successes will come to you as things go on. As you come here inspired by your own beliefs and inspired by the great conviction that man can live, must live with man.

It is indeed striking that this important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, of youth mingling, living, working with youth, should come from this mightiest nation on earth, the United States. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great Nation as a wealthy nation, a powerful nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But how many of

us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful. This is the secret of your greatness, of your might, which is not imposing or crushing people, but is filled with the hope of future good will and understanding. I hope this idea will thrive and all of you, my friends, will continue. I wish Mr. Shriver success, and continued success to all of you.

SHRIVER RECEIVES HONORARY CHULALONGKORN DOCTORATE

An idea carried out by dedicated people will change our world rather than guns, dollar bills, simple goodwill or international organizations, U.S. Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver told an audience at Chulalongkorn University Tuesday afternoon.

And the Peace Corps, he said, is a group of men and women dedicated to an idea—and ideas have changed the world in the past.

Mr. Shriver, speaking after he received an honorary doctorate from the university, said the Peace Corps "is different from anything we know.

"It is not merely nonpolitical, it goes beyond to reach the deepest hopes of man."

He said Peace Corps volunteers go overseas "to work with people—not to employ them, use them, or advise them.

"They do what the country they go to wants them to do—not what we think is best."

He said the Peace Corps volunteer goes overseas as a representative of the most powerful idea of all—the idea that free and committed men and women can cross, even transcend boundaries of culture and language, of alien tradition and great disparities of wealth, of old hostilities and new nationalisms, to meet with other men and women on the common ground of service to human welfare and human dignity."

Mr. Shriver said "perhaps the greatest testimony to the impact of the Peace Corps is the fact that other Western nations are following our lead.

"In the past year nearly every European country has expanded or established Peace Corps programs of their own.

"It is not an exaggeration to say we are on the verge of seeing the Peace Corps movement become the most widespread, peaceful, volunteer movement the world has ever seen."

He said the Peace Corps volunteer is discovering the world and in Thailand they have had the opportunity "to observe the patient and wise dignity" of its people and learn about "important values which are all too rare in America."

He said the idea which the Peace Corps represents is "right in itself."

The Peace Corps society, said Mr. Shirver, is "free, open, believing that all men can find fulfillment in service to the common good" and that society "can be a helpful passkey to the future."

In accepting the university degree, Mr. Shriver said he was "well aware that this degree is not given to me alone, but has been conferred upon me in recognition of the work done in this most important country by the Peace Corps volunteers.

"To them I extend my deepest appreciation for their superior service and for their devotion to the best interests of Thailand as well as to my own country."

Foreign Minister Thanat, in remarks following Shriver's speech on the role of the Peace Corps in foreign affairs said:

"It is indeed striking that this important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, of youth mingling, living, working with youth should come from this mightiest Nation on earth, the United States.

"Many of us who did not know the United States thought of this great nation as a wealthy nation, a powerful nation, endowed with great material strength, and many powerful weapons.

"But how many of us knew that in the United States, ideas and ideals were also powerful.

"And I think this is the secret of your greatness, of your might, which is not imposing or crushing people, but is the thought of future goodwill and understanding."

Last honorary degree from Chulalongkorn University for American was awarded in 1934, an honorary doctor of science degree given to A. G. Ellis who was sent to Thailand by the Rockefeller Foundation to organize Chulalongkorn medical faculty.

This week marks the second anniversary of the arrival of the first group of Peace Corps volunteers.

Unequal Ocean Rates Termed a Mirage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there have appeared irresponsible and nonfactual stories and editorials in the press relative to ocean freight rates. Some have tried to show that our Nation is losing export business because ocean freight rates on outgoing cargoes are higher than on incoming cargoes. The writers do the public a disservice when they do not, at least, report the full facts. They report only the charges about alleged disparities, and not the answers or refutations. I am grateful for a newspaper like the Journal of Commerce which does objective reporting. It carries an article in its January 17, 1964, issue which points out that the charge of unequal ocean rates is a mirage. I insert it in the RECORD for the information of the Members:

QUOTATIONS BUT NO CARGO, STEELMAN SAYS—UNEQUAL OCEAN RATES TERMED A MIRAGE

(By George Panitz)

A U.S.-based steel exporter showed rather pointedly yesterday how disparities in ocean freight that seemingly favor foreign suppliers over American competitors prove, in reality, to be little more than a mirage in at least one instance—scrap steel.

Although steamship lines list a much lower rate for moving scrap steel from the Far East to the United States than American exporters pay to ship this commodity to Japan, such cargoes never move inbound while outbound trade is very heavy, he testified.

KIMURA TESTIFIES

The account by Jiro Kimura, representatives of Nitchimen & Co., Inc., of New York, was made here at the continuing probe into steel shipping rates by the Federal Maritime Commission. Mr. Kimura, whose company ships high-grade steel scrap to an affiliate in Japan for rerolling purposes, said that he never heard of any scrap coming here from Japan despite the low ship rate.

The FMC is studying the question of inbound and outbound rates and its impact on American exporter as a result of complaints in Congress that the ocean freight tariffs of steamship conferences favor foreign producers in West Europe and Japan.

According to members of the Joint Economic Committee for the Congress steamship lines and their rate-governing conferences are damaging American steel firms by charging higher rates on export cargoes than that for the same items moving here from abroad.

However, witnesses at the present hearings have failed thus far to support these charges.

Mr. Kimura testified that his company has had some problems because of outbound shipping rates and reportedly lost an order to ship some 500 tons of scrap steel to Japan each month when the Far East Conference refused to accede to a request that it open its rate for this commodity.

Under cross-examination by Conference attorney, Elkan Turk, Jr., however, this issue showed itself to involve far more than ocean freight rates. Considerations of steel demands by Japanese mills as well as demand by plants both here and in Europe and Australia were reported to be important factors that cause scrap prices in Japan to fluctuate widely and to negate the importance of shipping rates.

In answer to a query by Mr. Turk, the witness conceded that the shipping rate has no effect on stimulating scrap steel shipments to the United States from Japan, although the rate inbound is much lower than the export rate.

Mr. Kimura agreed with the Conference attorney that the inbound rate for scrap steel, while low, was actually a "paper rate" since no cargo of this type moves here from Japan.

Previously, other steel exporters testifying at the FMC inquiry reported that aside from specialty items and emergency situations in the steel-producing areas of Europe, American-made products could not compete in those local markets even if the ocean transport was free of charge.

This was in direct opposition to the claims of the congressional committee headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS that higher outbound rates limited American steel exports in Europe and Japan. Another witness, Paul R. Hubert, president of the International Division of Crucible Steel Co. of America, reported, moreover, that ocean freight rates on incoming steel did not necessarily hurt sales of Crucible in the United States.

Mr. Hubert said that Crucible, 12th largest steel producer in the country, made a survey to determine impact of ocean rates on domestic sales but could not identify an instance where lower inbound freight rates have been responsible for the loss of local sales or the inability to make domestic sales.

The hearings will continue this morning at 45 Broadway.

America's Oldest Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest in a civil rights for the Indian people, I have asked consent to insert portions of an article written by Fred R. Zepp and carried in the February 1964 issue of the Christian Herald.

Some of the facts set forth are particularly interesting, as we consider the civil rights for Indians amendment, and some of the more interesting points included in the article are as follows:

AMERICA'S OLDEST MINORITY

In all the furor over civil rights these days, an increasing number of Americans are asking themselves what's happening to the American Indians (or, as they prefer to be called, Indian Americans).

The answer depends on the particular angle from which you're viewing the complete picture.

Compared to where they were, say, 40 years ago, our red-skinned neighbors today have made tremendous progress. But compared to the rest of the Nation, or to where many American Christians think the Indians should rightly be, their situation is bleak.

An editorial in the Harvard Law Review describes the Indian minority as a "people without a future and adds: "[They are] by far the worst fed, worst clad, and worst housed group in the United States. These people, recipients of the poorest educational and medical services in the country, are in a state of social and psychological maladjustment. This is a situation of which the American public is only dimly aware. The terrible poverty of the peoples of Asia and Africa prevails today on Indian reservations."

Dr. Garnet Larson, of the University of Nebraska's school of social work, has told a group of workers and laymen concerned about the Indian problem, at a consultation called by the National Council of the Episcopal Church: "In spite of the fact that for almost a century both the Federal Government and the church have been a part of life on the Indian reservations, there has been no appreciable cultural exchange, and economic and social deterioration has continued to take place among the Indian people."

Then, turning to the Plains Indians, Dr. Larson used words echoed by many in discussing Indians in other areas: "For the most part (they) still live in wretched hovels, continue to know poverty * * * lack education. * * * On some reservations there is excessive drinking, punctuated by violence." These, among other unpleasant aspects and facts.

The 1960 census reported 523,591 Indian men, women, and children. These people identified themselves with some 300 tribes in all 50 States. Some have passed so completely into the mainstream of American life that few, if any, of their neighbors think of them as Indians. But far and away the vast majority finds itself today still isolated, still swept apart from the prevailing social currents, still hopelessly underprivileged.

Experts say that the average Indian is poor, no matter what yardstick is used to measure his standing.

Take unemployment:

This is how Philleo Nash, U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, describes it: "We are dealing with about 380,000 Indian people (within the scope of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' programs), of whom perhaps 100,000 are employable, in terms of age, physical fitness, and other pertinent factors. About 40 percent of these—roughly 40,000 persons—are men and women currently out of work. With respect to the country as a whole, we are concerned when unemployment rises much above 4 percent * * * yet on the reservations we find rates averaging 40 percent and running much higher than this on some reservations in some seasons."

Use education as the yardstick and you get the same answer:

The median number of school years for the Indian is less than 8, 50 percent of the national average for adults over 25. Almost 1 out of 5 Indians have never attended any school. One church study indicates that 17 percent of children of school age are not enrolled, although there are indications that this figure is improving.

Look at it from the standpoint of health:

One study shows the Indian's life expectancy is 36 years, the white man's 68. Economically, his income runs from one-half, or less, to two-thirds of his white neighbor's; in some areas, it takes the Indian a year to earn what the white man makes in a month.

The overall picture is one of biting poverty, aimlessness, unemployment, hopelessness. Many mission workers say that on some reservations the Indian's only objective of a day is to visit the office and request something; at night, to congregate for whatever the idle hours may bring forth.

* * * * *

That being true, why is the picture so dark and what is being done to brighten it?

One thing seems sure: the problem isn't lack of Federal spending. Commissioner Nash says: "This is what we call 'the Indian probem.' A national conscience; appropriations; a big Bureau (of Indian Affairs); and the end result: poverty. Now why is this? What has gone wrong? Is it a money problem? I think not. The Congress has been generous with public funds on the reservations. From the beginning of the century up to 1960, about $3 billion had been appropriated for services to Indians. Between the Indian Health Division of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we are currently spending in the vicinity of a quarter of a billion dollars annually on services to Indians. For the coming fiscal year we are asking the Congress to provide about $725 for every Indian man, woman, and child. These huge sums are necessary, but the long-standing poverty on the reservation shows that the problem cannot be solved merely by pouring in more and more money unaccompanied by other changes."

Virtually all authorities agree that the basic cause of the Indian's poverty is the poor quality of his land. This, they say, is worsened by lack of education and absence of chances for employment.

Working to help solve the problem are the Federal Government, the church, and a few private agencies. Here and there, States—and, more commonly now, local communities—are pitching in. In the last few years some dramatic progress has been made in spots. But it is dwarfed by the magnitude of what remains to be done.

Mr. Speaker, the principal thing remaining to be done is to provide jobs and opportunity for jobs and to provide them on these reservation areas so that the Indian people can learn to work, learn to save, and learn self-reliance as they become independent through job opportunities. These can only be made possible through a program of either direct subsidies to industries moving to the reservations or through tax exemptions to industries moving to the reservations.

VFW Urges United States Stop Russian Wheat Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is an organization which has demonstrated a penetrating understanding of the goals and methods of communism. Because the VFW knows what communism seeks, and how it uses dishonest means to gain its objectives, the VFW took an inspiring lead among our national organizations in opposing the wheat deal with the Kremlin.

Under the leadership of Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, its national commander in chief, the VFW, has explained why the wheat deal helps communism, hurts the United States, weakens our leadership in the free world, and enhances the power of the Soviet Union.

In keeping with the insight and alertness which has characterized VFW action in this matter, Commander Lombardo has called for the stopping of wheat shipments to the Soviet Union as the result of the cruel shooting down of three U.S. flyers in an unarmed training plane that strayed off course over East Germany. Very appropriately, Commander Lombardo termed this tragedy a "coldblooded murder," and explained why it was no "isolated incident" as the Russian spokesman so arrogantly called it.

Again the VFW has performed an important service to our Nation, and, accordingly at this time, I include the text of Commander Lombardo's press release urging the stopping of wheat shipments to the Soviet Union:

VFW URGES UNITED STATES STOP WHEAT SALE TO RUSSIA

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 3.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, Brooklyn, N.Y., today urged that the United States stop shipments of wheat to Russia because of what he termed "the coldblooded murder of three U.S. flyers, brutally and needlessly shot down over the Russian zone of East Germany."

Explaining the VFW view, Commander Lombardo said, "This savage shooting down of an unarmed training plane, which had strayed from its course, is no 'isolated incident,' as the Soviet Union spokesman reportedly described it. It is the same kind of murder committed when the Soviet Union shot down a U.S. Air Force plane over international waters a few years ago. And, it's the same kind of murder committed by the Russian-armed Yugoslavian forces that shot down a U.S. transport that drifted off course. The time has come for the United States to let the Communists know that our flyers aren't 'fair game' for trigger-happy Red gunners."

"Also," the VFW commander added, "the Kremlin is doing all it can to cause trouble for the United States and our allies. Khrushchev blasted the United States for imperialism in Panama. He demands that we give up our vital vase in Guantanamo Bay, and warns us to keep out of Cyprus, where communism supports the terrorists."

Commander Lombardo continued, "Americans didn't expect any thanks for sending subsidized wheat to Communist Russia. But, the VFW believes that at least we shouldn't be paid off with murder and subversion. It seems that since we have bailed Khrushchev out of his possible wheat shortage brought about by his policy of 'guns before butter,' he now feels able to step up the Communist offensive against us."

"Therefore," Commander Lombardo concluded, "the VFW, comprising 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans, urges that the United States let Khrushchev know that we will stand for no more of his savage shooting down of our unarmed flyers. One way to do this is to stop the shipment of wheat and thus stop strengthening the Soviet Union, which is using its strength to destroy us."

Mr. Speaker, I also call attention to the statement of AFL–CIO dockworkers and seafarers unions in regard to the Russian wheat sale.

Here is the Commodity News Service report:

UNIONS THREATEN ACTION IN WHEAT SHIP DEAL

NEW YORK, N.Y., February 5.—Three AFL-CIO maritime unions, including the dockworkers and seafarers, have warned Federal officials in Washington that any repudiation of the Government's 50-50 cargo policy in regards to wheat shipments to the Soviet Union will force them to act.

The unions, while not spelling out the action they may take, cited the threat that the U.S. Government will allow Continental Grain Co. to select foreign-flag shipping over available American Tonnage despite repeated assurances that at least 50 percent of the movements are to be channeled via American-flag vessels.

The joint telegram was addressed to W. Willard Wirtz, Labor Secretary, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, Luther Hodges, Commerce Secretary, and Robert Giles, Acting Maritime Administrator.

It was signed by Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union; Thomas W. Gleason, international president of the International Longshoremen's Association; and Jesse Calhoon, president of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association.

Loss of Freedom for Any Group Poses Threat to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of our people are concerned with legislation only when they are directly affected as a group or as individuals. The important truth is that the issues we face in Congress are of vital concern to all of the people. No group can have its freedom taken away without the freedoms of all other Americans being put in peril.

This is something to think about when we are asked to pass legislation which could lead to socialized medicine and putting the doctors under Federal control. I can assure all those in the other professions, it would not be long before they, too, would become the victims of bureaucracy.

The following editorial from the AMA News sounding a warning issued to lawyers by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman RICHARD POFF, is well worth calling to your attention:

"LEGALCARE" NEXT?

Representative RICHARD H. POFF, of Virginia, urged every lawmaker and law practitioner to take an interest in a recent newspaper article datelined Warsaw. He placed the following news story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Poland's 5,700 lawyers will be forced into collectives under a measure ending private legal practice in the Communist nation.

"The bill was passed * * * by Poland's Communist-dominated parliament with only five opposing votes. Althought a client may still select his own attorney, fees will be set by the government and paid to the lawyers' association. Part of the income will be divided equally among all members of the collective and part in proportion to the work they do.

"Sponsors of the bill argued that legal fees were too high for ordinary people."

Commenting on the article, the Congressman said "many lawyers seem unconcerned about the fact that some people in America would like to see the medical profession socialized." Representative POFF, an attorney and a member of the House Judiciary Committee, added:

"Because they are not personally and immediately concerned, they have closed their eyes and ears to the threat. Lawyers would do well to come to the aid of their sister profession. Who can say that the next proposal might not be legal aid to the aged, and next medical and legal aid for everybody."

War on Poverty Needs Food Stamp Plan Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty in the United States received its first setback on Capitol Hill a few days ago when a particular committee decided to call a retreat instead of facing the enemy. What this will do to the morale of the rest of the army, I do not know. But I hope that one battle will not mean losing the war.

Nevertheless, the refusal to extend the food stamp plan throughout the country is very serious indeed. I have been assured that the pilot program that exists in my city of Pittsburgh will probably continue, but I am sorry that other areas of the country which need this program as vitally as we do will not have the opportunity to share in it.

At the moment 40,355 persons have certified to participate in the city of Pittsburgh, with more than $600,000 of the stamps distributed monthly. This is as tight a program as possible in the Government. There is no money given away. There is only food for empty stomachs, and surplus food at that.

I hope that after the civil rights bill is through and emotion is at a minimum that this program extension can be reconsidered.

I also enclose an excellent article on the subject written by Miss Ingrid Jewell, Washington correspondent for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette dealing with this matter:

WAR ON POVERTY

(By Ingrid Jewell)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—The House Agriculture Committee today tabled the Sullivan bill which would have extended and made permanent the food stamp plan for needy families.

This could have the effect of ending the food stamp plan now in use on a pilot basis in the city of Pittsburgh and three Pennsylvania counties: Fayette, Cambria, and Lucerne.

Presumably there would be no change until the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

Barring political and legislative pressure in the meantime, Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman will have to decide whether to attempt to carry on in the new fiscal year a program which the appropriate legislative committee of Congress has voted to kill.

The food stamp plan has been carried on a pilot basis since 1961, with Fayette County an original beneficiary. Pittsburgh has been a beneficiary since February 1963. The program has been handled administratively by the Secretary of Agriculture without specific authorizing legislation. Now the House committee has killed the legislation which would have given the program permanence.

A recent survey showed 40,355 persons were certified to participate in Pittsburgh, with more than $600,000 of the stamps distributed monthly, more than $200,000 of these being "bonus" stamps.

The way the program works is this: State welfare authorities certify eligibility. The certified person then buys with his own money stamps equal to the amount he has previously been spending on food. The Federal program supplements this with enough free stamps to bring his purchasing power up to what is required to nourish his family properly.

The pilot program has been costing about $30 million a year. The bill of Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, would have cost about $500 million a year.

The program Mrs. SULLIVAN promoted was also urged by President Johnson in his farm message to Congress.

Not the cost, but the philosophy, of the program was unpalatable to the House Agriculture Committee, which nearly always acts on a nonpartisan basis.

The history is this: In 1938, Congress passed a farm bill which included section 32, a section that set aside certain customs receipts for the purchase of farm products flooding the market in serious surplus. The theory behind section 32 was support of prices through removal from the market of surpluses. These surpluses have been used, over the years, for school lunches, public and charitable institutions, and foreign aid. All these uses the farm bloc in Congress approved. Section 32 would not be affected by the tabling of the Sullivan bill.

But that bill would have changed the emphasis, from help for the farmer to help for the needy consumer. The food stamp approach also greatly expands the kinds of food available cheap to these needy families.

The farm bloc disapproved, saying if Congress wants to vote money for welfare, the law should be so stated, and not masquerade as farm legislation.

Tabling of the Sullivan bill will not affect the basic leislation, with section 32. But it will, if it is allowed to stand, kill the food stamp plan.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The 75th Anniversary of Washington Board of Trade—Address by Benjamin McKelway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, 1964 marks the 75th anniversary of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, an organization of businessmen and civic leaders who have probably played a more important role in the growth and development of the Nation's Capital area than any other single civic or business group.

Actually, the board of trade's name belies its true role in the local affairs of the Nation's Capital City. To many the board of trade has been the civic and business conscience of Washington, D.C. To others, it has been an organization which has played a key role in local government in a city which does not have elected overseers. Without question, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade has been an effective force in the 75 years of its life.

Mr. Benjamin McKelway, one of Washington's most distinguished citizens and senior vice president and editorial chairman of the Evening Star Newspaper Co., was the principal speaker at the 75th anniversary observance function held by the board of trade on January 10. In the judgment of many Washingtonians, no more capable man could have been selected to make this anniversary address than Mr. McKelway. He understands the local Washington community because of his background of 44 years in the newspaper business here—most of them in an executive capacity with the Washington Evening Star. Mr. McKelway came to the Star in 1920 as a reporter, served in every editorial room capacity, became editor in 1946, was president of the Associated Press from 1957 to 1963 and became editorial chairman about 1 year ago.

Mr. President, Mr. McKelway's address makes absorbing reading for those interested in various phases of the growth of the Nation's Capital. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McKelway's address be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY BENJAMIN M. MCKELWAY, 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOARD OF TRADE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 10, 1964

President Boothby, distinguished guests, and members of the board of trade, according to the calendar we are perhaps a bit premature today in observing the 75th anniversary of the board of trade.

It is rather unusual, to say the least, to celebrate a birthday—November 27, 1889—some 10 months in advance of its anniversary. Even 9 months would be more defensible, from an obstetrical point of view.

But President Boothby takes a dim view of such quibbling over dates. The board of trade, he argues, must always look ahead. We begin the 75th year of our existence in 1964. Why not begin talking about it while the year is still young?

As a matter of fact, if we are premature in celebrating birthdates the board of trade was no premature baby. It was a long time aborning.

As early as 1865, close to a century ago, there had been one abortive attempt to found a board of trade. Some years later there had been another.

Th late Isadore Saks, lunching with a few friends in November of 1889, said it was a shame Washington had no board of trade. But he was merely reiterating an idea rather than making a new proposal. It was as if somebody today might say we ought to have another bridge across the Potomac—or do something about parking.

At any rate, one of Mr. Saks' luncheon companions was Berlan Wilkins, the new publisher of a newspaper then known, I believe, as the Washington Post. He invited some leading citizens to meet on the evening of November 27 in the red parlor of the Old Ebbitt House, just across the street on what is now the site of the National Press Building. They formed the board of trade.

Col. Myron M. Parker, Civil War veteran and prominent businessman, was elected president. A year later he delivered his first annual report.

What Colonel Parker said in that report illustrates the truth of the old French proverb—"The more it changes the more it remains the same thing."

"The necessity for an organization of this character at the National Capital has been manifest for many years," he told the board.

"The relations we occupy to the General Government are peculiar and widely different from those of other leading cities. Being governed by a Board of Commissioners appointed by the President, without the usual form of municipal government and without representation in Congress, the necessity for an organization like the board of trade representing * * * all sections and interests of the city was manifest to all * * *."

"It is a well-known fact," Colonel Parker continued, "that local measures affecting our interests have from time to time been antagonized by various organizations situated in different sections of the city * * *. It has been generally understood in Congress that sectional prejudice and opposition have often defeated needed legislation.

"The board of trade has organized in the hope that through concerted action by a representative body, we might exert a wide influence with Congress, and thus accomplish greater and more satisfactory results."

If the board of trade, in its 75th year, wants to make perfectly clear its reason to be, merely change the tense from past to present and reprint Colonel Parker's first annual report.

Speaking of history—as one must do in looking backward—a talented lady, Miss Constance McLaughlin Green, has just completed the second volume of her interpretive history of Washington, this one covering the period of 1870–1950. One of Miss Green's preoccupations is the Washington Board of Trade.

After its organization, she writes, the board "soon came to exercise greater power in Washington than anybody except Congress and the presidentially appointed District Commissioners. Within 2 years the District Committees of Congress and the Commissioners were turning to the board of trade for advice and by the end of the century it was an open secret that the Commissioners themselves owed their offices to the board's directors."

At the turn of the century, Miss Green observes: "The organization was intrinsically undemocratic * * * In the light of the abuses of municipal governments elsewhere in America, Washingtonions who shrank from the mere idea of popularly elected city officials had reason to place faith in the board of trade * * * A political scientist writing for a learned journal indeed argued that this unofficial, self-appointed 'city council' provided an ideal form of local government through a 'representative aristocracy'."

In her preface, Miss Green succinctly explains why she found the board of trade so interesting. She writes: "A nonindustrial, essentially noncommercial Washington is also set apart (from other cities) by the phenomenon of the indirect power exercised by a small group of businessmen, the board of trade."

I must confess to you that I had never thought of the indirect power attributed to the board of trade as a phenomenon. Nor had it occurred to me that its membership was composed of aristocrats. But the term "phenomenon" as applied to the powers of the board of trade, is unusually apt. One definition of phenomenon is "the appearance or observed features of something experienced, as distinguished from reality or the thing itself." The power of the board of trade, in other words, is "the appearance of something experienced, as distinguished from reality."

Some speculation regarding this phenomenon may not be out of order on this 75th anniversary.

Among the founders of the board in 1889 were men who may have remembered when Congress, 43 years before, in an unwise, visionless and probably unconstitutional display of frustration, retroceded to Virginia that portion of the original District of Columbia lying across the Potomac.

Parenthetically, it is noteworthy that other great minds in Congress, troubled or exasperated by the complexities of so many so-called home rule proposals now pending have recently advocated retrocession to Maryland of almost all of what remains of the District of Columbia as a way out of their dilemma. This repetition of history is another example of the saying that all we learn from the study of history is that we learn nothing from the study of history.

Among founders of the Board of Trade were men who had lived here as residents of the corporations of Washington and Georgetown, under locally elected mayors and city councils, lacking the resources and the power to do much more than meet primitive needs of a thinly scattered population—while the grand design for a great National Capital remained for the most part ignored.

They had witnessed the rapid, unplanned growth of Washington during the Civil War

and the woeful lack of facilities to accommodate that growth.

They were understandably gratified by the tardy decision of Congress, in 1871, to abolish the impotent local governments of Washington County and of the municipalities of Georgetown and Washington and to establish in their place one centralized government for the District with a presidentially appointed Governor, council and board of public works; a locally elected house of delegates, 22 in number, and an elected but voteless delegate in the House of Representatives. All this promised a new deal.

But the experiment was disillusioning. In its brief 3-year life the territorial government spent itself into near bankruptcy by undertaking to do too much of what Congress, in the past 71 years, had failed to do. There was little regret when Congress abolished the territorial government and substituted a temporary government under three appointed Commissioners.

Among founders of the Board of Trade there were those who had served on the "Committee of 100," a group formed by Washington residents to work with congressional committees in writing the Organic Act of 1878. That act made permanent the Commission government along lines that remain basically unchanged today. It contained a firm pledge to match general revenues from local taxation, dollar for dollar, with Federal funds, a delayed and most welcome recognition by Congress of the neglected truth that this is the Federal city, the seat of Government, over which Congress, under the Constitution, had been assigned exclusive jurisdiction.

Such then was the background of the organization meeting, 11 years later, of the Board of Trade. The first decade under the Organic Act of 1878 had brought promising results. The District Commissioners, with an assured source of income, were bringing order out of a somewhat chaotic past. Constructive progress in water supply, sewer ssytem, pavement of streets and their extension, was underway. The occasional debates in Congress over whether to stay in Washington or to move the seat of Government somewhere else—debates which chilled the spines of local property owners—were forgotten. Progress, permanence, and prosperity seemed just around the corner.

In resolving to meet its own obligations toward developing its own capital, however, and in establishing a commission form of government as its administrative agency, Congress had created a vacuum.

In abolishing the last vestiges of home rule, it left citizens of Washington with no means of self-expression—save the so often futile right of petition. Citizens' associations were organized in various parts of the city. They sought to promote their sectional interests. They spoke loudly, and often. But there was no single or persuasive voice—merely a clamor of voices.

The board of trade attempted to fill this vacuum. Its members represented a cross-section of the business and professional life of the city. Members of the board of directors were chosen from the city's best known citizens. They were interested enough, intelligent enough, and articulate enough to select and to argue for undertakings regarded as most essential in meeting the city's needs.

They worked for Washington on the practical assumption that what is good for Washington is good for the people who live here. They were anxious that people who did not live here would share their own pride in the Capital of the United States. Miss Green, to whose history I have already referred, sums up the source of much of the board's indirect power in an observation based on her own research:

"The [board of trade] reports from 1890 to 1901 in a dozen realms revealed painstaking investigation of civic wants and produced intelligent recommendations for meeting them."

Is there any real mystery about the board of trade's influence, to use a pleasant term, or its secret or indirect power, to use a more sinister expression?

Is it really phenomenal that committees of Congress have found, throughout most of the 75-year life of the board of trade that it has been a helpful source of information and guidance in meeting local legislative needs?

If a President of the United States wished to select a qualified person for Commissioner, well regarded in the community for his ability and trustworthiness rather than for his activities as a political partisan, is there anything evil or self-serving in the presentation by board of trade directors of names the President might consider? Anybody else, of course, could do and has done the same thing.

The legitimacy of the power attributed to the board of trade ought to be determined by the manner of its use, not by the fact that it has been used. The board of trade has stood for things that others have opposed. It has used its powers of persuasion to obtain what its elected directors believe is most desirable for Washington. This does not mean the board of trade has always been right. But the only source of power exercised by the board of trade has been the ability of its leadership to present a convincing case, and sometimes to step into situations, bogged down by disagreement, and use its good offices to produce workable compromise. Its success has been demonstrated by a unique, perhaps phenomenal, record of accomplishment in Washington's development, singularly free of scandal or the suggestion of scandal.

The attribution of unworthy motives is nothing new under the sun. It has often been used by critics of the board of trade Some of the critics deplore the Board's power because they resent the use of a power in which they do not participate. Some of them criticize a failure to use the power in behalf of things they think ought to be done.

On the whole the board has been more interested in advancing the commercial interests of the city than in some other areas. After all, pending a time when government may take on the job of doing everything, commercial interests do remain of some passing importance, being the source of jobs, of tax revenue and the means of accomplishing the ends of private enterprise.

But the board has been very generous in stepping aside, and leaving unchallenged the custodianship of certain otherwise neglected fields to the Americans for Democratic Action, for example, and other equally patriotic, unselfish, pure and noble organizations, striving to lift progress upward, as well as onward, beyond the reach of private enterprise.

Evil motives are sometimes assigned to the board of trade to explain its traditional opposition to home rule. The implication here is that a small group of businessmen allegedly dominated by such groups as real estate men, bankers, the operators of public utilities, merchants and even those subversive borers from within—the owners of private property—are obstructing the people's march into the promised land because they do not believe in the right to vote.

The board of trade's opposition to home rule stemmed originally from personal experience under various forms of home rule. Among the board's founders were those who believed the only real remedy for an indefensible denial of voting rights was to grant the vote where it would count. They wanted representation in the only real government of Washington—the Congress—rather than in some puppet local government, lacking the means to discharge a responsibility specifically assigned to Congress, and always subject to the whims of Congress.

I doubt that the 23d amendment would be in the Constitution today had it not been for the indirect power of the board of trade in working for its ratification. We still lack representation in Congress. It may require another futile experiment in home rule before a new generation of Washingtonians is convinced that representation in Congress is the only workable remedy for denial of local suffrage in the Federal city—unless we are to abandon the whole concept of the Federal city, after 164 years of rather successful progress toward its realization.

It would have been a misfortune in the past had the board of trade lacked or failed to use the phenomenal, indirect power which it is said to possess. It will be a misfortune in the future if the Board loses or is no longer capable of exercising that power.

Such a loss should result from the board's surrender of the prerogative it originally assumed. That prerogative is an attempt to speak, with the authority resulting from diligent preparation, knowledge, and responsibility for what it regards as the common interests, as distinguished from the special interests, of the community.

The loss could result if the board became merely another chamber of commerce or convention bureau, more interested in bringing visitors to Washington than in what they may find when they come to Washington. Chambers of commerce and convention bureaus perform useful services, but they do not exercise the influence advised by the board of trade.

The Washington Board of Trade of 1889 has now become the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. Whether or not it can assume, for the metropolitan area, the function it discharged for Washington 75 years ago—"the exercise of concerted action by a representative body"—poses a complex question.

But there is great need today for a representative group of citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area, dedicated to the task of building a great Capital City as the vital hub of its surrounding communities; a group of citizens that can speak with one voice, and by the wisdom rather than the noise of what it says, accomplish, in the words of Colonel Parker, "greater and more satisfactory results."

The Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade has the opportunity. That opportunity may be more elusive than it seemed 75 years ago. Whether the board can seize it remains a question for the next 75 years.

But more—not less—power, to the board of trade.

Ocean Freight Rates Minimized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, news stories published during and after hearings by the Joint Economic Committee for Congress last fall gave the impression that domestic steel producers were being priced out of foreign markets because of high ocean freight rates. Recent testimony before the Federal Maritime Commission by steel producers themselves absolutely refute that im-

pression. This testimony was revealed by a news article appearing in the January 16, 1964, issue of the Journal of Commerce. It is included with these remarks:

AT STEEL EXPORT HEARINGS: OCEAN RATE EFFECTS MINIMIZED

(By George Panitz)

Ocean freight rates were discounted again yesterday at a Federal Maritime Commission inquiry as a factor presently limiting U.S. steel exports to West Europe or Japan.

Ira Nadler, president of the Monarch Industrial Corp., New York, testified that all but specialty or surplus secondary American steel products are priced out of these markets by local suppliers abroad and not by the shipping rates of steamship companies.

He was the second steel exporter witness at the FMC probe to support the claims of the ship industry that current rate structures are not hurting the competitive stance of American companies. The agency is investigating the impact of ocean rates on U.S. steel trade.

The issue of possible damage to U.S. steel companies and the investigation by the maritime agency resulted from charges raised last year by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' Joint Economic Committee for the Congress.

The committee said that the steel rates of steamship freight conferences favored foreign companies and they cited differences between inbound and outbound rates on the same items to support the claim. The FMC came under congressional fire for permitting the rate disparities and the agency later ordered the investigation.

Mr. Nadler told FMC Examiner C. W. Robinson that the key element in sale of similar steel products is the landing price, which includes all transportation costs. American steel exports can't compete with foreign suppliers in their own domestic markets regardless of what price the U.S. product sells for, he said.

An earlier witness testified that American steel exports, aside from specialties, could not compete in the West European market even if the shipping charges were zero.

PHILIPPINES SHIPMENTS

But while rates on the European and Japanese sea routes are not a factor in steel exports, according to the witnesses, the rates are very important for American companies in supplying other areas, such as the Philippines.

Mr. Nadler reported that sales of his own company to the Philippines have declined drastically over recent years because of competition from Japan and lately from Australia.

However, he indicated, that the ocean freight rates from New York to the Philippines were not to blame for the loss of this trade, which resulted primarily from lower costs of steel in competing countries.

He reported that until Japanese steel mills began to meet the local needs for tinplate, American suppliers found a good market there but that this has now dried up almost completely.

In an indication that the ocean rates were not an important consideration in the tinplate trade, Mr. Nadler said that his firm negotiated a rate cut with an independent ship line in 1960 that was later matched by the Far East Conference. But, he added that the higher rate would not have hurt the sale.

A previous witness, Ralph L. Reynolds, commercial manager for the Copperwald Steel International Corp., testified that the shipping rates were a possible factor in limiting sales in the Philippines. He added, however, that ocean rates did not effect the firm's competitive position against European suppliers in the Philippines.

Mr. Reynolds testified that his firm has had serious rate problems with the conferences on shipment to the Far East but these appeared primarily to be differences in opinion over classification of steel products that were being exported.

Since rates vary for different items of cargo in the same general category, disputes often arise between shippers and steamship lines over classification, which determines the rate level.

Eulogy to President Kennedy by a Union Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, many eulogies to President Kennedy have been penned and not a few have been preserved in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have one more printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This tribute in verse is perhaps unique, for it is not only a better literary effort than some of those by nonprofessional writers, but it is the outpouring of a working man and union officer. He is Bruce Kingery, who has been for the past 14 years shop chairman of United Auto Workers Local 292, the Delco Radio local, in Kokomo, Ind. Mr. Kingery is also education chairman for this 5,000-member organization and Democratic committeeman from the city of Kokomo's 24th precinct. I am happy, Mr. President, to be able to draw attention to this expression of sorrow for our late President, which is at the same time to considerable extent a credo for a better day in America.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY

(By Bruce Kingery)

A part of you and me is dead
With his passing, for we knew him
And he knew us, we felt ourselves
So much a part of him, that life
Was more meaningful and God was good
Unto our land, and the destiny
Of this land of ours most truly seemed,
For the brief space of life that he
Was at its helm, the fulfillment years
Of mankind's dreams and hopes and prayers
To walk at last among the gods.

He was of giants,
Who walked among
The mighty ones of our space and time
And knew no peer in all the world
In the common aspirations of all mankind:
An end to wars, the finale to
All the plagues that cast their blight
Upon all the races of all humanity—
These were the goals he was dedicated to.

An end to poverty, he had to have
Compassion born of more-than-man:
The understanding, pity and sympathy for
The downtrodden masses of all this earth,
In order to know and to understand
The depth of deathless struggle against
The apocalyptic forces that rule and sway
So great a portion of the human tide
Of this planet, that Saros should
Forevermore be its lot and name.

He had to know of masses, steeped
In wretched poverty—and he knew it well,
Enough to forego a definite life of ease
In order to place his name among
Those awesome products of mortal womb,
Who, inspired by heaven, step out to meet
The challenge of the world—and embattle it.

An end to pestilence and disease
Were oaths he took, we swore with him,
To realize within each our own allotted span
And time of life, to put an end
To the crippling diseases and infirmities
That have plagued the hapless of this earth
From dawn's first day, throughout the time
Of all its existence, unto this age,
And, with him before us, showing the way,
We embarked upon the long and arduous road
Toward that goal of all our goals.

The end of ignorance, bigotry, hate;
What gigantic strides along the way
Our President took to totally eliminate
These basic causes for man's wars on man!
What genius was his! He lit the torch
And led a people and a land
Away from the pitted depths of gloom
And darkness of poverty, disease, and war,
And all the ills that plague mankind,
That mire him in the muck and mud
Of despair, when his very soul would reach
Out for the turrets of grace that rightfully
Are man's own natural heritage.

He led this people, and all the host
Of mankind unto the new, bright dawn
Of morning sunlight—for the dark is not
A match for sunlight, nor ever was.

He walked with heroes.
As one of them * * *
For he gave of his very life, itself,
In watery battleground in time of war,
Laying his life upon the line
Wherein all heroes have laid their lives
Since mankind first died for noble cause.
Who, living through history's gravest and greatest war,
To achieve his country's most cherished prize,
Fell * * * sudden prey to senseless hate
And died the martyr's death in peace—
Time, struck down by blind, unreasoning wrath
And venom-inoculated bigotry.

What debt we owe his small ones and
His widow, that all our lives might be
Spent in solemn remembrance of
Such singular act of senseless depravity,
Nor can, nor should we e'er forget
That the end result of all that hate,
Bigotry, ignorance, and rank prejudice
Implies * * * has left a lonely vigil in all the nights
For all her life to his grieving widow and
Fatherless loneliness for small children, who,
In their innocent childhood, cannot comprehend
That mortal frailty has bereft them of
A living father's deathless love.

Time * * * and the act itself have pressed
Upon our minds, our hearts, our very souls,
Such haunting innocence of each small child
And ineffable courage of woman and widow that
The indelible stamp of eternity
Shall remember such courage and innocence
For all time that was and is to be:
The epitome of sacrifice and nobility.

Such is the nature of man that he
Must kill the thing he cherishes most;
He destroys the good and retains the base
Things, for, were Time itself, compressed into
Minuteness—a few short hours ago
Man left his cold, dark caves behind
And when the pressures and duress of life
Leave him bewildered, still seeks sanctity
Among the caves * * * and cares not for the distant stars.

Yet the deed is done, nor can we part
With the memory of even a minute of it
Any less than we can seek to relegate
All to forgetfulness and undo that
Which is done, by willing that it were not so.

At times, throughout the infinite space
And moments of mankind's passing dream
Which mortals call: Life (and perhaps it is)
There comes a flaming, starlike meteor
That passes across the limited horizons of
Man's limited vision, as this man did.
(And so few like him, far too few,
To change the preordained destiny
Of man into something of higher, nobler mien)
And, like such meteor, through blackened skies
Causes man to look upward from whence he came,
Surely * * * And in looking upward, take hope anew
To higher endeavors than he deemed self capable of.

Such a man was this, the ages own
Him now forever but there was a time
When Camelot's dreams held but for a spell
The bright promise of better things to be,
For him: because he dared to dream the dreams;
For us: because we chose to share.

The meteor dies, for its short space
And span of existence across the skies
Is far too brief * * * but its inanimate
Self cannot be truly compared unto
The life and time allotted to
Heroes, such as this man, President
John Fitzgerald Kennedy was, for he,
Though dead, not truly died,
He, though gone, is inspiration unto
Those generations that, following his lighted way,
Shall see and know what lies beyond
The farthest acme of mankind's dearest hopes;
Shall see and know what kind of life
That God ordained for those who walk
The new frontiers of planet, time and space,
With human hands and hearts and minds
Dedicated to human progress for all mankind
To God's greater glory, that the spirits
Of unselfish souls like his might not
Have truly lived and died in vain.

Address by the Honorable Katharine St. George, of New York, at the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference, Washington, D.C., February 5-7, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this week, I have had the honor to be one of the U.S. delegates to the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference meeting here in Washington. The Chairman of the group, our distinguished colleague, Mrs. ST. GEORGE set the note on Wednesday for a profitable and thoughtful discussion of the many problems of mutual interest to all of us in the Western Hemisphere.

Emphasizing the need for expanded trade between our countries, Mrs. ST. GEORGE properly pointed out the weakness of the present Latin American trade patterns, the imbalance of our hemispheric trade and the need for common action to make trade expansion a building block for economic development and progress all over Latin America.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE's remarks follow:

SPEECH OF KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, PRESIDENT, U.S. GROUP AT THE THIRD INTER-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

It is a great pleasure and honor for the members of the U.S. Inter-Parliamentary National Group to be hosts to the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference.

In the past, we of the Western Hemisphere have looked more to Europe and the European powers for inspiration and guidance, and this is most natural as most of us have our roots and our basic philosophies in that Continent. Unfortunately, through this atavistic policy we have neglected our own hemisphere, we have drifted apart and we have become strangers to each other.

Never before has it been more important that the Western Hemisphere be united in its determination to preserve freedom and to improve the living conditions of the millions of its inhabitants who are impoverished. Never before has it been more important that the countries of this hemisphere understand, and be sympathetic with, each other's problems and work together for their solution. Of all the subjects that need to be discussed, and understood, by Western Hemisphere conferences none is more important than foreign trade.

Although the Western Hemisphere—Canada, the United States and Latin America—have less than 15 percent of the world's population, they account for over 40 percent of its production. The proportion of its land that can be used productively is higher than the world average, and it has an abundance of mineral wealth, including coal, iron, and nonferrous metals.

Production, per capita, in the hemisphere is much higher than in the rest of the world, averaging close to $1,500, but it is small compared with what it could be if human and material resources were utilized to maximum advantage.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE ECONOMIC GAPS

It is hardly necessary to add, before this audience, that averages and aggregates fail to portray an accurate picture and can be misleading.

Average per capita production in the Western Hemisphere is high, but parts of the hemisphere continue to lag.

Land transportation needs to be developed, and a favorable environment for the investment of domestic and foreign capital created.

These problems are not new to you, but they are problems that have thus far defied attempts at solution. The Alliance for Progress is an attempt to solve them, but it has not done so to date. It can of course be said that 10 years is too short a period of time in which to expect them to be solved. Generations rather than decades, and decades rather than years, will be necessary to get at the root causes.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Meanwhile, there is a very important area in which little has been done, but in which definitive action could be of vital importance in setting the stage for economic development. I refer to an expansion of trade throughout the hemisphere

Historically speaking, much of the explanation of the prosperity and growth of the United States during the past century and a half lies in the fact that American labor and American capital have had access to a large and prosperous market within the country's own borders. Never before in world history have industries been as free to develop without having to worry about governmental barriers against their sales. The United States has been, and continues to be, the largest free trade area—in terms of purchasing power—in world history.

The example, or perhaps more accurately, the good fortune, of the United States in this respect has been noted in Europe.

The economic significance of the formation of the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association is that 13 countries have combined into 2 groups to create for themselves markets in which there will be a minimum of barriers to the exchange of goods.

It would seem that if we of the Western Hemisphere could eventually develop a vast Common Market of the West, many of our problems would cease. I realize of course that there will be many obstacles in our way and that this plan will take years to perfect and bring to fruition. But we all know that Rome was not built in a day and that the European Common Market has been an idea in men's minds since the days of Charlemagne and that the idea of a United States of Europe was written about and foreseen by Victor Hugo a century ago.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE IS UNBALANCED

Although the trade of the Western Hemisphere is large, it is not as large as it ought to be. The most significant shortcoming, as far as economic development is concerned, however, relates to the composition of the trade, rather than to its volume.

About 30 percent of all U.S. foreign trade is with Western Europe. Over 20 percent is with Canada, and about 18 percent with Latin America.

Close to 60 percent of Canada's foreign trade is with the United States. A little less than 20 percent is with Western Europe, and less than 6 percent is with Latin America.

The external trade of Latin America with the United States and Canada, together, is about equal to its two-way trade with Western Europe, each of the two areas accounting for slightly more than 40 percent of the $17 billion total.

WEAK POSITION OF LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

Latin America's foreign trade position is less favorable today than it was before World War II. Although the value of Latin American exports increased a little more than 30 percent between 1948 and 1961, over 60 percent of the improvement was attributable to increased petroleum exports from Venezuela. If the figures for Venezuela are excluded, Latin American exports expanded by only 14 percent over the 13-year period. Thus, exports from Latin America in 1961 were actually smaller, on a per capita basis, than they were in 1948.

These facts illustrate the importance of diversifying trade and of intensifying specialization of production, in Latin America. The Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market are steps in the right direction, but there is a serious question whether the areas encompassed in their membership are sufficiently large and diversified to make possible production on a scale large enough to be economically sustainable.

It is evident that a substantial proportion of the outside assistance that has been received by Latin American countries in recent years has been canceled out by deterioration in the terms of trade. It seems to me that hope for economic development in the area lies in the direction of expanded trade and improvement in the terms of trade. A vigorous and realistic program for trade liberalization could go far toward achieving improvement in the economic well-being of the peoples of the whole hemisphere.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET (AN EXAMPLE)

The forthcoming trade negotiations in Geneva are important, not only to the United States, but to all of us in the Western Hemisphere. Together, we export approximately $7 billion of goods to the six countries comprising the European Common Market—Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, West Germany, and Italy. It is important that we convince the European Economic Community that it keep its markets open to our exports. We need to persuade them to reduce their new common external tariffs, and to eliminate as many of their discriminations against our commerce as possible.

We in the Western Hemisphere will have a better chance of inducing the European Economic Community to adopt a liberal import policy if we present a united front in negotiating at Geneva. If a Western Hemisphere trade organization were already in being, and could speak with a single voice for the entire hemisphere, we would be in a stronger position than we now are to secure meaningful concessions. Although the six EEC countries export less to the Western Hemisphere than they import from us ($4.6 billion, compared with $7.2 billion), they are not anxious to lose important foreign markets.

A PROPOSAL

Let us give serious consideration to the formation of a free trade area or Free Trade Association for the Western Hemisphere. Let us include the Latin American Republics, Canada, and the United States, and have as our objective the adoption of free trade with respect to all commodities traded in within the hemisphere, gradually over a period of 15 to 20 years. I would propose, further, that as far as possible the external tariffs applied to nonmember countries by each of the members be harmonized with each other.

The success of such an arrangement will depend upon the willingness of each member to accept imports from other members. The United States, with a gross national product rapidly approaching the $600 billion-a-year mark, should provide an immediate inducement to other countries to cooperate.

In return for access to its own large market, the United States would have access to expanded markets throughout the hemisphere. Of even greater importance would be the advantages that would accrue from having neighbors who are becoming increasingly prosperous. A rapidly developing, prosperous Western Hemisphere would be harmonious with the interests of the United States.

Trade expansion is one of the essential building blocks of economic development. A Western Hemisphere Association would provide a powerful weapon to break the vicious circle of lack of markets, underspecialization and lack of diversification of production, underdevelopment, and low levels of living.

Finally, may I say that I am speaking as a parliamentarian and as a friend, and that these ideas are my own and do not reflect Government policies. The true parliamentarian should play his part independently for the policies in which he believes, and not become a rubberstamp for the government in power.

We all have much to be concerned about in our own hemisphere. The clouds of oppression and dictatorship hang over us all. Let us unite and keep fighting that good fight for freedom that our forefathers fought in their day, and let us maintain the freedom we inherited from them and help it to grow and prosper in a bright and progressive future.

General de Gaulle's Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the French Government of General de Gaulle has come in for considerable criticism lately as a result of some of its decisions and actions in the realm of diplomacy. Some of these criticisms are, I believe, justified. I, for example, joined several Senators in a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate as viewing with disapproval France's decision to extend diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

All of us should bear in mind, however, that France is the oldest ally of the United States, and one that has displayed its loyalty to us when the chips are down—most notably in the October 1962 missiles crisis over Cuba. Despite our differences of opinion with our French ally, we must constantly try to understand the mainsprings of General de Gaulle's policies, for there is no doubt that we are dealing with one of the great statesmen—and certainly the most independent one—on the contemporary international scene.

In this spirit, I commend to the attention of my colleagues as well as to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an informative and insightful explanation of General de Gaulle's foreign policies by Stanley Hoffmann, professor of government at Harvard University and an expert on French affairs. This article appeared in the Reporter of January 30, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURSING DE GAULLE IS NOT A POLICY

(By Stanley Hoffmann)

Ever since his fateful press conference of January 14, 1963, General de Gaulle has become the favorite target of American commentators, officials, and semiofficials. Editorials mention him along with Khrushchev as the major obstacle to American diplomacy. Senator FULBRIGHT in a recent book, Dean Acheson, and Prof. Robert Bowie in a number of articles and speeches have asserted that De Gaulle's policy opposes some of America's major postwar aims: European unity, the Atlantic Community, and the transcending of old-fashioned nationalism.

American policymakers and commentators often assume that the only genuine kind of European unification is that advocated by Jean Monnet and his supporters, the establishment of supranational institutions. U.S. policy has not always been consistent; it vigorously supported Britain's application to the Common Market even though Britain made no more of a secret than did De Gaulle of its hostility to supranationality. This contradiction shows that American enthusiasm for the Monnet method is in part mystical faith in federalism, in part calculation: U.S. officials have helped that a supranational Europe would be united in its receptiveness to American influence.

Whether the Monnet method is appropriate for the solution of all the problems that still divide the western Europeans is a matter of serious doubt. When De Gaulle says that none of the six is really willing to accept important decisions made without its assent, the record bears him out. Despite years of haggling, the existence of the Coal and Steel Community has not allowed or compelled the six to define a common policy on sources of energy. In the Common Market itself, more than once, proposals presented by the supranational commission have been shelved or mutilated by the national ministers, especially over agriculture. The recent troubles about farm policy brought the Common Market to the brink of disruption. How a supranational committee and a European parliament could miraculously harmonize the luxuriantly divergent foreign and military policies of the six has never been explained. There is a common will to build European unity; there is still no joint definition of the kind of unity that ought to be achieved. An agreement to lower internal tariff barriers is one thing (and even that one had to be negotiated by the governments); a policy on the external tariff (i.e., trade with the rest of the world), on a common strategy, on a common policy toward the Soviets or in the United Nations is quite another matter.

U.S. spokesmen have called a confederal Europe along the lines proposed by De Gaulle unsatisfactory, either because it would be dominated by one member, France, or else because it would not represent real union. But the first argument confuses an attempt at leadership with a desire for domination, and the second misses at least three points. First, as long as no "better" Europe is possible (because of deep-seated differences, as I suggest, or because of Gaullist malice, as others say), the only alternative to the confederal one is none at all—a situation that U.S. policy has consistently and wisely sought to prevent since 1947, and one that encourages nationalism far more than does De Gaulle's proposal for confederation. Second, it is a mistake to ask De Gaule (or any other European leader) to "choose" between France's interest and the interest of Europe, for no European statesman will accept a European organization in which his nation's interests are sacrificed or ignored. Third, whether such an organization is truly "European" or not depends on its policies at least as much as on its structure.

It was because of De Gaule's insistence that a common agricultural policy was initiated and that the Common Market did not become a mere industrial free trading area, as the British would have preferred. It is he who now insists that the Six define a common trade and agricultural policy before negotiating with the United States during the coming Kennedy round in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade meeting. He has vigorously opposed deals between the Soviets and the United States (or the United States and Britain) at the expense of the European states or without their participation. On the other hand, the Benelux countries' rejection of De Gaulle's confederal proposals, Britain's suspicions of West Germany and persistent refusal to contemplate a European deterrence system, and Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak's enthusiasm for a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union could hardly be called contributions to Europe's unity and strength.

In those areas where the six have agreed on common policies, it would be hard to prove that the measures have always been

favorable to U.S. economic interests; the famous chicken war of 1963 is a good indication. Indeed, it has happened that suggestions made by the Common Market's Commission were watered down by the ministers, some of whom were reluctant to antagonize America. In other words, a merely confederal Europe is not necessarily a disaster for the United States, nor is a supranational one necessarily a blessing. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the only Europe the United States wants is one which may be occasionally troublesome but which would at least not challenge America's political and military leadership.

THE CHOICE FOR EUROPE

This is particularly true in the touchiest area of all: nuclear weapons. Official U.S. policy favors a multilateral nuclear force in which the United States would keep its veto power at first. This means that the circumstances in which and the price for which the veto could be abandoned would be determined by the United States. Such a force would give America a powerful grip on Europe's foreign and military policy, whereas all the Europeans would gain would be a limited access to a small part of the American deterrent—at a considerable financial cost for themselves. This is a recipe for frustration; it would whet the European appetite without satisfying it. The United States defends its proposal as a much better solution than a proliferation of national forces, and denounces France's nuclear program because it is national, not European. But at present, Germany is prevented by solemn treaties (and by political wisdom) from becoming a nuclear power, Britain prefers nuclear cooperation with the United States to a European formula, and there is as yet no European military and foreign policy. Without one there can be no European deterrent, just as there could be no European Defense Community 10 years ago.

Thus, the choice for the French (and for the other Western Europeans) is between exclusive reliance on the Anglo-American monopoly and the construction of an "emergency parachute" in Europe: a small French nuclear force. Why the French effort should compel West Germany to build its own nuclear force (and thus to jeopardize its international position and peace), any more than the British effort does or the proposed multilateral force would, remains a mystery. The French force could in time—i.e., after it has become a reality—turn out to be a convincing incentive to the other Western Europeans to devise a common policy so as to profit from and obtain some control over the French force.

Meanwhile, the United States denounces France's policy as disruptive of the Atlantic Alliance. Actually, the Franco-American conflict within the alliance reflects genuine divergences explainable by geography, history, and the plain facts of interstate rivalry, which an alliance never eliminates. Thus, in the military area France's craving for nuclear weapons (which started years before De Gaulle's return to power) originates in a fear shared by many, and in an evidence regretted by many. The fear is that of an American strategy which, by limiting the threat and postponing the use of nuclear weapons in case of Soviet provocation, decreases the deterrent value of those weapons and exposes Europe to the risks of a war of defense. The evidence is that of America's unilateral definition of allied military doctrine, which accounts for the desires of so many Europeans to get some hold over U.S. strategic policy. Can one blame De Gaulle for believing, especially after America's cancellation of the Skybolt, that the best hold is the grip one exerts through one's own strength and effort, rather than that which depends on the other's sufferance? De Gaulle has never presented his force as a potential replacement for America's as long as the cold war lasts, any more than he has ever asked for a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe. True, the French nuclear program is expensive; but it is also true that conventional rearmament is not cheaper, and that a division of labor that would leave all nuclear weapons in U.S. hands and specialize Europe in conventional forces would earmark Europe for permanent dependence—both military and political—in the cold war and permanent decline in the international competition.

That De Gaulle's policy implies a refusal to mortgage Europe's future cannot be concealed by the cliche that contrasts his inward-looking conception with the outward-looking notions of other statesmen. The cliche is discredited not only by statistics of trade between the Six and the rest of the world, but also by France's aid to underdeveloped countries in Africa and De Gaulle's concern for developments in Central and Eastern Europe. It is hard not to interpret current American policy as based on the acceptance of the status quo in Europe, and as projecting an Atlantic Community in which the Western Europeans would always look West rather than East, while the United States would remain free to deal directly with the Soviet Union, or with the new countries, without letting itself be handicapped by European misgivings. De Gaulle's policy, on the other hand, seems to aim at creating in Western Europe a center of power sufficiently coordinated with the United States to discourage any Soviet ambitions but sufficiently autonomous to attract those Eastern Europeans who regret the division of Europe and the loss of national independence, as well as to incite the Soviets to future concessions perhaps less costly than concessions to the United States. His objectives, clearly, are the decline of Soviet power and the return of the Soviet Union into the concert of Europe: here there is nothing inherently unacceptable to those, like Dean Acheson, who invented the doctrine and policy of "situations of strength" with the same objectives in mind. It is doubly absurd to see in De Gaulle's conception a will to a "third force." His line is harder than that of the United States, so as to protect Europe from the danger of new Yaltas. For the future, the purpose of a European center of power would not be to remove Europe from the cold war, but to accelerate the end of the cold war by precipitating a change in Soviet policy.

Once again, we find that the only thing such a conception really challenges is not American objectives but American leadership. When Robert Bowie writes that De Gaulle's Europe "would not be a partner of the United States but as independent and separate as possible," he makes one wonder whether in his mind partnership and independence are not incompatible.

As in the case of European unification, we must look at the real, not at the ideal, alternatives to De Gaulle that are available to U.S. policymakers. In France, the man the opposition is building up as the presidential candidate against De Gaulle, Socialist Gaston Defferre, has already expressed his hostility to the multilateral nuclear force and asked for the end of Soviet-American domination in the world. All over Western Europe, both the U.S. drive for a detente before any mending of Franco-American fences and the U.S. drive against European nuclear forces have been exploited by politicians who would like to take a leave from the East-West conflict altogether. If De Gaulle threatens U.S. policy by challenging U.S. leadership, at least he considers the Soviet menace real enough to push France into the atomic business and to oppose the current fashion of diplomatic flexibility. One may wonder whether U.S. policy and interests are not more threatened by those who pay lip service to U.S. leadership but who act as if the Soviets were no longer a revolutionary power, and as if the East-West conflict were a thing of the past. To oppose De Gaulle may well bring aid and comfort only to neutralists or to those men of good will but little memory whose initiatives tend to give away to the Soviets through negotiations many of the things the Soviet Union has not been able to obtain through intimidation.

DE GAULLE AND HISTORY

Many of De Gaulle's critics, who would grant that he has European interests in mind and that his opposition to Soviet totalitarianism is genuine, nevertheless condemn him for being a man of the 19th century, incurably in love with the nation-state, unaware of the obsolescence of national sovereignty, anachronistically concerned with French grandeur, and perversely attached to a Hobbesian notion of world politics. His is the voice of a disastrous past; the path of the future is not the balance of power, the rivalry of states, the pattern of alliances, but partnership, the rule of law, international organizations submitting states to common rules and disciplines. That De Gaulle's faith in the nation-state remains unshaken is obvious. What is not obvious is whether Americans are right in condemning nationalism so sweepingly, in interpreting De Gaulle's actions, and in charting the course of history.

As long as no form of social organization has yet appeared to replace the nation-state, or as long as the "general society of mankind," whose absence Rousseau noted, is not in sight, the only kinds of nationalism that are unquestionably evil are aggressive nationalism and a nationalism of resentment—Hitler's partook of both. Barring those, the alternative to a sane and sound nationalism of self-respect or pride is apt to be defeatism. Should one prefer the sad, divided, and dejected France of the 1930's or the confused and bitter France of the postwar years to the confident nation of De Gaulle? Is it in the interest of a major power to have satellites or allies?

Many will grant the point but still wonder whether De Gaulle's brand of nationalism and the apparently selfish and cold calculation of national interests on which he acts do not represent a disruptive leftover from the past. But De Gaulle is not a monument from the past. Anyone familiar with his writings and statements should know that grandeur, to him, is an attitude rather than a policy. It is an appeal to action as against resignation, and to sacrifices in return for power; it is the opposite from pettiness, not the contrary of realism. Indeed, De Gaulle as a political figure stands totally detached from the issues of the past (even some that were close to his heart, such as the French Empire) or from the political quarrels of the past. He summons the French to shed old habits and to "marry their century," to become a modern nation ably to play a new role, necessarily more modern than, but worthy of, the one France played in the past. He has emphasized the need for transformation and rejuvenation more skillfully and clearly than his predecessors—hence the hostility of many French conservatives toward him. It is when he thinks that others—foreign enemies or even allies—try to prevent France from playing the role he has set for it that he resorts to what one critic has called "obstruction of the highway." The rest of the time his efforts have tended to remove the domestic obstructionists and to build a highway that France could travel with pride as well as responsibility. Never has he advocated absolute sovereignty: "association" is a key word of his political vocabulary, and he has tried to organize associations of nations both in Western Europe and in the area of France's former empire. The man who depended on British and American help during the days of the Free French, and who cultivates Germany's support as well as sympathies in Asia and Latin America today,

knows rather well the perils and pains of isolation. If he sometimes seems to accept it, it is because he prefers temporary solitude to excessive dependence. Material and spiritual interdependence he has never denied; it is political dependence that he fears. But as long as the only alternative to the politically free nation is the politically dependent one, De Gaulle refuses to bow to "necessities" which are both specious and resistible.

For the "course of history" does not point to a mutation in the traditional game of international politics. Since the stakes are so much higher—with nuclear weapons, they are nothing less than the game itself—the actors are more prudent, or so we hope. The competition may be more subtle, but it has not been superseded. In the world as it is, the problem of who commands remains crucial. For a given nation, the choice is not between its obsolescent sovereignty and a larger community or civilization; it still is what it always was, though with new twists; a choice between trying to be wherever possible the master of its fate and becoming the client or protege of some other nation.

This is true even for Western European nations. Even there, where national pride and consciousness fell so low after the Second World War that appeals for the suicide of sovereignty were for a while well received, recovery has benefited the nation-state rather than the ideal larger community, and has led inevitably to a challenge of America's position. The European nations have often been compared to the Greek city-states. What replaced the Greek city-states were non-Greek empires. That only a European entity would have enough power to be a major unit in the world is clear, but just as obviously there would be no point in the undertaking if it were to be manipulated by some other entity, and at this stage there is no other way of creating it than an association of governments.

There is a fatal flaw in many American pronouncements against national sovereignty and warnings against a Europe that would act as a superpower: the attack on the nation-state and power politics is premature and one sided. Here again the critics are hardly consistent. Never before has the world been so well covered with nation-states, many of them, Americans like to believe, born with the help of the American midwife. In this world, neither of the present superpowers is willing to renounce the privileges and profits of sovereignty and might. The only nations whose obsolescence is constantly being proclaimed by Americans are those of Western Europe. Discrimination, even in the name of progress and harmony, cannot fail to be disliked and suspected. When it comes t promoting a better world, noblesse oblige: the lions should give the good example, or else the weaker animals will run away—even if they are told that it is from the course of history they are fleeing.

The truth of the matter is that this course is sometimes clear, for instance insofar as colonies are concerned, and sometimes very muddy, as with respect to what will succeed the nation-state. When history's direction was irresistible, De Gaulle has never stood in its way. When the direction is unsettled, his concern is not to find out history but to make history—to the best of his abilities and of France's resources. Whether he will succeed is far from certain; De Gaulle's policy may be an act of faith. However, his critics would be more convincing if they did not so often sound incensed, not by the scope of De Gaulle's ambition (which is indeed debatable) but by his having any ambition for France at all. Whatever his methods, his aims have been those of all French Governments since the war. If the criticisms concentrate on him, is it not because so many people had gotten used to discounting France, and refuse to take it seriously again?

Nuclear Submarine Is Memorial to Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been long established in our Nation's history that Gen. Casimir Pulaski was a truly great soldier and patriot. I have the honor of being a member of the board of directors of the Pulaski Foundation of America and it was indeed most gratifying to the members of the foundation when the Nation's 53d nuclear submarine was launched last Saturday at Groton, Conn., in memory of General Pulaski. In recognition of this event, the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader evening news published an editorial in its edition of Tuesday, February 4, 1964, and I include this editorial as part of my remarks today.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE IS MEMORIAL TO PULASKI

Launching of Nation's 53d nuclear submarine, the missile-firing *Casimir Pulaski*, at Groton, Conn., on Saturday was of special interest to this community because of the role local residents played in this latest tribute to Poland's native son who gave his life for American independence during the revolution.

Joseph Lester, Kingston, president of the Pulaski Foundation of America, who was a guest of honor at the launching, initiated the move to name the country's newest submarine after the famed hero who was wounded in the Battle of Savannah and died on board the *Wasp* on October 11, 1779.

With the cooperation of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Mr. Lester sent a letter to the late President John F. Kennedy who, in turn, approved the proposal in a message to the Department of Defense. Representative FLOOD was unable to attend the weekend ceremony because of pressing Government business in Washington. Judge Bernard Brominski is a director of the Pulaski Foundation and John B. Stetz, Wilkes-Barre businessman, is a member of the national council.

The official ceremony attracted a large number of Americans of Polish descent, including a delegation of more than 1,000 from the Polish American Congress.

The Nation's newest nuclear submarine is a fitting memorial to General Pulaski whose whose body was buried in the Atlantic off the coast of Savannah. The dashing Polish officer has all types of memorials on land, but none at sea where his mortal remains were consigned under such dramatic circumstances.

The fact that the *Casimir Pulaski* will be equipped to fire missiles with range of 2,500 miles makes it not only a powerful defender of the cause of freedom to which this distinguished officer dedicated his life, but also a deterrent to war as part of a mighty fleet that is to be increased in the years immediately ahead.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, there is widespread interest in seeking the best solution to the potentially serious problem which might confront the Nation if the President, through serious illness or other cause, might be unable to perform his duties. The American Bar Association has advanced a proposal which has much merit and is worthy of serious consideration. Recently, the Washington Post, in an editorial explaining its features, commented favorably on this proposal. Because of the clarity of this statement and the great significance of the problem, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD, so that it can be brought to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO AVOID A VACUUM

How can the United States bridge the gap of a possible serious illness or other kind of disability on the part of the President? For the first time, in our opinion, a group of experts has come up with a reasonably satisfactory answer. Its recommendations have been given far too little attention.

The group to which we refer is the panel assembled here by the American Bar Association to study presidential inability as well as succession to the Presidency. We have previously discussed the group's proposal for filling vacancies in the office of Vice President. Equally important is the suggested constitutional amendment to meet a potential emergency while the President is still in office.

Following the pattern of the agreement first worked out by President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, the bar group has endorsed an amendment which would make it unmistakably clear that, in case of a President's incapacity to act, his powers and duties, but not his Office, would "devolve upon the Vice President." This temporary shift of power to an "acting President" would last only for the duration of the President's sickness or other disability.

The President himself could initiate such a move by stating his inability in writing. If he did not or could not do so, the Vice President or another person next in the line of succession could intervene and exercise the Presidential power with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or some other body that might be set up by congressional act. In practice this would mean that the Vice President could take over, without invitation from the President, only in a dire emergency. The President's Cabinet would be a powerful safeguard against any possible usurpation, and we think it would be better to leave this check in the Cabinet, without allowing Congress to set up an alternative.

Normally the President would resume his functions by announcing his recovery in writing. This is as far as the Eisenhower-Nixon formula goes—a formula now in effect between President Johnson and Speaker McCORMACK. But that arrangement makes no allowance for the possibility that a men-

tally ill President might seek to regain power that would not be safe in his hands. In such a case the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet could, under the proposed amendment, challenge the President's claim of recovery. But the acting President could continue to function only if Congress should find, by a two-thirds vote of both Houses, that the President's inability had not been removed.

The relationships with which this proposal deals are extremely delicate ones. The greatest care must be taken to shield the presidential office from any tampering from without. Yet the existence of an Achilles' heel in the present setup must be recognized. We think the bar panel has come closer than any other group to providing a satisfactory solution. If there is still some risk of confusion over Presidential authority in its formula, we surmise that it is much smaller than the risk in the present arrangement, which makes it almost impossible to relieve the President if he should become incapacitated.

California and the World Oceans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have on several prior occasions addressed this House regarding my interest in oceanography. It has been my hope that in these expressions there might be a stimulus to awaken in the minds of my colleagues here in Congress an interest and a concern to direct a more meaningful thrust into a program of research and development in this last, vast frontier of our global environment.

It was a matter of great satisfaction to me that the State of California has recently demonstrated its enlivened concern in this field. My compliments and admiration go to our Gov. Edmund G. Brown for the foresight and wisdom displayed in calling the recently concluded Governor's Conference on California and the World Oceans. Under previous permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the timely and cogent remarks of the executive who leads a State in this Union with over 1,300 miles of coastline, and a State which has an obvious high stake in the development of the knowledge and technology of oceanography:

ADDRESS BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON CALIFORNIA AND THE WORLD OCEAN, CALIFORNIA MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY, LOS ANGELES, JANUARY 31, 1964

The launching of the Echo-2 satellite from the California coast last week and this conference dramatize the question before us today.

Space is being pierced. Man's restless quest for knowledge and his urge to conquer the empty heavens above will take him to the moon in our time. But the question is: Will we explore the ocean depths in our time? Will we discover in this generation the mysteries of that region where life itself began?

Many of you have been asking those questions. And you have been seeking the answers.

Now, I hope, with this conference you will have a new, more active partner in that questioning process—the State of California. Our magnificent research and training facilities at Scripps and the world-famous work being done by other institutions—both private and public—are well known to all of you. We have gone a long way in exploring the sea, its nature, its life and its uses, but the road is so long it is as though we have taken only a first step.

It is time, I think, for a searching appraisal by Government, private institutions and industry of where we are going in this vital area of knowledge and rich resources. And it is time to begin planning how to get there.

The sea belongs to all of us. But can each of us continue to act as though we own it? Should we be allowed to pollute it; to loot its riches indiscriminately; to fill the bays and foul the rivers that flow into it? Can we preserve the beaches while at the same time taking the oil from the tidelands?

The questions come fast and furiously. And they are immensely complex. I am not here today to give you the answers. Some of the questions we already are wrestling with. But the need is not so much for answers to individual questions but for a better understanding of our oceanic environment in its entirety so we can plan for and deal with the interrelationships involved.

I propose that this conference launch us on such an investigation here in California through the creation of a task force for marine resources development. I urge you to take it under consideration and advise me how best we can devise a planning and research body which will make California the leader in oceanography as it is today the leading State in the aerospace sciences.

We have the resources. We have the ocean environment in its many different forms. We have the research plant and we have the greatest aggregate of scientific and engineering skills in the country, if not in the world.

Let me now, as Governor, give you my thoughts on what a task force for a marine development plan might accomplish.

First, education: I do not have to tell you men who have sought assistants that we do not have enough oceanographers. It is estimated the Nation now has about 1,500 trained marine scientists. In 1962, we graduated only 34 fully qualified oceanographers. Only 10 universities grant degrees in marine sciences. Those are shocking statistics when you consider that the United States is the leading seapower in the world, militarily and economically.

And the figures illustrate how far behind we have fallen in our race for knowledge of the sea, for knowledge so vital it may involve our very survival in the distant future.

The State's effort in marine sciences education is not inconsiderable. We support the Scripps Institution with $1.5 million; the Marine Resources Institute for $134,000; the Bodega Marine Laboratory and the marine fisheries facility at Humboldt State College.

In addition, of course, we are deeply involved in many Federal research projects which help our educational effort.

This State's total commitment to education is the largest in the Nation. We have the most extensive system of tuition-free higher education in the world. And we are training many hundreds of scientists and engineers.

But, have we been slighting the marine sciences? Should we be training more oceanographers? Do we need more and different facilities? These are questions you men can answer for us. I hope you will undertake an examination of them and advise us of our needs for the future.

My second point concerns water: The adverse Supreme Court decision in the Colorado River case now has thrust upon California a reexamination of our long-range water policies and needs.

Certainly, we must now look harder than ever at the question of salt water conversion to provide for a population of 42 million persons by the year 2000, most of them in Southern California. The pilot plant at San Diego has proved the feasibility of salt water conversion.

The next step is to build an atomic plant which will produce both power and fresh water from the sea. Secretary Udall has proposed a 50-million-gallon prototype plant as part of the Pacific Southwest water plan. We have asked the bureau to separate that plan from the water project and build it independently of a regional water project.

Such a plant, producing 50 times more water than the San Diego facility, should give us an answer to the next question. Should we be thinking now of a power and seawater conversion plant of much greater capacity, say in the 25,000-megawatt range, producing 1 or 2 billion gallons of water a day? Based on present technology, it appears feasible.

What we need to establish, however, is where such an enormous plant could be built and what it would do to the beach and ocean environment around it. Great quantities of heat would be discharged into the sea from such a plant. What would the effect of such discharges be on marine life, on swimming, and on the purity of the water near the plant?

Is that not a question our new task force of advisors could undertake?

Third, let us look at the fishing industry for a moment—commercial and sport fishing: Both are big business in California. Both are important to many hundreds of thousands of people.

As the leading commercial fishing State in the Nation and as one of the most important in the world, we have a big stake in both the preservation and enhancement of ocean fishing.

The industry produces some $200 million annually and all of our estimates, including some from you gentlemen, indicate that the total yield could be doubled. We must find ways of doing this.

First, let me say that I do not think there is a basic conflict between commercial and sport fishing. There are plenty of fish out there for both and the policy of State government will continue to be the preservation of both kinds of fishing.

Nevertheless, there are complex and serious problems involved in reconciling the needs of sport and commercial fishermen and in assuring proper management of the fish harvest. I suggest that four things need doing in this field:

1. A complete survey and assessment of all the fish resources off the California coast must be made.

2. The habits of each harvestable species must be understood in relation to its physical and biological environment, so that it may be caught at the optimum time and place, and in the most efficient manner.

3. Ways must be found to utilize them; to develop the knowledge and technology for efficiently catching, handling, and processing them.

4. Laws and regulations implementing the results of this research must be adopted to insure that a maximum sustained yield can be continued.

I hope that in future discussions you will devote some attention to those questions. We need your expert advice and opinion and we would welcome your views.

Fourth, is recreation: Today people are flocking to the beaches and marinas in record numbers for boating, surfing, sunning, and skindiving.

By the year 2000, only 36 years from now, with more than 40 million people in the State, if all choose to visit the seashore at once we would have 8 persons standing on every foot of the usable shore.

Fortunately, that won't happen. But the mental picture of it illustrates the pressing need for a public policy which is based on the economic and recreational needs of a large population.

There is another concern. Our beaches are disappearing. Erosion is sweeping away the masses of sand which piled up along the California coast in the past. The process has been intensified because dam construction on our streams has reduced the movement of sand to the coastal beaches.

Let me cite one example of what is happening. Five years ago we purchased what is known as Bolsa Chica Beach, south of Long Beach. It will be erased within 10 years if the present erosion process continues. To construct reefs and groins to save this precious asset so enjoyed by millions annually will require an expenditure of $6,546,000. We think it worth the cost. In conjunction with the county and Federal Corps of Engineers, we have embarked on an ambitious plan to recoup the losses already suffered and to preclude further loss.

We look to you to find some means, probably mechanical, but greatly less costly than our present program, to turn sand from the ocean canyons, possibly to allow sand and silt to flow down the rivers rather than slowly inevitably back up behind the great dams.

Our concern for the beaches and recreation points up the many new problems in the multiple use of our marine resources made urgent by our rapidly expanding population and the increased availability of those resources.

We must preserve the beaches and develop the oil pools. We must build harbors and provide space for sailing. We must save both the party boats and the tuna fleets. And we must build atomic salt water plants and save the Bodega Bays and the Malibus.

I do not believe those are mutually exclusive goals. But they will not be attained without careful planning and without long-range thinking.

I ask you to begin that kind of planning and thinking. I promise you that we in Government will provide the forum and the legislative and administrative machinery to create a State marine resources development plan. I ask you to join in the making of it.

Finally, let me turn now to the Federal role in our marine future. In the current fiscal year the U.S. Government is spending in the order of $5 billion to explore the mysteries of space. For oceanography—$124 million. In terms of a gross national product of $600 billion and a Federal budget of $98 billion, $124 million is a pittance. It is grossly inadequate to meet the Russian and Japanese challenge in fishing and oceanography. It is grossly inadequate for the resources planning of this Nation.

I believe it is primarily a Federal responsibility to scientifically investigate and develop the resources of the sea.

The Federal Government assumes that responsibility for our land resources. It does so for space. No State has the resources to do the job. No State can assume a function which involves the national interest and security.

Dr. Schaefer points out that we know more about the surface of the Moon than we do about the region where life began. And it is this inner space which contains 90 percent of the Earth's animals and more mineral and food resources than the land has ever produced.

We know of immense phosphate deposits off the coast of Lower California, a rich source of fertilizers for our agricultural industry.

We know of deposits of mineral nodules, rich in manganese and cobalt; of dome-shaped geological structures off southern California that probably contain huge oil deposits; and we know of untapped fish resources worth billions of dollars.

But science, engineering, and technology must be brought to bear on these problems before they will yield answers.

We cannot find those answers with $124 million a year, less than the cost of a single space rocket. And I submit that national security and the national interest is as seriously involved in oceanography as it is in space.

I urge President Johnson and the Congress to make a new evaluation of this Nation's policies for oceanography and marine resources development.

I particularly recommend the following steps be taken immediately:

1. Passage of the bill now before Congress to create a national policy and master plan for oceanography and the development of marine resources.

2. An increase in educational aid. We particularly need new physical resources—laboratories by the sea, housing for scientists, classrooms, and equipment.

3. A program of Federal scholarships in oceanography to boost the present number of graduates in the marine sciences.

4. Grants to States for more fish surveys. California is sharply limited in its survey facilities. We have only one oceangoing boat to conduct fish population surveys where several could be utilized. The plain fact is we can only guess how many fish there are in the ocean, where they are, where they go and why.

5. Tax concessions for private research. We are told that space and defense spending will level off in the years ahead. When that happens, great research resources now devoted to the space effort will become unused and unemployed. That precious resource—our scientists and engineers—must not be wasted. We should plan now to convert some of them to civilian uses.

I suggest that this can be done by encouraging private industry to get into marine research and begin now to find ways to tap the riches of the ocean for this generation and future generations. Tax concessions for research, allowing space and defense contractors to invest some of their research facilities for civilian purposes, will assist that effort. The exploration of the oceans and the mining and harvesting of their riches is a logical and suitable goal for research-oriented organizations.

Such a program is critical for California. We are growing by 600,000 persons a year. We need 200,000 new jobs a year. In a changing national economy, we must seek new economic frontiers. Our thousand-mile coastline represents that frontier. Beyond it, in the waters of the great Pacific, lie the secrets of life itself.

We must probe for those secrets as we are probing for the moon.

We must unlock the mysteries of the depths as we are exploring the heavens above us.

Toward that end, I ask you men at this conference to join in a new pioneering effort that will retain our supremacy on top of and under the seas.

Practical Method Versus Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the other body in their consideration of the tax bill closed the door on various proposals to provide an income tax credit for parents as they encounter expenses of their family members' education, an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, January 30, edition of the Chicago Heights Star is timely.

In view of the action of the Senate, which was accomplished by an unprecedented amount of arm-twisting, the thoughtful, succinct commentary in this editorial comes too late to affect congressional deliberation, but dramatizes the frustrated hopes of many taxpayers for a practical rather than a political tax bill. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members:

PRACTICAL METHOD VERSUS HANDOUT

As might have been expected, opposition has developed to a proposal that the new Federal income tax bill provide credits for parents who are paying college tuition. We hope the objections will be dissolved during debate on the Senate floor.

This newspaper commented last December on the worth of the tax credit proposal. The credit would be deducted from the amount of income tax paid, rather than from the total taxable income. Thus the small taxpayer would receive treatment equal to that of the most wealthy.

No less important is the fact that this form of Federal aid to education would cost nothing to administer and could not possibly engender fears of Federal meddling in the field of education.

We are afraid there are many people in the Congress, however, who prefer to be in the position of giving something away directly. Merely permitting the voter to retain what is already his fails to fit the pattern of largess from a paternalistic government.

It is our hope that this time the practical method will prevail.

Address by the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, of New Hampshire, Before the Pan-American Interparliamentary Conference, February 6, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered at the third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference on February 6, here in Washington and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the speech was delivered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], in faultless Spanish.

The delegates from our sister republics were pleased and somewhat surprised at the Congressman's knowledge and understanding of their language. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] was a great help to us during this Conference and I feel that, as a member of the executive committee, he will serve us well in the future.

His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE PAN-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 6, 1964

Madam President and fellow delegates, as we gather here today in the seat of the Organization of American States as parliamentarians from the American Continent, it is most natural that we confront our common problems in a brotherly spirit with mutual understanding. The date of March 13, 1961, is the day during which a great effort was launched by the representatives of our Latin-American sister states and our late President, John F. Kennedy.

From this meeting emerged the blueprint for economic development and social progress under the name of the Alliance for Progress. Freedom, human dignity, and economic progress became the central themes enunciated in the Charter of Punta del Este.

Twenty American Republics became a collective entity dedicated to action. Each of us took inventory of our shortcomings and placed both our faults and our grievances upon the roundtable of international discussion.

It was at that time clearly understood by all that no program for economic development could succeed in Latin America unless a proper base were established in each country. That base was conceived as a launching pad from which to rocket our hemisphere to new heights of development as defined in the charter.

Each government pledged land reform, fiscal reform and an equitable tax collection system. These assurances were given to the U.S. Congress when it appropriated the first funds for the United States contribution and participation.

Every nation understood that these conditions had to be met before moneys were to be disbursed from the trust fund of the Inter-American Bank. Our Congress clearly embraced these conditions as vital components of the entire plan.

Today I may say that some countries have complied with these requisites while others have not. We are told that the parliaments of some nations have refused to go along with adequate land and tax reform while other nations have not had the executive leadership necessary to push and implement such programs.

Those nations which are doing their part in the Alliance are disheartened not by setbacks or by temporary failures. They are disheartened and discouraged by lack of effort, wherever it exists.

Those nations which are making progress within the Alliance are doing so only because of their own determination to do so. Those nations which have nothing to show but recurrent failure and a slipping toehold on the status quo must accept responsibility for their own inadequacies and, above all, strike out anew on the road to victory.

One point should be made abundantly clear. The United States is behind the aims of the Alliance for Progress. But, the Congress and the American people desire partnership only with those nations which have the will to initiate and carry through long needed reforms that will insure the human dignity of their own people. Let it be known that the Alliance for Progress has proven that there exist many nations in Latin America whose national fabric is jewel studded with unrelenting dedication to such high ideals.

The American people and the Congress have approached the Alliance as a brother wishing to join together with another brother in a common effort. The affinity that has already been established between the partners in the Alliance can be further strengthened. The only forces capable of piercing that affinity are unjust, agitated attacks cloaked under a blanket of inflammatory nationalism. Only when geared to the accomplishment of constructive projects is nationalism a welcome ingredient. Each member of the Alliance must examine its own contributions and then determine for itself whether national pride has been a force for construction or destruction.

On the part of the United States we have been and are providing resources in quantities necessary to help make this development plan a success. As the late President Kennedy pointed out, we provided the resources to help rebuild the economies of Western Europe against nearly equal odds.

It was then that the United States learned that any development program must be founded on a cornerstone of healthy, amicable partnership and dedicated resolve.

From March 13, 1961 to June 30, 1963, the United States has made a total of $2,490 million available to the Alliance for Progress. Of that sum, $403.7 million have been sent to Latin America under the food-for-peace-program. That program has fed more than 15 million people throughout Latin America.

During the current fiscal year, the United States will be channeling more financial resources into the Latin American economies. Funds will include $430 million in new appropriations; $95 million carried over and available to the Agency for International Development; $130 million in new Social Progress Trust Funds and $40 million in carryover funds available for the Social Progress Trust Fund.

It is plainly obvious that no one government could possibly undertake to singularly provide the financial resources necessary to successfully conclude so broad a program of development. A large share of the burden must be carried by private industry—both domestic and foreign. The United States, as well as many Latin American countries, has found that private enterprise can provide not only necessary capital, but also many lacking but vitally needed skills. In the United States private enterprise has provided not only goods and services, jobs, and economic advancement, but also through a lawful and just system of taxation our Government has received indispensable revenues with which to conduct the public business. It is a similar system of private enterprise and just taxation which the Alliance for Progress envisions as the ideal for Latin American development.

During 1962, all men of good will in this hemisphere were heartened to see 10 of the 19 Latin American member countries exceed the 2.5 percent per capita annual growth rate which was to be the aim of all participants. Yet due to inadequate growth in some of the larger countries the average annual growth for all of Latin America was below the 2.5 percent figure.

It must this year be our aim to achieve and exceed that rate of growth in every Latin American participating country.

President Johnson has vigorously reaffirmed this Nation's belief and trust in the Alliance. Each nation can do no less than reaffirm its trust in the Alliance and rededicate itself to its ideals.

My fellow delegates, we are all aware that those ideals are indeed high. To approach them will require a cooperative effort of great magnitude. Our determination shall be challenged in countless ways, but let us never forget that the rewards of success are also countless. The journey will be long, but it can be made, and together we shall make it.

Civil Rights Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional righs in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, the House Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, finally last November 20 reported out the compromise civil rights bill, which had been worked on for over 7 months.

This bill is not limited to one group of people. It has provisions which are very beneficial to all the people of our country.

One provision requires an educational survey on lack of opportunity due to race, color, religion, or national origin. The Attorney General is authorized to institute or intervene in cases involving denial of rights to full use of any facility owned, operated, or managed by public authority, where parties are unable to pursue legal remedy.

In connection with Federal aid, the administration bill contained a declaration that no law providing Federal assistance by grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, shall require such assistance to be furnished in circumstances in which persons are discriminated against because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The compromise bill contains a declaration that all persons shall have the right to participate free from discrimination in all programs and activities receiving Federal financial aid.

The bill contains a section providing for the establishment of an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which is authorized to initiate or receive charges, conduct investigations, seek voluntary solutions in cases where there is discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. In the event of failure to secure voluntary solution, the Commission is authorized to file a civil action for enforcement in a Federal district court.

The coverage is limited to employment under Federal contract and Federal employment. It applies to most employers of 25 or more employees—100 for the first year, 50 for the second year—and most unions of 25 or more members—100 for the first year, 50 for the second year—and by employment agencies—including State employment agencies assisted by USES—supplying employers covered under this bill.

This is really a fair employment practice section and 23 States, including Pennsylvania, already have FEPC laws. Now an advancement has been made in this bill with the proposal to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission.

The bill also contains important sections on voting rights in Federal elections; public accommodations—Pennsylvania already has a law on this subject; Civil Rights Commission; and the civil rights protection in which the Attorney General is authorized to intervene in private action to prevent denial of equal

protection of law on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

I very much hope that the Congress will act favorably on this measure.

Washington State Statutes Preempt Proposed Federal Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for more than a week I have listened carefully to the debate on the civil rights legislation presently under House consideration. The arguments offered, both pro and con, have ben most impressive and when amendments were offered I have supported or opposed them depending on how I believed each was in the public interest and would best protect the constitutional rights of all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is perfect and when this legislation goes to the other body, I am confident some of the provisions of H.R. 7152 can and will be improved. Meanwhile, I understand that every member of the Washington State congressional delegation has been receiving considerable mail from their constituents expressing concern with regard to the far-reaching effects of the civil rights bill. As a Member of Congress who has consistently opposed further expansion of Federal Government this concern is certainly understandable and in this connection, let me assure my constituents and the people of the State of Washington that our State already has laws comparable to or more stringent than those being considered in this bill.

As further proof, my colleague from eastern Washington's Fourth Congressional District asked for and received specific written assurances from Congressman WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, that the provisions of H.R. 7152 would have no effect on the State of Washington. Moreover I have received additional written assurances to the same effect from a representative of the Department of Justice in the person of Mr. Edward Guthman, for many years a well-known Seattle newspaperman. In other words, under H.R. 7152, State statutes would have priority over Federal law in my State of Washington and enforcement proceedings of civil rights laws would be by State rather than Federal officials. Mr. Speaker, this is particularly important to those of us who are fearful of the ever-expanding power of the Federal Government.

In this connection and under unanimous consent I include following these remarks the two letters previously referred to covering the matter of state preemption.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1964.

Hon. CATHERINE MAY,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CATHERINE: This is in response to your letter of January 22 wherein you seek information on statements made by a constituent in opposition to the civil rights bill.

One organization in particular has been circulating pamphlets, letters and other material in opposition to the civil rights bill (H.R. 7152) now before thhe House. This organization is seeking to defeat the bill by placing unfounded interpertations upon its provisions or by condenming provisions which are not actually contained in the bill as reported, but which were in the subcommittee bill.

In contrast to statements made by this organization and repeated in the letter received by you, every title of the civil rights bill is keyed strictly to the guarantee of civil rights for all Americans, Negro as well as white.

The drafters of the legislation (of which I was one) did not incorporate provisions indiscriminately for political advantage and without good reason. Each title was included because solid, well-documented proof had been presented to the House Judiciary Committee during lengthy hearings that American ctiizens were being denied their constitutional rights.

The bill is aimed at correcting irregularities in the right to vote, the opportunity to obtain a job, the ability to gain an adequate education, the right to receive the equal benefits and protection of Government and the opportunity to obtain reasonable accommodations while traveling in interstate commerce.

There is no doubt that the provisions of this bill will increase to some extent the authority of the Federal Government. Generally speaking, I am opposed to such increases of power. But, when basic rights of citizenship are involved and the State and local governments fail to guarantee these rights, then I believe the burden falls upon the Federal Government to take over the responsibility.

Whenever possible, the drafters of the bill have sought to surround the extension of authority with sufficient judicial and administrative safeguards. This was the case, for example, in title VI, where a recipient who has had terminated Federal financial assistance may seek judicial review of such termination. The same may be said of title VII where a businessman or labor union cannot be enjoined from discriminatory employment practices unless and until there has been a complete litigation of the matter in Federal court where the Government must sustain the burden of proof.

In addition, the important titles on public accommodations (title II) and employment (title VII), ample provision is made for the Federal Government to defer to the States complaints where State law provides a workable forum for handling the complaints.

Thirty-two States have public accommodation laws and 25 States have FEPC laws. Washington State has effective legislation in both areas which you, of course, are far more familiar with than I. Thus, in your State, as with many other States with effective legislation, there will be no cause for the Federal Government to intrude in these areas at all.

The civil rights bill is primarily aimed at correcting abuses in those areas of the country where local authority fails to take effective action. Whenever a State or locality meets its obligations in the area of civil rights, then the right or need for Federal intervention will disappear.

In this regard the drafters of the bill have taken precaution to guard against undue intrusion in local matters by the Federal Government. Thus, Federal officials will have no authority to correct "racial imbalance" but only to desegregate public schools in accordance with the Supreme Court decisions. Similarly, there will be no authority for the Federal Government to insist upon "racial balance" in employment. All that may be done is to enjoin discriminatory employment or membership practices of employers or labor unions.

I may also add that no criminal penalties are provided for in the bill. If violations are found to exist, the Federal courts are only authorized to enjoin the illegal behavior. Thus, it may be said that States and individuals alike are given the opportunity to cleanse their behavior without any undue burdens being placed upon them.

Finally, in response to the statement in your constituent's letter that all "public establishments" would be subject to Federal regulation under the bill, I can categorically deny this allegation. Title II has been primarily limited to eating establishments, places of lodging, gasoline stations, and places of amusement.

In addition, other places may be covered if they are located within one of the above covered establishments and hold themselves out as serving the patrons of such covered establishment (i.e., a barbershop located in a hotel). Every public establishment would be covered according to a provision of title II, if State law requires segregation, but this merely codifies existing case law and such a condition exists in only the most limited areas of the country.

I hope that my response to the statements of your constituent are sufficiently detailed to overcome such fears as may exist. I do regret the length of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Representative to Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 6, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am pleased to reply to your inquiry about what effect the Civil Rights bill now pending in the House of Representatives would have in the State of Washington. As a practical matter, the bill would have little or no effect.

You are well aware that any bona fide resident of the State of Washington can register to vote without any difficulty. Since there is no discrimination, the sections of the bill seeking to end voting discrimination would have no application in Washington.

Washington has had a law banning discrimination in places of public accommodation since 1890. Title II—the public accommodations section—of the bill now before the House specifically sets forth that a State law banning discrimination in places of public accommodation will take precedence over the Federal law. So, again, there would be no change in the existing situation in Washington with respect to public accommodation.

Since there is no discrimination in public facilities in the State of Washington, title III and title IV of the bill would have no practical application in Washington State. This is also true with respect to title VI which bans discrimination in federally assisted programs, since, again, no such situation exists in Washington State.

Title VII deals with fair employment practices. Washington has had a similar law since 1949, I understand, so there is very little likelihood that a Federal FEPC would have much application. Title VII also sets forth that where States have existing fair employment laws, those laws will remain in effect except to the extent they might conflict with the Federal law.

This covers the pertinent sections of the bill.

I am enclosing a summary of the bill and a copy of a letter which we have sent to a number of Members of Congress who have written requesting comments on extreme attacks on the Civil Rights bill by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom.

I hope you will find these useful and if you have any further questions or wish any further information, please do not hesitate to call on us.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

EDWIN GUTHMAN,
Special Assistant for Public Information.

Religion Is Irrelevant in Choosing Candidates for Public Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excellent statement on the choosing of the vice-presidential candidate. It was written by the distinguished publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, Ralph McGill.

Mr. McGill's column appeared in the February 2, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

IRRELEVANT ISSUE

By electing John F. Kennedy President of the United States, American voters succeeded also in removing religion from politics to a degree not yet determined. Certainly the old bugaboos, created by ignorance, arrogance and fear, are substantially eliminated. If a Pope can go to Jerusalem and the holy sites of Christianity in the region about the Golden City, then perhaps he may also visit the United States, Great Britain, or even Luther's Germany without arousing any great amount of idiotic clamor.

As the political year of 1964 moved from gilded paper caps, tooting horns and the quaffing of toasts into the realities of our social system, the spinoff from the politics of an election year became evident.

Speculative discussion began to be heard above the clatter and conversational babble of cocktail parties. The question being asked is whether each party will nominate a Roman Catholic as Vice President. Between bites of embalmed fish on crackers, the pros and cons clash loudly with the laughter of the martini addicts each afternoon in hotel and club rooms about the Nation.

The best reply to such talk, to date, comes from New York's Liberal Party. A policy statement from this organization, which often holds the balance of power in city and State elections, said that putting up a balanced ticket, with the choice for Vice President confined to a Roman Catholic, would "nullify the historic achievement of the Kennedy election."

"We believe that in choosing a vice presidential candidate in 1964, we should seek experience and stature in national and international affairs, proven ability in the highest public service and the profoundest commitment to the democratic principles on which this Nation was founded," the statement said.

The Liberal Party leadership did not oppose or suggest a Catholic not have a place on the ticket. The point made is one that all Americans might well make—that the question of religious affiliation is irrelevant.

At about the same time a Jesuit publication, America, published an editorial on the same subject. The editors took note of the fact that five of the eight persons most frequently mentioned as possible running mates with President Johnson are Roman Catholics. America said:

"It is gratifying that a man's Catholic faith is no longer an obstacle to the highest Federal office. We credit Mr. Kennedy with burying that issue forever. But we would regret to see it rise again in a new form, this time turned inside out. A candidate's Catholic faith should not become a qualification for office. It should neither block his way nor ease him onto the ticket. If the old 'religious issue' was shameful, its new version is ridiculous."

It is good now to have such healthy discussion. There is no state religion in America. Every man is presumed to be first of all a citizen. As a citizen he is free. He is free to be a Christian believer or not. He is free to associate himself with any other faith * * * or to withhold himself.

This brings us naturally to the U.S. Supreme Court's proper decision that the State may not require a pupil to attend prayers officially conducted by teachers, representing the State. Voluntary prayer is quite another matter. All the court said was that the Government, local, State, or natural, could not require prayer services. This in no sense was antireligous. It was in the best American tradition.

Our religion is personal—our religious affiliation is, and ought to be, irrelevant to our qualifications as a candidate for office.

University of Pittsburgh and a New Role for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding men in the Pittsburgh community, Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, recently received a well-earned honor for his leadership and accomplishments not only in the broad field of education, but the life and future of the city. His choice as Pittsburgh's "Man of the Year" has been lauded by all who know of his activities. As an example, I include an editorial comment from KDKA radio and television stations.

Last October, when the Pitt football team won its first three games and gained No. 3 ranking in the Nation, KDKA, a bit facetiously, named Chancellor Litchfield "Man or Coach of the Year." This, of course, was because the team responded to his orders to play daring, wideopen football.

Now, this early judgment has been confirmed to a much greater degree. Chancellor Litchfield officially has been named Pittsburgh's "Man of the Year," for his outstanding leadership and accomplishments not only in the broad field of education, but the life and future of this community.

In his acceptance speech, Dr. Litchfield talked about the new responsibility of education to help economic growth, and this theme was developed in KDKA's series of Focal Point documentaries. He pointed out the traditional university feels it is fulfilling its obligations by providing the teachers, the libraries, the laboratories, the free inquiry and the learning for students. He stressed that these functions are fundamental and always will be.

However, the Pitt Chancellor said today they are no longer enough. He thinks large urban-based universities must now accept a new role of using all of its knowledges for the solution of society's ills.

Dr. Litchfield pointed out that local universities have accepted this new role in organizing the Oakland Corp., the vast Panther Hollow project, to help the community in urban renewal. Universities rarely have accepted such a responsibility and in many parts of the Nation deliberately turn their backs on such responsibilities. Dr. Litchfield said there is a second, most important new role which he described this way:

"That is the responsibility to assist in systematically facilitating economic growth. Panther Hollow is one way of doing this. The efforts that we are presently making in conjunction with others to find ways of spinning the new knowledges off to the communities go far beyond the question of Panther Hollow. To use knowledge for the sake of economic growth is a concept which has not been traditional in American academic life. And yet there is something very fundamental here which is broader, if you will, than even economic growth."

Yes, to sum it up, Chancellor Litchfield thinks that in addition to its traditional academic functions, universities should find ways of moving new knowledge into productive use for the economic and social well-being, the improvement of health and all other areas of community life.

Most educators may view this as a radical departure, but it is essential to our advancement and the merging of all of these educational, economic, and social forces is bound to come. Local universities are leading the way. That is why Chancellor Litchfield, the spearhead of this movement, is Pittsburgh's Man of the Year. He is propelling the Pittsburgh area to a brighter economic and social future. He richly deserves this honor of Man of the Year in Pittsburgh, present and future.

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, many newspapers throughout the country, but none in its Capital, last Sunday ran a very interesting story by United Press International on one of America's most distinguished citizens, to whom not only U.S. citizens, but citizens throughout the free world, owe a debt of gratitude for his contributions to the protection of their freedoms. As printed in last Sunday's Los Angeles Times, the UPI story is as follows:

FIERY ADMIRAL RICKOVER—FIREBALL IN RETIREMENT—CONTROVERSIAL FATHER OF NUCLEAR FLEET CONTINUES WORK ON REACTORS WITH AEC

WASHINGTON.—Hyman G. Rickover, Saturday, stopped being the most controversial vice admiral on active duty in the Navy. He became the most controversial retired vice admiral in the Navy.

But his change in status will not diminish his influence in the Navy's drive for a nuclear-powered surface fleet.

The doughty, sharp-tongued father of the atomic submarines, a 120-pound dynamo of energy, will continue to be assistant chief for nuclear reactors for the Atomic Energy Commission.

He has to add the word "retired" after the words "vice admiral" in his official title, even though he is on active duty. According to law, precedent, and regulations he is not in line for further promotion.

CREATED PRECEDENT

Even the absence of promotion possibilities may be considered doubtful, since Rickover has created precedent frequently in the past and a special dispensation from Congress or the White House might elevate him further.

Rickover, who grew up in Chicago and was graduated from Annapolis Naval Academy in 1922, was forced to go on the retired list because he reached the age of 64 Monday. He already had been extended two years beyond the usual retirement age and the law contained no other loopholes of that kind.

Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze instead took advantage of a provision that retired officers can always be summoned to active duty. He called Rickover back to his post effective instantaneously upon his retirement.

"Admiral Rickover is unquestionably the the world's foremost authority on nuclear propulsion," Nitze said. "His contributions to the Navy and the Nation will be needed for so long as he is willing and able to serve his country."

GATHERS ENEMIES

The Secretary's high praise did nothing to remove general belief in the Defense Department that Rickover has accumulated more enemies than any other officer of his time.

This is scarcely surprising since he has repeatedly assailed the military service for incompetence, suggesting among other things a reduction of 20,000 in the number of Navy officers and the overhaul or closing of the service academies.

He also has lambasted sections of industry for poor workmanship and profiteering and has made a second profession of raking the American educational system over the coals.

But Rickover also has friends, and many of them are Members of Congress. Without help from these friends he would probably never have risen above the rank of captain, despite his achievements.

GETS RESULTS

The Congressmen like him for two main reasons:

He gets results, politically valuable in their districts. The United States fell behind in space and didn't do too well in some other fields but has always been pre-eminent in A-subs.

He gives them blunt talk instead of Government gobbledegook. It is widely suspected in Congress that much of the gobbledegook is ingeniously devised to say almost nothing, to gloss over unpleasant facts and to hide incompetence.

Rickover's part in building the atomic submarines beginning with the *Nautilus* is so well known that it sometimes comes as a surprise that he was awarded one of the Nation's highest decorations before he became interested in nuclear energy.

In 1946, after World War II service in the Bureau of Ships, he received the Legion of Merit for "overcoming tremendous procurement difficulties created by shortages in materials, manpower, and manufacturing facilities at a time when an unprecedented increase in production of electrical equipment was required."

He had some postwar duty with the Manhattan Project at Oak Ridge, Tenn., for which he received a commendation citing "outstanding service in connection with the development of the atomic bomb." But his work in nuclear propulsion did not begin until late 1947.

By mid-1952 he was receiving a gold star in lieu of a second Legion of Merit along with a citation generally regarded as an under statement.

"Captain Rickover, more than any other individual, is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear ship program," the citation said. "He has held tenaciously to a single important goal through discouraging frustration and opposition."

Rickover's next big battle is expected to be for nuclear power in all or almost all of the Navy's surface combat ships. He has been forced to watch some backsliding after construction of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, but the issue is still wide open.

ADVANTAGES SEEN

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's recent decision to build another conventionally powered carrier was carefully isolated as a special case to avoid further delay on that ship and without prejudice to the larger issue of future construction.

The setbacks may have had some advantage. In the meanwhile U.S. nuclear experts have learned how to build atomic propulsion systems in smaller sizes, more cheaply and with more durability in a single fuel loading.

This means that Rickover can present a better argument. Assured as he is of the ear of Congress, he can be expected to underscore in fiery and picturesque terms and on every suitable occasion his contention that there is no sense in building combat ships that are obsolete before they get to sea.

Commodity Credit Corporation Wheat Sales Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 5, I received the following telegram from Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in Minneapolis, Minn. This is the text of Mr. Thatcher's telegram:

Cooperative grain farmers in States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana, have a vital interest in raising the Commodity Credit Corporation wheat sales price from 105 to 115 percent of the support price. This will make possible not only full support benefits to the producer, but also maximum use of regular private market channels including their own cooperatives. It would prevent the Department of Agriculture from depressing wheat prices by dumping CCC stocks. I hope you will support the amendment to be offered for this purpose when the full Agriculture Committee considers the Purcell wheat bill. Thank you for your consideration of a policy crucial for normal marketing and efficient cooperation.

It is gratifying to receive this assurance of Mr. Thatcher's views concerning the CCC wheat sales price. I have advocated raising the price from 105 to 115 percent for a long time and such a provision is included in the voluntary wheat plan I introduced last May 23, as H.R. 6546. Most farm organizations now support the concept of raising the CCC price from 105 to 115 percent. They realize the disastrous effects on a farmer's income when the Department of Agriculture hands down the level of market prices. We must take action to prevent the Department of Agriculture from taking over the grain markets.

A Regrettable Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, today in the great debate over civil rights and civil liberties, we find men of judgment and purpose hard at work in an effort to seek the truth and further the great constitutional concept that Americans are a people governed by laws and not men. But occasionally during this struggle for truth and equality, there are those who would deviate from high purpose, would encourage the forces of revolution, and would incite emotional reaction. Such an event has just occurred in my district. Mr. Milford M. Foxwell has expressed, in his letter of February 5, 1964, to me, an American's reaction to this regrettable incident:

DEAR MR. MORTON: Before I get into my reasons for writing to you, there are one or two points I would like to make clear. First of all, I am not a racist, segregationist, or integrationist in any way, shape or form, but I am a lifetime resident of Dorchester County and cannot help but to become concerned with a situation that could easily destroy a system of government which has been proven to be the best on earth, and the part of that government to which I refer is our system of lawmaking and law enforcement. This phase I should think is among the most important in respect to our way of life. Certainly many of our dollars are spent in this direction, to say nothing of the countless number of people who dedicate their entire lives in this field.

My decision to write this letter came after reading an article which appeared in our local newspaper, the Daily Banner, under this date, a clipping of which I am enclosing. The Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Representative of the State of New York, addressed a meeting of the Cambridge Non-Violent Action Committee on Tuesday February 4, 1964, and the contents of his address, which are outlined in the enclosed clipping, are certainly out of order with respect to the position he holds as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I fully realize that freedom of speech is a prime principle on which this country was founded and I pray that this never changes, but it appears to me that we are headed for disaster if any man is allowed to address any group, white or colored, by telling them, and I quote "It is divinely right for the people of

Cambridge, Md., to break the law until they have had a share in making the law." Without arguing whether or not these people have a share in making the laws (which they do or else Mr. POWELL would not be a Congressman) Mr. POWELL should not be allowed to make such a statement, which could possibly incite a riot and in turn injure or even kill someone. I think Mr. POWELL or anyone else, white or colored, should be called on the carpet for such statements to any gathering of people regardless of their intent.

I am 32 years old, have a wife and two sons and my wife are I are both law-abiding people and we are trying desperately to raise our children as such. However, I found it extremely difficult to answer my 11-year-old son when he asked me "who is that man in that picture" (Mr. POWELL) because I do not believe that Mr. POWELL's remarks are suitable for those of a Congressman nor do I want my children to believe that such remarks are typical of the members of your fraternity.

I have been educated to believe that my share in making our laws is the right to vote, but according to Mr. POWELL this is wrong, and violence in lieu of reasoning is right where some people disagree with various aspects of our Government. This is certainly not the rule, but rather the exception or else we wouldn't be able to walk our streets in safety.

Should the type of encouragement Mr. POWELL gave his audience lead to violence, destruction of property and even personal injury, in my opinion he could be held responsible and should be held accountable for his actions. If the office you and Mr. POWELL hold does not maintain a higher standard of ethics than what he has shown to both the colored and white people of Cambridge, then I am wondering how all of us are supposed to live by laws that you help to make.

I want to stress again the fact that this in no way represents my views on civil rights, segregation, or integration. I merely feel that the laws of our Nation should be enforced regardless of who breaks them or for whatever reasons they may be broken, and that Mr. POWELL did this community, State and Nation a terrific injustice by the remarks he made.

Respectfully yours,

MILFORD M. FOXWELL.

Firmness Requested in Our Dealings With Cuba and Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, our soft, vacillating foreign policy continues to embarrass our allies and degrade our image and prestige around the world when we let two-bit, leftist, Communist sympathizers like Castro shove the United States around and intentionally violate treaties and international agreements such as the water supply agreement to Guantanamo Naval Base and permit violations of such as our Panama Canal Zone Treaty.

If we expect to remain a world opinion leader and maintain the respect of our allies, we must put some firmness and backbone in our dealings and reactions over such incidents. We will not gain respect by continuing to give in, back down, writing letters of protest as we did over the U.S. fliers who were shot down in Germany last week, or by selling wheat to the Communists and guaranteeing their credit.

Specifically, if Castor persists in refusing to supply the Guantanamo Base water in disaccord with our long-standing agreement, then we should move immediately to restore the water supply by taking over control of the supply facilities. Second, Castro hostilities continuing, we should establish a sea blockade around Cuba to prohibit the shipment of all goods to that island except medicines and necessary foodstuffs. Further, we should initiate immediate hard-hitting negotiations with our allies to stop their aid and trade to Cuba. Admittedly, the latter would be more difficult, now that this administration has agreed to aid Communist Russia with the shipment of U.S.-subsidized wheat and other goods.

H.R. 9744, Explanation and Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week on January 28, I introduced H.R. 9744, a bill to terminate the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project area and plan, to restore certain property in the District of Columbia to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes. Subsequently, my bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Since the introduction of this measure, there has developed considerable interest in how the bill, if enacted, would be implemented. Other pertinent questions also have been raised.

In an attempt to explain the intent of my legislative proposal, acknowledge the interest being evidenced toward it, and answer the questions I have heard, I am offering these remarks. At their conclusion, I am submitting a sectional analysis of the bill.

I think it is important at the outset to establish that the general concept of urban renewal is deserving of enthusiastic endorsement. Community improvement through the elimination of slums and blight and the removal of their causes is essential to the public welfare.

Poor housing, traffic congestion, inadequate sites for commercial and industrial growth, downtown decay, and neighborhood deterioration are proper targets for improvement programs, using public and private resources. Failure to plan and execute such programs carries a high cost, measured both in human and in economic values.

The incidence of disease, crime, and juvenile delinquency is more frequent in rundown areas than elsewhere. Blight creates greater needs for municipal services, while slum areas return less tax revenue to the municipality. The suffering brought from slum and blighting conditions is widespread and needs attention at all governmental levels.

There is, in my belief, a legitimate role for the Federal Government in urban renewal. It is to make available Federal assistance, in the form of grants and/or loans, to finance surveys and plans; to acquire, clear, and prepare land for redevelopment; and to relocate site residents. Congress repeatedly has recognized its constitutional obligation to remove a burden on the public welfare and, to that end, has enacted appropriate legislation.

Urban renewal is not without its faults, however. In fact, its administration has been far from faultless. The concept has been crippled by bureaucratic bungling, inertia, and inexperience, and relocation resistance.

By startling coincidence, Mr. Speaker, on the very day that I introduced H.R. 9744 in the interests of remedying the unfortunate utilization of urban renewal in Washington's Columbia Plaza project, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal a front-page story by Reporter Stanley Penn detailing the ills of urban renewal. It is pertinent, I believe, for me to share with my colleagues in the House, the following excerpt from Mr. Penn's article:

> In some cities, projects are going ahead on schedule and making dramatic changes in slum areas. But despite a measure of progress, most of the property cities have acquired for urban renewal purposes hasn't yet been developed.
>
> Of the 22,000 acres purchased by cities since the program began in 1949, only 6,800 have been resold to redevelopers. Among the remainder, 6,000 acres haven't been cleared yet of old buildings; another 3,300 have been cleared but no redevelopers have been found; and 5,900 acres are cleared and appear close to being sold to redevelopers.

With this overview in mind, and before presenting the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 9744, I want to address my remarks specifically to the reasons which prompted—if not, provoked—my introduction of this bill.

I serve on Subcommittee No. 4 of the District of Columbia Committee. During 1963, this subcommittee spent a great deal of time conducting hearings and studying the matter of urban renewal in the District of Columbia. Within the scope of this examination came Columbia Plaza.

From the information produced, I concluded that the approval by the District Commissioners of Columbia Plaza as an urban renewal project entitled to financial assistance under the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, was improper. This resulted from the presentation to the Commissioners of documentation that was not entirely representative of fact.

Urban renewal funds under the act cited above can be made available only where evidence of slum and deteriorated conditions meet certain specific criteria, including building and environmental deficiencies. Very definite standards must be met. Further, the District of Columbia, under the Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, prescribes statutory provisions for such standards:

namely, that those slum and blighted areas must be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

I believe our hearings conclusively confirmed the absence of such qualifying conditions in regard to Columbia Plaza. In fact, Board of Commissioners President Walter N. Tobriner testified before our subcommittee that had the information revealed in the hearings been known to the Commissioners when the project was approved, his Board almost certainly would have acted differently.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the passage of H.R. 9744 can help to reorient the Columbia Plaza project along more promising and less costly lines.

The analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 9774

GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The general purpose of the bill is to extinguish the Columbia Plaza project by terminating the project area boundaries and the project plan and to provide for the restoration of the real property within the area to those former owners of the property from whom the Redevelopment Land Agency acquired the land.

Section 1: Section 1 of the bill expresses the sense of the Congress that at the time the agencies of the Federal and District Governments, which have the responsibilities in connection with urban renewal programs, were considering and making decisions regarding the Columbia Plaza area, the officials of such agencies were not fully aware of all of the material and essential facts which subsequently have demonstrated that such a project should not have been approved. Further, the Congress finds that because of the foregoing, the approval of the project contravened the intent of Congress and therefore the taking of private property in the area worked an improper hardship on the owners, and such owners should have an opportunity to reacquire their property upon payment of the amount they received plus interest from the date of sale to the date of their reacquisition of the property. Exempt from this intent of the Congress is that portion of the projected area which was acquired for highway purposes.

Section 2: This section provides that the Columbia Plaza urban renewal area, boundaries for which were established by the Board of Commissioners, and the project plan for that area, later approved by the Commissioners, is terminated and of no further force and effect. All title and interest of the RLA to the real property in the Columbia Plaza area is transferred to the Administrator of the General Services Administration and he is authorized and directed to carry out provisions of the act and report to the Congress not later than 8 months from the date of enactment concerning the execution of the provisions of the act.

Section 3: Under this section the Administrator of the General Services Administration is directed to make an offer in writing, to each former owner of real property from whom the RLA acquired land, to reconvey the property to such former owner the land at a price equal to the cost of acquisition to the Agency plus interest at the rate of 6 percent from the date the Agency paid the former owner for the land. The offer of the Administrator shall not include any part of the urban renewal area which was acquired for highway purposes. If such former owner of land accepts the offer, transfer of title and settlement shall be effected within 90 days after acceptance.

The Administrator's offer to the former landowner shall be open for 30 days. At settlement the Administrator shall deliver to the former owner a special warranty deed without any greater encumbrances or restrictions than were of record at the date of acquisition of the property by the RLA.

Section 4: In the event the former owner rejects the offer of the Administrator, the Administrator shall, within 90 days of rejection of the offer or the expiration date of such offer, dispose of the land at public auction to the highest bidder.

Section 5: This section provides that no former owner may assign his right to repurchase to any other person. However, if any former owner is deceased or is legally incompetent to act, then, the offer shall be made to his heirs, successor, assigns or other legal representative.

Section 6: This section specifically defines the term "Columbia Plaza urban renewal project."

Section 7: This section provides that the streets and alleys which were acquired by the Agency shall revert to the same status and ownership as existed immediately before acquisition by the RLA and the Administrator of the General Services Administration is directed to execute such deeds and perform such acts as are necessary to carry out such section.

Section 8: This section provides that the zoning which shall apply to the real property which is sold by the Administrator of General Services Administration shall be the same as the zoning which was applicable to the property as of January 1, 1964, except that the property shall not be subject to any provisions or conditions relating to the Columbia Plaza urban renewal plan.

Section 9: Section 9 of the bill provides that the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall transfer to the RLA all funds received in excess of the costs incurred by him in carrying out the provisions of the act.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE BILL

One of the immediate questions that arises in the minds of some persons is whether the RLA and thus indirectly the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, would lose money by such reversion of property. Inasmuch as many factors are not known and cannot be accurately projected, it is possible only to deal with existing figures and make some general estimates as to what the possible result might be in this regard.

The cost of the land purchased from the private property owners, excluding the land in the freeway area, was $5,650,995. The latest available financial statement related to Columbia Plaza, and some costs have accrued since that date indicates that other expenditures in connection with planning, inspection, administrative costs, interests, and relocation total approximately $1 million. Thus, the gross expenditures total approximately $6,500,000.

The resale of the land would return $5,650,995. The interest on the amount paid to the private landowners from the time of RLA acquisition to the date of revesting of title in the private landowners cannot be precisely calculated. It appears that the amount of this interest would be not less than $300,000 and might approach as much as $500,000.

The final item involves the status of the portions of the project area which would revert to Federal streets and alleys. Since this land was taken over by the Agency without any compensation to the Federal Government it would revert to the Federal Government without any payment. In any redevelopment program for the complete area, the code authorizes the sale of the land at its reasonable value or not less than the assessed value set upon adjoining lands. Since approximately 100,000 square feet would remain outside of the highway right-of-way, the sale of this square footage could produce to the Government an additional $2 million. This amount plus the interest is substantially in excess of the total cost accumulated by the RLA in connection with the project.

TAXES AND SUITABILITY OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

If the land is reverted to the former property owners, redevelopment could be made under existing zoning law and building codes. The permitted uses for the existing zoning could result in structures which might accrue to the District of Columbia substantially more in annual taxes than the urban renewal project proposal. The objection, which opponents will interpose, are directed to the viewpoint that there would be an uncontrolled redevelopment and this would be undesirable in the area. It may be noted that Watergate Towne, immediately adjacent to the Columbia Plaza, is the most plush of any developments in the city. It is subject only to the National Capital Planning Commission, Fine Arts Commission, and the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia. No one has challenged the excellence of the Watergate project free from the covenants of an RLA plan.

The Air Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE AIR AGE

This Nation's air carriers are looking into the future, when bigger and faster planes will be carrying passengers to all corners of the earth. This new phase of the Air Age will shrink the world even further.

They have looked into the supersonic age, and what they have seen is now off the drafting boards and in the hands of U.S. officials. Three designs have been submitted by major plane builders—Lockheed, Boeing, and North American.

The three designs offer more capacity, more speed and more range than the only other supersonic airliner now in operation—the British-French Concorde supersonic jet.

The capacities of the proposed American supersonic airliners range from 150 to a potential 227. One version, the Lockheed design, can travel up to 1,980 miles an hour, three times the speed of sound.

There have been other dramatic innovations in the American supersonic designs. One plane has wings that change shape in flight. Another design features a nose that tilts downward 15 degrees to give the pilot better vision when he approaches the runway for a landing.

With the supersonic airliner, carriers will be able to sharply increase their earning power. On the other side of the ledger, these new planes will cost a lot more than the present transports, and the earning capacity of the new models will have to be a crucial factor in design.

The Government will subsidize the development and manufacture of the new supersonic liners up to 75 percent of the cost. The development cost alone is estimated at $1 billion. The manufacturers would be required to pick up the tab for the balance, but they have complained that this outlay is beyond their financial ability.

Under the financing formula drafted by Washington, the Federal Government would get back its share of the risk investment in the development by downpayments from the carriers when they purchase the planes. The Government also will get royalties as the planes are used.

The supersonic craft will be able to use existing runways.

We have been given a preview of the supersonic age, and it holds promise of being more exciting and exhilarating than the present jet phase. We are moving quickly into an aviation phase that should bring the world closer together * * * and the closer the the world gets, the better man will be able to understand his fellow man, even if he lives thousands of miles away. This is the exciting promise of the supersonic age.

J. Raiford Watson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1964, Mississippi lost one of its most outstanding and useful citizens, J. Raiford Watson, of Jackson.

At the time of his death, Mr. Watson was executive director of the Mississippi Railroad Association. Previously, he had rendered notable public service as assistant secretary of state and as secretary of the Mississippi State Senate.

Raiford Watson was well known to the Mississippi delegation in Congress and Members from other States. He was extremely well liked because of his charm, intelligence, and gracious bearing. Mr. Watson was a gentleman, and will be greatly missed by all who knew him. I shall especially miss his sage counsel, his helpful spirit, and his friendship which was manifested in many ways.

To his lovely and devoted wife, Alice, and to his children, Alice and John, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Mississippi State Legislature honoring his memory. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION HONORING J. RAIFORD WATSON, OF MISSISSIPPI

Whereas, our Almighty Creator, in His all-knowing and infinite wisdom, has called home one of his faithful servants, J. Raiford Watson; and

Whereas, Mr. Watson, son of the late Senator John Stewart Watson, Sr., of Lexington, was well known and highly respected in the public affairs of his State, having served it with distinction as assistant secretary of state for 5 years, as secretary of the senate during the first administration of Gov. Hugh White, and as a member of the executive committee of the agricultural and industrial board for 8 years; and

Whereas, at the time of his death, Mr. Watson was the executive director of the Mississippi Railroad Association; and

Whereas his host of friends throughout the State will miss his helpful and intelligent counsel, his unfailing courtesy, his gentle wit and his outstanding contribution to the progress of his community and his State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby commend the public and private life of J. Raiford Watson and express publicly our deep regret at his untimely death and extend our sincere sympathy to his family, his associates, and his many friends.

Hills Green, Rivers Clean: Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the so-called renaissance of Pittsburgh, of which we are so proud, is reaching out from the Golden Triangle to the hills, to the valleys, to the wide rivers that are our heritage in Pittsburgh. With the same vision, determination, and courage that gave impetus to the redevelopment of the central city and the abolition of smoke, Pittsburghers are preparing to bring back greenery to the hills, trees and wild growth to the valleys; and with clean rivers complete the magnificent renovation that makes Pittsburgh the Renaissance City of America.

Here is what the Greater Pittsburgh magazine, published monthly by the chamber of commerce, has written about such possibilities:

HILLS GREEN, RIVERS CLEAN: PITTSBURGH

Pittsburgh has the possibility and wherewithal of adopting with pride a motto similar to that of the Japanese city of Kyoto: "Hills green, rivers clean—Kyoto."

This is the conclusion reached in a study titled "Steep Slope Renewal: Its Opportunity and Challenge," published by Action-Housing, Inc., as one of its six-part series of reports forming the private civic agency's total urban renewal impact study for Allegheny County.

The study calls for creating a dramatic new aesthetic image of Pittsburgh through the development and conservation of the steep slope areas which are the city's natural heritage. It suggests that the enhancement and proper utilization of Pittsburgh's steep slopes could have psychological and economic effects equaling those that have already been brought about through smoke control, flood prevention, and the structural redevelopment of the Pittsburgh renaissance.

An organized program of steep slope renewal is recommended, with the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh coordinating with the city planning and city parks departments. Allegheny County outside the city also needs to devote attention to its steep slopes.

Hillsides and gorges, steep cliffs and deep valleys, have both frustrated and inspired Pittsburghers for more than 200 years, the report recounts. Now that the smoke has lifted and clear air is the order of the day, the slopes bring the promise of greenery, trees, and wild growth closer to every neighborhood.

If the steep slope areas were currently underdeveloped, it would be necessary only to determine which slopes should be conserved in a natural state and which are suited for special types of development. Unfortunately, much inappropriate development has taken place. The city faces the problem of removing uneconomic, largely blighted development from its steep slopes and adjacent hilltop and valley areas.

ECONOMIC ASSETS

The study cites west coast development of steep slopes, which began in the late 1940's, as illustrating the economic value of these sites. View lots for very expensive, single-family units in the Los Angeles hills bring as much as $20,000 in ready-to-build condition.

Perhaps the simplest answer to why Pittsburgh did not experience a similar boom in view sites is that most of the best views were already encumbered or abutted by scattered and unsightly development.

These are the highlights of the present pattern of slope development in Pittsburgh:

Eight thousand four hundred acres in Pittsburgh, 29 percent of the city's total acreage, are in slopes so steep that they are considered undevelopable through private efforts. These slopes constitute 86 percent of the city's vacant open space.

Much vacant steep slope land is intermingled with spreadout, largely blighted residential development; and many steep slopes in the natural state are threatened with blight.

More than 50 percent of the dwellings in slope areas are deficient.

Most tax delinquent property in Pittsburgh is in slope areas, including 2,226 of the 4,080 acres acquired by the taxing bodies from 1947 to 1959.

Twenty-five percent of the acreage in 47 proposed slope renewal areas is publicly owned, and only in a few instances has any of it been consolidated into parks.

The visual impact of blighted slopes has a depressing effect on the surrounding developed areas, discouraging their conservation and improvement. Many slope areas with private development potential have experienced no new development in 50 years. Most investment in steep slope property today is trapped investment.

A drain on the public treasury results from the high cost of maintenance and replacement of public facilities in steep slope areas. Unit capital and service costs are much higher than on level, more heavily developed land. (Eighty-five percent of the land in 47 proposed treatment areas is vacant.) Slope areas are difficult of access for refuse collection, require large annual maintenance expenditures for unimproved roads and streets, more frequent cleaning of sewer drops, frequent washout repairs, heavy winter street cindering, major emergency capital outlays to repair and replace decrepit old walls, sewers, and waterlines. The tax return is low from old, thinly spread structures.

According to 1945 estimates, when a program for replacement of wooden steps and boardwalks was being planned, the city then owned and maintained 29 miles of steps in a total of 447 locations. From 1945 to 1959, the city spent $2,133,000 on step repair and replacement. The city still owns and maintains 15 miles of steps in 500 locations.

The concept of conserving steep slopes in their natural state and removing unsound development goes back at least to the turn of the century.

BLIGHT SINCE 1900

During the rapid industrial growth of the early 1900's, there were frantic efforts to provide additional worker housing. Fervent pleas for preservation of the slopes made by the planners of the day were almost completely ignored.

The unscarred slopes which remain today only escaped mutilation due to the extreme difficulty of obtaining effective access or of providing any sound development.

Although recommendations have been made periodically, no action has been taken, except for the recent withholding from sale

of tax delinquent property and attempts at control through zoning.

Present zoning regulations do not provide proper control (slope angle, drainage, planting) over grading. This has resulted in ugly potentially unstable cuts into hillsides to provide buildable sites for commerce and light industrial uses, particularly along major streets.

In addition, the Action-Housing study reports, public agencies have set a bad example with their own construction practices, including cuts. "The anachronistic sign 'Caution—Falling Rock' along a new stretch of highway is typical."

PROGRAM COST

The pilot program developed by the Urban Renewal Impact Study has identified and tentatively delineated 5,000 acres for steep slope renewal—one-seventh of the entire city.

The program outlined would require $400,000 of local resources annually during its first 5 years, and $800,000 annually during the next 5 years. However, the sizable public land holdings in most of the steep slope areas constitute a particular advantage; in addition to being contributed at no cost to the project, they can also be credited as a local noncash grant to the project if it is federally aided, thus doing double duty.

There would also be considerable savings to the city, as renewal proceeds in the steep slope areas, in curtailing maintenance activities and eliminating capital outlays. For example the city now spends $500,000 annually on hard-surface paving in the areas; concrete steps cost more than $140,000 annually; and there are heavy expenses for reconstructing walls, sewers and the like.

STEEP SLOPES

The proposed steep slope renewal program for the city of Pittsburgh and the potential county program are substantially different. The city has direct control over development regulation; the county must work through the municipal units.

The city program uses the renewal technique in most cases because some existing blight must be removed; the county slopes are largely unblighted open space for which protection rather than renewal is needed. The exceptions can be covered by renewal projects such as the one proposed in Collier Township and in certain strip mined areas.

Pittsburgh offers an excellent example of large-scale diseconomies and many lost opportunities in its existing steep slope use pattern. Without a substantial effort, the rest of the county could suffer the same fate. Renewal later costs far more than conservation and sound development now.

Almost one-third (30 percent) of the land area of Allegheny County is in slopes of 15 percent or more. Much of this land is uneconomic for development and is suited best to be preserved and used as parkland and recreation areas.

Other slope areas can and should be developed, but with special techniques and requirements, some for industrial use, some for residential development.

The study recommends that the county planning commission make a comprehensive study of all slope areas outside of the city, identifying ownership, present use and best potential use, and setting standards of use for slopes which can be developed effectively and economically.

It also sees the need for an exploration of methods of financing a slope acquisition program for Allegheny County, probably to be made by the Pennsylvania Economy League, Inc. (western division), in cooperation with the Allegheny Conference on Community Development and the County Planning Commission.

The Secret Mission of Lt. Roger Hilsman, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Reader's Digest carries a drama in real life story of the Honorable Roger Hilsman, presently Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

It is a story of how Mr. Hilsman, as a young Army officer, worked tirelessly during World War II to reach his father, Col. Roger Hilsman, Sr., who had been captured by the Japanese in the Philippines. That the father and son were reunited only minutes after Japan had surrendered is testimony to the courage and tenacity of the then Lieutenant Hilsman.

The experience also, it should be added, gave him valuable experience in southeast Asia. He learned how to fight and survive there. The knowledge he has learned in his experiences serves him well in his post as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this truth-is-stranger-than-fiction narrative will be of interest and commend it to my colleagues:

THE SECRET MISSION OF LIEUTENANT HILSMAN: THE STORY OF A YOUNG SOLDIER WHO KEPT ON FIGHTING LONG AFTER HE WAS KNOCKED OUT OF ACTION

(By John G. Hubbell)

On Sunday afternoon, December 7, 1941, West Point Cadet Roger Hilsman, Jr., was strolling along a path overlooking the Hudson River with his mother. Only a few weeks earlier the two had said goodby to Roger's father, an Army colonel, as he left the United States for duty in the Philippines. Emma Hilsman, a bright, vivacious Army wife, had seen her husband leave for many trouble spots in 25 years of marriage, but now the deteriorating relations with Japan filled her with concern. Colonel Hilsman, who knew the Philippine Islands and their people well, had been one of a group sent for by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, then commander in chief of United States and Philippine forces.

When the colonel's oversea orders had arrived, he had hurried to West Point to say goodby to his son. As he was leaving, he apologized for not having had time to get a farewell gift, and insisted that Roger take the newest thing he had—an aluminum cigarette case. On December 7, Roger thought of this incident, and remembered that it was now almost Christmas. He suggested to his mother that they find a present for the colonel in the Thayer Hotel gift shop, not far from where they were walking.

In the shop, music issued from a radio. Then, stunning as a thunderclap, came a news flash: Japan had attacked Pearl Harbor. The air assault had been devastating. With the enemy's strike continuing elsewhere in the Pacific, the Philippines were sure to be a center of action.

Emma Hilsman went deathly pale, but in a few minutes she was the colonel's lady again. "Your father knows how to take care of himself," she said quietly. Roger nodded. He knew his father's fierce will and the skills he had acquired from a lifetime of soldiering with distinction.

During the following weeks, Roger and his mother learned from the newspapers that Colonel Hilsman had been assigned to the command of a U.S. Army garrison to train 2,000 Filipino volunteers. The garrison was at Davao, on Mindanao, southernmost of the Philippine Islands. On December 7, Japanese dive bombers had swept down on Davao, which the enemy prized as a staging base for an invasion of the Dutch East Indies. On December 20, the city fell to a Japanese task force of cruisers, destroyers, aircraft carriers, and assault ships.

After that there was no word of Colonel Hilsman. The War Department knew nothing. For Emma and Roger Hilsman, the flame of hope flickered low.

Then one day Roger was visited at West Point by Father Manuel Ortiz, Jesuit chaplain to Philippine President Manuel Quezon. When Quezon and his party were leaving, the priest said, they had stopped at Negros, an island north of Mindanao. There they met Colonel Hilsman. The Filipino troops proudly told of their fight at Davao under his leadership. After the hopeless battle, they had made an incredible 31-day march across the mountainous Mindanao wilderness. No man had ever traversed that interior before, but Colonel Hilsman had led his group through. He would not permit anyone not to make it.

The colonel had asked Father Ortiz to get word to his family that he was alive. The priest recited for Roger the battle cry of the Filipino troops under Colonel Hilsman's command: Pot-i-na ka Davao (kill now for Davao). After his visitor had left, Roger slowly, carefully scratched inside his West Point class ring the words Father Ortiz had brought him: Pot-i-na ka Davao.

But jubilance was soon shattered. The War Department reported that Colonel Hilsman was a prisoner of war; he had surrendered when the enemy threatened the slaughter of every last captive from Bataan and Corregidor unless all U.S. forces in the Philippines laid down their arms. There was no indication whatever of where, in the wide east Asian sphere of Japanese control, he had been imprisoned.

In his room, Roger sat alone, thinking. Suddenly the war had become very personal to him. He made a vow that somehow he would find out where his father was, and fight his way to him.

In June 1943, 2d Lt. Roger Hilsman, Jr., was graduated from West Point. Advanced training at Fort Benning, Ga., and maneuvers with the 97th Infantry Division in Louisiana followed. From Army Intelligence he learned that the senior American officers captured in the Philippines had been taken to Formosa. This meant that he must get combat duty in the Pacific. One day an urgent call came for volunteers for an extremely dangerous mission. Jungles were mentioned in the dispatch. Jungles meant the Pacific.

Thus, in May 1944, Roger was among 2,600 reinforcements on their way to join Merrill's Marauders, an outfit soon to earn worldwide fame by helping to break the Japanese hold on Burma. Maj. Gen. Frank D. Merrill's force had just seized an airstrip near a Japanese stronghold at Myitkyina, in northern Burma. The Marauders were barely hanging on; they needed help fast.

The battle for the Myitkyina airstrip was to rage a nightmarish 55 days, and Roger and the other new arrivals learned quickly that life depended on nerve, instinct, and luck. Apart from battle casualties, the men were ravaged by dysentery, malaria, jungle rot. At the end, there would remain of Roger's company only 23 out of 232 enlisted men, and the entire officer complement of

6 had to be replaced twice. Roger lasted a long time—25 days—before his number came up.

He was leading an advance patrol, probing deep into the jungle, seeking out positions of enemy strength. Suddenly he signaled his scouts to a halt; he had seen the glint of metal in a clump of bush ahead. In the next instant, gunfire burst from the bush. Roger felt his carbine ripped from his grasp, saw it go dancing through the air, saw his lead scout fall. Then a blow on the chest sent him sprawling into a shallow ditch below a low rice-paddy wall. There was a tingling numbness in his right side, and for a few seconds he lay there thinking, "It can't be serious. I can't leave this war—not yet."

As Japanese soldiers moved toward him, he heaved himself up, lurched over the paddy wall. Rifle fire slammed into the wall; he ran low toward the protective cover of deeper jungle, reached it, found his other two scouts. The three headed back toward their own lines through the protection of jungle shadow.

With their lines in sight, Roger fell unconscious. The battalion medical officer found 16 bullet holes in his uniform, and 4 bullets had struck home. Three had entered above his right hipbone. The fourth had been headed straight for his heart, but had been deflected by something in his right breast pocket. It was the aluminum cigarette case his father had given him at West Point. Obviously, Roger still had unfinished business in this world.

Surgery lasted a painful eterhity as Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the distinguished "Burma Surgeon," worked slowly, skillfully. Roger was then evacuated to an Army hospital in Shimbwiyang. There, after weeks of convalescence, he began haunting British and U.S. headquarters. What were Allied plans for Formosa? Was anything known of the prison camps there? Finally, he learned that the Japanese, fearing an invasion of Formosa, had removed the senior U.S. officer prisoners to a prison camp near Mukden, Manchuria.

Roger was warned, however, that many officers captured early in the war had been tried for "war crimes" and executed. Also, that conditions of transport from the Philippines to Formosa had been horrible; prisoners had been packed into the holds of ships and given little or no food or water; disease had killed them by the thousands.

But Roger would not believe that his father was dead. The young lieutenant determined now to get to Mukden. He hitchhiked a plane ride to Kunming, China, hoping to line up a field assignment with an outfit fighting near Manchuria. "No more combat for you," he was told. He went to Ledo, India. Everywhere the same answer: "With your wounds, the war is over. Go home." But Roger knew that his own personal war was far from finished.

Finally, he went to Col. William "Ray" Peers, head of the Office of Strategic Services operations in Burma. Peers asked a curt question: "Why do you want more combat?"

"I'm a professional, sir. I've had only 25 days of this war. I'd like another crack at it."

Peers figured, correctly, that the war meant something special to this young officer. And he could use a West Pointer with a knowledge of jungles. "Okay, lieutenant," he said, "I've got a job for you."

Roger's assignment was as OSS liaison officer to the British 14th Army in Burma. Four months later, Peers gave him command of his own guerrilla battalion. Now, with 300 Burmese, he cut down enemy patrols, fell on outposts, supply depots, trains, truck convoys. So effective was Roger's guerrilla band that the Japanese finally pulled some 3,000 men out of the fighting in the north to run him down. Still, each day he and his guerrillas rained havoc on Japanese concentrations in a different area, then faded off to some distant fastness.

By midsummer 1945, the Allies controlled Burma, and Roger, who had been promoted to captain, disbanded his guerrillas and reported back to Peers, inquiring when he could leave for Mukden. Colonel Peers now knew of Roger's determination to find his father, but he could only give him another liaison assignment, in southern China.

Then, even as Roger was en route to his new post, word arrived of the atomic strikes on Japan and that the U.S. high command had ordered that the officer-prisoners at Mukden were to be rescued. Peers instantly sent word to Roger: he was to draw a parachute and proceed immediately to Hsian, in northern China, to join the rescue team.

Roger took off for Hsian at midnight, and arrived there after dawn—only to find that the rescue team had already left. He was hustled aboard a B-24 and followed. There had been no formal Japanese surrender, but the Emperor had directed his forces to cease resistance. It was feared, however, that the fanatical Kwangtung Army in Manchuria might slaughter its captives and keep on fighting.

Hours later, Mukden hove into view and, as the plane approached an airfiled, Roger prepared to jump. But the pilot stopped him; two Russian aircraft were on the airstrip below, which meant that the Japanese had surrendered and it was was safe to land. On the field, a Japanese general explained that orders to surrender had just arrived; that the rescue team which had parachuted in ahead of Roger had been captured, but was now being released. The general told Roger how to find the prison camp near the city.

At the gate of the camp, a GI sentry snapped a salute, pumped Roger's hand. Roger braced himself to ask the question he had fought his way across the world to ask: "Is there a Colonel Hilsman here?"

The answer came fast and clear. "Yes, sir, that barracks there. Second floor."

Roger stared at the sentry, trying to take in what he had heard. Then, by an immense effort of will, he was moving, approaching the building. He was aware of men coming forward and shouting at him, but he walked past them, as if in a trance. Slowly he climbed the stairs.

There, at the top, sitting on a wooden bunk, was his father. Three and a half years of imprisonment had left him thin to the point of gauntness, but the old military bearing was there. For a long, uncertain moment, each searched the other's face. The older man rose slowly, a look of amazed, unbelieving recognition in his eyes. Softly, almost inaudibly, he said, "My God. My God." Then the two soldiers embraced, and Roger said, "I've brought you a present, sir." in his hand was the aluminum cigarette case his father had given him almost 4 years before.

A Trip Through Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, has written a number of highly informative, interesting, and amusing articles for his newspaper, following a trip through Ireland. Having been in Ireland myself on a number of occasions, I must may Mr. Heffernan has captured very well the characteristics of the Emerald Isle and the Irish people. I submit two of Mr. Heffernan's articles—one of the edition of January 26, 1964, and the other of February 2, 1964—for the RECORD because I am sure many outside of the paper's circulation area will enjoy reading these articles.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent, Jan. 26, 1964]

ON MOTORING IN IRELAND—ROUTE NUMBERS MAKE IT LOOK EASY ON THE MAP—JUST GOT SPEED LIMITS; HORSES OF IRISH "GYPSIES" CREATE GREATEST ROAD HAZARD AFTER DARK

(By Tom Heffernan)

If a motorist happens to be in Wilkes-Barre and wants to get to Easton it is very simple because Route 115 runs from one city to the other so all you have to do is get the driver on Route 115 and he's set. All he had to do is follow the route numbers from here to there.

Things would appear to be the same in Ireland but they get stickier even though, at the lower voltage life led on that part of the British Isles, nobody gets excited about it.

Anyway, instead of trying to get someplace in Pennsylvania, suppose you are in the city of Limerick, Ireland, and, looking at the road map, decide you want to go to Rath Luirc, off about 25 miles to the south.

Looks easy because, as the red line road, which means trunk line, runs from Limerick to Rath Luirc and is clearly marked Route 11, you see no great problem.

But don't start out too confidently—too free and easy.

Because, while the Route 11 designation stands out bravely on the map it just doesn't exist on the roads themselves and I have yet to see a route marker anyplace on the Emerald Isle.

YOU'LL GET THERE

However, in the case of Rath Luirc, the signs carrying the name of the town itself are to be found sufficiently often to get you there.

But then another situation arises.

On driving into Rath Luirc, if you should ask anyone what town you are in you will be told "Charleville"—pronounced Charl-a-ville, with the accent on the first syllable.

Why?

Well, the general feeling is that, mostly for political purposes, an effort is made to retain the Gaelic language.

So, most of the road signs and street signs are in that language, although, quite frequently, the signs give the name in both Gaelic and English—and, there is a story about that, too.

REQUIRED IN SCHOOLS

You see, it is required also that the ancient language of Ireland also be taught in the schools, though it seems quite a waste because it is quickly forgotten because of disuse, so that not 10 percent of the people speak it.

However, while they are still in school the youngsters have a fair idea of it.

So, when it first was decided that street signs be put up in Gaelic and the names then appeared in that language alone, many of the men engaged to put them up were easily confused since they spoke no Gaelic at all.

As a result, they put the signs up on the wrong streets.

The mistake was noted immediately by the youngsters and a good laugh was had by all, after which the problem was solved by having the street signs made bilingual.

SPEED LIMITS AND HORSES OF TINKERS

In just this past year speed limits have been introduced in Ireland, ranging from 30 to 60 miles per hour, depending on the area.

As yet, they do not seen to be taken too seriously.

Considering that Irish traffic is about what it was here in Luzerne County about 1925, you can understand.

There are plenty of good hardtop roads, too, which stay in good condition more easily than ours.

For one thing, there is the smaller number of cars and the lack of heavy vehicles.

For another, there is the lack of winter damage in most of the land which, you must remember, is closest of all the British Isles to the Gulf Stream which makes the climate what it is.

ROAD HAZARDS

In spite of the fact that Limerick is about the same latitude as Labrador, freezing temperatures are rare.

Getting back to traffic, it might be mentioned that probably the greatest hazard—especially after dark—is that presented by stray animals.

A dark horse or cow, standing stock still in the middle of the road, is hard to see at night.

Largely to blame, especially for the horses, are the Tinkers—the strange Irish "Gypsies," about 30,000 of whom range the land, educated, uncontrolled, and largely unwashed.

Their homes are wagons which resemble the covered wagons of the old West, except that they are all wood.

TURN ANIMALS LOOSE

They pull to the side of the road in the sparely inhabited areas, live there untaxed as long as they find it profitable and provide feed for their stock by turning the animals loose to graze along the sides of the road.

You see them huddled about a little fire, waiting for the dinner that is cooking in a little pot.

Most of the other Irish detest them but haven't the faintest idea what to do with them.

RESERVATIONS SUGGESTED

It has been suggested that they be herded into areas like the reservations into which America pushed the Inidans, but since that would mean the Tinkers could prey only on one another, it is unlikely they would stay put.

So, speed limit or no, take it easy at night or you may have to risk pitting your car against an 800-pound horse.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent, Feb. 2, 1964]

NAMING A TAVERN IN IRELAND—YOU CAN USE MUCH OF HISTORY TO CALL IT "THE BRAZEN HEAD"; HE FOUND U.S. COINAGE DIFFICULT

(By Tom Heffernan)

When a man has to pick a name for a cocktail lounge, bar and grill, or what-have-you in Luzerne County, chances are it will carry the same name he bears himself, or else a fantastic creation like Hi-De-Ho, Silver Star, Blue Moon and the like.

But while we were staying at nearby Adare—called the prettiest village in Ireland—a similar establishment reopened after completion of a considerable program of renovation and the name struck us.

It was called the Brazen Head.

What we found out was that you have a chance in those older lands to inherit something from centuries back, with hundreds of years of usage and based upon an incident of long, long ago.

THE MAIN STREET

The Brazen Head was located on O'Connell Street which means, no matter what town or city you are in, the same as "Main Street" means in America.

O'Connell Street is always the main street of whatever town you are in.

Anyway, looking up the background for the unusual name for the tavern, we got all the way back to the siege of Limerick—the siege, that is—a high water mark in Limerick history and it occurred back in the 17th century, perhaps a hundred years before the American Revolution.

It seems that during that siege, a redheaded girl stuck her head out of the window of a house (on another street) and had the great misfortune to give way to her curosity just as a cannonball from the besieging forces came along.

It took her head right off.

Time passed—a lot of it—but memory of the incident persisted.

Until, back around 1770, somebody opened a tavern in the house and, seeking a likely name while recalling the unfortunate end of the redheaded girl, named his place the Brazen Head.

Now many more years pass and while ownership of the tavern also passes from hand to hand a few times, the memory of the girl remains and so does the name.

Eventually—and just when we do not know—one of the owners moved his tavern from the side street where it always had been and from the house in which the redheaded girl had made her last mistake.

He took it over to what was to become O'Connell Street.

He took the name along, too.

And—despite more changes of ownership and even the recent complete renovation—the name remains.

It is still the Brazen Head.

Financing of Political Party Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, the question of encouragement of wider political participation in both major political parties is one that continues to receive the attention of many of us.

One way to stimulate greater citizen support would be to adopt legislation which would permit some type of tax credit or deduction for contributions to political parties.

This proposal has received the attention in Michigan of both the Democratic State chairman and the Republian State chairman, and their respective State central committees. I take pleasure at this point in inserting into the RECORD a joint statement released recently by Zolton, A. Ferency, Democratic State chairman, and Arthur G. Elliott, Jr., Republican State chairman:

JOINT STATEMENT OF ZOLTON A. FERENCY AND ARTHUR G. ELLIOTT, JR.

As chairmen of our respective political parties, we have together been reviewing problems concerning the financing of political party activities—problems that we both agree are becoming increasingly disturbing.

The complex difficulties of modern life require that voters be better informed on the issues of our day; that they have a clear understanding of the stands proposed by our major political parties on the vital problems of the day; that they be able to make discerning selections of public officials in elections.

The burden of properly informing and educating voters on both issues and candidates, falls to the major political party organizations. The expanding volume of needs and assignments require that the parties be more adequately and systematically financed to effectively carry out their responsibilities.

It is our belief that citizens will support the parties of their choice if they are given sufficient encouragement and inducements to do so.

To stimulate greater citizen support of the parties of their choice, we are asking Michigan Congressmen and Senators to join in a genuine bipartisan effort to initiate and promote passage of legislation, in this session of Congress, which will permit Federal income tax deductions for contributions to political parties.

We suggest allowances up to $50 for contributions of individuals, up to $100 for husbands and wives who file joint returns.

We are confident that such legislation would be an excellent start in the development of systematic procedures for financing the essential operations of political parties.

In addition, such a move will greatly encourage wider citizen activity in the management of political parties, and will reduce the danger of the parties coming under control of heavily financed special interest groups.

Reasonable Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, ROBERT SIKES, recently made what I deemed to be a most excellent statement before the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate concerning the nature and scope of the firearms legislation presently under consideration.

I commend this fine statement to all my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES, OF FLORIDA, TO THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE OF THE U.S. SENATE, JANUARY 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my feelings on the subject of additional gun laws now before this committee for consideration.

During the years that I have had the privilege of holding elected office, the subject of the right of the law-abiding citizen to keep and bear arms, as guaranteed by our Constitution, has been, and continues to be, a subject of interest and deep concern to me. It is a matter of particular moment now, because of renewed agitation for tighter gun laws.

The tragic and senseless assassination of President Kennedy quite naturally resulted in a wave of hysteria against weapons and the ownership of weapons. However deplorable this inexcusable act was, it scarcely follows that a crime committed by 1 man should cause 35 million gun owners to be persecuted. I seriously question that the legislation now proposed would have prevented the purchase of a gun by Lee Oswald or would have resulted in tighter security measures than those which were in effect.

There is already a Federal law that requires anyone selling guns interstate by mail, or otherwise, to buy a Federal Firearms License. This law further requires that every sale be recorded and this record retained on hand for a period of 10 years. This record contains a detailed description of the gun, including the name and address of the buyer as well as the serial number.

These records are available to any law enforcement officer. The fact to be remembered here is that this law is already in effect, and since the records are kept by the people in business, it does not cost the taxpayers one red cent. That this is an effective system is demonstrated by the fact that the information concerning the gun purchased by Lee Oswald was announced by the Dallas police on Saturday, the day after the assassination. The ballistic information on the bullet taken from Governor Connally, was announced on Monday. In other words, it would seem that the gun controls we already have are more effective than some law enforcement agencies of the State and Federal Government.

We do not measure loss of human life in dollars and cents. Nor would we decry the cost of a gun-control law which effectively prevented crime. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that any form of registration or control will cost tax dollars to operate and enforce. This is a burden which will be shared by all the people.

You cannot legislate against human inconsistencies. The person who shot President Kennedy was the instrument of his death, a gun is an inanimate object and by itself, can harm no one. The only people really affected by gun restrictions are the honest people. A man who needs a gun to commit a crime will get one by some method or another.

If anyone is convinced that antigun laws will reduce crime, and be a guarantee against violence and murder, then he is worse off than the ostrich. New York State has the toughest gun laws in America and probably the highest crime rate.

Great Britain, after Dunkirk, had only a few thousand small arms available in the entire country, and was requesting the people to contribute swords and crossbows for defense. This was the dilemma they faced because they did not have an armed civilian population to fall back on. Britain has tight gun laws.

During the German occupation of Norway and Denmark in World War II, the Germans were required to keep one soldier for every 10 square miles of territory because of the partisan groups' effective resistance. These people fell into the roles of guerrilla fighters easily because these were nations where gun ownership was encouraged. In other countries where government gun registration was required, the Germans had a handy list of all gun owners and were able to effectively disarm the entire nation.

When I purchase a weapon which is delivered in Washington, even though I own a Federal firearms license, I must go personally to the express office to receive it, and I must fully identify myself and sign several forms. Thus, I would assume that Washington is one of the stricter cities on ownership of firearms. But during a recent period when crime increased in the United States as a whole 14 percent, crime was increasing 41 percent in Washington. Gun laws are not the answer.

In a study by the FBI made in 564 cities during August 1960, involving a total populace of 69 million people, the following statistics were compiled:

Out of 7,348 aggravated assaults, 44 percent of the offenses were committed by cutting or stabbing—24 percent by blunt objects; 12.7 percent by shooting; 12.3 percent by hands, fists, or feet and 1.2 by use of poison.

Now, if it follows that crime will be reduced or eliminated by doing away with all the criminal's weapons, then it is reasonable to assume that these weapons should be dealt with and eliminated according to their frequence of use. Since 44 percent of the above assaults were the result of cutting and stabbing, then all knives and ice picks should be registered. Since blunt objects accounted for 24 percent of the mayhem, then naturally rocks, hammers, baseball bats, rolling pins, etc., should be serialized and registered.

Under the "shooting' heading should be included all weapons which propel any objects—whether by compressed air or rubber bands.

I do not question that there is a need for improvements. My statement simply is designed to show that we can easily go too far. The National Rifle Association, the leading organization of American sportsmen, has stated that it has no objection to legislation aimed at preventing the misuse of firearms, but that it opposes general registration of firearms and proposals to license the possession or purchase of firearms by law-abiding citizens.

Specifically, the association has said that it does not oppose legislation designed to prohibit possession of firearms by persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, drug addicts, and habitual drunkards; or making the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent.

In the event this distinguished committee feels that legislation is necessary, it is my belief that the amendments submitted by Senator DODD, which would provide notification by the shipper to the local responsible police agency when a firearms order has been placed, would provide adequate additional security and permit proper action to be taken to limit or prevent ownership of weapons by criminals, or those incompetent or irresponsible.

Now, let's look at the broader picture of firearms controls.

In recent years, seldom has a session of any State legislature or of Congress met without the introduction of at least one bill that would curtail the legitimate use and possession of firearms by citizens of good repute. The vast majority of these bills are introduced with the intention of curing some social ill, or to limit such use and possession by the juvenile delinquent and the criminal element.

While I do not take issue with the purposes for which these bills are intended, if administered correctly and given the proper emphasis, I certainly decry the efforts of some people or governmental agencies to severely limit the peaceful enjoyment of firearms by lawful citizens.

As the committee well knows, thousands of Americans who own and enjoy firearms for defense and sport now feel strongly that the continuation of this ownership and enjoyment is in jeopardy. Much of this came as the result of the assassination of President Kennedy. Before that took place, however, concern had been caused by the enactment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The contents of this act and executive policy on this subject generated much publicity and reaction throughout the country. The general grounds for criticism have been that the implementation of this law could place the United States in a dangerous political, economic, and military position vis-a-vis the Communist bloc. In order to make it absolutely clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act did not include the elimination of private firearms as part of the proposed disarmament program, I introduced a bill that will protect such rights of the citizen from encroachment by the Disarmament Agency. The language of my bill is identical to the one introduced by Senator HICKENLOOPER and is now contained in Public Law 88-186, amending the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. That language is as follows:

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms, by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

We consider it sound insurance in a good cause.

I have heard criticism from some quarters about allowing the free possession and use of firearms in modern American society. Arguments that this contributes to crime and constitutes a menace to free government are completely falaicous. Our forefathers knew what they were doing when they approved the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that "a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Then, as now, an armed citizenry is less likely to be cowed by criminal elements or oppressive government. Rather than restricting freedom, the right to possess arms guarantees it by instilling independence and strength in an enlightened people.

The United States is facing a critical period in its history. The years to come will decide the desperate battle between communism and freedom, individualism and totalitarianism. If we are to win this struggle, we will need to preserve and use every element of strength that is available to us. Americans are fighting in farflung corners of the world. Some of them will survive because of lessons in marksmanship and acquaintance with firearms gained as boys in a free society. The emphasis placed on smallarms marksmanship for survival in Vietnam bears out my long-held personal belief that there is a continuing need for men in the Armed Forces skilled in the use of basic firearms. As the lawmakers for this great Nation, we would be derelict in our duties if we allowed the right to keep and bear arms by responsible, law-abiding citizens to be curtailed.

I have read the statement of Senator MAGNUSON concerning the scope of the activities of this committee and have been informed of the proceedings that occurred during your previous hearings. I am strongly in favor of the intentions of the committee to study in detail any problems that may have arisen as the result of the case of accessibility of firearms to the undesirable elements of our society through mail-order channels. Such problems, if allowed to go unchecked, could result in further restrictions on the law-abiding citizen. If upon completion of your investigations, you deem it necessary to the continuing good of our society to recommend additional controls on firearms, I urge that the legislation be developed in the spirit of Senator MAGNUSON's statement of December 10, 1963, when he said:

"Any legislation, State or Federal, must consider the constitutional right of our citizens to bear arms. Responsible citizens have the right to possess firearms for purposes of self-protection, security of the Nation, hunting, and recognized sporting activities."

Let me assure the committee that I will actively support any legislation in keeping with these thoughts—legislation that will make it more difficult for criminals or those inclined toward criminal activities, mental incompetents, drug addicts, habitual drunkards, and juveniles to obtain firearms, and which will severely penalize those persons perpetrating crimes while armed. But let me urge caution in the enactment of these laws, lest they go much further than is needed or intended.

In the April 1960 issue of Guns magazine, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wrote the following:

"By calling attention to a well-regulated milita for the security of the Nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our Founding Fathers recognized the essentially civilian nature of our economy. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears of governmental tyranny, which gave rise to the second amendment, will ever be a major danger to our Nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our

basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important."

The man who wrote that was the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy.

Military Pay Is Shameful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of Thursday, February 6, 1964:

VICTIMS OF INDIFFERENCE—MILITARY PAY IS SHAMEFUL

A documentary of shame is going the rounds of America.

And it is being shrugged off, in many places.

It is the story of the U.S. military pay mess—how, lacking proper compensation, some of our Nation's fighting men are forced to moonlight on second jobs; how others are forced to beg relief to feed their families; how those in jobs alongside civilians see the civilian "rate" in almost every respect while they themselves, with sinking morale, find they are the forgotten men.

"Military morale * * * will quickly wither and die if soldiers come to believe themselves the victims of indifference and injustice on the part of their Government." So said Gen. Douglas MacArthur once.

What would he say now about a pay-raise bill for the military that arrived 5 years late, not in 1958, but in October 1963, and did not come near matching even the cost-of-living increase?

What would he say about the Government's giving this raise, with one hand, but then taking back, with the other, some or all of the increase through cancellations of certain oversea pay or adjustments of proficiency pay? (It has been estimated that one-third of all our servicemen receive nothing at all under the pay raise.)

What would he say about military pay scales that not only encourage dropouts from service (even by Annapolis graduates), but also require fighting men to sap their vigilance by moonlighting at other jobs such as gas station attendant or bartender?

What would he say about certain Navy families receiving handouts of Government surplus food (beans, lard, etc.) to provide decent meals? Or about the petty officer in New York whose family of seven got $172.70 monthly in city relief, just to exist?

What would he say—what would he say to warn us—about a military pay system that gives an ensign, just graduated from Annapolis, $328 a month, while a policeman in our own city of San Diego, also hired to protect us, starts at about $500.

It is interesting that in the last 5 years, 105 men have resigned out of the 1958 graduating class of Annapolis, which numbered 625. One said, "The Congress seemed to have forgotten us." Another, "In my daily assignment, a great deal of travel was required. I received $12 daily maximum; my civilian assistants drew $16."

A Navy lieutenant's (junior grade) annual pay is $6,900. His civilian counterpart in the merchant marine gets $12,000.

You can find other such comparisons all down the line. The uniformed military man, seeing them, can only sicken at the sight.

At the time of Pearl Harbor, one of the cries in America, in the armed services, in the human heart, was: "Oh, if we could only have been warned; if we could only have taken precautions."

What about taking warning now? What about taking warning at a system where fighting men's vigilance is being sapped by financial worry, or even too little sleep because of other jobs? What about taking warning at a pay system which may make some fighting men wonder whether they are, indeed, "the victims of indifference"?

Junior Chamber of Commerce for City Is Launched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a most interesting account of the organization of the junior chamber of commerce on August 4, 1922, in Pansacola, Fla. It is significant that among the charter members are some of Pensacola's leading citizens today. I am pleased to ask that this account be reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal, Aug. 4, 1922]

JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR CITY IS LAUNCHED—FORM JUNIOR COMMERCIAL CHAMBER HERE—CLARENCE MELTON ELECTED PRESIDENT, CONSTITUTION ADOPTED AND COMMITTEES APPOINTED—HUBERT LEE TELLS OF ATLANTA ORGANIZATION—PURPOSES OF CHAMBER ARE PROMOTION OF CIVIC ENTERPRISE AND COMMERCIAL RELATIONS

Permanent organization of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Pensacola was perfected last night at a well attended meeting featured by quick action which resulted in the adoption of constitution and bylaws, election of officers and the appointment of committee to become effective immediately.

Clarence Melton heads the association with William J. Johnson elected as temporary secretary, Tom Kennedy as first vice-president; John Burda, second vice president; Ashton Brosnaham, third vice president. Directors of which 14, including officers, comprise C. Tucyer, L. Brown, F. D. Sanchez, William Fauria, Wright Reese, E. Pfeiffer, E. Elebash, William Ray, William Blumer. Committee appointments included J. Jones, C. Tucker, Tom Kennedy, Tom Johnson, and Alex Saunders.

PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION

Purposes of the organization as outlined at the meeting last night are the promotion of civic enterprise * * * and constructive educational lines relating to port development and other interests of the city, and closer fellowship in matters relating to development.

The meeting was representative of the young manhood of Pensacola, business of many kinds having representation. The age limit was fixed at 28, and the next meeting was scheduled for next Tuesday.

SOME GOOD TALKS

Hubert F. Lee, of Atlanta, to whose initiative the chamber of commerce is indebted for the organization of the junior chamber of commerce, told briefly of the purposes of the organization and what it has done for Atlanta and other cities. Mr. Lee, who is attending the Citizen's Military Training Camp, and who has been promoted to the position of sergeant, said that he came to Pensacola in preference to other camps because he wished to put over the organization of junior chamber of commerce here. He declared that whatever helped Pensacola helped West Florida; that whatever is of advantage to West Florida is reflected in Georgia, and that whatever promotes the interests of Georgia is injected into the arteries of trade of the entire southeastern section.

UP TO MEMBERS

He impressed upon the members that it was strictly up to them as to whether the organization becomes a strong working force in the community life, and urged them to "get down to brass tacks" and put over the organization at once.

J. B. Price, secretary of the senior chamber of commerce, and J. B. Morrow, industrial commissioner, assisted in the preliminaries of the meeting, both making good talks, after which they gave place to the younger men, Clarence Melton having been elected temporary chairman, with William J. Johnson as temporary secretary.

Both Mr. Melton and Mr. Johnson made short snappy talks of a few minutes, but the greater part of the evening was devoted to business.

MR. MORROW SPEAKS

Mr. Morrow in his talk before the organization, was interrupted several times when he called attention to the forward strides that Pensacola is making and told the young men of the future that was theirs in the life of the community.

Mr. Morrow told of other experiences with junior chambers of commerce, and told the men that upon them will depend the success not only of the organization but of much of the constructive working force which is to put Pensacola forward and make West Florida one of the leading sections of the South.

"Hobson's" Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the terrible collision between the aircraft carrier *Wasp* and the destroyer-minesweeper *Hobson* in May 1952 that resulted in the loss of 176 lives on the *Hobson*, an editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled *"Hobson's* Choice." The thesis of this editorial is that accountability and responsibility are imperative as to which intentions are often irrelevant.

A popular saying is that "the road to hell is paved with good intention." I think our Government should remember this as it apparently continues to embrace the dangerous concept that we may get the Khrushchev Communists to go along with us while the Mao Tse-tungists are the enemy.

All Communists are our enemy. Peaceful coexistance with Communists is a snare and a delusion. Our national goal must be to obliterate communism from the face of the earth, by peaceful

and economic means if possible and by direct conflict wherever it is required, thereafter establishing a reasonable facsimile of freedom, justice and we hope Christianity throughout the world.

The heroic dead of the *Hobson* are long since silent. So will we be as a nation if we allow Government policy to proceed under the mistaken concept that one kind of Communist is different from another and that we can trust any Communist or Communist government.

If the balance of world power shifts to world communism, atomic attack and nuclear destruction of the United States is a virtual certainty—provided, of course, upon receipt of the eventual Communist ultimatum to surrender we elect to be dead rather than Red. Such an awful stage of affairs is even too late for responsibility.

This administration and it's immediate predecessor are on a collision course with disaster for America and the world in its handling of our foreign policy toward communism. As this editorial so well concludes:

When men lose confidence and trust in those who lead, order disintegrates into chaos and purposeful ships into uncontrollable derelicts.

I commend the reading of "*Hobson's* Choice" to every thinking American citizen in this light:

"HOBSON'S" CHOICE

One night past some 30,000 tons of ships went hurtling at each other through the darkness. When they met, 2,000 tons of ship and 176 men lay at the bottom of the sea in a faroff place.

Now comes the cruel business of accountability. Those who were there, those who are left from who were there, must answer how it happened and whose was the error that made it happen.

It is a cruel business because it was no wish of destruction that killed this ship and its 176 men; the accountability lies with good men who erred in judgment under stress so great that it is almost its own excuse. Cruel, because no matter how deep the probe, it cannot change the dead, because it cannot probe deeper than remorse.

And it seems more cruel still, because all around us in other places we see the plea accepted that what is done is done beyond discussion, and that for good men in their human errors there should be afterward no accountability.

We are told too how slanderous it is to probe into the doings of a captain now dead who cannot answer for himself, to hold him responsible for what he did when he was tired and when he did what he did under terrible stresses and from the best of intentions. How useless to debate the wrong courses of his successor, caught in a storm not of his own devising. How futile to talk of what is past when the pressing question is how to keep from sinking.

Everywhere else we are told how inhuman it is to submit men to the ordeal of answering for themselves. To haul them before committees and badger them with questions as to where they were and what they were doing while the ship or state careened from one course to another.

This probing into the sea seems more merciless because almost everywhere else we have abandoned accountability. What is done is done and why torture men with asking them afterward, "Why?"

Whom do we hold answerable for the sufferance of dishonesty in government, for the reckless waste of public moneys, for the incompetance that wrecks the currency, for the blunders that killed and still kill many times a hundred and seventy-six men in Korea? We can bring to bar the dishonest men, yes. But we are told men should no longer be held accountable for what they do as well as for what they intend. To err is not only human, it absolves responsibility.

Everywhere, that is except on the sea. On the sea there is a tradition older even than the traditions of the country itself and wiser in its age than this new custom. It is the traditions that with responsibility goes authority and with them both goes accountability.

This accountability is not for the intentions but for the deed. The captain of a ship, like the captain of a state, is given honor and privileges and trust beyond other men. But let him set the wrong course, let him touch ground, let him bring disaster to his ship or to his men, and he must answer for what he has done. No matter what, he cannot escape.

No one knows yet what happened on the sea after that crash in the night. But nine men left the bridge of the sinking ship and went into the darkness. Eight men came back to tell what happened there. The ninth, whatever happened, will not answer now because he has already answered for his accountability.

It is cruel, this accountability of good and well-intentional men. But the choice is that or an end to responsibility and finally, as the cruel sea has taught, an end to the confidence and trust in the men who lead, for men will not long trust leaders who feel themselves beyond accountability for what they do.

And when men lose confidence and trust in those who lead, order disintegrates into chaos and purposeful ships into uncontrollable derelicts."

The Breeding Place of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Willard Gleeson, general manager of radio station KICO in El Centro, Calif., recently had some very pertinent remarks to make in connection with who is to blame for any attitude of hate that might exist in this country. I think the responsibility for this feeling must be placed where it belongs—at the doorsteps of the Communists. I believe Mr. Willard Gleeson sums it up very well in these excerpts from the commentary on the American Freedom Network:

President Johnson urges the American people to avoid hate in our country. That is a fine thing, we can all agree with him, but his asking the people to avoid hate indicates that he feels all of us are causing hate.

By accusing nonhating people of hate, you make haters out of them, so let's quit lumping, by association, the innocent in with the guilty. Christian people are taught not to hate. They are taught love, taught to do unto others as you want others to do to you. It is a well-known fact that Christian people, while having an unshakable, uncompromising faith in God, this strong faith cannot be called hate, except possibly by those taught to hate all things, honorable and good.

Who, then, are those on earth who are taught to hate Who is it that have hate schools? Only the Communists are schooled in hate, taught to hate non-Communists, hate the almighty God and Jesus Christ, urged to hate the United States and all its institutions. Communists are taught to hate and destroy free enterprise.

So the President of the United States has a very simple problem to solve—recognize the breeding place of hate and destroy it. Stop cooperating with hate breeders. Oswald was taught to hate all these things by Communists, not by Christians. You can actually determine the degree of hate in people when you know how strongly the individual or group believes in communism.

Remember, the Communist teachers of hate say security, peace and peaceable coexistence will come out of their teachings. Reflect a moment on this. There is only one place where men and women have complete security, guaranteed peace, and coexistence under common and equal conditions of life. The Communists tell you this is the Communist objective. We have institutions in the United States with the very condition they seek. In our penitentiaries are people, while enjoying this ideal security and equality and peace, got there by hating, not by being free and God fearing. Shall we stay free or shall we go for peace and security in the penitentiary under Communist guards?

WILLARD GLEESON,
Radio Station KICO, El Centro, Calif.

Congressman Cederberg Cites Urgency in Lifting Domestic Sugar Quota Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, 10th Congressional District, in an address to Michigan sugarbeet growers and processors last Tuesday, pointed to the outstanding production job done by the Nation's sugarbeet industry in 1963, proving groundless fears of a shortage as the result of poor crops in Europe and Cuba.

However, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CEDERBERG, has also cited the urgency of early action on pending legislation to remove marketing restrictions on this year's domestic sugar crop.

These statements were part of an address by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CEDERBERG, at the Sugarbeet Day program at Michigan State University and, because of their timeliness, I submit his address for the consideration of my colleagues in the House. It follows:

THE SUGAR SITUATION

(By Congressman ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan)

Mr. Chairman and friends, it is indeed a special pleasure to be here today, and a privilege to be taking part in your Sugarbeet Day. This is the 34th consecutive year in which the university has set aside a special

day of this great annual Farmer's Week for discussions and the exchange of ideas about sugarbeets—significant recognition of the sugarbeet industry's longtime importance to our State. I am honored to take part in your program.

An outstanding feature of Sugarbeet Day—and, indeed, of Farmer's Week for all its 49 years—is the full participation of farmers in the discussions. We in Michigan may be inclined to take that for granted, for in our State there is a rich tradition of close and enduring ties between campus and farm—a tradition that goes back to the establishment, by our State legislature on February 12, 1855, of the very first State agricultural college in the United States, the college which has grown into this magnificent Michigan State University here at East Lansing.

The close working relationship between campus and farm—between the scientist in the experimental plot and the practical farmer on the land—has been a major reason for the tremendous gains in efficiency and productivity which the agriculture of Michigan has made over the years.

The precedents in this field established in Michigan have had a profound effect on our entire Nation. The Michigan idea of a State college devoted to agriculture soon spread to other States, given encouragement and impetus by the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862. The present-day efficiency of American agricultural production—the envy of the entire world—may be traced to those beginnings, which encouraged scientific research in agricultural subjects and which fostered the rapid practical application of scientific findings.

The benefits of American agricultural efficiency are not confined to agriculture; in fact, the achievements of agriculture are at the basis of and are the very foundation of the American standard of living. By continuously increasing the ability of fewer and fewer people on the land to produce more and more food and fiber, the primary necessities of life, you have enabled more people to go into the production of other things—the refrigerators, the automobiles, the television sets, and the countless other products—and to provide the great host of services, which form the fabric of the American standard of living.

About 50 years ago, when your Farmer's Week first started, one person on the farm produced the prime necessities of life for himself and only seven or eight persons living in the cities. Today, 1 person on the farm produces the food and fiber for himself and 28 persons in the cities.

This is a fact which I believe is not fully appreciated by the city dweller today, and in my conversations with city people I try to impress upon them the debt that all of us in America today owe to the technological achievements of American agriculture. And let me assure you this is not always easy to do. For with the reversal in the urban and rural population ratio of our country—with the change from a predominantly agricultural economy to an economy that is oriented largely to manufacture and trade—there has come a tremendous change in the thinking of the majority of our people. Most of you, as farmers, think of yourselves primarily as producers, and you are. But you are a minority. The majority of Americans are not farmers. The great majority of Americans today, even though they may be engaged directly in the production of some manufactured product, think of themselves primarily not as producers but as consumers. Their principal concern is how to make the paycheck stretch to cover the things and the services which they, as consumers, want to buy for themselves and their families.

This concern influences their whole thinking, and their emotional reaction to such things as farm programs. We might call it consumermindedness. It represents the way of thinking of the majority of Americans. It is reflected, inevitably, in the Congress of the United States. This is a fact of life which I believe needs to be recognized more fully today by farmers, and particularly by those who develop farm legislative programs. A program which seems to benefit only producers and does not recognize the needs and attitudes of consumers has a difficult time in Congress today. As the effects of reapportionment are felt more completely, giving the city populations still greater representation, such programs, if any are proposed, will have an even more difficult time in the future.

The reverse is also true. A farm program which can be shown to have operated for the benefit of consumers should win support among those Members of Congress, and they are now a majority, whose constituents are primarily city dwellers and therefore think primarily as consumers.

This has special significance for you sugarbeet producers, since your success is so closely tied to the form and substance of sugar legislation.

I am convinced that the sugar program has always operated for the benefit of American sugar consumers, as well as for the benefit of American sugar producers. The law specifically states that it shall be administered so that it will "protect the welfare of consumers" as well as of "those engaged in the domestic sugar industry," and it has so been administered. We all know that in past years the sugar program has provided adequate supplies for American consumers and that prices in the United States have been no more than the average of prices in other nations around the globe, and in terms of living standards and wages and consumer income our sugar prices have indeed been the lowest in the world.

If ever there were justification for the sugar program, from the point of view of the American consumer, the justification occurred during last year, when the program was put to one of the severest tests it has received in nearly 30 years of operation.

Unusual circumstances developed in the world sugar situation which had repercussions in the American sugar market. Instead of the usual situation of a world supply greatly in excess of demand, a combination of rising world demand and lowered production in various foreign countries brought supply and demand close together—nearly in balance. This, abetted by what I am convinced was excessive speculation in so-called world sugar futures, caused an unusual rise in prices on the very thin, residual market which is called, improperly, the world sugar market.

All of this, in turn, alarmed many of our large industrial users of sugar, and they began to buy greatly in excess of their then-current needs. Naturally, this exerted an upward pressure on domestic sugar prices, since our program is geared to a steady flow of sugar to meet normal needs.

In this emergency, it was the domestic sugar industry, and in particular the domestic beet sugar industry, which, more than any other segment of the sugar economy, performed for the benefit of the American consumer—both as to rushing additional supplies on the market and as to resisting the tremendous upward price pressures.

If there had not been a Sugar Act over the years, to provide some encouragement for maintaining a domestic sugar-producing industry, there may have been no domestic industry last year. If there had not been a domestic sugar-producing industry last year, our consumers would have been entirely dependent upon high priced and uncertain foreign supplies.

At the peak of the price distortion last May, the performance of the beet sugar industry in the interests of consumers was especially notable. Beet sugar prices in the large Chicago-West market, where both beet and cane sugars are sold in quantities, were 3 cents a pound below cane sugar prices. And during much of the rest of the year it was the beet sugar industry, by holding its prices significently under cane sugar prices generally, that exercised the restraining influence so necessary to keep the U.S. price to consumers from going through the ceiling.

I can readily understand why the cane sugar refiners, paying a higher price for their foreign raw sugar, felt their increases in the price of refined sugar were required in order to maintain their customary margin for expenses and profits. They would have felt obliged to raise their refined prices still more if the Sugar Act had not keep average foreign raw sugar prices on the American market lower than prices for the same sugar on the world market. Yet it is to the beet sugar industry that the great credit must and should go for resisting the strong upward pressures on price—and performing a notable service for the sugar consumers of America.

The beet sugar industry of this Nation successfully met another challenge during the turbulent year of 1963, and that was the challenge to produce. In an urgent plea to obtain more sugar for American consumers, the Government early last year assured you there would be no acreage restrictions on the planting of sugar beets during the present year, 1964, and then a few weeks later assured the industry that operations would also be unrestricted during 1965. You responded to the Government's pleas by planting more acres, and by increasing the capacity of the sugar plants to handle the additional crop.

Here in Michigan, although your acreage was already at a high level, you planted more than 9 percent more acres than you had in 1962. You were determined about this. In many cases, I know, the unusually cold and freezing spring caused some of you to lose your first planting and in some cases your second planting. But you replanted again and still again if necessary to produce the additional sugar that American consumers would need. And you took diligent care of your crop. You harvested more than 25 percent more acres last year than you did in 1962. It is my understanding that from the 1963 crop of Michigan beets between 2,900,000 and 3 million hundredweight of refined beet sugar have been produced, an alltime record.

For the entire Nation, the production of sugar from the 1963 crop of beets also established a new alltime high—in the neighborhood of 58 million hundredweight of refined sugar. Expressed in terms of the raw value equivalent, as quotas in the Sugar Act, are expressed, that is 3,100,000 tons of sugar, the first time in the industry's history that production has surpassed the 3-million-ton figure.

Truly this is a splendid record, a record of stewardship, a record of outstanding performance in behalf of consumers, a record that should, if its full meaning is thoroughly understood, win friends for this industry in Congress when sugar legislation is considered this year.

For, as you know, this again is a year when Congress will be taking up the Sugar Act. The foreign quotas expire at the end of this year, and the entire sugar picture has changed so drastically, in the domestic field as well as the foreign field, in the year and a half since the law was last amended, that the Congress will want to consider changes in the domestic quotas as well.

In fact, a substantial increase in the beet sugar quota is absolutely necessary if you are not to be penalized for having responded so remarkably to the Government's plea for greater production.

Most of the sugar from the 1963 crop of beets is available for the market this year, in 1964. This fall you will again harvest a big crop of sugarbeets, and beginning about the first of October the new-crop sugar will start to be available. This presents a prob-

lem for you and a problem for the Congress—because under the present law, your marketing quota, the limit on the amount you may sell, is only 2,700,000 tons. Yet with national production of 3,100,000 tons, you have much more than your quota available to sell—additional production that you achieved at the urgent plea of the Government.

There is now in both the House and the Senate, awaiting action, a joint resolution which would permit you to market this year all the sugar you can market from your production, regardless of your quota under the now outmoded quota pattern of the Sugar Act.

Early action is urgent so that the beet sugar companies can effectively plan for marketing all the sugar they have available, so that this sugar, which is in the warehouses and in the sugar silos here and now, which does not have to be shipped from some faroff foreign land, which is already in fully refined form and does not have to go through further processing,—so that this sugar can be sold to the American consumers who need it. Early action on this resolution should be of special interest to the large industrial users of sugar because some of the foreign sugar interests have shown an inability or unwillingness to ship sugar to the United States in the quantities required during the first half of this year.

I shall, of course, support prompt action on this resolution in the Congress.

However, the joint resolution for this year will not answer your long-range quota question. This question is complicated by more elements than the simple question of this year's quota.

First, there is the high level of production which you and the rest of the industry have now achieved. You are aware that it is the established industry—not any of the new factories encouraged by the present law—which has attained the remarkable increase in production achieved in the year just ended. Only a small portion, a very small portion, of the 3,100,000 tons of beet sugar produced can be traced to the one new beet sugar mill which started operations late last summer. Much of this expansion in production by the established industry has been through increases in acreage by established sugarbeet growers and by fuller utilization of the capacity of existing factories. But there has also been a considerable investment in the expansion of existing processing facilities and there is more to come. I understand my good friend, Hugh Eldred, will discuss expansion plans of your progressive Michigan companies this afternoon.

Now all this expansion of the existing industry's production has been made in response to the urgent pleas of the Government to produce more sugar for American consumers—but it has been made without any assurance, thus far, that the acreage which has been such a significant and fundamental factor in achieving the expanded production would be protected beyond the 1965 growing season.

On the other hand, the acreage in new areas for new factories which are to go into operation this year, and in 1965, and in 1966, will be protected from cutbacks during the first 3 years of each factory's operations. For the factories that will begin operating in 1966, this protection will be carried through the 1968 crop. Thus, if the sugar supply situation should so change by 1967 or 1968 that sugarbeet acreage in the United States must be reduced in order to keep beet sugar production within the beet sugar quota, or to keep your returns per ton at a reasonable level, the brunt of the reduction will be borne by the unprotected producers, or those who were able to increase less than others, that is, by the established industry—unless the law is changed.

The logical way, and I believe the only practical way, to provide some protection to the established growers, in the event of acreage reductions in the years beyond 1965, is to enlarge the basic beet sugar quota, and perhaps also the beet sugar industry's share of future growth in the total market, to such an extent that acreage reductions, if and when they come, will not penalize you who have met the challenge to serve American consumers during these trying times. This is the only fair and just thing to do.

It is my understanding that your industry representatives have been discussing this very thing the past few weeks. I hope you will not be too modest in your goals in this respect. Of course there will be opposition to whatever quota legislative goals you set. Most of the opposition will come, as in the past, from foreign sugar interests and their allies. But those groups cannot disprove your splendid record, nor can they match the performance in behalf of American consumers that you have achieved.

For example, some of the foreign sugar interests have displayed, this year, a strange reluctance to commit sugar to the American market at the going U.S. price for raw sugar. It seems to me that those countries whose industries failed to commit any global quota sugar to this market early this year, when they had plenty of sugar available to do so, should receive little consideration by the Congress when we hear their requests for quotas this year.

Of course I am not so naive as to believe that, simply because their record is not so plainly a record of serving consumers as is yours, that the foreign sugar interests will be less vigorous in their opposition to legislative fulfillment of the legitimate needs and goals of the American beet sugar industry. Nor am I unaware that there are sometimes forces at work in the Congress which do not seem apparent, and which are not evident in the speeches which take place on the legislative floor.

Yet I firmly believe that your case is fair and just. I believe that you can enlist the great sugar-consuming industries on your side, because you have served them well. I believe that since you have served consumers so well during a crucial year in sugar, you will find unusually widespread and favorable interest in your case in the Congress.

And I pledge to you my wholehearted personal support.

Waging War on Waste and Inefficiency in Government

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many times in my continuing study of military procurement, when a new case is completed and phased out, I am tempted to say, "We are winning battle after battle, but the end of the war is not in sight."

Today, I want to speak of another battle that has been won, resulting in a saving to the taxpayers. This case involves the proposed sole source purchase of 85 interference blanker subassemblies, a part of a radar set identified as the AN/FPS-6, a $155 piece of equipment that, as it turned out, was not even needed. This is another battle that has been won and a small saving made.

I doubt that the end of this war will be reached. As long as we have a defense budget of over $50 billion, it is going to be impossible to stamp out all the waste and inefficiency that it entails. But, if we in Congress continue to win the battles, we can help hold down the cost of defense without impairing our defense posture one iota.

That is exactly what I continue to seek to do daily in my efforts to revamp the policies and procedures under which our defense hardware is bought.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Appropriations Committee Defense Subcommittee and the Moss committee, I still receive daily the bidding information on electronics put out by the Defense Department. As a part of this material, on June 12, 1963, I noted an Army proposal to purchase 85 of these interference blankers sole source from only one bidder.

On page 7 of the bid set the Army certified that it had no drawings to allow competition. This always causes me to wonder what sort of staff work has been done to determine the availability of drawings to allow competition.

June 12, 1963, at 2:15 p.m., I requested copies of past contracts and all amendments for production of equipment. When unsatisfactory answers were given on June 14, Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer at the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Command, Philadelphia, was contacted by telephone.

He said he would look into the matter at once and advise me. He also thanked me for my interest, and said:

> You are doing a commendable job and are helping us. I personally appreciate your interest.

On June 18, Brigadier General Stanwix-Hay wrote me to report that—

The Army Electronics Materiel Agency had not purchased this item before but had obtained it from the Air Force through cross-provisioning procedures.

After my inquiry, the Air Force was contacted. It advised the Army that, indeed, manufacturer's drawings of the equipment were available and were being forwarded.

When a course of action was decided upon, I would be notified.

In a later clarification and expansion of his June 18, 1963, letter, General Stanwix-Hay wrote me to state that:

When the requirements for the interference blanker subassemblies were computed, Department of Defense commonality records failed to show any user of them other than the Army. Therefore, General Stanwix-Hay said, no effort was made to find if drawings or inventories of the equipment were on hand in any branch of the service.

After my telephone conversation with him on June 14, 1963, he had caused a complete review of the maintenance support plan to be conducted. This investigation revealed that the equipment was part of a larger Air Force equipment.

Then, and only then, was the Air Force queried as to the availability of competitive type procurement data.

On June 17, 1963, the Air Force told the Army drawings were in existence, and arrangements were made to obtain them for competitive procurement.

The requirement for the interference blanker subassemblies was necessary to fulfill anticipated requirements.

Taking these factors into consideration, General Stanwix-Hay canceled the sole source procurement and said he planned to issue a competitive procurement for the item.

Mr. Speaker, I waited till November 21 and then asked the Army what had transpired in the interim.

The answer was as frustrating as it was enlightening. Because, Mr. Speaker, as it turned out, the Army did not even need the equipment it proposed to buy sole source in the first place.

By letter December 6, 1963, Brig. Gen. Wesley C. Franklin, of the Army Electronics Materiel Command, again stated the Army's previous intention to buy the equipment as "replenishment requirements." In other words, they would be used as other equipment wore out or failed.

General Franklin then went on to state, and I quote:

> Actual experience has not substantiated the original consumption estimates. Consequently, stocks on hand are sufficient to satisfy Army needs and no further procurement action is anticipated at the present time. Should additional requirements develop in the future, competitive procurement data will be utilized.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, unless an inquiry had been made and unless the Army's stated course of action in this matter had been challenged, the subassemblies would have been purchased, found to be unneeded, and probably sold for scrap or surplus at a fraction of their cost. The taxpayers would have paid for something that was not even needed and that much more money would have gone sailing down the drain.

Here is another case where a single inquiry caused personnel in the Army to get off their duff and go to work. The result was evidence that entirely refuted the Army's prior position that competition was not possible because data did not exist. Later evidence showed the equipment was not needed, anyway.

All the evidence was in Army files and could have been uncovered before the procurement was issued. But this was not done until the Army had someone looking over its shoulder while it investigated.

Mr. Speaker, here is more concrete evidence that more intricate study must be given these defense budgets as they come to the Hill. The Subcommittee on Defense of the Appropriations Committee does an outstanding job, but it simply does not have the time or the manpower available to get down into the fine-comb details of the way our money is being spent.

That is why I continue to push for enactment of my bill, H.R. 4409, which would set up a bipartisan special committee of the Congress to act as a watchdog over defense expenditures.

The committee could do more to cut defense costs than any other agency or group, since it would have as its stated purpose the sole function of riding herd on sole source and negotiated contracts which many times lead to waste of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this is another battle that has been won. Perhaps we cannot win the war, but I can assure you we are going to go right on fighting it—one battle at a time.

The Moment of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of our most highly respected Members of the House of Representatives is Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON of the 22d District of Ohio. As ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Commitee Mrs. BOLTON has demonstrated a deep dedication to our national security and continually makes significant contributions to the work of her committee and to the work of Congress.

On Wednesday evening of this week Congresswoman BOLTON addressed the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington. Her speech is an excellent expression of good judgment.

The speech follows:

THE MOMENT OF TRUTH—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, WOMEN'S FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY, FEBRUARY 5, 1964

Madam Chairman, members of the committee, members of the Women's Forum on National Security, and guests, to be here with you this morning is truly a great privilege and I thank you for the honor you have done me and the pleasure you have given.

What days these are. How different from those we had hoped for. How difficult to understand the many confusions we face with every rising sun. Yet we must meet them with courage trying to see through the haze that all too often obscures our sun.

Perhaps a good way to look toward the future is to glance back into the past—for we know "The past is prologue."

My first winter in Washington was in 1917. Mr. Bolton was one of Secretary of War Newton Baker's aids and we lived at 1739 N Street, now a part of the pleasant Tabard Inn. It seems hardly possible now that one could meet an old school friend as I did in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue not far from the Willard and stand there and talk. But so it was before the onrush began.

Protocol was important in those days. One called formally, one was most careful. Even in 1928 when we returned to Washington with the Hoover administration one called on all the wives whose husbands ranked one's own. It was a pleasant custom and one met so many attractive women.

During that time some friends in New York sent me some counterfeit money and asked me to take it to the Treasury to have it looked into. Very timidly I did so and found myself in the hands of a keen-eyed, wholly delightful Mr. Moran who was soon to retire. I begged to be given the story when there was one and some weeks later had my curiosity and real interest satified. While we were waiting for the files Mr. Moran told me something of his growing concern for our country.

"Prohibition has done us all great harm," said he. "We find many of our eminent citizens are breaking the law in many ways that eventually cannot help giving the young people a sense that laws are there largely to be broken. But in addition it has established the new underground industry of bootlegging. The members of the trade are largely the Maffia and their ilk. They are paid exorbitantly, and money means power. They are men who have no regard or respect for human life nor for the country in which they live. I shall not see it," continued he, "but you will, Mrs. Bolton. They will take more and more power in higher and higher places." Look around you, ladies; was he not right?

I am inclined to believe that the era began anarchy that is abroad in the land today.

Beautiful as Washington is becoming, it has changed sadly since that day when we two women visited in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue. It has changed tragically indeed when neither women nor men are safe on the streets. It was only a few months ago that one of my own neighbors was shot to death but three or fours doors away. We all know the succession of tragedies that have established a murder pattern in Boston, in New York, Chicago, etc., culminating in the unthinkable assassination of President Kennedy.

In southeast Asia heads of state have been murdered, as they have been in Africa, one of these (a truly wonderful man) because a small group of soldiers were dicontented with their pay. What are we humans doing to ourselves? What has become of integrity and honor and loyalty?

Why are we permitting the very fundamental principles of our land to be twisted, now this way, now that, by people who have other principles? If I recall, it was one woman who started all the business about prayers in school that led to the somewhat misunderstood Supreme Court decision, one woman who has taken her boy (poor lad) to the West, declaring her atheism and disrupting everything. Only one justice dissented, and I am proud indeed that he is Justice Stewart, of Ohio.

It seems to me that there is no justification for these things. Are we no longer a Christian Nation, a believing Nation? We gladly give all who come here the right to worship deity in whatever way they choose. But does it follow that they have the right to tear down our ways? On our coins, and now over the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives, are the words "In God We Trust." Whoever comes into this country knows that. If they don't like it they should keep still or get out.

But why is it that words can so confuse eight of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court that they did not uphold our very foundations? Something of great value has been lost.

Thirty-five or forty years ago a small group of men and women who had become greatly disturbed by the reading matter more and more available to the young made some exhaustive studies, which were followed by studies of the motion pictures. They found a truly appalling situation with apparently endless funds filling the newsstands and the moviehouses with constantly more destructive material which now, of course, is in everybody's living room on TV.

Once upon a time when you went to the newsstand you found Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, St. Nicholas, and such magazine displayed. Those who wanted True Story, Confessions of a Man About Town, and more lurid ones still had to ask for them, whereupon they were brought out from way down under. Not so now. And to the magazines have been added the cheap paperbacks.

Don't mistake me. To have books at prices that can be paid easily is a tremendous boon—but there are all too many sallacious volumes on the racks. There is a wonderful

shop in the Washington airport that carries every sort and kind of fine book. One has to look hard to find even a detective tale. So it should be. And I must say a good word for the efforts being made by a number of the TV stations to give us increasingly attractive scientific, geographical, musical, and entertainment hours.

As I have watched these matters I have found that the Catholic Church really moved to have her people uphold decency. It has been disappointing to find volunteer censoring so ineffective.

Taking all these influence together, it would seem as if there were a powerful, well organized and financed group determined upon the destruction of the morale of the youth and the adults of the world. Are they not being tragically successful?

I think you will agree that we women as a whole do not borrow nor go into debt. Then why have we—who have had the vote for years—permitted the unbelievable extent of the national debt? Let's look at it coldbloodedly and very factually for a moment:

In fiscal year 1965, interest payments on our Federal debt will exceed the current annual cost of keeping our entire Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in uniform.

More than five times as much will be spent in the next fiscal year for debt interest payments than for total missile procurement by the Air Force.

Interest payments will consume nearly seven times more of our taxpayers' dollars than will total Federal payments to educational facilities.

The annual cost of carrying the national debt will be twice as expensive as our 1965 outlay for the entire space program.

Interest on the national debt will account for more than five times as much as Federal expenditures for our entire natural resources program.

More than 10 times as much will be spent on debt interest than for our entire Federal health research program.

We have been told for years that Federal deficits are relatively harmless in view of the growing gross national product—the gross national product we have thrust under our noses all the time. And of course we owe it only to ourselves. And we continue the fiction of "raising the debt limit" every little while—as though that was paid attention to.

To do anything about that we women would have to get very busy and learn about all the many facets of finance. How many of us would do this? And after we had become way wise, would we get out and do something about it? If we don't, who will?

In a wholly different area of our deteriorating position at home and abroad: We know there is confusion everywhere, especially among the young people. If we are honest with ourselves, can we keep from acknowledging that women are the keepers of the home, the holders of the keys? Here in our own country, thanks to our unwillingness really to pull our weight, discipline has been lost, respect has flown out the window, endless homes have been broken up, children are being left desolate, unhappy, with no understanding of the meaning of life—which in essence is made up of the disciplines of joy and sorrow, success and failure.

Am I wrong in believing that a nation is judged by its women? Are we American women giving other nations an image which lifts and builds strength, courage, decency, honor? I have tried to forget an experience I had years back in New Mexico at a corn dance, the shame I felt when a rather buxom blond joined the audience in short shorts, bare midriff, a bra, and a large hat that kept her neighbors from viewing a most beautiful dance. We seem to have grown so callous in the matter of dress and of behavior that one even sees occasional women in very abbreviated bathing suits up on Capitol Hill, in front of the old State, Navy building, all about town—and one shudders at the actions of both the young and the adult.

When I read that a young woman was raped just outside a Government building last week, I wonder how much she herself contributed to the man's excitement. Have you been happy over the very tight skirts and sweaters, the exaggerated bosoms? Surely not. Yet, what have any of us done to change the attitude of mind that makes and wears the current fashion? Certainly an eye for beauty would burn them overnight. To exaggerate sex in all possible ways seems to be the idea.

Let's look at the current Russian women. Yes, they are still cleaning streets and clearing away rubble—but Russia trains thousands of women as engineers, scientists, researchers, doctors and nurses, gymnasts, skaters, skiers, Olympic contenders, and I must say they put it all over us there.

Did you by any chance see a documentary film on ABC-TV not too many weeks ago? "Soviet Women." Of course, it was extremely well done—happy, busy, hard working, good looking women, young, middle-aged, and old. The questioner said to a young woman who published a magazine: "You do not seem to mention sex." A lovely smile came over her face and she said with a quiet seriousness: "No, to us sex is a very private matter." Would we could say the same?

Perhaps I am dwelling too long upon matters that are not to our credit in this, the most wonderful country in all the world. I have not meant to, but somehow we have been given so very much of beauty, of space, of varying climates, of all material things, that one can't help wondering whether the infinite may not be tempting us with too much—to see what use we put it to. Isn't it time that we stop and look at the conditions that make it possible for there to be poverty, loneliness, even hunger, side by side with ease, comfort, opulence? What is wrong with us that we have angry rioting in our streets because all children do not have educational opportunities? Isn't it ironic that our scientific progress is increasing unemployment partly because of that lack of education and training? Are you and I doing anything about it? Are we insisting that vocational training be available to those who need it most? And that can be done locally.

And then are we moving into the larger aspects and doing something about creating jobs and more jobs and more jobs? You know as well as I do (and some of you, no doubt, better) that the most essential thing in life is to have work—with it comes first of all a sense of self-respect, a fresh courage, a return of joy. Without it these things become increasingly less possible and happiness melts away as a deep bitterness takes its place.

This was not a part of the Vision that conceived us nor of the dream that brought us into life. Where did we lose our way?

If this is our moment of truth, let us not fear it. Rather, let us take our courage and our faith in both hands and pray the infinite for the light with which to see the path.

Your committee gave me as my subject: "Moment of Truth." One comes to such a moment rather fearsomely, for it means facing one's inmost self, going down the stairway within one's soul that leads to the dark passage one would like to forget. Although one's hand trembles as it holds the candle so that its light shines upon the shapes one finds there, one realizes that only the acknowledgment of the truth about each one can dispel the darkness and the fear.

Is that not so of nations as well? Is this not a moment when this great country of ours that was conceived in a vision and born of a dream must gather up all her courage and examine herself as never before, that she may recapture the vision and be true to the great principles of freedom, of justice and above all else, the principles of demonstrating God's love in His world? Not an easy task, I grant you—but if we find ways to do it, it will save mankind.

Why is it our woman's task? Let me tell you in what might be called a parable:

"And it came to pass that the infinite Lord of all created this earth and set it in the heavens, putting upon man the caretaker's responsibility. Time elapsed. Upon His return He found all things in great confusion: the courses of many rivers had been changed, forests had been moved about, hills had actually disappeared. Deeply sorrowful, the infinite withdrew Himself that He might meditate upon the method by which restoration of beauty and productiveness could be brought about.

"Upon His return He brought with Him woman. Upon her He had bestowed all the intelligence and the capacity He had given, man, and two things more. That she might understand both the agony and the ecstasy of creation He gave her pain. That she might bear it, He gave her laughter.

"Then He gave them to each other and said, 'The earth is in your charge, my children.'

"Gaily the man ran down the mountainside. But the woman turned and knelt before Him, saying, 'What wouldst Thou of me, my Lord?'

"With great tenderness He replied, 'Go thou with him, give him children, watch over him, and then when the moment comes, bring him back to me.' "

Surely there has never been such a moment as this in which we find ourselves. Although we know there are thousands upon thousands of fine, clean, earnest men and women in the United States and across the world, the very foundations of our life are being rocked by anarchy, by leachery, by faithlessness, by fear. What were we told 2,000 years ago? Was it not that "Perfect love casteth our fear"? What have we done to love?

Ladies for each of you, as for me and for our country, there is the moment of truth. May the infinite give us faith and hope and love, the greatest of them all, that we may fulfill His need of us.

McNamara Endangers Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of Monday, February 3, 1964:

NATION FACES PERIL AT SEA—MCNAMARA ENDANGERS NAVY

The Department of Defense has decided the United States should begin reducing its aircraft carrier attack forces.

You would think, listening to Secretary Robert S. McNamara, that this is a military judgment. It is not. It is the decision of civilians who have been imposed upon the military by the various defense reorganization acts.

Thus, control of the seas which cover 70 percent of the surface of the earth, and provide the most logical and cheapest means by which the power of the United States can be projected to any area and into any situation, no matter how small or large, is to be surrendered in large measure.

The Secretary made a point before Congress that the development of long-range fighter and troop-transport planes reduces the importance of the aircraft carrier. But, the 15,000 troops which recently were airborne to Europe carried only their personal weapons, and their heavy equipment had been previously transported by sea and put into ready position. This airlift also required available landing facilities.

Mr. McNamara, however, said the new fighter planes can fly the Atlantic with only one refueling and newer ones will be able to do it on their own. But, here again, the equipment and bombs they will need must be moved in advance by sea, and the airfields must be waiting.

The survival of the United States is assured by the mighty array of missiles which are pinpointed on the vital points of the Soviet Union and Red China. But these are weapons of last resort. And no nation—especially a Communist one—is going to commit suicide. Even in the eventuality of the final showdown, the sea offers a strategy of mobility, and ships do not die but change with technology. Missile submarines now hide under the seas and carriers with nuclear-carrying planes continually and silently slip from one position to another.

But war has become a struggle of limited actions, of revolution, border excursions, military and economic pressures, and subversions, and retaliatory power must be in an appropriate degree.

But we are going to pull back, and depend more on fighter planes based within the United States.

What good would these planes be, in a limited but dangerous situation along the China coast, if they had no landing facilities, say, in Formosa or Japan?

Mr. McNamara foresees this reduction in our carrier strike force as taking place over a period of 5 or 6 years. Presumably this period covers his possible retention in office as Secretary of Defense.

One individual, then, with the aid of civilian cost analysts, has decreed the fate of the Navy. The judgment is his, not that of the admirals.

Mr. McNamara has installed himself as the master strategist of war. The Navy, he says, shall be what he wants it to be.

We are in a perilous hour, as any one must know by the flames being fed around the world. That one man thinks he has all the answers poses a situation this country cannot afford.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report of print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Slums and Blighted Areas in Indianapolis Are Being Reclaimed by a Self-Help Program Which the Federal Urban Renewal Administration Should Encourage Other Cities To Emulate—Self-Help Urban Renewal Programs Are Being Ignored and Shunted Aside by the Administration Instead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the February 3, 1964, issue of Washington World, a magazine published in the Nation's Capital, carried an article on a highly significant self-help program which is reclaiming and improving homes in slum and blighted areas in Indianapolis, Ind. The article deals with a new concept of private enterprise which is enabling individuals to create their own capital by applying their own work and desire for a new home to the improvement of homes and the reclamation of blighted and slum neighborhoods. This novel approach to slum clearance has been called "team-based, guided, self-help homebuilding." It is similar, in its results, at least, to the preservation movement which, at a higher income level, has reclaimed whole sections of cities including the historic Georgetown section of the Nation's Capital. Both are self-help programs which do not involve one cent of Federal money or the aid of the Federal urban renewal program.

The novel experiment in Indianapolis is a project of three organizations: Flanner House Homes, Inc., which acts as major contractor, Flanner House, a settlement house, and the Board of Fundamental Education. Washington World reports that this self-help program is successfully reclaiming and replacing new homes in slum and blighted areas in other cities besides Indianapolis.

According to the Washington World:

> Homeowners replace slum dwellers, the city is cleaned up and relations of the community cemented. Families now have the opportunity to be an actual part of the construction of their new homes to earn 25 to 36 percent of the value of their home by this initiative investment. The men learn valuable skills while on the job. The women and children, stimulated by the thrill of the project, seek to improve their furnishings. Upholstery and sewing classes, tools and equipment are supplied as a part of the homebuilding program.

Families wishing to participate are selected by minimal requirements: an income of $3,500 to $3,800, enough financial stability to handle the mortgage payments and support of their families, and health enough to work an additional 20 hours a week.

The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, and the Johnson administration which has just sent a grandiose housing program to the Congress, should take note of this humble self-help experiment, which has much to recommend it over many of the federally-aided urban renewal projects.

For example, consider the southwest Washington, D.C. urban renewal project, where, after 23,000 people were displaced and the spending of nearly $100 million of Federal tax moneys, only about 5,000 people are now living—the astonishing result of 13 years of combined efforts on the part of the Federal and District of Columbia urban renewal agencies. The homes and small businesses which were formerly in the area were destroyed and replaced with high-rise, high-rent luxury apartments and prime office space.

It should be as clear to the President, as it is to everyone else, that apartments renting at $175 per month and town houses which sell for $30,000 to $40,000 are far beyond the reach of the low-income Negroes and members of other minority groups who formerly lived in this highly publicized urban renewal project.

The results achieved in this self-help program in Indianapolis, as well as in self-help commercial redevelopment projects in many cities including Rochester's "Midtown Plaza," and Pittsburgh's "Golden Triangle," which have not involved Federal urban renewal powers and tax funds, should put the Johnson administration and the Congress on notice that the Federal urban renewal program is only one way to achieve the revitalization of our cities and the provision of decent homes for our low-income citizens.

In fact, if the Federal urban renewal officials continue to support the increased use of Federal taxes to finance profitable downtown commercial development with its luxury apartment buildings, town houses, and prime office space, and continue to ignore the needs of the middle-and-low-income families of our Nation they may find these citizens in revolt against the Federal urban renewal program itself.

I include here the article from the Washington World to which I have referred in the hope that it will be seen and studied by the President and the officials heading up the Federal urban renewal program which has utterly and completely failed to live up to its promises to adequately relocate and rehouse the Negroes and others living in the blighted areas of our cities despite the expenditure of years of effort and billions of dollars in Federal taxes.

The article follows:

SELF-HELP HOMES REPLACING SLUMS

A new concept of private enterprise—enabling the individual to create his own capital by applying his own work and his desire for a new home—is one answer to the problem of blighted neighborhoods.

In Indianapolis, Ind., where it's been done successfully, the project is labeled "team-based, guided, self-help homebuilding." In other cities across the country, it's known by other names, but the effect has been the same—to replace slums with new homes for low and marginal income families.

Flanner House Homes, a nonprofit organization, acts as the major contractor for the program. Home-owners replace slum-dwellers, the city is cleaned up and relations of the community cemented. Families now have the opportunity to be an actual part of the construction of their new homes to earn 25 to 36 percent of the value of their home by this initiative investment. The men learn valuable skills while on the job. The women and children, stimulated by the thrill of the project, seek to improve their furnishings. Upholstery and sewing classes, tools and equipment are supplied as a part of the homebuilding program.

Families who wish to participate are selected by minimal requirements: an income of $3,500 to $3,800, enough financial stability to handle the mortgage payments and support of their families, and health enough to work an additional 20 hours a week.

Each builder receives a box of tools, schedules his workweek and assigned to a work team. Each man in each team is trained for a specific job and performs that job on all homes in the community in return for the work of others on his own home. All the homes are finished at the same time and all the families move in simultaneously.

The Indianapolis program had its trial and error period and the first house took over 5,600 man-hours and cost $17,000. Since that time the process has been reduced to 900 man-hours at a cost of $14,000 or less. this very successful program has completed homes for 331 families with an initial investment of $200,000 in the 13 years since its inception and has added nearly $5 million to the city's tax revenue.

But most important is the psychological and social impact on the people and the community. They have developed valuable skills which make home maintenance much more a matter of ease and determination and there is increased fellowship and mutuality of interest in the community.

A. Philip Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, several times I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report taken from the

files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which showed that the director of the march on Washington, A. Philip Randolph, in years past had been cited by that committee many times as being affiliated with subversive or Communist organizations. I am not alleging that he is a member of the Communist Party, as I do not know; but his background ought to be closely scrutinized and examined. He was cited on 20 occasions for associating with, or sponsoring groups that had been determined to be subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or by the U.S. Attorney General.

The designs of the Communist conspiracy to bore from within and undermine America may be found in the ranks of both the marchers for freedom and the outspoken element which has called for a simultaneous demonstration to counter the August 28 assembly. The overzealous extremists on both sides of the civil rights movement could fall easy prey to Communist infiltration. That is the thing that needs to be guarded against as the underlying aim of the Reds is to foment discord, bitterness, and division among our people. The Washington marchers have a right to peaceably assemble and ask redress of their complaints. It seems to me that it would be most desirable that the group meet in a stadium and air their charges instead of taking over so many of the Capital's busy arteries of traffic and interfering with vital and necessary governmental and business functions.

A. Philip Randolph was coeditor of the Messenger, which was published from 1919 to about 1925. The masthead of the Messenger referred to it as the only radical Negro magazine in America.

In order to portray the principles and philosophy of that magazine, I am quoting some excerpts from the Messenger:

"Soviet Government proceeds apeace. It bids fair to sweep over the whole world. The sooner the better, on with the dance" (the Messenger, May–June 1919).

"We want more Bolshevik patriotism. We want a patriotism represented by a flag so red that it symbolizes truly its oneness of blood running through each one's veins. We want more patriotism that surges with turbulent unrest. That is Bolshevik patriotism, and we want more of that brand in the United States" (from the Messenger, May–June 1919).

"You next take to task the editors of the Messenger, A. Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen, for being Bolshevists. While you are generally adept at distortion of facts and misrepresentation of circumstances, you have not greatly misrepresented us.

"The sword of Damocles dangles over your so-called white man's domination. Rumblings of revolution are heard in the distance. Nemesis is at hand" (the Messenger, October 1919).

Since the Messenger discontinued operations, Randolph has been furthering integration objectives. Here is a 1948 news item from the Washington, D.C., Times Herald, June 27, 1948:

JIM CROWISM FIGHT OPENED AGAINST DRAFT—DISOBEDIENCE DRIVE URGED BY AFL LEADER

NEW YORK, June 26.—A rebellion against the Draft Act was launched today by A. Philip Randolph, Negro AFL leader. Determined to fight Jim Crowism in the armed services, he announced a nationwide drive to urge Negroes and whites to refuse to register or be inducted and, if need be, to resort to such trickery as feigning illness and faking dependents. It was a daring step, but Randolph was prepared to face the consequences. "The drive," he said, "will get underway throughout the country unless President Truman issues an Executive order against segregation before August 16. "It will be conducted," he said, "by the League for Non-Violent Civil Disobedience Against Military Segregation," whose formation he announced. The civil disobedience was threatened by Randolph at a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee in Washington March 3. Senators MORSE of Oregon, and Baldwin, of Connecticut, warned that Randolph and his followers would face treason charges if they carried out their threat. "Field campaigners of the league will start visiting major cities Monday," Randolph said. "Adherents subjects to the draft registration after August 16 will be urged," he said, "to take any of four main courses of action: (1) open refusal to register; (2) quiet ignoring of registration; (3) refusal to be inducted; and (4) feigning illness—and other subterfuges."

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all of us to be on guard in this country and find out the kind of company that certain civil rights leaders keep.

How About a Prestige Poll Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1964 election campaign is upon us, it would seem to me that the Democrats would want to reveal another prestige poll, such as was politically had during the 1960 campaign.

I dare say that L.B.J. will not risk one of these polls today because our stock, worldwide, is the lowest in my lifetime. In the February 3 issue of the Miami Herald, Jim Bishop enumerates the insults we have received and our continuing stupidity in helping our enemies and neglecting our friends:

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 3, 1964]

AN UNEASY FEELING TURNS INTO ANGER

(By Jim Bishop)

As a student of history—not a political writer—an uneasy feeling is upon me. Either America is becoming soft, or my head is. We seem to be in metamorphosis from a high plane of justice through strength to one of apology through fear. The last time our country became indignant was when President John F. Kennedy ordered the Russians to take their missiles out of Cuba at once.

Name one other occasion when we stood toe to toe with anyone and refused to back down. I am opposed to war; I'm opposed to threats; but I favor unequivocal principles and justice. I also favor righteous anger in high places too. We don't have it. When a little nation like Panama kicks us in the pants, our President phones their President and says: "Let's talk this over like gentlemen."

If T. R. Roosevelt was in office, he'd have sent a task force or aircraft carriers, a division of U.S. Marines and some supporting destroyers. The United States would have landed in Panama, restored order, and then talked. In Zanzibar, our officials are arrested with impunity and the world watches as our people are humiliated. In the United Nations, when the Communist bloc refuses to pay its bills, Uncle Sam floats a bond issue, and, in effect, pays.

Militancy is not the solution, any more than self-degradation is. A malaise of fear is over the land. We are loaded with creature comforts and bereft of patriotism. Who volunteers these days to serve in the Armed Forces? Our boys have to be dragooned into service, and then they mark time like prisoners doing a sentence. Two of the most popular television programs are "Sergeant Bilko" and "McHale's Navy." Are they patriotic?

In Vietnam we fight an interminable war with helicopters for a people who revile us. The Chief of State of Cambodia will no longer accept our money unless we apologize for saying Cambodia appeared to be happy that President Kenendy was assassinated. We romance a man named Ben Bella as a liberator of his people, and he goes home and says he's a friend of the Soviet Union.

The French, who were lifted from under the German heel by American blood, take our money and make friends with Communist China. The British sell 400 buses to Cuba and are offended by our outrage. The Russians beg for wheat because they haven't got enough brains to feed themselves, and tell us that they will bury us.

Pakistan accepts our money for airports and then builds a road to Communist China. The new nations of Africa lynch white people, and condemn us for being slow to give our own Negroes equal opportunities. The most potent organization in the United States used to be the American Legion. Now it is CORE.

A skinny malcontent like Lee Oswald renounces his citizenship and, when he finds that he doesn't like Russia, the United States pays his fare home. American officials are kidnaped by Reds in Venezuela, and nobody can do anything about it. In West Germany, the Government fears the United States will recognize East Germany, but they work out a deal with the Communists for Christmas visits through the wall.

We send our Attorney General to Japan to beg President Sukarno not to start trouble in southeast Asia. Our former President, Dwight Eisenhower, got as far as the Philippine Islands on a state visit to Japan when he had to turn back for fear of being killed. Premier Nehru turns a cold neutral face to us when we ask for friends, but, when the Chinese cross his border, he screams for help and we send it.

King Hussein, of Jordan, salutes the Pope and talks of peace and then runs off to Cairo to discuss with Nasser ways and means of starting a war with Israel. An Orthodox Greek archbishop, President of Cyprus, says prayers for the Turkish women and children his people slaughtered. In South Africa, a small group of white men who do not belong there, oppress and kill a large number of Negroes who have been there for 3,000 years.

Japan, a defeated nation, builds more ships and shipyards. America, which won, shuts shipyards down. In Korea, which was supposedly a United Nations action, we sent more men, more guns, more money than anyone else and, 10 years later, Korea is still half slave, half free.

We lose a little here; we lose a little there. Our bills for defense come to over $50 billion a year. Our foreign aid amounts to another $4 billion. Can someone please tell me where the United States has gained anything except deepening contempt? Do we have a brother anywhere who is willing to lay down his life for us?

Am I angry? You bet I am.

Canal Zone Crisis: The Flag Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on January 31, 1964, I quoted the entire January 20, 1964, issue of the Panama Canal Spillway in which were summarized the principal facts in the January 9 Panamanian assault on the Canal Zone and our citizens residing in that American territory.

Members of the Congress and others, who have followed my addresses in the House since 1959, know that the current crisis is not sudden but the inevitable result of what has preceded and occurred just as predicted. The specific action on the part of our officials, which more than any other single cause, led to the present chaos in the Canal Zone, was the hoisting of the Panamanian flag over this American possession against the overwhelming vote—381 to 12—of the House, against the intent of the Congress as embodied in law—Gross amendment—and against international usage.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read in the January 27, 1964, issue of the Panama Canal Spillway a most factual summary of key events in Panama-United States relations as regards the Canal Zone and Panama Canal from the violent disturbances of November 3, 1959, to January 19, 1964.

The article is accompanied by a summary of all dual-flag installations in the Canal Zone, which include administration buildings, locks, hospitals, and the Thatcher Ferry Bridge; grade and high schools, the Canal Zone College, and even the cemeteries and mental hospital.

In order that the sovereign people of the United States and their Congress may know what has been perpetuated in the Canal Zone, I quote the indicated issue and urge that every Member of the Congress read the story of the disgraceful betrayal of the legitimate vital interests in the zone. In addition, I urge the loyal mass media; civic, fraternal, labor, patriotic, and veterans' organizations in all parts of the Nation to delve into the situation and to identify those individuals who are responsible for getting our country into the tragic situation at Panama.

The indicated article and accompanying summary follow:

THE FLAG ISSUE

Following violent disturbances on November 3, 1959, at the Canal Zone-Panama boundary, involving sovereignty, flags, and other issues, a special representative of the Department of State said in Panama on November 24, 1059: "During the course of our discussions, in response to a question by the President of Panama, I assured him that the policy of the U.S. Government with respect to the status of the Canal Zone remains as it had been stated more than 50 years ago to the effect that the United States recognizes that titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone remains in the Government of Panama."

Further demonstrations, including some violence against the Canal Zone, occurred again on November 28, 1959. Subsequently the Panamanian Ambassador to the United States in Washington presented a formal request for, among other things, the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

On December 2, 1959, President Eisenhower in a press conference stated that he did "in some form or other believe that we should have visual evidence that Panama does have titular sovereignty over the region." In a press conference on December 10, 1959, Secretary of State Herter stated that sympathetic consideration was being given to the proposal that the Panamanian flag fly in the Canal Zone.

On September 17, 1960, President Eisenhower directed that the U.S. flag and the Panamanian flag be flown together in a single place in the Canal Zone known as Shaler Triangle. This action was announced by a White House release which read as follows:

"Last December the President stated his belief that there should be visual evidence of Panama's titular sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone. The President has now, as a voluntary and unilateral decision on the part of the Government of the United States, approved and directed the flying of the flag of the Republic of Panama together with the U.S. flag on a daily basis in Shaler Triangle in the Canal Zone. The President has authorized the American Ambassador, Joseph S. Farland, to make a public statement to this effect.

"The President hopes that his decision will demonstrate the continuing close bonds that exist between the people of the United States and the Republic of Panama and their Governments."

The U.S. note transmitted to the Panama Foreign Office on September 17, 1960 stated (Department of State Bulletin, Oct. 10, 1960, vol. XLIII, No. 1111, p. 558):

"I am pleased to state that, after the highest consideration by my Government, I am instructed to inform you that as a further reflection of the genuine friendship existing between our two Governments and peoples, my Government has determined that as a voluntary act on the part of the United States, and in recognition of the titular sovereignty residing in the Republic of Panama with respect to the Canal Zone, the Panamanian flag will hereafter be flown together with the U.S. flag on a daily basis in the area known as Shaler Triangle in the Canal Zone. This determination is in no wise to be considered as modifying in any way the treaties and agreements in force between the United States and Panama."

On September 21, 1960, the two flags were first flown at Shaler Triangle, and have flown there daily since then.

On June 13, 1962, Presidents Kennedy and Chiari issued a joint communique stating that they were appointing high-level representatives to discuss points of dissatisfaction. Ambassador Farland and Governor Fleming were appointed by President Kennedy and Foreign Minister Solís and Dr. Octavio Fábrega were appointed by President Chiari.

The communiqué stated that the Presidents "agreed that their representatives will arrange for the flying of Panamanian flags in an approrpiate way in the Canal Zone."

The flag question was the first substantive matter discussed by the Special Commission. Governor Fleming with the concurrence of Ambassador Farland developed a list of 15 sites at which the United States and Panamanian flags would fly together in the Canal Zone, including Shaler Triangle where the two flags had been flying since September 21, 1960, by direction of President Eisenhower. The list of site locations for the dual flags was presented to Panama at a meeting on July 20, 1962, for discussion purposes, and was forwarded to Washington for review by the Department of State and others.

The selected sites were acquiesced in by Panama and were approved in principle by those reviewing the matter in Washington. The sites were substantially the same as those subsequently used except as affected by the addition of civilian school premises in January 1964.

The original list of sites did not include any schools. At no time did Panama or anyone in Washington object to the specific list of civilian areas or suggest any additions or deletions or raise a question about the schools. This remained true until after the trouble which began on January 7, 1964.

While the list of civilian sites was not itself controversial, Panama sought also to have her flag flown in military areas and on transiting ships. And some Members and many U.S. citizen residents in the Canal Zone felt strongly against the flying of the Panamanian flag at all in the Canal Zone. The House of Representatives had passed House Resolution 459 on February 2, 1960, against flying the Panamanian flag. The pertinent 1961 appropriation act contained a rider prohibiting the use of Canal Zone Government or Panama Canal Company funds to install a flagpole for flying a Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone (Public Law 85-451, May 13, 1960). Nevertheless the September 1960 action by President Eisenhower followed and the dual flags were established in Shaler Triangle, using special funds.

When the new Thatcher Ferry Bridge was dedicated on October 12, 1962, United States and Panamanian flags were flown at each end of the center span. These flags, the first dual sets to be flown since the Shaler Triangle action, have flown 24 hours a day ever since.

On October 29, 1962, in further implementation of the agreement, dual flags were flown at the administration building at Balboa Heights, and on November 1, 1962, at the administration building at Cristobal. This followed public announcement of the agreement on flags by President Chiari in an address to the Panamanian National Assembly on October 1, 1962.

On January 10, 1963, the Joint Commission created by Presidents Kennedy and Chiari issued a joint communique, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"1. It has been agreed that the flag of the Republic of Panama will be flown together with the flag of the United States of America on land in the Canal Zone where the flag of the United States of America is flown by civilian authorities. Private organizations and persons in the zone are free to display flags at will over their places of residence or business. Other aspects of the flag question will be discussed later."

On October 26, 1962, a Panama Canal Company employee, Gerald Doyle, had filed suit against the Governor of the Canal Zone seeking to enjoin the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. This action received substantial support from many Canal Zone residents and from some Members of Congress. While the suit was pending the Governor refrained from initiating any further dual flags at the remaining sites. Panama, apparently understanding the situation, did not press for action to further implement the flag agreement during the litigation, despite adverse press comment in Panama concerning the litigation.

The flag suit was dismissed by the U.S. District Court in the Canal Zone on July 8, 1963, the court opinion holding that the matter was one of executive discretion. The time for appeal expired on September 27, 1963, without an appeal having been filed.

Thereafter, the Governor directed that the dual flags be flown at the remaining selected sites. This was carried out in accordance with a schedule which would per-

mit completion of the installation of all poles by February 7, 1964. As each set of poles was erected the two flags were immediately flown thereon, without publicity or ceremony. In the meantime the list of 15 locations for the 2 flags had increased to 17 by reason of the Governor's addition of sites at 2 cemeteries, which had been mentioned but not specifically included at the time of the original list.

During the course of the year, some flagpoles at locations not selected for dual flags were removed, such as at the Governor's residence which is a block or so from the administration building where the two flags were already flying. The removal of flagpoles drew some adverse press comment. In general, the sites for the dual flags were selected to provide for such display in each major population area plus special locations such as the locks and governmental administration buildings.

In November 1963, the Governor considered flying the dual flags at the four high schools. This question was discussed informally with the Canal Zone civic council leaders and with the senior officials of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government. The civic councils felt strongly that such dual displays at the schools would lead to major flag incidents. Senior agency officials generally agreed with the civic councils. This position was consistent with the informal opinion received from school officials in 1962 when the question of flags at schools was first considered by the Governor. The original decision not to fly the dual flags outside the schools, and therefore no flag, under the agreement, was reaffirmed by the Governor in December 1963.

By the end of December 1963, 11 of the dual flag installations were in operation, with 5 more scheduled for January and early February 1964, and the final site set for new Gorgas Hospital when construction would be completed later in 1964.

During the Christmas holidays it was decided by the Governor that full implementation of the agreement with Panama would be put into effect on January 2, 1964, at which time the Panamanian flag would be flown wherever the U.S. flag was flown by civilian authorities. This meant that no U.S. flags would be flown outside the schools and at about four other locations where single U.S. flags were still flying on December 31.

On December 30, 1963, the following press release was issued by the Governor:

"On and after January 2, 1964, the Panamanian flag will be flown together with the flag of the United States on civilian land areas in the Canal Zone where the U.S. flag is flown by civilian authorities.

"This action implements the understanding made public in a joint communique issued by the two Governments earlier this year which stated that 'the flag of the Republic of Panama will be flown together with the flag of the United States of America on land in the Canal Zone where the flag of the United States of America is flown by civilian authorities. Private organizations and persons in the zone are free to display flags at will over their places of residence or business.'

"For some time the Panama Canal has been erecting dual flagpoles at selected sites. Work has been completed and the 2 flags are now flying at 11 of the sites. Dual flagpoles will be erected at five additional sites between now and the early part of February. One further location at which the two flags will fly will be the new Gorgas Hospital addition when it is completed later this year.

"The 11 locations where the 2 flags are now flying are Shaler Plaza, Thatcher Ferry Bridge, the Administration Building in Balboa and also at Cristobal, Miraflores, and Gatun locks, Coco Solo and Corozal Hospitals, Palo Seco, Margarita and Coco Solo. The five remaining locations in addition to the new Gorgas Hospital addition are Gamboa-Santa Cruz, Rainbow City, Paraiso, Mount Hope Cemetery, and Corozal Cemetery. Locations at which the U.S. flag has currently been flown alone and at which no flags will be flown on or after January 2, 1964, are the schools; the Ancon District Court Building; the Industrial Division, Cristobal; a site in Gamboa which will be replaced by the site for the two flags; and the present Gorgas Hospital.

"In accordance with law and customs requiring the U.S. flag to be displayed in or near schools, the U.S. flag will continue to be displayed in classrooms or elsewhere within the schools as at present. The Panamanian flag will continue to be displayed with the U.S. flag in all Latin American schools and in certain other schools as appropriate, following present practice."

Schools reopened on Thursday, January 2, 1964, after the Christmas holiday. The U.S. flag which formerly had been raised in front of each school on schooldays was no longer flown, in accordance with the commitment to Panama to fly two or none.

During the first few days of the new school period students at Balboa High School began to generate feeling in protest against the discontinuance of the U.S. flag outside the school. A U.S. flag is displayed in every classroom, but the outside flag became an object of current significance. By Monday, January 6, it was known by school officials and some parents and others that some of the students intended to go to school early on Tuesday, January 7, and to raise the U.S. flag on the outside pole at Balboa High School. On Friday, January 3, a petition to President Johnson protesting the discontinuance of the U.S. flag outside the Balboa High School was circulated at the school and signed by 400 to 500 students.

Balboa High School has an enrollment of 1,851. Of these, 1,777 are U.S. citizens. Nine hundred and twenty-seven or 50.1 percent of the students at Balboa High School are children of military or civilian personnel of the U.S. Armed Forces; 639 or 34.5 percent are children of employees of the Canal Zone Government and Panama Canal Company; 136 or 7.3 percent are children of American businessmen and other non-Government personnel in Panama and the Canal Zone. Seventy-five or 4.1 percent are children of U.S.-citizen employees of the U.S. Embassy, AID, USIS, and the Federal Aviation Agency. Seventy-four or 4 percent are non-U.S.-citizen tuition students, principally Panamanians.

By 6:45 a.m. on Tuesday, January 7, about 25 students had gathered on the lawn in front of the high school with a flag. The halyards were locked on the pole. Attempts were made to climb the pole but efforts to get the flag aloft were at first not successful. By 7:25 some 200 to 300 students, mostly observers, were present and a group of 50 to 80 were around the pole itself. The few actually working at it finally worked the halyards loose so that despite the lock the flag was raised at 7:25. School officials were present, and a couple of policemen were in the area. A dozen or so adults, presumably parents, were on the sidelines.

Classes started at 7:45 and nearly all students attended. Absenteeism during the day was nearly normal. A dozen or so adults and students remained in the area across the street from the campus. At 8:20 the acting superintendent of schools, the principal of the high school, and the civil affairs director, within whose bureau the schools operate, lowered the flag, which was taken to the principal's office.

The first class period was over at 8:38 a.m., and at 8:40 six college students and one high school student put up another small flag. About 150 students were on the school steps or lawn and they pledged allegiance to the flag. A number of adults were in the area. School officials were present. No police were in the immediate area.

No effort to prevent the students' action was taken because of a policy decision approved by the Governor that an incident involving physically preventing these American students from raising the American flag outside their school and pledging allegiance should be avoided, in the expectation that the protest demonstration would have achieved its purpose and the flag could be lowered quietly later. No laws were broken and it was considered that the demonstration by the students did not constitute a flying of the flag by civilian authorities.

It was understood that the active ringleader group of students intended to require authorities to use force if an effort were made to prevent the raising of the flag, or to take it down once up, or to remove the flagpole. School officials urged students to return to classes, which nearly all did. Photographers, professional and others, were present at all actions described.

During the morning a small group of students kept watch from just off the campus. Between classes large numbers appeared to see what had happened, there having been rumors that the authorities intended to remove the pole or halyard. At noon the students substituted a larger flag on the pole. After school about 100 students, with adults, remained around the area until late evening to prevent action to remove the flag or pole. About 25 remained on watch all night and were furnished food and blankets by adult sympathizers.

At 6 p.m. on Tuesday the flag was lowered by six high school boys. At 7:30 a.m. on Wednesday it was again raised. The situation was about the same on Wednesday. In the afternoon some 200 students marched around the flag with placards demanding that the flag stay up. Ringleaders told school officials that students would continue in classes so long as the flag was up. It was understood that if the flag were taken down the fire alarm would be used to signal a student rush to prevent the action. The principal put out written bulletins assuring that there was no intention to remove the flagpole, and cautioning against any improper use of the fire alarm system.

On the Atlantic side similar action was taken on Wednesday by large numbers of students at Cristobal High School with substantial parental support. Groups went to several elementary schools, also, and put up flags, on both the Atlantic and Pacific sides.

On Wednesday, January 8, the Governor issued a statement appealing to the public for cooperation. He reviewed the background of the dual flag program and said:

"I believe that it is unnecessary for me to dwell at length on the responsibilities of U.S. citizens to abide by the official commitments of their Government. I would, however, like to emphasize that we have a particular responsibility here in the Canal Zone where our actions are subject to direct view by citizens of other countries.

"I request the cooperation of all U.S. citizens at this time in honoring our country's commitments and in showing our good faith by our own actions. We must set the example and some recent actions have not been good in view of an international commitment of the United States.

"At the same time, I will say that the list of official locations at which the two flags are to be flown is not final and absolute. Should the various communities desire dual flag displays at other locations, it is possible that we can make appropriate additions in consonance with our international commitment. In this regard, I would look to the civic councils for advice as to the wishes of the communities."

On Thursday morning, January 9, the Governor pretaped and film-recorded an

address to the public. This statement was presented by Canal Zone radio and television at 6:15 p.m. It reviewed the discussions with Panama during the preceding 2 years with particular reference to the flag issue. The Governor explained the commitment to Panama, the selection of the sites for dual flags, and the issue as to flags at the schools. He stated that "the flag agreement is a valid commitment of our Government. We Americans in the Zone have an obligation as citizens to support that commitment regardless of our personal beliefs. I hope that we Americans will conduct ourselves with reason, and in an emotional situation successfully avoid emotionalism."

Following the tragic events of Thursday evening, January 9, and thereafter, which are not within the scope of this summary, the dual flags were directed to be flown outside the Canal Zone schools by Secretary of the Army Vance. The following announcement was made on January 11, 1964:

"After consultation with Governor Fleming, Secretary Vance announced tonight that the Canal Zone Government will continue to fly the U.S. flag outside public schools in the Canal Zone and that in accordance with the existing agreement between the Republic of Panama and the United States, the Panamanian flag will be flown alongside the U.S. flag at these locations."

Accordingly, poles were erected and the dual flags were flown from 17 public schools in the Canal Zone beginning January 15, 1964.

As of January 19, 1964, the Panamanian flag is being flown or is scheduled to be flown by civilian authorities in the Canal Zone where the U.S. flag is flown, at 30 locations, identified in the adjoining list which also states the date upon which the two flags were first flown together at each location.

SUMMARY: DUAL FLAG INSTALLATIONS IN CANAL ZONE

Location and date dual flags first flown

1. Shaler Triangle, September 21, 1960.
2. Thatcher Ferry Bridge, October 12, 1962.
3. Administration Building, Balboa Heights, October 29, 1962.
4. Administration Building, Cristobal, November 1, 1962.
5. Miraflores locks, October 24, 1963.
6. Gatun locks, November 9, 1963.
7. Coco Solo Hospital, November 15, 1963.
8. Corozal Hospital, November 30, 1963.
9. Palo Seco Hospital, December 4, 1963.
10. Margarita townsite, December 18, 1963.
11. Balboa High School, January 15, 1964.
12. Canal Zone College, January 15, 1964.
13. Balboa Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
14. Ancon Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
15. Diablo Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
16. Diablo Junior High School, January 15, 1964.
17. Los Rios Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
18. Pedro Miguel Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
19. Paraiso Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
20. Paraiso Junior-Senior High School, January 15, 1964.
21. Gamboa Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
22. Santa Cruz Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
23. Cristobal Junior-Senior High School, January 15, 1964.
24. Coco Solo Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
25. Rainbow City Junior-Senior High School, January 15, 1964.
26. Margarita Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
27. Gatun Elementary School, January 15, 1964.
28. Mount Hope Cementery, scheduled for January 31, 1964.
29. Corozal Cemetery, scheduled for February 7, 1964.
30. New Gorgas Hospital, scheduled later in 1964.

More on L.B.J. Stereo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the hastily called press conference a few weeks ago, the President casually mentioned he had received an expensive stereo from the now-renowned Bobby Baker.

In a story in the February 6 issue of Long Island's Newsday apparently Don B. Reynolds, the man who sold the President a substantial insurance policy, paid a TV repairman an $82 bill for making six or seven trips to the Johnson home in Washington to make sure that the stero was working well. The story follows:

L.B.J.'s STEREO WAS WELL TUNED

(By Don Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The former manager of a television shop said last night that he was paid by Don B. Reynolds not only to install a $585 stereo phonograph in President Johnson's home in 1959 but also far a half-dozen trips to adjust it. But he could shed no light on who actually gave the set to Johnson.

The account of the installation came from Donald F. Mulgannon, of Bethesda, Md., who 5 years ago was the manager of a TV-radio repair business. He said he was called by Reynolds, an insurance man who had sold Johnson a $100,000 policy, to install the set in Johnson's home in 1959 when Johnson was the Senate majority leader. In a recent public statement, the President said he thought the set was a gift from Robert G. (Bobby) Baker.

Mulgannon, 29, said in an interview: "As I remember, I made six or seven trips to Johnson's home. He never said anything about where he got the set. And I never would have asked because it was none of my business whatsoever." He said he made the extra trips over a 5-week period to adjust the tone and volume of the stereo at the request of Reynolds. The insurance agent paid for the work, Mulgannon said. The bill: $82. He said he also installed extra speakers in the Johnson home but the cost of that was borne by Johnson, with the payment coming from someplace in Texas.

Mulgannon said that less than a year later, he became an insurance salesman for a national firm. He said the firm, which he would not identify, was in no way connected with Reynolds' insurance business. In a recent appearance before the Senate Rules Committee, which is investigating Baker's financial affairs while he was Senate majority secretary, Reynolds testified that he sent the stereo to Johnson at Baker's suggestion.

Meanwhile, Senator Carl T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, a member of the Rules Committee, said yesterday that the whole question of who gave what to whom could be cleared up by the committee's calling Baker to "present any bills or invoices he may have." The committee has temporarily suspended its hearing while the Senate works on the President's tax-cut bill.

The NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal sponsors of civil rights legislation is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. A few years ago the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the various members of the board of directors and the official family and committees of the NAACP to determine their affiliation, if any, with organizations which had been determined by either the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General as being subversive.

On July 29, 1963, public records from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities covering 59 officers, directors, and members of committees of the NAACP were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by me. This material filled 29½ pages of the Appendix of the RECORD. On February 23, 1946, when the original insertion on this subject was made by me, it consisted of 77 persons who were in some official capacity of the NAACP organization.

There was a three-phase purpose in bringing this information to the attention of the public, one being that many years had passed and there was a likelihood of quite a number of personnel no longer holding official positions in the organization; a further reason being that the 1956 RECORD had become practically extinct; and finally to enlighten anyone, inluding the President and the present Attorney General about the activities of a large number of the leaders of the NAACP. All of those who were not in 1961 associated with the NAACP as revealed by the publication, "NAACP in Action—Report for 1961" have been deleted from the material incorporated in the RECORD.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities in compiling the material with respect to each individual used this language at the outset: "The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Commu-

nist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated."

To understand the civil rights movement as propagated by the NAACP, I feel that a person must know something of the history and development of the American Negro movement here in the United States subsequent to the Reconstruction period.

In 1895, Booker T. Washington, president of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, was selected to speak for the southern Negro at the Atlanta Exposition. Dr. Washington stated his position clearly and with great effect. I would like to quote a small part from his address which I feel sums up the entire philosophy enunciated by him and his group:

> The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

There was an entirely different school of thought, however, which was headed by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, of Atlantic University. Dr. DuBois was a very bitter critic of the Washingtonian movement, which he referred to as the Tuskegee machine. Dr. DuBois was the leader of the leftwing element of American Negro society which, in 1905, met at Niagara Falls, N.Y., and devised plans whereby complete social equality could be attained. This group was subsequently called the Niagara movement. The Niagara movement was not very effective, because it was hampered by lack of funds. However, in 1908, a race riot occurred in Springfield, Ill., the home of Abraham Lincoln, which aroused the interest of the dormant abolitionist movement in the North. As a result of the feeling which was aroused by the riots, William English Walling made a strong appeal for the emancipation of the American Negro in the fields of political and social equality. This appeal later became the clarion for the formation of a new organization, called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which joined the white liberals of the northern abolitionist traditions with the Negro liberals of the Niagara movement. Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washington group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up nine pages single spaced.

Many of the present-day NAACP officials have been cited many, many times as being affiliated with groups that have been declared subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General.

Do We Take This Lying Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Castro's cutting off our water supply is just another insult added to the many he has thrown at the United States—with no red-blooded reaction from us.

I suppose President Johnson is also seeking a consensus of what should be done here. Apparently his consensus on Panama has not been completed because we are doing nothing in that area of defeat.

In yesterday's Evening Star, an editorial proposes firm action and it is about time we took it.

All the L.B.J. romancing of communication media executives and their cover-up for him does not blot out the fact that it is time we must make a choice.

The above-mentioned article follows:

CASTRO'S CHALLENGE

In cutting off the water supply to Guantanamo, Fidel Castro has confronted the United States with an open and ominous challenge. There is no use trying to look the other way. We will face this threat and take the necessary action, or henceforth we will be hounded and harassed incessantly by Havana's two-bit dictator.

It is perfectly clear that the arrested Cuban "fishermen" were illegally in American waters. Our officials say that the captain of one of the vessels radioed Havana to this effect, and there is no reason to doubt it. There is also considerable reason to believe that this was a planned incident—that the fishermen were sent on their mission in the hope of provoking an arrest which would give Castro an excuse to shut off the water supply. At least, it seems significant that Castro allowed just 45 minutes between his protest and his shutting off of the water—hardly time for the United States to react. Meanwhile, his Russian friends were all set with a Pravda blast accusing "pirates" in the United States of "flouting international law." Perhaps we now have a pretty good clue as to one subject of recent conversations between Messrs. Castro and Khrushchev.

The water for our naval base comes from a pumping station on the Yateras River 4 miles from the reservation. We built the pumping station and the water pipeline in 1941, and have been paying $14,000 a month for use of the water. After completion, the station was turned over to a private Cuban company, which was nationalized when Castro seized power. So the setup, from his point of view, is ideal for harassment.

Of course, we can limp along at Guantanamo for a long time and perhaps indefinitely without water from the Yateras. And this without benefit of Castro's generosity in offering to turn on the water for an hour each day for the benefit of women and children on the base. This offer, of course, is not only a calculated affront. It is also a shrewd move. If we accept it we implicitly concede Castro's right to control the flow of water. If we reject it he will argue that he was willing to prevent suffering on the part of the Americans.

The issue, however, is not one of water alone. With rationing, tankers and similar expedients we could get by. The question is whether we will submit to this form of coercion—a coercion which obviously is designed to test our will and our reaction. If our officials decide to submit, they should do so in full awareness that this will be the first, but not the last, episode in a campaign aimed at eventually forcing us out of Guantanamo and undermining us throughout Latin America.

Admittedly, effective counteraction will not be easy. But it should be taken nevertheless. President Johnson has ordered a crash study to prepare a thorough set of recommendations to deal with the problem. Surely, in view of previous threats to the water supply, this must have been done long ago. If not, someone has been deplorably negligent.

When the pipeline was threatened during the Castro revolution, Marines were sent out to protect it. We think they should be used again.

A Letter to Anybody Who Cared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph B. Gregg, a teacher in Sunrise Junior High School, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., has composed and sent me a most venerable letter on the tragic circumstances of November 22, 1963. Under unanimous consent I insert the tribute written by Mr. Gregg in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ANYBODY WHO CARED

Every man, at some point in his life, acquires a hero—no, even more than that—an idol. And that, in the finest sense of the word.

Mine no longer walks this earth.

And in heretofore undiscovered reaches of my heart I have wept—and have suffered through the creation of a chasm of sorrow I did not know was capable of man.

I have sat in my Florida room with my wife, and watched and listened to the horror of it all unfold on TV, and I turned to hide the welling, glistening tears—because it is unmanly to cry. But through these hours I became a little lost boy at heart, and aren't little boys, at times like these, allowed to cry? Why then did I run, ashamedly, to the solitude of a room upstairs, to give lonely release to my heart?

These 2 days of timelessness I have gone to work and sat and stood and walked around wide eyed as a narcotic, yet as unseeing; concentrating on the "why," yet unthinking; stunned beyond the ability to believe, yet believing every one of the millions of words I have absorbed by now.

My idol has been toppled.

But deeper still in the recesses of my heart, where must dwell knowledge beyond attainment of a simple human brain, I know, as surely as I know his body is dead, he is not dead.

For as long as one man suffers from the cruelty of inequality; as long as one deranged mind calls for peace through war; for so long as one challenge to the salvation of mankind remains unbattled, the immortal soul and the unconquerable intellect of John Kennedy shall walk this earth—though he be embodied in us, the least of all his fellow men.

I pledge myself to carry on, in my fumbling way, and however I can, his noble dedicated and sacred work.

My idol is not dead.

JOSEPH B. GREGG,
Sunrise Junior High School, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Resolution by the Mississippi Legislature Urging Defeat of the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the passage of the civil rights bill would cause terrifying damage to race relations and to our form of government, the Mississippi Legislature has adopted a concurrent resolution urging the defeat of the bill now before the House.

On behalf of my colleagues, the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. WINSTEAD, and Mr. WILLIAMS], I include the concurrent resolution and commend it to the Members:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat the civil rights bill now before that body for consideration

Whereas we have witnessed in our time a gradual erosion of States rights and an ever-increasing degree of Federal control over affairs specifically reserved to the States by the Constitution; and

Whereas there is a clear and unmistakable trend toward further centralization of power in the Federal Government and an ever-increasing restriction on the rights and affairs of our citizens that may be conducted outside the scope of Federal intervention and control; and

Whereas we view this trend as a very definite danger to the existence and perpetuation of the American way of life as we have known it since the founding of our country; and

Whereas we are of the firm conviction that this danger is not confined to any one section or area of our Nation, but that it is inimical to the rights and privileges of the majority of our citizens in every section of our Nation and in every area of life: economic, social, moral, or religious; and

Whereas we regard the so-called civil rights bill now before Congress as the most iniquitous effort ever proposed to thwart the right and choice of the individual, or the majority, to the pursuit of happiness without Federal control; and

Whereas we believe that the passage of this bill further invading the rights of the States to govern themselves and solve their own problems would do irreparable damage to the already critical race relations, would widen the breach already brought about by efforts to force a social merger of incompatible elements of society, and would give untold impetus to the strife and turmoil that has torn our Nation asunder; and

Whereas we regard education and an effort to resolve our own problems on a local level as more effective in arriving at a solution than Federal compulsion, and we further deny the need of any action by Congress to further restrain and control local affairs by Federal statute; and

Whereas we regard this issue of such importance that we earnestly call upon the legislatures of other States throughout our Nation to join us in this expression of our will to the President, the National Congress, the Justice Department, and any and all other persons or agencies concerned, and to call upon them to recognize and respect the rights of States to local self-government, and to again turn their energies and efforts to the problems of unifying our Nation and performing the functions of government as defined in our Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mississippi House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That this body does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to defeat the so-called civil rights bill now before that body and to refrain from such infringement upon States rights as would result from the passage of this act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives, to the National Congress, to the press, to the legislatures of other States, and to any other appropriate person or agency.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 14, 1964.

WALTER SILLERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate January 23, 1964.

CARROLL GARTIN,
President of the Senate.

We Lose Ground to Reds From Cuba to Zanzibar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the present Democratic administration came to office on the pledge that it would "restore America's lost prestige and influence." This is one of the many promises it has failed to carry out.

In yesterday's Evening Star, Richard Wilson enumerates what is lacking in our foreign policy and proves beyond a doubt that our prestige is almost nonexistent throughout the world:

FOREIGN NATIONALISM STUMPS UNITED STATES—AMERICA CONTINUES TO LOSE GROUND TO REDS FROM CUBA TO ZANZIBAR

(By Richard Wilson)

U.S. officials, as well as the public, have become so inured to crisis that they have difficulty recognizing the basically adverse trend of world events at this time. There are signs, however, that inside the Johnson administration, as well as outside of it, a grave view is being taken of the present drift.

This is much more than just a drift; in some areas of the world it seems a flowing tide. In southeast Asia there is a rapid deterioration of the Western position, ranging from Vietnam and Cambodia to Indonesia, Burma, and Laos.

Ghana and Zanzibar, in Africa, have moved into the Communist orbit and Algeria and Morocco are edging that way. With Cuba the first Soviet base in the Western Hemisphere, Panama has now broken with the United States and there is increasing Communist-induced trouble in Bolivia, Venezuela, British Guiana and Brazil.

Adverse events are, in fact, shadowing American policy in at least a dozen countries in the world, partly under Soviet Communist pressure and partly under Chinese Communist pressure. It is hard to recall a period when so many pressures were felt in so many different places, and with so little prospect of an adequate American response.

Our inability to respond is in some ways alarming. The old ways are no longer effective. Attorney General Kennedy learned in Indonesia that the existence of American aid or the threat of its termination would have little, if any, effect on President Sukarno's determination to crush the new British-oriented nation of Malaysia.

Many American lives and many hundreds of millions of dollars, as well as the American military genius, have moved the problem in Vietnam no nearer to a foreseeable solution. All the goodwill in the world has helped us little in Ghana. Threatening events in East Africa might as well have been taking place on the moon; in fact, we might have known more about them if they had.

The picture does not look too bad until it is studied as a whole and then it is seen that the Communist position in terms of world politics is far advanced over what it was 4 years ago.

It is much easier to define what is wrong than to supply any kind of remedy. One thing that is wrong is that we have never been able to carry through a policy which identifies our interests with the rising nationalist interests in many countries in the world.

We do not know how to deal with the rising tide of nationalism whether it is in France, Cuba or Panama. Governments rise to power on a wave of hostility to the United States, or soon thereafter develop this hostility either genuinely or as a bargaining position.

This cannot be explained away as merely Communist-induced and a part of the Communist world revolution. The nationalist feeling runs deep and often needs no Communist stimulus, as, for example, in Cuba and Panama. But we never seem to be on the side of the nationalist in time to prevent a prior alinement with the Communists.

This may merely be in the nature of things. We stand for stability while the Communists stand for revolution.

We only know that in the past 4 years the nationalist problem has not gone away but has become more varied and widespread. Every now and then we get a new taste of it: the rioting in Panama, an unexpected coup in Vietnam, a military coup in some Latin American country.

For a time we have quiet on the more exposed frontiers of the world. Then our traffic into Berlin is stopped or a plane is shot down.

Next it may be a renewed Chinese Communist drive into India or Uganda may turn into a one-party Soviet-alined state, or Indonesia may go the way of Cambodia.

We may have a lull in the cold war with Russia, but an objective assessment of events should be convincing to President Johnson that his major problem is to arrest the contracting influence of the United States in world affairs.

The Democratic administration came to office on the pledge that it would restore America's lost prestige and influence. It has not yet done so. We have lost ground since 1960 from Cuba to Zanzibar.

Enforcement in Hotels and Cafes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House now has under consideration the so-called civil rights bill, I think it most appropriate that the views of Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the press of yesterday, be included in the RECORD. The column of Mr. Lawrence follows:

ENFORCEMENT IN HOTELS AND CAFES—MOUNTAIN OF LEGAL HEADACHES EXPECTED IN DEALING WITH PROPOSED RIGHTS LAW

(By David Lawrence)

It looks now as if enactment of a civil rights law prohibiting racial discriminaton in hotels, motels, and eating places may prove to be a boomerang. It could hasten the day when the legislation itself will become a dead letter due to an inability on the part of the Federal Government, even with all its resources, to carry out an effective enforcement operation.

Under existing constitutional law, there is no sanction for the legislation. But the hope of its sponsors is that the Supreme Court will reverse all earlier decisions and bow to the advocates of integration.

Attempts to enforce even constitutional laws sometimes have resulted in bitter feeling, rather than an amiable adjustment of differences. The Nation's experience with the liquor prohibition laws is a case in point. In fact, after a dozen years of frustration over the problem of enforcement, another amendment to the Constitution turned this whole issue back to the States.

Already the effort to desegregate public schools is backfiring. The boycotts and disturbances in the North are more numerous than in the South, and are often characterized by violence. A New York City newspaper reported the other day that the Negro boycott of the public schools there "was in disregard for the law," and that it did more "to alienate black and white, and alienate them when they are young so they can carry it with them forever, than anything that has happened in this city in 25 years."

Some progress toward adjustment of racial disputes has been made in various parts of the country, but this may be adversely affected when the public accommodations rules become known to the public and when the problem of enforcement is more widely discussed than it is today. One businessman writes of this prospect as follows:

"Many large hotels and restaurants are now integrated, but reserve the right not to serve guests for dozens of reasons: Women in shorts or beachwear, men without jacket or tie, men or women who are loud, disorderly, or drunk, etc. Under Federal law, how could such a dining room refuse to serve a drunken Negro and not be subject to litigation? Aside from the trouble and expense of going into court, how could the hotel prove the Negro's rejection was due to disorderly conduct or excessive drinking if the plaintiff claims discriminaton?"

Motels often do not rent to travelers with local license tags on their cars, or without luggage, or if they are in any way suspicious. This will provide excuses for discrimination. Undoubtedly word will get around in various communities that certain hotels, motels, and eating places actually do discriminate racially, and only white persons will be welcome. Nobody will advertise such a fact, but it will be spread by word of mouth.

The problem often is really not one involving any antiracial feeling on the part of the motel owner himself, but he discovers frequently that he can get more business by discrimination than by nondiscrimination.

The public accommodations law has been urged as a way to overcome these defects, but the prohibition experience argues the other way—that the businesses which comply with the law may find themselves at a disadvantage while their competitors use subterfuges to deny their facilities to those they do not choose to serve.

In the prohibition era, moreover, it took a vast army of Federal agents and large legal staffs to carry out an enforcement program involving customer relations. But bootlegging flourished and speakeasies were established to sell liquor in defiance of the law and the Constitution. Some persons were jailed, but a far greater number defied the law.

The big debate on the public accommodations section will come in the Senate, but all indications now are that the legislation will be enacted into law before summer. This means that the enforcement problem will be before the country soon thereafter, and a large number of lawsuits may be expected.

Meanwhile, the school-integration problem is reaching its most acute stage because neighborhood schools will no longer be protected from invasion by those who live outside the neighborhood. Efforts now are being made to produce a racial balance by transporting students from all parts of a city or county in order to integrate a larger and larger number of Negroes with whites.

This is encouraging enrollments in private schools. In some northern areas there is bitterness among white citizens who cannot afford to send their children to private schools and who resent the enforcement of integration.

Theoretically, the Supreme Court never ordered integration as such, but merely declared that segregation in public education is not constitutional. There has been no high court decision on whether, under the Constitution, the States can retain their right to require children living in a certain neighborhood to attend schools in the districts geographically prescribed.

Muzzling Our Panama Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, shocking though it is that we still have a vacancy in our Ambassadorship to Panama since last August, it is unbelievable that the former Ambassador, the Honorable Joseph S. Farland, was completely neglected by Secretary of State Rusk and the other do-gooders in the State Department upon his return from Panama.

Henry J. Taylor, in the Palm Beach Sun-Sentinel of February 3, graphically portrays this deliberate snub of someone who might have helped forestall our present crisis:

OUR EXPERT ON PANAMA WAS MUZZLED

(By Henry J. Taylor)

What really happened to Ambassador to Panama Joseph S. Farland should explain much about what confronts President Johnson.

Farland is an ex-FBI agent, counterintelligence expert, chief of mission for three and a half years in Panama, acclaimed as one of the most successfull ambassadors we have ever had in Latin America.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the House Foreign Affairs Committee January 15 he was taken by surprise by events in Panama.

The committee asked whether his Department had fully consulted the Ambassador. "Oh, yes, Mr. Farland has been completely debriefed," Rusk testified.

Farland has stated publicly he was asked nothing.

He said Rusk apparently relied on a subordinate, Lansing Collins, who reported to him after engaging Farland in "a short, and largely irrelevant conversation," that is all.

"When I arrived home in August," Farland said, "and the State Department circulated its customary notice to appropriate agencies listing returned ambassadors available for consultation, a man in the White House went to work.

"His name is Dalph Dunley. On whose authority he acted I do not know. But Dunley telephoned the various agencies, including the Pentagon, that I was not to be invited for consultation."

He stated also, "when I went to Washington for consultation in the late fall of 1962, Edwin Martin, the then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, stepped in.

" 'We here in the State Department will ordinate Lansing Collins, who reported to take care of any discussions about Panama with the CIA ourselves. Further, you are not to have discussions with Members of Congress on the Hill,' Martin directed."

Farland met President Kennedy at San Salvador last March.

"President Kennedy did not know about Martin's directive," Farland continued, "and in Martin's presence he crossed up Martin on the congressional angle.

"The President told me to see inquiring congressional leaders on my next trip home. I had nothing but courtesy, understanding, and so far as I know, approval from President Kennedy personally and directly."

Farland described the CIA as "underzealous in knowing what was happening in Panama and overzealous in building a CIA empire in the zone."

"The station Chief had exposed himself as a prominent figure in the high social world," Farland stated. "They simply did not know what was going on. I spelled this out repeatedly to both the State Department and CIA's Washington headquarters in terms of Isthmus and American security. Neither acted. It took me nearly a year to get the station Chief removed."

The Positive Approach for Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a favorite trick of the radical-liberals is to advocate all sorts of projects that strike at the very root of our freedoms and then charge those who oppose such attacks on liberty as being negative.

It is time for conservatives to point out that the positive approach to the issues of our time is to preserve this Re-

public, the capitalist system, and to protect our sovereignty. If we are for cotton, we are against the boll weevil.

"The positive emphasis" is a well-expressed statement by Bob White on the radio program "Life Line."

I include the statement as a part of these remarks:

THE POSITIVE EMPHASIS

This is "Life Line," Bob White from Washington.

It is an old error and sad distortion to say that to be for freedom is to be against almost everything. Especially in times of public concern and alarm, and even more on the occasion of national tragedy, the advocates of freedom are reproached as "anti's" and pessimists, and even accused of being moved by nothing better than petty and personal dislike of those in power.

American constructives have proved over and over again that this familiar charge is groundless. Nevertheless, it continues to be heard, not because the disproof fails to convince but because there seem to be some people who so much want to believe it. However, it has in the past been true that some patriots have dwelt overlong on criticism of those whose policies endanger freedom, to the point of leaving some good Americans unsure of what can be done in a practical way to avert such dangers.

In the months and years ahead, a positive emphasis is especially vital to the cause of individual freedom in America. Constructives must put their minds to work in deciding just what steps can and should be taken to limit Government and expand liberty in our country. They should say less about who is mistaken and more about what is mistaken. They may leave the hunting of actual Communists to the law and encourage law obedience. And they should learn how to teach every American who will listen just what increased personal liberty will mean, in happiness and hope, to him personally.

First of all, now, let's go over once again, in brief, the reasons why to be for freedom is a positive and constructive thing. Freedom is the highest social value we know. It both protects and encourages every person in doing the very best he can with what he has. It gives to all an equal opportunity and an equal dignity of the spirit. It safeguards for all the fruits of honest labor, skilled management, and creative achievement. Freedom is our highest social value, but it is more than that; it is the vital prerequisite, the necessary requirement for attaining any higher value, personal or religious.

Then why is it still so often said that to be for freedom is to be against everything? Because the lover of freedom must and does resist with all his might every plan and program designed to take freedom away for any purpose other than its own protection. It is the tragedy of our time that for many years most of the bold new programs proposed have been programs to limit freedom, often drastically, for the sake of imagined economic advantage to one group or another. But this is a tragedy that need not continue. Friends of freedom can put an end to it, not only by continuing to defend liberty, but even more by introducing bold new programs of their own for extending liberty.

This is what America ought to be doing. This is the essence of our country and of American destiny; the continuing growth of freedom and opportunity. As a nation, we have never been content and we never will be content to stand still or fall behind. That is why even those who actually and sincerely oppose any further extensions of freedom, and would prefer to restrict it, must present their ideas in the guise of progress when, in truth, they are no more than a turning back to the darkest days of ancient tyranny.

An important part of any program for action on behalf of freedom certainly is the exposure of the antifreedom nature of many policies and programs carried on by government today. But too much stress on this can help to hide the goal for which the advocate of freedom truly contends. It is not enuogh just to defeat or reverse these policies and programs, however pernicious and actually dangerous some of them may be. In the long run they must be replaced by policies and programs clearly working in favor of freedom.

Just to take one example of what we mean, there has been a great effort for years by the believers in big government to get it into public education by means of massive tax money subsidies to schools. So far this effort has succeeded only in the area of building construction and certain scholarship programs; with regard to teachers' salaries and other regular running expenses of the schools, it has failed. The Federal Government has been kept out and the local community still controls its own schools. This last has been a sort of negative victory. Friends of freedom, knowing that Federal payment of a school's regular expenses means Federal control of that school, have resisted the Federal aid to education plans with all their might, so that the most ambitious of them have been defeated. Constructives have been against something they certainly ought to be against, for freedom's sake.

And yet, to prove and justify their name, constructives ought, at the same time, to seek out positive ways of encouraging education in freedom, with a higher degree of local responsibility. Some proposals to this end have been made, but have received very little attention. It is suggested that income tax deductions or special tax credits be allowed for personal and parental expenses for higher education. This would be, in essence, a program for leaving more money in private hands—provided it was spent on education—instead of channeling that same money all through the enormous Federal Establishment and finally sending part of it back here and there as Federal support of education. In this way, education would be aided, which is what both sides want, but it would be done in freedom, through personal initiative, and not through the vast and cumbersome machinery of the Federal Government.

This is just one example. In every field of discussion and debate bearing upon freedom and big government, American constructives should be working out their own plans; plans for encouraging our citizens to make the best and fullest use of their rightful freedom as well as resisting every plan aimed at putting the Federal Government in control of their personal and local affairs.

It is one of the oldest rules of argumentation at every level, from two boys yelling at each other on a playground to a panel discussion of faculty members at a large university, that resorting to personal attack on your opponent is confessing to defeat on the issues of the argument. Trading insults is often, unfortunately, more exciting than trading thoughts; but it is not a healthy kind of excitement. And it is sure to cover up the fact that one side or the other has a sound and solid case which not all the yelling or hissing in the world can shake.

That is why the advocates of freedom, above all, should avoid the tactics of personal abuse and insults, of questioning the motives and sincerity of their opponents. The case for freedom is sound; what is more, it is indestructible. It cannot be answered or defeated in open debate unless one of two things happens: either the freedom side does not know its own strength and has not thought the issues through from the freedom point of view, or the opposition cleverly avoids the issues and ignores the case for freedom by the old devices of setting up strawmen and knocking them down, or appealing to emotion and thoughtlessness.

Though some friends of freedom have been led astray by their own emotions, and have resorted to attacks on the character and sincerity of their opponents, actually it is far more often that the spokesmen for big government use these very tactics on American constructives. Often they do so to such an extent that reasonable argument with them is impossible. But the answer to this is not to go into an even bigger rage of our own. It is to point out, clearly and impressively, just what tactics are being used and why. It is to show how loose talk about the radical right and extremism is being used to hide the fact that the statists have no answer to the positive points being raised by those who speak for freedom.

Some of the most striking victories won by constructives have been won because they kept their heads while their opponents lost theirs and therefore could show to every unbiased observer who truly had the confidence and courage of his convictions. Some of the saddest defeats suffered by constructives have come about because a misguided few, claiming to speak in their name, have themselves lost their heads and made wild charges which could not be proved.

It cannot be said too often that no friend of freedom needs to resort to the implication or the outright charge that his opponent in deabte is a Communist (or sympathetic to communism) in order to prove him wrong. Whether that opponent is sincere in his devotion to big government as an ideal, or merely looks upon it as a road to personal power, has not the slightest effect on the validity of the ideas and arguments he is using. And if truth be told, probably there is a little of each motive—a bit of sincere ideology, a bit of power-hunger—in the average collectivist. But his motives are not the issue. His ideas and policies are. Just as the road to infamy is so often paved with good intentions, so the road to communism may be paved (and has been in a number of countries) with the sincere but mistaken ideas of many who would be horrified to know what lies at the end of the trail they have taken.

It is, or ought to be, enough to say of collectivism and big government that they destroy freedom. Why, and to what purpose they destroy freedom surely would not matter to us once they had taken freedom away from us. The central issue is freedom itself. Do we want more of it, or less? And if we want more of it, how can we get it? These are the questions American constructives must prepare themselves to answer. Their great, positive contribution to history will come and must come in the programs they develop to give freedom back to the people, and to bring the freest of all countries—America—to new triumphs of achievements which no government planner could ever hope to imagine.

Until we meet again, remember: Freedom brings joy, and without freedom there is no joy. Ask the man who has walked the streets of East and then West Berlin.

Your station has aired a freedom program. When you hear a patriotic program, commend the sponsor and the station airing it.

This is Life Line, Bob White, from Washington.

Our Misunderstanding With De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that the United States should be

on the outs with France—always our ally and the country that did more than any other to back up our struggling Republic.

In yesterday's Washington News, Alice Widener tells us that we can better understand De Gaulle if we get the truth. She also tells us that, shockingly enough, the press misrepresented the actual happenings at the De Gaulle conference. Her column follows:

HE IS NOT OUR FOE—MISUNDERSTANDING WITH DE GAULLE IS TRAGIC

(By Alice Widener)

PARIS, FRANCE.—For better international accord, it seems important for us Americans to try to understand Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who is a living example of the Biblical saying that as a man thinks, so is he.

When he speaks for an hour and a half—as he did to almost a thousand of the world's leading journalists at the Elysee Palace on January 31—his words are his own and only his own; the product of his calm reflection. They describe governmental policies and decisions taken mostly at his own initiative.

Having been there myself, it was astonishing to read the accounts of his press conference in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune and in the international edition of the New York Times.

The Tribune report omitted any mention of the fact that General de Gaulle stressed emphatically his new view that France's establishment of diplomatic relations with Red China did not signify "any sort of approval for the regime which now dominates (Red) China."

The Times reported that De Gaulle took a dim view of our American Constitution, but did not say that the general clearly explained the great difference between our vast country and his own, stressing the fact that we have a Federal system with a great many rights reserved to the 50 States. In seeking to explain why our American constitutional system would not be a desirable one now for France, the general did not in the least attack our form of government.

As far as foreign affairs are concerned, it seemed plain to me that General de Gaulle is striving desperately to spare the West from the dire consequences of terrible mistakes made during 1943–51—from the catastrophe of Yalta (which he thoroughly disapproved) to the defeat in Korea, which vitually consigned Asia to the fate of becoming prey to Red China.

Douglas MacArthur warned in 1951 that we would pay for our mistakes in Korea "for a thousand years." Today, as Charles de Gaulle sees it, he is trying to prevent the price paid from being that of the destruction of Western civilization.

At his press conference, De Gaulle, alluded tactfully to the 20-year old fixed bipartisan foreign policy of our country, a policy which has so endangered the West as to bring it to the brink of ruination. And it must be admitted that a major part of our fixed foreign policy of appeasement was to force decolonialization for Western Europe while acceding to colonialization for the Soviet Union.

ENTENTE

In addition, De Gaulle is today faced with the necessity of striving to build an effective counterforce to an American-Soviet entente created by the late President John F. Kennedy in secret agreement with Nikita Khrushchev. The evil consequences of this entente are incalculable.

There is no doubt that every nation in Western Europe is frantically seeking to devise a means of reaching some kind of modus vivendi with the U.S.-U.S.S.R. entente permitting a degree of independence and also a means of surviving the entente. We are going to see an extraordinary series of arrangements in which France's recognition to Red China is only one and perhaps not even a major one.

A first step in our recouping the loss of confidence by Europeans is to try to grasp the fact that Charles de Gaulle is as he thinks. His every word reveals that he thinks in the manner of a Western Christian devoted heart, soul and mind to our civilization and that he acts according to the lights of his intellectual resolve to try to save it.

He is not a foe of ours or of the British; for such hostility he would have to turn against himself and all he stands for.

UNNECESSARY

Our misunderstanding with De Gaulle is tragic and unnecessary and must be corrected. It can be.

For such correction our State Department must face the fact that there is not a nation on the face of the globe willing to surrender an iota of its sovereignty except the United States; there is not a nation willing to defame its military men except our own; there is not a nation willing to despoil itself economically for others except our own.

Is every nation out of step but us? If this is the opinion of our State Department, then it is safe to predict that the United States of America will become wholly isolated in world affairs.

Profile of Mrs. Esther Peterson by James Deakin of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, consumer groups throughout the Nation have been heartened beyond measure by the appointment of Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson as Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. There are many Government agencies and thousands of Government employees working on issues of great importance to consumers, but often—by the nature of their assignments—they must work at cross purposes with each other or from opposing viewpoints of what constitutes the national interest. The individual consumer has not had any one top official spokesman within the executice department except the President himself, and Presidents have many other heavy burdens and responsibilities other than looking out for the individual consumer.

COOPERATION WITH CONSUMER AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

The appointment by President Johnson of Mrs. Peterson as a member of his White House staff, directly responsible to him for coordinating all of the consumer activities of the Government, and for advising him of consumer aspects of governmental policy, gives the consumer a powerful voice at the highest level of the administration. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I have been delighted with the cooperation Mrs. Peterson has already provided us in our efforts to represent the consumer interest in Government, and I look forward to a new era in consumer interests and consumer affairs as a result of her energetic and conscientious devotion to the huge task of making Government serve the consumer more effectively.

Many fine tributes have appeared in the press to Esther Peterson's ability and her accomplishments as the highest ranking woman in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. I think one of the best was written by a distinguished Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, James Deakin. It is particularly relevant now in connection with the proposals made to Congress this week by President Johnson in his consumer message.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article referred to from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, January 19, 1964, as follows:

SHE'S GOING TO BAT FOR CONSUMERS—NEWLY APPOINTED AID TO PRESIDENT ALREADY HOLDS THREE GOVERNMENT JOBS AND IS ALSO BUSY HOUSEWIFE

(By James Deakin)

Like millions of other American women, Mrs. Esther Peterson of suburban Arlington, Va., does the grocery shopping for her family. At the supermarket the other day, another housewife complained to her about the packaging of the meat.

"Why do they put it in these cardboard trays so you can't see the bottom of the steak?" she wanted to know. "You can't tell whether the bottom part of the meat is as good as the part that shows. Why don't they wrap it so that you can see the whole thing?"

Mrs. Peterson believes that the housewife deserves an answer to her question. As President Lyndon B. Johnson's newly appointed special assistant for consumer affairs, she has been assigned the task of giving the American consumer a "bill of rights"—the right to safety, the right to choose, the right to be heard in the councils of Government and the right to be informed.

"Everybody has a right to know what he is buying," she said in an interview. "If the package says a pound, there should be a pound inside. And a shopper shouldn't have to take a slide rule to the store to know what he is buying."

When Mr. Johnson decided to appoint a consumer voice in the White House, he gave the job to the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor Standards, the Director of the Women's Bureau and the executive secretary of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women. Mrs. Peterson, by common agreement the busiest woman in government, already held all these posts.

In announcing the appointment of Mrs. Peterson, who is believed to be the first woman ever to serve as a special Presidential assistant, Mr. Johnson established a new Presidential Committee on Consumer Interests, with Mrs. Peterson as its chairman.

She will continue in her present job, maintaining an office at the Labor Department as well as the White House. Although she rarely covers her blond hair, Mrs. Peterson will be wearing five governmental hats.

The new Presidential Committee will be composed of representatives of the Departments of Justice, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Federal Trade Commission and the

President's Council of Economic Advisers together with other Government officials designated by the President, and private citizens especially qualified to represent consumer interests.

The citizen-members of the Committee will be the existing Consumer Advisory Council, which will continue to function but as a part of the new committee. The Council was set up in July 1962 by the late President John F. Kennedy as an advisory arm of the Council of Economic Advisers.

In his 1960 campaign, Mr. Kennedy promised that if elected he would appoint a consumers' representative in the White House. Instead of doing this, however, he established the Consumer Advisory Council, a move that caused considerable dissatisfaction among consumer organizations which had hoped for a direct spokesman in the White House.

The appointment of Mrs. Peterson means that the 1960 pledge has been fulfilled by Mr. Johnson. For the first time, American consumers will have a top-level representative in the executive branch, with White House status and the access to national news media that this carries.

Based on Mrs. Peterson's past performance, there is little doubt that she will make full and effective use of the prestige of her new office to safeguard the interests of consumers, whom Mr. Kennedy once termed "the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized and whose views are not often heard."

The pluralistic nature of the American economy, Mrs. Peterson believes, means that almost everyone belongs to a definable group—a labor union, a professional association or a business enterprise—and can easily recognize his interests as a member of that group. What is more difficult to recognize, she said, is "the mutuality of interest that we all have as consumers."

Her aims will be to encourage increased awareness of this mutuality of interest, to inform the public about Federal activities in the field of consumer protection and to stimulate interest in legislation affecting the buying public.

Consumers, she told the Post-Dispatch, "have more protection than they realize. Almost 20,000 people in the Federal Government are employed in one activity or another that bears on protecting the consumer."

A 1961 report by the House Government Operations Committee listed 33 Federal departments and agencies that have programs affecting consumer interests or protecting the general public.

To focus attention on consumer problems, Mrs. Peterson is considering calling a series of regional conferences to which women's clubs, service organizations, and other interested groups would be invited.

In addition to offering a forum for discussion on consumer matters, the conferences would give officials of agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, and others an opportunity to describe their work in the consumer field.

Mrs. Peterson is also weighing the possibility of adding courses on sound purchasing practices, new products and other consumer information to the curriculum of adult education programs, and she hopes to encourage consumers to testify before congressional committees.

"Too often, most of the testimony on consumer bills is presented by economists and other professionals," she said. She would like to bring housewives to Washington to tell the legislators about the day-to-day problems of feeding and clothing a family in an assembly-line age of complicated credit plans, fancy packaging and confusing "economy size" and "giant economy size" labeling.

In its first report last October, the Consumer Advisory Council indorsed the truth-in-packaging bill sponsored by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, and the truth-in-lending measure sponsored by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois. The new Presidential Committee headed by Mrs. Peterson is expected to repeat these indorsements.

The truth-in-packaging bill would require the net weight of the contents to be printed prominently on the front of packages, would make it easy for the buyer to figure the price per ounce, would cut down "slack fill" in which part of the price goes for air and would eliminate designations such as "economy size."

The truth-in-lending bill, which is being fought by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers Association, retail merchants groups and automobile dealers associations, would require lenders to state the total dollar amount of credit charges and the true annual interest rate based on the unpaid balance.

In its report, the Consumer Advisory Council expressed strong opposition to another pending measure, the so-called quality stabilization bill, which would make it a Federal offense for retailers to sell branded and trademarked merchandise at prices lower than those set by manufacturers.

It has been estimated that enactment of this legislation would add as much as $10 billion a year to the cost of consumer products. Mrs. Peterson is personally opposed to this bill, but she declined to predict what stand the new Presidential Committee will take on the measure.

To her new job, Mrs. Peterson brings years of legislative experience and tremendous vitality that has made her name a byword in Washington as a doer. As a consumer spokesman, she has the added advantage of having reared four children, the youngest of whom is in high school.

A native of Provo, Utah, she is of Danish descent. Her grandparents were Danish immigrants. After graduating from Brigham Young University in Provo, she obtained a master of arts degree in physical education at Columbia University in New York in 1930.

From 1930, to 1936, she taught at the Winsor School, a girls' school in Boston, and in this period she became interested in social and labor problems as a volunteer teacher in the industrial department of the Young Women's Christian Association.

"In Boston, I came face to face for the first time with strikes and strikers," she recalled a few years ago. "These girls were receiving $1.32 for every dozen dresses they turned out, and the work involved the sewing on of a square pocket. When they were suddenly ordered to make the pocket heart shaped, the girls demanded more money. It took more time to sew on a heart than a square, and they were paid by the piece. It was called the heartbreak strike, and I've never forgotten it."

In 1939, Jacob Potofsky, then secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, offered her the job of assistant director of education for the union. From 1945 to 1948 she was the union's legislative representative in Washington.

From 1948 to 1957, she was in Stockholm and then Brussels, where her husband, Oliver A. Peterson, a State Department official, was stationed. She kept in close touch with developments in trade unionism in Europe and helped organize the first international school for working women. The school was concerned with developing standards for the employment of women.

In 1958, the family returned to the United States and Mrs. Peterson became a legislative representative, or lobbyist, for the AFL-CIO industrial union department, a post she held until January 1961, when President Kennedy appointed her Director of the Women's Bureau. Two months later she was promoted to Assistant Secretary of Labor, becoming the highest ranking woman in the administration.

Frank J. Johnson Speaks to the National American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 Frank J. Johnson, editor of the Washington Report of the American Security Council, delivered an exceedingly thoughtful and penetrating address to the American Legion Auxiliary's National Security Committee assembled in Washington, D.C. The speech follows:

THE MEANING OF PEACE

A couple of weeks ago I had an opportunity to go over to the National Press Club to listen to the assessment of the world scene which is presented there each year by a number of NBC news correspondents. Each of them gave a short report and evaluation on his or her area of interest. Two of these reports, one following the other, serve as the theme of my remarks today and illustrate the main point which I want to make about the current world situation.

One reporter, reflecting perhaps the peculiar environment of the United Nations, rejoiced at the great change in the world which, she believes, has followed the Cuban missile confrontation. Khrushchev decided, in her opinion, to forget all about war after that terrifying experience and to limit competition with the West from now on to the purely peaceful plane of ideas, in which books and not bullets would be decisive. There was every reason to believe that we would win this competition, she went on, if only we would summon the will to do what was necessary in terms of increased aid to the underdeveloped nations.

The man who followed her happened to be stationed in southeast Asia. As he approached the podium, he remarked, "Well, she has just invalidated everything I am going to say." And then he related, grimly, the bitter truth of how the war in South Vietnam—the war being fought very much with bullets—is going steadily against us, and of how the Western position in that vital part of the world has been steadily crumbling—and at a much accelerated rate during the past 2 or 3 months. We will lose that area, he concluded, unless there is a drastic change in American policy.

These two analyses starkly symbolize the supreme and tragic irony—for the West—of the present time. At the very moment when the talk of peace and peaceful coexistence is at an alltime high, and when everyone is relaxing and talking about an end to the cold war, at this very moment the tide of history is perhaps running more strongly against the West and its system of values than at any period since the cold war began. Panama and Zanzibar are perhaps additional surface manifestations of this trend, but it runs much more deeply than that. It stems from the growing awareness of the world's leaders that the left-leaning neutral "has it made" while the ally of the United States must tread a dangerous path; it proceeds from the simple fact that Castro Cuba has

survived 4 years of American hostility virtually unscathed and the wonderment of the world's uncommitted peoples at this phenomenon; it is due above all, I submit, to the fact that while the United States is quite able to handle any all-out Communist military threat, it is utterly unable to wage the cold war successfully under the rules of peace which we are allowing our enemies to prescribe for us. And this, in turn, results partly from our failure to understand clearly what this peace we are all talking about really means.

Let me return for a moment to our U.N. correspondent. She is right in a sense about the Cuban missile confrontation. I suspect that we are going to have quite a few years ahead of us which will be free of any major power confrontations with the Soviet Union. The missile crisis, we may conclude in retrospect, did represent at least a temporary climax to one period of Soviet policy and the beginning of another. It marked the failure of the Soviet effort to redress an unfavorable quantitative balance of strategic striking power by an end-run operation. Consequently, it marked the end of the period of diplomacy by nuclear blackmail, because we showed that we cannot really be blackmailed any longer.

Not only are the Soviets actually inferior to us in military power—which they have always been—but the West, thanks to the reconaissance satellite, knows that Russia is inferior, and Russia knows that we know she is inferior. This is why there never was any actual danger of general war over Cuba. The only real choice open to the Soviet Union was whether to bluff it out and see whether the United States would actually strike at Cuba or adopt the much more purdent course of trying to avert total defeat by withdrawing the missiles. They wisely chose to do the latter and thereby saved their Cuban position.

The lady's point, however, is that it was only after the confrontation that the Soviets made the fundamental decision for peace, which leads her to conclude that everything has now changed, that the relaxation of tension during the past year is a reflection of a changed Soviet attitude, and that as far as the cold war is concerned, we are just about out of the woods.

In this she could not be more mistaken. This misconception is a commonly held one today, and it stems partly as I say, from the fact that peace is understood differently by Communists and non-Communists.

Most serious students of communism understand this difference. Unfortunately, most of the leaders of the West—who must defend Western civilization against the total assault of international communism—are not life long students of that threat. They think and speak of peace in the traditional Western definition, which is the absence of armed conflict or the lack of serious danger of armed conflict. When applied to the Communists, this definition leads to the belief that relaxation of tension, improvement in the atmosphere and the settlement of specific disputes are all steps toward an end to the cold war which is generally thought to mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. Because we have allegedly made progress in some of these areas during the past year, some Western leaders and most opinionmakers, it seems, are holding out the serious prospect that the cold war is about to end and that peace, so defined, is a real prospect.

But to the Communists, all of this is a definition not of peace but of peaceful coexistence, and Marxism-Leninism makes a very sharp distinction between these two terms. We do not, and that is where the problem comes in.

Very simply, peaceful coexistence refers strictly to peaceful relations between states with different social systems and that is all. It allows for the very important exceptions of civil wars and wars of liberation, and it specifically recognizes as legitimate any and all forms of internal subversion and, if necessary, violent revolution aimed at replacing capitalist governments with socialist ones. While piously denying any intent to export revolution—a denial made meaningless on its face by the periodic international conclaves of Communist revolutionaries in Moscow—peaceful coexistence expressly denies the right of the West to export counterrevolution, that is, the Communists shall be free to undermine us, politically, from within, but we are not to stick our "pig's snout" into the socialist garden.

All peaceful coexistence really does, then, is reflect the practical acknowledgement by the Soviet Union that the nuclear facts of life preclude, for the time being, the employment of formal international war as a deliberate instrument of policy in the advancement of communism. The Chinese Communists appear to challenge this requirement for caution, but this may be more in the nature of an excuse rather than the real reason for the Sino-Soviet dispute. In any case, the Chinese in practice have been abiding by its terms. They are taking over southeast Asia and worming their way into Africa precisely under those terms.

Now the important point here is that there is absolutely nothing new in any of this. It predates the Cuban missile crisis by many years. It has been the official Soviet line since at least the 20th Communist Party Congress in 1956. All the Soviets have ever wanted from us and want today is simply that we abide more completely by its terms. That is what nuclear blackmail is all about. The Soviets have never had the slightest thought of war over any of the recent world crisis spots and will not consider war in the future unless or until they have first altered the military balance decisively in their favor. But by rocket rattling, from time to time, they have sought to frighten us into accepting the terms of peaceful coexistence, that is, to renounce the use of force of any kind in opposing Communist revolutions, to abandon our foreign bases and military commitments, to acknowledge Communist conquests as permanent, and for good measure, to even help the Communist world to promote our destruction by aiding it and trading with it. Do all these things, say the Communists and the cold war will end immediately.

This is the practical meaning of peaceful coexistence to the Soviets. But there is a second, and real level on which all Marxist-Leninists—including the Chinese—speak of and define peace. Real, permanent peace, they say, can never reign until peaceful coexistence has brought about its logical and inevitable denouement, until the competition of social systems has brought about the eradication of the last vestiges of imperialism from the face of the earth. And by "imperialism" they really mean the whole of the intellectual, cultural, political, economic, moral, and spiritual structure known as Western Civilization. Imperialism, they say, is by definition, a threat to peace. The fight for peace is the fight for the worldwide victory of communism. The world millenium and lasting peace can never come until imperialism is no more and communism rules supreme.

This is no mere semantic quibbling; the Communist world is deadly serious in its distinction between peaceful coexistence and peace. The proof is their constant reiteration of the theme that there cannot ever be coexistence of ideologies. And if we want a more concrete illustration, it is provided by Khrushchev's New Year's Day proclamation that his only difference with Peiping was over how to bury capitalism. He followed this a couple of days later by proposing, in effect, a worldwide nonaggression pact which would outlaw every employment of armed force except civil wars and wars of liberation waged by Communists against non-Communists. Under its terms the North Vietnamese, North Korean, Laotian, or Chinese Communists might be free to use force against South Vietnam, South Korea, Taiwan, or Laos; the East Germans might be free to enforce their "right" to blockade West Berlin; or Fidel Castro might go on giving clandestine support to Latin American Communists, as in Venezuela or Panama. But the United States would be legally prohibited from aiding the victim or of forcibly interfering anywhere with an established Communist government.

Today the Communist powers suffer from great internal weaknesses, but never has their external influence or success seemed greater. It is they, not we, who need and are profiting from peaceful coexistence. Khrushchev is in no position, after Cuba, to compel peaceful coexistence by threats. He must, rather, play upon the deep yearnings of the Western peoples for a step back from the imaginary nuclear precipice. And he must capitalize on the tendency of Western leaders to mistake peaceful coexistence for the real thing and to pass on this misunderstanding to their peoples. Our blindness to the realities of the world is the shocking measure of his success.

If the Cuban confrontation was a defeat for communism, and it was to a limited extent, then the ability of the Soviets to transform that defeat into a new image for international communism, to shift gears somewhat, and to then go on to pull the wool over the eyes of the West once more, must have almost no parallel in the annals of human credulity.

If the West is now to launch its own peace offensive, then the leaders of the West, and President Johnson in particular, owe it to their fellow citizens to explain just what kind of peace they have in mind. If they are determined that the lessons of the Bay of Pigs shall not be that we failed to give enough support to the Cuban freedom fighters, but rather that we should never have helped them at all; if they are determined that the lesson of the Cuban missiles is that we must never risk such a confrontation again; if they believe that we can avoid being buried by communism without any corresponding determination to bury it; and if, in short, they are now determined to go all out to reach an accommodation with communism, then it seems to me, they must be prepared to answer these ultimate questions:

1. Do they understand the Communist definition of true peace? Do they believe that we can really live in permanent genuine peace with international communism and still preserve the essential characteristics and values of Western civilization?

2. If they do, and if change by the Communists is their reason for believing so, then they should tell us exactly what change they expect. Aside from periodic shifts in tactics, do they expect a fundamental change in the core of Communist philosophy, world outlook, and purpose? Do they expect Khrushchev or his successors to fundamentally change their determination to "bury" us?

3. If this is really what they expect—and there is much evidence now that this is the underlying philosophy behind our foreign policy—then they owe us a much better explanation of why they expect it. Are they really convinced that Western policy toward communism is so wise and successful that the Communists will be permanently frustrated in efforts to absorb additional territories or make additional political inroads in non-Communist countries?

The facts utterly contradict any such comfortable assumption. Washington may find it politically expedient to pretend that Castro's influence is waning in Latin America, that Zanzibar has not really gone Commu-

nist, that Sukarno can be diverted from his aggressive intent by a chat with Robert Kennedy, or that southeast Asia generally is not being lost, but it will take more than optimistic propaganda to stop the precipitate decline of the Western position throughout the world. And until the Communist tide has somewhere been decisively met, stopped and thrown back, it is idle to think that the Communist purpose will change. Why should it? Communism is still winning.

The cold war cannot be won, or ended, and the true peace of international harmony cannot be achieved, under the Communist rules of peaceful coexistence. These rules must be changed if we are to avoid the ultimate defeat of the West and the worldwide victory for the peace of communism.

Statement on Conference Report, S. 298, Adopted Today, February 8, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is good legislation. It was reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The small business investment companies program is one of the best ever adopted by the Congress in the economic field. Money that would not have been available to small businesses came within their reach. It is a wonderful program—a gesture of faith in the ability of small business to serve this Nation.

Basically, the bill facilitates investment in small business investment companies and in investment by small business investment companies.

First of all, it raises the limit on the amount of debentures of small business investment companies that may be purchased by the Small Business Administration from $400,000 to $700,000, and permits such purchase for a period of 5 years after the date of enactment.

Secondly, it eliminates the dollar limit of small business investment companies investment in a single concern, but it retains a limitation that not more than 20 percent of assets would be reflected in a loan to any single company.

Thirdly, it permits small business to invest idle funds in insured savings and loan associations up to the amount of insurance.

Finally, it gives SBA specific authority to participate with banks and other lending institutions to make loans to small business investment companies.

HAS ALREADY PASSED SENATE

This bill will make it possible to continue this program of assistance to small business. Present funds are all tied up in prior investments. As a result, if the program is to continue, we must have this additional authorization. It is a bill that has been gone over carefully. It has passed the House without opposition. It has passed the Senate. And the two houses have come to an agreement in conference.

I urge immediate enactment of this bill, S. 298.

L.B.J.: Everything to Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that more and more Americans are catching on to the political duplicity of our President. In its editorial of February 3, the Lynchburg (Va.) News remarks about President Johnson's adeptness at it:

A REMARKABLE FEAT

The more we observe of him, the more we are impressed by President Johnson's political agility. With no visible effort, he can be for and agin' an issue at the same time—and appear to be consistent in the process.

Mr. Johnson gave a masterful demonstration of this agility during the 1960 elections when he ran for Vice President and Senator from Texas on two diametrically opposed platforms.

Congressman STEPHEN B. DEROUNIAN, the Republican who represents New York's Third District, recently called attention to this remarkable feat. He noted that in 1960, Mr. Johnson ran for Vice President on the Democratic national platform adopted in Los Angeles and for Senator from Texas on the platform adopted by the Democrtaic Party in Texas.

Then Mr. DEROUNIAN inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this comparison between those platforms:

The national platform endorsed further centralization of power in the Federal Government. The Texas platform denounced "Federal encroachment" and deplored the "growing and menacing concentration of power in the Central Government."

The national platform favored sit-in demonstrations. The Texas platform called for enforcement of laws designed to protect private property from physical occupation.

The national platform promised to close such tax loopholes as "depletion allowances." The Texas platform called for retention of the "present oil and gas depletion allowances."

The national platform supported Federal aid to education. The Texas platform opposed "the entry of the Federal Government in the general field of public education."

The national platform favored school desegregation. The Texas platform pledged "to protect the decisions of the people of local school districts in the operation and control of their schools."

The national platform favored a system of medical care for the aged as part of the social security system. The Texas platform deplored "socialistic proposals" and called for State rather than National action to deal with health problems of aged citizens and supported the alternative Kerr-Mills approach to the problem.

The national platform supported legislation to repeal State right-to-work laws. The Texas platform endorsed the Texas right-to-work law as "necessary to the free enterprise system and the growth and prosperity of Texas."

"To top it off," continued Congressman DEROUNIAN, "last Thursday evening, January 23, President Johnson issued a statement following the ratification of the 24th amendment to the Constitution by the South Dakota Legislature, an action which outlawed the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections, saying at that time:

"'As majority leader of the Senate, I personally urged the banishment of bars to voting. This triumph now of liberty over restriction is a proud moment for me.'"

"What President Johnson failed to tell the American people," said Mr. DEROUNIAN, "was that between 1942 and 1960, while a Member of the House of Representatives and then of the Senate, he voted 12 times against legislation to outlaw the poll tax."

Which Lyndon B. Johnson is the American people supposed to believe, asked Mr. DEROUNIAN.

That's easy. Both.

Statement of the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes Before the Senate Commerce Committee on Firearms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, testified January 23, 1964, before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The gentleman from Florida, Representative SIKES, appeared before the committee in opposition to certain firearms control legislation. In an excellent statement he dealt with almost every argument used in favor of the proposed legislation, and countered each proposition with strong logical assertions in oppositions to them.

One of the prized possessions throughout our history always has been to bear and own arms. This attitude toward firearms has become a historical tradition in the United States. Convictions on the right of reputable citizens to own and use firearms for lawful purposes were so strong that the Bill of Rights contains an amendment to the Constitution providing that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

In the light of this fundamental principle, the gentleman from Florida, Congressman SIKES, concluded his remarks with the following quote:

By calling attention to a well-regulated militia for the security of the Nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our Founding Fathers recognized the essentially civilian nature of our economy. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears of governmental tyranny, which gave rise to the second amendment, will ever be a major danger to our Nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important.

That quoted statement was made by the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy.

I commend to you the reading of his testimony which, with pleasure, I include as an extension of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, JANUARY 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to

express my feelings on the subject of additional gun laws now before this committee for consideration.

During the years that I have had the privilege of holding elected office, the subject of the right of the law-abiding citizen to keep and bear arms, as guaranteed by our Constitution, has been, and continues to be, a subject of interest and deep concern to me. It is a matter of particular moment now, because of renewed agitation for tighter gun laws.

The tragic and senseless assassination of President Kennedy quite naturally resulted in a wave of hysteria against weapons and the ownership of weapons. However, deplorable this inexcusable act was, it scarcely follows that a crime committed by one man should cause 35 million gun owners to be persecuted. I seriously question that the legislation now proposed would have prevented the purchase of a gun by Lee Oswald or would have resulted in tighter security measures than those which were in effect.

There is already a Federal law that requires anyone selling guns interstate by mail, or otherwise, to buy a Federal firearms license. This law further requires that every sale be recorded and this record retained on hand for a period of 10 years. This record contains a detailed description of the gun, including the name and address of the buyer as well as the serial number.

These records are available to any law-enforcement officer. The fact to be remembered here is that this law is already in effect, and since the records are kept by the people in business, it does not cost the taxpayers one red cent. That this is an effective system is demonstrated by the fact that the information concerning the gun purchased by Lee Oswald was announced by the Dallas police on Saturday, the day after the assassination. The ballistic information on the bullet taken from Governor Connally was announced on Monday. In other words, it would seem that the gun controls we already have may be more effective than some law-enforcement agencies of the State and Federal Government.

We do not measure loss of human life in dollars and cents. Nor would we decry the cost of a gun-control law which effectively prevented crime. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that any form of registration or control will cost tax dollars to operate and enforce. This is a burden which will be shared by all the people.

You cannot legislate against human inconsistencies. The person who shot President Kennedy was the instrument of his death, a gun is an inanimate object and, by itself, can harm no one. The only people really affected by gun restrictions are the honest people. A man who needs a gun to commit a crime will get one by some method or another.

If anyone is convinced that antigun laws will reduce crime, and be a guarantee against violence and murder, then he is worse off that the ostrich. New York State has the toughest gun laws in America and probably the highest crime rate.

Great Britain, after Dunkirk, had only a few thousand small arms available in the entire country, and was requesting the people to contribute swords and crossbows for defense. This was the dilemma they faced because they did not have an armed civilian population to fall back on. Britain has tight gun laws.

During the German occupation of Norway and Denmark, in World War II, the Germans were required to keep one soldier for every 10 square miles of territory because of the partisan groups effective resistance. These people fell into the roles of guerrilla fighters easily because these were nations where gun ownership was encouraged. In other countries where government gun registration was required, the Germans had a handy list of all gun owners and were able to effectively disarm the entire nation.

When I purchase a weapon which is delivered in Washington, even though I own a federal firearms license, I must go personally to the express office to receive it, and I must fully identify myself and sign several forms. Thus I would assume that Washington is one of the stricter cities on ownership of firearms. But during a recent period when crime increased in the United States as a whole 14 percent, crime was increasing 41 percent in Washington. Gun laws are not the answer.

In a study by the FBI made in 564 cities during August 1960, involving a total populace of 69 million people, the following statistics were compiled:

Out of 7,348 aggravated assaults, 44 percent of the offenses were committed by cutting or stabbing—24 percent by blunt objects; 12.7 percent by shooting; 12.3 percent by hands, fists or feet and 1.2 percent by use of poison.

Now, if it follows that crime will be reduced or eliminated by doing away with all the criminal's weapons, then it is reasonable to assume that these weapons should be dealt with and eliminated according to their frequency of use. Since 44 percent of the above assaults were the result of "cutting and stabbing," then all knives and ice picks should be registered. Since "blunt objects" accounted for 24 percent of the mayhem, then naturally rocks, hammers, baseball bats, rolling pins, etc., should be serialized and registered. Under the "shooting" heading should be included all weapons which propel any object—whether by compressed air or rubber bands.

I do not question that there is a need for improvements. My statement simply is designed to show that we can easily go too far. The National Rifle Association, the leading organization of American sportsmen, has stated that it has no objection to legislation aimed at preventing the misuse of firearms, but that it opposes general registration of firearms and proposals to license the possession or purchase of firearms by law-abiding citizens.

Specifically, the association has said that it does not oppose legislation designed to prohibit possession of firearms by persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, drug addicts and habitual drunkards; or making the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent.

In the event this distinguished committee feels that legislation is necessary, it is my belief that the amendments submitted by Senator DODD, which would provide notification by the shipper to the local responsible police agency when a firearms order has been placed, would provide adequate additional security and permit proper action to be taken to limit or prevent ownership of weapons by criminals, or those incompetent or irresponsible.

Now, let's look at the broader picture of firearms controls.

In recent years, seldom has a session of any State Legislature or of Congress met without the introduction of at least one bill that would curtail the legitimate use and possession of firearms by citizens of good repute. The vast majority of these bills are introduced with the intention of curing some social ill, or to limit such use and possession by the juvenile delinquent and the criminal element.

While I do not take issue with the purposes for which these bills are intended, if administered correctly and given the proper emphasis, I certainly decry the efforts of some people or governmental agencies to severely limit the peaceful employment of firearms by lawful citizens.

As the committee well knows, thousands of Americans who own and enjoy firearms for defense and sport now feel strongly that the continuation of this ownership and enjoyment is in jeopardy. Much of this came as the result of the assassination of President Kennedy. Before that took place, however, concern had been caused by the enactment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The contents of this act and executive policy on this subject generated much publicity and reaction throughout the country. The general grounds for criticism have been that the implementation of this law could place the United States in a dangerous political, economic, and military position vis-a-vis the Communist bloc. In order to make it absolutely clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act did not include the elimination of private firearms as part of the proposed disarmament program, I introduced a bill that will protect such rights of the citizen from encroachment by the Disarmament Agency. The language of my bill is identical to one introduced by Senator HICKENLOOPER and is now contained in Public Law 88-186, amending the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. That language is as follows:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government Agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education or training."

We consider it sound insurance in a good cause.

I have heard criticism from some quarters about allowing the free possession and use of firearms in modern American society. Arguments that this contributes to crime and constitutes a menace to free Government are completely fallacious.

Our forefathers knew what they were doing when they approved the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that "a well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Then, as now, an armed citizenry is less likely to be cowed by criminal elements or oppressive government. Rather than restricting freedom, the right to possess arms guarantees it by instilling independence and strength in an enlightened people.

The United States is facing a critical period in its history. The years to come will decide the desperate battle between communism and freedom, individualism and totalitarianism. If we are to win this struggle, we will need to preserve and use every element of strength that is available to us. Americans are fighting in farflung corners of the world. Some of them will survive because of lessons in marksmanship and acquaintances with firearms gained as boys in a free society. The emphasis placed on smallarms marksmanship for survival in Vietnam bears out my long-held personal belief that there is a continuing need for men in the Armed Forces skilled in the use of basic firearms. As the lawmakers for this great Nation, we would be derelict in our duties if we allowed the right to keep and bear arms by responsible, law-abiding citizens to be curtailed.

I have read the statement of Senator MAGNUSON concerning the scope of the activities of this committee and have been informed of the proceedings that occurred during your previous hearings. I am strongly in favor of the intentions of the committee to study in detail any problems that may have arisen as the result of the ease of accessibility of firearms to the undesirable elements of our society through mail-order channels. Such problems, if allowed to go unchecked, could result in further restrictions on the law-abiding citizens.

If upon completion of your investigations, you deem it necessary to the continuing good

of our society to recommend additional controls on firearms, I urge that the legislation be developed in the spirit of Senator MAGNUSON's statement of December 10, 1963, when he said:

"Any legislation, State or Federal, must consider the constitutional right of our citizens to bear arms. Responsible citizens have the right to possess firearms for purposes for self-protection, security of the Nation, hunting, and recognized sporting activities."

Let me assure the committee that I will support legislation in keeping with these thoughts—legislation that will make it more difficult for criminals or those inclined toward criminal activities, mental incompetents, drug addicts, habitual drunkards and juveniles to obtain firearms, and which will severely penalize those persons perpetuating crimes while armed. But let me urge caution in the enactment of these laws, lest they go much further than is needed or intended.

In the April 1960 issue of Guns magazine, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wrote the following:

"By calling attention to a well-regulated militia for the security of the Nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our Founding Fathers recognized the essentially civilian nature of our economy. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears of governmental tyranny, which gave rise to the second amendment, will ever be a major danger to our Nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important."

The man who wrote that was the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy.

John Steinbeck on Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have received permission from John Steinbeck's literary agent in New York to insert into the RECORD a famous article that he once wrote for the Saturday Review.

This article by the distinguished Nobel Prizewinning novelist received a great deal of attention when it was published, and I am indeed proud to make it part of the RECORD.

No one could attempt or desire to paraphrase Mr. Steinbeck's article, Mr. Speaker, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am certain that those who missed the article will be pleased to find it here.

The article follows:

ATQUE VALE

(By John Steinbeck)

I am constantly amazed at the qualities we expect in Negroes. No race has ever offered another such high regard. We expect Negroes to be wiser than we are, more tolerant than we are, braver, more dignified than we, more self-controlled and self-disciplined. We even demand more talent from them than from ourselves. A Negro must be 10 times as gifted as a white to receive equal recognition. We expect Negroes to have more endurance than we in athletics, more courage in defeat, more rhythm and versatility in music and dancing, more controlled emotion in theater. We expect them to obey rules of conduct we flout, to be more courteous, more gallant, more proud, more steadfast. In a word, while maintaining that Negroes are inferior to us, by our unquestioning faith in them we prove our conviction that they are superior in many fields, even fields we are presumed to be trained and conditioned in and they are not.

Let me give a few examples.

In the Alabama bus boycott we knew there would be no Negro violence—and there wasn't. The only violence was white violence.

In the streets we expect courtesy from Negroes even when we are ugly and overbearing.

In the prize ring we know a Negro will be game and will not complain at a decision.

In Little Rock we knew that any brutality would originate among the whites.

For a long time whites would not compete against Negroes for fear they might lose. It was said that their coordination—it was called animal coordination—was better and their physical responses quicker.

If there is racial trouble, we are convinced that Negroes will not strike the first blow, will not attack in the night, will not set off bombs, and our belief is borne out by events.

We expect Negroes to be good-tempered and self-controlled under all circumstances.

But our greatest expectation is that they will be honest, honorable, and decent. This is the most profound compliment we can pay any man or group. And the proof of this shows in our outrage when a Negro does not live up to the picture we ordinarily have of him.

With thousands of burglaries, muggings, embezzlements reported every day, we are upset when a Negro is found doing what so many whites do regularly.

In New York with its daily reports of public thefts, deceits, and assorted political and fiscal raids on public money and treason against public trust, one Negro who succumbs to the temptation to do what many white people do fills us with dismay and the papers are full of it. What greater compliment can we pay to a people?

Finally, let me bring it down to cases.

I have children, as many of you whites who read this have. Do you think your children would have the guts, the dignity, and the responsibility to go to school in Little Rock knowing they would be insulted, shoved, hated, sneered at, even spat upon day after day, and do it quietly without showing anger, petulance, or complaint? And even if they could take it, would they also get good grades?

Now I am a grown, fairly well-educated—I hope intelligent—white man. I know that violence can produce no good effect of any kind. And yet if my child were spat on and insulted, I couldn't trust myself not to get a ball bat and knock out a few brains. But I trust Negroes not to, and they haven't.

I think so much of those schoolchildren in Little Rock—a small handful who carry the will and conscience, the hopes and futures of millions in their arms. They have not let their people down. I think, what quiet pride their grandchildren can have in them knowing they came of such stock.

And then I think of the faces of the mob that tried to keep them out, faces drooling hatred, cursing and accursed faces, brave only in numbers, spitting their venom at children. And some of those faces, masked, sneaking in the night to plant a bomb—the final weapon of a coward.

What pride can their descendants take in their ancestry? But of course they will forget, or lie, or both.

When Martin Luther King was stabbed by a hysterical woman, he might well have felt some anger or hurt or despair. But his first words on coming out of the anesthetic were: "Don't let them hurt her. She needs help."

Perhaps some of the anger against Negroes stems from a profound sense of their superiority, and perhaps their superiority is rooted in having a cause and an unanswerable method composed of courage, restraint, and a sense of direction.

L.B.J. Double-Time Proposal Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson recommended that employers in certain industries be required to pay double for overtime work. It is not that easy.

In the February 4 issue of the Miami Herald an excellent editorial showed how this proposal could cause us more trouble rather than solve the problem:

THE WRONG ANSWER TO UNEMPLOYMENT—DOUBLE TIMING TO TROUBLE

Making jobs by Government control of wages paid and hours worked seems to have an irresistible lure to bureaucracy.

For instance, in a message to Congress last week President Johnson recommended that employers in certain industries be required to pay double for overtime work.

Labor Department statisticans who advise the President in these matters reason that with 15 million people regularly working more than 40 hours a week but with 4 million others unemployed, the penalty of double pay would create more jobs.

This, as the saying goes, would be nice work if you could get it. But how many industries would comply and escape the penalty of paying double time rather than time and a half?

Given the fringe benefits and the personnel costs which go with setting up new jobs, overtime often has been cheaper than hiring extra hands.

But the problem is somewhat more complex than slapping penalties on hapless employers.

For one thing, some labor unions deliberately foster a shortage of jobs by limiting the number of apprentices. The tendency then has been to shorten the workweek and make overtime necessary.

In New York City Electrical Workers won a 25-hour week in 1962 (they had demanded a 20-hour week), and while some apprentices have been added by agreement, electrical contracting has priced itself skyhigh.

Most garment workers are on a 35-hour week; in larger cities the workweek in printing and publishing is 36.6 hours, and in 18 labor markets studied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 47 percent of office workers and 10 percent of plant workers were clocked at under 40 hours.

For another thing, there is no apparent way to regulate "moonlighting"—working at an extra job after completing the regular hours down at the foundry.

Finally, we believe that thoughtful persons will take exception to the machinery which President Johnson would create to make jobs industry by industry.

Under the scheme proposed to Congress, each industry affected would be investi-

gated by a special committee made up of an equal number of members representing the public, the employes, and the employers.

The committee could recommend a limitation on hours of work, to be no less than 40 hours a week, and determine what to do on the basis of competitive factors, including costs, prices, and dislocations in the industry. The Secretary of Labor would move in and order the findings of the committee to be the law of the land.

Some persons with reasonably long memories will recall that this arrangement resembles the old NRA codes of great depression days when, for a time, the country seemed to be moving in the direction of the corporate state. A Supreme Court then less inclined toward Federal meddling knocked that one in the head.

Is the unemployment problem (which ought not to exist in a prosperous society) a matter of parcelling out jobs or is it a matter of training persons suitably and fitting them to work which is needed to be done?

We think it is the latter. So, too, did the Federal Government until recently.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Edward R. Murrow Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I know that my fellow Congressmen join me in my expression of extreme regret upon the resignation of Edward R. Murrow as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. Mr. Murrow has done an admirable job; as William F. Johnston pointed out in the January 22 issue of the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune:

Murrow's contribution to his Government is not easily or quickly replaceable, though. He accomplished a minor miracle in Federal service—creating public and congressional confidence in an activity of Government almost automatically subject to suspicion.

It is true that it will be extremely difficult for any man to follow in Murrow's footsteps, but President Johnson has appointed a very able man to take over the directorship of USIA. Carl Rowan, a relatively young man, has already enjoyed a distinguished career as an outstanding reporter, author, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and Ambassador to Finland. In Finland, Mr. Rowan made a real effort to break down the normal barriers of diplomatic reserve and expended a good deal of energy getting to know the Finnish people and understanding their point of view. He tried to present a realistic, not an idealized, picture of the United States to the Finnish people; in doing so, he made many friends for our country.

I am sure that Congress and the American public wish Mr. Rowan well in the difficult job which lies ahead of him.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial by William F. Johnston entitled "Mr. Murrow Steps Down," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD R. MURROW STEPS DOWN

Confirmation yesterday of the long-rumored resignation of Edward R. Murrow as Director of the U.S. Information Agency leaves to his successor the unenviable task of trying to sustain Murrow's high standards of performance.

President Lyndon B. Johnson accepted the resignation "with the greatest reluctance" to give Murrow time for a long convalescence from lung cancer surgery. Murrow's illness slowed his intense pace long before the death of President Kennedy, so perhaps he and Mr. Johnson at least will be spared the criticism that the resignation marks a further breakup of the Kennedy team.

Murrow's contribution to his Government is not easily or quickly replaceable, though. He accomplished a minor miracle in Federal service—creating public and congressional confidence in an activity of Government almost automatically subject to suspicion.

As chief of America's program to disseminate abroad information about the policies and performance of the United States, Murrow was described by this country's enemies and some of its citizens as head of the U.S. propaganda branch.

The brilliant and supremely articulate Murrow countered such slurs by insisting that the United States should hew strictly to the lines of truth, fairness, and objectivity in informing other countries about this Nation's goals, attainments, and shortcomings.

He brought to his task a remarkable reputation as one of the brighest stars in radio and television journalism. From his undergraduate days at Washington State University through his years of reporting and interpreting the news in this country and abroad, Murrow established an unsurpassed reputation in broadcasting. He was known throughout the United States as possessing one of the great voices of broadcasting, with a reporting skill and understanding to match.

In his service as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Murrow has insisted that his job is to tell the truth about the United States. When the news of this country has been painfully embarrassing—as in the case of racial conflicts—he has reported that news to listeners overseas, putting it in the perspective of America's goals and intentions, but still reporting it. His emphasis upon telling the balanced truth has earned him the criticism of those who would prefer exports of propaganda to the dissemination of truth. But it has won him the respect of those much more representative leaders of this country who do not fear the truth, at home or abroad.

His successor, Carl Rowan, now Ambassador to Finland and formerly an Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Information Policies, has two handicaps as he attempts to fill Murrow's position.

First, he is the first Negro to be appointed to a Federal position of this magnitude. This fact may make his task more difficult among the racially prejudiced in this country—in and out of Congress—though it may help him in his efforts to overcome the largest single blemish overseas on America's reputation.

Second, Rowan has some major fencemending to accomplish with the press in the United States. When the most recent flurry over management of the news was absorbing the country's attention last spring, Rowan retorted to press critics with more heat than wisdom. He infuriated many conscientious U.S. newspapermen by asserting that many newspapers deliberately distorted and sensationalized news of Government to "sell more newspapers." The charge may be supported to a degree in rare and isolated cases, but as a generalization it is unfair and untrue. This is one of those sophomoric cliches which the responsible press expects from the uninformed, but it does not become a newspaperman of Rowan's experience, nor one of the leading press officers of the National Government.

On the other hand, Rowan is an intelligent and energetic public servant who is experienced and skilled in the intricate processes of Government administration. He is an affable and engaging man when he guards against overstatement, and he is potentially quite capable of filling his imposing new assignment with distinction. He may have to acquire some political maturity in a hurry, but he has a job now which is designed to mature any man quickly.—B.J.

Banking, Profits, and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in an address by Mr. William F. Kelly, president of the American Bankers Association, before the 17th Annual Forecasting Conference of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, on January 9, 1964, it is my opinion that he presented points about banking, profits, and economic growth which will be of interest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and certainly to all Members of Congress.

With this in mind, I insert Mr. Kelly's speech which follows:

BANKING, PROFITS, AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

It is a great honor and privilege to have this opportunity of speaking at this dinner session, and to offer a few comments which I hope will be appropriate to the central theme of this forecasting conference—"Profits in a Socially Minded Economy."

At the outset, let me emphasize that I believe there is no basic conflict between the needs of a profit-oriented, free-enterprise economy and the need for what might be termed (for lack of a better phrase) social justice. In fact, a properly regulated, profit-driven economy is not only the best route to maximizing a nation's economic well-being, but it is also the most effective means of insuring social welfare. There is no better way of combating the social problems of unemployment, inadequate housing, and other aspects of substandard living than by making maximum efforts to insure that the domestic economy prospers, expands, and produces adequate job opportunities. This suggests, in turn, the need for constant stress on the key role of profits in the process of economic growth, and on the importance of maintaining adequate profit incentive.

Difficulties can arise, of course, when we attempt—through various instruments of national economic policy—to find quick solutions for the individual instances of poverty, ignorance, and social hardships which arise within the framework of a free-enterprise economy. The severity of these social blights in the long run will depend largely on the adequacy of the economy's performance. In attempting to deal with them through adaptations of national economic policy, we must be careful not to fashion shortrun remedies which impede the longer range performance of our economy.

We must try, in particular, to avoid encroachments on the strength of those incentives—in particular the profit incentive—which lend drive and energy to a free enterprise economy. Otherwise, the economy's performance may become progressively less adequate; and since most Government programs reflect the residual needs of the Na-

tion not met through normal market processes, then the need for additional Government programs may seem to be progressively more urgent.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The qualifications of a commercial banker for commenting on the social responsibilities of Government may be open to some question, but I hope you will agree with me that no industry can boast of closer ties with the process of economic growth than the commercial banking industry. The story of industrial development and progress in this country is a story, in effect, of the profitable use of credit. Credit availability permitted and speeded the origin and development of our major industries, mechanized our agriculture, and provided the purchasing power required for the development of mass markets for housing and consumer durables. In literally thousands of instances it served to translate improbable schemes into industrial and scientific realities which have brought jobs, income, and prosperity to millions of our citizens.

Throughout much of the history of this country, commercial banking had remarkably few restraints on its flexibility in providing the capital—much of which was risk capital—required for the innovation, risk taking, and even speculation which is characteristic of economic growth. Banks were operated for profits—then, as now—but the difference between banking in the old days and modern-day banking is that the lending function of the earliest commercial banks was not subject to broad restraints as it is today.

The policy dictating bank operations today is designed first and foremost to protect the safety of depositors' funds while earning a reasonable profit. An extensive network of regulations has been legislated to assure that bankers do not become too aggressive in their search for profits. It was not always so, for earlier bankers sometimes appeared to pay rather scant attention to the safety of depositors' and noteholders' funds. On occasions they may have loaned their funds in such a way as to maximize short-run profits, and this approach often carried them into highly speculative ventures. Many of these ventures failed, carrying banks down with them; but many succeeded and helped tremendously in making this country what it is today.

A CASE IN POINT

Some banks even failed in spite of the significant contributions they made to the Nation's economic development. One of the most famous instances was the National Bank of the State of Missouri, which closed its doors in June 1877. Some of you may have read the account of this incident in the book "Financing American Enterprise," by Prof. Paul B. Trescott of Kenyon College in Ohio.

James B. Eads, an engineer, was also a major stockholder of this bank. One of his projects was to form a company for building a bridge across the Mississippi at St. Louis so that railroad freight would not have to be transported across the river by ferry. The bridge was hailed as an engineering wonder, but it was not a financial success because the railroads were reluctant to pay the tolls.

Before the bridge was completed, Eads was involved in another engineering problem. The mouth of the Mississippi had become choked with mud and silt, and Government attempts to dredge the channel were unsuccessful. Eads told Congress that he could construct a series of jetties and have the channel deepen itself. When Congress hesitated, he said he would do it on his own and the Government could pay when the job was done. Eight months after he started, the channel deepened itself from 7 to 13 feet. In May 1876, the channel reached 17 feet and an ocean vessel went through the South Pass.

The Government, however, was slow in making payments and eventually paid less than the amounts stipulated. The company went deeper into debt. The bank, which had financed the major part of both of these projects, finally closed because it lost so much on these two engineering triumphs.

In 1879, the year the jetty work was completed, the channel reached a depth of 30 feet, and 26 times as much export went out through the Mississippi as had gone in the year the project was started.

Florence Dorsey, in "Road to the Sea," said, "Insurance rates on * * * perishables had dropped, the price of bread was cheapened over half the earth. New Orleans, raised from 11th to 2d place as the country's export point, was taking its place as a great port."

Ultimately the depositors of the bank were repaid in full, and the loss was suffered by the stockholders, of whom Eads was one of the largest. Professor Trescott said, "American bank credit seldom was put to better use."

Some of the other more successful ventures financed in part by banks can be found in such industries as petroleum, automobiles, steel, railroads, meat packing and shipbuilding.

A LESSON FROM THE PAST

The role of commercial banks in providing large amounts of risk capital—all in search of profits—helped make the country vigorous, enterprising, and dynamic. It also contributed weakness—in the form of large-scale bank failures from time to time with the resulting instability in the money supply. It was inevitable that restraints should be imposed on bank lending. I don't think that many businessmen or bankers would argue that commercial banks should be the major supplier of risk capital to American industry and commerce today as they were in the past century.

But isn't there a lesson in the spectacular growth performance of an era when capital and credit flowed freely—perhaps too freely—in search of the highest rates of return? I would suggest that there is. A free-enterprise economy relies on profits as the major factor influencing the allocation of its resources. The shifting profits of individual firms and industries reflect changes in the intensity of public demand for their products. These shifts in profit positions are constantly serving to strengthen or weaken the ability of individual firms and industries to command resources—labor, raw materials, and capital. Labor and capital move from industries and firms of weak demand to those of stronger demand. Through this process the resources of the Nation are allocated in accordance with public needs and desires—as reflected in consumer spending patterns.

It cannot be stressed too strongly, however, that reliance on profits for allocating resources and for maintaining balanced economic growth requires that funds be free to move—not only from one firm to another, but also from one area of the country to another. Otherwise, new firms cannot grow, speculative ventures of great promise cannot be financed, and the process of further revolutionizing commerce and industry for the benefit of society cannot be sustained. In short, unless funds are free to move in response to profit opportunities, the process of economic growth will be stifled.

BANKS AS MULTIPURPOSE LENDERS

The significance of this fact for the operations of the commercial banking system becomes obvious at once, for commercial banks are the principal multipurpose lenders in this country. Bank lending operations cover every aspect of commercial and industrial activity, and bank customers include all types of spending units—from households to business to government. Banks occupy the central position of the process through which credit continuously is being shifted from one firm to another, and from one industry to another, in response to profit performance and the opportunity for profitable use of credit. Among financial institutions, commercial banks are unique in this respect; for their all-encompassing lending role is in sharp contrast with the special-purpose lending of their competitors.

The critical role of banks in serving economic growth is not greatly lessened by the fact that banks no longer provide the bulk of risk capital for new ventures. The fact is that commercial banks, by virtue of the breadth of their contacts with spending units of all types, are often the point of inquiry for individuals who are long on new ideas and short on funds. Although only a portion of these applicants for risk capital can be accommodated with bank funds, the remainder are usually given advice as to how the risk capital might be raised. Of greater importance, however, is the fact that the availability of growth capital is just as essential to the process of economic growth as is venture capital. While banks cannot provide large amounts of venture capital, the amount of growth capital which they furnish is huge indeed. And, in allocating these funds for growth to those borrowers who can use them most efficiently, the banking system is participating as it should in promoting that allocation of resources which, in response to profit opportunities, best serves the needs of economic growth.

INROADS ON CAPITAL MOBILITY

I do not doubt that commercial banks, in their role of multipurpose lenders, will continue to allocate credit according to the dictates of the marketplace—that their loans will move into those uses for which there is greatest demand. There is, in fact, scarcely any other basis for a bank's lending policy. Nevertheless, I do not feel altogether confident that the responsiveness of bank lending to market forces can of itself assure the mobility of capital which is required to serve fully the interest of economic growth.

My reason for saying this is that, as time passes, the relative importance in a quantitative sense of banks as suppliers of credit to the Nation's borrowers becomes progressively smaller, and the relative importance of what are essentially single-purpose lenders becomes larger. Surely no one can doubt that this situation presents a serious threat to the mobility of credit. For to the extent that savings flow into the hands of largely single-purpose lenders, the funds are not free to move into the hands of credit users not served by these lenders. Nor, in many cases, are these lenders able to shift funds to various parts of the country in response to regional differences in credit needs. This credit is not mobile: it is not free to move from one industry to another in response to changes in profit opportunities as between industries. Nor does it move readily from one section of the country to another. This is in sharp contrast with the high mobility of funds made available to commercial banks, which lend to all types of borrowers and, through the correspondent banking system, in all areas of the country.

If we accept the proposition that the ability of capital to move to those areas of most profitable use is an essential requirement for economic growth—and I do accept it—then we must be concerned about the extraordinary growth of essentially single-purpose lenders in this country.

If this growth were the natural product of market forces at work, there would not be any valid basis for complaint. Certainly commercial bankers could not register a complaint under these circumstances. Our dedication to free-market forces is far too

strong to allow us to believe that we have an inherent right to grow.

SOCIAL PRIORITIES AND CREDIT USES

The fact is, however, that the inroads on capital and credit mobility being made by the growth of single-purpose lenders are not the result of market forces, but rather of public-policy decisions which assign a higher order of social priority to some uses of credit than to others. As a means of subsidizing housing credit, for example, the savings and loan industry is accorded highly preferential tax and regulatory treatment which places it in a position clearly superior to commercial banks in competing for the public's savings. Its spectacular growth record testifies to the effectiveness of the subsidy. Similarly, credit unions are accorded preferential tax treatment in the interest of attracting more funds to consumer lending.

I have no quarrel with either of these two industries. But I sharply disagree with the philosophy of the laws under which they operate. For the lesson to be learned from the study of economic growth is not that one type of credit is socially more desirable than another, but rather that it is socially desirable to allow credit to move freely into those areas where it is in greatest demand and can be used most profitably.

My friends in the savings and loan industry may argue that this is precisely the justification for their attempt to secure broader lending and investing powers. Their argument has little validity since it needs to be said that they should not expect to behave as multipurpose lenders while being regulated and taxed as single-purpose lenders. Legislation which would permit such a situation would be highly discriminatory to the Nation's commercial banks, for it would make possible the creation of new lending institutions which could operate as commercial banks in all major respects but under more liberal ground rules, particularly in the areas of regulation and taxes.

LIMITED BASIS FOR OPTIMISM

I would like to be able to cite evidence of growing awareness of the ultimate futility of attempting to serve social objectives by assigning an order of social priority to the users of credit. Lest we be tempted to do so, however, we might want to recall that it has been only a few years since great concern was expressed over a shortage of venture capital. Such concern was voiced even during a period of quite abundant mortgage credit. Perhaps at the time no one considered this alleged shortage in one market, coupled with quite liberal credit conditions in another, as evidence of a lack of credit mobility due to excessive channeling of the flow of savings.

An astute observer of economic history might have remedied the situation by introducing legislation calculated to promote greater mobility of capital among credit markets. The approach selected, however, was quite the opposite: venture capital for smaller firms was assigned a higher degree of social priority, and special incentives (including favorable tax treatment) were provided for the flow of funds into small business investment companies.

This sequence of events alone illustrates the logical outcome of attempts to legislate credit flows according to a predetermined scheme of social priorities. Such efforts can so disturb the credit allocation process that each step creates problems in another sector, with the ultimate pattern of credit allocation reflecting little or no relationship to what it would be under free-market processes.

OVERALL VIEW

As a banker with a vested interest in the growth of his industry, I naturally am concerned that banks—as the Nation's major multipurpose lenders—are faced with arbitrary handicaps to their competitive ability, which makes it difficult for them to share fully in the Nation's economic growth. As a citizen, I am even more concerned over existing trends which suggest that the flow of the Nation's savings is becoming progressively more compartmentalized. I believe that no single social priority can be placed above the objective of maintaining a prosperous and growing economy and that the free movement of capital, in response to profit opportunities, is essential to the sound functioning of that economy.

Have the Words "Made in U.S.A." Lost Their Magic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1964, the International Affairs Council of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce was privileged to have as its speaker, Mr. Anthony F. Arpaia, vice president, International Services, REA Express.

Mr. Arpaia's stimulating address on world trade is a fine example of the outstanding and informative talks presented by the council, and I am particularly pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The address follows:

HAVE THE WORDS "MADE IN U.S.A." LOST THEIR MAGIC?

(By Anthony F. Arpaia)

I know I am talking with group which is knowledgeable about world trade. However, it might be well to establish a little background on the subject, even though it may seem somewhat elementary.

For years the United States enjoyed a monopoly of mass production techniques. We were able to produce more goods per man-hour of production than any nation in the world. After World War II, as practically the only nation left with the capacity to produce at all, we enjoyed another monopoly. The war-ravaged nations were helpless and needed everything. We, as the supplier, not only met a large part of their current requirements but also supplied them with the basic modern machinery and equipment so that they could produce for themselves. They adopted mass production methods and became able not only to produce for themselves but aggressively seek and supply other markets. This they have done spectacularly by suppressing the old cartel philosophy and vigorously applying competitive marketing principles.

Now, for the first time, we are on the defensive. In fact, we are in the unusual position of having to struggle to preserve the integrity of the dollar, threatened by a deficit in our balance of payments.

We all know that balance of payments depends on many factors. The deficit is caused by the excess of goods and dollars spent, lent, or given abroad. U.S. foreign expenditures for military and economic aid are a big factor in our deficit. The administration, as you know, is making considerable progress in bringing down the dollar cost of these items and, further, is requiring that much of the foreign aid must be given in kind; that is, goods which are produced in this country. The reason the Government, for the last 4 years, has encouraged greater export activity on the part of American business is to help offset the drain on our gold reserves.

As a matter of fact, our balance of trade is not bad. For instance, our export surplus today is running at an annual rate of about $4½ billion. Typically, Florida had a favorable balance of exports over imports of 33.4 percent, This does not mean that there is not tremendous room for improvement. The truth is we are lagging behind other more aggressive trading nations in maintaining our share of the world's markets. One of the reasons ordinarily given is that the United States is priced out of the world's markets because of its higher wage rates and its higher costs. We assure that this has killed the magic of the words, "Made in U.S.A." This conclusion requires closer evaluation.

No nation, developed or undeveloped, can satisfy the needs of all of its people. Even in highly developed areas, where buying power is high and still growing, the quality and sales appeal of imported goods are persuasive factors and offer expanding markets. American products have achieved wide acceptance abroad. The label, "Made in U.S.A.," has had and has important impact mainly because these products are uniformly of high quality. Export trade also will grow because potential markets for American-made products exist in economically and socially underdeveloped countries—markets which presently are practically untouched. It is up to us to aggressively participate in these additional markets.

On a long-range basis our export position will improve for other reasons. First, the cost of living, particularly in Western Europe and Japan, has been moving up at an annual rate of nearly 5 percent, whereas ours has only been moving up at about 1 or 1½ percent for the last 3 years. Hence, the very prosperity of Western Europe and Japan is bringing about demands for wage increases which are quite a bit ahead of productivity gains. These increased costs will narrow the gap as far as the U.S. merchandisers are concerned and will make it less unequal for us to compete with these highly developed countries in other markets of the world.

Secondly, greater and more broadly based purchasing power is bound to have a strong impact on world trade. The market for consumer durables in Europe is still a vast one. For example, economically advanced countries such as West Germany, England, and France still have less than a third the use and ownership of such things as radios, televisions, automobiles, and telephones then we have in the United States.

We must not assume that we acquired only a business competitor when we rebuilt the countries of Europe and Asia after the last war. We also acquired potentially better customers. It has been estimated that in the next decade alone foreign trade will increase by almost $100 billion, or about 87 percent above levels. It is up to this country to get its share.

Added to these factors, the sheer force of population growth will intensify demand. It has been estimated that by 1970 the free world population will have increased by some 335 million, to a total of almost 2½ billion. This will mean more people to feed, house, clothe and to provide with the other conveniences and comforts of an improved station in life.

Now, before we talk further about our trade balance, we ought to analyze it a bit. Our exports to Western Europe have been strong this year, reflecting the continuing boom there, especially in the continental countries. Exports such as agricultural products, coal and oil made favorable comparisons with levels of previous years.

On the other hand, U.S. exports of most manufactured products either fell off or rose less than imports of similar types of products. Foreign competition has been especially rough on the cotton textile, pot-

tery, steel flatware, bicycle, plywood, portable typewriters, shipbuilding, radio transistor sets, watches, and certain kinds of chemicals. All of these are products which are turned out by large and efficient U.S. industries. Foreign competition, therefore, is really hurting in this range of commodities.

For this reason, concentration needs to be directed toward exporting goods at a higher stage of manufacture. Florida's increase in manufacturing, an increase of 84.3 percent in 6 years, shows that it has a growing interest in export prospects.

The Government is pressing for still broader participation by American industry and business in export trade. A Department of Commerce official was recently quoted as saying that over one-half of our foreign trade in manufacturing products is done by as few as 200 companies. Therefore, it is obvious that small and medium sized firms are playing to small a role in this vital part of our economy. There are about 4 million of these smaller concerns in this country. They lack the resources and the manpower of the large corporations with multinational representation in foreign branches, licensing agreements and participating arrangements. Only in exceptional cases will a medium sized or small American firm find opportunity for investment in production facilities abroad. In fact, the potential opportunities in such ventures have been grossly oversold to American companies in recent years.

Their most ready opportunity is to sell their products, sell them directly, just as they would at home. Our foreign trade is an extremely small proportion of national production in comparison with other industrial nations. But, since it is nevertheless an essential part, we ought to broaden the base to more nearly the proportions that other countries prove is possible.

This brings up other aspects of the competitive function: getting the goods from point of production to point of consumption. The details of getting these goods from origin to destination can be a frustrating experience to the newcomer. Many instances are reported where unsolicited orders from abroad have been ignored because it was felt that the bother involved didn't make it worthwhile. On the other hand, some which have been accepted by others have led to substantial export sales.

We at REA have given this subject considerable thought over the years and we have observed that when companies could sell at a certain and delivered price it would stimulate interest on the part of buyers since it would allow them to determine the sales price to the consumer and whether their product would have an attractive market. Unfortunately, each of the various forms of transportation which comprise our interstate and foreign common carriage operates relatively independently. Although each is obliged to recognize the others' functions at a point of interchange, they have not taken effective steps to integrate their services for the benefit of the shipper. The surface carriers have the rigidity of long habit behind them. The air industry, as a newer form of freight carriage, should not make the same mistake. They should be eager to see to it that shippers receive flexible service from origin to destination.

The potential for air freight is tremendous. It can best be fulfilled by joint through rates and service with other forms of carriage, with simplified rates and simple tariffs—easy to read and apply. This is what President Kennedy strongly urged in his historic message on transportation in April 1962. Florida, as the major air gateway to the Caribbean, Central and South America, as well as Europe, has a large stake in correcting the present trend. The development of the port of Miami increases its stake.

There should be no need for the average businessman to search for and deal with four or five specialists to get the job done. Buyers of transport service want simplicity and dependability—one-carrier responsibility through a single contract—so that tracing shipments, filing loss and damage claims, paying multiple freight bills, etc., will be minimized and, in any event, will not be expensive, exasperating, and time-consuming chores. Sellers or buyers should not be forced to make special arrangements for each leg of the haul or deal with several modes of transport, each with its unique pricing and service methods. They are entitled to one set of documents and the immediate negotiability of a through bill of lading against a letter of credit, upon its issuance by the pickup carrier.

It has been our feeling that, where applicable, no longer should the customer, whether he be exporter or importer, have to face the need to make separate and special arrangements, to pay a series of individual charges, or to suffer the loss of intransit time in the sequence of separate handlings by inland carrier, forwarder at the domestic port, ocean carrier, customs broker at oversea ports, and foreign inland carrier to final destination.

That is why, in addition to our conventional, foreign freight forwarding and customs brokerage service, we established a through-bill service almost 7 years ago which makes it as easy for the seller to deliver from any point in the United States to 99 countries of the free world at a known transportation charge in advance. And, when and if the exporter so desires, all documentation will be attended to by us upon receipt of a letter of instruction and a simple commercial invoice.

The cost-profit squeeze has given impetus to the search for additional ways to reduce total costs. One of the substantial built-in costs of any commodity is that of physical distribution. It is said to amount to one-third of the final cost of an article to the consumer. There are ways to reduce these overall costs so that the seller can become more competitive. This new concept is based on the elimination or reduction of every possible item of expense, direct and indirect, such as storage and the handling and rehandling in and out of warehouses, plus all the paperwork connected with it; the cost of carrying extra inventory, etc.

One of the keys to this process is dependable transit time, the faster the better. Significantly, all forms of transportation are now concentrating on speeding up service. The reductions of time, as well as exposure to damage, through unitization, containerization, palletization, and piggyback are probably the most dramatic and best-known efforts in this direction. The coordination of the services of different modes of transport through these prinicples is made easier. Containerization within the United States and a few other countries has been progressing rapidly. Its application to world trade is still not fully developed.

For example, my company's Unit-Pak containers—which can be used by any shipper—provide another simple, flat charge rate, applicable between most manufacturing communities. The Unit-Pak gives the shipper 101 cubic feet of container space. He may put anything he wishes into the container that does not require special protection from heat or cold. Rates are computed by the "container-mile" and are stated as a flat charge in even dollars.

As you know, this is a big change over the previous system, where each piece had to be itemized and weighed and the commodity description of each of the items in a shipment had to be ascertained on the basis of one or more classifications applying to the land, ocean, or air part of the voyage and the ratings and rates which go with such commodity classifications laboriously determined. All of the above rates can become components of through international rates.

In our international service, we have also inaugurated through container service to interior points. As of now, containers of miscellaneous package freight moving on conventional small shipment through rates are assembled and cleared through customs at Chicago for movement to the Continent and to the Orient. This service will be extended to cover other interior U.S. cities. A shipper knows that each container will leave on a certain day and make a certain sailing. This is a regular service on which he can depend. A small shipper, in addition to saving on export packing costs, avoids minimum ocean bill-of-lading charges.

These are the things which cover the physical part of the job of transportation by which the international shipper can be relieved of worry and cost.

Another of the major obstacles to the freer flow of international trade is excessive documentation. None of these documents are uniform and they vary from country to country in number and kinds. The costs, delays, and errors which can occur so easily under this heavy burden of administrative detail have been estimated to eat away at the $21 billion annual export business of the United States and frustrate the Government's goal of increased exports.

In a move to reduce the staggering amount of paperwork, a group of experts from the Pacific coast ocean shipping industry have submitted a proposal to standardize the 200 or more bills-of-lading forms used in the export industry. The Marine Exchange of the San Francisco Bay region, which has been working for 5 years on a worldwide, redtape cutting program for ocean commerce, has recommended a new bill-of-lading form that also permits simultaneous preparation of the officially required export declaration.

Consular documents are another problem. Most Latin American countries are especially severe in this respect. The objective on the part of thinking people in this field is that all of the multitudinous documents be combined into a single form acceptable to each country—a multipurpose document, with all the superfluous and unnecessary information eliminated.

Procedures and delays at national borders can nullify the technological progress which has been made in transportation. Today, distances are no longer measured in terms of miles but in terms of time—days, hours. The need for expeditious and efficient international transport has assumed new importance in the light of the changed world we live in. Under today's circumstances and pressures, transport barriers are relatively more burdensome and expensive.

We all recognize that global interdependence is an accomplished fact. We cannot escape our dependence and interdependence with other nations of the world. Every country has some relative advantage in the production of certain goods and free trade extends these advantages beyond a country's borders. A country which is lacking in raw materials, efficent plant equipment, or technical know-how may have to settle for a lower standard of living than one more bountifully endowed, but the standard will be lower than necessary if it is also denied free trading opportunities.

Historically, our industrial progress and prosperity were not created through the imposition of artificial frontier barriers, but have been based on free enterprise, private initiative, and a free market. Our challenge now is to create new products, higher quality, and improve efficiency so that we will lead the way with new and better things at the lowest possible price to the consumer. This has made the label "Made in U.S.A." attractive and marketable. It will keep it so.

How About Returning Panama to Colombia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, public concern over the Panamanian crisis is natural, and an understanding of the current situation is helped by a thorough review of the canal history.

Mr. A. T. Burch, retired editor of the Chicago Daily News, writing in that publication on Saturday, February 8, writes a very timely and thorough review of the canal history, and raises a fascinating question about returning Panama to Colombia. I insert the article into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members:

HOW ABOUT RETURNING PANAMA TO COLOMBIA?

With Cuba and Russia threatening another crisis that might build into anything, the Organization of American States is going to put us on trial over what, in the context, looks like a minor matter.

It will examine Panama's charges that the United States is guilty of imperialist aggression. Our State Department, reasonably, made no objection to the hearing.

It would be interesting, and perhaps profitable, if the United States pleaded guilty—to an amended complaint.

It is idle, no doubt, but amusing to speculate what would happen if the United States pleaded guilty to imperialistic aggression—not against Panama in 1964 but against Colombia in 1903. A proposal on our part to make full amends by giving Panama back to Colombia would undoubtedly inspire Panama to fight for the view that 60-year-old arrangements between nations ought not to be frivolously upset.

Early in Woodrow Wilson's administration, he negotiated a treaty with Colombia proposing to apologize for our Government's part in Panama's secession.

He also proposed to pay Colombia an indemnity of $25 million.

Theodore Roosevelt was outraged. "Not one dollar," he wrote in the Outlook, May 21, 1914, "can be paid—with propriety—and it would be an act of infamy to pay even a dollar to a nation which, in crooked greed, tried by blackmail to smirch the good name of the United States."

Henry F. Pringle's biography of T.R. tells how the latter's friends in the Senate, notably Henry Cabot Lodge, blocked confirmation of Wilson's Colombian treaty. Then World War I postponed further consideration. Lodge, who dominated the Senate's action on foreign policy for years, was the grandfather of the present ambassador of the same name.

REVERSES POSITION

Roosevelt died in 1919. In 1921, during Warren G. Harding's term, Lodge reversed his position. He took a leading part in enacting a bill to pay Colombia $25 million indemnity—but without apology.

In the Senate, Lodge pretended that his old friend Roosevelt would have gladly supported this measure on order to improve our trade with Colombia. American businessmen were then beginning to be interested in Colombia as a commercial customer and a possible new source for oil.

Lodge denied that the payment admitted wrongdoing of any kind. The money was to be paid, he said, "in consideration of the recognition by Colombia of the independence of Panama."

Payment by one country of such a sum to another country for recognizing a third must have been unprecedented, up to then, in world history. In our own way, to be sure, we give away much larger sums for no past consideration and vague, illusory hope for future advantage.

At the time of Panama's secession, Roosevelt denied taking any part in that revolution and even of having had precise advance knowledge of it. Overtly, the only military action the United States took was to use its fleet to prevent Colombia from sending troops to put down the Panama rebels.

The official pretext for using our ships was to prevent disruption of transit across the isthmus. Transit had been guaranteed to the United States and its citizens by a treaty of 1846 with New Granada, a country of which Colombia and several other present South American nations then formed a part.

In his biography, Pringle says Roosevelt's disavowals of prior knowledge about the revolution strain his theory that Roosevelt was not addicted to conscious falsification. This suggests an implication that Roosevelt's strong emotions sometimes warped the accuracy of his recollection.

BEHIND REVOLUTION

The principal manipulators of the revolution (achieved by corruption rather than force) were Philippe Bunau-Varilla, the Frenchman who represented the sucecssor to the original French canal company, bankrupt in 1889, and the new company's American counsel, William Nelson Cromwell. Cromwell was a partner in the law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell, of which John Foster Dulles was later to be a member.

Roosevelt and two of his Cabinet members were in close contact with Cromwell and Bunau-Varilla while the revolution was in the making. Cromwell and Bunau-Varilla were both on the ground when it took place.

American officers were sent well in advance to watch developments. American warships were on their way to both the Atlantic and Pacific sides of the isthmus before the revolution started. It was planned to coincide with their arrival.

In less than 24 hours after the coup, Bunau-Varilla, while retaining his French citizenship, had arranged for his appointment as Panama's Ambassador to the United States and was immediately on his way to Washington.

Roosevelt's protestations in 1903 of innocent ignorance cannot be reconciled with his later boasts, in his own writings and public speeches, that "I took Panama."

It is a well-documented fact that, if no revolution had taken place, Roosevelt was prepared to seize the isthmus by military force and build the canal, with or without Colombia's consent.

The specious justification of this course (which the revolution permitted him to avoid) was furnished by John Bassett Moore, professor of international law at Columbia University. His theory was based on the 1846 treaty with New Granada referred to above.

In a private letter Roosevelt declared that if Panama had not revolted he would have recommended to Congress to seize the isthmus by force. "I had actually," he said, "written the first draft of my message to that effect."

REFUSE TREATY

Roosevelt's denunciation of Colombia's "greed" arose from the refusal of the Colombian Congress to ratify a treaty for the Canal Zone, substantially identical with the treaty arranged soon afterward with Panama—a republic that had been created specifically for this purpose.

Officially, Colombia's legislative objections were based on the surrender of sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Roosevelt may have been correct in believing that the real reason was the hope of getting more money.

The United States was paying $40 million to the new French canal company. The old one had gone bankrupt primarily because of its inability to control the yellow fever, bubonic plague and malaria that ravaged the isthmus.

The United States offered to pay Colombia (and did pay Panama) $10 million down and $250,000-a-year rental. In 1939, the United States raised the annual payment to $430,000; in 1955 it was raised again to $1,930,000.

An admission to the Organization of American States that the United States had acted like an imperialist aggressor against Colombia in 1903 would be true. This country was imperialist minded, and no American more so than Theodore Roosevelt.

A few years previously we had accepted Hawaii as an American territory from American revolutionists against the former regime. We had recently taken Puerto Rico and the Philippines from Spain. In liberating Cuba from Spanish rule, we made no effort to disguise its status at that time as a protectorate.

Among the older, established nations, political morality has changed for the better since then. But whatever we did in 1903, shocking to today's standards, Panama was the beneficiary of it, not the victim.

If any statesman in the American hemisphere, north or south, recommended turning everything in Panama back to Colombia to redress the wrongs of 1903, he would be laughed at and scorned for his lack of realism.

Panama would certainly be the first to argue that international arrangements more than 60 years old should not be lightly upset. Indeed, compared with many members of the United Nations, Panama is now venerable with age.

Still, if even one party at the OAS conference table (Colombia, for instance) forced Panama to make this argument in favor of stability in mature territorial settlements, somebody might point out that American rights in Panama, created by the same series of events as Panama's independence, ought to have acquired validity by this time, also.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 8, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 8, 1964)

THE GREAT DEBATE—CIVIL RIGHTS

Debate this week in the House on the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, made it clear we may be seeing historymaking changes which will affect the rights and freedoms of the people for all time. In one of the most scholarly debates I have witnessed in my 9 years in Congress, the following points were made:

1. This legislation is a blueprint for total Federal regimentation of the people of the United States.

2. It will extend Federal control over businesses, industry, and over individuals, and reduce the power of the States, in a degree that exceeds the total of such extensions of power by all judical decisions and all congressional actions since the Constitution was adopted.

3. In this one measure we are wiping out more basic freedoms than in all the legislative history of this Nation.

4. This one bill puts into the hands of the President the awful power to make himself a virtual dictator.

All this is done under the guise of and in the zeal of protecting civil rights. The bill covers 87 pages and the debate runs into hundreds of pages in the RECORD so it is possible here only to highlight the most glaring arguments against enactment.

RIGHT TO VOTE

Title I deals with the right to vote and few will argue with the proper objective of this section. There are some grave questions raised, however, in extending the power of the Attorney General to invade the rights of the States in this area. How determined the advocates of the bill were to prevent any amendment was shown when they even defeated a proposal by Congressman DOWDY to prevent "dead people" from being voted (the tombstone amendment).

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

One of the most dangerous and controversial sections is title II, public accommodations. This section, more than any other, threatens our freedoms by:

1. Abridging the right to own and manage private property thus putting into jeopardy one of man's basic rights, the ownership of property.

2. Section 204 of this title the Attorney General may take action against an individual or a State upon the allegation of a "threatened violation." In section 203, the terms "discrimination and segregation" are used interchangeably with no clear definition which will put an end to government by law in favor of government by men.

3. This section also displays the inconsistency of the bill. Here an amendment to permit the Attorney General to act only on a signed complaint was defeated even though in other sections of the bill a signed complaint is necessary to initiate action.

4. The civil rights advocates voted down any protection for a property owner who may suffer economic loss or indeed may be forced out of business by this law.

TRIAL BY JURY DENIED

In title III, desegregation of public facilities, an attempt to protect the basic right of American citizens of trial by jury was voted down. Again, trial by jury is contained in other sections of the bill, but denied here in trials for criminal contempt brought by the Government against individuals.

FREEDOM TO RIOT

Encouragement of those who are now leading demonstrations, riots, and urging breaking the law came when the proponents of the bill voted down an amendment that no rioters or those inciting to riot would be hired as "desegregation specialists."

ATTACK ON PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

Private clubs, fraternal organizations (Masons, Knights of Columbus, etc.) civic groups, fraternities and sororities came dangerously close to being eliminated and showed the intent of some behind the civil rights legislation. They would open up to Federal inspection and control and to unrestricted membership all such organizations and would forbid the secret rituals which are a part of many religious and fraternal organizations.

TITLE VI COULD SAVE MONEY

Although I do not think it probable, title VI of the civil rights bill could help the poor taxpayer. It would eliminate Federal aid to any who practice discrimination. If this were enforced it would eliminate most Federal programs; cut Federal spending and save money; cause a return to private endeavors. I raised this point in debate, almost facetiously, because I am sure those who are strongest for civil rights would not want to give up any of the handouts of a paternal government.

This section, however, proves how this bill would put practically every citizen under the threat of Federal control. It would cover through such programs as FHA, Small Business Administration, and through the use of subsidies, practically anyone who buys or sells, does business with the Government or deals with anyone who does business with the Government.

FEPC

States rights, the right to work, freedom to hire and fire, all are put in jeopardy by title VII to create a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. Under this title every business, industry, employer, employment agency, labor union would be affected. Under this one part of the bill business could be required:

Recruit Negroes, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, or persons of particular national origin to end "racial imbalance" or "religious imbalance" found to exist in the opinion of Federal inspectors.

It would throw out learning, ability, training, willingness to work in the matter of hiring employees in favor of the sole consideration of race, religion, or national origin. It could well mean the end of private enterprise in America. The whole concept of the civil rights bill is based on government by men, not by law, and therein lies its greatest threat to the liberties of all.

Needed Salary Increase for Letter Carriers and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the sponsors of the legislation for pay increases for our letter carriers and other Federal employees, and I am very hopeful that early action will be taken by Congress.

With permission to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to an editorial which appeared on February 7, 1964, in the Chief, the civil employees' weekly newspaper, and was written by Mr. Philip Lepper, president of the New York Letter Carriers' Branch 36, NALC, AFL-CIO. I am very sympathetic with the plight of our letter carriers and support their plan for an orderly visual demonstration of their needs to take place on March 6. Mr. Lepper's editorial follows:

LETTER CARRIERS' PAY PLIGHT

(By Philip Lepper)

Federal employees, and particularly postal employees, have for too long been taken for granted. The proficiency, dedication, and resourcefulness of the letter carrier, which is continually acknowledged, is not properly reflected in the paycheck. It is astounding that a man's take-home pay, in step 6, amounts to about $83 and some few cents change every week for a family of four. Is it any wonder, therefore, that letter carriers are compelled to augment their income by working two jobs?

Consider, if you will, the arduous mental and physical demands of his position. The average letter carrier arises at 4:15 each morning in order to report to his station at 6 a.m. No additional differential is paid him for the work performed between 6 a.m. and 8 a.m., when most employees in government as well as private industry commence their day's work, with the vast majority starting no earlier than 9 a.m.

In order for a letter carrier to obtain 8 hours' rest, he must retire at 8:15 p.m., even before his children do. After a full day's work of 8 hours, he must then prepare for the second job, sapping his strength in an effort to make ends meet, and in so doing, aside from the strain on his health, he is deprived of a normal family life.

He is denied time and one half pay for Saturday work, receiving a day off instead. Many carriers in business districts work a 6-day, 40-hour week, unheard of in private industry.

What is his outlook toward educating his children in schools of higher education? What opportunity does he have for relaxation? This is the confrontation of the letter carrier today, plus his insistence that he be treated with dignity and respect.

President Johnson has wisely lent the support of his high office toward ameliorating the situation. The Congress must act with speed and sincerity, however, in its obligation to the letter carrier and other Federal employees. The Pay Reform Act of 1962 established the principle of comparability with private industry. It is a debt of honor that must be discharged.

Toward this end, the New York Letter Carriers' Branch 36, NALC, affiliated with the AFL-CIO, will demonstrate in an orderly and lawful manner, in accordance with the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912, on March 6 at the general post office. It will not be a strike; it will be a visual demonstration of our needs, through the use of signs carried by our people, preceded by a meeting of the branch at Manhattan Center. We are hopeful that Congressmen will join us in this demonstration of petition to expedite our much-needed and deserved increase in salary.

The 46th Anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, which took place on February 16, 1918.

The American people join with the over 1 million Lithuanians living in the United States and the nearly 3 million living in their native land in their hope and expectation that one day in the not-too-distant future they will be able to return to a free Lithuania, free from the oppression of communism. Communism in Lithuania has murdered hundreds of thousands, exiling many others to slave-labor camps in Siberia. With Soviet oppression has come poverty and an absolute decline in population.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania stands out today as a symbol to the world of Soviet imperialism. Free elections have not been held since the Communists took control and incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union in 1940. This imperialism and the extent of its exploitation of all Baltic countries far surpasses anything America has ever undertaken, even in our most expansive era. Let all those who search for the truth in today's troubled world see clearly the extent and power of Soviet imperialism.

Last year, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 55, which calls for free elections for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, to be held under the supervision of the United Nations. Many members have introduced similar resolutions. Action on these resolutions should be forthcoming quickly, and the President of the United States should directly challenge the Soviet Union to permit free and internationally supervised elections in the Baltic states. This is the way to rid these states of the Communist yoke and help them onto the road to freedom.

Days of Early Dutch Settlers Recalled by Flatlands Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the 16th Congressional District of New York, which includes Staten Island and the Flatlands Flatbush section of Brooklyn, there is a concentration of the Dutch population of the city of New York. The Protestant Dutch Reformed Church of Flatlands yesterday observed the 310th anniversary of its founding, and I would like to extend to them my congratulations. The New York Times of Monday, February 10, contains an article concerning the days of the early Dutch settlers in New York, and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article:

DAYS OF EARLY DUTCH SETTLERS RECALLED BY FLATLANDS CHURCH

The Protestant Dutch Reformed Church of Flatlands yesterday observed the 310th anniversary of its founding. A landmark of New York City, the church at Kings Highway and East 40th Street in Brooklyn is noted for its rural atmosphere and the simplicity of its architecture.

The present edifice, a small, white building in the late Federal style, was completed in 1848. It is the third to house the church since its founding on February 9, 1654.

Religious services were held by the Rev. Johannes Theodorus Polhemus in private homes in New Amersfort, as the area was once called, until the first church was erected in 1663.

The first Flatlands Church was octagonal in shape. Its roof and walls had heavy spruce shingles. In the open space in front of the church were stocks and a whipping post for punishment of crimes in the city's early days. Adjacent to the church is a burial ground where tombstones bear the names of many of the early Dutch settlers.

ONE OF STUYVESANT'S THREE

The church was enlarged in 1752 and rebuilt in 1794. The second church building remained for 54 years until the present edifice was built.

The Flatlands Church was one of three churches founded when Director General Peter Stuyvesant of New Netherland authorized the Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, who was the dominie of the church in the fort, now known as the Marble Collegiate Church, 5th Avenue and 29th Street, to go to Long Island and organize congregations at New Amersfort, Midwout and Breukelen.

The church at New Amersfort became the Flatlands church; the one at Midwout became the Reformed Church of Flatbush at 890 Flatbush Avenue, and the one at Breukelen, the Old First Reformed Church at 126 Seventh Avenue in Brooklyn. The Flatlands and the Flatbush churches continue on their original sites.

WHAT A CHURCH SHOULD DO

The Reverend Jon Hinkamp, the 23d minister of the Flatlands Church, said in his sermon yesterday that the church must "search into the life of the city to find the needs of the community wherein the opportunities of the church lie."

It is not sufficient, he maintained, to stand in a pulpit and answer questions that the congregation has not asked. There is a need, he emphasized, "for a broadening of vision beyond a simple vision of a country church."

The church, he said, was dedicated to serve the community and possibly the opportunity to serve it does not lie within 10 blocks of the church.

In an afternoon service of thanksgiving and rededication at the Flatlands Church, the Reverend Dr. Howard G. Hageman, pastor of the North Reformed Church in Newark, and former president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, said that the church must be willing to take chances and suffer rather than live on its heritage.

Our Fallen Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following poem written by my distinguished constituent, Mr. Fizer M. Noe, of Houston, Tex., in the Appendix of the RECORD. This is a most moving tribute to our late beloved President John F. Kennedy:

OUR FALLEN HERO

Cold lies the wreath upon the snow.
  Beneath it a form smolders to dust.
Our fallen hero's life is spent;
  His soul lives on among the just.

Life's battle now is fought and won;
  In each conflict he was brave and strong.
An assassin's bullet cut him down;
  He lies a hero uncrowned, renowned.

He battled here for peace.
  Walked head high, with firm sure power;
Self-giving, poured life and love
  Into each passing hour.

Like the Chief Guardian of his soul
  Was told of impending danger;
He steadfastly set his face toward Dallas
  And in triumph rode her streets no stranger.

Our First Fair Lady by his side,
  Shared each moment with equal pride.
Tall, straight and strong;
  He cowered not before any wrong.

He lived and died, not in vain;
  Help us our Father in Thy Name,
That in the end we shall give back to Thee
  A life well spent for God and man!

A white wreath lies upon the glistening snow;
  Beneath our Chieftain's body goes back to dust.
The eternal why? screams for reply;
  God made us; He is just!

—FIZER MONTAGUE NOE.

Gulf Area Stresses Family Fun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine article on the gulf area which appeared in the February 4 edition of Christian Science Monitor:

GULF AREA STRESSES FAMILY FUN

PENSACOLA, FLA.—History, the world's whitest beaches, and nature stand shoulder to shoulder facing the Gulf of Mexico along the 100-mile arc of U.S. Highway 98 stretching eastward from here to Panama City. Called Florida's "Miracle Strip," it is an all-year-round resort area, with the emphasis on family fun.

Pensacola itself was the first European settlement in North America, for a Spaniard named Don Tristan de Luna led more than 1,500 colonists ashore here in 1559, but after 2 years the first town was abandoned. The entire stretch between Pensacola and Panama City was claimed and settled permanently more than 60 years before the Pilgrims landed at Pilgrim Rock.

Evidence of these early settlers are still preserved, though most of the museums, forts, and other remnants of history here are of more recent vintage, much of it related to pirates, sunken ships, treasures and Indian and Civil War battles.

On nearby Santa Rosa Island, one of the more interesting attractions is "Spanish Village," a replica of the third site of Pensacola, dating back to 1721. Much older is Fort San Carlos, built by the Spaniards in 1598. Just beyond is old Fort Pickens, where the renegade Apache Indian, Geronimo, was imprisoned after being taken prisoner in Arizona.

FIESTA OF FIVE FLAGS

Down through the years, five flags—Spanish, French, English, United States, and Confederate have flown over Pensacola, and the bay has changed hands 13 times. Now, early each summer, usually at the beginning of June, Pensacola has an annual celebration called the Fiesta of Five Flags that commemorates De Luna's landing and the various nations that have ruled over the city in the over 400 years that followed.

For recreation, there is swimming, deep-sea and fresh-water fishing, and several golf courses, including one where the $25,000 Pensacola Open is played each spring, in the Pensacola area.

PIRATE HONORED

Some 30 miles eastward from Pensacola is Fort Walton Beach, where the old pirate Billy Bowlegs is honored every year with a festival. Here, too, are an Indian temple

mound and museum that traces local Indians back about 3,000 years. Just to the north of town is Eglin Field, site of the U.S. Air Force's reservation, where new planes, equipment, and air-guerrilla tactics are perfected.

It was here that Jimmy Doolittle and his men trained for their "30 seconds over Tokyo" at the beginning of World War II. The Playground Chamber of Commerce, in Fort Walton Beach, can arrange free tours of this base, including a tour of the climatic hangar, where any weather conditions on earth can be simulated.

Secret Agreement With Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the careless and unauthorized secret agreements that our State Department is making with foreign countries are again plaguing and embarrassing the United States.

It has now come to light that on June 15, 1962, American officials made a secret agreement with Panama. One provision of this agreement:

A new treaty will have to be adopted.

This, of course, refers to the 1903 treaty between the United States and Panama regarding the Panama Canal.

This 1962 agreement was so secret that Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman stated that he knew nothing about it.

This secret agreement must share a great portion of the responsibility for the anti-American riots in Panama.

According to the Washington Post on February 9, Reporter Dan Kurzman:

The secret understanding provides a revealing backdrop for the current crisis, helping to explain its explosively emotional and thus far stubbornly inflexible nature.

On several occasions following the riots that erupted in the Canal Zone on January 9 and 10, American officials, the record shows, have privately agreed to negotiate, not just to discuss, a treaty to replace the 1903 treaty granting the United States its present rights in the zone.

However, fears of adverse reaction in the United States, particularly from Congress, have prevented U.S. officials from saying publicly what they have said privately.

The State Department promptly denied that the 1962 memorandum constituted any commitment by the United States to renegotiate the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty. The memo was described as "simply a memorandum of conversation describing certain conditions which might entail treaty revision." Under Secretary of State Harriman also denied that U.S. officials have privately agreed to negotiate a new treaty, but admitted that he did not know what was done in 1962.

The United States had many years of experience in observing the frequently tragic results arising from secret diplomacy. At the close of World War I, President Woodrow Wilson specified in one of his 14 points:

There shall be no private international undertakings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

We cannot help but wonder how many more such potentially embarrassing secret agreements have been made. It is not in the interest of the United States to engage in this sort of dangerous diplomacy. We have the lessons of the past as examples to keep us from making such mistakes, and our officials would be well advised to heed them.

A Tribute to the AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans Organization of World War II has made substantial and persistent contributions in support of patriotic programs of this Nation, and has a most impressive record of demonstrated concern for and interest in the welfare of all veterans and their dependents.

Of course no unit or organization of any kind can do its work or fulfill its ambitions without the direction of able and devoted leaders. On this score, the AMVETS are fortunate indeed to have as their State commander in Massachusetts, Mr. John J. Towey. None has given more and few have given as much in sacrifice of time, energy, and devotion to zealous performance of the AMVETS patriotic program.

The Department of Massachusetts AMVETS and auxiliary in cosponsorship with the city of Boston held the annual Pearl Harbor remembrance at Faneuil Hall in Boston on December 8, 1963. On this occasion, State Commander Towey commemorated both November 22, 1963, and December 7, 1941, and paid homage to all those Americans who sacrificed their lives for our freedom.

The day before this observance Commander Towey had visited the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the grave of our late President John F. Kennedy and in his speech on the date of this observance pledged forever to try to live up to the standards that have been passed on to us and asked that all those in attendance make this pledge in order that we may have a better America tomorrow.

The AMVETS received their Federal charter in 1947. The name AMVETS was officially adopted at the first national convention in Chicago in October 1945. This organization literally born in war, has served the cause of peace since its founding. The charter was amended in 1950 to make veterans of Korea eligible. Eligibility in AMVETS is based on honorable service in the armed services or to those American citizens serving with the armed forces of an allied nation on or after September 16, 1940, and before January 31, 1955.

The white clover is the official flower of the AMVETS because it grows everywhere and symbolizes the farflung battlefields where members of AMVETS have served.

In one of its recently published statements of purpose the following objectives were set forth by AMVETS:

To help keep our country's feet on the ground in the matter of veterans' legislation and benefits; to provide the extra assistance needed and deserved by our fellow veteran, or his widow and children; to preserve in perpetual memory the sacrifice made by those who gave their lives for our country; to build a stronger Nation by helping to solve, as citizens, the problems of our communities and Nation.

It is a great honor and privilege to be a member of this fine patriotic organization. As one who holds a lifetime membership in the AMVETS I shall always cherish and try to live up to its high ideals and I shall endeavor to assist in its ambitions and aims in order to make this a better Nation for all.

As a federally chartered veterans organization the AMVETS can be depended upon to continue to serve the Nation in the cause of peace and to keep alive the memories of those who gave their full measure of devotion so that this Nation under God would not perish from the earth.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a very impressive work by H. William Sparks which I would like to share with my colleagues in the Congress, because of its timeliness and stirring message. The poem follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS

We want equal rights in all the schools.
We want equal rights in swimming pools.
Give us equal rights to learn a trade.
Give us equal rights to "make the grade."

Equal rights to choose a place to live.
Equal rights to try to get or give.
Equal rights to eat any place we choose.
And equal rights to make the news.

We want equal rights to praise or berate.
Equal rights to be masters of our fate.
Equal rights to work—Equal rights to cease.
Equal rights to walk the earth in peace.

Give us equal rights to be a man.
Equal rights to do the best we can.
Equal rights to mix with black and white.
These things we claim as our birthright.

Give us equal protection of the laws.
Give us equal justice to help our cause.
We want equal rights to picket or pray.
We want equal rights from day to day.

Equal rights to be smart, or to be dumb.
Equal rights to be like a king or bum.
To make it real clear—We want full rights
To all the rights now held by whites.

FEPC Reports on California Fair Housing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the progressive State of California has been operating now for nearly 5 months under the Rumford Fair Housing Act. In some apartment house circles this legislation has been classed as forced housing and discriminatory toward the property class.

I think it is significant that out of some 18 million people now residing in the Golden State that but 59 complaints have been filed with the State FEPC to date under the act. I wish to call to the attention of the Congress of the report recently filed by the State of California Division of Fair Employment Practices:

FEPC REPORTS ON OPERATION OF RUMFORD FAIR HOUSING ACT

A gradual increase in the number of complaints of alleged recial discrimination in housing, and their expeditious handling under provisions of the Rumford Fair Housing Act, were reported today in Los Angeles by Mrs. Carmen H. Warschaw, chairman of the California Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Thirty of the fifty-nine cases brought to FEPC since September 20, 1963, have reached final disposition, Mrs. Warschaw said. Eighteen of the others are new cases filed during the past 4 weeks.

Of the 30 completed cases, 14, or nearly half, resulted in satisfactory adjustments. All 14 involved discrimination against Negroes who, in most cases, had been refused an opportunity to be shown dwellings they wished to inspect. After investigation and conciliatory efforts by FEP Commissioners and staff, they were offered the accommodations.

With a single exception, all cases in which there was a finding of discrimination were settled through conciliation. The exception is a San Fernando apartment rental complaint brought to public hearing in Los Angeles on January 23 and still under advisement, awaiting the filing of briefs.

"We feel that the record of the past 4½ months indicates the soundness of the main assumption of the Rumford Act," said Mrs. Warschaw. "That is, that a grievance involving racial or religious discrimination in housing can be settled more promptly and therefore more effectively by a well-equipped administrative agency than through long litigation in the courts.

"The Fair Housing Act is new only because it assigns such a function to FEPC. Otherwise, essentially, it restates provisions of two statutes on the books since 1959, applying to dwellings financed with public assistance and to persons and firms in the business of housing.

"FEPC, which continues to handle a heavy load of employment discrimination cases, has shown in this short period that it can apply these provisions to the solution of the massive problem of inequities in the housing market."

Other facts about the 59 housing cases filed with FEPC between September 20, 1963, and January 31, 1964, as reported by Mrs. Warschaw:

Thirty-one cases originated in northern California, twenty-eight in southern California.

All but five were filed by Negroes. Two were from persons of Spanish surnames; one claimed discrimination because of national origin and religion; one East Indian alleged discrimination because of color; one claimed a tenant was aiding and abetting discrimination against Negroes.

The majority of cases involved apartment rentals, but some concerned sale or rental of homes. Twelve named real estate brokers as respondents or correspondents. Other respondents were public housing authorities, trailer parks, homeowners, a savings and loan association, a tract developer, a lessor, and a tenant.

Besides the 14 cases satisfactorily adjusted, 16 have been dismissed for reason of no evidence or insufficient evidence of discrimination, no jurisdiction, or withdrawal by the complainant.

Twenty-three complaints were filed in Los Angeles County and fifteen in San Francisco. Other counties: Orange, three; Riverside, one; San Bernardino, one; Marin, four; San Mateo, three; Contra Costa, two; Sacramento, two; Alameda, two; Tuolumne, one; Santa Clara, one; Merced, one.

Mrs. Warschaw made her report from the FEPC's new offices at 322 West First Street, Los Angeles. She was appointed chairman in January, succeeding John Anson Ford, who headed the FEPC from its beginning in September 1959 until last month. Ford was reappointed to commission membership.

Newly appointed to the commission last month by Gov. Edmund G. Brown were Louis Garcia, San Francisco attorney, and Clive H. Graham, Long Beach realtor. Other members who have served with Chairman Warschaw and Ford since 1959 are: Elton Brombascher, Richmond printing firm owner; C. L. Dellums, Oakland labor official; and Dwight R. Zook, Los Angeles aircraft executive.

Edward Howden is executive officer of the FEPC, which administers the Fair Employment Practice Act as well as the Fair Housing Act. The agency is part of the department of industrial relations, of which Ernest B. Webb is director.

Westside Jewish Community Center, Los Angeles, Celebrates 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Westside Jewish Community Center, which is located in my congressional district in Los Angeles, will celebrate its 10th anniversary of service to the community on Sunday, March 1, 1964.

Serving approximately 7,000 members each year, considering its 10-year history, the center has been a meetingplace for more than 6 million people from 3 to 93.

The programs offered by the center are rich and varied. They cover all of the arts with activities in drama, arts and crafts, music, and the dance. The center has been a focus of artistic endeavors including its annual art sale, regular exhibitions, and concerts. These are just a part of the many cultural endeavors which take place there.

Thousands of children especially participate in all kinds of programs sponsored by the center, including summer day camp, swimming all through the year, use of the gymnasium, the courts, and of course, the playground. Young working mothers have found a wonderful place for their very small children, under the guidance of the nursery school staff.

The center cooperates with all other community organizations. Upward of 500 groups and chapters of civic, philanthropic, and social clubs have held meetings and special events at Westside, including the Girl Scouts, Hadassah, Histadrut, Jewish War Veterans, Mizrachi Women, Pioneer Women, Red Cross, United Jewish Welfare Fund, and the United Way.

But I think that most important of all, the Westside Jewish Community Center offers an opportunity for friendship, not only to newcomers to Los Angeles, of which there are so many, but to those who have lived there for many years too. There is an opportunity for persons of any age to find a group or club to their liking.

I commend the Westside Jewish Community Center on its 10th anniversary, and I have every hope that the next 10 years will be as fruitful and as successful as these past 10.

Freedom and Opportunity for All Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times, it is refreshing to know that between those of the far right and those of the far left, the great majority of the American people still believe that there was in what our ancestors struggled for, the greatness of truth; and that there was in what Abraham Lincoln struggled to preserve and protect, freedom and opportunity for all mankind.

Perhaps no finer statement of the basic principles our forefathers struggled for, which Mr. Lincoln preserved, can be found than the Kansas resolution which was adopted by the 73d Annual Congress of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution at Lexington, Ky., on May 22, 1963, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Resolution to declare our hostility against all forms of governmental oppression, and against every form of tyranny over the mind of man

Whereas the great message of the American revolutionists of 1776 to the world was, that the state exists for the people, not the people for the state; that the human dignity of the individual means something, and must always be fiercely protected by courts and juries from governmental oppression, and from every form of tyranny over the mind of man; and

Whereas in recent times there has crept in amongst us reactionary, medieval, feudalistic, foreign ideologies from communistic

and other totalitarian states, utterly inconsistent with the political philosophy of our Founding Fathers: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution reaffirm the declarations of the first American revolutionists, and swear eternal hostility against all forms of governmental oppression, and against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

The Kansas Society of the Sons of the American Revolution was organized over 70 years ago by Judge Franklin G. Adams, the first secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society. During the 70 years of its existence, this splendid patriotic and historical society has quietly contributed in a great variety of ways to the preservation and the principles set out in this resolution. I am proud to be a member of this great patriotic organization.

Scouting Can Make the Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Scouting Can Make the Difference," which appeared in the February 4 issue of the Gleaner-Journal of Henderson, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SCOUTING CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

The 54th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America is being observed during Boy Scout Week, February 7 to 13, under the theme "Strengthen America—Scouting Can Make the Difference."

Across the Nation, there are now 3,990,000 boys in 136,800 Cub Scout packs, Boy Scout troops, and Explorer posts. It is in these units that boys' characters are influenced by cubmasters, scoutmasters, and explorer advisers. Here boys learn skills and leaderships and are encouraged to become men of character and participating citizens.

Nearly 1½ million adults gladly invest their time and energy as leaders in Scouting so that boys may grow into better citizens.

Since 1910 there have been 37½ million American boys and men in Scouting.

Recently, Malcolm B. Johnson, executive editor of the Tallahassee Democrat wrote of his experience with personnel experts who told some editors how to interview, test, and select employees. They have a test for nearly everything—aptitude, work skill, personality, alertness, and the like—but they didn't have a workable test for initiative or judgment.

Someone suggested, "Ask the applicant how far he got as a Boy Scout. If he tells you he made Eagle—or almost made it—you can be sure he once had most of what you want for a reporter or editor—and that he probably still has it."

Mr. Johnson says they tried that test on beginning reporters, and it hasn't failed yet.

It takes initiative, perseverance, curiosity, versatility, scholarship, and determination for a boy to win an Eagle Badge, Mr. Johnson believes. "By the time he gets it, he has the experience that will help him develop good judgment, high character, and probably personality—if he doesn't already have it.

There are other elements in Scouting of great value.

"There's cooperation and tolerance in a Boy Scout troop," he says. "The underdog or the picked chicken soon finds a defender, if he wants one, to help him take it; but there's competition, too, and pride and leadership.

"These Scouts still hold God and country high. They still snap to attention for the flag. They still mean it when they talk about doing a good turn every day. They take seriously the law that a Scout must be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

"They still stand erect and swear to obey the laws and to keep themselves 'physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.' Their badge still bears the motto—'Be Prepared.'

"Now, there may be some who'll call it corn and sneer at him; but nobody has offered anything to match it in making a real American out of a boy."

Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 9, 1964, the Washington Sunday Star carried an excellent editorial on the proceedings in the Bobby Baker case which I feel should be brought to the attention of the Congress. The editorial follows:

INTIMIDATION

There are several aspects—all bad—of the attempt to discredit the testimony of Don B. Reynolds, a principal witness in the Senate investigation of the Bobby Baker case.

One is the apparent effort to smear Mr. Reynolds by leaking supposedly confidential information in Government files. The accusations against Mr. Reynolds may be true or untrue. This is beside the point. What should be of primary concern, upon even a little reflection, are the implications of this shabby business. If anyone is disposed to shrug it off, he should ask himself: Could I be next?

Another aspect is the probably effect on some other person who may be called upon to testify before Senator JORDAN'S committee. Would he testify freely? Probably not, in the face of the prospect that the contents of the Government's secret files might be used against him. If this isn't intimidation, what is it?

A third aspect is the effect on the Senate committee. It has been made to look slightly idiotic. For its chairman says that neither the Senators on the committee nor the members of its staff had any knowledge of the information which somebody in the White House or elsewhere in the executive branch saw fit to leak.

The person or persons really responsible for this, not the underlings, ought to be publicly identified. But this may not be possible. One thing, however, is entirely possible. This is for the Jordan committee to get down to the serious business of investigating the Baker case and to demonstrate that it will not tamely submit to intimidation of its witnesses.

Don Reynolds should be called on for public testimony. Bobby Baker should be brought in and asked to tell his story under oath, subject to cross-examination. The same goes for Walter Jenkins, the President's aid. And there are others, whose names, if now unknown to the committee, can be readily ascertained.

It is much too late to sweep this business under the rug or to hush it up by resort to smear tactics. On the contrary, it seems to us that the members of the Jordan committee ought to be outraged by what has happened—and determined to dig harder and deeper.

Mrs. St. George and Inter-American Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentle lady from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], has performed a commendable service both to this House and to her country.

Two days ago, during the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference here in Washington, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, who served as chairman of the meeting, materially eased a ticklish situation. Her diplomacy in explaining that the absence from the Conference of some of those scheduled to represent the U.S. Congress resulted from their necessary presence on Capitol Hill for the consideration of important legislation ameliorated the irritation of Latin American delegates.

We owe Mrs. ST. GEORGE our gratitude and respect.

In that regard and for the information of those Members who may be unaware of Mrs. ST. GEORGE'S action in averting any offense to our distinguished counterparts from Central and South America, I offer the following news account from yesterday's New York Times:

MRS. ST. GEORGE PLACATES LATINS AT CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, February 6.—Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE managed to calm 60 irate Latin American delegates today at the Pan American Inter-Parliamentary Conference.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, the New York Republican who is chairman of the organization's third annual meeting and the only woman delegate, encountered a barrage of criticism because only three Members of Congress were present instead of the scheduled 26. The Latin Americans present felt this was cavalier treatment from the host country.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, with motherly patience, explained that the lawmakers were tied up with the tax bill in the Senate and civil rights in the House.

"Unfortunately, we must think about getting reelected every 2 years," she said, "Perhaps there are more perfect parliamentary systems than ours but we have to live with what we have."

EXPLANATION IS PRAISED

Delegates from eight Latin American countries praised her for her explanation.

In public and private remarks they continued to reflect dismay over what they think has been a lack of interest by the administration and Congress in the conference.

A widespread feeling was apparent that it had not been enough for Secretary of State Dean Rusk to open the 3-day meeting yesterday and for Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, to give a cocktail party..

Mrs. ST. GEORGE said there could have been "more commonsense and tact" in the preparations for the Conference.

Ignacio Luis Arcaya, President of the Chamber of Deputies of Venezuela and a former Foreign Minister, asked why no provision had been made to take the delegates to a session of the Senate or the House.

There was also discontent over the speeches of the U.S. delegates.

Representative JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico, discussing the development of the Alliance for Progress, stressed that more emphasis should be placed by Latin America on the self-help aspects of the program.

The Brazilian delegation countered by offering a five-point resolution demanding that the Alliance be strenghtened. It called for adopting a truly multilateral system for decisions, assuring fair prices for Latin American exports, helping countries reschedule external debts, eliminating protective policies of private enterprise and accelerating the economic integration of Latin America.

Senator João Agripino, of Brazil, expressed surprise when he was informed that the United States and the Latin American countries had already agreed on establishing an executive committee for the Alliance to determine joint policies.

"If this was done," he replied, "then there should have been greater publicity about it, so that our countries can find out more about what is happening to the Alliance."

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there is a group—a growing group—of Americans who need help and need it badly. They are the men and women whose age makes them no longer desirable in the job markets of the Nation. Many of them are skilled. But companies which are looking at retirement, disability, and fringe benefit problems want younger employees. There is discrimination against men and women in this group. Theirs is a harsh problem. Living costs are high. Income is low. Employers all too frequently follow a hard and fast rule against employing persons over 45.

In the field of help for the aging, a bill such as this could be useful. It would force action on a problem which has long been recognized, but about which nothing of consequence has been done. Year after year there is talk. There are high level conferences. Commissions are appointed. But nothing comes of it. After some pious resolutions, the problem goes back on the shelf. There is no comprehensive plan to help provide jobs for the aging.

For days the House has attempted to create an image by which to place this bill in a favorable light. A provision on the aging will not make it a good bill. But here at least is an area where action is needed. I sincerely hope the amendment will be accepted.

Caribbean Crisis: Castro's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I have repeatedly pointed out, the wave of violence now growing in the Caribbean does not consist of isolated incidents but form part of a well-coordinated plan for conquest. The cutting off of the water supply by the Cuban Government to our naval station at Guantanamo is directly related to the crisis at the focal target on the isthmus—the Panama Canal.

It was highly gratifying to read in the February 7, 1964, Evening Star of Washington, D.C., a thoughtful appraisal of this latest Cuban challenge and to note the positive action urged in it, with which many of our thoughtful citizens agree.

The indicated editorial follows:

CASTRO'S CHALLENGE

In cutting off the water supply to Guantanamo, Fidel Castro has confronted the United States with an open and ominous challenge. There is no use trying to look the other way. We will face this threat and take the necessary action, or henceforth we will be hounded and harassed incessantly by Havana's two-bit dictator.

It is perfectly clear that the arrested Cuban fishermen were illegally in American waters. Our officials say that the captain of one of the vessels radioed Havana to this effect, and there is no reason to doubt it. There is also considerable reason to believe that this was a planned incident—that the fishermen were sent on their mission in the hope of provoking an arrest which would give Castro an excuse to shut off the water supply. At least, it seems significant that Castro allowed just 45 minutes between his protest and his shutting off of the water—hardly time for the United States to react. Meanwhile, his Russian friends were all set with a Pravda blast accusing pirates in the United States of flouting international law. Perhaps we now have a pretty good clue as to one subject of recent conversations between Messrs. Castro and Khrushchev.

The water for our naval base comes from a pumping station on the Yateras River 4 miles from the reservation. We built the pumping station and the water pipeline in 1941, and have been paying $14,000 a month for use of the water. After completion, the station was turned over to a private Cuban company, which was nationalized when Castro seized power. So the setup, from his point of view, is ideal for harassment.

Of course, we can limp along at Guantanamo for a long time and perhaps indefinitely without water from the Yateras. And this without benefit of Castro's generosity in offering to turn on the water for an hour each day for the benefit of women and children on the base. This offer, of course, is not only a calculated affront; it is also a shrewd move. If we accept it we implicitly concede Castro's right to control the flow of water. If we reject it he will argue that he was willing to prevent suffering on the part of the Americans.

This issue, however, is not one of water alone. With rationing, tankers and similar expedients we could get by. The question is whether we will submit to this form of coercion—a coercion which obviously is designed to test our will and our reaction. If our officials decide to submit, they should do so in full awareness that this will be the first, but not the last, episode in a campaign aimed at eventually forcing us out of Guantanamo and undermining us throughout Latin America.

Admittedly, effective counteraction will not be easy. But it should be taken nevertheless. President Johnson has ordered a crash study to prepare a thorough set of recommendations to deal with the problem. Surely, in view of previous threats to the water supply, this must have been done long ago. If not, someone has been deplorably negligent.

When the pipeline was threatened during the Castro revolution, marines were sent out to protect it. We think they should be used again.

Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all have been reluctant to comment on the effectiveness of an investigation being conducted by a committee of the other body.

The implications of some aspects of the Baker case have grown so wide that we can on longer ignore them. Typical of responsible comment reflecting this unrest is the folowing editorial taken from the February 9, 1964 issue of the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star:

INTIMIDATION

There are several aspects—all bad—of the attempt to discredit the testimony of Don B. Reynolds, a principal witness in the Senate investigation of the Bobby Baker case.

One is the apparent effort to smear Mr. Reynolds by leaking supposedly confidential information in Government files. The accusations against Mr. Reynolds may be true or untrue. This is besides the point. What should be of primary concern, upon even a little reflection, are the implications of this shabby business. If anyone is disposed to shrug it off, he should ask himself: "Could I be next?"

Another aspect is the probable effect on some other person who may be called upon to testify before Senator JORDAN'S committee. Would he testify freely? Probably not, in the face of the prospect that the contents of the Government's secret files might be used against him. If this isn't intimidation, what is it?

A third aspect is the effect on the Senate committee. It has been made to look slightly idiotic. For its chairman says that neither the Senators on the committee nor the members of its staff had any knowledge of the information which somebody in the White House or elsewhere in the executive branch saw fit to leak.

The person or persons really responsible for this, not the underlings, ought to be publicly identified. But this may not be possible. One thing, however, is entirely possible. This is for the Jordan committee to get down to the serious business of investigating the Baker case and to demonstrate that it will not tamely submit to intimidation of its witnesses.

Don Reynolds should be called on for public testimony. Bobby Baker should be brought in and asked to tell his story under oath, subject to cross-examination. The same goes for Walter Jenkins, the President's aid. And there are others, whose names, if now unknown to the committee, can be readily ascertained.

It is much too late to sweep this business under the rug or to hush it up by resort to smear tactics. On the contrary, it seems to us that the members of the Jordan committee ought to be outraged by what has happened—and determined to dig harder and deeper.

What Are We Going To Do About Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Castro government in Cuba in cutting off the supply of fresh water to the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay is an action which was provocative but did not jeopardize our ability to maintain the aforesaid base. However, these actions of this irresponsible government have evoked many reactions, the most of which are a growing determination for a completely uncompromising attitude toward this Communist government. This reaction is very well expressed in an editorial which appeared on February 8; in the Bristol Daily Courier and Levittown Times, two outstanding newspapers in Bucks County, Pa. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the aforesaid editorial, which is as follows:

SLAPPING CASTRO DOWN

Fidel Castro's latest play, shutting off the water supply to Guantanamo Naval Base, in a meaningless stunt obviously designed only to tweak the tiger's tail. It has significance only in the matter of prestige before other nations.

Guantanamo has sufficient water supply at present to continue for some time and it can be resupplied without too much difficulty, both from bases on the mainland and through use of a distilling ship now in the giant Navy base.

The matter of prestige, however, is of sufficient importance to merit fast and punitive counteraction by the United States.

U.S. prestige, particularly in Latin America, has suffered some damaging blows lately. The Panamanian riots touched off by Castro and fostered by the oligarchy that controls the tiny nation, is only the most recent example of how far our image has slipped south of the border. Widespread disorder continues in the most pro-American nation in South America, Venezuela. Peronistas grow stronger in Argentina; American citizens are kidnapped with impunity in Bolivia and American interests expropriated in several other nations.

Our answer must fall short of Senator GOLDWATER's impulsive suggestion that we send in the marines. But it must fall just short of that; it will have to be decisive, effective and most of all, immediate. It is much too close to midnight now in Latin America.

Integrity in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the committee in the other body, which is investigating the Bobby Baker scandal, is very much interested in getting to the bottom of things. The American people suspect a coverup. It is, therefore, quite appropriate that Raymond Moley, in the February 10 issue of Newsweek, talks about official integrity:

OFFICIAL INTEGRITY

(By Raymond Moley)

The very special standard of integrity by which official conduct should be judged has always had a fascination for every serious student of politics. I should like to write a book about it sometime; not a series of tales about rogues and roguery, but an examination of the valid reasons why there should be a quite different and higher standard of integrity in public office than that which prevails in private transactions.

My interest in this was quickened when in 1930 and 1931 I served as a staff member when Judge Samuel Seabury was exposing political and official misconduct in New York. A year later I was associated with Governor Roosevelt when he was seeking the presidential nomination. His first important public expression in that campaign came when Seabury sent Sheriff Thomas A. Farley to Albany under charges. Roosevelt removed Farley from office under a new and very special interpretation of ethical principles. He said that when it appears that a public official enjoys a scale of living, or has bank deposits far exceeding the public salary he is known to receive, "he owes a positive public duty to the community to give a reasonable or credible explanation of the sources" thereof.

The principle in effect reverses the judicial rule that the State must prove guilt. It requires that the public official must prove his innocence in such an instance.

F.D.R.'S DEFINITION

Roosevelt then asked me to elaborate and explain this principle in his order removing Farley. This is what appeared in that document:

"Passive acquiescence by unthinking people in the actions of those who shrewdly turn to personal advantage the opportunities offered by public office is out of step with modern ideals of government and with political morality.

"The stewardship of public officers is a serious and sacred trust. They are so close to the means for private gain that in a sense not at all true of private citizens their personal possessions are invested with a public importance in the event that their stewardship is questioned. One of their deep obligations is to recognize this, not reluctantly or with resistance, but freely. It is in the true spirit of a public trust to give, when personally called upon, public proof of the nature, source, and extent of their financial affairs.

"It is true that this is not always pleasant. Public service makes many exacting demands. It does not offer large material compensation; often it takes more than it gives. But the truly worthy steward of the public is not affected by this. His ultimate satisfaction always must be a personal sense of a service well done, and done in a spirit of unselfishness. Standards of public service must be measured in this way. The State must expect compliance with these standards because if popular government is to continue to exist it must * * * hold its stewards to a stern and uncompromising rectitude. It must be a just but a jealous master.

"Public office means serving the public and nobody else."

READING FOR L.B.J.

This definition of the trust of public office received widespread approval at the time and set a new standard of public service. It is a pity that it has now been forgotten in Washington.

Lyndon B. Johnson as majority leader was, as he now admits, Bobby Baker's employer. His power to inquire into Baker's affairs and to remove him paralleled that of the Governor of New York in 1932 to remove Farley. But as President he has attributed the uproar about the Baker affair to Republican criticism which, he says, he has enjoyed for 32 years. It is unfortunate that while he can remember Republican criticism in 1932 he fails to remember Roosevelt's position in that year in the Farley case.

In the many laudatory stories about the new President it has been noted that there are two pictures of Roosevelt in the room where he works. He might glance at these and then send to the new White House library for volume I of "The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt." The Farley order appears on pages 580–584.

Waxman Publications Celebrate 20th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I take special pride in paying tribute to the Waxman Publications and especially to Mrs. Ruth Waxman, its present publisher, who has carried on in the tradition of her late husband, Mr. Al Waxman, in providing invaluable service to our Los Angeles community. The Waxman Publications are celebrating their 20th anniversary, and I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the Waxman Reporter on January 29, 1964:

REPORTER ENTERS 20TH YEAR OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Edward S. Sullivan)

Three of your Waxman Reporter publications this week change their volume numbers to "Twentieth Year—No. 1," to mark completion of 19 years of service to their communities. The Los Angeles Reporter, the Wilshire Reporter and the Pico Reporter start their 20th years of service today. They

have not missed a single week's issue in all those years.

For more than 19 years, the late Al S. Waxman, founding editor and publisher of this chain of newspapers, stood at the helm. Al Waxman pased away last June 8, at the height of his career of community service. Mrs. Ruth Waxman, who worked closely with her late husband for many years, is now publisher of these newspapers, and it is our aim, and we hope and trust we are fulfilling it, to continue to serve our city and our community on the same dedicated level that Al Waxman achieved.

Your Reporter has appeared regularly, week after week, through many ups and downs. Closest to a calamity, Al Waxman used to recall came one Wednesday morning when a sudden flash flood of rain completely drench many bundles of our papers as they stood on street corners awaiting delivery.

At his own expense that week, Al reprinted the entire run and delivered them the following day. "This is the type of service," pointed out Waxman, "that we give to our advertisers and readers. They want the Reporter, they expect the Reporter, and they will get the Reporter."

Throughout the Nation, and in Los Angeles, large, wealthy daily and weekly newspapers have been forced to fall by the wayside and disappear from the scene. Continued loyalty of readers and support of advertisers have helped the Reporter publications continue to flourish and grow. More pages, more advertisements, more features, more news and service were printed this past year by the Waxman Reporter Publications than ever before in their history.

The Waxman Reporter publications have loyal readers. This is most important, actually it is the lifeblood of a publication. Advertisers are important, but no newspaper can have advertisers unless it has readers. We are grateful to the more than 150,000 readers who have continued to look toward the Reporter for their information and education. Gratitude is also extended to the advertisers who have continued through the years to use the columns and pages of the Reporter to reach those more than 150,000 readers with their messages.

Waxman Reporter publications have a wide reputation as being an independent chain of newspapers. Politically independent, we endorse candidates regardless of political party, on the basis of being the person best qualified for the office, the one who will do the most for the citizenry. Each candidate is considered as an individual and, as a result, as high as 19 out of 21 Reporter-endorsed candidates have been elected to office.

Nearly all of the advertisers in the Reporter publications are independent merchants, home-owned and not a part of a vast chain of stores. Most of the merchants advertising in the Reporter own their own business here, own their own homes here and have genuine concern for the welfare and growth of this particular community.

The Reporter publications have one of the very largest mailbox sections of any newspaper in this city. Letters from readers are welcomed. Readers enjoy the "mailbox" because opinions other than those of the newspapers' ownership are expressed. The Waxman Reporter publications, have been cited many times for excellence in journalism and "outstanding, courageous editorials" as well as for general service to the community and its clubs, organizations, and institutions.

Editorials from this newspaper have been reprinted in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and one of Al Waxman's won a Pulitzer Prize editorial nomination.

As this chain of newspapers nears completion of two decades in the community, its publisher, editor, and entire staff rededicate themselves to produce a newspaper which will be of genuine service to this bright and proud community of ours.

Where There Is No Vision, the People Perish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lucile Hosmer, of San Carlos, Calif., who is president of the Federation of Republican Women, has prepared an excellent article with the title "Where There Is No Vision, the People Perish."

Under leave to insert my own remarks and extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article by Lucile Hosmer:

"WHERE THERE IS NO VISION, THE PEOPLE PERISH" (PROVERBS 29: 18)

(By Lucile Hosmer)

From Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," written in 1788, come these five basic conclusions as to why great civilizations wither and die:

1. The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home which is the basis for all human society.

2. Higher and higher taxes, the spending of public money for free bread and entertainment for the people.

3. The mad craze for pleasure; sports becoming more exciting, more brutal; entertainment of all kinds becoming more immoral.

4. The building of greater and greater armaments when the real enemy is within * * * that is the decay and destruction of individual responsibility.

5. The decay and destruction of religion; faith fading into mere form and ritual, losing touch with its true spirit, losing touch with life, thus losing the truth, the inspiration, and the power to guide the people.

A people determined to remain free are equally determind not to be deceived by demagoguery. They cannot be conquered either from within or without so long as they remain alert to these dangers. The enslavement of a people is always the result of ignorance, apathy or deceit. For that reason we, as Americans, must have knowledge, awareness, understanding, learning and appreciation of the fundamental principles upon which our free Republic was established. We should be aware of the lessons taught to us by history so that we may avoid the mistakes made by other civilizations. We should be aware that history points out that despotism wants wealth, power and force in a few elect and select hands, while liberty and order are always supported by the virtue of the people.

The loss of our liberties, through laws of expediency and the encroachment of the Federal Government into the minutest detail of the daily life of the individual has come about so stealthily and has been woven thread by tiny thread so silently that the individual citizen is completely unaware of what has happened to his liberties. He has lost his measuring rod, his standard of reference, because he has lost his understanding and appreciation of the spirit behind those basic liberties which made this Nation great.

The men who founded this Nation knew and understood that "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (II Corinthians 3: 17). These men had crossed a dangerous and unknown ocean to settle in an equally unknown land because they had the vision of a nation of liberty and freedom under God, for the individual. Their vision was based on the Bible as the chart of life. This, they followed in every avenue of their experience, in the home, in the school, in the business and particularly in government. They wanted no interference from institutions perpetuated by government. They recognized that the right of the individual to "Work out his own salvation" (Philippians 2: 12), must be respected if they wanted the same treatment for themselves. They recognized the necessity to express the qualities of self-reliance, self-discipline, self-government, and independence: Governed by obedience to the laws of the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Christianity. Looking to history once more, we should be aware that the form of government which a people develop identifies their thinking concerning themselves and their relationship to others. The character, the faith and the lives of the men and women of a nation determine what that nation shall be.

The tremendous shift from the Founding Fathers' faith that "God helps those who help themselves," and acceptance of the Bible as the chart of life, to the present-day belief that an all-wise, man-created government can and will take care of all problems for the individual: Plus the philosphy that "There are no fixed and certain values or principles because all things are relative," has created a situation of turmoil, confusion, and immorality which is weakening the whole fabric of our Nation.

Much has been written, lately, much has been discussed everywhere in our country concerning the necessity for a reassessment of our present-day moral values and modes of conduct. Great concern is evident over the spread of immorality, vandalism, and violence. The craze for pleasure, the undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home, the decay and destruction of religion, faith fading into mere form and ritual * * * losing the truth, the inspiration and the power to guide the people; all of this concerns our thinking citizens. Why? Because it has such a familiar ring from the annals of history. It has happened before.

As Americans, responsible for the education and virtue of the people through education, we need to alert and awaken those citizens who are indifferent or asleep to these conditions. We, as an enlightened people, must take stock of ourselves. We must reverse this trend of no individual responsibility for the motives or acts. No individual becomes mature or adult who refuses to accept self-discipline, self-reliance, and self-government as part of his life experience. This combined with a fixed and permanent and unchanging code of conduct by which to operate is what is needed to bring us back to sanity.

A recent article in a daily newspaper referred to the fact that for a long time many educators and psychiatrists believed that there was nothing worse for an individual than frustration.

However, today, many of them are coming to the conclusion the self-nausea, as a result of satisfying any and all urges, plus no self-discipline or self-government and having no fixed code of conduct, can be much more devastating to the life of an individual. This truth was recognized a long, long time ago. Proverbs 25: 28: "He that hath no rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down and without walls."

Those who accepted to Bible as the Chart of Life, also accepted the discipline of the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Christianity. They understood that there would always be conflict or frustration within themselves as they strove to attain the stature demanded of them by their faith. They had their standards of reference for conduct: Their measuring rod, by which they operated. When they understood and lived by these standards, they did not crack up when adversity or crises came into their lives. They had the courage and the foun-

dation from which they could operate and face them and go on. However, where there is no right and no wrong except what is relative and no individual is responsible for what he does, no matter how vicious, but can always blame someone else or a set of circumstances; what other result can there be in our society but violence and chaos? What has happened to morality of conduct? What has happened to individual responsibility for a man's own actions?

In his farewell address, George Washington said, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports * * * and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on the minds of peculiar structure, reason, and experience, both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religion."

As virtue declines, leadership declines. Personalities become more important than principles. Promises are made by demagogues who try to be "all things to all people." One segment of society is victimized to placate another segment. Higher and higher taxes, the spending of public money for free bread and entertainment for the people and the ignoring of the real enemy within * * * the decay and destruction of individual responsibility.

The breaking away from the Republic with its religious basis, is the breaking away from self-restraint, self-discipline, and individual responsibility. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Where there is no vision, no principles, no ideals, no fixed code of conduct, the people cast off self-restraint and individual responsibility with the only possible result * * * turmoil and chaos.

We overvalue words and undervalue truth. We overvalue rights and privileges and undervalue duties and responsibilities. We undervalue the individual and overvalue the people or society. We forget that society is made up of individuals and that the strength of society depends upon the strength and character of the individuals who compose it. We forget, too, that from the beginnings of history, that the salvation of a nation or a civilization has always been a few individuals who saw the dangers ahead, and who tried to warn the people and too often they became the "saving remnant" who carried the torch of liberty from age to age.

What is needed, today, is for the people of this Republic to appraise the state of the Union. We need a spirit of dedication aroused to the active support of our principles and our republican institutions, we need to awaken the citizens of this great Nation to the fact that they and they alone are the custodians of their Government and that this responsibility has not been and cannot be delegated to politicians who want more and more power in the hands of an elect and select few. If we as Americans, responsible for the political education and the virtue of the people, as history shows, if we fail to arouse the Nation, our great tradition of liberty under law, the greatest effort of man to maintain the spirit of liberty, will become a tradition without a country.

Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Star of February 9.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of words and millions of platitudes have been spoken on this floor about human rights, individual freedom, equality under the law, and the dignity of the individual, yet here is a case of cold, cynical intimidation of the rawest kind.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know Mr. Reynolds. I would not know him if I saw him. His public and private life are matters of complete indifference to me. But his rights are not of complete indifference.

Because if we are to be ruled by intimidation my rights and the rights of many others may be taken from us as a result of this first assault on the rights of a man called Reynolds.

The article follows:

INTIMIDATION

There are several aspects—all bad—of the attempt to discredit the testimony of Don B. Reynolds, a principal witness in the Senate investigation of the Bobby Baker case.

One is the apparent effort to smear Mr. Reynolds by leaking supposedly confidential information in Government files. The accusations against Mr. Reynolds may be true or untrue. This is beside the point. What should be of primary concern, upon even a little reflection, are the implications of this shabby business. If anyone is disposed to shrug it off, he should ask himself: Could I be next?

Another aspect is the probable effect on some other person who may be called upon to testify before Senator JORDAN's committee. Would he testify freely? Probably not, in the face of the prospect that the contents of the Government's secret files might be used against him. If this isn't intimidation, what is it?

A third aspect is the effect on the Senate committee. It has been made to look slightly idiotic. For its chairman says that neither the Senators on the committee nor the members of its staff had any knowledge of the information which somebody in the White House or elsewhere in the executive branch saw fit to leak.

The person or persons really responsible for this, not the underlings, ought to be publicly identified. But this may not be possible. One thing, however, is entirely possible. This is for the Jordan committee to get down to the serious business of investigating the Baker case and to demonstrate that it will not tamely submit to intimidation of its witnesses.

Don Reynolds should be called on for public testimony. Bobby Baker should be brought in and asked to tell his story under oath, subject to cross-examination. The same goes for Walter Jenkins, the President's aid. And there are others, whose names, if now unknown to the committee, can be readily ascertained.

It is much too late to sweep this business under the rug or to hush it up by resort to smear tactics. On the contrary, it seems to us that the members of the Jordan committee ought to be outraged by what has happened—and determined to dig harder and deeper.

The Communist Party Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, several groups of distinguished citizens from northern Virginia have simultaneously called to my attention a collection of excerpts from the Sunday Worker, the organ of the Communist Party of the United States. These citizens asked that I insert the text and the covering letter of Milton M. Lory, president of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies and the copy of the Worker's line on the Civil Rights Act, so that the Communist Party position will be known to all Americans. I herewith commend these remarks to my colleagues for their information:

AMERICAN COALITION
OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1964.

SPECIAL NOTICE

Less than 24 hours after President Kennedy was shot, an urgent meeting was held in New York City of about 100 top leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who laid down the immediate party line to be followed on the assassination. Later, a revised program to meet the changed situation was developed. This was issued as a 10,000-word directive, published in two installments of the Sunday Worker, under the byline of the secretary-general of the CPUSA, Gus Hall. The importance of this report is emphasized by an editorial introduction stating that the full text "will be published in pamphlet form shortly"—a treatment reserved for major party directives.

Such directives usually follow, and are based upon, basic policy directives issued from the Kremlin itself. The Red manifesto of December 5, 1960, which followed the Moscow conference of 81 Communist parties dealing with the problem of the grassroots anti-Communist movement in the United States was followed by a similar CPUSA directive signed by Gus Hall, published in the Sunday Worker of July 16, 1961, outlining the tactics to be used against the ultraright and the Kennedy administration. This was analyzed by Edward Hunter and published in an 82-page SISS report dated July 11, 1961, entitled "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program." This SISS report was so definitive that it formed the basis of major anti-Communist successes during 1961 and 1962 in countering the Communist drive to discredit and muzzle our military spokesmen in preparation for the use of Soviet nuclear missiles from launching sites in Cuba despite reassurances from the Kennedy administration that no such threat existed.

The present CPUSA directive offers a similar opportunity to alert the American people and to nullify the Communist plans. Wide dissemination of this blueprint for the destruction of the United States is an essential and urgent task. Reproduction of this material is therefore permitted and encouraged. Reprints of this special supplement may be obtained from the coalition office at cost.

MILTON M. LORY,
President.

CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUE WILL SHAKE AND SHAPE L.B.J. IN 1964

After the assassination crisis: "Where do we go from here, and how do we get there?" We Communists must: "avoid watchful waiting; take new initiatives; regroup for the battles ahead; turn to three main areas of concern: the new administration, the 1964 elections, and the civil rights struggle."

"With regard to the Johnson administration, the most important element, without which assessment is impossible; namely, the political landscape, the drastic change that has taken place since Truman. The scales in the world power structure have now tipped; not capitalism but the world system of Socialist states that is the strongest influence on world trends—some 50 countries—20 million Negro Americans are in revolt."

"The important question is how the new administration will react to these new realities. The Kennedy administration took this new landscape into account. In contrast to Goldwater, Rockefeller, Nixon, or the Dixiecrats, the Kennedy administration took a saner view of the world relationship of forces. Its policies also reflected the upsurge of the civil rights movement. The new administration, including L.B.J. himself, have shown every sign of following. The forces of labor, civil liberties, and peace, if united and organized, can be a determining factor in the coming period."

Communist aims "to be effective must be expressed in organizational forms. This necessity is an absolute prerequisite of any further advance; what is now called for is specific programs and outlooks"—avoiding "the elementary level of political gravitation toward some individual as a spokesman."

Communist political efforts in the 1964 election "must rest on four main pillars: the civil rights struggle, the growing restiveness of labor, the never-ceasing struggle for peace, and the mounting struggle against the ultraright, which is a basic feature of the other main pillars.

"The struggle against the ultraright is decisive for the whole future of the electoral system itself. These cannot exist in isolation from one another. The fact that they are directed against a common foe inevitably drives them together."

The tactical problem: "The peace movement, the civil rights movement, the trade unions; some candidates have won elections. Each of these groups operating on its own, can only remain a minority electoral protest movement." The twofold solution: "If the three groups combine their electoral power, they can be transformed almost overnight to a victorious election alliance, nominate and elect candidates, initiate actions."

"Through such a coalition, each group can increase its present power tenfold. Moreover, such an electoral coalition can develop into a permanent political alliance, pool its resources, concentrate its finances and manpower, and win. There is not a single city where such an alliance cannot become the dominant electoral force, can begin to change the existing power structure."

"Our overall 1964 tactics must be directed toward the following central tasks: (1) Mobilize the maximum number of Americans to express themselves politically against the ultraright; (2) give leadership to Americans who have become disillusioned with the two old parties, building an independent electoral coalition; (3) create the broadest possible left formations in the electoral field, overall agitation and propaganda directed at changing the power structure represented by the present membership of the U.S. Congress."

Emphasize Kennedy's role in the civil rights revolt: "The most significant domestic development of the Kennedy years will continue to affect all aspects of American life in growing measure; the Government, the churches, the political parties, the schools, the unions, the youth. The civil rights revolution has become the central arena in the struggle. Kennedy reflected this—his assassination—a deep shock to civil rights fighters. This was dramatically demonstrated in the removal of Malcolm X [who] did not mirror this loss."

"Racist terror greatly increased; a new feature; a campaign for reasonableness (which) keep repeating that it is not the Negro people or the leaders of the movement that are responsible for the 'unreasonableness" but rather the 'outsiders,' that is, the Communists and the left. It is a dangerous campaign. Its watchword is, 'Be satisfied with what you have gained—slow down.' It is designed to destroy the militancy of the movement and remold it to the pattern of tokenism and gradualism."

"Role of the masses: There has been a series of almost spontaneous outbursts, of repeated massive thrusts which have initiated each new wave of the struggle. It is these thrusts that have given this struggle its militancy and have brought it into the streets. This is the source of the power of this struggle. It cannot be taken for granted. If left on its own, its energies can be dissipated and diverted into other channels. Once this happens, the struggle has to wait until it is renewed and redirected."

Communication a serious problem: "a number of important organizations have appeared. The struggles have developed a core of brilliant and very often new, young, and militant leadership. This has provided a good general staff. But outside of the churches, most if not all of these organizations do not have large active memberships. Because of this the leadership and the working staffs have difficulties in reaching the millions who are involved. This becomes a serious problem"

"The greatest challenge is how to organize a successful struggle on this front (civil rights) * * * for this a necessary condition is a united working class. Never has there been a more opportune moment to drive this point home; white workers must understand—and they can be made to see it—that the trade unions can have the support of all workers, Negro and white, only if they also take up the problems arising from the policies of discrimination. The working class can be convinced to take on this fight on the grounds that only in this way can it achieve the unity necessary to tackle the problems facing the entire class. The progress made between the last two AFL-CIO conventions on this question offers an additional handle in this struggle."

"In the immediate future the struggle will proceed on three levels. First, the overall national objective will be to get the civil rights legislation passed by Congress. The second level will be organized struggle for specific objectives. This should not be viewed as a retreat from the high point of huge mass demonstrations. On the contrary, it is the strength displayed in the mass demonstrations that makes it possible to win the battles for specific victories. This kind of struggle takes initiative, planning, and organization; an area of challenge in which we can make a unique contribution. The third level is the continued struggle in the South. The one most formidable obstacle in the South is the reign of terror. If we could launch a national and an international campaign against this brutality we could make a signal contribution to the freeing of the South."

A special project: "Why can there not be a clearinghouse that exposes every act of terror in the world? This is something to which the churches might well direct their attention. The civil rights front is that on which the main battles are being fought today. It must at all times receive our top attention."

Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the leadership, as well as the individual Members, on both sides of this historic civil rights debate for the restrained and statesmanlike manner in which they have conducted themselves during the long and often arduous consideration of this measure.

I believe the Nation has a right to be proud of the way in which the House of Representatives has conducted its business these past several weeks, of the full and mature consideration given to each section of the bill, and of the strong and decisive action taken.

In my opinion, the House has acted in the highest traditions of freedom and of our democratic institutions—and in a manner to reflect honor on us all.

The actions we have taken here constitute a major step forward in our effort to guarantee every American, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, equal rights and equal opportunities in such vital areas as education, employment, and voting, in nearly 100 federally assisted programs of various kinds, in the administration of justice, in the use of public facilities, and in equal access to public accommodations.

BECAUSE IT IS RIGHT

My mind keeps returning to the inspiring words of the late President John F. Kennedy, when, last June, he called on Congress to take prompt and positive action "to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right."

President Kennedy pointed to the "fires of frustration and discord" that had broken out across the length and breath of the land, confronting our people with a serious moral crisis and demanding a supreme effort to right the many wrongs of the past and protect all citizens in their right to vote, to go to school, to get a job, and to be served in public places without arbitrary discrimination.

It is certainly a tragic paradox that the brutal and senseless assassination of President Kennedy in November has so shocked the country that many have finally come to believe there could be no more fitting tribute to his memory than the speedy enactment of this historic civil rights measure, for which he worked so hard.

SIDE BY SIDE

The new President, Lyndon Johnson, left no doubt of his position on this matter when, in his first address to a joint session of Congress, he declared:

> We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law.

In his eloquent state of the Union message in January, President Johnson set the pace when he challenged the Members of the House and Senate:

> Let this session of Congress me known as the session which did more for civil rights than the last hundred sessions combined.

Later, in the same address, the new Chief Executive outlined his personal philosophy on the subject:

> Let me make one principle of this administration abundantly clear: All of these increased opportunities—in employment,

education, housing and every field—must be open to Americans of every color.

As far as the writ of Federal law will run, we must abolish not some, but all racial discrimination.

For this is not merely an economic issue—or a social, political or international issue. It is a moral issue—and it must be met by the passage this session of the bill now pending in the House.

All members of the public should have equal access to facilities open to the public.

All members of the public should be equally eligible for Federal benefits financed by the public.

All members of the public should have an equal chance to vote for public officials—and to send their children to good public schools—and to contribute their talents to the public good.

Today Americans of all faces stand side by side in Berlin and Vietnam.

They died side by side in Korea.

Surely they can work and eat and travel side by side in America.

CALIFORNIA—AN EARLY LEADER

Those of us from California realize that most of the protections contained in the House measure have been on our statute books for many years.

But, as early leaders in the fight to extend our American constitutional heritage of freedom, equality, and individual liberty to all the State's citizens, we sometimes tend to take this heritage for granted, and often do not fully realize the importance of dynamic national leadership in the struggle to rid this country, once and for all, of the poison of racial and minority group discrimination.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS

Though it is now more than 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation was issued by President Abraham Lincoln, and it is only too apparent that we have a long way to go to fulfill the bright promise of that historic document.

As President Johnson has said:

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation, but not a fact.

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM

To me, the work of the past few years, on the part of Americans from all sections of the country, in helping to bring this comprehensive Civil Rights Act so near to enactment by the National Legislature, is an extremely encouraging and healthy sign.

It indicates, in my opinion, that the spirit of freedom is as much alive today as it was on that September day in 1787 when the framers of our Constitution joined together "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty" for themselves and for us, their posterity.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS TRADITION

From the earliest days of the Republic, Americans have always been concerned about equal enjoyment of the fruits of freedom.

In fact, the Founding Fathers and a solid majority of the citizens of the Original Thirteen States were so much in favord of written, enforcible guarantees of civil rights and civil liberties, that they insisted on acceptance of what ultimately became the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution—the world-famous Bill of Rights—as a definite condition for ratification by their respective States.

There is no doubt, and historians unanimously agree, that, without such firm assurance that the first order of business for the new Government would be adoption of these civil rights guarantees, it would have been nearly impossible to obtain ratification from the required nine States.

A SELF-EVIDENT TRUTH

Despite this historic tradition, and despite the unmistakable assertion of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal—and that they were endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—we in the United States have been incredibly slow in making this 187-year-old doctrine a reality for millions of our fellow citizens.

CONGRESSIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The year is now 1964—the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court's famous school desegregation decision. During these 10 years the judiciary branch of the Government, led by a vigorous and outspoken Supreme Court, has taken the lead and shouldered the major burden of assuring that our constitutional heritage of freedom, equality, and individual liberty is enjoyed by all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In more recent years, the executive branch has assumed its rightful leadership role in this struggle by taking the initiative and exerting its moral and legal authority toward the attainment of full equality of treatment for minority groups under the law.

However, with the exception of two measures of rather limited scope passed in 1957 and 1960, the legislative branch has seemed unable or unwilling to adapt itself to the changing times, and has failed to take a strong, unequivocal stand in favor of the principle of equal rights for all Americans.

We now have the opportunity as well as the urgent responsibility, to shake off the paralysis of the past, to move back into the mainstream of American life, and adopt a meaningful civil rights program at this session of Congress.

We must not fail to take advantage of this opportunity, for the legislative branch must reassume its historic role of guiding the often conflicting forces at work in our dynamic society—and guiding them into positive and constructive channels that will contribute to a brighter future for us all.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

It has been a pleasure for me to support the administration's strong and meaningful civil rights bill. I have supported it because I believe it long overdue that Congress join the noble crusade to create a better America, to banish the phrase "second-class citizen" from our vocabulary, and to fulfill the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality for all Americans.

Old Island Days in Key West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, Key Westers began their annual celebration of Old Island Days, which will continue through March 14.

The celebration features the annual "Wreckers Ball," Coronation Ball, flower exhibits, plays, dinners, and house and garden tours of famous landmarks. This year, in addition to the other lovely homes and gardens on display, the tour will include visits to the Ernest Hemingway house and the Tennessee Williams house.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, not only to bring to the attention of my colleagues this interesting and colorful celebration which I hope some of them may be privileged to see, but also to commend and extend my appreciation to those persons instrumental in the restoration and beautification of this lovely island of Key West.

While hundreds of persons have taken up the fight to save and restore famous old Key West landmarks, three people in particular stand out. They are Mrs. Reta Sawyer, Mrs. Jessie Porter Newton and Mr. Mitchell Wolfson. In a very short time and with very limited funds, the Old Island Restoration Foundation has accomplished an incredible feat.

Recently, the Key West Citizen, which has been a long and ardent supporter of this effort, published several articles which give an idea of the perseverance and hard work which have, and are, going into the project.

The articles follow:

[From the Key West (Fla.) Citizen, Jan. 28, 1964]

RETA SAWYER: SHE'S AT OLD ISLAND HELM

Mrs. Paul E. Sawyer has been president of Old Island Restoration Foundation since its inception in 1960. No one person, however active he has been in foundation projects, can visualize the work that she has done.

She thought up most of the ideas, and has a special talent for finding the right people to carry them out.

Her tact soothes hurt feelings, and steers the foundation around differences of opinion that might easily wreck it.

Reta Sawyer has become an able executive who runs an efficient office, and knows what every chairman is doing. She coordinates all the activities of Old Island Days and never fails to get the show on the road, without seeming harried or hurried.

Reta is truly dedicated to preserving the heritage of Key West, and to bringing it prosperity through tourists. She deserves a hearty "well done" from the community.

[From the Key West Citizen, Jan. 28, 1964]

HOW IT ALL STARTED: FIRST THE VISION, THEN THE REALITY

(By Mary Wood Malone)

Old Key West was nearing oblivion; nearly everybody wanted a modern box of a house and a place of business faced with plate glass and neon.

There was glee when an historic mansion on Duval Street, where Carolyn Lowe mounted to her widow's walk to taunt Union troops with a Confederate flag, burned to ruin, and the site became a dandy parking lot.

Jessie Porter Newton, a Conch woman with imagination, blazed with indignation, and did something.

She convinced the likeliest home-town-boy-made-good, financier Mitchell Wolfson, that he should restore some old house as an example. He told her to find one with historic significance, and let him know.

Wolfson bought a dilapidated house so quietly that the talk of razing it went on even after restoration work was started. It does not seem possible that he foresaw the amount of money and effort that would be expended, but he never flinched. Mrs. Wolfson thought of furnishing it with superb English antiques, and the entire family approved of purchasing, the four great folios of Audubon's "Birds of America."

That is how Key West got its finest treasure, the Audubon House.

A group of Key West women arranged entertainment for the crowd of guests who attended the opening of the Audubon House, and someone remembered the old custom of wearing red shawls. The guests were taken on a tour of other old houses, via the Conch train, and that was the beginning of the house and garden tour idea.

That same year, 1960, 10 people decided to form a society to try to preserve the unique buildings of Key West. Jessie Porter Newton persuaded the head of the National Trust to come to Key West to give advice. A charter was drawn up, and Old Island Restoration Foundation, Inc., was born, with no money and no idea of what to tackle.

One day, Mrs. Edward B. Knight, with Mrs. Newton and the then city manager, Bazel Crowe, in her car, turned into the Mallory Dock area. The wharf was a ruin, but some of the sturdy old warehouses were still in use.

They looked at the harbor and the incomparable view of the Gulf of Mexico, at the area of land already owned by the city, and had the same thought, "Wouldn't this be a wonderful location for a civic center?"

The timing was opportune. A public works board had been created by act of the legislature to do what a series of deadlocked city commissions had been unable to do—build a convention hall, a new city hall, and enlarge the golf course to 18 holes.

The fledgling Old Island Foundation tried out its power of persuasion. There was a time of discouragement, frustration, and ridicule, that no one likes to remember, but in the end the public works board and the city commission were convinced that the idea had merit.

When the restoration of the area that was Commodore Porter's base for antipiratical campaign was done, it was a handsome job.

The largest building, a red brick warehouse, was transformed into a community hall, air-conditioned and fully equipped for conventions, meetings, dances, exhibits, and concerts.

It was locked and empty most of the time, because it never occurred to people to put it to use. They just fussed because there was no place big enough for their doings. Other old buildings, unfinished inside, stood idle.

Then the Key West Players undertook to fix up a building, which became the Waterfront Playhouse. By superhuman efforts, they begged and borrowed $30,000 to make a gem of a theater.

Playgoers appreciate the widely spaced, comfortable seats, and the air conditioning. The fine stage and lighting equipment give the actors and singers the tools to produce truly professional performances.

Old Island Restoration Foundation, with a growing membership, took over a frame house that had once been the Steamship Co., moved it to a new location, and called it Hospitality House. It has from the beginning been a busy place, sought out by tourists to gather information about the town.

The last warehouse to be put to use houses the Key West Chamber of Commerce and the marketplace, a sort of woman's exchange, where clubs and church societies sell homemade products for charity.

WHERE THE TOURISTS ARE

Tourists immediately appreciated Old Mallory Square, and blazed the trail for the locals. They found that the wharf was a fine place to fish, to sun themselves and enjoy the view of the harbor and the Gulf of Mexico, and watch the Navy and fishing vessels go by.

Rank on rank of cars park there for free, while their owners start out on foot to see the old town, to ride the Conch train and to visit Key West Fabrics. Old houses and new construction done in the old manner have developed into a smart shopping area, selling merchandise that appeals to visitors.

OLD ISLAND POLICY

From the beginning, Old Island has used persuasion, example and encouragement in preserving the quaintness of Key West.

It wants no legal authority such as is exercised by the Vieux Carre Association of New Orleans, where property owners must obtain consent to repair a leaking roof.

Often the process is heartbreakingly slow, but it has paid off in good will.

Members called on all property owners in Conchtown, a roughly fan-shaped area bounded on the north by the waterfront, and by Whitehead, Angela and White Streets, to request them not to tear down or remodel their buildings without consulting Old Island's Board of Architectural Review.

More than 90 percent gave consent; the other owners simply could not be located, or the property was part of unsettled estates.

This plan has been surprisingly successful. The owner of a chain of hamburger stands was dissuaded from building one on Caroline Street. He picked a site on the very fringe of the old town, where there were already a number of modern buildings, and embellished the premises with a brick-paved garden.

The best result of the campaign is that property owners appreciate the charm and value of their own buildings, and are doing painting and repair work.

There is a brisk market for old houses. The exteriors are carefully preserved; the interiors equipped with modern comforts. It provides a lot of work for the building trades.

For a time, the restorers of dwellings were newcomers; now Key Westers are doing it, with houses they would have scorned a few years ago.

Business people are getting into the act. The first restoration was Harbor House. A sagging, halfburned old store has been made into a charming jewelry shop; several attorneys have their offices in old houses located near the courthouse; two real estate brokers have offices in quaint dwellings; a dress shop has built a new facade in the Old Island manner, and the Town House is the transformed La Concha.

A cottage in which the late, great John Dewey of Columbia University lived was remodeled to house an art gallery.

Half a dozen Duval Street property owners have plans in the making to transform business premises. It is hoped that all of them will eventually see the light, tear down the hideous false fronts and make the street what it used to be.

No one is going to force them to do it, but business survival will. What has Key West to attract visitors, besides climate and fishing, but its quaintness, tied in with its exciting history?

During the winter season, Hospitality House is staffed by volunteers who tell tourists what there is to see, and dispense advertising folders for the various attractions, such as the Audubon House, the Bahama House, and the newly-opened Hemingway and Old Pirate Houses.

People who invest money in preserving historic places deserve Old Island's help in persuading people that they are well worth seeing.

PUBLICIZING KEY WEST

Because Old Island Restoration Foundation is a nonprofit organization, it can ask for and get publicity that would bust the advertising budgets of General Motors and General Electric combined, all for free. It is merely a matter of knowing who to ask and assembling information about the "rock."

Reader's Digest and Life magazines have Key West stories already at press. There is the prospect of a picture story about the Martello Towers in Life. The text material has been submitted.

The biggest advertising agency in Florida is now sending Old Island Days stories and pictures to the travel editors of metropolitan papers, at no cost to the foundation.

The Miami Herald has a feature story with pictures on the Hemingway house, and has promised a general story on Old Island Days.

The Key West Citizen carries Old Island stories all year round, in addition to this special edition and the earlier mailaway.

Miami television station WTVJ donates spot announcements during the entire 6 weeks of Old Island Days, as do the Key West radio stations.

The Florida Development Commission will have all its pretty hostesses wearing Key West's traditional red shawls during Old Island Days, at the Florida Show Case in New York and at the welcome stations in North Florida.

HOW THE WORK GETS DONE

Old Island members donate their time and abilities, many on a full-time basis, to bring tourists to Key West, and to give them something to see and things to do, to keep them here.

The foundation operates on a frayed shoestring; it has 455 individual members at $5 a head, and 85 commercial members at $25.

The latter get advertising space in a handsomely printed brochure giving the Old Island Days program of events, which is distributed through the Florida Show Case in New York, transportation ticket offices and travel agencies around the country, and by the welcome stations for motorists.

And it isn't easy to sell these memberships.

One would think that every Key Wester would dash off a check to help the organization which has preserved the heritage of the island and benefited all kinds of business by attracting ever-increasing numbers of visitors.

State-Local Finances: Recurring Crisis or Gradual Evolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, with the tax bill a focal point in our legislative activities at the present time and one debated pro and con by experts in the field, an article by C. Lowell Harriss, professor of economics at Columbia University, would appear to be timely.

Professor Harriss, economic consultant for Tax Foundation, Inc., has written extensively on economics, public finance, and taxation. He has been a consultant on taxation to the U.S. Treasury, the United Nations, New York State, the city of New York, to Venezuela and to various private companies and organizations.

STATE-LOCAL FINANCES: RECURRING CRISIS OR GRADUAL EVOLUTION

(By C. Lowell Harriss, economic consultant, Tax Foundation, Inc.)

Reduction in Federal tax rates now seems certain. No one, however, talks seriously about cuts in State-local tax rates. Any discussion is likely to be about which tax rates are to be raised, by how much, and whether new revenue sources are required. Higher State-local tax rates lie ahead for most of us. This prospect grows out of another—rising State-local expenditure.

Are we building up to a crisis or can we expect the gradual adjustment which can be taken in stride?

Crises in State-local finance are in the making but not a single, great, nationwide crisis. For if one thing is true about State and local governments it is that they differ. Not all, by any means, will face financial strains. The bad troubles will not all hit in the same year or biennium. Yet most of us must expect that the communities and States in which we live will try to increase spending more rapidly than the existing revenue systems will support.

The postwar period has brought crises in State-local finance. They have been met, even though not always so well as we might like. More or less gradually, the public has coped with conflicts between its desires for more public services and its lack of enthusiasm for higher taxes. The results—in expenditures, taxation, and borrowing—have been impressive.

State-local revenue systems as they now stand will yield enough to pay for a lot of additional State-local service as the economy grows—but less than the public will want. Gaps must be expected. Filling them will strain both patience and pocketbooks.

Recent National Planning Association projections put State-local spending in 1976 at about $142 billion (1962 dollars). This would be nearly twice the 1963 total and a per capita increase approaching 80 percent, an expansion of nearly one-third in the percentage of gross national product. Any such rise in 13 years seems to me highly improbable. But when a serious study by an experienced organization suggests such growth, we must stop and think.

No one can look at population projections and expect—or desire—anything but more in total (not necessarily per capita) of the things we buy through State and local government. There is little reason to expect Federal expenditure to follow population trends closely—national defense, interest, foreign aid, space exploration, and veterans aid would seem to have slight relation to population growth. State-local spending, however, is related more closely to population. This spending will rise because Americans have chosen to have children in great number and also because, fortunately, we live longer. As a percentage of total population, however, growth may be significantly less than in recent years.

Yet an important unknown must be noted, and also a known which is unfavorable. (1) We do not know the amount of internal migration. The population that counts for any State or locality's spending is not the national total but the number within the jurisdiction. Over no longer than a decade the difference between high and low migration can be significant for some communities. (2) The known is that much of the growth will be in urban and metropolitan areas. And State-local spending per capita seems to rise with increasing urbanization and density.

From 1948 to 1961 per capita State-local spending rose about 7 percent a year, compounded. Such a rate, projected a dozen years, would lead to a staggering, but I think, unrealistic figure. Restraining forces also operate.

One restraint should be significant relief from wage-price increases. In the period 1948–62, the percentage increase in the prices of State-local purchases came to more than double that for the whole economy.

The real rise in State-local costs was not, in my judgment, so great. The figures make no allowance for changes in productivity in the Government sector, e.g., output per man-hour. In paying more to civil servants, the public may also be getting better quality of service or more units of output per man-hour. The average of over $5,300 paid to a schoolteacher today is generally for a person with more training than that of the teacher whose average 1950 salary was around $3,000. Not all of the increase in payment has been for inflation alone.

The next few years may be better for governments. Much State-local spending is for salaries. In 1950 State-local salary rates were often below those for comparable jobs in the rest of the economy. Figures for 1962 suggest that there has been a significant catching up. In the private economy the average annual earnings per full-time employee rose by $2,200 from 1948 to 1962 while for the State-local employees the rise was $2,500 to exactly the same average. The $300 gap closed is 6 percent of the present average salary. Differentials have been reduced and often wiped out. This is a cost which does not need to be incurred again.

Will an upward trend of prices in general continue to add to State-local spending? The Consumer Price Index keeps creeping upward, inducing pressure for wage increases. Construction costs—highly important for State and local governments—also go up. The outlook is uncertain.

LAWMAKERS APPEAR ANXIOUS TO SLOW TAX HIKES

A second restraining factor will be revenue stringency. Getting money has not always been easy for State and local governments in the last few years. Difficulties will grow. Present tax systems will bring increasing yields. Further tax rate increases are to be expected. But will they not encounter stronger resistance as tax rates must rise from historically high levels? Cuts in Federal tax rates will provide some offset. On balance, however, revenue stringency will be highly restrictive, not everywhere but on the average.

More lawmakers are concerned about damaging the prospects of the State or local economy by taxation. There is lively and growing competition for new companies and for the expansion of old. State or local governments are limited in what they can do to attract business. One thing that is possible is to refrain from taxes which impose burdens higher than elsewhere (in relation to the services of value to the businesses). More and more lawmakers appear to be anxious to go slow on tax increase.

Will State-local finances be eased by increases in Federal grants? The Federal Treasury is not bulging. Even though experience virtually assures that there will be more grant programs, and expansions of existing programs, one restrictive force seems clear. If a tax cut of the order of magnitude now before Congress is adopted, Federal budget deficits are likely for several years. Despite talk about "holding the line" on Federal spending, more growth is probable. If so, the amounts flowing to State and local governments will hardly continue to rise by the $700 million or so a year of the last decade.

A third factor restraining the growth of State-local spending has two parts, (1) the search for greater operating efficiency, and (2) the insistence on greater assurance that program decisions are justified.

ATTACH A "PRICE TAG" TO NEW PROGRAMS

Sometimes from within State-local governments, sometimes from without, sometimes from both sides, there are constructive forces for improving operating efficiency. While no one knows how much of the potential saving has been achieved to date, my guess is that the remaining opportunities are enormously greater than those already realized. The efforts needed for success are often difficult. Yet if the best of methods and procedures now known were applied wherever they would be appropriate, the savings over the country as a whole would be tremendous. And the search for still better methods must be unending.

The second element is the wise selection of what to do and how much, i.e., the program and its scope as distinguished from the methods of operation. Some progress is being made to improve decisionmaking. One helpful step is to insist that the price tag be attached to new spending proposals.

Now we return to the "upward pressure" theme.

(1) Quality

An improving quality of at least some State-local services is not only a necessary means to human progress but also an essential ingredient of a better standard of living. A lot of public business is yet undone—improvement in courts, policing, public health, parks and recreation facilities, education, provisions for the needy, streets and highways, traffic congestion and so on. Many communities and States are distressingly far behind the leaders. The costs of reaching on a broad scale the quality levels now achieved in some places will be heavy.

(2) Internal incentives for expansion: Outside support

Governmental agencies contain within themselves forces working for expansion—the close familiarity with both need and opportunity, the desire to do a better job, personal advance, the absence of market tests of the worth of the accomplishments. Agency officials become experts; legislators and the public cannot understand the intricacies and therefore feel pressed to follow the experts. "Inside" motivation is often linked closely with that for improving quality.

Not infrequently, the "clientele," a section of the public which is benefited especially, gives effective reenforcement to "inside" arguments for expansion. Some say a politician's job is to get benefits for his constituents to be paid for largely by others.

Organization of government employees, and the momentum built up over the postwar years, will enhance the pressure for salary and fringe increases.

(3) Built-in elements of expansion: Resistance to change

Many State and local governments are already committed more or less firmly to policies which will force rising expenditures. (Federal pressures have somewhat the same effect.) We cannot always distinguish clearly between built-in increases which go along with population growth and those which are in addition. Nevertheless, the total effect is to raise spending because of decisions made in the past, sometimes at another level of government. In addition to debt service, pension commitments, and automatic salary increases, such things as grant-in-aid programs have built-in elements of growth.

A related force is resistance to change—reluctance to modernize the obsolete, to dispense with the dispensable, to raise operating efficiency, to take advantage of new developments in science, business, social organization. Earmarking of revenues does not enhance the ability to control most effectively in the light of changing conditions.

(4) *Incomplete adjustments to inflation*

The full bill for past inflation has not yet been paid. The replacement of facilities built in the past will often need to be at much higher cost levels. Retirement plans are likely to call for higher pensions for past services than can be paid for by the funds obtained to date. The upward scaling of benefit rates in response to inflation has not always been accompanied by the accumulation of funds to pay the bill.

Some of today's senior, higher quality, and professional civil servants came to work for government when public service for persons of high ability and training was relatively more attractive than today. Many who have stayed on would probably not be inclined to accept government employment if they were now deciding on careers. While average salaries of State-local employees have been rising significantly, the salary position of the most valuable personnel has often deteriorated in relation to what has become available outside. For a small fraction of government employees, but a group of exceptional importance, salaries must go up unless quality of service is to deteriorate.

(5) *Density and urbanization*

Our land is one of increasing density and urbanization; and increases in State-local spending per capita have been closely associated with these two conditions. Costs of State-local government per capita will rise as the trends continue. Cities have always contained many poor people and many from different backgrounds; the next few years, however, may see relatively greater pressures as racial problems add to complexities. The problems of metropolitan areas cannot be met except at great expense (e.g., cost of land acquisition for highways and other public facilities). But we have more freedom than is sometimes assumed about the extent to which to use government spending as against the private economy.

State-local tax systems as now constituted bring yields which rise somewhat more in percentage terms than does gross national product. Consequently, gradual adjustment to much growth of spending will be easy. Without tax rate increases, total yields go up around 1.1 percent for each 1 percent rise in gross national product, perhaps more as a result of changes made in 1963 legisaltive sessions. For income taxes the responsiveness is higher than for sales and property taxes. Among income taxes the scale of rates makes a difference in yield sensitivity. As a result, variations among States in revenue outlook are more than minor.

Within States there will be substantial differences from one community to another in the growth of yield from present revenue systems. Considerable importance attaches to the amount of additions to the property tax base through new construction, real estate price increases, and assessment practices.

For the most part, however, yields of existing taxes will not suffice. Gaps will differ. We must expect wide disparity in the seriousness of the problems. Much will depend upon the growth of spending, and this is within the control of the public.

The history of mankind is one of unbroken difficulty of governments in getting revenues needed to finance the spending desired by those who make the decisions—whether the monarch with his wars and palaces or the modern suburban family wanting better schools. This condition will not end. Unless there is more drastic restraint on the growth of spending than experience gives us reason to expect, several States (and localities) must adopt new taxes and many must raise rates.

The author of Ecclesiastes may have exaggerated in saying "there is no new thing under the sun." But he had a point, and it applies to our problem. One major opportunity for meeting the challenges of State-local finance is anything but new. It is to improve the property tax. Some of us may almost feel, "This is where I came in" (to the world of taxation). Until well into the great depression, property taxation was dominant. It was well suited to gradual changes in spending because it offered a simple means of boosting rates from year to year. By the 1930's, however, the property tax had become not only heavy but also messy and riddled with defects. Here and there the postwar years have witnessed significant improvement. Currently there may be the beginning of a movement bringing substantial progress.

The property tax in principle may deserve no gold medals for excellence. Considering the alternatives available to the American people, however, it may offer the best promise for getting revenue to pay the rising bills for local government. In any such movement the first, and absolutely essential, step must be to reduce defects. In many localities they are serious—frequent and large. Yet experience in some communities has shown that persisting, gross inequities are not inherent in the tax. Remedy is possible. A recent report by the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations offers guidance. Civil leaders have an opportunity to help in a cause which combines several attractive features, e.g., greater equity in the sharing of a tax which will certainly be large, and strengthening local government.

Decisions made in the past and not as a practical matter within our control over the next few years (for example, those which will lead to continued population growth) make costly increases in State-local spending inevitable. Experience leaves little basis for doubt that other forces will lead to greater State-local spending per capita. Some of these forces are in one sense outside our control—desire for better schools or relief from traffic congestion. Yet in a realistic sense even these pressures are subject to control. We do have some choice about how fully and how efficiently we shall try to deal with them. The same is even truer of the influence for expenditure increase which will come from the numerous inducements for expansion of governmental services.

Today's State-local revenue systems, without tax rate increases, will finance much expansion of spending if the economy continues to grow at a speed which we can reasonably expect. But unless the trends of history change abruptly, most States and localities will encounter financial strains which cannot be met without new taxes and higher rates. The extent of these increased tax burdens will depend upon our choices about increases in expenditures.

Johnson Must Take a Cold Look at U.S. African Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the growing complications facing us in all parts of the globe, with especially troublesome signs developing in Africa, the instability of the new regimes is being universally argued.

In the last 3 years under the titular direction of Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, U.S. foreign policy in Africa has produced nothing but a series of black eyes and disaster. In view of the blundering operations in Africa in the last 3 years, a review of our African policy would be in order, and the point is effectively presented by Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington Bureau, in his Report from Washington in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

JOHNSON MUST TAKE A COLD LOOK AT U.S. AFRICAN POLICY

WASHINGTON, February 9—Against a background of uprisings, violence, unrest, and sagging economy, President Johnson will have to take a long, cold look at American foreign policy in Africa which has been a morass of frustration and failure.

Of the 35 nations in Africa—old and new—14 are bewitched, bothered, and bewildered. United Nations Secretary General U Thant, who has been touring some of the troubled spots, has likened the plight of some African nations to "teething troubles," although they have been marked by murder, assassination attempts, Communist seizure of power, and bloody revolts.

Teething troubles don't bring demands for troops to insure stability. British troops were sent to Uganda, Tanganyika, and Kenya. Nor can the sinister statements and actions of John Okello, a Cuban-trained revolutionary in Zanzibar, be likened to a baby going through phases of growth.

Okello fomented the bloody coup in Zanzibar. He threatened to force one enemy to kill his sons and daughters and then himself, and to force another to pour gasoline over himself and set himself afire. He didn't do it, but it shows a pattern of thinking, as does the insistence of Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana on being addressed as "the messiah."

It might be more accurate to acknowledge that these emerging nations have been given too much too soon. It would seem that they are not ripe for self-government, because they do not have a trained leadership or a developed sense of responsibility.

PORTUGAL IMPROVES POSITION IN ANGOLA

Of all the European nations that had great empires in Africa, now only Portugal remains. And despite predictions and demands that the Portuguese go immediately, they have actually improved their position in Angola, where Bakongo terrorists from across the border in Congo launched a blood bath of horror and murder last March. Now Congo is in the throes of another internal struggle due to the revolt of Communist terrorists in Kwilu Province.

The Portuguese refused to be stampeded, when terrorists led by Holden Roberto tried to foment a revolution almost 3 years ago. Although the initial assault fizzled, Roberto and his supporters, including leftwing Americans, were confident that the Portuguese would be bogged down by rain and jungle.

Although three rainy seasons have passed, the insurgent campaign is doing poorly and Portuguese soldiers, well fed and well trained, command strategic areas. The insurgents are poorly fed and must hide in the jungle.

It was supposed that the war in Angola would drain Portugal of its reserves. However, Portugal is running its campaign on a pay-as-you-go basis with an extra tax on luxuries. Portugal has been able to increase its monetary reserve by about 300 millions and to report a budget surplus in the 1963 calendar year.

GROUP UNABLE TO WIN WORLD SUPPORT

A third failure of the Roberto group has been its inability to win international support. The world has come to realize that

Portugal was and is developing a multiracial society and is not exploiting the natives. Portugal has less race consciousness than any other nation in the world, having developed multiracial societies in Brazil, India, and China as well as Africa. Now, Roberto has jolted our State Department by announcing he is seeking Communist support.

Meantime, conditions in Angola and Mozambique, Portugal's other African colony, have been booming. The tragedy of the Congo and the deterioration of Africa have cooled the ardor of even so-called liberal nations for interfering in African affairs. They talk of driving out Portugal but are not interested in any followthrough.

The natives in Angola and Mozambique are not agitating for independence. They never have, which has confounded the liberal nations. The late John F. Kennedy was, to a considerable extent, the prisoner of an African independence policy forced on him as a step toward emancipation of Negroes in America. American Negro leaders have since lost their enthusiasm for Africa for the Africans in the face of government breakdowns and the racist character of this policy.

President Johnson could choose to reverse the policy for one of caution and soundness.

Hon. William J. Green

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep regret and sorrow at the sudden and untimely passing of our late colleague from Pennsylvania, BILL GREEN.

To me WILLIAM J. GREEN will be remembered in history for one thing more than any other, and that is for his courageous and dogged support of the candidacy of John F. Kennedy for President of the United States. Largely as a result of the energetic and devoted work of BILL GREEN the great delegation from Pennsylvania swung to support John F. Kennedy on the eve of the 1960 Democratic convention, thereby virtually assuring his nomination on the first ballot at Los Angeles. No one worked harder in the subsequent campaign to elect Jack Kennedy President than BILL GREEN. And once Jack Kennedy became President there was no more loyal or enthusiastic supporter of the great President in the House than BILL GREEN. And that support, as we all know in this House, extended far beyond BILL GREEN's own vote or his own voice. BILL's friends in this House were legion and when he made up his mind to support President Kennedy on some crucial issue you could always count on BILL GREEN swinging into line behind the programs of the New Frontier a very influential segment of Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we still mourn the untimely death of our late President, and we have felt the shock which his death inevitably inflicted upon the great programs of accomplishment and achievement to which he had summoned this country. When the history of the Kennedy administration is written, Mr. Speaker, the name of WILLIAM J. GREEN will surely be written high on the roster of those who made this bright new era possible.

Mr. Speaker, we can be proud that President Johnson has picked up the reins of leadership so effectively and is carrying on the Kennedy program so brilliantly toward achievement. But all of us are the poorer and the sadder today because BILL GREEN has gone, because his infectious smile and his tireless energy will now be missing in this body, and because his great heart and his broad influence will also be missing in support of our new President as he carries on the great American program which BILL GREEN himself had so much of a hand in getting started.

To Mrs. Green and to her family Mrs. Stratton and I extend our deepest sympathy.

How Long Do We Purpose To Submit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the world have reacted similarly to the editorial of Col. Allen Griffin which I quote below. Our prestige is sagging at home and abroad. We confuse "patience" with "indecision"; "restraint" with lack of a firm policy. We appear to lack courage in our abilities or faith in our cause.

We should have confidence to do right, courage to avoid wrong, and the wisdom to know the difference.

Our posture as a world leader, our stature in Latin America, our image at home require that we enunciate a firm policy based on the principles we profess.

Just as quickly as we do so, we can bring peace with principle to our hemisphere.

Once Communist Castro has been successful in plucking one feather from the tail of the eagle, others can be taken more easily, until all are gone.

The editorial by Allen Griffin follows:

HOW LONG DO WE PROPOSE TO SUBMIT?

We do not know how long or how often a great nation must accept slaps and insults and remain great in the eyes of other nations it hopes to influence, or perhaps even in the eyes of its own people. The more the insults, the easier it becomes to accept them, like any habit derived from weakness.

Only a few days after Russian fighters shot down an unarmed American plane that had lost its way—and apparently its communications—over the frontier of East Germany, the mob in Ghana tore down the American Flag in an insulting demonstration against this country.

We have, of course, protested. We protested the unconscionable execution of three Amercian fliers, upon which our protests were rejected and we received a scolding instead—from our wheat eaters.

Yesterday we had the affair at Cuba, a continuing matter dating from another inexcusable display of weakness.

We believe a firmer American policy is called for, or before long the United States will be in the same category as the poor old British lion, which today presents the picture of a forlorn animal with its tail between its legs. It simply had been patient too long.

In the case of Ghana, for instance, the evidence is conclusive that the riots and insults were inspired by persons close to the Government and that they were tolerated if not encouraged by the redeemer, Mr. Nkrumah.

In an instance such as this, there appears to be only one honorable course, and it should be taken forthwith. Americans in Ghana should be ordered to leave the country. The Peace Corps should be withdrawn. The aid programs should be immediately ended, including whatever aid is in the pipelines. The Embassy should be reduced to a legation, and its staff should be skeletonized. In the event of another attack it should be withdrawn and the Ghana representative in Washington given his walking papers.

American decision in such circumstances should be precise and certain. There should be no doubt as to what to expect.

If the circumstances are different and the Government itself (including its equipment and communications) endeavored to prevent rather than encourage an outrage against the United States, a protest would result in an immediate apology and the affair would be ended on a civilized note.

Should such policies be applied only to emerging little countries that are emerging into murderous tyrranies such as Nkrumah's?

Not at all. For the sake of the almighty dollar on the one hand and the blowsiest sort of sentimentalism on the other, we continue to fill with bread the bellies of our sworn enemies. A contract for the sale of wheat is no more sacred than a sacred treaty, and we know what the Soviets have done with them.

The Urgent Case for Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express my strong support for prompt enactment of meaningful and effective civil rights legislation.

I sincerely believe our Nation cannot afford to delay longer in making certain that full rights are accorded every citizen, regardless of race, creed, or color. Tragically, a full century since the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation has not yet provided equal opportunity for Negroes in voting, education, employment, housing, the administration of justice, and public accommodations.

The more glaring evidences of this problem have been brought dramatically to our attention in recent months in stories datelined not only in the South but also in the North. We from the northern part of this Nation must not hypocritically lull ourselves into believing this is a sectional problem confined to the South. Such most certainly is not the case. With increasing regularity, our Nation has seen outward manifestations of the fires which have been smold-

ering so long in the North as well as the South. My own State within recent months has witnessed demonstrated unrest in the City of Brotherly Love.

Many have been looking at how far Negroes have come in the past two decades. Negroes, on the other hand, are looking at how far they still have to go. They see the snail's pace of school desegregation, although 10 years has passed since the Supreme Court decided Brown against Board of Education. They see limited employment opportunities, a disproportionately high rate of unemployment, exclusion from some public accommodations, and de facto school segregation in the North, equally as damaging to the personalities of their children as the legally enforced segregation condemned by the Supreme Court in 1954.

In sharp contrast with the swift rise to independence of the Africans in the world is the painful fact that American Negro citizens, after patiently employing the slow procedures of litigation to enforce their rights, and after numerous Supreme Court pronouncements reaffirming these rights, still find that the burden of proof remains upon Negroes and the burden of bit-by-bit implementation has remained on the courts.

The increasing determination of Negroes to exercise their rights, the moral and legal justification of their cause, the intransigency of some local authorities and the apathy of the citizenry and the Federal legislative and executive branches, have encouraged the Negro to take his case directly to the Nation. To a large extent, his actions are not unlike those in past years of groups such as women seeking to vote and labor seeking to establish its right to organize and bargain collectively.

The civil rights problem is not one which our leaders and our people can continue to view with complacency. The urgency is alarmingly apparent. No longer should we deprive a group of citizens of the rights which most of us have taken for granted. The Negro is entitled to no more rights than his fellow citizens; but certainly he should be accorded no less.

It is high time that the leadership and the citizenry of our Nation face up to the fact that we have a long way to go in civil rights and that we cannot take long to travel the distance. The problem cries out for quick decisive solution. The gravity of the situation is such that every citizen should be aware of the problem and searching his soul for the answer.

In the belief that an important part of that answer must be supplied by this Congress, I introduced on June 4 with a number of my colleagues, two bills—H.R. 6778 and H.R. 6779—to enact a Civil Rights Act of 1963 and an Equal Rights Act of 1963.

The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would give permanent status to the Civil Rights Commission and provide additional authority to the Commission to investigate violation of voting rights. Completion of the sixth grade would be presumed to provide sufficient literacy to vote in Federal elections.

The bill would grant the Attorney General authority, upon written complaint, to institute civil proceedings in behalf of anyone denied admission to a public school because of race or color. A Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment would be created with authority to investigate charges of discrimination by businesses, labor unions, or employment agencies engaged in performing Government contracts or supported by Government funds. In addition, State and local educational agencies could request financial assistance for pupil placement and administrative services to carry out desegregation programs.

The Equal Rights Act of 1963 would prohibit racial segregation or discrimination by businesses authorized by a State or political subdivision to provide accommodations, amusement, food or services to the public.

The Attorney General would be authorized to seek legal redress in district courts of the United States to prevent the loss of an individual's right to equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. Such action could be instituted upon written complaint of the individual involved, if he were unable to effectively seek legal protection in his own behalf because of financial limitations or threat of physical or economic reprisal.

Many of the features contained in my bills are contained in the bill now before this House (H.R. 7152). I wholeheartedly support this measure.

Negro Americans, understandably, are especially desirous that meaningful public accommodations legislation be passed. This particular proposal appears to have evoked the greatest public opposition. Some objectors are sincere in their protestations that such legislation, based upon the commerce clause, is unwarranted Federal intervention; others have merely seized upon this as an excuse for continuing to deny to the Negro the opportunities enjoyed by white citizens.

The concept of nondiscrimination in public accommodations has a strong foundation in English common law; all accommodations opened for public use are open for all the public to use. Few would dispute that English common law has had a significant impact upon the constitutional and legal framework within which our Nation operates.

In addition to sponsoring civil rights legislation, I have indicated my full support of this important effort by speaking on the floor of the House, by presenting a statement to the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, and by signing the discharge petition on H.R. 7152.

I regret that the citizenry of this Nation, despite the gravity of the problem, apparently remains, to a large extent, apathetic regarding the solutions. For no matter the form taken by legislation this year, there will still remain much to be done by every individual if we are to achieve a solution to this most important of human problems facing our Nation.

Realize it or not, each citizen has an enormous stake in the solution of this problem, because each has a vested interest in the future of our great country. I fervently hope, not only that the Congress will enact long overdue, effective civil rights measures, but also that people in all parts of the country will no longer remain apathetic to the pressing need for action.

Congressman Shriver's Annual Report to Kansas Fourth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my policy since coming to Congress to submit to the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas an anual report of my activities as their Congressman in the U. S. House of Representatives. This is the third annual report which covers the 1st session of the 98th Congress.

The 1st session of this 88th Congress was the longest in the peacetime history of our Nation. Adjournment sine die came on December 30, 1963, after a session of 356 days. It is because of the record length of the session that this report is being made later than in previous years.

Overshadowing all facets of activity in Washington was the tragic and shocking assassination of our President, John F. Kennedy. It remains incomprehensible how in 20th-century America such a terrible deed could occur. On December 5, 1963, I joined with other Members of the House of Representatives in a memorial tribute to the 35th President of the United States.

Immediately following the death of President Kennedy, we witnessed the orderly continuation of Government and national leadership under President Johnson which was essential to the conduct and survival of our Republic.

APPROPRIATIONS

The Congress, sparked by a Republican economy task force, was able to effect reductions of $6.5 billion from the record budget requests of the administration for fiscal 1964. Final appropriations voted amounted to $92.4 billion. One of the largest reductions—almost a billion dollars—was made in the foreign aid program.

ROLE OF CONGRESS

Of increasing concern throughout the year was a growing effort by certain national columnists, editorialists, and commentators to downgrade the legislative branch of Government. It was true that the legislative machinery did move slowly, and the majority leadership with comfortable margins in both the Senate and House of Representatievs did not always exercise its leadership effectively. However, such controversial issues as a major tax cut combined with a planned $12 billion deficit, and proposed broad civil rights legislation, required careful and extended committee hearings and deliberation.

We must remember that the Congress is a deliberative body. It cannot, nor

should it, serve as a rubber stamp for Presidential requests. The legislative process is not a single isolated act of short duration. This process can be rapid when the question at issue is a relatively routine one and where there is unanimous sentiment in favor of affirmative action. But where most important questions are at stake the process of deliberation is slow.

Congress, like the executive branch, works for the common good in the national interest. Our representative system of government is dependent upon maintaining and strengthening, where possible, this legislative system.

SHRIVER VOTING RECORD

More than 14,000 bills and resolutions were introduced during the session in both the House and Senate. Only 422 bills were enacted into law.

Your Congressman had a 96-percent attendance record during the session.

SHRIVER BILLS

During this session of Congress, I introduced several bills which were the result of careful and deliberate study and research. Following is a summary of some of those which I believe to be of special significance:

IMPACTED AREAS

Legislation to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of the law which provides Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities was introduced by me in May of 1963. Operations of McConnell Air Force Base at Wichita, construction of Titan missile sites around the Wichita area, and the defense activities of the Boeing Co. qualify many school districts in the Fourth Congressional District for such assistance. This legislation was included in the Vocational Education Act passed late in the session and signed into law by the President.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

I joined in sponsoring a resolution in the House providing for the creation of a select committee to conduct a complete and thorough investigation of federally sponsored research and development. The need for such a study is demonstrated by the fact that the President's 1964 budget included requests for expenditures of nearly $15 billion for research and development. Such expenditures have increased nearly five times in a decade. The resolution was adopted and the select committee has begun its study. It is to be hoped that its findings will enable the Congress to act knowledgeably and responsibly in making annual appropriations for Government research programs.

VOLUNTARY HEALTH PLAN

In August, I again introduced legislation to provide for a system of voluntary health insurance to assist in the medical and hospital care of the aged. Hearings have been held by the House Ways and Means Committee on the various health proposals including the administration's compulsory program financed through social security.

TAX RELIEF FOR PARENTS-STUDENTS

Once again I introduced legislation, early in the session, providing for a program of tax relief in the form of an income tax deduction to those bearing the cost of higher educational expenses. It is significant that more than 100 Members of the House and Senate have introduced similar legislation. I have joined in requesting the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to hold public hearings on this bill. Under the closed rule under which the tax bill was considered in the House, it was not possible to amend the bill to include this provision. An effort in the Senate recently to include such an amendment failed by only three votes. It is obvious that public support for such education relief is growing as more young people go on to college, and as higher educational expenses mount.

GUANTANAMO BRIEFING

The Cuban situation is among the vital interests of the American people. Because of my own concern and of those whom I represent in the Congress, I accepted the invitation of the Secretary of the Navy in July to go to our great naval base in Guantanamo Bay in Cuba.

My foremost impression resulting from a relatively short but thorough and intensive briefing and observation was that the United States must under no circumstances relinquish or leave this excellent naval base.

It is important to the security of this Nation as an ideal training station for our fleet. It is strategically located for protection of the Panama Canal, in fact the sea routes to the Caribbean and Latin America.

DISTRICT AND DEFENSE

Since coming to the Congress I have been working, along with most of my colleagues, for the maintenance and development of a defense system second to none for the United States. The Fourth District of Kansas—particularly the Wichita area—continues to play a vital role in defense production.

Although production of the B-52 bomber has been halted by the administration, contrary to the intent of the Congress, much of the modification work on the B-52 fleet is being done at the Boeing Co. in Wichita. The 1964 budget included an appropriation of almost $200 million for this work.

I have been assured by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force that the B-52 fleet will remain operational into the 1970's. It is to be hoped, however, that the administration will take steps to provide for an eventual follow-on manned aircraft to succeed the B-52 jet bomber.

SPACE VISITOR

During the past year, considerable time and effort was devoted to assisting business and industry in the Fourth District of Kansas to assume a greater role in our Nation's defense and space programs.

In March, Senators Carlson and Pearson, and myself accompanied James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, on a tour of educational and industrial facilities in Kansas to determine our capabilities for space projects.

Development of those capabilities and the opportunity to compete for space programs must be initiated at the local and State levels. However, the congressional delegation stands ready to cooperate and assist our State in securing consideration and attention from the proper Federal agencies.

PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE

As an initial step toward bringing our present capabilities to the attention of the Federal Government, the University of Wichita last summer sponsored a 2-day conference on doing business with the Federal Government. I assisted in securing the cooperation and participation of 40 officials from various Federal agencies in the Wichita conference. The Defense Supply Agency conducted a study of over 3,800 Kansas firms and found that 773 businesses and industries, both large and small, in our State could do business with the Federal Government.

SERVING CONSTITUENTS

In addition to the important legislative responsibilities of this congressional office, I have continued to assist and serve my constituents, to the best of my ability, in their individual relationships and problems with the Federal Government.

During the year my staff and I held 717 conferences with 62 different agencies in Washington in behalf of Fourth District constituents. We received and replied to nearly 800 requests for information and Government documents.

I have endeavored personally to read each piece of mail addressed to me from my district, and have dictated the replies to these communications.

Nearly 1,000 visitors from Kansas signed the guest book in my office. It is especially gratifying for me to be able to personally welcome visitors from my congressional district.

OPINION POLL

More than 100,000 questionnaires in the third annual Fourth District opinion poll were mailed to citizens throughout the district inviting them to inform me of their opinions on a variety of domestic and international issues pending before Congress. I am pleased to report that more than 12,000 questionnaires were returned to me and tabulated. The results previously were reported in my constituent newsletter.

FLOOD CONTROL-WATER CONSERVATION

Fourth District public works projects for flood control purposes received appropriations totaling $6,600,000 for the 1964 fiscal year. The Cheney Reservoir project, scheduled for completion in 1965, is slated to receive $3,800,000 for continued construction; $1 million was approved to launch construction of the Marion Reservoir and Dam; and $1.8 million was appropriated for continued construction on the Council Grove Dam.

ACADEMY COMPETITION

It is my privilege each year to make certain nominations to the outstanding service academies of our Nation. Nominees selected by me compete in academy-administered examinations for the final appointments. Those chosen by the academies in 1963 were as follows: U.S. Air Force Academy, Richard Charles Hedden, of Wichita, and Raymond Matthias Seiwert, of Goddard; U.S. Military Academy, Edward Richard Hubshman, of

Wichita; and U.S. Naval Academy, Eric Burgess Park of Wichita.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my sincere appreciation to the citizens of my district for their cooperation and support. It is a pleasure and privilege for me to represent them in Congress.

The Century of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1963, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith presented its 1963 Human Rights Award to the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at a dinner held in New York City.

The following article, which appeared in the December 1963, Anti-Defamation League bulletin, is based upon Lyndon B. Johnson's acceptance speech on that occasion. As the President pointed out the forces of bigotry are on the defensive and this is truly a century of human rights. When we finally pass the Civil Rights Act, we will be adding another milestone to the cause of liberty so ably espoused by Lyndon B. Johnson.

The article follows:

THE CENTURY OF HUMAN RIGHTS—WE SHALL HAVE FAILED OUR COUNTRY AND OUR CAUSE IF WE DO NOT FULFILL ITS PROMISE

(By Lyndon B. Johnson)

This century in which we live has been given many names. It has been eloquently described as the century of the common man; others have applied different descriptions of both hope and despair. For myself, I feel it may be most accurately and aptly described as the century of human rights.

It may seem paradoxical to refer to a century which has seen the rise of two of the greatest tyrannies in history—fascism and communism—as the century of human rights. But, in the light of historic human behavior, it becomes apparent that there is no paradox whatsoever—in fact, that the rise of these forces is evidence of the growing strength of the cause of equality.

The intense fury with which the totalitarians of both the right and the left deny the concept of human rights is the measure of their realization that their cause is doomed. People who are truly confident, people who truly believe they represent the wave of the future, do not resort to mass denial of age-old religious practices, mass denial of political rights, or mass extermination. These are the weapons of frustration—the last resort of men who know, however loudly they may deny the fact, that they have reached the end of one of the blind alleys of history.

It is difficult for our generation—which has known of Dachau and Warsaw, of the imprisonment of cardinals and the fate of Passover in the Soviet Union—to realize the tremendous advance of the concept of equal rights in the mid-20th century.

A few short decades ago, the thought that all men and women—regardless of race, creed, color, or origin—were entitled to equality of treatment was a novel idea. There was a concept of tolerance, but to far too many people it was a tolerance for "lesser breeds without the law" who were to be treated with kindness and humanity but not with equal regard as fellow human beings.

There are very few thinking men today who regard this kind of tolerance as a virtue, however much it may have contributed at one time to peaceful relations. The whole moral drive of the Western World is focused on the concept that we are all children of God—however we may worship our God—and entitled to judgment on our individual merits without regard to irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

This is the true wave of the future—the fulfillment of the dreams and hopes of moral men throughout the ages. However much we may fall short of our ideals, we are striving to attain them with an intensity heretofore unknown. They have become an accepted part of the fabric of our society. And however vehement may be the forces of bigotry, the fact remains that those forces are on the defensive. They are fighting a losing battle.

That is why I am confident our century—the century of human rights—will be remembered for the legacy it leaves to the future more than for its inheritance from the past.

It is abundantly clear that in the course of our Nation's affairs, we have arrived at a season of change in our policies and our relationships with the world—especially the non-Communist world. A period of searching reassessment has begun. However, we lose—and others lose—a necessary and indispensable perspective, when we neglect the fact that this is also a time for reassessment by all nations of the free world community.

All of us together are emerging from a period which has seen history's greatest explosion of political rights. We are also emerging from the early phase of what has been called the explosion of economic aspirations. In a very brief period, new world standards of political equality and equality of economic expectations have been established and we cannot neglect the implications.

We welcome what has happened. We are proudly conscious that both the revolution of political independence and that of economic expectations had their beginnings on these shores. We are conscious of special responsibilities to these forces which have reshaped the destinies of so many men. Our national policies since World War II have sought to honor those special responsibilities.

As the authentic revolutionaries of the world, however, we of America must make it clear to those who have chosen freedom that the revolution of freedom is fundamentally and above all else a revolution of human rights. And we must make it clear not only by words but by example and precept. Our own house must be in order.

When our system was created, many hard decisions were required. None was harder—none more revolutionary—than the decision embodied in our Bill of Rights that the Central Government should be prohibited from serving as the instrument for perpetuation of the prejudices and bias and discrimination of any sect or segment of American society. This decision was—and has continued to be—fundamental to our American unity, fundamental to our American capacity for economic growth, fundamental to the harmony of our society, and fundamental to our capacity for exercising leadership on behalf of freedom beyond our own shores.

We must not acquiesce passively to any concept that the world can enjoy a new freedom while remaining the accomplice and prisoner of old prejudices.

But if a better world is to be built, there must be a universal recognition that mankind must marshal the full potential of human resources and make full use of those potentials without regard to hereditary bias, prejudice, and discrimination.

If we of America are to rise to our full height as men in this century, we must face courageously the world's problem of human discrimination. We must speak clearly. We must speak in concrete terms. We must help the world to understand that the curing of the problems of discrimination is the beginning—not the end—of genuine freedom.

As long as there have been societies more complex than tribal simplicity, majorities and minorities have relied on stereotypes to mold their opinions of one another. Such stereotypes have been convenient—but they have also been cruel.

We can take some measure of satisfaction from the fact that there is progress and that these stereotypes disappear as human understanding spreads.

For example, after January 20, 1961, the two highest elective offices in the strongest free nation on earth were held by men who had overcome the handicap of the stereotype—for reasons of religion or region of birth. And I believe that each passing day will diminish the force of the stereotype for all of us.

Recently, when I attended the swearing in of an Ambassador of the United States it was noted in some accounts that I am "from a Southern State." The Ambassador himself was from a Southern State, also. But the accident of my birth became newsworthy, as did his, because I was born in the South of white parents—and he was born of Negro parents.

If to stand by his side, to shake his hand, wish him "Godspeed" makes news, then that is news I am proud to make.

I say this to emphasize that the effort made by your national leadership today against discrimination, against bias, against division, and against the tyranny of stereotypes is, above all, an effort directed by men who know personally the enemy—and know his toll.

But, I say this also to suggest that perhaps we of America should consider raising our sights toward larger horizons. Certainly in this field there is much still to accomplish—but what remains undone does not detract from the magnitude of what has been done.

Much of our effort is directed today to the subtle forms of discrimination. This is a necessary and worthwhile effort—and we cannot be content until we have succeeded completely. But when we look to the world as a whole, the problem of discrimination is a massive problem—requiring massive effort on our part.

We cannot be content until we commit ourselves to massive support of the cause of human rights everywhere.

Our American vocabulary is filled with frequent expressions identifying illiteracy, illness, ignorance and poverty as the oppressors of humankind. I believe we need to complete our vocabulary by acknowledging frankly that the greatest oppressor of all continues to be that of bias and prejudice.

We shall have failed our country and our cause if, from the position we are now privileged to enjoy in the world, we do not undertake the initiative in fulfilling the promise of this 20th century as the century of human rights.

If we are to be remembered as constructive builders of a better world of peace and justice and freedom we shall be remembered not for the dollars we sent abroad but for the force of the influence and leadership we exercise to improve the lot of mankind. It is this work that challenges us—it is this undertaking that summons us—it is toward this higher goal that we must lift up our sights and set our course.

LYNDON JOHNSON ON RECEIVING ADL'S 1963 HUMAN RIGHTS AWARD, APRIL 4, 1963

I am proud I live in a country where people have heart and where people come and give their support to causes that the

Anti-Defamation League puts first—serving others. I know something about your work. As a result of your counsels, people are enjoying the first democracy they ever tasted in their whole lives in many parts of the land * * * I want to thank you for permitting me to be part of you. I want to assure you that I understand the worthiness of your cause and I want to be a partner if I may.

Bacardi Home Newest Toast to Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am extremely proud to announce the addition of a new star on the Miami skyline—the beautiful new home of the national headquarters for Bacardi Imports, Inc.

Bacardi is the Nation's largest single brand liquor distributor—who has not heard of the famous Bacardi rum? In 1963 Bacardi Imports sold nearly 1 million cases of its rum, accounting for about 45 percent of all sales of rum in the United States.

Mr. H. B. Estrada, president of Bacardi Imports, has built a network of distributors which assures the sale of Bacardi rum in all 49 States where liquor is sold.

The magnificent new Bacardi offices located on Biscayne Boulevard in Miami is largely the work of Jose M. Bosch, chairman of the Bacardi Distilleries. Mr. Bosch has preserved the Bacardi organization even though a large part of its assets were expropriated by the Castro government. He has been called by his admirers a "true citizen of the hemisphere."

Mr. Speaker, the breathtaking beauty of the Bacardi Building, with its walls of Azulejos or blue and white ceramic tile murals designed and painted by the Brazilian artist-ceramicist, Francisco Brennand, must be seen to be believed. In behalf of the Bacardi people, I extend an invitation to each of you to visit the building on your next trip to Miami.

Recently, the Miami Herald, one of the foremost newspapers in our country, devoted an entire section to Bacardi Imports, Inc., and its new building, marking the 102d anniversary of the founding of the original Bacardi Co. in Santiago, Cuba.

The article follows:

BACARDI HOME NEWEST TOAST TO MIAMI

The striking blue and white tile covered office tower on Miami's Biscayne Boulevard is the new national headquarters for Bacardi Imports, Inc., an American sales organization that specializes in the sale of Bacardi rum.

This new building, which took more than a year to complete, houses the Nation's largest single brand liquor distributor. Bacardi Imports sold nearly 1 million cases of Bacardi rum in 1963 to markets within the United States and to the U.S. Armed Forces around the world.

In the United States, two out of every three bottles of Puerto Rican rum that are purchased by consumers are sold by Bacardi Imports. This share of the market accounts for some 45 percent of all sales of rum in the United States.

Bacardi Imports moved to Miami after more than 20 years of operations in New York City. In that period, H. B. Estrada, a native of suburban Philadelphia, has built this burgeoning sales organization into a network of distributors that makes Bacardi rum available in all 49 States where liquor is sold.

Mr. Estrada, as president, heads the executive force that includes G. V. Quinones as vice president and general sales manager, Edwin H. Neilsen, a vice president, and John Doyle, the treasurer.

While the building is owned and utilized by Bacardi Imports it stands as another example of the architectural genius of Jose M. Bosch, chairman of the Bacardi Distilleries.

While Mr. Bosch's prime interests have been in the preservation of the Bacardi organization in the face of an economic disaster that saw half of its assets taken through expropriation by the Castro regime, he has maintained a lively interest in building things beautiful.

Architectural Forum, in an account of Mr. Bosch's role in commissioning outstanding architects to design buildings for other Bacardi enterprises, said Mr. Bosch insists that his buildings be beautiful.

One of the world's most renowned architects, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, was the architect for the administration building at the Bacardi bottling plant some 20 miles north of Mexico City.

At that site, in addition, are the works of Felix Candela, a world-famous Mexican architect who designed a series of connected vaults of reinforced concrete to house the bottling line and shipping facilities.

Another Van der Rohe design had been completed and was ready for construction as the office building in Santiago, but the Communist overthrow prevented its erection.

For the Bacardi Building in Florida, Mr. Bosch asked Enrique Gutierrez of the architectural firm of Sagmac International of Puerto Rico to design the building.

He urged him to leave the plaza level free of obstructions and have the buildings set on four columns to give the illusion it floats freely in the air.

Much of the site has been left open for gardens and beautification. In keeping with the instructions, the architects outlined a building that occupies only 17 percent of the building site, above plaza level.

In addition, Mr. Bosch insisted on the provision for a parking area that would not detract from the building. To accomplish this, the entire plot was excavated and because of Miami's high water table, the equivalent of a "reverse swimming pool" has been built as an underground parking lot to accommodate the cars of 40 employees.

This basement, with water-tight walls, keeps out the water that permeates the coral soil.

Four columns of reinforced concrete rise from a solid foundation built on pilings to a truss that stretches across the top of the building. The columns are placed about a third of the way into the building and support the entire weight of the structure.

The seven floors above the plaze are suspended by post-tensioned cable from the truss on the eighth story.

The building's reception area is on the second floor, which is reached by elevator. The elevators are attached to the main building from an independent structure that is situated at the rear of the building.

The third floor is used by the importing firm's traffic department, where shipments are carefully followed, while the accounting department and Mr. Doyle occupy the fourth floor.

The fifth floor is used by the other company executives including Mr. Estrada, Mr. Quinones, and Mr. Neilsen in addition to Henry E. Caballero, assistant sales manager, and Luis de Lasa, sales promotion executive.

Probably the most striking aspects of the new office building are the huge Azulejos or blue and white ceramic tile murals that cover the north and south walls of the building and the sides of the elevator column.

These tiles are the work of Brazilian artist-ceramicist Francisco Brennand of Recife. He designed and painted the tiles at his workshop in Brazil on a commission from Mr. Bosch.

General contractors for the building were Frank J. Rooney Construction Co. of Miami. Bliss Associates of Miami Beach worked with Rooney on behalf of the architects.

Ground was broken for this new edifice on January 3, 1963, and the building was formally inaugurated on January 25, 1964.

Tomorrow marks the 102d anniversary of the founding of the original Bacardi Co. in Santiago, Cuba, by Don Facundo Bacardi and the year 1964 marks the 20th anniversary of the formation of Bacardi Imports, Inc.

"Doc" Goodpasture Is Good for What Ails Us in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing about the ugly American, and all too frequently we hear of the serviceman who does not portray a good image of the American people. The Government spends millions of dollars every year for one program or another to improve our image abroad. I know of no better example of the favorable force that the people-to-people efforts of an individual can create than that which is related in the article which appeared in the Washington Daily News, of Thursday, February 6, regarding Sgt. Milton Goodpasture, who comes from Decatur, Ill., which is in my congressional district.

Much news comes out of Vietnam daily which makes us wonder if we are accomplishing anything there. Sergeant Goodpasture, and those like him, are a most effective weapon against communism. I attach this article in the belief that this report from Vietnam will be of considerable interest to my colleagues:

HE SIMPLY SIGNS OUT—AND SOONER OR LATER COMES BACK—"DOC" GOODPASTURE IS GOOD FOR WHAT AILS US IN VIETNAM

(By Jim G. Lucas)

THAT SAN, South Vietnam, February 6.—"Doc can take that beat up old Chevy places you couldn't fight an armored battalion," the captain said.

He was talking about Sgt. Milton Goodpasture, who hails from Decatur, Ill., but now is more or less a permanent U.S. Army installation in the Far East. He's a medical corpsman.

If any Army man can be said to be his own boss, that Army man is "Doc" Goodpasture. Technically he's the medical adviser to a Vietnamese training battalion, but he comes and goes pretty much as he chooses. They don't ask where he's going, because sometimes "Doc" doesn't know himself. He simply signs out and—sooner or later—back in.

COMMUNITY DOCTOR

"Doc" also has the job of doctoring the aches and pains, and sometimes the wounds, of his fellow Americans on this training mission. But his principal job—one he undertook himself soon after he arrived a year ago—is community doctor in an area that never has had one. There are only 700 doctors in all Vietnam, and 400 of those are in the military services.

That the area is almost wholly in enemy hands doesn't bother him. There are people out there, and they are sick, and he has pills and ointments.

"Doc" drives a 1957 Chevy pickup. He has installed an easy chair in the back. He'll drive into a village and wait. Soon the ailing start showing up. "Doc" looks them over, bandages their wounds, washes their scabby sores, delouses them with bug bombs, gives them pills, talks with them in his limited Vietnamese and his even more limited Cambodian.

KIND

Somehow, they seem to understand him; maybe it's his tone of voice. It's infinitely kind and caring. He never seems to hurry, but somehow he manages to take care of everybody.

"Doc" also is highly resourceful. The other day they got word back at camp that he had broken his fan belt and was stranded. The way everybody carried on, you'd have thought it was some general out there. They looked high and low for a fan belt and, of course, they didn't have one. Then, right in the middle of all the fuss, old "Doc" Goodpasture drove up. He'd used his bootlaces.

Another amazing thing about "Doc" Goodpasture is that he is the only person—certainly the only American—around here who has never been shot at. The Vietcong have never bothered him. They can spot his old Chevy and let it alone. Maybe it's because, as "Doc" himself suggests, "I'm treating their families."

GOOD FOR UNITED STATES

Whatever the reason, "Doc" Goodpasture is doing the United States a lot of good out here. The enemy can't picture Americans as monsters when the locals well know "Doc" is an American. And if anyone were to suggest he is a combination of Tom Dooley and Albert Schweitzer, "Doc" would simply grin. "They're doctors. I'm just a medic," he says.

I rode with him from That San to Chau Lang the other day. We came to a gate. A bus was on the other side. Plenty of Americans would have barreled right through. "Doc" stopped, waved the bus to come on through, then got out and chatted with the driver and his passengers.

At a small village, an old woman stood by the side of the road and flagged him down.

"Get aboard, old girl," he shouted.

She climbed in, while half the village kids shouted their approval. We drove off, and she sat there like a queen, waving goodby to her subjects.

"She does this often," "Doc" said. "Claims she wants to go into Tri Ton. Actually, she just wants a ride. She'll be waiting to go home when I come back."

The Stature of John V. Lindsay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the historic civil rights discussion on the floor of the House today, I made reference to a recent New York Times article on the brilliant efforts exerted in behalf of this legislation by my distinguished colleague from New York, JOHN V. LINDSAY.

The article, which appeared on Saturday, February 8, was written by Warren Weaver, Jr., of the Times staff.

It is an excellent reportorial tribute to my colleague and friend, and one that might have been missed due to the session the night before. In feeling that it should be part of the RECORD, I do not think that it is out of place to also say for the record that many of his colleagues have known for years that JOHN V. LINDSAY is, indeed, one of the great legislators of this or any other time.

The article follows:

LINDSAY GAINING STATUS IN HOUSE—SOME SUGGEST THAT HE RUN FOR CITY OR STATE OFFICE

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The turbulent course of civil rights legislation in the House has pushed Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY into the political spotlight.

It is not a position that counfounds or distresses the 42-year-old New Yorker. In his 15 years in Republican politics, he has never shown a lack of confidence or a reluctance to battle both within and without his party.

But the role of Republican floor lieutenant for key sections of the civil rights bill has given Mr. LINDSAY a prominence in the Chamber that he has not always been successful in achieving during his 5 years in Congress.

For the last week, the Manhattan lawyer has been on the House floor or in the adjoining cloakrooms almost continuously from noon until early evening presenting the Judiciary Committee case, debating hostile amendments, and working out details with both Republicans and Democrats.

In another week, however, Mr. LINDSAY may be back in the "isolation ward," the political limbo to which the House Republican leadership periodically consigns restive young liberals whose acceptance of the "establishment" leaves something to be desired.

OFTEN AT ODDS WITH HALLECK

The New Yorker has found himself at odds with the House Republican leader, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, often enough—over sending wheat to Russia or liberalizing the Rules Committee—to have acquired a ready familiarity with the isolation ward.

The frustration implicit in being a liberal in a conservative House, as well as a Republican in a Democratic House, have led Mr. LINDSAY's friends to suggest that he take his widely acknowledged talents back to New York State in search of political advancement.

Two possibilities arise: The Republican nomination for mayor of New York City in 1965 and for Governor in 1966. Both involve serious political risks, as they offer major challenges.

In 1961 when the question arose, Mr. LINDSAY expressed a lack of interest in the mayoralty. As a Representative, he would not have to resign to run for mayor, and, as a Republican the mathematical odds would be heavily against him. The gubernatorial nomination, more than 2 years away, is full of questions. The assumption that the Republican nomination will be open relies on the theory that Governor Rockefeller will either be President or uninterested in a third term.

OTHER COMPETITION FACED

Even if Mr. Rockefeller is no longer a factor, Mr. LINDSAY would be up against serious competition from Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson and assembly Speaker Joseph F. Carlino, with the possibility of strong pressure for Senator JACOB K. JAVITS as an established winner.

At this date, Mr. LINDSAY is merely musing about such prospects, as he spends a good many evenings speaking at Republican and other functions in New York City and occasionally upstate.

Without regard to his work on the civil rights bill, Mr. LINDSAY manages to be one of the more active House Members. He is now drafting a Presidential succession proposal and a major reworking of the immigration laws, behind which he hopes to line up considerable Republican support.

Undeterred by his failure to get a seat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee a few years ago, Mr. LINDSAY is pursuing his international interests as a member of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, where he serves as reporter of the political committee.

Here he is working toward a new parliamentary alliance of the Atlantic nations by which major political and economic problems could be aired.

Michigan Governor Attacks Hate Groups of Far Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been warning the people I represent of the dangers resulting from the activities of the far right. Occasionally some have tended to pass off my efforts to tell the truth about the John Birch Society and their lunatic fringe associates in the radical right as political.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read in the Salt Lake Tribune of an outstanding speech delivered by Gov. George Romney, of Michigan rerecently in Salt Lake City. It is reported that Governor Romney addressed 1,400 Utah Republicans at a $50-per-person GOP fundraising dinner. I wish to compliment my friends in the Utah Republican Party for bringing Governor Romney to Utah to deliver this outstanding message. And, furthermore, I wish to compliment the Governor of Michigan for the great courage he has shown in supporting needed civil rights legislation and alining himself with the political moderates against the far right.

Mr. Speaker, following is the report of Governor Romney's speech as it appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on Saturday, January 18. I commend this speech by the Republican Governor of Michigan to my Republican friends in Idaho, who have suggested that my attack on the John Birch Society was motivated by politics, but who also are interested in learning the truth about the far right.

The speech follows:

PRESS FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, REBUFF HATE GROUPS, ROMNEY ASKS

(By O. N. Malmquist)

Gov. George Romney of Michigan Friday night told about 1,400 Utah Republicans at a $50 per person fundraising dinner that

the GOP should work without respite for "equal rights for all Americans" and rebuff "promptly and without equivocation" groups who cloak themselves in patriotic names and then stand for "resurgent nationalism, isolationalism, racism and social and economic retrogression."

The former Utah resident, who has attracted the national political spotlight as a Republican presidential prospect, reiterated at a press conference that he is not now and has no intention of becoming a candidate for the presidential or vice-presidential nomination.

But his address was aimed squarely at national issues around which the 1964 campaign already is churning.

Other planks of Governor Romney's recommended program for a victorious campaign included:

1. Leadership in the removal of "the basic conflict between principles of competition embodied in the antitrust laws and the principles of monopoly involved in collective bargaining laws."

2. Assumption of leadership in a national movement to restore the vitality of State and local governments in order to reduce the growing concentration of power in Washington.

3. Restoration of the integrity of the American dollar and of integrity of the American word both at home and abroad.

4. Constant work to prevent the gradual erosion of America's religious and moral foundation.

On the civil rights issue, Governor Romney said:

"There can be no equivocation on this point. If the Republican Party tries to buy the White House with the rights of others, it will become the greatest white elephant in the history of party politics.

"If the Republican Party mounts a white horse and carries a white standard into the 1964 campaign, it may win an election but it will lose forever its claim to Lincoln.

"Let me make my position completely and crystal clear. I support the bipartisan civil rights legislation that has been reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee and that is now in the House Rules Committee.

"But beyond that, the American Revolution so bravely begun in 1776 cannot be completed until every American—whatever his race, his color, his creed, or his national origin—can enjoy unimpeded his full rights as an American and as a child of God."

Turning to specifics, Governor Romney said these rights should include the right to vote and have the vote counted; to enter the occupation of one's choice and compete fairly to the limit of personal ability; to acquire and enjoy decent housing in the neighborhood of one's choice.

Equal access to all public facilities; enjoyment of equal treatment and services from all business establishments open to the public; to send one's children to public schools and colleges to which admission is granted without reference to race, color, creed or national origin.

To associate in peaceful protest against evils, real or imaginary; to worship in the manner of one's choosing, side by side with those sharing one's faith; effective governmental protection against those who would seek to interfere with the free exercise of legal rights; to be judged on personal character and virtues by one's fellow man.

"Let me emphasize again," he continued, "the Republican Party must not exploit racial or religious prejudices in order to gain a victory at the polls. To do so would be to disavow the heritage of Abraham Lincoln, to destroy part of the heritage of America and to renounce the spiritual heritage of the Judeo-Christian world."

On the second issue to which he gave special emphasis, the Governor said:

"As the party which recognizes, respects and seeks to advance the rights of individuals, we must also be sure that we profess sound respect for and recognition of the responsibilities of individuals.

"Just as some have misused the banner of States rights, we are also confronted in America today with those who confuse individualism with irresponsibility and liberty with license.

"Without concern for the facts, they sow the seeds of hate, of suspicion, of violence.

"They make wild charges of disloyalty about those who disagree with them.

"To broadcast their charges, such fanatics often form groups, frequently with patriotic names, and almost always with an appealing objective, such as 'fighting communism.'

"This cloak of patriotism enables them to attract some reasonable people as members, providing an aura of respectability. The reasonable membership greatly outnumbers the core group of irresponsibilie extremists, but it is the latter who are heard.

"These forces, by whatever names they call themselves, stand in favor of resurgent nationalism, of isolationism, of racism, and of social and economic retrogression. Waving the banner of Americanism, they deny the principles of America.

"Shouting the praises of individualism, they pledge allegiance to rigid creeds and dictatorial leaders. Theirs is a heritage of brown shirts and of black shirts, of massed flags and massed drums.

"They offer no constructive solution to the problems of our Nation. They destroy faith in our proven institutions, pit class against class, inflame suspicions and multiply fears.

"In America, fortunately, the numerical strength of such groups is anemic. In order to gain any appreciable visibility they must attach themselves—or attempt to attach themselves like any other parasite—to one or another of our major political parties.

"Such attempts invariably blossom in the course of a political campaign.

"Such efforts at infiltration, either individually or in force, should be, in my firm opinion, rebuffed promptly and without equivocation or temporizing by the Republican Party.

"I am not talking about groups of people," he continued. "I am talking about a few fanatics who can't see the difference between Gen. Dwight Eisenhower and a subversive tool of communism."

Gov. George D. Clyde, who introduced the Michigan Governor at the tribute dinner, alluded twice to the latter's prominence in the presidential candidate speculation. Referring to Governor Romney and his wife as Utahans on lend-lease to Michigan, Governor Clyde commented: "And we might be easily persuaded to extend these benefits to the entire Nation."

He also noted that a "George" hasn't been President since Washington and added:

"Who am I to say it is not time to correct this oversight."

Mrs. Romney, who spoke before her husband, urged women "to give more attention to improving the standards of politics and government."

Master of ceremonies was Richard L. Evans, member of the Council of Twelve Apostles, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He was introduced by T. Bowring Woodbury, general chairman of the dinner.

The invocation was offered by N. Eldon Tanner, second counselor in the First Presidency of the LDS Church, and the benediction was pronounced by the Reverend Frank M. Blish, minister of the First Congregational Church.

Retraining the Jobless, an Address of the Honorable Abraham D. Beame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend Abraham D. Beame, comptroller of the city of New York has, in the following speech, urged the Federal Government to offer tax credits to commerce and industry as an incentive to retrain jobless workers and launch "a significant attack upon the entire national problem of unemployment."

The address was originally scheduled for presentation at a Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration seminar on January 28. A blizzard prevented the comptroller from making his appearance at the seminar but I commend this excellent proposal to our colleagues as one sensible answer to the problem of retraining the unemployed.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ABRAHAM D. BEAME

During the past year, there has been much discussion, and a number of proposals, for attacking the problem of unemployment. Some proposals have urged the approach of committees, commissions, and studies. Others have called for the establishment of guidance and training programs.

We need approaches that are different from those which worked, or might have worked, a generation ago. We need new ideas for new realities. We are now concerned with unemployment in a boom economy. Approaches which might have been useful in depression days won't do the job—or get the jobs.

With these thoughts in mind, I offered a plan, earlier this year, to induce business and industry to take jobless teenagers off the streets, train them, and give them permanent jobs. I was concerned with the fact that New York City had an accumulated total of 100,000 boys and girls, between 14 and 19 years old, who had dropped out of elementary, junior high and high schools, before developing enough skills and training to give them good prospects for steady, gainful employment.

These young people face a world which becomes more complex and more demanding of skill and knowledge each day. Each step forward in our technology eliminates more of the unskilled, unspecialized jobs which are their only hope of economic survival.

I was disturbed by reports showing that in the 1961–62 school year, 5,635 boys and girls were graduated from vocational high schools in New York City, but during the same 12-month period a larger number, 6,299, dropped out of these schools. The figures for academic high schools were a little better but not good. We had 40,947 graduates and 16,570 dropouts.

The Public Education Association estimates the current dropout rate in New York City high schools at more than 38 percent, and places the national average at more than 30 percent.

It is true that New York City has many children from disadvantaged homes and families unfamiliar with our language, and this results in more dropouts than in nearby semiurban and suburban areas. Let no one

take false comfort from this fact, for there can be no hope of isolating this blight. The population moves steadily outward from the urban centers, and the problems of aimless, unprepared youth will become greater over a wider area in years to come.

These youngsters form a large and restless portion of our population. Some will wander into petty or serious crime. Many will struggle along the rest of their lives on the fringes of poverty, being of little benefit to the economy, or to themselves.

I urged that the Federal Government offer special incentives to business and industry to provide more on-the-job training, plus assured jobs, for these young people.

Since I first proposed that idea, I have given deeper study to its possibilities for application over a broader front. I am now convinced that it holds great promise not only as a solution to the problem of training and placing young school dropouts, but also as a significant attack upon the entire national problem of unemployment.

Many of the dropouts of a decade ago are among today's adult unemployed. As they grow older, they find fewer avenues of employment open to them. The Wall Street Journal recently reported the results of a survey of "help wanted" ads in many of the Nation's cities. A typical quote from a city where business is booming, is this: "Very few of the ads are for unskilled help of any kind."

And, in another city where business has been good and the number of "help wanted" ads has been increasing, a State employment office spokesman was quoted as saying: "High school graduates have no trouble locating jobs, but it's difficult to place high school dropouts."

This, of course, applies not only to boys and girls, but also to older jobseekers. Once past the teen years, they not only find it harder to locate jobs requiring no specific skills, but each year away from school makes a return to classwork for retraining less practical and less beneficial.

The most practical method of retraining able workers is by teaching them skills on the job. Commerce and industry are fully prepared for this kind of training, but they are understandably hesitant to undertake it for personnel with lower skills and a lower level of education, because of the costs involved.

We have become accustomed to call upon Government to solve such impasses, but Government is only one factor. Federal and local funds have been used in various programs to help retrain workers for productive jobs, but most of these have been token, pilot projects. Some have been successful, but only in limited areas and among small numbers.

Government alone cannot solve the problem. Our leaders of commerce and industry must do their share, not merely for the good of society, but for the safety of their own business ventures, because the health of our entire economy is affected by unemployment.

Large numbers of the work force who cannot get work lose their ability to be buying consumers. They cannot pay for goods they need. They do not keep our economy flourishing and expanding.

In his new book, "Challenge to Affluence," Gunnar Myrdal points to another serious danger to an economy which neglects to raise the quality of labor to fit the expanding demands for manpower during a boom.

He warns that without such efforts, "a boom is just a boom, and will be followed by a depression." And one of the reasons for such a result, according to Mr. Myrdal, is the fact that a scarcity of trained manpower, in the right places at the right time, limits economic expansion and puts an automatic brake on the boom.

Commerce and industry must recognize their responsibility to their own future, and to the future of the community, by starting at once a full-powered drive to retrain and reemploy this wasted manpower. The Federal Government should help establish this program by offering special incentives to commerce and industry to train these workers and give them jobs. These incentives could very well take the form of tax credits.

The benefits would be many. Business would have an enlarged pool of useful, trained, and skilled manpower, working in specific needed jobs. The Nation would gain new consumers, with regular incomes to spend. And Government would recoup a large part of its tax loss by turning idle men and women into productive, taxpaying citizens.

There is solid economic precedent for this proposal. Government offers increasingly liberal tax allowances for building up new industrial and commercial facilities. Why should it not offer tax credits for rebuilding human resources, the very foundation of our economy?

Government also recognizes the need for help to depressed geographical areas; why not for a depressed area of society—the nearly 6 percent of our employable manpower who are permanently unemployed?

Such an approach could do more than offer a means for attacking overall, nationwide unemployment. It could also make effective inroads on the knotty problems of technological joblessness in such areas of deep depression as West Virginia, western Pennsylvania, northern Minnesota, and northern New York.

West Virginia has long been considered a synonym for technological unemployment. The country's best minds have been put to work in attempts to rescue the State's resources of wasted manpower.

Most of the plans seem to fall before the fact that huge segments of West Virginia's manpower are trained for jobs which no longer exist. Yet, at the same time, the Wall Street Journal's survey tells us that a number of West Virginia industries are trying to recruit new employees, but cannot find the skills they need.

For instance, the Valley Camp Coal Co. is looking for men to operate cutting machines and shuttle cars in its Wheeling plant. But men who have mined with pick and shovel all their lives just don't have such skills. Valley Camp Coal also needs electricians, but the only way it can get them is to train them. Many firms find the costs of such training just too expensive to be feasible.

Industry in West Virginia, and in other depressed areas, needs an economic shove. Every hundred former coal miners who are retrained and returned to the work force are not only 100 men off the welfare dole and off the unemployment rolls, but also 100 customers restored to the tradesmen, clothing manufacturers, and the many other producers and sellers of daily necessities. They are also 100 regular taxpayers, once more paying their share of the costs of Federal, State, and local governments.

Industries in many parts of the Nation have long made it a practice to induce highly skilled workers—like engineers, technicians, and draftsmen—to accept jobs in locations far removed from their homes. The inducement is, generally, in the form of an offer to pay the costs of moving and relocation.

It is easy to understand that this kind of relocation would be too costly a burden to bear for personnel of lesser skills. A reasonable tax credit offered by the Federal Government could make such relocation possible on a large scale. Western Pennsylvania manpower might well be moved to eastern Pennsylvania industrial areas, and there retrained for permanent employment.

The plan I propose cannot be carried out most effectively on a local, or even a regional basis. It must be broad enough to encompass a nationwide readjustment of manpower availability and skills.

I visualize the heart of the project as being a Presidential committee, working with the Department of Labor, and with power to convass industry, State by State and plant by plant, to determine exactly what each plant is ready to do to cooperate. It should also find out what manpower is available and where it is located.

It requires not only the complete cooperation of commerce and industry, but also the support of organized labor. I shall discuss this aspect more fully, but first, let us consider the next step after the nationwide canvass.

The results of this study would provide the Presidential committee with material for a long-term plan of procedure in a coast-to-coast attack on the problem of unemployment.

I cannot presume to outline details of such a plan, without having completed the kind of study I have suggested. But some requirements are obvious. For instance, it would require formulas and procedures for determining how a firm could quality for tax incentives.

Basically, the credits should be given for new jobs, not for old jobs in which new trainees replace old employees, for such a loophole could make the entire plan self-defeating.

It would surely have to take into consideration seasonal variations in a specific industry, so that a normal seasonal increase in employment will not be mistaken for a gain in new jobs.

Trends over a period of years would also have to be taken into consideration, so that normal year-to-year growth would not be rewarded with tax credits. New jobs and new business expansion, beyond average trends, must be the result.

This tax credit program must be continued only as long as it is needed to reduce unemployment to a minimum, consistent with a healthy economy. After that, it must remain ready to be put into operation any time the threat of increasing unemployment again rears its ugly head.

And paramount among the important safeguards must be assurances of absolute, and unquestionable nondiscrimination. In this connection, you probably read last week's newspaper accounts of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report on job discrimination. You recall the Commission found a persistent pattern of exclusion of Negroes and members of other minority groups from job training programs.

A program such as I propose could do a great deal toward wiping out such pockets of bias. No plan of this kind that winks at bigotry can possibly be a success. There must be immutable guarantees of equal opportunity for all men and women, regardless of race, religion or origin.

Equally important, there must be no discrimination on the basis of age. Any worker who is physically and mentally capable of performing a given job should be eligible for employment in that job under the incentive program.

I am convinced that without the full cooperation of industry, we cannot halt the threat of increasing joblessness, nor reduce unemployment to a reasonable level.

Industry is the best judge of whether, and where, jobs are needed, and what new jobs will result in additional productivity. Government's financial help would certainly be needed, but not as the sponsor of make-work projects in which productivity is not a prime consideration.

We must keep in mind that the make-work programs were designed for the lean years of a deflationary period. Plans for today must fit in with an era of boom and expansion.

In the days of WPA, commerce and industry were sick and faltering. Today, in a flourishing economy, there are many healthy

businesses capable of creating useful, productive and profitable jobs. Business and industry are in a far better position than Government to determine what expansion will do the most good, and where the most useful jobs can best be established.

In the development of our economy in the last 100 years, organized labor has played an important, and often magnificent role. And, in the generation since the depression, the trade unions have come into their own in the development of a healthy, cooperative relationship between management and labor.

But there are things today that spell trouble, and the most disturbing of these is, of course, technological unemployment. The Labor Department estimates that unions have lost nearly half a million members in the past 2 years. The bulk of this loss can certainly be attributed to the effects of automation.

I urge labor to take the same positive attitude toward this tax credit program that it has toward the stabilization of employer-employee relationships. Organized labor has a great stake in the solution of the problem of unemployment, not only as its contribution toward helping to maintain the American way of life, but also to help preserve its past gains and achieve its future successes.

Some current approaches to the problem of unemployment cannot go far enough to provide today's answers for today's problems.

For example, I cite the Federal Manpower Act, which was recently expanded to provide retraining for less than a half million workers over the next 3 years. This is good, but not good enough.

Let us see what the results have been in New York City. During its first 17 months of operation, nearly 80,000 questionnaires were issued, 30,000 persons indicated interest in the program, 4,000 were tested, after preliminary screening, 997 were enrolled in the program, 256 completed training, and 153 were actually given jobs.

Other programs using Federal funds have been started from time to time. Among these have been an apprenticeship project, under the Labor Department's supervision, which enlisted fewer than 200 on-the-job trainees in all in New York City. There is also a program of classroom instruction in vocational skills, for unemployed workers anxious to seek work in other fields. This is under the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security. It operates on a very limited scale and does not include specific job assurances.

These figures, you may notice, are amazingly small in the light of New York City's between 250,000 and 300,000 unemployed. None is large enough, in scope, to make real inroads on the problem of unemployment and none stresses, as does the plan for tax credits, the specific orientation toward training with assured employment.

I should also make mention of another program that is just getting under way in New York City. It is called Job Orientation in Neighborhoods—or JOIN, for short. Under the sponsorship of the city and the U.S. Labor Department's Office of Manpower, this program will seek to counsel and teach school dropouts and will try to find jobs for them. It is still too early to determine what its effect will be.

At this point, we can well ask ourselves: How expensive would such a program of tax credits be? The best answer is a comparison with the only obvious alternative—a fully-subsidized program, with the Federal Government creating the jobs and paying the entire freight. A large part of such additional expense to Government must be paid by the business community in the form of Federal taxes.

It is true that a certain percentage of the cost would be recaptured in additional income taxes from the reemployed workers who benefit. But the tremendous administrative expenses of such a "makework" program might well wipe out the income tax gains.

On the other hand, a program of tax credits, geared to the usefulness and productivity of new jobs and operated within the framework of booming business, would offer many solid returns for the expenditures by both Government and business.

Let us consider what would happen in the case of a single job of one industrial worker at the national average wage of about $100 a week, or $5,200 a year. Management, paying the corporate income tax rate of 52 percent, could immediately write off half of this labor cost.

Let us say, merely for the purpose of illustration, that the Federal Government allows a 50 percent tax credit on the balance of the new worker's paycheck. This might appear to mean that about $1,300 in cash would be dipped out of the Federal Treasury, but it would not work out that way.

First, we must remember that training for most semiskilled jobs can be completed in a matter of weeks or months. Long before his first full year of employment, the new worker should be doing better than just earning his keep. When his employer begins to realize a profit on his production, the cost of establishing the new job disappears and any Government loss of incorporate income tax also disappears.

From the very beginning of his new job the worker becomes a fully-taxpaying citizen. As the head of a family with—let us say—two children, his Federal income tax alone would amount to about $450 a year, and that would also help reduce the net cost to the Government.

And, of course, the new jobholder's pay envelope would also contribute additional excise taxes to Federal, State, and local governments, through his purchase of everyday needs. His cash in the tills of local storekeepers would bring in additional income and business taxes. Local and State home relief and unemployment insurance costs would drop, providing additional tax savings.

Gradually, as the new employee gained more and more skill, and his productivity increased, he would be able to bring in additional net profits for his employer, who would gain a $5,200-a-year man at a cost of less than 25 percent.

I believe this program would stimulate the economy and work directly, and immediately, to provide new jobs, new tax revenues for Government, new income for business, and additional productivity for the Nation.

Even the forthcoming Federal income tax cut cannot have as immediate an effect on reducing unemployment. It is true that the cash made available for consumer spending by a sizeable tax reduction will have some of the same effects as the proposed tax credits. But it will take much more time for this general tax reduction to make noticeable inroads on our unemployment totals.

For example, there is no aspect of the proposed tax cut which is specifically tied to job creation, and thus can overcome an employer's hesitancy to put on new help. No program for reducing unemployment and increasing jobs and production can hope for success without the full support of business. I am confident that the tax credit plan has enough inducements to create such support.

By all means, let us have the general tax cut. I have always supported it, and I feel that it will provide a useful shot-in-the-arm to the economy. But, let us also have the tax credit program, so that we will not only give the economy a double-barreled upward shove, but also provide a key to end the stalemate of unemployment at the same time.

We must move now, and move fast. What we do today can have long-term benefits. Delay will compound the ailment.

I feel that the proposal for tax incentives I have outlined today is simple enough, broad enough, and can be effective enough to reduce unemployment, and provide the lift-off force we need to launch the growth and expansion to which we look forward in 1964.

Thank you very much.

Pittsburgh Groups Hold Memorial Services for President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1964, the senior citizens of the Young Men and Women's Hebrew Association and Irene Kaufmann Centers, of Pittsburgh, held memorial services in honor of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. There were nearly 500 people represented at this meeting and they passed a resolution which is beautifully written and quite moving in its purpose. I commend the reading of this resolution to my colleagues:

Whereas we, Americans of all racial, religious, and national backgrounds, but Americans all, are here assembled to honor and reverence the memory of our great and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and

Whereas though our hearts are still weighted with grief, and sorrow still shadows our Nation, the image of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will forever cast its luminous glow of faith and courage, lighting the road to the better future he sought for his countrymen; and

Whereas his dreams and hopes for America, were not vague, unchartered visions, but rather, were clearly articulated proposals in a program of action solidly based in his knowledge of his country's history and resources, and his undertaking of its people's needs; and

Whereas that program of action rightly emphasized—our Nation's responsibility in world peace and human betterment; the vigilant pursuit of freedom and equality for Americans of all races, creeds, and backgrounds; the spiritual and intellectual nourishment of our youth through increased educational opportunities, as well as the care of their bodies thorugh more effective health and housing measures; the decent treatment of the aging through comprehensive medical service and constructive use of leisure time; "to add," as he put it, "not just more years to life, but more life to the years"; the obligation of this generation of Americans to cherish and guard America's soil, its rivers and forests, its wildlife and its natural resources, so that future generations, too, will know the blessing of this great land's abundance, its beauty and its variety; and

Whereas we recognize that we most truly honor the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy when we honor his great and living purpose by giving our own unstinting service to that purpose: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we here assembled pledge our determined efforts toward the realization of the goals he charted with unflagging labor and steady will; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the press, our representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that she may know

our resolve, that though his great light has been taken from the world, its glow will ever remain to show the way for his fellow Americans.

The Holland Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was a victory for those who believe in guaranteeing to all Americans the right to vote. It was also a victory for Constitutional law, and proved once again that the Constitution can be amended, and that the amendment process is the proper way to effect fundamental change. The adoption of the 24th amendment is also a personal victory for the senior Senator from Florida, SPESSARD A. HOLLAND.

Senator HOLLAND began his battle for this amendment some 15 years ago. At that time, many States were levying a tax as a qualification and prerequisite for the privilege to vote. At the time of the adoption of the amendment, the number had been cut down to 5. Many States, seeking the merits of the Holland proposal, changed their laws in advance of the adoption of the amendment. These remaining will now be required to do the same.

The Florida Senator is a man of great courage and persistence. Many have given up long ago, or failed to push the proposal with the necessary determination to insure victory. The very fact that there are only 24 amendments to the Constitution, 10 of which were adopted as a package Bill of Rights, proves that the event is far from ordinary. Senator HOLLAND has thus joined the select few who have actually taken a personal part in the writing of the Constitution.

We in Florida have long known of the caliber of our senior Senator. He has served the people of his State with great distinction for over 40 years, as a county judge, State senator and Governor. In the U.S. Senate he has welcomed the opportunity to serve all Americans, and his amendment is but one example of this effort.

The Holland amendment is now the supreme law of the land. Many news articles and editorals have been written about the amendment and its author. Florida is particularly proud at this moment, and our own press reflects this.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert an article from the Miami Herald at this point in the RECORD, and to add to all the other expressions being received by the Senator, our very best congratulations and good wishes:

CALL IT THE HOLLAND AMENDMENT

Let's call it the Holland amendment. That is the rightful designation of the 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

It was written into our national charter when the South Dakota Legislature added the name of the 38th State to the list of ratifiers. Thus, the Holland amendment has been approved by three-fourths of the States, as required by the Constitution itself.

The deed is a victory for the principle of constitutional government. It is also a personal triumph for SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida's senior U.S. Senator.

For 15 years, Senator HOLLAND has battled almost singlehandedly toward this goal. His words henceforth will appear in the fundamental law of this land:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Only five States were still levying poll taxes of $1 or $2 when Cngress finally approved the Holland amendment last year. The fee was a vestige of colonial times, when each of the Thirteen Original States required property ownership, payment of public taxes, or a poll tax as qualification for voting. These conditions have been lifted over the years so that nowadays in most States the privilege of voting is handed almost automatically to every citizen reaching age 21.

The outcome is far from academic, however.

Since 1949, Senator HOLLAND has been contending that the only way Congress can do anything about the qualifications of voters is to propose an amendment to the Constitution. We share this view.

Others argued that the poll tax should be abolished by act of Congress, without amending the Constitution. Still others took the stand that Congress should keep hands off altogether—that fixing the qualifications of voters is a State—not a Federal—right.

Senator HOLLAND's long persistence has prevailed. The principle he stood for has been vindicated.

On a higher level, the Holland amendment proves that the people of the United States can still govern themselves as they please under our 177-year-old written Constitution—by obeying the terms of that Constitution.

Résumé of Resolutions Passed at the 67th Annual Convention, American National Cattlemen's Association, Memphis, Tenn., January 26–29, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, by far the most serious problem now facing our American cattle industry is the drastic drop in the prices of beef and beef products.

Many of the Members will recall last month's briefing by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in which the Secretary acknowledged the existence of this situation and cited the efforts being made to correct it.

Recently, at the 67th Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association, the import problem was, naturally, a topic of prime consideration.

The text of these resolutions will subsequently be transmitted to those members whose committee responsibilities require conversant familiarity with the desires and welfare of the cattlemen.

However, so that all of us may be aware of the general feelings of the Nation's beef producers, I submit, for publication in the RECORD, this résumé of the resolutions passed at the January 1964 convention of the Cattlemen's Association.

RÉSUMÉ OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE 67TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, MEMPHIS, TENN., JANUARY 26–29, 1964

Three critical resolutions adopted at Memphis concerned beef imports, beef grading, and railroads.

In the import action the cattlemen asked for quotas on imports of "beef and beef products established at levels substantially lower than imports of recent years" and that beef and beef products be eliminated from negotiation at the trade confab in Geneva this year and suggested that foreign meat be so labeled.

After much pro and con discussion on Federal beef grading the cattlemen turned down the cutability grade proposal of USDA but called for a reduction in the marbling requirements of younger animals as suggested in a report by Dr. E. J. Briskey of the University of Wisconsin.

Historically, the cattlemen have asked for economy in Government. This year their resolution specifically urged President Johnson to carry out his announced intention to effect economies in Government.

The stockmen said that meat inspection is done "primarily in interest of the public at large and therefore cost of Federal meat inspection should be paid for by the Government and not charged to processors as has been proposed."

They also asked that the inspection should be retained in the Agricultural Research Service and not transferred to the Agricultural Marketing Service as has been suggested by Government officials.

A resolution on wilderness legislation suggested that "for the present such legislation should be further studied by the Public Land Law Review Commission contemplated in H.R. 8070."

Cattlemen hold to the theory of multiple use of Federal lands and expressed in a resolution the feeling that "reduction of existing multiple uses on Federal lands for a special or single use violates the multiple-use principle and should be discouraged."

Expressions concerning public lands said that the Taylor Grazing Act "is a modern multiple-use conservation law and should be preserved as such"; that the Interior Department should restore the 3-year terms for Bureau of Land Management advisory board members; and asked Congress to pass legislation to declare that water rights "are a species of real property right under the laws of the respective States."

They asked that there be no reduction of preference numbers on the national forests until all possible improvements and management methods have been exhausted and that the limit on voluntary nonuse be extended more than 5 years.

Because thinning of trees by cutting and letting them lie causes a fire hazard to neighboring ranches, the stockmen ask that such Forest Service practices be discontinued "unless there is definite fire protection provided."

A resolution "urged greater utilization in grazing of public lands where feed production is a fire hazard and more liberal use of controlled fires."

Objection was voiced to "further appropriations for conversion of private land for the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service and others, and that all such matters be referred to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (designed to coordinate use of various lands for recreation), counseling with State agencies and be limited to a willing seller on a negotiated basis."

Cattlemen asked Federal and State land agencies to set up a program of public education to show that improvements are necessary to the proper utilization of our resources.

Supported legislation to free railroads to make competitive rate reductions on bulk and agricultural commodities "in a manner which can better serve the cattle and agricultural industry."

A resolution said that since proposed regulations requiring individual identification of cattle moving interstate do not include use of brand inspection as proper identification, "the following recommendations should be considered: (1) Cattle consigned by the owner and properly identified by brand or other recognized procedures at point of origin may move interstate, and (2) unidentified cattle may move one time only either intrastate or interstate to an improved market in the State of origin or a State contiguous thereto for such identification."

The cattlemen joined the U.S. Livestock Sanitary Association in calling for publication of a brochure on available information about anaplasmosis.

Immediate repeal of the luxury tax on leather goods was urged.

Civil Rights and Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, no union should be forced by this civil rights bill to take into its membership a Communist, an atheist, or any person unwanted by a majority of the union.

Local labor unions have duly elected officials the same as any other free democratic organization. They have their own rules, regulations and bylaws. Under this civil rights bill, the Federal Government will have the right to go into the local labor union and harass, browbeat, coerce, and force the duly elected union leaders into bringing into the union persons who claim they are being discriminated against. This is un-American. It is undemocratic and is definitely a step toward a Khrushchev-Castro type of government. I will never vote, Mr. Speaker, for any bill which will place a labor union in such a straitjacket and which would permit Federal agents, like the Gestapo, to sit in on union meetings and spy on their officials and all of the activities of the union.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the House the following, as it was written by some of the most distinguished lawyers on the House Judiciary Committee including the able and honorable gentleman from Louisiana, ED WILLIS, widely known opponent of communism and the great chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

LABOR UNIONS AND MEMBERS

To millions of working men and women, union membership is the most valuable asset they own. It is designed to insure job security and a rate of pay higher than they otherwise would receive. As none knows better than the union member, himself, these two benefits are dependent upon the system of seniority the unions have followed since their inception. Seniority is the base upon which unionism is founded. Without its system of seniority, a union would lose one of its greatest values to its members.

The provisions of this act grant the power to destroy union seniority. With the full statutory powers granted by this bill, the extent of actions which would be taken to destroy the seniority system is unknown and unknowable.

To disturb this traditional practice is to destroy a vital part of unionism. Under the power granted in this bill, if a carpenters' hiring hall, say, had 20 men waiting call, the first 10 in seniority being white carpenters, the union could be forced to pass them over in favor of carpenters beneath them in seniority, but of the stipulated race. And if the union roster did not contain the names of the carpenters of the race needed to racially balance the job, the union agent must, then, go into the street and recruit members of the stipulated race in sufficient number to comply with Federal orders, else his local could be held in violation of Federal law.

Neither competence nor experience is the key for employment under this bill. Race is the principal, first, criterion.

Specific penalties are provided for violation of this bill (title VII). However, in addition, the President "is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate to prevent the committing or continuing of an unlawful employment practice" in connection with title VI of the bill (sec. 711(b)). This, of course, amounts to practically unlimited authority. Unions held in violation of this bill may lose their rights and benefits under such labor statutes as the National Labor Relations Act, the Railway Labor Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and other legislation beneficial to labor. Representation rights and exclusive bargaining privileges could be canceled. Unions could be denied access to NLRB or National Mediation Board procedures.

Moreover, this bill affects unions from the other end, that of the employer, since the law applies to the employer, as well. It extends to railroads, motor carriers, airlines, and steamship companies handling mail or other Government shipments, enterprises receiving loans from the Small Business Administration, construction contractors financed through FHA or GI home loan insurance, the rural electrification program and practically all others (secs. 601, 602).

Consequently, however meticulous a local union may be as pertains to its racial practice, if a contractor, for example, has been adjudged guilty of discrimination and must, therefore, hire 100 or 1,000 workers of a given race—in preference to all others—before his job becomes racially balanced, it means the local which supplies his labor can send him only union members of that particular race—and the members of other races will sit until that number has been employed. If the union does not have among its membership the number required, it must recruit membership of that race to supply the contractor's needs. This is a specific instance of the Federal Government interfering in the contract rights of unions and employers.

By threat of contract cancellation and blacklisting, contractors could be forced to actively recruit employees of a specified race and upgrade them into skilled classifications, although this would displace union members in the skilled trades. Where skilled tradesmen of the specified race were not available from union sources, the agency could direct that they be recruited from nonunion sources, notwithstanding existing union shop or exclusive referral agreements.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask some member of the committee to answer the question why we would need an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and an Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, costing the taxpayers several millions of dollars. Please tell me why we would need both.

Mr. Chairman, apparently no one wishes to answer.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield, if the gentleman can give me an answer as to why he wants to be so profligate with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GOODELL. The Equal Employment Opportunity Committee to which the gentleman refers is limited to Federal contracts.

Mr. GROSS. Is limited to what?

Mr. GOODELL. To Federal contractors, when Federal contracts are involved, and to Federal employees. I would hope we could eventually eliminate the necessity for that Committee. It was set up under Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961. Its jurisdiction is limited.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I say to the gentleman that the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee activities go far beyond Government contracts. We have investigated the operation of this Committee. The gentleman is not factual when he makes that statement.

Mr. GOODELL. That is the basis for the Committee.

The Commission in this bill, at any rate, is to operate far beyond that purview. The scope of the Commission is to cover all employers affecting interstate commerce who have more than 100 employees the first year and thereafter down to those with 25 or more employees.

Mr. GROSS. So far as the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee is concerned, there are no holds barred. They go all over the landscape into every facet of employment in this Government.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The gentleman from Iowa is not looking for a Federal judgeship. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa yielded to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from Iowa that one of the main reasons for providing for the Commission in the legislation was to give the Commission legislative stature. The Committee of which the gentleman has spoken is a Presidential Committee under an Executive order.

It was the well nigh unanimous, if not unanimous, decision of the subcommittee that that was the compelling reason for the legislation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have not finished on the point.

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. It appears you have struck the opposition where the hair is short. As is so often the case, the gentleman from Iowa is right. With two tables full of experts here in the Chamber scrambling to find an answer to a very simple question, nobody has been able to come up with one which possesses either logic or fact.

It appears pretty obvious there will be under this bill a double layer of officialdom meddling in everybody's business throughout the country. There will be two Commissions—at double cost—competing for priority.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, we have the right to hope, indeed, some of us feel disposed to pray, that the passage of this legislation will add noble new arches and commanding spires to the magnificent edifice of a free America designed by Thomas Jefferson and the Founding Fathers and slowly, tediously, often painfully, but ever-persistently, perfected through nearly two centuries, by the sacrifices, the struggles, and the dreams of the American people.

Armenian Revolutionary Federation Credo

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in this Chamber and elsewhere my voice has been raised in the righteous cause of the captive nations. Too long have we been dragging our feet in the matter of the creation of a joint congressional committee to give direction and drive to the efforts of the world of freedom to rescue the captive nations from their unhappy plight.

Armenia is numbered among the captive nations. I am indebted to Arthur Kaprelian, a constituent of Armenian blood residing at 11915 South Wallace Street, Chicago, for a copy of the credo recently adopted by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation. It is an inspiring document worthy of place in the world's literature of freedom. That it may be read by my colleagues, I am extending my remarks to include the complete text of the credo, as follows:

THE ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION CREDO

The supreme aim of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation is the realization of a free, united, and independent democratic national homeland established on the territories of the historic fatherland of the Armenian nation.

We believe that the realization of this aim can only be possible in a free democratic world context. A world in which the danger of war is permanently eliminated, and where the existing and potential international dis-

putes can be resolved by peaceful means through the agency of a powerful international organization which shall be endowed with the necessary means of imposing its supreme will on great or small nation alike.

We believe that it is the indisputable and inviolable right of all nations, great or small alike, to possess their own independent government and to live and prosper under the canopy of its protection.

We believe that each nation, even the smallest and the weakest, can best develop its creative talents and its unique national individuality in its own, free and independent state.

We believe that each man, regardless of sex, race, or denomination, has a birthright to live out a free and happy life.

We believe that when a nation's fatherland is under the yoke of a more powerful alien nation, and the ruling nation is reluctant to end its tyranny by peaceful legitimate means, the nation which is ruled has the inviolable right to fight against that rule, and to resort to revolution and armed conflict, if necessary, for the liberation of its own fatherland.

We believe that each nation has an undeniable right to govern itself as it wishes and to express its collective will only through the medium of the free, universal secret ballot.

We believe that a nation, even within the limits of its independent national state, can best prosper and live the happy life when all its members, regardless of sex, race, or creed, enjoy the freedoms of press, of religion, and public assembly, the freedom to organize, to work, to travel, to move, and to communicate with others—conditions of which the Armenia of today is deprived.

We believe that when a nation is independent, and enjoys the benefits of a democratic government which is elected by the free, universal and secret vote of the people, any changes in the constitutional order are made only through constitutional channels; namely, by peaceful and legitimate means. Consequently, it is a crime which is tantamount to treason to effectuate any changes in the free constitutional order by armed force or by revolution.

We believe that a nation not only has the right, but it has the duty to dispense social justice to all the classes of society without discrimination, and to create such socio-economic conditions in which the humblest classes of the nation shall have the opportunity to enjoy a life which is in keeping with human dignity, fully adequate to meet the necessities of life.

We believe that the Armenian nation, as every nation, can best preserve and develop its unique physical and spiritual existence in a free and independent national homeland.

We believe that any nation, as well as the Armenian nation, in this atomic age when science has made gigantic strides in the fields of travel and communication, cannot develop and prosper in an isolated life. Science has wiped out the limitations of space and has brought the nations closer together, that all nations, great or small, aside from their aspirations to be free and independent, necessarily have need of cooperation, because, by virtue of their economies, their means of intercommunication and their cultural activities, more than at any other time, they are interdependent, and can meet their needs only through mutual understanding and close cooperation.

We believe that, as long as Armenia continues to remain under the Soviet rule, and as long as Armenia's historic territories are held by an alien power, it is the sacred duty of all Armenians to pursue the cause of the fatherland's liberation with all the possible means at their disposal.

THE WORLD CONGRESS OF THE ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION.

Britain Has Case in Bus Sale Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that a British firm will sell buses to Cuba is an ominous and discordant note in the U.S. effort to persuade our allies to join in an economic quarantine of Fidel Castro's Cuba. This announcement and subsequent events involving shifts in French policy are warnings of serious difficulties unless our Government can formulate a consistent policy opposing trade deals with the Communist bloc.

Certainly, there seems little doubt that our wheat sales to Russia and some of her satellites have weakened the moral arguments that have been persuasive with our allies in the past. If we continue to pursue a double standard in international trade policy, our arguments will not have much weight with our friends.

I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a thoughtful editorial on this important matter which appeared in the January 29 edition of the Concord (N.C.) Tribune:

BRITAIN HAS CASE IN BUS SALE DEAL

The British have snubbed the U.S. economic blockade of Cuba, and the general reaction among the American people seems to be that it was a lowdown trick for one ally to pull on another.

Britain has approved a multimillion-dollar sale of buses to Cuba, and has set up a 5-year credit plan to facilitate it. This was done despite an official expression of American opposition while the sale was being negotiated.

When the deal was complete, the U.S. Department of State commented that the sale "certainly does not help our effort to isolate the Cuban regime."

But there is another side to this coin.

In Britain, the sale is considered routine. It is a transaction between two nations which have a history of trade, and it involves what the British believe to be nonstrategic materials. Britain is not observing an economic blockade of Cuba, although Cuba is included in a general British ban on selling war materials to Communist countries.

The British manufacturer who won the bus contract was bidding against firms in France, West Germany, Japan, Spain, and Czechoslovakia.

The United States has long sought, and with some success, to discourage trade with Cuba by non-Communist countries. A U.S. law forbids aid to countries which violate strategic aspects of this ban.

Communist bloc countries have filled in with Cuban trade zooming above the billion-dollar level.

But non-Communist countries are still doing more than $200 million worth of business a year with Cuba. Japan is the biggest dealer, with Morocco, Britain, Egypt, Canada, Netherlands, West Germany, Chile, Spain, Tunisia, and Greece coming in for a share.

And when you get right down to it, the United States sounds a bit hypocritical in grousing about the British bus deal when the ink is not long dry on our own pact to sell wheat to Russia, the heartblood of the Communist organism. And our Government is willing to back up Russia's credit on the deal.

Which pot is accusing which kettle?

Wee Care Nursery Symbol of Community's Backbone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that with today's trend toward centralization of governmental functions the citizens of Belle Glade, Fla., have taken it upon themselves to handle their own problems, right in their own community. Belle Glade has always relied on migrant labor to aid in the harvesting and planting of crops, and this created a need for a nursery center to care for the children of the migrant workers. Belle Glade is now in the process of completing a community nursery which not only shows its concern for the families of migrant workers who so vitally aid the community, but also the determination to solve their own problems rather than pass them on to a higher up.

I submit for the RECORD an article which appeared in the Palm Beach Post, by Mr. Jonathan Koontz, on February 2, 1964, telling of the nursery and its development:

WEE CARE NURSERY SYMBOL OF COMMUNITY'S BACKBONE

(By Jonathan Koontz)

BELLE GLADE.—The building going up in the 100 block of Southeast 10th Street here is modern and airy in appearance, and will be a definite asset to its part of the city.

But it is much more than a desirable architectural addition.

Wee Care Day Nursery will provide care for 100 children of working mothers whose planting and harvesting jobs in the lush, green fields surrounding Belle Glade take them away from their families for many hours each day—soemtimes as much as 12 hours daily.

It will be the only day care nursery in the city, where the need for day care for at least 300 children is easily demonstrated.

But the building is a symbol of much more than its humanitarian function.

In agreeing to provide administration for the nursery, the Salvation Army has stepped into a brand new role in its Palm Beach County history.

The nursery is factual evidence that homegrown human talent and energy can succeed without county, State or Federal aid in an era when effective local action is disappearing under the impact of stronger governmental control.

In its planning and building, lasting ties of cooperation and friendship are being formed. Belle Glade is a city less divided against itself than before the days of the Wee Care Day Nursery.

No one knows who first recognized the need for the nursery, but the dream which finally materialized was born in the Belle Glade Interracial Council, a group of the leading white and Negro citizens of Belle Glade.

For more than 15 years this group has worked quietly for better understanding between the two main racial groups in Belle Glade, and toward the solution of community problems.

The day care problem was predominantly a Negro problem, and the council, in its consideration of it, embarked on a deliberate policy of finding as many resources as possible in the Negro community to aid in its solution.

"We wanted the Negro leadership of the community to take the lead throughout the solution of this problem," Miss Sara Lee Creech, a white member of the council, said recently.

"We knew they would need help from the white citizens who saw the need," she continued, "but we wanted them to feel that this was essentially their project, and the rest of the community would pitch in and help when help was necessary."

That is the way it has worked out.

The first attempt, back in the mid-1950's began when the Negro Women's Civic League, under the leadership of Mrs. Amelia Houston, started the purchase of the five lots on which the building now stands.

When promises of aid indicated a need for haste in the purchase of the lots, members of the interracial council went to the city council for help, and the city purchased three of the lots.

This attempt ended in bitter disappointment when promised financial help failed to materialize.

In the late 1950's, the council again revived the idea, but a poll of business leaders in the community showed one fatal flaw—people felt sure the building could be built, but no one was prepared to take the responsibility of running the nursery. Practically all the members of the council were business people who could not find this much time away from their businesses.

In late 1962 and early 1963 the solution came in the form of an effort by the Salvation Army to expand its activities in the glades area.

After several meetings with the council, Army leaders agreed to furnish administration of the nursery, and asked retired Brig. John Bivans to assist the project.

This time, the time was right, and the project has come as far as the roofing in of the building as though it were guided by unseen angel wings.

Wee Care, Inc., was formed and an outstanding Glades Negro leader, W. C. Taylor, was made its president. Miss Creech is vice president and chairman of the building committee.

George L. Royal became chairman of the finance committee, and took charge of the building fund campaign. Many Glades leaders, doctors, and other professional men and as well as businessmen and women worked on committees or became directors.

A goal of $60,000 was set for the building, and $12,000 for the first year's operation. When the money was slow in coming in, the building was started on faith and on whatever dollars were present.

Architect Chester A. Cone designed the building, and members of the finance committee, knowing his public spirit, were not surprised to see a contribution of the amount of his fee come back for use in the building.

A Negro organization headed by Taylor, known as the Everglades Progressive Citizens, was asked to construct the building. When they felt they needed help from someone with experience in large buildings, a white contractor, Bert Roemer, volunteered to supervise the work, and has done so.

The Negro builders, having had little experience with prestressed concrete, were a little worried when it came time for the huge beams to be swung into place. The angels wings could almost be heard as the big cranes began carefully placing the concrete in place. Not one single adjustment was needed. Everything fit perfectly.

Building suppliers gave materials to the project at their cost, and then discounted all the bills by 10 percent if paid by the 10th of the month. So far they have all been paid by the 10th.

The one Negro plumber in the city gave his time to the project, and when he ran into fabrication he could not handle, a white plumbing concern did the work at cost.

The senior masonry class from Lake Shore High School made a project of the north wall, with those who had already passed their exams doing the block laying, and others helping.

Money was slow in coming in, so the Negro citizens organized on a block basis and tried to get everyone to give $1.

When that well began to run dry, they organized committees of housewives who made coffee and sold it on the street for whatever amount the coffeedrinker wanted to donate, and raised $300 more.

The Lake Shore faculty played a football game with the alumni, and $400 more went into the pot. Two different Christmas savings clubs donated $50 each.

All the major churches and the ministerial association swung in behind the project, and the Belle Glade hospital staff heartily endorsed it.

The campaign for funds got underway in September 1963. As of this week, approximately $25,000 of the budgeted $60,000 for the building is in hand, but the building itself is nearly two-thirds completed.

So valuable have been the contributions of labor and the help on materials, that officers of Wee Care, Inc., figure that some $5,000 to $10,000 may be saved on the original low estimates of building and equipping the nursery.

There is still a very long way to go, but those working on the building seem to have complete faith that it will be finished.

Two weeks ago, a donation from a Lake Worth woman contained a cryptic note "Get that roof on."

So last week they did.

When the building is finished, and 100 migrant children start getting good meals and good, sound care, the people of Belle Glade may have a touch of pride in what they have done for the needy.

But what they have done for themselves may be even more important.

"Never has any one project done more to develop real understanding," says Miss Creech.

"The nursery has had a tremendous impact on racial understanding in Belle Glade," says Taylor.

"The white people have chipped in to help in what was essentially a Negro problem, and done it in such a way that the Negro can feel that he is basically solving his own problem.

"Now we know that people do care for these little children."

Repair Job Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Repair Job Needed," which appeared in the February 11, 1964, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

The editorial is as follows:

REPAIR JOB NEEDED

The House now has passed what has aptly been described as the "most far-reaching" civil rights bill ever put before Congress. This is no exaggeration. And as enacted by the House, the bill is very much in need of an overhaul.

The fact is that the bill—though new civil rights legislation is both desirable and necessary—did not receive anything like adequate consideration in the House. A few facts will illustrate the point. At present, there are 432 Members of the House. Every quorum call was answered by at least 400 Members. So the legislators were in attendance. But in votes taken on 21 issues affecting the bill, some of them of great importance, the average was 131.7 against amendment and 64.6 in favor. Why did less than half of the House membership take part in the debate and in the votes on amendments? Simply because those who were against the bill or who wanted to modify it, Republicans as well as Democrats, knew they were beaten before the first speech was made. They had no stomach for the fight and were more than willing to pass the battle onto the Senate, meanwhile trying to harvest a little partisan hay.

In the Senate, where the steamroller tactics so effectively used in the House cannot be employed, the entire bill will receive the careful consideration it deserves. This is proper. For a meaningful civil rights bill, when it becomes law, will have a profound effect—not only in the South, but in other sections of the country as well. It is better to consider it with care now than to regret ill-advised action later on.

There are three aspects of the House-approved bill which we think are especially in need of repair work in the Senate.

One is the failure of the bill to provide for jury trials in contempt proceedings except in title II, which concerns public accommodations. Critics asked why, for instance, was no jury trial provision contained in title III, relating to desegregation of public facilities. The answer was that defendants under this title generally would be public officials, and why give them jury trials? This is strange doctrine in legislation which is supposed to have some relationship to equal protection of the laws. Because a man is a public official does not make an indeterminate jail sentence at the hands of some arbitrary judge any more palatable—or equitable. We think that in all cases the jury trial provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 should be incorporated in this bill.

Our second point concerns title VI, authorizing the cutoff of Federal funds as an aid to desegregation and fair treatment.

This section vests an enormous power in the hands of the President and his subordinates. That it could be outrageously abused by a politically minded and irresponsible President is beyond question. The late President Kennedy was asked at a press conference last April about a Civil Rights Commission recommendation that the President seek power to cut off or suspend Federal aid funds to States which fail to comply with the Constitution and the laws. Mr. Kennedy's answer was that it "probably would be unwise" to give the President that kind of power.

Our feeling is that this section in the pending bill needs to be much more carefully drawn. Funds can be cut off when there has been a finding that a person has been subjected to discrimination. But discrimination is not defined. What, precisely, does it mean? We agree with the observation that, under this section, "the innocent are damned with the guilty if a Federal execu-

tive agency can terminate Federal programs in an entire State or in some geographical portion of a State because one citizen was 'discriminated' against by one State official or by a fellow citizen." There is the further point that in the South at least Negroes would probably suffer most when Federal aid is cut off.

Our third objection goes to title VII, generally known as the fair employment practices section. This section hits hard at both management and union practices which keep Negroes from obtaining jobs commensurate with their abilities. We wholeheartedly agree that legislation to accomplish this is needed. The pending proposal, however, is a draftsman's horror. Once again, key terms are not defined. No standards of evidence are set forth to guide the commission which would be created to administer the section. In the readily fall back on some form of quota system, which by all means should be avoided. If this section is accepted by the Senate, it should first be drastically overhauled, tightened up and clarified.

That this bill was railroaded through the House is beyond dispute. Representative MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, is a believer in civil rights and was a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee which initiated work on this bill. At first, he says, the measure was seriously considered. Then a "curious change" took place. Without any debate in the subcommittee, three sections were suddenly added by the majority—FEPC, broader powers for the Attorney General to intervene in suits, and a more sweeping public accommodations section. Then, on October 29, the full committee knocked out the language of the subcommittee bill. Substitute language, which was not drafted by the committee and the origin of which is not clear, was approved. Mr. MEADER first saw the completed draft when a copy was delivered to his home at 10:10 p.m. on the following Monday. The committee met the next morning at 10:30 and declared the bill not subject to amendment. That afternoon, following a recess necessitated by a meeting of the House, the bill was reported out.

Fortunately, this sort of thing can't happen in the Senate. The Senators will go over the bill line by line and clause by clause. We hope that an effective bill will be brought to a vote after full debate and passed without a filibuster. This will not happen, however, unless modifications are accepted. If they are not accepted, the only alternatives will be to invoke cloture or "wear out" the objectors. We do not believe that either can be successful.

An Image Needs Changing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the interval since January 31 when the House has been meeting between 9 and 10 hours per day, including both Saturdays, I have neglected to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Sedalia Democrat, Sedalia, Mo., under date of Friday, January 31, 1964, entitled "An Image Needs Changing."

The editorial points out that no longer is baseball or professional football the national pastime but the real sport of almost everyone is knocking Congress. Our good friend is very truthful when he says many of the speeches printed in the RECORD were never delivered, or if so, were at an hour of the day when page boys outnumbered Members on the floor. I think we must all commend his defense of Congress, however, when it is pointed out there should be no criticism when Congress does not immediately rush through a foreign aid bill or medical care or civil rights. He points out the function of Congress is adequate deliberation which is the best guarantee for wise legislation. No one can say that 10 days of debate for an average of 9 hours a day is rushing the civil rights bill, nor can anyone say that the issues were not fully debated and weighed before the final vote was taken. On the other hand, it seems to me that criticism against "certain" key committee heads is a valid one and without spelling it out, I suspect he has reference to the chairman of the Rules Committee and some others which have neglected, omitted, and in some cases, refused to hold hearings on meritorious matters.

I am certain we all agree that a growing of cynicism on the part of the people toward Congress could be fatal to the Republic.

The editorial follows:

AN IMAGE NEEDS CHANGING

You may argue whether the national pastime is still baseball or whether professional football has displaced it, but the real sport of the proletariat is neither of these. It's knocking Congress.

Seldom in history has that body been under such attack. It's not the U.S. Congress any more; it's the "Do-Nothing Congress," whether one is referring to the 87th or 88th or any other.

The sad thing is that so many people these days take it for granted that the constitutional purpose of Congress is mainly to criticize the President (whoever he may be) and keep him from grabbing too much power, and to pass only those laws which one side is able to jam through with main force or slip by on the grease slopped over from the ever-normal pork barrel.

Aside from this basic function, the popular impression goes, Congressmen divide their time between endless hearings on gangsters and other seamy citizens and holding interviews with reporters in which they discuss what legislation is going to be considered in the current session, when it will go through, how it will be gotten through, how it will be changed before it gets through, or why it won't go through at all.

True, a romantic picture of Congressmen stil survives among the young—a picture of white-maned, floppy-tied solons debating hotly in the aisles of the Senate or House.

Actually, most speeches printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were never delivered. Those that were, were read during an off-hour when page boys outnumbered the Congressmen present.

Just about everyone has a grievance against Congress. However, those who jump on it because it didn't immediately rush through the administration's foreign aid or medicare or civil rights bills are on just as shaky ground as those who maintain the fiction that Congress is simply deliberating.

Would that it were, for this is its function, and is the best guarantee of wise legislation.

Unfortunately, the majority of Congressmen never get a chance to vote on these bills, let alone deliberate on them. For an excess of checks and balances in the congressional machinery allows them to be bottled up in perpetuity through the will of certain key committee heads.

Can anyone truly say that the great issues (or, if you prefer, pseudoissues) of our time, such as medicare, have really been debated and weighed and considered by the people's representatives?

This is the trouble with Congress, and only Congress itself can provide the remedy which will enable it to regain its lost prestige.

The alternative is an increasing alienation from the people and a growing cynicism on their part that could be fatal to the Republic.

Peace Corps Teacher in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by a Peace Corps teacher in Africa in the Elementary School Journal published by the University of Chicago Press:

VOICI LE PEACE CORPS

(By Suellen Fisher)

The children I teach are 5 years old and are in school for the first time. Some were born here in Port Bouet, a fishing village on Africa's Ivory Coast; some moved here; but not one of them knows much French, the official language of the country. Nevertheless, they're proud to sport school uniforms—bright blue dresses for the girls, khaki shirts and shorts for the boys—and to stand at attention with the other 800 pupils for the weekly flag-raising ceremony.

They do not understand the words of their national anthem any better than American children comprehend all of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Luckily I am the only one who overhears their rendering of "pays de l'hospitalite" ("land of hospitality") as they sing out enthusiastically, "payez pour l'hospitalite" ("pay for the hospitality").

Naturally, I try to correct their pronunciation, but I do let them continue to sing "Sur le pont d'Abidjan" ("On the bridge of Abidjan") when we're in the classroom, out of earshot of older children who would mock the young ones' substitution of the African "Abidjan" for the proper French "Avignon."

Over the brown double doors of a classroom, which measures 15 feet by 15 feet, the letters S E, which stand for section enfantine (children's division), have been painted in white on a black slate. Thirty some boys and girls sit around six brightly colored tables. They already have intrusted to me their midmorning snacks—a slice of bread with tomato sauce and macaroni, mangoes, or dried fish—and are more or less attentive as I call the roll.

Sogbo Brokahi Stanilas, Bry Narcisse, and Bakary Traore have never appeared in class since I've been teaching here, so I make up simple arithmetic problems about how many more stools we would have to buy if they were to come.

In place of the children who are absent, however, are many who are not officially registered. The extras are children of some of the school's African teachers, a nephew of the former Minister of Education, fishermen's children, planters' children, taxidrivers' children, and others who come, I suppose, to be with their friends. This situation obliges me to sign the school register this way: "Registered, 30; present, 35; absent, 3."

Physical education is held in the morning, the coolest part of the school day. To begin with, I give the children variations of the exercises I learned as a Peace Corps trainee. I let them bend and stretch to "Meunier, tu dors" ("Miller, you are sleeping"), march and sing to "J'ai perdu le do de ma clarinette" ("I've lost the C of my clarinet"), and dance "La Capucine." I have them run races and play circle games to accustom them to the ideas of choosing teams, of winning, and of losing.

Lately, I have been using part of the 45-minute period to practice for la fete scolaire (school festival). La section enfantine is going to present three dances: the bunny hop, the hokey pokey, and the twist. The first two I taught them: the third they taught me.

While the children rest their heads, I get water from the pump, fill a bucket, and prepare soap and towel for the "soins de proprete" lesson ("lesson on cleanliness"). I guess they have been used to plain soap, because the day I took a cake of perfumed soap to the class the children could not stop smelling their hands.

One day the principal leaned in from his office, probably to ask me to explain the noise coming from my class. In the French system of education, noise seems to mean any talking that is not in unison. My principal never did get to pose his question, however, because I immediately invited him to see what was going on in each of my noise centers.

One group of children was busy arranging by size, from the smallest to the largest, a 15-piece set of plastic canisters (plastic bowls supplied to all volunteers), thus practicing distinguishing similar objects by size.

Another group was playing an arithmetic game I had made from file cards on which I had pasted a hundred sets of pictures for the children to pair up.

In the reading corner, a half-dozen other children sat turning the pages of books, pretending to read stories they had come to know by heart.

The group in the midst of an animal lotto game had grown a little rowdy (the principal did observe that the children were associating a French term with an image and were learning to play independently), but the noisiest group was hammering and banging wooden pieces together to form buildings and houses.

I had to justify the various activities as best I could.

The children's day ends with a cup of milk and a song. Milk is a real treat for them, and I have made a point of talking about the animal from which milk comes. They wrote about la vache ("the cow") in their notebooks and learned a charming recitation by Daudet on the sound milk makes as it squirts into the farmer's pail.

I was reminded, however, of the necessity of taking nothing for granted and of being sure my pupils have really understood, when late one afternoon Cyriaque, a bright 5-year-old, called out "Voila la vache." ("There's the cow.")

I stopped serving the cups of milk. "Cyriaque," I asked, bewildered by this observation "ou tu vois la vache?" ("Where do you see the cow?").

He smiled knowingly: "Mais, c'est toil, Mademoiselle, parceque tu nous donnes le lait" ("But you're the cow, Miss, because you give us milk").

(NOTE.—Suellen Fisher's account of her life as a teacher with the Peace Corps recently appeared in the Elementary School Journal, published by the University of Chicago Press.)

Appropriate Measures Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, behind erupting violence and the threat of it in many areas of the world, the hands of Communist agitators can be clearly seen. This is a period of increasing Communist threat. The Communist cadres are being sent into many unstable areas of the world to sow strife and unrest. Cuba has become a major base for the subversion of Latin America. Old grievances are being fanned into disorders and political demagoges in Latin America allow themselves to become willing partners. The continuing Panama crisis is a case in point.

Certainly our problems in Panama are not simple. However, we are challenged there dramatically and the world will take notice of our resolution or our willingness to retreat.

The relationship of many world events is evident if we view it in the framework of the great and continuing East-West struggle. Today, I want to commend to the House of Representatives the following editorial from the February 3, 1964, Concord (N.C.) Tribune, which searches aspects of this problem and asks questions that many Americans are asking today:

APPROPRIATE MEASURES NEEDED

How long do we put up with it?

How long does the rich and powerful United States allow itself to be shoved around by an unshaven stooge of communism?

At what point does appeasement become defeat? Or when does it give way to action—action of the kind that reasserts who's who in this hemisphere, or in the world for that matter?

Castro exchanges a bear hug with Khrushchev in Moscow. He had reason to. His followers had just brought to a head a sore point in Panama. And on the other side of the world, Castro-trained agents had upturned the British regime in Zanzibar and saw the U.S. consul jailed at gunpoint by pro-Red insurgents.

Maybe Castro realizes that he is being taken by Mr. K. Recent deals in sugar, with all the sweetness going to Russia, must have taught him something.

But Mr. Castro can see that we are being taken, too. The Russians are feeding on our wheat and we are signing the bill.

Castro can be happy, too, that his little island stronghold is wielding an influence far greater than its size and power warrant. He has seen increasing success in marketing Cuba's chief export in these tense days. That export is mass revolution.

His success is a reflection of U.S. concessions and retreats in principle. He will continue to press his product as long as he can get away with it.

Americans who live in the Panama Canal Zone are angry and alarmed. They warn against any more appeasement. They demand a firm stand to protect American rights, despite the hypocritical outrage of those who charge us with aggression.

It is just a little more than a year ago that the Kennedy administration promised appropriate measures to prevent the spread of Communist revolution and terrorism from Cuba to the Western Hemisphere. Appropriate measures clearly implied armed force if it is needed.

The Panama dispute is a focal point of the spreading Communist infection. It is not an incident which can be solved by arbitration and compromise. Appropriate measures are clearly indicated.

How long do we put up with it?

Spelling and Writing Not What They Should Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Spelling and Writing Not What They Should Be," which appeared in the February 5 issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SPELLING AND WRITING NOT WHAT THEY SHOULD BE

Shortly after perusing an article by Harper's editor John Fischer, who in a semi-humorous vein probed reasons "Why Nobody Can't Write Good," our attention was attracted to the television screen where words, presumably part of a lettered news flash, appeared as "sergeon general's office." Of course, this could have been a typographical error, still after being reminded by Mr. Fischer about educational deficiencies, we wondered.

Mr. Fischer states the principal reason for paucity of proper prose is a failure to teach language and its composition in our schools. Recalling our days in school—no easy task—we must agree that teachers failed to impress us enough with basic rules of composition. We went through all the procedures and no doubt had all the rules explained, but youth sheds learning unless something is done to cause him to concentrate. He needs treatment like that given by the man who takes a club and slams his mule across the head to "get its attention."

Every day we see hundreds of common words misspelled, or we think they are spelled wrong, since most authorities disagree with their arrangement of letters. This leads to the conclusion that people are paying no attention after a word they have read over and over is spelled differently when they write it. Incidentally, we are just as guilty of inattention as anyone else and quite often we are stumped by simple words.

We wonder how many millions of hours have been spent by teachers trying to get a message across to pupils whose minds are either on some other subject or consist of a plain blank. When examination time rolls around, teachers must get desperate when they discover how little has penetrated what passes for brain tissue. Desperation is succeeded by resignation when pedagogs finally

realize the world is peopled by few seeking wider horizons.

The trend in later years has been toward giving a variety of subjects in the hope of gaining attention of pupils. The trouble with this is the field keeps expanding and more is required every year to keep the attention thus tentatively obtained, and there is some question about the value of knowledge thus instilled.

Perhaps we should go back to concentrating more on basic English and spelling, devising some means to attract the attention of pupils to the advantages of learning first of all what words are, how they are spelled and how they are put together to carry a coherent message. This is done now but not to the degree necessary to raise the average student to a desirable literacy level.

One of the distinguishing marks of successful men is the ability to express themselves either in writing or speech. While literacy might not be an assurance of success, it is an important adjunct to success in every area of endeavor.

Press Is Urged To Meet Watchdog Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Clark R. Mollenhoff, Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter for the Cowles publications, has urged the American press to do a better job in carrying out its important role as a "watchdog" over Federal programs, policies, and personnel.

He expressed criticism of both the Federal Government and the press in delivering the annual William Allen White memorial address at the University of Kansas in Lawrence on February 10. Mollenhoff is this year's recipient of the William Allen White Award.

The following article on his speech appeared in the February 10 issue of the Kansas City Star:

PRESS FAILING AS A WATCHDOG—DUTY OF CRITICIZING WAYWARD GOVERNMENT UNFULFILLED, EDITORS TOLD—LACKING IN INITIATIVE—WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE LECTURER FLAYS EXCESS OF HANDOUTS

LAWRENCE, KANS.—Clark R. Mollenhoff, Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter, charged the Federal Government today with efforts to propagandize and suppress the news and then censured the press for not fighting these efforts more.

"The future of the American democracy is contingent upon the performance of the American press," he said in a prepared William Allen White memorial address. "If the press fails in its responsibility—if it flounders in a quagmire of superficiality, partisanship, laziness, and incompetence—then our great experiment in democracy will fail."

WINNER OF WHITE AWARD

Mollenhoff, a reporter for the Cowles publications, has won many awards for his Washington reporting besides the 1958 Pulitzer Prize and the White citation, which brought him here today. He spoke at the Kansas Memorial Union Building at the University of Kansas.

"The press is proud—usually too proud to accept criticism," Mollenhoff said.

He charged that the Nation's press is failing in its responsibility to criticize adequately Government programs, policies and personnel at the Federal level. And he added that there are disturbing signs it does not recognize this failure.

The press has demonstrated, he said, that it does not understand many stories of major importance and that there is mounting evidence that it does not even understand itself or its own self-interest.

NOT AN ALARMIST

"It is not my intention to view with alarm the deterioration of the press since the days of William Allen White," he said. "I do not believe there has been a deterioration.

"I do question whether the press has improved enough to meet the responsibility of a job that becomes more difficult each year. Despite the fact that there are hundreds of well-qualified reporters and editors, the performance is often mediocre or poor in Washington."

The press needs more tough self-criticism regarding the coverage of Federal Government, Mollenhoff declared, and he called such coverage the press' most vital function.

Among its failings, generally, in Washington coverage, Mollenhoff mentioned:

The Federal Government is so big and complex that too many reporters and editors become overwhelmed by the seemingly impossible job of serving as a watchdog over it.

"There has been a floundering by a press that has become more and more dependent upon handouts. Lacking understanding, the press follows the fads of the best Madison Avenue sloganeers."

Reporters who specialize in one area of the Federal Government in too many cases have been converted into propagandists for the agencels they cover—"a type of kept press."

Many newspapers copy the editorial judgment and opinions of some large east coast newspapers, some of which have been demonstrably wrong in the past, a fact which tends to destroy independent thinking and diversity.

"Over a period of 13 years," Mollenhoff said, "I have had the occasion to be critical of information policies of the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, and the Kennedy administration. I have tried to make that criticism tough and objective."

DISTORTIONS TO DECEIVE

Some high officials in each of these administrations, he said, engaged in unjustified secrecy policies and each used a wide range of public relations techniques, distortions and outright lies to deceive the public.

"The public officials deserved a lambasting for their arrogance in hiding or distorting the facts but the press was also responsible."

Mollenhoff described in detail what he said he considered two examples of the press' failure as watchdogs for the public—the TFX contract awarded General Dynamics by the Secretary of Defense, involving the spending integrity of the Defense Department and the judgment of Secretary Robert McNamara, and State Department efforts to crush Otto F. Otepka, a State Department security evaluator, for telling Congress the truth.

The bulk of the Washington press corps failed on these two stories, he said, and became propagandists for two political appointees.

He was less critical of press coverage of the Bobby Baker case but noted that even there many reporters did not become interested in it until a German party girl had been discovered on the fringe of some of Baker's social activities.

WAIT FOR SEX ANGLE

"It is amazing," he said, "how a little sex angle stimulated editorial interest in good government."

Mollenhoff also spoke harshly of President Johnson's new form of the press conference.

"I would hardly accept the logic of one editorial writer," he said, "who suggested that if Johnson feels the open press conferences of the past do not fit his personality, then he should be allowed to change.

"In the light of that type of editorial logic, we can only hope that democracy fits President Johnson's personality."

On the subject of television news, Mollenhoff said that TV usually waits until the daily press has done the spadework on an issue before it assumes a watchdog role. Its independence, however, is limited, he noted, because of various Government controls over the media.

The networks also put great stock in exclusive interviews with high Government officials, Mollenhoff added, and it is obvious they pay a price by limiting their independence.

MORE THAN DISMAY

"It is not necessary to be angry at newspapers or television reporters or commentators who fawn over public officials with a simpering sweetness," he said. "Only feel sorry for them."

"The press needs," Mollenhoff said, "and always will need, the independence characterized by William Allen White. The least we can do for his memory is to constantly remind ourselves of the many ways that a free and independent press can be weakened or even destroyed.

"It is our responsiblity to aggressively oppose anything that may contaminate democracy."

Mollenhoff also had a side comment on the reporting of local matters, noting that it can require as much ability and a great deal more courage to report on local issues and local people than it does "to ponder outrages in Zanzibar or Léopoldville."

"It is the power of each reporter and each editor," he said, "to make his choice. He can take the easy way and be a patsy for those in political power, but knowing in the end that he was a weak-kneed hero worshipper who bent to any political wind of strength.

"Or he can be a force for good and serve as a real check on government."

CAN DO BETTER

Mollenhoff concluded that he loves his job and criticizes the business he is in only because he knows "it can do so much more and can be so much more effective than it is."

"It has improved," he said, "but it needs more improvement." As a reporter for the Cowles publications, Mollenhoff's writing appears in such newspapers as the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, as well as Look magazine.

Prior to the lecture by Mollenhoff, Whitley Austin, editor of the Salina Journal, received the William Allen White Foundation's State citation for service to journalism and his community.

Rollo Clymer, editor of the El Dorado (Kansas) Times, made the presentation to Austin, who once was a reporter for William Allen White, the late editor of the Emporia Gazette in whose honor the foundation was established.

For the last 30 years, Austin has worked for the Harris group newspapers. He has been editor of the Salina Journal since 1949.

CULLS OUT THE DRIVEL

Clymer cited Austin for his editorials, saying: "The man has a knack of pouncing upon a lone fact in a wilderness of drivel—and making of it a vignette that is worthy of being read over and over."

"Austin seems to gravitate toward the storm centers," Clymer said. The late Gov. George Docking appointed Austin to the State board of regents, "and after a rosary of king-sized melees had burst about Dock-

ing's ears," Clymer recalled, "the Governor sadly admitted that his appointment was his 'big mistake.'"

It was such fearlessness in the face of authority, Clymer said, that helped make the Salina Journal a good newspaper under Austin's leadership.

SERVED AS CHAIRMAN

Gov. John Anderson reappointed Austin to a 4-year term on the board of regents in 1962. He was the chairman in 1961.

Austin, an honor graduate of the University of Wisconsin, is a past president of the Kansas Associated Press and is a trustee of the William Allen White Foundation.

In receiving the citation, Austin said of his experience with White:

"You learned to write by writing. You learned to report by excavating the facts and putting them together accurately. You were a showman and a gossip. You lived by surprise. You also were a historian devoted to truth, however dark the glass.

"You were a booster and a critic, a father confessor * * * a political huckster and a statesman, an errand boy and a prophet.

"But first of all you were a reporter, using your legs, your eyes, and your brains and writing the Kansas language."

The annual meeting of the White Foundation is held on February 10, the birthday of the famed editor of the Emporia Gazette who died in 1944.

Repair Job Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, while I am definitely in favor of adequate legislation strengthening the civil rights of all our citizens, I must confess that I voted for H.R. 7152 with very little enthusiasm. Judging from conversation with my colleagues, I learned that many had a similar feeling.

This lack of enthusiasm was due very largely to the fact that the measure was brought to the floor of the House without the careful and penetrating study which such an important and all-embracing measure deserves and demands. Furthermore, it gives to the President and others very broad authority that could be abused to the everlasting detriment of our Nation if exercised by irresponsible or politically minded people.

I feel confident and, indeed, I hope my confidence is well founded, that before taking final action on it the Senate will give this measure the study and penetrating analysis which it deserves. My thoughts in this respect are well expressed and summed up in the attached editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Tuesday, February 11, entitled "Repair Job Needed." This editorial analyzes the bill passed by the House in a constructive manner with a spirit of helpfulness, and it appears to me it is based on unassailable foundations. The editorial follows:

REPAIR JOB NEEDED

The House now has passed what has aptly been described as the most far-reaching civil rights bill ever put before Congress. This is no exaggeration. And as enacted by the House, the bill is very much in need of an overhaul.

The fact is that the bill—though new civil rights legislation is both desirable and necessary—did not receive anything like adequate consideration in the House. A few facts will illustrate the point. At present, there are 432 Members of the House. Every quorum call was answered by at least 400 Members. So the legislators were in attendance. But in votes taken on 21 issues affecting the bill, some of them of great importance, the average was 131.7 against amendment and 64.6 in favor. Why did less than half of the House membership take part in the debate and in the votes on amendments? Simply because those who were against the bill or who wanted to modify it, Republicans as well as Democrats, knew they were beaten before the first speech was made. They had no stomach for the fight and were more than willing to pass the battle on to the Senate, meanwhile trying to harvest a little partisan hay.

In the Senate, where the steamroller tactics so effectively used in the House cannot be employed, the entire bill will receive the careful consideration it deserves. This is proper. For a meaningful civil rights bill, when it becomes law, will have a profound effect—not only in the South, but in other sections of the country as well. It is better to consider it with care now than to regret ill-advised action later on.

There are three aspects of the House-approved bill which we think are especially in need of repair work in the Senate.

One is the failure of the bill to provide for jury trials in contempt proceedings except in title II, which concerns public accommodations. Critics asked why, for instance, was no jury trial provision contained in title III, relating to desegregation of public facilities. The answer was that defendants under this title generally would be public officials, and why give them jury trials? This is strange doctrine in legislation which is supposed to have some relationship to equal protection of the laws. Because a man is a public official does not make an indeterminate jail sentence at the hands of some arbitrary judge any more palatable—or equitable. We think that in all cases the jury trial provisions of the civil rights act of 1957 should be incorporated in this bill.

Our second point concerns title VI, authorizing the cutoff of Federal funds as an aid to desegregation and fair treatment.

This section vests an enormous power in the hands of the President and his subordinates. That it could be outrageously abused by a politically minded and irresponsible President is beyond question. The late President Kennedy was asked at a press conference last April about a Civil Rights Commission recommendation that the President seek power to cut off or suspend Federal aid funds to States which fail to comply with the Constitution and the laws. Mr. Kennedy's answer was that it probably would be unwise to give the President that kind of power.

Our feeling is that this section in the pending bill needs to be much more carefully drawn. Funds can be cut off when there has been a finding that a person has been subjected to discrimination. But discrimination is not defined. What, precisely, does it mean? We agree with the observation that, under this section, the innocent are damned with the guilty if a Federal executive agency can terminate Federal programs in an entire State or in some geographical portion of a State because one citizen was 'discriminated' against by one State official or by a fellow citizen. There is the further point that in the South at least Negroes would probably suffer most when Federal aid is cut off.

Our third objection goes to title VII, generally known as the fair employment practices section. This section hits hard at both management and union practices which keep Negroes from obtaining jobs commensurate with their abilities. We wholeheartedly agree that legislation to accomplish this is needed. The pending proposal, however, is a draftsman's horror. Once again, key terms are not defined. No standards of evidence are set forth to guide the commission which would be created to administer the section. In the absence of standards, the commission might readily fall back on some form of quota system, which by all means should be avoided. If this section is accepted by the Senate, it should first be drastically overhauled, tightened up, and clarified.

That this bill was railroaded through the House is beyond dispute. Representative MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, is a believer in civil rights and was a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee which initiated work on this bill. At first, he says, the measure was seriously considered. Then a curious change took place. Without any debate in the subcommittee, three sections were suddenly added by the majority—FEPC, broader powers for the Attorney General to intervene in suits, and a more sweeping public accommodations section. Then, on October 29, the full committee knocked out the language of the subcommittee bill. Substitute language, which was not drafted by the committee and the origin of which is not clear, was approved. Mr. MEADER first saw the completed draft when a copy was delivered to his home at 10:10 p.m. on the following Monday. The committee met the next morning at 10:30 and declared the bill not subject to amendment. That afternoon, following a recess necessitated by a meeting of the House, the bill was reported out.

Fortunately, this sort of thing can't happen in the Senate. The Senators will go over the bill line by line and clause by clause. We hope that an effective bill will be brought to a vote after full debate and passed without a filibuster. This will not happen, however, unless modifications are accepted. If they are not accepted, the only alternatives will be to invoke cloture or wear out the objectors. We do not believe that either can be successful.

Bills To Create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to place in the RECORD the text of a press release of the Committee on un-American Activities. This release reveals that the committee will hold hearings on February 18–20 on various bills to establish a Freedom Commission and Academy. Because the concept of a Freedom Academy has evoked considerable interest, I thought that Members of the House might be interested in knowing of the hearings to be held next week.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the House Committee on un-American Activities, announced today that on February 18, 19, and 20, 1964, the committee will hold public

hearings on various bills to create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy which have been referred to the committee.

The bills in question are: H.R. 352, introduced by Representative A. S. HERLONG, Jr.; H.R. 1617, introduced by Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER; H.R. 5366, introduced by Representative HALE BOGGS; and H.R. 8320, introduced by Representative ROBERT TAFT, Jr.; and H.R. 8757, introduced by Representative RICHARD SCHWEIKER.

All persons desiring to present testimony on these bills during the February 18-20 hearings should contact Mr. F. J. McNamara, staff director, Committee on un-American Activities, room 226, Cannon Office Building, Washington, D.C.

A Tribute to Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent correspondence from a distinguished constituent, Mr. Thomas Quickel, who has enjoyed a career of prominence as a journalist, we received a tribute to our flag created by John W. W. Cumming, rear admiral, U.S. Navy, retired, Portsmouth, Va. In Admiral Cumming's letter to our constituent he requested anyone who might be interested to help disseminate the tribute, emphasizing he sought nothing for himself but only that it might help America.

Admiral Cumming relates to Mr. Quickel that it was in 1942 while he was on convoy trips during World War II that most of the thoughts in the tribute came to his mind. He says he then tried to create something fundamental and basic with simplicity and yet would awaken response. Admiral Cumming is so eminently right when he says:

> Thoughts are things so to speak. Everything is born in the thought world before it is manifested or expressed in some form in the physical, material world.

The admiral proceeds to say in his letter that—

> The symbolic significance of our flag draws its theme from our Declaration of Independence, particularly from the glorious second paragraph of that immortal document.

His comment upon the word "defend" is that the word was intentionally and purposely used. No sane person wants war just for the sake of war. In life situations or occasions are encountered in which only moral courage may be required; some may require only physical courage; some may require both.

We believe the "tribute" has a creed for all patriotic people to live by and our crystallization of thoughts about the flag are brought into an orderly theme. The tribute to the flag follows:

A TRIBUTE TO OUR FLAG

(By John W. W. Cumming, June 8, 1942)

A salute to thee, Old Glory, the Stars and Stripes—our flag. Thou was born, June 14, 1777.

Thy field of blue with 50 stars of white doth represent the Union of States while thy 13 stripes of red and white, the original colonies; the first States to form the United States of America, our country; but—thou art more.

Thou are a silent symphony of red, white and blue, the harmony of home and country composed by God, himself, the master of life, liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness—thy glorious theme.

Thy canton of blue, like the firmament, displays now a galaxy, a constellation of bright shining stars in one of which each of us has a home, yet, every other star is likewise a home for each of us—one for all and all for one—a perfect union.

Thy stripes of white, six in number, emblazon on high, the purity of purpose of creation by the the Almighty God whose omniscience and omnipotence, in 6 days, brought into being all there is, including earth and overall therein gave He dominion to man—and—God was pleased because all was good; thus was thy birth first planned.

Thy stripes of red, seven in number, one for each day of the week in which to render passionate, living, virile worship and service to the infinite, by man serving man in joy and sadness, in plenty and poverty, in health and sickness, regardless of cost, sacrifice, race, color, or creed; thus do our part by providence planned.

I salute thee, my flag, because thou dost symbolize all I hold most dear—God, home, country—and I will defend thee against all enemies, domestic and foreign.

I salute thee.

A Salute to the Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the National Future Farmers of America Week will be observed this year from February 15 through 22, and it is with pleasure that I pay tribute to this organization.

The motto of the FFA, "Learning to do, doing to learn, earning to live, living to serve" emphasizes their purpose of preparing to become experienced, skilled farmers of the future. These young men fully deserve our support and encouragement in their endeavors as we will be depending upon them to utilize the rich, productive land that is our heritage. The training they are receiving assures us that the future of American agriculture will be in competent hands.

The FFA organization is a young, growing one. Launched in Kansas City, Mo., on November 20, 1928 by 35 vocational agriculture students with their leaders, it has become the largest farm boy organization in the world. Approximately 400,000 members participate in this intracurricular school group, composed of boys studying vocational agriculture. Membership is voluntary and the FFA has no political or religious affiliations.

The FFA trains young men to be not only farmers with skill and technical knowledge, but farmers with leadership experience and potential. This aspect is realized through public speaking contests, parliamentary procedure followed in meetings, and officer training. These young men have a creed which envisions the path along which their leadership will take them.

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years. I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

This is the ultimate goal of the leadership expected of each of them.

Recognizing that a continual supply of talent is needed in America's largest single industry, and that FFA, accompanying and complimenting the vocational agriculture program, is a vital source of this talent, I salute the FFA chapters not only in the Second District of Kentucky, but all the FFA participants throughout America for its invaluable service. I wish them continued success and agree with their creed which states, "I believe in the future of farming."

No Easy Answers to Wheat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, everyone in Congress is aware of the need for a sensible and realistic wheat program. Sometimes, however, we overlook the fact that one of our greatest assets in this world struggle against communism is the ability of our American farmers under our free enterprise system to produce an abundance of that most important commodity—food. This can be our hole card in dealing with the Kremlin, but only if we are wise enough to use it in a positive way.

I cannot help but feel that we are not winning the friendship of the man living in a grass hut with children suffering from malnutrition who hears that America is telling her farmers to cut back on their production. In order to utilize this food in the world today, it would seem that any farm program that is written must avoid export subsidies on wheat.

The Fargo Forum, a Pulitzer Prize-winning newspaper in my First District of North Dakota, has been running a series of thought-provoking editorials on the agricultural situation. I would like to give the other Members of Congress the opportunity to read the February 9 editorial, entitled "There Are No

Easy Answers to Wheat Problem," and include its herewith:

THERE ARE NO EASY ANSWERS TO WHEAT PROBLEM

There are no easy answers to any part of the Nation's wheat problem.

That's the message that comes through loud and clear, no matter whether you are talking about President Lyndon B. Johnson's farm message, the congressional debate in the House Agricultural Committee, or the several speakers who tackled the wheat problem before the Fargo Farm Forum here Thursday and Friday.

Out of the extensive discussion, though, comes one glimmer of hope. It was reported here and in Washington that the wheat carryover by the summer of 1965 might well be at the point where it could be regarded as a necessary reserve instead of a surplus.

Dr. Ted Rice, economist for the Continental Grain Co., the firm which has sold so much wheat and durum to Russia, told the Farm Forum that the Secretary of Agriculture has recognized that it is prudent and desirable for the United States to carry large grain reserves. He has stated that 600 million bushels of wheat and 40 to 50 million tons (1½ to 1¾) billion bushels of feed grains should be considered a reserve not a surplus.

Dr. Rice said such a goal could be met by mid-1965 unless a bumper crop upsets 1964 expectations.

The Russian sales are a major factor in cutting down the wheat in storage, but they also put an extra emphasis on the fact that the American farmer is being subsidized by 50 cents or more for every bushel of wheat he raises.

This subsidy gets a little extra criticism because it becomes matter of public notice every time a sale is made to the Communist bloc countries, and a great many nonfarm Americans have been quick to claim that Russia is being paid a subsidy to buy American wheat.

The sale of American durum—the wheat involved in Continental's first big sale to Russia—came under fire because the subsidy was 72 to 73 cents a bushel, about 15 cents per bushel higher than normal. The administration wouldn't admit it, and neither did the Continental spokesman, but this extra 15 cents was, in fact, a reimbursement to the company because it had to ship half the durum involved in American vessels at higher American freight rates.

It was, in fact, a subsidy to the maritime unions. If American shipping had not been required, the dockworkers would not have loaded any wheat bound for Russia—and there would have been no sales.

But the subsidy is paid on wheat, charged to the Department of Agriculture, and the American farm program gets another black eye. Nobody talks about the subsidy to labor. But it is there for all to see.

The two-price wheat bill sponsored by both Senator MILTON R. YOUNG and Representative MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota, Republicans, would avoid this subsidy on exports, and because of this approach may yet replace the administration-backed bill.

The Young-Andrews bill provides for a certificate plan which would guarantee producers 100 percent of parity on the wheat needed for domestic use, and no subsidies on wheat sold for export. The administration bill, whose sponsors include Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, would pay 80 percent of parity on domestic consumption and a lesser subsidy on export wheat, through the certificate plan.

The subsidy approach is under a steady attack from many sources. Take a look at what the Wall Street Journal says:

"It would be wonderful if the Nation had a farm program for all crops which would do the things President Johnson says a properly revised wheat program should do: Raise growers' incomes, avoid Federal budgetary cost increases, and at the same time prevent a rise in the cost of bread. If, as Mr. Johnson contends, the commodity programs developed during the last 30 years have served us well, it is a little hard to see why the costs, subsidies, surpluses and regimentation involved should now be so staggering."

The Chicago Tribune laments that the President's farm proposals are simply a replay of those advocated by President Kennedy's appointees "who have amply demonstrated they have no faith in the market system. The proposals do demonstrate, however, that the Democrats think the farm vote is for sale and they have what it takes to buy it."

The New York Times has a similar conclusion and contends there are solid economic grounds for dismantling the whole network of Government price supports for agriculture. It comes up with this novel idea: "The place to start is with tobacco, whose chronic use is recognized as injurious to public health. Whether or not to smoke may be a personal decision, but in view of Washington's own concern over the harm caused by cigarettes, it should hardly be promoting the production and consumption of tobacco through artificial subsidies."

This kind of attitude against farm subsidies may force one of the "easy answers" that could bring ruin to major segments of the farm economy. But if the wheat supply gets down to a workable size within the next 12 to 14 months, then we would have time to come up with a program that will work and will be accepted by the nonfarm voters.

Conservative Party of New York State Defends Constitutional Government and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the pseudoliberals have broken out in a rash of abuse of Congress for its refusal to hurriedly rubberstamp the recommendations of the Executive.

These critics would reform Congress and the present congressional system which provides for the study, public hearings, committee reviews, and debate of legislation. They would like to see this process speeded up. Many of the congressional checks and balances, in their opinion, should be eliminated.

In general these critics are inculcated with a totalitarian psychosis. They would place more and more power into the Executive and its bureaucracy. These shallow pseudoreformers would relegate the people's most direct representatives, the Congress of the United States, to the role of a subsidiary and advisory debating society under the dominance of the President.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times editorial of December 22, 1963, reviews the record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Its destructive criticism is based upon the totalitarian invalid assumption that all recommendations emanating from the White House bureaucracy are economically sound, sociologically advantageous, and can be soundly financed.

On December 24, 1963, Mr. Kieran O'Doherty, chairman of the committee on national affairs of the Conservative Party of New York State, wrote a most logical and adequate rebuttal to the New York Times editorial. The New York Times has not seen fit to publish his most excellent defense of Congress and our constitutional system.

Mr. O'Doherty's letter follows:

The NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIRS: Your lead editorial of December 22, "Congress Staggers Home," indicted Congress for "ineptitude," rebuked its Members for failing "to fulfill * * * the mandate they carry from the American people," and called for "modernization" of every aspect of the congressional structure. The Times itemized its complaints: Failure to pass the administration civil rights, tax reform, and medicare programs; failure to achieve "basic aid to education"; failure to provide aid for urban mass transportation and more funds for area redevelopment, etc.

The failures with which the Times would indict Congress are, in every instance, failures to act affirmatively upon the programs proposed by the Democratic administration. It seems odd to speak of a mandate from the American people for those programs, in view of the razor-thin margin of victory which put that administration in office in 1960, and the increasingly conservative election returns around the Nation in 1961, 1962, and 1963. It seems stranger still to view Congress as derelict in its duty because it refuses to rubberstamp Presidential proposals to pile still greater spending burdens upon the American taxpayer.

As the Founders envisioned the constitutional system, it is Congress' duty to exercise its independent judgment concerning the Nation's legislative needs. The President proposes, Congress disposes. We should be thankful for those features of the congressional system which insure that this judgment will be exercised in a deliberate fashion, with the greatest possible independence from the influence of demagoguery and emotion.

As New Yorkers, we should also be grateful for the New York Republican delegation to the House of Representatives, which, with a few notable exceptions, has played a leading role in resisting the centralizing effronteries which the Democratic administration would visit upon our constitutional system.

Very truly yours,

KIERAN O'DOHERTY.

Committee Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article entitled "Committee Staffs," from the Washington Newsletter of Friends Committee on National Legislation, December 1963:

COMMITTEE STAFFS

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa, has pointed out that while the ratio of Democrats in the House is 3 to 2, the ratio of committee staff members responsible to the Democrats is 8 to 1, thus depriving the Republicans of sufficient staff resources to be able to shape and support an independent position. Northern Democrats complain that 31 of 45 committee chairmen are southerners. If Congress is to improve its ability to exercise oversight of the large executive branch and improve its legislative performance, much will depend on the professional competence, the nonpartisanship and the necessary number of staff. For example, the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee had only 9 staff members to help it deal with the $49 billion request this year.

A Fine Week's Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this past 7 days has been a historic period for the House of Representatives. The President's civil rights program is halfway toward enactment, and the Nation has watched in wonder as this House has done its work.

With little bitterness or rancor the most all-encompassing, wide-sweeping civil rights legislation in history has been approved. The leaders of both political parties deserve a great deal of credit for their statesmanship and fairness, and the leaders of the opposition group have conducted themselves in the manner of true southern gentlemen.

All parts of the civil rights program are important and all will have a major effect on the lives and fortunes of our nonwhite population. At long last, a colored family will be able to travel the highways of this country and be assured of a place to eat and a place to sleep.

It is difficult to single out the most significant provision from the total program, but it seems to me that FEPC must rank close to the top of the list. Equality is a mockery if the economic opportunity is not included.

Fears have been expressed that fair employment rights for Negroes will mean fewer jobs for white workingmen. This is not true, of course, and our experience with FEPC in the State of California has proved this point. Many skilled jobs are going unfilled at the present time due to the shortage of skilled labor. Negro and white workers must be assured of full opportunity for these skilled positions, and our Nation will be the real loser if any qualified citizen is deprived of the chance to prove his worth.

All in all, I believe the House can take pride in its recent accomplishments. There can be no more talk of a do-nothing Congress as far as this session is concerned. The 88th Congress is now assured of a place in our history books. The civil rights bill, the tax reform bill, and the various educational bills have been landmarks of legislative progress. Tributes are due to all concerned, and a particular tribute goes to all Members of this past, fine week's work.

VFW Commander in Chief Lombardo Urges Reinforcement of Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Guantanamo Bay crisis clearly demonstrates that the Communist pressure is not only continuing, but is increasing, against U.S. positions throughout all the Caribbean and Latin America.

There can be no question but what Khrushchev and Castro are determined to chase the United States out of Guantanamo Bay. The reasons why the Communists are determined to expel us from that great base are simple ones: First, it is vital to the defense of the United States; second, the Soviet Union wants it as a Red submarine base.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to take positive measures. The threat against Guantanamo is a threat against the United States itself. The Communist master planners know how valuable Guantanamo Bay is to the United States. They know how valuable it would be to the Soviet Union, possessing, as it does, the world's largest submarine fleet.

We have come to expect constructive, strong, and imaginative leadership from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in supporting our national interest in times of crises such as that which we now face. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that the VFW has made a thoughtful and practicable proposal, designed to demonstrate the U.S. interest in Guantanamo Bay and to let the world—our friends and our enemies—know that we intend to stay there.

The VFW commander in chief, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., proposed in a statement, released to the press February 6, that the United States immediately reinforce defense units now at Guantanamo Bay. I believe that many Members of this House will concur with Commander Lombardo in his belief that such a demonstration of U.S. determination would have a sobering effect on Castro and the Kremlin. Such a publicized sailing of marines from the east coast of the United States as part of a naval task force to Guantanamo would be a clearly understood message that the United States is not going to be intimidated by Khrushchev's and Castro's threats.

Incidentally, it is worth noting that the VFW, comprising 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, has for a long time taken the lead in alerting our Nation to the value of Guantanamo Bay to the defense of the United States, and in warning our Nation that Guantanamo Bay is a key target of Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

One of the most remarkable and accurate prophecies made in international affairs in a long time occurred the evening of February 3, 1964. On that occasion the National VFW commander, Mr. Lombardo, addressing the Women's Forum on National Security at the Statler Hotel, in Washington, D.C., states that the Communist-inspired trouble in Panama was not an end in itself as far as Communist strategy was concerned. Commander Lombardo said that Panama was the buildup and the steppingstone toward the next major target of communism in the Western Hemisphere, and warned that the next target is Guantanamo Bay. In a matter of only a few days Castro triggered the current crisis. This should illustrate the high qualifications possessed by the national commander of the VFW in making a proposal for U.S. action against Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

Because of its strategic soundness and practicability of his proposal, the full text of Commander Lombardo's press release of February 6 pertaining to reinforcement of Guantanamo Bay follows:

VFW URGES REENFORCEMENT OF GUANTANAMO BAY

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 6.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, today urged the immediate reenforcement of Guantanomo Bay "to make it crystal clear to Castro and Khrushchev that the United States means to stay in Guantanamo in spite of the water cutoff by Castro."

Commander Lombardo, who visited the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base a few months ago, said, "Guantanamo Bay is vital to the defense of the Panama Canal, the Caribbean, and the sealanes between the United States and South America. We must, therefore, show the Kremlin, and Castro, that we will not temporize, compromise, or negotiate our right to Guantanamo Bay."

Continuing, the VFW leader said, "U.S. determination to stand fast in Guantanamo can be demonstrated by the immediate reinforcement of our defense forces at Guantanamo. I firmly believe that the sailing of marines to Guantanamo would have a sobering effect on Castro and the Kremlin. It would encourage our Latin American friends, who have been long waiting for an indication that U.S. patience with Red troublemakers has a limit. Castro's cutting off the water to our base should also cut off our patience."

Commander Lombardo explained that "Castro's cutting off the water supply should be no surprise. Not only do they want us out, but the Kremlin wants it as a base for the Russian submarine fleet—the world's largest."

Addressing the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington, D.C., February 3, Commander Lombardo stated that the next target after Panama "is Guantanamo Bay."

Concluding, Commander Lombardo said: "The United States has the fleet, and the Marines for a quick reinforcement of our Guantanamo Bay base. Such an immediate reinforcement of Guantanamo will demonstrate to our enemies—and our friends—that we are not going to be timid in using the force we have to defend that which is vital to the defense of our Nation and our friends. It will also let them know we aren't going to be bullied any more by Castro or his Kremlin coaches.

We Disagree With the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, during these hectic days of national and local debate over critical domestic and international problems, there is a continual outpouring of intemperate "analyses" offered by such groups as the John Birch Society. In recent weeks Reed Benson, Birch organizer in the Rocky Mountain States, has appeared in various localities of my congressional district. I am pleased to insert here the impression which Mr. Benson has made on Mr. Platt Cline, an outstanding northern Arizona publisher and editor. Mr. Cline has disagreed with many of my own political views, but he has always been unquestionably on the side of America and I therefore think his comments are worthy of my fellow Congressmen's attention.

(The article follows:)

WE DISAGREE WITH THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

We attended a public meeting of the John Birch Society here the other night.

A news report on the meeting and Reed Benson's speech appeared in the Sun yesterday.

What we have to say here now, therefore, is purely and simply opinion—our opinion.

So here goes.

We were told that the United States is losing the cold war.

With this, we do not agree. The West has suffered some setbacks. But we have won real victories more often than we have lost. There are many examples. Here are a few: Witness the ousting of the Commies from Greece; the blocking of the Reds in the Middle East; the resurgence of Europe as a bulwark against communism largely because of U.S. aid—in fact, we have done such a good job of helping Europe that they are no longer afraid, but are feeling their oats, as witness De Gaulle. We have aided both Communist Poland and Yugoslavia, and it is a good gamble that this aid has made possible their considerable independence from the U.S.S.R. We didn't do so good in Cuba, granted.

We were told that we are "ignorant of the enemy." This may be true as far as some of our people are concerned. But our State Department knows who and what we are dealing with, and so does our President, and his predecessors at least as far back as Truman, and the same goes for nearly all American newspapers and magazines.

We were told that we are losing "because of treason." We do not believe that treason is a major factor at all. We do not agree that the State Department is disloyal or pro-Communist as the Birch Society apparently wants us to believe. It is a serious disservice to our country to lead people to believe that our Government is not to be trusted. We think that such ideas, if generally held, could seriously weaken us in the contest with the Commies.

We do not agree that we should have used military force to aid the Hungarians. If we had, we would have had a world war on our hands. Russia would have thrown its entire military might into such a war.

Nor do we believe that we should "unleash Chiang." He has little following on mainland China. If he jumped the Formosa Straits his army wouldn't last a month. And we would lose our base on Formosa—or have a war with the Chinese on our hands.

As to Benson's conclusion—that the Birch Society almost alone is fighting communism—we must also disagree.

We with millions of others, are just as good American citizens as the Birchites, and we do not go along with their program.

We do not believe that most (or even a fraction) of the American press is consciously or unconsciously aiding the Reds, nor do we believe that any sizable part of the press has joined in a smear of the Birch Society.

We agree that a lot of the responsible press has disagreed with the society's methods, and so do we.

Our attitude is best summed up by a paragraph in an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which we suppose Birch Society friends would also label as subversive or at least as an "innocent dupe of the Communist conspiracy":

"What should concern (us) is that the extremists of far right and far left have this in common, that they alienate themselves from the mainstream of American democracy by an absolutism of political temper which is fundamentally hostile to our principles. It is the absolutist, whether of left or right, that democracy has to fear.

"This is the man who thinks that he alone possesses wisdom, patriotism, and virtue, who recognizes no obligation to accept community decisions with which he disagrees, who regards any means as justified by the end, who views the political process as a power struggle to impose conformity rather than as a means of reconciling differences."

Hon. R. Walter Riehlman Honored by Baptists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, we are always gratified when one of our colleagues is honored for his public service but it is particularly pleasing to me when the recognition comes to a good neighbor with whom I have closely worked and whose personal qualities have won my admiration and respect. Such was the case in the recent distinguished service award made to my good friend, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, who has represented the 34th District of New York for over 17 years. It was given by the Onondaga Baptist Association, January 24 last, at a testimonial dinner held in his honor.

The giving of this award clearly reflects appreciation of those qualities of mind and heart which mark him as a conscientious public servant. It is very heartening to have them recognized and applauded in such an appropriate and timely manner. I am sure this honor has brought great happiness to my colleague and served to reassure him that his dedicated and brilliant efforts have brought him close to the people he represents. The language of the citation speaks for itself but we in the Congress, who have observed the day-to-day integrity, capability, and faithfulness of WALTER RIEHLMAN, add not only our confirmation of his valuable contribution on the national scene but also, our congratulations to the people of the district who have repeatedly chosen him to represent them.

The appended text of the citation chronicles a lifetime of accomplishment and emphasizes the bond of appreciation and affection which can be developed between an able Congressman and an understanding constituency:

REPRESENTATIVE R. WALTER RIEHLMAN,
JANUARY 24, 1964

To Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, in recognition and appreciation of your leadership for 26 years in public service to the people of Onondaga County, the Onondaga Baptist Association wishes to take this opportunity to present you with this citation.

Distinguished public servant, dedicated Baptist layman, and Christian statesman, diligent businessman—all these and many other tributes could deservedly be paid to you on this occasion.

Representative of New York State's 34th Congressional District since 1947, you have served with distinction over these past 17 years. Prior to this office, you served on the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors, and as Onondaga County Clerk.

You have served on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, as chairman of the House Military Operations Subcommittee, the Science and Astronautics Committee, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the House Administration Committee. You give careful study to the bills before the House, on which you must vote, and you work diligently to understand and interpret the issues. You are responsive to the needs and wishes of you constituency and concerned for the area and people you represent. Your decisions and voting record reflect your basic Christian convictions and your deep sincerity in upholding what you believe to be right and just.

You have been an active member of the Tully Baptist Church, and many weekends you have traveled from Washington to Tully in order to be present at Sunday worship. Your concern for Christian higher education manifested itself in your sponsorship of the CHEC leadership dinner at Hotel Syracuse at the beginning of the CHEC campaign. Your church and your Christian faith are important to you. You have a deep concern for young people, evidenced in one way by the careful manner you utilize in selecting the young men for the three armed service academies. You call together outstanding churchmen, educators, newspapermen, and men in Government, who go over the credentials of the applicants carefully, and you abide by the recommendations of this select committee in your decisions as to who shall attend West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.

Another evidence of your concern for young people takes the form of a story. There was a young orphan boy who ran away from an orphanage. He came to your bakery in Tully, seeking work in return for a meal. You befriended this boy and took him into your home, and put him through college and seminary. He is now a minister serving Christ through the American Baptist Convention, and was at one time a minister in the Onondaga Baptist Association. And there have been others, too, whom you have helped and befriended along the way.

Your wife, Lucia Sherwood Riehlman, and your two children and four grandchildren love and respect you for your distinguished service, given unselfishly.

You have been active in civic and community life, thus wideing your influence as a Christian layman—in Tully Lodge, Shrine, Jesters Club, Rotary, Syracuse Press Club, and Scottish Rite Club. You are on the ad-

visory board of the Tully branch of the Marine Midland Trust Co., and president of the Hill and Dale Country Club, as well as secretary and treasurer of the R W Shopping Center in Tully. Thus your family, church, community, civic, and social life, as well as your distinguished career as a public servant all give witness to your belief that a Christian in politics is one of the best places for a Christian to be.

We therefore honor you tonight, and are proud that you are a member of an American Baptist Church in the Onondaga Baptist Association, affiliated with the New York State Baptist Convention, and the American Baptist Convention.

"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven." (Matthew 5: 16 (RSV)).

SYRACUSE, N.Y., *January 24, 1964.*

Report on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are well aware, as are all Members of the House, of the deep concern over certain actions of the administration and the proposed civil rights legislation.

In order that the fine people of Alabama who have honored me by electing me to the House of Representatives of the United States may know of my stand in these matters, I have prepared a report outlining the actions that I have taken to preserve States rights and setting forth my total and complete opposition to any further civil rights legislation which would usurp such rights.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this report includes the actions I have taken in opposition to the implementation of programs by the administration which are not only detrimental to Alabama but to the entire Nation.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this report in the RECORD at this point.

A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF ALABAMA

I know that many of our fine citizens of Alabama are not aware of the steps that I, as your elected Representative, am taking in an earnest effort to preserve States rights and to protect our southern way of life and our heritage.

Although I issue a weekly newsletter which is sent to each and every newspaper in the State as well as to all radio and television stations, often the contents of the newsletter never reach the individual Alabamian. I am, therefore, taking this means of keeping you informed of my activities and actions in this vital matter which is of deep concern to all of us.

There are, of course, many bills which have been introduced in the Congress during this session that are of great importance and require the most careful and detailed consideration but I do not believe that anything could be more detrimental to our State and our sister States than the proposed civil rights legislation and the actions taken by the executive branch of the Government in this area.

During this session of the Congress I have introduced four bills, all of which pertain to this subject. One resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States. Another is a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States. A third bill would amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State and a fourth bill would amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice making it a court-martial offense for any military commander using his command position and authority to prohibit military personnel from patronizing facilities in a town or community.

I would like to quote a statement which I made before the House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the proposed civil rights legislation:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee. I well realize the great interest that has been expressed and the desire of numerous witnesses to testify on this all-important subject of civil rights. I would be remiss in my duty as a representative of the people of the State of Alabama if I did not appear before you to express my total and complete opposition to this legislative proposal.

Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest conviction that any additional legislation in this field is both unnecessary and unwarranted. I further believe the if this matter is left in the hands of State governments that the issues can and will be resolved. I believe that the Constitution as intended by our forefathers provides this right to the individual States. I honestly believe that the designers of the Constitution would turn over in their graves if they know of the liberal interpretations that have been given to this document in recent years.

The continued liberalization of the Constitution and additional legislative action in the field of civil rights will, in my way of thinking, ultimately result in a police state.

The trend that the administration is now following indicates just that. If one just analyzes the Executive orders that have been issued and the directives and regulations that have been issued by the executive departments such analysis will confirm my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take the time of the committee to go into the various sections of the proposed bill and to discuss the many ramifications of them for I can say in summary that the enactment of any of the sections of any portions of the bill is contrary to my thinking and contrary to the thinking of not only the fine people of the State of Alabama but the thinking of many, many individuals throughout the length and breadth of America.

I appreciate as always, Mr. Chairman, the courtesy you and the committee have accorded me. I leave you with one thought in mind; please preserve our democracy—do not recommend any legislation that will place it in jeopardy.

I would also like to quote a release to all news media in June of this year elaborating on my opposition to the proposed civil rights legislation:

Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS continued today his total and complete opposition to the proposed civil rights legislation.

"It is not only my heritage but my intepretation of the Constitution that has instilled in me the rights of the individual States," ROBERTS said.

"In the 12 years that I have had the honor to represent the people of Alabama in the Congress, I have opposed all civil rights legislation. I have voted in opposition and have made numerous statements on the floor of the House opposing any usurpation of States rights. I am firmly convinced that the proposed legislation is designed to destroy the rights of the sovereign States and I intend to do all in my power to prevent passage of such a measure.

"During the Little Rock and Oxford incidents, and the latest incident in my own State of Alabama where Federal troops were used, I not only opposed the action by statements on the floor of the House but, together with other members of the delegation, advised the citizens of the State of my complete support in those trying hours and days. I further stated my opposition to the use of Federal troops in letters to the President.

"The Constitution, as written by our forefathers and as I interprete it, was to prevent persecution and to preserve individual rights. These rights are being taken away by the liberal interpretations of the Constitution by the Supreme Court. I, therefore, shall do everything I can to obtain action on my bill, House Joint Resolution 374, to establish a Court of the Union to curb the powers of the Supreme Court. This bill, in effect, proposes a constitutional amendment whereby upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States, the Court of the Union shall review the exercise of pewer or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court.

"The amendment is entirely in keeping with our traditional American concept of checks and balances. The Court of the Union would provide a check on the powers of the Supreme Court which does not exist now. It is apparent from many cases decided in recent years that some sort of check is essential. Serious questions have been raised in the minds of many of our citizens regarding the Supreme Court's decisions in many areas and some sort of restraint is necessary. In previous years the judiciary had been one of restraint and is the history of jurisprudence. Liberalization of the judiciary can only lead to eventual totalitarian rule. Therefore, it is not only essential but of paramount importance to place some sort of check on the liberalization of the judicial interpretations of the Supreme Court and realine our thinking in accordance with the intent of the Constitution as intended by our forefathers."

Another release which I made to all news media indicated my strong opposition to the proposal of the administration to withhold Federal funds for impacted school districts. This release was as follows:

Congressman ROBERTS today announced his total opposition to any proposal of the Kennedy administration to withhold Federal funds for impacted school districts.

Congressman ROBERTS said, "These funds were appropriated by the Congress for the purpose of relieving those school districts that were affected by Federal activities. No conditions or considerations were given to the allocation of these funds based on integration.

"Any action taken in this direction by the administration is capricious and arbitrary and is not the expressed intent of the Con-

gress in appropriating these funds. Any action in this direction will meet with my utmost objections and I will do all in my power as a Member of the House to oppose such action.

"Congress has repeatedly refused to use this approach and, in my opinion, will continue to write the laws without dictation from the Justice Department.

"This action will result in undue hardship on the school districts affected and may mean the destruction of the entire program under Public Laws 815 and 874. Up to this point, these programs have been free of Federal interference. With the threat of Federal intervention, there will be strong opposition to the continuance of this aid."

The above are but a few of the releases that my office has issued. In addition I have made statements in my weekly newsletter on six different occasions concerning this matter which is of grave concern not only to the people of Alabama but to the people of the entire Nation.

Excerpts from these newsletters follow:

WASHINGTON.—The heat wave is on in more ways than one in the Nation's Capitol. Not only is the weather at a high degree but your Southern delegations in the Congress are being treated with additional heat regarding the proposed civil rights legislation.

This is a paramount issue and I have stated my total and complete opposition to the legislation as submitted to the Congress by the administration. I am of the opinion that we should not attempt to legislate away the intent of the Constitution and that the Congress should get down to the serious business of reducing Government expenditures and reducing the tremendous national debt.

WASHINGTON.—In my opinion, the civil rights legislation as proposed by the administration is ill-timed, ill-conceived, unwarranted, unnecessary, and certainly is not in accord with the intention of the Constitution as written by our forefathers and the Declaration of Independence signed on July 4, 1776.

I believe that the administration is finding out that not only are we in the South very much concerned over certain proposals and their many ramifications, but the entire Nation is concerned. One cannot legislate equality nor force social acceptance upon people against their will.

It was only a few years ago when others believed that civil rights legislation was a problem confined only to the South. Today the Nation realizes that this is a problem of paramount importance to the country as a whole.

Based on the interpretation of the Constitution and considering the Declaration of Independence, I cannot conceive of how the Supreme Court has interpreted the Constitution in recent years. Interpretations such as those that have been made must of necessity be accomplished by trying to force conformity upon all sections by stretching the Constitution to cover situations never contemplated by the Founding Fathers. I do not concur in the interpretations that have been made by the Supreme Court and, as a Member of Congress, I shall speak out at every opportunity against the passage of any and all civil rights legislation. I believe that should any such legislation be enacted, it would be a step backward for this country. A look at the Nation's Capital, which is considered a pilot city, is not very uplifting. Washington has one of the highest crime rates of any city of its size and one of the highest percentages of welfare dependents.

I shall continue with all the force at my command to oppose this legislation and I am ready to spend every day of the year in this Congress to prevent the passage of this legislation.

The Birmingham News recently charged that Martin Luther King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference had on the payroll one Jack H. O'Dell, whom the newspaper exposed last year as being a concealed member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. I believe this to be so important to the welfare of our Nation that I have asked that the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee immediately investigate Jack O'Dell and his connection with Martin Luther King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

WASHINGTON.—By nature and tradition, the American people are a peace-loving people. We are not aggressors and do not attempt to instill in other people of the world our doctrines. We are, however, most jealous of our rights as free individuals and to that end, we shall protect those rights. I am prepared to to remain in the Capitol throughout the year in order to defend the rights of our people and our section of the country. I shall defend the peaceful way of life which we have enjoyed.

I will continue to speak out against any legislation whatsoever concerning civil rights and will support legislation that will enable us to live within the intent of the Constitution. To this end, I have introduced several bills on the subject.

I have also introduced a bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State. I believe such legislation is essential in view of the events that have occurred and are still taking place. I am speaking of the mass demonstrations conducted by individuals who are not residents of the States or areas in which the demonstrations take place.

A mass demonstration is scheduled in Washington next month. I am certainly not in accord with such action and can assure you that demonstrations of this sort can only increase my belief in the legislative action which I have proposed. I am also of the opinion that such action would indicate to the other Members of Congress the fallacy of any additional civil rights legislation.

In addition, an attempt will be made to get the civil rights legislation on the floor. Should this develop, I am sure a great deal of time will be consumed for there are a great many other Members who feel as I do in that we believe that there is ample legislation of this type on the statute books and any further legislation is unnecessary. We shall do all in our power to prevent further usurpation of States rights.

The march on Washington took place as scheduled. What did it accomplish? Certainly I do not believe it had any effect on the Members of Congress nor the people of the country. It did require a great expenditure of funds by the various organizations and cost the Federal Government and the District Government untold thousands of dollars in loss of time, maintenance, preparation, and so forth.

WASHINGTON—Alabamians are blessed with wonderful traditions and fine heritage. Truly the song "Stars Fell on Alabama" reflects this proud feeling of our State.

I believe, as I know all Alabamians believe, that we should protect our principles with everything at our command. However, I cannot see, nor can I condone taking matters into one's own hands.

Through the years of this democracy, the Constitution has provided an instrument to build a better place to live and worship as we choose. To be sure amendments to the Constitution have been offered and ratified by the States in accordance with the changing times. Nevertheless, we have abided by the Constitution and by the interpretation of it by the Courts. We have at no time considered violence to gain our point.

All of us are not in agreement with the decisions rendered by the courts, particularly in recent years. We in Alabama believe such decisions to be wrong. We must, however, continue to rely on the Constitution to protect our free democracy. Such can be accomplished only through the will of the people and the courts.

I do not believe that the demonstrations which have occurred are the product of Alabamians. Still they have reflected anything but credit to the people of Alabama.

If patience is practiced we can, in time, not only preserve our cause but can obtain our objectives peacefully.

To be sure, the administration has not been of assistance to us in our efforts and it continues to take actions that provoke and antagonize our people and pits one race against the other.

A good example is the action of the Secretary of Defense in issuing the order implementing the recommendations of the Gesell report which would give installation commanders (officers not qualified either by education or profession) the authority to determine whether facilities in cities and towns adjacent to military reservations should be declared off-limits when such facilities practice segregation. This could mean eventual military dictatorship.

I have protested this action to the Secretary of Defense and have also introduced a companion bill to one introduced by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice so as to make a commander subject to court-martial proceedings when he uses his command position and authority to prohibit military personnel from patronizing facilities in a town or community.

Another instance was recently brought to my attention whereby a family of a deceased veteran, one who had been decorated on numerous occasions, requested a military commander to furnish an honor guard for the veteran's burial in accordance with his heritage and belief. The commander advised the family that only integrated personnel was available thereby necessitating the family to request and receive an honor guard through one of the veterans organizations. I have protested this action of the commander to the Secretary of Defense since I believe that our honored dead, regardless of race, creed, or color, should be accorded a burial that is fitting and proper and in accordance with his wishes and beliefs.

I have spoken out many times on the floor of the House and have issued numerous statements on civil rights legislation, which I reiterate, is unnecessary and unwarranted. Unfortunately, these statements have not always been made available to the people by the news media. However, I assure each and every Alabamian that I shall continue to oppose any and all legislation that I feel is not in the best interest of our State and the Nation.

All of the subjects are of importance. Those of greatest concern are programs of the administration in regard to civil rights, pay legislation, tax legislation, agricultural legislation (the Cooley bill), minimum rate legislation, proposals for mass transportation, Domestic Peace Corps, foreign aid and excessive Government spending.

In the case of civil rights, I have spoken out on numerous occasions on the floor of the House and have made statements available to the news media protesting any fur-

ther legislation in this area. I firmly believe that the Federal Government has interfered with the rights of the individual States in some cases and I believe it is high time that the Congress look very carefully into these actions and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Regarding demonstrations in Birmingham, I wrote to the President in May requesting the removal of any threat to use troops in the situation. Realizing that many persons outside of Alabama did not understand the situation I spoke on the floor of the House at which time I inserted in the RECORD my letter to the President and also the text of a telegram that Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., publisher of the Birmingham News sent to the President concerning this matter.

My remarks were as follows:

DEMONSTRATIONS IN BIRMINGHAM

(Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial and a letter.)

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many persons outside of Alabama do not understand that recent outbreaks of violence in Birmingham have been caused primarily by public demonstrations in violation of local law and in defiance of a State court order. There has been no breakdown of local authority, and no violation of Federal law. So there is no justification for Federal interference in Birmingham.

I wish to put into the RECORD a copy of a letter I sent to the President on May 13 on this matter.

I also wish to put in the RECORD a copy of "A Telegram to the President," from Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., publisher of the Birmingham News, and printed on the front page of that newspaper on May 7—before the biggest and most provocative of the public demonstrations.

I call particular attention to Mr. Hanson's reminder to the President about the little-publicized statement of Father Albert S. Foley, chairman of the Alabama Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Father Foley, noting that Birmingham's new mayor, Albert Boutwell, had pledged to help local white and Negro leaders establish communication and actual results, said: "I now call on Dr. (Martin Luther) King again, in the name of properly, peacefully achieved civil rights for all citizens, Negro and white, to do his part to bring about an end to the disorder in the streets and give Birmingham citizens, Negro and white, their opportunity to achieve the ends that Mr. Kennedy has set forth."

Text of my letter and Mr. Hanson's telegram follow:

[From the Birmingham News, May 7, 1963]

A TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Birmingham expects that you as President of all the people will use your Office to encourage maintenance of law and order at all times.

Demonstrations have been unleashed in Birmingham by an organization which seems deliberately intent, having created open turmoil, on continuing it indefinitely.

Mr. President, if these were white marches, demonstrations, open defiances of uniformed law offices, we believe your administration would have taken vigorous action to discourage them.

Law and order, Mr. President, have been kept by local police and sheriff's departments. It is our expectation that this can be continued. But the strain is great daily. The way to eliminate such threat of violence is to prevent large crowds gathering. Police may contain the crowd, and have contained it. But the source of the demonstrations need attention.

Mr. President, daily we risk peril of grave injury or even death.

The white community and Negro community do not want this to happen. Citizens of Birmingham believe it would grieve you deeply if injury or death should result—particularly to Negro schoolchildren who are being cynically used in this needless day-after-day provocation.

But, Mr. President, Negroes are gathered, are excited by speeches, and then are sent boldly into the streets where they openly taunt police and provoke not only the white community but the very law itself.

If serious injury or death should result, Mr. President, you would certainly then ask yourself whether everything had been done, in advance, to have prevented it.

We ask you, sir, to use the influence of your office to end this open law violation and provocation.

The Attorney General of the United States himself has said that these demonstrations are ill timed. He has said repeatedly that law, that court orders, must be sustained. Responsible citizens here share that feeling, be the law Federal, State, or local. They believe law should apply equally to white and Negro.

Attorney General Kennedy has said that questions of justice should be settled in court, not in the streets. We agree. We are sure you do also.

We ask only that in Birmingham the same rule of law be applied equally to Negro and white. On that all men of honor profitably may stand. White respect for law, however, is assuredly damaged when Negroes seem with relative impunity to be able to foster open law defiance.

Mr. President, responsible whites of Birmingham understand that the other side of this coin is that they shall, themselves, take action to redress complaints of Negroes.

The U.S. Attorney General has noted publicly that such action now is in motion. He acknowledged publicly that "the elected mayor, Mr. Boutwell, already has made clear his intention to resolve the difficulties facing this community."

Mayor Boutwell is now awaiting only a final State supreme court decree to settle a legal issue as to when the newly elected city government will be seated. You will understand, Mr. President, his necessary desire to be certain, through the courts, as to his full authority before taking action.

On a television broadcast, Mayor Boutwell said, "When we are in undisputed authority we will give immediate and determined attention to resolving the difficulties that face us." He said local white and Negro leaders "can establish understanding, communication, and actual results."

"Actual results," Mr. President—isn't that what you as Chief Executive and what responsible Negroes want, "actual results?"

Father Albert S. Foley, Chairman of the Alabama Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has said without qualification that demonstrations impede sincere effort toward solution. He has said:

"Mayor Boutwell has made his move. I now call on Dr. [Martin Luther] King again, in the name of properly, peacefully achieved civil rights for all citizens, Negro and white, to do his part to bring about an end to disorder in the streets and give Birmingham citizens, Negro and white, their opportunity to achieve the ends that Mr. Kennedy has set forth."

That is the picture today, Mr. President. But apparently if there is to be order, and respect for law, and proper procedure through the courts as well as sincere white effort to meet this problem cooperatively; you, sir, must be the one to bring it.

Those who cause these demonstrations have ignored everyone else.

The basis for a solution already exists. This condition can only be jeopardized by continued open-street tumult.

Mr. President, it is our sincere belief that you, too, have a responsibility for this crisis. We recall that in the past some of these same demonstration leaders have met with you, presumably to discuss their problems and their goals.

Sir, what further you may do necessarily is the private judgment of the President of the United States. But may we now, most respectfully, ask that you consider whether your further counsel with Negro leaders of such demonstrations could serve a vital national and Birmingham objective.

Mr. President, our aim is the restoration of domestic tranquility, cessation of open disruption, and provision of a basis for calm negotiation toward concrete results which will answer legitimate complaints of Birmingham Negroes.

That, sir, is an honorable objective—for us and for you.

Respectfully,

CLARENCE B. HANSON, Jr.,
The Birmingham News.

WASHINGTON, May 7.—The White House said today it had received Birmingham News Publisher Clarence B. Hanson's telegram. A spokesman said there would be no comment.

MAY 13, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I seriously question the legal authority of the Federal Government to intervene in the Birmingham, Ala., situation.

What has happened, other than in a matter of degree, which makes the present situation a legal one for Federal interference when you, Mr. President, so forcefully stated at your press conference a few days ago that no Federal laws were being violated? Although there was a most serious outbreak of violence on Sunday morning, the same overall situation still prevails.

I am not an expert in matters of constitutional law, but I have checked with legal authorities and I am told that unless there is a breakdown in representative government, the Federal Government cannot step into a State or local situation. There has been no breakdown of local authority. Action has already been taken to apprehend the bomb throwers. Most observers have praised the self-restraint and the calm and deliberate judgment used by the Birmingham and Jefferson County police officers.

Governor Wallace has stated that he stands ready to send in sufficient law officers to back up the efforts of the local peace officers. The local citizens of Birmingham, together with the leaders of the Birmingham Negro community have worked together in harmony and cooperation to iron out the differences and achieve some peaceful settlement of the situation. Clearly there is no justification for Federal interference in this situation.

It seems clear that the professional outside agitators are seeking Federal interference as an easy way to their objectives. It seems to me that the administration will be doing everything in its power to nullify a peaceful settlement if it moves in Federal troops.

I, therefore, urge you to remove any threat of the use of troops in this situation.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

During the debate on the Defense Department appropriations bill I took the floor and spoke out against the report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, better known as the Gesell report.

My remarks were as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

(Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the recently released report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces is a real threat to the usefulness of our military bases. It, in effect, presupposes that unless an area near a military base is integrated, the people will be punished by removal of such base.

It also calls on military commanders to take the lead in these communities in desegregation. This, I am sure, is duty not contemplated by these military officers when they entered the service of their country.

It would seem that we are going to see some very unrealistic and repulsive measures employed to force communities on this issue.

In a time when we need all of our resources and energies in a state of high level preparedness, it would be hoped that the Congress would take a hard look at any such proposals.

I further elaborated on the Gesell report on the floor of the House when I specifically referred to the participation of military personnel in civil rights demonstrations.

These remarks follow:

PARTICIPATION BY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Defense Department appropriations bill, I made mention of a report released by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. I stated that this report indicated a real threat to our military bases as it presupposed that unless an area adjacent to military base was integrated, the people in the area would be punished by removal of the base. It also called upon military commanders to take the lead in the communities in the desegregation movement. At that time, I stated that such action as contemplated by the report was not considered by military officers when they entered the service of their country and I do not believe that they are qualified either by education or experience to enter into such programs.

I bring this to the attention of the House today, Mr. Speaker, since I read an article in the July 17, 1963 issue of the Washington Post, referring to orders issued at the Military Air Transport Base, Charleston, S.C. One order stated that base personnel were not to take part in civil rights demonstrations. Later, the order was revoked by a second order which stated that under Air Force policy, an airman off duty could take part in demonstrations as long as he wore civilian clothes and avoided injury that might prevent him from carrying out his duties.

The article further stated that the Secretary of Defense, in the face of protests, sharply restricted such activities last night: "It is highly inappropriate and unnecessary for military personnel, with their special obligations of citizenship to participate in these activities. I urge every man and woman in uniform to conduct himself accordingly."

The Secretary said in a memorandum to all Armed Forces. The article further noted that Secretary McNamara did not specifically forbid participation by troops when wearing civilian clothes, in off-duty hours.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the order issued by the Secretary of Defense leaves much to be desired. Military personnel are subject to call 24 hours a day. Participation in demonstrations such as have occurred have led to bodily injury. If military personnel is permitted to participate in these demonstrations and become incapacitated, they are not available for the intended purpose of the services. Further, Mr. Speaker, if injury occurs in any demonstration and where there are local ordinances or State laws forbidding such demonstrations, I would like to know how such injury could be found "in line of duty." It would appear that in such case a "not in line of duty" finding would follow and, therefore, the individual would be subject to court-martial proceedings.

In view of the importance of such action that could occur, I have written Secretary McNamara for an opinion on the matter.

The letter follows:

JULY 17, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Pentagon Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of your recent memorandum wherein you stated, "It is highly inappropriate and unnecessary for military personnel, with their special obligations of citizenship, to participate in these activities. I urge every man and woman in uniform to conduct himself accordingly."

I would like to propound a question regarding this memorandum, particularly, since you did not specifically forbid participation by troops when wearing civilian clothes in off-duty hours.

It is my understanding that military personnel are subject to call 24 hours a day. If injury occurs to military personnel in off-duty hours, wearing civilian clothes which was the result of demonstrations which are contrary to the laws of the municipality or the State, how could such injury be found "in line of duty?"

It would appear that if such injury did occur to military personnel as a result of these demonstrations, such injuries would necessarily be found "not in line of duty" and they would be, of course, subject to court-martial proceedings.

I would appreciate your comments in this regard at the earliest opportunity.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

In furtherance of my opposition to civil rights legislation and, believing that the Reverend Frank Mathews, of the St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Selma, Ala., made very pertinent remarks in an article entitled "Is It Not Against the Law To Break the Law?" I inserted the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IS IT NOT AGAINST THE LAW TO BREAK UNJUST LAWS?

(Extension of remarks of Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 30, 1963)

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Frank Mathews of the St. Paul's Episcopal Church, in Selma, Ala., recently wrote an article in his weekly bulletin and which was reprinted in the editorial column of the Selma Times Journal and the Anniston Star.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks of Reverend Mathews are very pertinent in regard to the issues facing us concerning civil rights and under permission previously granted, I wish to, at this time, revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

"[From the Anniston Star, July 22, 1963]

"IT IS AGAINST THE LAW

"The following was written by the Reverend Frank Mathews for the weekly bulletin put out by St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Selma. It was reprinted in the editorial columns of the Selma Times-Journal, and our hope is that it already has been brought to the attention of the individual whom it names and to the attention of others of like mentality.

"The Reverend Mr. Mathews wrote:

" 'I was appalled the other evening to hear a news commentator quote these words from the mouth of Dr. Martin Luther King: "It is not against the law to break unjust laws."

" 'This is a statement made by a man who has been supported, encouraged, praised, and strengthened by our National Government in general and the President of the United States in particular.

" 'This philosophy that gives the right to an individual to decide which laws are just and which unjust, that gives the right to an individual to assert his own devices and desires against the whole legislative system of our Nation, that gives the right to an individual to openly defy democratically imposed restrictions to satisfy personal whims—this philosophy is calculated to destroy the civilization of our Nation.

" 'This philosophy is the way of the jungle, where the hyena eats the monkey and the lion eats the hyena and the hunter kills the lion.

" 'It is the primitive law of "surival of the fittest," where the strong prey on the weak, where there are no limitations imposed to protect society from the greed of sinful man. This philosophy does, in fact, abolish law, because laws which can be freely broken are not laws at all, and without laws we have no civilized society.

" 'It is not a question of whether the laws are just or unjust. There are undoubtedly many unjust laws on our statute books.

" 'But there is a constitutional method of repealing those laws, and until and unless they are repealed by democratically appointed means, they remain the law and each individual is subject to their limitations and restrictions.

" 'Therefore, contrary to the stated philosophy of Dr. Martin Luther King, it is against the law to break unjust laws, and those who openly defy the law should be punished, rather than protected by the armed might of the Federal Government.' "

More recently, the Gesell report was discussed in detail on the House floor. Numerous Members expressed their very deep concern and opposition to the implementation of this report. During the course of this discussion I took the floor and made the following comments:

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] and I thank him for yielding to me and for taking this time.

I agree with the gentleman it is not a question of integration or segregation. It is a question of putting a political twist or use of our armed services to which it has not been put before, this business of calling upon military commanders to go out and become leaders of the community where they happen to be stationed to promote one particular philosophy.

I appreciate very much the gentleman's service and the service he has rendered the House in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an analysis by General Almond, commander of the 77th Division under General MacArthur in Korea, who has analyzed this report. He has had a tremendous amount of experience in the armed services and I am proud he lives in my district. I understand that he lost a son in the Korean conflict.

I commend the gentleman for his diligence in this matter.

I include as part of my remarks the following excerpts from the analysis made by General Almond:

"EXCERPTS OF ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS ON THE INITIAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

"(Made by Edward M. Almond, lieutenant general, U.S. Army, retired, July 25, 1963)

"I. Introduction

"The initial subject report dealing with equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States has been carefully reviewed by the undersigned and it is believed that the average objective reader of the report would be struck by the dictatorial recommendations, the vagueness of many charges and the bias whereby the Committee making the report to the President clearly shows that it is willing to go to any limit to insure integration in its most complete degree and this without regard to the effects that it may have on the balance of the Armed Forces which constitute between 85 and 90 percent of our military services.

"II. Outstanding characteristics of the report

"1. It proposes to deny essential information to promote boards in the military services (pp. 24 and 25, photographs).

"2. It demands in the name of 'equal opportunity' a higher percentage in Negro promotions rather than education, age in service, and the more fundamental consideration of merit (p. 20).

"3. It seeks integration 'for the amalgamation of the races' and not merely to secure equal opportunity and use of skills (see pp. 34 and 35).

"4. It invokes responsibilities and makes demands on post and area commanders by coercive methods to force integration on civilian communities by 'threat and blackmail.'

"5. It encourages and recommends the establishment of an agency whereby accusation of 'discrimination' may be made by secret testimony without the person accused being given the source of the accusation.

"6. It quotes injustices repeatedly but at the same time admits that the Committee verified very few and many times none of the facts.

"7. It draws many inferences loosely and in general terms, even to the extent of challenging the integrity of responsible military leaders.

"8. It does not envisage a real evaluation of the individual Negro based on merit but repeatedly speaks of opportunities and 'latent' skills inherent in the Negro.

"9. It recommends a 'spy system' to be called monitoring with an especially sympathetic monitor throughout the range of troop levels in order to report on responsible commanders as to how they carry out their functions.

"10. It strongly recommends that those responsible for integrating Negroes among white elements of commands be given to understand that such accomplishments will redound to the credit of the author of such plans for the purposes of furthering his promotion.

"11. It emphasize repeatedly that Negroes should operate without reference to race and that there should be no record of blood or race on the Negroes' record of services. Later on in the report it complains of the inability to determine what cases there are which have been committed against the Negroes, since it has no way of determining from the military record whether the individual is a Negro or not. It goes on further to claim that the absence of such a record has cost untold time and money to accumulate such information for the purposes of the report.

"12. Signers of the report are: Nathaniel S. Colley; Abe Fortas; Gerhard A. Gesell, chairman; Louis J. Hector; Benjamin Muse; Joh H. Sengstacke; Whitney M. Young, Jr.; Laurence I. Hewes III, Committee counsel.

"Three of the members of this Committee are Negroes and the other four have a long career as racial agitators working with the ADA, ADL, and the NAACP. Not a single member appears to have a practical and objective approach to the subject of integration. From some of the recommendations made, it is apparent that the committee is willing to go to any length to discredit the commander who does not meet the integration criteria that the committee sets up and to institute a spy system which places the post commander in a thoroughly discredited position.

"13. The immaturity of this Committee is esablished by its reference to the several Inspector General's Departments of the Armed Services which have been known for careful analyses and unblemished integrity since the beginning of the organization of all of our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; this report would dispense with the Inspector General handling anything that has to do with integration and would set up a monitoring service with a special appointee who would handle such cases. The Communist Soviets have such a system and have had since the beginning of the Russian Revolution in 1917. He is known as a 'political commissar,' whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on their manner of performance of duty. The effrontery of this Committee to propose such a departure from the system of integrity of such long standing in the military services is shocking and revolting.

"14. This whole report is reminiscent of the experiences of the undersigned when he was the commander of the 92d Division and had so many problems to confront him in various phases of training and in combat from the period of September 1942 to August 1945., One of the most notable problems was that of promotion. Negro advocates of rapid promotion had no hesitancy in recommending that a percentage of Negroes comparable to the Negro population strength of the United State should obtain in all promotions in the 92d Division. They complained bitterly when white officers who had commanded companies in training for as much as a year were promoted to the next grade and Negro lieutenants who had just joined the unit or had had only 3 or 4 months' service were not promoted percentagewise.

"15. Needless to say, such complaints were taken with the validity that they deserved but this instance is cited to show that nothing has changed in the nature of those who are determined to integrate the Armed Forces and determined to secure what is called 'equal rights and opportunities' for skills and abilities. It seems never to have occurred to the authors of such projects that there may be a slight difference between the average white and the average Negro in his ability to absorb information and to deliver a satisfactory performance. It is a known fact that during World War II it required in training 3½ to 4 times as much ammunition expenditure on the part of Negroes as compared to whites in order to secure a reasonable comparison of weapons performance in firing.

"16. The undersigned has interviewed three different post commanders since reading this report and the meddlings and directives and complaints that are foisted upon post commanders are little short of tragic. This report if put into effect will do more to damage the morale of the military services than anything that could be devised.

"EDWARD M. ALMOND,
"Lieutenant General,
"U.S. Army (Retired)."

While the foregoing indicates my strong feeling in regard to the problem of civil rights and the expression of the feeling of all Alabamians, I have on other occasions joined with the entire Alabama delegation in the Congress to express my total opposition to various actions of the administration in connection with this matter.

I shall, as long as I am privileged to represent the fine people of Alabama, speak out on every occasion and voice my objections to any action proposed by the Congress, the judiciary or the executive branch of the Government that is contrary to our belief.

Resolution by South Dakota on Grain Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the South Dakota Legislature relating to the proposal by the Commodity Credit Corporation that it plans to assume the risk for agricultural commodities owned or pledged as collateral on price-support loans in commercial storage.

The resolution is as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

Concurrent resolution urging that the Commodity Credit Corporation recognize the statutory requirements provided by South Dakota law, establishing the insurance protection which licensed South Dakota public grain warehousemen shall maintain in force upon grain held in storage, and urging the abandonment of any proposed action by said Commodity Credit Corporation to abrogate these laws by substituting the Federal Government as insuror

Whereas the licensed public warehousemen of South Dakota are required by law to insure all grain that they hold in storage, either for private individuals or for the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has publicly announced its intention to become its own insuror on commodities owned by the Government or pledged as collateral on price-support loans in commercial storage, and to arbitrarily assess costs of this Federal assumption of risk against the warehouseman; and

Whereas public grain warehousemen insure the contents of their warehouses under reporting forms of insurance contracts which are designed to provide flexible protection for the fluctuating values created by constantly changing quantities and market values, the operation of which policies require the full reporting of all grain stocks regardless of ownership; and

Whereas the extent to which grain in public storage may or may not be pledged as collateral on price-support loans from day to day could never be accurately established for insurance purposes; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation proposes to levy a charge against the warehouseman's storage payments, for assuming a risk which he cannot segregate as a practical matter of accounting, and which

he is compelled to insure by law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the 39th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the action proposed by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be in conflict with the regulatory controls already wisely established by the legislature of this State and administered by the Public Utilities Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That this proposal would arbitrarily subject every warehouseman to two systems of insuring the same risk, at a duplication of cost which would be an unfair and unnecessary burden upon them; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota hereby memorialize the Commodity Credit Corporation to abandon their plan as being incompatible with State laws and necessary insurance practices; and be it finally

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of South Dakota.

Adopted by the senate January 23, 1964.

Concurred in by the house of representatives January 30, 1964.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary, State Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a sad day for Lithuanians, however, as they are no longer free and independent. The world knows it has been a captive of the Soviet Union since taken by force of arms on June 15, 1940. It is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of these people that such a proud day should still be observed in the hopes that one day they may again be free. In the hope that the question of the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States could be brought up for discussion in the United Nations, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 236. It would have been a fine tribute to these people if my resolution or one of the many other resolutions introduced in behalf of the captive nations could have been acted upon by the House this week. We continue to hope that action will be taken in the near future.

Foreign Aid Dollars Have Bought Only Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent column in the February 3, 1964, issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel, Reporter Jim Bishop properly asks:

Can someone please tell me where the United States has gained anything except deepening contempt?

Every Member of Congress should ponder this question, and I commend the Bishop column to the attention of my colleagues:

U.S. DOLLARS HAVE BOUGHT ONLY CONTEMPT
(By Jim Bishop)

As a student of history—not a political writer—an uneasy feeling is upon me. Either America is becoming soft, or my head is. We seem to be in a metamorphosis from a high plane of justice through strength to one of apology through fear. The last time our country became indignant was when President John F. Kennedy ordered the Russians to take their missiles out of Cuba at once.

Name one other occasion when we stood toe to toe with anyone and refused to back down. I am opposed to war; I'm opposed to threats; but I favor unequivocal principles and justice. I also favor righteous anger in high places too. We don't have it. When a little nation like Panama kicks us in the pants, our President phones their President and says: "Let's talk this over like gentlemen."

If T. R. Roosevelt was in office, he'd have sent a task force of aircraft carriers, a division of marines, and some supporting destroyers. We would have landed in Panama, restored order, and then talked. In Zanzibar, our officials are arrested with impunity, and the world watches as our people are humiliated. In the United Nations, when the Communist bloc refuses to pay its bills, Uncle Sam floats a bond issue, and, in effect, pays.

Militancy is not the solution, any more than self-degradation is. A malaise of fear is over the land. We are loaded with creature comforts and bereft of patriotism. Who volunteers these days to serve in the Armed Forces?

In Vietnam we fight an interminable war with helicopters for a people who revile us. The chief of state of Cambodia will no longer accept our money unless we apologize for saying Cambodia appeared to be happy that President Kennedy was assassinated. We romance a man named Ben Bella as a liberator of his people, and he goes home and says he's a friend of the Soviet Union.

The French, who were lifted from under the German heel by American blood, take our money and make friends with Communist China. The British sell 400 buses to Cuba, and are offended by our outrage. The Russians beg for wheat because they haven't got enough brains to feed themselves, and tell us that they will bury us.

Pakistan accepts our money for airports, and then builds a road to Communist China. The new nations of Africa lynch white people, and condemn us for being slow to give our own Negroes equal opportunities. The most potent organization in the United States used to be the American Legion. Now it is CORE.

A malcontent like Lee Oswald renounces his citizenship and, when he finds that he doesn't like Russia, the United States pays his fare home. American officials are kidnaped by Reds in Venezuela, and nobody can do anything about it. In West Germany, the Government fears that the United States will recognize East Germany, but they work out a deal with the Communists for Christmas visits through the wall.

We send our Attorney General to Japan to beg President Sukarno not to start trouble in southeast Asia. Our former President, Dwight Eisenhower, got as far as the Philippine Islands on a state visit to Japan when he had to turn back for fear of being killed. Premier Nehru turns a cold neutral face to us when we ask for friends, but, when the Chinese cross his border, he screams for help and we send it.

King Hussein of Jordan salutes the Pope and talks of peace and then runs off to Cairo to discuss with Nasser ways and means of starting a war with Israel.

Japan, a defeated nation, builds more ships and shipyards. America, which won, shuts shipyards down.

We lose a little here; we lose a little there. Our bills for defense come to over $50 billion a year. Our foreign aid amounts to another $4 billion. Can someone please tell me where the United States has gained anything except deepening contempt? Do we have a brother anywhere who is willing to lay down his life for us?

Am I angry? You bet I am.

Effect of Films on the World: Moscow Festival—A Report by George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some excerpts from an extremely interesting report by the able Director of the Motion Picture Service of the U.S. Information Agency, George Stevens, Jr., concerning the Third International Film Festival held last year in Moscow.

Mr. Stevens was chairman of the official U.S. delegation to the festival. Although the United States did not enter any films in the contest, our delegation took to the festival what it considered top films in various categories. In this report, printed in the October 17, 1963, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Stevens tells of the Russian reaction to these films and of the events of the contest.

I take this opportunity to call attention to Mr. Stevens' report in view of some recent hearings conducted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the role of art and culture in the Communist world. The Communists attach very great importance to films and it is

therefore prudent on our part to learn what we can of their attitude toward motion pictures.

Excerpts from Mr. Stevens' report follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 17, 1963]

EFFECT OF FILMS ON THE WORLD

For someone who has enjoyed the beaches at Cannes and the beaches at Venice or other more luxurious sites of film festivals, the ominous introduction about the Moscow event indicates a more serious talk than you are going to hear. However, to tell about this experience, which was an extraordinary one for anybody who had the good fortune to be there, it is necessary to put the whole event and the reason for it in a sort of framework. There were 64 countries represented in Moscow at the film festival—this their third.

That was the day before it started. On the day the festival actually started, there were 63 countries. The Chinese Communists had gone home with their film.

The idea of a film festival in Moscow I think is, in a way, strangely more significant than some other places in the world. A long time ago Lenin had said to the Soviet people:

"The motion picture is the most important of all the arts."

Stalin is to have said sometime later to an American filmmaker, that if he, Stalin, controlled Hollywood, he would "be able to sell the idea of communism in 3 years."

Last March 28 Mr. Khrushchev, in speaking to the artists of the Soviet Union, again affirmed the conviction that "to us, the Soviets, the cinema is the most important of all the arts."

SUPERB THEATER BUILT

Inside the Kremlin in the last 2 years the Russians have built what is unquestionably the most magnificent theater in the world. It is an extraordinary edifice of glass and marble, seats 6,000 people, it is beautiful in its design, with escalators running throughout to keep an easy flow of people coming in and coming out of the three tiers of the auditorium. Beside each chair is a place where one can plug in for the 14 simultaneous languages from which one can choose, to hear the film or whatever event is taking place.

In the back of the theater there are two television cameras and throughout each performance these cameras photograph what is going on on the stage, and if someone wants to go outside, there are television monitors through the auditorium on which one can watch the actual performance or the film.

We got some idea of the flavor of things to come in a strange way when they introduced the jury. The jury was made up of prominent people from many nations, nine from the Iron Curtain, six from the Western world. The biggest applause of the evening came at the time the American juror, Stanley Kramer, was introduced. Shocking applause. It was continuous and enthusiastic. And, it was the result of the showing of two of his films in Moscow, one, "Inherit the Wind" which was played widely as part of the cultural exchange and the other "On the Beach."

Also, two of his scripts from his recent films had been published in Moscow in book form. "Judgment at Nuremberg" and "The Defiant Ones."

Mr. Kramer's popularity and the respect he enjoyed became a kind of wonderful asset to the American delegation.

We had brought with us really a new philosophy as far as the Moscow film festival vis-a-vis the United States was concerned. In the first festival we had not officially participated, although we showed a film out of competition, "The Diary of Anne Frank."

In the second festival we did participate with a film that was not well received, but our participation was not on a large scale.

This time we elected to take the opportunity to attempt an experiment. We wanted to take what we thought to be the very best American filmmaking to Moscow and to show it at their festival. The films we took were: "West Side Story," a musical; "Some Like It Hot," a comedy; "Ben-Hur," a spectacle; "David and Lisa," a small film, and Mr. Kramer had with him two of his films, "Judgment at Nuremberg" and "The Defiant Ones." In this we felt we had a rounded group of American films—films which were not only excellent but also showed a certain diversity in American filmmaking.

APPEALED TREMENDOUSLY

The first film to be shown was "West Side Story." I have always felt that this would be a terribly interesting film to see behind the Iron Curtain, and there have been those whe felt it would be to our disadvantage to show it.

The first showing of "West Side Story" was at 10 o'clock in the morning.

One thing we found very quickly was that these American films had great popularity and there was a great curiosity about them, these films appealed tremendously to the capitalistic instincts of the Russians. Consequently, when we appeared at the theater at 10 o'clock in the morning for the first show, people were lined up—the Soviet citizens were lined up to buy their tickets for the show that would take place at 9 o'clock that night—they were lined up as far as we could see.

With me for the presentation of the film that morning were Susan Strasberg and Stanley Kramer.

As we came into the theater I sensed a tremendous kind of warmth and interest, really more than warmth. A fascination on the part of this audience, a hunger and eagerness. And when Susan Strasberg was introduced, she was introduced as the girl who originated the role of "The Diary of Anne Frank" on Broadway. This brought tremendous response, great applause from the Soviets, because this was a story that they had an affection for.

When Mr. Kramer came on he made some remarks and I will take the time to read them, because his remarks represent the ideas with which we represented you at Moscow, and I can say in reading these that they were interrupted frequently with applause.

GREATER UNDERSTANDING

Mr. Kramer said: "The purpose of a film festival * * * and the stated purpose of this one * * * the people attempt greater understanding of each other through the cinema art. That is why the American delegation is here. There is a great deal we do not understand about a people for whom we have much affection. Now we bring our films in the belief there is a great deal you do not understand about us."

Incidentally, Peter Ustinov was along on this mission and every time the Cubans were introduced they were introduced as "the people from that heroic little island."

Peter Ustinov was just a man with a beard. In Moscow they had never seen him; they don't know what he does. He is overweight, and his suit is never pressed, and finally he was introduced. I would see him around in the lobby introducing himself as "Peter Ustinov, I'm from that heroic little island, England."

The Russians have been, in my opinion, great, farsighted about the idea of motion pictures, probably from this admonition they have had through the years from the heads of state. And for some time now they have been training filmmakers from around the world or training people to be filmmakers.

At the festival they have an opportunity to bring back the people they have trained, the person from Outer Mongolia has gone back to his country and made a film—he can bring it back to this festival. Consequently, there were 34 films shown in 12 days in competition—and, for the jury, that's three or four films each day, which is arduous. But the filmmakers from Outer Mongolia, the filmmaker from Senegal, the filmmaker from Tanganyika who has been trained in the Soviet Union comes back and he has his night on the stage in the Kremlin right alongside, or the night after Fellini has had it, or the French have had it. And, its really a way of honoring these people, whose cinema industries they are developing.

CALIBER VERY LOW

Consequently, the caliber of films was very low, not much to be expected really, because they were very experimental. These are terribly small countries, and some of them are totally inept.

But in seeing the audiences look at dynamic films, "Judgment at Nuremberg" was an extraordinary thing to see with the Russian audience, because an audience is unpredictable. You can't legislate how an audience will respond to something and there were great suspicions as to how, on the part of the Soviets, how their public would respond to "Judgment at Nuremberg."

The audience was stunned by it. Their thoughts were aroused by it and there were few things in the picture that the Soviets overlooked. For instance, the line where one of the actors says: "The Russians have made their move in Czechoslovakia."

You hear this tremendous buzzing throughout the audience to a new idea, or when Maximillian Schell in his summation before the jury points to the Germans and says: "Are these men alone guilty? Or is it not more of us? What about the Russians * * * who made a pact with Hitler and gave him time?" Buzz-buzz-buzz-buzz.

The film is full of ideas and it is terribly difficult to know which idea someone is going to take out of it. I asked my interpreter, a bright young man, a college student, what he thought of "Judgment at Nuremberg." He said: "I like that film. I like it better than 'The Great Escape.' I like films with ideas and I like films with thoughts."

And, I said, realizing that he had never seen Spencer Tracy in his days with Katharine Hepburn (he thought Spencer Tracy was born 60 years old), "What did you think of Spencer Tracy?" and he said: "He's probably the best actor in the world."

I thought, here's a young man who has read certain things about the United States and he sees a man playing a midwestern judge, a man of principle, and plays it so well that this boy thinks he is the best actor in the world. I think this young man has had an impression. And that's why I think of the tremendous power of films behind the Iron Curtain as far as the Western World is concerned.

When you figure that in the Soviet Union alone 11 million people see films each day, that's a tremendous source of thinking and response.

As a conclusion to this and to the whole experience at Mocsow, just the idea that we have a real opportunity behind the Iron Curtain in sending our very best films because they reach across the huge Soviet Union. They reach 11 million people a day. I think our only danger is to send anything but our best, to send films with the strongest ideas and I think we will be richly rewarded.

Dr. Glenn Olds: Innovator at Springfield College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, since assuming the presidency of Springfield College in my home city of Springfield, Mass., in 1958, Dr. Glenn Olds has transformed this well-known college into a vibrant institution with a revitalized curriculum, increased enrollment, new buildings, and new programs for aiding juvenile delinquents, the establishment of a physical education and community service training program for Peace Corpsmen going to Latin America, and the establishment of a Community Tensions Center which was the first to be established in the country.

The February 15 issue of the Saturday Review of Literature carried a most interesting article of tribute to Dr. Olds for his achievements at Springfield College, written by Mary Kersey Harvey, and under unanimous consent I include it with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GLENN OLDS: INNOVATOR AT SPRINGFIELD

(By Mary Kersey Harvey)

When Glenn Olds assumed the presidency of Springfield College in 1958 (at the age of 37), he found it enfeebled by 9 years of deficit financing, struggling to recover its mission. There wasn't one bona fide classroom building for a student body of 1,100. Faculty salaries averaged a little over $6,000. Seven members of the English faculty huddled in a single office behind the handball court. Although Springfield was world-famous as a developer of physical education teachers and youth leaders, its "smorgasbord" curriculum lacked coherence and balance. "Springfield needed," Olds recalls, "everything money could buy, but it still had the one thing money cannot buy—a moral commitment and conviction about a quality of education of the whole man in the service of all men. On this we built."

Olds shattered traditions, tramped on academic toes, and questioned everything, in the style of all innovators. He was obviously not trying to win any popularity contests. His strategy was the dialectic and dialogue of crisis, creativity, and construction. In less than 6 years—with the help of many dedicated faculty members—he has revamped and revitalized the college's undergraduate curriculum, reorganized and strengthened its division of graduate study, and given fresh impetus to its world-known international outreach. Under this program Olds has established relationships with campuses, teachers, and students in several Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

Glenn Olds describes himself as just an Oregon farmer at heart. His family crossed the plains in a covered wagon. He logged and farmed along with his father, milked 2 dozen cows before going to grade school every morning, and helped fortify the chronically feeble family finances as a boy boxer in curtain raisers in remote, Pacific Northwest rings. He split cordwood for a whole summer to buy a trumpet that he parlayed into his own dance band, an outfit that helped pay his way through college. Summers he spent alone in the mountains as a forest ranger, reading, writing, and reflecting.

"My whole life," he observes, "has been one of participation and reflection, advance, and withdrawal." Once he hitchhiked all over the United States. His mother was a Mormon, his father a Roman Catholic. They raised Olds to be a Quaker. In college he studied Judaism and was later ordained a Methodist minister. At Yale his dissertation on "The Nature of Moral Insight" earned him a Ph. D. in philosophy. Tough on himself (his workday for years has been roughly 16 hours), he can't understand why a country that can send satellites spinning around the earth can't find a way to get the man out of the boy.

One way to speed the maturation process, Olds believes, is to draw the student into affairs of the college. Today the student is involved in running Springfield to a remarkable degree. Olds put the student body president into the president's cabinet. ("I tried to get him elected to the board of trustees, but failed, though I haven't surrendered yet.") He instituted regular student leadership training conferences, dorm councils for self-government, annual budget reviews with students, convocations on crisis issues, and weekly meetings with students in his own home.

The college sets an example of putting service ahead of self by sharing its resources generously with the local, national, and world community. Among its many service programs are:

A halfway house to help youthful offenders make the transition from prison to society. Springfield is the only college operating such a center. (The other three are run by the Bureau of Prisons.) In just 2 years the prerelease guidance center has put scores of young men back into the mainstream of life.

A physical education and community service training program for Peace Corps men going into Latin America, described by Deputy Director William Moyers, as "one of the country's finest."

The college's community tensions center was one of the first to be established in the country. (There are still only a handful.) It conducts research and offers courses and consultation in racial, ethnic, and religious relations.

A partial listing of community agencies and institutions where Springfield alumni now serve would include American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Red Cross, Boys' Clubs, Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, Jewish Welfare Board, USO, YMCA, the YWCA. Others are to be found serving camps and recreation departments, corrective and penal institutions, guidance centers, halfway houses, hospitals, neighborhood houses, and hundreds of schools and colleges in every State in the Union and in 55 countries throughout the world.

During Olds' short tenure at Springfield, faculty fringe benefits have increased 45 percent and salaries have risen from 25 to 35 percent. Seven new buildings have gone up. Scholarships and annual income have tripled, the budget doubled. Enrollment reached a record high last fall—1,546 full-time students. A few months ago the B.A. was added to the string of degrees the college now awards (B.S., B.P.E., M.S., M. Ed., D.P.E.). The Springfield College Corp. (which included the late President John F. Kennedy) has been revitalized by new men and women from across the country, including Art Linkletter in Los Angeles, American Motors magnate George Cullen in Detroit, and radio-TV executive John Hayes of the Washington Post Co.

"Someone once wisely said," Olds points out, "that good education is always ahead of the people and behind the needs of the times. I think a good educator should be in that terrible tension in between—bringing the liveliest sense of the needs of his time and the possibilities of human nature to bear on the realities and resources of his people—both students and faculty and those who support them. It is not the coziest spot in the world," Olds admits, "and it is certainly one of the loneliest. But, man for man, hour for hour, it is surely the liveliest. And, one would like to hope, one of the helpingest. How could one feel otherwise when his deepest desire is to lift the largest load for human good in the shortest time?"

Faith in Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on the back cover of the February 1964 issue of Sunshine magazine, published since 1924 in Litchfield, Ill., is an excellent article by W. G. Vollmer. It needs no explanation and I commend its reading to my colleagues.

Under unanimous consent, the article follows:

FAITH IN OURSELVES

(By W. G. Vollmer)

The Scriptures remind us that "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." This Biblical admonition tells us that we cannot think in terms of failure, and then succeed—in terms of weakness, and then be strong—in terms of fear, and then be courageous—in terms of doubt, and then have faith.

Our material well-being is ample proof that we have had faith in ourselves.

It is proof, too, that the "Lord helps those who help themselves."

Each of us can help revive the spirit which built our country by renewing and revitalizing this faith in ourselves.

We know that it has paid off in richer, in happier, in fuller lives.

We know that it has brought us the greatest outpouring of goods and services the world has ever known before.

We know, too, that it can bring us peace and security.

The history of our country is the history of a people with faith in themselves.

But in recent years we have lost some of this faith.

We have started leaning upon the Government for aid and for assistance—we have started looking to the Government for the solution of personal and community problems.

If we persist in this dependency upon Government, we shall surely destroy one of the basic faiths that helped to make our country free, prosperous, and strong.

As dependence upon the Government's ability to solve personal and community problems increases, faith in ourselves is gradually weakened * * * and eventually destroyed.

Faith in our own ingenuity, resourcefulness, and ability to take care of the basic needs of life is essential to the preservation of human rights and personal liberties.

This kind of faith in ourselves is what our forefathers handed down to us. It is our responsibility to perserve it untarnished—undiminished, for the generations which will follow us.

Negro History Week in Yonkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this week at the same time this body passed, with bipartisan support, the most far-reaching civil rights bill since Reconstruction Days, Negro History Week was and is being celebrated in many homes, schools, churches, clubs, and organizations throughout our country.

I am proud to say that the public schools in Yonkers, N.Y., which I have the honor and privilege to represent, are this year participating in Negro History Week, according to the following article which appeared in the Yonkers Herald Statesman, one of the leading Macy chain newspapers in Winchester County:

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK SCHOOL PROGRAMS SET

Yonkers' public schools will mark Negro History Week, opening Monday, with special programs and activities at all grade levels.

Asst. School Supt. Grace S. Hoberg has distributed to all elementary school teachers a "Guide for Teachers" on contributions of Afro-Americans to the American culture.

The guide contains illustrations and samples on all grade levels in the areas of language, arts, science, crafts, physical activities, music, audio-visual aids and reference materials for teachers.

Albert J. Torres, music coordinator, has prepared a list of appropriate recordings and instrumental performances. Photographs of outstanding Negroes and posters on Negro history and pamphlets are made available by the Yonkers Commission on Human Relations.

Sponsored by the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Negro History Week got its start in 1926. It is an occasion for public exercise, inviting special attention to the achievements of the Negro. With the cooperation of ministers, teachers, professional and businessmen throughout the country, this celebration has proved to be an annual success. Negro History Week has helped to arouse American people to a keener appreciation of the contributions of the Negro to civilization.

The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History was organized in 1915. The five purposes of the association are as follows:

First, promote historical research and writing;

Second, publish books on Negro life and history;

Third, promote study of the Negro through schools, colleges, churches, homes, fraternity groups, and clubs;

Fourth, collection of historical manuscripts and matter relating to the Negro people throughout the world; and

Fifth, bring about harmony between the races and acceptance by interpreting the history of one to the other.

Since the educational approach to civil rights is as important as the legal approach, I thought it appropriate to call attention to the program that is being sponsored by the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History.

Those desiring more information on the "Guide for Teachers" and other educational materials published by this organization, may address their inquiries as follows: the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1538 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Sleeping Bear Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD two very touching letters received by me, one from a distinguished American and conservationist, Miss Mary Harden, urging enactment of an adequate legislative authorization for Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Park, and the other from her brother, Clare Harden.

I believe these two communications constitute a fine memorial for a splendid American citizen and her words on the need for an adequate national reservation in the area are not only plain but compelling.

The letters follow:

FEBRUARY 6, 1964.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This may be a bit unusual, but I am fulfilling, as Miss Harden's brother, her last wish, in forwarding to you this letter.

This morning she was in an automobile accident and, I am sure, killed instantly.

This letter was typed ready for her signature, and I think that this would be her wish, that I mail the letter that she had given on the 5th of February.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE HARDEN.

CARSON CITY, MICH.,
February 5, 1964.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing you concerning Senate bill 792, Sleeping Bear and National Lakeshore Park, passed recently by the Senate. I understand that this bill is now before the Subcommittee on National Parks of the House of Representatives Interior Committee. Two other bills—GRIFFIN, H.R. 2400, and STAEBLER, H.R. 4201—relating to the same territory are also before the subcommittee.

In view of the variety of interests (recreation, conservation, wildlife) and needs (stimulation of local and State economy, increased tourist activities) of the people of Michigan, there is an urgent need for more park land than specified in S. 792. Nothing less than 77,000 acres should be considered adequate in relation to the population growth of Michigan and the area surrounding the Great Lakes.

As you consider bill S. 792, I am sure that you will find many constructive provisions for meeting the objections of the opposition. One forward-looking provision is concerned with cooperative planning among Federal, State, and local governments for the development of Sleeping Bear and Lakeshore Park. Many members of the opposition group are not even residents of Michigan, but I am confident that you, as a citizen of Michigan, are very much aware of the importance of establishing a park which will take care of the people that you represent as well as all the citizens of Michigan.

Will you please alert your fellow Congressmen, particularly committee members, to this very important problem of park expansion of acreage of bill S. 792 to 77,000 acres.

Respectfully yours,

_____.

It Was Planned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the recent attack on our Panama Canal Zone was cold, calculated, stark aggression—comparable to other instances of Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I remind this House of the ruthless Russian Communist attack on Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary and Poland. Mr. Speaker, this attack on the Panama Canal Zone was inspired by this same international conspiracy.

I urge every Member of the Congress and every citizen to carefully study the following documented facts by John T. O'Rourke which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 22:

THOSE PANAMANIAN RIOTS WERE A PUT-UP JOB

(By John T. O'Rourke)

How did so much public comment about the Panamanian riots get so completely off the track? It must baffle even the most charitable mind.

How, indeed, could such a trivial circumstance trigger such crazy behavior? It makes one reach for Dr. Freud's witchbook on symbolism and compulsions.

IT WAS PLANNED

The real answer is, of course, it was manufactured, and that is what so many reporters missed.

No one, of course, expected anything but lies from Panama's radio and press, or from Moscow, Cuba or anti-American news media in South American.

WHERE'S THE GUILT

But how does one explain the self-starting guilt feeling, or whatever it was, that obviously inspired various pundits and commentators (and those who parrot them) which caused them to swallow the propaganda whole and blame nonviolent flag-raising schoolchildren and their parents for the organized and deliberate violence and destruction by invading mobs?

News reports, when they stuck to facts, were accurate enough to make actual events clear. The zone was invaded.

But, almost immediately, interpreters began interpreting, predigesters of opinion began masticating, and newspaper readers and TV and radio listeners all over the country were being told that it was all due to the "colonialism" of the threatened Canal Zone residents, as if they or the canal took money out of Panama, instead of putting money into it. The fact is, far from exploiting the country, the canal brings, directly and indirectly, an amount about equal to the entire Panamanian Republic's annual budget.

BERLIN WALL?

One so-called special correspondent (not this newspaper's) wrote a juicy lead about

the "fiery student leader" crying "There is our Berlin Wall" as he pointed to the fence along the Canal Zone border.

This dim bulb failed to report that peaceful Panamanians, of course, never have trouble walking into the zone at all; in fact, even the first demonstrators marched in, unmolested, only to then attack, burn, and destroy.

And later, of course, to kill.

BACKGROUND

There is a background to this tragic event which should at least be roughly sketched in, if newspaper readers are to be able to put it in focus, and to sense the atmosphere in which it occurred.

To start with, this riot was planned. A minute-by-minute record of the real attack shows that it started in several strategic places, practically simultaneously.

MOB STEERED

It was coordinated with sound trucks inciting and directing the mob, and with radio broadcasts on stations owned by both leftwing politicians and the oilgarchists.

Panama's radio MIA network began to build up the story even before the attack.

IT'S TRADITIONAL

There's nothing new in all this. Mobs have been used, deliberately and cynically, by the handful of family dynasties which own and run (badly) Panama ever since the country was founded.

Rioters against the completely legal presence of the United States in the Canal Zone are hired by local politicians during election campaigns to provide a scapegoat for the people they govern, whose poverty they are either unwilling or unable to alleviate. This is despite the fact that Panama is the second highest recipient of U.S. aid to Latin America.

There is not the slightest reason to suppose, with election day only 4 months away, that these riots were, for the first time in Panama's history, a spontaneous reaction to a flag being raised by schoolchildren at a school (built by U.S. taxpayers) inside the Canal Zone. That was the excuse for the riot; not the reason.

Hal Hendrix, Scripps-Howard's seasoned reporter on Latin America, quoted an expert witness that it was the best organized "spontaneous" riot he ever saw.

SLOGANS

In addition to traditional anti-American riots mentioned above, regularly paid for by politicians, the Panamanian background includes equally well organized campaigns of sloganeering. Walls of buildings are kept bright by "students" with paintpots, smearing "The Canal Is Ours!" and denunciations of "Yankee Imperialist Dogs." They get paid for the paint job.

U.S. Canal Zone kids read these signs. They are also taught in school the canal's actual status. They know who built it, who paid for it, and who pays the yearly fee to Panama.

WHO'S A DOG?

They also know that the "Imperialist Yankee Dogs" referred to means their pop, who perhaps runs one of the locomotives that tow the ships, or who works at the commissary. They don't see pop as an imperialist dog.

Then there is mother. She, for instance, used to be able to buy good, cheap New Zealand and Australian beef in the Canal Zone. But a couple of years ago, the U.S. Government agreed to buy Panamanian beef instead, which is poorer and costs more.

Is this "colonialism"? Whose colonialism? At any rate, mother doesn't feel a bit like an imperialist. Probably she has sounded off at the dinner table when the meat was tougher than usual, and cost more.

MITIGATES

Perhaps, in this atmosphere, a bit of resentfulness can be understood. Mind you, these U.S. children didn't tear up the Panamanian flag, which is the usual fate of U.S. flags at the hands of Panamanian and other Latin students.

All they did was hoist their own at their school. They shouldn't have done it; granted.

But it was a foregone conclusion, when they they did, that young Panamanians would march on it. After all, they have been organized (and paid) to do just that sort of thing for years.

The radio was building up the ruckus even before it started. However, it is safe to say that if the flag raising had not been used as a trigger, something else would have been found soon.

THEY'RE CHEAP

Riots like these do not cost much to start—a couple of years ago, a demonstrator could be hired all day for a dollar and perhaps beer and sandwiches at midday. Once it is going, loafers will join the melee just for the beer and sandwiches, and hope for a dollar.

But, while the "students" first threw rocks and burned automobiles, the real fireworks came later in the evening and to assume that it was "spontaneous" is to display a naivete equal to adult belief in Santa Claus.

INSURRECTION

There was the radio station owned by Panama's woman deputy Thelma King, who travels regularly to Castro's Cuba, shouting to people to march on the zone to "defend" Panama's holy soil, and calling on them to take the guns away from their own National Guard and use them, unless the Guards joined them in the attack.

There was the conservative party radio station, screaming that the only good gringo was a dead gringo.

Altho it wasn't reported at first, it is now well-known that defending canal police used their weapons only after they ran out of tear gas, and that the U.S. troops were never called out until 7:59 p.m. on Thursday, January 9, after the burning and destroying had been going on inside the Canal Zone for more than 3 hours. (The first batch of students entered the zone at 4:40 p.m.)

LYING PROPAGANDA

When snipers fired on the U.S. troops they returned the fire.

This is what President Chiari told his people over the radio was a "cowardly U.S. attack." This is what Panama's Ambassador to the United Nations said was "bloody aggression." They knew, when they said these things, what actually was going on. They knew they were lying.

Scripps-Howard's Reporter Hendrix managed to get into the riddled Tivoli Hotel (in the zone but near the border) by Sunday afternoon. U.S. troops were using it as an observation post. It was still under attack. About 350 rounds were fired at it, and 10 Molotov cocktails. All the windows on the fire side were smashed by bullets. Trained U.S. marksmen had been posted in the hotel, and directed careful fire at the snipers. Who's attacking whom?

IT SURPRISED

Nevertheless, the fact that U.S. soldiery returned fire with fire was undoubtedly a profound shock, not only in Panama, but all over South America. It's understandable; let's look at the background again.

In the last big demonstration against the canal, in 1959, U.S. troops stood fast and held their fire, as commanded, while the Panamanian mob stoned them. Although soldiers were felled as they held their ranks, not a cartridge was exploded.

HATE STUFF

Nevertheless, the next day, a newspaper owned and operated by the son of a former President of Panama, carried a page 1 cartoon showing the face of President Eisenhower with the body of a monster, his claws disemboweling a brave Panamanian youth, and Mr. Eisenhower's bloody fangs tearing into the hero's entrails.

Apparently, many comparatively recent events have convinced South Americans and others that U.S. troops are, by policy, paper tigers.

For instance, in Venezuela, both U.S. soldiers and officers have been stripped of their uniforms down to their drawers, degraded, and kidnaped by armed gangs, without firing a shot.

EVEN THE MARINES

No rifle even cracked when, a few years ago, a whole file of U.S. Marines were kidnaped and held for ransom by Raul Castro. And these were Leathernecks. Perhaps that incident may have started the notion that the U.S. military were harmless.

You can readily see why it comes as a surprise to many Latins and others when it turns out our guns actually will shoot.

NO REDS

Two days ago, Panamanian Ambassador Aguilino Boyd denied the one important new ingredient that made this most recent outbreak different from earlier ones, and more sinister. He said there was no Communist Castro influence.

This ignores the fact that leftwing Deputy Thelma King, screaming for blood on her radio, had been to Havana.

It ignores the fact that 200 or 300 Panamanian "students" had recently been put through the Che Guevara's school for guerrillas.

It ignores the fact that one "student" killed in the riot was one Arosemena. He was 28, married, had two children, and had just been in Havana for 3 weeks.

A STUDENT?

If these are mere coincidences and Ambassador Boyd is right, then only Panama's leading politicians are left to be responsible for the whole thing.

Ambassador Boyd also said his Government had instructed him to say that nothing short of a new treaty, with a view in Panamanian control of the canal, would satisfy.

One resident of Panama City asked our reporter: "How can they expect to run the canal when they can't even collect their own garbage." Look up that street."

And sure enough, the street was filthy with garbage.

THAT PAY FUSS

Another issue called "burning" in the news dispatches is the pay and job differentials between Panamanians and U.S. citizens hired in the zone. Pay has been largely equalized by now, but job opportunity differentials still "burn."

But most readers do not know that while it had ben corrected in the zone, Panamanians themselves still operate not on two differentials, but three; one for Americans, one for Panamanians, and a third for nonnationals who get less than Panamanians for doing the same labor. These are largely Negroes from the Caribbean islands who have smuggled themselves in to try to earn a living.

In the country illegally, they dare not complain or organize against their own exploitation; they're warned that if they do, they'll be shipped out to the islands where the pickings are even slimmer.

WHOSE MONEY?

Panamanian financial idealism applies strictly to money from the Yankees; not to their own.

Several years ago, this writer had a conversation with Dr. Harmodio Arias, rich, distinguished lawyer, publisher, former President of Panama, and known all over the world as the legal father of the Panamanian merchant marine, whereby cargo ship owners of other nationalities, seeking to escape unionization and taxes, are allowed to "lawfully" fly the Panamanian flag—for a fee which Panama collects.

At this time, Dr. Arias' newspaper was publishing passionate editorials on the iniquity of the Canal Zone authorities paying U.S. citizens more than Panamanian citizens for doing the same work.

AID SAME THING

A moment later he admitted that he was doing the same thing; that in his own composing room, he was paying American printers more than he was paying Panamanian printers.

"They're more efficient," he explained blandly.

Needless to say, this would have been no satisfactory defense if the Canal Zone authorities had used it.

The ambivalence of Dr. Arias can be shown in practically every political position Panama's leaders assume.

WHAT'S BEHIND IT

In the upcoming election, incumbent President Chiari and his party are running scared; so are the leaders of the other dozen or so parties. The reason is that Arnulfo Aria, a rich demagogic political wildman, is out in front with poverty-ridden masses.

Dr. Arnulfo Arias has been President twice before, and was kicked out twice before his term was up. Last time around, he nationalized all private businesses, by decree. At the outset of the war, he was pro-Nazi. He admired Mussolini. He says anything.

The result is, everybody's rabble rousing, crying to catch up with Arias because no one knows what might happen if he gets in again.

And so the rabble was roused on January 9 and now everybody wants to tear up the treaty and run the canal some other way.

MORE FEES

A strong argument can be made for increased canal fees, with more income for Panama and the United States, too. (The original investment has never been paid off.) But it is doubtful if increased canal income to Panama would benefit the country's poor; the politicians would more likely raise their own pay. However, increased rates might make a second canal economically attractive to build somewhere else.

It is, of course, impossible in one article to explore the whole canal issue; the purpose here is merely to show the climate—the "ambiencia" as the Latins call it—in which this recent storm blew up.

Misconceptions launched by propaganda and faulty interpretation of events have already caused many well-meaning persons to think that somehow the United States was wrong and caused this whole thing.

It didn't.

Ernie Pyle Award Goes to Jack Steele

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Jack Steele, political writer for the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, has recently been awarded the Ernie Pyle Memorial Award. I have followed Mr. Steele's accurate and nonpartisan reporting for many years and it has always been a source of regret to me that he is not carried by any of the newspapers in my district. I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Steele on receiving this great award and I salute him as a model for others in his profession. The January 24, 1964, issue of the Washington News showed rightful pride in announcing this award to one of its most distinguished contributors.

The article follows:

JACK STEELE CRACKS ANOTHER

Jack Steele, Washington political writer for the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, is an old hand at cracking exclusive stories. As a result, he has been awarded a number of top prizes.

He has just won another—the annual Ernie Pyle Memorial Award, worth $1,000 in cash and an engraved plaque. This was for the "magnificent" job (quoting the judges) he did last summer in his on-the-spot stories of the racial troubles in Alabama and Mississippi.

Jack is a first-class reporter in anybody's book—accurate, objective, diligent. So we take deep pride in this latest recognition.

We also happily salute Bill Porterfield of the Houston Chronicle (a competitor of the Scripps-Howard Houston Press). Mr. Porterfield won an identical prize (the Ernie Pyle Award was given in duplicate this year). We quote from the judges:

"He gets inside the characters about whom he writes. You finish reading his stories with the feeling that you really know these people. Ernie Pyle would have liked him."

Indeed, Ernie, we believe, would have been highly pleased with both men. We are.

Resolution by South Dakota Legislature in Appreciation of Senator Karl E. Mundt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the South Dakota Legislature expressing the appreciation of the people of South Dakota for the service of our distinguished senior Senator, KARL E. MUNDT:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of the people of South Dakota for the long, distinguished service of KARL E. MUNDT, senior Senator from South Dakota, in the Congress of the United States

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT, our senior Senator from South Dakota, has devoted 25 years in his life to the service of the people of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has served this State and Nation in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States and has achieved national recognition for his contribution to the growth, development and freedom of our State and Nation; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has earned the affection and esteem of his colleagues in the Congress of the United States and of the people of South Dakota as has been evidenced by the recent congratulatory expressions extended to him on the occasion of his 25th anniversary dinner at Madison, S. Dak.; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has never wavered from his devotion to principle and his selfless determination to promote the welfare of the people of South Dakota and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the people of South Dakota through their elected representatives in the Legislature of South Dakota, both houses concurring, do hereby express their appreciation for the long, distinguished, devoted and fearless service of KARL E. MUNDT and wish for him many more years of good health and humanitarian devotion to this State and Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to Senator MUNDT, and to each member of the congregational delegation from South Dakota.

Adopted by the senate, January 27, 1964.

Concurred in the house of representatives, February 4, 1964.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary, State Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

High Price Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the Army Times of February 12, 1964, with regard to the so-called quality stabilization bill as follows:

HIGH PRICE SCHEME

Congress is giving serious consideration to a bill which could wipe out every cent of the recently enacted military pay raise, and then some. That bill is S. 774, misnamed the "Quality Stabilization Act." As far as this newspaper can see, the measure has nothing whatever to do with quality, but it would have a great deal to do with the cost of virtually everything that Americans buy.

Basically, the bill would give certain businessmen the power to set minimum prices. It is proposed under the guise of enabling owners of well-advertised brands to maintain the quality of their products by guaranteeing that their stuff won't sell for too low a price, and proponents argue the bill won't necessarily mean a price increase.

This argument is pure horseradish, and we have the figures to prove it.

Wherever businesses have had the power to fix prices, the price has gone up. That's only natural; that's what people are in business for. Let's take some examples, provided to Congress last week by the U.S. Department of Justice:

An official New York study of liquor prices in New York, where every store must charge the same price for the same liquor, and the prices in Washington, D.C., where a businessman can charge whatever he wants, shows what price fixing can do. Jim Beam typically costs $3.49 a fifth in Washington, over $4.95 a fifth in New York (a difference of about 30 percent). Old Crow is $3.39 in Washington, $5.30 in New York. Comparing the 20 leading brands, the investigators found Washingtonians could buy the stuff cheaper in every case (taxes are about the same). As far as we know, liquor in New York has no better quality than liquor anywhere else; it just costs more.

Of course, lots of people don't drink, but they have the same stake in this bill now going through the congressional mill. Justice Department figures show that Prestone antifreeze costs about 20 percent less in competitive areas than it does in fair trade areas. A Sunbeam percolator costs 20 percent less in free areas, a Bulova watch is 23 percent cheaper. Savings are 31 percent for Alka-Seltzer, more than 6 percent for gasoline, flashbulbs about 14 percent, baby powder 19 percent, and so on.

Theoretically, PX's and commissaries should not be affected by fixed prices. But as a practical matter, on-post prices are bound to go up. Prices in the community would rise, and the PX's would have to follow suit. Raising the price of a bottle of aspirin in the PX certainly wouldn't boost the aspirin's quality.

Right now, says a Justice Department official, there are 150 pending antitrust cases, and about half of them involve price-fixing. S. 774 would legalize, facilitate, or encourage the same practice that the Government now is trying to wipe out.

On top of that, a long line of State court decisions indicates there are some serious constitutional questions raised by S. 774.

It would be a shocking thing if the Government, which is supposed to be responsive to the people, were to ask for the power to fix prices. Yet the pending bill would give that power to a few thousand men and women who are responsible only to themselves and their stockholders.

A Government attorney testifying before a Senate Commerce Subcommittee summed it up last week when he said:

"The bill might more aptly be named 'The Consumer High Price Act.' In our view, it is bad legislation."

And whatever happened to free enterprise?

A Profile in Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, LOUIS WYMAN, made a superb, forceful, and courageous defense of the Constitution on Monday. I have never heard a more timely or dynamic oration.

His defense of the Constitution is refreshing and stimulating. This House can be proud of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

I commend to the attention of the country an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, February 12, very significantly on Lincoln's birthday—the great emancipator and defender of human rights:

A LEGISLATOR SPEAKS OUT ON RIGHTS—SAYS MEASURE WOULDN'T WIN 50 VOTES IF HOUSE TOOK SECRET BALLOT TODAY

(By David Lawrence)

Ninety-eight years ago—after the Civil War was over—an intolerant majority in Congress disregarded the Constitution, took away seats from duly elected Members of the House and Senate, and sent troops to certain States to compel the legislatures, at bayonet point, to ratify the 14th amendment to the Constitution. A Civil Rights Act was subsequently passed, and the Supreme Court later declared it unconstitutional.

Today, nearly a century later, a frightened if not terrorized majority in the House of Representatives—stampeded by nationwide demonstrations that have often led to violence—has passed a so-called civil rights bill which actually takes away some important civil rights from the citizens.

If the Senate now should pass the same bill as the House did, a Federal police force would be authorized to enter any kind of business—not just hotels or restaurants—and investigate whether its hiring or promotion of employees is conducted on the basis of racial or religious discrimination.

Although the measure passed the House by a vote of 290 to 130, Representative WYMAN, Republican, of New Hampshire, says that if a secret ballot were taken in the House, the legislation wouldn't get 50 votes. Mr. WYMAN was formerly attorney general of his State and also was president of the National Association of Attorneys General. He was twice elected chairman of the standing committee on jurisprudence of the American Bar Association. Here are some extracts from a significant speech he delivered this week to the House of Representatives:

"This legislation makes a mockery of the Constitution. To yield to pressure for an unconstitutional law because of sympathy for social injustice is to say that the end justifies the means * * *.

"I came here to uphold the Constitution, not to destroy it. To uphold it, I am compelled to vote against this bill * * *.

"It means finally that there is no power in this Congress to legislate as is here proposed in regard to private lives, private business, and individual activity within and among the several States having nothing to do with interstate commerce and not constituting State action.

"And it is the sheerest hypocrisy to contend that by so defining such private conduct that it becomes constitutionally amenable to Federal law when the power to enact the law was never given to the Federal Government in the Constitution. It is hypocrisy compounded by fraud upon the people to ignore these basic truths because some Members believe there are more votes for their reelection to be found in perpetuating the fraud than in protecting the constitutional rights of the people—all the people, both white and colored, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and disbeliever * * *.

"There are still many private rights in America that under our Constitution are beyond the power of Government to regulate, and one of these is the right to pick and choose one's associates, one's friends, and one's customers in private business * * *.

"The passage of unconstitutional legislation in the face of political pressure, contrary to oath to support the Constitution, on the basis that the end justifies the means, is a perversion of our function as responsible legislators * * *.

"A vote here for this bill is a vote against the proper interests and reserved rights of the American people, not a vote for them. Make no mistake about one thing—that we are dealing with an iceberg here. Nine-tenths of public opinion on this legislation has never been shown on the surface. When people realize what an invasion of their private rights is here involved—and they will come to realize it as time goes by should this ever become law—we can rest assured that as surely as there will be an 89th Congress a vote in favor of this bill will come back to haunt those who did so * * *.

"It should be clearly understood in this connection that what is here sought to be regulated is private business. These are not federally run establishments nor even State owned or operated. They are privately owned—maybe even by you or me or our next door neighbor, be he or she black or white * * *.

"We have never subscribed, even by the Founding Fathers, to a Constitution that ever gave to the Federal Government the power to say by decree that if we want to engage in business for a profit we must so manage the business as not to be discriminating in our choice of customers. Heaven forbid such doctrine, or yet another rock in the foundation of free enterprise will have been shattered by representatives of a government that itself grew to giant stature and strength in a competitive world through that very same free enterprise * * *.

"If we do not stand up and be counted in this Chamber for what we know is legally required by the Constitution of the United States of America, then what are we preserving? Do we have majority rule in this land or don't we? Are we to abdicate our responsibilities as Congressmen to satisfy a minority pressure that urges that out of sympathy and a record of social injustice—because regulation by Congress of those States that have failed to regulate is a desirable end—that we should with this legislation say 'Damn the Constitution. Full speed ahead'? Of course not."

Tribute to Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 12, was the 218th anniversary of the birth of the great Polish hero, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Kosciuszko, however, is a hero known and loved by more than the Polish people. Wherever men love freedom, wherever men fight and suffer and endure for national independence and individual liberties, the name of Kosciuszko is, and will always be, an inspiration to young and old, and a beacon light of courage.

Kosciuszko was inspired to his deeds of valor in the Polish struggle for freedom and in the American Revolution by his youthful reading of Plutarch's "Lives of the Greeks and Romans." For us, today, he stands enshrined among those, his favorite heroes of antiquity. The inspiration the young Polish boy took from his reading of the deeds and triumphs of men of old, is paralleled today by the inspiration our young people take from the heroism of our gallant warriors of the American Revolution, among whom Kosciuszko ranks high.

The contribution of Kosciuszko to the American cause was so substantial, in

widely differing spheres of military activity, that he can justly be counted among the architects of the final victory at Yorktown. His first accomplishment, the fortifying of the Delaware River, in 1776, facilitated the defense of Philadelphia in the first period of the war. The failure of General Gates to take Kosciuszko's advice and fortify Mount Defiance is considered to have caused the loss of Ticonderoga. Soon after Burgoyne had taken Ticonderoga from the Americans, however, Kosciuszko was able both to select a battlefield and plan the fortifications, contributing greatly to the brilliant victory of Saratoga. For 2 years then, from 1778 to 1780, he was in charge of the planning and construction of the fortifications defending the strategic post of West Point, from which task he was summoned to join Gates and then Nathanael Greene in the southern campaign. Greene's retreat before Cornwallis' forces in the campaign of 1781, which has been termed "masterly," and which resulted ultimately in Cornwallis' being lodged, in a constricted and powerless position, on the peninsula between the York and the James Rivers—this masterly retreat by Greene is to be attributed in large part to the skillful planning and swift execution of movements by the army's transportation services, under Kosciuszko's direction. In the subsequent campaign near Charleston, S.C., he gained distinction as a dashing leader of cavalry, and was one of the first to enter Charleston after its evacuation by the British.

It is good to remember, in contrast to the tragedy of Poland's desperate and unsuccessful struggle for freedom under Kosciuszko's leadership, that this brave leader had, here in America, his share in a glorious victory and complete triumph, and that he enjoyed, later, the experience of public receptions and reunions with old friends in America, and that Congress, for once giving a hero his due during his lifetime, appropriated $15,000 for him, and made him a land grant of 500 acres in Ohio.

Americans of Polish ancestry are proud to claim the patriotic hero, Kosciuszko, as foremost among Polish contributions to the glorious traditions of this country. From his history, and the history of other Poles who have come to America, the Polish people have learned to expect here a warm welcome, equal opportunity, and the national and individual freedom that fate has so long and so cruelly denied to their homeland.

From century to century, and from generation to generation, the Poles have contributed to the defense and the building of America, and have attained honor and fame among us. The high place of Brigadier General Kosciuszko in the Continental Army is paralleled today by the presence of a Polish American in the Cabinet—John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General. Patriotic service to America, in peace and in war, is the tradition handed down from Kosciuszko to today's Americans of Polish descent. May this spirit never die.

"The American Way"—Address of Conrad Woelfel, National President of the Workmen's Benefit Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this year the Workmen's Benefit of the United States of America celebrates its 80th anniversary. Founded by a group of German-American immigrants to provide mutual help in times of economic crisis, this fraternal society has grown through the ensuing years to become one of the most active and respected organizations of this type in our Nation. I am proud that its two largest branches, Nos. 91 and 92, have their headquarters in the 20th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. I want to call my colleagues attention to an important address made before a meeting of its national executive board, meeting in New York City on January 30, 1964, by Conrad Woelfel, national president of the Workmen's Benefit Fund:

THE AMERICAN WAY

Grover Cleveland was the Democratic candidate for President for President, James Blaine the Republican candidate, and New York City was recovering from a disastrous financial panic, when a small group of German immigrants met in October 1884, and formed the General Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of New York City and Vicinity, a fraternal benefit society founded to provide mutual assistance in times of illness or death.

Today, the outgrowth of that small group, not the Workmen's Benefit Fund, is entering upon its 80th year. Its membership has grown from a dozen founders to over 50,000, with branches in 22 States. During the first year, it paid out $150 in benefits to its members; last year almost $1.25 million was paid. During the past 79 years, it has paid out over $44 million in hospital, surgical, medical, disability, and death benefits.

THE BEGINNING

The story begins—like the American story—with a group of men who sought political asylum. With their families they fled the oppressive laws of Germany under Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, in the 1880's. They came to the United States. They came as freemen—machinists, cigarmakers, and other skilled craftsmen, to work and to raise their families in freedom. A major part of that freedom is the right of men to organize to protect themselves from political tyranny, from economic exploitation, from the poverty which follows upon the sickness or death of the family's provider.

Wage earners in the 1880's could not fall back upon savings, as their paychecks were small. Neither was there any aid from the Government, or organized charity, to which they might turn. On September 24, 1884, a group of those exiled German workers met for the purpose of forming an association which would protect its members in times of sickness or death. Scandals had brought the established profitmaking insurance companies into disrepute. "Order of the day," the minutes of that meeting read, "self-help." Less than a month later, on October 19, 1884, that association was founded—the General Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of New York City and Vicinity.

The beginnings were modest enough; payments to begin when the organization had 75 members; weekly sick benefits of from $6 to $9; a death benefit of $75. These payments seem insignificant in the light of today's wages and the cost of living, but it should be remembered that 70 years ago $7 a week was the salary of a skilled workingman. Only a few months after the establishment of the society, it was faced with a dramatic challenge. Two members died. The $150 needed in death benefits had not yet been collected in the treasury. Had the society failed its members in that crisis, it could not have survived. But the enterprising treasurer raised the money by borrowing from friends. The death benefits were paid, and the society's reputation for honesty and reliability was thereby established.

The membership rolls expanded. By 1887 there were four branches with 527 members. By the end of 1888 there were 733 members and 15 branches in 3 States—New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. Growth was so rapid and so extensive that the society's name had to be changed to include the wider territory; it was now called—Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of North America. (The designation "North" was later dropped.) After 1888, sick benefits were extended to 26 weeks, with another 25 weeks at half benefit, and death benefits were raised from the original $75 to $150 in 1888 and $250 in 1891.

With such rapid growth, there was a sharp need for new administrative machinery. The small group of German workmen who founded the society had provided a completely democratic organization, and the organization proved flexible enough to meet the needs of expansion. Headquarters were expanded, too—from a small office on East Fourth Street at $6 a month to a store at $12, and by 1889 the society leased larger quarters in the Metropolitan Savings Bank Building on Third Avenue, which remained its home until 1930 when it moved into its own building at 714 Seneca Avenue in Brooklyn.

The problem of coordinating the activities of the member branches with the main administration was met and solved by holding a convention. The first was held in November 1892 and there all branches were represented. A second convention met in 1895 and a third in 1898. In 1898 the national executive board applied for incorporation of the society. There were now 161 branches in 21 States and over 20,000 members. Eminent personalities began to join the organization, among them the genius in the field of electricity, Charles Steinmetz, who for a time was the financial secretary of one of its branches, Daniel Hoan and Jasper McLevy, many-term mayor of Milwaukee and Bridgeport, respectively.

By 1905, the society had grown so large that it needed its own publication to spread news of its activities to its membership. At the convention of that year, a motion was passed authorizing the publication of a paper, Solidarity. Its first issue appeared in April 1906 and it has since been published regularly over half a century as the official organ of the society. Its policy was stated clearly in that first issue: "Our paper shall be a means of enlightenment and conciliation. Its best efforts will be given to that great work of culture: the winning of the workers to the goal which we must set for ourselves * * *. Enlightenment, teaching, education are the prerequisites."

WORLD WAR I HARASSMENT AND AID TO GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

The workmen's sick and death benefit fund, having been founded by German immigrants, remained essentially German in composition in its early years. Its convention of 1910

proposed, among other things, the organization of English-speaking branches. During World War I, the society, like all German-American groups of the times, was subjected to a certain amount of harassment by self-styled superpatriots. Its loyalty to America, however, was never questioned, and the society grew in strength during the War. Soon after World War I, the U.S. Department of Labor asked the society for permission to scan its records for statistical purposes, because the organization's sick benefit figures were, at that time, practically the only source of health insurance statistics. The society gladly cooperated with various Government agencies, for it had been an early advocate of a system of Government-run social security. Even today, the society is urging broader coverage and higher benefits under the social security laws.

POSTWAR EXPANSION AND THE DEPRESSION

The postwar period was one of expansion and consolidation for the society. In 1928, the organization adopted new additions to its benefit structure; women could now join the sick benefit group, and children were also admitted to the society. Membership rose to a new peak in 1929. In 1934, when it celebrated its 50th anniversary, it could look back with satisfaction over its half century with the knowledge that it had survived war, labor unrest, and the great depression. During the period of great unemployment, its relief fund had helped thousands of members to survive. No person was dropped from membership for nonpayment of dues, so that regardless of the members' economic condition, they were eligible for benefits in times of sickness and distress.

OPPOSITION TO TOTALITARIANISM

In a new era, which recognized the rights and duties of men to organize in their own interests for their security and protection, the society moved ahead steadily. In 1939 at the 18th convention, its name was officially changed to the workmen's benefit fund. Once again, as it had done many times before, the workmen's benefit fund asserted its firm opposition to fascism, nazism, and communism, "with their intolerance, hatred, persecution, and destruction of culture, freedom, and peace." At this convention, too, the medical care and hospital plan was adopted on a national basis, following the institution of similar services by local branches a few years earlier.

The workmen's benefit fund continued to expand its activities and its services to members. The 20th national convention of 1943 set up a life insurance program of regular and endowment policies. The emergency relief fund had been greatly strengthened and is constantly being used to help member families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods or other disasters. District committees were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, of course, also engaged in social and educational activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health purposes. Many branches provide general practitioner care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.

By 1959, the membership had greatly expanded—embracing all economic groups, ethnic and national backgrounds, and religious faiths—with branches in 22 States and the District of Columbia. Its economic strength was reflected not only in the reports of its activities by the insurance department of the State of New York, which carefully supervises fraternal societies, but in such increased services to members as providing life insurance policies up to $25,000 and the addition of major medical coverage.

With its membership a representative cross-section of American citizens, the organization continued its opposition to all forms of totalitarianism. Publication of a photograph of a 14-year-old Hungarian Freedom Fighter on the cover of Solidarity—soon after the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian rebellion—reflected the membership's violent disapproval of Communist imperialism and the subjugation of free peoples. Many of the new WBF members were refugees from Communist oppression and they needed no reminder that democracy was still the finest form of government.

And it was entirely fitting that at its 25th national convention, held in New York City the week of June 1, 1963, that the Workmen's Benefit Fund opened a nationwide campaign to raise funds to erect an international interfaith memorial to the victims of Nazi persecution by making the first contribution to the American Committee for the Dachau Memorial. At this same convention, the delegates strongly endorsed a program of medical care for the aged through social security and the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps.

Over the years of growth there have been many changes, but the fundamental structure of the Workmen's Benefit Fund has remained unchanged. The editor of its magazine Solidarity reiterated briefly just what their organization means to all its members: "In itself, the society is a very sober-minded affair, a purely protective institution, organized for self-help on a nonprofit basis. The very purpose gives the organization its idealistic aims. For this reason, progressive thinking men and women of all national origins, and of all occupations, can be active in the Workmen's Benefit Fund as they are active in political, educational, and economic organizations."

One for Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit, Mich., Free Press of Thursday, January 23, 1964, condemning the so-called quality stabilization bill which will gouge consumers, ruin small businessmen, make a shambles of the antitrust laws and peril the free competitive economic system which has made America great:

ONE FOR YOUR CONGRESSMAN

The quality brands people keep slugging along—futilely, we hope.

Latest of their offerings to come to hand is a speech by John W. Anderson, who, besides being an auto parts maker, is president of Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.

His talk makes it appear that American housewives are predominantly against being able to find bargains. Having known quite a few housewives, we doubt this exceedingly.

In case you're not up on the quality brands bit, it is the latest mislabeling of a push to put across a Federal price-fixing bill. The prices would be fixed by manufacturers and no merchant would be able to lop off a few dollars or pennies.

It would take the competition out of retailing. For a given kind of merchandise, it wouldn't matter where you went. For the consumer there would be no sharing of skillful management's benefits.

For instance, if a merchant ran his store so well that he could make an entirely satisfactory 2 cents by selling a given brand of toothpaste at 39 cents, he'd be forced willy-nilly to take a 4-cent profit (2 cents of it unnecessarily taken out of your fiscal hide) if the quality brands price happened to be fixed at 41 cents.

There is a congressional election this fall. If you're interested in where your money goes, ask the candidates where they stand on this price-fixing legislation in a new disguise. If you vote for anybody who says he's for it, you'll be voting for an increase in your household bills.

The Objectives of House Concurrent Resolution 66

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in freedom for the small Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Because of my interest, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 66 in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As Lithuanian Independence Day is being commemorated by the Congress this week, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the objectives of House Concurrent Resolution 66, which I hope can be passed during this session:

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the question of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

Safe Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in 1959 I first introduced legislation for the establishing of safety standards for automobiles sold in interstate commerce. I introduced this bill again in the 86th Congress when it passed the House but failed to pass the Senate. During the 87th Congress the bill was again introduced by me and, again passed the House and failed to pass in the Senate. In this Congress I again introduced the bill, H.R. 1341. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported the bill out of committee and it is currently on the Union Calendar awaiting House action which I am hopeful can be taken soon.

The State of Massachusetts found this program of such importance that legislation has been introduced in the State legislature calling for a code of minimum safety standards for motor vehicles. Certainly this is a step in the right direction and I am hopeful and will encourage other States to follow this lead.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the proposed legislation introduced in the Massachusetts State Legislature:

CODE OF MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Legislation filed by Senator Francis X. McCann, of Cambridge, and the Massachusetts Division of the American Automobile Association:

"*Resolved*, That an unpaid special commission, to consist of two members of the senate, three members of the house of representatives, and registrar of motor vehicles, the commissioner of public safety, and two persons to be appointed by the Governor is hereby authorized and directed to make a thorough study of the safety utility of current motor vehicle design, of devices developed by research and experimental groups, and to evaluate these matters for the purpose of developing a code of minimum safety standards for the manufacture of motor vehicles to be sold within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Said commission shall, not later than December 31, 1964, report to the general court the results of its study, together with legislative recommendations drawn up as a proposed code of minimum safety standards for motor vehicle design and construction.

"The commission's findings and recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, a consideration of the following motor vehicle design features:

"1. Padded headrests to prevent whiplash injury.

"2. Design of seats moulded to person's natural pressure distribution.

"3. Securely fastened seat cushions.

"4. Backrests which can be secured in an upright position, when the back is designed to be lowered for easy access to the back seat.

"5. Seats adjustable for height so that drivers of all sizes can have clear forward vision.

"6. 180° forward visibility area from driver's seat.

"7. Removal of tinted windshields.

"8. Use of only hardened glass, not laminated.

"9. Constant radius of curvature in window glass to avoid distortion.

"10. Fuller sweep design of windshield wipers.

"11. Rear windshield wipers and defrosters.

"12. Ensolite of equivalent padding wherever impact is most frequent—visor, dash, header area and the like.

"13. Recessing or removal of all projecting knobs or instrument controls which could be a dangerous point of impact.

"14. Inside door locks controllable from front seat (against children's tampering).

"15. Ceiling lights recessed.

"16. Roof padded on inside to protect against head injuries.

"17 Rollover strength in roof.

"18. Strengthened wall between trunk and rear seat and attachments to secure trunk contents so that objects carried there will not become missiles into the passenger compartment in the even of collision.

"19. Visual and auditory speed warnings on the speedometer.

"20. Fuel monitor light to indicate dangerously low fuel level.

"21. Illumination of dash instruments at night by read light of appropriate level of intensity to protect the driver's night vision.

"22. Dark painted dashboards to reduce glare and reflections.

"23. Automatic light dimmer switch (similar to autronic eye).

"24. Shape coding of knobs and handles so they can be distinguished by feel.

"25. Hydraulic steering.

"26. Standby mechanical steering system on vehicle having power steering.

"27. Fail-safe braking system, involving two separate, independent braking systems for front and rear wheels.

"28. Telescoping steering shafts.

"29. Deep-dish steering wheels with appropriate energy absorbing design.

"30. Standardization of shift lever patterns on both automatic and manual shift mechanisms.

"31. Exhaust pipe positioned so carbon-monoxide fumes are not exhausted under or drawn under car.

"32. Automatic carbon-monoxide detector.

"33. Air intake to passenger compartment near to top car (carbon-monoxide avoidance).

"34. Passenger compartment air exhaust near top of car.

"35. Engineering of cars and trucks so that no interference exists in driving actions, as brake and accelerator too close or wheel too close to body.

"36. Rigid bumper backup plate with energy absorbing material between it and the bumper.

"37. Complete wraparound bumpers rigidly attached to frame and having energy absorbing padding.

"38. Use of steel of adequate strength for the body of vehicles, reinforced with adequate framework, so that vehicles will not so readily collapse or fold up in collision.

"39. Recessed door handles.

"40. Colored rear light indicator when foot leaves gas pedal.

"41. Bumpers shaped smoothly.

"42. Rounded hood to protect pedestrians.

"43. No headlight shades or sharp hood ornaments (pedestrian protection).

"44. Light under the car to silhouette at night for easy visibility.

"45. Improved front suspension systems designed to keep wear to a minimum and development of lubricants which will not wash away or run out, further increasing wear and metal fatigue.

"Said commission shall be provided with quarters in the State house or elsewhere, may hold public hearings, and invite individuals to testify and shall have the power to employ such consultants and professional and research organizations as may be necessary and to incur such expenses as may be necessary for carrying out the purpose of this resolve."

No Bargain Counter Solutions in Foreign Policy, Delaware Junior Chamber of Commerce Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the world has shrunk so much in terms of communications and travel that a news dispatch originating today 10,000 miles away, many time in a country little known, and whose existence has hardly heretofore been considered important to the welfare of the 180 million people of our country, can signal a violent explosion in world affairs and all too often may be related to a failure of U.S. foreign policy. In these circumstances it is inevitable, perhaps, that many well-intentioned newspaper columnists, editorial writers, and just plain, ordinary citizens would offer what might, with justice, be called bargain counter solutions to the difficult problems facing our Nation. What is becoming increasingly clear, however, is that there are no simple solutions in the conduct of foreign policy. We must constantly bear this in mind. Too often in the past when other nations have adopted bargain counter solutions, almost always the results have proved to be disastrous.

I include here the text of a speech I delivered to the Delaware Junior Chamber of Commerce meeting in New Castle, Del., Sunday, February 9, 1964:

THE KIND OF WORLD WE SEEK IS THE ONLY KIND IN WHICH THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY CAN BE ASSURED TO OUR POSTERITY

(By Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Congressman at large from Delaware)

There are more foreign policy experts on the national scene today than in those periods of American history immediately after World War I and again after World War II, when the only objective of American foreign policy was not to become entangled in any involvement abroad.

The complexity of our involvement in the field of international relations today is best exemplified by the few "bargain counter" solutions that are offered by most of the so-called foreign policy experts. This applies to those in government, to newspaper columnists, editorial writers, and just plain ordinary citizens. The volume of words describing the problems is, nevertheless, indicative of the magnitude of our involvement.

At no time in recent years has this become more self-evident than by a reading of the public press in the past several months. From Vietnam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Burma, and Laos we travel tens of thousands of miles across the globe to Ghana, Zanzibar, Tanganyika, back to Berlin, and across the Atlantic to Panama and Cuba. A news dispatch originating 10,000 miles away, many times in a country little known and whose existence is hardly heretofore considered to be important to the welfare of the 180 million people of our country, signals a violent explosion in world affairs and is all too often related to a failure of U.S. foreign policy.

Whether we like it or not, in the eyes of the rest of the world, and in the community of nations, the United States stands alone today as the only major power not weakened by war or burdened by the heritage of an imperialistic history. And as the realities of the cold war confrontations have unfolded over these past decades, the realization that we were opposed by another nation equally considered, in some areas of the world, to be a giant nation, we have been compelled to accept the challenge of Russian Communist imperialism. To counter the thrust of an undeclared war we have sought to extend the protection of a U.S. military shield to large areas of the world undefended by former colonial powers. At the same time, we have taken up the equally necessary task of providing the new nations with technical and economic assistance to help them raise their standards of living so that, like us, they too, could advance the cause of freemen.

The need for a leading world power to consider each problem in the context of total world responsibility necessarily imposes restraints upon the exercise of power—restraints that we sometimes find frustrating. A nation such as ours cannot make decisions in one part of the world without setting precedents in another. It must at all times be sensitive to the impact of the concentric waves that flow out from any decision it may make.

Because of this fact, we cannot always move with the simple directness that delights our taste for action. If we move abruptly in one part of the world—even though it may be satisfying to our national soul—we may do vast mischief to the fabric of our relations at vital points elsewhere.

Restraint to this same degree is not always felt by powers that play a more limited role in world affairs. Because their interests are geographically restricted, they often do not feel the same high degree of concern for the implications or repercussions of their actions.

Nonetheless, actions taken by one Atlantic nation in disregard of the obligations of total world responsibility can be both self-defeating and destructive. And if, in fact, members of the Atlantic Community persistently pursue courses of action that ignore the realities of interdependence, the effective policies of the Atlantic nations will be reduced to their lowest—and weakest—common denominator.

In President Johnson's words, we seek "a world of peace and justice, of freedom and abundance, for our time and for all time to come."

That is the kind of world which, we believe, most of mankind desires. That is the ultimate objective of our partnership with the economically advanced nations of the Atlantic and the Pacific. It is the ultimate objective of our assistance to the less developed nations—each of which, as it moves forward economically and socially and becomes more stable politically, adds to the total strength of the free world. It is the ultimate objective which causes us to try to improve and strengthen, bit by bit, a network of international institutions—some regional, some specialized, and, most comprehensive of all, the United Nations.

Such a world can be achieved only by unremitting effort. And at every stage it must be protected from the assaults of those who would impose on the human race a form of society that is both brutal and inefficient.

The kind of world we seek is the only kind in which the blessings of liberty can be assured to our posterity. It can be achieved if we, and all others who aspire to this goal—work intelligently and unceasingly at the task of building it.

Preparedness for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last summer when I managed the fallout shelter bill on this floor I compared the concept of civil defense to that of an insurance policy. We hope we never have to use this type of insurance, but it is abundantly wise to have the protection.

Now we have in this great Nation a few harpies, scolds, and professional cynics who have built a veritable career by assailing civil defense. Civil defense has replaced the mother-in-law as the standby for shopworn jokes and crude generalizations.

Therefore, it is a pleasure to plant a few kernels of logic amidst this corn of current usage. The Forum, a publication of the National Institute for Disaster Mobilization, contained a brief article in its January 1964 issue, and I commend this to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows herewith:

PREPAREDNESS FOR WHAT?

In this day of peace overtures and disarmament, of budget and personnel reductions and economies, of an alternately cold-hot war, and countless other problems which beset the Nation and every one of us, those concerned with preparedness are often prompted to wonder whether their efforts are futile, and "Preparedness for what?"

The current situation with regard to civil defense and emergency planning, in their broadest terms, appears quite futile. One notes that the Congress fails to take steps to provide operational funds for programs of even the most basic nature, despite the fact that there is an established Federal responsibility, by congressional edict. OEP has suffered a serious reduction in funds and personnel in its appropriations; and we can see no early action with regard to OCD appropriations. Even the Congress itself appears uncertain of what needs to be done and how much to spend.

Despite all of this there are thoughtful individuals in communities and industries who continue their efforts to maintain some semblance of a reasonable degree of preparedness. Preparedness for what? Many are convinced that regardless of whether we need wartime civil defense and emergency planning for the postattack period, there will always be real values in prepardness for coping with peacetime disasters of all types and magnitudes. There remains that pioneer spirit of America which calls for personal initiative and the assumption of individual responsibilities for national survival, for which they are willing to pay personally.

There are companies which deem emergency planning or industrial defense, or disaster control as essential elements of their normal corporate responsibilities and day-to-day operational functions.

Preparedness for what? In a nationwide telecast on December 14, following the Los Angeles flood disaster, Mayor Samuel Yorty said: "The department of water and power, which built this dam, is insured to the extent of $14 million, so that if we are liable, the people will receive, of course, the benefit of the insurance. * * * During the emergency we were fortunate that the area was relatively small, because of the fact that the Los Angeles City Council has all but abolished our central Civil Defense organization. This handicapped us somewhat in communications and handling people who were made refugees by the flood. It should be a good lesson to other cities who were thinking of scrapping their civil defense and disaster organizations, because you can never tell when these things are going to happen—when they do, you need trained people and ready plans."

Preparedness for what? On January 16, the press carried a news item quoting the commander of the Soviet land forces, urging "the creation of special shelters to protect citizens against radiation and giving instructions on the protection of exposed parts of the body and respiration." He also urged "provisions to protect animals, food, and water," and said "procedures should be planned for ministering to the wounded after an all-out attack." On January 19, U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara stated, looking into the 1970's, that "the greatest increase in military threats from Soviet Russia will be in nuclear-powered submarines and long-range reconnaissance and attack capabilities." He also said, "I believe this Nation is wealthy enough to buy whatever defense we require to maintain our security."

Preparedness for what—by whom? Preparedness is a broad subject, encompassing many areas, placing responsibilities in many places. While it is definitely an important Government responsibility, it can never be fully effective without the sharing of responsibility by all of us. Preparedness must be considered, planned for, and initiated by companies, communities, and individuals if there is to be survival assurance, regardless of whether it be a major local catastrophe or an all-out enemy attack.

NIDM feels that the strongest impetus for effective preparedness planning can result from corporate initiative. Companies should examine their own vulnerabilities, problems of survival and recovery, responsibilities to: themselves and their stockholders and owners, to their employees, suppliers and customers, to the communities in which they are located, and to the Nation of which they are a part. Such thinking is a definite corporate and management responsibility which cannot be shirked, if we do not wish to rue the day we failed to consider survival for what—by whom?

The Alamedan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Times Star of Alameda, Calif., an article appeared which I found very nostalgic.

This article described an important part of life that is now but a memory. Before television screens were in every home, the recreational pastime for all of us was the local movie.

The comedy, tragedy, and romance of the dramatic presentations of the celluloid world of make-believe helped us to forget for a while the human misery of a terrible depression as well as the terrible years of war. The anticipation of going to the movies and the enjoyment of the 2 or so hours spent there including the ice cream, popcorn, soda pop, and bubble gum is something none of us will ever forget as this facet of our way of life is unfortunately fading into history.

I believe the following article is a fine tribute to the local movie theater and the wonderful entertainment it offered:

[From the Alameda (Calif.) Times-Star, Jan. 23, 1964]

THE ALAMEDAN

(By Everett Johannes)

On Judy Garland's television show the other night, Ken Murray showed some films of the Hollywood stars at play. They were all there—Jean Harlow with her fabulous platinum blonde hair; Gable, with the dimple, and Carole Lombard, of the high, high forehead.

An watching those stars of the fabled movie era, quite a number of Alamedans must have thought back on the old days at the Alameda Theater. For going to the Alameda Theater, you see, used to be a way of life.

Ah, the Alameda Theater in the days when movie stars were a hotter news topic than the cold war.

They used to give away monthly programs to hang on your wall so you always knew what was coming in the weeks ahead * * *. There were always seats on the aisle reserved for the hard of hearing, and when the people put on the earphones, sometimes you could hear the echo if you sat in the seat directly behind.

There was a Mickey Mouse Club. As kids, we all signed up and on our birthdays, the Alameda Theater manager—that man who always wore a tuxedo in the evenings—would send us two free passes to the Saturday matinee * * *.

The Alameda Theater.

Regular admission was 35 cents, kids with student body cards were admitted for a quarter, and children under 6 got in free.

There was Bank Night and Ten-O-Win and other gimmicks to draw the depression crowds in. And well known youngsters, to earn junior prom money, served as ushers in flaming red jackets. The lads who took a turn at the entrance, tearing your ticket in half and giving you back the stub, included Bob Crown, Hugh O'Neil and Ralph Bardoff.

"Let's go to the movies."

And the high school girls used to go to weep. They wept bucketfuls when the cruel Mrs. Danvers urged Joan Fontaine to jump out a window in "Rebecca." They wept, too, when Katharine Hepburn sat on a window seat and looked out at the moonlit night in "Little Women." And they cried as they've never cried before when Paul Henreid put two cigarettes in his mouth and lighted them—one for himself and one for the reigning favorite of the ladies, Miss Bette Davis.

The Alameda Theater was really in its glory when popcorn wasn't sold in the lobby—you had to dart out to the sweet shop next door between the features. And everyone went across the street, after the show, to have a cone at the Alameda Dairy.

In the afternoon, the ladies used to go to the matinees. Their favorites were Irene Dunne, as the kept woman, in "Back Street," and Vivien Leigh, as the fallen woman, in "Waterloo Bridge," and Helen Hayes, dying in her lover's arms, in "A Farewell to Arms." And the ladies at the matinees, as often as not, included Mrs. Edna Giffen, of Fernside; and Mayme Dunleavy, of the well-known West End family, and Mrs. Henry Wichman, of the Adelphian Club.

The movies at the Alameda.

The newsreel came to an end and the camera swung around on you and proclaimed: "The Eyes and Ears of the World." The colored travelogs always closed: "And so we say goodbye to the pearl of the Emerald Isles."

In the lobby you saw everybody and anybody. There were the Winthrop J. Branscheids, with their daughters. And the Frank Weedens with their sons. There was Dr. Ben Neff of the East Side, and Dr. John Bajuk of the West Side.

The water in the fountain in the lobby was always cold, going down. There was always a mother roaming up and down the aisles, looking for some child who had stayed in the show too long. There was also always a little kid leading a littler kid up the aisle and toward the restroom. And there was always, always a woman with a sobbing infant. Whenever the picture got good, the child cried, but would the mother take it out—No.

"Save me a seat on aisle 3," used to be the cry.

The movies.

The stars, in those golden days, were Will Rogers, Marie Dressler, and Shirley Temple. A far cry, you'll agree, from today's Liz Taylor.

"Coming next week," the trailer used to proclaim.

Action. Romance. Thrills.

Then you'd get flashes of the next attraction—Garbo wrapping a turban around her head in "The Painted Veil," Merle Oberon running over the moors in "Wuthering Heights," Wallace Berry being lovable in "The Champ."

"Don't miss it," the preview told us.

And we Alamedans never did.

Panama Canal: Symbol of Breakdown in Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the expertly directed operations for conquest by communistic revolutionary strategists at widely separated focal points, the Panama Canal, as the key target in the Caribbean and Latin America, has attracted world attention and become a symbol for a breakdown in one of the oldest principles in international law—avoidance of interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

An able discussion by David Lawrence of the failure of Government in regard to such focal points of conflict as Panama published in the January 31, 1964, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., warns that unless our policies are based on fundamental principles instead of expedient improvisations, the resulting situation will create a world chaos that will bring about the big war that all seek to avoid.

In connection with the question as to what is the law in respect to the Panama Canal, this subject has been ably presented with comprehensive documentation in many scholarly addresses in the House by my most distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. Editors, writers, commentators, and students of all nations, who seek basic facts with respect to the Panama Canal rather than trivia, should consult his addresses and supply to our people the views and conclusions that this eminent authority has so brilliantly set forth.

The indicated article by David Lawrence follows:

DIFFICULTIES FOR THE UNITED STATES: ENFORCING OF INTERNATIONAL LAW SEEN NEEDED BY WEST TO AVERT CHAOS

(By David Lawrence)

Troubles are multiplying all over the world for the U.S. Government, which still refuses to look facts in the face and instead follows a policy of wishful thinking and avoidance of realistic truths.

For the biggest single fact is that, whether in South Vietnam or Cyprus or Berlin or Africa or Cuba or Panama, the hand of evil is communistic and is directed by the Kremlin.

Although the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Southeast Asia Alliance are supposed to hold things together against Russia and Red China, another unpleasant fact is that a major partner in both alliances—France—has just broken away. This helped to cause the overthrow of the government in South Vietnam, where the fear had developed that French intimacy with the Red Chinese would, by the deceptive process of "neutralization," hand the country over to the Communists.

Yet, in the midst of such intrigue, the United States maintains 15,500 troops in South Vietnam, where already more than 100 Americans have lost their lives and many others have been wounded. About $1.5 million a day is the cost to the taxpayers of this country.

Why are the American military forces in South Vietnam? The official answer is that they are present at the request of the South Vietnam Government. But there have been three governments in succession in recent months in that country, and it is evident that the United States has become involved almost inextricably in the internal affairs of Vietnam on the pretext that this is necessary to hold the Communists in check and preserve world peace.

But as the Communist apparatus spreads its operations throughout the world and meddles in Cuba, in Panama, and in other Latin American countries, as well as in Africa and Asia, the main culprit—the Soviet Government—is treated as if no crime has been committed anywhere. Subversion by the Communists is denounced and infiltration condemned, but the United States continues futile talkfests in Geneva on the subject of disarmament, even as the Russians themselves refuse to take the word of the American Government that an unarmed training plane strayed across a boundary. There is not the slightest sign of the mutual

trust and good faith so essential to any successful negotiation between civilized governments.

Meanwhile, the involvement of America in distant lands grows more and more extensive every day. President Johnson has been asked to send military forces of this country as a part of an international expedition to help police Cyprus and maintain order there between Greeks and Turks. The British, who have just been called upon to rescue some of their former colonies in Africa from anarchy, have eliminated their military draft and are expecting other countries, including the United States, to help them out in Cyprus.

It is apparent also that the "anticolonialism" drive, fostered with such vehemence by Soviet propaganda, has caused a state of anarchy in many African countries whose peoples are not being allowed to exercise their right of selfdetermination. Despotic rulers have arisen to impose totalitarian governments and the usual forms of tyranny that communism espouses.

The Soviet Government, which is responsible for the provocation of trouble on every continent, maintains an innocent posture, and the free world selfishly and foolishly consents to furnish economic aid to the Communist side of the cold war. It is a tragic situation for which the peoples of the West must take much of the blame. Many leaders, moreover, and many segments of the press—in Europe, especially—are adopting a course of appeasement toward the Russians.

Despite all the mischief being wrought by the Moscow government, the sending of goods—including the sale of wheat—and the lending of money to the cold war enemy are considered legitimate. This is vigorously defended in London, Paris, and Washington, as well as in other capitals of this hemisphere.

What is the answer? It is to sever commercial and eventually, if necessary, diplomatic relations with any government that cannot be trusted to keep its word and that refuses to cease violating the oldest principles of international law and the words of the United Nations Charter which condemn any interference by an outside power in the internal affairs of any other country.

Unless policies in the Western World are based on fundamental principle instead of expediency, chaos will result and the situation will bring the big war that nobody wants. If, as alleged by Secretary of Defense McNamara, the United States is militarily stronger than Russia, then the existence of such strength ought to be sufficient to cause the Kremlin to stop meddling in the internal affairs of other countries. But there is doubt whether this armed power means anything, because the free governments of the world continue pussyfoot policies.

Resoluteness has become an obsolete word. The appeasement at Munich is scornfully referred to nowadays as ancient history because it happened 25 years ago. But it cannot be forgotten that less than 12 months afterward in a credulous world the most destructive war of all times broke out.

Sisters of the Holy Child Observe Centenary of Founding of Sharon School of Holy Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Sisters of the Holy Child of Sharon Hill, Pa., observed the centenary of the Sharon School of the Holy Child on January 25, 1964. The 100th anniversary celebration included a thanksgiving mass and the receipt by the Sisters of the Holy Child of a special message from President Lyndon B. Johnson. Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a story written by one of the students at the school, Teresa Satoris, about the observance, the message from President Johnson, and the sermon delivered at the mass by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles Mynaugh:

HOLY CHILD OBSERVES 100TH ANNIVERSARY—PROGRAM FEATURES MASS, FILM

(By Teresa Satoris)

SHARON HILL.—As part of Holy Child School's centennial celebration, students attended a mass today in thanksgiving for the blessings given Sharon during the past 100 years.

Sharon was founded in 1964 when the Reverend Charles Carter gave the Society of the Holy Child a tract of land for the establishment of a girl's school.

The Sharon Glee Club sang Psalm 18 in an arrangement by the French Jesuit Father Gelineau. This arrangement closely resembles the Hebrew psalmody. The student body made the responses to the psalm.

A film was shown this afternoon for both schools in Sharon's gym.

ENTRANCE EXAM

The entrance exam will be given Saturday at Sharon.

Scholarship applicants will take the morning test at 8:45 a.m. and entrance applicants will take the afternoon test at 12:45 p.m.

Freshmen volunteers and student officers will be hostesses to the eighth graders.

SODALITY WORKSHOP

Ten senior sodalists left this afternoon for a weekend school workshop for the lay apostolate at the University of Scranton.

The meeting aims to make the high school student aware of his responsibilities in Catholic action, the areas he can serve in and the techniques he can use.

Emphasis will also be directed toward the development of the sodalist's spiritual life.

Planned are seminars, daily mass, an informal dance, a talent hour, and a movie.

Sharon delegates to the meeting are Carroll Juliano, Anne Schulcz, Teresa Satoris, Charleen McCann, Karen O'Brien, Denis Casciato, Margaret Reavey, Jane Szczepaniak, Dianne Kerr, and Mary Jagodzinski, prefect.

L.B.J. CITES HOLY CHILD

SHARON HILL.—The School of the Holy Child has received a telegram from President Lyndon B. Johnson congratulating it on its 100th anniversary.

The telegram, addressed to Mother St. Andrew, mother superior of the Holy Child Convent, said:

"On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Sharon school, I am delighted to extend my warmest congratulations to you, to all the sisters of the Holy Child of Sharon Hill, the alumnae, and to all participating in the memorable celebration.

"With every good wish for the future.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

SERMON BY THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR CHARLES MYNAUGH, CENTENARY OF THE SHARON SCHOOL OF THE HOLY CHILD, FEAST OF THE CONVERSION OF SAINT PAUL, JANUARY 25, 1964

Conversion in the mind of Our Lord was a very significant and sometimes very easy thing. Many came to Christ to ask Him how to achieve the Kingdom of Heaven; how to turn themselves about that they might follow His teaching. Nicodemus came by night asking how to accomplish the Kingdom of God. Our Divine Savior told him: "Unless you be born again of water and of the Holy Spirit, you cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." This caused confusion in the mind of the seeking Nicodemus because he could not understand just how he could become a child again. Many months later they came to ask in a group how to seek the Kingdom of Heaven. Our Lord took a child and stood him up before Him and said: "Unless you be converted and become as little children, you shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven." In the one instance Our Lord asks for rebirth through Baptism, and in the other the immediate following of Him in the imitation of the childlike qualities of a young person.

Conversion in the mind of Christ is predicated upon the simplicity of a child's life, for as the child is in nature, God expects us to be in grace. What he has by point of age and innocence, God demands of His followers—a complete resurgence in grace itself, so that He was not giving two separate answers on the same idea—one to Nicodemus and the other to the people. He was still talking about the same thing—conversion. The conversion that He sought of Nicodemus was that of childlike simplicity. The conversion he sought for Saint Peter who had denied Him was to bring him back once more through the simple protestation of childlike love. When He said to Saint Peter: "Lovest Thou Me more than these?" and Saint Peter answered: "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee", that was simple love, a childlike quality.

The conversion of Saint Paul followed the same pattern. This man was so confused, all mixed up on what he believed to be inimical to his country and to the welfare of the people. Then suddenly he found himself confronted, when God revealed himself while Paul was on his way to Damascus. On this feast we celebrate today we can miss its intimate simplicity unless we realize the approach Christ made to His own persecutor. When blinding Him, calling attention to His Presence, Christ cried: "Why persecutest Me?" and Saint Paul asked the question: "Who art Thou?"—simply—"Jesus, Whom thou persecutest"—the direct approach, the need for conversion for him was once more presented to us in the sense of how to return to God.

If a simplicity is the answer, we would do well to analyze this simplicity. And this is had in the sense of a child for as God made His own entrance into our world, our human history, in the form of a child, He gives us the first personal example in that He draws us on in this following conversion of our lives for Him and all those who will be benefited by it. He has the right to insist upon the unification of our love for Him. Any complication in our lives is really developed from the idea that our passions are confused. Once they are coordinated and brought into a single love for God Himself, then we begin the simple approach, uncomplicated love, and, therefore, perfect service of the Divine Majesty. Further, true simplicity is built on a concept of a lack of self-consciousness and so the child loves everybody and finds everything easy to accept. He does not think of himself; he thinks only of the love he can find and give to the world about him. This, then, becomes the real secret of the practical conversion of our lives to follow Christ.

If this is the success of conversion in the mind of Christ—simplicity, childlike love, then it is no wonder that it found such success in the life of Cornelia Connelly, for here was one who had a simple love of God, not childish, but untrammelled—clear, pure, lacking all self-consciousness, and so her whole approach, not only to the conversion of herself toward God, but the conversion of her own subjects to God, would find itself so wonderfully expressed in the one instruction she gave to all her children and which epitomizes her whole attitude of de-

velopment of religious life: "Be yourself, but let that self be what Christ wants," the simple lack of self-consciousness, simply to be what Christ wants you to be to fulfill the designs God had in mind when He made you, to develop the intimacy of the glory you can give to God by being what Gad made you to be.

Thus the development of the Sisters of the Holy Child has been historically, and properly so, one of simplicity. The very idea that sought this new community to move to a place called Australia was at once glamorous, interesting, fascinating, but this was put aside because it was too complicated, too involved, not so much as the idea of the missionary expedition, but too much involved in the idea that it would bring the pure, simple love of the community to itself, not to God's service. So the decision was made that they should come to America.

Coming to the United States during wartime, they were given a place at Towanda, Pa., about 190 miles from here, on the border of New York State. Starting off to America with the idea of the missionary notion, they came to Towanda, Pa., following the simple, unaffected presentation of those things which were offered to them at the time for service. They came to a nation that was complicated—complicated in the time of warfare, complicated with ideas of social injustice, and coming to this Nation at this time, knowing the political difficulties in which they might be involved, they still came with an untrammelled love of God to serve Him. Towanda was not easy—almost a desperation—but it wasn't that tragic. Towanda lasted for about 2 years. In the meanwhile Father Carter, vicar-general of the archdiocese, had invited Mother Connelly to send more sisters for his school at the Assumption parish in Philadelphia. So the sisters came, and all the while Towanda got worse. It became imperative for the bishop of Philadelphia, Bishop Wood, and Father Carter, to make their ideas known very strongly to Mother Cornelia that Towanda had to be abandoned. So Sharon was born.

Sharon came into existence because of the needs in this archdiocese and the needs of this country for simple love of God. Sharon came into existence, not because of a defeat at Towanda, but Sharon came into existence because the complications of Towanda made it necessary that it be abandoned. The complexities of all the involvements of the family who owned the property, of the other community who had the need for the resources of the fields and the farms, made it impossible for the sisters to stay there—all complications brought on by human ideas, not by God. God's own intervention came in the mind and the voice of the church that brought the sisters back to Philadelphia.

And so Sharon began its history 100 years ago, in 1864, and from that moment the impact of the Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus here at Sharon has been that of simple love of God and the elegance of being one's self. This impact has been felt not only by the community in which it lives, but also by the community of the church whose children have grown under these teachings, under these indoctrinations. It is so easy to take the word "simplicity" and put it aside as something very nice to talk about, but the hard fact of developing a pure, clear love of God, lacking in selfishness, is the greatest difficulty in following Christ because it means putting aside everything else and seeing only His way of doing things. The direct approach of doing God's will is found evidently in the history of the archdiocese of Philadelphia for, having established Sharon in 1864, the simple approach then was: "Where's the work to be done?" The academy was to be established under Mother Cornelia's ideas. This would be done, but the church was growing in Philadelphia. In the year 1865 only three parishes were established in the archdiocese, and all three of them were staffed by the Sisters of the Holy Child—St. Agatha's, St. Edward's, and St. Clement's. All of them became staffed by these sisters who went with a simple direct approach to serve God in this new community in this new world. So they began to develop not only their sensitivity toward the organization of the church in the archdiocese, but also their own sensitivity in building among themselves the spirit of their community in the notion of conversion which epitomized the whole life of Mother Connelly.

We do well to analyze very carefully today the impact of the Sisters of the Holy Child in the century they have served at Sharon. Sharon will always be the center of the Sisters of the Holy Child in the United States—not Towanda—for Sharon was the simple way to do things. Sharon will always be the great role of the life of Mother Connelly among the American people—not the colleges, not the institutions, not the great spread idea of missionary endeavor, because Sharon is the simple heart of the family of God under Mother Cornelia's notion: "Serve God and be yourself here," and from this selflessness, in God's idea, then communicate the love that only man can give to God because his heart and his will are so formed in God's plan.

We, therefore, congratulate—all of us today—the Sisters of the Holy Child on their stability and fundamental principle of conversion. Growth can be characterized by schools, by students, by members of the community, but the only growth worth while characterizing at this moment is the growth in sensitivity to the service of God, and if the term "Holy Child" has ever meant anything it has to mean simplicity. If the very title for the community is to have any bearing upon its traditions and upon its development through the last century and the years in God's Providence to come, it will be epitomized in the sense of what childlike life means as it is communicated by these Sisters and by all those who learn to love God and serve His Divine Majesty with the simplicity of the Infant King. It was the way that God chose to enter our history—as a Child; it was the way Christ delineated our conversion—to be childlike. Therefore, it is no small wonder that Mother Connelly could bring us to this point. Thank God this day for the understanding of the sense of childlike love of God in full simplicity and what it means to be friends, children, and members of the Sisters of the Holy Child. We can leave you only, therefore, with the very ideas of Mother Cornelia herself—not simply to be yourself, but to make sure that you are the self God made you to be, but also the driving theme of her own life new a world can see in her own epitaph, for "it is love which knoweth no measure; love which feareth no labor; it is love that maketh sweet all that is bitter; and it is love which findeth rest in God alone. This is the story of Mother Cornelia.

There are many interesting and fabulous things to talk about in her life—the difficulties and problems. They all must be recorded and they all mean much in the development of her ideas and her personality impinged upon us, followers of the Sisters of the Holy Child, but, more important, the promotion of Mother Cornelia Connelly will be made successful only if it is uncomplicated. The development of her personality for us as American Catholic people that we might be able to lead the rest of the Catholics in the world to understand the full meaning of the sense of the Holy Child—that merit will be had when we are able to present to the rest of the world a full understanding of Mother Cornelia Connelly's idea of sanctity—simplicity. This makes it the more difficult to pursue her cause and offer our prayers in her behalf that Almighty God may see it provident to bring her to the special position in our community and in the world. Sharon will have its part, not only because of the centenary of service, but in the teachings and title of Mother Cornelia Connelly, but Sharon will have its part in the promotion of Cornelia Connelly's cause only if it keeps us alive in the sense of untrammelled love that serves God perfectly and really makes the spirit of Mother Cornelia Connelly live. In this sense, then, we—all of us—offer our congratulations to the Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus on the accomplishments of this centenary at Sharon, but more than anything else, we promise them the ambition in our lives to serve in simplicity the God to whom we are converted out of love, and if that conversion of ours can be the mark of Mother Connelly's sanctity, God be praised for our efforts.

Reporter Sue Cronk Spotlights Need for Cosmetics Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sue Cronk, a reporter for the Washington Post, has been writing an excellent series of articles appearing this week on the need for legislation to protect the American consumer from fraud and from harm. I commend the Washington Post for printing this series—each of the articles so far has touched on a very important gap in our consumer laws.

The third article in the series, appearing Tuesday, discussed the need for legislation for the pretesting of cosmetics. This is one of the major provisions of H.R. 1235, my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. I have been introducing bills for the pretesting for safety of cosmetics since my first year in Congress, in 1953. Passage of such legislation is long overdue, as President Kennedy's Consumer Message of March 15, 1962, pointed out, and as President Johnson's Consumer Message of February 5, 1964, also emphasized.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks the excellent article from Tuesday's Washington Post on the need for cosmetic legislation, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 11, 1964]

PITFALLS MORE THAN SKIN DEEP: BEAUTY HAS ITS HAZARDS

[Third in a series]

(By Sue Cronk)

Beauty may be only skin deep, but American women smear more than $2 billion worth of cosmetics annually on that surface quantity in their unceasing quest for loveliness.

In hopes of finding beauty in a jar, women try face and skin creams containing such additives as turtle oil, shark oil, chick embryo extract, pigskin extract, queen bee royal jelly, and horse blood serum.

There are some of the ingredients ballyhooed in advertisements. But what else do those jars, tubes, and bottles of glamor contain?

You can't tell from their labels.

The Nation's cosmetic industry has enjoyed phenomenal growth in the last quarter of a century. Its revenue today is 300 times what it was in 1940. Yet, according to Consumer Reports, "protection afforded (the user) under the present Federal law is minimal. * * * The buyer of an unfamiliar cosmetic has no assurance of its safety in normal use."

Although deodorants and medicated cosmetics for acne sufferers list some of their ingredients, there is no law requiring cosmetics manufacturers to divulge all their contents, even by the Food and Drug Administration.

More important, unlike food and drug manufacturers, they are not required to pretest new ingredients for safety before placing a cosmetic on the market.

Some cosmetics manufacturers guard against the possibility of distributing a highly toxic product by testing their cosmetics on laboratory animals before marketing them. Others just market a new product in a limited area and if there are no complaints of injuries or allergic reactions, marketing is expanded.

If a product turns out to be harmful, notes Consumer Reports, "the FDA may step in only after enough people have been hurt—and have reported the fact—to demonstrate that the product is harmful."

For instance some 700 women reported damaged fingernails from a new kind of nail color a few years ago before the FDA could get it off the market.

A few recent court cases put the problem into a sharper light.

A Maryland woman won $1,000 in a suit against a Langley Park beauty salon last year after a bleach job caused her to miss work for 3 weeks because of a blistered scalp.

An Oklahoma retailer was found liable in another 1963 court judgment for a customer's losing part of her hair and having the rest of it matted by a hair spray.

A Virginia couple recently filed a suit asking $300,000 from a leading cosmetics manufacturer, claiming an antiperspirant made them ill.

President Johnson last week asked Congress to give the FDA the "needed authority to require a showing that cosmetics are safe before they are offered to the public."

In his message on consumer interests, the President also recommended new legislation to extend the inspection authority the FDA now has over prescription drugs to cosmetics, food, over-the-counter drugs, and to therapeutic, diagnostic and prosthetic devices.

It took the thalidomide tragedies of 1962 to get quick congressional passage of the Kefauver Drug Control Act which plugged prescription drug loopholes in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

To plug other loopholes existing in the act since 1938, Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat of Missouri, has twice introduced the omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, and in 1962 the Kennedy administration introduced H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582, which cover substantially the same ground—ranging from Federal controls over habit-forming barbiturates to requirements that therapeutic devices be proven both safe and effective.

Although Mrs. SULLIVAN hasn't been personally injured by a cosmetic since she suffered "great irritation" from having her blond eyelashes dyed during the thirties, she is particularly interested in protecting women from "the menace of technology that makes them guinea pigs for new products."

Coal-tar hair dyes containing poisonous or injurious ingredients, for instance, can be marketed with no restraint except that they must carry labels warning of possible danger.

Reputable beauticians give patch tests for sensitivity before dying a customer's hair. Women coloring their hair at home may be unaware that such precautions are necessary, especially if the warning is buried in a lengthy list of step-by-step instructions. Sometimes the beauty seeker doesn't bother with fine print on the label.

In addition to pretesting for safety, Mrs. SULLIVAN wants cosmetics manufacturers to list a product's ingredients on its label in much the same way that canners list the contents of a can of beef stew or vegetable soup.

If you suffer a severe allergic reaction to a new cosmetic, or if your child accidentally swallows one, she points out, your doctor has difficulty prescribing treatment because he doesn't know what ingredient caused the trouble.

But, object some manufacturers, a list of ingredients would tip off competitors to what their cosmetics contain.

"I don't think it would be any protection at all," says Steve Mayhan of the Toilet Goods Association," every cosmetic contains 50 or 60 ingredients bearing such technical names that the average consumer wouldn't know what they were. Anyway there would not be enough room on the label."

He pointed out that if a person knew what she were allergic to, she could buy the specially manufactured hypoallergenic products.

Cosmetics manufacturers are not opposed to either pretesting or inspection of ingredients, says Mayhan, "but they are not willing to put temptation in the way of some inspector by giving out their valuable formulas."

"I'm not trying to put any cosmetic manufacturers out of business," Mrs. SULLIVAN says adding that she is sure that no major manufacturer is "anxious to poison, disfigure, denail, scalp, burn, or otherwise injure the American consumer."

But because of the "competitive situation" in the cosmetics industry and the many new products which are "accompanied by a wave of high pressure advertising and promotion," she is anxious to "make it safe for a woman to pick any cosmetic off the shelf. She should be able to know that it's been pretested for safety and, if she knows what she's allergic to, she should be able to tell from a clear label whether or not she can use it."

Tribute to Our Beloved Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial tribute to our beloved late President at Adas Shalom Synagogue in Detroit, Mich., by its distinguished rabbi, Jacob E. Segal, an eminent churchman and community leader.

I believe that the sincere and touching tribute to our beloved late President by this outstanding American merits a place in the RECORD.

The tribute follows:

IN MEMORIAM—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, 35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A memorial tribute by Rabbi Jacob E. Segal, delivered at Adas Shalom Synagogue, November 25, 1963)

At 12 noon today, in our Nation's Capital, the final act of a tragic drama will begin to play itself out before the eyes of the world. A solemn cortege will wind its way from the White House to the National Cemetery at Arlington. There John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, cut off by a madman's bullet, will be laid to rest.

We have a gathered here now in a private prelude to that final act on the national stage. We have gathered here as a Jewish congregation, to give voice to our common grief—to the broken hearts, the sundered love and the shattered spirits which we share with all Americans and with men and women of good will everywhere, at the sudden incredible passing of our valiant young President.

The devastating bulletins which on Friday afternoon began to inundate and darken our homes and offices—the cataclysmic bulletin that made last Friday the blackest Erev Shabbos in American's history—these bulletins, in spite of a grief-drenched weekend, still ring in our ears like a grotesque fantasy, a savage nightmare from which at any moment we hope to awaken.

Why is this news still so new, so incredible? Is it simply because the leader of a Nation has suddenly died?

No, that cannot be all. This news is still so incredible because it was the single most unlikely, most inconceivable tragedy that could have struck the world.

As a British televised tribute touchingly put it last night, if any elder statesman, American or foreign, had died, it would have been a shock and a major tragedy—yet somehow capable of absorption and belief.

But, that this young man, so vital and vibrant, so handsome and brilliant, so athletic and dashing, so literate and eloquent, so active, so full of grace and wit and charm, so mature yet so youthful, so wise and courageous, yet so boyish and dynamic;

That this young man, whose essential nature was reflected in the word "vigah";

That this young President—who in less than 3 years rose to be the acknowledged leader of the free world and the protagonist of an America respected even by the enemy;

That this young and vigorous husband, this loving son, this doting father of two beautiful little children;

That he should have been snatched away by a madman's bullet, was the most unlikely, unacceptable news that is still at this moment impossible to accept or believe.

Yet, though our conscious mind refuses to believe it, something else in us tells us it is true, after all.

In a kind of half-dream world we have been drawn together here on less than 1 day's notice to pay our respects, as Americans and as Jews, to the memory of the leader who, we cannot believe, has fallen.

The fact that so many have gathered here to honor his memory, is a measure of how honorable his memory is—of how great an honor the remembrance of his life may yet shed upon this Nation and the world.

But the fact that we have come to the synagogue is a measure of something else. It is a measure of our desperate need to find comfort in the House of God. In an hour of infamy and sorrow, we Americans of all faiths, and even those of no particular faith—have nowhere else to turn—except to God.

We somehow cannot get Lincoln out of our mind, when we think of the young President who was martyred on the streets of Dallas.

We cannot forget the sublime irony that the Gettysburg Address was delivered by Lincoln 100 years ago last Tuesday, and that 100 years have gone by since Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

I am not invoking the magic of numbers. Yet in some meaningful way history has come full circle again:

If Lincoln was a martyr to the cause of human liberty, if his signing of the Emancipation Proclamation made him the target of an assassin a year and a half later—

Then it may be equally true, alas, that John Kennedy's courage in proclaiming a second emancipation for the Negroes and the underprivileged of our time;

His vigorous stand for the cause of civil rights;

His willingness to lead the battle for all human rights;

Engendered the kind of violent opposition and insane bitter hatred which created the immoral climate in which an assassin could dream of performing his demoniac act of murder.

We cannot help thinking of Lincoln as the backdrop for Kennedy, when we read again the poignant lines which Edwin Markham wrote at the death of Lincoln:

"And when he fell in whirlwind he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky!"

How prophetic and biblical those words sound. How reminiscent of the Psalmist, who when he sought comfort from God, cried out:

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills,
From whence shall my help come?"

Our help, our comfort will come, if we lift up our eyes unto the hills;

If we honestly gaze at the lonesome place which has been left by our martyred young President "against the sky";

If we study and cherish the story of his young meteoric and brilliant life against the sky of eternal moral values;

If we cherish his valiant deeds against the horizon of those moral ideals and commitments—to truth and justice, to peace and human freedom—which were the guiding stars, the moral heavens by which John Fitzgerald Kennedy charted his course.

His ideals and commitments were many, and the galaxy of his stars was bright. But the two that shone brighest and most steady were his two north stars: world peace, and equal human rights for all the citizens of this land.

His place against the sky may seem lonesome now that this lordly cedar has fallen. But in that lonesome patch of sky we can still see—

If we only have the will and the courage to look we can still see those two stars, and many others beside them beckoning to us with their unfailing light, as they beckoned to him before he was cut down.

I could not help thinking of this last night when in my mood of sorrow I turned to a treasury of American poetry and read again Walt Whitman's stirring ode on the death of Lincoln, his tragic yet triumphant "O Captain, My Captain."

"O Captain! my Captain! our fearful trip is done,
The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won,
The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting,
While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessel grim and daring;
But O heart! heart! heart!
O the bleeding drops of red,
Where on the deck my Captain lies,
Fallen cold and dead.

"My Captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still,
My father does not feel my arm, he has no pulse nor will.
The ship is anchor'd safe and sound, its voyage closed and done,
From fearful trip the victor ship comes in with object won;
Exult O shores, and ring O bells!
But I with mournful tread,
Walk the deck my Captain lies,
Fallen cold and dead."

The poem rings true emotionally. Yet some of its lines are not yet fulfilled:

"Our fearful trip is not yet done,
Our ship has not yet weathered every rack,
The prize we have sought is not yet won!
Though our captain lies fallen, cold and dead,
That prize—
Of a universal peace, and secure and equal human rights
Remains yet to be won!"

We may yet win that prize—if we gird ourselves with his vision and his courage, with his love of all people as creatures equally made in the image of God.

As Lincoln and Kennedy kept mingling in my mind last night, I recalled those other even greater lines written by Walt Whitman, when he beheld the coffin of Lincoln winding its way across the field and meadows of this land, back to its burial place:

"When lilacs last in the dooryard bloomed,
And the great star early drooped in the western sky in the night,
I mourned, and yet shall mourn with ever-returning spring.
Sure to me you bring,
Lilac blooming perennial and drooping star in the west,
And thought of him I love.

"Over the breast of the spring, the land, amid cities,
Amid lanes and through old woods * * *
Carrying a corpse to where it shall rest in in the grave,
Night and day journeys a coffin.
Coffin that passes through lanes and streets,
Through day and night with the great cloud darkening the land,
With the pomp of the inlooped flags with the cities draped in black * * *
With processions long and winding and the flambeaus of the night,
With the countless torches lit, with the silent sea of faces and the unbared heads * * *
With the tolling, tolling bells' perpetual clang,
Here, coffin that slowly passes.
I give you this sprig of lilac."

I could not help thinking of these lines, because all through this dismal week, and through the coming months and years, so many bereaved individuals, so many bruised and loving hearts of men, women and children in this land will feel like saying to John Fitzgerald Kennedy: "I give you this sprig of lilac."

We have all been impressed by the royal pageantry of dukes and emperors, of queens and generals, who in solemn pomp have descended upon Washington this weekend.

But far more impressive was the sight of those hundreds of thousands of humble, ordinary people who filed past the flag-draped catafalque in the rotunda of the Capitol—all day yesterday and all through the night, even to this moment—including some young students I know personally, who have made the tearful journey from the University of Michigan to Washington—to wrest a tender glimpse of the coffin, to give the fallen leader their own little "sprig of lilac."

I could not help thinking of comfort when I read John F. Kennedy's Thanksgiving proclamation, which appeared in the Detroit News on Thursday, November 21—the day before he left us.

"Over three centuries ago, our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts, far from home in a lonely wilderness, set aside a time for thanksgiving. On the appointed day, they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the laws which bound them together and for the faith which united them under God.

"Today we give thanks, most of all, for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, for the courage and the humility, which they possessed and which we must seek every day to emulate.

"As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not utter words but to live by them.

"Now, therefore, I, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 28, 1963, as a day of national thanksgiving.

"On that day let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice and understanding among all men and all nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

The President asked us to gather in our sanctuaries to thank God. We have gathered instead to intone a prelude to his funeral.

Yet if we truly want to honor his memory, we dare not entirely ignore his summons. Alongside our grief, we must force our trembling lips to utter a prayer of thanksgiving, that this man has lived among us.

The best way to frame our thanks is to dedicate our lives to that vision of glory which he invoked so nobly in his inaugural address. On that frigid day in January 1961, John Kennedy stood in the whirling snow in the shadow of the Capitol dome—in whose rotunda he has lain in state all day yesterday and all through the night—and chanted forth his dream and his faith, for all the world to hear:

"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor, will light our country and all who serve it, and the glow of that fire, can truly light the world.

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

With this summons ringing in our hearts, let us rise in prayer for our martyred President, and ask God for the courage and the will to make His work truly our own.

A Parent's Prayer for Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two poems written by my good friend, David Gimbel, of Brooklyn, N.Y. For the past 15 years Mr. Gimbel has devoted and dedicated his life to the cause of mentally retarded children. He has given of himself generously to these most innocent children in the entire world. An indication of his feeling for them can be found in these poetic words:

A PARENT'S PRAYER FOR RETARDED CHILDREN

(By David Gimbel)

"Our Heavenly Father," we beseech Thee in Thy goodness so that Thou will take these innocent children out of their wilderness of confusion. 'Tis we, the heartbroken parents, who look to Thee for Thy sacred map which will help us to guide these exceptional children to the eternal road of promise and hope.

For they are the most wonderful of Thy creatures "O Lord" without a blemish of hate, jealously, or greed. They are in a sense the true essence of brotherhood, who daily extend their little hands for that precious treasure of understanding.

Grant them "O Lord" the blessing of being wanted and in Thy goodness, instill into Thy normal children a sense of awakening, so that they will not ignore their afflicted fellow creatures, but take them into their fold as a mother takes her infant unto her breast.

"O Lord" stir the hearts of those who have been complacent and in Thy bountiful mercy open up new horizons for dedicated men of science who may one day bring us parents the world over the comfort of knowing that mental retardation will be erased from this earth.

Give us the vision "O Lord" for tomorrow is forever, so that we Thy children and with Thy blessings shall find happiness at the end of our rainbow of hope.

A RETARDED CHILD'S PRAYER

(By David Gimbel)

If all retarded children could understand and pray,
They would lift their eyes to heaven and perhaps, this is what they'd say.
The words so deep within their hearts that they cannot express,
To make them well and happy, "Dear God" These children bless.

Forsake me not "O Lord" I humbly beg and pray,
That Thou will move those clouds away and bid the sun to stay.
For somehow I do not seem to grasp the things that children do.
While neighbors whisper softly and my parents feel so blue.

The children playing in the street, from me just shy away,
And so many times I would like to join, but with me they do not play.
I watch my mommy turn aside and to me it is not clear,
For when I touch her pretty face, there always is a tear.

When mommy lights the candles just before the Sabbath day,
I always watch and listen and to Thee I hear her pray.
Make my baby well "O Lord" with Thy compassion, dignity, and love,
And grant us a blessed miracle from Thy kingdom up above.

Our home is bright with love "Dear Lord," like sunshine on the flowers,
And all of us together we spend such happy hours.
My daddy is so kind and in the evening when he comes home,
He picks me up into his arms and I'm not so alone.

Then when its time for bed I get my goodnight kiss,
So before I close my eyes dear God I only hope and wish,
That I awaken and be all well then skies will be so clear,
With no more tears upon the cheeks of my mommy and daddy dear.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of medical care for our aged under the social security program. It is as follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to give my testimony before your committee. I am one of the sponsors of medical care for our aged citizens under the social security program. My bill, H.R. 4886, is identical to the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 3920. I hope your committee will report out this legislation in the near future so that the House might act on it in this session of Congress.

During the past few years I have been greatly impressed by the tremendous increase in public awareness of the health care problems faced by our aged and aging citizens, and the growing realization that the financing of their needed health care is a problem of national magnitude. There is now a general recognition, reflected by the discussions and debates on the subject throughout the Nation, that an area of great need exists here, and that the Federal Government can and should play a part in helping to finance health care for the aged. Some have contended that programs to help finance medical care should wait until sufficient medical personnel are available and adequate facilities have been provided. Last year we took a step to improve the availability of medical care when we enacted the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. However, arrangements to assist the aged in meeting the cost of health care cannot and should not be put off because personnel or facilities may not be available in every single instance. It is immoral to deny the aged health insurance because, with it, they will be able to compete for care on equal terms with insured younger people.

The crux of the problem facing aged persons can be stated quite briefly. People over 65 have twice the medical costs of younger people and only one-half as much income. The average aged couple in the United States has an income of a little more than $53 a week—about $27 per person. The income of the senior citizen who lives alone averages only $23 a week, and nearly half of the elderly live alone. The senior citizen simply can't stretch this income to pay for the average of two or three spells of hospitalization he can expect in old age. It is even hard to pay day-to-day living expenses on what the average aged person has.

Nor do the aged have enough savings or other assets to fall back on when illness strikes. Despite their relative prosperity before retirement, about one in three aged persons has less than $100 in saving that can be cashed.

Nine of ten people over 65 will visit a hospital before they die. Two out of three who are over 65 will visit a hospital two or more times before they die. More than half of the married couples will visit one; one of the couples will visit a hospital more than four times before they die. More than half of the couples have an average cost of expense of illness in old age of $700 per illness and an average stay in a hospital of 15 days per stay during illness for those over 65. Hospital costs have gone from an average of $9 a day in 1946 to $32 a day average now.

These facts give rise to the feeling that there is no question but that consideration must be given to means of meeting the cost of illness in old age.

That the problem of financing health care in old age is extremely serious and widespread is no longer a real issue. The American Medical Association, the distinguished bipartisan National Committee on Health Care of the Aged, and a series of disparate organizations recognize the need for Government help in meeting this need. The only major question that remains to be settled is how the problem should be relieved.

Some who oppose hospital insurance for the aged under social security have asserted that private insurance can meet practically the entire problem of insuring older people. Such optimism is wholly unfounded. About one-half of the aged do not have any health insurance at all. And many of those who have some form of health insurance have woefully inadequate coverage. This is partly because elderly people are bad health risks and it costs more for insurance companies to insure them. Another reason is that most of the working people who have health insurance are enrolled under group contracts, while retired people who are insured are, in most cases, under nongroup policies. Group coverage usually provides twice as much protection for each health insurance dollar as individual policies.

In looking at the possibility of any further spreading of voluntary health insurance, the fact must be faced that aged people who have protection tend to be in the higher income brackets and in good health, and of these, very few have protection that can be considered adequate. It is predominantly the low income people and the people who are in poor health who are still not covered or are covered very poorly. These are the very people who are the poorest risks from a health insurance standpoint and who can least afford to pay insurance premiums. As things stand now, the prospect for improvements in the health insurance coverage of our elderly citizens is far from bright.

Pointing up the inability of private insurance to do the job is the experience of my State's 65 plan—a highly publicized statewide effort to bring private health insurance to more people through a pooling of the experience and resources of 49 insurance companies.

It is apparent, after more than 1 year of experience, that the New York 65 plan is far too costly for a substantial portion of the State's aged people. Only 117,000 people out of a total eligible population of 1,900,000 are enrolled. Their low retirement incomes are characterized by the following facts: More than one-quarter of all men aged 65 and over in New York have incomes of less than $1,000 a year; another one-quarter have less than $2,000, which must be used in many cases not only to support themselves but also their wives. And aged widows—who make up more than half of all aged women—are generally worse off than these men. A premium of $228 a year represents about 20 percent of the median annual income of all persons aged 65 and over in the State of New York. A premium of $456 for an aged couple represents more than 15 percent of median family income. For example, the median annual income for aged couples in the United States is only $2,800, and not much more than this for aged couples in

New York. A further indication that this plan is too expensive for our aged is the fact that 30 percent of New York's aged did not enroll themselves, but were enrolled by their sons and daughters or some other person.

The opponents of providing hospital insurance under social security say that the Federal Government's role should be limited to financial help with State and local public assistance programs. I cannot agree that improvements in these programs offer anything like a solution to the problem.

Getting help through public assistance always depends on meeting a means test—which often involves an investigation of not only the senior citizen's personal affairs, but those of his children as well. If there is one attitude Americans have in common, it is the desire to maintain individual dignity and privacy. Most people find it humiliating to have to prove they are poor, to tell how they spend their money, and to be told how the welfare office thinks they should spend their money. Many of our senior citizens would rather forego needed medical care—even to the detriment of their health—than go before a public welfare agency and admit failure to be able to go it on their own. Unlike the younger person, once in poverty the senior citizen knows he cannot ever escape reliance on charity. He is rendered a permanent ward of the State, without hope for a better life, a decent burial, or even a token inheritance for his children. A relief recipient cannot escape the State even by dying. For the final action on his death, in New York, will be that the State will take his home to repay the relief grudgingly given him.

It is interesting that some proponents of the means test approach to medicine feel that there is just a limited need amongst the aged for help in meeting their medical expenses. These proponents do not admit that the aged, as a group, are worse off than the balance of the population. For instance, Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, during these hearings said that he estimated no more than 15 to 20 percent of the aged need help with their day-to-day living expenses and costly medical expenses, when they arise. He added that this group is being helped through existing Federal-State public assistance programs. The States do not agree this is the case. More than half of the States fail to make OAA payments which meet their own measurement of financial need—in other words, more than 25 States do not provide the aged with assistance which the States themselves have determined to be necessary to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and health. This unwillingness to meet minimum standard of living requirements also applies to the States' willingness to meet minimum health care needs for those needing medical care assistance. Half the States allow in the budgets (which many do not then meet) less than $40 a month for rent for a couple. Slum housing results, and inadequate medical care follows, even for assistance recipients. The many needy nonrecipients get nothing.

By January 1964, 32 States and 4 other jurisdictions were operating MAA (Kerr-Mills) programs for the medically indigent. Over half of these limit eligibility to aged individuals with annual incomes below $1,200 or $1,500. Hospital care is limited to more than 15 days per admission in two States, and no more than 15 days per year in two others. Some States provide no medical relief unless the needy senior citizen has a life-endangering or sight-endangering condition. They will help only when it is generally too late. Most States act as though rehabilitation for the crippled or dental care, eyeglasses and hearing aids are luxuries to be preserved for the wealthy. Does this suggest that assistance takes care of the needy?

New York State has a good MAA program. In fiscal year 1963 all the other States put together paid out less than twice as much for their medically indigent senior citizens as New York. But even this State claims the estate of relief recipients; give no help if children of the aged might, by sacrificing, give help. It doesn't take much of an imagination to see how little the other States are doing.

The welfare patient frequently cannot use his personal physician—a clinic is good enough for him, and he is likely to be directed to the cheapest hospital, frequently a county or city institution where the quality of care is quite poor. Welfare funds are usually enough to pay only nursing homes that are of poor quality, hazardous, unsanitary, and unsafe by the State's own standards. Frequently, less is paid for nursing home care than is needed for room and board in a boarding house.

The reason that so little has been done in the great majority of the States is that they are unwilling or unable to raise their share of the needed funds. The Federal Government puts no strings on the grants of money it will provide but unless new sources for State revenues are found, older people will continue to suffer in deprivation and want.

I am convinced that we must look beyond public assistance for a solution to the problem the aged face in meeting the costs of needed health care. Public assistance programs are not a real answer to the problem because they are no help until after the individual is reduced from self-sufficiency to poverty. The goal should be to prevent poverty—to keep people off relief. Many older people preserve their dignity and independence even though barely able to meet their day-to-day living expenses. These people are constantly faced with the threat that a costly illness will wipe out a lifetime of savings, threaten the ownership of a home, and force them, after a lifetime of independence, to go on record as being no longer self-sufficient members of their community. It is unfortunate, but I am sure it is true, that aged people will go without the necessities of life before they will go before strangers and ask for charity.

I am convinced that the Federal Government must act without further delay to help our older people meet their health care costs. I am equally convinced that this help must be provided in a way that maintains the individual dignity of older people as well as their security. It is for these reasons that I have introduced a bill to provide hospital insurance for the aged under social security and have pledged my support for Representative King's identical administration bill which will, when enacted, provide a program of hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

Our hospital insurance proposal contemplates that the financing of basic hospital insurance protection for the aged through social security would be the keystone of a threefold structure of protection for the aged in meeting the cost of health care. First, basic hospital insurance protection would be afforded the Nation's aged through social security; second, the existence of a program of basic protection would encourage the development of additional protection through individual savings, private insurance, and employer benefit plans; third, good medical assistance would become practicable in all States to help the relatively small group not eligible for the basic protection under social security.

If hospital insurance were provided under social security the workers' payments would be spread over their working lifetimes and would be matched by payments by their employers, so that only modest employee payments would be required.

Those already old, it is true, would receive this hospital insurance protection without having contributed to the cost. But this is one of the advantages of a social insurance program. Under social insurance, the benefit of any improvements that are made in the program are made available to those who are already retired as well as those who will retire in the future. This has been the case with all the social security benefit increases enacted since the program started.

Few issues have stirred up as much controversy and discussion as the problem of meeting the health care costs of the aged. Much of the discussion has reflected more heat than light. Accusations, misstatements, half-truths, and glittering generalities have filled the air. Much of the correspondence I have received shows that my constituents are for a program of medical care for our aged under social security, and they are tired of attacks used by opponents to defeat a proposal that would mean so much to the great majority of our people.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding, I would like to point out that the late President Kennedy fully supported and worked for our aged and the proposal to protect them against their hospital costs. There are few who need be reminded that he told the House in a message to the Congress in February 1963, that "hospital insurance for our older citizen on social security offers a reasonable and practical solution to a critical problem. It is the logical extension of a principle established 28 years ago in the social security system and confirmed many times since by both Congress and the American voters. It is based on the fundamental premise that contributions during the working years, matched by employers' contributions, should enable people to prepay and build earned rights and benefits to safeguard them in their old age."

And President Johnson, before assuming the highest office in the land, and now in that office, has urged positive action on this critical proposal and is working to see that positive action is taken.

I want to urge the Ways and Means Committee to give the Members of the House an opportunity to vote on this bill. My constituents, and the general public, and my colleagues are all concerned with the question, and we want our votes counted on this matter of such great national significance. This issue has been in the national spotlight and it is time to bring it to a vote in the national forum.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Excessive Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution passed by the South Dakota Legislature dealing with the serious problem of the excessive beef imports.

The resolution is as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States; pertaining to beef imports

Be is resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein:

(Introduced by Messrs. Ramey and Abdnor)

Whereas agriculture as a whole during 1963 suffered numerous setbacks and this condition or any solution or program relative thereto were not set forth in any manner in President Johnson's state of the Union message; and

Whereas according to a news release from the Agricultural Department of the United States published in newspapers during the last few days of 1963, it was revealed that farm prices in comparison to items upon which parity is figured had reached their lowest point since 1939; and

Whereas farmers received 5½ percent less for their livestock marketed in 1963 and that such loss had an adverse effect upon all farming and ranching operations and that such loss was reflected not only in livestock produce but also in the raising of feed grains; and

Whereas all the farming people are more than desirous of doing their share in the field of foreign relations, people associated with agriculture are entitled to some of the considerations given to all other agencies throughout the United States, and while it is apparent that there is a great divergence of opinion over Government subsidy programs as shown by the defeat of the wheat referendum, certainly all people in agriculture believe in equal protection of the agriculture industry as furnished by the laws of the U.S. Government for other industries; and

Whereas imports of boneless beef, veal and mutton, and all fresh or frozen products as a whole of these items have more than tripled since 1959 when Congress reduced import duties on these products by 50 percent, and following which the United States swung from a position of being a net exporter of these products to a net importer thereof; and

Whereas from 1960 to 1962 the total meat consumption in the United States increased by 4.3 percent and during the same period the consumption of imported beef increased by 81.8 percent, and while in 1930 the tariff on beef imported into the United States amounted to 58 percent of the value of the domestic product, by 1962 the tariff had been reduced to 9.5 percent of the domestic product; and

Whereas most of the foreign nations sending meats to the United States have stringent regulations against the importation of the U.S. livestock products; and

Whereas Senators CURTIS, of Nebraska, and SIMPSON, of Wyoming, introduced legislation as amendments to the 1963 feed grain bill to effectuate reduction of such imports, and by the inclusion of such amendments in the feed grain program attempted to gain the support of feed grain producers for the livestock industry; and

Whereas all the foregoing facts and many more similar thereto were presented on the floor of the U.S. Senate in open discussion without dispute and are reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 15, 1963, between pages 8202 and 8218 thereof; and

Whereas on page 8215, Senator MUNDT, senior Senator from South Dakota, spoke in support of such legislation, and subsequently voted therefor; and

Whereas Senator MCGOVERN, the junior Senator from South Dakota, according to late press releases now also recognizes the serious adverse effect that imports of foreign livestock products have upon prices paid South Dakota farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President and Congress be memorialized by this body and especially that all congressional delegates of South Dakota to the U.S. Congress be memorialized to pass legislation such as that introduced by Senators CURTIS and SIMPSON as before stated, to afford the agricultural industry support similar to that given to other industries of this Nation, and which action would substantially assist the agricultural industry without the use of Government funds.

Adopted by the senate January 30, 1964.

Concurred in the house of representatives February 6, 1964.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary, State Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk,
House of Representatives.

Poetic Tribute to Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest poems about our late beloved and lamented President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that I have read, was written by Mrs. Molly Kazan and was printed by the New York Herald Tribune the day of the Kennedy funeral and reprinted on Thanksgiving Day. Under unanimous consent, I include this poem with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THANKSGIVING 1963

(By Molly Kazan)

I think that what he gave us most was pride.
It felt good to have a President like that:
bright, brave and funny and goodlooking.

I saw him once drive down East Seventy-second Street
in an open car, in the autumn sun
(as he drove yesterday in Dallas.)
His thatch of brown hair looked as though it had grown extra thick
the way our wood animals in Connecticut
grow extra fur for winter.
And he looked as though it was fun to be alive,
to be a politician,
to be a President,
to be a Kennedy,
to be a man.

He revived our pride.
It felt good to have a President
who read his mail,
who read the papers,
who read books and played touch football.
It was a pleasure and a cause for pride
to watch him take the quizzing of the press
with cameras grinding—
take it in his stride,
with zest.
He'd parry, thrust, answer or duck,
and fire a verbal shot on target,
hitting with the same answer, the segregationists in a Louisiana hamlet and a government in southeast Asia.
He made you feel that he knew what was going on in both places.
He would come out of the quiz with an "A" in Economics, Military Science, Constitutional Law, Farm Problems and the moonshot program
and still take time to appreciate Miss May Craig.

We were privileged to see him on the worst day
(till yesterday),
the Bay of Pigs day,
and we marveled at his coolth and style
and were amazed at an air (that plainly was habitual)
of modesty
and even diffidence.
It felt good to have a President
who said, It was my fault.
And went on from there.

It felt good to have a President
who looked well in Vienna, Paris, Rome, Berlin
and at the podium of the United Nations
—and who would go to Dublin,
put a wreath where it did the most good
and leave unspoken
the satisfaction of an Irishman
enroute to 10 Downing Street
as head of the U.S. government.

What was spoken
was spoken well.
What was unspoken
needed to be unspoken.
It was none of our business if his back hurt.

He revived our pride.
He gave grist to our pride.
He was respectful of intellect;
he was respectful of excellence;
he was respectful of accomplishment and skill;
he was respectful of the clear and subtle uses of our language;
he was respectful of courage.
And all these things he cultivated in himself.

He was respectful of our heritage.
He is now part of it.

He affirmed our future.
Our future is more hopeful
because of his work
but our future is not safe nor sure.
He kept telling us that.
This is a very dangerous and uncertain world.
I quote. He said that yesterday.

He respected facts,
And we must now live with the fact of his murder.

Our children cried when the news came. They phoned and we phoned
and we cried and we were not ashamed of crying but we were ashamed of what had happened.
The youngest could not remember any other President, not clearly.
She felt as if the world had stopped.

We said, it is a shame, a very deep shame.
But this country will go on
more proudly
and with a clearer sense of who we are
and what we have it in us to become
because we had a President like that.
He revived our pride.
We are lucky that we had him for 3 years.

The President of the Central Bucks Chamber of Commerce, Bucks County, Pa., Calls for Expansion of the Federal Urban Renewal and Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Central Bucks Chamber

of Commerce, Bucks County, Pa., William O. Kline, of Doylestown, has called for support of the administration housing program presented to the Congress by President Johnson.

I include the text of the telegram sent to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee by Mr. Kline. Since it appears to indicate that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is far from united in its opposition to the President's housing program, this telegram would seem to be of more than passing interest:

DOYLESTOWN, PA.,
February 4, 1964.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
State of Texas, Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

As president of the Central Bucks Chamber of Commerce, Bucks County, Pa., for the past 3 years, I strongly denounce the position taken by Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and Board Chairman H. Ladd Plumley, in regard to both the Federal urban renewal and public housing program. I am positive they are not speaking for many chambers of commerce throughout the United States to support this vitally needed expanded legislation as proposed by our President, Lyndon B. Johnson. I want to go on record as unequivocably supporting the expansion of both these programs. I will be glad to appear at your hearing, if requested, to make my views known in detail.

WILLIAM O. KLINE,
President,
Central Bucks Chamber of Commerce.

Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, as we continue this great debate on civil rights, I cannot help but feel that this is a most significant and historical period in the annals of our Nation. It is a matter which our people have discussed for many years and one of vital interest to the entire country. I am convinced that the problem of civil rights is not only the overriding issue of this session of Congress, but perhaps the most significant issue of our time.

Civil rights is also one of the most difficult problems this Nation has ever confronted in its history. We cannot close our eyes and believe that the problem does not exist. We cannot ignore it and wish it would somehow disappear. We must meet it—and I think what we are doing here today is making a sincere effort to deal with this problem and to find a solution.

We must recognize that times change. We must also recognize that new challenges have arisen which demand a new approach. This great Nation of ours has been characterized throughout its history by its ability to adjust to changes and to meet the challenges of the times. I am confident that we still possess that ability.

Right now we are faced with a tremendous challenge in the field of civil rights. We cannot ignore the fact that we are in the throes of a great social change, some even refer to it as a social revolution.

More than 100 years ago, in 1863, Abraham Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation assuring freedom and equality to all Americans. Now, a century later, millions of our citizens are still deprived of these rights. In the South, as well as in other parts of the country, we have recently seen strong evidence of the impatience of the Negro people who are the victims of discrimination and racism. This impatience is expressed in the form of marches, demonstrations, sit-ins, protests, appeals. Fortunately, they have been of a nonviolent character, with a few exceptions. It would, indeed, be a dark and sad day for America if this impatience gives way to riots and bloodshed.

Negro leaders themselves are well aware and seriously concerned over such developments. James Farmer, the national director of CORE—Congress of Racial Equality—one of the leading Negro organizations in the country, stated last summer at the annual convention of his organization:

> No one can stop the demonstrations. The question is: Can we keep them orderly and nonviolent?

This is a matter which deserves much thought. Demonstrations can get out of control, and the consequences would then be most tragic for all concerned, Negro and white. Not only could it lead to loss of life and destruction of property, but it would alienate the sympathy of millions of white people throughout the country who support civil rights. It would bring much harm to the very cause for which Negroes are fighting and would set that cause back, and it would do irreparable harm to our Nation's prestige abroad. These are factors which should be seriously considered by Negro leaders in their efforts to keep the demonstrations from becoming destructive and violent. This is a responsibility which they must assume.

At the same time, the white people must realize that the Negro is tired of excuses and endless debates. He is alarmed, and even angry at times, when he sees that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation he is still far from enjoying rights of citizenship, he is still struggling for elemental justice, for the right to vote, the right to give his children an education, the right to decent housing, equal opportunities for employment, and the use of public accommodations. White people, too, must assume their share of responsibility under such circumstances by showing understanding, by avoiding provocation, and by cooperating in the effort to assure civil rights for all Americans.

Let me make one point clear, however. We must recognize the right of Negroes for equal opportunities for obtaining a job, an education, proper housing, and so forth. Denying this right to them is indefensible. But granting a man a job merely because he is a Negro is also indefensible. Merit and ability should be the determining factors, and not the color of a man's skin, or his religious beliefs, or his national origin. All that we ask—and I am sure all that the Negroes themselves ask—is that they be given an equal opportunity, that the same yardstick that is applied to whites in employment, housing, education, public accommodations, and the like, should also be applied to them. That is a fair and just request.

At all levels of government, Federal, State, county, and municipal, we must work to find a peaceful solution to this problem which, as I stated earlier, is the overriding moral issue of our day. Americans must realize that the time for excuses and explanations has passed, and that the time for action has arrived. We must reexamine our sense of moral values and moral objectives. We cannot afford in good conscience to let the struggle of the Negro for true emancipation take place within a nation that seems to have forgotten its own moral values. Failure to provide civil rights for all our citizens will weaken the fabric of our Nation at a crucial time in human events when we need our full strength to cope with other domestic and international problems.

As I reflect over the struggle for civil rights, the thought comes to mind: Why this intolerance in this great country of ours toward the member of a minority group, toward the person who belongs to a different race or faith? Did we not all contribute of our brain and brawn to make the United States what it is today? Do we not all seek the security of our country, the welfare of our Nation? The children born in our country today know neither prejudice nor hatred of their playmates in their formative years. They are given by Almighty God inalienable rights of freedom and equality, which neither man nor law can take away from them or deny to them.

A nation that lives up to these rights and provides all of its citizens with the opportunity to enjoy them is a happy and prosperous nation. A civilization or society that assumes the responsibility that what is granted to one will be granted to all should have no fear that it cannot survive the onslaught of communism. It cannot be vanquished because its people have something to live by and to fight for.

It stands to reason that, in this crucial era for all of humanity, this is certainly a time for all men of good will to unite, to set aside their petty bickering, to rise above partisan and geographical lines, and to go forward together in their efforts to achieve security and peace. Unfortunately, the civil rights issue serves to

divide us, to weaken us, to arouse sectional strife, and to detract our attention from the real problems and dangers facing our country today. This is exactly what Khrushchev and his comrades in Moscow want—division in our ranks, chaos in our land, and our attention diverted to other matters, while they go about gobbling up nation after nation until we are ready to fall prey to their schemes. We fail to treat a deadly cancer, but worry over a cut on our finger.

This is a time that calls for balanced minds and clear vision to understand the human values behind the struggle for for civil rights. It is time we realize that second-class citizenship for any segment of our population is no longer feasible or desirable. We have outlived those concepts. The world will no longer tolerate them. The times have changed and the challenges are here. If there are any among us who doubt it, I urge you to look at developments in Asia and Africa where many new and independent nations have recently arisen, and also at Latin America. Just as colonialism is a thing of the past, so discrimination and second-class citizenship status are things of the past. The sooner we realize this, the better for us. The longer we cling to outmoded concepts, the more we stand to lose at home and abroad.

It was one of our great labor leaders, Samuel Gompers, the founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor, who said:

> America is not merely a name. It is not merely a land. It is not merely a country, nor is it merely a continent. America is a symbol; it is an ideal; the hopes of the world can be expressed in the ideal—America.

That has been true all through our history. That is the image in which mankind has always regarded our Nation—the symbol, the ideal, the hope of humanity. The story of America over the past two centuries is the story of a growing and expanding nation where new opportunities have been opened up to more and more of its citizens, so that they can participate as equal partners in a free society—free also from discrimination. Instead of freedom from discrimination, some sections of our citizenry are suffering from an infection of discrimination which is sapping our strength, holding back our economic growth, and destroying our national unity and the moral fiber of our Nation.

Consider, for example, what discrimination in housing is doing to our cities, the decay it is causing both in human lives and in property. In a book by Howard Moody, called "The City: Metropolis or New Jerusalem?"—Published about a year ago—we read as follows:

> A city is dying when it has an eye for real estate value, but has lost its heart for personal values; when it has an understanding of traffic flow, but little concern about the flow of human beings; when we have increasing competence in building, but less and less time for housing and ethical codes: when human values are absent at the heart of the city's decisionmaking, planning, and the execution of its plans. * * * Then the city dies and all that is left, humanly, is decay.

Unfortunately, this is the situation in many of our cities today, large and small, where Negroes and others are subject to discrimination in housing and to other indignities.

I am opposed to such practices. I am opposed to treating Americans as second-class citizens by denying them basic rights enjoyed by all others. We must not recognize any caste system in the United States, or the supremacy of one race over another. Such practices can never be justified in the light of our moral and democratic principles, because there is no moral justification for racial or religious discrimination.

This country is comprised of people from all corners of the earth, all races, religions, and nationality groups. All of them have made important contributions toward the growth of our country and the shaping of its destiny. To abuse our civil rights, to continue discriminatory practices against our fellow citizens, is most injurious to our way of life and to everything that this Nation has stood for and fought for in the last two centuries. It is intolerable at all times, it is morally wrong under any circumstances.

Somewhere recently I came across these lines by an American poet:

> Give us wide walls to build our temple of liberty, O God.
> The North shall be built of love, to stand against the winds of fate;
> The South of tolerance, that we may, in building, outreach hate;
> The East our faith, that rises clear and new each day;
> The West our hope, that even dies a glorious way.
> The threshold 'neath our feet will be humility:
> The roof—the very sky itself—infinity.
> God, give us wide walls to build this great temple of American liberty.

Mr. Chairman, for the sake of our great Nation and its future, we must build with love and tolerance: with faith in our country that it will remain the ideal and the hope of mankind; and with the firm belief in human brotherhood, freedom, and true understanding among the nations of the world. We cannot be wrong if we are on the side of God and man.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, we are drawing near to the close of the debate on this deceptively styled civil rights bill. In my votes and in the amendments I have offered I have endeavored to remove the unconstitutional and totalitarian provisions of this bill. I have been joined by many other good Democrats and a few Republicans. Our votes have been cast in this manner because we believe in preserving the rights of all the people regardless of race, color, or creed.

I have strongly contested these points but have won only a few small victories. I do not have the time to point out to you all of the unconstitutional and totalitarian provisions embodied in the bill and have been unable to do so in the 9 days we have debated. There are just too many provisions. Certain portions of it are so clearly unconstitutional that if the bill is enacted the basic and fundamental powers of the States and of the local governments to regulate business and to govern the relationships of individuals to each other will have been preempted.

Some of you have stated privately that you are against the bill, yet that you will stand on the floor of this House and vote in favor of passing this bill because you hope to gain a vote by such a vote. This is in derogation of your oath to support the Constitution. As for me, I refuse to barter the liberties provided to all of the people in the Constitution and sell their freedom for the hope of a vote.

I think too much of my oath as a Member of Congress and I value my self-respect too highly to commit such an act of perfidy. This so-called civil rights bill will be a campaign issue in all of your districts including my own—yet I have made my decision and have faced the matter squarely as any sincere representative of the people should do. Already, this bill is a campaign issue in my own district, where a liberal opponent has embraced this bill as dear to his heart. Nevertheless, I have felt impelled to be unequivocal in my stand. I am not a fence straddler and it is not my nature to be such and I do not believe that the people of the Seventh Texas Congressional District elected me to betray them, as this bill, if enacted, would do.

Discrimination of every form is demonstrated in the bill but its authors were extremely careful to refrain from defining "discrimination" at any place in the proposal. I believe this was wilfully done in order to make it easier for its executioners to carry out whatever end they may seek by regulation rather than being bound by the provisions of law. In all the history of Congress, no committee has ever, ever brought forth a piece of legislation that would hand such dictatorial powers to the executive branch and particularly to the Attorney General. If this bill is enacted as written, I predict that within a few years, its strongest proponents of today will be coming before Congress begging to stop the discrimination brought on by this act against all of the people of this country of all races, creeds, and colors.

I have always supported equal rights under the law for all people; I have always been for the protection of the rights of every race, regardless of the color of skin, or the religion. The amendments that I offered on the floor of the House during the debate on the bill were to guarantee such equal rights. But let me tell you, if this piece of legislation goes through the Congress, and becomes law, we have practiced discrimination against our own—our brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, aunts, and uncles, but most serious of all, against our own children, because we are throwing them back into the reactionary feudal days of the past, with persecution, liquidation and centralized power—and this is true, regardless of race, religion, or color of the skin.

I do not think that the Democratic leader who lies beneath the eternal flame atop a hill in Arlington Cemetery would have cast his vote for the passing of this bill. It does not pay tribute to the ideals of nondiscriminatory living. In fact, this proposal is 11 bills rolled up into one, at least half of which enact discrimination into the law of the land.

I would like to hear any one of the supporters of this bill give his definition of "liberty." That small, but meaningful word, "liberty"—the most precious word placed between the covers of a dictionary. I think that some of the supporters and even the authors of the bill would decline the opportunity to present such definition, because it just might tell us where they all really stand.

Someone stood on the floor of the House a few days ago, and said that at a recent breakfast attended by President Johnson and Evangelist Billy Graham, the idea was discussed that if there were a secret ballot on the bill, that it would not get 15 votes in favor of its passage—and I think that is true.

I have been elected to Congress six times in the past and I say to you if I have ever practiced discrimination against any person, group, or body, I do not think I would be here today on the floor of this House as a Member of Congress. If there be anyone who thinks differently, he is calling the people of the Seventh Texas Congressional District dishonest.

We must not move backward into the darkness of the past—let us not chain our leaders of the future with the shackles of totalitarianism contained in this vicious proposal. Instead, we should look at ourselves, and forget party, left, right, middle, or anything else, and think of future generations. We must be honest with ourselves; when liberty is chained, it dies. If all the Members of the U.S. Congress would be honest with themselves and with posterity—if they really care for the future of our great Nation, the walls of dictatorship that have been drawn in this legislation would be dropped, and these 11 bills, wrapped under one cover and called civil rights would be relegated to the infamous Hades from whence it came, and America could yet be called the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The plea is made that this legislation is necessary—that this retreat to medieval times is good—yet it has been well said that necessity is the plea for every infringement of human liberty. It is the argument of tyrants and the creed of slaves.

My colleagues, from the depths of my heart and with all sincerity, I urge you, for the sake of all we hold dear, for the sake of human liberty, for the sake of posterity, to oppose this bill as it is here before us. By doing so, you can insure for yourselves the blessing of future generations. If this bill is enacted you will have entombed liberty and earned for yourself the fervent condemnation by your children and your children's children for enslaving them.

As we approach the end of debate on whether to impose this instrument of dishonor and disgrace upon a free people, I stand here pleading and praying on behalf of the people in the words of that king of olden times—"deliver us into the hands of a merciful God; place us not in the hands of man."

Narragansett Bay: A Great New Sea Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article written by Dr. John A. Knauss, dean, Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island. The article appeared in the February 1964 issue of the New Englander. It is an excellent analysis of the vigorous growth in research facilities now underway in Narragansett Bay:

ON THE SHORE OF NARRAGANSETT BAY: A GREAT NEW SEA LABORATORY—MORE THAN THE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IT IS ADDING TO THE REGION'S ECONOMY, THIS SEASIDE COMPLEX IS ADDING TO MAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE VAST AND MYSTERIOUS SEA

(By Dr. John A. Knauss, dean, Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island)

After struggling to raise a crop on the rocky soil of New England, many of the area's early settlers turned to the sea for a living: hunting fish for food and carrying the commerce of the world in their swift vessels. But the world beneath the waves remained a mystery.

While farmers were learning about crop rotation, chemical fertilizers, selective breeding, and pesticides, the rivers, bays, and coastal ocean areas were becoming giant cesspools to accommodate the wastes of a booming population and industrial economy.

The fishing boats still go out from Rockland, Gloucester, Boston, New Bedford, and Point Judith, but despite progress in developing electronic aids, improved power systems, and some new fishing gear, man is still a hunter in an uncertain environment.

As a result of the lag in modernizing its fishing and processing techniques, this country has slipped from the second largest fishing nation to fifth after Japan, Peru, Red China, and Russia.

In 1962, for instance, 72 percent of the U.S. fishing fleet was from 11 to 50 years old. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has reported "the average medium trawler fishing North Atlantic waters was built in 1941. Small trawlers are even older—the average vessel having been built in 1938."

However, there is hope now that new legislation—raising the subsidy rate for construction of new vessels from 33⅓ to 50 percent—will enable construction of vessels better able to compete with foreign intruders.

Despite the handicaps, the New England fishing industry's catch was worth in excess of $60 million, according to the most recent Federal reports.

Meanwhile, pollution kills or makes unfit for human consumption whole populations of fish and shellfish. It threatens the growing boating and recreation industries.

Piecemeal efforts to protect and develop the region's bountiful marine resources have, in many cases, been hampered by ignorance.

But a growing $6 million marine research complex at Narragansett Bay, R.I., should help provide the knowledge and data to cope with the expanding marine problems.

Nucleus for this development is the 88-acre Narragansett Bay campus of the University of Rhode Island, headquarters for the graduate school of oceanography and home port for the 180-foot research vessel, *Trident*. Together the facilities represent an investment of about $650,000. Its annual payroll of about $580,000 provides 109 scientists, technicians, and staff people who work at the site.

Under an agreement with the Association of New England State Universities, University of Rhode Island has volunteered to become the center for marine sciences in the six-State region.

As a result of this arrangement students from anywhere in New England may enroll in the masters or Ph. D. programs at the University of Rhode Island on the same tuition basis as is granted Rhode Island students who enroll at the school.

To the south of the University of Rhode Island campus sits a squat concrete fortress, housing Rhode Island's first critical nuclear reactor. The $1 million "swimming pool" model was built as a research tool on land donated to the Rhode Island Atomic Energy Commission by the University of Rhode Island. In addition to providing researchers with short-lived isotopes, the reactor promises to be a powerful drawing card for scientific talent.

There are also other applications in the marine sciences. For instance, a planned University of Rhode Island project calls for bombarding fish organs and tissue with neutrons. This very precise method of determining the quantity of elements present may allow biologists to detect minute differences between different groups of the same species. Later it might be possible to introduce varying trace elements into fish tissue so they would be permanently "marked.". This might give a ready means for studying the habits and migratory patterns of fish.

A few hundred yards to the north of the reactor, equipment is being moved into the U.S. Public Health Service's (U.S. PHS) $1,165,000 facility: The Northeast Shellfish Sanitation Research Center.

By this summer the shovels will break ground for a fourth building: the U.S. PHS, $1,700,000 Water Quality Criteria Laboratory.

In the planning stages for the area is the Marine Sports Research Station which it is expected the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will construct. Like the other Federal facilities, it will probably be built on land donated by the University of Rhode Island board of trustees.

Eventually over 300 persons will be gathered together on the hillside site overlooking the waters of Narragansett Bay and the Atlantic Ocean.

"This small and most sightly spot may well become one of the most significant areas for science and service to the people of the east-

ern seaboard," Dr. Francis H. Horn, University of Rhode Island president, has said, adding "there is a growing feeling that research into the nature and resources of the sea may hold as great potential for the future as space science."

As separate entities any of these facilities may make important contributions to the marine sciences, but those of us associated with the project are excited about the possibilities that will exist for joint projects and for the exchange of ideas—both formally and informally.

In addition there is already some discussion about the development of joint facilities—such as a cooperative library and communication center or a common dining hall.

A demonstration of what many different talents can accomplish when brought to bear on marine problems is in evidence at University of Rhode Island. For the past 3 years an organization called the University Committee on the Marine Resources Program has looked for opportunities to involve faculty members in research in the marine sciences. This committee has been chaired by Dr. Nelson Marshall, professor of biological oceanography.

Today members of 13 departments, other than the school of oceanography, are engaged in marine studies or research. An agricultural economist compiled a report on "The Economic Effect of Narragansett Bay upon Surrounding Communities." The director of the computer laboratory (who is also an oceanographer) is studying computer applications in fishing biology. An agronomist is developing methods of rebuilding dunes and stabilizing beaches by plantings.

Many suggestions have been made that colleges of fisheries, somewhat like colleges of agriculture, should be established, but this would be time consuming, expensive, and cumbersome. At present it appears that existing resources and knowledge within the university are sufficient to accomplish the job.

As Dr. Marshall has noted, "Give people a chance to work on problems of the sea, and they love it."

The great need today is for intelligent planning to resolve conflicts in utilization of the region's marine resources. For instance, Narragansett Bay, R.I., is used by the Navy, by sports and commercial fishermen, and by boating and sailing enthusiasts. It is also a cesspool for pollution, but its shores remain, for the time being, a desirable site for residential housing.

No effective long-range planning can be undertaken without taking all these varied uses and the economic consequences into consideration. While universities and other research agencies can provide information and studies, it is the responsibility of existing social and political organizations to take action.

However, many of us believe more can be done by the university in developing an applied fisheries program, in educating the public to the problems in managing and developing marine resources, and in closing the gap between scientific discovery and on-the-job application. This might result in some sort of "extension" program such as now exists in colleges of agriculture.

Steps have already been made in this direction. For the past 3 years, for instance, Dr. Marshall's marine resources program has sponsored a "Fishermen's Forum" on the University of Rhode Island campus. Last May the topics covered included, "Fishing with the New Stern Trawler," "New Developments in Fish Oil, Meal, and Solubles," "Vessel Subsidies, Loans, and Grants—Present Rules and Proposed Legislation," "Electronic Aids to Fishing and Navigation," and "Fishery Research Methods." Local fishermen had a chance to listen and then ask questions of a marine engineer, officials from the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and a University of Rhode Island biological oceanographer.

Although much of our attention is focused on the bays, estuaries, and nearby coastal ocean, the research being conducted far out to sea aboard *Trident* will also have an impact in many areas.

The movements of the ocean effect the distribution of animal and plant life and distribute the minerals forming the basic foodstuffs. Phytoplankton—the minute plants of the sea—are the initial link in the food chain. The sea also acts as a mammoth heat reservoir influencing weather. Many first breed and then migrate great distances before they are caught.

The Federal research facilities that are being developed in Rhode Island reflect a concern for the public health and welfare. Wesley E. Gilbertson, chief of the Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection of the U.S. PHS, said problems with shellfish sanitation "had been manifested in three outbreaks of infectious hepatitis, one small outbreak of typhoid fever, four separate instances of paralytic shellfish poisoning, and a recent incident involving a previously unknown toxin."

Is there some way polluted shellfish may be purified? A study is already being conducted of various processes by the Rhode Island Division of Fish and Game at Bristol, R.I. Scientists from the Northeast Shellfish Sanitation Research Center and University of Rhode Island are cooperating in the investigation.

In New England in 1961, according to the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the shellfish crop had a value of $29 million. On the basis of a survey of Narragansett Bay, John L. Rego, former director of the Rhode Island Department of Agriculture, has estimated that the value of the shellfish crop in Rhode Island could be nearly doubled if some purification process were developed and put to use.

The sports fishing scientists want to find out what it takes to produce game fish; how they can spawn in large numbers and obtain sufficient food. They are also interested in pollution and pesticides and what effects these varying agents have on fish. The Rhode Island facility will also be the base for study of fish migration in Massachusetts' waters and elsewhere.

The question of what constitutes pollution may seem to be a simple one at first, but the definition advanced by the man responsible for planning the work of the water quality criteria lab is a broad one and indicates the scope of the work to be undertaken by this facility.

Dr. Clarence M. Tarzwell calls pollution, "the addition of any material, or any change in the quality of water, which interferes with, or lessens, or destroys a desired use." Therefore the acceptable limits for the concentration of a material might vary, depending on whether the area under construction was to be used for bathing, fishing, or boating.

To accomplish the water quality control lab's work, one of the most unusual and extensive aquariums in the world will be gathered together under the same roof. This will mean collecting marine organisms up and down the entire coast. Then short-term screening tests will be run to determine which species are most sensitive to toxic materials.

More extensive studies of the most sensitive species will then be conducted. Finally, the toxic factors will be investigated under "environmental" conditions to insure that laboratory findings are not contrary to what would actually happen in the natural setting.

After completion of this process, the scientists will be ready to make recommendations on water quality standards which must then be accepted by the State and Federal Governments.

These and related research activities all over the country give promise of producing revolutionary changes in utilizing the resources of the sea.

Dr. Saul B. Saila, University of Rhode Island associate professor of oceanography, said "the time will come when we will be farming clams, just like potatoes and there will probably be more money in it, too." He also thinks it is within the realm of possibility to predict the location of fish using a computer programed to accept such information as barometric pressure, temperatures, and other hydrographic data.

It is also likely that steps will be taken to insure that a greater percentage of eggs hatch and infant mortality in fish is decreased.

We may soon be mining the sea floor on a large scale. Under vast areas of the ocean are plentiful deposits of mineral nodules containing not only manganese and iron, but also smaller percentages of cobalt, copper, and nickel.

And someday in the future we may even farm the open ocean. In reporting on the First International Symposium on Cetacean (mammals such as whales and dolphins) Research, the magazine, Undersea Technology reported:

"It was proposed that dolphins and other sea animals be domesticated to help manage sea farms which could help feed the increasingly large number of hungry people in the world. Prof. Ritchie Calder of the University of Edinburgh, claimed that sea ranches, sea pastures, and sea stud farms are not absurdities.

"He also suggested plowing up ocean floors with pumps to put organic and mineral materials back into fish-feeding layers. 'I can see,' he said, 'employing that highly intelligent and apparently loquacious creature, the dolphin, as the sheep dog or even the farm manager of our submarine ranches.' Great arms of the sea could be fenced off, he said, by putting mild electric shock waves across the entrances to discourage fish from migrating, just as strands of electric wire remind farm animals."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address of Hon. Fernand J. St Germain, Member of Congress, First District, Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following remarks of the Honorable FERNAND ST GERMAIN, Member of Congress from the First District of Rhode Island, which were to be given at the annual Awards Dinner of the Boy Scouts of America in Woonsocket, R.I. The substance of this address concerns, most appropriately, the National Service Corps Act.

I am a firm supporter of this concept, and a cosponsor of this legislation in the Senate. Congressman ST GERMAIN, in this excellent speech, points out that the proposed National Service Corps is an integral part of the administration's program to help abolish poverty in our country.

Therefore, I take this opportunity to call to my colleague's attention Congressman ST GERMAIN's address, for I believe it both underscores the need for this legislation and plainly demonstrates the benefits that would be accrued by our entire Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND, AT THE ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER, THUNDERMIST DISTRICT, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, SATURDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 8, 1964, WOONSOCKET, R.I.

The Boy Scouts of America is one of the greatest organizations in this country. The benefits it has given the youth of the Nation are so numerous that it would take a separate speech just to mention each of them.

There is one common factor, however, in all the activities of the Boy Scouts—that factor is service—service in the name of God, in the name of fellow men, and in the name of country. There is no better way to assure that a boy will learn the virtues of fairness, tolerance, patriotism, and helpfulness than to have him join the Boy Scouts and participate in the many phases of its work.

Service is given by the Boy Scouts and similar organizations for the simple reason that service is needed. Americans have always been quick to respond to this need. A good example of this is the Peace Corps which has aided countless millions of people abroad in both direct and indirect ways. We are all familiar with the efforts of its thousands of volunteers—both young and old—who have left the security and comforts of the United States in order to be of personal and immediate help to the sick, the destitute, and the suffering throughout the far corners of the world.

Spectacular though the success of the Peace Corps has been, we must not forget the great needs which exist here at home. Although it seems hard for most of us to believe, just short of 40 million Americans are in dire straits and desperately need assistance. These 40 million people must be classified as seriously deprived citizens. They are the people in city and rural slums who so few of us see. They are mentally retarded children in understaffed institutions throughout the Nation. They are the migrant farm workers and their children who roam from place to place with the availability of work. They are the American Indians, many of whose living conditions are so bad that their life expectancy is 20 years less than ours.

In order to meet these and other pressing needs, our late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, proposed the creation of an agency similar to the Peace Corps which would work on the domestic scene. I am very proud to be one of the cosponsors of this bill which is titled, appropriately enough, the National Service Corps Act.

President Kennedy's proposal was made after a thorough study by a committee composed of members of the Cabinet under the chairmanship of the Attorney General. They recommended a program which would call to service a maximum of 5,000 dedicated citizens of all ages to give a year or two of their time in a dedicated effort to improve the lot of their fellow Americans who need help so badly. These volunteers would only receive a nominal stipend as a living allowance. Like the volunteers of the Peace Corps, their main compensation would be the satisfaction of knowing that they were making a real contribution to the welfare of those far less fortunate than themselves.

I want to stress that the National Service Corps proposal is not a bid by the Federal Government to encroach upon the work being done by State and private agencies. To the contrary, local initiative is envisioned as the cornerstone of the entire program. The proof of this is that National Service Corps personnel would go only to communities and areas where they were specifically invited. Moreover, their work would last for only a limited period of time and they would always be under the supervision of local agencies. Once again, the motivating idea of the Corps is service, and there will be no attempt by the Federal Government to extend either its authority or influence. When the job is done, the volunteers will depart, leaving it to the local agencies to continue the work which has begun.

Despite the real need which exists for establishment of the Corps, and despite the fact that it has received strong support from numerous public service groups throughout the country who agree that a project of such scope must have a Federal base in order to be successful, the National Service Corps Act passed the Senate by only a few votes and is still in committee on the House side.

It is imperative that the bill become law in the near future so that President Johnson's declared war against poverty and want may be fought in the most effective and efficient way. In his state of the Union message at the beginning of the current congressional session, President Johnson echoed the late President Kennedy's call for action by stating:

"We must create a National Service Corps to help the economically handicapped of our country the same way the Peace Corps helps those abroad."

The President's statement makes it plain that the National Service Corps is an integral part of the great program to abolish poverty in our country which ranks among the most prosperous on earth. The Corps would aid in the antipoverty campaign in three important ways:

1. It would help supply the skilled trained manpower which will be needed by communities undertaking antipoverty programs but lacking personnel to man them. All indications point to the fact that these personnel shortages will be serious.

2. It would help to bring immediate visibility to problems and to the community's effort to solve them.

3. It would provide the necessary motivation to get communities going on the task.

You may be sure that as your Congressman I shall continue to press for final passage of this important legislation. Perhaps some of you people here tonight, or your friends, may at some time become volunteers in the Corps. To my mind, it would be a marvelous experience for young people graduating from college who want to spend a year or two in humanitarian service before entering upon their careers, regardless of what those careers might be. It would also be a tremendous experience for senior citizens who have retired but have a strong desire to continue to lead useful and productive lives. While these two groups are ideally suited to the work of the Corps, any qualified citizen who has the time and the interest will be welcome to join in this effort.

To sum up, the National Service Corps will be an organization of dedicated Americans pledged to do a difficult, tedious, and usually thankless job—helping others to help themselves. They will be men and women not looking for material rewards, but spiritual and personal ones. From the point of view of many so-called practical persons, they will be considered impractical idealists who are wasting a year or two of their lives in assisting people who will never be able to help them. Several years ago, the same "practical" citizens were saying the identical thing about the Peace Corps volunteers. They were dreamers, so the story went, going abroad to impossible places to do an impossible job. The success of the Peace Corps has proved that its antagonists were wrong. The job has been done and continues to be done. The same will be true of the National Service Corps on the domestic front.

In wartime, all citizens of a country join together in a common effort to achieve victory. All-out war against poverty has now been declared here in our own country. It is the duty of every American to support the President in this fight. If all of us do this, the conquest of man's deadly enemies of poverty, disease, and ignorance will be assured.

Render Unto Dairy What Is Dairy's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the importance of congressional action to aid all our dairy farmers is emphasized by the vital role which dairying plays in our total farm economy.

Dairy products led the list in value of basic farm commodities produced in 1963. Milk and its products accounted for $4,805 million of the income of our Nation's farmers last year. Cotton came in a poor second, accounting for $2,837 million of our farm income. Wheat, which was third, brought in $2,071 million.

As I pointed out in a letter to the delegates to the 33d annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, it is an unfortunate fact that the problems of our dairy farmers sometimes tend to be relegated to a place of lesser importance behind the problems of the producers of other commodities, such as cotton and wheat. According to a statement made on February 11 by Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles Murphy before the Senate Agriculture Committee, the total expenditure for the cotton program this year will be nearly $800 million. By contrast, the cost of the dairy price support program for the current marketing year is estimated at $376 million.

In other words, the value of our cotton production is 59 percent of the value of our dairy production. Yet the cost of our cotton program is 212 percent of the cost of the dairy program. Frankly, I think it is high time the Congress gives to the dairy industry the attention which it deserves.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my message to the Wisconsin Farmers Union in the RECORD:

FEBRUARY 14, 1964.

GILBERT ROHDE,
President, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention, Madison, Wis.

DEAR FRIEND: Please extend my greetings and best wishes to the delegates to the 33d annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, being held February 16, 17, and 18 in Madison. I regret that congressional business prevents me from being there in person for this important meeting of Wisconsin farmers.

Since we share a common interest in a healthy dairy economy, I wish to comment briefly on the necessity for a comprehensive and sound dairy program to raise the income of dairymen and cut our burdensome dairy surpluses. Needless to say, I am delighted that President Johnson has included dairy products among the five commodities requiring the immediate attention of Congress. The other commodities are wheat, cotton, sugar, and potatoes.

It is an unfortunate fact that the problems of our dairymen sometimes tend to be relegated to a place of lesser importance behind the problems of the producers of other commodities, such as cotton and wheat. However, the importance of our dairy industry to our total farm economy cannot be overemphasized.

Dairy products led the list in value of basic farm commodities produced in 1963. Milk and its products accounted for $4,805 million of the income of our Nation's farmers last year. Cotton came in a poor second, accounting for $2,837 million of our farm income. Wheat, which was third, brought in $2,071 million.

These figures are particularly interesting when you compare the cost of the current programs for dairy and cotton. According to a statement made February 11 by Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles Murphy before the Senate Agriculture Committee, the total expenditure for the cotton program this year will be nearly $800 million. By contrast, the cost of the dairy price support program for the current marketing year is estimated at $376 million.

In other words, the value of our cotton production is 59 percent of the value of our dairy production. Yet the cost of our cotton program is 212 percent of the cost of the dairy program. Frankly, I think it is high time the Congress gives to the dairy industry the attention which it deserves.

I am encouraged by the fact that the President is recommending legislation to aid manufacturing milk producers as well as those under Federal milk marketing orders. In his farm message to Congress, he called for the two-way dairy program which is provided in legislation that I have introduced in the House.

Specifically, my bill authorizes direct payments to producers outside Federal milk marketing orders who voluntarily agree not to expand their production beyond that of the base year, or a percentage of the base year. It retains the present floor of 75 percent of parity under dairy price supports.

In addition, the measure permits producers in Federal milk market order areas to reduce their production of milk without reducing their share of the class I market. Payments for surplus reduction are also included.

Currently, the House Agriculture Committee has before it a Senate-passed bill which is restricted to Federal milk markets. Well over 600,000 farmers sell their milk outside of Federal order markets, as compared with the 187,000 producers operating under the Federal milk orders. Over 75 percent of the milk produced in Wisconsin is sold in a relatively free market.

I have made no secret of my opposition to the Senate bill, for I do not believe the benefits of a dairy program should be confined to the minority of our dairy farmers who, because of a lucky geographical accident, are already benefiting from the higher price provisions of Federal milk marketing orders. I am hopeful that President Johnson's dairy recommendations will be of material help to those of us in Congress who are working for a comprehensive dairy program for both manufacturing milk and Federal market order dairymen.

Again, my good wishes for a successful meeting and another successful year.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

Lincoln Day Address by Mark Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 7, 1964, the Republicans of Allegany County, Md., were privileged to have Mr. Mark Evans, vice president of Metromedia, Inc., as the guest speaker at our annual Lincoln Day dinner.

Each of us has come to know Mark Evans as a man of great insight—a man who has become a welcome TV visitor in our homes. His interviews and commentary have contributed greatly to our understanding and appreciation of public affairs.

As was expected, Mark Evans came to Allegany County with a message. His message is applicable to all American citizens who might take for granted the system of government which we espouse. Those citizens of Allegany County who were present at the Lincoln Day dinner on February 7 were much the better for having heard Mark Evans.

His address presents questions of utmost importance to all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Mark Evans at the annual Lincoln Day dinner in Cumberland, Md., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARK EVANS, VICE PRESIDENT, METROMEDIA, INC., AT ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY DINNER, ALLEGANY COUNTRY, CUMBERLAND, MD.

I wonder, as I'm sure you have at times, what we concerned ourselves with before communism came along. I wonder where it all began? I wonder how it all began?

Winston Churchill, in his magnificent perspicacity—his ability to put the finger right on the problem—was defined, I think somewhat contradictory in his definition of the Soviet Union when he said, "the Soviet Union is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." That sounds like a Washington definition but when you analyze it, it is fairly sound. George Kennan, our former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, once said there are no experts on the Soviet Union—only varying degrees of ignorance. To this, I subscribe and plead guilty. Between East and West Berlin today, there has been built a line of demarcation—a great schism—between two ideologies now locked in a struggle—literally a death struggle—to see which one of these two systems will survive. We cannot kid ourselves any longer. One of us have got to go. I am sure many of you have read and talked a good deal about the subject and, incidentally, I had it here in a press conference; I lost it somewhere along the line—it is a piece of barbed wire that I literally broke on that line of demarcation between the East and West. I come from the State of Utah, and I know what barbed wire was originally intended for, and I'm not sure but what the symbolism isn't completely still there.

Being very elemental now, I probably will repeat something of which you are well aware. Let me point out something of the background of Sovietdom. First of all, if you doubled the United States with our two new States—and placed that area over the map of Russia, you still wouldn't cover the confines of the Soviet Union. Take China and Canada and double that area—you still wouldn't cover the face of Mother Russia. Let's get the full picture and recognize that in the United States we have four time zones and as you fly across the country you can't help but revel in the breadth and width of this tremendous land. In the Soviet Union, when it is noon on one boundary, it is almost midnight on the other boundary. It covers 11 time zones. They speak—and, believe me, this is part of their problem—they speak 60 different languages in

the Soviet Union—60 different languages. This land covers one-sixth of all the earth, without considering their satellites. I think there is little doubt in anybody's mind, as a student of history, that there never was a country on the face of the earth that was more ripe and ready for revolution than was Russia 40 years ago.

If ever human life had been completely disregarded; if ever there had been a time in the history of that country or any country when human dignity was at a lower ebb, I don't know when it was. They were ripe for what happened. It seemed the church and the state were vying with each other as to which could be the most evil toward mankind. And, believe me, in the Soviet Union today this is the picture—this is the posture they paint of capitalism and religion. They never let them forget it for one moment. Here is the country that was revolutionized by an ideology authorized by a man named Marx, who was born a Jew, became a Catholic and finally an atheist; whose philosophy was passed on to Gorki and Lenin and Stalin—and Khrushchev. You may remember when the Soviet leaders came to this country. It was not unusual for them to walk along the line of people and walk right up—and this is typical Soviet modus operandi—they would walk up to somebody and say—How much money do you make?—How much rent do you pay?—How many cars do you have? No "How do you do"—no introductions—just that pointblank statement. I tried it on one of their citizens—on several of them, as a matter of fact—one afternoon while driving along in a taxicab going out to the Soviet exhibition. Out of a clear blue sky, using an interpreter who was my friend, I said, "Herb, ask him this question. Throw it at him real hard and fast." And it was done. The question was, "What do you think of communism?" It was most obvious that it shook the old boy as he grabbed the wheel tightly and almost came to a halt as he pulled over to the side and analyzed the situation. Finally, he turned around in typical Brooklynese fashion with both palms pointed upward and said, "For 40 years—it is all I know." On the plus side, let's remember that here is a country where 40 years ago 95 percent of the people were illiterate; and today it is just reversed. Let's remember that this is the same country that within 20 years has increased its population only to the point where it was 20 years ago. Remember, they lost 20 million men and 10 million soldiers in the war.

For some time, I had a program on the radio in Washington that was quite successful because the people participated. I had two telephones on my desk. I would ask the question of the day, and on this particular day, I asked the question, "Is it a good idea to let Khrushchev come to this country and propagandize?" After a number of diverse opinions, a lady called, almost in tears, and she said, "Mr. Evans, I have a 17-year-old son. For 3 years this boy has not made an intelligent comment at the dinner table. His every thought has been girls and cars, and rock and roll, and movies and what have you. The other evening at the dinner table, he brought tears to my eyes as he turned to his dad and asked the first intelligent question he'd asked in 3 years. Provoked by all the publicity that was given to the arrival of Khruchchev, he simply turned to his dad and said, 'Dad, what is communism?'" And she said, "I submit to you the possibility that if we were to double the Federal debt, and I am sure that makes the Bureau of the Budget and the rest of us shudder, but if we paid the equivalent of the Federal debt to Khrushchev to come over here and if we could get every boy in America to ask every father, and every father could intelligently answer that question, you couldn't pay Khrushchev enough."

What is communism? Let's analyze seriously—what is this thing called communism? It is not, as many people think, a political party. This is a complete misrepresentation of the fact. Because communism is a 7-day-a-week, 52-week-a-year, 24-hour-a-day religion, pure and simple; a religion that dictates their every thought and action.

Now the question arises, and I am sure most people have thought at one time or another—go ahead, let them have their system. Why can't we get along with them? Why can't we have our system and they have theirs? There is one basic way in which we differ from these people on the other side of that curtain. It is a simple transferral of words—the same words just inverted. On the other side of the curtain they count people; and on this side, people count. There is a set of rules, and I am sure those of you who play sports, either passively or actively, are aware of the incongruity of trying to participate on a field of sport with two completely different sets of rules. It is incomprehensible. It cannot work; you have chaos. Unquestionably, internationally, that is exactly what we have. We have tried to get along with these people using two completely different sets of rules. One of the basic theses of the Soviet system is this—and I hope and pray that Lyndon Johnson, or whoever follows in his shoes, will never forget it. I hope and pray that anybody else, regardless of the echelon in which they work in Government, will never forget when they deal with the Soviets. It is simply this—if you remember it you don't have to remember anything else: Under their system all is moral if it serves the state. These are Lenin's own words. It is moral if it serves the state. Mr. Truman found it out the hard way. I remember the press conference when he came back and said—"Good old Joe." A year later he was saying some other things, as only he can say them. Because Good Old Joe had broken 38 different promises he made at Potsdam. Since World War II there has been complete and utter obvious disregarding of 50 treaties we made with the Soviet Government. Jack Kennedy in Vienna matured a great deal, I think, when he was talking about Laos and found out they were violating the very things they were talking about while seated at a table in Vienna. At that moment, the go-ahead had been given to resume atomic testing. It is moral if it serves the state. I don't care what the crime, it is completely moral.

So, we have these two systems that, I believe, are completely irreconcilable and I think we have got to awaken to that fact. It is my sincere belief, and I've tried to study on this as much as I can, that this system that has made you affluent—that this system is in jeopardy as it has never been before in the history of our country. It may come as a surprise to a lot of people, but I think democracy truly is on trial. I think it is on trial for its very life, and the irony of it is that you are the judge and you are the jury in this amazing trial. And you are going to determine whether or not democracy works and will continue to live. Whether it really can survive. Dialectical materialism teaches this and it is a basic concept of the Soviet way of life, "that as feudalism was replaced by democracy, so will democracy be replaced by communism." And it is on this cornerstone they build their whole building.

I don't know whether you know it—you may recall it if I bring it to your attention. In the history of the world there have been no less than 20 full-fledged civilizations. Today, these are paragraphs in history books. They no longer exist. These were affluent, successful societies, civilizations that dominated the world at one time or another. What happened? How did they collapse? If you will read your history book further—and I hope you will check me out on this—they fell apart, not by conquest—not on the battlefield—they fell apart because they surrendered their individual freedoms to the responsibility of a central all-powerful government. It happened.

I think one of the worst terms I know is the "cold war." It is a term of complacency. We find a certain degree of complacency and a certain amount of comfort in the fact that nobody is dying. I contend that the basic difference between a cold war and a hot war is that in a cold war people are not dying, but a system is dying. Our system is sick—it is desperately sick. This hasn't happened overnight. It is a paralysis. Many of you have had people—friends and neighbors and relatives—die of cancer, and you have seen that slow insidious growth that takes over the human anatomy. Just as the socialistic system to which I draw the comparison is squeezing our system and trying to end its life. I can't help but admire their honesty. If it is honest, believe me, it has a purpose. May I quote to you a couple of prophetic utterances of Khrushchev between his table poundings. "We will pursue the teachings of Marx that capitalism must be destroyed. And there is as much chance of us forsaking that cause as there is that shrimps will learn to whistle." In 1923, Nicolai Lenin said this: "We will take Eastern Europe." Have they done it? "We will next organize the hordes of Asia." Have they done it? "And then they will surround the United States." Have you checked recently what happened in British Guiana? Have you heard recently what's happened in Brazil? Are you aware of what's happening 90 miles off our Florida coast? "We will take Eastern Europe; we will organize the hordes of Asia, and then surround the United States and then that last bastion of capitalists will not have to be taken—it will fall into our outstretched hands like overripened fruits." Bulganin said, "We cannot appeal to the American workingman now because he is too well fed. But when through inflation America has priced herself out of the world market and unemployment follows—then we will settle our debt with the United States."

I firmly believe that, goaded on by Reds, many of our labor unions scream for more money. And, believe me, I don't hold business above blame because some avaricious, greedy businessmen, tagging on their own demands to the union demands, have caused the price to go up and both of these important segments of the American economy become unwilling, perhaps unknowing, but nevertheless, most effective dupes of communism. Listen to these facts. A man who earned $5,000 in 1940—in order to stand still in 1961—do you know how much he has to earn? Today he has to earn $14,000 a year. Remember—in order to break even. In 15 years from now, let's project the same inflationary growth in 1975 if we continue to have this inflationary spiral go on. A man who in 1940 earned $5,000 a year will in 1975—in order to stand still—have to earn $33,000 a year. Lenin in 1923 said, "The way to destroy capitalism is to debauch the currency." Khrushchev said, "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism; however, we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until suddenly they awake and find they have communism." Remember Norman Thomas? He tried to be President of the United States six times. He said this, "The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism, but under the name of liberalism they will adopt every fragment of the Socialist program, until America will one day be a Socialist nation without knowing how it happened." The

Commies have a very salient term, authored by a man by the name of Rodabush. He called it "encroaching control." They use subterfuge beautifully. In a large defense plant not many years ago, a man came through after closing hours with a wheelbarrow full of sawdust. The guard stopped him and said, "Wait a minute. Where are you going?" He said, "I just have some sawdust, I'm taking it home." The guard looked at the contents of the wheelbarrow and said, "Go ahead." This happened every night at the same time after hours for about 6 months and finally the guard stopped him. He said, "Wait a minute, let me see that sawdust." He ran his hand through the sawdust—"All right, go ahead." This went on for a year and a half, the same time every night, and finally the man quit. The guard saw him in a supermarket a few weeks later and he said, "Say, I miss you. I got used to you. But what were you doing with all that sawdust?" The ex-defense worker said, "Sawdust, schmawdust. I was throwing the sawdust away—I was stealing wheelbarrows." My point is: We are losing the wheelbarrows while worrying about the sawdust.

I have a question. Consider it seriously. Are you a victim of this encroaching control? While you're thinking that over, remember that in 15 years the number of public employees has jumped 50 percent; the public payroll has jumped 170 percent. One out of seven, almost one out of six, people now work for the Government. Twenty-five percent of all the public utilities in the country are now owned by the Government. Housing, transportation, education, the Government owns today 19,000 businesses in this country, many of which are losing money—and they are being supported by the taxes of the people with whom they are competing, in many instances. I am interested in the food business and, as a case in point, these men who pay their taxes are competing with the Army commissaries, so they can pay more taxes to support more commissaries, to pay more taxes to support more Government businesses. The Government is in 47 different lines of business—from fertilizer to surgical equipment—from rum distilleries to tin smelters. I think I needn't tell you much about the agricultural picture, but recently, with 17½ million pounds of butter in storage, the Armed Forces needed more butter. What did they do? They bought 500,000 pounds of butter. In New Mexico recently, some stalwart citizens rented land at 25 cents an acre. Real sharp boys. They rented that worthless land at two bits an acre. Under the soil bank program, they rented it back to the United States for $25 an acre because they didn't plant anything on it. You could no more plant anything on it than you could on that tabletop. CHARLIE HALLECK told me something very interesting one day. I played golf with him and we got off the golf game and started talking about the problems of the country. He said, "Mark, what we need in this country is not more statesmanship on Capitol Hill—obviously, we need it there—but we need statesmanship among the people." The largest subsidy check in the United States is $1,300,000. You ought to be shaken up a little bit. It goes to people not in the United States. They are not even citizens of the United States.

Let me get back to my question. Have they reached you yet? I am in the radio and television business. Part of our interest is in that; and I've got news for you. The radio and television people in this country are running scared. Now, they wouldn't entertain the thought of censorship, but there is a great big sword of Damocles hanging over the necks of every radio and television executive in this country. If he doesn't do what one man or a group of men think he should do, the day will happen—the time will come—when that rug will be pulled right out from under him and he will be out of business as he will fail to get his license renewed. One of the criticisms of television programs is excessive violence. I can't help but smile a little bit when I read of that. You don't have to read many newspapers to see violence. You don't have to read far in the Bible to read where a man lost his head and was put on a platter because a woman wanted it. There is a great bedtime story. The sacrificial offer of Isaac was quite a thriller. You don't have to go any further than the Crucifixion of Christ, himself, to recognize that violence is a part of life. I'm not condoning excessive violence on television, believe me, but I do vehemently say it is wrong of Government—call it what term you want—to stand over an industry such as ours and dictate what it shall be. Because the man who follows Mr. Henry may not like opera, he may not even like horse opera; he may not like sports; he may not like anything that you like. And the man that follows him may take it further. It is the little steps that are frightening.

We are also in the billboard business. As you heard, we own Foster and Kleiser and we're proud of it—it's a very effective means of advertising. We know, for example, that in a 4-week period in this great city with a No. 100-board showing (452 boards), advertisers can reach 98 percent of the people. Now, the problem is blown all out of proportion by the newspapers. You can't blame them because they want their own advertising dollar thicker.

Let me tell you what happened in the State of Oregon, when the people were given a choice. In the State of Oregon this issue was taken to the people by plebescite and I think it may surprise you because you are taken in with some of the stories you read. The people of the State of Oregon, pioneers that they are, voted 2 to 1 in favor of letting them continue—not because they love billboards but because they demanded the right for that industry to go on. They said the right was theirs and could not be punitively legislated against. The people spoke, not the newspapers. The danger of misusing government is that someday they may not like smokestacks; they might not even like horn-rimmed glasses. It is possible that if they ever get around to baldheads, a lot of us are in trouble.

In my estimation the greatest friend of communism is not the pink; the greatest friend of communism is not the out-and-out Red. To me, the greatest friend of communism in this country is maybe somebody that fills your shoes; that greatest friend of the Communist Party in this country is the part-time citizen. The guy who pays his taxes and casts his ballot and thinks he is a great man. Even in casting ballots, do you know that in 1952 only 62.7 percent of the people went to the ballot boxes? It wasn't much better last election. You know why they didn't vote? Twelve percent were sick; 8 percent forgot; 11 percent were absent; and 4 out of every 16—25 out of every 100; 100 out of every 400—1 million out of every 4 million—didn't give a damn—they didn't care. To me, democracy is like a marriage. I've got 20 years seniority myself, and I know a little bit whereof I speak. The minute you stop courting your wife, you're on the downhill side of marriage. The minute you stop courting your Government, the minute you stop really considering democracy and making it work—you're on your way out.

Let me shake your conscience a little bit. How many of you know who your precinct captain is? How many of you have ever given 30 cents to a political campaign? Don't do it—Cope will—and so will some of the big business interests in this country. A Congressman who is beholden to one of these organizations has no choice. And I don't think there is a Congressman on Capitol Hill who wouldn't rather have $1 from 1,000 people than he would to have $1,000 from 1 person. He's helpless; he's hopeless when that happens. When large amounts are given, the giver knows how to collect.

How many of you know who represents you in the State legislature? I wonder how many of you know what your Senator does? Or your Congressman? Do you know their voting records? Do you care? Do we really care? Oh, we hate communism with a passion. But do we love democracy? You know, we have lost sight of this system itself. We really don't have democracy as such. In a pure democracy people attended town hall and they voted on the issues themselves. Today, we must elect and select people from our midst; send them to city hall, the State capitol, or Washington. But you don't forget them any more than you would in your business send a man out to a branch and say, "Go ahead, forget me." You can imagine what troubles you would have, businesswise.

Let me give you a definition of an idiot. Nothing personal to any of you. An idiot—the original definition of this ancient Greek word—was one who took no part in politics. I subscribe to that definition 100 percent. Politics is local; politics is people. You don't run for office necessarily to be interested in politics. We'd better mind our own political business or we'll have no political business to mind. We've got to employ the same talent that made us successful as businessmen in making this system work or we're going to lose it. There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. You cannot avoid the issue. Let me give you a couple of quotations here that I thought were rather interesting. "The Constitution of the United States gives Congress no power to legislate in the matter of a great number of vital problems of Government such as the conduct of public utilities; of banks; of insurance; of business; of agriculture; of education; of special welfare or social welfare, and a dozen other important features. Washington must never be permitted to interfere in these avenues of our affairs." I'll bet you a dollar and a quarter not one of you could give me the man who made that quote. It happened in Albany, and it was uttered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. May I quote to your from the Boston Post, April 23, 1950. "The scarlet thread"—I love that terminology—"the scarlet thread running through the thoughts and the actions of people all over the world is the delegation of great problems to the all-absorbing leviathan—the state. Every time that we try to lift a problem to the Government, to the same extent we're sacrificing the liberties of the people." There is only one thing we can do about this thing. Politics is a struggle not of men. Politics is a struggle of forces and the only thing we can do is fight big government. I don't care the political banner you wear; in fact, I think one party is almost as guilty as the other because they are eager to be elected and they yield to you, the people. I repeat, politics is a struggle not of men but of forces. We can and we must act; and we must act very soon. We have got to pour back into the system the same efforts that made us successful in business. To save the system will take time, money, and effort. Our form of Government can no longer work by osmosis.

Dr. Ernst Wilkinson, of Brigham Young University, has offered several suggestions I think we must begin to follow. They are as utopian as all getout. But, you've got to hitch your wagon to a star to get off the ground. Begin with the Presidential words on inaugural day 1961. They were magnificent. Would that he'd subscribe to them all the way. He said, "It's not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." What a wonderful breath of fresh air that was that went wafting across the Nation—and stopped. Second, we've got to stop giving lip service. I mean you,

Mr. Businessman. Because you cannot criticize Government handouts for the other fellow with your own snoot deep in the public trough. I shuddered as I heard on the air the other day of a poll that was made here in Los Angeles. They asked the people who were listeners to this particular program whether or not they thought there should be subsidies of railroads. And there was not one dissenting vote. Not one. It's become the vogue. Most people you know are conservative with the other guy's money. The farmer thinks the laborer should be more conservative; the laborer thinks farmers should be more conservative; the businessman who wants Government loans and so on. Third, businessmen, I think, have got to take more leadership in their local civic affairs. I shudder when I think of government or a business which says to their young employees, "Go ahead, fight for your party if you want, but don't get it associated with my business." Fourth, Government must be forced by public pressure to act fairly to all groups of business and labor alike. We have these great pendulums that take place with new governments, swinging far in opposite directions with each succeeding administration. Fifth, we've got to have faith in this system. I'm in the advertising business. If I had the right, I would have every television program, every radio program, every newspaper, every billboard with a slug on it to sell the system. The sixth point is to rise up in righteous anger when the rights of anyone are tread upon. When your neighbor loses his rights, you lose part of yours. The last point is that we must start right at the very school system, beginning with the first grade on. We have got to put pressure on our school groups to sell the gospel of free enterprise if we want it to prevail.

We have a competitive system, thank God for it. I think Caterpillar's a better company because it's got competition. I think General Motors is better because Chrysler and Ford are breathing down their necks. I think Del Monte is better because of Libby. I think that Safeway is better because there is an A. & P.; that Foster & Kleiser is better because we have competition. I think America, by the same token, can be greater and stronger because we have now got a real competitor in the business of government. We must, however, now decide which of these systems we want. I love this quote from W. Somerset Maugham. Think it over very carefully. He said, "A nation that wants anything more than freedom will lose that freedom. And the irony is if it is comfort and security it wants, it will lose them, too."

I believe most sincerely that this challenge is deeper than politics. Now, this is strictly my own personal opinion, but I sincerely believe it. It's basic; it's fundamental. I think it springs from the life of two men, each of them bidding for the faith of mankind. One man in an upper room in the Soho District of London, his pen scratching far into the night—"There is no God. Only matter in motion. The Communist kingdom is coming. The proletariat are destined to rule the world. And when the kingdom comes, all social and economical injustice will be abolished. The perfect society will have arrived." That man was Karl Marx. In another upper room in faraway Palestine, another man speaks to his disciples of every generation. He says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. I am the vine and you are the branches; abide in me and I in you. This is my commandment: that you love one another as I have loved you; love thine enemy; seek truth. Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Gentlemen of this great organization, the choice is now—the choice is real. We must decide whether we want this system to prevail. We must change now. I think it is more honorable—I sincerely mean this—to go all the way for the Communists and the Socialists than to try to straddle the Iron Curtain as we're presently trying to do. We cannot continue with the status quo and still perpetuate the system of which I happen to be very fond. We simply cannot sit on our capitalistic derrieres and expect the system to work by itself. I sincerely believe that freedom is never more than one generation away, and I can't think of a better way—I cannot think of a surer way for you and for me to spend the sunset of our lives—to spend our declining years—telling our grandchildren what it was like to be free men than to continue to practice as we are now practicing this thing called part-time citizenship.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 we commemorated an independence day which was more an occasion of sorrow than a cause for rejoicing. On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence after more than a century of Russian domination. Yesterday, 46 years later, we celebrated the anniversary of Lithuania's independence in sad recognition of the fact that the independence of this brave Baltic people was short-lived. For two decades Lithuania prospered as an independent nation encouraging the creative arts and guaranteeing to its citizens the human rights they had so long fought for. Literature, music flourished. Writers and artists once again found inspiration in Lithuania's national folklore. Considerable progress was achieved in education and social legislation. But in 1940 the tide of progress was reversed with the onset of a new era of Russian domination.

The efforts of two decades of independence, the achievements of a national culture were virtually erased by the onslaught of the Red armies. The Soviet dictators, choosing to ignore a pledge they had made twenty years before to renounce forever all rights to sovereignty over Lithuania, stealthily extended their control over Lithuania, first by forcing a mutual assistance treaty upon the unfortunate Lithuanians, then by occupying the country, and finally on August 3, 1940, by incorporating Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. This was the end of democracy in Lithuania. Finding themselves in the iron grip of a cruel totalitarian dictatorship, many Lithuanians fled in fear from their homeland, among them the many thousands who honored us by choosing the United States as their new homeland. To all who remained in Lithuania freedom is still but a dream, a vision of hope that one day the yoke of Russian tyranny may once again be thrown off.

I would take this opportunity to join my fellow Americans in urging all Lithuanian patriots to hold fast to their vision of a new day of independence. The pain of oppression is cruel; only hope for the future makes it bearable.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit also for the RECORD, a very fine letter I have received from my constituent, Mr. A. J. Norwesh, who is the president of the Glen Cove, N.Y., chapter of Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States:

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC STATES, GLEN COVE CHAPTER,
February 5, 1964.

The Honorable STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEROUNIAN: This is a statement of our thoughts and sentiments concerning the forgotten Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, formerly of the League of Nations, forgotten by the United Nations.

This year we are marking the 713th anniversary since the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania.

We must have a single standard for freedom and not lead from fear. For instance the United States should filibuster if necessary in the United Nations against any discussion of colonialism until Soviet colonialism in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia is put on the agenda. They have the same right to be free and independent as any new state in Africa. We must not fear that this would rock the boat in East-West negotiations because a boat that loses its true course (freedom) will eventually hit stormy weather and itself be destroyed.

Very truly yours,

A. J. NORWESH,
President.

John F. Kennedy—Forthright for Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "John F. Kennedy—Forthright for Fisheries," published in the Pacific Fisherman, January 1964, issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY—FORTHRIGHT FOR FISHERIES

Forthright advocacy of fisheries, intelligent understanding of the fishing industry, and grasp of the international significance of the resource and its conservation were notable characteristics of President John F. Kennedy and his actions in office.

It is doubtful if any previous President, certainly none in a century, had quite the same comprehension of fisheries—world fisheries as well as those of the United States—as did this man from Massachusetts.

He had been in office less than 3 months when he wrote:

"The seas around us * * * represent one of our most important resources. If vigorously developed, this resource can be of great

benefit to the Nation and to all mankind * * *.

"The seas offer a wealth of nutritional resources. They already are a principal source of protein. They can provide many times the current food supply if we but learn to garner and husband this self-renewing larder. To meet the vast needs of an expanding population, the bounty of the sea must be made more available. Within two decades, our own Nation will require over a million more tons of seafood than we now harvest."

Significantly, he wrote these words to Lyndon B. Johnson, new President of the United States. They set in motion a new tide of sea study and marine utilization which must continue even though its author is gone.

President Kennedy's support of U.S. fisheries and international conservation called for courage, and he acted with courage as well as comprehension.

In approving recommendations of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission in March 1963, he said:

"In reaching this decision, we have not only taken into account our international obligations, but also the domestic factors which have come to our attention. We consider that this action advances the cause of the principle of abstention which is at the heart of the Tripartite Fisheries Treaty of 1952, and which provides a reasonable workable, and essential procedure for dealing with certain major North Pacific fisheries problems. We are determined to work for the continuation of this principle and of the treaty in which it is set forth."

With renegotiation of that treaty due for intergovernment conference in 1963, President Kennedy named a knowledgeable man as Ambassador and head of the delegation, another Bay Stater, a man from Gloucester—Benjamin A. Smith. In outlining for him the U.S. position, the President again supported the principle of abstention, saying:

"This principle is sound and reasonable. Without restraints of this nature the nations of the world run serious risks of depleting fisheries * * *. Unless international agreements are strictly enforced there is grave danger of permanent injury to our ocean resources * * *. In dealing with the North Pacific fisheries problems we shall be mindful of our responsibility for the preservation of vital fishing resources. * * * We shall hope for the same understanding from other nations."

These are plain, forthright words. Not since Cordell Hull has an American statesman spoken so firmly for fisheries. Such words, and the courage and understanding which uttered them, won for John F. Kennedy the honor and respect of other men of courage who reap the sea.

In their hearts they hope President Johnson will recall and reaffirm the letter President Kennedy wrote him March 29, 1961, beginning: "The seas around us represent one of our greatest resources."

Free Trade Versus Price Fixing—American Consumer Would Be Clipped by Quality Stabilization Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau at its 45th annual meeting recently in Chicago went on record as opposing the so-called quality stabilization legislation now pending before the Congress.

A recent editorial from the Tennessee Farm Bureau News states the Farm Bureau's position and points to the increased cost that would result should legislation of this type be enacted. Mr. Speaker, this is a very excellent and informative editorial and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WHAT FAIR TRADE WOULD COST

In adopting Farm Bureau policies for the new year, delegates to the 45th annual meeting in Chicago last month had this to say about fair trade laws:

"So-called fair trade pricing practices are inconsistent with the principles of a competitive economic system. We oppose Federal resale price maintenance legislation."

Hearings on a bill to fix resale prices were recently held by the Senate. Some of the things presented by witnesses are worth some thought. First, what would the so-called quality stabilization bill mean to the American consumer?

It would mean, according to the Justice Department, that he would have to pay at least 20 percent more for every item he purchased, from a vial of vitamins to an automobile. And the bite might be even worse than that.

The Justice Department estimate is based upon comparison of prices charged on identical items in fair trade, price-fixed States and free-trade States. Statistics show, the Justice Department says, that under fair trade consumers pay from 19 to 27 percent more, and that the average boost in their cost of living on fair-traded items is 24 percent.

One retailer, opposing the quality stabilization bill, testified that it would cost each American family from $100 to $250 a year more on essential items—and possibly even more.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, in testimony opposing passage of the bill, cited the graphic experience in Ohio. An Ohio fair trade law was declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court, and prices, instead of being fixed, were set once more in the open market, by competition. Almost overnight, they dropped 20 percent. Automatic coffeemakers, which had been price-fixed at $39.95, suddenly sold for $29.97. Electric frying pans, which had been pegged at $19.95, became available for a mere $13.87.

After the initial wave of price cutting, Congressman CELLER testified, the market soon settled down and became stable at a level about 20 percent below what it had been. The wave of business failures that fair trade advocates had predicted in such a situation did not come to pass. All that happened, Congressman CELLER said, was that "the consuming public received the benefit" of drastically lower prices.

Fair trade price fixing works an especial hardship on the ill and the aged who must patronize the drug stores. Congressman CELLER cited some striking examples of the kind of markups on standard, brand-name products—the very items that would be most certainly price-fixed under the quality stabilization bill—that have taken place in fair trade conditions. In Miami, where free-trade competition prevails, a particular vitamin costs $1.79 instead of the fair traded price of $3.11; a specific cold remedy, 97 cents instead of $1.08; antibiotic capsules $6.40 instead of $7.96.

Retailers who oppose quality stabilization as a price-fixing gimmick testified before congressional committees that, under fair trade laws, retail prices are inflated by a consistent 40 percent markup above wholesale. "We do not need or want such a markup on any of our goods and we do not believe the consumer should be forced to pay it," one retailer testified.

He cited examples from the wares on his shelves. He was retailing after-shave lotion (wholesale price 75 cents) for 99 cents; the fair trade or suggested retail price would have been $2.25. He retailed shampoo (wholesale price 60 cents) for 81 cents; the fair trade markup would have made it $1. And so it went on item after item.

Under quality stabilization, the American consumer might anticipate that he will be hit for extra dimes and dollars on virtually every item he buys—the food he eats, the drugs and vitamins he swallows, the lotions he puts on his face and hair, the appliances he buys for his home. Economic experts predicted to congressional committees that the American public probably would be clipped for an extra $5 billion annually—and that the bite conceivably would run as high as a staggering $14 billion.

Abe Lincoln Was a Hoosier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as we return from our recess honoring the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest leaders this Nation has ever known, Abraham Lincoln, it is a fitting time to note, as does an editorial in the Lafayette, Ind., Journal and Courier, that he spent most of his formative years, from the age of 7 to that of 21, as a resident of the State of Indiana.

We in Indiana are proud to have the new Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, which includes the original Tom Lincoln Farm and the nearby gravesite of Nancy Hanks Lincoln, the mother to whom President Lincoln said he owed so much. This new part of the national park system was established in 1962 by the 87th Congress, which enacted into law the substance of a bill which I introduced as S. 376.

It was in Indiana that the young Abe Lincoln did his lessons by the light from the fireplace. It was here that he learned to split rails and to do the chores of a pioneer farm family. For 14 years, the most formative of his life, Abraham Lincoln was a Hoosier and associated with his Hoosier neighbors, from whom in their sturdy qualities came some of the influences which molded his stature for all time.

We in Indiana may regret that he left our State to carve out his career elsewhere, but we are glad we could say that it is we who gave him to Illinois and to the Nation, as a full-grown man who had already attained his majority. So I ask unanimous consent Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial referred to above.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA'S IMPORTANT, TOO

Once again, Illinois has jumped far out ahead of Indiana in claiming credit for giving Abraham Lincoln to the Nation.

Work is being pushed forward on a $1 million Illinois Pavilion at the 1964 New York World's Fair, featuring an animated Abraham Lincoln figure that will sit, rise, talk, and gesture to audiences of 500 at a time in the pavilion theater. Walt Disney has created the figure, with dimensions of its features having been taken from a life mask.

Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois has been quoted as saying Lincoln is recognized abroad as a symbol of America and that the Illinois Pavilion at the New York exposition would give world visitors an opportunity to learn of "the importance of Illinois."

Will any mention be made at the fair of the fact that "Honest Abe" spent his formative, boyhood years in Indiana? This seems unlikely. Nor is it probable that it will be pointed out that during his 14 years in Hoosierland, his associations with residents of Pigeon Creek Valley helped him to develop his "horsesense," his strength of character, and his great ambition to make something of himself.

Lincoln did not leave Indiana until after his 21st birthday, and yet it is not uncommon for Illinois to claim complete credit for his development, to describe him as exclusively a product of Illinois.

We know it isn't so, but unfortunately this is not general knowledge outside of Indiana. Perhaps it is high time for Indiana to do plently of shouting about the major role it played in the upbringing of one of the greatest of all Americans. And let's hope we won't be drowned out by the voice that will emanate from the animated figure in the Illinois Pavilion.

Planners at Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1964, in addressing the House of Representatives, I called attention to the phony new parity formula which had been announced by the Department of Agriculture on January 31, 1964. Not only did I call attention to the fact that this juggling of the parity formula was a brazen attempt to fool the farmer and the public by statistical manipulation but that it was also in violation of law.

The Wall Street Journal in its issue of Thursday, February 13, 1964, in an editorial entitled "Planners at Play," makes reference to this phony operation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith the editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

PLANNERS AT PLAY

The Government's farm program is festooned with so many illusions that adding still another isn't likely to make matters any worse—or any better.

The latest illusions involve farm parity. Parity is designed to express the relationship between the price farmers receive for commodities and the price they have to pay for the things they buy. It's computed on a base period, usually 1909–14, which was a very good one from the farmers' standpoint. In figuring parity, the Agriculture Department has been counting as the farmer's receipts only his cash income from farm marketings.

Taking that base period as representing 100, the theoretical ideal, it follows that when parity goes over 100 the farmers ought to be doing just fine. When it falls below 100, they should be doing less well.

Less well, paritywise, is what they have been doing since World War II and Truman administration days when parity floated above 100. Lately it's been sliding, until now farm prices are at 78 percent of parity, a point below a year ago and the lowest in about 20 years.

Now this whole notion of parity as a statistical device is dubious, not to say ridiculous; it's almost impossible to apply in a way that really means anything. Anyway, why should what farmers received and paid out 50 years ago be a standard for today? No one has been so thoughtful as to worry about such a relationship for any other segment of the economy.

Still, parity's low state has been an embarrassment to Agriculture Secretary Freeman. It leaves the impression that the Government's farm programs have, among other things, failed to shore up the farmer's purchasing power.

Mr. Freeman's statisticians, however, have figured out a way to pull that parity figure up a little. They are adjusting it to include as farmers' receipts not only income from marketing but also income from the Federal payments that supplement farm income. By adding these to farm receipts—presto—the parity ratio now is raised from 78 to 81.

Whether anyone has been fooled by this sleight-of-hand is a question. Another question is whether things would be worse if the planners finally grew up instead of forever playing with magical toys.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 16, 1964, in the 24th Pennsylvania District and throughout the world Lithuanians commemorated the 46th anniversary since the proclamation of the restoration of Lithuania's independence on February 16, 1918, at Vilnius.

This anniversary date reminds us that the free world must continue its efforts through peaceful means to liberate Lithuania from Soviet colonization.

Our commemoration of this memorable day in Lithuanian history would not be complete without mentioning the mass methods used by Russia to break the resistance of the Lithuanian people.

In 1940 when the Communists rode in on the shoulders of the Red army, the Russian director of the secret police ordered the immediate arrest of all leaders and active members of all non-Communist parties. This resulted in about 2,000 leading people being arrested without any legal recourse and being sentenced to prison or shot.

In November 1940, the Communists issued an order to account for all anti-Communist forces in Lithuania. This accounting was to include all former members of anti-Soviet political parties, organizations and groups; all former members of nationalistic parties, organizations, and groups; former gendarmes, policemen, and generals; former army officers; persons expelled from the Communist Party; political emigrants; all citizens of foreign countries; former workers of the Red Cross; former noblemen, estate owners, merchants, bankers, and employers of hired help. These people were all to be purged. Between June 14 and June 21, 1941, 34,260 persons were sent to Siberia.

In 1944, when the Communists again invaded Lithuania, a new wave of deportations was carried out. There were several other deportations, and finally in 1948–49, to break the resistance of Lithuanian farmers to collectivism, about 10 percent of Lithuania's population, more than 300,000 people, were deported to Siberia. Today Lithuania's seaboard areas are peopled by Russians. The freedom-loving Lithuanians are broken and scattered about Siberia, where many of them are worked to death. About a third, or as many as 1 million, Lithuanians have been so treated.

This is vicious imperialism, without a doubt. When one reads the sugar-coated words of Communist propagandists, it is difficult to believe that such hypocrisy could exist.

The Lithuanian people have furnished the world an example of suffering and bravery such as few people have endured. Let us hope that not another sadness is brought to Lithuanians, in Lithuania, or abroad. Let us hope that not another country must bear the unbearable agony of Communist oppression.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian Independence, observed yesterday by all liberty-loving peoples everywhere, comes again to stab our conscience and remind us of how derelict we have been in failing to substantially support these stalwart people who have been enslaved these many years for no other reason than that they loomed so small in the face of totalitarian colossus.

There is no one among us who wants to unleash the dogs of another war in a program of liberation of captive peoples. There is no one who wants to flex our nuclear capability with the view of intimidating the self-elected captors of the brave Lithuanians. But there are a lot of people who decry those gestures of amity which we make toward such slavemasters, especially since they are the same brigands who threaten to bury us.

The Lithuanians are a God-fearing people who have earned the right of self-government and who have resisted despotism and atheistic communism with a fervor bequeathed to them by their valiant forebears. All they want is the privilege of living out their lives without let or hindrance from some foreign overlord. And we demean ourselves and the cause of freedom everywhere when we traffic with such despots and thereby beguile ourselves into believing that they mean us any better treatment than that shown those citizens of the Baltic States. On this day of Lithuanian hope and aspiration let us realize that the best service we can render the cause of liberty around the world is to stand fast in our refusal to concede anything to those who perpetuate communistic colonialism and who fail to accord to all people the full rights of self-determination about which they so loudly prate.

Freedom and Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of my colleagues are familiar with the Life Line broadcasts originating here in Washington, which carry many worthwhile messages. I would like to include in the RECORD a transcript of a recent broadcast which I believe merits special attention:

FREEDOM AND HATE

In the aftermath of the great tragedy this Nation suffered in November, no word is being used more loosely than "hate." As we value our freedom, the soundness of our Government, and our way of life, we must restrict this word and its use to the proper channels before every one of us is smeared by its tarbrush.

Every sane and loyal American citizen, like every dutiful Christian, abhors hatred in any form. Not one in full possession of his senses would present hatred as a good thing, or recommend that it be aroused among our people. No doubt there are a few who stir up hatred for their own ends. But these are much rarer specimens than much current talk would have us believe.

More to the point is the charge that certain statements and ideas arouse hatred even though their advocates do not intend this result. This does sometimes happen, and the fact that it does should impose on all whose views are spread in public media a high standard of care for all that they say.

But if we extend the fear of hatred and stirring up hatred so far that we silence honest and needed criticism, and sound and valuable opinion, this will in the long run do as much if not more damage to us all than the worst kinds of open hatred.

The word "hatred," as applied to American life in general, used to mean only the ugly extremes of feeling stirred up by controversies over race and religion. But now it seems that it is being extended to the whole range of comment and controversy on national issues. It is even being spread that many friends of freedom are actually friends of hate. It cannot be right for American constructives to sit silently for an indefinite period and endure such libels. Far from helping to reunite a shocked and grieving nation, these attacks and implications can serve no purpose but dividing us still further.

At the same time it is a fact that history has now placed upon American constructives an even higher standard of duty than ever before. They must take care that nothing they say or do could be twisted in any way by any reasoning mind to imply a hatred for any person or group, or a libel against any person or group not fully supported by fact and truth.

Let's look at a few examples of what is, and what is not, an actual incitement to hatred.

It is inciting hatred to say or imply, without solid proof based on sworn testimony in a court of law, that any official of our Government is a Communist or a traitor, or willingly does the bidding of Communists and traitors. The detection of those few who are actually and actively disloyal to our country is not a task for commentators or other amateurs in the field of detection. It is rightfully a task for the law enforcement agencies and the courts of this country. Loose charges of communism and treason do arouse hatred of the persons attacked, and therefore should not be indulged in by any responsible constructive.

But at the same time it is not inciting hatred to show that certain policies of our Government and certain ideas urged by persons and groups would have the effect of weakening freedom and strengthening communism in their worldwide struggle. It's not inciting hatred to point out the many ways in which Marxist ideas have influenced our thought, even among persons who would be horrified, and rightly so, to be called Marxists. Criticism of this kind may, it is true, often be resented by the persons, groups, and officials so criticized. But it is still constructive criticism. Its aim is not to injure or to destroy anyone, but to correct error—to set those beguiled and led astray by mistaken thinking once more upon the path of right and truth. It is the conviction of the American constructive that our errors can be corrected, our mistakes compensated for, and our course set right before it is too late. All these things will be done not by promoting hatred of anyone, but by changing our policies.

On the other side of the coin, it is inciting hatred to say or imply, without proof, that any American or group of Americans willingly helped to create something called a climate of opinion favorable to such a savage crime as the assassination of a President. It is inciting hatred to say or imply that that terrible crime branded a stigma of guilt on the whole American people. It is so because people will not bear a stigma of guilt they do not feel they deserve; if there is enough talk about it, they will simply begin trying to pin it one someone else, and the obvious candidates for this ignominy are all who may ever have criticized the late President for whatever reason. Can anyone really believe that encouraging hatred of so many is going to cut down the danger from hatred in the United States?

At the same time it is not inciting hatred to point out the simple facts about the assassin, who he was, what he had done, the groups he had worked for; and it is not inciting hatred to remind all of us how necessary it is to control and stamp out every vestige of political fanaticism that could lead any American to such a deed.

It is clear that we must draw an unmistakable line between the responsible advocacy of freedom and the actual stirring up of hate, so that every friend of freedom can defend vigorously and successfully his right and indeed duty to point out errors and mistakes in our national policy when he is convinced that they endanger freedom. Life Line believes that this line can best be drawn in accordance with the very principles consistently upheld in composing and presenting these Life Line broadcasts; that there should be no criticism of racial and religious minority groups as such and no personal attacks on any officeholder high or low. By confining their criticism to the real issues, to the performance of our Government rather than to the character of those within it, American constructives will win the respect they deserve and should be able to show to all that they hold no hatred, but instead good will and high hope, for America and America's Government.

Nor should criticism itself be the sole or even the prime endeavor of the committed believer in freedom. He should never cease to seek out and to hold up in pride every constructive element in the American tradition and way of life, and every scrap of evidence which comes forward to show the basic soundness of our Nation and people even in these troubled times. It is true that many sincere believers in freedom are convinced that for many years our country has followed a road which takes us all farther and farther away from the highest degree of freedom. Yet, though we may have taken a wrong road, we have never lost sight of the goal. The overwhelming majority of Americans still believe in freedom. If they can be convinced there is a better, straighter, and more direct road to that goal they will take it. To find such a road is the mission of the dedicated patriot today. Hate has nothing whatever to do with that mission. Its essence is hope—and love.

No man sincerely wishes freedom for all his fellow men unless he loves them; it is only those who hate or (more often) fear their fellow men who wish to confine and control them. Freedom is the most priceless gift one mortal can give another. By its nature, it is not a gift which rightfully has any "strings" attached or can ever justly be revoked, unless the man who has been given freedom abuses it by injuring others. Freedom and hatred are poles apart; there is no possible reasonable connection between them. There are, unfortunately, a few who pretend to be for freedom when hatred is their real motive; but such persons are not limited to any one part of the political spectrum of "right to left," but may be found anywhere, using any group which they can deceive. The classic example was Adolf Hitler and his National Socialism, which at one time or another made an appeal to every group from right to left, and got some support from all who did not or could not see that its real basis was hatred.

The survival of freedom in a threatening world demands men and women who will dedicate much of their lives to its cause and its triumph. Such men and women must necessarily often criticize the many trends away from freedom in the world today. That criticism does not rightfully imply hatred for any who differ, who cannot see what freedom truly is and what it most desperately needs in this 20th century.

It does not even rightfully imply hatred for the Communists themselves, for Cristianity teaches us that no soul is beyond redemption and in our own time that teaching has been borne out by the redemption of many former Communists such as the late Whittaker Chambers. Freedom is a universal ideal; it shuts out no one in the whole world. Rather it invites every man to share in a braver, brighter future.

Never in our recent history has it been more important than now for every American patriot to keep this vision clear and sharp before him. We have suffered a great tragedy. We would suffer an immensely greater tragedy if we were to allow confused and misled men to convince the Nation that the advocacy of freedom has anything to do with the blind hate of a single man which brought about the crime we all abhor. If the friends of freedom come to see more

clearly than ever before that the basis of their doctrine is hope and love, and can show this to the American people, their cause is still certain to triumph.

Freedom and America were born together and if they die, shall die together. But let us do all we can to give them eternal life.

A Eulogy to Martyrs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Castleman, publicity director of the American Federation of Senior Citizens, delivered a eulogy to senior citizens groups throughout the Chicago area. The Senior Citizen is a publication devoted toward helping the aged attain a more secure life. The movement is affiliated with the Chicago Council and the National Council of Senior Citizens. His rendition, as follows, was interesting and provocative:

A EULOGY TO MARTYRS

(By Wm. Castleman, chairman, Uptown Senior Citizens Association)

The world has a long list of martyrs, men, and women who gave their lives for the love of their fellowmen. Over 3,000 years ago, Moses, a son of a slave, the first known emancipator of human slavery, became a Prince in the House of the Pharaohs of Egypt. He built a nation based on the freedom of the individual, with opportunity for his people to life and happiness was his greatest concern. His duty laid plainly before him; the effort to lay the foundation of a social state in which deep poverty and degrading want should be unknown—where men released from the meanest struggles that waste human energy should have the opportunity for intellectual and moral development.

This great leader of mankind, who could have had anything that his heart desired, gave up all the luxuries that wealth could give, to live among his people, who down through the centuries have stood steadfast to the belief in the Mosaic laws in the face of endless persecutions. To this day no one knows where the sepculcher of Moses is at. Yet, he left the people of the world laws of human behavior that will live to the end of time. These laws, the Ten Commandments, are as necessary to life and happiness today as they were 3,000 years ago, if humanity is to survive the great storms of life in this critical period.

Some of our historians record that some 1,932 years ago, a son of a carpenter, whose love for humanity, justice and peace, became a threat to the Roman oligarchy, who in their fears sentenced him to death. He was compelled to drag a heavy manmade cross over a long road to Calvary to be crucified. The jeers of the ignorant, the biased, and the uninformed, rent the air in glee, while others stood silently by with tears streaming down their faces in deep prayer.

And in our country, another emancipator of slaves, came forth to lead our Nation to greater freedom, justice, and opportunity, Abraham Lincoln, a son of a farmer. Having deep convictions, he was able to save our Nation in a bitter struggle between the forces of slavery and those of liberty. He tried hard to prevent a conflict and the loss of human life in seeking a solution toward preserving our Nation. He died at the hands of an assassin, cutting short his dream of building a better world. Had he lived a full lifespan, maybe we would not now need to face the grave problem of equal rights.

And again our Nation is in mourning. A young man, a millionaire's son, is shot by an assassin's bullet. Was his love for humanity, for liberty, and justice the cause of his destruction? Why has this occurred at a time when the world is so badly in need of a great leader for peace and humanity? John F. Kennedy had the courage, the capacity, and the love for his fellow men. He could have saved the Nation from internal strife, and brought peace to a world of chaos. Can his untimely death be a warning to us, that unles we abolish greed and selfishness we are doomed by the laws of nature and nature's God. Are we to be obliterated from the face of the earth? This was true of the dinosaurs some thousands of years ago. Nature's laws, God's laws, if you please, have no favorites.

May the light of reason direct us in this dark hour toward the laudable aims and aspirations of our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy. May his dream of a New Frontier for humanity be our inspiration to make his dream a reality in our day. He then shall not have given his life for his country in vain. His body has ceased to be with us, but his spirit lives on, ever reminding us that our duty is to make his dream of a New Frontier come true, that we may all enjoy a better and more peaceful world.

MY PRESIDENT IS DEAD

Oh, the wind is bitter cold tonight
  That moans through the cypress trees.
The moon is dark and has no face
  And gone is the gentle breeze,
So still is the song of the mockingbird,
  His music I hear no more.
And the angry waves cry out in the night
  As they beat on the ragged shore.

Oh, lift him gently and lay him down
  Beneath a blanket of snow,
Wrap him with love and tenderness
  For cold are the winds that blow.

He was only here for such a little while,
  He was much too young to die.
So find him a valley that's green again
  With a patch of blue for his sky.

Maybe he wasn't always right,
  But he fought for what he believed,
For a better world and the right to be free
  In a land that must not be deceived.

He looked like a boy when he smiled sometimes
  With a twinkle in his eye.
Yet he stood so tall in the world of men.
  Why did he have to die?

Bewilderment covers the earth tonight,
  A nation stands shocked and stunned.
How could the violent seed of hate
  Stop a life that has only begun?

Let not the good that he sought to do
  Lie now in the cold dark grave.
Let the peace on earth and the freedom of man
  Be the price for the life he gave.

Oh, cold is the wind from the mountain tonight
  And unknown the road ahead
For the wind wails out through the cypress trees
  My President is dead.

—BILLEE SHOECRAFT.

President Johnson's Remarks at Weizmann Institute of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a landmark in our relations with Israel is evidenced by the speech made by Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, at the 18th annual dinner of the Weizmann Institute of Science on February 6 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. The cooperation between our two countries, I believe, will make for good will and advise all the Arab countries of the Near East that we desire to assist them all in obtaining a better life for their people, irrespective of their nationality.

It is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Members of this body, the President's address:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 18TH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. Stone, Mr. Feinberg, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome this opportunity tonight to join in paying tribute to a great son of the Jewish people, and to one of the most exciting creation of the Republic of Israel—the Weizmann Institute of Science. The great name of Weizmann does not belong to the Jewish people alone. It has enriched the moral treasury of our age.

While I am proud to be here, and while you have been most hospitable, none of us can conceal our grief that President Kennedy is not here tonight in person to deliver this address. This was the kind of occasion he most enjoyed—an opportunity to help the advancement of science, a chance to be here with men of ideas. His spirit remains with us tonight. Your sorrow is eloquently expressed in the ways you have chosen to honor his memory.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy believed in a partnership between science and public policy—and no man in this century has better symbolized that partnership than Dr. Weizmann. A great chemist, he was also a great statesman. His selection as the first President of Israel reinforced the unbroken moral tradition that linked him to the great prophets of an unforgotten past.

Few nations have had a scientist as head of state. But all nations have begun to recognize their dependence on scientific progress. It means the realization of a higher standard of living for people. It means the development and the conservation of resources. It means the military strength to preserve freedom. It means the knowledge to conquer space. If anything is certain about national and international affairs, it is that science will play an ever more central role in the years ahead of us.

The Weizmann Institute is a source of pride to every single friend of Israel. It is an international scientific institution in every sense of the word. To its buildings come students from all over the globe. It has helped to make Israel one of the foremost scientific resources of the world.

Israel knows well the importance of science. At its birth in 1948, this tiny little nation faced monumental problems of eco-

nomic survival. Only a fifth of its meager territory was fit for cultivation. Yet it was called upon to sustain a population that more than doubled in 10 years. One of its earliest and most important scientific problems was the same problem that has troubled so many nations of the globe, and troubled so many parts of the world. This problem is water—water for irrigation, water for consumption, water for industry and recreation, and all of its other uses.

Our own water problems in this country are not yet solved. We, like Israel, need to find cheap ways of converting salt water to fresh water.

So let us work together. This Nation has begun discussions with the representatives of Israel on cooperative research in using nuclear energy to turn salt water into fresh water. This project poses a challenge to our scientific and technical skills. I promise no early and easy results, particularly since Jerry Wiesner has left us and has gone back to the classroom. But the opportunities are so vast and the stakes are so high that it is worth all our efforts and worth all our energy, for water means life, water means opportunity, and water means prosperity for those who never knew the meaning of these words. Water can banish hunger and can reclaim the desert and change the course of history.

We are equally ready to cooperate with other countries anxious to cure water shortages.

At 12 o'clock noon today the Cuban Government shut off water to the Guantanamo Naval Base. The excuse they gave was the arrest by the U.S. Government of 35 Cuban fishermen. These fishermen were clearly inside the U.S. territorial waters. The United States has long assumed that the Cuban Government would cut off the water to Guantanamo and has put into force already contingency plans.

There is enough water there tonight to last for 12 days, in addition to which water can be brought in and will be brought in indefinitely by ship from Port Everglades, Fla.

The State Department, in the last few minutes, has just concluded a 2-hour meeting on this subject with the Secretary of Defense and with my assistant, Mr. Bundy, who will brief me on my return to the Capitol tonight.

The State Department has issued a statement a few moments ago which learly establishes that Cuban fishing vessels intercepted by our Coast Guard were clearly inside our territorial waters. The captains of these boats reported this fact by radio to Havana just before the arrest came.

The United States has known since Mr. Castro took over and allied himself with a foreign power that he would some day cut off the water to our Guantanamo base. We have much such plans for such an eventuality. Our troops in Cuba and their families will have the water they need.

In our cooperative water program that I was talking about between Israel and the United States, the International Atomic Energy Agency will play a very vital part. In this way we will demonstrate the constructive meaning of man's mastery of the atom. We will pool the intellectual resources of Israel and America, and all mankind, for the benefit of all the world. We will better pursue our common quest for water, for water should never divide men; it should unite them. Water should never be a cause of war; it should always be a force for peace, and peace is first on our agenda. It is not there only because it is right and decent to seek peace. The larger reason is there is no rational alternative to peace.

We face a choice which only two other Presidents of the United States have confronted—whether our civilization, as we know it, will survive. Nuclear war is no longer a mere theoretical possibility. No other Presidents in our history have had this responsibility.

We are built to withstand an attack—and to strike back. There is no question that we have the capacity to destroy any enemy, anywhere. But we court no territories. We covet to dominate no people. We seek no satellites. But we do intend to preserve and protect the peace, and our capacity to do this, I assure you, will not diminish. Victor is no longer a truth. It is only a word to describe whoever is left alive in the ruins.

If we put high emphasis on each step toward peace, so matter how feeble the gait or how short the stride, it is because I think we understand the nature of this new and changed world, a world where in only a matter of moments we could destroy 100 million people in the Soviet Union, they could destroy 100 million people in Europe, and they could destroy 100 million people here in the United States.

So that is why even the seemingly small disputes between small countries—or the invisible hand behind a visible threat to democracy in other lands—that is why the eruption of trouble somewhere in the world, or anywhere in the world, is always so important to us.

Tonight there are a dozen explosive incidents in the world. Tomorrow there may be more. But we must treat these disturbances not as isolated threats to be responded to only at that moment, but in the perspective of the history we hope will be.

We envy no neighbor. We covet no territory. We are looking for no satellites. We believe the most plausible solution to war is simply for each nation to leave its neighbors in peace. This would then free us all to attack those ancient enemies of all mankind who for centuries have warred on man and his hope—poverty and ignorance, misery and disease. If we will just join together to destroy them, we will destroy the roots of war.

Science, and the Weizmanns all over the globe, are in the frontline of this army that is fighting man's ageless foes.

So tonight as I speak to you with affection and share with you pride in Israel's achievements, I speak the warm sentiments uttered by every American President since Harry S. Truman. In the desires and hopes of these Presidents, I say to you and I say to the world that I would not underestimate the complexity of all the age-old Middle East rivalries and hostilities.

But the basic hope of the United States for this area is not so complex and not so different from that of all mankind. I think it is inscribed in the ancient writ of the prophets and on the modern buildings of the United Nations.

It is very simply a desire for the day when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation * * * nor shall they learn war any more." That is my prayer. That is my prophecy.

Houdini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of February 14, 1964:

HOUDINI

Watching Lyndon B. Johnson at work brings to mind nothing so vivid as an old-style Houdini. There is the hypnotic patter during the performance, the object held aloft for our gaze, the assurances that nothing is up the sleeve, the confident smile and the constant movement of props.

Above all, there is movement. What a numbing procession of proposals we have seen in the past few weeks. Every President must send up a string of messages to Congress at this time of year if he's worth his salt, but Mr. Johnson, as they say, has added new dimensions.

The list of those for whom he professes a special concern now includes women in Government (50 new faces within a month), eggheads (just give your ideas to Dr. Goldman), the farmer, the poor, the homeowner, the taxpayer, the investor, the aged, and youth.

The administration is solicitous of the housewife and would educate her to shop shrewdly. The jobseeker has been told that Mr. Johnson carries his interests close to the bosom—though he'd better not try for a Government job this year. Businessmen need look no further than the tax cut for corporations and the shrunken light bills for the White House to find a kindred spirit.

This is not an easy juggling act. In his state-of-the-Union message, the President frowned on the 45-hour week (overtime creates unemployment) but also the 35-hour week (inflationary). Forty hours seems just right.

Some cynics suggest that politics may lie behind the blizzard of memos and that Mr. Johnson doesn't really expect them all to be carried out. Well, there is no formula for sure victory in November, but we can offer a sure one for going mad: Try to please everybody. The stream of pronouncements creates an impression of dynamic progress, and many of the programs contain admirable goals. But at the present rate, the image also runs the hazard of looking a bit frenzied.

Besides, the number of potential voter blocs for whom a special appeal can be fashioned may soon be exhausted. The other day, having buttered up the Jewish community with a scheme to produce water in Israel through nuclear power (which offended the Arabs), Mr. Johnson suggested building a "memorial to God" in Washington. That seems to leave the administration with only Eskimos, one-armed paperhangers and used car salesmen still not on the list. With them out of the way, what on earth can a President find to do between now and November?

Remarks by Robert E. Giles, Acting Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, at Launching of "Gulf Shipper," Avondale Shipyards, February 15, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 15, Hon. Robert E. Giles, Acting Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, delivered a speech in my district which succinctly and imaginatively reviewed the great progress our Nation is making in the

modernization of our merchant marine. It is a record of which all Americans can be proud, as Mr. Giles so ably points out.

The occasion for the speech was the launching of the beautiful vessel, the *Gulf Shipper*, at Avondale Shipyards in my district. It is a source of genuine pride to me that the honor of christening this fine new ship was accorded to my youngest daughter, Corinne. It was an occasion she will remember all her life.

This splendid ship was built by Avondale Shipyards, which has become the finest shipyard in our country. It will be operated by Gulf & South American Steamship Co., which is wholly owned by Lykes Bros and the Grace Lines, both of whom have made a marvelous contribution to the American merchant marine and to the development of trade with Latin America and the rest of the world.

Here is Mr. Giles' speech:

REMARKS BY ROBERT E. GILES, ACTING MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AT LAUNCHING OF "GULF SHIPPER," AVONDALE SHIPYARDS, FEBRUARY 15, 1964

I am delighted to be here today to represent the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce. It is refreshing indeed to see the tangible results of some of our efforts in the Maritime Administration, along with the efforts of the shipowner and the shipyard, in the form of this beautiful vessel, the *Gulf Shipper*.

This is the first launching I have attended since assuming last November the interim responsibilities of Acting Maritime Administrator. President Johnson has given renewed emphasis to the goal of efficiency and economy in the expenditure of Federal funds. Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has added his own renewed emphasis to this goal in the administration of all programs in the Department of Commerce. It is appropriate, therefore, that this ceremony is taking place in a yard which has, in a few years, become a leading builder of ships in America. This record has been achieved by Avondale because Avondale—its management and its workers—have consistently demonstrated the ability to build fine ships at low competitive bids.

The unique launching ways from which two ships will go sideways into the water today is a visible manifestation of an imaginative approach to shipbuilding which has placed Avondale in its present high position among U.S. shipyards.

Gulf & South American Steamship Co. is also to be warmly congratulated on the manner in which it has met its contractual obligations to the U.S. Government for the complete replacement of its fleet. This is the fourth of its five ships to be launched. All five are scheduled to be in service by this time next year.

I mentioned the U.S. Government's interest in these ships. This is just another way of referring to the interest of all U.S. citizens. This public interest, this interest of all U.S. citizens in our merchant fleet, must always be kept in mind. The good work of Avondale has resulted in savings for U.S. taxpayers on that portion of the cost of this ship which the U.S. Government will pay. Efficient operation of the *Gulf Shipper* by Gulf & South American will also mean a lower operating subsidy to be met by tax dollars under the Government's contractual commitment with this company. The company agrees to provide regular, reliable service on an important U.S. trade route and to replace its ships as they become obsolete. In this way, we are assured that our country's continuing need for a good merchant fleet will be met.

This occasion and this new ship symbolize to me the value of the U.S. merchant marine to our manufacturers and farmers, and all who are engaged directly or indirectly in international trade. And I think it is true all of us benefit, directly or indirectly, from an expanding international trade. We look to our manufacturers, our farmers, and others directly engaged in international trade for a steady increase in our exports. This is needed for the overall economic well-being of this country. A 6-percent increase in 1963 has raised our exports to a record level of $21.7 billion. Much of our exports consist of agricultural products such as those which pass through this gateway at New Orleans to all continents of the world.

I believe there is too often a lack of understanding on the part of the American shipper that his shipping cost on ships such as these are no higher than his cost on foreign-flag ships. All of us must increase our cooperative efforts to make known the services of the American merchant marine. All of us must do far more in the future than we have in the past to see that our ocean shipping services are not only known but that these services are reliably available. It does no good to have fast, modern ships, with rates competitive with the rest of the world, if our shippers cannot count on prompt and uninterrupted service.

During the past 7 years, 80 new merchant ships have been put into service. Thirty-five more new ships are now on order. Another 16 are to be contracted for this coming year. The total subsidized fleet of some 300 ships is to be completely replaced by the end of the next decade.

We have had an energetic search for new ways to cut costs, such as the introduction of mechanized engine rooms and other cost-saving features. These innovations apply to many of the new ships now under construction. The *Gulf Shipper* has itself benefited from this effort. Just a month ago, President Johnson pushed a button in Washington to signal the keel laying of a new ship, right here in Avondale for one of the Gulf & South American's parent companies—the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. The promise of mechanization can, however, be achieved only with the cooperation of labor as well as management and Government. Our maritime unions are to be commended for their cooperative efforts in searching for ways by which the benefits of improved technology may be properly shared by workers as well as management and the U.S. taxpayers—all of whom have a direct financial interest in the U.S. merchant marine.

We also have many research and development projects under way to help the U.S. merchant marine. Some of these are designed to develop entirely new types of ships, such as the nuclear-powered *Savannah*, the hydrofoil ship *Denison* and the surface-effect ship. Other research efforts are more prosaic but in the long run may be just as far reaching in their benficial effect—such as improved methods of operation, integrated transportation systems, greater use of computers and navigational aids, improved cargo handling gear, and standardized containers.

There are some problems in the U.S. merchant marine for which the responsibility rests upon labor, upon management, and upon the Federal Government. The fact that on any given day these problems may weigh heavily down upon us should not blind us to the challenge and the promise that is ours in the future. There is no problem that confronts us today that we cannot solve, if we want to do so. I am confident that all of us having a direct interest and concern in the U.S. merchant marine—management, labor, and government—will meet our challenges and our obligations.

In the *Gulf Shipper*, we have a symbol of all that is right with the U.S. merchant marine. Let us today send her forth with our best wishes for calm seas and prosperous voyages to do her work on the oceans of the world.

Resolutions of American-Ukrainians of the City of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions adopted by Americans of Ukrainian descent in the city of Detroit at a mass meeting on December 8, 1963, commemorating the 30th anniversary of the manmade famine in the Ukraine in 1932–33 which speak clearly of the frightful sufferings inflicted upon Ukrainian peasants by ruthless Communist rulers:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN-UKRAINIANS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT AND VICINITY ASSEMBLED AT THE MASS MEETING ON DECEMBER 8, 1963, COMMEMORATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MANMADE FAMINE IN UKRAINE IN 1932–33

We, American-Ukrainians of the city of Detroit and vicinity, assembled at the mass meeting observing the 30th anniversary of the infamous famine in Ukraine, express our heartfelt feelings of profound sorrow and highest respect for the innocent victims of the Moscow-enslaved Ukraine and constitute the following:

1. Famine in Ukraine in the years of 1932–33 was not due to natural causes, but was planned deliberately and ruthlessly carried out by the U.S.S.R. Government in order to destroy the freedom-loving Ukrainians, especially Ukrainian peasants who had done no wrong except that of tilling their own soil.

2. All the victims, of the Communist-provoked most infamous famine, according to official statistical data of the Red regime, number close to 7 million Ukrainians, who died fighting boldly for the basic human rights. For approximately 10 years, they continuously opposed Communistic collectivization in Ukraine. They would rather die than give up and resign their human dignity.

3. This famine—deliberately organized by the Red regime of Moscow and unknown to the rest of the world—was a gigantic action against all Ukrainians. Through such means, it tried to force them to give up all their possessions and to make them slaves.

4. Famine in Ukraine, the country which always had the richest soil in the world as well as rich natural resources, is an obvious and documented genocide committed by Moscow. For this drastic deed it should stand trial before the international tribunal.

Observing the 30th anniversary of this tragic event, we take this opportunity to remind the free world of some of the other numerous crimes of the Moscow regime that were committed in Ukraine in modern times. These crimes have to do with the mass graves at Vinnizia, prisons filled with massacred Ukrainian political prisoners in 1941, millions of victims during "the yezhovshchyna purge" in 1936, millions of political prisoners at the concentration camps in Siberia and hard labor camps in Kazakhstan, as well as with the murders of the leaders of the Ukrainian liberation movement.

These are only a few criminal deeds from the long list of crimes which Ukrainians

could present to the Moscow regime and prove them to be infallibly true and real.

Making the free world aware of these crimes committed by the Communist regime, we demand that the Moscow empire, which in such ruthless ways enslaves and destroys European and Asian nations—and lately threatens the free world and most likely prepares a new famine in the coming year—not only be convicted by the international tribunal, but also be divided according to ethnographical principles into free national states, because only in this manner a true and permanent peace can be achieved in the world.

William Allen White Foundation Award to Clark Mollenhoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World of January 10 reports the substance of the annual William Allen White lecture, given at the University of Kansas by Clark Mollenhoff. Because of its general interest among my colleagues in the Congress, I include the Journal-World story here in the RECORD:

NEWSMAN CITES PRESS FAILURE IN UNITED STATES TODAY—GOVERNMENT'S SIZE CALLED FRUSTRATION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPORTERS

"The press of the Nation is failing in its responsibility and there are disturbing signs that the press does not recognize its failures," a Pulitzer Prize winning reporter said today.

Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington reporter for the Cowles publications, said "the major press problem today can be linked directly to the size and complexity of the $100 billion a year Federal operation. Too often reporters are frustrated and then overwhelmed by the seemingly impossible job of serving as a watchdog on Federal spending policies."

Mollenhoff delivered the annual William Allen White lecture at 3:30 p.m. today in the Forum Room of the Kansas Union. He received the William Allen White Foundation's seventh annual national citation for service to his profession and his community.

Speaking on the topic, "Life Line of Democracy," Mollenhoff said, "No one really comes to grips with the press problem in Washington. There has been a floundering by a press that has become more and more dependent upon handouts. Trapped in its own superficiality, the press is an easy victim of the big lie. Lacking understanding, the press follows the fads of the best Madison Avenue sloganeers.

"Steps to deal with the problem of bigness have resulted in some unhealthy developments. Specialists have been assigned to governmental agencies to provide more knowledgeable coverage. In too many cases, these specialists have been converted into propagandists for the agencies they cover. The TFX story is an illustration of how many 'watchdogs of democracy' were transformed into lap dogs of the Pentagon political appointees."

Mollenhoff said "the TFX story involved the integrity of the spending practices in the Defense Department and the judgment of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, who overruled the top level Pentagon Source Selection Board that had favored the Boeing firm in contract negotiations.

"Testimony before the McClellan committee shows McNamara will waste more than $400 million by an arbitrary decision to hand the $6.5 billion TFX program to Texas-based General Dynamics.

"There were only about a dozen reporters who read the whole record of the TFX investigation, and a few who read enough to be familiar with the weakness of McNamara's position. However, there were dozens of apologists for McNamara who have written authoritatively without benefit of reading the record.

"Why would Defense Secretary McNamara overrule a unanimous recommendation to make what experts regard as a wrong decision to pay the highest price for the second-best plane?" Mollenhoff asked. "McNamara had help on this case from Roswell Gilpatric, the former lawyer for General Dynamics, and from Fred Korth, whose Continental National Bank of Fort Worth had General Dynamics as one of its best customers."

Mollenhoff pointed out that "it is true that high officials of any administration may fool any of us on a few issues and for a short period of time despite diligent work. But if it becomes apparent that any large segment of the press is being fooled for any extended period of time, then the press just isn't doing its job.

"Under the Truman administration there were efforts to hide the tax scandals. Under President Eisenhower, there were unjustified efforts to hide the record. The late President Kennedy authorized use of executive privilege to bar congressional committees from information about governmental operations, and there were a large number of efforts to curb dissent and stifle criticism. Unfortunately, unknowing and shortsighted elements in the press were patsies for the Kennedy administration. They even helped justify barriers to curb dissent and curtail the flow of information.

"There are indications that Johnson may curtail the presidential press conference," Molenhoff said. "There are indications that Johnson will depend mainly on those cozy little spur-of-the-moment meetings with the regular White House reporters. Those gatherings present a minimum danger of the tough question that often needs to be asked. Johnson has indicated he might supplement this with some informal television chats with a few reporters, whom I will wager he will handpick.

"If that is to be the new press conference format, then I'm against it. I would hardly accept the logic of one editorial writer who suggested that if Johnson feels the open press conferences of the past do not 'fit his personality' then he should be allowed to change.

"In the light of that type of editorial logic, we can only hope that democracy fits President Johnson's personality."

Mollenhoff continued "the national television networks can, and do, serve as a great force in informing the public on important issues. However, television seldom serves as a leader in exploring bad government. It is unrealistic to expect more of television. The industry operates on government licenses, and under constant threat of more government control. This certainly limits its independence.

"Comments on weaknesses and problems of the press should not discourage young reporters," Mollenhoff said. "Where the job is being done poorly, there is great opportunity for those who will study and work on the complex jobs.

"I am elated when editors and reporters demonstrate aggressive independence as in the Bobby Baker investiagtion. We all hurt when independence is destroyed or given away.

"Last October and November, the press demonstrated in the Bobby Baker case that it has the courage and the great capacity for deep investigation when it has the will to do the job. In a few short weeks the press had a hundred or more reporters probing nearly every political, social, and business deal that Baker had touched.

"Unfortunately, I must report that the interest of many others did not arise until after the appearance of a story about a German party girl who had been on the fringe of some of the Baker social action. It is amazing how a little sex angle stimulates editorial interest in good government."

Mollenhoff said "the editorial profession is one that gives us the opportunity to be a strong voice and a strong force in good government. We can mold good public officials into better public officials by demanding top performance. We can make bad public officials toe the line or risk exposure or ouster.

"The press needs, and always will need, the independence characterized by William Allen White. The least we can do for his memory is to constantly remind ourselves of the many ways that a free and independent press can be weakened or even destroyed. It is our responsibility to aggressively oppose anything that may contaminate the lifeline of democracy."

Mollenhoff has been in Washington since 1950 for Cowles Publications, which include the Des Moines Register & Tribune, the Minneapolis Star & Tribune and Look magazine. He won the Pulitzer Prize for national reporting in 1958 and has received numerous other awards.

Negro Millionaire S. B. Fuller Advises His Race To Halt Demonstrations, Go to School With Their Own, Stop Suing and Start Selling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a timely article written from Chicago by Bob Ingram of the Montgomery Advertiser staff, Montgomery, Ala.:

A WALLACE ALLY IN CHICAGO—NEGRO MILLIONAIRE S. B. FULLER ADVISES HIS RACE TO HALT DEMONSTRATIONS, GO TO SCHOOL WITH THEIR OWN, STOP SUING, AND START SELLING

(By Bob Ingram)

CHICAGO, ILL.—The unsolicited recommendation is herewith made that Governor Wallace do what might seem politically unthinkable—integrate his honorary military staff.

Nominated for this no longer very select society is S. B. Fuller, a very wealthy Chicago Negro industrialist. You may have heard of Fuller before, but if you haven't, you should. He doesn't talk like Negroes are supposed to talk.

An example of this was found in the Chicago papers Friday, some of which contained a report of a press conference held by Fuller before he addressed a meeting (segregated) of 100 national Negro business leaders.

What Fuller said couldn't have been improved upon by Wallace himself.

Fuller said in so many words that all the street demonstrations in the world, backed up by all manner of civil rights legislation, will not improve the racial situation. "Integration will not be effective until the white man favors it," he declared. "You cannot legislate men's thoughts, yet any Negro who does not think his salvation lies in the civil rights movement is looked down upon by the entire race."

IT MUST BE WON

"Negroes must gain economic equality through their own initiative before they can achieve racial equality," he continued. And he said bluntly that the cause of the Negro's economic plight was not primarily discrimination "so much as it is the Negro's lack of desire to improve his lot."

Fuller suggested that civil rights leaders might better spend their time encouraging Negroes to get off public assistance rolls and into jobs.

"If we don't stop the relief trend," he said, "over 50 percent of the Negro population will be living on Government reservations within the next 20 years."

It was in the area of classroom integration—a very hot issue in Chicago as well as Notasulga—that Fuller spoke like a true Wallace man.

"It makes little difference where Negroes obtain education in all-Negro or integrated schools," he declared. "If a white person gets a good education going to school without colored persons, I can't believe that a colored person can't get a good education without going to school with white persons."

DON'T FORCE ME

Fuller, who has made $1 million or more in business, also made it quite clear that he didn't buy any part of the civil rights bill concerning employment.

"I would resent anybody forcing me to hire someone I didn't want," he said.

What did Fuller recommend? An abandonment of the protest demonstrations and the launching of a public relations campaign "to enhance the Negro image."

"Let's quit suing the white and start selling him," Fuller said.

The comments by Fuller, exceptional though they might seem, were not without some support elsewhere in Chicago.

On Thursday the city board of education—the target of sit-ins, picketing, demonstrations and the like—gave way to the pressure and by a 5–2 vote adopted a resolution which in effect endorsed the transporting of students from one school to another to correct racial imbalances.

The resolution didn't please either side. Negro leaders complained that it set no date when such a program would be launched. They vowed that a mass boycott of Chicago schools scheduled February 25 would be held.

WHITE RESISTANCE

James Thazan, Jr., president of the Southwest Council of Civic Organizations—a group of white property owners who represent 24 square miles in the city—said his organization was completely opposed to the resolution.

"We don't believe in integration just for integration's sake," he said. "This board is taking too many liberties on their own. I can't see five or six people changing our whole way of life—forcing children to go to school somewhere else, when parents have picked where they want to live and send their children to school."

On another page in the Sun-Times was printed a letter which contained a cryptic suggestion to Chicago Negro leaders. It said:

"The prospect of a second school boycott doesn't impress me—now if the Negro leaders would pick a day and see that all of their children were in school instead of out, that would impress me."

IT'S TIME TO STOP

All of this points up a fact which was already becoming evident—the pendulum may be swinging in the other direction in regard to civil rights demonstrations and the like.

Richard Nixon said as much in his Cincinnati address Wednesday night, and a Friday editorial in the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal took the same line, to wit:

"Street marches, picketing, demonstrations and sitdowns have become, regrettably, almost a way of life. The idea spreads. When someone gets excited, the impulse is to do as others have done. It is dangerous. It is irresponsible. It hurts the cause of democracy * * * it is time to stop and think."

Somebody with an imagination labeled the Negro protest demonstrations of the past year as the "Revolution of 1963." Signs of a counterrevolution are beginning to sprout, and concede it or not, Governor Wallace sowed some of these seeds. History may so record this fact someday.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, to those of us in the free world, the observance of Lithuanian Independence Day should be a time both for prayerful reflection and renewed determination. We as Americans can reflect on the freedoms and liberties which we all too often take for granted, and we can once more voice our hope and determination that the captive nations, including Lithuania, who once enjoyed their freedoms may again one day regain them.

Yesterday marked the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. The Lithuanian state was formed 713 years ago. Yet, since 1940 Lithuania has been a captive nation, overrun by the force of arms. The United States has never recognized the demise of the Republic of Lithuania, and we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with the Lithuanian Legation in Washington.

On January 9, 1963, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 15, which reads as follows:

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations declares as one of its purposes the development of friendly relations among nations based "on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples"; and

Whereas the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics has by force suppressed the freedom of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and continues to deny them the rights of self-determination by free elections; and

Whereas suppression of the freedom of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is an invitation to violence and threatens the peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States should seek through the United Nations and otherwise to bring about the withdrawal of Soviet forces stationed in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and the holding of free elections in those nations to the end that they may once again live as free, independent, and sovereign members of the community of nations.

May I express the hope that the Congress will take favorable action on House Concurrent Resolution 15 in the near future and that not too far away will be a new independence day for the courageous people of Lithuania.

Program Sponsored by the Perth Amboy Tercentenary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1964, three celebrations were held in the city of Perth Amboy, N.J.

The birthdays of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Abraham Lincoln were celebrated, and a program sponsored by the Perth Amboy Tercentenary Committee was held.

I would like to insert details of these events in which so many of our outstanding citizens participated.

They follow:

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Zenon Lesniowski, pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, placed a patriotic floral wreath and gave the main address commemorating the birthday of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, on February 12, 1964, in front of Kosciuszko's monument, at St. Stephen's School, State Street, Perth Amboy, N.J.

It was a triple celebration. Besides Kosciuszko's birthday, the city of Perth Amboy, N.J., Tercentenary Committee celebrated Abraham Lincoln's birthday and the tercentenary of New Jersey (300 years).

John J. Wolczanski, administrative assistant to City Commissioner Oliver R. Kovacs, was chairman and Deputy Mayor Joseph J. Soporowski presented Right Reverend Monsignor Lesniowski with New Jersey State and tercentenary flags. Both Wolczanski and Soporowski are members of the Perth Amboy Tercentenary Committee.

The program opened with Rev. Henry Bogdan giving the invocation and Rev. Vincent Nebus rendered the benediction. Both are from St. Stephen's Church.

The speakers included Rev. Joseph Piotrowski; Anthony S. Majewski, president of the Pulaski Citizens' Club, Inc.; Stanley M. Pryga, president, Middlesex County Polish-American Congress; Peter Poiantowski, president, Polish Cadets; Joseph Soporowski, Sr., Perth Amboy Housing Authority; Charles F. Cap, Perth Amboy Recreation Department; and Anthony Baczeski, trustee of the St. Stephen's Church.

The Boy Scouts of America, Troop No. 8, schoolchildren from St. Stephen's School, and United Poles in colorful Polish folk attire formed an honor guard.

Also attending were Reverend Felician Sisters; parishioners of St. Stephen's Church; Pulaski Citizens' Club, Inc.; United Poles of America; St. Stephen's Holy Name Society; and the Polish Cadets.

ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. ZENON LESNIOWSKI AT GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO DAY, SPONSORED BY CITY OF PERTH AMBOY, N.J., TERCENTENARY, FEBRUARY 12, 1964

The best proof of Poland's sympathies toward the American Revolution were Polish volunteers, who crossed the ocean to fight in the ranks of patriots. The most famous of them, and one to heed the call of "the shot that was heard around the world," was Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Kosciuszko was born on February 12, 1746, in the village of Mereczowszczyzna, Poland. He received his education in the Corps of Cadets in Warsaw, and then in the schools of artillery and engineering in France.

Learning of the American Revolution, he offered his services to the emissaries of the Colonies in Paris. America needed capable officers, hence he was gladly accepted. On August of 1776, Kosciuszko landed in the New World.

Philadelphia was at the time the seat of the Congress of Colonies. The English armies posed a threat of capturing that city. To save it, Kosciuszko executed fortifications, that brought his praise of the Americans and merited him the rank of colonel of the Engineers.

WITH NORTHERN ARMY—KOSCIUSZKO'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE VICTORY AT SARATOGA

In the beginning of the year 1777, Kosciuszko was sent to the northern army, which under General Gates, operated along the upper part of the Hudson River.

In service here, he distinguished himself and rendered his more important assistances to the American cause at Saratoga.

Directed by General Gates to select a strong position, Kosciuszko chose Bemis Heights near Saratoga and entrenched them. It was on this spot that General Burgoyne surrendered on October 11, 1777. All authorities agree that Kosciuszko's skill as an engineer contributed to the American victory on this occasion and consequently to the recognition of the United States by France. Evidently, Washington was informed of the part Kosciuszko played at Saratoga, for in his letter to the President of Congress, dated November 7, 1777, he called him "a gentleman of science and merit."

He was a good friend of Gen. George Washington and Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Kosciuszko met Pulaski for the first time on Christmas Eve at Trenton, N.J.

AT WEST POINT

By resolution of Congress, Kosciuszko was sent to West Point on March of 1778 for the purpose of strengthening the defenses of the Hudson. He changed the surrounding heights of West Point into an inaccessible fortress, and closed the Hudson River with great chains stretched across. With this strategic move, he assured security for the Americans in the northern theater of war. "To his care and sedulous appreciation, the American people are indebted for the defense of West Point," was the praise spoken by George Washington.

He spent 2 years at West Point. In his spare time, Kosciuszko loved to "putter around" in the garden with flowers. "The Kosciuszko Garden" has been kept up all these years by the West Point Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy. They also erected a statue in his honor at West Point.

WITH THE ARMY IN THE SOUTH—WITH GENERAL GREENE

On August 1780, Kosciuszko was transferred as the chief engineer to the southern army commanded by Gen. Nathaniel Greene. In many battles in North Carolina and South Carolina, he distinguished himself as a capable engineer, and brave officer.

When the Colonies gained their freedom, he returned to Poland. In 1784 he was decorated by the Congress with the title of a general for long, arduous, and meritorious service.

He distinguished himself in the Polish-Prussian campaign of 1792. He assumed the leadership of the Polish insurrection to throw off the yoke of the crowned despots, who conspired against his native land. He fought the famous Battle of Raclawice, but lost to the overwhelming power of the enemy.

Freed from the Prussian prison, he came back to America in 1797. He was greeted everywhere in this country, as a "Hero of Nations." On September 9, he visited General White in New Brunswick, N.J.

He planned to live here, but hearing a year later that Poland gained a degree of freedom, he went back to Europe to serve his cause for his country, to his last breath.

When returning to Europe in 1798, he signed all his land, 500 acres on the left bank of the Scioto River in the State of Ohio, where now rises the city of Columbus, granted to him by Congress toward the liberation of Negroes and empowered Thomas Jefferson to carry out his will.

He died on October 18, 1817, in Seleure, Switzerland.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Today, we are also commemorating the birth of a great American hero, Abraham Lincoln.

He is one of the long deceased, yet long remembered men, who have illumined his country's history.

So let us now remember, what both Lincoln and Kosciuszko "lived and died for."

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.—Over 60 hobbyists and merchants from all over the Nation will display their coins and antiques, among them a tiger's tooth, at an antique show to be held on Saturday, February 15 and Sunday, February 16 in the Hungarian Reformed Church Center, 347 Kirkland Place, Perth Amboy, N.J.

The program is arranged by the city of Perth Amboy's New Jersey Tercentenary Committee.

Albert Baumlin of Perth Amboy and Gordon Adams of Fords, N.J., are cochairmen.

The judges are City Commissioner Dr. Richard M. Budnicki; Deputy Mayor Joseph J. Soporowski; Stephen P. Bandola, administration assistant to Commissioner Ernest M. Muska and John J. Wolczanski, administration assistant to Commissioner Olver R. Kovacs.

Black-Baker Hit It Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, scarcely a day passes but what the citizens of this country are treated to further information regarding the get-rich-quick activities of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker and his friends.

This time the Washington Daily News of February 17, 1964, provides some of the background on one, Fred B. Black, Jr., who came out of the little town of Carterville, Mo., to find a comfortable berth on the Washington gravy train.

Bobby Baker, as secretary to the Democrat majority in the Senate, was a protege of the then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson. The Daily News story indicates the Baker-Black association was mutually profitable, especially with respect to their vending machine manipulations.

Committees of Congress, dealing with Defense and Space Agencies, ought to be particularly interested in the Baker-Black vending machine contracts in view of the fact that Black is the registered lobbyist for North American Aviation and Melpar, Inc., a North American subcontractor.

How the Baker-Black vending company obtained lucrative contracts with North American and other holders of fat Government contracts should be of real interest to the proper congressional committees.

The Daily News story follows:

(By Julian Morrison)

A man named Fred B. Black, Jr., rides up Capitol Hill today for the "umteenth" time, but it will be a far different trip than any he's made before.

And on his way to the Old Senate Office Building to face questioning by Senate Rules Committee probers on his connection with the Bobby Baker case, he'll probably pass the District Court Building where he has an entirely different type of appointment later this week.

TRIAL

Fred Black is North American Aviation Corp.'s contact man in Washington and he's been mentioned so often by newspapers since Mr. Baker quit his influential post as Senate majority secretary last October that his lawyers last week claimed—unsuccessfully—he couldn't get a fair trial on income tax evasion charges until after the November presidential election.

Fred B. Black, Jr., was born in 1914 in the tiny town of Carterville, Mo., the son of a general merchant.

A couple of years after Robert G. Baker was born in the equally tiny town of Pickens, S.C., Fred Black graduated from high school in Carterville.

BRIEF STINT

Following a brief stint in college, he went to work for Franklin D. Roosevelt's Works Projects Administration, then sold chemicals for a short time.

Somewhere in the frantic period just before the United States entered World War II, Fred Black caught the attention of Donald Nelson, head of the administration's War Production Board, and in 1941 he went to work for the WPB as a senior business analyist.

Later, he worked for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, then, briefly, for the Office of Price Administration before his Army number came up in 1943.

PAGE BOY

The year before Fred Black became an army private, Robert G. Baker, aged 14, came to Washington from South Carolina to become a Senate page boy.

After the war (he was discharged as a sergeant in 1946), Fred Black launched a career in promotion work in New Mexico, in Denver, in his home State, and in Los Angeles.

By Christmas of 1955, he had made such a success of his work that he chartered a firm—BLYCO Corp.—in Joplin, Mo. He described it as a "general and business corporation, including public relations, sales and management research, and representation."

SECRETARY

Earlier that same year, in Washington, Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson handpicked a secretary for the Democrats in the upper House of Congress and got him approved by a vote of the party's caucus. His nominee—Robert G. Baker.

During the next few years the two B's—Black and Baker prospered both in money

and influence—altho, in retrospect, the young majority secretary seems to have been lagging behind his future colleague.

At any rate, a Federal grand jury indicted Mr. Black last March on charges of income tax evasion. The Government has listed 95 checks from 8 sources it says Mr. Black didn't tell about in deliberately attempting to defraud it. The checks total nearly $160,000.

CHARGE

The Government alleges that Fred Black's actual taxable income rose from $73,155.21 in 1956 to $125,138.65 in 1959.

Mr. Black moved his base of operations to Washington when BLYCO began to roll and various documents list his address alternately as the Sheraton Carlton Hotel and 1730 K Street NW.

Several of the checks the Government says he failed to report as taxable income are listed as payable to the hotel from a Chicago foundry company.

The Howard Foundry Co., the tax suit says, wrote a total of $5,823.10 in checks to the hotel, most of them for $500 each, presumably indicating the monthly rental on the luxurious suite of rooms Mr. Black maintains there.

MANSION

During part of this period the Blacks were leasing, for $400 per month, a house at 4421 Hawthorne Street NW., but they gave this up in April of 1958 for an $82,000 Spring Valley mansion at 4054 52d Terrace.

Mr. Black is said to have been a heavy contributor in the 1960 campaign of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson for the Democratic Presidential nomination and the next year the two men became backyard neighbors when the Johnsons bought Mrs. Pearl Mesta's fashionable Spring Valley home.

Early last year Robert G. Baker moved his family into a spanking new, $125,000 showplace a stone's throw from his former boss and his present partner.

For some time, Mr. Black has represented North American Aviation as a contact man between it and the Government.

PAYROLL

He is reportedly on North America's payroll to the tune of $14,000 per month—$168,000 a year, and Melpar, Inc., a large North American subcontractor, reportedly pays him between $25,000 and $40,000 a year.

What intrigues Rules Committee investigators is the fact that Serv-U, the Black-Baker vending company, suddenly obtained lucrative contracts with North American plants and other west coast defense contractors 2 years ago.

It is also of prime interest to them that at least two Serv-U stockholders are men with Las Vegas gambling connections.

The Black-Baker-North American dealings interested another party—Capitol Vending Co. president Ralph Hill, who sued the two men for allegedly conspiring with Melpar to cancel Capitol Vending's contract last year in favor of another vending company in which they had an interest. It was this suit which opened the "Pandora's box" of the Bobby Baker case.

Fifty-second Statehood Anniversary of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago my home State became the 48th State to enter the Union. Since that time Arizona—the Grand Canyon State—has been growing not only in economic and other material ways but in spiritual ways as well. Today the once "Baby State" is one of the fastest growing members of the U.S. family. Our deserts, valleys, mountains and mesas are glimmering with the sparkle of virile youth. This is the first Congress in which I have represented the Grand Canyon State. I merely want to boast to my colleagues that on this year's Valentine Day and 52d statehood anniversary my heart belongs to Arizona and make it clear that Arizona is full of pride in being a part of these great United States.

We Must Not Impose More Federal Burdens on Our Small Meat Processors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter to me from Mr. Clifford Baker, Iowa Cream & Produce Co., 420 East Broadway, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I see no logical reason or justification for imposing more Federal inspection on our small meat processors who are already employing every sanitary means necessary to furnish pure, healthful meat of every description to our consuming public.

Let us call a halt to this kind of Federal imposition and thus give our small free enterprisers who are the backbone of American business, a breathing spell, that they might carry on without too many Federal roadblocks.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1964.

Re President Johnson's proposed bill on the expanded inspection of meat.

Representative BEN JENSEN,
State of Iowa,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are hoping your vote when this bill comes up before you will be "no," because all of us small poultry processors will find it impossible to continue to operate. As it stands now we are not able to cross the State line with dressed poultry and have always abided with this law, which has limited our business somewhat.

So many of us only dress poultry a few hours each day and can't stand the cost of a full-time inspector. The same for a meat processor—as all towns large and small have locker plants that kill for the farmer and process their meats, as we do poultry, for their lockers and freezers.

We have operated for 30 years and better and have a successful business with satisfied customers all through the years. Repeat business always means satisfied customers and quality products. Should this bill be passed we would, like hundreds of smaller operators, have to lay off help and close our doors which wouldn't help the unemployment problem.

There are only two large volume buyers of poultry in Nebraska now and not many more in Iowa, that process poultry. Should all we smaller poultry dealers be forced to close our doors I am wondering what all the farmers will do with their poultry when they go to sell it, as the bigger processors couldn't consume all of the volume, nor could the farmers haul them across the State to sell them to the big processor.

Please give this some serious thought and view it from all angles, and we hope you will register a "no" vote when this bill is presented.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD BAKER.

The Critical Difference Between Free World Peace and Khrushchev's Soviet-Communist Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is befuddled between the connotations of peace and "peaceful coexistence." The psuedo-liberals, the left-wing elements and the political leadership of this country have exploited the yearning of our Nation for a true, enduring world peace.

Our State Department is substituting Khrushchev's Communist version of "peaceful coexistence" for the peace with religious, political and economic freedom that our people seek. This administration is imposing upon this Nation a gradual acceptance of Communist "peaceful coexistence" covered with a false label of peace.

On February 3, 1964, Mr. Frank J. Johnson, Foreign Editor, American Security Council, delivered an address on the subject of peace. His talk was a timely and significant contribution toward a much needed exposé of the dangers of accepting Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence."

The following are excerpts from Mr. Johnson's address:

At the very moment when the talk of peace and peaceful coexistence is at an all-time high, and when everyone is relaxing and talking about an end to the cold war, at this very moment the tide of history is perhaps running more strongly against the West and its system of values than at any period since the cold war began.

Peace is understood differently by Communists and non-Communists.

Most serious students of communism understand this difference. Unfortunately, most of the leaders of the West—who must defend Western civilization against the total assault of international communism—are not lifelong students of that threat. They think and speak of peace in the traditional Western definition which is the absence of armed conflict or the lack of serious danger of armed conflict. When applied to the Communists, this definiton leads to the belief that relaxation of tension, improvement in the atmosphere and the settlement of specific disputes are all steps toward an end to the cold war which is generally thought to mean an end to the threat of nuclear war.

But to the Communist, all of this is a definition not of peace but of peaceful coexistence, and Marxism-Leninism makes a very sharp distinction between these two terms.

We do not, and that is where the problem comes in.

Very simply, peaceful coexistence refers strictly to peaceful relations between states with different social systems and that is all. It allows for the very important exceptions of civil wars and wars of liberation, and it specifically recognizes as legitimate any and all forms of internal subversion and, if necessary, violent revolution aimed at replacing capitalist governments with socialist ones. While piously denying any intent to export revolution—a denial made meaningless on its face by the periodic international conclaves of Communist revolutionaries in Moscow—peaceful coexistence expressly denies the right of the West to export counterrevolution, that is, the Communists shall be free to undermine us, politically, from within but we are not to stick our "pig's snout" into the socialist garden.

This is the practical meaning of peaceful coexistence to the Soviets. But there is a second, and real level on which all Marxist-Leninists—including the Chinese—speak of and define peace. Real, permanent peace, they say, can never reign until peaceful coexistence has brought about its logical and inevitable denouement, until the competition of social systems has brought about the eradication of the last vestiges of imperialism from the face of the earth. And by imperialism they really mean the whole of the intellectual, cultural, political, economic, moral and spiritual structure known as Western civilization. Imperialism, they say, is by definition, a threat to peace. The fight for peace is the fight for the worldwide victory of communism. The world millenium and lasting peace can never come until imperialism is no more and communism rules supreme.

This is no mere sematic quibbling: the Communist world is deadly serious in its distinction between peaceful coexistence and peace. The proof is their constant reiteration of the theme that there cannot ever be coexistence of ideologies.

Washington may find it politically expedient to pretend that Castro's influence is waning in Latin America, that Zanzibar has not really gone Communist, that Sukarno can be diverted from his aggressive intent by a chat with Robert Kennedy, or that southeast Asia generally is not being lost, but it will take more than optimistic propaganda to stop the precipitate decline of the Western position throughout the world. And until the Communist tide has somewhere been decisively met, stopped and thrown back, it is idle to think that the Communist purpose will change. Why should it? Communism is still winning.

The cold war cannot be won, or ended, and the true peace of international harmony cannot be achieved, under the Communist rules of peaceful coexistence. These rules must be changed if we are to avoid the ultimate defeat of the West and the worldwide victory for the peace of communism.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, marked the 46th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is an occasion well worth noting, and honoring, for this brave country, seized in 1940 by Russia and forced to live under Communist rule, has millions of patriots the world over praying and struggling for freedom for their homeland.

The United States has never recognized the illegal seizure of Lithuania and two of here neighboring states, Latvia and Estonia, and we are committed to the restoration of freedom in those nations.

I might point out that Lithuania's history as a nation dates back to the year 1200. She possesses a rich inheritance of cultural value and a love of freedom and compassion for her fellow man. And 46 years ago, in 1918, Lithuania gained her release from the despicable despotism that had dominated her ancient heritage. Lithuanians, wherever they might be, can recall that moment with pride.

The tyranny which enslaves Lithuania today completely overshadows that tyranny which oppressed her in the past. It was tragic that her independence should have been so short lived.

Yet, today, the more than 2 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, and millions of their fellow patriots, understand what that day in 1918 meant, and know that the spirit of freedom that was born then in that nation shall never die.

To retain this glowing spirit of liberty, to strengthen and to expand it, requires constant vigilance and perseverance, and that is our task. Today, we shall rededicate ourselves to the principle and to the long hard struggle of regaining freedom for Lithuania. We might take as our inspiration the courage and loyalty that Lithuanians throughout the world demonstrate in their march toward their goal of freedom for their homeland.

Mobs on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in behalf of what we consider an extremely good cause, it is difficult not to resort to means and methods which do a disservice to that cause.

Many of us have been concerned that the trend toward street demonstrations, shouting mobs and unruly crowds is leading us to increasing disrespect of lawful authority and disregard for lawful procedures. We find among ourselves reflections of those rioting mobs in other nations whose actions we deprecate and despise.

Our lawful institutions still offer to all a chance to be heard—and a chance to pursue denied rights through legal channels. Before we go any further down the road to "democracy by demonstration" we would do well to consider its ultimate destination. If it continues, it would in time force the establishment of strong tyrannical authority and the opportunity to dissent would vanish.

In this connection, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of February 14, 1964, is of interest:

MOBS ON THE MOVE

Are Americans being conditioned to accept anarchy? The suggestion may not be as ridiculous as it looks on first sight. Let's mull over some indications.

In the capital city of Ohio 4,000 students of the State university staged a demonstration which lasted for several hours. They blocked traffic in main streets. The damage included cut trolley cables and broken windows in buildings and parked cars. What was it all about? The students were "protesting" because a woman student was arrested and jailed by city police for failure to respond to a summons for jaywalking.

It was a clash between two small groups of high school student demonstrators which touched off the recent Panama riots. A group of American students in the Canal Zone didn't like a rule discontinuing the flying of the American flag at their high school, so they ran up a flag and then surrounded the base of the school's flagpole to prevent anyone from taking it down. A group of Panamanian students came with their flag which they tried to carry to the flagpole. Authorities succeeeded in keeping the two groups apart then, but the spark had been struck.

Where do these young people get the idea that when the law displeases them the thing to do is get together enough force to intimidate the law or take it into their own hands? They get it from their elders.

When pickets turned up at rocket bases, national attention was called to a campaign of sabotage which has been going on against the Florida East Coast Railway for 13 months. In that period, Columnist Victor Riesel reports, there have been 210 incidents of sabotage, assault and shooting. The damage total has reached almost $1 million. Riesel called it a war. The weapons have included dynamite, acid, and bullets.

In New York City a few days ago, half a million children were truants from school in a planned boycott which was organized, promoted, and carried out by adults. Similar boycotts have been organized in some other large cities. What's this about? These are demonstrations aimed at forcing school authorities to change pupil-placement policies.

The civil rights movement has attracted worldwide attention through a long series of street demonstrations and acts of violence. These have usually involved children or students, but almost invariably they have been organized and promoted by adults.

The organizing and the incitement of violence have occurred from both sides of the controversy. They have been promoted on one hand by those trying to tear down discriminatory laws and practices, and on the other hand by those trying to prevent use of the supremacy of Federal law to change conditions.

The National Capital last summer was the scene of a massive civil rights "march." It was carried off without violence. Nevertheless, it was a calculated attempt to impress Congress with the sheer size of a crowd in the streets.

In an Indiana district last fall the opening of a school was forcibly prevented by blockades set up by adults to prevent buses from reaching the school. This was the method chosen by a group of parents to protest the decision of school authorities to continue use of buildings the parents thought were not safe.

The common thread which runs through all of these examples—and there are countless others—is the resort to crowd action or to violence, either open or stealthy, to change

legal authority or simply in substitution for it. They are attempts to express "rights" in terms of the biggest crowd or the strongest force.

This is the road to anarchy.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 15, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT: AMERICAN PRESTIGE SINKS AS CONFUSION REIGNS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

American prestige around the world has never been lower. In less than 3 months our confused and worried foreign policy has resulted in more widespread anti-Americanism, more insults to our flag and American officials, a more rapid decline in U.S. prestige than ever before. The State Department and the White House seem unable or unwilling to cope with the almost daily crises and as each new anti-American episode explodes offer the same tired explanation, "We were taken by surprise."

Just 1 day's news on January 31 offered the following:

1. Panama: The riots that erupted January 9 brought old resentments to the surface, severed diplomatic relations, led to demands for revising the Canal Zone treaty. Panama demanded the Organization of American States condemn the United States for aggression. Prospect: Worsening relations, prolonged bitterness in Central America.

2. Germany: An American T-39 unarmed jet trainer that strayed into East Germany was shot down and three American airmen killed. We protested. The Communists returned the bodies of our airmen. Prospect: No action by the United States anticipated and more incidents and probably American deaths at the hands of the Soviet and her stooges.

3. Cyprus: Fierce Greek-Turkish rivalry erupted in December. Both of these nations are U.S. allies. Although the British have assumed the responsibility for keeping peace on the island, the violence was directed against the United States. It was our Embassy that was bombed and our Ambassador whose life was threatened. Prospect: Continued violence with increased anti-Americanism and the possibility that the situation will be turned over to the U.N. which will permit the Soviet Union to send in troops.

4. Vietnam: Last November's coup was followed by a countercoup with charges of neutralism, betrayal, and revenge. The United States worries about the future and apparently has no control over the situation or effective means to prosecute the war against the Communists, a war which we refuse to recognize in spite of the fact that American boys are dying in it. Prospect: A long, drawn-out fight with victory over the Communists uncertain.

These events, reported on one day, were followed by Castro's contemptuous move cutting off the water to Guantanamo; in Mexico the Red Chinese are making a strong bid for Mexican recognition of Red China; in Brazil, President Goulart and his strongly pro-Communist cabinet is preparing to recognize Red China; France has already given recognition to the Communists; the Organization of American States finds proof that Cuba is guilty of subversion and sabotage in Venezuela; Britain tells the United States she plans to increase trade with Cuba, the Soviet Union, and the whole Communist world.

Why? Why is anti-Americanism increasing around the world? What has happened to U.S. leadership?

Some reasons may be outlined as follows:

1. Lack of a firm, understandable foreign policy backed up by the will to win a cold war.

2. Appeasement of the Communists under threat of nuclear war.

3. Secret deals, beginning at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam and continuing at least through the Panama memorandum of last June have resulted in concessions to the Communists and others who have used them against us.

4. Billions in foreign aid which have gone to strengthen Communist countries and those alined with the Communists; have built up foreign competition with American industries helping to strengthen foreign economies at the expense of our own.

5. The continual Communist-inspired harangue against the United States in the United Nations where we pay most of the bills but are outvoted by Communists and emerging nations, many of whom pay nothing or next to nothing.

Since Franklin Roosevelt forced recognition of Soviet Russia in 1933, giving the Communists respectability and starting them on the road to a world power, succeeding Democratic administrations have shown the same lack of understanding of the Communist conspiracy and its goal to dominate the world. They refuse to believe Communist leaders who boldly state they will destroy capitalism, bury the United States, and will be the victors in a world in which our children will live under communism.

We can save the United States. We need to take action now.

1. We should announce a foreign policy that is in the self-interest of the United States and which will preserve freedom in the world. This means (a) reinstating the Monroe Doctrine; (b) get the Communists out of the Western Hemisphere; (c) serve notice that Communist aggression or subversion against any free nation will be met with retaliation against the core of the conspiracy, Soviet Russia.

2. We should maintain our military strength, making it perfectly clear that we have the means and the will to protect ourselves and any nation which will stand with us in defense of freedom.

3. We should strengthen our own economy, which undergirds our military strength, by putting an end to wasteful spending, Federal controls, and welfare programs that weaken the private enterprise system and threaten the freedoms of our people at home.

What Meat Imports Really Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Drovers Journal restates the problem of beef imports in clearly understandable terms and makes some observations which are most timely. The administration persists in being ineffectual in meeting this problem, at grave peril to the country.

The editorial follows:

WHAT MEAT IMPORTS REALLY MEAN

Forgetting percentages and vague references to how much meat imports into the United States are up, just what do these imports mean to American cattlemen in terms of lost market?

This question is answered quite graphically in a report which Joe Beam, president of the Ohio Cattle Feeders Association, and James H. Warner, secretary of the Ohio feeders, released to the membership recently.

Starting with a figure of 1,885,400,000 pounds of beef and veal imported into the United States in 1963, they calculate that this is the equivalent of 3,250,000 cattle replaced by imported beef.

Then they go back beyond this figure and calculate that also replaced are 4,010,000 cattle in a second herd needed to produce 3.25 million slaughter cattle. They arrive at this figure on the basis of allowing for 3,820,000 breeding cows (figuring an 85-percent calf crop), and 190,000 bulls (figuring one bull for each 20 cows).

In addition, they assume, there must be a third herd producing replacements. For this they allowed 450,000 2-year-old cows for replacement; 220,000 2-year-old bulls for replacement; 450,000 yearling heifers to replace the 2-year-olds; 22,000 yearling bulls to replace the 2-year-olds; 450,000 heifer calves to replace the yearlings; 22,000 bull calves to replace the yearlings; all this adds up to 1,416,000 head of growing cattle to replace the second herd.

To what does all of this add up? Well, 3,250,000 slaughter cattle replaced by the 1963 imports, 4,010,000 breeding cattle to produce the 3.25 million slaughter cattle, and 1,416,000 breeding cattle to replace the second herd, which adds up to a grand total of 8,676,000 head of cattle replaced by the beef and veal being imported at the 1963 rate.

Startling? Yes, but we don't stop there.

How many acres of U.S. land would be required to produce the pasture, hay, and grain to maintain 8,676,000 additional cattle? At 5 acres per head, it would take 43,380,000 acres.

At this point, it is appropriate to note the inconsistency of our permitting such imports to continue on the present scale. For how can we do so and still justify the push for farm acreage control legislation? How can we do so and push for legislation to fight rural and agri-business underemployment? How can we do so and still concern ourselves with the need for a higher level of business activity, economic growth, and gross national product? Meat imports on the present scale are definitely a negative factor to agriculture, and to the general economy as well.

"Cattlemen and agri-business both lose," asserted Beam and Warner. "First, they lose because imported beef and veal replaces U.S. production. U.S. producers are losing at the rate of 3,250,000 cattle multiplied by 1,000 pounds multiplied by 25 cents per pound or $812,400,000 annually. And agri-business loses, too.

"Second, U.S. producers are losing because 1,885,000 pounds of imported beef and veal helped depress the live value of every cattle in the United States sold for slaughter. How much? Nobody knows. We do know that 28,100,000 cattle slaughtered in 1963 multiplied by $35 per head is another loss of $983,500,000. A total loss of $1,796 million. Agri-business loses, too."

The Ohioans concede that part of the reduced income potential which U.S. cattlemen suffered during 1963 probably was caused by too much U.S. beef and other meats, and partly by too many cattle of too heavy weights. But they question the propriety of blaming overproduction as the basis of the cattleman's low-price troubles through

much of 1963 and up to the present time. They point out that the supply buildup in cattle was merely a reflection of desirable increased demand and that moving to meet large demand was a proper move by cattlemen. They explain overholding as a move by individual feeders to protect their investment and a gamble on a better price that did not pay off but did result in too many heavy cattle. Neither of these factors might have operated to cause the price drop without the 11-percent imports piled on top, they assert.

In the end, they raise the question of whether the reluctance by some Government officials to meet the beef import threat may reflect an attitude of retaliation against cattlemen for their long record of opposition to Government control and subsidy, and their faith in the law of supply and demand. It is being pointed out by some, note Beam & Warner, that tariff protection is really "no different than subsidy or Government control."

The Ohio treatment of this subject adds a great deal of food for thought.

Adger Emerson Player

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article about Adger Emerson Player, a member of the U.S. Embassy in Ghana, which appeared in the New York Times on February 11. Mr. Player deserves our commendation for it was he who, with great courage, raced through an angry crowd in Ghana to raise the American flag after it was taken down by the crowd. Mr. Player is a splendid American who has earned the admiration of his countrymen.

The article follows:

FLAG'S MODEST RESCUER: ADGER EMERSON PLAYER

ACCRA, GHANA, February 10.—"I don't know what all this fuss is about," Adger Emerson Player said last week when informed that a Member of Congress had recommended him for the Freedom Award, the highest U.S. honor for a civilian. The "fuss" began last Tuesday when Mr. Player bulled through a crowd of Ghanaian demonstrators who were about to tear up the U.S. flag outside the American Embassy. He grabbed the halyard just as the flag was about to touch the ground and ran the flag back up the pole.

For this action Mr. Player received two more notices today: a personal letter from President Johnson praising him for his bravery and vilification by the Ghanaian Times.

When Mr. Player was told of the medal suggested by Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, he remarked with a shrug: "I just happened to be the closest. Anybody would have done the same thing."

"IT'S ALL BEEN EXAGGERATED"

As for talk about getting a medal:

"It's all been exaggerated. I just hope it doesn't go any farther. It would cheapen the award to equate what I did as being worthy of such an honor."

Such modesty is typical of Mr. Player, a 31-year-old Negro with the build of a halfback and the manner of a scholar.

Born May 6, 1932, in Denver, he attended East Denver High School, managed a B-minus average and went out for football, basketball, and baseball, "but I never got a letter in anything."

When he was admitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder there was no question but that he would have to work to pay his tuition. Moses Player, his 70-year-old father, was gassed in France in World War I and receives a disability pension. His mother worked as a cook at Colorado Woman's College in Denver.

STUDIED IN GERMANY

College, he recalls, was much the same as high school: "Got the same B-minus majoring in international relations and played the same football, basketball, and baseball without winning a letter."

While at Boulder he took part in demonstrations in support of the sit-ins in the South and he picketed in the boycott campaign directed at the Woolworth chain.

Armed with a B.A. and a scholarship, he went to Germany and studied a year at Erlangen University near Nuremberg, then served 2 years as an enlisted man in the Army in Germany and France. He already spoke Spanish and his years in Europe gave him fluent German and French.

After discharge he returned to Boulder, where he took an M.A. in political science, concentrating on Africa. This time he avoided sports and managed nearly straight A's. He also met Barbara Brown, a girl from Okmulgee, Okla., who was teaching at the Convent of the Good Shepherd School for Delinquent Girls in Denver. Five months after the first date they were married.

TAKES A "DULL" JOB

That was in 1960. He took a "dull" job in Washington doing research on French-speaking Africa for the Army. But he didn't stay long. In 1962 he was accepted into the Foreign Service as a noncareer officer.

Ghana is Mr. Player's first post. He and his wife now have two children, Marzella, 3, and Monte, 9 months, who was born in Accra.

Mr. Player works in the Embassy's political section. "But the staff is so small you have a hand in everything," he said. "Economics, labor. The legal side of things."

"And of course," he added, "things are happening here."

Science Magazine Focuses Attention on Congress and Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives comes under the microscope of Science, the weekly magazine of the Association for the Advancement of Science, in its February 7 issue. The article, which leads the news and comment section of this distinguished publication, devotes particular attention to the organization and operations of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

John Walsh, author of the article, notes that "just as a connoisseur of football often watches the line play rather than the backfield, an observer of Congress can instructively focus attention on the appropriations process."

I believe that my colleagues of the Congress will find this article of particular interest and I commend it to their reading as well as others. It is a well-written, interesting, and analytical article, and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

APPROPRIATIONS: THE CRITICS OF CONGRESS OFTEN SLIGHT AN INNER REDOUBT OF THE SYSTEM

(By John Walsh)

The literature of analysis and abuse of the U.S. Congress is a rich one, but for a year or two it has been evident that criticism of the National Legislature has been mounting toward one of its periodic peaks.

Liberal critics argue that Congress is unresponsive to the exigencies of the latter half of the 20th century. Resistance to innovating legislation they attribute to rigid rules and customs which they claim make Congress, in practice, an extremely undemocratic institution. Concentrated fire has been turned on the Senate filibuster and the House Rules Committee, and broader criticism is directed at a feudalistic committee system, which, fused to the principle of seniority, makes the inheritance of power in Congress depend primarily on survival.

While study of congressional pathology is popular these days, relatively little attention is paid to an extremely significant area of action—the domain of the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate. Because appropriations business is so complicated and is usually conducted so discreetly in committee and so smoothly on the floor, the public is likely to be little aware of its import. But just as a connoisseur of football often watches the line play rather than the backfield, an observer of Congress can instructively focus on the appropriations process.

It is true that Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which deals with foreign aid appropriations, in recent years has gained public notice by organizing an annual "Donnybrook" over the aid program's appropriations. It is also true that, with much less spectacle, ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas, as chairman of two Appropriations Subcommittees which control the funds for the space program and the National Science Foundation, exercises a strong influence over the Federal science effort.

It is gratefully acknowledged within the medical research community, also, that Representative JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, have used their Appropriations Subcommittee chairmanships to enhance the fortunes of the great Federal health research program. But the system which gives these men their leverage seems to get little attention.

The Appropriations Committees derive their influence from a main well of congressional authority, the right to spend or withhold money. Federal programs which involve the spending of money require a dual legislative process—authorization and appropriation. Standing legislative committees like Armed Services, Interior, Public Works, or Education and Labor in the House, for example, must first report legislation containing an authorization for a particular sum. When this bill passes the House, then the Appropriations Committee, after hearings of its own, sends along for enactment an appropriations measure which actually provides the money.

The House Appropriations Committee cultivates a reputation for fine-tooth-comb tac-

tics and frugality. Often House Appropriations recommends a smaller sum than that provided for in the authorization, and the House usually follows its advice on money matters.

For a number of years the House has generally been less liberal with appropriations than the Senate, and a pattern has emerged under which the House sets a low figure, the Senate sets a higher one, and the difference is roughly split in conference. Also, the House Appropriations Committee tends to give special attention to growth sectors of the budget, as its action on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and National Science Foundation last year indicated.

It may be useful, therefore, to examine how this House committee operates, not only because of its power but because in many ways it epitomizes the congressional system and illustrates how formidable are the internal obstacles to reform.

HARD WORK A TRADITION

Appropriations members are proud of the committee tradition of hard work on the dull detail of appropriations measures, and this industriousness gives them an expertise which makes it perilous for nonmembers to challenge them on the floor of the House. Because of its reputation for resistance to spending, and because the committee deals with every spending measure, the committee regards itself, and is regarded in the House, as a bastion against the erosion of congressional fiscal authority by the Executive.

Unity of action is a secret of power for the Appropriations Committee, and this unity is, on the face of it, remarkable, since the committee is the largest in Congress, with 50 members, 30 of them Democrats and 20 from the Republican minority. But the united front which the committee usually presents is the manifestation of a well-run hierarchy, which is the committee's real organizational form.

The Appropriations Committee, the Rules Committee, and the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee are the three committees to which assignment is most highly coveted in the House. Winning a place on any of them ordinarily requires a waiting period of several terms from the time a Congressman is first elected. Moving to the Appropriations Committee means sacrificing seniority built up on another, less exalted committee and starting again at the bottom of the seniority ladder.

Eligibility depends first on the location of a candidate's district, since geographical balance is one of the time-honored ways of insuring that regional interests are represented. A junior member who has won a reputation as a maverick or troublemaker, or who simply talks too much, is unlikely to get the necessary backing from his colleagues or the party leaders which is necessary for assignment to Appropriations. The aspirant must, in short, have demonstrated that he lives by what has been called the Rayburn rule of conduct in the House: "to get along, go along."

The new member finds that joining the committee does make a difference. Federal agencies are anxious to oblige a member of the committee that oversees their budgets. The military services seem to be particularly alert to the implications, and as one member put it, "If you go anyplace abroad they practically meet you with a brass band." There is a feeling current in Congress that a member of the Appropriations Committee can get more for his district.

But in committee matters the new member finds himself very much an apprentice. Assignments to subcommittees are entirely in the gift of the chairman, and junior members almost always get posts on minor subcommittees, or even, for a time, on no subcommittee at all.

At subcommittee and committee meetings the tenderfoot is expected to be seen and not heard. He is advised to pick some rather narrow and often obscure area of specialization and spend a few years in mastering it. His elders on the committee are regarded as his betters, and the junior member will be discouraged from offering criticism or amendments much more sternly than on other committees.

Appropriations is a highly compartmentalized committee. The 13 subcommittees are the operating units, with the subcommittee chairmen wielding decisive influence within their special fields. The committee seems to be ruled by a kind of board of directors, headed by the chairman and including the subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members of the committee and subcommittees. Partisanship within appropriations appears to be a diminished element, supplanted to some extent by the committee's economizing esprit de corps.

Chairman of the Appropriations Committee is Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat of Missouri, who is 84 years old. CANNON has sat in Congress for 40 years, has served as parliamentarian, and literally wrote the book, "Cannon's Procedures," used to untangle parliamentary snarls in the House.

CHAIRMAN'S OPTION

The committee's rules enable CANNON to appoint subcommittee chairmen without regard to seniority, and he seems to have handpicked men for special jobs, as in the case of PASSMAN, but the chairman's power depends on his working relations with the senior members of the committee of both parties and he cannot afford to offend them unduly, nor they him.

Cooperation is the watchword in the committee, and differences are settled privately. Virtually all appropriations hearings are held in executive session, which means that public and press are excluded. Congressmen who are not members of the Appropriations Subcommittee holding hearings are not welcome at the sessions, and this even goes for other members of the Appropriations Committee. This is not the case in most other committees.

At the final "markup" sessions of a subcommittee, when an appropriations bill is being put in final form for forwarding to the committee, CANNON and the ranking minority member are usually on hand.

Meetings of the full committee tend to be cut and dried. It is the practice of the committee not to furnish members the published hearings or the bill under consideration until the day action is to be taken. Most significant, the report which explains the committee's treatment of a bill is printed before the meeting, with the obvious implication that no changes will be made and that the function of the full committee is simply to relay the bill from the subcommittee to the House floor.

The Appropriations Committee staff, which compiles hearings and writes reports, is regarded as both competent and hard working. Because of the complexity of the material they deal with and the committee's mode of operation, the staff is felt to exercise unusually strong influence. As one fairly junior member of the committee put it, "It's a good staff, and they have a hell of a lot to say."

The mechanics of power in the Appropriations Committee are exemplified in the concentration of senior members on the most important subcommittees to form a kind of interlocking directorate. CANNON himself is chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, which is still probably the fulcrum of internal influence in Congress. THOMAS is not only chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee and of the Deficiencies Subcommittee, which handles the sensitive matter of supplemental appropriations, but is also a member of the Defense Subcommittee. FOGARTY, in addition to his chairmanship of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, is a member of the Public Works Subcommittee. As one Congressman observed, "six or seven guys have it sewed up."

This lack of pure democracy from time to time ignites protests from inside and outside the committee. In the waning days of the last session, for example, Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, made public his resentment at being refused permission to file separate and dissenting views on an appropriations measure. This is a privilege granted to members in most committees.

JOELSON objected to the committee report on the foreign aid appropriations bill because he felt the full committee had not been given enough time to study the matter.

A FASCINATING JOB

Despite this incident, JOELSON is pleased with his committee assignment. He says that while, to outsiders, the Appropriations Committee member "might seem a glorified accountant," he has a fascinating job because it is the only place "from which it is possible to see the whole sweep of government." This fascination, says JOELSON, is what "makes it so frustrating that it isn't more democratic."

While JOELSON clashed with CANNON and has reservations about the committee's workings, he at the same time also displays an obviously genuine respect for the chairman, whose command of appropriations detail is legendary. Of CANNON, JOELSON says, "although I differ with him on procedural matters, I am amazed at his sharpness and dedication."

JOELSON's mixed feelings suggest the contradiction which lies at the heart of the problem of congressional reform. The system is undemocratic, but nobody seems to have put forward a fundamentally different alternative which is likely to work better. Committee and subcommittee chairmen in most cases are acknowledged to know their business well.

SUBCOMMITTEE POWERS

THOMAS and FOGARTY are good examples of subcommittee doyens who are conscientious and well-informed about activities in their jurisdictions. They may not, in fact, have the scientific backgrounds necessary to make technical judgments on research programs, but their grasp of agency operations and the way they go about making decisions on appropriations questions has earned them regard as well as awe among officials of agencies whose budgets they handle.

Defenders of the system are easy to find. Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, is a member of the Appropriations Committee who stands above the halfway position on the seniority ladder and is an example of the loyal Appropriations committeeman. EVINS is author of a book, "Understanding Congress," published last year and has probably thought out his views more systematically than many of his colleagues. EVINS is convinced that there is no alternative to the seniority system. He says he is convinced that if Congress were given the option of a free vote for committee chairman and subcommittee chairman, more than 90 percent of the incumbents would be elected. Many Members appear to feel that seniority is the principle of order and stability in the congressional system and that its abolition would bring chaos. EVINS believes that some reforms might be desirable, but like many of his colleagues he does not dwell on the subject.

As to inequality of opportunity and influence between junior and senior members on his own committee, Representative EVINS points to the Appropriations Committee edu-

cation process and asks, "Doesn't experience, maturity and judgment outweigh even brilliance?"

EVINS' book, in which he draws on his experience in the House, is one of a number published in the last 2 or 3 years which signal a swing of interest to the House of Representatives, an institution which had been relatively neglected but gained attention early in the Kennedy administration when it was noticed that many of the new President's stickiest problems centered there.

Political scientists descended on the House with their questionnaires and depth interviews and discovered cross-currents and rich subtleties which have always been ignored or glossed over in conventional textbooks on government.[1]

Much of the criticism of Congress has been based on oversimplified views of how it works, and this is one of the reasons why the way of the reformer has been hard. It is true, for instance, that even some Members of Congress do not understand the mysteries of the Appropriations Committee. And it is remarkable that legislative committee members, who after all consider themselves specialists too, do not take umbrage when the Appropriations Committee countermands their orders on agency funds. The new explorations by scholarly legislators and scholars of the National Legislature should put matters in clearer perspective.

It is interesting to note that, while Senators have attacked their own "establishment" and leadership openly on the floor of the Senate, no such general assault has been mounted in the House.

The House is a closed society and a parochial one. Senators play on a national stage, but the House, for example, has never served as a launching pad for presidential candidates. The Congressman is insulated from national opinion. His base of power is his district. He is surrounded by a sympathetic staff and bolstered by the company of colleagues who share the ordeal of biennial elections. The rules of his game are the rules of the House.

Only Congress can change Congress, and with things as they are, this means that the congressional elders would have to decide to diminish their own power. It is a truism that the longer a Congressman serves, the more influential he grows and the less critical of the institution he becomes. The political scientists have a word for this process of indoctrination and conditioning of the individual—"socialization." And what it means in Congress for reform is that the men who count honestly feel that the critics just don't understand.

[1] Examples: are "New Perspectives on the House of Representatives," edited by Robert L. Peabody and Nelson W. Polsby, published last year, and "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It," by Charles L. Clapp, and "The House Rules Committee," by James A. Robinson, which have appeared recently.

Scholarship Cruise on "Clipper"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a unique educational experience will be made available this summer for approximately 60 graduating seniors of our Nation's secondary schools. Designed as an experiment in controlled educational environments, a project of the Institute for Special Programs in Education will conduct a program on board the *Yankee Clipper* as they cruise in the Caribbean and along the coast of South America. An article describing this interesting program appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, on February 9, written by William Fripp. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SCHOLARSHIP CRUISE ON "CLIPPER"

(By William Fripp)

The *Yankee Clipper* is looking for some intellectual ballast.

Some 60 of the Nation's top secondary school graduating seniors are being sought to join the vessel's unique educational odyssey before it sets sail from San Juan in July.

And over half of these will be on either full or partial scholarships, reports Bernard Goldhirsh, MIT physicist and president of the Institute for Special Programs in Education.

About 30 full and 15 partial scholarships will be provided in this inaugural seaborne educational program, Goldhirsh says.

For the nonscholarship voyager the Caribbean trip will cost $1,790.

The student being sought for the program, Goldhirsh explains, will be judged on the basis of emotional maturity, capacity for sustained reasoning, creative potential, and breadth of curiosity.

Many graduating secondary school seniors are "now at a critical point in their lives, groping for self-concepts and adult roles," he continues.

The *Clipper* program, through it emphasis on integrating the various disciplines, will help the student realize that there is a relevancy in what he is learning, Goldhirsh adds.

Why a shipboard education?

The vessel, Goldhirsh explains, will "provide a controlled environment free from outside disturbances and artificial structures and an ideal setting for rigorous academic effort."

In port for 2 days after each 4 days at sea, the *Clipper* will offer students the opportunity to meet with local intellectuals, government officials, business and labor leaders, and student contemporaries.

The trip will touch major cities in the Caribbean, South and Central America, and Mexico.

The faculty consists of 10 Ph. D. candidates from Harvard and MIT.

Courses taught will be physics, engineering, mathematics, economics, English, social psychology, biological science, political science, esthetics, and philosophy.

To insure the program's interdisciplinary approach, the faculty member will orient himself on each of the other fields before the trip. On board they will exchange lecture notes.

The academic day will consist of morning lectures, afternoon seminars, and evening reflection and study.

Recreational activities will include chamber and folk music, sailing, astronomy and navigation, photography, and dramatics.

The Institute for Special Programs in Education, which is administering the trip, is a nonprofit educational organization conducting research in teaching-learning methods located at 90 Pembroke Street.

Inquiries should be sent to Goldhirsh at the institute.

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks we have been more than normally upset by the many eruptions in various parts of our world affecting the welfare and security of the United States.

Chief amongst these disturbances is the unsolved and particularly disturbing situation in Panama.

Although some of us are completely at a loss for answers to this problem, we must admit that one of our esteemed colleagues, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, of the 11th Pennsylvania District, has repeatedly and accurately advised the House, the administration, and the public of the deteriorating relations between Panama and the United States.

Recently Congressman FLOOD sent another of a series of memorandums to the White House. Mr. Speaker I believe this important document should be read by all Members of Congress.

The memorandum follows:

JANUARY 7, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The Whte House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Among the most crucial subjects of policy determination now facing our Government are those relating to the Panama Canal, which matters have been under active consideration in the Congress for a period of years.

Under the clarifications so far accomplished in the course of congressional debates and hearings, the principal issues established include:

(a) The paramount question of safeguarding U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, which since 1955 have been seriously jeopardized through the process of piecemeal erosions, some of which have been counter to the formal expressions of the Congress and opposed to the official policies of the United States as followed for nearly half a century.

(b) The problem of the major operational improvement and increase of transit capacity of the existing canal by means of its major modification to embody the principles of the Terminal Lake—third locks modernization program. This solution, developed in the Panama Canal organization as the result of World War II experience, has been authoritatively recognized as providing at minimum cost the best operational canal practicable of achievement.

(c) The matter of a new canal at, or near, the present site or elsewhere.

As to the sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over the canal enterprise, their unimpaired continuance gently requires a reaffirmation of our policy along the lines of House Concurrent Resolution 105 (Cannon resolution). In this connection it has long been clear to informed and thoughtful persons that the Panama Canal could not have been constructed nor subsequently maintained and operated with less authority vested in and exercised by the United States than that expressly granted under the 1903 treaty with Panama.

During recent years our Government has yielded to politically and communistically motivated and ever increasing demands of Panama, at times featured by mob violence requiring the use of the U.S. Army to protect the Canal Zone against invasion, sabotage, and outright violence. The time has come to check these dangerous erosions and to reassert our time-honored canal policy squarely based on treaties; otherwise, chaos will inevitably result and the United States will lose the canal and international communism will take over not only the isthmus but also the other countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Panama Canal, as the symbol of our national strength and determination, is the greatest single buffer against conquest by the world revolutionary movement of the entire Western Hemisphere. As such, it is, indeed, the keystone in the arch of hemispheric defense.

As to the modification of the Panama Canal, since the advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, the issues involved in this important subject have been persistently confused and delayed by advocates of the discarded plan for a sea level canal at Panama. In consequence, there has been put forth a mass of misleading official and unofficial propaganda. Moreover, the recent efforts toward modernizing the present canal have been in the nature of symptomatic treatments rather than realistic solutions. Thus, they altogether fail to solve the problem of providing the major operational improvement of the existing canal and the additional transisthmian facilities for the inevitable demands of increased traffic. As to the various means proposed, to meet these problems, practically all the distinguished engineering and other leaders who participated in the construction of the canal and many other eminent engineering, navigational, and nuclear warfare experts have approved the Terminal Lake-third locks plan as the best solution. See attached memorial addressed to the Congress for some of the views expressed in these regards.

In regard to the matter of a new canal at or near the present site or a second canal, this problem involves decisions of the gravest character, which must not be made lightly or controlled by routine groups that would benefit from their own recommendations as has been attempted in the past with tragic consequences. The interests supporting such ex parte control of canal policy determination include the following:

(a) Manufacturers of heavy earth-moving machinery seeking markets for their products.

(b) A limited number of professional engineers, military and civilian, associated or hoping to be connected with these interests.

More than 20 years of delays, confusion, and procrastination on the part of responsible officials have prevented the formulation of an adequate plan for the modernization of the present canal and due consideration of the most obvious, most logical, economic and least hazardous plan—that provided in the Terminal Lake-third locks design. Experience has shown that the required vision and leadership will not come from routine agencies on matters of fundamental planning and must be obtained from those who are independent.

In this connection, it should be especially noted that all advocates of a sea-level project near the present site have uniformly ignored the vital diplomatic questions that would be involved in that project. These are the huge indemnity and increased annuity to be demanded by Panama for a new canal treaty, the reduction of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, and the limitation of the duration of the treatey. In contrast, these crucial diplomatic questions will not be involved in the Terminal Lake-third locks program for modernization of the Panama Canal, which is a paramount consideration.

The proper handling of the canal problem would be an achievement of the highest importance for our country and all nations that use the canal and bring great distinction to those responsible for success.

In meeting counter-arguments against the program that I shall later outline, which are to be expected from routine officials and agencies, attention is invited to the 1939 third locks project fiasco in the Canal Zone. Some $75 million of the taxpayers' money was expended on an understanding that was later shown to be a navigational monstrosity and which became a target for severe criticism among navigation interests and independent engineers thoroughly conversant with the subject. Moreover, any third locks project that fails to eliminate the Pedro Miguel bottleneck locks and to consolidate all Pacific locks in new structures near Aguadulce (close to Miraflores) to create a summit lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with the layout at Gatun, should be dismissed as unworthy of serious consideration, however plausibly it may be urged.

The following action program for the President is recommended:

(a) Make, or cause to be made, a positive reaffirmation of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal as provided by treaty and as contemplated in House Concurrent Resolution 105 (CANNON) and House Concurrent Resolution 113 (FLOOD).

(b) Send a special message to the Congress recommending prompt enactment of legislation to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission to make the necessary studies and report on the question of increased facilities at Panama or a new canal on some other Isthmian site as provided in H.R. 863 (BOW), H.R. 3858 (FLOOD), H.R. 5787 (HOSMER) and H.R. 8563 (THOMPSON of Texas).

As shown by the sponsorship of pending measures and debates in the House, the interoceanic canal question is nonpartisan and will be handled on the highest plane of statesmanship. Copies of the resolutions and bills mentioned are attached.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article and editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 24, 1964, concerning the excellent testimony of Prof. Joseph M. Klamon at Washington University in opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Jan. 24, 1964]

JUST PLAIN PRICE FIXING

In these United States, if a man is out to legalize price fixing, eliminate competition, guarantee his profits, or bilk the consumer, it's obvious he's not going to say so.

More likely he is going to conceal his scheme under some high-falutin', altruistic-sounding moniker like a Quality Stabilization Act. And that's what's happening.

Missourians can be thankful that once again, in Congress yesterday, the consumer's champion, Dr. Joseph M. Klamon, professor of marketing from Washington University, entered the lists on their behalf. Arrayed against him are the same old adversaries: well-heeled lobbyists bankrolled by little bands of retailers seeking Federal relief from the discipline of the marketplace.

Specifically, the Quality Stabilization Act would prohibit any merchant from selling a national brand product at a price lower than that set by the manufacturer. This means, of course, the national fixing of prices by the manufacturer, thus circumventing antitrust laws.

It means the stifling of competition among retailers, with the consumer the loser. It means soaring, artificial prices, negating any tax cut benefits we got and crippling the national economy.

The consumer is supposed to be king in a free enterprise system. If this self-serving bill were passed, his crown would be usurped by the manufacturer.

The motives of some retailers in pushing the measure are obvious. They are afraid of merchants who cut prices and attract new customers—to the benefit of the consumer. They are palsied with fear over merchandisers who pare profits on single items to make it up in volume—again to the benefit of the consumer.

Missouri and three other States have never had nor wanted such laws (which formerly went under the name of "fair trade" acts.) Supreme courts of 23 other States have ruled these measures wholly or in part unconstitutional.

They are being buried State by State. So reactionaries are jockeying to foist a Federal price-fixing statute on the whole Nation—even thought States don't want this shackle on free enterprise.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Jan. 24, 1964]

PRICE-FIXING BILL ASSAILED AS COSTLY—WOULD COST PUBLIC $7 BILLION A YEAR, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR TESTIFIES

WASHINGTON.—A bill pending in Congress would raise the prices of more than 40 branded goods and cost the public between $7 and $14 billion every year in higher, noncompetitive prices, Prof. Joseph M. Klamon, of Washington University, said here Thursday.

Professor Klamon, professor of marketing at the university and economic adviser to the Consumer Federation of St. Louis and St. Louis County, testified against the bill at a hearing of the Senate Commerce Committee.

The hearing originally was scheduled for 2 months ago, but was postponed because of President Kennedy's death. Professor Klamon pointed out that less than a month before his death, the late President stated his opposition to the bill.

Falsely labeled the "quality stabilization" bill, it has "nothing whatever to do with quality," he told the Senators. It is aimed, he charged, at repealing and destroying all State and Federal antitrust laws as applied to trademarked, or name brand goods.

Professor Klamon praised the press in Missouri, including the Globe-Democrat, and elsewhere across the Nation for its exposure of the true nature of the bill.

Lobbyists advocating the measure "are not here as proponents of lower prices or price freedom," he said. "Rather they are here as they always have been to fix prices, to raise prices, to destroy our Federal and State antitrust laws, to interfere with the market concept of pricing."

An exclusive monopoly is given by way of a patent "to reward an inventor for his inventiveness," but this continues for only 17 years, Professor Klamon noted.

"The bill before you," he told the committee, "would give the owner of a trademark, merely because he uses a brand or

trade name to identify his product, a right forever to control the resale price of his product, although such a trademark is only an identifying benchmark requiring no inventiveness.

"And this control would not be for 17 years but forever."

If the bill becomes law, he added, all a manufacturer would need to do to escape antitrust laws would be "to put a jacket or trade name on his product." This would then legalize price fixing, he said.

Professor Klamon cited and quoted from a number of newspaper articles and governmental reports supporting his views on the bill.

"I should add that every consumer's organization in the country, as well as leaders of agricultural groups and labor, have repeatedly testified against this type of legislation as being inimical to public interest," he said.

Many States, including Missouri, do not permit price fixing, Professor Klamon said. This bill, if enacted, would force these States to permit fixing of prices.

"This bill would legalize what is essentially a sales tax upon branded goods," he declared.

It would be implemented "not by any governmental agency but by private manufacturers who own brand names, and the benefit of this increase in prices at the expense of the public would not go to any governmental treasury, State or Federal, but to the owners of these brand names," Professor Klamon added.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, 46 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state.

The Lithuanian people united in the common cause of their independence, and the young nation, in its flourishing growth, showed its natural aptitude for independent statehood. Unfortunately, that independence was short-lived, lasting only a little more than 20 years. In the early part of World War II, Lithuania was invaded first by Nazi Germany and later by Soviet Russia. We are reminded on this 46th anniversary that independence has yet to become a reality for the Lithuanian people.

The U.S. Government has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic States by the Soviet Union, and all friends of freedom today join in the fervent hope for a better future for this brave land and its people.

Therefore, on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to a courageous people who continue the valiant struggle for independence. Today's enslavement stands as an example of Soviet deceit and treachery.

We share in the hope that Lithuania and all captive nations will one day be given their rightful places with the free and independent nations of the world.

Lincoln Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, each year on Lincoln's Birthday the distinguished citizens and patriotic service organizations and civic groups gather at Lincoln's Tomb at Springfield, Ill., to commemorate the day of his birth. The American Legion celebrated its 30th Annual American Legion Pilgrimage this year, the distinguished national commander, Daniel J. Foley, of the American Legion delivered the eulogy of the day to Lincoln's memory, as follows:

LINCOLN DAY MESSAGE, 1964

(By Daniel F. Foley)

Nearly 100 years ago, while serving as President of the United States, the Great Emancipator whom we honor here today was cut down by an assassin's bullet. Yet, he lives today in the hearts of his countrymen for his great humanitarian works, for his compassion toward his fellow man, for his love of country which led him to sacrifice his own life in the cause of the Republic strong and united.

Less than 100 days ago, another President of these United States lost his lift in the same manner. While these two men were representative of opposite political parties—while their deaths were separated by nearly a century—each labored in his own time and in his own way toward an identical objective. Both Abraham Lincoln and John Fitzgerald Kennedy fought the good fight for the right of every man, every citizens of this great Nation, to enjoy to the fullest extent equality of opportunity and the bright promise of freedom envisioned by our Founding Fathers when they proclaimed that "all men are created equal," and that each is "endowed with certain inalienable rights."

Their dissimilarities were as striking as their similarities, and yet, to me, here is a classic illustration of a point which I have stressed so many times since becoming national commander of the American Legion—it is the fact that the ties which bind free and freedom-loving men together are infinitely stronger than the forces which seek to rend them apart.

In spite of so many superficial values which change with the changing times, the eternal values of truth, of devotion to high ideals, of dedication to service of the cause of God and man, remain untouched by time and circumstances.

The ideal of liberty with justice for all is as precious to men of today as it was to men of Lincoln's day, and Americans of today have proved as willing to lay down their lives in the defense of the ideals in which they believe, as did their forebears of a century ago.

As we pause here in the presence of a great American martyr to the cause of freedom; as we look once more to our past to draw new strength to sustain us for today and for tomorrow, we cannot help but feel the strong ties created by the many parallels between his time and ours, and we are further strengthened in the knowledge that we share with Abraham Lincoln membership in the greatest society on earth, the society of freemen.

Yet, in drawing parallels, we find that the struggle for freedom, internally and internationally, marks our day as did the tragic struggle which pitted brother against brother and which tried the soul of the Great Emancipator.

While there are at this moment no great clashes of arms, there is isolated skirmishing in many places throughout the world, all of which are a part of the resounding worldwide clash of ideologies pitting freemen against those who would enslave them, with the freedom of all mankind hanging in the balance.

The American way of life was strengthened by men such as Lincoln who had the courage to fight and to die for all those things which they held dear. This way of life has been further strengthened and preserved by new generations of Americans with the courage of their convictions in the ensuing 99 years, and, God willing, those cherished freedoms will be preserved by the same breed of man for all time to come.

Bitter strife split the Union which Lincoln labored so tirelessly to preserve. Bitter differences, not easily reconcilable, and which may not be resolved in our time, split the world today. Then, as now, we lived under the premise that all men are created equal, but now, as then, all men are not provided with equal opportunity to prove that premise.

To be sure, much progress has been made since the great Lincoln laid down the burdens of state, but I believe we have not progressed as much as he would have liked us to. As in every facet of life's work, while much has been done, much remains to be done.

It has been said that the ground of freedom is gained by inches, and those of the American Legion who have engaged in bitter strife for the winning and preserving of freedom have, in so many instances seen how literally true that statement is.

In some of the most brutual combat the world has ever seen, in the long stalemated trench warfare of World War I, in the costly and tortuous breakthrough at Anzio, at Guadalcanal, and in innumerable other encounters forever enshrined in the annals of American military history, members of the American Legion have seen the ground of freedom literally gained by inches.

Let us here resolve to safeguard those precious inches of freedom that have been gained, that we may never have to fight over the same battlefields again. Let us, with open minds and hearts and with all the courage that we can muster, dare to explore new areas of freedom both domestically and internationally.

Let us live like men, informed and knowledgeable of the issues of our age, fearless of those issues and ready to face them realistically and to seek sane and sensible solutions to those issues. The example for us in this task was set by the one whom we honor here this day, for he stood above the crowd as a tower of strength, of courage, and of personal integrity in his own day.

I believe the American Legion has charted a true course for its members to follow in its defining of Americanism as adopted and reconfirmed by two successive national conventions. A portion of that definition reads as follows:

"The essence of Americanism is therefore, class, religious, and racial tolerance. It should be emphasized in the strongest language possible that the maintenance of these three form of tolerance is essential to the preservation of Americanism. They constitute the three great pillars upon which our constitutional Republic rests, and if any of these pillars is destroyed, the whole structure of the American system of government will crumble to the earth. Therefore, the man who advocates class hatred is plainly un-American even if he professes racial and religious tolerance. The converse of this proposition is equally true. It is as un-American to hate one's neighbor who has

more of this world's material goods as it is to hate him because he was born into another race or worships God according to a different faith."

Life's difficult problems, my friends, have no easy answers, but I do believe the few lines which I have just quoted will serve well as guidelines not only for Legionnaires, but for all Americans during these critical times in which we are privileged to live. Let us never forsake principle for expediency lest we surrender easily what has been won so dearly—this may well apply to our course of action both at home and abroad.

Some may regard this pilgrimage of ours today as a sentimental journey. It does have the elements. But, more truly, this is a brief journey into a glorious past for drawing the sustenance and strengthening the will to perpetuate a glorious present and to insure a glorious future.

Surely it was the dream of Lincoln—yes, his firm belief—that the things for which he labored were achievable goals. One of those objectives, perhaps the most pressing of his era, was achieved within his lifetime, the goal of a nation united. Before his death, war had ended and threads of union were being rewoven.

Surely we, who are the beneficiaries of this great heritage to which Lincoln contributed so much, can in good conscience do no less than give our very best efforts that the principles and ideals for which he labored so valiantly shall not only live, but shall be expanded upon in our time.

In conclusion, may I call upon all within the sound of my voice to use this 30th annual American Legion-led pilgrimage to the final resting place of a great American for the dual purpose of paying homage to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and for drawing from this moment new faith, strength, and courage that we may meet and master our trials as he did his so long ago.

The Right To Criticize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 13, 1964:

THE RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

President Johnson didn't add to his stature by his comments on critics of this Nation's foreign policy. And neither did he shed light as to the causes for the current disarray of that policy.

His assertion that those who criticize the Government—his administration—were alining themselves with the Nation's enemies and causing almost as much trouble as other enemies constituted a somewhat hackneyed political defense more suitable to the hustings than to the Presidency.

Any American citizen has a right—a God-given right as well as a constitutional right—to raise questions, to seek information, as to the policies of his Government. That right was not suspended when Mr. Johnson succeeded to the Presidency.

To lump critics—specifically critics who fail to make constructive suggestions—with the enemies of this Nation, as did Mr. Johnson, smacks of an intent to silence opposition. It will probably have the opposite effect.

Decisions and policy implementations which involve the lives and fortunes of American citizens are the rightful concern of every American citizen; not merely of those who chance to be in Government.

The Sun-Times recognizes that there are situations and other matters sometimes involved in foreign affairs which cannot be proclaimed from the housetops. But it doesn't believe that it is the responsibility of everyone who objects to the continued presence of Fidel Castro in Cuba to suggest a way to bring about his removal in a manner acceptable to the State Department. It doesn't agree that it is the duty of every American who questions our role in South Vietnam to provide the Pentagon with a formula for victory. It doesn't accept the implied theory that any one who objects to sending American soldier to Cyprus, to the Congo, or anywhere else must necessarily be lumped with enemies of this Nation unless he suggests some other place they can be sent.

Any American citizen has the right to disagree with a policy which permits the sale of American wheat to Soviet Russia. He isn't required, as the consequence of such objection, to go out and find another market for wheat.

The parents of every American soldier in South Vietnam have a right to know the truth about the situation in in southeast Asia. They haven't been getting it from the Pentagon.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is in disarray. It is in disarray primarily because President Charles de Gaulle of France objects to American policies in its implementation. Must American citizens who criticize the Government for allowing that disarray provide the administration with a blueprint for the restoration of that very essential alliance? Isn't it enough that they provide the soldiers and the money that the Government employs in Europe?

Why shouldn't American citizens criticize conditions which permit every tinhorn dictator to mock the United States.

Mr. Johnson's sensitivity to criticism can best be assuaged if Mr. Johnson will straighten out some of the many contradictions in American foreign policy. True, he inherited from both Republican and Democratic administrations much of that policy. However, he had, as one of the most influential Members of the Senate, a hand in its shaping.

The Sun-Times has many times contended the United States needs to take a realistic look at its many-faceted, much fractured and sometimes contradictory foreign policy. It needs to be overhauled.

This is a task to which the administration should be devoting itself. Until it does, the President and the State Department will, no doubt, continue to be the target of criticism by many loyal Americans who are not required to do the job assigned the President and the State Department.

Birch Society Sets New Low for Viciousness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to my colleagues' attention a reasonably written account about the John Birch Society's impressions on Arizona Publisher Platt Cline. That same writer has now written a column which reflects the astonishment of most Americans who have learned about the vicious Birch Society article concerning President Kennedy's assassination. The irresponsible Bircher article was written by Revilo P. Oliver, professor of classical languages at the University of Illinois. I almost feel safe in saying that Professor Oliver, who has also participated in the activities of such groups as the Christian Crusade and We, the People, has attained an incomparable low with this latest bit of "Communist conspiracy analysis." Thanks be to God that the reasonableness of Americans is beginning to manifest itself through such clear expressions as the following article by Arizona's Platt Cline.

BIRCH SOCIETY SETS NEW LOW FOR VICIOUSNESS

If any proof is needed that the leadership of the John Birch Society is at best frightened, irresponsible, and cuckoo, and at worst is deliberately sowing fear, distrust, suspicion, and disloyalty among us, it is to be found in an article appearing in the February issue of American Opinion, the society's monthly journal.

The article, "Marxmanship in Dallas," by Revilo P. Oliver of the University of Illinois, a despicable and vicious attack on the late President, the Attorney General, the Chief Justice and others, is described as a "superb commentary" by Robert Welch, founder of the Birchites.

Reading this hate-laden, paranoidal, fantastic commentary on the assassination should be enough to disenchant any even slightly reasonable member with the society and its methods.

The article offers three explanations for the assassination, terming all others as preposterous.

"That Kennedy was executed by the Communist conspiracy because he was planning to turn American. For this comforting hypothesis, there is no evidence now known."

"That * * * it was the result of one of the rifts that not infrequently occur within the management of the Communist conspiracy, whose satraps sometimes liquidate one another."

"That the conspiracy ordered the assassination as part of systematic preparation for a domestic takeover."

The article claims that President Kennedy may have been shot because he was falling behind in the Communist timetable for takeover of the United States.

"The assassination * * * may have been necessary as only means of avoiding or even long deferring, national scandals so flagrant as to shock the whole of our brainwashed and hypnotized populace back to sanity.

"Kennedy * * * with whose blessing and support the Central Intelligence Agency staged a fake 'invasion' of Cuba designed to strengthen our mortal enemies there and to disgrace us—disgrace us not merely by ignominious failure but by the inhuman crime of having lured brave men into a trip and sent them to their suffering and death * * * Kennedy, who, in close collaboration with Khrushchev, staged the phony 'embargo' that was improvised to befuddle the suckers * * * and to provide for several months a cover for the steady and rapid transfer of Soviet troops and Soviet weapons to Cuba for eventual use against us.

"Mr. Dulles' CIA is also the gang that helped Castro attain power in Cuba, staged the fake 'invasion' to destroy anti-Communist organizations in Cuba, recently carried

out (in close cooperation with Soviet Secret Police) the murders in South Vietnam as a prelude to complete and open Communist occupation, and is known to have served the Soviet in many other ways * * *."

In dealing with the Commission headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, appointed by President Johnson to investigate the assassination, Oliver says that its functions are:

"To cover up for the Communist conspiracy as much as possible * * * to suppress permanently the report of the FBI which it has already acted to conceal from the American people; to smother and suppress the evidence of close contacts between Oswald and Rubenstein * * * during the period immediately preceding the assassination * * *; to harrass the Dallas police as much as possible; to try to smear and intimidate loyal Americans in every way possible; to go as much further as may be feasible; to create propaganda for other Communist projects to facilitate the final conquest of the United States; to cooperate when the conspiracy arrangers for further violence."

He further says that "Oswald * * * participated in some of the many other forms of subversion that flourish openly in defiance of law through the connivance of the Attorney General.

"According to a story that has been neither confirmed or denied officially * * * Oswald was arrested as a suspect (in the attempt to shoot General Walker) but was released through the personal intervention of Robert F. Kennedy * * *.

"(Oswald) and his Communist wife were brought to the U.S. in open violation of American law by our Communist-dominated State Department."

It is also charged that Kennedy had planned to subvert and sabotage the Nation's defenses.

There is much more of the same, but enough is enough.

Reading the Vinson Vane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is doubly an honor and a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a splendid speech given last month in Atlanta, by Dr. Rufus C. Harris, president of Mercer University and former president of my alma mater, Tulane University in New Orleans, on the occasion of the award of the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Public Service to the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia.

It is most fitting that a great southern educator, himself a native son of Georgia, should present Georgia's highest award to a great statesman from the Peach State, and undoubtedly one of the greatest legislators ever to sit in the Halls of Congress—Chairman CARL VINSON. I say it is doubly a pleasure for me to insert Dr. Harris' address in the RECORD because I have had the honor to serve with Mr. VINSON for almost 20 years in the House, and I was a law student at Tulane when Dr. Harris was dean of the college of law.

In the finest manner, Dr. Harris pays tribute to this great Member of the House of Representatives for his dedicated public service to the people of his native State and to all the people of our country. As chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee in the House for more than 15 years, and as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee for almost as long a period, Mr. VINSON has been one of the guiding forces in building our Nation's Defense Establishment to the great pinnacle of strength and depth which it enjoys today.

Dr. Harris, who was dean of Tulane's College of Law—1927–37—during my tenure as a law student and who then served for 23 more years as president of Tulane, probably offered the highest accolade to Congressman VINSON when he told his audience that:

There are countless Georgians—

And I vouchsafe, all of us here in Congress—

who carry in their hearts a lingering hope that he may carry on.

Chairman VINSON has left an indelible mark not only on the growth and development of our Armed Forces, but also upon all of us in the House who have had the honor and the privilege to serve with him; and we would wish him to remain with us, although we agree, in the words of Dr. Harris that—

No unfairness is intended by asking more of him who has given so much.

I am confident that I speak for all Members of the House when I say that we are pleased to join with Dr. Harris and the citizens of Georgia in saluting our colleague and friend for his dedicated service and congratulating him on receiving the highest award which the people of his State can bestow. Although CARL VINSON may leave us here in Washington, he will remain forever in our hearts so long as we have breath—he will remain forever in the hearts of his countrymen.

I am happy to request unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD Dr. Harris' presentation address to representatives of the Associated Industries of Georgia on the memorable occasion of awarding to Chairman VINSON the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Public Service on Wednesday, January 22, 1964, at the Dinkler Plaza Hotel in Atlanta.

The speech follows:

READING THE VINSON VANE

(By Rufus Carrollton Harris)

A short while ago, in one of the world's oldest cities, I observed the statue of a Greek philosopher cherished in the classical period of Athenian history. The base of the statue bore this quotation: "It is fit that the immortal gods should judge the errors of men; it remains for mortal beings to honor their noble endeavor." Our purpose here tonight is to honor the noble endeavor of a distinguished Georgian. It is difficult to determine if this occasion has more meaning for the notable citizen to whom the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Service is awarded, than for those who assemble here to acknowledge the significant fulfillment of a great man's dream of life.

The man chosen to receive this evening the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Service, the highest award presented by citizens of this State, has spent almost a lifetime in the public service. It would be difficult for anyone to undertake an adequate citation of his range of work and achievement. It is appropriate, however, that we should reminisce for a moment. It was in 1883 that our honoree was born on a farm a few miles from his present home at Milledgeville, Ga. He received his secondary education in Milledgeville, and at the age of 16 he enrolled at Mercer University. Even before graduation from the law school in 1902, he began a public career. From this I derive a pardonable satisfaction, for it was at Mercer University, I believe, that the initial steps were formed for a career destined to become as purposeful and as illustrious in the processes of government and legislation, as the exciting history of our country affords.

After the law school, he returned to Milledgeville to practice law, and in 1906 was elected solicitor for Baldwin County. But there were wider horizons ahead. In 1909 he became a representative in the Georgia General Assembly, and in his last 2 years there he was named speaker pro tempore. He left the legislature to become Baldwin County court judge, and thus for a short while Milledgeville claimed her native son to administer public justice. In 1914 there existed an unexpired term in Congress from the 10th District. This was the turning point in his life. He received the Democratic nomination, and on November 3, 1914, took the oath as Congressman in the 63d Congress. He has been there continuously, including the present one, the 88th. This record of continued service is unequaled in our history. Twenty-four times he has been reelected to this post. The Nation is saddened by his announced retirement. Although an inadequate knowledge of the facts exists, and no unfairness is intended by asking more of him who has given so much, yet there are countless Georgians who carry in their hearts a lingering hope that he may carry on. Three years ago when President Lyndon B. Johnson presented the annual law day address at Mercer, he stated to me what he has said publicly: "Certainly everyone would agree that this man is one of the great legislators of our time."

Congressman VINSON has been chairman of a standing committee of Congress for more than 30 years, a record unequaled in the history of the House of Representatives. He served for 16 years on the House Naval Affairs Committee, which was merged into the Armed Services Committee after World War II. With the exception of a brief period when he was the ranking minority member, he has served as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. This service has brought him nationwide prominence. The Democratic whip, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, states admiringly that his colleagues refer to our guest affectionately and respectfully as "the Admiral." The fact that he is one of the Nation's superior military experts is consoling to most of the Nation in these times when world disaster is so ominous. The effective development, direction, and expanded use of American seapower—a power not well enough comprehended in our history—did not simply happen. Back of it was indeed more than one great man, but primarily it was made possible by the unique position and determination of our honoree. Before he was born, of course, the American Navy had shaped the lives of many of his predecessors. But we may assert confidently that the American Navy has woven its way into and through his life as ceaselessly as a mighty river cuts through the heart of a continent.

It is the quality of a life measured by its contribution to the moral structure of its society which inspires occasions such as this. The life of our honoree has been characterized by such service, and by devotion to his family and friends. His integrity as a man has earned the respect of his associates, but

his personal loyalties have earned for him the love of people. The philosopher chooses to relate the processes of education to the lives of men. He asserts that purpose and character in a society come chiefly from its exceptional citizens who somehow acquire exceptional understanding and motivation. I profess the end of education as commitment—the commitment of people to compassionate moral and social responsibility. This has been made manifest in the life of our guest. He is a man of many skills. The exceptional man must have the capacity for many. If skill were all he needed, he would do quite well for himself. But he has more. He has perspective and dwells in a sense of community with those who stir him by parallel forms of exceptional endeavor. This too is necessary, because the dream of an easy mechanical character of social progress has been shattered by the experiences of this generation. Our honoree knows there is no single, simple, nor easy way to secure America's advancement. There is need for abundant exceptional service.

How well the exceptional man shall fare in the immediate future in our area depends not so much upon him as upon the area. In the right environment he will be esteemed; in the wrong environment he will be derided. The burden rests not with him, for he has no alternative but to maintain his steadfastness. The burden rests rather upon all of us. In a society where regimentation of any kind is imposed, the person who allows himself to be pressured into the narrow confines of any category may appear to prosper. But in a society which is free to take shape and change according to its needs, wills and vision, he will not do so. There only the sensitive and exceptional man will actually prosper. It would be well for us if that kind of person may walk the earth in dignity, for in order to advance we must have such people. We are beginning, I think, to strive earnestly for them, and in this complex world we must have more than a small coterie of such.

The future progress of our area cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. Our honored guest knows that Georgia can pay no greater tribute to him and to his work than to provide opportunity for men like him in the future. That, I believe, is the basic aim of our distinguished Governor's broad educational program. Southern young people with restless curiosity, impelled to learn sometimes because they cannot help it, must be afforded the opportunity to reach unprecedented levels. They are the ones who will develop our social patterns, they will advance the human and commercial relations of the area. Their desire, like that of tonight's recipient, will be to acquire the means and ways to public usefulness and personal meaning.

Deep in the heart of Georgians is generous recognition of the magnificent example of public usefulness, integrity and commitment which our honoree's life and work have manifested. Prideful of his State but no less prideful of his country he is chosen to receive the Georgia Medal for distinguished public service. Ladies and gentlemen, I present this medal and the scroll which attests it, to the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Congressional Fraternity Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Sigma Chi Fraternity magazine carries a listing of fraternity memberships of all of the Members of the 88th Congress. I have found this list very interesting and I believe that most of our colleagues and others will also find this tabulation of fraternity memberships of interest.

Democrats and Republicans join ranks as fraternity brothers—Democratic Whip HALE BOGGS being a fraternity brother of Republican leader CHARLIE HALLECK, and Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON is a fraternity brother of the late Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. It all goes to prove again that we can have our differences and still remain fraternity brothers.

The list follows:

The following information compiled earlier this fall by Carroll Lurding of Stewart Howe Services, Inc., reveals that some 70 percent of the Senators and roughly 40 percent of the Representatives in the 88th Congress are members of fraternities, sororities, or similar student societies.

Percentagewise, the Republicans (50 percent) have a higher number of fraternity members in Congress than do the Democrats (38 percent). Of the 33 Republican Senators, 24 are members (73 percent), while 46 of the 67 Democrats are Greeks (69 percent). In the House, Republicans hold a numerical as well as percentage lead. Eighty-two of the 177 Republican Representatives are fraternity members (46 percent), compared to 78 of 259 for the Democrats (30 percent). Figured any way, the Greek-letter impact on Congress is substantial.

Among the fraternities represented, Pi Kappa Alpha has the largest delegation in the Senate with seven members (although three of these hold honorary memberships). Alpha Tau Omega follows closely with six. Delta Kappa Epsilon, Delta Upsilon, and Sigma Chi each have four, and Phi Gamma Delta has three. In total, 30 national and 7 local fraternal organizations, plus 2 sororities (Delta Zeta and Sigma Kappa), are represented in the Senate.

In the lower house, Phi Delta Theta has much the largest delegation with 15[1] members. Interestingly, it has no members in the current Senate, Sigma Chi has 11[2] members; Beta Theta Pi has 10; Kappa Alpha Order and Sigma Phi Epsilon each have 9; Pi Kappa Alpha and Sigma Alpha Epsilon have 8; Alpha Tau Omega and Lambda Chi Alpha have 7; and Kappa Sigma has 6. One sorority (Alpha Chi Omega) and 40 fraternities are represented in the lower house.

In total representation in both houses, Phi Delt,[1] PiKA[3] and Sigma Chi lead with 15,[4] followed by ATO with 13, and Beta with an even dozen. In both houses, a total of 49 national and 10 local groups are represented. Of those fraternities with six or more men in Congress, Deke, KA Order, Lambda Chi, PiKA, SAE, and Sig Ep are most heavily Democratic, while Beta, DU, and Sigma Chi are most strongly Republican.

Sigma Chi's senatorial delegation of four is evenly divided between the two parties. In the House, however, the GOP leads a lopsided 9-to-3 ratio over the Democrats. Overall, Sigma Chi is represented by 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats.

By State, Oregon has the highest percentage of fraternity or sorority members in its delegation to Washington. Five of its six Senators and Representatives are fraternity members. Other States with 75 percent or more of their Congressmen as members are Florida, Idaho, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Washington.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The results of the study by individual fraternity and sorority are:

Acacia (two Senators, four Representatives)—Senate: Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas; Ralph Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas. House: William Bray, Republican, of Indiana; Edward Hutchinson, Republican, of Michigan; Homer Thornberry, Democrat, of Texas; O. C. Fisher, Democrat, of Texas.

Alpha Chi Rho (two Senators, two Representatives)—Senate: JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi; HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania. House: DAVID MARTIN, Republican, of Nebraska; JAMES WEAVER, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Alpha Delta Gamma (one Representative)—House: EDWARD DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois.

Alpha Delta Phi (one Senator, one Representative)—Senate: THRUSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky. House: ROBERT BARRY, Republican, of New York.

Alpha Epsilon Pi (one Representative)—HERMAN TOLL, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Alpha Gamma Rho (three Representatives)—House: ROBERT SIKES, Democrat, of Florida; RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana; CLIFFORD MCINTIRE, Republican, of Maine.

Alpha Phi Alpha (one Representative)—House: ADAM POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

Alpha Sigma Phi (two Representatives)—House: HORACE KORNEGAY, Democrat, of North Carolina; THOR TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington.

Alpha Tau Omega (six Senators, seven Representatives)—Senate: SPESSARD HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida; LEN JORDAN, Republican, of Idaho; BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana; JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi; MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming. House: KENNETH ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama; H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California; SAM GIBBONS, Democrat, of Florida; EDWARD GURNEY, Republican, of Florida; FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, Democrat, of Kentucky; CLARENCE LONG, Democrat, of Maryland; GEORGE GOODLING, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Beta Sigma Rho (one Representative)—House: CHARLES JOELSON, Democrat, of New York.

Beta Theta Pi (2 Senators, 10 Representatives)—Senate: JOHN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky; NORRIS COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire; House: JOHN RHODES, Republican, of Arizona; CHARLES TEAGUE, Republican, of California; DONALD BROTZMAN, Republican of Colorado; WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat of Colorado; CHARLES HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana; ROBERT ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas; HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana; JAMIE WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi; A. ULLMAN, Democrat, of Oregon; ARCH MOORE, Republican, of West Virginia.

Chi Phi (four Representatives)—House: CHARLES JONAS, Republican, of North Carolina; WILLIAM MINSHALL, Republican, of Ohio; JOHN SAYLOR, Republican of Pennsylvania; VERNON THOMSON, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Chi Psi (one Senator, one Representative)—Senate: WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin; House: HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Delta Chi (one Senator)—Senate: HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington.

Delta Kappa Epsilon (four Senators, five Representatives)—Senate: LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama; RUSSELL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana; STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri; STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio; House: DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California; GILLIS LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana; STANLEY TUPPER, Republican, of Maine; GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire.

Delta Phi (one Senator)—Senate: DANIEL BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland.

Delta Psi (one Senator)—Senate: JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Delta Sigma Phi (two Representatives)—House: ROSS ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana; EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana.

Delta Tau Delta (two Representatives)—House: JAMES MORRISON, Democrat, of Louisiana; JACKSON BETTS, Republican, of Ohio.

Delta Upsilon (four Senators, three Representatives)—Senate: PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey; KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York; WINSTON PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont; House: J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, of California; WILLIAM AVERY, Republican, of Kansas; ROBERT STAFFORD, Republican, of Vermont.

Kappa Alpha Order (one Senator, nine Representatives)—Senate: CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware; House: ROBERT JONES, Democrat, of Alabama; CHARLES GUBSER, Republican, of California; CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida; CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia; ROBERT STEPHENS, Democrat, of Georgia; CARL ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma; ROBERT HEMPHILL, Democrat, of South Carolina; PORTER HARDY, Democrat, of Virginia; JOEL BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia.

Kappa Sigma (two Senators, six Representatives)—Senate: Estes Kefauver (since deceased, Democrat, of Tennessee; John Tower, Republican, of Texas; House: Dante Fascell, Democrat, of Florida; Robert Dole, Republican, of Kansas; Joe Waggonner, Democrat, of Louisiana; Clarence Cannon, Democrat, of Missouri; James Healey, Democrat, of New York; Frank Horton, Republican, of New York.

Lambda Chi Alpha (two Senators, seven Representatives)—Senate: VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana; ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada; House: HAROLD JOHNSON, Democrat, of California; RICHARD HANNA, Democrat, of California; THOMAS ABERNETHY, Democrat, of Mississippi; DURWARD HALL, Republican, of Missouri; CARL RICH, Republican, of Ohio; E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota; OMAR BURLESON, Democrat, of Texas.

Omega Psi Phi (one Representative)—House: ROBERT NIX, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Phi Delta Theta (15 Representatives)—House: Paul Rogers, Democrat, of Florida; William Springer, Republican, of Illinois; Garner Shriver, Republican, of Kansas; Frank Chelf, Democrat, of Kentucky; Richard Bolling, Democrat, of Missouri; William Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey; Charles Goodell, Republican, of New York; Harold Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina; James Broyhill, Republican, of North Carolina; John Jarman, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Francis Walter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Robert Corbett, Republican, of Pennsylvania; James Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Clark Thompson, Democrat, of Texas; K. W. Stinson, Republican, of Washington.

Phi Gamma Delta (three Senators, five Representatives)—Senate: GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado; MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma; HOWARD EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma; House: ALPHONSO BELL, Republican, of California; COMPTON WHITE, Democrat, of Idaho; BARRATT O'HARA, Oemocrat, of Illinois; OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York; ED EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

Phi Kappa Psi (one Senator, five Representatives)—Senate: THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California; House: CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California; WINFIELD DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana; JAMES BROMWELL, Republican, of Iowa; WILLIAM RANDALL, Democrat, of Missouri; JOHN MARSH, Democrat, of Virginia.

Phi Kappa Sigma (three Representatives)—House: HOWARD ROBISON, Republican, of New York; RICHARD SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania; JOE EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Phi Kappa Theta (one Senator)—Senate: EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Phi Sigma Epsilon (one Representative)—House: FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa.

Phi Sigma Kappa (one Senator, one Representative)—Senate: FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio; House: THOMAS CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri.

Pi Kappa Alpha (seven Senators, eight Representatives)—Senate: JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama; EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois; ALLEN ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana; WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina; FRANK MOSS, Democrat, of Utah; WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia; House: E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas; LESLIE ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois; WILLIAM COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi; PAUL JONES, Democrat, of Missouri; GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York; DAVID HENDERSON, Democrat, of North Carolina; JOE POOL, Democrat, of Texas.

Pi Kappa Phi (one Senator, two Representatives)—Senate: OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina; House: GEORGE GRANT, Democrat, of Alabama; A. S. HERLONG, Democrat, of Florida.

Psi Upsilon (five Representatives)—House: ABNER SIBAL, Republican, of Connecticut; CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota; CLARENCE KILBURN, Republican, of New York; SAMUEL STRATTON, Democrat, of New York; JACK WESTLAND, Republican, of Washington.

Sigma Alpha Epsilon (two Senators, eight Representatives)—Senate: GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida; RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia; House: ARMISTEAD SELDEN, Democrat, of Alabama; OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas; JOHN FLYNT, Democrat, of Georgia; BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts; DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; W. E. BROCK, Republican, of Tennessee; CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee; TOM MURRAY, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Sigma Nu (two Senators, five Representatievs)—Senate: Herman Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia; Quentin Burdick, Democrat, of North Dakota; House: George Andrews, Democrat, of Alabama; Robert Michel, Republican, of Illinois; Samuel Devine, Republican, of Ohio; Walter Norblad, Republican, of Oregon; HOWARD BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee.

Sigma Phi (one Representative)—House: HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Sigma Phi Epsilon (two Senators, nine Representatives)—Senate: BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa; HARRY BYRD, Democrat of Virginia; House: D. R. MATTHEWS, Democrat, of Florida; WALTER BARING, Democrat, of Nevada; BASIL WHITENER, Democrat, of North Carolina; PAGE BELCHER, Republican, of Oklahoma; WALTER ROGERS, Democrat, of Texas; VAUGHAN GARY, Democrat, of Virginia; WILLIAM TUCK, Democrat, of Virginia; PAT JENNINGS, Democrat, of Virginia; WALT HORAN, Republican, of Washington.

Sigma Pi (one Senator, one Representative)—Senate: EDWIN MECHEM, Republican, of New Mexico; House: FRANK BOW, Republican, of Ohio.

Tau Delta Phi (one Senator)—Senate: HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Tau Kappa Epsilon (one Senator)—Senate: ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia.

Theta Chi (two Senators, four Representatives)—Senate: CARL CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska; WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington; House: ROBERT MCLOSKEY, Republican, of Illinois; NEIL STAEBLER, Democrat, of Michigan; LOUIS WYMAN, Republican, of New Hampshire; EUGENE KEOGH, Democrat, of New York.

Theta Delta Chi (one Representative)—House: HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Theta Xi (one Senator)—Senate: FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho.

Zeta Beta Tau (one Senator)—Senate: ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Alpha Chi Omega (one Representative)—House: CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington.

Delta Zeta (one Senator)—Senate: MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon.

Sigma Kappa (one Senator)—Senate: MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine.

Local organizations (seven Senators, two Representatives)—Senate: ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska; PETER DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts; EDWARD KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts; CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico; JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa; CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island; House: BOB WILSON, Republican, of California; EMILIO DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut.

---

[1] Phi Delta Theta's delegation was reduced to 14 with the death of Representative Francis Walter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

[2] MARK ANDREWS, Republican, of North Dakota, raises to 12 the number of Sigma Chi Representatives.

[3] As previously noted, three of this number are honorary members.

[4] Sigma Chi now leads the pack with 16 Members of Congress.

Martin Reports $70 Million in Cost Reductions for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of President Johnson's first acts was to direct a personal appeal to defense contractors asking their help in reducing military expenditures through the exercise of all possible economies in the performance of defense contracts. This, of course, is in keeping with the declared policy of the Johnson administration to administer the affairs of our Government with "utmost thrift and frugality."

I am sure that the Nation's defense contractors and their many thousands of employees will heed the President's appeal and will do their part to see that the Government receives a dollar's value for every dollar spent.

In this regard, I was particularly impressed by a recent announcement by one defense contractor, Martin Co., reporting savings of more than $70 million last year through a companywide cost reduction program. Martin Co., which I am pleased to say maintains headquarters and a major manufacturing facility in Middle River, Md., is responsible for such defense and space projects as the Titan III Air Force space booster, the Sprint antimissile, and the Titan II launch vehicle for the Gemini two-man spacecraft.

I think the results this company has achieved with the cooperation of its conscientious employees, in reducing defense costs are significant. In the long run I am hopeful that such efforts will be rewarded with more contract and job opportunities. With union and management teaming up to cut costs, the company will be in a better competitive position to bid and win more contracts. I commend Martin Co. and its employees for their achievement and insert in the RECORD a statement on the firm's 1963 cost reduction activities:

MARTIN REPORTS $70 MILLION IN COST REDUCTIONS FOR 1963

BALTIMORE, MD., January 30.—Martin Co. today reported cost reductions of more than $70 million during 1963 on its defense and space work for the Government.

William B. Bergen, president of Martin, advised defense and space agency officials in Washington of the documented results of the company's efforts.

He also pledged that Martin will continue vigorously this year, and improve wherever possible the formalized cost reduction program it has had in effect more than 2 years.

"Our 1963 savings, which exceeded the minimums we had set as our goal, were achieved without impairing the quality of our products or their scheduled deliveries," Bergen said. The $70 million savings was on contract work with a value of some $670 million and represents an average of some $1,800 for each of the company's employees.

Martin has set minimum 1964 cost reduction goals for each of its divisions, at Baltimore, Denver, Colo., and Orlando and Cocoa Beach, Fla., which total more than $50 million, an amount Bergen called "commensurate with our workload after taking account of the cumulative reductions that we already have effected on our continuing prime contracts."

Vendors and subcontractors, who receive approximately half of every contract dollar awarded to Martin, have been periodically called in by the company to attend cost reduction seminars. The most recent in this series was held at Baltimore in mid-January. Representatives of nearly 100 vendors and subcontractors attended, and on that occasion President Lyndon B. Johnson sent Bergen this telegram:

"I am extremely pleased and most gratified to learn of the steps your company is taking to enlist the support of your major subcontractors for the Department of Defense cost reduction program. The theme of your symposium, 'Less Cost Per Product,' is a timely response to the appeal for support which Secretary McNamara and I made to your company and some 7,500 other defense contractors on December 2. I am certain that your conference will produce concrete results. With warm good wishes to you and all those participating.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

In reporting on Martin's 1963 cost reduction results, Bergen praised the company's subcontractors. He noted, for example, that Martin's Denver division—producer of the Air Force Titan I and II ICBM's and the Titan III standard space launch system—documented some $46 million in cost reductions during 1963, more than half of which resulted from cooperative responses by subcontractors to the division's campaign for reducing costs.

"Over the entire company," Bergen said, "Martin also has stressed the necessity of competitive buying in its procurement activities to such an extent that a spot check in 1 recent month showed approximately 95 percent of all such purchases stemmed from competitive bidding.

"I have given a pledge to President Johnson, Defense Secretary McNamara and Space Administrator Webb that our company intends the most aggressive support of the administration's cost reduction efforts. We believe this objective is good business in the best possible sense—for us as a company, and for the entire Nation and free world as well."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Investment Powers, Federal Savings and Loan Associations

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9609) to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman of the Committee very much.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the full and adequate statement in support of this measure which he has given here on the floor today; also for the thorough examination of this measure which was given by his committee. The matter has been thoroughly explored and has been strongly supported and recommended by the committee as a result of its hearings.

The able chairman has set out the several respects in which this bill will enable the savings and loan associations of this country, now an industry with more than $100 billion of assets, better to serve the public.

I am glad that my able colleague from Michigan on the committee has emphasized that mobile dwellings are eligible for assistance under this bill. Millions of Americans live in these mobile homes. If you came to my State, Florida, you will see great trailer camps where thousands of people congregate in their various trailers and enjoy all the facilities necessary for the maintenance of their homes. These mobile homes have the virtue of mobility as well as the advantages of the convenience and comfort of fixed living in these trailer camps when they choose not to be mobile.

In addition, a great many of the students in the colleges and universities use these mobile homes as their dwelling places. In that respect, too, they make a very valuable contribution to the furnishing of adequate housing facilities for our country. This is simply another respect in which this measure enables the savings and loan industry, fathered and fostered by the Congress, more effectively to serve the public of our land.

Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs which has 96 clubs and 145,000 members, resolutions were passed on the subjects of the Panama Canal and the work of J. Edgar Hoover.

The resolution on Panama urges that our Government not surrender or compromise U.S. jurisdiction and control over the canal. The resolution on the subject of J. Edgar Hoover commends the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a lifetime of service to the cause of law enforcement.

Mr. President, at the request of the federation, I ask that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG ISLAND FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., RESOLUTION ON PANAMA CANAL

Whereas widespread propaganda of Communist origin has been, and still is, aimed at the internationalization of the Panama Canal and the wresting of its ownership and control from the United States of America; and

Whereas radical elements in the Republic of Panama are carrying on active and highly provocative propaganda on behalf of fantastic demands for (a) further, and impossible annuity and other benefits, and (b) the impairment and practical destruction of the absolute and exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity, of the United States of America over constitutionally acquired territory of the Canal Zone, and over the Panama Canal, constructed at the expense of the American taxpayer and maintained and operated by the United States of America on terms of equality for all nations as required by treaty; and

Whereas these agitations have as their purpose, the liquidation or fatal weakening of such sovereignty, altogether indispensable for the maintenance, operation, and protection of the canal, and this without the slightest suggestion of reimbursement to the United States of America for its vast investment in the canal enterprise: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc. (in convention assembled this 15th day of January 1960), That the recurring crises in relations between our Government and that of the Republic of Panama should receive immedately the most serious attention of our Executive as well as our legislative bodies; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge both Houses of Congress of the United States to proclaim by joint resolution the constitutional sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone, and to declare that the policy of the United States shall be not to surrender in any way, nor to compromise, U.S. jurisdiction over and control of the Canal Zone and U.S. ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, secretary of the Senate and House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITIZENS' ACTION COMMITTEE, NASSAU-SUFFOLK, FOR LONG ISLAND FEDERATION, COMMENDING THE HONORABLE J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has dedicated his entire life to fighting the criminal and the subversive and under whose leadership the Federal Bureau of Investigation has become a highly respected American institution standing for the highest principles of justice, freedom and fair play; and

Whereas with wisdom, foresight, and outstanding personal integrity the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has given to the profession of law enforcement a preeminence in its role of public service; and

Whereas in these days of mounting world and national tensions we continue to seek the inspiring leadership of this dedicated American: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 17th day of January 1964 express its deep gratitude to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover for his years of outstanding public service and commend Mr. Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their unparalleled contribution to the welfare and safety of the American people; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention convey to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation its gratitude and continued support and that copies of this resolution be sent to: Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, President, United States; Hon J. Edgar Hoover; Hon. Robert Kennedy, Attorney General, United States; U.S. Senators and Representatives representing the members of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc.

The Genius of Leonard Baskin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished art critic of the New York Times,

Mr. John Canaday, has written many articles on the development of Leonard Baskin.

When Mr. Canaday refers to this genuine American genius as "one of the handful of best artists of his generation" the praise is not polite but precise.

For Leonard Baskin is, indeed, a major artist who already belongs to the ages.

It is a remarkable fact that this young sculptor, printmaker, book designer, and printer, has established worldwide fame in so short a time. And yet it is true that in the middle of this century this country has produced an artist capable of, as Canaday states, "deepening his exploration of a single theme, the invincibility of the spirit against all the degradations that assault it."

The fact that Leonard Baskin resides within my congressional district is a great privilege for me, Mr. Speaker. Discerning critics around the world have been overwhelmed by the great artistic power of this professor at Smith College in Northampton, who also owns and operates the famous Gehenna Press, a press that has produced some of the more beautiful books made by man in this century.

It is a great honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to include the full article by Mr. Canaday from the New York Times of Sunday, February 9:

BASKIN AND THE SOOTY GOD—IN A NEW EXHIBITION, THE AMERICAN SCULPTOR NOT ONLY AFFIRMS HIS HIGH POSITION, BUT TOPS IT

(By John Canaday)

From exhibition to exhibition—and his exhibitions have been frequent over the last several years—Leonard Baskin has not only affirmed his position as one of the handful of best artists of his generation, but has continued to top whatever he has done before. In his current exhibition at the Borgenicht Gallery, he does it once again, and he does it as he has done it before, not by increasing the dose, as is necessary for the kind of artist who has to keep himself going on a kind of esthetic heroin, but by deepening his exploration of a single theme, the invincibility of the spirit against all the degradations that assault it.

This is a theme that has run through art from the beginning, whether in the form of prehistoric charms against evil forces or as expositions of the promises of regeneration and immortality that men have always held out to themselves. It is a theme that has been given thousands, tens of thousands, of shapes in sculpture and painting, changing with time, place and society. It is also a theme so vulnerable to mawkishness that its history of embarrassing manifestations, by the thousand and tens of thousands, has made it suspect in a century when doubt, rather than hope, is not only the basis but the nearest thing to a conclusion that we have been able to reach in our way of thought.

DIVERSIONS

Any artist who shares our nearly universal contemporary malady is a fool if he believes that he can remedy it by working in the traditions of art that were generated by philosophical convictions now dead, or at least dead for him, which is what counts. He is quite justified in occupying himself with the production of diversions for the audience that has been created for him by the tastemakers who have accepted the status quo as regrettable but irremediable, and have found that art as heroin is better than no art at all. This is an unshakable defense for the bulk of our contemporary art, although it is not one likely to be popular with anyone whose self-esteem depends on believing that the ingenious exercises on which he spends his life are something more than temporary excitants.

The surprising thing is that as many artists come through as do, that so many are able to find within circumscribed fields, chosen from a fragmented world, expressions as valid if not as universal as those that could be achieved by artists in more cohesive societies. But the most surprising thing of all is to find an artist who, as a rational humanist rather than an eccentric mystic, still explores the oldest and most universal theme of all, believes in it, and manages to give it contemporary vitality.

Baskin is such an artist, whether in his drawings, his prints or his sculpture. His current exhibition is of sculpture only, all of it executed during the last year. It includes new versions of familiar Baskin motifs (birds, the Dutch painter, the laureate), but for me it centers on a bronze, about three-quarters life size, of Hephaestus (Vulcan). No photograph was available for use as an illustration here, but that is not as bad as it might be: Baskin's bronzes are notably antiphotogenic. They lose their imposing presence when translated into two dimensions and their rough textures often photograph like mud pies.

There is nothing muddy about the Hephaestus. It is the latest and a most impressive development in Baskin's series of physically grotesque male nudes—dead, maimed, or violated bodies; carcasses or scarred, torn and clotted masses of flesh that are ignoble and vulnerable in themselves but are ennobled and made impregnable as shells of the spirit. It seems impossible to say this without turning rhetorical, but Baskin's power is that he says it fully and dramatically without artificial eloquence. He is the least showy of sculptors, and one among contemporaries who best knows the difference between dramatic creation and theatrical invention.

Hephaestus, the lamed god of fire and blacksmith to the other gods, stands with a great swollen growth of belly balanced over spindly legs, his monstrous torso surmounted by a battered, coarsely bearded head. This was the ugly god among the beautiful ones, by one legend born lame and hurled from Olympus when his mother, Hera, saw him; by another, lamed in boyhood when his father, Zeus, threw him to earth in irritation. Aphrodite, the loveliest goddess, was forced to marry him as a humiliating punishment. She cuckolded him on a truly Olympian scale. He was taunted for sport, tricked by his friends. His own tricks backfired. He was the sooty god of the blackened forge, the runt of the litter, a supercraftsman but more servant than fellow to the other gods.

BUT STILL A GOD

To turn such a figure into a noble one without falling into sentimentality is the problem Baskin solves again and again. There are no uprolled eyes, no gestures of humility or self-pity. There are much fortitude, much pride of acceptance and even a high degree of good humor.

Where does Baskin come from? If we must find an immediate filial connection, it could be to Rodin, in the bronzes, but Rodin, like a Greek, found the human body expressive in its beauty. His "Old Armoress" is a lament for beauty lost; not a revelation of the spirit persistent within a shriveled body. And when Rodin came to deal with his monument to Balzac, he began with nude studies but was finally defeated by Balzac's spectacular embonpoint and sheathed him in columnar draperies. Even Rodin's' headless, armless, and legless torsos, proposed as immediate ancestors of contemporary sculpture, are more related to broken classical sculpture than they are to maimed beings.

Baskin is never repelled by shriveled or bloated flesh. Like Rembrandt, he finds more profound truths revealed through the body's ugliness than through its perfection. But this is only the old classic-romantic contrast, so elastic as to be meaningless except at its extreme poles, and you cannot search in Baskin's sculpture for a family tree without getting back, eventually, to Egypt. Nor is it safe to generalize about his compassion and nobility. He can also be sly or sinister, as well as comic. He is never quite purely any one thing, which probably accounts for his continued growth, and certainly accounts for the deepening impression made by any single one of his works when it is known over a period of time.

Champlain Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Champlain Waterway has long offered opportunities as a vital artery of commerce which would link the large market area in New York and other metropolitan regions along the eastern seaboard of the United States with the industrial and commercial regions that have been burgeoning in the eastern provinces of Canada. It is added development, not displacing any other projects. This source of great economic potential should be developed and, specifically, a recent proposal for a study of the waterway for which funds were approved in the first session of the 88th Congress in the public works appropriation bill should be followed through.

I call attention to the statement of Mr. William L. Rich, chairman of the Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway made during the hearings on September 20, 1963, of the International Joint Commission on the Champlain Waterway project at Sorel, P.Q., Canada, in support of the economic development of the waterway and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM LATHROP RICH, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE NEW YORK-MONTREAL SEAWAY DURING THE HEARING OF THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION ON THE CHAMPLAIN WATERWAY PROJECT AT SOREL, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, CANADA, SEPTEMBER 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the International Joint Commission, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen.

In the statement that I made, as Chairman of the Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway, during your hearing at Albany, N.Y., September 16, 1963, our position on the proposed modernization of the Champlain Waterway was clearly defined and its relation to the Great North American Waterway emphasized.

Our purpose and interest in that waterway, as we have so stated, is to try to assure:

1. That it will not have to be rebuilt in the foreseeable future.

2. That it be so planned that it will have an ultimate adequate capacity, at least, equal to that of the St. Lawrence River.

3. That its locks can be twinned, without their being rebuilt, when the volume of traffic so demands.

4. That its relationship to the Great North American Waterway be understood and recognized.

We are convinced, that when this and all the other segments of that Great North American Waterway have been developed, having a uniform capacity, it will result in such an economic expansion explosion, all along its route, far beyond our most ambitious dreams.

At present its development does not appear to indicate any uniformity in planning or grasp of what its ultimate capacity has to be in order to satisfy the future demands of the shippers.

Our studies of the present developments along its route have convinced us that ultimately its capacity, as expressed in terms of lock size, will approach the following dimensions: Length 1,200 feet, width 110 feet and sill clearance 40 feet.

The first reaction to those dimensions will be that they are fantastic, absurd, and quite out of reason.

Well, let's take note of just what is coming into being as the new Soo locks near the Sault Sainte Marie. Their length is to be 1,200 feet and their width cannot be less than 100 feet, because vessels to make use of those locks, are now under design to have a length of 900 feet and a beam of 90 feet (Marine Engineering/Log, May 1962, p. 63).

Those large, long new vessels will be locked in the Great Lakes because the largest vessel that now can traverse the present St. Lawrence Seaway is 730 feet long, having a beam of 75 feet and draws 25½ feet of water.

The St. Lawrence Seaway now has a controlled depth of 27 feet. Vessels that draw 25½ feet, in fresh water, are allowed to traverse it.

Now, let us observe what is taking place at Montreal, Province of Quebec, Canada, with respect to the St. Lawrence River.

There the depth of the river has dropped to 35 feet. Plans are being developed to restore that water level, not just to 37 feet but to increase the depth to 40 feet. For that suggested increase in channel depth, see the item in Canadian Shipping, June 1962, page 54, quoting Mr. Andre Ganon, chairman, Montreal Port Council. He suggested that the winter opening of the St. Lawrence River should be followed by a deepening of the channel to 40 feet.

So now you see, a channel, 40 feet deep, is already being discussed in Canada.

Now consider the recent development related to the St. Lawrence Seaway as reported from Ottawa, Canada, in the New York Times, August 3, 1963, headed, "All-Canada Waterway Linking Lakes to Sea Planned by Ottawa." "The Canadian Government announced that it would embark on a program to increase the capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway and to create an all-Canadian waterway between the Great Lakes and the sea." "The initial phase of the improvement, which will complete the twinning of the eight locks of the Welland Canal, is expected to cost $180 million.

"Canada then plans to build a new St. Lawrence lock at Cornwall, Ontario, providing a waterway between salt water and the lakes entirely within Canadian territory, Mr. George McIlraith, Minister of Transport, told the House of Commons. With the twinning of the Welland Canal locks, Mr. McIlraith said, consideration must be given to the capacity of the whole seaway system. That is why construction of a lock at Cornwall is being planned. In his statement to the Commons, Mr. McIlraith said that with another lock in the area of Rockway in the United States as a counterpart of the Iroquois lock, the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence Seaway would then have duplicate locks, with one canal being entirely in Canada and the other in the United States."

Over 2 years ago, on July 13, 1961, as reported in the Milwaukee Journal, Mr. Joseph M. McCann, then Deputy Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, stated while inspecting the port of Milwaukee, that "within 10 years, traffic will be so heavy in the seaway that its locks will have to be twinned and possibly its channels deepened from 27 to 35 feet. Such twinning may have to be done earlier on the Welland Canal."

By that statement, Mr. McCann indicated that he recognized that the present capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway is not adequate to permit the passage of vessels of large enough capacity to satisfy the needs of the shippers and he then foresaw the need for twinning the locks of the Welland Canal, which is now being undertaken by Canada.

It becomes obvious, from the statements made by the United States and Canadian spokesmen, that the capacity of the present seaway has got to be increased.

That increase can be obtained through two methods, the one, by dredging between and rebuilding the present locks, which would necessitate a complete shutdown, during the reconstruction, of the seaway; the other by dredging between and building of new locks having the ultimate capacity, which would be, in terms of lock size, which we have concluded from our studies, to be as follows: have a length of 1,200 feet, a width of 110 feet, and a sill clearance of 40 feet.

By the latter method a shutdown of the present seaway would not be necessary, and therefore there would be no interruption of the steady flow of international commerce into the heartland of this continent.

From all that we have observed, we now see two situations developing that can become unpleasant, to say the least. The one, consisting of two independent competing seaway systems, the other, an ever-increasing bottleneck at Montreal, Province of Quebec, Canada, that will interfere with the steady flow of international commerce.

An increase in the capacity of the seaway will solve both of those problems and we are convinced, that the adoption of the second method, mentioned before, will provide the correct solution.

With the adoption of either solution to the problem, the end result will be two separate seaways. If that has to be so, will it not be preferable to wind up with waterways having different capacities, the one, having the capacity of the present seaway; namely, having a controlled depth of 27 feet and the other having a controlled depth of 37 feet, or equal to that of the St. Lawrence River.

Not only would the bottleneck at Montreal disappear but the ocean-going vessels could then sail on up into the Great Lakes and the 900- by 90-foot lake vessels could move on down to the St. Lawrence River and no longer be restricted to the Great Lakes.

We envisage the Great North American Waterway, as a waterway extending from Duluth, Minn., in the northwest to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, eventually developing into one having a uniform capacity from one end to the other but that eventuality will not be assured unless the Governments of the United States and Canada come to an agreement as to what its ultimate capacity shall be.

Within the last few weeks, I was forcefully reminded by the senior Canadian engineer that the present seaway was not built until, "Canada threatened to go it alone." That condition of affairs was brought about by procrastination on the part of the United States and a similar condition of affairs appears to be developing now, as indicated by the remarks of Mr. George McIlraith, Minister of Transport, as reported in the New York Times, Saturday, August 3, 1963. His remarks indicate that Canada, sensing a new U.S. procrastination, intends to twin lock the Welland Canal and by building two new locks in the present seaway route, have a waterway completely within her control and independent of any U.S. influence.

To have such a condition develop between two such longstanding cooperative adjoining countries must not be allowed.

We believe that a mutually agreeable solution to this waterway problem can be evolved.

We offer, for consideration, the following solution, based upon the conditions as we know them to be and upon Canada's indicated intentions, as reported in the newspapers.

1. That the Governments of the United States and Canada agree, before any future plans are made, as to what the ultimate practical controlled channel depth shall be for this Great North American Waterway. We recommend that the controlled depth for this waterway be not less than 37 feet or at least equal to that of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Province of Quebec, Canada.

2. That all future modernization of locks and waterways, connecting the Great Lakes conform to that agreed controlled depth.

3. That the Welland Canal be retained at its presently controlled depth.

4. That a complete new waterway be constructed west of the present Welland Canal and that its controlled depth shall be equal to the newly agreed upon depth for the whole waterway.

5. That a complete waterway be developed along the north banks of the St. Lawrence River, having a controlled depth of 27 feet. According to what Mr. George McIlraith, Minister of Transport, told the House of Commons, as reported in the New York Times, August 3, 1963, that is just what Canada now plans to do.

6. That a complete new waterway be built along the south banks of the St. Lawrence River, having a controlled depth equal to that agreed upon for the whole waterway.

7. That the water level at Montreal, Province of Quebec, Canada, be restored to the agreed controlled depth by the building of a dam, downriver below Montreal that can maintain a constant water level for the whole Montreal-Sorel-Richelieu River section of this waterway. That dam can produce additional electrical power if properly located.

That master plan, if followed, can result in the solution of all the problems of this waterway and it can bring unlimited prosperity to the eastern section of Canada and the United States.

We have endeavored to draw a picture of the Great North American Waterway as we see it developed in the future and to relate the proposed Champlain Cutoff to it, in order to emphasize the necessity for planning this waterway to have an ultimate adequate capacity, at least, equal to that of the St. Lawrence River.

I thank you.

U.S. Prestige Sags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, February 7, 1964:

HEMISPHERE TEST—U.S. PRESTIGE SAGS

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

WASHINGTON.—A steady erosion of U.S. prestige and power in Latin America is seen here as the basic factor in Washington's present relations with the hemisphere.

This view holds that respect for the United States has been slowly and gradually eroded from Mexico southward to southernmost Argentina and Chile in the postwar years.

At the same time, the Latin American nations continue to look to the United States for leadership in solving some of the major problems existing in the Latin American countries.

Coming from knowledgeable sources here, this assessment is not meant to sound a note of overriding pessimism.

PRESSURES BUILD

To the contrary, Washington appears to regard this new and evolving picture as a challenge for more impressive hemispheric leadership on the part of the United States.

Expression of this viewpoint comes at a time when there are numerous pressures on Washington to make some alterations in its hemisphere stance. There are hints that some changes may well be forthcoming. But just exactly how broad sweeping these changes will be, if indeed they do take place, is not at all certain.

There have been, of course, personnel switches taking place in the leadership of Washington's Latin American command with the ascension of Lyndon B. Johnson to the Presidency.

Most significant has been appointment of Thomas C. Mann as Undersecretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Longtime hemisphere specialist and lately Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Mann has been on the job barely 2 months, and his approach to hemisphere issues has not been articulated publicly.

UNITED STATES LOOKED TO FOR AID

But the task Mr. Mann faces, as President Johnson's Latin American chieftain, is a formidable one—and especially so if one accepts the view that Washington's prestige in the hemisphere is waning.

Here are some of the reasons:

Latin America looks to the United States for assistance in meeting some of its critical economic and social problems. In the next 20 to 25 years, the population of Latin America, now about 210 million, is expected to double.

This means that at the minimum, there will need to be a doubling of the number of jobs, the amount of food products, the number of schools, and the like, merely to keep the hemisphere up to its 1964 level—to say nothing of the growth which it ought to achieve.

This is a difficult situation at best even when conditions for growth are favorable—and this Washington assessment suggests that conditions in Latin America are none too favorable.

What makes the picture dark are these items: excessive nationalist pressures, evidences of graft and corruption, lack of sufficient numbers of trained economists, inflation (as in Brazil where 1963 registered an 80-percent inflationary spiral in 1 year), political pressures, and an outflow of dollars from the area.

According to this assessment, Washington intends to go on helping the Latin American lands tackle their problems and is going to work to inspire a sense of confidence among Latin Americans that the problems are not without solution.

Washington can be expected to push hard for the Alliance for Progress—working to win hemispherewide acceptance for the five principal legs of the Alliance: tax reform, land reform, health, education, and housing.

DOLLAR DIFFICULTIES

Moreover, according to this view, the U.S. Congress and its citizenry have got to face up to the declining prestige as a factor in changing world conditions.

Pressures of self-interest are leading Latin American nations to do pretty much what they consider to be in their best interests. Hemisphere countries also note the difficulties in the United States over the dollar shortage and the increasing difficulty that any administration in the White House has in getting aid appropriations through Congress.

Its no wonder, these sources seem to conclude, that Washington faces this situation of declining prestige throughout the hemisphere—and elsewhere.

Prospectus on the New York World's Fair, 1964-65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964–65, Corp., at the joint annual meeting of members and directors, at Flushing Meadows, Long Island, on January 22, 1964, being an address in the nature of a prospectus on the fair.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65 CORP.

In this final interim report I am content to ride along, to add little to what my associates have said, to thank them again, to bide the result and trust to hard work, continued vigilance and good luck to see us through.

The last minute problems, crises, and tempests in teapots in the building of a fair are the supreme test of the effectiveness of an organization. Our staff is functioning smoothly. It is in high gear. Those in charge of engineering and contracts, the building trades and the sponsors of pavilions, exhibits, concessions, and amusements are working harmoniously with our executives. We shall have a tremendous show. Unless we meet extraordinary obstacles which can not be anticipated, we shall open fully equipped on schedule.

It has been necessary to explain repeatedly that we have no single centrally controlled physical concept to implement our theme. We aim at variety, not uniformity, at freedom of experiment and expression, not at tradition, integration and the cohesion which draws all elements together. This principle applies of course most conspicuously to design.

Years ago there was an old guide at a State Capitol who used to point dramatically upward in the rotunda and say, "The ceiling, my friends, is embololical." Well, our ceiling at the Fair too is "embololical," and those who hoped we would have either a classical revival or a revolution will have to be satisfied with extraordinary shapes and forms selected independently by our participants and not by us.

In design liberal mindedness is what we aim at. Many an architect builds monuments to himself, and exhibitors at the Fair naturally go for easily recognizable symbols of their own products. Maybe Brendan Behan was right when he said that good architecture is invisible.

As to operation, we aim at an orderly, safe, respectable, properly policed, and controlled fair. Ninety-nine percent of the patrons want it that way and their expectations will prevail. The other 1 percent will not be allowed to interfere with the comfort of the 99. A fair can be fun without license, disorder, and offense.

Considerable forethought and ingenuity have gone into Flushing Meadow. The ideal fair is not planned as Wren or L'Enfant or Haussmann would build a city. It is fashioned temporarily within a permanent framework and pattern which will accommodate a large urban park later. Every tree and shrub which fit the ultimate pattern, on public avenues and squares and on the lots of exhibitors, are salvaged, and every utility above and below ground is built to last and serve the park or to be removed or abandoned when the fair closes. These things are not left to chance.

You have received the postfair preliminary park report and the proposal for a modified agreement with the city under which the fair offers to complete a unique Queens park system, including Flushing Meadow and the corridor beyond. This proposal is of course contingent upon a sufficient earned fair balance to pay the cost. The financial assumptions back of it are outlined. This is a prospectus. No guarantee goes with it, but it is our honest belief that the actual results will fully sustain our hopes. We therefore ask that our objectives, with such modifications as may be required, be determined in advance so that we can proceed in an orderly, constructive fashion to insure that this fair at least will live in usefulness as well as memory long after 1965.

Thank you for your patience. That's all I have to say.

Aid Won't Buy Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., appeared in the Journal American of February 16.

Mr. Hearst is well versed in foreign affairs and gives a factual, though rather disheartening, picture of our country's present plight in that field.

The article follows:

AID WON'T BUY FRIENDS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

A columnist, to be worth reading, should never court public approval as a primary objective. Some of the columns and editorials written by my father provoked vehemently hostile reaction, although in many cases time proved him right. Similarly, some views that have been expressed here were not calculated to win any popularity prizes.

Contrariwise, it is always pleasant to have one's opinions widely supported. Last Sunday's Editor's Report, for example, attracted one of the heaviest volumes of mail since I began putting one word after another in this

space. It was overwhelmingly favorable. It cut across party lines. It came from men and women. Geographically, it took in readers along our east and west coasts.

It was, in brief, a genuine response. As such—as a kind of weather vane of at least a sizable segment of public opinion—it might be of more than passing interest to the Johnson administration.

Last week's column said in substance that it is time to change the image of the United States from one of apology and retreat to one of firmness and strength. It said it was time to stop the futile business of trying to buy friends with foreign aid.

That theme, by the way, is not new here. Back in the Truman and Eisenhower administrations it was stated in this column and in editorials in the Hearst newspapers that it is imposible to buy international friendship; but that it is possible, and far more desirable, to earn international respect.

It will never be earned by placating our enemies, by feeding soothing syrup in the form of our taxpayers' money to ingrates, or by placating our allies at the expenses of U.S. interests or security.

If a quest for popularity, above all else, is a mistake for a newspaper writer, how infinitely worse a mistake it is for a great power. It is in this connection that I regret the unfortunate implications of a remark by President Johnson in his off-the-cuff speech to a group of Internal Revenue officials last Tuesday. We are, Mr. Johnson said, "a much beloved people throughout the world."

It is unfortunate because (a) it is inaccurate and (b) it connotes that wanting to be loved is a goal of foreign policy.

Disregarding our explicit enemies such as Khrushchev, Mao, Castro, and company, are we beloved in Ghana?

Are we beloved in Egypt?

Are we beloved in Indonesia?

Are we beloved in Pakistan?

Are we beloved in Algiers?

Are we beloved in Cyprus?

Are we beloved in Panama?

Are we, come to think of it, beloved in France?

More important, why should wanting to be loved be an objective of foreign policy?

My friend, Cy Sulzberger, in his column in the New York Times this past week, observed that Sir Alec Douglas-Home could do President Johnson a service by pointing out that a great power is always unpopular, and must expect to be so. Sir Alec could speak with authority. Britain did not remain the foremost power in the world for so long by seeking to turn foreign relations into a Miss Rheingold contest.

As suggested here last week, an excellent place to start showing firmness and to start treating ingrates as they should be treated, is Ghana, and it could be done by cutting off American aid. To date that has amounted to $150 million—in other words, American taxpayers' money has been used to bolster the oppressive regime of President Kwame Nkrumah, a professed Marxist and unprofessed megalomaniac.

We've been doing some research on this. The astouding thing is that in order to get any action, someone is going to have to light a fire in or under Foggy Bottom, the State Department.

Sources of reliable information in Washington tell me that Foggy Bottom is still disinclined to consider Nkrumah a Marxist—even though Nkrumah has proclaimed himself one; even though Ghanaian Defense Minister Kofi Baako has boastfully declared: "Nkrumah is to Africa today what Lenin was to the Soviet Union in 1917."

In fact, Foggy Bottom, according to my informants, is determined to continue American aid to Ghana for the Volta Dam project and an aluminum smelting plant.

The lame excuse is that we don't want communism to establish a beachhead in Ghana.

Establish a beachhead? How foggy can Foggy Bottom get? There is already in Ghana, in the person of Nkrumah, in his cabinet of stooges, in his kept press, in his one-party rule, a Marxist rule in being—no mere beachhead. And it is Nkrumah's ambition to extend it to all Africa.

This past week, for example, the Ghanaian Times viciously attacked Emerson Player, a patriotic and courageous member of our Embassy staff, as a "Skunk and Judas." Mr. Player, a Negro, was thus denounced because he shouldered his way through a mob which had lowered the American flag before the Embassy, to raise the flag again on its staff.

The Ghanaian Times was incensed because Mr. Player is a Negro and gave loyalty to his country precedence over the color of his skin, which happens to be the same as that of the Ghanaians. Mr. Player said simply: "I am proud to be an American." Don't you know that all Americans are proud of him?

The Player affair is only one of several recent incidents of overt anti-Americanism, which has included the expulsion of four American professors from Ghana University for "subversive activities," meaning refusal to teach the Marxist doctrines.

How much more evidence does Foggy Bottom need?

This is not even to imply that all foreign aid is bad and should be junked. The worldwide distribution of American largesse is much-maligned, much-praised, and much-disputed.

The Hearst newspapers do not oppose the program. They have, in fact, supported it—in principle—during the White House tenures of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now Johnson.

There is, we feel, nothing simply black and white about the program. And anyone who supports or opposes it on so uncompromising a basis is, to my way of thinking, regrettably naive to say the least.

More than 80 percent of funds given in foreign aid are spent in this country. Thus almost all material assistance sent abroad is purchased here, from American producers and suppliers.

With the great funds currently being appropriated to maintain the program, it is easily seen that it contributes heavily to the health of the national economy, in terms of business prosperity and employment demand.

But whatever way you slice it, the money spent is still the American taxpayers' money. And if it is not being spent to the taxpayers' benefit, then what on earth is the purpose of its expenditure?

Even outright altruism cannot be justified if it backfires in the face of our national interest.

A certain chap by the name of Charles de Gaulle, who lives in Paris, has—characteristically—seemed long aware of this.

France used to control, in splendid colonial style, immense tracts of Africa, stretching from the Mediterranean Sea to that continent's central jungles.

Now this vast swath of territory is free. It is, however, heavily dependent on the generosity of France and is in continuous receipt of that fair land's bounty.

It seems, though, that there are some strings attached. And although these are technically invisible, they do lead inevitably to the conclusion that when La Belle France dishes out the aid, she gets something in return.

This at least takes the form of a ready alinement of foreign policy on the part of the taker with the giver. Thus France can nearly always count on the support and cooperation of its former colonies within and without the United Nations.

(What effect this may have on the potential admission of Red China to the U.N. remains to be seen; it will probably show even more spectacularly than before how overwhelming French influence is in the nations to which it provides aid.)

In other words, France is selective and condition-imposing—either openly or diplomatically—when it comes to providing foreign aid.

And the United States should be the same.

Aid—"with strings attached"—has become an unmentionable phrase in our modern lexicon of diplomacy—or so many executors of our foreign policy would have us believe.

But in the maddeningly expensive, frustrating, and often totally unproductive administration of the foreign aid program, such unmentionables are called for.

The program should be totally selective and conditional upon the receiver's at least being on our side. And the dispensation of American wealth should come under direct and increasing American supervision.

We should, in fact, attach all the strings we have at our command—and pull them hard.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, continuing the practice which I estabilshed with gratifying results during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I include in today's RECORD a complete tally of my voting and attendance performance during the final weeks of 1963 and the first legislative month of 1964.

As most Members are perhaps aware, these periodic reports are sent to all registered voters in California's 25th District. Their reaction to this method of keeping them informed has been extreme heartening, and is sound rebuttal to the cynical view that "What the voters do not know cannot be used against you." In my judgment, a voter's right to know is sacrosanct and one of the cornerstones upon which this great Nation was built.

I know that the vast majority of my colleagues have developed in varying degrees their own methods of keeping in touch with their constitutents, through monthly newsletters, radio and television, yearend wrapup reports, questionnaires, and so on. I would not presume to suggest that one method is better than another, or more effective, nor would I advise anyone how best to fulfill the electorate's desire and need for information concerning the respresentation it is receiving.

Nevertheless, I would suggest that all of us study the methods of communication used by each other. In so doing we can perform a great public service by helping develop to as fine a degree as possible an important tool designed to further the cause of government of, by and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include my first congressional voting record report for 1964:

Roll call No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
221	Dec. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Carey, Democrat of New York (94 Members absent).
222	Dec. 6		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican of Iowa (207 Members absent; R.B.C. at meeting with Peace Corps Director, Thailand).
223	Dec. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican of Indiana (71 Members absent).
224	do	7885	Yea	195	165	74	On acceptance of conference report re foreign assistance authorization bill. (1 Member answered "present"; see rollcall No. 133.)
225	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Harsha, Republican of Ohio (87 Members absent).
226	do	8929	Yea	278	76	80	Motion to recommit District of Columbia rapid transit bill.
227	Dec. 10	8747	Yea	356	22	56	On acceptance of conference report on independent offices appropriation bill.
228	do	8747	Not voting	170	204	60	Motion that House recede from disagreement with Senate amendment earmarking $1,700,000 for construction of veterans' hospital in Florida. (R.B.C. at meeting with Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs); would have voted "nay."
229	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Harris, Democrat, of Arkansas (61 Members absent).
230	do	6518	Yea	273	109	53	On acceptance of conference report on Clean Air Act. (See rollcall No. 102.)
231	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (75 Members absent).
232	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (83 Members absent; R.B.C. in office with visitor from Turkey).
233	do	579	Yea	345	12	76	To permit consideration of bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts (1 Member answered "present").
234	Dec. 11		Yea	214	166	54	Motion to adjourn by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma.
235	Dec. 12	9140	Yea	330	47	57	On acceptance of conference report on public works appropriation bill (1 Member answered "present").
236	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (78 Members absent).
237*	do	4955	Nay	180	193	60	Motion to recommit conference report on vocational education bill.
238*	do	4955	Yea	30	65	68	On passage of vocational education bill conference report.
239	Dec. 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. McLoskey, Republican of Illinois (115 Members absent).
240	do	9139	Yea	30	4	130	On acceptance of conference report on military construction appropriation bill.
241	Dec. 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (55 Members absent).
242*	do	9499	Nay	218	169	46	Motion to recommit foreign aid appropriation bill for Export-Import Bank amendment (1 Member answered "present").
243*	do	9499	Yea	249	135	46	On passage of foreign aid appropriation bill (4 Members answered "present").
244	Dec. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Stinson, Republican of Washington (70 Members absent).
245	do	8667	Nay	329	41	63	Conference report on public works appropriation bill—motion that House insist on disagreement to Senate amendment (1 Member answered "present").
246	do	9413	Yea	352	6	76	To provide coinage of John F. Kennedy 50-cent pieces.
247	Dec. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Findley, Republican, of Illinois (98 Members absent).
248	do	875	Yea	324	4	106	Supplemental appropriations to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for mental retardation programs.
249*	Dec. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (144 Members absent).
250*	Dec. 21		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (169 Members absent; this call came at 2 a.m.—R.B.C. sleeping in office, failed to receive whip call).
251*	do	598	Nay	182	95	156	On adoption of resolution to permit consideration of conference report on foreign aid authorization bill (1 Member answered "present").
252*	do	9499	Nay	141	136	153	Motion to maintain House disagreement on Export-Import Bank amendment to foreign aid bill (3 Members answered "present") (adjourned at 5:45 a.m.).
253	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (162 Members absent).
254	Dec. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (146 Members absent).
255*	do	600	Yea	202	105	125	On adoption of resolution to permit consideration of conference report on foreign aid bill on same day rule granted (⅔ vote needed for adoption; resolution failed).
256*	Dec. 24	9499	Yea	189	158	80	On passage of foreign aid bill conference report (6 Members answered "present").
1* to 21*	Jan. 7-31		Absent				R.B.C. conducting congressional report meetings in the District.
22 to 29	Feb. 1-8		Present				Quorum calls by Messrs. Gross, Cederberg, and Van Pelt (average of 25 Members absent per call).
30	Feb. 8		Yea	220	175	36	Motion to adjourn at 10:07 p.m.
31	Feb. 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (23 Members absent).
32*	do	7152	Yea	290	130	11	On passage of Civil Rights Act.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 237 AND 238, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

In this era of increased automation and mass unemployment of the unskilled, there can be little question that Government must take a firm hand in helping equip our young people for full and productive careers in vocational occupations. This consensus is certainly reflected in the final House vote of 301 to 65 on H.R. 4955. It has been more than 17 years since Congress enacted far-reaching legislation in this field and in the intervening years the labor market has made greater and greater demands on workers. More education and a higher degree of skills are needed, but recent statistics indicate that about 35 percent of our children now in grade school will not become high school graduates. Approximately half of those students who graduate from high school will not go to college, but will seek jobs. Yet only about 13 percent of our high-school-aged children are presently enrolled in vocational educational programs. This alarming trend must be reversed and I am hopeful that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will help bring this about.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 242, 243, 251, 252, 255, AND 256, FOREIGN AID BILL

At 7 a.m. on December 24, the House met for final consideration of the foreign aid authorization bill, a measure which 8 days earlier had cleared the House with a provision that would have blocked underwriting by the Export-Import Bank of wheat sales to the Soviet Union. On rollcall No. 242 I voted against attaching this amendment to the bill, but when it was included in the bill, I supported passage of the entire measure. I was confident, however, that the Senate would not accept the Bank amendment, and this prediction was borne out in conference committee. House and Senate conferees dropped the amendment and the bill was returned to the House. Then came the donnybrook that did much to tarnish the image of Congress in the public eye. With Christmas only a few days off, the House Democratic leadership was unable to keep its forces in the Capital. Republicans, however, showing strong party discipline under the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman HALLECK, were on the floor for rollcall No. 252 and by a five-vote majority refused to accept the conference committee's discarding of the controversial amendment. The conference report again came before the House on rollcall No. 256, this time with a Democratic majority on the floor. The foreign aid bill passed in the form recommended by House-Senate conferees.

It is regrettable that the GOP keyed its attack on the so-called wheat amendment to an issue of "communism versus anticommunism." This was not the issue. The issue was one of foreign policy, trust in the President of the United States, and the use of every weapon at our disposal in waging the cold war. I consider all of my votes—whether the issue be aid to education, departmental appropriations, mental retardation or what have you—to be votes for a stronger and more prosperous America, and therefore against communism. I am sure this is true of all Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and accusations and insinuations to the contrary are a disservice to the entire body.

The Export-Import Bank amendment was designed to sharply curtail Presidential flexibility in conducting foreign policy, an area of responsibility which is given to the executive branch by the Constitution. Whether the Bank may or may not extend credit in the sale of wheat for dollars is a judgment that should properly be made by the President, reporting to Congress, and by the hard-headed businessmen who formulate the Bank's policies.

It is worth noting that Edwin Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, had this to say about the wheat sales:

> The action of President Kennedy and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges in approving the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union through private commercial channels at the world price for cash or short-term credit is commendable. It will benefit the U.S. economy particularly in the area of reducing our balance-of-payments deficit and by providing an outlet of surplus wheat which is costing taxpayers enormous sums in storage charges.

President Eisenhower made this observation:

> If in a matter of an economic deal we saw that we got a very great advantage, then it is a good horse trade, and in a horse trade * * * there is no principle that is being furthered, it is just a material gain. If there is a mutual advantage you can't kick about a trade.

In the words of a spokesman for the American Bankers Association:

> Since every dollar of gold they [the Soviet Union] pay us is another dollar they cannot spend for military purposes, I cannot see any valid objection to this proposed sale.

This entire line of reasoning was obviously shared by the Eisenhower administration for in 1957 the Export-Import Bank guaranteed a $30 million loan to Poland to buy a tinplate mine, and again in 1958 the Bank guaranteed a $25 million purchase of pharmaceutical products to this same Communist country.

The greatest irony in the entire wheat amendment hassle was the violent anti-sale position taken by extremist groups. Hurling their familiar charge of "treason" at anyone with whom they disagree, they failed to recall that one of their most ardent supporters and leading spokesman, former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, advocated the sale of surplus agricultural products to Iron Curtain countries as far back as 1955. In fact, in that year, a multimillion dollar sale of hybrid corn and seeds and farm machinery to Russia was transacted.

I saw no objection to the foreign aid authorization bill conference report. It said in simple language that the Export-Import Bank is not to guarantee any payment incurred by a Communist country in the purchase of any product, except when the President determines that it is in the national interest to extend credit. It is a matter of having faith in the President's judgment. I have that faith.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner in Memory of the Late Senator Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to incorporate at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, at the presentation of a citation to Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman, the widow of the late great Senator Lehman of New York State. The presentation was made at the 16th Annual National Roosevelt Day dinner at the Hotel Commodore in New York City on January 30, which was sponsored by Americans for Democratic Action.

We all mourn the passing of Senator Lehman, a great and outstanding statesman and public servant, who devoted so many years of his life to his State and to his country. However, it is not surprising that Mrs. Lehman, too, has given most unselfishly of her time and energies in the service of mankind. She more than deserves this tribute, which was affectionately bestowed upon her by a vast army of admirers.

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT PRESENTATION OF CITATION TO MRS. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, 16TH ANNUAL NATIONAL ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER, JANUARY 30, 1964

As mayor, I salute this occasion. I salute the ADA and its guests tonight. I salute those who are being honored in the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The ADA serves many worthwhile purposes, but if it served no other than to sponsor these annual affairs in the name and spirit of the immortal Franklin Delano Roosevelt, it would be a deserved existence.

We are all in accord on our goals.

The New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, and now the war against poverty, all are complementary concepts, to achieve the realization of the assertion in our national charter of independence, that all men are created equal, and that all have an inalienable, and therefore an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It was a year ago tomorrow night that I addressed the last Roosevelt dinner and paid my tribute, as we all did that night, to that beloved figure in the history of our age, Eleanor Roosevelt.

Today, a year later, we take grievous note of the passing of him whose name was inextricably bound to those of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt by ties of purpose, principle, political alliance, and mutual undertakings, Herbert H. Lehman. And so another giant oak from the forest of our great men and women has fallen.

Just as Eleanor Roosevelt, always a mighty force for good and progress, came to express the great love she bore for her departed, in terms of still greater deeds of devotion and achievement for her fellow human beings, so Edith Altschul Lehman—gentle lady of powerful purpose for whom I personally have an affectionate respect bordering on awe—has served, is serving, and will serve.

The age produced a pattern. The age is passing.

I feel greatly privileged to be allowed to participate in these distinguished presentations. I could, myself, write the citations for practically every one of those being singled out tonight, since every one of them has been involved in my thoughts or considerations as a major actor in the drama of the people of the city of New York.

But of all of tonight's presentations that I would have been happy to make, none could give me a deeper satisfaction or sense of distinction than the one it is my great honor to deliver.

I will not speak of her work with the Play Schools Association, with the Henry Street Settlement, with the Mount Sinai Hospital, or with the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. I will not speak of her outstanding contributions to the artistic and cultural life of our city, State, and Nation. To speak of any or all of these is to give detail and to lose sight of the grand design of a woman of total devotion, dedication, goodness, and liberal purpose.

I will read the citation:

"CITATION TO EDITH ALTSCHUL LEHMAN

For being a source of strength, endurance, pomposity, of rightmindedness without false righteousness, and of striking forcefulness in a manner ladylike and gentle;

For being a strong, though often silent power for good and goodness * * * for the weak and the helpless;

For being a source of strength, endurance, and resolution for Herbert Henry Lehman whom we all loved and admired;

For giving of herself unstintingly to liberalism's cause and to humanity's service.

(Presented by Americans for Democratic Action at its Sixteenth Annual National Roosevelt Day Dinner, January the thirtieth, 1964.)

Mayor ROBERT F. WAGNER.

A Political Realist Becomes a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Representative Riemer VanTil, a member of the Michigan State Legislature and a resident of my congressional district, delivered the address in the Michigan House of Representatives in commemoration of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Mr. VanTil entitled his remarks "A Political Realist Becomes a Statesman."

Under leave to extend my remarks I include his address:

A POLITICAL REALIST BECOMES A STATESMAN

Certainly it is fitting that we should set aside a few moments for tribute to a great American—one who has well deserved the title "Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator."

We need not add plaudits, platitudes of praise or often repeated eulogies, but rather,

we should reevaluate for this occasion the political present in light of the history of which he was so significant a part.

No longer is Lincoln the exclusive property of the Republican Party—time has made him an all American; in fact, he is claimed today by all of civilized humanity. His greatness is such that political partisans of every shade, left and right, invoke the blessings of his spirit upon whatever scheme they may dream of in the name of humanity.

Proponents of extensive government control quote Lincoln as follows: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities."

On the other hand, proponents of less government and more free enterprise quote with equal vigor the remainder of the same statement "in all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the government ought not to interfere."

In spite of these apparent contradictions and paradoxes, it may be possible to sift a few kernels of truth out of the maze of Lincoln lore and myth—truth so basic that it may be used as a guideline in the solution of problems in what we flatteringly call "this advanced age."

There is a parallel to our being assembled in this house today and that of Lincoln's political orientation. He served in the Illinois House of Representatives, twice he served as majority leader. Lincoln held elected offices, and ran for public office, losing more often than winning. He ran the entire gamut of party politics from precinct delegate to the Presidency and having arrived to the Presidency he sanctioned the party road by dispensing patronage to political faithfuls in a manner similar, perhaps more adroitly than a noted predecessor, President Jackson.

In the history of Lincoln's political orientation, through party rank, this history ought to stimulate and encourage members of this house, as it discomfits both the cynic and the moral purist who sneeringly asks, "Can any good come out of party politics?" The political facts of Lincoln's life dispel the popular myth that as a young nation stood on the precipice of abysmal self-destruction it turned its eyes toward the Midwest prairies—at that very moment out of the horizon appeared a man, ax in hand, a rail on his shoulder—then in this mystical niche in history this Nation recognized her messiah.

To say that Lincoln was a party politician, even a political opportunist, is only to realize that his opportunities for statesmanship were made possible by his accomplishments as a politician.

As a successful politician, Lincoln held no inflexible dogma. He said, "my policy is to have no policy." Now this is not to say that he lacked purpose or creed.

His consuming purpose was to preserve constitutional government. The question was simply, "must a government, of necessity, be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence." Lincoln was convinced that the two positions could meet and balance. Time and again he insisted that the Declaration of Independence could only be effected and realized for all men regardless of race under a constitutional republic.

On July 4, 1861 in his war message to Congress, Lincoln said, "This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form, and substance, of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders—to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all—to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance, in the race of life. Yielding to partial and temporary departures from necessity, this is the leading object of the government for whose existence we contend." To preserve the Union as the only means of governing a free people was his purpose regardless of sacrifice. High ideals and noble purposes are not self-propelled to ultimate achievement.

History is replete with examples of the appraisal of Lincoln's contemporaries, indicating that certainly he would be unable to maintain and perpetuate the Union. His patience was construed as weakness; his passivity as indecision; his humor as insincerity; his flexibility as shameful compromise. His critics were positive that he would not be nominated for a second term, and there was a time when Lincoln was inclined to believe this himself.

In spite of these judgments—how and why did he finally achieve, and in so great a measure, that we memorialize him here today?

It has already been suggested that his political training was essential. Of course, there are factors innate, environmental and experimental, which eminently qualified him for the difficult years of the war. Lincoln had a realistic sense of his own destiny. Lincoln knew there were limits to rational human activity. "Now, at the end of 3 years of struggle" he said, "the Nation's condition is not what either party, or any man, devised or expected. God alone can claim it." Although having the torch of freedom in his hand, he did not run ahead of God with it. Lincoln therefore did not propose to absolve humanity of its responsibilities, nor to shield it from all its woe, but to provide that all people should have equal opportunity to pursue happiness if they would.

Lincoln said and believed that in a democratic society the ballot represented "the last best hope of earth." In a free society one had to believe in the soundness of peoples judgment. Again realistically he did not identify the voice of the people with the voice of God. This philosophy of man enabled him to be flexible in decisions, patient in the development of events, no matter how adverse.

Though Lincoln had a well defined purpose—he did not have a dogmatic preconceived policy of attaining that purpose. In an annual message to Congress Lincoln said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country." Lincoln illustrated this by saying, "The pilots on our western rivers steer from point to point as they call it—setting the course of the boat no farther than they can see—that is all I propose to myself." This pragmatic approach enabled him to meet situations as they were rather than how he might have wished them to be.

Lincoln had another ally—that of his understanding of human nature. He used and maneuvered his friends and opponents adroitly to accomplish his goal. Lincoln said, "Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed."

Beyond that which has been observed Lincoln had the quality of justice tempered with mercy. He did not regard the Confederacy as an enemy except in a strict military sense. Ninety-nine years ago tomorrow he gave the following order: "To the military officers commanding in West Tennessee. * * * It is my wish for you to relieve the people from all burdens, harrassments, and oppressions, so far as possible, consistently with your military necessities: That the object of the war being to restore and maintain the blessings of peace and good government, I desire you to help, and not hinder, every advance in that direction." One Lincoln author summarized his character by saying, "This was Lincoln's genius—he was politic without being unprincipled, patient without being resigned, flexible without being opportunistic, toughminded without being brutal, determined without being fanatical, religious without being dogmatic or unworldly, tender without being sentimental and devoted to man without worshiping man."

Can then the past speak to the present? Yes, in saying that the principle upon which freedom is based remains eternally the same. The perpetuation of this freedom must be the purpose of each generation in a free society and that he, who would be the bearer of this purpose, must pay the price of disciplined and responsible political leadership.

Dr. C. Kermit Phelps Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Kansas City Star describes the ceremonies honoring Dr. C. Kermit Phelps as the Civil Servant of the Year in the Kansas City area:

HONOR FOR U.S. CIVIL SERVANT—DR. C. KERMIT PHELPS, A PSYCHOLOGIST, IS NAMED AT KIWANIS EVENT—URGES PRIDE IN WORK—JUDGE JOHN W. OLIVER, THE SPEAKER, SAYS AFFAIRS ARE IN GOOD HANDS

Dr. C. Kermit Phelps, a 55-year-old psychologist, was chosen Civil Servant of the Year from among 12 Federal employees in Kansas City honored last night at a recognition dinner sponsored by the Kiwanis Council of Greater Kansas City and the Federal personnel council.

Dr. Phelps is the chief of psychology service at the veterans hospital, an assistant professor of psychology at the University of Kansas and teaches at the medical center, the University of Missouri at Kansas City, Rockhurst College, and Avila College.

FROM MANY AGENCIES

The others honored:

Roger Leroy Bishop, Internal Revenue Service; Claude A. Follmer, Treasury Department; Norman H. Gosney, Air Force; Merwin S. Hans, Labor Department; Neal B. Harrison, Department of the Army; James H. Hart, Civil Service Commission; Andy J. Isaacson, Bureau of Public Roads; Reese Melvin Miller, Corps of Engineers; Clifford C. Skoog, Federal Aviation Agency; Cyrus A. Slater, National Labor Relations Board, and Carl F. Zartar, Bureau of Prisons.

The honorees were nominated from among 22,000 Federal employees in the area by their various departments for the top honor. The winner was chosen by the sponsoring organizations.

Dr. Phelps has been in psychological work since he received his bachelor's degree in 1935. Subsequently he earned a master's degree in the field, and in 1952 received his doctorate at the University of Kansas. He has been with the Federal Government since 1949, working in his field in this area.

He is the originator of the Phelps-Scheerer organic battery, a test devised to determine the extent of brain damage suffered by a patient.

WIDE RANGE OF SERVICE

The doctor is active in many civic and volunteer organizations, including the Council for Receration for the Handicapped and the School for Exceptional Children, and is on the advisory board of Queen of the World and St. Mary's hospitals. He is on the board of the Greater Kansas City Mental Health

Association and the Missouri State Board of Mental Health. He is chairman of the education committee of the National Council of Christians and Jews.

"I accept this award on behalf of all those who aided me in attaining my dreams and goals," Dr. Phelps said. "I have had the loyal support of many persons from many walks of life. I want to accept this on behalf of those who helped me so much."

Judge John W. Oliver of the Federal district court, the main speaker lauded the civil service system.

"Many grumble about bureaucracy," he said, "but in their hearts know that their affairs are in good hands; that few mistakes are made."

ON REGIONAL PLAN

The Civil Service faces a constant challenge to improve the efficiency of its services, he said. To help meet this challenge President Kennedy, in 1962, ordered the formation of regional Federal executive boards to foster coordination among Federal agencies outside of Washington.

The Kansas City region has such a board, headed by Ted C. Bland, postmaster, who introduced the judge at the dinner, attended by 360 persons at the Hotel President.

Judge Oliver said the formation of the boards has been the most successful steps taken toward fostering understanding on the part of personnel who administer Federal programs and the public which benefits from them.

FOR PRIDE IN WORK

"To realize the full potential of the Federal executive boards," Judge Oliver said, "all employees must maintain the highest pride in the execution of their responsibilities.

"We all know that the full challenge cannot be met by one man like Dr. Phelps whom we honor here. It can be met by the same dedication of all employees that Dr. Phelps has shown."

Tax Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the February 7, 1964, Washington Newsletter of my distinguished senior Senator, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina. This newsletter exemplifies an understanding of the impact of the tax bill on the wages and salaries of the people of America. It has been particularly helpful to me in answering a great many questions about the percentage of tax cut which would be enjoyed by people having various tax brackets. I think it will be of value to anyone interested in the tax legislation. The letter is as follows:

A WASHINGTON LETTER, FROM OLIN D. JOHNSTON, U.S. SENATOR, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

FEBRUARY 7, 1964.

DEAR FELLOW SOUTH CAROLINIAN: The tax cut bill is a much better bill than I thought the Senate and Congress would approve. I wanted a tax cut to help people in the lower income brackets and this bill does just that. The bill gives $11.7 billion in annual tax relief. Of this amount, $9.3 billion is direct and immediate relief to individual taxpayers. The rest of the cut, $2.4 billion, would benefit corporations.

Virtually every American taxpayer—whether high or low income, single, or married, executive or wage earner—will pay less in taxes when the proposed tax program goes into effect. The vast majority of taxpayers will pay substantially less in taxes. The largest share of the individual tax reduction will go to those with incomes of $10,000 and less, who need it most, who account for close to 85 percent of all taxable returns, and who are likely to put a large part of their tax savings into the spending stream.

Principally as a result of individual tax rate reductions and the minimum standard deduction, those with incomes of $3,000 and less will have their taxes cut by an average of nearly 40 percent, when the program is fully in effect.

On the average, those with incomes in the $3,000 to $5,000 range would have their taxes cut by over 27 percent. Those with incomes in the $5,000 to $10,000 range would have their taxes cut by nearly 21 percent. Taxpayers with incomes of more than $10,000 would have their taxes reduced by more than 15 percent. Elderly taxpayers will also benefit substantially from the tax bill.

The most important benefit in the bill is that it gives an immediate incomes increase to the taxpayer, increasing his purchasing power, expanding the economy, and creating jobs. It is estimated that our economy will be expanded by more than $30 billion which will create nearly 3 million jobs. Sample tax cut tables follow:

Single taxpayer with standard deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	$60	$14	$46	77
$1,500	150	85	65	43
$2,000	240	161	79	33
$3,000	422	329	93	22
$4,000	620	500	120	19
$5,000	818	671	147	18
$6,000	1,048	866	182	17
$7,500	1,405	1,168	237	17
$10,000	2,096	1,742	354	17
$12,500	2,982	2,478	504	17
$15,000	4,002	3,334	668	17
$17,500	5,153	4,291	862	17
$20,000	6,412	5,350	1,062	17

Married couple with 1 dependent, with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$420	$309	$111	26
$6,000	576	434	142	25
$7,500	844	668	176	21
$10,000	1,328	1,087	241	18
$12,500	1,816	1,509	307	17
$15,000	2,369	1,976	393	17
$17,500	2,952	2,468	484	16
$20,000	3,590	3,000	590	16
$25,000	5,025	4,196	829	16
$30,000	6,648	5,559	1,089	16
$40,000	10,475	8,766	1,709	16
$50,000	14,912	12,536	2,376	16
$75,000	25,324	21,486	3,838	15
$100,000	37,134	31,526	5,608	15

Married couple with 2 dependents, with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$300	$218	$82	27
$6,000	456	338	118	26
$7,500	720	561	159	22
$10,000	1,196	973	223	19
$12,500	1,664	1,337	287	17
$15,000	2,213	1,844	369	17
$17,500	2,772	2,318	454	16
$20,000	3,410	2,850	560	16
$25,000	4,821	4,024	797	16
$30,000	6,420	5,367	1,053	16
$40,000	10,188	8,525	1,663	16
$50,000	14,576	12,248	2,328	16
$75,000	24,952	21,168	3,784	15
$100,000	36,720	31,178	5,542	15

Married couple with 3 dependents, with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$180	$129	$51	28
$6,000	336	245	91	27
$7,500	600	459	141	24
$10,000	1,064	859	205	19
$12,500	1,531	1,263	268	18
$15,000	2,057	1,712	345	17
$17,500	2,610	2,179	431	17
$20,000	3,230	2,700	530	16
$25,000	4,617	3,856	761	16
$30,000	6,192	5,175	1,017	16
$40,000	9,906	8,291	1,615	16
$50,000	14,255	11,971	2,284	16
$75,000	24,580	20,850	3,730	15
$100,000	36,330	30,840	5,490	15

Single taxpayer over 65, with standard deduction

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0		
$1,500	$30	0	$30	100
$2,000	120	$56	64	53
$3,000	300	209	91	30
$4,000	488	386	102	21
$5,000	686	557	129	19
$6,000	892	734	158	18
$7,500	1,243	1,031	212	17
$10,000	1,900	1,580	320	17

Married couple with 3 dependents, with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	0	0		
$4,000	$120	$42	$78	65
$5,000	300	185	115	38
$6,000	480	338	142	30
$7,500	750	578	172	23
$10,000	1,240	1,000	240	19
$12,500	1,810	1,490	320	18
$15,000	2,460	2,040	420	17
$17,500	3,170	2,635	535	17
$20,000	3,920	3,260	660	17

Married couple with 4 dependents, with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent tax cut
$1,000	0			
$1,500	0			
$2,000	0			
$3,000	0			
$4,000	0			
$5,000	$180	$84	$96	53
$6,000	360	$230	$130	36
$7,500	630	467	163	26
$10,000	1,108	886	222	20
$12,500	1,658	1,361	297	18
$15,000	2,304	1,908	396	17
$17,500	2,990	2,485	505	17
$20,000	3,740	3,110	630	17

Married couple with no dependents, with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$540	$405	$135	25
$6,000	696	535	161	23
$7,500	976	782	194	20
$10,000	1,460	1,201	259	18
$12,500	1,972	1,641	331	17
$15,000	2,525	2,108	417	16
$17,500	3,133	2,618	515	16
$20,000	3,770	3,150	620	16
$25,000	5,229	4,367	862	16
$30,000	6,886	5,762	1,124	16
$40,000	10,775	9,018	1,757	16
$50,000	15,248	12,824	2,424	16
$75,000	25,696	21,804	3,892	15
$100,000	37,548	31,874	5,674	15

Married couple, both over 65, with standard deduction

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	$60	0	$60	100
$4,000	240	$140	100	42
$5,000	420	290	130	31
$6,000	600	450	150	25
$7,500	877	686	191	22
$10,000	1,372	1,114	258	19

Married couple with no dependents with standard deduction

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0	0	0
$1,500	$30	0	$30	100
$2,000	120	$56	64	53
$3,000	300	200	100	33
$4,000	480	354	126	26
$5,000	660	501	159	24
$6,000	844	658	186	22
$7,500	1,141	951	226	20
$10,000	1,636	1,342	294	18
$12,500	2,278	1,886	392	17
$15,000	2,960	2,460	500	17
$17,500	3,710	3,085	625	17
$20,000	4,532	3,764	768	17

Married couple with 1 dependent with standard deduction

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	$0	$0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	180	98	$82	46
$4,000	360	245	115	32
$5,000	540	402	138	26
$6,000	720	552	168	23
$7,500	1,009	800	209	21
$10,000	1,504	1,228	276	18
$12,500	2,122	1,754	368	17
$15,000	2,780	2,310	470	17
$17,500	3,530	2,935	595	17
$20,000	4,328	3,596	732	17

Married couple with 2 dependents with standard deduction

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	$0	$0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	60	0	60	100
$4,000	240	140	100	42
$5,000	420	290	130	31
$6,000	600	450	150	25
$7,500	877	686	191	22
$10,000	1,372	1,114	258	19
$12,500	1,966	1,622	344	17
$15,000	2,616	2,172	444	17
$17,500	3,350	2,785	565	17
$20,000	4,124	3,428	696	17

Married couple, both over 65 with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salaries)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	0	0		
$4,000	$144	$103	$41	28
$5,000	300	218	82	27
$6,000	456	338	118	26
$7,500	720	561	159	22
$10,000	1,196	973	223	19

Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Diary of a Rent Striker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the rent strike in New York City organized and led by Jesse Gray dramatizes the plight of hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens who dwell in intolerable housing. On February 16, 1964, the New York Herald Tribune published a day-by-day diary of a young woman, Inocencia Flores, who lives at 16 East 117th Street—a building in Harlem, the tenants of which participated in a rent strike. The diary describes the shocking conditions under which so many of our urban residents must live. There are few documents which more eloquently support the case for Federal aid to low-cost housing than this one. I have spoken repeatedly of the urgent need for congressional action and introduced H.R. 5877 to remove the statutory 15 percent limitation on the amount of assistance which may be provided in any one State and H.R. 5878 to remove the ceiling on the annual contributions for assistance to low-rent public housing. I hope this account of life in 20th century America will convince my colleagues of the urgency of the situation:

DIARY OF A RENT STRIKER—LIFE AMID RATS AND JUNKIES

There were rats and cockroaches, broken ceilings and dripping faucets, little heat and less hot water, and so a group of Harlem tenants, led by Jesse Gray and his Community Council of Housing, ignited the Harlem rent strike last November.

"No repairs—no rent" became their motto, and from their office in an abandoned store at 6 East 117th Street, they have conducted rallies and marched on the picket line. Mr. Gray, who has been arrested during antirent demonstrations, says that more than 300 buildings sprinkled throughout Harlem are now on rent strike. One of the first to be hit was the building at 16 East 117th Street.

According to official records, this building is owned by the One Can Realty Corp., whose president was listed as Mrs. Ruth Zalaznick, of 697 Northcumberland Road, Teaneck, N.J.

Soon after the rent strike began at 16 East 117th Street, the landlord tried to dispossess the tenants. But the court, inspecting the building violations, ordered the rent to be paid to the court instead of the landlord pending repairs. On February 5, the judge ordered the rent money returned to the tenants. The buildings department has started receivership proceedings to take over the tenement.

Among the striking tenants is Mrs. Inocencia Flores, 39, who lives in apartment 971. Mrs. Flores was born in Puerto Rico, attended high school and then the University of Puerto Rico for part of 1 year, came to the United States in 1944 and began working in the garment district, trimming and making clothes. She has four children—Carmen, 12; Louisa, 11; Miriam, 6; and Tom, 2. She is separated from her husband and is on relief.

Here, for the Herald Tribune, Mrs. Flores offers her diary, a day-by-day account of life in a rent-struck Harlem building.

—FRANCIS SUGRUE.

Wednesday, February 5: I got up at 6:45. The first thing to do was light the oven. The boiler was broke so not getting the heat. All the tenants together bought the oil. We give $7.50 for each tenant. But the boiler old and many things we don't know about the pipes, so one of the men next door who used to be superintendent is trying to fix. I make the breakfast for the three children who go to school. I give them orange juice, oatmeal, scrambled eggs, and Ovaltine. They have lunch in school and sometimes they don't like the food and won't eat, so I say you have a good breakfast. Miss Christine Washington stick her head in at 7:30 and say she go to work. I used to live on ground floor and she was all the time trying to get me move to third floor next door to her because this place vacant and the junkies use it and she scared the junkies break the wall to get into her place and steal everything because she live alone and go to work.

I'm glad I come up here to live because the rats so big downstairs. We all say the "rats is big as cats." I had a baseball bat for the rats. It's lucky me and the children never got bit. The children go to school and I clean the house and empty the pan in the bathroom that catches the water dripping from pipe in the big hole in the ceiling. You have to carry umbrella to the bathroom sometimes. I go to the laundry place this afternoon and I wash again on Saturday because I change my kids' clothes every day because I don't want them dirty to attract the rats.

After I go out to a rent strike meeting at night, I come home and the women tell me that five policemen came and broke down the door of the vacant apartment of the ground floor where we have meetings for the tenants in our building. They come looking for something—maybe junkies, but we got nothing in there only paper and some chairs and tables. They knocked them all over. The women heard the policemen laughing. When I come up to my place the children already in bed and I bathe myself and then I go to bed and read the newspaper until 11:30.

Thursday, February 6: I wake up at 6 o'clock and I went to the kitchen to heat a bottle for my baby. When I put the light on in the kitchen I yelled so loud that I don't know if I disturbed the neighbors. There was a big rat coming out from the garbage pail. He looks like a cat. I ran to my room, I called my daughter Carmen to go to the kitchen to see if the coast was clear. She's not scared of the rats. So I could go back to the kitchen to heat the bottle for my baby. Then I left the baby with a friend and went downtown.

I went to Center Street because today is the day we getting our money that we have deposit in court for our back rent. I get some $140 and I pay some $60 for gas and electricity and make out my listing for the supermarket and I spent almost $35 worth of grocery. I spent almost 2 hours shopping and when I come back I started putting everything away and the shelves never so full and the icebox filled for the first time in long ago. I get some things for the fun of it—like ice cream for the girls. After supper I sat down in the living room and read the papers. The girls started washing the dishes and cleaning the kitchen. When they finish the girls have a bath. We are happy because there is so much food in the kitchen.

Friday, February 7: This morning I woke up a little early. The baby woke up at 5 o'clock. I went to the kitchen but this time I didn't see the rat.

After the girls left for school I started washing the dishes and cleaning the kitchen. I am thinking about their school. Today they ain't teaching enough. My oldest girl is 5.9 in reading. This is low level in reading. I go to school and English teacher tell me they ain't got enough books to read and that's why my daughter behind. I doesn't care about integration like that. It doesn't bother me. I agree with boycott for some reasons. To get better education and better teachers and better materials in school. I don't like

putting them in buses and sending them away. I like to stay here and change the system. Some teachers has to be changed. My girl take Spanish in junior high school, and I said to her, "Tell your teacher I'm going to be in school one day to teach him Spanish because I don't know where he learns to teach Spanish but it ain't Spanish."

I went later downstairs and I met one of the tenants. She was telling me to go picketing downtown because they had Mr. Gray in jail. But I couldn't go because the lock on my door no good and couldn't lock, so I couldn't leave door open. I was so mad that Mr. Gray arrested. If I be there I would have been arrested. I love this struggle for our rights. We have to fight. We have right in this country. We have freedom if we do it in order. I love what Mr. Gray is doing because he likes to struggle for people and rights. I'm pretty good woman. I don't bother anyone. But I got my rights. I fight for them. I don't care about jail. Jail don't scare me. If have to go to jail, I go. I didn't steal. I didn't kill nobody. There's no record for me. But if I have to go, I go.

Saturday, February 8: I woke up at 7:30 and I gave a bottle to the baby. I went to the kitchen to make some coffee. Then I called my two oldest girls. They were going to church. They were going to catechism lessons on Saturday. Later I went down to a friend of mine's house. I didn't see her for several days and I found her in bed. She had a bad cold and fever. When I came back a tenant called me and asked me what was new in the building because she works daytimes. She wanted to know about the junkies. Have they been on the top floor where the vacant apartments is? That's why I have leaking from the ceiling. The junkies on the top floor break the pipes and take the fixtures and the sink and sell them and that's where the water comes. * * * I'm not ascared of the junkies. I open the door and I see the junkies and I tell them to go or I call the police. Many people scared of them, but they scared of my face. I got a baseball bat for the rats and for the junkies. I sometimes see a junkie in the hallway taking the junk and I give him a broom and say "Sweep the hall," and he does what I tell him and hand me back the broom after he sweep the hall. I'm not scared of no junkies. I know my rights and I know my self-respect. After supper I played cards (casino) for 2 hours with the girls and later I got dressed and I went to a party for the rent strike. This party was to get funds to the cause. I had a good time. Mr. Gray was there dancing. He was so happy.

Sunday, February 9: I had a nice night's sleep. I got up at 8 o'clock and I gave the baby a bottle. Then I dressed up in a hurry to go to church. When I go to church I pray for to have better house and have a decent living. I hope He's hearing. But I don't get discouraged on Him. I have faith. I don't care how cold I am I never lose my faith. When I come out of church I was feeling so good. I met some friends of mine. When I came home I called my girls, so they get dressed and I fixed them breakfast and then sent them to church. After around 1:30 came some friends of mine to visit. We had some refreshments and talked about the children and the way this neighborhood was and different subjects. We make jokes. I had a real nice time. Believe it or not this was the first weekend I passed so happy. We had plenty of steam and I was feeling good.

Monday, February 10: This morning I fixed some Cream of Wheat, eggs, and Ovaltine. I had my black coffee At 9:30 a man came to fix the rat holes. He charged me only $3. He left around 11. Then one of the tenants came to tell me that we only have oil for today and every tenant have to give $7.50 to send for more oil. I went to see some tenants to tell them there is no more oil. We all have to cooperate with money for the oil. It's very hard to collect because some are willing to give but others start fussing. I don't know why because it is for the benefit of all, especially those with children. We have to be our own landlord and supers. We had to be looking for the building and I tell you we doing better than if there is an owner. Later I went down in the basement with another tenant to see about the boiler, but we found it missing water in the inside and she didn't light it up and anyway there was not too much oil in it. I hope nothing bad happens, because we too had given $5 each tenant to buy some material to repair the boiler. If something happens is going to be pretty hard to make another collection.

Tuesday, February 11: This morning was too cold in the house that I had to light the oven and heat hot water. We had no steam, the boiler is not running good. I feel miserable. You know when the house is cold you can't do nothing. When the girls left for school I went back to bed. I just got up at 11:30 and this house is so cold. Living in a cold apartment is terrible. I wish I could have one of those kerosene stoves to heat myself.

My living room and my room is Alaska. I'm going to heat some pea soup and make coffee. I sat down in the kitchen by the stove to read some papers and keep warm. This is terrible situation. Living the way I live in this slum house is miserable. I don't wish no body to live the way I live. Inside a house in this condition, no steam, no hot water, ceiling falling on you, running water from the ceiling, to go to the bathroom you have to use an umbrella, rats everywhere. I suggest that landlords having human being living this way instead of sending them to jail they must make them live at least a month in this same conditions, so they know the way they pile up money in a bank. The house was so cold we all went to bed around 8 o'clock.

Wednesday, February 12: I wake up around 5 o'clock and the first thing I did was light the oven and the heater so when the girls wake up is a little warm. I didn't call them to 11 because they didn't have to go to school. It still so cold they trembling. You feel like crying.

I think if I stay a little longer in this kind of living I'm going to be dead duck. I know that to get a project you have to have somebody prominent to back you up. Many peopeople got to the project and they don't even need them. I had been feeling applications I don't know since when. This year I feel another one. My only weapon is my vote. This year I don't vote for nobody. May be my vote don't count, but don't forget if you have 14 cent you need another penny so you take the bus or the subway. At least I clean my house and you could eat on the floor. The rest of the day I didn't do nothing. I was so mad all day long. I cooked a big pot of soup. I leave it to God to help me. I have faith in Him.

Thursday, February 13: I couldn't get up this morning. The house was so cold that I came out of bed at 7:15. I heated some water. I leave the oven light up all night because the heater gave up. I fixed some oatmeal, eggs, and some Ovaltine for the girls. I had some coffee. I clean the house. The baby was sleeping. Later on, the inspector came. They were supposed to come to every apartment and look all violations. They knock at the door and asked if anything had been fixed. I think even the inspectors are afraid of this slum conditions that's why they didn't dare to come inside. I didn't blame them. They don't want to take a rat or any bug to their houses, or get dirty in this filthy houses.

We had for dinner chicken with rice, soup and salad. The girls has cake. After they ate they did their homework and wash the dishes. At 8:30 I went downstairs to a meeting we had. We discuss about why there is no heat. We agreed to give $10 to fix the boiler for the oil. A man is coming to fix it. I came upstairs and had some coffee and a little later on everybody went to bed. I hope everybody give the $10 so we have some heat soon.

Friday, February 14: I didn't write this about Friday in my book until this Saturday morning, because Friday night I sick and so cold I go to bed and could not write in the book. But this about Friday. I got up at 5 and light the oven and put some water to heat. At 7 I called the two oldest girls for school. I didn't send the little one. because she was coughing too much and with a running nose. I gave some baby aspirin and I put some vick in her nose and chest and I gave some hot tea. I leaved her in bed.

It was so cold in here that I didn't want to do nothing in the house. I fixed some soup for lunch and read for a while in the kitchen and after a while I went out and clean the hallway, I didn't mop because there was no hot water, but at least the hallway looked a little clean.

Later on I fixed dinner I was not feeling good. I had a headache and my throat hurt. I hope I do not catch a cold. I hope some day God help me and all this experience I had be restore with a very living and happiness. It is really hard to believe that this happens here in New York and richest city in the world. But such is Harlem and hope. Is this the way to live. I rather go to the moon in the next trip.

Panama Canal Crisis, January 9-12, 1964: Commendation of Marine Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable achievements in the history of the Panama Canal since its opening to traffic in 1914 was its uninterrupted transit of vessels during recent period of Red-led Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone and violence, January 9–12, 1964.

Though I have previously given fullest praise to the entire Panama Canal organization for this noteworthy accomplishment, the Nation should know that it was primarily the work of the Marine Bureau. This Bureau consists of various grades of personnel concerned with the transit of vessels and navigation from the time they arrive at one terminal until they depart at the other. This personnel includes launch crews, boarding parties, and pilots; tug crews and harbor service forces; traffic controllers and signalmen; line handlers and lock personnel; and the necessary administrative personnel and officers; all operating under a Marine Director.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include in my remarks the January 17, 1964, commendation by the Marine Director of the personnel of the Marine Bureau for their extraordinary performances:

JANUARY 17, 1964.

To Marine Bureau Personnel who worked January 10, 11, and 12, 1964.

From Marine Director.

Subject: Commendation.

As your Marine Director I am very proud of the superb manner in which you performed your duties during the recent period of riots and civil commotion.

With tension running high, many personnel absent from work, and all other normal activities of the Company/Government suspended, you continued to put ships through the Canal without interruption. Many of you worked long extra hours without complaint. As a result of your professional competence and devotion to duty the canal was operated with great efficiency on all three days with a new high in efficient operation being achieved on Sunday, January 12, when 28 ships were transited with an average time in Canal Zone waters of only 9.4 hours.

You have earned the admiration and gratitude of the shipping world for a job well done.

You can take great pride in your achievement for which I extend to each of you my highest praise and commandation.

M. J. PRINCE.

Zanzibar: Victim of Cuban-Trained Guerrillas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, aroused by the Panamanian outbreak on January 9, 1964, the people of our country have become more keenly aware of the problems of the Caribbean than at any time since the early part of the 19th century and are pondering what else may be in store.

One reason is to be found in the overthrow by Cuban-trained guerrillas of the Government of Zanzibar, a strategic island on the east coast of Africa, and the establishment of a Communist dictatorship, which were featured by mass liquidations of political opponents.

This frightful story, as told by Robert Conley in the January 19, 1964, issue of the Chicago Tribune, should be considered by all who are concerned with the dangerous problems of the Caribbean.

The story follows:

BARE ROLE OF REDS IN ZANZIBAR—GANG TRAINED BY CUBANS LEADS REVOLT

(By Robert Conley)

MOMBASA, KENYA, January 18.—Zanzibar is on edge of becoming the Cuba of Africa.

This week's supposed African revolution that overthrew the island's Arab minority government was planned and carried out by Cuban-trained guerrillas to establish a Communist regime on Zanzibar, a main stepping-off point to the heart of Africa.

By most responsible accounts, black nationalists had little to do with it. They were used as camouflage for the guerrillas it is understood.

TWO THOUSAND ARE SLAIN

At least 2,000 "political suspects" are believed to have died since the revolution deposed Sultan Seyyid Jamshid Bin Abdullah, the island's traditional Arab monarch, last Sunday. Most of the victims were Arabs. The final death toll, it is feared, may reach 4,000.

"There has been a hellish massacre," one Zanzibari said.

These disclosures can be reported for the first time today from here on east African coast, just north of the island. They could not even be hinted at from Zanzibar because of the military censorship of every word leaving the island.

In the view of Western diplomats closely concerned with Zanzibar, the revolution this week represents communism's first attempt to seize political control in black Africa by force. The means are Cuban-trained guerrillas.

THIRTY TO FIFTY ON ISLAND

Between 30 and 50 of them are known to be on the island. Nearly all are Zanzibaris.

Some wear beards, mustaches, or long hair. Others wear berets or baseball caps. They look startlingly similar to the revolutionaries led by Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba. No Cubans have been seen.

"We do not want America to interfere with our revolution," one of the guerrillas warned a visitor. "Want no Congo here. We want a Cuba."

Only a tenth of the casualties reportedly occurred in 12 hours of fighting through the narrow, ancient streets of Zanzibar town last Sunday. The great bulk of the victims are said to have been gunned down by guerrillas in a campaign of political liquidation which followed.

USE MASS GRAVES

Hundreds of bodies reportedly were buried in mass graves. One rebel band admitted burying 160 bodies. They said they had dug 40 holes in ground and put 4 bodies in each.

As the death toll continues to rise, diplomats are moving further away from their initial reaction that the revolution was the culmination of years of racial bitterness and frustration on the island. Zanzibar has 230,000 Africans and 50,000 Arabs.

"This is systematic mass murder," one westerner said.

At Dole, about 20 miles north of Zanzibar town, the island's capital, the entire Arab community of 200 persons was said to have been massacred.

GREETINGS TO NIKITA

ZANZIBAR, January 18.—Field Marshal John Okello, Zanzibar's self-styled strong man, today sent greetings to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and said capitalism is ready for the grave. Earlier the revolutionary regime announced that it will be known henceforth as the "People's Republic of Zanzibar."

Let's Make Up Our Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editor of Farm Journal magazine, Mr. Carroll P. Streeter, is the author of this timely and excellent comment on the Russian wheat deal.

The text of Mr. Streeter's editorial follows:

LET'S MAKE UP OUR MIND

You'll have to pardon us if we seem puzzled. Like a lot of other ordinary American citizens we don't know too much about the intricacies of foreign policy. But we do know this:

Up to February 1, 175 American boys have died in a far-off place called Vietnam while the rest of us have looked the other way. We've got 15,500 more American boys down there exposed to being shot—and we still have 50,000 facing a Communist enemy in Korea.

We're putting up with a nest of virulent communism 90 miles off our shores—one that tests our resolve by shutting off the water at our Guantanamo Bay Naval Station and that spreads flames all over Latin America and as far as Zanzibar off the coast of Africa, while we patiently traipse around with a bucket trying to douse the fires.

We know well enough where the money and men to make this trouble come from—Moscow. And Khrushchev, embracing Castro for the photographers, tells us to keep hands off his boy—the same Khrushchev with whom we are now trying to buddy up.

Meanwhile, France, a presumed ally, tries to embrace Red China. She does all she can in other ways to embarrass us in southeast Asia, where American boys are dying.

Great Britain, our friend, comes to Castro's rescue with several hundred buses. For what? For a few bucks.

Canada, another friend, has been bailing out Mao in Red China for years with huge shipments of wheat. Commercially it has paid. These and the big sale to Russia last fall have sopped up all the wheat Canada could raisce, while we sat on a surplus here. Now there's a veritable footrace to see who can get to the Communist world with the "mostest firstest."

And how about us? We're no better. For dollars, and nothing but dollars, and without a single political concession or even an attempt to get one, we're almost in a frenzy to sell wheat to Russia (while righteously denying any to Red China and criticizing Britain for selling buses to Castro).

We're so anxious to take in the money that we'll apparently make any concession necessary. We uttered brave words at the time of the deal—to quiet our own citizens. The sale would have to be for cash on the barrelhead. Now we've retreated and let it be for credit. The grain had to be shipped in American bottoms. Well, maybe only half of it in American ships, we were presently saying. And when the Russians wouldn't agree to that, because Americans ships charge more, we simply paid the exporter an extra 14 cents per bushel, to relieve the Russians of the necessity. This was a quiet little deal in which the U.S. taxpayer footed the bill without ever knowing it.

Meanwhile we shell out billions upon billions to contain communism. That's what much of our huge foreign aid expenditure is really for. Certainly it's what our enormous military expenditure is for.

We send Bobby Kennedy half way around the world to try to quiet Mr. Sukarno in Indonesia; we dispatch other trouble shooters to Africa and Central and South America; we have Adlai Stevenson make another wrist-slapping speech in the United Nations; we get contradictory reports from Secretary McNamara on how our war is going in Vietnam. The less said about it the better, apparently. Let's not look now. Maybe it will just go away.

Too bad about the 175 American boys, of course, but things like that can't be helped.

They can't? Well certainly they can't so long as we have no clear foreign policy versus communism, and so long as we lack the backbone to enforce a policy even if our Government had one.

Isn't it about time the United States of America decided how to fight this "cold" war, then fought it?

The 88th Congress Reconvenes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are greatly interested in knowing what legislation may be forthcoming from Congress this year. For this reason, I have made the 2d session of the 88th Congress the subject of my February newsletter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my newsletter, as well as the paragraphs under the heading "As I See It," in the RECORD:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JACK WESTLAND, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY, 1964

THE 88TH CONGRESS RECONVENES

The 2d session of the 88th Congress has begun with a new skipper at the helm. President Johnson begins his first full year as President and the country will shortly find out if his is a new program or a continuation of the old. Time will tell. Many are still trying to figure out how we can provide all the programs the President is asking for and still keep the budget at the level he proposed. While it's true he's asking for nearly a billion less than last year's budget, the $97.9 billion requested still includes an anticipated $4.9 billion deficit. Most important is the request for $103.7 billion in new obligational authority. This is the gage of what an administration actually plans to spend. If that authority is granted it could eliminate most of the $6.5 billion Congress saved in appropriations for the current year and produce an actual $10.7 billion deficit for the coming year.

The recent resignations of Arthur Schlesinger and Ted Sorenson, both considered to have wielded great power in the White House, would indicate that the Johnson programs and methods may be different than those of former President Kennedy. If their resignations mean a disenchantment of the liberal wing of the Democrat Party then the President can face some intraparty battles.

This session should be a comparatively short one. An election year makes quite a bit of difference in the activities of Government. Although I may be sticking my neck out I'll predict that we'll adjourn not later than September 1; that we'll pass a civil rights bill by April; that we'll pass the tax bill by March 1 (retroactive to January 1); and that we'll pass a wilderness bill that everyone can live with. I'll predict that Pacific Northwest power preference legislation will pass which will protect the industries of the State of Washington.

I also believe that Congress has a fair chance of bringing our budget almost into balance, something I've fought for for years. But I can see no relief for the lumber industry in the northwest—the President's recent veto of even the labeling (country of origin) bill indicates the lack of sympathy of the administration.

I can see no satisfactory conclusion to the war in Vietnam which is costing many lives and a million dollars a day.

I can see no success in our relations with Castro Cuba—it would be more predictable that that situation may even get worse since Mr. Bunker, who arranged for the Sukarno (Indonesia) takeover of the Dutch West Indies, has been named ambassador to the Organization of American States.

I can see no improvement in our relations with De Gaulle, but to the contrary a worsening.

I can see no improvement in the composition of the United Nations—in fact the admission of Red China becomes a distinct possibility now that France has "recognized" them.

I guess that's about enough of looking into the crystal ball for this letter. Maybe (and I hope so) I'll be wrong in my assessment of our position in foreign affairs.

Just don't forget for 1 minute that, despite all our problems, this is the greatest nation on earth and the envy of the entire world.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

I am aware that one of the fine opportunities which goes with congressional life in Washington, D.C., is to be invited to be a hostess at the Annual Congressional Wives Prayer Breakfast. On February 5, 1964, the breakfast was held at the Mayflower Hotel. Congressional wives, and member guests of prayer groups, totaling 750 ladies, heard sincere remarks from both President and Mrs. Johnson, and from Dr. Billy Graham, who incidentally was introduced as the husband of our main speaker, Mrs. William Graham of North Carolina.

Mrs. Graham is an unusually attractive, tall young lady in fact she and her husband look very much alike. She's an excellent speaker, with warmth and a sense of up-to-date humor. I appreciated her remark that she does a lot of her praying on the hoof—while washing dishes, tending to children, etc. I find waiting for elevators, and the underground tunnel walk from the House Office Building to the Capitol are good areas for "praying on the hoof."

One of Mrs. Graham's favorite prayer stories is about the man who was trying to "get with religion." His prayer was this: "Lord have mercy * * * cause mercy suits our case."

All in all, this was a splendid way to start a day.

VISITORS

Anacortes: Mr. and Mrs. Marion O. Berentson; Mr. Steve Petcoff.

Blaine: Mr. and Mrs. Jack Gloslie; Mr. and Mrs. Boyd McPhail.

Clinton: Sue Kinskie.

Edmonds: Mr. R. C. Schiefelbein.

Monroe: Mrs. Dorothy J. Bennett.

Port Angeles: Douglas Crowell.

Sedro-Woolley: Mrs. Frank S. Evans.

P.S.—Let me remind you that your letters are welcome any time you want to give me your ideas on legislation before the Congress or any time you have a problem involving the Federal Government.

Georgetown University Debating Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure today to announce that the debating team from Miami Beach High School has won the 13th annual Georgetown University high-school debating tournament.

Two seniors, David Kaye and Allen Fuller, from Miami Beach High School, defeated Jesuit High School of New Orleans in the final round of the tournament. The topic for the debates was "Medicare," with the teams alternating between the affirmative and negative position for each successive round.

These two young men are members of the National Forensic League, the national high school honorary debating society. For their supreme efforts here in Washington during the 3 days of keen competition, the Miami Beach team was presented the Ryder Challenge Cup, named in honor of Father Ryder who established the Philodemic Debating Society around 1831.

The Miami Beach team is not the only one from Dade County, Fla., to take home honors. The highest individual award of the tournament went to Martin Galbert, of Miami Senior High School. He was named the top debater of the entire tournament.

Mr. Speaker, I am justly proud of these fine young people from the district which I have the honor to represent—the Fourth Congressional District of Florida. I might add that of the three Florida teams competing, all were representing high schools from the Fourth Congressional District. They were Miami Beach Senior High School, Miami Senior High School, and Coral Gables Senior High School.

The four young people representing Coral Gables Senior High School paid a visit to my office yesterday. They were: Cynthia Perwin, Louis Sperling, Jose Garcia, and Larry Mans. Although I did not have the pleasure of greeting them personally, my office staff was most impressed by their eagerness and enthusiasm and their keen awareness of domestic and world affairs.

The Georgetown University tournament, which began last Friday and went through Sunday, was the largest high school debating tournament ever held. A total of 180 teams from 103 schools competed; 30 States were represented by approximately 500 of the top debaters in our Nation.

This grueling tournament began with 6 preliminary rounds which narrowed the field to the top 16 teams. The remaining teams met in four sudden-death rounds, leaving 8 teams, then 4, then 2, and finally the winning team. The Miami Beach team won a total of 10 debates to carry off top honors.

My heartiest congratulations to all the young men and women competing in this nationwide debating tournament, and in particular my congratulations and sincere thanks to the winners who represented Florida and Dade County so outstandingly, and to their teachers and coaches.

How Congo Abuses Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Monday, February 10, 1964:

HOW CONGO ABUSES FREEDOM

(By Arthur Veysey)

LEOPOLDVILLE, CONGO.—Anybody wanting to learn how not to run a country should come to the Congo. He need only look at events of the last 3 years to see what not to do. The Congo is a classic example of mismanagement. The basic trouble was that politicians did not accept the harsh fact that money must be earned and collected before it can be spent. The man walking the street in an undershirt and khaki shorts had for years watched Belgians enter a bank, write a check, and receive a handful of cash. He thought that, once the Belgians had gone, he could walk into the bank, make some magic marks on a piece of paper, and get money galore.

Politicians who moved into the Belgian offices and their mansions along the river equally saw no connection between the amount of money they could spend and the amount they could collect in taxes or borrow. Thus they engaged on a joyous spending spree.

In Belgian days, a white man received something like 10 times as much pay as a black man here. The takeover politicians immediately put themselves on white man's pay. They also conferred this happy uplift to a lesser degree on favored persons, such as teachers.

It is openly said that to complicate the financial crime some politicians helped themselves to vast sums of money directed toward special purposes. There are stories that in 42 months of golden freedom some Congolese politicians have tucked away multimillion-dollar fortunes in such safe places as Switzerland.

The Belgians got along with one government in Leopoldville and six provincial governments, which acted as local agents for the central regime. But the Congo politicians have gone in for our Federal system. There are thus 23 governments offering all kinds of jobs for the boys.

There is one possible benefit from the carveup. It cut the Congo into regions of a size which can be controlled by one strong man. Of course, some emergent strong men are already defying the central rulers. The cumulative financial result of all this is that expenses have gone up about threefold. At the same time, tax collections have dropped sharply.

Many Congolese stopped paying taxes upon gaining independence. Wasn't that one of the benefactions of liberty? To make up the shortage of Congo francs, Congo has been hiring Swiss printers to run off money by the bale. There is a story that at first the local treasury on receiving a printing bill told the printers to run off some more and pay themselves. The Swiss printers were smarter than that.

Any first-year economics student would guess that in this situation the Congo should have bounding inflation. He would be right. In Belgian days the Congo franc was equal to the Belgian franc at 50 to the dollar. Within months after independence, the Congo franc fell apart. Then it was devalued at 65 to the dollar. In the street Congo francs for use here can now be bought for about 350 to the dollar. Outside the Congo, the franc is worthless.

These various rates for money mean golden opportunity for clever people who do not fear the government, but hard times for those who must be honest, or want to be honest.

The unofficial or black market is gradually dominating commercial life. Even imported American-aid foods slide off into the black market, their prices multiplied sometimes sixfold. A sharp operator manipulating the currency and dropping bribes into the right pockets to obtain import and export permits can get rich quickly.

During Belgian days, the Congo shipped out about $500 million worth of local products each year. Copper from Katanga was the biggest item, about $200 million. The Belgians brought in mostly for their own use about $300 million worth of foreign goods, chiefly Belgian.

In the first year after independence, the Congo shipped out under Central Government authority only about $100 million worth of products. The Katanga, then self-declared independent, continued to ship its own copper. Kasai diamonds were smuggled across the river to Brazzaville, where buyers waited in hotel rooms.

Palm oil is the main cash crop. In the rest of the Congo large foreign plantations, mainly British, have continued to run, but Congolese have, until recent weeks, failed to tend properly their groves. They have declined to sell what palm nuts they did harvest because they had to do so at the official rate of exchange and, at 65 francs to the dollar, the effort was not worthwhile.

The first real effects of another devaluation last November are only now being felt, especially at Léopoldville. As noted earlier, much of the economy was already running on the black market rate, but two important commodities, bread and beer, were based on the official rate.

Since the wheat was all brought in through American aid and the busy large breweries ran on imported grains, a drop in the official rate from 65 to 150 to the dollar is now being reflected in retail prices of bread and beer.

The political repercussions are apt to be strong because under American aid bread has become the capital's staple food and Leopoldville men drink beer in literally staggering quantities.

Since independence the population of Leopoldville has jumped from about 400,000 to at least a million and a quarter with fewer jobs available now than in Belgian days. Idleness and poverty are deepening. Roguery is increasing. Soon a loaf of bread will cost more than an hour's wage of those who are working and a bottle of beer a third of a day's wage. Grumbling is mounting and the people are showing more anger. There is talk of a general uprising and rioting.

The government's control is weak and the opportunity for strong-willed rebels is frightening to those who seek law and order.

If Pierre Mulele wins in Kwilu Province and becomes a national hero and a god, Léopoldville could be as easily available to him as Havana was to Fidel Castro. The outlook all around is not good.

A Healthy Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the theme of dignity in old age, in sickness as well as in health, has been struck by both the late President Kennedy and by President Johnson in stressing the need for a program of medical care for the aged.

Especially in the case of hospitalization, the most seriously affected are often our elderly citizens who have been self-sufficient for most of their lives. Hit by the weight of hospital bills, many are forced to turn to charity, or welfare, programs which are themselves greatly overburdened.

I think the following editorial, from the February 12 Newark Star-Ledger, which points up this problem, aptly illustrates its resolution under the provisions of the King-Anderson bill. The article as a whole is a concise, well-written endorsement of the administration's program, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

A HEALTHY APPROACH

Medicare suffered a severe relapse early in its legislative life.

It went into a steady decline and it has been convalescing for a number of months. The recovery has been slow until this week, when it took a sudden turn for the better. It was a dramatic recovery that some people had been forecasting for the past couple of weeks.

Adrenalin was pumped into the ailing bill by President Johnson with his appeal to Congress for a program of hospital and nursing home care for the aged. This care would be financed through social security.

"There is no need and no room for second-class health services," the President noted in a special health message to Congress.

The President's interest in the revival of controversial medical care for the aged was not unexpected. He made it one of his major points in his state of the Union address that he would push for enactment of this program, originally proposed by the Kennedy administration.

The medical care program being supported by Mr. Johnson is incorporated in the King-Anderson bill that is pending in Congress. Hearings on the legislation were completed 2 weeks ago by the House Ways and Means Committee but no action has been taken.

The financing of the medical care program was detailed by the President in his message. One-quarter of 1 percent would be added to social security contributions paid by both employer and employee. Annual earnings subject to social security taxes would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200.

All persons over 65 would be eligible for medical care in hospitals and nursing homes. Those not covered by social security would be cared for with appropriations from general funds, giving them similar protection.

Since doctor bills would still have to be borne by the patient, it would remove one of the serious objections by medical groups that the free choice of physician would not be possible under federally financed proposals.

One of the ironies of the dramatic advances made by modern medicine is that it has significantly increased the lifespan of Americans. They are living longer but their illnesses are longer and prohibitively costly. The declining years of our elderly can and has become a medical nightmare because prolonged sickness can wipe out life savings.

For these people, as the President observed, "old age can become a dark corridor of fear."

The care of the aged is a social obligation, a historical obligation that goes back for centuries. It is a debt that society msut assume fully and forthrightly. We are doing it now through our welfare assistance programs.

One-third of the aged forced to seek old-age assistance are compelled to do so because of ill health. One-third of the Federal welfare funds are going to older people for medical care.

The big factor missing in the present program is the abysmal lack of dignity for elderly people who must seek public assistance because prolonged illness has wiped out their savings.

Under medicare, they would be entitled to this protection. It would not be charity, since they would have paid for it during their lifetime out of their earnings. It is a healthy approach in dealing with the growing problem of the elderly sick.

Panama Canal Zone: There To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the attempted Panamanian mob assault on the canal on January 9, 1964, evoked a deluge of editorials throughout the Nation. Some of this writing has been based upon sketchy knowledge of the history of the creation of the Republic of Panama, the acquisition by the United States of the Canal Zone, and the building of the Panama Canal.

Over the past few years those and other aspects of interoceanic canal problems and isthmian history have been dealt with at great length by my distinguished and scholarly colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in a valuable series of addresses in the Congress on the canal question.

In the light of the background gained by reviewing his addresses, it was indeed gratifying to read in the January 15, 1964, issue of the Chicago Tribune a thoughtful editorial urging our Government to stand firm at Panama.

The editorial follows:

THERE TO STAY

President Johnson will have the support of his countrymen in the forthright stance he has taken concerning America's title to the Panama Canal. The President said the United States cannot allow the security of the canal to be imperiled, that it has a recognized obligation to operate the canal efficiently and securely, and that it intends to honor that obligation.

We hope the President stands on that and goes no further in heeding the demands of Panamanians, prodded by Communists, to assent to some alteration in the status of the canal. The United States, as he have said, is secured by a treaty more than 60 years old to operate and protect the canal and the Canal Zone "in perpetuity, as if were sovereign."

The steps taken by President Eisenhower and Kennedy to acknowledge some "titular sovereignty" of Panama within the zone by decreeing that the Panamanian flag be flown within the zone alongside the American flag were unwise and unnecessary. Mr. Eisenhower's Assistant Secretary of the Army, George H. Roderick, said at the time the original concession was made that to Panamanians flying of their flag was not the final objective.

Yet from time to time various American spokesmen have given encouragement to Panamanian nationalism by implying that U.S. treaty rights were somehow negotiable.

In 1956, after President Nasser of Egypt seized the Suez Canal and deposed the foreign operators, mostly British and French interests, the late Secretary of State Dulles joined at London with his British and French counterparts in a declaration which could be troublesome if related to the Panama Canal. The communique announced:

"They do not question the right of Egypt to enjoy and exercise all the powers of a fully sovereign and independent state, including the generally recognized right, under appropriate conditions, to nationalize assets, not impressed with an international interest, which are subject to its political authority."

Later, important figures in the Kennedy administration began embellishing this gratuitous doctrine with remarks implying that international control of the canal was inevitable. A typical pronouncement of this sort was that of Adlai Stevenson, American Ambassador to the United Nations. On a visit to Panama in 1961, he stated that "the logical future of the canal may be some form of internationalization." A man who professes to be a diplomat ought to be able to understand the plain language of a treaty, but Stevenson did not sound as if he knew the contents of the treaty of November 18, 1903, with Panama.

That influential State Department people would not be averse to such a surrender as that envisioned by Stevenson was seen in the visit to Panama in January 1963, of Abdel Hamid Abubakr, Secretary General of Nasser's Suez Canal Authority. Abubakr, who carried out the nationalization of the Suez Canal for Nasser, was invited to Panama under the State Department's "foreign leader" program and was the guest of the canal.

He was photographed there with Robert J. Fleming, Jr., the Kennedy-appointed Governor of the canal. Abubakr seized the opportunity to lecture audiences on the Nasser snatch of the Suez Canal from its legal owners. Later on Fleming sounded as if he wouldn't argue too much if the same thing were done to the Panama Canal. In a speech to the American Society of Civil Engineers, he championed "the social revolution of today" and called for the slaughter of the "sacred cows of the 19th and early 20th centuries," which carried the implication that he was condemning American "colonialism" in Panama. He scoffed at "conservatism" and "silly resistance to change."

We hope that President Johnson will rise above such misguided agents and advisers as Stevenson and Fleming, and that he will stand his ground on the unshakable foundation of the treaty of 1903.

Panama Canal: Gallup Poll Reports Firm Policy Favored by Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the years since starting my addresses on interoceanic canal questions in 1957, my mail on this vital subject has mounted. Correspondents in various parts of the United States and other countries who know the situation at Panama have expressed very positive views as to what our Panama Canal policy should be.

Thus when stating in the Congress on a number of occasions that I believed the views presented in my addresses reflected the overwhelming attitude of our people, my conclusion was not based upon conjectural reasoning but was a considered judgment derived from a mass of data from informed, disinterested observers thoroughly conversant with the subject.

It was not surprising, therefore, to read in the Gallup poll report published in the February 12, 1964, issue of the Washington Post that the general public in our country opposes yielding to Panamanian demands and urges a firm policy on the part of our Government.

The provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 105—by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]—and House Concurrent Resolution 113—by myself—which are now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, would clarify, make definite, and reaffirm the Panama Canal policy in accordance with the wishes of the overwhelming mass of our people. It was the knowledge of their wishes that caused the House, on February 2, 1960, by a vote of 381 to 12, to oppose the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the above, I urge prompt action by the House on the two indicated resolutions now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

At an early date, I shall try to deal comprehensively with the overall interoceanic canals problem now being discussed throughout the Nation as the result of the January 9, 1964, Red-led Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone.

The indicated Gallup poll report follows:

THE GALLUP POLL: FIRM POLICY ON PANAMA FAVORED BY AMERICANS

PRINCETON, N.J., February 11.—The firm policy of the U.S. Government in regard to Panama is in line with the thinking of those persons among the general public who have followed the dispute.

Among the 64 percent who are familiar with the issue, a Gallup poll finds opinion to be 6 to 1 on the side that the United States should not give in to Panama's demands for new treaties to give it greater control over the Panama Canal.

Those who favor a strong stand argue that the United States built the canal, has invested a great deal of money in it, and that "a treaty is a treaty, and the Panamanians should live by it."

About one person in five of those who think the United States should maintain full control of the Canal Zone would, in addition, favor discussions to try to settle differences between the two countries—also in line with current U.S. policy.

"We should stand firm in dealing with them," said a 24-year-old North Carolina housewife, "but listen to their arguments."

Those who do not support current Government policy say that a new treaty should be drawn up or that the United States ought to withdraw from the Canal Zone completely.

Gallup poll reporters asked the following question of everyone:

"Have you followed the dispute between the United States and Panama over the Canal Zone?"

The 64 percent who answered "yes," were then asked:

"What step or steps do you think the United States should take next in the Panama dispute?"

The following table shows the frequency of responses given by persons who have followed the dispute between the two countries:

[In percent]

United States should maintain a "firm" policy in regard to Panama, make no concessions	45
United States should maintain a "firm" policy, but try to improve relations with Panama	11
United States should make concessions: pay Panama more rent for canal; draw up new treaty; give canal to Panama	9
United States should guard against communism in the area	4
A new canal should be built	4
Other replies	4
No opinion	23

William Allen White Award to Clark Mollenhoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last week the University of Kansas bestowed upon two journalists its seventh annual William Allen White Awards. Mr. Whitley Austin, editor of the Salina (Kans.) Journal was recipient of one of the awards which is made annually to a Kansas journalist. Mr. Austin was cited for his service to journalism and his community. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington reporter for the Cowles Publications, received a citation for service to his profession and his community.

Significantly, these awards are made each year by Kansas University on the birthday of William Allen White, the famed editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon entitled "Keeping Washington Honest," and an excerpt from Mr. Mollenhoff's William Allen White lecture:

KEEPING WASHINGTON HONEST

In every national administration, it is probably safe to say, there have been cases of malfeasance in office, abuses of authority, and favoritism. Sometimes these become public knowledge and make headlines; sometimes they do not.

Because such instances occur—the "bad apples" in any barrel—the Nation's press must be constantly alert to ferret out any wrongdoing it finds. This is what Clark R. Mollenhoff, prize-winning investigative reporter, told Kansas editors in his William Allen White lecture this week.

Mollenhoff's concern was that the U.S. press is failing its responsibility through superficiality, partisanship, laziness, and incompetence. And he cited three major cases in the Kennedy-Johnson administration to make his point.

First, he outlined the TFX case and Defense Secretary McNamara's decision in it based on faulty data—choosing to pay the highest price for the second-best plane. He pointed out that too many newsmen and editors failed to dig into the matter deeply, preferring to accept the Pentagon handouts in defense of McNamara.

Second, he cited the Otepka case (see excerpt from his talk on this which follow). In this, which he calls "an outrageous, cynical and brutal effort to crush a dissenter for telling Congress the truth," he contends some newsmen accepted the State Department's version without seeking to determine the true facts.

Third, he points out that the news corps in Washington only began to do a digging job on the Bobby Baker case when it began to make headlines about party girls.

Mollenhoff knows whereof he speaks on these topics because he is one of the few newsmen who does try to ferret out the truth and let the chips fall where they may. The press needs more like him. This is a challenge for our educational institutions to encourage bright young people with the ability to probe for the essential truth and make journalism a career.

Unless people are fully informed, dishonesty in government and distortion of information can undermine the foundations of our freedom.

PRESS MISHANDLED OTEPKA CASE

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is an excerpt from the 15th annual William Allen White lecture last Monday, made by a Pulitzer Prize winning investigative reporter.)

I believe that the press has an obligation to aggressively pursue any evidence that high officials have lied under oath about Government operations. There is an additional obligation to ferret out all evidence that others were engaged in subornation of perjury or in condoning false statements or illegal wiretaps. This would seem basic. However, in the words of Senator MORSE, many uninformed reporters were "the parrots of the 'line' from the executive branch * * * [and] care nothing of the merits of the case made * * * in Congress."

Otto F. Otepka, the chief security evaluator at the State Department, became a State Department employee in 1953 shortly after the Eisenhower administration came to power. Some reporters found this fact alone to be grounds for being hostile to Otepka, and they characterized him as the last vestige of McCarthyism at the State Department.

They did not know, or at least did not report, that Otepka was a career civil servant with no political ties who had been transferred from the Civil Service Commission to the State Department because of his experience as a lawyer and security evaluator. Otepka believed in a strict security operation, but he was not an irrational man who saw a Red under every bed. In fact, it was Otepka who had recommended clearance of Wolf Ladejinsky in 1954 when some more zealous persons sought to label the career agriculture attaché a security risk.

He served with such distinction as a security evaluator that in 1958, Secretary of State Dulles awarded him the Department distinguished service award. Early in the Kennedy administration, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Roger W. Jones commended Otepka as a skilled and balanced security evaluator. That was before direct conflicts of testimony developed involving Otepka and his superiors.

Otepka delivered three State Department documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to prove he was telling the truth. One of Otepka's superiors charged this was insubordination and violation of rules. To some reporters the delivery of documents to a Senate subcommittee was justification for firing.

They did not know, or at least did not report, that Otepka delivered the documents to prove that he was telling the truth with regard to the handling of a security matter. His testimony had been in conflict with the testimony of one of his superiors, and he produced the records to prove he was truthful.

Opetka delivered documents that also proved his superiors were wrong. To some State Department-oriented reporters and editorial writers, this was McCarthyism.

There are veteran reporters and editorial writers who do not understand the vital function of Congress in checking the administration and operations of the executive branch. Many can't tell the difference between a responsible investigation as conducted by the late Senator Kefauver, Senator McClellan, or Representative Blatnik, and one of the late Senator Joe McCarthy's free-swinging extravaganzas. Many didn't try to tell the difference. They are automatically against any investigations, and automatically mouth the executive branch line without regard for its inconsistency or provable fallacy.

In their eagerness to oust Otepka, two State Department officials—John F. Reilly and Elmer Dewey Hill—took part in attaching a listening device to Otepka's telephone. A third official knew about it.

All three testified under oath that they had no knowledge that any wire-tap, "bug," or listening device had been attached to Otepka's telephone. Not until after a Senate floor speech warned of perjury, did these three high State Department officials write letters to the Senate committee admitting the use of listening devices on Otepka's telephone. However, in admitting the use of the listening device, the three high officials explained that there was no listening on the wire and no interception of Otepka's calls. Since then, these letters—prepared in the State Department legal office and approved by Rusk—have been established as being inaccurate.

Electronic expert Hill has testified that he actually recorded more than a dozen conversations on Otepka's wire as part of a plan to try to get evidence to serve as a basis for ousting the security evaluator. He testified that Reilly knew of the recordings, and had a special interest in one of them.

The documented record shows what is characterized by Senator DODD as "perjury," "falsification," and "lying" by three high-level officials who were trying to "get" Otto Otepka. Yet some newspapers have ignored this story. Others have continued to take the State Department line that the proof of "false" testimony on the wiretaps is not connected with the charges against Otepka.

Although Reilly and Hill have resigned, they have not been criticized by Secretary of State Rusk. Rusk allowed Belisle to remain in the State Department for weeks after becoming aware of the "untruthful" statements in the transcript. Secretary Rusk and his top aids continue ahead with the Reilly-initiated charges to oust Otepka for cooperating with Congress.

The activities of the State Department have been an outrageous, cynical and brutal effort to crush a dissenter for telling Congress the truth. In many ways, it is as bad as anything Joseph McCarthy did in his most irresponsible moments.

But more outrageous than the State Department's action has been the press performance. Some newsmen accepted the State Department philosophy that dissenters like Otepka should be squelched, and Congress barred from the facts.

The Otepka case involves the effectiveness of the State Department security program. It involves the question of the integrity of many high-level officials in a Department that is entrusted with vital foreign policy decisions. Yet, with only a few exceptions, the press had ignored this major investigation or has given it coverage warped to the State Department distortions.

Address by Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll at Launching of the Modernized Bathyscaph "Trieste"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to insert into the RECORD a speech given by Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, oceanographer of the U.S. Navy, at the launching of the modernized bathyscaph *Trieste*.

In his 33 years of service with the Navy, Admiral Knoll has ranged the world's oceans, has had many varied and responsible tasks, and was a most appropriate choice last August for the post of Navy oceanographer.

The *Trieste* holds the record for the world's deepest dive. It has been undergoing structural changes to enable it to perform more amazing underwater feats. I am pleased and proud that my hometown of San Diego was the site of its launching on January 17, 1964.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will find Admiral Knoll's speech informative and interesting. It describes the vast science of oceanography and some of the problems mankind faces in efforts to unravel the mysteries of the ocean.

Text of the speech is as follows:

REMARKS BY REAR ADM. DENYS W. KNOLL AT REDEDICATION OF "TRIESTE" JANUARY 17, 1964

Admiral Loomis, Admiral Fahy, Mayor Curran, Captain Mason, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am especially pleased with this opoprtunity to be with you at the rededication of the bathyscaph *Trieste*.

Coincident with exploding technology that is a part of our daily life, we hear eminent scientists call for the creation of a "science of survival," however, such a science may never be found.

Our late President, John F. Kennedy, recognized oceanography as a field for research and new understanding, because he believed that a working knowledge of the ocean environment and its plant, animal, and chemical content, may well be the most important work that we are doing for our future well-being and survival.

Oceanography is therefore occasionally mentioned as a science for survival.

Oceanography is an interdisciplinary science. To understand the ocean environment, and to exploit the wealth of the oceans successfully requires dynamic leaders in the basic disciplines of physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and mathematics.

Throughout our history this Nation has effectively exploited the surfaces of the oceans both militarily and economically. We now have a national program to acquire understanding and to exploit the resources of the oceans as a whole.

The oceans comprise more than 70 percent of the earth's surface. They are truly the last unexplored area of the earth, awaiting invasions by inquisitive man.

In our lifetime man has been literally realizing his dreams. Our many accomplishments are awe inspiring. At the beginning of this century men very proudly circumnavigated the earth in 2 or 3 months. Now man has orbited the earth in little more than an hour, and plans are being made to fly to the moon.

The conquest of inner space, our oceans, is yet to be glamorized; nevertheless, achievements in ocean exploration have been equally awe inspiring. The bathyscaph *Trieste* is an unique vehicle for investigating the depths of the oceans. It has achieved many firsts, and particularly when Lt. Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard made human observations in the Marianas Trench (January 1960), one of the deepest parts of the ocean (35,800 feet) and at a pressure of 17,000 pounds per square inch.

We are indebted to the great Swiss physicist, Auguste Piccard, for his construction of and inventiveness in the construction of *Trieste*. Based on principles of ballooning, the fabrication of the first bathyscaph was started in 1946. The third bathyscaph, built in 1952 and 1953 by Piccard, was the *Trieste* that the Navy acquired in 1957.

Today, 3 years after Lieutenant Walsh's expedition, *Trieste* is still the only vehicle available for making human observations in the ocean depths.

With the loss of the nuclear submarine *Thresher* in April 1963, the services of *Trieste* were immediately requested.

Lt. Cmdr. Don Keach as officer in charge and assisted by Lt. George Martin made a total of 10 dives in the *Thresher* search area. Debris of *Thresher* were sighted on three dives, and on one dive *Trieste* was able to secure and bring back to the surface " a section of internal piping" from the *Thresher*. The approximate true location of *Thresher* debris in 8,400 feet of water would not have been possible to verify without a vehicle like *Trieste* for human observations.

Our oceanographic program requires many vehicles like *Trieste* to conduct scientific research, to identify phenomena for investigation, and to collect valuable data to improve man's knowledge of the ocean depths. Deep research vehicles, capable of transporting men to the deepest depths of the oceans, are needed to successfully implement our national oceanographic program. These vehicles will combine human visual observations with photography, sonar, or magnetic detection, and other observational methods yet to be developed.

As Americans, you may correctly ask various questions, such as:

What may we expect to learn about the ocean depths and ocean bottom by visiting them?

What more can we learn from human observers than can be learned by sending down highly sophisticated instruments?

What are the costs the United States will have to bear to reach these goals?

Are the costs commensurate with the expected results?

How are the expenditures, in money, in manpower, and in technological resources, going to affect other national goals of the United States?

A comprehensive knowledge of the ocean depths and the physical, chemical, and biological processes that occur in the oceans will initially help us to design new and more reliable weapons systems for the defense of this Nation. Of even greater importance, this knowledge will help us to feed the underprivileged people of the world by adding seafood to the diet of the world's peoples. By farming the sea intelligently, we can increase the volume and variety of fish food and plant life for human consumption. The minerals in the sea and on the ocean bottom will ultimately become competitive with depleted mineral resources on land. Fresh water from sea water will more and more be used to irrigate arid areas of the globe. These are but a few of our goals.

Human observers in the ocean depths will be able to observe new phenomena that the most sophisticated instrument would not record.

The costs of this program are inexpensive, when compared with the promised tangible contributions this new knowledge can make to the Nation's long-range objectives, and the welfare of mankind as a whole. By using this new knowledge, and exploiting the ocean wealth intelligently, the United States will have available the new techniques for (1) feeding the underprivileged, (2) providing fresh water to arid areas, (3) having available new sources of chemical elements for technological development, and (4) implementing realistically many of our foreign policies affecting the welfare of mankind everywhere.

In our long history, our many glorious achievements—scientific, military, and technological—have only been possible because we had God-fearing, imaginative, resourceful, dynamic leaders to exploit the equipment and material resources available.

As we rededicate *Trieste* to her important work to increase our knowledge of the ocean depths, it is well that we pay special tribute to the Piccards, to Don Walsh, Don Keach, Larry Schumacher, and George Martin for their pioneering spirit. From this great land in the years immediately ahead, we need many more inspired and dedicated public servants to work in the ocean environment, in order that our future history will record that our great Navy and great Nation were equal to the demands of the ocean tasks, and our knowledge of the oceans really proved to be the answer to the better life for all peoples—our ever-present national goal.

Secretary Freeman Says Food Stamp Plan Is Most Effective Method Yet Devised To Insure Adequate Diet for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp bill, H.R. 8107, has been tabled by the House Committee on Agriculture. I hope this is only a temporary setback on the legislation. I think all of us who represent areas where pilot food stamp projects are in operation can attest to the fact that the food stamp method of distributing surplus food to the needy—through the regular grocery stores and the regular channels of trade—is far superior to the direct distribution system.

The Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, at a luncheon sponsored by the Almas Shrine Temple last Friday here in Washington, had some very interesting comments on the effectiveness of the food stamp plan. I think his comments are worth reading and I submit them as part of my remarks, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT A LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY THE ALMAS SHRINE TEMPLE AT THE SPHINX CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1964

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today that the food stamp program "is the most effective method yet devised to insure that all Americans have the opportunity for an adequate diet."

He spoke at a luncheon sponsored by the Almas Shrine Temple at the Sphinx Club, Washington, D.C.

"I want to make it clear to those people in the cities and urban areas who know the value of the food stamp program and who are concerned that our food abundance should be distributed more effectively that the American farmer and his family share the same concern and the same goal.

"The food stamp program is an essential instrument in the war on poverty. It represents the belief that every citizen should have an adequate, nutritious diet. It is an expression of a basic spiritual and moral principle * * * a principle which the farmer holds deeply.

"The American farmer is concerned when people are hungry because he knows that our system of family farms produces more

than enough food for every man, woman and child in this country.

"He has supported the food-for-peace program because it is the most effective means of sharing our food abundance with millions of hungry people throughout the world. And he supports the food stamp program in this country as the most effective method yet devised to insure that all Americans have the opportunity for an adequate diet. There is no excuse nor is there any reason why any American should go hungry when this country is able to produce food in overflowing abundance.

"Thus, the action earlier this week on the proposal to shift the pilot food stamp program to a permanent basis means that the Agriculture Committee has set the proposal aside for later consideration. It should not mean the food stamp program is dead."

The Secretary said the Department's experience to date with the pilot food stamp projects—which now covers 366,000 persons in 43 areas located in 22 States—shows that:

Participants, who pay a little over $6 for every $10 worth of coupons, substantially increased their food consumption. More than 80 percent of the increase came in meats, fruits, and vegetables. Compared to the diets available under the direct distribution of surplus commodities, the number of families able to achieve a nutritionally adequate diet was almost doubled.

The demand for food products which come under Federal price support programs is greater than under the direct distribution program, primarily because of the increased use of meat and meat products which increases the use of feed grains. In addition, while the cost of the food stamp program and a comparable direct distribution program are nearly the same, the return to farmers under the food stamp program is greater.

Retail food store sales have increased an average 8 percent in the pilot food stamp areas. The additional dollars spent for food stimulate the economy of the community. Thus, where the direct distribution program requires a competing distribution system, the food stamp program works for the benefit of the food industry as well as the consumer. Yet the cost to the Government is about the same.

The Secretary noted that few persons have attempted to take advantage of the food stamp program in the pilot areas, and pointed out that less than one-half of 1 percent of the participating stores had been involved in program violations.

"Most of the violations involved the sale of ineligible products, such as imported foods and soap and paper supplies. Few cases have involved the exchange of coupons for cash."

Hon. William J. Green, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the pontifical mass celebrated by Archbishop Krol of the city of Philadelphia Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul in commemoration of the death at the funeral of Congressman William J. Green, Jr., was held on the 24th day of December 1963. His excellency, the Archbishop Krol, gave the eulogy during the religious ceremonies, touching upon the distinguished career of his intimate friend, Congressman William J. Green, Jr.—both as to his political activity and as a Catholic father and citizen. It is with a deep sense of humility that I present for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memorable and prophetic words brilliantly rendered on that sacred day—given before a distinguished group of citizens and officials of the Nation, the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania, including the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Mayor James H. J. Tate and his cabinet, and Lieutenant Governor Shaffer, and Members of the U.S. Congress, city, State, and Federal judiciary, and other officials.

The eulogy follows:

PRAYERFUL REFLECTIONS AT THE FUNERAL OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

Death has brought us together in this cathedral on the vigil of Christmas. Mournfully, we pay final tribute to the memory of William J. Green, Jr., and pray for the happy repose of his immortal soul, as we lay his mortal remains to rest. The solemn strains and prayers of the Requiem Mass, console us and strengthen our humble submission to the inscrutable decree of God, which summoned him who was so loved and revered as a husband, father, public servant and friend.

There is no irreconcilable discord between birth and death; between the joy which attends the commemoration of Christ's birth, and the sorrow which attends the funeral of a dear one. I speak, not only from profound religious convictions, but also from personal experience. Five years ago this very day and this very hour, I offered a similar service at the funeral of my own father.

Christian joy and hope does not exist in a vacuum. Christian optimism is not an indefectible comfort which suppresses the tragic realities of life. Our joy derives from the hope of the victory that transcends all sorrow and tragedy; a victory in which we pass beyond sorrow and tragedy to glory with Christ crucified and Christ risen.

The annual preparation for the observance of the feast of Christ's birth, in the season of advent, contains a curious telescoping of time, merging the past, with the present and with the future. We are called upon to prepare for a fitting observance of the historical fact of Christ's coming. We are called upon to give that historic fact a visible and meaningful effect in contemporary reality in our own lives, by accepting Christ into our hearts, and evincing his presence by a holiness of life. Finally, we are called upon to prepare for the final coming of Christ in power and majesty as the judge of our every thought, word, and dead.

Throughout advent and the Christmas season, the church focuses the light of faith upon the very meaning of life, of history, of man and of our own being. While encouraging the traditional family joys, she points out the redemptive purposes of Christ's coming as the true source of our joy. We rejoice because Christ the Saviour, through His death and resurrection, opened for us the gates of heaven.

The Christmas holly may be viewed as a blood-spattered holly—with its red berries. In the midst of Christmas joys, the church on the day following Christmas observes the feast of St. Stephen—the first Christian to shed his blood as a martyr. Two days later the church observes the feast of the holy innocents, whose blood flowed freely in Herod's vain attempt to kill the promised Saviour. With true Christian realism, the church blends the joys and sorrows of life, and directs us to the victory with Christ crucified and risen, which transcends all sorrow and tragedy.

It is not my purpose to praise one who in life shunned words of praise. However as the shepherd of the flock of Christ in Philadelphia, I find great comfort together with the family of the deceased in the pattern of life and of death of the deceased. He made a sincere effort to manifest in his life his acceptance of Christ's coming. He was a devoted son, husband, and father. He was faithful to his trust as a representative of his people. In his last illness, with true Christian realism he prepared for the coming of Christ in judgment.

Our burial prayers are as much for the comfort of the living as they are in supplication for God's mercy upon the dead. We extend our prayerful condolences to his devoted wife, mother, and children, who have given ample evidence of their resignation to the will of God; of their acceptance of the death of a beloved husband and father as an act of God. We know that God will comfort and console them.

We pray that the almightly and merciful Father will help them to bear their cross, and not to languish in fruitless and unavailing grief, but will direct them to the Christian hope of victory which transcends all human sorrow and grief.

May the immortal soul of William J. Green, rest in peace.

A Longing for Freedom

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much recently about the liberalization of regimes in Eastern Europe, much about sending wheat to the Soviet Union, much about a hoped for followup to the test ban treaty. But we have been hearing little about those small, valiant Baltic countries which were absorbed in the vast Soviet empire at the end of World War II. Indeed, these countries are virtually shut off from the world. If we are looking for evidence of the loosening of the Soviet hold on Eastern Europe let us look there first. The scene we find is bleak. There is no sign of relief.

On February 16 of this year Lithuania became a so-called Soviet Republic. All independent Lithuanian agencies and institutions were abolished. The political, economic and cultural life of Lithuania has been Sovietized. Terror, deportations, mass arrests and executions have been employed to subdue the Lithuanian people. The land of Lithuanians has been collectivized; the Lithuanian economy has been subjected to the prior requirements of the Soviet economy. We find no signs of gradually lightening despotism. We find unmitigated suffering in the harsh grip of the Soviet master.

A nation that has striven for its independence—the Lithuanians struggled for over a hundred years; any people that has achieved independence as the Lithuanians did but for too short a time between 1918 and 1940; can never again put aside the knowledge of what it is to be a free people. Today, almost 3 million Lithuanians and over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent guard

the knowledge of what it meant to be free, and guard the hope that one day that knowledge will bear fruit. This is an appropriate time to salute their courage, salute their faith, and salute their adherence to the ideals that they share with all free peoples.

Prescription for Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include an article from the Human Events magazine of February 15, 1964, entitled "Prescription for Panama," which is a reprint of an editorial appearing in the Richmond, Va., News-Leader.

PRESCRIPTION FOR PANAMA: WE MUST FIRMLY UPHOLD OUR OWN DIGNITY AND RIGHTS

Something like a return to sanity is creeping into the Panamanian situation now that President Roberto Chiari realizes that the Castroite merry-go-round doesn't go anywhere. The Panamanian President, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Under Secretary George Ball have all come up with public statements deploring Communist infiltration of the riots. The deaths of half of the Panamanian victims have now been accounted for; they died in Panamanian violence.

There are three problems to be considered in the Panamanian problem.

The action of the students of Balboa High School still stands as an inspiring act of patriotism. It was no burst of highjinks, but another in a yearlong series of responsible protests by American citizens in the zone. They have been vigorously supporting the official stand of the U.S. Congress, as reiterated most recently last month.

The giveaway philosophy of the State Department, however, has encouraged Communist and leftist propagandists in Panama. The flag raisings culminated 2 weeks of growing tension caused by the ill-conceived action of the Canal Zone Governor in banning the American flag. The Communists had abundant time to organize the demonstrations, which erupted simultaneously on both sides of the isthmus, far from Balboa High School. The American targets were carefully selected; gasoline stations were tapped for fuel, and modern fireproof buildings were gutted by arson experts. It was not in vain that Panamanian Deputy Thelma King called for a bloody revolution after her most recent visit to Havana.

The remaining question, then, is this: Why did President Chiari issue inflammatory statements to his own people, and break diplomatic relations with the United States? Not a Red himself, he fails to see danger from revolutionaries whose thinking is remarkably like his own.

His party is up for reelection this year, and his political position is remarkably unstable. He has failed to win the impossible goal of nationalizing the canal, and his own regime has allowed the country to flounder in corruption and incompetence. Late in October a serious split developed in his party. The splintered factions will be running against the popular and pro-American former President, Arnulfo Arias.

Thus President Chiari is left with one remaining issue, and it is a phantom issue: "discrimination" against Panamanians. Most of the higher paying jobs in the Canal Company are held by Americans. Most of these are top-security jobs that could never go to non-U.S. citizens in any case. The Canal Zone civil service reports that many skilled jobs open to Panamanians are going begging; it is not to be expected that a small, underdeveloped country of 1 million could supply the necessary technicians in large quantities. Americans also get a 25-percent cost-of-living bonus to lure them down to the tropics. Panamanians, on the other hand, are earning far more than they would be paid by Panamanian businessmen. President Chiari himself is a case in point: A millionaire sugar-mill owner, he has consistently opposed independent labor unions among his own employees.

From the canal Panama gets many efficiently run services—water, electricity, dockage. Directly from the United States Panama has received twice as much aid ($100 million) as any other Caribbean country except Costa Rica, and more than all of South America combined. The U.S. Army's Operation Friendship has performed many extensive works of charity and training. U.S. health services abound. The canal itself annually pumps $88 million into the local economy. The U.S. Treasury gets an annual "profit" of less than $2 million for some $1.5 billion invested. We have been generous.

The prescription for Panama, nevertheless, is not to stand adamant and insulting. Our first duty is firmly to uphold our own dignity and rights. Secondly we should take advantage of the absence of Castro to stir up the Organization of American States. Thirdly, we should call President Chiari's bluff and reject the "symbolic" concessions which have resulted in so much suffering for Panama. Lastly, we should at once begin to dig the Nicaraguan Canal, where we have a friendly government and treaty rights which have lain dormant for years. The inadequacy of the Panamanian waterway has increased the feasibility of the Nicaraguan plan. Two canals are better than none.

Hon. Charles E. Goodell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial tribute to the gentleman from New York, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL.

The editorial appeared in the February 7, 1964, edition of the Buffalo Evening News of Buffalo, N.Y., one of this country's outstanding newspapers.

The editorial follows:

LEGISLATIVE CRAFTSMAN

Legislating is, among other things, a craft, and once in awhile a legislator comes along who is enough of a master craftsman so that it is sheer pleasure to watch him work.

One of these is the Congressman from Jamestown, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL. Although a Republican and serving only in his third term in a Democratic Congress, Mr. GOODELL has managed—through a combination of diligent homework, alertness, persuasiveness and a talent for bringing reasonable people together on a reasonable compromise—to put his distinctive mark on several major bills in the area of manpower and education in the last two Congresses.

Now he has done it again in the current civil rights debate.

One of the key sections of the civil rights bill, to ban discrimination in public accommodations, sought to invoke the 14th amendment's prohibition of State actions abridging the privileges of citizens. It would prohibit racial discrimination if it is carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, "custom or usage"; or is required, fostered or encouraged by action of a State or a political subdivision thereof.

The words here that triggered the most violent reaction from southerners—and many others as well—were those we have quoted, "custom or usage." Opponents argued, and not without reason, that to ban practices carried out under cover, not of any State law or local regulation, but only of "custom or usage" would stretch the 14th amendment to the point of equating private discrimination with State action. Defenders of the phrase replied that segregation is so ingrained "by custom and usage" in much of the South that it often has "the force of law."

Representative GOODELL listened thoughtfully to the debaters' points, then quietly proposed a simple change of language, to read: "* * * is carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation; or is carried on under color of any custom or usage fostered, required or enforced by officials of the State or political subdivision thereof."

Much better, the southerners agreed. No objections, said Judiciary Committee Chairman CELLER, managing the bill for the administration. So the Goodell amendment, along with one further minor clarification (deleting of the word "fostered"), was accepted by a voice vote—and the civil rights bill was made just that much more precise and workable. It is, as we say, the sort of craftsmanship that has marked Mr. GOODELL as a real comer—a legislators' legislator—among the still relatively junior Members of Congress.

Fair Play for Cuba Takes New Name, Is Back in Biz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York News, February 6, 1964:

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA TAKES NEW NAME, IS BACK IN BIZ

(By William Federici and Henry Lee)

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which ostensibly fell to pieces after member Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated President Kennedy, is again doing business under a new name, high intelligence sources told the News last night.

The Castro lovers have regrouped under the name of Friends of Latin America and, according to the News sources, are making grandiose plans to pour money and support into such trouble spots as the Canal Zone and Venezuela.

However, the leaders may find they have stubbed their toes over a reactionary capitalistic device known as the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

HAVE NOT REGISTERED

According to the News informants, Friends of Latin America and its top brass have not registered under the act.

As a matter of fact, even before the disclosure of the revived activities, the News was told, the Justice Department had been studying possible prosecutions of the old Fair Play leaders for asserted violations of the same act.

Part of the Government's case would presumably be based on testimony taken by a congressional committee. One witness asserted that some of Fair Play's financing "came from Fidel Castro." Additionally, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover cited the dead committee as "one of the main outlets in the United States for pro-Castro propaganda."

ARE OUT OF REACH

Two of Fair Play's leaders are now out of reach of the Government. Robert Taber, who founded the outfit 4 years ago, is safe in Cuba. His successor, Richard Gibson, is working for a leftwing publication in France.

However, its last top dog, Vincent Theodore Lee, is still around.

When Fair Play closed up shop at 799 Broadway, Lee dropped out of sight, and his home in Greenwich Village appeared deserted. Nonetheless, surveillance was maintained and Lee unexpectedly showed up three times in the past week, the News was told.

REPORTED CONFERRING

According to the intelligence sources, he has been busily conferring with his old Fair Play associates. At the same time, the word has gone out to various chapters throughout the country which had also closed down after the assassination.

These units have been given the new name and new procedures and are expected to reconstitute themselves—unless the Government moves in on the leadership.

The 43d Anniversary of the Armenian Revolt Against Soviet Tyranny

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all freedom loving Americans—and particularly on behalf of those Americans of Armenian descent—I rise on this day, the 43d anniversary of the successful Armenian revolt against Soviet tyranny and terror.

No people have demonstrated greater determination or more love for freedom than those who once were part of the Armenian Nation; and who are now spread in various lands around the globe, including a great many who reside in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

Our Nation supports the independence of an ever-increasing number of new nations. However, it is appropriate to point out that little or nothing is being done to assist the Armenian people—or other nations which are now encompassed by the Iron Curtain—to regain their national freedom.

I call again upon the administration to give support to the resolution—House Joint Resolution 15—offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, to establish a Captive Nations Commission. This measure would restore hope and—eventually, I trust—freedom for Armenia as well as for the provinces and satellite nations, which are now under Communist domination.

The adoption of this joint resolution would seem to be a first step in encouraging Armenia's emergence as a free nation.

The determination of Armenians to remain free—no matter where their temporary abode—is hailed here, today. Freedom loving people everywhere applaud the dreams, hopes and realistic goal of a restored free and independent Armenian nation.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the brave people of Lithuania on this anniversary of their freedom and independence—an anniversary that they themselves cannot celebrate fittingly in their homeland because that freedom and independence has been cruelly taken away from them. Because of the tragic loss of their voice in governing themselves and in commemorating their day of freedom, it is for us, in a land blessed with freedom, to speak for them and to recall their historical struggles and earlier emancipation.

Today, when so many new nations throughout the globe are experiencing freedom for the first time, the dire plight of the heroic Lithuanian people is evermore heart rending. Like the other formerly independent states that have been forced against their will into the Soviet sphere, Lithuania lives and is sustained in the hope that some day the yoke of tyranny will be loosened and that she again will be able to assume her rightful status in the family of free self-governing nations. The oppression and terror imposed upon her people by the Soviet tyrants has been a prime force in welding that hope into a fierce determination.

The fervor of the peoples subjected to the Soviet domination is a major source of worry and concern to those dictators. The sentiments of Americans expressed in ceremonies like these in the U.S. Congress and in broadcasts beamed to the Iron Curtain countries by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe are a constant reminder to the Communists that the plight of the subjugated people is not forgotten. To those people we today send our most sincere good wishes and remembrances. We want them to know that they will never be forgotten.

To their compatriots now living in the United States, we convey our warmest greetings. Particularly, do we greet the members of the Lithuanian American Council and congratulate them on their splendid efforts in keeping alive the traditions of their native land. Their work is an inspiration to the enslaved Lithuanian people whose confidence in once more achieving independence must be kept alive.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, marked the 46th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania from czarist Russia's tyranny which its people had endured for over 100 years. Unfortunately, that independence was of short duration, and the brave people of this land are once again suffering under the yoke of oppression of the Soviet Union.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Lithuanians here in America and in their native land and in reaffirming our dedication to the cause of freedom for all captive nations.

In this regard, there are a number of resolutions pending before the Congress which call for the United States to initiate action in the United Nations or otherwise to bring about not only the withdrawal of Soviet forces but free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I ask my colleagues to heed the following plea for favorable congressional action which has been made by Dr. Giedra Sidrys, of Streator, Ill.:

Soviet Russia keeps the Baltic States under a military occupation and under a subjugation which amounts to slavery. Of all the parts of the Soviet Empire, this is the area where suppression of freedom and individual liberties has reached its peak. This fact should be incompatible with the consciousness of the Western World. By virtue of their centuries-old independence, social achievements, and cultural aspects, the Baltic States were a part of the Western World, dedicated to the ideals of national and individual freedom. The Baltic people were, and still are, in this respect, spiritual brothers of the people of the United States of America. The resolutions demanding their freedom would be one step toward recognition that we are not entirely free as long as our brothers in Europe suffer in slavery.

The Baltic people have gone to desperate lengths in their hopeless fight for freedom. This fight continues, or at least simmers, throughout Europe wherever freedom is suppressed. Such a resolution would be a spiritual lift for the hope of freedom deep in the hearts of these people.

Preparation and Conduct of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., addressed to the Society of the Four Arts, Palm Beach, Fla., on February 4, 1964, being a dissertation on the preparation and conduct of the fair.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65 CORP. ADDRESSED TO THE SOCIETY OF THE FOUR ARTS, PALM BEACH, FLA., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1964

You have witnessed our fair recording and heard General Potter's rollcall of participants, exhibits, and spectacles. There is little left which justifies detaining you. The sun is over the foreyardarm. The guests have heard the loud bassoon, and the Ancient Mariner with his albatross and other obsessions is simply interrupting traffic.

Some questions about the building of a fair remain unanswered. At any rate, there are doubts which assail the ultraconservative, puzzles which plague the curious and inquisitive and critical observations which, since I am known as a controversial character—whatever that is—are usually passed on to me. The entrepreneur or impresario is usually what in the vernacular is called the fall guy or patsy. He must speak up when the banns are proclaimed or forever hold his peace.

I am no Gatti-Casazza, no Angier Duke of protocol, and in the bright lexicon of fairs, the mantle of Elijah has descended on worthier if not tougher shoulders. Some years ago a distinguished, or should I say well-known, Englishman, the son of his father, asked my friend Herbert Bayard Swope after I had left his library, why Herb spent time with ditchdiggers when there were so many more charming people about. Herb passed this compliment on to me. I am indeed a dirt mover and park man, a brother to dragons, a companion to owls, and an honorary engineer by predilection, training and preference. Occasionally I have to stop to philosophize, and if I do so now I hope you will not regard it as altogether out of character.

I have been asked repeatedly about architecture and art at the fair. The fair prefers no school, order, movement, class, party, fraternity, group, or clique. The individual views of fair executives bear no relation to the conduct of the fair. Trojan and Tyrian, we welcome them all, but we can't spend fair money to build pavilions for the advance guard, pay their bills and underwrite their creeds. My personal opinions on this subject are wholly irrelevant. We favor the utmost freedom of taste, opinion and method on the part of our participants as to both facades and interiors. We aim at variety, experiment and competition, not at central control and uniformity. In the end this policy will prove itself.

Nevertheless, the cognoscenti keep needling me about my own very inconsequential views on such highly inflammatory subjects as abstract art. You are not going to catch me very far off base in this ball game. I will however hazard one timid observation. Traditionally artists served a long apprenticeship as draughtsmen and were close students of the history and practice of perspective, composition, light, shade, pigments, and color. Sculptors deigned to have a working knowledge of anatomy. These used to be the recognized and indispensable tools of the trade. Now we are asked to appraise, appreciate and accept as gospel the big leap into abstraction, mood, startling colors and the iconoclastic repudiation of the past. This leads to a rhetorical question. Is it perhaps possible that some at least of this revolutionary stuff may not prove to be esthetically durable, that posterity may not like it and that when the wave of the future breaks and recedes, some broken shards and debris may remain?

We are asked why we lay claim to being a World's Fair when quite a few regions and areas are missing. Instead of celebrating the presence in the fair of many nations, old and new, who are eagerly participating, the critics shake their gory locks mournfully and ask where are the British Raj, Malagasy, Rudolf the Rainier, and his Roulette, the Sultan of Kuwait with his bottomless oil, Cadillacs, harems, heat, sand flies and camel dung? Where, they say, are Lichtenstein, Luxembourg, San Marino, Ruritania, Graustark, and Andorra? How can a fair claim to be worldwide without them? And where are Ultima Thule, Terra del Fuego, Shangri La, and the Sultan of Swat?

The motivations of missing States of the Union are probed and explored while the obstacles, financial and legislative, actually surmounted by participants, are glossed over. The faultfinders devote their energies to deploring the absentees. Now that the hounds of spring are on the winter's traces, these critics, who are the fleas and gadflies of progress, may make the hounds move faster. I suppose that is what critics are for.

At the beginning we were told by gloomy prophets that the fair could never get off the ground financially. At the same time another element in the whispering gallery hissed that there would be gamblers' gold in them thar meadows and that funny money would make a killing. Well, if there are to be killings, which I doubt, the fair will make them and put all the proceeds into a public park.

For quite a while the word went around among the international barflies and intelligentsia that our case was hopeless because we were not sanctioned by the so-called Bureau of International Expositions, a voluntary agency located in Paris, which under our Constitution we could only have joined by treaty approved by Congress and under other impossible conditions. We found that most of these critics had no idea what B.I.E. meant. They reminded me of the alphabetical agencies and gobbledegook back in the depression years. In that extraordinary and hilarious period we had on our staff a sleepy genius whose mind was fixed on cloverleafs and overpasses. His chums were discussing their colleges and one of them asked this planner, "Were you RPI?" He scratched his poll and answered, "Let's see. I was NRA, TERA, WPA, REA, PWA, RFC, and CCC. Yes, I guess I was RPI, too."

Perhaps Shelley was right when he replied to a critic:

"There is no sport in hate when all the rage is on one side."

So we write off the critics and go on our way cheerfully. Pretty soon as the train gathers momentum we shall see the last sceptic swing himself on the last step of the calaboose.

We have been endlessly besieged by those who insist that the fair put its heaviest emphasis on culture as against science, on art as against engineering, on fun as opposed to education, on our States as compared to foreign countries, on fine food as distinguished from dogs, beer and hamburgers, on music and the theater as against rides and mechanical devices. The exposition is being run by barbarians and illiterates, one faction avers, while another complains that we are overrefined and go for out-of-this world stuff.

You can hear anything you will listen to. As to the sound of music, rumor has it that throughout Flushing Meadow you will have to shout to be heard above the fountain music and the Coca Cola carillons, that the international section will echo with the beat of jungle drums, that along the Rialto jukeboxes will play "O Sole Mio" and "Arrivederci Roma" all day and night without interruption, and that we have practiced so hard in the temples of religion that we have pulled out the vox humana stops on the organs. It may all be true. Does the fair cater primarily to visitors who will shop, buy, and spend as opposed to those whose interests are in the shrines, museums, and performing arts? Are our real objectives in fact commercial or cultural? Will you titillate or teach? Are we for Mammon or for the enternal verities? It is a good deal like asking whether we favor reason or imagination, poetry or prose. The fanatics shout, "Under which king, Besonian? speak, or die." This badgering gets to be plain silly. Will we play up our luxury and pride and hide the seamy side of town? Shall we emphasize the melting pot or the cradle of liberty?

We cannot please all the extremists and surely we can not satisfy the fanatics. A fair is a fair is a fair. It is all things to all people. There must be a balance of attractions and that gets down to commonsense rather than academic theory. This gives me a chance to remark that I only wish all our exhibitors were as enthusiastic, imaginative, cooperative, and easy to work with as Florida.

Then there are those who ask, "What has New York to offer that it should be preferred above other cities?" Now I don't propose to appear here as either a meek apologist for what I believe is today, on its 300th anniversary, the world's greatest city, or as one of those objectionable boasters who announces at bars and bistros that he would rather be a lamp post in New York than be mayor of Chicago. Ours is no mean city. It has its detractors abroad and in the hinterland and, I regret to say, plenty of dubious domestic birds who foul their own nest.

Probably much of the feeling of some outsiders about New York is, as the late Speaker Tom Reed, of Maine, once sapiently announced, "just plain, high-minded envy," and no doubt the sensational squawks and catcalls of some of our local journalists and pundits might be characterized in the words of Thomas Carlyle, no mean slinger of English himself, as "obscene owl droppings." May I suggest that to the jaundiced everything looks yellow, to the dyspeptic everything is sour and that everything seems outrageous to the angry man.

New York is a great, enormously complex, puzzling, and endlessly fascinating town. It is the Nation's most powerful municipal magnet. It has much to show and commend it. It is the home, sweet home of the poor, the oppressed, the eager, the ambitious. It is always busy, and sometimes rude and abrupt, but at bottom it is friendly and hospitable, and in this year and in 1965 it will present a face of welcome and greeting to all visitors, asking only a response in kind.

One thing more. Don't count on seeing our fair in a day. Read our reports, look at our model at the main entrance, figure what intrigues you most, spread and space your visits over as long a time as you can possibly spare. Ride, rest, and relax in between. Don't run yourself ragged. This is something to sample and savor. It will delight you and your children now and brighten your evenings later. You will surely never forget it. This we promise, and we shall keep our word.

Suggestions for Our Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a communication from one of my constituents making certain suggestions in regard to foreign aid. While I do not necessarily subscribe to all the views and conclusions in the letter, it does offer some suggestions worthy of further study, and for this reason I am introducing a portion if it into the RECORD:

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
January 31, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT TAFT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TAFT: Of all the programs on the Federal scene today, I believe foreign aid has been more widely condemned than any other. There seem to be three main criticisms of foreign aid as presently administered:

1. It promotes Marxism by channeling all aid through the recipient country's government.
2. It is wastefully ineffective.
3. It is a drain on our own economy, contributing to our international deficit.

In order to meet the above criticisms, I would propose to limit economic aid to those countries which agree to the following points:

1. Eadh country would match the U.S. funds provided for each project on a dollar-for-dollar basis (this ratio is not sacrosanct).
2. Every project would be privately managed by an existing free enterprise company or one organized for the purpose.
3. Each project would calculate a pay-out to justify the investment before the funds would be released.

Now I realize that there will be many arguments advanced as to the impracticality of this proposal by the free spenders as well as those who conscientiously think it unworkable; however, the great merit of the scheme is that it will force interested, vested local interests into channelling their intelligence, energies, and funds into a free enterprise endeavor which will permanently improve the economy of the country. Now those energies are spent largely on the expansion of bureaucratic governments while private funds leave the country for safekeeping.

Arguments will be heard, for example, that a highway or road is needed to provide service to a proposed cannery project. This road should be provided in the fashion roads were provided in the early days of the United States, either by government taxes or by an entrepreneur who charged toll. This road then, in itself, could conceivably become a valid economic project qualifying for U.S. funds on a matched basis.

As you reflect upon the possible results of such a program, it appears to meet the three criticisms of the existing program quite well. In the order listed above, it would certainly not aid Marxism. We know Marxism doesn't work. Marxist countries are unable to feed themselves. These projects could provide the testing grounds for all the world to see in order to establish the clear superiority of the free enterprise system over Marxism. Secondly, this approach to economic aid would not be near so wasteful as the existing approach. Certainly the majority of the people in this country recognize that the free enterprise system, with its natural checks and balances, is much more efficient than the Marxist system and, consequently, the chances of success of the various projects would be greatly enhanced by using the economic approach proved by the success of the U.S. economy. The countries involved would eventually stand on their own feet as they learned to wield the economic tools vividly demonstrated by the test projects. Isn't this our ultimate objective? Thirdly, the drain on our own economy would be minimized because unquestionably one result would be a smaller outgo of U.S. funds because of the valid economic restrictions imposed. There would be no more yachts, $50 million airports for three planes, etc. In adidtion, if the enterprise proved profitable as calculated, the funds would be repaid.

I do not contemplate that this general policy would be easy to implement. There will be many valid objections to it, as well as efforts to circumvent it by the recipient countries (dummy companies, etc.). There can be no question, however, that the present policy has failed tragically and has proved not only difficult to administer in an efficient fashion, but impossible. This policy would fall with rude impact upon many of our friends to the south and elsewhere, but in the final analysis they would adjust themselves to this type of aid rather than to none at all. This, then, could be the beginning of a true acceptance of responsibility by these countries. Knowing that the United States would no longer bail them but of their problems would be the greatest incentive possible for them to work out their own salvation.

Very truly yours,

T. M. TURNER.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, when we attempt to legislate on economic problems, and particularly one such as unemployment in private industry, it is most unfortunate that more of our colleagues have not experienced meeting a payroll, completing the myriad of Government forms and reports, or competing for business against larger or more favorably situated organizations.

In connection with the current proposal for double overtime pay, one of my constituents, a brick manufacturer of long standing, writes me as follows:

DEAR MR. WHARTON: This is with respect to H.R. 9802—premium wage rates for overtime work. We have given this proposal considerable study. We look with a skeptical eye on the statement of its supporters that the tripartite committee would restrict its recommendations for not less than double time for overtime to selected industries. Double time for overtime for our little company would involve a cost burden that would wipe out our incentive to operate. It is impractical for us to hire extra help as an alternative. We hope that you will take a position against H.R. 9802.

Obviously, we are not going to encourage employment by putting employers out of business, and this is exactly what has been going on for some time. Government regulation has reached the saturation point and I hear many complaints concerning this harassment of private industry. New York State lost 4,000 small farms last year because all of our farm assistance programs are designed to assist the big operator, and Federal regulations have discouraged many more thousands of small businessmen in the same period. The least we can do is to stop encouraging unemployment through such ridiculous ideas as this.

Communist Propaganda and Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Congress takes up a good deal of time every year in special observances of the independence days of the nations conquered by the Soviet Union. One might wonder whether such observances serve any useful purpose, or whether we Congressmen really think our speeches have any value in light of the seemingly ironclad control over these countries which the Soviet Union has. The answer is: Our words here definitely have a purpose—the purpose of exposing communism for what it is, and our speeches do have value, particularly because the supposed ironclad control of the Soviet Union is an element of Communist propaganda and is not the true situation in Eastern Europe today.

Communist Parties all over the world have constantly harped on their chorus of lies for many years. Certain ideas have been repeated over and over again, and since the world has been effectively barred from entering the Communist bloc to find the truth, many believe these ideas.

Lithuania presents a living refutation of everything communism preaches. The Lithuanian people have a proud cultural heritage of freedom. They had developed an outstanding nation before Moscow was anything but a barbaric outpost. Lithuania suffered 120 years of despotic czarist rule without losing its national unity and cultural integrity. When 1918 came, the people rallied behind great leaders and proclaimed their independence on February 16, which we celebrate today. Thereafter Lithuania became a repected member of the League of Nations, the people enjoyed the best kind of representative government and their living standards improved more rapidly than ever before in history. By 1940 Lithuania was a prosperous, stable country founded on private farming and growing industrial production.

Into this scene marched the Soviet Union. By subversion and force, it conquered Lithuania. Immediately all freedom was suppressed. Party leaders were

executed. Newspapers and magazines were seized. Millions of citizens were arrested without legal recourse to habeas corpus or counsel. Then a completely Communist parliament asked to be admitted to the Soviet Union. What else could have happened when no opposition at all was allowed to exist?

Since 1940 many more freedom-loving people have died in Lithuania. All the land has been seized and farmers have been forced into collective farms despite vigorous resistance. Millions of Lithuanians have been exiled to Sibera and elsewhere, and replaced by loyal Russians, especially in the coastal areas, who can be expected to keep an eye on the Lithuanians. All the natural resources which Lithuanians had developed were seized and exploited for the benefit of the Russian people. Lithuanians have been reduced to second-class citizenship and second-rate living standards. All this proceeded in complete darkness—no foreigners at all have been allowed into Lithuania until just 2 years ago.

Once this true situation has been exposed, Communist propaganda becomes the obvious farce that it is. Four major claims of communism are reduced to absurdity: First, that peoples voluntarily join communism; second, that the consistuent republics of the U.S.S.R. outside the Russian Republic itself enjoy autonomy; third, that communism has brought a better life to the East European people; and finally, fourth, that communism is the wave of the future.

The fact is that no nation has ever voluntarily adopted communism. Despite the most strenuous and well-financed efforts in Italy, Indonesia, India, and elsewhere, communism has yet to win a parliamentary majority. It never shall. Communists can fool a few people and frighten a few others, but without the support of the Red army, they cannot win. The reason is that Communist promises of a better life have been thoroughly disproved. There are too many examples like Lithuania, where the most basic rights of civilized peoples have been ignored; where living standards are low; and where millions have suffered and died needlessly.

Therefore we serve a useful purpose here in remembering Lithuanian Independence Day. Communism is not the wave of the future, but rather a temporary reversion to barbarism. In a few countries, which were very primitive, communism may gain many converts. But time is on our side. The principles of freedom can compete with any totalitarian system and win. Our duty is to maintain and enunciate the doctrine of freedom, clearly and openly, so the world will remember the doctrine and remember where it is heading. Especially we must be willing to take a few moments of our time to encourage the oppressed peoples, suffering under communism, and to remind them what freedom is, and to encourage them to continue striving toward it.

Navy Key to Pacific Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, "No Time To Drop Guard—Navy Key to Pacific Defense":

[From the San Diego Union, Dec. 9, 1963]

NO TIME TO DROP GUARD—NAVY KEY TO PACIFIC DEFENSE

Across the broad reaches of the Pacific Ocean an enemy is watching for the first sign of wavering in our announced policy to hold back thetide of communism.

The United States should make no move in that area that could be so construed. But we may be about to make one.

Reports persist that the Department of Defense intends to go through with its plan to take the control of our Armed Forces in the Pacific area away from the Navy, on the excuse of rotating commands, and under a new concept of mobility which was demonstrated recently by the airlifting of Army troops to West Berlin.

The distances in the Pacific areas, however, are far vaster, and the relatively few available supply bases and landing fields also are isolated by distance.

The Pacific Ocean is a Navy zone. The Pacific Fleet has 270,000 personnel, which includes 72,000 marines, about 3,000 aircraft and 425 ships. They are impressive figures—and they comprise an effective and respected force.

The Navy has so much more striking power in the Pacific than the other services that it is difficult to understand how Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara could consider placing control and command of this area in hands other than those of the Navy.

The Navy-Marine team has a unique capability of being able to land an assault force with enough equipment and supplies to stay and fight, with carrier aircraft covering the marines until their own air arm can establish operations ashore.

The military situation may be different in relation to Europe, where there are many friendly airfields on which to land, and where supplies and equipment have been stocked for years in advance.

But across the Pacific, we have only toeholds. And the enemy controls much of the shoreline, or can control it. Thus today the 7th Fleet patrols the Western Pacific and keeps the Chinese Communists in check while we aid such countries as Korea and South Vietnam in their efforts to remain independent.

The United States won the great war in the Pacific, despite Pearl Harbor, with a Navy command and we think it will come as a shock to Americans when they learn the Navy, with its Marine Corps, is no longer masterminding the defenses of the Pacific. And, too, throughout the Orient the U.S. Navy is the symbol of power and resistance.

But we are told now that in this missile age the old principles of conflict do not apply, that more of our strength can be kept at home, and we can lessen our dependency on ships and planes. Too much emphasis on second-strike missiles also is stressed. This is false reasoning.

Conflict has gone on as usual. Since the development of the atom bomb the British Empire has been liquidated, Indo-China was lost in a long war, Korea has been cut in two, South Vietnam burns with Communist rebellion. There have been military engagements in the Suez area, in Algeria, among the new African nations, and so on. The list is staggeringly long, but the significance is that they represent no missile or atomic engagement.

The pattern of conquest and revolution has been set. We must meet the situation as it exists and develops.

At the first sign that we are drawing away from the frontline, the enemy may be ready for a bigger gamble.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the liberty-loving Lithuanian people are among the proudest and most individualistic people in all Europe. Though never numbering more than 3 million at any time in their long and turbulent history, they have contributed more than their share to the common pool of European civilization. In their northeastern homeland on the Baltic shore they have played an important part in the political, social, and cultural history of that part of Europe. They had their grand and glorious days in the late Middle Ages and early in modern times. Then, by the grim fates of history, they lost their freedom and independence, and were engulfed in the polyglot empire of czarist Russia late in the 18th century.

They were almost submerged in that empire, but fortunately they were not lost, and never lost their national identity. For more than 100 years they kept up their national spirit and their hope for freedom, struggling hard to regain their national independence. Finally, in 1918, they succeeded in attaining their goal, proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year, established the Lithuanian Republic and adopted a democratic form of government. Under this government of their own choice they lived happily for more than 20 years, vigorously working at the task of reshaping a better life for themselves in their beloved homeland. Before this self-imposed task was completed, however, the clouds of war descended upon them. The aggressors struck.

In 1940 Lithuania ceased to exist as an independent state when Stalin's Red army overran and occupied the country.

Since the middle of that fateful year the Lithuanians have experienced the cruel tyranny of both Nazi and Communist domination. The end of the war brought no relief to them. In fact, since 1945 their misery and suffering have been aggravated under Communist totalitar-

ian tyranny. Lithuania has become a large concentration camp, a prison-house for its helpless inhabitants. During all these years the country has been practically sealed off from the free world, and Lithuanians have no free contact with their spiritual brothers of the free West.

In observing the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we hope to keep alive the undying spirit of freedom among these people. We know that they will continue to resist in every practicable way the despotism hoisted over them. Their courage, their tenacity and their loyalty to noble traditions will in time defeat the guns and tanks of their heartless and godless oppressors. Our ardent prayers go with them on the 46th anniversary of their independence day.

Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago President Johnson accepted the resignation of one of the country's most devoted and gifted public servants, Mr. Edward R. Murrow. Mr. Murrow's departure as Director of the U.S. Information Agency deprives the Government of a first-rate mind and talent.

When he accepted President Kennedy's offer in 1961 to direct the oversea information program, he left behind him an extraordinarily successful career in radio and television.

For 25 years he provided CBS listeners with news, commentary, and public affairs programs in a fashion which has yet to be improved upon. Whether as an education reporter or a war correspondent, his analysis always displayed those superb observations and insights which placed them in a class by themselves.

Later, when he gave his attention to television, millions of viewers admired his grasp of the social problems besetting our age, his courage in dealing with highly controversial material, and his ability to elucidate the central points of friction in our society.

As much as any single individual, he gave the television industry a stature it had not achieved in its earlier days and he made the documentary a salable commodity. His was a performance of great virtuosity.

When he went to the USIA, he brought with him the knowledge, good taste, and high standards which had formerly been his hallmark. These were precisely the endowments needed to project an accurate portrait of the United States to people in other nations.

During his all too short stay as USIA Director, he injected a sense of importance and urgency into its activities and helped the agency realize much more of its full potential.

The Government will miss Mr. Murrow's intelligence, imagination and commitment to calling. Hopefully, he will see fit to return to the television reportage and commentary of which he is such a master.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column appearing in the New York (N.Y.) Times of Sunday, February 2, 1964, by Jack Gould, which elaborates more fully Mr. Murrow's contribution to his country and his vocation:

STYLE AND AUTHORITY—LOOKING AHEAD WITH EDWARD R. MURROW, THE MAN WHO PUT A SPINE IN THE BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

(By Jack Gould)

There was a touch of irony in the coincidence that within a week's time Edward R. Murrow should temporarily leave the broadcasting scene for a California vacation and that the Federal Communications Commission should champion provocative and controversial radio and television. The juxtaposition of man and issue hardly could have been more appropriate.

In resigning as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, a thankless task of acquainting the world with American attitudes, Mr. Murrow chose to take an option on desert sunshine by way of furthering his recovery from his recent operation for lung cancer.

No doubt pills, loafing, reading, and golf are fine for most people in such circumstances, but in Mr. Murrow's case there is only one therapy that will soothe his nerves. It is work. As soon as he can escape from the medical do-gooders, he should team up again with Fred W. Friendly and get on with specific assignments in behalf of "CBS Reports."

When news of Mr. Murrow's departure became official with the appointment of Carl T. Rowan as his successor, there were many words of appreciation, notably those by James Reston, of the professional journalist and human being.

In accepting Mr. Murrow's resignation, President Johnson recalled the commentator's unforgettable broadcasts from London in wartime. There was mention of his rehabilitation of the USIA. But overlooked was what some considered perhaps his biggest contribution of all: he put a spine in the broadcasting industry.

RADIO REPORTING

Radio, of course, had its outspokeness to the reports of Elmer Davis, Raymond Gram Swing, Eric Sevareid, William Shirer, and Mr. Murrow. But practically without exception these were commentaries, often biting and incisive. In terms of original reporting there was hardly any probing in depth, no documentaries worthy of the name and certainly no national controversy.

With the war's end came the phenomenally rapid introduction of television, and one of the first casualties was the institution of commentary. The airwaves in some ways were more vapid than ever, but it was little noticed because of the understandably high excitement over the novelty of TV.

Moreover, there were ominous clouds looming over the broadcast industry. Much of high management was terrorized and intimidated by accusations against certain artists; blacklists of many kinds were abroad. Controversy became a dangerous word, and some of the most prominent persons in the country were not invited before the microphone, not because they were suspected of subversion, but because they voiced strong views.

ENTER "SEE IT NOW"

It was into this environment that on November 18, 1951, there came the show called "See It Now," a program on which Mr. Murrow and Mr. Friendly decided to push back the horizons of electronic journalism. It engendered excitement from the start but it was not until the winter of 1954 that the presentation elevated the medium of TV to perhaps its most eloquent moment of editorial fury. "See It Now" on March 9 of that year came to grips with Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

Mr. Murrow risked and received the wrath of Mr. McCarthy to a degree not experienced by any other journalist. But the commentator never once wavered in his stand and indeed often belittled his role. It is not too much to suggest that it was the Murrow broadcast that first made clear to a mass audience the dimensions and implications of McCarthyism. It was the beginning of the series of challenges that were to lead to the Senator's ultimate undoing.

Many other controversial documentaries were to be done on "See It Now"; most, probably, are now forgotten. But the spirit and integrity of Mr. Murrow remains in force to this moment. There is not a major commentator on any network who will not agree that whatever he is privileged to say today in no small part is due to Mr. Murrow.

ART OF UNDERSTATEMENT

Part of the effectiveness of Mr. Murrow rested in his singular style and authority on the air; to his job he brought the most devastating of passions and convictions, the art of understatement. That he was the most videogenic of commentators admittedly did not hurt either.

With Mr. Murrow's resignation from CBS to join the Kennedy administration, there were many who predicted that he was going to be missed without being precisely certain in what way. Now the reason is clear and it is the best of all arguments for his return.

NEWS SENSE

The knack of Mr. Murrow was to be one jump ahead of the news, to plunge into the hot issue before it really got hot, to prepare the viewer for events that might affect his life or conscience. Today's documentaries are losing their quality. Too many shows are trailing the news by days or weeks and are losing much of their potential impact by being dated. They are following opinion rather than helping to shape it.

While Mr. Murrow basks restlessly in the California sun, Mr. Friendly should give his colleague an assignment. From his recent vantage point in the center of Washington and his knowledge gained from the USIA, it would be fascinating to learn Mr. Murrow's list of priorities for public concern in the months ahead. His immense curiosity, his disciplined feeling for outrage and his fierce independence can continue to be an inspiration to his fellow craftsmen. Broadcasting gave fame and fortune to Mr. Murrow, but it remains in debt to the man.

The 46th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, was the 46th anni-

versary of the independence of the sovereign state of Lithuania.

Today, throughout the entire world, we are concerned with problems of vast international import. This applies to Africa, Asia, South America, and Europe. Faced by existing problems, we tend to forget the plight of those countries that have suffered for many years under Communist tyranny. Lithuania is one of those countries. Lithuania should never be forgotten.

The people of Lithuania enjoyed but a brief period of self-government before they were overwhelmed by Communist tyranny. From 1940 to the present date, the darkness of Soviet oppression has lain heavy on Lithuania. Despite this long oppression the spirit of freedom still lives within that valiant nation.

In the years to come when the whole world will once again be free, when the forces of tyranny in all forms are wiped from the face of the earth, Lithuania and the Lithuanian people will take their place among the free peoples of the earth. Until that day arrives, I pay tribute to the valor, the spirit, and the determination of the Lithuanian people, and wish them an early return to the freedom that was theirs during the period covered by the years between the First and Second World Wars.

I know that the people of Lithuania have not been forgotten by the people of the free world, and I join with them in saluting Lithuania on her independence day.

Lumber Standards Change Could Cripple Our Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a move is now underway by a few giant timber companies to change the size standards of lumber. The crippling effect that this development could have for ports, such as my home port of Boston, is spelled out in an excellent article in the February 2 issue of the Boston Globe. The first two sentences of the article, written by Mr. Earl Banner, explain why this question should be seriously considered by every Member of this body who has a port in his district:

A move by some giants of the lumber business to eliminate so-called green lumber from the American Lumber Standards Code, and still further reduce the dimensions of the prosaic 2 by 4, most commonly used stud in the building trade, could cost the port of Boston more than a quarter of its general cargo imports.

The joker in the proposal is that Government approval of a newer, slimmer 2 by 4 (now only 1⅝ inches by 3⅝ inches, but perhaps soon to be a dainty 1½ inches by 3½ inches) will automatically enrich some of the proponent companies by millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, these giant timber companies should not be permitted to perpetrate such a major economic move under the guise of making technological improvements. At least, this vital economic matter deserves the fullest public airing before any action is taken by the Department of Commerce. In this regard, I am pleased to learn that my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, who is chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution, has announced tentative plans for hearings on the lumber standards issue. I also understand that our beloved Speaker has urged our colleague from California to allow adequate time for the presentation by Massachusetts port interests and wholesale and retail lumber dealers at these hearings. Please be assured, Mr. Speaker, that I will give this matter my fullest support.

At this time, under unanimous consent, I include the Boston Globe article and the press announcement of the hearings by the gentleman from California in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Boton Sunday Globe, Feb. 2, 1964]

LUMBER INDUSTRY MOVE COULD COST PORT PLENTY

(By Earl Banner)

A move by some giants of the lumber business to eliminate so-called green lumber from the American Lumber Standards Code, and still further reduce the dimensions of the prosaic 2 by 4 most commonly used stud in the building trade, could cost the port of Boston more than a quarter of its general cargo imports.

The joker in the proposal is that Government approval of a newer, slimmer 2 by 4 (now only 1⅝ by 3⅝ inches, but perhaps soon to be a dainty 1½ by 3½ inches) will automatically enrich some of the proponent companies by millions of dollars.

National adoption of the proposed new 2 by 4 will automatically increase the number of 2 by 4's in a given log by roughly 10 percent.

"It will amount to a 10-percent boost in inventory, and capital gains that will be counted in the hundreds of millions," one opponent of the proposal contends.

One of the chief proponents of the still slimmer 2 by 4 is the Weyerhaeuser Co., the lumber industry's Goliath whose timber acreage is exceeded only by the Government itself.

This proposed revision of lumber standards, already under consideration by the U.S. Department of Commerce, could dry up the movement of lumber tonnage (more than 100 million board feet last year) from Boston Harbor.

GREEN LUMBER BID

That segment of the industry seeking elimination of green lumber from the American Lumber Standards, presented its proposals to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges in Washington on Friday.

House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and EDWARD M. KENNEDY have asked Secretary Hodges to give equal time to that segment of the national lumber industry opposed to the proposals.

The petition signed by the Bay State's three congressional leaders informed Secretary Hodges they were "particularly anxious to have Mr. Sherman Whipple, president of Wiggin Terminals, Inc., Boston, included in the equal-time meeting with you."

Whipple told the Globe the proposed elimination of all but kiln-dried lumber from the American Lumber Standards would end waterborne shipment of lumber from the west coast.

"All government and large-scale building projects must adhere to American Lumber Standards," Whipple explained. "Elimination of so-called green lumber which simply means it is not kiln dried—would eliminate green lumber from the trade. Kiln-dried lumber cannot be shipped via ships."

Import of green lumber into Boston comprises 26 percent of the port's general cargo imports. Most of the lumber is discharged and stored temporarily out of doors at the big Castle Island terminal.

LUMBER EASTBOUND

Most of the domestic lumber imports received here are carried in ships of either States Marine or Calmar, a subsidiary of the Bethlehem Steel Co.

These carry cargoes of structural steel westbound, and lumber eastbound.

"Unless they can carry lumber eastbound, this last surviving segment of the once-thriving intercoastal trade will die out," Whipple said. "It will be a serious blow to the whole port community."

Other east coast lumber terminals with just as much reason for concern as the port of Boston are at Providence, New Haven and New London, Newark, Brooklyn.

Speaker MCCORMACK also received a request for his services in arranging an equal-time conference with Secretary Hodges from John R. Furman, president of Furman Lumber, Inc., who reported that New England lumber people opposed to the proposed new standards include three firms with combined gross annual sales of over $100 million in the Northeast.

These include Blanchard Lumber, of Walpole, Shepard & Morse, of Boston, and the New England Wholesale Lumber Association (40 wholesalers).

In Washington last week, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, announced aspirant for a Senate seat, wrote to Secretary Hodges relaying complaints he has received about the proposed new 2 by 4.

"In summarizing the contents of the complaints received," wrote ROOSEVELT, "I would say they reduce to five basic issues."

These are, he said:

1. The proposed new standards are discriminatory.

2. The American Lumber Standards Committee proposing these new standards is not broadly representative of the lumbering industry and is dominated by monopolistic interests.

3. The economic impact resulting from the proposed standards will cause hardship on many in the lumber industry, particularly on the smaller business organizations.

4. There has been no demonstration that the proposed changes will be of benefit to the consuming public, whereas there is reportedly evidence to show that the changes will be of considerable benefit to the relatively few motivating proponents of the changes.

5. The conception and promotion of the new standards is in violation of the law.

GRAVELY CONCERNED

"I am gravely concerned about these charges," ROOSEVELT wrote.

"The allegation that the proposed changes are discriminatory stems from the fact that the existing national standards for lumber allow for both dry and green, or unseasoned, lumber, whereas the proposed new standards include sizes for dry lumber only."

"This obviously means that green lumber would be a nonstandard item immediately upon the Department of Commerce's promulgation of the changes as they are now proposed. The significance of this point is underlined by the fact that more than half of all softwood lumber production is green lumber."

ROOSEVELT, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Distribution (under the Committee on Small Business), reported he is receiving communications supported by affidavit and other data which "if correct, indicate a movement is underway by large organizations in the lumber industry which

could ultimately eliminate smaller organizations."

ROOSEVELT informed Hodges, "If hearings appear necessary, it is my intention to open them in California."

[From the office of Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT]

ROOSEVELT TO HOLD LUMBER MEETINGS

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, will meet with California lumber representatives on February 16 and 17 to discuss proposed hearings on size changes in lumber standards.

ROOSEVELT, chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution, has been asked by California timber spokesmen to hold hearings on the controversial proposal which has divided the entire lumber industry.

On Sunday at 11 a.m., at the Beverly-Wilshire Hotel in Los Angeles, ROOSEVELT will meet with wholesale and retail lumber dealers and southern California port interests.

On Monday, February 17, he will meet in San Francisco with northern California lumber producers, manufacturers, and port and shipping interests representing both management and labor. The meeting will be at 2:30 at the Fairmont Hotel.

The issue at stake is a proposal to change the size of nominally 2-inch dry kiln lumber to 1 to 1½ inches, without including comparable size change for unseasoned or green lumber. The larger lumber manufacturers are in favor of the proposed change, while smaller lumber operators are contending that it would put them out of business.

ROOSEVELT said he was considering holding subcommittee hearings in both northern and southern California, on the east coast, and in Washington, D.C. "If we decide to hold hearings, we will want the fullest possible exposition of the facts from both sides," he said. "Commerce Department officials have informed me that this proposal has provoked more mail and more pressure from both sides than any issue to come before them in a long time. Because it so vitally affects both the consuming public and the small businessman, there seems to be a definite need to publicly air the fact of this controversy."

In announcing the meetings, the California Congressman also released the text of a five-page letter he had written to Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, asking that Commerce Department action be delayed until his subcommittee could determine whether hearings are required. The Commerce Department has jurisdiction over standards in lumber sizes.

In his letter, ROOSEVELT informed Hodges that he has received considerable evidence "which, if correct, indicates a movement is underway by large organizations in the lumber industry which could ultimately eliminate smaller organizations."

"This, of course," ROOSEVELT said, "is contrary to the public interest in whose behalf we are both committed to act."

ROOSEVELT said that a summary of the widespread complaints he had received from lumber producers, consumers, wholesale and retail, and shipping interests, boils down to five basic issues. He listed them as follows:

1. The proposed new standards are discriminatory.

2. The American Lumber Standards Committee proposing these new standards is not broadly representative of the lumbering industry and is dominated by monopolistic interests.

3. The economic impact resulting from the proposed standards will bring hardship to many in the lumber industry, particularly to the smaller business organizations.

4. There has been no demonstration that the proposed changes will be of benefit to the consuming public, whereas there is reportedly evidence to show that the changes will be of considerable benefit to the relatively few proponents of the changes.

5. The conception and promotion of the new standards is in violation of the law.

"If any of these charges are true," ROOSEVELT concluded, then the makeup of the American Lumber Standards Committee "would appear to be open to the charge made against it of being a biased committee that is dominated by selfish interests."

The New York State Legislative Program, 1964, Affiliated Young Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to set forth at this point the New York State legislative program for 1964 of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc.

This program was adopted by the above-mentioned organization at their meeting on January 2 at the Hotel Piccadilly in New York City. Although the majority of their legislative aims are under the jurisdiction of the State legislature, I felt that the proposals and recommendations of these Young Democrats would be of interest to my colleagues.

The program follows:

THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1964 OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK, ADOPTED THURSDAY, JANUARY 2, 1964, AT THE HOTEL PICCADILLY, 227 WEST 45TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

The Statewide Legislative Committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York held their meeting last evening, at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City, and unanimously endorsed the following legislation which they will recommend to the State legislature when they convene on January 8, 1964:

"Raise drinking age to 21 years; restrict sales of rifles, shotguns, live ammunition, pig stickers, and modified switch-blades; change permanent personnel registration law in New York City to allow voters who move not to reregister, but write a notarized letter of change of address; vote at 18 years; blind persons allowed to vote by absentee ballot; grand juries right to criticize public officials; more vocational camps, rehabilitation and training centers for youthful offenders; primary election for State officers; legalized off-track betting by referendum; raise minimum wage to $1.50 an hour; permanent spring primary election in June; bonus for Korean veterans; prize fight abolition; free tuition at all municipal institutions of higher education; presidential preference primaries; recodification of the criminal statutes to strengthen rape laws, nonaddict pushers in illegal sale of narcotics for profit, and using knife in any crime of violence; code of ethics; teacher pay raise; more middle income housing; greater State aid for aged, for retarded and handicapped; more State scholarships to encourage students of technical talent; tax incentive to attract new industries; increase State aid for education as to fair share of the taxes; State legislature to ratify the 15th amendment; advocate a printed record be published and made available to the public of full proceedings of State legislature; and reapportionment, so that the 1962 State elections for State senators can be made fair in the future, as then, the Republicans with 2,608,797 votes elected 33 State senators, while the Democrats with 105,409 more votes elected 8 less State senators."

The above legislation will be introduced in the State legislature in January 1964 by our 14 members in the State senate and 29 in State assembly, with Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx, chairman in the assembly, and Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, chairman in the senate.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, presided at this meeting.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, to take part in the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day is to add a stone to that figurative monument to endurance, faith, and the love of freedom which the Lithuanians have erected for themselves over the years. To those who know something of the history of these indomitable people it is not surprising that they bear the torch of liberty through decades of darkened hope and relentless domination.

To some observers it might seem that the years since the 1918 date which we now honor have been as much filled with the darkness of domination as with the all too brief light of liberty; and that the clouds show no sign of lifting. Why then this nostalgic celebration of what is lost and the raising of what appear to be false hopes? Is this not an unkind twisting of a knife in a wound?

To them let it be said that the history of the Lithuanian people bears witness to the triumph through the ages of faith and fortitude. The years since the rebirth of independence in 1918 are but a small part of the long and inspiring story of the Lithuanian people, whose history is known since the Middle Ages. The recorded story of Lithuania as a nation dates from the year 1009. In the next 200 years we find a united state of many principalities under one Christian king. This state, powerful and independent, was to expand its boundaries, its influence, its civilization during succeeding centuries to cover what was later Byelorussian and the Russian S.S.R. A union with Poland through marriage of the heads of state brought together the advanced civilization of central Europe, which was to last politically until 1795. By then the hordes of Eastern Europe had overrun the territory to the east and south of Lithuania's boundaries. Soon they had swallowed Lithuania also. But, like Jonah, Lithuania was to remain unabsorbed. Its civilization, its traditions, its spirit of independence never suc-

cumbed to the vicissitudes of physical domination. Despite all the efforts at russification, the Lithuanian language, religion, and culture were preserved. For nearly a century and a half Russia was able to put down all revolt; but the Lithuanians never lost their goal of renewed independence.

In 1918 that goal was realized. Lithuania was again a nation free and sovereign. Though that freedom was to be again snatched away by the powerful Russian state, now the Soviet Union, Lithuanian independence of spirit could not be overcome. The recrudescence of Russian domination could never succeed in assimilating the Lithuanian culture. It has been kept alive wherever the Lithuanian people are to be found. The basic spirit of independence is as alive as it has been down the centuries. We admire it. We cherish it. We hail it. We find sympathy for it in this land founded on liberty and the love of freedom.

Statement of Policy by Joseph W. Barr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we remember how eloquent and articulate our former colleague Joe Barr used to be on the floor of this House. In his new capacity as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, he has not lost his eloquence. This morning, Joe addressed the Corporation's 330-plus Washington office employees in his first policy declaration. It is a ringing statement casting the Corporation in a new and broadened role to assure the viability and stability of the Nation's economy.

The complete text of the statement follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY BY JOSEPH W. BARR

Three weeks ago after I had been sworn in, President Johnson made a short speech to the audience gathered in the Cabinet room. He told one of his favorite stories about the time in Indianapolis several years ago when he was concluding a speech by urging the audience to seize a matchless opportunity to obtain a great public servant by voting for me. His oratory was superb, but he forgot my name. When I saw that he was groping, I called out in tones that I hoped were subdued, but seemed to echo through the hall, "Barr, Joe Barr." He finally heard me, and I had a recommendation by the then majority leader of the Senate. (I also was elected.)

There is a sequel to this story which the President does not tell. Before he left town he asked me to call him in Texas the minute the polls closed. I called him to inform him that I had been elected; he congratulated me briefly and then told me to stand by for a call the next morning. At 10 a.m. the next day one of his senior staff members called to tell me precisely how to begin a congressional career. During the next few months, I saw Senator Johnson frequently for help and advice. His advice was simple: "Determine for yourself how you can be most useful. I will help you get in a position where you can make your best contribution."

President Johnson has a wide reputation for being effective with the Congress. Oddly enough, I never see any perceptive analyses of "Why." In my opinion his strength lies in two directions. To those Senators senior to him who gave him the responsibility of majority leader, his strength lies in their knowledge that he discharged his duties well and faithfully. To those Senators, and Congressmen like myself, who were juniors to him, his strength lies in their knowledge that he gave them a chance to do their best. I am going to try to imitate both of those attributes.

This Corporation was born in desperate days. In 1931, 2,293 commercial banks with $1.7 billion in deposits failed. The next year there were 1,453 bank failures with $706 million in deposits and for 1933 the total was a shocking 4,000 banks—with total deposits of more than $3.5 billion.

This tidal wave of bank failures destroyed public confidence in the commercial banking system and its demand deposits which constituted at that time about two-thirds of the money supply of the country. Recovery was impossible unless public confidence in demand deposits and in the banking system was restored.

The Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 established this Corporation and was unquestionably the single most important factor in restoring the viability of the Nation's deposit currency. There were no mile-long parades such as that which kicked off the NRA. The Corporation began quietly under the aegis of Mr. Walter J. Cummings, who certainly did not compare in dramatic or forensic ability with some of the more colorful early New Deal figures. But the Corporation's success has been little short of incredible. Bank failures are almost unknown. The possibility of losing money in a failed bank does not occur to an American citizen. The possibility of a sharp and sudden contraction in the money supply resulting from a wave of bank failures is a factor which the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury no longer take into account in their respective areas of money and debt management.

As a matter of fact the success of the Corporation is almost embarrassing. Let none of us think that we can rest secure and complacent in this lovely building on top of our almost $3 billion in assets.

My favorite lines from the speeches of the late President John F. Kennedy are these: "We are on the side of the hill, not the top. The absence of war is not peace. The absence of recession is not growth." This is the way that I view the posture of this Corporation. The horror of thousands of bank failures is behind us and I intend to devote sufficient time to our problems of regulation and examination to see that it stays behind us. But our demand deposits and our money supply face less apparent but nonetheless real challenges.

The Secretary of the Treasury faces a daily struggle to reduce and eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit. Anything that I can do, or that this Corporation can do, to assist him in his efforts, should be done without hesitation.

The President, as he guides our foreign policy in a troubled and turbulent world, may also have use for the nonfinancial resources of this Corporation in the support of the international financial institutions which we have helped to create.

Finally, President Johnson has declared war on poverty. This attack will be of necessity complicated, tedious, and demanding. However, this Corporation will not shrink from any responsibility in this area which the President may wish to delegate to us.

Neither I nor this Corporation has the competence to move in all areas of public policy and we shall not attempt to do so. But in those areas which contain a present or potential threat to our economy, we shall not hesitate to move if our help is needed. In addition to our regulatory and examination duties, we act in this Corporation as trustee for nearly $3 billion in assets of the American people. Surely our responsibility as trustees runs to more than petty bickering over details of regulatory policy.

In the past 10 days I have watched over 500 men and women, the Congress of the United States, work their way through many intricacies and controversies surrounding taxes and civil rights. Surely if they can resolve national differences in these terribly troubled and complex areas, then three men, the Chairman of this Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, can sit together and reason together about the differences that divide the commercial banking community. If we cannot, then I believe that the Congress is perfectly justified in firing us all and starting over again either with new men or a new system.

I invite you to join me in a climb up "the side of the hill." I make you only one promise—the same promise that President Johnson gave to me—the promise that I will give each of you the chance to do his best.

February the Month of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article by Joe Martin, executive secretary of the American Veterans' Press Association, in the Southwest Messenger Press of February 6, 1964, as follows:

VETS PRESS

(By Joe Martin)

Throughout the broad expanse of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary, the month of February is observed as Americanism Month, a period of rededication to our democratic form of government. It is also a time to review the accomplishments of posts and units in this area.

It is appropriate that special emphasis on Americanism should be placed in the month of February, the birthdays of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—two of our greatest Presidents whose exemplary lives personified the principles of the American way of life.

The characteristic which distinguishes our form of government from others is the recognition of the truth that the inherent and fundamental rights of men are derived from God and not from governments, dictators, or majorities.

These inaliable rights, which are the gift of man from his Creator, are freedom of worship; freedom of speech; freedom of the press; freedom of assemblage; freedom to work in such occupation as the experience, training and qualifications of man may enable him to secure and hold; freedom to enjoy the fruits of his work, which means the protection of property rights; and the rights to pursue his happiness so long as he does not harm others in the pursuit of his happiness.

Upon these basic principles, the whole structure of our form of government was established by our forefathers.

Americanism is love of America, loyalty to her institutions as the best yet devised by man to secure life, liberty, individual dignity and happiness; and the willingness to defend our flag against all enemies; foreign and domestic.

Americanism is a vital, active living force. Americanism means peace, strength, the will and the courage to live as free men in a free land. It means a friendly hand to people everywhere who respect our way of thinking. It is not a word; it is a cause, a way of life, a challenge and a hope in this world of turmoil.

Americanism is an ideal of loyal patriotism, religious tolerance, righteous freedom, fearless courage, honest integrity, abiding faith in the commanding destiny of the United States, and a fathomless love for the principles which led our forefathers to found this country.

Americanism is unqualified loyalty to the ideals of government set forth in the Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. It is freedom without license, religion without bigotry, charity without bias or race hatred, love of flag and a readiness to defend that for which it stands against every alien and subversive influence from without or within.

Finally, it s a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, 1746-1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the unrelenting efforts and untold sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Yet others, not native of this country, but gallant fighters for the cause of liberty, contributed significantly to its success. Tadeusz Kosciuszko of Poland, a dauntless and gifted soldier of freedom, was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marked him as a great hero of his day.

Each year at this time we recall the great contribution he made to the victory that led to the founding of this Nation and which gave us the liberty we now enjoy.

Kosciuszko brought to a struggling nation not only military skill, but a spirit that served to encourage the men of a greatly outnumbered, and outequipped army. As an engineer he brought know-how that helped in building the essential fortifications. His advice and counsel were of immeasurable assistance to the commanders of our Continental Army.

Following the end of the War for Independence, Kosciuszko, not content with having contributed so much to the cause of our freedom, returned to his native Poland to fight against the Russian imperialists in 1792. He was imprisoned by the Russians. When freed he returned to the United States, the Congress having voted him money and land.

It was so in character of the great man that he used part of what the Congress had given him to found one of the first Negro schools in America.

Returning to Poland, again in 1798, he was hopeful that his nation might regain its own independence. He died without having seen this come about.

The memory of his deeds, his long fight for liberty, are to this day an inspiration to men everywhere who cherish freedom. The people of his native land still are not free. They live under Soviet domination, still denied the freedom for which Kosciuszko fought on two continents.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Business Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last Monday in a speech before the National League of Insured Savings Associations in Washington, I said that unless this Congress, in the most prosperous year of our national history, put the brakes on deficit financing, we would eventually experience the type of inflation that has wrecked the economy of a nation with perhaps, the greatest natural resources of any in the world; namely, Brazil.

It is significant that the splendid paper called American Banker published in its issue of that day an article by an outstanding economist, J. A. Livingston, entitled "Business Outlook." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of that statement.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Restraint is unpopular. It is fashionable for Congressmen and college professors to berate the Federal Reserve Board for apprehensions about the deterioration of credit.

This is understandable. In the midst of prosperity, he who suggests that prosperity always seeds its own destruction becomes a party pooper. I'd rather note the risk beforehand than to write about the consequences afterward as Washington Irving did, thus:

"Every now and then the world is visited by one of those delusive seasons when 'the credit system,' as it is called, expands to full luxuriance; everybody trusts everybody; a bad debt is a thing unheard of; the broad way to certain and sudden wealth lies plain and open, and men are tempted to dash forward boldly.

"Promissory notes * * * are liberally discounted at the banks, which become so many mints to coin words into cash; and as the supply of words into cash; and as the supply of words is inexhaustible, a vast amount of promissory capital is soon in circulation. Everyone now talks in thousands; nothing is heard but gigantic operations in trade, great purchases and sales of real property, and immense sums made at every transfer.

"All, to be sure, yet exists only in promise; but the believer in promises calculates the aggregate as solid capital, and falls back in amazement at the amount of public wealth, the 'unexampled state of public prosperity.'

"Could this delusion always last, the life of a merchant would indeed be a golden dream; but it is as short as it is brilliant. Let but a doubt enter, and the 'season of unexampled prosperity' is at an end. * * * The promissory capital begins to vanish in smoke. * * * The whole superstructure, built upon credit and reared by speculation, crumbles to the ground. * * * 'It is such stuff as dreams are made on.' "

Cyprus and Makarios

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, today's news continues to bring us reports of a deepening crisis on the island of Cyprus, with sporadic fighting and ominous danger signs. The crisis is also the subject of a special session of the United Nations.

It behooves us to inform ourselves on the complexities of the problem. Before we can persuade, we must first understand.

First, the island of Cyprus must be pacified. This will be exceedingly difficult. Then a political solution must be found. This will be even more difficult. It is vitally important that an armed clash between the two NATO partners, Greece and Turkey, be averted. Such a clash could unhinge the free world position in the Eastern Mediterranean. Moreover, it is necessary that the inherent tragedy of further bloodletting between the two ancient rivals be stopped.

The situation is explosive, not only on the island, but in Greece and Turkey. It is often overlooked that there is a substantial Greek population in Turkey, mostly in Istanbul and Asia Minor, and a smaller Turkish population in Greece, mostly in western Thrace and Rhodes. They may become the victims of a spillover of Cypriot passions.

Some of the best interpretive writing on the Eastern Mediterranean is being done by Peter Marudas, a young reporter for the Baltimore Sun. He is from Detroit, Mich., and a graduate of the University of Michigan. His parents are constituents of mine. His incisive article, "The Role of Makarios," appeared in the February 11, 1964, issue of the Baltimore Sun. I commend it to my colleagues. Under unanimous consent, the article follows:

THE ROLE OF MAKARIOS

(By Peter N. Marudas)

Since the advent of the current crisis on Cyprus, it has become increasingly clear to America and her allies that the chief stumbling block to a peaceful solution of the island's communal difficulties is the seeming intransigence of Archbishop Makarios, Cypriot Republic president.

The 50-year-old prelate, spiritual and political leader of the island's 500,000-strong Greek population, has stubbornly opposed American and British proposals providing that NATO forces be stationed on the embattled island to prevent further hostilities between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

It is the archbishop who, contrary to American desires, has repeatedly insisted that any peace-keeping force be controlled by the United Nations Security Council, and he only among the negotiating parties in London refuses to support the Anglo-American position.

Both the Greek and Turkish Governments, just recently near war over Cyprus, and even the Turkish Cypriot leadership have begrudgingly agreed to NATO intervention. The bearded ethnarch stands alone in opposition.

The question which disturbs many Western observers is what motivates the archbishop's seemingly anti-Western stance. Is he, as his critics contend, purposely seeking to introduce Russian influence into the crisis by throwing the matter into the Security Council where the Soviets can use an obstructionist veto? Or is he deliberately placating militant Greek Cypriots, both left and right, by adopting a tough negotiating position.

In the past, the American-educated religious leader has been portrayed by critics as another Rasputin, an intriguer and terrorist operating under the cassock and the cloth. His admirers call him a responsible leader truly attempting to govern fairly and effectively on an island pockmarked by ethnic strife.

Unquestionably the archbishop's refusal to comply with Anglo-American demands has prevented quick solution to the current crisis. On the other hand, it is clear that what constitutes an equitable solution is a question of strong disagreement between him and Western policymakers.

Some points concerning the archbishop's policy seem to require clarification and explanation.

The contention that he sympathizes with Soviet aims in the Eastern Mediterranean can, of course, be dismissed immediately. As a Greek Orthodox churchman, Makarios harbors a traditional mistrust for communism, a fear in some Orthodox circles which borders on extreme distrust.

However, as a political leader seeking to influence the destiny of his nation as well as gain immediate policy advantages, the prospect of Soviet influence or its imminent threat may appeal to him as an inviting counterbalance to American and British power. This technique, certainly not novel, has been successfully employed by many neutralist nations including Makarios' neighbors, Egypt and Yugoslavia. It should not be overlooked that the archbishop was in attendance at the last neutralist conference held in Yugoslavia.

The assertion that his resistance to American proddings is dictated by internal political difficulties resulting from extremist pressure appears to possess some degree of validity. But the actual influence of the supposedly large Communist Party operating on Cyprus, and exclusively within Greek Cypriot ranks, seems exaggerated.

True, the party is one of the island's larger political groupings and it controls Cyprus' biggest trade union, but by their own admission local leftwingers have an actual following smaller than is generally believed. The union, the Panycyprian Federation of Labor, is plagued by worker apathy and a remarkable record of financial nonsupport from members.

A potentially greater threat to Makarios' moderation comes from the right, as represented by national hero George Grivas, who led the terrorist organization EOKA during 5 years of bloody guerrilla warfare against the British. Although loosely organized,

rightwing extremists are active and are in contact with Grivas, now residing in Athens under the watchful eye of the Greek Government.

As with any political leader, Archbishop Makarios must be judged on past performance and future policy aims.

A review of Cyprus' strife-torn history during the past 10 years recalls that the politically oriented prelate was always in the forefront of the Enosis—union—movement seeking integration of Cyprus into the Greek nation. From the early 1950's the archbishop has dominated Greek Cypriot political activity, and has become that group's chief international spokesman.

After more than 7 years of terrorism by both Greek and Turkish Cypriots, an agreement was reached in London in 1960, with England, Greece, and Turkey guaranteeing Cyprus' independence as a sovereign nation-state. The concord was signed by Makarios most reluctantly, under extreme pressure from London and Washington.

Prior to the London agreement, Makarios had carried the Greek Cypriot cause for self-determination to the United Nations, where it received strong General Assembly support but faded away due to American indifference and Turko-English opposition.

The United States, caught in the hassle of three NATO members—Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey—dashed Makarios' hopes for union, and pushed the London treaty which called for independence and placement of troop detachments on Cyprus from the three concerned powers.

The archbishop, recognized by friend and foe as a shrewd politician, has not forgotten the cold shoulder he received in 1960 from NATO and its American leader. Undoubtedly, he also recalls the cordial reception lavished on him in the United Nations by representatives of the small nations.

It is notable then that Makarios has not only unilaterally denounced the London agreement but demands that any future police force be predicated on the pullout of all Greek and Turkish military contingents. It is believed that he will accept English and American units. This seems unavoidable since the British already maintain 2 military installations on the island and currently have an approximate 3,000 men engaged in keeping the peace.

Stubbornly, however, Makarios insists that the United Nations control any police mission, regardless of its makeup.

From what one can glean from the archbishop's public admissions, he and his advisers have shelved any idea of union with Greece. He, like leaders in mainland Greece, seems resigned to a Greek-dominated Cyprus, remaining in the British Commonwealth, yet independent in foreign policy.

The archbishop may be accused of precipitating current violence by seeking changes in the Constitution, not only prohibited by the London accord but adamantly opposed by the island's Turkish community. The changes, which would have essentially strengthened the President's hand, were proclaimed by Makarios as necessary for modern and effective government. The Turks called the move a plot to deprive them of privileges guaranteed by the Allied Powers. When Makarios continued his push for change the Turks reacted violently as did the Greeks in return.

Thus if we can take the archbishop at his word he seems genuinely interested in creating a viable national and sovereign state on Cyprus, divorced from either Greek or Turkish dominance. This, he claims, is the reasoning behind abrogating the London agreement, in favor of a more flexible document.

As one writer has described the archbishop's dilemma: "His (Makarios') point was always that the country simply could not be run that way. He sought to amend the Constitution but this was in itself unconstitutional and was in any case blocked by the Turkish veto."

The archbishop's double-barreled strategy seems directed at nullifying the Constitution imposed on him by the London agreement and reasserting his nation's badly shaken sovereignty by introduction of a United Nations police force rather than a contingent from NATO, an alliance with which Cyprus has no affiliation except through the guarantee powers.

Understandably, the United States and Great Britain have tried to limit the issue to the Western alliance and to prevent war between Turkey and Greece over Cyprus. Makarios admittedly will not endorse such a policy and contends that United Nations presence is required since his nation is a member of that international body. And he is apparently willing to risk Russian influence in the Security Council to attain this end.

Cypriot sources indicate the archbishop is not happy with his current unpopularity in the United States, most of it occasioned by unsolicited Russian support for his position. But he now appears determined to let the diplomatic chips fall where they may.

It is undeniable that during the past month the Allies have made some modest concessions to Makarios. They have agreed that a NATO-dominated police detachment could include troops from other European but nonalliance nations such as Sweden. And although refusing to withdraw Greek and Turkish units, Anglo-American diplomats have suggested they be assigned functions unrelated to peacekeeping.

More important is the tentative agreement by the United States and Great Britain in some type of Security Council supervision of the proposed peacekeeping force in Cyprus.

Meanwhile, the archbishop's initiatives at influencing world opinion have not gone unrewarded. Premier Khrushchev has strongly supported his stand with a strong warning against NATO meddling. Archbishop Makarios has also received support from former colonies sympathetic with his battle against the Western powers.

At this point it is still debatable whether the Cypriot leader's negotiating position will pay off in concrete advantages. And the question still remains: If the Allies should give in to his demands, will the Turkish Cypriots and their protectors in Ankara stand by idly watching the archbishop pull off a diplomatic coup de grace?

Whether the archbishop's policy will, over the long term, be beneficial to Cyprus is a matter of opinion. One thing is sure. He is determined this time to play the major role in deciding the island's future political development, as he was not able to do in 1960.

The World Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the St. Augustine Record.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural abundance is one of the greatest blessings that we have in America. Too often, we emphasize the problems connected with the efficiency of the American farmer, and we do not pay tribute to his efficiency and to the consecration that he has given to his job of producing the food and fiber necessary not only to feed this country, but to help hungry peoples throughout the world.

The problem of food is certainly the most important problem facing the world today. We in America are, indeed, blessed by agricultural abundance. I am pleased to submit here a very interesting editorial which appeared in the St. Augustine Record, St. Augustine, Fla., on January 31, 1964, which emphasizes the magnitude of the world food problem:

THE WORLD FOOD PROBLEM

America for a great many years has been plagued by a unique problem—where to store all the food that we grow, cannot eat, and cannot sell. By contrast, most of the countries around the world already face a chronic shortage of food supplies. And if population growth continues at the present rate, they will move inexorably closer to the hard reality of starvation itself.

An official study recently completed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture confirms what has been a growing worry in the minds of many of the world's leaders—that unless some presently unforeseen breakthrough occurs, world food production can no longer keep up with the explosive growth in the number of the world's people.

Commenting on this study, U.S. News & World Report observes that, "In the foreseeable future, famine looms as a prospect that can become more serious than the threat of nuclear war. Unless a way soon is found to control the problem of worldwide population explosion, starvation will take over as a partial solution to that problem."

The facts of the Department of Agriculture report are startling. Grain provides most of the energy in human diet, either directly or through its use as feed in the production of meat, poultry, and dairy products. Two-thirds of the world's people live in Latin America and in Asia, and in these areas, with the exception of the U.S.S.R., output of grain per person from the mid-1930's to 1961 has fallen. It has decreased 2 percent in Asia and 16 percent in Latin America. Starting from a low level of production, output of grain per person in Eastern Europe, Russia, and Africa has increased only slightly during the same period. As things now stand, just three areas containing but one-fifth of the world's people have the capability of producing a food supply sufficient to meet the needs of their growing populations in future years. These are Australia-New Zealand, North America, and Western Europe, where grain output per person from the mid-1930's to 1961 has increased respectively 51, 44, and 19 percent.

At the present time, grain exports from Canada and the United States are the primary barrier against famine in vast areas of the world. For 3 years, Canadian grain has been a major prop sustaining Communist China. Exports from the United States are now helping to meet a crisis in Russia and are holding back hunger in Pakistan, India, South Korea, and many nations of Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

The Agriculture Department survey indicates that grain surpluses in the United States and Canada available for export will increase sharply in the years ahead, but that this supply can be expected to meet only a fraction of the world's needs.

One clear impression emerges from all this. If the human race is to escape the Malthusian prediction that increases in world population would inevitably lead to mass starvation, there must be a concerted effort to turn the best in technology and research toward achieving new and more efficient methods of producing the sustenance by which man lives.

This is indeed a formidable challenge for less developed areas of the world. Raising their food production capabilities involves, not only capital investment of huge proportions, but a vastly accelerated advance of their people into the modern world. Productive agriculture such as we know in the United States is not easy of achievement. It rests upon an exceedingly broad base of technical know-how, education, and industrial capability making available the machinery, the specialized feeds and seeds, and the chemicals to enrich the land and control crop destroying diseases and pests.

Only through careful but intensive use of all these factors can man hope to tip the balance of nature in his favor, and perhaps tap as yet unknown sources of food production. He may reach the stars, but it looks as if his toughest job in the foreseeable future will be learning to feed himself on earth.

Edmund L. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert therein an editorial from the Carroll County Times. This editorial mourns the death of Edmund L. Carr, county commissioner of Carroll County. Mr. Carr exemplifies the highest type of dedicated public servant. Although he represented the Republican minority on the board of county commissioners, the other commissioners testified to his cooperation with them which produced constructive action on behalf of Carroll County, Md. I am delighted to include this well-deserved tribute to Mr. Carr in the RECORD:

EDMUND L. CARR

Edmund L. Carr, county commisisoner, Carroll County, has returned to his Maker.

With his passing, the county has lost an outstanding man of character and loyalty and a dedicated public servant. Mr. Carr will definitely be missed and it will not be an easy task to fill his shoes.

In mourning the loss of the Republican minority member of the board of county commissioners, President Horace S. Brauning, Sr., and Francis Crawford, both Democrats, noted: "We learned to appreciate his views and judgments as a county commissioner and considered him a most dedicated person. Certainly his loss will be felt by the members of this board." What finer tribute could be paid a man.

Planning Director George A. Grier said, "I have had the privilege of working for many boards of county commissioners over the past 15 years. Mr. Carr was, in my mind, one of the most dedicated, conscientious, and able public servants I have had the opportunity to be associated with in those years. His loss to Carroll County will be felt by all of us."

The public official and the man on the street all felt the same way—"Mr. Carr was a well-loved man and a dedicated public servant," they said. This recognition reached into the house of delegates, now in session, which passed a resolution expressing sympathy on Mr. Carr's death.

As president of the board for 4 years and as a commissioner for another 5 years, Mr. Carr was always kind, considerate, and compassionate of the public's need for services.

"His constant personal attention and steadfast desire to please will remain in the hearts and minds of many Carroll County friends," is the way Chamber Manager J. Howard West put it.

County Treasurer Paul Bonsack pointed out Mr. Carr's interest in "all phases of public business" and "he put the welfare of his county first."

Mr. Carr was admired and respected by all who knew him. He was admired by Republicans and Democrats alike. In the 4 years that we knew Ed Carr we heard nothing derogatory concerning his public and personal life.

An active businessman—he was coowner of Carr's Department Store in Manchester—Commissioner Carr was active in community and church affairs. He was on numerous boards and commissions and was active on all.

Only 3 weeks prior to his death Chamber Manager West and we visited the commissioner in his fine Manchester home and discussed many county problems. It was a good feeling to know that we had been able to spend so much time with him in a constructive way.

Mr. Carr had been stricken at his desk last October and was confined in the Carroll County General Hospital for several months. He was well on the road to recovery and had told us that he would return to his desk shortly.

With his untimely passing, Carroll County and the State of Maryland have lost a great friend and a highly dedicated public servant.

How One Small Businessman Saw Through the Billie Sol Estes Bamboozle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, we have not heard the name Billie Sol Estes in some time, but I believe many of us in Congress and throughout the Nation still are amazed, but not amused by the way he managed to bamboozle Government agencies and amass a sizable fortune in the process.

Recently, in Hastings, Mich., in my home district, a very interesting letter came to light. Written by Mr. Richard Groos, president of a relatively small industrial firm, the letter shows how one private businessman, using information available to anyone—including the Government—was able to see through the Estes bubble when it was first beginning to expand, 8 years ago.

The text of Mr. Groos' letter, together with able comment by Mr. Richard Cook, editor of the Hastings Banner, is well worth reading by anyone who was puzzled, as I was, by the Estes affair.

The article containing this interesting letter follows:

BILLIE SOL ESTES DIDN'T IMPRESS HASTINGS MAN

Eight years ago, a glib, fast-talking Texan by the name of Billie Sol Estes was in process of parlaying his way to a sprawling paper empire founded on misrepresentation and "hot air." He not only flimflammed many a businessman but Government agencies as well.

Indirectly, all of us helped to inflate Billie's paper balloon via Federal tax dollars that were unwillingly tossed down the drain.

In view of all this, a letter dictated by Richard A. Groos on November 29, 1956, is of real significance. Brought to light recently while in process of moving the Tyden Corp. office from its old location on Mill Street to the new plant on West State, it reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 29, 1956.

Subject: Billie Sol Estes, Pecos, Tex., (Farmers Storage Co. of Sudan).

Mr. J. R. DAVENPORT,
Texas Automatic Sprinkler Corp.,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. DAVENPORT: In accordance with our telephone conversation I am returning to you herewith, all the papers, financial report, and Dun's report on the above.

As explained to you on the telephone we do not believe that we can handle this contract as it does not provide for the usual downpayment.

There are other conditions that we do not understand, for instance, Mr. Estes' financial statement shows, liabilities of $426,000. The Dun's report shows liabilities between $1 million and $1,500,000. Also his statements show assets totaling over $370,000, located in Pecos, Blytheville, Ark., and Spokane, Wash. None of these companies are listed in our latest Dun's book with the exception of the Verhalen Mercantile Co. at Pecos, which is listed from $50,000 to $75,000 fair, or third grade. These corporations are larger than average size and it seems rather surprising to us that they would not be listed and rated by Dun's.

Mr. Estes is 31 years old according to the Dun's report. His assets are spread all over the country. He must be quite a promoter to be in so many activities. If anything happened to him it would create quite a problem.

For these reasons we do not think it advisable for us to handle this contract.

Very truly yours,

VIKING EQUIPMENT CO.,
R. A. GROOS,
President.

Mr. Groos, of course, is as interested in making a profit as any businessman should be—since, without profits our free enterprise system wouldn't be free for very long.

However, by using information available to anyone, he concluded that the facts did not aline with the claims, so, he questioned the soundness of Estes Enterprises, concluded that the chance for loss far outweighed the prospects for a reasonable gain and turned the deal down, thereby saving his company from a deal that would have ended on the "red ink" side of the ledger.

If Government agencies had displayed a similar degree of commonsense, the Billie Sol Estes balloon would never have been lifted from the ground and, without the prestige of Federal support, perhaps businessmen would not have been so easily fooled.

Panama Canal: Political Dawn for Panamanian Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in the endless news stories and editorials that

have appeared, and are still appearing, since the January 9, 1964, Panamanian mob assault on the Canal Zone there has evolved a clear picture: The Panama Canal has become a pawn for Panamanian politicians.

As the most recent evidence of this, I include as part of my remarks an informative news story by Dan Kurzman in the February 13, 1964, issue of the Washington Post:

CANDIDACY OF ARNULFO ARIAS HELPS TO EXPLAIN DEADLOCK OVER CANAL ISSUE

(By Dan Kurzman)

Submerged in the passions of the Panama drama is a little publicized development that both helps to explain the present diplomatic deadlock over the canal issue and contains the seeds of a future Panamanian political explosion.

On January 4, 5 days before the riots broke out between Panamanian nationalists and American Canal Zone residents, a man with thick black hair, a thin mustache, and cold steely eyes stood on a platform in Panama City and shouted high-pitched phrases that sent an adoring crowd of almost 50,000 into wild delirium.

The man was Arnulfo Arias, who had twice been President of Panama—in 1940–41 and 1949–51. Now Arnulfo, as he is called, was throwing his hat in the presidential ring once more. He would run in the election scheduled for May, he told the huge, cheering throng that had turned out to welcome the decision.

HAD PART IN RIOTS

Oddly, many who cheered the loudest had participated in riots that had ousted him from office in the past because of his Nazi tendencies. But now all was forgotten. For Arnulfo, like Hitler, Mussolini, Castro, and other demogogs, has a hypnotic way with people.

This fact was not lost on President Roberto Chiari and other members of the ruling oligarchy who have traditionally run Panama like a privately owned enterprise.

When the canal storm broke, therefore, they viewed all the more politically necessary an unbending attitude toward the United States in line with popular nationalist sentiment.

And indeed, Arnulfo has been placed in a somewhat embarrassing position. For before the violence, he had committed himself to a pro-American attitude, reportedly for opportunistic reasons. His opponents charge that one of these reasons lies in financial support from U.S. businessmen in Panama who view his strongarm approach as the answer to communism.

Stuck with his pro-Americanism, Arnulfo, has since the riots, blamed the Chiari government more for the current mess than he has the United States. A measure of his popularity is that this stand does not appear to have hurt him much.

Some American officials in Panama, grateful for a refreshingly moderate voice in the midst of nationalist fanaticism, have indicated they would not be entirely unhappy if Arnulfo won the election.

"Democracy can be carried too far in some underdeveloped countries," one U.S. diplomat remarked when reminded of Arnulfo's totalitarian background. In any case, he has probably changed, say these officials. Yet, Arnulfo himself appears to disagree. At the January 4 meeting, he expressed, not repentence for the past, but magnanimously enough, forgiveness of those who had ousted his previous regimes.

"We forgive," he shrilled. "We are Christians and must forgive. * * * The only judge who acquits or convicts is the people. And your enthusiastic presence here shows that others stand convicted nationally and we are democratically acquitted."

Thus did Arnulfo, who had served as a diplomat in Nazi Germany in the 1930's, declare himself innocent of any wrongdoing when, mimicking Hitler's style, he confiscated the property of Chinese Panamanians, denationalized Panamanians of West Indian origin, prohibited the arming of Allied ships flying the Panama flag during the war, and introduced in 1941 a Nazi-style constitution.

Arias was overthrown the first time about 2 weeks before Pearl Harbor by a pro-American group in his cabinet, reportedly with behind-the-scenes U.S. support.

When, in 1949, he regained the Presidency after a disputed election, a U.S. State Department official described his seizure of power as a shocking and most serious blow to the good neighbor policy.

BARRED FOR LIFE

In 1951, after Armulfo tried to reestablish his Nazi-style 1941 constitution by decree, a popular uprising again deposed him, and the National Assembly voted unanimously to bar him from public office for life.

But with Arias regaining popularity, President Chiari (whom Arnulfo had replaced as President in 1949) had this ban lifted in the hope that Arnulfo would back his party in the coming election. Typically, Arias inaugurated a political movement of his own which has relentlessly attacked the Chiari government.

Why is Arnulfo so popular? His extraordinary personal charm is one reason. But another is that he is the only strong candidate who promises to fight the entrenched oligarchy, as symbolized by Chiari, that has been so reluctant to press for social reforms. Arnulfo is offering the people the grandiose promises usually made by the Communists, but without the communism. In other words, a refitted fascism.

And the Panamanian people, longing for reform whatever the brand name, are listening to his promises—to the horror of Chiari and company, who are desperately clinging to the Canal Zone dispute in the hope of papering over their unattractive public image.

The Rovner Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an extraordinary proposal by Edward H. Rovner, of Philadelphia, to help meet the unemployment problem in his area and, at the same time, the security problem at Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba. He suggests that President Johnson hire locally unemployed persons to fill vacancies at Guantanamo resulting from the dismissal of native Cubans by White House order.

Mr. Rovner, I might note, is the Republican candidate for Congress from Pennsylvania's Fifth District.

I call this plan to the attention of the House, because it appears to be an idea with merit.

The text of the release on the Rovner plan follows:

THE ROVNER PLAN

A Philadelphia labor leader called upon President Johnson today to hire local unemployed to fill vacancies at the Guantanamo Naval Base resulting from the dismissal of native Cubans by White House order.

Edward H. Rovner (Waiter's Union Local 434 AFL–CIO), pointed out that many of the dismissed Cubans held unskilled or semi-skilled jobs and this type of employment is so urgently needed by Philadelphia's unemployed.

Rovner, Republican candidate for Congress in the Fifth Pennsylvania District, is conducting his campaign on what he terms "bread and butter" issues. An Executive order by the President for an intensive recruitment program in the Philadelphia area would aid the area's economy by getting these people off unemployment and relief rolls and back into productive channels.

"It is heartbreakig to see the erosion of the human spirit after long periods of unemployment," Rovner said, and added:

"But it is most gratifying to see how these workers pick themselves up once they are given even the slightest opportunity to get off the dole and to provide once more for their families."

In his telegram to the President, Rovner pointed out that "Government apparatus to carry out such a plan is already in being. The Pennsylvania State Employment Service is well equipped and qualified to carry out such a humanitarian program."

The GOP congressional candidate also recommended that the Government provide transportation and housing for Philadelphians and their families hired for these jobs.

"It is obvious that persons unemployed for any length of time cannot finance a major, long-distance move such as involved here," he wired.

In addition to Guantanamo, Rovner also suggested American labor be given preference in other international projects underwritten by America taxes. He suggested the Canal Zone as another prime example of where American labor should be given preference over local workers of questionable loyalty.

Farm Programs: Profit Weighed Against Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, in a February 5 editorial attaching the President's farm message, repeated its now familiar pleas for what it terms a return to the "free marketing system."

The Journal never defines this system, but invariably indicates it is something we can achieve only by going backward. There was, the Journal intimates, a golden age of freedom for farmers in our past that must be relocated and revived. And it usually makes the abandonment of existing programs for supporting the price of farm commodities the first step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, this Journal is widely read in the Nation's business community. In casually casting aside programs for farm commodity price support, it gives no attention to the distress this solution to the farm problem would cause in both rural and urban areas of the Nation.

In recent years, as a result of technological advances, there has been a migra-

tion of farm people to towns and cities. There is another form of migration from the land to the city, however, and that is the movement of farm-earned dollars.

If the Journal wants to throw farm programs out the window it should, in all fairness, warn its most constant readers—the industrialists and businessmen and stock traders—that they would share the cost of such an action and the cost would run well into the billions of dollars.

A recent study by the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Economic Development shows net farm income would drop by $5.7 billion—from $13.3 billion in 1962 to $7.6 billion in 1967—without national programs to stabilize prices and production of feed grains and wheat.

The $5 billion loss is tied to the abandonment of only the feed grains and wheat programs—the losses would mount even higher as dairy, cotton, tobacco, peanut and conservation cost-sharing programs were discarded.

Five billion dollars will buy long caravans of cars, trucks and tractors; will buy thousands of refrigerators, TV receivers and other home appliances and furnishings; will buy rack after rack of clothing and box after box of shoes; will build and remodel homes, and provide jobs in the factories and mills of cities and towns and for the building trades.

Where will the industrialists, the businessmen, the factory workers go to find a substitute for these billions of dollars?

The Wall Street Journal was founded in 1882.

In 1882 one American farmer produced enough food for himself and five others. Today 1 American farmer produces enough food for himself and 28 others. The skills of our farmers, and the productivity of our farms, have made their greatest gains in the years since the early 1930's—years marked by farmer-Government cooperation in efforts to improve farm income. As recently as 1930 the number of persons supplied per farmworker was slightly less than 10. Between 1940 and 1960 there was a gain of more than 15 in the number of persons provided with food by a single farmer—from 10 to 25. Such progress does not occur where free enterprise, free competition and freedom for decision-making by the individual are prohibited.

I don't know what percentage of disposable income American families had to invest in food back in 1882. But as recently as 1939 consumers were spending 22.3 percent of their disposable incomes for food. In the war years the figure went up to nearly 27 percent. In the 1960's it has been around 19 percent.

In 1963, American families had $403 billion of spending money and they used only 19 percent of it—$77 billion—for the purchase of food. In 1948, 15 years earlier, they were spending 25.5 percent of their disposable income for food. If they had been required to spend the same percentage of their 1963 income for food as they did in 1948, their grocery bill would have been $103 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest part of this saving of $26 billion in 1963 in the cost of food to American consumers must be attributed to the dramatic increase in efficiency in agricultural production and marketing.

Does anyone believe that a substantial part of this increased efficiency should not be attributed to Government programs? Government research has shown the way to more abundance and more efficient production. Price supports and other assistance to farmers have given them the assurance of stability that is necessary to effective planning and the incomes with which to purchase the machinery, equipment, and technological supplies that have brought about this increased efficiency.

Even if there is subtracted from the $26 billion saving to consumers in 1963 the full amount of the Department of Agriculture appropriation for the fiscal year 1964—about $6 billion—this still leaves a clear saving to American consumers in 1963 of approximately $20 billion compared to 1949.

As everyone knows, only a relatively small part of the Department of Agriculture appropriation finds its way directly to farmers. Less than $3 billion is programed for price-support operations and approximately 60 percent of this will consist of nonfarm expenditures to warehousemen, transportation companies, and exporters, and to pay for food donated to needy persons. The other $3 billion of the appropriation goes to pay for a multitude of programs and services, many of which are directly for the benefit of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a reasonable conclusion that in 1963, agricultural programs did not cost consumers a cent, but saved them something more than $20 billion compared to 15 years ago.

Because of this saving in their food bill, city and town families are able to spend more for the education of their children, for health care, for homes and home furnishings, and for cars and recreation. How prosperous would these areas of the economy be in 1963 without the $20 billion consumers are saving on food?

In the Wall Street Journal's Farm Message editorial, reference is made to a proposed wheat program with the declaration it would be impossible to raise the incomes of growers above currently-anticipated 1964 levels without boosting the price of bread to consumers. The legislation recently developed by the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee opens the avenue for better farm returns than would be possible without such legislation, and at the same time protects consumers from any bread price increase resulting from wheat costs. Under this bill, millers would be paying no more for wheat than they've been paying during the past year and there would be no reason whatever for an increase in bread prices.

The Congress of the United States wasn't just looking for something to do when it tried to create some farm programs in the 1920's and when it succeeded in creating them in the 1930's. It was acting in response to human and economic needs.

The Congress, from time to time, has updated these programs in response to changing conditions—and the need to update some of them again was made clear in the President's farm message.

Mr. Speaker, the story of food and agriculture in the United States of America is not the story of failure written in the editorial columns of the Wall Street Journal. It is a story of achievement, and the achievement is a blessing to every American consumer and the envy of all the world.

Lincoln, Kennedy Seen Victims of Same Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an article in the Wakefield Daily Item, entitled "Lincoln, Kennedy Seen Victims of Same Hatred." This article covers the highlights of a Lincoln's Day speech before the Wakefield, Mass., Rotary Club by Attorney William J. Lee. Mr. Lee, a close personal friend of mine, is an outstanding citizen of Wakefield, and one of Massachusetts' leading authorities on the life of Abraham Lincoln:

LINCOLN, KENNEDY SEEN VICTIMS OF SAME HATRED

The atmosphere of hatred out of which grew the assassination of President John F. Kennedy was similar to, and in fact a part of, that which led to the killing of Abraham Lincoln, Attorney William J. Lee told the Rotary Club yesterday.

Mr. Lee, one of Wakefields leading authorities on the life of Lincoln, briefly traced similarities in the conditions surrounding the two Presidents.

Lincoln, he found, was the object of perhaps more intense hatred than any other American public figure. He was vilified, maligned, insulted and condemned in newspapers in both the North and the South, with a passion hard to duplicate in the history of American politics.

Standing at the base of this feeling against him was the issue of the Negro, then the Negro slave.

Slavery in Lincoln's time was a matter of great economic significance. In 1860, Mr. Lee said, there were 4 million slaves, worth $2 billion. They held a value as chattel, like livestock, farm equipment or any other possession, and were vital to the burgeoning cotton-producing industry, he pointed out.

President Lincoln was not an abolitionist, Mr. Lee told the group. Rather he did not want to see slavery expand into the new States and territories, and he was realistic enough to see that the Nation could not live forever half slave and half free.

In Lincoln's time there were severe penalties in the legal codes of many States against teaching slaves anything. Schooling was denied them, as was the right to religious worship. Educating a slave was providing tinder for a fire of rebellion which the slaveholder feared, the speaker said.

Yet the slave actually was likely better off than the immigrant and native labor used in the North. Mr. Lee portrayed the slave as cared for fed and housed, with no need for money. In the northern factories, however, men, women, and children worked 12- and

13-hour days 6 days a week for poverty wages, and actually were subjected to the employer's whips, he said.

But the northerners had freedom the right to education and the choice of how they would worship, Mr. Lee said. These three possessions put them in a class not equaled by the Negro. And that, Mr. Lee felt, made all the difference.

In the hundred years since Lincoln, the speaker found that the Negro lot has been improved only a little. The Negro needs education, with his freedom, and he has not achieved it. He needs protection from those who would deny him his right to worship and to the exercise of freedom in public places where he still is not allowed to go in many States.

In the passion to prevent the Negro from attaining these things now, Mr. Lee saw the same hatred as those surrounding Lincoln and stemming from the same source, building up to a fever pitch around President Kennedy. The name "Kennedy" was anathema in the South before November 22, 1963. Politicians ran for office on the basis of the intensity of their hatred for John Kennedy. Members of his administration were physically and verbally assaulted in the South.

The pitch of southern hatred against Mr. Kennedy hardly can be understood here, Mr. Lee said, and it was similar to that which prompted Mr. Lincoln's advisers to spirit him through Baltimore and to the White House incognito, so he would not be attacked by his enemies before he even took office as President.

And 100 years later the same hatred seethed, and at least one major writer felt sure ahead of time that John Kennedy would be killed if he entered the roiling political battleground of the Southern States.

"And what after these hundred years," Mr. Lee asked in conclusion, "was John Kennedy trying to get for the Negro? A chance to go to school, a chance to go to church, and a chance to sit at a lunch counter and eat a hotdog."

Progress in Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, including membership on the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, I have had occasion to be concerned with the problems of the territory of Guam stemming from great damage done a year ago by typhoons. When I, in company with four of our colleagues, stopped in Guam last month en route to inspect U.S. operations in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, it was apparent that the people of Guam, with help provided under the Guam Rehabilitation Act, had rallied very well under the leadership of Governor Manuel F. L. Guerrero and pursuant to constructive enactments of the Guam Legislature. The progress of which I speak was ably elucidated in an eloquent speech by Governor Guerrero at the opening of the second regular session of the Seventh Guam Legislature, which my congressional group had the privilege of attending.

Said speech reads as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF THE SEVENTH GUAM LEGISLATURE BY GOV. MANUEL F. L. GUERRERO, JANUARY 13, 1964

Mr. Speaker, honorable members of the legislature, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and friends of Guam:

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to appear here today because it is my sincere hope and belief that January 1964 marks the beginning of a year of challenge and achievement which will usher in a new era for the territory of Guam.

This session of your honorable body and the months which follow it may well mark advancements which will lead to the time, in the not-too-distant future, when new meaning will be given the term often used to describe our island—"America's Showcase in the Far East."

We are highly honored to have with us today five Members of the U.S. Congress, and I join you in bidding them welcome.

While they are in the territory I hope to brief them in detail on the progress which we are making slowly but surely in using Office of Emergency Planning funds and preparing to use appropriations from the Guam rehabilitation bill in rebuilding our island.

The action of these gentlemen in assisting us in our rehabilitation program, as well as their presence here today, offers concrete evidence of the interest which our national Government has in Guam.

Following their visit with us I hope they will return to Washington bearing the word to the Congress, the President, and the American people that Guam is working diligently to merit the confidence which our Nation has placed in us.

So far as the Members of this honorable body are concerned, I do not intend to dwell at length on the progress we have made in the past 14 months. You gentlemen have been a vital part of that progress, and it is my firm belief that your accomplishments during that period will stand as a monument to you, both as individuals and as a legislature, because you have formulated a vast amount of sensible legislation which will greatly speed the redevelopment of our island.

You are fully familiar with such things as our plans for reestablishing the commercial port and constructing a new and badly needed air terminal.

You know, of course, the details of our massive plans for rebuilding many of our public facilities, in which we will be using to a great extent the Guam rehabilitation bill and other Federal programs.

This will be a complex and exacting task and, in order to make sure it is performed with constant coordination, I have recently made permanent the assignment of Mr. George Ingling as overall director of our rehabilitation, with the rank of Assistant Secretary.

I honestly feel that we are making as much progress as possible, but even greater efforts and even more dynamic accomplishments are demanded now and in the days to come. I know I can count on you to deliver them, and I pledge all members of the executive departments will spare no efforts in helping carry out programs which our island must have in the next 3 years.

Now I use that time period rather loosely.

Some of the things we must accomplish can and will be completed before the end of 3 years. Others will take much longer—some even longer than many of us will serve in government.

But let me remind you of two brief, simple phrases which may well become part of our Nation's historical lexicon.

On a cold, raw day in January 1961, in Washington, John Fitzgerald Kennedy described the formidable task which lay before him as he rallied the American people with a call for development of a peaceful and prosperous world.

He admitted than many of the accomplishments he sought would not come in his administration, or in our lifetimes.

But, he said this: "Let us begin."

And only a few short weeks ago, after an assassin's bullet had ended the short but useful life of John F. Kennedy, his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, stood before a joint session of the House and Senate, recalled those three determined words, and added to them. He said: "Let us continue."

I propose that we take those two simple but ringing challenges as our guideposts as we work to make our territory the type of community which these two wonderful Americans have pictured and for which they have worked.

As we mourn the tragic passing of the one, as we continue to give everlasting support to the other, let us keep faith with these two great leaders.

Now, as I said before, I believe we are making progress in the frustrating task of rehabilitating our island.

Our tremendous building program actually is just getting underway, but it has had the best planning and technical direction of all concerned, especially the Officer in Charge of Construction for the Commander of Naval Forces Marianas.

I have the highest praise for that organization which is overseeing the OEP phases of our rebuilding, and I believe we owe it a special word of appreciation.

Within the next few months the fruits of these efforts will be dramatically apparent, and within 2 years I believe we will have a greatly improved physical plant for the operation of our schools, our hospital, and other elements of our government.

But this is only a small part of our task.

New public buildings can mean only an empty promise to our children unless we can offer them a steadily improving standard of living which can, and must, match that of any section in the United States in a few short years.

This is a debt which we owe them, and it will not be easy to pay. Our resources admittedly are limited. Our island is remote, although the jet age and the nuclear age are reducing that remoteness day by day.

We must keep pace with these new ages by developing an economy which will sustain us, and which will grow and expand in the coming years, even as our population is certain to grow and expand.

We must approach this period with imagination. We must alalyze, husband, and develop our resources to the fullest, and it is about some of these demands upon us which I want to speak briefly today.

First, I would cite the fact that one of our greatest resources is our land, and too much of it has lain fallow too long. In the executive branch we are initiating new studies on the utilization of our private as well as our government land. The time is long overdue when we must put more of it to work.

I know the land of Guam, and I know the problems, but we must not shunt these problems aside.

There are among you some of the best and most imaginative minds on the island, and I urge you to join with us in seeking to make public lands more readily available, and to encourage in every way possible the profitable use of private lands. And let none of us say that these are things which we cannot accomplish.

I hope to present to you from time to time proposed legislation aimed at solutions of these problems. I believe that we must take whatever steps necessary to elevate agriculture on Guam from the backyard garden

status to the realm of commercial operation, with sound programs for development of large cultivated areas and effective marketing programs.

Another resource, which seldom is considered as such, lies within our government and the services which it renders to our people. We must move forward in several areas in this field, and shortly I will be sending you proposals for changes which I believe are vitally needed.

I will again ask you to separate our Public Health Division from the Department of Medical Services, setting up Guam Memorial Hospital as a separate entity just as we have done with the College of Guam, the public utility agency, and the commercial port. This change will, I believe, insure our people better medical attention, which is something we cannot afford to deny them.

In the interest of progressive government I will ask you to create a three-member city council for Agana. Our capital city has been hampered too long by the lack of a modern municipal system of government, which could well lead to the solution of land problems, as well as stimulate and control its orderly development as a show place.

I believe also that this council can serve as a pattern for other municipalities as they develop and demand more modern government.

In another move toward better government, I am going to ask that you extend the terms of our island judges from 4 to 8 years. The members of our island bench hold important position which can affect all of us, and I feel that it is only proper to lengthen these terms and free them from all possible burdens which could be imposed by the present shorter tenures.

With the growth of our population and the continuing influx of outside influences, I can foresee the possibility of shortcomings in our enforcement agencies which are now scattered and uncoordinated in their operations. Consequently, I intend to ask that you combine them all into one Department of Security and, in time, I hope to request that you join me in various programs which will strengthen and improve the standards of this vital phase of government.

Also in the field of government we are faced with personnel and morale problems which we must correct. I am told that a committee which you created by resolution to study our pay structure will be reporting to you shortly. I know you are faced with a tremendous task in implementing this report, and I pledge to you all possible assistance from the executive branch in working out inequities and formulating a sensible and more effective pay schedule.

I know that you will, as you have in the past, give sincere and thoughtful attention to the problems within our government, and I call on every person on the public payroll to consider himself and the services he renders as a resource for the betterment of all residents of our island.

Let us turn for a moment to something which I am sure rankles the pride of most of us. I am speaking of the physical appearance of our island. I would be the first to admit that it looks much better than it did a year, or even a month ago. And certainly a great deal of credit is due a large majority of our residents who invested money and effort in the removal of typhoon wreckage and in cleaning their property.

But all of their efforts are rapidly becoming negated because of the inaction of a selfish few.

You are going to be asked in this session to appropriate a sizable amount of money for the development of a tourism program, and I believe this is an excellent investment for the territory.

I intend to proclaim shortly a period for an islandwide cleanup campaign, and I already have been promised the unlimited support of a number of our fine civic organizations which take pride in our island and take pleasure in contributing to its welfare.

But our tax money and our hard work will accomplish nothing if the individuals without pride remain inactive.

We have on our books laws governing the cleaning of public nuisances from private property. Effective enforcement may well require amendment of these laws.

I will be sending you shortly proposals in this field. And I will also send you a separate funding bill, allocating money to carry out a program under which the Government would remove unsightly and unhealthful wreckage and other debris where necessary.

Property cleared in this manner will carry a lien until the Government is repaid for this service which it should not have to perform.

But we cannot allow this situation to exist longer, and I promise faithfully that any program you approve will be rigidly and rapidly effected.

In another, more long-range, step to permanently improve the appearance of Guam, as well as raise our standards, I will be presenting to you in the next 10 days initial details on urban renewal programs proposed for Yona and Sinajana. You will be asked to pass resolutions aimed at securing funds for surveys, and planning for these projects.

Let me remind you that this program is complex and will move very slowly. It will be many months before we can see definite action. But we must begin the modern redevelopment of our villages and I urgently request that you take the initial steps by adopting the resolutions.

In the field of private housing we are making some progress toward our goal to place more of our people in typhoon-proof structures.

But here, again, we are faced with problems. Liberalized Federal loan guarantee programs have been made available, and are still available. But it is readily apparent that a portion of our population cannot qualify under them, so we are studying the possibility of making additional home loan funds available through Guam Finance Agency. The agency's record of collections on home loans in this category is good, and an expanded program may well be indicated here.

Also in the field of housing we are faced with the problem of caring for over 40 families on the welfare rolls who now live in the temporary tent units which we are committed to remove within the coming months.

These unfortunate people are the responsibility of the Government, and it is possible that some measure of local financing will be necessary to provide them with housing.

In still another area pertaining to housing we have under study a plan to extend our building regulations which are not now applicable to our rural areas, where the homeowner should have just as much protection as the urban dweller.

I also expect to submit to you shortly the first of a series of proposals designed to modernize our commercial laws. It will take some time for us to jointly accomplish this purpose, but the time is overdue for us to formulate new baisc laws which will create a more favorable business climate and offer more protection to the consumer.

With reference to this proposed legislation, it is my intention to give you more time than you have had during some previous sessions to work upon it. We are going to make every possible effort to give you practically all of our administration proposals during the first 15 days of the session. It is hoped that this will enable you to conduct studies and hearings at a sensible pace, and without the burdens of pressure that have plagued you at times in the past.

I will, of course, send you our proposed budget just as soon as possible.

We have followed the policy laid down by President Johnson, who has called for prudence in Government spending. Fund requests from every department have been thoroughly considered and cuts have been made in every area where reductions will not hamper services and advancements in our Government.

I am pleased to tell you that I have had utmost cooperation from all departments who have been asked to tighten their planned expenditures in the interest of reaching a practical and sensible budget.

Now I have attempted to touch on some of our plans and our needs, and I have, above all, attempted to stress the importance of development of our resources.

But I have saved until now a few remarks on our most important resource—our people.

Of great concern to me, and to a great many of our citizens, is the constantly growing problem of juvenile delinquency. Our community is no different from others, as this is a national problem. But it is one blot on our social image which we must erase.

Accordingly, we have asked for outside assistance, and a survey of our local problems was launched last week by a specialist in this field. I am sure his report is going to point up a number of shortcomings and possibly some of them will require legislation. Certainly all of them will demand of all of us more attention to this condition, which can spread in a cancerous fashion, tainting our entire community.

Our people, considered as a vital resource, are closely tied to the development of a stable economy which must come for their own benefit. The development of this type of economy will depend greatly upon our ability to develop within our own people greater skills.

Despite great odds, we do have an industrial potential which can be developed through the coming years.

I am pleased to tell you that a number of people are taking a new look at our free port status and exploring possibilities for the development of light industries here.

But one of the first things they will need will be a well-stocked skilled labor pool.

In the past few weeks we have taken steps to strengthen our program in the trade and technical school, which has never received the attention it merits. We now have about 200 students and, despite the handicaps of operating in the present inadequate plant, we hope to enroll 300 next fall. When the new facility is completed next year, we can handle 500, and I hope then to ask you to expand the school so we can eventually teach 1,000 students.

With the use of the new school, I intend to ask you and everyone on Guam to join me in a concentrated campaign to upgrade the status of that institution so that it will rank equally with our other high schools.

Let us begin in these years when these deserving youngsters are in the formative ages to instill in them a respect for skills and a pride in craftsmanship.

Let us remove any stigma now attached on Guam to a blue collar, and help these young people advance with dignity to proficiency and productivity.

Already our efforts to improve the school are being well received. The Guam Contractors Association has formed a volunteer 10-member advisory council which is working with school officials on curriculum needs and other training phases. This council will assist in working out proposed legislation which you probably will receive in June to set up an effective apprentice program.

I hope it will lead to the day when we can graduate craftsmen instead of poorly trained youngsters who become frustrated before developing into skilled workers who can contribute to themselves and their community.

It is expected that councils will be set up soon for the automotive, electronics, and other trades.

But all of this is not really enough if we are to develop a stable and ample labor pool which can advance industry, provide support for thousands of our people, and lessen our dependence on outside labor sources.

One of our greatest problems cannot be solved by legislation.

That is the creation within our business community of the desire and ability to offer greater incentives to good workers.

We frequently hear criticism of our people who leave private employment for jobs in the military and Government. But can we blame them when the military and Government offer the security of retirement plans, vacations, sick leave, and other fringe benefits which are taken for granted in all other areas?

Some of our private firms offer these things, but a majority do not. As a result, we find a strange paradox on Guam.

In other areas governments and government arms are faced with an exodus of good employees who leave to enter private employment. Here, the situation is reversed, and will remain so until our business community awakens by itself or is awakened by some outside influence to the fact that these benefits are accepted things in this day and time and will, in some manner, come eventually.

As I have said before, this problem is not a subject for legislation or Government action.

But I do believe that we, as Government officials interested in the betterment of our entire community, should bend every effort to create the proper climate for such advancements.

I regret that I have talked at such length. But as a former member of this legislature, I am always pleased to return here and discuss with you our mutual problems.

I am especially grateful to you for your highly constructive efforts during the past year. We have been through a difficult period, but it has not been a period when we were without friends.

The Navy, the Air Force, and all the other Federal agencies, have, as always, been steadfast in their support of our community, and our working relationships have never been better.

We have found assistance and guidance in the Department of the Interior, the Budget Bureau, the Office of Emergency Planning, and countless other Federal agencies.

The Members of the Congress have surpassed all their previous generous efforts to show an interest in Guam and a willingness to help our island help itself.

President Johnson is aware of our problems and needs, and stands ready to support us just as did President Kennedy.

Within our own Government, we have found loyalty and devotion in trying times. Great credit is due our teachers, our hospital workers, and the people in other departments who have performed valiantly under the greatest of hardships.

And, most certainly, we have all been encouraged continually by the actions of all our people whose cooperation has been outstanding despite frustrations and personal inconveniences.

In retrospect, I believe we can class 1963 as a good year, in which we said "Let us begin."

I am certain that, with the guidance of God, we can class 1964 as a year of challenge and achievement, when we can all say, "Let us continue."

Thank you.

An Address by the Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at the Annual Dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health, February 11, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of meeting the needs of the mentally ill has become more visible in recent years. The neglect of the past has been replaced with new opportunities for the care and prevention of mental illness. Recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, gave a talk on this timely subject before the annual dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health on February 11, 1964. Under previous permission I place the text of his excellent remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH, FEBRUARY 11, 1964

I feel very much at home here in Maryland among you who share with me concern for the mental health of our citizens. You who have had it in your hearts to join this gathering now have it in your hands to bring to your State a new era of promise for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded toward which we have labored so long.

We meet together at a time of great momentum in our Nation's drive against the mental illnesses. The community mental health centers program envisioned in recent Federal legislation, and toward which you are already planning in your mental health services, is a consummation of a nationwide effort, of two decades of study and work.

It is to this new opportunity I would like us to address ourselves this evening.

Mental health care today concerns every city and community and State in the country. This point has been made indelibly clear to us in Congress. I am sure it is just as clear to you, and that you in the Commonwealth of Maryland, who are no strangers to bold pioneering, will continue the vital planning, the action essential to breaking from the dreary patchwork of old ways.

We can look back to the days—the not-so-far-distant days—when the locked ward, the bolted door, and the barred window were our major gifts to the mentally ill; when they were regarded, if regarded at all, as inmates in the safe custody of State asylums.

Today the large, isolated asylum is as archaic as the last vestige of the narrow, one-lane roads we see beside our superhighways, the pock-marked relics which lead from nowhere to nowhere.

Indeed, no field of public health has undergone more radical change than the care and prevention of the mental illnesses. It continues to undergo change. In the last two decades, our ability to treat the mentally troubled and our capacity to prevent mental disorders have been greatly accelerated. Steadily, our sole reliance on the mental hospital has diminished. Steadily, the very nature of the mental hospital itself has changed. We have begun to deal significantly with the mental health of our citizens in terms of our own time and knowledge, and not of some past century.

Today we are far better prepared to give help to our people as they live in the communities of our affluent land. We can give help to the disturbed child, the unhappy adolescent, the troubled new mother. We can give help to the chronic alcoholic and the mentally retarded. We can give help to our growing number of elderly citizens. A vast inheritance of knowledge and dedication has prepared us. Now let us move forward to provide that help on a broad scale.

When I began my service on the House Appropriations Subcommittee 17 years ago, it may have seemed a poor risk to many to sponsor the National Mental Health Act and to provide funds for the new National Institute of Mental Health. But in no field of domestic well-being am I more proud of our efforts, those first hesitant efforts to give national impetus against the problems of mental ills.

For our States and communities can and do advance against the darkness of old systems as they are shown the way. Under the National Mental Health Act, States must match each Federal dollar given for grants-in-aid with $1 from their own funds. In actual practice, however, the States are doing much more than this. By 1961 they were matching Federal funds of more than $6 million for community mental health services with $85 million budgeted by State and local governments.

This fostering of mental health care within the community is reflected in the spread of the Nation's outpatient psychiatric clinics. By 1961, our 500 clinics had grown to more than 1,500, sponsored privately or by schools, courts, universities, general and mental hospitals, charities, foundations, agencies for veterans, public health, and welfare. Today 56 fewer persons per 100,000 population are in our public mental hospitals than there were in 1950, and clinics are treating as many patients as are admitted to public and private mental hospitals combined.

On our mutual journey into mental health research, exploring the barriers of the mental illnesses has led us to other advances in the care of our people. Some disorders previously requiring long care were responding to shorter, intensive treatment, frequently in the general hospital near the patients' families and homes. Today the number of psychiatric patients admitted to general hospitals equals the number admitted to mental hospitals. These citizens are being helped through crises without the indignity of custodial care. This is another promising outcome of our Federal-local team.

And I could cite other advances in the mental health care of our citizens in States alert to the model, the successful new trials proceeding without respite in our common resolve.

In these trials, we have viewed mental health problems as a spectrum of problems requiring a spectrum of services. Many elements combined to remove our old blindfolds, to give us this outlook. One element is the high cost of traditional, custodial hospital care—last year, this was more than $2 billion. Another element is the buildup of medical knowledge stimulated in trying to find our way past this costly deadend. Another element is our invigorating social insight inherited from the turmoil of the

world's people and the consequent revulsion at public neglect of our citizen's needs.

Thus, the stimulus we have mustered at the national level has stemmed, in democratic partnership, the backwash of stagnant medical care. Extensive Federal grants spurring research in mental health, training workers in mental health, supporting experimental projects, continue. Now they can go forward, with your help, into broad and integrated systems of mental health services.

To this end, the increasing National interest in the mental health care of our citizens has recently provided new momentum. Just 1 year ago our late President Kennedy delivered before Congress his unprecedented message on mental illness and mental retardation. Within months, the Federal Government provided action. Within months, recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health which could be implemented under the existing law were written into the Federal budget: more funds for improving mental hospitals, more funds for training hospital personnel, more funds for care of the mentally retarded.

And, as a starting point for a new national mental health program, $8,400,000 was earmarked for nationwide, long-range planning of mental health services. It was an effort and a concept without parallel in the history of public health in our land.

For this planning, each State was first summoned to survey its mental health needs and resources, and to have in readiness channels into every county to insure a flow of participation in the plans. In this common cause, State agencies; lay groups representing church, school, and industry; enforcement officials; medical and social authorities met and still confer. The wide representation in these preliminary moves toward planning has been as unique as the task.

In the fresh mobilization against the mental illnesses, other recommendations to the President were introduced before Congress as new legislation, passed, and signed into two new laws.

One law amends the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation. This is Public Law 88-156. It provides massive funds for four programs. For maternal and child health and crippled children's services, funds are increased by steps from $50 million a year in fiscal 1963 to $100 million in 1970 and after. For maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation, $120 million has been authorized over a 5-year period. For research projects in maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, there is $8 million a year; and to encourage States to plan for action against mental retardation, $2 million has been assigned.

The other legislation, Public Law 88-164, appropriates, under title I, $126 million for the construction of research centers for mental retardation, for university-associated facilities, and for facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded. For training teachers of mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and physically handicapped children, $47 million has been assigned under title III, $6 million will sponsor research and demonstration projects in the education of these handicapped children.

It is title II of this act, directed to the welfare of the general community, I now submit to your attention. This title provides $150 million in matching funds for the construction of community mental health centers through 1967. Starting in fiscal 1965, the money is being made available in increasing amounts, yearly, from $35 million to $50 million in 1966 to $65 million in 1967, to give the States ample time to complete their mental health services planning.

It is this act which provides the seed, nurtured by your tending, from which your coordinated mental health services can grow.

If we are about to emerge upon a new horizon of care for our citizens, the community mental health center can be seen as its bright core. For the goal of these centers is the goal of all our efforts—to prevent the mental illnesses, to diagnose them promptly and effectively when they do occur, and to rehabilitate those who have suffered from mental disorders.

Within our counties and within our great cities, the mental health center can be fashioned into an arsenal of our modern weapons against the mental illnesses. These weapons include general diagnostic and evaluation service, acute inpatient service, outpatient service, day-care service, and emergency service available around the clock. We can arm our centers with rehabilitation service, consultation service, services for public information and education, supervision of foster homes and home visiting care. The center can become a place for research, and for the training of mental health workers needed in our ranks. Indeed, the center can be a community haven within which our troubled compatriots can receive a continuity of care. As their needs change, they can move among the appropriate services, proceeding from diagnosis, to cure, to rehabilitation * * * and then, should the need arise, back to treatment.

These centers can perform another great function. As you know, help which we today call mental health guidance has been given to people since times of old by teachers, physicians, and clergy. By providing professional consultation for these indispensable servants of the community, and for lawyers, law-enforcement officers, and social workers, the center becomes part of the very pulse of mental illness prevention.

Since many of you may become involved in developing mental health centers in Maryland—I understand that your mental hygiene commisioner has had the foresight to request again in his budget this year funds to start three mental health center programs—I should like to share with you a few of the points made to our Appropriations Subcommittee when we considered the support of mental health centers.

One point made was that there is no intention of supporting facilities or services which duplicate—though they may extend—those already existing in a community.

Another point made was that the community mental health centers can be started in different ways. Each center can be as unique as its own community. It may function under a variety of auspices: State, county, municipal, and voluntary. Physically, it can exist under one roof or become the focal point of services conveniently located near each other. It can exist also under a variety of organizational arrangements.

For example, in one city, the center may be based at a general hospital. Since most of the large general hospitals already furnish psychiatric care, a day service, night service, and outpatient service could be added all at once, or in stages. Another community may decide that its mental health center should start with an outpatient facility. In rural Pennsylvania, a tricounty mental health center established 3 years ago for outpatient treatment has already added a mobile unit, and anticipates expanding its services further. In New Haven, ambitious plans are already on the drawing board for a $2 million mental health center under university and city auspices. The possibilities are flexible, various.

The one common essential, however—a third point emphasized before us in Congress—is that to participate in the Federal funding, each center must fit within a comprehensive, long-range plan for mental health services, the planning now underway in our States.

Now let us consider some of the challenges in moving forward with the new Federal benefits.

As enacted, the law provides Federal aid for the construction of mental health centers, not for their maintenance and staffing. Therefore, in order to share in the appropriation, the States will have to indicate adequate support and staffing of the centers. We in Congress who advocated Federal assistance for staffing hope now that most areas of the country will be able to provide this needed assurance to get their centers underway. We hope that geographic differences and lack of funds or personnel will not deprive some of our less well-off States of essential community services.

Another challenge, faced by all planners, including Congressmen, is how to alter old systems while still being, as it were, entrapped within them. In the planning for mental health services, all agencies, and dedicated individuals involved must look beyond whatever special prerogatives they may harbor, in benefit to the common good. Entanglements over jurisdiction, while understandable in such a broad effort, can only block our hard-won momentum. As a legislator, I can well assure you that to gain support mental health leaders must present coordinated plans, a united front.

Whether in Annapolis or in Washington, we legislators want to be reasonably sure that the money we appropriate makes reasonable sense. This, of course, presents another challenge to the planners of new ways.

I commend to my fellow legislators, however, that the public cost of providing more meaningful and more extensive mental health services may prove to be a wise investment not only in greater human happiness, but in budgetary savings in the long run. The results of one study, for instance, has shown that a vocational rehabilitation program for mental patients costing $53,000 yielded reduced hospital costs of $449,000, and $256,000 in annual wages earned by the released patients. Investment in another project, in Pennsylvania, is conserving both funds and human dignity. There the cost of operating a screening center for patients headed for mental hospitals is more than offset by directing many to less costly outpatient care.

Here in your own State, I understand, shortened hospital stays resulting from improved care and treatment has decreased the average cost of treating a patient 40 percent over the past 10 years.

To be sure, as we extend our services the cost of caring for the mentally ill will be met to an increasing extent by the private sector of our economy. Individual fees, individual and group insurance will share the financial burden. But whatever arrangements we make for the care of the more vulnerable among us, we can in good conscience no longer withhold from the public the knowledge, the skills, the promise which science has laid at our door.

In closing, I should like to salute you here in Maryland for the forward advances you have already made in behalf of the mental health of your citizens. These advances you are now prepared to weave into a concerted design of services for the future.

You have moved to accredit your State mental hospitals, and you are still improving them and expanding their service. You have moved to provide more programs of community care. In Baltimore, a new day hospital in a rented building is enabling mental patients to spend their evenings and weekends at home. In the same city, a new clinic for alcoholics is bringing new hope to many families. You have moved to provide for patients discharged from mental hospitals and for the mentally retarded foster homes to replace the environment of institutions, the environment of loneliness.

Within the mental health profession, your many eminent citizens have also provided

leadership. The first psychiatric case register in the Nation is recording in Maryland data on the prevalence, patterns of treatment, and final outcome of mental disorders. One of the first preliminary plans for planning mental health services was submitted by Maryland, and that planning is now proceeding.

These are some of Maryland's vital moves, and I am certain there are more. Surely you will be counted among the States traversing further up the road, toward community mental health. From $1½ to $3 million in Federal funds may be made available to your State for the construction of mental health centers. With 145 centers across the Nation anticipated within the next 3 years, let it not be said that Maryland failed to build for her citizens.

As we meet in our halls of assembly, let us recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "The care of human life and happiness, and not its destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

As we meet in our halls of assembly, let us recall our late young President who was to be the tragic victim of the very kind of mental blot he sought to erase: the unseen, untended disorders which rebuke our civilization. Who knows how many untold acts of violence, days of trouble, and nights of misery shall never come to pass because of our present determinations?

When President Johnson included mental illness in his first message to Congress last year, the signal was clear: our Federal Government, our States, and our communities have at last become inseparable partners against the tenacious shadows of public neglect. And in partnership, we shall advance steadily toward new horizons of mental health care. For, finally, we are in view of the shining, indeed, the lustrous reality that all but a small proportion of the mentally ill can achieve constructive living, and that the mental health of our people can and will be strengthened in every city and town in our land.

Increasing Our Educational Opportunities in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the expansion of educational opportunities for young people in our various States is a project which, as a former teacher, I have been exploring for some time. The Iowa plan which I have offered, is one of the approaches to help increase and improve the educational opportunities for our people, by offering a tax credit for college expenses.

In connection with civil rights and increased educational opportunities for minority groups, especially Negro Americans, a number of constructive pilot projects have been set up at several universities from California to New Hampshire to recruit talented Negro young men and women. A number of the most challenging and difficult, especially those at Princeton, Dartmouth, and Oberlin College in Ohio are being made possible through the Rockefeller Foundation. The National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students is supplementing the work of the Rockefeller Foundation and similar institutions.

It is my sincere hope that this voluntary, civic effort will encourage other citizens to contribute their share to this work.

Below follows an article from the Wall Street Journal of January 29, 1964, concerning these programs:

MANY COLLEGES OFFER EXTRA FINANCIAL AID TO RECRUIT NEGROES—SCHOLARSHIP PICTURE BRIGHTENS IN HOUSTON; PRINCETON CALLS RIVALRY FOR TALENT INTENSE

(By Lawrence Lynch)

LOS ANGELES.—Benny Robinson, a senior with a B plus average at Jordan High School here, figures he will need financial help to get through college. Since Benny's parents both work, the most he could ordinarily expect would be a scholarship paying half his tuition, room, board and other educational expenses.

Benny's school counselors have told him, however, that at least two California universities will probably offer to foot his entire higher education bill. Ironically, the reason for this special consideration is the same one that might have made it harder for Benny to get into college a few years ago; Benny is a Negro.

Prodded by the stepped-up pace of the drive for civil rights, and their own liberal traditions, a number of northern and western colleges are becoming increasingly concerned about their small Negro enrollments. As a result, they're making special efforts, including offering extra financial aid, to recruit qualified Negro students.

Qualified Negro applicants, however, are few and far between, educators say. "The annual pool of young Negroes who are prepared to meet the educational standards of universities like Princeton is depressingly small," says Princeton President Robert F. Goheen. "And because there are so few of them, the competition among universities to enroll them is nowadays intense."

TALENT SCOUT

Two years ago Princeton and the seven other Ivy League universities formed a "cooperative program for educational opportunity." They commissioned Charles E. McCarthy, Jr., a residence dean at Yale, to scout eastern urban centers and Southern States for Negro high school seniors with academic ability. Last spring, seven eastern women's colleges joined the program. Mr. McCarthy says a qualified Negro will get all the financial help he needs.

Mr. McCarthy's work and related efforts by individual schools seem to be paying off. Yale's freshman Negro enrollment increased to 12 last fall from 6 the year before; Princeton's jumped to 10 from 2 or 3 over the same period. Wellesley College, one of the women's schools participating in the program last fall brought in nine Negro coeds from Southern Negro colleges to spend their junior year at its Massachusetts campus.

Interest in Negro students goes well beyond these 15 schools. The National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students (NSSFNS) reports the number of colleges accepting its applicants increased to 353 from 319 in the last 2 years. NSSFNS helps Negro high school students decide where to go to colelge, passes along their records to interested schools and helps them win financial aid.

Richard L. Plaut, president of the service, says such Southern schools as Davidson College, Duke University, and Tulane University have asked for NSSFNS applicants for the first time within the last year. He adds that the number of schools awarding scholarships to the service's applicants climbed to 214 from 186 over the last 2 years.

PICK AND CHOOSE

Many top-ranking Negro high school seniors this spring will be able to pick and choose among scholarship offers. John E. Codwell, principal of all-Negro Jack Yates Senior High School in Houston, expects that most students in the top 10 percent of the present senior class will get scholarship offers from at least two colleges and all students in the top 5 percent will get offers from at least three schools.

Some colleges are trying to develop more qualified Negro applicants by encouraging them early in their high school careers. Admission officers from seven southern California colleges will visit four predominately Negro Los Angeles high schools this spring, mainly to try convincing Negro 9th and 10th graders that scholarship money is plentiful for students with high marks.

Princeton, Dartmouth College, and Oberlin College are setting up summer sessions for selected students in the early stages of secondary education; the students are from low-income families and most will be Negroes. The programs, operating under $150,000 Rockefeller Foundation grants, will test where intensive study can help students overcome inadequate educational backgrounds and prepare for college.

Let's Make Up Our Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 1964 edition of the Farm Journal:

LET'S MAKE UP OUR MIND

You'll have to pardon us if we seem puzzled. Like a lot of other ordinary American citizens we don't know too much about the intricacies of foreign policy. But we do know this:

Up to February 1, 175 American boys have died in a far-off place called Vietnam while the rest of us have looked the other way. We've got 15,500 more American boys down there exposed to being shot—and we still have 50,000 facing a Communist enemy in Korea.

We're putting up with a nest of virulent communism 90 miles off our shores—one that tests our resolve by shutting off the water at our Guantanamo Bay naval station and that spreads flames all over Latin America and as far as Zanzibar off the coast of Africa, while we patiently traipse around with a bucket trying to douse the fires.

We know well enough where the money and men to make this trouble come from—Moscow. And Khrushchev, embracing Castro for the photographers, tells us to keep hands off his boy—the same Khrushchev with whom we are now trying to buddy up.

Meanwhile—

France, a presumed ally, tries to embrace Red China. She does all she can in other ways to embarrass us in southeast Asia, where American boys are dying.

Great Britain, our friend, comes to Castro's rescue with several hundred buses. For what? For a few bucks.

Canada, another friend, has been bailing out Mao in Red China for years with huge shipments of wheat. Commercially it has paid. These and the big sale to Russia last fall have sopped up all the wheat Canada

could raise, while we sat on a surplus here. Now there's veritable footrace to see who can get to the Communist world with the "mostest firstest."

And how about us? We're no better. For dollars, and nothing but dollars, and without a single political concession or even an attempt to get one, we're almost in a frenzy to sell wheat to Russia (while righteously denying any to Red China and criticizing Britain for selling buses to Castro).

We're so anxious to take in the money that we'll apparently make any concession necessary. We uttered brave words at the time of the deal—to quiet our own citizens. The sale would have to be for cash on the barrelhead. Now we've retreated and let it be for credit. The grain had to be shipped in American bottoms. Well, maybe only half of it in American ships, we were presently saying. And when the Russians wouldn't agree to that, because American ships charge more, we simply paid the exporter an extra 14 cents per bushel, to relieve the Russians of the necessity. This was a quiet little deal in which the U.S. taxpayer footed the bill without even knowing it.

Meanwhile we shell out billions upon billions to contain communism. That's what much of our huge foreign aid expenditure is really for. Certainly it's what our enormous military expenditure is for.

We send Bobby Kennedy half way around the world to try to quiet Mr. Sukarno in Indonesia; we dispatch other trouble shooters to Africa and Central and South America; we have Adlai Stevenson make another wrist-slapping speech in the United Nations; we get contradictory reports from Secretary McNamara on how our war is going in Vietnam. The less said about it the better, apparently. Let's not look now. Maybe it will just go away.

Too bad about the 175 American boys, of course, but things like that can't be helped.

They can't? Well certainly they can't so long as we have no clear foreign policy versus communism, and so long as we lack the guts to enforce a policy even if our Government had one.

Isn't it about time the United States of America decided how to fight this cold war, then fought it?

Suburbia: An Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Choate School News entitled "Suburbia: An Analysis," by Chris Meyer, a student at Choate. The article is a timely and interesting one, and I am pleased to enclose it at the request of our former colleague, the Honorable John A. McGuire.

SUBURBIA: AN ANALYSIS

(By Chris Meyer)

Within the last decade a new kind of community has emerged in the United States. Different from the homes of the country or the apartments in the cities, the dwellings of these towns are inhabited permanently, and yet the inhabitants are not there most of the time. The areas described, of course, are the suburban districts of the country. For every city there is a suburbia. Pittsburgh has its Sewickley. New York has its Greenwich. It is nowadays in evidence, moreover, that these communities show the pulse of the upper class populous in the United States. When one examines the society of these villages, one sees many weak points that have affected the social structure of the entire country.

How does suburbia attack the family? What are its germ carriers? How does the germ infect its victim? It starts with the father wanting to work in the city but live in the country. This, of course, is almost entirely impossible if he wants to go home each night. So he settles for, instead of the farm he really envisions, a ranch house in a suburban area. Unfortunately, he finds that there are many other fathers who are doing exactly the same thing. They all have to commute to make a living. Thus the men of the community form a sort of informal fraternity, going to work on the 8:09 and coming home each night on the 5:05. Here the trouble begins. The fathers of the families, being in the city all day, are now greatly separated from the home. The children know him only vaguely, since they only see him 3 or 4 hours a day. The infants thus miss the paternal relationship which should prove so valuable to them in later years. The boys miss the firm, stable hands guiding them through life; the girls miss their conceived perfect man. As a result, the children as a whole become more unstable, and juvenile delinquency flourishes.

An even more hideous effect stems from the sustained marital relationship; the woman of the house becomes far more independent in her thinking. She finds things to do while hubby is at the office. She may get a job, for instance, in some store or organization. Moreover, due to the lack of time spent with her beloved spouse, her views begin to differ from those of her husband. These differences could only be resolved by constant companionship with her beloved one. As a result of arguments of this trivial nature, the husband and the wife get further and further away from each other and the divorce rate steadily climbs.

How, moreover, are the fathers affected? What happens to them while leading this hustle-bustle life of commuting? To start with, they become extremely rundown and tired. After a hard day, they have barely enough strength to climb into their beds. Through this lack of energy, they lose interest in everything except their work and sleep. They cease to read books—no time for that. They stop all hobbies. They play no sports and consequently become fat and out of shape. The men become sloppy and unclean. They find little time to do such insignificant chores as polishing their shoes, getting a good shave, or making sure their clothes are properly cleaned and pressed. They often go to work with egg still on their faces or spots on their ties. This, moreover, influences their children and they too become very messy, dirty and ill groomed, through no fault of their own.

The community itself also suffers in the hands of this sort of a person. The whole society revolves around a core of status-seeking businessmen. There is so much "trying to beat the Joneses" that it even affects the children. The kids are only allowed to play with certain people. Classes are formed and strictly obeyed, even to the extent of governing which part of town to settle in. Each small district forms its own social group and even its own area government in some cases. Everybody lives to talk about other people's faults and to spread false rumors behind their neighbors' backs.

How does this affect you? In most cases it affects you directly. Over 50 percent of the boys at Choate come from urban or suburban districts. How could it affect you, if you are not one of these areas? The United States is growing all the time. Small towns are growing into great cities. Perhaps your village is next on fate's list. How can you stop this decline in society? If anyone knew, he would have the secret of utopia.

Each day into the great cities of the Nation—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles—swarm thousands of suburban businessmen. Each day, at the hour of 5 or 6 in the afternoon, the same thousands of suburban businessmen swarm out of the cities to their homes in suburbia. Each day, the businessmen spend 1 to 3 hours transporting themselves to and from their offices in the cities. Each day, the suburbanite keeps the stock market moving through his investments. Each day, the suburban businessman acts as an agent for this investor. Each day, suburban businessmen run the various advertising agencies. Each day, suburban businessmen run this Nation.

It's Time for a Change, Says Bob Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, Congressman BOB WILSON, addressed a gathering at a Lincoln Day dinner in Penobscot County, Maine, and I wish to include in the RECORD an article in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, of February 13, 1964, concerning the distinguished gentleman's talk:

SHOW OF GUTS ASKED BY CALIFORNIA CONGRESSMAN

(By Nelle Penley)

Lashing out at the Johnson administration, Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, declared Wednesday evening that "if there ever was a time for a change in our foreign policy and for an end to peaceful coexistence and those who are pushing it—it is now."

WILSON addressed more than 150 Republicans at a Lincoln Day dinner held at Pilots Grill under the sponsorship of the Penobscot County GOP Committee.

Citing the armed conflicts now going on in the world, WILSON said already all but 5 of the 36 independent African States have abandoned any pretense of democracy. "These," he declared, "are just a few of the current crop of coexistence bankruptcies." He also mentioned French President de Gaulle's recognition of Red China and the Cyprus, Cuba, and Panama crises.

He told the group that he mentioned this complete collapse of our foreign policy house of cards, because it has cost us, since we started to buy peace at any price, more than $100 billion.

"We've tried to give and it hasn't worked. We've tried give in—it hasn't worked. Let's try give up all this expensive shilly-shallying and show some guts," the speaker urged pointing out that he felt this approach would work.

"Let's tell the world that Uncle Sam is through with catering to Communist capers—is through with being the live one for global beatniks—is going to give back with interest the shin kicks he's been getting and give them back in a much more vital place."

"Isn't that what every partiotic American wants?" he asked.

Speaking of the Great Emancipator, WILSON said the Republican Party has always been the party of freedom. When slavery became an issue, he said, there was no talk

of peaceful coexistence with the slave States. Slavery to the Republicans was intolerable. We honestly believe that all men were created equal and should therefore live as equals with equal opportunity for all. The speaker said that today that is one of the planks in the Republican platform and always will be.

"If Lincoln were alive today, and saw our world of chaotic divisions and subdivisions—if he knew of the ultimate weapons we possess—he would be amazed at our blindness. He would cry out, I am sure, 'If a nation cannot so endure, how much less the world?' "

WILSON felt Lincoln would recognize coexistence as a stopgap measure and would never have believed in it as a permanent mode of international living. He would have recognized it for the stopgap measure that it is. He would have known that it was born of wishful thinking and—as a solution to our present world problems as phony as a three dollar bill.

The California Congressman warned his listeners, "Every day that we have dealings with the Communists and play along with them we are increasing their strength, building their resources for the inevitable showdown. We are playing a game of global poker today.

"Peaceful coexistence is just another word for appeasement and you know where that leads. It's peaceful coexistence Johnson style when he gave the Kremlin a credit card to purchase wheat for the Russians and when we signed the nuclear test ban," the speaker charged.

"We are practically at war with Russia. It may be labeled as the 'cold war' but the fact is that Red Russia's policy toward us has not been altered a single degree—Russia is waging war on us," asserted WILSON.

He paid high tribute to Representative CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, candidate for U.S. Senator in the coming campaign against Democratic Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, and who introduced him Wednesday evening.

WILSON termed MCINTIRE "one of the finest men who has ever come down to Washington," pointing to his sincerity, honesty, and hard work.

Norman Minsky, of Bangor, presided at the meeting and the invocation was given by Dr. Frederick W. Whittaker. Both are members of the Maine Legislature.

The Quarantine of Cuba in International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., in a recent speech vigorously urged the establishment of a naval patrol between Red Cuba and the Panama Canal.

Explaining the VFW suggestion, Commander Lombardo said:

It is abundantly evident that Communist agitators were behind much of the tragic rioting against the U.S. zone in Panama. On the basis of the past record of Red subversion, it is merely realistic to expect that there will be more Red effort to embarrass, weaken, and dislodge the United States from control on our vital Panama Canal.

This is no spur-of-the-moment incident and the United States must take positive and effective measures for our own strategic safety. Therefore, our Government should immediately establish a naval patrol—a quarantine—between Castro's Cuba and the Panama Canal area. The purpose of this patrol would be to prevent the further export of Red subversion, weapons, and propaganda from Cuba to Panama and all Central America.

It should be remembered that there is much precedent from such a quarantine patrol. One was established by President Eisenhower during the Honduran crisis. Also, President Kennedy put elements of the 2d Fleet between Cuba and the Dominican Republic during the crisis resulting from the assassination of Trujillo. In both instances a purpose was to prevent Cuban-based Communists from exploiting the troubled areas. If such action was justified then, and it certainly was, then a similar naval patrol between Red Cuba and the Panama area is fully justified now. Such a patrol would in a real sense be a quarantine, preventing communism from further poisoning our relationship with our longtime friends in Central America.

Concluding, Commander Lombardo said:

We had better let our friends, as well as our enemies, know that we don't intend to be intimidated by the mobs, and we aren't going to knuckle under to arrogant demands to renegotiate our control of the Panama Canal Zone. If we ever agree to renegotiating our authority in the U.S. zone, then we will have triggered a chain reaction of disaster, and our base rights at Guantanamo Bay will be the next Communist target for negotiation.

Commander Lombardo's statement gains additional merit and force in view of the timely article by Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States in the January Air Force Judge Advocate General's bulletin. Dr. Re is a professor of law at St. John's University School of Law and is currently on leave of absence. He received his B.S.—cum laude—and LL. B.—summa cum laude—degrees from St. John's University, his J.S.D. degree from New York University. He is vice chairman of the Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association. He is a member of the New York State bar, and holds the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve—JAG—International Affairs Division—MOARS—OTJAG, Headquarters, USAF.

I would like to insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Dr. Re's excellent analysis of the Cuba quarantine:

THE QUARANTINE OF CUBA IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Edward D. Re)

"This urgent transformation of Cuba into an important strategic base—by the presence of these large, long-range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction—constitutes an explicit threat to the peace and security of all the Americas in flagrant and deliberate defiance of the Rio Pact of 1947, the traditions of this Nation and hemisphere, the joint resolution of the 87th Congress, the Charter of the United Nations, and my own public warnings to the Soviets.

"Neither the United Statese of America nor the world community of nations can tolerate deliberate deception and offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small. We no longer live in a world where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security to constitute maximum peril. Nuclear weapons are so destructive and ballistic missiles are so swift that any substantially increased possibility of their use or any sudden change in their deployment may well be regarded as a definite threat to peace.

"The 1930's taught us a clear lesson: Aggressive conduct, if allowed to grow unchecked and unchallenged, ultimately leads to war. This Nation is opposed to war. We are also true to our word.

"In the defense of our own security and of the entire Western Hemisphere, and under the authority entrusted to me by the Constitution as endorsed by the resolution of Congress, I have directed that the following initial steps be taken immediately:

"First. To halt this offensive buildup, a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba is being initiated. All ships of any kind bound for Cuba from whatever nation or port will, if found to contain cargoes of offensive weapons, be turned back. This quarantine will be extended, if needed, to other types of cargo and carriers.

"Our goal is not the victory of might but the vindication of right—not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere and, we hope, around the world."

I. INTRODUCTION

In these stirring words, on October 22, 1962, President John F. Kennedy announced to the world the U.S. quarantine of Cuba. With an already assured place in history, the President of the United States, on that historic day, thus revealed to a world explosive with tension and fear, a new device of the international legal order. Specifically aimed against Cuba's definite threat to the peace, and with a clear realization of the dreadful risks, the United States embarked upon a quarantine of Cuba.

In assessing the peril-infested times that preceded and followed the President's historic decision, future historians may well agree that the quarantine of Cuba was the most significant single event of this era. Fully cognizant of the speed and destructive force of nuclear weapons, that decision, by reaffirming a free nation's love of freedom more than peace, thereby preserved both peace and freedom.

Indeed, much will be written concerning the momentous decision of that fateful day. Historians, however objective, will emphasize certain aspects of the event from the viewpoint of their particular interest. Whether viewed politically, philosophically or militarily, all authors will have a great deal to record for future generations.

To the lawyer, whose professional discipline instinctively causes him to question the legality of all human action, the foremost question will concern the legal basis of the quarantine. Indeed, it is a tribute to the lawyer that he will permit his thoughts to focus upon the lawfulness of the action—even though his very survival might have been in the balance.

There is no doubt that much will be written about the quarantine of Cuba. Many phases of this emerging literature are already apparent to the legal scholar. For the international lawyer, the questions will be very specific and sharply defined. What are the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947—the Rio Pact—that authorized the announced action? Are there provisions in the Charter of the United Nations that have a bearing upon the legality of that decision? Did there exist generally accepted principles of international law pertaining to a quarantine of Cuba? What are the traditions of this Nation and hemisphere, and on what promulgations are they based?

Presumably, at some point the discussion must come to grips with the basic question whether the concepts of international law, particularly those surrounding 19th century naval warfare, are adequate to cope with the problems ushered in by the nuclear age. Since the action against Cuba was a quarantine, the lawyer inevitably must anticipate the question "How does a quarantine differ from a blockade?"

Even the most cursory answer would have to commence with the concepts of international law that deal with those acts of a nation termed "acts short of war." The layman will now learn that the blockade is only one of these acts and that the term itself refers to two different actions, depending upon whether it is a belligerent or a pacific blockade. Soon, in a genuine attempt to enlighten, the international lawyer will find himself explaining not only the legal aspects of blockade, but also other more or less related notions such as embargo, interdiction, intervention, reprisal and retorsion. These terms, although well known to the international lawyer and therefore capable of definition, assume new meaning depending upon time, place, and surrounding circumstances. Such, the layman will be told, is the flexibility and adaptability of the law. Still, the question will persist, "Why a quarantine?" and how does it differ from these other notions "well known to the international lawyer"?

II. LEGALITY IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

It may be appropriate at the outset to note certain jurisprudential difficulties that exist in defining the notion of legality in the international sense. The difficulty goes to the very roots of international law. Austinian jurists often observe that there is no such thing as international law in the strict legal sense and that the concept of legality, therefore, is largely meaningless. On the other hand, the international lawyer may point to a host of principles that actually exist, and are in fact observed by the community of nations. Whether this observance or compliance is ultimately founded upon mutual or unilateral self-interest, the effectiveness of various international sanctions, or the dictates of necessity, poses interesting jurisprudential questions. Clearly the legality of an act in the international legal sense must be ultimately concerned with the aims of international law itself. These aims or purposes may range from the fostering of peace and the advancement of human civilization to simple self-preservation. It is this unsettled atmosphere surrounding the basic aims of international law that beclouds the legality of international acts such as the quarantine of Cuba.

Not only the international lawyer, but diplomats and those concerned with foreign policy may wish to make additional inquiries. Does the act offend the international conscience? Does it further world peace and order? Is it reasonable in conception and in execution? Are there analogous precedents in international law?

The student also knows of other relevant aspects of international law. For example, under the traditional international law of reprisals, some acts admittedly illegal may, under certain circumstances, become legal or justifiable. Other acts which are normally considered unlawful in time of peace may be lawful in time of war. And international law has finally begun seriously to question the legality of war itself.

Nevertheless, the legality of the Cuban quarantine may be examined in light of the two chief sources of international law. The first is customary international law, which may be found in the custom and usage of countries. This source is "based upon the common consent of nations extending over a period of time of sufficient duration to cause it to become crystallized into a rule of conduct."[1] The second is conventional international law, which consists of treaties, pronouncements of foreign offices, statements by writers, and decisions of certain national and international tribunals.[2]

III. THE QUARANTINE UNDER CUSTOMARY INTERNATIONAL LAW

(a) *History of the term*

The quarantine of Cuba has been referred to by several titles. Although many have described it as a "limited naval blockade," the U.S. proclamation was actually entitled "Interdiction of the Delivery of Offensive Weapons to Cuba."[3] The term "quarantine," even apart from its common meanings in medical and legal practice, has had a long history in maritime law. It originally meant a period of 40 days, during which a ship arriving in port, and suspected of being infected with a malignant or contagious disease, was obliged to forbear all intercourse with the shore. The word is still used in a wider sense to indicate any forced stoppage of travel, communication, or intercourse, due to contagion or infections—including the spreading of plant and animal pests on land or by sea. Although the imposition of a traditional quarantine was indeed a forceful and unfriendly display of power, it has been universally regarded as a peaceful act of self-preservation.

Apart from the obvious analogy to the spread of disease, President Kennedy's choice of this term to describe the Cuban blockade may be regarded as extremely significant. Rather than utilize the warlike language of blockade, the President indicated, from the very beginning, an intent to characterize the act as essentially peaceful.

(b) *Acts short of war*

Referring solely to the limited naval blockade of Cuba, the quarantine may be included in the series of measures in that area of international law entitled "Acts Short of War." These acts may range from minor international insults, such as placing a lesser official in charge of a consulate, to substantially warlike acts short of formally-declared war itself. International law has sought to categorize and define these acts short of war by listing them in order of their severity and by defining their respective elements. The spectrum includes such actions as the imposition of higher tariffs, restrictions on currency, the sequestration of foreign property, the severing of diplomatic relations and other acts of international harassment. The cold war of this decade has added several measures to the list: jamming of radio broadcasts, propaganda barrages, denunciations before various international organizations, and the recognition of competitive governments, to mention but a few.

It has been indicated that certain acts short of war, although unlawful in time of peace, may be lawful in time of war. It has also been said of these retaliatory measures that they "have come about by the absence of law-enforcing machinery in international law. Thus, a method has been developed that is not war and yet is intended to redress wrongs committed by another state forcefully and summarily."[4]

(c) *Retaliation, retorsion, and reprisal*

The terms "retaliation," "retorsion," and "reprisal" are generally used loosely and interchangeably to describe these acts short of war. Retaliation, the most general term, is not a technical concept and does not have a well-defined meaning. Retorsion is used to define those acts that are legal but deliberately unkind and discourteous which are taken to redress prior acts likewise legal but also unkind and discourteous. Increases of tariff rates are a familiar example.

Reprisals, on the other hand, are usually defined as injurious and otherwise internationally illegal acts of one state that are permitted as measures of redress against another state for its own international delinquency. These may take a great variety of forms.

Traditional international law has recognized three conditions which would justify a reprisal. First, the reprisal must be preceded by an act contrary to international law. Second, it must be preceded by an unsatisfied demand for redress. Finally, the reprisal must be commensurate with or proportionate to the illegal act committed.

The distinction between retorsion and reprisal is often vague and ill-drawn. Historically, there has e isted some element of force and seizure in reprisals, the concept apparently having originated from the "letters of marque and reprisal" issued to private persons to enable them to avenge a wrong or secure a remedy.[5] Although the term "reprisal" is often used in a broad sense to include all coercive measures, in its narrower sense it is used to describe an act ordinarily illegal but justified against a prior violation of international law.

(d) *Embargo, Pacific blockade and belligerent blockade*

Traditional international law has recognized several different types of naval reprisals. Embargo is a special form in which vessels of the delinquent state are detained in the ports of the State that imposes the embargo. A blockade, in general, consists in the cutting off of a foreign port or coast by means of a naval operation. Two types of blockade are recognized in international law. A pacific blockade is the prevention of maritime communication with a foreign port by the use of force without technically destroying peaceful relations. It may be noted that the term is essentially a contradictory one, since a pacific blockade may be regarded as an act of war and, indeed, sometimes leads to war. Although in the past, pacific blockades have varied greatly in nature, they have generally been termed pacific if the blockading state does not intend the blockade as an act of war or if the blockaded state does not choose to regard it as such.

It has been observed, somewhat cynically, that pacific blockade has been utilized principally by the major powers who do not wish the inconvenience of war with smaller countries. Be that as it may, the pacific blockade has a long history in international law and is generally recognized as an effective means of hastening a settlement of international disputes without recourse to war.

It ought to be added that there is a wide diversity of opinion as to the effect of a pacific blockade upon the vessels of third nations. The weight of authority, however, seems to favor the view that a pacific blockade may not be enforced against the vessels of third nations.[6]

In contrast to the pacific blockade, a belligerent blockade is one carried on during a state of war. Although it is an unequivocally hostile measure of war against the enemy, its principal object is to cut off trade and communications rather than to destroy the port or induce a surrender by force. It is essentially a strategic pressure move having military and economic significance. The belligerent blockade may range from the de facto or simple blockade declared by a local commanding officer to the public or governmental blockade established by a formal act of state. As far as neutrals are concerned, the prerequisite elements of a belligerent blockade are knowledge, which may be accomplished either by public declaration or actual notification of vessels, and effectiveness of execution.[7] Enforcement methods have varied considerably: the vessel or its cargo (or both) may be forfeited, turned back, escorted out of the area to another

Footnotes at end of speech.

port or, under certain circumstances, sunk.

Apart from the basic distinctions in conception, motive and means of execution, it may be readily seen that the principal difference between the two types of blockade is to be found in the rights and duties of blockading states in relation to the ships of third states. Although the area is by no means completely settled, under customary international law, a pacific blockade is inapplicable to vessels of a third state. A belligerent blockade, on the other hand, would also apply to the ships of neutrals or other states.

(e) Other related acts: Visit and search; maritime seizure and capture

Closely allied to the concept and purpose of belligerent and pacific blockade are certain other measures that have been exercised by belligerents in wartime. Visit and search is the right of a belligerent to stop, visit, and search a vessel to learn whether it is connected with the hostilities. Under customary international law, the principal condition of a legal visitation and search is that it be executed with consideration and reasonableness. Generally, the vessel is ordered to stop or lie to, or is brought to. Innocent vessels must be allowed to proceed, but if there is cause for capture, the vessel is seized and sent to a prize court for adjudication.

Maritime seizure and capture of neutral private vessels during wartime may be justified on several grounds, including an attempt to break a blockade, or "if the vessel itself may be contraband or may be carrying contraband."[8] In such cases, the vessel is taken to the nearest home port for adjudication by a prize court.

Contraband in maritime law has been defined as consisting of neutral goods for use in war which have a belligerent destination. Absolute contraband consists of goods solely for use in war; conditional contraband includes goods which may be used either for war or peace. Under the law of contraband, neutral vessels carrying goods in violation of law or treaty are subject to seizure.

While the legality of these various rights and measures has always been the subject of dispute, it is significant to observe that they are firmly accepted in traditional international law as incidents of war. Furthermore, there is a trend which favors the application of these and other laws of war to an increasing variety of situations which, although hostile, do not constitute actual war. The Cuban quarantine, as one of the most severe measures yet initiated in the cold war, may indeed represent the latest evidence of this trend.

(f) The quarantine of Cuba

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated that customary international law on the subject of blockade and allied concepts is rather complex, if not inconsistent and unrealistic. Nevertheless, it may be seen readily that the Cuban quarantine partakes of the elements of both pacific and belligerent blockade. Although the language proclaiming the quarantine (and in particular the language prescribing the methods for its enforcement) is couched in terms of the belligerent blockade, the quarantine was not a belligerent blockade. It was neither intended as an act of war nor did it occur in wartime. Regardless of one's view of the cold war and its severity, it is impossible to agree with those who find the cold war the necessary prerequisite element of war. In any event, it may be pointed out that the blockaded country was not prepared to regard the quarantine as an act of war. While perhaps couched in the terms of a belligerent blockade, and while possessing some of its elements, particularly in relation to vessels of third nations, the quarantine was motivated throughout by a pacific intent, and fulfilled more closely the conditions of a pacific blockade.

Some have assailed the quarantine as a complete and drastic departure from traditional international law and a violation of the law of nations. As may be seen from an examination of the international legal structure, such is not the case. Looked upon as a whole, the quarantine is indeed a new form of reprisal. Upon closer scrutiny, however, it may be seen that each individual element of the quarantine has precedent in customary international law. There are no new elements as such in the quarantine; rather, it involved a novel combination of traditional elements. A study of its proclamation, the implementing orders of execution, its actual operation, motives, and all the surrounding circumstances, cannot but impress the student with the fact that the quarantine was actually carefully modeled to fit into the existing international legal pattern—to extend it and adapt it to a new situation without impairing its fundamental precepts.

The flexibility and adaptability of international law, like any other area of law, is manifest in the continued evolution of older concepts to meet the exigencies of a rapidly advancing world. Just as pacific blockade was an outgrowth of older principles, the quarantine was a newer form of reprisal. As such, it has taken its place somewhere between the classic forms of belligerent and pacific blockade, although far closer to the pacific blockade.

Let us proceed to investigate the relation of the quarantine to the right of national and collective self-defense as reflected in conventional international law.

That relation must be examined in light of the prior acts of Cuba, the principles of self-defense, and the applicable hemispheric treaty obligations. The stark reality of the situation is set forth in the previously quoted words of President Kennedy. The speed of ballistic missiles and the destructive force of nuclear weapons set the stage for the problems that face nations in the 20th century. Could legal concepts such as those surrounding the notion of blockade, developed to cope with 19th century aspects of naval warfare, adequately meet the imminent problem that had to be solved?

IV. THE QUARANTINE UNDER CONVENTIONAL INTERNATIONAL LAW

The framework of conventional international law in which the legality of the Cuban quarantine must be investigated consists of the treaties and other international agreements to which the United States is a party, including the Charter of the United Nations and the various regional organizations authorized and recognized by that organ. It also includes other treaties to which the United States and Cuba are parties, together with the various declarations of individual and collective national intent.

(a) Charter of the United Nations

The Charter of the United Nations,[9] entered into as a binding treaty by the United States, is part of the law of the land. Article 1(1) of the charter sets forth the purposes of the United Nations as follows:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

Article 2(3) provides that "All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered." This provision is not an absolute restriction against the use of force. Although article 2(4) provides that "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations," the preamble of the charter expressly provides for the use of armed force "in the common interest."

Procedures for the pacific settlement of international disputes are set forth at length in the charter. Article 33(1), for instance, provides that "The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." Article 35 provides that nations may bring the dispute to the attention of the Security Council or the General Assembly, and if this means fails, they are obliged by article 37 to refer the dispute to the Security Council.

It is interesting to note the various measures "not involving the use of armed force" that may be employed by the Security Council to enforce its decisions. Article 41 provides that "These may include complete or partial interruption of economical relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations." If these means prove inadequate, article 42 provides that the Security Council "may take such action by air, sea, or land forces, as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations."

It may therefore be seen that blockade by the sea forces of a member nation is specifically provided for in the U.N. Charter as a measure of enforcement by the Security Council. This would indicate that the quarantine, as a means of enforcement, is not contrary to the spirit or terms of the charter.

In the course of events leading up to the Cuban quarantine, it is often forgotten that the United States did attempt to follow the procedures for pacific settlement outlined in article 33. These efforts culminated in the request by the United States for an emergency session of the Security Council on October 23, 1962. It is this final step, under the prescribed United Nations procedure, that has subjected the action of the United States to the charge of illegality. Admittedly, the quarantine was established by Presidential proclamation on October 23, and not by the Security Council. And by its terms, it went into effect the following day. Hence, it is further pointed out that the quarantine had already been announced when the United States sought to comply with article 37 in referring the dispute to the Security Council.[10]

Although the United States had sought at all stages to utilize the established U.N. procedure, its recourse to the Security Council chronologically came after the President's message announcing the quarantine. In addition, the subsequent effective proclamation was made by the United States, not the U.N. Security Council. Were these actions therefore violative of the U.N. Charter?

(b) National self-defense

The answer to the question is reasonably to be found in article 51 of the U.N. Charter. That article provides:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken

Footnotes at end of speech.

by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

It should be noted that the right of self-defense is an integral part of international law and is simply reflected and codified in article 51 of the charter. Its exercise, therefore, while legally conforming to the provisions of article 51 of the U.N. Charter, is not exclusively dependent upon that article for its authority. Clearly, under a construction that is meaningful and realistic in the present posture of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, one must conclude that the action of the United States was a lawful exercise of the basic and inherent right of national self-defense.

While cogent moral reasons lend support to the quarantine of Cuba, specifically it is article 51 of the U.N. Charter which refutes the charge of illegality. After a reading of article 51, the specific charge must center around the interpretation of the words "armed attack" in that article, since no "armed attack" had been launched against the United States. Can these words be reasonably interpreted to contemplate an actual, physical armed attack only? Such an interpretation would seem to be divorced from the grim realities of modern warfare and cannot possibly prevail in the 20th century. In an era of imminent and immediate mass destruction, literal adherence to the concept of actual armed attack is indeed a hollow argument. National self-defense, to retain any semblance of meaning and effectiveness must, because of modern armaments, be reasonably anticipatory in nature. This interpretation of armed attack, as including measures based upon reasonable anticipatory self-defense, is clearly consistent with the reality of the situation. It is not remiss to point out that it possesses the advantage of preserving the peace by not allowing aggressive conduct to grow unchecked and unchallenged.

(c) *Collective self-defense; regional agencies*

Within the framework of the U.N. Charter, the quarantine is not only a proper exercise of the right of national self-defense recognized by article 51, but is also consistent with the aims and ideals of the U.N. Its legality, however, also rests upon the precepts of collective self-defense as expressly recognized by the U.N. Charter. Article 52 (1) provides for the existence of "regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

Such a regional organization is the Organization of American States (OAS) which is recognized by the United Nations as coming within article 52(1) of the U.N. Charter. Like the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the OAS [11] is a treaty which binds both Cuba and the United States. Indeed, the Charter of the OAS reflects the U.N. Charter to a considerable degree. Article 15 of the OAS Charter denies the right of intervention, and article 17 expresses the customary international law rule that the territory of a state is inviolable. Article 19, however, provides specifically that "Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in articles 15 and 17." The OAS Charter thus recognizes and implements other existing treaties, including the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; i.e., the Rio Treaty of 1947.

Chapter V of the OAS Charter summarizes, by a treaty provision, the inter-American system of collective self-defense. Article 24 of that charter provides:

"Every act of aggression by a State against the territorial integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State shall be considered an act of aggression against the other American States."

Chapter V further provides in article 25:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extra-continental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American States, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American States, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective self-defense, shall apply the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject."

These provisions include not only the procedures that had already been established in the Rio Treaty of 1947 and the declarations that had been in effect among the American States for at least 20 years prior to the OAS Charter, but also the later resolutions of Caracas and Punta del Este which brought the international Communist conspiracy within the ambit of article 25.

(d) *Collective self-defense; other treaties and declarations; the Rio Treaty of 1947*

The OAS Charter, signed in 1948, was the culmination of at least 20 years of agreements, declarations, and resolutions among the American States concerning their mutual and collective self-defense of the Western Hemisphere, many of which are legally binding obligations on the United States and Cuba. In the Declaration of Lima of 1938,[12] for instance, these states had expressed their "determination to make effective their solidarity" when "the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American Republic is thus threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them."

Again, in the Declaration of Panama of 1939,[13] the American States asserted their rights of collective security and self-defense over large segments of the oceans surrounding North and South America.

In the act of Habana of 1940,[14] it was specifically provided that "any attempts on the part of a non-American State against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American State will be considered as an act of aggression against the states which signed this declaration."

A similar provision was contained in the act of Chapultepec of 1945.[15] This act further recommended the framing of a postwar treaty to deal with the problems of threats or acts of aggression against any American Republic and the provision of corrective measures, including the use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression. The act of Chapultepec eventually led to the signing of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947—the Rio Treaty.[16]

The preamble of this treaty states that "the obligation of mutual assistance and common defense of the American Republics is essentially related to their democratic ideals and to their will to cooperate permanently in the fulfillment of the principles and purposes of a policy of peace."

The preamble further provides that the American States:

"Have resolved, in conformity with the objectives stated above, to conclude the following treaty, in order to assure peace, through adequate means, to provide for effective reciprocal assistance to meet armed attacks against any American State, and in order to deal with threats of aggression against any of them."

The provisions of article 6 of the Rio Treaty are extremely significant. This article provides as follows:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The similarity of this article to article 25 of the OAS Charter should be noted. Of particular importance is the fact that the concept of armed attack—the same as that of article 51 of the U.N. Charter—is here amplified and extended by definition to include "an agression which is not an armed attack, an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict or any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America." This extension, as variously modified in both articles, indeed lends support to the more realistic interpretation of the same words in article 51 of the U.N. Charter.

The agreements and declarations of solidarity of the American States did not end with the Rio Treaty of 1947 or the Charter of the OAS in 1948. In Caracas, in 1954,[17] the 10th Inter-American Conference of American Republics condemned the Communist movement "as constituting intervention in American affairs," expressed "the determination of the American States to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interests of an alien despotism," and declared that the "domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

Similarly, the foreign ministers of the American Republics met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January, 1962 [18] to consider once again the threat of the spread of Communist ideals and conduct in Cuba. As a result, the Organ of Consultation of the OAS excluded the Communist Government of Cuba from the inter-American system, and resolved as follows:

"1. That adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system and the alinement of such a government with the Communist bloc breaks the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere.

"2. That the present Government of Cuba, which has officially indentified itself as a Marxist-Leninist government, is incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system.

"3. That this incompatibility excludes the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system.

"4. That the Council of the Organization of American States and the other organs and organizations of the inter-American system adopt without delay the measures necessary to carry out this resolution."

It was pursuant to article 25 of the OAS Charter and article 6 of the Rio Treaty that, on October 23, 1962, the Council of the Organization of American States met in its capacity as provisional consultative organ

Footnotes at end of speech.

under the Rio Treaty at the request of the United States.[19] The consultative organ, consisting of 20 American Republics, unanimously recommended that member states "take all measures, including the use of armed force" to dispel the threat to their mutual security, resolving:

"1. To call for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other weapons with any offensive capability;

"2. To recommend that the member states, in accordance with articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, take all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they may deem necessary to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet powers military material [sic] and related supplies which may threaten the peace and security of the continent and to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive capability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and security of the continent."

This action was specifically in accordance with article 8 of the Rio Treaty, which provides that:

"For the purposes of this treaty, the measures on which the organ of consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force."

In conjunction with articles 6 and 8, article 3 of the Rio Treaty contains an important expression of the relationship of the inherent right of self-defense of the U.N. Charter. The Congress, in its joint resolution adopted by the Senate on September 20, 1962,[20] recognized this fact, citing article 3 at length:

"Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that 'an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations'."[21]

The joint resolution of the Congress, after citing the Monroe Doctrine, article 3 of the Rio Treaty of 1947, and the Punta del Este resolution above, went on to say:

"Whereas the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

"(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

"(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

"(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

V. CONCLUSION

With the joint resolution of Congress expressing the determination of the United States with respect to Cuba, we have run the full cycle of the legal background of President Kennedy's message of October 22 and proclamation of October 23, 1962. In branding the "urgent transformation of Cuba into an important strategic base by the presence of * * * large, long-range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction" an "explicit threat to the peace and security of all the Americas," President Kennedy cited the Rio Treaty of 1947, the traditions of this Nation and hemisphere, the joint resolution of Congress, the Charter of the United Nations, and his own public warnings to the Soviets.

On which of these, then, was the legality of the Cuban quarantine ultimately based? First of all, the quarantine was a legitimate exercise of the inherent right of self-defense, a right recognized by article 51 of the U.N. Charter. Secondly, through the Organization of American States and pursuant to the provisions of the Rio Treaty of 1947, it was an exercise of the equally inherent right of collective self-defense, a right also recognized by article 51 of the U.N. Charter. Finally, it was justifiable on broader grounds, both legal and moral: That of the preservation and maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the basic goals of international law and the ideals expressed in the U.N. Charter.

Scholars ought not to lose sight of the fact that the actions of Cuba and the Soviets were in themselves illegal under international law as a contravention, not only of the U.N. Charter, but as acts of interference, aggression and threats to the security of the Americans as this security had been expressed for at least 24 years in solemnly ratified treaties, declarations, and agreements. Any doubt as to the illegality of the Cuban acts against the American States was surely dispelled by the resolutions of Caracas and Punta del Este.

We have already examined the essential nature of the quarantine itself as a new measure in international law. In his choice of the procedural vehicle to be used to enforce and protect the rights of all the Americas. President Kennedy acted with a restraint that indicated a deep respect for the institutions, concepts, and traditions of international law and a desire to vindicate the U.N. and OAS Charters. In the final analysis, it may be argued that the reasonableness of the quarantine itself and its acceptance by the other nations of the world, its peaceful intent, and the ends it sought to accomplish are indeed eloquent testimony of its legality.

The world has recently witnessed a dramatic change from the 19th century concepts of naval warfare. Because of the striking power and almost incredible advances in the science of modern armaments, new means have had to be devised to meet present needs. It may truly be said that traditional international law was no longer capable of regulating nuclear warfare in the legal terms of the previous century. With the Cuban quarantine, we have seen the emergence of a new vital concept for the regulation of this modern warfare—one which has evolved naturally and organically from the traditional international law.

It has been wisely said that although the law must be stable, it cannot stand still. This being so, we are indeed privileged to witness, in this century, a new device of the international legal order whose application in the quarantine of Cuba helped to preserve our freedom and may in the future help to preserve our very civilization.

---

[1] 1 Hackworth, Digest of International Law 1 (1940).

[2] Ibid.

[3] See 47 Department of State Bulletin 717 (Nov. 12, 1962); 57 Am. J. Int'l L. 512 (1963).

[4] "Note on Retaliation, Retorsion and Reprisals" in Orfield and Re, "Cases and Materials on International Law," 613 (1955).

[5] Ibid. See also "Note on Embargo and Pacific Blockade," Orfield and Re, op. cit. supra at 617. The act constituting the reprisal would ordinarily appear, therefore, to be illegal at first glance. If it fulfills the requisites of a true reprisal, however, it becomes "legal"—as a reprisal.

[6] See, e.g., Wilson, "Handbook of International Law" 237–48, 379 (1939), and authorities cited therein. See also Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations," 176 (1950); 2 Hyde, "International Law, Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States," 1669 (2d ed. 1945).

[7] The "effectiveness of execution" requirement was an outgrowth of the "paper blockades" of the 19th century in which one nation sought to blockade another simply by proclaiming the blockade to other nations.

[8] Contrast this language, that of the classic belligerent blockade and seizure with the Presidential Interdiction of the Delivery of Offensive Weapons to Cuba, Proclamation No. 3504, 47 Department of State Bulletin No. 717 (Nov. 12, 1962).

[9] T.S. No. 993, U.N. DPI/16 10521—2 DM (1962).

[10] President Kennedy's message of Oct. 22 said that he had "directed that the following initial steps be taken immediately: First, a strict quarantine is being initiated." See 47 Department of State Bulletin No. 716 (Nov. 12, 1962). Immediately thereafter, the United States placed the Cuban situation before the U.N. Security Council and requested an urgent meeting of the Council. Id. at 723–724. The Council did not act on the Soviet resolution condemning the quarantine, but, by general consent, agreed to pursue a negotiated settlement through the Secretary General. On Oct. 23, the OAS organ of consultation met and recommended the use of "all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force." Id. at 723. The formal proclamation of the President, citing this OAS resolution, then followed on Oct. 23, and went into effect the following way. This proclamation did not refer to either the United Nations or the Security Council action, presumably because, in the words of Secretary of State Rusk, it was necessary to act "without awaiting the outcome of the United Nations approach." Id. at 722. Referral of the matter to the Security Council by the United States may also be interpreted as a strict compliance with the reporting proviso of art. 51, infra.

[11] 2 U.S.T. and O.I.A. 2416 (1951).

[12] 5 Hackworth, "Digest of International Law," 463, 464 (1943).

[13] See 34 Am. J. Int'l L. 17 (Supp. 1940).

[14] See 5 Hackworth, op. cit. supra, note 12, at 466 (1943).

[15] 60 Stat. 1831, 1837 (1945).

[16] 62 Stat. 1681 (1948).

[17] See 30 Department of State Bulletin No. 634, 638 (Apr. 26, 1954).

[18] See 46 Department of State Bulletin No. 278, 279 (Feb. 19, 1962).

[19] See 47 Department of State Bulletin No. 720–723 (Nov. 12, 1962).

[20] S.J. Res. 230, Sept. 20, 1962 (Senate); Sept. 26, 1962 (House of Representatives), (approved Oct. 3, 1962), 47 Department of State Bulletin No. 597 (Oct. 22, 1962).

[21] Thus, art. 51 of the U.N. Charter (which specifically includes "collective" self-defense within its terms) also operates as an exception to art. 53, which prohibits regional agencies from taking "enforcement action" without prior authorization of the Security Council.

Much Ado on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 6, 1964:

INSIDE REPORT: MUCH ADO ON FOREIGN AID

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

WASHINGTON.—After much ado but little action, President Johnson's foreign aid committee—featuring Ball, Bell, Bundy, Black, Bullitt and Co.—is about ready to disband.

It was a noble idea, this committee to study foreign aid. But it never had a chance. It never even had a name.

In the first place, President Kennedy tried the "Let's appoint a committee" approach to get foreign aid off the congressional shoals more than a year ago. Instead of helping, this committee, headed by Lucius Clay, inadvertently shot more holes in the leaky vessel. The experience was sobering.

In the second place, congressional disagreements over how to package foreign aid for easy handling on Capitol Hill seem irreconcilable.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, a Johnson confidant and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has been vainly arguing in favor of dismantling various component parts of the aid bill and distributing them throughout the Government (and in different committees of Congress). For example, he wants all military aid split out of the bill—and out of the Agency for International Development (AID)—and turned over to the Pentagon.

President Johnson leans toward this approach himself. But Representative THOMAS MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has written a personal letter to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara sternly opposing the move.

Even if MORGAN and FULBRIGHT agreed, however, they could not persuade two of the trustees of Congress: Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and Representative CARL VINSON, the prestigious Georgians who head the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

If the military portion of the bill were sliced away, it would have to be handled by these two committees. VINSON has said he would whip through a resolution referring it right back to MORGAN'S Foreign Affairs Committee.

And MORGAN insists that if FULBRIGHT'S plan were adopted, the administration would lose a dozen or so House committee votes for the foreign aid authorization bill this spring. Military aid, MORGAN claims, is the sweetener needed to move the unpopular aid bill through his committee each year.

President Johnson's Foreign Aid Panel, which taxied down the runway with characteristic flourish on December 26, never really got off the ground. One of its members, for example, is Sargent Shriver, the head of the Peace Corps. But the President sent Shriver on a global tour soon after the Panel had its second meeting.

Shriver was put on the Committee in hopes that if the aid program could be dismembered and parceled out among different agencies, technical assistance could be tucked into the Peace Corps.

This was not the brightest of hopes. Shriver is as eager to take over foreign aid as he is to catch leprosy.

The story of the President's Committee does not stop there. Newspapers soon carried leaked stories that Under Secretary of State George Ball, the Chairman, was to move the Aid Agency lock, stock, and barrel into the State Department.

These reports, with all the other rumors, hardly raised spirits in AID. The Agency's morale, which is never more than barely visible, disappeared altogether.

Now, however, it is very unlikely that much will be changed. The appropriation for a few components of military aid, such as money for training foreign troops and the regular allocation to NATO, may be transferred to the defense budget. AID would be delighted.

And then the President's Committee, which was supposed to make its report by January 15, will pass into limbo in the footsteps of the Clay Committee and countless forgotten study committees.

When that happens, Assistant Secretary of Defense William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John Bullitt, and former World Bank President Eugene Black, along with the other members, can forget about reorganizing foreign aid—until next year.

And Bell can get back to full-time work at AID, where his plans to focus foreign aid on fewer countries, cut employees, and get results have been temporarily sidetracked.

Chattanooga's Local Initiative Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention, once again, to our all-American city, Chattanooga, Tenn., and to a manner in which our citizens effectively participate in local government.

To extoll this great city's extraordinary progress, just within the last 12 months, would take a great deal of time. Today I want to point out one constructive idea, conceived by dynamic Mayor Ralph Kelley, which has paid handsome dividends: that is the creation of specialized citizens committees to study municipal problems and make recommendations for action.

Over 200 Chattanooga area leaders are serving on 8 committees broken down into 32 subcommittees. There is a full employment committee, a tourist development committee, a boost-the-economy committee, and many others dealing with particular aspects of city government. I hasten to point out these Chattanoogans are contributing their services without financial compensation. Such a pool of professional assistance would, under normal circumstances, cost the city hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Through participation, these individuals themselves have become more keenly aware of the responsibilities and demands of a modern, progressive city. Through their efforts, a city has become more exciting, more challenging, and more responsive to the individual needs of its citizenry.

We hear a lot these days about the need for more Federal programs to correct local problems of all kinds. We are deluged with administration plans calling for the Central Government to step in and direct community affairs. With this so-called assistance could come a dependence on Washington and a reduction in personal enterprise and local initiative, which have been the keystones of America since the birth of our Nation.

In hopes that other municipalities in the Nation may benefit from learning of Chattanooga's successful citizen participation program, an article "Chattanooga's Civic Committees Pay Dividends," written by Tom Williams, and published in the January and February edition of Nation's Cities, follows.

CHATTANOOGA'S CIVIC COMMITTEES PAY DIVIDENDS

(By Tom Williams)

When 35-year-old Attorney Ralph Kelley was running last spring for mayor of Chattanooga, Tenn. (population 130,000), he told the voters without equivocation that if he were elected he would call on them—as citizens—for help and advice in making Chattanooga's government the best and most efficiently operated anywhere.

It was more than just a political promise, as Chattanoogans have found out in the 9 months Mayor Kelley has been in office. A unique and all-encompassing program of citizen participation in government has been launched in a big way, and it has already paid dividends by obtaining for the city services of highly skilled and highly paid professional people in all lines of endeavor—at a cost of not 1 cent.

Citizens skilled in the field of finance, for instance, have contributed their services as members of the fiscal affairs committee, whose recommendations that certain idle funds be invested in Treasury bills have already saved Chattanooga and its taxpayers thousands of dollars per month.

Members of the full employment committee have helped to give the city a study of the local labor market that is more complete and up to date than any in the city's history. And the first of a series of proposed programs for training the unemployed has already been launched. (More than $700,000 in manpower-development training programs has already been approved.) Unemployment has dropped by 33 percent in 8 months although the committee would be the last to claim that it deserves credit for it.

Citizens serving on a tourist development committee are hard at work, contributing hour upon hour of their own time, in boosting one of the major areas of Chattanooga's diversified economy—the travel and tourist industry. Other committees are also working, and still others are being formed. And Chattanoogans, through the overwhelming response of citizens to assist their city's government, have been provided specialized services and advice that the city could never have afforded if it had had to pay for these commodities.

Lawyers, financiers, accountants, insurance experts, safety experts, experienced leaders in the field of business and labor and in many other specialized fields are being called on to make the city government's operation smooth running and efficient and to solve longstanding problems. One specialist whose services, obtained through a citizens committee, cost the city not a cent, normally is paid at the rate of $300 per day.

So far, 8 committees—with 32 subcommittees—have been organized and are now functioning; more than 200 highly qualified citizens are participants. And makeup of these committees is a far cry from the usual makeup of honorary citizens committees which some public officials appoint merely for window dressing. The members range from housewives to millionaires, representing every level of the economy and every field of endeavor. Their common interest is that they all want a better city and are willing to help the new administration shape one.

In making appointments to citizen committees Mayor Kelley is careful not to limit the committees to his own supporters or to citizens living within the city limits. Much of the work of the citizen committees is and will be beneficial to the entire area rather than just the city government. So, in selecting the committees, the mayor relies upon

citizen help. Two citizen coordinators assist in the organization of the committees, while the city's director of public affairs, Robert A. Elmore, serves as overall coordinator.

A major reason the committee system of citizen participation is working well in Chattanooga, says Elmore, is that adequate professional assistance is provided to all the committees. Careful arrangements are made for committees to have the benefit of consultants and to be provided technical assistance in their work— something that has been overlooked in many other cities where committees of citizens have not proved so successful. The municipal technical advisory service, for example, has worked closely with both the fiscal affairs and the city employees' merit system committees.

Besides the direct benefits being given the city of Chattanooga by its citizens committees, there are fringe benefits from the way the committees function. All the committees meet at city hall, creating a healthy situation whereby local citizens are frequently in and out of the building which houses their city government. They have complete access to all information about their government, and nothing is hidden from them.

In addition to the fiscal affairs committee, the full employment committee, and the tourist development committee, citizens are contributing their services as members of the boost-the-economy committee, a city employees' merit system committee, a safety coordinating committee, a biracial committee, and a community improvement committee.

Citizens committee projects in Chattanooga are far from vague. Each of these groups has specific assignments. The boost-the-economy committee was set up to review the city's services to industry, study location for a new technical school, put into effect new ideas to attract industry.

The fiscal affairs committee was named to review the city's purchasing practices, to help and advise with the installation of a data processing center, to aid the city in investing its funds, to aid with the annual budget, and to increase the efficiency of the city.

The full employment committee is studying high school dropouts and ways to combat this problem, as well as studying employment for minors, training programs for adults, the area's unemployment situation, and the matter of employing the physically handicapped, senior citizens, Negroes, and others hard to place.

And the tourist development committee is looking into plans for a downtown marina on the Tennessee River, expanding family camping sites, planning tours of points of interest, and events on nearby Chickamauga Lake, and arranging for visitor information.

The community improvement committee will promote the golden gateway urban renewal program and encourage immediate development of available sites. It will investigate minority housing problems and work toward their solution, and it will assist in the consideration of development programs of the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Planning Commission.

The insurance committee will seek out ways the city can save money on insurance premiums and still obtain the best possible coverage, while the public relations committee will work to build local pride and civic spirit and obtain favorable publicity.

Most ideas brought out during political campaigns are never heard of again. But Mayor Ralph Kelley's program for citizen participation in Chattanooga's city government has grown into a reality which in a few short months has proved over and over again its immense value. Thousands of hours have already been spent on projects of all kinds, and the city is enjoying benfits never before obtainable.

The simple philosophy which makes it work, perhaps, is summed up like this: Government can do just so much by itself, and citizens can do just so much. But acting together, citizens and government can work most effectively for the good of the community.

Chattanooga is finding out that this is true.

Who Is the American Veteran and What Is He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, there are roughly some 22 million veterans in the United States—men and women who served our Nation in the armed services in time of war. Probably no single group in American society has been more publicly derided and maligned, seriously or in jest, unless possibly it can be the mother-in-law.

We in Wisconsin are indeed fortunate in having an exceedingly able director of veterans' affairs, Mr. John R. Moses, an effective administrator as well as one who understands the problems and needs of all veterans. He appreciates the tremendous sacrifices they made in terms of education, careers, and families when called upon to defend our country, and he is equally sensitive to our implicit obligation to compensate them for services received.

I wish to include here the text of a speech which Mr. Moses delivered recently before the Rotary Club of West Madison. Those of my colleagues who are veterans will find his comments most gratifying. I believe it will provide those who are not veterans with some compelling insights into the interests and aspirations of the American veterans:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR THE VETERAN IN 1964

It's difficult and generally unproductive to talk about a broad subject such as the veteran, without pinning the discussion down to specifics at some stage of the game. Inadequate information or to general discussion can only lead to misunderstanding.

We all know the veteran individually, even as we know each other, but the veteran, in the generic sense, is often misunderstood and often unfairly maligned. At all times except during or immediately after a nation's involvement in war the veteran's lot has been disrepute. To many he has been a street corner pencil or apple peddler, a shiftless mendicant, a seeker of handouts, of something for nothing—or else he is viewed as a drumbeater, a flagwaver, a naive but troublesome chauvinist.

He becomes a caricature—a two-dimensional figure that impresses without having substance, that postures without having life. You and I may be veterans, but we join in the popular pastime of casting the veteran generically in the role of a bum.

To examine his caricature then, and to get down to specifics; What is the veteran?

The veteran in Wisconsin is 450,000 men and women who served their State and Nation in the Armed Forces in time of war.

If the veteran served in World War I, and of 122,000 there are 59,000 alive who did, his average age is 69.

If he served in World War II, and 290,000 men and women in the State today did, his average age is 44.

If he served in the Korean conflict, and 101,000 of today's State residents did, his average age is 32.

The few Spanish-American War veterans still alive are over 85 years of age, on the average.

But the veteran is more, much more, than a 450,000 segment of the State's 4 million residents.

Based on the national average, although only 20 percent of all persons over 18 are veterans, over 44 percent of the population are either veterans, dependent members of veterans' families or dependent survivors of deceased veterans; 81 million in our Nation today are potentially eligible for Federal veterans' benefits. Census figures indicate that the situation is not greatly different in Wisconsin.

According to the last census, 80 percent of Wisconsin veterans are in "head of the family" status. Of Wisconsin's 986,000 families, 40 percent are headed by a veteran of wartime military service. In some counties it is estimated that at least half of the household units are headed by veterans.

His income is above the average of nonveterans.

He is a teacher, a professional man, a businessman, a laborer, a public servant—and I don't put that in declining order of importance.

He is a Republican, a Democrat, a Catholic, a Protestant. He is a family man, and an organization man. While nationally only one out of eight veterans belong to a veterans' organization, in Wisconsin one out of four are members of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and other similar groups.

He is a tremendously significant part of Wisconsin, past and present, and of the Nation. In short, he is three dimensional, he is flesh and blood, he is as rational, as respectable as you and I—he is not the empty cariature we may think of when the term "veteran" is used, and most emphatically, he is not a bum.

The villain of the piece, I believe, is something known as veterans benefits. A national magazine article by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce appearing a month or so ago started out in this fashion:

"It's time we stopped treating America's 22 million veterans as a privileged group. As a group, veterans have no God-given right to special consideration.

"Plunder has become so prevalent in American political life that it would be difficult to name the worst offenders—were it not for the blatant and outrageous maneuver called veterans benefits."

And the article closes with these words:

"The prospect is that, unless we take strong preventive measures, an enormous number of Americans will come to depend on handouts, and our economy will be bizarrely and ruinously altered. The creeping, demoralizing monster of governmental paternalism must be halted and destroyed."

Those are strong words, reminiscent almost of the tortured opposition to the introduction of social security in the 1930's, and they invite rebuttal. But they are typical of a strong body of thought in the country today.

Obviously, veterans benefits arise out of military service in time of war. They may consist of hospitalization if the veteran is disabled or unable to afford indicated treatment, they may consist of compensation for service-connected disability, of a nominal pension for the poor and elderly veteran who is incapacited from gainful employment, of loan privileges, of educational assistance.

But enumerating types of veterans benefits doesn't tell the story, and a brief exam-

ination of the development of veterans benefits may be helpful.

The history of veterans benefits closely parallels the history of mankind's wars, and the first thing to understand is that this "creeping, demoralizing monster of governmental paternalism" is not new, but has rather been an inseparable adjunct of most of the warring of great nations from earliest times.

The great oriental civilizations of antiquity furnished pensions for soldiers released from duty.

The Greek city-states established a system of veterans preference for legislative and magisterial offices, cared for and educated the children of those who died in battle, and pensioned veterans with permanent disabilities.

The Romans, early in their history, developed an elaborate system of veterans benefits, the main elements of which were a general program of land grants and lump-sum pensions that ranged as high as one-half of the total wages earned in service.

With the collapse of Rome and the decline of Europe into the Dark Ages the Roman system of veterans benefits collapsed like most of the systems of that great civilization. By the mid-1600's, however, the emerging nations of Europe began again to provide pensions and medical treatment, and this Nation has followed the redevelopment of systems of veterans benefits there.

But, you may say, granted that this evil has been around for a long time—how did it get started? And how can anyone justify giving special consideration to veterans?

The answer, I believe, is not essentially based on social or humanitarian considerations. Nor is it simply a raid on the till accomplished by the might of a forceful veterans lobby. Rather, the answer should be sought in the activity that made veterans of men—the area of our military requirements in the Nation's defense—and in partial answer to the magazine article, it would make as much sense to argue that our military expenditures are ruining the country.

Service by the professional military forces is deemed essential to the Nation as a whole, and because it assures us of security and leaves the majority free to pursue their own interests and ambitions, we routinely recognize the maintenance of the Armed Forces as a proper charge upon the Public Treasury. We educate and train the Regular members of the Armed Forces. We guarantee them job security and reasonable compensation. We provide them with fringe benefits such as medical and hospital services for themselves and their families, both during active duty and upon retirement. We authorize retirement at an early age, and pay them retirement benefits, and we assist them in utilizing their military skills in integrating themselves into civilian life.

And yet, although we readily accept such treatment of the professional military forces as being consistent with sound employment practices and essential for the national security, this Nation's history in time of war is not the history of professional soldiers. It is rather the history of citizen soldiers, whose interests and ambitions were completely alien to the ways of war. Their service, voluntary or otherwise, involved an uprooting from established employment, from family life, and family responsibilities. The conclusion cannot be avoided that the citizen soldier is the most significant element of our national defense; a permanent and indespensible part of this Nation's Military Establishment.

It is with that understanding that we come to realize that programs of veterans benefits are not based solely upon the necessity of caring for the disabled—they are based as well, are justified as well, upon the necessity of compensating the returning citizen soldier for his sacrifices in health, in time spent, in hardship and danger endured, in opportunity passed by, in earning capacity diminished by virtue of that service.

Abraham Lincoln declared it to be a public policy "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

Theodore Roosevelt went further, when he said, "No other citizen deserves so well of the Republic as the veteran. They did the one deed which, if left undone, would have meant that all else in our history went for nothing. But for their steadfast promise all our annals would be meaningless and our great experiment in popular freedom and self-government a gloomy failure."

Perhaps the most important and least recognized basis for such programs of veterans benefits is the necessity of adding to the strength of our Nation's defense by demonstrating to succeeding generations, upon whose willing service in its defense our country's continued security depends, not only that the causes we fight for are just, and not only that it is vitally necessary that in order to protect our cherished institutions every American must stand ready to serve in our Armed Forces, but also that our State and our Nation keep faith with those who serve.

These, then, are the premises upon which both the need and the justification for programs of veterans benefits are based. They are not a gratuity, a handout, a dole—they are a part of a realistic and honorable compensation plan, of payment for services received, that is as necessary to our Nation and as much a part of the costs of its defense as is the cost of guns and ammunition, of ships and tanks and planes.

Will America Be Destroyed by Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Herbert G. Stone, one of Kingsport, Tenn.'s most outstanding citizens, who has long been identified with Boy Scout work, and Dr. J. J. Range, a prominent Johnson City physician and Scout leader, have called my attention to an outstanding speech by Mr. Harley Erb. Mr. Erb is a truly dedicated individual and he has devoted most of his life to the Boy Scout movement.

To quote Mr. John M. Jones, editor of the Greeneville Sun, Greeneville, Tenn., in the Friday, January 31, 1964, edition of his newspaper:

The following speech by Mr. Harley Erb delivered before Sequoyah Council Boy Scouts of America at their annual recognition dinner on January 28, 1964, is a challenge to every true American. This thought-provoking message should be studied by every parent. This speech marked the retirement of Mr. Erb from active Scouting, which he had served for more than 40 years. For the past few years he has been regional director of the Boy Scouts of America with headquarters in Memphis, Tenn. His responsibility covered Scouting in five Southeastern States.

I am happy to make this speech available to all Members of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WILL AMERICA BE DESTROYED BY AMERICANS?

America is a great nation, and our beloved homeland. We join in chorus with—

"My country 'tis of thee
Sweet land of liberty
Land where our fathers died,
Land of the Pilgrim's pride."

Yes, we sing of the land of the free and the home of the brave. We call this Nation "America the Beautiful"—

"O beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain."

Yes, America is beautiful. But is America safe?

Once China built a wall. She lived behind it. She laughed at her enemies. She felt secure. Soon an invader came from the north. Three times China found the enemy inside her gates. They did not storm the wall. They did not go around it. They simply bribed the gatekeeper.

It seems only yesterday that France built a wall—the Maginot line. Steel and stone. She felt secure behind it. She put her faith in it. Yet, France fell. Why? Something was missing.

There was a gap through which the invader came. That gap was not only in the wall. It was in the spirit of the people.

NINETEEN OF TWENTY-ONE CIVILIZATIONS HAVE DIED FROM WITHIN

Today America builds a wall: a ring of steel, ships and planes, and guns and missiles. But is this enough? Does America have what China lacked? What France lacked? Does she have total defense? She builds her wall. Does she build character? Spirit? The will to sacrifice?

Before our very eyes the world changes. Nations collapse. Every edition of the press, every news commentator tells of another startling development.

Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that 19 to 21 civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. There were no bands playing and no flags waving when these civilizations decayed; it happened slowly, in the quiet and the dark when no one was aware.

Do you realize that no great republic, no great democracy ever lived very long? Greece had a great democracy and provided the greatest degree of freedom and the highest standard of living known to her day; but it vanished. Rome came along with the greatest republic. Roman citizenship was cherished; yea, it was sought, it was bought. But Rome, falling into the throes of politics, began to tax everything that could be regulated—even to the load that could be carried on an ass.

And what was the result? Yes, they began to put names on the public payroll until a third of the citizens of Rome were on the national payroll, and that republic collapsed. A dictatorship followed until the fat, accumulated during the days of the republic, had been consumed, and then the Empire fell and great was the fall thereof. It ushered in a period known as the Dark Ages, lasting a thousand years. Should our American private enterprise system fall, I believe it would usher in a period again comparable only to the fall of Rome.

MOST DEMOCRACIES HAVE LASTED ABOUT 200 YEARS

The prominent historian, Channing Pollock, observed that most democracies last for about 200 years. They are conceived and developed by simple, vigorous, idealistic, hard-working people who, unfortunately, with success become rich and decadent, learn to live without labor, depend more on the largess of big government.

With the end of the second century of our democracy a short 12 years away, it appears very much in order to examine its political, social, and economic structure to ascertain whether it contains a unique charter which makes it impervious to the lessons of history.

Are our people subject to the same frailties as the citizens of the democracies that died in the past?

Can we overcome these weaknesses and remain the strongest and most blessed people on earth?

Are we willing to stand firmly with the basic American ideal that there can be no substitute for individual initiative and productivity?

It has been pointed out many times, that what we have to fear is not force from without—but weakness from within. No one is likely to destroy America but Americans. Our way of life could be destroyed without a shot being fired.

WHERE ARE WE IN OUR POLITICAL CYCLE?

The history of nations shows that the cycle of the body politic slowly but surely undergoes change. It progresses from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to complacency, from complacency to apathy, from apathy to fear, from fear to dependency, from dependency back to bondage.

Faith, courage, and freedom represent the life elements of growth—either in a man or a nation. Spiritual faith and courage were the bone and sinew of the first freedom our people enjoyed on this continent. Then, as free hard-working Americans, our growth to abundance was only a matter of time.

Do we dare ask ourselves if the United States, though cast in the role of a leader to preserve and strengthen world civilization, isn't, itself, tottering internally because too many of its citizens have abandoned the virtues that comprised the basic format of its own civilization? For instance, if spiritual faith, courage, and the willingness of our forbears to work hard were the sustaining virtues, and if, solely because of them, they were able to create our own civilization, can we now in the United States substitute for these virtues the human weaknesses of selfishness, complacency, apathy, and fear—and still hope to survive as a civilized nation?

OUR GREATEST THREAT

I do not believe the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or guided missiles. I do not think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care—when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men.

Philip Van Doren Stern said: "The fight for freedom is an endless battle. Its victories are never final; its defeats never permanent. Each generation must defend its heritage, for each seeming conquest gives a rise to new forces that will attempt to substitute fresh means of oppression for the old. There can be no peace in a world of life and growth. Every battle the fathers thought finished will have to be fought anew by their children if they wish to preserve and extend this freedom."

If America is destroyed it may be by Americans who salute the flag, sing the national anthem, march in patriotic parades, cheer Fourth of July speakers—normally good Americans, but Americans who fail to comprehend what is required to keep our country strong and free.

DOES HISTORY FORETELL THE FUTURE?

In 1787 Edward Gibbon completed his noble work, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.". Here is the way he accounted for the fall:

1. The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home, which is the basis of human society.

2. Higher and higher taxes and the spending of public moneys for free bread and circuses for the populace.

3. The mad craze for pleasure; sports becoming every year more and more exciting and more brutal.

4. The building of gigantic armaments when the real enemy was within the decadence of the people.

5. The decay of religion—faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life and becoming impotent to warn and guide the people.

Is there a parallel for us in America today? Could the same reasons that destroyed Rome destroy America?

Nations are never conquered from outside unless they are rotten inside.

Communism does not hope to wrest control of the United States by a bloody war. Attack would bring retaliation. Moscow and its agents have another plan—an old one which hasn't gotten us yet and never will if Americans remain united in spirit and mind.

The Moscow method is to divide, to sow seeds of hate, fear and doubt, to weaken segments of organized society and then infiltrate, to attack American laws, economics, customs, and beliefs.

Theodore Roosevelt said, "The things that will destroy America are prosperity, at any price; peace at any price; safety first instead of duty first; the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

If we dwelt on the many things that we see disturbing in the life of America today, I fear we would all become discouraged.

We find people more and more turning to pleasure seeking and profits, and away from hard work and high standards of the past.

There is evidence of a decline of U.S. morals and moral fiber, and a lack of dedication.

The skyrocketing cost of the welfare state increased in 8 years from $6.9 to $20.3 billion in 1961. Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death." Now everyone just says, "Give me."

Our present Federal debt is equal to a first mortgage of $10,000 on all owned homes in the country. A total of $307 billion.

We continue to move in the direction of more Federal intervention, more concentration of power, more spending, more taxing, more paternalism.

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

I fear that we tend to become so afraid of Moscow that we are insufficiently afraid of Washington. And this applies to the administration of both parties. If America is to withstand these influences and these problems, there must be a renewal of the spirit of our forefathers, an appreciation of the American way of life, strengthening of muscle and sinew and character of the Nation. America neds guts as well as guns. National character is the core of national defense.

The things that go right in this democracy and the things that go wrong are not something outside of us. The splendor of America is our splendor. The shame of America is our shame. Government or industry, or crime or great achievement is not something abstract. It is just people; people like you and me.

Could many of our ills today have resulted from our failure to train a strong citizenry from the only source we have—the boys and girls of each community in the Nation?

Have they grown up to believe in (1) politics without principle, (2) pleasure without conscience, (3) knowledge without effort, (4) wealth without work, (5) business without morality, (6) science without humanity, and (7) worship without sacrifice.

Give a pig and a boy everything each wants, and you will get a good pig and a bad boy.

Could it be that through the training of youth we can help serve America?

SCOUTING CAN CONTRIBUTE TO OUR STAMINA

Can we, through Scouting contribute to America's stamina and survival? I believe we can. We can teach reverence to God, unselfishness, love of country, and the fundamental principles of righteous living. We can try to train youth through men of character. We urge a religious life; we encourage good education; we promote patriotism; we emphasize honesty, trustworthiness, loyalty, and many fine attributes of good character. I won't go into all the details because of lack of time, but the opportunity is yours, and the need is great. One of our tasks is to rediscover and reassert our faith in the spiritual, nonutilitarian values on which American life has rested from its beginning.

We can never survive unless our young men have a dedication that exceeds the dedication of the enemy. Character must become important in this country again. The old essentials of honesty, self respect, loyalty, must be taught the younger generation.

Those of us who may be conscious of the seriousness of the situation must act and act now. It takes something spectacular to get folks excited, like a burning house. Nobody notices one that is simply decaying.

All of our wonderful heritage is now threatened; from without by the forces of communism with nuclear weapons and at home by those who would abandon the ancient landmarks set by our fathers, and take us down the road to socialism. We might survive a nuclear attack—but we cannot survive (any better than Athens and Rome) moral degeneration and the abandonment of fundamental principles. For, "Who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be not raised again. Like the coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional liberty."

Scouters, we must make sure that freedom means more to our youth than just peace. We must make sure that freedom means more to our youth than just a security. We must make sure that freedom means more to our youth than just selfish gain. We must emphasize the need of character in the citizens of America.

THE POWER OF AMERICA

The power of America lies in every boy and girl back in the hinterlands of this great Nation. The strength of America will be no greater than these young people as they grow in character and prepare themselves to step across the threshold of citizenship.

If America is to remain the symbol of strength and freedom, its citizens must somewhere find the courage to live. Basic to the elements which make our Nation strong is moral and spiritual strength. These are the elements our forefathers had.

The future we face is one of great promise but it will be a future that will challenge our ideals as never before. It is our responsibility to build the utmost in character and faith and judgment in these young people, who, someday will take our place.

The following prayer by William I. Nichols would be appropriate as a prayer for all Americans:

"O God, whose name was on the lips of the men who founded this Nation, and on the lips of men who died for it—be with us yet. Guide us through this period of crisis, confusion, and insecurity. Keep us steadfast in remembering the truths our forefathers lived by. Restore our innocence, renew our vision, enter our hearts and keep us brave. Give us, as Americans, the strength to do Thy work and to make this country worthy of Thy blessing. Amen."

Charlie Daniel Creates Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles E. Daniel, the world's largest industrial contractor and former U.S. Senator received the award as "Industrialist of the Year" in New York City, on November 11, 1963. On behalf of the National Association of Industrial Realtors, our former colleague, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, presented the award.

Charlie Daniel's program to develop our natural resources, through new industry with more jobs, is a classic example of the best way to eliminate poverty. In South Carolina, we are proud of him.

It is with a great deal of personal pride in Senator Daniel's achievements that I commend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Congress, the following tribute which appeared in Business Week about this distinguished industrialist, devoted patriot and great American.

A ONE-MAN MAGNET FOR INDUSTRY—GREENVILLE BUILDER CHARLES E. DANIEL HAS TALKED HUNDREDS OF COMPANIES INTO PUTTING UP PLANTS IN SOUTHEAST, MOSTLY SOUTH CAROLINA—AND HAS BUILT 400 OF THEM HIMSELF

Probably no single individual has worked harder and more successfully to draw industry to the Southeast—and grab a big share of it for his own native soil—than a Greenville (S.C.) builder named Charles E. Daniel, chairman of Daniel Construction Co.

Shortly after he started out as a builder, Daniel went to a South Carolina textile manufacturer and asked to build his next plant. "Why should I give the job to you?" the man asked. "Because," said Daniel, "I can build it faster, cheaper, and better than anybody else." He got the job—and more later on from the same executive.

Through all the great postwar industrial development of the South, he has been tirelessly pursuing U.S. corporations on behalf of the State of South Carolina and Charles Daniel. With a disarming manner, relentless drive, a talent for turning important people into lifelong friends, and a topflight building organization, he has persuaded hundreds of companies, including dozens of blue-chip outfits, to let him build their new plants—in South Carolina when he can, in another Southern State when he must.

Incalculable

"He has been of incalculable benefit—the nearest thing I know to perpetual energy for sparking industry in South Carolina and the South," says South Carolina Gov. Donald S. Russell.

Along the way, his unflagging efforts have made him the largest industrial contractor in the Southeast and one of his State's two or three richest, most powerful men. The plants he has built are worth around $2 billion—and he's working on 104 projects totaling some $271 million, the largest volume he has handled in a decade of growth.

Contractors aren't usually thought of as industrialists. But last November 11, his 68th birthday, Daniel received at the Waldorf Astoria in New York—from his friend Richard M. Nixon, on behalf of the National Association of Industrial Realtors—an award as Industrialist of the Year. Previous recipients included such men as Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., Benjamin F. Fairless, and Thomas J. Watson.

I. OUT OF THE DITCH

Daniel admits with a smile: "They say I divide plants equally, one for South Carolina and one for the rest of the South. Actually, I have to serve the interest of the client."

Clearly, he serves it as often as possible in his native State. The divisional head of a major company says: "He certainly influenced our choice of South Carolina. He gave us six or eight site locations, five of which were in South Carolina. This was sort of loading the dice—but they were good sites."

The actual score:

A total of 250 major industrial plants in South Carolina, 400 plants in all the 12 Southern States where he operates.

Textile mills are his specialty, but he also puts up office buildings, hotels and motels, apartments, stores, shopping centers—almost anything except roads and dams.

The plants he has helped locate and build, Daniel estimates, have provided some 150,000 new industrial jobs for the region, twice that many supporting and supply jobs. "Seeing the South climb out of the ditch," he says, "gives me more pleasure than anything else."

New deals

The company is currently building 54 new industrial plants, including a $30 million nylon plant for American Enka Corp., a $14 million tissue mill for Georgia-Pacific Corp., and "the most modern textile mill in the world" for J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.

Daniel expects to complete over $150 million worth of work in the coming year. On this he will draw about 3.5 percent gross fees, and net, after taxes, between $2.2 million and $2.6 million. Daniel, his wife, and his younger brother Hugh, the company president, own the business completely.

Daniel is now looking further afield. He'll soon open a Chicago sales office to add to the one in New York. In 1962 he started an experimental office in Brussels to supervise some European work for a client. Other companies he builds for are looking overseas, and he is deciding whether to make it permanent.

II. STALKING THE PLANT

Daniel's approach while plant hunting can vary, but the basic situation is the same. He has so many friends in the State and among businessmen elsewhere that he soon hears of plans for expansion—and about the time a company starts thinking about a new plant, Daniel appears in its offices.

Some years ago, for example, he and a friend dropped by unannounced at the New York headquarters of a major corporation while a board meeting was in progress. When the directors learned that Daniel and his companion, former Secretary of State and Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes, then Governor of South Carolina, were outside, they adjourned temporarily.

During pleasantries, Daniel offered to find a good site for a new plant he had heard the company was planning. The upshot was that the company decided in a few months on a plant in South Carolina. The builder: Charles E. Daniel.

Getting at it

Once company officials agree to let him help find a site, Daniel supplies all kinds of cost comparisons, taxes, utility rates, labor surveys. He puts one of his airplanes (he now has three) at company executives' disposal, invites them to Greenville, perhaps to a small dinner with the Governor and leading businessmen.

He may visit sites with the company president, but he's careful about that: "When I walk through town, the price of land goes up."

The prize

All this while, there's no mention of building the plant. In fact, Daniel worked to help Du Pont locate in South Carolina, knowing it does its own building. Though he explains his services, he doesn't come right out and ask for the job. But he can get the point over.

Once he found a site for a company, with no commitment to build. But one day the company president found Daniel's grading equipment on the job—showing his eagerness, and discouraging competitors. He won.

III. WEIGHTY VOICE

Not surprisingly, Daniel's personal standing has risen steadily as his business has grown. Estimates of his personal fortune run from $20 million to $40 million. He is one of South Carolina's major employers. Longstanding friendships with businessmen and politicians, especially Byrnes and Senator STROM THURMOND, give his conservative voice added weight. Daniel himself served in the U.S. Senate in 1954, on a short interim appointment by Governor Byrnes.

Daniel's influence has gone to help create what he believes is a nourishing climate for business. He worked to get laws that are beneficial to business—tax exemption, for example, on production machinery and materials. His efforts include keeping out elements he regards as discordant, especially strongly unionized companies. "I have occasionally asked companies not to come to South Carolina," he says, "when I felt they wouldn't fit in."

He has run afoul of the National Labor Relations Board himself. He won, by a 3-to-1 vote, an NLRB-sponsored election in his mechanical department in 1961, but the union appealed on the ground the company used coercion. The case is still pending.

Outspoken

On one controversial issue, Daniel shows outspoken liberalism. He believes in helping Negroes economically and educationally. Two years ago, at a festival in the black belt town of Hampton, he told startled listeners:

"The desegregation issue cannot continue to be hidden behind the door * * *. We have a definite obligation to increase the productivity of our Negro citizens, to provide them with good jobs at good wages and to continue to assure them of fair treatment. By raising their education and economic status, we would raise the whole economy of the State."

Of Daniel's own work force of 8,800, 26 percent are Negroes; about 800 are skilled mechanics working alongside white workers, at equal pay.

Muttering

Daniel's pursuit and capture of industrial building in and for South Carolina has been so vigorous that, inevitably, there has been some resentment. There have been mutterings that he controlled the State Development Board, got inside tips. Daniel's executives snort that he is better able to give tips than receive them.

Walter W. Harper, director of the board, insists Daniel gets exactly the same treatment as any other contractor. But he adds

that Daniel's bigger effort in the field naturally brings greater results.

Wider

Daniel's orbit swings a good deal wider than most contractors'. He travels widely to seek new plants and visit business friends, is a member of the Business Council, sits on the board of eight major companies, including Eastern Air Lines, Prudential Insurance Co. He gets the call for such groups as the committee formed by top businessmen last year to push a tax cut.

The center of his activities, though, is his highly efficient building organization; he has no hobbies, no children, digs his feet in at the hint of vacation. He has let much of the day-to-day business go to five hard-working executives in Greenville, especially Executive Vice President Buck Mickel ,his wife's nephew. This leaves him free for the wide-ranging business-social mixing he is skilled at and enjoys.

IV. DRIVE TO BUILD

A longtime friend, president Roger Milliken, of Deering Milliken, Inc., hits Daniel's most obvious quality—"drive, he works 7 days a week." When not traveling, he roams the office, poking into details. Every day or so he jumps in his car and drives off to look over a construction job. If he sees something that's not right, the field supervisor soon is reminded that he's working for a tough, self-made man.

One thing and another

This drive, plus organizing skill, won Daniel a reputation for fast, efficient building when he launched his company in 1935.

It started a process he casually calls one thing leading to another—as, for example, at the Chemstrand nylon plant in Pensacola, Fla., which Du Pont originally built for Chemstrand. Daniel, called in on a small job 8 years ago, has been building one addition after another until his work there comes to about $150 million, and has built $100 million for Chemstrand elsewhere.

In all, some 70 percent of current work is repeat business like this.

Complete, speedy

Two things especially characterize his work:

He lays heavy stress on offering a complete package—just taking over and performing turnkey service: "The company just orders the plant, tells us what it wants. We do everything up to the day we turn over the key to the finished plant."

His organizing talent and drive to keep men and materials on schedule largely account for his astonishing construction speed. Says Woodside Mills' president, Robert S. Small: "Don't tell Charlie Daniel you want your plant before you really want it—because you'll get it."

A maker of door locks once told Daniel he couldn't meet his schedule. Daniel said all right, but he'd go ahead with the dedication, with signs on the door saying there were no locks because X Co. failed to meet its commitment. "We got the locks," says Daniel.

Where Will the War on Poverty Lead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the underlying principle of communism is "from each according to his ability; to each according to his need." How close are we going to parallel that concept in the administration's proposed war on poverty, the goal of which has been stated by the President:

> We are going to take all the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the haves and give it to the have-nots that need it.

The far-reaching administration program, which out-New Deals the original New Deal, provides more welfare than the Fair Deal and proposes far more Federal intervention in the lives of all the people, may well be the means by which the social planners put an end to the private enterprise system. If we allow the Federal Government to set an arbitrary figure and then determine that all those with incomes below that figure are living in poverty, we will take a long step toward giving bureaucracy sole determination as to how the people should live. If we accept the principle that it is proper for the Federal Government to feed, cloth, house, provide jobs, medical care, and other necessities for the people, then we will have adopted the Socialist-Communist concept of government and our private enterprise system will be through.

Mr. Speaker, before we begin debate on authorizing what some administration officials have stated may run as high as $11 billion for the new welfare proposals, should we not ask ourselves these basic questions?

In the following article from the Dallas Morning News, Ken Thompson points out the extent to which we may be asked to carry "Johnson's Poverty Package":

HERE'S THE ISSUE: JOHNSON'S POVERTY PACKAGE

(By Ken Thompson)

President Johnson's "declaration of war" on poverty has been compared with Franklin Delano Roosevelt's first New Deal. Though on the surface the attacks may appear similar, at heart the problems are very different.

When the New Deal was launched, Amercans were in the depths of their worst depression—poverty striking at millions who had known comfort and security.

Today, though the President and his economic advisers tell us that there are some 35 million Americans living below minimum standards of decency, our economy is thriving and we are engaging in a wide variety of social-welfare programs that have functioned at full steam for a generation.

The three levels of government in America today are spending approximately $44 billion a year on welfare (not including education) and the Federal Government is spending about three-fifths of this amount.

Opponents of President Johnson's poverty package cite these facts to argue against proposals for new welfare outlays. How, they ask, can bigger welfare programs end poverty if 30 years of the welfare state have failed to do the job?

Those who support a boost in welfare programs use the same facts, but adapt them to a different argument.

They maintain that our economic prosperity has little or no effect on the poor in our midst and, in fact, often makes their problems more severe.

Technological advances, they say, have abolished many unskilled jobs which used to be held by the poor.

As for a generation of welfare programs failing to do the job, they argue that not enough has been spent on them and what has been spent has often attacked only the symptoms, rather than the causes, of poverty. They want welfare redirected, as well as expanded.

In his state of the Union message on January 8, President Johnson underscored this last argument, pledging that his war on poverty would aim to deal with shortcomings in education, training, housing, and community standards which condemn many to a poverty from which they have no hope of escape.

Johnson itemized about a dozen specific programs in his message which would be a part of the poverty package he will ask Congress to approve in the coming months.

Details of these programs will be given in later messages to Congress, though many of them can be surmised, as most of the package is composed of warmed-over Kennedy requests—some of which have been rejected already by Congress.

These are the main items in the program:

A special project for the Appalachian region, stretching from Pennsylvania to Alabama, which has suffered severe unemployment and contains perhaps the worst rural slums in the Nation.

Medical care for the aged under the social security program.

Increased unemployment compensation.

Extension of minimum-wage laws to cover an additional 2 million workers.

Creation of a domestic Peace Corps to bolster economic aid and social work in hard-hit areas.

An enlarged food-stamp plan to distribute more surplus food to the needy.

Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps which would put jobless youth to work on useful projects.

Expansion of the area redevelopment and urban renewal programs.

Broadening of Federal housing programs.

More aid to education, with special new projects for depressed areas.

A mass-transit program for urban areas.

Accelerated public works.

On February 1, Johnson appointed Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver to head up efforts to bring all of these programs together and to coordinate Federal, State, local and private welfare efforts into "a frontal assault on the sources of poverty." His job will be cut out for him, and what the cost will be is anybody's guess.

The President told Congress in his budget message that he was asking for more than a billion dollars to begin the attack on poverty. Some $500 million was to go for special programs, and another $600 million to beef up existing programs.

If and when these dozen or so programs get in full swing, the costs will soar. It is impossible to make an accurate estimate of the final price tag, though the President's Council of Economic Advisers recently suggested, half in jest, that $11 billion in direct Government handouts per year might raise the income of the Nation's poor to a minimum standard of living.

President Johnson himself set the tone of his antipoverty program last month when he said: "We are going to try to take all the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the haves and give it to the have-nots that need it."

An official of the U.S. Census Bureau, asked how much poverty exists in this country today, remarked: "It depends on how high you set the standard." One county in Kentucky, for example, is listed by the Government as "depressed." Half the homes lack bathrooms, a fourth do not have running water—but 88 percent have washing machines and 67 percent have television sets.

In 1947, one out of every three families had incomes under $3,000 a year. By 1962 it was only one out of five.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ROLLCALLS NOS. 1–21

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

During the first month of the 88th Congress' 2d session, which convened on January 7, I remained in the 25th District conducting an extensive series of public report meetings with constituents. Contact with the people in open and frank face-to-face discussions is to me one of the most essential features of government by, of, and for the people. My report meetings had two basic aims: to thoroughly acquaint constituents with my record during the first session, to give them an opportunity to present their views regarding the representation they received; and to get the benefit of their thinking on matters of major consequence which are likely to come before the Congress in 1964.

In a normal congressional year such meetings would have been possible during adjournment between sessions. But 1963 was not a normal year. It was the fifth longest session in the Nation's history, stretching from January 9 through December 30—356 days. It would have been a disservice to citizens of my district, I think, to have deprived them of their right of access to me simply because Congress—largely for a variety of internal reasons—failed to act with dispatch after due deliberation of issues facing the American people.

To insure that citizens had access to me—and I to them—I programed 152 congressional report meetings during January, holding 6 meetings a day during the week and 8 meetings on Saturdays. The meeting places were carefully selected throughout the district so constituents would not have to drive miles to attend. Every registered voter received an invitation—printed at my expense—advising him of the time and place a meeting would be held in his neighborhood. In addition, every voter received—at my expense—a 12-page booklet containing my complete voting record through December 4, my attendance record on quorum calls during this period, and explanations of why I voted as I did on legislation which I thought to be of greatest significance.

Equipped with this written and detailed report, the people knew exactly what I did, where I stood and why. And because they had this information, it was for me—and I hope for them—an exhilarting experience in the exercise of democracy when we met face to face. It was people-to-people government in the highest sense.

During the days that I spent with my constituents in the district, the House had 14 quorum calls and 7 rollcalls. The latter covered votes on amendments to the Federal Airport Act (S. 1153); amendments to the Library Services Act (H.R. 4879), and amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act (H.R. 6041). On final passage of each of these measures the voting balance ranged from 27 to 1 to 3 to 1 in favor. On these final votes my presence in the House would not have affected the outcome of the proposals, one way or the other. As these measures made their way to the floor, I kept in close telephone contact with my Washington office to determine whether an issue was likely to be decided by a handful of Members. Had I been present during final voting on these bills, I would have voted "yea" on each of them.

On January 31, with only one more round of Saturday congressional report meetings to go, I flew to Washington to be present for debate and voting on the Civil Rights Act. My wife filled in for me at Saturday's meetings, and I rescheduled these report sessions for February 15, when I was in my district during the Lincoln Day recess.

ROLLCALL NO. 32

CIVIL RIGHTS

The most comprehensive civil rights bill in the Nation's history passed the House by a margin of better than 2 to 1 after 9 days of debate on 140 proposed amendments. Credit for the bill's success must go to 138 Republicans and 152 Democrats who repeatedly warded off southern attempts to cripple the measure. But as they went down to defeat, outweighed by an overwhelming majority of national opinion, southern Congressmen were at all times gentlemen and statesmen. Their attitude, oration, and strategy was in the best traditions of the House.

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of public misconception regarding provisions of the civil rights bill as approved by the House. Many well-meaning Americans fear it because they have been misinformed as to what it is and what it is not. They do not understand what the bill is designed to accomplish and how. And yet the bill deserves to be understood and supported by all citizens who hold allegiance to the American heritage of freedom, who in thought, word, and deed believe "that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The aim of the first title of the 10-section bill is to enforce the constitutional right to vote in Federal elections, a right guaranteed by the 15th amendment to all citizens, but a right which is being denied and thwarted with impunity by many Southern States which determine voting qualifications solely on the basis of color.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Title II makes discrimination unlawful in establishments that serve the public if their operations affect interstate commerce, or if State law requires that a business segregate or discriminate. Covered under the bill are hotels, motels, and lodging houses except those that rent less than six rooms and have an owner living on the premises. Also covered are lunchcounters, soda fountains, gasoline stations, restaurants, movie houses, theaters, sports arenas, and other places of exhibition or entertainment. Private clubs are not included in the bill. Public accommodation laws are already in the statute books of 32 States—including California—and title II of the Civil Rights Act would serve to make equal access a national right.

Our late and beloved President Kennedy stated the legal argument for title II in these words:

> No property owner who holds his premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of the public on grounds of race or color. Just as the law requires common carriers to serve equally all who wish their services, so it can require public accommodations to accommodate equally all segments of the general public.

Enforcement provisions provide latitude for persuasion and conciliation in public accommodations disputes and guarantee just protection for the rights of accused offenders.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Whereas places of public accommodation are usually privately owned, public facilities are generally owned by a State, county, or city and are built and maintained with public funds. Such facilities should therefore be available on an equal basis to all citizens and taxpayers. But today in many Southern counties and cities, public parks, playgrounds, community centers, libraries, and so forth, are closed to Negroes. Title III is designed to provide legal assistance from the U.S. Attorney General to persons who are deprived of the 14th amendment's "equal protection of the laws" by being denied equal access to and full use of public facilities. If the Attorney General finds that an aggrieved party cannot bear the financial burden of filing and maintaining a lawsuit, the Federal Government can bring court action on his behalf. The Attorney General is also empowered to intervene in—but not to initiate—suits seeking relief from denial of "equal protection" in areas other than public facilities. Presumably this would involve cases of alleged denial of the rights of assembly, petition, free speech, and so forth.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Title IV is designed to speed up the school desegregation process which has been moving at a snail's pace since the Supreme Court decision 10 years ago. At the present rate, school desegregation in many Southern cities will not be completed for at least another century. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, under title IV, would be authorized to give technical assistance to school districts which ask for help in formulating and implementing desegregation plans. The Attorney General would be empowered to bring court action against school boards which fail to desegregate if aggrieved parents certify that they cannot bring their own suit because of financial reasons or fear of economic or personal reprisals.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Title V extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another 4 years.

A product of the 1957 Rights Act, the Commission is authorized to: First, investigate complaints of denial of voting rights because of race or religion; second, study segregationist legal maneuvers aimed at denial of "equal protection under the laws"; and third, evaluate Federal activity regarding the 14th amendment's "equal protection" clause. Title V would also broaden the Commission's area of activity by permitting it to serve as a national information clearinghouse on equal protection in employment, education, housing, voting, transportation, and so forth. In addition, the Commission could investigate complaints of voting frauds allegedly perpetrated because of a citizen's race.

FEDERAL FUNDS

Title VI is designed to overcome one of the greatest ironies of the Nation's racial problem: the support and promotion of discrimination by funds of a Federal Government which has ruled that discrimination is in violation of the Constitution. Many hospitals, for example, constructed and equipped with Federal funds under the Hill-Burton Act, either do not accept Negro patients or segregate those that are accepted, and deny Negro doctors staff privileges. Many universities and research facilities working on projects financed by the Federal Government close their doors to Negroes. Many schools built and maintained with Federal funds under the impacted areas program are operated on a segregated basis. Many Negro children are being denied participation in federally financed school lunch programs. Many Negro families are being denied surplus commodities provided by the Department of Agriculture. Many Negroes are being denied access to housing built under urban renewal programs. The list goes on and on.

Title VI declares that discrimination in any program receiving Federal financial assistance is contrary to public policy. Federal agencies are authorized, but not required, to withhold Federal funds after notice, hearings, and persuasive efforts to obtain voluntary compliance have failed. The agency must also submit a report to the Congress. An order to cut off funds must be approved by the President, but penalized State and local agencies may appeal the action in Federal courts.

I am hopeful that in most cases the goals of Title VI can be achieved without resorting to actual cutoff of funds. Two years ago, for example, several Southern universities agreed to admit qualified Negroes to summer programs financed under the National Defense Education Act, rather than face the loss of Federal aid. Several years ago a Veterans Hospital in Mississippi opened its doors to Negroes rather than have no hospital at all. This year several schools in Florida and Texas, built and maintained under the impacted areas program, admitted Negro children rather than lose Federal funds. In any event, when persuasion and administrative efforts fail to bring compliance, funds will be withheld only from a county or area immediately involved in a specific Federal program. Aid would not necessarily be halted to an entire State.

MISCELLANEOUS

Title VIII directs the Census Bureau to compile registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin in areas designated by the Civil Rights Commission for congressional elections since January 1960. Such information could presumably be used as a basis for reducing House representation, pursuant to the 14th amendment, for States which deny the equal right to vote. The bill's last two titles provide for appeal procedure in State courts and authorize necessary funds for carrying out provisions of the act.

MORALLY RIGHT

With the exception of the last three titles, provisions of the bill have already been written into California law with a corresponding positive effect upon the State's 18 million residents. California has been a pioneer in enlightened race relations and has set an excellent example for the Nation to follow. There is nothing in H.R. 7152 which will be new to Californians.

In my judgment, the provisions of the Civil Rights Act are morally right, intellectually sound, legally correct, and socially necessary. I believe that the Declaration of Independence is more than a justification of rebellion. It is also a statement of the American democratic creed. It is designed to justify the past and chart the future—and the future is now. Today we are a Nation on trial and the jury must be the conscience of each individual. It is our opportunity to reaffirm by translating into action one of the basic truths that the Founding Fathers held to be self-evident—that all men are created equal. By so doing, we can go forward accepting the challenge and sharing the hope which President Johnson has enunciated so eloquently—that the world will not narrow into a neighborhood before it has broadened into a brotherhood.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Title VII, the longest and most complicated section of the civil rights bill, declares it an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire or promote, to segregate or to discriminate on the job against any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin. This title applies to labor unions and employment agencies, as well as to employers. For the first year after the effective date, employers and unions with 100 or more workers are covered. This drops to 75 the second year and 50 the third year. Thereafter, all employers with 25 workers in industries affecting commerce will be covered. The title establishes a five-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. No more than three members may belong to the same political party. The Commission would be empowered to investigate complaints and go to court in civil actions to halt or prevent unlawful employment practices. Before bringing court action, however, the Commission must first investigate and then seek to end the unlawful practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. The Commission is authorized to make agreements ceding jurisdiction to State fair employment practices commissions, such as that in California and 24 other States.

Title VII is perhaps the most important section of the bill when viewed from the strong desire of 20 million Negroes to build, through their own efforts, a more secure place in American society. Statistics which show that they are being denied their right to the pursuit of happiness are impressive: The Negro unemployment rate is twice as high as the rate for whites. Negro earnings are slightly more than half as high. Many of the better jobs are closed to Negroes altogether. Across the Nation they are victims of the last-hired, first-fired doctrine. Thus their potential contribution to American society remains unfulfilled. They contribute less to production and, therefore, have less to give toward consumption. Negroes cost society more in unemployment and welfare benefits than they would if there were no color barriers to jobs. Many opponents of the civil rights bill declare "Negroes should work to improve their economic condition." Title VII will go a long way toward giving them this opportunity.

Baptists for Broadcast Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present to the House a resolution adopted by the South Carolina Broadcasters Association.

I have great personal pride in this resolution because of its reference to my own Baptist denomination. Baptists have traditionally fought for freedom. One of the great patriots in the early history of our country was Roger Williams who founded the State of Rhode Island while seeking religious freedom and individual liberty.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom to broadcast is just as essential as the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly, and the freedom of the press.

The following resolution by the South Carolina Broadcasters Association is deeply appreciated by those of us who believe in this basic freedom and I commend it to the Congress and to the country:

RESOLUTION BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, WINTER MEETING, FEBRUARY 1, 1964

Whereas radio and television broadcasts produced by the Radio and Television Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention number over 1,300 programs per week in the United States and 25 foreign countries; and

Whereas the Radio and Television Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Paul M. Stephens, director, representing some 10 million members, has editorially ex-

pressed opposition to increased governmental regulation of local broadcasting operations in apparent violation of basic constitutional guarantees of freedom; and

Whereas the Beam, a monthly publication of the Radio and Television Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, has now chartered a course which includes (1) speaking out on issues of importance to free and unfettered use of electronic media, (2) continuing to emphasize the great amount of good being done in broadcasting, as a countermeasure to those critics who see only its faults, and (3) presenting regular features on stations and to individuals who are doing new things—exploring new areas—especially in the field of public service programing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Carolina Broadcasters Association expresses its approval of the position taken by the Radio and Television Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, in opposition to increased governmental control of broadcasting operations, and send a copy of this approval to Paul M. Stephens, director, and copies to the South Carolina congressional delegation, as information.

The Johnson-Home Communique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I voice the sentiment of this Chamber in hailing the recent Johnson-Home communique. Its tone of quiet confidence was a source of encouragement. It reflected an air of comity and candor. It revealed proven and tested allies working toward the attainment of common goals.

It was the first opportunity of President Johnson and Prime Minister Douglas-Home for a working meeting since they assumed the leadership of their respective Governments. But it followed in the high tradition of Wilson and Lloyd George, Roosevelt and Churchill, Kennedy and Macmillan.

Both men saluted the test ban accord, and at the same time reaffirmed their intent to search out other ways of reducing tension, of banishing the risks of war, of lifting the crushing burden of armament. In particular the Prime Minister welcomed the proposals made to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference by the United States in President Johnson's message of January 21.

Both leaders pledged their full support to the United Nations.

The President and the Prime Minister affirmed our common hopes, aims, and aspirations in Southeast Asia. The Prime Minister reemphasized the United Kingdom's support for the U.S. policy in South Vietnam. The President reaffirmed the support of the United States for the peaceful national independence of Malaysia.

But they found peace alone an inadequate goal. They sought it as a necessary precondition for expanding international trade and promoting economic growth for all to the end that all peoples of this world may live out their days free from the shroud of fear and the specter of want.

Dallas Mourns the Passing of a Great Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Dallas Sunday News of February 16, 1964, a lead story began with these words:

A heart that had beaten with the pulse of Dallas for more than half a century stopped Saturday when former Mayor R. L. Thornton died.

Bob Thornton well deserved the title of "Mr. Dallas." As one of Dallas' dynamic men, as mayor of this great community during a period of much of its progress, as a leader of the community throughout his life and as an inspiration to all of us who had the privilege of knowing him and sharing with him pride in Dallas, his contribution to his fellow citizens was unequalled.

I consider it one of the rare privileges of my life to have been a friend of Bob Thornton. It was my good fortune that his term as mayor of Dallas coincided so closely with my first years as Representative of the Fifth District in Congress—1953 to 1961, the better part of Dallas' golden decade. In those years approximately $130 million in public improvements were made in Dallas. Another $51 million went for capital improvements during the 1958–61 period. This was local money. Dallas, under the leadership of Bob Thornton, carved its own destiny and paid for its progress with its own money, not Federal aid. It is given to few men to be loved and respected by a whole community without regard to party alliances or differences of political opinion. Bob Thornton was such a man and, although Dallas will miss him, we are better because he lived. Whatever monuments may be erected in the future to honor his memory, Dallas itself, will be the most lasting tribute. A great American city, moving forward in the true pioneer spirit of America which he so ably exemplified.

I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, some of the editorial tributes which were carried in the Dallas Morning News and the Dallas Times Herald.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Feb. 16, 1964]

R. L. "MR. DALLAS" THORNTON DIES—"KEEP DIRT FLYING" SLOGAN OF LEADER FOR MANY YEARS

A heart that had beaten with the pulse of Dallas for more than half a century stopped Saturday when former Mayor R. L. Thornton died.

One of the city's best known civic leaders, Robert Lee Thornton, 83, delighted in the nickname: "Mr. Dallas."

Mr. Thornton, son of a tenant farmer, was a 500-pound-a-day cottonpicker who started a bank with $6,000 in borrowed money in 1916 and built it into the giant Mercantile National Bank, a $400 million institution.

In failing health for several years, Thornton became seriously ill Tuesday and went home early from his office at the bank where he was chairman of the board.

He died at his residence, 6941 Gaston, at 4:15 a.m., Saturday.

Services will be held at 3 p.m., Monday in the Highland Park Methodist Church with the Reverend William H. Dickinson, Jr., officiating. Burial will be in Restland Memorial Park.

The body will lie in state at Sparkman's Funeral Home, 2115 Ross, until noon Monday, and after 1 p.m. at the Highland Park Church.

Mr. Thornton served as mayor of the city from 1953 until 1961. But in or out of office he was a guiding force in the community.

"Keep the dirt flying," was his slogan, and during his administration Dallas Love Field was enlarged and a new city hall, library, and auditorium were built.

It was Mr. Thornton who, more than any man, built the State Fair of Texas into the biggest State fair in the Nation.

On his first trip to Dallas as a 9-year-old boy, the mayor-to-be, with 50 cents in his pocket, visited the State Fair of Texas. It was love at first sight.

He played the leading role in attracting the Texas centennial celebration to Dallas in 1936. It was the centennial exposition that gave momentum to the yearly State fairs.

In 1945, he became president of the State fair. When he resigned as president last fall to become board chairman, the once financially shaky exposition had become a booming success.

The snowy-haired cigar-smoking Thornton had little formal education—but he had energy and vision. He was the first banker in Dallas to make automobile loans, a mainstay of the banking industry nowadays.

Mr. Thornton was a member and one of the organizers of the Dallas Citizens Council. He was also active in dozens of other organizations.

Survivors, all from Dallas, include his wife; a son, Robert Lee Thornton, Jr.; two daughters, Mrs. J. Frank Holt and Mrs. Ralph Brinegar, eight grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

SON OF TENANT FARMER: THORNTON CITED MANY TIMES FOR WORK AS CIVIC LEADER

Probably no man in Dallas received more civic honors—or worked harder to earn them—than R. L. Thornton, who died Saturday.

The walls of his office in the Mercantile National Bank, where he was board chairman, are lined with plaques, awards, and citations.

Among them are the "Linz Award of 1947," the Greater Dallas Planning Council's 1955 "Distinguished Citizenship Award," the Sales Executive Club's 1948 "No. 1 Salesman of Dallas Award," a 1959 "Man of Vision Award" from the Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and an honorary "Doctor of Humane Letters" degree conferred by the University of Dallas in 1963.

There are scores of others.

Born August 10, 1880, in Hamilton County, Thornton was the son of William Travis Thornton, a tenant farmer. The infant first saw the light of day in a half-dugout house on the banks of the Brazos River.

When he was 7, Mr. Thornton moved with his family to Ellis County. There the boy became a champion cottonpicker. Mr. Thornton completed school at Bristol and went to work as a clerk in a general store at $18 a month.

Two years later he borrowed money from his boss to attend business school in Dallas. He stayed.

After an ill-fated venture with a book store and a stint at selling candy, he borrowed $6,000 to found his own bank. In 1933 he was elected to the first of three terms as chamber of commerce president.

Mr. Thornton had served in many civic capacities when in 1953 he was "drafted" to run for mayor. He was besieged with pleas to head the ticket of the Citizens Charter Association, which he had ramrodded for years. He held the mayor's position until 1961.

He was a member and an organizer of the Dallas Citizens Council. He was also a member of the Children's Development Center, Dallas County United Fund Committee and the Texas Turnpike Authority. He was vice president of the Southwestern Medical Foundation.

He was a director of Lone Star Steel Co.; Burrus Mills, Inc.; Dallas Hotel Co. (the Adolphus); Dallas Power & Light Co.; Southwestern Life Insurance Co.; Weatherford, Mineral Wells & Northwestern Railway Co.; Dallas Grand Opera Association; Dallas Symphony Orchestra, Texas Research Foundation, Trinity Improvement Association, and Texas Scottish Rite Hospital. An active Democrat, he was the friend of politicians across the country, from Presidents down.

He was a member of the Greater Dallas Council of Churches' Executive Committee. He served as chairman of the big gifts division of the United Fund for 1961. And he headed the bond drive for the new courthouse complex for Dallas County.

He was a 33d degree Mason. He spent almost every free weekend fishing in east Texas.

HE EVEN FISHED HARD: THORNTON BELIEVED IN ACTION

R. L. Thornton, Sr., the grand old man of Dallas, jutted his cigar at a jaunty angle through 8 years as mayor at the city council's round table—and never tolerated a boring moment.

Whether it was a zoning case with passionate argument or the routine opening of sewer pipe bids, Mr. Thornton's angular frame relaxing, listened with head cocked and was always potentially ready to drop a witty bomb of a remark.

Audiences in city hall, his fellow councilmen and the press, anyone who had experience with Uncle Bob, never relaxed their hearing; they did not wish to miss his next quip.

Banking, running the city government, wheeling the State fair into opulence—all these may have been his vocation. His avocation, certainly enough, was fishing, most of which in recent years he performed at Little Sandy, a private east Texas camp on Highway 80 east of Mineola.

Mr. Thornton, the most revered member, habitually was given the head place at the table in the community dining hall. At night, he would sit at the big log fire in his nearby cabin, shoes off, regaling his guests with fishing tales and gently twitting them about their prowess.

The country boy, who years ago fished only when he could play hooky from the cotton row, plugged, for bass religiously through the later years. Only recently, because of health, he had to become a still "minnie" fisherman.

"Is that a hole in them lily pads, son?" he would inquire from the next boat. "Yes, sir," would come the reply. Mr. Thornton, on the verge of cataract operations, would flip his plug expertly through the air, letting it thump squarely in the distant clearing. A thin chuckle would be heard through the cigar smoke.

At Little Sandy, his urge to fish long and hard would brook no defiance from the weather. Once two guests, cold from a morning's fishing in the sleety rain, warmed their backsides against his log fire.

The white-thatched mayor roamed restlessly back and forth before the dripping picture window, searching for a hole in the clouds.

Suddenly he wheeled toward his guests.

"Come on, boys, I didn't come down here to stand before no fire. Let's get to fishing," he ordered.

Another Thornton remark, calculated to keep his guests' minds on the goal ahead, was "C'mon, boys. There ain't no bass in a scotch and sody."

One of the epic sights at Little Sandy was the view of Uncle Bob and Perry, his veteran Negro guide, reappearing in their little boat after a day's fishing.

Mr. Thornton, in his early eighties, sat in a high seat, thronelike, while Perry, as old and about as physically capable, operated the outboard motor. The heating element was a can full of sand, into which Perry would pour kerosene and then apply the match.

Darkened with soot, it was difficult to identify either guide or fisherman until the veteran banker removed his hat.

The heating bucket in the boat was something like the old lard bucket Thornton once carried his lunch in when he attended country school for 3-month terms. He wore blue jeans as a youngster back in the 1880's and struggled with Webster's blue-backed speller.

His formal training in the English language was negligible, but few men have had a more graceful touch with the language or a more deft gift of the precise and beautifully expressive word.

There are some famous Thornton quotes.

For instance, to the board of directors of his beloved State Fair of Texas: "We got greener grass, taller trees, and bluer skies than any other fair in the world. We got more ducks on the lagoon and more birds in the trees. And, gentlemen, we got a cash register under every bush, and we're planting more bushes."

Or, "The best advertisin' in the world is what gets yelled from clothesline to clothesline. And to make it favorable, you got to give the people a bargain. Whether it's a musical or the fair itself, you got to give 'em more than their money's worth. In this day of television, you can't fool any of the people any of the time."

Or, "Action don't mean a thing. You got action on a rockinghorse, but you don't get nowhere. If a chairman's really in command of a meetin', he can get a second to a motion to assassinate a man."

Again about meetings, "If it's a 'do' meetin', I'm available. If it's a 'don't' meetin', I ain't interested."

Sometimes Uncle Bob was reverent about his Nation and his city. At a 1961 Fourth of July observance he said: "I believe in peace. I believe in prayer. But there must come a time—and it has come in the history of mankind and America—when we say we will stand up flatfooted and will not sacrifice an inch of our independence or our freedom. And that we will continue to live in this Nation under the creed of independence."

A few months ago Mr. Thornton was talking about the space needle at the Seattle's World Fair, which he visited in 1962.

He wanted one like it, only better, for Dallas; perhaps the only Thornton dream that did not materialize.

"It revolves, it moves so slow you hardly know it," he said about eating in the space needle restaurant up in the sky. From a country boy up, you always want to crawl up on the tallest barn, the tallest tree. That's heredity."

That probably could be as good a line as any to leave Mr. Thornton with. He was the country boy who always wanted to climb the tallest tree. And he did so. And the rest of us looked far up at him. And we shall always do so.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Feb. 16, 1964]

WELL DONE, MR. DALLAS

Robert L. Thornton, Sr., the fabulous "Uncle Bob" who put the "big" in Big D, has ended his earthly chores.

But the next 50, or even 100 years, of Dallas area progress will not pass without some trace of his keen foresight appearing almost daily.

Vision was his forte. No mountain was too high for Bob Thornton. He reached for the peaks and seldom missed achievement.

His philosophy was simple * * * think big and "Keep the dirt flying." He loved his city and he loved its people. Unselfishly, without the hint of personal gain, he went about dreaming dreams that came true. Monuments to his planning tower over every section of the city.

It was only coincidental that the banker born in a dugout became one of the great mayors of Dallas. He had been the city's leader for years from the sidelines. Rarely did he make a public speech that he did not emphasize that Dallas was great because of its people.

And Bob Thornton himself, for nearly three-quarters of a century, was one of the most superb of those citizens. He posed every imperative question of the future from the viewpoint of a plain citizen.

The touch that he possessed made him tens of thousands of friends in every area of Dallas. Bob Thornton could not walk a single street without knowing, and understanding, thousands of "his" people * * * of every race, every position.

The centennial, the State Fair of Texas, the chamber of commerce, a growing, prospering city, one of the Nation's foremost banks, all of these along with the plans for future growth are among the things Bob Thornton left behind for Dallas and Texas. These were the products of his mind and energies.

We say, "Well done, Mr. Dallas."

DALLASITES MOURN DEATH OF ROBERT L. THORNTON, SR.: FUNERAL MONDAY FOR "MR. DALLAS"

Dallasites from all walks of life Saturday mourned the death of R. L. Thornton, Sr., the beloved former mayor who guided Dallas through some of its greatest years of progress.

Thousands are expected to attend the funeral at 3 p.m. Monday in the Highland Park Methodist Church for the tall, white-thatched banker whose forceful personality and dedication to the city he loved earned him the title, "Mr. Dallas."

His was a philosophy of building. In the 8 years he served as mayor, 1953–61, his administration overcame a serious water crisis and chinked the last mortar on the public library, municipal auditorium, city hall, and airport terminal.

Death came to the 83-year-old leader at his home at 4 a.m. Saturday. He had suffered respiratory ailments in recent weeks.

The body will lie in state at Sparkman's, 2115 Ross Avenue, until noon Monday and after 1 p.m. at the Highland Park church.

Rev. William H. Dickinson, Jr., will officiate at the services.

PALLBEARERS NAMED

Pallbearers will include Karl Hoblitzelle, J. Darrell Francis, Milton F. Brown, John H. Rauscher, Charles C. Pierce, Laurence Melton, W. C. Miller, Elgin Crull, C. A. Tatum, James H. Stewart, Earle Wyatt, George A. Linskie, Martin Benno, Tom B. Fisher, Jack P. Burrus, Julius Schepps, Charles R. Meeker, Jr., and D. E. Blackburn.

Honorary pallbearers are officers and directors of the Mercantile National Bank, of which Mr. Thornton was chairman of the board.

Burial will be in Restland Memorial Park.

Mr. Thornton is survived by his wife; a son, Robert Lee Thornton, Jr.; two daughters, Mrs. J. Frank Holt and Mrs. Ralph Brinegar, all of Dallas; eight grandchildren, R. L. Thornton III, T. L. Thornton, J. Frank Holt III, Mary Brinegar, Carol Brinegar, Nan Brinegar, and Franklin Brinegar, all of Dallas; and Mrs. R. A. Farmer, Jr., of South Carolina; in addition to seven great-grandchildren.

BORN IN DUGOUT

He was born in a dugout in an atmosphere of poverty and he knew the hoe and sack of the cottonfields at an early age. These country lessons and homey vernacular he never discarded, though he came to build and head a bank whose total resources are more than $400 million.

Mr. Thornton was a longtime president of the State Fair of Texas and was a founder of the influential Dallas Citizens Council.

A long cigar his almost constant companion, Mr. Thornton prepetuated the east Texas idiom with an earthy wit. As if the word "dynamic" were not forceful enough, he modified it to "dydamic" in reference to the type of leadership Dallas should have.

He was born August 10, 1880, in the humble dugout on the banks of the Bosque River in Hamilton County. He quickly learned the vagaries of the mule and turning plow and his family moved to a two-roomed house on a hill.

LEANER DAYS

But after an almost Biblical 7-year cycle, the lean days of drought came and they moved eastward in a covered wagon pulled by a gaunt team and settled on Village Creek near Ennis in Ellis County.

At 7 years of age, the whip-thin youth found himself dragging a cotton sack through the fields, stripping off bolls during the day and at night sleeping with the rest of the family on the mounds of white fluff in the gin.

When winter came, there was work clearing bottomlands, but he found himself not strong enough to wield a 3-pound axe; instead, he took a smaller hatchet to underbrush.

In 1888, the Thornton family became tenant farmers and young Bob managed to see Dallas the next year during the time of the State fair. Although he eked out only an eighth grade education, he later was to head the fair organization for 19 years. He was elevated to board chairman of the fair last year.

The drudgery of farm life brought him to notice distinctly that when money was needed by his father, he obtained it in town and paid it back there. He went into Bristol and talked himself into an $18-a-month job as a clerk in a store. This was $2 more than the wages of a farmhand.

In 1904, he became a traveling salesman for a candy company. This, at last, enabled him to move about and he quickly amassed enough money to try the candy business for himself. It didn't work, and in 1910, he tried the book business, becoming coowner of a book store in Dallas. Texas' free textbook law forced him out of business. He tried the mortgage business.

It was in 1914 with $6,000 borrowed, he and two partners established what is now the Mercantile National Bank. They opened for business at 8:30 a.m., October 14, and by 5:30 p.m. that day had $12,906 in deposits.

PIONEERED AUTO NOTES

In those early, experimental days, one of the town's citizens walked into the fledgling bank one day and was aghast to see a sign "Auto Notes."

"Take it down," he warned young Banker Thornton, "It isn't sound banking." But to Mr. Thornton, banking was simply lending money; "jitney notes" carried no special onus with him. The sign stayed. In 1917 the bank was renamed County State Bank, with deposits of $165,385.

The bank continued its growth and managed to weather the 1929 crash without closing its doors.

Dallas called upon him to head its chamber of commerce.

In 1934, his salesmanship was put to an extreme test. A commission had been formed to decide the site of the 1936 Texas Centennial, and it looked for a while as if Dallas might lose the prize until Mr. Thornton did some fast talking. It was a down-to-earth, cotton-patch speech—a recitation of the practical—and it kept things going.

A month later, he did some verbal bulldozing and when his sometimes tinny, staccato voice died down, Dallas businessmen found they had put up $1.5 million for the centennial. A $3 million city bond issue was floated.

The Texas Centennial was held in Dallas in 1936. It was big, racuous, and uninhibited. But it brought Dallas a commercial shot in the arm.

CHOSEN AS MAYOR

In 1953 the Citizens Charter Association urged Mr. Thornton to run for mayor. He was at first unconvinced, but later succumbed to a draft.

For the next 8 years, the CCA was in firm control of Dallas municipal government. And R. L. Thornton was its leader.

In the period 1955–61, approximately $130 million in public improvements were made in Dallas. Another $51 million went for capital improvements during the 1958–61 period.

Mr. Thornton's many affiliations included the Children's Development Center, United Fund, Texas Turnpike Authority, Lone Star Steel, Burrus Mills, Dallas Hotel Co., Dallas Power & Light Co., Southwestern Life Insurance Co., Weatherford, Mineral Wells & Northwestern Railway Co. A 33d degree Mason, he was also a member of the Dallas Scottish Rite bodies.

He held offices or directorships in the Dallas Grand Opera Association, Dallas Symphony Orchestra, Southwestern Medical Foundation, Texas Research Foundation, Trinity Improvement Association, Texas Scottish Rite Hospital, and Greater Dallas Council of Churches.

He was named "Headliner of the Year" by the Press Club of Dallas in 1955.

Cleveland's Mr. Chips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in every community of America there are teachers who leave a special imprint upon the lives of the young men and women who pass through their classes. In a quiet, unassuming and often underestimated way, these teachers become the inspiration which lead to real educational achievement.

In the city of Cleveland, one of my constituents and close personal friends, Mr. William J. Ternansky, has distinguished himself in this manner. In the past 31 years, he has been teaching in the high schools and colleges of our community. When we salute William Ternansky as "Cleveland's Mr. Chips," we saluté a profession in which he exemplifies the highest qualities.

Following is a splendid article on William Ternansky written by Bob Seltzer which appeared in the Cleveland Press on Monday, February 17, 1964:

HE IS CLEVELAND'S MR. CHIPS

(By Bob Seltzer)

William J. Ternansky is Cleveland's counterpart of Mr. Chips, the beloved schoolmaster of James Hilton's famous novel.

Ternansky has taught more students in his 31 years at Cathedral Latin High School, his alma mater, than any other teacher in its history. He leaves an indelible impression on them. They are devoutly loyal for his inspiration and love of excellence.

His major objective is the optimum in learning and character to produce good citizens. His rigorous discipline of students stems from the hardships of his boyhood.

He sets high standards and is intolerant of mediocrity, if a student has the capacity for better work. He is dominant, the master, yet there is nothing pedantic about him.

Ternansky has been named Latin's "Man of the Year" as an outstanding alumnus and for his diligent efforts in instilling in students a desire for academic superiority.

He will be presented the alumni associations' annual merit award for 1964 at the communion breakfast next Sunday at the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel.

Among the alumni saluting him will be educators, priests, several city councilmen, two judges, principals of two area high schools, several suburban mayors and State legislators, physicians, surgeons, lawyers, and high-ranking military officers.

"One of the best rewards is to see a former student become a success in life and remember me," said Ternansky.

"There is no success without order and discipline. My aim for my students is a disciplined mind in a morally and physically fit body.

"Basically, today's students are the same as 31 years ago, but they have more distractions. Perhaps a more affluent society hasn't served them as well. Part of the blame for delinquency lies in a breakdown of the spirit of family life."

Ternansky, 55, a sturdy bald man with a fringe of gray and a slight mustache, is of Hungarian descent.

He lives in the house in which he was born at 9914 Buckeye Road. He worked his way through Cathedral Latin and John Carroll University as a Press delivery boy, a street lamplighter, library page, grocery clerk, farmhand and golf caddy. He has an M.A. from Carroll in social studies.

Ternansky was a basketball coach at St. Elizabeth School while attending Carroll. He has taught German, problems of democracy, American government, and now is chairman of social sciences.

He has served as social activity moderator and college adviser. Since 1938 he has been instructor in political science three afternoons weekly at Ursuline College. For 10 years he taught night classes at Carroll and 7 summers at St. John College.

Ternansky and his wife, Stella, have two sons: William, 12, and Robert, 9. Ternansky's father, Frank, 90, lives with him.

Dr. Grayson Kirk's Tribute to John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, the day of national mourning for our late President John F.

Kennedy, Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, delivered an address at the memorial service in St. Paul's Chapel at Columbia. Among the many heartfelt eulogies to President Kennedy, I believe that Dr. Kirk's is one of the most inspiring I have read. I am sure my colleagues will be moved by Dr. Kirk's eloquent tribute which follows:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(Memorial address by Grayson Kirk)

On this sad day unnumbered millions of men and women have gathered together as we have done to pay a last word of respect and tribute to the memory of a great man. The earth that this afternoon receives the shattered body of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is wet with the unashamed tears of an outraged mankind. The world has been stunned by the effect of a single senseless and brutal act committed by a creature who at that moment forfeited his right to membership in the human race.

No greater blow can be dealt a nation than to strike down a chosen leader who had amply demonstrated a capacity for leadership rare among men of any generation. The entire Nation grieves, not merely out of a decent sympathy for a bereaved family and close personal friends, but because it knows that it, too, has suffered a crippling loss; that it, too, has been impoverished; that it, too, has been shamed before the world. And as our people bow their heads in their grief, they bow them also in shame that such a thing could have happened in our land and in our time.

The poignancy of our grief is all the more intense because we do not need to wait to be told by future historians that this was no mere and ordinary man thrust into high office by the chance results of democratic political process. We know in our hearts, and we know with deep and abiding conviction, that this was a man who possessed in abundance those special and unusual qualities of which our people at this time in their history stood in great need, from which they derived deep and lasting benefit, and without which they must look into a bleak and troubled future.

And on this afternoon of national mourning, it is fitting that we recall, for the benefit of all our citizens, some of the reasons why our loss is a national disaster, the like of which few generations have had to endure. So doing, we take some small measure of comfort in remembering what we have had; so doing, we set up in ourselves criteria by which we may measure those who would follow our President in this, the highest of all our offices.

We honor the memory of John Kennedy because he was a man of courage. He knew instinctively the importance of this quality among leaders. He wrote discerningly about it, in order that we might all be more aware of our national need for men who possessed it. In his youth he demonstrated that, in his own character, it was stronger than even the primal instinct for self-preservation. In his maturity he did not flinch from decisions that he knew would evoke hostility and abuse from men whose vision of the Nation's welfare was narrow, selfish, and distorted. First among all leaders he faced the terrible risk of nuclear war in order to protect the basic national interests of the people whom he had sworn to protect and defend.

But his was not the blind courage in face of danger which, happily, comes to many men in time of crisis. His was the courage derived from the intelligent evaluation of all facets of a complex and perilous situation and fortified by the strength of basic convictions. His was the courage of intelligence, the courage that goes beyond that of many intelligent men who, faced with a grave and unpleasant problem, lapse into the agony of indecision and the error of impulsive judgment.

Though as a young man he offered his life for his country, his final gift of this, the most precious of man's possessions, was more than a supreme sacrifice just in defense of his country. He wanted his country to become a land in which our democratic ideals would be more fully realized, a land in which we and our children could take ever greater pride, a land in which the old dreams of mankind might at last be realized. And he gave up his life because despicable and selfish men, hating this prospect, so filled the atmosphere with their venom that one mean creature became their tool and their agent. Now that the deed is done, and our President is gone, their protestations of innocence and even of brief ring hollowly upon our ears. John Kennedy died because he wanted a better America. Consciously he fought them, knowing as he must have, what the risks were. Bravely he died, not so much for the America of today as for the America of the future.

John Kennedy had more than courage and intelligence. He had compassion. Born to wealth and, had he so chosen, a life of ease and indolence, he elected a career of public service, one in which he could put his talents to work for his fellow men. Just as he was proud of the great qualities and achievements of his country, he was deeply troubled by the inequities and inequalities which still persisted in a society ostensibly dedicated to their elimination. He was troubled, too, by the new injustices, the new hazards of life that grew out of social and technological change.

He saw a society in which men of one color were being denied that equality of opportunity which is the foundation stone of America. He saw a society in which the benefits of modern medical progress were on occasion denied to men and women because they lacked the means to pay for their needs. He saw a society in which aged men and women of limited resources were being ruthlessly pushed aside and allowed to live out their final years in that quiet helpless desperation that only poverty without hope can breed.

And because he was a man of compassion, he grieved over these cancers in the body politic. And because he was a man of action, he strove to excise them and to heal their wounds. And because he was a determined man, not content to allow an affluent society to be so afflicted, he died.

Today as we reflect with gratitude upon those great qualities, this constructively directed energy, this vision of what our country might be and must become, we must ask ourselves what good, what possible benefit, we as a people can derive from this man's life, what lessons we may take to our hearts from this crushing tragedy. Our grief must be tempered with the resolution that the sacrifice was not vainly made, that out of our national sorrow there may come some good, that from the shrine of this bloodstained soil in Arlington there may come a chastened and better America. In no other way can we justify to him what he did for us.

First and foremost, we must resolve to be more responsible in our thoughts and actions. This land of ours is plagued by men of small minds, men of vicious and uncontrolled emotions, men for whom hatred is greater than love, men whose concern for their fellow men is lost in insensate bigotry, men who in their hearts despise all that this Nation stands for, men who do not deserve the land in which they live. It does not matter whether they are of the reactionary right or the radical left, the menace which they present to this country is equally ominous becouse they would—in order to bring back a world that never was or one that betrays the cause of human freedom—destroy all our effort.

Since we are obliged by the imperatives of that freedom to permit such men to carry on, to a reasonable extent, their destructive activities, it is the obligation of those of us who really love our country to be more energetic, more alert to the danger, more willing to remind our citizens about the dangers implicit in the ravings of the extremists. When we are silent in the face of this danger, when we deride our chosen leaders or sit quietly by when others do so, when we allow ourselves to become irrational in our partisanship, when we allow others to sneer at our principles, we are unconscious accomplices in the sabotage of our country. Apathy in these circumstances is cowardice. If this experience through which we have passed does not chasten our hearts, and does not steel our determination to combat these forces of destruction about us, then may God help us, because we will not help ourselves.

It has been the historic pride of this country for the past century that our excesses of political partisanship have never reached the point when the conflict on either side jeopardized loyalty to our constitution and our democracy. This is still true of the overwhelming majority of Americans, but we face today, in this respect, greater dangers than at any time since the Civil War. Respect for law is lost in the selfishness of men who try to cheat and evade its commands. Respect for law is lost in the organized resistance of men to the application of the Constitution under which they live. Respect for law is dead when our highest officers are physically assaulted, when their lives are threatened, and when such threats become grim reality. To these dangers we must become more alert. Against them we must devise countermeasures. From them we must learn and practice that self-discipline which has never been congenial to our people but upon which the future of our country depends. In this respect, we hang our heads in shame over the spectacle which we present to the world, a spectacle which ill accords with our boasting.

More energy against the extremists and their poison, more self-discipline—even these are not enough if we are to justify by the future health and progress of our society the sacrifice John Kennedy made for his country. Each segment of our society must reexamine its responsibilities. The press, radio, and television, through their emphasis upon the reporting of violence often go beyond their basic need to keep us informed; by these emphases they may condone and inflame still further violence, and they cannot escape social responsibility by saying that they are merely giving the public what it wants. In the home, the extreme permissiveness of our modern parents breeds in their children contempt for all authority, a contempt that takes its toll in broken youthful lives and bewildered parents who try to evade responsibility for their own failures by casting the blame on others. And, of course, our schools, our colleges, and our universities need to reexamine their functions and to try to discover how, along with their traditional duties, they can impart to their students a greater sense of social responsibility. The death of our beloved President carries a lesson to every part of our society and to every institution. In his memory we must heed it.

Thus, today, in our grief and our remorse, we look sadly, but with new resolve to the future. We are determined to create in this land the democracy in which he believed, one which applies the ancient principles of human dignity, equality, and opportunity to the conditions and necessities of modern life. As we do this, and as we bring nearer to reality, the dreams of men like the man we mourn today, we make out of his gallant life and its tragic ending a national treasure for the future. We can do no more, and we can do no less. His soul is in the hands of God, his heritage in the hearts of our people.

The Wine of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest poets in the United States is a former professor of mine at Wesleyan University and a man who has attained national recognition in the arts, in the academic world, and as an elected official. He is the former Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut, Wilbert Snow.

Following the death of our late President, John F. Kennedy, Governor Snow wrote a brief poem in his memory. It was published on the cover of the January 1964 issue of the Wesleyan Alumnus magazine, and drew my attention immediately. It is one of the best statements I have seen to express the image of a young man struck down in the midst of his promise.

I had an opportunity to discuss this poem with Governor Snow recently and I asked him in particular about the use of two words. One was "Eshcol" in the line—"Loving the wine of Freedom's Eshcol brook." His idea was that the wine of freedom should be made from the biggest and best grapes. He got the impression from the Book of Numbers in the Bible, chapter 13, verses 23–24:

And they came unto the brook of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes, and they bare it between two upon a staff.* * * The place was called the brook Eshcol, because of the cluster of grapes which the children of Israel cut down from thence.

The other word was "ichor" in line 6 of the poem which reads: "As the ichor of our old New England schools." Governor Snow explained that the ichor fluid took the place of blood in the bodies of the gods in Greek mythology. His purpose in this use, therefore, was to cite the individual freedom which the President loved and which has been nourished in him by the old schools, Choate, Princeton, and Harvard, that he attended.

I have found this poem most inspirational and I believe it should be published in the RECORD so that all Members may read it and reflect upon it:

J.F.K.

(By Wilbert Snow)

Greek runner on whom people loved to look,
  World Consul with a youthful mind and heart,
Lover of wine from Freedom's Eshcol brook,
  A Rennaissance man whom the world of art
Enriched and widened and endowed with balance,
  As the ichor of our old New England schools
Gave Emersonion luster to his talents,
  And honed his humerous Irish foil for fools.
New man of this new day, he shamed us all
  By keeping faith with the American dream;
He trusted it and labored to install
  An order that would bring the sorry scheme
Of old world hatreds to an end. Stars, mourn
  That such a radiant soul from earth was torn.

The Large Mess Called Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Indonesia is one of the richest countries in the world. She has the fifth largest population. She has a two-way trade of more than a billion dollars annually. She has a wealth of natural resources, much of it untapped. And, she has thousands of square miles of untilled soil.

At the same time, and I have been emphasizing this point since I returned from a southeast Asia inspection trip in 1962, Indonesia is in deep trouble economically. And this must be of concern to us for Indonesia is pursuing a foreign policy which is reckless and dangerous. It must be of concern to us for Indonesia is in a position to be the balance wheel in this troubled and explosive part of the world.

As Keyes Beech has pointed out in an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post on February 15:

There is a limit to how much gross mismanagement even a country so lavishly endowed as Indonesia can stand. And signs are multiplying that the limit is about to be reached.

And as Beach goes on:

Nowhere is Indonesia's economic plight better mirrored than in the hopeless faces of starving people in central Java. It's not that there isn't enough food. It's that runaway inflation has driven prices so high that many people cannot afford to buy. And the inflation can be traced directly to Sukarno's economic mismanagement and his reckless drive for international power and prestige at the expense of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this penetrating description of an important problem to our colleagues' attention:

THE LARGE MESS CALLED INDONESIA

(By Keyes Beech)

DJAKARTA, INDONESIA.—A European resident of 15 years' standing said: "I don't see why you Americans worry so much about the Indonesian economy collapsing. Didn't you know it collapsed 14 years ago?"

This is an exaggeration with a great deal of truth. Indonesia's economy began to go downhill when it got independence from the Dutch and, with the exception a few quick glances over the shoulder it has never looked back.

Nothing about the way the Indonesian economy works—or doesn't work—makes sense. For the last decade forecasts of economic disaster have been voiced so often they began to sound like a scratchy phonograph record. But somehow, mainly due to the resilience of Indonesia's predominantly peasant population and bountiful nature, Indonesia survived.

Yet it seems there is a limit to how much gross mismanagement even a country so lavishly endowed as Indonesia can stand, and signs are multiplying that the limit is about to be reached—if not this year, then perhaps the next.

Economic confrontation with neighboring Malaysia cost Indonesia between $300 and $400 million in trade and aid at a time when the economy was already reeling. And the full cost of President Sukarno's "crush Malaysia" campaign has yet to be measured.

Exports in 1964 probably won't exceed $400 million. Yet Indonesia needs between $500 and $800 million worth of imports annually to keep going.

Foreign exchange reserves are down to $50 million, a pitiful low for a country with a two-way trade of more than a billion dollars annually.

In Dutch colonial days Indonesia was a rice-exporting nation. Yet Indonesian imported 1 million tons of rice in 1963, will have to import 1.5 million tons in 1964, and perhaps 2 million in 1965.

Where the money is coming from nobody knows. One highly qualified source estimates that if the present trend continues—and there is no apparent inclination on the part of the Government to reverse it—Indonesia will be spending 40 percent of its export earnings on food imports within 5 years.

This in a country one-fourth the size of the United States with barely tapped underground resources and thousands of square miles of untilled soil.

If there's one word that fits Indonesia today, it's stagnant. Industry is stagnant. So is the farm economy, especially in densely populated Java.

Sugar mills are falling apart for lack of spare parts. Sixty percent of all the textile mills in east Java have been forced to shut down because the price of yarn is 60 percent more than they can get for the finished product.

Last year's critical spare parts shortage was temporarily relieved by a $17 million U.S. loan—3 days later Sukarno bought $20 million worth of jetliners—but only temporarily.

Whole fleets of trucks and buses are sitting on blocks for lack of tires or spare parts. Miles of railway trackage and rolling stock have succumbed to neglect and old age. Shipping, vitally important to an island country stretching over 3,000 miles of ocean, is woefully inadequate.

Multiply these examples a thousand times and you have some idea of Indonesia's economic decay. The once-great city of Surabaya in east Java is but a shadow of its former self.

But nowhere is Indonesia's economic plight better mirrored than in the hopeless faces of starving people in central Java.

What makes this starvation all the more deplorable is that it's so unnecessary. Indonesia is so rich overall that for human beings to starve here is like a hen starving sitting on a bushel of corn.

It's not that there isn't enough food. It's that runaway inflation has driven prices so high that many people cannot afford to buy. And the inflation can be traced directly to Sukarno's economic mismanagement and his reckless drive for international power and prestige at the expense of his country.

The government's attitude toward the hardship of the people was perhaps best summarized in a recent remark by Foreign Minister Subandrio, Sukarno's No. 2 man. When a visitor mentioned reports of mass hunger in central Java, Subandrio conceded the reports were true.

"But there's a bright side," he added. "The Indonesians are a lazy people. Perhaps they'll work harder if they get hungry enough."

Easy Availability of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic assassination of President Ken-

nedy, the Congress and the public have been flooded with demands that the Federal Government do something about the so-called easy availability of firearms. Much of this reaction to the murder in Dallas has been generated in a highly charged atmosphere of emotionalism and shock.

While this reaction is understandable, it unfortunately has been pervaded by a lack of knowledge of the facts of firearms controls on the Federal and State levels in this Nation. Sweeping assertions have been made that almost anybody could obtain a firearm through the mails with nothing more than a request and a few dollars. The statements made in the press, over the radio and on television have created the impression in many person's minds and in the minds of the world's peoples that this Nation still operates with the code of the wilderness and the frontier. The creation of such an impression, Mr. Speaker, is a great disservice to the American people and to the cause of law and order. Clearly, when one investigates the facts of the situation, one finds that many controls—often of a highly restrictive nature—already exist on the Federal and State levels. Moreover, further examination reveals that the sins of a relatively few unscrupulous firearms dealers should not be visited upon the vast majority of those persons who enjoy firearms for the legitimate purposes of marksmanship, hunting, and collecting.

An experienced and calm voice amidst the turmoil and fury has been that of my esteemed colleague and fellow shooter-sportsman, the gentleman from California, the Honorable CECIL R. KING, a distinguished Member of this House and of the Committee on Ways and Means. The statement of the gentleman from California, Congressman KING, on firearms legislation submitted to the Senate Committee on Commerce is a call to the rational and realistic, to the equitable and factual. Because of this, I wish for this statement to be commended to this House and to the attention of the American people:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CECIL R. KING TO THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, DECEMBER 13, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I have read with considerable interest your statement of December 10 concerning the nature and scope of the firearms legislation that will be considered by your committee today and in subsequent open hearings. I strongly endorse your general approach to a solution of the problems that give rise to such legislation and your intention of conducting a thorough exploration of this entire subject in an atmosphere of calm deliberation.

The possession and use of firearms by the law-abiding citizens of our Nation, based on the traditional guarantees of our Constitution, have long been a subject of interest and importance to me. On numerous occasions during the years that I have served in the House of Representatives, I have had the distinct privilege and pleasure of sponsoring several bills designed to further the peaceful enjoyment of legitimate shooting activities by citizens of good repute as a sport or hobby, and in the interest of our national defense. In each instance, I have endeavored to stress the necessity of penalizing the man behind the gun, rather than the gun itself.

Inanimate objects, such as firearms, knives, axes, or clubs, do not and cannot cause crime. They do not and cannot supply the motive or impulse. The causes of crime must be sought elsewhere—in greed, hatred, jealousy, and general moral depravity—and the remedy, if any there be, is more likely to be found in morals and education, in improved police methods of detection, and in the more prompt and certain imposition of punishment.

As a result of the tragic events in Dallas, the ire of the general public, in their efforts to vent their anger on the causes of such a national disaster, has been directed toward the weapon used to kill, without a full realization of the loss of constitutional freedoms that could result from such misguided intentions or misplacement of values. I do not think that this committee will entertain such intentions or embark on such a disastrous course of action.

I fully support legislation designed to prohibit the possession of firearms by persons who have been finally convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, drug addicts and persons while adjudicated habitual drunkards; legislation providing severe additional penalties for the use of a dangerous weapon in the commission of a crime; and legislation making the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent and the use of firearms in public by juveniles subject to adequate supervision.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you and your committee will give a thorough study to all factors involved in the matter of proper and sound firearms regulation. To this end, I pledge my wholehearted cooperation and support.

Honorable Carl T. Rowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has recently nominated Carl T. Rowan, of Tennessee, as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. In connection with this appointment, the Nashville Banner has written an editorial commending Mr. Rowan for his ability and accomplishments.

Mr. Rowan is a native of Tennessee and resided for many years in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. A few days ago, I wrote to Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging prompt confirmation of this appointment.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter, together with the editorial from the Nashville Banner, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial and letter follow:

NEW POST FOR ROWAN

To replace the ailing Edward R. Murrow as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, President Johnson has picked Carl T. Rowan, a native of Tennessee, who becomes by this appointment the highest ranking Negro in Government.

An able newspaperman, whose college education began at Tennessee A & I University here, he has as capably filled the posts assigned in public service since he entered upon that career by appointment as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. From that he went to Finland as U.S. Ambassador.

He knows the responsibilities of public office, which certainly attend the administrative function now assigned; and whose need has been less the flair for tinseled showmanship that it has had than down-to-earth presentation dealing in information.

Carl Rowan's accomplishments in public life deserve recognition, and are a credit to his home State. On the strict basis of personal ability, the appointment has much to recommend it.

FEBRUARY 13, 1964.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with your committee's consideration of the Honorable Carl T. Rowan, whom President Johnson has nominated as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, I want to join with others in commending him and urging his confirmation.

Mr. Rowan has served his Government ably in various capacities. Just recently, he completed a tour of duty as our Ambassador to Finland, a post which he filled with distinction.

It seems clear that he is eminently qualified to serve as Director of the U.S. Information Agency and his past record of performance demonstrates that he will carry out the duties and obligations of this office creditably and effectively.

Mr. Rowan is a native Tennessean and for many years a resident in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. I wish to endorse him and urge his speedy confirmation.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
(S) JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

More Questions on Our Puzzling Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that my puzzlement and amazement over many phases of our foreign policy increase as time goes on.

Some time ago I raised some questions as to why we subsidized Communist leaders like Tito to the tune of billions of dollars—all taxpayer money, of course—on the grounds that we thereby are weakening communism. Perhaps I am unable to grasp the esoteric reasoning of our policy planners, but it seems to me, that by contributing billions of dollars to Communist dictators, we are underwriting a system that is dedicated to our destruction.

In the recent Zanzibar rebellion, every news story I read attributed the overthrow of the elected government to Cuban-trained revolutionaries. The State Department, however, said it was not certain that the new government was Communist. Even after the new rulers proclaimed Zanzibar as a peoples repub-

lic in the fashion of the Communist nations, the State Department remained unconvinced. I recall our diplomatic experts in the State Department did not believe Castro was a Communist until the day he announced his communism to the world.

Many other phases of our foreign policy baffle me. One recent instance has me quite bewildered. Here is the situation. In effect, we are underwriting and supporting the regime of Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the former Belgian Congo. We have spent in this disorganized country some $500 million, through the United Nations and our own foreign aid program, and will give it much more. We backed the U.N. attack on Moise Tshombe, former President of Katanga Province, forcing Katanga, which wanted to become independent, to subordinate itself to Adoula.

One Holden Roberto is the leader of a movement intended to drive the Portuguese out of Angola, a Portuguese possession in West Africa. Roberto maintains a government-in-exile on the soil of the former Belgian Congo. This government has been recognized by Adoula, and he is assisting Roberto in his plans for an invasion of Angola. Incidentally, Roberto is being assisted also by other African nations, including Ben Bella, Algerian dictator, who is friendly to Castro and hostile to the United States.

Charges have been made from time to time that Roberto has had Communist backing. These have been denied by our State Department. In fact, there have been rumors that we looked with favor on Roberto, regarding him as a sort of Adoula, who would be on our side when the Portuguese are driven out of Africa. However, Pieter Lessing, and other reputable authorities, have insisted that Roberto had Communist backing for his invasion of Angola in March 1961. Roberto's band of terrorists tortured and butchered, sparing neither age nor sex. The atrocities were represented in this country as justifiable acts by a heavily oppressed people. The United States sided with Roberto's assassins, and, at the U.N. our representatives actually voted with Communist Russia to condemn the Portuguese for defending themselves. But many reputable journalists and commentators visited Angola after March of 1961. Their stories were quite different than the early reports which were spread by Portugal's enemies.

But early this year Roberto did a most embarrassing thing, embarrassing to our foreign policy planners. He suddenly announced that he intended to seek Communist support, including Red Chinese support, in his campaign against the Portuguese. He is quoted in the New York Times as saying that he intended to visit Peiping, Moscow, and possibly Cuba.

He is quoted in the New York Times as saying:

> The Communists assured me that we can have whatever we need in arms and money. We are firmly decided to accept.

The open Roberto-Communist alliance raises some very interesting questions. We are underwriting Adoula, who in turn is underwriting Roberto. Moreover, without a haven in the Congo, to which he can retreat after striking at Angola, Roberto cannot operate. It is evident that he has little support inside Angola, itself.

Do we still intend to allow Roberto to use the Congo as the base for Communist operations intended to drive the Portuguese out of Angola? Do we still intend to underwrite an operation aimed at a friendly nation, Portugal, on behalf of our deadly enemies?

Someone may say that we cannot tell Adoula what to do. No, but we can stop giving him taxpayer dollars. If we do that, he would not be able to continue in business. We can use our influence to have the U.N. troops removed from the Congo, where they are preventing utter chaos. We can stop help financing the destruction of the free world and our own destruction as well.

Finally, does the State Department intend to continue to be guided in its African policy by the American Committee on Africa? This outfit has been Roberto's backer in the United States and has helped him with propaganda, and in other ways. There is plenty of evidence that the committee, which once included many prominent and deluded citizens as members, has been heavily infiltrated by Communist sympathizers. One prominent staff member, Hope Stevens, has belonged to 20 or more Commie fronts, over a period of years. Still others have played footsie with the Commies on many occasions.

Yet, George M. Houser, executive director of the committee, is a member of the State Department's Advisory Council on African Affairs. Dr. John A. Marcum, another American committee member, also is a member of the Council. And Frank Montero, prominent in American committee affairs, actually is a member of our U.N. delegation.

If these men are shaping our African policies, we can look forward to continued support for Roberto, who plans to take over Portuguese Africa with Communist support.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have had no answers from our foreign policy makers to my queries about foreign affairs. Perhaps, personally, I am not sufficiently important to warrant attention from our great State Department. Yet, I insist that the questions I have raised are pertinent and deserve attention. They go to the very heart of matters, and may explain why the Communist tide is advancing over the world and why the retreat of democracy continues.

J.F.K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, many eloquent words have been spoken and lines of poetry have been written in tribute to the memory of our late President John F. Kennedy.

A good friend of mine, Mrs. Agnes Brown, of Oakland, Calif., has written her personal reflection on the greatness of President Kennedy and it is certainly a touching eulogy and I am pleased to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

J.F.K.

The inauguration that snowy day,
The Cardinal, the Poet-Trumpets gay,
A challenging speech in staccatoed phrase
His wisdom and vision charting new ways.

The parents, brothers, sisters and cousins,
Peace Corpsmen circled the globe by dozens,
Vienna to Rio we heard acclaim.
The heroic Leader had won world fame.

New Frontiersmen were most everywhere
In quickened Space-age, that handsome pair
Children were playing in hallowed place
Beauty, Poetry, Song in White House grace.

Our Modern Lancelot Pursued his Grail
We watched him debate on his campaign trail
From West Virginia to the Golden Gate
He saw new ways to solve problems of state.

Who can ever forget the brilliant mind,
That eloquent voice and love of mankind,
The sparkling dry wit, ever flashing smile,
Was loved from Berlin to Emerald isle.

And a child shall lead them we've seen again,
Little John saluted him for all men,
We'll carry on as we know he would say,
I'll be thinking of all in the U.S.A.

—AGNES BROWN.

The New Jersey Farm Bureau Takes Pride in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, each year New Jersey Farm Bureau members journey to Washington to meet with the New Jersey congressional delegation and express their views on matters of mutual concern to the farmers of the State and their elected representatives. I always welcome the opportunity to see those who have proven again and again the reason why New Jersey is known as the Garden State, and to hear their comments and opinions.

At the luncheon held today, a particularly significant speech was delivered by Carleton E. Heritage, the president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau. Mr. Heritage took issue with those who see the orderly processes of Congress through critical eyes. He applauded the committee system, and the deliberate approach to legislation, and suggested that Congress is acting in the best interests of the people in opposing additional restrictions and the increasing number of executive suggestions for new Federal Government activity.

In include at this point the remarks made by Mr. Heritage:

A FARMER LOOKS AT CONGRESS

(By Carleton E. Heritage, president, New Jersey Farm Bureau)

Members of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, one of the privileges of a president is to say what he wants to say before others have a chance. With your indulgence, I

would like to take advantage of that unwritten privilege today.

We are all hearing and reading a lot these days about the Congress of the United States. A great many writers and political experts seem to think that a majority of the American people are critical of the Congress because it moves too slowly, fails to report legislation to the floor of the Senate or House; or does not go along with the recommendations of the executive branch of the Government.

As a farmer, I would like to say a few things about the Congress and the role I feel it should perform. I believe that I speak for a majority of farmers in New Jersey in these remarks.

We believe in the Constitution of the United States. We believe in the doctrine of separation of power between the Federal Government and the State governments; and we believe just as strongly in the separate and coequal branches of the Federal Government: The legislative, the executive, and the judicial. We believe it is the job of the Congress, within the limits of the Constitution, to write the law of the land. It is the job of the executive to make recommendations to the Congress on legislation; but more importantly, to administer the laws adopted by the Congress. It's the job of the judiciary to interpret the laws, and to rule upon their constitutionality. We think it is important these three equal branches of Government do not infringe upon each other.

While farmers may at times be critical of the kinds of laws passed by the Congress—particularly with reference to farm legislation—we do not agree with those who are highly critical with the general operations of the Congress. In general, we think the Congress should be a deliberate body. It should not act in haste. We believe in the committee system as the best system yet devised to operate the Congress in an orderly manner.

It appears to us that those who are most critical of the Congress are people who have various axes to grind in the form of legislation. Most of these critics seem to favor an increasing number of laws that would involve the Federal Government in more and more functions, activities, and responsibilities. To us, this is a dangerous trend. We are sincerely fearful that the Federal Government is already too powerful and too expensive. We believe the emphasis should be on strengthening local and State governments.

In short, we thank God for the Congress of the United States. We believe it is the most important foundation of our freedom as a people. You are the people we have helped to select back in our home districts to represent us here in Washington. We believe you are closer to our thinking than anyone else in Washington. Every 2 years, we have an opportunity to consider whether or not you are representing our best interests; and we vote accordingly. Whenever the people become dissatisfied with Members of the Congress they have the right and responsibility to make changes.

It may be true that some changes in procedures would improve the operation of the Congress; but we believe drastic changes are neither needed nor desirable. We do not agree with those who seem to advocate changes that would make the Congress a rubberstamp of the Executive; and we look with disfavor upon attempts of the courts to legislate, rather than judge.

We agree with Mr. Moses, of New York, that the only way to have a better Congress is to elect better men and women to Congress—men and women who believe in the letter and spirit of the Constitution; and who believe in the historic role and responsibility of the Congress.

Farm legislation is a good example. We have made ourselves clear for many years that most of the farm legislation passed by Congress—especially legislation involving price supports, controls, and subsidies—is not in the best interest of most New Jersey farmers. We think Members of Congress from New Jersey should base their votes on farm legislation on the best interests of New Jersey consumers and farmers, and not the interests of a minority of farmers in other States. In general, we would be happier if you would vote for legislation that would lead us gradually away from farm controls and subsidies, and a reduction in the budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This is not to say the Federal Government does not have a proper and valuable role to play in agriculture. We agree that it does. Many of the programs of research and education are absolutely essential and should not be diminished; but in the field of price supports, controls, subsidies, and market manipulation, we would be better off with less.

In short, what I am trying to say is that most farmers are not among those who are highly critical of the Congress. We do not always agree with the decisions made by the Congress; but we believe it is closer to the majorty thinking of all the people than any other branch of Government.

Resolution on Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29 of the American Legion of Miami, Fla., of which I am proud to be a member, has adopted a resolution on the Canal Zone, which I think fitting and proper to commend to my colleagues:

RESOLUTION ON CANAL ZONE

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Panama entered into a treaty, November 18, 1903, wherein the Republic of Panama granted to the United States, over a strip 10 miles wide across the Isthmus of Panama "all extra territorial rights in perpetuity to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any sovereign rights, power or authority," in the said area; and

Whereas pursuant to such treaty, the United States undertook the task of building the Panama Canal under seemingly unsurmountable obstacles, banished disease, designed new machinery, modernized engineering methods and with American genius, medical science, engineering efficiency, and American capital built the canal and has operated it efficiently and effectively in a manner safeguarding the United States and the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas 30,000 U.S. nationals, canal workers, military personnel, and their dependents, reside in the Canal Zone solely for the operation and defense of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas led by hotheaded Panamanian nationals, there have been periodic clashes in and around the Canal Zone since it was built, throughout which time our Government has acted equitably and fairly to Panamanians and has among other items, amended the treaty in 1936, has increased annual rental payments, and in 1960, ill advisedly, after adjournment of the 86th Congress, by Executive order, permitted and allowed the Panamanian flag to be flown alongside of the Stars and Stripes in the Canal Zone, none of which actions of appeasement were effective, but which only whetted the appetites of the Panamanian leaders for more and more concessions, culminating in a demand for complete revision of the said treaty as a price for resuming diplomatic relations, unilaterally broken by the Republic of Panama, and have attracted the public sympathy for them of Communist leader Khrushchev and his satellite, Cuban leader Castro; and

Whereas there comes a time in the affairs of nations, as well as men, when its security must be safeguarded and as far as the Government of the United States and the Republic of Panama is concerned, that time is now; the time for appeasement of those who would kill our citizens and desecrate the Stars and Stripes has passed, the time to publicly serve notice to all the world, including Khrushchev and Castro, by official action of our Government of the United States, that it will protect its citizens, its rights, and its property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, respectfully requests His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to rescind and revoke the Executive order entered in 1960, after adjournment of the 86th Congress, which provided that the flag of the Republic of Panama be permitted to be flown on equal status with the flag of the United States in the Canal Zone; and be it further

Resolved, That Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, hereby and herein petitions the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to adopt a policy of determination to safeguard American lives and interests in the area of the Canal Zone and make no further retreat from principle and national self-interest; and be it further

Resolved, That authenticated copies of this resolution, under seal of the post, be forwarded to the following:

His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, majority leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee;

Hon. WAYNE MORSE, chairman, Subcommittee of American Republics Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, minority leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Senators from Florida, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress, member of Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. DANTE FASCELL and Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Members of Congress from the greater Miami area, Washington, D.C.;

Hon. Daniel J. Foley, national commander, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.;

Hon. John J. Adams, department commander, Department of Florida, the American Legion, Greenacres City, Fla.

(The above and foregoing resolution offered by Past Commander J. K. Williams, and duly adopted unanimously, at regular meeting assembled, January 24, 1964, by Harvey W. Seeds Post, No. 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla.

HENRY J. HALAM,
Post Commander.

Attest:

WILLIAM E. COX,
Post Adjutant.

Destroying Obsolete Bombers: A Constructive Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that both the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star have endorsed, in their editorial columns, one of the suggestions made by the United States at the current Geneva Disarmament Conference—the suggestion that the Soviet Union join with us in destroying bombers which will soon be, or are already, obsolete, on a 1-for-1 basis.

On February 10 the Star commented:

The prime purpose of this, as our officials explained, would be to keep such weapons from finding their way into markets where they could be bought up by small powers. Thus there would be less chance of these powers engaging in air strikes against each other, and the cause of peace would thereby be served.

And as the Star continued:

It could head off proliferation of bombers which, in their way, are as dangerous as bombs.

A Post editorial on February 2 made generally similar comments and concluded:

Small steps are easier and more likely than large. The idea of burning all bombers in the world may produce a glorious imaginary conflagration for some future day. But the burning of useless Soviet and American bombers could make a welcome and warming blaze—now.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to state my agreement with this position. Unlike the unrealistic and unacceptable Soviet proposals to destroy all bombers of all countries immediately, the American suggestion represents a small but practical step in preventing the spread of the arms race to other countries—it represents a small but constructive step in the disarmament steps which must be pursued for the future of mankind—and it does so without jeopardy to our defense posture.

Especially it should be noted that aircraft such as our B-47's will soon be obsolete anyway. But both the B-47's and the Badgers could pose a threat to the world's security in the hands of third powers.

The complete text of the Post and Star editorials follows:

BOMBER BONFIRE

The Soviet proposal to destroy bombers surely is vague enough and possibly is promising enough to merit the clarification which the American Government now seeks. In a formal session of the disarmament conference at Geneva, the Soviet delegate, Mr. Tsarapkin, spoke of an agreement to destroy obsolete bombers. Since this seemed to resemble an older American suggestion for a one-by-one joint bonfire of obsolete American B-47's and Soviet Badgers, the American delegate, Mr. Foster, passed a preliminary judgment in favor.

This was good. A B-47-Badger bonfire would not reduce the security of either country or alter the balance of power, nor would it rouse the sleeping-dog inspection problem. But it would serve the extremely positive purpose of preventing the bombers from falling into the hands of third countries by whom they might be used. It also would be a useful psychological display of real disarmament.

In the corridors at Geneva, however, Mr. Tsarapkin gave a less encouraging version, saying that all countries and not just the Soviet Union and the United States should throw bombers into the fire, and that all bombers and not just obsolete ones should be burned. The broad scope of this version doubtless dooms any early hope for it. France and China, who count on airplanes to carry their future nuclear bombs, would reject it, to cite but one complication. Nor can Moscow be taken seriously for an idea which would obviously be to its own strategic disadvantage; destruction of bombers would expose Moscow to the full effects of its own inferiority in strategic missiles.

Surely small steps are easier and more likely than large. The idea of burning all bombers in the world may produce a glorious imaginary conflagration for some future day. But the burning of useless Soviet and American bombers could make a welcome and warming blaze—now.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 10, 1964]

BURN THE BOMBERS?

In informal discussions with the Russians last year, American representatives suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union join in building a bonfire to destroy their obsolete or obsolescent bombers. The prime purpose of this, as our officials explained, would be to keep such weapons from finding their way into markets where they could be bought up by small powers. Thus there would be less chance of those powers engaging in air strikes against each other, and the cause of peace would thereby be served.

This idea now has been seconded by Semyon Tsarapkin, the Kremlin's chief representative at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. But he has enlarged upon it to an extent that almost burlesques it. What the Soviet Union wants, he says, is to light a bonfire—and right away—that would destroy "all bombers of all countries." The proposal could hardly be more unrealistic. It is based on the untenable premise that weapon-carrying planes of every type are already obsolete. The fact is that they are not. The United States has no intention of burning up aircraft it still can use to good effect. Neither, of course, does a country like France. And neither does Russia.

Mr. Tsarapkin's remarks must be judged accordingly. They plainly indicate that the Kremlin is not really being very serious in responding to the American idea of destroying obsolescent aircraft like our B-47's and the Soviet Badgers. Nevertheless the idea remains sound. If it were made operable, it could head off proliferation of bombers which, in their way, are as dangerous as bombs.

Charles S. Minter: The Academy's Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the February 18, 1964, edition of the Washington Post in the RECORD. It is a feature story on the Naval Academy's new Superintendent, Adm. Charles S. Minter, which points out—among other things—his unusual qualifications for the job that he so recently assumed:

CHARLES S. MINTER ONE OF NEW BREED—THE ADMIRAL KNOWS HIS ACADEMY—STRESSES LEADERSHIP IS NAVY WAY

(By Bus Ham)

ANNAPOLIS, MD., February 17.—The players on the Naval Academy football team are finding it difficult to elect a captain for next fall's games. They're particular.

A deadlock on the first ballot. A second, and still tied. Now it is hoped that someone may be chosen in a day or two.

All of which pleases the new Superintendent. He sees it as a significant indication that leadership doesn't come cheaply at the Academy; the middies insist that it be merited.

The man now sitting in the admiral's chair waiting for the name of the captain-elect to come across his desk is Charles S. Minter. He's been on the job since mid-January. What the admiral hopes for is that the footballers will finally decide on someone like Tom Lynch, the center who held the middies together last autumn through the force of his personality.

"They'll pick the right man," Admiral Minter said confidently. "They have an uncanny way of finding the right man for the Academy." Their values are pretty sound.

Admiral Minter is in a position to know the Middies almost as well as they know themselves. He is in his third tour of duty at the Academy, a form of recognition which comes to few men.

A dozen years ago he was executive officer in the athletic department, then commandant of the midshipmen, now he's "the Admiral."

He holds two other distinctions; at 49, he is the youngest of all Academy superintendents, and never before had the Commandant gone directly to the Superintendency.

A fine figure of a man at 6 feet 3 inches and 210 pounds, Admiral Minter was a member of the crew and the "B" squad in football in his midshipman days.

He is not a Navy man by accident.

"We had Navy people in our family and I had definite ideas about coming to the Academy when I was in high school," Admiral Minter recalled.

"My father was a lawyer in Covington, Va., and brought me to Annapolis to look around. I went to a prep school here, Cochran-Bryant, no longer in existence, then got an appointment to the Academy."

Admiral Minter has become identified as one of the "new breed of Navy men."

Expansive, friendly, articulate and in no way deludes himself about greatness of the individual.

"It would be presumptous of me to say I am an educator," he said. "This is another military command, in a different environment and atmosphere. The educators are on the faculty."

Admiral Minter is a flier at heart, and was with a patrol squadron in Iceland when World War II broke out, thence to Trinidad to cover convoys on submarine patrol, later with the attack carrier *Randolph* in the Pacific.

He cherishes most his initiation as a "shellback."

"You become a 'shellback' when you cross the equator," he said. "Until then, you're a 'pollywog.'

"The thing which made this event so exceptional for me was the presence of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, aboard the cruiser U.S.S. *Houston*. He signed my certificate, and that's pretty special for a junior officer."

The interview was bound to get around to

Roger Staubach, and what effect the mounds of praise heaped on him have had on this superstar, also Academy life.

"Not a single unhappy incident," Admiral Minter said. "Basically, this is because of the strength of Roger's character.

"He is honestly humble, and religious, and has such remarkable ability to roll with the punches that I have never detected a single bit of envy toward him by other midshipmen.

"To show you how unselfish and dedicated Roger is, he was in New York with his parents and girl friend, and while they went to a show, he took his books up to the hotel room and spent the evening studying.

"He still is swarmed with requests from Governors' offices to Capitol Hill, but has remained just like the other midshipmen through it all."

The National Gallery of Art—Calendar of Events, March 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1964

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale Collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener Collections of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Ground floor, central gallery, galleries G–7 through G–15. Through March 22.

Recent publication: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Exhibition catalog; 100 pages, 9 by 10¾ inches, with preface by John Walker, foreword by René d'Harnoncourt, and introduction by Alfred H. Barr, Jr., 13 color plates, 141 black-and-white illustrations, reproducing all of the 153 paintings in the exhibition. $2.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: Color postcard: Antonis Mor, "Portrait of a Gentleman," 5 cents postpaid, 11 by 14 inches color reproduction; Turner, "Mortlake Terrace," 25 cents postpaid.

Thirteenth annual series A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: On March 8, Jakob Rosenberg, professor of fine arts and curator of prints, Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University, will begin a series of seven consecutive Sunday lectures, entitled "On Quality in Art: Criteria of Excellence in the Past and Present."

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday, 4 to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 1

Work of art of the week:[1] "Chalice of the Abbot Suger from Saint-Denis," French (c. 1140); (Widener Collection) gallery G–2; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Chinese Porcelains," central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Trends in Contemporary American Art," guest speaker, Emily Genauer, art critic, New York Herald Tribune; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Monica Ortiz, soprano; Igor Chichagov, pianist; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 2, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 8

Painting of the week:[1] Corot, "Ville d'Avray," (gift of Count Cecil Pecci-Blunt) gallery 77; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Art of the 15th Century," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture (13th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts): "Quality Judgment in the Renaissance: Vasari," guest speaker, Jakob Rosenberg, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: The Feldman String Quartet; Elizabeth Forman, soprano; east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MARCH 9, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 15

Painting of the week:[1] Hals, "Portrait of an Officer" (Mellon collection), gallery 47 Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Art of the 16th Century," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture (13th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts): "Quality Judgment in the Baroque: Roger de Piles and Sir Joshua Reynolds," guest speaker, Jakob Rosenberg, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Sergio Perticaroli, pianist; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 16, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 22

Painting of the week:[1] El Greco, "Laocoön" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 30, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Art of the 17th Century," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture, (13th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts): "Quality Judgment in the 19th Century: Thoré-Bürger," guest speaker, Jakob Rosenberg; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Strings, Richard Bales, conductor; Robert Parris, harpsichord; east garden court, 9.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 29

Painting of the week:[1] Cossa, "The Crucifixion." (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 19, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2, Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Art of the 18th Century," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1, Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3, Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture (13th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the Fine Arts): "Quality Judgment in the Early 20th Century: Roger Fry," guest speaker, Jakob Rosenberg; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; east garden court, 8.

Footnote at end of speech.

[1] 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale this week, 15 cents. (If mailed, 25 cents regular price.)

Will America Wake Up in Time?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is grave danger that because our policymakers refuse to recognize the Communist goal, that America will be disarmed and ripe for the takeover by the Kremlin. Those who voice concern over the deterioration of American prestige and the increasing strength of the Soviet Union are now called "bellyachers" as the administration attempts to silence any opposition or criticism of a foreign policy that has proven to be totally ineffective.

Patriots have been scorned before and it may be that some will have to bear the wrath of those who believe that only the policies of a single party or a single individual should rule our destiny. If this is to be the case, so be it, but I am confident there are those in America sufficiently concerned with the course we are following that no amount of abuse or name calling will deter them from trying to arouse the American people before it is too late. While England slept the seeds of World War II were planted and germinated. Let it not be said that world war III occurred because Americans were not alert to the dangerous forces at loose in the world.

George Todt, Los Angeles columnist, points out in the following article the dangers in the foolhardy course we are following in trying to keep peace by unilaterally disarming the United States:

REDS ARM FOR PEACE

("All of us in the Korean underground work consider this information on 'Laser beam weapons' as important as our 1946 report on the Sino-Soviet plan to take over the Chinese mainland by 1950, the 1947 report on Soviet atom bomb production, the 1954 report on the Soviet's first sputnik development and our 1962 report on the Cuban crisis."—KILSOO HAAN, letter, Feb. 1, 1964.)

(By George Todt)

As our home-grown American appeasers shrill "Better Red than dead!" and the incredible world government addicts bray their nonsensical cliches—and marchers scream "Brotherhood" with venom—what are the peace-loving Sino-Soviet allies doing these days?

While modern civilian Neville Chamberlains in our Department of Defense (or is it Disarmament?) nurture well-advanced plans to sack SAC and our needed first-strike capabilities, the wily Reds may be creating fantastic superweapons for themselves. Will it upset the present balance of deterrent military power?

Several days ago I received a disturbing letter from my Korean underground friend, Kilsoo Haan, who has made for himself a remarkably successful record in the past.

Included from this private citizen was a carbon copy of a warning letter to our Secretary of Defense. Robert McNamara, in the Pentagon, as follows:

"Reliable contacts with the office of Red China's ministry of national defense learned two items of important military information:

WARNING TO US

"1. On September 16, 1962, Soviet scientists, technicians, and engineers, under strict secrecy, successfully tested the first 'laser beam antimissile-missile weapon' experiment in Leningrad, Russia.

"The Soviet officials representing the Soviet ministry of defense, in October 1963 informed the Red Chinese that Russia hopes to have the 'Laser beam antimissile-missile weapon' system militarily operational within 2 years.

"2. Marshal Chu Teh revealed that the Soviet Union will soon install and equip 100 trawlers and 30 merchant ships with Polaris-type missiles of 500-mile range and anti-submarine warfare missiles with 300-mile range to counteract the NATO Multinational Nuclear Force."

FOR OUR SECURITY

The Korean underground workers expressed the urgency of arousing U.S. Department of Defense officials to correctly—and realistically—evaluate these two items in the interest of our national security.

They noted that the Red Chinese colleagues in the Ministry of Defense—and particularly Marshal Chu Teh—are enthusiastic, even overjoyed, at the news of successful Russian experiments with laser beam technology.

The implications are only too obvious for us, or should be. Once this type of advanced weapon has been successfully tested and the bugs ironed out, it could usher in a new and more modern phase of aerospace warfare.

For the laser beam "AMM weapon" described by Kilsoo Haan need only be attached to a globe-girdling complex of orbiting space stations equipped with television eyes thereafter—something the Soviet scientists are already working on—to kill ICBM's as they arise majestically from their launching pads. Conceivably, all in a matter of seconds.

MATTER OF SECONDS

"It is our sincere belief that unless the American people be informed," wrote the noted Korean underground agent, "the U.S. Defense officials—due to their overconfident attitude concerning U.S. missile superiority—may overlook the military significance of these two items as they did the result of Russia's superbomb neutralizing all electronic communications systems and their 'space platform' program."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

How Handicapped Workers in My Community Are Proving That Ability Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following prize-winning essays from high school students in the 23d District of California. These splendid essays were entered in our annual competitions held on the local level under the sponsorship of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The essays follow:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Kathy Van Wagner, age 17 years, Paramount High School, Paramount, Calif.)

Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States, once remarked, "In these demanding times, the labor force of our Nation is our most precious asset. Working shoulder to shoulder, the handicapped can add spirit and power to America as we seek to promote the strength of the whole free world."

In our community there are several organizations whose purpose it is to train, for employment, handicapped men and women. Good Will Industries and Veterans Rehabilitation Facilities are the most outstanding in this field, but there is a new one, Community Rehabilitation Industries (CRI) in Long Beach, that is advancing rapidly in this field.

I visited CRI recently and while there observed four different groups at work. Each group had 8 to 12 workers. Some of the men were tying wire harnesses for electronic equipment; 10,000 of these have been made for Hughes Aircraft on a contractural basis. Another group were working on telephone equipment rebuilding phone instruments, making new telephone jacks and polishing old phones to refinish them. Some of the men were working on a base for a turret used in missiles and satellites. They were filing and burnishing the fitting leaving them as smooth and friction free as possible. They also were reconditioning and sharpening old drills. Sometimes they recondition as many as 50,000 drills per month.

The purpose of CRI is to teach the handicapped trades or skills within their ability, make sure they can do it well and then find them a position in a company which can use their skills.

When a handicapped persons comes to CRI he is first put to work on wire harnesses to evaluate his or her capabilities. Later he is either kept doing this job or placed in a different type of work depending on the job for which he is best fitted. During the training period a trainee is expected to work 7 hours a day. He is also getting used to regular working hours during this period. When a trainee can put out 50 percent of the maximum work load on his job he is placed on the CRI payroll. From then on he must work 8 hours a day, and he will be paid anywhere from 50 cents to $2 an hour as his skill increases.

Now the most difficult job begins—finding a job in industry for the trainee. "Any applicant giving history of cerebral embolism, thrombosis, or a stroke shall be routinely rejected." These words are quoted from one of the most widely used manuals in industrial medical work. It is sometimes difficult for the employer to realize that he is hiring the handicapped person's ability and not his disability.

On every handicapped person from CRI a "placement package" is written. This is a case history giving every possible detail about the worker, from previous work history before disablement through his training period. It gives his production ability and his limitations, and even his safety awareness and confidence level. From this useful information the employer can best know his potential employee's skills and restrictions.

Private industries are beginning to realize the potential of the handicapped person. And they are even making special allowances to help them, such as giving them parking places accessible to the building and building ramps and elevators for those in wheelchairs.

The Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, in the area, also does very fine work with the handicapped in training them in their vocational school. It also employs many of the disabled at clerical work either part time or full time right at the hospital.

By employing the handicapped, everyone can profit. The impaired person is able to add to the efficiency of our working force, they are restored to economic independence, and the community is aided by the addition of a contributing member of society.

Rehabilitation is teaching the handicapped person to live and work within the limits of his disability and to the extent of his capabilities.

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Marilyn Anne Lowry, 17, Lynwood High School, Lynwood, Calif.)

Handicapped people in my community are proving that ability counts by refusing to admit that they are any different from the average person. Ernest Conrad, manager of the United Handicapped People's Workshop in South Gate, Calif., explains "No one is handicapped and everyone is handicapped." These words, meaning that everyone is capable of doing something, no matter how trivial, and that no one can do everything, have become inspiration to hundreds of handicapped workers.

These handicapped people are asserting their worth by gaining an increasing number of jobs in large corporations, by entering the professional fields, and by organizing their own companies to challenge the business world.

Stirred by determination and de facto inequality, many handicapped people have earned jobs in large corporations. North American and Hughes, especially, are hiring as many qualified handicapped workers as possible, sometimes even constructing special platforms for a disabled employee.

Other jobs—lawyers, teachers, businessmen—are not out of reach to the handicapped. In my community, for example, there are a one-armed district attorney, a clubfooted educator, a hunchbacked salesman, and an epileptic city recreation department employee, to name a few. All of these men are competing for their jobs; all are respected, responsible, and settled in their work.

The State of California and its schools will train the handicapped, but finding work for them afterward presents a national problem. Turned down by employers hesitant to hire handicapped workers, the trained but out-of-work handicapped live off welfare, become depressed, and often contemplate suicide. At this point, independent corporations like the United Handicapped People's Workshop in South Gate come to the rescue.

By employing no one but the handicapped, these corporations take despondent handicapped people off relief aid and give them the opportunity to earn their own livings. For example, a man previously considered unfit for employment because he is completely paralyzed from the waist down is presently working at the workshop in South Gate, and has charge of the 10 people working in his section of the plant. Another man, crippled from an automobile accident, completes electrical circuits for the workshop while lying on his stomach at home. No physical requirements are set for jobs, but workers should have good hands and eyes to work at the South Gate Workshop. However, these requirements are not inflexible; several blind men are employed at the workshop, constructing electronic harnesses from directions in braille.

Having a job and receiving a regular pay check are tremendous boosters for handicapped people deemed unemployable by most factory regulations. Another inflation of their egos is that their workshop bids for contracts along with other electronic plants. Skilled work in harness and cable assemblies, braiding and shielding, terminal board assemblies, and printed circuit assemblies as well as electronic components for manufacturers of radios, televisions, missiles, digital computers, and communication systems keep contracts coming and work steady. Handicapped people have also had small roles in many Government moonshots and Minuteman missiles.

All that handicapped people are striving for is a chance to prove their capabilities in a world of normal people. Records of those who have been given the opportunity more than justify this demand; they have become producers in their community instead of parasites on society.

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS OF MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Lyle Hill, Dremingay High School, Compton, Calif.)

Simply because one of the faculties of a person doesn't operate correctly, this person must look forward to much difficulty in finding a job. Many employers don't want to hire a handicapped person because they think he won't be able to work efficiently or he will require special training. The fact is it's just the opposite. When a person, for example, loses his sight, his other senses are worked overtime in order to compensate for the loss. Although the person is at first at a disadvantage on a new job, once he becomes situated his other highly developed senses help him to become just as good or

even better than the other worker in his line. Because the handicapped person does have a difficult time in finding a job, he will certainly not be jumping from one job to another, so any training required won't be wasted.

I have a personal interest in the handicapped since my own father lost the vision of his right eye in an industrial accident. Before the accident occurred he worked only on regular production jobs in a furniture factory. The loss of one eye denied him his depth of vision. As a result of the extreme competition in the furniture industry, speedy operation of the machinery is a necessity. Since wodworking machinery is basically dangerous, it was no longer possible for my father to continue in the production type of work. He then began to specialize in the building of custom-made furniture. In the type of work quality is more important than speed. He now builds furniture for many of the well-known interior decorators on the west coast. My father has recently made furniture of the ex-President of Mexico. He also made many of the furnishings for Desi Arnaz's apartment in the new Desi Arnaz Indian Wells Hotel in Palm Springs.

Mr. Karl Faulhaber, of Compton, is another example of one who has overcome the difficulties of the handicapped. Several years ago his right arm, from the elbow down to and including his hand, was badly mangled when it became caught between the rollers of a glue-spreading machine in a plywood factory. During the many months of convalescence, he became interested in the study of photography. The injury left his hand and fingers stiff making it difficult for him to continue in his occupation. Because of his great interest in photography he decided that this might be a profitable line of endeavor. Mr. Faulhaber made a tour of the Western United States, taking pictures as he traveled. When he returned home he was able to get several engagements to show his pictures and tell of his travels. This convinced him that photography could be a profitable business for him and also one that he could handle although handicapped. Mr. Faulhaber has now become a world traveler and a very successful man, showing travel films, and lecturing throughout the United States.

These are only two of many examples that one could tell of to demonstrate that a handicapped person can be successful if he will take advantage of his undeveloped capabilities. In today's complex society with its multitude of job classifications, there should be more job opportunities than ever before for the handicapped if they will develop their dormant abilities and if the employers will recognize their potential.

The Situation in Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a draft resolution of the Order of Ahepa, Athens Chapter No. 24, dealing with the situation in Cyprus, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT RESOLUTION

To the Members of Ahepa, Athens Chapter No. 24:

Whereas the Greek race is facing tragic moments; and

Whereas the Island of Cyprus, a Greek island for over 3,500 years, in body, soul, and spirit, Hellenic; faces the grim uncertainty of a provocative war; whereby the forces of oppression seek to reinsert and impose their will on the lives of all Hellenes on the Island of Cyprus; and

Whereas some one-half million inhabitants of said island are, in justice, endeavoring to unite Cyprus with the mainland and motherland, Greece: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Ahepa, Athens Chapter No. 24, institute the initiative and so notify, Supreme Lodge National Headquarters in Washington, D.C., to:

(A) Contact the Cypriot delegation of the United Nations Assembly, in the city of New York, for the purposes of concurring with them for the preparation of an editorial of protest; enlightening the officials and citizens of the Government of the United States and peoples of the free world: on the historic origin of the islands and its continued importance as a Christian governed entity.

(B) Such an editorial, carefully prepared through the joint participation of the officers of our National Supreme Headquarters, including appropriate officials of the Cypriot delegation; to be circulated by said headquarters to all chapters in the United States and elsewhere, for insertion in the leading metropolitan or community newspapers of their respective areas, as their worthy contribution to the cause of and for freedom.

(C) A copy of each and every editorial as published by the local chapters shall be submitted to the Supreme Headquarters in Washington, for a compilation of said published editorials into a bound, book volume.

Therefore in conclusion, let it be now adopted and henceforth said that Athens Chapter No. 24, its residence firmly established in the citadel of American freedom; hereby undertakes to publish the first of said editorial, in the foremost metropolitan newspaper of our cultured city, the Athens of America.

May God, our Supreme Architect, preserve, our ancient and proven culture.

A Farmer Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the representatives of the New Jersey Farm Bureau held yesterday here in Washington, their president, Mr. Carleton E. Heritage, made an outstanding address entitled "A Farmer Looks at Congress," and I am pleased to have permission to insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The farmers of New Jersey, and I believe it applies to all the farmers in the country, are practical, patriotic, thoughtful men. They believe in realities because that is the atmosphere in which they work and carry on their livelihood and I am sure it gives much encouragement to Members of Congress these days to know that this group of real American citizens believe in the work that Congress is doing. Mr. Heritage's address is full of sound and sensible reasoning but may I emphasize one paragraph as follows:

It appears to us that those who are most critical of the Congress are people who have various axes to grind in the form of legislation. Most of these critics seem to favor an increasing number of laws that would involve the Federal Government in more and more functions, activities, and responsibilities. To us, this is a dangerous trend. We are sincerely fearful that the Federal Government is already too powerful and too expensive. We believe the emphasis should be on strengthening local and State governments.

This is the real philosophy of free men and I am confident will meet with the approval of all Americans.

Mr. Heritage's speech is as follows:

A FARMER LOOKS AT CONGRESS

(By Carleton E. Heritage, president, New Jersey Farm Bureau)

Members of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, one of the privileges of a president is to say what he wants to say before others have a chance. With your indulgence, I would like to take advantage of that unwritten privilege today.

We are all hearing and reading a lot these days about the Congress of the United States. A great many writers and political experts seem to think that a majority of the American people are critical of the Congress because it moves too slowly, fails to report legislation to the floor of the Senate or House; or does not go along with the recommendations of the executive branch of the Government.

As a farmer, I would like to say a few things about the Congress and the role I feel it should perform. I believe that I speak for a majority of farmers in New Jersey in these remarks.

We believe in the Constitution of the United States. We believe in the doctrine of separation of power between the Federal Government and the State governments; and we believe just as strongly in the separate and coequal branches of the Federal Government: The legislative, the executive, and the judicial. We believe it is the job of the Congress, within the limits of the Constitution, to write the law of the land. It is the job of the Executive to make recommendations to the Congress on legislation; but more importantly, to administer the laws adopted by the Congress. It's the job of the judiciary to interpret the laws, and to rule upon their constitutionality. We think it is important these three equal branches of Government do not infringe upon each other.

While farmers may at times be critical of the kinds of laws passed by the Congress—particularly with reference to farm legislation—we do not agree with those who are highly critical with the general operations of the Congress. In general, we think the Congress should be a deliberate body. It should not act in haste. We believe in the committee system as the best system yet devised to operate the Congress in an orderly manner.

It appears to us that those who are most critical of the Congress are people who have various axes to grind in the form of legislation. Most of these critics seem to favor an increasing number of laws that would involve the Federal Government in more and more functions, activities, and responsibilities. To us, this is a dangerous trend. We are sincerely fearful that the Federal Govern-

ment is already too powerful and too expensive. We believe the emphasis should be on strengthening local and State governments.

In short, we thank God for the Congress of the United States. We believe it is the most important foundation of our freedom as a people. You are the people we have helped to elect back in our home districts to represent us here in Washington. We believe you are closer to our thinking than anyone else in Washington. Every 2 years, we have an opportunity to consider whether or not you are representing our best interests; and we vote accordingly. Whenever the people become dissatisfied with Members of the Congress they have the right and responsibility to make changes.

It may be true that some changes in procedures would improve the operation of the Congress; but we believe drastic changes are neither needed nor desirable. We do not agree with those who seem to advocate changes that would make the Congress a rubberstamp of the Executive; and we look with disfavor upon attempts of the courts to legislate, rather than judge.

We agree with Mr. Moses, of New York, that the only way to have a better Congress is to elect better men and women to Congress—men and women who believe in the letter and spirit of the Constitution; and who believe in the historic role and responsibility of the Congress.

Farm legislation is a good example. We have made ourselves clear for many years that most of the farm legislation passed by Congress—especially legislation involving price supports, controls, and subsidies—are not in the best interest of most New Jersey farmers. We think Members of Congress from New Jersey should base their votes on farm legislation on the best interests of New Jersey consumers and farmers, and not the interests of a minority of farmers in other States. In general, we would be happier if you would vote for legislation that would lead us gradually away from farm controls and subsidies, and a reduction in the budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This is not to say the Federal Government does not have a proper and valuable role to play in agriculture. We agree that it does. Many of the programs of research and education are absolutely essential and should not be diminished; but in the field of price supports, controls, subsidies, and market manipulation, we would be better off with less.

In short, what I am trying to say is that most farmers are not among those who are highly critical of the Congress. We do not always agree with the decisions made by the Congress; but we believe it is closer to the majority thinking of all the people than any other branch of Government.

Let's Get Off the Deck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Let's Get Off the Deck," which appeared in the Tulsa Daily World on February 16, 1964:

LET'S GET OFF THE DECK

The Arkansas River navigation program is in trouble. It is in such deep trouble that its completion to the Tulsa-Catoosa area—now scheduled in a tight time fit for 1970—could be set back as far as 1975.

This is the drab outlook brought about by President Johnson's economy budget. In next year's budget, the Arkansas navigation project, in line for $125 million, has been sharply reduced to $84 million. This is a $41 million cutback from the Corps of Engineers closely measured capability of assimilating the full $125 million in an orderly manner.

Strangely, little adverse reaction has been heard, to date, on this problem. On the ground, apparently, that money lost this year can be picked up next year and the program restored to its completion schedule.

We say this is wrong thinking. Certainly money might be picked up—but there is no way of recalling or picking up time—and if the Arkansas project is to be completed by 1970, time is of the essence.

This is a serious problem because so much is at stake. Space-age and related industries—not to mention the vast interest manifested in warehousing and manufacture in consumer goods—have exhibited a tremendous interest in the Northeast Oklahoma area. Literally scores of major industries are actively planning on locations in the area; yet these locations are almost singularly dependent upon the availability of water transportation.

The loss in time in completing the navigation stream is, thus, of such vital importance to a vast area of the Central and Southwest as to make any delays in its completion verge upon the calamitous.

We felt it incumbent to hit this subject hard because we do not believe a full realization of what a chopped budget means has sunk in on those who have staked a great deal on this navigation project. We feel it necessary not only upon domestic interests hereabouts to make a battle for a restoration of funds, but that it is the duty and responsibility of our congressional delegation to get with it and do the same. We simply cannot let this program be delayed, provided we sincerely want to enjoy the economic benefits that water transportation promises.

Here, bluntly, is what we are up against: If we stand still for the $41 million reduction in budget for the next year, we are facing the roughest fight of all the following year when we seek the $138 million already requested—plus the $41 million lost this year.

How can the Corps of Engineers justify its capability a year from now to economically spend $179 million when this year its capability is $125 million? It can't, and we are foolish if we believe it can. It is here, now, that this irretrievable time is lost and the fate of the navigation stream is left to an uncertain destiny.

We are more than justified in broaching the hard, economic facts of the problem at this time; perhaps most pertinently because there is every indication that while the President's economy budget treated roughly with the Arkansas program, it permitted increases in funds for the Ohio and Columbia river valleys, and held at least even on the Mississippi and Missouri systems. We could scarcely complain had the budget treated equally, on a percentage reduction basis, each of these programs; but, there is much doubt that even that has occurred.

We further feel justified in mentioning Mr. Johnson's vast interest in what he calls an "antipoverty" program. He discusses, specifically, a rather nebulous area known as Appalachia. We wonder if the budget cutters realize that poverty and underprivilege are important in this area of the Nation? Or if they realize that of the plentitude of backward or poverty-stricken counties in the Kansas-Oklahoma-Arkansas sector more than half are on or adjacent to the Arkansas River.

What greater antipoverty program could the President envision than that manifest in the Arkansas navigation program? For here is a program that is not made-work; it is not tree-chopping, street-sweeping, or handle-leaning. It is an actively pursued program capable of enlightening and awakening a vast area to a prosperity never before dreamed of. This, in our mind, is antipoverty with purpose. And our river project has demonstrated that it is a potential antipoverty program that already has produced results.

Let us get off the deck of complacency. Let us go to bat for the very thing that President Johnson says he is most anxious to provide: economic betterment for all.

Uncle Sam Speaks in a Puny Falsetto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Jim Bishop was brought to my attention by a constituent who saw it in the Middletown Record of Middletown, N.Y., in my district.

Mr. Bishop voices the thoughts and frustrations, not to mention the humiliation, of many of our citizens. It is high time to prove to the world that Uncle Sam is not a weak old man with a "falsetto voice," but a mature man with a keen brain and plenty of muscle.

The article follows:

UNCLE SAM SPEAKS IN A PUNY FALSETTO

(By Jim Bishop)

As a student of history—not a political writer—an uneasy feeling is upon me. Either America is becoming soft, or my head is. We seem to be in metamorphosis from a high plane of justice through strength to one of apology through fear. The last time our country became indignant was when President John F. Kennedy ordered the Russians to take their missiles out of Cuba at once.

Name one other occasion when we stood toe-to-toe with anyone and refused to back down. I am opposed to war; I'm opposed to threats; but I favor unequivocal principles and justice. I also favor righteous anger in high places too. We don't have it. When a little nation like Panama kicks us in the pants, our President phones their President and says: "Let's talk this over like gentlemen."

If T. R. Roosevelt was in office, he'd have sent a task force of aircraft carriers, a division of U.S. marines, and some supporting destroyers. The United States would have landed in Panama, restored order, and then talked. In Zanzibar, our officials are arrested with impunity, and the world watches as our people are humiliated. In the United Nations, when the Communist bloc refuses to pay its bills, Uncle Sam floats a bond issue, and in effect, pays.

Militancy is not the solution, any more than self-degradation is. A malaise of fear is over the land. We are loaded with creature comforts and bereft of patriotism. Who volunteers these days to serve in the Armed Forces? Our boys have to be dragooned into service, and then they mark time like prisoners doing a sentence. Two of the most popular television programs are "Sergeant Bilko" and "McHale's Navy." Are they patriotic?

In Vietnam we fight an interminable war with helicopters for a people who revile us. The Chief of State of Cambodia will no longer accept our money unless we apologize

for saying Cambodia appeared to be happy that President Kennedy was assassinated. We romance a man named Ben Bella as a liberator of his people, and he goes home and says he's a friend of the Soivet Union.

The French, who were lifted from under the German heel by American blood, take our money and make friends with Communist China. The British sell 400 buses to Cuba, and are offended by our outrage. The Russians beg for wheat because they haven't go enough brains to feed themselves, and tell us that they will bury us.

Pakistan accepts our money for airports, and then builds a road to Communist China. The new nations of Africa lynch white people, and condemn us for being slow to give our own Negroes equal opportunities. The most potent organization in the United States used to be the American Legion. Now it is CORE.

A skinny malcontent like Lee Oswald renounced his citizenship, and when he finds that he doesn't like Russia, the United States pays his fare home, American officials are kidnaped by Reds in Venezuela, and nobody can do anything about it. In West Germany, the Government fears that the United States will recognize East Germany, but they work out a deal with the Communists for Christmas visits through the wall.

We send our Attorney General to Japan to beg President Sukarno not to start trouble in southeast Asia. Our former President, Dwight Eisenhower, got as far as the Philippine Islands on a state visit to Japan when he had to turn back for fear of being killed. Premier Nehru turns a cold neutral face to us when we ask for friends, but, when the Chinese cross his border, he screams for help and we send it.

King Hussein, of Jordan, salutes the Pope and talks of peace and then runs off to Cairo to discuss with Nassar ways and means of starting a war with Israel. An Orthodox Greek archbishop, President of Cyprus, says prayers for the Turkish women and children his people slaughtered. In South Africa, a small group of white men who do not belong there, oppress and kill a large number of Negroes who have been there for 3,000 years.

Japan, a defeated nation, builds more ships and shipyards. America, which won shuts shipyards down. In Korea, which was supposedly a United Nations action, we sent more men, more guns, more money than anyone else and, 10 years later, Korea is still half slave, half free.

We lose a little here; we lose a little there. Our bills for defense come to over $50 billion a year. Our foreign aid amounts to another $4 billion. Can someone please tell me where the United States has gained anything except deepening contempt? Do we have a brother anywhere who is willing to lay down his life for us?

Am I angry? You bet I am.

An Episode During the Panama Riots—Panamanian Employees Protect the Property of an American Employer in a Voluntary Round-the-Clock Vigil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, although the news from Panama in recent weeks has emphasized existing tensions between the Panamanian Government and our own, there is considerable evidence that the people of Panama still recognize the close ties of friendship which have bound our two countries together over the years.

For instance, I have been told of one such event that took place during the critical days of rioting in Panama last month. Although the headlines pointed up the existing differences between the United States and Panama, this event reflects a happier picture of relations between our peoples.

At the time of the riots following the Canal Zone flag incident, I am told, the Sears Roebuck Store in Panama City had no company representatives at the store. The U.S. president of Sears' Panamanian operations was in the United States, and along with other Americans in the area, the store manager was warned to remain at home and stay off the streets by the State Department because of the volatile situation.

In the midst of the strife and confusion, and unbeknownst to Sears' store manager or any other company supervisor, 28 Panamanian employees voluntarily set up a 24-hour patrol of the store properties. The volunteer patrol continued throughout the crisis, and company property and interests were unharmed. After the weekend rioting, Sears reopened on Monday, but the patrol continued to guard the premises on a round-the-clock basis.

Small as it is, I believe this incident reflects the basic friendship that exists between Americans and Panamanians of good will—a hemispheric friendship that can and should increase between good neighbors and partners in progress.

The United States does have friends among the people of Panama and Central America. Despite the efforts of enemies who agitate to stir up anti-American feeling, this evidence of Sears' Panamanian employees who voluntarily protected American property, conceivably at some personal risk, demonstrates a commendable bond of friendship between our peoples—a bond that I hope will be strengthened by good citizens of both countries.

Today's Meaning of "Liberal" and "Conservative"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was written by the Honorable J. L. Lupton, former State senator of Connecticut, to his son, Josiah, who apparently had been brainwashed by his college professor. I think this is an excellent appraisal of the meanings of the two words discussed.

The letter follows:

DEAR SIR: I understand that in school recently you were told that conversatives are trying to turn back the clock. The implication in such a remark, of course, is that all true and good political progress today comes only from the so-called liberals. It also suggests that all change is progress and that dogged efforts to hold fast to established principles of limited constitutional government are old fashioned and even somehow unpatriotic.

In order to realize how truly inappropriate the accusation is (that conservatives are trying to turn back the clock) it is necessary to know how some political words have changed in meaning over the years. Not very many years ago, the word "liberal" in politics meant a person who was a champion of human freedom. The 18th century liberal believed that too much government deprived the individual of his natural rights.

If you remember your Revolutionary War history, the Boston Tea Party was a demonstration by liberals; Patrick Henry made a very liberal speech; and Thomas Jefferson's writings about men being created equal and about the necessity for complete separation of church and State were so liberal that they were considered inflammatory and rebellious. Almost everyone in those days accepted domination by government as the norm. Individual liberty was a fantastic, a radical ideal. It was taken for granted that everyone was a subject of the king; you lived and worked with the approval of the crown or the king's appointed agents. You were either born to position in life and, therefore, to education and opportunity; or, if you were not, there wasn't much you could do about it. The conservative thing to do in those days was to accept government control. It was the way of life. The liberal idea, which took root in the minds of men like Burke, Paine, Jefferson, Madison, and others, was the belief that the individual citizen must be in control of his government.

Now, we Americans have had our Constitution and our personal liberties for a long time—almost 200 years. It may not be surprising but it is tragically true that after such a long time many of us take freedom for granted. We often forget to take personal care not to let government have the upperhand over our lives the way it did before 1776. As Thomas Paine wrote, "What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value."

It is true we have voted for the changes which have made our Federal Government so huge in just the last 35 years. But is this possibly because many Americans, after so many years of freedom, have lost the fear of government? Perhaps we have voted for more and more benefits and services from government because we have lost our instinctive distrust of the controls, regulations, and taxes which automatically accompany this government help, and which eventually become so burdensome that they first stifle economic opportunity, then economic freedom, and finally personal liberty.

It is a strange and bitter irony that the words "liberal" and "conservative" have opposite meanings today from what they meant in Washington's time. Today, the liberal (so called) is the proponent of more and more government; and the conservative is the Paul Revere who warns of danger ahead.

Far from turning the clock back the modern conservative urges Americans to appreciate their freedoms now lest through apathy or misguided thinking we slip back once more into a way of life in which government comes first and the citizen last.

In truth then, the modern liberal is the one who would actually turn back the clock. He goes about preaching a gospel of government for its own sake. Never does he give a hint of concern about overspending or about overbuilding the Federal bureaucracy. The modern liberal loves and trusts government. The modern liberal's answer to each problem is more government.

We know the ultimate outcome of such a course for our country. History books are filled with example after example of the downfall of nations whose people turned from the hard work of guarding liberty, and followed instead a Pied Piper promising something for nothing. In the days of Rome, it was bread and circuses; today it is the myth of free Federal aid. You might call it seduction by subsidy.

We know we cannot exalt government without diminishing the individual. We know we cannot extol public property without degrading private property. And we know we cannot defend and advance human rights unless private property rights are held inviolate.

We conservatives would wind the clock of freedom by lifting some of the burdensome weights of government with more individual effort. We would cut away the redtape of bureaucracy from the works. We would set off the alarm anytime the Federal Government unnecessarily steals another prerogative from the State governments or spends more than it takes in, or usurps in the executive those powers which belong to the peoples' representatives. Especially, we would mark the lateness of the hour whenever our Government would yoke us together unequally with nations who do not respect the sacred character of the individual.

Socialism and state planning are not modern ideas; they are centuries old. There will be men in every age who seek power over others by offering security in exchange for freedom.

It is today's conservative who is the true progressive, for he favors limited government in order to give unlimited opportunity to every man.

DAD.

What's Wrong With USIA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the growing deterioration of the U.S. image abroad, not only directly related to the conduct of our foreign policy, but equally important in questioning the effectiveness of our psychological activity in the cold war, a review of the operations of the U.S. Information Agency is certainly in order.

Columnist Richard Wilson, writing in the Monday, February 10, edition of the Washington Evening Star, in a timely and effective fashion discusses this vital, yet unfortunately effective, Agency. I insert the article at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD for the attention of the Members:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH USIA?—AGENCY UNCOORDINATED, MISDIRECTED IN MANY AREAS, COMMISSION FINDS

(By Richard Wilson)

A report by the Advisory Commission on the U.S. Information Program is written so circumspectly that it sounds like the usual meaningless federalese and thus got little public attention.

When interpreted in plain words, however, it is strong medicine.

In short, the report concludes that we are not putting our best foot forward in the worldwide war of words and ideas against communism.

This is disturbing to many Congressmen who have had firsthand contact with the U.S. Information Agency. That is why the Advisory Commission exists. It was formed by Congress to permit uncommitted and knowledgeable people outside the Agency to study the program in the public's interest and render a judgment in a report to Congress.

If the USIA is as uncoordinated and misdirected in as many different areas as the Advisory Commission's findings now indicate, the problem deserves immediate attention at the highest level.

Many millions in the world know about the United States chiefly through the U.S. information program. Its mission is to inform the world accurately, to act as a propaganda apparatus against the propaganda machine of international communism, and to administer cultural and educational exchanges and programs.

USIA's mission is basically a positive one to promote the United States of America. Some of its personnel seem confused about this and wish to be objective in the academic or journalistic style of modern realism, thinking that this would be more convincing in the untutored areas of the world. This attitude does not impress Congressmen favorably, nor does it seem to carry too much weight with an advisory commission made up of experts in the field.

The Commission defines USIA's aims as promoting abroad an understanding of the American economy, and appreciation of American culture, confidence in American military strength, respect for America's scientific progress, and a balanced understanding of America's racial problems and progress.

The Commission earlier sharply criticized the Agency for distributing a film of the march on Washington for Negro equality in African countries where it would be misunderstood. This criticism was reinforced in the annual report warning the Agency to avoid questionable presentations of historic events which lead to domestic controversy.

The Commission has tried to tell the Agency, if it can get anyone to listen, that congressional doubts about its operations must be given more serious attention. It points out that the USIA has trouble with its appropriations because Congress has so often discovered examples of ineffective planning and administration.

The Commission finds a basic lack of coordination that calls for appointment of a permanent career administrator to supply some kind of continuity in policy and operation. Too many people, the Commission finds in effect, are going off in too many different directions under too many different administrators.

Those administrators are also advised to stop making so many speeches about what they think America's posture in the world ought to be.

The latter criticism gets somewhere near the heart of the matter. So many USIA people have such definite ideas on what America ought to be, rather than what it is, that they would be better in the role of critics than as propagandists. They cannot quite conceive of themselves as propagandists, at least for the kind of aims outlined by the Advisory Commission.

They are too much enthralled with the divisions in American life and too little with its unity.

These matters of conscience do not weigh so heavily with our Russian antagonists, who probably have a more clearly defined mission.

It takes a special kind of artful intellect to be a successful propagandist and we haven't yet found him, after many years of trying, at the top level in USIA. The new director, Carl Rowan, already a center of controversy for the precise reasons dwelt on by the Commission, would do well to study its findings with care.

Beef: Imports; Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, most Americans realize that expanding world trade involves both buying and selling. At the same time most of us believe each product in trade should be offered on its merit and that quality is still a vital ingredient in the marketplace. The comments made by Chilly Perry, a name well known in the beef industry, raise some serious questions with regard to the international beef market which should be considered as a part of an overall pattern of trade in agricultural products.

Since I, too, am an Angus breeder, I have a personal interest in this subject and I believe Mr. Perry's editorial which appeared in the January issue of Angus Topics, a trade publication of the beef industry, will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BEEF: IMPORTS; EXPORTS

Has anyone presented a clear picture to the American public of the exact status of the beef industry in the national picture of foreign trade? Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in a talk on December 10 in Minneapolis, Minn., made this statement, "There is conclusive evidence—that a short term, overexpansion in fed beef, too many steers on the range, too many fed steers in the feeder pens, too many overweight steers sent to slaughter—is responsible for most of the current market situation. Imports do have an effect but it is far less significant than current overproduction." He also reminds us that we can not urge lower tariffs and higher quotas from other countries if we are not willing to demonstrate our belief in this ourselves. His assistant, George L. Mehren, in a talk at Bakersfield, Calif., would appear to be telling the American cattlemen that they do not know enough about the foreign trade situation to criticize the Department of Agriculture's marketing policies. He referred to the livestock man's cherished rugged individualism and remarked that the cattle industry is the most independent, unregulated, unsubsidized production in this country, yet stated that the total Government's subsidies to the cattle industry since 1936 have amounted to over $3½ billion, which included such things as construction of range fences, drilling wells, cattle feeding and nutritional experiments, animal disease research, pasture and range improvements, among others. He went on to explain that the population growth in this country could absorb an annual 3-percent increase in beef production, that domestic beef supplies have increased 10 percent in the last year, and that the retail value of beef consumed in this country was about $10 billion each year.

The American National Cattlemen's Association reminds us the current duty on foreign beef is 3 cents a pound and that under consideration are proposals to cut in half, or remove entirely, the tariffs on beef and veal and live cattle, already the lowest in the world. They term the $8.3 billion domestic beef industry the most important segment of agriculture. Leo Weldor, president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association points out that

beef imports for the first 8 month in 1963 amounted to 11 percent of domestic beef production, which is an increase of almost 6 percent since 1960. From Australia in the last 2 weeks of October 2,858,240 pounds of beef were shipped to the United States, the first 2 weeks of November another 15,572,480 pounds were shipped, during December 11,200,000 pounds were shipped from New Zealand, all this on top of 840,692,000 pounds of beef and veal imported from January through September.

At the same time there were 156,564,000 pounds of pork and 68,389,000 pounds of lamb imported. During this same period January-September we exported 115,024,000 pounds of meat which was broken down into 18,838,000 pounds of beef and veal, 92,033,000 pounds of pork, 659,000 pounds of lamb and the balance in sausages and canned meats. Of this Canada and Mexico take about three-fifths, with Japan steadily increasing their imports.

At this same time we read where the British limit their meat imports from non-Commonwealth sources, Australia is improving their meat packing plants to better meet U.S. standards, Italy imports chilled beef from New Zealand, the United States is the world's largest importer of meats taking over 50 percent of the world export trade, EEC countries increase import duties on shipments of variety meats, and U.S. meat exports to Venezuela decline. It would appear that every other country in the world has either tariffs or import quotas, or both, in order to protect their citizens' economic condition. Yet the cattle industry in the United States is asked to believe that with a 10-percent increase in domestic production and 11 percent importation, the domestic overproduction is the cause of reduced prices. It may well be—but would it be—if it did not have to compete with cheap, imported beef? We are told that of this imported beef 81 percent is frozen, boneless, and is not in competition with our domestic fed beef industry. This imported beef goes into hamburger, sausages, variety meats, etc. which could well utilize this grade of domestic beef with the resulting improvement in prices for cows and lower grade steers, this in turn would send more cows to market, reduce our annual production increase somewhat and bring a firmer general tone to the beef market. One must also remember that today's consumer preferences for meat have increased the percentage of fed beef cuts that go into the production of hamburger.

Our production costs, feed, equipment, labor, etc., are beyond the control of the cattleman and largely subsidized by the Government—it all helps to put the American cattlemen at a disadvantage when competing with the Australian beef producer who can keep a cow for $6 per year. It would appear that the American cattleman is entitled to either tariff or quota protection during those years when domestic production exceeds domestic consumption resulting in a financial loss for the American cattleman. It would appear that increased tariffs and reduced quotas in other importing countries has resulted in a surplus among the exporting countries and the handiest place to dump it is the American market because it is unprotected and uncontrolled.

Another thought that cannot help but rear it's ugly head is that the Department of Agriculture is willing and possibly even anxious to use the unprotected American cattle industry as a pawn in this world chess game of imports and exports so it can protect the $6 billion agricultural export trade of the United States—all of which is under Government control except our poultry meat exports. In the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 Congress charged the Department of Agriculture with the responsibility of improving marketing methods and facilities and reducing distribution costs so the price spread between the producer and consumer would be narrowed. In the first 7 years under this act the Department of Agriculture has failed since the producer's share of the consumer dollar has steadily decreased while marketing and distribution costs have increased. Are they so concerned in increasing world trade in the surplus commodities of this country that they are telling the cattleman to get on the team or else? It would be a sad day should this come to pass—even contemplation of it is enough to fight about. Remember, the squeaking wheel gets the grease, as recently illustrated when France was told to buy more American chickens or pay a higher tariff on all trucks and brandy shipped to this country.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, Soviet domination of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia represents naked colonialism at its worst. Few if any more flagrant examples exist in the world today. Consequently, as we commemorate the 46th anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania, the largest of the Baltic countries, at the Council of Vilnius, it is important that we use the opportunity to consider what positive action can be taken that will advance the day when Lithuania and its neighboring states will once again be free and independent.

The Soviet annexation of Lithuania was cynical, brutal, and illegal, and it remains all these things and more. Every time the Soviet Union speaks of freedom or condemns colonialism, its record in Lithuania makes a mockery of the Communist regime's pretensions and stands as convincing evidence of its hypocrisy.

The U.S. Government has firmly and consistently refused to recognize this illegal annexation. We have honored the Lithuanian people for their continued devotion to the ideals of freedom and justice under the most difficult of conditions. And we have encouraged them to hold fast to their aspirations for independence.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, we have a strong obligation to back up our words and our ideals with action of a more meaningful and effective kind. A very useful blueprint of such action has been furnished to many of our colleagues by our Lithuanian American constituents in the form of a proposed resolution for consideration by the Congress. This resolution, if adopted, would request the President to bring the Baltic question before the United Nations where the Soviet Union would be asked to withdraw its troops and agents from the three countries, to return Baltic exiles and prisoners to their homelands, and to permit free, U.N.-conducted elections.

This is a reasonable and responsible course of action. I endorse it and I have urged the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House to give this proposal serious consideration.

As a part of my remarks on this important occasion, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of a resolution adopted on February 9 by the Linden, N.J., branch of the Lithuanian American Council and the text of a resolution adopted at a Lithuanian American mass meeting on February 16, sponsored by the Elizabeth, N.J., chapter of the Lithuanian American Community of the United States of America, Inc.:

RESOLUTION BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J.

Whereas on February 16, 1964, commemorating the 46th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, the feeling of many Lithuanian Americans may well be guided by the words of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country"; and

Whereas Lithuania, the country of our ancestors, once an independent and flourishing republic, recognized and respected by the world's major powers, was invaded and occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940, its people enslaved and systematically being now annihilated; and

Whereas despite its pretense of advocating and backing complete freedom and independence for all nations; the Soviet Union deceitfully continues its occupation and suppression of Lithuania as well as other captive European nations; and

Whereas the yearning for truth, justice, and freedom burns in the heart of every man of good will, the power of this yearning cannot be extinguished by a tyranny no matter how forceful: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm our determination to continue to carry on the effort whereby Lithuania once again shall regain her freedom and rightful independence; and

Resolved, That we earnestly beseech our Government to hold fast to its position of nonrecognition of the unlawful Soviet rule of Lithuania and other enslaved countries and demand that the Soviet Union validate its high-flown oratory about ending colonialism everywhere in the world by immediately withdrawing all Soviet troops and colonialists from Lithuania and all other captive nations—that our Government insist that the liberation of these enslaved nations be a basic condition for the start of any treaty negotiations with the Soviet Union; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer, and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,
President.
MARGARITA SAMATAS,
Secretary.

LINDEN, N.J., *February 9, 1964.*

RESOLUTION BY THE ELIZABETH CHAPTER OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

Whereas Lithuania and the other two Baltic nations, Latvia and Estonia, the first victims of the new Soviet Russian colonialism, are continuously suffering under the illegal Soviet Union occupation since June 1940;

Whereas Lithuanian, a more than 700-year-old nation, undoubtedly has the same rights to be free and independent as any new state in Africa or Asia;

Whereas the denial of the national freedom in any place in the world, including the Soviet Union, is illogical and intolerable;

Whereas the Lithuanian, as well as Latvian and Estonian, people are strongly opposed to the foreign occupation and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had rightly enjoyed for many centuries in the past;

Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize the Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, as Americans of Lithuanian origin, reaffirm our adherence to the American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That we sincerely urge the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Members of the Senate and the House to help to pass one of some 42 Senate and House concurrent resolutions, pending now before the Senate and House committees, requesting the Government of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and request the Soviet Union's withdrawal from the Baltic States and return all exiled peoples from Siberia and prisons and to conduct free democratic elections under the supervision of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our sincere gratitude to the President of the United States for the continuous refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union and to the honorable Members of the Senate and the House for their support of the cause of national freedom; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be forwarded this day to His Excellency Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, Hon. Dean Rusk Secretary of State, Hon. Carl Hayden, Senate President pro tempore, Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House, Hon. Harrison A. Williams and Clifford P. Case, our Senators, Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, our Congresswoman, and the press.

VINCAS MAMAITIS,
Chairman.
MRS. MARY JUSKA,
Secretary.

Concentration in Food Industry Poses Increasingly Disturbing Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the evidence that the trend toward concentration in the food industry is accelerating is causing growing concern in the Nation's small and independent business community, which represents 95 percent of our business population. Appropriately and inevitably, this question becomes a matter of more urgent concern to Congress. President Johnson recently has stressed the administration's growing concern over this problem, and has called for a bipartisan study by Congress of the "revolutionary changes" occurring in the marketplace.

Articles published recently in two of the country's leading newspapers—the Christian Science Monitor and the Washington Post—reflect the rise of this concern and serve to underline the seriousness of the issue posed by the continuing movement toward vertical integration and concentration of economic power in the hands of a few large enterprises. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. They follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor Feb. 15, 1964]

CHANGES IN FOOD MARKETING

(By Josephine Ripley)

There is growing concern in Washington over bigness, particularly in the food industry.

The President, in his farm message to Congress, spoke of the "revolutionary changes" which have taken place in food distribution with the chainstores now predominant.

He asked that Congress appoint a bipartisan commission to appraise these changes, with the interest of the consumer in mind.

The antitrust division of the Department of Justice has its eye on food manufacturing, with 47 investigations pending and 23 cases in progress.

A recent suit, filed on December 26, 1963, charged nine retail chains with conspiring to suppress the use of a certain type of trading stamps in their marketing area by setting up their own stamp plan in an effort to create a monopoly and squeeze out the competition.

Another case charging price fixing was brought against a large wholesaler. The company was indicted on charges of trying to drive out of business a competitor who sold at a lower price.

The indictment charged the wholesaler with cutting prices below cost in order to destroy the competition.

These particular cases illustrate the type of "market power" with which the Government is concerned.

Such remarkable changes have taken place in the whole area of food marketing within the past decade or so, with the coming of the supermarkets and giant shopping centers, that a critical survey is considered urgent.

In Congress, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, has urged that a study be made of the effect on food prices of a few giant corporations and chainstores.

Others have expressed similar concern, Representative JOE EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, said: "We need to understand what is taking place in our marketing system so that we can devise public policies to guide us in serving the public interest."

Representative ROOSEVELT, who is chairman of the distributions subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, would like to have particular attention given to the effects of vertical integration upon the food industry.

This is in obvious response to the President's suggestion that the implications of other changes that take place as vertical integration and contract farming be explored.

Vertical integration is the type of operation where a supermarket owns its own poultry farm or its own bakery, or does its own canning.

This represents an unusual concentration of power in the marketplace. What does it do to small business? to consumers? or to farmers? The Government wants to know what dangers there are in this kind of a setup.

Contract farming is another form of bigness. It is similar to vertical integration except that the supermarket chain, or whatever it may be, does not own these properties itself, but has them under contract.

This means the chain outfit can control the whole operation because of the size of these contracts. How is this power used?

Does it mean cheaper food for the consumer? With normal competition eliminated extraordinary power in the marketplace is channeled to one source. What effect does this have on quality? on packing?

The power of the supermarket chains was posed by the President in these words in the farm message: "There are some 200,000 retail grocery stores, but we know that $1 out of every $2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate, voluntary, or cooperative chains."

A bill which Representative ROOSEVELT has introduced with respect to vertical integration would prohibit any outfit doing more than a $30-million-a-year business from engaging in its own meatpacking or any meatpacker from operating its own market chain under the same conditions.

It does not deal with the problem of contract farming, however. Nor does it deal with the efforts of some farm organizations and farm leaders to achieve control of supply through combined operations.

Pricewise these large enterprises would appear to be of benefit to the consumer. But there are other aspects which the Government would like to explore involving quality, the possibility of collusion, and other aspects of bigness in an industry which touches the life of every individual in the Nation.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1964]

FOOD DILEMMA: ARE THE MARKETS TOO SUPER?

(By Julius Duscha)

Is the farmer being reduced to a hired hand for the food processors and big chainstores?

And have the supermarket chains become so powerful that they can arbitrarily set the prices housewives must pay for food?

These are two basic questions that would be studied—and perhaps answered—by a commission President Johnson has asked Congress to establish.

In his special message on agriculture the President urged Congress to set up a bipartisan commission to study and appraise the vast changes in the food industry.

As the President noted, there has been a revolution in the distribution as well as the production of food. But no one really knows what effect the developments have had on farmers or consumers.

The greatest change over the last 30 years has been the ever-increasing power and influence of the big supermarket chains.

Mr. Johnson pointed out in his message that $1 out of every $2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate, voluntary, or cooperative chains. There are 200,000 grocery stores in the United States.

But the concentration is even greater than the President indicated. A House Small Business Committee report shows that the 10 largest food chains sell almost 30 percent of all the food purchased at retail. What is more, the three largest chains account for almost half the business done by all food chains.

The supermarket chains now have the power and influence that the meatpackers had 50 years ago. Concern over the power of the packinghouses led to legislation prohibiting them from expanding their activities into the retail meat business.

Now suggestions are being made by farm organizations and other groups that laws should be passed to keep supermarket chains out of the processing and production of food.

The supermarkets point out in rebuttal that their profit margins are low—about 1 percent on sales—and that competition among them is intense.

Today supermarket chains not only sell bread and milk; they also operate their own bakeries and milk-processing plants.

They make contracts directly with farmers for the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables. They get farmers to grow the kinds of peas, tomatoes, apples, and oranges that can be canned with the least effort and waste.

And the chains not only buy cattle direct from huge western operations where as many as 50,000 steers may be force fed at one time; some of the chains operate their own feedlots as a hedge against fluctuations in cattle prices.

Another major change in the marketing of agricultural commodities has come about with the development of an assembly-line broiler production bankrolled by the feed industry.

The farmer's wife no longer raises a few hundred chickens to get enough money to buy a new dress from time to time.

Now feed manufacturers contract with farmers for the production of 10,000 or more chickens at a time according to rigid formulas. As a result, the farmers have lost some of their independence, but broiler production is profitable to most farmers—and in the supermarkets chicken is as cheap as hamburger.

Although the development of "contract farming" has come with a rush in the broiler industry, similar controls over production and marketing were worked out early in the 1900's by growers of oranges and grapefruit and in the 1920's and 1930's by dairy farmers banded together in cooperatives.

Other crops whose production and marketing have been carefully controlled for many years include sugarbeets and cane, other fruits and vegetables, hybrid seed corn and turkeys.

But if present trends continue the already sharply declining role of the open marketing of farm commodities may soon disappear altogether.

The best example is in the marketing of cattle. The big central cattle markets in Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, and St. Paul get fewer and fewer cattle each year.

In the days before World War II when practically all cattle were marketed through these big stockyards, farmers knew the prices being offered from day to day and even from hour to hour and could make their individual marketing plans accordingly.

Now more and more cattle are being marketed by farmers directly to processors and supermarket chains, often under contracts that were signed before the farmers even got the cattle from the western ranges.

As marketing and pricing decisions are being taken out of public places like stockyards, farmers are becoming increasingly concerned not only because they are afraid they are losing their independence but also because they fear they are being cut off from vital pricing information.

Although farmers talk a lot about preserving their independence, they have not hesitated to organize cooperatives, to sign contracts with processors and to take orders from them when such arrangements seem to be to the farmers' advantage.

There is no reason to deplore all the changes that have come in the marketing of farm commodities. Many of the developments are in the farmers' interests.

But most farmers and the spokesmen for their organizations agree with Agriculture Department economists that the changes should be studied so that their impact can be determined with some accuracy.

And what does all of the concentration in the marketing of food mean to the housewife as she enters crowded supermarkets stuffed with 4,000 to 5,000 different items?

The farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar steadily declined in the last decade from 44 percent in 1953 to 38 percent last year.

But food prices have continued to increase as packaging, processing, labor, and distribution costs have climbed. Also, housewives are demanding—and getting—more foods that only need to be heated at home.

Food may indeed be a bargain, as Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman maintains, but the ever greater concentration of food processing and marketing into the hands of fewer and fewer corporations raises disturbing questions that ought to be answered.

Paul Harvey Comments on Public Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call my colleague's attention to an excellent column by Mr. Paul Harvey, one of the Nation's most popular columnists and radio and television commentators, which was recently distributed by the General Features Corp.

I believe Mr. Harvey has summarized what many of us in public life have long felt regarding the double standard of treatment imposed upon men and women in public life.

I am sure every public official will appreciate the compassion and understanding which Mr. Harvey demonstrates in the following observation.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has spent 20 years of his life in journalism, I should like to merely add, "amen," to Mr. Harvey's very poignant observation.

Mr. Harvey's column follows:

OUR UNCIVIL TREATMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS

(By Paul Harvey)

You and I would not think of treating the servants in our kitchen the way we treat our civil servants.

A businessman with money is respected.

A politician with money is suspected.

In business, reciprocity is necessary, prudent, and wise.

In politics it's called a deal.

You make a gigantic mistake in business, you declare bankruptcy.

You make a gigantic mistake in politics, you and your family are permanently disgraced.

The businessman offers a bribe—"that's business."

A politician accepts a bribe—"that's a crime."

Defenders of this double standard insist that what politicians do is public, what industry does is private. Why?

Does that defense really make sense when the consuming public pays for the hanky-panky in industry as surely as the taxpaying public pays for the politician's boondoggle?

Another thing: It's smart for a workingman to get more than he's worth for working less than he's able.

But the politician is expected to sacrifice, to accept less than he's worth, but be always on duty.

And who ever heard of time and a half for a Congressman?

A factory hand tries to get in to see the chairman of the board and he'll get old waiting.

In politics your door is expected to be open all the time, you are expected to be available to anybody.

That's not all: In business, longtime experience is an asset, an endorsement, a virtue.

In politics too long and you're a "hack."

A businessman's careless remark would never get out of the boardroom.

A politician's total image is crucified by one intemperate utterance quoted out of context.

The press contributes to this double-standard; let's admit it. There are too many "it has been rumored" accusations about politicians which get printed on the front page and retracted, if at all, somewhere in the want ads.

If you are in one business and buy stock in others, you are "diversifying."

If you are a politician with outside income, you are "profiteering."

If you give a few hours to the community fund you are hailed as a selfless, public-spirited citizen.

A lawmaker sacrifices precious months out of his year to attend legislative sessions and you wonder "what's he getting out of it?"

The Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare recently published a report called Ethical Standards in Government. It was the judgment of the committee that ethical standards among public officials are generally higher than those prevailing in so-called private business.

In a republic we elect men to do our deciding for us.

Theoretically we elect our best men. Actually we tend to elect men our own size.

How is it that we presume to demand of these ordinary creatures such extraordinary conduct?

L.B.J. and Bobby Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article by Richard Wilson in last night's Washington Evening Star indicates the necessity of President Johnson to insist on the ethical principles he was so willing to espouse under a Republican administration.

The article follows:

THE PUBLIC AND THE BAKER AFFAIR—A NOTE OF CYNICAL REACTION IS FOUND THAT COULD HARM ADMINISTRATION

(By Richard Wilson)

President Johnson's administration has had such a fine beginning in general that he may not have correctly assessed the intrusion of a note of cynicism in the public reaction.

It should be warning enough to Mr. Johnson that something has gone wrong when newspapers of established integrity and responsibility devote so much space in the news columns and on the editorial pages to Mr. Johnson's relationship to Robert Baker.

This attention is not inspired by any desire to embarrass Mr. Johnson politically or otherwise. It is due to the possibility that what is seen in the Baker case is only the tip of the iceberg.

Mr. Baker was Senator Johnson's lieutenant in the political operations of the Democratic majority of the U.S. Senate. Mr. Baker's financial, business and social operations while in this unique relationship with Mr. Johnson are fascinating in themselves. The gift of a stereo set to Mr. Johnson adds

the little fillip that fixes public attention. But neither is more than a glimmering of what the Baker case is all about.

Nobody in official life wishes to talk about this, least of all the President, and hardly much more his friendly antagonist, the Republican leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN.

The iceberg below the surface is a rugged affair. It contains what might be called the secrets of Congress, including the more materialistic reasons behind the actions of Congressmen.

This is the forbidden territory of privilege and prerogative, of cash for campaigning, of little dinners with constituents who have much to gain or lose in governmental action, of huge defense contract awards tinged by favoritism, of rewards promised for favorable or unfavorable votes, of influence used with regulatory agencies.

This is the shadowland where arm twisting and pressure have become polished techniques, where special and inexplicable relationships persist between Congressmen and lobbyists—the area, in short, where the public interest becomes entangled with the private interest.

For many months the curiosity about this shadowland was largely confined to Washington. Mr. Baker, himself, was unknown in the country as a whole. President Johnson's name had not been mentioned publicly. It looked as if the Baker probe might blow over or remain of mere intramural interest in the capital. But there are increasing signs that the Baker probe is arousing puzzled interest and concern throughout the country. The Johnson administration has been slow to sense this; or, if not slow then determined to let the sensation wear itself out.

This has given the President's opposition the opening it wanted. Tens of thousands of anti-Johnson broadsides have been ordered by Republican Congressmen. They show President Johnson with his arm around Bobby Baker and surrounding this picture are scores of headlines on the various sensations in the Baker case. Mr. Johnson is being reminded of the declaration of ethical conduct he sponsored in the Senate and of President Kennedy's injunctions against Federal employees' accepting gifts.

The atmosphere in Washington is growingly censorious as the President cuts off questioning on the Baker case. A key witness finds his integrity impugned by official documents dug out by or handed out to a widely read columnist. In some quarters this attack on the witness is seen as fair warning that Johnson detractors must be prepared to be sorely punished, and their past had better be lilywhite. More and more talk is heard here that those who do not fall in line will suffer. It is put to Congressmen bluntly: "Are you a Johnson man or not?"

Mr. Johnson does not need to permit the further contamination of the atmosphere in Washington by talk of this kind. Those who saw what happened in the Truman administration could remind him that a President who stood mute amidst scandal narrowly avoided being defeated and won election with less than a majority of the total vote. It is said there is not enough time before election for the cynicism in Washington to spread to the country. This may be so, but it is still no reason why the President should not reassert now the ethical principles he was so willing to pronounce when the Republicans were in power.

Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, Speaks on Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from New Jersey, Hon. CLIFFORD CASE, spoke last week in Plainfield, N.J., on the need for and commonsense behind better governmental planning among communities located in heavily urban areas.

Senator CASE's speech is particularly valuable, I believe, because he makes his case simply, factually and persuasively. In an area of Government where poor communication has sometimes brought needless misunderstanding, Senator CASE has expressed commonsense proposals in a commonsense way.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senator CASE's speech:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, OF NEW JERSEY, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE PLAINFIELD BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, PARK HOTEL, PLAINFIELD, N.J., THURSDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 13, 1964

As businessmen, you plan ahead. This is accepted, indeed expected, as sound business practice. It is also good governmental practice, although some profess to see something sinister in it when it involves more than one political subdivision. In fact, sitting down with one's neighbors across town or county lines is often essential to the efficient and effective use of public moneys.

Throughout New Jersey, the most highly urbanized State in the Nation, there is a growing trend among our communities to plan together when it becomes the interest of an area as a whole to do so.

In Monmouth County, for example, exploratory talks have been going on among seven communities bordering the Shrewsbury River with the thought of establishing a single major sewage treatment plant to serve all.

Would seven individually-built, individually financed treatment plants discharging their effluent into the Shrewsbury River be an improvement over a single plant, jointly financed, with sewerlines capable of discharging the treated waste beyond the river and into the Atlantic Ocean? The answer seems clear.

The Federal Government may also have a role in this project. For there is a Federal program of assistance to, among other things, construction of sewage treatment facilities. The Federal Government also has funds available for planning joint studies.

In our State there are many Federal programs which affect cities and suburbs. One problem of increasing severity in some communities is the relocation to decent homes of those displaced from slums by highways, urban renewal and other federally financed public works projects.

In order to assure that urban renewal, for example, is in the interests of the neighborhoods affected, a workable program concept was initiated. This is designed to provide assurance by the communities to the Federal Government that the local people have a long-range plan for overall community development. Relocation plans for those displaced are included.

But the uprooting of families from old neighborhoods has given rise to second thoughts about urban renewal. In some places, the emphasis has already shifted from the bulldozer approach to rehabilitation. Not always is it best to flatten everything that may look like a slum on the outside. It is not always possible or desirable to relocate every family or every business. Disruption of stability which families have known in their neighborhoods can be much more demoralizing than living in modest, but clean and safe, quarters.

Enforcement of housing codes helps avoid the bulldozer. New emphasis on citizen participation in a community's urban renewal activities has helped.

Many difficulties in urban renewal have developed because community leaders have not been kept informed as plans develop or afforded an opportunity to express their views before a proposal is formally before the local governing body.

Once this stage is reached the community and its constituent neighborhoods may find themselves in a take-it-or-leave-it situation. Had there been adequate consultation and an effective planning process a number of years ago, the urban renewal program of Federal-private redevelopment of urban and suburban areas would have been much more successful for the individuals affected. It is scarcely sound, I believe, for the Federal Government to measure the success of its urban renewal program by the number of loan and grant contracts it has entered into with municipalities. Nor can we measure the success of our redevelopment programs in terms of the number of slums our bulldozers flatten. The real measure is to be found in individual and community well-being, that is to say, in human terms. And in these terms the current reappraisal is certainly in order.

A number of Federal programs cut across political boundaries affecting whole regions as well as single communities. These programs range from private housing assistance to direct Federal subsidization for public housing, highways, air and water pollution aids, and many others.

Such questions as the location of a jet airport, to be built in considerable part with Federal funds, can drastically affect the future of New Jersey's remaining green areas.

Because conflicts involving Federal programs inevitably arise both within individual communities and in the broader regions which the programs are designed to serve, I believe that the Federal Government's role in the planning process needs reviewing. A bill which has just recently passed the Senate points the way. Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, is the chief sponsor of this bill which includes several legislative proposals of my own.

This Senate-passed bill would encourage individual communities and counties to join in areawide or regional solutions to problems. The bill has four broad objectives.

They are (1) to increase the economy and efficiency of operations of Federal, State, and local governments in meeting the needs of metropolitan areas; (2) to facilitate the coordination of intergovernmental relations and activities on a continuing basis; (3) to provide a more effective exchange of information in the planning and development process; (4) to encourage comprehensive

planning and development on an areawide basis without regard to political boundaries.

To accomplish these goals, the bill provides that each application for a federally assisted loan or grant affecting a metropolitan area be accompanied by the comments and recommendations of a planning agency performing metropolitan or regional planning for the area in which the assistance is to be used. Secondly, a statement is to be submitted by the applicant that it has considered these comments and recommendations prior to formal application. These provisions would apply to all applications made after June 30, 1965, for urban renewal and open-space projects in a metropolitan area, and for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage and waste treatment works, highways, public housing, and transportation facilities.

The need for local and areawide review of Federal loan and grant applications is created by a combination of factors, among them, the rapid population growth of these areas, the many Federal programs affecting the development of urban and suburban areas, and the number of local units of government independently initiating such applications. These proposals for Federal assistance are often made without reference to other Federal, State, local, or private development programs. Frequently their impact on the overall urban area which they are designed to serve is not fully considered.

This bill, if finally passed by the House, will help us to insure that the desires of the communities and larger areas which would be affected are reflected in federally assisted public works projects.

Effective regional and metropolitan planning by itself will not cure all our urban problems. We will probably always have to fight the natural disinclination to attack the hard decisions, including the allocation of scarce land, water, and economic development resources. One way to overcome it is to encourage greater collaboration among all the various groups and agencies concerned with urban developments.

Petition of Taxpayer's Educational Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased and impressed by a petition which has been presented to me by the Taxpayer's Educational Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization with headquarters at Austin, Tex., of which Mr. Gene O. Parker is president, Mr. E. Clay Lafield is executive director, and Mr. Joseph E. Bacon is legislative director.

This petition has been circulated in each of the 50 States and contains many thousands of names. It is, without question, the largest I have ever seen or received. It deals in part with the preservation of the percentage depletion principle and is impressive testimony that Americans from all walks of life are aware of this necessary and long established depreciation allowance on depleting capital assets. This unusually large petition signifies that a tremendous group of people from all sections of this great country are aware of, and pleased with, the service, quality, and availability of the thousands of products possible from the dynamic free-enterprise American petroleum and mining industries.

I commend to the Congress the objectives of this petition and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned taxpayers, hereby exercise our rights as citizens to petition the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and its members, as well as all Members of the U.S. Congress, pertaining to a proposal to change the tax provisions applying to natural resources and extractive industries.

Whereas four specific changes in longstanding petroleum tax policies have been recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy. The cumulative effects of these proposals would be far-reaching and disruptive. They would discourage development of our essential energy supplies, inflict hardships on large segments of our economy, including hundreds of petroleum industry service and supply organizations, employment, and tax revenues in more than 30 petroleum producing States; and

Whereas these tax proposals, designed to impose an additional $300 million tax burden on the oil and gas producing industry, would discourage investment activities, shrink our resources base of vital energy supplies, and defeat our tax policy goal of stimulating economic activity in the Nation's largest resource industry; and

Whereas the first change proposed would serve to reduce the net income from producing properties for the purpose of calculating depletion. This would have the effect of reducing the amount of depletion allowance; and

Whereas the other proposals would repeal the provisions permitting properties to be aggregated for tax purposes, tax as ordinary income a part of what is now treated as capital gain in the sale of properties; and limit the application of foreign development expenditures; and

Whereas the changes are designed to affect directly the mining and petroleum industries. These industries can ill afford an increase in their tax load; and

Whereas any tax changes affecting the oil industry will have dire consequences upon the entire economic life of all citizens throughout the United States, including our schools, churches, charities, homeowners, wage earners, and all businesses, large and small; and

Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee rejected all of President Kennedy's proposals affecting the oil depletion allowance, excepting only one. The tax bill as now written repeals the provision permitting properties to be aggregated for tax purposes.

Therefore we urge the Senate Finance Committee and Members of the Congress to reject the administration proposal to repeal the provision allowing aggregation of properties for tax purposes. In consideration of the petroleum industry's great impact on the economic life of this country, we further urge the Congress to reject any and all proposals which would adversely change historic petroleum tax policies.

Steel Imports—Testimony of Mr. Leslie B. Worthington, President, United States Steel Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, leaders from the steel industry are here in Washington this week to testify before the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee about the steel industry's alarm over our worsening world trade position. We all should listen to their words of warning over the inroads being made by imported steel and the threat it brings to our steel industry.

This testimony is part of the U.S. preparation for the trade negotiations due to commence May 4 in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. At the request of Special Representative Christian Herter, the presidents of several of our steel companies have testified, emphasizing that imports are steadily outpacing exports. Figures will prove for the first 11 months of 1963 that we have experienced the worst deficit in tonnage since 1959 when we first imported more steel than we exported. Our steel import deficit for 1964 is growing worse.

One of the most tragic results which stems from this situation is the way imports cause substantial unemployment. This is bringing adverse effects to many of our already hard hit depressed areas.

Mr. Leslie B. Worthington, president of the United States Steel Corp., testified before the Trade Information Committee on February 19, 1964, and it is my privilege to recommend his remarks, which I insert herewith, to the attention of all the Members of Congress.

My name is Leslie B. Worthington and I am president of United States Steel Corp., 525 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa. I welcome this chance to discuss with you the opportunities and obstacles which I believe confront our Government and the steel industry in achieving further freedom of world trade.

In our company, we believe in free trade under equally fair competitive conditions. We recognize, however, that unfair and destructive trade practices, such as dumping, must be eliminated before free trade between the United States and foreign nations in steel products can be realized.

Given a competitive climate that is fair to all, we believe we can successfully meet the serious competitive problems that now face us in markets abroad and at home; but such a climate in steel mill products simply does not exist in the world today.

To keep our products competitive is our responsibility as a steel producer. But to keep a competitive climate that is fair is something that only Government can do.

Thus, the representatives of our Government at the trade negotiations should seek voluntary agreement that will eliminate unfair methods which restrict and impede competition and will, at the same time, encour-

age constructive practices that will promote world trade.

Only our Government is in a position to eliminate destructive trade practices in steel products; and we would think that Government would undertake to do this, not alone because in this country we believe in fair competition, but also because of the importance of the domestic steel industry to the economic well-being of the United States.

The importance of a vital steel industry to our nation in wartime has been very well demonstrated on three occasions during my lifetime. The importance of the industry to our national economy in peacetime can, I believe, be demonstrated by reference to a very few representative data.

There are more than 500,000 employees of the American steel industry engaged in the production and distribution of steel mill products. Many thousand more are employed in the mining, processing and transportation of raw materials, in the fabrication of the mill products and in related industries.

The payrolls of the American steel producers in 1963 exceeded $4 billion.

There are steel plants in some 300 different communities in this country and each of them contributes to the economic welfare of the community in which it is located.

Taxes paid by the steel companies in 1962 to local, State and Federal governments exceeded the sum of their net profits and amounted to more than $743 million.

During the post World War II period, the American steel industry has averaged nearly $1 billion a year in capital expenditures. Such expenditures in 1964 are expected to reach $1½ billion.

Steel mill products are the raw material for a host of manufacturing industries in the United States. It has been estimated that nearly one-third of total man-hours in manufacturing are devoted to the further fabricating of steel mill products into end-use articles.

That a healthy and progressive steel industry is essential to the economy and defense of this country cannot, I believe, be seriously questioned.

No doubt our Government has a considerable stake in the well-being of the steel industry and, because that well-being is now under serious challenge—and under circumstances with which only our Government can cope—I believe the problem should be made clear at this time.

These circumstances actually arise out of the tremendous postwar, worldwide growth in steel production. Table 30 of the brief we have filed with the committee shows that in 1930, 25 nations produced steel and, of the total production of 100 million ingot tons, the United States produced about 44 percent.

Following the end of World War II—in 1946—30 nations were producing steel and the United States produced about 54 percent of it. However, 16 years later—in 1962—55 nations were producing steel and, out of nearly 395 million tons of steel ingots poured in that year, the United States produced just under 25 percent.

It is estimated that by 1965, 71 nations will be producing steel and many of the newcomers can be expected to add to the chaos that exists in the export markets of the world.

Since the close of World War II, our Government has provided the money to build, modernize, or expand 179 different foreign steel plants. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22, 1963, this money has reached the astonishing total of $1,735 million. By way of contrast, the American steel producer has been able to expand and improve his own steel mill facilities through his ability to pay his own way—and without direct help of any kind from his Government.

The view is sometimes expressed that at least some of the nations which have built or are planning steel plants could better invest in agriculture or other development that would contribute more significantly to the improvement of the living standards of their people. However this may be, the fact remains that many nations continue to be successful in rasing the large sums necessary for the installation or expansion of steel plants—notwithstanding that the plants now in operation around the world, to say nothing of plants now building or in the planning stage, have the capacity to produce steel far in excess of the world's present requirements.

It is this foreign steel excess capacity and its utilization to flood world markets with dumped steel that has created the problem which I believe must be the concern of our Government.

It seems to be true that, in every foreign country which has a steel industry, the Government assists in building an export trade. Such assistance would account for the practice that appears generally to be followed in foreign nations of operating steel mills so as to earn foreign exchange, to bring the export-import trade into balance and to serve other political considerations.

In the major foreign steel-producing nations, the requirements of the domestic market are generally supplied at prices which the steel producers jointly seek to stabilize—usually with the aid of their government. Since there is an excess of steel-producing capacity in these nations, the remaining production, not absorbed in the domestic market, is then dumped in the export market at whatever prices it will bring. To the extent that the foreign steel producer is able to cover his fixed charges out of his domestic sales, he is then in a position to price his export sales on his incremental costs. By marketing his excess production in this way, he is able to utilize a labor force which either the law or local practice causes him to maintain, regardless of the need for their services; and he is also able to earn foreign exchange for his government and to serve his own financial interests in the bargain.

In many of the smaller countries, heavy capital investment in modern steelmaking equipment, lack of domestic or other economical sources of raw materials, inefficient labor and other costly operations would indicate that serious losses must be incurred on sales in export but, nevertheless, political considerations seem to dictate that this policy be followed.

These attitudes, policies, and practices on the part of foreign steelmakers and their governments, including the willingness of governments to subsidize exports, are reflected in the steel export markets of today. As the volume of export offerings has continued to increase, competition for available business has become more and more intense. Under these circumstances, prices on steel products exported to the United States and to nonsteel producing nations have been driven to levels that reflect the predatory and destructive competitive practices that are prevalent among exporters.

We in United States Steel believe that it is good business to treat all of our customers alike, both large and small. For this reason, we publish prices free on board mill on our steel mill products and quote these prices to each of our customers. We reduce our prices both at the mill and at delivery points to meet lower prices quoted by our domestic competitors in competitive areas when we believe this is the sound thing to do and when such action is consistent with our practice of treating all of our customers in an even-handed fashion.

On a few occasions we have attempted to meet the indiscriminate prices quoted in the United States by the importers of foreign steel. We found—as we lowered our own price—that the price on the foreign steel was reduced correspondingly. Of course, this is the characteristic of the dumping price—that it will be lowered in whatever amount is necessary to take the business away from the domestic supplier.

Any overall effort to meet dumping prices could foreseeably end in disaster for any private company that is operating in a free competitive enocomy. And we have not yet found it advisable to attempt to meet on a customer-by-customer basis the dumping prices which are being quoted on imported steel in the United States. We are fully aware that the latter practice would work to the disadvantage of those of our customers who prefer to buy domestic products—even though the price is higher than the prices quoted on foreign steel—as well as those of our customers who are not in a position to buy all or even a substantial part of their requirements from importers.

We try to sell regularly in the home markets of other steel-producing nations where prices are stable and are not much different from our own domestic prices. However, in the non-steel-producing foreign nations of the world, it would be necessary that we meet dumping prices if we were to be successful in selling our products. To undertake to do so would, we think, favor consumers abroad to the marked disadvantage of our domestic customers.

We hope to be able to continue this even-handed basis of selling our products because we believe it is important that we contribute as much as possible to the ability of each of our customers to maintain a healthy competitive position in the markets in which he sells his products. A good many of them compete successfully in the sale abroad of their products made of steel, as well as competing with each other in their own markets in this country. The United States has a favorable export balance of trade in capital equipment and consumer durable goods manufactured from steel. One of the factors making this possible is that the manufacturers of these products in the United States are able to buy their steel from domestic steel producers at prices which compare favorably with the prices paid by their foreign competitors in other major steel producing countries.

With many nations now striving for the creation or further expansion of steelmaking facilities, our problem is becoming more and more aggravated with the flooding of export markets. This is particularly true of our own coastal markets. In these markets, steel products have been sold at constantly declining prices as cutthroat competition from an ever-increasing number of steel-producing nations has forced them down.

As to Russia and the other Red bloc countries, it is very likely true that they have it in their power to enter any foreign market, including the United States, on a basis that would threaten the collapse of the domestic industry.

The chaotic price competition in the world export steel trade, as reflected in the pricing of exports of steel mill products to the United States, has created a problem which can only be described as critical. We believe in free trade under equally fair competitive conditions. Such fair competitive conditions simply do not exist in the steel export markets of the world today.

History bears out the view that the suppression of unfair competitive practices in no way hinders or stifles the flow of free trade in any market—domestic or foreign—quite the contrary. If standards of fair competition could be established in world trade in steel products, they would, I believe, prove a far greater stimulus to such trade than any adjustments that are possible in the existing tariffs of the steel producing nations.

It is our recommendation, as stated in our brief, that rates of duty and nontariff trade barriers should be considered jointly in rela-

tion to their overall impact on international trade in steel mill products. In this connection, both duties and nontariff trade barriers imposed by other nations on imports from the United States should be compared with the duties and nontariff trade barriers imposed by the United States on steel imports from such other nations. Adjustments should then be negotiated which will provide the opportunity to the American steel producer and to the steel producers of other nations to compete in world markets on a fair basis of equality. Furthermore, unfair and destructive trade practices, such as dumping, must be eliminated before free trade between the United States and foreign nations in steel products can be realized. If these objectives cannot be accomplished, then steel mill products should be placed on the U.S. reserve list. In addition, if other nations should increase their rates of duty or increase or impose other levies or barriers on steel imports from the United States, then the U.S. rates of duty should be increased correspondingly.

Thank you.

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from one of the most respected men in the livestock industry in Omaha. Mr. Regan could perhaps be termed the dean of the Omaha Livestock Commission men, and I have the utmost confidence in what he says relative to the seriousness of the importation of foreign meat products into this country.

The information which he sends me follows:

I have been reading with great interest news releases from Washington on the meetings being held by representatives of the livestock industry with various Government agencies and Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. While vacationing in California, I have been able to observe some of the things that are happening in this area.

During the past few years, mostly during the past 2 years, as many as 10 commercial-type feedlots have been built in Mexico across the border from Texas, Arizona, and California. At present there have been constructed four slaughtering and processing plants near or adjacent to these feedlots. Construction of an additional plant at Mexicali will be started soon.

I have been informed that President Lopez Mateos is a full partner in the feedlots and processing programs. It has been said that President Mateos represents the Mexican Government agency.

The grading and inspection programs followed in these plants are comparable to those followed in the United States. The fresh meat from these plants (the quality of which is a good as that processed in the United States) is moving into the United States in ever-increasing quantities. It is being shipped to points as far east as Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida. Several carloads of carcass beef have been sold on the Los Angeles market during the past month.

Large portions of the grain fed in these feedlots are purchased from the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Alliance for Progress loan program. It has been stated by some of the managers of these feedlots: "We are buying this grain and do not have to pay for it for 3 years." Most of the grain fed in these feedlots imported from the United States is milo; 10 carloads of Commodity Credit Corporation milo was seen on the siding at Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, recently, and I understand from a reliable source that over 200 carloads of such grain have moved into these feedlots just across the border during the past 9 months. I further understand from a reliable source that the price of this grain is subsidized by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The importation of beef from Mexico, unless some steps are taken, will continue to increase and will have a depressing effect upon the price of carcass beef in this country. It is a direct competitor of our best quality beef.

The amount of frozen boneless beef from Australia and New Zeland is increasing every year. I understand from people who have been in Australia that the Australian Government has a very lush subsidized cattle program and it is their desire to increase the use of their lands for the grazing of cattle, of which they have large amounts.

I also understand from a reliable government agency that of the total consumption of beef and veal in California during 1962, 4 percent was imported; during the year 1963, 14 percent of the total beef and veal consumed in California was imported.

It is very apparent to me that unless steps are taken, the livestock industry of our country is going to be dominated by import products which will result in the ruination of a major industry. I feel a thorough investigation of these facts should be made.

Sincerely,

REGAN-THOMPSON CO.,
J. J. REGAN, Sr.

North Dakota Left Holding the Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial by my good friend Chick Kircher, editor in chief of the Farmer, published in St. Paul, Minn., concerning the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota.

Our State has in a sense been discriminated against by the removal of over half a million acres of land that has not only left our tax rolls but has removed a large amount of the area that served as a dependable source of supplemental feed production for our livestock herds in time of recurrent drought. The irrigation of 250,000 acres would in effect replace this land given up for reservoir bottom.

These irrigated lands would serve as a dependable source of feed through drought periods and would make unnecessary periodic importations of hay at $30-a-ton freight charges to maintain foundation herds. Any farmer knows that you cannot maintain a dependable livestock agriculture without a year-after-year source of reasonably priced feed.

The article follows:

NORTH DAKOTA LEFT HOLDING THE BAG

Construction of the giant Garrison Dam across the Missouri River north of Bismarck, N. Dak., has not fulfilled all early promises of great good for the State.

The Garrison Dam and the Oahe Dam across the Missouri in South Dakota backed up water that flooded 548,000 acres in North Dakota. Much of this was excellent grazing and cropland. As plans for the dams were in the making there were, of course, some objections to the flooding, but prospects for the good that would accrue to North Dakota far outweighed the objections.

In addition to downstream flood control in which neither North or South Dakota were as much interested as States to the south, these two dams were built for the purpose of generating power, and, immensely important to the economy of the State, to provide water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic use.

The promise of good resulting from the dams' functions in supplying power and downstream flood control is being accomplished, but the good to come from water for irrigation and other uses still is far in the future. Thus, North Dakota has been left holding the bag. Its economy has suffered the loss of much good land, and it has not yet gained the benefits of water diverted from the huge pool behind the dam.

A group of 3,000 North Dakotans, banded together in the North Dakota Water Users Association, is not accepting the State's unhappy situation without protest. In the weeks immediately ahead delegations of members, under the leadership of R. L. Dushinski, editor of the Devils Lake Journal, association president, will go to Washington to urge Members of the Congress to relieve the situation.

Action that will be asked is for an appropriation of $225 million needed for the Garrison diversion project that will provide water for irrigating 250,000 acres, and provide 40 cities, towns, and villages with the water they need.

The fact will be pointed out that a diversion project, much larger in scope, was authorized by the Congress in 1944. It was thought then that a million acres of land would be suitable for irrigation. Later it was determined that, because of soil characteristics, not all of the large area is suitable. Mapped since is the 250,000-acre area in central and southern North Dakota that is suitable.

Even if the project gets immediate congressional approval the irrigated land will soon be brought into production. In fact, according to Mr. Dushinski it will be 20 years before the benefits of irrigation will have been spread over the 250,000 acres. And by that time U.S. population will have increased to the point where the production from the land will be needed.

Maybe the North Dakotans are a little starry eyed about the benefits that would evolve from the project. But if only half of what is expected actually materializes the project will be worth far more than its cost. Benefits outlined by Mr. Dushinski are: Establishment of 3,400 new farms in the area; an annual trade increase of $145 million; 20,000 new jobs that will support 100,000 additional people in the State.

And what should arouse special enthusiasm in Washington is that this proposed project is largely self-liquidating. Based upon long experience with other irrigation projects it is estimated irrigators will pay off

89 percent of the Government's total investment.

It is to be hoped for the economy of the entire upper Midwest that the North Dakota Waters Users Association gets the congressional approval and appropriation it is seeking.

The American Legion Supports Prayer in Public Schools and Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the action of the American Legion taken at their national convention held in Miami last September.

Having been a member of the American Legion since 1919 and aware of the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion which states:

For God and country we associate ourselves together.

This action by the American Legion and this article fills me with gratification and is proof that the American Legion believes as I do, that God has a permanent place in our American society and particularly in all our public schools and places.

The American Legion report follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION'S POSITION

At its 1963 national convention numerous department resolutions in support of such a constitutional amendment were considered and consolidated and approved as Resolution 25, placing the American Legion in support of a constitutional amendment, as follows:

"SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, or educational institution supported in whole or in part from any public funds from providing for the voluntary participation by the students thereof in the reading of passages from the Bible or in regularly scheduled periods of nonsectarian prayer.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

On December 18, 1963, when the American Legion announced its decision to support Congressman BECKER's Discharge Petition No. 3, the following statement was made:

"A discharge petition is a seldom used parliamentary procedure but it is authorized in the rules of the House. The American Legion has supported discharge petitions but once or twice in its history and does so now, only because of the unusual circumstances surrounding the prayer and Bible-reading issue, and related possibilities."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER AND BIBLE READING LOCKED IN COMMITTEE—LEGION SUPPORTS DISCHARGED PETITION

The American Legion has joined in a movement in Congress for a discharge petition to force out of the House Judiciary Committee a proposed constitutional amendment. The amendment, identified as House Joint Resolution 693, would guarantee voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools and other public places, and forbid judicial or legislative prohibition of references to God on such things as coins, paper money, etc.

The Legion is urging its members and all Americans interested in such a constitutional amendment to ask their Representatives in the House to sign discharge petition No. 3 in order to move the resolution out of the Judiciary Committee onto the floor of the House.

A discharge petition, though seldom used, is authorized by the rules of the House to permit a majority to move a bill out of the committee which is disposed not to report it out. The American Legion has supported discharge petitions only a few times in its history. As of February 4, there were 134 Representatives who had signed the petition, and 84 more signatures were needed to provide the required majority of 218 out of 435 Members of the House.

Supreme Court decisions in 1962 and 1963 led directly to the movement to amend the Constitution. A New York case in 1962 stopped New York State from prescribing a prayer to be read in the schools, on the ground that this was a mixing of church and State. Later a New York Board of education decision interpreted this to mean that even if all the parents of children in a classroom wished a prayer of which they approved to be read, it could not be. A New York district court denied this interpretation, but its ruling may go to a higher court.

A 1963 Supreme Court decision ruled that even if a school would excuse any objectors from participating in school prayer or Bible readings, the school still could not conduct such religious exercises. The Court here went beyond the conflict of church and State and into the field of psychology by basing the decision in part on a belief that it would be humiliating for an objector to excuse himself. It entered the field of voluntary student participation in school religious observances and found against it. These decisions in turn led to a rash of actions and proposals to remove the phrase "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and challenges to "In God We Trust" on coinage and other Government issue.

The American Legion and numerous Members of the House have not challenged the decision forbidding compulsory joining in prayer prescribed by a State. But they have taken the position that a constitutional guarantee of voluntary participation in school and other public religious exercises is now necessary, while any attempt to legislate a prohibition of Government use of the word "God" is an attempt to legislate atheism. Both matters are seen as an interference of the State in religion rather than being guarantees of religious freedom.

Numerous resolutions for a constitutional amendment died in the Judiciary Committee in the last (87th) Congress. In the first session of the present (88th) Congress, 131 joint resolutions for such an amendment were introduced, with indications that either no hearings would be held on them by the Judiciary Committee or that hearings would be held too late to permit any action in this Congress.

Last September 10, Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, in consultation with many colleagues, introduced House Joint Resolution 693 as a sort of master proposal, whose key passage is:

"Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures in any public school or government institution or place, if participation is voluntary. Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental, or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States."

BECKER also introduced Discharge Petition No. 3 to force House Joint Resolution 693 out of committee. The American Legion, which at its last convention endorsed a constitutional amendment to guarantee voluntary school and other public prayer and Bible reading, threw its backing to the proposals sponsored by Representative BECKER.

If the proposal clears the Congress it will still require approval of three-quarters of the State legislatures before becoming a part of the Constitution.

Sir Alec Returns the Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, like a number of other Americans I am becoming more and more concerned about the relationship of our country with other nations in the world and I was so impressed by the editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on February 19, "Sir Alex Returns the Winner," that I was prompted to ask permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The observations contained therein, I regret to say, are in my opinion accurate. As a result of the conference with the British Prime Minister, no progress was made in bolstering the security of our country in any way, shape, or form. No nation can expect to endure in the atmosphere of defeat which has shrouded us these past few years. We must revise our thinking and our attitude and stimulate and harden our dignity, our power, and our prestige among the nations of the world.

The editorial follows:

SIR ALEC RETURNS THE WINNER

The British press as a whole, both pro- and anti-government, is very pleased with the results of Sir Alec Douglas-Home's visit to the United States. And well it might be. Sir Alec got what he wanted. President Johnson got nothing—or less than nothing. Both men face elections later this year. If the outcome of their meeting were translated into votes Sir Alec's stock should be up and President Johnson's down.

Britain wanted us to help out with its problems in Cyprus and in southeast Asia, particularly in the defense of Malaysia from Indonesian aggression. President Johnson agreed to do so. We, on the other hand, wanted Britain to stop sabotaging our policy of economic boycott against Cuba and to withhold long-term credits from the Communist powers, notably Russia and China, pending future political and security developments. Sir Alec refused, and Mr. Johnson was left holding the bag.

Much more is involved than a loss of face for the Johnson administration at home and abroad. Our basic positions for dealing with the Communists have been breached and are now being overwhelmed by Britain and other West European countries. They have now embarked on a mad scramble for business, and the slogan once more is: the devil take the hindmost.

It is true that Washington helped open the floodgates by surrendering to domestic interests anxious to sell surplus wheat to Russia. But there is a difference between feeding hungry Communists and building up the Soviet (or Red Chinese) industrial complex with long-term credits, as the British now propose to do. Food, if consumed by the recipient country, may not contribute to promoting Communist revolutions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The products of industrial machines, on the other hand, may very well do so.

There is also a difference between feeding hungry Communists in Russia or China and putting Castro's broken economy back on the road with buses and trucks. In Moscow and Peiping we have no hope of bringing down the Communist regime. In Havana we do, and our policy of economic boycott against Cuba was based on that hope. Furthermore, it was our belief that Russia should bear the full economic cost of maintaining a satellite in the Caribbean and that none of our allies—certainly not Britain—should assist the Soviet Union in that undertaking.

President Johnson, having failed to dissuade Sir Alec from seeking the best of both worlds (at our expense), is left with ruptured economic policies for dealing with Havana and Moscow. He faces the difficult and unpleasant task of repairing the damage.

The Shackled Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Shackled Giant," which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune on February 13, 1964:

THE SHACKLED GIANT

The Corps of Engineers closed the dam at Eufaula this week, right on schedule, and one of the biggest manmade lakes in the United States began forming. It will be bigger than Texoma, bigger than the Grand Canyon's Lake Mead. It will be a splendid lake.

By yesterday, the water had backed up to a depth of 8 feet. Eventually it will be 85 feet deep. That may take 5 months or a year or two—it all depends on the rain upstream.

Eufaula is a multipurpose project. It is hydroelectric power, flood control, pollution control, recreation (a bigger industry than we dreamed), and water storage. It's the biggest thing of its kind that ever happened to eastern Oklahoma.

But the point we want to make here is that this magnificent $120 million achievement can do no more than break even, financially, until the other lakes of the Arkansas River Basin are created, and the banks of the Arkansas River itself stabilized.

Only then will the barges—which represent the biggest single benefit in the billion-dollar Arkansas River Basin project—be able to navigate upstream from the Mississippi to Tulsa.

Without its companion lakes, Eufaula is a house with half a roof, an automobile with half an engine, a shackled giant. And as long as it remains incomplete, it means wasted potential.

We mention this because President Johnson's budget message to Congress last month created what the Arkansas Basin Development Association calls a very difficult problem for the residents of the Arkansas Valley.

For the coming fiscal year, the President suggests $84 million for construction work in the valley. This is a sizable amount of money, but it is $5 million less than Congress provided last year, and considerably less than the project needs if it is to be finished by 1970.

The Corps of Engineers can finish the job by that date if they have the money. But if appropriations continued on the same $84 million per year that the President is now suggesting, the work might not be finished before 1974.

Why is that so bad? Well, it is estimated that each year's delay in completion of the project will mean a loss to the Nation of $54 million in benefits. A 4-year delay would cost $216 million. And that takes no account of the inevitable rise in construction costs that comes with each passing year, nor of the side benefits which would otherwise accrue to industry and the residents of the area.

There will—and this is the heart of the matter—be that much less wealth for the Government to tax. At a time when Congress is cutting taxes in the hope of stimulating the economy to the production of more taxable wealth, a slowdown in Arkansas Basin appropriations does not seem to make much sense.

The Arkansas Basin project is now more than one-third complete, and there is no doubt at all that the Government and the Nation are committed to complete it. In the circumstances, the sooner it is done, the better for everyone. We hope Congress can see it that way.

Private Power Campaign Is an Insult to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1964, the Nashville Tennessean published what I feel to be an excellent editorial and one which I commend to the attention of our colleagues. On February 16, 1964, the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, published an editorial which I commend to the attention of all friends of the Tennessee Valley Authority and to those who support the belief that low-rate and plentiful power is one of the keys to the economic growth of this Nation.

These two editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Feb. 17, 1964]

PRIVATE POWER CAMPAIGN IS AN INSULT TO CONGRESS

Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, has disclosed on the floor of the Senate how the private power lobby is mounting a highly organized propaganda campaign to destroy all public power and in particular the rural electrification program and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The propaganda is directed mainly at farm people—those who benefit most from the agencies under attack—and seeks to play upon their feelings of patriotism. The idea it tries to convey, naturally, is that public power of any kind is un-American and that anyone who approves of it is unfaithful to the Nation's ideals.

The main part of the propaganda drive, according to Senator METCALF, consists of a moving picture to be shown to civic clubs, PTA and women's groups, farm organizations, etc. The movie comes with a manual of instructions to the operator on how to get the best effects from soft lighting, dramatic music, and irrelevant quotes from the Nation's heroes.

The movie, says Senator METCALF, "consists mainly of a discussion between a farmer, his son, and a fictitious Congressman who is the mouthpiece for the power company propaganda line.

"This so-called Congressman immediately identifies himself with the audience through appeals to family ties, good fellowship, individual initiative, and similar accepted values of American daily life."

Then, according to the Senator, the fictitious Congressman "sets up strawmen consisting of the usual power company scare words—subsidized rates, unfair competition, Government interference, and all the rest—then proceeds to knock them down with incredible distortions of truth."

After the showing, members of the audience are urged to send their protests of public power to their own Congressmen, and the manual tells how it should be done.

The power company official who is showing the movie hands out sample letters, various types of stationery, pens, and stamped envelopes.

"Sample letters should be on various colored and sized stationery and handwritten," the manual says, according to Senator METCALF. "This will give members of your audience an authentic guide, yet, because it looks as though it is an actual letter someone has written, avoids the chances of copying and standardized letters coming from your audience to any one Congressman. This will allow the action obtained to appear spontaneous to the recipient and not as though it were a planned concerted effort by any one interested group."

Senator METCALF charges that the propaganda campaign, called Project Action is a "deliberately calculated plan to pressure Congress into a premeditated course of legislative action.

"The technique involved in this campaign, I am convinced, is wrong. Moreover it is a dangerous threat to our democratic processes because, if it works, our democratic processes would not."

Senator METCALF has done a public service in discovering and exposing this insulting attempt to sway congressional opinion. It should be a warning to Congress to be on the alert for results of the high-pressure campaign, conducted at the expense of private power's customers and subsidized by the taxpayers through tax concessions to the utility companies.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Feb. 16, 1964]

COMPARING TVA AND CAP

The more we look at the central Arizona project (CAP) as compared with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) the stranger it is to see Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, proposing to break up TVA while sponsoring building of CAP.

We have previously made a comparison in an editorial, from information readily available. Now Morris Cunningham, our Washington bureau chief, has obtained the CAP details.

Wilson Dam installations were the original equipment of TVA. That dam is still in use and, by installation of all generators for which it was designed, it continues to produce more electricity than any other TVA dam. This dam was surplus property from World War I, put to use by TVA.

But CAP's basic unit would be an extremely big new dam in the Colorado River. The Bridge Canyon Dam would be 673 feet

high, while TVA's highest, Fontana, is 480 feet in the air. It is so huge that plans call for this one dam to produce 1,500,000 kilowatts of power. That is 3 times as much as comes from Wilson Dam, and 15 times as much as TVA's Norris Dam.

TVA was a comparatively modest investment of Federal funds in the welfare of a region. It took more than 12 years for the TVA investment to grow to $400 million. CAP would begin at 1,074 millions of dollars.

Both TVA and CAP plans call for return of the investments in power to the Treasury on 50-year schedules, which TVA is doing and CAP hopes to do.

TVA pays interest at the average rate the Government has to pay on bond money. During the most recent fiscal year it was 3.285 percent. The formula for CAP would have called for 3 percent.

In lieu of taxes, TVA pays to States and counties 5 percent of what it collects from selling electricity, except the power bought for Government use. The CAP legislation provides nothing for taxes.

This is one of the strangest parts of the Goldwater attitude. The States and counties are collecting more from TVA than the private power companies ever paid them. Yet he says private ownership of TVA property would mean a gain in taxpayments, which could come true only if private owners took it in higher prices for electricity in the area supposedly benefited.

At the same time his name is on CAP legislation that skips any such taxes.

Neither TVA nor the CAP proposal includes taxpayments to the Federal Government.

First consideration of TVA is flood control. The dams hold back winter rains and let the runoff down gradually through generators producing electricity for people who live near and for vast defense installations, especially the Atomic Energy Commission.

With CAP the big use of the water is for irrigation. In addition to the fact that this region is dry there is the handicap that it is higher than the source of water. Almost a third of the electricity will have to be used for pumping water uphill, a costly and artificial factor absent from the TVA development.

TVA's water is used to provide a channel for barges and give its region the advantage of a reliable channel for water-borne freight. Aside from freight actually moved by water there is a tremendous value to the region in the way the barges force down the price of rail freight.

The CAP region will have nothing in the way of navigation to show for its construction expenses.

In the valley of the Tennessee River millions of dollars in values have been created in the form of recreational opportunities along the lake shores, preservation of wildlife and increase of fish, and general usefulness of the area.

These are, in a manner of speaking, a gift from the business in wholesale electricity conducted by TVA. That is to say money from electricity provides whatever expense TVA has for these purposes and repays the Treasury for the investment.

Since TVA was designed, however, the formula has been changed. In financing CAP a value has been assigned to these purposes. Almost $40 million is assigned to recreation, fish, and wildlife care, and to area redevelopment.

This is an amount which is subtracted from the costs to be repaid by sale of irrigation water and electricity. TVA is repaying similar expenses, which might be translated to say that the price of electricity in the Tennessee project pays these bills, while in the Arizona project they are a subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers.

There is one other consideration, aside from the specifics of dollars and repayments to the U.S. Treasury. TVA is a going operation, now more than 30 years old and such a success that visitors from around the world have come to admire it and inquire how they can imitate it.

CAP is only an idea, with its soundness still to be demonstrated.

There are many similarities between TVA and CAP. Where there are differences the advantages seem to be held by TVA.

Senator GOLDWATER has flatly declined to debate his conclusion that TVA is bad but CAP is good.

It seems to us that if CAP seems good to the Senator, TVA would seem much better, if only it was in Arizona.

Testimonial to Morris A. Kasoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of the community and last night at the Emerson Hotel in Baltimore such recognition was given to Morris A. Kasoff. About 600 persons were present to honor him. Mr. Kasoff has just retired as president of the Safety First Club, an organization dedicated to traffic safety, and he has been, and is, very active in many other community organization.

A member of the Maryland House of Delegates, Edgar P. Silver, served as toastmaster. The national anthem was sung by Joseph L. Manning, and the invocation was given by Cantor Saul Z. Hammerman. William J. Ryan, present president of the Safety First Club, welcomed the gathering. The Maryland commissioner of labor and industry, Henry Miller, delivered a heartwarming testimonial based on his years of friendship with Mr. Kasoff and it is my privilege to include this address as follows:

ADDRESS OF HENRY MILLER

In rising to speak this evening, I am reminded of the prayer delivered by a rabbi at another testimonial dinner, he stated: "Oh Lord, inspire the second speaker with eloquence and incisiveness of thought, grant the second speaker the capacity to inspire, to lift and to arouse, endow the third speaker with beauty of thought." He continued in this manner until he covered the entire list and then he concluded, "But Lord, have mercy on the first speaker."

This is my lot this evening, and in keeping with that spirit of prayer I, too, should like to fulfill an ancient Hebrew one, which asks "Give me my flowers in life, when their fragrance and aroma I can enjoy and their beauty is visible to my seeing eye rather than a mark upon my earth."

These flowers of living tribute I offer to a man whom I have been proud to know for all these many years, and 'tho greatness in a man, as in a mountain, requires distance to be seen and appreciated, yet flowers to be understood, must find comprehension in the buds from which they spring. And oh what buds I remember in the life of Mache Kashoff.

For in truth, those seeds prophesied the healthy growth which brought him the honor, dignity, and prestige that now are his due reward.

I deem it an honor and a privilege to have been selected to say a few words on behalf of my friend, Morris Kasoff. Some years ago there was an institution named the Jewish Education Alliance, which was an organization dedicated for the development of young boys so that they may be able to face the rigors of life in later years.

This institution was located in east Baltimore, the birthplace of our honored guest. It is comprised of many clubs with many boys, belonging to them. The boys were all engaged in athletic, social and literary activities and competed against one another, which developed them as men, and enabled them to compete later on in life in a world of unbounding opportunities, yet requiring dogged determination to succeed.

Morris Kashoff was a member of the Standard Club, which was formed and organized in 1922, and was part of the Jewish Educational Alliance. He participated in all of the activities offered and excelled in most of the programs, be it athletic or literary. As a matter of fact, in those years he was a ladies' man, because whenever his club wanted a stag banquet, Mache, as his friends affectionately called him, insisted that we take dates. As usual, he would win out.

As a matter of fact, he even stood out then as an individual being known as the only man who wore a tuxedo with white socks.

As years went on Mache developed a sense of leadership, graduating from the JEA—cum laude. And now, by reason of the human teachings he received at this JEA, he is exhibiting today that leadership which he learned yesterday.

We all know that his story is the story of the modern Horatio Alger, born of poor but humble parents and having to quit school at an early age so that he may work for his food and lodging. He attended night schools; namely, the Baltimore College of Commerce, where he received some of his business training. He then went on up the ladder in the business and communal life of our city where he now is the president of his own company, the Key, Wine & Liquor Co.; on the board of trustees of St. Agnes Hospital, former president of the Safety First Club of Maryland and now Chairman of its Board; Chairman of the Convention Bureau of this city, and a member of many fraternal and charitable organizations, too numerous to mention. During his climb up the ladder of success he also found time to be a wonderful husband, a devoted father and a loving grandfather.

And although he is not a politician, he nevertheless has been responsible for many of our citizens attaining the role of statesmen in this city and State.

He has participated in all programs for the benefit and general welfare of the people of this community.

Mache has endeared himself to his many friends of today, without forgetting his friends of yesterday. The Standard Club which was made up of 25 to 30 young men still meets after an existence of over 40 years. Mache is an important part of that Standard Club, even today, and participates in all of their activities.

In my mind, and I am sure in the minds of all of us gathered here tonight, to pay testimonial to him, we all know that his endeavors for the benefit of the people of this city has earned him the name: "Mr. Baltimore."

I know that this evening of tribute will well be remembered by Mache, not as a completion of good work, but as another milestone in his path of service and dedication to his community and fellowman.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Maryland, J. Millard Tawes, was the principal speaker and presented a leader-in-life-saving plaque to Mr. Kasoff, and also

made him an admiral of the Chesapeake Bay.

In addition to the above named, other guests at the head table included Frank Udoff, U.S. marshal for Maryland; Prof. Theron A. Tompkins, director, Safety Education Center, University of Maryland; Police Commissioner Bernard J. Schmidt; Paul E. Burke, executive director of the Maryland Traffic Safety Commission; Mrs. Edgar P. Silver, wife of the toastmaster; Col. Carey Jarman, superintendent of the Maryland State Police; John R. Jewell, commissioner of motor vehicles; District of Columbia Director of Motor Vehicles George England; State Comptroller Louis L. Goldstein; and our colleagues, George Fallon, Samuel Friedel, and myself.

James H. Darcey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, James H. Darcey was one of the great men of Waterbury.

In his death on February 13, 1964, our city lost one who was a "mover and shaker" in the words of the poet. By this, I mean that he was continuously taking vigorous action, not only for the welfare and progress of the newspapers which he managed, but also for the community of Waterbury and the State of Connecticut.

In his passing, I lost a staunch friend who had been a valued adviser during my whole adult life.

More than this, our city and State lost a man of real stature who through his idealism, his vigor, his foresight and his power of leadership had created many monuments of progress which will last far beyond the lives of present-day citizens of Connecticut.

The Waterbury-Republican, which Jim Darcey managed so successfully over a period of more than 35 years, in its lead editorial paid a graceful and complete tribute to him and I take pleasure in appending that editorial to my remarks as a fitting tribute to Jim Darcey, a great American.

JAMES H. DARCEY

A friend is gone, a man of talent and of motion.

In the death of James H. Darcey, we at the Republican and the American have lost one of the best general managers in the newspaper business. You would have to look for a long time before you found another one like him. You would look a long time before you found another who was quicker or surer with a decision on money policy or advertising procedure or management matters. There weren't many newspaper business executives who could match Jim Darcey for tough-mindedness, for practical acceptance of hard fact, or for fast and imaginative solutions to problems which would floor the ordinary man.

Jim Darcey was the kind of executive who seemed to be moving a mile a minute—even when he was sitting at his desk. He was a fast walker. He talked fast. He thought fast. And he never slowed down, from the day he joined these newspapers in 1920 until the day he packed his briefcase last December and moved up to St. Mary's Hospital so the doctors could check him over.

It took a lot of work to keep this man busy, and his life was filled with the details of enough enterprises for half a dozen ordinary enterprisers. He was busy, on the one hand, with the affairs of St. Mary's Hospital or of the banks he advised. On the other, he was raising money for a church, building another new school for Cheshire, helping the Governor wangle more Federal aid for Connecticut highways, or working to expand the operations of one of the printing or delivery businesses with which he was associated.

Jim Darcey's approach to every enterprise was to make it bigger, to make it move faster, to make it newer or more comprehensive—and more profitable. He was an innovator, an activist, a builder. He never stood still himself. Nothing that he touched stood still.

Most of Jim Darcey's time and energy, however, was devoted to the newspaper business. This was his love and his career. This was where he fulfilled himself. This was his element.

We shall miss his brisk administration here. It will not be easy to fill in behind the two busy telephones on the desk that was his. We shall miss his friendship, his cheerful confidence, his wit and his assurance.

We are sure that the whole community will miss Jim Darcey, too. For his decisiveness, his positive approach to public affairs, his creative ability in the realm of business—all these qualities were given generously to improve the institutions and the communities where he lived and worked.

Centennial of Heroic Death of Col. Geza Mihalotzy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this country has many heroes, whose anniversaries pass by without any special notice. However, we have alert Americans, who make an effort to pay tribute to these deserved heroes. In my district, Mr. John C. Sciranka, American-Slovak journalist has called to the attention recently the three such American heroes, which were publicized in the Passaic-Clifton Herald News, and also the "Katolicky Sokol."

Mr. Sciranka writes:

On this President Abraham Lincoln's 155th birthday, among countless humanitarian deeds which he performed, in tribute to this emancipator, we wish to single out the following which are often overlooked by historians.

The first is about Col. John B. Turchin, who was born in the Don Province, old Russia, under the name of Ivan B. Turchineff on January 23, 1823. He was an officer in the czar's army. Owing to his liberal views, he left Russia and came to the United States, where under the name of Turchin he, as an engineer, worked for the Illinois Central Railroad, where he achieved a high position. However, when President Lincoln needed his services, he joined the Union Army and performed great deeds for the northern States.

Colonel Turchin's wife left her comfortable home and spent a great deal of time organizing women into nursing units. She was often called as the "Florence Nightingale of the Civil War." She went on the battlefields and nursed the wounded soldiers.

Those Americans of Slavonic descent, who wish to pay honor to foreign leaders of their nationalities, should remember these two forgotten humanitarians.

Colonel Turchin was condemned by the military court for releasing the colored slaves before the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation. When the matter was brought up before the Commander in Chief, Lincoln not only cleared Colonel Turchin but also commended him for having courage to act as he did.

The third deed for which the American Slovaks are grateful to Lincoln is his sanction of the Lincoln Slavonic Riflemen, organized on February 4, 1861, by Col. Geza Mihalotzy, who fell a century ago in the battle at Chattanooga, Tenn., often referred to as Fort Mihalotzy. Had Lincoln lived, Mihalotzy would have been brigadier general and, no doubt, Colonel Turchin would have also been elevated. Let us remember these forgotten heroes on Lincoln's birthday, when we pay our tribute to the great Emancipator.

And Mr. Sciranka wrote the following article on Colonel Mihalotzy:

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF HEROIC DEATH OF COL. GEZA MIHALOTZY

(By John C. Sciranka)

On March 11, 1964, we pause as Americans to pay our tribute to a hero who played a great role in the American Civil War. He is Col. Geza Mihalotzy, born in Hungary of Slovak parentage in the county of Zemplin, the same county that was also the birthplace of famous Joseph Pulitzer, great American newspaperman. Colonel Mihalotzy was mortally wounded on March 11, 1864, and March 11 marks the 100th anniversary of his heroic death.

Colonel Mihalotzy escaped his native country after a revolution of the serfs and after many obstacles came to the United States. He was an able organizer and on February 4, 1861, sent this petition from Chicago, Ill., to President-elect Abraham Lincoln:

(The letter is from the Hertz A. Lincoln collection, Congressional Library, Washington, D.C.)

CHICAGO, *February 4, 1861.*

To the Honorable A. LINCOLN.

DEAR SIR: We have organized a company of Militia in this city, composed of men of Hungarian, Bohemian, and Slavonic origin. Being the first company formed in the United States of said nationalities we respectfully ask leave of your Excellency to entitle ourselves "Lincoln Riflemen," of Slavonic origin.

If you will kindly sanction our use of your name, we will endeavor to do honor to it, whenever we may be called to perform active service.

Respectfully in behalf of the Company,

GEZA MIHALOTZY, *Captain.*

I cheerfully grant the request above made.

A. LINCOLN.

It is interesting to note in connection with the above letter that a few days after his answer to the above-mentioned letter, Lincoln left Springfield, Ill., for Washington for his inauguration. Even at that time it was known that the Southern States wanted to secede from the whole; South Carolina had already seceded in December, and after her, there was to be formed an independent federacy with six other States.

There were no open hostilities as was observed by historians, since the cannons of Fort Sumpter at Charleston thundered later, the 14th of April, but Geza Mihalotzy and

his Hungarian, Bohemian, and Slovak compatriots even then had organized volunteers among whom were the following whose names have been preserved: Geza Mihalotzy, Julius Kuna, Gustav Kovac, Sandor Jekelfalussy, Frank Langfield, and Joseph Kis. That was the first volunteer company in America composed solely of immigrants. This company later gave rise to the 24th Regiment of Illinois Militia. Mihalotzy became its colonel and on March 11, 1864, he fell in a battle near Chattanooga, Tenn. And Fort Chattanooga is often mentioned as Fort Mihaltzy in older histories.

Rev. John Porubsky, noted American Slovak historian who died in 1953 in Scranton, Pa., mentions in his writings that President Lincoln had previous connections with the Slovaks of Illinois, especially Chicago. It is certain that Julius Kuna often conversed with the Great Emancipator. Julius Stachel Szamvald from the county of Spis, Slovakia, was in the immediate vicinity when Lincoln gave his historical Gettysburg address. Later Stachel was made a general and even received the Congressional Medal of Honor. No doubt that Slovaks and other Slavs were in the majority in Lincoln's Riflemen, since they chose the name "Lincoln Riflemen of Slavonic Origin." And please, let us remember that this happened in 1861.

Now let us look at the volumes of War of Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Volume 32, page 102, contains a letter written by Colonel Mihalotzy to the general of his brigade. It is headed this way: "Headquarters, 24th Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Chattanooga, Tenn., January 24, 1864." The letter is about 2 pages and is signed, "G. Mihalotzy, colonel, 24th Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Commanding Expedition, Maj. Gen. J. M. Palmer, commanding 14th Corps." Colonel Mihalotzy is mentioned in volume 3, page 45; volume 10, pages 47–49; volume 16, page 637; volume 23, pages 411, 438; Second Brigade, volume 30, part 3, page 273; volume 31, part 2, page 791; volume 31, part 3, page 554.

Colonel Mihalotzy came to Chicago after the collapse of a revolution in his homeland in 1848. He enlisted in 1861 in the 124th Illinois Volunteers (first Hecker Regiment), and on the resignation of Colonel Hecker, a few weeks later, he was promoted to the colonelcy. "A trained soldier, he served with gallantry and distinction but was fatally wounded at Buzzard's Roost February 24, 1864, dying at Chattanooga March 11, 1864." (This sketch was copied from the Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois by Newton Bateman, LL.D., and others, vol. 1, p. 374, Chicago, Ill., 1926.)

The following item was copied from the War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series 1, volume 32, part 1, reports, page 453:

"About 12 o'clock at night (February 25, 1864) the rebel pickets advanced and there was considerable firing, in which some men were killed and wounded. Among the latter was Col. Geza Mihalotzy, the gallant colonel of the 24th Illinois. I regret to report that he has since died.

"Very respectfully,

"R. W. JOHNSON,
"Brigadier General, Commanding Division.

"Maj. D. W. NORTON,
"Acting Assistant Adjutant General."

In a letter in regard to the Chickamagua campaign we have the following paragraph:

"Commanding officers, Cols. H. A. Hambright and G. Mihalotzy, Lt. Cols. G. B. Bingham and H. C. Hobart, and Lt. David Flansburg, with their staff officers, are entitled to great praise for their coolness and bravery exhibited during these protracted engagements.

"JOHN C. STARWEATHER,
"Brigadier General, Commanding.

"Capt. B. H. POLK,
"Assistant Adjutant General, First Division."

(Copies from the War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series 1, vol. 30, pt. 1, p. 302.)

In all the official records of these volumes, Col. Geza Mihalotzy is mentioned as colonel of the 24th Illinois Regiment, therefore the statement in his obituary copied from the Illinois Encyclopdia in which he was mentioned colonel of the 124th Regiment is incorrect, for the official records must be right.

Col. Geza Mihalotzy is buried at the National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., in section A, grave No. 439.

On the 100th anniversary of the heroic death of this great soldier of Slovakian parentage, born and educated in Hungary, we think of his enslaved compatriots in Slovakia and Hungary, who need today men of courage like Col. Geza Mihalotzy.

And in this great land of opportunity and freedom, when we pause to pay our tribute to Colonel Mihalotzy, we are reminded of another colonel, the Honorable John Slezak, also born of Slovak parentage in his native country, which was then Hungary, who came to this country at the age of 18, who enlisted in World War I as private and during World War II served as colonel and whom President Eisenhower appointed to the office of U.S. Assistant Secretary of the Army and elevated him in January 1954 to the office of Under Secretary of the Army. Col. John Slezak comes from the State of Illinois, the town of Sycamore, where he is loved and respected. It is men like Colonels Mihalotzy and Slezak who will guard this Nation against its enemies and see that the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people will not perish from this earth.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE, U.S. Representative from Illinois, paid tribute to Colonel Mihalotzy in the U.S. Congress at the writer's request on May 19, 1954 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 24, 1954, p. A3798) at the time of the 90th anniversary of his death, which we acknowledge with sincere thanks and appreciation.

We also add with justified pride that U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy paid the following tribute to Colonel Mihalotzy in his address during the Slet (Meet) of the Slovak Catholic Sokol on Sunday, July 14, 1963, at Youngstown, Ohio, when he also delivered a message from his brother, the President of the United States, the late John F. Kennedy:

"The Slovak Company of the Union Army in the Civil War was famed for its daring and fortitude. Geza Mihalotzy, an officer of that company who died of battle wounds in 1864, is still a legendary figure in the annals of that war. * * *"

We conclude our tribute to Colonel Mihalotzy on this, his centennial of heroic death with a petition, which was sent to the U.S. Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, who recently approved the naming of the 28th missile-firing submarine *General Casimir Pulaski*, a noted Polish count, who became a hero of the American Revolution, which was also the 53d nuclear-powered submarine, that at a next opportunity a nuclear submarine or some other defense weapon be named in honor of Colonel Mihalotzy, to commemorate the centennial of his heroic death.

Big Business?—Union Chief's An Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a writer once described the atmosphere surrounding labor-management relations as a "psychology of siege." Other commentators, yielding to the common sin of oversimplification, have emphasized the wide chasm between the two worlds of labor and business—the disparity of interests, of background, of training and perspective which suggests that "never the twain shall meet."

It happens occasionally, however, that close observers of the men who lead these two great economic forces produce a levelheaded reminder that those two worlds are not as far apart as many suppose, that the twain can and do meet.

An excellent example appears in a recent article by Mr. Gene Roberts in the Detroit Free Press. That article contains a summary of the remarkable career of Herschel J. Womack, secretary-treasurer and chief executive officer of Local 876 of the Retail Employees Union.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we can all profit from this healthy reminder that a position of leadership—in business, in labor and elsewhere—has its roots not so much in the unique traditions of a major group as in the familiar qualities of hard work, dedication, and valuable preparation for the responsibilities of leadership. Here, in effect, is a fusion of the two worlds of business and labor, and I commend this interesting article to the attention of my colleagues.

BIG BUSINESS?—UNION CHIEF'S AN EXPERT

(By Gene Roberts)

Herchel J. Womack lived the life of a harried executive in 1963.

He planned a $58,000 advertising budget, fretted over an expanding waistline, survived a 50-day strike, attended board meetings at a once-a-week clip and reported at year's end that revenues were ahead of the previous 12-month period.

A hard year for a businessman?

Perhaps. But Womack is a union official—secretary-treasurer and chief executive officer of local 376 of the Retail Store Employees Union.

He took over the local in 1957 when it had fewer than 9,000 members and built it in 2½ years to 23,000 members. He then called it the "world's largest white-collar local."

This was a short-lived distinction, however. In 1960, his local gave away 8,000 members to launch 4 other locals in Michigan. The union since has replaced the loss partially by bringing in 3,000 recruits.

Womack outlined his organization formula over lunch recently while alternately toying with his martini glass and pulling at black-rimmed, executive-type spectacles.

Essentially, he admitted without a blush, he follows "sound business principles."

Last year, for example, his union spent $58,000 on an advertising campaign designed to encourage shopping at stores in which the union is the bargaining agent.

"This makes sense" he said. "If our stores do good business, then they can afford to pay better wages."

Womack also worries about the union's public image. He likes to see his members play a role in civic affairs and participate in the AFL–CIO community.

"We've got to create a good impression with the public," he said. "I went into a supermarket recently and found one girl who thought she could close up her cash register promptly at quitting time, even when she had customers waiting.

"I told her we wouldn't stand for it. It hurts the union and it hurts business.

"Now, I don't mean I'm opposed to the 40-hour week. I'd like to see an ever-shorter workweek. But if it takes a couple of more minutes to be polite—well, it's worth it in the long run."

Personnel, said Womack, is as important to a union as it is to business. He's increased his local's full-time staff to 50 from the 17 he inherited in 1957, and he sees no reason why union officials can't draw executive salaries.

His own pay is not meager. He gets $22,800 a year from the local, plus allowances and an expense account.

Womack's union career reads like a page from a businessman's biography.

Unlike the old-style labor leader who rose to the top office in his local after serving an apprenticeship as shop steward, Womack was transferred into power much like a department store manager.

In Detroit in 1957, local 876 was alined closely with the Teamsters Union. It even had its executive offices in the Teamsters' Trumbull Avenue office complex, built by Teamster President Jimmy Hoffa.

Womack's international union wanted its Michigan local to be an independent organization. It placed the union under a trusteeship and transferred Womack, who was the eeship and transferred Womack, who was then the international's representative in California to head it.

Womack—his members call him "Hersch"—since has been elected to a 2-year and a 3-year term as secretary-treasurer.

In Detroit, Womack's influence rose with his local's membership. Already he is a member of the executive boards of the Wayne County and State councils of the AFL–CIO, a member of the Municipal Parking Authority, and president of the Union Label-Service Trades Council of Detroit.

The major test of his union's strength came only 6 months ago when he called a strike at Montgomery Ward stores in the Detroit area. It was the first strike the 53-year-old unionist had called since signing his first card in Los Angeles in 1937.

After 50 days of picketing, union and management reached a settlement that gave local 876 gains in wages and fringe benefits, a union shop, and dues checkoff provisions.

This year, Womack's union wants to solidify its strength in Detroit-area foodstores by bringing members under a single contract.

Womack was "born" a trade unionist.

"When I was growing up in Missouri, my father was a lead miner, and helped organize the mines," he said.

Later, when his father moved to the west coast to become a steam engineer, Womack followed and took a job as a bagger in a Los Angeles supermarket.

In 1937, soon after joining the union, he was hired as a $35-a-week organizer for the Los Angeles local. Two years later he became local president.

"Except for about 2 years, when I went into business for myself, I've been a full-time union man ever since," Womack said.

He returned to the union, brimming with ideas he borrowed from business.

He's still borrowing.

Armed Forces Help in a Civil Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a blizzard of immense proportions recently swept across the Texas Panhandle, the district I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives, piling up snow on the level to a depth of 25 inches and more. Drifting of this new fallen snow caused enormous drifts and it was virtually impossible for ranchers in some sections of the Panhandle to transport feed to their starving cattle.

In this emergency, which threatened to result in severe losses of cattle, the Army and the Air Force came to the assistance of National Guard units based in the Panhandle. An aerial hay drop from C–119 flying boxcars was organized and executed, more than 2,200 bales of hay were dropped to snowbound cattle in isolated pastures, and as a result the loss of cattle was held to a minimum.

I am proud to pay deserved tribute to the men of our armed services who participated in this mission. I described the operation and its success in my weekly newsletter to my constituents, and I include it in the RECORD as a tribute to the officers and men who served so well:

DEAR FELLOW TEXAN: When I first received word that a blizzard had begun in the Panhandle, I knew that human lives might be endangered and that thousands of cattle might be stranded without feed in the driving, drifting snow. I telephoned my friend Maj. Gen. Selden Simpson in Amarillo and offered my help should the National Guard division he commands—the famous 36th Division—require the help of the U.S. Army or Air Force in alleviating distress. General Simpson said he would keep me advised of the situation. We both recognized that an airdrop of cattle feed might be necessary before the storm abated.

Late Thursday night, General Simpson telephoned to inform me that Panhandle ranchers, particularly in Gray County, feared their herds would suffer heavy losses unless feed could be delivered to them. Blizzard-bound cattle had been without feed since the previous Monday, and General Simpson said losses would mount rapidly unless feed could be gotten to them within 36 hours. An airdrop of feed—a "haydrop"—appeared necessary, he said. He suggested that cargo helicopters might be employed and said that men from Panhandle units of the 36th Division stood ready to load the aircraft and mark drop zones.

I then conferred with Lt. Gen. Carl H. Jark, the commanding general of the 4th Army at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. General Jark well understands the problems that can develop on the plains when a heavy snow storm strikes, and he promised immediate assistance in planning and organizing a hay drop to the stranded cattle. The general assigned the duty of working out the details to the 4th Army's young operations officer, Maj. Conrad K. Hausman. The job was one for the Army and the Army area command because the Defense Department has designated the Army as the action agent for coordinating the emergency assistance of all services when problems arise within the continental United States.

Major Hausman obviously relishes such assignments—not only because they provide a means by which the Army can be of direct assistance to American citizens but also because planning and executing such operations provide good training for more warlike emergencies.

Working closely with General Jark, Major Hausman quickly determined that the Air National Guard in Texas was not equipped for the task. The Texas ANG has fighter aircraft and a few reconnaisance helicopters but no cargo aircraft. Major Hausman contacted the 4th Air Force Reserve Region to determine the status of Reserve air crews which might be coming on active duty for training or which might be on emergency call. He and General Jark had determined that the most suitable aircraft for the hay drop mission were C–119's, the old flying boxcars, and such planes were based at Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, and Ellington Air Force Base, Houston. Major Hausman lined up crews for four C–119's at Ellington Air Force Base, home base of the 924th Squadron of the 446th Troop Carrier Wing. Crews were alerted and Major Hausman messaged headquarters in Washington for the necessary high-level approval. That was quick in coming, and at the Pentagon the people who knew of the plans for the operation dubbed it "The Case of the Hungry Cows."

Meanwhile, General Jark's staff members were in contact with General Simpson and also with me and with Maj. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith, the commanding general at Amarillo Air Force Base. All was in readiness for the planes to fly from Houston to Amarillo to begin loading hay—but as of Friday afternoon not enough hay had been rounded up. While waiting for the hay to be accumulated, General Simpson reported to me, he was dispatching National Guardsmen in trucks to go to the ranches to see if they could push through to the pastures.

At noon Saturday, the four planes of the 924th Squadron reached Amarillo Air Force Base and hay was loaded aboard. Through that afternoon and on into Sunday afternoon, the wonderful crewmen of the 924th flew sortie after sortie over 5 Panhandle counties, dropping more than 2,200 bales of hay to the cattle below. So hungry were the cattle that as the planes swung around for a second pass over the fields, the men aboard could see the cattle beginning to eat hay dropped to them moments before. General Simpson reported to me that the operation was highly successful. "The ranchers were 100 percent enthusiastic about it," he said. "It saved their necks." The good news that came this week was that the air drop helped reduce cattle losses from the storm far below the loss experienced in the 1957 blizzard.

To General Jark and Major Hausman, General Simpson, General Monteith, and their staffs—and to the flying crewmen of the 924th Squadron at Ellington—my heartiest congratulations and thanks for a job well done.

In Memoriam of John F. Kennedy and Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two truly moving tributes paid in memory of the late President, John F. Kennedy, and our beloved colleague and friend, Francis E. Walter, as they appear in the 1963 annual report by Mr. William F. Jones, president of the Easton National Bank and Trust Co., of Easton, Pa., and by Messrs. Hubert J. Horan, Jr., chairman of the board, James D. Henderson, vice chairman of the board, and J. Harrison Jones, president of the Broad Street Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

The first of these memorial tributes reads as follows:

It is with regret we record the passing on May 31, 1963, of one of our oldest directors from point of service. The Honorable Francis E. Walter, former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, a director of this bank since January 12, 1932, served with dignity, loyalty, and selflessness. His devotion to the affairs of the bank will be long and gratefully remembered.

The second tribute is as follows:

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three will always be remembered as the year in which a youthful, courageous, and very popular President was assassinated without rhyme or reason. President Kennedy was a man of great good will and a real American.

Who will ever forget the picture of the President and Mrs. Kennedy, their faces radiant with happiness, greeting the crowd at the Dallas Airport, and the picture taken the same day of Mrs. Kennedy standing on the steps of the hospital where the President had died, her face a picture of misery and her dress splattered with her husband's blood?

Let all of us in the words of the liturgy of the church of which President Kennedy was a communicant, say "Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him."

In spite of our sorrow we still must look to the future. We must pick up the pieces, rebuild our world, and go forward.

A kind fate aided and abetted by John F. Kennedy, picked Lyndon B. Johnson as the Democratic candidate for Vice President. For this we can indeed be grateful.

President Johnson by reason of experience and temperament is eminently qualified to carry the burden thrust upon him.

In 1963 our country, as well as our bank, suffered a great loss in the death of Congressman Francis E. Walter. Mr. Walter had been a director of our bank since 1946 and a director of Mid-City Bank and Trust Co. until its merger with our company in December 1946. Mr. Walter had been a vice president of our bank since 1949 and was most helpful by his sound advice and intellectual integrity. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Walter was an extremely able lawyer and had been a Member of Congress from 1933 to the date of his death. He was one of the most powerful men in Congress, highly respected by Republicans and Democrats. He was a Deputy Speaker of the House (appointed by Speaker Rayburn), chairman of the Democratic caucus, chairman of the Immigration Committee, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Most important, he was sincerely loved by all who knew him.

Legislative Policies of the American Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked the legislative representative of the American Medical Association to furnish me a review of the position of the association on legislation in the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

I asked for this information in view of my deep interest in the welfare and health of our people and at the same time recognizing the importance of this great organization and the influence it has on the American public. For the information of all Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I insert, at this point in the RECORD, the review of the policies of the AMA as submitted to me:

REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE POLICIES OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION: 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

During the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the American Medical Association submitted 25 statements to congressional committees. Twenty-two of these statements were concerned with 15 subjects on which legislation was introduced. Of the 15 subjects, the association, in the main, favored 10, opposed 4, and partially opposed 1. Three of the subjects opposed by the association were also opposed by the Kennedy administration. The three remaining statements submitted by the association were of an informational character.

The following is a brief report, by subject, of the policy statements of the American Medical Association.

AGED

H.R. 297 and others: Office for senior citizens in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

AMA position: Opposed the establishment of a separate Federal agency for aging as being unnecessary in that the activities of the Federal agencies concerned with this subject are presently being coordinated by an existing Office of Aging in the Welfare Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by the President's Council on Aging.

Administration position: Opposed the establishment of a separate office of aging.

AIR POLLUTION

H.R. 6518: Clean Air Act.

AMA position: Favored all provisions except that which authorized court action by the Federal Government. The association believes existing judicial machinery offers an adequate remedy.

Administration position: Favored a modified Federal court action provision.

CIVIL DEFENSE

H.R. 8200: Construction of public fallout shelters.

AMA position: Favored the principle; suggested amendments to the bill.

Administration position: Favored.

H.R. 5517: Civil defense appropriations.

AMA position: Favored appropriations to complete shelter program and for stocking of shelters.

Administration position: Favored.

DOCTOR DRAFT

H.R. 2438: Extension of Doctor Draft Act.

AMA position: Favored, with the recommendation that the extension be for a shorter period.

Administration position: Favored.

EDUCATION

H.R. 12: Health Professions Educational Assistance Act.

AMA position: Favored construction provisions. Opposed the loan provisions on the basis that funds for this purpose are available from other sources, including the association's medical education loan guarantee program.

Administration position: Favored.

HEALTH CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3920: Hospital Insurance Act of 1963.

AMA position: Opposed as unnecessary, inordinately expensive, and a threat to the health care of all Americans.

Administration position: Favored.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND RETARDATION

S. 1576: Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act.

AMA position: Favored the construction provisions. Opposed the initial staffing of community mental health centers in the belief that this is a community responsibility and that if reliance were placed on a Federal subsidy for staffing, the role of the Federal Government as a provider of funds would not easily be terminated.

Administration position: Favored.

H.R. 7544: Maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments.

AMA position: Favored; suggested minor amendments.

Administration position: Favored.

MILITARY PHYSICIANS' PAY

H.R. 5555: Increased incentive pay for military physicians and dentists.

AMA position: Favored.

Administration position: Favored.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

H.R. 2410: Public Health Service reorganization.

AMA position: Favored, with a suggested amendment relating to retention of the Surgeon General's authority to appoint the Director of the National Institutes of Health and other bureau chiefs from the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

Administration position: Favored.

SEAMEN

S. 978: PHS medical care for persons engaged or self-employed on U.S. vessels.

AMA position: Opposed on the basis that such care is not justified either by need or by any special relationship of the beneficiaries to the Federal Government. The association believes such care should be provided by voluntary health insurance.

Administration position: Favored.

TAXATION

H.R. 8363: Medical expense deduction provisions.

AMA Position: Favored elimination of 1 percent floor on drug expenses. Opposed 5 percent floor on deductions. Suggested liberalizing amendments.

Administration position: Favored.

VETERANS

H.R. 8009: Nursing home care for veterans.

AMA position: Opposed because most beneficiaries would be veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

Administration position: Opposed.

WATER POLLUTION

S. 649: Water Pollution Control Act amendments.

AMA position: Opposed transfer of program administration from the Public Health Service to a new agency on the basis that it would be detrimental to the health of the public and would not result in an improved program.

Administration position: Opposed the establishment of a new agency.

Practical Economy Contrasted With Theoretical Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board has before it a proceeding to determine the feasibility of establishing an area airport at Toddy, N.C., to replace local air service now in effect at Rocky Mount, Kinston, and Goldsboro, N.C. An editorial in the Goldsboro News-Argus clearly states the

central point at issue and reveals some interesting economic data. I commend this editorial as interesting reading not only in connection with this specific proceeding, but to all Members concerned about practical economy as contrasted with theoretical savings:

WE COULD SAVE $1,000 BY SPENDING $58,500

Any day now, the Civil Aeronautics Board should be making its decision regarding a proposed central airport serving eastern North Carolina.

There is no reason to suspect that the CAB will do anything but reaffirm the repeated findings and decisions of the past.

They are that the central airport idea—as desirable as it might be in some locations—simply is not feasible for eastern North Carolina if the communities are to have adequate commercial air service.

Hearings were held recently in Washington at the request of Greenville and some other communities not now receiving air service. Eastern North Carolina must be concerned over the lack of service to such communities as Greenville. Such service is important to their future growth and industrial development.

But a plan that would result in inadequate service for all communities is not the solution to the problem.

Greenville has maintained that if the service were concentrated at a central field at Toddy, 80 percent of the traffic now generated at the surrounding cities would migrate there.

Piedmont Airlines says its surveys have shown that only 25 percent of the traffic would be retained. The remainder would either use other methods of transportation or go to more distant air terminals where better scheduling would be available.

There have been many inconsistencies in the argument over a central airport.

The bureau of economic regulation—the only disinterested agency to our knowledge that has favored the central airport—says substantial savings would be realized by the Post Office Department if all the airmail were taken to one instead of three airports.

The Post Office Department made a study. It found that it would, indeed, save $1,000 a year in air transportation costs. But it would cost an additional $58,500 a year in messenger service getting the mail from the central airport to the surrounding post offices.

Eastern North Carolina communities have spent many thousands of dollars in their effort to get commercial air service. Because the issue continues to be unresolved after years of study and hearings, they are spending many thousands more to retain the service they have won. Facilities which are planned to take care of the service are held in abeyance while a final decision is reached.

The Civil Aeronautics Board and the communities which challenge the service which every examiner has found to be proper and most feasible, should take into consideration the expense—in time and money—and the delay and inconvenience of the failure to reach and accept a final decision.

Hopefully the CAB will lose no time in reaffirming the repeated findings of competent examiners over the years. And hopefully it will let the communities that now have service concentrate on developing more air traffic rather than having to constantly expend energies and funds arguing an issue which already has been settled.

Veterinary Medicine's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial February 1, the Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City called attention to the important role of veterinary medicine and the mounting demand for services in this field.

My bill, H.R. 9820, which is a companion measure to that of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] would authorize Federal matching grants for construction of the veterinary school facilities so badly needed if the estimated demand of some 47,000 veterinarians by 1980, more than twice the present number, is to be met.

The Daily Oklahoman's editorial follows:

VETERINARY MEDICINE'S ROLE

Although its role in protecting public health and aiding our economy surpasses the ordinary conception, veterinary medicine has not received all the attention it should. We are fortunate in having at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, one of the 5 veterinary medical schools of 16 States making up the Southern Regional Education Board.

Many urban dwellers think of veterinary medicine mostly in terms of treatment for dogs and cats. Perhaps these people are aware generally of veterinary inspection activities in packing and other food processing plants engaged in interstate commerce. Yet small animal practice is done by only 17 percent of licensed veterinarians in the Nation. Some of them deal with other small animals as well. There are only 5,500 modern doctors of veterinary medicine in the southern region and they work in many professional areas. There is a demand for many more. The goal is 50,000 by 1980.

Through fieldwork, research, and private practice and the U.S. Public Health Service, veterinarians have contributed to progress against hookworm, food poisoning, cancer, and heart disease. They have aided in fighting malaria, yellow fever, and tick-borne typhus, all of which diseases have been severe plagues of the South, although their eventual elimination can be foreseen.

By illustration, there was a recent joint battle in a southern State against a puzzling respiratory outbreak that affected many townspeople. Teamwork disclosed this was caused by sheepshearers who contracted the original illness from sheep infected with anthrax. One researcher, working on cardiac problems in dogs, obtained information valuable in the treatment of pulmonary hypertension in man. Veterinarians serve also as epidemiologists where there are many cross-currents affecting both human and animal lives. Many veterinarians are engaged in research for governmental and private agencies.

With all their other activities more than half of all veterinarians are engaged in agricultural work, primarily livestock disease prevention, care and elimination. Aside from meat inspection, or milk and dairy product investigation, the most direct benefit from this to the general public is economic. In Oklahoma alone it amounts to thousands of dollars annually.

The school of veterinary medicine at Oklahoma State was started in 1947 because of a popular demand by livestock interests. This is not a brief or simple course. The average student who earns a degree has had 6 years of schooling before he acquires a State license to practice. Two years of preveterinary study is followed by 4 years of professional study. The attrition rate is relatively high. Oklahoma draws students for its school from many States. Placement is no problem.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, several times over the last several months I have commented on the urban renewal program, each time clearly indicating my support for it. I have taken this position because I believe that community improvement through the elimination of slum and blight and the causes thereof is essential to the public welfare.

I have said and I repeat that, in my opinion, the Federal Government has a responsibility to help local communities in their efforts to redevelop slum areas, including downtown areas.

Last week Commissioner William L. Slayton of the Urban Renewal Administration was in my home city of Rochester to address the chamber of commerce. While there he had an opportunity to visit what he said was one of the finest of all downtown renewal projects that he has seen—the Midtown Plaza project.

What makes this project unique is the fact that it was undertaken and completed without any Federal financial assistance.

Without the excellent cooperation between private enterprise and local government, this multimillion-dollar shopping and business complex would not have been possible. However, there are times and situations when even this type of cooperation is not adequate to enable the locality and its citizens to do the job in urban renewal that they want and need to do. Thus it is that Rochester now has in planning or underway five federally assisted urban renewal projects having a total grant reservation or allocation of over $28 million.

Like Midtown Plaza, these projects are vitally important to Rochester, and they also represent close cooperation between private enterprise and governmental action. It is obvious that wherever there is a successful project there also is this type of cooperation, and where there is this cooperation there also will be a

successful project. This was the theme of Commissioner Slayton's message to the chamber of commerce, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, COMMISSIONER, URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AT THE ROCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ROCHESTER, N.Y., FEBRUARY 14, 1964

I am happy to be here today because it gives me an opportunity to discharge a year-old obligation. A year ago I was scheduled to speak in Rochester, but urgent business prevented my trip. So here I am on my very first visit to your city.

What I have seen here impresses me greatly. Your imaginative and successful midtown plaza has received justifiable national acclaim. Your four federally assisted urban renewal projects show a diversity and practicality that augur well for sound contribution to the future growth and health of your city. And your undertaking of a community renewal program, the timetable for renewal achievement in Rochester, is clear evidence of the comprehensive view that your people take of urban renewal and its possibilities.

And I am happy to be here as a guest of your chamber of commerce. There seems to be an effort, eminently lacking in success thus far, I am glad to say, to prove some sort of incompatibility between urban renewal and the social and economic philosophies of business organiaztions, such as chambers of commerce. Yet compatibility, I believe, is rather the watchword here today, as it is in so many other American cities.

But more of that later. I would like to speak first of the urban renewal program, and give you some idea of its accomplishments. Then I would like to show you how closely we on the Government side have been hewing to the line laid down by Congress in the Housing Act of 1949: "Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can."

Now, how did the urban renewal program start? Beginning in the 1930's, it became quite apparent to students of the urban scene that our cities were deteriorating at an alarming rate. Exhaustive studies carried out by the Federal Government and voluminous testimony from local businessmen and officials outlined quite clearly the problems involved and indicated the necessary solutions. The findings are still quite valid today.

To a great extent, the growth and persistence of blight has its roots in the inability of private enterprise to rebuild—without aid—the deteriorating parts of the city to meet changing needs and functions of urban areas. There are two basic obstacles. First, the entrepreneur faces the problem of assembling a number of parcels, under diverse ownerships, in order to create a tract large enough to support efficient, modern development and at the same time withstand the effects of adjacent blight. One or two "holdouts" can and sometimes do block his plans.

The second obstacle is the tremendously high cost. The acquisition costs to a private developer would often reflect inflated, speculative values. They would also include the costs of existing structures which, though deteriorating and obsolete, do have an economic value that becomes a significant item of cost when they are demolished to make way for new buildings.

The answer to these obstacles provided by Congress was title I of the Housing Act of 1949. Briefly, it provided a system of loans and grants and technical assistance to communities to help them undertake urban renewal.

By enacting title I, Congress clearly indicated that the clearance and redevelopment of blighted areas was a national objective, that private enterprise could not do it alone, that public power to assemble land was necessary, and that the public costs should be shared by Federal and local governments. In providing for a Federal sharing in the costs, the Congress recognized two hard facts. First, our cities were financially strapped—as they continue to be—by the squeeze between rising municipal expenditures and limited taxable resources. Secondly, and I think equally important, the Congress acknowledged that urban blight was a national problem and that the afflicted cities could not be expected to solve it alone. The human, social, and economic costs of slums spread far beyond municipal boundaries.

At the outset, urban renewal was, by law, oriented toward residential renewal. However, in 1954 Congress made an important change. It authorized the use of 10 percent of Federal urban renewal grant funds for nonresidential projects. This was gradually increased to 30 percent in the Housing Act of 1961.

This increase in the authority to undertake nonresidential projects illustrates an important trend in the urban renewal process. It has reflected a growing awareness of the importance of using renewal to revitalize the economic base and the taxable resources of cities, large and small. It has recognized the contribution of urban renewal in creating better job opportunities as well as in improving housing conditions. These two objectives of renewal are interdependent.

Now, where do we stand today? About 1,500 urban renewal projects are being carried out by nearly 750 cities. Of the original $4 billion authorized by Congress for urban renewal grants, all but about $200 million has been committed.

We are now beginning to see some substantial results from the urban renewal program. About 30 square miles of land have been acquired and approximately 10 square miles have been committed to redevelopers. A good deal of construction has already taken place.

You can see the results in such places as Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores in Chicago, the apartment houses and shopping center and townhouses in Southwest Washington, the impressive office buildings in Constitution Plaza in Hartford, the shopping center adjacent to downtown Lowell, Mass., the new downtown motel in Norfolk, the stunning office building in Charles Center in downtown Baltimore, the sports arena with the movable roof in downtown Pittsburgh, the new downtown complex in New Haven, to mention a very few.

But let's get down to cases. One of the basic worries of cities is how to increase their diminishing tax bases. With the flight of middle and upper income families to the suburbs, followed to some degree by trade and industry, cities have been squeezed between a rising volume of welfare services and decreasing tax revenues. One of the objectives of urban renewal has always been to sustain and increase the capacity of cities to meet these rising needs—and its impact thus far upon taxable values is noteworthy. Significant increases are already evident. After redevelopment, assessed values are averaging more than five times the values before redevelopment.

For example:

The redevelopment of Southwest Washington, D.C., is expected to produce about $4.8 million annually in taxes as compared to about $600,000 previously, an increase of eight times in annual tax revenue.

The Gratiot project in Detroit resulted in taxes increasing from $70,000 before redevelopment to $512,000 after, and this occurred despite a 31-percent decrease in the taxable land area.

Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago has stated that the annual tax revenues from 27 redevelopment projects in his city are expected to increase from $2.3 million to $4.8 million.

Calexico, Calif., was the first city in that State to complete an urban renewal project. Before redevelopment, the 21-acre project paid $4,400 annually in property taxes. According to our latest information, the same area is now paying approximately $16,400.

Prior to redevelopment, annual taxes on the properties in the Norfolk, Va., downtown project were $165,650. It is estimated that when redevelopment is completed, the annual taxes will amount to $375,000.

The Clinton Park project in Oakland, Calif., a rehabilitation and conservation project, resulted in nearly $7 million worth of new construction, and tax revenues from the project area rose from $49,000 to $195,000 upon completion.

These tax revenue increases were obtained directly from land and improvements within the urban renewal project areas. It is our experience that urban renewal also generates new investment outside the project area—particularly the fringes—and that this too results in higher assessed valuations and tax levies. However, as yet we have no way of measuring this increase. It is also significant that the tax revenue increases occurred despite the fact that in most of these projects urban renewal resulted also in an increase in the proportion of tax-exempt land—parks, playgrounds, and so on—in the redeveloped areas.

Where do such tax revenues come from? For the most part, from private enterprise. An article in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal describes how various communities are utilizing urban renewal to retain older industries and attract new ones. The article states, for example, "* * * cities have recognized that companies can't be kept in obsolete, cramped plant they have outgrown, but must be helped to find new land on which they can put up roomier and more modern buildings. * * * To get the land, many cities have begun federally assisted urban renewal projects." The article goes on to tell how businessmen in various cities are teaming up with their local officials to develop new more efficient sites.

With all of this new construction, employment goes hand in hand * * * employment in the construction of the new buildings, and employment generated by the new enterprises.

Let's take a small town—Morristown, Tenn. The Morristown Chamber of Commerce has issued an attractive little leaflet on the benefits of urban renewal in its own community. It quotes the president of a local freight line as stating that, since its move into the urban renewal project area, "volume of outbound traffic has increased some 43 percent over the same period of 1961."

It quotes the owner of a chicken-processing plant as saying, "When we have relocated into our new plant in the urban renewal area we will increase our chicken-processing operation from 4,800 to 9,600 birds per hour. This increased production should provide jobs for 150 additional Morristown citizens."

The chamber of commerce leaflet also states that more than $200,000 in payrolls has already been engendered by urban renewal in Morristown.

I could go on and cite numerous other instances of economic growth stimulated by urban renewal, but I think you have the point.

These are visible evidences of what urban renewal has accomplished in the way of rebuilding. As I have indicated, urban renewal also has cleared many square miles of slums and blighted areas and is also in the process of rehabilitating a good many more square miles of housing that is still salvable. Urban renewal has also relocated more than 125,000 families into decent, safe, and sanitary hous-

ing. In effect, urban renewal has become in this respect a program of rehousing families from slum and blighted areas into standard housing.

When you look at this record of accomplishment and the prospects for the future you can understand why President Johnson, in his recent message to Congress on housing and community development, said, "The Federal program of urban renewal is today our principal instrument for restoring the hope and renewing the vitality of our older cities and wornout neighborhoods."

So much for the physical and social accomplishments of the program. Now I would like to emphasize one of the philosophic concepts of urban renewal. That is, the reliance upon private enterprise for the rebuilding process as one of the most important aspects. It is a partnership between the city and the private entrepreneur to rebuild the city.

This is a new kind of public-private relationship. It requires the closest kind of collaboration and the closest kind of understanding on the part of each. On the one hand, the public—the city government—must understand that if private enterprise is to participate, private enterprise must be able to make a reasonable profit.

Obviously, private enterprise cannot and will not participate if it cannot make a profit.

On the other hand, the private enterprise representative must also recognize that urban renewal is a public program in which public funds are being used to achieve public objectives. The renewal plan as adopted by the city is a statement of the city's public objectives in the rebuilding of a particular area. Private enterprise must therefore recognize that it must subject itself to the carrying out of these public objectives. Hence, it must be sympathetic to and understanding of these public objectives.

How has business responded to these opportunities and challenges of rebuilding and revitalizing our cities through urban renewal? I have given you some instances, but I believe it would be well to probe a little deeper.

Today, the great majority of cities with urban renewal programs have the support of their local chambers of commerce or other chief business organizations. In some cities the chamber has been a prime mover in the program, in others it has been an important support factor. In still others, a special organization, created with the blessing of the chamber, has been the urban renewal catalyst.

We find chamber support in the old cities of the East, the small towns everywhere, the vigorous Great Lakes cities like Rochester, the newer cities of the west coast—cities all across our great land. Some examples are:

Boston, where the chamber raised the money to pay Victor Gruen $150,000 to develop a downtown plan, with the idea that ultimately an urban renewal project will implement the plan. The chamber also financed some studies of the deteriorating waterfront area through a nonprofit corporation sponsored by the chamber.

Providence: Through the chamber itself as well as a number of other entities organized by chamber members, the city's redevelopment program has been assisted immeasurably.

Hartford: When the original plan for the redevelopment of Constitution Plaza bogged down, it was the chamber of commerce that took an active role in the negotiations that eventually brought about the Travelers Insurance sponsorship.

Philadelphia: The chamber of commerce has actively supported the local renewal program and has worked closely with other groups in various aspects of the city's overall redevelopment program. This includes such independent action groups as the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp., the Greater Philadelphia Movement, and the Old Philadelphia Corp. Many of the members and officers of the chamber are among the leaders of these groups. The chamber has also encouraged and stimulated the efforts of the West Philadelphia Corp. in its program to upgrade the western section of the city.

Newark: As in Hartford, the chamber was a prime force in inducing Prudential and Mutual Benefit Life not to move from Newark, but to get behind renewal efforts. As a result, Newark has seen a halt in the exodus of business and population, and for the first time in a generation, the ever-spiralling real estate tax rate has been stabilized. The chamber has issued a series of reports on the program.

Washington and Little Rock: Both cities have active downtown progress groups. In Little Rock the movement has been actively supported by the chamber of commerce, and in Washington by the board of trade.

Atlanta's Chamber of Commerce has been one of the most vocal advocates of urban renewal of any such group in the United States. Its monthly magazine has reported periodically on the status of the program and its benefits.

San Antonio has strong support for urban renewal from its chamber. A subsidiary of the chamber is advocating a "HemisFair" to be established in an urban renewal project.

Woodbridge, N.J.: One of the first communities in the country to undertake a community renewal program in advance of any project activity, Woodbridge experienced a tremendous growth in recent years. One of the largest townships in the State, it is really a collection of loosely knit neighborhoods. The chamber, Jaycees, and a Citizens' Redevelopment Commission all collaborated in bringing about the survey.

Sacramento, Calif.: One of the best programs in the country has resulted in a tremendously improved downtown environment and a major revamping of the approaches to the State capitol. Throughout, the chamber, has taken a very active supporting role.

Minneapolis, Minn.: The chamber has been an active proponent of urban renewal since its inception. It has a special Urban Redevelopment Committee that acts as liaison between the business community and the local renewal agency.

In this idscussion, I have touched on a number of points. Most of them I hope have been of close personal importance to you, because I know of your pride in your city. This is the thought I would like to leave with you:

Today we have the greatest opportunity in our national history to strengthen our cities. Whatever we do—or fail to do—will have its effects far a long, long time. Let us do the best we can—using every tool, every instrument, every program available. In this way, we may leave to future generations the kind of cities and Nation that past generations could only perceive in hopes and dreams.

Harry W. Kalich

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Harry W. Kalich, chief talley clerk of the House, is retiring at the end of February after almost 18 years of service with us. After an earlier career in government in New York he first came to Washington to serve as secretary to Congressman James A. Roe and subsequently assumed the duties in the House of Representatives which he has performed so ably.

Harry Kalich has been a devoted public servant, performing an essential function which requires accurate, careful, and meticulous work. Now, on the basis of doctor's orders, he is compelled to accept much-deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, in view of his fine service to you and to Members as a whole, I believe it altogether fitting that coupled with our expressions of regret at his retirement that we wish him every success, happiness, and a return to good health. We are extremely grateful to him for his devoted and distinguished service over these many years.

Diplomatic Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker—

We're almost babes in the woods when it comes to international diplomacy.

These are the words of William F. Freehoff, Jr., whose editorials over radio station WKPT in Kingsport, Tenn., have won for him nationwide acclaim.

In the following editorial, Mr. Freehoff has hit the heart of an age-old problem—a poorly trained diplomatic corps; in fact, he has presented what could very well be the ultimate solution to our dilemma. Therefore, I want to share Mr. Freehoff's hard-hitting statements with my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESIONAL RECORD:

This fine country of ours is almost 190 years old; yet, we're almost babes in the woods when it comes to international diplomacy. European nations all too often make us look pretty sick when diplomatic negotiations get underway. Our strongest suit is the fact that we are the richest country on the face of the earth; hence we can throw some weight around when finances enter the picture. We are also the most powerful Nation on earth, which also helps in negotiations.

After those two factors, we fall on our faces many times. The image we create around the world is something short of enviable in altogether too many cases. Most of our diplomats of top rank are political appointees. A post of Ambassador to some European country is usually a choice political plum given for hard work and/or money in the current President's campaign. Some of these appointments have been almost disastrous for us.

Why wouldn't it be an excellent idea for this country to establish an actual diplomatic academy similar to West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, Coast Guard Academy, and so on? Nobody argues seriously the merits of the service academies; we have seen how valuable they are to our military services. Yet, we allow our diplomatic corps to come from people who do not have the necessary specialized training to cope with other diplomats who are thoroughly ground-

ed in their field. Too many of our diplomats cannot even speak the native tongue of the land to which they are accredited as an Ambassador.

In talking with people who have been overseas a great deal and who are intensely interested in international affairs, we hear much too often that our State Department has and is falling down on the job pretty badly.

If we expect to improve our international position in diplomacy, we must get started toward the establishment of such a diplomatic academy.

Think about it.

VFW Key Objections for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have been tremendously impressed by the forthright and intelligent presentation of information and programs by our highly respected veterans organizations. Only yesterday, for example, the committee was given the opportunity to hear testimony by Douglas H. McGarrity, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans. It was a truly fine presentation of facts and a fine outline of the DAV's goals for the men who depend upon it for guidance and leadership.

Along these lines, a recent publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has come to my attention through the good offices of the organization's dedicated commander in chief, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo. It is titled "Key Objectives for 1964." I believe it is one of the most comprehensive and humane summaries I have seen concerning the overall aims of the VFW, and I am sure it expresses the views of most American veterans who are members of this organization and others which perform similar services for them.

This admirable publication of the VFW follows:

KEY OBJECTIVES FOR 1964

(Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Joseph J. Lombardo, commander in chief)

VETERANS LEGISLATION

Down through the years the VFW has earnestly tried to represent the Nation's veterans in the Halls of Congress, State legislatures, the White House, and other Federal bureaus and agencies. Without this representation, it is doubtful that the generous program of veterans' rights and benefits which we enjoy today would ever have come into being.

Experience reveals that public officials are busy men and women. A brief digest of the highlights of the resolutions is believed to be the best approach to presenting the VFW program. The absence of a particular approved national convention resolution from these key objectives does not mean that the resolution will not receive vigorous VFW support. The four key points follow:

Establish a standing Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate.

Additional nursing home beds for long-term chronically ill invalid veterans.

Liberalize the pension program for aged and disabled veterans.

Vigorous opposition to governmental efforts to weaken and eliminate veterans' preference in Federal civil service.

Other important objectives, based on resolutions proferred by the 1963 delegates, and slated for keen support, cover elevation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Cabinet rank, and the continued favorable consideration of compensation rates for the service disabled, including dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities.

Equally important on the committee's list is the provision to provide national service life insurance to veterans unable to obtain commercial life insurance due to service-connected disabilities and reopening of the NSLI program for 1 year to permit World War II and Korean conflict veterans an opportunity to obtain up to $10,000 insurance. Other objectives include outpatient treatment for all veterans entitled to permanent and total disability pension payments, education assistance to children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability and the continuation of veterans' preference by veterans' employment service in local State employment offices throughout the Nation.

NATIONAL SECURITY

A preamble, incorporated with the major VFW objectives for 1964, was adopted. It reads as follows:

"Our Nation and the free world have entered another era of peril.

"The danger is not new, but it is even more perilous as communism seeks to generate a feeling of security, friendship, and good will—all for the purpose of dulling the alertness, weakening the will, and reducing the military defenses of the United States and our allies. While the Kremlin smiles, Communist aggression, sabotage, and subversion continue relentlessly on a global scale. Communist deception must not succeed by inducing our Nation to seek peace by appeasement, or to reduce our military power by false budget savings.

"Our Nation's survival depends on our Nation's strength."

The program follows:

Enactment of adequate pay scales for military personnel.

Support large-scale military family housing and modern barracks.

Establish facilities for dependents in military hospitals.

Resist efforts of commercial interests to reduce or eliminate PX's and commissaries, and restore such service as has been restricted.

Expand high school and college ROTC.

Assure U.S. leadership, peaceful and military, in space.

Continue development of manned aircraft, manned bomber force, and build new manned interceptors.

Establish Army strength of at least 1 million. Modernize weaponry.

National Guard of at least 400,000, Reserve of 300,000. See aerial mobility for Army.

Exploit nuclear power for aircraft carriers and other surface ships and support adequate ship and construction program.

Support of Joint Chiefs of Staff system.

Full support of positive civil defense incentive program.

Provide foreign aid only to countries of free world.

Oppose any appeasement in West Berlin and Cuba. Enforce Monroe Doctrine. Also retain full U.S. control of Guantanamo Base.

Withdraw from U.N. if Red China is seated.

Support all-out moves to beat Communists in South Vietnam.

Back NATO buildup as bulwark against Reds.

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

James E. van Zandt, chairman, Pennsylvania.
John W. Mahan, Montana.
Merton B. Tice, South Dakota.
Peter Stack, Texas.
Weldon Le Roy Maddox, Maryland.
E. Spencer Walton, Indiana.
Daniel S. Brady, New York.
Leonard E. Friedlander, New York.
J. Rufus Klawans, California.
David C. Doten, Tennessee.
John J. Gammick, Nevada.
Joe T. Wood, Georgia.
David S. Taylor, South Carolina.
William E. Tomek, Nebraska.
Alcuin G. Loehr, Minnesota.
Frank G. Hahn, New Jersey.
Harold J. Burke, New York.
George F. Senner, Jr., Arizona.
Olen E. Holmes, Maine.
J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware.
Sverre Roang, Wisconsin.
Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana.

NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

T. C. Connell, chairman, Texas.
Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy (retired), consultant, Washington, D.C.
Louis G. Feldmann, Pennsylvania.
Charles C. Ralls, Washington.
Paul C. Wolman, Maryland.
Louis E. Starr, Oregon.
James Earl Rudder, Texas.
Edward I. Condren, New York.
Guy J. Swope, Pennsylvania.
Carl C. Banno, New York.
Leon G. Turrou, Paris, France.
J. T. Rutherford, Texas.
James Comedy, Ohio.
Lee Summers, Idaho.
Leon B. Buer, Michigan.
Patrick E. Carr, Louisiana.
Harry J. Wilters, Jr., Alabama.
Roy E. Frazier, Jr., Illinois.
Robert K. Christenberry, New York.
Billy J. Langston, Okinawa.

NATIONAL CIVIL DEFENSE COMMITTEE

J. Wellington Rupp, chairman, Washington.

Northwestern University Helps United States Aim for Moon—Great Gains Made in the Teaching of Astronomy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following Chicago Tribune article of February 19, 1964, describes some of the work in the U.S. space effort which is being carried on by the Astronomy Department of Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill.:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY HELPS UNITED STATES AIM FOR MOON—GREAT GAINS MADE IN THE TEACHING OF ASTRONOMY

(By Frank Hughes)

The moon is the immediate target of America's multibillion dollar space effort, and if and when the United States reaches that great satellite with something better than unmanned probes, Northwestern University seems certain to share in the responsibility and credit.

The space age has reoriented and rejuvenated the science of astronomy, transforming it from the "poor cousin" of the sciences to a vital necessity for space success.

Northwestern already has rejuvenated its astronomy department, tailoring it for frontier conquests in space, and with the addition of the $3,200,000 Lindheimer Astronomical Research Center on the northern tip of the new lake-fill campus in Evanston, Northwestern University will be in a position to help decide where, how, and when man goes in space.

CENTER PROVIDED BY GRANT

Dr. J. Allen Hynek, who came to Evanston in 1960 to head the astronomy department, will direct the Lindheimer Center, known as LARC, made possible by a grant from the family of the late Benjamin Lindheimer, well-known sportsman.

Dr. Hynek and the associates he has brought to Northwestern have a string of accomplishments that virtually guarantees Northwestern University's participation in any moon effort. With him is Dr. Karl G. Henize, an astrophysicist and specialist in observation astronomy in the southern hemisphere, and Dr. William T. Powers, an electrical engineer who is a specialist in the moon project. Dr. Hynek himself, at 53, is an example of the modern expert in man's oldest science.

"The role of director of an astronomical center is touchy," he said. "You can't just go gungho into space. You have to keep one foot on solid old-fashioned astronomy. We are adding five full-time faculty members in the next 3 years.

ADD AN ASTROPHYSICIST

"We already have added a Chinese astrophysicist to strengthen our theoretical side. We also want two young men who grew up in modern astronomy with the idea that going to the moon is just natural. And we are going to add two others to continue application of television techniques to astronomy, the use of the image orthicon and lasers."

Dr. Hynek isn't interested in putting a man on the moon right now. What he is interested in doing, and what he and his associates believe is entirely feasible, is putting a telescope on the moon. Northwestern's work with television techniques in astronomy, laser beams, and the image orthicon has proved to Hynek that remote control telescopes are not only practical but desirable. His field of study has been worldwide and he and Dr. Henize set up the 12 satellite observing stations around the world.

"The moon is solid so you don't have the instability of spacecraft to compensate for," Dr. Hynek said. "It has not atmosphere, so there is no atmospheric distortion such as on earth where clouds, water particles, dust, and manmade particles interfere and make stars twinkle. If you had a telescope on the moon, you could point it where you want to by remote control and the picture would go into an image orthicon to be flashed back to earth on the same laser beam that controls the moon telescope."

HEART IS IMAGE ORTHICON

The heart of the moon telescope will be the image orthicon, Dr. Hynek said. This is the same device as the picture tube in television cameras. A laser beam (light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation) will provide the control system. Laser comes about as close to the death ray of science fiction as is possible today. It is a light beam of fantastic intensity projected through a tubular crystal of synthetic ruby and made possible by the parametric amplifiers used in ultrahigh frequency radio and radio telescopes. A laser beam would cut off a man's hand a few feet from the source.

Riding the light beam are modulated signals in the gigacycle spectrum. (A gigacycle is 1,000 megacycles.) These radiolike impulses will send controlling signals to the moon telescope and the picture from the image orthicon telescope on the moon will travel back to earth on the laser, just as a television signal travels through space to a home television set.

The telescope itself, carried to the moon on a rocket similar to the recent lunar probes, would be a "head or tails" box with a telescope inside that could be used no matter how it rolled or landed when the capsule came down. The only external part would be a retractible arm with a mirrow at the end, which on signal from earth could be aimed so it would reflect the light of a chosen star into the telescope lens.

EXCELLENT RESOLUTION ON EARTH

This lens would be a concave reflecting mirror 10 to 20 inches in diameter with a very long focal length. The orthicon tube scan at a rate of 10 lines per millimeter (more than 250 lines per inch), fine enough to give excellent picture resolution on a television screen on earth.

Time on the lunar telescope would be allotted to observatories and at a given hour an astronomer could switch on his laser, give the moon telescope its orders, and receive the information from it he wanted.

The Lindheimer Center soon will have a 40-inch reflecting telescope which Dr. Hynek believes is optimum for this climate. It will have the same light gathering power as the great 40-inch lens at Yerkes Observatory, Williams Bay, Wis., but will use a mirror instead of the lens.

Dr. Hynek said that the principal interest at LARC will be in the graduate program, where top astronomical scientists will be trained.

At the start, at least, work at LARC will be split between space-age astronomy and earth-based spectroscopy, the measurement of the quality of stellar light.

RESEARCH AND TEACHING

"Teaching is tremendously important," Dr. Hynek said, "but it must go hand in hand with research in astronomy because working at the frontier of science is the best thing you can do for your students. We have more applications at the graduate level right now than we can handle. We are building our undergraduate program to create a reservoir of competent graduate material for LARC.

"MOL—the Manned Orbital Laboratory—is very important, and an astronomical camera probably will be used in the Gemini satellite, the astronauts being trained here in how to use it. The National Aeronautical and Space Administration is directing this and has proposed a 20-inch telescope will be used in the satellite, which probably will be designed here under the direction of Dr. Henize.

"So, you see, we will have one foot on the ground and one in space. The importance of getting above the atmosphere for an undistorted view of our universe is beyond measure."

Safe Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have indicated my concern over the various degress of quality of first-line tires and the fact that the average motorist is not aware of the variance of the tires he purchases.

I have introduced legislation, which is now law, to provide seat belt standards. I have also introduced legislation which previously passed the House but failed to pass the Senate and have again introduced legislation this Congress to provide safety standards for automobiles sold in interstate commerce. This bill, H.R. 1341 is now pending on the Union Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I point this out since it is obvious that some of the States are becoming concerned over the problem of safety on the highways. With particular reference to safe tires, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the New York State Legislature has become interested in this subject and there is now pending before that body a legislative proposal which I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD; for this is another indication of the trend that the various States are taking in this field:

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE AMENDS VEHICLE AND TRAFFIC LAW, IN RELATION TO MINIMUM SPECIFICATIONS FOR TIRES

SECTION 1. Section 375 of the vehicle and traffic law is hereby amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, to be paragraph 37, to read as follows:

"37. TIRES, SALE OF.

"(a) On and after January 1, 1966, no person, firm, association, or corporation shall sell, offer or expose for sale, or have in his possession with intent to sell any new motor vehicle tire or motorcycle tire which has been manufactured after January 1, 1966, unless such tire is of a type which has been approved by the commissioner of motor vehicles. Included under the provisions herein are tires affixed to a motor vehicle or motorcycle when such motor vehicle or motorcycle in its entirety is sold.

"(b) The commissioner shall, prior to July 1, 1965, promulgate and publish maximum safe loads which may be carried by tires of the various tire and rim sizes and ply ratings or other carcass strength rating at various inflation pressures. The commissioner's designation of tire and rim size shall include the acceptable range of tire cross-sectional and circumferential dimensions which define a tire of a given tire and rim size and shall state the method of measuring such dimensions. Once a safe load is established for a given tire and rim size and ply rating or other carcass strength rating, the commissioner shall not designate a changed safe load for a given tire and rim size without adequately differentiating the designation from prior designations for the same tire and rim size and ply rating or other carcass strength rating.

"(c) The commissioner shall also, prior to July 1, 1965, promulgate and publish for the various tire and rim sizes and carcass strength ratings minimum requirements for adequate original condition blowout resistance according to laboratory performance tests. Such requirements and tests shall encompass as a minimum the ability of the tire to resist static internal pressure, ability to resist carcass breakage by forcible penetration of a test plunger, ability to resist repeated impacts, and ability to resist continuous high-speed running. Requirements to pass such tests shall necessitate that the tire have reasonable margins of blowout safety for each type of test, and shall insure that for blowout safety, such margins shall not be less than those margins existent on a typical first line or 100-level tire as provided on new cars. The commissioner shall also publish an approved list of tire types and sizes which have met laboratory performance test requirements and he shall determine at regular intervals whether such tire types and sizes continue to meet such laboratory performance test requirements. For purposes of determining the ability of tires to meet test requirements, the commissioner may ac-

cept certified evidence of tests performed by the tire manufacturer, may employ evidence of design similarity where tires of the same design characteristics are made in many sizes, and shall require independent evidence of the passage of laboratory performance tests as necessary. The commissioner may withdraw from the approved published list any tire type or size and require independent evidence that the performance test requirements have been met prior to replacing it on the list. The commissioner shall not approve any tire of a stated tire and rim size unless such tire has dimensions within the acceptable range.

"(d) On and after January 1, 1966, it shall be unlawful to sell any new motor vehicle tire or motorcycle tire unless, at the time of sale, the purchaser is provided with a written statement as to the safe load carrying capacity of the tire as defined by the regulations of the commissioner.

"(e) On and after January 1, 1966, it shall be unlawful to sell a new automobile unless the tires installed on said automobile possess a safe loading capacity as defined by the regulations of the commissioner which will not be exceeded when the automobile is fully loaded.

"(f) On and after January 1, 1966, it shall be unlawful to sell a new automobile, unless at the time of sale the purchaser is provided with a statement of the rated carrying capacity of the vehicle when fully loaded, and a statement of the actual loads upon each tire resulting when fully loaded. Such statement shall also contain the tire and rim size, ply rating, or other carcass strength rating, and inflation pressure necessary for these actual loads and actual loads stated shall be accurate within 30 pounds. The statement of rated fully loaded carrying capacity shall be described in terms of number and seated location of adult passengers of stated weight plus the weight of baggage or other load carried in stated normal spaces.

"(g) On and after January 1, 1966, it shall be unlawful for one who sells tires to install such tires on a motor vehicle or motorcycle which will be overloaded when the vehicle is fully loaded or to install a tire on a rim not of the correct size.

"(h) The provisions of this section shall apply only to motor vehicles registered under the provisions of subdivision 6 of section 401 and motorcycles registered under section 410 of this chapter.

"(i) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this subdivision shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $50 or by imprisonment not exceeding 15 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE AMENDS THE VEHICLE AND TRAFFIC LAW, IN RELATION TO MINIMUM SPECIFICATIONS FOR RETREADED TIRES

SECTION 1. Section 375 of the vehicle and traffic law is hereby amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, to be paragraph 38, to read as follows:

"38. RETREADED TIRES, SALE OF.

"(a) On and after January 1, 1966, no person, firm, association, or corporation shall sell, offer or expose for sale, or have in his possession with intent to sell any newly retreaded motor vehicle or motorcycle tire which has been retreaded after January 1, 1966, unless such tire is of a type which has been approved by the commissioner of motor vehicles. Included under the provisions herein are tires affixed to a motor vehicle or motorcycle when such motor vehicle or motorcycle in its entirety is sold.

"(b) The commissioner shall, prior to July 1, 1965, promulgate and publish regulations for proper practices to be used in the retreading of motor vehicle and motorcycle tires. Such regulations shall insure an adequate level of resistance of the retreaded tire to blowouts. The regulation shall also provide for, but not be limited to, the following:

"Permanent and conspicuous marking of the tire to identify it as a retreaded tire; permanent and conspicuous marking of the tire with the name and location of the firm or agency which has done the retreading work; minimum standards for tires suitable to be retreaded, including a prohibition against use of any tire which has broken cords, except as may be caused by simple puncture and any tire which has been previously retreaded; and adequate procedures, materials, and practices.

"(c) After January 1, 1966, it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, association, or corporation to retread any motor vehicle or motorcycle tire, unless such retreading is performed in compliance with the requirements promulgated by the commissioner.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall apply only to motor vehicles registered under the provisions of subdivision 6 of section 401 and motorcycles registered under section 410 of this chapter.

"(e) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this subdivision shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $50 or by imprisonment not exceeding 15 days or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

Progress Report on the 88th Congress to the Residents of the 15th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln-Washington birthday interval is an opportune time to assess the record, gains, and goals of the 88th Congress and report on my stewardship to the people of our district.

The 88th Congress, with its longest session in peacetime history, has already written some new records into history but, for that matter, so have the beloved Mets. Some may say the comparison is appropriate.

I believe that we stayed in there like Yankees, pitched as hard as Koufax and will end our session with a major league legislative average.

No one can dispute that at this stage we have two eye-catching four-masters to our credit in the House; the successful passage of the tax cut and civil rights bills. The success of these bills is the result of intensive, tedious, and devoted committee study and action. Committee work is the keystone of an effective legislature.

In baseball, as in the National-American pastime we call Congress, spring training does the conditioning that wins ball games and we did our training in committees until our bills were fit and ready. This Congress took time because Members labored long and well to shake out the kinks and to bring bills to the floor in shape to meet any test.

THE TAX CUT AND CIVIL RIGHTS

In the tax reduction bill, the preparation of the Committee on Ways and Means enabled us to pass the bill by an overwhelming margin. The report of the House-Senate conferees will probably be adopted by a landslide because the tax cut is sound and timely. This reduction is the first since withholding began and it will be retroactive to January 1, 1964. I supported this bill because the next best thing to earning more for your keep is keeping more of your earnings. It is a good bill because it ends the burden of Government as a majority shareholder in business profits and frees capital for the expansion of private enterprise with more employment. It is beneficial for salary and wage earners with an average cut of 20 percent and has especially favorable provisions for senior citizens and heads of families.

My sole disappointment is that the bill does not give effect to the plan I have sponsored to give tax credit for tuition and educational expense (H.R. 5491). It is high time that we encouraged the investment in education which tuition represents. Tuition costs have increased 100 percent in 10 years and private colleges especially are hard put to meet higher costs. Unless these schools can handle their share of increased enrollment, public colleges will be called upon to do this with Government carrying the expense. This would be far more costly than tuition credit and I intend to press for hearings and consideration of my bill. The fact that a similar plan by Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut came within three votes of passage in the Senate without the benefit of full hearings is a good sign for future action.

It is important to note that tax reduction is feasible only because Congress has fixed a tight lid on expenditures. Using a fine mesh strainer on appropriations, we sifted budget requests until we were able to effect reductions of $6.3 billion. This protects the soundness of the dollar and precludes inflation which could abate the effect of the tax cut. President Johnson's scaling down of budget requests by another $600 million is further evidence that responsive government need not be expensive government.

"THE EDUCATION CONGRESS"

At the outset of the 88th Congress I sought and secured a significant change in committee assignment. I asked to be shifted from the snug vaults of the Banking and Currency Committee to the stormy arena of the Education and Labor Committee. I did so because the greatest areas of challenge and opportunity before us are in the education of our children and all others who need education or are needed by education. My activities on this committee have been gratifying to me and, I believe, meaningful to the people of our district and our country.

In fact, if this Congress could be rated by our children and their descendants as it is by our contemporaries, I feel it would be accorded a superior grade for its work in education alone. This is so because much of the legislation we passed is of far-reaching, long-range effect that will benefit many future generations.

I am not alone in this appraisal. President Johnson describes our deeds in education in this manner:

This Congress is well on its way to doing more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was pased 100 years ago.

He later stated on signing one of our committee bills that—

This session of the Congress will go down in history as the "Education Congress of 1963."

Our district was honored in that your Representative was invited to the White House for the signing of these vital education bills. The pens used by the President on three occasions will be displayed in our district office as a tribute to the devotion of our people to excellence in education.

Our district has more students enrolled in secondary, college, and graduate schools than any congressional area in the United States. It was my pleasure to demonstrate this to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Hon. Francis Keppel, during his visit to our county at my invitation during the American Education Week proclaimed by our late President John F. Kennedy. To his memory, because he had that special grace of intellect and devotion to knowledge, our work in education under his leadership will stand as his most effective monument. The last message I heard from him, during a visit to the President's house, was a wish expressed in the Lincoln bedroom that we would achieve the gains in education so necessary to true equality in opportunity for all Americans.

A recital of these gains will indicate how well we succeeded in our committee.

The Higher Education Facilities Act is the first general college aid program ever enacted. It provides for loans and grants for both public and private colleges on a fair and equal basis. The bill will provide the funds for expansion of college facilities so that all institutions can expand to meet the new wave of enrollment without raising tuition beyond reach.

To help students meet tuition costs through loans, we tripled the size of student loan funds so that no student may be denied access to financial assistance. All students in public and private colleges are eligible.

Recognizing technological developments and the impact of automation, we passed manpower development and training aid and expanded the Vocational Education Act.

These are designed to hit at hard core unemployment and the demand for new skills in a broad range from technical training to practical nursing. It is significant to note that vocational education has been a category of Federal aid since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, but it awaited the action of this Congress to bring its provisions into cadence with today's needs.

We recognized the advancing level of literacy and demand for good reading and extended the Federal Library Assistance Act. Until this Congress, the benefits of this act were available only to rural areas under 10,000 persons so that our own cities and others were ineligible. We struck down that wall of discrimination against city residents and made equal benefits available to all.

The Health Professions Education Act passed by this Congress will bring the long and expensive training required to become physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health and medical professionals within the means of thousands of qualified students. Until we passed this bill the number of medical school applicants was declining, from 22,279 in 1950 to 14,397 in 1960. One-fourth of our interns and residents were foreign medical school graduates. Existing medical schools could not accommodate increased numbers and the cost of education for careers in medicine and health was beyond average means. Now with construction grants for both public and private medical schools and loans available to students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, et cetera, we are reversing the scarcity-of-practitioner trend in the healing arts.

This entire report could be devoted to our gains in education but to do so would be to slight our progress in many other fields. But before leaving the subject of education, I wish to emphasize that every bill we passed made adequate provision for fair and equal treatment for all students and all interests in education—public and private—without discrimination. In considering every bill that comes before my committee I will continue to urge that the basic American principle of equality in educational assistance at every level of government must prevail. In general education, our GI bill for junior is earning support steadily.

A complete recital of all the measures enacted by the 88th Congress is beyond the compass of this synopsis but I do believe that areas where we initiated new or breakthrough programs deserve mention.

MENTAL RETARDATION AND MENTAL HEALTH

For the first time, acting on a beam of hope from enlightened research, this Congress met the national aspects of the problem of mental retardation. Through grants to be administered through the States' public and private nonprofit centers for research, clinical treatment, care and education of the mentally retarded will be provided. In the words of our late President who was personally devoted to this legislation, we are now certain "that those who have felt the hand of fate will not be victims of neglect."

In the field of mental health we found that the Nation is suffering from overcrowded and inadequate facilities for the mentally ill. Half the hospital beds in the country are occupied by mental patients under the old system of quarantining the patient rather than pursuing care and treatment. New methods of therapy, rehabilitation, and research through community centers to be constructed, should result in long-term savings and restoration of human resources under this program.

In the entire field of handicaps we increased our commitment to crippled children and maternal health services, and in a variety of other programs we provided for new treatment, training and facilities for those impaired in vision, speech or hearing.

I was honored to be named last month by the Speaker of the House as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Institution for the Deaf, Gallaudet College, the only such college in the world. It is my hope that I can make a substantial contribution to education for the deaf in this new capacity.

THE CLEAN AIR BILL

In November 1953, New York City suffered a temperature inversion, a lid of warm air overlaid cooler, heavier air, at ground level. For 10 days a stagnant pall trapped pollutants and smog hung over the city. By the time it blew out to sea 240 persons had died. With the fumes of increasing traffic density and industrial and power production drifting across State borders, it was high time for the Government to act on air pollution. I am especially concerned for our area by reason of the imminent increase in vehicle exhaust fumes which will follow from the new bridge across the narrows and its approaches.

Now, by a joint undertaking of local, State, and Federal Governments, the Clean Air Act of 1963 will abate the nuisance of respiratory poisons which cause chronic disease and aggravate heart conditions as well as causing economic damage of $11 billion yearly.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND MERCHANT MARINE

With half of every Federal dollar invested in our national security, we are assured that our defense is the strongest in the world. The words of Washington, 175 years ago, are still valid. "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace," he said in his first annual address. With Communist-fed eruptions freckling the face of the earth, we cannot let down in our firm policy of preparedness. This includes a mix of modern armaments. In specifics, it also means a strong surface fleet, modern and well maintained, with shipyards such as the New York Naval Shipyard modernized and up to strength to serve that fleet. I am pleased that our entire New York delegation without partisanship is committed to the preservation of the mission of our shipyard as a vital service.

At the same time we must probe in every way for peaceful reduction of world tensions and it is to the credit of President Kennedy and President Johnson that the peril of nuclear war is reduced and less threatening than at any time since the weapons of ultimate destruction became operational.

As a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, I have a deep personal interest in the growth of our maritime service. I am distressed that our loss of freight to foreign-flag operators has reduced our share of seaborne commerce to less than 10 percent of the world market. I intend to support legislation now before Congress to build up a modern competitive merchant fleet built in our domestic shipyards and manned by American merchant sailors to gain a proper share

of world tonnage. In the light of the fivefold expansion of the Soviet merchant fleet now underway, we must support a building program or yield our traditional position of sea supremacy.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION

In addition to my responsibilities on the Education and Labor Committee, I serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Our record in this committee continues to be one of achievement in the development of parks, preservation of natural resources, and creation of recreational opportunities. The land and water conservation fund bill to finance park and open space area acquisition of underdeveloped acreage is pending after favorable committee action. It is hopeful that we can also make progress on the wilderness bill to preserve primitive areas for future generations.

This year we enacted a law to set up the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to look to our future needs and cooperate with State and local agencies to see that the unspoiled areas of the Nation and our fish and wildlife opportunities are not overrun with asphalt.

In our own State the creation of a national seashore at Fire Island has had favorable hearings before my subcommittee and should be enacted during this session.

GENERAL

Since this report is meant only to hit the legislative high spots, it does not incorporate the many other items of garden variety legislation on which the Congress has acted, such as equal pay for women, privately built housing for the elderly, the military pay raise, et cetera. Each of these was a gain which we produced after extended study demonstrated clear and definite needs and Federal responsibility.

Among others, our attention is now concentrated on such problems as that of the aging, treated in the Carey-Fogarty bill, the "Older Americans Act," which has been voted favorably in our subcommittee. This is not to be confused with hospital care for the aging on which we are continuing hearings to try and reach a solution worthy of broad support. In any solution we must not sacrifice our present health standards which the medical profession has made the highest in the world.

NEW DISTRICT OFFICE

In addition to the legislative activities here in the Capitol, I am encouraged that so many of our residents have seen fit to write on Federal matters of interest. Nothing is more inspiring to a Representative than to have an interested electorate, whether we agree or disagree.

It is a matter of regret that the extended session of Congress needed to cope with the complex of national problems has reduced the time that I am able to spend in our district in personal discussion with our residents.

To offset this and to provide close contact with my constituents and to make it convenient for people of our district to present their needs and problems I opened a new district office centrally located at 7718 Fourth Avenue.

This office is staffed by competent assistants throughout the week and you can contact us at any time by calling Terrace 9-2300. I am gratified that through our district offices we have handled many hundreds of requests such as information for school papers, explanation of Presidential succession, job opportunities in Federal service, and just plain complaints, which I welcome as a sign of healthy diversity.

I shall continue to be present in our district office every Saturday morning when legislative duties permit as I have been for the last 3 years. I extend a cordial invitation to any of our residents, regardless of age, origin, or party affiliation, to visit with me at my Washington or Brooklyn offices from Monday through Saturday. There are so many national problems I would like to solve with you and so little I can do without you.

In closing, it is my hope that before the adjournment sine die of the 88th Congress we can strive together without partisanship or prejudice to move toward the high destiny which lies ahead for this great Nation in order that the dreams and hopes of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be realized. We have made a good beginning and I will do my best to continue.

A Complete Misnomer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Times, an outstanding newspaper of Shelby, N.C., in the edition of February 18, 1964, editorialized on the subject of the civil rights bill. This editorial is very well written and I believe will be of interest to our colleagues.

I request the unanimous consent that it be made a part of the Appendix of today's RECORD.

A COMPLETE MISNOMER

We agree with Congressman BASIL WHITENER that all nine sections of the civil rights bill serve as a device to broaden Federal power and are unconstitutional. There is indeed no more complete misnomer than the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1963 which is belligerently uncivil and destroys rights of all rather than protecting the rights of any.

While, mercifully, it was not passed in 1963, Congress is being pressed now for passage of a revised version that is not "watered down" but more drastic and more sweeping than the original. The measure in all truth could be renamed the "socialists' omnibus bill of 1963."

Its concerns for "discrimination," "race," and "religion"—none of which terms is defined in the bill—is a cover for an unprecedented power grab by the Executive, revealed in such language as: "The President is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate" and: "Each Federal department and agency * * * shall take action to effectuate." Title VI, if you read it carefully, reveals the $100-billion blackjack that is to be swung over the heads of all * * * to belabor all races and all creeds.

A minority report filed by Congressman WHITENER along with five other members of the House Judiciary Committee, Representatives WILLIS, FORRESTER, TUCK, ASHMORE, and DOWDY, all of them Democrats, all of them lawyers, and all experts on this type of legislation, declares flatly that the bill is unconstitutional and points out that it "vests almost unlimited authority in the President and his appointees to do whatever they desire."

It reminded them, they said, of the words of George Washington: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

In conclusion, these lawmakers said: "In all the years Congress has pondered the equities of civil rights legislation, no committee has ever suggested for the Executive such totality of power as is embodied in this package of legislation. Grant it, and our fireball of liberty will spin into darkness, suffocate. For our Republic cannot live without breath and breath of our Republic is personal liberty and personal responsibility."

We shudder to think that this "totality of power" will be granted unless those who recognize the peril can offset the pressure of the misguided and the ambitious.

If you cherish liberty and the right of free choice on which American achievement is based, write your Senators and tell them why it is necessary that they vote against the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

The Fed's First Half-Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the December 1963, issue of Banking, the Journal of the American Banking Association, which contains a transcript of a panel discussion marking the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Federal Reserve Act.

The panel participants were W. Randolph Burgess, Chairman of the Atlantic Treaty Association, former Ambassador to NATO and former President of the American Bankers Association; Chester Morrill, former Secretary and Special Adviser to the Federal Reserve Board; Matt S. Szymczak, former member of the Federal Reserve Board, presently lecturing at Georgetown University and associated with C. J. Devine & Co.; John K. McKee, former member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve; and Herbert Brattler, Washington correspondent for Banking magazine.

The article follows:

THE FED'S FIRST HALF CENTURY

(NOTE.—To observe the golden anniversary of the Federal Reserve Act, banking's Washington correspondent, Herbert Bratter, discussed informally its past, present, and future with four men who have been closely associated with it. The recorded discussion was necessarily limited and some minor deletions were made in this transcript.)

Mr. BRATTER. December 1963 marks the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Fed-

eral Reserve Act, which gave us our present central banking system. This is a good time to stop and look back.

The Federal Reserve was intended to remedy some of the defects in our money and banking system which had become all too evident, particularly during the so-called money panic of 1907. The act was a political compromise. It compromised between those who wanted a privately owned central banking system operated by the banks and those who wanted a completely governmental or Federal central banking system. It compromised, too, between those who wanted a single central bank and those favoring a system of autonomous regional banks.

During the 50 years preceding the Federal Reserve Act the economy had been marked by many economic depressions and money was a leading political question. The National Currency Act of 1863 introduced the national bank note, which was intended to and did displace State bank notes. But the discovery of rich silver mines in the 1870's brought demands for bimetallism and introduced the silver certificate. We have only to recall the "Crime of 1873," the Greenback Party, the Populist movement, "Coin" Harvey, and William Jennings Bryan, or to look over the money planks in the Republican and Democratic platforms to realize how political the money question had become. The silver question of the 19th century was not quieted until the Gold Standard Act of 1900.

The Federal Reserve System, as adopted during the first year of the Wilson administration, stemmed from the work of the National Monetary Commission of 1908 to 1912; but the recommendations of that Republican-dominated group were considerably modified by the Democratic Congress and administration of 1913. The roots of the System may be traced further back to the 1894 Baltimore plan of bank circulation devised by former Comptroller A. Barton Hepburn and endorsed by the ABA; and to the businessmen's Indianapolis Monetary Commission of 1897–98 which recommended an "elastic circulation."

In your view, Mr. Burgess, what has the past half century of the Federal Reserve System meant to this country?

Mr. BURGESS. In the first place, I think we ought to take a look at the history.

The Federal Reserve System supplied for this country a central banking system which it had not had for 78 years. It has been pretty well demonstrated over the years that every important country has to have some kind of central banking system, some public institution which would act as the banker for the Government, which would issue the money that the country requires and, even more important, would exercise some control, some influence, over the flow of money so that it was adequate to transact the country's business, but not so ample that it may cause inflation.

Now, when this country started off following the inauguration of President Washington in 1789, we, of course, had no central bank then. But, very soon, Washington and Alexander Hamilton, who was Secretary of the Treasury, presented to the Congress a proposal for a central bank. This was adopted in 1791 and for 20 years the First Bank of the United States supplied for this country what other countries had in the form of central banks.

The charter of this bank expired in 1811 and was not renewed. But we found that we could not get along without that kind of bank and so in 1816, again, there was legislation creating the Second Bank of the United States.

Mr. BRATTER. When you say "central bank," do you mean central bank as we understand the term today, or do you mean something different?

Mr. BURGESS. I mean it really was very much as we understand the term today, but the term is a bit misleading because "central bank" means to some people a single institution; whereas, when we adopted the System there were 12 Federal Reserve banks. But in those days, what we adopted under Hamilton's leadership and then later in 1816 was a single central bank which served the Government.

That ran into political trouble and in 1836 it was abolished under President Jackson. Then for 78 years we tried to run a great country without any central banking system, and with pretty sad results. We had periodic money panics, we had lack of stability and lack of confidence and, in the Civil War, we had to go off specie payments for a while.

In a way, we were dependent upon London and on the Bank of England. Because, having no central banking system of our own, additions to our supply of money had to come from London. We were a great country, dependent upon the money market of another country.

Toward the latter part of the last century and early in this one, there was tremendous agitation for a central banking system, and the Federal Reserve System was the result. It supplied us for the first time in 78 years with a good, sound central banking system.

Now, broadly, and before we start discussing details, I would like to say that the 50 years of the Federal Reserve System have marked the greatest period of industrial and business expansion and social growth that the world has ever seen. The United States has really put on a demonstration, and the Federal Reserve System has been there to furnish the financial sinews needed to bring about this enormous progress.

FED'S EARLY HISTORY

Mr. BRATTER. I think it would be interesting if we heard from Mr. Morrill, because, not only was he with the Federal Reserve Board for many years, but he has done considerable research into its early history.

During the past 50 years, hasn't the Fed had to meet many unforeseen emergencies? If so, would you tell us something about the early history?

Mr. MORRILL. In retrospect, it seems to me that the years from the organization of the Federal Reserve Board in 1914 to its reorganization in 1936 covered the period in which the Federal Reserve System learned to swim. Ordinarily, we use "System" in a limited sense, meaning primarily the Federal Reserve Board and the 12 Federal Reserve banks. As a matter of fact, commercial banks representing 84 percent of the deposits of all such banks are also, under the terms of the law, members of the Federal Reserve System.

When the Reserve banks opened their doors in 1914, in makeshift quarters, war had begun in Europe but had not yet become the World War with the United States as a participant. During the intervening period, before the United States declared war, organization problems were dominant and the necessity for determination of national credit or monetary policies did not seem to be pressing. The reduction of statutory bank reserve requirements had eased the credit situation. But with this Government's declaration of war in 1917 came the first great problem of Treasury financing confronted by the System. It was met by liberal discounting for member banks and preferential treatment of Government securities. Commercial banks were enabled not only to make substantial loans on Government securities, but also to accumulate large investments of their own. Senator Carter Glass expressed the opinion "that the World War could not have been financed but for the Federal Reserve Act."

On the other hand, the resulting creation of a greatly increased supply of money together with consumer demands brought about inflationary developments. Credit expansion was rapid, prices doubled, and gold reserves decreased. Government expenditures did not decline immediately. The Treasury needed to float additional securities, and it was opposed for the time being to credit restraints by the Federal Reserve System. In 1919 the System warned member banks against the consequences of such developments and, in accordance with traditional central banking practice, discount rates were raised to exercise some restraint upon the increasing demands for credit which, however, continued until mid-1920 when prices collapsed, particularly for agricultural products. An investigation was launched by Congress, and the commission created for this purpose decided as one of its conclusions that the Board and the Reserve banks were not responsible for the deflation.

The 1920's saw the closing of many smaller banks, particularly in agricultural communities, but also saw improving industrial conditions after the relatively short depression, and a substantial decrease in demands upon the Reserve banks for discounts took place. Even so there were fluctuations, and operations by the Reserve banks in the Government securities market taught the system that under coordination they had the quality of a major instrument of credit policy.

Also in this period, through the initiative of the New York Reserve Bank, strong and enduring correspondent relations were established with the Bank of England, the Bank of France, and other European central banks. These arrangements have been of great importance in the ultimate achievement by the United States of world leadership in finance.

During the latter part of the twenties there was building up an economic situation which resulted in the stock market crash of 1929 and the American share in the depression of the thirties. When the speculative situation became apparent through rapidly rising security prices and the increasing demand for bank credit to finance security operations, the Reserve banks attempted to deal with it through advances in discount rates, and the Federal Reserve Board through public warnings. After the collapse, discount rates were reduced and purchases of Government securities were made by the Reserve banks to ease the banking situation.

The ability of the system to deal adequately with the situation was hampered, however, by legal restrictions upon the discounting powers of the Reserve banks and on the collateral that could be used to secure Federal Reserve notes until 1932, when the Congress authorized the use of Government securities as collateral for the notes and somewhat relaxed the discounting restrictions. The Reserve banks were thus enabled to buy Government securities in greater volume and to increase the reserves of the banking system.

At the same time the Government was attempting through other means outside the Federal Reserve System to deal with the depression problem; but with the incoming change of administration in 1933 the so-called banking holiday seemed inevitable and unprecedented actions were taken. The other participants in this discussion doubtless will have something to say about these developments.

Since I mentioned at the beginning that it seems that during this earlier period the Reserve System was learning to swim, it seems fair also to add something about its accomplishments. The System supplied currency meeting all legitimate needs; handled successfully the financing of the Government in wartime; brought about coordinated open market operations in Government securities as a major instrument for effecting monetary policy; developed an ap-

preciation of the underlying fact that requirements respecting bank reserves were not merely for reasons of safety but were really a means of influencing credit conditions; facilitated more nearly uniform lending rates throughout the country; through par collection of checks and the interdistrict settlement fund and otherwise, tremendously improved and lowered the cost of transferring money nationwide and internationally; through the development of its research staff established the foundation for reliable and respected information and data on financial and business conditions; participated in the development of means of stabilizing the extension of credit for purchasing and carrying listed securities; and rendered many necessary services to the Government without charge or very modest charges. All of the expenses of the Reserve banks, although they were not operated for profit, were met without the necessity of Government capital, loans, or other public financing.

Under the terms of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 it is worthy of note that the Reserve bank charters were to run for 20 years. But such was the change of political climate that, unlike the First and Second Banks of the United States, and with very little debate, the charters of the 12 Reserve banks were extended without limit before the 20-year period expired.

Mr. BRATTER. Well, Mr. Morrill, you have brought us now to the period of the 1930's and the great changes that were made by the Congress. Governor Szymczak, that was exactly the time when you came to the Board, and I wonder if you would discuss some of the big changes that were made during the thirties, particularly those that you witnessed.

EMERGENCY LAWS OF 1930'S

Mr. SZYMCZAK. When I came to the Board in 1933, some of the legislation was already passed by Congress, because an emergency developed that required quick action by the legislative authority to enable the Federal Reserve System to function, with the intent of having an influence on business and industry, through the credit situation in the country.

So, therefore, in the thirties—I believe it was in May 1933—Congress passed emergency legislation enabling the Federal Reserve Board, under an emergency, to increase or decrease reserve requirements with the approval of the President of the United States and with a minimum vote of five of the then seven Board members. This, of course, was not used because it became evident that, should the Board declare an emergency in order to increase or decrease reserve requirements, it would add to rather than take away from the emergency in the economy and in the money market. It was not a good instrument of monetary policy.

However, the Banking Act of 1935 supplemented the legislation on reserve requirements by giving the Federal Reserve Board power to increase or decrease reserve requirements up to twice the statutory minimum. At that time the statuory minimum was 13 percent for demand deposits of central reserve city banks, 10 percent for reserve city banks, and 7 percent for country banks. On time and savings deposits the Board was given the power to double the statutory minimum, which was 3 percent.

Because of a huge increase in bank reserves, with inflationary threats, the Board used this instrument of monetary policy even though, at that time, it had no experience in the use of an instrument that was so blunt. It affected all member banks no matter what their position in loans and investments and in their reserves. The Board used it twice on the upside and once on the downside during this early period.

Then, of course, there developed in 1933 a new organization in the Federal Reserve that was based upon an agreement among the presidents, then called the "governors," of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and which developed later, in the Banking Act of 1935, into an Open Market Committee. However, it began through the original authority in the Federal Reserve Act.

In the Banking Act of 1935, the Open Market Committee was to consist of the seven appointed Board members. Under the Banking Act of 1935, the two ex officio members (the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of Currency) were no longer members of the Board and instead of five appointive members of the Board the legislation authorized the seven appointive members plus five presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

This was further changed a little later so that, instead of a rotation of all the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, the president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank became a continuing member of the Open Market Committee, inasmuch as the New York bank was located in the money and the capital markets and inasmuch as the New York bank was and continued to be agent of the Open Market Committee.

AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM

A real System developed then, in my opinion, because the presidents, all of them at one time or another, worked together with the Federal Reserve Board in the monetary field. No longer was there a separation of the Federal Reserve banks and the Board of Governors, but rather there was a system for formulation and operation, not only in open market policy which was very important; but also at these meetings of the Open Market Committee there could be and there were discussed the economy, the credit situation, and the use of other instruments of monetary policy, such as reserve requirements and discount rates which, according to the Banking Act of 1935, had to be reviewed at least every 14 days by the directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and submitted to the Board in Washington for approval or disapproval, for review and determination. Cooperation, therefore, on reserve requirements, open market operations, and discount rates made the whole System participate in effectuating monetary policy in the interest of the economy.

Therefore, the whole situation created by this System cooperation enabled the Board members to understand what was going on in various parts of the country, not only by their own direct contacts and knowledge, but also from the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks as they attended the meetings. It also enabled the Federal Reserve banks to cooperate with the Board in Washington by holding annual meetings of new directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Every new director of a Federal Reserve bank now comes to Washington for about a day or two. With this constant contact there is no separation of Washington from the rest of the country, but there is a unified System approach to the whole country—and its economy.

Also, the Federal Advisory Council—consisting of 12 bankers appointed by the directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks—brings to the Board in Washington not only the views of these bankers, but also the knowledge they obtain in their particular parts of the country.

And the chairmen and vice chairmen of the Federal Reserve banks, who are appointed by the Board of Governors, meet with the Board at least once a year.

Mr. BRATTER. Do you believe those contacts are important?

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. SZYMCZAK. I think, from my experience, they are the most important contribution that the System has made over the years to consolidate its manpower and know-how in the money and credit field to serve the public interest. There is not a separation between the private banking interests and the public interest, as personified by the Government in Washington. These two become one—the public interest. That is a very vital thing, in my opinion, because economic and money and credit policy must have a national approach to the whole economy, not merely parts of it.

Mr. MORRILL. In saying they become one, however, you don't mean to imply they always agree?

Mr. SZYMCZAK. No, there is disagreement, not only among the presidents who attend the meetings of the Open Market Committee, but there is also disagreement among the board members who are on the Open Market Committee, and that is as it should be.

It is also important to note here that in the Banking Act of 1935 there is a provision for an annual report by the Board of Governors to Congress on the monetary policy questions as they arise, and this report shows how the individual members of the Open Market Committee voted and why. This also informs the public.

There are other matters that are important, in my opinion. For instance, the original open market operations started by each Federal Reserve bank buying or selling to meet its own requirements; to earn its living. One of the original purposes of these open market operations was not only to meet the situation but also to get revenue by which to operate.

Mr. MORRILL. It might be commented in that connection that the freedom of any bank to participate or not participate continued on down until the Banking Act of 1935.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. Yes. In this connection there were several developments. The first was before 1922. Then in 1922 until 1923 there was a voluntary agreement among the Federal Reserve banks to get together under the direction of the Chairman, who was the president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. And there were in this voluntary committee first four banks—New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago. Later on, Cleveland was added to the first four, making five.

Mr. BURGESS. In 1923 the important thing that happened was the Federal Reserve Board passed a resolution which recognized this Committee and its relation to the Board and specified what it considered should be the objectives of the work of the Committee. It gave the Committee for the first time a kind of a System status. That was the beginning of the steps that you outlined to make this thing into one organ for the whole System.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. That is right. You see, the 12 heads of the Federal Reserve banks were organized under regulations issued by the Federal Reserve Board and that Board had the power of approval or disapproval. If a bank did not want to join in the buying or selling of securities in the open market, it had to notify the Chairman of the Open Market Committee and likewise the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

EVOLUTION OF THE OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. MORRILL. It is fair to comment at this point that probably the first time the System realized that open market operations had an effect upon the reserves of member banks was shortly following the original organization of this group of presidents. For example, some Reserve banks discovered that when they bought Government securities their discounts were retired, and vice versa.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. Yes. That was one of the reasons for the development which was initiated by the New York Federal Reserve Bank. It was evident that member banks borrowed at the Federal Reserve banks when they had to meet the situation in which they had no reserves. Therefore, when the System operated to provide them reserves by buying Government securities, the member banks reduced their borrowing at the Federal Reserve banks. In the original, of course,

even the bankers' acceptances were not bought or sold for the purpose of affecting the reserves of the banks. They were for the purpose of developing a bankers' acceptance market in this country such as was developed abroad, and we were trying to follow in this country what other central banks were doing in their countries.

Mr. BURGESS. The interesting thing to me about all this is that there was a process of evolution. A process of finding out by experience how these things operated all through the early and middle 1920's. We were finding out by practical experience how all these things would work and we did not need a Congress to come and tell us what we should do. In the Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935, Congress was simply putting into law what the system had learned from experience.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. And we learned more and more that interest rates, discount rates, generally throughout the country are national. We learned that we could not change a discount rate in one Federal Reserve district and not do it in another district.

Mr. BRATTER. Does that mean that the original concept of a group of 12 regional banks with some degree of autonomy was gradually being lost in a national concept?

Mr. SZYMCZAK. No, I would not say that. I think it was the national concept of monetary policy that made the System one. I am trying to bring out the fact that the System became a true unity, not two parts, one consisting of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and a Board in Washington, and one representing the interests of the banks who were considered for a period of time as the owners of the Federal Reserve System, because they owned stock in their Federal Reserve banks. They soon learned they weren't the owners of the Federal Reserve System, that it was and is a public institution—part of our Government.

Mr. MCKEE. I want to make an observation in that connection. I think that if you were looking at the time when the System was set up, one could imagine that they had in view creating a nationwide debt payment system in this country in place of one that had been very limited. How many people had checking accounts? The only money that was saved was saved in savings accounts. But, as the country grew, the economy required the check collection as it has become today through the Federal Reserve. What would you do without it?

Now, I would like to give some of those people some of the credit for foresight because it was through the building of the 12 Federal Reserve banks which took the place of subtreasuries that there was produced the ability to handle the large volume of not only the public's exchange of credit and debt, but the Government's as well.

Mr. BURGESS. That meant that checks, when they were used in payment of debts or other contracts, could be collected promptly. A check on Dallas is just as good as a check on New York now because it is collected through the Federal Reserve System so quickly.

Mr. BRATTER. In 1922, as I recall, it was enacted that agriculture should be represented on the Board of Governors. Is that correct?

THE MEN ON THE BOARD

Mr. SZYMCZAK. Yes, there was a change as to agriculture. However, there is a point which was brought out recently by the Commission on Money and Credit that I think is very vital. That is, instead of having a representation geographically or by industry, commerce, agriculture, and finance, the important thing is to have men on the Board of Governors who have experience, know the subject, and can objectively devote themselves to the task. The moment we start saying the Board members should represent specific parts of the economy, we get into what some of the central banks in other countries have. They have so many representatives of different interests, each representing his own interests, that they cannot come to a decision. A Board member must represent the public interest.

Mr. BRATTER. Would you tell us, Governor McKee, something about other changes that were enacted in the thirties and forties, such as control over the stock-market margins, consumer credit, and so forth?

Mr. MCKEE. From the experience gained from the great depression, Congress, after extensive hearings, passed the acts of 1933, 1934, and 1935 that created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and gave statutory recognition to the Federal Reserve System Open Market Committee. These acts did much to restore confidence and create sound policies for the future regarding credit and economic stabilization.

While the authority granted under the acts of 1933 and 1935 presented the problem of many new regulations to be issued, the Federal Reserve System issued such regulations after exhaustive hearings were held with interested parties.

From 1935 until 1941 the economy moved in cycles of reasonable limits and when action seemed necessary, appropriate action was taken to relieve or correct extreme situations. Open market operations appeared to be the better control over credit, and margin requirements over speculation.

By 1941, consumer credit total outstanding had increased considerably since the depression and had branched out into many commodities besides automobiles. Things to buy became somewhat scarce in some lines and the price structure was rising. Under authority given by Presidential order, the Federal Reserve Board issued regulation W in 1942.

You will remember the defense savings bonds that were put out before we entered World War II. The System adopted payroll deduction plans that were very successful and were also adopted throughout Government, banks, and industry. The handling of war savings bonds developed during 1942 into one of the largest single operations of the Reserve System since its establishment. The bonds sold in this fashion eliminated some of the pressure on the price structure during World War II, and resulted in a huge buying power by the end of the war.

By April 1942 the armed services had to advance funds in order to get contractors to accept orders for material. Some of the advances were to be used for plant expansion and machine tools. This method put an added strain on the Treasury and had the effect of inflating deposits.

About that time the Federal Reserve Board, acting under Presidential authority, issued its regulation V for the guidance of Federal Reserve banks in handling guaranties of loans to contractors which the Army, the Navy, and Maritime Commission considered essential to the prosecution of the war. If a lending institution would make a loan by advancing its funds, the armed services or the Commission would guarantee the lending institution a substantial percentage of the loan. The Federal Reserve banks acted as fiscal agents for these three services.

This program was most successful. Loans and commitments were made as high as a billion dollars and as low as $1,000.

Commitment fees collected by the armed services and the Commission for their guaranties produced income sufficient to pay all losses on loans and left a sizable surplus to the Government from this operation.

The Federal Reserve System during 50 years has been amended many times and its responsibilities materially increased. As fiscal agent for the Government it should rate as high as any central bank in the world. For the members of the System it might be considered a standby in case of need, and it has assisted commerce and industry materially over this period of 50 years in making and receiving payments through its check collection system.

RELATIONS WITH TREASURY

Mr. BRATTER. Relations between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have always been a subject of active interest. I would like to hear some discussion of the changes that have taken place or any aspects that have not changed in those relationships over the years.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, historically, of course, before the Federal Reserve System came in, the Secretary of the Treasury as the top financial officer of the Government was usually the one who had to intervene in the markets—make deposits in gold or some other action, whenever things got seriously bad.

With the creation of a new financial agency there was bound to be a problem as to the relationship between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Reserve System.

This is not true just in the United States. This is true all over the world. In some countries the central bank is dominated by the treasury. In some it has somewhat greater freedom. And during the life of the Federal Reserve System, this conflict had to be resolved one way or another.

The first Federal Reserve Act had the Secretary of the Treasury as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in a dominating position, and it had also the Comptroller of the Currency, who is one of the assistants of the Secretary of the Treasury, as a member of the Board.

It is very interesting, too, that the Federal Reserve Board had offices in the Treasury Building just down the hall from the Secretary of the Treasury. What developed was that the Secretary of the Treasury did not ordinarily come to meetings of the Board, but whenever there was a really important issue he would come in, and people thought he just told them what to do—and there was a lot in it. People saw, over a period, that there was a conflict of interest.

BIGGEST BORROWER

The Secretary of the Treasury is the biggest borrower in the country. He borrows more money than anybody else and it is inconsistent to have him also sitting on the Board which decides what the interest rates are to be and what is the best for the country in terms of monetary policy.

So there was a huge debate about this in 1933 and in 1935, when we were picking up the pieces after the depression, and during consideration of the legislation that Mr. Szymczak has referred to. As the result of this discussion the act was changed so that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller were no longer members of the Federal Reserve Board.

Now, do they work together? Well, of course they work together. They have to work together. And the Secretary of the Treasury now consults with the Federal Reserve officials before he issues any securities. The Federal Reserve people always consult with the Secretary of the Treasury before they make any major moves.

Beyond that, some years ago when Mr. Eisenhower was President and Mr. Anderson was Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Humphrey before that, there were always regular meetings between the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Very often they met with the President.

When I was in the Treasury, every Monday Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve System, would come over to lunch and usually Arthur Burns, of the Council of Economic Advisers, was there; and every Wednesday

the Treasury staff would go over to the Board for lunch.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. On Monday the Chairman goes to the Treasury and on Wednesday the Treasury goes to the Board of Governors. This has been true for a very long time.

SEPARATE FUNCTIONS

Mr. BURGESS. But the important thing is that, while they worked together, it was clearly recognized that they had two different functions. In the last analysis, the Federal Reserve System has to make up its own mind about its own policy in the interest of the public good of the country, and the Treasury has to operate in a separate compartment.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. There is another item: The Federal Reserve banks are fiscal agents of the Treasury. In other words, every time the Treasury issues a security it issues it through the Federal Reserve banks. They are the means by which the Treasury sells its securities.

Mr. BURGESS. And the Federal Reserve cashes the coupons and carries on a whole mass of fiscal agency operations.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. That is right. Also, the Federal Reserve operated originally in the open market in bankers' acceptances, and operated in municipal warrants, and then started slowly to operate in Government securities. Originally, the debt was small and, therefore, this field was limited. Later on, however, the Government securities being issued, especially after the thirties, were just tremendous and the Fed, at some point or other, not only operated for the purpose of providing or withdrawing reserves, but also of trying to affect or influence an orderly market in Government securities.

Then came the war and at that time the Fed operated in such a manner as to keep the interest rates where they were on Government securities so they would be readily salable.

Mr. BRATTER. During your many years on the Board, did you perceive any change in the relationships between the Treasury and the Fed or has it been continuously as described?

Mr. SZYMCZAK. As described by Mr. Burgess. Through experience both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury realized that one cannot assume the authority of the other but still leave the responsibility with the other.

Mr. MCKEE. Now, of course, there were controversial individuals on both sides, but we are thinking about a period of 50 years.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. That is right and so, looking at the picture for the whole 50-year period and in the future, the Federal Reserve cannot operate in a vacuum. It must know what the Treasury is doing or contemplating doing, and the Treasury must know what the Federal Reserve contemplates doing or is doing. But, the Treasury cannot take the responsibility for what the Federal Reserve does. Therefore the independence of the System lies in retaining this responsibility. I think that is important from the public interest standpoint and the congressional standpoint.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Burgess, I think, made a very excellent statement of the broad reasons for the change. I think there is also a practical aspect of the operations of the Board, in that, as he pointed out, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency usually only came to the meetings when they considered something important was pending, or something that they were especially interested in.

But the Board's busines went on from day to day. There were multifarious activities requiring full-time attention of Board members, and sometimes there was the element of, you might say, hampering the Board, to have to bring somebody up to date.

Mr. BURGESS. Exactly. To have the Secretary of the Treasury walk into the Board without having heard the debate and the discussion and just all of a sudden cast his vote without a complete knowledge of that background, it could be very irritating—and it was.

Mr. MORRILL. And sometimes it was embarrassing to the Comptroller of the Currency because in the Treasury he was subordinate to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BRATTER. Banking's readers would be especially interested in changes which have occurred in the role of member banks in the System. Mr. Burgess, as a former Reserve bank official as well as a commercial banker and as former president of the ABA, what is the story on this question?

ROLE OF MEMBER BANKS

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I think at the beginning, there was a real difference of opinion as to whether the Federal Reserve System was to be sort of a servant of the banks, or whether it was to be an independent agency that would consider banking opinion only along with other opinions in making its policy.

I think gradually bankers have recognized very clearly that the Federal Reserve System is not their servant, that the Federal Reserve System is an independent public agency. It is the business of the bankers to benefit from it and to give it their best counsel, and to accept the judgments of the Reserve System as they are developed from all the different various points of view.

I think that bankers recognize the great value to them of this System. One indication of that is that when a member banker is nominated for a position as one of the directors of a Federal Reserve bank (three out of the nine directors are bankers chosen by banks) he almost never declines the nomination. It is considered a great honor to come to the Reserve bank every 2 weeks or whenever their meetings are held, and to sit there and to take part in the discussions, and to give advice and learn more about the Federal Reserve System and why it operates as it does.

But this is a two-way street. Bankers contribute to the Reserve System their best judgment, but similarly, a lot of bankers have learned how the Federal Reserve System works, and it makes them sort of salesmen for this System. They understand it and they explain it to their own banker friends and to their business friends, so that the policy in this country, in a democracy, is effected not in a mechanical way; it is effected because of the way people understand it. I think that participation of the bankers in this System is one of the finest things for bringing out a public understanding of the System, what it does and means.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. I think that is an important contribution of the Federal Reserve System. It has supplied information through its bulletins and through the various publications of the Federal Reserve banks on various subjects that affect the economy, explaining the credit policy and explaining the operation of the Federal Reserve System, distributing this information to schools, to those engaged in business and banking, and to others. The Federal Reserve System has a great deal of information that it compiles and gives out.

SALIENT CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. BRATTER. I think it would be interesting to have the members of the panel summarize what each one considers to have been the main contributions of the Federal Reserve System to date.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. I think there are several. One is that the member banks and those bankers who are on the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve banks and the advisory council, realize fully that this is a public institution in the public interest. That is No. 1.

No. 2, that the Federal Reserve banks and the Board in Washington have, through experience, formed a System that makes for unity in the Federal Reserve rather than for a division of responsibility.

Mr. BRATTER. Mr. Burgess, what do you think?

Mr. BURGESS. Well, as you know, I have served abroad as U.S. representative in NATO, and so I have had contact with the international scene. I think I might mention the great international contribution of the Reserve System.

It was pointed out earlier by Mr. Morrill that in the early days of the System there was a realization that no country lives by itself alone, and there were relationships established with the Bank of England and the Bank of France, and others. That has continued and has become enormously important, partly because the United States became, certainly in the twenties and then again after the great war, the custodian of a major part of the world's gold. We became the greatest financial power in the world, and the way that was administered had reactions, not only at home, not only in our own domestic economy, but all over the world.

The fact that we exported a lot of our gold and it went to Germany, France, Italy, and England and also went to a lot of the less-developed countries, was a basis for the recovery of those countries from the economic depression which hit them after the war. And the broad monetary policies adopted by the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury have had an enormous effect on that development.

Now, today, we have the problem the other way around. We are continuing to lose gold beyond the point where it is beneficial for the rest of the world and where it begins to hurt us. And now this System is taking very interesting and valuable steps to meet that situation.

They are working through the International Monetary Fund, and officers of the Federal Reserve System visit Europe and other foreign areas at frequent intervals. They maintain these international contacts which are very valuable.

The System has made tremendous achievements in international finance, making for stability, the avoidance of emergencies and crises, and facilitating a sound credit policy which is neither inflationary nor deflationary.

Mr. BRATTER. Governor McKee, have you any thoughts to add to that?

Mr. MCKEE. Well, thinking over the past 50 years, our Nation has been transformed from a debtor nation to a creditor nation. Within that period, which covered tremendous growth in this country, it is a question whether that growth could have been as extensive and as well developed without the Federal Reserve System.

Two big contributions that I see it has made to our national economy have been a currency mechanism which was badly needed when it was formed and the check collection system, both of which nobody in this country would vote to abolish. It is almost impossible to think that any subtreasury organization that might be run by the Government could ever do that kind of a job.

Mr. BRATTER. How about you, Mr. Morrill?

Mr. MORRILL. I have been impressed by the large part that holding company activities initiated in the Banking Act of 1933 and amplified in the Banking Act of 1935 and subsequent legislation have played in the deliberations of the Board, as reflected to some extent in the monthly issues of the Federal Reserve Bulletin. Proposed expansions of individual holding companies, among other things, have raised questions regarding their potential effect upon local competition, calling for extensive investigation and consideration of the views not only of the parties immediately concerned, but also of other governmental agencies, according to their

respective interests, with substantial differences of opinion from time to time.

One thing that I think was not foreseen, and could not have been foreseen perhaps, by the framers of the Federal Reserve Act, was the fact that not only the influence but also the powers of the Federal Reserve System have been extended far outside of member banks, notably through consumer credit regulations and the regulation of stock market credit. And the influence of the System has extended in other directions; for example, members of the staffs of the Board and the banks have been invited to foreign countries to advise them on their central banking and other related problems.

Governor Szymczak has had such an intimate part in some of the relations of this System, outside of its immediate province, such as under the Bretton Woods Agreement, that I think he might comment upon them.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. The National Advisory Council, created after the Bretton Woods Agreement went into effect, is a national institution and it, in effect, represents the Government on financial matters that have to do with foreign markets—lending abroad, operating in a fashion that is consistent with policies abroad and here—so that all international financial matters come before this National Advisory Council.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board is a member of that National Advisory Council. The Secretary of the Treasury is the NAC's chairman, and also on the National Advisory Council are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and others.

So, on the whole, there is a continuous amount of information that comes to the National Advisory Council and from the National Advisory Council to the Federal Reserve System. Because of the disposition of the Federal Reserve System to look at all of these matters dispassionately and objectively, without concern for appropriations or other policies, but rather looking at each matter that comes before it on a long-term, objective basis, it is able to and does make, a real contribution.

As you know, while we are not members of the Bank for International Settlements, Board members as well as staff members attend meetings of the BIS which are held 10 times a year in Basle, and also the meetings of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Mr. BRATTER. All of this has a very direct bearing on the balance of payments?

Mr. SZYMCZAK. Yes and also more. The Edge Act corporations are under the supervision of the Board of Governors. Applications for their incorporation must be approved by the Board. Foreign branches of banks in the United States must be approved and supervised by the Board of Governors. The Board has other international responsibilities.

Mr. BRATTER. I wonder if some member of this panel would care to comment on the future. We have dealt, up to now, only with the past 50 years. Is there anybody who would like to take a look ahead?

Mr. BURGESS. May I, before you do that, add one point I think has been omitted and which I think is a matter of substance. This is the personnel of the Reserve System.

The Reserve System is not a Government system. It is not a private system. It is a public institution and its employees and officers, except for the Federal Reserve Board, are not appointed by the Government politically. Fortunately, the System has been generally free from political pressures. They are able to pay a little better salaries than Government salaries. They are able to attract good people and to hold them.

Mr. MCKEE. I might add, too, from being on the outside, it is very complimentary to the System to see with what prestige the officers are held by member banks, and the consideration given them wherever they go in their own territory.

Mr. SZYMCZAK. There are two recent reports and recommendations that are naturally getting the attention of Congress at the present time and have a bearing on the Federal Reserve System. The first is the report by the Commission on Money and Credit which was published in 1961 and on which Congress had hearings before the Joint Economic Committee. The other is the recent report of the Committee appointed by the President called the Committee on Financial Institutions. This was the result of a recommendation of the Commission on Money and Credit, and this later Committee consisted of Government agency people having to do with financial institutions, including the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and others in the Government who have to do with financial institutions.

The recommendations of these two groups are already before the Congress. And in discussions in Congress it is evident it will take some time to make the changes recommended.

Out of these recommendations came a request on the part of the administration to draw up some legislation that would enable the savings and loans and banks to be and to continue to be liquid, which raises the question of reserve requirements.

One of the proposals of the Financial Institutions Committee, is that reserve requirements should also be established for savings and loan associations on their shares and also for mutual savings banks on their deposits; and also a maximum rate of interest or dividends on the shares should be established for savings and loan associations on a standby basis; but that standby basis would also be for a maximum rate of interest on time and savings deposits of member banks.

At one time this maximum rate of interest was considered by some people in the Federal Reserve System as an instrument of monetary policy because by increasing or decreasing the maximum rate of interest the Federal Reserve System would appear to be affecting rates of lending—but I doubt the advisability of the Federal Reserve having that power to establish maximum interest rates. If anybody should have it, it should not be the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. BRATTER. What do you see ahead for the Federal Reserve System? We are talking in broad terms.

POWERS WILL INCREASE

Mr. SZYMCZAK. I think the Federal Reserve will increase its powers and responsibilities and its independence. It will broaden its scope of activities, even beyond what it is doing now in foreign exchange and its other operations in the international field. By its very nature money and credit is an economic element that must have constant and increasing alteration so that it can be properly and rationally adjusted to the changing needs of economy—both national and international. This is certainly most evident today, and it will be even more evident in the future as international trade and financial transactions become more complex and more extensive in this changing world.

Reserve requirements of member banks are on both demand and savings deposits and on these the member banks have no income return, but in my opinion, they are an essential instrument of monetary policy; they do place the member bank at a competitive disadvantage with nonmember banks and nonbank financial institutions. This is a subject that has had considerable attention and I am sure it will continue to have the attention of the Federal Reserve and the Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Szymczak has just been discussing the fact that a good many proposals have been made for changes in the banking system and changes in the Federal Reserve System.

I think the interesting thing about that is that really, after very careful review, the President's committee and these other committees have not suggested really any fundamental change in the general structure of the Federal Reserve System, or any curtailment of its powers. On the other hand, that does not mean that the System does not have any great problems.

The greatest problem I see is this, that a good many college professors and theoretical people are proposing today a general policy, a monetary policy, which they would impose or enforce upon the Federal Reserve System, which I think is highly inflationary, and this is a policy of pouring out a great deal of money with the idea that this would cure the employment situation.

Now, this goes back through the history of the System. We find a great many occasions when people thought that the Federal Reserve System should have made money easier and cheaper and more freely available. Businessmen sometimes think that way as well as college professors and others.

But time after time the Federal Reserve System, weighing the careful judgment of its Reserve bank directors and the Board here in Washington and the personnel in the Federal Reserve System, has come to the conclusion that a policy of restraint in the use of credit, not making money too easy, was essential for the greatest good of the country. When they came to that conclusion they had to make decisions that was not popular.

It is never popular to make money tight, to raise the discount rate, to make money less freely available. And yet careful students know that the greatest danger in monetary policy is the danger of inflation of the overuse of credit which later can lead to a rash of difficulties. This is one lesson of the wave of speculation in the late twenties—that money was used too freely.

Mr. BRATTER. Well, gentlemen, may I recapitulate our discussion. While we have been unable to mention, let alone discuss, all of the important changes of the past five decades, it is clear from the points reviewed that the Federal Reserve System has encountered problems of nature and magnitude not foreseen by its founders; and that the System has been adapted and has adapted itself to these developments.

Tribute to Harry Kalich

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Harry Kalich is a wonderful friend to all of us. I shall cherish his friendship as long as I live. He is a devoted public servant; an ideal public servant, and I would like to join all my colleagues in saying to Harry and his family we wish for them the best that life affords and may he enjoy his well-earned retirement for many, many years.

British-Cuba Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of this period is the continuing deterioration of our image—as well as strength—abroad, and the contribution of Secretary of State Rusk as the administration's spokesman in this field has been less than sensational.

Columnist Max Freedman, writing in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, points out the very obvious flaws in the veiled threat of Secretary Rusk over a possible U.S. shoppers' boycott of British products. The injection of this subject into the dispute with Britain over trade with Cuba is a radical, juvenile performance, and is effectively discussed in the article to which I refer:

RUSK ON BRITISH TRADE WITH CUBA—SECRETARY CALLED AT FAULT IN COMMENT ON POSSIBILITY OF A PRIVATE BOYCOTT

(By Max Freedman)

Secretary of State Rusk has come perilously close to introducing a new principle that is wicked as well as stupid. It is the principle that entire nations can be guilty of guilt by association.

On a program broadcast by the Voice of America, Mr. Rusk was asked about an American boycott of British goods because of Britain's trade with Cuba. He answered: "I think it is possible there may be some consumer reaction here in this country with respect to firms that specifically engage in that trade. But that is something that is in the hands of private citizens; we have no part in that ourselves."

Now it is most unlikely that very many Americans will have any occasion to do business with the British firm that sold the buses to Cuba—the recent item in this trade that has received the most publicity. Unless Mr. Rusk's statement is meaningless, he must be saying that a private American boycott should extend to all the firms that are trading with Cuba. How can an American consumer possibly have all this detailed information about British trade?

Mr. Rusk was not talking about a general boycott of British goods. He was talking about British firms "that specifically engage" in trade with Cuba. But there is utterly no reason why Mr. Rusk should make this distinction.

These firms are not being treated as moral lepers in England. The British people are not trying to boycott them. The British Government wants more trade with Cuba. So does the Labor Party. The British press is overwhelmingly in favor of expanded trade.

Mr. Rusk has won no praise in Britain for his supposed moderation. His reference to a boycott against particular British firms has merely bewildered people and aroused great suspicion. He stands accused of conducting a campaign against British trade for which he is unwilling to take any responsibility. Since when has Pontius Pilate come to be regarded as a model for American statesmen?

Mr. Rusk forgets that millions of Americans have personal knowledge of boycotts. In the years before the war they tried to boycott goods from Nazi Germany and Japan. The challenge from those dictator states was without precedent. By comparison, the Cuban problem is a puny affair. But Americans boycotted German and Japanese goods. They did not boycott the goods of particular firms in other countries specifically trading with the dictators. That absurdity has been reserved for Mr. Rusk.

Despite the resentment in many countries against Nazi Germany and Japan, the boycott failed and the war came. Every boycott in recent history, whether conducted privately by consumers or proclaimed officially by Government, has failed. A boycott failed to stop Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia. The American boycott has failed to break China or Cuba. The boycott of South Africa by many Asian and African countries had been a clumsy gesture, not a fatal weapon. Israel still stands despite the Arab boycott.

That is the record of experience with boycotts. It provides no support for the belief that enough people in enough countries will support the boycott to make it prevail. The record shows, on the contrary, that there will always be someone who will break the boycott or refuse to accept it. In Cuba we know in advance that the boycott must fail. All the Communist countries will trade with Cuba, and Britain and France are hardly alone among the democratic nations in planning to increase their Cuban trade.

What makes this controversy almost grotesque is that Mr. Rusk in behaving as if the Cuban market is one of the important markets of world trade. He does not recognize that Britain objects even more to American political dictation of world trade than to any loss of sales in Cuba.

As Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk has a clear duty in the present dispute. It is his duty not to echo popular prejudices about Cuba but to fight them. He must dare to educate the American people by emphasizing unpopular truths and neglected realities. It is a duty which he has yet to fulfill.

Support for Raising CCC Resale Price on Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I again express my belief that it is in the best interests of the Nation's farmers to raise the resale price of Government-owned surplus stocks of wheat under the Commodity Credit Corporation, from 105 percent of the support level to 115 percent. Increasing the resale level would allow the open market to operate to better advantage, since the 105-percent level tends to set a ceiling on the market. This belief is shared by the National Farm Bureau Federation and all the major farm organizations.

I believe that this point and others relating to needed grain legislation are aptly interpreted in the following radio broadcast, presented on many Midwest stations by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.:

As the Senate Committee on Agriculture starts its work on a wheat bill, GTA is urging two important additions as part of our campaign to protect wheat farmers' income.

One such foundation would be to stop Government sales of wheat at only 5 percent above the support level, which is only 10 cents above the present loan. Just as long as there are Government wheat supplies of the class, grade, or quality the trade wants, this selling price makes the ceiling on the market beyond which price can't go. Farmers can't redeem their loans and get any higher return. Most wheat put under loan passes into Government hands, and instead of the Government holding just the surplus, it handles a large part of each crop. In the judgment of GTA's general manager, M. W. Thatcher, and others, the ceiling ought to be at least 15 percent above the ceiling or 19 cents above the new loan. That would mean a dime more per bushel coming to producers before Government sales could be made. And it would mean that farmers could use their own co-op elevators which they have worked so hard to build.

A second important change urgently needed is for the Government to stop deducting storage charges from off-farm wheat loans. This would add another dime per bushel to the floor price for all who sold wheat early in the season. It would cost the Government little and benefit farmers much. Without this change farmers can't get the minimum support promised by law. Instead of getting 50 percent of parity, farmers will get only 50 percent less the storage deductions.

Now is the time for farmers, their cooperatives, and Main Street business supporters to let Congress know that wheat income must be saved, and that should include a higher Government ceiling price on sales, and an end to Government storage deductions from wheat loans made off farm.

Write to your Congressmen and Senators, and help them get these changes made.

What's Wrong With L.B.J.'s Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, since we appear to be fair game for every dictator in the world, Henry J. Taylor's excellent article in last Monday's Washington Daily News is well worth reading:

CRY "FROG"—AND WE JUMP

(By Henry J. Taylor)

It's a dream world.

A Castro-trained Zanzibar pigmy can put a gun at the back of our American consul and walk him to the docks. Do our ships move to protect him? Oh, no, he's just booted off to east Africa like a bag of burlap.

Three American airmen can be shot down in East Germany, and so what?

Soviet stooges can bomb the U.S. Embassy on Cyprus, surrounded by the great U.S. 6th Fleet, and photograph our Ambassador struggling in the debris and dust. The front page pictures were a sellout in Nicosia while the population watched Americans flee.

Tuppenny Ghanaian tyrant Kwame Nkrumah makes Red hay with anti-American insults, and threatened, helpless U.S. teachers are given 24 hours to get out of the country.

Congolese make a mockery of our official representation, burning our flags and tearing American passports into pieces.

Panamanian whatnots, led by more than 70 Castro-trained goons, can ambush and kill our soldiers at the Balbo High School and bomb our Embassy to boot. Our dead are quietly returned to America.

For the past 2 years, some place in the world, American embassies, consulates, or agencies have been attacked, burned, or

looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity. And every time even a little bobtailed tyrant kicks us in the teeth, to say nothing of Khrushchev or Mao, Washington hastens to say he didn't mean it.

Castro can cut off a U.S. naval base's water. We talk tough on Monday and decide on Tuesday that he doesn't mean too much trouble, after all. Meanwhile, Soviet troops can remain 90 miles off our shores 15 months after the President of the United States told the world that they must leave.

In all this, we are supposed to find a foreign policy? We are to believe a policy exists? This is not a policy; it is a catastrophe.

The result? It is not easy for a country to chop the world's leading nation down to size. But the U.S.S.R. is doing a first-class job of it.

It has been nearly 20 years since we were fully respected in the world. This came with our victory in 1945. But in vast areas the Soviet became even more respected than the United States. Yet the respect of the world is our first line of defense. This was the magic of our hallowed flag: "Don't tread on me."

Soviet policy may be a mystery to our Government but it is not a mystery to the Kremlin.

What we are seeing is the Soviet technique of gradualism. Accustom people to retreating and you cannot only push them out of firm positions (like Cuba) but they'll even begin to believe that ducking into doorways is really much better than walking down the street.

This means the agggressor is getting what he wants by having it given to him. Throughout all history that has always been the road finally to war (or surrender)—never to peace.

Our momentum down this disastrous road must be broken. Never in history have enemies won so much by so little. Never have our incredible losses in strategic positions and world authority mounted so rapidly and on all sides.

If we do not retaliate against the calculated humiliations we're suffering all over the globe, our days as the world's No. 1 power are numbered. The Soviet and its stooges cry "frog" and we jump. This must stop, or God help the United States.

Letter on School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I request consent to insert in the RECORD a letter which I recently received from one of my constituents, Mr. Edward P. Hinman.

Eleven years ago Mr. Hinman was a high school dropout. It did not take him long to realize his mistake, but it was long enough so that he could not go back. Instead he was forced to complete his education on his own resources, a challenge to which he most proudly responded, though only with considerable effort and sacrifice.

Today Mr. Hinman holds a position befitting the college courses which he has also completed, and he has engaged in a personal drive to minimize the number of young people who will make the same mistake that he has so long regretted.

I commend his letter to all those who are concerned with the dropout problem:

DEAR SIR: Eleven years ago I quit high school and became a dropout. I worked 3 years then joined the Navy for 4 years. Shortly after quitting school, I realized I had made the serious mistake that thousands of young people are making every day—quitting high school.

A year after quitting school, I began taking steps in the form of self-education to make up for what I had missed. During my first year in the Navy, I completed my high school education through USAFI—with honors. In addition, I completed several college courses—with distinction. Today, almost 3 years after my discharge, I have a very good position as a data processing customer engineer with IBM. My situation is not unique, but nevertheless, it was an arduous path to get where I am today.

I share your deep concern with the increasing problem of the high school dropout and what faces him when he decides to take the same road that I took. The increasing number of dropouts is placing a heavy burden on our society—our welfare agencies—and themselves. There are very few employment opportunities awaiting them and many roads lead to dead ends. Employment requirements are becoming increasingly tougher to meet for graduates, let alone dropouts, in almost all fields of employment. Many unskilled jobs are being replaced by more efficient, labor saving, cost reducing devices such as automation, etc. My position with IBM proves this out. With the day of the computer age upon us, even everyday bookkeeping is a truly complicated, sophisticated business, which can only be accomplished by highly qualified, knowledgeable personnel. The businesses of today are forced to turn their backs on these dropouts, but why must we? I realize we don't intentionally and many communities have innovated programs to help dropouts, such as counseling, training, etc. But, why is all this necessary?

Much is being said of this problem at a local and governmental level, but what great step is being taken to help avoid this situation of over 1 million unemployed dropouts—and what safeguard is being effected to prevent its increase each year?

No one tried to stop me when I quit school and I regret that to this day. At 16 I certainly wasn't in the position to judge whether I should end my education when I felt like it. Why are 16-year-olds allowed to do this today?

I would like the answer to the following question, if you can give it to me, Congressman. Why can't a bill be introduced to Congress that would make it compulsive for a student to complete high school? If this isn't possible on a national level, why can't it be attempted with our own State of Connecticut? I realize 16 is the legal working age in Connecticut, but it should be with stipulations, such as, not interfering with school or replacing it. Many parents don't care if their children quit school to work. If they won't stop their children—who will?

We limit the drinking age at 21 and voting at 21, yet how can we justifiably allow a young person of 16 to quit school and walk into our adult world unprepared to meet its qualifications?

Laws are made to protect the citizens and the innocent. Our young people are citizens and innocent ones at that. We should protect them and prevent these mistakes that could mar their futures for the rest of their lives.

I would certainly appreciate any comments you might have on this subject of great concern to many of us, Congressman.

EDWARD P. HINMAN, Jr.

Forty Miles of Information Every Day From Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, while the manned space flight program is, deservedly, the glamour part of National Aeronautics and Space Administration activities day in and day out, our unmanned satellites hurtling through space are adding new chapters to scientific knowledge. The voluminous data which are being gleaned by NASA's space science program will serve as an indispensable steppingstone to the moon—and to the stars beyond—in man's quest into the universe.

One of the best accounts I have read of the achievements of NASA's space science program was written by Lawrence Lessing for Fortune magazine of January 1964.

After graphically outlining the many significant contributions to our knowledge which have been made, and will be made, by the satellites of the Vanguard, Explorer, Mariner, OSO, IMP, Ranger, Surveyor, and other series, the article correctly points out that the crowning achievement will be getting men to the moon so astronomers with telescopes and radio and radar facilities can view the universe more directly. This is the master key to all future exploration of space.

The article concludes with the ringing declaration:

Already the new knowledge acquired in space exceeds by far the value of funds so far spent. For knowledge, more than guns and butter, is the true power of modern states.

The article follows:

FORTY MILES OF INFORMATION EVERY DAY FROM SPACE

(By Lawrence Lessing)

(Unmanned, and often unheralded, satellites are yielding a great fund of knowledge that is revolutionizing science's view of the universe: vast solar winds are buffeting the Van Allen Belt, cosmic dust may be affecting our weather, and the Earth turns out to be pearshaped.)

Not since Galileo poked the first optik tube at the heavens in 1609 has there been such an opening of windows on the universe as in these first years of space exploration. Today we know beyond theory or doubt that space is filled with vast interacting forces and energies, stretching down from the farthest star to Earth, and with matter in many strange, tenuous, yet palpable forms. Bringing in this new knowledge is an amazing variety of scientific satellites orbiting between 200 and 100,000 miles or more above the Earth. They range from the early grapefruit-sized Vanguards to the later, larger, drum-sized Explorers, equipped with marvels of electronic miniaturization—magnetometers, radiation counters, and the like. In addition, there are the workaday satellites, such as Tiros (for weather study), Telstar and Syncom (for communication), and various semimilitary satellites, such as Injun and Transit. Coursing closer in are the smaller sounding rockets, and farther out the long-

range interplanetary probes. The record-breaker to date is Mariner 2, which late in 1962 skimmed out 180 million miles from the Earth to pass close to the planet Venus.

Altogether about 200 satellites and interplanetary probes have been successfully lofted, two-thirds of them from the United States. Currently some active satellites are being tracked by the Goddard Space Flight Center, hub of NASA's scientific satellite and sounding-rocket program. Every day some 40 miles of data pour in from these orbiters in space to Goddard's Communication Center in Greenbelt, Md. Even in these early years, with power and payloads limited, and most of the big dramatic efforts still to come, the sum of the data indicates that another big corner has been turned in human knowledge.

In 6 years these space vehicles have discovered not only a great radiation belt surrounding the earth to a height of some 40,000 miles or more, but also beyond it a great solar wind, endlessly blowing, and huge plasma clouds, arising from the sun, that periodically stir this wind into tremendous magnetic storms, penetrating all of planetary space. In addition, they have found high above the previously known atmosphere a broad band of helium gas, a deep layer of hydrogen, and great dust belts of as yet unknown origin and extent. Farther out they have discovered new clues to the mystery of the stars.

THE GIANT LEAP ABOVE THE ATMOSPHERE

This reorientation of men's minds to space is bound to have as profoundly philosophical and practical effects as Galileo's proof of the Copernican theory that the earth is not the center of the universe. Galileo's new astronomy, as later codified in the laws of celestial motion by Newton, came to underlie the arts of navigation, seapower, mechanics, and the whole scientific-industrial revolution. In much the same way, but at a much more accelerated pace, new knowledge of space is greatly extending the sciences of astronomy, cosmology, and astrophysics. And it is already beginning to revolutionize communication, energy conversion, power generation, transportation, geodetic surveying, and weather prediction down here on earth, as well as providing the basic data for navigating the last great ocean, space itself.

Three centuries of peering through the telescope gave scientists, well before the age of satellites, a remarkably rich, complex, and sweeping view of the universe. Astronomers analyzed the composition and probable evolution of stars, classified them and their galaxies, probed the nuclear processes that make them go, and detected, twining among the far interstices of space, huge clouds of gaseous hydrogen and dust. So far as is now known, the universe out to the remotest star is all of one stupendous piece. It conforms to the same physical laws and is composed of the same chemical elements, in differing proportions, as those found on earth.

But telescopes and other instruments have about reached the limits of their resolving power from earth. No telescope much bigger than Mount Palomar's 200-inch reflector is contemplated, because the technical difficulties of construction are enormous and the small amount of additional light that even a 300-inch reflector might draw through the atmosphere would hardly make it worthwhile. The atmosphere is the major block. It makes viewing the universe the equivalent of observing the world from under about 35 feet of water. Cut off by the atmosphere's absorbing matter, some 90 percent of the radiant spectrum of the universe, mainly in the ultraviolet, gamma, and X-ray regions, is invisible from earth. Thus up to now men have had only two small windows to peer through—one in the very narrow band of visible light, the other, only recently discovered, in a narrow slot of radio frequencies. Though radio telescopes can be made to "see" much farther than optical ones, their resolving power is much weaker and their information more uncertain. It is one of the towering feats of the human mind that through these small apertures men were able to piece together so coherent a view of the cosmos.

But so long as observatories were earth-bound, cosmology had to remain a largely speculative science. All knowledge of the universe had to be gleaned from highly incomplete information, from a few spectral lines on a photographic plate or wiggles on a graph. Conflicting theories still abound; indeed, almost everything so far found in space was foreshadowed somewhere in theory. Still unresolved are such large questions as the structure of stars and galaxies, the precise composition of planets, the distribution of matter and energy, and the origin of the solar system and of the universe itself. To decide conflicts over these and many other matters, men need to see in greater detail and out to greater distances than is now possible through the wavering envelop of air—out to at least 7 or 8 billion light-years.

The rocket's giant leap above the atmosphere, therefore, has opened an entirely new era in man's study of the universe. For the first time, it allows instruments and men to be placed far above the obstructing air. It opens to view the full spectrum of cosmic radiation. And it permits the mounting of experiments in space itself to test theories and gain more knowledge. The non-air-breathing rocket and artificial satellite must be counted as a great technological innovation as the telescope, which laid all the foundations of the lofty science of astronomy. Though the artificial satellite has disturbed none of these foundations as yet, it has brought in a wealth of new details, upset many theories, and uncovered not a few surprises.

PLOTTING A THIRD HARMONIC

One of the early surprises, paradoxically, related to the earth itself. The orbits of the first small satellites revealed that the earth is not exactly the "oblate spheroid" familiar in geography texts. This first approximation of the earth's shape—a sphere slightly flattened at the poles, like an orange—was arrived at by assuming that the earth is an almost perfect fluid or plastic body that takes this shape under its own mass, gravitational pull, and rotation. It was known that there were sizable gravitational irregularities affecting this shape, but how big and of what form they were was long in dispute, because gravity measurements were largely limited to that 20 percent of the earth's surface covered by land, small local irregularities confused the calculations, and the earth as a whole had never been seen from any great distance objectively.

Almost as soon as the first satellites were up and being accurately tracked, this picture began to be clarified. The satellites undulated up and down in the varying gravitational pull of the earth that held them in orbit. This pull was not smooth, as meager surface measurements had let some theorists to suppose, but bumpy. Since the gravitational field at any point is directly dependent on the gravitational field at the surface of the earth, the true shape of the earth could be calculated from the satellites' orbits. Anyone was free to observe orbits, and scientists from the United States, England, and Czehcoslovakia rushed in with calculations to show that the flattening at the poles is actually about 250 feet less than was assumed. The pattern of satellite gyrations also indicated that the earth has a much more complex shape than this slightly elliptic variation of a sphere, called a second harmoic. John A. O'Keefe and Anne E. Bailie, two NASA scientists, soon plotted a dominant third harmonic that pulls the North Pole some 100 feet higher than the South, and causes a bulge below the Equator some 50 feet greater than the one above it, thus giving the earth a pear shape. Six years of continuous observation of various satellites now confirms beyond doubt this slightly pear-shaped earth.

The consequences are much greater than these small corrections would indicate. The stresses in the earth implied by the highly uneven gravitational pull are so big that either the earth must be held together by a structure much stronger than was suspected or the forces driving its fluid convection system must be greater than was supposed. Indeed, the new data tends to weaken the plastic theory and to support a less popular theory advanced by Britain's Sir Harold Jeffreys that the earth is a solid down to its molten core, a solid with some elasticity, like bread. This throws some doubt on the generally accepted idea of continental drift—i.e., that the continents were formed from one or two huge land masses that fissured and drifted apart on the fluid mantle—since no convection currents could pass through a really solid base. A few theorists think that since the stresses may go down to the very bottom of this solid mantle, they may have been set up early in the earth's history by some enormous shock, such as the breaking away of a large portion of the earth from what is now the Pacific Ocean to form the moon. This revives a theory of the moon's origin that was once widely held but has long been discarded.

Some corroboration of the new structure and stress theories may be found in the fact that the equatorial bulge now observed is measurably bigger than it should be. Taking into account the calculable slowing down of the earth's rotation by lunar tides, this bulge seems to correspond to what it should have been some 50 million years ago when the earth's day was some 4 minutes shorter than it is now.

Though all these ideas are still very new and highly controversial, space satellites have given a penetrating new look to the deep interior of the earth and to its history. There are also more practical results. For the first time the earth's shape can be determined with great accuracy. From data and photographs assembled by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, various groups have now carried orbital analysis out to the 11th harmonic, and have found huge positive anomalies or great dimples in the gravitational field, coinciding with great earthquake areas. This is not only of vital military significance, improving the Air Force's accuracy in plotting flights and targets, but it is also important to all cartography, and even more to space navigation.

THE MYSTERIES OF THE RADIO MIRRORS

Above the earth the region from which rockets and satellites have brought the greatest influx of new knowledge is the ionosphere. This is the great band of thin ionized gases (gases whose atoms have been stripped of electrons) at the top of the atmosphere that acts as a giant electrified mirror reflecting radio waves around the earth. It was discovered in 1924 by Britain's Sir Edward Appleton, who bounced a radio signal straight up off its surface. But until space vehicles came along, the ionosphere was to high for exploration by anything but radio waves, and then only at its lower levels. Nearly all detailed knowledge of this boiling cauldron of ionization, subject to wide temperature fluctuations and blackouts in magnetic storms, has come only in the last few years.

Older radio observations had placed the ionosphere between about 40 and 250 miles up, and divided it into four distinct layers—D (present only in daylight), E, F1, and F2—each of which reflected a different range of wavelengths, according to electron density. One of the big mysteries was what caused these layers to reflect differently. Another perplexing fact was that, while the lowest D layer disappeared at night, as might be ex-

pected of ionization processes triggered by sunlight, the E layer persisted throughout the night, and the high F layers, though diminished, grew more stable.

Space exploration has begun to explain some of these mysteries. It has indicated that the upper limits of the ionosphere extend much farther out than had been suspected—beyond 3,000 miles—and it is rapidly filling in details on the exact nature and peculiar features of the layers. A new, transient layer, labeled "C," has been found some 10 miles below D. The C–D region, between 30 and 35 miles up, is the least known and most critical one. It is where radio waves are blocked or absorbed during auroral and sunspot disturbances. At lower levels in this region, ionization of air molecules has been traced to cosmic rays; at upper levels it is caused by a type of ultraviolet solar radiation called Lyman alpha and, during solar flares, by X-rays. Above the C–D region, between 55 and 85 miles up, is the E region, the lowest mirror for radio broadcasts. Here a broad band of ultraviolet and X-rays kicks off a maelstrom of reactions—over 50 all told, it is estimated—of which the major ones so far pinned down involve the formation of nitric oxide and oxygen ions. The F region, the major reflector of shortwaves, is between 85 and 600 miles on up; here the brunt of solar radiation raises electron densities to a peak of some 1 million electrons per cubic centimeter (against 100,000 in E, and less than 1,000 in D). For the first time, the E and F regions have been measured by day and by night, and a clue has been found to their mysterious persistence in darkness. As it is now understood, this persistence is linked to a diffusion process in F and to a leakage of energetic particles from the great Van Allen radiation belt discovered above the ionosphere, of which more will be said later in the article.

Some unexpected local peculiarities have also been uncovered in the ionosphere. One is a trough in D, clear of electrons; it has tentatively been linked to a recently discovered dust belt that could be sweeping out free electrons. Another curious phenomenon is a sharp hump of increased radiation in E, called sporadic E, whose erratic appearances have long been known to cause radio transmission trouble. This increased radiation is now provisionally linked to the presence of a great wind shear (two winds traveling at great speeds in opposite directions) that was discovered by a sodium-vapor rocket; it may also possibly be linked to certain magnetic-field conditions. Other never-before-seen details of the upper ionosphere have been uncovered by two unusual satellites, built by British Commonwealth space investigators, and launched by NASA in 1962. One, the British satellite Ariel, discovered three big equatorial bulges of dense ionospheric particles, reaching up to some 3,000 miles. The other, the Canadian satellite Alouette, equipped with a sweep-frequency transmitter, is taking continuous topside soundings of the whole ionosphere.

NASA's Robert A. Bourdeau has set himself the goal of mapping the whole ionosphere and plotting all its interactions, from above and below, in latitude as well as depth, through at least one complete 11-year solar cycle—obviously a tall order. The reason for this concerted attack is that the ionosphere has an effect on all communications, particularly shortwave commercial, aviation, and military. The study is being pressed not only by NASA but also by the Air Force and the Naval Research Laboratory, both of which have worked on the problem much longer. In order to track missiles, satellites, and spacecraft accurately, and to communicate reliably in the air as well as in space, it is important to know as precisely as possible the refractive errors introduced by the boiling ionosphere. Once the ionosphere's workings become familiar in detail, it should become possible to predict changes in advance and even to take some direct measures to control them.

Various control schemes are being seriously studied. For example, a pinch of iodide crystals injected by rocket—literally one part in 100 billion parts of atmosphere—might quiet the D region during solar flares, making shortwave transmission during flare activity feasible. But before any tampering is done, all possible consequences need to be known exactly. A slight contaminant trapped in the D region under a temperature inversion (e.g., a cold layer above a hot one) might permanently change its transmission of radio waves, and not for the better. Even the most recondite new knowledge, therefore, has loud practical reverberations.

THE STRANGE IRON DUST

In the emerging, ever more detailed profile of the upper atmosphere, another surprising feature came to light. The classic conception of the ionosphere was of a region that progressed smoothly from a very thin air mixture of oxygen-nitrogen to a level where atomic oxygen alone prevailed, and then trailed off into even thinner hydrogen in the near vaccum of space. In 1960, however, Marcel Nicolet of Belgium's Centre National des Recherches de l'Espace suggested theoretically, from studies of the drag on Echo, the first communication balloon satellite, that there must be another constituent above the pure oxygen layer. The only element that fitted the data was helium. Later that year the first satellite specifically equipped to study the ionosphere, Explorer 8, detected and measured, among other things, a layer of helium ions, nearly 1,000 miles deep, starting at about 600 miles up. Beyond this, other satellites reported what appeared to be a huge halo of hydrogen, in slightly greater concentration than that in interplanetary space, out to some 6,000 miles.

Within this huge area, and several earth radii beyond, still more provocative matter was discovered. This was cosmic dust, floating in far greater profusion near the earth than had been generally suspected, though such a layer had been predicted earlier by the Smithsonian Observatory's Fred L. Whipple. Most of it seems to be fine micrometeorite particles, not of the familiar, heavy iron-nickel type, but of a lighter, fragile type known as stony meteoroids. There are various suppositions about the origin of these particles. They might be debris from the collision of small planets, the breakup of meteors, the backsplash of meteors hitting the moon, or the disintegration of comets—huge "dirty snowballs" of frozen gases and cosmic rubble, a million or more of which are constantly roaming the solar system.

Some 10,000 tons of this dust, it is now estimated, fall on the earth each day. Its iron content is equivalent to a sizable portion of the earth's annual iron and steel production. Moreover, rocket probes have tended to show that this dust collects in huge orbits or belts. One belt was placed at about 11 miles above the earth, another seemed to lie somewhere between 50 and 80 miles up. Last summer two Massachusetts Institute of Technology professors, G. Fiocco and L. D. Smullin, shot pencil-thin beams of light into this region from a ruby laser, the powerful new coherent-light generator, and got back reflections that seemed to indicate two distinct upper belts, one at 50 miles, the other at 70.

WHAT CAUSES WEATHER?

The existence of such dust belts tends to encourage a theory proposed in 1953 by Dr. Edward G. Bowen, of Australia, and long hotly contested by meteorologists, that a link exists between large meteor showers and periods of heavy rainfall on earth. Bowen's theory required that cosmic dust particles be trapped in the vicinity of the earth in quasi-stable orbits, from which they are periodically dumped by an influx of particles from meteor showers to sift down and act as nuclei in forming ice and raindrops in clouds. Recently the theory has been elaborated by Bowen and others. They have found striking correlations over long periods between rainfall and certain phases of the moon, which, they speculate, may further control the periodicity of meteor showers.

Though the theory is far from being accepted, one of the dust belts has gone far to explain another phenomenon for which meteorologists have long sought an answer. In 1962 rockets fired over Sweden into a formation of noctilucent clouds—mysterious high clouds, far above the normal cloud level, seen only at dusk in high latitudes—returned with actual samples of cosmic-dust nuclei enclosed in ice particles. These seem to form the clouds at the 50-mile dust-belt level, precisely where more recently sounding rockets have found the lowest temperature ever recorded in the atmosphere, −289° F. This may be the first small link between cosmic events and weather formations on earth.

It is now known from rocket and satellite measurements that the whole upper sphere of atmospheric gases expands and contracts, churns and subsides, in direct response to the cyclic activity of the sun. No such clear links, however, have yet been found between activities in the upper atmosphere and the lower, where weather is formed. The processes here are complex and indirect. Another decade of observing all the variabels from top to bottom of the atmosphere through a full solar cycle, with a great assist from the Tiros satellites' infrared readings of heat return from earth, should clarify these links and greatly advance weather prediction and control. Horizons must inevitably move out with the greatly expanded knowledge of the atmosphere. For, if the great radiation belt farther out is taken into account, the conception of the atmospheric environment that the earth is now known to carry with it through space has been enlarged in the last few years at least 400-fold.

OUT THROUGH THE GREAT ARCS OF RADIATION

The radiation belt, extending from about 600 miles above the magnetic equator out to 40,000 miles or more, remains the single greatest discovery in space thus far. As early as 1907 the Norwegian Physicist Carl Störmer had speculated that, because the earth had a measurable magnetic field caused by the giant dynamo effect of its rotation about its molten iron core, it could trap charged particles in its lines of force. A model of how it might be done was provided in the 1950's by laboratory experiments aimed at containing thermonuclear particle reactions in so-called magnetic bottles. But until rockets came along, no one could get instruments high enough to see the effect. And no one was prepared for either the intensity or the extent of the radiation belt to be found in the earth's magnetic field, not even the experimenter who discovered it and gave the belt his name, a physicist at the State University of Iowa, James A. van Allen.

The story is now familiar of how Van Allen and his associates put a simple Geiger tube in the first U.S. satellite, Explorer 1, to count cosmic rays, and found that it went dead over long stretches. Hastily rigging another tube for Explorer 3, they got the same results, and finally concluded dumfoundedly that the counter was not malfunctioning but was being paralyzed by particles coming in at a rate at least 100,000 times faster than cosmic rays. The cosmic-ray data was thrust aside and forgotten as everyone scrambled to explore this unexpectedly great new field. It appeared at first to lie in two distinct belts, symmetrically disposed around

the earth, curving sharply in at the poles in the classic lines of force of a dipole magnet. In its lower reaches it overlapped the ionosphere, but its radiation was quite different from and many orders of magnitude more intense than that of the ionosphere. The intense component in the inner belt, reaching a peak at about 2,000 miles, appeared from early measurements to be mainly high-energy protons (hydrogen nuclei stripped of electrons); in the outer belt, peaking at about 10,000 miles, it seemed to be mainly high-energy electrons.

Less well known is the story of how this picture has changed with later satellite exploration. There are not two Van Allen belts, as was generally believed, but only one of huge dimensions, though the terms inner and outer zone remain in use. And the zonal distribution of particles is much more complex (see diagram on pages 120 and 121) [not printed in RECORD] than originally appeared. The flight of Explorer 12 in 1961 overturned the neat zonal divisions by finding that the outer region contains an important number of low-energy protons, as well as electrons, thus indicating that a more realistic picture of the belt would be a regional overlay of high- and low-energy protons and electrons. At the same time the symmetrical concept disappeared with the discovery by Explorer 10 that the belt extends out much farther from the dark side of the earth than from the light. This is caused by a steady "wind" of particles from the sun that compresses it on the sunlit side and blows it out in back—perhaps as much as 100,000 miles or more.

In this enormous area many conundrums remain. One theory is that radiation-belt particles come from two main sources: in the outer zone, from particles streaming in on solar flares and the relatively constant solar wind; in the inner zone, from cosmic-ray reactions with atmospheric atoms, producing secondary protons and electrons and accounting for the very high-energy radiation at this level. But exactly how solar particles get into the strong magnetic field is still a question. And how the particles, once trapped, maintain themselves and accelerate in energy is still unclear. Complicating the problem is the fact that the field constantly loses electrons to the atmosphere or to outer space, in greater or lesser amounts, by processes not yet known but suspected of having effect not only on the ionosphere but on the weather below. How long, on the average, particles remain in the belt is therefore an important question, to which a recent experiment gave some startling answers.

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST UNCONTROLLED EXPERIMENT

On July 9, 1962, the U.S. Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission exploded a 1.4-megaton nuclear bomb 250 miles above Johnston Island in the Pacific in an experiment code-named Starfish. The military purposes, of course, were never divulged. There was speculation, however, that these revolved about the study of blackout—i.e., the possibility of paralyzing a nation's defenses by blacking out communications, control systems, and missile-guidance mechanisms with radiation from a high nuclear blast. Riding along with this was a scientific experiment designed to study any artificial radiation belt created by the blast. A series of smaller tests high over the South Atlantic in 1958, called Argus, had had some interesting though short-term results. But the Starfish burst went beyond most expectations.

Within seconds, flashing auroras appeared 3,000 miles away in the night skies over Samoa and New Zealand. The floor of the ionosphere's D region precipitously dropped nearly 10 miles, under intense ionization, disrupting all radio communications in the Pacific area. The whole magnetic field shook violently around the world. Within 6 minutes, a big radio-telescope antenna 6,000 miles away in Peru registered a nearly tenfold jump in background noise. Within a month, three satellites were knocked out—Ariel, temporarily, Transit 4-B, a navigational satellite, and Traac, a scientific vehicle—by radiation poisoning of solar cells. Others had their life spans greatly reduced by radiation damage. But two satellites—Injun 1, launched with instrumentation by Van Allen's group a year before, and Bell Telephone Laboratories' communication satellite Telstar 1, launched a day after the blast—operated long enough to monitor the initial radiation from two heights. The explosion shot an enormous jet of electrons to unexpected altitudes, where they were trapped. It is estimated that over 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 electrons were injected into the belt, of such intensity that they could easily be detected above the natural electron flux. While most of the immediate, spectacular effects swiftly subsided, there remained this new belt of dangerously high radiation coiling within the old belt around the earth.

Controversy had flared before the test, when groups of United States and European scientists protested its dangers and uncertain consequences. There was even more bitter controversy afterward over how long the new radiation would remain. Van Allen's group, which had gone along with the test and monitored it at low altitudes, maintained that the new belt would disappear by absorption in the atmosphere within a year; others, led by NASA's Wilmot N. Hess, leaning on Telstar and other satellite measurements higher up, estimated that it would last much longer. As in many scientific controversies, both proved right, but not to the same degree. At low altitudes the new radiation was quickly dispersed in the atmosphere, and at high altitudes it disappeared, through magnetic fluctuations, into space. This was proved, ironically enough, by a series of three, equally strong, high-altitude Russian tests that apishly followed Starfish some 3 months later. Because the Russian shots injected particles into the belt from very high Siberian latitudes, where the highest magnetic lines of force bend down toward earth, most of their radiation was carried into the lowest and highest regions of the belt, where it was soon dissipated. But most of Starfish's intense radiation, injected from equitorial latitudes, wound up at the more stable, intermediate altitude of 1,000 to 2,000 miles, where it hung on.

Late in 1962, Van Allen finally concluded from further data that the artificial belt of electrons is likely to last 10 years. And results are now in from Explorer 15, sent up specifically to measure the new belt, and its data shows that if the electrons follow their present observed rate of decay "it will be possible to detect their presence among the naturally trapped particles for at least 20 years." This may be shortened during the next peak of solar activity, due about 1968–69 on its regular 11-year schedule, when big solar flares may tend to flush out electrons. Meanwhile the flux remains intense enough to constitute a real, additional radiation hazard to men and equipment. An astronaut at about 1,000 miles up, with maximum practical shielding, would receive about 25 roentgens an hour. A total of about 100 are enough to cause violent nausea and radiation sickness, and an accumulation of 500 is lethal. "It is not a region in which to sit or linger," says Wilmot Hess.

On the credit side, the experiment has brought in more knowledge more quickly than possibly any other device concerning the probable life cycle of particles in the belt. And this knowledge is spurring the military, NASA, and industry to develop more radiation-resistant equipment. But scientifically the test was an uncontrolled experiment of awful proportions. So little was known before the test about the natural radiation belt that the study of its properties may now be obscured for years by the artificial belt. And militarily the test may prove simply that radiation blackout, like its progenitor, the bomb, is a weapon as likely to knock out its users as its victims. Repeated high-altitude bursts of even bigger bombs could easily create a belt many thousand times more intense than the present one, bringing an end to the reliable operation of all scientific, weather, communication, navigation, and other satellites, and endangering all space exploration. There was therefore more than one reason why last summer's test ban treaty included an agreement to keep nuclear explosions out of space.

WINDS THAT "BLOW" 1,000 MILES PER SECOND

Any premature end to space exploration would be high tragedy, for only now, beyond the radiation belt, instruments are beginning to yield answers to some of the age-old secrets of the sun and earth and planets, and of the interplanetary medium that joins them.

Explorers 10 and 12, besides measuring the earth's magnetic belt, made the first detailed observations of the solar wind—a plasma of hot, highly attenuated, ionized gases composed of protons, electrons, and helium nuclei—flowing in steadily but variably at gentle cosmic speeds of 200 to 500 miles per second. Now and again this wind is whipped to velocities of 1,000 miles a second or more by solar flares—long, intensely hot tongues of plasma, distantly observed for decades, leaping from huge explosions on the sun in bright sunspot areas. Rocket probes and satellites have now been sent into the area of flares to measure them directly. In major flares, their data shows, a large chunk of the sun's substance is ripped out, carrying with it an actual portion of the sun's magnetic field. This acts as a gigantic magnetic "bottle," conducting the hot plasma streaming out into space, and occasionally detaching itself from the sun as a giant, self-contained plasma cloud. This plasma moves upon the earth at supersonic speeds, preceded by an enormous shock wave, battering and compressing the radiation belt, sending magnetic disturbances down through the ionosphere into the earth.

The radiation accompanying such flares is the single greatest hazard in space. There is as yet no really good protection against the biggest flares. Fortunately, they occur infrequently, only once or twice a year at the height of sunspot activity; unfortunately, they are also highly unpredictable. Hence much more needs to be known about the behavior of the sun, quite aside from advancing pure knowledge, so that spacemen can be warned in time to adjust flights, take evasive action, or escape back to earth. Up to now, nothing noted on the sun has given sufficient warning time. But NASA's orbiting solar observatory, launched in 1962, turned up a hopeful clue. Preceding some larger flares by a few hours was a series of tiny microflares, never observed before. A close watch of these micoflares and other features may make it possible to predict the giant flares. Late last year NASA launched the first of a series of IMP's (interplanetary monitoring platforms) to orbit at a maximum height of nearly 200,000 miles and keep a constant watch on the sun.

A GREAT SORTIE INTO THE SOLAR SYSTEM

Nearly all long-distance records for a satellite thus far were broken by Mariner 2, the space probe designed by California Institute of Technology's Jet Propulsion Laboratory and launched on a pass at Venus in December 1962. In 129 days of continuous operation and communication out to a record 53,900,000 miles from Earth, it transmitted back some 65 million bits of information, now stored on tape. Only the major peaks of

this mountainous pile of data have so far been analyzed.

On its way out, Mariner 2 confirmed the solar wind at great distances. It affirmed the concentration of cosmic dust near earth, finding it 10,000 times denser than farther out. Only two meteoroid hits of any significant size were registered on the whole journey. And it found that the entire radiation dosage on the trip was much less than expected, only about three roentgens. It would have been a good year for manned space flights.

Some 22,000 miles from Venus, at a signal from earth, Mariner turned its microwave and infrared scanners on the high, impenetrable clouds of that mysterious planet. Instruments registered a surface temperature on Venus of some 800° F., no detectable water vapor, and no cosmic dust in its vicinity. The planet had almost no apparent rotation and no magnetic field—hence nothing to shield it from intense solar flares. It appeared to be a dead and stifling world under the greenhouse effect of its dense cloud cover, speculatively a smoglike mixture of hydrocarbon gases. This confirmed some theories about the planet and severely jolted others. Twenty days later Mariner departed into a silent, eternal orbit around the sun.

Late this year another Mariner will probe around Mars, where the possibility of finding conditions more favorable to some form of life is greatest. Also scheduled is a series of Surveyor flights to the moon, from which the United States has been less successful than the Russians in getting back data. Meanwhile, the whole program is moving from small satellites, each fitted to a single mission, to big, advanced, flying-boxcar satellites, crammed with 20 to 50 sets of instruments for broad-scale attacks on big areas. Starting with the orbiting solar observatories (to probe the Sun and all solar plasma phenomena), this new generation will include a series of orbiting geophysical observatories (for the upper atmosphere, radiation belt, and magnetic field), and, as a crowning effort sometime in 1965, the first Orbiting Astronomical Observatory (for stars and galaxies). The whole series is aimed at a methodical look at the whole solar system and intergalactic space. An understanding of the origin and workings of the solar system should go far to solve some of the deeper problems of galactic space, where only recently the great radio telescope at Jodrell Bank, England, has measured magnetic fields between the stars, associated with great clouds of hydrogen and dust, much like the plasma connecting Sun and Earth.

BIG BANG OR STEADY STATE

Beyond the solar system, rocket probes and satellites so far have brought in only a few tantalizing hints of greater discoveries to come. A series of probes has shown, for instance, that hot stars are putting out less ultraviolet radiation than previously calculated; less by as much as 30 to 40 percent. If the measurements are not being shrouded by dust clouds or other factors, this means that the stars are burning hydrogen much more slowly than was thought and the whole scale of stellar evolution may have to be revised.

Another series of probes, capped by Explorer 11, turned up what may be a key bit of evidence in determining the origin of the universe. There are two well-known theories. The leading one is the big bang theory, in which it is postulated that the universe began at a finite point in time, some millions of years ago, with the explosion of a gigantic, dense, primordial atom, creating all the present elements, stars, and galaxies. This is inferred from the strongest cosmic evidence thus far, that all the galaxies are observably receding from one another at tremendous speeds as if from that original explosion. The second theory, called the steady state, infers that the universe has no beginning or end but is continually creating new hydrogen between the stars to replenish the disappearing galaxies. The new rocket findings show, however, that there are many fewer gamma rays in interstellar space than there should be if hydrogen is being created continuously. Hence the newest findings tend to support the big bang theory against the steady state.

More recently, a series of rocket probes has made another big discovery in one constellation of our own galaxy. This is a huge source of X-rays, undetectable from earth, about 1,000 times more intense than those from the sun or any known stellar processes. In the most distant galaxies, radio telescopes have recently discovered other inexplicably huge sources of energy, greater than any thermonuclear processes so far known on earth. All this leads physicists to anticipate the discovery of entirely new principles for generating enormous amounts of power, and along with this, from further study of solar plasmas and other stellar phenomena, new energy transfer and conversion techniques. Meanwhile, more advanced ultraviolet, gamma, and X-ray instruments in the new orbiting observatories may well reveal other wholly new and perhaps revolutionary aspects of the universe.

Already being planned for advanced satellites are experiments to investigate some of the fundamental yet still largely mysterious underpinnings of the universe, such as the force of gravity and the speed of light, the great universal constant that is the linchpin of modern physics.

IS MAN LOST IN SPACE?

Ultimately, of course, and sooner than the word implies, men will go out there to observe, experiment, and see for themselves. As great and ingenious an advance as space instruments are, they still observe the universe at many removes. Much of the data they send back is equivocal, open to various interpretations, or just plain inconclusive. And no instrument can be designed to cope with all possible unknowns. Even so eagerly awaited an advance as the orbiting astronomical satellite is still a highly unstable platform from which to view the stars. It is subject to perturbations, hard to aim or keep on targets, and its telescopic pictures are degraded by television transmission back to earth. Once astronomers are carried in satellites, it should be a great improvement, for there is no substitute at a telescopic eyepiece for the astronomer's direct vision and control.

But even then, the artificial satellite is not an ideal platform, for every slightest movement of the astronomer will cause an equal and opposite movement of his weightless observatory. And even an orbiting space station—the much larger, more permanent type of manned satellite being proposed by some—would have the same defect, plus the additional disadvantage that, in order to make it habitable for extended periods, it will probably have to be spun to give it some measure of artificial gravity.

But there is nearby a natural satellite—the moon—that is an almost perfect space platform. It is big and solid. It has almost no atmosphere to speak of and just enough gravity to make it possible easily to erect huge, stable structures, such as telescopes, radio, and radar facilities. From these astronomers will be able to view the universe more directly, through fewer intervening systems and hindrances, than ever before. Hence, despite recent political pulling and hauling, there are many sound scientific reasons, as well as others, for getting men to the moon. And this will be done, for it is the master key to all future exploration of space.

The purposes of this exploration are no clearer to many men in this age than they were in Galileo's, so it is not strange that there is opposition. In this economic age, however, the opposition is not so much theological as budgetary. Both seem equally mistaken in the context of their times, for the earlier astronomical discoveries did not diminish man's spirit but rather enlarged and ennobled it, and space discoveries should have the same uplifting and enlarging effect. After all, a budget is only money, but new knowledge is a dukedom whose great wealth and resources cannot even begin to be estimated or exhausted. Already the new knowledge acquired in space exceeds by far the value of funds so far spent. For knowledge, more than guns and butter, is the true power of modern states.

Cuba Is Guilty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the excitement over the latest crisis at Guantanamo, we might tend to forget Castro's completely illegal and belligerent activities against other members of the Organization of American States.

An editorial in the Monday, February 17, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, very properly reemphasizes the guilt of the Castro government in its aggression against Venezuela and most properly calls for severe and lasting sanctions. I insert the article for the Appendix of the RECORD:

CUBA IS GUILTY

According to reliable sources the five-nation, inter-American investigating team of the Organization of American States has finished its investigation and has found Communist Cuba guilty of aggression against Venezuela. The official report is due to be released shortly.

The OAS investigating team was made up of representatives from Uruguay, Costa Rica, Colombia, Argentina, and the United States. Their report is based on several pieces of confirmed evidence.

One such piece of evidence was the existence of documents showing that Cuba has trained more than 400 Venezuelans in guerrilla warfare in the past 2 years. There was, also, the evidence of some 3 tons of arms found on a remote beach in Venezuela. The arms were positively identified as having come from Cuba by means of serial numbers on record in Belgium, the source where Cuba bought the arms.

A raid by Venezuelan police on the home of a known Communist in Venezuela turned up documents outlining plans to capture the capital city of Caracas.

Under the terms of the 1947 Rio de Janeiro treaty of mutual assistance the OAS may now invoke one or more sanctions against Cuba. These sanctions include the ending of both diplomatic and consular relations, an economic blockade against Cuba or the use of outright armed force.

Such sanctions have been imposed in only one other case by inter-American action, that of a Venezuelan complaint against Trujillo in 1960. The sanctions of that time were severe; they consisted of a break in diplomatic relations, a partial economic boycott and the suspension of all trade in arms and war materials. The Trujillo regime collapsed a short time later.

What sanctions the OAS will impose against Cuba are not known. It is hoped, in some circles in Washington and Latin America, that they will be severe and lasting.

Panama Riots: Deputy Thelma King's Role in Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the frequently mentioned names of the Red infiltrated Panamanian Government is Deputy Thelma King, of the National Assembly.

A news story by Jules Dubois in the January 19, 1964, issue of the Chicago Tribune supplies some interesting reading about her activities in urging the Panamanian people to go into the streets and fight.

The news story follows:

WOMAN SAYS SHE EGGED ON PANAMA RIOTS

(By Jules Dubois)

PANAMA CITY, January 18.—Thelma King, 42, rabblerousing Colon congresswoman and admirer of Cuba's Fidel Castro, told the story of her role in last week's flag war on the Canal Zone boundary.

In an exclusive interview at her office in the legislative palace here, she admitted that she made radio broadcasts calling on the people to go into the streets and fight.

She denied that she is a Communist but admitted that she has had long-standing links with them. Miss King advocates that only the Panama flag be flown in the Canal Zone.

URGED CONTINUED BREAK

She also admits that she is one of those who urged President Roberto Chiari not to renew relations with the United States until an airtight commitment was obtained for a new treaty. She said that she started that pressure Thursday after the peace agreement was published.

Dressed in mourning black, she conceded that if it were not for the fact that she enjoys parliamentary immunity she would be in jail for her role in the Panamanian riots.

Miss King said that the United States is no longer the No. 1 power in the world and can no longer use the "big stick" policy. The United States and Russia are equal both in balance of power and in influence throughout the world, she said.

WANTS CANAL FOR PANAMA

Miss King expressed hope that the United States would abandon the canal. She said she objects to the internationalization of the canal and prefers nationalization.

"We are not going to change one master for a group of them," she said. "The day we make a change it will be for nationalization."

"Did you call out the troops and the people in Panama City?" she was asked.

Answer. I called on the Guardia National to leave its barracks and defend the Panamanian people. When I did it, I was complying with my duty as a deputy of the national assembly. It was the obligation of the Panamanians to go out and fight because the constitution said so.

Question. I understand that you went to the palace to ask for arms for the people.

Answer. I told the President of the Republic—and I said so over the air—that if he did not want to use the National Guard please to give the people arms so they would not be massacred with empty hands.

FEARED MASSACRE

Question. What did he answer?

Answer. The President told me that if the National Guard went into the streets, the massacre would have been greater, which I do not believe.

Question. Then the President did not wish to order the Guardia to act?

Answer. The President of the Republic considered at the moment—and I believe that he still considers it—that the National Guard is not equipped to oppose the American troops. I believe the commander of the Guard thinks the same. I asked myself then, why do we have it? To defend ourselves against whom?

POLICE FORCE ADEQUATE

Question. Aren't they here to defend the border and the country?

Answer. To do that a police force is enough.

Question. Do you advocate modifying the structure of the Guardia National exclusively to that of a police force?

Answer. I would devote all my efforts to that. I have been fighting for that a long time. I never have understood why the Americans want such a strong force as our guard here. I am absolutely sure that we can defend ourselves with our own means, as we now have proved. That error, that mistake, that communism is coming here is false."

Selling What Railroads Can Produce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Selling What Railroads Can Produce," by D. W. Brosnan, president of the Southern Railway System, which we in Alabama are proud to claim as one of the great rail systems of the country.

This article appeared in the January-February 1964 issue of Progressive Railroading, which is distributed to the chief executives and officials of railroads throughout the United States.

Mr. Brosnan asserts, in this article, that railroads are demonstrating a great industrial flexibility, in this day and age, and that they can compete more vigorously with other forms of transport if they will only use the best sales techniques, unremittingly.

The article is as follows:

SELLING WHAT RAILROADS CAN PRODUCE

(By D. W. Brosnan, president, Southern Railway System)

Evidence grows stronger that railroads are in the earliest days of a new era that will see great growth in their usefulness to the public and in their use by shippers.

America's railroads for many years have seemed the ultimate paradox in a competitive economy that supposedly responds to the principles of free enterprise. They continue to struggle for bare survival in a competitive transportation world, yet railroads have shown two prime competitive abilities that should make them highly useful to the public, profitable to their owners and a source of strength and security to their employees.

First, railroads can attain and maintain a high productive capacity in their almost unlimited ability to move freight. Second, railroads can "manufacture" this freight transportation at low unit costs that grow lower with every increase in the volume of traffic.

Such competitive strengths have formed the basis for spectacular success in most other mass production industries. If they have not led to market growth, company stability and healthy profits in the rail industry, there must be—and there is—a reason.

SALES EFFORTS MUST BE INTENSIFIED

Change for the better will come swiftly as railroads continue to intensify their present sales efforts and put proven techniques of modern marketing to work in selling customers the high-quality, low-cost transportation railroads can produce at a profit.

For far too many years the railroads have taken a negative, self-defeating approach to the problem of competition. Attrition of business has been accepted as a fact of life. Railroads have often considered it a great accomplishment just to slow down the rate at which they were bleeding to death because of traffic losses to competitive modes of transportation. Cost-saving improvements applied as tourniquets have done little more than sustain flickers of life in what should be a vigorously healthy railroad industry.

Railroads make much in public statements of the billions of dollars spent in modernization, especially in the years since the end of the Korean conflict. These dollars, for the most part, have been spent defensively. Emphasis has been placed on saving what is left of rail traffic from further inroads by competitors. Little has been done to mount a strong and well-planned attack on the traffic being moved by other modes of transportation.

The challenge and great opportunity for railroads in the years immediately ahead calls for emphasis on selling. Railroads must make competition, not merely try to meet or respond to competitive situations set up by other modes. Railroads must regain the initiative that has been seized by others who spotted railroad weaknesses in pricing and marketing and then worked effectively to take traffic away from railroads by taking advantage of these weaknesses.

In the years ahead railroads must learn to make competition for common carrier trucks, common carrier bargelines, common carrier pipelines, common carrier airlines and, especially, for private and unregulated carriers of freight. All have competitive weaknesses that can be exploited to the railroads' gain.

In the public interest and in the long-run interests of the railroads, railroads must also make competition for each other. There must be intramodal as well as intermodal competition. Cooperation in the rail industry can be a fine thing, but genuine competition is also needed to forestall cooperative mediocrity. The public is entitled to the best jobs and lowest prices railroads can generate in competition with one another as well as in competition with other forms of transportation.

The undeniable technological progress which railroads have made in recent years has so far been largely nonproductive progress. Proof is found in traffic statistics that show railroads still losing ground to other freight transporters.

RAILROAD TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS REAL

Railroad technological progress is real. No question about that. Railroads have learned

to do things better. Costs have been controlled and, in numerous instances, lowered substantially. But when billions in property improvements and an increase in efficiency result in a loss of business, something is seriously wrong. That something is the lack of a marketing approach that really sells what railroads can produce.

To some extent the railroads today can be said to resemble the muscular models pictured in advertisements in physical culture magazines. Muscles are on display but they appear to be for show and not for use. So much attention has been given to their development that useful employment of the apparent strength is rarely emphasized.

Railroads have the "muscles." It is time to stop admiring them and start using them. Railroad management faces the challenge to get going, to find ways of putting the "muscles" of efficient productive capacity to full use in developing new and more useful railroad services and pricing these services to attract business.

Continuing technological advances will be required to keep railroads in business in the future but emphasis should shift as rapidly as possible from internal cost control to the improvement and customer tailoring of railroad equipment, services, and pricing.

MARKET RESEARCH

Those charged with the responsibility of marketing rail transportation can well look at the railroad industry's own buying practices when it is a customer. When a railroad goes into the market to buy from its suppliers it is accustomed to getting what it asks for and demands nothing less. Railroads, too, often buy according to their own specifications and do not consider it strange that those who want railroad orders are willing to adapt their products to meet the specifications. Or, even, to set up special production lines geared to filling railroad orders.

Manufacturers interested in the railroad market go even further and are constantly at work on product improvement or the development of entirely new products which can earn them a greater share of railroad business. They try to anticipate railroad needs. They send representatives to purchasing agents offices armed with sales information about new products that will save railroads money in a direct way or that, by improving performance and reducing operating costs, will save railroads money in indirect ways.

The more successful a railroad supplier is in developing things a railroad can't afford not to buy, the greater the certainty that company has of a profitable existence. There is a lesson here for railroads, if they will heed it.

Market research underlies all such business-getting efforts—sound, factual, painstaking market research. It is linked with aggressive, persistent, doorbell-ringing salesmanship that does not depend on casual cordiality but on a sure grasp of railroad needs and with a product tailored and priced to meet those needs.

Similar research and selling approaches are virtually new in the railroad business. We have been so far behind the times in these areas that we are only beginning to realize that many shippers today couldn't afford to use some presently available railroad services even if the railroads offered these services for nothing. Fortunately, the "products" railroads are trying to sell are in most cases better than that. Nevertheless, and all too often, the kind of transportation railroads are trying to sell is the kind that is easiest to produce.

Because railroad freight transportation has so often fallen far short of meeting customer needs, many shippers have gone to highway or waterway common carriers to get what railroads would not give them. Others have bought tailormade services from contract carriers. And, most harmful to the welfare of all common carriers, an increasing number of shippers have taken their freight completely out of the common carrier market into private transportation.

The extent of this erosion of traffic and the number of revenue dollars involved are readily apparent in some recent statistics released by the Transportation Association of America. During 1962 about $38 billion was spent for the intercity transportation of freight. Rail freight service, including shipper costs for loading and unloading, accounted for something over $10 billion of this. All carriers fully regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board got just about half of the $38 billion. Obviously, the rest was spent by shippers for some form of private or unregulated carriage.

There is some mighty appetizing arithmetic for railroads in these figures. About $28 billion worth of intercity freight transportation business in this country is freight that railroads are not now handling. Two-thirds of it is not moving by regulated common carrier at all. There's plenty of business to be had but railroads will have to do a lot better job of pricing, selling, and service if it is to be attracted to rail movement.

Most of the traffic railroads have lost went elsewhere because railroads did not know what their customers needed or, if they did know, failed to come up with the services and the pricing to satisfy customer requirements. "Lost" applies not only to business that has been diverted from railroads to other carriers but business the railroads have never had.

Every ton of freight moving in overland transportation is potential railroad business. A great deal of it is also readily obtainable railroad business if the high-volume, low-cost advantages of railroads are packaged, priced, and marketed with customer appeal after sound market research has been done.

BUSINESS SUCCESS DEPENDS ON SATISFIED CUSTOMERS

Any successful business has to be conducted for the convenience of the customer, not that of the seller. This platitude is so basic as to cause raised eyebrows at almost any meeting of salesmen of consumer goods. Yet there is much too little evidence that railroads understand this kind of selling.

Part of it requires that railroads find out in greater detail what the "convenience" of a customer really requires. His need may be for some special equipment design to help him control loading and unloading costs or prevent damage to fragile freight. Dependable delivery on a specified schedule may be vital to the efficient functioning of his plant production line. Freight rates subject to adjustment may be pricing rail service out of consideration entirely. One or all of these, and many more factors, may affect a shipper's choice of carriers. A railroad that wants a shipper's business must know the customer's freight movement requirements intimately. Sometimes, it must know them better than the customer does. That's when a real job of selling can be done.

When you're in the business of selling answers to distribution problems—and that is what modern railroading is all about—you're lost unless you know what the problems are. Discovering them involves sitting down with the customer and studying his operation for distribution problems that exist or may develop. Save the shipper money and you'll get his business. Southern Railway has done this to an increasing extent in recent years. So have other railroads. But all railroads will have to do more of this kind of selling than any railroad has done up to now.

New business on the rails or old business reclaimed for railroad movement will stay with a carrier only as long as performance matches promises. Control over the quality of service rendered a customer is essential in a highly competitive world that permits a shipper to shift rapidly from one transportation mode to another when his business is not being properly handled. Keeping a customer sold demands that railroads deal with their shipper acounts in the same way other industries protect their product reputations. Service failures cannot be lightly dismissed.

The rewards can be great when an intelligent enthusiasm is given to sales efforts in the freight traffic field. Great for the railroads. Great for their customers. Great for the public that pays all freight bills eventually.

Customers are waiting in far greater numbers for railroads to do something for them than the declining traffic statistics of recent years would seem to indicate. Every cost-savings-to-the-customer approach that railroads have made on a studied-market basis has usually surprised their proponents by being productive of more traffic than anticipated. "Trial" efforts have often found the railroads short of being able to meet demands for the services offered. At times it has seemed that shippers were more anxious to use railroad service than railroads were to supply it.

CONSUMER—GETTING PRICING

Railroad customers and potential customers have responded favorably to every sales approach which has been based on an understanding of their needs for sensible services, cost-cutting car equipment, and realistic pricing. With these tied together into a money-saving proposition when overall transportation costs are considered, no one with freight to move can ignore what railroads offer.

This has called for railroads breaking away from tradition, recognizing that railroading is not a tradition but a business. A business that is in competition with other businesses for the shipper's dollar. A business that has a new role to play in the complex production and distribution system of modern-day American economy. When railroads have done this—throwing away their scrapbooks full of mementoes of days that will never return and getting out their briefcases—business has been brought back to the rails.

More of it will be brought back as it has been brought back by tri-level auto-carriers, containerized and piggyback freight movements, unitized trains or one-commodity volume movement rates, specialized freight cars like Southern Railway's "Big John," and an enlightened pricing policy that shares benefits with customers when costs of transportation can be reduced.

Southern Railway's "Big John" grain freight rate reduction illustrates one of the almost limitless possibilities inherent in alert, aggressive, customer-oriented marketing. Thorough research developed the facts. Grain was moving in tremendous volume into the grain-deficit Southeast from the grain-rich Midwest. Very little was moving by rail, most was hauled in unregulated highway trucks and a substantial part of this in back-haul movements, helping highway trucks meet operating costs that enabled them to underprice rail service on other traffic. Here was an inviting market for "no-frills" railroad transportation.

Southern's designers created the right car (national grain dealers have since declared for the use of "Big John" covered-hopper-car types since Southern first introduced the 100-tons-plus concept) and Southern had cars built. A multiple-car rate about 60 percent lower than the existing rail rate was feasible with a highly satisfactory profit margin and Southern published the rate.

Then began the most difficult of all the sales approaches railroads face, regularly when trying to build business and save customers money while doing so. The Inter-

state Commerce Commission had to be sold on giving its approval to the new greatly lowered grain freight rates. The whole round of protests, delays, suspensions, investigation, commission hearings and, finally, court actions have been required to get the rates into what is still temporary effect. Only after almost 22 months from the time when the rates were filed could customers begin to use them. Meanwhile, excessive freight charges on grain moving into the Southeast continued to be collected from a defenseless public whose welfare the Commission is charged with protecting.

LEGISLATIVE CORRECTION OF RATE LAWS NECESSARY

Giving the Commission full credit for sincerity in its attempts to interpret the law it must administer, the absurdity of its continued efforts to allocate traffic among modes of transportation by administrative decisions is clearly apparent if genuine competition among modes of carriage is to be encouraged.

The cure is not continued castigation of the Commission. It lies in the area of legislative correction of laws that fail to affirm clearly the rights and freedoms of all carriers to do their best jobs at lowest fair and nondiscriminatory prices for users of freight transportation. This is a sales job for railroads. And the customers to be sold in this instance are the American people, most of whom believe completely in the virtues of free enterprise. Railroads, as a whole, have not done all they might in urging Congress to permit competitive freedom in transportation.

Maximum selling of the transportation railroads can produce must remain subject to these administrative handicaps until our Nation's laws are changed. Only then will the public get the full benefits through lower prices of the railroads' ability to move freight in great volume at low cost.

Meanwhile, it remains true that railroads have only begun to scratch the surface of the exciting possibilities that market research, service improvement, equipment design, realistic customer-getting pricing, etc., offer for the more effective, more profitable use of the modern transportation plant created around the basics of the flanged wheel and the steel rail.

In Defense of Bellyachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, President Johnson contended that those who criticized him were "bellyachers."

An excellent editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News of February 13, sent to me by a constituent, makes many sound observances on Mr. Johnson's head-in-sand attitude. It follows:

THINGS COULD BE WORSE BUT ROSE-COLORED GLASSES WON'T MAKE THEM PLEASANT

(By Jack W. Gore)

There are many times in this business when we wish we could don some rose-colored glasses and look at recent happenings in this country and throughout the world with the aplomb and lack of concern that President Johnson displayed this past Tuesday.

Speaking informally before a group of Internal Revenue people, the President conveyed the impression that while things were not going quite as well as most of us might wish, they could be a lot worse than they actually are.

The President then lashed out at critics of his administration and declared that the best way to treat them is to ask that "God forgive them for they know not what they do."

This is a roundabout and polite way for a President to tell people like us that we are too stupid to understand the delicate balance of world affairs these days, and that only those in the high echelons of our Government are in any position to explain events in the right way and put them into their proper perspective for the benefit of the people of this Nation.

Well, we could be stupid but we are not so naive as to believe that we are winning a ball game when we are going into the final innings with the score 10–0 against us. Sure, the score could be worse. It could be 16–0 or even 25–0, but surely that is no legitimate reason to explain away the mistakes and the errors that have put us so far behind another type of ball—the eight ball.

One of the basic purposes of a free press in any country is to try to differentiate, for the benefit of the people it serves, between political propaganda and the cold, sterile facts behind any particular situation. This is also supposed to be one of the functions of an opposition party, but today it seems to be a function which many members of the GOP appear to have forgotten.

In any event, however, we aren't seeking reelection to any public office and we have no political ambitions which force us to sweep unpleasant or embarrasing facts under the nearest rug in the vain hope they will thus go unnoticed. We happen to believe this Nation of ours isn't doing anywhere near as well in the conduct of its foreign relations as President Johnson has attempted to indicate. We also believe it is not only silly but dangerous to our future security to gloss over the tragic events of the past couple of years with the weak explanation that things could be much worse.

Perhaps we are not living under the immediate threat of being clobbered by Soviet missiles as President Johnson says we were some 18 months ago. Perhaps we don't have a recent Bay of Pigs disaster to forget and cover up in the most adroit manner possible.

We are, however, still paying the penalty for the weakness we displayed on those two occasions, and no amount of political double-talk by President Johnson or anybody else can change that fact.

Mr. Johnson would have us believe that we are forced to compromise our principles and keep backing away from one crisis after another in order to save the world from destruction by nuclear weapons. We'll certainly grant the point that both Russia and the United States have the nuclear capacity to destroy each other, but we do not grant the point that Russia is any more eager to touch off a nuclear holocaust than we are.

After all, why should Russia want to resort to nuclear war to obtain objectives it is already achieving through diplomatic and other means? Can President Johnson deny that Russia took over Cuba without firing a single shot and that the Soviets now have the help of our allies in breaking our so-called economic blockade? Can President Johnson deny that American soldiers are being killed in a losing battle to prevent the Communists from taking over Vietnam while the Russians sit back and laugh at our efforts to extricate ourselves from this dreary situation? Can he deny that while American diplomats and citizens are being pummeled by angry mobs in various parts of the world, Russia is apparently enjoying almost complete immunity from such events, and has its agents and sympathizers busy in a score of other places stirring up additional trouble for us faster than we can cope with that we already have?

Washington should be truthful about our foreign policy for a change. Certainly we have problems and certainly we can't just "mash a button" and have everything turn up roses for us. But at the same time, we cannot maintain respect in the world by kicking our friends in the teeth and backing away from every crisis for fear we are going to offend somebody or break up our present cozy little "detente" with the Soviets.

God will undoubtedly forgive those who know not what they do. But we doubt that even God will save those who know what they should do and don't do it under the impression they can conquer godless communism with kindness.

Critics of failures in the conduct of our foreign policy have good cause to be deeply concerned about where we are heading. Truth compels admitting of the fact we are losing our war against communism, and we hardly think President Johnson has done the Nation any service by brushing aside our failures with the explanation we could be doing worse. This excuse may satisfy the female reporters and the wives of diplomats and Congressmen with whom Mr. Johnson dances away the hours almost nightly at the White House, but it is an explanation that leaves us completely cold and completely fearful we're going to lost a war before our leaders take off their rosy, politically-tinted glasses and recognize our enemy for what he is.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian Council of Miami recently adopted a resolution in commemoration of the 46th anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania has been occupied by the Communist forces since June 1940, but the American citizens who have loved ones and relatives there have not forgotten these oppressed people.

The resolution follows:

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI,
Miami, Fla., February 16, 1964.

Resolution adopted by a meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of Miami, on February 16, 1964, at Miami Lithuanian American Citizens Club in Miami, Fla., to commemorate the 46th anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918:

"Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, enjoyed a free and independent existence from 1918 until June 1940, when the Soviet Union by chicanery, subversion, and force invaded and occupied the country, and still rules and oppresses the Lithuanian nation to this day; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States strongly denounced the unlawful Soviet seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, and rightly does not recognize the illegal annexation and Moscow-imposed rule of these countries; and

"Whereas with the attention of the world focused on the new African and Asian nations which were liberated from colonialism

with the aid of the United Nations and have joined the community of free and independent states, the plight of Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied nations has largely been neglected: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we request and urge our Government to instruct the U.S. delegation of the United Nations to place the case of occupied Lithuania and the other Soviet-captive nations before the committee on the abolition of colonialism and the liberation of all nations and peoples from foreign rule and oppression, principles for which the Soviet Union avowedly stands, the necessary evidence for presentation of this case is complete and ready in the 'Report of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States Into the U.S.S.R.' (U.S. House of Representatives); be it also

"Resolved, To urge our Senators and the Members of Congress from our districts to support the introduction by the United States of the case of the Baltic States and other Soviet-enslaved nations before the appropriate body of the United Nations; be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; and copies thereof to Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Senators from our State; the Congressmen from our districts; and the local press."

Done this 16th day of February 1964, at Miami, Fla.

A. D. KAULAKIS,
Chairman.
Mrs. J. BUKAVECKAS,
Secretary.

U.S. Humiliation Sponsored by Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a column by Henry J. Taylor, which appeared in the Houston Press on Monday, February 17. Mr. Taylor points out the manner in which the Reds are calling the tune and the United States dancing to Communist music. Is it not reasonable to ask the administration when there will be a change in foreign policy to preserve the security of the United States instead of trying to protect the image of the Red dictator in the Kremlin?

Mr. Taylor's column follows:

CALCULATED HUMILIATIONS: REDS CRYING "FROG" AND UNITED STATES JUMPING ALL OVER THE WORLD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

It's a dream world.

A Castro-trained Zanzibar pigmy can put a gun at the back of our American consul and walk him to the docks. Do our ships move to protect him? Oh, no, he's just booted off to East Africa like a bag of burlap.

Three American airmen can be shot down in East Germany, and so what?

Soviet stooges can bomb the U.S. Embassy on Cyprus, surrounded by the great U.S. 7th Fleet, and photograph our Ambassador struggling in the debris and dust. The front-page pictures were a sellout in Nicosia while the population watched the Americans flee.

Two-penny Ghanan tyrant Kwame Nkrumah makes Red hay with anti-American insults, and threatened, helpless U.S. teachers are given 24 hours to get out of the country.

Congolese make a mockery of our official representation, burning our flags and tearing American passports into pieces.

Panamanian whatnots, led by more than 70 Castro-trained goons, can ambush and kill our soldiers in the Balboa High School and bomb our Embassy to boot. Our dead are quietly returned to America.

ONE NATIONAL INSULT PER MONTH

For the past 2 years, some place in the world, American Embassies, consulates, or agencies have been attacked, burned or looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity.

And every time even a little bob-tailed tyrant kicks us in the teeth, to say nothing of Khrushchev or Mao, Washington hastens to say he didn't mean it.

Castro can cut off a U.S. naval base's water. We talk tough on Monday and decide on Tuesday that he doesn't mean too much trouble, after all. Meanwhile, Soviet troops can remain 90 miles off our shores 15 months after the President of the United States told the world that they must leave.

In all this we are supposed to find a foreign policy? We are to believe a policy exists? This is not a policy; it is a catastrophe.

The result: It is not easy for a country to chop the world's leading nation down to size. But the U.S.S.R. is doing a first-class job of it.

NOW UP TO L.B.J.

It has been nearly 20 years since we were fully respected in the world. This came with our victory in 1945. But in vast areas the Soviet became even more respected than the United States.

Yet the respect of the world is our first line of defense. This was the magic in our hallowed flag: "Don't tread on me."

There are always barbarians outside the walls. International life is the history of great marauders and the balance of power and of older nations on the road to ruin. Yet barbarians, competitors, and despoilers have received more credit for their programs than they deserve. Generally what they have superseded or destroyed is already so shattered by appeasement, demoralization, rationalizations, and blindness that it was ripe and hollow for the bully beforehand.

Soviet policy may be a mystery to our Government but it is not a mystery to the Kremlin.

What Premier Khrushchev wanted President Kennedy to do was not to make peace as the late President understood it but to make the President stop resisting the U.S.S.R and seal the status quo, plus much more. He wants the same with President Johnson.

STOP IT OR ELSE

What we are seeing is the Soviet technique of gradualism.

Accustom people to retreating and you can not only push them out of firm positions (like Cuba) but they will even begin to believe that ducking into doorways is really much better than walking down the street.

This means the aggressor is getting what he wants by having it given to him. Throughout all history that has always been the road finally to war (or surrender), never to peace.

Our momentum down this disastrous road must be broken. Never in history have enemies won so much by so little. Never have our incredible losses in strategic positions and world authority mounted so rapidly and on all sides.

If we do not retaliate against the calculated humiliations we are suffering all over the globe, our days as the world's No. 1 power are numbered.

The Soviet and its stooges cry "frog" and we jump. This must stop, or God help the United States.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

The House in Commitee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, no single piece of legislation in the past decade or more of our history approaches the importance and significance of this bill which this House has been debating for the past several days. Indeed, few other single pieces of legislation will ever be proposed which will have the impact of H.R. 7152.

Since debate began on the bill, we have heard many hours of discussion, and the legislative history of the civil rights bill will clearly indicate that we have attached the importance to this bill that it so justly deserves.

I think it is important to remember that this bill is designed to give the force of law to the principles for which this country has stood for centuries—equality and liberty. It is, in a way, a shame that we must legislate on this question. Equality should be axiomatic in the United States. Nonetheless, since this is a grave social and economic problem within and without our boundaries, we have the responsibility, indeed the obligation, to rectify the injustices which have plagued minority groups in America.

It is obvious that our prestige abroad has suffered as a result of our dilatory tactics in the field of civil rights. True, we are not the only nation with a discrimination problem, but as the leader of the free world and symbol of equality, this refusal to insure equal rights has seriously impaired our position.

I believe that our prestige at home has suffered also. Who can be proud of race riots and violent demonstrations of bigotry? Who can be proud of discrimination in hiring and in education? Who can be proud of unjustified blocks to voting? Our self-respect should dwindle with each indication of bigotry and racism.

Passage of this bill will not only further the cause of equality, but it will vindicate our Nation's claim to worldwide respect as the home of liberty.

A nation is more than a piece of paper which proclaims its identity and principles. Because it is composed of human beings, it is prey to human frailties. It is only as perfect as its weaknesses—only

as strong as its determination to eliminate these weaknesses. The United States has always risen to outside challenges to its security and must now rise to the inward challenge to assure freedom to all of its people, regardless of race, color, or national origin.

Our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee have presented to us a bill which I feel is a good one. Its opponents have raised many arguments, especially centering around the public accommodations and fair employment practices section. I should like to reflect on these sections for a moment.

In July 1963, the Meriden Record, a prominent newspaper in my district, printed an editorial on the public accommodations section of this bill. I believe that this editorial is worthy of attention. It states succinctly the theory behind public accommodations legislation. The editor writes:

Opponents of President Kennedy's proposed new civil rights legislation criticize the provisions having to do with barring discrimination in stores, restaurants, hotels, and the like on the grounds that they infringe the rights of private property. For the Federal Government to dictate that there be no discrimination by owners and managers of businesses which serve the public as to the race of those they serve is an unwarranted invasion of the freedom of an individual to use his property as he pleases, the argument runs.

This is true. But this particular invasion, when and if it occurs on a Federal level, will be neither the first nor the morst burdensome. It's been a long time since we've been able to do exactly as we pleased with our property, any of us. Its use has long been restricted for the purposes of making it conform with the general health, safety, and economic prosperity of the community, and all signs are for more restrictions rather than less.

Even private property which is reserved for strictly private use has got to conform with building codes, fire laws, and zoning ordinances. A man can't put his house where he likes on his lot, and he can't put a two-family house on property he owns in a one-family zone.

When you move into the field of property which is used for business serving the public, the restrictions are manifold and often expensive.

A man can't wash his restaurant dishes the way he pleases. He's got to provide designated fire exits. He must obtain licenses for food and liquor, and abide by the provisions under which they are issued, in the interests of protecting the public.

Connecticut is with two-thirds of the rest of the country, some 30 States and many cities besides the District of Columbia, which include among these regulations for the conduct of places doing business with the public a law which forbids discrimination on account of race or color. It can't be claimed that the law has done away with such discrimination, but at least it makes it more difficult, and defines the intent of the principle with which most of us agree. It's another infringement on the free use of private property, but it is generally recognized as neither burdensome nor unfair. Moreover, the infringement of property rights is justifiable because it is necessary to advance the cause, at least equally important, of civil rights.

Mr. Chairman, this is a thoughtful and excellent analysis of the question and I commend its contents and philosophy.

Discrimination is a subtle and devasting problem. It has faced all of our people, in varying forms, since the beginning of this country. From the Puritan abhorrence of the Catholic in the 1700's, from the Chinese Exclusion Acts of the 1800's, from the "no Irish need apply" signs of the late 1800's and early 1900's, from the refusal to hire the Italians in the early 1900's, from the problems faced by all immigrant groups down to those frustrating our Negro communities, Americans have faced and dealt with the problem of discrimination. Undoubtedly, the problems faced by the Negro are of greater magnitude and will require greater efforts to solve, but I believe that it is in the very nature of this country to act swiftly and fairly to end this grave injustice and to assure a climate of freedom that will judge each man, woman, and child on his or her merit, blind to the hallmarks of color, accent, or ethnic origin.

Although we pass this bill—and it must be passed—we must still concern ourselves with the less obvious problems of discrimination. We must work together in every city, every community, every neighborhood to give reality to our principles and strength to our goals. I am sure that all Americans will react to this challenge and that it will be met with maturity and with the wisdom of shared experiences and common goals.

Drop in Wheat Farmer's Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to make some changes in our price support program for wheat. It is apparent that wheat farmer's income in 1964 will be down from 1963.

The Department of Agriculture should be prevented from acting as a serious depressent on wheat.

The Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., in a recent radio broadcast heard on many Midwest stations, has suggested improvement of the legislation considered in the Senate.

I believe that every Member of Congress should give this matter serious consideration. Cotton presently has a resale formula of 115 percent of the support price plus carrying charges. It is of utmost importance that this formula be applied to other comomdities, especially to wheat.

I believe both suggestions of the GTA are worthy of the support of Congress. This is the text of the broadcast:

As you know from our broadcasts, the showdown on a new wheat law is rapidly coming in the U.S. Senate. The need for action is urgent—or there will be a drastic drop in 1964 wheat prices.

Futures markets at Chicago and Kansas City now are running at a level which would return farmers about $1.45 per bushel on the next crop. That is still 20 cents over what the loan will be if no action is taken by Congress, but it is a long way below today's prices, and there would be no Government payments to help make up the deficit in wheat farmers' income.

Crop conditions in the winter wheat belt both in the United States and in Europe are also improved—although it is a long time to harvest yet.

Difficulties in shipping U.S. wheat to Russia may mean more U.S. wheat on hand to hold down prices this next season.

All of these reasons are why many Senators in both parties are hard at work right now on the new wheat bill. It's expected that the Agriculture Committee may finish its work this afternoon or tomorrow, so that the whole Senate can debate it next week.

Even with the best efforts, it is likely that there will be still a substantial drop in wheat income, maybe as much as $250 million. That would still be a lot less than the five or six hundred million slash which will hit the Wheat Belt if no law is passed. This big drop is why GTA has been working on two important amendments which could add more than $100 million to wheat farmers' income and wipe out much of the expected deficit.

M. W. Thatcher, GTA's general manager, has urged Congress to put a stop to storage deductions from wheat loans. This now knocks an average of a dime per bushel off the support price and gives farmers less than what the law says they are entitled to.

A second amendment would prevent Government sales of wheat at less than 15 percent above the support price. This would add at least a dime a bushel to market prices each year after the harvest rush is over. It would also allow farmers to redeem their wheat loans and move their wheat through their own cooperatives, instead of having such a large part of each crop going through Government hands.

Both of these amendments are under consideration, but the chance of adopting them or any strong wheat bill looks in very grave doubt right now. Unless a real all-out effort is made—wheat farmers will end up with either no wheat law or such a poor one that they might as well have none.

If that's the case, M. W. Thatcher says the forthcoming National Farmers Union convention in St. Paul will turn out to be a wake—instead of a successful meeting. To bolster the fight, it's reported that the assistant majority leader of the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY, has been placed in charge of mustering all possible support. It will take a bipartisan effort, though, and that's why every wheat farmer should write or wire his two Senators—regardless of how strong a fight they are already making.

Ask your two Senators to give all their attention to this most critical question now before them—getting a wheat bill which will save your income in 1964 and 1965. Do it now or it may be too late.

That's the message we bring you today from GTA's general manager, M. W. Thatcher, who is in hourly contact with what is going on at the Capitol.

The Candidacy of Astronaut John Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks today an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of February 22, 1964. In view of some of the statements that have been made as to why Col. John Glenn should not run for the U.S.

Senate, I think this editorial certainly puts this matter into proper perspective. I believe that Colonel Glenn's experience is something that the country should utilize to the highest possible degree, and I think the U.S. Senate is the proper place to utilize it. The Saturday Evening Post editorial follows:

THE CANDIDACY OF ASTRONAUT JOHN GLENN

When John Glenn announced that he was going into political orbit, a great howl went up. Many people said he had no experience for the Senate, and others complained that if he had to go into politics, he could start somewhere below the top. The Senate, said the New York Herald Tribune, is the wrong place for him to start. "It's just that the Senate, like Project Mercury, requires certain skills, specialized knowledge, and experience of its own."

John Glenn is, of course, a political novice, but it is hardly fair to suggest that his experience would have no relevance in the Senate. The principal business of the U.S. Government is defense. More than half the budget goes into it. The great new business of the future is space. Next year's budget calls for an expenditure of $5 billion on space research and technology. John Glenn has spent 21 years in the defense business as a U.S. marine. As the first American to orbit the earth, he would be the first U.S. Senator with direct experience and knowledge of the space business.

Ironically, many of the people who frown upon the idea of Glenn's running are those who constantly urge good men to go into politics. The notion that some sort of legislative magic is needed in order to be a Senator is overrated. If the record of the 88th Congress has proved anything, it is that the qualities most urgently needed in the Senate are youth, energy, drive, and impatience with the status quo.

In the coming months John Glenn's views will be thoroughly aired. If he manages to defeat Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, his 74-year-old opponent in the May 5 Democratic primary (the Senator is confident he will beat Glenn "handily"), he will face a formidable opponent in Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., in the fall elections. As a candidate for the Senate, Glenn deserves to be judged on all his qualifications; on a realistic appraisal of his experience, on the programs he advocates, and the understanding and imagination with which he advocates them.

Man's Eternal Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of my colleagues to the editorial, "Man's Eternal Enemies," which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on Sunday, February 16. It eloquently strikes a note of hope for a more stable world:

As it has been for centuries, mankind's common enemies have been hunger, poverty, and disease.

These enemies still beset one-third of the world's inhabitants, a depressing figure when compared with the affluence that has come in the 20th century to the developed nations, such as the United States, West Germany, France, and Britain.

It is equally depressing that these problems had been relegated to a lesser priority because of an obsessive preoccupation by an anxiety-ridden world with the cold war.

The arms race between the powerful leaders of the two world blocs—the United States and the Soviet Union—made the commitment of vast sums to defense imperative. This meant that funds that could have been used on a greater scale for undeveloped countries has not been available.

This was particularly true in this country, where a reluctant Congress had been taking a harder, colder look at our foreign aid programs.

In this connection, it should be noted that our military spending represents more than half of the national budget. At the same time, we are committing less than 2 percent of our gross national product to aid undeveloped countries.

But in recent weeks, there has been a hopeful atmosphere, judging from soundings in Washington and Moscow, the seats of the world's dominant powers.

Despite the ominous rumblings emanating from Peking, which is making new noises about Moscow's revisionist policies, President Johnson and Premier Khrushchev have been scaling down defense demands.

The foundation for this new look at arms spending was laid by the President in his appearance before the United Nations, where he made an urgent appeal for an end to the cold war "once and for all."

Mr. Johnson spoke of a New Deal on a world scale for the developing nations, similar to the one that came to the United States 30 years ago, an era that was marked by sweeping social legislation to fight back the oppressive tides of depression that lapped over our economy.

The United States, Mr. Johnson said, wants "sanity and security and peace for all, above all."

These words clearly chart the course that the President has marked out, a course away from another catastrophic world war. More important it points to a course toward a more stabilized world, which would be able to devote greater energy and funds toward the defeat of mankind's eternal enemies * * * hunger, poverty, and disease.

Pygmies Humiliate America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public is rightfully demanding a complete review of our foreign policy especially as it relates to the need to maintain the position of the United States as a leading power of the free world, not permitting the deterioration which has set in completely over the last 3 years.

Columnist Henry J. Taylor, writing in the Monday, February 17, edition of the Pittsburgh Press, dramatically calls attention to the abuse the United States is taking throughout the world, and I believe his views, which are those of millions of citizens across the country, might well be heeded here in Washington. I include the article at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PYGMIES HUMILIATE AMERICA—UNITED STATES SWALLOWS INSULTS OF WORLD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

It's a dream world.

A Castro-trained Zanzibar pygmy can put a gun at the back of our American consul and walk him to the docks. Do our ships move to protect him? Oh, no, he's just booted off to East Africa like a bag of burlap.

Three American airmen can be shot down in East Germany, and so what?

Soviet stooges can bomb the U.S. Embassy on Cyprus, surrounded by the great U.S. 6th Fleet, and photograph our Ambassador struggling in the debris and dust. The front-page pictures were a sellout in Nicosia while the population watched the Americans flee.

Two-penny Ghanaian tyrant Kwame Nkrumah makes Red hay with anti-American insults, and threatened, helpless U.S. teachers are given 24 hours to get out of the country.

Congolese make a mockery of our official representation, burning our flags and tearing American passports into pieces.

AMERICANS DEAD

Panamanian whatnots, led by more than 70 Castro-trained goons, can ambush and kill our soldiers in the Balboa High School and bomb our Embassy to boot. Our dead are quietly returned to America.

For the past 2 years, some place in the world, American embassies, consulates, or agencies have been attacked, burned, or looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity. And every time even a little bobtailed tyrant kicks us in the teeth, to say nothing or Khrushchev or Mao, Washington hastens to say he didn't mean it.

Castro can cut off a U.S. naval base's water. We talk tough on Monday and decide on Tuesday that he doesn't mean too much trouble, after all.

In all this we are supposed to find a foreign policy? We are to believe a policy exists? This is not a policy; it is a catastrophe.

The result? It is not easy for a country to chop the world's leading nation down to size. But the U.S.S.R. is doing a first-class job of it.

It has been nearly 20 years since we were fully respected in the world. This came with our victory in 1945. But in vast areas the Soviet became even more respected than the United States. Yet the respect of the world is our first line of defense. This was the magic in our hallowed flag: "Don't tread on me."

There are always barbarians outside the walls. International life is the history of great marauders and the balance of power and of older nations on the road to ruin.

Yet barbarians, competitors and despoilers have received more credit for their programs than they deserve. Generally what they have superseded or destroyed is already so shattered by appeasement, demoralization, rationalizations, and blindness that it was ripe and hollow for the bully beforehand.

SOVIET TECHNIQUE

What Premier Khrushchev wanted President Kennedy to do was not to make peace as the late President understood it but to make the President stop resisting the U.S.S.R. and seal the status quo, plus much more. He wants the same with President Johnson.

What we are seeing is the Soviet technique of gradualism. Accustom people to retreating and you can not only push them out of firm positions (like Cuba) but they'll even begin to believe that ducking into doorways is really much better than walking down the street.

This means the aggressor is getting what he wants by having it given to him. Throughout all history that has always been the road finally to war (or surrender), never to peace.

Our momentum down this disastrous road must be broken. Never in history have enemies won so much by so little. Never have our incredible losses in strategic positions and world authority mounted so rapidly and on all sides.

If we do not retaliate against the calculated humiliations we're suffering all over the globe, our days as the world's No. 1 power are numbered.

The Economics of Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last month the University of Michigan and the Bendix Systems Division of the Bendix Corp. sponsored the Second International Arms Control and Disarmament Symposium. Experts in various fields and from various States and countries participated in the symposium at the University of Michigan. One of the most interesting papers was presented by Mrs. Donna Allen, a Washington economist. Mrs. Allen presented an important and provocative view of the relationship between our economic situation and military spending. A summary of Mrs. Allen's paper appeared in the Ann Arbor News on January 23, 1964. I urge my colleagues to read the following article which summarizes Mrs. Allen's paper.

SPEAKS AT ARMS CONTROL SYMPOSIUM: ECONOMIST CHALLENGES TRADITIONAL VIEWPOINT

(By Helen Petrick)

"The best thing for the American economy is disarmament," is the view economist Mrs. Donna Allen, of Washington, D.C., voiced today in the first of three papers presented by women at the Second International Arms Control and Disarmament Symposium being held on the local campus.

She gave her paper, "The Economic Necessity to Disarm: A Challenge to the Old Assumptions," under the sponsorship of the national organizations of Women Strike for Peace and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

Challenging the traditional view that holds that the economics of disarmament threatens dislocation, depression, and disaster, she made four points.

1. Arms spending is not good for the economy and must share responsibility for the country's present bad economic condition.

The military economy has drained off too much of the scientific, engineering, and other special skills that are needed to automate the civilian economy. Military automation produces evils of overly speedy displacement of workers avoided by civilian automation which is controlled by market forces.

2. The American economy is not a healthy one. As evidenced by high unemployment, it is in serious trouble with worse to come in less than 10 years.

3. It is erroneous to assume that political forces, and thus the Congress, will not change in this decade as do some pessimistic disarmament economists. This view incorrectly holds, according to Mrs. Allen, that the defense spending prop to the economy will have to be fought back every inch of the way by moral persuasion. Influencing future Congresses will be the Negro, now in revolt against being ignored, and unprecedented numbers of young people entering the job market which lacks opportunities.

4. Disarmament will come out of economic necessity. The only place where there is money in sufficient amount to solve our economic problems is in the arms budget. Congress must dip into that budget to finance needed solutions.

Mrs. Allen says that the two national women's peace organizations sponsored her appearance here because they are impatient with current belief that disarmament will cause depression.

The speaker received an M.A. degree from the University of Chicago where she concentrated in problems of industrial relations and government fiscal policy.

She taught industrial relations at Cornell University from 1953 to 1955. That school will soon publish her current book, "Fringe Benefits: Wages or Social Obligation?"

Her appearance at the symposium is the occasion of a second visit to this city. In June of 1962, she took part in the first national meeting of Women Strike for Peace held in Ann Arbor.

She was a member of the original group in November 1961, demonstrating against the arms race in Washington which formed the nucleus of the nationwide movement of Women Strike for Peace.

She is chairman of the National Legislative Committee of the WILPF, a member of its national board and executive and policy committees.

Discussing her sponsor groups during an interview, Mrs. Allen described the WILPF as a structured organization with a broad spectrum of interest in social issues such as the cause of peace and freedom, civil rights, and economic problems. The Ann Arbor group lists 35 members.

The second group, Women Strike for Peace, which in known in Ann Arbor as Women for Peace, differs in that it has no membership dues and no officers. Women work toward a broad common goal of general and complete disarmament without being bound by organizational commitments.

Why don't the two groups disband now that there is a nuclear test ban?

"Our ultimate goal is total, general, and complete disarmament. This has not been achieved. As long as nuclear weapons exist in the world, it's not a safe place in which to live," she says.

Brushing aside the suggestion that such a viewpoint might be interpreted as surrender to the Russians, Mrs. Allen says, "the two women's groups believe in complete disarmament on both sides by agreement." According to her, East-West conferences have revealed that on the other side of the Iron Curtain, women are as disturbed by the arms race as are American women. She says they are working in their own way toward the same goals although this has not yet included demonstrations.

In private life, Mrs. Allen is the wife of Russell Allen, associate professor of industrial relations at Michigan State University and until recently with the AFL-CIO in Washington. They have four teenage children.

She believes that "women in their concern for the future generation turn to peace movements because they are distressed about a world where people talk about blowing themselves up."

Other women participating in the arms symposium include Prof. Esther Milner of Brooklyn College's School of Education, speaking on disarmament planning, and Miss Helga Haftendorn of Bonn, Germany, representing the German Society of Foreign Affairs reading a paper on that country's participation in disarmament negotiation.

Statement Supporting Hospital Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I share the hope entertained by many of my colleagues that the able Committee on Ways and Means of this House will in this session favorably report to the House the hospital aid bill as strongly recommended by President Johnson and supported, I believe, by the great majority of the Members of the Congress and of the people of the country.

I should like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues in the House a statement in support of the hospital aid bill which I made before the House Ways and Means Committee on November 21, 1963.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE, NOVEMBER 21, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am not altogether a stranger to this subject or related subjects. You will recall that back in the early days of the war our people were shocked at the large number of our men between the ages of 18 and 44 who were rejected from selective service because of physical and educational inadequacies. In the field of health alone, 2,997,000 men were rejected because of physical defects.

Because of the fact that that was a matter of vital concern to our national security, I introduced in the other body a resolution which led to the establishment of a committee which, among other things, had the obligation to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult, regarding the distribution and utilization of medical personnel, facilities, and related health services.

For some 3 years, that committee functioned and was known generally as the Committee on War Time Health and Education, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Welfare of the other body. As I said, I had the honor to be chairman of that committee. We made a number of inquiries into the health needs of our people, the personnel which was available to care for the needs of our people in the area of physical health, and what in addition to what was already available the Federal Government might provide.

As a part of that investigation and as a result of the conclusions we reached on account of it, our committee recommended, among other things, that the Federal Government set up a program to assist in the building of hospitals over the country and our recommendations came to be the Hill-Burton bill which originated in the other body and which is now the law of the land, and it has done immeasurably good.

Fortunately, it maintains the principle of simply being primarily concerned with the provision of hospital facilities and, as you know, today Federal assistance is available to public or private hospitals on the basis of their serving the needs in the area where they happen to be located. There is no way to tell you how many lives have been saved, how much the health of the people of this country has been promoted by that measure which was undertaken by the Congress of the United States and has been steadily maintained and enlarged by the Congress.

We also recommended an extensive program of Federal programs in the field of research and as an outgrowth of that and of other proposals we have today many institutions in the National Institutes of Health which are making immeasurably valuable contributions to the health of the people of our country * * * the prolonging of the lives of our citizens, by virtue of the research that is being carried on. But it became apparent to all of us, Mr. Chairman, that not only did we need the hospital facilities and the medical and other personnel of technical abilities, but we also had to find some way to make it possible for the people of this country to get the benefits of these facilities and the immeasurable skills that are now available in this country from our technical personnel in the medical field.

We discovered as a result of our investigation that the private insurance program as it then existed, and I think the same is true today; was not adequate to meet the needs of our people. We discovered that the people did not have the private means that would make those facilities and that personnel available to them.

Consequently, back near the middle forties, my committee strongly recommended a national health insurance program or compulsory health insurance program, as it was variously called and later recommended by President Truman. The bill came to be known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill which I was an introducer and I have constantly maintained the stability and soundness of that principle.

Today, however, I think our primary concern is to limit the application of that principle to the hospital area, to the provisions of hospital care, and today I do not favor the inclusion of anything in the principle or in the program except a provision of hospital facilities because I think the principle should have a fair trial in the provision of those facilities. After sound experience the Congress and the country can determine whether we need to go or should go beyond the limitations of that program which is embodied today basically in the recommendations of the President and in the bill introduced by the able gentleman from California, Mr. KING, which with his permission I was permitted to introduce a copy of in the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the President of the United States deemed this subject of sufficient importance, that is, the provision of care for the elderly in many fields, to send a special message to the Congress in February 1963. In the course of that message the President said:

"Our senior citizens are sick more frequently and for more prolonged periods than the rest of the population. Of over 100 persons age 65 or over, 80 suffer some kind of chronic ailment, 28 have heart disease or high blood pressure, 27 have arthritis or rheumatism, 10 have impaired vision, and 17 have hearing impairments, 16 are hospitalized one or more times annually. They require three times as many days of hospital care every year as persons under the age of 65.

"Yet, only half of those age 65 and over have any kind of health insurance, only one-third of those with incomes under $2,000 a year have such insurance; only one-third of those age 75 and over have such insurance; and it has been estimated that 10 to 15 percent of the health costs of older people are reimbursed by insurance."

The able chairman of the special committee which has been making a study in the province of the aging in the other body, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator MCNAMARA, in a report he made in Februrary of 1963 said:

"Even those of the aged who are fortunate at one time or another to be able to secure some degree of protection through the purchase of hospitalization insurance have felt these often frail needs slip or slipping from their grasp, for increases in the cost of hospitalization have even outstripped the rise in hospital charges. No other major items of consumer expense have experienced rises comparable to the increases in the cost of hospital services and hospitalization insurance. These two items are in a class by themselves. By way of comparison, during the period 1960 through 1962, the price of food increased by some 4 percent, clothing by about 2 percent, and housing by approximately 4 percent, as compared with an increase of an estimated 27 percent in hospital service charges."

Now, what are the needs of these people? How adequate is their ability to provide these facilities and services for themselves?

The President touched upon that point, Mr. Chairman, in his comments to the Congress in February of last year. The President said:

"The average annual income received by aged couples is half that of younger two-person families. Almost half of those over 65 living alone receive $1,000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than $2,000 a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than $1,000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their homes, of less than $5,000. One out of 8—2¼ million people—are on public assistance, averaging about $60 per month per person, supplemented by medical care payments averaging about $15 a month."

Now, Mr. Chairman, prior to coming here this morning, I called on the telephone the county manager of Dade County, a part of which I have the honor to represent in this House, Mr. Irvin MacNair. We have two county hospitals in Dade County.

By the way, our population in our county is a little over a million. Jackson Memorial and Kendall hospitals are the county hospitals. In the last fiscal year, the fiscal year 1962–63, the budgets of those two hospitals were $17,727,000. Of that budget the county of Dade from funds derived from the taxpayers of our county contributed in excess of $8½ million. Less than half of the budgets of those two county hospitals was met by private-paid patients who were patients and hospitalized in those two county institutions.

In the current year, and the fiscal year begins October 1, for the fiscal year 1963–64 Mr. MacNair advised me the budget for those two county hospitals is $18,729,831 and the budget of the county contains funds of a little over $8½ million to be contributed by the county for meeting this budget is something over $18 million because of the inability of so many of the patients in these two institutions to meet the charges that were incurred by their hospitalization in those two institutions.

Now, the county welfare people of course determine how much the patient can pay of his own expenses incurred, and what the patient cannot pay is a part of this budget or taxpayer's contribution to the cost of hospital care for the people of our county. We do not in Dade County have any limitation of residence to make one eligible to get the benefit of this problem. As you know, under certain other programs there is a period of residence required before the citizen can get the benefit of the program.

Consequently, a good many of our people are transients that come or tourists that come from other parts of the country but they live in our county. They are human beings, and I am proud of the fact that our county has recognized and our people have supported the county in doing it, our Christian or our religious obligation to those people to provide that which they cannot themselves provide to enable them to get the hospital care that their physical condition requires.

Mr. Chairman, I want to lay down a premise upon which I stand before this honorable committee and our House and the country in advocating the King bill and the President's recommendations and hospital care for our senior citizens.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that if it is sound and desirable to have old-age and survivors insurance which when a citizen passes the age of retirement entitles him to an annuity of so much a month under that program, the extension of that program to provide a fund which would provide hospital care for the citizen when he or she reaches the same age of eligibility is not only sound, but more desirable than the one that would provide the monthly annuity.

I know there are those who say, Mr. Chairman, "Well why give any hospital assistance to anybody who doesn't need it? Well, why provide an annuity to a retired citizen who doesn't need it? Why impose a tax upon the employer and upon every eligible employee under the old-age and survivors insurance program when there are many who could get along without it?"

Some of them would have means of their own when they retire. Some of them would be able to work and earn enough to provide their food, and lodging, and their clothing, and their essential requirements. Others could live on their children. Some of them could share the blessings of charity and the benedictions of kindness in their community. But why have we determined not to rely upon those sources in order that a man or woman when he or she comes to the age of 62 or 65 might have an assured minimum income which would contribute at least a minimum level of living to that citizen of the greatest and richest country in the world?

Because human experience has taught that most people don't save. Some are unable to save enough. Some are beset by the vicissitudes of misfortunes in the course of their life.

We know that the fact is that most of them, however worthy they are in character and possessed of virtue, come to that age in their lives without the necessary means to sustain them on a decent minimum level of living as America believes is the right of the people of this land; so through old-age and survivors insurance we tax the employer and through him the people and we tax every covered employee so that when the time of retirement comes there will be a little annuity available.

Prior to the recent amendment it was only $40 a month for some. I believe the maximum is now $140 or $150 a month for an individual, but, it is there. And, Mr. Chairman, have you ever heard anybody say that he regreted his contributions in his working lifetime to the old-age and survivors insurance fund with the provision that from that fund there would be a monthly sum available to him when he came to the age of retirement?

I have never heard an employer, Mr. Chairman, say, "I resent the compulsion of my Federal Government that made me contribute an amount equal to that contributed by my employees into a fund which will give an annuity to my employees when they reach the age of retirement." So the people who pay, the covered employee and the covered employer, I haven't heard protesting before this Congress or before your honorable committee, asking that you relieve them of that obligation to provide retirement benefits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that there is even greater reason to extend the same principle of social security to the provision of a fund out of which hospital care could be provided to senior citizens than there is for the provision of a fund out of which a minimum annuity would be available when the covered person reached the age of retirement. Now, why?

Well, because hospital expenses, as everybody agrees, are more common to that segment of our citizens than to a younger group; in the second place, because hospital expenses are a contingent thing which nobody can evaluate. Nobody can tell how much the hospital bill is going to be. You can know what a minimum level of living is. You can get along on $50 or $75 or $100 or $150 a month, but suppose the hospital bill is $2,500. Where is the money coming from for that?

In regard to insurance on our homes nobody says, "Well, all right, you can insure your home and if it burns up you can get $75 a month for 30 years." If my home burns I don't want $75 for 30 years. I want the amount to restore my home, to repair it or rebuild it. If I have a fire I don't know what the extent of the fire will be. I don't know the amount of damage to my home, so the insurance policy provides that my home will be repaired or replaced in substance by the insurer, whatever the amount of the damage is, and it seems to me the same principle applies here.

I think I recall having seen the figures, and I am sure your able committee is thoroughly cognizant of all of them that of the senior citizens who went into hospitals—I believe something like one of 10 of those covered by social security the average hospital bill was over $700.

Now, Mr. Chairman, $700 is a large amount of money to a lot of people, particularly in this age group of no longer earning, dependent upon the savings of a lifetime or upon good fortune which may have brought in some financial stability, so I say Mr. Chairman, that if old age and survivors insurance is sound and desirable, the extension of the principle and the proven principle—and you deserve great credit, Mr. Chairman, you and your able committee for this program—the extension of that program to provide the funds required for hospital care, is sound and even more desirable than the old age and survivors insurance program of today, which none would eliminate, which provides a limited annuity when the citizen comes to the time of retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I said I knew of no employee or employer coming here to protest to this honorable and able committee against extending the old age and survivors insurance program to cover hospital care. Where are the employees, Mr. Chairman, in your hearing room protesting against the possible imposition of this tax upon them?

What do the labor leaders say who represent as able spokesmen the organized working people of the country? Do they come here to protest against this burden that the President is asking you to impose upon their members? They come here to support this program. Mr. Chairman.

Do you see here in your hearing room or is your calendar crowded with protests from the employers who would pay half of the tax under this program? I haven't seen them. They don't trouble me. I haven't heard of an organized lobby from the employers of this country who would have to pay one-half the cost of this measure if it were enacted.

Mr. Chairman, the employees are asking you for this program. The senior citizens are begging for it, Mr. Chairman. The employers are not protesting and I believe in general they accept the principle as sound. So where does the opposition come from? Not from the people who would pay the tax.

I don't know how vigorous the opposition of hospital care but in general I think the only thing the hospital would fear is that maybe there might be interference in their administration. I think adequate safeguards can be thrown around that.

No, Mr. Chairman, according to my experience, and I do not say it in any way disparaging to them, the most articulare spokesmen in America today against this proposal are not the people who pay and the hospitals who would provide service, Mr. Chairman, but it comes from the medical profession, from the doctors.

I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that as outstanding as is the skill of the medical profession in its own area, we Americans can consider how the bill at the hospital of the retired senior citizens can be paid without necessarily relying upon the financial advice or the political sagacity, or the governmental knowledge of the medical profession, devoted to a technical area which is somewhat beyond the problems that you are considering here.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a most vital matter to so many of the people of our country. In my country, and I add only this in conclusion and I thank you for your indulgence, there are over 100,000 people who are covered by old-age and survivors insurance, and I don't have the figures as to how many of those people, Mr. Chairman, are included within the $8½ million that I as a taxpayer in my county contributed to the hospitalization of people who could not pay for hospitalization in my county, but if a tenth of my population is covered by old-age and survivors insurance, I can't but believe that a great deal of this burden upon us as taxpayers in our country would be relieved if these people had as they paid, as they worked, provided their own funds out of which these hospital charges could be paid.

Mr. Chairman, I end as I began. I affirm that if old-age and survivors insurance is sound and desirable, the extension of that principle to cover the provision of hospital coverage to retired citizens is not only sound, but even more desirable and imperative because it effects human life and health itself.

An Agonizing Reappraisal: A New Munich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, two very penetrating articles by David Lawrence, concerning our posture in the world today should be read by every American. The articles follow:

ALLIES' ISOLATIONISM AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Isolationism rather than internationalism seems to have emerged as the basis for national policy in Great Britain and France, as well as in some of the smaller countries of Europe.

The United States, for many years the practitioner of isolationism, now faces a crucial decision—whether to continue to pour out billions to other countries in the world, or to copy both France and Britain and give priority to the interests of the United States as a single power rather than as a partner.

The phrase "Western alliance" has a hollow sound today. The United Nations, moreover, as the theoretical savior of national sovereignties, is now almost bankrupt, financially as well as morally.

In the face of this situation, it would not be surprising if the American people were asked to debate in the coming presidential campaign whether they favor letting billions of dollars of their tax money continue to flow all around the world and whether they wish to maintain standing armies in Europe indefinitely.

More than 120 Americans have been killed in Vietnam. American marines were suddenly ordered a few days ago to be ready, if necessary, to fight in Cyprus, but mostly to help the British out of a dilemma there.

The Chinese Communists are getting a stronger hold in southeast Asia as well as in Africa, primarily because Great Britain, the United States, and France do not stand together.

The biggest shock in diplomacy that the United States has experienced for a long time came on Wednesday after the President and the British Prime Minister had conferred for 2 days amid much social entertainment. They issued a carefully worded communique which implied that the two governments while having differences of opinion, were nevertheless closely knit in friendship and partnership.

But the reporters had only had this communique in their hands a few minutes when they went to the British Embassy for a news conference at which the Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, announced that Britain would not only continue its transactions with Castro in Cuba for trucks and other items of trade, but would also arrange Government guarantees of long-term credits for private companies in their business dealings with the Soviet Union.

This action was a humiliating experience for the American Government, because, when sharp differences in policy like this happen, there is usually at least a wait of a few days until the visiting dignitary gets home and announces his policies, presumably after consultation with his associates.

The impression here, however, is that the British Government had made up its mind beforehand to ignore American protests about trading with Cuba and had decided to go ahead with its policy of financing economic recovery in the Soviet Union. In fact, negotiations for a $266-million deal were going on in London between British firms and Soviet emissaries while President Johnson and Sir Alec Douglas-Home were meeting in Washington. The British are planning to build chemical plants in Russia which could indirectly be helpful to a war economy. Another $280 million deal to erect more factories in Russia now is under discussion in London.

The Prime Minister perceived that there was opposition in the United States to the British policy, and while in Washington explained that the British believe that comfortable Communists are less dangerous than hungry ones. After several days of polite and perfunctory statements, Secretary of State Rusk finally said in a statement broadcast overseas by the "Voice of America":

"I think the principal problem we see in that (the Prime Minister's statement) is that we cannot guarantee that the Communists will use the resources that are available to them to make themselves comfortable and fat. They may keep themselves lean and use the resources available to them for armaments and for the support of subversive activities in other countries and for pursuing the objectives of the world revolution."

Secretary Rusk hinted that the American people might decide to boycott some of the British firms which sell goods here if those same firms continue to help the Soviet Union.

Concurrently, the leaders of the maritime unions of the AFL-CIO denounced the sale of American wheat to Russia and called on President Johnson to halt what they termed "a dangerous program." The AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department adopted a resolution urging the 29 unions to obey an order to refuse to load wheat on ships destined for the Soviet Union.

The deal by which the United States sold wheat to the Soviets was unmoral on its face, but it was supposed to offer an economic benefit to our farm States. The

British and French were quick to take advantage of the readiness of the United States to sell wheat to the Soviet Union. They, along with Spain, Italy, Belgium, and Sweden, are shipping goods to Cuba.

It's everybody for himself. Certainly the time is at hand for an agonizing reappraisal of foreign policy as a whole by the American people.

WEST WARNED AGAINST A NEW MUNICH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—These are critical moments in world history. They are not made less serious by the ceremonials and cordial expressions of friendship between the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States. For basic differences between the major powers of the Western alliance are glossed over in the diplomacy that so earnestly seeks to put the best face on disquieting facts.

It was like this in the 1930's, too. Britain was eager for trade, and almost up to the last few months of 1939, when the war broke out, actually supplied Hitler with arms. Proposals for economic boycott made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt were rebuffed.

This is not to imply that any government in the Communist bloc is necessarily planning war today, but certainly the Western will to fight is being tested. For if the same ends can be obtained by the Communists without a war, they will not hesitate to increase their acts of aggression against and infiltration of the countries of the free world.

Castro's recent behavior in Cuba is a case in point. He got a scare in 1962 when the late President Kennedy mobilized American military forces and demanded that Soviet missiles be removed. But the Cuban dictator doesn't know today whether President Johnson will be equally resolute. By cutting off the water supply at Guantanamo, the Cuban regime put the new President to a first test and found that there was no military reprisal.

Denying water to the base was, of course, a hostile act by Castro. It was indeed, a flagrant disregard of the practical side of America's treaty with Cuba, which permits the United States to use Guantanamo as a naval base. The Washington Government reacted merely by providing another source of water supply outside Cuba. But the episode was a lost opportunity. Up to that time there had been no overt threat against the American naval base. When a threat was openly made, the United States turned away instead of insisting that the water be provided and warning that, if this was not done, American troops would be ordered to seize the pumping station and thus provide the base with the water to which it was entitled if the treaty was to be observed in good faith.

The lack of resoluteness in the White House and State Department must have made a deep impression on Castro and on his advisers, especially those in Moscow. For if it is assumed that the United States will accept such acts of aggression rather than take any military action in an area only 90 miles away from the shores of this country, then additional steps might be risked by the Communists as a means of further humiliating the U.S. Government before the world.

Even as Castro moved against the U.S. base in Cuba, Moscow moved to mess up the situation in Cyprus and in other parts of the world. The Communist hand is in Ghana and other African Republics which are slowly coming under Communist rule. There are signs that Red China is attempting to extend its influence in Africa. Though outwardly, Peiping and Moscow debate the dialectics of their complicated philosophy, they are, in fact, operating behind the scenes with coincident measures of subversion aimed at other parts of the world.

The Moscow alliance with Castro has resulted in attempts to take over Venezuela. Investigating committees of inter-American organizations have discovered the details of the plots. But the United States has apparently adopted a policy of acquiescence marked only by a few formal protests.

The truth is, however, that Castro is strengthening his economy, and England, Canada, and France are, to a certain extent, helping him by selling him goods.

Some of the evidences of the appeasement mood in the West are coming to the surface. The British Prime Minister publicly asserts the British intention to trade with Cuba and extend credits to Russia. To remove discontent, rather than to let the discontent remain and grow, is hardly the way to promote revolution inside a country.

The biggest single danger of a third world war is in a miscalculation by the enemy. In 1938, the appeasement at Munich was misconstrued by Hitler as a sign of weakness on the part of the Western governments. The clamor today in Europe and Canada for an entente with Red China and the open encouragement being given by France to the Communist Chinese strike a sympathetic chord with the appeasement minded in this country. It is declared that a new era is at hand—an era in which the facts of an enemy's conquests must be recognized. Such a course is synonymous with surrender. It gives the enemy, including Castro, grounds for believing that further steps can be taken without risk of retaliation by military force.

Boycotts and Bribes Should Not Be a Lever To Control Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take the liberty to insert at this point two editorials—one from the New York Times, and the other from the Washington Post—both critical of the current development in our foreign policy whereby U.S. aid to some of our allies is terminated because of their trade with Cuba.

I agree wholeheartedly with these editorials, and feel that such a step tends to weaken our entire foreign policy. We cannot and should not use such boycotts and threats as a lever with which to try to control our allies, and I trust that the administration and the State Department will take this piecemeal curtailment of aid under immediate review before the problem is compounded.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 20, 1964]

BOYCOTTS AND BRIBES

The U.S. Government's action in terminating aid programs to Great Britain, France and Yugoslavia as reprisal for their trade with Cuba is objectionable on grounds of both principle and practicality.

It is objectionable in principle because it suggests that our aid is based on a quid pro quo, that its purpose is to get the recipient countries to pursue policies friendly to us, that it constitutes a lever which we feel free to use for diplomatic purposes. It also is objectionable because it embraces the practices of the Communist countries which utilize trade to achieve political purposes. This step is going to confuse many of our friends who have agreed with us in the past that it is a bad thing to use aid and trade for political ends.

In practical terms, the policy is equally vulnerable. The amounts of these aid programs do not furnish us leverage that can be effectively employed to get a great nation to change its policies. If Great Britain could not be persuaded to adhere to the Cuban trade boycott by all the arguments available to us as a friend and ally, it is doubtful that it will be persuaded to abandon its principles by a bribe of less than $100,000. A country that could be purchased in this manner would be beneath our contempt.

So the policy stands condemned on all grounds. It is bad in principle and bad in practice and we ought to retreat from it as rapidly as we can do so. It is a policy that will hurt Cuba very little; it will hurt her suppliers hardly at all. It amounts to little more than a public admission that we are annoyed. It is inconsistent with our role as a great power thus openly to acknowledge our impotent rage.

Perhaps the action was intended only to show the people of the United States that the administration is not soft on Cuba, that it is prepared to take extreme measures when required. There must be better ways to make that point. The action does not demonstrate that we are firm as much as it demonstrates that we are infirm—it does not show that we are strong; it shows that we are weak—so weak that we are ready to injure our best friends a little if only that injury will damage our worst enemy a little. This is a dangerous weakness in a great power. It exhibits an alarming subservience to sheer emotion and indignation.

The more we attempt to use aid and trade in this matter, the more we are going to find ourselves in conflict with the rest of the world. Opposition seems to make us cling to this discredited policy even more frantically. As our friends and allies, one by one, desert us, instead of looking about for means to club them into conformity, we might better re-examine the policy. It is a policy that can work only if it is pursued in concert with other powers and when that concert fails, there is no plausible alternative but to change the policy.

Cuba seems to cast some fatal spell upon our senses. We can be depended upon to act with blind rage and indignation whenever we touch our relations with that unfortunate and wretched island. Important as it is to restore the independence of Cuba, it is not so important that we should risk the loss of the friendship of our oldest allies in order to enforce a policy that at most will only irritate and that, in any case, will not destroy the regime in Cuba.

[From The New York Times, Feb. 20, 1964]

FOREIGN OR DOMESTIC POLICY?

American foreign policy has become an extension of internal politics in respect to our efforts to curtail trade with Cuba. There is no other credible explanation for the administration's method of trying to punish some of the nations, including our most important ally, because of their dealings with the Castro government.

In the case of Great Britain, France and Yugoslavia, the cut in military aid is the merest tap on the wrist. In the case of Spain and Morocco, whose aid total will be frozen, more is potentially at stake, but not enough to force these countries to give up their trade with Cuba. Greece and Japan are inexplicably left unpunished.

In any event, the action undercuts the whole purpose of the military aid program.

The defense of the Western World in general and of the United States in particular is the objective—and the sole valid objective—of foreign military aid. This objective is thwarted if military aid is to be turned on or off to suit extraneous reasons that have nothing to do with building up military defenses in the countries to which the aid is applied.

The best that can be hoped is that the chosen countries will shrug off the U.S. measures condescendingly as a gesture by President Johnson to the domestic opposition, rightwing Democratic as well as Republican. It is well realized that the United States is in the throes of an electoral campaign. The Republican leaders—Goldwater, Rockefeller, Nixon, Keating— are having a glorious time pummeling the Johnson administration because it somehow seems unable to overthrow the Castro regime. In addition, if President Johnson seemed too conciliatory toward Panama, he would presumably bring an avalanche from the same sources down on his head.

In reality, this is conducting foreign policy from weakness, not strength. An obviously futile policy is worse than no policy. Furthermore, the State Department is being devious and secretive about its Cuban and Panamanian policies. When Secretary Rusk asked the world to note that Americans might boycott British goods in retaliation for British trade with Cuba he was, of course, inviting Americans to carry out such a boycott. When newspapermen in Washington tried to get a fuller explanation of the curtailment of foreign aid, the State Department refused to throw any light on it.

One is left with a sense of bafflement. What are the criteria being used by Washington in following the policies it does on Panama and Cuba? If the Government will not answer, the public must conclude that the issues involved concern internal American politics more than foreign affairs.

A Tribute to Harry Kalich

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a real pleasure for me to join in tribute to Harry Kalich. Not only has he been a very good friend for these many years, but he has been an invaluable and dedicated public servant, and a genuine asset to this House and to the country.

Harry's life has been one of service, and his personal qualities and professional competence have earned him the sincere admiration and affection of all of us who have known and worked with him. I am sure that he must feel a deep sense of gratitude knowing that he leaves us with a job well done, and I wish him and his charming wife all the happy years ahead that they so richly deserve.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Where Is Peace Corps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege to hear the remarks of Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, at the National Press Club. What he had to say about the Peace Corps, the ideal upon which it was based, and the impact of the late Preidsent Kennedy upon the people of the world was inspiring and heartening. In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of his talk, I include the full text of Mr. Shriver's address as a part of my remarks:

WHERE IS PEACE CORPS?

(Address by Sargent Shriver at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Friday, February 21, 1964)

Two clear and powerful impressions have remained etched in my mind since my recent trip around the world.

First was the enormous impact of President Kennedy's death on the little people of the small towns and villages of the entire world of freemen.

Second was the enormous impact the Peace Corps has had on the attitudes of the people of every country in which volunteers are working.

And I am certain that both of these rest on the same foundation.

When I arrived in Israel, on the first leg of my trip, former Prime Minister Ben-Gurion told me that the death of President Kennedy was the occasion of the "first worldwide mourning in the history of man."

The rest of my trip proved that he was right.

Our volunteers in small Turkish villages told me how their students had come to class after the assassination weeping openly.

In the countryside of Iran, one of our workers was approached on November 22 by a fellow worker who, with tears in his eyes, announced, "Our President is dead."

In Nepal, villagers walked for more than 5 days to the place where our volunteers were working, just to bring them the news.

In other towns of the Near and Far East people spontaneously assumed the garb of mourning. In several places local high schools searched for a flag, which they ordinarily did not use, just so they could fly it at half mast.

Everywhere, mayors and tribal chiefs, as well as kings and presidents, told us they had never seen such a universal outpouring of emotion, of grief and loss, at the death of a foreign leader.

I could multiply such stories a hundredfold. And I think it is typical of America that, as much as we admired President Kennedy, few in this country had any real conception of the place this man had found in the hearts and the hopes of the world's people.

Why is it? What were the qualities of John F. Kennedy that he could reach into the villages of Turkey, penetrate the mud huts of the altiplano of Peru, become meaningful to illiterate workers in Nepal whose only contact with the outside world is a transistor radio?

This is an important question. It is important not merely as the pilogue to the career of a great man. It is important because in the answer we will find a clearer understanding of our strength as a nation and how we can use that strength to help create the kind of world we want.

Through the Peace Corps, I believe, we can find part of that answer. For the Peace Corps was his creation. In a unique way it reflected his ideas and qualities. And, consequently, it has had, in its own way, a similar impact among the people of the world.

In Thailand I received an honorary degree from Chulalongkorn University—only the second awarded to an American. It was in honor of the work of the Peace Corps in that country. At the ceremony the Foreign Minister of Thailand said:

"Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great Nation as a wealthy nation, a powerful nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But how many of us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful. This is the secret of your greatness, of your might, which is not imposing or crushing people, but is filled with the hope of future good will and understanding. It is indeed striking that this important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, should come from this mightiest Nation on earth, the United States."

In the Philippines the Peace Corps recently became the first non-Asian group to win the Ramon Magsaysay award, given to persons in Asia who "exemplify in spirit, integrity and devotion to liberty," of the late President of the Philippines.

In Arequipa, Peru, when the Peace Corps was attacked by the Communists, the answer came not from the government or diplomats, but from the AUPA—the Associacion Urbana del Problacion Arequipena, the slum dwellers of Arequipa who live in some of the worst conditions in the world. Their alcalde, or leader, said, "We raise our most energetic protest against the attitude of a few persons who have not seen the reality of the benefits being received by thousands of workers."

In the Dominican Republic a group of people were writing "Yankee Go Home" on a wall, while one of our volunteers watched. When they finished he said, "I guess that means I'll have to go home." They turned and said, "No, we mean Yankees, not the Peace Corps."

Recently in Africa, a child, seeing one of our volunteers enter his village, turned to his mother and said, "Look, there's a white man." "No," she answered, "He's not a white man. He's a Peace Corps volunteer."

I could multiply these stories, and tell you of other awards. But the point I am trying to illustrate was most eloquently expressed by a local official in Sarawak, who said of the volunteers who were helping him cut road through the jungle: "They're not your people anymore, they're mine."

And, on a larger scale, this was true of John Kennedy. When he died, he was no longer America's, he was the world's.

The world of freemen had taken Kennedy as their own. Why they had done so is illustrated by a remark made by Colombian President Lleras Camargo after Kennedy received a tumultuous welcome in the streets of Bogatá.

"Do you know why those workers and campesinos are cheering you like that?" President Camargo asked.

"It's because they believe you are on their side."

This is true. I have seen it on every continent of the world. But why is it true? President Kennedy was only one man. The Peace Corps consists of only a few thousand Americans scattered over four continents.

It is not because we are a powerful and important nation, nor because President Kennedy could make decisions which would affect the lives of men around the world. The world has seen powerful nations and powerful men before. In the area of the Middle East and Asia where I just visited, Darius the King and Alexander the Great once held the power of life and death over millions. Great nations have had great empires, and their leaders, in Shakespeare's words, did "bestride the narrow world like a Colossus." Many of them had far more command over their worlds than John F. Kennedy had over his. But although they ruled men's destinies, they rarely ruled their hearts in as universal and profound a way.

No, power alone is not the secret. The key is simply that several qualities came together in a single person, at one time, when the world was hungry for those qualities.

First, he was a man of ideas and of ideals. It is true that he was a man of action; a man who knew how to use power and when not to use it. But at the core of all his actions was a deep set of convictions and beliefs. To him freedom, racial justice, human welfare, individual dignity were not just casual rhetoric, but deep commitments to which he gave his energy and ultimately his life. The people of the world sensed this. It is easy for Americans to become cynical about the importance of ideas; to become too impressed with the importance of wealth and power. But the strength of our own country rests upon the ideals of the small group of men who ran our revolution. This also is the secret of the success of Christianity and Islam, of the industrial revolution and the Renaissance. Victor Hugo wrote that "no army in the world can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come." And history proves that men who combine practical action with commitment to ideals have a far more profound and enduring impact than those who simply seek power and wealth.

And the Peace Corps is committed to an ideal. Today I have brought with me some of the people who work for the Corps. They work and volunteer for the Peace Corps because they believe that with their own hands and skill they can cross boundaries of culture and tradition to meet others on the common ground of service to human welfare. I will introduce them to you later. These people aren't looking for jobs. You couldn't pay them for what they did, and are doing both abroad and here at home. The Peace Corps started in one room. It now occupies 12 floors. But if Congress closed the entire operation down tomorrow, there wouldn't be an unemployed person the next morning.

We must not make the mistake that many people make when, for example, they criticize the Alliance for Progress on the grounds that it has not raised national incomes enough or increased the flow of capital. The

real question is whether it has helped create faith in the future, confidence that the job is possible, and trust in the honest intentions of the United States. These qualities, and not dollar bills or guns, will shape this hemisphere.

Second, President Kennedy was a man of peace. Whether it was his restraint in the Cuban missile crisis or his successful efforts to secure a test ban treaty, the policies and the posture of his administration left little doubt that he desired a world where war was no longer a daily threat. And since this is what the world wants, they loved him for it; and far from being afraid of American power, they felt more secure that it was in his hands.

The Peace Corps, too, is an instrument of peace. It's members espouse no party line or try to extend the political domination of their country. They go to work with and learn from people of every country. They are concerned with how people can live better, not how they can fight better.

Third, President Kennedy was a man of this generation. Today 55 percent of the world's population is 25 or under. They saw in President Kennedy a man who had come to maturity in their time, who shared their experiences, their nearness with conflict, their hope that somehow our new knowledge could become an instrument to make life more meaningful and abundant. He was a product of today's world and his life seemed to stretch forward into the future rather than back into the past.

This is true also of the Peace Corps—the idea which he had the daring to put into practice. Volunteers are primarily men and women of this generation who can meet on common ground with their conterparts across the world. When we began many said that we could not afford to send young and inexperienced Americans to serve overseas. But the opposite has been true. We cannot afford not to send our young and dedicated citizens abroad. For they show the world the face of the real, not the "ugly," American.

Fourth, he was, in the most meaningful sense, a volunteer. He, and many others of his administration, proved that Americans are not content to sit back and idly enjoy the comforts of our abundant society. For him the commitment to public service overrode all thoughts of private pleasure or gain. He spent much of his own energy seeking to ennoble the practice of politics and the work of government, believing a great nation deserved the best of its men. In a speech just before his death, President Kennedy quoted Robert Frost as saying "Nothing is true except as a man or men adhere to it—to live for it, to spend themselves on it, to die for it." This might well be among his epitaphs.

And this is also true of the Peace Corps. Our 7,500 volunteers have all given up opportunities to live comfortably in America, to go into distant countries, to work without pay, under difficult and sometimes even hazardous conditions. They have done this because they have found more meaning in service than in the pursuit of pleasure or the easy life. Nothing is more astonishing to people around the world than to see young Americans choosing to leave America—especially the America foreigners only know from the movies—to share their lives. And they do this not because they have to, but because they want to—as John Kenendy wanted to serve his country and the world.

Fifth, President Kennedy cared. He cared for the hungry, the dispossessed, the hated and the fearful. And the people of the world knew that. Much of their feeling came from his activities at home—his fight for racial justice and an end to poverty—as well as his concern for economic development and social justice abroad. How did they know it? It was not because they were acquainted with his policies or programs or read his speeches. Many cannot read at all. They knew it through that curious sixth sense by which people detect compassion and concern and unmask phoniness and vanity. This is something we have seen at work in our own democratic process. To them he was not a remote, commanding figure in a far-off capital, but a man whose presence and concern reached into their farms or their homes in slums. I still am taken aback when I walk into a village hut on a distant continent and find a picture of John Kennedy on the wall, torn from a newspaper and placed beside the family album or mementos.

The Peace Corps, too, is an organization which cares. Our volunteers are overseas because they want to help people learn, or take care of their health, or increase their agricultural production, or raise their incomes. They cannot convey this at a distance as President Kennedy did, but they do it by being there; by demonstrating every day, with their work, that they are trying to help. In a remote village of only 500 people in Afghanistan a volunteer lives as a teacher. Throughout the entire valley, spread over many miles with 20,000 people, he is known as "the American who has come to teach us."

Of course, President Kennedy's intelligence and capacity were respected. They were vital to his success. But these other qualities won him his place in men's hearts. He was not a father protector, a medicine man who would solve all problems. He was a man who gave people confidence that problems could be solved and that they could solve them.

He did not ask that people believe in him. He asked that people believe in themselves.

This touches the deepest hope of all.

And even though it is only a few months since his death, I found around the world that there is already a growing sense of relief and gratitude that these basic beliefs and attitudes are still vigorously guiding the United States, that they will continue to help shape its policies.

In a remote area of Nepal some of our volunteers were introduced to the local citizens as "Westerners." After they had worked there for a few months a delegation cautiously approached them and said: "You can't be Westerners. What are you?" A volunteer answered, "We are Peace Corps volunteers." "Oh," the Nepalese replied, "and where is Peace Corps?"

Peace Corps is right here. It is the real "other America." It exists somewhere underneath the tinsel, the swimming pools and neon signs, the racial hatred and the poverty. It is the America we are often embarrassed to talk about unless we hide it in the lyrics of songs; but which in times of need we have ultimately managed to be true to. If we have the courage to commit ourselves to this America—to work for it, to believe in it, then we may be equal to the hopes John Kennedy had for us.

Tribute to Congressman Matsunaga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, we were proud of the oratorical presentation of President Washington's Farewell Address by Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA of Hawaii this morning—given in commemoration of Washington's birthday anniversary. Personally Congressman MATSUNAGA is one of the most popular and congenial men in the House. He is a considerate individual with poise and a beneficent attitude of helpfulness toward others. He is an optimist and looks happily upon life with deep contentment and appreciation—avoiding anger and gloom.

In the years that I have attended the House ceremonies on Washington's birthday, no one presented Washington's Farewell Address—a masterpiece of oratorical effort in itself—with such sincerity and earnestness that carried with it such deep impressions of the advice and admonitions so vividly portrayed by President Washington for the guidance of the future leaders of the Republic.

Mr. MATSUNAGA emphasized with gesticulatory precision the high principles clothed in the key phrases enunciated by President Washington. He did honor to his State, his constituency, and the House of Representatives in a fine forensic effort well done. It was a splendid address worthy of the purposes intended. I congratulate my good friend from Hawaii.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through 24,455 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 17th report of my voting and attendance record. These 17 reports show how I voted on 2,164 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 93 percent.

In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 137 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls. I answered "present" to 120 quorum calls, and I was absent for 17 quorum calls.

88th Cong., 1st sess.

Roll-call No.	Date 1963	Measure, question, and result	Vote
2	Jan. 9	**Election of Speaker.** (McCormack 256, Halleck 175.)	Halleck.
		H. Res. 5, permanently enlarging House Rules Committee from 13 to 15 members:	
3	Jan. 9	On ordering the previous question (ending debate). (Adopted 249 to 183.)	Nay.
4	Jan. 9	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 235 to 196.)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 284, making supplemental appropriations of $508,172,000 for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963:	
5	Feb. 27	On passage. (Passed 254 to 154.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 249, providing funds for Committee on Un-American Activities:	
6	Feb. 27	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 386 to 20.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2438, extending the military draft laws:	
8	Mar. 11	On passage. (Passed 388 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4374, authorizing President to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America:	
9	Mar. 12	On passage. (Passed 378 to 21.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 2440, authorizing appropriations for military arms procurement during fiscal 1964:	
12	Mar. 13	On amendment adding $363,700,000 for the RS-70 plane. (Adopted 226 to 179.)	Nay.
13	Mar. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by $636,385,250. (Rejected 149 to 258.)	Yea.
14	Mar. 13	On passage. (Passed 374 to 33.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5366; making appropriations for Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1964:	
16	Apr. 4	On passage. (Passed 386 to 17.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1963:	
19	Apr. 10	On amendment providing an additional $450,000,000 for accelerated public works program. (Adopted 228 to 184.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5389, repealing law authorizing Federal Reserve silver certificates:	
20	Apr. 10	On passage. (Passed 252 to 122.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12, authorizing program of Federal grants to medical, dental, and related-type college facilities and a loan program for certain students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy:	
23	Apr. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete student loan provisions. (Rejected 171 to 239.)	Yea.
24	Apr. 24	On passage. (Passed 288 to 122.)	Nay.
		H.R. 4997, modifying and extending feed grain program prior to May 21 wheat referendum:	
29	Apr. 25	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 196 to 205.)	Yea.
30	Apr. 25	On passage. (Passed 208 to 195.)	Nay.
		H.R. 1762, giving statutory authority to Interior Department's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:	
33	Apr. 29	On amendment requiring Secretary of Interior to report annually to Congress on donations under the bill. (Adopted 292 to 50.)	Yea.
		H.R. 40, to assist States to provide additional research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations:	
38	May 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 275 to 30.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 245, limiting use of funds for foreign travel by Members and employees of Congress and requiring itemized reports:	
40	May 7	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 387 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1963:	
41	May 8	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to disagree to Senate amendment providing $65,000 for an International Peace Corps Secretariat. (Agreed to 207 to 190.)	Yea.
		H.R. 950, amending the Internal Security Act to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency:	
43	May 9	On passage. (Passed 340 to 40.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4274, permitting District of Columbia public school teachers to use reasonable force in maintaining order:	
44	May 13	On passage. (Passed 278 to 53.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1963:	
45	May 14	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 242 to 129.)	Nay.
46	May 14	On motion ordering previous question (ending debate) on amendment regarding Philippine war damage claims. (Rejected 168 to 207.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 340, authorizing counterpart funds for travel of certain members of Committee on Education and Labor to Switzerland and other foreign countries:	
48	May 14	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 153 to 217.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6009, increasing temporary national debt limit to $307,000,000,000 through June 30 and to $309,000,000,000 from July 1 through August 31:	
51	May 15	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to extend existing $305,000,000,000 ceiling without increase. (Rejected 195 to 222.)	Yea.
52	May 15	On passage. (Passed 213 to 204.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 362, providing for consideration of H.R. 6060, requiring that equal work be compensated with equal pay, regardless of sex of the workers:	
54	May 23	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 362 to 9.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 368, authorizing counterpart funds for travel of certain members of Committee on Education and Labor to International Labor Organization conference in Geneva:	
58	May 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 278 to 52.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5497, extending the Mexican farm labor program through December 1965:	
59	May 29	On passage. (Rejected 158 to 174.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3496, extending for 2 years the Reorganization Act of 1949 which allows the President to submit to Congress plans to reorganize Government agencies:	
61	June 4	On amendment prohibiting President from using act to abolish or create new executive department without usual legislative process. (Adopted 226 to 175.)	Yea.
66	June 4	On motion to adjourn for purpose of preventing Republican discussion of civil rights legislation. (Rejected 53 to 276.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6754, appropriating $5,979,457,000 for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1964:	
72	June 6	On passage. (Passed 288 to 79.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6868, appropriating $140,000,000 ($22,000,000 more than 1963) for the legislative branch for fiscal 1964:	
74	June 11	On passage. (Passed 271 to 122.)	Nay.
		H.R. 4996, authorizing an additional $455,500,000 for the Area Redevelopment Administration:	
79	June 12	On passage. (Rejected 204 to 209.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6755, extending excise and corporation income taxes for 1 year:	
81	June 13	On passage. (Passed 283 to 91.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7063, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal 1964:	
83	June 18	On passage. (Passed 301 to 93.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 247, suspending the equal time requirement of the Communications Act for 1964 presidential campaign, in order to permit TV and radio debate by major candidates:	
85	June 19	On passage. (Passed 263 to 126.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6177, increasing annual Federal payments to District of Columbia from $32,000,000 to $45,000,000:	
87	June 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase payment to $53,000,000. (Rejected 99 to 237.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7179, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1964:	
91	June 26	On passage. (Passed 410 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 3179, appointing judges to the U.S. Court of Military Appeals for Life tenure instead of 15-year terms:	
93	July 9	On passage. (Passed 314 to 82)	Yea.
		H.R. 4897, repealing provisions of Sedition Act restricting application to acts committed only in United States:	
95	July 16	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 40 to 339.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5279, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for fiscal 1964:	
96	July 17	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to Senate appropriation for plans for the Smithsonian's National Air Museum. (Rejected 144 to 245.)	Nay.
97	July 17	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 333 to 50.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5171, authorizing General Services to coordinate the purchase and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal agencies:	
101	July 18	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 96 to 258.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6518, to initiate and strengthen programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution (Clean Air Act):	
102	July 24	On passage. (Passed 273 to 102.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4638, authorizing certain services, facilities, and funds for the orderly transition of executive power upon the election of a new President and Vice President:	
104	July 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete all funds from bill. (Rejected 29 to 343.)	Nay.
		H.R. 3872, extending for 5 years the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and increasing its lending authority:	
106	July 30	On motion to recommit conference report and insist on disagreement to Senate amendment continuing "backdoor" financing for the agency. (Adopted 379 to 11.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 453, special rule waiving points of order against a Philippine war claims amendment in the conference report on H.R. 5207, the Foreign Service buildings authorization:	
108	July 31	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 234 to 166.)	Nay.

Footnotes at end of table.

88th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1963	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. Res. 467, providing for consideration of H.R 7500, authorizing appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
110	Aug. 1	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 387 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7500, authorizing $5,203,719,400 for NASA for fiscal 1964:	
111	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 335 to 57.)	Nay.
		S. 1652, extending for 3 years period for raising contributions for construction of National Cultural Center:	
113	Aug. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 293 to 33.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4955, Vocational Education Act of 1963:	
115	Aug. 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to require programs to be conducted on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. (Rejected 181 to 217.)	Yea.
116	Aug. 6	On passage. (Passed 378 to 21.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 477, providing for consideration of H.R. 7824, extending the existing temporary $309,000,000,000 national debt limit:	
118	Aug. 7	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 303 to 72.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7824, extending the existing temporary $309,000,000,000 national debt limit:	
121	Aug. 8	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to reduce temporary limit to $307,000,000,000 and to limit extension for 2 months. (Rejected 164 to 229.)	Yea.
122	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 221 to 175.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7525, amending the District of Columbia Code to increase investigative powers of the police and to fix stricter penalties for certain offenses:	
124	Aug. 12	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 114 to 222.)	Nay.
		H.R 6143, authorizing a 5-year program of Federal grants and loans for college academic facilities:	
126	Aug. 14	On passage. (Passed 287 to 113.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7885, authorizing appropriations of $4,087,075,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1964:	
132	Aug. 23	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by $585,000,000. (Agreed to 222 to 188.)	Yea.
133	Aug. 23	On passage of bill as reduced by above motion. (Passed 224 to 186.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7500, authorizing $5,350,820,400 for the NASA in fiscal 1964:	
138	Aug. 28	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to reduce authorization to amount approved by the House. (Rejected 176 to 200.)	Yea.
139	Aug. 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 248 to 125.)	Nay.
		S. 1576, Mental Retardation Facilities Act:	
144	Sept. 10	On passage. (Passed 335 to 18.)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 504, creating a select committee to investigate expenditures for Federal research programs and activities:	
146	Sept. 11	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 336 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 527, providing for consideration of H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963:	
151	Sept. 24	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 324 to 67.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963:	
156	Sept. 25	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to make the tax reduction dependent on holding the level of expenditures to not in excess of $97,000,000,000 in 1964 and $98,000,000,000 in 1965. (Rejected 190 to 226.)	Yea.
157	Sept. 25	On passage. (Passed 271 to 155.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5555, authorizing a military pay increase:	
160	Oct. 1	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 333 to 5.)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 539, providing for consideration of H.R 7044, authorizing $1,500,000 for construction of Corregidor-Bataan Memorial:	
162	Oct. 1	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed 314 to 12.)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 541, providing for House agreement to a Senate amendment extending for 1 year the life of the Civil Rights Commission:	
165	Oct. 7	On motion to suspend rules and agree to resolution. (Agreed to 265 to 80.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7179, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1964:	
167	Oct. 8	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 336 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8747, making appropriations for sundry independent offices for fiscal 1964:	
170	Oct. 10	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce NASA budget by $200,000,000. (Rejected 145 to 192.)	Yea.
171	Oct. 10	On passage. (Passed 302 to 32.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5871, modifying retirement benefits of District of Columbia municipal judges:	
172	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed 150 to 96.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6237, authorizing $500,000 annually for 5 years to aid public and private groups to publish historical documents:	
174	Oct. 15	On passage. (Passed 158 to 154.)	Nay.
		S. 1576, Mental Retardation Facilities Act:	
176	Oct. 21	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 299 to 13.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8821, amending the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act and title XII of the Social Security Act:	
178	Oct. 22	On passage. (Passed 350 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5945, establishing a commission to recommend procedures for settlement of political status of Puerto Rico:	
180	Oct. 23	On passage. (Passed 320 to 44.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 782, continuing appropriations for certain departments of Government:	
183	Oct. 28	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 280 to 11.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 314, granting additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor:	
184	Oct. 28	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 119 to 164.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6500, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
188	Oct. 31	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 356 to 1.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 8195, extending the Mexican farm labor program for 1 year:	
189	Oct. 31	On passage. (Passed 173 to 160.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 6143, College Academic Facilities Act:	
191	Nov. 6	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 258 to 92.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8920, revising the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act:	
192	Nov. 6	On motion to recommit. (Agreed to 258 to 98.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 564, providing for the consideration of H.R. 8969, raising and extending the temporary debt limit:	
194	Nov. 7	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 212 to 149.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8969, increasing temporary national debt limit from $309,000,000,000 to $315,000,000,000 through June 1964:	
195	Nov. 7	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 172 to 197.)	Yea.
196	Nov. 7	On passage. (Passed 187 to 179.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8864, authorizing the United States to participate and carry out its obligation under the International Coffee Agreement:	
200	Nov. 14	On passage. (Passed 181 to 145.)	Not viting.[1]
		H.R. 2988, authorizing up to $2,000,000 for participation by the Armed Forces personnel in international civilian and military sports competition: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 285 to 30.)	Nay.
202	Nov. 18		
		H.R. 8135, authorizing public recreational facilities at Sanford Reservoir, Canadian River project, Texas:	
203	Nov. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 283 to 30.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9139, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1964:	
205	Nov. 18	On passage. (Passed 332 to 5.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 9140, Public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1964:	
207	Nov. 19	On passage. (Passed 358 to 27.)	Yea.
		S. 777, authorizing funds for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1964 and 1965 and imposing certain limitations:	
209	Nov. 20	On passage. (Passed 251 to 134.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9124, revising ROTC programs:	
211	Dec. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 177 to 154, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 10, requiring temporary summer jobs in Government agencies in Washington, D.C., area be subject to nationwide competitive examinations:	
213	Dec. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 18.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 6196, subsidizing the cotton industry:	
219	Dec. 4	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 179 to 224.)	Yea.
220	Dec. 4	On passage. (Passed 216 to 182.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7885, authorizing appropriations of $3,600,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1964 and adding a number of legislative restrictions:	
224	Dec. 9	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 195 to 164)	Yea.
		H.R. 8929, authorizing construction of $400,000,000 rail transit system for Washington, D.C.:	
226	Dec. 9	On motion to recommit. (Agreed to 278 to 76.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8747, making appropriations for sundry independent offices for fiscal 1964:	
227	Dec. 10	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 356 to 22.)	Yea.
228	Dec. 10	On motion to agree to Senate amendment, ordering the Veterans' Administration to construct Bay Pines Hospital for which funds had been previously appropriated. (Rejected 170 to 204.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

88th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1963	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 6518, strengthening programs for prevention and abatement of air pollution (Clean Air Act):	
230	Dec. 10	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 273 to 109.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 579, providing for consideration of H.R. 7457, providing legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts:	
233	Dec. 10	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 345 to 12.)	Yea.
234	Dec. 11	On motion to adjourn for the day in order to prevent consideration of civil rights legislation under Calendar Wednesday procedure. (Agreed to 214 to 166.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9140, making appropriations for public works for fiscal 1964:	
235	Dec. 12	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 330 to 47.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4955, authorizing new funds for expanded vocational education program; and extending the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
237	Dec. 12	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to delete authorizations of $150 million for new Federal work-study program and residential vocational education schools added by Senate. (Rejected 180 to 193.)	Yea.
238	Dec. 12	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 301 to 65.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9139, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1964:	
240	Dec. 13	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 301 to 4.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9499, making appropriations of $2,800,000,000 for foreign aid for fiscal 1964, a cut of $1,700,000,000 from administration's request:	
242	Dec. 16	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing credit of Communist governments. (Agreed to 218 to 169.).	Yea.
243	Dec. 16	On passage, as amended by above motion. (Passed 250 to 135)	Yea.
		H.R. 8667, making additional appropriations for certain river basin planning (conference report):	
245	Dec. 17	On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment authorizing $50,000,000 for construction of Knowles Dam in Montana. (Adopted 329 to 41.).	Yea.
		H.R. 9413, providing for 50-cent coins bearing likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy:	
246	Dec. 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Agreed to 352 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 875, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1964 for mental retardation programs:	
248	Dec. 19	On passage. (Passed 324 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 598, waiving points of order against conference report on H.R. 9499 with Senate amendment permitting President to authorize Export-Import Bank guarantees on credit to Communist countries for purchase of U.S. commodities:	
251	Dec. 21	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 182 to 95.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1964:	
252	Dec. 21	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment permitting President to authorize Export-Import Bank guarantees on credit to Communist countries for purchase of U.S. commodities. (Agreed to 141 to 136.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 600, waiving points of order and authorizing motion to accept Senate amendment to second conference report on H.R. 9499, permitting President to authorize Export-Import Bank guarantees on credit to Communist countries for purchase of U.S. commodities:	
255	Dec. 23	On motion to consider resolution. (Rejected 202 to 105, a ⅔ vote being required without 1-day layover of rule.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1964:	
256	Dec. 24	On motion to amend 2d conference report to permit President to authorize Export-Import Bank guarantees on credit to Communist countries for purchase of U.S. commodities. (Agreed to 189 to 158.)	Nay.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

Guantanamo: Guardian of Panamá Canal Northern Flank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of recent statements in the Congress concerning the security of the strategic Caribbean basin, especially the brilliant addresses of my scholarly and distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the significance of Guantanamo in protecting the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal has been repeatedly pointed out.

At present, both of these key spots are under coordinated psychological attack and what happens to one will inevitably affect the other. If one is surrendered, the loss of the other will inevitably follow, and with worldwide repercussions.

An illuminating appraisal of the current water crisis at Guantanamo by David Lawrence, the distinguished editor of the U.S. News & World Report, follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1964]

GUANTANAMO: ONE UP FOR CASTRO—CUBAN DICTATOR RISKS JAB AT PRESIDENT AND FINDS HE DOESN'T GET KNOCKED OUT

(By David Lawrence)

These are critical moments in world history. They are not made less serious by the ceremonials and cordial expressions of friendship between the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States. For basic differences between the major powers of the Western alliance are glossed over in the diplomacy that so earnestly seeks to put the best face on disquieting facts.

It was like this in the 1930's, too. Britain was eager for trade and almost up to the last few months of 1939, when the war broke out, actually supplied Hitler with arms. Proposals for economic boycott made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt were rebuffed.

This is not to imply that any government in the Communist bloc is necessarily planning war today, but certainly the Western will to fight is being tested. For if the same ends can be obtained by the Communists without a war, they will not hesitate to increase their acts of aggression against and infiltration of the countries of the free world.

Mr. Castro's recent behavior in Cuba is a case in point. He got a scare in 1962 when the late President Kennedy mobilized American military forces and demanded that Soviet missiles be removed. But the Cuban dictator doesn't know today whether President Johnson will be equally resolute. By cutting off the water supply at Guantanamo, the Cuban regime put the new President to a first test and found that there was no military reprisal.

Denying water to the base was, of course, a hostile act by Mr. Castro. It was, indeed, a flagrant disregard of the practical side of America's treaty with Cuba which permits the United States to use Guantanamo as a naval base. Washington reacted merely by providing another source of water supply outside Cuba. But the episode was a lost opportunity. Up to that time there had been no overt threat against the American naval base. When a threat was openly made, the United States turned away instead of insisting that the water be provided and warning that, if this was not done, American troops would be ordered to seize the pumping station and thus provide the base with the water to which it was entitled if the threat was to be observed in good faith.

The lack of resoluteness in the White House and State Department must have made a deep impression on Mr. Castro and on his advisers, especially those in Moscow. For if it is assumed that the United States will accept such acts of aggression rather than take any military action in an area only 90 miles away from the shores of this country, then additional steps might be risked by the Communists as a means of further humiliating the U.S. Government before the world.

Even as Mr. Castro moved against the U.S. base in Cuba, Moscow moved to mess up the situation in Cyprus and in other parts of the world. The Communist hand is in Ghana and other African "republics" which are slowly coming under Communist rule. There are signs that Red China is attempting to extend its influence in Africa. Though outwardly Peiping and Moscow debate the "dialectics" of their complicated philosophy, they are in fact operating behind the scenes with coincident measures of subversion aimed at other parts of the world.

The Moscow alliance with Mr. Castro has resulted in attempts to take over Venezuela. Investigating committees of inter-American organizations have discovered the details of the plots. But the United States has apparently adopted a policy of acquiescence marked only by a few formal protests.

The truth is, however, that Mr. Castro is strengthening his economy, and England, Canada, and France are to a certain extent helping him by selling him goods.

Some of the evidences of the appeasement mood in the West are coming to the surface. The British Prime Minister publicly asserts the British intention to trade with Cuba and extend credits to Russia. To remove discontent, rather than to let the discontent remain and grow, is hardly the way to promote revolution inside a country.

The biggest single danger of a third world war is in a miscalculation by the enemy. In 1938, the appeasement at Munich was misconstrued by Hitler as a sign of weakness on the part of Western governments. The clamor today in Europe and Canada for an entente with Red China and the open en-

couragement being given by France to the Communist Chinese strike a sympathetic chord with the appeasement-minded in this country. It is declared that a new era is at hand—an era in which the facts of an enemy's conquests must be recognized. Such a course is synonymous with surrender. It gives the enemy, including Mr. Castro, grounds for believing that further steps can be taken without risk to retaliation by military force.

Washington Criticized Alliances and Applauded Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, George Washington's Farewell Address was one of his least understood and most misrepresented speeches. In it he warned of the frailties of all alliances, but applauded the federal union system that had recently been adopted by the American States.

He said:

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns.

In short, Washington said that an alliance cannot be an adequate substitute for a government. In words so clear they cannot be misunderstood, he said that alliances "must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced."

Without exception, alliances have failed to stand the test of time. They are unworthy of confidence. They are fundamentally doomed to failure.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is no exception.

The NATO alliance has experienced an abundance of the "infractions and interruptions" which Washington foretold.

To cite a few: Cyprus, French recognition of Communist China, British sale of buses to Cuba, Canadian sale of wheat to Red China, French blackball of British entry in the Common Market, U.S. cancellation of Skybolt, test ban treaty of Moscow, essentially a bilateral deal between United States and Russia, withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy, U.S. insistence on keeping keys to all NATO atomic weapons, stalemate over the multilateral naval forces, and broad tendency toward coexistence with the Communists, compromise, talk of disarmament—each of which tends to weaken the thin thread of alliance.

Our nuclear policies now place more trust in our enemies than in our friends. We have never been at war with France at any time since this Republic was founded. And yet, our nuclear policies deny France—and other NATO nations—the nuclear weapons we know—and they know—the enemy possesses.

We complain when the British sell buses to Cuban Communists, but see nothing wrong in selling wheat to Russia, the heartland of the Communist movement.

We fight a chicken war with our friends, and hand the enemy "super-duper" bargains in wheat—better prices than we offer to our friends.

These events—the inevitable infractions and interruptions of which Washington spoke—have caused a steady deterioration of NATO.

When we review our weak follow-through after the Cuban confrontation, the withdrawal of missiles from our NATO allies—Turkey and Italy—our shameful silence over the murder of U.S. airmen over East Germany—who can blame our European allies for wondering if, in a showdown, we would really use nuclear weapons to defend their homes? Who can blame them for seeking, in their own way, to appease the Communists?

Not long ago, I heard one of our top military leaders bitterly exclaim, "We have a minimal deterrent, no-win policy."

Present policies are heading us to ultimate isolation in which liberty will surely perish from within if not from aggressive forces across the borders. Surrounded by a sea of communism, we would likely resort to police-state methods at home to meet the police-state menace abroad.

NATO has been described as the most hopeful agency we have for peace and freedom. But, at best, it is but a hopeful beginning. It is far weaker than the Articles of Confederation which were criticized by Washington and found to be totally inadequate in the 18th century.

If a system was too flimsy for the horse-and-buggy days, can we safely settle for one still more flimsy for the rocket age?

NATO is an alliance and nothing more. As such, it carries in it the same seeds for self-destruction typical of all alliances. In its present form it is doomed to failure.

Our NATO defense force hangs by the tiny thread of national expediency. Unanimity is required before anything can be done. In the flashing instant of a nuclear showdown, unanimity may come too late or not at all.

No one can foretell the decision of any member of NATO—not even our own—until the moment of crisis arrives.

The present NATO structure is not good enough. We must build the house of freedom on solid rock, not the shifting uncertain sands of alliance. The best foundation is the Federal union system which Washington himself applauded. It is as American as apple pie, and everyday America bespeaks its success.

It is high time we start to rebuild NATO into a federal union, so that freedom-loving people can avoid the infractions and interruptions of which Washington so eloquently warned.

Death, Smoke Rings, and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, for years our deaths have been connected with smoking. Few have bothered to mention that our tax structure and our economy is also inextricably woven into smoke rings. Certainly, no one has said this better nor more entertainingly, in regard to the Michigan tax structure, than my neighbor, Will Muller, of the Detroit News. I am pleased to place his remarks in the RECORD for all to read as follows:

One way for those who have quit smoking to pass these long winter evenings is in trying to recall how they spent their World War II Michigan bonus.

For heroes with "ruptured ducks" in their lapels, the windfall ran as high as $500. An occasional oddball with faint heart banked it. Others woke up after cashing their checks with their minds complete blanks.

Some used the bonus money to acquire a wife and home (more on this later). Some of the more cautious settled for second-hand cars. Some took trips to other States and found those old service buddies who had invited them for weekends were all away from home.

It was a lighthearted time. The home cooking was wonderful. A Federal Government was sending those who asked for it rockingchair money under the "52–20" program, $20 a week for 1 year. But all the while, the collection agent was sneaking up to the back door.

The State voted $270 million in veterans' bonus bonds. Legislators settled in at Lansing. In the spring of 1947, they decided to impose a cigarette tax, not exactly to pay the bonus but to dump into the general fund from which the bonus would be paid.

UP AND UP

The first levy of 3 cents a pack was applied July 1, 1947, and raised $19,376,084 in its first year. The rate went up to 5 cents in 1957 and to 7 cents in 1962. In the fiscal year of 1963, the tax raised $68,563,651.

The impression the tax was tied to retirement of the original World War II bonus bonds has clung, although the smokers' bellows have been sacrificed to the enrichment of the State's general purse ever since the cigarette tax became a loving tribute to the World War II soldiers who survived to pay it.

In 1954, legislators approved a Korean war bonus of $80 million, and voters backed them with a constitutional amendment. This was not tied to the tax either—only by the hold-over implication of the first issue. The 2-cent cigarette bump in 1957 was just for incidentals.

Then, in 1962, came that last 2-cent jog. Here is where the World War II GI who invested his bonus in a wife reappeared as a problem. Legislators took a look at the popping population of the schools and ear-

marked the additional 2 cents on a pack of cigarettes for school aid.

Since the tax first was imposed as a humanitarian gesture, ostensibly to make veterans of World War II happy. Michigan has collected $584,476,516. A World War II veteran who bought a fishing reel or cowboy boots or a bassinet with his bonus can figure out from this his share of the payment.

He can argue a cigarette tax was inevitable anyway. He can explain that much of the tax raised public buildings and did a host of good works.

STILL A PATSY

He's still history's patsy. The tax got on the books under the guise of being kind to ex-servicemen. And now the State is talking about taxing the cigarette more so it can educate the children of taxpaying fathers not to smoke.

Add to the 7-cent Michigan tax the 8-cent Federal take on each package. Apply that to the 1,012,777,564 packs sold in Michigan last year.

No wonder a survivor of the 630,000 veterans who drew bonuses has lungs resembling something an Indian trapper used to sell to trading posts. Last year he kept 36,756 vending machines and their 2,630 operators, plus an army of cigarette girls, busy.

This is no time for the man determined to give his lungs and his arteries to the stabilization of the Michigan economy to falter. There's still $24,851,000 due on the $230 million of World War II bonus bonds actually sold.

And some of his children are still in kindergarten.

Lithuanian Independence Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives an excellent article which appeared on February 13, 1964, in the Cambridge (Mass.) Chronicle-Sun. This message, sponsored by the Knights of Lithuania, Council No. 18, which is located in my home city of Cambridge, accurately describes the tragedy of that small nation and the valor of its people. It should be an inspiration to all people everywhere and I am proud to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD of the Congress of the United States:

MESSAGE SPONSORED BY KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, COUNCIL NO. 18, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

This Sunday, February 16, is a solemn day for the 1 million Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans in the United States. It is the 46th anniversary of the day when, after a century and a half of foreign rule, the Lithuanian nation declared the reestablishment of her independence.

A small nation planted on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea for 2,000 years, Lithuania, like many other east-central European nations, has been wedged between powerful and hostile neighbors: Germany on the west and Russia on the east. At one time, in the 14th and 15th centuries, Lithuania was a strong kingdom holding vast territory; but long years of war, first in halting the Teutonic march to the east, then in resisting the Muscovite push to the west, slowly weakened her. Internal dissension did the rest, and in 1795 she finally fell under Russian bondage.

The determination of the Lithuanian people to lead their own life of freedom could not, however, be extinguished in spite of numerous oppressive measures (among them a ban of printing books and newspapers in the Lithuanian language). The opportunity came, after many years, when all seemed dark and lost, with the collapse of the Russian and German empires in World War I. On February 16, 1918, Lithuanians proclaimed their country once more a free and sovereign state.

The next two decades saw rapid growth and development in all fields: the economy, social relations, education, arts and sciences. Starting from a condition of enforced backwardness, Lithuania in a short time grew into a progressive modern European country.

But it did not last. With the advent of World War II, darkness once more descended on Lithuania, as on the rest of east-central Europe. First, the Soviet, then the Nazi, and then again the Soviet armies overran the country, bringing destruction and tyranny. Soviet rule was finally established; hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were deported to slave labor camps in Siberia; a determined resistance movement was wiped out after 5 years of ruthless struggle which saw entire army divisions pitted against small guerrilla bands. Many Lithuanians escaped and came to America (as many had come fleeing czarist oppression around the turn of the century), seeking to be able to live in human dignity.

This Sunday, as Lithuanians scattered throughout the world commemorate the day when their nation rose for an all too brief time of life in freedom, they can only remind men everywhere that freedom for all enslaved peoples must be a goal of anyone interested in genuine world peace. True peace, as distinct from the present, mere, uneasy truce enforced by a balance of terror, requires that relations among nations be determined by their intrinsic rights and duties, and not by comparison of military might. Such determination is necessary that freedom thus be enjoyed, not only by the large nations which can preserve their freedom by their own power, but also by small nations which have no less right to freedom.

As long as millions of Lithuanians and others bear the Soviet yoke, there will be no more than a truce in the world. A globe truly at peace cannot be half free and half slave.

Peace Corps in Sierra Leone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an address by the Honorable Ahmad Wuric, Sierra Leone's Minister of Education, to a group of Peace Corps teachers:

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to have this opportunity of meeting the Peace Corps volunteers working in Sierra Leone. I was very sorry that my recent world tour made it impossible for me to do this year what I did last year, that is to welcome in person the volunteers soon after their arrival to this country. I have, however kept in close touch with your activities since my return, and have received many good reports of the work you are doing.

I am pleased to note that this group has settled down even more rapidly, and with even fewer difficulties, than did the first group. This is a tribute to the capacity of your organization to improve its process of selection and training in the light of experience gained in the field. I am certain this improvement in the quality of service given by the Peace Corps to Sierra Leone will continue.

A few months ago I met Dr. Walter Carrington and members of his staff in the Peace Corps office in Washington. We discussed the possibility of extending in a number of new directions the assistance which the Peace Corps gives to Sierra Leone. For obvious reasons I cannot on the present occasion give you details of these proposals. But I refer to them because I should like you to know how much the Government of Sierra Leone, and in particular we in the Ministry of Education, value the help you have given us and are still giving us. It is for this reason that I sought new fields for your endeavors. I know your representative here, Mr. McClure, is as anxious as I am that your usefulness to this country should be extended; and as soon as possible firm decisions will be made to effect this.

The Peace Corps has in a very real sense opened new windows in our schools, admitting a breath of fresh air to many stuffy corners, and revealing new horizons of interest to many pupils. This has been perhaps your greatest achievement. We did not lack academic challenge in our secondary schools. Our syllabuses and examinations are demanding, and we feel they should remain so. What we did lack in all too many schools was an adequate range and variety of nonacademic activities, both inside and outside the classroom.

Such activities form so important a part of the education of any child. None of our schools has an orchestra; few have bands, choirs, or drama groups. In some schools too little attention is paid to games and sports. A series of swimming tragedies off the beaches of Freetown had made that important form of physical exercise unpopular. Self-help in school construction was regarded by many of our pupils as below their dignity.

The first Peace Corps volunteers arrived just over 2 years ago, and to them must go a good deal of the credit for the changes in attitude in many of these matters which we are beginning to see. A fine band has been formed at St. Edward's Secondary School, and another at the Catholic Training College in Bo; and it is particularly pleasing to think that as in the latter case its members are teachers in training, their new interest and skills will be spread as they disperse to their various schools after completing their training. At numerous school prize-giving ceremonies Peace Corps teachers are in evidence behind the scenes, having helped to train the actors and singers. They are equally in evidence at the Brookfields Stadium and other sports arenas during interhouse and interschool sports, bringing their energy and enthusiasm to the task of drawing out the best performance from our school athletes.

I am told that some volunteers were even enterprising enough to play American football at King Tom, though my informant added that their courage did not extend to allowing on our hard ground the notoriously vigorous tackling which characterizes that game. At Hastings, thanks again to the Peace Corps, dozens of pupils have learned to swim, safely and enjoyably. On the compound of St. Andrew's Secondary School, Bo, a new dormitory block is almost completed. It is financed with voluntary contributions, and erected through the voluntary labor of

the pupils, led by an enterprising principal, and a staff amongst whom, as one might expect, there are Peace Corps volunteers.

These are vitally essential contributions to education in Sierra Leone, Mr. Chairman. I want, on behalf of the Government, to thank you for them; and to end by paying tribute to the man who conceived the idea of the Peace Corps, the late President John F. Kennedy. May the memory of his life, no less than the circumstances of his death, be your inspiration to continue to help us to make Sierra Leone a better place for its own citizens to live in, and a healthier and stronger member of the family of nations.

The Spirit Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a deserving tribute was paid recently to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania and to the many Lithuanian-American citizens in an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 15 issue of the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial with my remarks:

THE SPIRIT LIVES ON

Once again Independence Day brings no joy to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania.

It was back on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania proclaimed her independence and instituted her own democratic republic. For a short 22 years the young nation made great progress in all fields of endeavor, and its citizenry prospered in peace and freedom.

On July 12, 1920, a peace treaty was signed with Russia in which was stated, "Russia without any prejudice recognizes the selfrule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences * * * and for all times with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian Nation or territory."

During its independence, Lithuania was a land of happy tranquillity, governing herself capably and maintaining peaceful relations with her neighbors.

A dark day in the history of Lithuania occurred on June 15, 1940, when the Iron Curtain was lowered over the land as Russian troops marched into Lithuania and seized the nation, thereby annihilating the territorial integrity and political independence of sovereign peoples.

The U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize the Soviet occupation of Lithuania.

Down through the years, the torch of freedom has continued to burn in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. Many have been martyrs to the cause, particularly members of the clergy who simply sought the right to worship.

As independence day dawns tomorrow in their native land, thousands upon thousands of loyal American citizens of Lithuanian descent will offer their prayers in the hope that someday the curtain of gloom will be lifted, and Lithuania will again be recognized in her rightful place among free nations of the world.

Hydrofoil Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of February 18 carried a story entitled "Hydrofoil Success Story." It describes flying across the Rio de la Plata from Buenos Aires and is quite an interesting article.

The most interesting part of the story, however, is the note preceding it that asks why we are slow to adopt hydrofoil services in this country.

The British are ahead of us in the field of ground effects machines known in our scientific parlance as GEMS. The British call them hovercraft.

They propose to sell hovercraft to newly emerging nations, and countries that have great river systems such as Latin America, Africa, southeast Asia, to act as the transportation media in those areas. We are still experimenting with this and have made little or no progress in the field.

I think that the article by Mr. Harold Jones, of the Copley News Service, is well worth reading.

FLYING ACROSS THE RIO DE LA PLATA: HYDROFOIL SUCCESS STORY

(By Harold Y. Jones)

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA.—One of the dandiest boat rides in Latin America is a 50-minute "flying" cruise 35 miles across the muddy Rio de la Plata estuary from here to Colonia, Uruguay.

The boats are 92 feet long, 20 feet wide (or 35 feet from foiltip to foiltip), and they draw 11½ feet in port, only 5 feet cruising up on foil.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEEN SEATS

They have a crew of nine—captain, executive officer, two mechanics, two sailors, and three stewardesses. There are 117 seats, 50 of them in a forward cabin, 55 aft and 12 in first-class armchairs in the elegantly appointed Belvedere salon on the upper deck.

"The boats are tremendously popular," said a company official. "We've been in business just over a year and already we've carried more than 170,000 passengers."

You make the trip in a German-designed, Swiss-patented, Italian-made hydrofoil boat that travels above the water, not through it. U.S. engineers are trying to develop equally serviceable models but appear to be far behind.

Americans making the classic down-the-west-coast-up-the-east-coast swing through Latin America's major capitals by plane like to break up the trip by hydrofoiling to Colonia taking a 2-hour bus ride to Montevideo, little Uruguay's capital, and then taking the overnight steamer from Montevideo back to Buenos Aires a day or two later.

The hydrofoil is like an airplane wing, including ailerons, that knifes cleanly through the water almost free of drag.

UP AND FASTER

As speed increases the foil lifts the bow out of the water. Then the stern comes up, riding on a pair of gigantic water skis. At cruising speed (45 miles an hour) only the foil, skis, rudder, stern stabilizing fins, and propellers are in the water. The hull is high and dry.

The ride is as smooth or rough as it would be for a conventional boat of comparable size. It depends on the weather.

An Argentine firm spent $530,000 each for three of the hydrofoils (they call them aliscafos) and now runs them in regular service several times a day between here and Colonia. There is also a service to Conception del Uruguay, an Argentine town 150 miles up the Uruguay River from Buenos Aires.

The aliscafos compete with the four airlines which run nearly 20 flights a day between Buenos Aires and Montevideo. Round trip by air is about $20. By aliscafo it's about $10.

TOO CHOPPY

Alimar officials decided against running the aliscafos directly from Buenos Aires to Montevideo (it would have been a 3-hour trip) because fares high enough to show a profit would not have been attractive and because the estuary near Montevideo is too choppy for comfortable rides.

Hydrofoils are making similar runs in several other countries, including Italy, Venezuela, Greece, Norway, Japan, Egypt, Finland, and Switzerland. Behind the Iron Curtain alone, it's said, there are more than 150 lines now in operation.

Peace Corps in Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 13 Peace Corps volunteers—7 full time, 6 part time—are teaching at the College of Business Administration of Haile Selassie I University, which was established in the fall of 1963 to help meet the rapidly growing need for business education in Ethiopia. It is the objective of this college to provide trained management people who possess the combination of technical skills, breadth of vision, and sound decisionmaking ability required for a dynamic and growing business community in Ethiopia.

The college of business has its own compound of classrooms, offices, and library on the main university campus. Students on this campus have their own cafeteria and recreation facilities. Plans for next year will place the college in the new classroom unit being constructed on the main campus.

One of the fastest growing colleges in the university, the college of business, now has an enrollment of 170 students in the regular day program leading to a bachelor of business administration. There, in addition, several hundred students enrolled in the night courses offered by the college of business. A special executive secretary program is being planned to help practicing secretaries upgrade their skills, and an advanced management program is being planned for local business executives.

The college of business is placing great stress on research into the local business environment and the problems of Ethiopian business so that the course of study can be directed specifically to Ethiopian needs.

Seven Peace Corps volunteers are assigned full time to the college of business, and six volunteers are teaching there on a part-time basis. They teach in both the day and evening programs. In addition to teaching, they are conducting research at Ethiopian banks and businesses to develop case studies which are relevant to business methods in Ethiopia and which are being incorporated into the classroom instruction.

The following is a list of the courses volunteers are teaching and the textbooks they are using this year:

Elementary accounting:

Noble & Niswonger, "Principles of Accounting."

Myra & Hartman, "Mathematics of Investment."

Immediate accounting: Kanen, Brock & Simmons, "Intermediate Accounting."

Introduction to business management: Arthur Weimer, "Business Administration: An Introductory Management Approach."

Typewriting (noncredit): Towe, Weinger & Lloyd, "Gregg Typewriting for Colleges."

Business English: Parkhurst, "English for Business."

Advanced accounting and financial controls:

Anthony, "Management Accounting."

Neuner, "Cost Accounting."

Holmes, "Basic Business Auditing."

Marketing: Phillips & Duncan, "Marketing Problems and Methods."

Business finance:

Vandell & Coleman, "Case Problems in Finance."

Johnson, "Finance Management."

Business report writing: Hay & Lesekar, "Business Report Writing."

Mr. Samuel A. Goldsmith Receives Award of Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in these days, when so many in our country are looking to the Federal Government to take care of their needs, it is heartening to know that the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago continues to rely on private philanthropy and privately supported agencies for the care of the aged, infirm, and troubled. The Federation believes strongly in the concept of individual responsibility and has established a memorial award in memory of Julius Rosenwald, one of the Federation's founders and its first president, which is given each year to that individual who has made outstanding contributions to advance the purposes of the Federation.

This year, the award was presented to Mr. Samuel A. Goldsmith, who was the unanimous first choice of the award committee. The influence of Mr. Goldsmith, who will complete his 50th year in the field of social work this year, has spread far beyond the Chicago area. He has been cited by the Illinois Welfare Association as a high-ranking welfare statesman of Illinois, whose able direction and skillful leadership in meeting the human needs of the Jewish community and in serving humanity throughout the world have been outstanding and without parallel.

Among the many significant posts held by Mr. Goldsmith have been the presidency of the National Conference of Jewish Social Work; executive director of the Jewish Charities of Chicago and executive secretary of the Jewish Welfare Fund; member of the executive committee of the National Refugee Service; chairman of the Chicago Mayor's Committee on the Relief Problem; and with Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, he organized the special gift activities of a huge fund-raising effort for relief work in the city of Chicago and later helped in the organization of the Community Fund, serving as a member of its board of directors and of its executive committee for 20 years. As a lieutenant colonel, Mr. Goldsmith served under the Allied Military Government and then under the Allied Control Commission in Sicily and Italy. He was later called to become chief of the Displaced Persons Branch, Allied Forces Headquarters, Mediterranean Theater of Operations.

For his services to humanity and his achievements in the advancement of the purposes of the Jewish Federation, Mr. Goldsmith richly merits the highest and most precious award of the Federation and serves as an inspiration to all who believe that through individual effort and service the cause of human welfare can best be advanced.

The Shipbuilding Industry in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable persons in our country with respect to the shipbuilding industry, both in this country and abroad, is Mr. A. F. Young, director of the Iron Shipbuilders International Marine Council of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, AFL–CIO. I know of no one who is more concerned with the welfare of our own shipbuilding industry, or our national defense posture than he is. Last fall he visited Japan and made a factual study and survey of the Japanese shipbuilding industry. The information contained in his report should be of interest to many Members of Congress, and for that reason I am inserting it in the RECORD:

THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY IN JAPAN

(By A. F. Young)

Japan has long been a major shipbuilding nation although before World War II, practically all of its ship construction was for domestic use. The Japanese Navy ranked among the world's largest and most modern. Since 1950 there has been an astounding expansion of this basic industry which embraces nearly every field of production. The very latest in welding techniques, material handling, block construction, optical lofting, monopole gas cutting, etc., are established processes. Many shipyards which could build ships up to 20,000 deadweight tons, have been enlarged so as to build vessels over 60,000 deadweight tons. Numerous dry docks have been made large enough to accommodate these ships. It once required 6 to 7 months to complete a super-tanker but now only 3 to 4 months are necessary. Approximately $200 million have been spent in the last 12 years in the shipbuilding rationalization program. The resulting cut in shipbuilding costs has made Japan the No. 1 shipbuilding country of the world; more than 60 percent of the ships built in the last 7 years have been exported. The merging of shipbuilding companies is being implemented. We believe mergers will mushroom in the days ahead. This will further challenge the competitive position of other freeworld countries.

Export ship construction orders awarded to Japanese shipbuilding during the first half of this year total 93 vessels of 2,238,000 gross tons (841,466 gross tons in 1958). The industry in 1963 will exceed the postwar high of 2,350,000 gross tons set in 1955. Orders, to date, show a 31-percent increase over the same period last year and is 86 percent above the goal of 1,200,000 set for the current fiscal year. Of the total order, 47 were for large tankers and 25 for supersized tankers in the 65,000 deadweight tons and over class. About 70 percent of the orders were placed with major shipbuilders (see addendum A) such as Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries, Mitsui Shipbuilding & Engineering, Hitachi Zosen & Mitsubishi Zosen.

Major shipbuilders are now building or planning larger docks for production capacity of 150,000 d.w.t. tankers in expectation of orders for larger ships and invesitgation teams are being sent abroad for market surveys. The tendency to construct supertankers, whereby one of 150,000 d.w.t. will supplant three of 50,000 d.w.t., will further depress world shipbuilding. The Japanese shipbuilding industry is currently enjoying a period of unprecedented prosperity.

SHIP REPAIR AND CONVERSION

The ship repairing departments of Japanese shipyards have, for several years, been constructing and expanding their repairing and conversion facilities concurrently with increasing the capacities of cranes, etc. A remarkable upsurge in work has ensued. In 1958, 4,919 ships underwent repairs or conversion at a price of $62,150,000, the last figures show 6,233 ships at a price of $86,850,000. It can be anticipated, under existing circumstances, that a bulk of the increasing conversion and repair, worldwide, will go to Japanese shipyards.

NUCLEAR POWER

Understandably, atomic energy after 1945, in any form, was anathamatic to Japan, which delayed research and development of nuclear power propulsion; however, an investigation group comprising 21 representatives of the government, shipbuilding and shipping companies visited America and

Europe in 1959 to investigate a basic plan for nuclear-powered ships.

The Japanese Government has aided research on nuclear-powered ships for the past 3 years, and experiments and studies have been conducted mainly in the Transport Technical Research Institute of the Japanese Transporation Ministry and the Nuclear Power Research Association of Japan principally on the following points:

(a) Reactor location and hull construction around the reactor compartment.

(b) On the control of a reactor for marine propulsion.

(c) On the insertion of safety rods when a ship pitches and rolls.

(d) On hull construction around the reaction room.

(e) On the influence of external forces on the reactors in nuclear-powered ships.

UNIONS

There are 25 national labor federations (see addendum B); however, the preponderence of the union membership is in 3 of them, i.e., Sohyo 4.1 million, Domei Kaigi 1.2 million and Churitsu Roren 1.3 million.

SOHYO

Sohyo was established in 1950 in protest against the Japanese Communist Party domination of the then leading union federation Sanbetsu. The Communist element left Sanbetsu, which quickly went out of existence, and joined Sohyo, en masse. Since 1957 the non-Communists in Sohyo have had undisputed control although Communist and pro-Communist elements are able to muster about 25 percent of its convention votes. Sohyo has been dogmatically Marxist and is prone to endorse the concept of class warfare and political general strike tactics. The bulk of Sohyo strength lies in the public service workers, particularly the railwaymen, postal workers, teachers, municipal and prefectural government employees.

During the last few years, Sohyo and some of its affiliated unions, particularly the teachers, have moved to the right. Among the reasons for this moderation are the bad outcome of the coal miners' strike; the backfiring of the anti-American demonstrations; and the bad showing of the two Socialist parties in the recent elections.

DOMEI KAIGI

A federation called Zenro was formed in 1954 by unionists who bolted Sohyo in protest against that group's pro-Communist orientation, just as Sohyo itself had been formed by anti-Communists seceding from Sanbetsu. The core of Zenro's membership comes from seamen, textile workers and electricians. Zenro, which is affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), is pro-American and stands for an economically oriented trade unionism in contrast with Sohyo's heavy emphasis upon political weapons and goals.

Just as Sohyo provides the principal backing for the Japan Socialist Party, so Zenro does for the considerably smaller Democratic Socialist Party, made up largely of former members of the Japan Socialist Party, who withdrew in 1959 and 1960 in protest against the larger group's doctrinaire Marxism. The Democratic Socialists have taken as their model the British Labour Party and the West German SPD. In early 1962, Zenro entered into an "equal partnership" with another federation, Sodomei, establishing Domei Kaigi. Sodomei had previously belonged, as an entity, to Zenro, so the new organization represents no appreciable increase in numerical strength. Domei Kaigi really consists of three federations, Zenro, Sodomei, and Zenkanko. Zenro is the more aggressive and effective wing of Domei Kaigi. Zenkanko is a council of public workers unions consisting of a number of unions which previously belonged to either Zenro or Sodomei.

CHURITSU ROREN

This is a loose amalgamation formed in January 1961, composed of industrial workers that declined affiliation with either Sohyo or Domei Kaigi. Its membership is drawn mostly from the Electrical Manufacturing Workers (Denki Roren) and construction workers. Ideologically, it is much closer to Sohyo than to Domei Kaigi, and has often joined with Sohyo in joint protest movements. The central governing body of this federation has very little authority over individual member unions.

About 2,100,000 Japanese workers are affiliated with the ICFTU through the coordinating committee of the ICFTU-affiliated unions in Japan. While all Zenro and Sodomei unions are members of the coordinating committee, only five Sohyo affiliates belong. A few small Sohyo affiliates are members of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) through their trade union internationals (TUI's).

Rumors of a merger between Sohyo and Zenro are prevalent, but there has not been any concrete confirmation of these reports. However, it is notable that Sohyo and Zenro have agreed to cooperate in the establishment of a wage research center. The closer cooperation between U.S. and Sohyo unions is a further proof of the moderating influences in Sohyo.

The conflict between the national federations, has negated the maximum effectiveness of a progressive labor movement. It is felt that in the next decade, a unified national federation, patterned in some measure on the AFL–CIO, will eventuate.

The union membership of Japan is about 8,500,000 out of a total work force of approximately 30 million, exclusive of those in the agricultural sector. In only 17 years the labor unions have become a recognized and accepted part of the national economy. They continue to grow in both membership and prestige.

The unions of Japan, with the National Seamen's Union being possibly the only exception, are referred to as "enterprise unions," that is, unions composed of employees of one company at each facility.

There has been little collaboration or communication between unions. They have unilaterally legislated and administered their affairs with obvious disregard as to the benefits of uniformity. There is a widening awareness that only through unity can the ultimate of objectives be achieved. A transition in policy is underway. The unionists of Japan are ever alert to ways and means for progress.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: HOURS, WAGES, FRINGES

The right to organize and bargain collectively, which Japanese labor enjoys, is not the fruit of a hard-fought struggle by labor. The right was established by the allied occupation forces following the war. Approximately 80 percent of the union members are covered by negotiated agreements.

The wage structure, according to our standards, is complex. The level of formal education usually determines the assignment of employees; college graduates to office or staff functions; senior high school generally to clerical; junior high school graduates to production. These form three distinct job clusters. Each has a separate wage structure.

Divisions between these structures are rigid, though each moves upward whenever there is increase through collective bargaining, etc. Rarely do employees move from a lower to a higher cluster.

Within each wage structure, years of service (seniority) is the most important factor. Since most of the regular permanent employees are hired immediately upon graduation from school, seniority is closely correlated with age; therefore, age becomes the primary determinant.

The following table shows the influence of educational level and age on wages:

Index of wages by educational level and age

[100=wage of a 15-year-old junior high school graduate]

Educational level at which graduated	Age group						
	15	18	22	30	40	50	55
Junior high	100	139	198	315	432	515	548
Senior high	----	128	188	337	516	661	820
College	----	----	187	359	600	782	872

It is difficult to generalize about the composition of the standard wage. A specific example from one company may be helpful; the components included in the standard wage and their approximate relativity to the total is as follows:

Item:	*Percent of total*
Basic wage:	
Job pay	43.5
Age pay	18.6
Seniority pay	5.2
Allowances:	
Efficency	16.9
Location	8.7
Attendance	4.5
Family	2.2
Special work	.3
Performance	.1
Total	100.0

The following will illustrate briefly the nature of the item with some indication of its money value:

Job pay: This company has introduced an evaluation system. It is applied in determining that part of the total wage labeled "job pay." In practice, seniority still plays the dominant role in promotion from a lower to a higher grade of job classification.

Age pay: The allocation at age 15 is $5.84. This is increased by 0.42 for each year beyond this. Thus, a college graduate hired at age 23 receives $9.16 for age pay alone.

Seniority pay: Every employee receives a 0.42 monthly increase automatically each year as long as he stays with the company.

Efficiency allowance: This is based upon an appraisal of the worker, every 6 months, by his immediate supervisor.

Location allowance: Locations are grouped into high- and low-cost regions by a predetermined method. In a high-cost area the worker receives an extra $5.84 if married, $4.17 if single, and $2.50 if under 20 years of age.

Attendance allowance: This is merely a device to discourage absenteeism. For example, a worker who is not absent at all for a particular month receives extra pay equivalent to 2 days' basic wage.

Family allowance: In the company under discussion, $2.78 is given to a worker for his wife, $1.39 for each additional dependent up to three, and $.83 for each dependent beyond the wife and three other dependents.

Special work allowance: The worker gets 1.4 to 2.8 cents a day extra while doing work designated by the company as being hazardous or dirty.

Items such as the above and their amounts vary widely by company and by industry, but the general principles are much the same in all industries.

The impact of nonstandard wage items such as allowances for housing, transportation, shift premiums, overtime (1¼ times the hourly rate in shipyards), etc., varies and is nebulous.

Many companies have their own houses, apartments and dormitories for their employees. In some instances allowances are

paid employees for living separately from family because of work assignment.

Some firms pay all transportation costs for employees who commute by train or bus. Others pay part of the cost.

THE BONUS SYSTEM

Almost all employees, including civil service, schoolteachers, college professors, and employees of other nonprofit organizations, receive a summer and also a year-end bonus. It is usually expressed in number of months' pay. It varies by years, by industry, by company, by seniority, by position, and by job cluster. In industry it is somewhat closely related to company profit. Usually it is no less than 4 months' wage, in terms of standard wage, for the year. The greater the seniority and the higher the employee's position, the greater the number of months' pay that he receives.

The system is really nothing but regular wage or salary plus profit sharing. I talked to many workers, asking if they would prefer a higher wage rate into which the bonus would be absorbed, rather than the bonus system. Without exception, they indicated a preference for the bonus system.

It must be kept in mind that nonregular workers receive at most only a nominal bonus. Also, workers in small businesses receive much less than their counterparts in large firms.

The bonus system is one of the most important factors which widen income differences between older and younger groups, between large and small businesses, and between profit and nonprofit organizations. It is utterly meaningless to discuss wage levels of industrial workers in Japan without referring to the bonus system.

RETIREMENT AND SEVERANCE

Retirement at age 55 is compulsory.

Besides the government-sponsored unemployment compensation plan, most large companies have their own severance and retirement allowance plans. These usually call for payment in a lump sum. A small number of companies have adopted an annuity plan, paying the retirement allowance in installments for a certain number of years after the employee retires.

In general the severance or retirement allowance depends on the number of years of service with a particular company and the employee's standard wage at the time of separation. The multiplier of the monthly standard wage at time of separation applicable to given years of service is predetermined, usually by negotiation with the union. Here is an example of multipliers for a large company:

Multipliers for calculation of severance and retirement allowance

Years of service:	*Multiplier*
5	4.72
10	9.50
15	16.50
20	23.50
25	30.50
30	37.50
35	41.00

The allowance is equal to the monthly standard wage, at time of separation, times the corresponding multiplier. Most employers are reluctant and seldom lay off regular employees. An employee laid off usually gets severance pay as provided in the table plus a percentage of that severance pay as determined by union negotiation.

PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

The preponderance of employees hired after graduation become permanent employees so called. It is mutually understood that the employer-employee relationship will prevail until retirement by the worker at age 55. Any possibility of termination is extremely remote. The number of permanent employees is apparently determined by the employer based on historical and anticipated workload. The shipbuilding industry, perhaps more than any other, is periodically subject to severe fluctuation in employment opportunity. This creates an extraordinary problem to the establishment of a "permanent employee" category. When an unusual amount of work prevails, it necessitates a sharp and immediate increase in workers who are regarded as temporary employees. Although the number of temporary employees has diminished during the last 5 years, primarily through union demands insofar as the direct payrolls are concerned, the reduction is an illusion rather than a fact. A policy of subcontracting is utilized whereby the subcontractor furnishes the necessary employees who work side by side, on practically all jobs, with the permanent employees. Through this method, the shipyard company is absolved from obligations as to tenure of employment, fringe benefits and so forth. It is possible that the hourly rate of the subcontractors' employees may, and in some cases it does, exceed that of the permanent employees. These subcontractors workers, in large numbers, have been steadily employed for the last few years. It is believed that many of these subcontractors really have an interlocking relationship with the large shipbuilding companies.

The General Federation of Ship Building Workers' Unions (Zosensoren) has about 47,000 members and is affiliated with the Japanese Confederation of Labor (Domei Kaigi). The All Japan Shipbuilding Workers Union (Zensosen) is an independent national union and has 76,000 members.

The wage level is relatively high in shipbuilding. The main reason being that this industry consists mostly of large-scale enterprises where modernized plants and equipment make attainment of higher productivity possible.

The normal workweek in shipyards is 42 hours. Every major shipyard (those capable of building ships of 10,000 tons or over) is working a minimum of 6 hours overtime a week. One of those we visited was regularly working 2½ hours overtime a day.

The approximate pay of the Japanese shipyard worker is $100 a month. Wages over the last 10 years have increased about 50 percent. The rate of 5 percent increase a year is, to say the least, a remarkable phenomenon. It far surpasses the rate of increase in the United States, United Kingdom, and other West European countries except the Federal Republic of Germany.

The rapid increase in earnings has vastly improved the workers' living conditions. The climb has continued without interruption. The consumption expenditure of the average worker's family is upward of 50 percent greater than in 1953.

In 1953, the "summer bonus allowance" was $30.56; the "year end bonus" $44.45, a total of about $75. The last available figures show a summer bonus of roughly $140; a year-end bonus of $160, a total of approximately $300.

To make any comparison of Japanese wage levels with other countries where wide disparities in living and consumption patterns, price structures, etc., prevail, becomes tremendously involved. The simplest comparison is by means of official exchange rates; according to this method the average hourly earnings of the Japanese industrial employee, as expressed in U.S. currency, is about 40 cents. This is approximately 15 percent of the U.S. average, and one-half of that of West Germany. However, such a simple method of international wage comparison is obviously inadequate. The extraordinary fringes, etc., referred to herein are not fully evaluated in this comparison. It will suffice only as an illustration.

IDEOLOGY

In the instant aftermath of the war, the Japanese people were vulnerable to Communist propaganda and intrigue, in fact any ideology deemed incompatible with the democracy of the United States. The horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was vivid and the reaction normal. The unions, in their infancy, were prey for infiltration. The radical minority continuing to espouse the Marxist dogma are extremely vocal and volatile but as the unions have matured, this element has diminished.

Union members account for about 12 percent of the members of the Lower House and 20 percent of those of the Upper House of the Japanese Diet (Parliament), with many more elected to local public bodies. A great number of unionists are also active in various advisory organs of the Government such as the Council on the Social Security System and the Council on Employment. Their influence is felt throughout the legislative and administrative processes of the Government.

The political relationship of Japan with the United States is increasingly healthy. American labor, through its participation in the cultural exchange and other programs has contributed immeasurably to the constant enhancement of mutual respect and understanding. Democracy will steadily flourish in stride with the vigorous continuity of our efforts. Communism is on the wane.

CONCLUSION

The modern facilities, technological advances, ingenuity, and skill of the Japanese threaten the survival of the U.S. shipbuilding industry. The solution rests with the Congress of the United States. It must recognize that without the aid and cooperation of Government, the U.S. shipbuilding industry will ultimately vanish. The Congress must provide ways and means to insure the profitable operation of U.S. shipyards. Increased and expanded availability of subsidies are a prime requisite. Legislation designed to eliminate impossible foreign competition through such subsidies and other enabling acts as to cargo preference, etc., are immediately essential.

The transition from conventional to nuclear power propulsion for all ships of our Navy should be speedily effectuated.

The Department of Navy, Shipbuilders Council of America, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, in conjunction with innumerable other organizations and knowledgeable individuals have long been clamoring for adequate congressional action. We believe the time has come when further delay could be catastrophic. The advent of the gigantic jet airliners; supertankers; dry cargo ships, etc.; ultimate replacement of surface craft by submersibles with resultant shortening of sealanes, all of which will drastically reduce the number of ships needed for ocean-borne commerce; and the missile and its impact on our warships, are a few of multiple reasons demanding not only Government recognition, but action, now.

ADDENDUM A. MAJOR SHIPBUILDERS OF JAPAN

Fujinagata Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd. (founded 1689)

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Osaka (main works)	1	[1] 12,500	[2] 1	[1] 5,000
	2	[1] 6,000	[2] 2	[1] 10,000
	3	[1] 9,000		

[1] About.
[2] Funamachi Works, Osaka.
Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 60,000 gross tons; ship repairing, 900,000 gross tons.

Hakodate Dock Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Building berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Hakodate	3	4,000	1	11,000
	4	13,000	2	5,000
Muroran	1	500	1	21,000
	2	500		

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 90,000 deadweight; ship repairing, 800,000 deadweight.

Hitachi Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Building berth	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock	Capacity (gross tons)
Sakurajima, Osaka		[1] 12,200		[1] 12,800
		[1] 16,000		
		[1] 8,750		
Chikko, Osaka				[1] 20,000
				[1] 10,000
Innoshima, Hiroshima		[1] 15,000		[1] 7,000
		[1] 10,000		[1] 3,500
		[1] 25,000		[1] 31,000
		[1] 45,000		

[1] About.

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 220,000 gross tons; ship repairing, 3,650,000 gross tons.

Iino Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (deadweight tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (deadweight tons)
Kyoto	1	15,000	1	1,500
	2	10,000	2	35,000
	[1] 2	35,000	3	65,000
	[1] 3	80,000		

[1] Drydock.

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 100,000 deadweight tons, ship repairing, 600,000 deadweight tons.

Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Aio 1	1	24,000	1	25,000
	2	40,000	2	7,000
	3	70,000		
	4	13,000		
	5	7,000		
Tokyo 2	1	15,000	1	7,000
	2	6,500	2	14,000
	3	6,000		
	4	1,500		
	5	22,000		

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 580,000 deadweight tons; ship repairing, 2,100,000 gross tons.

Kasado Dockyard Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Kasado, Kudamatsu	1	3,500	1	10,000
	2	11,000	2	3,500

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 30,000 gross tons; ship repairing, 700,000 gross tons.

Mitsubishi Heavy-Industries, Reorganized, Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Kobe	1	65,000	1	7,000
	2	50,000	2	13,000
	4	22,000	3	21,000
			4	50,000

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 300,000 gross tons; ship repairing, 5,000,000 gross tons.

Mitsubishi Nippon Heavy-Industries, Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Yokohama	3	30,000	1	20,000
	4	15,000	2	5,000
	5	50,000	3	9,000

Mitsubishi Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (tons)
Nagasaki	1	57,000	1	12,000
	2	88,000	2	4,000
	3	38,000	3	57,500
	4	36,000		
	5	38,000		
	6	19,000		
Shimonoseki	1	3,000	1	11,000
	2	5,000	2	8,000
			3	2,000
			4	500
Hiroshima	1	[1] 25,000	1	10,000
	2	[1] 10,000		
	3	[1] 12,000		
	4	14,500		

[1] Gross tons.

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 400,000 gross tons.

Namura Shipyard Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Osaka	1	10,000	1	3,530
	2	13,000	2	9,000

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 50,000 gross tons; ship repairing, 500,000 gross tons.

Mitsui Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (dead weight tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (dead weight tons)
Tamano	2	53,000	1	19,000
	3	26,000	2	20,500
	4	47,000	4	21,000
	5	13,000		
	6	12,000		
Chiba	1	85,000	1	56,000

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 393,000 dead weight tons; ship repairing, 2,500,000 dead weight tons.

Onomichi Dockyard Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (dead weight tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (dead weight tons)
Onomichi	1	9,000	1	2,200
	2	2,400	2	2,900
	3	800	3	8,000

Nagoya Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Nagoya	1	6,000	1	10,500
	2	10,500	2	1,500
	3	6,000		
	4	15,000		

Annual production capacity Shipbuilding, 48,300 gross tons; ship repairing, 1,440,000 gross tons.

Nippon Kokan Kabushiki Kaisha

Facilities	Shipbuilding berths No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Tsurumi	1	2,000		
	2	14,500		
	5	45,000		
Shimizu	1	14,000		
	2	10,000		
Asano			1	20,000
			2	9,000

Sanoyasu Dockyard Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (deadweight tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (deadweight tons)
Osaka	1	20,500	1	15,000
	2	20,500	2	5,500
	3	5,500		

Annual production capacity: shipbuilding, 90,000 deadweight tons; ship repairing, 500,000 deadweight tons.

Osaka Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Osaka	1	15,000		
	2	5,000		
	3	8,600		
	4	1,000		
Kizugawa	1	1,500	1	1,800

Sasebo Heavy Industries Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Nagasaki	1	2,500	1	8,000
	2	14,000	2	26,000
	3	14,000	3	42,000
			4	80,000
			5	6,000
			6	13,000

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 143,000 tons; ship repairing, 1,750,000 gross tons.

The Uraga Dock Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (gross tons)	Dry-dock No.	Capacity (gross tons)
Uraga	2	28,000	1	9,500
	3	39,000	2	6,000
	4	5,000		
	5	10,000		
	6	10,000		
	7	10,000		
Yokohama	1	200		

Annual production capacity: Shipbuilding, 244,000 gross tons; ship repairing, 800,000 gross tons.

The Kure Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd.

Facilities	Shipbuilding berth No.	Capacity (deadweight tons)	Drydock No.	Capacity (deadweight tons)
Kure, Hiroshima	1	2,200	1	6,500
	2	10,000	2	11,000
	3	85,000		
	4	1,000		

THE KAWASAKI DOCKYARD CO., LTD.

The Kawasaki Dockyard in Kobe, one of the foremost shipbuilding concerns in Japan, has, in recent years, been completely modernized, utilizing "remotegraph," a remotely controlled enlarged marking and cutting machine, advanced welding techniques, etc., which has resulted in a drastic cut in manhours. To illustrate: previously, at the Kawasaki Dockyard, on tankers larger than 30,000 d.w.t., 5 months were spent in the building berth and 3 months after the ship was launched. Under the new methods, the time has been cut more than half. Kawasaki Dockyard has, for several years, been conducting research in the field of nuclear power propulsion.

Actual specifics re this year unavailable.

ADDENDUM B—NATIONAL LABOR FEDERATIONS

General Council of Japan Trade Unions (Sohyo).

Japan Coal Mine Workers Union (Tanro).

General Federation of Private Railway Workers Unions (Shitetsu Soren).

National Federation of Iron & Steel Workers Unions (Tekko Roren).

Japan Federation of Synthetic Chemistry Workers Unions (Goka Roren).

National Metal & Machine Trade Union (Zenkoku Kinzoku).

All-Japan Express Workers Union (Zennittsu).

All-Japan Federation of Metal Miners Unions (Zenko).

Japan Teachers Union (Nikkyoso).

National Federation of Local & Municipal Government Workers Unions (Jichiro).

National Railway Workers Union (Kokuro).

All-Japan Communications Employees Union (Zentei).

National Electric Communications Workers Union (Zendentsu).

All Agriculture-Forestry Ministry's Workers Union (Zennorin).

All-Japan Garrison Forces Labor Union (Zenchuro).

All Monopoly Corporation Workers Union (Zensembai).

National Federation of Metal Industry Workers Unions (Kinzoku Domei).

National Federation of Textile Workers Unions (Zensen Domei).

All-Japan Seamens Union (Kaiin).

National Garrison Forces Labor Union (Nitchuro).

National Federation of Electric Power Workers Unions (Denroren).

All-Japan Federation of Electric Appliances Workers Unions (Denki Roren).

Japan Labor Union Congress (Zenro).

Japan Federation of Trade Unions (Sodomei).

National Federation of Industrial Unions (Shin Sambetsu).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

District of Columbia Commissioners Receive Human Relations Award at Brotherhood Dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on February 17, 1964, the 15th brotherhood dinner of the Washington region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel, with more than 1,200 persons in attendance.

This respected organization is comprised of religiously motivated people, "seeking through education and discussion to promote civic cooperation and mutual understanding among men of good will of all religious and ethnic groups without compromise of religious beliefs." In the Metropolitan Capital area this effort is carried forward with the guidance of energetic leaders and members who recognize the challenges of the 1960's and who meet the needs of a "community in change" with dynamic, imaginative programs.

Through these worthwhile projects the NCCJ is a strong partner in the cooperative venture to make this city a better habitation for all people. It assists and complements the work of other human relations agencies in Washington. Its activities provide opportunities for continuing conference and consultation among representatives of the religious and racial heritages of America. Therefore, by meeting and talking together, a workable approach to new understanding is provided.

The program was opened by dinner chairman, A. Scott Offcut. The national anthem was led by Walter F. McArdle. Rabbi Lewis A. Weintraub, president of the Washington Board of Rabbis, gave the invocation. Following dinner, Al. Philip Kane, cochairman of the Washigton region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, extended greetings and a welcome to those in attendance.

Mr. President, each year the National Conference of Christians and Jews selects persons to be honored with national awards for their efforts in the field of human relations. This year the honorees were the members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia: the Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, President of the Board; the Honorable John B. Duncan; and Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke. Presentations were made by the Honorable Brooks Hays, national chairman of Brotherhood Week, and a recipient of the award last year. Mr. Hays' moving tribute to John F. Kennedy, also a past recipient, was a high point of the evening. I shall often remember the humor and heart-warming remarks of my former congressional colleague.

The citation presented to the District Commissioners reads as follows:

The National Conference of Christians and Jews acclaims the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia—

For distinguished and courageous service to the Nation's Capital, especially in the crisis year of 1963;

For serious dedication to the search for solutions to the complex human relations problems of their community;

For encouraging all departments of the District of Columbia to improve their human relations practices;

For carrying out so skillfully the complex duties of the Board which affect the lives of all citizens of the District of Columbia; and

For striving continually to enhance the image of Washington in the eyes of the Nation and the world.

On behalf of his fellow Commissioners, Board President Tobriner delivered a meaningful response. In accepting the national award Commissioner Tobriner pointed out that for any measure of accomplishment the total community must be involved in a committment to brotherhood.

The program closed with a benediction by the Most Reverend Philip Matthew Hannan.

During the evening a telegram was received from the President of the United States commending the work of the District of Columbia Commissioners. It read as follows:

I want to add a word of appreciation to the Board of Commissioners of the District whom you are honoring this evening. Mr. Tobriner, Mr. Duncan, and General Duke have each made a generous contribution to the public life and to the government of this city. Their efforts have helped to bring this city closer to the ideals which we enshrine in the observance of Brotherhood Week.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Among the guests of honor were the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, and the dean of the diplomatic corps, Dr. Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Ambassador of Nicaragua.

Mr. President, I commend Leonard P. Aries, vice president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and Russell L. Bradley, executive director, for the effective manner in which this memorable event was planned and carried forward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix the message of response by Commissioner Tobriner, together with a list of former award recipients.

There being no objection, the message and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSIONER TOBRINER'S RESPONSE

For my colleagues and myself, I speak our appreciation for this honor. There is nothing that has happened to us during our terms of office as District Commissioners that has meant more than this Brotherhood Award. The award is made to the Board of Commissioners, but it is clear that it is really an award for the total efforts of the District of Columbia, its many departments and agencies that are striving to practice the concepts of brotherhood and equal opportunity.

In a broader sense, the award belongs to the entire Washington community. We have made progress in the area of human rights in the District, but the credit for this progress, in a very real and large sense, belongs to private organizations such as the national conference, to the leaders of our churches and synagogues, to the many businessmen and civic leaders who have advanced the cause of brotherhood in their own activities, and to countless individuals of good will, white and Negro, rich and poor. For any measure of accomplishment the total community must be involved in this commitment to brotherhood, and no sector of the community, certainly not government alone, can achieve much on its own. If government has made some contribution to this progress, it is only because we are operating in a favorable community climate, and because we are reflecting a strong community consensus in support of equal rights and opportunities.

And so, on behalf of the Board of Commissioners, I accept this award with pride, but I accept it with embarrassment, because all of us know well that much remains to be done.

Many of our citizens still suffer the indignities of racial and religious prejudice in their daily lives. There is still conflict and division within our community. Problems of a serious nature remain unsolved, and Washington cannot yet begin to claim to be a city of brotherhood.

In the year 1555, Bishop Latimer, while waiting to be burned at the stake in Oxford for heresy, had these words of cheer for the unfortunate citizen who was to precede him, "Play the man Master Ridley; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."

Let us, also, dare to hope, that you and we have within the past several years here in Washington, and with God's grace, lit a candle whose light, however dim and imperceptible at this time, may so grow in strength that hatred and bigotry, prejudice and intolerance, may be banished from all the peoples of our land.

FORMER AWARD RECIPIENTS

Hon. Harry S. Truman, 1950; Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, 1951; Joseph D. Kaufman (deceased), 1952; William E. Leahy (deceased), 1953; Frank R. Jelleff (deceased), 1954; Hon. Daniel W. Bell and Mrs. Jehu L. Hunter, 1955; Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1956; E. K. Morris, 1957; Aaron Goldman, 1958; Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle, 1959; Milton S. Kronheim, Sr., 1960; Mrs. Henry Gichner, Dr. John J. O'Connor, and Hon. John B. Duncan, 1961; Hon.

John F. Kennedy (deceased), 1962; Milton W. King, Hon. Brooks Hays, the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., 1963.

Canal Zone Territory: Should Be Widened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, among the demands now being made by Panama as the price of peace is cession to that country of so-called "unused" lands in the Canal Zone territorial possession of the United States, as described in an article by Virginia Prewett in the February 12, 1964, issue of the Washington Daily News.

As all who have followed the addresses on the Panama Canal know that, in addition to the grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone under the 1903 treaty with Panama, the United States obtained title to all land and waters in the zone through purchase from individual owners. Moreover, President Taft, under the authority of the Panama Canal Act of 1912 and in conformity with the 1903 treaty, by Executive order of December 5, 1912, declared that "all land and land underwater within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the Panama Canal."

Panamanian threats of various forms against the summit level water supply and modernized methods of warfare demand more land than is now in the zone. The new defense and security needs, so well emphasized by the January mob assaults on the Canal Zone, call for a larger zone. This should include the entire watershed of the Chagres River, just as was recommended in 1916 to the Congress by Gen. Clarence E. Edwards when he was commanding general of the U.S. Army in the zone. This is the proper counterdemand to Panamanian demands for retrocession of U.S. territory.

The indicated news story follows:

JOKER HIDDEN IN PANAMA PEACE PRICE

(By Virginia Prewett)

Panama's demands on the United States as its price for resuming friendly relations contain an economic joker that could give Panama over half the Canal Zone area—properties worth many millions of dollars. It is their demand for the United States to cede to Panama the unused zone lands.

Though Panama remains vague on the exact definition of this term, this condition has aroused considerable sympathy among the Latin American ambassadors trying to mediate the crisis with the United States. They argue that our great rich country can afford to be big on the dollar details.

CITY OF COLON

"The unused lands are under the city of Colon," a Latin American member of the Organization of American States Peace Committee mistakenly assured me.

"The land belongs to the Canal Company, which rents it to Panamanians. The latter put up shoddy buildings, since they don't own the property, and this prejudices the city."

The Panama Canal Company reveals this impression to be erroneous. The properties referred to, which the United States took over from the old French concessionaires who tried first to build a canal, were returned to Panama under the 1955 treaty.

The Panamanian Government has sold some of the properties, valued in all at $25 million, but rents some as the Canal Company used to do.

EYE OTHERS

Panamanians actually have their eye on two other kinds of unused lands within the zone. The 10-mile-wide, 30-mile-long Canal Zone contains many fenced-off U.S. military installations, airfields, engineering works and administrative and residential sections. A U.S. official estimates these may take up half the total zone area.

Most of these reserves cluster at the two ocean mouths of the canal, with others at the town of Gamboa, a halfway point. In between are undeveloped strips, mostly jungle, that come to the canal's edge.

But other much more valuable properties called "unused land" by Panamanians are found inside the improved, fenced areas. One example is near Colon, on the Atlantic side, where a former Navy airfield called France Field has been turned back to the Company. Housing covers part of it, but "several thousand acres" are vacant.

RESERVATION

Similarly, near Panama City is the Corundu military reservation, where there are "several square miles" of unoccupied land. As potential urban property, both tracts are worth many millions of dollars.

An estimate of the amount of unused land in the zone by the Panamanian Embassy is "around 50,000 hectares." This is nearly two-thirds the zone area, including the waterway.

And it is a very fat package of boodle for Panama's politicos to carve up.

Chess in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 4 years ago I had the pleasure of bringing to the attention of my colleagues the first Armed Forces Chess Championship Tournament, a unique and unprecedented effort to enhance the prestige of the services by encouraging their members to take an interest in the ancient game of chess as an intellectually stimulating recreational activity.

At that time I said, as I have for many years:

We must stimulate greater interest and participation in this type of program in the United States.

Today it is exceedingly gratifying to be able to report that there is greater interest in this activity, in the civilian as well as the military community.

This is a revealing and reassuring development. It indicates an awareness on the part of our people that in the world of today and tomorrow this most time-honored and universal of all pastimes which challenge the intellect is as important, in terms of individual and national honor and prestige, as are the more publicized forms of competition such as our national pastime or the sports in the Olympic games. It is reassuring to know that so many of our people recognize this fact and that their numbers are increasing from year to year.

For the interest which has been generated in and by the Armed Forces chess program, credit is due in large measure to Mr. Thomas Emery, donor of the championship trophy, to the American Chess Foundation which sponsors the program with assistance from the USO and the U.S. Chess Federation, to the Secretary of Defense, and the members of of the honorary committee for the encouragement they have given, and to the education and recreation authorities in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who give this program the benefit of their personal attention and official support.

Because I so strongly believe that this kind of effort should be encouraged and because I know that this concern is shared by many other Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the announcement of plans for the fifth annual Armed Forces chess competitions which will culminate in the title tournament in Washington, November 7–14, 1964.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMED FORCES CHESS TITLE TOURNAMENT, NOVEMBER 7–14

The fifth annual Armed Forces chess program, in which outstanding players of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard compete for the Thomas Emery championship trophy and other awards, will culminate in a title tournament at the USO in Washington, D.C., November 7–14, 1964, it was announced today by the American Chess Foundation, which sponsors the program with the cooperation of the USO and the U.S. Chess Federation.

Dr. Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education, is the new chairman of the honorary committee for the competitions, succeeding Gen. David M. Shoup, recently retired Marine Corps Commandant under whose leadership the committee was established 2 years ago. General Shoup is continuing his relationship in the role of honorary president of the American Chess Foundation.

Other members of the committee are: Maj. Gen. Joe C. Lambert, the Adjutant General of the Army; Rear Adm. Donald G. Irvine, Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for Education and Training; Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, U.S. Air Force; Maj. Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr., Assistant Chief of Staff G–3, U.S. Marine Corps; and Rear Adm. George A. Knudsen, Chief, Office of Personnel, U.S. Coast Guard.

The title tournament will be limited to 16 players: five Army, five Air Force, and six Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. In selecting its team the Air Force—present holder of the Emery trophy, having taken the three top places in the 1963 tournament—will depend, as heretofore, on a servicewide tournament, at Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., September 7–12. The other services will make their selections on the basis of major command tournaments, U.S. Chess

Federation ratings, and other records. All men and women on active duty are eligible.

In announcing the 1964 program, American Chess Foundation President Walter J. Fried, of New York, stated that the foundation will, as in previous years, underwrite all tournament costs, including per diem expenses of the finalists, award silver cups to the first-, second-, and third-place winners, and provide silver medallions for all participants.

THE 1964 ARMED FORCES CHESS

The Navy Times will again present special awards to the top-ranking Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard players, and there will be similar recognition for the most successful Army and Air Force contenders.

The foundation president paid tribute to the education and recreation authorities of the Armed Forces and recalled Defense Secretary McNamara's prediction last year that these authorities would continue to cooperate in generating interest and participation "with a view toward producing more and better chess players." He said, "There is every evidence that interest and participation are increasing, so much so that we are now exploring possibilities at the international level, within the NATO, Pan American, or other organizational framework. These prospects should encourage many more players to enter the Armed Forces competitions."

The American Chess Foundation is a chartered, nonprofit, educational organization to encourage Americans to play chess, to increase public understanding of its values for intellectual development and scientific training purposes, and to develop formidable contenders for international chess honors. The Armed Forces program was initiated in 1960 on a grant from World War I Marine Thomas Emery, an internationally known chess player and advocate of chess especially for the training of military leaders and diplomats.

The U.S. Chess Federation, rating authority in this country, cooperates through its regional vice presidents who are available for technical advice and assistance to special service offices of Armed Forces commands and nearby USO clubs. The federation also has a special arrangement whereby, regardless of USCF membership, any Armed Forces tournament player may obtain USCF rating by forwarding to USCF, 80 East 11th Street, New York 3, N.Y., the tournament record and standard rating fee of 10 cents per game.

Information regarding cooperation or participation in the Armed Forces chess program may be obtained from special service officers at military and naval commands, representatives of the U.S. Chess Federation or the USO, chess liaison officers at Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard headquarters, or from the American Chess Foundation, 1372 Broadway, New York 18, N.Y. Names and addresses of chess liaison officers and USCF vice presidents are attached.

ARMED FORCES CHESS LIAISON OFFICERS, 1964

Miss Pat Abernethy, Recreation Branch, Recreation-Education Division, PSSD, Office of The Adjutant General, 2420 Building T-A, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 5-5483).

Mr. Benny G. Lewis, Recreation Branch, Office of Assistant Chief for Morale Service, Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1808 Arlington Annex, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 4-1163).

Maj. Shelton D. Kem, Sports and Recreation Branch, Air Force Personnel Center (AFPMP-PB), Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.

Maj. N. C. Farrington, Jr., Recreation Section, Special Services Branch, Personnel Department, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Building 3, Henderson Hall, Washington, D.C. (Oxford 4-2450).

Lt. Comdr. James P. Randle, Special Services Division, Headquarters, U.S. Coast Guard, 1300 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. (Worth 4-2647).

U.S. CHESS FEDERATION VICE PRESIDENTS, 1964

James A. Burgess, 329 Adams Street, Dorchester, Mass.

Eli Bourdon, 1195 Hampden Street, Holyoke, Mass.

Stanley W. D. King, 38 North Prospect Street, Eastern Point, Groton, Conn.

Donald Schultz, 3 Horizon Hill Drive, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Peter Berlow, Chemistry Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Charles Keyser, 55 Laurel Avenue, Bloomfield, N.J.

Frederick Townsend, 103 Halsey Avenue, West Lawn, Pa.

William Byland, 1610 Bigelow Apartments, Pittsburgh 19, Pa.

George S. Thomas, Post Office Box 1, Burtonsville, Md.

Dr. Stuart Noblin, 805 Yarmouth Road, Raleigh, N.C.

Dr. Robert L. Froemke, 1516 Argonne Road, Tallahassee, Fla.

Joseph Sullivan, Jr., 230 North Purdue, Apartment 102, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

F. W. Bauer, 4467 Kittridge Road, Dayton, Ohio.

Norbert L. Matthews, Beech Grove, Ind.

Frank Skoff, 4833 North Avers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Eward V. Gaba, 17,328 Ohio, Detroit, Mich.

Dr. George Van Dyke Tiers, 165 South Cleveland, St. Paul, Minn.

John M. Osness, 320 Columbia Circle, Waterloo, Iowa.

John Beitling, 3533 Genesee Street, Kansas City, Mo.

Kenneth R. Smith, 2710 El Tivoli Drive, Dallas, Tex.

Dr. J. J. Reid, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Richard S. Vandenburg, 2316 Regan Avenue, Boise, Idaho.

Mabel Burlingame, 3310 East Roosevelt Street, Phoenix, Ariz.

Gordon S. Barrett, 1744 Redesdale Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

Findley: Farm Law Watchdog—Freeman Labels Him "Hatchetman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article from the Chicago Tribune of February 23, entitled, "Findley: Farm Law Watchdog." This excellent article, written by the nationally recognized journalist Willard Edwards, relates the fight by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, to prohibit the use of export-import funds to guarantee credit to communistic nations for the purchase of wheat:

FINDLEY: FARM LAW WATCHDOG—FREEMAN LABELS HIM "HATCHETMAN"

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—On the island of Guam, in the spring of 1944, the ratio men to women was roughly 3,000 to 1.

This ratio was presumably delightful to the 50 Navy nurses stationed on the Pacific outpost and appalling to more than 150,000 American fighting men starving for femine companionship.

A very junior grade Navy lieutenant, 22 years old, conducted a thoughtful survey of this situation. Undismayed by the rivalry of admirals and generals, not to mention the serried ranks of lesser mortals, he singled out one of the prettiest of the nurses (who outranked him), snared here attention and eventually secured her promise to wed.

SUCCESS PATTERN SET

By almost unanimous vote of those who witnessed this achievement, the young man was acclaimed "most likely to succeed" in any future endeavors he might attempt.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, looking back upon that incident from the advanced age of 42, is quick to concede that he may never again record a greater triumph against stiffer opposition.

A recent photograph of Mrs. Findley, who was Lt. (jg.) Lucille Genne, of Stoughton, Mass., during World War II, confirmed the magnitude of his victory. A redheaded beauty then, of French-Irish extraction, the passage of 20 years has not dimmed her charms.

JEEP DOESN'T HURT

FINDLEY was asked the key to his success in the field of romance. His answer indicated the essential role of transportation in wooing, American style.

"I had a jeep," he said. "That didn't hurt."

He has carried into politics the same aggressive style and disregard of obstacles. Only 3 years in Congress, a period occupied by most freshmen in learning the ropes, he has played a prominent role in two major legislative battles, causing discomfiture to two Presidents.

These exploits gained him a supreme accolade only 12 days ago from Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

CALLED HATCHETMAN

"FINDLEY is the political hatchetman of the Republican Party," fumed Freeman at a banquet in Decatur, Ill.

Freeman thus expressed the administration's ire at a series of attacks by FINDLEY on the sale of American wheat to Russia. This project is fast boiling up into one of the big issues of the 1964 campaign.

HARD HIT IN 1930'S

In Congress where many years of seniority are usually required to attain distinction and influence, due notice was taken of this singling out of a comparative newcomer for a Cabinet member's anger FINDLEY is admittedly a man to be watched among the group of young Republicans vying for leadership in the years to come.

He has made it the hard way, one of the generation whose parents were hard hit in the depression 1930's. He grew up in Jacksonville, Ill., one of a family of seven, with an invalid father and a mother who supported the family by earnings of $15 a week in management of the high school cafeteria.

In those innocent days, the Findleys never thought of seeking State or Government relief. They did not realize they were underprivileged members of society, entitled to Government paternalism. The two sons and three daughters pitched in to help in the business of survival. Everyone worked and contributed his or her pittance to the family budget. All worked their way through college, and four of them are now teachers or professors.

Findley was early seized by a desire to engage in politics and to publicize his opinions in that field. As an eighth-grader, he bought a mimeograph machine with which he made a little money printing church bulletins and neighborhood news.

LOVES TO SOUND OFF

"I was opinionated at an early age," he confessed, "and I loved to sound off. By the time I was in high school, I was circulating biting editorials about the Supreme Court packing proposal."

In the 1936 presidential election, at the age of 15, he was a fervent Landon booster, and organized a teenage band (he plays the trombone) which played at Republican rallies. The odds against the GOP candidate in that election were almost as long as those Findley later faced on Guam, and he learned, without discouragement, that long shots rarely win.

He fired furnaces, sold sandwiches, and besieged the local newspaper, the Journal-Courier, until he was given a part-time job as a reporter. At 19, he was writing a sports column, possessing the ideal qualifications for such a post of authority—some familiarity with but no great skill in games, and a facility in secondguessing, an irresistible urge to voice pontifical judgments.

HAS VARIED DUTIES

He was also covering news and photographing participants in it, operating a press, sweeping out the office, and occasionally turning out an editorial.

World War II found him working his way through Illinois college. By accelerating his studies, he gained his degree, plus a Phi Beta Kappa key, in January 1943. Then he enlisted in the Navy, became a supply corps officer with the Seabees and served 15 months in the Pacific. His battalion was being readied for an invasion of Japan when the war ended. He served with the Army of Occupation in Japan.

Discharged in January 1946, he immediately married the girl he had found on Guam. They have two children, Craig, a high school sophomore, and Diane, a fifth-grader, both redheads like their mother.

WORKS IN WASHINGTON

FINDLEY worked a year in Washington, D.C., for a monthly magazine called Freedom and Union, a publication supporting the "Union Now" theories of Clarence K. Streit. He still clings to the view that the American constitutional system should be used to join the free nations of the world into an effective organization for peace.

This attitude gets him into violent arguments with some of his conservative colleagues who, with good reason, regard him as one of their own on domestic issues.

"All I say today is that we ought to get the best brains in the United States to sit down with the best brains in the North Atlantic Community and convert NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) into a durable, useful instrument," said FINDLEY. "That's what our forefathers did in uniting the 13 Colonies. We've got to do something because we are floundering, otherwise."

RETURN TO ILLINOIS

The lure of journalism persisted and FINDLEY returned to Illinois where he bought a one-third minority interest in the Pike County Republican, published in Pittsfield, Ill., a country weekly founded in 1842. It was once owned by John G. Nicolay, Lincoln's secretary and biographer.

Pittsfield, a town of 4,000, has been his home since 1947. He acquired control of another weekly, the Independent Press of Griggsville, Ill.

Politics called and FINDLEY in 1952 sought the Republican nomination for State senator. He was defeated by a woman candidate, Lillian Schlagenhauf, who went on to win the senate seat and hold it to this day.

SEES NO CHANCE

"I thought I was through in politics," FINDLEY recalled. "Looking ahead, I could see no possible chance for me, even in the State legislature."

Then, in 1958, Representative Sid Simpson, Republican, of Illinois, who had represented the 20th Congressional District for 16 years and who was a shoo-in for reelection to a ninth term, died a few weeks before the November election. His widow was induced to run in his place and was victorious but she announced she would serve only one term.

"I had 2 years to get ready," FINDLEY said. I began making speeches, 150 of them, in all 14 counties of the district. The regular organization favored another candidate, but I had a running start. In a very hot primary, I ran first, although the three other candidates received a larger combined vote."

SELLS LINCOLN PHOTO

FINDLEY was short of funds. Frantically seeking a way to raise money, he dug up a rare Lincoln photograph, showing the President and his two secretaries, Nicolay and John Hay, which he had procured for a modest sum years earlier.

Surveying the small field of prospective purchasers, FINDLEY picked out John Hay Whitney, descendant of the Lincoln secretary, and sold him the photograph for an amount which he did not wish to disclose. It was enough to permit him to acquire sole control of the Pike Country Republican and ease the financial stress of campaigning.

FINDLEY won the 1960 election handily by 15,500 votes, but redistricting in 1962 threw him into competition with Representative Peter F. Mack, Democrat, of Illinois, a demonstrated votegetter. The prominence gained by FINDLEY in his freshman term helped him win reelection to a second term by 11,000 votes.

GAINS WIDE ATTENTION

As a freshman member of the House Agriculture Committee, he was at the bottom of the heap, but he gained such wide attention by a series of forceful attacks on the administration's farm bill that the Republican leadership accorded him an almost unprecedented distinction.

When voting on the farm bill approached its climax on June 21, 1962, Findley was permitted to offer the opposition's motion to recommit the measure. To the consternation of the Kennedy forces, the motion carried, 215 to 205, and the bill was dead.

"That was a milestone in American agriculture," said Findley. "I doubt if there will be another effort in years toward mandatory acreage of feed grains. It was the high level of the New Frontier attempts to regiment the farmer."

WIELDS HATCHET AGAIN

Secretary Freeman, at this point, presumably formed his opinion that Findley was a "hatchet man," but there was more to come. Last December, Findley again caught administration leaders off guard when he proposed an amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill, prohibiting use of export-import funds to guarantee credit to Communist nations in such transactions as the sale of wheat.

The Illinois Member again led the floor battle. Temporarily defeated on a tie teller vote, 133 to 133, his amendment was revived in a motion to recommit, which carried, 218 to 169. The fight continued almost until Christmas day when administration forces finally procured a compromise which permitted credit to the Red bloc only when President Johnson declared it to be in the public interest.

When the President, to facilitate the wheat sale to Russia, was forced to make this politically embarrassing statement, Findley told the House: "This is approval of taxpayer-backed credit cards for the Soviet Union and six other Communist governments. It gives credit backing to the Communist government responsible for the murder exactly 1 week earlier of three unarmed U.S. airmen over East Germany."

Senate and House Members, Staff Personnel, View Worthwhile Film, "One Man's Way," Based on the Life of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale—Don Murray Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Wednesday afternoon, February 19, it was my privilege, with Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, to host an advance showing of the film "One Man's Way," in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building. This outstanding motion picture is based on the life of one of America's most respected religious leaders, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, and will premiere in Washington on February 26 at the Keiths Theater.

Invited guests on this memorable occasion were Members of the Congress, staff personnel, and employees of the various congressional committees. A considerable number gathered to share the inspiration and entertainment of this unusual picture.

Each of us is familiar with the contributions of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale to the moral and spiritual life of our Nation. Through his forceful ministry he brings new insights and attitudes to thousands, and his book, "The Power of Positive Thinking," has enjoyed a world readership.

An added treat at the screening was the personal appearance of Don Murray, the accomplished young actor who carries the role of Dr. Peale. Mr. Murray has appeared in "Bus Stop" and "Hoodlum Priest," but is perhaps best remembered by Washington audiences for his outstanding portrayal of a youthful Senator in "Advise and Consent."

Don's performance in "One Man's Way" is a heart warming one. He brings to the screen a purpose and conviction which accurately convey the dynamic personality of Dr. Peale and the full impact of his message.

Special recognition and commendation should also go to Frank Ross, producer of the picture. Mr. Ross conceived the idea for the film, secured the cooperation of Dr. Peale, and supervised production until a finished product was achieved.

I recommend "One Man's Way" to the attention of my colleagues and to other thoughtful persons. This is more than the story of a man—it is a challenge to all of us to seek a rewarding and more fruitful life in these times of tension and unrest.

Wheat: Diplomatic Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of February 21, 1964:

WHEAT: DIPLOMATIC NIGHTMARE—FOREIGN NATIONS CITE ACTION BY UNITED STATES IN OPENING DOOR TO TRADE WITH REDS

The Kennedy-Johnson administration will be held responsible by many voters next November for one of the biggest boners in foreign policy that a State Department has ever allowed to happen. It was the consent given to the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, notwithstanding the cold war.

This move has proved a boomerang. It has started a wave of deals whereby Great Britain and France and other countries have begun not only to export goods to Cuba but to help build factories for the Russians which can be indirectly of aid to them in preparing for war.

The late President Kennedy, in a press conference last October 9, said of the wheat deal that it was not a government-to-government transaction, that credits would be granted by banks, and that the grain dealers will take the risk with the private banks.

The total impression given at the time was that the United States would not grant any subsidy or any credits.

But it turns out that the Government here has guaranteed the loans which the banks made, and Members of Congress have revealed that in one particular sale—involving 37 million bushels of wheat at a price of $78.5 million—there was a subsidy by the U.S. Government of a little more than $24 million. Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN now says:

"The wheat deal with the Soviet Union initiated last October and currently being feverishly pursued by the Johnson administration, is doing far greater damage to American foreign policy than it is good to the American economy.

"The chain of events which has followed this reversal of our economic policy toward Russia shows how costly the decision has been. It has all but destroyed our economic blockade of Cuba, a result forecast by Representative HALLECK on October 2 last year when he said: 'If the Kennedy administration puts its stamp of approval on sale of wheat to the Soviets, how can our Government expect to persuade other nations not to trade with Cuba in the future?'

"The truth is now upon us. We can no longer persuade them.

"In short, the wheat deal is turning into a diplomatic nightmare. Nothing has so undermined our leadership of the free world in a score of years."

Representative HALLECK, leader of the Republicans in the House, in a separate statement, draws attention to the boycott by maritime unions in the United States against loading wheat for shipment to the Soviet Union. He points out that nearly 75 percent of the wheat shipped so far has been on foreign vessels, despite the White pledge that at least 50 percent of the deliveries would be in American ships. He also estimates that more than $40 million in subsidies will have been paid by American taxpayers in connection with the wheat deal.

Meanwhile, the Department of State seems to be in a state of confusion. At first it was hinted that Americans were so annoyed over the British export of goods to Cuba that it was possible there would be a boycott on the part of consumers in this country who have previously been buying products manufactured by the British companies doing business with Cuba. But not a spokesman for the Department of State says: "The United States does not favor consumer boycotts."

This, apparently, is the result of an unfavorable reaction abroad. Yet, on February 15, in a specially prepared broadcast around the world distributed by the "Voice of America," Secretary Rusk said:

"Well, we don't ourselves plan to organize any boycott against the goods of countries that may be engaged in that (the Cuban) trade. I think it is possible there may be some consumer reaction here in this country, here and there with respect to firms that specifically engage in that trade. But that's something that is in the hands of private citizens; we have no part in that ourselves."

There were hints from other Government officials to the same effect and an indication that the State Department approved of the boycott, but apparently complaints caused the State Department to back down. It is this backing and filling which has encouraged foreign governments to take matters in their own hands, knowing full well that they will not meet any real opposition from the American Government. The principal reason for this, of course, is that the State Department has been checkmated by its own blunder in allowing wheat to be sold to the Soviet Union.

Bobby Baker's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if, as some reports indicate, the Senate Rules Committee is getting ready to throw in the sponge on the Bobby Baker investigation, it should think twice before so doing.

As the editorial in the Washington Star makes clear, the public will not be satisfied with a whitewash of this sordid mess.

The Star editorial follows:

BOBBY BAKER'S DEFENSE

If the Senate Rules Committee has been conducting a "legislative trial" of Bobby Baker, as charged by Attorney Edward Bennett Williams, the defense which has been offered on Mr. Baker's behalf is far from persuasive. For it comes down to a plea of possible self-incrimination.

The committee, however, is not conducting a legislative trial. Nor do we think its intention to question the former Majority Secretary of the Senate in public is aimed only at embarrassing or exposing Mr. Baker. Mr. Williams' accusations on these points are of a piece with his exhibition of a radio transmitter which he said had been attached (not by the committee) to the telephone of Edward Levinson, Nevada gambler and former business associate of Mr. Baker. The effect of all this is to divert attention from the real issues and is a legitimate exercise by counsel for the defense. But it should not be permitted to frighten off the committee. It is our hope, Mr. Williams' accusations notwithstanding, that Senator JORDAN and his colleagues intend to follow this thing through to the end.

There are some indications, however, that the committee is getting ready to throw in the sponge. Its counsel, Lennox P. McLendon, has told reporters the investigation "is getting to the point where we can begin to think about coming to an end." He said he still isn't sure whether White House Aid Walter Jenkins will be called to testify about an apparent conflict of sworn testimony between himself and Don Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance agent. Surprisingly, Mr. McLendon describes the apparent conflict in testimony as being so small.

It doesn't seem small to us. And we do not think it can be brushed off by saying that as far as the investigation of Senate employees is concerned the evidence is satisfactory as it stands.

If broader investigative authority is needed, the committee ought to ask for it. Meanwhile, it should be borne in mind that if there is any legislative trial in the affair, it is the committee, and the Senate, which are on trial. The public, as jurors, will not be satisfied with a whitewash, or even with the offering up of a few minor sacrificial lambs on the altar of integrity.

Panama Crisis: Censorship and Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as the weeks since the sensational headlines and the initial news stories about the January 9, 1964, Red-led and Red-directed mob assault on the Canal Zone passed, a pattern in the mass news media has gradually evolved. It minimizes the violence of the Panamanian mobs and the failure of the Panama Government to act vigorously, avoids mention of important facts about those days of terror on the isthmus, and criticizes the U.S. forces that defended American lives and property in the Canal Zone and prevented sabotage of vital structures of the Panama Canal.

Fortunately, this obvious censorship has not been completely effective because of loyal individuals in the press, in the Canal Zone Government, and in agencies of the Federal Government on the isthmus. There have been leaks on the isthmus and in Washington from all agencies concerned, but these leaks have been in the interest of our country's security.

An informative news story by Virginia Prewett in the February 19, 1964, issue of the Washington Daily News about current Panama crisis probe of the OAS gives advance notice as to what to expect from the report due from that international agency concerning the Red Cuban activities in the January Panamanian mob assault on the Canal Zone. It is clear from the facts it presents that the people of our country and the Congress are being denied crucial facts in the full story, which obviously must be

known to all the intelligence agencies on the isthmus.

To supply information about events that should, under normal operations of the press, be sensational disclosures, I shall quote a recent Allen-Scott report from an isthmian source that is highly pertinent and I commend it for reading by every Member of the Congress and also by cognizant officials of the Executive.

The indicated news story and report follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 19, 1964]

REPORT FROM OAS COMMITTEE: PANAMA PROBE CLEARS CASTRO

(By Virginia Prewett)

As might have been predicted, Fidel Castro promises to come out the winner when the Organization of American States investigation of the January 9 Panamanian riots is completed.

An early leak from the OAS investigating committee in Panama first of all minimizes the Communist role in the fatal riots at the edge of the Canal Zone.

While not formally condemning the United States for aggression, the committee's findings reportedly do condemn the U.S. forces for overenergetic action against Panamanian civilians. This neatly gives the Communist anti-American propaganda machine its "New World Hungary," with the United States as the villain.

The advance news from Panama omits mention of Panamanian responsibility in the disorders. The riots were obviously far from spontaneous nor did Panamanian forces seek to check them for 26 hours. If Castroites aren't to blame here, then the Chiari government or other Panamanians are. But it seems that Panamanians, like the Communists, may get off scot free.

The most significant fact in the advance notice is the whitewash of Castro's Cuba.

It was to be forseen that Cuba would come in for gentle treatment when Mexico's OAS Ambassador, Dr. Vicente Sanchez Gavito, took a leading part in forming the investigating committee. He began to do so, it is true, after other Latin Americans who had worked hard on the Peace Committee did not want to touch the formal investigation of the January 9 riots.

"GO EASY" GROUP

Though Mexico's relations with the United States improve yearly, Dr. Sanchez Gavito belongs to the hard-core "go easy on Castro" group of Mexican officials. He worked actively to get the representative of another government with pro-Castro leanings, that of Brazil, on the investigating committee.

This was accomplished through a squeeze play. The United States was openly accused in the OAS of not wanting Brazil on the committee. The United States then felt obliged to say that Brazil's presence would be acceptable.

A deeper truth in this situation is that the U.S. diplomatic team in Panama headed by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin Martin did not try very hard to make a case against the Castro Communists.

NOT IMPORTANT

Even before the OAS investigating committee went to Panama, this team told U.S. newsmen that the Communist role in the January 9 riots couldn't have been so important after all.

The State Department is notoriously divided on the question of Castro's Cuba. We appear to be heading into another episode in which the "soft on Castro" school of thought triumphs again.

Nor would it be the first time that "soft on Castro" Mexicans and Brazilian attitudes have had behind-scenes aid and comfort from our own "go easy on Castro" diplomats.

ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: PANAMA PERMITS AGITATORS' EXIT

WASHINGTON.—Some two-score Communist snipers and agitators, in the forefront of the destructive rioting and slaying of four U.S. soldiers in Panama, have been quietly allowed to leave that country.

They include eight professional Red killers who were seized and jailed by Panama National Guardsmen during the costly violence.

The Communist guerrillas—Panamanians, Cubans, Mexicans and other Latins, some of them veterans of the recent Red terrorist operations in Venezuela—were flown to Mexico. From there, a number have gone to Cuba.

Directly involved in this secret exodus are two top Panamanian officials—Education Minister Solis Palma and Eloy Benedetti, legal adviser to the Foreign Minister.

OFFICIALS ARRANGED ENTRY

A detailed intelligence report charges that the two leftist Panamanian officials not only cleared the way for the surreptitious departure of the trained Red guerrillas and snipers, but arranged for their coming to Panama and were in constant touch with them during the murderous demonstrations.

Benedetti particularly is credited with being in close contact with the imported Communist goons. He was especially active in getting those jailed released.

These sensational disclosures are being withheld from the U.S. public at the insistence of the State Department—on the ground that their publication might further complicate the tortuous and uncertain deliberations with the leftist-tinged regime of President Roberto Chiari.

Intelligence and military authorities vigorously dispute this view. They are urging President Johnson to make these facts known to prepare the American people for a possible Communist takeover in Panama.

It is contended there is grave danger of that.

Chiari's government is said to be so extensively infiltrated with Reds and fellow travelers that in order to stay in office, he will have to submit to the extremist demands of Palma and Benedetti.

It is asserted the two leftist leaders are claiming that only direct U.S. armed intervention can block Communist seizure of Panama.

THE RED SETUP IN PANAMA

Communist forces in Panama are operating both underground and in the open.

The underground is financed and supplied chiefly by Cuba via Mexico. The visible apparatus holds key places in government and the university and controls the leftist wing of the Socialist Party, with more than 10,000 members.

Avowed aim of all the leftwing elements is to create the utmost dissension with the United States over the Canal and the Panama Zone issues.

The departments of education and agriculture are heavily Communist infiltrated, as are the school of law, journalism and education of the University of Panama. The university is the headquarters of the Communist underground, and middle-aged "permanent students" actually paid Red agitators, hold key places on the campus.

Thelma King, a pro-Castroite leader in the Socialist Party and member of the Panamanian Congress, is a forefront figure of the above-ground apparatus. Significantly, she returned from a visit to Cuba just before the rioting and killings. She made the trip by way of Mexico—as virtually all the leftists do.

An Afro-Panamanian, Mrs. King's principal propaganda organ is radio station Tribuna.

We're Shocked Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following excellent editorial entitled "We're Shocked Again," by George Putnam, which was presented on the 10 o'clock news report, January 29 and January 30, 1964, on television station KTTV, channel 11, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Today, we are registering unanimous shock over the shooting down of an American jet trainer over East Germany. The plane, unarmed; the men, killed.

We are expressing shock at such bloodthirsty action on the part of the Communists. But why shock, when we realize that the whole history of Communist behavior is brutal, murderous, and bloodthirsty; that they will kill and lie and cheat and steal to gain their selfish ends. And yet, in a way, we have ourselves to blame.

We indicated to the Communists that we were spineless by allowing enslaved nations of the world to remain enslaved. We showed the Communists in our behavior following the Korean war that we would dance to their tune. We failed to stand together with our allies on the Suez Canal. We stood by and allowed the Communists to exterminate the people of Tibet. We talked big and did nothing when the brave Hungarian people revolted against the Communists. We allowed a so-called neutral government to be established in Laos. We stood by and watched Cuba taken over by Communists in direct violation of our Monroe Doctrine.

We said we would not tolerate communism in this hemisphere, that communism is not negotiable here, but we allowed Communist saboteurs to spread out from Castro's Cuba to pillage and burn and murder in Venezuela, Brazil, Colombia, and Panama. Then, we prevented Cuban exiles from launching attacks against Castro and communism, and we stood by and did nothing when the Organization of American States pleaded for strong action against Castro. And this, by a unanimous vote. We supported an extremely doubtful line in the Katanga crisis.

American boys are losing their lives fighting what appears to be a hopeless venture in South Vietnam, trying to support a government that is today reported overthrown. These Americans ordered by us to fight in a war where we are not declared to be a belligerent.

But today, we're shocked by the shooting down of an unarmed American plane that strayed over East Germany in a storm. Three Americans killed. Now what do we do?

Our Government has set the pattern—has indicated to the Communists that we will not fight back, even though Americans are killed in South Vietnam or in the skies over Europe, or any other place.

And now, comes a message from Communist Russia, calling it a clear intrusion—the plane was intercepted—it did not obey orders—accuses U.S. authorities of gross provocation aimed at aggravating the situation in central Europe.

Washington protests the shooting down of the plane and the killing of all three officers aboard in what are called the strongest possible terms. We demand a Soviet investigation. The Russians promptly reject the protest.

America's blood will boil—briefly—and then, presumably, this, too, will be forgotten.

It is time that we change this horrible course of events. For if we do not, nothing short of disaster will save America. Nothing short of bringing this great Nation to its knees will save it from oblivion, and you and I, and millions of Americans, will be guilty of losing the greatest Nation in the history of the world, if we allow it to fall. Apathy? Yes.

But, more than this, is the knowledge that something is happening to our Nation, and and we just don't bother to do a thing about it. Centuries ago nations fell and men faced disaster because they had very little to say about their destiny. But in the United States of America, we have the privilege—the right—to speak out and vote and maintain our sovereignty, our freedom, our liberty. We have a Constitution that requires Congress and the President to act for the common defense.

Within a few months politicians will plead with us for their votes. They will plead just as did Neville Chamberlain. They will promise, as did Chamberlain. "Well, what can I do about?" you ask.

You and I can sound off so loud, so direct, so meaningfully, that the politicians in Washington will interrupt their cocktail parties and their gatherings with lobbyists and special interests, and be forced to take a brandnew look at the miserable situation we are in today. You and I, as American citizens, can write to them, and tell them that we prefer the Winston Churchills to the Neville Chamberlains.

Leaders in the history of man have always gained strength from the strength of the people. Well, now is the time to put starch in their spines and tell them we've had enough of the Bay of Pigs and private ransom and the Berlin wall and a troika in Laos and neutrality and coalition and so-called coexistence and the kind of peace of which Khrushchev speaks.

We can let these leaders of ours know that we've had enough talk, enough threats, enough compromises, enough backdowns. We can tell them we believe that the Monroe Doctrine lives if we will breathe new life into it and let it live.

It's time to get tough, Uncla Sam. It's time to stand firm. It has been demonstrated that the power of the United States is the only thing that stands in the way of the advance of communism. Firmness on the part of the United States is the only thing the Communists understand, for in those rare instances when the United States has stood firm, the Communists have backed down.

It is not enough to be shocked over the American lives being dribbled away in South Vietnam, or in the skies over Europe. It is time to tell the Communists that we mean business. It is time we let the world know that we are a peace-loving nation—but not a spineless one.

And that we intend to stand firm even if it means looking the Communists straight in the eye and saying, "We've had enough." As we almost did in the Cuban crisis.

Addiction to Alliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal recently. It is very timely, especially after Washington's Birthday and the reading of his Farewell Address last week.

I have never quite understood why we read the Farewell Address, unless we want to point out what a long way we have come since it was written and how completely we disregard the excellent advice given by our first President.

From being careful to avoid entangling alliances, we now dash hither and yon seeking alliances with all and sundry, usually to our discomfiture in the long-run.

The final sentence in the editorial is worthy of our thoughtful consideration:

At the least the Government appears to need some straighter and more detached thinking about the nature and limitations of alliances, before our addiction traps us in still more of the world's costly follies.

The editorial follows:

ADDICTION TO ALLIANCES

When George Washington warned the infant Republic against enduring alliances, he presumably had in mind permanent pacts with one or two of the then great powers. At any rate, he could hardly have envisaged today's scene: America involved in innumerable multiple alliances, often working at cross-purposes, entangling not only us but everybody else as well.

The most ridiculous, albeit potentially dangerous, current symptom of this malady concerns Cyprus. Because of an intrinsically insignificant conflict between Greek and Turkish communities on a tiny Mediterranean island, the great United States is thrashing about, desperately trying to restore peace and prevent a possible war between the nations of Greece and Turkey.

How come? Because the United States is the mainstay of NATO, and both Greece and Turkey are also members of the alliance. And what, dear reader, is NATO's ostensible purpose? That is right: To defend Western Europe against Soviet Communist attack. Cyprus represents a fine falling-off from that noble purpose.

Unhappily such weird distortions are almost as numerous as the alliances themselves. Southeast Asia is an area affected by one or more international understandings, but nobody bothers about Vietnam except the United States; not even, it sometimes seems, the South Vietnamese. Except, of course, General de Gaulle, another NATO partner; he is pushing a Vietnamese policy exactly the opposite of the U.S. Government's

Alliances can not only leave us in the lurch; they can also deter us from action that might be called for. The inter-American alliances make a virtue of nonintervention, which is all very nice. But nonintervention is, if nothing more, a psychological bar against decisive steps against Cuba's communism, should such a course become necessary for the security of the United States and Latin America.

Part of the trouble, of course, is a misunderstanding of what alliances are for, plus an unrealistic expectation that allies can have identical policies on all issues in all places. It is naive to suppose that the existence of NATO is a guarantee of peace among its more fractious members; we should try to keep NATO on its right track.

Similarly, we have no particular right to expect France, simply because it is an ally in Europe, to follow our line on Red China and Vietnam. Or to insist that Britain refrain from selling buses to Cuba—especially when we are busily selling wheat to Russia.

Yet the relentless illogic of the prevailing view of alliances leads the U.S. Government into strange diplomatic moves. So we retaliate against Britain for its Cuban trading by turning off the trickle of military aid the nation is still receiving. Such pettiness merely annoys our allies, without doing a thing in the world toward solving the Cuban problem.

But part of the trouble is also the very multiplicity of the alliances. NATO, in its original design that is, is a sound idea, even a necessity in the face of the Soviet threat in Europe. It has worked as well as it has because it rests on basic mutual interest; although there are plenty of Communists in Western Europe, none of the governments particularly relishes the prospect of being devoured by Soviet communism.

As with so many things, however, the United States proceeded to go to extremes with the alliance device. It assumed that what would work in Europe would also work in Asia, southeast Asia and—as it has long dreamed—the Middle East.

The plain truth is that these areas include peoples and governments markedly different from our own. They differ notably in their attitudes toward communism, but they are also driven by all kinds of religious, communal and other hostilities. Our military alliance with Pakistan, for example, has long exacerbated our relations with India. The essential ingredient of a workable alliance, mutual interest and purpose, is often not present or not sufficiently strong.

"Disengagement" is a word the diplomats have been batting around for years, usually meaning a physical separation of the Communist and Western forces in Europe. Maybe we need a little disengagement from some of our all too entangling alliances.

At the least the Government appears to need some straighter and more detached thinking about the nature and limitations of alliances, before our addiction traps us in still more of the world's costly follies.

Communist Economic Superiority a Myth: A German Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the hollowness of Premier Khrushchev's boast about burying capitalism has been evident for a long time. Our free enterprise system, which according to Marxism-Leninism is supposed to destroy itself because of its own internal contradictions, has made a mockery of the Communist claim to economic infallibility. State planning which leaves no room for individual initiative has led the Soviet Union to the rather embarrassing position of relying on the capitalist nations for the necessities of life. The inherent contradictions not of capitalism but of communism are concisely stated in a recent article of January 24, 1964, appearing in the German Tribune. This article points out that the slow pace of Soviet economy has greatly hampered, among other things, Soviet trade with Austria, West Germany, and other Western nations:

THE END OF THE MYTH—ECONOMIC FAILURES HAMPER SOVIET FOREIGN TRADE

(By Frankfurter Rundschau)

FRANKFURT, January 24.—When Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev was once asked how he pro-

poses to bury capitalism, as he claimed to adhere to the principle of coexistence, the Soviet Premier said that the planned economy of the East bloc was so superior to the anarchic economy system of capitalism that it was only a question of time when capitalism "would finally succumb, defeated in its own province of foreign trade."

This coexistence pattern was to be applied in trade with developing countries, and, indeed, the Soviets succeeded in spreading the conviction in a number of countries that it was more advantageous for them to do their trade with the East bloc, because in that respect they could rely on long-term planning and long-term stability. Planned economy, Moscow said, would never be subject to a cycle of booms, and slumps, and thus is not exposed to crises. Soviet foreign trade would always offer a supply of goods, free from disturbances, and develop with a rising trend. This was so, the Communists claimed, because according to Marxism and Leninism this state of affairs was "willed by providence."

This thesis and hypothesis was hardly ever refuted by Western observers, until the Republic of Austria a few weeks ago found that it is not void of all dangers to rely on Moscow's economic plans.

Like a bolt out of the blue, the representatives of Austria during the Austrian-Soviet negotiations on the subject of a new trade agreement, were hit in Moscow by the statement that the Soviet Union intended to slash the volume of the goods exchange with the Austrian Republic in 1964 by no less than one-half.

This was announced at a time when the Kremlin had to sell gold in London in order to be able to pay for American and Canadian wheat so urgently required to stave off want in the Soviet Union. Only thanks to their skillful tactics did the Austrians succeed in attaining a result according to which by value the new trade agreement is only about 15 percent below that of the agreement it replaces.

On December 5, 1963, however, Soviet Economist Maximova stated in the lecture delivered at the Arbeitskreis Ost in Vienna that European Eastern trade has very good development chances, and that Austro-Soviet trade could be increased by 20 percent without any difficulties.

After all this the Soviet Union astonished the world by a new admission of its grave economic difficulties. In an aide memoire the Kremlin told the Federal Republic that the Soviet Union would not renew the trade agreement with the Federal Republic terminated by the end of last year, but proposed that the exchange of goods this year (1964) should be transacted on the basis of the commodity list of 1963, the volume of which corresponded to approximately the volume of 1962, i.e., DM895 million of imports from Russia, and DM826 million of exports to Russia, i.e. a very modest volume.

All this shows that German-Soviet trade, too, has become involved in the general Russian misery.

ECONOMIC MISERY

This becomes even clearer if it is borne in mind that the Federal Republic of Germany in recent years had imported approximately 300,000 tons of wheat and feeding barley from the U.S.S.R. annually, while last year the Soviet Union bought wheat flour from the Federal Republic. This item, incidentally, was the largest in German eastern trade, and it can be assumed that the U.S.S.R. at present feels that it is impossible to fill this gap by other goods that may be attractive for the West.

But the economic misery is not the only thing that thwarts Soviet foreign trade plans at present. According to the dogmas Soviet economic planning is absolutely infallible. Yet the planners have forgotten to allow for the great significance of chemistry and chemical industry for any national economy; the Soviet Government now wants to make up for this backlog, cost it what it may, and wants to achieve in a few years what has been neglected in decades, this costs money. It ties so much of capacity that even important building projects such as the Siberian hydropower station at Bratsk was throttled, or even suspended for the time being.

But what is more, the U.S.S.R. today cannot actually afford to live without a flourishing foreign trade. After all, no lesser man than Khrushchev himself had revealed what great percentage of chemical equipment and aggregates had to be bought from the West, if his gigantic plans for the expansion of the chemical industry were to be accomplished at all. If Soviet foreign trade stagnates today, or if reversing trends should arise, this cannot at all be to the liking of Soviet planners. To get their foreign trade going again, they have the choice of two possibilities: either a freely convertible currency is introduced, and the principle of bartering, commodity by commodity, like in the stone age is scrapped for good, or they receive the support of long-term Western credits for further development, which would practically amount to a kind of development aid being given by capitalism to communism. Both, however, would mean the end of the myth of governmet-controlled foreign trade that can be planned without any difficulties and disturbances.

Government Should Stay Out of Fundraising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1964, I joined the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the introduction of a House resolution requesting a study and investigation of the proposed combined fundraising effort among Federal employees by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

In order that our colleagues may become familiar with the far-reaching effects of this proposal, I submit this editorial from the January 5, 1964, edition of the Orlando Sentinel for insertion in the RECORD.

The ultimate injury which can be done to the charity campaigns of our local communities by competition from the Federal Government is explained in detail in this editorial. Also put forth is an alternative plan through which the Government can help, rather than duplicate or destroy the initiative of the Nation's community fundraising efforts.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT SHOULD STAY OUT OF FUNDRAISING

As if the Federal Government didn't have enough to do already, the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission is proposing it go into fundraising by determining for each Federal employee in each community just which agencies he may give to, and how his contribution should be divided through a Federal solicitation plan.

The job of fundraising for charity is already being done by private citizen volunteers through United Appeal, United Fund drives, Community Chests and the individual agencies.

To duplicate their efforts at Government expense would be foolhardy and wasteful, and would in some cases spell the end of the United Appeal movement.

As outlined by Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of Civil Service, the plan would be given a trial run in eight local United Fund and Community Chest areas in the fall.

Each Federal installation would set up its own campaign which would be manned by Federal personnel. They would carry on what the Goverment calls a "single campaign" in the fall for all health and welfare agencies approved by officials in Washington for solicitation of Federal employees.

There are 22 such agencies, including United Fund which is considered one agency. (In Orange County, United Appeal represents 33 agencies.)

The Government proposes to encourage personnel to earmark their contributions first to the general group such as United Fund, health, international, and so on, then to the individual agency within the group.

For example, if you wanted to give half your donation to health you would indicate that, then you would indicate the amount to the specific agency dealing with health, such as the American Cancer Society.

This would serve the purposes of the contributor well, but obviously some agencies would get more than they needed, some far less.

Federal employees would make their contributions through the payroll deduction plan which today is not allowed for charitable purposes by the Federal Government.

Participating agencies would be required to produce and pay for materials used in the local Federal campaigns; and would have to pay the cost of operating the Federal payroll deduction system.

The contributions would be deducted by the Treasury, held in Washington and sent to the agencies from time to time. Since there are 2.5 million persons under civil service the accounting procedures would be staggering.

Another bad aspect of the plan is that United Appeal could no longer determine its own local goal. The goal would have to be negotiated with the local Federal coordinating group.

The unwieldiness of the plan should be enough to defeat it. That plus the fact that the Government would likely be looking over the shoulder of each employee to see that he contributed whether he wanted to or not, and possibly that he contributed to the right agencies.

Although it would start, if it does, on a limited basis in the eight test areas, when and if it becomes operative on a national scale it wouldn't be long before everyone involved in any way with the Federal Government might be asked to come in.

Possibilities for future inclusion along with the 2.5 million civil service employees are all members of the Armed Forces, all those drawing social security or any kind of pension from the Government, all those working for firms doing Government work.

CENTRAL CONTROL

Furthermore, the proposal arbitrarily takes from the local community the right of self-determination as to which agencies may solict and what campaign plan will be used. These decisions would be made in Washington.

Designation by each contributor would be substituted for budgeting by the local agency. The agency might make a budget but whether it got the money it needs would be left to chance.

And the plan would force some agencies to solicit Federal employees only through united funds while allowing other agencies free choice at the local level.

Summed up, control of the United Fund campaign would be taken out of the hands of the United Fund.

The claim that the plan would result in a single campaign is not true. National health agencies and international agencies would still be free to solicit Federal employees at their homes and on the streets.

There would be fierce competition among agencies to obtain Federal designations, and the pressure on Washington to accept additional individual agencies would be irresistible. The efforts of community leadership to solve the growing problem of multiple appeals and overlapping in the health field would be dealt a severe blow.

We cannot see that the plan would do anything beneficial for the community. While some agencies would undoubtedly be helped tremendously, others equally worthy and necessary would pass out of the picture.

The plan disregards the lessons learned from long experience by hundreds of local communities and fails to provide such valuable elements of United Fund raising as community-based allocation of funds by a representative volunteer citizens' committee, and agreement by participating agencies to eliminate their separate campaigns in the community at large.

BETTER APPROACH

A far better approach to the matter of Federal employee participation would be for the Federal Government to allow payroll deductions for contributions to existing united funds, united appeals, and community chests as private industry now does.

Federal employees under civil service in the Orange County area, and personnel at military bases, give generously to United Appeal of Orange County. But allowing them to make their contributions through payroll deduction would simplify matters for them and United Appeal. And this plan would do everything, and more, for the agencies involved than would the proposed Federal plan.

The Sentinel was one of those which helped organize United Appeal of Orange County 8 years ago. United Appeal has been successful in bringing the majority of our agencies into one fund drive for the benefit of the agencies and citizens as well.

For the Federal Government to step in now and wreck our United Appeal—and thousands like it throughout the land is wrong and foolish.

President Lyndon Johnson has declared a policy of cutting down on Federal expense, on unnecessary activities and unnecessary jobs in the Government.

The proposal by civil service would do exactly the opposite: It would add hundreds, perhaps thousands, to the Federal payroll, create an entire new bureau to administer the program, and put the Government in the private health and welfare business.

Undoubtedly the matter has not reached attention of the President yet. As things go, it is a small one on the international scene. But as it is tremendously important to thousands of cities throughout the Nation with community chests, we're asking the President to take a look at it, and to use his authority to cancel the plan before it goes into effect on even a trial basis next fall.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, now that the civil rights bill has successfully passed the House, a column by Roscoe Drummond, published February 3, concerning civil rights is of special interest. This astute and frank observer of the Washington scene has outlined some of the problems that confront the civil rights bill in the weeks ahead.

In view of the outstanding and successful Republican efforts in connection with civil rights during these past months and weeks, I, as one who has worked very hard for many years in this area and who has deep personal convictions about what we all should do, feel that the Republican Party should again make its stand crystal clear.

Several Republican Governors, notably Nelson Rockefeller, George Romney, William Scranton and others have spoken out clearly and forcefully that we are the party of Lincoln, and we intend to maintain a constructive, positive civil rights position.

The text of Mr. Drummond's column follows:

CRUCIAL 2 WEEKS: ROCKY ROAD IN CONGRESS FOR THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In order to judge the trend of the great debate on civil rights in Congress during the next few weeks, these are the developments to be closely watched:

1. House approval without any important weakening of the bill sent to the floor by the Judiciary Committee is essential. It is essential to protect it from being further diluted by the southern democrats in the Senate.

2. The objective of the southern opponents of the bill in the Senate will be to remove the following provisions as the price of allowing it to come to a vote: (a) The ban on discrimination in public accommodations; (b) title III, which entitles the Justice Department to intervene in civil rights civil suits; (c) title VI, permitting the withholding of Federal funds from States practicing discrimination; (d) a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission.

3. The power of the Senate filibuster—can it be broken?

Bear in mind that no filibuster on civil rights legislation has ever been broken before its principal purposes were achieved. This was true when two diluted civil rights bills were passed during the second term of President Eisenhower.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the leader of the procivil rights Democrats in the Senate, has stated that 25 Republican votes will be needed to end the filibuster by cloture.

This is, in itself, an accurate but highly one-sided and partisan statement of the political realities. The Democratic tactic is to blame the Republicans for not joining in applying cloture (which many Senators oppose in principle) to a filibuster which is no part of Republican doing, a filibuster by senior leaders of the Democratic Party and for which the Democratic Party ought to be held responsible.

At this stage it seems clear that the administration Democrats want to claim full credit for a worthy and worthwhile civil rights bill which can be enacted only with Republican support and disclaim all blame if other Democrats make its enactment impossible.

The Republicans feel this is a transparent ploy and ought not to fool anybody. If Mr. HUMPHREY is right in his low estimate of the number of Democratic Senators who will vote for cloture, then the prospect of breaking the filibuster by cloture is lost in advance.

But there is another way of surmounting the filibuster without gravely diluting the bill. It is for the Senate, after a fair period of thorough debate, to hold day-and-night sessions, 24 hours a day unendingly, and leave it to public opinion to develop sufficient pressure to rescue the bill from filibuster for its own sake.

This is, in fact, the essential philosophy of those who earnestly believe the filibuster is desirable in order that a substantial minority may have the fullest opportunity to develop their case and persuade the country that they are right.

I believe a civil rights filibuster will have the opposite effect; that it will persuade the country that the supporters of the bill are right and that voter opinion can make itself sufficiently felt to bring the matter to a vote. But the Democratic leadership will have to have the stamina to hold the Senate in continuous session.

It is regrettable that the bipartisan coalition, which brought the bill through the House Judiciary and Rules Committees, is now badly frayed. The main civil rights leadership groups are lined up on the Democratic side, heedless of the indispensable work performed by the Republicans.

The case for Republican support of the bill is strong. Men like Representatives THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, and such Republican Senators as JAVITS and KEATING, of New York, KUCHEL, of California, SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and CASE, of New Jersey do not see great dividends in the Negro vote for the Republican Party as a whole, but they know that an end to racial discrimination is right in itself and that the Republican Party must reflect the deep desire of the American people for fairplay.

It Does Seem Strange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Daily News points up a question that demands an answer: How did Bobby Baker, protege of President Lyndon B. Johnson, make "a potful of money doing business with people who since have testified he did not actually do anything for them?"

This is but one of many unanswered questions in the strange case of Baker, former secretary to former Senate Majority Leader Johnson. We agree that the lack of answers given to the Senate Rules Committee thus far should "spur the committee to the deepest possible inquiry."

The Daily News editorial follows:

IT DOES SEEM STRANGE

Reporters assigned to the Senate Rules Committee investigation of Bobby Baker's affairs asked the committee chairman, Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, how he figured Mr. Baker could have made a potful of money doing business with people who since have testified he didn't actually do anything for them.

"It does seem a little strange," the Senator replied.

Up to now, this description fits the whole story. It especially applies to Mr. Baker's appearance yesterday before the Rules Committee.

At this appearance, Mr. Baker refused to bring his records, despite a committee subpena. And his lawyers then challenged the whole proceedings. They accused the committee of attempting to try Mr. Baker, of invading judicial functions, and even hauled in a juicy herring about somebody sometime tapping the telephone of one of Mr. Baker's associates, Edward Levinson, who runs a gambling casino in Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. Baker made a lot of money, according to testimony, in a lot of assorted enterprises with a wide assortment of companies and people—all while he was majority secretary to the Senate, at a cost of $19,600 a year to the taxpayers.

When the Senate first threatened an inquiry, Mr. Baker abruptly quit his Senate job. He since has declined to talk to anybody. He will not produce his records, or even explain why he won't. He says he is relying on the first amendment to the Constitution (free speech), the fourth amendment (which forbids unwarranted search), the fifth (which frees him from testifying if he thinks he would be incriminated), and the sixth (which guarantees trial by jury). His lawyer says any testimony by Mr. Baker before the committee might unfairly disadvantage him if the Government should prosecute.

The Senate committee is merely investigating to learn whether there was any "conflict of interest" between Mr. Baker's taxpayer job and his wide-ranging business deals. If not, his elaborate but noncommital response to the subpena does, indeed "seem a little strange." It also should spur the committee to the deepest possible inquiry.

The 46th Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, Estonians are an outstanding example of a people who love liberty and never are discouraged in their fight to obtain it. Forcibly brought under the control of the Russian czars in the 18th century, they suffered for about two hundred years under this autocracy and finally achieved their freedom and proclaimed their national independence on February 24, 1918.

As a result of the Russian Revolution of 1917 these sturdy and stouthearted people lived happily under their own democratic government, the Estonian Republic, until they were robbed of their freedom in 1940 when the country was annexed to the Soviet Union and they became enslaved under the godless communism ideology.

Today is the 46th anniversary of the independence they won in 1918 and every lover of justice and freedom in the world wishes them well. All are thrilled by their example of courage and fidelity to those principles which they hold so dear. May their hope never grow dim, may their courage never be shaken, and may they in God's good time achieve their heart's desire and renew their life under a republican form of government.

Civil Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the able commentator, Mr. Paul Harvey, which speaks for itself.

Mr. Harvey deserves the thanks of all citizens sincerely interested in maintaining the high quality of representative government which exists at all levels in these United States.

The article follows:

OUR UNCIVIL TREATMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS

(By Paul Harvey)

You and I would not think of treating the servants in our kitchen the way we treat our civil servants.

A businessman with money is respected.

A politician with money is suspected.

In business, reciprocity is necessary, prudent and wise.

In politics it's called "a deal."

You make a gigantic mistake in business, you declare bankruptcy.

You make a gigantic mistake in politics, you and your family are permanently disgraced.

The businessman offers a bribe, "that's business."

A politician accepts a bribe, "that's a crime."

Defenders of this double standard insist that what politicians do is "public," what industry does is "private." Why?

Does that defense really make sense when the consuming public pays for the hanky-panky in industry as surely as the taxpaying public pays for the politician's boondoggle?

Another thing: It's smart for a "workingman" to get more than he's worth for working less than he's able.

But the politician is expected to "sacrifice," to accept less than he's worth, but be always "on duty."

And who ever heard of time-and-a-half for a Congressman?

A factory hand tries to get in to see the chairman of the board and he'll get old waiting.

In politics your door is expected to be open all the time, you are expected to be available to anybody.

That's not all: In business, longtime experience is an asset, an endorsement, a virtue.

In politics too long and you're a "hack."

A businessman's careless remark would never get out of the board room.

A politician's total image is crucified by one intemperate utterance quoted out of context.

The press contributes to this double standard; let's admit it. There are too many "it has been rumored" accusations about politicians which get printed on the front page and retracted, if at all, somewhere in the want ads.

If you are in one business and buy stock in others, you are diversifying."

If you are a politician with outside income, you are profiteering."

If you give a few hours to the Community Fund you are hailed as a selfless, public-spirited citizen.

A lawmaker sacrifices precious months out of his year to attend legislative sessions and you wonder "what's he getting out of it?"

The Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare recently published a report called "Ethical Standards in Government." It was the judgment of the committee that ethical standards among public officials are generally higher than those prevailing in so-called private business.

In a Republic we elect men to do our deciding for us.

Theoretically we elect our best men. Actually we tend to elect men our own size.

How is it that we presume to demand of these ordinary creatures such extraordinary conduct?

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, we should commemorate the brave independence of the Lithuanian people who after defeating Czarist forces on February 16, 1918, and enjoying brief freedom between World War I and II, lost their freedom to the harsh forces of communism. But the Communist takeover of Lithuania before and after World War II did not destroy the spirit of freedom of the Lithuanian people. The continuation of meetings and activities by Lithuanians living in the West proves that they have not forgotten their love of country and that hope is still alive among Lithuanians for a time when their homeland can regain its independence. This anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day should remind Americans of an age when the United States neglected the struggles for freedom in other parts of the world and allowed totalitarianism to grow and expand—a policy that we cannot afford again.

At a time when various disarmament and peace gestures are being made by the United States to the Soviet Union, the enslavement of the Eastern European country of Lithuania should serve as a reminder to Americans of the true nature of communism. Dedicated to geographic expansion, communism seeks to destroy the weak and will use any method to accomplish its objectives of tyranny regardless of how ruthless. Thousands of Lithuanians have been either executed or exiled to Siberia. The Soviet's suppression of minority peoples such as the Lithuanians clearly indicates the hypocrisy of the Soviet Union's attack in the United Nations on the colonial policies of the West. By dominating Eastern Europe and seizing the Baltic Republics, the Soviet Union is by far the largest colonial power in the world.

The United States should continue to give encouragement to the peoples of Eastern Europe through Voice of America broadcasts, support of exile groups, and discussion of Communist colonialism before the United Nations. Negotiations with the Soviets undertaken by the United States should include the status of captive nations abroad, and our goal should be a firm resolve that not again will a small nation fall under the control of communism.

Red Squeeze Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Flint (Mich.) Journal of February 9, 1964, entitled "Another Red Squeeze Play Trips Tiptoeing Americans," cogently relates the many seemingly adverse yet essentially similar incidents which have recently exposed the weaknesses of the Government's current approach in dealing with the Communists. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hope to share this analysis with the wider audience it deserves, particularly here in the Nation's Capital. I know that many of my colleagues will find, as I have found, that this statement reflects in large measure their own views with respect to the Government's recent conduct of foreign affairs.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER RED SQUEEZE PLAY TRAPS TIPTOEING AMERICA

That the U.S. Government's policy of bending over backward to seek more harmonious relations with the Kremlin is merely strengthening the Communists hand in international affairs should now be obvious to all.

Let's consider two recent incidents.

Last week, an unarmed U.S. jet trainer appeared over Communist East Germany. Russian fighter planes downed the trainer and all three U.S. Air Force officers were killed.

Not only was the act admitted, but the Soviet Union accused the United States of deliberately attempting to aggravate the situation in central Europe.

The "imperialistic" U.S. Government was charged with full responsibility for the "gross provocation."

The United States managed a weak protest, but the only satisfaction obtained was return of the three bodies.

State Department spokesmen were quoted as admitting that the incident was serious, but hastened to add that it was not as provocative from the standpoint of East-West relations as the Soviet shooting of a U.S. reconnaissance plane over the Barents Sea in 1960.

Apparently this was to imply that the Soviets aren't as irresponsible or as much on the muscle as they were 3 years ago. Small comfort for the dead airmen and their families.

Now for the other incident. Last Sunday 36 Cuban fishermen were seized off the Florida coast, charged with illegal fishing in U.S. waters.

Almost immediately, the Soviet Union warned this country that the action could lead to disastrous consequences. Thursday, Soviet puppet Fidel Castro shut off the water supply for the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo, Cuba, in retaliation. The water will be kept off, he told the United States, until the Cuban fishermen are released. And he went into a name-calling tirade accusing the United States of a deliberate act of hostility against his country.

Except for taking steps to provide water to Guantanamo on an emergency basis for an "indefinite" time, Washington admittedly doesn't know quite what to do about the Communists' squeeze play.

We can't seem to win for losing—or at least fear of losing.

On one hand, a U.S. plane violated Soviet air space. Three U.S. lives were lost, and we were painted as a villain who was caught in the act.

Apparently we didn't dare press the point.

On the other hand, Cuban fishing boats violated our territorial water rights. We didn't gun down the fishermen, but put them under arrest. So we are accused of unwarranted aggression and handed an ultimatum.

Apparently we don't dare press this point either.

In both incidents, the fear was expressed that if we talked too tough or took an uncompromising stand, the supposedly smoothed relations between the United States and Russia might again be riled.

This is exactly what the Soviets are counting on. This is what they always have counted on when it suits their purpose to flex their muscles.

They are convinced that weak-willed, complacent Americans will avoid an out-and-out showdown at all costs.

Being a peaceful, freedom-loving people, our country likes to believe every good-neighborly expression Soviet Premier Khrushchev utters. And we are lulled into a false sense of security.

Then when we relax and start concerning ourselves more with improving our standard of living than with strengthening our national defenses, Khrushchev delivers another rabbit punch.

It smarts, but we take it without retaliating. After all, we wouldn't want to make our fat Soviet buddy angry.

Why we are repeatedly surprised by such Communist tactics is the mystery. The pattern has been the same ever since we have been hooked up in this ideological warfare.

What we seem to forget is that the few times we have called the Soviets' bluff and issued our own ultimatum, they have backed off and complied with our demands. Khrushchev's record shows he has no stomach for pushing the United States to the limit.

This is why our Government should quit putting so much faith in Communist peace agreements and remain consistent in answering tough Soviet threats with tough talk of our own. This is the only safe course we dare to follow.

Wavering and back tracking does not enhance the chances of world peace. It only encourages the Communists to step up their schedule of world takeover.

Only with a threat of force staring Khrushchev in the face is he willing to listen to reason. We must ever have such a threat available and make everyone aware of our willingness to back it up as long as the goal of communism remains unchanged.

Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, little is heard from Estonia now, but escapees report that Russian Communists rule the country with a heavy hand. Yet the national ideals of a free Estonia are carried on by some 100,000 Estonians who succeeded in escaping to the free world.

The Republic of Estonia was established after World War I on February 24, 1918. This was not the beginning of the Estonian State, however. This struggle for freedom began more than 700 years ago and no force could ever break the Estonian's will for national self-determination. Many wars ravaged their country and medieval fortresses bear witness to the rule by power rather than justice. In 1918–20 Estonians fought courageously against Soviet Russia and German forces and won their freedom.

The period from 1918 to 1940 saw a free people give a new look to their country. New and modern homes, hotels, public buildings, and factories were erected. There was a tremendous increase in the number of small farms equipped with up-to-date implements. Mining and refining of oil laid a solid foundation for an expanding industry and the national income doubled.

Estonia, though small in size was large in culture. Education was the primary concern and the number of students and graduates of the two universities, compared with total population, was one of the highest in Europe. It was a land of large historic churches and the contribution of the church to the culture and to the educational development of Estonia has been considerable. The intense striving for their national self-expression is reflected in their highly developed literature and creative arts.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, in the short period of 22 years, 1918 to 1940, a proud and courageous people, after 700 years of foreign occupation, made great strides.

But in 1940 Estonia was overrun again. This time it was Soviet Russia and even though the Western world still recognizes its independence her people are now forced to live under Russian Communist rule.

Again I repeat, Mr. Speaker, little is heard from Estonia now, yet the national ideals of a free Estonia are carried on by some 100,000 Estonians who succeeded in escaping to the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I join with these courageous people in commemoration of Estonian Independence Day.

The Beautiful American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent insert in the Appendix an editorial from the February 14, 1964, issue of the South Bend Tribune concerning the courageous act of Emerson Player, the U.S. Foreign Service officer stationed at the American Embassy in Ghana:

THE BEAUTIFUL AMERICAN

A. Emerson Player is a scholarly, 31-year-old Negro with the build of a football player.

A native of Denver, he worked his way through the University of Colorado in Boulder. He holds a master's degree in political science and has studied abroad. He speaks fluent Spanish, German, and French.

While in Boulder, he took part in demonstrations supporting Southern sit-ins and

he helped picket a chain store during a boycott.

He is a noncareer officer in the U.S. Foreign Service and is currently serving in his first post, the American Embassy in Accra, Ghana.

A few days ago, Mr. Player was recommended for the Freedom Award, the highest U.S. honor awarded to a civilian. "I don't know what all the fuss is about," he shrugged when he learned that.

The fuss, in case you didn't connect the name, is about this:

When a mob of Ghanaian demonstrators were in the process of hauling down the American flag outside our Embassy in Accra recently, Mr. Player bulled his way through the mob, snatched the halyard just before the flag touched the ground, and ran the Stars and Stripes back up the pole.

Our hat is humbly off to A. Emerson Player. No ugly American, he.

Are We Being Softened Up To Agree To Admitting Red China to the United Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy statements by the administration arouse some concern that the American people are being softened up for a whole string of backdowns to the Communists.

While we are being told that we are universally loved, and that our foreign affairs have never been in better shape, we see chaos in Africa, declining U.S. prestige in Asia, a Cuba growing stronger through the help of our allies, and communism a continued threat to every country in South America.

It looks as though the first great test to see how far the American people can be pushed in being made to swallow the "let's get along with the Communists" line, will come in bringing Red China into the United Nations. The following analysis of what French recognition of Red China means in this regard is well worth reading. It was written by Philip Geyelin in the Wall Street Journal of February 14, 1964. The article entitled "French Recognition of Peiping Leads United States To Consider Possible Changes in Policy," follows:

U.N. AND RED CHINA—FRENCH RECOGNITION OF PEIPING LEADS UNITED STATES TO CONSIDER POSSIBLE CHANGES IN POLICY

(By Philip Geyelin)

NEW YORK—U.S. diplomats, dug in along the United Nations front against the admission of the Red Chinese, are flashing brave words and ominous warnings back to Washington.

The French defection to recognition of Peiping is stirring some second thoughts among U.N. delegates hitherto hostile to Red China's entry; at the U.N. documents room, clerks report they've been cleaned out of copies of the records of last year's China debate and balloting. But France's switch has clearly started no stampede. Result: With increased assurance, U.S. officials on the spot here vow they can hold out against Communist Chinese membership in the world body and even head off serious discussion of the subject at least until after November's election.

Yet the French move, it's now widely conceded, probably also hastens the ultimate day, though nobody is sure by how much, when the U.S. position—adamantly against seating the Peiping Government and stalwartly in support of retaining the Nationals as China's U.N. representatives—will be overrun. "The trend was hardening in our favor," says one U.S. authority. "Now we have to face the prospect that it will swing the other way."

BREAKING SOME OF THE ICE

Adds a high U.N. official, whose assessment is less likely to be impaired by partiality: "It would be unrealistic not to believe that a move by a country like France has not changed the situation. To at least some extent, it's bound to break some of the ice."

The net effect is that the supercharged Red Chinese question is unlikely to explode upon the U.S. election scene, with repercussions that could be shattering to the Democrats and richly rewarding to Republicans. But Mr. Johnson's diplomatic operatives, while welcoming any respite from an early showdown, are peering anxiously beyond election day and very quietly pondering the possibility of major change in this country's China policy.

Their reasoning runs like this: So long as the U.N. seems unlikely to vote Red China in, the United States can afford to stand pat with its argument that Peiping is not nearly peace loving enough to qualify for U.N. membership. But this line leads the United States into a dilemma, if you assume, as most experts now do, that eventually the U.N. is going to vote Red China in, peace loving or not.

As that day approaches, the diplomats reason, either Washington must retreat against powerful presure from Americans mindful of blantant Peiping aggression in Korea, Tibet, India, and covert troublemaking in South Vietnam and elsewhere around the globe, or it must risk resounding defeat in the U.N. and heavy loss of prestige. In the process, they figure, American popular support for the U.N. would be sure to sour, with crippling impact on U.S. influence in the world group. If that's indeed the long-range outlook, many diplomats are beginning to argue, perhaps the United States should begin preparing now for strategic withdrawal to safer ground.

This last conclusion, it must quickly be said, is a long way from being official policy, and may never be. For one thing, few policymakers are yet prepared to state just what new stance the United States could take, barring some easing of Red China's aggressive attitudes. But the prospect remains that U.N. pressures, abetted by General de Gaulle, may operate to knock the United States off its stout "one (Nationalist) China" stand. And a look at the short- and long-term outlook for the "Chinese representation" question in the world body gives at least some glimmering of how this might happen, what defenses the United States has against it, and how these defenses could erode.

REMODELING THE HALL

Normally, the next occasion for debating the China issue would be next fall's General Assembly session, which would ordinarily open in September. But there are important factors working toward delay; the Assembly hall is now being remodeled to provide more seating space for the U.N.'s fast-growing membership. In theory, this work might be finished before the U.S. election, but American officials are counting on at least the usual delays in such projects to throw the Assembly opening into mid-November.

This still leaves dozens of different ways that the Chinese question could come up. Technically the right of Chiang Kai-shek's envoys to represent China can be challenged at any time in the 11-nation Security Council, which meets around the year and includes China as one of its 5 permanent members (the others are the United States, Britain, France, and Russia); or the issue can be raised in sessions of U.N. affiliates such as the Food and Agricultural Organization or the World Health Organization; or it could arise out of an emergency General Assembly meeting called to cope with a crisis in Panama, Cyprus, the Congo, or wherever.

But U.N. diplomats doubt any of this will happen. An emergency General Assembly session, experts note, would not just threaten raising the China question but also pose an even more explosive issue: Russia's arrearages on payments for special peacekeeping missions in the Congo and elsewhere, which the United States is prepared to cite as grounds for depriving Russia of its Assembly vote. The feeling of large and little participants in the controversy is that it ought not to be raised in an emergency Assembly session, especially with a U.S. election in the offing.

Sudden posing of the Russian financial issue, many delegates believe, would risk heating cold war tensions; by November, it's hoped, some compromise settlement may be worked out.

Raising the China issue as a "credentials question" in the Security Council or a U.N. affiliate strikes most onlookers as unlikely on other grounds. For one thing, it's not clear what country would lead the move. Only Red China's puppet, Albania, seems to feel passionately on the subject, and its weight is slight. "With most people, here, there's no great, positive yearning to have the Red Chinese in," says one Western diplomat, adding: "It's much more a sense that somehow it isn't right for 700 million people not to be represented in an outfit that pretends to be a world body and that without Red China in on things there's no hope of really working out agreements on disarmament and peace."

Attempting to settle the matter on technical "credentials" issues, it's also felt, would somehow demean the U.N.'s dignity, which matters mightily to many smaller members.

Add to all this a consciousness that raising tough U.N. questions in the heat of a U.S. election campaign would embarrass and irritate the United States, which is the organization's chief financial prop, and the result is almost a quiet agreement not to pose the China question until after the U.S. balloting.

What will happen then?

The answer depends on how the question comes up; it's never yet arisen strictly on the issue of whether Red China should be a member. From 1958 to 1960, the question was whether the subject should even be discussed; by steadily decreasing majorities, the Assembly agreed not to bring it up. In 1960 the United States switched strategy, agreeing the subject was discussable, but arguing that it was an important question under the U.N. rules, and that Red China's admission therefore required a two-thirds vote of all nations present and voting "yes" or "no"; this was approved by a 61-to-34 vote.

MOST OPPOSE FORMOSA OUSTER

Even after that, the voting has been not on whether Red China should be allowed in, but on whether Peiping should supplant Chiang's Formosa, which would thus be kicked out. Three times resolutions advancing this proposition have been rejected, by widening margins. But even this doesn't really explain U.N. sentiment; the best guess of seasoned onlookers here is that a comfortable majority does favor Red China's membership, but not at the Chinese Nationalists' expense. Ousting a club member sets a disagreeable precedent, many nations believe.

U.N.

The best guess is that next year this inner contradiction will continue and the voting won't be greatly changed. French officials

have been spreading the word that they will merely shift from opposing Red Chinese membership to abstention. But U.S. diplomats are skeptical; they insist that French prestige will call for supporting the government it has recognized and that French pressure will be turned on France's former African colonies to back Peiping, too.

Even so, the guessing is that this pressure would switch only a handful of votes, well short of the two-thirds majority needed. France's impact might have been greater, ironically, if its switch had been less extreme—if it had straddled the issue by maintaining relations with both Chinas and thus achieving at least the semblance of a two-Chinas policy. In time, this might have paved the way for broader application of the tw-Chinas approach to the U.N. stalemate and hastened the day when Red China might be ushered in without forcing Nationalist China out.

Such an approach still strikes most experts as the only logical way out of the present deadlock; massive vote switches would be needed to provide the two-thirds majority needed to simply switch Chinas. But the U.S. defenses could crumble in other ways: The voting may bring at least a simple majority in favor of supplanting Nationalist Chinese with Communists; the psychological impact of this might make it awkward for the United States to remain indefinitely in the minority. Or it might encourage the majority to reverse the two-thirds requirements vote, even though by tradition such votes become a permanent part of U.N. procedures.

If the U.S. diplomats are correct, none of this is likely to happen before November's election. That prospect may be comforting to Democratic politicians, but the diplomats are a good deal less relaxed.

The Baker Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, Mr. Richard Wilson, columnist for the Washington Star, the Des Moines Register and other newspapers, warns that the investigation of Bobby Baker, protege of President Lyndon B. Johnson, must not be swept under the rug.

Mr. Wilson's timely column follows:

THE PUBLIC AND THE BAKER AFFAIR—A NOTE OF CYNICAL REACTION IS FOUND THAT COULD HARM ADMINISTRATION

(By Richard Wilson)

President Johnson's administration has had such a fine beginning in general that he may not have correctly assessed the intrusion of a note of cynicism in the public reaction.

It should be warning enough to Mr. Johnson that something has gone wrong when newspapers of established integrity and responsibility devote so much space in the news columns and on the editorial pages to Mr. Johnson's relationship to Robert Baker.

This attention is not inspired by any desire to embarrass Mr. Johnson politically or otherwise. It is due to the possibility that what is seen in the Baker case is only the tip of the iceberg.

Mr. Baker was Senator Johnson's lieutenant in the political operations of the Democratic majority of the U.S. Senate. Mr. Baker's financial, business and social operations while in this unique relationship with Mr. Johnson are fascinating in themselves. The gift of a stereo set to Mr. Johnson adds the little fillip that fixes public attention. But neither is more than a glimmering of what the Baker case is all about.

Nobody in official life wishes to talk about this, least of all the President, and hardly much more his friendly antagonist, the Republican leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN.

The iceberg below the surface is a rugged affair. It contains what might be called the secrets of Congress, including the more materialistic reasons behind the actions of Congressmen.

This is the forbidden territory of privilege and prerogative, of cash for campaigning, of little dinners with constituents who have much to gain or lose in governmental action, of huge defense contract awards tinged by favoritism, of rewards promised for favorable or unfavorable votes, of influence used with regulatory agencies.

This is the shadowland where armtwisting and pressure have become polished techniques, where special and inexplicable relationships persist between Congressmen and lobbyists—the area, in short, where the public interest becomes entangled with the private interest.

For many months the curiosity about this shadowland was largely confined to Washington. Mr. Baker, himself, was unknown in the country as a whole. President Johnson's name had not been mentioned publicly. It looked as if the Baker probe might blow over or remain of mere intramural interest in the Capital. But there are increasing signs that the Baker probe is arousing puzzled interest and concern throughout the country. The Johnson administration has been slow to sense this; or, if not slow then determined to let the sensation wear itself out.

This has given the President's opposition the opening it wanted. Tens of thousands of anti-Johnson broadsides have been ordered by Republican Congressmen. They show President Johnson with his arm around Bobby Baker and surrounding this picture are scores of headlines on the various sensations in the Baker case. Mr. Johnson is being reminded of the declaration of ethical conduct he sponsored in the Senate and of President Kennedy's injunctions against Federal employees accepting gifts.

The atmosphere in Washington is growingly censorious as the President cuts off questioning on the Baker case. A key witness finds his integrity impugned by official documents dug out by or handed out to a widely read columnist. In some quarters this attack on the witness is seen as fair warning that Johnson detractors must be prepared to be sorely punished, and their past had better be lily white. More and more talk is heard here that those who do not fall in line will suffer. It is put to Congressmen bluntly: "Are you a Johnson man or not?"

Mr. Johnson does not need to permit the further contamination of the atmosphere in Washington by talk of this kind. Those who saw what happened in the Truman administration could remind him that a President who stood mute amidst scandal narrowly avoided being defeated and won election with less than a majority of the total vote. It is said there is not enough time before election for the cynicism in Washington to spread to the country. This may be so, but it is still no reason why the President should not reassert now the ethical principles he was so willing to pronounce when the Republicans were in power.

What Really Happened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, "What Really Happened" on January 9, 1964, and subsequent to that date in the Panama Canal Zone is of prime interest and importance to each of us and to our country.

An article bearing this title, described as a factual summary of the events of Thursday, January 9, gives some supplemental information prepared and written by an experienced professional newspaperman and was printed in the Spillway as a service to its readers. It is not an official report of either the Panama Canal enterprise or the U.S. Government. However, it is worthy of note.

The summary of events follows:

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED

This is a factual summary of the events of Thursday, January 9, plus some supplemental information, prepared and written by an experienced professional newspaperman, and printed in the Spillway as a service to its readers. It is not an official report of either the Panama Canal enterprise or of the U.S. Government.

At about 4:40 p.m. on January 9 an estimated 200 Panamanian high school students, boys and girls, from the Instituto Nacional in Panama City entered the Canal Zone and proceeded up Gorgas Road carrying small Panamanian flags, the Panama National Institute Student Federation banner and the school flag. They also carried several provocative signs such as "Panama Is Sovereign in the Canal Zone." They proceeded in a peaceful manner to the Canal Zone Governor's residence, where they paused and sang the Panamanian national anthem and then went to the Panama Canal Administration Building, down the stairs and past the Goethals Memorial to an area one block from the Balboa High School, shouting "Yankee Go Home" and similar slogans. Here they were halted by a squad of 10 Canal Zone police officers who had instructions from the Acting Governor, Col. David S. Parker, to stop the students at this point. The Canal Zone police were instructed to use no violence, but to halt the students, so as to avoid an incident.

(Governor Fleming had left the isthmus via Tocumen by air on January 9, 1964, at 5 p.m. en route to Washington for an official appointment with Thomas Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Stephen Ailes, Under Secretary of the Army. On arrival in Miami, he was informed by Balboa Heights of the situation in the Canal Zone and Panama. After consultation with Washington, Governor Fleming returned to the Canal Zone by the first available flight to Panama. He arrived at Tocumen about 3:20 a.m., January 10, 1964, and reached the Canal Zone shortly thereafter.)

The leaders of the Panama student group informed Capt. Gaddis Wall, District Police Commander, Balboa, that they wished to go to the Balboa High School flagpole for the purpose of raising the Panama National Institute flag (a Panama flag with the school emblem and name in the flag's center) on the pole beside the U.S. flag, which was flying at the time, and to sing their national anthem. After some discussion among and

with the students, the group was informed that five Panama students would be escorted by police to the Balboa High School flagpole, where they would be able to have their ceremony and display this flag in front of the flagpole, if they wished. Although the leaders of the group agreed to this proposition, there was considerable opposition to the proposal among the group. The opposition was led by an adult Panamanian, reportedly a Panama school teacher.

The five Panamanian students were escorted by the Canal Zone police to the Balboa High School flagpole. A number of Balboa High School students were gathered about the flagpole base. The Balboa High School students and a large group of adult U.S. civilians on the school grounds, who had gathered from nearby residential areas, joined in the singing of the U.S. national anthem.

The Panama delegation refused to have a ceremony unless they could have it on the spot occupied by the Balboa High School students, who would not move. The Panama delegation then wanted to raise the Panama school flag on the flagpole where the U.S. flag was flying, and Police Captain Wall refused permission. The Panamanian and Balboa students at the flagpole began exchanging insulting remarks.

Recognizing the tense atmosphere, the Canal Zone police endeavored to convince the five Panamanian students to rejoin the remaining members of their group before an incident could occur, but the students resisted violently. It was necessary for the police detail to forcibly push them from the flagpole. The flag was carried by four Panama students holding it at the top edge. Capt. Gaddis Wall, an eyewitness, made these two statements based on his own observations. No Canal Zone policeman tore or ripped the flag. No U.S. student tore or ripped the flag. There was a tight cordon of Canal Zone police surrounding the Panama students and separating them from the U.S. students. Since there was scuffling, pushing, and physical struggle between the Canal Zone police and the Panamanian students, the four Panama students holding the flag apparently tore it themselves during the scuffle.

The five students with the flag and a Panama National Institute Student Federation banner joined their waiting group, which was surrounded by a cordon of police to keep them separated from the Canal Zone high school students and adults in front of the Balboa High School. The Panamanian group shouted at the police for several minutes. At no time was there any encounter between the large group of Panama students and the students of the Canal Zone, as O'Connor Place road separated them.

Canal Zone officials had requested the motor transportation division to send buses to the vicinity of Balboa High School, to stand by and provide shuttle transportation to the Republic for the Panamanian student demonstrators. At 5:45 p.m. three large buses were dispatched from the Ancon garage. The buses were parked on Gorgona Road alonside the Balboa High School Activities Building. The Panamanian students were offered this transportation but refused it.

The Panama students, after shouting insults, turned and started up the steep bank and 129 stone steps to the Panama Canal Administration Building. They halted near the dual flagpoles from which the United States flag flies beside the flag of the Republic of Panama. At 6:25 p.m., a group of the Panama students made an effort to lower the U.S. flag but were prevented from doing so by several U.S. civilians. With considerable shouting, the Panama students left the area and headed back to Panama City.

As the Panama students passed the Panama Canal Administration Building, they began damaging property. The group proceeded back over Gorgas Road, and en route threw stones. Five windowpanes of glass were broken on the east wing of the Panama Canal Administration Building. Twenty street lights were broken, a sign was torn off the pole in front of the Gorgas Laboratory Building, and approximately 40 louvers were broken in the Panama Canal Treasurer's Office. All the trashcans along the road were overturned. Many automobiles were stoned and car windows were broken.

The Canal Zone police refrained from making any arrests of the students in order to get the group out of the Canal Zone as quickly as possible.

While this Panama student group was en route to Fourth of July Avenue, the Canal Zone police contacted the Panama National Guard headquarters, and informed them of the situation.

From 6:45 until about 7:15 p.m., the Panama students milled around on Fourth of July Avenue, opposite the Panama National Institute, and large crowds started forming and increased rapidly.

By 7:30 p.m., the Panama mob, now grown to an estimated 2,000, moved north on Fourth of July Avenue and Kennedy Avenue to a point between the Tivoli Guest House and Shaler Triangle. Many of the demonstrators attempted to climb the fence between Kennedy Avenue and the Tivoli Guest House. A Canal Zone police detail at that location repelled them by laying a screen of tear gas along the fence. Three automobiles were turned over and burned by the demonstrators in their march from the Panama National Institute.

Only 19 Canal Zone police were on duty on the whole Pacific side when the Panamanian students entered the Canal Zone. By 7:30 p.m. practically the entire Canal Zone police force, totaling about 85 men, was deployed along the Canal Zone border and by 7:30 p.m. it was apparent the police could not hold the crowds. The police were authorized to use tear gas, and firearms if necessary to protect life.

At about 8 p.m., the Panama mob across from the Tivoli Guest House started to move along President Kennedy Avenue, heading for the Ancon Railroad Station and the freight house. Two Canal Zone police sergeants and 8 Canal Zone policemen on duty in this vicinity fell back from the intersection of Frangipani Street and Roosevelt Avenue before the onslaught of at least 3,000. They took up position between the Panama Canal Sanitation Office and the civilian homes on Frangipani Street.

The mob upset and burned an unoccupied automobile at the intersection of Roosevelt Avenue and Frangipani Street and some of the Canal Zone police advanced and threw all the tear gas they had. The mob was stopped temporarily at this point from advancing further into the Canal Zone and the homes were saved from being overrun.

About 2 or 3 minutes later, part of the mob started to burn and sack the Ancon freight house. Railroad passenger cars were set on fire and windows in the passenger railroad cars were broken. Other elements of the mob started breaking windows as they forced their way into the Ancon Laundry across the street from the railroad station. Several hundred of the mob started toward the Ancon Little Theater, where a rehearsal was in progress, and toward the Ancon housing area. One policeman with a shotgun and three other policemen were sent to protect life and property in that area.

As the mob headed for the residential area on Manzanillo Street in Ancon, the police were authorized to open fire with shotguns and revolvers, shooting over the heads of the mob and on the ground in front of them.

This action, at 8:20 p.m. as nearly as can be determined, was necessary to save lives. It was the first actual firing by Canal Zone police, although by that time seven Canal Zone policemen at that location had been injured in the hail of stones and flying objects directed against them.

For the next 10 minutes, the mob surged back and forth and made several efforts to penetrate the Frangipani Street residential area, but were turned back by tear gas and shots fired over their heads. Small arms fire was heard coming from Panama during this time. Considerable damage was done to the Shaler bus terminal.

The Canal Zone police received numerous reports that Molotov cocktails were being thrown against the U.S. District Courthouse in Ancon. A wire fence within the zone was torn down in front of the U.S. district court and along Fourth of July Avenue.

Acting Canal Zone Governor David S. Parker made a personal inspection of the Canal Zone-Panama border in the vicinity of the Tivoli Guest House shortly before 8 p.m. His car was stoned twice in the vicinity of the Tivoli Guest House. By that time a crowd estimated between 5,000 and 6,000 was gathering along Fourth of July Avenue. Molotov cocktails were being thrown against buildings in the Canal Zone and a number of cars had been set on fire. The Canal Zone police were having difficulty in holding back the crowds which had penetrated several hundred yards into the Canal Zone and it was apparent that life and property were in serious jeopardy.

At 7:59 p.m., Acting Governor Parker reported to Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, commander in chief, U.S. Southern Command, that he was unable to maintain law and order in the Canal Zone with only the police and other civilian authorities. Acting Governor Parker requested General O'Meara to assume command of the Canal Zone.

Within 40 minutes from the time the first shots were fired by the Canal Zone police, U.S. Army personnel arrived at Portobello Street in Ancon. Complete Army control in that area was assumed about 20 minutes later after Brig. Gen. G. L. Mabry, Jr., Director J-3, Plans and Operations, U.S. Southern Command, had completed an assessment of the situation. He directed that no further firing be done unless an attack was made, as the Army was ready to move into that position and take over. Sporadic small arms fire was heard coming from Panama City.

A small group of policemen, sent to the Ancon freight house after the Army arrived, dispersed a mob armed with Molotov cocktails, which were being thrown at the freight house. A Canal Zone fire rig arrived in time to put out the fire at the freight house, caused by the fire bombs.

A Molotov cocktail was thrown through the windshield of an automobile that came out of Panama into the Canal Zone at Frangipani Street, Ancon. The car burst into flames, but the two passengers escaped.

At 9:15 p.m., upward of 1,000 Panama demonstrators proceeded from the Canal Zone-Panama limits into the Canal Zone toward Balboa on Balboa Road. They were stopped initially by an eight-man detail of policemen. The mob threw stones at the police and gunshots were heard. The Canal Zone police fired over the heads of the mob and onto the roadway in front of them in an attempt to stop them. The demonstration continued and was still in progress when the Canal Zone police detail (which had been increased to 30 men) was relieved by a U.S. Army platoon about 10:30 p.m., after the mob had penetrated about 400 yards into the Canal Zone.

The large crowd on Fourth of July Avenue in the area of the H Street intersection in Panama City commenced coming across Fourth of July Avenue at about 9:35 p.m., throwing stones at the home of U.S. District Court Judge Guthrie F. Crowe. The stones broke through the screens and entered the house and were followed by three Molotov cocktails. One fire bomb landed underneath

the house, against the wooden latticework, another landed on the front porch, and the third, upstairs inside the house. Despite the continuous hail of rocks thrown by the mob, Judge Crowe and Canal Zone police personnel at the scene succeeded in throwing the Molotov cocktails out of the house and extinguished one burning underneath the house.

Shortly afterward, several more Molotov cocktails were thrown and landed about in the same places as the first. The hail of rocks now was so thick it was extremely dangerous to go anywhere near the fire. Canal Zone firefighters appeared on the scene, but were unable to approach the house due to the continuous shower of rocks. A small Canal Zone police detail, reinforced by a squad of policemen who fired a number of shots into the air and into the ground, dispersed the rioters, who took cover in buildings across Fourth of July Avenue and down "H" Street in Panama City. Canal Zone Fire Division personnel went into action and extinguished the blaze at Judge Crowe's home, where only minor damage was done.

The rioters reappeared at 9:55 p.m. and demonstrated for about 2 hours. They burned automobiles they brought out of Panama, as well as cars that had been parked on the side of the road and in garages of the apartment houses in the vicinity. All these cars were pushed onto Fourth of July Avenue after they had been set on fire.

Sporadic shots were heard, apparently coming from buildings in Panama City near the Canal Zone border. From 12:45 a.m. to 3 a.m., January 10, the Canal Zone police furnished support to the military. After 3 a.m., the Canal Zone police were removed from the border and resumed zonal police patrols. At no time during the above events did Canal Zone police enter the Republic of Panama.

During the period of attempting to control the Panama mob at various locations, many Canal Zone police officers received injuries, but none were serious.

The Atlantic side of the isthmus was fairly quiet until 9:05 p.m., Thursday, January 9. When information was received by the Cristobal District Canal Zone police that rioting had broken out in the Balboa District, available personnel were called out and placed at strategic points along the boundary.

At 9:05 p.m., information was received that about 20 Panamanians were proceeding toward the Canal Zone-Panama border at Colon, carrying a Panamanian flag and shouting anti-United States insults. In little more than 15 minutes, the group grew to about 1,500 men, women, and children. They marched down Roosevelt Avenue to the Cristobal Administration Building, where, during the day, the Panama flag flies alongside the U.S. flag on dual flagstaffs. Some of the mob went to the second floor of the building and raised the Panama flag, under the surveillance of a riot squad of police.

During the flag raising, Daniel Delgado Duarte, Mayor of Colon, accompanied by several members of the Colon Municipal Council, talked to the crowd and aided in averting violence at that time. Several agitators in the mob tried to incite the crowd, but were restrained.

At 9:30 p.m., the mob removed the Panama flag they had previously placed on the Cristobal Administration Building and started dispersing, many shouting insulting remarks as they passed the Cristobal Police Station. The crowd went back to Roosevelt Avenue, and on the way back to Colon, broke windows in two cars parked on the street and the lower windows of buildings along Steamship Row. The mob broke windows on the 11th Street side of the former Cristobal Commissary building and windows in the Masonic Temple.

National Guard headquarters in Colon was advised that elements of the mob were heading for the U.S. Consulate in Colon, and National Guardsmen were dispatched to that location.

The Colon mob grew in size but was contained by the Colon National Guard until about 10 p.m., when some of the mob broke past and moved up to Balboa Avenue.

Part of the mob moved south on Balboa Avenue into the Canal Zone, breaking windows in the Canal Central Employment Office, License Office, and in the Cristobal Railroad Station. Police held them at that location until troops arrived.

It was reported that windows were being broken at the Cristobal YMCA and that it was being looted. A riot squad of about 10 Canal Zone policemen routed some 50 looters. Four Panamanians arrested inside the building were brought to Cristobal Police Station and charged with participating in a riot. Several policemen were injured by brickbats.

Some Atlantic-side Canal Zone police officers had been injured during the rioting prior to the time the military assumed control.

After the U.S. military assumed command in the Canal Zone, most of the action on the Pacific side of the Isthmus was contained along the Panama-Canal Zone border. On the Atlantic side, the Colon mobs did intense damage. Canal Zone police and U.S. troops were subjected to rock throwing and other attacks. Persistent sniper fire killed three American soldiers and wounded many others, including civilians.

No Americans were involved, except as victims, in the burning, looting, and other violence in Panama. No Canal Zone police or U.S. troops entered the Republic of Panama. Canal Zone residents remained at their residences and did not participate in nor provoke any violence.

Major damage on the Pacific side of the Canal Zone, as of Saturday night, included the following: Tivoli Guest House extensively damaged (persistent sniper fire forced evacuation of Tivoli Guest House Friday night); Ancon School damaged; one flagpole razed at Shaler Triangle, the first Canal Zone site where the Panama flag was raised to fly alongside the U.S. flag; Ancon Laundry damaged; and Canal Zone police booths at Balboa Road, the Limits, and the Ancon Gymnasium destroyed. The fence on Fourth of July Avenue was torn down at numerous places. The Shaler Bus Terminal was wrecked and street light standards on Fourth of July Avenue and Thatcher Ferry Bridge approach were damaged.

In addition, windows were broken in railroad coaches at Panama Railroad Station in Ancon and one coach set afire; all light fixtures on Panama Railroad Station platform were broken, station office records were scattered in the station and on the tracks, shipments in baggage rooms were pilfered, drug shipments were strewn along the tracks, office furniture and files in station office were overturned and scattered, lockers were broken open and vandalized; houses in Gavilan area were stoned; street signs were torn down on President Kennedy Avenue; some outside lights were broken at Gorgas Hospital and ambulances at Gorgas were dented by rocks; and windows were broken in the Sanitation Division's Ancon office.

The major damage in the Cristobal area included: the Cristobal YMCA, which was gutted by fire; the Masonic Temple, which was abandoned to fire; the Sanitation Office, which was destroyed by fire, and the Cristobal warehouse which was burned. The Panama Canal Personnel Bureau offices, the driver license examiner's office, and the nurse's office in the former Cristobal Commissary building were left a shambles with all glass broken, furniture and typewriters thrown in the street, and papers strewn about the floor. The baggage room, ticket seller's office, dispatcher's office, yardmaster's office, car inspector's office, shop area, and toilet facilities were destroyed by fire and a shelter in the Dock Yard 9 outside fenced area was destroyed by fire. A dozen or more ties in the main line track in Colon and an equivalent number of ties on the ladder track also were burned out. As a result of this damage, railroad trains were unable to operate into the Cristobal pier area.

In Panama, within sight of the Canal Zone boundary, rioting mobs, partly students but with many adults, overturned and burned cars, and burned and damaged a number of buildings in Panama, especially those occupied by U.S. firms.

By taking emergency measures the transit operations of the Panama Canal continued uninterrupted. There were 31 ships transited on Friday; 26 transited on Saturday, and 34 were scheduled to transit Sunday.

Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., commended the outstanding performance of duty by the police officers and the personnel of the Fire Division, who loyally and courageously served long hours without relief. He spoke of the maturity displayed by nearly all Panama Canal employees, both United States and Panamanian, who stayed with their jobs and kept ships transiting and other essential supporting operations on schedule. Governor Fleming mentioned what a welcome sight the morning train was when it arrived at Balboa Heights Friday morning, as evidence of the organization's determination to continue on.

Background information on the Panamanian student march to Balboa High School on January 9 is given below:

On December 30, 1963, Governor Fleming issued a press release stating the commencing January 2, 1964, the Panamanian flag would be flown alongside the U.S. flag on civilian land areas in the Canal Zone wherever the latter flag was flown by civilian authorities.

This plan was described as implementing an agreement reached earlier in 1963 between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Panama.

The press release of the Governor was printed both in English and Spanish in local newspapers. It stated that both flags were flying at 11 different sites, including Shaler Plaza (near the Panamanian boundary at Ancon, Canal Zone) and at the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, and that six additional sites had been selected. It was also indicated that the U.S. flag would not be officially flown alone at certain other sites in civilian communities.

Among the places where the flag would no longer fly was outside Balboa High School. Some students, encouraged by their parents, resented the removal of the U.S. flag from their school.

On the morning of Tuesday, January 7, students ignored the Governor's directive and raised the U.S. flag at the flagpole on the lawn of Balboa High School. An hour later, Civil Affairs Director Bernard I. Everson and High School Principal David A. Speir took down the flag and removed it.

A short time later, Balboa High School students gathered outside the school and massed for a demonstration. Some students raised a smaller flag on the flagpole and it was not removed the second time by school officials.

Students who feared the Panama Canal officials might remove the flagpole stood vigil during the night. The next day, students at several other schools also raised American flags.

The student activity with its controversial aspects was printed in detail. The majority of the Spanish language news media twisted the story to make it appear that the Balboa High School students objected to the flying of the Panamanian flag.

This was the situation which led to the visit to Balboa of the students from Panama's Instituto Nacional on the afternoon of Thursday, January 9, which, as it later turned out, was the catalyst for the violence which started that night.

Great Lakes Water Level Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1964, the Bay County, Mich., Board of Supervisors passed a resolution calling for a study through the joint action of the Governments of the United States and Canada, to investigate the possibility of regulating the water levels of the Great Lakes in order to insure that these levels be kept sufficiently high so as not to impair the conservation of the Great Lakes as one of our great natural resources. I am pleased to inform my colleagues, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, that the Genesee County Board of Supervisors and the Ingham County Board of Supervisors both have recently passed resolutions endorsing the action of the Bay County Board.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, MASON, MICH.

Whereas the waters of Lakes Michigan and Huron are of vital importance to the peoples and communities of Ingham County; and

Whereas any great reduction in either the quality or quantity of these waters is a direct threat to the future and well-being of its people; and

Whereas the Bay County Board of Supervisors at its regular meeting of January 14, 1964, adopted a resolution relative to the water levels of the Great Lakes and the water level of Saginaw Bay and River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ingham County Board of Supervisors lend its support to the provisions of the resolution adopted by the Bay County Board of Supervisors; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our representatives in the U.S. Congress and Senate, to our representatives in the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate, to the State Association of Supervisors, the Governor of the State of Michigan, and Michigan Deartments of Conservation, Economic Development, and Health.

HAROLD F. PLETZ,
ARTHUR V. WHITTINGTON,
Legislative Committee.

RESOLUTION BY GENESEE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Whereas the waters of Saginaw Bay and River and the adjoining waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan are of vital importance not only to the people of Bay County but to all other communities located on or adjacent to their shores and whereas any great reduction in either quality or quantity of these waters is a direct threat to the future and well-being of its people; and

Whereas lowering of the water levels of Lakes Huron and Michigan to an alltime low record, as of this date, is a direct threat to our welfare and economy by the impairment of water supplies, sewage facilities, shipping and commerce, navigational channels, recreational developments, wildlife, and many other items vital to our continued way of life and existence; and

Whereas it is a well-known fact that the levels of the Great Lakes rise and fall in cycles of high and low water and over a period of time regains a normal level and this would be somewhat true for the future except that man has changed this by altering the flow of water by deepening the shipping channels throughout the Great Lakes to take advantage of the St. Lwarence Seaway's 27-foot draft and further there is a diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan to the Mississippi watershed for the purpose of disposing of sewage wastes which all result in more waters leaving the lakes than nature can replace by precipitation. This abnormal drain of Lakes Huron and Michigan running unchecked will result in a new record low at the bottom of each succeeding cycle, so that conceivably in time there would only be a series of channels between Bay City and Detroit; and

Whereas through the joint efforts and cooperation of Canada and the United States the level of Lake Superior, the largest body of fresh water in the world, is regulated as to the amount of water allowed to flow from it to the other Great Lakes and as a result is still well above any record lows, which leads to a conclusion that a similar program might be feasible and practical for Lakes Huron and Michigan as a solution to a problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bay County Board of Supervisors approve a study and survey by the joint action of the United States and Canadian Governments, to seek a solution to the control of the levels of the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan, in the best interest of all concerned; by placing regulating devices at certain strategic points in the connecting channels between Lakes Huron and Erie or wherever the study would indicate the best cost versus benefit ratio; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all our representatives in the U.S. Congress and Senate, to the State Association of Supervisors, Gov. George Romney, Michigan Departments of Conservation, Economic Development, and Health, Dow Chemical Co., Wickes Marine Terminal, Defoe Shipbuilding Co., and any other appropriate persons, agencies, or organizations who could lend vital assistance to this project of preserving one of the last of our great national resources, fresh water. To paraphrase our late President of the United States, "This can't be done in a month or a year or 5 years, but let us begin."

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial on the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States as broadcast over radio station KVIL in Dallas, Tex.:

CONSTITUTION DAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1964

You know that you are only as strong as your constitution. Your health, happiness, and life expectancy depend on its reliability. Yet we human beings overeat, neglect exercise, develop habits that impair this vital resource.

Our United States of America can be indicted for similar irresponsibility. This country's proven invaluable form of free government is only as strong as its Constitution. Yet with callous indifference, the average citizen stands by while that strength is undermined. Politically appointed and politically minded courts alter this foundation of our Government by new constructions blithely explained as necessary under social changes. Our Constitution is changed by the personal political and social thinking of nine men.

On Wednesday, March 4, the Constitution of this country will be exactly 175 years old. Let's make that truly Constitution Day. Let's have a proclamation by Gov. John Connally declaring this Constitution Day in Texas. Have it read in schools, courts, meetings. Let's rededicate ourselves to study and understanding of the Constitution. Only by preserving that document and its meaning is this country secure.

JOHN COYLE,
President, KVIL.

Wool Industry Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of South Carolina is keenly aware of the dire threat to the woolen industry through unfair, low-wage, foreign imports.

The following concurrent resolution adopted unanimously by the house and senate of South Carolina offers a solution to this problem which we urge the President and the U.S. negotiating team to consider as a course for our country to follow during the negotiations scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take such action as necessary to protect the woolen industry of this country

Whereas between 1947 and 1962 the wool textile industry in the United States has lost—

1. Over 100,000 jobs;
2. About 300 plants or establishments;
3. Twenty-one thousand eight hundred and thirty-six broadlooms;
4. Two million one hundred and sixty-nine thousand spindles;
5. One thousand and forty-two combs; and
6. Approximately 60 percent of the machinery used in the industry; and

Whereas it appears that the loss trend will continue unless appropriate action is taken by the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas these losses are adversely affecting communities on a nationwide basis; and

Whereas it has been previously determined by acts of Congress and opinions of those connected with defense mobilization that an adequate wool textile industry is essential to national security; and

Whereas the late President John F. Kennedy declared, on May 2, 1961, that "It (the textile industry) is of vital importance in peacetime and it has direct effect upon our total economy"; and

Whereas it is recommended by those with peculiar knowledge of the industry to the President of the United States that—

1. Wool product duties be reserved from the negotiating list scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

2. The Government urgently and unremittingly pursue solution of the wool product import problem through international negotiations and accord; or, failing that;

3. The Government act unilaterally to restrain wool product imports to prevent market disruption and to restore and foster fair competition to avert the liquidation of an essential industry; and

Whereas the members of the General Assembly of South Carolina share in the concern for the future of the woolen industry and wish to convey this concern to the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to take such steps as is necessary to protect the woolen industry of this country and urgently recommend that the President act in the following more specific manner:

1. That wool product duties be reserved from the negotiating list scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the Central Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

2. That the Government urgently and unremittingly pursue solution of the wool product import problem through international negotiations and accord; or, failing that;

3. That the Government act unilaterally to restrain wool products imports to prevent market disruption and to restore and foster fair competition to avert the liquidation of an essential industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Member of the congressional districts from South Carolina, and to the Honorable Edwin Wilkinson, president, National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

The United States Should Pay for Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine the National Provisioner for February 8, 1964, printed an article describing the efforts of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] to block a Budget Bureau proposal, which was included in President Johnson's 1965 fiscal year budget, to shift the cost of Federal inspection of meat and poultry from the Government to the processors. Mrs. SULLIVAN has warned that it would be, in effect, a Federal sales tax on meat and poultry, since the cost of inspection would be passed on to the consumer in higher prices.

This article sets forth another reason why the beautiful and charming gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], has rightfully earned the praise and respect of her colleagues. Her work to protect the consumer from hazardous drugs and contaminants in foods, drugs, and cosmetics; to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration; and to create a food stamp program, which is benefiting so richly our poor and retired, is well known. Certainly this vigorous and respected legislator has again merited the gratitude of our American people for an action so much in the public interest.

The Congresswoman from Missouri, long recognized in the House as a spokesman for the consumer interest, has given cogent reasons why we should not change the emphasis on meat and poultry inspection from a public health protection to a service to industry.

These reasons are included in the article in the National Provisioner which follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR SULLIVAN SAYS UNITED STATES SHOULD PAY FOR MEAT INSPECTION

The proposal of President Johnson to shift the costs of meat and poultry inspection from the Government to federally inspected plants "would be a great step backward" and "would jeopardize two of the most successful consumer programs of the Federal Government," Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, who has been in the forefront of the congressional move for more consumer protection, declared last weekend.

Representative SULLIVAN introduced the first bill to make Federal inspection of poultry compulsory, a proposal finally enacted as the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, and also is the sponsor of a pending measure (H.R. 940) patterned after that act which provides for Federal meat inspection extension into major producing or consuming areas designated by the Secretary of Agriculture after a public hearing.

Meat and poultry inspection are public health programs and should be paid for by the entire public through taxes levied on the basis of ability to pay, Mrs. SULLIVAN pointed out in an extension of remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1. She likened the proposed inspection fee to "a Federal sales tax on the consumer," warned of the inherent danger of processor control if processors pay for the public health service and said President Johnson's proposal "runs exactly counter" to the recommendation of the late President Kennedy in his 1962 consumer message.

The text of Mrs. SULLIVAN's remarks follows:

"Mr. Speaker, the Budget Bureau for years has been proposing user charges for a variety of Federal services to business or industry reflecting the actual cost to the Government of providing these services. I believe that the Hoover Commission proposed increases in the fees charged, or the institution of fees where none was charged, to cover such Federal costs. Congress has enacted some of the specific proposals of this nature, but many of them have been extremely controversial and have been rejected. One such proposal, I remember, would have instituted a form of tolls for river navigation. There have been others proposed by President Eisenhower and also, in his budget recommendations, by President Kennedy.

"The first Johnson budget, I find not only renews some of the proposals made by President Kennedy and President Eisenhower in their budget messages for user charges—for commercial and general aviation and for transportation on inland waterways, and for patents—but indicates the intention of striking out into a new area: user charges to cover the complete cost to the Federal Government of meat and poultry inspection by the Department of Agriculture.

"A STEP BACKWARD

"This would be a great step backward. Poultry inspection, prior to the passage of the 1957 act for compulsory inspection of all poultry in interstate commerce, used to be on a voluntary, fee-for-service basis. It was inadequate as a consumer protection and we abandoned it in 1957 when we placed the costs of the compulsory service on the Department of Agriculture just as we had done for years in the case of meat inspection.

"We have had meat inspection since 1906 and I think all the costs of this service have been paid by the Federal Government except for 1 year—1948—following which we went back to the previous arrangement.

"Poultry inspection as originally set up—as a voluntary, fee-for-service program—was intended primarily as a marketing promotion idea to push the sale of poultry by educating the public to the fact that federally inspected poultry was wholesome poultry. Processors, in many cases, were willing to pay the fees for the inspection service because of the sales promotion value of the 'U.S. Inspected for Wholesomeness' stamp. Competitively speaking, it was worth the cost to the processor to have this stamp on his product.

"We discovered in the mid-1950's, however, that a great deal of poultry being sold in interstate commerce without Federal inspection was unfit to eat and constituted a health hazard for the public and also for the employees of the uninspected plant. That is why I introduced the first poultry inspection bill, proposing the idea of compulsory Federal inspection which we finally enacted in 1957. We recognized that poultry inspection was more important as a consumer protection than as an industry marketing aid. That is why the costs of poultry inspection are assessed against all the taxpayers rather than against the processors. As a public health program, it should be paid for by the entire public through taxes levied on the basis of ability to pay. The very same thing has always been true on meat inspection, except for the one year when the costs were assessed on the industry.

SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES

"Mr. Speaker, my concern over this proposal in the budget to transfer meat and poultry inspection costs from Government to industry is not based on any crocodile tears for the poor producers or processors. My concern is strictly for the consumer. The processors are required by law to have interstate shipments of meat and poultry continuously inspected for wholesomeness by the Federal Government. Charging them for this service now provided free by the Government would mean two things:

"First of all, it would mean an automatic passthrough of this added cost to the consumer, by the processor. True, the consumer is now paying for this service through his income taxes. But his income tax is based on his ability to pay. A processing fee for a compulsory service rendered by the Federal Government would, in effect, be a Federal sales tax on the consumer at the retail level on meat and poultry. Therefore, the lowest income families would pay a disproportionately high share of the cost of Federal inspection. That is completely unfair and I am sure it is not President Johnson's intention.

"The second serious consequence of transferring the cost of compulsory Federal inspection of meat and poultry from the Government to the processors would be more subtle but no less significant, from a consumer standpoint. When poultry processors were paying the costs of Federal inspection of their product, many of them insisted upon and obtained what amounted to a form of hire-and-fire control over the personnel who did the inspecting. Inspectors were transferred, because processors complained about the toughness of their decisions in rejecting shipments or individual birds. When you place the financing of a Federal service in the cash register of private businesses, you run the risk of pressures which are hard to resist. After all, if the businessman is paying for this service, he is going to insist on a stronger voice in the manner in which the service is rendered. I can foresee consumers losing

faith in the integrity of the stamp 'U.S. inspected for wholesomeness' if the inspection service should be redirected in philosophy from a public health service for consumers into a service for business for which business pays the cost.

"REVERSAL OF KENNEDY MESSAGE

"Mr. Speaker, the proposal in President Johnson's budget for user charges for meat and poultry inspection runs exactly counter to the recommendation of President Kennedy in his historic consumer message of March 15, 1962, when he recommended expansion of meat inspection to include much of the meat sold only in intrastate commerce. On that same day, I introduced a bill to expand the meat inspection service to cover all meat shipped into designated major consuming areas whether across State lines or not. One of the main talking points in support of this idea was the fact that under it the small processors operating only in intrastate commerce could obtain the Federal inspection service on the same free basis as interstate processors, once they installed the required sanitation equipment and facilities. If we establish a user charge, the small processor who does not now have Federal inspection will certainly have no incentive to obtain it.

"From all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to reconsider this proposal and order the Budget Bureau to withdraw it. In an attempt to save a comparatively tiny fraction of the Federal budget—$49 million out of nearly $100 billion—this proposal would jeopardize two of the most successful consumer programs of the Federal Government. I have have called to the attention of the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, the dangers I feel are inherent in the budget proposal to place meat and poultry inspection on a fee-for-service basis. The processor will only pass on the charges to consumers in the form of higher prices, falling unevenly on lower income families, which now have difficulty enough in finding the money for a decent diet."

Assistant Secretary of State Williams Voices Strong Optimism on Future of Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the whole text of the address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the International Affairs Association, University of Pennsylvania, on February 15, 1964:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS ASSOCIATION, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1964

In recent weeks, the voices of those who feel that independent Africa already is doomed to failure have been growing louder and more intense. Only a few days ago, one columnist made the flat assertions that the Communists had "taken over" Zanzibar and Somalia, that they are "more deeply entrenched than ever" in Guinea and Algeria, that their actions in the Congo had cost us "hundreds of millions" of dollars, that "somebody" is kicking over the traces in Tanganyika and that the future of Kenya, Uganda, Togo, and other African nations is in doubt.

Other people fear the United States has been lax in the conduct of its affairs in Africa. One indignant citizen even wired President Johnson that it was "absolutely incredible" that we did not declare war on Zanzibar because of that country's treatment of our diplomats.

It seems, then, that this is a good opportunity to review what actually has happened recently in Africa and to put into perspective the U.S. role on that continent. Africa has problems and plenty of them, but it is making progress, too. In the long run, I am optimistic for its future.

Let's look at some of the trouble spots first. But to begin with, let me point out that no one ever expected that Africa's early years of independence would be completely tranquil. No other group of countries had smooth sailing in the first years of their national life. What is remarkable is that 31 new African nations have come to independence in the last dozen years with so little trouble. With the major exceptions of Algeria and the Congo, the transitional period from colonial to independent status was achieved in Africa under exceptionally harmonious circumstances.

The vast majority of the peoples of Africa face monumental problems of poverty, illiteracy, disease, and malnutrition. They expect independence to bring swift changes in their conditions of life, and they are pressing their leaders for improvements in every field. However, in view of Africa's shortages of capital, skilled technicians, teachers, doctors, administrators, entrepreneurs, and many other categories of trained personnel, it is next to impossible to make rapid strides to improve living standards. And without speedy progress, the people are apt to be dissatisfied and their unrest is released in the form of disturbances. This dissatisfaction with economic and social progress is a primary cause of Africa's recent troubles.

Above all, however, the Africans are both deeply committed to and deeply frustrated in problems which we would consider to be broadly political. They have intense aspirations to assure their human dignity and national independence. There is no doubt that one of their principal ambitions is to achieve continentwide freedom and self-government. The situation in southern Africa is thus a universal cause of dissatisfaction and ferment. This is where cataclysmic troubles could occur.

Now let's run through some of the recent difficulties beginning with Zanzibar, which started out as a nationalist revolution but picked up some Communist overtones. That country has long been divided between a ruling Arab minority—roughly 16 percent of the population—and a dissatisfied African majority. When Zanzibar achieved its independence in December, the Arab element was in control of the new government, despite the fact that the major African party had received 54 percent of the popular vote. It was almost inevitable that the dissatisfaction of the African nationalists would lead to some kind of an explosion, and such an explosion occurred in January. While the basic cause of the rebellion was African dissatisfaction, it is equally true that pro-Communist elements helped incite the revolt and quickly injected themselves into some of the leadership positions. What remains unclarified is whether the African nationalists or the Communist-trained infiltrators will emerge in political control. We are watching this developing situation carefully, and we are hopeful that the Zanzibar Government will pursue its own national interests and develop a truly nonalined African government.

Another situation that caused the United States concern was the recent series of troop mutinies in the east African nations of Tanganyika, Uganda and Kenya. We now believe that these situations were motivated by economic factors, although there seem to be some suspicious circumstances.

Fortunately, the wise and swift actions to restore law and order taken by the east African heads of state have put their countries back under control. Measures have been taken to punish the mutineers, and new security units are being formed to prevent similar uprisings in the future.

The situation in Rwanda is less clear because of the difficulty in obtaining accurate facts about what is happening. There seems to be little question, however, that many lives have been lost in this clash, which has its principal roots in a revolt against a feudal system several centuries old.

The disputed border area between the Somali Republic, Ethiopia and Kenya is another problem that has roots in the historical past. Nomadic Somali tribesmen have traditionally resided in the border areas between these countries and have migrated without regard for national boundaries. The Somali Government desires to unit all ethnic Somali people, including those in Kenya and Ethiopia with the people of Somalia itself. Recently, clashes have broken out between the Somalis and Ethiopians along their common border. Our Ambassadors in both countries have urged the respective governments to seek a peaceful solution to their problem, and I have met with the Somali and Ethiopian Ambassadors in Washington to encourage peaceful approaches to the dispute. We give our wholehearted support to a peaceful solution in the Organization of African Unity, in the United Nations or elsewhere.

With regard to the Somali Republic, let me state that the United States does not accept the proposition that Somalia is under Communist control. Somalia has been a stable country with many Western ties. It has felt, however, that it needed military assistance for its defense. The United States, Germany, and Italy were willing to supply what we felt was an adequate supply of military assistance, but the Soviet Union made a larger offer which was accepted by Somalia. Although we feel that this arrangement undoubtedly will increase Soviet influence in Somalia, we do not believe the Somalis willingly will give up their independence for Soviet arms. Western nations are continuing their economic assistance programs in Somalia and will seek to help Somalia preserve its independence.

Elsewhere in Africa, countries accept Soviet and Chinese Communist aid, too. There is no question that the Communists exercise a degree of influence in some of these countries and are constantly seeking to exert more. However, the total influence exercised at this time—while naturally a matter of concern—by no means approaches the point of control anywhere. As a matter of fact, the African sense of independence is so keen that it willingly brooks no domination. Nevertheless, the West must help African countries so that there will be no temptation to risk their independence.

Now that I have summarized some of Africa's problems, you might ask if I still feel hopeful for Africa's future. The answer is "yes." I am hopeful because of Africa's own efforts to move the continent ahead, because of the strong free world effort to help Africans to help themselves and because of the determination of the U.S. Government to assist Africa to develop in peace, freedom, and stability.

Although many African nations became independent with severe economic handicaps, the peoples of the new nations are working industriously to build their countries as rapidly as possible.

Unfortunately, Africa has not yet developed an overall set of statistics, so I'll rest the case for improvement on a few illustrative examples.

Nigeria, which has one-seventh or more of Africa's population, has faced political

challenges but has, by and large, maintained an even keel. Economically, much progress also is under way. Nigeria is proud to be generating from its own resources one-half of the needed capital for its $3 billion, 6-year development program. Actually, whenever Nigeria develops a good project, there are generally several industrial countries ready to help finance it.

The following statistics give some idea of progress in Nigeria:

Its gross national product has risen at an average annual rate of 3.8 percent since 1950; its total agricultural production—the basis of African economies—showed a 23-percent increase in 1961 over its average agricultural production for the 1952–54 period; in petroleum production, its output rose from 552,000 metric tons in 1958 to 3,300,000 tons in 1962; the number of primary school children tripled from 820,000 in 1948 to 2,600,000 in 1958; Nigeria went from no universities in 1947 to 5 today; its commercial road vehicles more than doubled between 1953 and 1962, rising from 10,700 to 23,900; and its electric power production rose to 660 million kilowatt-hours in 1962—8 times the 86 million kilowatt-hours generated in 1947.

The entire continent is an area seething with vitality and stirring with determination to make good. Africa is rich in natural resources, and its governments are increasingly putting that wealth to work for their people. For their part, many people are willing to sacrifice their own gains to assure a better life for their children.

In Kenya, I recall dedicating a new AID-sponsored school, built on land donated by the local villagers, who also were providing the funds to maintain and operate the school. I remember well the warm glow of satisfaction and pride of accomplishment on the faces of the Kikuyu men and women whose children were going to be educated in that new school.

While there have been many forward strides taken in economic development, health, education and other fields, there are, of course, even greater strides to be taken. But the promising aspect of the huge job ahead is that the people of Africa are willing to work hard to bring about progress.

In the field of political cooperation, I believe Africans can take genuine pride in the advances that have been made. Although many African nations have not yet celebrated their fourth independence day, they have already brought into being an effective Africa-wide Organization of African Unity.

Formed only last May at the important African Heads of State Conference at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the OAU already has made significant strides in promoting political cooperation among its 33 members. The OAU played a major role in stopping Algerian-Moroccan hostilities last fall, and an OAU Conciliation Commission is helping to resolve differences between those two countries.

This week an extraordinary meeting of the OAU Council of Ministers was held at Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika, where East African security problems and the Ethiopian-Samoli dispute were discussed. Later this month, the regularly scheduled Council of Ministers meeting will be held at Lagos, Nigeria, where it is likely that such important matters as Rwanda-Burundi problems and other topics will be dealt with. This meeting will be followed by the annual African Heads of State Conference at Tunis in late spring.

Another aspect of the OAU's efforts to solve its own problems was demonstrated at the first session of the OAU Educational and Cultural Commission at Leopoldville, Congo, in early January. That meeting established a Programing Committee to draw up a 3-year program designed to break down language barriers, coordinate university education and accelerate scientific and technological education. It also proposed that an inter-African news agency be established for the continent and planned for increased teaching of all forms of African culture.

That so much has been done in so short a time is a remarkable achievement. We favor these constructive steps toward African unity, and we believe they represent realistic progress toward Africa-wide cooperation.

In addition to what Africans are doing for themselves, the nations of the free world also are making important contributions to Africa's growth. Among the major contributors are the former colonial powers—the metropoles—who are providing a high level of economic assistance to Africa, both unilaterally and through such international bodies as the United Nations and the Common Market Development Fund. It is readily apparent that without support of this kind from free world nations Africa's present progress would be slowed down considerably.

For our own part, the United States believes that Africa has a promising future, and we are anxious to play a part in its development. Private U.S. groups have been doing this for years—American missionaries, foundations, business and labor organizations, colleges and universities, and civic and fraternal organizations. In recent years, governmental assistance has been added to private efforts to help meet Africa's needs. We now are assisting African nations through such organizations as the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, the Export-Import Bank; through exchange programs and scholarships; and through our contributions to international organizations.

In his first state of the Union message, President Johnson asserted the need for such assistance when he said: "We must strengthen the ability of free nations everywhere to develop their independence and raise their standard of living, and thereby frustrate those who prey on poverty and chaos. To do this, the rich must help the poor—and we must do our part."

In so saying, he continued the great tradition initiated by President Kennedy, whose genuine concern for Africa and other underdeveloped areas of the world was demonstrated so often.

Over the years we have developed our fundamental African policy to encourage Africa's political, economic and social development and to assist in the growth of peaceful, stable and independent nations on that continent. We know that peace and security are indivisible, and we want to help establish and maintain societies in Africa that can make their own positive contributions to world peace and progress.

Despite temporary setbacks and disappointments, we are confident that the nations of Africa will become increasingly important members of the world community in the future, and we believe there are many trends in modern Africa that are leading that continent's nations to more responsible and prominent roles in world affairs. If that motion can be maintained—and I, for one, am confident it can—then the world in which future generations will live will be an inestimably better one for all men.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 22, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, FEBRUARY 22, 1964

REDISTRICTING

"One man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." That is probably the most important sentence in the Supreme Court ruling on redistricting. Justice Black, writing the majority opinion, declared:

"We do not believe that the framers of the Constitution intended to permit * * * vote-diluting discrimination to be accomplished through the device of districts containing widely varied numbers of inhabitants. To say that a vote is worth more in one district than in another would not only be counter to our fundamental ideas of democratic government, it would cast aside the principle of a House of Representatives elected 'by the people,' a principle tenaciously fought for and established at the Continental Convention of 1787."

As one who believes in States rights I regret that redistricting has been thrown into the Federal courts. It is too bad our Texas State officials failed in their responsibility of meeting this problem and solving it. They have had plenty of time. Dallas County has had disproportionate representation for the past 10 years as our district experienced unprecedented growth while adjoining districts have gained barely any population growth. The people of Texas, and especially the people of Dallas, ar being robbed of equitable representation because the Governor and the Democratic controlled State senate killed a house passed bill last year. This was an obvious political move and was so stated and the senate action put politics ahead of the principle that "one man's vote is worth as much as another's."

What has the failure of the Texas Legislature to act cost the people of Dallas County?

1. The latest available figures give Dallas County a population of 1,106,363.

2. These same figures show a population of 219,637 in the adjoining Fourth District.

To illustrate how such unequal representation affects the individual, consider just the appointment of young men to the military academies. A boy in the small Fourth Texas District has five times a better chance of getting an appointment than does a boy in adjoining Dallas County. This means that when the Democratic Texas Senate killed the redistricting bill last year it penalized every young man in Dallas County.

The Fifth Texas District has a greater population than 15 States and 10 of these States are represented by 2 Representatives in the House as well as 2 Senators.

State	Population	Representatives	Senators
Maine	969,265	2	2
New Hampshire	606,921	2	2
Vermont	389,881	1	2
Rhode Island	859,488	2	2
North Dakota	632,446	2	2
Delaware	446,292	1	2
Montana	674,767	2	2
Idaho	667,191	2	2
Wyoming	330,066	1	2
New Mexico	951,023	2	2
Utah	890,627	2	2
Nevada	285,278	1	2
Alaska	226,167	1	2
Hawaii	632,772	2	2
Dallas County, Tex.	1,106,363	1	2
State of Texas	9,579,677		

WORKLOAD OF A CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

There is no doubt that eventually Dallas County will get an additional Congressman. Regardless of how long it takes to eliminate the present inequity, the people of the Fifth District may be assured that they will be

given the best representation it is possible for me and my staff to give them. My representation of the people of the Fifth District is always nonpolitical. I am proud of the record of service we have been able to maintain in spite of the obvious difficulties in dealing with the heaviest mail load of any congressional office.

Prompt attention is given to our casework. This consists of thousands of problems of servicemen, social security recipients, taxpayers, small businessmen, Dallas industries, any citizen who has a problem with any one of the many Federal bureaus and agencies. We receive thousands of requests for information material from students, teachers, citizens interested in learning about their Government. In addition, we answer as completely and as promptly as possible the 400 or 500 letters each day which deal with bills pending in Congress. There is only one consideration in this office—service to the people of Dallas County—service in handling their problems and inquiries, in the work on the Ways and Means Committee dealing with tax legislation, and on the floor of the House in debating measures which affect the lives of all of us.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED

I regret the Texas Legislature failed to do what was right in redistricting. I would rather not have the Federal Government making decisions on voting rules for the individual States. Because the States did not assume the responsibility the Federal Government did enter the picture through the Federal courts. Now that action must be taken, it should not be a court decision. Therefore, it is now up to Congress to define the rules for congressional redistricting and equitable representation.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

Bible Reading in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this body is well aware of the current public concern over the consequences flowing from several recent Supreme Court decisions concerning the offering of prayers and Bible reading in our public schools. This spontaneous outpouring reflects the conviction on the part of a great many citizens who believe that while there should be "no law respecting an establishment of religion" neither should there be anything "prohibiting the free exercise thereof," whether by law, court ruling or executive decision or interpretation. It is the ununderstanding of these citizens that while religion is essentially a matter of private conscience that this is not to say that religion has no public relevance and importance. Furthermore they hold that the so-called wall of separation of church and state erected by the first amendment in no way sought to prohibit the free, voluntary public expression of religious wisdom and knowledge.

A recent significant expression of this aroused public sentiment has been the action taken by the Michigan Legislature in passing Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the petition of the Michigan legislators who have requested the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution stating that "the free exercise of religion includes the right to offer prayers in public schools." I hope that this resolution will prompt similar action by other State legislatures and that this concerted effort will finally bring about, without further delay, hearings on the numerous bills now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

The resolution follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN, MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 1

(Offered by Senators Zaagman, Lundgren, Nichols, Youngblood, Jr., Beadle, Younger, Rozcyki, Stephens, Lockwood, Leppien, Begick, Smeekens, Geerlings, Fitzgerald, McManiman, Schweigert, Dehmel, Hughes, Porter, and VanderLaan.)

A concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to initiate amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature respectfully request the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or to call a convention for such purpose, as provided by law, to add to the Constitution an article providing that:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. The free exercise of religion shall include the right to offer prayers in public schools."; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate, February 4, 1964.

Adopted by the house of representatives, February 12, 1964.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
/s/ BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Two Indiana Newspapers Comment on the Water Crisis in Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD four thoughtful editorials from four newspapers published in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

The first, entitled "Needed: Detachment—But Not Marine," was published in the February 2, 1964, issue of the Goshen News, follows:

NEEDED DETACHMENT—BUT NOT MARINE

The important thing to remember about the water crisis in Guantanamo is that it was not unexpected.

Authorities at the base have known for years that Castro might at any time order the water cut off under one pretext or another. So they have maintained a 12-day emergency supply, and are prepared to have water shipped in from Florida and to supplement the supply with evaporators aboard ships.

The situation does not seem to call for a detachment of Marines to march out of Guantanamo and turn the water on by force, as suggested by BARRY GOLDWATER.

The kind of detachment really needed is one of firm patience, born of confidence in the rightness of the American position.

The water shutoff is not a showdown between Castro and the United States—at least, not yet. It is not an attempt to force the United States out of the base, which Castro knows surely would not work, but is pure and simple harassment under the guise of protesting the arrest of 36 Cuban fishermen in U.S. waters.

This new development is the Cuban version of the Berlin blockade of 1948–49. In this instance though, the logistics involved in supplying the base are infinitely simpler and the Guantanamo population of some 10,000 cannot be compared with the 2½ million people in West Berlin.

But like the blockade, the "Battle of Guantanamo" will be decided not by any physical confrontation of the United States with Cuba but by American determination and, hopefully, the backing of world opinion.

Barring an actual invasion of Guantanamo by Cuba or direct attack on U.S. citizens, the course for the United States is one dictated by quiet strength and calm dignity.

The second editorial, "Panama to Guantanamo," was published in the February 13, 1964, issue of the Michigan City News Dispatch.

PANAMA TO GUANTANAMO

It would be laughable, if it were not so serious, that these are times when a small country can easily pick on a big one.

Woe to the larger country—especially if it's name is the United States—that has any uncorrected problem in its oversea relations.

The small country with a grievance has only to accuse and make a move. The Communists are ready to apply hot pokers on the spot and to unleash their propaganda machines from here to there.

Nonalined countries, particularly small ones, are prone to sympathize at once and without thinking very much. There is an international incident and the big country—the United States, of course—finds its reputation and, what is more important, its leadership, widely assailed.

These are serious matters when the United States is not without some faults, and yet it carries the major burden of protecting the entire world against the Communist aggressor. Its leadership of the free world is too important to everyone to be constantly covered with tarnish whenever something much smaller goes wrong.

This was the story of the Panama incident, which was significant in itself and worthy of correction all around but has become an international weapon against the United States in the cold war that is all out of proportion.

Now the Communits Cuban leadership and its ally Pravda, which is always in readiness, have moved in. The evidence suggests that they saw in the irritation that followed Panama a good chance to score off the "American imperialists."

They appear to have staged a deliberate violation of a Florida fishing law—not yet tested in the courts—which had been aimed specifically at the Communist leadership of Cuba. This gave pretext for touching a sensitive American political and national nerve at Guantanamo. A fizzing reaction from American patriots was assured and splendid fodder for Communist propaganda mills around the world. Press the button, make

the big country angry and irritate the rest of the world against it.

The free world has been growing more sophisticated about this sort of thing.

We hope and are inclined to think the Communists have misjudged this case. The reaction of American public opinion to the Panama affair was both reasonable and eager to improve what was an unfortunate situation all around. This must have been understood by a good many people overseas. Now the Cuban and Soviet effort to exploit the situation and make a wholly disproportionate noise over Guantanamo is too contrived to be wholly successful. It could prove a boomerang.

The third editorial, "Castro and Water," was published in the February 11, 1964, issue of the La Porte Herald-Argus.

CASTRO AND WATER

Castro turned off the water faucet to the Guantanamo Naval Base but he has no intention of fighting Uncle Sam at the base. Trying to oust the United States is far from his thoughts. That makes sense, as his chances of pushing the United States into the sea there are about as good as a tropical ski jumper's at the Winter Olympics.

The water turning off incident actually precipitated no great crisis in American-Cuban relationship, despite the Goldwaters and other excitable Congressmen who came forth with the usual prose about "a little snip tweaking our nose again." The United States was prepared for such a cessation of water supply and the water will be imported to Guantanamo as was planned months ago.

If Castro thought that by the turning off of the water he could give the new American President a real test he found out that Mr. Johnson could not did react without hesitation. He ordered that Guantanamo be made completely self-sufficient and that the number of Cubans employed there, about 3,500, be reduced. The latter action will mean fewer American dollars going into the Cuban economy.

Other than that, the situation remains about as before. The United States is trying, and without apparent result, to induce allied governments to reduce or eliminate their trading with Cuba. How ineffectual that sort of diplomatic urging can be is reflected by action of a rightwing nation such as Spain flirting with more Cuban trade. And Spain now is moving to attempt to do business with Soviet Russia and Iron Curtain nations. Business is just simply business.

Castro, while beset by many domestic problems, is nevertheless in firm control. He can be expected now to exploit the arrest of the Cuban fishermen seized in U.S. territorial waters. And if the State of Florida exacts unusually stiff punishment, or even finds the fishermen guilty at all, there will be the cries of "Yankee imperialism." And whether Washington likes its or not, these cries impress certain Latin American classes.

President Johnson's policy of firmness without flag waving or vituperation is about the best we can frame for now. The GOLDWATER cries of "send in the Marines" are not only childish and wild but morally indefensible. These are not the days of Teddy Roosevelt and the white man's burden. We live in a world when might no longer makes right where big and little nations are concerned. To send in the Marines would be to tumble down the whole edifice of U.S. prestige and collaboration in Latin America. And in a nuclear age it would be also to risk the holocaust.

The fourth editorial, "Scheme To Test Johnson," was published in the February 11, 1964, issue of the South Bend Tribune.

SCHEME TO TEST JOHNSON

The evidence is convincing that the intrusion of Cuban fishing boats into the territorial waters of Florida was no accident, but in fact part of a scheme to test the mettle of the new Johnson administration.

Why else would the fishing boats have radioed Havana that they were well inside the 3-mile limit? The Cubans were well aware that the message would be intercepted—that it amounted to a call to the U.S. Coast Guard to swoop down on the four-boat Cuban fleet.

Under normal circumstances, the crews would have attempted to steal to sea.

Why else would Fidel Castro issue an ultimatum to the United States to release the captured crews within 45 minutes or face a shutoff of the fresh water supply to the Guantanamo Naval Base?

He knew very well that nothing could be done in 45 minutes and that he could then shut off the fresh water supply to the American base and claim justification.

It was a neat trick to focus world attention again on the presence of the big American naval base on Cuban soil at the very time that Washington is having trouble with Panama on a similar matter and is bedeviled elsewhere by a wave of anti-Americanism.

To this extent, Castro has succeeded.

But if Castro thought he could humiliate the United States through a swift capitulation to his ultimatum he was sadly mistaken.

He has been told that he can keep the water he denied with a magnanimous offer to turn on the tap an hour a day for the benefit of women and children. He has been told that we will make the base self-sufficient where the fresh water supply is concerned. This is a polite way of telling him that we don't intend to be pushed out of Guantanamo—now or in the foreseeable future.

And as for the Soviet interference, we may as well tell them what General McAuliffe told the Germans when they called for the surrender of an American force at Bastogne: Nuts.

Meanwhile, Florida should treat the Cubans taken from the fishing boats as any other batch of law violators would be treated.

Book Larnin'

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of economics professors in the New York area launched a campaign directed against the quality stabilization bill. The professors published a purported "fact sheet" designed to show that enactment of the quality stabilization bill would be bad for business, the consumer and the national economy.

Those of us who favor quality stabilization are all too familiar with the misleading statistics and conclusions cited by the professors in their argument against the bill. As has been pointed out, these arguments seemingly follow, slogan for slogan, the propaganda line generally put forth by the special interest opponents of quality stabilization.

But in view of the academic attack on this legislation, I was reminded of a classic column concerning the pitfalls sometimes involved when professors deal with the flesh and blood economic world of the marketplace. The column, entitled, "Economics Book Larnin' Sure Swells Unemployment," is in a humorous vein from Billy Rose's syndicated newspaper column, but the insight it offers is nevertheless rewarding. With unanimous consent, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

For the past 20 years a friend of mine in Indiana has been selling hamburgers and making a right pretty dollar at it. He's hard of hearing, so he never listens to the radio and he's had so much trouble with his eyes that he never looks at a newspaper. But the hamburgers he sells are good hamburgers and so his inability to keep up with the times has never interfered with his business.

A few weeks back the old man's son got out of college after majoring in economics and when he got home he said, "Pop, I think you ought to start watching your pennies. The European situation is all messed up and we're beginning to feel it over here. According to the Dow-Jones index, this country is facing a big depression."

"I don't know this Dow Jones," said his father, "but any friend of yours is a friend of mine. Besides, you figure to know what you're talking about, seeing as how you've been hanging out with professors for the past 4 years."

The next morning the old man canceled the billboards on which he had been advertising his roadside stand for years, and that night switched off his neon sign at 8 o'clock. And a week later he laid off most of the girls who had been carrying the trays out to the cars.

Encouraged by these savings he next eliminated his famous piccalili sauce, stopped throwing the stale buns away, and substituted cheap meat for the U.S. prime he had always used. This only capital investment was for a newfangled gadget guaranteed to get 20 slices out of an onion.

Well, last week his son's predictions had all come true. In fact there was one day when not a single car drove up to the stand.

"Thanks for tipping me off," said the old man to his son that evening. "There sure is one helluva depression in this country."

Harry Kalich

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Kalich, a neighbor of mine in Queens County, N.Y.

We in the community recognize him as an outstanding leader in all fields beneficial to the community in which he resides, and we wholeheartedly approve his unselfish efforts as a leader and moving spirit in these activities.

Prior to coming to Washington, Harry served with distinction in the office of the Sheriff of Queens County, as deputy tax appraiser in the State tax department, and as commissioner of motor vehicles for Queens County.

Harry came to Washington in 1945 and took over the job as tally clerk of the House of Representatives, where he has earned the respect of all Members. During this time we have found him able, courteous, most cooperative, and friend-

ly, and we appreciate the dignified manner in which he conducted the office of tally clerk.

Certainly, he has earned his retirement, and my hope is that he and Mrs. Kalich will enjoy many years of leisure and happiness.

A College Grows in Hayward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great achievements in the State of California is the manner in which higher education is being developed through a dynamic program of State colleges.

With California's astounding growth and the population boom bringing our State to the No. 1 position in the Nation, there was a demand for adequate opportunities for higher education.

The State legislature approved a number of new college campuses throughout California which are conveniently located near population centers.

One of these campuses is the California State College at Hayward. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Oakland Tribune of January 12, 1964.

This interesting story helps to tell why California has a higher educational system which is second to none in the country.

The story follows:

A COLLEGE GROWS IN HAYWARD—LITTLE CAL STATE AIMS AT FUTURE

(By Carl Irving)

HAYWARD.—Little California State College is setting standards for the day when 22,000 students will enroll on the hilltop campus.

The college has been forced to revise upward estimates of student enrollment in another 20 years. But it wants to hold fast to its aim for excellence, and it has just received some good news.

National testing, in competition with some 140,000 students from many large and prominent universities, shows Cal State's to be considerably above average.

The recent tests are a measure of the caliber of the students, the quality of their courses and their professors.

GOALS MADE CLEAR

Long before the college moved to its new and stately setting on a steep hill above Hayward, its goals were made clear. President Fred F. Harcleroad, working in a cramped high school office, said in 1959:

"I believe we can provide a program for students to raise the level of excellence."

Cal State has a current enrollment of 2,400 students, with an additional 1,000 expected next fall when it adds a sophomore class and becomes a 4-year college for the first time.

THREE HUNDRED DIVERTED

The new students will include 300 diverted from overcrowded San Francisco and San Jose State Colleges. This diversion will increase, eventually, to more than 800 a year, while regular enrollment swells concurrently.

It is before this time, that the college wants to set high standards. The president puts it this way:

"We have recruited a superior faculty—80 percent with Ph. D.'s about twice the national average for colleges and universities.

"We are on the way to developing a top-flight liberal arts college with excellence as its theme."

The quality of the faculty is attributed to several reasons, but two are visably evident, on clear days, from the campus: The proximity of Palo Alto and Berkeley, homes of two leading universities.

LURE TO SCHOLARS

Stanford and the University of California, with nationally renowned libraries, are a lure to scholars who want to continue research while teaching nearby.

"Colleges in the bay area don't have much trouble attracting men from leading eastern universities," one newcomer to the Cal State faculty said.

"I hear some of my colleagues talk about the challenge of a new campus, but I think bigger attractions are the cultural stimulation of the bay area and the nice climate."

The faculty roster lists the institutions at which professors formerly taught. It is almost a list of the Nation's leading universities.

WELL ESTABLISHED

Mathematics, physics, and psychology already are well established, with some research underway, sponsored by grants from the National Science Foundation.

A $150,000 computer center is set up and a master of science degree is offered in mathematics. A master of arts degree is offered in English.

There is emphasis on languages, with Spanish and French offered as majors, German, Arabic, Hindu, and Russian will be offered later as majors.

The college offers a year-long survey course on the history of western culture modeled on that at Stanford University. All students are required to take junior and senior discussion classes, where they will be tested on their competence in biological and physical sciences, the humanities, and social science.

AMPLY STOCKED

The library already contains more books than some State college libraries which were established before World War I.

Some of the leading professors include Dr. Virgil Salera, former senior economist at the American Enterprise Association in Washington, D.C.; Dr. Andrew Guthrie, former head of the U.S. radiological defense laboratory at Hunters Point.

Dr. Theodore Roszak, former member of the Stanford history faculty, Dr. Douglas L. Peterson, authority on Renaissance literature, also from Stanford; Dr. Edward Ham, professor of French literature from the University of Michigan, and Dr. Arnold P. Biella, English scholar from Fresno State College.

RESIDENTS BENEFIT

Harcleroad also notes that residents in nearby communities will benefit.

"There already are excellent music and drama programs and outstanding speakers. In addition, people nearby can enroll for part-time studies."

Construction plans move ahead as quickly as money is made available. Only two buildings—the Fine Arts and the Science building—have been erected on the scarred hilltop so far. But construction of a $2 million music building will start in about 2 weeks.

It will be a circular, two-story structure, with a view of the bay plain.

Just below the summit, work goes forward on playing fields, beside a newly constructed fieldhouse. A $25,000 landscaping project, to be finished by springtime, will cover over some of the presently bare slopes.

SERIES OF POOLS

The master plan will provide lots of open space between the buildings on the 365-acre campus, but these will be made more attractive with a series of pools surrounded by foliage, each typical to a different section of the State.

The contemporary architectural lines will be followed in construction of the tall library building shaped somewhat like the United Nations secretariat. This theme building will rise at the edge of the hilltop.

But all this is still years away and meanwhile, campus deans have to see how they can keep providing enough space for all the students. The cafeteria is temporarily in the fine arts building and English students take classes in laboratories designed for science students.

CROWDED AREA

The library is crammed onto the main floor of the science building, and student assemblies have to gather in the beginnings of an outdoor amphitheater, rain or shine.

"Still, it's better than designing buildings which are intended for general use and then have to change them all after everything is built," said one planner.

"This way, we can eventually move everybody into a building designed for his field of study. We are very lucky to be able to start from scratch, with a master plan."

There is lots to do in the way of planning, even so far afield as considering the site of the nearest station for the future Bay Area Rapid Transit System.

But there is also quite a lot of building of such things as faculty and curriculum.

"You know," said one harried dean, "people have this idea of a leisurely campus life. Well, we are in here all day and we come back for more at night."

AIMING FOR BEST

Then he added: "Fortunately, nobody minds because there aren't any well-worn grooves yet. And we're aiming for the best."

This aspiration is reflected repeatedly, even in such superficial things as the nickname of the college—the "Pioneer," a space vehicle.

And it was with approval of students and faculty that the college was renamed "California State College at Hayward" last fall.

"Several other State colleges are imitating us and changing their names, but we were the first and maybe it will stick—we'd like to be known as just 'Cal State,'" said one faculty leader.

Alameda County, which once led the State in number of young people who never made it to college, now has one of the most aspiring members of the State college system.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh, on February 10, 1964, the following resolution on Soviet anti-Semitism was unanimously adopted:

The Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh deplores the continuing discrimination against Jews by the Government of the Soviet Union. It notes that official restrictions deny them freedom of worship, and increasingly destroy their cul-

tural traditions, religious practices and Jewish education; it being noted that the U.S.S.R. Constitution permits free exercise of distinctive religious and cultural practices by other nationalities and religious minorities.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to fulfill their stated purpose of equality and support of human rights by restoring to the Jews of that country their rights to sustain their religious beliefs and preserve their cultural traditions.

We call upon the Secretary General of the United Nations to use his good offices to the end that the virtual spiritual genocide of Soviet Jewry shall not be fulfilled; and we call upon the officials of the Government of the United States to take the necessary steps to protest against this evil.

To Chimbote, Peru, People-to-People Program Is "El Milagro de Pensacola"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "To Chimbote, Peru, People-to-People Program is 'El Milagro de Pensacola,'" which appeared in the Pensacola News Journal, Sunday, February 2. A group of civic-minded citizens sponsor the Pensacola "People-to-People" program.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks on February 24, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following:

TO CHIMBOTE, PERU, PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM IS "EL MILAGRO DE PENSACOLA"

(By Charles Reese)

Disease, in the barriadas of Chimbote, Peru, is not a sterilized statistic.

It is a specter that prowls among the cardboard shacks and cries out in the pain-taut voice of a neighbor or stares with the dead eyes of a little 6-year-old girl.

This past summer it prowled again, suffocating and crippling the impoverished Peruvians with the heavy grip of polio and the people settled back in hopeless fear to see who would be left; there had never been any place to run in the barriadas.

But this time the specter vanished.

Grateful hands nailed up a new sign over a bare little building on the edge of barriada, It said:

"El Milagro de Pensacola."

"The miracle from Pensacola."

It isn't a miracle, however, to people in Pensacola. It is called, here, the people-to-ple program and the little building by the barriada is nothing more magical than an outpatient clinic, staffed by a Peace Corps nurse, equipped by the Escambia County Medical Society.

What halted the specter of polio this past summer was Salk vaccine, also not a miracle.

The outpatient clinic and a large recreation field now rising out of the hot sand on the outskirts of Chimbote are the results of people in Pensacola being interested in people in Chimbote, a crowded seacoast city on the Pacific Ocean.

Pensacolians are interested, frankly, because Capt. H. B. Grow, a retired Navy captain, began to make them interested over a year ago with talk about a sister city project and how people—just plain folks—could do something to squelch a lot of loudmouthed Communists in Latin America.

Captain Grow told Pensacolians—anybody who listen: This country can't survive in all of Latin America. Its 200 million people and its vast sources are captured by the Communists.

He told Pensacolians that they couldn't save the continent by themselves, of course. It would be irrational to even think so.

But, he went on, it could set an example of how an American city, with a little work and a little cash, could reach into Latin America and touch the lives of people in a way that would give them a realistic picture of Americans.

It would give them a picture they could use as a criterion when the leftist came along and set up his anti-American soapbox.

It would give them a visible demonstration that Americans are not enslavers, bent on keeping them impoverished for the sake of profit, as the leftist around the corner keeps saying.

And Pensacolians listened.

Pretty soon there was a group of men to staff a people-to-people council, there was encouragement from the U.S. Government, and before long there was a sister city—Chimbote.

Pensacolians and Peruvians picked another sister city, too, Miraflores, but it was Chimbote that the work would be directed toward. Miraflores was comparatively prosperous and was doing all right by itself.

What did Chimbote need?

Chimbote answered, a place for children to play, some place for them to go while their parents worked all day in the fishmeal factories or other business; some place to take them out of the barriada for a few hours and remind them that their lives were not necessarily bounded inexorably and permanently by those stinking alleys and sagging walls.

Some place to show them a future.

"All right, we'll build you one," Pensacolians said, and they set to work to do it.

Fundraising is an American art, and Pensacolians know how to do it as well as the next city. Committees have to be set up, speakers brought in, local speakers sent around the civic club circuit.

It takes a lot of talking, a lot of letter-writing.

During 1963, the campaign rolled on, not with the high-power speed, not even always steadily, because for Pensacolians it is not the only project they have to complete.

There are other fund drives, United Fund and more. There is the annual celebration, the Fiesta of Five Flags. There are schools letting in and letting out, vacations to take and jobs to come back to.

And the rest of the world was moving. Crises erupted here and abroad. Venezuelans were killed trying to vote. Americans died in Asian swamps. A President was killed.

But throughout the year, as persistent as a river current, the people-to-people program went on. Construction was started and funds flowed to the contractor.

And in Peru, the program was beginning to take shape and to have an effect on the Peruvians, sparked by what Americans were doing in their own land.

A Peruvian donated the land for the recreation center and after the walls began to rise, the Chimbote Lions Club announced they would finance a basketball court.

The wife of Chimbote's mayor, Mrs. Jorge Sarmiento, raised $2,000 and built five children's playgrounds in the five of barriadas.

She organized a women's group known as the Angels of Mercy who pay monthly dues into a fund that finances medical aid for special cases.

International Petroleum Co., was asked to build a tennis court and Sears of Peru agreed to uniform a soccer league.

This sparking of Peruvian activity is what impresses James H. Boren, a U.S. State Department specialist, the most.

Boren is special assistant to the U.S. coordinator of the Alliance for Progress and self-help is, he says, the single most important factor in the Alliance.

The U.S. Government even contributed its share to the miracle from Pensacola. AID a Government agency, supplied the building materials; the Peace Corps supplied a supervisor; the Peruvians themselves supplied the labor; and Pensacola provided the equipment and supplies—$10,000 worth.

Kathy Brown, the nurse who supervises the clinic which now treats 35 to 40 patients a day, called it a Godsend, after the polio scare.

Words of congratulations and praises have poured in upon Pensacolians from both Governments.

The latest word received is from Thomas C. Mann, recently appointed Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs.

"The people of Pensacola are to be congratulated for their interest and initiative in extending meaningful direct assistance to the people of Chimbote," he wrote people-to-people officials.

Boren is also pleased that Pensacola's example has spread to other cities. He said interest has been expressed by cities in 22 States in the program within the last 4 months.

Captain Grow recently received a letter from Delos Hamlin, head of a group in Oakland, Mich., which has established a program with the people of the Cauca Valley of Colombia.

"We salute you," Hamlin said, and invited an exchange of ideas.

The American Society of Peru—a group of American businessmen there—cabled: "Program exemplifies a well-planned and well-organized sister city relationship. No more pragmatic evidence is required to show what may be accomplished through the dedicated efforts of private individuals with the wholehearted support of U.S. aid and the Peace Corps.

"Saludos, Captain Grow and the people of Pensacola, for a job well done."

But all these indications of success don't mean the Pensacola people are sitting back and resting.

The contractor working on the recreation center has caught up with the funds and a final push is needed to complete the project.

Captain Grow and other people-to-people officials feel confident the money will be raised.

When it is, the recreation center will be dedicated in March.

And Americans, who are used to being called ugly, will find that winning the cold war is not the impossible task it sometimes seems.

To prove it, they can go to Chimbote and a particular barriada.

The inhabitants of these shanty towns gravitate toward leaders and from the house of one of the leaders flies a proud symbol of this particular leader's friend: The flag of the United States of America.

For "Dixie" Honor—South Carolina General Assembly Adopts Resolution to Camden Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the Con-

gress and the Nation to the accomplishment of merit and deserving praise by the Camden, S.C., band director, Mr. William H. Basden, school superintendent, Mr. J. C. Walton, and the Camden High School Marching Band. Recently this band marched in the Mardi Gras Parade in New Orleans, La. and was chosen "The Greatest Band in Dixie." In keeping with the salutation which I feel they deserve, I include in my remarks an article from the Camden, S.C., Chronicle of Wednesday, February 19, 1964, reciting the resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly giving deserving honor and praise to the band, its members and its mentors.

The article is as follows:

FOR "DIXIE" HONOR—SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY ADOPTS RESOLUTION TO CAMDEN BAND

The South Carolina Senate and House of Representatives have adopted a resolution commending the Camden High School Marching Band on being chosen "The Greatest Band in Dixie" at the recent Mardi Gras Parade in New Orleans.

Kershaw County Senator John C. West authored and introduced the resolution in the senate last week. The senate passed the resolution last Thursday and the house of representatives concurred yesterday (Tuesday).

The resolution:

"S. 643. Mr. West: A concurrent resolution commending the Camden High School Marching Band and its director, William H. Basden, on being selected as the greatest band in Dixie.

"Whereas the Camden High School Marching Band earlier this year, in competition with bands from throughout South Carolina, defeated all rivals to emerge as the State's No. 1 marching band; and

"Whereas the Camden High School Marching Band and its director, William H. Basden, on Sunday, February 9, took the big step when in New Orleans, the city that is no stranger to great bands, it matched precision steps and martial music against 18 of Dixie's finest bands from 14 States and marched straight into the hearts of the judges who acclaimed it the 'greatest band in Dixie'; and

"Whereas Camden High's 'greatest band in Dixie' was invited to New Orleans where it received a resounding reception as its stirring renditions quickened the pulse and set the feet of Mardi Gras celebrants to tapping as it marched down New Orleans' Canal Street in the parade with martial airs that spanned the years from John Philip Sousa's 'Stars and Stripes,' to Meridith Willson's '76 trombones'; and

"Whereas the general assembly appreciates the necessary time, energy, and dedication of the members of the Camden High School Marching Band, and the limitless tenacity, patience, and faith of Director Basden to mold into one coordinated and harmonious unit the 67 members that compose the 'greatest band in Dixie'; and

"Whereas the general assembly desires in behalf of itself and the citizens of South Carolina to extend the heartiest congratulations to the Camden High School Marching Band and its director, William H. Basden: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Camden High School Marching Band and its director, William H. Basden, be congratulated and commended on being selected the 'greatest band in Dixie.' This is an outstanding achievement and all the citizens of the State of South Carolina are justly overcome with pride in the accomplishments of these youngsters under the superb leadership of Director William H. Basden; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to William H. Basden, director of the band, and J. C. Walton, superintendent of schools at Camden."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

y

Appendix

Address of Hon. Endicott Peabody, Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an address delivered by the Honorable Endicott Peabody, Governor of Massachusetts, Monday, February 24, 1964, before the National Housing Conference, Hotel Statler Hilton, Washington, D.C. His Excellency the Governor has brought to the attention of those attending the conference the great accomplishments made in housing in the Nation and in particular in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As one of those who had the privilege of sponsoring housing legislation enacted into law as a member of the great and general court in Massachusetts, and also as a former member of the Banking and Currency Committee in the U.S. Congress, I take great pride in his remarks. Coming from the forward-looking Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am indeed happy to have the opportunity to have this address included in the RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the benefit of the distinguished Governor's thoughts on this important subject. The address follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE ENDICOTT PEABODY, GOVERNOR, THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE 33D ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, HOTEL STATLER HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is a pleasure for me to be with you today and to bring the greetings of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to this gathering both individually and collectively.

It is an honor to be part of your 33d annual meeting here in the Nation's Capital and to participate in its activities.

I wish to take this occasion to congratulate and commend your organization and its membership for the impact for good which you exert nationally, within your respective States, and your respective communities. Much has been accomplished, through your efforts and influence, for effective legislation in the fields of housing, urban renewal, and community development.

Our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, left his mark in every facet of American Government. He will be remembered for his efforts: to expand urban planning and renewal; to give Cabinet status to the agency concerned most with urban problems; to launch a new program of Federal aid to metropolitan transportation facilities; and to provide effective assistance to depressed areas.

President Johnson now carries forward the same torch of leadership. We who speak for State and local government welcome the opportunity to support the President's programs in a real partnership for progress. As the Governor of a great State—and an urban State—I see no threat to State sovereignty in such a partnership. Instead, I believe it is fully consistent with our basic constitutional heritage to explore practical solutions for tangible problems. What we must do is to avoid doctrinaire approaches and doctrinaire solutions which generate much heat, very little light, and no benefit.

We welcome the President's leadership in the struggle to insure lawful equality for all our citizens. In Massachusetts we have the most comprehensive and effective State legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing and job opportunity.

We welcome President Johnson's summons to a great crusade against poverty in America. We endorse the need to strengthen and to expand the scope of the Federal area redevelopment program.

We welcome the sense of humanity and the sense of justice implicit in President Johnson's message on housing and community development.

Yet, I would suggest that the enactment of Federal programs is not enough. Each of our 50 States has its own responsibility which it must exercise in terms of its own needs and circumstances. For example, in Massachusetts we have tried to anticipate the President's recommendation for a department of housing and community development. I have recommended to our great and general court—the Massachusetts Legislature—the establishment of a reorganized economic development agency encompassing public housing, urban renewal, regional and local planning assistance, industrial development, tourist promotion, foreign trade, and science and technological development. We foresee such an agency joining with its Federal equivalents in a coordinated attack on pockets of economic distress and urban blight. Experience across the Nation indicates that the fragmented administration of isolated programs diminishes their potential maximum contributions.

It is imperative that our State governments remedy their inadequate support of municipal and metropolitan needs. Just as we seek equality of partnership with Washington, we must offer a similar relationship for the common good to our cities. We have recently opened a Washington office of the Commonwealth to assist both our State agencies and our cities and towns in drawing effectively upon available Federal aid.

Since the Housing Act of 1937 which saw the start of federally aided public housing, and the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954 which brought about urban redevelopment and community planning, and the Housing Act of 1956 which provided for specially planned and designed housing for our elderly citizens, great strides have been made but we have yet much to accomplish both at the Federal and the State levels.

Today in our country there are approximately 18 million persons 65 years of age and over, which is 10 percent of our population. In our own Commonwealth there are close to 600,000 persons 65 years of age and over representing over 11.3 percent of our population. Due to the many advances in medicine, getriatrics and gerontology (the study of the aging), the lifespan today is—on the average—25 years greater than it was 60 years ago. As the years go on, the increase in the elderly population will be far greater than the increase in the overall population.

Since 1953 Massachusetts has been providing specially planned and designed housing for persons 65 years of age and over of low income, and is continuing to provide this special housing at an accelerated pace.

These apartments are of modern design, one- or two-story garden type, with all features of comfort and safety for the elderly. Each apartment consists of a living-dining area, fully equipped kitchen, a full bath and bedroom which accommodates a full bed or twin beds. They are designed and planned for occupancy by a lone individual or a couple.

On July 18, 1963, ever mindful of the needs of the elderly within the Commonwealth, I signed chapter 551 increasing the guarantee for this special housing by an additional $20 million, thus bringing the total guarantee to $125 million. I have further directed that this program be expedited and construction hastened in every community where there is a need and desire for this special housing.

We take great pride in the fact that Massachusetts leads the Nation in providing, in cooperation with our many local housing authorities, special housing for its elderly of low income and is recognized both nationally and internationally for its leadership in this housing endeavor.

This is no longer an experiment but a way of life with our elderly. Let us keep in mind that this is in no way a welfare program for a pauperizing program—it is something due the elderly who in their younger and productive years were the mainstay and backbone of their respective communities.

Currently there are 106 developments comprising some 4,700 apartments completed and occupied in every geographic location throughout the Commonwealth, 18 under construction, and 19 ready to go out for construction bid. Over and above these figures, there are 83 communities in the early planing stage for a first, second, third, and even a fifth development.

Briefly and simply, I will discuss the legislation under which this program is operated. This special housing program is authorized under chapter 667, "an act to provide for the housing of elderly persons of low income. There are three main parts to this act as follows:

1. The Commonwealth guarantees the notes or bonds of local housing authorities to construct such housing, as the act now stands, up to $125 million worth.

2. The Commonwealth pays a subsidy or annual contribution of 2½ percent based on the total development cost of each project. (This is the amount paid to make up the difference in the necessary rent to carry each and every apartment and thus a rental is achieved which the elderly of low, fixed incomes can pay.) Under unusual circumstances, and upon approval and certification of the State housing board to the State comptroller, an additional annual contribution of 1½ percent may be paid.

3. The period of amortization of mortgage is 40 years, in other words, any notes or bonds issued by local housing authorities must be paid off in 40 years.

The actual cost of this program to the taxpayers of the Commonwealth is slight in comparison to the tremendous benefit to the elderly. The subsidy for fiscal 1963–64 will be approximately $1,200,000, a small percent-

age of our overall State budget of some $600 million, for the same period.

As the act now stands at $125 million guarantee when all housing is constructed and receiving full subsidy at 2½ percent, the yearly cost for providing a new way of life and happiness for our elderly citizens will be $3,125,000 annually.

The primary purpose of this program is to serve the elderly in providing this specially designed and planned housing at rents which they can afford in order that they may spend their added years, God willing, in good health, comfort, companionship, and security. In providing this housing, the boost to the economy of our communities and the State as a whole should not be discounted.

Our theme this morning is "The Needs of States and Local Governments for Effective Federal Legislation in the Fields of Housing, Urban Renewal, and Community Development."

The needs of our Nation will be well served if President Johnson's programs are enacted. His proposed housing and community development legislation is an essential to the restoration of our urban centers. His dramatic declaration of war against poverty warrants our unstinting support.

In addition, there are various specific legislative enactments I believe we should welcome. We require direct Federal aid for mass commuter transportation and, therefore, we must back the Williams bill. Sooner or later we must have more effective legislative tools for dealing with the rehabilitation of salvagable residential property.

On the basis of our Massachusetts experience I would urge a modification in the Federal public housing program to permit a direct partnership with State government in this essential endeavor. Essentially this would allow the Federal agency to contribute by way of subsidy directly to equivalent State housing programs where the State provides direct financial assistance. To illustrate, instead of maintaining a competitive Federal housing-for-the-elderly program, the funds and credit available thereunder—a 5-percent annual subsidy—could be contributed directly to the State program to reduce rentals and to increase the total amount of such subsidized housing. Direct program administration and construction responsibility could then vest directly in the State housing agency. Naturally, such an option would be available only where the State government provided a reasonably equivalent public housing program, and where it made a substantial direct contribution toward the cost of the program.

When we consider the severe problems facing other nations, we realize the extent to which we must be grateful for our constitutional and economic heritage. We can solve our problems—given good will and the kind of partnership we are considering here.

Tackle or Tag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter from a constituent and respected friend which dramatizes our foreign policy difficulties more clearly than anything I have seen in recent weeks. Mr. Daniel A. Cronin, Jr., who is president of the Macbick Co. of Wilmington, Mass., is a keen student of world affairs, and I would like my colleagues to have the benefit of his trenchant analysis of our current problems. Excerpts from Mr. Cronin's letter follow:

I say again that there is a desperate need for someone to spell out what should be the objectives of our foreign policy.

Increasingly, I feel that we can no longer expect to lead the world if we will not exercise the responsibilities and burdens of leadership. Words alone will not stir Castro from exporting communism from Cuba; words alone will not prohibit the massacre of American missionaries in the Congo; words alone will not discourage British shipments of trucks to Cuba.

Indeed, the old rule, "Put up or shut up," applies in foreign affairs as in most other human activities. If we're not going to put up, then I suggest we shut up. Loose foreign-aid bribery attempts make us the laughingstock of the world. We should disengage ourselves from alliances which we will not really support.

America must make a choice between playing tackle or tag foreign policy. If we don't want to play tackle, we shouldn't expect to use the big stadium.

The Queens Plan To Improve Judicial Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the plan for improved selection of judges on State courts which has been proposed by the Queens County Bar Association in New York City, called the Queens plan, in my judgment very much merits the national attention which it has received. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an excerpt from a recent address given by Nat H. Hentel, president of the Queens County Bar Association, which decribes the present status of the Queens plan.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Then there is the first practical application in the last election of the "Plan to improve the selection of judges." The secret balloting of all members with respect to the qualifications of judicial candidates and the endorsement of one judicial candidate based upon the tabulated results have excited the attention of all thoughtful lawyers, bar associations, and judicial improvement organizations throughout the Nation. We have spread the responsibility of assessing the qualifications of judicial candidates over the entire membership of the Queens Bar. The plan has received heady praise for the courage and imagination of our bar from many quarters. The plan proves that lawyers will fulfill their professional responsibilities with integrity under the canons of ethics without regard to political or other considerations. A challenge to the right to spend our funds to carry out the plan instituted by one of our members is now being litigated with the friendly support of other New York City and the New York State bar associations. This is a case of first impression in New York, and possibly in the Nation. It is a case of tremendous significance to the organized bar of all the United States. We are carrying a very important ball in the cause of our chartered purpose: "The improvement and facilitation of the administration of justice." We do not intend to drop the ball.

The adoption of the so-called Queens plan has led our bar into taking a leading role in the efforts of the coordinating committee of the Metropolitan Bar Associations, all represented tonight on the dais through their presidents or vice presidents. The coordinating committee is now concentrating its efforts on establishing standards for judicial qualifications for the entire city of New York. More will be heard of this by the profession and the public in the coming months. Personally, I hope that these efforts will lead to a campaign by all of the New York City bar associations working in unison to win improved judicial selection methods in the city and State of New York. It is my personal feeling that these efforts should culminate in the not too distant future by the calling of a State constitutional convention to reform the law and institute improved techniques of selecting and electing judges in this State. We are not deluding ourselves that our plan is the ultimate panacea. It is merely a step in the right direction, but only for the short haul. The long-range improvements called for by the present sophistication of our society will require much more work and a concentration of all of our talents and efforts in attaining this desired goal.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, 1963, when the House first acted on the tax bill, H.R. 8363, I listed the inequities which I thought would be perpetuated by this legislation. At that time, I expressed the hope that the tax bill would provide more than an Indian summer of growth and prosperity.

As we approach the hour of final action on this bill, my doubts continue and I hope that they are overwhelmed by facts and circumstances which will provide that the advocates of this tax bill are correct in their arguments.

Following is an editorial which appeared in the Plain Dealer, Monday, February 24, 1964, entitled "The Tax Bill: A Risk":

THE TAX BILL: A RISK

The tax reduction bill which Congress will send to the White House this week marks a radical departure in U.S. fiscal policy.

In the face of estimated huge Treasury deficits for this fiscal year and the next, tax revenues will be substantially cut. Some $800 million a month will be knocked off tax bills, mainly in lower and middle income brackets.

The theory is that consumer spending will bring a boom in productivity and so increase industrial activity and employment. A resultant rise in taxable income will be expected to provide revenues to offset the loss in the reduced rates and, eventually, produce a balanced budget.

If the expected happens, fine. But if taxpayers decide to salt away their savings instead of spending, or if a spending boom

touches off an inflationary rise in prices and wages, the effect could be severely damaging.

Economists are divided on the probable effects. A conservative group sees the tax bill as a politically motivated fraud. Others maintain that the basic principles of the bill are sound and that its influence on the economy will be healthy. Only the test of time will prove who is right.

Only time, too, will tell whether the weighting of the bill's benefits in favor of the low and middle income groups and against those in the higher brackets was economically sound. There are some economists who feel this weighting may reduce some of the expected beneficial effects of the tax cut by failing to provide equitable tax relief to those who have the money to invest in new but sometimes risky ventures.

The Plain Dealer regrets that essential reforms in the taxation structures were almost wholly abandoned. Loopholes and preferences to special interests remain to deprive the Treasury of billions of dollars a year. There is crying need for revisions in this area.

It must be kept in mind that this bill gained wide support in Congress on the promise of the Johnson administration to curb Federal spending sharply. If spending continues to mount, the prospect of a balanced budget, and of the success of the new fiscal policy, is dark.

The tax bill starts the country on a program which must be considered risky. It will require a combination of Government prudence and public—industry, labor and citizenry—restraint and understanding to make it achieve its long-range objectives.

Who Gains? The Tax Cut Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in reading the National Observer of Monday, February 24, 1964, I came across an article describing in laymen's language the main provisions of the tax cut bill.

I would like to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and any constituents interested in the major effects of the tax cut we are supporting today:

WHO GAINS? THE TAX CUT IS HERE

The biggest tax cut in history is expected to become law this week, in time to begin showing up in employee pay checks early next month. A final House-Senate compromise draft, almost sure to reach President Johnson's desk in its present form, was agreed to last week. The bill's two-stage reduction will save taxpayers an average 19 percent on tax bills when fully effective next year. Two-thirds of the $11.5 billion tax cut will go into effect immediately, retroactive to January 1, 1964. Here are the main features of the bill:

RATE STRUCTURE

Lowers current individual tax rates, ranging from 20 percent at the bottom bracket to 91 percent at the top, to a range of 16 to 77 percent for this calendar year and to a range of 14 to 70 percent in 1965 and thereafter. The present 18 percent withholding rate—the percentage of employee wages now held back by employers for taxes—will drop to 14 percent 8 days after the bill becomes law. The corporate tax rate, now 52 percent, will be lowered to 48 percent.

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Abolishes deductions for payment of State and local taxes on liquor, cigarettes, and such miscellaneous items as hotel rooms and theater tickets. Also bans deductions for State and local drivers' licenses and auto-tag fees. Still deductible under the new law will be State and local taxes on gasoline, plus general sales, property, and income taxes. Estimated revenue gain: $300 million annually.

STANDARD DEDUCTIONS

At present a taxpayer who doesn't itemize deductions can claim a standard deduction equal to 10 percent of gross income, up to $1,000 on a joint return. The new law adds an alternative formula, under which the taxpayer can claim a $300 deduction for himself, plus an additional $100 for his wife and other dependents, up to $1,000. This provision will remove 1,500,000 low-income persons from tax rolls. Estimated revenue loss: $320 million annually.

DIVIDEND INCOME

Under present law, the first $50 of income from stock dividends ($100 for couples filing joint returns) is not taxable, and an amount equal to 4 percent of dividends above that amount can be subtracted from the tax bill. The new law will raise the exclusion to $100 ($200 on joint returns), cuts the dividend credit to 2 percent on 1964 incomes, and repeals the credit thereafter. Estimated revenue gain: $300 million annually.

CAPITAL GAINS

Leaves unchanged the present 25-percent capital gains tax on profits from the sale of stock or other property. But the law will require an executive to hold stock purchased under option plans for at least 3 years before he sells it, instead of the present 6-month minimum, to benefit from the favorable capital gains rate. Under a stock option plan, an executive receives from his company an option to buy a certain number of shares of company stock at a specified price. He may buy the stock at that price even if the market value of the stock rises above it.

INCOME AVERAGING

Permits artists, writers, athletes, and others whose income fluctuates widely from year to year to average their incomes over a 5-year period to gain more favorable tax treatment. A taxpayer whose income is at least one-third greater than his average annual income in the 4 preceding years is eligible. Estimated revenue loss: $40 million annually.

ELDERLY TAXPAYERS

Benefits a taxpayer 65 years of age or older by exempting from capital gains taxation the first $20,000 of proceeds from the sale of his home if he had lived in it for 5 years, repealing the rule limiting tax deductions for drugs and medicines to outlays above 1 percent of his income, and liberalizing the special tax credit granted to retired couples against dividends and other kinds of investment income on other joint returns.

BY THE WAYSIDE

Omitted from the final bill are several revenue-raising proposals requested by the late President Kennedy in submitting the tax bill to Congress in January 1963. Chief among the omissions:

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Would have discouraged the practice of itemizing deductions by limiting such deductions to those in excess of an amount equal to 5 percent of a taxpayer's income.

OIL AND GAS

Would have had the effect of reducing the present 27½-percent depletion allowance to 22 percent. This and other oil and gas reforms would have raised an estimated $300 million in annual revenues.

CAPITAL GAINS

Would have eliminated capital gains treatment of stock options, and imposed a tax on capital gains at death.

Restore Western Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in today's issue of the Chicago Sun-Times is significant and presents a timely warning. Unless the United States accepts the challenge of leadership, there will be further deterioration of the Western allied common front against communism, with its serious consequences. The article follows:

RESTORE WESTERN UNITY

Richard M. Nixon's Peoria indictment of the Johnson administration's handling of foreign policy, especially the problem of Cuba, was an excellent summation of the fumble and bumble which has characterized the State Department in recent months. More importantly, however, the former Vice President and 1960 Republican nominee for President made constructive suggestions well worth consideration.

Accusing the Johnson administration of having hoodwinked and soft-soaped the American people about "the most disastrous series of foreign policy defeats since World War II," Nixon called for a summit conference of Western leaders for the purpose of formulating a concerted policy.

The Western alliance has been fragmented. It no longer presents a common front to communism. The United States goes one way, France another, and Great Britain still another. True, the same might be said of Soviet Russia and Red China. Currently, they have their differences. Essentially, however, they have the same basic policy. As has been said, they differ merely over the methods to be employed in accomplishing the undoing of the West.

The differences among the Western Powers are more fundamental. France and Great Britain are engaging in definite acts of appeasement; the United States, on the other hand, appeases one day and defies the next.

The West has lost its common purpose.

A summit conference of Western leaders might be able to achieve unity of purpose. If such cannot be obtained, the United States will at least know that it has to go it alone and knowing can plan and act accordingly.

"The most urgent problem confronting the Johnson administration," Nixon said, "is to restore the Atlantic Alliance so that the free world can present a united front against communism in Cuba, southeast Asia, and other areas."

European statesmen fail to grasp the seriousness with which Americans regard the continuance of Fidel Castro and his communist regime in Cuba. So long as Western European nations continue their Cuban trade and insist on expanding its scope they can anticipate growing resentment in the United States.

They have chosen to undermine U.S. policy in the Caribbean. France has, in addition, chosen to do likewise in Asia.

Communism is the only beneficiary of the present disarray in the West.

An effort to resolve differences—to work out a common policy—should be made by the Western nations.

The United States can go it alone.

The vital question is, Can Western Europe?

A bit of sober reflection on the part of Western European statesmen might provide them with the answer which, obviously, is they cannot.

Restoring the unity of the Western alliance is, in the long run, far more important to the world than maintaining the election day unity of Northern and Southern Democrats or of seaboard and Middle West Republicans.

Sir Alec Douglas-Home should also recognize that it is of greater importance than whether he and his Tory Party stay in office. Whether President Charles de Gaulle can be prevailed upon to recognize anything other than France's short-term interests is problematical.

That Boston Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, after less than 1½ hours of discussion, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics decided to approve the report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration providing for the new Electronics Research Center in Boston, Mass. This was done without receiving testimony from any non-NASA witnesses either for or against such a center and with only the most limited opportunity for debate.

This action, assuming it is confirmed by the Senate Space Committee, will launch a facility involving more than $237 million of the taxpayers' money by 1969 and over $1 billion by 1979. It will result in the establishment of a center in Massachusetts which will employ an estimated 2,100 personnel in the electronics field.

I do not believe that the Congress should become involved in site selections for Federal facilities. I do, however, believe that Congress has the responsibility to expend the taxpayers' dollars only in a most judicious and necessary manner. There is, in my mind, still considerable question as to the need for this center. Furthermore, there is considerable question in my mind as to whether, if such a center is needed, as opposed to developing additional electronics capability at existing centers, the criteria used for selecting Boston as the site were sound. Specifically, if the people of this country are going to spend $20 to $40 billion on a manned lunar landing, I believe that we should, at the same time, attempt to gain the maximum technology utilization and industrial application of the new products, processes, and techniques which result from the expenditure of these research and development dollars. Certainly with the expenditure of vast sum of money on space exploration there will be many consumer benefits which could accrue to the taxpayers apart from the space program. However, until and unless NASA and the Federal Government make a concerted effort to disperse these centers rather than concentrate them in two or three areas, there will be no opportunity for industry to rub shoulders with Government scientists so that they may evaluate and, hopefully, utilize for the benefit of the American public the new processes, products, and techniques which space expenditures are creating.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Johnson administration have, in my opinion, made a serious mistake. The taxpayers of this country will be paying for it for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following editorials which appeared in Missiles and Rockets and the Chicago Tribune, respectively:

THAT BOSTON CENTER

(By William J. Coughlin)

We have now entered a suspenseful 45-day period in which Congress must decide if it will act on the latest recommendation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration regarding its proposed Electronics Research Center.

Last year, NASA proposed that the $50 million Center be located in the Boston area. Congress asked the space agency for further justification of the Center and its location.

After a series of presentations by other interested areas, NASA Administrator James Webb has reaffirmed the agency's choice of Boston as the preferred site—to the surprise of almost no one.

NASA will be permitted to proceed on this basis if the recommendation is not vetoed by Congress within 45 days.

We favor such a veto.

We favor it on an issue far more fundamental than that of location. We do not believe NASA has submitted convincing proof of the need for such a Center.

We have read the space agency's detailed justification. We have talked to responsible electronics authorities in both industry and Government. We have, within the past week, talked to corporate officers of a number of electronics firms in the Boston area. These have been firms which, in some cases, have supported the move to bring a NASA electronics center to Boston.

More than one of these officials has admitted, in effect: "We do not see any requirement for such a center. But if there is to be one, and it appears there is, then we want it in the Boston area."

The reason for this is frankly expressed self-interest. Many Massachusetts electronics firms at first feared, and openly opposed, establishment of the Center in their backyard. The reason: concern over competition for scientific talent.

On further examination, this fear faded with the realization that establishment of the Center nearby undoubtedly would lead to more business for firms in the Boston area. Despite NASA pledges that its principal concern would be inhouse research, the history of such enterprises in the past indicated it soon would be turning to more ambitious projects.

It is not surprising, therefore, that a number of Boston area firms have campaigned both quietly and effectively in behalf of the Center. More of a surprise, perhaps, is the fact that some of those who have been most active in this campaign will answer with an honest negative the basic question of whether such a center really is needed.

That NASA needs an additional electronics capability, particularly one to provide increased reliability, is not questioned. But NASA has not built a convincing case that this capability should be isolated in one corner of the Nation, far from the NASA centers deeply engaged in manned and unmanned flight programs.

If funds are to be provided for this purpose, they should be devoted to strengthening electronics know-how at the program-oriented centers where it is directly applicable.

NASA's own plea in support of the proposed center, that electronics makes up at least 70 percent of each space vehicle, is in itself an argument for building this capability at the existing centers, not at an academic cell placed conveniently near the fine universities of the Northeast.

A further argument against the proposed new facility is that it comes too late in time to contribute in any substantial manner to the Apollo program. If we can go to the moon without it, we can do a number of other things without it. Under any NASA budget, and particularly under the present severely restricted space agency budget, the proposed electronics center is a luxury we can ill afford. Congress should act to kill it during this 45-day period.

Our deep concern continues, not only with this facility, but with the proliferation of organizations in the university, nonprofit and Government fields which are doing work which can be done more effectively by private industry.

The necessity of staying in business, and showing a profit to the stockholders at the end of the year, is a powerful motivating force toward an economic and effective operation.

Consider, then, the recruiting advertisement in the New York Times on January 26 on behalf of the U.S. naval laboratories in the Washington, D.C., area. This offered a promising future "free from the job-permanence worries that plague the defense industry these days."

We suggest you read that novel and interesting thought again. The naval laboratories—the naval laboratories, mind you—are free of the uncertainty surrounding a fluctuating military budget. Nor is this just research activity. At the naval propellant plant, for example, "they manufacture, inspect, test, and deliver missile propulsion units, too."

Industry frequently concerns itself with the role of the nonprofit corporation. Yet, Dr. C. W. Halligan, president of Mitre Corp., had a word to say in a recent issue of Industrial Research which might be very applicable to the Navy activity described above. He said: "The company must not take on work that can be done more appropriately by other available sources. The company must avoid extending the scope of its work into areas that belong to others. This is especially true of the proper fields of industry, such as detailed design and manufacture."

We suggest that the Navy, engaging in the manufacture of missile propulsion units while attempting to lure talent from industry with promises of freedom from the "job-permanence worries" plaguing that same industry, is perverting the free enterprise system it serves.

Someone should be horsewhipped for this, as the country editors used to say. Then another country implement, the axe, should be used on NASA's proposed electronics research center, on the U.S. naval laboratories and on a great many more of these swollen parasites on the free enterprise system.

POLITICAL PAYOFF

The Middle West has been shut out again in the distribution of facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Boston has been selected as the site of the $60 million Electronics Research Center, just as Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, predicted 13 months ago after his election to the Senate. He campaigned for the seat on the promise: "I can do more for Massachusetts."

There never was a chance for an honest appraisal of the 50 areas which sought the Research Center. The Senate bill authorizing the Center contained a provision that Boston would be the site. Objections in the House caused the removal of this provision and the appointment of a committee which went through the motions of considering other places.

By the committee's own standards, the logical place for the Center was Chicago because it is already the greatest center of electronics production and research and it has the largest concentration of scientists and other skilled persons to staff the Center.

Eleven universities within 250 miles of Chicago produce at least one-third of the Nation's doctors of philosophy in the physical sciences. Only the New Jersey area rivals Metropolitan Chicago in electronics production. No other area approaches Chicago in its concentration of facilities to support electronics research.

These facts and others were supplied to NASA by committees named by Governor Kerner, Mayor Daley, the Chicago Association of Commerce, and others. They wasted their time and money in going to Washington. The NASA Committee obviously had its instructions from the White House. The pretense of considering other cities was only an effort to calm outraged middle westerners and to spray perfume on a rotten deal.

In an election year, President Johnson sees the importance of retaining the support of the New England States, which are the headquarters of the Kennedy family's political domain. He evidently expects the Daley machine in Chicago to continue rolling up its big Democratic majorities, no matter how shabbily Chicago is dealt with by the administration in Washington.

We are not in favor of using research centers and other Government facilities to make political payoffs, but if all other standards are going to be disregarded, it is high time for Mayor Daley to remind the administration how the Democrats squeaked into the White House in 1960.

The late President Kennedy carried Illinois by a reported margin of 8,858 votes, and at least that many votes were stolen in Chicago. He carried Texas by a reported margin of 46,233, probably because 100,000 or so votes for Richard Nixon were disqualified by Democratic election officials.

Texas has been rewarded by receiving the multimillion dollar Manned Space Aircraft Center at Houston. Illinois has got nothing. Mayor Daley's influence in Washington seems to be mostly imaginary.

Memorial Trees in Freedom Forest, Israel, in Memory of the Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the officers and members of the Jewish Veterans Association to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, informing her of the planting of 100 trees in the Freedom Forest in Israel in memory of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH VETERANS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., January 1964.

Mrs. JACQUELINE KENNEDY,
Georgetown,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KENNEDY: This organization has planted 100 trees in the Freedom Forest in Israel in memory of your late husband, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our beloved President, who has done so much for mankind and international peace, and who will live forever in our memory.

Very truly,

MORRIS DAHLERBRUCH,
President.

PAULA BADMAN,
President, Ladies Auxiliary.

LEO GOMPERTZ,
Honorary President.

JACK H. HAAS,
Vice Commander.

LEO STOCK,
Secretary.

LEOPOLD LANDENBERGER,
Honorary President.

Memory Day for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a moving communication from Mrs. Dorothy M. Hosey and her fourth grade class at the Delmar Elementary School, Delmar, N.Y.

As the proud grandfather of a little boy in another fourth grade, I am privileged to present the letter from the Delmar children and their teacher. It follows:

DELMAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Delmar, N.Y., February 20, 1964.

Hon. Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN,
Member of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'BRIEN: Mrs. Dorothy M. Hosey, fourth grade teacher in the Delmar Elementary School, and her fourth grade pupils unanimously voted February 19, 1964, that the 88th Congress of these United States of America read into their records for the future and expeditious action the following resolution; namely, that—

"November 22 of each year be set aside as a Memory Day to be observed throughout the Nation in honor of or late and beloved President, leader and friend, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in order that it be—

"A day not of disgrace but a day of honor;

"A day not of sin but of prayerful atonement;

"A day not of desecration but of dedication;

"A day not of destruction but of consecration; and

"A day not of forgetfulness but a day in memory of the life ideals and accomplishments of this fine and good man."

We respectfully request that a copy of this resolution and action thereon be forwarded to the 36 of us at our expense (if necessary) so that we may learn steps that have been taken on this resolution and if it is possible, have it read into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mrs. Dorothy Hosey, the teacher was voted by the class to help draw up this resolution and letter. We thank you Congressman O'BRIEN, for your help. We request that replies to this letter be sent to our teacher, Mrs. Dorothy M. Hosey, in as much as she helped us with this resolution and thought of it and motivated us so please note this in your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully,

Mrs. DOROTHY M. HOSEY
(And her fourth-grade class).

Signatures: Mrs. Dorothy H. Hosey, teacher; Lauren MacGregor, class president, age 9½, Bradely Titus, class vice president, age 9¾, Sally Bowker, class secretary, age 9½, who thought of the name for this day, "Memory Day for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy"; Debbie Rabetz, Susan Dill, Rita Silverman, Raym Garinger, Leonard Angerame, Mark Kenyon, Duncan Martin, David Paquette, Mary Bethe Romango, George Seabury, Stephen Parrott, Rossman, Billy, Barbie Seal, Gispo Linda, Mary Day, Jesse Turner, Edward Mendus, Pat Aiken, Ronnie Edmonds, Kathy Stevens, Michael McAuliffe, Gordon Hamilton, Stephen Gates.

Dangerous Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

DANGEROUS GAMES

Thanks to the interpretations put forward by anonymous officials, the world learns that President Johnson's California speech was "deliberately pregnant with meaning." This meaningfulness will be found down in the middle of the speech in a sentence warning those engaged in aggression in South Vietnam that this activity is a "deeply dangerous game."

Perhaps it was necessary to focus attention on the phrase, and to suggest that it carried a warning to North Vietnam and even to the Red Chinese of dire things to come unless they behave themselves. For threats of this sort have been cheapened by long exposure to them. One can hardly pick up a paper without reading something of the sort from Messrs. Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung or Castro. It even revies memories of "massive retaliation"—a warning that supposedly was pregnant with meaning, but which long since has been all but forgotten.

The thing about this, it seems to us, is that threats are all right—if we mean them. The President's comment, with the benefit of the interpretations, surely will be taken in Saigon as meaning that the United States intends to enlarge the war if necessary to prevent the Communist aggressors from overrunning South Vietnam. But is this really our intention?

Can we hope that the South Vietnam forces, which have so far been unable to take care of themselves on home ground, can carry the war to the enemy? If not, will the Johnson administration, in an election year, commit more American forces to the war? If so, the purpose should be stated in clearer language. If not, then we are guilty of raising hopes which, when disappointed, will

gravely injure that "image" of the United States about which so much has been heard.

We do not believe that the war in South Vietnam has been lost, or that it necessarily will be lost even without major American intervention. The possibility, however, is there, and we must face it. The time may not be far off when we will have to move in with our own forces or see all of our effort, hopes and sacrifices go down the drain. In such a situation, mere threats will not be enough. They must be accompanied by the will to use whatever force is necessary to back them up. If the will is lacking we should not stake our prestige on empty threats. For this, too, is a dangerous game.

Constituent Says To Clean Up Poverty You Must Bend Your Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a letter from one of my good constituents, Mrs. Ray Petroski of Spring Valley, Ill., who most eloquently expresses her feeling that she is fed up with the President's poverty program.

Under pressure from the administration, an effort to give tax relief to needy and deserving college students and their parents was defeated in the Senate. Among those who voted against the bill were Senators who had previously introduced similar bills.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what those Senators, who did not have the courage of their convictions, will tell their constituents, particularly those that think like Mrs. Petroski.

The letter follows:

SPRING VALLEY, ILL.,
February 20, 1964.

Congressman ROBERT MICHEL,
Eighteenth District of Illinois,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I write this letter to you on behalf of my son and daughter who are college students. They were very fortunate in obtaining summer jobs to help further their education. It was a severe blow to them and to us when so much income tax was held from them. Two hundred fourteen dollars was paid in by son; only $84 refunded to him. I need not tell you what that amount of money means to a college student. We are hard working people, ambitious and efficient, striving to better ourselves. Let's stop giving money to people on aid and start making them earn it. Let's stop taking income tax from college students until they have received a bachelor's degree. My son worked as a laborer on construction. Would these people on aid—I call some of them lazy, shiftless bums living on our taxes—take a job as my son did? I need not answer that question, either. The President says we must clean up poverty. All he has to do is hand each one a broom, pick and shovel, and tell them to bend their backs. I do not want to be sarcastic with you but I am angered when I think that my son working his way through college has to pay income tax to aid people too lazy to help themselves. The newspapers are filled with ads seeking workers, but why work when it's handed to you. My four children have earned and paid for every inch of their education, as it should be, along with the little help we can give them. Others could be doing the same, but they are not. We must stop these handouts and help those who help themselves. I know that we'll all be working, all be paying income tax even after this letter is written to you, but I just had to express my feelings.

Yours truly,

MRS. RAY PETROSKI, Sr.

The American Spirit, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a fine speech by a young student in California, Mr. John Keller, entitled, "The American Spirit, 1964." I recommend it highly to the readers of this RECORD:

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT, 1964

(By John Keller)

The headline in Thursday morning's paper read: "Johnson Vows End to Poverty." And he really did. At first, I couldn't help laughing. But after some reflection, it's hard to know whether to laugh or cry. It is the sort of statement one expects to find on the sports page or some other such haven of make believe in modern America. It is the kind of grandstanding boast typical of a Cassius Clay, threatening to KO the 7th Fleet in two rounds, not of a President of the United States.

Perhaps it is enough to say that the statement is patently foolish on its face, and move on. For poverty has been, to a greater or lesser extent, the companion of man since the pride of our first parents defied the will of their Creator. End poverty, indeed. One might just as well take his trusty rifle and aim and fire point blank at original sin.

But there is something more significant and more troubling about a mind and philosophy which could produce such a statement. It reflects either a cynicism so crass that it would trade on the wants and hopes of needy people for political profit, or a naivete so profound as to be dangerous in such a high office.

I don't mean to imply here that I am either campaigning for the perpetuation of poverty, or inveighing against compassion for human suffering. What I am saying is this: Poverty is an unfortunate, but widespread human condition and will not be wiped out by act of Congress, or Executive order, this year or next or in all probability in this century, if indeed ever.

I am saying, furthermore, that those who believe that it can are pursuing an illusion. That illusion is twofold. One part consists of the belief that any human problem can be solved merely by the simple-minded remedy of throwing a little money at it. A lack of money or of a comfortable home are not the only things which make a man poor. And many of the so-called "poor" don't know they are, don't care, haven't the capacity to improve themselves, nor the will if they had.

The second part of this illusion, which is actually a cause of the first, is the belief that man has only material wants and thus can be satisfied with only material solutions. No recognition of psychological, spiritual, or moral needs is shown, no realization even that they do exist.

Unfortunately, the Magi of this illusion, happen also to be the leading intellectuals and political thinkers of our day. Their ideas pervade the very marrow of American thought in our own time.

And that is why, I think, we are witnessing what amounts to a full-scale retreat from reality by the American people with the intellectuals and opinion molders in the vanguard. Having no understanding or conception of it, they can only engage themselves in headlong flight when faced with the deeper mysteries of human nature.

That is why, for example, we have the spectacle of Howard K. Smith in a state of psychological disintegration when contemplating two murders in 3 days.

"Heads of state just aren't assassinated in Western Europe," he moans. And with one anguished phrase this Oxford graduate obliterated from the pages of history the executions of Charles II and Mary, Queen of Scots, the War of the Roses, the entire French Revolution, the assassination which began World War I, various attempts on the lives of such men as Adolf Hitler and Charles de Gaulle and some 20 centuries of bloody conflict on that sorry continent.

We are presented, further, with the phenomenon of our Chief Justice publicly laying the blame for our national tragedy on his own political enemies before the facts were known and after the facts were known and proven to be just the opposite of what he charged. It was as if he had prepared for that moment long and hard and could not bear to leave all that good material unused.

What is most deplorable, however, is that millions of Americans still believe him. And they believe him because they want to believe him, they have let themselves be conditioned to believing such things.

And why? Because for too many there is nothing else left to believe, except what they want to. We are a nation whose moral compass has been badly damaged. Our universities, our press, our most respected thinkers and leaders have spent the last four decades flushing out every trace of individual responsibility and direction, every nonmaterial aspect of human life. And we are left with a desire to believe, but nothing to believe in, a need to worship but only emptiness to fulfill it.

For it is not emptiness that causes a people to defy their national leader and react as if they had been deprived of salvation when, like other men, his time comes.

Someone once said that the opposite of love was, not hate, but indifference. I think perhaps that the opposite of morality is, not immorality, but none at all, a kind of moral nonalinement. And that is where I think we find ourselves today.

It has for some time been my belief that the fact of America during the 1930's mirrored the soul of America during the 1920's. What, then, I wonder, can we say of the future, and of the soul, the once noble spirit of America today?

When half of the world languishes in slavery and we break bread with their masters.

When our most idolized actress is a woman whose most notable achievement is the destruction of two homes and six marriages and whose respect for human love and the happiness of others is on a par with that of a 3-year-old child.

When our press searches hungrily in the dark corners of our legislatures for a domestic Christine Keeler. And finds her.

When our Government courts the favor of tyrants and international gangsters and betrays trusting allies into the hands of murderers.

When our people have the gall to speak of "peace and prosperity," while the world is in flames and human freedom is threatened with extinction.

Our national tragedy, our national shame is not that John F. Kennedy was murdered in Dallas on November 22, tragic though that is. Our national tragedy is that the President of the United States was struck down by the henchman of an alien, a hostile ideology, and the American people haven't the moral fortitude to do anything but replace Benjamin Franklin on the 50-cent piece.

Is Era Ending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Newburgh News of Newburgh, N.Y., in my district, gives a very true picture of what a great many people in my district, in my State, and in our country, are thinking.

Mr. Speaker, we believe, and we are sure, that this is a proud people and we do not wish to continue to play the role of Pinwheel Pete or of "He Who Gets Slapped." Patience is a great virtue, but patience will not last forever, nor can we endure humiliation indefinitely.

The editorial follows:

IS ERA ENDING?

History has a way of looking back at certain centuries or eras and dubbing them appropriately—the Golden Age of Pericles, the Renaissance, etc.

Without waiting for history, we nominate this as the Era of American Patience.

Never before in the history of mankind has a great nation, seeking only to do the right thing, quietly tolerated year after year of insults, threats, slanders, small wars, and murderous provocations.

We have turned the cheek so many times that Uncle Sam could be renamed Pinwheel Pete.

Our embassies have been bombed or burned from Cyprus to South America to Indonesia.

The record shows planned murders of Americans in Africa, senseless and anti-American rioting in Panama, vilification in Ghana, repetitive threats of a nuclear showdown from Russia, assembly line efforts by Cuba to inspire revolutions with America as the whipping boy, a back of the hand from Britain which is doing business with Cuba, a back of the hand from France which is doing business with Cuba and Red China, and now finally Cuba's vicious prodding in shutting off water to the Guantanamo Naval Base.

Let it be interpolated here that Guantanamo is not in itself a crisis; by reserve supplies and by tankers it can get what water it needs.

But the disturbing possibility now—and you hear it from normally quiet people—is that Americans may be getting fed up.

Can't our enemies, and our alleged friends, see this? Can't they see that in a democratic form of government, a public tired of global abuse and small-scale murder can vote into power men who will end the Era of American Patience?

Can't they understand that the brilliant struggle of America to preserve unity, and thus to bring about peace on earth, is the only reason why American patience exists? For if it becomes even more apparent than it is now that unity is collapsing, America will feel free to act unilaterally and strongly, instead of turning the other cheek.

After the tragic death of President Kennedy and the sure-handed takeover by President Johnson, there was a feeling in the Nation there wouldnt' be much of an election race; Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S conservative stock dropped sharply. But the other day, to cheering rallies in New Hampshire, the Arizona Senator said he was sick and tired of having the American flag spat upon; that if Castro doesn't turn on the (water) tap at Guantanamo, we should send a detachment of Marines in to do it.

There is most definitely the making of a tough election race.

And world conditions created by thoughtless friends and savagely cocky enemies are causing it.

If there is to be an easing of the world scene, somebody other than Uncle Sam—or Pinwheel Pete—should move quickly.

Arizona's Outstanding Public Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, sweeping and general attacks on this Nation's public employment services ought to be condemned. If there are instances in which agencies are functioning poorly then they should be subjected to specific criticism. But it is a disservice to castigate by blanket criticisms the many fine men and women working in our public employment agencies.

In my own State of Arizona we pride ourselves on the excellence of our adjunct of the U.S. Employment Service. Over the years the Arizona State Employment Service has earned a reputation for excellence. It has shown skill and initiative in serving both workers and management and in working for the general improvement and development of the State's economy.

I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the February 17, 1964, edition of the Casa Grande Dispatch, a fine community-minded paper owned and edited by Mr. Donovan Kramer:

A GOOD RECORD

If every Government agency operated with the efficiency and dedication of the Arizona Employment Service, taxpayers would be better served, at less expense. We know of no other State which maintains such an excellent agency to aid in the employment of unemployed workers.

The Casa Grande office is a fine example. Its personnel are constantly working to find positions for applicants, and go to considerable efforts to test them, to make sure the applicants are qualified for the positions. Office personnel inquire of prospective employers, and take an interest in the problems of those seeking work.

When an employer needs personnel, the employment office intelligently tests and scans prospective applicants.

When a worker is not entitled to unemployment compensation, the Arizona Employment Office is faithful to the spirit of the law, and refuses to grant "rocking chair" money for those who do not deserve it.

Unfortunately, in many States, citizens are not so fortunate as we are here in Arizona. In some places, the employment office has become in many ways a headquarters for an easy handout.

Unemployed find it easier to stay on the dole than to go out and get a job. If they do work, they will only accept cash, so they can continue to illegally draw their unemployment compensation.

Self-respect goes down the drain, while the State's reserve fund is dribbled away to the undeserving. Employers' taxes rise, to keep the State's fund at a safe level.

Last week, the Arizona Employment Service prosecuted an Eloy resident who was acquiring unemployment compensation illegally.

It is plain that the Arizona Employment Service is an agency to help find work for those needing it, and helping employers find the right worker.

The office has repeatedly proven that its duties are performed in a professional manner, with an eye to the best interests of all, employee, employer, and taxpayer. Such an enlightened viewpoint is an asset to Arizona's growth.

A Man To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on George Washington which appeared in the New York Journal-American under the syndicated column of Walter Winchell. This is a different type of column in that it goes into the basic character of George Washington and does not particularly wave the flag in the general way that so many editorials did last Friday.

Walter Winchell lays it on the line when he says that Washington was "the target of venomous opposition during his lifetime," and puts to rest the implication that George Washington had complete support of all factions during his two-term tenure. He goes on to highlight the fact that George Washington did not believe a third term was improper, a violation of the Constitution, or not in accord with the Founding Fathers' ideas.

I commend to your reading this down-to-earth, realistic portrait of our first President:

A MAN TO REMEMBER

George Washington's appointment to command the Yankee Doodle forces was dictated more by geography than military acumen. The choice was chiefly the consequence of political expediency. The South was generally reluctant to support the Revolution. Hence an influential Dixie citizen was chosen for the high position in an effort to unify the colonies. Such are the vagaries of history. Washington's acceptance speech was notable for his simple humility. He declared that he was not equal to the demands of the faith placed in him and feared "my flesh might fail under some unlucky event."

His purity of patriotism has never been equaled and his courage was above reproach. Nevertheless, Washington's fine simplicities

failed to guarantee immunity from the savagery of politics. He was stunned and baffled by hypocrisy and deceit. When a man's character is measured by the peaks of mountains, he cannot descend to the muddy depths.

Physically impressive, he looked like a general should look. Washington was 6 feet 3, weighed over 200, was broad shouldered and muscular. His complexion was fair and his eyes piercing blue. His wisdom far exceeded his formal education, which was limited. He was tutored for a few years in reading, writing, and geography. His education ended when he was 16 and he went off to the wild West as a surveyor's assistant.

He became Chief Executive amid the earnest acclaim of his countrymen. The singing quality of the high honor (as Washington's successors learned) marks the overture for the solemn beat of harsh realities. The fierce disputes over the Constitution's ratification left burning scars. The controversy incited by the French Revolution and the Jay Treaty rocked the Nation. And there was violent opposition to the whisky tax. It is difficult to imagine that the man who achieved an exalted position in history was the target of venomous opposition during his lifetime. He was denounced at mass meetings and there was one assassination attempt. One paper even forged letters in an attempt to embarrass him.

A man of immense dignity—he refused to shake hands during his 8 years in office. He felt such a gesture of familiarity was beneath the Presidency. He always bowed instead. However, there were times when his profound dignity cracked. Henry Knox (Washington's Secretary of War) has described the President's private reaction to abusive press campaigns: "The President was much inflamed; got into one of those passions when he cannot command himself; ran on—much on the personal abuse which had been bestowed on him; defied any man on earth to produce one single act of his since he had been in the Government which was not done on the purest motives and that by God he had rather be in his own grave than in his present position."

Washington did not believe a third term was improper or a violation of the Constitution. The bitterly partisan conflicts, the pretentious frauds, the ingrates—these were the sources of his decision to retire. He called in Editor D. C. Claypoole to announce his decision. Claypoole didn't rush into print with his historic scoop. It took over a week for the big news to reach type—when his paper published Washington's Farewell Address.

The amazing extent of the ill feeling toward Washington can be estimated by the following: When a Congressional committee sought to draft a polite reply to his Farewell Address, numerous dissenters refused to vote their thanks. They utilized the occasion to renew and intensify their attacks against the retired Chief Executive.

A glacial exterior created the impression that he was beyond human frailties. A reading of his private correspondence indicates that the adversities of war frequently tested his iron will. He was no stranger to heartbreak. When victory seemed unattainable, he wrote: "The reflection upon my situation, and that of this army, produces many an uneasy hour. Few people know the predicament we are in, on a thousand accounts—fewer still will believe, if any disaster happens to these lines, from what cause it flows."

When he embraced the serenity of Mount Vernon, Washington began his historic journey to the viewless heights. The personal criticism soon subsided and destiny started to fulfill the magnificent vows. Before he passed, Washington was comforted by the knowledge that he would represent a pinnacle of American history. His last words were: "I die hard." And he was right. For he still lives.

Bracero Anecdote, 1964: Salute to California Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that nearly 2 months of the 2d session of the 88th Congress has expired and there is yet to be introduced a bill in the Congress to extend the bracero internation worker program beyond December 31, 1964.

Representatives from user agricultural areas have exercised commendable restraight in abating the introduction of legislation in this subject area. We are motivated, no doubt, by the projected will of a majority of the Congress.

Based on a desire to cooperate with the Congress, the Council of California Growers last week went on record to the effect that the growers this year would not seek an extension of Public Law 78, but would exert every diligent cooperative effort looking forward to complete utilization of our domestic labor supply.

Perhaps the growers will be successful. Perhaps they will have to come back to the Congress in a later year to exact our support for a supplemental labor force once again. Be it remembered then that they exercised restraint, cooperation, and economic sacrifice in 1964.

The news release respecting the growers position and the statement of grower's president, John V. Newman, follow:

SACRAMENTO.—Representatives of California agriculture today announced that they have no intention of seeking another extension of Public Law 78—the bracero program—beyond its present expiration on December 31 of this year.

At the same time, spokesman John V. Newman asked the State board of agriculture to lend its support in promoting a series of immediate State studies of the problems which will arise from the abandonment of the bracero program.

Newman told the board that agriculture has decided to accept the end of the bracero program because of the facts of life. These, said Newman, included agriculture's recognition of what is reported to be the will of the American people as expressed by Members of Congress—and, the serious unemployment situation which exists throughout California and the Nation."

In place of the bracero program, he said California farmers intend to embark upon a massive intra- and interstate domestic recruitment program for qualified agricultural workers. He said agriculture hopefully will seek to more fully utilize the talents of qualified unemployed by finding them gainful employment in agriculture.

At the same time, Newman pointed out to the board that there are a number of ponderous problems which will require assistance in seeking solutions. He asked the State board to urge the Governor to help in the establishment of studies to determine:

1. The actual number of farmworkers needed in California on a county-by-county, crop-by-crop, month-by-month basis.

2. The projected rate of mechanization to determine the length of time these jobs will be available before they are replaced by machines.

3. The number of men and women, throughout California and the Nation, qualified, willing, and able to perform the temporary farm jobs available.

4. The wages, housing, transportation, and other requirements which these men and women feel they would have to have before filling these farm jobs.

5. The statewide need for family housing, school, health, welfare, and other facilities to accommodate this new California work force and their dependents.

Finally, Newman asked the board to aid in a study of agriculture's ability to meet the additional costs that might arise from this program.

He reinforced his request to the board with the statement that agriculture is the prime industry in California. He added that the Nation also has a stake in the well-being of California agriculture inasmuch as the State provides about a quarter of all the Nation's table foods including nearly half of the vegetables, fruits, and nuts.

Newman told the board that the program of recruitment was not something planned for the future. He pointed out that the citrus industry of the State has been operating a domestic recruitment program for several months. As the other crops are ready for harvest, he said, the recruitment program will intensify. He therefore urged the State department of employment to step up its screening of both urban and rural unemployed to determine their willingness, qualifications, and availability for temporary farm labor.

"We believe that California must have a supplemental labor program to continue in agriculture," Newman told the board. "In the past we have depended upon the excellent bracero program. Now we must turn to something else, so we are going to seek to find our supplemental workers among those farmworkers who customarily work in other States, as well as our qualified industrial unemployed."

TEXT OF STATEMENT OF JOHN V. NEWMAN TO CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 17, 1964

Mr. President and members of the State board of agriculture, today I have the honor—and the grave responsibility—of bringing to you a matter which we believe is of the greatest importance. It is of importance not only to agriculture—our No. 1 industry—but to every segment of our economy. As a matter of fact, we believe it is of concern to every citizen of this Nation.

I have been granted the privilege today of speaking for California agriculture in making a declaration of policy. We also have a series of recommendations upon which we sincerely hope you will act today—and we urge you to recommend to Governor Brown at the earliest possible moment.

This declaration of policy is based upon a number of facts we have analyzed carefully. These facts lead us to believe that an extension of Public Law 78—the bracero program—is not in the cards.

As realists, we must accept this fact—but we should make one thing clear. We do not believe that California agriculture can continue to produce the present volume of the highest quality food—as we now are—without some kind of supplementary labor. Therefore, this statement of policy is in no way a repudiation of the bracero program—nor of any other supplementary program. It is a recognition of what has been stated to be the will of the people as expressed by Members of Congress.

This statement we are about to make is based on more than political realism. It is based on another fact of life—the serious unemployment situation which exists in California as well as the rest of the Nation.

With this as a preface, therefore, California agriculture today would like to place itself on record as:

1. Announcing that we cannot now see any great value in seeking or supporting the extension of Public Law 78 beyond December 31, 1964—or hope for any other foreign labor program.

2. Promising that it will embark immediately on a massive domestic recruitment program in the sincere hope of filling the void created by the loss of the bracero program with qualified domestic farmworkers.

3. Urging the unequivocal support of this board for the program and requesting your assistance in urging upon the Governor administration support for the program and the necessary studies which must accompany it.

We believe there are two major problems which must be solved. These problems are—and should be—of concern to all people; not only in California but throughout the United States.

First, of course, is the problem of unemployment.

Second, is the problem of filling California's farm labor needs.

Solution of the first problem means maximum utilization of our greatest resource—our people—and elimination of the pockets of urban and rural poverty to which President Johnson and Governor Brown so often refer.

Solution of the second problem is necessary because of the vital role which agriculture plays in the economy of California. It is the State's greatest single source of new wealth.

But, in addition, it has a national impact. It supplies 43 percent of the Nation's vegetables; 42 percent of the Nation's entire supply of fruits and nuts; or, more than 25 percent of the national supply of table food.

We hope that we can accomplish both objectives by matching farm jobs in California with men and women from the Nation's unemployed ranks who are qualified farmworkers and are able and willing to fill these jobs.

We pledge our support to this program and we invite all other Americans of good will to join us.

However, to insure the success of such a program, we need facts—facts which presently are unavailable. Indeed, they are facts agriculture would be unable to compile by itself.

For this reason, we request your help. We ask you to adopt our schedule of proposed studies and that you urge them upon the Governor and his administration as necessary for the survival of our No. 1 industry.

We believe the studies are of such importance that they should be allocated prime priority. We believe that the facts determined will be of such impact that they should be widely distributed upon completion of the studies.

The studies fall into two general categories:

1. The source of potential farmworkers and the number needed; and

2. The preparations which the State must make to welcome these people to our population.

In category 1, we believe the following are vital:

1. A study to determine the actual number of farmworkers needed in California county by county, crop by crop, month by month, to determine exactly the number and type of jobs that must be filled and the duration of employment involved. In addition, because of the distinct possibility that the number of jobs will decline as agricultural mechanization develops, it is considered imperative that this study also include a mechanization survey so that accurate projections can be made concerning the agricultural job opportunities available in agriculture in 1965, 1966, 1967, and for the following 6 or 7 years.

2. (a) A statewide study to determine the number of men and women who are willing, qualified and able to perform the various types of agricultural labor involved (e.g., hoeing, thinning, irrigating, pruning, harvesting, etc.). We urge that this study include all Californians presently drawing unemployment insurance, relief and welfare payments, etc., and that all such individuals also indicate the agricultural areas of the State to which they would travel for agricultural work; estimates as to their transportation and housing requirements and the wages at which they would be willing to perform this work. We also strongly urge that this study also include a thorough review of existing laws, interpretations of law and/or regulations which may have the effect of limiting employment opportunities for individuals who would like to obtain gainful temporary employment but are now prohibited or restricted from doing so.

(b) In view of the possibility that an insufficient number of qualified Californians could be found in time to fill the agricultural jobs that must be filled by the expiration of the bracero program at the end of this year, we also make the following request as part and parcel of this statewide employment study.

We urge that Governor Brown advise President Johnson of California's desire to provide gainful employment to all qualified farmworkers who desire such employment. We further urge that the Governor request the President to authorize a similar study—throughout the other 49 States—to determine how many unemployed workers and their families are willing to come to California to fill these necessary farm labor jobs; the wages and type of family housing they would require as well as a reasonable estimate of their travel needs.

3. To enable the Governor and his cabinet to better evaluate the results of the studies called for above, we also request that a thorough survey be made to determine the economic capabilities of California agriculture insofar as wage paying ability is concerned for growers of various crops in the various areas of the State.

It is further urged that in conducting this survey California's competitive situation with other States and other nations be kept constantly in mind.

This brings us to the second category of studies which are imperative in order to provide all of the information which the public, Government, and agriculture must have in order to solve these pressing problems. The studies in this category are necessary if we are to avoid the possibility of creating new pockets of poverty here in California * * * and if we are to make certain that California's farmworkers are cared for as it would appear the American public feels they must be cared for, be they from California originally or those families who move here from other States. These studies are as follows:

1. A study to determine the amount of family housing which will be required to accommodate the workers and their families. We believe that such a study should include information as to (a) estimated length of occupancy per year; (b) the possible inclusion of family facilities for cannery workers as well as fieldworkers and their families; (c) the types of housing, e.g. apartment type units, single or duplex dwellings, fixed versus mobile, etc. And, of course, the cost of construction for such facilities on a statewide basis. We would also strongly suggest that this study include a thorough analysis of existing housing rules and regulations which may have to be revised or modified depending on the results of the initial phases of this study.

2. A study to pinpoint the number and cost of classrooms and teachers required to provide the children of our new California farmworkers with the same type of education other California children receive.

3. A study to reveal the anticipated welfare costs which must be taken into consideration and planned for in recognition of two important facts: (a) That agriculture is a seasonal industry; and (b) that, unlike supplementary foreign workers (braceros) who returned to their homes in Mexico and elsewhere when the work was completed, our new domestic work force will remain in California throughout the year. Therefore, in addition to participating in the study, it would appear as if the State as well as the county boards of supervisors should begin now to make plans to receive and properly accommodate those workers and their families who will be coming into the area to assist in the harvesting of our crops.

While these studies are underway, we assure you that agriculture will press forward vigorously with its domestic recruiting program both in California and outside. At the same time, we further request that you—through the Governor—request the department of employment also to intensify its already extensive recruiting and screening program, concentrating even greater efforts in areas of urban unemployment as well as rural areas throughout California. This includes a stepped-up program of screening urban residents to determine their willingness and qualifications for temporary farmwork.

With the encouragement we know we will get from you and the Governor, we are sure we can interest county boards of supervisors in making plans to prevent a recurrence of the unhappy events of the middle 1930's.

We are sincere, gentlemen. We will do our part and we welcome your thoughts, suggestions, and guidance.

We are determined to exercise every tool available to us to develop—for California—a labor force to replace the bracero. And in so doing, make certain that the type of program outlined is not only necessary—but that it is practical as well. For the last thing that anyone wants is a "grapes of wrath, 1965" and beyond.

Appalachia Plan Gets County OK

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit an article from the February 20 edition of the Prince George's Enquirer-Gazette, published in Upper Marlboro, Md. This article includes a resolution adopted by the county commissioners commending President Johnson for his program to aid the poverty-stricken Appalachian region. The Prince George's County commissioners deserve credit for recognizing the importance of this program to Maryland and other States in the Appalachian region. The text of the article follows:

APPALACHIA PLAN GETS COUNTY OK

(By Del Malkie)

The Board of Commissioners of Prince George's County this week issued a proclamation commending the action being taken by President Johnson in his proposed program of action to alleviate problems facing the poverty-stricken Appalachian region, which includes portions of Maryland.

Commissioner Robert F. Sutphin made the motion that the commissioners support the President's much needed action saying "This is a great step forward and would have con-

siderable impact on Maryland as well as other States involved in the region."

The motion read as follows:

"Whereas the President of the United States has recognized one of the most critical problems facing the Nation and the State of Maryland; and

"Whereas the President has put into motion efforts to evaluate and attack the problem of the blighted and in some cases poverty-stricken areas in the Appalachian region extending from Pennsylvania into the State of Alabama; and

"Whereas several counties in the State of Maryland, particularly those in the western part of the State, may well be substantially assisted by means of this proposed program of evaluation and assistance; and

"Whereas there are certain people in the State of Maryland and elsewhere, aspiring to public office who have been and are criticizing the President for taking the initiative in putting this worthwhile and needed program into action: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Prince Georges County, Md., That President Lyndon B. Johnson, and the administrative branch of the Federal Government be commended for putting into action this much needed program, which we feel contains the sentiments of the vast majority of the citizens of this area. We further encourage and urge the President to go forward with this project as expeditiously as possible.

"Dated this 18th day of February 1964, at Upper Marlboro, Md.

"M. BAYNE BROOKE,
"Chairman pro tempore, Board of County Commissioners, Prince Georges County, Md.

"Attest:

"D. LEONARD DYER,
"Clerk."

Representative Steed Suggests "A Diferent Look at the Home Rule Question"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, proposals for varying degrees of home rule for the District of Columbia have been the subject of discussion in the House on many occasions during the past several years, and the issue is one which holds a continuing interest for many Members. Since the amount and kind of home rule to be authorized has never been stabilized by agreement among several contending elements, and the subject is open to discussion, I am pleased to offer for consideration a provocative appraisal from the gentleman from Oklahoma, Representative TOM STEED, my distinguished colleague on the Appropriations Committee, as published in the February issue of Washington magazine:

Do the residents of the District of Columbia really want the same right to vote and self-government that all other citizens enjoy?

Or, is the current pressure for home rule really a movement inspired by selfish interest groups who use the voteless status argument as a smokescreen?

The answers to these questions must be determined before any effective understanding or proper decision can be made on today's governmental problem in this unparalleled political subdivision of the United States, officially created as the District of Columbia and commonly recognized as the city of Washington.

The Founding Fathers created the District as a home for the Federal Government, apart and away from the powers and influences of the several States. A Federal City meeting these needs and requirements and a city of Washington governed by its citizens can be created. To do this, a curtailment of that area which includes only the Federal City would have to be approved, with the remainder of what is now part of the District being returned to the State of Maryland.

Full voting rights for the residents of the District as it now stands would not place these residents on an equal footing with other American voters. It would give them superrights. It would leave the imbalance of voting privilege as badly out of balance as is presently the case.

Cutting the Federal City down to that area known as Capitol Hill, with some additional area covering the major part of the Federal building complex which includes the White House, would accomplish all restorations of citizenship rights that can be legally and fairly espoused.

This reduction of the Federal City to an area in which all property is owned by the Federal Government, and in which no private citizens can reside, would simplify the matter of governing and regulating the Federal City as an independent home for the President, the Congress, and the Supreme Court, and would leave the remainder free to grow and develop in the same manner as is now possible and available to all other metropolitan areas in the United States.

Under no system of government can the needs of the metropolitan area be met so long as the imaginary line of the District boundary continues to serve as an unbridgeable barrier to a comprehensive area government.

The District and its immediate environs are so bound together economically that this political wall will forever act as a crippling barrier until it is removed.

Under the existing situation there can never be proper planning and administration of such community needs as fire protection, police, transportation, education, and all the other major necessities for a large municipal entity.

The District of Columbia government, under the present system and under all others attempted in the past, is by necessity a combination of a municipality, a county, and a State. None of the checks and balances which exist throughout the States can be enjoyed in the District.

In a politically chosen system of government, the same bosses and forces that would control the city hall, would control the county and State levels. That is not so in the States, even in those having the largest metropolitan areas. Not to have these balances and restraints would automatically lead to chaos, controversy, mismanagement, and all the other ills that a political action can generate.

Until about 70 years ago, the District had home rule. Several varieties were attempted. The record shows that all were failures. The same factors that caused the failure of home rule in the earlier days of District history still exist and will as surely bring about failure of any home rule plan that can be adopted now as it did to all those attempted in those earlier years. Any student of the history of the District would have to come to this conclusion.

Removing of the District line would enable the city of Washington to be incorporated under Maryland law with its boundaries expanding to whatever extent its governmental needs required. It would truly become a self-governed municipality, with its citizens having the same rights and privileges of all other Americans.

The remaining Federal City, having no problem of private land ownership or residence to bother with, would present no problems of government or administration. The courts and the Congress would remain away and apart from the control of any State or local governing force. The "man on the white horse" could not bar the doors and invoke dictatorship as has been feared, and which fear caused the Founding Fathers to create the District in the first place.

These are commonsense and realistic factors, which history already teaches us should be considered. Whether they ever are adopted will depend upon the proper answer to the first two questions raised at the beginning of this statement.

If equality with all the remainder of the United States is not the objective, the other arguments and reasons for home rule are not worthy of the risks involved to adopt them. Adoption of home rule on the watered down and diluted basis now pending would at best merely be swapping present ills for a new set of ills.

Decline and Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS G. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against tax reduction when it was before the House. I voted against the conference report today. Essentially, my reasons are very simple. As a Nation, we can no more have our cake and eat it too than we can as individuals. In good times this country should conserve its strength and operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. Tax reduction is completely incompatible with such a goal.

Speaking of goals, I sought election to Congress hoping that it would be possible to help put this country on a sound course of real leadership and strength. However, there has been little of either in any of the administration's handling of domestic or foreign crises since the 88th Congress was convened. Politically inspired tax reduction is fiscal weakness just as selling wheat on credit to Communists is a national weakness and the Bobby Baker scandals evidence corruption reaching to the core of the American Government.

As May Craig so well writes in her critical look at America appearing in this week's U.S. News & World Report, unless there is once again a devotion to strength and principle in this land we of the present generation are living witnesses to the decline and fall of the American Republic.

I commend Mrs. Craig's "Critical Look at America" to the serious reading of all citizens:

A WOMAN WRITER TAKES A CRITICAL LOOK AT AMERICA

Unless there is a change, deep down, in the American people, a genuine crusade against self-indulgence, immorality, public and private, then we are witnesses to the decline and fall of the American Republic.

Death on the highways, a pack a day, cheating from top to bottom in our society, get rich quick, breakup of the family, fal-

tering in foreign policy, reckless debt—these have destroyed nations before us. Why should we think we can take that path and change history?

Look around you, and everywhere you see lack of principle and steadfastness in the right and brave. The disgraceful cover on the recent issue of a publication with a nationwide circulation and its palliating story of sexual immorality adds adult consent to the looseness of our youth, already far down the road of delinquency, shiftlessness, derogation of virginity in our girls who will be the mothers of tomorrow.

There is no financial morality in our Government—"Charge it," is the accepted practice.

Round the world they think they can take our money with one hand and slap us in the face with the other. We talk of our leadership, but we are apparently incapable of giving leadership.

One listens with dismay to the campaigning for the Presidency that is going on. Oh, for a crusader to call us back to dignity and strength and austerity.

What was that last word? "Austerity"—plain living and high thinking, putting our money into the real things of life, not mink-handled saucepans and three cars in every garage; public servants who are not Bobby Bakers. Schools for the young, care for the elderly, strength so that none will dare attack us, a worthy succession to those men with feet wrapped in bloody bandages at Valley Forge to give us liberty. How have we used the liberty they bought for us so dearly?

Because it is unpleasant to think of unpleasant things, we say the Soviet Union may be changing its determination to bury us. Red China is bad, of course, but maybe not Khrushchev. Halfheartedly we send American men to die in jungles, where we do not have the guts to go in to win or to stay out.

We sell wheat to Russia to save her from a demonstration that communism cannot produce enough food for its own people. If we do this to get rid of surplus wheat, which we have already subsidized and which we will subsidize again to give it to the Communists cheaper, we might try discouraging the production of surplus wheat and remember the old-fashioned private enterprise where one grows for the market, not the Government storage bins.

We faltered in Cuba and now she is the homeland of subversion of all Latin America and Africa. Where will we find a strong man to lead us? Would we vote for one if he campaigned, crying in the wilderness that we come and be saved—from ourselves? We could have saved Cuba for freedom, and saved ourselves and the rest of Latin America from this nest of communism, but we did not. Around the world they do not believe what we say; they look at what we do.

The United Nations was founded in this country. Now it is a messy combination of polyglot nations, old and new, grabbing for our money and ignoring our halfhearted arguments.

The idea of letting in a small nation of fewer than a half million people, utterly inexperienced in governing itself, unproved as a stable, honest state—letting them in within a few days of their establishment. We might at least insist on a period of probation.

The United Nations itself should be forced into financial honesty by the United States refusing to keep on paying the bills while many get a free ride while outvoting us. The idea of letting in Red China in the face of the charter which says, "peace-loving nations." True, we are against letting Red China in, but all we do is get out our handkerchiefs and weep into them while the majority in the U.N. does as it pleases.

We waste untold sums on useless defense, and fail to keep ourselves truly strong in all fields, to be able to fight small as well as missile wars.

We sign test ban treaties with known enemies, known defaulters on treaties, that we will not test as we may need to. Why should we put our defense in such an agreement? If our defense experts—not businessman McNamara (Secretary of Defense)—say we need to test, then let us test without asking permission of friend or foe.

We fiddle-faddle in southeast Asia, and may be ignominiously pushed out. Maybe we should never have gone in there—let the Reds take it—but there is one thing for sure: If we go in anywhere, we should go in to win.

We are losing the respect of the world, and respect is more necessary to a nation, as to a person, than affection. We get little affection from the people we have helped over the years—and we are losing respect.

Nobody respects a fumbler, a weak man, a wobbler, in policy or deeds.

First, every one of us has to clean out weakness and selfishness and immorality of all types. Then choose leaders who with strength and principle and intelligence will lead us to where we can have self-respect and respect of others.

Would we elect such a man if he campaigned on such a platform?

Risks in the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago the highly respected newspaper, the New York Times, ran an editorial pointing up the dangers of a tax cut. I subscribe fully to what the editorial says and commend its attention to the House:

RISKS IN THE ECONOMY

President Johnson's election-year budget manages to contain something for everybody: tax cuts for consumers and businessmen, lower spending for conservatives, an antipoverty program for liberals. In his anxiety to fashion a package that could gain quick acceptance and enable the economy to scale new peaks, the President is taking a big gamble. He sacrifices moderation and runs the risk of destabilization that is associated with lofty heights.

There is no immediate threat of a fall. With the pace of business activity quickening, the one big danger lies in rushing ahead too fast. Mr. Johnson proposes tax cuts for 1964 that are the biggest single reduction in history. His economic projections assume that this immoderate dose can only benefit the economy. Without it he warns of a recession; with it he sees the upsurge reaching new high ground but still a long way from real trouble.

Presidents have been all too fallible as economic prophets. The rise in business activity last year, for example, exceeded the upper limits of the forecast made by the White House, which had anticipated a tax cut in its projection. Mr. Johnson gives himself an even wider margin for error, but his range of predictions fails to take into account that the tax cuts could produce inflationary pressures and other excesses.

The President counseled against unwarranted wage or price increases. But there is a definite conflict between his plan to relax the tax brake holding down the private sector and his desire for restraint. Mr. Johnson appears to have ruled out the use of a more restrictive monetary policy unless the situation is clearly out of hand; similarly, he is unlikely to resort to the tactics used by his predecessor in dealing with the steel industry in 1962, which proved so unsettling. So if the altitude provokes dizziness, the administration is without a safety belt.

The economy may somehow sit through 1964 unscathed, but then the budget calls for a rapid withdrawal of stimulants. The expansionary impact of tax reductions will be fading just when spending is scheduled to be cut back. If that happened when the economy needed a second wind, it could result in a long, hard drop.

Aggressive risks are called for when the economy is in the throes of a recession or if it is afflicted with serious imbalance. Neither situation applies today. The climb toward new noninflationary peaks demands prudence, and good timing, in reducing spending and taxes alike.

Civilian International Pays Tribute to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, each year at the Washington Tomb at Mount Vernon, Va., in my congressional district, representatives of Civitan International pay a tribute to George Washington and other of the Nation's founders.

On Sunday, February 16, 1964, the president of Civitan International, Mr. Louis M. Hopping of Detroit, Mich., acted as spokesman for his organization.

Mr. Hopping's speech is one in which I believe my congressional colleagues will find much of value, and I, therefore, am pleased to include in this RECORD the entire article from the Alexandria Gazette of February 18, concerning this event:

NATIONAL CREDIT PRESERVATION IS URGED

Louis M. Hopping, of Detroit, Mich., president of Civitan International urged Americans to preserve the national credit by avoiding greater accumulation of public debt as he presented the service group's annual tribute to George Washington and others of the Nation's founders Sunday afternoon. He was speaking at Civitan's annual pilgrimage to the Washington Tomb at Mount Vernon and making its major plea of the year for responsible citizenship.

The Civitan chief united with his fellows of the Chesapeake districts and the host Civitan Club of Mount Vernon in the tribute to the Nation's first President and general. He quoted from Washington's oft-repeated words in his plea for a fiscally responsible government and against the current huge accumulations of national and other public debt, urging shunning of "the occasions of expense" cited by Washington that promoted that debt.

President Hopping also laid Civitan International's memorial wreath at Washington's bier. He preceded the Chesapeake district's governor, A. Joseph Czillich, of Trenton, N.J., and President John E. Vest of the Mount Vernon club in the laying of three wreaths that were Civitan's symbolic tribute.

The Mount Vernon club's famous youth group, the Mount Vernon Guard, led a procession of Civitans representing international, district, and a number of individual clubs from Mount Vernon's main gate to the tomb. Garbed as Revolutionary marines such as Washington used in his Presidency as an honor guard, with colors and fife and drum music, the guard led the procession to the tomb. It provided incidental music during the program, closing it with "Taps." The Reverend Bruce H. Campbell, of St. Mark's Episcopal Church gave the invocation and benediction.

After the program most of the assemblage were led by the guard to the Mount Vernon mansion, where they were guests of Director C. C. Wall, for a tour of Washington's beloved home. The Civitan International leader and other visitors participating in the annual tribute were guests of the Mount Vernon club at the Walnut Room, Thompson's Corner Restaurant, for dinner in the evening.

President Hopping's address at the tomb, which he titled "Mount Vernon Soliloquy," follows:

"General George Washington lives here. He was President of the United States of America from 1789 until the end of his second term 8 years later. This country place became his home in 1752. However, he has had to spend so much time in public service in the legislature and in the Army that he could not enjoy the peace and quiet of these Virginia hills as frequently and as fully as he wished he might.

"The general is at home today. He came down from the Capital to be with his family and friends. We are here to pay a brief, friendly visit to General Washington in honor of his birthday. He was born in 1732, so he would be 232. We have presented a wreath as a humble token of our esteem and respect for him.

"The general is seemingly enjoying a quiet period after a very busy season, so it is not our wish to disturb him. He has invited his fellow Americans to visit him. We are honored to be able to share the hospitality of his home, and the inspiration of his presence, although we may not expect that he will enter into the conversation today. He has written many letters, some of which are of a public nature, and has thoughtfully left some of these letters for us to read. By doing so, we can inform ourselves as to his thoughts and advice on some of the important public issues.

"The senior members of the family call our host by his given name, George, but, of course, the younger members of the family and the neighbors do not allow themselves such undue familiarity. They refer to him as Mr. Washington, but in every reference to him one can detect the deep affection for the man, as well as respect for his character and greatness of mind.

"The general has always been meticulous about the details of his personal affairs, even in the midst of pressing public duties. His account books, the cultivated fields, and formal gardens, as well as the mansion house and the appurtenances here at Mount Vernon all show the care with which he planned and maintained his personal affairs.

"The general gradually and consistently developed and enlarged this estate during his life here. Col. John Washington, the great-grandfather of George, was the immigrant member of the family. He came from England in 1657 or 1658. It has been rumored that the family had some financial reverses in England which turned Colonel Washington's attention toward America. This is a typical American family history, is it not?

"Colonel Washington and an associate, named Spencer, bought 5,000 acres of land on the Potomac. George's father, Augustine, took the north 2,500 acres of land near Hunting Creek about 1735, when George was 3 years old. George had been born at Wakefield, but was hardly old enough to remember his first home at the time the family moved to Ferry Farm on the westerly bank of the Rappahannock River. The senior Washington of that generation occupied Ferry Farm about 8 years. Following his death in 1743, when George was 11, the latter lived there with his older brother, Lawrence. George studied mathematics and surveying. He surveyed many lands in Virginia. His brother, Lawrence, built the mansion at Mount Vernon, which George inherited on Lawrence's death in 1752. So George was 20 when he became head of the Washington family at Mount Vernon. Seven years later, in 1759, when George was 27, he was married to Martha Dandrige Custis. This event brought enlarged family life to Mount Vernon.

"Mr. Washington enlarged the house in 1773. At this time, Mr. Washington was one of the more prosperous, progressive farmers of Virginia. War clouds were on the horizon, but they did not yet appear ominous. Mr. Washintgon added adjacent lands to his original holdings.

"The Colony of Virginia was a great, relatively untouched empire within its own expansive borders. Its resources were scarcely known. Its geographic grandeur was resting in peaceful solitude. Except for some Indian troubles in the West, and increasing popular resistance to British laws, Virginia must have been a good place in which to live in those days.

"The other immediate members of the family are not here. They are resting at Wakefield, Mr. Washington's birthplace. We pay our affectionate respects to them also, as it is they who shared with the first President the intimate family life of Mount Vernon. It is they who helped and witnessed his rise to prominence in Virginia, which in turn brought Mr. Washington to the attention of Americans from other colonies. It is they who went to church with him in Alexandria. The members of his family know how Mr. Washington valued his association with his neighbors in the volunteer fire department, and his fraternal friendships in his lodge.

"Mr. Washington was an orderly man. He had broad and varied interests, yet he kept everything in orderly array in his mind, day by day. He supported his community in every worthwhile activity. He gave to each facet of his many interests the importance he adjudged it to deserve in its relationship to the whole, full life he planned for himself and the members of his household.

"When the crushing affairs of empire crowded in upon Virginia, Mr. Washington's keen analysis of public affairs and his scale of personal priorities, gave hints of the greatness of his character, not yet at that time fully developed. He seemed to know how to place in proper order the whole of a man's life in such a way that, if all men did likewise, there would be maximum peace, prosperity, and happiness for all. Indeed, he seemed to know that the right order of thoughts and things is ordained by a gracious Supreme Being, and that he, himself, should be God's humble servant to bring order, and the ultimate justice, into the world.

"General Washington chose this quiet place on the northern slope of Mount Vernon. The orderly arrangement of a man's life calls for a suitable place for music, the arts, gaiety, and the social graces, such as Mount Vernon has in the mansion house. The orderly arrangement also calls for a personal study for the master, in which to administer the many details of family and friends, with carriages, utility rooms, servants, and bountiful supplies. A husbandman needs tools, seed for planting, and storage bins for crops. A private landing place on the Potomac is an invitation to enter into seagoing commerce. Mount Vernon has these attributes.

"A joint venture with friends in a canal along the nonnavigable upper Potomac shows how to move commerce inland by cooperative efforts. There is always much bustling activity in and about the mansion, reaching even into the master's study. Where does one go to enjoy solitude? I surmise to this wooded retreat (the area of the tomb).

"Friends are always welcome, and are treated with courtesy and respect. Some are so gallant and personable as to win the general's open admiration and affection. It was in this house atop Mount Vernon that the youthful General Marquis De Lafayette, at the insistence of General Washington, recuperated from wounds received in battle for American independence. Mr. Washington, even before receiving his titles of general and then President, was known as a gentleman, because his character and his bearing established his prestige in any company. In the company of any soldier, Mr. Washington was a general because he had the leadership capacity of a general. In any gathering of self-governing citizens, Mr. Washington was a President, because his colleagues recognized his character as the rock upon which they needed to base their joint deliberative efforts. The titles, and the evidences of authority which accompanied them, were only natural consequences—outward evidences of the character of the inward man.

"General Washington chose the heights of Valley Forge, near Norristown, Pa., as the place to watch and pray and nourish the thin line of American patriotism through its severest winter encampment. Other men wielded the power of empire. Other men were motivated by personal ambition. Washington held the line of unswerving purpose and a righteous cause. The picture of General Washington in faithful solitary prayer at Valley Forge has become a spiritual light to posterity.

"General Washington himself chose this spot for his final resting place. This modest crypt is a tomb for the earthly remains of a great man; but it is also a place of meditation—a sanctuary for a nation. This simple unostentatious vault sets an example in the way Washington himself saw fit to do. It is unique among the burial places of kings or Presidents. It may be the smallest in physical dimensions. It is on the lands and very near to the home of its owner. Washington does not surrender his independence and self-reliance, even in death. The general, being a strong pioneer, was called upon to be a leader in so many ways.

"He was the first General of the Armies of the United States. He was the President of the First Constitutional Convention of the United States. He was the first President of the United States of America. His election in each of these instances was by a unanimous vote. When he would have been elected to a third term as President, he declined with modest dignity. His governing principle was to do that which was best for the country. He leaned not to his own understanding but constantly sought divine guidance.

"This vault speaks not of death, but of quiet, meditative watchfulness in the serenity of eternal spirit.

"General Washington was inaurgurated as President of the United States at New York on April 30, 1789. Seven days earlier, an event took place that was the mutiny on the *Bounty*, which left an indelible chapter in naval history. The French Revolution began on July 20, 1789, less than 2 months after Washington's first inauguration. The resistance to British rule in the American Colonies, and the latter's fight for self-government and independence had extended over a 20-year period from 1763 to 1783. Included were 7 years of warfare in which men suffered indescribable hardships. We should not forget that the times were troubled in Washington's day. He must

have known that they would be troubled in every generation.

"As he charted a wise course for his personal life, and for his nation in his lifetime on earth, so he charted a wise course for any future troubled world. The principles on which he relied, and the God in whom he placed his trust, are timeless and changeless. Washington sought the absolute laws of divine government. He was willing to strive with all his human might to bring righteous self-government to this earth. Now that he has been translated into a spiritual realm, he has left this modest tomb to turn our thoughts to the blessings for which he prayed for divine guidance.

"Let us refer to some of the inspired words of Washington as he has left them for us.

"Washington called attention in his Farewell Address that 'Passions agitated in every direction are likely to mislead' to 'vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging' to 'situations in which * * * want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism.' In the face of these difficulties he testified to his constituents, 'the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected.'

"Washington offered some recommendations for frequent review, 'with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsels.'

"His advise is: 'The unity of government *. * * is a main pillar of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize.'

"He added: 'This is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively, though often covertly and insidiously, directed.'

"Do we see signs in the present times of the wisdom of this advice? Then let us be alert to protect freedom's future.

"Washington becomes more specific. 'One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection.'

"On another, but most timely subject, Washington writes: 'As a very important source of strength and security, cherish the public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense * * * avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned.'

"The retiring first President posed a question: 'Can it be that providence has not connected the permanent facility of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas, is it rendered impossible by its vices?'

"Thank you, Mr. President. We know that as a people who have vices. Their elimination comprises our responsibilities as individuals acting on principles of religion and morality. The future of our Nation depends on this. We must cleanse our Nation of vices—now.

"We must now take leave of this peaceful place, and our communion here with the spirit which founded this country. But we shall return frequently, as you wished, Mr. President, to review our thoughts with your advice as to how best to preserve our liberty."

Russians' Income Tax Poses Few Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on the most sweeping tax legislation in the recent history of our Nation. I voted in favor of this legislation with a clear conscience and with the firm conviction that it is a positive step in the broadening of our economic base and the creation of new market opportunity for thousands of our citizens.

I read in the Washington Evening Star last Thursday night, a review of the tax problems that confront the Russian citizens. I think the contrast is well to consider at this time and under the leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the article for your information:

RUSSIANS' INCOME TAX POSES FEW PROBLEMS

Moscow.—Russians spend far less time sweating over their income tax returns than do Americans or the citizens of most Western countries, mainly because they have less figuring to do. The Russian taxpayer does not have to worry about differences between earned income and dividends from securities because he owns no securities. He is not concerned with deductions for dependents, business expenses, medical care, etc., but pays a straight percentage.

The Soviet income tax, like the American, is graduated according to the size of income but there all similarity ends. Under the existing scale, incomes of less than 732 rubles per year are tax exempt. Since the present minimum wage in the Soviet Union is 420 rubles this means a considerable portion of the population has no income tax problem at all.

Those with annual earnings of 744 rubles pay 10.80 rubles income tax (0.14 percent). At 1,200 rubles per year the tax rate jumps to 8.2 percent, while those people with annual income of 2,400 rubles pay 10.6 percent. If you earn 2,544 rubles per year, you have reached the top bracket of 13 percent regardless of the amount. Even if your income was a million rubles you would still pay only 13 percent. The maximum Soviet rate roughly coincides with the U.S. minimum.

FREE INCOME A FACTOR

In judging Soviet income levels one should bear in mind that rent, communal services, and medical care, major items in the budgets of most families in the West, are nominal in the budget of the average Soviet citizen who also enjoys various other forms of free incomes. His cash goes almost entirely for food and clothing. Clothing in particular is expensive. The cheapest man's coat comes to around 100 rubles, shoes seldom less than 30.

The ruble is officially valued at slightly more than one to the dollar, but a more realistic rate corresponding to its purchasing power would be between two and three rubles to the dollar. Few families, even with both husband and wife working, have more than 200 rubles a month to live on. Most have less than 150.

But there is hardly any limit on the earnings of a successful writer or playwright. Pay scales for screen and stage actors are more modest. Even a star seldom gets more than 400 to 500 rubles per month. Industrial executives and Government officials are about in this same bracket. Top scientists and members of the academy earn from 10,000 to 25,000 rubles per year.

Thus, the Soviet income tax favors people with large earned incomes—the very groups that are hardest hit by American income tax. In the Soviet Union there are no capital gains taxes, no depletion allowances for oil wells, since there are no private oil well owners.

STALIN SET CEILING

The 13-percent income tax ceiling was established in 1946 in a rather casual manner. Prior to that large incomes had been subject to far heavier taxation, but one day poet Nikolai Gribachov, a kind of Kremlin poet laureate, chatting with Stalin, complained that he and his fellow writers were treated by the revenue authorities as though they were bourgeois exploiters. Stalin proved quite receptive and without further ado penned a memorandum "recommending" the 13-percent limit.

In the early days of the Communist regime, income tax was primarily used as a weapon to liquidate the upper and middle classes and put private business out of business. The maxim "the power to tax is the power to destroy" found dramatic application. Having ascertained what the income was from a particular enterprise, the Soviet tax bureau would arbitrarily impose an amount which wiped out the entire margin and was in fact confiscatory.

Nowadays the Soviet Government's main source of revenue is from trade turnover, a kind of built-in sales tax. Every plant or enterprise, being Government owned, pipes its profits into the Government till. The same is true of trade organizations, so that at each stage the Government reaps the gains or pockets the losses.

Retail trade prices are seldom related to production cost. As in the case of monopolies everywhere they are largely determined by what the traffic will bear.

Often the markup is fantastically high. On oranges imported from Italy and Morocco the profit is around 1,000 percent. It is even higher on vodka, which costs the State a fraction of a kopek per liter to produce, but sells for over 3 rubles per liter.

President Is Reminded of Harm Residual Oil Quotas Do to New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of the irreparable harm being done to New England by failure to eliminate restrictions on the imports of residual fuel oil.

A recent article appearing in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, February 17, 1964, points up the urgency for action by the President and Secretary Udall.

PRESIDENT IS REMINDED OF HARM RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS DO TO NEW ENGLAND

There is still a lot of winter left, but apart from the constant reminder that we have a long heating season in this part of the country, the New England Council is wise to keep pressing the Johnson administration, as it did its predecessor, for regional relief on residual oil pricing and quotas.

When Lyndon Johnson moved into the White House, one of his first acts was to turn over to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, among other things, the residual oil dispute. And Udall, apparently, has bought the same bill of goods sold former President Eisenhower—that residual quotas are needed to maintain the economic health of the U.S. oil industry and enhance the national security.

None of this is true, and New England has paid heavily since 1959—an estimated $70 million—for this needless restraint. The domestic industry produces almost no residual oil, and while the soft coal industry complains that it is being hurt, neither New England nor New York States, whose utilities, hospitals, and public buildings are now fully dependent upon residual oil, can return to using coal.

In fact, just a year ago the Office of Emergency Planning found that relaxation of quotas "would be consistent with national security," and the New England Council today is reminding President Johnson of the the recommendation. In all fairness, the White House should advise Secretary Udall of the grave harm being done by retention of these useless quotas.

Preserving Freedom as a Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 29 of this year my colleague and our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, addressed the presidents' conference of the Independent Grocers Alliance in Chicago.

This organization represents more than 5,000 independently owned food stores, all in the category of small business.

His discussion of some of the problems we face as a nation bearing the lion's share of the burden of preserving freedom as a way of life deserve the most thoughtful consideration on the part of every Member.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. HALLECK, REPUBLICAN, OF INDIANA, MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I'm glad, for several reasons, that I could come out here today and be with you.

First, it's good to see an old friend I have known for many years, George Florey, who was helpful to me during my earlier years in Congress when we were both considerably younger.

When he asked me to come out here I juggled my schedule as best I could to take part in your program.

I must admit I'm operating on a tight schedule, just as you are. I've got to get on out to Lincoln, Nebr., this afternoon, and I hope I make it. Otherwise some good people are going to be embarrassed, I suppose, because they advertised me as speaker at a $100 a plate dinner.

Not that they're paying a hundred bucks to hear me, you understand—and not that the food will be worth a hundred dollars a plate, either.

But I am part of a package deal. I follow the dessert course.

Out there I'll make a no-doubt-about-it Republican speech.

This one is going to be what I call a nonpartisan Republican speech. But I won't intentionally offend anyone if I can help it.

The second reason I'm glad I could be with you is to pay my respects in person to a man who has demonstrated—beyond any doubt—his faith in our system of competitive enterprise—your president, Don Grimes.

In my book he is a great American who, as his father did before him, has made, and is making, a major contribution to the healthy growth and development of our Nation's basic economic strength—small business.

I'm happy, too, that I could come out and meet with the kind of people for whom I have had a great affinity since my earliest days in the Congress of the United States.

Because let me say, without any apologies, that I am not one of those in Government who has an allergy for business—or for a businessman who happens to be successful.

I don't want to suggest that because I first went to bat for small business a long time ago that I am anti big business.

We all recognize, I am certain, that you can't win wars, or do a lot of other things in this modern world in competition with other nations—especially the dictator nations—without the productive capacity of big industries.

You can't make steel—or missiles—in a blacksmith shop.

You can't mass produce automobiles in a neighborhood garage.

But by the same token, it will be a sad day for America if the time ever comes when small business as we know it today is gone from the scene.

It will be a sad day if the time ever comes when a man with an idea, with a spirit of independence, with a desire to serve people in his own way, and to the extent of his own capacities, can't work for himself.

Because there is really no greater incentive for progress than that a man reap the reward of his initiative, his diligence, and his willingness to put faith in himself on the line.

So I salute the officers and members of IGA for what you have done and are doing for the cause of independent small business.

You are meeting a challenge in the highest traditions of our great system and may you continue to grow and prosper in the years ahead.

But I didn't come out here just to confirm what you already know—that your success is America's success.

Rather I want to talk to you briefly about some of the problems we all face as citizens of a great nation that today—more than any other nation—carries the burden of preserving liberty in a world half slave and half free.

I think we can all agree, without any arguments and without any partisan feeling, that we're not going to preserve freedom anywhere else unless we hold fast to freedom here at home.

And we all know that the rights we enjoy today are guaranteed by the most remarkable document ever conceived by the mind of man—the Constitution of the United States.

We all know it—and have known it since we were kids in school.

But do we appreciate it?

Do we appreciate why this system has endured to become the oldest continuous political system on the face of the earth?

Or do we just take it for granted that we will go on and on, come what may?

Well, let's look that one over.

Ours is a government of checks and balances, a system designed to prevent any concentration of power that could lead to one-man rule.

The word I want to concentrate on today is "balance," because the more I see of our total operation as a society of free people, the more I am convinced that the maintenance of balance in all our activity is the key to survival as a free people.

Nature itself depends on balance.

The greatest abundance of crops results from a balance of sun, rain, nourishment, and human effort.

We read about well-balanced athletic teams, balance of trade, supply and demand, balance of power, and, may I add—budgets—in your business and in mine.

Having this in mind, I'd like to explore a few major areas where we may fairly ask how far down the road we have gone toward upsetting the system of built-in balances designed by our forefathers with one thought in mind—to preserve a maximum of individual freedom by holding the power of government to a minimum.

We have been living in an age of what is called a "cold war"—a struggle between slave states and free to determine which shall be the ultimate victor in the contest for the mind of man.

It is a struggle which will decide whether a society of men governs itself from the bottom up—as does ours—or from the top down—as does the Kremlin.

We all hope it will never have to be decided in the holocaust of war, but we can't be certain.

Anyone old enough to understand what he reads in the paper knows there are trouble spots all over the world: Vietnam, Cuba, Panama, the Congo—none of which we can ignore.

Suffice it to say that because of the dangers posed to our own security we are forced to keep our guard up.

This, then, involves the maintenance of a vast arsenal of military hardware, together with millions of men and women in uniform.

The burden of this Military Establishment represents more than half our total Federal budget.

And this is a price tag we must pay—like it or not—to protect ourselves and the free world from threat of disaster.

But the nagging question all of us must face—and particularly those of us charged with providing for the defense of our country is this:

At what point do we feel assurance that we have provided adequately for that security?

What is enough and what is too much?

The domestic needs of an expanding nation are pressing in upon us.

We could use more schools, more hospitals, more roads, more skilled personnel—more of almost any civilian resources you might care to mention.

Our State and local communities are becoming more and more desperate in their search for ways to finance their own traditional areas of service.

But the Federal Government's massive demand for income has shriveled the sources of tax dollars at the grassroots level.

I well recall a remark by former President Dwight Eisenhower when he was still General of the Armies.

General Eisenhower understood the real secret of America's strength, and this country had no leader more dedicated to our free enterprise system.

"The military," he said on this occasion, "is but the cutting edge of the great productive machine that is America."

I have never heard it put any better.

And the question that keeps a lot of us awake nights is just how far can we go in spending our wealth to create weapons of war without creating a burden that could wreck us without a shot ever having been fired in anger?

Where is the balance between the size of the cutting edge and the power of the machine behind it?

There are those who say we ought to embark on full mobilization and go for broke, regardless of the horrible consequences to humanity.

There are others, probably just as sincere, who crusade for complete disarmament on the theory that our potential enemies will follow suit.

Well, I happen to think that both extremes are unrealistic, to say the least, and that as long as the cold war persists—with brushfires breaking out here and there—we've got to be ready for any eventuality.

You know, Khrushchev boasted he would bury us, but he said he didn't mean through war.

I'd hate to think he could bury us by bluffing this country into bankruptcy.

Another major area involving the need for balance lies in the relationship of various units of government.

I'm afraid that here we are getting badly out of kilter, with a very real danger that the imbalance is going to get worse before it gets better, unless people like you make your voices heard in no uncertain terms.

Let me talk a bit, first, about the relationship between the three major branches of our Federal Government, with emphasis on the executive and legislative branches.

I say this because bringing the judicial branch into this discussion would require more time than I've got today.

In any event, we start with the well-known fact that ours is a tripartite system, three independent branches—and I know you like the word "independent" as much as I do.

As a Member of the Congress I am a part of a larger organization—as you are. At the same time, my first obligation is to satisfy my constituents, just as your success depends on how well you serve the customers of your area.

Believe me, the folks I represent know what they want from me just as much as your folks know what they expect you to deliver.

And the one thing none of us had better forget is that if we let them down we're dead.

That's what keeps us on our toes—and that's as it should be.

I've been around long enough to know that anyone in business goes home at night once in a while wondering whether the battle is worth it.

Well, let me assure you: I take my lumps, too.

But the fact that we are all still in business would indicate, it seems to me, that as far as most folks are concerned, we are doing all right.

Which leads me to the observation that maybe all this criticism of the Congress ought to be considered for what it's worth: the loud protests of a noisy minority of social pleaders—a lot of them, by the way, who are paid to protest.

Let me tell you a story.

It seems there was a young fellow down in Arkansas who lived on a farm that had some swampland on it.

One day he read an ad in a magazine by a company offering a dollar a piece for bullfrog skins.

The youngster wrote to the company telling them he could furnish a thousand frogskins or more if they could use them.

The company wired back: "Will take all you can send."

A week later the boy wrote the company, "Am sending you 1 dozen frogskins under separate cover. The noise sure fooled me."

Forgive me if I dwell just a few more minutes on this business of Congress. It happens to be my favorite subject.

I'm not thin-skinned as far as criticism is concerned. If I were I couldn't have survived nearly 30 years in Washington.

And I'm not going to applaud the length of the last session, because there really wasn't any excuse for keeping us there that long.

I could say I'd vote to adjourn a Democrat Congress anytime because no good can come of it.

And I could say there's nothing wrong with Congress a good election wouldn't cure.

But I won't say either one of those things—for the record—because you might accuse me of being partisan.

But I do repeat: we were kept in session too long.

Especially when the issue that kept us on the job right up to the day before Christmas was whether or not we would play Santa Claus to Khrushchev and give him a credit card for American wheat.

I'm not against selling surplus wheat to Russia if they pay cash on the barrelhead for it. And by cash I mean dollars or gold—not rubles.

This would help our balance-of-payments situation—and there's that old word "balance" again.

But I have a conviction, as have the rest of the people on my side in the House of Representatives—almost to a man—that if you make the Soviet Union spend money for what they buy from us, to that extent you reduce their capacity to spend money creating mischief around the world.

By the same token, if we extend them credit to supply their needs, we simply add to that capacity.

This is what our side believed, and this is what we fought for right down to the wire. We were finally overwhelmed by sheer force of numbers, because when the opposition turns out in force we're in the minority by a 3 to 2 ratio.

One of the arguments put forward against banning use of the Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit to the Russians was that the Congress would thereby usurp a power in the conduct of foreign affairs reserved for the President.

But it has gotten to the point where a major area of our foreign relations involves the appropriating of public money for the various military and economic programs of assistance to other nations.

Certainly, in this regard, it is the responsibility of the Congress to take a long hard look at this whole matter of how much we can help others without beginning to hurt ourselves.

This we have been doing, having in mind the necessity of balancing out our defense needs at home with offshore bases abroad.

All of which reminds me of the dear old lady who sent a note to the Bureau of Internal Revenue saying, "I do hope you will give my money to some nice country."

Which about sums up the attitude of a lot of Americans. We want to help our friends as best we can—as long as they are willing to help us and to help themselves. But we don't want to give aid and comfort to a potential enemy.

So I do want to speak up for Congress as an institution.

And it occurs to me that business and Congress have one thing at least in common: we're both whipping boys—and usually from the same sources.

One of the criticisms leveled at Congress is that it didn't pass enough legislation last year.

Well for my money, folks, we deserve more credit for what we refused to do, than for what we did do.

And I think most Americans go along with that. Especially taxpayers. In fact anyone who has the least concern for the ever-increasing cost of Government will grade Congress on the plus side for the fact that it didn't pass a lot of new spending programs.

The second biggest single item in our budget today represents interest on the national debt—and we had to raise that limit twice last year.

By coincidence, this figure just happens to be the same as the amount of the proposed tax cut the whole country is waiting for—$11 billion.

Think about that for a minute.

Incidentally, the country is going to get that tax cut, in my opinion, because enough of us down there insisted there be a cutback in spending to make a tax reduction meaningful.

We got that job done.

I'm not going to mention all the bad things people say about Congress. I'd wind up with an inferiority complex.

But we all know there are those who contend we ought to act—willy-nilly—on every proposal sent to us by the administration.

All I can say to that is, God save the Republic.

Last year, for instance, we had something between 400 and 500 proposals to consider—depending on whose figures you take.

More than 100 involved spending money—guess whose.

Some 70 more involved slapping more controls on guess who.

Look, my friends, just let me say this: Congress couldn't have given all those programs the study they needed in 5 years, let alone 1.

I've been asked whether some of the proposals made and rejected last year will fare any better this year.

My answer is "No."

The tax bill and the civil rights bill were not rejected last year. They are both highly complicated measures which deserved, and are receiving, thoughtful consideration.

In my opinion there will be affirmative action on both in the near future.

Congress, in the future as it has in the past, will measure up to its responsibilities to the people.

We have demonstrated that in times of crisis we can move swiftly on matters obviously in the national interest.

But the Congress has always been cautious not to be stampeded into ill-considered action for which there is no demonstrated need or widespread public demand.

There is nothing new about criticism of Congress. It's been going on almost since this country got underway as a Republic.

And I'm sure it will continue.

But I happen to think that the Congress, as our Founding Fathers intended, is the voice of the people—and that what Congress does or doesn't do pretty well reflects the hopes and aspirations of the majority of our citizens.

Of course the institution of Congress isn't perfect. Neither are its Members. Neither is business of businessmen.

As a matter of fact, there are a few things about humanity in general that don't measure up to the standards set for us a long, long time ago.

So we keep trying.

And as far as I'm concerned we keep what we've got until somebody convinces me he's got something better to offer—and I haven't heard about it yet.

Balance in government under our system also involves the relationship of the Federal operation with State and local units of government.

The separation of powers was the subject of great debate among the framers of our Constitution.

No one argues that the conduct of war and foreign relations is not the responsibility of the Federal Government.

So are such things as the regulation and promotion of orderly interstate commerce; the protection of basic human rights, such as property, freedom of speech, assembly, and trial by jury.

I don't want to oversimplify. We all realize that life today is more complex than it was even a couple of decades ago.

But a lot of rights and responsibilities were deliberately left with the people because the men who drafted the Constitution knew about tyranny.

What we must ask ourselves in all seriousness today is this: How far have we drifted from the concept of decisionmaking by the

people back home on matters that have traditionally involved local determination?

Are we on the right track, my friends, in assuming that a man at a desk in Washington can have a better understanding of the needs of your home community than your mayor, your township trustee, or your county commissioner?

And will that man at the desk in Washington be as accountable to you and your neighbors as the local official you can hire or fire, by your vote as a free citizen?

I think the answer is obvious.

And so we come to the most important area of balance of all—the relationship between government and the individual.

It is the sum total of what I have been talking about.

How far have we come and how far do we go in this business of government—especially the Federal Government, far removed, moving in on the lives of its citizens?

To what extent does Washington take upon itself problems ranging from planned parenthood to aid programs for more parking places?

How far do we go in providing the essentials of existence until the citizen becomes an absolute ward of government—a ward who sends all of his income—if he has any—to the Department of Internal Revenue and then just votes for a living? If he has a vote.

I don't want to believe this could ever happen in America—neither do you.

But you know and I know—every person who will be honest with himself knows—that we have gone a long way down that road.

Today some 50 million Americans get Government checks of one kind or another.

Today your Government exercises more direct control over the lives of people than ever before and the end is not in sight.

I hope, for the good of this great country of ours, and for the future of your sons and daughters that somehow we can stem this tide before we reach the point of no return.

Let me close with a story that goes back to the days when our Republic was being born.

The Continental Congress was meeting in Philadelphia, hammering out, word by word, the deathless prose of our great Constitution.

As the deliberations neared their climax a crowd gathered on the lawn in front of Independence Hall.

The meeting finally broke up and wise old Benjamin Franklin came out and down the steps.

A woman rushed up to him and asked, "Dr. Franklin, what have you given us, a monarchy or a republic?"

Whereupon Franklin said this:

"Madam, we have given you a republic—if you can keep it."

He didn't say if "we" can keep it—he said "you."

This, then, is the challenge we all face: To do our part—to contribute what we can—toward preserving this wonderful way of life which has made us the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

Measure up to your own individual responsibilities as free citizens and I have no doubt we will win through.

To the People of Estonia

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join with your loved ones to commemorate with you the 46th anniversary of your once independence day, the Estonian Independence Day. My prayer and wish is to see you regain your freedom and celebrate your independence day in your beloved and historic homeland. For nearly 24 years you have been robbed of your priceless possession, your freedom, by your heartless foes, and since the early days of the last war you have been prisoners in your homeland. You endured all the vicissitudes of the war in the hope that in the end you would have your reward in freedom. History records an unfortunate blot in your lives; your genuine friends could not help you in your struggle for your freedom; you have been at the mercy of your heartless oppressors. But we millions of friends of the Estonian people in this great Republic are hoping and praying for your freedom, for your deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny. God bless you and may His mercy help to keep alive the spark of love for the dignity of person—and for justice to you and yours.

Address of Hon. William O. Douglas, Recipient of B'nai Zion's First Bill of Rights Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1963, several hundred leaders and representatives of B'nai Zion, an American Zionist fraternal organization of which I have the honor to be a national vice president, met at the New York Hilton Hotel for the presentation of B'nai Zion's first annual Bill of Rights Award to the Honorable William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Justice Douglas was unanimously selected as the recipient of this first award by the American Affairs Committee of B'nai Zion as the "American who has rendered the most outstanding service for the advancement of the basic tenets of freedom, equity, and justice embodied in the Bill of Rights."

The presentation of the award was made by New York State Supreme Court Justice Arthur Markewich, former president of B'nai Zion. After the presentation Justice Douglas delivered the following address on the rule of law:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT, RECIPIENT OF FIRST ANNUAL B'NAI ZION BILL OF RIGHTS AWARD, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1963, AT THE NEW YORK HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

On September 12, 1777, the day after the British won the Battle of Brandywine and when it seemed that Philadelphia might fall, Thomas Paine wrote:

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it. The event of yesterday was one of those kind of alarms which is just sufficient to rouse us to duty, without being of consequence enough to depress our fortitude. It is not a field of a few acres of ground, but a cause, that we are defending, and whether we defeat the enemy in one battle, or by degrees, the consequences will be the same."

We have moved a long way down the stream of history since the date of Brandywine. But issues as inflammatory as the results of that battle possess us. Racial differences, religious differences, ideological differences ignite communities; and nowadays we live so close to each other and have become so interdependent that tensions, transmitted by efficient mass media of communications, can quickly possess an entire nation. When, therefore, pleas are made that the end justifies the means, emotions can easily be aroused; and the immobilization of people may be as dangerous to the rule of law as the summoning of a mob.

Yet the rule of law—man's only safety from the jungle of passions—exalts procedure. We know in quiet moments of repose that steadfast rules are needed to govern those hours of crisis when emotions break the dams of self-control and carry people pell-mell on angry waters.

My friend, Edmond Cahn of New York University Law School, has written an interesting piece called "The Consumers of Injustice" in which he considers the underlying lawlessness in so-called civilized countries. He quotes Michel D. Montaigne: "How many condemnations I have witnessed more criminal than the crime."

Cahn writes about one case where "It was convenient for the city and its merchants that someone, almost anyone, be found, identified, and convicted."

Cahn goes on to say: "We must concede that most of the pattern is very old, older than the Bible. It is older than the death that came to Uriah the Hittite because a king desired to possess Uriah's wife, or the death that came to Naboth because another king desired to possess Naboth's vineyard, and there is no comforting reason to assert that any city or State is today immune from incidents of the kind." (34 N.Y.L. Rev. 1166, 1169.)

The use of force against the opposition is part and parcel of Communist ideology and education. Mimeographed pamphlets in Latin America show in detail how to kill a noncooperative villager, how to make an auto into a bomb, how to use household furniture as a barricade. Some think that this infection has reached the free world.

I. F. Stone recently asked how many of us "did not welcome the assassination of Diem and his brother Nhu in South Vietnam?" Do we reach for the dagger, or the gun, in our thinking, when it suits our political view to do so? Do we ever believe that the end justifies the means? Do we favor murder, when it comes to our own hated opponents?

A friend of mine in the far West writes: "I think we better call in all our missionaries from all parts of the world—bring them back here and civilize our own people first."

Former Governor LeRoy Collins of Florida recently talked about the decent people who "remain cravenly silent or lamely defensive" while rabblerousers incite "sick souls to violence." He spoke of the urgent need for decent people to tell "the bloody shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry." While he spoke essentially of racial problems in a Southern framework of reference, what he said is also good for the North and the East and the West, as well—on racial issues, on the wheat sale to Russia, on the test ban treaty, and on all questions that deeply stir the emotions of our people.

The late Mr. Justice Brandeis once wrote:

"Man somehow gropes his way to wisdom and law. But he no sooner acquires them, than he abuses them. He does not live by them of his own free will. He must be driven to do so. He must be accused and lashed when he ignores them."

I believe that our people—South as well as North, East, and West—are dedicated to a

rule of law. I believe that they would readopt the Bill of Rights today (including the 14th and 15th amendments) if they were given the opportunity for sober thought and reflection. But man the world over was an emotional being before he was an intellectual one. Emotions often carry a particular day. That is why regimentation to defined procedure is essential to a rule of law. To quote Mr. Justice Brandeis once more:

"To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means * * * would bring terrible retribution." (*Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 485.)

Or as Mr. Justice Hunt said years earlier, "No one may do evil that good may come." (*Jeffries* v. *Life Ins. Co.*, 22 Wall, 47, 52.)

If the bigots command the platforms and occupy the editorial desks, the rule of law degenerates into a regime of whim and caprice. The eternal task is to persuade perceptive people to be outspoken on matters of principle. The stature of judges is of course important. But the Bill of Rights—its procedural as well as its substantive guarantees—is vital in a particular community only when the pulpits are strong and vocal behind the rule of law—only when the school boards are alert and unafraid—only when parent-teachers associations, chambers of commerce, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, newspapers, radio and TV, and all other community groups promote an understanding of the Bill of Rights and in times of storm and crisis, as well as on calm occasions, stand against the bigots and on the side of the rule of law.

This makes the task of living under a rule of law a difficult one. The structure we build is never completed; it is always in danger not so much of being torn down as depreciating by neglect.

Those who first spoke of the need of eternal vigilance have warned from the beginning of the high price a people pay for life under a rule of law. But those who have walked under the stars, breathing deeply the air of a free society, know that another kind of life would be unbearable.

Resolution Honoring Senator Karl E. Mundt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, Senator from South Dakota, has received numerous testimonials to his outstanding service to South Dakota and the Nation over a span of 25 years, including a resolution passed by the South Dakota Legislature.

Latest of the accolades presented Senator MUNDT on the silver anniversary of his congressional service comes in a resolution adopted by the South Dakota Federation of Republican Women. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include that resolution:

Whereas the Honorable Senator KARL E. MUNDT has brought great honor to the State of South Dakota, having given 25 years of continuous service in the Congress of the United States, with great dignity and untiring efforts: Therefore, now be it

Resolved, That we, the South Dakota Federation of Republican Women, do hereby record our high esteem and deep appreciation for honor and service brought to the State and Nation through the efforts of both Senator and Mrs. KARL E. MUNDT.

We hereby affix our signatures this 23d day of January 1964.

The South Dakota Federation of Republican Women.

ANNABELLE BAUMBERGER, *Treasurer.*
MYRTLE M. THUE, *Secretary.*
AGNES CHRISTIANSEN, *President.*

Dangerous Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the following editorial from the February 24, 1964, Evening Star, to the attention of the Members. It is well reasoned, and I commend it to your reading and consideration:

DANGEROUS GAMES

Thanks to interpretations put forward by anonymous officials, the world learns that President Johnson's California speech was "deliberately pregnant with meaning." This meaningfulness will be found down in the middle of the speech in a sentence warning those engaged in aggression in South Vietnam that this activity is a "deeply dangerous game."

Perhaps it was necessary to focus attention on the phrase, and to suggest that it carried a warning to North Vietnam and even to the Red Chinese of dire things to come unless they behave themselves. For threats of this sort have been cheapened by long exposure to them. One can hardly pick up a paper without reading something of the sort from Messrs. Khrushchev, Mao Tzetung or Castro. It even revives memories of massive retaliation—a warning that supposedly was pregnant with meaning, but which long since has been all but forgotten.

The thing about this, it seems to us, is that threats are all right—if we mean them. The President's comment, with the benefit of the interpretations, surely will be taken in Saigon as meaning that the United States intends to enlarge the war if necessary to prevent the Communist aggressors from overrunning South Vietnam. But is this really our intention?

Can we hope that the South Vietnam forces, which have so far been unable to take care of themselves on home ground, can carry the war to the enemy? If not, will the Johnson administration, in an election year, commit more American forces to the war? If so, the purpose should be stated in clearer language. If not, then we are guilty of raising hopes which, when disappointed, will gravely injure that image of the United States about which so much has been heard.

We do not believe that the war in South Vietnam has been lost, or that it necessarily will be lost even without major American intervention. The possibility, however, is there, and we must face it. The time may not be far off when we will have to move in with our own forces or see all of our effort, hopes, and sacrifices go down the drain. In such a situation, mere threats will not be enough. They must be accompanied by the will to use whatever force is necessary to back them up. If the will is lacking we should not stake our prestige on empty threats. For this, too, is a dangerous game.

Troubles Multiply, but United States Still Avoids Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TROUBLES MULTIPLY, BUT UNITED STATES STILL AVOIDS TRUTH

(By David Lawrence)

Troubles are multiplying all over the world for the U.S. Government, which still refuses to look facts in the face and instead follows a policy of wishful thinking and avoidance of realistic truths.

For the biggest single fact is that whether in South Vietnam or Cyprus or Berlin or Africa or Cuba or Panama, the hand of evil is communistic and is directed by the Kremlin.

Although the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the southeast Asia Alliance are supposed to hold things together against Russia and Red China, another unpleasant fact is that a major partner in both alliances—France—has just broken away. This helped to cause the overthrow of the government in South Vietnam, where the fear had developed that French intimacy with the Red Chinese would, by the deceptive process of neutralization, hand the country over to the Communists.

Yet, in the midst of such intrigue, the United States maintains 15,500 troops in South Vietnam, where already more than 100 Americans have lost their lives and many others have been wounded. About $1.5 million a day is the cost to the taxpayers of this country.

Why are the American military forces in South Vietnam? The official answer is that they are present at the request of the South Vietnam Government. But there have been three governments in succession in recent months in that country, and it is evident the United States has become involved almost inextricably in the internal affairs of Vietnam on the pretext this is necessary to hold the Communists in check and preserve world peace.

But as the Communist apparatus spreads its operations throughout the world and meddles in Cuba, in Panama, and in other Latin-American countries, as well as in Africa and Asia, the main culprit—the Soviet Government—is treated as if no crime has been committed anywhere.

Subversion by the Communists is denounced and infiltration condemned, but the United States continues futile talkfests in Geneva on the subject of disarmament, even as the Russians themselves refuse to take the word of the American Government that an unarmed training plane strayed across a boundary. There is not the slightest sign of the mutual trust and good faith so essential to any successful negotiation between civilized governments.

It is apparent also that the "anticolonialism" drive, fostered with such vehemence by Soviet propaganda, has caused a state of anarchy in many African countries whose peoples are not being allowed to exercise their right of self-determination. Despotic rulers have arisen to impose totalitarian governments and the usual forms of tyranny that communism espouses.

The Soviet Government, which is responsible for the provocation of trouble on every continent, maintains an innocent posture, and the free world selfishly and foolishly consents to furnish economic aid to the

Communist side of the cold war. It is a tragic situation for which the peoples of the West must take much of the blame. Many leaders, moreover, and many segments of the press—in Europe, especially—are adopting a course of appeasement toward the Soviets.

Despite all the mischief being wrought by the Moscow Government, the sending of goods—including the sale of wheat—and the lending of money to the cold war enemy are considered legitimate. This is vigorously defended in London, Paris, and Washington as well as in other capitals of this hemisphere.

ARA Projects Are Helping in the Economic Recovery of Idaho Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, while I was in my congressional district during the period between sessions of the 88th Congress I had an opportunity to see at firsthand the progress of a series of projects of the Area Redevelopment Administration which are helping to improve economic conditions and helping to create new employment opportunities in those areas of my congressional district which have experienced high unemployment levels in recent years.

These projects cover a wide range and include a lumber finishing plant, a plywood manufacturing facility, a fertilizer blending operation, a study of the recreation and tourism potentials on the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, and development of a splendid ski facility at Schweitzer Basin in Bonner County which just opened this past December.

This ski resort was developed with the help of a $345,000 investment by ARA. This was no Federal handout; it was a loan, repayable to the Federal Treasury, with interest. Local public and private investment brought the total cost of the project to a little over half a million dollars. This included, in addition to the ARA investment, an investment of $30,000 by the city of Sandpoint; $53,000 by Schweitzer Basin, Inc., the local nonprofit development organization, and a $127,000 investment by the company.

I am especially proud of the fact that this is a really cooperative effort aimed at improving job opportunities and the economic conditions in an area. It includes Federal financing, local public investment, local nonprofit development company funds—plus the company's private investment.

Furthermore, the Schweitzer Basin ski facilities are turning out to be highly successful. The facility has been in operation for a little more than a month, and already has proved to be a major attraction. For example, a crowd of more than 2,500 thronged the basin on the Sunday after Christmas.

Local enthusiasm for the Schweitzer Basin project is running very high and is reflected in a new optimism among citizens over the area's general economic recovery prospects.

One local newspaper, the Sandpoint News-Bulletin, calls the ski basin the greatest single factor in this optimistic outlook, pointing to its phenomenal success which is outdrawing the most sanguine predictions.

Discussing the local cooperation which brought the ski facility to successful conclusion, the paper had this to say:

We've not only developed what may well be one of the greatest ski areas in the world, but we've learned that we can work together as a powerful and effective team. This is a wonderful thing for the community to know. It portends many an accomplishment in the years ahead.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the ARA has helped the economic development of my district and is continuing to do so. As time goes on I am sure that we are going to note even more the strong influence of the local, State, and Federal, private and public partnership that is helping generate new job opportunities, and through this, is bringing about the economic revitalization of areas which have been faced with serious economic problems.

The Area Redevelopment Administration is making a tremendous contribution to this cooperative effort. The ARA program is an important tool in America's job of stamping out poverty, joblessness, and economic stagnation in the disadvantaged areas of this great Nation of ours.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would also like to include a portion of a letter recently written by Mr. Jim Parsons, manager of the North Idaho Economic Development Association, Inc., of Sandpoint, Idaho, who explains the rejuvenated spirit and economy of the Sandpoint area:

Day by day, this project (Schweitzer Basin) looms as far more significant than we had anticipated in our wildest moments. Weekends, of course, continue to be the big days, with each succeeding Sunday attracting a larger crowd than the preceding one. Last Sunday, for example, the crowd was estimated at 3,200 or 3,300, and it also was a record day for numbers of skiers. (By the cash tally.)

There are some substantial indications we will be faced with the need for additional lift facilities before another season rolls around.

Business this week is at a high level, due in part to beautiful sunny weather and unusually good powder snow skiing, but probably more to the fact that this is the time of semester break at northwest colleges. Currently, 110 members of the Washington State University Outing Club and their chaperones are here for 4 days. Connie's Cafe feeds them, and they headquarter at the Ponderay Hotel. I suspect the old hotel hasn't had that many guests since Farragut days when they stacked the sailors like cordwood. Needless to say, groups like this are bringing joy to the hearts of the beer distributors and the operator of the local pizza palace.

Among the enclosures are the Idaho and Emerald Empire labor market reports which you will find of interest. To these official statements, I can add some unofficial observations based on direct checks. Schweitzer Basin itself has proved to be a larger employer than anticipated. The direct on-site payroll hits 37 on weekends and during holiday periods.

Employment has stiffened elsewhere, and even businesses which have not had to provide new jobs are nevertheless feeling the impact of the new money in the area.

Sandpoint has a new ski shop which employs a minimum of three.

Bob Cox of the Travelers Motel says a year ago the firm had 3 to 5 employees; this year it is working 17 to 20. Most motels are well filled weekends and getting some weekday business.

The small Hupp Motel on Third Avenue is a good example. In the last week, patrons have included: One family of four, one couple, and a single adult from Pullman, Wash.; two doctors from Trail, B.C.; a group of five members of the Nelson, B.C., ski club; two girls from Greenacres, Wash.; a family of three from Spokane; and two men who flew their private plane from Powell, Wyo. All of these guests came here for skiing and more than half either made reservations or indicated they would return.

The president of the Mountaineers Club of Calgary was here over the weekend making plans for two charter busloads of skiers for 4 days during the Easter period. The Edmonton Ski Club also is considering a group trip this season.

Manager Sam Wormington and one of our directors, Dr. Jack Fowler of Spokane, are on a whirlwind promotional tour of the Laurentians, Montreal, and Ottawa ski areas; Mount Snow and Mount Stowe, Vt., Chicago, and the Twin Cities. The intent is to build weekday business.

While Dr. Fowler is an enthusiastic booster, his primary interest on the trip is to inspect ski lodges for construction and operating ideas. He has a group of Spokane people who plan to build a lodge next summer on land immediately adjoining ours. It would be a sort of cooperative apartment type of thing for those who put the money up, but overnight lodging facilities for the public also would be included.

One of the local beer distributors says his business is up 20 percent this season. He reports taverns in other towns such as Bonners Ferry, as well as joints along the highways are getting ski business.

Wayne Humbert of Clark Fork said he gets some business regularly from Montana skiers, and the lighthouse at Hope is developing a good weekend dinner business, primarily from skiers in the Libby area who come to Schweitzer via the Bull River Road. Templin's Grill at Coeur d'Alene is getting a heavy weekend dinner play from Spokane skiers who stop on their way home.

"Pinky" Cochrane of Sandpoint said his gas business was up 21 percent in December and there have been reports of increased gas pumped in towns such as Priest River and Newport, Wash. Our Bonner County gas stations haven't profited as much as they might because we are encircled by a gas war. Prices in most areas outside the county are running about 10 cents a gallon lower.

Entirely aside from all other factors, the area has gone absolutely wacky over skiing. This is the most wonderful thing that has happened in years. The young people turn out in droves for weekend skiing. In addition to free instruction for junior and senior high students, we provide free classes Wednesday for housewives and Thursday for businessmen. These groups are growing by leaps and bounds.

People, like salesmen, who visit Standpoint regularly say you can feel the new spirit the minute you hit the town. Morale is high—and this, of course, is half the battle (to coin a phrase). I never have seen such widespread, general optimism.

To reiterate what was said before, both your office and the ARA people can take genuine pride in Schweitzer Basin. I honestly believe it would be impossible to find an ARA project anywhere in the Nation that has made as terrific an impact—population

considered—as this one has on Sandpoint and Bonner County. It is truly a classic example of accomplishing original ARA objectives in a high degree.

I know I express the feelings of many—especially the directors who have put in so much time as a community effort—in again saying a heartfelt "Thank you for the help you have been to us."

The Continuing Curse of Chronic Mass Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent, Mr. Frank McCallister, director of the Labor Education Division, Roosevelt University, has written me concerning what he rightly terms as "the continuing curse of chronic mass unemployment." He brought to my attention an excellent article on this subject authored by John E. Cullerton, the able director of our Illinois Department of Labor, and asked that I have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased to comply with his request as I feel John Cullerton's approach to the unemployment problem deserves widespread circulation and is of particular significance in light of the administration's current war on poverty. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks I commend to my colleagues and the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Cullerton's article as printed in the Illinois Labor Bulletin:

THE DIRECTOR'S PAGE

(By John E. Cullerton)

I know of no subject which should engage our time and most earnest thought more than the problem of employment in the 1960's.

There is far more involved in employment in the 1960's than our own material prosperity.

WORLD LEADERSHIP INVOLVED

Our world leadership is involved. We are not going to retain a position of leadership if we continue to limp along under a heavy burden of unemployed, and if we do not prove to the world our capacity to solve this problem. Our ratio of unemployed is notoriously high—compared with West Germany, France, Britain, Denmark, and the Scandinavian countries. These nations are watching anxiously to see if we can overcome our unemployment. Their futures are inextricably bound up with our own maintenance of a strong and growing economy, and well they know it. This is precisely the case, too, with the uncommitted nations of the world, and the emergent nations of Africa and Asia. And you may be sure that the Soviets are watching our performance with vigilance.

WORLD TRADE AT STAKE

Our ability to compete in the fiercely contested world markets is involved. Unless we can do better in our employment policies, we will reach the point eventually when we will be unable to make the technical changes that will enable us to compete.

It is inconceivable to me that we will not, in the near future, undertake those measures and programs of action which will prevent unemployment from becoming a way of life—an American way of life—for millions of persons. We are in danger of chronic unemployment becoming structured into our social-economic system, unless we take the most resolute action to devise and put into operation programs on a number of fronts.

Before reaching any conclusions as to what actions government should take, I think it is necessary to begin by stating several conclusions with regard to actions already taken.

First, I believe that the Employment Act of 1946 should be reexamined in the light of conditions in 1963. We do not now have a full employment policy. I conclude that despite its obvious benefits, the Employment Act can be vastly improved. It can be improved in its machinery, but most of all, it can be improved by fixing its sights on a full employment goal.

A second conclusion is that while the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act have produced tremendous benefits, they are in fact wholly deficient. They deal in a limited way with almost unlimited problems; they deal with the symptoms but do not attack the basic illnesses in our economy; and, they are at the most, modest efforts. Giving these programs all of the credit due them, I think it still can be said that they are at best mild medicine for serious ailments. The usefulness of both acts is impaired by their temporary concept and short-range programing.

From these statements you man infer that I believe in bolder and more comprehensive programs for the 1960's and 1970's. I do. I am deeply concerned that we undertake these programs without that delay which will only aggravate our problems and make them more nearly unsolvable.

In Illinois, our unemployment rate has been consistently from 1 to 2 percentage points below the national average, and in this we have been fortunate. However, at times in the past 3 years, over one-fifth of our counties have been classed as "distressed," where high and persistent unemployment existed. In some southern Illinois areas, unemployment has mounted as high as 28 percent.

We have no cause to congratulate ourselves.

By 1970, only about 5 percent of jobs will be in the unskilled classification. Farming, which once absorbed the unskilled labor force, has become a highly skilled occupation with practically no employment opportunities left even at present. Between 1950 and 1960, farm employment of managers and workers in Illinois declined 30 percent, and will decline possibly even more in the 1960's. The unskilled, who once went to the farms for work, form 28.6 percent of our jobless white persons, and 37.3 percent of our jobless Negroes; the semiskilled 24.8 percent of the jobless whites, and 24.6 percent of the jobless Negroes. Where can these unemployed go now?

Lack of a skill can only be translated as the lack of an education. This is proved by the fact that the Illinois State Employment Service had to interview nearly 36,000 applicants before it found 3,100 who were qualified in educational accomplishment to take the manpower training courses. Lack of skill traces unerringly to basic functional illiteracy in great numbers of the unemployed.

When you consider this situation against the fact that the Illinois labor force will increase 18.6 percent by 1970, and the 18-to-24-year group by 62.9 percent, you can get a measure of our future problems.

Census figures for 1960 disclose that we have, in Illinois, 380,000 persons of 25 years of age or older who never went beyond the fifth grade in school; 207,000 whites and 60,933 Negroes attended school from the first to the fourth year; 292,916 whites and 60,900 Negroes completed from five to six years of schooling; 285,000 whites and 43,591 Negroes completed the seventh year; and 181,000 whites and 90,227 Negroes finished the eighth grade only.

Advanced technology, new and intricate skills, higher education, automated machinery, are pinching these people off the payrolls. These are the persons who are being shoved onto the relief rolls. They include tens of thousands of school drop-outs who never have been and never will be able to secure steady employment. These are the persons to whom the doors of opportunity are closed. Many of them being functionally illiterate, they are incapable of being trained in any skill for which there is a present market.

I propose we consider not what should be done in the 1960's, but in the 1970's, and 1980, insofar as it is possible to foresee.

GENERAL EDUCATION

The English historian, H. G. Wells, once observed that "all of history is a race between education and catastrophe."

Government should undertake an immediate reassessment of our educational goals and our system by a commission broadly representative of the public, the Government, business, industry, trades, with the technical assistance of professional educators. It should embrace the best judgments of many diverse economic and social groups.

And what should such a reassessment produce?

First, better directions of our educational programs, with more stress on equipping students to obtain and hold jobs.

Second, a massive attack on illiteracy and social boredom through programs of adult education, using all of our educational facilities from grade school to college—a meaningful State program in every community.

Third, a program giving the relief clients opportunity to obtain education. Should not such an educational participation be made a condition for receiving relief payments? As basic illiteracy is overcome among relief and nonrelief adults, the training could be propelled gradually into vocational courses to develop job skills for which there exists a growing market.

Fourth, any educational drive should include a breakthrough program against school dropouts.

I ask, also, if we should not consider adapting to our own usage the West German system? There, a student who drops out of high school is required, by law, to take 3 years of training in a vocational school, learning a useful trade. This program is tied into a vast apprentice training system which regularly has some 1,200,000 annual enrollees, and 400,000 graduates—the latter being accepted as qualified workmen upon their graduation. The training is administered by 80,000 unpaid volunteers, and standards are coordinated by the local chambers of commerce, industry, trades and crafts, in cooperation with schools, government, trade unions and employer organizations. The system works. Should we not have a similar system of education here? I believe that MDT training could be adapted to underwrite and direct such a program.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Since 1940, agricultural workers in Illinois have declined by almost 45 percent. Projection of labor force trends indicates a further decline of 25.2 percent by 1970.

Despite the drastic decline in agricultural employment, 25 percent of the vocational students in 1962 were enrolled in vocational agriculture. Despite the fact that women constitute one-third of the labor force, homemaking courses constituted the single largest vocational education program. A total of $1,143,000 was being spent annually on agriculture training, and $1,489,000 on homemaking. In the first instance of agriculture, the training is in an area where jobs are nonexistent; second, homemaking training

has a social value, but its applicability to job finding is nearly, if not totally, nil. Unquestionably, there is a great misdirection of vocational education.

Bureaucratic Blunders Blamed for U.S. Errors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RAYMOND MOLEY SAYS: BUREAUCRATIC BLUNDERS BLAMED FOR U.S. ERRORS

A nationally known and thoroughly experienced Republican told me recently of the responses he has received from the crowds before which he has been making speeches critical of the Johnson administration. He says attacks on the present budget, on wheeler-dealing in Government, on Federal welfare programs, and even on communism in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, elicit lukewarm responses.

But when he recently cut to the real reason why our foreign affairs are going so badly, the public response was terrific. When he says our State Department and our Foreign Service need a Republican President and Secretary of State who will clean out and reorganize the present bureaucracy, he gets enthusiastic applause.

In this, the public shows itself to be far ahead of most of our opposition political leaders and also the President and the Secretary of State.

The blunders that lost Cuba and are losing our control of our own Panama Canal, that contribute to the slaughter of American boys in Vietnam and the mess in the Congo are not always due to bad decisions by a President. He is the prisoner of the people who give him advice. The real mischief is done down below by the bureaucracy.

The last Secretary of State who really ran his own Department served 40 years ago. He was Charles Evans Hughes. Secretary Stimson and his bureaucrats busied themselves in creating the Manchurian policy which led to our war with Japan. President Hoover, occupied in fighting the depression, had little responsibility for foreign policy and has said he realized later it was a mistake.

When Cordell Hull accepted the job of Secretary of State, he specifically told F.D.R. he would not be responsible for administration of the State Department. He wanted only to impose his ideas about lower tariffs.

And so it went until John Foster Dulles took over in 1953. But Dulles spent his time traveling abroad to conferences. The Department ran itself. During that time the bureaucrats on the fourth floor helped Castro get control of Cuba. The two Ambassadors to Cuba, Gardner and Smith, tried to get through to Dulles and Eisenhower with their story, but were prevented from doing so by the bureaucrats.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations has been at work for months on a study of the administration of national security at home and abroad. From time to time it has published highly informative testimony of active and retired Ambassadors. This has revealed very serious defects in the administration of foreign affairs as they have appeared to individuals with actual experience.

More recently the subcommittee has issued a report of its own concerning the Office of Secretary of State. It states bluntly facts which show how completely the Secretary is hemmed in by his bueaucracy. Secretary Rusk, himself, former Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett, and certain Ambassadors have confirmed this situation.

It is apparent the layer upon layer of officials, the innumerable committees, the interrelation with other agencies such as the Defense Department, AID, USIA, and CIA all create completely unwieldly machinery. The wonder is that any policy can be effectively implemented at all.

What the report, since it is nonpartisan, does not say is that mere tinkering with this organization cannot suffice. What is needed is a new President who will, through a powerful Secretary of State, reorganize the whole machinery from top to bottom. Nothing short of a major operation will do. This should be a major issue in this year's presidential campaign.

A Bill To Restrict by 50 Percent Imports of Meats of Every Description

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which restricts imports of meat and meat products into the United States. The bill reads as follows:

H.R. 10099

A bill to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the total quantity of meat and meat products originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during any twelve-month import period, shall not (except as provided in section 3) exceed 50 per centum of the average annual quantity of meat and meat products imported from such country during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "meat and meat products" includes (A) beef, veal, lamb, mutton, pork, poultry, and any other meat to which part 2 of schedule 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States applies, whether or not prepared or preserved and whether canned, cured, dressed, or in any other form, (B) live animals imported to provide meat of any kind for human consumption, and (C) any food product which contains meat, of any kind or in any form, and which is intended for human consumption; and

(2) the term "twelve-month import period" means the twelve-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or any subsequent twelve-month period beginning on an anniversary of such date.

SEC. 3. If, during any twelve-month import period (after the first such period), the total United States market for meat and meat products (as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture) exceeds the total average annual United States market for meat and meat products during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963, the maximum quantity of meat and meat products which could otherwise be imported into the United States from any country during such period within the limitation imposed by the first section of this Act shall be increased to an amount bearing the same ratio to such quantity as such market during the twelve-month import period bears to such total average annual market during such five-year period.

SEC. 4. Each quantity referred to in the first section of this Act shall be expressed in terms of dollar value, or in terms of such other units (as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture) as will permit its magnitude to be measured, or equated or compared with other quantities in determining whether and to what extent the limitation imposed by such section is applicable, without regard to the kinds of meat and meat products or the proportions of the various kinds of meat and meat products which are included in such quantity. In the case of a product which contains but is not composed exclusively of meat, there shall be taken into account, in determining the magnitude of the quantity involved, only so much of such product, or only so much of the value of such product, as constitutes or is attributable to the meat contained therein.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him jointly with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make such determinations and establish such procedures as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this Act.

You will note, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that my bill restricts by 50 percent the average annual quantities of all meats of all kinds and in all forms of packaging and of all live meat animals imported into the United States from all foreign countries during the past 5-year period ending on December 31, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, our cattle feeders especially are suffering a most desperate cost price squeeze and have for the past year or more. Primarily due to the large beef imports of every description many stockmen have already been driven to the wall, and unless a bill such as mine is very soon made law, thousands upon thousands of our stockmen will be driven into bankruptcy, and also our entire national economy will suffer.

I sincerely hope that every Member of the House and Senate will give full consideration and support to my bill and effectively work for its early passage.

Hon. Frank Horton

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other Members who are today acknowledging the outstanding military career of our colleague, the gentleman from New York, FRANK HORTON. Being awarded the Army's Bronze Star is indeed a great honor and we all congratulate him. However, his military service represents just one phase of FRANK's successful and effective career. From the end of the war and up until his election to Congress he served his community of Rochester, N.Y., with distinc-

tion as a private citizen and then as an elected official. In 1962 he was elected to the 88th Congress where he has made outstanding contributions as a new Member. We all look forward to a long and productive career for him in the House as a Congressman. I am confident it will continue to be as outstanding as his career in the military as an infantryman. In selecting FRANK HORTON to represent them, the citizens of his district have chosen well.

Open Occupancy No Problem for Eichler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that still faces us concerning civil rights and that is being contested in my own State of California right now concerns the matter of open occupancy.

Eichler Homes is one of the half-dozen best-known builders in the United States and is widely known as a pioneer in selling on an open occupancy basis.

Housing and Home Finance Agency officials are concerned about housing minority groups and, accordingly, Marshall Kaplan, urban planner with the Division of Urban Studies, HHFA Office of Program Policy, interviewed Edward P. Eichler on the evolution of the Eichler policy and its effect on Eichler's operations.

An abridged version of the interview was recently printed in the February 1964 issue of House & Home, and I recommend it as "must" reading for all of my colleagues.

The article follows:

HOW EICHLER SELLS OPEN OCCUPANCY WITH NO FUSS

Question. How many units have you built since you started in 1948?

Answer. About 9,000. I would say out of about 700 houses a year, about 30 to 40 are sold to Negroes. Maybe it's gradually going up a bit as Negroes go up in economic scale.

Question. Did you always sell units on an open-occupancy basis?

Answer. From the earliest date, we always sold to Orientals. I think the first house we sold to an Oriental was in late 1950 or 1951 in Palo Alto. This was the first time this issue ever came up. Some people in the neighborhood got a little upset when he made the deposit and before he moved in. It was nothing of any great proportion.

Question. Did you lose any sales?

Answer. Not that I know of. From that time, we sold to a considerable number of Orientals here and there, in our small subdivisions around Palo Alto. We were selling the bulk of our houses at $13,000 to $16,000.

Question. What was the community's reaction to your selling to Orientals? Any pressures, any changes in zoning?

Answer. No community reaction at all.

Question. When did you begin to sell to Negroes?

Answer. In the fall of 1954. We had started a subdivision in Palo Alto for 243 houses. It was the first we had done—and probably the first one in the country—in which there were to be planned community facilities—a nursery school, swimming pool, and a park. We had committed ourselves to a higher price range in volume, at $16,950 to $19,500. The subdivision was an enormous success. We had sold, I would guess, about two-thirds of it, and had built about a third, when an unexpected event occurred.

I was working in the office one night when a lady called me up. She asked, "Do you discriminate in the sale of your houses? Do you sell houses to minorities?" I had never heard this question before. I had done some personal selling, but for the most part I directed sales operations. I said, "I don't understand what you mean." She replied that she was a Negro and so was her husband. She said she was renting a small house right across the street from our subdivision. They wanted to buy a better house. She asked me if I would come to her home to talk with her and her husband. I did this. In the conversation, I found that she was a nurse and her husband was a scientist who taught at Stanford and also worked in a laboratory. They said they liked our houses, and she asked, "Will you sell us a house?" Well, frankly, I told her the issue had never come up and I would like to talk to my father about it. My father's reaction was somewhat like, "Why are you bothering me about this? I've got a lot of problems, and I haven't got time for these little problems." I went back to these people and said, "OK, go pick a house and make a deposit and we will put it through the regular procedures."

The house they selected was just started. It was on a cul-de-sac, and I think all the other houses on that cul-de-sac were sold. The couple went through all the usual procedures, processing the loan, picking colors, asking for changes—the usual things that buyers do. They were noticed by some other buyers who were also doing this, and by others who had moved in. There was very, very little feedback to us from this. A few people called. Some talked with a little bit of hostility. They were disturbed about property values. They denied that they were prejudiced. I think in some cases these disclaimers were accurate. To most of these people I said that, as we construed the law, I felt that when we sold a federally-insured and financed unit we were required to sell to any qualified buyer. I admitted that it was questionable whether it was or wasn't the law, and besides many builders were violating it in any event. But I said to these people that I didn't think there would be any problems. This was what we were going to do. If everybody calmed down, there would be no problem. There was one incident with the people who had bought the house next door. The husband came to see me without his wife and said she was very disturbed about the Negro moving in. He said these were not economic concerns but related to the actual social relationships which might ensue. He wasn't trying to talk Eichler Homes out of what we were doing since he thought it was the right thing to do. But he had a personal problem and didn't think he could live there because his wife would be unhappy. Would we buy the house back from him? We did, and resold it shortly thereafter. The Negro family lived there for 5 or 6 years, then moved when the husband got transferred to Chicago.

Question. There were no other overt community reactions?

Answer. Flat out nothing. Everything went smoothly.

Question. What about the kids?

Answer. The kids? Their kids swam in the swimming pool, and so on.

Question. No community reaction? No ostracism?

Answer. No. I admit that in those days in Palo Alto our houses were attracting a somewhat special kind of person—college professors and other intellectual types. Yet it seemed that even in our other subdivisions we had people who would be more tolerant just because their educational level was higher. I surely don't want to put this on the grounds of political liberalism, because I guess there were about as many conservatives in our subdivision as in any other. I'm sure that the Negro was accepted more on the basis of just a general tolerance.

Question. Do you feel people were concerned more with the quality of housing than with the Negro occupants?

Answer. Right. I think that there was some luck in this because the market was strong—ours particularly. We were a very dominant force in Palo Alto.

Question. Were potential customers scared off when they heard or saw that you sold to Negroes?

Answer. I don't think so. This subdivision was nearly all sold by the time they moved in.

Question. Did other Negro families move in?

Answer. I don't know whether any moved in by resale since then.

Question. Did the Negro family sell through a real estate broker?

Answer. I don't know. Occupants rarely use a broker there. Prices went up over $10,000 in 7 or 8 years. Prices of all houses went up, but these went up much more.

Question. When did the next Negro buyer come to you?

Answer. About a year later, a couple of doctors who had bought houses in our San Rafael subdivision in Marin County came to see me in Palo Alto. We had then sold 50 or 60 houses in San Rafael, where we owned a terrific amount of land, the equivalent of 600 or 700 lots, which for us was a great deal of land. The doctors came to ask if we would sell a house to a Negro. I asked why they had come all that way, 50 miles, to ask this question. They said they had a friend with whom they both went to Harvard Medical School, a Negro, who was in the Air Force at Hamilton Field but would get out of the service in a few months, would be a radiologist in some local hospital, and wanted to use his GI eligibility to buy a house. They thought he was a great guy, and they knew generally what the real estate situation was. They thought it would be great to get him a house. I said, certainly, I would sell him a house. Tell him to go pick it out.

Question. Was this pending sale known in the general area?

Answer. Yes. The buyer went out on Sunday with his wife and child to look at the house and the landscaping. A month or more went by and I forgot about the whole thing. Then I got a phone call from a fellow who was very disturbed. He asked questions like, "What are you doing to me?" and "Why are you doing this?" I said I really didn't understand what he was talking about. Then he said he understood a Negro was buying a house. Incidentally, the house the Negro was buying was as far away from his as could be.

Question. How did you answer this individual's questions?

Answer. I explained that I didn't think this was a problem. Besides, I said, I just didn't think it was any of his business and he was getting himself upset for nothing. I was a little surprised because I didn't think he was the kind of man to do this.

Question. What type was he?

Answer. He was an artist. My prejudices were that it was unlikely for an artist to have this kind of reaction. And he had a very small investment in this house, which I thought would limit concern. I learned from this experience and others that the size of the downpayment people make has nothing to do with reactions to any issue. People with no downpayment will feel that they have just as big a stake as somebody who

pays cash. Frequently, bigger. In fact, I would say that the people I've had least trouble with on all kinds of issues have been those who make large or all-cash payments.

Question. Any other community reaction?

Answer. Well, from that point on, I began to get rumblings from the salesman. Little groups were forming. There were some ringleaders trying to foment feeling. I said to the salesman, "Okay, keep me informed." Finally, the salesman (who was personally committed to the principle of integration) said, "This is getting serious. There are about 20 people who are very upset. There's going to be some trouble." He thought I should get involved.

Question. What did you do?

Answer. First I talked to four people immediately around the house the Negro family had selected. I ask them how they felt. One was one of the two doctors, so obviously his reaction was favorable. The other three said, "I'm too busy," "I haven't got time for this sort of thing," and "I don't care." They had other problems. Then I met with a group of eight aroused people, the ringleader of which seemed to be neurotic. He threatened me physically and with all sorts of actions. I tried to explain that our actions conformed to law, though this was not the principal reason we were doing it. I told them we were going to do it, and if they felt it would hurt their property values we would buy their houses back. Furthermore, we had an enormous investment in this land, and if we thought it was going to hurt property values we would not do this kind of thing. I said we weren't telling them what to do and they were not in a position to tell us what to do. I must say I got nowhere in this conversation. They didn't convince me and I didn't convince them. Some of the activity kept up. It was frightening more people who otherwise would not have been aroused.

Question. Was there any outside influence behind this?

Answer. Brokers began to use this against us in a competitive way. It was easy, since Marin County had had relatively little experience with Negroes. A broker would tell some of our prospects, "You don't want to live there. There are Negroes buying there." Several people who finally did buy from us reported this. Some brokers even called us to say we were hurting the county.

Question. After your visit, did the adverse reaction subside?

Answer. Well, the rumblings continued. We decided, finally, to have a meeting with a broader group of 20 or so people. My father attended. I wasn't there. My understanding is that, in a rather severe tone, he told these people substantially that he was damned if they were going to tell him what to do. He put it on a very personal basis, that he had a bigger investment than they did, that after all it was his property and his decision. They could take any action they wanted to. He offered to buy their houses back from them. He made this offer specifically to the two ringleaders. They immediately refused, saying their houses were worth much more money than when they bought them. Well, apparently just the force of his personality was such that it knocked off most of the opposition. The minute the Negro moved in, everything stopped. It was the last word we heard about anything.

Question. No incidents?

Answer. Nothing. It proved a point that has been with me ever since. That is, if you are going to sell a house to a Negro, you should try to get him moved in as quickly as possible. You will get a large volume of people who are apathetic, you'll get a small body of people who are violently in favor, and a small body who are violently opposed. Those opposed will probably be able to add to their ranks by fear or by action. Once the sale is made, however, and the family is in, people are faced with a fait accompli. Only the fringe will react. People won't cut off their noses to spite their faces.

Question. Was the reaction in your San Rafael development complemented by pressure from any local government agency or from local financial institutions?

Answer. I never observed anything of this nature.

Question. What year was this now? And what did you plan to do?

Answer. This was late in 1955. We decided we would continue to sell on an open-occupancy basis and that we would establish a clear policy that everybody in the organization understood. But we would seek the smallest amount of outside publicity. We were going to treat it as a business decision, not as a solution of social problems. Every aspect of the operation would be one in which we would simply treat Negroes like any other potential buyers.

Question. You have now gone as far south as Orange County, which is considered a very conservative area. Have you run into any obstacles associated with the citizenry or local government?

Answer. No.

Question. Were there any obstacles in buying land down there?

Answer. The people who sell land are only interested in the money.

Question. I have heard that you had a project where the first 9 or 10 buyers were Negro and the overall sales were slow.

Answer. You are probably referring to a subdivision in which there were a variety of problems. Sales were slow for reasons that had nothing to do with the Negro issue. In about a year we sold to 5 Negroes, I think, out of a total of only about 60 houses, so the percentage of sales to Negroes was somewhat higher than usual. Incidentally, in the last 6 months the sales have dramatically picked up. We even sold some more houses to Negroes, so while I think that it caused us a little more trouble than we would have had otherwise, the net effect of Negro buyers wasn't very harmful. My general conclusion was that the rapid pickup in sales indicates again that the Negro influence was not the major cause of earlier troubles. There are now 8 Negro families out of about 150 sales there.

Question. Did you at any time have your salesmen try to delay sales to Negroes or delay their moving into the projects until you got more of a percentage of whites?

Answer. No. We talked about it, but decided not to. First, we were nowhere near any kind of really severe situation, and second, we didn't even know how to do it. We never had to face that question. I suppose there might be a point under certain conditions when a builder would have to face that.

Question. Most examples of integrated, open occupancy house developments are not in areas on the fringe of the Negro ghetto. You have built in the central city. In San Francisco you have built right next to public housing. (1) Have you felt that this location hurt your sales? (2) Have you sold to Negro occupants in these particular projects? (3) Do you contemplate it? (4) Would your policy be the same if a Negro came into your development in this kind of area?

Answer. We have a subdivision in San Francisco consisting of townhouses priced from $28,000 to $30,000 (H. & H. December 1962). It is in an old area of the city right near an old public housing project built before World War II. The project has about 1,000 units with about one-third Negro occupancy. How the presence of Negroes in that public housing project is affecting sales, I don't know. But we sold some of the townhouses to Negroes. We have sold about half the project which, when completed, will have 211 units. To date, we have sold about 4 or 5 percent to Negroes, the usual average.

Question. You have sold to a small percentage of Negroes and you are still making white sales in your development?

Answer. Our selling houses to Negroes there has almost no effect on sales at all. I think, in fact, that if the general market were truly open, the middle-class Negro buyer would be as bothered about this location as the middle-class white. I think this is a class distinction. It's the middle-class family saying, "I don't want to live next to the lower class family." I think it has little to do with race, except that most whites associate Negroes with the lower class.

Question. Then you don't attribute any negative market factors here to the fact that you have sold to nonwhites?

Answer. Not here, though I admit that our general policy probably leads some people not to come at all. Open occupancy here is of no greater impact than any other place. It may be even less, because whites are buying in the city and probably have less expectation of total segregation in the city.

Question. What about your project in downtown San Francisco in the renewal area? Did you run into problems there?

Answer. That consists of 72 garden apartments, selling for $35,000 to $36,000 or renting for $260 to $275 a month. We sold one and rented one to Negro families (current sales and rentals: 3 to Negroes, 59 to whites).

Question. To what degree did the school factor affect your sales?

Answer. The elementary school in the neighborhood is almost entirely Negro and draws from the public housing project. Our big units are designed for families, so I suspect the neighborhood has hurt sales. But this is a class distinction; it applies to Negro and white families equally.

Question. Then the Negroes feel objectively the same as whites about school problems?

Answer. That's right. The difference is that the white can say, "Well, I am sorry, I'll live someplace else," and will pay more money or make other sacrifices to stay out of what he feels is a bad area. The Negro has no choice.

Question. How long have you been well known to sell to nonwhites?

Answer. At least 4 years. This came about largely because of certain disputes we had with the Home Builders Association over the general subject. As you know, my dad resigned from the association. Despite the public awareness, we haven't had the rapid influx of Negroes that many predicted we would have.

Question. Isn't this a reflection of the price scale of your homes?

Answer. Yes, in part, though some recent Eichler subdivisions have been only slightly above the State average in prices. I don't think, even in a lower price range, that if one of the major builders just quietly decided to sell to Negroes that there would be any great influx. Certainly if most major builders did it, there wouldn't be a great problem.

Quesion. What effect has your open-occupancy policy had on total sales?

Answer. It varies by subdivision. Overall, it has not hurt. We have had some cases where whites bought our houses just because of our open-occupancy policy.

If someone is really interested in buying a house, and then the issue comes up, in that case we "win" 9 times out of 10. There probably is a greater impact among the people who never mention the matter, or who never come at all because they learn that Eichler sells to Negroes. I think this is a very small number of people, statistically. Our policy is a special attitude of responsibility to the industry and the community. This includes producing a good product in a well-designed community. There is a right way and a wrong way to do things.

Question. What special sales techniques have you developed to meet market resistance?

Answer. First, I evolved a policy under which no answer would be given to people on this question unless it was asked. If a buyer does not ask anything about the matter, he never hears about it from our salesman or us. If he asks first if we sell on an open-occupancy basis, we answer, "Yes, we sell to any qualified buyer." If he asks, "Are there any Negroes in this subdivision?", the answer is yes or no, depending on the fact. We do not answer more than the question. If you came to us and did not ask if there were Catholics, Jews, etc., in the subdivision, we wouldn't tell you.

Question. What about your answer to the perennial question relative to the Negro and property values?

Answer. The salesman gives all the usual responses, ranging from law to "It's the right thing to do," to our own experiences in the resale market. There is another interesting argument. This is that the only time existence of a minority group, particularly Negroes, leads to devaluation is when there is panic selling by the whites. Thus, because it is well known that Eichler Homes sells on an open-occupancy basis, there is not likely to be panic selling if Negroes buy. This is so because the whites already know our policy when they buy. In a sense, we say that our policy is almost protection.

Question. Then in any location you will sell to any qualified buyer?

Answer. Yes. But another control is that we tell the salesman to watch where there may be several Negroes bunching. In most cases, the Negroes themselves will prevent it if they see it. If there are two or three Negro families in a cul-de-sac, and a fourth comes along, the salesman will try to influence the newcomer to take another house. Rarely has this happened. But if a Negro should insist that he wants a particular house next to other Negroes' homes, we would sell him that house.

Question. With an open-occupancy policy, is it easier to rent or sell in multifamily buildings than in single-family houses? I have heard it expressed that it's easier to sell single-family homes because of the proximity involved in apartments.

Answer. I think the analysis is incorrect. An apartment offers more anonymity. Also, I think people buying a house have a great feeling of commitment both financially and emotionally. Therefore, they are subject to greater fears.

Probably the basic reason the white is concerned so much is not monetary, though it's fashionable and nice to give that reason. I think the real reasons have to do with social relationships, particularly among children. Adults think if they don't like the Negro they can avoid him—but they know the kids don't work that way. The kids run around, they don't see color, they play. I think this worries people. It's foreign to them so they fear it is bad.

Question. Do you think you could have been successful with this policy if you hadn't had the housing background and the necessary means to hold you over a period during any lag in sales resulting from the Negro occupancy?

Answer. I don't think that any fairly large builder's sales will be materially affected by an open-occupancy policy, because he is big enough to absorb it. The chances of getting two Negroes out of the first five, for instance, might really frighten small builders because their scope is so small. I think it is a question of being strong enough so you are completely identified as a builder. That's your business: you are fairly well known in the community; the bankers, the city council, the planning commission, the building inspectors, the market itself are reasonably familiar with you. Therefore, your switch into this policy will not identify you as being principally a builder of integrated housing but as a builder who is now planning to sell his houses on an open-occupancy basis.

Question. Do you conclude, then, that the big builder must take the lead in bringing this along because the small builder faces a greater risk?

Answer. Right. After all, if the small builder is asked to do this initially, and the big builder isn't, the small builder is put at an even greater disadvantage competitively.

Look at what happens the other way around, as seen by our experience in Palo Alto, where we have been an enormous influence. By 1956 we were building over 80 percent of the housing. When it became known that Eichler Homes was selling on an open-occupancy basis, some real estate brokers were upset and started saying they thought this would hurt the city. But this died down quickly, and now almost the whole market has opened up to a wide degree. Resales in our subdivisions are occasionally made to Negroes. Negroes can buy houses in non-Eichler subdivisions. The brokers have become used to it and so have the citizens. The living fact—the demonstration—is the only form of education I think can be truly useful. Here, in a sense, Eichler Homes is in a position to pass its own local fair-housing law.

Question. Do you believe that at the price level you are building, the quality and design of the homes, the characteristics of the neighborhood and the community become more important than the factor of white or Negro occupancy?

Answer. Yes. And I also think that at a higher price range it is easier to do this because you deal with people who have more education. They may not be any more tolerant in the classic sense but they will not react as strongly to their intolerances.

Question. Is the rate of foreclosures or delinquency payments the same for your Negro buyers as for your white buyers?

Answer. I've never heard of a foreclosure of a house that a Negro has bought. But the rate of foreclosures on our houses is so low I think you could find no statistical basis for a comparison. Our Negro buyers' incomes are, if anything, slightly higher.

Question. Is open occupancy good business?

Answer. I haven't said that it is good business. What I say is, I don't think it is bad business. Almost every kind of lending institution in the country is aware of our policy and we have never had any problem with any institution on this account. We have not had any problems with local officials anywhere. I think that it is probably not a dangerous practice, particularly for a reasonably competent large builder of at least 100 houses a year. Most of the fears builders have in this regard are greatly exaggerated.

Question. Eichler Homes has operated through two recessions and you had Negro occupancies in at least one, in 1957–59. Did you notice a change in your competitive status? Did your resale values hold up?

Answer. In general, our competitive position has been better in a tough market than in a seller's market. In a soft market, we continue to attract people. Qualitative factors become important in a tough market because what happens in a tough market is that people are harder to sell. Therefore, these qualitative factors become more important in a recession.

Question. Will you sum up your personal views on open occupancy?

Answer. I think white resistance to living where there might be Negroes results from the white's fear of the unknown, and fear of the relationships which might result with the children. These fears are quickly dissipated as people experience the fact that no great problems develop.

Even though there are some risks in selling on an open-occupancy basis, builders really don't have any other choice. Builders are in a position which they have denied for too long. That is, when they build a lot of houses or apartments they create communities. They create a lot of things in that community which are going to be there a long time after the builder leaves.

I'm convinced that the race question is the one single biggest block to advancement in this society. On all kinds of levels, in terms of personal relationships, in terms of education, in terms of expenditures for education particularly, and for other things we need in our society, we have unused resources and capacity. Builders cannot evade the fact that what they do is going to have an impact on the whole community. They cannot simply say, "Well, I'm just a businessman. I'm here to make a buck." They are businessmen and they have to try to make money—but they are also contributing to the kinds of communities and environments in which people are going to live. I think builders would be much better off if they faced this responsibility.

The Problem Called Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the threat posed by Cyprus to peace in the Mediterranean and to the future of NATO is grave indeed. It is a threat all too frequently clouded with emotionalism and misunderstanding, yet a threat which must be clearly viewed by reasonable men if reasonable and realistic solutions are to be achieved.

Two recent articles—one appearing in the New York Times on February 23 and the other by Robert Estabrook in the Washington Post on the same day—speak directly and thoughtfully to the problem at hand. I commend them to our colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 23, 1964]

GREEKS QUESTION U.S. LEADERSHIP

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—Back from 3 weeks in the turmoil of the Cypriot dispute, the correspondent must try to sort out basic realities. Clearly the Greek Cypriot Government of President Makarios has connived at violence in an attempt to subdue the Turkish minority. Superficially this may seem majority self-determination, but it abets counterviolence that draws in outsiders. One can only hope that United Nations Secretary General U Thant will succeed where Anglo-American peacekeeping efforts have failed.

Certain shortcomings of British and American policy affect future influence in the area. Makarios is patently unreasonable, but the original attempt to introduce a NATO peacekeeping force into Cyprus was a mistake because of its divisive and provocative implications. This mistake was later corrected by eliminating reference to NATO countries, but confidence is not encouraged by American denials that such reference was ever made.

Britain is reaping the fruit of having attempted to check Greek Cypriot terrorism and demands for union with Greece in the mid-1950's by encouraging Turkish Cypriot opposition. The skill and patience of British forces now in Cyprus command admiration. But some of the frustrations they encounter in dealing with guerrilla war result from previous attempts to retain control by playing one faction against the other.

Despite clamor at home, both the Greek and the Turkish Governments have been fundamentally restrained and cooperative. But attitudes in each country are strikingly different. Turkish concern about the fate of Turkish Cypriots is genuine and the possibility of military intervention cannot be discounted, but Turkey is a big country preoccupied internally with making democratic government work. Moreover, there is awareness of the importance of good relations with Greece.

Turkish restraint is due largely to the wise leadership of a remarkable man, Prime Minister Ismet Inonu, who has just escaped an assassination attempt. Inonu has withstood public passions and military pressures. Turkish faith in the United States and the Western alliance is touching.

Greece by contrast seeks to find a role suiting her individual temperament. Many Greeks voice personal identification with the cause of the Greek Cypriots. Many also bare their animosity toward Turkey—the ember of long years of Ottoman rule fanned by the dreadful 1955 anti-Greek riots in Istanbul. Although the government has behaved responsibly and the new Prime Minister, George Papandreou, may be a calming factor, emotions are at a high pitch. Irrational or not, this is the situation.

Loyalty to NATO is strained by what is regarded as an American and British tendency to side with Turkey. Emotions were further inflamed when American officials did not tell the government of the Anglo-American decision to beat Cyprus to an appeal to the U.N. Security Council—because previously details of the Anglo-American peacekeeping plan had been leaked to Makarios.

As a byproduct of this emotional fixation there is mumbling that Greece ought to follow the lead of French President de Gaulle, who was immensely popular on his visit last year. He has shown, it is said, that a country can be anti-Communist and still stand apart from the great powers.

Some hold that De Gaulle's policy is unreal because it is not based upon military strength. It is true that he benefits from the American strategic shield against nuclear attack which he does not expect to happen. His political acumen and initiative nevertheless enable him to capitalize upon resentments in such countries as Greece—resentments against being taken for granted as a virtual satellite and against Americans too much in evidence.

Greeks complain with some merit that the United States interfered blatantly in past elections. American support of former conservative Prime Minister Constantine Caramanlis was so unquestioning that at least one previous ambassador thought it unnecessary even to see the leader of the opposition—who happened to be Papandreou.

We can hardly be surprised when short-range finagling for tactical advantage rebounds later to haunt us. Attitudes in the eastern Mediterranean relate closely to those found elsewhere in the alliance, and they emphasize the need for a general redefinition of American objectives beyond mere crisis diplomacy. American leadership is increasingly in question. It is scarcely enough merely to reiterate the old policies which others in today's changed situation may regard as more trite than true.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 23, 1964]

CYPRUS RIDDLE—PROBLEM FOR U.N.

The island of Cyprus is less than one-tenth the size of Cuba, and in terms of population is among the half-dozen smallest nations in the U.N. Yet last week this tiny piece of territory occupied the attention of the world's great powers and its fate was a matter of grave international concern.

Efforts to resolve the conflict between Cyprus' 450,000 inhabitants of Greek extraction and 100,000 inhabitants of Turkish extraction centered on the Security Council. On the outcome hinged the chances for settling an issue that could tear NATO apart and make the eastern Mediterranean a new area of East-West contention.

The danger to NATO lies in the fact that two members of the alliance—Greece and Turkey—have been threatening to intervene militarily on opposite sides of the Cyprus conflict. The mere threat of war and the mutual recriminations between the two NATO partners have already damaged the strength and stability of the eastern flank of the alliance. An actual outbreak of fighting between the two would shatter NATO's position in the eastern Mediterranean and might mean disintegration of the entire alliance.

The danger of Cyprus becoming an East-West issue stems from U.N. entry into the dispute—something Britain and the United States had hoped to prevent. Moscow's opportunity for maneuver in the Cyprus crisis has now greatly increased. Russia has long sought to establish a focus of power and influence in the eastern Mediterranean; in the Cyprus issue she apparently sees a chance of doing so while injecting herself into the middle of a NATO dispute. Communist strength in the Greek labor unions on Cyprus poses the threat of a leftwing bid for power—with Moscow's aid—if turmoil on the island continues.

Last week this interplay of pressures shaped the debate and maneuvers in the U.N. Security Council. The principal issue was the composition and terms of authorization of a force to keep peace on Cyprus where at least 250 persons have perished in the communal strife since last December. Britain, which has troops on the island under the terms of the 1960 independence treaty, has been augmenting its force, which was less than 3,000 when the fighting broke out in December. But Britain's military reserves are badly strained. She wants an international force of about 10,000—preferably drawn from NATO countries—to maintain peace on Cyprus so efforts can go forward for a political settlement.

STANDS OF PARTIES

These were the positions taken by the major parties to the controversy in the Security Council last week:

Greek Cypriots: They asked the Council to take full responsibility for the peacekeeping force and also sought a formal commitment from the Council to the "independence and territorial integrity" of the island. The Cyprus Government, headed by Archbishop Makarios, a Greek, apparently believes that such a commitment by the Council would nullify the 1960 treaty. That treaty gave Britain, Greece, and Turkey the right to intervene militarily in Cyprus to uphold the terms of the country's Constitution and preserve the status quo.

The archbishop wants to prevent such intervention by Turkey. He hopes to carry out constitutional reforms that, among other things, would eliminate the Turkish Cypriots' power to veto some legislation. It was the archbishop's proclamation of the reforms last December that led to the communal violence.

TURKISH DEMANDS

Turkey: The Turkish representative sought from the Security Council a resolution specifically endorsing the Cypriot Constitution and the 1960 treaty of guarantee. He warned against a resolution and authorization for a peacekeeping force which the Greek Cypriots "could pretend to interpret as though international treaties have been abrogated."

Britain and United States: They concentrated mainly on trying to limit any connection between the U.N. and the peacekeeping force, and also to limit the degree of intervention by the organization in Cyprus' affairs. Their fear is that the larger the authority and role of the U.N., the more meddlesome the Soviets will be, thus further complicating chances for a compromise solution.

Soviet Union: Russia's role last week tended to substantiate the Western fears. The Soviet representative fully supported the Greek Cypriot position and said a resolution by the Security Council would supersede the 1960 treaty.

Wednesday evening, Security Council debate was suspended until this Tuesday. The action was taken at the request of Secretary General U Thant so that he could try to work out a compromise on the composition and terms of reference of the peacekeeping force. Mr. Thant was said to be trying to achieve agreement on a formula that would put the force under the Security Council "umbrella" without making it exclusively a U.N. responsibility. Some form of endorsement of the territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus might be expressed, but not so as to abrogate the 1960 treaty. The Secretary General would also appoint a mediator who would seek a permanent solution of the communal conflict.

At the weekend, Mr. Thant was in virtually continuous conference with the interested parties in the effort to obtain a compromise agreement.

Assuming agreement is eventually reached on the composition and authorization of a peacekeeping force, what kind of political settlement is possible

The Greek Cypriots have made plain they will never accept the extreme Turkish demand—taksim, or partition of the island. In response to such pressures, in fact, they raise an extreme demand of their own—enosis, or union of Cyprus with Greece.

There has been talk about "administrative partition" of Cyprus—a partial division of authority over the two communities without actually establishing separate autonomies. But there are serious difficulties in the way of such a solution, even if it were acceptable in principle to the two sides.

Greek and Turkish communities are geographically intermixed throughout the island and in many cases occupy the same villages. Of 634 villages on Cyprus, 395 are Greek, 121 are Turkish, and 114 are mixed (there are four villages of other nationalities). In many areas, the economies of the two communities are interdependent. Thus even an administrative division—let alone full partition—might involve uprooting and relocating thousands of people.

Conceivably Archbishop Makarios might modify his proposed constitutional reforms to the point where they would be acceptable to the Turks. Thus far, however, he has rejected any such course and the Turks have stated that they want new and stronger guarantees now, not a reduction of their rights.

But the trouble is that the "bargaining" is being conducted by riflefire in the streets. Until the violence is halted, the Cypriot conflict will continue to raise the threat of major international repercussions.

Some Unknown Facts About Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Washington Star, Mr. Robert J. Lewis gave some heretofore un-

known facts about the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

I had in mind the facts revealed in this article when I introduced the resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission, so that the Members could have gone into all the facets of the memorial. Instead, Congress authorized this Center, knowing very little about it.

The article follows:

UNDERSTANDING THE CENTER

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Part of the reason why a number of Members have said that Congress has been misled regarding the size, requirements, and cost of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is that there never has been a clear public statement by the architects or sponsors that gives the full dimensions of this project.

As a result, an aura of suspicion has arisen that can best be cleared away, perhaps, by making very clear to Congress, and to everyone else, that the present design calls for a mammoth building whose base will cover more than one and a half times the amount of land occupied by the Capitol in which Congress meets.

An understanding of this project also demands that it be made clear the building will have a maximum height at least 122 feet above grade on the river side, and that this is a 12-story height as most stories are measured.

Another fact that should be faced squarely is that the total cost of the proposed design will not be $30 million, or even $50 million, but at least $54 or $55 million, without including the value of land the Government already owns. The current market value of the setting would be at least $10 million more, which would bring the total project value to a minimum of about $65 million.

We do not refer here to the dimensions of this project to harm it but to help it, and to prevent further misunderstanding in the future.

The tendency on the part of the sponsors understandably has been to minimize the size, the requirements, and the cost, and this course, however plausible and proper it may have seemed, cannot any longer be assumed to be a helpful one now that Congress is to be relied on to appropriate and guarantee so large a part of the funds.

One of the reasons why no one seems to have a full understanding of the great size of this proposed design is that sponsors persist in referring to only one part of the building "the superstructure" as the building itself.

The substructure and superstructure are inseparable parts of the same building. The substructure is not underground. It is almost entirely above ground on the river side and is exposed to view. This has not been made clear.

Playing down existence of the substructure minimizes the apparent size and cost. It also is the reason for the real lack of understanding of this project. From now on, the sponsors might do well to speak frankly of the fact that the building is an entity with a podium or base having a maximum length of 700 feet and a maximum width of 530 feet, and that the maximum usable area of the building on its largest level is 700 by 400 feet.

Thus, the largest floor—which will be one of three to be used for parking cars—has a total area of about 6½ acres. The Capitol, including the east front extension, covers 4 acres.

Another thing to know about this proposed building is that a 700-foot-long, 27-foot-high length of the substructure will be exposed to view on the river side.

If the present design is to be used as the final one for the building, it is evident that what is proposed here is one of the largest structures in Washington.

It will be larger in both length and width than the new Smithsonian Museum of History and Technology, which cost $36 million, and which is 577 feet long by 300 feet wide on the first floor and steps back to 491 feet in length and 216 feet in width on the second, third and fourth floors.

The Center, in fact, has a proposed length only 50 feet short of the huge 750-foot-long third House Office Building now nearing completion on Capitol Hill at a cost of $85 million.

In renaming the Center as a memorial, and in voting authorization of $30.9 million support, Congress has acted promptly and generously. Now is the time for all the facts about the current design to be made public by the architects and sponsors in a form everyone can understand.

If Congress fully understands what is being proposed, it can then make informed decisions on lands and funds that will minimize the prospect of later recrimination.

Moody Memorial First Methodist Church, Galveston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 16, in Galveston, Tex., a new Methodist church was dedicated. It was of special historical interest and importance not only to Methodists but also to all who profess Christianity.

Many years ago, an Englishman by the name of Charles Shearn came to Texas bringing with him a very young son named John. After a stormy time which included involvement in the War with Mexico, the elder Shearn settled in Houston. His son later established the Shearn Memorial Methodist Church which was one of the first strongholds of Methodism in the State.

A daughter, Libbie, married a Galveston man named William L. Moody, Jr. Mrs. Moody, throughout her life, had a dream of establishing a memorial church in Galveston which would carry on the Methodist traditions of her father and her grandfather. In her will, she made abundant provision for the church and her husband, when he died, confirmed her wishes.

It was this church which was dedicated in Galveston on the morning of Sunday, February 16, 1964.

An honor guest at the dedication was Mrs. Moody's daughter, Libbie Moody Thompson, wife of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, CLARK W. THOMPSON.

Bishop Paul E. Martin, who presided at the dedication ceremonies, suggested that the program which follows should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my privilege to comply with his suggestion:

MOODY MEMORIAL FIRST METHODIST CHURCH—"THE ISLAND CATHEDRAL"—GALVESTON, TEX.

(Bishop Paul E. Martin, Texas conference; Rev. Ray Loden, district superintendent; Rev. Weldon B. Morton, minister; Dr. S. Stephen McKenney, minister emeritus)

THE PRESENTATION OF THE NEW EDIFICE FOR DEDICATION—MOODY MEMORIAL FIRST METHODIST CHURCH

(In honor and in memory of Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Moody, Jr., Sunday, February 16, 1964, 10:30 a.m.)

This building complex with its appointments is built as a memorial provided by the late Mrs. Libbie Shearn Moody in recognition of the very generous provision made in her will. She is joined in this memorial by her husband, Mr. W. L. Moody, Jr. Mr. Moody also made a memorial provision in providing the windows. The lower panels on each side are dedicated to his wife, Mrs. Libbie Shearn Moody and in memory of his mother, Mrs. Pherabe Elizabeth Moody.

Altar vase and flowers are given in honor of Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Kennedy by their daughters, Mrs. Lee M. Terrill, Mrs. Neal D. Cannon, and Mrs. Clarence E. Gilmore.

DEDICATION SERVICE—ORDER OF WORSHIP

Prelude: "Blessed Jesus, At Thy Word" (hymn No. 310).

(Chorale variations by Johann Gottfried Walther.)

Introit (sung by the choir from the Narthex).

Processional hymn No. 1: "Holy, Holy, Holy."

(The procession of the choir shall be followed by the bishop, the pastor, and the district superintendents. The congregation shall stand as the bishop enters.)

Call to worship

Minister: "Serve the Lord with gladness."

People: "Enter into His gates with thanksgiving and into His courts with praise."

Minister: "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our maker."

People: "He is our God; and we are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand. Amen."

Affirmation of faith (p. 512, No. 1).

The collect for dedication day

(Here let the people unite with the minister in prayer:)

"Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, with thy most gracious favor, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name, and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Anthem "Christ Is Our Cornerstone" (Aufdemberge):

"Christ is our Cornerstone, on Him alone we build; with His true saints alone the courts of heav'n are filled. On His great love our hopes we place of present grace and joys above. Here, gracious God, do Thou forevermore draw nigh; accept each faithful vow and mark each suppliant sigh. In copious show'r on all who pray each holy day Thy blessing pour. Here may we gain from heav'n the grace which we implore and may that grace, once giv'n be with us evermore until that day when all the blest to endless rest are called away. Oh, then, with hymns of praise these hallowed courts shall ring; our voices we will raise the Three in One to sing, and thus proclaim in joyful song, both loud and long, that glorious name. Amen."

Canticle of the church (Dr. Joe Z. Tower).

(To be said responsively by the minister and the people:)

Minister: "How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts."

People: "My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God."

Minister: "Yea, the sparrow hath found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even Thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King, and my God."

People: "Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house: they will be still praising Thee."

Minister: "Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee; in whose heart are the ways of them."

People: "Who passing through the valley of weeping make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools."

Minister: "They go from strength to strength every one of them in Zion appeareth before God."

People: "O Lord God of hosts, hear my prayer: give ear, O God of Jacob."

Minister: "Behold, O God our shield, and look upon the fact of Thine anointed."

People: "For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness."

Minister: "For the Lord God is a sun and shield: the Lord will give grace and glory: no good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly."

People: "O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man that trusteth in Thee."

The Gloria Patri:

"Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

The Scripture lesson (Rev. Ray Loden).

The morning prayer (Dr. Neal D. Cannon, president of the cabinet).

(Concluded with the Lord's Prayer and choral amen.)

Recognition of guests and rollcall.

Worship of God with tithes and offerings.

Offertory: "The Lord Is My Shepherd" (Alec Rowley).

Hymn No. 550 "Come, O Thou God of Grace" (Giardini).

Sermon of dedication (Bishop Paul E. Martin).

The act of dedication

(The trustees shall present the building for dedication:)

"We present this building to be dedicated to the glory of God and the service of men."

(Then shall the bishop say:)

"By what name shall this church henceforth be known?"

(To which shall be answered by the trustees:)

"It shall be called Moody Memorial First Methodist Church."

(Then shall the members of the cabinet receive the building and shall say:)

"Beloved in the Lord, we rejoice that God put it into the hearts of his people to build this house to the glory of His name. We now accept this building to be known as Moody Memorial First Methodist Church, to dedicate it, and to set it apart for the worship of Almighty God and the service of all men. Let us therefore, as we are assembled, solemnly dedicate this place to its proper and sacred uses."

(Then, all standing, the bishop shall say, the people responding:)

"To the glory of God the Father, who has called us by His grace.

"To the honor of His Son, who loved us and gave Himself for us.

"To the praise of the Holy Spirit, who illumines and sanctifies us.

"We dedicate this house—

"For the worship of God in prayer and praise.

"For the preaching of the everlasting gospel.

"For the celebration of the holy Sacraments.

"We dedicate this house—

"For the comfort of all who mourn.

"For strength to those who are tempted.

"For light to those who seek the way.

"We dedicate this house—

"For the hallowing of family life.

"For teaching and guiding the young.

"For the perfecting of the saints.

"We dedicate this house—

"For the conversion of sinners.

"For the promotion of righteousness.

"For the extension of the Kingdom of God.

"We dedicate this house—

"In the unity of the faith.

"In the bond of Christian brotherhood.

"In charity and good will to all.

"We dedicate this house—

"In gratitude for the labors of all who love and serve this church.

"In loving remembrance of those who have finished their course.

"In the hope of a blessed immortality through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The prayer of dedication (Bishop Martin):

"O eternal God, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, much less the walls of temples made with hands; graciously accept the dedication of this house to thy honor and glory. Amen."

Recessional hymn No. 226, "O Jesus, I Have Promised."

(The congregation will stand in the singing of the hymn.)

Benediction (Dr. Stewart Clendenin).

(Choral amen by the choir.)

Postlude: "Rigaudon" (Compre).

SANCTUARY WINDOWS

These windows are designed by the very eminent European artist, Gabriel Loire, of Chartres, France, and are presented as follows:

Northside—New Testament themes (from entrance to chancel):

Window No. 1: Dedicated to the nativity.

Window No. 2: Dedicated to baptism.

Window No. 3: Dedicated to the eucharist/communion.

Window No. 4: Dedicated to the crucifixion.

Window No. 5: Dedicated to the ressurection.

Southside—Old Testament themes:

Window No. 1: The vision of Ezekiel, the four evangelists.

Window No. 2: Dedicated to Moses, giving of the law.

Window No. 3: The burning bush.

Window No. 4: Dedicated to the original sin.

Window No. 5: Dedicated to the creation of the world.

(The eternal life window over the main entrance with the symbol Alpha and Omega.)

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND MEMBERS OF THE BUILDING COMMITTEE

A. Roy Graves, Richard Klaerner, D. G. Kobs, E. M. Norton, R. T. Richards, Paul L. Rounsaville, Homer Sanderford, Harry Tholcken, Jr., and Ben Windle.

THE BISHOP AND THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS OF THE ELEVEN DISTRICTS OF THE TEXAS CONFERENCE

Paul E. Martin, bishop; Stewart Clendenin, Beaumont district; Karl O. Bayer, Bryan district; G. Ray Loden, Galveston, district; William L. Hattaway, Houston, east district; Wayne H. McCleskey, Houston west district; A. Grady Hallonquist, Huntsville district; Walter R. Wills, Longview district; Neal D. Cannon, Nacogdoches district; Stanley Carter, Palestine district; Compton Riley, Texargana district; and, Derwood L. Blackwell, Tyler district.

CHURCH OFFICERS AND STAFF

Paul L. Rounsaville, chairman of the official board; A. Roy Graves, chairman, board of trustees; R. T. Richards, church treasurer; Ward B. Benson, Jr., church school superintendent; Mrs. Wm. Cowan, president, WSCS; Bruce Farmer, president, Methodist Men; Mrs. Jim Kendall, director of religious education; Mrs. Julian R. Picone, church secretary; Arthur F. Click, financial secretary; Mrs. Ward B. Benson, Jr., organist; Peter D. Tkach, choir director; and, Ernest Robertson, custodian.

This church has been erected to the glory of God with the full anticipation that all those who enter its doors may have a greater knowledge of the Spirit of Christ and a deeper understanding of the message of His church.

Three New Lakes in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing realization among the several hundred thousand residents of north-central Indiana of the vast recreational and economic potential to be found in the three flood control reservoir projects now underway in the Fifth Congressional District.

The primary purpose of these reservoirs is to alleviate the periodic flood conditions on the Wabash River downstream from the projects. But there is an ancillary benefit to be derived in the seasonal pools which will stretch out for miles behind the reservoir dams.

The people of the area who have to drive a number of miles today to reach adequate sites for water recreation will find three huge lakes almost at their back door. Two of them will be virtually equal in size to the largest lake in Indiana today. The third will be only slightly smaller.

There is little doubt a new recreation center for Indiana is in the making. If it is to realize its full potential there must be adequate planning by State and local governments.

The fact that these steps are being initiated now, 2 years in advance of completion of the first project, is clear evidence the officials are aware of a golden economic and recreational era ahead.

A recent editorial broadcast by Fort Wayne radio station WOWO presents an accurate and concise picture of the responsibilities which must be met if we are to reap full harvest of the benefits to be offered by these three projects:

NORTHERN INDIANA'S NEW LAKES

(By C. W. Vandagrift, general manager, WOWO, Fort Wayne, Ind.)

One of these years, we citizens of northern Indiana, western Ohio, and southern Michigan are going to look up and find three huge, new artificial lakes in our backyard. Each of these bodies of water will be approximately 10 to 12 miles long, and will have specified areas set aside for such interesting occupations as fishing, water-skiing, boating, camping, and picnicking.

They are, of course, the new flood-control reservoirs which will rise behind large dams on the Mississinewa, Salamonie, and Wabash Rivers within the next few years.

At a recent meeting in Wabash, Ind., held in that city's beautiful Honeywell Memorial

Community Building, we learned that the timetable for these new lakes will bring the Mississinewa and Salamonie Reservoirs into existence in 1966 and 1967 respectively, with the Wabash coming along in 1969. For orientation purposes, the first two lie just a few miles south of the city of Wabash, with the so-called Huntington Reservoir slightly southeast of that city.

At the meeting referred to earlier, representatives of the State departments of public health, conservation, and highways met with officials of five Indiana counties, within whose boundaries the new reservoirs will rise.

Some of the problems brought out by public health officer, Don Ort, are enough to make you shudder; this one in particular. Imagine what will happen to our beautiful new lakes if some five-county system of sanitary sewage control is not organized. Imagine what they will be like in a few years if there is no common five-county plan for proper land use, including zoning control. Without such planning, our new lakes could become smelly slums almost before they are built.

At this moment, only Wabash County of the five involved, have a full time public health officer. The State board is strongly urging Grant, Huntington, Miami, and Wells Counties to acquire such a full-time officer. That, of course, is only a first step. It then becomes the job of those counties, as well as the cities of Marion, Gas City, Huntington, Peru, Wabash, and Bluffton, to evolve an overall plan of land-use and sanitation control for our new artifical lakes.

The citizens of these communities owe that much to the rest of us.

Khrushchev Using U.N. To Prevent Peaceful Settlement in Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again the U.N. is being used by the Soviet Union to thwart the peace of the world. Using peace as a propaganda weapon to impress the ignorant and the uninformed, Khrushchev plays with peace and war like a game of chess. He instigates violence, rebellion, and revolution, then piously calls for peace, but only on Soviet terms. With each settlement Communist influence gains and the free world suffers another defeat.

Nowhere is the Soviet design better illustrated than in the Cyprus situation now before the United Nations. While the Western Powers have been attempting to bring a peaceful solution to this troubled island, the Communists have been trying to instigate war between Greece and Turkey, two NATO allies. As usual the United States and the British have been conned into throwing the matter into the U.N. where the Soviets may work their will. Any practical program to insure peace is balked by the Soviet delegate and the result probably will be U.N. action in line with the Khrushchev plan.

Khrushchev's intent was exposed by "Three Star Extra," the Shell Oil Co. news program broadcast over NBC on February 20. The commentator said in part:

But Khrushchev's intention is transparently dishonest, as is being revealed by the Soviet delegate to the U.N. Security Counsel in its current discussions on the Cyprus crisis. Everyone else is trying to do what Khrushchev pretends to desire; namely, prevent the Greek and Turkish Cypriots from cutting each other's throats, and so substitute reason and negotiation for violence. To this end, various forms of peace force are being discussed, not to impose any outside settlement upon Cyprus but to keep the peace and a reasoned solution possible. The Soviet delegate alines this as an attempt to impose a NATO settlement upon Cyprus.

He would have the U.N. limit itself to holding a ring around Cyprus and letting Greek and Turkish Cypriots fight it out. Since the Turkish Cypriots are outnumbered 4 to 1, this would quickly bring in the Turkish forces to even the balance, which in turn would lead to war between Greece and Turkey, two members of NATO.

These are the developments Khrushchev is actually trying to foment.

Needed Tax Reduction With Certain Undesirable Features

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House are today faced with an option to vote to accept or reject in its entirety the tax bill H.R. 8363, which will provide over $11.5 billion in Federal tax relief when it is fully effective. Faced with an alternative of all or nothing, I must reluctantly accept certain undesirable features so that all Americans will be able to benefit immediately from other parts of the bill that have been worked out successfully with bipartisan support.

The bill as a whole recognizes the necessity of removing tax impediments to the development of a strong economy. For example, although the individual income tax rates are still steeply progressive, relief has been given in all marginal tax brackets. The heavy shackels that the high and progressive rates have had on private entrepreneurship and risk taking have taken a serious toll in recent years on our economic growth and employment record. Both political parties have recognized this dampening force of the high tax rates and united in presenting to the American public a tax program that will at least mitigate some of these retarding influences.

We must not allow ourselves to regard H.R. 8363 as a panacea for all economic ills. The budgetary balance problem still looms heavily over us. We must, therefore, never lose sight of the urgent need for Federal expenditure reduction. It is important that the administration and Congress make an all-out effort to cut our expenditure level and return us to a balanced budget program. Unless we accomplish this, we will see the benefits of our tax program dwindled away by inflation and costly debt financing.

The tax program, which is in its final stage of congressional action, has as its direct objective a revitalization of our national economy. The tax rate reductions are designed to create additional personal consumption and business investment. We have seen published tabulations on what it means to various income level taxpayers. There seems to be supportable evidence that the lower income individuals, who today spend virtually all of their income, will spend most of their additional disposable income provided by the rate reductions. But I would like to point out a few facts about the cuts in the middle and higher income brackets.

As I mentioned earlier, the rates are still quite progressive and high. If we can maintain a strict control over Government expenditure policy, we will then be able to reduce these rates that bear so heavily on the investment sector of our economy—and thus add one further component of strength to our economy.

A more immediate concern of mine about the tax bill is that certain features will result in a smaller net reduction in the rates of the middle and higher income groups than would appear from the tax rate schedule.

Perhaps the most regrettable feature of the tax bill from that standpoint is the repeal of the current tax treatment of dividend income. While the overall objective of the tax bill is to encourage a higher level of economic activity, the repeal of the tax credit removes an incentive to invest in equity capital, which is a vital source of a healthy business expansion program.

In 1954 the dividend exclusion and credit were written into the Internal Revenue Code to encourage greater equity ownership of our industrial facilities and to increase the availability of investment funds. These provisions have worked well. It is only regrettable that they were not raised above their modest levels so as to stimulate investment even more effectively. Thus, it seems utterly illogical to encourage investment on the one hand by cutting tax rates at a cost of billions of dollars and then to repeal an important incentive feature which involved only a modest loss of revenues to the Government. If we take into account the economic stimulus fostered by the existing provisions, I would not be surprised if the additional economic activity resulting from them largely offsets any revenue loss from the provisions.

The continuation of the tax credit is wholly justifiable merely for the sake of reducing double taxation alone. Income that is distributed as dividends is subject first to the corporate income tax, and then to the individual income tax in the hand of the stockholder. No other type of income, including salaries and wages, is twice taxed. Yet, although we purport to recognize equity as a fundamental requirement of a good tax system, we single out dividend income for double taxation.

If we honestly face up to the inequity of double taxation, and the attendant problems connected with it, we would

feel impelled to expand the relief to the stockholders rather than take away their small 4 percent benefit.

Although politically appealing, the arguments supporting the repeal of the dividend tax credit were weak economic justifications. One such argument was that the credit is more beneficial to the higher income groups and thus is bad. This argument does not recognize the fact that these middle and higher income groups are the potential investors upon whom the greatest dependence for equity capital is placed. Furthermore, if these groups are hindered from maintaining a high level of investment, employment and production will suffer a sore setback. Why penalize the group of Americans upon whom so much depends?

Another objectionable feature of the bill is the requirement that some employees, under certain circumstances, must pay tax on employer contributions to a group term life insurance program set up for the employees.

Under present law no tax liability results to employees covered under such a program. Under the bill, however, an employee must pay a tax on the employer's cost applicable to that part of a policy whose value exceeds a certain limit. This is certainly not compatible with our usual tax policy toward fringe benefits set up for the welfare of employees.

This action will have a definite tendency to discourage these programs. It may result in the setting of limits in the amount for which any employee may be covered. It may very well have the overall effect of reducing proportionately the amount of coverage for the lower income groups—so that everyone will lose. This type of discouragement of beneficial employee programs has no proper place in the tax bill. It is unfortunate that we must either accept the provision or vote against the entire bill.

Taxation of this imputed income will mean very little revenuewise to the Federal Government. The additional cost of complying with the new regulations, as well as the additional cost of administering the provision, may very well exceed the additional estimated revenues to the Government. This provision is one further example of Federal encroachment in a socially desirable program of the free enterprise system. Even worse, it may be the beginning of serious inroads by the Government into the whole area of fringe benefits designed to help the financial status of employees.

Another ill-conceived so-called reform measure in the bill deals with restricting the tax treatment of stock options. The present tax treatment was designed to foster better corporate management by encouraging ownership in the business by its manager. Yet the bill will interfere with a tax incentive program that has been operating quite successfully.

The bill, for example, requires that the option must be exercised within 5 years—as compared to 10 years under present law—in order to be accorded favorable tax treatment. This is shortsightedness. Five years will often be too short a time in which enough improvement can be made in a company's position that the additional efforts of the executive will be reflected in the market value of the stock. This would be particularly true if the option is granted during the peak of a business cycle.

Reducing the time during which the option may be exercised may have several undesirable results. The employee may strive to improve the company's position in too short a period of time. This may result in a far less stable improvement than would be accomplished over a longer run. Moreover, if the employee has no assurance of benefiting from the plan because the time limitation is too short, the incentive feature would be lost. Thus, a quick unstable growth in business and loss of the incentive feature of the stock option would strip the program of the qualities that are intended to be beneficial to the economy.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I shall support the passage of H.R. 8363. It provides the American public a long-overdue tax relief. If I had the choice, I would vote for tax reduction, but would oppose certain so-called tax reform features which will have adverse economic effects. This bill will result in a revenue loss of $11.5 billion in 1965. With this in view, we must strive to economize and cut Federal expenditures wherever we can. Only in this way can we expect to see a balanced Federal budget in the not too distant future.

Hon. Frank Horton

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative FRANK HORTON.

FRANK HORTON's bravery "above and beyond the call of duty" is appropriately recognized through the award to him of the Army's Bronze Star medal for his heroism in World War II.

In addition to his ready call to duty and personal bravery, FRANK HORTON has demonstrated his qualities for public service as a Member of Congress representing the 36th District of the State of New York. It has been my fortune to serve with FRANK HORTON as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations. From this experience, I know—firsthand—of his interest in promoting efficiency and economy in the operation of our Federal departments and agencies. I expect his record of public service in the U.S. Congress to match his outstanding military service in the U.S. Army.

I salute FRANK HORTON as a brave patriot and as a wise and able Member of the greatest legislative body in the world—the U.S. House of Representatives.

D.C. Transit's National Capital Transportation Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1964, O. Roy Chalk, president of the D.C. Transit Corp., Inc., announced the formation of a new division to be called the National Capital Transportation Division. The division will be specifically designed to seek solutions to the mass transportation problems of the Washington metropolitan area. Mr. Chalk is to be commended for this public-spirited move and should receive the cooperation of the agencies of the District of Columbia government and the local governments of the surrounding areas directly concerned in mass transportation problems.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following press statement announcing the formation of the new division:

Mr. O. Roy Chalk, president of D.C. Transit System, Inc., today announced the formation of a new division of the transit company, to be called the National Capital Transportation Division.

The chairman of the new division will be Mr. James H. Flanagan, senior vice president. Mr. Flanagan has been engaged in the regulation and operation of transit services in the area for 22 years, both as chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and as an executive officer of D.C. Transit System, Inc.

The functions of the National Capital Transportation Division will embrace both immediate and long-range planning in the development of an all-bus rapid transit system to fully meet the mass transportation requirements of the metropolitan area of Washington. These plans will give consideration to the expansion and revision of routes and service; the establishment of new express service; an expanded program for new fringe parking areas; the establishment of new giant bus terminals, both onstreet and subsurface; the creation of special aids to rapid mass transportation, establishment of exclusive bus lanes, exclusive bus streets, one-way streets, underpasses, bypasses, overpasses, and short one- and two-block vehicular tunnels; and the improvement of all facilities devoted to the service of the residents of the metropolitan area. The establishment of extended interurban travel, involving new modes of transportation such as superrail, will be the subject of special attention.

Another important objective of D.C. Transit's National Capital Transportation Division will be the finalization of a plan for complete unification of all mass transit facilities of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia covering the entire metropolitan area.

Mr. Chalk stated that private enterprise can do the job for less money and in less time at no cost for unnecessary studies by the Government. He further stated that the tremendous potential savings to taxpayers becomes apparent immediately.

Mr. Chalk plans to establish and advisory council to assist the National Capital Transportation Division. Representatives from the following organizations, among others, have already been invited to act on such advisory council:

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, Montgomery County Council, Downtown Progress, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee, District of Columbia Republican Central Committee, Hihgway Users Conference, Metropolitan Police Department, Prince Georges County Commissioners, Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission, House District of Columbia Committee, Senate District of Columbia Committee, General Services Administration, District of Columbia Junior Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Citizens Associations, Transit Improvement Association, Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce, Merchants and Manufacturers Association, American Automobile Association, Central Businessmen's Association, Arlington County Chamber of Commerce, Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, Prince Georges County Chamber of Commerce, District of Columbia Parent Teachers Association, District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and a While House representative.

The cooperation of all responsible agencies of the Government and of other companies serving the metropolitan area will be solicited.

The new Division will include the following D.C. Transit executives: Morris Fox, first vice president; Alfred Savage, director of maintenance; Isaac Goad, director of transportation; George Keyser, director of sales; William Bell, director of research and development; Godfrey Butler, director of personnel; Frank Sparshott, chief engineer and Sam Hatfield, assistant comptroller with an aggregate of 237 years of operating experience to their credit. The efforts of the D.C. Transit personnel, in Mr. Chalk's opinion, will be of immeasurable assistance in dissipating the frustration and confusion which presently exists in the planning for improved community transportation services.

Programs embracing the plans of D.C. Transit System's National Capital Transportation Division will be presented to Congress in the near future.

Mr. Flanagan will devote most of his time and attention to the objectives of the new division. His duties as comptroller of D.C. Transit System, Inc., will be assumed by Mr. Parker C. Peterman who, it was also announced today, had been appointed to the position of vice president and comptroller.

Mr. Peterman, age 36, is the youngest man to have attained the rank of comptroller in the history of D.C. Transit System, Inc., or any other public utility in the area. He has been with the company 4 years and was formerly with the public accounting firm of Price Waterhouse & Co.

Kansas University Professor Analyzes Russian Agriculture Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal carries a story, dateline Munich, on the First International Symposium on Soviet Agriculture. Kansas University's professor, Roy D. Laird, is playing a prominent role in the symposium. Because of its general interest today, I include the story at this point:

SOVIET CROP WOE MAY EXCEED INDICATIONS, SPUR RETREAT IN POLICY, STUDY GROUP SAYS

MUNICH.—Russian agriculture may be in an even bigger mess than recent purchases of grain by Communists in the West indicate. And farm problems may force policy changes in the Kremlin, such as a retreat from long-held socialistic economic dogmas.

These were the opinions of 40 top Kremlinologists from the Western World—men who make foreign ministry, State Department or scholarly careers of evaluating trends in the Communist world. They gathered here for the first international symposium on Soviet agriculture, sponsored by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., a respected emigre-staffed analytical organization. Their purpose was to evaluate the situation behind the Iron Curtain in light of Communist farm troubles.

It is general knowledge that Russia experienced a disastrous crop harvest in 1963. Communists have obscured the extent of the catastrophe, but they can't hide the purchase of nearly $1 billion of wheat from the West. Authorities at this meeting estimate grain output in the Soviet Union last year at 30 percent less than the 147.5 million metric tons of 1962 and 40 percent less than the 172.1 million metric tons set as the 1963 target. A metric ton equals 2,204.6 pounds.

One Soviet publication recently published data implying that grain output totaled about 115 million metric tons last year. No analyst here would accept that figure. The consensus placed the total closer to 105 million metric tons, although a few said the figure might have been as low as 95 million. (In Washington several days ago some analysts put the figure as low as 93 million metric tons.)

The analysts noted, however, that, even if the Soviet figure is accepted, it shows a disastrous drop from 1962, far worse than initial Soviet reports.

CROP WAS FIFTH FAILURE IN ROW

This was the fifth successive disappointing crop. During these 5 years the average annual increase in agricultural production has been about 1 percent, compared with the 8 percent planned, it was said.

The weather is only partially to blame, the authorities said. The basic causes are mismanagement, too much control by politicians who know little about farming, lack of adequate incentives for peasants, shortages of skilled people, and inadequate investments.

The effect of crop failures is spreading throughout the Soviet economy. The wheat supply is likely to remain tight within the Soviet bloc, but is unlikely to become precarious unless another bad crop follows that of 1963, the authorities said.

However, corrective measures may result in major industry dislocations. Some Soviet oil engineers, for example, may be diverted into petrochemicals because chemical engineers are short. This could hurt Soviet expansion in the petroleum industry. Big expansions begun in mining of potassium salt and phosphorite deposits necessitate switching of machinery from other mining operations. Iron-ore developments may suffer. This pattern is reflected throughout the Soviet empire, and even the most astute planners can't foresee all the repercussions.

"The rate of Soviet economic growth has surely passed its apogee, and new rules must be made for an economy with a radically different rate of growth," said Prof. Roy D. Laird, a Russian specialist of the University of Kansas at Lawrence.

In an address to the meeting, he added: "The 1963 crop losses weren't just an isolated failure. The sorry state of agricultural production is forcing the Communist leadership along paths of economic retreat, at least as defined in past society dogmas. This must be paid for by a lowered priority to industry."

FUNDS DIVERTED FROM INDUSTRY

Others emphasized that funds are being diverted from heavy industry, which all Communist dogma says must be the preferred industry, and into agriculture and the chemical industry.

Communist Party officials are beginning to listen to farm technicians, although the technicians still don't have a decisive voice in farm methods. Incentives are being reevaluated. And some voices in the Communist world are urging development of a sort of sharecropping system wherever possible to stimulate individual initiative. The Communists, however, are still so wary of such capitalistic devices that they use Marxist jargon when referring to "initiative."

There are other signs that the Russians are painfully reevaluating Leninistic theories on farming and on running an economy, participants at the meeting said. But opinion was that remedies being proposed may not be enough.

PRIVATE INITIATIVE SUGGESTED

"The only real solution is to return to private initiative," said Prof. Otto Schiller of Heidelberg University. He added: "But it may already be too late for that. Most farmers have been on collective or state farms for so long that they now wouldn't know how to make the individual decisions required on family farms."

Prof. Alec Nove, of the Department of International Economic Studies of Glasgow University, Scotland, blamed the political complexion of Soviet agricultural administration for troubles.

He said: "There must be more autonomy for farm managements, with less control by Communist Party theorists. When you analyze recent developments, it appears that this had been appreciated in words only."

Werner Klatt, a Russian authority at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, analyzed some facets of the recently announced $46 billion plan to expand the Soviet chemical industry. He said, "It is difficult to see how so ambitious a program can be carried out without causing major dislocations throughout the remainder of the economy. In fact, declining rates of growth are being anticipated in various sectors of industry other than chemicals."

Researchers at the meeting also doubted the ability of the Russians to attain chemical goals. Data presented showed little chance of a sizable supply of fertilizers for main grain crops becoming available before 1967 at the earliest. This raises the possibility that another bad grain crop between now and 1968 could force more heavy grain purchasing by the Communists in the West, further depleting Soviet gold and foreign exchange reserves.

A tabulation of such Soviet orders indicated the total may exceed 13 million metric tons in the 1963–64 crop year and may cost close to $1 billion including freight charges, in Soviet gold and foreign exchange. This compares with net Soviet exports to all countries of 6 to 7 million tons in each of the previous 4 years, an export that had resulted in hard currency earnings of approximately $100 million a year for the Russians.

Experiments aimed at exploiting new types of fertilizers derived from coal are underway. Installations are planned for producing ammonium liquid solutions at coking plants in Moscow, Ionava, Dorogobuzh, and Cherkassy. But Soviet agriculture doesn't even have storage facilities for liquid fertilizers, let alone any ability to handle the material.

S. S. Kabysh, a senior analyst with the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., presented studies showing that soil erosion is an acute problem not only in the central

Asian virgin lands but also in the productive areas of Europe. Years of emphasis on productivity, with little attention to land conservation, have taken a toll, he said.

"Yet experimental work on protection of soil from water and wind erosion is still only in its early stages in the Soviet Union, and there still exists no special center for directing operations," asserted Mr. Kabysh.

The Fallacy Behind the Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the danger of inflation resulting from the tax cut has been eloquently stated many times and in many publications. One of the finest articles of this nature appeared in the February issue of the Readers Digest. Authored by James Daniel, the article points out that it will be the American people who will pay for the tax cut if there is not a substantial reduction in Federal spending. Inflation hurts those with fixed incomes and savings the hardest and it is usually these people who can least afford it.

The article follows:

THE FALLACY BEHIND THE TAX CUT

(By James Daniel)

For millions of Americans, cutting taxes without reducing Federal spending will mean not the greater purchasing power the administration promises but only more inflation.

In all the talk out of Washington about the controversial $11-billion Federal tax cut, much has been said about its stimulating benefits. Surprisingly little attention has been paid to the adverse effect that reducing Federal revenue is likely to have on the real incomes and savings of the American people. For this is the first time that a tax cut has been introduced without a corresponding reduction of expenditures.

The proposal is "a time bomb for inflation," according to the minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee. The proposed bill, says the report, "embarks upon a program of deliberate and planned deficits in the guise of tax reform. The danger of such a course should be obvious. It is self-destructive. The Russians will not bury us; we will bury ourselves. A long-range program of planned deficits means a long-range program of planned inflation."

There is little doubt that a properly proportioned tax cut, substantially offset by a reduction of present Federal spending, would stimulate business and employment, raise real wages and profits and lay the foundation for a new surge of economic growth. But this, unhappily, is not the kind of tax cut being advocated. The administration wants tax rates cut when Federal spending for 3 years has been soaring in $5-billion leaps (from $81.5 to $98 billion) and is bound to keep rising. Even if President Johnson's new budget stays close to $100 billion, it contains built-in spending programs—from space to education to welfare—that will mean vast future increases. Moreover, past experience shows that a January estimate of spending almost always is on the low side and must be augmented in later months via supplemental requests.

Thus, with taxes going down and expenditures going up, the revenue losses must be made up by additional Federal borrowing. And since sustained Federal borrowing invites, makes possible and sooner or later is followed by inflation, any lessening of the citizen's burden as a taxpayer will be counteracted by an increase in his burden as a consumer.

Already, the rising cost of living stimulated by the $4.6 billion deficit in fiscal 1962 and the $6.2 billion deficit in fiscal 1963 has nullified for most people any possible increase in purchasing power likely to result from the tax cut. And if this planned inflation accelerates even moderately, the average citizen soon may find himself poorer than before.

Fortunately for the politicians in Washington—and unfortunately for their 190 million constituents—most people have difficulty explaining the connection between Federal deficit spending and rising costs and prices. But the majority of the American people, deep in their bones, are convinced that such a connection exists. They know that the wealth of the Government is simply the wealth of its citizens, that the Government cannot give something away without first taking it away from the people.

INSTANT MONEY

As the Wall Street Journal commented recently: "If the Government reduces taxes while it has a $9 billion deficit (or more), those $9 billion must be taken out of the hide of the economy in some other fashion. In effect, the Government will simply print up 9 billion paper dollars. The resulting inflation will take back from the people the relief that the Government professes to give by lower tax rates."

This is how it works:

When the Government spends more than it takes in, it must borrow to cover the difference. How it borrows determines how inflationary the effect will be. It is least inflationary if you or I lend money to the Government by buying a bond. It is potentially more inflationary if a commercial bank buys the bond. No actual cash is exchanged. The purchasing bank simply credits the Government with a deposit from which the Government can draw. But when the commercial bank resells the bond to a Federal Reserve Bank, it becomes highly inflationary. In that case, the commercial bank's reserves have been increased by the amount of the bond and it now can lend six or seven times that amount to other borrowers.

The whole process is not essentially different from ordering the Bureau of Printing and Engraving to print up x billion new dollar bills. Since the central banking system operates on credit, the old-fashioned "printing-press" method of inflation is unnecessary.

All this "new money" or credit begins to compete with the "old money"—represented by your and my current income and our savings—to capture the available supply of goods and services. More dollars chasing after goods and services spell higher prices.

Furthermore, the mere knowledge that more money is being put in circulation serves as an invitation for sellers of goods and services to raise their prices. (In several basic industries with relatively few companies setting prices, a flurry of price increases took place last fall, apparently in the mere expectation that the tax cut would pass.) Labor unions, emboldened by the prospect of more money in circulation, demand higher wages. Employers are tempted to grant wage demands they cannot afford to pay except on the premise that the higher wages will be recovered by higher prices.

The result of this vicious circle is steadily rising prices—and a decline in the value of the dollar. Not only do real incomes fail to keep pace with money incomes, but fixed savings—the money you and I put away for a rainy day—are secretly leached away.

SHRUNKEN DOLLARS

Some economic planners do not view this deterioration of the dollar with any alarm. Indeed, some of them believe that deficit spending will cure unemployment and promote growth. Their argument is based on the economic theory that creeping inflation is inevitable and beneficial. In the thinking of many economists in Washington this is the only way to have full employment.

The fact that inflation is planned is something that Washington officials prefer not to talk much about in public. But in November 1961, the President's Council of Economic Advisers circulated a model of the managed U.S. economy, assuming a 1½-percent-per-year increase in prices. The official title given to the model was "full employment perspective."

Full employment, as they define the term, still eludes the Council of Economic Advisers, but the cost-of-living rise is right on schedule. In August, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index for the Nation as a whole registered a 1½-percent increase over the year before. In New York City, the 12-month increase amounted to 2½ percent. But where will prices soar from here? The deficits in the foreseeable future are certain to be much bigger than in fiscal 1962 or 1963.

OUT OF WHOSE HIDE?

The existence of an officially planned dollar depreciation of around 1½ percent per year is reason enough by itself to be extremely skeptical of the proponents' claim that tax cutting will send American consumers on a buying spree to load up on washing machines, refrigerators, color television sets and new automobiles.

Here's why:

Under the tax-cut bill a married man with a $5,000 income, a wife and two children, taking standard deductions, will owe $325 of federal income tax in 1964 instead of the $420 he owed in 1963 and preceding years. Under the second and final stage of the tax cut he will owe $290 in 1965 and succeeding years.

But with the dollar losing around 1½ percent of its purchasing power every year, such a man's after-tax income in 1964 will have lost $69.09 of the purchasing power it had in 1963—making his tax relief not the $95 announced by proponents but only $25.91. This is barely enough to buy an extra pack and a half of cigarettes once a week.

In 1965 this man's after-tax income will have $138.08 less purchasing power than it had in 1963—converting his $130 of tax relief into a net loss of $8.08. After 1965 the after-tax purchasing power of a $5,000 income will decline at a more rapid rate because there will be no further tax reduction.

Nor is this the whole story of what a tax cut financed with borrowed money can do to American pocketbooks. A man with a $5,000 income has some fixed savings. They may be a savings account, or the cash surrender value of life insurance, or prospective retirement benefits under a company pension plan or social security. If the total of such credits amounts to, say, $2,000, then a 1½-percent dollar depreciation is costing this man $29.56 a year—wiping out even the $25.91 temporary net increase in his purchasing power in 1964.

From the Federal Government's point of view, the whole operation can be quite profitable, because it steadily reduces the Government's future obligations. When the dollar is shrinking in value 1½ percent per year, the Government is in effect repudiating $4.5 billion annually of the present bonded national debt of $300 billion. This is value taken from the millions of Americans who have bought U.S. savings bonds or have entrusted their savings to instiutions such as insurance companies that invest in Government bonds.

In addition, the United States is sliding out from under its major unbonded obliga-

tions. For example, under the social security system the Government is now committed to pay $625 billion in future retirement, survivors' and disability benefits to presently covered individuals. With the dollar depreciating around 1½ percent per year, the Government is reducing the purchasing power of these future payments to you and me by $9.2 billion a year.

Thus, even the Government's own books, confirm the truth of the Wall Street Journal's statement that the deficit is being "taken out of the hide of the economy—the American people, that is."

SELF-PROTECTION

Can we protect ourselves against such irresponsible fiscal management? The answer is an emphatic "yes." Any time we, the people, insist that the Government balance its budget, inflation will grind to a halt. A good way to begin is to invest in a 5-cent stamp to write your Congressman saying that a real tax cut is devoutly to be desired; but a phony tax cut, financed by more borrowing and more debt, is no favor to anybody. It would do no harm to say that a vote for such a tax cut will be remembered in the privacy of the voting booth this coming November.

After that you might spend another nickel on a letter to the Council of Economic Advisers, The White House, Washington, D.C., saying that you are watching carefully what is happening to your cost of living and that you are holding the economic planners jointly responsible with Congress.

If Washington officials want to claim credit, as they always do, for the good things that happen in this great American economy of ours, then it is high time they be made to accept responsibility for the daily defeats millions of Americans suffer in their struggle with the rising cost of living.

Constitution Day—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a second editorial by John Coyle, president of radio station KVIL in Dallas and broadcast over that station on February 16, dealing with the 175th birthday of the Constitution of the United States:

CONSTITUTION DAY—PART II

FEBRUARY 16, 1964.

On Wednesday, March 4, the Constitution of this country will be exactly 175 years old. That will be Constitution Day, an anniversary to which too often the average citizen gives only perfunctory attention. One result has been that over the years and especially in the last 40, courts have kicked around the meaning of the Constitution without remedial action by Congress. Yet our continued security rests on the unimpaired strength of this fundamental document. Only so can continue the most successful form of government ever devised for free men.

This 175th Constitution Day must be made a special occasion. All right-thinking Americans must rededicate the preservation of this basis on which our Government rests. That can only be done by continued study and support of its provisions. Insist that the Constitution can be changed only by amendment, not by the quibbling of new judicial definitions.

KVIL urges Governor John Connally to proclaim Constitution Day in Texas. The proclamation should be read in every school, court, and meeting on March 4, stressed by all news media.

Make this Constitution Day real.

JOHN COYLE,
President, KVIL.

Bobby Baker Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the country knows that those in the highest positions in the executive department are viewing with trepidation the investigation of Bobby Baker's sordid affairs in the other body. Yesterday's New York Times editorially demands the truth about this whole rotten episode:

TRUTH IN THE BAKER AFFAIR

The refusal of Robert G. Baker to produce his business records in response to a subpena from the Senate Rules Committee, which has been seeking to determine whether he misused his influence while he was secretary to the Democratic majority, raises some interesting questions of constitutional law and public policy. It had previously been brought out before the committee that Mr. Baker's own estimate of his net worth had grown from $11,000 to $2 million during his relatively brief tenure.

Mr. Baker pleaded the first, fourth, fifth, and sixth amendments to support his refusal. The first amendment, guaranteeing the right of free speech, appears to have been invoked because of alleged wiretapping against him by the Government. The relevance of the fourth, dealing with unreasonable search and seizure, has not been made clear. The fifth amendment, of course, guarantees that no person may be compelled to be a witness against himself in any criminal case. We have defended the right to invoke it many times. It is a bulwark of our liberties. Mr. Baker is just as much entitled to its protection as any extremist of the left or right.

But it is the invocation of the sixth amendment, which guarantees the right to a jury trial in all criminal cases, that is of especial interest. Edward Bennett Williams, Mr. Baker's counsel, has told the committee he recognizes its right to gather information for legislative purposes, but has challenged its right to conduct what he calls "a legislative trial," which, he says, would be conducted in a highly partisan atmosphere, and in which his client would have no right to cross-examine witnesses.

The answer, it seems to us, lies in the resolution authorizing the inquiry, unanimously adopted by the Senate on October 10 on motion of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It authorizes the Senate Rules Committee to investigate the financial and business interests and activities of any present or former officer or employee of the Senate to determine whether these have involved any conflicts of interest or other improprieties—clearly a legitimate and justified legislative purpose.

Complicated procedural questions lie ahead. But with or without Mr. Baker's testimony, and with or without his records, the committee must proceed relentlessly to carry out its mandate. Too many other persons, and too much principle, are involved for it to halt.

Beef Import Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, while the agreement with Australia and New Zealand on beef and mutton imports was a step in the right direction, I must register my disappointment that it did not include lamb and also that it was not based upon a 5-year average of such imports.

Australia and New Zealand account for approximately 80 percent of our imports of beef and veal. Right now approximately 11 percent of our domestic meat market is filled by foreign imports. The 1962–63 average, which formed the basis for the voluntary agreement, witnessed by far the highest imports of beef and mutton into this country in history. For that reason, it would seem that a 5-year average, rather than the 2-year peak period, would have been more fair and realistic.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I was disappointed because the agreement did not include lamb. I call attention to the fact that lamb imports have increased over 1,000 percent since 1957. Our sheep population is now the lowest since 1867. This decrease is due to lack of profit in the industry. From this it is clear that excessive imports of this product can be very harmful.

New York City is one of the three areas of this country that the domestic lamb industry must depend on for over 70 percent of its lamb sales. New York City is also the port through which the bulk of our lamb imports arrive. A few too many lambs there breaks the wholesale market and since New York is the sensitive price-setting point, the live lamb market frequently follows the lower New York market and breaks all over the Nation. It follows that a drop of even ½-cent per pound in our live lamb market as a result of the influx of imports is equivalent to a 5-cent per pound drop in wool prices.

The average farm price of U.S. lambs in 1963 was only $18.20 per hundredweight compared to the beef cattle price of $19.80.

Mr. Speaker, if lamb and mutton imports cannot be held at the average of the last 5 years, then I feel the industry would approve holding imports of lamb even at present increased levels in order to remove the present uncertainty as to volume coming in, resulting in further liquidation in an already depressed industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to effectuate the objective which I have described. A copy of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the total quantities of beef, veal, lamb and mutton (in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat) originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any

period of twelve months shall not exceed the average annual quantities of such products imported from such country during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963: *Provided*, That beginning January 1, 1965, there may be an annual increase in the total quantities of such products which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for such purpose, corresponding to the annual rate of increase in the total United States market for such products, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Our Inaction on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this week, the OAS report on Castro's doings in Venezuela will be presented to the United States. The report shows without a doubt the subversive nature of Castro's beachhead, Venezuela.

Based upon past inactions, I will predict that we will do nothing. Yesterday's Wall Street Journal has an excellent article on the whole subject of Cuba:

HEATING UP CUBA: OAS REPORT ON CASTRO PLOT AGAINST VENEZUELA MAY FUEL A NEW CRISIS—BATTLE PLAN AND ARMS CACHES REVEALED—CALL FOR STERNER JOHNSON STAND IS EXPECTED—CUBAN ECONOMY MAKES GAINS

(By Phillip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—A new crisis is quietly building up over Cuba. Some top officials think it could blow up into the biggest foreign policy test and perhaps the nastiest domestic political dilemma that President Johnson will encounter between now and election day.

The trouble only begins with the current ruckus over burgeoning West European trade with Fidel Castro. This is causing the Johnson administration trouble enough with friendly nations abroad and with political critics at home. But the real catalyst to fresh crisis is expected this week in the form of a report by a special investigating team of the 21-nation Organization of American States (OAS).

The subject is familiar enough: Castroite subversion in Venezuela. But the contents, say officials in a position to know, are explosive. They add up, at least in U.S. eyes, to an eye-popping expose of an elaborate Castro-inspired plot to foment widespread revolt, timed to last fall's Venezuelan elections. Included is evidence, already aired, of large caches of arms of Cuban origin.

But also available to the OAS group is well-documented evidence, insiders say, of a detailed battle plan to put these weapons to use, including such specifics as the precise positioning of bazooka teams and other insurgent groups to take over key Caracas strongpoints while the bulk of Venezuela's Army was scattered around the nation on election day, seeking to keep order at polling booths. While the plan failed with discovery of the arms caches and the Venezuelan election came off succesfully, these revelations apparently constitute long-awaited evidence clearly and directly implicating Castro for the first time in terrorism and subversion outside Cuba.

CLAMOR FOR ACTION LIKELY

The OAS investigators are charged only with reporting the evidence to that body's ruling council. But the effect of such damning evidence, officially set forth by a responsible inter-American team of probers, is certain to be loud clamor—from anti-Castroites in Latin America and from Cuban policy critics in the United States—for action. And the effect of this, in turn, can only be measured by a look at this country's Cuban dilemma as it currently stands. This is the picture that emerges from talks with experts in all of the Government's centers of Cuban expertise:

For all the U.S. efforts to undermine Castro by economic sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and unmentionable covert efforts to stir disaffection, his position still strikes most experts as strong. "There are none of the traditional signs of a revolution going sour," concedes one U.S. official, adding: "You might not be able to call it a really stable regime, but it's far from falling apart."

The Cuban economy, which most analysts consider the key to any effort to bring about Castro's downfall, is proving remarkably resilient, even to glaring Communist mismanagement. One reason is heavy Soviet help. Another is some fast footwork by Mr. Castro to soften the impact of U.S. trade sanctions; instead of succumbing, like so many small-country revolutionaries, to the prestige lure of forced industrialization, he is engaged in a great leap backward to a sugar-and-cattle economy which is less susceptible to economic strangulation.

Worldwide sugar shortages and resulting soaring sugar prices have also played into Castro's hands by more than offsetting the impact of Cuba's nearly disastrous sugar crop last year. Result: From almost empty coffers a year or so ago, Cuba has piled up close to $100 million in foreign exchange, making it a tempting market for British buses and French and Spanish trucks.

TRADE-SANCTION FRUSTRATION

The Western sales to Cuba are not only undercutting the U.S. embargo effort but making the whole scheme of trade sanctions look futile and the United States look embarrassingly impotent. Already this frustration is fanning public demand in the United States for stronger measures against Castro. Without specifics, every Republican candidate is crying for something more.

Yet U.S. strategists have been racking their brains ever since the Bay of Pigs fiasco 3 years ago without coming up with anything they consider might be more effective against Castro, short of blockade, invasion, or other use of force. And so far, with memories of 1962's nerve-searing missile confrontation still fresh, the decision has been firmly against force.

Such is the U.S. sense of frustration that there has even been increased talk among some officials of the ultimate need for a radical policy shift, to downgrade the Cuban menace and explore the possibility of coexistence with a Castro lured away from close Communist-bloc connections by increased trade with the West. While the Russians probably couldn't afford the loss of face should Castro slip his Communist leash completely, they themselves are thought to be solidly behind his recent efforts to drum up more Western trade. They might welcome some loosening of their hold on him in exchange for lightening a foreign aid burden that by some estimates has cost them upward of $750 million in 3 years.

Castro himself has been hinting he might be interested in making restitution for seized Yankee property in Cuba in return for resumption of diplomatic ties.

But no U.S. official can seriously advocate this softer course in an election year. Castro's involvement in the Panamanian rioting against the United States, his arbitrary cut-off of water to the U.S. Guantanamo base, and his continued troublemaking elsewhere in the hemisphere would make any suggestion of coexistence unthinkable, even before the OAS report pictures the Cuban leader caught redhanded in his most flagrant hemispheric mischiefmaking to date.

With publication of the OAS report, the administration will be in this awkward and dangerous spot: The outcry for some sort of action is sure to become irresistible; yet the use of force will become no more appealing and the alternatives to it no less promising. Right now U.S. policymakers are refusing to tip their hand. "All I can say is that we are going into this with our eyes wide open," declares one. But the United States will be ready to propose further measures against Castro when the time is considered right.

The question remains what?

The answer depends partly on how persuasive the Venezuela evidence may appear to nations such as Mexico, Brazil, Uruguay, Bolivia, and Chile—to name the five OAS members that have not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba. Venezuelan diplomats, who have been touring the hemisphere, flashing their dossier on Castro and seeking support for their indirect aggression charge, report a favorable response, even in such centers of apathy to Castro as Brazil.

So, at the least, U.S. officials count on the OAS council to recommend a meeting at the foreign ministers' level to deal with the Venezuelan case. Even then, however, Latins' disinclination to mix in each other's affairs, plus widespread reluctance to stir home-front leftists by assailing Castro, will tend to limit any OAS action, U.S. officials fear. A logical first step might be a finding of aggression, then agreement on severing of remaining diplomatic ties, followed by some token tightening of trade sanctions, which in Latin America are almost total already. The last remaining air and sea links between Cuba and the rest of Latin America might likewise be sliced.

LITTLE IMPACT SEEN

But with Cuban trade ties expanding to other Western lands, and the OAS already on record in opposition to Castro, such measures are hardly likely to have much impact. And the likelihood that the OAS might endorse more forceful measures, such as a quarantine to shut off arms traffic from Cuba to other Latin countries strikes most experts as somewhat remote.

The result, then, may be largely to expose OAS impotency. But this would not take the United States off the hook, either at home or in the hemisphere. So already officials are citing passages from a resolution passed 2 years ago at an anti-Castro OAS rally in Punta del Este which might seem to condone action by individual OAS members, in any numbers down to, say, the United States and Venezuela alone, to "strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security."

As some experts read this, it would clear the way for any combination of OAS members to band together to blockade Cuba, tighten up patrols of the Caribbean coast, establish international counterguerrilla units, or even muster an expeditionary force to invade Castro's island stronghold. Probably there will be demands from some quarters, whether militantly anti-Castro Caribbean nations or some U.S. politicians, for any or all of these approaches.

At this point it's impossible to foretell how the administration ultimately will react. All that's clear is that, as one top administration adviser puts it, "This thing is going to be too big to sweep under the rug."

Some officials hope the OAS report may make it easier for the United States to talk its allies out of trading with Castro, or to take stiffer action against the Western traders. The State Department is hastily seeking to discourage the private consumer boycotts that Secretary Rusk once seemed to be condoning; but U.S. diplomats are trying to persuade private U.S. business to use its

influence on affiliates, subsidiaries or licensees abroad to halt the Cuban trade. More forceful action, such as U.S. Government refusal to buy goods from offending foreign firms, or denial of licenses for U.S. exports to the offenders, is not ruled out.

BUT TRADE MAY GROW

Even so, allied trade with Cuba may well grow, rather than shrink, in the weeks just ahead; Japan, West Germany, Italy, and others are said to be poised for trade deals with Castro, especially if Britain's Leyland Motors follows up its 400-bus, $11 million order with 1,000 additional buses now under consideration. "Everybody's watching Leyland's lead," says one official.

Experts differ on just how much material help this allied trading furnishes Castro; presumably he could acquire some of these items from the Red bloc. But psychologically, U.S. officials complain, the trading adds to the impression of Castro's permanence—which in turn improves his oversea credit rating and encourages more trade.

Perhaps most important, the spurt of Western trade with Cuba strengthens the impression that whatever the United States is doing to get rid of Castro, it isn't working very well. Thus it will be all the harder for President Johnson to maintain in the face of the Venezuelan exposé that the United States is really wearing Castro down.

"After this OAS report, we're going to have to do something more, and something that really convinces people that we're doing something more," says one adviser, who is no clearer than anybody else what more can or will be done.

Jellyfish Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Johnson administration continues its foreign policy retreat in all parts of the globe, the timidity which it has displayed in the circumstances surrounding abuses of our representatives and citizens in Zanzibar is especially disturbing.

This morning's Chicago Tribune has a brief, timely, and practical editorial on this subject which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

JELLYFISH DIPLOMACY

This country's sagging prestige abroad isn't going to be helped by the cringing haste with which we recognized the leftwing revolutionary regime in Zanzibar, 4 days after it had thrown out our only remaining diplomat, or by the flimsy excuses offered in an effort to justify that recognition.

We are told that our charge d'affaires, Donald Petterson, wasn't actually expelled; that he was merely asked to leave in order to demonstrate the Karume regime's irritation at our delay in giving it the recognition which had been given so promptly last month by Russia, Red China, and Cuba.

We are told that recognition might "discourage" a trend toward communism—although two members of the comic opera trio which run Zanzibar learned their political lessons in Peking and Havana, respectively, and have already tried to export their revolution to the mainland of Africa. Besides, it is to "discourage" communism that we have refused to recognize the Peking government and that we broke relations with Castro.

Finally, we are told that recognition had already been discussed with Britain before Mr. Petterson's expulsion—or, pardon us, his requested departure. What may have gone on behind closed doors, we're afraid, won't make much difference to most people.

All they know is that the United States and Britain have yielded reluctantly to the newest and one of the tiniest totalitarian states in the world. Leftwing troublemakers everywhere have learned that if the United States doesn't seem to like them at first, they need only give us a few kicks and we'll come crawling in search of friendship.

Freedom and Freedom Songs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a fascinating article by Theodore Bikel appeared in the March 1964, issue of the national folk music magazine Hootenanny. The noted singer and actor eloquently describes the importance of folk songs and folk singing to the civil rights movement. Theodore Bikel has dedicated his time and talent to the struggle for equality, and his article provides much insight into the dynamic of the civil rights movement. I recommend it to my colleagues:

FREEDOM SONGS—FROM EGYPT TO MISSISSIPPI

(By Theodore Bikel)

A logical and obvious statement: "There would have been no contemporary 'freedom' songs but for the integration movement in the South."

A seemingly illogical statement: "There would have been no movement but for the songs."

Yet, for all its irrationality, the latter statement was made in complete seriousness by one of the leaders of the movement, the closer examination more than bears out his contention. It asserts, in fact, that the music emanating from the Southern streets, churches and jails is not merely a product but, rather, one of the prime causes of the demonstrations, the prayer vigils and the mass meetings.

It emphasizes that many of the so-called direct action undertakings could not have been conceived or carried out, that the beatings and the jailhouses might have stopped the movement in its tracks, that faith and courage would not have prevailed had it not been for the songs.

This, of course, may be fairly true of any liberation movement in history, but it is doubly true of the Negro movement, and for sound psychological reasons, I do not refer to mass psychology, which no doubt can easily explain crowd behavior and reaction to musical stimuli during times of stress and in a group's pursuit of a common ideal. I refer to psychology based upon the ethnic and social structure perculiar to Negro society, especially in the South, a society that is applying its own temperament and time-worn mode of behavior to this 20th century political movement.

One need be no ethnomusicologist or anthropologist (indeed, this writer lays no claim to any such scholarly distinction) to know that Negroes, by tradition and natural inclination, are incapable of conducting a gathering of any kind without punctuating and underlining what is being said with music and song. Speeches and even prayer in a Negro meeting must evoke the crowning experience of song, without which no feeling of mass communication is possible. Such was the trademark of the Negro church, and such is the trademark of the mass movement aimed at integration. Although this is a black-and-white-together movement, it takes its emotional shape from the Negro characteristics of mass dedication.

It should be noted that this obviously secular movement not only has insoluble ties with the various Negro churches, but also relies on religious traditions and practices in its everyday workings. The mass meeting—planning a sit-in, a freedom march, or a voter registration drive—is held in the church; the demonstrators, bleeding and weak from the beatings and the fasting in jail, make their way to the church; the local leader of the movement is more often than not the minister of the church; and many of the songs that are sung are the old spirituals and gospel tunes with new words.

Where yesterday the minister from the pulpit promised the congregation a slice of the Kingdom of God, and everyone answered, "Amen, hallelujah," he admonishes them today from the same pulpit to "go down and register to vote," and the answer is still, "Amen, hallelujah." For he is asking for an act of religious dedication, and they receive it as such.

Indeed, what else does it represent when those who heed the call find physical violence and humiliation of personal dignity in their path. How inevitable must the identification seem that draws a parallel between the early martyrs and the fate of Medgar Evers, William Moore, James Travis, and the hundreds of Freedom Fighters who were beaten, shot at, trampled on or killed, carrying the word "freedom" on their lips. Little wonder then that the hymn and the freedom song become as one, that there is no telling where man leaves off and God begins.

"Over my head I see freedom in the air;
There must be a God somewhere."

To anyone who still thinks it exaggerated to say that there could be no movement without the songs, one must answer from personal observation. The sights and sounds of a little Negro church in Albany, Ga., or in Clarksdale, Miss., or of a larger church in Birmingham, Ala., are a powerful memory to have. You are a participant, true, and less than objective because of a personal involvement with the cause. But you are also a guest from the North, with the observing eye of a visitor. And you know the tell-tale signs of weariness, of boredom with the repetitiveness of the speeches that lurk in the eyes of the congregation. A crisis is on. That means there has been a mass meeting every single night for the last week or more.

Although the speakers may be most revered as leaders and bear illustrious names such as King, Shuttlesworth, Abernathy, or Walker, the heart is heavy from the bombings, the bloodshed, the look of children fresh out of jail. Also, nonviolence does not come easy. How do you teach yourself not to lash out in fury when the white man raises a fist, a club, or a gun? How do you master your impulses when your own child is carried into your house, beaten senseless and bloody for having committed the crime of sitting at a soda fountain or going to a movie? The words, inspiring as they are, do not quite penetrate the curtain of dull pain and anxiety. But then someone begins to sing:

"We have walked through the shadow of death
We've had to walk all by ourselves
But we'll never turn back,
No, we'll never turn back."

Until we've all been freed and we have equality. All of a sudden it begins to make sense, not in a rational way, but in an emotional acknowledgement; although the mind had failed to understand, the soul had nodded assent. And the singing continues:

"We shall not, we shall not be moved,
We shall not, we shall not be moved,
Just like a tree that's standing by the water,
We shall not be moved."

"That's right, brother," come the exclamations. "You tell 'em." And a new verse, with acid humor this time:

"Tell Governor Wallace he shall be removed,
Tell Governor Wallace he shall be removed,
Just like a pail of garbage in the alley,
He shall be removed."

The eyes are brighter now; there is a dawning of fresh energy and renewed courage. And the songs do not let up. They attack apathy and resigned complacency in various ways: with earthy sarcasm, and a new verb:

"Down here in Mississippi
No neutrals have we met
Tell me, will you fight for freedom
Or 'Tom' for Ross Barnett?
Which side are you on?
Which side are you on?"

And with words of inspiration that in any other context might have sounded forced or even corny:

"I don't mind the jailhouse
'Cause I want my freedom
I want my freedom now."

Many words of this are often substituted—such as: I don't mind "walking" or "marching" or "dogs" or "Bull Connor." As you watch a boy, no older than 9, sing in all seriousness and fervor, "I dont mind dying 'cause I want my freedom," and you realize that he is not just mouthing words, but knows what he is saying, you look about and see all the weariness and listlessness gone from the eyes of the assembled. They are ready to meet the haters again. Tonight, if need be; because freedom is already 100 years too late in coming.

A large number of these songs have existed for a long time; they were sung by Negro congregants at every service. Why then assume that the texts of such songs should have suddenly triggered or even inspired action in the 1960's when they failed to do so 15, 25, or 40 years ago? I suppose the answer lies in a shift of interpretation. The term "freedom" was, until recently, used as a word of solace. It referred to a freedom that was promised in the afterlife; in the Kingdom of Heaven, in the arms of Jesus:

And before I'd be a slave,
I'd be buried in my grave,
And go home to my Lord and be free.

Or:

I have trials here below
But I keep singing 'cause I know
Yes I know—(Oh my Lord)—
My change will come.

It was not until the boycott of Montgomery, Ala., in 1955, the freedom rides and sit-ins in North Carolina and Tennessee, the Albany movement in 1960, the voter registration drive in Greenwood, Miss.; not until Birmingham, Cambridge, Md., and Danville, Va., that the words "change" and "freedom" were read with an appended "now." Even the unofficial anthem of the movement, every verse of which used to include the words "some day," has undergone changes:

Black and white together now it says, and
We are not afraid today.

The movement of the 1960's is, in fact, pledging its efforts, its energy, its dedication to the brotherhood of white and black, its determination to remain nonviolent in the struggle, its willingness to risk jail—and even death—for the cause. Anything but its patience. For that has run out.

"Avadim Hayinu Ve'ata B'ney Chorin"—goes an old Hebrew song. "Once we were slaves, but now we are freemen." It is quite obvious why the freedom movement of today draws upon the Biblical source so much, and finds itself particularly moved by the analogy of Egypt and Mississippi, Pharaoh and Barnett, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and George Wallace, overseer of Alabama. There seems to be an heirloom of suffering that slaves and former slaves understand profoundly. So it appears that the song of the Israelites, building Pharaoh's pyramids in Egypt, was but a forefather of the tune sung by the Negroes picking Eastland's cotton in Leflore County. By a curious set of circumstances, the analogy goes even farther:

Go down Moses
Way down in Egypt Land
Tell old Pharaoh
To let my people go.

Negro ministers and church choirs have been singing this for generations. But in today's crisis in the Mississippi Delta, one wonders if those who sing these words are not quite reverently referring to Robert Moses of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who has come to lead his people to freedom as did his namesake in Egypt. History's pun, perhaps; but was not the original Moses an "outside agitator" too?

There is an old Talmudic saying: "In every generation, man must look upon himself as if he had personally come out of the bondage of Egypt." So it is with the idea—and the song—of freedom. If it is a fire of the same torch, and a torch of the same making, then the fire is being rekindled and the song being sung anew each time man's yoke becomes unbearable.

For freedom is not something that can be won and stashed away—it has to be fought for over and over again in each generation, whenever men seek to enslave others. Thus I see a chain throughout history that links the song of the slaves in Egypt with the battlecry of the Maccabees, the song of the French Revolution, the Greek revolt against the Turks, the Industrial Revolution in Europe, the Irish Rebellion against the English, and today's song of freedom in America.

A new day is coming upon us at last. It does not come unaided. If we are privileged to see its dawn at all, then surely we owe recognition to those who hastened the hour—to Martin Luther King, James Farmer, Medgar Evers, Bob Moses, Jim Forman, Charles Sherrod, Bob Zellner, Jim Peck, Sam Block and the host of leaders, students and ministers who gave a new meaning to hackneyed words such as "justice" and "brotherhood."

History, however, will owe the greatest debt to those who sang in the jails and on the courthouse steps, for their song will stand as the one tangible reminder of this era, its shame and its nobility, long after the hatemongers—and their victims—are forgotten.

Hon. Frank Horton

SPEECH
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this merited tribute to our colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON.

I am equally pleased that the Department of the Army has corrected the previous oversight and awarded Colonel HORTON the Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism.

It is interesting to note that the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON, with characteristic modesty, limited the reference to his World War II career to the simple line "service in North Africa and Italy from November 1942 to August 1945" in the Congressional Directory.

It will be 20 years next year since the end of World War II and it is good to have a reminder of this kind of the valiant and heroic service of many of our colleagues and of countless fellow Americans in that titanic struggle.

Hearings Set on Congressional Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have announced today hearings on March 18 on legislative proposals including my own bill, H.R. 2836, to solve the problem of the formation of congressional districts.

The hearings will also present the opportunity to all interested Members of the Congress to present their views on the problem with which they have been confronted since the recent decision of the Supreme Court involving congressional districts.

The decision in the case of Wesberry against Sanders has justified the position which I have taken on the problem of Federal standards for congressional districts and the enforcement of these standards since I first introduced legislation in the 82d Congress. During my long tenure in Congress, I have analyzed and studied that problem and have long believed that it was not an acute but a chronic one and now the recent decision has convinced not only the Members of the House of Representatives but the public at large that this is such a problem for all. We can no longer postpone a solution. Immediate action is necessary.

My bill, H.R. 2836, provides that every State with more than one Representative must divide its territory into districts. Each State legislature, under my proposal, would draw the lines for each congressional district along Federal standards which would be required to be composed of contiguous territory, reasonably compact as to form and contain a population not more than nor less than 15 percent of the population for the average congressional district in the State. Under my proposal, a Federal district court would be given the jurisdiction to review the action of each State legislature to review a State's redistricting act and also to expedite such litigation.

As introduced by me, the bill would not become effective until after the Nine-

teenth Decennial Census, but in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court, I believe that date should be made effective at an earlier date, perhaps in time for the election of the 90th Congress. I believe, in the light of the language of the Supreme Court in its recent decision, that congressional districts should be composed of populations as nearly equal as practicable. The enactment of my proposal, providing for a 15-percent deviation above or below a State average, would be of assistance both to State legislatures and also to courts in deciding whether or not congressional districts meet constitutional requirements.

Under the dissenting opinion in the recent case, a shadow of doubt has been cast upon 398 of the 435 congressional seats. The representation of 37 States in the House should not be left in doubt. My figure of a 15-percent deviation, which is also one that has received the support of many political scientists, is considered an equitable standard for fair congressional districting. Moreover, by permitting the States rather than the courts to draw the lines, I believe a better local understanding of geographic and other local interests can be blended into a fair congressional district.

There can be no question about constitutional power of Congress to enact my proposal in this area. Indeed, the decision of the Supreme Court clearly indicated this. Nor can there be any doubt that a legislative solution is far better than a judicial one in a field which is primarily legislative in nature and responsibility. Congressional approval of my bill will put an end once and for all to the case-by-case rulings as to whether or not the actions of State legislatures were fair or unfair. My bill clearly recognizes that the States should have the opportunity to meet their responsibilities of drawing the lines for equitable congressional districts. The guidelines will be supplied by the enactment of my bill. The responsibility will be one for the States to meet those standards.

Luke E. Hart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Luke E. Hart, for 10 years supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, one of the Nation's most distinguished Catholic laymen and a civic leader in St. Louis for decades, is dead. His contributions to St. Louis, his church, and his country will not soon be forgotten by the scores of people whose lives were enriched by his dedication to the promotion of the common good. The February 21 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat paid a moving tribute to Mr. Hart. Luke Hart was a personal friend as are many of the members of his family.

The editorial follows:

LUKE E. HART

One of the most distinguished Catholic laymen of the Nation, Luke E. Hart, has died—rich in years, honors, and achievement. For more than a decade he had been supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, a fraternal organization of Catholic men. Before that he served as supreme Knights of Columbus advocate 31 years and a member of the society's governing board 35 years.

Though Mr. Hart's outstanding achievements were as a leader in the Knights of Columbus, he had been widely active in St. Louis civic, charitable and business affairs. He launched local chapters of the Big Brothers, the USO and the Boys Club, served on the city's first board of aldermen and was for a while president of the Hamilton Brown Shoe Co. and a director of the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel.

Probably no layman of the Catholic Church received more papal honors. The last was in 1962 from Pope John. Mr. Hart sponsored the costly, invaluable microfilming of Vatican documents for the Pope Pius XII Library at St. Louis University, and started the Knights of Columbus advertising campaign explaining doctrine—perhaps an important stimulus to the current move for ecumenism.

Luke Hart was a devoted son and successful lay leader of his church. His interests also were community wide, especially concerned with youth welfare. He would like and well reserves just such an epitaph.

Miami: Host to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently over WTVJ–TV, channel 4, in Miami, Ralph Renick who is vice president in charge of news presented an editorial which I believe is an appropriate one to commend to my colleagues.

Mr. Renick cites the efforts of a group of 300 people called the Council for International Visitors. Their work is truly outstanding and a fine example of what one group of citizens, working together, is doing to promote greater understanding among the peoples of the world.

The president of the council is Comdr. Samuel F. Harby, vice presidents are Mrs. H. Franklin Williams and Mrs. Albert Pick, treasurer is Mr. Joe C. Morris, the secretary is Mrs. L. N. Felts and the program director is Mrs. Ralph V. Kirk.

These people, along with the outstanding persons serving on the board of directors and the volunteers who make up the membership of the council, are to be commended for their fine example of good citizenship and service, not only to the community but to our Nation.

MIAMI: HOST TO THE WORLD

A group of Miamians have been doing what all the money and resources of the U.S. Government could never do. These people have been showing foreign visitors the warmth and kindness inherent in Americans.

A thousand words or pamphlets or photographs could not duplicate the effect of an evening spent with an American family. This personal experience reveals to a citizen from another country that America is truly a great nation of people with malice for nobody.

For 6 years, some 300 dedicated people have been organized into a group called Council for International Visitors. The CIV has made foreign visitors, here on educational or cultural missions, feel at home while in Miami.

Last year, 850 foreign visitors were given hospitality through the CIV program. Hundreds of home-cooked meals, tours, and introductions to friends were among services given—without expecting anything in return.

The only trouble with the project is that it has been so successful it has run into trouble. There is no pressing financial problems but the CIV people do need the services of somebody who can devote considerable time to the project to turn it into a smooth running operation. The group needs a volunteer coordinator.

The enthusiastic members are there and ready to serve but somebody needs to be at the helm.

Similar groups have been tremendously active in cities from Boston to Sioux City, Iowa.

Miami's Council for International Visitors has the potential to develop into one of the Nation's most effective. Perhaps you know of somebody tailor made for the coordinator's job. If landlocked, isolated Sioux City can become a center for foreign visitors, imagine what Miami—Gateway to the Americas, and the world—could become.

Resolution for a National Constitutional Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from volume 23, summer 1963, of the Federal Bar Journal. It points up some of the more unfortunate aspects of these proposed amendments to the Constitution.

The article follows:

COMMENTS AND DEVELOPMENTS—RESOLUTIONS FOR A NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

(By Stewart R. Jaffy)[1]

Three resolutions to call a national constitutional convention have been introduced and are being passed in State legislatures throughout the country. These resolutions are of interest to members of the Federal Bar Association because they would, if approved by two-thirds of the States, result in a national constitutional convention which could significantly alter the concept and structure of the Federal Government.

The resolutions discussed hereinafter are worded in an identical fashion upon their introduction in the various State legislatures. The theory being that if 34 States (two-thirds of the States) approve one or more identical resolutions calling for a national constitutional convention for a specific purpose, then under article V of the Constitution, the Congress would have to call such a convention.

The first of these resolutions (hereinafter R. 1) would call a national constitutional convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States by removing jurisdiction from the Federal courts in State legislative apportionment matters. If such an amendment were adopted it would

Footnotes at end of speech.

reverse the decision of the Supreme Court in *Baker* v. *Carr*[2] that Federal courts have jurisdiction under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to entertain suits alleging an unconstitutional apportionment of a State legislature. The significance of the Baker decision, becomes readily apparent when it is realized that after that decision was announced over 60 State legislative reapportionment cases were filed complaining about the apportionment in some 37 States, and, probably resulting in at least partial reapportionment in an estimated 25 States.[3] The Supreme Court during the 1963 term will hear cases concerning legislative apportionment in the States of New York, Maryland, Virginia, Alabama, and Delaware.[4]

Thirteen States have already voted in favor of the Resolution 1 proposal.[5]

The second resolution (hereinafter R. 2) would change the method of amending the Constitution by eliminating the constitutional convention as a method of amendment and in lieu thereof permit the State legislatures, by direct action, to propose an amendment. Thus, under this proposal, once two-thirds of the States legislatures proposed an amendment, then Congress would have to submit the proposal to all the States and the amendment would become effective once ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Twelve States have voted in favor of R. 2.[6]

The third resolution (R. 3) would create a super Supreme Court. The court would consist of the chief justice of each State in the Union and would have jurisdiction to review and override U.S. Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions.

R. 3 has not made much headway. Only five State legislatures have voted in favor of R. 3.[7]

In connection with these resolutions, Mr. Chief Justice Warren has stated:

"If proposals of this magnitude had been made in the early days of the Republic, the voices of the lawyers of that time would have been heard from one end of our land to the other."

"Surely the Constitution should be as precious to us now as it was then."[8]

In response to the Chief Justice's question: "If lawyers are not to be the watchmen for the Constitution, on whom are we to rely?", the Toledo (Ohio) Blade published full page advertisements with the answer: "Upon the newspapers of America."[9] The Blade advertisement set forth the names of the major Ohio papers which had spoken against the three resolutions.

The defeat in Ohio of R. 1 and R. 2[10] has been widely regarded as a major legislative upset during the past session of the Ohio Legislature. The majority leaders of both houses were outspoken in favor of the aforesaid resolutions. R. 1 finally passed the senate committee, after first being defeated. It was never submitted to the Ohio Senate when it was learned that members of the majority would not go along with the leadership. The R. 2 proposal was finally scrapped in committee and a new proposal offered which called for a constitutional convention,[11] to "clarify the responsibilities and jurisdiction of the Federal and State governments." This resolution was not acted upon. The steam from the aforesaid resolutions in Ohio was removed when the Federal district three-judge court considering the suit alleging there was State legislative malapportionment in Ohio ruled in favor of the status quo.

The extreme nature of these three resolutions has been emphasized by Prof. Charles L. Black of the Yale Law School. He has said that these resolutions:

"aim not at the preservation but at the subversion of the balance in Federal-State relations."[12]

President Kennedy,[13] Attorney General Kennedy,[14] and many Congressmen, including Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois,[15] CASE, of New Jersey,[16] YOUNG, of Ohio,[17] have condemned these resolutions.

Because these resolutions directly attack the Constitution and the Supreme Court and would alter the concept of the United States as a Nation, it behooves members of the Federal Bar Association to be aware of this problem.

THE PROBLEMS OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

There never been a U.S. Constitutional Convention under article V. No one knows what subject matter could be considered.

While the resolutions call for a convention to propose specific amendments, article V provides for the call of a convention by Congress for proposing amendments. It would thus seem that, subject to whatever operating procedures were adopted, any delegate or delegation could propose other amendments to the Constitution.[18] Think of the unknowns presented. We would open the Constitution to the vagaries of every pressure group in existence.

Considering the growth accomplished by this country under the Constitution and the remarkable stability of Government which has existed it is difficult to see why we should resort to a convention method of amendment with its attendant possibility of drastic constitutional change. Surely, if there is need to reexamine the Constitution it can be done in the customary fashion through debate in Congress achieving a consensus and resulting in the submission of the amendment to the States. Other problems concerning the composition of such a convention are discussed by Professor Black in the articles cited. Basically, these problems show the impossibility of determining what groups would have effective control of such a convention.

RESOLUTION 1 IS AN ATTACK UPON THE SUPREME COURT

Resolution 1 attacks the U.S. Supreme Court for its decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*. The *Baker* case dealt with the matter of State legislative apportionment in the State of Tennessee where the State legislature did not follow its own provisions for reapportioning the State legislature since 1901. The situation in Tennessee was also true in other States. For example, the Oklahoma Legislature had only token reapportionment since 1911.[19] In situations where the State legislatures did not follow their own legislative provisions it can be said that they brought the reapportionment cases on themselves.

The importance of a person's vote to our form of Government cannot be overestimated. Where a situation is created which restricts the value of a person's vote, whether it be through a method of stuffing the ballot box,[20] fraudulent tabulation,[21] or creating a formula depriving certain people of the equal value of their vote, who is in a better position that the Federal courts of this land to act? Why, then, should the Supreme Court be criticized for finding that certain States have deprived citizens of the right to have their vote count fully?

As attorneys we know that under the adversary system every time that the Supreme Court decides a case there may be a loser representing some powerful interest group. By establishing a precedent of amending the Constitution to restrict Supreme Court jurisdiction every time that someone is unhappy with a decision we destroy the stability that exists under our present system. We also do away with the principle of finality. Instead of the Court being the final arbiter all decisions would now become subject to review by amendment. Add to this the idea that under R. 2 the States could directly initiate amendments and it can be seen that the concept of one national policy on any issue would be destroyed.

Further, to hold over the Supreme Court as a club the possibility that every decision rendered would invoke constitutional amendment impairs the effectiveness of that Court. The Justices of this Court are supposedly removed from pressures by life tenure. Would it not be a mistake to place the Court in a position where it must give consideration to the pressure groups which exist throughout the country?

RESOLUTION 2 AND ITS EFFECT

The greatest opposition to R. 2 is premised on the argument that it would destroy the concept of the United States as a nation. By permitting amendments to be initiated by two-thirds of the States acting independently of each other, but in concert, and then providing for an automatic submission to the State legislatures for ratification by three-fourths of the States, there would occur a significant shift of power into the hands of State legislatures. It must be remembered that under article V of the Constitution, the Congress designates whether ratification should be by State legislatures or by State constitutional convention. Under the present system, as to amendments which have been adopted, the Congress deliberates on a proposed amendment, the people have a chance to express their feelings through their representatives in Washington and the latter temper their actions in accordance with their responsibility as a U.S. Senator or Representative. Under R. 2, no longer would there be a chance for the Congressman to take testimony and deliberate, no longer would there be a chance for the executive branch to recommend or testify. Instead, the will of the State legislatures would be dominant.

It has been suggested that the constitutional convention method is unworkable because it has never been used and, further, that there is something wrong with the fact that there have been so few amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Certainly, the convention method is available. That it has not been used only indicates that there has not been a crisis in our Government of the type which would necessitate such drastic action as a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution. That such a method is unworkable is belied by the fact that an attempt is now being made through these resolutions to call such a convention. That there have been so few amendments to our Constitution speaks well of the work of the Founding Fathers. In addition, it shows the stability that exists in our Government. After all, it is this document that provides the organic law of the land. This instrument, considering all the changes and advancements in science and our environment since its adoption, is correctly called a "living Constitution." Any attempts to tamper with the Constitution, therefore, should be viewed with some skepticism and with much caution and proposals adopted only after considerable debate.

R. 2 has been criticized as an attempt to restore the country to a confederation type of government.[22] Certainly, the significant shift of power which the resolution would engender would change our existing form of Federal Government.

One of the more telling arguments against R. 2 has been expressed by Professor Black when he points out that under such a proposal, if adopted, it would be possible for 15 percent of the people to govern affirmatively the rest of the United States. Professor Black's figures are determined by recognizing that the 38 least populous States (enough to provide a two-thirds favorable vote and a three-fourths ratification under the resolution) have less than 40 percent of the American population. Further, as to 34 of these least populous States "it takes approximately 38 percent of the people to form the constituencies of enough State

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

senators or representatives to pass a measure through the more accurately representative house of the State legislature."[22] This would mean that 38 percent of the 40 percent of the American population could propose and ratify a constitutional amendment. Instead of a method of protecting the minority, as under our present Constitution, we would have government by the minority.

---

[1] Partner, Waterman, Jaffy, Van Heyde & Taylor, Attorneys, Columbus, Ohio; president, Columbus Chapter, Federal Bar Association.

[2] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[3] Abram, "A New Civil Right," 52 Nat. Civic Review 186 (April 1963).

[4] The Supreme Court heard the cases in the first four States during the weeks of Nov. 11 and 18. The Delaware case is scheduled for hearing on Dec. 9, 1963.

[5] Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and Texas. In addition, it has passed one house in Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois, Oregon, New Jersey, and South Carolina.

[6] Florida, Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wyoming, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Texas, and Missouri.

[7] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Wyoming.

[8] Address of Mr. Chief Justice Warren at the dedication of the new law building at Duke University, April 27, 1963.

[9] The Washington Post; New York Times; the Toledo Blade; all dated June 3, 1963.

[10] Ohio Senate Joint Resolution 13 and House Joint Resolution 44, respectively.

[11] The new resolution called for a constitutional convention to consider (1) a clearer delineation between Federal and State jurisdictions; (2) resolving the competition between Federal and State Governments for tax sources; (3) apportionment of representation in the State legislature; (4) electoral college reforms.

[12] Black, "The Proposed Amendment of Article V: A Threatened Disaster," 72 Yale L.J. 957 (April 1963).

See also, Black, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments: They would return us to Confederacy," 49 A.B.A.J. 637.

[13] May 8, 1963.

[14] May 4, 1963.

[15] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8262, May 15, 1963.

[16] May 8, 1963.

[17] June 4, 1963.

[18] Black, supra note 10. See also, Shanahan, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments: They Will Strengthen Federal-State Relations," 49 A.B.A.J. 631 at 633.

[19] *Moss* v. *Burkhart*, 207 F. Supp. 885 (1962).

[20] *U.S.* v. *Saylor*, 322 U.S. 385.

[21] *U.S.* v. *Classic*, 313 U.S. 299.

[22] Black, supra, note 10.

[23] Id.

Housing's Friend on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, February 16, 1964, with reference to the announced retirement from Congress of our distinguished and beloved colleague, Representative ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama. As the editorial points out, the Congress can ill afford to lose a legislator of Mr. RAINS' experience, ability, and integrity. It is to be hoped that he will reconsider his decision.

The editorial follows.

HOUSING'S FRIEND ON THE HILL

The announcement by Representative ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, that he intends to retire from Congress at the end of this session can be greeted only with a hope that the decision is not irrevocable.

First-rate legislators are a commodity eternally in short supply, but the prospective loss of Mr. RAINS, still full of vigor, wit, and industry at 61, promises to be particularly damaging.

Housing legislation has been his interest, and will be his monument. Every housing bill enacted since 1955—and there have been seven of major proportions—bears the stamp of his political skill and of a mind that combines political and economic liberalism with keen practicality in matters of business and finance.

It is commonly said in the House cloakrooms that Mr. RAINS' sponsorship of a bill will automatically create 20 additional votes for it. Those 20 votes have often proved crucial. They will be even more needed in the future as housing legislation of all kinds becomes more inextricably bound up with all the complex and emotional issues of integration. Mr. RAINS still has an important job to do for the Nation.

Hawaii's Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, there are instances in which the unselfish, dedicated schoolteachers who inspire our youth to study hard and to make something of themselves deserve special recognition for the services which they render to our country.

One such teacher is Kiyoshi Yabui, of Kahului, Maui, Hawaii, who has for the past 18 years devoted his free time to aiding students in need of assistance. We can be truly grateful for men like Mr. Yabui who help to make America great.

Mr. Yabui's story is told in the following article from the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser for February 16, 1964:

STUDENTS OCCUPY TEACHER'S OFF-DUTY TIME

(By Robert Johnson)

KAHULUI, MAUI.—Kiyoshi Yabui, a shy, round-shaped, unmarried man of 44, is a teacher.

He teaches regular seventh and eighth grade classes at Kahului School, where he has taught for about 18 years.

But after regular school hours, he stays on to teach and counsel students until 5 p.m. or so every schoolday.

And every school night from 7 to 9:30 or 10 p.m. his classroom is ablaze with lights and full of boys and girls. He helps them with their homework.

And every weekend, when he drives to Lahaina to visit his mother, his car also carries up to half a dozen students.

During the summers he provides a one-man, voluntary 6-week summer school in English and mathematics, open to any who want to come, up to 40 students.

And when he isn't teaching school or visiting his family's beach home in Lahaina, he's available to anyone who knows him for piano and ukulele lessons. He doesn't charge for the lessons.

He's been doing most of these things during the 18 years he's been at Kahului School.

For most of those years Yabui's work has gone without much public notice. But this year public recognition has come to him.

Yabui was selected last November from among 5,000 Hawaii public school teachers as Hawaii's "Teacher of the Year."

The selection was announced in January by the department of education. But it didn't receive much notice. So a group of Maui men and women, mostly parents of children who have received his help, have banded together to do him honor.

A testimonial luau will be held at 6 p.m., Saturday, at the Kahului School cafetorium. Toru Suzuki is chairman.

Last week Yabui was asked to explain why he gives to much of his time to what most people consider work, without being paid beyond his teacher's salary. He said it just sort of happened. And he's kept it up because "I'm single, I have the time, others have their own families."

How did it get started? Said Yabui: "The kids asked me."

He explained that it began in Makawao "when I first came out to teach, more than 20 years ago." It began, he said, because he liked music, and in the beginning, he explained, he learned from the kids.

"In Makawao the kids liked music and they always came with their guitars and doublebass. It was through them that I really learned to play the piano."

Then, more than 15 years ago at Kahului, "a group of kids asked me if they could learn the ukulele. I couldn't play it myself. I said let's learn together. We met once a week and had somebody come to teach us. After a year or so, I started teaching it to my home classes."

The voluntary after duty hours and night classes started the same way, about the same time, with a group of kids. "They asked me if I could come at night to help them. I said OK. It was two or three kids, but others wanted to come.

"It just kept growing until some nights I had as many as three classrooms full, more than I could manage, and I had to set a limit."

Today, his limit is one room full. His principal, Wallace Tanaka said, "He has sort of a waiting list. He cannot take all who want to come. He has permission to use his classroom for these activities. There's never been any trouble." It was Tanaka who first nominated him for teacher of the year.

Yabui said, "A lot of kids actually cannot study at home. Some say the problem is TV. Others say it's their younger brothers and sisters. They bring their homework here in the evenings. If there is anything I can help them with, I do it.

"Parents hear about it and bring their kids from other schools, who need help. It's hard to turn any away."

He explained why he takes no money for his music lessons: "I picked it up myself, learned it myself. It didn't cost me money, so I couldn't very well ask people to pay me. Music is a release, it's something I enjoy."

Yabui's Kahului School classroom is equipped with an upright piano and more than the ordinary collection of books.

"In the course of 20 years or so," he said, "I've accumulated reference books and other material the kids can use. And I make contacts for them with people who might have stuff I don't have."

What is the greatest need of his students?

"You'd be surprised, it isn't math. The biggest deficiency in our children is in English—grammar and and literature. Summers, I require them to do one book report a week. We hope 1 in 20 will get the reading habit."

Yabui keeps what he calls his philosophy of education neatly typed on a small rectangle of paper under the glass top of his desk. He pointed out that the statement was composed by someone else, but that he lifted it from an education pamphlet because he feels it states his philosophy as well as he could himself. It reads:

"There is only one thing worse than the smugness and prejudice of the ignorant and that is the smugness and prejudice of the 'educated.' Education that does not engender a sense of humility in the student, that does not make him appallingly aware of how much there is to know, is not true education, it is simply mental calisthenics.

"From education students should acquire enough knowledge so that they need not look up to others with envy, enough wisdom so that they will not look down on others with disdain."

Hoax Brought Diem Downfall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, has earned the admiration and gratitude of the American people for his outstanding efforts in exposing the sinister, subversive, and unbelievable schemes and machinations of the Communist conspiracy in this country and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress the following Associated Press story which appeared in The State, a great South Carolina daily, published in our capital city of Columbia:

CITES U.N. FACTFINDING COMMISSION—SENATOR CHARGES PRESS AIDED HOAX IN DIEM DOWNFALL

WASHINGTON.—Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, charged Sunday that a hoax for which he blamed some of the press brought the downfall of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in South Vietnam.

He critized no newspaper by name.

DODD made the accusations in a letter appended to a Senate-financed reprint of a 324-page report released last December 9 by a United Nations Factfinding Commission which had visited Vietnam.

UPON REQUEST

The reprint was made at DODD's request as an official Senate Internal Security Subcommittee document "for the information of Senators," DODD said in a statement. He said he made the request because he believes the report was "virtually ignored by the press for more than 2 weeks after its release date until some enterprising commentators got hold of the story."

Noting that the U.N. factfinders made no formal findings on their study of allegations of serious violation of human rights by the Diem regime including persecution of Buddhists, DODD declared: "I believe that any objective person would have to conclude from reading it that the accounts of massive persecution of the Buddhist religion were, at the best, vastly exaggerated, and at the worst, a sordid propaganda fraud."

DOUBTS

The Diem government was toppled last November 1, and Diem and Ngo Dinh Nhu, his strongman brother-in-law, were slain.

DODD said that "some of the testimony presented in the report raises doubts about the authenticity and the spontaneity of suicides" by Buddhists who burned themselves to death in Saigon streets in protest against alleged persecution by the Diem government.

DODD said the factfinders did not report on political motives but that he believes Communist propaganda was behind many of the atrocity stories.

He said the report quoted a 19-year-old Buddhist monk as stating that he had been talked into agreeing to burn himself to death with stories of atrocities and promises that he would be given pain-killing drugs. He said the youth was prevented by the police from setting himself ablaze.

DEAD OR ALIVE

DODD said the mission told also of interviewing a number of Buddhists who had been reported killed, and that the mission "could find no evidence to substantiate published reports in the press that Buddhist monks had been thrown from upper stories during the raid on the Xa Loi pagoda."

"What all this adds up to, in my opinion," DODD wrote, "is that the American people have once again been grievously misinformed by some of their newspapers on a foreign situation that vitally concerns them."

DODD said that "important American newspapers" during World War II pictured the Yugoslav partisan Mihailovitch as a collaborator with the Nazis, and portrayed Tito as a hero, and, "The result was the betrayal of Mihailovitch and the installation of a Communist regime."

A CROOK

He said that some of these papers reported that China's Chiang Kai-shek "was a crook and the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers and the result was a confusion of policy that led to the installation of a Communist regime in China."

DODD said "there were papers" which contended that Cuba's Fidel Castro was "not a Communist but a cross between Robin Hood and Thomas Jefferson; and the result was a Communist regime in Cuba."

ANOTHER HOAX

"Now we have been the victim of still another hoax, in consequence of which the government of Ngo Dinh Diem has been destroyed and a chaotic situation has been created that will make a Communist takeover more difficult to resist," he wrote.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 46th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, I pause with others in the free world to recognize this day.

For almost a quarter of a century the peoples of this nation have been under Communist rule. During this time nothing has changed with regard to the denial of fundamental right of people to choose their government. The right of freedom of speech is still as foreign as the freedom of political gathering.

Today there are few ways the people of this Republic can demonstrate their attitude toward the one party political regime, but the increasing number of qualified voters who are abstaining from exercising their rights is a most noticeable one.

The existence of the people in the homeland is not an easy one but their hope for a brighter future rests in the hearts of relatives and friends in the free world. The cause of all of the captive European nations is one in which freedom loving people the world over continue to encourage. I commend all of those people who continuously dedicate their efforts that others may live in peace and freedom.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Conservation's Last Frontier—Clean Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, an excellent discussion of the problem of air pollution and the action taken by Congress last session to combat it has been written by Will T. Johns for the February 15 edition of Conservation News, which is published as an educational service by the National Wildlife Federation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION'S LAST FRONTIER—CLEAN AIR

When President Lyndon B. Johnson affixed his signature to Public Law 88-206 on December 17, 1963, the battle lines were drawn for a coordinated attack on conservation's last frontier—the air we breathe.

Known as the "Clean Air Act of 1963," this piece of major legislation by the 88th Congress started when the late President John F. Kennedy directed a health message to Congress on February 7, 1963, asking for means of dealing with "threats to the physical well-being of our families from the contamination of food, air and water."

"We need to broaden our surveillance and control of pollution in the air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat," he declared. "We need to intensify our research effort in this area, to define the precise damages done to our health by various contaminants, and to develop more effective and economical means of controlling or eliminating them."

The President recommended an intensified air pollution research program. He also asked for financial air pollution control grants and law enforcement authority. He pointed out that the Nation is currently spending 10 cents per capita a year in fighting a problem which alone costs an estimated $64 per capita annually in economic losses.

The first bill carrying out the President's request was S. 432. It actually had been introduced on January 23, 1963, prior to the President's message, but was held on the desk for 10 days before referral to the Senate Committee on Public Works. It was introduced by Senators ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware, E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland, HOWARD W. CANNON, of Nevada, THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming, WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, and WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington.

Companion measures introduced in the House were referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6518 was reported favorably, with amendments, on July 9 and was passed by the House on July 24. S. 432 was reported favorably, with amendments, on November 7, 1963, by the Senate Committee on Public Works, but on November 19, the Senate passed H.R. 6518 after the language in S. 432 was substituted for that in H.R. 6518. The proposal then went to a conference committee which came out on December 5 with a compromise version. The conference report was adopted on December 10 by the House on a record vote of 273 to 109 and referred to the Senate. The Senate adopted the conference report the same day, clearing the bill for the White House.

What is the Clean Air Act of 1963? Basically, it accelerates, extends, and strengthens the Federal air pollution control program. It also establishes a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control. A Federal law enforcement program, similar to that on water pollution, would be established to control air pollution. Up to $25 million would be authorized for the 1965 fiscal year, $30 million for fiscal 1966, and $35 million for fiscal 1967.

The Congress, in its findings, emphasized that—

1. The predominant part of the Nation's population is located in rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdiction and often extend into two or more States.

2. The growth in the amount of complexity of air pollution has resulted in mounting dangers to public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation.

3. The prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of State and local governments but that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

Why a Clean Air Act of 1963? Eight years have elapsed since enactment of the first identifiable Federal program in air pollution. This first step was taken with Public Law 159, 84th Congress, approved July 14, 1955. The law authorized a program of research and technical assistance and contained some provisions for Federal grants-in-aid to air pollution control agencies. But time has clearly shown that this was not enough.

Only one-third of the States have established programs to deal with air pollution, most of them quite limited in scope. Local government programs, in the few places they exist, are generally understaffed and without sufficient financial and trained manpower resources. Only 34 local programs have annual budgets exceeding $25,000 and 7 of these are in California. Of the other 51 local air pollution control agencies, 21 try to function on less than $10,000 per year. In the past decade, despite a 30-percent increase in urban population, there has been, outside of California, no overall increase in manpower to combat air pollution at the local level.

In 1961 it was estimated that air pollution problems existed in 308 American communities and about 7,300 areas, housing 60 percent of the Nation's population, were or soon would be confronted with air pollution problems of one kind or another. Congress found that a number of States do not have air pollution control laws.

How important is air pollution control? The air we breathe is probably the most important of all our natural resources—but the one we take most for granted. "Free as the air" has long been a popular public misconception in the American way of life. Everyone knows we need fresh, clean air every few seconds in order to live. But few persons realize the enormous demands upon our air supply to sustain our modern technological way of liffe. Far more air than fuel, even in terms of actual weight, is used in all combustion processes—from burning gasoline in the family car to burning coal in a huge electric powerplant. The combustion processes replace usable air with potentially harmful pollutants. The capability of the atmosphere to disperse and dilute these pollutants, especially in urban areas where people, vehicles, and industries tend to congregate in ever-greater numbers, is strictly limited. Air knows no State lines nor city limits. Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion each year in the United States, of which $500 million represents agricultural losses alone. Polluted air can peel paint from your house, cause smog through which you try to drive, and even endanger your health. In his special health message to Congress on February 7, 1963, President Kennedy, in fact, observed that there is overwhelming scientific evidence linking air pollution to the aggravation of heart conditions and to increases in susceptibility to chronic respiratory diseases, particularly among older people. More recently, there is mounting evidence that polluted air may play an important role in the growth of cancer among the American people.

From the Dust Bowl of the thirties came the first public realization that good soil is essential to life. From the shortage of clear water in the forties to clean, cool, and refresh a growing industrial society came the public knowledge and desire to stop water pollution.

Now, in the sixties, America has come to the final step in a long overdue wise use of the most important natural resource—the invisible resource—the air we breathe and use to run the most powerful nation on earth. The Clean Air Act of 1963 will go down in history as a major landmark in this country's conservation record.

The United Fund Sees a New Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under previous permission to revise and extend my remarks, include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in

the Providence Journal of Monday, February 24, 1964:

THE UNITED FUND SEES A NEW PERIL

(By Selig Greenberg)

The United Fund concept of charitable giving on the basis of carefully evaluated need rather than emotional appeal is seriously threatened by a new plan for solicitation of servicemen and Federal employes initiated by John W. Macy, Jr., chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Under a policy established in 1957, Federal installations now have a minimum of two and a maximum of four charity campaigns a year. At the Newport Naval Base and the Quonset Naval Air Station, there are two such annual drives, one for the United Fund and the other for a number of national health agencies as well as international organizations. Among the latter are CARE and Radio Free Europe. Some Government installations have separate campaigns for the international agencies and for Red Cross where that organization is not affiliated with the United Fund, as it is here.

A TEST PLAN

Mr. Macy recently announced that Federal authorities would like to consolidate these separate drives into a single annual charity campaign. By way of a start, it is planned to run single drives next fall on an experimental basis in seven cities in various parts of the country. The results of the experiments will determine future policy for all Government installations and agencies.

The plan has evoked sharp opposition from the United Community Funds and Councils of America, the national U.F. organization, whose board of directors has attacked it as "unsound and contrary to the best interests of the contributors, the communities involved and our member agencies." John S. Hayes, the organization's president, has written Mr. Macy that "if the type of joint campaigning you are proposing were generally adopted, it would result in complete chaos in united fund raising and jeopardize the entire voluntary health and welfare structure."

There has been a mounting flood of protests from United Fund organizations throughout the country, and Members of Congress are being urged to try to kill Mr. Macy's project before it gets off the ground. In view of the powerful interests involved on both sides of the argument, a first-class scrap appears to be in the making.

On the face of it, it seems paradoxical that the United Fund, which has long espoused the idea of "one campaign for all," should strenuously oppose the proposal for a single Federal charity drive. But examination of Mr. Macy's plan clearly shows the reasons for the concern of the U.F. leadership.

Major features of the plan are:

1. Each Federal installation will set up its own campaign manned by Federal personnel. In the current list of 22 approved participating agencies, the United Fund appears as one organization and the Red Cross where it is not a U.F. member is also counted as one. All the others are national or international agencies.

2. Contributors will be encouraged to designate the organizations which they would like to benefit from their gifts. Such designations could be made first to the group (United Fund, national health agencies, international agencies and in some cases Red Cross) and then to individual organizations within the group. In cases where the donor makes no specific designation, the undesignated money would be divided among the participating agencies in the same ratio as their respective proportion of the overall campaign goal for the installation.

SPECIAL FORMULA

3. But while the names of the individual national and international agencies will appear on the pledge card, there is no assurance that the United Fund will be permitted by the local Federal coordinating group to list its member organizations. In fact, there is every reason to believe that in the case of United Funds of any size—the Rhode Island United Fund now has 98 member agencies—it will be virtually impossible to do so.

4. Contributors will be allowed for the first time to pay their gifts through the payroll deduction system. But after this fall's demonstrations, the participating agencies will have to bear the cost of operating the system.

5. The national health agencies and the international group will have a special goal-setting formula. This formula has a built-in escalator providing for a goal increase each year until 100 percent participation has been achieved at the dollar level desired by these agencies. The United Fund goal, on the other hand, will be negotiated with the local Federal coordinating group.

OTHER OBJECTIONS

The United Funds strongly feel that lumping together the local federated community campaign of a large number of member agencies with the appeals of individual organizations is unfair. It disregards the fact that the national and international agencies are unwilling to accept the principle of local citizen review of their programs and budgets to which the UF members adhere and refuse to give up their costly independent drives.

Equally objectionable from the United Fund's point of view is the substitution of designation by each contributor for budgeting through which funds are allocated by a citizens' committee in a position to consider relative needs in the context of overall community planning.

This sets the stage for fierce competition among agencies for contributions and puts a premium on emotional appeal instead of carefully considered need. Under this kind of setup, it is not inconceivable that such organizations as the Muscular Distrophy Associations of America or the National Multiple Sclerosis Society could get a bigger share of the proceeds than the United Fund with its much wider spectrum of service.

The danger of reducing the United Fund to the status of just another agency rather than the representative of a large number of component organizations is amply illustrated by a look at the situation in this State.

The United Fund's member agencies in Rhode Island currently have budgets totaling $11,500,000 a year, with deficits of $3,600,000 which have to be met through the annual fund-raising effort. Counting in the Newport chest which recently merged with the United Fund here and Newport Red Cross which will soon also become a UF member, the United Fund last year raised about $135,000 in the two naval installations in this State.

If Mr. Macy's plan for a single Federal campaign is put into effect, the 98 Rhode Island United Fund member agencies would have to compete under one listing with organizations whose annual budgets in this State come to only about $700,000. There is, moreover, no guarantee that the number of independent agencies approved for participation in the Federal drive will not keep on growing, thereby aggravating the problem of multiple and overlapping appeals and increasing the hazard that the United Fund may be lost in the shuffle.

"When you start combining apples and pears," a local United Fund executive remarked the other day, "you endanger the criteria of community-based allocation of funds on the basis of relative need."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of United Community Funds and Councils asserts that "attempting to combine agencies that accepts the disciplines of united fundraising as well as the benefits with organizations that are unwilling to do so is discriminatory and presents problems in solicitation which defy solutions fair to all parties concerned."

FAR-REACHING ISSUES

The national United Fund organization also maintains that Mr. Macy's proposal endorses a method of solicitation contrary to that generally and successfully used by industry and organized labor and removes the influence of U.F. volunteer workers from the "effort to save campaign expenses, allocate funds intelligently, and promote sound community planning."

Mr. Macy contends in defense of his plan that consolidation of the separate drives at the Federal installations into a single campaign not only would save official time and expense but would at least double the present annual contributions of $20 million through inauguration of the payroll deduction system to spread out giving over the year.

Mr. Hayes, the president of United Community Funds and Councils, has retorted that most independent organizations "are almost entirely supported by cash contributions and normally do not solicit on an employee group basis" and that payroll deduction 'is feasible only for a united drive in which designation of gifts is not stressed." The issues, he said, go "far beyond rasing more money." The United Funds would naturally welcome a higher level of giving by servicemen and Federal employees. But fully as vital, Mr. Hayes has emphasized, is that the money should be "more intelligently applied to carefully screened needs."

One of the Good Guys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Seattle and the State of Washington this month lost their dean of political reporters, Russell J. Nelson, known affectionately to his many thousands of readers throughout the Pacific Northwest as "Stub."

A perceptive analyst of the political scene, completely objective and fair-minded, while never pulling punches, "Stub" Nelson wrote his daily column in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer without fear or favor. In so doing he won and held for more than two decades the respect of citizens of all ranks and political affiliation and of the entire Washington State press corps, including those who at State and national political conventions, and at sessions of the State legislature, were his competitors. For many years he served as president of the organization of legislative reporters—which fact attests to the high regard with which they held him.

Throughout his brilliant career as a political reporter, I was proud to consider "Stub" a warm and personal friend; yet I could not truthfully say that I was closer to "Stub" than other elected officials or candidates for public office with whom he was in frequent or continual contact. Ours was a friendship of mutual respect for each other's integrity, which perhaps over the years is the finest friendship one may have.

When such a friend passes on, it is difficult to put in words one's personal emotions or to express the sense of loss which overwhelms us.

Ed Donohoe, columnist for the Washington Teamster, published in Seattle, has done this as well as anyone I know in the February 14 issue of that newspaper. I hope all my colleagues in the Senate, whichever of the 50 States they represent, will read this column. Then those who do so will know "Stub" Nelson as I did, as the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] did, as Washington's entire congressional delegation did, and as the citizenry of our State did, and will gain from this knowledge, although "Stub" Nelson has passed on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "One of the Good Guys," by Ed Donohoe, published in the Washington Teamster issue of February 14, 1964, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OF THE GOOD GUYS

(By Ed Donohoe)

Although there are others who knew him better as friend and confidant, or as they say "when," nonetheless the death of Stub Nelson, Post-Intelligencer political writer, strikes us as a deep personal loss, and a blow to what we look upon as the art of personal journalism.

Stub was the kind of fellow who couldn't help but get involved in the stories he wrote, and while others might stump for equal time in political reporting, or the odious status quo, we still preferred the way Stub approached the job and executed his art.

As a writer surely there are others who would turn a better phrase, or discuss the profundities of politics until they become downright boring. In all sincerity, what Stub Nelson had was the human touch.

Coming from sports as he did, he never quite shook either the lingo or the elements of a race, contest or game. You would find the handicap, the 2 o'clock hitter, the strong finisher, the dark horse, or the man who was obviously out of his class. All you had to do was transpose officeseeker or incumbent for horse or athlete, and you could read Stub Nelson like a thrilling account of a title fight.

Of course, we liked the Nelson approach to affairs of state. We liked the way he could break a complex situation down to components that the majority of his readers could readily understand. In a way, he was involving his audience in the things that he was involved in.

Yes, his stories had the who, what, where, when and how—but you could also dig out that very important answer to the question "why." And he was able to avoid a sermon, lecture, or what we dread most, pontification.

Oh, there were times that we could disagree with something Stub Nelson expounded but he wasn't the kind to bear a grudge or put a disputant on some sort of list.

What he was best known for was his quiet, unassuming charm coupled with an endless inquisitive search for more than one opinion on a subject. Not that he wasn't capable of letting you know where he stood, what he personally thought, and his ideas of the outcome. Probably he couldn't shake that sportswriting tendency to prognosticate even to trivial events like getting up in the morning.

In the election campaign of 1952 Stub and I served on a "Meet the Press" panel assembled to interview Senator Harry Pulliam Cain. I have always felt that my presence on that show helped to "deep six" Radio at a time it was mortally locked in combat with the emerging giant called television.

What went on during the half hour with the then junior Senator doesn't bear repeating, but Stub waived the last question on the show to apologize for the antics of one of his fellow members on the panel.

It precipitated quite a buzz in political ranks at the time, but I think Stub made his point on two scores:

I never appeared on another interviewing panel; and the program, which got its talent—such as it was—for free, went belly-up.

The Nelson theme was quite simple: I work for a newspaper, I like to be regarded as all newspaper, why build up an opposition medium?

The tragedy that has befallen the Post-Intelligencer strikes home harder when one considers the great talents whose signatures are no more in the span of only 4 years. There is no Mike Donohoe, no Dick Sharp, no Lucy Cohen, no Slim Lynch, and now—no Stub Nelson.

What these people brought to their newspaper wasn't always spelled out in column inches under a byline. The best word to describe their gift to journalism is savvy—they knew what was going on, who was doing what to whom; they knew people and were known by people, lots of people.

They brought identity to their newspaper and they could use the newspaper to best advantage. It was not uncommon that each of these, and other good ones we might have overlooked, broke their bigger stories on their day off simply because somebody with a story to tell remembered to call. Though the five mentioned might have been of different personality and temperament, all were reliable in their field, all commanded an audience, all "worked" at their trade.

Because he was involved in the business of reporting about politicians and events in a homespun language that was easy to read, there was this quality about Stub Nelson that really stood out—his eminent fairness. He tried to tell the important things that happened in the way he saw them happen. Politicians have a way of disagreeing with just about everything they read, and most of the ideas they can't claim as their own. But around the State, which was really Stub's "beat," the majority regarded Mr. Nelson as one of the very best in his calling.

And it may be that life will pick up where Stub left off; another will be appointed to fill his shoes.

But I find it hard, because he was such a good guy, not to think of his passing as calamitous for the kind of journalism he knew best.

Resolution on Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, state-sponsored anti-Semitism did not end with the defeat of Nazi Germany. In the Soviet Union, anti-Semitism is practiced and officially condoned. The guarantees of the U.S.S.R. constitution regarding minorities are rendered meaningless. In a nation which discourages religion, the Jewish religion is the most harassed, the most curbed, the most restricted.

The deteriorating situation of Jews resident in the Soviet Union should be a source of deep concern and apprehension. An expression of this apprehension is reflected in the adoption of the following resolution by the Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit.

Under unanimous consent, the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council, composed of representatives of 340 Jewish member organizations in the metropolitan Detroit area, deplores the continuing perpetration of cultural and religious genocide against Jews in the Soviet Union by the Soviet Government. Official restrictions imposed upon the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union deny to them their freedom of worship, isolate them from their tradition and from their co-religionists in other parts of the world, and destroy their specifically Jewish spirit.

Prohibitions against the making or importation of Jewish religious objects—of prayer shawls, phylacteries, prayerbooks, Bibles, religious calendars—and against maintaining spiritual ties with coreligionists abroad, are indications of the harsh and restrictive discriminatory measures. Jewish religious and cultural life is further circumscribed by restrictions against the Yiddish theatre and press, religious schools, publishing of books in Yiddish and Hebrew. Traditional burial is proscribed and much anguish is occasioned by the sufferng thus imposed.

All of these restrictions are in contradistinction to the status accorded to other nationality and religious minorities resident in the Soviet Union.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to implement their often repeated concern for, and championship of, freedom for all nationalities and groups, by according to Soviet Jews the same status and conditions enjoyed by other groupings of Soviet citizens, and to restore to the U.S.S.R.'s Jewish citizens their rights to—

1. Jewish education in all its forms;
2. Continuity of Jewish cultural life through literature, theater, schools, press, publishing houses, and other forms of cultural expression in Yiddish and in Hebrew;
3. Reopening of synagogues to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry;
4. Jewish ritual observance in its traditional forms;
5. Reestablishment of religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad; and
6. Be reunited with their families in other lands, from whom they have been separated.

We appeal to the Soviet Government—as a matter of urgency and elementary decency—to recognize the rights of Jews to their own language, religious and cultural expression to the degree permitted to all other ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

Our call also goes out to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to use his good offices and the machinery of this world body, of which the Soviet Union is a member nation, to act against the cultural and religious genocide being perpetrated against Soviet Jewry.

We also call upon the Government of the United States, our President, our Secretary of State, our Congressmen, and our Ambassador to the United Nations, to protest to the Soviet Government, through diplomatic and other channels, against the oppressions herein detailed.

The officers of the Jewish Community Council are instructed to send copies of this resolution to the officials above mentioned, and to take all appropriate measures to the accomplishment of these ends, independently and in concert with national agencies and other like-minded groups.

Unanimously adopted by the Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit, January 13, 1964.

The Opochensky Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., has reprinted in its February 9, 1964, issue a copy of an article from the Christian Beacon entitled "The Opochensky Trip." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that the Members of the Congress might get some better insight into the type of material which is being presented on many college campuses today by visiting lecturers, in an effort to make the Communists appear to be merely peaceful Socialists who are seeking the same ends as is Christianity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Beacon]

THE OPOCENSKY TRIP

Milan Opocensky, the assistant to Josef L. Hromadka, is running into protest and difficulty wherever he goes on college campuses.

Representatives of International Christian Youth are meeting him at each stop on his trip. Following his encounter with ICY at the University of Delaware, which brought the widest kind of publicity, he ran into difficulty at Boston University in Massachusetts and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. From there he went to Oberlin College, at Oberlin, Ohio, where the Rev. John Milheim of ICY confronted him with direct questions.

Opocensky told a group during a coffee hour that he declined to debate the representative of International Christian Youth, Carl Thomas McIntire, on the advice of the National Council of Churches, which was sponsoring his visit.

He also explained that those who wanted to get his literature could obtain it from the headquarters of the United Presbyterian Church in New York City.

When he spoke in the First Congregational Church of Madison, Wis., following his brief visit to the University of Wisconsin, he abandoned his announced theme and simply gave a Biblical message. Young people of ICY were passing out leaflets exposing Opocensky's praise of the Communist regime and his support of the reconstruction in Czechoslovakia. These leaflets raised questions for all who were entering the building to hear Opocensky.

ICY spokesmen at Berkeley, University of California, were able to obtain copies of the preliminary study material, including the bibliography that the select group of students are to read before they are privileged to enter into the confrontation.

The program, East-West Conversation, for Berkeley, Calif., January 31 through February 2, 1964, has two major themes: "The Problem of Man in a Socialist Society," and "Christian Existence in a Communist Country."

Accompanying Opocensky is Dr. Charles C. West, associate professor of Christian Ethics at Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.

The sponsor is the University Church Council. The 3-day meeting is to be held in Dwinelle Hall, Westminister House, and on Sunday he is scheduled to speak in the Trinity Methodist Church in the morning, and in the afternoon and evening in the First Presbyterian Church.

The folder announcing Opocensky's views said:

"He had declared: 'The Socialist revolution in our country since 1948 is not a deviation from God's plans for my country. It is part of the historical development of the country.' And he wrote: 'The (Marxist) fight against religion can be understood as a serious and deep expression of human longing for wonderful freedom, independence, dignity, and real human life.'"

The documents released for study in advance include "Christian Existence in a Communist Country" by Milan Opocensky and "The Church in East Germany," by Harvey Cox.

The article reports: "Harvey Cox is known to our readers for his assessments of Playboy and the Miss America pageant. On leave from his post at Andover Newton Theological School, Mr. Cox has studied and worked in Berlin this year. This article marks his first appearance since his election as contributing editor." The article is a reprint from "Christianity and Crisis."

"The Christian Church and Communist Atheism," by Helmut Gollwitzer, another document released for study, is reprinted from a release of the World Student Christian Federation and is, we are told, "especially for the East-West Dialogues sponsored by the National Student Christian Federation."

Among the things that Gollwitzer says in regard to atheism is, "The church must abandon all false alliances formed in order to oppose Communist atheism."

And again, "The church must cooperate in the effort to abolish conditions 'in which man is a humiliated, enslaved, abandoned, and contemptible creature' (Karl Marx)."

Another article by Milan Machovec is reproduced from the Student World Chronicle which is a publication of the World Student Christian Federation. It is entitled, "Marxist View."

The article concludes:

"We are convinced that the greatest task in human history, the building up of a Communist society, contributes to the development of the highest human qualities. We cannot wait until non-Communists trust us. Therefore may a sincere, fair struggle decide who wins the prize; in other words, who first gets close to man and stands up for him."

Thus the publications of the World Student Christian Federation present in a most attractive form the propaganda of the Marxists for the building of a Communist society.

In the bibliography prepared and the articles submitted, there is no documentation supporting the cause of the free West. The entire approach is from the standpoint of the Marxist and the Communist.

It is a one-sided representation, and yet it is being carried on under a Christian cover and through organizations, which have direct contact with young people who are working through the student campus groups.

The Opocensky trip has been carefully planned, the literature anticipated, and prepared in advance.

It is an effort to meet on the highest level of intellectual appeal, students of the United States and first, to persuade them that they should not resist communism; and, second, to induce them to help the Communists succeed in their program.

The general idea seems to be that the Communists and the Christians are working toward the same goal though their methods may be different, and for this reason the Christian can help the Communist.

What Can I Do for Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, a young Coast Guard enlisted man, Donald Blackwell, S.N., of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., recently won one of the Freedom Foundation awards for an essay he recently wrote in competition with many young people throughout our country.

This is a distinct honor to Mr. Blackwell and the U.S. Coast Guard. It reflects upon the high caliber of men in the ranks of the service.

I thought Members would be interested in reading one of the contributions presented by this 20-year-old coastguardsman. It is in the form of a prayer:

WHAT CAN I DO FOR FREEDOM?

Dear God:

I have often asked for your blessings in many a way,
But "What Can I Do for Freedom" on this particular day.
Sometimes I fail to recognize what freedom really means to me,
Until I stop and consider the lives of so many who died to make us free.
My brother wore a uniform, way back I dont remember when,
But I do know that he came back and I was able to see him again.
I have thanked you many times for bringing him home the same,
But this time I want to bless those who stayed to remain.
They died by thousands, peace, tranquility, and freedom, being their only fight,
So that I, and others like me will know the difference between wrong and right.
And when it comes to furthering my education, for freedom I will do my best,
So when important questions confront me, the answer I won't have to guess.
I am too young to vote, but the time is not far away,
And when I am able, the first in line I will be that day.
I will try and maintain high morals so everyone who knows me will be proud,
And when my neighbor's burden is too great, I will help if I am allowed.
And if I am able and my life for my country's freedom I must give,
Then this too I will do so that others, in this wonderful land, in freedom may live.
And if abundant in wealth, then money I would be more than glad to send,
So that the loss of our Nation's freedom would never be threatened again.
And if a master of skills I would be, then I would carry my teachings from shore to shore,
So that the distant gap between us and other countries would slowly lessen more and more.

There is no use kidding, a master of skills
and rich in wealth do not apply to me,
But I am a member of the armed forces,
dedicated to keep the American people
free;
On the eleventh of November and other days
as well, my uniform I will proudly
don,
Not because it is my military duty, but to
remember those who died so freedom
could go on.
When I joined the service and took up mili-
tary life, I knew it was something I
had to do,
To in some small way try and preserve the
freedom that men died for, both for
me and you.
So, Dear God, I thank you for your blessing
and close this prayer,
Hoping that other countries will realize that
our welcoming mat is always there.
—D. BLACKWELL (343-779) SN.

Meat Imports No. 1: Dealers Say Import Curb Is Not Enough—Some Cattlemen Call It Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, farmers, feeders, all those dependent upon the production of meat and meat products are truly up in arms over the skyrocketing rise in foreign meat imports into this country. Imports have depressed prices in this vital industry to the point where farmers, producers, and those concerned with the industry are becoming bankrupt. These imports are of particular concern to the States west of the Mississippi River. I would venture to guess that it is of equal concern to almost every State in the Union, because almost every State produces meat for the Nation's table. Not only is this of actual concern to those engaged in this industry but of equal concern to the many businesses throughout the country who depend upon farmers and others in the livestock business for the sale of their products.

A series of nine articles written by reporters for the Omaha World-Herald appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18 on page 2966 and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, beginning on page 3327. The Omaha World-Herald, which is the voice of the Midlands, sent two reporters and a photographer throughout the United States in a search for information and facts concerning this critical problem, which resulted in the nine-part series of articles referred to above.

The World-Herald is published in Omaha, Nebr., which city is known as the beef capital of the world due to the fact that more livestock is processed in the Omaha market than in any other city. Aside from the nine informative articles from the World-Herald referred to above, I submit the following stories which have appeared in this outstanding newspaper.

One of these stories follows:

DEALERS SAY IMPORT CURB ISN'T ENOUGH—SOME CATTLEMEN HERE CALL IT RIDICULOUS

Reaction among local cattlemen to the Australia-New Zealand import agreement ranged from ridicule to outrage Tuesday.

"As a feeder, raiser, and farmer, I feel that so-called agreement should be fought by every Member of the Congress and the Senate," an irate livestock dealer asserted.

"It's inadequate," continued James Regan, Jr., of Regan, Regan & Hess. "I canont see where a quota of imports in excess of the amount imported to the United States in 1960 would be of any value to the economy of the country at this critical time."

PRETTY RIDICULOUS

"It's no where near enough, agreed Frank Berigan, manager of Berigan Brothers Livestock Commission Co. "There's going to be a lot of fellows who just aren't going to be able to feed next year. This isn't helping them one bit."

"It's pretty ridiculous," charged cattle dealer Bill Foxley. "I realize that maybe every little bit counts but this is pretty little."

He maintained that "something should have been done long before the situation got as bad as it has."

Charles W. O'Rourke, vice president of the Union Stock Yards Co., predicted the pact "will solve no problems at all."

FLIMSY THING

He termed it "flimsy" and speculated that it is a "Government attempt to quiet the people down."

"But it certainly won't quiet those farmers and feeders who are losing $40 or $50 on every head of cattle," he argued.

The agreement, he said, is "apparently a very voluntary thing with Australia and New Zealand still in command."

Schools Urged To Develop Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of February 24, 1964:

HELIX HIGH CEREMONY—RAFFERTY URGES SCHOOLS TO DEVELOP PATRIOTISM

(By Charles Davis)

State school Superintendent Maxwell Rafferty, yesterday struck critically at efforts to bar expressions of patriotic reverence and asked educators to tell America "what is good and true and right."

Rafferty was flanked by more than 175 flags and banners as he addressed a massing of the colors ceremony sponsored by the Cajon Valley Chapter of the Military Order of World Wars.

Four hundred persons in the stands at Helix High School stadium stood and applauded after he finished speaking.

LENGTHY CEREMONY

The more than 2-hour ceremony featured a parade, a band concert, a pageant depicting the history of Old Glory, massing and blessing of the colors, and a youth group's medley of patriotic songs.

An El Capitan High School California Cadet Corps member, one of several score colorbearers from numerous organizations, collapsed after standing in the field 35 minutes and was treated in a nearby mobile emergency unit.

Speaking on "The Song of Freedom," Rafferty deplored a move by the American Civil Liberties Union in La Mesa-Spring Valley school district to eliminate songs written in the form of prayers.

ILLEGAL STANZA

He also cited New York where, he said, in recent months it has become illegal to sing the last stanza of the Star-Spangled Banner.

Rafferty said songs which invoke the name of the Deity in the form of prayer are "America," "America, the Beautiful," "God Bless America" and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

"Does anyone seriously believe that these songs of inspiration, sung for so long by all our people, regardless of religion or creed, have suddenly begun to violate freedom of religion on the part of little children" he asked.

Rafferty charged a sort of sick campaign of whispering and inference to the effect that a patriot is an enemy of international peace and good will.

He quoted a high appointed official of this State—whom afterward he declined to identify to reporters—as saying that the idea of America being sacred soil is a lot of paranoiac patriotism.

"I am sure that to this gentleman, and to many like him, the soil of his native land is not sacred, that it is just dirt, no different from the soil of any other land," Rafferty said.

"But I want to make my own position crystal clear. America's soil is sacred to me."

TIME TO SPEAK

Applause broke out when Rafferty said this is "no time for tame surrender to those among us who would tamper with the dearly bought birthright of our people."

Then he added:

"It is instead a time for those of us in education to stand to our guns, to tell America not what she wants to hear but what is good and true and right for her to hear, to tell her not only what we have done for her in the past but what we are prepared yet to do."

The Marine Corps Recruit Depot band in the schoolyard ceremony played three of the songs which Rafferty linked with moves to eliminate them from schools, and, after he spoke, others were included in a presentation by the Youth for Christ singers and orchestra.

OPENING PARADE

Scouts, students, veterans, Shriners, law officers, and women's auxiliaries all took part in an opening flag parade around the field's track and later stood for more than an hour on both sides of a stand occupied by mayors, legislators, civic, military, and veterans representatives.

The flags and banners that they carried snapped briskly in the breeze.

Col. Francis J. Andrews, U.S. Army, retired, commander of the MOWW chapter, called Old Glory a "glowing beacon of liberty to all of the world" and voiced regret at possible loss of a feeling of swelling pride among Americans upon seeing the flag.

Capt. P. A. Horton, U.S. Army, retired, narrated an "Evolution of the Flag," in which Grossmont Union High School District students carried 14 antecedents of the present flag to the front of the stands.

Spark M. Matsunaga, of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Rafu Shimpo, a newspaper in my city of Los Angeles, has published an article about one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Hawaii, Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA. It pays glowing tribute to him as an officer of the famed 100th Infantry Battalion composed of Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II, as a legislator, and as a personality. Because in the year that I have known "SPARKY," as he is affectionately known to all of us, I have learned to respect him most highly and regard him as one of our most promising men in the Congress, I offer the following article, published in the Rafu Shimpo supplement of December 1963:

SPARK MATSUNAGA: "IF WE ARE TO SHARE OUR JUST BURDEN, WE MUST WORK SIDE BY SIDE, WITHOUT FEAR"

(By Dan Komai)

Just recently, I had lunch with a Congressman.

That in itself was not historic but he was the Representative from the 50th State in the Union—Hawaii.

He was SPARK MASAYUKI MATSUNAGA, the second Japanese American to serve the people in the Legislature. He took office in January of 1963 at the same time that DANIEL K. INOUYE, the first Japanese American to be elected to the Legislature was being sworn into the Senate.

Christened MASAYUKI on his birth in Kauai on October 8, 1916, the young MATSUNAGA picked up the name "SPARK" from his playmates. During a childhood game when he was tagged "it," his friends said he jumped like "Spark Plug," Barney Google's horse.

The name stuck and he adopted it legally. Now, most of his colleagues call him that and even the late President John F. Kennedy, on a trip to Hawaii, called him "SPARKY" because they seemed to have trouble pronouncing MASAYUKI or MATSUNAGA.

Despite the capriciousness of his adopted name, he is a serious servant of the people, imbued with a real desire to help his fellow man and humanity. He credits his father who is known as the Living Saint in his community in Hawaii for his credo.

Before coming to Washington, MATSUNAGA was majority leader of the House of Representatives of the Hawaii Territorial Legislature in 1959. While a member of the house of representatives, he served as chairman of the judiciary committee, chairman of the juvenile court, recreation and welfare committee, vice chairman of the tourism and land committees. In 1959, he had lost the Democratic candidacy for Lieutenant Governor of Hawaii by a narrow margin.

Prior to that, the graduate of Kauai High School, University of Hawaii in 1941, Harvard Law School in 1951, and Northwestern University Traffic Institute, ABA course for judge and prosecutor in 1957, served during World War II as a member of the 100th Infantry Battalion.

MATSUNAGA, a member of Company K of the 229th Infantry of the Hawaii National Guard, was among those of Japanese ancestry in American uniform who were corraled after Pearl Harbor at Schofield Barracks and shipped to Wisconsin. When the chance came to join the special battalion to prove their loyalty to the land of their birth on the field of battle, he and others plunged right in.

He was wounded twice. He earned the Bronze Star medal, Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster, Army Commendation medal during his service with the 100th Infantry Battalion in North Africa and Italy and with the Military Intelligence Service Language School at Fort Snelling. He was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1953 with the rank of captain.

He had this to say about World War II and his fellow soldiers:

"It is frequently said that men don't die for ideals, that a man is put into uniform, sent to the battlefront, and usually doesn't know what he is fighting for, even if he is forced to the point of giving up his life. Let me tell you that the men of the 100th and of the 442d Combat Team did die for ideals and they knew what they were fighting for.

"Men like Private Kawano, my messenger, who, in his last few words, told me in effect, 'Well, Lieutenant, I know I'm going to die but I have no regrets. I know that as a result of my dying, those of us who will go home and our folks back home will be recognized as true Americans and will live a better life.'

"We Americans of Japanese ancestry proved our Americanism on the field of battle. But, I have found, as you may have too, despite the fact that we built an unquestionable foundation of loyalty, there are those among us who still advocate the belief that being of Japanese ancestry we must behave differently from other Americans, that we must remember that we are of Japenese ancestry and must not aggressively project ourselves to the forefront in the American scene."

At the time MATSUNAGA won his seat in the U.S. House of Representatives on his leadership and integrity, he said:

"If we are to make our fullest contribution to the American way of life; if we are to share our just burden in building a greater America, we must cease to be hyphenated Americans and work side by side, without fear of criticism on account of our race, along with any and all other Americans.

"On the night of my election, I was interviewed over Radio NHK, Tokyo, by telephone, for a half-hour period in the Japanese language. In my message to the people of Japan, I reiterated the fact that being born of immigrant Japanese parents, I had aspired to and been elected to one of the highest offices in the Nation. This, I pointed out, was living proof that here in the United States, democracy was not only preached but also practiced; that here in America, regardless of one's race or color, one could aspire to the greatest heights.

"This I believed as a child and more strongly believe today as a man."

This man, his wife, and family on moving to Washington joined the activities of the Japanese community wholeheartedly. At a recent talent show, his daughters Karen, 13; Keene, 10; and Diane, 8; did a captivating hula. SPARKY, himself, joined into the delight of the audience and sang a solid "nani-wa buski." The Matsunagas have two active sons in Merle, 6; and Matthew, 4.

This is the man with whom I had lunch and with whom I talked.

He asked on my arrival at his House office, "Have you ever eaten in the House of Representatives restaurant?" Upon my negative answer, he said, "Let's go."

We went down the "Catacombs" under the building and up to the restaurant. All along the way he was greeted by colleagues who called him "SPARK" or "SPARKY." Even in the dining room, he was greeted as such.

After lunch, Congressman MATSUNAGA offered to take me on a tour through the Capitol. Since Congress was not in session that day, SPARK said he would take me down on the floor of the House, which is a rare treat.

At the entrance to the House were a young Caucasian couple from New Jersey, who were obviously tourists. SPARK asked if they wanted to go in. The couple replied they could not, pointing to a sign which read, "Members Only, No Admittance."

MATSUNAGA said, "Be my guest" and introduced himself.

He led us down to the floor of the House and explained how Congress operated when in session. He took us to the Speaker's chair and allowed us to try it for "size." He showed us the bullet holes from the shots fired by the Puerto Ricans during the Truman administration.

After leaving the House, MATSUNAGA invited the young couple to join us.

While he was explaining the rotunda under the Capitol dome, an Oriental gentleman stopped and listened attentively. The Congressman asked where he was from and introduced himself. He asked the Japanese visitor to join us.

Then, we were treated to a visit to the "meditation room," a small chapel-like room just off the rotunda. Very few visitors ever get to see this room and many do not know of its existence. This is a private room in which the Nation's leaders meditate and seek guidance. Only one Senator or Congressman is allowed in there at one time. The room is constantly guarded.

This small chapel has a beautifully stained glass representing the birth and progress of this Nation under one God.

Later we visited the joint conference room, which once had been the old Senate and later the Supreme Court. This room is also under lock and key.

Congressman MATSUNAGA had the guard open the door for us and as we entered, a group of tourists started to follow us in. The guard stopped them and asked if they were with us or with any Member of Congress. Otherwise, they were not allowed to enter.

SPARK yelled out to the guard, "Let them in. Let them be my guests."

The young Congressman asked where the visitors were from. "California," was the reply. "Oh, we're neighbors. I'm from Hawaii." Amid the laughter, MATSUNAGA introduced himself and now our entourage had swelled to 10.

He took us onto the floor of the Senate and told us its history.

Upon coming out of the Senate, the group left, favorably impressed. Many of his guests had been surprised to see a U.S. Congressman of Japanese ancestry. MATSUNAGA by his demeanor had set them all at ease.

Not one member of this entourage had been his constituent.

I believe that this brief visit revealed Congressman SPARK MASAYUKI MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii, as a man with warm-hearted spontaniety who was dedicated to serving his country with humility for the purpose of serving his fellow men.

Meat Imports No. 2: Nebraskans Favor Meat Quota Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the critical situation facing the meat-producing industry in the United States, I include a

second article from the Omaha World-Herald, which follows:

NEBRASKANS FAVOR MEAT QUOTA PLAN

Beef import agreements with Australia and New Zealand were the target of scathing attacks Tuesday by some of the men who know Nebraska's economy best—Nebraska bankers.

"This so-called edict from the State Department sold us right down the river," declared N. T. Tiemann, president of the Commercial State Bank at Wausa and vice president of the Nebraska Bankers Association.

"All we have in rural areas in Nebraska are land and people," he added, "and the catalyst that makes land and people work on a full-time basis is livestock."

John M. Shonsey, executive vice president of the Omaha National Bank, said the agreements were a blow "to every State west of the Mississippi."

REMARKS APPLAUDED

His remarks were applauded by nearly 40 Nebraska bankers who had breakfast in the capitol Tuesday with members of the Nebraska congressional delegation.

The agreements announced Monday by the State and Agriculture Departments provide for meat shipments from Australia and New Zealand this year at the average of the 1962 and 1963 import levels.

The two nations exported record amounts of beef and veal to the United States in both 1962 and 1963.

In addition, a growth factor will allow a 3.7-percent increase in exports from the two countries in both 1965 and 1966.

A. J. Hallas, president of the Stockyards National Bank in Omaha, said Tuesday the agreements were "completely out of line."

"It's going to have an effect on the entire midwestern economy," he added.

ECONOMY HURT

He and Mr. Shonsey noted that serious declines in livestock prices send ripples through the entire economy, affecting purchases of such things as automobiles, farm machinery, and petroleum products.

Mr. Shonsey said his bank has noticed the impact of falling livestock prices.

"We note that our customers have lost a considerable amount of their net worth," he explained.

J. Y. Castle, president of the McDonald State Bank at North Platte, cited the drop in cattle prices from 1962 to 1963.

"When you knock your selling price down 25 percent," he said, "the whole economy is in trouble."

W. W. Marshall, Jr., executive vice president of the Commercial National Bank and Trust Co. of Grand Island, said he had talked to livestock producers just before coming to Washington.

"We agreed that the greatest blight on Nebraska's economy at the present time is livestock prices," he said.

Adon Jeffrey, president of the First National Bank at Wayne, said he felt "very definitely that the food-producing part of our economy is being depressed."

"Cattlemen are having a tough time—there's no doubt about it," said Harold Qualsett, executive vice president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank at Schuyler.

Several of the bankers said they felt the answer to the problem was legislation—the imposition of import quotas or higher duties.

Lyman Stuckey, president of the Lexington State Bank and president of the Nebraska Bankers Association, said he felt he could speak for most of the bankers, then added:

"We are in favor of the quota system.

"I think it [the quota] should be put at about zero."

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA told the bankers that the agreements were "engineered" by the State Department.

"Who was there to represent the farmers?" he asked. "We don't know."

"We've given a corner on the market to the boys away from here," Mr. HRUSKA added.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM of Omaha said the agreements involved a few concessions "that don't amount to anything" and called them an apparent attempt to "fool the people."

"It seems to me the only answer is some good stiff legislation," he said.

The bankers were in Washington for a 3-day round of meetings and briefings with Treasury, Federal Reserve and other Government officials.

Sertomans Urge Backing of American Way Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Sertoma Clubs throughout the United States celebrated Freedom Week during the period of February 16–22, 1964. During this period, thousands of copies of the Declaration of Independence and other materials were distributed in communities throughout the country in an effort to help Americans to become more conscious of their heritage and their responsibilities as citizens. I have been very pleased to read of the outstanding services performed to the public during Freedom Week by Sertomans in South Carolina. A news article in the Greenville News of February 16, 1964, described these activities and paid tribute to important contributions they are making to the American way of life. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article entitled "Sertomans Urge Backing of American Way Week" and the editorial entitled "Getting Back to Fundamentals," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERTOMANS URGE BACKING OF AMERICAN WAY WEEK

The Sertoma clubs of Greenville are asking Greenvillians to become more conscious of their heritage and of their responsibilities as citizens during a weeklong observance of American Way Week starting today.

The 200 members of the city's three Sertoma clubs have modified the Freedom Week of the national organization into their own "American Way Week."

William J. Bryson of the Greenville Sertoma Club, chairman for the week, and his committee have had printed several thousand book marks stressing "Our American Way of Life Is Your Responsibility" and singlefold, billfold-sized cards carrying one selection each from the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and Washington's Inaugural prayer.

A fourth message on the cards asks: "Have You Forgotten Something?"

"Our American Way of Life requires informed, responsible citizens.

"Have you—like too many—forgotten the principles upon which our country is founded? Have you—like too many—forgotten your civic duties?

"Rededicate yourself NOW to understanding and practicing true Americanism.

"Democracy dies through neglect."

After carrying out a similar program separately in previous Greenville Sertoma, with 100 years, the two older clubs, members and Neal Houston as president, and Sunrisers Sertoma, with 60 members and John E. Johnson as president, and the city's newest Sertoma Club, the Blue Ridge, with 40 members and M. W. Wiesner as president, have joined together for the first time in the sponsoring the present citywide observance.

Members will distribute the bookmarks and cards tomorrow to restaurants, businesses, and other places where they will get wide circulation.

Mayor David G. Traxler has urged in a proclamation that Greenvillians support the objectives of the week and "rededicate themselves to the principles of our American Way of Life."

Sertomans have urged Greenvillians to use this week as an occasion for visiting the Freedom Shrine at the Greenville County Library, a display of facsimile copies of America's most famous documents, including the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. The Greenville Sertoma Club was responsible for the shrine's establishment several years ago.

Another feature of the patriotic observance will be the presentation of copies of the declaration to newly naturalized citizens at U.S. district court later this month.

GETTING BACK TO FUNDAMENTALS

At intervals during the year various patriotic and civic organizations hold or sponsor special observances, lasting a day or a week, dedicated to recalling attention to the American ideal.

Like the lessons of childhood, these tenets tend to be neglected or even forgotten in the rush of daily living and the headlong plunge of events and political, social, and economic change.

These periods of revival of patriotism and renewed appreciation, if only momentary as things go these days, of the basic principles upon which the Republic of the United States was founded, are good for us.

We, all of us, need now and then to stop, reflect on, and ponder fundamentals. We should think of the American dream and try to see it as it really is, stripped of the distortions to which years of self-seeking expediency have subjected it and relieved of the tarnish left by failure to live up to its original concepts.

In Greenville the Sertoma club has modified the Freedom Week of their national organization into an observance of their own "American Way Week" stressing the theme that "Our American way of life is your responsibility."

That, unfortunately, is what too many Americans have forgotten—the responsibilities and obligations that freedom imposes upon those who would enjoy—and preserve—its fruits.

Someone once wrote vividly of the decline and final decay of the ancient democracy of Athens, which was a model of pure democracy because it provided by direct, as distinguished from representative rule of the people. When the freedom the Athenians desired became freedom from responsibility, when they began to demand of the state material security rather than seeking to make the state secure, then they lost all. They lost both liberty and security and were never free again.

And we must not think it can't happen to or in the United States, for there are many signs that it is already happening. Only a revival of the individual's appreciation of his American heritage of both freedom and responsibility, together with the will and the knowledge of how to act, can head off the trend.

In this connection, we cite for the benefit of the Sertomans and all others willing to take an interest in "My Creed" written some

years ago by Dean Alfange and published in This Week magazine:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take a calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole.

"I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of achievement to the stale calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. It is my heritage to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefits of my creations, and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done.'

"All of this is what it means to be an American."

This is not the easy way. It is not the way of the social planners who do not realize or do not care that if they remove from life the risks they rob it of its rewards; if they teach men to treat their hard-won rights as unearned privileges they remove incentive and make of them faceless clods; and if they place conformity to the lowest common denominator ahead of personal achievement they have taken from life its purpose.

If the people of the United States make a deal like this, the civilization Americans have wrought will not recover in a thousand years, if ever.

What's Good About Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, every day in the press we find much attention given to those who break the legal and moral laws of our society. Although they are in the minority, as compared to millions of law-abiding citizens, they, the "do-baders," are sensationalized. Because we live in the midst of many people whom we consider good and honorable, we do not jump to the conclusion that all people are bad, because a few have done wrong.

With our AID program, it is different. The American people are detached from the vast activities of AID. Normally, their only knowledge of our foreign assistance program is obtained from the press, and, because all too often the press sensationalizes shortcomings in our oversea efforts and either minimizes or overlooks outstanding accomplishments, many of our people get the idea that our entire foreign aid program is a waste.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I, of course, come across instance after instance of where our AID dollars and people are doing a tremendous job, and I feel this knowledge should be shared with the American people and their Representatives in Congress, who have doubts as to the overall value of our foreign assistance activities. This is the first of several weekly installments I intend to insert in the RECORD under the title of "What's Good About Foreign Aid" for the benefit of those who are interested in knowing more about our AID program. I trust these articles will help to demonstrate that whereas our AID program, as an essential part of free world mutual security, does need improvement; it is certainly not the worthless endeavor that many believe it to be.

ACHACACHI WATER SYSTEM IN BOLIVA

Bolivia. Capital: La Paz. Area: 424,160 square miles. Population (estimated 1962): 3,549,000. Density per square mile (1962): 8.5. Geography: Landlocked, mountainous, high altitude. Economy: Mining (tin, lead, silver); agriculture: Cereals, livestock, a little industry. Gross domestic product (1961): $387.3 million. Average income under $100 per year.

In considering American foreign aid, we tend to think that we alone do all and that the receiving country does nothing, but often the coordination between their developing programs and ours is nothing short of amazing. Among the most primitive countries in Latin America, Bolivia has mobilized with our help its limited financial and technical resources. Their interaction with ours is well illustrated in the recent water system project completed last summer on the Bolivian Altiplano in a large, out-of-the-way town of 6,000 with the improbable name of Achacachi.

An American missionary there had long dreamed of replacing the traditional method of hauling water from a nearby river with a sanitary potable water system. He interested AID officials and the local people in his idea. Once in motion, it seemed as if everyone pitched in to help. While AID paid for the project, which amounted to only a little American equipment and piping already on hand, the Bolivian Army provided some engineers and the skilled labor under the civic action program which seeks to tap the resources of the military for economic development. The inhabitants, after they realized that the operation was in earnest and that they would greatly benefit, enthusiastically leaped in to provide the backbone of the labor force. Sometimes as many as 1,000 adults and children were out digging at one time. An American technician and Peace Corps volunteers in Bolivia on health program assignments assisted the townspeople.

But the project does not stop here. AID water-supply technicians will periodically inspect the water system and Peace Corps men have already begun their followup work which will not only include health training, but also the encouragement of the townspeople to lay piping in all of the town and to build some public latrines.

Thus, different American and Bolivian programs combined to help the townspeople built their much-needed water system. Both immediate and long-range rewards will result from this effort. Already, the radical leftist campesino leader there has been replaced with a more moderate man. In the long run, the improved health and morale of the townspeople and the new skills they learned building the pipe system, will reap greater rewards—and all because of a little American piping and Bolivian labor.

Accomplishments of Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial written by Oliver Starr, Jr., of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, is an outstanding contribution on the great work being accomplished by Project Hope in its highly successful effort to benefit humanity:

STARR GAZING

(By Oliver Starr, Jr.)

Never has a ship been more aptly named that the SS *Hope*.

When it steams into a foreign harbor, hope comes to hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children who had almost lost hope that anyone on the face of the globe cared about them.

The SS *Hope* is now fulfilling the dream that former President Dwight Eisenhower had when he proposed the people-to-people program. Project Hope began in the fall of 1958 when the President asked Dr. William B. Walsh, a prominent Washington, D.C., heart specialist, to start a people-to-people health project.

Dr. Walsh submitted a plan for the world's first peacetime hospital ship, a reconverted 15,000-ton vessel from World War II and the Korean war—*The Consolation*. *The Consolation* was refitted and renamed the SS *Hope*.

When the U.S. symbol of friendship and mercy sailed from San Francisco in September of 1960, bound for Indonesia, there were aboard more than a score of some of the Nation's best physicians and dentists, as well as some 25 American nurses and other auxiliary personnel. The doctors and dentists were all volunteers. (They volunteer for a tour of duty that usually runs from 2 to 3 months. Every year about 150 physicians and dentists volunteer to serve on the SS *Hope*.)

The Indonesian trip marked the beginning of an unending success story for the SS *Hope*. When it sailed from Indonesia after 8 months, the Times of Indonesia editorialized: "The East forgets many things but never, never loses its reverence for the teacher. Those on the *Hope* will live long in our memory." Behind lay an impressive record: 200 Indonesian doctors and Indonesian nurses trained, 1,000 lectures and seminars held, 18,000 patients treated, 700 operations performed, and thousands examined and X-rayed.

Dr. Alexander Miller, of Cleveland, an orthopedic surgeon who is the brother of Rabbi Carl Miller, of Gary, was among the physicians aboard when the SS *Hope* made its next voyage—to Saigon, South Vietnam, in June of 1961.

In South Vietnam he found there was only 1 doctor for every 30,000 persons, only 300 doctors in a nation of 14 million people. Ashore he helped set up clinics for treating patients and for instructing local physicians. The more serious cases were sent aboard the SS *Hope* which has three operating rooms in constant use, as well as excellent facilities for oral surgery, a modern X-ray department, a pharmacy, and a complete medical library. (Supplying books and literature to doctors in foreign lands is another service of the SS *Hope*.)

The SS *Hope* has 200 hospital beds but due to a shortage of personnel only about 100 can be occupied at present.

In some areas Dr. Miller found no doctors at all. Witch doctors had often taken over, practicing mysticism, incantation, and even the strange cult of acupuncture where they stick needles into various parts of the patient's body to try to relieve disease symptoms.

"Most of the people there don't have any medical care at all," said Dr. Miller, "but accept their ailments philosophically. They feel that they are being punished for something they have done in a previous existence, and that if they accept it stoically they will be rewarded in the next world they enter.

"Their sanitary problems are tremendous. But our Public Health Service is doing an excellent job there in eliminating malaria, gastrointestinal diseases, and many other diseases found where there have been unsanitary conditions.

"In my own field I saw hundreds of children who had contracted polio and where severe deformities, which could have been prevented, had been permitted to develop. Major surgery often was necessary in these cases."

Dr. Miller said that many of the young South Vietnam doctors were so stimulated by the experience of working with American physicians that they decided to continue their studies of Western medicine.

"The work of the SS *Hope* was one of the most talked of things in these countries," said Dr. Miller, "and while initially there were feelings of suspicion about the coming of the ship, these were soon overcome, and the departure of the ship was cause for much sorrow on the part of the people."

Dr. Miller has since returned to work with South Vietnam doctors on two occasions—in March and April of 1962 and during November and December of 1963. The SS *Hope* also has toured South America, stopping in Peru for 10 months, and is now in Ecuador. Next year it will head for the emerging nations in Africa.

Silence Is Not Golden—Joint Chiefs Must Be Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union:

SILENCE IS NOT GOLDEN—JOINT CHIEFS MUST BE HEARD

The members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are being described as the "five silent men." By law, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the principal military advisers to the President of the United States. By present practice, they have been supplanted by a single Chief of Staff, and a civilian at that.

The National Security Act of 1947 and the Reorganization Act of 1958 specifically provided against a single chief of staff, a single uniform, or a single service, a large Joint Chief of Staff organization, and a national general staff.

But what is the situation today?

Robert H. Barnum, national president of the Navy League of the United States, points out that while the law orginally limited the Joint Staff to not more than 100, it has been changed until today it totals nearly 2,000 persons.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff has been reduced, or almost drowned, under the weight of a civilian bureaucracy that has usurped military decisionmaking and as Mr. Barnum says:

"Naval Intelligence, as an organization, has been destroyed. G-2, of the Army and Air Force Intelligence, as organizations, have been seriously torn apart. The Central Intelligence Agency is being worked upon, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff 'Intelligence Group' seriously cut, all by administrative action.

"We have, like it or not, a single supply agency, a single military intelligence agency, a single communications agency, a single press and speech censorship agency, a single atomic support agency, and a single National Security Agency."

Administrative individuals without military background, experience, education, and often without understanding, are making some of the most serious if not the most critical decisions affecting the country's security.

Out of the welter of civilian bureaucracy, one bureaucrat emerges as undisputed boss, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

As Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, USN, retired, has shown, the five members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when meeting as a body bring together a total of 178 years of varied military experience tested in both war and peace. By contrast, Mr. McNamara has had 3 years as Secretary of Defense plus a couple of years of wartime service as an Army captain specializing in finance and management.

The phrase "the Pentagon says" suggests a voice of military authority. Such is not the case. The voices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not heard in America—unless Congress brings them before its committees. Congress has a duty to air their military opinions on every point of the military budget and on every question of weapons and strategy.

Relations With Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Daily News of New York has printed in its February 24, 1964, issue, a terse but most sensible editorial opinion on our relations with the so-called Republic of Ghana. The editorial is entitled "Give Ghana the Gate." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE GHANA THE GATE—LET'S TAKE NO MORE INSULTS

The West African "Republic" of Ghana has for years been a big beneficiary of U.S. foreign aid.

We've authorized or spent a total of $160 million in the area—including $147 million toward the cost of a big power dam on the Volta River. Soviet Russia has promised to finance another part of this project.

In return, we are now on the receiving end of a hate campaign kicked up by Ghana's dictator, who calls himself its President, Kwame Nkrumah.

If Nkrumah isn't a Communist, he'll do until a real Communist comes along and grabs power in Ghana.

Ghana newspapers smear Americans in Ghana, as "spies" and "colonialists." Our Peace Corps members there are accused of subversion, even while Nkrumah asks for more of them to come over and help teach his people needed skills.

It's time, we think, for the United States to pull all of its nationals out of Ghana and stop spending any money there for any purpose.

It is time, indeed, for us to stop taking insults anywhere in the world—and Ghana is as good a place as any for us to begin hitting back.

Spotlight on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American real estate editor, Morton Kail, in a column on Friday, February 21, emphasized the fast action of the Johnson administration in the field of housing. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend it to you for your reading:

FAST ACTION SEEN ON BUILDING LAW

(By Morton Kail)

President Johnson has been lightning fast on the draw with his housing program this year and has sent his top administrators to shoot it out with legislative snipers in committee hearings during the past 2 weeks. The housing bill roundup usually takes place toward the end of every second year. But with the administration's swift action at the start of 1964, the bill is expected to be ready for the President's brand before summer.

Although most provisions deal with urban renewal and low-income housing, there are many benefits for average homeowners among its major recommendations.

For the upper price home buyer, FHA mortgages would be raised from the present $25,000 to a $30,000 limit for single homes; two- and three-family houses would also increase $5,000 to a limit of $32,500.

Lower income home buyers will be able to benefit from the FHA's section 203(i) program, which will be raised from a $9,000 limit to $11,000.

Vacation houses also will be able to use the same financing rule to obtain mortgages up to 90 percent of their sales value.

Another measure would provide better new communities by insuring loans to builders for acquisition of land, and the development of the property with sewer systems, water systems, and other facilities.

The long-needed helping hand for families that have suffered heartbreak with their homes will be extended by the Government. FHA would pay to correct "structural or other major defects" in FHA-inspected homes which builders fail to repair. The agency also will encourage lenders to avoid foreclosing mortgages in default when the circumstances are beyond the control of the homeowner.

Federal Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver testified before the House of Representatives Housing Subcommittee that the legislation, especially the community development provisions, "represents the most significant new departure in Federal assistance to private industry."

The President's war on poverty will make the housing field one of its major battlefronts with more than 240,000 new housing units in 4 years, increased funds for urban renewal, relocation assistance, and housing for the elderly.

Meat Imports No. 3: Down Under Meat Exports Trim Just Crumb for Stockmen of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the critical situation facing the people engaged in the production of meat for American tables, I include a third article from the Omaha World-Herald which I recommend to all those who are similarly concerned:

DOWN UNDER MEAT EXPORTS TRIM JUST CRUMB FOR STOCKMEN OF UNITED STATES

Australia and New Zealand have agreed to limit beef shipments to the United States under agreements involving a small and only temporary cutback in their record 1963 exports.

The agreements announced Monday by the State and Agriculture Departments came under immediate fire from some cattle country Congressmen, Republicans and Democrats.

Both nations will reduce meat exports by about 6 percent in 1964, but a "growth factor" in the arrangement will allow them to recoup the reduction in 1965 and 1966.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Omaha, described the agreements as "a crumb tossed to the stockmen of the United States.

IT'S A COMPROMISE

Described as a compromise by one top State Department official, the voluntary agreements provide that:

In 1964, Australia and New Zealand will hold exports to the average of their 1963 and 1962 shipments. They exported record amounts of beef and veal to the United States in both 1963 and 1962.

An increase of 3.7 percent in exports will be allowed in 1965 and another 3.7 percent in 1966 as an allowance for the expanding American market.

In a note outlining its understanding of the agreement, Australia said it would undertake to limit exports "so long as Australia's access to the U.S. market for beef, veal, and mutton is not limited by an increase in the duties of these products." (Such an understanding seemingly imposes an obligation on the administration to oppose any future congressional moves to raise import duties, or, perhaps, to impose import quotas.)

The agreements are of indefinite duration, but are to be reviewed every 3 years. They can be canceled by either party on 6 months' notice.

IT'S A COLD DAY

Senaotr ROMAN HRUSKA, of Nebraska, declared that the announced agreements made it "a cold day in February" for domestic livestock interests.

"This is no rollback," he asserted. "It is a surrender of the best interests of all agriculture, and especially of the cattle industry."

Representative TOM MORRIS, Democrat, of New Mexico, denounced the agreement.

"Why have any agreement at all if it is to authorize a continuation of the level of imports which has hurt U.S. cattlemen?" he asked in a House speech.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said that he was pleased that the agreements had been concluded.

He said they will "benefit our livestock producers materially."

Mr. Freeman said future expansion of beef imports will be far below recent levels.

ONLY FIRST STEP

The agreement was described by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, as "only a first, limited step" in helping American beef farmers.

He said the agreement represents some limitation on imports but that the choice of 1962 and 1963 as the base year for determining limits gives Australia and New Zealand exporters "the fattest possible limits."

"I do not think that we should automatically guarantee to foreign meat producers a share of our market. We have in the past provided more freedom of entry into our meat markets than virtually any other nation in the world. It is time we placed other nations on notice that such freedom is not to be viewed as an invitation to dump all their surplus meat products on the United States."

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, Republican, of Kansas, called the meat import rollback "entirely inadequate."

FARMERS HURT

The agreement, he said, demonstrates "dominance of the State Department in determining domestic agricultural policy to the detriment of American farmers."

Those were typical of comments from Congressmen of important beef-producing areas.

In Australia's case, the agreements cover beef, veal, and mutton in all forms other than canned, cured, and cooked meats and live animals.

It has agreed to limit exports in 1964 to 542 million pounds of meat, product weight.

Last year Australia exported 517 million pounds of beef and veal and 55 million pounds of mutton to the United States. In 1962 it exported 442 million pounds of beef and veal and 64 million pounds of mutton.

Thus, it was obvious that its shipments of beef and veal to the United States this year will be well above the level reached in 1962, which was a record up to that time. By 1966 the exports could top the record 1963 level.

BEEF AND VEAL

Some American cattle groups had hoped for a rollback in imports to the average for 1958–62. In that period Australia shipped this country an average of 213 million pounds of beef and veal a year.

The agreement with New Zealand applies only to beef and veal.

It provides for exports of 231 million pounds in 1964, an increase to 239 million pounds in 1965 and to 248 million pounds in 1966.

New Zealand shipped the United States 244 million pounds last year, 214 million pounds in 1962.

The agreements contain no enforcement or penalty provisions since they are voluntary. It was pointed out that violations undoubtedly would invite restrictive congressional action.

PRICES SLUMP

Agriculture and State Department officials stuck to their contention that the sharp declines in domestic cattle prices were caused primarily by heavy domestic production. Imports, they said, were "a contributing factor."

American livestock interests have put much of the blame for slumping prices on the large and rapid increase in imports.

Administration officials said nothing was promised Australia and New Zealand in return for the agreements except that the United States pledged its support to moves to expand the access of meat-producing nations to world markets.

"They're sweet, reasonable people," said a State Department official, when asked why the two nations agreed to export limitations.

He added that he felt they preferred "to know where they are going," even if it involved some restrictions, rather than be uncertain.

WOULD HAVE RISEN

Officials estimated the imports would have jumped 8 to 10 percent this year over 1963 levels in the absence of the agreements.

One said a substantial element of the American livestock industry felt that agreements were a satisfactory compromise. He did not identify this element.

He and others indicated the administration expects to reach similar agreements soon with Mexico and Ireland, two other exporters of beef to the United States.

Another feature of the agreements was that Australia and New Zealand gave assurances they would not discriminate against American-owned meat industry interests in their countries.

They also agreed to hold the proportion of primal cuts, such as steaks and roasts, to approximately current export levels.

Military and Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, space may be the battleground of the future. We must fully develop our space potential with the military aspects in mind. To deter our enemies and to insure our security we must gear our space program to these factors. Our program in the past has placed much emphasis on the peaceful development of the outer reaches and on prestige.

I place in the RECORD the following editorial from the Record Argus, Greenville, Pa., which points out that we must be alert to the military dangers of space:

COOPERATION IN SPACE

Military implications of space ventures have been underscored in Defense Secretary McNamara's announcement that the Air Force will develop a manned orbiting laboratory for launching in about 4 years.

Thus the Pentagon steps in ahead of the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration as sponsor of what will apparently be the first manned U.S. space station. Providing for orbiting two men for 2 to 4 weeks the Pentagon's project is less ambitious than some which NASA has contemplated, but, in consequence, it should be easier to get off the ground.

The 4-year timetable, being relatively brief, represents recognition that the United States must be fully abreast of the military dangers in space, and of defense against them. The laboratory will test the possibilities of using space stations for photograhpic reconnaissance, as command posts for military operations on earth, and as lookouts for enemy satellites. "Insurance," Mr. McNamara called it.

This has a grim, if realistic, tone, but the military emphasis should not obscure more productive opportunities including long awaited testing of man's ability to survive in space for an extended period.

The Pentagon has agreed to cooperate with NASA on such experiments, and an effective space program demands that this cooperation be wholehearted and uncomplicated by rival endeavors.

Rigging of Bids in Navy Department, Bureau of Weapons Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Navy currently has underway two purchases of electronics equipment that are supposed to be competitive buys. The truth is that they are both rigged to go to one company.

This same company is today making this equipment under terms of past sole source contracts. This company's president is a onetime associate of the very Navy engineer who is writing the terms under which this equipment will be purchased. And this engineer, Mr. Speaker, presently handles over $3 million worth of business for this same firm in the Navy Department Bureau of Weapons.

You might think it unbelievable that Navy Department officials would allow this to go on. The fact is they have known it for months because I called it to their attention.

Today, after months of study into the background of Navy purchases from this firm, I am going to name names, dates, amounts and equipments to demonstrate how one firm can set the stage to get business in wholesale lots from one small area of the Navy Department.

First, let us deal with the two current procurements—where the waste still has not taken place. Unless someone in the Navy steps in and takes a hand, these two procurements will prove how one Government worker can produce a climate suitable for one manufacturer only and detrimental to all other bidders simply by restricting the time for delivery of certain complex electronic equipments.

The first buy is for a radio direction finder that is technically nomenclatured AN/ALD-2. Bidding closes March 17, 1964—St. Patrick's Day—at the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa. The previous manufacturer of this equipment is Babcock Electronic Corp., Costa Mesa, Calif.

Under terms of this purchase, first delivery is required in June, 1964. With bidding closing March 17, 1964, we can expect a contract award by mid-April, based on past experience. Thus, less than 60 days is allowed a manufacturer to produce this equipment, have it tested and passed and readied for delivery to the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, my sources in both the Navy and the electronics industry say it is not possible for any company other than the current producer to meet this time schedule.

Thus, unless someone in the Navy steps in and changes this artificially tight time schedule, there will be, in reality, little or no competitive bidding, and the taxpayer's pocket will be picked while industry is hoodwinked again.

The second purchase is now being processed by the Navy Purchasing Office here in Washington. It is also competitive in nature. It is for what is called the AN/SRW-4, a complex rack of electronic gear used to control the flight of pilotless drone aircraft. It, too, has been made sole source and without competition in the past by Babcock Electronics, Costa Mesa, Calif., for about $25,000 each.

The Navy specifies in its invitation that new units of the AN/SRW-4 must be delivered for testing before production runs are started. This test model must be delivered 90 days after the award of a contract. The IFB also contains what are called liquidated damages—which the contractor must pay for every day the delivery schedule slips.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, electronics industry technicians—and Navy technicians—tell me the only firm that can do this work is the present sole source producer, Babcock Electronics.

Now, let us go one layer deeper. Let us see who is represented here by the word "Navy." As my colleague from Louisiana once said, "Let's get the bodies up here."

Mr. Speaker, the Navy engineer in charge of both these procurements is a man named Harry A. McConaghy, who lives at 5447 Chevy Chase Parkway NW., Washington. He is attached to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

What Mr. McConaghy has done in both these cases is as simple as it is devastating. He has practically guaranteed to eliminate all competition, since no industrial marketing manager who values his skin is going to quote a competitive price against such bob-tailed delivery schedules with damages staring him in the face for every day he is late.

Now, to understand the way that Government business is often transacted, it is necessary to know the backgrounds of the people involved. To accomplish this, I have asked the General Accounting Office to supply me with background materials on all the companies and principals involved.

To state the situation very briefly, it turns out that the President of Babcock Electronics is a former Navy employee who worked at one time with Mr. McConaghy. It also turns out that Mr. McConaghy is at present handling over $3 million of Navy business for Babcock, all of it negotiated or sole source—noncompetitive.

I want to state here and now and for the record—I have no quarrel with Babcock Electronics. The company is in business to make money for its stockholders. It must play the Defense purchasing game by the rules laid down by the people in positions of power.

It is the system of awarding contracts and the civil servants who put themselves in positions of question that must be looked into constantly by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the president of Babcock Electronics is Moody Besancon. Understandably, he spends much of his time in Washington and much of this time is in the company of Mr. McConaghy. This, too, is understandable since much of Babcock's Navy business flows from this source.

Mr. Besancon is, as I have said, an ex-Navy employee. He left his GS-12 job, then paying about $7,570 per year, to accept outside employment which soon resulted in his accepting the presidency of Babcock Electronics.

To refresh the memory of Members, let me remind them that Mr. McConaghy, the Navy engineer, also has technical cogniznace over the radio set—the AN/DRW-29 about which I spoke on the floor of the House last August 15, 1963—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 14280. This is the case in which the Navy fought to restrict the bidding to Babcock and where earlier sole source prices for the radio were $1,500. When competition was forced for the radio, the price fell to $702.98 each.

During that same period, Mr. Speaker, I had the General Accounting Office ascertain the exact number of contracts Babcock had acquired through Mr. McConaghy's office and what percentage of his total workload these contracts represented.

In addition, I asked about Mr. Besancon, since I was informed by people in the Navy that he was an ex-engineer who had worked in the Navy with Mr. McConaghy some years ago.

For the record, I would like to insert the Comptroller General's report, File No. B-151274, which relates to this matter:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1963.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Reference is made to your letter of July 23, 1963, wherein information was requested pertaining to Harry McConaghy, a Bureau of Naval Weapons engineer, and to Babcock Electronics of Costa Mesa, Calif. The data presented below are in the same order as the information requested in your letter.

1. A schedule of current contracts and related data under the cognizance of Harry McConaghy, obtained from the Bureau of Naval Weapons, is attached. The schedule shows that as of July 31, 1963, Mr. McConaghy had project cognizance over 12 contracts totaling $10,435,333, on which deliveries had not been completed. Six of these contracts totaling $3,179,730 were with Babcock Electronics.

2. Our review of recent Standard & Poor's Corp. reports showed that the president of Babcock Electronics is Mr. Moody Besancon. We obtained from the Bureau of Naval Weapons the service record card of Mr. Moody Besancon and determined that he was employed by the Department of the Navy for 3 months and was separated from the Navy payroll on June 1, 1956. During his employment, he was classified as electronic engineer (radio), grade GS-12, at $7,570 per annum and assigned to the Systems Section of the Guided Missiles Guidance Branch, Bureau of Aeronautics. We were furnished a job description for work performed in this section by the Bureau of Naval Weapons. This section had the responsibility for the development, testing, and procurement of complete guidance systems and for the integration of components developed by other sections and agencies into guidance systems for all missiles under the cognizance of the Bureau of Aeronautics and for the evaluation of such systems.

3. The Bureau of Naval Weapons informed us that the latest information available as of May 31, 1963, indicates that the Babcock Electronics' total business backlog is approximately $8 million. Of this amount, we estimate that approximately $2.5 million, or about 30 percent, represents the backlog of prime contracts with the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Contracts on which deliveries have not been completed on equipments or services under project cognizance of RMWC-53 (Mr. H. A. McConaghy) as of July 31, 1963

Item	Contractor	Contract No.	Date	Equipment	Quantity	Unit price	Total price
1	Babcock Electronics, 1640 Monrovia Ave., Costa Mesa, Calif.	NOw 63-0381	June 25, 1963	AN/SRW-4 (all versions including DASH) course of instruction for training in checkout equipment for functional checkout.	Group of 5		$76,867.00
2	do	NOw 63-0311	May 17, 1963	SRW-4A components (target control system)[1]	Group of 50	$42,619.00	2,130,953.00
3	do	NOw 63-0656	Apr. 19, 1963	DRW-29 (radio receiver)	Group of 300	1,186.00	358,020.00
4	do	NOw 62-1105	Sept. 5, 1962	Reproducible drawings auto-positive for AN/-SRW-4 systems.	20 sets	3,843.35	[2] 76,867.00
5	do	NOw 62-0619	Mar. 9, 1962	DRW-29 (radio receiver) including spare parts and support equipment.	Group of 240	1,293.89	[2] 454,449.76
6	do	NOw 61-0894	June 21, 1961	Study program for new carrier frequency assignment for radio-controlled command guidance.			[2] 82,573.30
	Total, current contracts with Babcock Electronics.						3,179,730.06
7	Gyrodyne Co. of America, Inc., Flowerfield St., St. James, Long Island, N.Y.	NOw 63-0306	May 9, 1963	SRW-4A components (target control system)[1]	Group of 50	17,630.00	881,500.00
8	ARF Products, Inc., Box 57, Raton, N. Mex.	N600(19)60039 (NPO Wash.).	Mar. 13, 1963	USQ-11A miss distance measurement system	Group of 90	805.00	72,900.00
9	do	N600(19)58315 (NPO Wash.).	Apr. 6, 1962	do	Group of 350	754.14	263,949.00
10	Northrop Corp., 8000 Woodley Ave., Van Nuys, Calif.	NOw 61-0553	June 29, 1961	KD2R-5 targets, drawings, spares, etc	Basic, 300 Am. #3, 400	4,347.00 3,465.00	4,380,324.00
11	Reeves Instrument Corp., Garden City, Long Island, N.Y.	NOw 61-0755-f	June 21, 1961	To obtain adequate "out of sight" target aircraft control equipment for fleet training requirements (ANMSQ-51).	15 units and 12 man-months.		1,432,132.00
12	Electronic Assistance Corp., 20 Bridge Ave., Red Bank, N.J.	N600(19)56444 (NPO Wash.).	Feb. 15, 1961	ARW-56, 55, 59 (radio receiver set)	ARW-56 (12) ARW-55 (154) ARW-59 (154)	2,066.00 845.00 380.00	224,798.00
	Total, all contracts						10,435,333.06

[1] These 2 equipments are installed as 1 package.

[2] Payments made on these contracts as of May 31, 1963, amounted to $530,104.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for installations and Logistics, Mr. Kenneth E. BeLieu, has been cognizant of this matter at least since August 5, 1963, when he answered my letter to him on the subject.

Mr. BeLieu's answers to my questions deal with this very subject. It is interesting to note that, while supposedly intimately acquainted with this matter and with procurement details, Mr. BeLieu still closes his eyes to 60- and 90-day delivery schedules to be imposed on industry at the whim of an engineer for the benefit of one company.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. BeLieu's letter and enclosures at this point:

AUGUST 5, 1963.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of July 23, 1963, to the Secretary of the Navy, in which you request some personal background on Mr. Harry A. McConaghy and a statement of the nomenclature of electronic equipment under his cognizance.

The requested data are furnished as enclosures (1) and (2).

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH E. BELIEU.

PERSONAL DATA ON MR. HARRY A. MCCONAGHY

Mr. Harry A. McConaghy was born in Camden, N.J., on March 6, 1910. He attended Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., between 1935 and 1936. Since then he has attended numerous technical schools and has taken courses in radio and electrical engineering.

Mr. McConaghy has over 24 years of Government service which has been gained primarily in Pennsylvania and Washington, D.C. He came to the Electronics Production Resources Agency, in Washington, D.C., in 1951 from the Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pa. After a short period of employment in private industry in 1953, he returned to the Navy with the Bureau of Aeronautics which merged with the Bureau of Ordnance in 1959 to form the Bureau of Naval Weapons, where he is currently employed as an electronic engineer.

In 1958 Mr. McConaghy was given a Superior Achievement Award for coordinating two major fire control systems programs, and in 1962 he received a Superior Accomplishment Award for efforts in preparation of the handbook, "Configuration Data, Target Control System AN/SRW-4."

He lives at 5447 Chevy Chase Parkway NW., Washington, D.C., with his wife and daughter.

EQUIPMENT UNDER COGNIZANCE OF THE TARGET CONTROL SECTION, INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGET BRANCH, MISSILE WEAPON CONTROL DIVISION OF THE BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS

The section which Mr. McConaghy heads has the following equipments under its technical cognizance:

DESIGNATION AND WORD TITLE

AN/SRW-4 series; target control system.
AN/ARW-55 series; receiver set, radio.
AN/ARW-56 series; receiver set, radio.
AN/ARW-59 series; receiver set, radio.
AN/ARW-66 series; receiver set, radio.
AN/ARW-78 series; receiver set, radio.
AN/ARW-79 series; receiver set, radio.
AN/DSA-2-3 series; formation control equipment.
AN/URS-1 series; tracking station, target aircraft.
AN/MSQ-51 series; mobile out-of-sight target control van.
AN/DRW-29 series; receiving set, radio.
AN/FRW-2 series; transmitter set, radio.
AN/FRW-3 series; transmitter set, radio.
AN/USQ-11 series; miss distance measurements system.
AN/USQ-11A; miss distance measurements system.
AN/ART-5 series; miss distance measurements transponder.

In addition, the section is responsible for technical development in C-band control equipment and target reflectivity augmentation systems.

Mr. Speaker, it is my strong conviction that manufacturers dealing with the Government should get equitable treatment. They are entitled to that and no more, but they are not getting it in the procurement of the AN/ALD-2 and the AN/SRW-4.

As long as the superiors of civil servants at the implementation level stand aside and allow the wheeling and dealing to go on below them, we are going to see tax dollars wasted in wholesale quantities. And, just as certainly, honest manufacturers who can do a job for the Government at less cost are going to be shut out in the cold with the door slammed in their faces time after time.

Someone must speak for them and it is the duty of the Congress to see that their interests are protected. Such protection will flow from enactment of my bill to establish a joint, bipartisan, blue-ribbon watchdog committee to maintain a constant, searching surveillance over defense contract procedures.

Until this bill is enacted, it is up to a Member of Congress to do his duty as he sees fit and to continue to ferret out such specific cases of waste—past, present, and future—and stop as much as he can.

In that regard, I have recently made personal inquiry of Rear Adm. W. T. Hines, USN, Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons, under correspondence dated 17 February and 22 February 1964. These letters deal with the two procurements I have spoken of here today. They are included at this point in my remarks, and his answers will be furnished for the RECORD when they arrive.

FEBRUARY 17, 1964.

Re AN/SRW-4( ) Control.

DEAR ADMIRAL HINES: Your personal attention is invited to the fact that the Navy Purchasing Office in Washington is processing a BuWeps requirement for the AN/SRW-4( ) Target Control Systems under an invitation for bid bearing the number 600-604-64. This equipment has been under previous sole-source contracts with Babcock Radio, the last of which was recorded here under NOw-63-0311. Will you please furnish me a copy of that contract (No. 0311) as soon as possible?

Admiral Hines, will you please make it your personal business to examine the Babcock record of contracts from the Bureau of Naval Weapons prior to and subsequent to the time the current president of this firm

left the employ of the Bureau of Weapons. Would you also examine the number of contracts awarded to Babcock and notice how the huge preponderance of those contracts come under the same engineering cognizance of a single Navy employee.

With all this background information in front of you, Admiral Hines, you will have the same information that has been in front of me for many weeks, and with those facts in your mind, will you please examine Invitation 600-604-64.

Notice that this Invitation contains liquidated damage provisions against the delivery schedule which requires preproduction units of each equipment plus test equipment within 90 days after date of contract.

Admiral Hines, I ask you only one question. Does the Bureau of Naval Weapons really require preproduction units within 90 days after date of the contract, or is this requirement a simple manifestation of "good will" of a single BuWeps employee who earnestly desires to protect Babcock Radio from all competition? Your reply will be of considerable interest.

Very truly yours,

EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 22, 1964.

Re Babcock Electronics Corp.

DEAR ADMIRAL HINES: The long arm of Navy BuWeps influence extends silently and effectively from Washington to the Aviation Supply Depot in Philadelphia, and I am not in the least surprised. It is, however, time that some positive action was taken to correct a situation in your Bureau that is vicious if it is not criminal.

I have written you previously on a similar subject, and today, I invite your attention to ASO Negotiation 383-709016/64 scheduled for closing 17 March 1964 covering components of the AN/ALD-2 Direction Finder (previously sole source to Babcock Electronics Corp., Costa Mesa, California, under the benign auspices of BuWeps). Delivery requirements under this negotiation (demanded by your Bureau) began in June 1964. Even if your people in ASO acted with lightning speed, the "successful" contractor under this procurement will have something less than 60 days to deliver fairly complex electronic equipment. This arbitrary requirement, of course, is another block thrown in by a single BuWeps engineer to discourage competition from "Babcock's equipment."

Will you please do what you can to arrange for a realistic delivery schedule under 64-709016, and in the meantime, I will see what else I can do to get a little more light on this subject.

Very truly yours,

EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Navy will see the error of its ways in these two procurements, even as other branches of the service have likewise made changes I suggested. If the changes are made, we can look forward to two more open and competitive procurements.

The Government should get its equipment at less cost and on time, industry will get a break and the taxpayers will get a bit more relief.

This is the course of action open to the Navy. Of course, it can also adopt a "close ranks against the enemy on Capitol Hill" policy again, but I hardly think this will be in its own best interest.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the other Members of the House await the Navy's decision in this case eagerly, as I will.

Demonstrations Bring More Harm Than Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. (TIC) FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Macon Telegraph, a nationally known daily newspaper published at Macon, Ga., carried a letter to the editor, written by Maj. Hughes A. Robinson, retired, pointing out that racial demonstrations bring more harm than good.

I have had numerous requests to insert that letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of public interest.

I commend it to the public.

The letter reads as follows:

DEMONSTRATIONS BRING MORE HARM THAN GOOD

EDITOR, THE TELEGRAPH:

Four full years of fervid agitation by self-styled leaders of pressure groups among Negroes have added not 1 cent to the economic stability of the Negro race. On the contrary, there are still unresolved problems involving the schools and public accommodations more numerous than previously was the case.

There have been in excess of 1,800 demonstrations during 1963 and thousands of arrests of demonstrators for whom bail had to be provided and legal defense made available. Thus far the results obtained from said demonstrations have done the Negroes 500 percent more harm than good, creating resistance on the part of the white groups, and also intensified racial feelings.

After several years of so-called integration of the schools, the public schools in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and elsewhere appear to be as segregated as ever before if not more so. When Negroes enter in large number, the whites leave in still larger numbers in all sections of the East, the Middle West, and the West.

If the Negroes desire to improve their conditions, they must first start with themselves. Public accommodations written into legislation is not the answer. Prohibition proved that you cannot regulate the private lives of individuals.

Juvenile delinquency; an enormous amount of homosexuality in our schools and colleges among male instructors; exploitation of our teachers by Negro principals who demand, and get, from $25 to $100 from each teacher under them for items not required by the city, county, or State; excessive drinking; excessive sexual relations resulting into 10 times the number of babies that the families can support; and dirty bathrooms and dirty backyards—all these are problems that the professional agitators, self-styled leaders, and demagogues have ignored entirely among the Negro peoples.

It is a responsibility of the individual to seek to improve himself or herself, and avoid boisterous, unrestrained behavior. Excellent conduct, and superior behavior will go much further than legislation on public accommodations.

Professional agitators have discouraged patriotism and the obedience to law and respect for constitutional authorities. This is among the most dangerous elements ever to arise in our American life.

HUGHES ALONZA ROBINSON,
Major, U.S. Army, Retired.

FORT VALLEY.

Let's Take the Confusion From Furniture Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 1963, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Candid Customer," written by Margaret Dana, as it appeared in the Christion Science Monitor on Monday, August 19, 1963. I was particularly interested in the article because on January 17, 1963, I introduced H.R. 1998, the purpose of which is to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated products to which the article alludes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to further call attention to the fact that a recent Federal Trade Commission ruling requires that such labels be applied by manufacturers, but there is still no guarantee that the customer be told precisely what he is buying at the time of purchase in his local store. My bill provides for this guarantee which every consumer is entitled to and to which the Consumer Advisory Council alluded in its first report to the President, dated October 1, 1963, on page 13, wherein it states:

WOOD LABELING

The Consumer Advisory Council believe that the principle that the consumer has the right to be informed—to be provided with accurate information so that he can make an intelligent purchase decision—which has in the past been applied to the identification and labeling of textile fibers, furs, flammable fabrics, and wool, should now be extended to the field of furniture.

Mr. Speaker, the principle that the consumer has the right to be informed was once again dramatically called to our attention by an article entitled "Let's Take Confusion From Furniture Buying," written by Margaret Dana and appearing in the Chicago American for Sunday, January 19, 1964, and which I know will be of interest to all Members who are interested in the welfare of our consumer and in the passage of my bill H.R. 1998:

[From Chicago's American, Jan. 10, 1964]

LET'S TAKE CONFUSION FROM FURNITURE BUYING

(By Margaret Dana)

One of the most persistent requests for information comes in from women everywhere, every year, and all year round. It has to do with knowing exactly what kind of wood is being used in the furniture they buy. To put it simply, apparently most consumers feel they don't know, have no sure way of telling, and consider it important to know before they buy, instead of afterward when it is too late.

It has been an increasingly confused situation for years. We are living in an era of "look alikes," anyway, when even technical experts often can't tell what a thing is made of until they get it into a laboratory and use destructive tests on it. With the increasing skills of the industry, which can finish a surface so that it is impossible to

tell in the furniture shows whether the surface is a solid hardwood, or a veneer, or a stain and grain on plywood or plastic or some other new material, consumers are usually wholly at sea about it.

This is not meant to suggest that there are not appropriate and excellent uses for all manner of finishes and materials. What women are saying is that they feel they have a right to know exactly which is which, and to choose the one they prefer on the basis of that knowledge.

Some industry members have always agreed with this premise. They take great care to label furniture as to what woods or other materials are used. But other manufacturers evidently prefer the confusion; perhaps because it is more profitable for them. So although voluntary regulation is certainly the preferred way to correct such a situation, there comes a time when it takes a law to cut through the puzzle. This happened in the case of wool products, furs, and fibers.

So to all inquiring consumers who ask me impatiently why something isn't being done to get wood labeled correctly, I can only say that something is being done, but the vigorous help of consumers themselves is needed. Just such a law, to require woods and simulated woods to be labeled correctly, is before Congress. If you want it passed you should speak up so your voices can be heard by the committees who handle this bill.

After all, Congressmen are not mind readers, they must depend on what they see and hear. If you want to get your sentiments on record, write me a letter stating how you feel about the wood labeling law, and I'll get your "voice" to the right committees.

Another kind of protection for consumers is reported in a note in a little publication called "Medicine at Work," published by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. In this report is the interesting fact that 16 pharmacies of Baltimore, Md., are offering 25-cent gift certificates for every prescription bottle over 3 months old.

This seems like a sound way to implement the campaign to get consumers to protect themselves by getting rid of old and possibly dangerous prescription bottles. Perhaps pharmacies in your city would like to try this too.

Meat Imports No. 4: Cattle Raisers Say They Are Sold Down River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to the almost tragic situation facing the people engaged in the production of meat and meat products for the American table, I include the following article from the Omaha World-Herald:

CATTLE RAISERS SAY THEY ARE SOLD DOWN RIVER

(By Don Shasteen)

Cattlemen attending a conference on beef cattle supplies and prices Tuesday accused the Federal Government of selling them down the river in its beef import agreements with Australia and New Zealand.

"I don't see how we can get out of the doldrums by giving them the maximum," State Senator Elvin Adamson, of Nenzel, president of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, declared.

"It doesn't appear to me that we did any negotiating. We're just accepting the mandate of the Australians."

He referred to agreements announced Monday by the State and Agricultural Departments in Washington.

"Our imports from Australia last year were ridiculously high and now we're going to freeze them at that level. By 1966, they'll be above the 1963 level," Mr. Adamson observed.

"It's a vicious, dirty thing," declared Rancher Don Hanna, of Brownlee.

He said delegates to the American National Cattlemen Association meeting at Memphis, Tenn., last month unanimously rejected the same proposal. He emphasized voting was on a State-by-State basis.

"It looks like we've had the rug jerked from under us," Mr. Hanna said. "This is pure sabotage."

He said it appears that the administration is "trying to preclude the possibility of Congress doing anything to stop this" high level of beef imports.

"I think it's the damndest thing that ever happened," asserted Thedford Rancher Chester Paxton.

"I think it's a complete sellout for political expediency. The heat was building, and they couldn't take it, so they folded our industry in on us."

Give Us a Jolt To Wake Us Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in the February 20 issue of Hartley Publications of Columbus, Ohio, a very timely and thought-provoking column was submitted by the very able Carleton C. Hartley, entitled "Give Us a Jolt To Wake Us Up."

In order that Members of Congress may have an opportunity to reflect on these matters, I am submitting Mr. Hartley's column in the RECORD:

GIVE US A JOLT TO WAKE US UP

A youngster of 6 or 7 is asked by her mother to pick up her clothes. The reply is, "Oh yea? I don't have to." The mother proceeds to pick up the clothes and the only reprimand is a loudmouth scolding

A high school lad drives the family car to a dance and is told to be home at 12. He arrives at 2. The next morning he is greeted with unpleasant words only. He has no fear of words.

A college student is given a ticket for jaywalking and is picked up by police. A bevy of "I'll show you" attitude fellow students take it unto themselves to handle the situation through a demonstration that unfortunately cost the taxpayers something over $12,000, served no earthly good, execpt to show how fortunate they were that no one was killed or injured.

Down in Florida, East Coast Railroad workers are on strike and someone proceeds to handle the situation in his own way by bombing trains.

To the south of the United States, a bearded beatnik called Castro takes it on himself to show this country that he is as big as the whole of us. We pat his wrist gently by merely saying we will deprive him of some of the things he wants from this country.

He says "To h - - - with you" again and calls on our good allies in France and Britain. They come to his rescue and give him his needs and make him a strong enemy. Again we have turned the other cheek.

Mr. Khrushchev shouts to the world he will bury us. But good Joe's, as we are, we ship him enough wheat so his starving millions can get strong enough to give him the support he needs to do that very thing. * * * bury us.

From the youngster of seven above, to the lengths of the globe, we in the United States are enjoying the easy life. We have everything and we seem to feel we will always have more than enough.

We have adopted the easy, the progressive way, of handling our situations. Yell about everything and do nothing to indicate we mean anything we say.

God give us the intelligence, the strength, the will to see ourselves as we really are—weakened individuals, weakened families, weakened States, a weakened nation.

God give us a jolt and wake us up.

Former Ambassador Farland Sheds Light on Panama Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a broad insight into the problem of U.S. relations with Panama as they relate to the current contorversy over our country's control of the Canal Zone is given by Joseph S. Farland, our former Ambassador to Panama, in an intevriew with John M. Hightower of the Associated Press. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FORMER AMBASSADOR FARLAND SHEDS LIGHT ON PANAMA CRISIS

(By John M. Hightower)

The Panama Canal crisis really began back in 1903, as former Ambassador Joseph S. Farland sees it, and has been 61 years coming to a climax.

Now, Mr. Farland says, the time is long overdue for the United States and Panama to stop playing around with fringe issues and meet the central problem head-on.

The central problem as he presents it—and he was a foremost expert for more than 3 years—is Panama's demand for a canal partnership with the United States. The former envoy stops short of saying this demand should be met. But he insists the United States should face up to it.

The demand is at the heart of the dispute which exploded into violence along the Canal Zone a month ago and could erupt again if diplomacy fails to keep tempers calm. The explosion left no doubt that thousands of Panamanians, stirred up here and there by Castro Communist agitators, are extremely dissatisfied with the treaty arrangements under which the United States has absolute control of the canal, its surrounding zone, and all its operations.

Mr. Farland discussed the prolonged and continuing crisis in an exclusive interview with the Associated Press, giving the first detailed exposition of views he had previously presented to the Government during his service as Ambassador.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Here are the key questions and answers drawn from Mr. Farland's experience and firsthand knowledge on what's wrong between the United States and Panama:

Question. What is behind the crisis between the United States and Panama?

Answer. You have to look back into history. The trouble really started in 1903 when we signed the treaty which gave us rights to build the canal. Panama had been a part of Colombia. We had offered Colombia a treaty but their Assembly adjourned without acting on it. A few months later, Panama declared its independence and we recognized it.

That was on November 6, 1903. On the 18th we had a signed and sealed treaty with Panama. We had helped Panama become independent, and the treaty we made with Panama was very different from the treaty we had offered Colombia.

Question. What were the differences?

Answer. There were four that were important. First, Colombia would have retained sovereignty over the canal. But in the treaty with Panama sovereignty control of the Canal Zone was given to the United States.

Second, the term offered Colombia was, I believe, 99 years plus the right of renewal. The treaty we signed with Panama gave us the canal in perpetuity.

Third, the width of the Canal Zone proposed to Colombia was 6 miles wide. The zone we got from Panama is 10 miles wide.

Fourth, we offered Colombia a judicial arrangement including Colombian courts, United States courts, and mixed courts. Under the Panama treaty we have United States courts in the Canal Zone.

Those are the points which have been in controversy all these years.

OBJECTIONS BY PANAMA

Question. Do you mean that Panamanians have been objecting on these points—the absolute and perpetual U.S. control of the canal—since 1903?

Answer. The objections began practically before the ink was dry on the document. And the Panamanians are still concerned, vitally, nationalistically, by these very points.

Understand, I am not saying they were right or wrong in their opinions. I am saying those opinions going back to 1903 form the basis of their complaints.

Question. What about the U.S. attitude toward the canal?

Answer. The canal quite suddenly changed our whole position in the world. It was a great engineering achievement. We succeeded, you know, where the French had failed. The French were the great builders of that time, and they had dug the Suez Canal. The success in Panama was an important contribution to the development of U.S. prestige as a world power.

Question. May that be one reason why there are such feelings about the canal in this country?

Answer. I think there have to be strong feelings about the canal. Over the years that has come to be true especially for the people who built the canal and who have operated it. I have known individuals who identified themselves with the canal and felt that through their work they were serving not only their country but humanity.

COMPLAINTS BY AMERICANS

Question. Do you think that is typical of those Americans who live and work in the zone?

Answer. One of them told me: "We can't buy our house. We have no real tenure on our job. There is no land in the Canal Zone we can own. Our grass is cut on certain days. We buy our food from the commissary."

But you know there is a human need to have possessions. Therefore, as this man said, "we stand to own the canal."

Question. During the latest flareup of the crisis, the people who live in the zone have been criticized as being too possessive about it. What do you think?

Answer. There has been much written and said against them. But you have to realize that there has never been a time since the canal opened when a failure of the canal resulted from human frailty. The canal has run efficiently because of their excellent workmanship.

Their great concern is over their future. I have recommended and continue to recommend that if we dig a sea level canal we should be prepared to reintroduce these people, who have worked so long and hard and faithfully, to a new life in the United States. There would be less than 4,000 workers; they are skilled and they have a great deal to offer.

THREE GENERATIONS

Question. Are the people there for long periods of time?

Answer. Generally speaking, yes. This is one of the questions that some Members of Congress have raised: whether they are there too long. Many are living in the zone for the third generation. Their grandfathers came to dig the canal and the families stayed.

Question. Are these people antagonistic to the Panamanians?

Answer. A small minority may be. But I think the majority do not have antagonistic feelings. They are very much interested in Panama and want to help its people.

Question. Are the Panamanians antagonistic toward the people in the zone?

Answer. By and large, no. But problems develop not because of majorities but usually because of minorities. The Fourth of July Avenue is one of the dividing lines in Panama City, and there are feelings of ultranationalism on both sides of the avenue.

Question. To what extent do you think personal feelings on either side may be responsible for the tremendous emotional outbursts of the kind that recently disrupted United States-Panamanian relations?

Answer. Again, take a quick look at the past. We practiced segregation in the Canal Zone up to about 1955 (when the 1903 treaty was amended in Panama's favor). We had in the zone two systems of payment. A U.S. citizen was paid in gold; a non-U.S. citizen in silver. Stores, schools, toilets, all sorts of things were segregated. There were gold stores and silver stores. That system was a source of trouble.

Question. What does the canal mean to Panama financially?

Answer. The original annual payment was $250,000. That has been raised twice and is now $1,930,000. But as the informed Panamanian is well aware, that is only a small fraction of what the canal means to the gross national product of Panama. Panama's annual increment as a result of salaries, wages, purchases, and the like is about $85 million.

U.S. AID PROGRAM

Question. How does the U.S. aid program fit in?

Answer. Until a few years ago it was mainly a small technical assistance program. It became large about 1960 when Washington put new emphasis on loans and grants for development under the Agency for International Development and later the Alliance for Progress. (Aid to Panama has been running about $6 million a year recently).

Question. What is your criticism of the aid program in Panama?

Answer. My basic concern is very simple. There has been too much emphasis on so-called social development to the detriment of economic developments.

I certainly favor social developments, but the economy of the country must be strong and healthy to support those developments. Social advancements must be coordinated with the growth of the economy.

Question. Can you be more specific?

Answer. For one thing, we have too many lending agencies in Washington. They compete against each other. We have too many grandiose concepts of what is needed. We are building highways in Latin America when all we need is a trail, an all-weather trail.

In Panama for instance, about 93 percent of the land is owned by the Government. The primary problem is access—for the campesino (peasant) to get to a piece of land and later to get his produce out to market. Thus he can become part of the economic life of the country.

My emphasis was on the farm-to-market roads, actually little all-weather trails. There are few beasts of burden in Panama and much of the country cargo is carried on the back of the campesino. We got a road built into the village of Sona, in a rice-growing area, at a cost of less than $5,000 a mile. This area is now part of the lifestream of Panama and will start producing more rice than it consumes.

So by building that little road we increased the economic well-being of the campesinos, we increased the country's food supply, and we gave the people hope of improving their standard of living.

THE ROAD PROBLEM

Question. You think the aid program has concentrated too much on big roads?

Answer. Yes, it's a basic fact of life. One of the lending agencies built a road from Santiago to Puerto Mutas. The Panamanians are aghast at this road with its modern concrete bridges and its heavy crushed-rock roadbed. I have traveled over it, and the little kids rush out to see the automobile going by, as American kids did in the 1920's when an airplane flew over. An automobile on that road is a rarity.

Question. What about aid in education?

Answer. We are building schools but we fail to put textbooks in those schools. Only within the recent past has a book program been undertaken. I complained about this deficiency to every Congressman I could, to the AID program, and USIA.

What we have needed is something like the old McGuffey reader, something the little kid can have as his own. This may cost only 5 or 10 cents, but we have to have some little maxims in there. We don't have to sell our form of democracy. But we do have to sell the basic principles. This need was recognized by many people here in Washington and they were fighting for it to be met.

Question. Were the Panamanian children getting any books at all?

Answer. The Communists were sending in books. They were used to some degree in the buildings that we were constructing.

CAUSE OF RIOTS

Question. What happened in Panama between your departure in August and the rioting in January? What happened to cause the rioting?

Answer. I don't know all that happened. I had been much concerned about the fact that the progress we had made had merely changed the political climate to make it more favorable to the adjustment of differences. But the basic differences were, and are, still there. They're not all one-sided, either.

When I heard the news about the flag incident in Balboa, I told my wife "the reaction in Panama is only going to take a matter of minutes." The fact the violence occurred is to me a great personal tragedy, because there is a great deal of good feeling on both sides of Fourth of July Avenue for our two countries.

Now the longer we remain apart the more difficult it will be to heal the wounds that have been opened.

Question. Do you think it is still a manageable problem?

Answer. Yes. I believe there is basic goodwill on both sides which can still be utilized. But to open the way, as one Panamanian recently wrote me, the voices of moderation must again be heard.

Question. You enjoyed the national popularity in Panama and the people evidently thought you respected their aspirations. Do you think they feel the United States respects their aspirations?

Answer. I don't agree, and I didn't agree, as the Government of Panama was well aware, with all of their demands or positions. But I felt and feel that basically, in order to work out any understanding, we must meet the basic problems head on. This applies to both the Panamanians and the Americans.

CHANGES IN TREATY

Question. The basic problem is that Panama wants substantial changes in the treaty?

Answer. As I read it, they want a commitment that we will renegotiate the 1903 treaty.

Question. What are your ideas on that?

Answer. I have a number of ideas, but I prefer not to discuss them publicly at this time.

Question. Do you think the problem can be handled at this time when both the United States and Panama are approaching national elections?

Answer. That tends to exacerbate and inflame all emotional issues.

Question. There has been some suggestion that there are too many U.S. authorities in Panama—the Ambassador, the commander of U.S. military forces, the Governor of the Canal Zone. What do you think?

Answer. We have U.S. brass busting out all over. One recommendation that I made years ago was that there should be one U.S. voice in Panama and the zone. When I was Ambassador I was on the best of terms with both the Governor and the military commander. But that kind of relationship has not always been true and would not necessarily be in the future. Anyway, the Canal Zone is the problem between the United States and Panama and in any great activity one voice is essential.

Question. What do you see as the solution to the problem of divided authority?

Answer. In my opinion the Ambassador will eventually have to exercise that voice. I think he will have to have some policy powers in the zone along with his duties as the envoy of the United States to the Government of Panama. The U.S. citizens in the zone, about 16,000 of them, generally feel the Ambassador is Washington's Ambassador to the zone, though of course he is not.

The necessity for changing the Ambassador's role will decrease radically if a second canal is built because then there would be far fewer U.S. citizens. The complement would be maybe 500 people as against 16,000.

Question. How would this come about?

Answer. There would be no need to operate the present canal if a sea level canal were opened. A sea level canal would not have all the locks and equipment that the present canal has. I understand it would be over 1,000 feet wide and ships would sail through without even the assistance of pilots. This, incidentally, is a matter of great concern to Panama. Think of the drop in the number of individuals who would be employed.

A SECOND CANAL?

Question. Do you favor building the second canal?

Answer. Whether it should be built will depend on the result of studies now being made. I know it is technically possible to build it with nuclear explosions today. The economic necessity is another factor.

Question. If the present system is so much more profitable to Panama, the Government there might not really want a second canal. Would it, at least, object to digging it with nuclear power, which would be relatively quick and cheap?

Answer. When I left there was concern about the impact on their economic life, but they were definitely considering the possibility. We had had some talks which indicated a need for exploring the subject. The United States was particularly interested in the Darien route (through jungle country south of the present waterway).

Question. As the situation now stands the Canal Zone runs through the heart of Panama and the country exists on either side of it. Do you see any advantage in working toward a kind of partnership arrangement between the United States and Panama?

Answer. The concept of partnership is what the Panamanians want. They are not interested in having an international body take over the canal. They say, "This is between the United States and Panama. If you give up your rights here, this is ours."

Question. Do you think the partnership idea could be worked out practically?

Answer. I think it could be explored with possibilities of some success.

Question. What would partnership actually mean?

Answer. In a practical sense, it would mean a greater return to Panamanians. These are things they look to—a greater return to their Government, a greater participation in the operation in terms of personnel, and a voice in the management. This is what they have been striving for over the years.

Meat Imports No. 5: Australia Packer Holds Big Edge—Steers Much Cheaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the critical situation having to do with meat imports which are having such an effect on the economy of the United States, I include a further article from the Omaha World-Herald which follows:

AUSTRALIA PACKER HOLDS BIG EDGE; STEERS MUCH CHEAPER

How do foreign and U.S. cattle on the hoof compare in cost?

Readers have been asking that question. Here are some answers:

On the Sydney, Australia, market the last Christmas season meatpackers were paying approximately $106 for a 1,000-pound steer, Australian sources said.

At the same time, a steer of comparable weight was bringing $180 in Omaha and other principal livestock markets, cattle buyers' records show.

Heavy steers were selling in Australia at an average of $121 a head. In the United States they were bringing about $200.

Down Under, the average price paid by packers for a prime yearling was $112 a head. The same animal would have cost about $188 in Omaha.

But the yearling would not normally go to a packer in the United States. It would be placed in a feedlot or on a Corn Belt farm where it would convert grain into meat.

And, based on 1963 and early 1964 experience, the feeder would lose money on the process.

Australian cattle are not marketed by the live hundredweight. Instead, a skilled buyer inspects an animal and pays for it on the basis of prospective dressed weight.

The Sydney prices quoted have been converted to compare with U.S. marketing practices.

Mexican cattle are usually cheaper than U.S. stock, too.

Joe Feffer, Brawley, Calif., who normally buys more than 10,000 head of cattle a year in Mexico, reports that fat-cattle prices in Mexicali have been averaging about 4 cents a pound lower than at major U.S. markets.

"And Mexicali is Mexico's most competitive market, so the difference is greater at other Mexican locations," Mr. Feffer said.

George Docking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas has long had a reputation for producing rugged individualists, particularly in the field of politics. Perhaps this record faded a bit in the early 20th century—if so George Docking did much to brighten it. Sometimes blunt, stubborn, and uncompromising, apparently the antithesis of the popular image of a successful politician, he nonetheless established his own political rules and became the only Democrat in the history of the State elected Governor for two consecutive terms.

The death of George Docking, at the relatively early age of 59, is a great loss to the State of Kansas, and to the Nation which he was serving as a Director of the Export-Import Bank. I submit for your attention a few of the many fine editorials in his memory which have appeared in newspapers of my district:

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News, Jan. 22, 1964]

PLACE IN HISTORY ASSURED

The untimely death of George Docking, taken before the age of 60, removes a unique figure from the Kansas political scene. But it leaves behind a vivid mark, for Docking will occupy a special place in Kansas history.

In 1956 he became the first Democrat to be elected Governor of Kansas in 20 years. In 1958, he became the first Democrat in history to be reelected Governor.

In many ways, he was not a politician at all. He broke most of the rules as easily as he broke the one against Democratic Governors. He unified his own party as it has not been, before or since; but at the same time he won enough Republican votes to be elected twice.

His chief virtues were at the same time his political vices. He was blunt and stubborn and uncompromising. These qualities blew like a fresh breeze into the capital building which reeks of too much double talk, uncertainty and compromise. But they also hurt Docking and his party when they defied political realities.

His supreme act of defiance was to try to win an unprecedented third term rather than using his power and prestige to groom a successor. But this was typical of the man: Having set himself upon a course, he would not be deterred from it.

Another example was his dogged support of John F. Kennedy, from the very beginning of Kennedy's campaign for the presidential nomination, until election day, despite Kennedy's unpopularity in Kansas.

The News supported Docking in one of his races for Governor, opposed him in the other two. We supported many of his programs as Governor; opposed many others.

It is from that vantage point—as both a friend and critic—that we consider his place in Kansas history well earned. May he rest in peace.

[From the Hays (Kans.) Daily News, Jan. 22, 1964]

HE WAS FIRST CLASS FIGHTER

Formal state honors are at this hour being accorded the late Gov. George Docking in the statehouse at Topeka, prior to burial tomorrow in Kansas City, Kans. It is fitting he be so honored.

George Docking, whether one was with or against him during his turbulent days as Governor, was quite a guy. He was the only Democrat in the history of Kansas to occupy the office for two terms, which in this Commonwealth of almost monolithic Republicanism was no mean feat. That he lost on a third-term try is not surprising. Tradition, or maybe the scars engendered during 4 hectic years of almost incessant warfare with a legislature loaded against him, plus his willingness to tangle with members of his own party when he felt so inclined, probably combined to deny him 6 years as Governor.

One thing none can deny: Docking was a first-class fighter. He took on all comers with no holds barred. He likened himself to a tight-fisted liberal, whatever that may be. He most certainly was not a pussyfooter. When he had something to say, he said it in terms most emphatic.

He took on the board of regents, the University of Kansas and chancellor thereof, the Republican leadership of the legislature with relish, the medical profession, and everyone else wishing to enter the arena of political bloodletting.

He was a stanch advocate of conservatism in State government and was of that almost extinct school believing the taxpayers should get a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent.

He was the most roundly cussed occupant of the Governor's chair during his occupancy, of modern times. At times it seemed a political opponent who couldn't start the day with a blast at him or his policies considered it a day lost. He was neverat a loss to shoot back, sometimes devastatingly. The fact he was elected the first time by a plurality of 115,000 votes and the second by 102,000 would indicate, as has been correctly stated, that he was disliked by everyone but the voters.

Interestingly, many of the things he advocated and which were so ferociously opposed at the time by his detractors, have since been accepted or are in the process of being adopted by those who could see little merit in them at the time.

Whether or not Docking was a great Governor is a matter of opinion, but none can deny he was an interesting one. To his credit it must be acknowledged he had no hesitancy in saying "no" when he felt the situation demanded, although it oftentimes wasn't the popular reaction to proposals he negated. In this respect he was considerably different from the run of the mill.

We have often wondered how Docking would have fared had he been a Republican.

[From the Norton Daily Telegram]

NOT SUCH A BAD GUY

George Docking who died Monday night at a Kansas City, Kans., hospital, was the only Democrat ever to serve two terms as Governor of Kansas.

He won election the first time largely because of a bitter split in the Republican Party between supporters and opponents of Fred Hall.

His reelection, by a big majority, however, must be credited in large part to the fact that he made this State a mighty fine Governor during his first term in the opinion of the great majority of Kansans.

Governor Docking won support by his unorthodox attitudes. He sneered at the politicians in his own party, and made the part old guard furious by appointing the men he considered best qualified for State jobs, regardless of their politics. He appointed a number of Republicans (some of whom later turned on him) over the objections of leaders of his own party.

Docking said about politicians in general:

"Politicians annoy the hell out of me—fighting among themselves for personal gain and glory. There are not enough kingdoms for all the kings."

Docking, we always thought, made a great Governor throughout his first term and part of his second, but in the end he became like the politicians he referred to, and finally the Kingdom of Kansas wasn't enough for him; he had succumbed to the same sickness he had fumed against.

For one thing, he fell into the politicians' favorite trap of waging unreasoning war on newspapers in general.

Later, we think, he overcame this, and his service as a member of the Export-Import Bank was distinguished and unselfish.

Overall, Governor Docking's record was one of the best we have seen in the last 20 years.

He was unorthodox in other ways besides his attitude toward politicians. He was one of the first Governors in many years to really practice economy, in addition to preaching same. He attacked many of the sacred cows of Kansas in a genuine effort to hold down spending. Voters showed they liked this by reelecting him.

Governors who practice as well as preach true economy are rare mammals.

Governor Docking made mistakes—one of them being his decision to seek a third term—but then who of us on this terrestrial sphere doesn't make them? On the whole, he was a good Governor and served his State well.

Meat Import No. 6: Australia Proud of Beef Victory—Is It True That the Beef Import Quota Agreement With Australia Is in Exchange for a Deal Under Which Australia Is Buying TFX Fighters From the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the critical situation confronting a large segment of the American economy, having to do with skyrocketing of beef imports into this country, I include a further article from the Omaha World-Herald. Because this article refers to the TFX controversy as having a bearing on the so-called agreement with Australia and New Zealand, I recommend the reading of this article to my colleagues.

AUSTRALIA PROUD OF BEEF VICTORY

A former Omahan who listens to shortwave broadcasts reported Tuesday night Australia "is proud of the beef victory it won over the United States."

Larry Dayton telephoned the World-Herald from Walker, Minn., to say he heard newscasts from Australia in which commentators were "crowing" about their country getting a permanent piece of the American beef market in a voluntary agreement made public Monday.

Mr. Dayton, now in the resort business in Minnesota, suggested that residents of the Midlands can hear the "crowing" themselves by listening to the Australian broadcasts, heard best between 6:30 and 7 a.m., Omaha time, on the 25-meter band.

From outstate Nebraska, came a report obtained through a telephone conversation to Australia that Australian newspapers are saying the beef import quota agreement is in exchange for a deal under which Australia is buying TFX fighters from the United States.

How Baker Turned Access Into an Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week of February 8, 1964:

HOW BAKER TURNED ACCESS INTO AN ASSET

The world of Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, was one with trappings and traditions unfamiliar to most.

Here, a young man with ambition and aggressiveness could come to know a lot of powerful people. This meant importance, and importance meant power and still more importance.

Glimpses into this world are coming from the Senate Rules Committee, which is conducting hearings on Baker's far-ranging outside interests while he held his Senate job. Baker has not yet testified. But a picture of this young man in a hurry and his activities emerges from testimony that provides a fascinating insight into what happens when the orbits of the political and business worlds cross.

How meaningful the inquiry really is remains to be seen. Hearings have been canceled while the Senate debates the tax bill. But after that they will resume, and Rules Committee Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, is under Republican pressure to expand the scope of the inquiry. Next witness scheduled: Fred Black, Washington representative for North American Aviation, a close friend of Baker.

Campaign ammunition: The Baker hearings, in any event, are almost certain to provide campaign material for the Republicans this fall. Baker was a protege of President Johnson when the President was Senate Democratic majority leader. And a close Johnson aid, Walter Jenkins, has been characterized as playing a part in getting an insurance agent, who sold insurance to Johnson, to buy television time he did not want on the Johnson family station in Austin, Tex.

Washington quietly wonders whether more extracurricular links will be established between Johnson and Baker. Johnson aids privately maintain there won't be any more. Republicans are tentatively preparing a "mess in Washington" campaign pitch for use in the election campaign this fall.

I. MAN WITH ENTREE

Baker was successful financially. His net worth is estimated to have increased from $11,095 in 1954 to more than $2 million last year—while his salary was $19,600 a year.

Where this came from is not at all clear from testimony given to the Rules Committee so far. But it is clear that Baker was a willing link between Congress and the men with money to spend who knock on senatorial doors.

"Washington is full of people who want to get to Senators but there are so many walls in between," says one former Senate employee. "Bobby was important because he didn't know just one Senator, he knew a hundred of them."

Says a midwestern Senator: "Look, this is a real world and legislation has enormous importance in dollars and cents. There are influences trying to work on us all the time, and they are ready to spend money." As time passed, Baker became a broker between people who wanted to get things done and people who could do things. His asset was access.

Testimony before the Rules Committee so far has turned up no clear-cut examples of law violations by the former majority secretary. Baker's extensive activities are suspect, both from the standpoint of possible conflict of interest, against which there are laws, and influence peddling, which is not necesarily illegal.

Lyndon's boy: Baker, who turned 35 a month after he resigned his job in October, came to the Senate as a 14-year-old page and never really left it for the next 20 years. By 1952, he was head tedephone boy for the Democrats, and he caught the eye of Lyndon B. Johnson. After the Democrats won control of the Senate in the 1954 election, Johnson named Baker majority secretary.

Baker, under Johnson's tutelage, became adept at his job. He developed a feeling for senatorial politics; he came to know the intricacies of how to wheedle a crucial vote, who to pressure, and when.

Baker ingratiated himself with Senators who were Johnson's supporters. As he became more and more identified as "Lyndon's boy," Baker's own prestige within the Senate climbed. A group of students interviewing him several years ago asked him if he planned to run for the Senate. He replied: "Next to the leader, I've already got more power than anyone here."

Freer agent: But some of Baker's former associates feel that Johnson was a restraining influence on his majority secretary. When Johnson left the majority leader's job, says one of them, Baker remained behind with power but without "Johnson to keep him in check." "After 1960," says this informant, "he was almost a free agent. Then his power meant all the credits he had accrued plus the power he was reputed to have. He got into deals because people thought he was powerful."

Disgruntled Senators: There was not, however, unanimous acclaim by Democratic Senators for Baker. "The majority secretary has great power in telling people when votes are coming and when they are not, and he could penalize people by denying them this information," says one Senator.

Further, Baker was an important figure on the Democratic policy committee, which makes committee assignments, and some northern liberals claim he discriminated against them. More importantly, he was, in the words of another Senator, "the unofficial factotum on the Senate campaign committee." Campaign funds move in and out of this group with a minimum of public disclosure. Funds would funnel through Baker.

This Senator continues: "In 1960, I got $5,000 from the committee, $3,500 of which I had raised myself. Another Senator, in a much smaller State, got $22,000," he says.

II. HOW HE PROFITED

"As he had access to the Senators," says a former associate, "so did people have access to him."

Don B. Reynolds, a Washington insurance agent who was associated with Baker, made a succinct explanation of this factor. At one point, while testifying before the Rules Committee, Reynolds said: "Well, he knew a lot more people than anyone else I knew, sir."

Insurance deals: Baker was an officer of Reynolds' firm, but he never put any money into the operation. The relationship, as Reynolds explains it, was for Baker to attract potential insurance customers because "there is a certain amount of prestige in having prestige clients." In return, Reynolds returned to Baker the commissions he had received on policies sold to Baker and his family. This, plus other money given by Reynolds to Baker, between October 1960, and October 1963, amounted to roughly $15,000.

Reynolds sold two policies, totaling $200,000, on Johnson's life. Reynolds claims that Baker introduced him to Jenkins, Johnson's closest personal aid, and in negotiating sale of the first policy he says he was led to believe he would have to buy some time on the Johnson TV station in Austin. He did, and resold it to Albert G. Young, president of Mid-Atlantic Stainless Steel Co., Inc., a maker of cookware. Jenkins denies he had "knowledge of any arrangements by which Reynolds purchased advertising time on the TV station." But Young testified he discussed the arrangement on the telephone with a man he took to be Jenkins.

Prominent partners: This is the sole tie with Johnson that has been uncovered so far. Baker's other deals, though, included some important partners, especially businessmen associated with the Murchison brothers of Dallas.

His friendship with several Murchison executives has been a fruitful one for Baker. For example, he received more than $7,000 in 1962 and 1963 as a "finder's fee" for helping the Murchisons find a domestic outlet for their Haitian American Meat & Provision Corp., S.A., a packing plant in Port au Prince.

Joint stock purchases: He also was a partner with Robert F. Thompson, executive vice-president of Tecon Corp., a Murchison-owned construction company, in buying two big blocks of shares in Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co., of Milwaukee. Thompson arranged, by telephone, to borrow $64,000 from the First National Bank in Dallas to buy the first block of 2,990 shares (at $21.50) in December 1960. He got another loan of $250,000 from the same bank to buy the second block of 9,000 shares in October 1961, when the price had gone up to $27.50. Baker did not supply any cash himself, though Thompson said he paid half of the interest on the outstanding loans. They still hold 8,565 shares.

With Thomas D. Webb, Jr., the Murchisons' Washington lawyer, Baker joined a group that floated a $105,000 loan from the Teamsters' pension fund to build a motel in Jacksonville, Fla., but he pulled out. Baker and Scott I. Peek, former aid to Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, refused to sign the mortgage as guarantors and sold their shares in the venture, according to Webb.

The Murchison interests got nothing in return from Baker, according to testimony. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, asked Webb if he ever had gone to Baker for help in any legislative problems. "No," he replied. "I don't know of any bill that has been up in particular that the Murchisons have ever been interested in."

Initial transaction: Baker's joint venture with Webb in Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co., stock followed purchases he made on his own, after discussing the company's prospects with Max H. Karl, its president. Baker bought his initial stock in August 1959, before the company had registered its stock with the Securities and Exchange Commission. He paid $28,750 for 50 units of the stock, including 200 shares of Mortgage Guaranty and 50 shares of a subsidiary that since has been merged with the parent.

Following two splits and a stock dividend, Karl figures that a purchaser at this time paid about $1.49 a share and he estimated that a purchase of $28,750 in 1959 currently is worth about $400,000. Baker, however, has sold some of this stock and transferred some, and Karl said he now is record holder of 9,274 shares.

In February 1963 Karl wrote a long letter to Baker outlining prospects for his company, as well as legislative changes that would benefit it. But when he was asked if the purpose of the letter was to influence legislation, Karl replied, "No, that is not the fact." His aim, Karl said, was to keep Baker "informed on something that I could not talk to him about, because we never seemed to have any time."

Vending ventures: One of Baker's most ambitious ventures was the founding of a vending machine company, Serv-U Corp., in which he and Fred Black, the Washington representative for North American Aviation, each held a 28½-percent interest. It was this portion of Baker's enterprises that initiated the inquiry into his activities. Ralph Hill, an old friend of Baker, had won a contract from Melpar, Inc., a Westinghouse Air Brake Co. subsidiary, which entitled him to install and operate vending machines in Melpar's plant in suburban Washington. Webb and his associate, Francis E. Law, a public relations consultant, also represented Melpar, and at Baker's request had introduced Hill to Melpar officials.

Hill, however, later filed a civil suit, naming Baker among the defendants. He charged that Baker later tried to take the Melpar franchise away from him and swing it to another vending company associated with Serv-U.

Still another Baker venture was a posh motel in Ocean City, Md., in which he was a partner. In a pitch to his Senate friends, Baker advertised the Carousel Motel as a haven for the "advise and consent" set. The motel, after financial difficulties, was sold to Baker's Serv-U for a little more than $1 million, despite an earlier offer by Thompson, the Tecon executive, for $1.5 million. Senate investigators asked Thompson if his offer was made at Baker's request to bolster the motel's value, but Thompson declared he thought the seashore property was worth that much.

Quid pro quo: Matthew McCloskey, former treasurer of the Democratic National Committee and Ambassador to Ireland, was another Baker friend. McCloskey won the competitive contract to build the District of Columbia Stadium and, at Baker's request, hired insurance man Reynolds to act as broker on a performance bond on the stadium's construction. For this, Reynolds received $10,031, and he soon paid Baker $4,000. This payment, part of roughly $15,000 given to Baker over the years, was in return for "efforts that he had been making in my behalf," Reynolds explained.

The Sabine River, Texas Biggest River, and Its Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD an article that pertains to the development of the Sabine River. The article was sent to me by the Honorable Verne Clements, president of the Longview National Bank who, along with Mr. Monk Willis and others, has taken a great deal of interest in the development of the Sabine River. Mr. Clements and Mr. Willis have appeared before congressional committees with me in behalf of money for surveys of the Sabine River and its tributaries.

FROM ORANGE TO LONGVIEW—TOLEDO BEND DAM PROJECT BUOYS HOPES ON TEXAS BIGGEST RIVER

(By Bob Bowman)

CENTER.—For longer than most care to remember, Sabine River leaders have been hearing towboat whistles in their dreams.

They have envisioned long strings of barges plying the river between Longview and Orange, bringing new prosperity to east Texas.

DREAM COMING TRUE

Today, instead of a bewhiskered vision, navigation on the Sabine—most prolific of Texas rivers—looms as an early probability. Construction could begin in 1967 or 1968.

The river's canalization timetable is geared to a 4-year study of the stream by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, but Sabine leaders feel the study, when completed in mid-1966, will show that the project is economically feasible.

LAKE BUOYS HOPES

Biggest reason for their optimism is the $60 million Toledo Bend Dam project, which will create a 70-mile-long lake spanning more than a third of the distance from Longview to Orange.

"The Toledo Reservoir should enhance greatly the feasibility of navigation on the Sabine," D. N. Beasley of San Augustine, president of the Sabine River Authority of Texas, said.

"Not only will it create 70 miles of uninterrupted waterway for barge traffic, but its releases will greatly improve the stabilized flow of the river below the dam."

REPORT FAVORABLE

When the twin Sabine River authorities of Texas and Louisiana award a dam contract in mid-March, it will include provisions for future navigation accepted by the Corps of Engineers.

Encouragement for early canalization of the Sabine has also come from a voluminous river study by Forrest & Cotton of Dallas, SRA engineers.

The report shows that navigation is "an engineering possibility" and pinpoints probable locations of three additional dams that would be needed to stabilize the river's flow and depth.

CALLS FOR "SMALL DAMS"

These include a 45-foot dam at Bon Wier, in Newton County; a 40-foot dam at Stateline, near Logansport, La., and a 50-foot dam near Carthage, in Panola County. Beasley calls these "small dams" in comparison with Toledo Bend's 110-foot height.

The Bon Wier Dam, about 100 miles from the Sabine's mouth, would primarily create a regulatory reservoir to catch releases from Toledo Bend and stabilize their flow.

CALLED SIMPLE THING

Conversion of the Sabine to canalization will be a "simple thing" compared with the enormity of the Trinity River project, Beasley said.

Still another factor in the navigation proposal is the Sabine's discharge, 6.8 million acre-feet.

SRA members will start pushing for early canalization after their Toledo Bend project is past the point of no return.

"The authority is completely in accord with navigation," says Beasley, "but we've got to put Toledo Bend first."

State Senator Martin Dies Jr., of Lufkin believes navigation on the Sabine will be the turning point of east Texas economy.

TWO OFFICES AT WORK

The Corps of Engineers study is underway by corps district offices in Fort Worth and Galveston. It began in 1962. The current appropriation by Congress for the study totals $115,000.

The study also embraces water supply, drainage, flood protection and pollution.

Improvements to a minor segment of the Sabine canal, from Orange to Echo, already have been approved by Congress. Planning for this is underway by the Galveston district office with a $300,000 appropriation.

There also has been discussion, but no study authorized, of a canal linking Toledo Bend Reservoir and Sam Rayburn Lake on the Angelina River. Proponents say a 10-mile canal would provide the Lufkin-Nacogdoches area with a vital outlet to the Gulf coast by way of the middle Angelina and lower Sabine Rivers.

Wayne Johnston Begins 20th Year as President of the Illinois Central

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, President Wayne A. Johnston of the Illinois Central Railroad enters upon his 20th year in that office. Although he has in his career earned many laurels and citations for his efforts in advancing community, city, county, State and National programs both at civic and educational levels of public service, yet his true love is as the chief keeper of the fortunes of the Illinois Central Railroad system in its business and personnel problems.

His many friends congratulate him upon his successful accomplishments in placing the Illinois Central Railroad among the leaders of the railroad systems of the Nation. He deserves the commendation of all of his fellow Illinoisans together with the employees and officials of the Illinois Central for his progressive and executive leadership in his field. May God protect and guide him in his dedication to a public service so important to the economy of his city, State and Nation.

The following article appearing in the Chicago Tribune reflects the public acceptance that he enjoys in Illinois:

WAYNE JOHNSTON BEGINS 20TH YEAR AS IC'S CHIEF

(By Louis Dombrowski)

The voice at the other end of the telephone growled, "Johnston."

Most first-time callers to the office of Wayne A. Johnston, president of the Illinois Central Railroad, generally are taken aback by the gruff voice. He answers his own telephone.

Johnston begins his 20th year in the IC presidency today. Come July, he will surpass the IC presidential tenure record of 19½ years set by Stuyvesant Fish, the 10th IC chief.

Few men have headed a major railroad as long as Johnston. It was on February 23, 1945, that Johnston, then general manager of the railroad, was notified that the board had named him president. He was 47, one of the youngest chief executives of all time.

EATS, SLEEPS, BREATHES IC

Knowledgable, articulate, and often outspoken, Johnston's colleagues and family insist "he eats, sleeps, and breathes Illinois Central and railroading" in that order.

The 16th president of the Illinois Central since its founding in 1851 has been with the railroad for nearly 46 years starting as an accountant.

In his 19 years as president, Johnston transformed the railroad from steampower to diesel. The IC debt structure was reduced from more than $286 million to less than $179 million despite heavy post-war inflation. The Illinois Central has consistently shown a profit in the last 19 years, averaging more than $19½ million annually.

Johnston's efforts in the IC have been hailed in railroad circles, in financial centers, and by the American Institute of Management, which described the management team built by the somewhat portly president as "professional management in the best sense of the word."

He is an ardent champion of railroads, consistently optimistic about the industry's future and the future of the IC. Besides his tenure at the "Mainline of Mid-America," Johnston is the senior board member of the Association of American Railroads.

EXPRESSES THANKS TO GOD

"As I start my 20th year as president of the IC, I thank God that He has given me the good health and energy to do this job," he said recently.

"I would not trade places with any man in the world, for I love what I do.

"To the end of my days, I will be glad that I walked into the division office at Champaign, Ill., that morning back in 1918 and asked if the railroad could use an accountant."

Meat Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article that appeared in the February 19 edition of the Stockman's Journal, published in Omaha, Nebr. Cattlemen from the meat-producing States are extremely concerned about the influx of foreign meats flooding our markets, and they are thoroughly disappointed with the recent beef import reduction.

AGREED BEEF IMPORT REDUCTION DISAPPOINTS U.S. CATTLE INDUSTRY—CALL GOES OUT FOR TOUGH LEGISLATIVE RESTRICTIONS

Cattlemen, feeders, legislators, and bankers—representing practically every phase of the producing side of the cattle industry—reacted strongly Tuesday to an announcement that Australia and New Zealand have agreed to curb by 6 percent their shipments of beef to the United States.

While all of these interests favor reduction of foreign imports of meat, they were generally disappointed by the amount of reduction that would result from the agreement announced late Monday by the Federal Government.

As a result, many have called for strict legislation to control the growing volume of meat imports, believed a depressing influence on currently sagging domestic beef cattle prices.

The need for postive legislation to provide reasonable protection against heavy imports of foreign beef was emphasized by the American National Cattlemen's Association upon learning that the two largest shippers, Australia and New Zealand, had agreed on a high quota for future beef shipments to the United States.

Brooks J. Keogh, assocation president, said in Denver the agreement was not unexpected but that the organization and its 38 affiliated State groups and many Governors and Congressmen are "extremely disappointed because we had asked for a lower base than that agreed to."

The agreement provides Australia and New Zealand with quotas equal to the average shipped here during 1962 and 1963, with a "growth factor" allowing for an annual increase in tonnage of 3.7 percent.

Cattlemen, recognizing that reasonable competition is healthy, had asked for substantially lower quotas because the levels of imports during 1962 and 1963 were exceptionally high and were causing considerable disruption and financial loss in the domestic cattle and beef industry.

"It is only natural that Australia and New Zealand would accept such high quotas because they have everything to gain," Keogh said.

"Our Nation, until now, has had virtually no protection against foreign meat, and it appears that these high quotas still will leave the domestic beef industry in trouble," he said.

"Our only hope is for legislation to establish more reasonable quotas on indiscriminate and ruinous imports," Keogh added.

NLFA OFFICIALS DISTURBED, DISGUSTED WITH AGREEMENT

Officials of the National Livestock Feeders Association in Omaha were disturbed and disgusted with the details of the agreement made Monday with Australia and New Zealand on the limitations of imports of beef, veal, and mutton.

"I'm dumbfounded and can't understand why our Government would consent to such an unrealistic agreement," said Erwin E. Dubbert of Laurens, Iowa, president of the NLFA.

"Under the circumstances," Dubbert continued, "we have no alternative but to ask legislation that will reduce imports of beef and veal to the 1960 level which approximated 5 percent of the U.S. production, and we intend to pursue legislation with all the strength we have."

Under the agreement, Australia and New Zealand, said they would hold exports of beef, veal, and mutton to the United States to the average volume sent here in the years, 1962–63. However, since the agreement does not include cooked, cured, and canned products total imports in 1964 could equal or exceed the 1963 volume. The agreement also permits annual increases beginning in 1965 at the rate of 3.7 percent which is higher than our domestic population increase.

"The arrangement would permit imports of beef and veal in 1964 at the approximate level 1.6 billion pounds, carcass weight basis," said B. H. (Bill) Jones, associate secretary-treasurer of the NLFA, "and this means adding the equivalent of 2,667,000 head of 1,000-pound fed cattle to our annual domestic slaughter, or 50,000 to 51,000 head of extra cattle every week." Jones said the domestic livestock economy simply cannot stand this unreasonable addition to our plentiful domestic supply.

"The announced arrangement with the Australian and New Zealand Governments is more in the nature of a surrender by the United States instead of a realistic agreement," said Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary of the NLFA.

"At the annual convention of the feeders association held just last week in St. Louis, Mo., the membership demanded a reduction in imports to approximately 775 million pounds annually and, despite the agreement, the wheels are already in motion to carry out these instructions," Magdanz added.

Exiles Losing Hope for Free Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as a portion of my remarks, I would like to insert an editorial from the San Diego Union of February 19, 1964, written by Charles Keely entitled "Exiles Losing Hope for Free Cuba."

Mr. Keely is a veteran Latin American affairs reported for the Copely News Service and has traveled widely in Latin America. For more than 3 years he has concentrated on trends in Latin America from his vantage point here in Washington and in 1963 was the runner-up for the Raymond Clapper Award for his early reporting on the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba.

His article follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 19, 1964]

EXILES LOSING HOPE FOR FREE CUBA

(By Charles Keely)

The Cuban exiles' hopes for a free Cuba are fading under the Johnson administration.

There had been cautious optimism in exile circles that Mr. Johnson would untie some of the restrictive quarantines imposed on militant exile groups by President Kennedy.

These included the banning of all pirate raids and arms running to guerrillas inside Cuba.

But President Johnson appears equally firm in his policy to limit all but U.S.-sanctioned operations against Fidel Castro.

At least one militant refugee group is reliably reported to be carrying out infrequent—about one a month—attacks on their homeland. The organization, known as "Mambises," is said to operate out of Central America.

But other exile action groups are still being handcuffed. Federal agents apprehended a 50-foot boat with 16 refugees aboard on January 12 off Key West, Fla. The armed boat, manned by anti-Castro rebels, was boarded by a U.S. Coast Guard cutter and returned to port.

Exile sources say the 16, members of a group called "Commandos Autenticos," were all trained by the U.S. Army at Fort Jackson, S.C. The rebels were carrying food, shoes, boots, and other equipment to guerrillas in Cuba's Escambray Mountains.

Exiles point with bitter irony to the fact that while a search is still being made for their agents off the Florida coast, a California fisherman, Denys Lee Kirby, 22, recently sailed a stolen shrimp boat to Cuba unmolested and defected.

In addition, there are growing reports of economic advances being made in Cuba which have all but obliterated the Kennedy-Johnson policy of driving Castro to his knees with a trade embargo.

Increased Western trade with Cuba and high world-market prices for Castro's sugar have apparently coupled to ease many of Cuba's critical shortages.

Indeed, exiles report Cuba's restaurants are again filling up and offer good selections of food. Other items, virtually unavailable 6 months ago, are back on store shelves or obtainable through the black market, exiles say.

Anti-Castro rebel activity has been nearly exhausted, exile intelligence sources report. Communist bloc technical services are beginning to pay off in sugar refining and other agricultural areas. What the Russians cannot provide for Castro, he is now obtaining from U.S. allies.

Exiles claim under-the-table payments to refugee organizations are still heavy, but most are limited to propaganda programs.

In short, Cuban exiles believe the 90 miles to their homeland is getting longer every day.

Faulty Approach to Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of President Johnson's proposals which has received considerable attention is the recommendation that we change the overtime provisions of our present wage-hour law.

If the mail being received in my office is typical of that being received by other Members, there is considerable doubt of the wisdom, as well as the timing of the suggestion.

One of the first editorial comments of the year from a publication in my district appeared in the Sunday, February 23 edition of the Chicago Heights Star, which I place into the RECORD at this point, believing it to be a calm, constructive analysis of many aspects of the overtime payment debate.

The editorial follows:

AS WE SEE IT: FAULTY APPROACH TO PROBLEM

Attempts to cut deeply into the problem of unemployment deserve the most sympathetic attention of all who might be able to contribute toward its solution. It is distressing to reflect that even in times of high prosperity many good people have difficulty finding a job.

Nevertheless, those who believe that we can legislate our way out of the predicament through such devices as double time for overtime work would be well advised to consider all aspects of the proposed panacea.

The expectation of the plan's proponents, apparently, is that overtime work would be greatly diminished by this regulation, giving way to new jobs. But would it? Surely, if it were practical to convert the extra work into new jobs, that would be done now to avoid paying time and one-half for extra hours.

It is more likely that some employers would be forced to pay the extra overtime wage, resulting in higher prices for their products or services, provided it did not render them noncompetitive.

In many instances, it can be anticipated, overtime workers would be replaced by "moonlighters" working at straight time, or greater efforts would be made to eliminate after-hours operations. The results of these developments might be more serious than all of the others combined.

Human nature being what it is, we can assume that many workers are committed to time payments and even mortgages geared to overtime pay. The effect of repossessions and foreclosures on the economy, not to mention the individuals involved, should be taken into account while studying the pros and cons of the Federal proposal on overtime.

We don't think there is a simple answer to the unemployment question.

We do believe, however, that sensible first steps can be taken without fear that the cure will be worse than the disease. A tremendously important first step is one such as that undertaken by welfare officials—the training of unskilled workers for jobs that are or might be available. There just isn't any way to open up employment opportunities for persons who can't qualify in the first place.

Second, every effort should be made to expand and solidify the economy with a view to making more jobs available for those who do qualify. It is not a simple method, but it is more durable than the dubious shortcut now under consideration.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, much comment has been made recently about weaknesses in our presidential succession laws. As an obvious example, we now have no Vice President. It has been pointed out, legitimately, I think, that we are taking a risk in leaving that office vacant, particularly in this era where disaster and tragedy in many forms could upset our top leadership structure.

Mademoiselle magazine has made a very intelligent and lively discussion of this and other problems concerning the Vice Presidency in an editorial in its March issue. I am inserting this in the RECORD, with hopes that my colleagues will find its ideas interesting and useful:

THE '64 QUESTION

In this year of 1964, as in every election year, we may be electing two Presidents. We know now, in the spring that it can happen here, that our heritage of violence persists; and that 20th century pressures on the President are such that his physical survival, in good health, is chancy. Will we remember it this summer and have the wisdom to nominate men for the Vice Presidency whom we would be proud to have as President should the unhappy need arise?

"The Vice Presidency," writes historian Clinton Rossiter, "is one of our oldest problems." (And certainly from John Adams to Lyndon Johnson the men who have held that office have shared but one common emotion: frustration.) "The reality of vice presidential importance," adds Rossiter, "has generally loomed far more prominently in the Nation's political consciousness than the possibility of a succession to the Presidency," consequently, "the real danger of the powerless Vice Presidency is * * * that it is rarely occupied by a man for whom a majority of the people would have voted as a candidate for the Presidency."

This is our dilemma: given our current place in the world, an inferior candidate is no longer a thinkable solution. It might endanger our safety and would surely fill our allies with dismay. Yet under our system, the official importance of the Vice President is inevitable because—to restate the truism—only one man can be President at a time.

The office has, thanks to the wisdom of recent Presidents (beginning with President Truman), gained stature in recent years. Vice Presidents Nixon and Johnson both undertook important good will tours abroad and special assignments at home. But essentially, the man who accepts a Vice Presidential candidacy must resign himself, willingly, to the role of perpetual understudy. On Broadway, the understudy is not another star; he is an extra who must patiently go through his small, daily routines, ready for the breaks but not expecting them. Today, at least, the Vice President is kept informed of-important matters in progress—and keeping abreast is a task in itself. (Never again must a Vice President succeed to office, as President Truman did, unaware of anything as portentous as the atom bomb.) Nonetheless, for a first-rate man who has exercised actual power or control—a Senator or Governor—sitting on the sidelines and wondering whether he could do it better must be galling. Yet the Vice Presidency requires precisely this quality of gallant restraint. When President Johnson accepted the Vice Presidency in 1960, some of his supporters expressed surprise and wonder that a man of his influence should allow himself to be benched for the duration. Today the Nation can only be grateful.

This brings us to the theory and practice of ticket balancing. Under our system, the Vice President's chief value, in the eyes of the politicians, is a votegetter. The Vice President has habitually been expected to compensate for any political deficiencies of the Presidential candidate and/or to bring any dissidents into the party fold. Although the notion sounds sensible, the TV show "That Was the Week That Was" recently reduced it to the ultimate absurdity. Discussing a running mate for President Johnson, one character said that we needed a northerner from the industrial East; a liberal (Johnson is reputed to be more conservative than Kennedy—as yet unproved); an isolationist (the President is an internationalist); a bachelor (the President is married and has two daughters), and an alcoholic (the President is not a heavy drinker).

We hope the point is taken to heart. For as former Vice President Nixon recently told Mile, "The time has passed in the United States when we can afford the luxury of so-called ticket balancing in selecting our candidates for Vice President." But when the time comes this summer, will the top brass in both parties think responsibly about a Vice Presidential nominee?

The compensatory theory is valid as a short-range campaign strategy, perhaps. But the fact that it has been nothing but a campaign strategy all these years speaks volumes about the low estate of the Vice Presidency. When one thinks of it, why should the Vice President be the exact opposite of the President? What good is it going to do? If the President is a liberal and the Vice President a conservative, if the President is an intellectual and the Vice President a pragmatist, if the Vice President's whole view of international affairs, domestic policies, personal inclinations are directly opposed to those of the President, how are they going to communicate? All too often they haven't. The Vice President, by courtesty, now sits in Cabinet meetings and on the National Security Council, but only to keep himself informed, not to contribute except deferentially, on occasion. He may be helpful with Congress, although he has no real power, no patronage, no capacity to logroll. Yet, if he were more carefully attuned to the President, the Vice President might well contribute heavily in the way, say, that Robert Kennedy contributed so conspicuously to his brother's administration.

The campaign lasts about 4 months. The Presidential term lasts, hopefully, 4 years. Surely the longer interval is the one that should be filled to best advantage. This is not to suggest that the Vice President should not be a good campaigner. Of course, he should. We merely wish to note here that ticket balancing has every disadvantage. In fact, it is one of the world's greatest confidence games. Comforting sentiments uttered from a campaign train by a Vice Presidential candidate are but soughings of the wind if they happen to diverge from the fundamental philosophies of the Presidential candidate (though the divergences will be carefully coated over during the campaign). However, when you stop and reflect that the Vice President, if elected, will not be in there pitching for his own particular philosophy but will be bound to support the President, then ticket balancing becomes meaningless.

If a President dies in office, surely a majority of the electorate, which presumably chose him for his policies and attitudes, would prefer to see those policies maintained, at least until the next election. Clearly, a Vice President who is in harmony with the President is far better able to carry forward than one who is at total variance with him. Thus, the Vice President should first and foremost be a man who could step into the Presidency with a minimum of frictional transition. Everyone both here and abroad would know approximately where they stood; namely, in the same place as before. (On the other hand, if the Vice President happened to come from a different part of the country, have a different religion, all well and good.)

Considering that death and disability are increasingly a fact of current political life, we concur with Mr. Rossiter: "It would be reassuring to know that from this time forward neither party would nominate a man to the second office who had not been considered seriously for the first." Furthermore, as both the two-term amendment and the growth of the office itself have helped to place an incumbent Vice President in the logical line of succession to an outgoing President, each party must recognize that it is potentially choosing two Presidents in any case.

Above all, we urge that ticket balancing be expunged from the national consciousness (or at least relegated to the subconscious). Now is the time to rethink the Vice Presidency. We must stop applauding the diversity between presidential and vice-presidential candidates and rejoice, instead, in their sameness. A Vice President can only raise the stature of the office, and his own prestige, at the will and pleasure of the President. If there is no rapport, the Vice President will have little chance to distinguish himself in the councils of the administration, and the country may well be the poorer.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting another Mademoiselle editorial which discussed the results of a "midget poll" by the magazine. Mademoiselle asked its staffers, a group including many bright young ladies, what they would like to see Congress enact in 1964. This fine magazine said it respectfully submitted the results of this informal poll for Congress to consider:

MADEMOISELLE'S PLATFORM: AN APPEAL TO THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mademoiselle's staff is made up of individuals from all parts of the country and of various political faiths, ages, races, religions. With this election year very much on our mind, we asked only the younger staffers (thinking their views would come closest to our readership) for a list of bills

they would most like to see Congress enact in 1964. Admittedly, the very nature and speed of this midget poll did not permit much weighing of pro and con. Admittedly, a young staff on a publication dedicated to young women might be expected to strike an idealistic note. (Ah, youth, it's wonderful.) Still, and for the record, other than a few, small, dissenting voices, here are the top five bills this well-educated bright, in-their-early-twenties segment would put before Congress:

1. Passage of the civil rights bill (97 percent in favor).
2. Reduction of income taxes for everyone.
3. Federal aid to education (and/or tax deduction of college tuitions).
4. Continuance of foreign aid.
5. Amendment of the 1947 Presidential Succession Act.

A sprinkling of votes came in strongly for Federal aid to the arts; for a cut in defense spending; for greater cooperation with the Soviet Union (this was not spelled out); for the enactment of the Dodd proposal to limit the sale of firearms; a law making the assassination of the President and Vice President a Federal rather than State offense. A proposal was made that the labor unions come under the antitrust laws. And there were at least a dozen other matters our young women wanted brought before Congress (including the establishment of a domestic Peace Corps, repeal of the ban on prayers in public schools, the outlawing of professional boxing, the enactment of medicare, and the dissemination of birth control information). Nor did they forget "Mile's Open Letter to Congress" (March 1962) asking for the repeal of the excise tax on cosmetics, pocketbooks, and other such essentials. While we love to live in a man's world, this last, they feel, is a little too discriminatory. [N.B.: We should point out that our informal poll was taken before the Government report on cigarettes.]

Gentlemen of the 89th Congress, we respectfully submit the thoughts of this minute group of young women (who are, however, all of voting age). Their ideas—and ideals—may be reflected by several million other young women voters. While Congress doesn't have a moment to lose, our young readers have till November to cast the die.

A final thought, on our editorial part, follows.

Cold War Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in our quest for lasting world peace, the battle for men's minds will no doubt prove in the long run to be as important as the maintenance or development of arms.

The United States is rightfully increasing its program of education among foreign students, for the bringing of students to our country for study is a prime weapon in this battle.

I am submitting for the consideration of the House two editorials from the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of February 16, 1964, entitled "Cold War Students" and "More From Far East."

The second of these editorial points out that within the last 10 years the proportion of foreign students in the United States from the Far East has risen from 23 percent to 37 percent.

Hawaii is making a significant contribution to the Asian foreign student program through the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii's new academic development plan, which stresses an orientation toward the Pacific and Asia. Hawaii, I am proud to note, is playing an important role in the cold war.

The editorials follow:

COLD WAR STUDENTS

A sharp increase in the number of foreign students from underdeveloped countries at United States and Communist bloc colleges and universities points up a dramatic area of cold war rivalry.

So far, all Communist countries combined trail the United States in the number of visiting students.

Altogether, the Communist countries have 15,000 to 20,000 students and technicians in training from underdeveloped countries.

By comparison, the United States had more than 64,000 foreign students in the last academic year—although many of these are from other Western countries.

Even so, students in the United States from underdeveloped countries total well over 20,000.

There is, of course, much more than mere numbers to the foreign student race between the Western and Communist worlds.

The underdeveloped countries remain the key to much of the cold war, and both the East and West are competing to influence the leaders-to-be of those areas through scholarships and education.

A Los Angeles Times Service report says that since 1960 the number of students going from Africa, Asia, and Latin America to study in Communist countries has more than tripled.

The Russians are emphasizing Africa. They want to get and train the leaders—both academic and labor. And they want to train the technicians.

In 1959, for example, only 265 African students went to Communist countries. By the end of last year, some 5,000 were attending Red schools. Ghana, Guinea, Algeria, Nigeria, Somali Republic, and Kenya are the best recruiting areas for the Reds.

Asian students number 2,000 a year to Communist countries, and Latin America sends about 5,000 (2,000 from Cuba).

The Communists, however, have run into trouble with some of the African students over racial discrimination.

The U.S. program, as seen on the accompanying chart, includes a great number of students from the Far East. Other areas that send us large numbers of foreign students include Latin America—more than 11,000—the Near and Middle East, Europe, and Canada. Africa, while starting low, is showing rapid increases.

The U.S. program is extensive and diffuse. Where the Russians can, if they wish, divert government funds to provide full scholarships and transportation to foreign students in countries they deem politically important, the United States has a myriad of programs—some Government, some private.

Whether the United States likes it or not, the foreign student has become involved in the cold war politics. tI is assumed, and generally is true, that a foreign student in the United States will return to his country with a better understanding of us, and some goodwill.

The Russians are not always so subtle, and push hard to convert the students into active Communists—or at least into sympathizers. The push can even extend to training in subversive and guerrilla activity.

Education and politics make a potent cold war mix.

MORE FROM FAR EAST

The tremendous increase in foreign students in the United States from the Far East over the past 10 years could have an important meaning to Hawaii.

The State's vital and intimate interest in Asia—economically and culturally—is reflected not only in our population but in our institutions as well.

While the overall foreign student population of the United States has almost doubled over the past 10 years, a startling shift has been in the composition of the foreign student group.

In 1952–53, for example, Europe, Latin America, and the Far East each were represented by 23 percent of the foreign students in the United States.

Last year, however, the Far East's proportion of the foreign students leaped to 37 percent, while Europe's declined to 12 percent, and Latin America's to 17 percent.

Only Africa, increasing from 3 to 11 percent, showed a larger proportionate gain.

A look at the top eight areas sending students to the United States last year is revealing. Canada, because of its closeness and language, is No. 1. But after that, India, the Republic of China, and Japan are next. Iran is No. 5.

Then it's Korea, the Philippines, and Hong Kong. Six out of eight from Asia.

This is made all the more pertinent when viewed in the growing role of the East-West Center, and the far-looking University of Hawaii's new academic development plan.

The plan stresses an orientation toward the Pacific and Asia as a key to quality educational development.

Even with the university emphasis and the East-West Center, Hawaii will never actually educate great numbers of foreign students. (The university had 529 foreign students last year, and the East-West Center—to the beginning of this school year—has had a total participation of 858 students, 530 trainees, and 64 scholars.)

It must remain for the mainland universities to provide the bulk of the foreign student education. The leaders in foreign student education are universities like California, New York, Illinois, and Michigan.

American-educated Asians are likely to continue their contacts with the United States.

Hawaii, with an orientation toward Asia, stands ready to participate in the growing commercial and cultural relationships.

Will Johnson Debate With GOP Opponent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Independent of February 22–23, 1964:

WILL JOHNSON DEBATE WITH GOP OPPONENT?

(By Ernie Kreiling)

HOLLYWOOD.—As the political climate is warming up, greater interest is being generated over the possibility of television debates between President Johnson and the Republican presidential candidate.

Congress, however, is dragging its feet. In order to have network television debates of the kind that put Mr. Kennedy in the

White House, Congress must act to temporarily suspend section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, which, as it now stands, requires that all legally qualified candidates for political office be afforded equal time and opportunity to present their ideas.

This would mean as many as 14 separate candidates demanding the same opportunity for a series of debates as would be available to the Republican and Democratic candidates.

But where is that legislative action now? It's smothered deep in one of Congress inscrutable committees. One columnist speculated that the Democratic committee chairman is purposely sitting on it until he learns whether or not President Johnson wants to stand in public debate with his Republican adversary.

President Kennedy had, of course, committed himself to such debates, a commitment not binding on Mr. Johnson. So, it is reasoned, if President Johnson decides to shy away from the debates—and there are many hazards in it for an incumbent—his Democratic Congress might then bottle up the necessary legislation, thereby removing some of the onus from the President's reluctance.

The networks, of course, are anxious to go ahead with plans, and there's little doubt but that the American public is assuming that such debates are forever a part of the American scene. Congress, however, is uncertain and action on the bill to remove this limiting section of the Communication Act will probably be stalled until as late as possible.

But with luck, Congress will act, and, again, with luck, the format of such debates will be more meaningful than they were last time when newsmen were largely responsible for deciding what subjects were discussed.

In order to come up with a truly significant format, NBC last year granted to the American Political Science Association funds to conduct an independent study to determine the best format for such personal confrontations. The committee studying the problem is composed of respected scholars of public affairs and communications. Their recommendation, though not binding on anyone, will undoubtedly be given serious consideration by the candidates and networks involved.

NBC deserves considerable credit for making such a study possible.

Commercial and Educational Television Coexist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following remarks by the Honorable Frederick W. Ford, Commissioner of the Federal Communications Committee, made before the Philadelphia Branch of American Women in Radio & Television on February 18, 1964.

Because of the timeliness of Mr. Ford's remarks, I commend them to my colleagues:

COMMERCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION COEXIST

(Address by Commissioner Frederick W. Ford, Federal Communications Commission; before the Philadelphia Branch of American Women in Radio & Television, Philadelphia, Pa., February 18, 1964)

The technical art of television has a long history and utilizes the contributions made by the inventive genius of many men going back perhaps as far as 1884 when Paul Nipkow, a German, patented a scanning disk for transmitting pictures by wireless. By 1927 progress in the art had been made to a point that Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, participated in an experimental television program sent by wire between New York and Washington by the Bell Telephone Laboratories.

In 1928, a few broadcast stations were experimenting with television. These few experimenters grew to 17 experimental television stations by 1937. President Roosevelt was seen on television in 1939 when he opened the World's Fair in New York and in 1940 the Republican and Democratic conventions were first televised.

On April 30, 1941 the Commission authorized commercial television operations to start July 1, of that year. WNBT, New York was awarded the first grant of a construction permit looking toward regular operation which brought into existence our commercial television service. By May, 1942, 10 commercial television stations were on the air, 6 of which continued to provide service during the war. In 1945 the Commission allocated 13 VHF channels to television, (later reduced to 12), and resumed normal processing of applications; however, by September 30, 1948 it became necessary to stop additional station authorizations because of interference problems that had developed and because it became increasingly evident that the few available VHF channels were inadequate to provide a truly nationwide competitive television service.

There were 108 stations on the air at that time and approximately 1,500,000 television receivers in the hands of the public. This number was to increase to approximately 16 million when the so-called "freeze" order was lifted nearly 5 years later.

On April 14, 1952, the Commission issued its sixth report and order adding 70 UHF channels to the 12 VHF channels then in use and adopting an assignment table making more than 2,000 channel assignments (over 1,400 UHF and over 500 VHF) to nearly 1,300 communities throughout the United States, including 242 (82 VHF and 162 UHF) assignments for noncommercial educational use (about 12 percent) which has now been increased to 348 (109 VHF and 239 UHF).

You will recall that the late Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock in her detailed separate views on that report concurred in the educational reservations but dissented from the report insofar as it failed to make more adequate and proper provision for educational stations.

Thus, to the existing commercial television system established in 1941 and held in check until 1952, were added reservations for education far short of the number necessary for an adequate nationwide educational television system.

In that same year on July 23, 1952, the Commission made a grant of its first noncommercial television construction permit to Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science (KSAC-TV) at Manhattan, Kans. On May 25, 1953, KUHT of the University of Houston, Tex., went on the air and our educational television system began its coexistence with the commercial television system. An outstanding example of their previous relationship was, of course, right here in Philadelphia where the TV "School of the Air" used as a part of the regular curriculum in the classroom began operation in 1949 and where the TV "University of the Air" began its operation in 1951 on station WFIL.

As was anticipated, the growth of educational television has been much slower than commercial television. I became a member of the Commission a little more than 5 years after this report and order was adopted. At that time there were 475 commercial television and 24 educational television stations on the air. There was great concern over the failure of UHF to become an integrated part of our system, and the Commission was divided on what should be done about the UHF-VHF problem. Needless to say, unless channels already in use by commercial stations were to be withdrawn, most of the expansion of educational television would have to take place in the UHF portion of the allocation if an adequate nationwide system were ever to be developed. This withdrawal appeared highly unlikely since the public had invested millions of dollars in television receivers (which now number approximately 60 million) in order to receive commercial programs. The tremendous nationwide audiences were developed by commercial interests. It could not be assumed that educational programs would hold that audience for its programs in competition with other attractions to which the population devotes its leisure time, nor continue to stimulate the mass production of receivers at a comparatively low price. Commercial television appears to me, therefore, to be essential to educational television in maintaining the huge audience potential from which educational television will draw its share.

About 1960, I received the impression that educators were approaching the Commission concerning their problems with hat in hand, so to speak. This was a little appalling to me. When I was a growing boy, my father, an aggressive educator and an experienced practical politician was head of the school system in West Virginia. I had seen him win tough legislative battles with the aid of ad hoc coalitions in order to get a proper share of the tax dollar for education.

In December of 1958, I undertook an exhaustive analysis of the UHF-VHF problem in a speech at Houston, Tex., and outlined a program to solve the problem. At that time I was advised by my technical advisers against recommending an all-channel receiver law. However, they reversed their opinions later, and on February 11, 1959, I recommended to my colleagues a bill which I played a major part in drafting to give the Commission authority to require that all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce be equipped to receive all channels. I described the need for such legislation in detail to the Institute for Education by Radio-Television at Columbus, Ohio, in May of that year. During the period I was chairman in 1960, a bill for this purpose was introduced in Congress at the request of the Commission. I was very pleased to see a modification of this bill finally enacted into law on July 10, 1962.

In 1960, I was given a subject for another address to the institute but not on the topic uppermost in my mind which was this seeming reluctance of educators to battle for frequencies and the urgent need for a nationwide survey of the channel assignments needed in order to establish an adequate nationwide system of educational television to be presented to the Commission with a militant demand for the assignments. This was a task which Miss Hennock had urged

the Commission to undertake in 1952, but which from my observations in retrospect, the Commission was ill prepared to do. I asked for an opportunity to present his idea which was given to me at a luncheon meeting of the Institute in 1960. Leonard Marks, the general counsel for the institute, told me at the conclusion of my remarks that the board had agreed to undertake the survey I requested.

As you know, this survey was completed under a contract with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in November 1961, and formally presented to the Commission in October of 1963 recommending 1,197 assignments for educational television.

On October 24, 1963, the Commission issued its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket No. 14229, proposing to reserve 703 assignments (99 VHF and 604 UHF) for educational television. The major difference between the recommendation of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters and the Commission's proposal is in the number of assignments to each city. Moreover, the Commission in docket No. 14744 on July 25, 1963, allocated the band 2500 to 2690 Mc/s for the new Instructional Television Fixed Service. This service has also come into existence by the recent grant of 3 construction permits and an anticipated 100 more in 1964, and offers school systems an opportunity to use multiple channels to serve their various school locations. The time for reply comments on the proposal for additional broadcast channel reservations has been extended to April 3, 1964, all of which must be considered in reaching our conclusion on the proper number of assignments to be made. A final assignment table reserving a sufficient number of channels for an adequate nationwide system of educational television should be adopted sometime after that date. In the meantime, we are proceeding with the processing of educational television applications with the stipulation that a different channel may be substituted if necessary to comply with the new table when it is adopted.

Meanwhile, a third and very important bill introduced by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, which had been pending in the Congress for some time, was enacted into law on July 10, 1962. This law authorized appropriations (through matching grants) to assist in the construction of educational television broadcast facilities. Thus, the three-cornered foundation for the development of educational television begun in 1959 is almost completed. That is: the 1962 all-channel receiver law; the 1961 survey of needs and 1963 proposed rulemaking for the reservation of adequate channels for educational television; and the 1962 law authorizing Federal funds to assist in the construction of educational broadcast facilities.

It is interesting to note that there are now 86 operating educational stations serving a potential of 110 million viewers in 38 States compared with 567 operating commercial stations serving 98 percent of the population of the country. Over 7 million students use educational television as a part of their daily activity. Approximately 5,000 persons are employed directly in educational television. There are approximately 27 construction permits for stations outstanding and 28 applications for improved facilities or new stations on file. Capital investment in educational television is approximately $40 million with annual operating costs of the existing 86 stations of approximately $20 million.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has received 55 applications for matching grants since this program got underway in July 1963, and has authorized 11 grants-in-aid to date.

The story of the coming into existence of educational television would not be complete without paying special attention to the existing commercial broadcasters who have contributed millions of dollars and encouragement to educational television facilities. For example, the American Broadcasting Co. has contributed $250,000 to the station in New York and thousands of dollars in programs and equipment to this and other stations. The Columbia Broadcasting System in the past 6 years has contributed in cash and equipment to stations in Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities in excess of $1,500,000 in addition to programs of substantial value. The National Broadcasting Co. has contributed at least $700,000 in cash and $150,000 in equipment to various educational facilities as well as program material valued at $800,000 which was not used on the network.

Many independent stations have also contributed large sums of cash to struggling educational television stations such as the gifts of thousands of dollars by Metro-Media.

Thus, the existing commercial television interests have been generous in helping the educational television system into existence. Almost every State has an official body responsible for the development of educational broadcasting and it appears that we are now on the threshold of a breakthrough to an adequate nationwide educational television system.

Finally, I think we can conclude that commercial television and educational television are complementary. I do not think that it is being sentimental to conclude also that commercial and educational television need each other and the public needs them both. Certainly, up to this time, in order to exist at all, educational television has had to coexist. I suspect that this situation will continue for the foreseeable future. I would, therefore, urge all educators to keep criticism of their good friends—the commercial television system—constructive when other mass mediums which do not contribute to your cause in such a practical way are having a field day of criticism at the expense of the commercial television system. In this way, I am sure you will be aided in growing into an indispensable part of the warp and woof of American life, and thrive in this friendly but critical coexistence—all in furtherance of the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Columnist Fears We Are Being Victimized by Pacifist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is indeed concern among many Americans that the policies being followed by our national leadership may be ripening us for a final takeover by the Communist bloc. Some of this thinking is expressed in a column by George Todt, in the Los Anglese Herald Examiner. I include Mr. Todt's column here in the hope it may arouse more interest in the adoption of a firm and understandable foreign policy which will make clear to our enemies and our allies that the United States has the means and the will to protect our freedoms. The column follows:

BITING THE HAND THAT

(By George Todt)

"The primary task of U.S. Armed Forces is to protect American lives and property."—Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, U.S. Air Force.

Recently Paramount Studios in Hollywood showed me a preview of a frightening soon-to-be-released film called "Seven Days in May," an authentic version of the controversial book of the same name by authors Charles W. Bailey II and Fletcher Knebel.

This motion picture is extremely well done—almost devilishly so, in fact—but it is frightening because it downgrades the military officers of our Republic and labels them potential traitors.

TREATY WITH RUSS

This is sheer poppycock to those in the know because the American officer corps throughout our armed services is the most loyal and dedicated in the history of any nation, past or present.

According to the plot, laid sometime in the future, the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington plots to take over the Government from a weak-kneed President—and almost succeeds.

The reason? Well, President Jordan Lyman (Fredric March) has just concluded an idiotic universal disarmament treaty with the dear old Soviet Union—perhaps by executive agreement—and his popularity rating has sunk to an all-time low of 29 percent yet on the liberal leftwing Gallup poll.

THE REAL PURPOSE

At this point, fearing the worst, the Air Force four-star general—frankly corresponding to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay at this time—decides to stage a treasonable revolt with the best of good intentions.

Somehow slick-talking Burt Lancaster has all the Joint Chiefs eating out of his hand, plus rable rousers, plus the fickle public.

But just in the nick of time, loyal Marine Col. Kirk Douglas finks out on his general in the Pentagon, squeals to March—and the jig's up.

See this film. It's techniques are most revealing.

After watching Lancaster, March, and Douglas go through their paces, I was reminded of other motion pictures in the continuing skein: Stanley Kramer's "On the Beach"; "Advise and Consent"; "The Ugly American," and "Dr. Strangelove."

It seems to me the real purpose behind these offerings may be to convince the public of the "Fail-Safe" unreliability of our officials in Government—particularly in the armed services. Why?

Perhaps if we become convinced the military leaders are not to be trusted with our security, we will shop elsewhere.

Where? Well, why not try peace through law and world government? We could throw away our nuclear bombs and other armaments, trust the encroaching Reds to do the same, and then—peace—it's wonderful.

There is just one fly in this particular ointment, however. Just how far can we trust the amoral, cheating Communist leaders? Since the blackguard Lenin came to power in 1917, the Soviet Union has broken 62 of 64 major agreements made with us.

BOLSTER OUR AIR FORCE

What does it behoove our Republic to make a treaty with a calculating liar who will break his word before the day is over if it pleases him to do so?

Those with the spunk of a defeated Neville (peace in our time) Chamberlain in these modern days may think that the road to world peace lies in "agreements"—read "appeasements" here—with Communist leaders. But they seldom keep their word. Why bother?

Our real peace hope is the U.S. Air Force. Let's upgrade this instrument of peace with some new bombers.

Steel Industry Seeks Fair Competition Standards From Present Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD, the excellent statement of Leslie B. Worthington, president of the United States Steel Corp., before the Trade Information Committee of the office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, of the Executive Office of the President, at Washington, D.C.

I rise to point out the injustice and loss being caused to our U.S. steel industry, and the steelworkers of America, by the present administration in Washington permitting large scale dumping of surplus foreign steel and steel products on the U.S. market.

If the administration administered the U.S. Anti-Dumping Act legislation in accordance with the intent of Congress, the U.S. steel industry would be able to compete fairly with its foreign competitors in the domestic U.S. steel market.

The U.S. steel industry is being severely injured by the failure and neglect of the administration to prevent concerted dumping of foreign steel, wire, rod, sheets, and many steel products on the U.S. domestic market.

This unwarranted dumping of foreign steel has resulted in depressing our domestic steel production, and reduction of our U.S. steel mill operating rate. The foreign steel dumping is causing layoffs, unemployment and a substantial loss of jobs for our steelworkers of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the United States.

The above-mentioned statement follows:

STATEMENT OF LESLIE B. WORTHINGTON

I welcome this chance to discuss with you the opportunities and obstacles which I believe confront our Government and the steel industry in achieving further freedom of world trade.

In our company, we believe in free trade under equally fair competitive conditions. We recognize, however, that unfair and destructive trade practices, such as dumping, must be eliminated before free trade between the United States and foreign nations in steel products can be realized.

Given a competitive climate that is fair to all, we believe we can successfully meet the serious competitive problems that now face us in markets abroad and at home; but such a climate in steel mill products simply does not exist in the world today.

To keep our products competitive is our responsibility as a steel producer. But to keep a competitive climate that is fair is something that only Government can do.

Thus, the representatives of our Government at the trade negotiations should seek voluntary agreement that will eliminate unfair methods which restrict and impede competition and will, at the same time, encourage constructive practices that will promote world trade.

Only our Government is in a position to eliminate destructive trade practices in steel products; and we would think that Government would undertake to do this, not alone because in this country we believe in fair competition, but also because of the importance of the domestic steel industry to the economic well-being of the United States.

The importance of a vital steel industry to our Nation in wartime has been very well demonstrated on three occasions during my lifetime. The importance of the industry to our national economy in peacetime can, I believe, be demonstrated by reference to a very few representative data.

There are more than 500,000 employees of the American steel industry engaged in the production and distribution of steelmill products. Many thousand more are employed in the mining, processing, and transportation of raw materials, in the fabrication of the mill products, and in related industries.

The payrolls of the American steel producers in 1963 exceeded $4 billion.

There are steel plants in some 300 different communities in this country and each of them contributes to the economic welfare of the community in which it is located.

Taxes paid by the steel companies in 1962 to local, State, and Federal governments exceeded the sum of their net profits and amounted to more than $743 million.

During the post-World War II period, the American steel industry has averaged nearly $1 billion a year in capital expenditures. Such expenditures in 1964 are expected to reach $1½ billion.

Steelmill products are the raw material for a host of manufacturing industries in the United States. It has been estimated that nearly one-third of total man-hours in manufacturing are devoted to the further fabricating of steelmill products into end-use articles.

That a healthy and progressive steel industry is essential to the economy and defense of this country cannot, I believe, be seriously questioned.

No doubt our Government has a considerable stake in the well-being of the steel industry and, because that well-being is now under serious challenge—and under circumstances with which only our Government can cope—I believe the problem should be made clear at this time.

These circumstances actually arise out of the tremendous postwar, worldwide growth in steel production. Table 30 of the brief we have filed with the committee shows that in 1930, 25 nations produced steel and, of the total production of 100 million ingot tons, the United States produced about 44 percent.

Following the end of World War II—in 1946—30 nations were producing steel, and the United States produced about 54 percent of it. However, 16 years later—in 1962—55 nations were producing steel and, out of nearly 395 million tons of steel ingots poured in that year, the United States produced just under 25 percent.

It is estimated that by 1965, 71 nations will be producing steel and many of the newcomers can be expected to add to the chaos that exists in the export markets of the world.

Since the close of World War II, our Government has provided the money to build, modernize, or expand 179 different foreign steel plants. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22, 1963, this money has reached the astonishing total of $1,735 million. By way of contrast, the American steel producer has been able to expand and improve his own steel mill facilities through his ability to pay his own way—and without direct help of any kind from his Government.

The view is sometimes expressed that at least some of the nations which have built or are planning steel plants could better invest in agriculture or other development that would contribute more significantly to the improvement of the living standards of their people. However this may be, the fact remains that many nations continue to be successful in raising the large sums necessary for the installation or expansion of steel plants—notwithstanding that the plants now in operation around the world, to say nothing of plants now building or in the planning stage, have the capacity to produce steel far in excess of the world's present requirements.

It is this foreign steel excess capacity and its utilization to flood world markets with dumped steel that has created the problem which I believe must be the concern of our Government.

It seems to be true that, in every foreign country which has a steel industry, the government assists in building an export trade. Such assistance would account for the practice that appears generally to be followed in foreign nations of operating steel mills so as to earn foreign exchange, to bring the export-import trade into balance, and to serve other political considerations.

In the major foreign steel-producing nations, the requirements of the domestic market are generally supplied at prices which the steel producers jointly seek to stabilize—usually with the aid of their government. Since there is an excess of steel-producing capacity in these nations, the remaining production, not absorbed in the domestic market, is then dumped in the export market at whatever prices it will bring. To the extent that the foreign steel producer is able to cover his fixed charges out of his domestic sales, he is then in a position to price his export sales on his incremental costs. By marketing his excess production in this way, he is able to utilize a labor force which either the law or local practice causes him to maintain, regardless of the need for their services; and he is also able to earn foreign exchange for his government and to serve his own financial interests in the bargain.

In many of the smaller countries, heavy capital investment in modern steel-making equipment, lack of domestic or other economical sources of raw materials, inefficient labor, and other costly operations would indicate that serious losses must be incurred on sales in export but, nevertheless, political considerations seem to dictate that this policy be followed.

These attitudes, policies, and practices on the part of foreign steelmakers and their governments, including the willingness of governments to subsidize exports, are reflected in the steel export markets of today. As the volume of export offerings has continued to increase, competition for available business has become more and more intense. Under these circumstances, prices on steel products exported to the United States and to non-steel-producing nations have been driven to levels that reflect the predatory and destructive competitive practices that are prevalent among exporters.

We in United States Steel believe that it is good business to treat all of our customers alike, both large and small. For this reason, we publish prices f.o.b. mill on our steel mill products and quote these prices to each of our customers. We reduce our prices both at the mill and at delivery points to meet lower prices quoted by our domestic competitors in competitive areas when we believe this is the sound thing to do and when such action is consistent with our practice of treating all of our customers in an evenhanded fashion.

My company has on a few occasions attempted to meet the indiscriminate prices quoted in the United States by the importers of foreign steel. We found—as we lowered our own price—that the price on the foreign steel was reduced correspondingly. Of course, this is the characteristic of the dumping price—that it will be lowered in whatever amount is necessary to take the business away from the domestic supplier.

Any overall effort to meet dump prices could foreseeably end in disaster for any private company that is operating in a free competitive economy. And we have not yet found it advisable to attempt to meet on a customer-by-customer basis the dumping prices which are being quoted on imported steel in the United States. We are fully aware that the latter practice would work to the disadvantage of those of our customers who prefer to buy domestic products—even though the price is higher than the prices quoted on foreign steel—as well as those of our customers who are not in a position to buy all or even a substantial part of their requirements from importers.

My company tries to sell regularly in the home markets of other steel-producing nations where prices are stable and are not much different from our own domestic prices. However, in the non-steel-producing foreign nations of the world, it would be necessary that we meet dumping prices if we were to be successful in selling our products. To undertake to do so would, we think, favor consumers abroad to the marked disadvantage of our domestic customers.

We hope to be able to continue this even-handed basis of selling our products because we believe it is important that we contribute as much as possible to the ability of each of our customers to maintain a healthy competitive position in the markets in which he sells his products. A good many of them compete successfully in the sale abroad of their products made of steel, as well as competing with each other in their own markets in this country. The United States has a favorable export balance of trade in capital equipment and consumer durable goods manufactured from steel. One of the factors making this possible is that the manufacturers of these products in the United States are able to buy their steel from domestic steel producers at prices which compare favorably with the prices paid by their foreign competitors in other major steel-producing countries.

With many nations now striving for the creation or further expansion of steelmaking facilities, our problem is becoming more and more aggravated with the flooding of export markets. This is particularly true of our own coastal markets. In these markets, steel products have been sold at constantly declining prices as cutthroat competition from an ever increasing number of steel producing nations has forced them down.

As to Russia and the other Red bloc countries, it is very likely true that they have it in their power to enter any foreign market, including the United States, on a basis that would threaten the collapse of the domestic industry.

The chaotic price competition in the world export steel trade, as reflected in the pricing of exports of steel mill products to the United States, has created a problem which can only be described as critical. We believe in free trade under equally fair competitive conditions. Such fair competitive conditions simply do not exist in the steel export markets of the world today.

History bears out the view that the suppression of unfair competitive practices in no way hinders or stifles the flow of free trade in any market, domestic or foreign, quite the contrary. If standards of fair competition could be established in world trade in steel products, they would, I believe, prove a far greater stimulus to such trade than any adjustments that are possible in the existing tariffs of the steel-producing nations.

It is our recommendation, as stated in our brief, that rates of duty and nontariff trade barriers should be considered jointly in relation to their overall impact on international trade in steel mill products. In this connection, both duties and nontariff trade barriers imposed by other nations on imports from the United States should be compared with the duties and nontariff trade barriers imposed by the United States on steel imports from such other nations. Adjustments should then be negotiated which will provide the opportunity to the American steel producer and to the steel producers of other nations to compete in world markets on a fair basis of equality. Furthermore, unfair and destructive trade practices, such as dumping, must be eliminated before free trade between the United States and foreign nations in steel products can be realized. If these objectives cannot be accomplished, then steel mill products should be placed on the U.S. reserve list. In addition, if other nations should increase their rates of duty or increase or impose other levies or barriers on steel imports fom the United States, then the U.S. rates of duty should be increased correspondingly.

Thank you.

Controls Versus Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, February 23 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times carried a brief editorial, pointing out the basic reasons for the defects in Communist agriculture attracting considerable attention.

Since there is continued debate on the long-term wisdom of our subsidizing Communist countries through the vehicle of farm commodity sales, the comment in this editorial on the reasons for the failure of the Communist farm economy is certainly in order, and I place the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members.

CONTROLS VERSUS FREEDOMS

The National Association of Manufacturers points out, with a small chuckle, that the Communists in Bulgaria who hew to the strict Marxist line have been taken aback by a recent turn of events.

Somehow or other—perhaps as an experiment—a textile plant in Bulgaria was allowed to plan its own products, buy its own materials and seek out its own customers.

If this was an experiment it turned out wrong-side-to for the Communists. The textile plant completed its year's production quota 6 weeks ahead of schedule, it paid its workers 10 percent more than did plants run by the State and it made a comfortable profit.

This state of affairs is a rather blunt refutation of the economic theories of the Marxists, who hold that state-run enterprise and strict controls are the only way to prosper.

It is a matter of record that in many Communist nations there is an increasing move toward the lessening of government controls and a leaning toward the principles of free enterprise. Poland has halted for the most part, her collectivization of farms because production has been down and the farmers' lot in desperate. Cuba is now beginning to admit that rigid state controls do not aid in raising tobacco or sugar.

This, however, does not seem to make much of an impression on the planners in our own Government who seek constantly to impose more and more Federal controls over agriculture, various segments of industry and, lately, by creating a new Department of Housing and Community Planning that could, conceivably, have a considerable impact on real estate operations all over the country.

It is said that a democratic form of government constantly seeks new ways to better the way of life of those who live under it but it is wise not to rush headlong down roads that have already been demonstrated to be rutted and lead to nowhere.

Lady Bird Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the March issue of the Ladies' Home Journal contains a fine article about our First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. The article, written by Katie Louchheim, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, amply illustrates the warm and sympathetic and gracious nature of "Lady Bird" Johnson. It details her charitable good works and her responsive nature to the less fortunate among the American people.

In 1962 in Greece, Mrs. Johnson typically visited day nurseries, craft schools, and community centers. At home, as the article points out, Mrs. Johnson takes wives of heads of state to see the new developments in education at the Washington schools or shows them the work of the Urban Service Corps volunteers headed by wives of Cabinet members.

I think the American people can take pride in the varied activities of Mrs. Johnson who is truly fulfilling the role of the First Lady among American women.

Under unanimous consent, place this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LADY BIRD JOHNSON

The evolution of the role of First Lady in America during the past half century has been, in its way, almost as dramatic and sweeping as the expansion of the role of the Chief Executive. Regardless of how much distaste the First Lady may possess for public life, her role can no longer be a private one; she acquires indirect power when her husband takes the oath of office as President of the United States. This power or influence, a complex and delicate mixture of various social, political and moral forces, bears upon nearly every important situation and tradition in our national life. Of one of the two ladies pictured above [not printed in RECORD], we know quite a lot. Her grace and charm as a White House hostess, her quiet pride in her family life, and her heroism in the face of a senseless tragedy have been brought to Americans in hundreds of pictures and articles. We know less of the wife of President Johnson. In the pages that follow, Ladies' Home Journal presents a warm and human report of an exclusive White House visit made by Katie Louchheim, a longtime friend of the new First Lady, shortly after Mrs. Johnson moved into the Executive Mansion. Mrs. Louchheim is well qualified for this assignment since, in addition to her acquaintance with Mrs. Johnson, she is a familiar figure on the capital scene. Now a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State—the highest rank ever achieved by a woman in that department—she is a former vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. This magazine is also proud to publish a poignant and

remarkable personal essay on Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy by Katherine Anne Porter, one of America's most distinguished writers. We feel that Miss Porter's essay of appreciation is one of the most eloquent and moving tributes ever to appear in Ladies' Home Journal.

Claudia Alta Johnson is unique. As a longtime friend, I am certain that, for her, every human being is important. Shortly after the Johnsons moved into the White House, the First Lady and I talked of the continuity of her interests, and of the future. We were in the family living room. Yellow roses, barely opened, stood on the small table before us. Pale-yellow slip covers, soft chintz and the jewel tones of a small Persian rug complemented the mahogany pieces of the Federal period.

By the desk, Mrs. Johnson had hung a colored photograph of the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. We talked of the birthday parties she used to give him, inviting all the children of the Texas delegation. Mr. Sam would say, "This is the nicest thing anyone ever did for me," and he never missed an opportunity to praise Lady Bird Johnson.

I remember sitting with Mr. Sam in the drawing room of Washington's F Street Club, in 1955. Lady Bird, accompanied by her husband, then majority leader of the Senate, had just appeared in the doorway. There was a flurry. High-ranking officials began pushing past lesser notables. The Speaker pronounced judgment, punctuating his remarks with a forefinger: "That is the greatest woman I've ever known," he said. "She's good and she's kind. She hasn't a mean thought, and she's got more sense than most men. The smartest thing Lyndon ever did was to marry her. He's just lucky."

Speaker Rayburn was right. In Washington, a city where every talent is suspect and every drawing room crowded with critics, witnesses to the First Lady's social assets vie with one another to describe them. "She is indefatigable. How does she always manage to be gracious, act as if she wasn't bored, look as if she never tires?" says a friend who campaigned with her in 1960. "She manages so well," explains the wife of a Presidential aid, "because she is self-disciplined and possesses a natural reserve of energy. The two together make it possible for her to use this energy effectively and do so many things so well in so little time."

But the real reason, I suspect, is that her first love is people. Four-H clubbers, grassroots politicians, Nobel Prizewinners, eggheads—the First Lady is people-oriented. It would be difficult for her to pretend that sort of thing. Washington is small-town. Gossip takes the place of parlor games, hypocrisy is passed with the canapes. People who wear masks in public are quickly exposed. Anyone who has been in public life for 27 years, as Lady Bird has, has been tested many times and dissected at every dinner table. The First Lady always emerges with her legendary reputation for sincerity intact, because she is real, she is natural, and she is consistently honest with herself. Even Washington cannot alter those ingredients of character. Lady Bird, as her intimates can attest, has only one face.

What is she made of? Why, when one described her to strangers, does she sound almost too perfect? How can she manage to keep every woman friend and yet make men describe her as beguiling?

Self-discipline, the kind that comes with responsibilities, is only part of the answer. A deep religious sense is another part. When the President was stricken with his serious heart attack in 1955 and it was touch-and-go whether he would recover, friends who knew of her dedicated faith gave her a cross to keep by her side during her lonely night vigil.

"She has great inner strength," says former Congressman Homer Thornberry (now a judge), perhaps the closest friend the President and his wife have. "An ordinary woman would go to pieces under stress, but not Bird. Her children are remarkable; they will do all right in the White House, because she taught them early on how to deal with problems of public life. And she has such good judgment. The President and I will be discussing some problem and he will say: 'Let's ask Bird.' We'd discover she already had all the facts and had made up her mind."

Inner strength is most often a virtue alloted to men. So are good judgment and the reasoned reply based on knowledge of facts. It would never do for a well-bred southern lady to admit to possession of the tools of the intellect. Lady Bird's deceptive feminine demeanor serves as a suitable disguise for a woman of stature and substance.

Men find her beguiling because she is at once a good conversationalist and a better listener—a difficult and little-practiced art.

Women friends, on both sides of the political aisle, are devoted because she has never lost kinship with them. The highly competitive biographical market has been flooded with anecdotes that invariably begin: "She was so kind, she wrote to me, she came to see me, she rescued us."

My own files contain letters from the President and Mrs. Johnson, all full of warm friendship.

In the fall of 1960, the vice-presidential candidate called late one evening to ask me please to go "campaigning with Bird." The hour and the personal request were both typical.

Of course I went, and watched with admiration Mrs. Johnson's increasingly successful struggle to master her shyness. "Thousands of barbecues and hundreds of speeches helped," and she adds, "Lyndon expects a lot of me and so I've learned not to be afraid any more."

Despite her own protests to the contrary, the First Lady is by disposition, experience and inclination what President Lyndon Johnson calls a can-do woman.

What can and will she do as First Lady?

She will do the routine job expertly. She has graduated with honors from more receiving lines, charity bazaars, ladies' lunches, and head-table endurance contests than any of her predecessors. Her expression is naturally alert, and she is modest without being self-conscious. She suffers fools cheerfully. She admits that she doesn't bore easily, and she never complains of her feet.

Acting as the late President's hostess on occasions when Mrs. Kennedy could not be present, seated between visiting dignitaries who spoke no English, she plowed right in with the same intelligent enthusiasm and and dependable charm that helped elect her husband to the House and then to the Senate.

But Mrs. Johnson is also an innovator. Before taking off with the Vice President on his good will missions, the State Department, at her request, prepared lists of important women in the countries she was about to visit. Her schedule, separate from the Vice President's, always included visits with women "doers"—doctors, journalists, scientists, social workers, senators, judges—and stops at whatever projects they had evolved in their efforts to eradicate the various ill of mankind.

In the fall of 1962, after Mrs. Johnson's trip to Greece, our Ambassador's wife, Eve Labouisse, wrote describing her visits to urban community centers, day nurseries for children of working mothers, farm schools for boys, and handicraft centers. "These meetings were not formal in character and their objective was personal contact and interesting conversation. This was accomplished not only because of Mrs. Johnson's direct and gracious manner but also because her interest was so real and because in several areas, such as social welfare, journalism, and business, she herself knew a great deal. Her intellectual curiosity, her warm and spontaneous friendliness gained for her the affection of all the Greeks who met her."

One of my duties in the State Department was to dramatize effectively the importance of women visitors to the new administration. How better accomplish this than to ask Mrs. Johnson to receive them? In the spring of 1961, 12 Latin American social workers, the first of many such groups, visited the United States under the auspices of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Exchange. Lady Bird invited them to the Vice President's office in the Capitol. Over the coffee and cake they got both empathy and history. "There are many little things I love about the Capitol Building. It is—in looks and being—such a continuing thing, stretched from time to time to meet the new demands of the growing Nation," Mrs. Johnson began in that friendly southern drawl.

Between these official visits there were the emergencies, when we knew, that despite an already overcrowded schedule, she would help out: the time the woman from Bolivia brought her husband's gift of a silver wedding dish to present; the visit from the Turkish ladies who had commissioned a special American flag.

Lady Bird's own estimate of herself is modest; she does not think of herself as businesslike. Mrs. Johnson has her own answer to the eternal question: What is a woman's business? "Her first and most important business is to provide a comfortable, peaceful, efficient and, above all, a happy home. Her business must also be to raise her children with sturdy bodies, independent, disciplined minds, a sense of obligation to their country and the assurance that spiritual strength is their greatest bulwark." And she adds, "To serve as a vast resource of thoughtful energy for the betterment of their community."

For all the millions of homemakers and mothers, tired of being twitted about the retreat to the hearth and weary of being unfavorably compared to the talented career types, these are encouraging and soothing words. Lady Bird is a homemaker, and she wants homemakers to know she identifies with them. "Mathematically," she says, "it is very unlikely that many of us will leave our 'footprints in the sands of time,' but through the people we love, we make the greatest contribution of all—a gift to their immortality."

How will she keep her family free from the insistent demands of public life? How can she preserve their privacy?

"We'll live as we always have," she answered. "Lyndon will involve us all, Lynda and Lucy and myself, in the fascinating people and doings that go on about him. He feels the girls should be as interested in the political world as he is—and they are. He calls on them, no matter where they are or who is there. Sometimes I watch, holding my breath, but they never let him down."

Lynda's interest in history is her father's special joy. She has his drive, his keen perception, his inquiring mind, even his mannerisms.

Lucy loves dogs and cats, makes brownies, writes poetry and is more the domestic type. Both girls have adjusted to the insistent demands of public life; they respond gladly and drink in the opportunities for learning by association with the great minds of their day.

Yet they are still two very natural, exuberant young girls, and Mrs. Johnson makes a point of keeping their surroundings in this key.

Lucy's white painted furniture, moved from the Elms to the White House, might be any American teenager's. The white ruffled canopy bed, the typical young girl's knickknacks, a silver heart-shaped box, personal mementos, books, photographs of her family, a radio by the bed and an open fire make the room cozy. On Lynda's bed across the hall a large Teddy bear waits for its keeper.

We spoke of Lady Bird's plans: The ways she might make the White House a showcase for women of achievement. They will be her ways, as individual as have been her accents in all her doings, whether at the Elms, the L.B.J. ranch in Texas, or in the 30 countries she has traversed "bragging on women."

She may invite prominent women visitors from abroad to tea, and bring in newspaperwomen to help them tell their stories. She will take the wives of heads of state to see the new developments in education at the Washington schools. She will show them the work of the Urban Service Corps volunteers headed by Cabinet wives. She will go with them to Cape Kennedy and Monticello, to the wonders of the space age and the past.

She will set the stage for people in the arts and entertainment world at White House dinners. Will she introduce them herself, as she so graciously did on occasions at the Elms? "I may," she answered, as I reminded her of her expertise in bringing together the "doers" and listeners at luncheons for Indira Gandhi or Japanese cabinet wives. "I thought you might like to visit with some of our own," she would begin. "I am always so proud when we can show off such lady activists as"—and follow with pertinent facts about her special guests: a woman judge, an economist, an astronomer, a discerning art collector.

Life in the White House will have the personal, informal touch she has given every home she has created. She will take pains at everything, but this won't be obvious. There will be the dignity due the occasion and the surroundings, and yet the western breezes will blow and the flavorful "you all" will make every guest believe "it was mighty good to see you." She will go on signing her own mail and making her own personal telephone calls to invite old and new friends to visit; being a keen observer and an intelligent listener and the person her husband turns to for solace and advice.

Early in the campaign I had to introduce Mrs. Johnson to a large audience. I had given a great deal of thought to what I could say that would do her justice. In the end I simply said, "Lady Bird Johnson brings to high office one very great advantage, besides the obvious ones of experience, aptitude and devotion: she does not have to change. She can just be herself and measure up." This is still the case. The White House has as many rooms as the job of First Lady has hopes and heartaches, but all Lady Bird Johnson has to do to measure up is be herself.

Time To See the Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union:

TIME TO SEE THE PLAN

Addressing a Pentagon press conference on February 6, 1963, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara declared: "The President has stated * * * that it is the policy of the Government to prevent the use of Cuba as a base for subversion or overt aggression against other nations of the hemisphere. * * * We have contingency plans to prevent that situation."

On January 27, 1964, a wire service reported:

"Defense Secretary McNamara said today there is solid evidence that weapons are being sent from Cuba to dissident groups in other Latin American countries.

" 'Communists are trying to exploit their foothold in Latin America by taking advantage of political and economic instability,' he said. 'While Cuba now presents a diminished direct threat to the United States, the continued existence of a Communist regime there poses an increasing threat to many Latin American nations, since it serves as a base for Castro-promoted, Communist-led subversive activities.' "

If Mr. McNamara had any doubts about Castro-inspired subversion, he could have looked at a report a five-nation Inter-American investigating team filed with the Organization of American States. The report documented Cuban aggression in Venezuela.

It would seem one more report is due from the administration—on location of the contingency plan.

Gun Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely statement from Mr. M. A. Smith which appeared in the Times-Leader, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

READERS' COLUMN—GUN AUTHORITY WARNS AGAINST REGULATIONS, BASED ON HYSTERIA

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

I appreciate the opportunity to use your column to acquaint the many thousands of hunters, shooters, and arms collectors in this area with the fact that a number of bills, pertaining to the control of firearms, was heard by a Senate committee last Tuesday. These bills range from complete confiscation of all arms to requirements for a police permit to purchase or own any firearms or ammunition, including collector's items or antiques.

It is presumptuous to think the events of November 22 are the sole reason for the proposed new legislation for the authors of many of these bills have presented them for approval, never successfully, but now seem to think they can capitalize on the hysteria sweeping some segments of the country—an hysteria which has been encouraged and enlarged out of proportion by half-truths, innuendo, and untold facts.

One, let us examine the mail-order rifle. The dealer involved sold the rifle in accord with the law. The purchaser violated the postal laws by renting a post office box under an alias. (Postal Manual 151.32.) Without violating postal laws, he might have purchased a mail-order rifle directly from the Government which has sold several million firearms in this manner at prices ranging from $1.50 each, plus shipping to current prices as low as $10 to $20 each, plus shipping.

In a fairly recent month, 65,000 M-1 carbines were sold by the Government, mail order at $20 each. Proponents of legislation to bar mail-order sales of rifles would have you believe that each of such sales create a potential assassin. How asinine can you get? A man who has murder in his heart will obtain a weapon to accomplish the deed by any means, purchase or theft or by making the weapon, and not necessarily a firearm.

REGISTRATION OF RIFLES

How about registering all rifles? Oswald's rifle was traced because its sale was recorded. Did this prevent the deed? And suppose a police permit had been required to purchase the rifle. Here was a man who could obtain a passport in 2 days—and we need hardly beat that subject to death.

Some newscastered seemed anxious to give the impression that only a man equipped with a highpowered rifle complete with telescope could have accomplished such a deed. Yet every year at the national shooting matches at Camp Perry, we have men shooting at a 3⅜-inch circle at 50 yards with pistols, without telescopes, firing five shots within 10 seconds, and scoring up to 90 points or better out of a possible hundred.

If Oswald had used a repeating shotgun without telescope with double O buckshot at that range of about 75 yards, he could have killed everybody in the President's car. So much for that impression.

Some of the proponents of strict firearms control give the excuse that this country is no longer a frontier, and why do the people need firearms? Well, the way I see that, our country always has been, is now, and always will be a frontier for its enemies, within and without. The Communist Party has worked for registration of all firearms in those countries, formerly free, which now lie behind the Iron Curtain. Certainly the party would shed no tears if such legislation were to be enacted here.

Actually, to register the firearms owned by some 45 million Americans, a great number of political jobs would be created at no little cost to the taxpayer and would in no way prevent crime. This is the record where such registration laws have been enacted. The only benefit involved would accrue to these jobholders in the form of wages.

SWITZERLAND CITED

Does widespread ownership of firearms constitute a public menace? Let me cite Switzerland. This country is about one third the size of Pennsylvania with a population about equal to half of Pennsylvania. This small country has a citizen army of some 720,000 men, each of whom must keep in his home full military uniform and equipment, including such weapons as high powered semiautomatic and fully automatic rifles, and a combat supply of ammunition. Every 1 or 2 years, each man must report for 2 weeks of military training, during which time he must qualify in marksmanship. If he does not qualify within the training period, he must remain and practice until he does qualify—at his own expense.

A Swiss citizen's possession of sporting firearms and ammunition is unrestricted. I verified the facts heretofore stated by telephoning the military attache at the Swiss Embassy in Washington, D.C. He also stated that there is probably not one Swiss home that is not armed in some manner.

And why is the crime rate so low in Switzerland? You just might gather a few clues to the answer in the foregoing paragraph.

One local publication contained editorial comment to the effect that no gun hobbyist would object to registering his arms, also that registration would keep poorly maintained guns out of the field. This editor's comments should be evaluated according to his experience with either gun hobbyists or guns. He also pointed out that among those who would object would be the "extremist patriot." I would like to point out that among those groups insisting on complete

firearms registration would be the extremist traitor. If there is a choice, I'll stick with the former with no apologies for my choice.

Free ownership of firearms leads to much research and development in that field. But "they" say "leave that to the military." Every practical small arms used by the military forces of this country in the past 63 years has been the product of a civilian arms technician or gunsmith.

Among these, one familiar to every GI is the M-1 carbine, which was invented by a man serving a life sentence for second degree murder working in a poorly equipped prison machine shop. The M-3 machinegun (grease gun) was designed by a civilian gunsmith. About 8 million of these were produced at a cost of about $7.50 each. John Garand, civilian, invented the M-1 rifle.

The military produced the new M-14 rifle to supersede the M-1, which is probably the reason the Government is now buying the AR-15 (developed by civilians) which might supersede the M-14 which has to be superceded by something, or just about anything.

Will registration of firearms control them? No. It is possible for any person with even minor mechanical inclination to make a serviceable firearm from common plumbing supplies. This writer could assemble an extremely powerful and effective firearm from common material in 15 minutes, and make the ammunition from material which could be purchased at the local drugstore.

Even air rifles of .45 caliber can be made which are capable of killing deer at a hundred yards. Impossible? Lewis and Clark carried one on the Northwest expedition.

I recall two of my boyhood friends who, having the run of a junkyard, constructed a light carriage mounted artillery piece capable of shooting a 5 pound ball over a mile—using only scrapped car and truck parts from the junkyard.

This subject is vast; much more could be written, but I will summarize:

ARMED CITIZENS ASSET

Experience shows that the great majority of citizens are competent to own firearms without restriction, and in so doing constitute an asset to national security.

Registration has not and cannot keep weapons out of the hands of those who would use them wrongfully.

If legislation of any kind can eliminate murder, it would have to be such as to control human emotions.

I strongly urge every hunter, shooter, collector, and all interested persons to contact his Congressman and U.S. Senator, voicing opposition to any new firearms legislation at this time, or at any time without comprehensive public hearings.

M. A. SMITH.

WILKES-BARRE.

Tribute to the Late President Kennedy by the Mapletown Grange of Montgomery County, N.Y., and a Plea for the Passage of President Kennedy's Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a thoughtful and moving resolution adopted last December by the Mapletown Grange of Montgomery County, N.Y., in my congressional district, in tribute to our late beloved martyred President, John F. Kennedy. The resolution, it will be noted, urges the passage of the civil rights bill which President Kennedy strongly supported, and which this House has now adopted and sent to the Senate.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF MAPLETOWN GRANGE, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, N.Y., DECEMBER 7, 1963

Whereas our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, has been brutally assassinated by one of some subversive group in America who are trying desperately or otherwise to poison the minds of the young of our country; and

Whereas our martyred President, in championing the cause for justice for all oppressed people everywhere in the world, set an example for all fairminded people to stand up for right and be heard; and

Whereas the great feelings of consternation and brief and the outpouring of millions to mourn his loss were also mourning the loss of those martyred colored children so brutally killed in their churches in the South and whose assassins have either not been found or if known not punished: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Mapletown Grange No. 613 in Montgomery County respectfully petition our Congressmen to vote immediately to bring the "civil rights" legislation out of the Rules Committee of Congress so it can be passed before this session ends. Thus more bloodshed and extreme suffering will be prevented.

PAUL J. CONWAY,
Secretary, Mapletown Subordinate Grange No. 613, Montgomery County.

Nationally Known Economists Question Independence of the Federal Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been holding hearings on the Federal Reserve System for the past month. These hearings are providing a comprehensive review of the Federal Reserve's operations and structure and an evaluation of its policies and their impact on our economy. In the early stages of the hearings we heard from five of the Governors of the System and the Presidents of the 12 district Federal Reserve Banks. We also heard from the Associate General Counsel and Deputy Director of Accounting and Auditing Policy of the General Accounting Office. Now we are getting testimony from economists, who are experts in monetary policy and banking operations, from major universities throughout the country. By the time they have finished I am sure we will have greatly increased our understanding of the Federal Reserve and the effectiveness of its policies. To date, the witnesses have been Prof. Harry J. Johnson, of the University of Chicago, Prof. Henry Villard, of the City College of New York, and Prof. Karl Brunner of UCLA. They brought into sharp focus some major questions about the Federal Reserve, and especially its independence.

Excerpts from the prepared statements of Professors Johnson, Villard, and Brunner, given in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Domestic Finance Subcommittee, on February 25 and 26, 1964, follow:

Professor Johnson:

1. The argument that an independent monetary authority is needed to prevent inflation "is an argument for establishing the monetary authority as a fourth branch of the Constitution, charged with the function of forcing the legislature and the executive to follow conservative economic policies involving the balancing of the budget and restraint on Government expenditures. In other words, it involves the establishment of a special position in Government for the owners of one form of property—owners of money and of assets fixed in terms of money—a position which is inconsistent with the principles of democratic equality and the presumption of democracy that the purpose of government is to serve the social good."

2. The assumption that an independent Fed will govern monetary policy flexibility and efficiently and in the best interests of the country "is not consistent with the historical evidence of the behavior of monetary authorities." Professor Johnson's prepared statement speaks of a pattern of "restrictive episodes" followed by "sharp policy reversal." He attributes this pattern "to the concentration of the Federal Reserve on money market conditions, interest rates, and member bank reserve positions as the objects of monetary control." He says that "the performance of the Federal Reserve as an agency of economic stabilization would be considerably improved if it were to devote less attention to monetary and banking conditions and more to the effects of its policy actions on the quantity of money and its rate of change."

3. Defects in the Fed's policies "are inherent in the conception, constitution, and operating responsibilities and methods of an independent monetary authority and are unlikely to be greatly modified by gradual improvement of the techniques of central banking on the basis of accumulated experience."

4. The Fed has become "a political animal on its own behalf, devoting considerable effort to justifying its policies * * * and passing the buck on to the executive or the legislature, the result being to obfuscate the policy choices that have to be made."

Professor Villard:

1. Concerning monetary policy over the past several years, Professor Villard said, "in order to reduce the rate of increase in prices by hardly more than 1 percent a year we have recently been wasting perhaps 5 percent of our productive potential * * * a very poor bargain indeed."

2. Overall economic policy "should be delegated to no one less than the President." Policies should be formulated by a National Economic Council to include representatives of the Federal Reserve System, the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other agencies.

3. "If, under such delegation, the President were to abuse his powers (say) to obtain low interest rates for the Treasury, the electorate would then know whom to hold accountable for any subsequent inflation. In short, I am prepared to compromise the independence of the Reserve System in order to achieve overall coordination of economic policy."

Professor Brunner:

1. Presents a detailed factual analysis which "indicates the broad association behavior of the money supply and the behavior of the unemployment rate." Summarizing, he states, "An accelerating growth-rate of

the money stock has been typically associated with declining levels of unemployment. Gradual retardations in this growth-rate were reflected in the appearance of slower and more hesitant absorption of unemployment * * * low or abruptly collapsing growth rates tended to be associated with a stationary or even slightly increasing unemployment trend, accompanied by rapid and comparatively substantial short-run fluctuations.

2. Control over the money supply yields thus no assurance of paradise. In particular, control over the money supply is not sufficient to eliminate all fluctuations in aggregate activity. But intelligent control over the money supply can be sufficent to eliminate destabilizing impulses generated by the monetary system and maintain the remaining fluctuations in a comparatively narrow range.

3. Professor Brunner states that effective monetary policy "requires a validated knowledge about the nature of the money supply process." But, based on the facts for the postwar period, "the Federal Reserve authorities lack a coherent notion of the process operated on, that they are frequently guided by fallacious assessments of evolving situations, and even misconstrue the meaning of their own policy behavior."

4. Professor Brunner's analysis shows also that "substantially greater discretionary power is actually delegated to the account manager than is formally acknowledged. Our detailed investigations summarized in the study indicated above, led us moreover to the conclusion that policy changes have frequently been initiated by the account manager and were subsequently supported by a suitable consensus of the FOMC."

U.S. Steel Industry's Opposition to Foreign Surplus Steel Dumping on U.S. Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit a chart showing the alarming history of the rise of foreign surplus steel dumping on the U.S. domestic market. This tragic error by the present administration is causing the shutting of U.S. mills, the closing of working shifts, and is resulting in actual unemployment and part-time employment in Pittsburgh, as well as Pennsylvania, and the steel manufacturing areas of the United States.

I ask that the administration promptly act, and stop this flood of surplus steel dumping which is not only breaking the price structure of our U.S. mills, but is really causing depression, unemployment, and larger relief rolls for our fine U.S. steelworkers and their families. This negligent failure to act is causing many workers and their families to face the bleak prospect of loss of the jobs they now hold. We in Congress must prevent such tragic results.

The chart follows:

Chart showing rise of imports of foreign steel into U.S. domestic market

Year	Imports		Exports		1957–63 imports as percent of U.S. consumption
	Tons	Dollars	Tons	Dollars	
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
1957	1,155	(1)	5,348	(1)	1.5
1958	1,707	(1)	2,823	(1)	2.9
1959	4,396	516,568	1,677	363,043	6.1
1960	3,359	448,781	2,977	660,845	4.7
1961	3,163	380,447	1,990	423,087	4.7
1962	4,100	484,382	2,013	424,048	5.6
1963 (11 months)	5,054	584,891	1,950	420,658	6.9

[1] Not available.

Source: 1963 figures are estimate by Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. Data: American Iron & Steel Institute.

The Water Rush in Russia

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most capable men in the Government right now is the Honorable Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Commissioner Dominy has set a consistently high standard of public service under the past two administrations, and I am grateful that we have a man of his caliber in this position because of the absolutely vital importance of reclamation to the development of the whole Western United States.

In the current issue of the magazine Reclamation Era, Commissioner Dominy has written a very interesting and worthwhile report on his recent trip to Russia which I am including in my remarks at this time for the attention of my colleagues:

THE WATER RUSH IN RUSSIA

(By Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy)

Soviet leaders make no secret of their plans to overtake the United States, indeed as Khrushchev has said "to bury you," in the utilization of their natural resources as in all other production.

In support of their ambitions, U.S.S.R. irrigation officials aim to develop 2.5 million acres of new irrigation lands each year for the next 20 years. This goal seemed incredible to us as specialists of reclamation in the United States, until we had the opportunity to assess the actual development and potential of Russia's land and water resources.

On the 3-week cultural exchange tour made last September, I headed a group of top U.S. irrigation engineers and leaders who inspected existing and potential irrigation developments in the U.S.S.R. Members of the U.S. delegation from the Department of the Interior were Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior Robert W. Nelson and Bureau of Reclamation members, Gilbert G. Stam, Chief of the Division of Irrigation and Land Use, Washington, D.C.; Hollis Sanford, Chief of the Division of Irrigation Operations; and Frank E. Rippon, Chief of the Canals Branch, both of the Office of Chief Engineer, Denver, Colo.

Other U.S. delegates were Ned Greenwood, of the Soil Conservation Service; M. C. Bryant, rancher and businessman from San Angelo, Tex.; Floyd E. Bonge, vice president of the Eastern Municipal District, Hemet, Calif.; Dr. J. B. Fuller, member of the Federal Farm Credit Board and longtime chairman of the board of commissioners of the Goshen Irrigation District, North Platte project, Nebraska; and LeSalle E. Coles, past president of the National Reclamation Association, Prineville, Oreg.

Local Soviet officials repeatedly made reference to the importance of irrigation in meeting the food and fiber needs not only of the U.S.S.R. but also of the underdeveloped nations of the world. It is plain that these leaders are looking to the dependability of irrigation in their homeland to strengthen their bid for world supremacy. Consequently, Soviet officials are moving rapidly, though somewhat awkwardly, to develop their country's vast potential in water and land resources.

VISITED TWO IMPORTANT AREAS

Escorting the American delegation wherever we requested, cordial Soviet hosts arranged for the Americanskys, as we are called in that country, to become acquanited with two important irrigation areas, Ceneral Asia and Transcaucasia.

In Central Asia, the Republic of Uzbek, which has a most picturesque land and culture, is one of the greatest producers and is a major contributor to the Soviet Union's Central Asian breadbasket. A primitive Uzbek people was captured by the Russian czars in 1859. Even with modern technology utilizing their rich native soil, these primarily Asiatic people called Uzbekians still live a relatively primitive and genuinely friendly existence. The adjacent Republics of Tadzhik and Kirgiz are similarly impressive.

People in the Republics of Azerbaidzhan, Georgia, and Armenia in the Transcaucasian area live in a more advanced technology and European influence in contrast to those of the Central Asian Republics.

Located along the 40th parallel, which in the United States is the border dividing Nebraska and Kansas and cuts through the northern parts of Colorado, Utah, Nevada, and California, these high water-yielding areas include millions of acres of fertile land suitable for irrigation.

Many thousands of acres of the primary crop of cotton can be seen from roadside. A few single-row cottonpicking machines were observed in equipment yards, but nearly all of the irrigated cottonfields are harvested by the armies of hand pickers. In contrast, nearly all of the irrigated cotton in the United States is picked mechanically.

Alfalfa and corn production is spotty, but they are used to some extent in rotation with

cotton. Grapes are grown in great variety and quantity. Other important specialty crops include melons, figs, peaches, pears, apples, and nuts. Production of silk is important in some parts.

SHEEP GRAZING HEAVY

Central Asia grazes millions of sheep, primarily the fat-tailed variety, and comparatively few cattle. In Transcaucasia, the relative importance of cattle was greater. Most cattle are the dairy or dual-purpose type, with quality only fair. Development plans call for irrigation of several hundred thousand acres of mountain valley grazing land in Transcaucasia, which will improve the distribution of stockwater and increase production of milk, meat, and wool.

An infestation of noxious weeds including Canada thistle prevails in overabundance and remedial action is not evident.

Each Republic has its own well-financed design institute and hydraulics laboratory to exercise major influence over the formulation of new project plans and construction. Operations at the institutes include work in irrigation, drainage, hydraulics, soils, economics, soil and water relationships, hydraulic structures, soil mechanics, sprinkler irrigation, and machine testing. The Georgian S.S.R. hydraulics laboratory alone has an annual budget of $750,000.

Seepage from canals is a severe problem in some areas and local officials have not yet determined upon the best method of treatment. In one case the loss was estimated to be 17 percent in a 36-mile reach, a loss similar to that of many unlined canals in Western United States.

Many miles of precast concrete flumes are being installed to distribute irrigation water to irrigable lands.

Because of expansion and contraction, the joints in concrete flumes open up and leak to some extent. This results in settlement of the flume supports, misalinement, and other maintenance problems. A new type of mastic for sealing the flume joints is being developed and used in some lines. The new mastic is presumably an adhesive type of plastic material with considerable elasticity.

Some good-quality asbestos cement pipe is manufactured in the Soviet Union and is being used to a limited extent in the irrigation systems. However, virtually no concrete pipe is manufactured or used for this purpose.

In the Hungary Steppe generally the lands are afflicted by severe salt problems. The reclamation process includes construction of main drains, lateral drains, and numerous temporary open drains to permit rapid leaching of the soils. Land containing 8-percent salt must be reduced to 2 percent before crops are planted. Some of these lands are planted to rice for 3 to 4 years. After the salt problem is sufficiently corrected, cotton is planted.

After initial reclamation, the temporary drains are eliminated and many of the permanent drainage laterals are lined in tile. A machine developed in the U.S.S.R. is reported capable of laying drainage tile up to 10½-foot depths.

A large plant operation serving the Hungary Steppe development makes precast reinforced-concrete flume sections in four sizes with depths of 16, 24, 32, and 40 inches.

In Azerbaidzhan, which currently irrigates 3 million acres of land, the 60-foot-high Pirsagat Dam is being constructed of an expansive clay to provide supplemental irrigation water to an area principally devoted to feed crops and livestock. Their method of dam construction is not being used in the United States. When taken from the pits, the clay is 16 to 18 percent moisture by weight. After the clay is placed on the dam by truck and spread by tractor-dozer, water is added to raise the moisture content to 27 percent. No mechanical compaction is used except that which is incidental to movement of trucks and tractors over the surface as the layers are applied.

A large amount of irrigable land is irrigated by sprinkler systems. The sprinkler heads are of different design, but similar in principle to those in the United States.

The Republic of Armenia has some irrigation works in and near its capital city of Yerevan which are reported to be 2,000 years old. Extending from Lake Sevan to Yerevan is the costly Sevan-Razdan power and irrigation system now irrigating 32,000 acres of land. When completed it will irrigate 74,000 acres. The system includes 178 flumes (78 are finished and in operation), 70 steel siphons, and 13 bridges. The route of the canal contains eight power sites, six of which have been developed. All are operated from a central control panel in Yerevan and are interconnected with the Transcaucasion power system. Two of these plants are constructed underground.

A portion of the shoreline of Lake Sevan is equipped experimentally with automatic devices for applying fatty alcohols (principally hexadecanol) to the lake surface to reduce surface evaporation.

SOME COMPARISONS

Similar research is being conducted in the United States by or in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, the chief difference being that we have concentrated on the use of a powdered form of compound, while the U.S.S.R. is using a liquid. Laboratory officials supplied the tour group with a sample of the Soviet's liquid compound. They reported experiments to date reveal that evaporation from Lake Sevan can be reduced 20 to 25 percent.

To reclamationists from the United States who inspected the water resource facilities and developments in the Soviet Union, it is evident that the differences in the programs of the two countries are like the differences in the philosophies of the two. America's development is dependent primarily upon individual initiative and free enterprise, and the Soviet's upon decisions and orders from the committee and the followers of Lenin.

In spite of gigantic efforts to increase production, improve housing, and generally raise standards of living, years will be required for Russia to develop, manufacture, and build the plants, products, and structures necessary to equal the present-day accomplishments of the United States.

Although it is not known what proportion of the national budget is used for development of her rich natural resources compared to the share devoted to the buildup of military might and exploration of space, it is evident that the Soviets neither waste time nor withhold rubles from their reclamation effort.

Whatever the outcome of the Soviet move, it will behoove us to spare no effort, under our own system of private enterprise and cooperation, to maintain and foster a positive resource development program. It is a keystone in our national economy.

An American Citizen Speaks His Mind on Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter written to the editors of a number of newspapers by a citizen of Dallas, Tex., the district I have the privilege to represent in the House. Mr. A. G. Hill, well respected for his patriotic participation in governmental affairs expresses the thoughts of many as to our inept and confused policy which led to the humiliation of this Government at the hands of riot-bent mobs in Panama.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1964.

To the EDITOR,
The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

The facts seem quite clear that the rioting in Panama was incited and encouraged by Communist agents, Panamanian politicians and local radio stations. There were no aggressive acts by American citizens and no invasion of Panama by any American personnel. All rioting took place in the Canal Zone.

In view of these facts it would seem that our Government would be requesting an apology and indemnity for loss of American lives and payment of damages for loss of American property. However, no such request has been made, and it has now been announced in the face of continued bitter and unfounding charges by the Panamanian Government and the breaking off of diplomatic relations by them, that we will continue giving foreign aid to Panama if we are assured that our representatives passing out the gifts will not be harmed.

What has happened to our national honor, logic, integrity, principles, and courage?

Sincerely yours,

A. G. HILL.

Memorial to God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following reaction to the suggestion that a Memorial to God be built in Washington. The author is Henry Harris, editor of the West Point (Miss.) Times Leader. It follows:

(By Henry Harris)

President Lyndon Johnson has proposed that all of America's religious faiths join in erecting in Washington "a fitting memorial to the God who made us all." The suggestion rings with both politics and paganism. What type of fitting memorial could be built for God. We're told in the 20th chapter of Exodus: "* * * You shall have no other gods before Me. You shall not make yourself a graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them or serve them; for I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and the fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments."

The greatest monument to God which could be built in Washington would be in the form of dedicated Christian governmental officials who put the teachings of Jesus above the power of the ballot * * * who treat their own bodies as God's holy temples * * * and who set an example of decency and dedication for the entire Nation to follow.

"A fitting memorial to God" in Washington? Why the entire universe is a memorial and a monument to God. If we but look, we see monuments to Him every day * * * in the brilliance of a sunset * * * in the majesty of the towering snow-capped mountains * * * in the glorious eruption of spring * * * in the laughter of a little child.

Skeletons Rattle—New Troubles Pry Loose Old Plans for Second Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting discussion of new canal possibilities in Central America, taken from the February 3 issue of Washington World:

SKELETONS RATTLE—NEW TROUBLES PRY LOOSE OLD PLANS FOR SECOND CANAL

Capitol Hill talk of a new Atlantic-Pacific canal is rattling the pages of history and uncovering many long-lost skeletons.

Perhaps the most interesting deals with the selection of Nicaragua for the original canal site, the approval of the proposal in the Senate, the upheaval in the House and the ultimate compromise that placed the canal in Panama.

The prime backer of the canal through Nicaragua was American financier Cornelius Vanderbilt, whose Accessory Transit Co. transported California-bound gold prospectors and later settlers up the San Juan River across Lake Nicaragua and then by coach or wagon to the Pacific for the coastal ship run up to California. The backers stressed the fact that only a 12-mile land cut would have to be made on the west side of the lake to connect with the ocean and an all-water route would be completed.

This was so strongly supported with money and logic that it enjoyed clear sailing through the Senate.

FRENCH GET BREAK

However, the backers of the proposal for the United States to bail out the French company that had spent 24 years and more than $300 million in an unsuccessful effort to dig across the Isthmus of Panama were not to be outdone. They had done their work well in the House. The Republic of Nicaragua issued a new postage stamp showing the huge volcano, Momotombo, and this was the break the French had been seeking.

Every Member of Congress received a post card mailed from Managua, Nicaragua, with the picture of the volcano and the question: Is this where you want the canal to go?

Finesse won out over brute strength and dollars and Panama was approved by Congress in 1902.

President Teddy Roosevelt was unable to do business with the Republic of Colombia of which Panama was then a province.

What followed is described by historians "as brazen a bit of imperial landgrabbing as is recorded in modern times."

The Panamanians revolted. This news reached the White House at 11:31 a.m. on November 6, 1902, and 76 minutes later the Republic of Panama was officially recognized. Seven days later, the two countries signed a treaty which gave the United States, in perpetuity, a zone 5 miles wide on either side of the canal.

HEART OF CRISIS

This treaty is the heart of the present Panama crisis.

The canal was completed between 1904 and 1914 and the first ship, the SS *Ancon*, started through the canal August 15, 1914.

Meanwhile, the proponents of the Nicaraguan canal site were not idle. Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan signed a treaty in 1914 which gave the United States exclusive rights for a canal on the San Juan River across Lake Nicaragua and into the Pacific for a period of 99 years. The price paid for this was $3 million.

The U.S. Senate approved this pact in 1916, but this only released unexpected furies.

Costa Rica protested that Nicaragua could not concede exclusive rights on the San Juan River which was Costa Rica's boundary as well as Nicaragua's. El Salvador denounced a provision which permitted the United States to build naval bases in the Bay of Fonseca, which El Salvador considered as a threat to her territory.

These protests were heard by the Central American Court, which rendered verdicts in favor of Costa Rica and El Salvador.

VERDICT IGNORED

Although the United States had helped to create the Central American Court, the verdict was ignored and the court went out of existence in 1918.

Nicaraguans have from time to time encouraged the United States to build a canal and through the years Members of Congress have introduced legislation to establish a commission to explore the possibility of a new canal.

The late Senator Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee for many years introduced such a bill and for the last half dozen years Representative DAN FLOOD, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., has been sponsoring a measure to establish a study commission.

With the Panama crisis, Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and WAYNE MORSE, two influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have spoken out in favor of an alternate canal site.

MANSFIELD has urged Mexico with help from other maritime nations to build a sea-level canal from Tehuantepec to Coatzacoalcos in southern Mexico. This canal would follow the Trans-Isthmus highway (Route 185) a distance of 193 miles.

USE OF EXPLOSIVES?

MANSFIELD says the sea-level canal can be built economically and quickly, especially with the use of atomic explosives for excavation.

Proponents of the Nicaraguan canal say atomic explosives can also be used and that 10 to 12 miles can be dug much quicker than 193 miles, even if the short strip is a bit higher.

Meanwhile, Senator NORRIS COTTON, of Lebanon, N.H., has introduced a measure that would create a commission to explore the possibility of a new Atlantic-Pacific canal in Central America.

Goal for a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, February 23, Chicago's Sunday American carried an editorial entitled, "Goal for a Nation," which I should like to call to the attention of not only my colleagues here in Congress but to every single other American involved directly or indirectly, including the President, in the gigantic task of planning for America's future.

This is one of the finest editorials that I have seen. It clearly and succintly places the whole problem of racial unrest in its proper perspective and boldly outlines a realistic program which I am sure we Americans can carry out.

This editorial quite properly points out that the time has come to take a second look at some of our efforts to help other nations when problems continue grave here in our own country. I am happy to say that Congress last year reduced foreign aid expenditures considerably, and I was privileged to participate in that reduction. This year the President himself has recommended substantial cuts and I am sure his request will be trimmed even further, by the Congress.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I believe the program outlined by Chicago's Sunday American offers all of us an excellent guideline for getting at the very root of America's domestic problem of chronic and costly unemployment.

This editorial's plea for job retraining to put people back to work takes on even added significance when we recall that in the one State of Illinois alone, our State legislature last year had to appropriate $690 million for general relief in Illinois for this biennium.

I know of no more costly problem to all American taxpayers than the unemployed American whose basic needs must be fulfilled by his fellow Americans through general relief or some other form of public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate Mr. Stuart List, publisher, and Mr. Lloyd Wendt, editor, for this excellent editorial which follows:

GOAL FOR A NATION

We cannot forever survive the kind of internal dissension which has brought this Nation repeatedly to the brink of disaster during the last several months. The aspirations of the Negro for social freedom and economic justice must be realized not only because they are morally right, but because revolution or genocide are the only alternatives and they are impossible alternatives.

Both whites and Negroes have been guilty in the past of treating the problem emotionally and politically, without finding solutions which will be just, realistic and permanent. Such solutions must be found, if all of our children are to have any peace and security.

It is not enough to say that civil rights must be recognized legally and morally. There will be no real advance toward a final solution until minority groups, of whatever color, approach a state of actual equality. That means economic equality. If you have jobs, and income, you ultimately can provide the sort of social environment in which you want to live.

To get jobs you must first have jobs available. Second, you must be trained for them, or be retrained. Third, you must not be barred for any artificial reason, such as race. Right now we're working only on the elimination of the third factor.

What is really needed is a massive program for the education and retraining of the minority group. Pending the effect of such a program, it will be necessary to create jobs.

Instead of planning to spend billions to land men on the moon, billions for foreign aid, we might better divert a great deal of this money toward the provision of education and jobs for our unemployed minorities.

During World War II we had the Manhattan project. Billions were spent on it. Busi-

ness production was rechanneled for it. Our best brains were committed to it. Few knew that the ultimate goal was to be the production of an atomic bomb. But we all knew that somehow the Manhattan project might save the country.

We need now a Manhattan project to save the country from the disaster of racial conflict. We need the ideas of the best brains we can assemble. We need to devote all the billions that are required. We need to dislocate the status quo where necessary to achieve the ultimate goal, which is the realization of the American dream.

First, education will be needed.

If, to bring the minority child up to a competitive status, we must spend more money on him than on the majority child, then this should be done. Not to unfairly favor the minority, but because he must have educational equality if we are to have responsibility and stability. In other words, since the Negro has had educational disadvantages over the years, we must now give him the best possible education to create the responsible citizenship needed.

If, as the statistics show, the Negro is much harder hit by unemployment than any other group, then we will have to work harder retraining the unemployed Negro and provide him with work useful to the community and useful to him. Otherwise, he cannot be a responsible, stable member of the community.

Certain Negro leaders who want dissension and chaos will not welcome these suggestions, since they thrive on the disaffected. Certain Negro politicians will object because they now can easily control unschooled constituents living in a ghetto.

Certain white people will object because they regard themselves as naturally and insufferably superior, or they fear they are not superior and don't want Negro competition.

The minority problem is not going to go away for the benefit of any of these. It is with us. It will grow greater, rather than less. So long as the problem is kicked around by politicians for partisan benefits, there will be no solution.

What is needed is the bipartisan approach of wartime. The Congress can create a study commission to hear all sides of the racial minority problem and to recommend ultimately an all-out attack that will give the minorities education and a chance for jobs. Armed with these accourements, the minorities will get social justice without demonstrations, without violence, and without dying under madmen's bombs.

The Revenue Act of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the Revenue Act of 1964 has now been written into law by the House of Representatives and the Senate. I am informed that the President will sign the legislation today, thereby putting the act into full force and effect.

Since many of our taxpayers are interested in knowing what the act will do insofar as their income tax liabilities of the future are concerned, I have secured a group of sample tables from the Treasury Department. While not all inclusive, the tables do accurately reflect the opinion of the Treasury Department as to how this legislation will operate as to the class of taxpayers mentioned in the tables.

Because of my belief that these tables will be of interest to many of our citizens, I ask that they be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Sample tax cut tables follow:

Single taxpayer with standard deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	$60	$14	$46	77
$1,500	150	85	65	43
$2,000	240	161	79	33
$3,000	422	329	93	22
$4,000	620	500	120	19
$5,000	818	671	147	18
$6,000	1,048	866	182	17
$7,500	1,405	1,168	237	17
$10,000	2,096	1,742	354	17
$12,500	2,982	2,478	504	17
$15,000	4,002	3,334	668	17
$17,500	5,153	4,291	862	17
$20,000	6,412	5,350	1,062	17

Married couple with no dependents with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0	0	0
$1,500	$30	0	$30	100
$2,000	120	$56	64	53
$3,000	300	200	100	33
$4,000	480	354	126	26
$5,000	660	501	159	24
$6,000	844	658	186	22
$7,500	1,141	915	226	20
$10,000	1,636	1,342	294	18
$12,500	2,278	1,886	392	17
$15,000	2,960	2,460	500	17
$17,500	3,710	3,085	625	17
$20,000	4,532	3,764	768	17

Married couple with 1 dependent with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0	--------	--------
$1,500	0	0	--------	--------
$2,000	0	0	--------	--------
$3,000	$180	$98	$82	46
$4,000	360	245	115	32
$5,000	540	402	138	26
$6,000	720	552	168	23
$7,500	1,009	800	209	21
$10,000	1,504	1,228	276	18
$12,500	2,122	1,754	368	17
$15,000	2,780	2,310	470	17
$17,500	3,530	2,935	595	17
$20,000	4,328	3,596	732	17

Married couple with 2 dependents with standard deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0	--------	--------
$1,500	0	0	--------	--------
$2,000	0	0	--------	--------
$3,000	$60	0	$60	100
$4,000	240	$140	100	42
$5,000	420	290	130	31
$6,000	600	450	150	25
$7,500	877	686	191	22
$10,000	1,372	1,114	258	19
$12,500	1,966	1,622	344	17
$15,000	2,616	2,172	444	17
$17,500	3,350	2,785	565	17
$20,000	4,124	3,428	696	17

Married couple, both over 65, with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0	--------	--------
$1,500	0	0	--------	--------
$2,000	0	0	--------	--------
$3,000	0	0	--------	--------
$4,000	$144	$103	$41	28
$5,000	300	218	82	27
$6,000	456	338	118	26
$7,500	720	561	159	22
$10,000	1,196	973	223	19

Married couple with 1 dependent with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$420	$309	$111	26
$6,000	576	434	142	25
$7,500	844	668	176	21
$10,000	1,328	1,087	241	18
$12,500	1,816	1,509	307	17
$15,000	2,369	1,967	383	17
$17,500	2,952	2,468	484	16
$20,000	3,590	3,000	590	16
$25,000	5,025	4,196	829	16
$30,000	6,648	5,559	1,089	16
$40,000	10,475	8,766	1,709	16
$50,000	14,912	12,536	2,376	16
$75,000	25,324	21,486	3,838	15
$100,000	37,134	31,526	5,608	15

Married couple with 2 dependents with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$300	$218	$82	27
$6,000	456	338	118	26
$7,500	720	561	159	22
$10,000	1,196	973	223	19
$12,500	1,664	1,337	287	17
$15,000	2,213	1,844	369	17
$17,500	2,772	2,318	454	16
$20,000	3,410	2,850	560	16
$25,000	4,821	4,024	797	16
$30,000	6,420	5,367	1,053	16
$40,000	10,188	8,525	1,663	16
$50,000	14,576	12,248	2,328	16
$75,000	24,952	21,168	3,784	15
$100,000	36,720	31,178	5,542	15

Married couple with 3 dependents with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$180	$129	$51	28
$6,000	336	245	91	27
$7,500	600	459	141	24
$10,000	1,064	859	205	19
$12,500	1,531	1,263	268	18
$15,000	2,057	1,712	345	17
$17,500	2,610	2,179	431	17
$20,000	3,230	2,700	530	16
$25,000	4,617	3,856	761	16
$30,000	6,192	5,175	1,017	16
$40,000	9,906	8,291	1,615	16
$50,000	14,255	11,971	2,284	16
$75,000	24,580	20,850	3,730	15
$100,000	36,330	30,840	5,490	15

Single taxpayer over 65 with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0	--------	--------
$1,500	$30	0	$30	100
$2,000	120	$56	64	53
$3,000	300	209	91	30
$4,000	488	386	102	21
$5,000	686	557	129	19
$6,000	892	734	158	18
$7,500	1,243	1,031	212	17
$10,000	1,900	1,580	320	17

Married couple with 3 dependents with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	0	0		
$4,000	$120	$42	$78	65
$5,000	300	185	115	38
$6,000	480	338	142	30
$7,500	750	578	172	23
$10,000	1,240	1,000	240	19
$12,500	1,810	1,490	320	18
$15,000	2,460	2,040	420	17
$17,500	3,170	2,635	535	17
$20,000	3,920	3,260	660	17

Married couple with 4 dependents with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0			
$1,500	0			
$2,000	0			
$3,000	0			
$4,000	0			
$5,000	$180	$84	$96	53
$6,000	360	230	130	36
$7,500	630	467	163	26
$10,000	1,108	886	222	20
$12,500	1,658	1,361	297	18
$15,000	2,304	1,908	396	17
$17,500	2,990	2,485	505	17
$20,000	3,740	3,110	630	17

Married couple with no dependents with typical average itemized deductions

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$5,000	$540	$405	$135	25
$6,000	696	535	161	23
$7,500	976	782	194	20
$10,000	1,460	1,201	259	18
$12,500	1,972	1,641	331	17
$15,000	2,525	2,108	417	16
$17,500	3,133	2,618	515	16
$20,000	3,770	3,150	620	16
$25,000	5,229	4,367	862	16
$30,000	6,886	5,762	1,124	16
$40,000	10,775	9,018	1,757	16
$50,000	15,248	12,824	2,424	16
$75,000	25,696	21,804	3,892	15
$100,000	37,548	31,874	5,674	15

Married couple both over 65 with standard deduction

Income (wages and salary)	Present tax	New tax	Tax cut	Percent of tax cut
$1,000	0	0		
$1,500	0	0		
$2,000	0	0		
$3,000	$60	0	$60	100
$4,000	240	$140	100	42
$5,000	420	290	130	31
$6,000	600	450	150	25
$7,500	877	686	191	22
$10,000	1,372	1,114	258	19

Goal for a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing dialog among Americans as to the need for equality and equal opportunity for all regardless of race, color, or creed, the newspapers and the television industry have contributed a great service in giving expression to the feelings of the great majority of our citizens.

The realization of equal opportunity for all cannot come about simply through good will and legislative declaration. If racial discrimination were suddenly to disappear in this country, there would still remain problems of similar magnitude before real equality could be achieved.

One of our city's leading editors, Lloyd Wendt, of the Chicago American, has shown a perceptive understanding of some of the problems that have not been given the proper emphasis, and in the Sunday American of this last week he made a thoughtful presentation of his point of view. Under leave to extend my remarks I include his article and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

GOAL FOR A NATION

We cannot forever survive the kind of internal dissension which has brought this Nation repeatedly to the brink of disaster during the last several months. The aspirations of the Negro for social freedom and economic justice must be realized not only because they are morally right, but because revolution or genocide are the only alternatives and they are impossible alternatives.

Both whites and Negroes have been guilty in the past of treating the problem emotionally and politically, without finding solutions which will be just, realistic, and permanent. Such solutions must be found, if all of our children are to have any peace and security.

It is not enough to say that civil rights must be recognized legally and morally. There will be no real advance toward a final solution until minority groups, of whatever color, approach a state of actual equality. That means economic equality. If you have jobs, and income, you ultimately can provide the sort of social environment in which you want to live.

To get jobs you must first have jobs available. Second, you must be trained for them, or be retrained. Third, you must not be barred for any artificial reason, such as race. Right now we're working only on the elimination of the third factor.

What is really needed is a massive program for the education and retraining of the minority group. Pending the effect of such a program, it will be necessary to create jobs.

Instead of planning to spend billions to land men on the moon, billions for foreign aid, we might better divert a great deal of this money toward the provision of education and jobs for our unemployed minorities.

During World War II we had the Manhattan project. Billions were contributed to it. Business production was rechanneled for it. Our best brains were committed to it. Few knew that the ultimate goal was to be the production of an atomic bomb. But we all knew that somehow the Manhattan project might save the country.

We need now a Manhattan project to save the country from the disaster of racial conflict. We need the ideas of the best brains we can assemble. We need to devote all the billions that are required. We need to dislocate the status quo where necessary to achieve the ultimate goal, which is the realization of the American dream.

First, education will be needed.

If, to bring the minority child up to a competitive status, we must spend more money on him than on the majority child, then this should be done. Not to unfairly favor the minority, but because he must have educational equality if we are to have responsibility and stability. In other words, since the Negro has had educational disadvantages over the years, we must now give him the best possible education to create the responsible citizenship needed.

If, as the statistics show, the Negro is much harder hit by unemployment than any other group, then we will have to work harder retraining the unemployed Negro and provide him with work useful to the community and useful to him. Otherwise, he cannot be a responsible, stable member of the community.

Certain Negro leaders who want dissension and chaos will not welcome these suggestions, since they thrive on the disaffected. Certain Negro politicians will object because they now can easily control unschooled constituents living in a ghetto.

Certain white people will object because they regard themselves as naturally and insufferably superior, or they fear they are not superior and don't want Negro competition.

The minority problem is not going to go away for the benefit of any of these. It is with us. It will grow greater, rather than less. So long as the problem is kicked around by politicians for partisan benefits, there will be no solution.

What is needed is the bipartisan approach of wartime. The Congress can create a study commission to hear all sides of the racial minority problem and to recommend ultimately an all-out attack that will give the minorities education and a chance for jobs. Armed with these accoutrements, the minorities will get social justice without demonstrations, without violence, and without dying under madmen's bombs.

Death of a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, during the period of time set aside by the House of Representatives for tributes to the memory of the late President, I was privileged to bring to the attention of my colleagues several articles and editorials from newspapers in my district in southeastern Massachusetts—an area well known and loved by John F. Kennedy.

The purpose of doing so was to illustrate the kind of stunned reaction and deep sorrow that was felt by people who not only knew John Kennedy as a former Congressman and Senator, and ultimately President of the United States, but also as a neighbor and friend.

It has been brought to my attention that my tribute omitted reference to a newspaper that is published in the town that was, on many occasions, the site of the temporary White House, Hyannis, Mass.

The newspaper, the largest on Cape Cod, is the Cape Cod Standard-Times. The title of the fine editorial they published upon receipt of that tragic news is, "Death of a President."

Even though the time of official mourning is passed, the shock and sorrow of this event are still with us, and these heartfelt words are as timely as they were on November 23, 1963:

DEATH OF A PRESIDENT

A Nation is still aghast by the virtually incredible assassination of its President.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a Cape Cod colonist by affection, was shot down yesterday in Texas, shot down in the prime of his being in a horrifying burst of gunfire that stunned the entire world.

The President was waving from a limousine when the treacherous attack deprived the world of an acknowledged leader.

It couldn't happen—but it did.

And that it did left the country utterly shocked in disbelief. The country hoped against hope, when the President was taken into a hospital that he would emerge alive, that he could continue his vigorous tenure in the White House.

It was not to be; a remarkable career had been ended by an assassin's bullet.

For it was a remarkable career that had been shared in happy days from youth to this summer with his Cape Cod neighbors. It had seen him rise through the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate to the Presidency of the world's greatest power. All had thrilled, on a bitterly cold day in January 1961, to one of the most inspiring inaugural addresses ever delivered. All had trembled, with him, only a year ago, on the precipice of nuclear war involving Cuba.

And now he is gone to his Maker, deprived, in a tick of history, of his tremendous joy of life, of his supreme confidence that this could be made into a better world.

It happened and mankind mourns him and presses its sorrowing condolences on a bereft family.

National Children's Dental Health Week, February 2–8, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 through 8 of this year, the country once again observed National Children's Dental Health Week. This was the 16th consecutive year for such an observance. As did his three predecessors in their time, President Johnson issued a message saluting the event and from reports already received it is clear that a great many related activities took place all over the Nation, not the least of them, I am happy to say, in my own State of Pennsylvania.

There are two facts most worthy of note concerning dental disease. First, that it is perhaps mankind's most widespread affliction. Almost no one is immune to it or free from its effects. Nine out of 10 people suffer from some form of dental disease and 85 million manhours of work are lost annually because of it. And yet, the second fact worth noting is that few diseases can be more readily controlled by the exercise of a little care and diligence.

As in the past, the American Dental Association and its local societies carried out this year a massive educational effort. The 7th district and 10th district dental societies of Pennsylvania, to which the dentists in my district belong, were again an important part of this national effort. During the 7 days of the observance, schoolchildren everywhere undertook special projects, saw films and heard talks designed to increase their understanding of dentistry and dental health.

For many years, the dental profession has thus wisely concentrated much of its educational efforts on young people. If in his youth a person can learn the value of good dental health and develop the habits of a proper diet, regular brushing after meals and periodic visits to the family dentist, then he can be confident of enjoying sound dental health throughout his life. The intimate relationship between it and good general health makes this a goal well worth striving for.

The dental profession has made remarkable strides in recent years in discovering and applying new methods for the treatment and prevention of dental disease. They are today on the threshold of even greater discoveries, possibly even a vaccine against tooth decay. But the family dentist still needs the active cooperation of each of us if the present appalling rate of dental disease is to be reduced. While the events of National Children's Dental Health Week are still fresh in our minds, it is appropriate that all of us, especially the parents of young children, resolve to give him that cooperation more consistently in the future than we perhaps have in the past.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a bright flame marks the final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery of one of freedom's most ardent and eloquent advocates. The voice once so familiar in these halls is now hushed in tragic death. While its sound no longer greets our ears, its bold and fervid enunciations will never be forgotten.

That heroic devotion to truth and justice, to equality and fraternity, we so often admired, and which is exemplified by countless acts and incidents extending through years of an active existence, is a most worthy example for all good men.

The principles which he professed and the work which he performed, professions and practice being in perfect harmony, will in all future time and in all nations render the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy a synonym for human liberty.

His oratorical powers, general information, and keenness of wit gained for him a worldwide affection. As an advocate he was quick and powerful. Laying hold of the strong points in a cause, he presented them in a succinct and comprehensive manner. He was always an ardent friend of public improvement and universal education, a bitter opponent to human slavery and oppression.

The grand blows which he struck in his great battle for liberty and justice will long survive him and leave their impress upon all lands, strengthening the purpose of the toiling and struggling millions on earth. His successful life-battle should teach us the value and self-sustaining power of a career consecrated to the best interests of his country and his fellowmen.

In this impressive hour, while reviewing his heroic and unselfish acts, let us renew our vows of fidelity to the great principles which he so long, so ably, and so faithfully maintained. Let us here, and now, pledge our lives anew to the cause of human liberty and human progress, resolving that no obstacle nor selfish interest shall cause us to falter, so that when we too pass away the benedictions of mankind shall bless us, as they now bless him for whom we mourn, and it shall be said of us as it is now said of him: "He hath not lived in vain."

The image of John Fitzgerald Kennedy needs no monument. The imprint of his mind is upon the history of his country, and is more ineffaceable there than all the dedication we authorize in his memory. It is the Stalins who die in their beds. It is the Lincolns and the Kennedys, the humanitarians and reformers who die with their boots on. As policies are bigger than men may it be the legacy to our great Nation that much of what our late President initiated will go forward.

Many Members of the House Have Today Introduced Identical Bills To Materially Reduce Meat Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill which, if made law, will materially reduce imports on all meats of every description, including livestock, by 50 percent. At least 12 of my colleagues of the House will or have today introduced identical bills to my bill, H.R. 10099, and I invite all my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle to do likewise.

The provisions contained in H.R. 10099 are as follows:

H.R. 10099

A bill to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the total quantity of meat and meat products originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during any twelve-month import period, shall not (except as provided in section 3) exceed 50 per centum of the average annual quantity of meat and meat products imported from such country during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "meat and meat products" includes (A) beef, veal, lamb, mutton, pork, poultry, and any other meat to which part 2 of schedule 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the

United States applies, whether or not prepared or preserved and whether canned, cured, dressed, or in any other form, (B) live animals imported to provide meat of any kind for human consumption, and (C) any food product which contains meat, of any kind or in any form, and which is intended for human consumption; and

(2) the term "twelve-month import period" means the twelve-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or any subsequent twelve-month period beginning on an anniversary of such date.

SEC. 3. If, during any twelve-month import period (after the first such period), the total United States market for meat and meat products (as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture) exceeds the total average annual United States market for meat and meat products during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963, the maximum quantity of meat and meat products which could otherwise be imported into the United States from any country during such period within the limitation imposed by the first section of this Act shall be increased to an amount bearing the same ratio to such quality as such market during the twelve-month import period bears to such total average annual market during such five-year period.

SEC. 4. Each quantity referred to in the first section of this Act shall be expressed in terms of dollar value, or in terms of such other units (as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture) as will permit its magnitude to be measured, or equated or compared with other quantities in determining whether and to what extent the limitation imposed by such section is applicable, without regard to the kinds of meat and meat products or the proportion of the various kinds of meat and meat products which are included in such quantity. In the case of a product which contains but is not composed exclusively of meat, there shall be taken into account, in determining the magnitude of the quantity involved, only so much of such product, or only so much of the value of such product, as constitutes or is attributable to the meat contained therein.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him jointly with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make such determinations and establish such procedures as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this Act.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Crisis in Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the United States face a serious economic crisis in coming months. I believe there is overwhelming evidence to show that, in the absence of congressional action, farm income will drop to its lowest level in several years.

On January 15, I addressed the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 439—on this subject. At that time I pointed out recent studies made by agricultural economists in the land-grant colleges, experts with no political axe to grind, about the future economic outlook for farmers.

An Iowa State University study mentioned in that report to the Congress stated that after allowing for the effects of lower prices on production, in the absence of production adjustment and price support programs, net farm income within a few years would fall 40 percent or more.

A 1960 Iowa State study estimated that if price supports, production controls, and the conservation reserve were abandoned, within a few years the prices of hogs and beef cattle, respectively, would decline to 11 cents and 12 cents per pound. The price of corn would fall to 66 cents per bushel, and wheat prices would fall to 74 cents per bushel. Net income from livestock products might fall by 50 percent.

Similar expert estimates were made in studies at Pennsylvania State University and Cornell University. I would seriously invite my colleagues to read this statement in the January 15 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

An article which appeared today in the Wall Street Journal over the byline of Mr. Michael G. Gartner is more directly applicable to the situation in which we find ourselves today.

This article describes the general economic pessimism which is prevalent in farm areas of the Nation today. It cites the USDA estimate of a sharp decrease in farm income for the second year in a row. It is estimated that farm income will fall this year from the 1963 total of $12.3 to $11.6 billion. This prospect, plus low livestock prices, the probability of lower tobacco allotments, the likelihood of a small citrus harvest, and many other factors, is already being reflected in other areas of the economy.

Retail sales in agricultural areas are down, farm equipment sales are down as much as 30 percent in some areas.

This is not a bright picture. The Congress has an opportunity to help improve this picture in the next few days. The biggest single boost to the farm economy would be passage of an adequate wheat program. Farmers, both individually and through their organizations, have indicated they want a voluntary program along the lines of the voluntary certificate program now under consideration.

I feel that a most significant point to consider during deliberations on this proposed wheat program is the fact that it would replace $400 million of farm income without increasing the cost to the Government over what this cost will be in the absence of new legislation. And this is a voluntary, not a mandatory, program.

The article from the February 27 Wall Street Journal mentioned above follows. It is my sincere hope that it will receive the careful study it deserves. It is also my hope that the Congress will act promptly on this vital wheat legislation:

RURAL SLOWDOWN—FARMERS BEGIN TO CUT SPENDING AS THEY FACE BIG DROP IN 1964 INCOME—$700 MILLION EARNINGS DECLINE SEEN AS FARM PRICES SAG; TRACTOR, STORE SALES SLIP—AN ELECTION YEAR HEADACHE?

(By Michael G. Gartner)

While their city cousins confidently look ahead to another year of prosperity, the Nation's farmers are worrying about a recession. They already are cutting back hard on their spending in a trend which could become the Johnson administration's first major economic headache.

From Archbold, Ohio, where an auctioneer talks of a 10-percent decline in used farm equipment prices over the past year, to Storm Lake, Iowa, where a department store manager complains of a 15-percent drop in February business compared with a year earlier, rural businessmen offer a gloomy picture of prospects on the farm. "These people are just hanging onto their purses," says P. A. Ekstrom, sales manager for Brady Implement Co., an International Harvester dealer in Dodge City, Kans., as he reports a 30-percent drop in truck sales so far this year from the like 1963 period.

The farm pessimism seems well founded. According to recent Agriculture Department estimates, farmers' net income this year is expected to fall sharply to $11.6 billion from $12.3 billion in 1963. The drop, which would be the second in a row, would push farm earnings to the lowest level in 5 years.

FROM CATTLE TO ORANGES

Hardly a sector of the farming community seems likely to escape an economic downturn—indeed, some already are beginning to feel the pinch. In the Midwest, prices of cattle and hogs—the backbone of the farm economy there—are hovering near the lowest levels in several years. In the Southeast, a bumper tobacco crop last year has carried stocks well above levels in recent years and a 10-percent reduction in acreage allotments is scheduled for this year. In the citrus areas of Florida, California, and Texas, this year's orange crop is expected to be down 6 percent from last year's freeze-damaged harvest and 20 percent below the 5-year average; the grapefruit story is much the same.

But by far the biggest blow to the farm economy will be felt by wheatgrowers. In a delayed reaction to last year's farmers rejection of acreage controls and high price supports, wheat prices are declining. Prices on new-crop wheat for delivery after July now average about $1.65 a bushel, down more than 30 cents from last year. What's more, Agriculture Secretary Freeman has predicted wheat may fall as low as the support price of $1.25 before the year is out. Altogether, net income of the Nations' wheatgrowers is expected to slide to about $1.7 billion this year, down 25 percent from $2.3 billion in 1963.

While farm prices are on the decline, production costs are on the increase. This year production costs are expected to climb to $29.3 billion, up from $28.7 billion last year.

WHEAT LEGISLATION PUSHED

Such statistics haven't escaped the watchful eyes of Washington. With elections looming in November, the administration is busy trying to push through Congress a bill which would give wheatgrowers some relief from the oncoming slump. With a prod from the White House, Senate Democratic leaders have given top priority to efforts to bring the bill to vote in hope of gaining its passage before the Senate becomes ensnarled in the impending fight over civil rights.

In brief, the administration bill would permit Secretary Freeman to boost the price support to between $1.65 and $2.25 a bushel on domestically consumed wheat and to between $1.30 and $2.25 on wheat for export. It's expected that Mr. Freeman would set supports high enough to restore at least $400 million of this year's expected $600 million drop in wheat farm income.

But the bill's chance of congressional passage remains slim. Even if it passes the Senate, heavy opposition in the House is expected.

So most farmers hold little hope of any big new Federal help this year and are bracing for a rough time. Their fears are being translated mostly into a slowdown in capital expenditures—spending on such things as tractors, plows, and buildings. "Sales of used tractors are off 50 percent so far this year," laments Donald Irion, parts manager of Oahe Implement Co. in the wheat town of Pierre, S. Dak.

A WIDESPREAD DECLINE

Such reports are by no means isolated. Of nearly two score used farm equipment dealers interviewed, about half said sales so far this year were trailing 1963 and they could see nothing ahead to reverse the downtrend.

The capital spending cutback comes partly at the urging of some farm leaders. Garrett Sikkema, president of the Illinois Livestock Feeders Association, this week warned feeders to "tighten their belts" and take a hard look at the present and prospective financial situation of their industry before making any new capital expenditures. "The financial stability of the feeding industry is threatened at this time and it is a known fact that added competition of imports * * * is continuing to contribute to this grave situation," he declared.

Though most spending cutbacks are voluntary, some farmers are facing little choice because of tightening bank credit.

Roby L. Sloan, economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, says "many banks have imposed additional limitations on some types of loans, apparently reflecting greater caution on feeder cattle loans following poor experiences in the 1962–63 feeding year."

Economist Sloan notes, too, that banks are boosting collateral requirement and interest rates on some loans to farmers. He says 10 percent of the agricultural banks in the Seventh Federal Reserve District (Iowa and parts of Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Indiana) now are charging higher rates on nonreal estate loans than they did a year ago and that more than a third of the Iowa banks surveyed reported they were requiring additional collateral.

Opposition to Appointment of Joe Dickerson as Director of the Office of Oil and Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 25, the Milwaukee Sentinel published an editorial questioning the recent appointment of former oil lobbyist Joe Dickerson as head of the Office of Oil and Gas. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POOR UMPIRE

While praising President Johnson, Senator PROXMIRE nevertheless is pouring troubled water on the oil policy of the administration.

As a Senator, Mr. Johnson was a proper champion of the oil industry, PROXMIRE says. As President, he says, Mr. Johnson properly delegated to the Department of the Interior full, complete, and final authority over oil policy.

But now, not so properly in PROXMIRE's view, Interior Secretary Udall has appointed an oil lobbyist, Joe T. Dickerson, to be Director of the Office of Oil and Gas. The Director, PROXMIRE says, should act as an impartial, objective referee between the oil industry and the consumer and between the oil industry and true conservationists whose interests often contradict and conflict with those of the oil industry.

In a Senate speech, PROXMIRE has called the appointment of oil lobbyists to oversee the oil industries "putting the foxes in charge of the henhouse." In the interest of justice for the consumers and taxpayers as well as the oil-producing industry, PROXMIRE is urging President Johnson and Secretary Udall to reconsider this "unfortunate appointment."

It does appear to be something to be reconsidered, especially in the light of the administration's loudly proclaimed concern for consumers. As PROXMIRE put it, "True conservationists, and the American oil consumer have about as much chance of a fair break out of this lineup in the Interior Department with its new sovereignty over the oil industry as the Beatles have of being in President Johnson's Cabinet."

The Situation in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John T. O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News, presented an excellent sizeup of the Panamanian situation through the eyes of a longtime observer of Latin American Affairs. This article was specifically called to my attention by Mr. Guy Trucano, Jr., 1705 Wilmoore SE., Albuquerque, N. Mex. For the information and consideration of my colleagues, the article follows:

AN ANALYSIS BY AN EXPERT: THE SITUATION IN PANAMA

(By John T. O'Rourke)

WASHINGTON.—How did so much public comment about the recent Panamanian riots get so completely off the track? It must baffle even the most charitable mind.

How, indeed, could such a trivial circumstance trigger such crazy behavior?

The real answer is, of course, the rioting was manufactured.

No one, of course, expected anything but lies from Panama's radio and press, or from Moscow, Cuba or anti-American news media in South America.

GUILT FEELING

But how does one explain the guilt feeling, or whatever it was, that obviously inspired various U.S. pundits and commentators and which caused them to swallow the propaganda whole, and blame nonviolent flag-raising schoolchildren and their parents for the organized and deliberate violence and destruction by invading mobs?

News reports, when they stuck to facts, were accurate enough to make actual events clear. The zone was invaded.

But, almost immediately, interpreters began interpreting, predigesters of opinion began masticating, and newspaper readers, and TV and radio listeners all over the country were being told that it was all due to the "colonialism" of the threatened Canal Zone residents, as if they or the canal took money out of Panama, instead of putting money into it. The fact is, far from exploiting the country, the canal brings, directly and indirectly, an amount about equal to the entire Panamanian Republic's annual budget.

There is a background to this tragic event which should at least be roughly sketched in.

COORDINATED RIOT

This riot was planned. A minute-by-minute record of the real attack shows that it started in several strategic places, practically simultaneously.

It was coordinated with sound trucks inciting and directing the mob, and with radio broadcasts on stations owned by both left-wing politicians and the oligarchists.

Panama's Radio Mia network began to build up the story even before the attack.

There's nothing new in all this. Mobs have been used, deliberately and cynically, by the handful of family dynasties which own and have run (badly) Panama ever since the country was founded.

Rioters against the completely legal presence of the United States in the Canal Zone are hired by local politicians during election campaigns to provide a scapegoat for the people they govern, whose poverty they are either unwilling or unable to alleviate. Panama is the second highest recipient of U.S. aid to Latin America.

There is not the slightest reason to suppose, with election only 4 months away, that the riots were, for the first time in Panama's history, a spontaneous reaction to a flag being raised by schoolchildren at a school (built by U.S. taxpayers) inside the Canal Zone. That was the excuse for the riot; not the reason.

Hal Hendrix, Scripps-Howard's seasoned reporter on Latin America, quoted an expert witness that it was the best organized spontaneous riot he ever saw.

In addition to traditional anti-American riots mentioned above, regularly paid for by politicians, the Panamanian background includes equally well-organized campaigns of sloganeering. Walls of buildings are kept bright by students with paintpots, smearing "The canal is ours" and denunciations of "Yankee imperialist dogs." They get paid for the paint job.

U.S. Canal Zone kids read these signs. They are also taught in school the canal's actual status. They know who built it, who paid for it, and who pays the yearly fee to Panama.

They also know that the "imperialist Yankee dogs" referred to means their pop, who perhaps runs one of the locomotives that tow the ships, or who works at the commissary.

POORER BUT COSTLIER

Then there is mother. She, for instance, used to be able to buy good, cheap New Zealand and Australian beef in the Canal Zone. But a couple of years ago, the U.S. Government agreed to buy Panamanian beef instead, which is poorer and costs more.

Perhaps, in this atmosphere, a bit of resentfulness can be understood. Mind you, these U.S. children didn't tear up the Panamanian flag, which is the usual fate of U.S. flags at the hands of Panamanian and other Latin students.

All they did was hoist their own at their school. They shouldn't have done it; granted. But it was a foregone conclusion, when they did, that young Panamanians would march on it. They have been organized (and paid) to do just that sort of thing for years.

The radio was building up the ruckus even before it started. However, it is safe to say that if the flag raising had not been used as a trigger, something else would have been found soon.

Riots like these do not cost much to start.

While the students first threw rocks and burned automobiles, the real fireworks came later in the evening and to assume that it was spontaneous is to display a naivete equal to adult belief in Santa Claus.

There was the radio station owned by Panama's woman deputy, Thelma King, who travels regularly to Castro's Cuba, shouting to people to march on the zone to defend Panama's holy soil, and calling on them to take the guns away from their own national guard and use them, unless the guards joined them in the attack.

There was the Conservative Party radio station, screaming that the only good gringo was a dead gringo.

Although it wasn't reported at first, it is now well known that defending canal police used their weapons only after they ran out of tear gas, and that the U.S. troops were never called out until 7:59 p.m., on Thursday, January 9, after the burning and destroying had been going on inside the Canal Zone for more than 3 hours. (The first batch of students entered the zone at 4:40 p.m.)

ONLY RETURNED FIRE

When snipers fired on the U.S. troops they returned the fire.

This is what President Chiari told his people over the radio was a "cowardly U.S. attack"; this is what Panama's Ambassador

to the United Nations said was "bloody aggression." They knew when they said these things they were lying.

Reporter Hendrix managed to get into the riddled Tivoli Hotel (in the zone but near the border) by Sunday afternoon. U.S. troops were using it as an observation post. It was still under attack. About 850 rounds were fired at it, and 10 Molotov cocktails. All windows on the fire side were smashed by bullets. Trained U.S. marksmen had been posted in the hotel. They directed careful fire at the snipers. Who's attacking whom?

Nevertheless, the fact that U.S. soldiery returned fire with fire was undoubtedly a profound shock, not only in Panama, but all over South America. It's understandable. Let's look at the background again.

In the last big demonstration against the canal, in 1959, U.S. troops stood fast and held their fire, as commanded, while the Panamanian mob stoned them. Although soldiers were felled as they held their ranks, not a cartridge was exploded.

Nevertheless, the next day, a newspaper owned and operated by the son of a former President of Panama, carried a page 1 cartoon showing the face of President Eisenhower with the body of a monster, his claws disemboweling a brave Panamanian youth, and Eisenhower's bloody fangs tearing into the hero's entrails.

Apparently many comparatively recent events have convinced South Americans and others that U.S. troops are, by policy, paper tigers.

Panama's United Nations Ambassador Aguilino Boyd denied the one important new ingredient that made this most recent outbreak different from earlier ones, and more sinister. He said there was no Communist Castro influence.

This ignores the fact that leftwing deputy, Thelma King, screaming for blood on her radio, had been to Havana.

It ignores the fact that 200 or 300 Panamanian "students" had recently been put through Che Guevara's school for guerillas.

AN IGNORED FACT

It ignores the fact that one "student" killed in the riot was one Arosemena, aged 28, married, two children, and had just been in Havana for 3 weeks. A student?

If these are mere coincidences and Ambassador Boyd is right, then only Panama's leading politicians are left to be responsible for the whole thing.

Ambassador Boyd also said his Government had instructed him to say that nothing short of a new treaty, with a view to Panamanian control of the canal, would satisfy.

One resident of Panama City asked our reporter: "How can they expect to run the canal when they can't even collect their own garbage? Look up that street."

And sure enough, the street was filthy with garbage.

Another issue called burning in the news dispatches is the pay and job differentials between Panamanians and United States citizens hired in the zone. Pay has been largely equalized by now but job opportunity differentials still burn.

But most readers do not know that while it has been corrected in the zone, Panamanians themselves still operate not on two differentials, but three; one for Americans, one for Panamanians, and a third for nonnationals who get less than Panamanians for doing the same labor. These are largely Negroes from the Caribbean Islands who have smuggled themselves in to try to earn a living.

Panamanians' financial idealism applies strictly to money from the Yankees; not to their own.

Several years ago, this writer had a conversation with Dr. Harmodio Arias, rich, distinguished lawyer, publisher, former President of Panama, and known all over the world as the legal father of the Panamanian merchant marine, whereby cargo ship owners of other nationality, seeking to escape unionization and taxes, are allowed to lawfully fly the Panamanian flag—for a fee—which Panama collects.

PASSIONATE EDITORIALS

At the time, Dr. Arias' newspaper was publishing passionate editorials on the inequity of the Canal Zone authorities paying U.S. citizens more than Panamanian citizens for doing the same work.

A moment later he admitted that he was doing the same thing, that he was paying American printers more than Panamanian printers.

"They're more efficient," he explained blandly.

The ambivalence of Dr. Arias can be shown in practically every political position its country's leaders assume.

A strong argument can be made for increased canal fees, with more income for Panama and the United States too. (The original investment has never been paid off.) But it is doubtful if increased canal income to Panama would benefit the country's poor. The politicians would more likely raise their own pay. However, increased rates might make a second canal economically attractive to build somewhere else.

UNITED STATES NOT TO BLAME

It is, of course, impossible in one article to explore the whole canal issue, the purpose here is merely to show the climate—the "ambiencia" as the Latins call it—in which this recent storm blew up.

Misconceptions launched by propaganda and faulty interpretation of events have already caused many well-meaning persons to think that somehow the United States was wrong and caused this whole thing.

It didn't.

Four-H Club Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate well know, I have had a longtime and abiding interest in the 4-H Club programs and related Extension Service work.

Recently, my home State of Mississippi sent 33 youngsters, boys and girls who have excelled in their 4-H Club projects, to the National 4-H Club Congress, in Chicago.

I am especially proud of them and their work; and, for that reason, I recommend to the Senate the reading of an editorial published on December 7, 1963, in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger. The editorial points up the good works and the outstanding achievements of these 4-H students, who tomorrow will bear the responsibilities of leadership in their community, State, and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE PROUD OF OUR 33 WINNERS ATTENDING NATIONAL 4-H CONGRESS

Mississippi is proud of those 31 young 4-H Club members and 2 adult leaders attending the National 4-H Club Congress in Chicago this week. They have won this "trip of a lifetime" by virtue of their championship achievements in project work of our State 4-H program.

Our delegates along with some 1,500 other boys, girls, and adult leaders from throughout the Nation are receiving special recognition and awards at the annual 4-H Congress. They are participating in special events, banquets, and various programs as guests of public-spirited sponsors of this big annual event.

In 1907, the late William Hall "Corn Club" Smith as superintendent of schools in Holmes County started what was known at the time as Corn Clubs for Boys. He received prompt and valuable assistance from farm leaders at Mississippi State University. The movement quickly spread across the South and later the entire Nation, under the name of 4-H Clubs.

Since its inception as a nationwide organization, Mississippi has furnished a number of youthful champions in various projects. Here is the honor roll of State delegates to the National Congress this week, competing for national honors and college scholarships in their categories:

Larry Bratton of Bruce, automotive care; Alice Rhea of West Point, poultry; Eloise Scott of Mount Olive, canning.

C. O. Herchenhahn, Jr. of Hattiesburg, dairying; his sister, Melleen Herchenhahn, home economics; Marsha Lynn Jones also of Hattiesburg, dress revue.

Walter Sullivan, Jr. of Lexington, cotton; Edward Cleveland of near Belzoni, truck crops; Billy Logue of Dorsey, corn; Mikell Davis of Bay Springs, pasture; Sandra Hussey of Tupelo, clothing.

Betty Ruth Keel of Holly Springs, frozen foods; Dale Weaver of Smithville, foods; Martha Johnson of Decatur, achievement; Mary Skinner of Union, garden; Linda Harris of Decatur, recreation.

Carolyn Rowzee, health, and Suzanne Simmons, safety, both of State College; Dennis Rester of Poplarville, forestry; Barbara Henderson of Pontotoc, leadership; Mack Young of Marks, field crops; Dan Webb of Florence, citizenship; Melvin Rhodes of Brandon, swine.

Tom Robertson of Holly Ridge, beef; Nancy McClatchy of Indianola, home improvement; Larry Herbison of Bolivar County, tractor; George Garrison of Ripley, achievement; Ralph Meeks of Tiplersville, electric; Kenneth Harrell of Vicksburg, agricultural award; Stanley Anthony of Greenville, leadership; Harley Metcalfe III, of Metcalfe, entomology.

Adult leader winners of trips to the National Congress are the Reverend M. L. Douglass of Wesson, and Mrs. Carl Douglas of Bogue Chitto.

Fellow Mississippians salute each of these leaders, wishing them success at the National Congress and confident that the 4-H Club program will continue to achieve outstanding results in an important field of youth leadership.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the mayor and the board of commissioners of the city of Union City, in my congressional district, endorsing President Johnson's program of medical care for the aged under social security.

We all know that our aged population needs our help. They need our help now—not tomorrow or the day after. Why do we hesitate? Surely, democracy has a heartline for its elder generation. Surely, that much is owed them. Surely, they deserve their common share of humanity. I myself have taken a strong stand in support of medicare and have urged the House Ways and Means Committee, which recently concluded hearings, of the urgent need for this legislation. Let us stop this costly waste of time and lives. Let us help our aged now—before it is too late. Let's get medicare out of committee and on to the floor for a vote. Let us follow the voices raised in this petition.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the citizens of Union City, State of New Jersey, United States, are faced with a serious problem regarding medical care and attention, especially to elderly citizens; and

Whereas Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, recognizes this serious problem and has recommended medicare legislation in order to alleviate the citizens of the United States from this grave and serious hardship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Union City on behalf of themselves and the citizens of the city of Union City do hereby endorse the President's plan of medical care and attention for the aged; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS of the 14th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey; be it further

Resolved, That the citizens of the city of Union City be advised of the seriousness of the problem regarding medical care for the aged and that they request Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS of the 14th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey to endorse President Johnson's plan for medicare.

Grassroots Approach to Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is indeed heartening for me to note that the people of Idaho are responding so responsibly to the new grassroots approach to the Alliance for Progress. Recent articles published in the Idaho press reflect the forward thrust of local groups set in motion by an initial meeting in Boise the first of February.

At that gathering, a group of Idahoans representing business, education, labor, civic organizations, womens clubs, the ministerial association, and agriculture met to hear a presentation on the small projects program of the Alliance. Mr. James Boren, special assistant to the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and Mr. Wade Fleetwood, my executive secretary for 7 years and now a congressional liaison officer with AID in the Department of State, traveled to Idaho in response to interest there in the new aproach. They explained the program of having people in a given locality of a State closely tied to Alliance projects with people in Latin American localities. These projects are too small to handle within our formal economic program under the Alliance, but they represent immediate needs of Latin American people in scores of places. The project may be a small generator to light a few bulbs for a night literacy class for adults. The generator is given in exchange for self-help measures by the villagers—such as installing a blackboard at the front of the room. The self-help feature is paramount in the program, so that a meaningful partnership between peoples results.

I was pleased to meet with these two gentlemen in my office prior to their trip and give them my encouragement and support for the objectives of this approach to the Alliance. It is an approach that makes sense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles published in the Idaho Observer of February 13 and the Idaho Statesman of February 13. They show in detail the work now being carried on by local Idaho groups to foster better understanding among peoples of North and South America. The small project approach is buying time for the slower—effects of the Alliance for Progress to emerge, and is worthy of widespread support. It is a needed complement to the Alliance program. I am proud that Idaho has joined in this broad effort by the people in the private sector of our States to help their fellowmen.

I wish especially to congratulate the Boise Valley Alliance for Progress Committee for their leadership in this small projects program. Mr. John Chapman is serving as the chairman of the local committee, and Mr. Byron Johnson as vice chairman. The first project of supplying sewing machines and a typewriter to an orphanage in Ecuador has been undertaken by the Boise Junior Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Roger Mock, chairman of the Jaycee project, announced that the machines would be purchased locally and sent to the Ecuadoran school.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Observer, Feb. 13, 1964]

A DIRECT LINK IN ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—COMMITTEE INITIATES PROJECT

"We will be the Boise Valley Alliance for Progress Committee," announced young John Chapman, attorney with the Hawley law firm. Mr. Chapman has accepted designation as chairman of the citizens' group formed following a meeting February 3 with Mr. James H. Boren of the Department of State.

When Mr. Boren left Boise later in the week he had turned over to Mr. Chapman a file of project folders marked "Alianza: Ecuador." Less than 1 week later the first of those folders had been stamped "Project: Boise Junior Chamber of Commerce" and a challenging new experiment in foreign relations had begun in the Boise Valley.

The project chairman for the JC's, Mr. Roger Mott, will concern himself with a school, the Hogar Indigena, near the village of Conocoto, Province of Pichincha, Ecuador. The school provides a home and schooling for 100 orphans and destitute, abandoned children of the area. It is administered by 10 nuns of the Order of Mercedias with very limited resources.

The children in this school must not only be housed and fed, but must be helped to develop skills for their adult years. With four domestic Singer pedal type sewing machines (or their equivalent) the nuns could teach the Indian children to make their own clothes, make articles for sale, and also develop a skill which has definite market value in the economy. Their second need is for a typewriter to help in the preparation of educational material for the school's classes, where elementary subjects and Spanish are taught in an area burdened with illiteracy.

As the first folder moves from Mr. Chapman's file into the hands of the junior chamber, the title of the next project is revealed. The Instituto Indiginosta is located in the village of Quaytacama, Chimborazo, Ecuador. Its students are young men from the Indian families of the region. Their native language is Quechua, the language of the ancient Inca Empire. At the Instituto, they are taught Spanish, and there are some also studying English. They are being trained in a 6-year course as teachers and community leaders to work among their people—alternative leadership to the Fidelista movement.

The Instituto director has an expanded course of study planned—his need is equipment. The equipment list reads: 20 complete handtool boxes, agricultural handtools, and a blockmaking machine. With this the school could develop its acreage into an agricultural demonstration farm (and improve the student's diet in the process), make cinder blocks to complete the buildings for classes, and develop the skills and competency of the students as they prepare to help their own people who are often shy and hostile to outsiders.

Beneath this folder are more. All of them specific projects. All of them already worked out by the local Ecuadorian village people. All waiting to be selected by the citizens of the Boise Valley as their particular responsibility of this new experiment in direct diplomacy.

[From the Idaho Observer, Feb. 13, 1964]

IDAHO TO ECUADOR

(By Alice Dieter)

Idaho's irrigation projects are on a vastly different scale than this one being built by Peruvian campasinos to bring water to their village fields. Idaho may build its channels differently, but we understand the driving need for water on our arid lands.

There is a sequel to this picture. The villagers received a small amount of help on the project they had begun. They became part of a growing program of people-to-people assistance. One community in the United States offered to supplement their labor with a $750 jackhammer. A Peace Corps volunteer on the scene delivered the machinery and demonstrated its use. The dream of water on parched fields became a reality for the people of the village.

Later that same year the Communists organized a march from this Peruvian valley. It was joined by hundreds of ragged, desperate people. But it was not joined by the people of this village.

This was only one of the stories told by Mr. James Boren of the Department of State when he spoke before a Boise audience on February 3. Mr. Boren is a special assistant to the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress. He is a Texas businessman new to Government service. He has been serving in Peru where one-third of his time was in the field working directly with the campasinos.

Mr. Boren's purpose in Boise was to tell the story of a new phase in our Latin American policy. The Alliance for Progress is built on the sound logic of fostering self-help in this area so vital to our interests. The program is designed to be more than a relationship between governments. It hopes to enlist the involvement of business, civic groups, and educational institutions in direct contacts with Latin Americans.

The larger problems of economic development in the area remain the same: dams, roads, electricity, basic investment to vitalize stagnant, unproductive economies. Projects like this take time, and time is running out in Latin America.

It will take ingenuity to buy time. The man in the village must feel concrete hope right now or the major projects will never be completed under any form of democratic government, for the Communists and the Fidelistas are on the move.

Across the United States many individual communities are responding to the challenge by concerning themselves with the problems of specific communities in Latin America. Needs are matched with talents. Projects are specifics, worked out carefully, step by step. Within the American community many groups can participate, each one with the satisfaction of knowing specifically what their project is.

Oakland County, Mich., is working directly with an area in Colombia to provide assistance in developing a good municipal budgeting procedure. Business contacts have developed between the two communities. Students have been exchanged, and suddenly the people of Oakland County have a personal stake in a Province of Colombia.

One Central American city has a medical center referred to as the miracle of Pensacola, for its equipping became a community project for the Florida city.

A village high in the Peruvian Andes had built a school (without Government help) and had an adult literacy program underway—by the light of a kerosene lamp. The village received a small gasoline generator, in exchange of their agreement to provide a larger blackboard and build two latrines.

Mr. Boren stressed that one of the major benefits of the program was that the people themselves worked out the plans and became responsible for completion. Such effort fostered the much-needed local leadership, Fidelistas appeal to the restive people at the local level. Local leadership must be developed to offer a visible alternative to revolution.

Mr. Boren stated that Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru were already making good response to the challenge of the Alliance program. "It is a tremendous job, for we are trying to change 300 years of tradition in a fuedal structure."

"What do you have in mind for Idaho," came the question from the floor.

Mr. Boren smiled and dipped his hand into a bulging briefcase full of slim project folders.

"Well," he said with a Texas drawl, "we need some help in Ecuador."

[From the Idaho Statesman, Feb. 13, 1964]

SEWING MACHINES DRIVE—BOISE JAYCEES TO AID ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The Boise Valley Alliance for Progress Committee, Wednesday, anounced a program for supplying needed items to Latin American individuals had been underwritten by the Boise Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Jaycees will raise funds to supply four footpedal sewing machines and a typewriter to the Hogar Indigena School for Orphans. The school is located near Conocoto, Ecuador.

John Chapman, chairman of the local committee, and Byron Johnson, vice chairman, said the local group was organized recently. They said it is designed to serve as an aid to the State Department's Alliance for Progress program. Objectives, they said, include supplying items which are not available in the State Department's budget.

"These local, volunteer committees," Chapman said, "can do much to help save Latin American countries and their people from infiltration by Cuba and Communists. We can fill in where the State Department can't."

Chapman and Johnson pointed out a State Department mission director in Latin American countries knows the needs of the individuals. He suggests programs or articles which might be a help to the State Department. The Department, in turn, forwards the suggestions to a local committee.

Once the articles are purchased locally they are shipped to the director who places them in the hands of the people, school, or organization. He then makes a report to the group underwriting the project, Chapman said.

LOCAL PURCHASE SLATED

Roger Mock, who is chairman of the Jaycee project, said the sewing machines and typewriter would be purchased locally and sent to the Ecuadorean school.

Chapman and Johnson said the committee had several other projects. Persons or groups interested in backing one, they said, may contact them through Post Office Box 1617.

They said the mission director prepares brochures on those to receive the articles and supplies them to the State Department. These are forwarded to local volunteer committees.

The Hogar Indigena school provides a home and schooling for more than 100 orphans and destitute children. It is administered by 10 nuns from the Order of Mercedarias. Most of the children are girls, ranging in age from 2 to 16.

The children receive schooling in basic education subjects with emphasis on practical training which will enable them to be economically self-sufficient later.

One of these courses is sewing, but unfortunately, according to the State Department director, the three machines they have are inadequate and no funds for more are available. Aid requested was for four sewing machines and a typewriter.

Vallejo Honors Young Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, too often the common but rich qualities of character expressed in outstanding deeds of action are casually accepted in today's youth while vast quantities of time and money are spent in an effort to retrain and recharacterize the less fortunate.

Recently in my hometown of Vallejo a young man was honored for his heroic rescue of a friend while on an excursion. The local news article follows:

MAYOR WILL HONOR HEROIC VALLEJO BOY, COMPANION TODAY

Two Vallejo boys will be singularly honored tonight—one as a hero and the other as his grateful companion whose life he saved.

Both youngesters, together with members of their families, have been invited to appear before the city council in city hall at 8 p.m. by Mayor Florence E. Douglas to be publicly acclaimed for the courage each displayed in overcoming panic and suffering during an ordeal that nearly turned an Easter vacation camping trip into a tragedy.

Tonight's city hall appearance will mark a happy ending to a frightening experience that occurred 8 months ago for Robert Ogle, 12, son of Mr. and Mrs. Reid Ogle of 252 Cottonwood Street, and the youngster to whom he owes his life—Larry Milani, 11, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Milani of 419 Baywood Drive.

HEROIC ACTION

In recognition of young Milani's heroic action, Mayor Douglas will present him with a handsome plaque which she had designed and made especially for him as a permanent momento of his lifesaving achievement.

Actually, the plaque is an award for bravery, citing Milani for "his quick action and good judgment in preventing his friend from drowning on April 8, 1963."

Accompanying the plaque will be a special proclamation, bearing the official seal of the city, further commending young Milani for his courage and good judgment.

Mayor Douglas also will bestow special honors on young Ogle, the boy whose life Milani is credited with saving, when he, too, will be presented with a proclamation citing his courage in resuming a normal life after enduring months of suffering as a result of the injuries he received in his mishap.

And as special memento of tonight's occasion, Mayor Douglas also will present Ogle with a St. Christopher's medal—something which the boy's grandmother informed the mayor he has always wanted.

TWO YOUTHS

The two boys were principal figures in a near tragedy that marked an Easter vacation outing with a group of about 10 students who had set up camp in the Green Valley Falls area near Wild Horse Lake last April with their teacher, Daryle Alwine, of 206 Grapewood Avenue, who also will attend tonight's ceremonies.

Ogle and Milani, together with Calvin Phillips, 12, of 210 Maywood Drive, left the camp, despite a warning by Alwine to stay nearby, to look for salamanders in a creek flowing below a steep embankment.

Ogle tried to swing out over the creek from some vines trailing from a tree and fell, tumbling headlong down the rocky bank into the water below, suffering critical head injuries.

Milani rushed to his friend's aid and held the head of the unconscious boy out of the water until Phillips ran back to the camp and returned with help. Young Ogle remained in critical condition for months in an Oakland hospital and only recently was released to return to school and pick up the threads of his life that nearly ended in the remote Napa County region 8 months ago.

Young Milani's heroic action was called to the attention of Mayor Douglas by Alwine with a suggestion he deserved some kind of public recognition. She agreed and arranged tonight's ceremonies.

"Milani's presence of mind and avoidance of panic in sending for help and holding Ogle's head out of water undoubtedly saved the life of Robert Ogle," Alwine said. "I think young Milani richly deserves some kind of public recognition for a performance in an emergency which would do credit to any adult—let alone an 11-year-old boy."

EXCEPTIONAL BOY

Alwine described young Ogle as "an exceptional boy with unusual potential before the accident—intelligent, athletic, and a real leader. Now, thanks to Larry Milani, Bob has a good chance of living up to that potential."

Mayor Douglas said she is "happy to commend Larry Milani as a brave boy who had the intelligence to handle this situation in such a manner with the least danger to the boy he saved. It took a lot of courage for him to hold his young friend's bleeding head above water and he displayed a brand of stamina that would have been commendable in an adult.

"The plaque he will receive tonight is just a small token of the recognition which he so richly deserves and has earned."

Similarly, Mayor Douglas said, the St. Christopher's medal and proclamation that will be presented to young Ogle this evening are "small tokens in recognition of the terrible suffering he underwent and the courage and bravery he exhibited throughout this dreadful tragedy.

"He has displayed admirable courage and fortitude in returning to school and resuming his normal life as a boy whose life has been spared by the action of a resourceful friend.

"Few persons are privileged to undergo such an inspiring experience—especially at such a young age—as these two boys," the mayor added. "The gift of life is a rare privilege which I hope these two boys will cherish as a bond between them as long as they live."

Nigerian Diplomat Says American Ideals Unknown to World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Durham Morning Herald:

PROJECT REAL U.S. IMAGE: UDOCHI—NIGERIAN DIPLOMAT SAYS AMERICAN IDEALS UNKNOWN TO WORLD

(By Allen MacDuff)

Julius M. Udochi, the Ambassador of Nigeria to the United States, told a group of approximately 150 persons at the Jack Tar Hotel Sunday afternoon that "it is time for the real American image of brotherhood and generosity to get out to the world."

Udochi's appearance in Durham was at the invitation of Asa T. Spaulding, president of North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. The Ambassador had earlier addressed the congregation of White Rock Baptist Church, as part of its Brotherhood Day program.

"Your ideal of the fatherhood of man and brotherhood of man is not reflected in the press of Africa and the press of the world," Udochi told the gathering at the hotel.

"At this time, the United States supports the largest foreign aid program to underdeveloped countries of any nation in the world," he said.

"This is only one example of the true spirit and ideal of the United States which I have found to exist since coming to this country 4 years ago.

"But it is true that this image has not been allowed to escape to the world," Udochi said.

"Many of the problems of our day center around the matter of race, and it is this view of the United States which much of the world receives. Instead of reading about something good which the United States is trying to do, more often the reader of a newspaper in Africa and elsewhere will read something about someone in Mississippi and other parts of the South.

"When the United States does something good, no one hears about it," he continued. "But when something happens in Mississippi, the whole world sees it.

"I can only pray fervently that the real American ideal and the real American image which I have noted since coming to this country may yet get out to the world," the Ambassador concluded.

After the hotel reception, Udochi said Nigeria, which received its independence from Great Britain in 1960, has since developed an effective free press and communications system to serve the needs of its 40 million residents, largest population of a country in Africa.

He said news of recent racial demonstrations in the United States receives extensive play in the Nigerian press, particularly photographs which usually depict Negro demonstrators being clubbed or beaten by police.

Udochi noted that editorial comment in the papers of his young republic is not very flattering to the United States.

Nevertheless, he said, "our leaders know the efforts being made by your country to meet and solve your racial problems, and of their efforts to aid the developing and emerging nations in other areas."

He said he has been very careful about where he stops to eat in the United States when he's traveling, and rarely goes into the South except by invitation. He noted that some members of his Embassy staff in Washington had reported some unpleasant experiences when they were traveling in the South and elsewhere.

"I have been very careful in such matters because I like to look for a good relationship with the American people," Udochi said. "I have been very fortunate in that the American people I have met have shown me that they truly believe in the ideal of brotherhood, as our people do also."

He said he felt the racial demonstrations in the South "help to dramatize the problem and jolt people out of complacency, and thus make it possible to seek a solution to the problem."

Secretary Nitze Speaks at Christening of U.S.S. "America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 the newest U.S. fighting ship, the attack carrier U.S.S. *America*, was launched at Newport News, Va. She was sponsored by Mrs. David McDonald, wife of the Chief of Naval Operations. Commemorating the occasion, Hon. Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy, delivered the following significant remarks:

REMARKS OF HON. PAUL H. NITZE, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "AMERICA" (CVA-66), NEWPORT NEWS, VA., FEBRUARY 1, 1964

Admiral McDonald, Mr. Blewett, distinguished Members of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen:

In volume I of the "Dictionary of American Naval Fighting Ships," America is defined as the large land mass in the Western Hemisphere. It is stated further that the term is frequently used to designate the United States of America.

This may seem to be a bit of unnecessary information to many Americans, but I believe that definition is particularly appropriate, when we consider the role that U.S.S. *America* is destined to play in the drama that continues to unfold daily on the oceans of the world. She will represent the United States of America. Peoples of many nations will see her. Her crew will be America to many in foreign lands. I believe this splendid ship is aptly named.

It is a signal honor for me to join with you here in Virginia on this particular occasion. We gather to witness the giving of life to this ship, even as life in our Nation had its beginnings within the borders of this Commonwealth. For nearly 2 centuries America has looked to Virginia for much of its tradition and history. And now we can be grateful to her skilled craftsmen, naval architects, planners and designers for the creation of a new *America*, a goliath of the seas that for 3 years has been abuilding here in this fine shipyard. This ship will be a splendid addition to our progress for peace in the greatest and finest Navy the world has ever known.

On the day the commission pennant is hoisted aloft, a signal will thus be given to the world that our defensive strength is increased once more, and that another mighty ship is ready to assume her place in our deterrent force, to assist in the preservation of our precious heritage.

As a nation, we must be certain that our military power can be projected over the seas against whatever opposition may be brought to bear. We can expect continued pressure against our allies and against the uncommitted nations of the world. We must respond to requests for help with the necessary force. Balanced naval forces fulfill an important role in this world posture. They possess a capability which is unique.

America is, and always has been, a maritime nation. Our export and import commerce is geared to a sea-based transportation system, augmented by aircraft systems. Our defense posture is based largely on maritime alliances with other maritime nations. Our commerce, our defense, and our very future are thus wedded to the effective use and control of the seas.

The attack carriers with their manned aircraft are now, and will be for a long time to come, the primary and indispensable ingredient of modern sea-based weapons systems. If we are to continue full exploitation of all the oceans of the world, then we must have the carrier to provide air power wherever it is needed and when it is needed. If we intend to continue to be able to cope with the entire spectrum of international relations—showing the flag, cold war, hot war, providing support for our marines ashore, or escalation into nuclear exchange—we must have air power, based on mobile, vesatile, self-contained, seagoing flight decks.

Carriers can act as visible instruments of foreign policy in their normal operating areas.

The air group on the carriers can provide close ground support to marine amphibious landings and combat operations. It can also furnish air cover over a given combat area—at sea or ashore.

Each combat plane on board can carry more conventional firepower than could the B-17 in World War II.

Each has a nuclear capability and a rapid retaliatory capability.

Manned aircraft can discriminate between targets at the last moment.

The carrier has a vital role in our ASW force.

Without transgressing the sovereignity of other nations, our carrier task forces can be placed within effective range of any potential trouble spot. There is an ever increasing realization that the political invulnerability of our carrier forces is vital to our success in supporting foreign policy in all phases of peace and war.

It is no exaggeration to say that no nation has never before had such farflung commitments requiring seapower on so great a scale or for as broad a spectrum of tasks. In truth, the sun is always shining on an

American fleet, ready to accept any challenge.

Accordingly, our forces in being must be maintained at a high level. Their responsiveness to an ever-changing situation must be instantaneous and effective. Powerful support is now provided our national policy. Careful planning will insure that this excellent posture will be maintained, so that assigned tasks may be met successfully.

Modernization of our naval strength is continuous and, as funds and technology permit, as rapid as possible. It is not a simple matter of quickly replacing all old ships, planes and weapons with new. We must take advantage of the proven technological gains of the past years, and while testing carefully for their ultimate worth, those coming to the fore. With respect to shipbuilding, this indicates an orderly acceleration of construction until past deficiencies are overcome, and then an orderly replacement program. A balanced, systematic program will further enable us to insure that full value is received for every dollar spent.

Let me say in this regard that I am particularly pleased with the excellent craftsmanship, the cost consciousness and cost effectiveness that has been the hallmark of the shipyard where we now stand. I am happy to congratulate the management and the employees for that excellence. I look forward to the day when this fine ship takes her place along with numerous other products of the skill that is to be found here, and thus adds measurably to our front line of strength.

Thanks to all of you for being here and for sharing these few moments. Mrs. McDonald, all of us are grateful to you for consenting to be the sponsor of *America*, and for participating in this traditional ceremony. Once she is given symbolic life by you, she becomes home for nearly 5,000 officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps. I know you will follow her progress most readily during those months of preparation that yet remain before she takes her place at sea with the fleet. I know you share with me, and with all of us, confidence that her exploits as a fast carrier will add even greater luster to what is already a proud name, one revered around the world.

To the officers and men of U.S.S. *America*, and to those who will join you here during the next few months, I wish you success as you undertake the responsibilities that are yours. I want you to know that I have confidence in your ability to discharge your missions thoroughly and well. Remember, if you will, that wherever you sail in U.S.S. *America*, you are America. That one word represents hope and even freedom for millions throughout the world. You can look forward to rewarding experiences and great satisfaction in knowing that you have served your country and your Navy well. Best wishes to you, smooth sailing, and Godspeed.

Africa Is Just Learning About Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Eric Sevareid, writing in the Sunday, February 23, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, directed attention to the problems facing the emerging nations of Africa.

His point was effectively made that the people of that continent were in as great a danger of abuse of their individual liberties under their own governments as they had claimed to be during their colonial period.

The constant agitation and activities of the Communists in Africa fully repudiate the present administration's foreign policy of coexistence and points up the fallacy of our foreign policy blueprint. I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

AFRICA IS JUST LEARNING ABOUT IMPERIALISM

(By Eric Sevareid)

The oscillograph of American hopes and fears registers wide fluctuations in any given period, on any given matter.

The needle has been quivering back and forth on the matter of communism in black Africa. It seems only yesterday that we were taking the smuggest self-congratulatory satisfaction over the fiasco of Russian penetration attempts in the Congo and in Guinea. Today, with the barnstorming of Chou En-lai, the coup by a Communist-oriented political crew in Zanzibar and the new wave of ruthless, anti-imperialist idiocies by Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana, a sudden apprehension spreads that black Africa in general is about to collapse into Communist control.

This is hardly the imminent prospect. What the Communists, more particularly the Chinese Communists, are immediately seeking is a solid foothold in Africa from which to work. There is no certainty yet that even Zanzibar will fill their bill. What can help pave the way for communization in East Africa are the current programs there of "Africanization," the hasty turning over to untrained Africans of economic institutions and the civil service, threatening the same kind of breakdown that occurred in the Congo, where Belgians, of necessity, are now returning.

But only the unteachable will discount the long-range determination of the Chinese if not the Russians.

African students and other movers and shakers continue nevertheless, as if in an intellectual trance, to identify imperialism only with the West. Just as Latin Americans continued far too long to identify it with the United States. What may be required for Africans, as it was required for Latin Americans, is the pain of the Communist thorn in their own flesh. It took the death of young Cubans in the Bay of Pigs, Castro's formal proclamation of communism and his assaults on Venezuela to waken thousands of influential people in Latin America.

It will be luck if such an object lesson can be avoided in Africa. Serious intellectual attack on communism as a way of life is only just beginning there. Some of it is coming from young African students who have returned from Peiping, maddened, disillusioned and frightened by what they experienced there. This has included the most blatant race prejudice, with the repeated imprisonment of Chinese girls who became friendly with African boys.

All this is recounted in rather chilling detail by a Ghanaian medical student, Emmanuel John Hevi, in a new book, "An African Student in China. Our propaganda services could do worse than to flood African university towns with this volume. By Hevi's figures there were 118 legitimate black African students in China in early 1961. By April of 1962, only 22 remained and 10 of these were trying to get out.

But these were legitimate students. On another level there are all the Africans brought to China and to Czechoslovakia for short courses in propaganda and armed subversion. Hevi, now—naturally—exiled from Ghana, issues this warning:

"The Communist bloc will soon be flooding the African continent with thousands of young, energetic Africans, ready to believe that their own countries will be sending up sputniks and spacemen within a few years if only they adopt the Communist system. Because Africa has as yet not developed an effective counterbalance to these pro-Communist forces in her midst, there is very little resistance to them."

Africans have to get it through their heads before it is too late that imperialists, as Hevi puts it, "come in all colors: white, yellow, and black; yes, even black."

American Farm Bureau Federation's Stand on Importation of Meat From Australia and New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau, in which he disagrees with agreements which our country has entered into with Australia and New Zealand with regard to the importation of meat. I concur completely with the position of Mr. Shuman. This is but another example of permitting the American marketplace to be plundered and invaded from abroad. This calls for furthering investigation of this country's trade policies.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1964.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: Your telegram announcing the agreements which have been entered into with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand with respect to the importation of meat, concludes with the sentence, "Livestock producers will benefit materially and immediately."

I couldn't disagree with you more. Government supply management on an international scale is no better than the domestic variety which has been rejected by both the Congress and American farmers.

As you know, we opposed from the outset proposals to deal with the meat import problem through the negotiation of a so-called commodity arrangement. We have had enough experience with international commodity agreements to know that they are worse than worthless in promoting and protecting the interests of farmers and ranchers.

Instead of being worthy of commendation, these particular agreements amount to a betrayal of American agriculture. The effect is to give foreign competitors assurance that they will be able to increase sales in the U.S. market in the future in return for a relatively small, temporary cutback. This must come as a shocking disappointment to most of those associated with this abortive effort.

Cattle feeders particularly have suffered from a sharp decline in prices. Your Department has estimated the 1963 decline in choice steer prices at $3.70 per hundredweight with about 50 cents of it attributable to in-

creased meat imports and about $3.20 due to the effect of the increased meat supply produced domestically. This may or may not be an accurate appraisal.

What has not been made clear is that the major cause of the decline in fed-cattle prices has been the dumping of CCC-owned stocks of feed grains in 1961 and 1962. This action artificially depressed feed grain prices and set in motion the buildup in cattle and hog numbers. Official USDA statistics reveal that corn consumption by cattle on feed in 1963 was 32.9 percent greater than in 1960. Cattlemen are now reaping the heartbreaking results of this mistaken policy, which apparently was inaugurated in a desperate attempt to make the so-called emergency feed grain program look like a success instead of the dismal failure it has been.

As bad as the recently concluded meat agreements are, in and of themselves, there is another most important and far-reaching aspect that deserves attention. Our negotiators at the upcoming trade negotiation sessions have a difficult enough job to perform in insisting on realistic reductions in trade restrictions, including nontariff restrictions, against U.S. exports. The precedent established by our Government, having agreed to a meaningless commodity arrangement in the case of meat imports, provides an additional burden to bear. This action has the effect of cutting the ground out from under the U.S. representatives at the forthcoming trade negotiations and constitutes a grave disservice to all farmers and ranchers in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

International Development Association Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9022) to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week during the course of the House debate on H.R. 9022, a bill which proposes to amend the International Development Association Act, I stated that the legislation came out of the wrong committee—that it should have been handled by the Foreign Affairs Committee rather than the Banking and Currency Committee in view of the fact that H.R. 9022 is a foreign aid bill far more than it is a banking matter.

At the same time, I declared my support of U.S. participation in an increase in the resources of the IDA, and for the RECORD I would like to reaffirm my position since subsequently I, along with a majority of my distinguished colleagues, voted to recommit H.R. 9022.

Under the right circumstances the recommital motion would not carry—since this House has demonstrated before its approval of multilateral aid. Had the responsible committee having to do with foreign aid been familiar with this legislation, had the bill been brought out properly, and, had it been adequately debated in the House, this Body would not have shown so little faith in the legislation and those managing it, by voting first against the main committee amendment which in effect was a substitute to the bill, and later voting to recommit the legislation.

In the event this bill cannot now be routed to the Foreign Affairs Committee, the latter committee should at least be given an opportunity to explore it since it trangresses the foreign field in a very large measure.

Virginia's "Image" and Race Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va., by Dr. Gordon B. Hancock:

VIRGINIA'S "IMAGE" AND "RACE PREJUDICE"

Your editorial of February 11, "On the Ball, Virginia," was most timely and struck a responsive chord in the heart of thousands.

Virginia is a great State and is richly blessed with many of the finest people who ever breathed the breath of life. Contrary to the notions of many here in Virginia and to many in other parts, Virginia's greatness did not pass in toto with colonial times. There are great people in Virginia as of 1964. In this fact we all may take a justifiable pride.

Virginia has nearly a million Negroes who are genuinely interested in Virginia's image even as they are proud of her greatness. No image of Virginia is true that ignores the lot and labors of these Negro citizens. They are loyal and industrious and aspiring and as such seek full citizenship, and it is to Virginia's credit that these Negroes aspire to first-class unhampered citizenship.

Although rushed to the front in times of war and too often to the rear in times of peace, these nearly a million Negroes are giving their best to make a greater Virginia tomorrow. When Virginia's Negroes grow dissatisfied and resentful when they must struggle for the rights and privileges which the scum of the white race can enjoy as matters of course, it should be understandable. Virginia's Negro citizens are still afflicted and ridden by a race prejudice whose dictates take precedence over the word of God and the teachings of Jesus Christ, and its is sadly true that the claims of the kingdom of God must stand aside until the claims of race prejudice are served.

During the current congressional fight for the civil right bill, Virginia's Congressmen were solidly against it although it offered hope that it moved the Negro a step closer to first-class citizenship and promised relief from the disabilities and humiliations of the curse of segregation, and it is safe to assert that Virginia Senators will lead the fight of the bill's defeat in the upcoming fight in the Senate.

Virginia was the birthplace of the doctrines of massive resistance and interpositionism which inspired resistance throughout the South to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision—which was unanimous—to try to make a full-fledged citizen of the worthy Negro Americans. Virginia's newspapers have generally heckled and derided and disparaged the Supreme Court since that decision. It is also true that Virginia is still ruled by a political machine, a pattern of political life grown outmoded and obsolete almost everywhere else.

Virginia's Prince Edward County is the Nation's only county with closed public schools. Virginia is the only State so far as we know that gave the German Nazis a beachhead in this country.

Virginia's race prejudice kept out of the White House one of the ablest men this country have ever produced.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week marks one of the most important events in modern Lithuanian history, for on February 16, 1918, the brave Lithuanian people threw off the yoke of Russian oppression and proclaimed their independence. They wanted to exercise the right of every nation and control their destiny, just as they had during the Middle Ages when, joined with Poland, their state had made a lasting contribution to the development of European civilization. With the rise of empires on all sides in Austria, Russia, and Germany, Lithuania's integrity was first threatened and then destroyed in 1795 during the partition of Poland and Lithuania.

During the intervening years under Russian domination, the Lithuanians never lost their desire for independence. Czarist attempts at Russification failed as the Lithuanians arose time after time in revolt. Finally their chance came in 1918 during the chaos of World War I. With Imperialist Russia and Germany reeling under the impact of Western arms and internal revolution, Lithuania declared its independence.

The following years were the golden years of modern Lithuania. Under national leadership and a democratic, parliamentary government, the entire economic spectrum from industry to agriculture widened and developed. Social services were extended to the less fortunate and Lithuanian culture flourished in a liberal atmosphere.

But this free existence was not destined to last long. Once more Lithuania was to be squeezed between the totalitarian states on either side of it. Both Russia and Germany coveted Lithuanian land for settlement of its own people. To this end first one and then the other put pressure on the helpless Baltic state. By the end of World War II, Lithuania was once more under Russian domination.

The United States has never recognized this Russian usurpation of Lithuanian rights, nor the fraudulent elec-

tions which made Lithuania a part of Russia.

On the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, we extend our sympathies to the Lithuanian people who in their hearts yearn for liberty and the return of their own, democratic government. Many of them have died in the past for the dream of independence: during czarist times, during the First World War and after, and especially during the Second World War. Someday they will once again have their freedom and the cause of liberty will have advanced one more step.

Resolution on Foreign Printing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from the members of the Harrisburg Typographical Union 14 which, in turn, includes a resolution on foreign printing.

This was the first time this problem in this particular field had been called to my attention. It certainly seems to me that the facts outlined in this resolution demand a study and investigation by the proper authorities to see what can be done to remedy the situation. Surely the request "that any book to carry the imprint 'Printed in the United States' must be manufactured in its entirety within the United States from type set therein" seems completely necessary and also entirely fair and reasonable.

The letter follows:

HARRISBURG TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION 14,
Harrisburg, Pa., February 1, 1964.

Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a meeting held on Sunday, January 5, 1964, the members of Harrisburg Typographical Union 14 approved the following resolution and requested that it be sent to you for your consideration and appropriate action:

"RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN PRINTING

"Whereas foreign competition has forced every manufacturer of size in the technical and arts book industry out of business, and forced the layoff of hundreds of printers in the United States due to lack of work from book publishers; and

"Whereas U.S. book publishers more and more are sending typesetting work to England, Ireland, Scotland, Holland, and Japan; and

"Whereas the American printer is becoming unemployed due to the importation of reproduction proofs from type being set abroad and printed in the United States, and protected by the U.S. copyright laws; and

"Whereas in most cases the prices quoted are approximately 70 percent of the cost of publishing a book in this country: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That Harrisburg Typographical Union 14 contact our Senators and Congressmen, urging them to review the existing copyright laws and especially section 16 referring to mechanical work to be done in the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That any book to carry the imprint 'Printed in the United States' must be manufactured in its entirety within the United States from type set therein; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we request support of all Senators and Congressmen in any legislation that may be presented to amend the copyright laws; and that a copy of this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

Respectfully yours,
F. E. MATTHEWS,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

A Woman Writer Takes a Critical Look at America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to insert into the RECORD an article written by that well-known lady of the press corps, Mrs. May Craig. Known for her pretty hats and keen mind, her penetrating questions have needled the best of us here in Washington. When she asks a question it hits home—often times uncomfortably so.

She has done it again in this article written for her paper, the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram, which was reprinted this week in U.S. News & World Report. This time she has aimed her provocative suggestions not only at the leadership in this Nation but at every adult in the country. I hope every Member of this body will read this article:

A WOMAN WRITER TAKES A CRITICAL LOOK AT AMERICA

Unless there is a change, deep down, in the American people, a genuine crusade against self-indulgence, immorality, public and private, then we are witnesses to the decline and fall of the American Republic.

Death on the highways, a pack a day, cheating from top to bottom in our society, get rich quick, break-up of the family, faltering in foreign policy, reckless debt—these have destroyed nations before us. Why should we think we can take that path and change history?

Look around you, and everywhere you see lack of principle and steadfastness in the right and brave. The disgraceful cover on the recent issue of a publication with a nationwide circulation and its palliating story of sexual immorality adds adult consent to the looseness of our youth, already far down the road of delinquency, shiftlessness, derogation of virginity in our girls who will be the mothers of tomorrow.

There is no financial morality in our Government—"Charge it," is the accepted practice.

Round the world they think they can take our money with one hand and slap us in the face with the other. We talk of our leadership, but we are apparently incapable of giving leadership.

One listens with dismay to the campaigning for the Presidency that is going on. Oh, for a crusader to call us back to dignity and strength and austerity.

What was that last word? "Austerity"—plain living and high thinking, putting our money into the real things of life, not mink-handled saucepans and three cars in every garage; public servants who are not Bobby Bakers. Schools for the young, care for the elderly, strength so that none will dare attack us, a worthy succession to those men with feet wrapped in bloody bandages at Valley Forge to give us liberty. How have we used the liberty they bought for us so dearly?

Because it is unpleasant to think of unpleasant things, we say the Soviet Union may be changing its determination to bury us. Red China is bad, of course, but maybe not Khrushchev. Halfheartedly we send American men to die in jungles, where we do not have the guts to go in to win or to stay out.

We sell wheat to Russia to save her from a demonstration that communism cannot produce enough food for its own people. If we do this to get rid of surplus wheat, which we have already subsidized and which we will subsidize again to give it to the Communists cheaper, we might try discouraging the production of surplus wheat and remember the old-fashioned private enterprise where one grows for the market, not the Government storage bins.

We faltered in Cuba and now she is the homeland of subversion of all Latin America and Africa. Where will we find a strong man to lead us? Would we vote for one if he campaigned, crying in the wilderness that we come and be saved—from ourselves? We could have saved Cuba for freedom, and saved ourselves and the rest of Latin America from this nest of communism, but we did not. Around the world they do not believe what we say; they look at what we do.

The United Nations was founded in this country. Now it is a messy combination of polyglot nations, old and new, grabbing for our money and ignoring our halfhearted arguments.

The idea of letting in a small nation of fewer than a half million people, utterly inexperienced in governing itself, unproved as a stable, honest state—letting them in within a few days of their establishment. We might at least insist on a period of probation.

The United Nations itself should be forced into financial honesty by the United States refusing to keep on paying the bills while many get a free ride while outvoting us. The idea of letting in Red China in the face of the Charter which says, "peace-loving nations." True, we are against letting Red China in, but all we do is get out our handkerchiefs and weep into them while the majority in the U.N. does as it pleases.

We waste untold sums on useless defense, and fail to keep ourselves truly strong in all fields, to be able to fight small as well as missile wars.

We sign test ban treaties with known enemies, known defaulters on treaties, that we will not test as we may need to. Why should we put our defense in such an agreement? If our defense experts—not businessman McNamara [Secretary of Defense]—say we need to test, then let us test without asking permission of friend or foe.

We fiddle-faddle in southeast Asia, and may be ignominiously pushed out. Maybe we should never have gone in there—let the Reds take it—but there is one thing for sure: If we go in anywhere, we should go in to win.

We are losing the respect of the world, and respect is more necessary to a nation, as to a person, than affection. We get little affection from the people we have helped over the years—and we are losing respect.

Nobody respects a fumbler, a weak man, a wobbler, in policy or deeds.

First, every one of us has to clean out weakness and selfishness and immorality of all types. Then choose leaders who with strength and principle and intelligence will lead us to where we can have self-respect and respect of others.

Would we elect such a man if he campaigned on such a platform?

U.S. Steel Industry Faces Loss of Markets, and Loss in jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit excerpts from an excellent article in Business Week magazine in the issue of February 15, 1964:

ALARM OVER INROADS OF LARGE FOREIGN STEEL DUMPING WILL BRING THE U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY'S VARSITY TEAM TO TELL U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION OF ITS TROUBLES AND HOPED-FOR REMEDIES

Steel's first team goes to Washington February 18, 19, and 20. For 3 days, presidents of a dozen steel companies will tell the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee about the industry's alarm over its worsening world trade position (table) and the remedies it suggests.

Steel will have its say as part of the U.S. preparation for the Kennedy round of trade negotiations due to start May 4 in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Last fall, Christian Herter, chief U.S. negotiator, invited steel—and many other industries—to provide marketplace knowledge to guide U.S. negotiators at the GATT bargaining sessions. The hearings before the Tariff Commission and TIC are part of the procedure used in establishing what the United States will offer—and ask for—in Geneva.

INDUSTRY SHIFT

A month or so ago, the steel industry didn't seem to feel there was much point in taking the hearings seriously. Some felt that Herter's invitation should be ignored. Then sentiment shifted to a perfunctory filing of briefs, and next to the idea that commercial research directors or sales VIP's should testify at the hearings.

But as the industry studied its position, its reaction grew more urgent. That's why presidents or chairmen of six of the eight largest producers—plus those of at least half a dozen others—will testify for the 15 minutes each company gets. They'll make these points:

Full employment is just as much U.S. public policy as is freer trade, and right now, the two clearly conflict in the case of steel.

Foreign steel producers are violating the GATT in various ways to the disadvantage of the U.S. steel industry.

Through its postwar aid programs, Washington has helped build so much new steel capacity abroad that the U.S. steel industry has lost its dominance in the world market.

DISTURBING FIGURES

To emphasize its plight, the industry can point to the way imports are steadily outpacing exports. Figures for the first 11 months of 1963 show the worst deficit, in tons, since 1959—when we first imported more steel than we exported.

In dollars, the latest statistics are even more disturbing. Imports for the 11 months were $100 million above total 1962 steel imports. And steel's 11-month dollar deficit was $104 million greater than in all 1962—$164 million against $60 million.

STRONG LANGUAGE

In their briefs, steel companies warned bluntly that 1964's steel import deficit will worsen. From an all-time high of 6.9 percent of apparent U.S. consumption in 1963, prophesized President William J. Stephens, of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., imports could double within 18 months. Japan, he said, will have enough galvanized sheet capacity with 2 years "to eliminate the United States from world markets." Britain and Japan, he went on, are adding capacity that will render "world trade conditions in tinplate chaotic."

United States Steel Corp. was milder in its brief. But its president, L. B. Worthington, pointed to "virtually insuperable barriers we now face" in competing not only here but in the markets of competitors and in third-country markets.

LOSS IN JOBS

Briefs dealt bluntly with unemployment and the way imports are reducing employment levels here.

"Loss of 4,180 jobs displaced by imported rods," said Pittsburgh Steel Co., "is costing American steelworkers $32 million in pay and benefits."

The American Iron & Steel Institute brief took the point even further: "It is estimated that the domestic steel industry would have provided $375 million in wages and salaries for an additional 50,000 workers in 1962 if it could have maintained its 1953–57 average participation in world steel trade and had experienced no further erosion of domestic markets by imports."

Looking just at exports, President Alfred S. Glossbrenner, of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., said that between 1957 and 1962 "the loss in seamless pipe exports alone can be measured as an equivalent loss of 3,000 to 4,000 jobs in U.S. seamless pipe mills."

All the 15 U.S. seamless mills and 37 of the 38 U.S. rod mills are located in C or D labor markets—those of moderate or relatively substantial unemployment, the Youngstown and Pittsburgh briefs note.

COST-OF-ENTRY ISSUE

What should our trade negotiators do about this in the Kennedy round?

All agree that U.S. tariffs on steel mill products should not be cut. They average 5.9 percent and are the world's lowest. But some want them put on the reserve (nonnegotiable) list from the start, while others suggest this be done only if nontariff concessions can't be had.

The difference is really just in bargaining technique. The steel industry is unanimous in wanting our GATT negotiators to equalize the cost of entry of steel products into all steel importing nations. That involves considering all charges in imports, not merely duties. The United States charges duty only. Other nations impose transmission, import, turnover, sales, and stamp taxes. Moreover, they grant export subsidies of several kinds. Steelmakers feel these disparities shut them out of export markets while propping open the door for imports.

"A 100-foot quantity of standard 2-inch pipe shipped from the United States to France," says AISI President John P. Roche, "accumulates French duties, stamp taxes, and transaction taxes to the amount of $18.71. A similar shipment from France to the United States is assessed only the $1.10 duty."

DUMPING PROBLEM

Steelmen are equally angry about dumping, and will say so in Washington next week. In seven steel cases last year, the Treasury Department ruled that dumping took place in five. But the Tariff Commission denied injury in any.

Steelmen note that the European Coal and Steel Community last month raised its external tariff to counter what it called dumping by the United Kingdom, Japan, and various Soviet-bloc nations. They argue that the GATT agreement explicitly forbids dumping—in language close to the U.S. Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. J. & L.'s stand is this: Strengthen GATT's antidumping provision, include a rolled-steel products section in it, and impose steel-import quotas until effective antidumping programs are in operation.

In a letter to Herter this week, President David McDonald of the United Steel Workers also complained about the tariff hike put through by the Coal and Steel Community. But McDonald suggested a milder way of meeting the problem. He said the United States should insist on bargaining from the old levels, refuse any concessions on steel products if the Europeans refuse to do this.

American Legion Resolution From the Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, let us listen to the men under the gun. The following resolution was adopted by the American Legion, Department of the Panama Canal Zone, in a special meeting held February 13, 1964.

These loyal men are more aware of the danger to our country than anyone in Washington could possibly be. The distinguished department commander, Robert O. Bauman, in his appeal to the Congress, said:

Your interest and help in this situation would be greatly appreciated as the outcome of the recently provoked incidents by the Republic of Panama will determine whether the countries in Latin America will remain allied to democracy or fall in the hands of the Communists.

I hope every Member of the Congress will read this resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Whereas the duties and responsibilities of U.S. citizen-policemen in the Canal Zone demand of the individual unquestioned loyalty and allegiance to the United States; and

Whereas these policemen must meet every security criteria conceived by law and regulations necessary to the safeguarding of life and property and to insure continuity and capability of operation and administration of Canal Zone activities under any circumstances by the U.S. Government; and

Whereas a Panamanian police candidate in taking an oath of office would not and could not pledge an oath of loyalty and allegiance to the U.S. Government; and

Whereas the hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone policemen would be interpreted by citizens of the Republic of Panama as another act of appeasement and reaffirmation of their demands for complete absolute sovereignty within the Canal Zone: Therefore be it

Resolved by the department executive committee, the American Legion, Department of the Panama Canal Zone (meeting at the American Legion Club, February 14, 1964), To oppose the hiring of Panamanian citizens as policemen in the Canal Zone as a threat to national security of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we protest the hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone policemen as a violation of the Canal Zone Code (title 2, Sec. 147: Security Positions) which requires the use of U.S. citizens to insure continuity and capability of operation and administration of activities in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to refuse any and all

requests for monetary appropriations for which any part will be used to pay the salaries of Panamanians hired as policemen in the Canal Zone; and be it finally

Resolved, That we advise all concerned of this new threat to U.S. control over the Canal Zone.

"How Good a Neighbor Am I?"—A Pastoral Letter on Racial Justice and Charity, by Bishop Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., Diocese of Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from the text of a pastorial letter on racial justice and charity by Bishop Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., of the diocese of Gary, Ind.

This pastoral letter, entitled, "How Good a Neighbor Am I?" was drawn to my attention by the Honorable Alban M. Smith, the distinguished judge of the circuit court of La Porte County, Ind.

The letter follows:

HOW GOOD A NEIGHBOR AM I?—A PASTORAL LETTER ON RACIAL JUSTICE AND CHARITY

(By Bishop Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., diocese of Gary)

The infinite wisdom and creative genius of Almighty God reveals itself delightfully in the countless varieties with which it surrounds us, all combining to form one majestic and magnificent mosaic—the world. Mosaics are made of many small stones of various colors and sizes which arranged artistically and skillfully form a pleasing picture. Even a momentary consideration of the variety easily seen in the different kinds of flowers, birds, animals, insects, and even in the stars and planets prompts us to exclaim with St. Paul: "Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God." (Romans 11, 33.)

The most precious pieces in the divine mosaic of the world are human beings. Although each differs from the other in color, shape, size and brilliance, together they give tone, quality and character to the mosaic. Because God is a flawless artisan, each piece fits perfectly and contributes faultlessly to the harmonious unity of the divine masterpiece.

Hateful spite can make even the most beautiful mosaic an object of brutal defacement. Of the many attempts at disfigurement which persistently plague the divine mosaic of mankind, none are more annoying and none more in need of prevention than those stemming from racial tension. These tensions exist in all parts of the world, in many cities of our own country, and right here around us. It is to the elimination of racial injustice that this letter is addressed. The purpose of this pastoral message is to focus attention as sharply as possible on the divine mosaic with the hope that the blotches and scars on it will be recognized for what they really are—heinous crimes against God and man. The intellectual conviction that racial segregation and discrimination are not Christian—is sterile without the total commitment of our souls and hearts to this fact. To teach, guide and sanctify is the obligation incumbent upon the bishop because of his pastoral office. This letter, however, is not written as the fulfillment of an official duty. It is rather the expression of a deep and painfully felt concern for many sorely tried and shamefully treated members of our community, Negroes in particular.

The inbred social evils of generations will require strong and sometimes drastic action to dispel them. When a disease afflicts parts of a body and threatens the life of the person, drastic measures are often necessary to eradicate it. Prejudice, segregation, and discrimination are symptoms of a malignancy that threaten the spiritual and material welfare of the whole human race. As in the case of malignancies, complete eradication is the only possible remedy.

Persistent racial injustice has so sensitized the feelings and emotions of those affected that they no longer can endure the pain and anguish of constant frustration. In a determined effort, Negroes are pooling their resources, uniting their energies, enduring hardships, and making sacrifices for the complete suppression of racial injustice and the free exercise of their human rights and dignities. Right-thinking persons and practicing Christians should lend them a hand in this determined effort. Furthermore, the knowledge that growth in personal perfection is not possible while the blemish of racial injustice stains the conscience should stimulate genuine concern and effective cooperation.

This message offers no simple or easy solution for the elimination of prejudice, discrimination, or segregation. It means to depict the repeated defacing, disfiguring, and distorting of the divine mosaic of mankind as malevolent acts of vandalism. It proposes a search of the soul—piercing enough to recognize the devilishness of the evil and contrite enough to bring about a real change in attitude. It hopes to shine the light of divine truth as found in the Gospels brightly enough to dispel the blinding darkness of prejudice and reveal the joy and goodness of living in fraternal unity.

PART I. THE CHRISTIAN TEACHING ON RACE

"By this will all men know that you are my disciples if you have love for one another." (John 13, 35). The true meaning of "Christian" has never been more clearly stated. "A new commandment I give you that you love one another." (John 13, 34). No words in the New Testament are more explicit, more exacting. For the Christian it is not enough to know the teachings of Christ. He must comprehend them, proclaim them, and apply them to his daily living.

Racial injustice calls attention to words such as prejudice, discrimination and segregation, and places them frequently on our lips. The ugly and brutal significance of these terms is not thoroughly understood. In this letter prejudice is considered an attitude of mind and heart, whether conscious or unconscious, in which an adverse judgment about a person or group of persons is made because of preconceived notions, regardless of fact. People often judge individuals on the real, or supposed characteristics of a group, and just as often judge a whole group by one individual. Discrimination and segregation can be considered as the practice of such prejudice.

Christian tradition reveals fundamental beliefs about man which eliminate any rational basis for racial prejudice, discrimination, or segregation. As the simile of the mosaic indicates there are differences among people but each person is essential for the perfect picture.

PART II. AREAS OF CONCERN

Human society is the arena within which the prize of personal salvation is to be won. The social conditions fostered or tolerated by us aid or hinder our own salvation as well as that of those who live with us under them. "I tell you the plain truth inasmuch as you did this to one of these least brethren of mine, you did it to me." (Matt. 25, 40.) Living in peace with our fellow men is not a matter of choice but a divine command. In living with our fellow men mistakes will be made, some honest, some deceitful. They will be disturbing but they must be finally forgiven and forgotten. The forgiveness of our own faults against others is absolutely contingent on our willingness to forgive others their transgressions against us; and not the slightest hint of any other way is to be found in Sacred Scriptures.

The record of oppression due to racial prejudice is shamefully long. Its blot smears the pages of history. Each wave of immigrants to our country experienced the sting of prejudice. They were poor, unskilled, uneducated, and unable to communicate. Many were forced because of social and economic necessity to segregate themselves. Their efforts to improve their status were often met with scorn and contempt. Gradually the foreigners gained acceptance. This acceptance came about not so much by a change of attitude based on Christian justice and charity but more by natural assimilation. Second and third generations could not readily be recognized as a distinct ethnic group.

The Negro is faced with similar challenges in housing, employment, education, and political denomination. For him, however, the challenge is intensified and perpetuated by the high visibility of his darker skin. Regardless of his personal qualifications, he is seldom, if ever, acceptable without any reservation in the dominant white society. He is not free to live where he chooses in accordance with his economic status. He is often thwarted in his employment and educational aspirations. He is politically restricted, religiously frustrated, socially ostracized and individually demoralized. So consistent has this pattern of discrimination against him been that today the United States as a Nation is being accused of hypocrisy and religion of failure in view of the glaring discrepancies between principle and practice.

Particular issues

Prejudice, segregation, and discrimination defile every thing they touch but their effects on housing, employment, education, religion, and associations are especially deplorable.

Housing

The evidences of segregation in housing are strikingly acute. So is the evidence that this is deliberate. This containment implies that one race is not fit to live with another. This is immoral. Some of our cities and all of our suburban areas are virtually devoid of Negro homes. This condition is far from a matter of choice on the part of the Negro. Christian doctrine and democratic principles affirm the rights of all persons to live where they choose and in homes which their economic position can afford.

Segregated housing inevitably leads to overcrowded housing. This in turn gives rise to slum conditions and the consequent problems of physical, social, and spiritual deterioration. It is cruel to advertise the benefits of good housing and then tolerate slums in which culture and the practice of virtue are practically impossible. At the root of discrimination in housing lies the ugliness of personal prejudice against darker-skinned people constantly generating feverish suspicions, hatred, distrust, and unwillingness to behave as a neighbor. Realtors, property owners and prospective buyers and sellers who resort to unwritten restrictive covenants and rely on the feebleness of law enforcement against discriminatory selling are guilty of perpetuating segregation.

While legislation in itself cannot directly destroy prejudice, its influence is important in the combating of discrimination. Good legislation can become a potent educational force, giving support to the timid and prod-

ding the conscience of the indifferent. Legislators and Government officials are obliged to conscientiously strive for laws aimed at preventing or eliminating racial discrimination in housing. The votes of citizens should approved and accept these laws with the firm resolve to abide by them.

It was the enchanting welcome of the wide-open spaces and the unrestricted plenitude of homesites in America which beckoned freedom-loving people from all parts of the world. They in turn helped make America the greatest Nation on earth, the land of the free and the home of the brave. The warmly inviting welcome of good housing—sincerely open—can banish the irritating barriers of discrimination. As a consequence the climate of social relations would be vastly improved. The type of human progress which upholds virtue as man's basic right in which all his other human rights are implied would be furthered. Good housing unhampered by prejudice will facilitate the practice of virtue and pave the way to living in peace and joy.

Economic Aspects

Closely alined with the housing problem is the inequality of economic opportunity. Significant gains have been made in diminishing racial discrimination in hiring but much more remans to be accomplished. Insufficient is the concern given to the flagrant discrepancies evident in upgrading and promotion practices. Granted that race should be no criterion for promotion, neither should it be a barrier to advancement. Promotion on the basis of talent and achievement is an honorable and just claim which deserves unbiased recognition. "He who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim these rights as marks of his dignity." (Pope John XXIII in Peace on Earth.)

Dicrimination in professions, crafts and trade discourages the acquisition of proficiency and skill. No one gives his best where his talents are not appreciated. Because the Negro has been hindered in his preparations for occupations requiring special skills, justice calls for special efforts in the behalf of his training. Restricting the Negro to unskilled tasks not only checks his progress but works to the detriment of the Nation's labor force. Proper motivation and equal opportunity can provide the Negro youth with solid confidence which will strengthen his faith in himself and brighten his outlook in the future. Equal opportunity for employment can prevent despair, overcome racism and curb the spirit of rebellion.

Education

In furthering the best interests of Negro youth and the future of America, the racial segregation of schools can no longer be tolerated. It is hypocrisy to teach democracy in segregated schools. Segregated schools exist because there is segregation in housing. Eliminate the one and the other will soon vanish. It is irony to educate for democracy with all its implied rights and freedoms in deliberately segregated institutions of learning. How cruel to open classroom doors and reveal opportunities for a better way of life—to awaken desires for nobler goals and then to close a gate of constraint on neighborhoods where real culture and virtue are hardly possible, and where dreams turn into nightmares. Catholic parochial schools should be outstanding examples of the unity and equality of all human beings which Christian doctrine demands.

Other Institutions and Associations

Our hospitals have made praiseworthy strides in the integration of patients and personnel. They should be on constant alert to eliminate any vestiges of discrimination. Physicians, nurses, and hospital personnel are offered numerous opportunities for the practice of the corporal works of mercy. Any bias in the performance of these works would tend to retard recovery and add to the physical and mental discomfort of the patient.

Organizations bearing the name "Catholic" or associated with Catholic causes ought to have qualifications for membership which are identical in every respect for any sincere applicant. Everything else being equal our Negro brothers should be extended invitations and welcomes into our associations in ways that show more finely our delight in having them. Past negligences can be atoned for by heartwarming examples of Christian brotherly love. "Charity" says St. Peter, "covers a multitude of sins." (1 Peter, 4, 8)

No one who considers himself a Christian should join any association which has as its stated or implied purpose the hindrance or the humiliation of another group because of race. On the other hand, no one should take issue with another for joining an organization designed specifically to promote the uniquely distinct interests of its members.

PART III. PASTORAL CONSIDERATION

The role of the parish

The basic unit in the church universal is the parish. It is for the parish to act as a leaven in the community, spreading the faith and maintaining a social climate conducive to the growth of holiness. The parish should be a living organism constantly concerned about the spiritual and material welfare of the people dwelling within its confines. In the furtherance of racial equality parishes should act promptly and decisively. Delay, hesitancy, indifference and excuses point up the lack of positive good and can become grave faults of omission, damaging to the parish and injurious to the parishioners. The lack of positive good—a sin of omission—is one which Christ singles out as deserving a place in hell. Parishes are guided in their spiritual activities and acceptance of parishioners by Ecclesiastical law. The supreme law of the church which is the salvation of souls must prevail in cases involving racial and minority groups.

Under no circumstances should the steeple of the parish church cast over its territory a gloomy shadow indicative of exclusiveness or a lack of missionary zeal. The steeple should be for all people a beacon of truth reflecting the bright light of the Son of God. Parishes could perform a great social service in their communities if they would inspire their parishioners to work for and cooperate with civic and neighborhood organizations toward the following goals and objectives: A. Housing legislation completely fair and strong enough to shatter the present pattern of compulsory segregation. B. Systematic enforcement of building codes, fire prevention ordinances and zoning laws. C. Realistic preparation of people in changing neighborhoods for integration. D. Welcome newcomers into the neighborhood warmly with an evident interest in their welfare.

Individual responsibility

It is essential that the barriers that are causing racial misunderstanding be broken down. Those of us who are white can ask our Negro acquaintance how it feels to be denied service at hotels or restaurants. We can inquire how restrictions in employment affect their families and particularly the incentive for further education of their children. We can learn the anguish they feel because of their inability to secure decent housing in more attractive neighborhoods. We can get to know about their frustrations and aspirations.

Those of us who are Negro might ask our white associates to describe their apprehensions and reservations. All the pitfalls of misunderstanding should be openly faced, not for the sake of debate but with the idea of building solid bridges of mutual understanding. Only the open and free exchange of opinions can bring about the proper realization of the rights and responsibilities that bind all sides.

Peaceful demonstrations which are a part of our American heritage are being used by our Negro neighbors to attract attention to their claims. As long as they serve a useful purpose under the guidance of responsible leadership they deserve our sympathetic attention and cooperation. Violence in any form is to be deplored. It only fans the flames of angry passions and stretches tension to the breaking point.

Examination of conscience

God never makes a mistake. Every human being created by Him is here for a perfect reason. Comprehension of this truth will cause every individual to look at another with respect, no matter what his condition. Where differences exist that seem to defy explanation, personal adjustment and resignation to the will of God is the only approach to a solution. On matters of racial injustice consciences should be examined frequently; attitudes aired and purified; emotions controlled and the mind kept open. Prejudice is a form of pride and like pride is seldom ever recognized by the possessor. The proud and prejudiced man looks down on his fellowman, and as long as he does is prevented from looking up to see the God of mercy and compassion, the Father of us all.

The Greatest Virtue

The key word in this message is charity—charity as it connotes the love of neighbor based on the love of God. Charity is not the giving of alms, is not condescension. It is a flaming devotion which radiates a brilliance and a warmth that brings joy and happiness to everyone it embraces. When we call upon charity to solve our racial misunderstanding we are not slighting justice, for it is charity that compliments and fulfills justice. Without charity genuine peace among people is not possible. St. Paul's description of charity is worth recalling here. "If I should speak the languages of men and of angels, but have no love, I am no more than a noisy gong and a clanging cymbal. Love is long-suffering, love is kind * * * it is not irritable, it takes no note of injury; it is not glad when injustice triumphs; it is glad when the truth prevails. Always it is ready to make allowances; always to trust; always to hope; always to be patient." (I Corinthians 13: 1, 4–7.)

Charity is meaningless until it is applied to dealings with our neighbor, and then it becomes a vibrant force. Charity needs a neighbor. Who? It was a lawyer who asked Christ the same question, and in answer the Lord narrated the parable of the Good Samaritan and gave the perfect definition of a neighbor. The lawyer asked, Who is my neighbor? Christ replies, Which of these men behaved like a neighbor? Christ pointed out that a neighbor is not someone in the second person but a way of behaving in the first person. A neighbor is not someone else but one's self. Essentially the story of the Good Samaritan states that I do not have a neighbor. I make myself somebody's neighbor. Being a neighbor is the personal way in which I meet someone else. It is the substantialization of the query—How good a neighbor am I? My encounter with someone else is more important than either of us may realize at the moment. When the last day comes, the day of judgment I will discover that it is the way in which I all unknowing met Christ.

I call for a courageous and unfaltering response to the challenges of racial justice and brotherly love. I plead for clear thinking, convincing speech, forthright action. I pray that divine assistance remain with us.

Egypt Under Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is much misinformation regarding the character of the present Egyptian Government headed by President Nasser. In the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 63, winter, 1963–64, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization located at 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., there is a timely critique entitled "Egypt Under Nasser." I believe this article deserves the careful consideration of all security-minded Americans.

The article follows:

EGYPT UNDER NASSER

The Foreign Policy Association's bimonthly publication Headline Series provides valuable information on current world problems, for the edification of its members and readers. The September–October (1963) issue carries an interesting analysis of "Egypt under Nasser" by Prof. Malcolm H. Kerr of the University of California, Los Angeles. Professor Kerr taught at the American University at Beirut and has written books and articles on Middle Eastern affairs. His background and knowledge of the Middle East would therefore qualify him to provide further enlightenment on this important subject. Yet, candor compels us to state that his review of Nasser's policies, particularly those pertaining to foreign relations, was not as probing as it might have been.

NASSER'S POLITICAL MACHINE

We do not question the essential facts presented by Professor Kerr, but rather how they were brought together and how he relates or fails to relate them to each other. On the whole, his analysis of the domestic situation in Egypt is interesting. On the political front, Professor Kerr points out that despite Nasser's presumed intentions to introduce parliamentary forms of government, the regime is still dominated by the same small military clique which overthrew the Farouk monarchy in 1952.

Professor Kerr notes that Nasser first established the so-called liberation rally in 1953, superseded in 1957 by the national union. Presently, the sole political party is the so called Arab Socialist Union. However, as Professor Kerr observes, despite Nasser's professed objective to activate grassroot support through these organizations, his regime in practice, discourages initiative from below. Distinction is made between the active members who are the elite, and the mass membership. All decisions of policy and action emanate from Nasser and are carried out by the active members. The structure and its functions are reminiscent of the Nazi Party setup under Hitler.

According to Professor Kerr, Nasser justifies this method of rule on the grounds that democracy is not so much a political concept as it is, above all, a matter of social equality and economic opportunity. This may be Nasser's rationale for dictatorship, but how can social equality and economic opportunity be achieved, if the Egyptian masses are treated like sheep with regard to the political life of the country? Unfortunately, Professor Kerr does not deal with this contradiction. On the other hand, he seems to accept Nasser's allegation that criticism of inefficiency and corporation is welcomed. This comes as a surprise to us, and it would have been most helpful if Professor Kerr had told his readers where and when such criticisms have been made.

Professor Kerr does not challenge Nasser's assertion that his government has dealt relatively gently with those "few individuals who selfishly refuse to cooperate." Yet, Nasser has not been able to conceal the fact that his government has established concentration camps which are run by German Nazis. The fact is that any critic of the Nasser government runs the risk of his life as well as his property, if he dares to voice his opposition publicly.

As regards the press, Professor Kerr writes that while it is controlled by the Nasser regime, it repudiates the excesses and deprivations of Stalinism. Parenthetically, we were never under the impression that Stalinism has been a real issue in Nasser's Egypt. According to Professor Kerr, the Cairo press insists that the government's "ideology is receptive to new ideas and diversity of opinion." To this assertion, Professor Kerr writes "one may wonder to what extent this is so." This, too, surprises us since one who is conversant with Middle Eastern affairs, such as Professor Kerr, should know that the Nasser government forbids diversity of opinion. Indeed, the very control of all organs of public opinion precludes diversity and dissent. As a practical matter, how can any opponent of Nasser air his views before the public when the radio, press, televison, and the public platforms are under the thumb of Nasser and his military cohorts?

PROGRESS

As regards Nasser's contributions to the economic and social development of Egypt, Professor Kerr refers to the land reforms and to the alleged determination of the government to bring about a radical improvement in the conditions of the people. Yet, on the basis of Professor Kerr's own estimate, "Most Egyptian adults are still illiterate, suffer from at least one parasitic disease, and subsist on an annual income of not much more than $100." Professor Kerr declares that the agrarian reform law of 1952 was one of the earliest accomplishments of the regime. However, when one examines the results of that law and subsequent measures in this field, they are found to be pitifully small. Thus, Professor Kerr estimates that over 2 million families "each own a single acre or less and an estimated 1.5 million own no land at all." The limitations of the land reform program are further emphasized by the fact brought out by Professor Kerr, that the population increases by 600,000 annually.

Professor Kerr estimates that the daily wage for farm laborers is about 33 cents per day "which even by Egyptian standards amounts to destitution." As regards industry, he states that production rose over 47 percent in the years 1952–59 but that Nasser's policies alone are not responsible for this increase. According to Professor Kerr, by 1952 Egypt was "already among the more industrialized countries of the Middle East."

Despite the rise in production, one finds that the Egyptian economy is virtually bankrupt. Indeed, it manages to stay afloat thanks to the huge handouts from the United States, the Soviet Union, West Germany, Japan, and Italy. This is a fact which has been acknowledged by American authorities. True, the Egyptian economy has been beset by fluctuations in cotton prices and the severe damage to the crops. Yet, with these allowances, one cannot ignore the fact that the damage could be partially overcome if Egypt placed most of its resources in the service of peaceful construction. Unfortunately, the Egyptian military establishment continues to have the highest priority, and the size of Nasser's armed forces expands year by year. Professor Kerr himself acknowledges that Egypt's military expenses are a "secrecy-shrouded matter."

GUNS INSTEAD OF BUTTER

The Soviets, of course, have given hundreds of millions of dollars worth of military hardware to the Egyptian Government. Moreover, Professor Kerr refers to reports "of vast outlays for armament production in Egyptian factories." The millions of dollars which are being spent to support Egypt's aggression in Yemen and her recent intervention in the Moroccan-Algerian conflict, are additional items of military expenditure.

Egypt's military buildup is not only supported directly and/or indirectly by the major powers, but also from what Professor Kerr admits to be forced savings squeezed from the miserable wages of the Egyptian workers and peasants. We believe Professor Kerr understated the case when he said that these huge military outlays "placed an uncertain but certainly enormous drag on the pace of economic advancement." We might say that it is a misleading statement too, because simple economics indicates that a poor country like Egypt cannot have guns and butter. How can a truly peaceful economy develop with a broadening market for consumer consumption when the very lifeblood of the economy is sucked into the Egyptian military machine?

EGYPT'S FOREIGN POLICY

At this point it is appropriate to examine Professor Kerr's comments on Nasser's foreign policies. Professor Kerr does not relate Nasser's domestic program with his foreign policy and yet, it is an elementary fact that foreign policy is a function of a country's domestic program. A domestic policy which emphasizes guns instead of butter produces a foreign policy for aggression.

Professor Kerr does note Egypt's propensity to subvert the independence of her neighbors. Nevertheless, he cushions this with the allegation that to many Arabs "Nasser's policy of subversion appears as the act not of a power hungry dictator, but rather of potential liberator." The fact that there are Arabs in other countries who worship Nasser, gives this statement plausibility. However, when one probes more deeply into this situation, one finds that Nasser's following does not, by any means, take in a majority of the Arab peoples. No one has ever taken a nose count of Nasser's followers. There have been no plebescites to indicate the sentiment for or against him. Certainly, his followers in other countries are vociferous, articulate, and seem to have an inexhaustible supply of funds. Yet, every time that Nasser has endeavored to capitalize on his so-called popularity, his efforts have gone up in smoke.

The extent of Nasser's popularity is a subject which deserves careful study and evaluation. It is a disservice to those who want to be well informed to be told that the noise of the Nasserites is proof of the Egyptian President's unchallenged popularity. Certainly, the sharp conflicts between Nasser on the one hand and the leaders of neighboring Arab States show that Nasser has a long way to go before he can make good his claim that he is the modern Saladin.

Professor Kerr alleges that it is "Nasser's hostility to Israel which has done the most to make him a controversial figure in America. We must say that this is a misleading and harmful statement. First of all, it is not Nasser's hostility to Israel per se which disturbs most Americans but rather his enmity toward the United States. Professor Kerr has little to say about Nasser's views toward the United States and yet, it is precisely his ceaseless undermining activity against our country which is the most alarming aspect of his foreign policies. An examination of Nasser's speeches, the propaganda of Cairo's radio and press, and the activities of Egypt's agents throughout Af-

rica, Asia, and Latin America, demonstrate quite clearly that the Nasser government is determined to destroy the U.S. position in those key areas of the world.

EGYPT'S "MEIN KAMPF"

Moreover, Egypt's hate-inciting policies toward Israel serve as a smokescreen which conceals Nasser's hatred of the West. Israel is also used as a scapegoat to extract concession after concession from the United States and other Western Powers. His so-called anticommunism to which Professor Kerr refers, also serves as a smokescreen for his blackmail policies. Nasser's professions of loyalty to the Soviet Union have been unequivocal and he has not hesitated to tell this to President Kennedy himself. Professor Kerr makes no mention of this fact. However, in our judgment, the major flaw in Professor Kerr's presentation lies in his failure to show that Nasserism is, above all, anti-Western and that its main objective is to eject the West from the Middle East and Africa.

We make this charge not on any emotional or intuitive basis. It is fully supported in President Nasser's own book "Egypt's Liberation." It seems to us that any intelligent discussion of Nasser's foreign policy should begin with an examination of this book wherein Nasser outlines his ultimate aims. It was the failure to take seriously Hitler's "Mein Kampf" which helped to paralyze and muddle the thinking of Western statesmen in the 1930's. We would recommend that all of the members of the Foreign Policy Association read Nasser's book if they want to obtain a true understanding of Egyptian foreign policy. It is indeed regrettable that Professor Kerr makes no reference whatsoever to this book which is the "bible" of Egypt's foreign policy.

Finally, we must take note of Professor Kerr's allegation that Nasser does not contemplate the destruction of Israel. To support this view, Professor Kerr refers to Nasser's interviews with Western journalists wherein the Egyptian President purportedly viewed the original 1947 U.N. partition recommendation, together with other U.N. resolutions as "an acceptable basis for peace." However, these resolutions, as Professor Kerr concedes, would reduce Israel's present territory and would permit all Arabs who claim to be refugees, to return en masse to a much smaller Israel. Obviously, if these proposals were accepted, Nasser would achieve the destruction of Israel "by peaceful means." Surely, Professor Kerr knows that Israel could not maintain its independence, nor its viability under such conditions.

Nasser has publicly stated over and over again through the years that he plans to liquidate Israel by force of arms at the opportune moment. Yet, Professor Kerr tells us that "it may be doubted whether at any time, even in 1956, Nasser's intentions were as violent as they may have seemed." This is an astonishing assertion. When a man publicly and repeatedly declares that he intends to kill another man and when he constantly wields his gun before all to see, must the spectators refrain from acting because he has not as yet fired? This is the present state of affairs in the Middle East. President Nasser has not moved against Israel yet, but he has told the whole world repeatedly that this is the raison d'être for Egypt's military buildup. Can we say that despite all of this, Nasser's intentions are peaceful?

As regards a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, Professor Kerr first tells us that Nasser's plan "falls short of the destruction of Israel," but then Professor Kerr goes on to say that "only the strongest and most prestigious Arab leader armed with the confidence not only of his own people but of the populations of the Arab States could conceivably negotiate effectively with Israel." Nasser, in Professor Kerr's view, is not in that position. Yet, throughout his analysis one finds numerous references to Nasser's outstanding leadership in the Arab world.

Professor Kerr writes: "For many years now Ghamal Abdel Nasser has enjoyed a unique position of prestige both within Egypt and throughout much of the Arab world. His authority at home is unchallenged." If Nasser is that man, and if he is a man of peace, then he could certainly lead the way toward an equitable solution of the key issues in the Middle East. But if Nasser does not meet those standards, then the myth of his uniqueness should be exposed for what it is; namely, a shrewd public relations operation, aided and abetted by powerful special interests in the United States who mistake his blackmail tactcs for cooperation.

Bonneville Power Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Bonneville Power Administration plays a vital role in the economy of the Pacific Northwest. For this reason, proposals to increase the cost of electrical power sold by the BPA to public and private agencies are of great concern to the people I represent. Recently, the board of directors for the Everett Chamber of Commerce in my district passed a resolution on this subject. The chamber realizes that there are no easy solutions, but suggests that intensive study of the total power problem will help solve not only the problems of today, but will also help to avoid greater problems of the future. I invite the attention of the House of Representatives to this resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas Bonneville Power Administration has announced that it proposes to increase the cost of electrical power sold to public and private agencies in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas such increases would be passed along to the customers of these agencies, particularly to business and industry, deterring payroll expansion at a time when increased employment is essential to the economic health of the region; and

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration has as yet not taken into consideration the amount of additional revenue which will be generated as a result of the Canadian compact and the proposed Northwest-Southwest Intertie, and therefore does not know what its true financial status will be with or without a general rate increase; and

Whereas the customers of Bonneville Power Administration has expressed agreement to waiving the 5-year reopening clause in their contracts, permitting a rate adjustment subsequent to 1964: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bonneville Power Administration be urged to withhold filing its proposed rate increase for at least 1 year; and further, that an intensive study of anticipated usage and costs over the next 10 years be instituted immediately to determine prior to December 1965, whether an increase would at any time be justified.

Poverty: Target for Education—An Address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Delivered on February 15, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD what I think is a most significant and thoughtful address on a subject of increasing concern to many Americans.

The address, "Poverty: Target for Education," was delivered by the able and distinguished U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, before the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City, N.J.

In light of President Johnson's call in his state of the Union message for an "unconditional war on poverty" in the United States, I believe that Members of Congress will read with particular interest Commissioner Keppel's address, which follows:

AN ADDRESS BY FRANCIS KEPPEL, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I am delighted to be with you today. Originally I was to come here on an easy mission—to offer greetings to America's school administrators. This could have been accomplished briskly and without much strain—either for you or for me—for there is no audience which so clearly deserves the greetings and good wishes of all who are interested in the future of American education.

Somewhere along the line, however, the signals were changed and I was asked to deliver a fullfledged address, no matter what the strain might be on either of us. But I am happy to have the opportunity. There is much for us to talk about. We are at an historic moment in American education. I think that we all sense it, that we all see prospects opening before us which were closed only a few years ago.

Last year, the 88th Congress passed more significant legislative acts for education than any Congress before it. Last month, several of us from the Office of Education met with the Nation's educators at regional meetings across the country to commit this legislation to prompt and effective action. Each of these meetings was marked by high enthusiasm and expectancy. One gets the feeling that America's educators are at least being summoned from the wings to the center of the stage.

The spirit of these meetings and the spirit of our times convince me that we are now given a chance which does not come often to the educational community, that education has truly reached a time of momentum and possibility. We are called on to use our skills to bring all our public schools into the 20th century and to prepare them for the demands of the 21st century, less than four decades hence.

TWO PROPOSALS

As we meet here, the Congress and the administration are considering two major measures to further strengthen our schools. The first of these calls on Federal aid for the selective raising of teacher salaries and the construction of adequate classrooms for pub-

lic elementary and secondary education. It would bring to teaching some of the financial rewards and status so clearly necessary if we are to recruit the teachers we need, and it would replace makeshift, ramshackle classrooms which have been neglected for generations.

This modest proposal has been argued long and endlessly both inside and outside of Congress. It has been subjected to vociferous and various pressures. It is now time that these pressures be lifted, that further debate be halted, that special interests stand aside for the sake of the Nation's interest in the foundation of American education.

The second measure is something new. To be recommended this year by President Johnson, it will be designed as an immediate attack, through education, on some of the problems of poverty and deprivation within our society. It will call for Federal assistance to strengthen education specifically among America's poor, to balance the scales of opportunity for children who need the best of education but ever so seldom receive it. It will regard poverty as a prime target for education.

It is this problem of poverty and education that I want to discuss today. It is a topic you have already heard much about—in the press, in the speeches of the President, in your own seminars. But here in the family, so to speak, I want to deal more directly with certain points than we sometimes do in public.

EDUCATION AND POVERTY

There is no question in my mind—and I think there is none in yours—that education can be vital to the alleviation of poverty. The President himself has called on America's schools as the first and most effective weapon in this concerted war against poverty. At every turn in our technological age, the statisticians show us that unemployment grows wherever educational levels are low, that income rises wherever education achievement is high, that poverty and lack of education are always linked. The public is now awakened to the need for improving the schools of the poor and this is a heartening sign indeed.

But it is gratuitous, to say the least, to preach on this theme to this audience, so many of whose members are the prophets whose voices have for so long been ignored on this score. Much more to the point for us is to explore candidly together some of the pitfalls in our path and some of the difficulties we must overcome if we are to succeed in fulfilling the promise of education as the conqueror of poverty and the harbinger of hope.

First of all, we must face with all the honesty at our command the fundamental question of whether we really believe what we say—that education can fulfill this promise, that we can truly bring equal opportunity to the schools of poverty.

So many schoolmen have been discouraged for so long that it has become easy to say brave words, but in our actions to show that we no longer believe them. It has become easy to be satisfied with schools which exist in form, but not in substance—where teachers seem to teach and children seem to attend—forgetting in our discouragement that students are not really learning. When we have been struggling for years with double sessions and shortages of teachers, it is easy to become satisfied if we can provide a classroom for every student and a teacher for every classroom.

If we mean to succeed, we can no longer accept the idea that it is enough for school administrators to administer the status quo, when our proper role is to give creative leadership to new and challenging possibilities. For us, the deadliest ailment is complacency.

Next to complacency, we must guard against defensiveness. This is a disease especially troublesome to our profession. I have been amazed and dismayed to see how often the public's desire to do something to improve education in our slums has been interpreted by our profession as an attack upon the schools. I have received comments, for instance, on an article I wrote for a recent New York Times education supplement to the effect that at a time of difficulty in education, I should not attack and condemn the schools for failure. In this article, I told how parents of one slum school formed a picket line to protest the poor educational achievement of their children. One school official was much offended and said that we "must attack problems and not schools."

FACING THE PROBLEMS

Let me say here as forcefully as I can that the essential step to progress is to face up squarely to our shortcomings. The plain fact of the matter is that we are simply not reaching hundreds of thousands of children who are now in our schools. You know it and I know it and the public knows it. Unless we can accept this as a starting point and sit down and work for new solutions, we will be lost. If we spend our precious energies in attacking and defending, we will miss the opportunity of the century to conquer this difficult problems we have struggled with so long.

There is another preliminary point we should not miss. Of all the pressures we now feel which tend to evoke our defenses—and there are many pressures—the most acute is the civil rights movement. I know it is not easy for the superintendent on the firing line to maintain his balance and perspective in dealing with the difficulties of desegregation. The pressures now generated are enormous and emotions are high. But in spite of all the present difficulties, I say: "Thank God for the civil rights movement." It provides the very opportunity we have been looking for.

For years, we have talked of the disinterest and apathy of slum parents. We have argued that we can't teach their children because they are not interested in education and because their parents have not taught them to be interested. But now, out of the civil rights movement, we are learning differently. We are learning that many of these parents are interested and have finally found a way to express their interest.

In the past, they have rejected the schools and all we had to offer, because they had no hope that education was really for them. Today, however, they see a hope that the schools can be an instrument for the fulfillment of their aspirations. If we can't deal creatively with this motivation for which we have looked so long, if once again we beat down this hope and return these people to despair, it will be the tragedy of our times.

If we intend to be truly creative, to bring equality of educational opportunity to these children, it is clear to me that we must mount the crest of the wave instead of losing ourselves in the troughs. We must discard for all time a cluster of old misunderstandings and misbegotten myths which have stood in the way of progress.

SOME MYTHS

These are some myths I would especially choose for the ashcan of history.

First is the myth that the children of our slums are of a lower order than children in other sectors of our economy. We perpetuate this myth with such labels as "culturally deprived" and "disadvantaged," "socially underprivileged" and "handicapped." These labels may generally describe the social and economic backgrounds from which these children come. But far too often, we have used these labels as alibis for our failure to find a way to educate these children.

A second myth is that the children of poverty are not merely difficult to teach, but are virtually unteachable. It is true that they come from families of low educational attainment, that their homes lack books and other incentives to learning, that they come to school without middle-class cultural endowments. But we cannot—and we dare not—continue to use this dreary recital as an excuse for poor schools and ineffective education.

A third myth is that these children can hardly hope for high academic achievement, that the best we can do is to send them along to the dumping ground that so many of our vocational training schools have been made. This is a double-edged slur. It is a slur against modern vocational education, which increasingly requires basic academic skills for any hope of success. And it is a slur against these children, who deserve more than detours from education.

At the outset, I asked how we can bring true educational equality to the schools of America's poor, how we can give these children a fair chance for success?

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

One way is through Federal legislation—through the President's emergency program of educational grants to impoverished areas. This vital program would improve teaching in low-income areas, establish learning and study centers, create coordinated counseling services, enrich cultural backgrounds and assist these children toward as high a level of education as they are capable of attaining.

There is also a companion approach to the President's program, which is no less vital if we mean to succeed. It call for the dedication of America's school administrators, of all who are interested in American education, for there can be no success at the Federal level that is not initiated and carried forward in our schools and school systems across the land. This is admittedly a difficult course, beset with problems. But since when has education been a career for those who plan to take it easy?

Out of our difficulties and problems, I think we can distill some fundamentals which will help to guide us as we join educational forces to combat poverty, to raise the levels of opportunity in the schools of the poor.

First, we need to recognize that the substandard school is precisely the wrong school for the children of poverty. These children need the most skilled of teachers, not the least skilled; the least crowded of classrooms, not the most crowded; the best of educational opportunity, not the least of educational opportunity. All this they need to make up for deprivations suffered in every other aspect of their lives.

Second, these children need an imaginative change from ways of teaching which do not work and will not work. Again, let us be candid. We have found that a vast number of these children will reject traditional texts and curriculums—even with good teachers and good buildings. Can't we extend them a better and more helpful helping hand? I think we can and, with purpose, I think we will.

As a rockbottom start, we need new primers and readers for them which recognize their existence in our society. When textbooks reflect only white middle-class life, complete with commodious split-level homes, how can we expect to reach poor white, Negro or Puerto Rican children? Instead, we need textbooks written in terms of their own environments, in terms of their own lives and talents and aspirations.

Above all, we need teachers who are trained and gifted in teaching these children. All too often, teaching our deprived children has seemed a personal deprivation to the teachers we send to their classrooms. They are usually unfamiliar with the home and community life of their students. They are unaccustomed to youngsters who come to

school from families where books and learning are strangers, where the daily struggle for livelihood blots out the long-term struggle for educational attainment.

The successful teacher of these children needs warmth and insight which no legislative act can accomplish. These qualities must be in her at the outset. But they will be lost or blunted if those in charge of our schools fail to encourage and stimulate these qualities. They are a rare treasure. We must look for these teachers perceptively and recognize their worth.

Third, and finally, we need a broad and flexible attitude in administering these schools of poverty. They cannot succeed if they continue to stand aside and apart from the communities they serve. It has chilled me, as I'm sure it does many of you, to see the iron doors of the slum school slam shut at 3:30 when school closes for the day. The bolts are drawn; the fortress is secure; the school is protected from the neighborhood.

Into such fortress schools as these, teachers come from an outside world to teach bewildered children, and when school is over, they leave again for the outside world. Some of these schools even refuse to list their telephone number in order to avoid the distraction of parents calling.

NEW APPROACHES

I don't pretend to know the answers, but I do know that we can't succeed with schools like these. We must bring the school into the community's life and the community into the school. We must reach out to these parents, as they are now reaching out to us.

We must build on their desire for self-help, which is the only kind of help that really works.

We must be more flexible with our authority, more willing to seek and invent new answers when old ones fail. We must learn to work with others in the community—with health and welfare, public and private agencies, and with parents especially—and to work as we have never worked before. When the school becomes—as it can become—a beacon of promise instead of a dark fortress within the community, then we can mark our day of accomplishment.

In this effort, we have much to learn. I think we can learn much from the gifted teachers who today are bringing the best they have to these schools and these children and receive, in return, the best these children can give. Struggling against real odds, they approach their teaching tasks with dedication and fervor. They do not consider that they have been consigned to the least of teaching tasks, but to the most challenging of tasks.

In recent weeks, I have visited with such gifted teachers. It has been a heartwarming experience, a sign of the human capacity to reach out in understanding. I remember one moment especially as a warning and also a promise of change.

A teacher was speaking of the frustration of aptitude tests which may successfully measure America's middle class culture but fail dismally to measure the latent intelligence of the poor. She spoke of the results of these tests when applied to her own students, who respond poorly to them.

"Far too often," she said, "we don't ask what's wrong with this test, or what's wrong with this school, but what's wrong with this child who failed. And pretty soon, the child becomes that which he has been judged."

Now, we, as educators, are also undergoing a time of testing. Let us hope that, for us, the test this time is appropriate, that it truly measures our abilities, and that we are prepared to take it.

And when our judgment comes, let it be said that we gave the excellence that was in us to these schools of poverty, that our actions and deeds made the difference that led to the success of education in our day.

Connecticut Dairy Farmers Oppose Merger of Milk Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers in my congressional district are alarmed over a proposed merger of the southeastern New England Federal milk order with the Boston Federal milk order. Many of them have written me in opposition to this merger for a variety of reasons, such as a loss in income from milk by approximately 15 to 25 cents per hundredweight, an increase in the cost of transportation, and other reasons.

I am informed that most of the dairy farmers of Connecticut feel that the present system is working well and that the southeastern milk order is operating smoothly in conjunction with the other New England orders in handling both bulk and packaged milk. If a merger should take place, it may seriously hurt many of these farmers and it is doubtful whether they could survive such a blow.

In an effort to be helpful to our dairy farmers, I contacted the U.S. Department of Agriculture to express my opposition to the proposed merger. I am now in receipt of a reply from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, which I am inserting into the RECORD. Although a decision has not yet been reached, the Secretary states in his letter that "in reaching an appropriate decision full consideration wil be given to all facets of the merger issue."

I also insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut by Commissioner Joseph N. Gill of the Connecticut State Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Commissioner Gill's letter deals with the same subject and contains valuable information in the matter. Please note his observation at the conclusion of his letter that "every responsible dairy farm organization is strongly opposed" to the proposed merger.

Included are also several of the many letters I received from dairy farmers of the area voicing their opposition. I am pleased to insert all this material into the RECORD and to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1964.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: This is in reference to your inquiry concerning proposals to revise the southeastern New England Federal milk order, including proposals to merge this order with other New England Federal milk orders.

A joint public hearing was held January and February of last year in New England with respect to proposed amendments to the southeastern New England, Connecticut, Greater Boston, Springfield, and Worcester Federal milk orders. The consolidation under one regulation of the southeastern New England order with certain or all of these other orders was an important issue on which evidence was taken. A substantial amount of evidence was presented at the hearing both in support of and in opposition to such merger.

The Department is now reviewing the record of this hearing, which was quite lengthy, and the briefs were voluminous. It involved a number of issues which, if adopted, would have a substantial impact on all of the New England milk orders.

In the formulation of its recommended decision on the proposals considered, the Department is required by statute to base its recommendations solely on the evidence obtained at the hearing. You may be assured that in reaching an appropriate decision full consideration will be given to all facets of the merger issue. A recommended decision on this matter will be issued as expeditiously as possible and all interested parties will have opportunity to file any exceptions they may have as to its findings and conclusions.

We appreciate your interest in the milk producers serving the southeastern New England market. Please let us know if we can service you in any other way.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Hartford, Conn., February 20, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Any help that you may be able to give the eastern Connecticut dairymen in opposing the merger of the southeastern New England milk marketing order with the Boston order will, I know, be greatly appreciated. The State dairy cooperatives, including the Connecticut Milk Producers' Association; the Modern Milk Marketing Association; the Torrington Cooperative; the Connecticut Farm Bureau, and all the dairy farm groups, are firmly opposed to this merger.

The following information may be of assistance to you in this matter:

1. Connecticut producers in the southeastern order produced 126 million pounds of milk in 1963. It is estimated that the merging of the southeastern order with the Boston order (because that order has a much lower proportionate use of its producer milk as fluid milk, which is the highest priced milk in comparison with milk used for cream, ice cream, and manufactured products) would mean an annual loss in net cash farm income to Connecticut producers of approximately 15 to 25 cents per hundredweight, which would be equivalent to $189,000 to $315,000;

2. Technical changes in the Boston order based on the cost of transporting the producer milk, and differentials (or premiums) because of the producer's proximity to his market could mean an additional 15 to 25 cents deduction per hundredweight from the price the producer would obtain;

3. The southeastern order has and is working satisfactorily with its regulatory requirements already so well integrated with the other New England orders that there is no restriction in the movement of bulk or packaged milk to or from any other market;

4. Connecticut producers in the southeastern order have gone to considerable expense in planning their production of milk to meet the specific requirements inherent in the southeastern market as well as promoting the sale of fluid milk products in their market;

5. The southeastern order would never have been voted in by the producers, if there had been any intimation that they would lose their order in 5 years, and be merged with the Boston order, regardless of their objections to the merger; and

6. The southeastern order is ninth in size among the 82 Federal orders now in existence. No federally regulated market has been merged in the past where producers were not agreeable to the merger.

In closing, TOM, I can only repeat that every responsible dairy farm organization is strongly opposed to the possibility of the southeastern order being merged with the Boston order.

I am sure that your efforts will be gratefully appreciated by every dairyman in Connecticut as well as by my own department. If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH N. GILL,
Commissioner.

TOLLAND COUNTY FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Sommersville, Conn., February 19, 1964.

Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: The Tolland County Farm Bureau, Inc., wishes to go on record as being opposed to the proposed merger of the south east milk order and the Boston Federal order.

The southeast order has been working well and is well integrated with the other four New England orders. The proposed merger with the Boston Federal order would result in considerable loss of income to the Connecticut producers in the southeast order.

We urge you to contact Secretary of Agriculture O. Freeman, Under Secretary of Agriculture G. Mehren and Chief of Dairy Division H. Forrest of the U.S. Deparament of Agriculture and to indicate to them the opposition of the southeast producers to this proposed merger.

Sincerely yours,

IDA K. HOLCOMB, *Secretary*
Mrs. Rockwell Holcomb.

WOODSTOCK, CONN.,
February 22, 1964.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am against the proposed merger of the southeast Federal milk order with the Boston Federal milk order. The former is the ninth largest in the country and the daily farmers in it are doing a good job of producing to market needs.

The farmers voted for this order 5 years ago, but would never have done so had they know it would be merged with any other order. The price of milk to producers has already been cut several times and this proposed merger would further reduce prices by 15 to 25 cents, which would mean about a $315,000 net cash farm income loss for the area. There is in addition a location differential price reduction of from 15 to 25 cents under consideration. These reductions are not in line with President Johnson's campaign to help the low income groups in this land: milk prices are far below the rest of our rising economy.

As a producing dairy farmer in the southeast Federal milk order I urge you to use your influences against this merger. Please contact Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Under Secretary of Agriculture George Mahran, and also Chief of the Dairy Division H. Forrest and express our strong opposition to this merger without delay, as a decision is expected to be made by March 1.

Thank you for your attention to this legislation.

Yours truly,

MRS. RICHARD M. WEEK.

SPY ROCK FARM,
Jewett City, Conn., February 12, 1964.

Representative WM. L. ST. ONGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. ONGE: I am writing to you regarding a matter which disturbs me very much, as well as hundreds of other dairy farmers in eastern Connecticut, who are shipping milk to the Providence market.

An attempt has been made to merge the southeastern marketing order with the Boston order, and if this should happen it would be very detrimental to the welfare of dairy farmers in eastern Connecticut. It would mean a substantial financial loss to us, and being in an already critical dairy price squeeze, this would force even more farmers out of business. Hearings regarding this matter have been held throughout New England, and it is up to the Marketing Branch of the Department of Agriculture to decide as to the final disposition.

I attended a meeting recently at the extension service building at Norwich, where Prof. Stewart Johnson of the University of Connecticut, as well as the manager of the local dairymen's association of Providence Bill Newman, spoke and we were given to understand that the southeastern market has just about a 50-percent chance of not being swallowed up by the Boston market. I understand that Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, is trying his best to prevent this merger, since many of his constituents would incur a substantial reduction of income. If a merger should take place, we would rather merge with the Connecticut order where prices run approximately the same as in the southeastern area.

I would appreciate very much your looking into this matter soon, and would be thankful for your support in our endeavor, as a decision is about to be forthcoming on this issue. I am also sending a similar letter to Senator THOMAS J. DODD, asking him for his support in our behalf.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT KALLMAN.

PLAINFIELD, CONN., *February 18, 1964.*

Representative ST. ONGE:

This letter concerns the proposed merger of the southeast order and the Boston Federal order milk markets.

We the undersigned are opposed to this merger for several reasons. We in the south order would receive a lower price per hundredweight for our milk and have higher transportation rates. We have paid for promoting market sales and are producing quality milk according to market needs. If others want an order like ours, let them work together and get it but not by taking a slice out of our pie to put in theirs.

In conclusion we strongly urge you to state our opposition to this merger to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ALTON C. EXLEY.
WILLIAM S. EXLEY.
Mr. and Mrs. MAURICE DESJARDINS.

STERLING, CONN., *February 25, 1964.*

Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. ONGE: We are opposed to the merger of the southeast order with the Boston Federal order. If this should take place we would lose between 15 and 25 cents per hundredweight of milk. Also transportation would be increased on location differential.

The southeast order is working well and is well integrated with the other four New England orders in handling both bulk and packaged milk.

We feel the southeast order can much better represent us and solve our problems than would the Boston Federal order. If we had known 5 years ago that the market order would be merged we never would have voted for that order.

We operate a family self-employed farm and have just built a new 60-cow stanchion barn. If we have to take a decrease in milk payments, with the increased expenses for farm machinery plus insurances and taxes and payments for the new barn we would not be able to survive. We have always been on the farm and have no other trade.

Please contact Secretary of Agriculture O. Freeman, Under Secretary of Agriculture George Mehren, and Chief of Dairy Division H. Forrest, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, indicating to them our opposition to this merger.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. JORDAN.

POMFRET CENTER, CONN.,
February 17, 1964.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: I am writing you in regard to the proposed merger of the Boston Federal milk order with the southeast order, of which I am a member.

I want you to know I strongly oppose this merger, as it will further lower the price of milk, and we are having a hard enough time at the present price of milk.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM CHVIRKO.

STROUT REALTY,
Hebron, Conn., February 17, 1964.

Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned strongly plead with you not to vote for the merger. It would mean disaster for the dairy farmer.

We struggle enough as it is.

Sincerely yours,

HUGO AND EDITH LEDERER.

Another Flub

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor, Joseph C. Harsch, a most respected correspondent, tells us how the ineptness of either the President's Office or the State Department has ruffled the feelings between England and the United States. It is no wonder, then, that the British have accelerated their trade with the Communist countries. The article follows:

STATE OF THE NATIONS: FOOTNOTE TO HISTORY

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—Not so very long ago the Attorney General of the United States, Robert F. Kennedy, set out from Washington for the Far East where his visit included Indonesia and a session with the president of that country, Dr. Sukarno.

From Indonesia, Mr. Kennedy returned to Washington by way of London where he had friendly discussions with the highest officials of the British Government, following which that government asserted its confidence in Mr. Kennedy and its approval of the position he had been taking during his trip.

Yet to this day there continues to be a nagging, lurking suspicion in British journalistic and officials minds that somehow Mr. Kennedy was up to no good and that beneath all the surface candor and good will for the British he and Washington would still like to appease Dr. Sukarno at the expense of Malaysia.

Behind this continuing, nagging suspicion is one of those minute facts of history which keep cropping up to beset the determinist school of historians.

It now can be reported on unquestionable authority that the British Foreign Office in London first heard of the Kennedy trip from the newspapers.

To the layman this may sound unexciting and irrelevant. However, in the world of diplomats and diplomacy it is unheard of for a good ally to send one of its top Government officials into an area of primary importance to another ally without telling the other ally about it in advance. It is one of those things which simply isn't done among friends.

So exceptional and inexcusable is such behavior that the British were entirely justified in being suspicious. Why, if Mr. Kennedy were going to Indonesia to be helpful, didn't he tell them about it first. There is simply no adequate answer or explanation. It cannot be explained on any basis except either unfriendly intent or almost inconceivable oversight.

The true explanation, so this reporter has been informed, is that the White House thought the State Department was telling the British Ambassador in Washington and the State Department thought the White House was telling the British Embassy and someone forgot to do the normal liaison work and neither realized until too late that no one had told.

A part of the explanation could conceivably be that one factor in the designation of Mr. Kennedy for the mission was the humanitarian one of giving him something to do outside Washington to take his mind off his family sorrows. That motive is more human than professional and hence it is conceivable that the project was never staffed through the professional channels which are experienced in preventing misunderstandings.

It is small wonder that there is still a residue of suspicion and discomfort in London whenever Indonesia is mentioned—particularly now that President Sukarno's military forces appear to be resuming the offensive in Borneo against the British.

The relevant point is that this happens between the closest and friendliest pair of allies anywhere in the world—some would say ever in history.

If this sort of clumsy oversight leading to gnawing and continuing suspicion can occur between the best of friends it is no wonder that it is sometimes difficult to hold an alliance together among many countries with fewer interests in common.

It was probably a byproduct of a new administration not yet in full efficient routine working order. Still, it did happen between Washington and London. It suggests that the millennium may still be some distance in the future.

Pulp and Paper Industry Continues To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's paper industry is a $15 billion a year industry. This industry operated more than 5,000 plants in the United States last year, paying 600,000 employees a total of $4 billion in wages. Per capita consumption was a record 455 pounds, about twice that of England, and several times that of Western European countries.

Mr. Speaker, in the Southeast, the No. 1 crop being grown on our farms today is pine trees. Tree farming throughout the Nation is expanding, and is captivating the imagination of our farmers. A growing paper industry not only creates additional jobs on the farm, but also an expanding market for hardwood and pine trees grown on the farm.

I salute and congratulate the pulp and paper industry.

The 46th Anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 14, last, a radio hour, sponsored by the Worcester, Mass., area Lithuanian-American parishes and organizations, commemorating the 46th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, was held and the program was broadcast over radio station WNEB.

It was my privilege, together with Anthony J. Miller, Esq., a prominent Lithuanian attorney of Worcester, to speak to the listening radio audience on this eventful occasion and I have been asked to include, at this point, the addresses delivered by Mr. Miller and myself and they follow:

RADIO BROADCAST OF ANTHONY J. MILLER, ESQ., ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE OVER RADIO STATION WNEB, FEBRUARY 14, 1964

As an American citizen of Lithuanian decent, I am very proud and privileged to take part, with our good Congressman and friend, the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE, in this ceremony commemorating the 46th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council at Vilnius declared Lithuania a free and independent republic and created a provisional government to hold national elections for the first time in centuries. This day marked a great rebirth of the Lithuanian nation. Many years of suppression had not dimmed their love of freedom. This should be remembered by the entire world. Let us not underestimate the power of freedom to stir the minds and inflame the courage of suppressed peoples. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that Lithuania is a suppressed nation. Lithuania was conquered against its will by overwhelming brutal force and is held by force under international communism.

Within months after the declaration of Lithuanian independence, Bolshevik troops were massed on the border awaiting German withdrawal.

After the German withdrawal, the Russian troops invaded Lithuania and occupied the capital, Vilnius. But the new provisional government of Lithuania, which was created by the Lithuanian National Council, withdrew to the city of Kaunas, where it organized a national army, which soundly defeated the overwhelming Red forces. This event proved beyond a doubt the ability of the Lithuanian people to fight for their homeland and to organize a popular government, respected by the people.

In 1920, the Soviet Government renounced forever, sovereignty over Lithuania. Later, Lithuania was recognized as a free and independent Republic by all major powers, and Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations, where it was respected, and where it exercised significant leadership. Surely the Lithuanian people would not surrender this position of world importance to become a vassal republic of the Soviet Union.

Within Lithuania, in the years from 1920 to 1940, immense social and economic improvements were made. The land reform programs, begun under the new national government, gave farms to thousands of families. The introduction of new techniques and materials meant everyone ate better, and there was still enough food left for exporting. Lithuanian industrial establishments increased from 2,474 in 1920 to over 16,000 by 1939. Transportation was vastly improved. Social legislation brought health, education, and welfare benefits within reach of the needy in Lithuania, and the Lithuanian Government continued to function democratically and always had the support of the people. Why, then, would Lithuania voluntarily choose to surrender these immense fruits of a free democratic government for exploitation, suppression, destruction, exportation to Siberia, and murder? The truth is, of course, it did not.

The Soviet Union forced Lithuania to capitulate to the entry of numerous thousands of troops into Lithuania, despite every attempt at cooperation which Lithuania made. Once the massive Russian Army was in Lithuania, no resistance was allowed, free elections were never again permitted, and Lithuania became a victim to be exploited for the benefit of Russia; a pattern which has since become sadly familiar in many other countries.

Let it be known that the Lithuanian people not willingly submit to the terrible living conditions, destruction, deportations, killings, and innumerable cruelties inflicted on them by the Communists. And certainly, there is no peace in the hearts of the Lithuanian people throughout the world. They remember their independence day which gave them a brief, but nevertheless precious few years of freedom and self-democratic government. How sad that they cannot themselves openly celebrate their independence. Our words here are no substitute for the Lithuanians' own freedom. But it is our duty as freedom-loving American citizens of Lithuanian descent to remember that Lithuanian Independence Day in 1918, proclaimed at Vilnius, encouraged the people of our native land and all freedom-loving people to keep alive the spark of freedom, with the faith, hope and certainty that in the nearest future, God will see fit to restore Lithuania as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world. Let us then pray that this may come to pass in the near future, and may God grant that that day may be soon.

RADIO BROADCAST OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE OVER RADIO STATION WNEB, FEBRUARY 14, 1964

As your Representative in the U.S. Congress, it is an honor and privilege to join with you in these exercises commemorating the 46th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

This program has become a tradition with all Lithuanians, because it is held to annually recall that great day of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of persecution under a hostile, foreign rule. Lithuania, on that day, had earned its stature as an independent, demo-

cratic republic. There was cause for rejoicing and the future was faced with confidence. The people of Lithuania were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty.

However, in this year of 1964, our observance of your independence day is, regretably, clouded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been darkened by the violent storms of tyranny. We reflect with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration by the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter is a hollow mockery in the present suppression of the Lithuanian people.

Lithuania is undergoing a shameless conquest; she has become the victim of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big state has ever waged against a gallant, honorable, but weaker neighbor.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. The Christian faith, which, in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. From my own knowledge and experience with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power than can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering, at this time, to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Here, in the United States, I earnestly believe that most Americans are becomingly increasingly more concerned about the fate of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, which stand in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which our people have fought and died in two World Wars.

I consider it the solemn duty of every officer of our National Government to reveal the truth of the extinguishment of self-government, that is being forced upon the smaller nations, like Lithuania, by the Russian Government policy of expansion through fraud, intimidation, and coercion.

World War II was fought with the clear understanding and pledged purpose that common victory should bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the oppressed nations of the world.

We cannot conceive of the recent war being won until that pledge has been carried out. The major world powers, including the United States, are unwitting parties to the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations while they continue to allow peaceful, freedom-loving peoples to be cruelly dominated by the Soviet rule of imperialistic terrorism—which defies every decent concept of self-determination and democracy.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples. In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

You and I must rededicate ourselves today to the persevering revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania so that the United Nations shall be called upon to meet the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania.

In this cause you will have the complete support of freedom-loving people throughout the world; they will join in your efforts and prayers that your homeland may be restored as a free and independent republic among the other nations of the world.

God grant that this day may be in the immediate future.

Mobilizing for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert at this point an editorial which appeared in last Sunday's Long Island Press, entitled "Mobilizing for Peace."

Discussions have been underway about the problems to be faced and surmounted if and when our economy, now geared overwhelmingly to defense and military expenditures, can be switched to peacetime civilian pursuits.

To effect as smooth and orderly a transition as possible, legislation has been proposed—which I have cosponsored in the House of Representatives—to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, which would call for a nationwide study and consideration of all the complex problems of such a changeover. President Johnson has already set in motion his own intergovernmental committee to study ways and means of converting our industries to a peacetime basis, and I am very happy to see that the press has put its stamp of approval on the efforts being made to bring about further open discussions of the difficulties we face in trying to work out such a conversion.

The editorial follows:

MOBILIZING FOR PEACE

With the way things are going at the Geneva disarmament talks, with brush fire wars and rebellions all over the world, with the belligerence of Communist leaders, it might seem idle to discuss converting a defense-oriented economy to one oriented to a world at peace.

Yet there are many who detect waste and diminishing returns in the continued stockpiling of mass destruction weapons when we have enounghto destroy the world many times over.

While we must never allow ourselves to become vulnerable to military defeat, we must yet think of a tomorrow when one-fifth of the Nation's goods will not go to military purposes.

That is why President Johnson set up an interdepartment committee to study the problems of converting our industry to a peacetime basis. And that is why a group of Long Island labor leaders met with the President last week, and urged him to choose Long Island for a pilot study of how conversion can best be brought about.

But it appears likely such a study may be met with strong skepticism by some of the men who run our defense industries.

Sperry Gyroscope President Carl A. Frische, speaking at an "Economic Forecast Conference" February 15, at C. W. Post College, saw conversion in any near future as "more of a rosy mirage than real." He said "it would be difficult to find or name any significant example of the defense-oriented segment or company which has successfully converted from military production to industrial or consumer activity * * * There is no ready-made market for the absorption of manpower engaged in the industry, should national policy * * * require cutbacks * * * There are no cheap and easy paths to solving conversion problems.

"Our goal must be to get an increasing share of the defense and space business available."

But just because conversion may be difficult is hardly reason to look away from it. Just because it's never been done before by defense industries doesn't mean it's impossible. On the contrary, the very fact it is complex and new is the compelling reason to study the problem now.

Mr. Frische also maintained there should be no "government and government-controlled mechanisms under the hood of the economy." He suggested "we let Russia continue with that." Yet it seems contradictory to call Federal spending for civilian purposes socialistic while urging more Federal contracts for defense as a proper goal for Long Island.

Conversion to peace production is no more socialistic than defense production. Defense is completely dependent on Federal direction and financing. Conversion should mean even less Federal participation and even greater opportunity for competitive free enterprise. Since there is no blueprint for conversion, there are opportunities for farsighted businessmen to join with government and labor in what should be a positive and exciting venture.

Peace production offers many wealth-producing, positive possibilities—foreign markets for basic industrial equipment, and national markets for housing, hospitals, water supply systems, education plants, electric power facilities, and transportation nets, to mention a few.

No one thinks conversion will be painless. But we cannot ignore the problem—and the opportunities—in switching to an economy in which military expenditures will no longer make up 20 percent of all our manufacturing.

L.B.J.: For Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it should be a stunning blow to the American people that our President, in the past, has tried to placate those on both sides of an issue. In yesterday's Washington News, William F. Buckley, Jr., recounts how the majority leader was trapped by a mother and her stepson who wrote on both sides of one issue. Their replies from Senator Lyndon B. Johnson were "yes" to both sides.

In addition, Mr. Buckley also sets forth other instances of political duplicity.

Let us hope that, now he is President, Mr. Johnson has ceased playing this game.

HONESTY IN POLITICS?

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Several years ago I received from a frustrated lady a letter denouncing the prevailing political hypocrisy.

She had a concrete example in mind, having recently ambushed an important legislator by the following wonderfully devious, wonderful simple, and if I may say so utterly feminine, means.

The lady conscripted her stepson in the conspiracy and together they addressed letters to their Senator taking exactly opposite points of view on the question whether the loyalty oath should be retained as a part the National Defense Education Act. The lady argued for the retention of the oath; her stepson just as heatedly for its removal. The boy gave as his return address the college he was then attending. The lady used their home address.

In due course they both heard back, and in the letter to the boy the Senator indicated his private agreement with the boy's objections to the loyalty oath and implied he would do what he could to remove it; and in the letter to the lady, he indicated his private agreement with its desirability, and implied he would do what he could to retain it.

"What," asked the indignant lady in her letter to me, enclosing the hot goods, "are we going to do about Lyndon Johnson?"

Well, I tried to oblige the lady by publishing the Senator's two letters cheek-by-jowl in National Review, and those who chanced on them there may have been a little disillusioned by the Senator's performance; but then again, they may not have been disillusioned at all, if it is true that nobody much cares any more about political honesty, which is not a part of the wave of the future we are all told we should be glad we are riding.

A couple of weeks ago Representative STEVEN DEROUNIAN, Republican, of New York, tried to make the point that Lyndon Johnson is squarely on the record on both sides of most public issues.

He cited Mr. Johnson's campaign of 1960, and it is apparent that he behaved himself pretty much as he did towards the lady and her stepson.

On the national stage, Mr. Johnson ran for Vice President under the Democratic national platform which, in Representative Derounian's summation, called for further centralization of power in the Federal Government; promises to close such tax loopholes as depletion allowances; support of Federal aid to education; favoring of school desegregation; support of a system of medical care for the aged as part of the social security system; and of legislation to repeal State right-to-work law.

But in Texas, where he was running simultaneously for reelection as Senator, it was something else again. There Mr. Johnson called for retention of the present oil and gas depletion allowances; opposition to the entry of the Federal Government in the general field of public education; local control of the schools; opposition to socialistic proposals for dealing with health problems of aged citizens; and endorsement of the Texas right-to-work law.

The same man, as President, on greeting joyously the ratification of the 24th amendment last month, pointed to the nobility of his endeavors in its behalf: "As majority leader of the Senate, I personally urged the banishment of bars to voting. This triumph now of liberty over restriction is a proud moment for me."

But the record shows that from 1942 to 1960, as a Member of the House and then the Senate L.B.J. voted against legislation to outlaw the poll tax 12 out of 13 times.

It may be that the lady and her stepson just don't understand politics. I hope they never will.

(NOTE.—Mr. Buckley's column reminds us of a remark attributed to the late Senator Jim Watson: "A politician must be like Caesar's wife; all things to all men.")

The Western Islands and Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the recent earthquakes on São Jorge in the Azores brought immediate offers of assistance from this Government to the residents of the Portuguese island. American military units have joined in the emergency evacuation of many homeless victims of the untimely disaster, and the Portuguese Government has been assured of our willingness to be of further assistance if necessary.

It should be noted, that while the Portuguese have been grateful for our help and offers of help, the National Government in Lisbon took commendably prompt and effective steps to assist the victims of São Jorge, without relying unduly on outside assistance.

Our friendship for the people of the Azores transcends the usual humanitarian motives in a case such as this, or our alliance with a loyal NATO ally and longtime friend in the Western alliance. Our ties with these beautiful islands date to the mid-18th century, when New Bedford and Nantucket whalers came upon them after crossing on favoring winds, the wide and forbidding expanse of the Atlantic.

A recent editorial in the Falmouth, (Mass.) Enterprise takes eloquent note of the common heritage of many present-day Americans with the unfortunate victims of São Jorge, as well as the residents of the many other islands of the Azores—the islands of the Hawks. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

THE WESTERN ISLANDS AND OUR HERITAGE

Islands of the Hawks—the Azores—the Portuguese called them when they found this North Atlantic archipelago in 1432. Hawks in great numbers were soaring over the mountainous slopes and steep, high shores. All was lushly verdant in this paradise of climate softened and moistened by the miles of sea around.

To New England whalemen who came upon them as early as 1763 they were always the Western Islands. Whaleships from New Bedford, Nantucket, and the Vineyard reached them by crossing the Atlantic with the favoring westerly winds.

In the harbor of Horta on the island of Fayal these whalers replenished water and found fresh fruits and vegetables for their larders. Among the islanders the whaleships recruited crewmen. And so, early in the story of our coast, Azoreans came back with the ships to settle on Cape Cod and our islands, to turn scrub lands into productive farms and to provide much needed manpower for development for our resorts.

Names of the islands are as familiar in Falmouth as our own place names—Flores, Fayal, São Jorge, Terceira, São Miguel, Pico. They are the fatherland of many of our American citizens of today.

Pico means, in Portuguese, peak. We were reminded by the news of Wednesday that volcanic action has always threatened these peaks which rise above the sea 800 miles off the Portuguese coast. Across their area of some 1,000 square miles quakes have been frequent. In 1811 an island rose near São Miguel only to disappear again. In 1957, a submarine volcano formed an island close to Fayal. This eruption continued for 30 days. Then the island vanished. There was a major eruption in 1926 and quakes on Terceira in 1951 and in the city of Ponta Delgada on São Miguel in 1952.

Though breadth of the Atlantic rolls between Cape Cod and the island of São Jorge, disaster there comes close to the heart of Falmouth. Now there is concern for the quake victims. Later, we are sure, there will be help. The Western Islands have a place in our heritage.

Address by Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., the Under Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., the Under Secretary of Commerce, at the Arthur S. Flemming Awards luncheon of the downtown chapter of the District of Columbia Junior Chamber of Commerce, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Thursday, February 13, 1964. I should also like to include a list of the Flemming Award winners and their distinguished accomplishments. The Flemming Awards program was established by the downtown chapter of the District of Columbia Junior Chamber of Commerce to recognize especially meritorious work and to encourage high standards of performance, to attract high-caliber young men to Government service and the opportunities and responsibilities it presents:

REMARKS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., AT THE ARTHUR S. FLEMMING AWARDS LUNCHEON OF THE DOWNTOWN CHAPTER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

It is a pleasure to participate in this program honoring these 10 distinguished Federal employees.

May I first commend you Jaycees for sponsoring the Flemming awards. To give public recognition to the work of often little heralded and usually underpaid Government servants reflects much credit on your organization. And I want to express your Government's appreciation of it.

While we meet today to honor 10 outstanding men, in a larger sense we are here to honor the reawakened spirit of service in our country that they symbolize.

Evidence of this new dedication to something larger than ourselves is everywhere throughout America. It is not confined to Government service, nor to the supergrades in Government. Rather, we see it both in and out of government, in both high and low places.

We see it in young businessmen acting through such community organizations as this. We in the Department of Commerce see it in the voluntary service of businessmen assisting the Government in the export expansion drive, in maintaining a State of defense readiness in the Executive Reserve,

and in advisory capacities in our scientific and technological bureaus.

We all see it in the young men and women of the Peace Corps, working under difficult conditions in remote villages around the world; we see it in a young and courageous doctor ministering to the sick in southeast Asia; and we see it in the struggle here at home to assure equal rights for all our citizens.

It is unmistakable: there is abroad in the land a new idealism, a new spirit of patriotism, a new sense of mission, a new concern for the welfare of all humanity. Born in the wartime sacrifices of our fighting men, it has carried over into every facet of civilian life. President Kennedy helped lead this reawakening, and President Johnson will sustain it through his personal leadership of the war on poverty and in many other Government programs. It is a growing movement that has traditions going back to the sacrifices of the pioneering men and women who founded this Nation, and it is something of which every American can be proud.

The 10 men we honor today have compiled especially noteworthy records of service. In pushing back the frontiers of scientific knowledge and in distinguished achievement in administrative capacities, they have demonstrated extraordinary ability and outstanding devotion to their jobs.

And not only this. They have done so, we all know, at considerable financial sacrifice, for there is not one among them who could not earn far more in private industry. We in Government are especially aware of this fact, for we lose hundreds of able men and women to the private sector of our economy every year, and we know the difficulty and the cost of recruiting replacements for them.

And this is happening at a time when the very highest skills are required by government in order to properly discharge its complex duties in our increasingly complex society. Only first-rate personnel can produce first-rate government. The wisest legislation and the soundest policies cannot result in good government without able people to administer those laws and carry out those policies with energy, skill, and dispatch.

The need is especially great in the top levels of government, the very place where our pay scales have been so inadequate compared to those prevalent in industry. Independent surveys have shown that the salaries in industry are double those of the government for comparable work in some of the highest grades of service.

President Kennedy emphasized the point in 1962 when he first proposed legislation to correct the situation. It is in these top levels, he told Congress "in which our need for quality is most acute—in which keen judgment, experience, and competence are at a premium. It is here that we face our most difficult personnel problems. It is at these grades that we employ our top scientists, doctors, engineers, experts, and managers."

As you all know, Congress responded by enacting the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which for the first time adopted the principle of comparability for determining Federal salary levels—that is, Federal pay shall be reasonably comparable with prevailing private enterprise salaries for the same levels of work. The act also provides for annual review of Federal salaries and requires the President to submit an annual report to Congress on any necessary adjustments.

One raise has already gone into effect in two stages, and the administration has recommended an additional raise to establish comparability at the upper levels.

President Johnson has emphasized that such raises are an economy measure, since efficiency in Government will come primarily "from the hard and conscientious work of our top managers, who are now plainly underpaid for what is expected of them."

There is nothing more wasteful than spending the taxpayers' money on employees who cannot perform to the high standards required by the job and demanded by the American people. It is therefore bad policy and unsound economics to fail to attract our ablest men and women to this work.

We are hopeful that Congress will act on President Johnson's request. If we expect our civil servants to fulfill their obligations to the Nation with skill and devotion, the Nation must not shirk its responsibilities to them. As President Kennedy said, "The success of this Government, and thus the success of our Nation, depend in the last analysis upon the quality of our career services."

In honoring these 10 outstanding young men in Government today, we are acknowledging that quality. We must also work to maintain it. And so we are not so much honoring what these 10 men have done as what they will do and what they are capable of doing. The example they have set in serving their country is important not only to those who also serve but to those who might serve in the days ahead.

THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ARTHUR S. FLEMMING AWARD WINNERS FOR 1963

ADMINISTRATIVE

Donald R. Chadwick, M.D., Post Office Box 4515 RFD, Upper Marlboro, Md. Age 38.

(Chief, Division of Radiological Health, Public Health Service; Medical Director, Health, Education, and Welfare. Responsible for directing the development and conduct of a national program for protection of the health of the public from radiation hazards from all sources.)

Richard N. Gardner, 3417 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. Age 36.

(Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Department of State. Responsible for the development of U.S. policy within the United Nations and its family of specialized and affiliated agencies, as well as in other of the 70 international organizations of which the United States is a member.)

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., 301 G Street SW., Washington, D.C. Age 35.

(Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission. Charged with the responsibility for administering and enforcing laws in the field of antitrust and trade regulation.)

Jerome Herbert Perlmutter, 513 East Indian Spring Drive, Silver Spring, Md. Age 39.

(Chief, Division of Publishing Services, U.S. Department of State. Responsible for approving all State Department publications, including white papers, speeches reports, magazines, books, and treaties and agreements to which this Nation is a part.)

George Leon Rogosa, 1178 Stonewood Lane, Rockville, Md. Age 39.

(Chief, Nuclear, Atomic, and Classical Physics Branch, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Responsible for administering research programs in nuclear structure physics, extranuclear properties of matter, isotope separation and stable nuclides which are carried out in the national laboratories and at a large number of universities and research institutions throughout the United States.)

SCIENTIFC

Dr. Sjoerd Lieuwe Bonting, 5523 Grosvenor Lane, Bethesda, Md. Age 38.

(Head, Section of Cell Biology, Opthalmology Branch, National Institutes of Health. As head of the Section of Cell Biology, Opthalmology Branch, he directs research on the developing and functional eye.)

Christopher Columbus Kraft, Jr., 23 Imperial Avenue, Friendswood, Tex. Age 39.

(Assistant Director for Flight Operations, NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex. As NASA Flight Director during actual manned space flights, he exercises the critical responsibilities of controlling the flight from liftoff of the launch vehicle to landing of the spacecraft in the recovery area.)

Serge Nicholas Timasheff, 705 East Hartwell Lane, Wyndmoor, Philadelphia, Pa. Age 37.

(Supervisory chemist, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Conducts research on the physical and chemical properties of milk protein and other biological macromolecules, which includes the interruption of these properties and their dependence on genetic factors and on the structure of the nucleic acids which control the synthesis of these proteins in vivo.)

John W. Townsend, Jr, 25 Windward Drive, Severna Park, Md. Age 39.

(Assistant Director, Space, Science and Satellite Applications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md. Responsible for planning and directing a complex organization involved in a broad program of research in space sciences, the development of space technology and the practical application of such research and developments.)

Dr. James Richard Wait, 756 14th Street, Boulder, Colo. Age 39.

(Physicist (electronics), National Bureau of Standards. Senior research fellow on the staff of the Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and an internationally known authority in radio wave propagation.)

The Housewife Goes to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, the Honorable CATHERINE MAY, the Congresswoman from the State of Washington, was the guest speaker at the Texas Roundup at the 57th Annual Convention of the National Canners Association in Dallas, Tex.

As Mrs. MAY always does, she made an excellent speech on February 4, 1964. The speech was entitled "The Housewife Goes to Congress." The next to the last paragraph of the speech is particularly worth reading again and again.

The speech follows:

I have waited almost 23 years for a proper occasion to present itself wherein I might thank the food editors of America for the role they played at one time in my life in saving not only my job, but quite possibly my life. In 1941, an optimistic, but obviously naive, radio manager hired me as the women's editor of his station. In this capacity my job was to go on the air for an hour or so every day and tell the housewives of Tacoma, Wash., how to run their homes, how to treat their husbands, how to bring up their children, and how to cook.

At that time, I was one of those college-bred products euphemistically referred to as a "bachelor girl." In the short teaching career that lay behind me, as an apartment and boarding house dweller, I have done a masterful job of avoiding any contact with the kitchen, the dustpan and the washing machine on all occasions.

So, blithely I entered this new career fully equipped with this complete set of handicaps—plus one more—the station insisted that my air name be Mary Terry. Parenthetically, as nauseating as this name was, in time I became very thankful to have the protection of this alias, since it is probably

one of the reasons I managed to avoid being hung at high noon by an organized group of irate Tacoma housewives.

Today, I point with pride, as well as considerable surprise, to the fact that I held that job for a year and emerged comparatively unscathed. In retrospect, I suppose this must have been partly because my women listeners were intelligent enough to recognize that the advice I gave them on bringing up their husband and children was obviously idiotic (for all I know they may have thought I was doing a comedy show); and second, because constantly through the mail there came to my desk those wonderful articles on how to buy and prepare food from the real experts—you, the food editors.

My goodness, but I have always been grateful to you and industry home economists. You saved me so much writing time, too. My script would go something like this: "As I was in my sunny little kitchen the other day (my kitchen at that time was a gas burner behind a closet door), I decided to whip up a little New Orleans bouillabaisse, so I took my oysters," and then on to the recital of the recipe as carefully prepared in many test kitchens after months of study by you, the real cooks.

Of course, there were unexpected hazards to this technique because every once in a while a listener would obtain my home telephone number and call me up on an evening or a weekend to say "Miss Terry, I've lost that wonderful old family recipe you have for ham sauce. Would you please give me the ingredients?" After a few of these embarrassing occasions I learned to keep my family recipes of yours in a file by the phone book. And so, today, the first occasion I have had since then to find so many food editors corralled in one room, I welcome this opportunity to say, "thank you"—and, "forgive me."

As you have probably assumed from the title of this speech I eventually did become a housewife. As a matter of fact, I proceeded in my women's radio program work to Seattle, Wash., during World War II, met a handsome staff sergeant in the Infantry named James O. May, married him and, in due time, we had two children. Early in our marriage, we returned to my husband's hometown—Bloomfield, N.J.—where I worked as a writer for Adelaide Hawley, a well-known commentator on WEAF in New York. After the war, we returned to my hometown of Yakima, Wash., where my husband went into business and I became a mother and homemaker in earnest (and also began to understand for the first time what outrages I had perpetrated on my early radio audiences).

The road that took this housewife to Congress involves a story that we do not have time to present in detail today. In more or less synopsis form, I continued to combine my career as a radio broadcaster, interested specificaly in women's activities, with my job as wife, mother, and homemaker. Inevitably my interests widened to women's community activities and her responsibilities in this field. And it was then that Jim and I joined the Young Republican Club of Yakima and began to assume some responsibility in the area of government policies and helping to get good people to represent us at the government policymaking level. This activity eventually led to my election as a State representative in the Washington Legislature, where I served 6 years, and then took the next step and was elected to Congress in 1958, where I have now served 5 years.

During these 11 years of service in public office I have often been asked in interviews how I became interested in politics. The question is usually put as if there were something incongruous or conflicting about a nonprofessional woman, mainly interested in her husband, family, and her home, involving herself in political party work—which on occasion leads to election to a public office. Certainly in today's world I can see no conflict at all when there is no move made by our Government today that does not directly or indirectly involve the welfare of that which a woman holds most dear—her husband, her family, and her home. To me, the real puzzle is that any American woman today could fail to have a good, healthy intelligent curiosity about how her representatives in Government are spending her money and involving themselves in her decisions.

And I know no better case to cite as an excellent illustration of this than the case of the consumer versus Congress.

Because my experience, both in my personal and career life, dealt so largely with the consumer housewife, it is obvious that I would have a special interest in watching what is going on in Congress in those areas that are referred to as activities on behalf of consumer interest or consumer protection.

My committee assignment is the House Committee on Agriculture and I serve on six subcommittees. All our dealings are with laws that have to do with the production of food and fiber. In other words—they are all directly concerned in the end with the consumer. And, may I state right here, I have always taken for granted that everybody was a consumer because everybody eats, wears clothes, lives in some sort of a shelter, and buys things pertaining thereto. Frankly, I have never thought of the consumer as a set-apart, minority group that needed special representation or a special organized voice to speak on its downtrodden, inadequately protected behalf.

Well, since coming to Congress, I have certainly learned that there have sprung up several schools of thought that differ from mine. To listen to some of the more vocal, militant, and radical groups talk, while they wage their battles as self-appointed champions of the consumer, the average American purchaser when he walks into the marketplace enters some sort of terrifying and unregulated jungle with frightening and mysterious evils lurking behind every counter. The exaggerated version of this melodrama depicts the storekeeper as a Simon Legree villain, complete with black mustache and heartless sneer, and, what I resent most, it portrays the American housewife as an absolute idiot.

As I said, this is the exagerated picture, but quite honestly, it is also the implication you get as you listen to some of the testimony I have heard, or read some of the committee transcripts, or peruse some of the articles that have been written on this subject. "Consumeritis" has aroused my curiosity, and, as an American housewife and on behalf of the American housewife, I have a few questions to propound concerning this new movement.

But, first I would lay this premise of personal belief as a foundation for all my remarks—there cannot be a double standard of ethics for business and government. False labeling, misrepresentation, commercial fraud, and corporate bureaucracy are evil and wrong under any circumstance. Wherever these evils, abuses and malpractices exist, we must move to meet them. If businessmen, as integral factors in our free society today, do not develop facilities for self-policing and for protecting the public, then they are traitors to the voluntary cause they espouse because they deliberately invite government regulation. And, on the other hand, those who maintain that government intervention is the sole approach for public protection are traitors to the basic tenet on which our government is formed—personal liberty and free choice.

Now—first question—just how unregulated is the jungle of the marketplace? In 1961, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, initiated a study to determine how many agencies of the Federal Government were concerning themselves with activities which (1) directly protected the consumer; (2) advance the interest of the consumer; and (3) indirectly involved the consumer or the effect of protecting the general public. The results of this study were astonishing and, by the way, they piled up to hundreds of pages of compiled data.

In the first place, out of 35 departments and agencies of the Federal Government, only two of them perform no activities in the consumer field. Analysis of this report showed that 118 different activities were listed as directly protecting and advancing consumer interests. These activities involve annual program expenditure totaling $953 million and the programs employ full time, 6,500 Federal workers. In addition, these agencies carried on 135 programs in the interest of indirectly protecting or helping consumer interest and there were 43 additional activities not specifically labeled as consumer programs but which were identified as protecting the general public. That adds up to the Federal Government being involved in 296 programs to help the consumer.

Obviously, time does not permit me to list the nature of all these programs but many of them come under the Department of Agriculture and I am sure you join me in giving your enthusiastic support to most of them. For example, research in the field of biological controls for insects and diseases on agricultural crops. We are all familiar with the protective functions of the Food and Drug Administration and, with very little objection, give them support. But, fact one is that we have 296 consumer activities being carried on by the Federal Government. Fact two: we have dozens of pending propositions for putting the State and Federal Government further into the field of regulation and protection of the consumer.

In highlight review of these activities and recommendations: In 1962, President Kennedy appointed a Consumer Advisory Council. This Council made its first report of recommendations last October. The report made 26 recommendations and proposed 8 studies. Frankly, I felt it left much to be desired as a well-thought-out documentary study on consumer interest. But, it certainly did go into a whole range of currency political issues that are before Congress. The report concerned itself with taxation, civil rights, public housing, electrical transmission, safety on the highways, and governmental financing. This, in addition to many subjects that did have some identifiable connection with consumer problems.

Considering that these above-listed bills call for sweeping changes, are extremely complicated and have been under study by congressional groups, citizens' groups, special interest groups and experts in the field for many years, I can only be surprised when I think that this Council (which had only five meetings in a little more than a year) thought it could arrive at definite conclusions on all of them. In addition to this, they managed to give full endorsement of our opposition to some of the most complex bills that we are still studying in Congress.

And back to Congress—there we have a number of legislative measures pending, all presented as bills to protect the buying public against fraud at the marketplace. The most controversial of these has been the Hart Packaging and Labeling Control bill, oftentimes referred to as the "Truth in Packaging" bill. This would give unprecedented government authority over the size and labeling of canned foods. This bill has been reported by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee but the full committee has not taken any action on it. There is a companion bill in the House but action upon it is pending and nothing has been scheduled.

This Congress, at present count, has some 26 legislative items before it that would affect the members of our host organization, the National Canners Association.

On to the State legislatures—Mr. Milan D. Smith, executive vice president of the National Canners Association, gave a speech before our Northwest Canners and Freezers Association at their convention in Seattle in which he reported on how many State legislatures are proposing regulatory measures in the food packaging, labeling, and consumer field. In this talk, he listed State after State where attempts are being made to license, set up labeling standards, and adopt new weights and measures regulations or laws.

In this speech, Mr. Smith said and I quote, "It seems to be the current vogue among some legislators today to try to do something for the consumer." I couldn't agree more and I think it is highly important for all of us—for whom something is going to be done—to stop and ask some searching questions about just what is motivating this movement:

(1) Are our legislators and Federal and State agencies being flooded with complaints from all over the country? I have made a spot check on a number of occasions with colleagues who are close to consumer legislation and I have also checked statements and asked questions of the various bureaus in Government dealing with this problem. At no time did I get an answer that indicated that letters of complaint on any one of several consumer matters totaled more than 200 or 300. That is on any one subject. Since we have about 182 million consumers today in the United States, I don't think we can define this as a flood.

(2) Is this new consumer movement getting impetus because individuals and groups concerned with it have found that it has a great deal of political appeal? Without making any individual or blanket indictment, the answer to that one seems pretty obvious to me. I think it was inevitable that some people should find out that there was a lot of political appeal and color to the oft-used technique of telling a large group of people that they were in trouble or danger and then announce that they were going to protect them. As we say in Congress, you can't be against God, motherhood, and apple pie.

(3) [Most important of all], Doesn't this make a wonderful issue to cloak the real purpose of those who believe in more total regimentation by government? I believe these questions are very valid. But, in case you think I am going overboard and on my part trying to dream up dangers that don't exist, let's discuss some of the implications of the activities and the legislative proposals that I have listed for you.

I told you that the first report by the Consumer Advisory Council gave sweeping recommendations on a whole score of Government programs and controls, in addition to specific consumer interest proposals. Now this is a first report by this Committee and, hopefully, future reports will show greater responsibility of conclusion directly pointed at the area in which they make their studies. But, meanwhile, it is an advisory document made by men and women of status who are presidentially appointed. It cannot fail to have potential influence among those individuals and groups where it might be widely circulated. My sincere hope is that those who study this report will do so objectively and will be guided to see its inconsistencies, and separate its facts from its fallacies.

This report, among other things, recommends the passage of the Hart bill on packaging and labeling. Let's talk about that for a moment. Doesn't grade labeling sound, at first thought, like a splendid thing for the housewives? What housewife is not entitled to adequate information printed on the label which would help her decide between one can of beans over another can of beans? But I think she is also entitled to something better—to something more flexible and more informative than a Federal yardstick used in Washington, D.C., which roughly and categorically puts all the qualities and varying factors of taste and flavor into three A–B–C categories.

I may be ignorant of some economic principle here, but I honestly don't see how we can avoid putting a ceiling on quality if we stress minimum standards, and then tie them to a Government-imposed flat selling price for the product. Nor do I find any incentive for creative and imaginative businessmen to produce more and better goods at a lower cost, the process which makes the American family the best fed family in the world. And for the life of me, I can't understand these self-styled champions who assume that some individual Federal worker, no matter how sincere or well trained, can do these things better than the individual housewife.

Now, I submit that the American "housefrau" is a real competent, smart cookie. She knows how to discriminate and discriminate well between poor and good quality. The American housewife is the best budget balancer I know. (I sometimes wonder why the U.S. Treasury doesn't call her in to learn a few tricks on how to keep "outgo balanced with income.")

And I don't have to tell this group that she knows how to regulate the seller. All the government officials and all the government laws in the world are as nothing as compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one can of beans over another can of beans. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring, and in regulating American business enterprise.

And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice. I want to protect her right to reward or punish the businessman. I want her to stay the boss of the marketplace. As long as she is, then there's no danger to our free enterprise system.

And I know of no better example than to take the food industry and its development and progress as outstanding proof of how and why the American way of life really works. At a time when food has become one of the most obviously important weapons in the cold war, I just can't understand those theorists, those planners, who are trying to step up this movement to involve the Government even further into the decisions of the consumer, the farmer, the food processor, and the food distributor.

Just a week or so ago, I came across an article in a national magazine entitled "Better To Be Fed Than Red." It was written by Mr. W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Co., who is also a trustee of the Nutrition Foundation and former national chairman of the Radio Free Europe Fund. In this article, he gives a clear and excellent analysis of the serious food problems in Soviet Russia, China, East Germany and most of the satellite countries. And he certainly makes an excellent case for why totalitarianism and a flourishing food industry don't go together. As he says, it is not a question of land resources or weather conditions or farm machinery or distribution methods; it boils right down to "how do we make people eat what the central authorities decide they should eat and what is going to make the farmer, the processor, and the distributor want to cater to the consumer?" In other words, the two magic, precious, important ingredients missing are freedom of choice and incentive and profit motives. Then Mr. Murphy goes on to say and I quote him, "Now how do we—with a democratic, private enterprise profit system—achieve such good results, whereas the totalitarian states have so much trouble in the matter of foods?"

"The success of America's food industry is based on these two premises: the public is to be offered foods that the public wants. The food business operates under a free private enterprise system and can make profits. Our ideological competitors base their food industry on the concepts that: The public must take the foods the government wants to give them. The food business operates as a part of the state and profits go to the state, not to individuals."

And so Mr. Murphy's advice to the Marxist state is that if they wish to catch up with the American food industry, they'll have to do two things—serve the consumer what he wants, and provide the farmers, the food processors, and the food distributors the freedom to operate their own enterprises and achieve the rewards that come from their own efforts. I don't know whether Mr. Khrushchev and company are going to take this very sound advice. It sounds like a pretty dangerous dilution of the Communist doctrine to me. But, I do know that if this country takes some of the advice that is being offered today on what we should do to protect and help the consumer, we'll be on the road to downgrade and weaken one of the greatest success stories the progressive American system has to offer.

I guess you have concluded by now that this housewife went to Congress, and, as a result, has become more concerned than ever about the consumers, but my concern is what government may be doing to them while it's doing something for them.

And we need to appeal to the women of America in this particular cause of assuring that whenever consumer legislation or action is proposed that they give it the most careful study possible before offering their support. I say this—not only because it is the women we most often think of when we talk about the consumer—but, because of the great influence she can have on Congress and State legislatures. If they would use it, the women's vote outnumbers the men's today. Politicians of both parties recognize women as outstanding political workers but most important of all, the average man in public office is scared to death of the organized women's drive on behalf of a cause that has aroused either her indignation or her imagination. For years I have been consistently urging women everywhere to recognize this powerful political potential which they have and to use it in the right causes. At the same time, I stress to them that with this power goes a great responsibility and that is to be sure that they exercise study, judgment, wisdom, and caution in selecting the right cause. And I want women everywhere to become interested in consumer legislation with the realization that, not only is the matter of protection involved, but her freedom to buy goods of her own choosing is equally involved.

Lastly, I call upon business to continue their efforts to build the strength of private enterprise against the threats of more centralized Government controls. Those who represent your interests in Congress and in State legislatures have been doing an outstanding job, but they can't do it alone. Every time business anywhere fails to exercise voluntary discretion, the rug is pulled out from under the feet of those who are charged with the responsibility of protecting your best interests in the areas where laws are made. Every abuse of the business trust creates a clamor for Government action. On the other hand, as business becomes ever more vigorous in self-regulation, ever more vigorous in insistence on truth in advertising and truth in labeling, then the threat of

Government intervention fades further away.

You and I, the housewife and the businessman, have done right well together up to now with our mutual interests. I'd like us to continue to work out our problems together—battle them out together if necessary—but let's not bring any more Government umpires into the ring.

Beatice City Council, First Nebraska District, Prohibits Foreign Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, from the wealth of material currently appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe that most Members of Congress are aware of the critical plight of the livestock industry. In addition, I am pleased to note that many of my colleagues have introduced legislation that would solve the beef import crisis, if almost any one of them were adopted.

By way of this continuing interest in the beef import crisis, therefore, I would like to introduce the two attached letters and an ordinance from a major community within the First District of Nebraska, the city of Beatrice. This city feels the effect of the beef import crisis so keenly, its mayor and council have passed an ordinance to prohibit the sale of imported fresh and frozen beef. A letter from the city council invites other cities to follow Beatrice as an example. The letters and text of the ordinance are self-explanatory. I recommend them to my colleagues.

The letters and ordinance follow:

CITY OF BEATRICE,
Beatrice, Nebr., February 25, 1964.

Representative RALPH BEERMANN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: Enclosed is a copy of ordinance No. 1455, passed by the City Council of Beatrice at their regular meeting last night. Also enclosed is a copy of a letter that I am sending, along with a copy of the ordinance, to the mayor of each city of the first class in Nebraska.

I thought you might be interested in seeing how our folks feel about the importation of fresh and frozen beef.

Sincerely,

WM. W. COOK., Sr.
Mayor.

CITY OF BEATRICE,
Beatrice, Nebr., February 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of ordinance No. 1455 passed by unanimous vote of our city council at their regular meeting held last night.

We feel that the beef industry is one of the most important industries in our State. We are the "Beef State."

It is very difficult to find out how many million pounds of fresh and frozen beef are imported not only from Australia and New Zealand but from such countries as Mexico, Argentina, and others. We are sure that if the accurate figure could be obtained, it would total many millions of pounds, and that the people of this country would be amazed at the size of the figure.

According to the people that are in favor of importing fresh and frozen beef, it is the increase in our own cattle population that has caused the drop in the beef price. This may be true in a small way, but the addition of millions of pounds of imported fresh and frozen beef has had a big effect on the price. It is like tying a rock onto the foot of a drowning man. Our entire beef market is affected, from our prime steers to our cutter cow (the cull dairy cow) market.

The decrease in price paid to our producer over the past 12 to 18 months has not been reflected, in most cases, in the retail price paid for beef purchased over the butcher's counter. Why?

Many industries are protected from the importation of cheap merchandise, many times inferior in quality (such as much of the fresh and frozen beef), produced by cheap labor (such as much of the fresh and frozen beef), by high protective tariffs. Why not a tariff on imported fresh and frozen beef?

As stated before, the beef industry in the Middle West (Nebraska, Kansas, Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, and several other States) is a major industry. What happens and who is affected by a depressed beef market? The beef producer, the feeder, and the dairyman, all lose money; which, in turn, affects the retail merchants, implement dealers, financial institutions, automobile dealers, etc.; which, in turn, will affect the whoelsaler of such products, the manufacturers of such products, and the laboring class of people that makes these products. All of our economy is affected.

Let's make ourselves heard in Washington. Please have your council pass a similar ordinance. Send copies to your Senators and Representatives. Persuade other cities to pass a similar ordinance. Contact your friends in surrounding States.

We are all fighting for new industry. How about helping a very good and important industry that we now have? You know the old saying, "The wheel that squeaks loudest gets the most grease."

Sincerely,

WM. W. COOK, Sr.,
Mayor.

P.S.—This letter is being mailed to all cities of the first class.

ORDINANCE NO. 1455

An ordinance to prohibit the sale of fresh or frozen imported beef, to prescribe regulations for persons in possession of fresh or frozen imported beef, to prescribe penalties and to provide for the effective date of this ordinance

Whereas the welfare of the city of Beatrice, its trade and commerce, are dependent on the agricultural community which surrounds it; and

Whereas the community produces substantial quantities of beef of fine quality and should be protected from competition of imported fresh and frozen beef: Now, therefore, be it

Ordained by the mayor and council of the City of Beatrice, Nebr.:

SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any person to sell or offer for sale within the city of Beatrice, Nebr., any fresh or frozen beef produced or processed outside the United States or its territorial possessions.

SEC. 2. Any wholesale establishment or retail store having in its possession any fresh or frozen beef whose origin is outside the United States or its territorial possessions shall display a sign in a prominent place on the outside of the building facing the street stating "Imported Beef Within," and the letters of such sign shall be at least 10 inches in height.

SEC. 3. Any person violating any conditions or requirements of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punishable by fine of not exceeding $50. Each person shall be deemed guilty of a separate offense for each day during any portion of which any violation of the provision of this ordinance is committed, continued, or permitted.

SEC. 4. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication according to law.

Passed and approved this 24th day of February 1964.

WM. W. COOK, Sr.,
Mayor.

Give Us Less Ocean or More Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, although the theme title I have given these remarks is not found in the speech by Vice Adm. Claude Ricketts, U.S. Navy, I have asked be printed below, it nevertheless is one which should concern every American interested in the problems of national defense. These problems were, in his customary manner of brilliance, discussed by Admiral Ricketts a few weeks ago in the following address to the western regional meeting of the Navy League at Colorado Springs:

ADDRESS BY ADM. CLAUDE RICKETTS, U.S. NAVY, VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE WESTERN REGIONAL MEETING OF THE NAVY LEAGUE, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, no doubt you realize that I have been put in a rather difficult position in appearing before you tonight. This is because you have scheduled here at the regional conference several days of discussions and talks on various facets of our national posture. You have come here with a great deal of accumulated knowledge of our Military Establishment and, particularly, of our naval programs. You will discuss them further during the next few days. You have had some talks by some very excellent and well-informed people. Also, I recognize in the audience many of those to whom I have talked recently, particularly over the Navy Day weekend.

So the question arises: What is there that I can talk about that you have not already heard or that you will not hear in the next few days? This is a very special challenge. Consequently, I decided to approach the subject somewhat differently by discussing more extensively some of the broader aspects of our problems, particularly those which face our Nation as a whole, and our Military Establishment as a whole.

The position that I hold as Vice Chief of Naval Operations requires attention to a great spectrum of subjects. Some of them appear to be relatively minor, but certainly of long-range importance. Almost all of them have a bearing upon the broad spectrum of naval plans and programs. But, fortunately, there are times when one has the occasion to sit back and think about some of the broader problems that are facing our country. Also, one in my position should not be circumscribed in his thinking; that is, unduly circumscribed. He cannot be restricted to the day-to-day problems that come across his desk. Therefore, on occasions, the mind naturally expands to some of the broader aspects of the factors that are

involved in our military posture as a whole.

Certainly, in these broader subjects, as well as to strictly Navy programs, one cannot rely upon his own talents alone, nor can he exhaust the possibilities of thought by himself. I am extremely fortunate in having the opportunity to talk to many others, to read papers that have been generated by others, to hear speeches that have been made by others, the opportunity to associate with very able and learned men. Not all of these discussions are restricted to strictly military subjects. In our profession, some consideration must be given to international affairs. Naturally, as military men, we do not make the national policy, but certainly, we do assist in implementing it. One of our major roles is the implementation of national policy. Consequently, we must give it some thought, because, like everything else that one is supporting, he can do a better job if he has some concept of its origin; some concept of the objectives that are being sought; some knowledge of the thinking that went into the evolution of that policy.

So, what I would like to cover with you briefly tonight is a little about our national stature in the world today. How did we get where we are? What about the future? What is our role in the world today and what will it be in the future? Then, a little about the military support of those national objectives. And finally, what about the people who man and support our Military Establishment?

Suppose we start off by considering a few pertinent points about the history and development of the United States. In these days there are many newly independent countries in the world. Some of these countries have a considerable potential for the future. Some are restricted in their resources, both as to raw materials, basic wealth, and as to numbers of people. Some are small in territory so that their total influence or involvement in world affairs may not be as great as that of the larger nations. But, regardless of the size of nations that are newly independent, or those that have been long independent, and even though singly they may not be a strong power, collectively they can be very important. For example, some of these countries have territory that is strategically located, especially in these days where a small spot of land frequently can be used to assist in the control of large surrounding areas. You will remember that during World War II in the Pacific, we split the blood of many Americans in the capture of minute parcels of land in order that we could use that little sand spit, or in some cases a little larger piece of territory, for an airfield, or the protected lagoon for quite waters for the replenishment of our fleets.

What I am getting at here is that contributions to a united effort to sustain the free world need not always come from a highly industrialized populace or militarily powerful nation. But what is needed is the cooperative assistance of those countries who have faith in the things that we stand for and who are willing to contribute, as did the widow in the Bible in putting her 2 mites into the collection plate.

As human history goes, it has not been long since the United States was a newly independent power. At that time we had under our sovereignty only a small amount of territory—just a fringe of land along the Atlantic coast; a mere foothold upon a vast continent. We were largely concerned at that time and for some time thereafter with our own internal development. Our internal communications were slow; the international scene did not give us great concern. There were great powers in the world then who exercised tremendous influence over world affairs; the immediate destiny of Europe; the immediate destiny of other continents. They were important and influenced our future, but we were involved largely in our local problems of getting ourselves established as a nation, looking to our domestic problems more than to world problems. There were other world leaders at that time and, of course, one of the things that helped us, even then, was that we had friends, we had allies, some of whom were world powers.

On the other hand, we had enemies periodically, some of whom were also world powers.

But our newly independent country, newly established, had some tremendously great basic strengths. It had people of vision; pioneers who were willing to undergo the hardships of the times; to make the sacrifices demanded by a new land and undeveloped country; who were willing to face the hardships and make the sacrifices that were necessary to establish the kind of a country that they envisioned. They had unity of purpose, not a regimented unity of purpose, but one born of an inherent and common understanding of freedom. They had great spiritual strength. They had tremendous confidence and belief in our destiny, a belief in the rightness of our cause. They had a great amount of natural wealth within our own borders, and they rapidly developed the means to exploit that wealth. But, and this is also important, they had the vision to reach beyond our shores for the material we did not have within. They had the foresight to advocate and vigorously support the concept of freedom of the seas, and they sometimes went to war in support of that concept. In other words, there was established early in our history a philosophy (and the means to support it) of the exercise of the use of the seas in both peace and war to bring to our shores the raw material to support the greatest industrial complex in the world.

Each passing year witnessed the progress and growth of our country. In world crises we chose the right cause. We were governed by what was right rather than by selfish interests. We had the wisdom to choose the winning side, and we contributed to the victory. And so we emerged from each world crisis with increased world stature. Gradually, we became a world power, an increasingly great world power.

Our growth was rapid, it coincided with a worldwide industrial revolution, the advantages of which we readily grasped. We exercised our national power with discretion, sometimes we were reticent—perhaps too much so—in the use of military power either in war or readiness for war. We did not always accept the fact that military power can be used, not only to make war, but to prevent war. The action leading up to the attack on Pearl Harbor might be a typical example. We were too slow to recognize the magnitude of the threat to us. We had a tremendous national posture at that time but we didn't bring it into evident creation in time. Consequently, our national aims and national will were mistaken.

Many times we have had to learn—or relearn lessons. Perhaps over the years we have put an unjustified trust in man. But that is our nature. We have tended to evaluate others by our own standards and, therefore, at times, expected too much from them. Nations as well as individuals have different standards. In some cases, unfortunately, the heart of man has not kept pace with the mind of man.

Now, as to our current international stature: We have gone through this evolution from just a few colonies, struggling for their own existence, to our current position as the strongest power in the world and the leader of the free world. There have passed to our shoulders awesome responsibilities. We have no acceptable choice but to shoulder these responsibilities with confidence and determination. No other nation of the free world has the capacity that we have to take them on.

Isn't it fortunate for the free world that with our philosophy of liberty and freedom, we have reached the physical stature that we have concurrently with unmatched technological advances? Isn't it fortunate, for example, that the nuclear bomb came to us in those few moments of history ahead of the time it came to aggressor nations?

For a fleeting moment in history the United States had a complete monopoly in nuclear weapons. With our principles and philosophy, we did not exercise this monopoly in aggression. Even though we could foresee the time when other nations with other motives would obtain this weapon, we exercised restraint. It is perhaps the most noble exercise of restraint in the history of man. What aggressor in such a position would have done likewise? But our restraint was in accordance with our principles.

Today, and in recent years, we have learned to adapt ourselves to the threat that can come, not only from military power in the hands of others, but to even more insidious threats of erosion of the free world by other means such as economics, psychological, political, and other measures that are available for aggressive use.

With our background, it is a tribute to our people that they recognize the requisites of power. They recognize that it forms the background of other actions required to forestall military as well as other forms of aggression on the part of others. It requires tremendous wisdom to tread the narrow line between a premature use of power in combat and an undue delay in its use, or even an abdication of its use. With the destructive power of modern weapons, this discretion is more important now than ever before, and will be increasingly important in the future.

May God give us continuing wisdom here, because it is beyond the capabilities of the human mind to tread this narrow line without divine guidance.

What should be the nature of our military power? One thing about it, its nature is far different from anything of the past. It is different because of the multiple uses to which it can be put. It is different because modern weapons have altered military tactics even more.

Both of these alterations have come from the increasingly destructive power of modern weapons; their increasingly great range; increasingly scientific advances that permit us to multiply the physical power and perceptive senses of man to a degree far greater than ever before. For example, in World War II, it was necessary that we make our advances across the Pacific by a successive capture of bits of land in order that we could eventually bring our weapons within range of enemy territory. We still must retain the capability to carry out this kind of strategy. However, it is no longer necessary for us to capture one additional foot of territory in order to place a weapon on any target in the world. From our own sovereign territory we can reach many targets heretofore beyond our reach. And with our sea-based weapons systems added thereto, we can reach any target in the world. This is the kind of thing that has altered the strategy that is available to us.

In the realm of tactics, the very fact that we have rendered transparent the previously opaque atmosphere of fog, clouds, and darkness by the use of radar, our tactics in defense and offense have been greatly changed.

Many of these advances have also been achieved by aggressor nations. Much destructive power is in their hands also. Therefore, our national military posture must take into account all of the possible kinds of aggression that might be used against us. So, what I would say that our

military forces must have above all things is versatility; flexibility—that makes our military power usable—usable practically. By practically usable, I mean throughout the full spectrum from a show of force all the way to all-out nuclear war. It is only by having this kind of versatility, this flexibility of national power, that we can provide our Government officials with a choice, a multiple choice of national actions in a tense world situation. This kind of flexibility and versatility can be available to us only if we exploit the full advantages that are offered by the three media of combat; that is, the land, sea, and air. The elimination of the capability to exploit the potential of any one of these will seriously reduce the alternatives available to national action.

Now, my profession is the sea. Seapower is my business. It has been for over 39 years. So, you can't expect me to deliver a speech to this audience without some emphasis upon it. The first requisite of U.S. seapower is that it be a member of the team that exploits the potentials of the land, sea, and air that I mentioned above. Our seapower must be developed so that it is both a deterrent to war and an instrument in war; it has to support our national objectives; it has to be compatible with our national character; it has to be structured so that it works effectively in an integrated strategy carried out by our multiple choices of decision whether this seapower is used in isolation from other facets of our national power or in concert therewith.

We have to be ready to react instantly to any kind of a demand that is put upon us. We must never put our officials in a position when we say, "this is the thing that we can do." We must be ready always to fight this month, this day, this hour. Likewise, we must at the same time keep our eye to the future, because the future becomes the today of tomorrow and unless we can look forward with vision to the needs of tomorrow, to what science can give us tomorrow, to what we can absorb tomorrow, to what we are capable of operating tomorrow, we will not be in a position to utilize our full potential tomorrow. This is an area in which we require tremendous imagination, tremendous judgment, tremendous assistance from science, from industry, from education, from all segments of American society.

Now, let's talk about the people of the Navy. What are their characteristics? What are their qualifications? What are their motivations? How do they meet the requirements to man the Navy of the future?

Like most professions in these modern times, the requirements for Navy men have changed and are changing and will change in many ways. There are many of the characteristics that remain the same. The people of the Navy have always had to be dedicated; motivated by patriotism rather than by the dollar. As science advances, Navy men have had to become increasingly imaginative in the application of science. We have to have the ability to see beyond our own profession. We have to keep in mind our national characteristics. We have to know our national objectives. We cannot be circumscribed in our thinking by just the day-to-day business of fighting a ship at sea.

In my office I have a little placard which reads, "Lord, help me to keep my own horizon beyond the beams of my own ship." This is not always an easy thing to do.

Above perhaps anything else, we have to have integrity in our people. They must justify the confidence that the Nation has always shown in us. They must exercise their profession with dignity.

Sailors have always been representatives of the United States in foreign lands. The proper kind of representation is becoming increasingly important. We devote a great deal of time to the training of our people to bring credit to the United States wherever they may be.

As professional sailors, we have a long tradition; it is an unique tradition. We must respect tradition, but on the other hand, we must integrate tradition with progress. Tradition need not be an obstacle to progress, but rather it can and should be used as an assistance to progress. It is frequently an inspiration to progress.

We should frequently turn our eyes inward and inspect ourselves in order to see whether we are and will continue to be a truly elite corps of people. We must solicit criticism, that is, constructive criticism, from others. We want to be asked questions; we want to know how other people look at us and evaluate our performance, because frequently one does not have a true image of himself. Robert Burns put this very succinctly when he said, "Would some power the giftie gie us to see ourselves as others see us, t'would from many a blunder free us, and foolish notion."

These are the kind of people that we need. Our source is from every segment of American society. We must depend upon American homes, churches, schools, civic organizations, to provide us with the quality of people we need. You must demand of us that we ensure to you a full return on the investment that you have made in providing us with the people, the ships, and the equipment to make up your modern Navy.

The Bobby Baker Case: Play Acting by the Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the farcical episode in the other body, called the Bobby Baker investigation, would be ridiculous if it were not so serious. Yesterday's Washington Star rightly condemns this travesty:

WHODUNIT

The long-awaited public appearance of Bobby Baker before the Senate Rules Committee didn't produce any new evidence. But in its way it was quite a show.

The first act featured some legal jousting between Attorney Edward Bennett Williams and the committee, especially the committee chairman. Mr. Williams put on a first-rate demonstration of how to get rid of TV cameras without really trying. And when the lights went out and the curtain went down, Attorney Williams was the winner going away. It was almost as much of a surprise mismatch as the Clay-Liston affair.

The second act starred Bobby Baker in the witness chair, stoutly refusing to answer all sorts of embarrassing questions. At the end, Committee Counsel Lennox P. McLendon opined: "We have witnessed a tragedy this morning because a man who has occupied a very high position in Government—so important, so sensitive, so close to the heart of Government—finds it necessary to invoke the protection of the fifth amendment to protect himself against his own version of the truth, not someone else's version." This is neatly put. But it overlooks the basic dilemma in which Bobby Baker found himself—namely that to answer some questions might make him legally liable to answer all. Which he didn't want to do.

For our part, the grand finale came in the third act, the theme for which was: Hi-fi, hi-fi, who gave the hi-fi? Its feature was a whodunit to end all whodunits.

Don Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, has told the Senate Committee that it was he who paid for and gave a hi-fi set to Lyndon Johnson. President Johnson has said the set was a gift from Bobby Baker. When the committee asked Mr. Baker about it he refused to answer. Why? On the ground, among others, that a truthful response might tend to incriminate him.

What a spectacle.

Congressman William Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very deeply grieved by the very sad news of the untimely passing of my dear, beloved friend, Representative WILLIAM GREEN, of Pennsylvania.

For many years I served in the House with this great, outstanding leader of our democracy. He was a colleague of mine on the House Armed Services Committee, as well as in this great, deliberative body. He was outstanding in every respect and a dear, beloved friend.

BILLY GREEN was a rare and unusually gifted public servant and leader. He was possessed of magnetic personality and amiable personal qualities. He was a man of intense loyalty to his friends and the many good causes to which he was pledged.

He was a man of exceptional ability and keen awareness of the great problems of our time, endowed with deep convictions and firm resolute purpose, a great heart and a great mind, and a special, burning interest in the betterment and well-being of his fellow human beings.

His career was brilliant, outstanding, and the great progress he made during his life was predicated on his own natural talents, high ambitions, hard, persevering work and unflagging persistency in reaching his goals. He had a great gift for making sound, intelligent, judgments and decisions.

BILLY GREEN was not only an outstanding Congressman, but also the exceptionally successful political leader of his party in the great city of Philadelphia. Only a virtual superman could have performed the duties of these two high callings as Congressman GREEN performed them. His many burdens and responsibilities which he so cheerfully accepted and so commendably discharged, made many heavy demands upon his time, his energy, his attention, and his physical resources. That he was

able to accomplish as much as he did throughout his brilliant career is not only a great tribute to Congressman GREEN, but must give us all pause to wonder how he was able to perform his many duties and meet the many demands made upon him. He died a martyr to his distinguished public service.

Notwithstanding his high positions, which he held with such becoming modesty, a quality that was part of his very nature, and the direct powers of leadership of a great, municipal political organization which he exercised with such commendable restraint, efficiency, eagerness, and dignity, Congressman GREEN never lost sight of the basic purposes of this great Government and the needs of those unable to help themselves.

Instinctively humble, he was always approachable, available and willing to go out of his way, even at the cost of personal sacrifice, to respond to the very many requests and demands of the people of the rank and file of his district and city. He was greatly beloved in the House for his innate modesty and loyalty to his friends.

BILLY GREEN was a great patriot, a man who loved his country, and who was deeply devoted to promoting its best interests. His outstanding record in the Congress, his amiable personal qualities and his warm, loyal friendship will long be remembered in this distinguished body, where he had so many friends on both sides of the aisle.

We are all greatly saddened by the loss of such a dear friend and distinguished colleague. His passing has left a void in our midst that can never be filled. His memory will long remain with us. His peerless service here, his kindness, generosity, his good will and cooperative spirit will long continue to inspire us.

My heart is deeply touched by the loss of a valued friend and admired colleague. His great district, city, and Nation are vastly the poorer for his passing because he has been taken from us while at the peak of his powers, with many great tasks and glorious victories for the people still ahead of him. With a deeply sorrowing heart, I join his bereaved family, friends, and district, in mourning his loss, which is indeed irreparable for them as it is for us. I extend to them my deeply felt, most heartfelt sympathy in their sorrowful bereavement. I hope they may all be comforted in their sorrow by the knowledge of BILLY'S essential goodness and kindness and many fine qualities and achievements, so manifest to all.

His great love and devotion to the ideals and values of America, his deep, religious faith and the knowledge of the high regard, esteem and affection in which he was held by all, will long keep his memory green.

May he find rest and peace in his eternal reward.

May the sainted Patrick he loved take him to his arms and may he dwell in the House of the Lord forever.

The Contradictions Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor a hard-hitting editorial tells us what has been wrong with this administration's policy in Vietnam, including the contradictions of the various leaders of the Democratic Party.

It is time for forthrightness with the American people. News from Vietnam has been censored too long.

For the Members' attention, I am inserting the following article:

STEADY, MR. PRESIDENT

The Johnson administration has badly mismanaged its public statements on the most vital foreign issue facing the United States today: the war in Vietnam. The President and his various spokesmen have made a long series of contradictory comments, spread over a good many weeks now, that have confused the specialists, let alone the American people.

We do not wish to be unduly harsh. President Kennedy had his Bay of Pigs roughly 3 months after he took office. President Johnson has had the same amount of time before a real crisis, much more serious than Panama or Guantanamo, has begun to blow up in Vietnam. He has been preoccupied with domestic matters.

And this is no Bay of Pigs affair. What is obviously happening is a top-level review of U.S. policy on the war in southeast Asia. At such a time the differing viewpoints battling behind the scenes in Washington begin to leak out.

Nevertheless the confusion is especially painful and dangerous right now. No one has to be reminded that this is an election year. Governor Rockefeller has announced a damaging list of administration statements that contradict each other. (We could substantially enlarge the list.) Mr. Nixon has said he is hardening his foreign policy line and does not like the smell of things in South Vietnam. Senator DODD, who fought so hard for Tshombe and Katanga in the Congo crisis is out with a statement saying withdrawal of American support for the Diem regime was based on a "hoax" perpetrated by American newsmen who committed a "sordid propaganda fraud" in exaggerating persecutions of the Buddhists. There are all the ingredients, legitimate and exaggerated, of Vietnam becoming another Cuba in terms of a high noise level of public emotion, concern, and confusion.

The President holds the key to this. He can hasten the decision process. Meantime he can avoid having such responsible officials as himself and Messrs. Rusk, McNamara, and Mansfield giving out statements that are only partially true and misleading, or openly at odds with each other.

We cannot believe that President Johnson would or could accept U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam or false neutralization. This would be worse than the Bay of Pigs. He can, however, threaten to carry the war to North Vietnam. His decision on this point is of the utmost importance and we will discuss it in another editorial. Until he decides, the administration must take the lead and thereby help others in the presidential campaign to do the same, in keeping comments at the level of the utmost discretion and responsibility.

Our Critical Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this Congress will have the opportunity to pass the Housing and Community Development Act of 1964 in the near future. Following is my statement to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in which I urge approval of this important bill:

STATEMENT BY HON. JACOB H. GILBERT, OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the administration's Housing and Community Development Act of 1964, now under consideration by your committee, is vitally important to the people of the 22d district of New York, which I have the honor to represent, as it is to every densely populated area in our Nation. The housing shortage is one of the gravest problems with which we are confronted today.

Decent housing and good neighborhoods are essential to our standard of living. Yet, here in the richest nation in the world, millions of American families have never lived in decent homes and are without suitable housing today. The 1960 census reported 5,300,000 families with incomes of less than $3,000 who live in substandard homes.

Letters from my constituents reach my desk daily describing incredible and shocking housing conditions; they are suffering grave hardships because of the great lack of housing available to them in their low economic bracket, and they must look to the Federal Government for assistance. Their pleas are pitiful; their applications have been on file with the housing authority for many years, and still no hope can be given them that they will soon be enabled to move into a housing project. Those with large families are in despair; applicants in this category can be given no encouragement, for the shortage of units to accommodate large families remains acute. In these families in particular the children exist under intolerable and unbelievably awful conditions. It is no exaggeration to say that these children's lives are ruined, their entire futures jeopardized, and that they will pay dearly for our neglect of their sad plight.

Public housing remains the only means by which families of low income can obtain suitable apartments at rents they can afford to pay. Although much progress has been made in New York City during the past three decades, a substantial increase in funds for public housing must be provided by the Congress if we are to make any real progress in reducing the huge backlog of applications of poorly housed families. We realize the housing problem of the low-income family by these figures: The New York City Housing Authority received 97,568 applica-

tions in 1963 and was able to accommodate only 11,115 families. New York City has a backlog of 200,000 low-income families who cannot move from their present substandard quarters unless and until they are provided with subsidized low-rent apartments.

In view of the critical shortage of public housing, the administration's request that we provide for 60,000 additional public housing units per year for 4 years, is a modest one. This Congress has a moral obligation to do all in its power to make it possible for every citizen to live in a decent dwelling, to see to it that children of those in the low-income brackets may have the opportunities good housing provides. Suitable housing, a good environment, go a long way toward combating juvenile delinquency; slums and slum conditions breed evils which beset the youth of our Nation and ruin their lives. Any investment our Federal Government makes in providing good, low-rent housing will be amply repaid in many ways, improvement in the morale of our citizens and the lessening of the many serious problems created by substandard housing.

In New York City alone, there are 50,000 elderly single persons in the low-income bracket who are desperately in need of suitable housing. I am pleased that this bill will benefit the low-income single elderly persons as well as couples.

The urban renewal program contained in the bill is of utmost importance. This would help housing authorities to provide housing for very low income displacees at below average rentals; it would make low-income displaced single persons eligible for public housing, would assist small businesses displaced by urban renewal, would authorize the FHA to insure below-market interest rate loans for moderate-income elderly persons owning homes in urban renewal areas to enable them to rehabilitate instead of being forced to sell. Slums represent an intolerable burden; they are the root of terrible human suffering as well as ultimate high costs to the community. Elimination of blighted neighborhoods and substandard housing must now be our goal, and one we should work toward with diligence.

The Democratic Party has had an illustrious record of facing up to its responsibilities to achieve the goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, which calls for "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family." Democrats, through the years, have fought for legislation to reach that goal and have succeeded in passing good housing bills. The bill under consideration represents another great stride forward in helping our people fulfill one of the most fundamental human needs: to have a decent place in which to live.

I urge your committee to approve this bill. Our responsibility is clear and it is our duty to discharge that responsibility without delay. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will have the opportunity to pass the bill in the near future, so that the various programs provided can be implemented and the work go forward.

Tribute to Harry W. Kalich

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending best wishes to Harry W. Kalich who will retire from his duties as tally clerk at the end of the month.

The accolades which have thus far been showered on him are richly deserved. For Harry has served the House of Representatives long and well in a position of recognized responsibility.

For myself, I miss him. Our association through the years has been a most pleasant one; and, for me, his announced retirement came as a surprise. Harry's youthful appearance would make it seem that such an event would be years in the future.

But, nonetheless, this retirement is well deserved. Harry can, indeed, look back on years of accomplishment and good deeds.

My wife and I join in wishing Harry and his wife all the best things in the golden years to come. May God's choicest blessings come to you and yours.

Tax Cut Benefits Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, most of the Nation's 4.5 million small businesses will feel the benefit of the Federal income tax reduction made available almost immediately following the signing of this bill into law on yesterday by President Johnson.

Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Eugene Foley, has pointed out that these benefits will increase to several billion dollars annually when the full impact if felt. The House Small Business Committee has studied and investigated the many vexing problems of the small business segment of our economy and is pleased that the impact of tax reduction by the new law will show the following among other major benefits to small business and our economy:

Small businesses will reap direct benefits of more than $1 billion in 1964 and more than $1.25 billion in 1965 as a result of the tax deductions.

An estimated 1.5 million taxpayers with very low incomes—and this includes many very small retail shops and service establishments—will be removed from the Federal income tax rolls.

In addition to the reductions, which are relatively greater for small business than for large, small businesses will share in the benefits from increased business volume and higher profits as the economy expands at a more rapid rate. The benefits resulting from expanding business and profits will in time exceed appreciably the amount of the direct tax reduction.

The national economy will receive a direct stimulus of about $8 billion in 1964 as a result of the reduction in the withholding rate from 18 to 14 percent.

Since an estimated 92 to 94 percent of the tax savings will be reflected in increased consumer purchases, small business will be among the first to feel the thrust of the increased consumer demand, particularly the retail trade and service industries.

The House Small Business Committee is pleased that its recommendations are being realized.

George and Alice Wallace: Great Benefactors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I learned with much gratification, but with little surprise, of the magnificent gift of $500,000 to the city of Fitchburg, Mass., in my district, for its excellent library, by my esteemed friend, Mr. George R. Wallace, chairman of the board of the Fitchburg Paper Co., and outstanding citizen in that great city and the Nation.

Mr. Wallace is nationally known, prominent and honored in the business world for the great success he has achieved as one of our great, progressive captains of industry. The scientists tell us that the huge icebergs of our northern oceans are one-fifth above water and four-fifths under water. In a similar sense, Mr. Wallace's outstanding achievements are only partially disclosed to our view or knowledge, and for the most part those which relate to charity, benevolence and philanthropy are obscured behind the veil of humility and passion for anonymity in such matters that surrounds this beloved, distinguished gentleman.

This great and generous gift, which has been fulfilled, will most likely be translated into the principal motivating factor in a fine new library for Fitchburg. It is another, of very many, evidences of the gleaming spirit of civic interest, generosity and community devotion that has characterized George Wallace throughout his busy, constructive lifetime, and that also motivated his distinguished father, whom he succeeded, and his family.

No good cause has been big enough to be overlooked by this great public benefactor, and none too small to receive the attention of his generous heart.

While I know that he strongly disapproves of mention of his various, widespread, unstinted generosities, which in a lifetime represent a large fortune, his friends will not let him escape due credit for the many truly great things he has done in the field of public benefaction, nor ever cease to recall and acclaim his many contributions to community, State, and Nation.

A man like George Wallace could never possibly be adequately appreciated for his noble deeds because many of them are, as I have mentioned, undisclosed and unknown. It would never be possible even to encompass the full spectrum of his generosity—which has truly known no bounds—religious, charitable, educational, public and individual.

I think it should be observed that this kind of man represents the very best

that we have in this country, or in the wide world, for that matter, a laudable example of our economic life and our national product, a man who very ably concerns himself, not only with private interests, but with compassionate and warming devotion to promoting the greatest good for the greatest number, with a host of activities for the alleviation, advancement, and betterment of his fellow man.

In this particular instance, it is the Fitchburg library that will benefit from his most generous gift. In others, it has been a hospital or a heart fund, or health benefits, or scholarships, aid for crippled children—the indigent and handicapped, or a legion of similar worthy human causes designed to help the ordinary man as well as the community.

So long as America can develop men like George Wallace, men of culture, men of gentlemanly qualities, men of high intelligence and great ability, men of fierce, competitive drive and warm, humanitarian purpose dedicated to the good things in our society, if the people will be inspired and guided by his generous example, we shall not need to have real concern about the future of the Nation, notwithstanding the trial, tribulations, and sacrifices that may be required to protect, retain, and perfect our free institutions as effective instruments of human progress.

I thank George Wallace for his grand generosity to the great, examplary, Fitchburg library, which is so generally and deeply appreciated by the officials and people of the city.

No doubt the one who appreciates the gift the most, and who, I think, really had much to do with sparking the gift if the truth were known and is codonor, is his gracious. charming wife, and brilliant, devoted helpmate, Mrs. Alice Wallace, whose capable, energetic, tenacious leadership and work for extended library services in the community and Nation, has been momentous, successful, and indeed one of the primary reasons for the broad, new programs which have been recently adopted at local, State, and National levels. Her contributions will always be gratefully recalled.

Of utmost significance, is the recent library services and construction bill which passed the Congress. The advanced ideas in this bill were, in the first instance, largely the product of Mrs. Wallace's fertile mind, and her leadership was the key to much of the success that has been achieved in this very important vital phase of public education, so essential to the efficient dissemination of knowledge and enlightenment in our day and in the future.

I simply cannot find the words to praise these two great Americans adequately, and I know they would not want laudation in any event. But I know what they have done, what they have so unselfishly given, will invoke the deepest, sincerest gratitude of all the people concerned, of every race, class, and creed, and that the benefits they have thus conferred will be immeasurably vast and enduring in lifting vital levels in the Nation.

I am proud to have such inspiring, dedicated Americans in my district, proud and grateful that they are warm friends, and I want to commend, compliment, and thank them from the bottom of my heart for what they have done, for what they are doing, and for what I know they propose to do in the future in so many areas of public benefaction.

May the good Lord keep, guide, and preserve them for many years to come to work in the fruitful vineyards of American democracy, bringing encouragement, uplift, generous assistance, and inspiration to so many of our fellow citizens—to all of us.

Their example of personal warmth and devoted, unbounded generosity to the cause of our people of the rank and file, will long continue to animate and fortify us in our determined struggle to protect and preserve and strengthen our great country in all its wide ramifications of the public good, and to advance the great ideals we cherish as Americans for enduring peace, for humane improvement, justice, freedom, prosperity, and happiness for all God's children.

James M. Lynch, Esq.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1964, at the age of 95 years, there died in Waterbury, Conn., one of the outstanding figures of our part of Connecticut, Attorney James M. Lynch.

Mr. Lynch's career made a reality of what is often lightly called the "American dream." Born in the Irish countryside to a peasant family, he came to the United States as a boy and with perseverance, foresight, and industrious application of his native intelligence, brought himself to a position of prominence in our community.

Mr. Lynch began his career as a printer and rapidly mastered his trade until he reached a managerial position. At the same time, he continued his studies to prepare himself for the ultimate decision to embark upon a legal career. After concerted private study, Mr. Lynch was admitted to the Tennessee bar and subsequently became a member of the Connecticut bar. From the time of his admission to practice, his career was highly successful. Not only did he engage in the private practice of law in all its branches and in all courts, but he achieved notable success in a number of public positions. Among these, he served as workmen's compensation commissioner for the fifth district of Connecticut, majority leader of the board of aldermen of the city of Waterbury and a member of the board of park commissioners of the city of Waterbury.

Mr. Lynch was generously endowed by nature with the gift of a fine, if slight, physique and he enjoyed, until the most recent times, the active practice of the law and the company of his fellow citizens at numerous social and community affairs.

Calm and gentle, but resolute of purpose and firm in conviction, Mr. Lynch was a strong force for the development of the traditional religious and patriotic virtues, as well as for civic improvement and the material betterment of his fellow man.

All of us in Waterbury mourn his passing, but find consolation in the memory of his long and fruitful life.

The Inter-American Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am chairman, we have concerned ourselves with this Nation's ideological effort. One of the real dangers that confront this Nation throughout the world and especially in Latin America is the understanding gap.

We have often spoken of this hemisphere's community of interests. We have seldom considered its community of ideas. If the large universities of Latin America drift under the pernicious influence of the extreme left, it is not because we were bested in debate, but because we were not found to debate.

Mr. Speaker, let us engage the intellects of these students, professors, and academicians. Let us encourage those programs which enhance and supplement those which we have. Let us widen the boulevard for intellectual exchange.

I call and commend to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "The Inter-American Academy," by Dr. Robert E. McNicoll, appearing in the current issue of the Journal of Inter-American Studies. Dr. McNicoll, founder and editor of this internationally recognized journal, has taught in the foremost universities of North and South America. He has served as consultant to the Government of Peru.

This widely traveled scholar has rendered most considerable service to our Government. During World War II he accepted appointment to a very sensitive position in the State Department. Now he has again accepted public service as a director in the U.S. Information Agency's joint program with Peru.

The article follows:

THE INTER-AMERICAN ACADEMY

(By Robert E. McNicoll)

When the Journal of Inter-American Studies was launched 5 years ago its initial number stated that "the communication of ideas between the different parts of the Western Hemisphere has never been adequate." This appears to be the case still, despite the many agencies that have joined the Journal in its effort to improve matters in this respect. There is a basic understanding gap which can only be bridged by

the intellectuals, the writers, and the professional leaders who are particularly important south of the Rio Grande where their function has not been taken over by a Madison Avenue. We Americans of the North are strong on physical accomplishments but somewhat short of ideas. We design a cheap automobile and then are forced to build roads and reshape society to cope with the unforeseen changes that result. With us, the material accomplishment is attained first and then a small segment of the population, possibly immured in academic towers, begins to ponder the social and ideological effects of the physical transformation.

We are beginning to understand Latin Americans when we realize that this is not the case with them. In the first place, an intellectual elite dominates all aspects of life. In the next place, with this elite, the concept is first and the material realization of the concept may be years behind. When we have to reach a meeting of minds with them on some great program, such as the Alliance for Progress, we must establish first the ideology, the mystique, or we will not gain either understanding or support. We must confess that, despite notable and praiseworthy exceptions, we have not done this with the Alliance for Progress and hence its troubles south of the border. Further, it must be admitted that we have never convinced a large proportion of these same intellectuals that the culture and the institutions of the United States hold anything of use for Latin America.

This, I believe, is unfortunate for them as well as for us. When the basic tenets of the Western World are under strong and clever attack, it should be easy to show how much all Americans have in common and that, basically, their ideals and ours are similar despite differences in the development of institutions. We greatly need a closer and more coherent interchange of ideas between the people whose business is ideas in both Americas.

This has been the purpose of the Inter-American Academy. Founded in 1959, "to foster better understanding and cooperation through cultural exchange between scholars, teachers, writers and leaders of the Western Hemisphere," it has had an extremely modest career despite the grandeur of its basic ideas and purposes. The reason has not been failure of its distinguished members to cooperate but primarily our failure to convince Americans north of the Rio Grande of the importance of its role and thus obtain financial support for programs worthy of its distinguished membership.

The following are the presently elected members: Francisco Aguilera, Chile; Ricardo Alfaro, Panama; Germán Arciniegas, Colombia; Rafael Arévalo Martínez, Guatamala; Jorge Basadre, Peru; Dantès Bellegarde, Haiti; Jaime Benítez, Puerto Rico; Justo Pastor Benítez, Paraguay; Marta Brunet, Chile; Benjamín Carrión, Ecuador; Alfonso Caso, Mexico; José Figueres, Costa Rica; Guillermo Francovich, Bolivia; Gilberto Freyre, Brazil; Rómulo Gallegos, Venezuela; Samuel Guy Inman, United States; Amanda Labarca, Chile; Sturgis E. Leavitt, United States; Muna Lee, United States; Roberto Levillier, Argentina; Alceu Amoroso Lima, Brazil; Archibald MacLeish, United States; Cecilia Mireles, Brazil; Arturo Morales Carrión, Puerto Rico; Dana G. Munro, United States; Estuardo Núñez, Peru; Victoria Ocampo, Argentina; Alfredo Pareja Diezcanseco, Ecuador; Eugenio Pereira Salas, Chile; Mariano Picón Salas, Venezuela; Raúl Prebisch, Argentina; Jean Price-Mars, Haiti; J. Fred Rippy, United States; Luis Alberto Sánchez, Peru; Eduardo Santos, Colombia; Ernesto de la Torre Villar, Mexico; Jaime Torres Bodet, Mexico; Víctor L. Urquidi, Mexico; Arturo Uslar Pietri, Venezuela; Erico Veríssimo, Brazil; Arthur Whitaker, United States; Irene A. Wright, United States; Gonzalo Zaldumbide, Ecuador; Silvio Zavala, Mexico; Alberto Zum Felde, Uruguay.

The Journal, with this number, becomes the organ of the Inter-American Academy, convinced not only that its idea is sound but that it is only by such means that mutual understanding and cooperation can be attained by the peoples of the American nations. The select audience to which the Journal addresses itself—whose response to its efforts has been so encouraging—constitutes the moral and intellectual leadership of the Americas and will determine its future regardless of the temporary ascendancy of one political group or another. If, as I believe, America will continue to be American and dominated by Americans, this leadership is the only group that can make possible the success of such noble attempts as the Alliance for Progress. If the ideal has not been perceived and accepted in the South, it is in great part because we of the North have not known how—nor to whom—to present its message. Ariel has never failed to respond to any spiritual appeal phrased in the language of eternal truth and addressed to the minds and hearts of men. Let us be worthy of our great, departed, Chief by showing that his vision is shared by thousands of lesser men in the North who understand and respect the position of the cultural leaders of the South.

Soviet Conquest of the Free Nations of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, probably the greatest tragedy of this century was the Soviet conquest of the smaller free nations of Europe that were caught in the sweep of Russian aggression and for more than 20 years now have been under domination of that dictatorial power.

One of these unfortunate nations was Estonia, a country that had known freedom and the joy of independence for 22 years. It was for that period a happy, prosperous land that enjoyed a thriving farm economy; a nation that took pride in its forests, fields and lakes; a nation with no great differences in wealth; a nation with a flourishing national culture and strong ties with its Scandinavian neighbors and other countries of the West.

On February 24, 1960, Estonia fell under the heel of the Soviet aggressor.

Within a few short months all had changed. The menace that loomed to the East became a foreboding presence. The oppressor ruthlessly forced Estonian life into the Soviet mold. Land was collectivized, the forests decimated, the fishing reserves were carelessly exploited, trade was subjected to the prior demands of the Soviet economy, living standards sank, class differences became glaring. Deportations and summary executions accompanied the wiping out of cherished freedoms.

The United States does not recognize the incorporation of free Estonia into the Soviet Union. Its hopes and wishes are joined to those of the Estonians; its ideals are inextricably linked with theirs, which must not be forgotten on this day—the 46th anniversary of Estonian independence—or on any day throughout the year.

Lithuanian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1964 a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent, sponsored by the Lithuanian parishes of St. Casimir's Church and Our Lady of Vilna Church, together with 31 Lithuanian organizations was held at the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club Auditorium in Worcester, Mass., to commemorate the 46th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

At this meeting a resolution, in substance pledging Lithuanian-Americans present to persevere in the pursuit of liberty for native Lithuanians, was unanimously approved, and it was my particular honor and privilege to address the assembly.

At this point I would like to include the newspaper account of the meeting that appeared in the February 24, 1964, issue of the Worcester, Mass., Telegram, together with the resolution adopted, and I have also been requested to introduce the address I gave.

The insertions follow:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Feb. 24, 1964]

LITHUANIANS NOTE DATE OF FREEDOM

U.S. Representative HAROLD D. DONOHUE told Worcester area Lithuanian-Americans last night that when the Soviet Union seizes a free nation as it seized Lithuania in 1940, "something of our own freedom is chipped away."

Representative DONOHUE spoke at a Lithuanian Independence Day celebration sponsored by 31 Lithuanian-American organizations at the Lithuanian Naturalization Social Club last night. He reviewed the 22 years of the Lithuanian Republic and condemned the Soviet Union for having "snuffed out the pure and shining light of freedom."

Other speakers included Holy Cross Prof. V. Andrius Mantautas, Richard J. Sarapas, and Anthony J. Miller.

Taps was sounded in honor of the late President Kennedy and for Lithuanian heroes and martyrs.

The program included choral singing by boys and girls of the Saturday Lithuanian classes of St. Casimirs and Our Lady of Vilna Churches and by the Lithuanian Art Lovers Circle under the direction of John Beinoris. Miss Jurate Garsys recited Lithuanian poetry. Folk dancing was performed by Lithuanian Boy and Girl Scouts.

Anthony M. Seskevich and Pranas Stanelis were cochairmen. Rev. John J. Bakanas and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Constantine A. Vasys were honorary cochairmen.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, LITHUANIAN CLUB, WORCESTER, MASS., FEBRUARY 23, 1964

As a friend and neighbor, as well as your Representative in the U.S. Congress, I feel honored and privileged to again join you in these annual ceremonies commemorating the birth of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. That memorable day marked the end of over a hundred years of suffering by the Lithuanian people under a hostile foreign rule.

For the next 22 years, until June 15, 1940, Lithuania was a free and self-governing country. On this occasion, I think it most fitting that we remind ourselves and the world of some of the accomplishments of the Lithuanian people in this comparatively short period.

During these 22 years, the number of primary schools was increased from 677 to 2,696. Over 100 high and secondary schools were constructed and more than 4,000 advanced students were enrolled in the University of Kaunas.

Every city in Lithuania of more than 5,000 inhabitants supported opera seasons and gave all who wished a chance to hear the world's greatest operas and artists. Throughout the country there were special schools for music, art and the ballet. Industry and commerce reached heights never before attained in a country of such small population, which at the time was 3 million. Practically everyone with any ambition owned his own home or his own farm.

In brief summary, this is the remarkable record of the people and the Government of Lithuania in the 22 years of their freedom and independence. This is the period that we recall with pride and joy.

However, that glorious record was suddenly and cruelly terminated on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union violated all of its treaty commitments with Lithuania and the Communist Red army moved in to dominate the country and its people.

Sad though the memory of those fateful days may be, we do well to pause in the midst of our busy and peaceful lives to mark those days of infamy when the light of freedom was so brutally extinguished in this great nation.

There are many reasons why we, as free men and women, must not allow the fate of this country and its citizens to sink into the ocean of historic oblivion.

First of all, they are our brothers. The acts of brutality to them are the acts of brutality to us, their brothers in the human race. When they are deprived of freedom and denied their basic human rights, something of our own freedom is chipped away, and therefore must not escape the condemnation of free men.

It was not because of provocation; it was not because of the threat of force; it was not because of hostile social activity that caused the Soviet troops to move in. It was simply the action of the totalitarian bully who entered the sacred precincts of this country and snuffed out the pure and shining light of freedom which stood out in such bold contrast to their own government which suppresses the freedom of opinion and controls its people by secret police, terrorism, deportations and forced labor camps.

The Soviet leaders have even moved to crush and eliminate religion itself by the suppression of clerical education, the harassment of individual priests and the embarrassment and persecution of bishops. But notwithstanding this calculated oppression, it has not eliminated in the hearts of the Lithuanian people their devotion to God and His church, and their fidelity to religion burns more brightly than ever in their breasts.

In these difficult and dangerous circumstances, our hearts must be filled with admiration and affection for these brave people who will not submit to the yoke of the conqueror.

Let us then, on this anniversary, pledge to our brothers across the sea that their sufferings will not be in vain and their persecution forgotten.

That is why we must keep the case of Lithuania and other small nations before the bar of international public opinion. We must resist every effort to have it sidetracked and we must seize every practical opportunity to bring freedom back to their suffering people.

With firmness, therefore, with devotion to their cause, with confidence in the ultimate triumph of right and justice, let us on this anniversary pledge that our efforts shall not lessen until Lithuania shall once again be numbered among the free nations of the world.

Whereas the liberty of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in June 1940 notwithstanding solemn treaties and agreements of nonagression; and

Whereas the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had rightly and deservedly enjoyed for many centuries in the past; and

Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and

Whereas the Soviet Russia through her representatives in the United Nations and at other international forums has been posing as the protector of all subjugated peoples, especially former colonies in Africa and Asia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the Soviet Russia's policy of colonialism in Eastern Europe and to force Soviet to conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the United Nations supervision; and be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States approve or indorse no agreements which would in any manner accede to the outgrowth of any past, present, or future Soviet aggressive action; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the U.S. representative to the United Nations, to the U.S. Senators of Massachusetts, to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts and the press.

PRAUAS STANELY,
Committee Chairman.
VIOLETA MATULEVIEUITE,
Secretary.

Ignoring of Cuba Brings Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, since January 1961, we have never had a policy on Cuba or the rest of Latin America. In yesterday's Daily News, Virginia Prewett tells us of the risks involved because of our appeasement of communism.

The interesting news editorial follows:

L.B.J. FACES RISKY PATH ON CUBA

(By Virginia Prewett)

With a decision on Cuban policy soon to be faced up to, President Johnson walks a high, dangerous path in foreign policy, with a tremendous precipice on each side.

Cuba is the touchstone of our Latin American policy. So long as the Communist satellite exists in the Caribbean, the bars to the Western Hemisphere are down. And if the United States does not soon rescue Latin America's struggling democratic forces from inrushing waves of influence, we shall see two developments.

First, France means to stage a comeback in Latin America, where it once enjoyed great cultural influence and considerable trade. It may seem that the worst effect of this comeback would be to make respectable in Latin America the De Gaulle attitude toward Red China.

TODAY'S JOLT

But European authorities tell us that General de Gaulle's championship of Red China is only today's jolt. Writing in Paris' Le Figaro, the French Academician Andre Francois-Poncet reports a growing fear that General de Gaulle will next establish an entente with East Germany. Francois-Poncet is a former French Ambassador to Bonn.

General de Gaulle has already sent private emissaries into East Germany, says the writer. Beyond this, of course, lies the further jolt to the West—a De Gaulle move for the Allies to leave West Berlin—and, of course, for the United States to get out of Europe.

As France rushes into part of the vacuum we have left by refusing to support democratic leadership in Latin America, the French will make respectable not only their policy on Red China, but this other change lurking beyond tomorrow.

CONCERNS MEXICO

The second development if we do nothing about Cuba concerns Mexico. In spite of all the cordiality at President Johnson's recent meeting with Mexico's President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, the Mexican leader used the occasion to deal the United States a gratuitous stab, not in the back, but right in the front.

This was President Lopez Mateos' statement to the press that the Cuban problem ought to be settled in the United Nations, a stand directly challenging U.S. policy on Cuba.

It was an uncalled for public jab in the midst of the handshaking and the Mexican leader did it as if it were the most natural thing in the world.

If our present policy continues, Mexico's will not remain static. On the contrary, we may expect to see Mexico provide for Red China the same kind of effective bridgehead into the Latin American land mass that Mexico is today providing Red Cuba.

If we do not stop this trend, this is inevitable. Our complete paralysis in face of Moscow's power thrust through Cuba in fact creates this inevitability.

U.S. Customs Service 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening last here at

the Sheraton-Park Hotel I had the great privilege and high honor of attending a splendid banquet marking the 175th anniversary of the U.S. customs service, one of the historically great and dependable arms of our Government. The distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, made a highly interesting and pertinent address on this occasion and it is my pleasure, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, to include with these remarks his speech on this important and interesting occasion.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT A DINNER MARKING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1964

Mr. McIntyre, Members of Congress, Commissioner Nichols, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege to be among the guests at this gathering, which marks not only the birthday of the father of our country but also the 175th anniversary of the U.S. customs service. Legislation enacted by the 88th Congress calls on the American people to "observe this anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities," and President Johnson has proclaimed 1964 "U.S. Customs Year."

The customs service has for one and three-quarter centuries stood guard at our gates, and, as Franklin Roosevelt observed, "its history embodies the history of both our domestic growth and our foreign relations."

If you customs officials think life is complicated today, just imagine what it must have been like 180 years ago; the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut placed heavy imposts on such things as chickens, eggs, and feed. Connecticut wood was measured; cabbages and turnips were appraised. Duty had to be paid on virtually everything shipped between the States.

It wasn't until 1789 that this chaotic state of affairs was corrected, when the new Constitution gave the Federal Government the muscle it needed to, "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises [adding that] all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

In the early days, customs receipts provided the bulk of our Nation's revenues. Two million dollars of the total of 2½ million collected in the year 1789 came from customs duties. That $2 million compares with customs collections last year of almost $1¾ billion. It is impressive to note in passing that despite the continued increase in collections, the actual cost of collecting a dollar of customs revenues has dropped over the past 17 years by an astonishing 29 percent. I think this simple statistic is eloquent tribute to the efficiency, dedication, and energy of the men and women in the customs service, a service which has some very distinguished alumni:

Many of you will recall that Nathaniel Hawthorne was once a measurer in the Boston Customhouse, at an annual salary of $1,500. He later became surveyor of customs, and it is said that during his tour of duty he came upon old records that inspired him to write his famous novel, "The Scarlet Letter." The service in those days evidently didn't have anything approaching the thorough training programs it has today. At one point Hawthorne wrote his friend Longfellow that he didn't believe he would have any difficulty fulfilling his duties "since, I don't know what they are."

Herman Melville, author of "Moby Dick," was an inspector in the New York Customhouse for 20 years, where he was paid the sum of $4 a day. The same rate of pay was earned by the famous poet, Edward Arlington Robinson, who worked as a special agent at the port of New York.

I wonder how many of the 9,000 men and women currently in the service are at work on manuscripts that will one day become literary classics, or at least dramatic television or movie scripts?

Certainly you have the material at hand. Take the work of the customs agency service, for example—the enforcement arm of the Bureau that wages an around-the-clock campaign against smuggling. Nowadays, plainclothes, special agents can and do make use of the very latest investigatory and surveillance aids.

At John F. Kennedy Airport in New York, for instance, closed circuit television cameras permit behind-the-scenes agents to observe passengers' movements on a TV screen. Anyone attempting to edge a small parcel along the floor with his foot, or attempting to pass a package to a bystander is readily detected.

But even with this kind of equipment, inspectors have to develop what amounts to a sixth sense to spot the incoming traveler who may be attempting to smuggle something into the country. Not long ago, this sixth sense led an alert inspector to order a thorough search of a man and wife and their 3-month-old infant who were returning from a trip to Mexico. The search eventually uncovered a quantity of marijuana—neatly concealed in the baby's diaper.

Diapers are by no means the only hiding places used by would-be smugglers which must be ferreted out by our well-trained inspectors. Smugglers have utilized hatbands, coat linings, automobile panels, hollowed-out heels—and even a piece of salami. One hapless traveler made the mistake of attempting to secrete a $475 gold pin in a piece of salami, evidently unaware of the restrictions placed on the imports of processed meats. The salami was confiscated as a matter of routine, its gold filling quickly detected.

Narcotics smuggling alone represents a major task for our customs inspectors. Seizures and arrests of narcotics and other smugglers are constantly being made along the borders of the United States. In fiscal 1963 there were in all 6,855 seizures made, valued at over $24 million.

Too few Americans are fully aware of the dangers involved in this regular work of customs inspectors. Since 1900, 42 customs officers have been killed in the line of duty by violators of customs laws or by accident while on duty, 49 others have been seriously wounded or injured by violators, and 68 have been seriously injured on duty. In this same period, some 95 smugglers are known to have been killed in gun battles with customs enforcement officers.

Inside, in the customs laboratories, and out front—where it meets the traveling public—the customs service has been steadily at work improving and streamlining its service. Introduction of oral baggage declaration at all airports in the United States has greatly speeded customs formalities. At Kennedy Airport in New York, the average time it now takes for travelers is 4 minutes per person—a record hard to match anywhere in the world, especially in view of the fact that an average of 4,000 persons arrive there daily.

Impressive, too, is the fact that despite a greatly increased volume of business since the war, the number of customs employees is now somewhat less than it was 25 years ago. There were about 10,000 in the customs service in 1939, and there are about 9,000 in the service now, efficiently handling such increases in business as these:

(1) U.S. imports in 1939 were valued at $2.1 billion. In 1963 they reached $16.5 billion—an eightfold increase.

(2) Customs collections in 1939 totaled $350.4 million. In 1963 they came to almost $1¾ billion—a fivefold increase.

(3) Consumption entries filed in 1939 were 514,000. In 1963 they were 1,528,000—a threefold increase. And all of this, remember, with 10 percent fewer personnel.

In the face of this ever growing workload, your determination to continue seeking ways to improve your service to the traveling public, and to the international business community, is to be commended. After 175 years, you're not resting on your oars. Your efforts have been instrumental in furthering the administration's policy of encouraging foreign travel to the United States by speeding up customs procedures, by encouraging facelifting of facilities at our various ports and, above all, by greeting visitors to our shores with courteous, efficient personnel—our dockside dispensers of good will.

It is a source of real satisfaction to those of us in the Treasury Department to salute Customs employees on their 175th Birthday. To Assistant Secretary Reed, to Commissioner Nichols, and to all of you, I say for all of us in the Department—congratulations on a job well done.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Proposed Quality Stabilization Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, many times in recent months I have had occasion to speak out on the nature of the propaganda campaign being waged against the quality stabilization bill. I have pointed out that the antiquality stabilization forces are sparing no expense in their effort to blur the fundamental issues involved in this quality stabilization fight.

Now evidence has been brought to my attention which bears out the fact that those special interest merchandisers who benefit from the present chaos of the American retail market are engineering a high-priced, high-pressure campaign to defeat quality stabilization.

According to Discount Store News, a trade journal, these special interest opponents—primarily discount house operators conducting their campaign under the name of "The Committee for Competitive Prices"—last October raised a war chest in the amount of $125,000 to kill the quality stabilization bill. The trade newspaper said that assessments were made in the amount of $6,000 per member. The size of this war chest obviously reflects fear of quality stabilization and of the genuinely competitive conditions that this legislation would produce in our retail market place.

Backing up this report by Discount Store News, a document was circulated on February 14, 1964, regarding the propaganda efforts of the so-called Committee for Competitive Prices among members of the so-called low margin retail industry.

It would be worthwhile for certain critics of quality stabilization—notably some newspaper editorial writers—to familiarize themselves with what this document reveals about the operations of the propaganda organization working against this legislation.

The document clearly demonstrates that what some people had mistakenly believed to be a genuine grassroots opposition to quality stabilization is nothing of the sort. As a matter of fact, the Committee for Competitive Prices report openly boasts of the propaganda techniques employed to simulate a grassroots movement.

Here it is, for all to read and digest, a case study in how a special interest pressure group is attempting to manipulate congressional and public attitudes toward a particular piece of legislation by means of high-pressure propaganda.

Let me cite an example contained in one section of this report. Several weeks ago I addressed the Senate regarding a purported fact sheet being circulated by half a dozen New York area professors concerning the quality stabilization bill. This fact sheet was highly critical of the bill, and I observed at the time that it appeared to follow, line-for-line, the propaganda being put forth by antiquality stabilization spokesmen. Yet, on its surface, the professors' fact sheet seemed innocent enough, merely the spontaneous work of a group of economists who wanted to make their opinions known on an important economic issue.

But now, as the report of the Committee for Competitive Prices indicates, opponents of quality stabilization have conducted a special prominent citizens campaign to recruit well-known figures in their fight to defeat the bill. And the fact sheet distributed by the economics professors appears to be a key part of this campaign. The report boasts of the meticulous job in this propaganda area. The question remains, of course—and an answer is strongly implied within the report—as to who subsidized and paid for distribution of the professors' fact sheet?

As the Committee for Competitive Prices itself points out in a November 12 letter to retailers, and I quote:

> It costs dollars and cents to plan and write material, print it, and mail it.
>
> It costs dollars and cents to call upon the knowledge of experts in order to reach the public, the press, the key organizations, the effective journals of opinion.

Clearly, the activities of the Committee for Competitive Prices are relevant to the overall quality stabilization issue. For this reason I ask that three documents circulated under the committee letterhead—two letters and the February 14 report to retailers—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The principle raised by these documents seems to me to be clear: Is the Congress to be permitted to consider legislation on its merits or is the legislative process to become a pawn of the highest propaganda bidder?

The special interest opponents of quality stabilization obviously believe that dollars and cents is the criterion by which the public and the Congress is to measure the worth of legislation. They are wrong in this belief—and it remains for the Congress to prove them wrong by enactment of the quality stabilization bill into law.

There being no objection, the memorandums and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1964.

To: Low margin retail industry.

From: The Committee for Competitive Prices.

We would like to bring you up to date on the activities of the highly intensive educational campaign conducted by this committee in opposition to the Quality Stabilization Act. You will recall that this group was organized on October 1. Since then, printed materials, press information, consumer education tools and legislative liaison have all been part of an all-out effort to acquaint the public and members of Congress with the facts about this bill.

Following are highlights of the committee's work:

1. Consumer leaflet: Printing of a consumer leaflet condensing the economic facts of the Quality Stabilization Act for distribution through retail stores, consumer organizations, welfare groups, and other public blocks. To date, requests have been received for approximately 2,400,000 leaflets. Many of our committee members stores have provided the principal channel of distribution. Large quantities have also been ordered by labor unions, civil service groups, and others directly concerned with a possible increase in the cost of living. You will also be interested in knowing that the leaflets have inspired considerable consumer mail directed to the committee (in which case, the letters have been forwarded to Congress) or sent to specific Representatives and Senators.

2. Retail action guide: A retail action guide was prepared for all stores in the discount field. The guide provided ways and means of bringing the Quality Stabilization Act to the public's attention and we are pleased to report that many large chains and independent stores have used the outline to good advantage. Many have been in touch with the committee to report on the progress of their local efforts. Where such efforts inspired consumer mail, these letters have been placed on the desks of appropriate U.S. Federal Government members. A good deal of this groundwork was made possible by a helpful portion of trade publicity from Discount Merchandiser and Discount Store News.

3. Press information kit: Over 600 newspaper editors (business and editorial page writers) received a press information background kit complete with all the facts necessary to tell the story on the Quality Stabilization Act. There were over seven business feature stories in each kit, prepared in the light of specific economic points of view. As a result of this press information campaign, newspapers have been consistently running business articles and editorials in opposition to the bill.

4. Prominent citizens: In response to the meticulous job done in bringing the Quality Stabilization Act facts to the attention of influential American leaders, several prominent citizens undertook to send letters over their personal signatures to prominent economists, jurists, educators, artists, and labor leaders. Each letter contained background material on the Quality Stabilization Act and a request for signed endorsements of an anti-Quality Stabilization Act position. These letters were initiated by:

a. Dr. Arthur Larson, director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, and Director of the U.S. Information Agency under President Eisenhower;

b. Dr. Arthur Flemming, president of the University of Oregon; and

c. Dr. Roy Blough, professor of international business, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University; Dr. Arthur R. Burns, professor of economics, Columbia University; Dr. Charles H. Hession, professor of economics, Brooklyn College; Dr. Charles Hoff-

man, acting chairman, economics department, State University of New York; Dr. Henry H. Villard, chairman of the economics department, City College of New York; and Dr. Harold L. Wattel, chairman, division of business, Hofstra College.

The response to these letters has been rewarding, indicating that there is strong opposition to the Quality Stabilization Act from prominent Americans aware of the implications of so-called fair trade legislation. We are attaching to this report the names of the respondees to these letters. The signatures and the statements are now being transmitted to members of the Senate Commerce Committee and to members of the House Rules Committee.

Your committee is continuing to provide the press and the public with requested materials on this conceivably dangerous legislation—dangerous since it so seriously threatens competition and the possibilities of increased prices. With your financial assistance, we can continue to keep the community alerted until the bill is finally resolved—hopefully by defeat. Thus far, we know that our work is bearing fruit. Letters received from key Congressmen and Senators indicate a growing awareness and opposition. Perhaps the most significant of these is a letter from Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, dated December 30, 1963. The final sentence in Senator MAGNUSON's letter reads:

"For your information, there have been similar bills introduced almost annually for the last 10 years, but the Committee on Commerce has not reported any one of them favorably."

It is our educated guess that the Senator feels the chances of this bill coming out of committee with a favorable recommendation are slim. However, there are no guarantees and congressional sympathies waver, depending upon public reaction. We do believe that the sands have shifted in our direction because of the thorough and effective way in which we have conducted this program.

A financial report on the Committee for Competitive Prices' income and disbursements for the period October 15, 1963, to January 31, 1964, is being sent with this report to all contributing members.

In order to continue our efforts, we need additional funds. If you have not as yet made your contribution, would you please send it to: Committee for Competitive Prices, Attention: Harold Gottfried, New York, N.Y.

COMMITTEE FOR COMPETITIVE PRICES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FELLOW RETAILER: You know, of course, that the so-called quality stabilization bill, authorizing manufacturers to establish resale prices on brand items, is a serious threat to the operation of your business.

What you may not realize is that this bill is moving along in Congress with dangerous speed. Unless you move fast and hard against it, it may be enacted this year.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already approved it. The bill is now in the House Rules Committee.

If the Rules Committee permits it to go to the House floor for a vote, the bill stands a good chance of passing. Remember that special interests have been pressing for this legislation for many years. Plenty of votes are already lined up for it.

Then here's what you can expect: (1) Your suppliers will set your selling prices; (2) the weakest stores in your area—with the highest operating costs—will be able to sell at the same prices as you do.

This bill is directly aimed at discount and low margin operations; at you. If it passes, say goodbye to running your own business your own way.

Enclosed are seven ideas that will help you stop the so-called Quality Stabilization Act.

Use them. Your business is worth saving.

Sincerely yours,
COMMITTEE FOR COMPETITIVE PRICES,
MARTIN CHASE.

MEMORANDUM

To: All retailers.
From: The Committee for Competitive Prices.
Date: November 12, 1963.

The tools needed to fight the Quality Stabilization Act take money.

It costs dollars and cents to plan and write material, print it and mail it.

It costs dollars and cents to call upon the knowledge of experts in order to reach the public, the press, the key organizations, the effective journals of opinion.

It costs dollars and cents to save your business.

Make no mistake. Unless a strong voice is raised against the Quality Stabilization Act, there is a better than even chance that it will pass. Then what?

If you haven't already done so, send your check immediately to: Mr. Harold Gottfried, Atlantic Mills, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Please make your check payable to the Committee for Competitive Prices.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, We Ohioans have given many outstanding holders of public office to our Nation. Certainly the name of Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON could well be added to that list of distinguished patriots. It was just 24 years ago today that she took her place on the floor of the House of Representatives. The people of her Ohio district had elected her to succeed her late illustrious husband, Chester C. Bolton. She has devoted every moment since in service to her country. As ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, her responsibility has been great. She has welcomed that responsibility and discharged her duties most efficiently. No one has a greater compassion toward all humanity. Her work in the field of health has contributed toward the achievement of new goals in that field. Her work in international conferences, both here and abroad, has been of great aid in our diplomatic relations with the nations of the world. The love and respect that the people of her district have for her is well established. They have, by ever-increasing majorities, returned her 12 times to this body. Our Nation has known no more devoted public servant. It is indeed an honor to serve at her side.

President Johnson Addresses Immigration Leader—Ahepa Supreme President Plumides Represents American Hellenes at Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article containing the text of President Johnson's statement on immigration legislation on January 13, 1964, at the White House.

I wish to include also an article concerning the participation in this conference of John G. Plumides, supreme president of the Order of Ahepa.

Both these articles appeared in the January–February 1964 issue of the Ahepan.

The articles follow:

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON ADDRESSES IMMIGRATION LEADERS

President Johnson gave a rousing send-off to the Senate hearings on immigration legislation on January 13 at the White House. Several members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees were present, including Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee; Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan; Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York; and Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, on whom the President called for remarks. Also present were the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Mr. Raymond F. Farrell, and Mr. Abba P. Schwartz, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, as well as a number of officials of the State and Justice Departments.

Some 50 leaders of national religious, labor, civic, and nationality organizations attended the meeting.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS

President Johnson addressed the conference as follows:

"We have met for the purpose of pointing up the fact that we have very serious problems in trying to get a fair immigration law. There is now before the Congress a bill that, I hope, can be supported by a majority of the Members of the Congress. This bill applies new tests and new standards which we believe are reasonable and fair and right.

"I refer specifically to: What is the training and qualification of the immigrant who seeks admission? What kind of a citizen would he make if he were admitted? What is his relationship to persons in the United States? And what is the time of his application? These are rules that are full of commonsense, common decency, which operate for the common good.

"That is why in my state of the Union message last Wednesday I said that I hoped, that in establishing preferences, a nation that was really built by immigrants, immigrants from all lands, that we could ask those who seek to immigrate now: What can you do for our country? But we ought to never ask 'In what country were you born?'

"President Roosevelt and President Truman and President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have all asked for a revision in the

present statute. The present statute has overtones of discrimination. President Truman said that the idea behind discrimination was, to put it boldly, that English or Irish names were better and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. And such a concept is utterly unworthy of our tradition and our ideals.

"Now each of us and all of us are descended from immigrants. I hope we would ask ourselves this question: How would we feel, if we were put in the other fellow's place? Maybe by doing that and engaging in a little introspection for a time we would find it a good feeling to apply the Golden Rule and do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

"GREEK QUOTA ONLY 398

"Great Britain has a quota of 65,000. It uses less than half of that quota. Germany has a quota of 25,000, which it never fills. Italy has a quota of 5,645 but it has a current backlog of almost 300,000. Greece has a quota of only 398 but it has a current backlog of over 100,000. So I think that the immigration statutes require very special examination.

"I would hope that we would do nothing hasty and makeshift, but I hope that we would apply the tests that I have outlined and the standards that I have suggested. * * * These objective stands, I believe, would serve the national interest and I would hope that the Congress at this session would find that a majority of its Members could follow this path.

"I want to thank each of you for coming here this morning. I want to ask you to dedicate such time and effort and your talents as it may be possible to helping us reason together and achieve the standards that history will record as being fair and just and that we, ourselves, can be proud that we played a part in helping to achieve. I particularly thank the Members of the Congress who have come here this morning and who hear many conflicting viewpoints, but who I believe all were elected on a platform of doing what they believed to be right and who, I am confident, when the chips are down will see that fair and just legislation is written, that if they use it to apply to themselves they would feel they had had at least a fair shake."

AHEPA SUPREME PRESIDENT PLUMIDES REPRESENTS AMERICAN HELLENES AT IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE WITH PRESIDENT JOHNSON

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Ahepa Supreme President John G. Plumides attended a special White House Conference on Immigration on Monday, January 13, at 10:30 a.m., at the invitation of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Plumides was invited as the only representative of all Americans of Hellenic descent to the conference which heard President Johnson express his strong views on the inequities of our present laws on immigration.

"President Johnson is very much concerned about this country's present immigration laws, and is strongly in favor of their immediate revision," President Plumides stated: "At the White House meeting, which was attended by about 40 national leaders of labor, ethnic, and social groups, he spoke at length with reference to the Greek quota."

The Ahepa supreme president explained that President Johnson stated that the Greek immigration quota is oversubscribed by some 100,000 at the present time, and that the President also compared the Greek and Italian quotas with German and British quotas. "President Johnson made it very clear that he will insist to Congress that the Greek immigration quota be increased, through revision of the law, and that there should no longer be any disparagement in such quotas between such countries as Greece, Italy, Germany, and England. The conference with the President lasted for about 35 minutes, and everyone present was greatly impressed with the President's strong feelings and sincerity on the immigration question," President Plumides concluded.

COSPONSORS

Cosponsors of the new Senate bill on immigration, as well as members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, were also present. The Ahepa supreme president reported that Senators PHILIP HART, of Michigan, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, addressed the conference, speaking favorably on the bill. During the course of the meeting, President Johnson reminded his audience that former President Truman had also previously pointed out the present inequities in immigration laws as applying to Greece and Italy, in comparison with the quotas for England and Germany.

In a short personal conversation with President Plumides before the opening of the meeting, President Johnson said that he was very familiar with the Order of Ahepa, and with its work in this country, as well as in Greece, and Canada. President Plumides also spoke with Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, brother of the late President Kennedy, and Senator KENNEDY expressed his personal hope that the new immigration bill would be passed during the present session of Congress. The Ahepa supreme president expressed his pleasure in being invited by President Johnson to attend as the representative of Americans of Hellenic descent, and affirmed that the Order of Ahepa would continue to support and spearhead all efforts aimed at the revision of present immigration laws.

Telegram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent for insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I set forth a telegram to the President of the United States from Merton Glover, president of the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The beef import agreement announced on Monday, February 17, 1964, with Australia and New Zealand permitting imports surpassing anything this country has ever experienced would be disastrous to the cattle industry of South Dakota.

The cattle industry in South Dakota generates the greatest income, employment, investment, and source of urban mainstreet commerce of any industry in South Dakota.

The import agreement reached with Australia and New Zealand for the years 1964, 1965, and 1966, will cripple the cattle industry and economy of South Dakota.

We have appeared before the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission discussing the impact of imports on South Dakota and have asked to be heard in April for the hearings authorized by the Senate Finance Committee.

We are certain the agreement announced will financially ruin a large number of the cattle operators in South Dakota and will further prevent any expansion of the cattle industry in South Dakota.

We ask this agreement be cancelled by you until such time as hearings asked for by the Senate Finance Committee can be completed and the total beef import problem be examined.

The serious jeopardy the agreement with Australia and New Zealand places our people and cattle operations requires me to urge you to give this request your personal and immediate attention.

MERTON GLOVER,
President, South Dakota Stockgrowers Association,
PORCUPINE, S. DAK.

Statement of John P. Roche, President of American Iron & Steel Institute, to the U.S. Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee, Washington, D.C., February 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD, the excellent statement of John P. Roche, president of American Iron & Steel Institute, to the U.S. Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee, Washington, D.C., February 1964:

JOHN P. ROCHE, TESTIMONY BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 18, 1964, AND TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

My name is John P. Roche and I am president of American Iron & Steel Institute. The institute is a nonprofit trade association consisting of 87 member companies. The steel industry is truly one of America's basic industries. It employs more than 500,000 persons in about 275 companies in 300 communities in 37 States. Eighty-five of those companies make raw steel required to manufacture their finished products; the remainder are engaged in the further processing of semifinished steel produced by others. The industry spends more than $6 billion annually for the many hundreds of materials, services, and supplies it consumes. It currently generates revenues of about $15 billion a year. It is the basic material used in manufacturing industries accounting for about one-third of total manufacturing employment in the United States.

Both the labor and capital facilities used in the steel industry are highly specific to steel production; that is, neither resource can be easily or quickly absorbed in other sectors of the economy if it happens to be displaced by imported steel. More importantly perhaps, steel or steel products constitute the economic mainstay of a substantial number of local communities.

In 1963, the industry produced 109.3 million tons of ingots and steel for castings. While that was an improvement over the less-than-100-million-ton annual figures of the previous 5 years, it was well below the 117-million-ton record of 1955 and was also below the levels reached in 1953, 1956, and 1957.

Steel is a vibrant and energetic industry steadily increasing its efficiency in order to improve its competitive position at home and broad. It has its problems and is making significant headway in solving many of them. Of these, none is more important or more pressing than the decline of our share

in world steel trade through the reduction of exports and the fast rise in the tonnage of foreign steel moving into this country.

This adverse development in international trade was a matter or grave concern to the steel industry in 1962 when the American Iron & Steel Institute adopted a resolution on the subject of free trade which says in part: "We believe in and subscribe to the objective of a free and growing two-way international trade for this country. No industrial nation like the United States can have any other objective in its own best economic and political interest."

The United States is no longer a net steel exporter. It was a substantial steel exporter through 1957 but in the period 1958–62, U.S. exports of steel mill products were reduced to little more than half the volume of the 1953–57 period—or to only 6 percent of world trade compared to about 15 percent in the earlier period. Meanwhile, imports of steel products into the United States nearly tripled. They rose to 9 percent of world imports, against 4 percent in the 1953–57 period. And the U.S. foreign trade balance in steel shifted from an annual export surplus of 3 to 4 million tons to an import surplus of equal amount in 1963.

World trade in steelmill products has been increasing and reached 44 to 45 million tons in recent years, nearly triple the 1950 volume. But U.S. exports have stagnated at about 2 million tons, while U.S. imports have risen rapidly to a level of about 5½ million tons in 1963. The 5.5 million tons displaced 40,000 steelworkers and a payroll of more than $300 million. But this is history.

The American steel industry is determined to recapture the markets which it has lost in this country and to become a significant factor once again in the export market. But we cannot accomplish either objective without some consideration from the Government. There may have been a time when we could have won this battle without regard to the hurdles established by other governments—but not any more. Here are a few of the reasons why:

1. The increasing trend toward self-sufficiency in steel on the part of countries that formerly imported their requirements. Steel mills appear to be regarded by many as a symbol of national prestige. Even when installation of a steel mill is clearly uneconomic in the short run and quite possibly uneconomic in the long run, political considerations have often led to a decision to use scarce resources to build steel mills rather than alternative kinds of facilities. Thus, countries such as Venezuela, Peru, Argentina, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the Republic of the Congo, which formerly constituted markets for exports, are now supplying much of their own steel needs, and in some cases are even exporting small surpluses.

2. Except for the United States, major steel exporting countries have traditionally maintained a two-price system in which home market customers are forced to subsidize export sales at dumping prices. This situation has, of course, been aggravated in recent years by the existence of substantial excess capacity in the major steel producing countries, which tends to increase the pressure for expansion of export markets.

3. The rapid trend toward parity of technology and facilities among major world steel producers, hence a narrowing in the historic American advantage in product quality and productive efficiency. Much of this has been a direct result of U.S. foreign economic and technical assistance.

4. The low absolute and relative level of U.S. tariff rates on steel products and the absence of nontariff trade barriers in the United States in contrast to their continued existence abroad.

This perhaps is an opportune time to mention briefly antidumping and national preference legislation.

Antidumping legislation: Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade condemns dumping. I believe that the negotiators should urge that all countries should provide effective means of preventing this unfair and disruptive trade practice and that no concessions should be made which would weaken this principle.

National preference legislation: The Federal Buy American Act of March 2, 1933, is a statutory enactment in full force and effect under GATT as "existing legislation." The negotiators from foreign countries may contend that the United States should agree to relax the terms of the American act. Our negotiators should realize that other countries have national preference policies, formal or informal, and therefore, should make no concessions. This subject is covered fully in exhibit D of our brief.

U.S. rates of duty on steel mill products are among the lowest of all U.S. rates on industrial goods. For example, a comparison of 1961 U.S. tariff rates on industrial goods shows that steel products carry ad valorem duty rates averaging about 6 percent. That is lower than any other major product group except inorganic chemicals, agricultural machinery, and fertilizers. Steel tariff rates are from one-half to one-third of those of other industrial imports.

Moreover, in steel trade, our tariff rates are clearly lower than those of our major competitors. They rank with the lowest averages of duties on steel products among the nations of the world.

At the same time, it is to be borne in mind that there is a significant difference in the base on which duties are assessed abroad as compared with the United States. The ad valorem duties of the principal foreign countries are imposed on a cost, insurance, and freight value, whereas in the case of the United States the duties are based on the free on board value at the foreign point of shipment. A recent study by the Committee for Economic Development shows that this difference in procedure means that countries which levy on a cost, insurance, and freight basis obtain an average of 10 percent increase in their effective tariff protection compared to the United States.

On top of all this, the inherent disadvantage of the United States vis-a-vis the ECSC is being further compounded by the recent more of the high authority authorizing an increase in steel tariff rates which became effective on February 15. France has already raised its duties and the other countries are expected to follow suit in line with their traditional policy of protecting the producers of their basic commodities.

With respect to nontariff barriers, there are a number of practices in various countries which tend either to limit their imports or to expand their exports to the detriment of the U.S. competitive position in world markets. These include transactions taxes and import equalization taxes, surcharges in addition to tariff rates, import licensing and quotas, foreign exchange controls, customs formalities, and exclusive supplier agreements, and the fact that some market practices prohibited by law in the United States are often condoned in some foreign countries.

While the incidence of these barriers varies widely from country to country, the industrialized nations generally are freer of such barriers than are the developing countries. But many industrialized countries do have effective devices for limiting imports. Japan from time to time has invoked standby import licenses and foreign exchange controls to curb imports. Transactions, or equalization, taxes are widely used in Western Europe. This drastically affects the competitive position of countries like the United States which depend less on such indirect taxes on sales and more on direct taxes on personal and corporate net income. Present European practice is to levy such taxes on imports, and rebate them on exports.

U.S. producers are affected significantly in three ways, by the impact of such taxes: (1) In U.S. sales to these countries; (2) in competition with their products in third country markets; and (3) in competition with imports from those countries in the U.S. domestic market.

In my view, rates of duty cannot be separated meaningfully from the additional barriers to trade, such as the transactions, turnover, and equalization taxes of our main European competitors. Commercially, these barriers together constitute a governmentally-determined cost of entry which is weighted against the American steel producer.

So long as foreign producers of steel stand securely behind a barrier comprised of tariffs plus intangible—but nonetheless very real—obstacles to entry, e.g., protracted delays in processing clearances, import quotas, exchange control, etc., they have the economic wherewithal for continuing to dump in the virtually unsheltered U.S. markets. There is no question but that such protection provides a particularly powerful subsidy for dumping raids on the U.S. market.

I respectfully submit, it is readily apparent that further reductions of U.S. rates of duty on any steel products could only result in the encouragement of further expansion of foreign capacity and in more damage to the welfare of American steel producers and their employees, and to heavy longrun penalties to the American economy as a whole.

We know that the U.S. Government is principally concerned with the impact of international trade on our balance-of-payments position and unemployment in the United States. The American steel industry is equally concerned. We submit that both these factors are present equally, no matter the size of company or the current status of the profit and loss statements of the member companies of the industry, large and small.

The United States had an unfavorable balance of trade in steel mill products amounting to $170 million in 1963. Five years earlier we had a favorable balance of $355 million, a difference in our payments position of over half a billion dollars.

Concerning employment, steelworkers comprise an important part of the total labor force in cities like Pittsburgh, Pa.; Youngstown, Ohio; and Gary, Ind.; and represent the bulk of workers in such steel towns as Bethlehem, Pa.; Middletown, Ohio; Fontana, Calif.; and many others.

In summary, I would like to make four points:

1. The major objective of the negotiations should be to seek a large expansion of trade while avoiding undue hardships to particular industries and workers.

2. American steel producers find themselves at a great and increasing disadvantage in meeting foreign competition at home and in world markets.

3. Because of the continuing growth in the excess of steel supply over demand abroad, there is no basis for expecting early improvement in this position of U.S. producers.

4. And, finally, American producers should be given the opportunity to compete on a basis of equality. This calls for the adjustment of foreign tariffs, the removal or lowering of nontariff trade barriers, and the elimination of destructive and unfair competitive practices. If these reasonable objectives are not attainable by our negotiators, the United States should not offer steel products for tariff reductions at the GATT negotiations. This would still leave substantial inequities for which correction should continue to be sought.

We realize that the upcoming Kennedy round of negotiations will be one link in a long chain of conferences which over the years we hope, as you do, will develop what our American Iron and Steel Institution resolution previously quoted calls "A free and growing two-way international trade for this

country." We are determined that steel will be a strong and substantial contributor to the growth of U.S. exports.

We pledge our assistance in developing the Government's policy on international trade. To this end, we respectfully suggest that you accept our proposal to provide a permanent corps of industry advisers to you and to any other agency of our Government, not only for these negotiations, but for the future as well.

Estonian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Estonians constitute perhaps the smallest distinct nationality group in all Europe. Certainly their country in northeastern Europe, on the Baltic Sea, is one of the smallest. But to these gallant and gifted people neither mere numbers, nor the size of their homeland, have been of little importance. Being dauntless and daring, they have always faced their far more powerful foes, invariably many times their numbers, with courage and firm determination, convinced that theirs has been a righteous cause. Even in defeat they have made themselves great and glorious. At times when it was impossible for them to maintain their national independence, even then they refused to bow their heads and bend their knees to their overlords and conquerors.

They maintained that worthy and honorable stand during the two centuries prior to 1918 when they were subjected to cruel treatment in the hands of czars' agents. They were fiercely persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and advocated, but they refused to be silenced and subdued. Thus steadfastly they clung to these ideals until the time came for their liberation. Toward the end of 1917, when the czarist regime of Russia was shattered, they had their chance, seized upon it and proclaimed their national independence on February 24, 1918.

Since then world-rocking events have brought on many revolutionary changes everywhere. But the change brought about in the first years of the last war ushered in a new tragedy in the history of many peoples, including that of the Estonian people. After enjoying the blessings of freedom and democracy for two decades during interwar years, Estonia was attacked by the Red army, occupied, and then annexed to the Soviet Union in mid-1940. Estonians have not known freedom since that fateful year. During the war they fondly hoped that their freedom would be restored at the end of that war, but that was not to be, for even before the end of that war Communists had Estonia under their heels, and they still hold its helpless people in their relentless hands.

Today the once independent and free Estonia is one large prison camp for its inhabitants. They are completely cut off from the free world, and hardly anyone from the West is allowed to enter the country. We know little of their actual existence, but that little is disheartening. Without any personal and political freedom, they lead a miserable life. We are, however, assured that they have not lost their hope for their deliverance from misery and servitude, from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the 46th anniversary celebration of Estonian Independence Day we pray that soon they attain their goal, their national independence.

IDA Deserves Another Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the defeat of the extension of the International Development Association was a serious defeat of a constructive approach to foreign assistance. It is ironic that those who have complained about the shortcomings of the unilateral approach have strangled the very hope for a reasonable alternative. It is saddening to see that the bill was defeated in its youth on partisan grounds after it was conceived on a bipartisan basis during the Eisenhower administration. Of the 188 who voted for the bill in 1960 and who are still in Congress, I note that only a little over half continued to vote to extend IDA's life.

Yet, nothing on IDA's part justified such defections. The following facts have not been challenged—IDA is soundly managed, more immune to diplomatic pressures—which has far more advantages than the so-called control over unilateral programs—and uses less of our money and more of our allies' money to accomplish concrete goals.

I can only hope, as the following New York Times editorial does, that many Members will reconsider the matter, not on a political basis, but in recognition of what the program is doing and can do. In this way, they will reaffirm their faith which they gave to the program in 1960, a program which, I repeat, has maintained an impeccable record.

The editorial follows:

DEFEAT FOR IDA

In turning down the administration's request for a $312 million contribution to the International Development Association, the House of Representatives has committed a blunder of the first magnitude.

The more rational critics of foreign aid have argued with some cogency that there has been some waste and mismanagement in the dispersion of funds. They have pointed out that economic aid has in some instances been dissipated because of political considerations. They have charged that the United States has shouldered too much of the burden of help for the underdeveloped nations. But in voting against IDA, they are only helping destroy a very real corrective for precisely the features of foreign aid that they do not like.

The fact is that IDA, which is operated by the World Bank to provide long-term development loans on liberal terms, is an answer to many of the more reasonable criticisms of foreign aid. It lends, rather than grants money to projects only after they are demonstrated to be economically sound; it is a multilateral operation, which assures a minimum of political influence; and it offers the prospect of attracting an increasing amount of funds from the industralized nations of Europe, which have preferred to conduct their aid programs on a purely unilateral basis.

By denying funds to IDA, the House may cause this constructive and cooperative approach to foreign aid to wither away. The initial outlays to set up IDA are now nearing exhaustion. Unless there is a new injection of money it cannot continue its development activities. Without IDA's supplementary lending, the World Bank will be able to expand its own operations.

Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of the Treasury Dillon have already expressed the hope that the House will reconsider its hasty and ill-advised rejection of IDA. We join in that hope, and urge the several local New York Republicans who helped massacre IDA—to change their stand in recognition of the efficient and economical form of aid that IDA provides.

The Lumber Standards Controversy

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks yesterday I referred to a memorandum on the proceedings at two recent conferences in Los Angeles and San Francisco regarding proposals on national lumber standards.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM ON INFORMAL FINDINGS OF WEST COAST CONFERENCE RE PROPOSED LUMBER STANDARDS

Two conferences with interested members of the lumber industry and related segments of the economy were recently held by me for the purpose of determining:

(a) The anticipated effect on small business interests of the proposed change in lumber standards if the same is adopted.

(b) The extent to which those small businesses prospectively affected by the proposed standard have received representation on the ALSC or received an opportunity to place their views before the committee or its members.

The first conference was held in Los Angeles on February 16. Thirty-three attended representing: lumber retailers and wholesalers, homebuilders, port authorities, Carpenters' Union, Teamsters' Union, trucking interests, lumber manufacturers, NLMA, lumber and sawmill workers, and maritime interests.

The second conference was held in San Francisco on February 17. Fifty-seven attended representing: lumber manufacturers, port authorities, box manufacturers, NLMA, Carpenters' Union, lumber exporters, International Longshoremen's Union, laminated board manufacturers.

It is to be noted that although the great majority of those in attendance opposed the new standard, those favoring the proposed change also had representatives present. A complete list of those attending including

the name of the firm or other entity represented by each individual is attached to this memorandum.

The range of small business testimony was most impressive. It included statements of firms manufacturing lumber from a number of different species. Virtually every manufacturer presented statements opposing the new stndard. Many expressed doubt over their ability to survive if it is adopted. Fabricators of wood products such as boxes and laminated beams were represented. These, too, opposed the new standard. Labor representatives from carpentry and maritime international unions spoke out against the proposal. Port authorities from a number of ports from San Diego to Redwood City, Calif., expressed grave concern over the effect the proposed size change would have upon their operation. They unanimously opposed the adoption of the new standard.

Small business firms engaged in the "resaw" industry stated the new standard would put them out of business. Homebuilders in opposing the new standard estimated that it would increase the cost of new homes to consumers by over $1,000 per unit. Both wholesalers and retailers from the Greater Los Angeles market, the largest in the country, expressed opposition to the proposal.

The representative of NLMA, two representatives of the Weyerhaeuser Co. and two others spoke for the proposal.

It was the consensus of the proponents of the new standard that its adoption had been fully considered by all concerned parties. They argued that the new sizes would enable the lumber industry to better compete with other building materials. They also maintained there were important consumer benefits which would result from its adoption.

Even more persuasive than the almost monolithic opposition to the substance of the proposal was the general criticism of the procedure followed by the American Lumber Standards Committee and the organizations whose representatives comprise the committee.

A number of interests do not have spokesmen on the ALSC. Those appearing for labor, ports, maritime interests and home builders, for example, stated they were without representation on the ALSC.

Within those organizations which are represented on the committee, it is not clear that opportunity has been afforded the membership to present its views. Telegrams expressing opposition to the proposal were received from members of the Western Pine Association stating that the sender of the wire had not been consulted or even given an opportunity to express his views prior to the casting of the vote for the proposal by WPA's representative on the ALSC.

Again, at the San Francisco conference, the spokesman for the California Redwood Association stated his organization was solidly for the proposal. This was denied by others present who stated that the majority of those in the organization opposed the new standard.

On 15 separate occasions those making statements were asked whether they had been consulted concerning the new standard and whether they had received any opportunity to present their views. Both questions were answered in the negative. The statement was also repeatedly made that no one had seen the new standard or been able to obtain answers to their many questions concerning the proposal.

Thus, from these two conferences, the following points emerge:

1. In California, the Nation's largest consumer of lumber, there is widespread conviction among affected interests that the proposed changes in lumber standards would seriously injure the State's ports, maritime interests, lumber manufacturers, box manufacturers and other fabricators of lumber products, home builders, consumers, carpenters and maritime workers.

2. Despite this concern among so many groups vital to the economy of the State, there was a consensus among those attending the conferences that no opportunity has been afforded interested parties to effectively present their views concerning this matter. It is alleged that in some instances this has resulted because of lack of representation on the standards committee. In other cases it has allegedly occurred because of the absence of democratic processes within some of the organizations represented on the ALSC.

3. Denied any opportunity to help fashion a proposal which they feel is of vital importance to their economic survival, many small businessmen face a gag rule situation in which their only choice is to vote yes or no on a question of infinite complexity, the ramifications of which may determine the entire course of this industry for years to come.

4. It appears that there is a real question as to whether minimal standards of procedural fairness have been maintained during the process of drafting and voting upon the proposed changes.

5. There appear to be real regional differences concerning some of the proposed changes in the standard. It is not known whether sufficient care has been taken to insure that no region is unduly injured by the action of the committee.

6. A number of small businessmen contend that all organizations having representation on the committee should be required to certify that they have polled their membership or otherwise determined the position of those they represent.

7. An aggressive public relations campaign on behalf of the proposed changes appears to have been undertaken by NLMA and some of the larger manufacturing firms judging from the advertisements and clippings shown me.

8. Smaller firms do not have adequate resources to compete with either the media promotion on personal contact campaign available to those supporting the changes, according to those at the conferences.

9. The proposed new lumber standard will be sent to 20 percent or more of various user and other groups. It is not known how this 20 percent were selected or how representative of their group they may be. Some questions have been raised concerning the appropriations of the groups included in this list.

10. After reading and attempting to fully understand the proposed new standard, it does not appear to me that the average member of the acceptors list is apt to fully grasp all of the many complex matters contained therein.

11. It is not known to what extent the procedural pattern followed in this matter has deviated from that followed by other standards programs supervised by the Department of Commerce.

12. For the reasons set forth in 7–11 above, it appears to be particularly important that the greatest possible care be taken to insure that all affected interests be given a full opportunity to present testimony. Procedural fairness prior to submission of the proposal to the acceptor list is of equal importance to post submission procedure.

13. Since many of the charges received by the subcommittee pertain to the conduct of the American Lumber Standards Committee, it would be inappropriate for that body to conduct an investigation of those charges. The Department of Commerce, while charged with supervising the Standards Committee, would not be an appropriate forum for the presentation of testimony by the many small business and related interests who have evinced a desire to be heard.

Without passing judgment on the merits of the proposal, it seems evident that the controversy may best be resolved by a thorough examination of both the procedural and substantive questions involved.

On Thursday, February 20, the ALSC met in Chicago and added certain provisions to the proposed standard. In order to determine whether this addition has met any of the objections voiced by those at the Los Angeles conference, the following telegram was sent to those who attended the conference:

"Please indicate return wire whether additions new lumber standard adopted by ALSC February 20, Chicago, change your position concerning standard.

"JAMES ROOSEVELT."

The consensus of the replies is that this addition in no way alters the situation. Copies of the replies received in response to this inquiry are attached together with a list of those to whom the inquiry was sent.

LIST OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE AT LOS ANGELES CONFERENCE

Name, address, and lumber interest

Ralph Hill, 830 Old Mill Road, Pasadena, Calif., retail lumber.

J. F. Parkinson, 1708 Pescadores, San Pedro, Calif., Los Angeles Harbor Department.

William R. Daly, 1365 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, Calif., Port of San Diego.

William James Zumwalt, assistant port attorney, 1365 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, Calif., Port of San Diego.

J. H. McJunklin, Post Office Box 570, Long Beach, Calif., Port of Long Beach.

Homer Sullivan, 1247 Wilmington Boulevard, Wilmington, Calif., Lumber & Sawmill Workers Union, Local 1407.

Marshall Wooten, 1319 Harvard Street, Santa Monica, Calif., Lumber & Sawmill Workers Union, Local 2288.

M. F. O'Sullivan, 6980 Cherry Avenue, Long Beach, Calif., Rossman Mill & Lumber Co., Ltd.

Alfred H. Wahl, 1442 East Anaheim Street, Wilmington, Calif., Consolidated Lumber Co.

Ray K. Cherry, 335 North LaCienega Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., Builder-developer.

Leonard B. Netzorg, 712 Equitable Building, Portland, Ore., Western Forest Industries Association.

Kingston McKee, 524 South Rosemead, Pasadena, Calif., Forest Lumber Co.

Paul R. Hollenbeck, 1100 Isabel Street, Burbank, Calif., Lumber Service Co.

James D. Rossman, 110 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif., T.H. & F. Wholesale Lumber.

G. John Lipani, 9543 Bolton Road, Los Angeles, Calif. Weyerhaeuser Co.

H. G. Larrick, Jr., Post Office Box 37, Solana Beach, Calif., retail lumber.

John P. Weston, 336 North Central Avenue, Glendale 3, Calif., Far West Fir Sales.

Doug Moir, 158 Paseo Delicias, Redondo Beach, W. R. Chamberlin S. S. Co.

Nick Cordil, 9516 Cattaraugus Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif., District Council of Carpenters.

Howard O. Lee, 9258 Muller Street, Downey, Calif., Lee Lumber Hauling.

Don Ford, 1200 South Grevillea, Inglewood, Calif., Mines Avenue Trucking.

Carl Ramstrom, 900 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

John Fies, 681 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Claude Ripley, 1314 Elm Avenue, Long Beach, Calif., Teamsters Union Local 692.

Miles W. Davidson, 130 Via Pasqual, Redondo Beach, Calif., Sun Lumber Co.

R. B. Buchan, 1135 West Huntington Drive, Arcadia, Calif., National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Tom Melin, 1424–24th Avenue, Longview, Wash., Lumber Manufacturer and West Coast Lumber Inspection Bureau representative

Terry Mullin, 1022 Ocean Front, Santa Monica, Calif., retail lumber.

Homer Burnaby, 141 Hudson Place, Los Angeles 4, Calif., retail lumber.

S. G. McDonald, 508 West Floral Drive, Whittier, Calif., retail lumber.

Wayne Gardner, 1100 Isabel Street, Burbank, Calif., Lumber Association of Southern California.

Stanley E. Brown, 7817 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys, Calif., retail lumber.

George E. Cordrey, 802 Terminal Street, 10th Avenue, Marine Terminal, San Diego, Calif., San Diego Lumbermen's Association.

Paul Rau, 222 West Gregory, Kansas City, Mo., the Marley Co.

Joe Derrah, 2153 Canal Drive, Redding, Calif., Dee Lumber Co.

Walter Blum, Third and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif., House & Home.

John Fies, 681 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Henry R. Welch, Post Office Box 698, Crescent City, Calif., A. C. Dutton Lumber Corp.

Carl A. Brower, Crescent City, Calif., harbor commissioner.

O. N. Eubank, Fort Bragg, Calif., Aborigine Lumber Co.

E. W. Thrasher, Post Office Box 97, Calpella, Calif., Al Thrasher Lumber Co.

Jack Bouldin, Box 705, Fort Bragg, Calif., Aborigine Lumber Co.

R. H. McKannay, 275 Pacheco Street, San Francisco, Calif., MarMac Lumber Co.

Ernest M. Park, Post Office Box 263, Arcata, Calif., Brightwood Lumber Co.

Stanley Preble, Post Office Box 3850, Eureka, Calif., Tidewater Mills.

Evan Jeffreys, Post Office Box 607, Healdsburg, Calif., Idaho Lumber Co.

R. R. Fair, Post Office Box 1346, San Rafael, Calif., Fair-Hipsley, Inc.

M. O. Hipsley, Post Office Box 1346, San Rafael, Calif., Fair-Hipsley, Inc.

N. Bailiff, Post Office Box 1267, Santa Rosa, Calif., Fleur Products Co.

M. A. Ewing, Post Office Box 1079, Sacramento, Calif., State office of architecture and construction.

Jack Tarason, Post Office Box 705, Fort Bragg, Calif., Aborigine Lumber Co.

Bill White, Post Office Box 327, Orinda, Calif., Thornton Lumber Sales.

John E. Tunnicliffe, 1190 Lincoln Avenue, San Jose, Calif., California Lumber Inspection Service.

Lester Holmes, 666 Mount Hermon Road, Santa Cruz, Calif., Holmes-Hannigan Lumber Co.

Ben Ward, 681 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

George Schmidbauer, Box 120, Ukiah, Calif., F. M. Crawford Lumber Co.

Arthur H. Harwood, General Delivery, Branscomb, Calif., Branscomb Enterprises.

James J. McLoughlin, 100 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., the Martin Bros. Container & Timber Products Corp.

E. G. Covington, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif., the Wooden Box Institute.

R. J. Gehring, Sausalito, Calif., Service Lumber Co.

C. H. Fallert, Brookings, Oreg., South Coast Lumber Co.

Stan Lore, San Francisco, Calif., Brotherhood of Carpenters.

Anthony Raines, California State Council of Carpenters.

John Lawrence, California State Council of Carpenters.

Neal I. Pinson, 681 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

J. C. Morrison, San Francisco, Calif., J. J. Moore & Co., exporters.

Frank Billings, 100 California Street, Cal-Pacific Redwood Co.

L. A. Hickok, 451 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif., J. J. Moore & Co., exporters.

K. E. Rinke, 10447 NE. Weidler, Portland, Oreg., K. E. Rinke & Associates.

F. J. Fair, 869 Lily Avenue, Cupertino, Calif., Weyerhauser Co.

R. K. Rasmussen, 2115 Greenegays Drive, Redwood City, Calif., Weyerhauser Co.

H. J. Ford, 2740 Hyde Street, San Francisco, Calif., American Forest Products Corp.

Lincoln Fairley, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., International Longshoreman's Union.

Leonard B. Netzorg, 712 Equitable Building, Portland, Oreg., Western Forest Industries Association.

Victor S. Roth, 264 Arlington Avenue, Kensington, Calif., Triangle Lumber Co.

Knute Weidman, 261 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, Calif., Knute Weidman Lumber Co.

Wesley L. Hubbard, Port of Redwood City, Hubbard & Johnson.

Harry W. Sharp, 150 North Lincoln, Stockton, Calif., the Marley Co.

Phillip Farnsworth, 617 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif., California Redwood Association.

G. F. Bunnington, 430 40th Street, Oakland, Calif.

Gordon L. Saunders, 703 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., Lamon Lumber Co.

Ellen McNamara, Rainer, Oreg., Rainier Mfg. Co.

Gerhart Bendix, Selad Valley, Calif., Hi-Ridge Lumber Co.

Robert L. Spoo, Eureka, Calif., Precision Lumber Co.

Frank McCrary, Jr., Davenport, Calif., Big Creek Lumber Co.

Wendell Paquette, Burlington, Calif., Sawmill Sales Co.

Sam Wingate, Arcata, Calif., VanVleet Wood Products.

R. P. Kilgore, San Rafael, Calif., Kilgore Lumber Co.

John A. Davenport, Post Office Box 793, Red Bluff, Calif., Western Forest Industries Association.

Richard Caletti, Healdsburg, Calif., Standard Structures, Inc.

Book telegram to the following:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE,
February 24, 1964.

Mr. MILES DAVIDSON,
Sun Lumber Co.,
Los Angeles, Calif.:
Mr. RALPH HILL,
Owens-Parks Lumber Co.,
Los Angeles, Calif.:
Mr. NICK CORDIL,
Los Angeles, Calif.:
Mr. WAYNE GARDINER,
Lumber Association of Southern California,
Burbank, Calif.:
Mr. KINGSTON MCKEE,
Forest Lumber Co.,
Pasadena, Calif.:
Mr. GEORGE E. CORDREY,
San Diego Lumbermen's Association,
San Diego, Calif.:
Mr. CARL A. BROWER,
Harbor Commissioner,
Crescent City, Calif.:
Mr. JOHN FIES,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association,
San Francisco, Calif.:
Mr. HENRY R. WELCH,
A. C. Dutton Lumber Corp.,
Crescent City, Calif.:
Mr. STANLEY PREBLE,
Tidewater Mills,
Eureka, Calif.:
Mr. N. BAILIFF,
Fluor Products Co.,
Santa Rosa, Calif.:
Mr. JOHN E. TUNNICLIFFE,
California Lumber Inspection Service,
San Jose, Calif.:
Mr. JAMES J. MCLOUGHLIN,
Martin Bros. Container & Timber Products Corp.,
San Francisco, Calif.:
Mr. KNUTE WEIDMAN,
Knute Weidman Lumber Co.,
Palo Alto, Calif.:
Mr. ROY K. CHERRY,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

Please indicate by return wire whether additions to new lumber standard adopted by ALSC in February at Chicago changes your position concerning the standard.

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT.

REPLIES RECEIVED TO TELEGRAPHED INQUIRY, TO DATE, FEBRUARY 26, 1964

Kingston McKee Forest Lumber Co., 524 South Rosemead Boulevard, Pasadena: "Position unchanged as to new lumber standards. Greatly concerned as to the complete lack of representation from retail lumber industry in southern California on all committees."

Miles W. Davidson, chairman, lumber standards committee: "No change in position indicated here. Industry spokesmen ask for meaningful representation before ALSC. Eighteen permitted to promoted standards proposals that would effect economics changes in this area."

Ralph D. Hill: "Position on lumber standards not changed. Additions made by ALSC were for benefit of legal objections without providing workable sizes for green mills. So-called grade simplification purpose not served by size proliferation. Southern California industry still without representation. February 20 meeting only served to illustrate validity of objections voiced to you by California retailers, transportation, labor, builders, and port operators. Dislocation of orderly marketing is predictable result for much of basic California industry. Workable solution to size issue still exists and still ignored in proposal made by Lumber Association of Southern California."

Nick Cordil, mill representative, Los Angeles County District Council of Carpenters, 2200 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.: "The so-called changes adopted by the ALSC on February 20, at Chicago would not change anything substantially as far as our southern California lumber industry is concerned. I still do not think this should be acted upon until we are properly represented. It would still replace over 1,000 of our members in the lumber industry."

Fluor Products Co., Inc., N. L. Bailiff: "New lumber standard adopted February 20 does not change our position, nor does it eliminate the design and manufacturing cost problems created by altogether new lumber sizes."

Knute Weidman, Post Office Box 88, Palo Alto, Calif.: "Not in agreement with additions to new Standards adopted February 20, Further hearings should be held."

"John Fies, National Lumber Manufacturers Association: "This is in response to your telegram of February 24. Our position remains that we wish the revised simplified practice recommendation 16—, being American lumber standards for softwood lumber, to be submitted to the acceptor list as soon as possible."

A. C. Dutton Lumber Corp., Henry R. Welch, alternate ALSC member: "Re your wire of February 24 size standards adopted at Chicago February 20 does not change my position that even with this additions new lumber standards are very far from complete and entirely inadequate to fit the needs of the lumber industry."

J. J. McLoughlin, Martin Bros. Containers & Timber Products Corp.: "Retel ALSC standard, position unchanged. New standard 1 11/32 green presents same problems outlined at meeting February 17 concerning 1½ dry. Urgently request your support of small business by requesting public hearing before ALSC proposal is adopted."

The California Lumber Inspection Service, John E. Tunnicliffe, general manager:

"Speaking for 95 percent of our total subscribers representing 500 million board feet green annual production the recent ALSC additions do not change our position regarding new proposed ALSC standards clarification and review of ALSC proposals are necessary on behalf of the California green lumber producers."

George E. Cordrey, San Diego Lumbermen's Association: "Action of ALSC on February 20 is step in right direction but feel that table of equivalent green sizes must be an integral part of standard. Request no action on referendum until after meeting requested by opponents early in March. Feel reconstitution of ALSC is necessary to permit greater representation of green mills and distributors."

Stanley Preble, Tidewater Mills, Inc.: "Retel additions adopted by ALSC, do not change our position. In 2½ years we have built export shipments from 0 to 35 to 40 percent of our production. Changes of domestic sizes could eliminate us 100 percent from export and force us to concentrate on domestic sizes and market. This is the fear of other mills trying to push export in Douglas fir, redwood and other species the U.S. whole lumber export program is in jeopardy.

"We feel that reducing sizes will upset the balance of the lumber economics in favor of the large timber owning mills at the expense of the smaller company. The small mills generally belong to associations controlled by large companies and have not been properly represented.

"We urge that you carry on with the proposed hearings to hold free and open discussions on the new standards to give all parties concerned an opportunity to be represented. Other areas that should be explored are the makeup of the acceptor list and possible reconstitution of the ALSC."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks of speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

America's Second Most Influential Government Personage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the March 1964 issue of the Retail Clerks Advocate. This article, while brief, gives us further insight into the makeup of our respected, capable, and dynamic Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The article follows:

AMERICA'S SECOND MOST INFLUENCIAL GOVERNMENT PERSONAGE: JOHN W. MCCORMACK

In November 1963 JOHN MCCORMACK was thrust into a position experienced by no other American. As Speaker of the House of Representatives, he was already the most powerful and influential person in our system of government, after the President. With the assassination of John F. Kennedy, his broad legislative powers were combined with an executive branch responsibility as he became direct successor to the supreme office of the President.

This is a heavy burden, but during his entire career, MCCORMACK has never shirked an assignment and has always discharged his duties ably.

JOHN MCCORMACK has had an important influence on the course of our Government during 21 crucial years. The New Deal, the defense programs of two critical wars, the Marshall plan, the development of the atomic bomb, all bear the scrutiny, and in many cases the imprint, of his opinions and efforts.

First elected to the Congress in 1928, he has served for 18 consecutive terms. He was elected House majority leader in 1941 and served in that post more than twice as long as anyone else in the entire history of the Congress. He became Speaker on January 9, 1962, following the death of Sam Rayburn.

MCCORMACK was born of Irish parents in South Boston, Mass., on December 21, 1891. Hard times were no novelty to the McCormack's, but the family's circumstances seriously worsened when the father died. The mother then had to undertake the bringing up of a family of small children and at 13 JOHN had to go to work to help. This meant leaving school at the end of the eighth grade, as so many of his friends were forced to do. But JOHN's education did not stop there. The ambitious boy continued school at night, enrolling at the South Boston Night High School. It was necessary for him to work all day, walk home from downtown Boston, about 2 miles away, have supper, and then climb Dorchester Heights Hill to the high school, spending 2 hours, 5 nights a week, attending classes.

The first step toward Washington came when JOHN was able to obtain a job in a Boston law office. He read law at night, and passed the Massachusetts bar examination at the age of 21. After he passed the bar, he went into practice on his own, and his success led to his first venture into political life.

This was election as a member of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, which was called in 1917 to revise old Massachusetts laws. Some of these were older than the United States, dating to back before the Revolution.

He came to public notice at this time when he sponsored an amendment providing for public initiative and referendum in the newly established State laws. At the time it was a controversial subject, but MCCORMACK led the fight for it and won.

Following service in the Army during World War I, he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1920. After a 2-year term, he was elected to the State senate, serving for 4 years. During the last half of the term he served as Democratic leader. From this position it was inevitable that he gravitate to Washington. And in the larger forum, his outstanding qualities soon brought him to a leadership position.

In 1918, JOHN MCCORMACK married Harriet Joyce, a native of South Boston. A standout in an area of beautiful girls, Harriet Joyce was a well-known soloist, engaged in a study of grand opera when she gave up her promising career to devote herself to her husband's rise to prominence.

They have no children, but the Speaker is devoted to his nephew, Edward McCormack, who was attorney general of Massachusetts and a candidate for the U.S. Senate in the last election.

The McCormack's live quietly in Washington, rarely participating in the social life of the Capital. Whenever they travel, they always travel together. And the Speaker prides himself in always finding time in his busy schedule to have dinner at home with his wife every night.

John Monahan, an assistant to MCCORMACK, relates that when the Speaker was asked after his election whether he would continue this custom, he said, "I shall so be able to coincide my new duties as the Speaker of the National House of Representatives that they will not conflict with what I consider the paramount pleasure of my life."

Reflecting perhaps the environment in in which he grew up, MCCORMACK has always been a strong defender and advocate for the underprivileged and the workingman.

He has always been in the forefront on sound labor legislation, had an important part in the establishment of the laws providing for collective bargaining, strongly endorsed the proposals for the minimum wage, from the first proposal up to the increased maximum advocated by President Kennedy. In the expansion of the social security laws and proposed increased benefits in aid to the underprivileged, more assistance and better care of the aged, he has always been a strong and forceful speaker.

His convictions are based on the belief that in prosperous America there is no place for human suffering from want or neglect. It is the Federal Government's responsibility to provide leadership and financial assistance so that all governments, State and local, can under this leadership join in taking care of every American in need.

In foreign affairs, he takes the position that we are the leading nation of the world with deep responsibilities toward our fellow nations and fellow men; responsibilities that we must meet without hesitation or equivocation. It is our duty to sustain this dominant position, and the Speaker will do his utmost to maintain it.

A friend of the Retail Clerks International Association, McCormack addressed the 24th convention on film, saying, "The retail clerks have always been close to my heart. Our friendship was formed in my early years of public service in Boston when I was a member of both branches of the Massachusetts Legislature and has ripened through my years of service in the Halls of Congress.

"I take this opportunity to thank all the members of the Retail Clerks International Association and your dynamic leaders for the support of past years and your continuing support of social and economic justice; also for the great contribution you have made to carry into complete effectiveness the constitutional right of all citizens for equal opportunities under the law, without regard to race, color, or creed.

"Your enviable record of achievement in the fields of organizing, of collective bargaining, of community service, and of national defense and foreign affairs has written a bright chapter in the history of the union movement and is a tribute to your organization."

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as I told the Senate on September 30, Soviet anti-Semitism is of increasing concern to people throughout the world. Despite Soviet protestations to the contrary, the Russian Government is conducting severe repressive measures against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution from the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh on this important subject.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL OF GREATER PITTSBURGH, FEBRUARY 10, 1964

The Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh deplores the continuing discrimination against Jews by the Government of the Soviet Union. It notes that official restrictions deny them freedom of worship, and increasingly destroy their cultural traditions, religious practices and Jewish education; it being noted that the U.S.S.R. Constitution permits free exercise of distinctive religious and cultural practices by other nationalities and religious minorities.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to fulfill their stated purpose of equality and support of human rights by

restoring to the Jews of that country their rights to sustain their religious beliefs and preserve their cultural traditions.

We call upon the Secretary General of the United Nations to use his good offices to the end that the virtual spiritual genocide of Soviet Jewry shall not be fulfilled; and we call upon the officials of the Government of the United States to take the necessary steps to protest against this evil.

Friendly Sons To Honor Monsignor Costello, of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as for many years past, on March 17 the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick will hold its annual dinner in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. I have attended many of these affairs through the years but this year I will not be able to be present at the Wilkes-Barre dinner as I have been invited to deliver the principal address at the St. Patrick's Day dinner in Pittston, Pa., also in my congressional district.

Last year, at the St. Patrick's affair in Wilkes-Barre, that organization was kind enough to select me as the recipient for its Man of the Year Award. I felt greatly honored and deeply appreciative of this recognition and I shall always cherish the memory of that occasion.

This year, the award will be made to one of the most distinguished and gifted churchmen in our section of the State of Pennsylvania, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis A. Costello, V.F., pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception, Wilkes-Barre.

A thoughtful and well-deserved editorial on the additional honor to be bestowed on Monsignor Costello was published in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, the Evening News on Friday, February 21, 1964, and it gives me great pleasure to make this editorial part of my remarks today.

Editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Feb. 21, 1964]

FRIENDLY SONS TO HONOR MONSIGNOR COSTELLO, OF WILKES-BARRE

The choice of the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis A. Costello, V.F., as the recipient of the Man of the Year Award of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at the annual dinner in Hotel Sterling on March 17 will be warmly applauded by a host of friends and admirers in and out of the organization.

His selection on the basis of his service to God and man, as demonstrated by his dedication to his faith and community, was a logical one. As pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception, Wilkes-Barre, dean of the Northeast Luzerne County Deanery, examiner of the junior clergy, as well as a domestic prelate and doctor of laws, he has been singled out for heavy responsibilities and many signal honors during a brilliant career that still has a long way to go in the normal course.

His extracurricular activities range over a wide field. He has served as a member of the boards of King's and Misericordia Colleges, chairman of the executive committee of the Catholic youth center, moderator of the council of Catholic women and the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, Friar of the Fourth Degree Assembly of the Knights of Columbus, member of the Wyoming Valley Study Commission, officer of the Labor-Management-Citizens' Committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce, and director of the Wyoming Valley United Fund and the blue cross.

Nor is that all. He is widely known as an author, critic, and public speaker. He pioneered in offering Mass over television for shut-ins. He also conducted a monthly radio program.

That is a great deal of ground to cover while carrying on his pastoral labors for 37 years, including tours of duty in two of the foremost charges in the diocese—his present assignment and St. Peter's Cathedral at Scranton.

As a spiritual leader, he is a credit to his Irish forebears, to Ireland's patron, St. Patrick, and to his own patrons, St. Francis of Assisi and St. Anthony of Padua, whose names he bears.

As a good neighbor and good citizen, he has illuminated the record from his native Hazleton to his adopted Wilkes-Barre through his zeal and good works.

In paying tribute to this versatile and gifted churchman on St. Patrick's Day in keeping with tradition, the Friendly Sons will enhance the occasion.

A Woman Writer Takes a Critical Look at America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report entitled "A Woman Writer Takes a Critical Look at America." I believe that this is one of the finest articles I have read in a long time. I hope that every Member of the House and people all over the country read this article. Miss Craig has condensed the conditions as they really are, and they demand examination at the highest levels. Personally, I do not know Miss Craig very well, but I want to commend her for this very important and discerning article. I hope what she has done will accomplish some of the desired action by the administration.

The article follows:

A WOMAN WRITER TAKES A CRITICAL LOOK AT AMERICA

(Following is full text of an article by May Craig, Washington correspondent, reprinted by permission from the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram of Feb. 9, 1964:)

Unless there is a change, deep down, in the American people, a genuine crusade against self-indulgence; immorality, public and private; then we are witnesses to the decline and fall of the American Republic.

Death on the highways, a pack a day, cheating from top to bottom in our society, get rich quick, breakup of the family, faltering in foreign policy, reckless debt—these have destroyed nations before us. Why should we think we can take that path and change history?

Look around you, and everywhere you see lack of principle and steadfastness in the right and brave. The disgraceful cover on the recent issue of a publication with a nationwide circulation and its palliating story of sexual immorality adds adult consent to the looseness of our youth, already far down the road of delinquency, shiftlessness, derogation of virginity in our girls who will be the mothers of tomorrow.

There is no financial morality in our Government—"charge it," is the accepted practice.

Round the world they think they can take our money with one hand and slap us in the face with the other. We talk of our leadership, but we are apparently incapable of giving leadership.

One listens with dismay to the campaigning for the Presidency that is going on. Oh, for a crusader to call us back to dignity and strength and austerity.

What was that last word? "Austerity"—plain living and high thinking, putting our money into the real things of life, not mink-handled saucepans and three cars in every garage; public servants who are not Bobby Bakers. Schools for the young, care for the elderly, strength so that none will dare attack us, a worthy succession to those men with feet wrapped in bloody bandages at Valley Forge to give us liberty. How have we used the liberty they bought for us so dearly?

Because it is unpleasant to think of unpleasant things, we say the Soviet Union may be changing its determination to "bury us." Red China is bad, of course, but maybe not Khrushchev. Half-heartedly we send American men to die in jungles, where we do not have the guts to go in to win or to stay out.

We sell wheat to Russia to save her from a demonstration that communism cannot produce enough food for its own people. If we do this to get rid of surplus wheat, which we have already subsidized and which we will subsidize again to give it to the Communists cheaper, we might try discouraging the production of surplus wheat and remember the old-fashioned private enterprise where one grows for the market, not the Government storage bins.

We faltered in Cuba and now she is the homeland of subversion of all Latin America and Africa. Where will we find a strong man to lead us? Would we vote for one if he campaigned, crying in the wilderness that we come and be saved—from ourselves? We could have saved Cuba for freedom, and saved ourselves and the rest of Latin America from this nest of communism, but we did not. Around the world they do not believe what we say; they look at what we do.

The United Nations was founded in this country. Now it is a messy combination of polygot nations, old and new, grabbing for our money and ignoring our half-hearted arguments.

The idea of letting in a small nation of fewer than a half million people, utterly inexperienced in governing itself, unproved as a stable, honest state—letting them in within a few days of their establishment. We might at least insist on a period of probation.

The United Nations itself should be forced into financial honesty by the United States refusing to keep on paying the bills while many get a free ride while outvoting us. The idea of letting in Red China in the fact of the charter which says, "peace-loving nations." True, we are against letting Red China in, but all we do is get our handkerchiefs and weep into them while the majority in the U.N. does as it pleases.

We waste untold sums on useless defense, and fail to keep ourselves truly strong in all fields, to be able to fight small as well as missile wars.

We sign test-ban treaties with known enemies, known defaulters on treaties, that we will not test as we may need to. Why should

we put our defense in such an agreement? If our defense experts—not businessman McNamara [Secretary of Defense]—say we need to test, then let us test without asking permission of friend or foe.

We fiddle-faddle in southeast Asia, and may be ignominiously pushed out. Maybe we should never have gone in there—let the Reds take it—but there is one thing for sure: If we go in anywhere, we should go in to win.

We are losing the respect of the world, and respect is more necessary to a nation, as to a person, than affection. We get little affection from the people we have helped over the years, and we are losing respect.

Nobody respects a fumbler, a weak man, a wobbler, in policy or deeds.

First, every one of us has to clean out weakness and selfishness and immorality of all types. Then choose leaders who with strength and principle and intelligence will lead us to where we can have self-respect and respect of others.

Would we elect such a man if he campaigned on such a platform?

Help for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a major effort to prevent juvenile delinquency and curb school dropouts called "Mobilization for Youth," has been underway in the lower Manhattan area of New York City with considerable success. This project is the most impressive of its kind ever attempted, and more than 2 years of research, planning, and coordination of community organizations went into preparation for the program. With a staff of 100, Mobilization for Youth offers a variety of new services in education, vocational and social services, youth employment, recreation and community development.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a feature article on it by Howard Colson entitled "East Side Story: Cities From Coast to Coast Are Watching New York's Mobilization for Youth, an Experiment in People," which appeared in the pictorial living section of the New York Journal-American, January 12, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST SIDE STORY: CITIES FROM COAST TO COAST ARE WATCHING NEW YORK'S MOBILIZATION FOR YOUTH, AN EXPERIMENT IN PEOPLE

(By Howard Colson)

At 17, Paul is a school dropout. Until recently, anyone predicting his future would foresee a discouraging series of low paying, dead end jobs. Today, he's at work learning and earning in the one area of his consuming interest—automobiles. He has been given a chance.

Marilyn, also an unsuccessful high school student who was surly and argumentative, is taking her first tentative steps, in her job as a waitress, toward the discovery of what it means to hold a job and do it well.

Juanita, a high school senior, has wanted to be a teacher as long as she can remember. Today, she's learning something about the future she plans by helping fifth graders Janet, Anthony, and John with their homework. She's also earning money desperately needed for the family coffers.

Michael, just 4, loves to visit the apartment where all the ladies are. There are toys, plenty of other children and lots of milk and cookies to eat before Mommy comes back to take him home.

The link that binds these four is a program called Mobilization for Youth, a time-limited, 5-year, $14 million experiment in the control and prevention of juvenile delinquency.

New York City is providing the laboratory, a 67-block area from East 14th Street to the Brooklyn Bridge and Avenue B to the East River, a region of high delinquency and dropout rate, poverty, and heavy concentration of minorities from Puerto Rico and the Deep South.

A broadside of Mobilization for Youth programs in the areas of work, education, group work and community organization, and services to individuals and families, has been fashioned to seek proven methods of combating delinquency. With the support of the Federal and city governments and the Ford Foundation, the program is expected to be in operation through 1965. Across the country, 14 other projects are now in the planning stages with an eye to Mobilization for Youth experiences.

In a variety of work programs, young people are receiving on-the-job training in industry, with wages shared by Mobilization for Youth and the employer, or are being specially trained in Mobilization for Youth's Urban Youth Work Corps projects. Here, they learn clerical work, sewing machine operation, woodworking or general shop skills. They pump gas and handle engine tuneups at the Mobilization for Youth service station or automotive shop. They learn hospital duties at one of four cooperating institutions, or are assigned to building repair projects.

At Bloomingdale's, boys and girls are working at entry retailing jobs. The store, incidentally, accepted twice as many trainees in a second group as it had included in the first.

The Mobilization for Youth Job Center is located at 214 East Second Street. Here, young people, 16 to 21, who reside in the area can seek help. Some 90 percent of those who do are high school dropouts and many find their way into one of the Urban Youth Work Corps projects. One such operation is the Mobilization for Youth Luncheonette at Avenue B and Second Street.

"These kids are hip," one project manager has said. "Sure, they're dropouts, but the majority of them are extremely bright. They have difficulties, of course. One boy's work is slow and you find it's because he won't yell his orders to the chef—he's ashamed of his accent. We have to make him yell rather than let him walk the length of the counter to deliver each order in person.

"Then there's the arithmetic problem. We're a nonprofit operation, so we don't charge tax, but these kids have to learn how to compute that 5 percent—just as they'll be asked to do in any restaurant. I had to pass one girl along to another project recently. It was a shame. She had ability and a fine attitude about work, but she just couldn't seem to figure that percentage."

The maximum time a young person can spend on a project is about 6 months, but many are ready sooner for further training in outside jobs. Often, whether they can learn and hold a job in a project like the luncheonette will depend upon factors that might be considered minor under other circumstances.

"You can see a kid improve and grow from the first time you comment 'nice job' when he's learned something," the manager has added. "We can teach many of these youngsters but the big problem is to get the employers to offer them jobs afterward."

In the area of education, Mobilization for Youth programs include inservice teacher training (with visits to the homes of pupils and attention to the problems of teaching in a depressed area). Corrective reading programs and reading clinics aid youth. There are early childhood and preschool programs, one in which 4-year-olds are hied off to kindergarten.

In this "world of education," one special program serves a dual purpose. It aids elementary schoolchildren and helps keep academically able teenagers in school. Teens in the homework helper program earn $11 weekly for tutoring fourth- and fifth-grade youngsters.

Says Albert R. Deering, who heads the program, "This is often the first contact the elementary youngster has had with someone who has achieved something academically. This 'model identification' is a major part of the plan."

All tutoring is on a one-to-one basis, with teens traveling to local grammer schools to teach up to two afternoons a week from 3 to 5 p.m. They walk their charges home at the close of the sessions.

"We can't expect to get expert teachers," says Mr. Deering, "but we do get some excellent tutors."

The teenagers, incidentally, don't miss much, as witness one of the required daily reports filed last semester:

"Today, Ivan and I read r book. He reads well and didn't make any mistakes. We also did math. He has trouble in that subject. Ivan looked for any excuse to avoid work. Twice, he asked me if he could go to the bathroom. I let him go once. Every minute he asked me if he could sharpen his pencil. All he is interested in is playing games."

Among its wide range of services, Mobilization for Youth maintains four neighborhood centers staffed to answer questions on anything from housing problems to civil rights.

There are activities for preadolescents and an adventure corps for kids 9 to 13, who get to wear a distinctive uniform.

A detached worker program, in cooperation with the youth board and five other agencies, reaches out to area gang members. Coffeeshops offer teens their own "club" settings.

One of the most popular services is rendered by a group of 15 energetic and dedicated women, the visting homemakers, a potent housewife-to-housewife force. Operating from a groundfloor apartment at 90 Avenue D, in the Jacob Riis Houses, these women fan over the area. About half are fluent in Spanish and each looks after about six families at a time.

Dorothy Yates, who supervises the group, explains: "Our service is geared to the problems of poverty. It may mean helping a woman get the most for her shopping dollar, or helping the overwhelmed mother get organized. She may not even be able to find the time to take her children for proper medical checkups. You'd be surprised at how long such a mother can spend on lines. When you're poor and you seek help, you wait—sometimes for hours."

The visiting homemakers group has been together just over 1 year, starting from an intensive 11-day training period. "It was sort of a sorority initiation and we developed quite an esprit de corps," recalls Mrs. Yates.

The homemakers are also babysitters, but with a difference. The babies come to them. A room in the headquarters apartment has been set aside and stocked with toys. A steady stream of little boys and girls are picked up and delivered through the day. The kitchen oven works overtime turning out cookies, from surplus food materials, for everyone on hand.

Basic to the Mobilization for Youth programs is the integrated one of research and

evaluation. Mobilization for Youth's reason for being is research. Mountains of data will have to be sifted before meaningful answers eventually can be forthcoming.

For instance, at the start of Mobilization for Youth, teams interviewed 1 of every 10 families in the area concerning their attitudes toward themselves and their neighborhood, plus dozens of other probing queries. Before Mobilization for Youth shuts down, there will be a followup and lengthy requestioning of these same families so that valid and valuable comparisons can be drawn.

Control groups in various projects and programs will yield different data. For example, did Ivan, who had the advantage of tutoring, go on to become a better student than Joseph, who wasn't selected for the program?

Mobilization for Youth enjoys the advantage of a "word of mouth" campaign among area residents. While many young people are recommended to the job center, many others just drop in, because they've heard about it in the neighborhood. The visiting homemakers have been stopped on the streets more than once to discuss a problem with a mother who's heard they can help.

Apparently, "Lower East Siders" know Mobilization for Youth has arrived. The story of what this unique experiment in people will mean for them—and for the rest of New York and other American cities plagued with delinquency—is now being written.

Republicans Recognize Duty To Criticize Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the present administration is becoming more and more of a question mark in the eyes of the American public.

I would like to submit for the RECORD an excellent article by Russell Kirk which appeared in the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus on February 29, 1964, which points out that it is the duty and responsibility of the Republican Party to objectively criticize our foreign policy.

The article follows:

REPUBLICANS RECOGNIZE DUTY TO CRITICIZE FOREIGN POLICY

(By Russell Kirk)

President Johnson is annoyed with Mr. Nixon, Senator Goldwater, Governor Rockefeller, and other eminent Republicans for their harsh words against his foreign policy. "God forgive them, for they know not what they do," he has said of these critics—paraphrasing the words of the dying Christ.

But President Johnson is not the Saviour, and he has not been crucified—only criticized, and criticized less severely than most Presidents have been. Moreover, Messrs. Nixon, Goldwater, and Rockefeller know perfectly well what they are doing: Nixon and Rockefeller have enjoyed considerable experience in foreign affairs, and GOLDWATER in military matters. They are aware that it is the duty of an opposition to criticize the foreign policy of an incumbent government.

USUALLY DEBATABLE

As this columnist has written before, the notion of bipartisan foreign policy ordinarily is an illusion. For "politics to stop at the water's edge," as Mr. Johnson asks, we would have to assume that there can be only one patriotic foreign policy—and that the State Department is executing this policy intelligently. But in reality, foreign policy almost always is as debatable as domestic policy: One has to choose among different possible policies, and the State Department can be mistaken or misguided. Nowadays, foreign policy is even more important than domestic policy—and so must be scrutinized with some severity.

"Regardless of what you hear and regardless of what some of the bellyachers say," President Johnson continued in his same recent talk, "we are a much beloved people throughout the world." Beloved? Conceivably. But a great power rarely is loved, nor should a great power aspire to be loved by all the world, as if the United States were a warm puppy. Great powers ought to be respected by their allies, and dreaded by their foes. Love is for persons, not for great states. A foreign policy founded on popularity polls, on the error that to be beloved is to be strong, requires some penetrating criticism from the opposition party.

Even where love is concerned, people may doubt that American policy is succeeding, without being justly treated as crucifiers of the Saviour. This columnist had not observed much love recently for the United States in Panama, Zanzibar, Cuba, Brazil, Cyprus, or even France. Love commonly is the child of gratitude. More and more of our friends abroad have begun to doubt whether they owe us gratitude.

The unfortunate anti-Communists of South Vietnam and Laos are not going to love us if we abandon our struggle against the Communists of North Vietnam.

The responsible folk of Colombia, Venezuela, Nicaragua, and Guatemala are not going to love us if we refuse to act against Castro's subversive power and to refuse to allow our Caribbean allies to act in their own defense.

The better elements in Africa are not going to love us if we subsidize the virulent Nkrumah in Ghana in his pro-Communist designs.

So even if being "beloved" is taken for the index to a successful foreign policy, the present courses of our national administration must be subjected to some candid partisan exposure.

Iowa Livestock Feeders Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Ida County, Iowa, in my congressional district, is one of the important cattle feeding areas in the country. Iowa for several years has been the leading producer of marketable beef. In 1963, Iowa produced 11 percent of the beef supply for the Nation. Total imports for the same period were 10.6 percent of the Nation's total meat consumption. The Nation's cattle feeders, including my constituents in Ida County, Iowa, are being hurt by these imports. Recently, 40 livestock feeders of Ida County, Iowa, sent a letter to President Johnson, Secretary Freeman, and others regarding their plight. Copy of the letter is as follows:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States.
ORVILLE W. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.
Senator JACK R. MILLER,
Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Gov. HAROLD E. HUGHES.

DEAR SIR: We, as farmer-feeders, have had a fixed cost price placed upon our acres of production for the past several years that has steadily increased as new methods of production have become a necessity. At the same time as our costs have steadily increased, we find that the price we receive per unit produced has steadily decreased.

We feeders, in Ida County, have found that marketing our crops through livestock has become an almost absolute necessity. We can produce our meats marketed from this area as economical as possible by buying the better gaining animals, using the most efficient ration possible and putting to use the best management practices that have been tried and proven. Yet, at the same time our produce is placed upon the consumer market it must be in direct competition with an inferior, imported product that is unknown to the consumer.

Our State of Iowa, for the past many years, has been the leading producer of marketable beef. Last year, 1963, we produced 11 percent of the beef supply for our Nation. Total imports for the same period were 10.6 percent of the Nation's total meat consumption. We feel that the situation brings a hardship upon our economy as food producers for the Nation. We feel that some restrictions must be made mandatory to aid us in our plight.

Currently we have seen great strides in our industry for the production of quality beef yet we, as producers, are operating today at a loss. History has proven that agriculture of any nation is the forerunner of any economic growth of that nation. We, as farmer-feeders, do not ask for handouts but we feel that fair prices are a necessity to allow us to keep abreast of our rising costs which technological advancements have demanded of us.

The following is the reported taxes paid by the undersigned for the years 1962 and 1963:

Reported 1962 income taxes paid	$46,631.00
Reported 1962 other taxes paid	16,678.00
Total reported taxes paid in 1962	63,309.00
Reported 1963 income taxes paid	12,542.00
Reported 1963 other taxes paid	23,892.00
Total reported taxes paid in 1963	36,434.00
Net loss to our Government	26,875.00

A significance can be derived from these figures in the fact that while income taxes paid to our Government has been greatly reduced, other taxes have increased. The average reduction in reported income taxes per taxpayer for these 2 years is $655.

How Arab Boycott Attempts To Intimidate Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I recently called to the attention of the Secretary of State a letter received by Mr. Isador

Ash, of Pittsburgh, from the Central Office for the Boycott of Israel. I protested in the strongest terms that this kind of extortion is permitted to go on and I will report further to the Senate when I receive a reply from the Secretary of State.

Since that time there has been called to my attention an excellent article by Mr. I. L. Kenen in the Hadassah magazine for February 1964.

Mr. Kenen writes:

Experience has shown that the boycott threat is meaningless where it is firmly resisted.

That is exactly the point I am trying to make with officials in our Government. There is no reason why American citizens must take abuse from pseudogovernmental organizations in Arab countries.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kenen's article, entitled, "Washington: Growing Resistance," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARAB BOYCOTT—WASHINGTON: GROWING RESISTANCE

(By I. L. Kenen)

The Arab boycott in the United States takes two forms—discrimination against American Jews and the blacklisting of Americans who invest in Israel's economy.

Official Washington has often proclaimed that it "neither recognizes nor condones" the Arab boycott and that it has registered its disapproval with the Arab States. Our government has discouraged discriminatory practices against American Jews—based on their religion only—and these seem to be dying out. But Washington has failed to halt blacklisting of Americans who help Israel.

The most notorious examples of the anti-Jewish boycott in the past were the 1952 agreement which allowed Saudi Arabia to bar Jews from the U.S. base at Dhahran; Aramco's hiring practices; travel restrictions on American Jews; and the circulation of a Saudi Arabian questionnaire which required firms to certify that management and ownership were "Judenrein."

These practices caused angry repercussions in Congress. The Senate adopted the Lehman resolution in 1956, decrying discrimination against Americans on the grounds of race and religion. The national conventions followed with vigorous platform planks. Nevertheless, in 1957, the administration extended the Dhahran agreement for another 5 years and went so far as to inform New York's State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) that U.S. interests in Saudi Arabia might be injured if Aramco were compelled to hire Jews.

Then Congress took a tougher line. Every year since 1959, it has approved an amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill which asserts that distinctions between Americans, based on race or religion, are repugnant to American principles.

Since then the administration has tried to persuade the Arabs to drop stultifying anti-Jewish procedures. Obviously such practices discredit Arab propaganda pretensions which disavow anti-Semitism and which attempt to justify the boycott as a righteous weapon in a defensive war against Israel and aggressive Zionism. Since 1960, the Arabs have apparently discontinued the boycott questionnaire which asked American firms if they had Jewish directors and officials.

In addition, dollar-conscious, tourist-seeking Arab governments have liberalized travel regulations to admit Jews—but not Zionists. These gains have not been publicized, lest Arab public opinion force reconsideration. The Dhahran base agreement ended in 1962 and last year no one checked the religion of Jewish members of the U.S. military contingent dispatched to reassure Saudi Arabia in the face of the Egyptian threat from Yemen.

In contrast with these limited successes, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce have failed to cope with the economic boycott which is directed against American firms dealing with Israel.

The Arab questionnaire, which is sent out from headquarters in Damascus, asks business firms whether they have branch factories, assembly plants, investments, general agencies, consultative services, technical assistance, patents, trademarks, copyrights in Israel. Companies face blacklisting unless they dispose of these interests and prove the sale and the repatriation of their funds to an American depository.

The blacklist also applies to American ships which bring oil or military supplies to Israel.

American manufacturers are sometimes required by American exporters to include a certification on invoices which reads:

"The goods described in this invoice are neither of Israel origin nor do they contain Israel materials."

One manufacturer who protested to Washington was told that while the United States disapproved of the boycott regulations, "it would not be appropriate for the Department to intervene in the commercial relations of either of the two American firms."

The letter went on to say that certification or documentation as to the origin of goods is not an uncommon requirement in international trade.

In 1960, it became known that the U.S. Navy was discouraging American shippers who traded with Israel from bidding on U.S. oil shipment contracts. Anyone who put in a bid was told that he did so at his own risk if his ship were blacklisted by the Arabs and he was unable to carry out the contract.

Public commotion forced the scrapping of the "Haifa clause," but this exposé and the capitulation to Nasser in the Suez blockade led, in May 1960, to the adoption of the Douglas-Keating amendment to the foreign aid bill, which opposed U.S. aid to countries which engage in boycotts, blockades, and other acts of economic warfare against other recipients of U.S. aid.

The Department of State insisted that the amendment would be counterproductive and refused to implement it, arguing that any efforts to link U.S. aid with the Suez issue "would only intensify the very trade and transit restrictions which we all hope may be eliminated, while, at the same time, playing into the hands of the Communists by exacerbating Middle East tensions."

How many American firms have yielded to the boycott? It is difficult to say. Israel has prospered despite the boycott, as the figures show.

The boycott has been applied capriciously. Most of those who have ignored it or defied it have escaped blacklisting. In most cases, apparently, the Arabs do not apply the boycott where they, themselves, may be hurt. Thus, the international airlines and the big hotels have gone into Israel and have escaped reprisals. On the other hand, some businessmen have felt that they had to withdraw from Israel.

What can be done about the boycott? American businessmen could decide, as a matter of policy, to spurn Arab questionnaires and demands for "certificates of origin." Local chambers of commerce and other trade associations could take the initiative and might do so if they were encouraged by the Federal Government. The White House and the Department of Commerce could abandon the cautious laissez-faire attitude and provide leadership. Experience has shown that the boycott threat is meaningless where it is firmly resisted.

The United States—as a Government—has defied the boycott. It refused to accept Cairo's demand that an American Theater Guild production, starring Helen Hayes, drop Tel Aviv if it wanted to play Cairo. Moreover, the American Government has been encouraging businessmen to expand their trade with Israel. A recent trade mission sponsored by the Department of Commerce came back with a highly enthusiastic report on the growing investment and business opportunities in Israel, which far outweigh the market offered by the Arab economies.

American businessmen who are forced to make an either-or decision are inclined to go forward with their programs in Israel, not only because of the expanding market in that country but because Israel's growing technical skill provides a profitable association for American businessmen who are interested in world trade. This partnership between Israel and American businessmen will not be confined to Israel's territory, for Israel products and know-how are today being exported all over the world.

Horatio Alger Came to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the columnist, Arthur Hoppe, has written for the Washington Star and other newspapers the touching story of how Horatio Alger came to the world's wonderful capital of make-believe, and how, at the ripe old age of 36 he had amassed a fortune of $2 million.

The columnist tells the story as follows:

HORATIO ALGER CAME TO WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Once upon a time, there was a poor little boy who lived in a poor little town. His family was poor. His friends were poor. He was very, very poor. His name was Horatio Alger.

But although he was poor, young Horatio was filled with the ambition and fortitude which has made our Nation great. "I will press on through life," he said, squaring his little jaw, "and become a rich man."

At first, he determined to go to Wall Street to begin his career as a humble shoeshine boy, in hopes some tycoon would befriend him. "But no," he said, "it would be wiser to go to the place which has the most money in the whole wide world."

So he went to Washington.

Our Horatio was 14 years old when he came to Washington to make his fortune. He began as a humble Senate page boy. His duties were lowly and the pay a mere pittance. But his heart was filled with resolve.

"It matters not that I am poor and uneducated," said little Horatio, clenching his tiny fists. "For America is the land of opportunity. I shall work hard and I shall study hard. And I shall listen to the Senators I serve, for they are the wisest and most successful men in our Nation. And thus I shall make my fortune."

So while the other little pages idled away their spare time in carousing and loose living, our Horatio worked hard, studied hard and sat at the feet of the Senators to learn the secret of success.

He observed how friendly and generous they were, even with wealthy businessmen. He observed how happy they were to do favors for others. And how happy others were to do favors for them. And he marveled at how, despite such generosity, all grew richer. "Truly," he said, "the secret of success is to be friendly and generous."

And he was. He did little favors for the Senators, pluckily rescuing their little bills when in danger of being runover by some committee. And in no time, the Senator from Texas, who was the cleverest man in the Senate, made him his personal assistant. And the Senator from Oklahoma, who was the richest man in the Senate, looked upon him as a son. And they taught him all they knew.

But success did not spoil our Horatio. He forged ahead, doing bigger and bigger favors for all. In reward for such virtue, businessmen offered him profitable investments, bankers begged to lend him money and the Senators were proud to call him their friend.

And thus he grew up admired, respected and worth $2 million—a shining example to little boys everywhere that all it takes to struggle up the long path from rags to riches is hard work, generosity, and pluck.

Ah, that our story could end here. But, alas, our Horatio fell upon evil times. Jealous rivals accused him of the worst crime known to Washington: "influence peddling"—or doing favors in hopes of reward.

Friends and fortune fled him. None was more shocked than the businessmen and Senators who had guided him all through his youth and young manhood. They called for hearings and probes and investigations. "How," they asked each other, sadly shaking their heads, "could a fine young man like that have gone wrong?"

Moral: All it takes today to struggle up the long path from rags to riches is hard work, generosity, and pluck. But don't forget to cover your tracks.

Soviet Satellite Observation Maintained in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial pointed out that the Soviet press agency Tass has announced that a leading Soviet scientist will man a satellite observation station in Cuba. This is further evidence that the Soviet and Red Cuba are doing business as usual and of the continuing mischievous activities of the Cuban dictator.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

CASTRO BUSINESS AS USUAL

Besides being a base point (denied by Moscow) for missile launching, Castro's Cuba is to be (confirmed by Moscow) a grandstand seat for satellite watching. What satellite operations? United States of course.

The announcement speaks for itself: The Soviet Union has sent a leading Russian scientist to establish a satellite observation station in Cuba, less than 250 miles from the U.S. missile base at Cape Kennedy.

The official press agency Tass identified the scientist as Nikolai Yerpylev, scientific secretary of the Soviet Academy of Science. It said equipment for the satellite station, including "chronometers and astronomical instruments," has already been shipped to Cuba.

What else is anybody's guess.

Cuban exiles at Miami report that an American scientist once suspected of peddling atomic secrets to Russia has been set up in a nuclear laboratory in Cuba by Castro. They identify him as Robert Walder.

The Soviet and Red Cuba are doing business as usual—inimical to the hemisphere. Only on the surface, and hardly there, has anything been changed since the so-called confrontation of October 1962.

Recently, Secretary of State Dean Rusk voiced the opinion that Fidel Castro is not a permanent part of the Cuban scene, indicating that it is his belief that the Communist regime eventually will topple.

At the same time, Mr. Rusk had a few harsh words to say about our allies who have been engaging in lucrative trade with Castro. This, he maintains, is bad business.

If the Castro government is a transitory thing, what or who is going to provide the impetus needed to put it to flight? It seems to be the consensus of those familiar with internal conditions that an uprising from within could not succeed unless there was an assault from without by Cuban loyalist troops.

And the Bay of Pigs fiasco has proved that it is impossible to land assault troops without supporting air cover. Whether promised or not by the United States, the Cuban assault troops did not get air support and were either slaughtered or captured.

The existence on the island of Russian troops to back up Castro's own militia negates the chances of a counterrevolution succeeding. The Cubans could not do it any more successfully than the freedom fighters of Hungary who were mauled by Soviet armor.

It is true, as the Secretary of State opines, that trade with Castro by our friends is doing nothing more than strenthening him.

But this Nation can do nothing about either—the ultimate overthrow of the Cuban Reds or the halting of trade—without coming to grips with reality.

As the Banner has said many times, words and empty threats will avail us nothing—and neither will wishful thinking.

Guilt Complex Over Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, much of U.S. foreign policy toward small nations often seems to be derived from a guilt complex, the notion that because we are a large and great Nation we have something to be ashamed of. This false premise causes us difficulties in many areas, but at the moment most acutely in Panama. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the McKeesport, Pa., Daily News which I believe furnishes an excellent analysis of this problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE YIELD AGAIN

The United States notified the five-nation Inter-American Peace Committee that it was willing to discuss "the whole range of outstanding issues" with Panama and thus won a truce in the Canal Zone crisis.

After the notice from Washington reached the conferees in Panama, an agreement was entered into whereby Panama would resume diplomatic relations with us pending the opening of negotiations on the "issues."

Should we celebrate? Certainly not. The truce came simply because the mighty United States which ladles millions into Panama and spreads billions throughout Latin America, was the one to back down. Even our original Panama Canal treaty, once a rock upon which we stood resolutely, now becomes subject to new discussions.

The backdown in Panama results from two serious faults in the conduct of our foreign affairs. One is the guilt complex which continues to prevail in the State Department, the notion that we have something to be ashamed of in the fact that we are great, while other countries necessarily are not, and that the imparity of this situation means past wrongs on our part unredressed. The other is the philosophy of expediency, first adopted by the late Secretary John Foster Dulles, that holds that we must bend wherever the bending will buy a respite from a problem.

On the first point, it should be made clear, regardless of what any State Department apologist for us might say, that we have nothing to be embarrassed about in Panama. The charges that we won the Canal Zone by "gunboat" diplomacy often are made. They are crude libels on the leadership of a past America.

The facts are these. The world, and not only the United States, badly needed a canal across the narrow neck of land known as the Isthmus of Panama. France first tried to build it and failed, defeated by the malaria then rampant in the jungles there. Under the proud and ebullient leadership of Teddy Roosevelt, we decided to make the attempt.

Negotiations for land space with the Government of Colombia got nowhere because the price set by its administrators and the conditions under which they wanted the canal to be operated were impossible. When we backed away, a northern province of Colombia revolted and established the new nation of Panama. In due time, Teddy Roosevelt recognized the regime, worked out the canal treaty and, as history records, enabled American skills to wipe out the malaria and build the canal.

What, then, have we to be red faced about in that? Our success in Panama was a boon to our shipping, of course, and to our naval planning. But it was an immense benefit also to the shipping of the world and thus to peoples everywhere. More ships of other flags pass annually across Panama than do ships of our own registry. The tolls they pay never have been enough to cover our maintenance costs, or provide a normal monetary return on our investment.

Our position in the Canal Zone has meant a prosperity for Panama and its Central American neighbors far greater than they possibly could have attained otherwise. The canal itself provides employment for thousands. U.S. dollars, paid directly to Panamanians and flowing into the Panama economy through the spending of Americans stationed there, total millions annually.

Why, in view of this, has the canal caused us trouble even though on past occasions we unilaterally adjusted upward our land-lease payments to Panama to the point where they now are four times the amounts originally called for in the treaty? Some accredit the restlessness in Panama to an "awakening nationalism." Others point an accusing finger at us because squalor persists in certain parts of that region.

But, on balance, Panama owes much to us and every reasonable person in that country would admit it. The big job, however, is to get those guilt-complexed people in our State Department to admit it also.

Our first mistake in Panama came in the Eisenhower administration, and under Mr. Dulles, when a Red-inspired demonstration got us to yield on the treaty provisions and order that the Panamanian flag had to fly beside the Stars and Stripes over our installations in the Canal Zone. This was the kind of retreat under pressure which always, in time, builds up more pressures.

Now we have new demonstrations inducing us not only to give way on another treaty provision or two, but to submit to discussions "all issues outstanding" which means, of course, the treaty itself. We wonder what Teddy Roosevelt, if alive today, would say to that.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today is the opening of "Save Your Vision Week," as proclaimed by the President. The importance of good vision to our economy and to our daily life is such that I feel that some mention of this annual event should be made in this Chamber in which so many decisions are made which affect our Nation.

Since 1927, "Save Your Vision Week" has been a part of this Nation's many public-benefit campaigns. Since that time, the Governors of every State and mayors of thousands of municipalities have issued proclamations urging the observance of "Save Your Vision Week" during the first week of March. More than 1,300 radio stations and 325 television stations will begin broadcasting messages on vision care today.

We have built this country on our ability to mass produce and market good and services. The need to see comfortably and efficiently is an integral part of the production line. Poor vision, improper safety measures, and poor lighting combine to endanger not only the eyesight and lives of employees, but to impair the efficiency of industry. Eye accidents occur at the rate of 2 per minute every working day in American industry. An estimated 20 million is lost each year to industry from accidents alone.

The tragedy is that 98 percent of all eye injuries could be prevented with proper safety precautions, proper illumination, and regular vision examinations for employees. The U.S. Department of Labor, in a study from 1951–55, proved that a good safety campaign among Federal employees reduced disabilities due to vision injuries by 40 percent.

We face a challenging future today. My colleagues are well aware of the unlimited frontiers of space exploration. An expanding population and economy pose tremendous challenges to planners, architects, government, and business. We have broadened educational opportunities for our children, and the need for trained, qualified graduates in art, science, industry, and the professions has never been greater.

Congress is concerned with the problem of dropouts in our school system. City and State authorities are struggling to overcome the corresponding problems of juvenile delinquency and increased unemployment. Here, too, vision is an important factor.

Research shows millions of children repeat one or more years' work because they are unable to visually keep pace with their classmates. Studies by the University of Chicago reveal one out of two children who fail reading need vision care.

Our mounting traffic toll is of great concern to all public officials. Yet one out of every six drivers is visually handicapped and does not know it. The automobile he drives, built by the labor and imagination of industry, can be a vehicle which rushes him to destruction or injury simply because the driver lacks the ability to see danger in sufficient time to stop.

All Americans should recognize their responsibility to safeguard this precious gift of sight and to utilize it to the greatest ability science can enable them.

The American Optometric Association in past years has supported this campaign to stimulate interest in preventive and protective eye care. Since vision is so important to our country and to our people, I believe it is appropriate for Congress to recognize the opening day of this event and to urge all professions to support its public service principle.

European Doubts on U.S. Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is always helpful to read the penetrating and perspective diplomatic analyses of Constantine Brown, veteran political analyst of Washington who now lives in Rome, Italy.

His latest contribution emphasizes what I have tried to stress: that the crises which we have been observing in various parts of the world, including Panama and Guantanamo, are not isolated incidents but parts of careful planning of Red strategists.

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Feb. 22, 1964]

EUROPEAN DOUBTS ON U.S. POLICIES—AMERICA'S TOGETHERNESS PATTERN WITH RUSSIA CAUSES RESENTMENT

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—Pope Paul VI said in an address on Ash Wednesday to Rome priests: "Ideals are in a crisis; philosophy has been replaced by calculations of expediency * * * Spiritual and moral gains are no longer in fashion. The sword of the spirit has been left in the scabbard of doubt and spiritual confusion."

With these words he has also expressed the doubts which exist today in the minds of European leaders about the trends in American policies.

How will American statesmanship handle the headaches it is suffering from crises around the world? With the same bromide and tranquilizers it has used in recent years? What, in fact, is America's foreign policy these days? Is there any likelihood for emergence of a strong American leadership?

These are questions which are being asked by members of the moribund NATO coalition created at great expense after the last war. And since no one in the confused European capitals can find an answer there is an increasing tendency toward a policy of "everybody for himself." Many eyes are turned toward Paris and President de Gaulle. But fear of Washington reprisals keeps the West Europeans away from him. Washington regards General de Gaulle as it used to regard Stalin and Khrushchev. Washington also does not believe that France has become, even temporarily, spiritually, and physically a power.

Americans believe that the English-speaking nations should dominate the free world and Western Europe should follow our lead. At one time American goals were clear: Opposition to Communist expansion in Europe, Asia, Africa and in our own hemisphere. Then this clear and fundamental American policy began to veer toward togetherness with the Soviet Union because of fear of a nuclear war. Hence it was assumed the only solution to this century's problem was togetherness with Russia.

This thesis was shared up to a point by our allies. But there was resentment in Paris, Bonn, and even the lesser capitals of our allies that we were moving unilaterally toward that goal; that they were not privy to our diplomatic discussions with the Kremlin. Our allies were told to trust our negotiators because all our actions were for the best of the coalition.

Fear began to develop in the minds of the Europeans, accustomed over the centuries to diplomatic double crosses, that the English-speaking nations were making their own arrangements with the enemy and that others may have to pay the price for this new Washington-London policy.

This reporter was told by influential Germans that Germany may have to pay soon the "second installment for its defeat in 1945." And, it was added, "we may not know what that installment may be until we are being urged to sign on the dotted line."

But in recent months doubts as to whether Washington knew what it was doing and where it was going began to arise seriously in the minds of many Europeans.

General de Gaulle alone made his doubts public by putting spokes in our diplomatic wheels. He recognized Communist China and signed far-reaching economic agreements with Russia. The latter is in fact not a challenge to us or the other members of the coalition. Everybody has been trading with Russia, and with Cuba. At first these deals were under cover; more recently out in the open. We ourselves have sold the former enemy vast quantities of grains, not for humanitarian reasons but to get rid of our vast surplus.

If we, the originators of the containment policy, are acting in this manner, why should the others, it is argued, not do the same? British Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas-Home asked this question at his meeting with President Johnson. There was no convincing answer we could give. We have been telling our allies that the new policy of togetherness with the Soviet Union will tend to lessen strife which threatens every portion of the world. This so far has proven to be a fallacy.

The Russian and Chinese hand can be seen everywhere from Zanzibar to Cyprus, from Panama to Vietnam. The Cuban incident was hatched in Moscow, according to

well-informed European sources, during Fidel Castro's recent visit. Its main purpose was to test the determination of the Texan in the White House and see how he reacted to another crisis involving for the first time our territory, the Guantánamo naval base.

The togetherness advocated by our policymakers cannot be a one-way street. But Mr. Khrushchev has decided to make it so and seems to be able to get away with it.

Farmers in Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Miles City Daily Star, Miles City, Mont., on February 24, 1964:

FARMERS IN JAIL

While wheat is being shipped to Khrushchev to shore up his sagging economy, two very stark developments are taking place. First, two American farmers have been sent to jail for 2 years for overplanting this or similar wheat; and longshoremen have refused to load wheat for Russia on ships in Houston, Tex.

Loren and Mervin Gajewski, of Alexander, N. Dak., heard in 1959 from a U.S. Department of Agriculture agent that they were overplanting wheat on one of their farms. They had been receiving no penalty notices, and their inadvertent crime was a great surprise to them.

The overplanting first caused a series of penalties to be charged to the brothers. This resulted in extensive Government liens against their property. While these were being contested the Gajewskis heard of their indictment for "conspiring to defeat the AAA," which is the gravamen of their crime, and for giving false answers to the Federal Government. The latter offense proceeded from the first one and had to do with the manner in which their family farm income was reported.

The Gajewskis first settled in the badlands of North Dakota three generations ago. The German grandfather of the jailed brothers homesteaded in that vast frontier area. These three generations of Gajewskis have given the North Dakota soil the hard work that has made it productive. They have been helping to feed men and women all over the world. For lesser accomplishments, to say the least, statesmen on the world scene are being awarded decorations and high honors. The fruits of the Gajewski labors, in small measure, albeit, are being sent in foreign aid to Tito, to Gomulka, to Sukarno, to the "Redeemer" Nkrumah, and to other Communist dictators around the world who are laboring to bury us all.

A prison is a bleak place and my heart goes out to these two courageous men. The day before the U.S. marshals apprehended them on February 14, and took them to the county jail in Bismarck before transfer to a Federal prison, I asked two of their friends to be sure to take pictures of them entering the prison compound. It is a photograph that every farmer in the land should pin up in his farmhouse. Here is the portrayal of one of "the crimes of 1964" in our country. As the number of farmers dwindles and the number of employees of the Department of Agriculture soars, we can be expecting more such incarcerations in our land.

The Gajewskis, at one point in the litigation, could have settled for a fine on a nolo contendere plea. They had the old-fashioned idea that since they had committed no wrong, they could receive no punishment.

The Houston longshoremen have been showing some of the same fundamental thinking about loading the wheat for Khrushchev. Not only are we giving Khrushchev the sinews to carry on his war against us but we are not even keeping the commitments made when the deal was announced. The longshoremen are calling upon the Government to honor its resolve that 50 percent of the wheat would be shipped in American ships. This, like so many of our resolutions, was jettisoned to appease Khrushchev after we had taken the bait on the sale of the wheat.

As I write this, the longshoremen are holding their own in the face of Washington pressures. The ILA and the SIU, the two unions involved, have no illusions about communism.

But why are only the small farmers and the longshoremen resisting the tide of totalitarianism that is sweeping our land?

A Birthday Letter From a Freshman to His Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD one of the finest letters I have ever read. It is written by a 17-year-old freshman to his father on his birthday. I am proud to say the young man who wrote the letter at one time was my page in the House of Representatives.

The letter follows:

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
Monday, February 3.

DEAR DADDY: Well I'm the same old great correspondent that I ever was. I'm always late on birthdays and things because I never think of what tomorrow's date is so please forgive my being late, but I was early in a way. During exams I ran across the following poem and immediately thought of you. It was quoted by the chaplain of Boston University (I draw no corollary between that institution and you) upon the completion of their chapel and I thought it particularly fitting to you, not just in the obvious material sense, but more importantly in the spiritual aspect of the poem's message. It follows:

"When we build,
Let us think we build forever,
Let it not be for present delight
Nor present use alone;
Let it be such work
As our descendants will thank us for,
And let us think
As we lay our stone,
That a time will come when those
Stones will be sacred because
Our hands touched them,
And that men will say as they look
Upon the labor
And wrought substance of them,
'See. This our fathers did for us.'"

—JOHN RUSKIN.

When I write this I don't think of you as a builder of buildings but as the builder of intangible things that you are: the builder of love, hope, aspirations, and responsibility. Of all the things you have given me, the one I value most is the desire to be great. "No matter what you are, even if you're the corner peanut vendor, be the best peanut vendor there is." I would like to be the stone, the labor, that my sons will look upon and say, "See. This our fathers did for us."

You have given me the aspirations and the love but it is now my job to turn them into something worthy. It is my job to have responsibility, and in turn to instill these qualities in my sons so that they may give them to theirs, and so on. I just pray that I'm not the weak link in the chain. I'm so fickle and irresponsible that it is unbelievable, but still I can see it. As long as I can see my shortcomings and still have the desire to overcome them I'm not lost, but then again I can't say that from this moment on I will be changed. I did that at the first of last semester and I was all right for a couple of months, but during the last 4 weeks of classes and exams I completely reversed and the result will show up on my grade slip. I saw then, as I do now, that this is my last chance and if I don't do well now I might as well give it all up. I'm not promising anything but just saying that I think there will be an improvement. There surely is room enough for it.

This is already a day late so I had better get it mailed. Happy birthday and I hope you have at least 43 more.

Love,

TOMMY.

Politics, 1963: At Year's End, Out of Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a yearend column by Herbert G. Klein, editor of the San Diego Union, in which he mentioned the minority staffing fight being carried on by Republicans in Congress.

The column follows:

POLITICS, 1963: AT YEAR'S END, OUT OF FOCUS

(By Herbert G. Klein)

When President Lyndon Johnson arrived at his sprawling LBJ ranch in Texas Christmas Eve, he took time out to hunt deer. He missed bagging any. He succeeded later.

But that was his first real miss since becoming President.

Mr. Johnson takes great pride in his ability as a hunter and as a politician. And, as a politician, he has used his brief tenure in the White House to maximum advantage.

On the LBJ spread, the President enjoys barbecues, his hunts, and his forays around the ranch in radio-equipped motor vehicles. In the ranching country, he has learned to bring in the harvest quickly when the time is right.

He applies the ranch lesson to politics, and 1963 ends with the President harvesting political gains. He emerges from the moratorium on politics strongly entrenched. He has shown remarkable self-confidence during a difficult period.

Two months ago there was speculation whether Mr. Johnson would be retained on the Democratic ticket in 1964, although the late President Kennedy indicated that he

wanted his Vice President to run again with him. Today, within the Democratic Party, there is little speculation about an opponent for President Johnson—most of the guessing is about his potential running mate.

Until President Kennedy's assassination, the name Kennedy has dominated all politics in 1963. It figured in every phase of Republican strategy. And the late President was counted upon by his party to counteract potential congressional losses.

As the year ends, Democrats are uncertain whether President Johnson can transfer his present popularity to other candidates. There is no question, however, about his domination of the scene.

This has been a year of congressional stalemate. Democrats have failed to capitalize on majorities in both Houses of Congress because of a lack of strong leadership.

The quiet political battle in Congress has been illustrated by the uphill fight of the Republican minority in the House to regain some staff appropriations for its committees. The Democrats earlier had cut the minority staffs to a point where the GOP Members had difficulty gaining needed reasearch.

The Republican minority succeeded in winning at least small gains in the staffing battle after a long and well-organized battle. The quiet gain will enable them to develop issues they will need next year.

Civil rights and our policies regarding the Soviet Union emerge as the two issues with the widest public interest. Politically, civil rights was the most explosive issue in 1963, and various elections showed that it affected both Negroes and whites. What its long-range effects would have been had President Kennedy lived will never be known, but a new President brings a new and unknown quality to the issue.

The same holds true on policies toward Russia. President Johnson has yet to be tested by the Communists. His initial battle with Congress over credit on wheat sales to the Russians indicates that he will carry on Mr. Kennedy's policies but the picture is not clear.

This year has seen more agreements reached with the Kremlin than at any other recent time. It also has seen a widening breach between Republicans (joined by some Democrats) and the administration over the merits and consequences of these foreign policies.

At times in history, the judiciary branch, the legislative branch or the executive branch has dominated the other two. During 1963, the executive branch was dominant, and, in some instances, it successfully bypassed Congress.

Early in his term as President, Mr. Kennedy used the telephone frequently to request support from Congressmen and others.

President Johnson has used the same device. He is reported to have called all members of the House Agricultural Committee to gain support. And his personal calls outside of Washington have ranged from Billy Graham to business executives.

If Mr. Johnson is to sell his legislative program for next year, the support will be needed. Despite talk of economies, his budget will break peacetime records. And many issues that went unresolved in 1963 must go before Congress early next year.

As a practical politician, President Johnson knows well that his popularity could fall as rapidly as it has ascended.

This has been a year when no major new figures have emerged from either political party. Some have gained and others lost but the personalities are the same.

As the only announced Republican candidate, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has worked hardest at creating a national organization. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has taken preliminary steps toward such an organization but he is not as far along. None of the other potential Republican candidates has anything approaching a national campaign staff.

In 1963, first Rockefeller led polls on possible candidates for the GOP nomination. Then the polls showed GOLDWATER clearly ahead. After President Kennedy's death, the year ended with the polls uncertain.

The story of the President's death the rise of a new President's stand foremost in one's mind at the end of 1963.

And the events make it impossible to foresee fully the impact 1963 will have on 1964.

Deputy Thelma King—Castro Admirer of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, among the most active revolutionary agitators over the radio in Panama during the January 9, 1964, outbreak and mob assaults on the Canal Zone was a member of the National Assembly of that country—Deputy Thelma King. This fact will not surprise those who have followed the starting of the communistic revolutionary fires now raging in the Caribbean.

While documentary evidence of Deputy King's activities is extensive, there is not much in the way of published interviews by her with reliable news reporters. It was, therefore, with much interest that I read in the January 14, 1964, issue of the Bulletin of the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies a reprinting of a news story by Edward Scott in the December 18, 1963, issue of the Panama American in which he quotes an interview with this Panamanian legislator.

In this interview she establishes in her own words the following facts:

First. That Deputy King is a friend and admirer of Fidel Castro of Cuba.

Second. That she advocates violent revolution of the Castro type in Panama as necessary for the progress of that country.

Third. That in its course she approves of executions by firing squads as definitely necessarly.

Fourth. That she asserts Panama as sovereign over the Canal Zone and will secure effective sovereignty over it, peacefully if possible but violently if necessary.

Fifth. That she recognizes Castro as the complete leader for Latin American countries.

In order that the important documentation afforded by this interview may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress in connection with the Red background, direction and leadership of the January 9, 1964, outbreak, I quote it as part of my remarks and urge that it be read by all members of committees with legislative and appropriation cognizance over Panama Canal matters:

THELMA KING—CASTRO ADMIRER

(By Edward Scott)

Wilson Hall, chief correspondent in Latin America for NBC of New York, had an interview with Thelma King, deputy to the Panamanian National Assembly, and one of the Republic's most controversial revolutionary figures, when he was here 2 weeks ago.

The interview was taped on Walter Diamond's small recorder, NBC was not satisfied with the quality for network use, and asked me to do the interview again with Mrs. King—which assignment I dutifully performed in the studios of BOG, courtesy of Manager Ramon Levy.

It was used on NBC's "Monitor" program last Sunday night, and the following is a transcript of the encounter between Deputy Thelma King and Edward Unready, isthmian correspondent of NBC.

Question. Sra. King, would you mind giving me your estimate of the Cuban situation, now that the rockets brought in by the U.S.S.R. apparently have been removed?

Answer. I think the situation is better because now there will be peace for Cuba and for all the hemisphere.

Question. How do you think that Dr. Castro emerged from the situation. Do you think that he enjoys more worldwide support or support among his people or do you think that support for him has diminished?

Answer. Definitely more support because Castro has proved to the world that he does not receive orders from Russia or from the United States.

Question. You are very friendly with Mr. Castro, are you not?

Answer. Yes, very much.

Question. And I understand that you admire him as a leader.

Answer. I do admire him.

Question. In an interview today, you were reported to have said that a revolution—that revolutionary activity—is as inevitable as the rain. Did you say something of that character?

Answer. Oh, yes, I did, because I think that a revolution in Panama is necessary.

Question. What kind of revolution do you speak of—a revolution of the Castro type?

Answer. A Panamanian revolution, but a very violent one.

Question. Will that affect the Panama Canal?

Answer. I don't know. If the Americans interfere, maybe, but I suppose that the Americans are going to leave the Panamanians to deal their own revolution.

Question. And do you think this revolution might be accompanied by firing squads as they had in Cuba?

Answer. I don't know, but in a revolution, firing squads are always necessary.

Question. You mean to execute people, to shoot them?

Answer. Well, in every revolution that becomes very necessary.

Question. And so you think it might be necessary in the Panamanian revolution?

Answer. Definitely.

Question. And what is your view of the present political status of the Canal Zone? Do you still maintain as you have stated on previous occasions that Panama is the sovereign of the U.S. jurisdiction of the Canal Zone or what is known as the U.S. jurisdiction of the Canal Zone?

Answer. Panama is sovereign of the Canal Zone, she is, she was, and she will always be. Force has denied Panama all of the rights in the Canal Zone but we will get it one day.

Question. And what form do you think it will take? How do you think you will be able to secure effective sovereignty over the Canal Zone?

Answer. It depends. Peacefully if the Americans do not want to do it in a violent form but in any way we will get it because that is the right of the Panamanians and the new generations are not going to stand for what our forefathers did in 1903 because that belongs to the past and we want to build a very new country.

Question. Do you think that the alternative is violence?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. And what form of violence would you suggest might occur?

Answer. I don't know how it is going to happen because I cannot decide for all the Panamanians, but I know that the Panamanians are completely aware that we have to get sovereignty in the Canal Zone and we will get it one way or the other.

Question. What do you think is the position of Castro revolutionary activity in the other Latin American countries including Panama since the blockade in Cuba and the cancellation of the blockade by the United States?

Answer. I think Castro has more support now because the Latin Americans feel that Castro has proved to the world that he is the only leader in Latin America and the way that Castro has managed the situation has revealed without any doubt that he is a complete leader for Latin American countries. I think that Castro has more support now than he ever had before.

Economy and the Electricity Bill—Ol' Elbie Saves $4.32 on Lights but Owes $167,000 for Telephone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe, in his usual satirical manner published a column in the Washington Star of February 27, 1964, which certainly places the story about turning out the lights in the White House in its proper perspective.

The column follows:

ECONOMY AND THE ELECTRICITY BILL—OL' ELBIE SAVES $4.32 ON LIGHTS BUT OWES $167,000 FOR TELEPHONE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, friends. How y'all tonight? Welcome to "Just Plain Folks," the rib-ticklin, tee-vee adventures of the rootin'-tootin' Jay family starring ol' Elbie Jay, the friendliest wrangler ever to wrangle his way out of Texas.

As you recollect, ol' Elbie, his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, and their two cute tads, L'il Bird and Bye-Bye Bird, have moved into this fancy white house back East. As we join up with ol' Elbie, he and his faithful sidekick, Sancho Pierre, are in the Oval Room. As you can see, it's right dark in their this evening.

ELBIE. Now just you wait, Pierre, till I hitch my chair up to this here desk. There now, you can light the match.

PIERRE. Couldn't I turn on the lamp, Chief? Just for a minute?

ELBIE. Now I ask you, son. How's it going to be if some sneaky, snoopin' reporter (and I love them all) peers in the window and catches us using up expensive electricity like it was going out of style?

PIERRE. Well, I suppose it wouldn't help your image of economy and frugality.

ELBIE. Right. That's what I keep tellin' Birdie Bird, when she gets fancy and wants to eat by candlelight.

PIERRE. What's wrong with eating by candlelight?

ELBIE. What's wrong with eating in the dark? Economy, son, economy. Now light the match and hand me that there bill I got to sign. What's it for?

PIERRE (lighting match). Let's see. Oh, it's that $50 billion defense appropriation.

ELBIE. Fine. There. They don't call me the fastest ball point west of the Pecos for nothing. Now, no sense wasting that match. While you got it lit, get me somebody on the telephone to howdy with. How about that camel driver in Pakistan? Wait. First get me Senator RUSSELL down in Georgia. I want to tell him how I saved another $4.32 this month on electricity.

PIERRE. I forgot, Chief. You've got one more bill here.

ELBIE. What's it for?

PIERRE. It's for $167,342.23. From the telephone company.

ELBIE. Well, pay it out of that coffee can labeled "Pin Money for Cheering Up Old Friends."

PIERRE (as match burns fingers). Ouch. Chief, do you really think economizing is worth the effort?

ELBIE. Pierre, son, economy is a wondrous thing. Last month, I saved $4.32 on electricity. Them fine gentlemen on Capitol Hill was mightily impressed by what a careful, frugal, trustworthy man I obviously am. So, because I saved $4.32, they are now about to cut the taxes $11 billion. Isn't that wondrous? And now you make sure our reporter friends get a copy of that there bill.

PIERRE. The telephone bill?

ELBIE. The electricity bill, you Cottonhead. Sometimes, son, I don't think you know a thing about economy in Government.

Can Elbie keep up his lonely battle to save money? No matter what the cost? Tune in next time, folks. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say: "Take care of the pennies long enough and the dollars'll take care of you."

North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce Honors Three Outstanding Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce honored the State's three most outstanding young men at a banquet on Saturday evening, February 29, 1964, at Gastonia, N.C. North Carolina's distinguished former Governor, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, made the principal address at the banquet.

James H. Atkins, published of the Gastonia Gazette, Gastonia, N.C.; C. M. Vanstory III, vice president of the Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Greensboro, N.C.; and Nick Galifianakis, an attorney at Durham, N.C., and assistant professor of business law at Duke University were the young men honored as the three outstanding young men of North Carolina.

The North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce could not have selected three young men more deserving of the high honor to be named the States' outstanding you men of the year. They are personal friends of mine, and I share the great pride of the people of North Carolina in the great service they have rendered to their local communities and the State in civic, business, and educational activities.

An article appearing in the March 1 edition of the Gastonia Gazette describes the achievements of these young men. I know that my colleagues will find it interesting, and I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GAZETTE PRESIDENT HONORED AS ONE OF STATE'S THREE OUTSTANDING MEN—ATKINS, VANSTORY, GALIFIANAKIS ARE CITED AT BANQUET

(By Dave Baity)

A Gastonia newspaperman, a Durham lawyer, and a Greensboro banker were named North Carolina's Three Outstanding Young Men in ceremonies here Saturday night at the Gaston YMCA. Featured speaker at the event was Luther Hodges, former North Carolina Governor and now Secretary of Commerce.

Winner of the Three Outstanding Young Men, North Carolina awards were James H. Atkins, president of the Gastonia Gazette; C. M. Vanstory III, vice president of Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Greensboro; and Nick Galifianakis, Durham lawyer and assistant professor of business law at Duke University.

The 3 were chosen from some 30 nominations throughout the State.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD WINNER

"I don't know what to say," Atkins said when presented the award. "Anything I've ever done must be shared with other people who've worked with me * * * with the community, which is a wonderful one, my family. I'm very proud of this award. All I can say is thank you so much."

Atkins was the 1963 winner of the Distinguished Service Award in Gastonia. President and general manager of the Gastonia Gazette, he is a Gastonia native and the son of Mrs. Stewart Atkins and the late Mr. Atkins.

A graduate of the local schools, he attended Duke University and took an LL. B. from Duke Law School.

After serving a 3-year tour of duty with the U.S. Air Force, he practiced law in Charlotte and in 1960 gave up his practice to take over his family's interest in the newspaper.

Active in virtually every civic endeavor in Gastonia, Atkins has been a champion of Gaston Community College. He served as cochairman of a jaycee project last fall of preparing the "Gastonia Story" to be submitted to a national panel for the selection of the 11 "All America Cities of the United States." Gastonia was selected as one of the 22 finalists and results of the 11 winners are to be announced later.

Atkins is president of the Gaston County Mental Health Association, a member of the new regional library board of Gaston and Lincoln Counties, a member of the Gaston County Library Board of Trustees, is treasurer of the Gaston County Merchants Association, and chairman of the mayor's committee on sidewalks.

He is also vice chairman of the human relations council, a member of the board of advisers of Belmont Abbey College, a member of the board of advisers of the Salvation Army, serves as a director of the Gastonia Chamber of Commerce and the YMCA, is a member of the official board of First Methodist Church, a board member of the Girl Scout Council, Inc., and the Boy Scouts, a Rotarian, and a trustee of the Nature Museum.

Atkins, 32, is married to the former Carol Smedley of Cleveland, Ohio, and is the father of two children, Jimmy, 7, and Laura, 5.

VANSTORY

"This is certainly one of the most exciting moments of my life, Vanstory said in accepting his award. "It certainly doesn't seem right to receive an award for everyday things that you enjoy doing. But I'm not going to give it back to you. Thanks."

Vanstory is 34 and has a long list of civic-minded credits. He was cochairman of the membership committee for the Greensboro YMCA for 1963, a member of the board of directors of the Children's Home Society, chairman of the Guilford County Savings Bond Drive, a member of the Board of Carolinas United Community Service, general chairman of the 1963 Holiday Jubilee in Greensboro, major of the finance division of the United Fund of Greater Greensboro, director of the Southern Board of Economic Education, member of the finance committee for the Piedmont Girl Scout Council, and a member of the Greensboro Sports Council.

He is also a deacon of Greensboro's First Presbyterian Church, a member of the Greensboro Committee for Greensboro College, a member of the Rotary Club, a 32d degree Spanish Rite Mason and a member of the Oasis Shrine Temple, chairman of the membership committee of the Merchants and Manufacturers Club, and has done outstanding work with the Central YMCA, advisory board of the Greensboro Public Library and United Fund.

He is married and the father of three children, ages 8, 6, and 3.

GALIFIANAKIS

"I'm really poverty stricken for words," Nick Galifianakis said when presented his TOYMNC award. "Except to say that I sincerely and deeply appreciate this distinction. My fellow citizens in Durham appreciate it, my wife appreciates it, my good mother appreciates it, and my brothers appreciate it. Thank you."

Galifianakis is a native of Durham, the son of Sophia and Mike Galifianakis who emigrated from the Island of Crete, Greece.

He attended Durham city schools and Duke University where he took an A.B. in 1951 and an LL.B. in 1953.

From 1956–59, Galifianakis was attorney-staff instructor at the Legal Aid Clinic, Duke University School of Law and was elected to the 1961 and 1963 North Carolina State Legislature.

Married to the former Louise Cheatham of Durham, he is the father of two daughters, Stephanie and Katherine.

He is a member of the board of trustees of St. Barbara's Greek Orthodox Church and served as the church's general counsel, president of the youth group of St. Barbara's, was an organizer and first president of Durham Lawyer's Club, a member of the American, State, Durham County and 14th Judicial District Bar Associations, chairman of the Legal Aid Committee of the 14th District Bar Association, a member of the American Legion, Durham Kiwanis Club, Durham Jaycees, cochairman of the professional division of the Durham United Fund, a member of the board of directors of the Durham County March of Dimes, and a member of the board of advisers of AIEC.

In the 1963 general assembly, he succeeded John W. Umstead of Chapel Hill to the chairmanship of the house committee on mental institutions.

POVERTY PROBLEM

Hodges said in his prepared speech the United States easily could afford an $11 billion dole to raise all poverty-stricken families out of that category, but added this would not be a sound solution.

"It's a problem of human resource development," he said, comparing the poverty problem in this country to fundamental problems in underdeveloped nations.

"If we are to break the cycle of poverty in which millions of Americans are trapped, we must help them and their children—especially the children—develop their individual capacities to do work which will earn them decent livelihoods," he said.

"Forty percent of North Carolina's 1 million families earned less than $3,000 in 1959, the income year covered by the 1960 census," Hodges said. He noted that 150,000 of these were Negro families and 250,000 of them were white. "And, of the quarter of a million North Carolinians who live alone, 60 percent had incomes of less than $1,500."

POOR EDUCATION

Elaborating on his human resource development, he noted that 34 percent of the State's young men failed to pass the selective service mental qualification test. "This is a reflection, not upon the inherent ability of our people, but upon the quality of the education we have been giving our youth."

He added that the State government ranks third in the Nation in the percentage of its revenue devoted to education, saying, "I think this suggests that we must do a better job of arousing support for our public schools at the local level."

The TOYMNC banquet hosted this year by the Gastonia Junior Chamber of Commerce, is an annual North Carolina Jaycees affair. Representatives from throughout the State were present for the awards presentations.

Forty-sixth Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in today's RECORD the translated version of a speech delivered by the Honorable J. Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires of the Lithuanian Legation here in Washington, which he delivered at the Lithuanian Independence Day commemoration of the Lithuanian American Society of Washington, D.C., on Sunday, February 16, 1964, at the Washington Hotel.

The address follows:

FORTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished and honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, on this 46th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, the sons and daughters of a very ancient land recall with pride a most honorable heritage. Lithuania has one of the richest histories of any of the states of Eastern Europe. She was established as a state over 700 years ago by King Mindaugas, and in the years since, she has both accomplished much and suffered much. She was once one of the largest nations of Eastern Europe, and under the leadership of Vytautas the Great, protected herself and other nations from the onslaughts of the Teutonic Knights. She was, in a word, a fortress of friendly strength to her friends, and a protector of freedom and human dignity. Above all, she has always been a lover of freedom, because it is only in freedom that the good life may flower for the greatest number of people. And in the manner of a lover, she has striven to see that love bear fruit in action, and has always busily labored to defend and exalt that freedom.

During the nineteenth century, Lithuania was under the oppressive rule of czarist regimes, and for 40 years it was forbidden to print anything in the Lithuanian language. This was one of the blackest nights in Lithuania's history, but her loyal sons and daughters, especially in the United States, rallied bravely to sustain their homeland's aspirations to freedom. After many kinds of heroic support, in the aftermath of what we all hoped would be the only Great War, Lithuania reached the long-awaited day of her national rebirth, and rejoined the family of free nations as a result of the Declaration of Independence of February 16, 1918.

In the ensuing years, freemen everywhere could rejoice in the flowering of human freedom exhibited by the free Lithuanian Republic. The newly reborn nation embarked on an enviably illustrious path of progress in agriculture, education, industry, the arts and sciences, and the allied forms of self-determined human dignity and perfectibility.

In the wake of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, the nations of the free world recognized Lithuania as a sovereign nation, with Soviet Russia included. But the solemn agreements and treaties that are binding on all other nations are considered by the Soviets as ony a means to an end. The Soviets solemnly promised to respect Lithuania's independence forever. Yet "forever," in Communist jargon, may mean several years or several days, but it will always mean only what is convenient for the Soviets, and above all what serves their exclusive self-interests. As a result of this, the Soviet Union, in spite of solemn pledges and agreements binding under international law, forcibly occupied Lithuania in 1940; and that illegal occupation continues today.

Thus Lithuania, after having achieved so much and after having given promise of much more, fell upon days of renewed and increasingly bitter suffering. During its days of modern freedom and independence in this century, Lithuania had become known as the land of plenty to her Russian neighbors, and was often called "Little America." But once the Sovietized "paradise" was thrust upon the Lithuanian people, there followed only economic bleakness, increasing poverty, and human degradation. And the nefarious symbol of the Soviet "liberating" process is the number of deportations that the Kremlin carried out in Lithuania and other Baltic countries. These mass deportations, part of a program of genocide, have long shocked the conscience of the world, but the Soviets have a knack for reminding us over and over again of their capacity for atrocity; and one of the many vivid recent examples of this is the image of Peter Fechter dying in his own congealed blood at the base of the Berlin Wall. Yet atrocity, both physical and moral, has for almost 24 years been the instrument of Soviet efforts to wipe out political liberty and the liberty of the human spirit in Lithuania. Human life, for the Soviets, is expendable; so too is human dignity.

Now, the proud Lithuanian state is in the grasp of a totalitarian regime that wishes to annihilate even the memory of Lithuania's golden days of freedom and independence. But the United States and other nations of the free world have refused to recognize the Soviet aggression in Lithuania and the other Baltic States; this has been repeatedly emphasized in statements of several American Presidents, including the late President Kennedy, and his successor, President Johnson, who 3 days ago emphasized that the role of freemen in a world yearning for peace is to stand for "what is right, what is honorable, what is enlightened." As a specific expression of the commitment of the United States to support the just aspirations of the Lithuanian people, it is my pleasure to read to you today a letter I have received from the Secretary of State:

"FEBRUARY 12, 1964.

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the 46th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is my privilege to convey to you the sincere good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

"Americans have always championed the principles of freedom and self-determination for all nations and have condemned their forcible suppression, wherever it has occurred. The U.S. Government, by its firm and consistent refusal to recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, honors the Lithuanian people's devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice. We are confident that the enduring qualities of the Lithuanian nation will aid it in achieving eventually its legitimate aspirations for national independence.

"Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK."

Each year, when Lithuanian Independence Day comes, Lithuanians and their friends throughout the world are united in the memory of a nation's greatness and in the steadfast hope of her rebirth. They are also united in gratitude for the manifold ways in which free men have voiced their determination that the boundaries of the united human spirit's earnest quest for a better world in which freedom may flower shall not stop at the Berlin wall, or in the streets of Budapest, or at the barbed wire of the Lithuanian frontier. Our gratitude to the Secretary of State and the American Government and people for this support and determination is genuine, and shall not die, as our will to be free shall not die.

When we voice our hopes for the rebirth of a free Lithuania, we do not do it as a matter of abstracted desire or wishful thinking. On the contrary, we know, and history teaches us this, that events and movements of history are made by men, and that good men by their wisdom and leadership can instrumentally cause a better world.

We are privileged to have present with us here today a number of people who are actively committed to that quest for a better world, and whose leadership both puts them in the public eye and merits public gratitude. Congressman DANIEL FLOOD is beloved by all Lithuanians not just because he has always been their friend, but because he has a keen sense of human values, an habitually expressed awareness of human dignity and human progress and the justice that must always govern human relationships. Because he is a wisely committed man, he has been able to help other people achieve a better world from a position of leadership, and it is his commitments to human value which have made him a friend of Lithuania and a stanch supporter of her just aspirations. Our gratefulness to him is accentuated by the fact that, as on a number of previous occasions, he has arranged the hour of tributes to Lithuania that will take place tomorrow in the House of Representatives.

By the same token, Msgr. John Cartwright, the rector of St. Matthew's Cathedral, has enriched the world because he has enriched Washington. He has made it possible for men in this hectic nerve center of the world to be more clearly and substantially aware of the fact that "here on earth, God's work must truly be our own." He has kept men mindful of a peace beyond programs, parties and politics because he has given them a vision to keep in mind. And that vision is one that fills us with hope, and sustains our own determination to work with divine inquietude for justice here on earth.

We are also grateful that Monsignor Abbo, formerly with the apostolic delegation and now professor at the Catholic University, is here with us this morning. Again, this is not just because he has lived in Lithuania and is a longtime friend of Lithuanians, but because the world is made better by the fact that his work and ministry are dedicated to making the City of Man a godly city. It is, therefore, the total view of human life and human possibilities that gives the people of our enslaved country a great hope, for they are made aware of being loved—as the present Pope has put it—of being loved immensely, warmly, divinely.

Finally, in mentioning some of the men for whose friendship we are grateful, we greet in all brotherhood the representatives of Estonia and Latvia. They know our hearts and minds; they know the depths of sorrow and the heights of prideful strength which unite us in what President Kennedy once called "the long twilight struggle." No one has ever put it better. The Baltic peoples are strong with an ancient strength, and they know that this will sustain them in that struggle, however long it will be.

The Soviet occupation has not dimmed the Lithuanian people's bright hope of freedom. History teaches that tyrants may have temporray success in defeating just aspirations, but in the end they fall to very low depths indeed. Such, even in our own time, is the paradoxical fate of Josef Stalin. His removal from honored interment to an obscure grave by the Kremlin Wall shows quite well that justice has a habit of burying its own undertakers. And this pattern will persist as long as men are willing to fight and die for the freedom which is synonymous with life for them—whether at Thermopylae or Bunker Hill or Budapest or the Berlin Wall or the forests of Lithuania. The pattern of liberty and justice is woven firmly into the lives of Lithuanians. Though they now experience the perilous night, as did Francis Scott Key, they know that the day will come and that, "with the dawn's early light," their flag will still be there. Long may it wave.

Homebuilding Industry and Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1964, I introduced House Resolution 611, which would express the sense of the House that the Federal Reserve Board should use extreme caution to prevent restrictive monetary policies from dissipating the economic stimulus we all hope for from the tax reduction legislation now pending in the Congress. I was pleased to note that the same policy was strongly advocated in the President's economic message which was sent to the Congress on the same day I introduced my resolution. In this case, I like to think it was a coincidence which coincides with the public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I am now further pleased to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. William Blackfield, president of the National Association of Home Builders, which supports the viewpoint expressed in my resolution and gives assurance that the homebuilding industry shares my views. The homebuilding industry is a great and productive industry and it is a kingpin in our economy. It is no oversimplification to say that our overall economy cannot prosper without a prosperous home construction industry. This industry, perhaps more than any other sector of the economy, has had bitter experience with the shattering effects upon production and employment which misguided monetary policies can cause. I am pleased to bring Mr. Blackfield's letter to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

JANUARY 28, 1964.

Hon. ALBERT RAINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I congratulate you upon your action in preparing and introducing House Resolution 611. I can assure you that the homebuilding industry shares the concern and supports the viewpoint expressed in your resolution.

Broad and restrictive monetary actions by the Federal Reserve System during the decade of the 1950's and in some cases by other elements of the executive branch, periodically and, at times, sharply curtailed the flow of mortgage funds and production of housing. Further, from our standpoint these broad and restrictive monetary actions frequently led to major consequences, perhaps inherent, which compounded their depressing impact upon the productive, multiplier aspects of the economy accounted for by the homebuilding industry.

First, they were either too early or too late insofar as proper timing went with respect to future financing of housing. Second the broad measures available to the Federal Reserve System contain no avenue of escape for the long-term investment area of mortgage financing, even when the Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with respect to mortgage funds, are anxious to lessen the impact of a broadly restrictive action. For this reason Congress was constantly involved during the 1950's in a rescue operation to prevent the drastic up and down swings in the flow of mortgage funds and the production of housing from completely disrupting the industry and its contribution to the economy.

We recognize, as did the President in his economic message, that monetary policy must remain flexible and that inflation is presently a kind of sleeping economic wolf against whom there must be a constant guard. Nevertheless we are confident that if the pending tax cuts become effective early during 1964 their benefit will stimulate the general economy, including the housing industry, and we would hate to see this benefit dissipated through monetary actions not thoroughly warranted by current or immediately prospective evidence of inflation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM BLACKFIELD, *President.*

On Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the many Representatives who has introduced a bill for medical care for the aged financed through the social security system, I was pleased to read a recent editorial "On Medicare," which was published by one of New Jersey's most outstanding weekly newspapers, the Woodbridge Independent-Leader.

The editorial follows:

ON MEDICARE

There no longer seems a chance Congress will avoid a showdown this year on the question of medical care for the elderly, under social security financing.

President Johnson has put an unequivocal "must" label on the legislation, along with tax reduction and civil rights. And, staked out so firmly in an election year when he is already obviously campaigning, he cannot afford to let lawmakers go home without rendering a verdict on the issue, one way or the other.

On the heels of the Chief Executive's pronouncement other medicare proponents have stepped up their pressure for the plan—the latest evidence being a demand by a group called the National Council of Senior Citizens. They demanded investigation of recent rate increases in the cost of health insurance to the over-65 group.

According to the council, more than half of America's 17 million elderly have no health insurance. Even minimum private protection is rapidly being priced out of financial reach of the rest, it is said.

It also contends the average private policy pays less than one-third of the hospital cost an elderly patient would likely incur.

Those contentions, if correct, would undercut the basic position of those opposing the social security approach.

Unanswered, they provide a powerful argument for the legislation Congress has up to now resisted.

Keep Farmers Free, Pleads a Troubled, Enlightened Young Iowa Farmer, Tom Mackland, of Crescent, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take the liberty of including one letter to me and one to the President from Tom Mackland, a young farmer of Crescent, Iowa. You will note Tom is fearful of creeping Federal control over farming, our greatest free private industry.

The letters follow:

CRESCENT, IOWA.

Representative BEN F. JENSEN,
Representative Offices,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to President Johnson. This letter is but an explanation of what I believe is the common feeling of farmers in my area.

The administration is reportedly going to try to continue with controls in agriculture. This can only prolong the time until the farmers of our Nation can regain the freedoms taken from them by powers granted the USDA.

I urge your support in a continuing fight against policies which will deny any segment of our economy the freedom of opportunity. I sincerely believe the farmers of America are being denied this freedom under the present feed grain program. Any extension of this type of program to other agricultural commodities, such as wheat and livestock, could be detrimental to our Nation's farmers.

I realize this will be a tough battle, due to this being an election year, but feel that a possibility does exist that we might be able to reduce the Government's powers in agriculture.

Sincerely,

TOM MACKLAND.

CRESCENT, IOWA,
February 4, 1964.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: As a young farmer in Iowa, I face many management decisions in attempting to plan my future in today's agriculture.

The difficulties one encounters in trying to reach a satisfying conclusion to the problems involved becomes even more difficult due to the uncertainties of farm programs. This becomes a real factor when trying to determine if enlarging on a livestock program would be profitable. The possibility of the Government's becoming directly involved, such as through quotas or controls, or indirectly involved by the sale of CCC stocks, poses a major threat to the profitability of any major, long-term type of investment in expansion. Yet, the only way for agriculture to continue providing the American people with the quality and quantity we are famous for, necessitates individual growth by successful managers in agriculture.

I believe that farmers should be entitled to an opportunity to grow unrestricted by direct competition from their Government. The present low prices of cattle are the direct result of Government policies toward the disposal of CCC stocks of grain, the same grain that was built up due to the Government's role in agriculture. Wherever the USDA has attempted to "help" a segment of agriculture through controls and "price fixing," they have priced the commodity out of the world market, built up huge expensive Government stockpiles, and failed to solve the original problems. In the case of cotton, the USDA has not only managed to break many cotton farmers, they have put many American textile manufacturers out of business also.

Wheat farmers voted against unrealistic high supports and Government controls last May 21. Before the vote, USDA warned that cheap feed would result in low livestock prices. However, the USDA had been selling CCC stocks at reduced rates, creating a surplus of cheap feed while urging farmers to vote "yes" to prevent the same problem from existing.

Politics and agriculture don't seem to make a successful mixture when one studies the last several years of farm programs. However, I realize the necessity of the Government's role in respect to meat imports. This is a situation that only the Government can control to our Nation's best advantage. Your recent statements in regard to an investigation of the buying policies of large chainstores is another area where only the Government would be able to protect the interests of our Nation.

I fully believe the farmer of today would much rather depend upon his abilities and know-how than to have his future determined by an agency of the Federal Government. The recent decision of the Supreme Court regarding the freedom "of" or "from" religion in our public schools was but just an extension of our freedoms as defined by the Bill of Rights. I wonder if an interpretation might not be in order as to whether a Government agency has the right to take away one of the most important freedoms of all—the freedom of opportunity.

Success has always been a worthy challenge in our country, Mr. President, please help us keep it an attainable goal without fear of it being stifled through some whim of the USDA or other power-hungry individuals.

Yours sincerely.

TOM MACKLAND.

Exposing, Cutting the Phony Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, "Exposing, Cutting the Phony Budget," rightfully charges the Congress with the responsibility of trimming the administration's budget wherever we can, and of giving the people the facts about where the fat is and why it can be cut without impairing the national interest.

I commend this thoughtful admonition to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

EXPOSING, CUTTING THE PHONY BUDGET

Congress has a twofold duty as it approaches President Johnson's budget for the new fiscal year. One job is to trim it. The other is to give people the facts about it.

There is evidence that the Republicans in both the House and the Senate are about the task in good shape.

On the first county: Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, who is chairman of a GOP budget-cutting task force, says:

"We will analyze every spending request in the budget, item by item, in the hope of trimming as much as $6 billion. Despite Johnson's purported cutback in Federal spending, there is still plenty of fat in the 1965 budget. We are convinced there are spending proposals that can be cut without weakening our defense or undermining nondefense activities."

This, everyone understands, is as it should be. It is up to Congress to adopt a budget and appropriate the money. When that is done conscientiously, the House and the Senate are fulfilling one of their highest functions.

Beyond that, Congress has an obligation to disabuse the public of any misconception that President Johnson is as insistent upon frugality as he pretends to be.

Congressman Bow was speaking for the Republicans in the House when he said:

"We will pay close attention to the $4.2 billion in supplemental appropriations for which President Johnson has asked. This request is simply a gimmick by which he would shift the $4.2 billion from 1965 spending to 1964. The shift is a mere bookkeeping maneuver designed to make the present administration look better than the Kennedy administration. Unless the $4.2 billion can be cut, nearly two-thirds of the $6.5 billion savings we made last year will be wiped out. Further, President Johnson has underestimated the cost of his welfare programs, another standard gimmick."

When Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, addressed an Iowa Republican fundraising dinner crowd in Des Moines last week, he condemned a "phony budget." As one of the most adept in Washington at debunking political hanky-panky, this Member of the upper House matched Congressman Bow's demonstration of Johnson's "gimmickry."

The efforts of these two Members of Congress, and of others, should not be dismissed as partisan politics. It is imperative that the American people have the facts if they are to judge intelligently.

Large numbers have been impressed by Mr. Johnson's shadowboxing with extravagance and waste. Lest they be misled to faulty conclusions, the officials charged with the responsibility must expose the phony budget and the false economy.

Does Government Spending Help Economic Growth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 31, Mr. Ira T. Ellis, economist for E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject, "Does Government Spending Help Economic Growth?" Excerpts from this address, as published in the Commonwealth, follow:

SPACE SPENDING NO PANACEA FOR U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM, ELLIS DECLARES

(By Ira T. Ellis)

Any kind of spending is stimulating to the communities where the facilities are located, to the individuals employed, and the suppliers.

If some foreign country were providing the funds, or if they were from a very low-cost gold mine, space spending would be stimulating. But funds for space spending come ultimately from tax receipts.

How much are we talking about? Space spending rose from $0.4 billion in fiscal 1960 to perhaps $4.4 billion this year, and an estimated $5 billion next year.

This may be compared with the $3.7 billion spent last year for construction of all public and private education buildings in the United States, or the $1.5 billion spent for construction of all public and private hospitals and similar institutions, or the $1 billion spent for constructing churches and other religious buildings.

It may also be compared with the $8 billion consumers spent for tobacco products in 1963, or the $5.5 billion for physicians, the $5.5 billion for religious and welfare activities, or the $3 billion for higher education.

WE HAVE SCARCE RESOURCES

A basic economic principle is that we have scarce resources of labor and capital. Use of some of these resources for space spending precludes their use for other purposes. They can be used only once.

Scientists, engineers, production workers, and administrators engaged in space activities are not available for other desirable activities.

The Federal budget for 1965 projects spending of $97.9 billion in fiscal 1965 with corresponding receipts of only $93 billion. The resulting deficit of $4.9 billion must be financed by borrowing.

The deficit must be financed without resorting to the commercial banking system, that is, without inflating the money supply.

TAX CUT STIMULANCE OVER-ESTIMATED

The projections of Federal tax collections for fiscal 1965 seem very optimistic. Personal income tax collections are expected to rise $1 billion, or 2 percent, in spite of tax rate reductions which may average 10 percent. Similarly, corporate income tax collections are expected to rise $2 billion, or 8 percent, in spite of reductions in corporate income tax rates totaling about 4 percent.

Hasn't the administration seriously overestimated the potential stimulation from tax cuts? Aren't we facing a substantially greater deficit in fical 1965 than the proposed $4.9 billion? Isn't there danger that the deficit will be so large that we may have to sell significant amounts of securities to the commercial banking system? Such a development would be orthodox inflation, i.e., expansion of the money supply through commercial bank credit.

The inevitable result would be a rising commodity price level. This is the way France went in the four and one-half decades after 1913; it is the way most South American countries are operating their Federal finances today. We can have necessary defense spending or space spending, but shouldn't we be willing to pay for it as we go?

WON'T HELP ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Spending for the space program will have relatively little effect on our problem of unemployment because unemployment affects primarily young workers or unskilled workers of all ages. Space spending goes heavily to skilled workers, and especially to scientists and engineers.

Unemployment figures for the country are based on a sample census each month by the Bureau of the Census covering some 35,000 households.

Two sets of questions are asked: (1) How many people in this family 14 years of age and over are working? (These are in the labor force, and they are the employed.) (2) How many people in this family 14 years of age and over are not working, but are looking for work? (These are in the labor force, and they are the unemployed.)

BOYS AND GIRLS UNEMPLOYED

Naturally, unemployment rates are relatively high among boys and girls 16 to 19 years of age. The unemployment rate among boys 16 to 19 years of age was 16.3 percent last November. The corresponding rate for girls was 17.4 percent.

Many of these reportedly unemployed boys and girls are in school and looking only for part-time work. Obviously, their skill level is relatively low and therefore unemployment among this group is relatively high.

Unemployment is relatively low among married men of all ages. It averaged only 3.2 percent for all married men in the country last November, and it averaged only 3.3 percent for all of 1963.

Unemployment is directly related to skill. The unemployment rate last November among technical and professional workers—engineers, scientists, college professors, doctors, school teachers, etc.—was only 1.6 percent. Among managers, officials, and proprietors the unemployment rate was only 1.4 percent.

At the other end of the scale, the unemployment rate last November among nonfarm laborers was 11.9 percent.

Finally, the unemployment data indicate a great deal of changing jobs rather than that 5.5 percent of the potential labor force are continuously unemployed. Half the unemployed last November were not unemployed in the previous month.

The hard core unemployed—men and women, boys and girls, out of work for as long as 6 months—numbered only 463,000 last November, out of a civilian labor force of 73.3 million, or only 0.6 percent of the total.

Increased space spending is not likely to employ many boys and girls 16 to 19 years of age, or many nonfarm laborers. Even with space spending already accounting for 4.5 percent of the Federal budget, space spending is having little effect on unemployment. The unemployment rate averaged 5.6 percent in 1960, and it averaged 5.7 percent in 1963.

WON'T HELP IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

Another basis American economic problem is relatively slow economic growth. Will space spending help here? The answer depends somewhat on the definition.

I think of economic growth as an increase in the purchase of goods and services consumers want and are willing to pay for—such things as housing and household operation, food, clothing, medical care, college education for their children, automobiles, travel, religious and welfare activities—all the myriad goods and services individuals buy with their income after taxes.

But space spending does not promise any significant goods and services to be bought by individuals. It does not generate income in the same way automobile production and sales, for example, generate income, or furniture, or household appliances.

MUST ALSO CONSIDER TAXING SIDE

The income transferred by space spending comes from taxes, and could have been generated by alternative employment, e.g., producing automobiles instead of rockets, or building houses instead of test centers.

Actually, if we go back to the thirties, only Italy, Japan, and Canada have exceeded us in economic growth.

It is only if we include Government spending as such in the economic output of the country, as we do in the familiar concept of the gross national product—the total value of all the goods and services produced in the country—that space spending, or Federal spending for agricultural surpluses, or even spending for defense, seems to contribute to economic growth. But these expenditures seem to contribute only if we consider the spending side—and do not consider the taxing side—or if we consider the spending side and do not consider the alterantive uses individuals might have made of the money the Government took in taxes.

There are many Government services, of course, which consumers do wish to buy and are willing to pay for. Government spending is not good or bad in itself; it should be measured on the basis of whether the goods and services produced by the spending are wanted by people.

The basic question should not relate to specific areas, but to the benefit or detriment of the American people as a whole from a given Government spending program.

With relatively small dependence on foreign trade, our standard of living depends largely on what we produce, on how we use our scarce resources of capital, scientific brainpower, and other trained labor.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (Rune A. Marken): Wouldn't foreign aid be a better place to cut Federal spending?

Answer. No, although we could cut foreign aid. Remember, Federal revenues go up $4 billion a year merely by economic growth and if we merely held spending level, we could soon balance budget. The question is, What do we want for the effort we put in? Economics says we can have this thing or that thing, but not both, with the same dollars and people.

Question. (George Wale): Will United States experience another depression of magnitude of 1873–79 or 1934–39?

Answer. Eventually, but not soon. These were caused by declines in investment. The little recessions are principally from declines in inventory. We must ask: Are we overstimulating investments, such as roads and schools, for the short term? What will happen when, after forced draft, we have to pull back? Will we run out of places in which to invest? Government can't prevent depressions. It can only inflate the money supply.

Question. (L. S. White): Where get jobs for 4 million unemployed?

Answer. There is little unemployment for adult skilled labor. In last 12 months we increased employment by 1,500,000. We are undergoing massive shift of employment from agriculture to manufacturing and service industries. This is desirable, although tough on persons involved. The Federal Government has dropped, in 12 months, 1,000 employees.

Question. (Roy P. Newell): Does responsibility for poverty and unemployment lie with private enterprise or socialistic sector?

Answer. Private enterprise. Better opportunities for profit will bring investments and increase employment.

Question. (Hilary H. Crawford): Isn't main purpose of moon shot to get bigger bombs in air?

Answer. Military are not interested beyond first 500 miles. Basic reason is prestige.

A Tall Pine, Hon. R. H. Carraway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid tribute to a great newspaperman. The tribute is paid by one of the most outstanding newspaper publishers of this Nation, Hon. Carl Estes of the Longview Daily News. It is paid to Mr. R. H. Carraway, former publisher of the Mineola Monitor. I knew Mr. Carraway for more than a quarter of a century. He possessed the great attributes attributed to him by Col. Carl Estes. We all shall miss him. I join with his many friends in expressing my profound sympathy to the members of his family in the passing of Mr. Carraway.

The tribute follows:

A TALL PINE: AN EDITORIAL

Every community of our great country has one or more men who because of long demonstrated ability, compassion, dedication, and service are regarded by their fellow citizens as standing head and shoulders above the crowd. Here in east Texas we call these men tall pines. In the passing of Robert Henry Carraway, of Mineola, another tall pine has fallen.

Mr. Carraway, editor and publisher of the Mineolo Monitor from 1923 to 1956 when he retired, could have distinguished himself in many fields. He could have been a great banker—he was once a banker in Caddo, Okla. He could have become a leader in government—President Woodrow Wilson named him a postmaster, and he served as city commissioner of Mineola. He might have become a national figure as a churchman—he served as an elder in the Presbyterian Church, Oklahoma Synod, and was active and faithful in the Methodist Church at Mineola.

Instead, R. H. Carraway chose to follow in the footsteps of his pioneer father, who published the Nacogdoches Sentinel for many years, and gave 33 years of his life as an editor and publisher serving the people and the interests of Mineola, Wood County, and the neighboring east Texas area.

It was a work which brought him honors and recognition, both at home and statewide. He was a past president of the North and East Texas Press Association, and for years was active in the Texas Press Association, and the Texas Editorial Association.

He was active in Masonic work, holding membership in the Mineola Masonic Blue Lodge No. 502 A.F. & A.M., the Dallas Scottish Rite Masonic body, the York Rite, and Hella Temple of Dallas. Following funeral services Monday afternoon at the First Methodist Church in Mineola with the Reverend E. J. Davis, Jr., officiating, graveside rites were in charge of the Masonic order at Rose Lawn Memorial Park in Mineola.

Mr. Carraway was a member of what the newspaper estate calls "the old school"—meaning he was one who rolled up his sleeves, worked at the job early and late, and faithfully chronicled the goings and comings, the achievements and the hopes, and regretfully even the shortcomings, of his community and the area. He was constructive, even when he thought it needful to criticize.

At his retirement in 1956, Mr. Carraway was one of east Texas' best known journalists. In retirement, he never lost his keen personal interest in the people of his area. He kept in close touch with family and community activities, showed concern in individual and area needs and problems, and demonstrated his interest and support where matters of growth and progress were concerned.

Those of us who have known R. H. Carraway across the years know of his deep personal dedication as an editor and publisher to the people of his area and to the institutions which worked for public progress and the happiness and well-being of the citizenship. He stood tall and straight among his countrymen, and that is how we shall remember him.

Substantial Benefits From Tax Cut for Entire Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the significance of the signing of the tax cut bill continues to command widespread interest. In my newsletter of this week, "Capitol Comments," I have pointed out the importance of the signing of this famous document and its importance as a means of strengthening the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include my newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS: PRESIDENT USES 24 PENS IN SIGNING TAX CUT BILL AT IMPRESSIVE CEREMONY

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress—Fourth District, Tennessee)

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, your Representative was among those invited to the White House by President Lyndon B. Johnson to witness the signing of the tax cut bill, providing for the greatest tax reduction in our history, which now is law.

The signing of this famous document—bringing tax relief to millions of American taxpayers—came shortly after the Congress had completed action on the bill. Scene of the impressive signing ceremony was the East Room, where members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the Finance Committee of the Senate, legislative leaders and representatives of business and labor were in attendance. It was a memorable experience for all who stood by while the President affixed his signature to the parchment on which the now historic revenue measure is engrossed.

Among those in attendance were Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK; Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, Majority Whip HALE BOGGS; Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK; chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR D. MILLS; and ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, JOHN W. BYRNES.

Some two dozen pens were used in the signing. President Johnson presented the pens to some of those in attendance, including one to your Representative. The President then spoke to the Nation and millions of citizens participated in the ceremony through the medium of radio and television.

The White House assemblage reflected the across-the-board, bipartisan, all-embracing nature of the $11.5 billion tax cut itself. President Johnson spoke of this aspect of the Revenue Act while singling out his predecessor, the late President Kennedy, and leaders of Congress for special mention.

SUBSTANTIAL BENEFITS FOR THE WHOLE ECONOMY

As President Johnson said in his televised address to the Nation, this tax cut is the single most important step taken to strengthen our economy and bring a better way of life to our citizens.

It is also notable as "an expression of faith in our system of free enterprise," the President remarked.

"We could have chosen to strengthen the economy through a higher level of Government spending," he said. "Instead we chose tax reduction—and at the same time we reduced Government spending."

LARGEST PERCENTAGE CUT TO THOSE EARNING THE LEAST

Fifty-one million Americans share in the reduction in individual tax rates averaging nearly 20 percent—for a total of $9.2 billion over the next 2 years.

Business, along with individuals, receives substantial benefits. "And," the President noted, "small business benefits most of all."

The President, after citing examples of how individuals and businesses in all income brackets will benefit, added: "The important point is that this bill means increased income for almost every taxpayer and business in America—and those earning the least will receive the largest percentage reductions."

Underscoring the tax cut's importance as a means of strengthing the national economy, the President said: "No one can bury us—or bluff us—or beat us—so long as our economy remains strong."

Emphasizing that "we have created the most prosperous Nation in history" by placing "maximum reliance on the initiative and creative energies of individual busnessmen and workers," he concluded: "With your help—and the help of this legislation—let us cisoe ranks and continue to build a nation whose strength lies in our program for prosperity and our passion for peace."

Latest Frenzy of the Birchers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the John Birch Society continues to disseminate frenzied hate and falsehood. The Nashville Tennessean recently published an editorial entitled "Latest Frenzy of the Birchers" which I commend to my colleagues:

LATEST FRENZY OF THE BIRCHERS

A great many people realized that the John Birch Society had lost all contact with sanity when its founder accused former President Eisenhower of treason and called the late John Foster Dulles a Communist.

But the society has outdone itself with its latest publication, which carries an article saying that President Kennedy's "memory will be cherished with distaste"

because he did much for "the Communist conspiracy" but was falling behind a scheduled date for the "effective capture of the United States" in 1963, and was rapidly becoming a political liability to the Reds.

It also said the late President "procured his election by peddling boob bait to the suckers."

This is the kind of sick thinking and conversation that poisons the minds of susceptible people already filled with some kind of nameless terror over frustrations of a nuclear age. Terror is a step away from hate and hate a step away from violence.

The assassination of President Kennedy has had a sobering effect on this country. It has recalled, for the most part, the terrible price which can be paid for the harvest which the pestilence seedsmen have sown.

Perhaps it is this new soberness which has spurred the Birchers to new heights of frenzy and falsehood from which not even a slain President is exempt.

Tax-Cut Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Henry Hazlitt in the March 9, 1964, issue of Newsweek points out that the tax cut so loudly acclaimed by the administration is more froth than substance. As many of us have said from the beginning, a real tax cut cannot be made without a corresponding cut in Federal spending. This administration has resorted instead to juggling figures making both the tax cut and the promise of Government economy meaningless. The tax cut legislation may be a good way to win votes for the administration, but then again, it is possible the people are more aware of its real meaning than the President and his economic advisers believe.

Mr. Hazlitt's article follows:

BUSINESS TIDES: TAX-CUT FALLACIES

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration's pressure for the $11.5 billion tax cut just enacted may be cynically ascribed to an effort to win the coming election. But it is also supported by an economic theory, a theory now widely and sincerely held, that is set forth in some detail in the recent Economic Report of the Council of Economic Advisers.

It is a pure demand theory. It assumes that, whenever there is recession or unemployment, the reason must be insufficient demand. "Excessive unemployment is the most obvious symptom and one of the worst consequences of a level of demand that falls short of the Nation's potential output."

Therefore, the report concludes, "the Federal Government must adjust its programs to complement private demand. * * * The budget must counterbalance private demand." "Inadequate" private demand "can be corrected either by expanding Government purchases to employ idle resources * * * or by expanding private business and personal aftertax incomes through reduced tax rates." In other words, the Government can deliberately resort to deficits.

But this last word is still unpopular. It arouses distrust, so the council shies away from it. Instead, it invents a new concept—"the full-employment budget." This is a purely hypothetical budget, with no relation to the real one. It is what the relation of Government expenditures and revenues ought to have been, according to the council's theory, to bring about full employment (or rather, to prevent unemployment from going above 4 percent).

DREAMWORLD SURPLUS

Let's see some of the consequences of this new concept. We have had 28 actual deficits in the last 34 years. But when we start talking of "full-employment budgets" most of these turn out to be "surpluses." In the fourth quarter of 1963 the Treasury was estimating the actual deficit at a rate of $9 billion a year, but it turns out from the new calculations of the Council of Economic Advisers that at the time there was a "full-employment" surplus of $9 billion. In fact, by this new method of hypothetical figuring there couldn't be a deficit in the "full-employment budget," no matter what the actual figures showed, as long as there was any unemployment.

The fallacies in this theory should be clear. It is a stale Keynesianism. It takes it for granted that any "idle resources" or unemployment anywhere must be the result of "deficiency of aggregate demand." By demand it means, of course, monetary demand. So this demand is to be increased either by more Government spending or lower taxes, and the bigger deficit is to be paid for by printing more money—i.e., by inflation. "When aggregate demand is generally deficient and investment and consumption are expanding too slowly to provide jobs for all those seeking employment, expansionary monetary policy normally can and should accompany expansionary fiscal policy."

DEMAND AND PRICE

Nowhere does the council recognize that demand is merely relative to price. When goods are priced too high some of them must remain unsold. When labor is priced too high some of it must remain unemployed. Unemployment is the result of maladjustment of wages and prices. Given wage-price coordination, supply creates its own demand.

The only way to cure unemployment is to permit, through free market competition, the necessary adjustments and coordinations throughout the wage-price system, and to encourage saving, investment, and profits. As Keynes himself conceded in 1932: "There is no possible means of curing unemployment except by restoring to employers a proper margin of profit."

Given workable wage-price relationships, full employment is possible without deficits and without inflation. But even huge deficits and inflation cannot bring full employment if wage rates are encouraged to rise faster than prices and productivity.

To cut taxes and increase our inflationary deficit may give us an overheated economy till election time, but it is a reckless and ominous policy for the longer future.

President Johnson—A Friend of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Hon. Eugene P. Foley, has written a lucid and informative article regarding the services and progress of the Small Business Administration. This article apears in the February 1964 issue of the Sbane Bulletin—the news bulletin of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

Administrator Foley describes the various actions taken by President Johnson during the course of his career as a Senator in behalf of small business and rightfully concludes that small business has a friend in President Johnson.

I believe that many of my colleagues and others will be interested in reading this article and I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS HAS FRIEND IN PRESIDENT JOHNSON

(By Eugene P. Foley, Administrator, Small Business Administration)

America's small business community can look forward to a continuation of high level support from the White House, for in President Lyndon B. Johnson it has an old friend.

One needs only to note President Johnson's record in the Congress to know his concren for the well-being of the Nation's 4½ million small businessmen.

Under President Kennedy, small business fared better than in any other similar period in history. Small business contributed its proportionate share as gains were racked up in the gross national product, personal income, corporate profits and industrial production.

To maintain a rising economy, President Kennedy asked Congress to approve tax reductions. When President Johnson assumed office, he gave tax reductions a similar top priority in his legislative program, and hopes to see them a reality early this year. In order to support his request, the President has ordered economies in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The proposed tax reductions would unlock the door to fuller utilization of the American economy by stimulating consumer markets and higher investment demand and by creating new job opportunities. More than any tax proposal from the executive branch in my memory, this program is tailored to provide benefits to small business throughout the country.

President Johnson long has had an active interest in the small businessman. In 1950, he was one of those who saw the need for establishing the Senate Small Business Committee, and in 1953 he urged passage of legislation which set up the Small Business Administration—the Government spokesman for small business. He was a sponsor of the Small Business Investment Company Act (SBIC) in 1958. In urging pasage of the latter legislation, he told the Senate in a speech:

"There is not a Senator in this body who is not conscious of the need for capital in our small businesses. There is not a Senator who has not devoted time to the study of the problems of small businesses; and there is not a Senator who is unaware that, despite the efforts of private enterprise, and of the Small Business Administration, small business remains in great need of capital with which to grow, to compete, and even to survive."

Later in 1958 President Johnson summed up the work of Congress in behalf of small business in these words:

"There have been many aspects of this session of Congress which have filled me with great pride. But one I consider of particular importance consists of the progress that has been made in legislation for small business.

"For too many years small business has

been very much like the weather—something that everybody talks about but nobody does anything about.

"This has been due largely to some of the peculiar economic problems of small business. It took time to gather information; it took time to form coherent policies; and it took time to pass the necessary measures."

In an address in Milwaukee in 1963, the then Vice President said "small business must have a chance to succeed."

Since becoming President, Mr. Johnson made his first statement on small business in connection with the meeting of the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies in New York in early December. He sent the meeting this letter:

"Please extend my best wishes to the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies on the occasion of its fifth annual meeting. As one of the original sponsors of the legislation which made this program possible, I have been following developments in this industry with great interest and I am gratified at the role SBIC's are playing in assisting small businessmen who are unable to obtain financing from other banking sources. Despite the inevitable problems this young industry is facing, I am confident it will achieve the important goals those of us who were in Congress foresaw when we passed this legislation.

"The SBIC program has had the support of every administration and Congress since passage of the Small Business Investment Act. Please take this opportunity to assure both the SBIC industry and the small business community that my administration will continue this support. I see great promise in this program and I look to Small Business Investment Companies to play an increasingly important role in enabling small business to share in and contribute to a growing and prospering economy."

President Johnson is continuing the White House Committee on Small Business which was formed under President Kennedy. As Administrator of the Small Business Administration, I have the honor to serve as chairman. The purpose of the Committee is to develop new, constructive policies and programs for small business, interagency coordination to assure small business a larger share of Government contracts, and a close-knit program of increased assistance to small firms. The Committee is composed of the heads of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Justice, Labor, and Treasury, and the Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, Federal Trade Commission, General Services Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The vigorous efforts made by President Kennedy to assist small business through the Small Business Administration are being continued under President Johnson.

Businessmen may be interested to know that since taking over as SBA Administrator, I have instituted a number of innovations designed to provide small firms with faster service on loan applications. I also have eliminated much of the redtape attached to our programs, with the result that borrowers are receiving more expeditious service. I also have enlisted the knowledge and experience of private businessmen, educators, and professional men to advise me on matters affecting small firms, and to assist in finding ways to keep the agency's programs responsive to the needs of small business.

Every indication points to a prosperous 1964 for the small businessman—a record one if the President's tax proposals are approved.

All-Cargo Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks, an address delivered by Mr. Richard M. Jackson, president, Seaboard World Airlines, Inc., on the important subject of the problems of the all-cargo airlines, which he delivered at the Aviation/Space Writers Association luncheon in New York City on February 13, 1964.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am desirous of giving greater visibility to all ideas which are of benefit to our ever-growing and dynamic airline industry.

Mr. Jackson is a young, able and aggressive leader in the airline industry and he presents the case for all-cargo airlines in his speech. Possibly not all of those interested in the airline industry will completely agree with his remarks, but his thought-provoking views should be given careful consideration if the airline industry is to meet the challenge of the last half of the 20th century.

The address follows:

ALL-CARGO AIRLINES: TO BE OR NOT TO BE THAT IS NOT THE QUESTION

(By Richard M. Jackson)

The economic well-being of the U.S. all-cargo carriers has been a subject of much discussion and debate in recent months both officially in Washington and unofficially in the industry. The problem in its simplest terms seems to be that at the present time these carriers cannot make a profit from cargo revenues only, and that their ability to survive has therefore been questioned.

Let me make it clear at this point that there are considerable differences in the business potential and the present financial well-being among the five certificated U.S. all-cargo carriers.

In the case of our company, Seaboard World Airlines, we are in a different business atmosphere than that of the domestic all-cargo carriers, because we operate across the North Atlantic where there is a more stable rate structure, longer flights, and a greater competitive advantage over surface transport. We have just announced our second successive profitable year, and intend to continue the trend. However, for the purposes of this discussion I am referring to the group of five certificated U.S. all-cargo carriers but am keeping in mind these distinctions between Seaboard World and the others.

The balance sheets of some all-cargo carriers are respectable, and those of others are frightening. Some have shown regular profits, others constant losses. But the reasons for these different financial postures are not necessarily related to their success in operating a commercial cargo franchise—or to put it another way, their financial ups and downs have largely depended on the size, pricing, and continuity of their military contract business, which has represented from 40 percent to almost 100 percent of their revenues, depending on the individual carrier.

This does not mean that several of these carriers have not made serious efforts to build a commercial air cargo business—and with some success with respect to serving the public and promoting an infant industry. However, in all frankness it must be said that no carrier has made a profit solely from the cargo revenues of all-cargo commercial service. Indeed, in addition to these losers are all the large combination carriers who operate all-cargo service, and in fact, they are the biggest losers because they operate the most all-cargo service.

These statements may be shocking and disillusioning, but do they indicate a conclusion that all-cargo services should not be operated?

This question cannot be answered quickly without examining the specific interests involved.

First of all, the all-cargo carriers alone have invested or committed some $100 million for modern, all-cargo aircraft. The combination carriers have followed suit with orders of over $100 million for new cargo fleets. Right or wrong, what's done is done, and cannot be undone. Let's face it, the modern, all-cargo airplane is here to stay, and it's our job to make it work profitably for its operator and the public that it serves. There has been too much talk recently in industry and Government speculating that death after all may be the easiest way out for an important segment of the industry. Let's dispense with this funereal approach that the best way to kill a cold is to slit your throat. Over the years the air cargo industry has been the victim of overzealous advanced billings, and yet despite the resulting pessimism at the failure to live up to expectations, it has grown at a prodigious rate, one which would make any other industry ecstatic.

What is the fundamental reason for the unprofitable all-cargo operations of today? The answer is amazingly simple—the modern cargo airplane is too big for the airfreight market alone. There is not enough revenue available from cargo only to pay for the operation of the big airplane. How did we all get caught in this position? Several years ago when the industry was operating smaller piston cargo airplanes, the operating costs climbed past the 100 percent break-even load factor point, and the only hope for the future was to replace the smaller airplane with much larger, lower unit operating cost airplanes such as the CL-44, DC-8F, and 707. The profitability problem then shifted from one of too high costs to one of too low revenues, where we find ourselves today.

The problem has been magnified by excessive buying of these huge new cargo airplanes to the point where the total cargo capability of the jet bellies and all-cargo planes in operation and on order is probably five to ten times the current market size.

Here we have a situation in which the basic source of revenue does not by itself support the total costs of operation. Is this situation unique to the all-cargo operations of the airlines? I think the answer is definitely "no". Careful examination of the revenue and cost figures of the largest U.S. passenger airlines reveals that their passenger revenues alone cannot support their level of operations. These carriers are blessed

with broad franchises for the carriage of mail, passengers, and cargo which produce substantial revenues from other than scheduled pasenger service amounting from 10 to 26 percent of their gross revenues. A good example is Pan American whose 1962 statement shows $45 million of mail revenues, $50 million of cargo revenues, and $35 million of charter and other transport revenues, for a total of $130 million or 26 percent of their gross. And these figures do not include another $100 million plus of Government contracts for maintenance of missile bases. It is quite clear that these revenues derived from mail, cargo, and contract work are absolutely essential not only to the profitability of these airlines, but to the maintenance of their current level of operations including frequency of service, number of points served, and even tariff levels. To put it more bluntly, these ancillary revenues largely control the financial destinies of the passenger airlines and are the sales of byproducts of the passenger airlines' manufacturing plant. For passenger airlines, mail and cargo are ancillary; and for cargo airlines, mail and passengers are ancillary. In the broad field of commerce, there is a commonplace economic fact of life, that the profitable sale of the byproducts can be the difference between making or losing money on the entire business.

Now let's get back to the all-cargo airlines where the regulatory purists have determined that cargo airlines must show that all-cargo-only operations are needed only if they are profitable. The purists are determined in their doctrinaire way to prove to the world that all-cargo is or isn't a proper free enterprise commercial activity. They don't really care which way it turns out, as long as truth is served. Their hands are washed clean by the intellectual process of throwing the Christians to the lions to see who will win.

Obviously I am of the opinion that the all-cargo carriers should be permitted to sell their byproduct which is empty capacity without the artificial restrictions currently in place.

A singular characteristic of our business is that our huge-capacity airplanes cannot be economically tramped around the world without presold contractual revenues such as those mentioned above. The glorious opportunity to serve new cities, new countries, and new markets, or even to add frequencies to existing points, is taken with great trepidation unless the expenses of each new flight can be partially underwritten by a known source of revenue. Each new transatlantic round-trip flight, for instance, can cost as much as $25,000, and it is a foolhardy man indeed who attempts it for the first time with nothing but a prayer for commercial cargo. We cannot afford to experiment in a small way in a new market, because the irreducible minimum is the single round-trip cost, which is large. Ancillary revenues are essential to route and market development. It is also important to note that such auxiliary revenues are needed on a round-trip basis. Examples of one-way sources, such as some military common carriage cargo shipments, are only 50-percent effective to round-trip economics.

Let us examine more closely the various types of ancillary revenues and their effectiveness in holding house and home together. There are two general types. The first and perhaps the most important kind of ancillary revenue is that which contributes directly to every commercial cargo flight flown. Examples of this are revenues derived from mail, military common carriage contracts, and so-called blocked space agreements for cargo carriage for other carriers. In each case, these revenues fill up otherwise empty space on each regular flight, thus making it financially possible to operate the flight and to expand commercial frequencies. Since two of these sources are contractual and thus subject to termination by the other party, the cargo carriers need a more permanent auxiliary revenue source such as the passenger "top-off" program Seaboard World has proposed to the Government.

The second major area of ancillary revenues includes military and civilian charters, aircraft leasing, and other services performed with existing equipment, facilities, and manpower. The revenues from these sources do not directly contribute to the economic viability of individual scheduled service trips, but they do help defray corporate fixed costs which are already required to permit operation of the scheduled service. Scheduled transportation is one of the riskiest businesses in the world because its product is so perishable, and any source of revenue which will contribute to defraying the fixed expenses of being in that business is welcome.

A word of warning at this point—my seeming preoccupation so far in this talk with sources of revenue other than retail commercial cargo should not be misconstrued. Cargo is our main business, and the others are byproducts. Competitively, Seaboard World Airlines is quite successful in the pure cargo field, and is today the largest airfreight carrier in the North Atlantic among 18 competitors. But neither we nor they could have reached our present positions without ancillary sources of revenue.

I have already stated that scheduled all-cargo operations are not profitable because the modern, all-cargo airplane is too big for the present size of the cargo-only market, and sufficient ancillary sources of revenue have not yet been made available to fill the gap.

What can the airlines do about it? One thing is certain—they cannot find a smaller airplane with competitive speed and economic capability—there is no such machine. The other alternatives are:

1. First, the all-cargo airplane operators may continue to take losses with the hope that the market will grow fast enough to produce at least a break-even operation before the cash runs out.

The combination carriers are following this course, with the exception that their cash has not and probably will not run out because they already have sufficient ancillary revenues. The all-cargo carriers, with notable exceptions, have tried to outwait cargo development, but for several the cash has disappeared. Is this alternative of waiting for market growth realistic or is it "pie in the sky"? The market growth rates vary between cities and between countries, but let's assume an average annual growth rate of 15 percent, which isn't either high or low for a long period of years. Also let's assume that cargo capacity that is or could be made available today in jet belly compartments and in modern, all-cargo airplanes in service and on order is roughly five times the present market size. Let's also assume that a cargo rate structure will exist for years that will permit a 75-percent break-even load factor. On this basis it would take 9½ years for the market to grow to reach the break-even point, and 5 years just to double its present size. If the growth rate could be maintained at 25 percent per year, instead of 15 percent, it would still take 6 years to reach break even.

Admittedly, these numbers are not exact but I believe that they are of the proper order of magnitude—and remember that this calculation assumes no further increase in capacity beyond aircraft now in service and on order. It therefore appears to me this alternative of waiting for market growth is probably unrealistic.

2. The second alternative for the all-cargo carriers is to give up the ghost as independent operators, and try to become assimilated into larger, more profitable operations—either airline or otherwise, which have ancillary revenues.

This technique is intriguing but probably quite remote as to its feasibility, unless the cargo carrier has something substantial to offer to a potential partner such as a good route and traffic potential not available to the partner, minimal loss risk during preprofit growth period, revenues which would be largely additive to those of the new partner, expenses which could be reduced by the union, and a favorable tax situation. However, these and other subjective factors involved in potential mergers are not easily proven or reconciled.

3. A third alternative for the all-cargo carriers is to try to obtain exclusivety of franchise of some sort. For example, three of the domestic all-cargo carriers have asked the Civil Aeronautics Board for exclusive right to operate all-cargo airplanes domestically. The CAB has recently indicated they are seriously considering some form of exclusivety for the cargo carriers, such as permitting blocked-space agreements only by all-cargo carriers with combination carriers. Obviously an exclusive franchise of one sort or another would be helpful, provided it contributes positively to expanding all-cargo scheduled service, as in the case of blocked space cargo contracts (an idea, incidentally, initiated and launched by Seaboard World Airlines over the bitter opposition of the passenger airlines which now want to claim it as their own). The CAB in considering exclusivety features may wish to differentiate between certain of the all-cargo carriers due to fundamental differences in their markets, ratemaking, and competitive situations.

4. The fourth alternative is to have the ability to develop sufficient ancillary sources of revenue. In Seaboard World, we have tried to accomplish this objective and to some extent we have been successful. We have three "blocked space" agreements for the sale of cargo capacity to other airlines and a common carriage military cargo contract, all of which are carried on scheduled services. Since these ancillary revenues are probably transitory, we have sought permanent replacement by formally requesting the CAB to grant us the right to develop the low fare passenger market in order to have the opportunity to tap ancillary revenues from a broad source while at the same time developing a new market. We feel there are ways for the CAB to assure that such revenues will be truly "ancillary" to the basic cargo business.

The ability to develop commercial ancillary revenues requires CAB approval, and to obtain additional Government traffic requires U.S. Government sponsorship and/or approval from either the Department of Defense, Post Office Department, and/or the CAB. An important anomaly exists in this area wherein the CAB is charged with the franchising of airlines and promoting the health and welfare of civil aviation and yet the other two Departments control the real means of effecting these objectives with annual air transportation awards approaching $300 million. The CAB on the other hand is given a meager $80 million a year by Congress to dole out as subsidy to needy carriers. The second anomaly is that the all-cargo carriers don't qualify as being needy, because their original franchise said they can't be needy, whereas, all the other certificated carriers qualify as being eligible for subsidy. The paradox deepens when Government officials publicly seek ways to improving the all-cargo carriers' position and in the same week take existing contractual revenues of millions of dollars annually away from those same carriers by reducing the rates charged to Government for military transportation. "How can we help you?" they cry as they snip the bottoms out of our pockets. I doubt if the public and even some of the press know that the airlines

have been carrying military passengers for the Government between the United States and Paris for $100 ahead, and now the Government authorities have seen fit to reduce that fare to $92 under the banner of a governmental economy drive. A $100 ticket to Europe strikes me as a terrific buy, even by the Government. Civilian air transportation rates do not approach that figure. It is clear to me that if the Government could act more cohesively on the matters of franchises, transportation awards, and subsidy, the all-cargo carriers' problems could be more readily resolved.

For example, would it not be possible for the Government to reallocate the distribution of its huge mail and military contract revenues to serve the public interest objective of developing a sound all-cargo industry? Let me put it another way. What developmental purpose is being served by handing out over $200 million of these awards annually to the large profitable passenger carriers? It almost appears that these large carriers are being heavily subsidized to compete with the all-cargo carriers. Isn't it time to put the shoe on the other foot?

It is easy for a member of industry to stand back and take potshots at various Government agencies for their inability to solve his problems, and today I am guilty of that. I have intended, however, to do more than that, and I hope in a constructive manner. It is important that the all-cargo carriers be understood for what they are, and not for what they might have been. It is important that they are alive today as a potent force in the development of a young industry and in the support of the Nation's military mobilization base. It is important that their contribution to the public welfare be sustained and nourished to produce greater contributions through industry growth. It is important that the Government officials charged with the responsibility carefully review the various courses of action, decide, and then bend every effort to implement them. And last but not least, it is very important that the all-cargo carriers help themselves through innovation and sound management to grow and prosper and fulfill the public interest objectives.

Tax Cut Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Washington Evening Star, of February 27, sets forth in detail some of the dangers involved by the enacting of the so-called tax reduction bill.

The editorial follows:

TAX CUT HOPES

A week from today the Nation will begin to feel the first effects of the tax cut which will pump some $11.5 billion into the private enterprise side of the economy.

This bold economic venture puts a fine feather in President Johnson's political cap. Needless to say, it is accompanied by high hopes. No one should lose sight of the fact, however, that it is also attended by very real dangers.

President Johnson, naturally enough, emphasized the hopeful aspects in his brief remarks last evening. The $9.2 billion which the cut will bring to individual taxpayers is expected to be introduced into the economy through an increase in private spending. This, it is hoped, will stimulate a reactivation of the estimated 13.5 percent of our productive capacity which now lies idle. It is also hoped that the cutback in corporate taxes will encourage new plant expansion.

If all of these hopes are realized enough new jobs should be created to make a significant dent in unemployment—now 5.5 percent of the labor force, or around 4 million people. Fulfillment of the hopes should also result in a stepup in economic activity and a rise in Government revenues, perhaps enough to offset in major part, if not entirely, the large budget deficit which will be an immediate consequence of the tax cut.

The dangers, however, will be very much with us. One is that the rise in the deficit, unless accompanied by the most rigid Federal economy, will again set in motion that inflationary spiral which has been relatively inactive in recent years. Fortunately, President Johnson gives every indication that he intends to clamp down hard on Federal spending.

A second and perhaps greater danger is that the benefits of the tax cut will be wiped out by excessive boosts in wages and prices. A reactivation of the unused segment of our productive plant should tend to hold prices down. But there is no guarantee of this. The one certain thing is that stiff price increases, brought on by unwarranted wage rises, can speedily eat up the $9.2 billion in tax savings which will go into the pockets of the consumers in a full year. In this event, all of us will feel the lash of the inflationary demon.

Danger in Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks I have been calling attention to the problems in Cyprus. In accordance with that practice, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of February 27, 1964:

DANGER IN CYPRUS

As the vanguard of Soviet aviation experts arrives on Cyprus to set up a link with Moscow, some of the fog which has hung over that island is lifted.

The pattern beginning to emerge is alarming.

Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus, no longer appears as merely a fanatic pro-Greek who encourages his 80-percent majority to vent their hate by slaughtering the minority Turkish Cypriots. What he has said and done in the past few days has more the look of a conscious collaborator who has opened the door for a Soviet threat to the entire Middle East.

Makarios could well be the Castro of the Mediterranean.

Ever since the United States and Britain began trying to put the lid back on Cyprus' civil strife, Makarios has sabotaged every effort. He rejected a NATO peacekeeping force and a British Commonwealth force. Now he is refusing to go along with a United Nations force—which he had demanded—unless it includes disavowal of the treaty which gave Cyprus independence.

That treaty entitles each of Cyprus' three sponsors—Britain, Greece, and Turkey—to intervene on its own to keep the peace on the island. The current slaughter gives the Turks a reason for such intervention, protecting their kin.

The U.N. has no power to abrogate the treaty, but by Makarios' involving the world organization, the Soviet has sneaked into the picture. Creating an aviation link at the height of civil war is a transparent ruse.

It is no accident that Makarios' followers have been armed by the Soviet via Egypt. Neither is it chance that Soviet "air experts" arrived on Cyprus via Cairo. Nor is it a routine matter that Makarios has just increased the strength of his own armed force.

A look at the map shows that, from Cyprus, the Russians could prevent any interference while they accomplish their old dream of taking over the Mideast and its strategic oil.

It is not a dream now. The danger is real and present.

Depressed Cattle Prices and Their Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include my release of February 28, along with a letter to me from Arthur Deist, of Audubon, Iowa, and one from Mr. Delmar Goos, president of the Board of Education of the Carson-Macedonia Schools, expressing their concern and the widespread effect of depressed cattle prices.

My release and letters follow:

WASHINGTON.—Congressman BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa, said today that cattle feeders and Congress are taking the bull by the horns.

JENSEN said: "We are now fully convinced that the President, the State Department, and the Tariff Commission have agreed to do little or nothing to head off the flood of price depressing meat imports."

"There are many more consumers than cattle feeders," JENSEN said.

On February 25, 26 and 27, 17 House Members introduced identical bills, which provide for a 50-percent reduction of the average imports of all meats, canned, processed, and live, during the past 5 years. These Members are: BRAY and ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana; JENSEN, KYL, HOEVEN, and GROSS, of Iowa; LAIRD, SCHADEBERG, and VAN PELT, of Wisconsin; MCLOSKEY, of Illinois; QUILLEN, of Tennessee; WEAVER, of Pennsylvania; BEERMANN, of Nebraska; BERRY, of South Dakota; DON CLAUSEN, of California; HALL, of Missouri, and HARRISON, of Wyoming.

JENSEN reported that thousands of cattle feeders of the Midwest will meet at KMA Radio Station at Shenandoah, Iowa, at 10 a.m., March 2, to determine such action as is necessary to ward off further financial ruin.

BEEF PRODUCERS OF AUDUBON,
Audubon, Iowa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN: Have been listening to news on radio and I and beef producers of Audubon County are very happy to hear the stand you have taken on imports of meat and poultry and eggs on your bill up for legislation. Please don't take "No" for an answer from our "hogwash" fellows who run the imports. They had better wake

up before our country goes broke. How can we live without anything to do in our own country? If we would keep out beef and meat we could give more jobs and we could feed up more of our own grain in our own cattle. It would help in two ways, corn and meat. Do we have to look out for every country besides our own and let our meat producers go to the wall head first? If we don't get action soon we will come with force. We will not be fooled. Thanks again, BEN. We will depend on you as we have in the past.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR DEIST.

CARSON, IOWA,
February 28, 1964.

Mr. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: As president of the Board of Education of the Carson-Macedonia Community School District, I feel it is my obligation to write you in regard to the cattle feeder's plight in our area.

This not only is a financial blow to our farm community in regard to personal income, but we will be unable to meet the challenge of educating our children to meet the future problems of the world.

If it is true that only a small percent of beef is being imported; Why is U.S. beef ignored at the markets? Small percentages sometimes make large differences.

Being taxed to the hilt seems a poor way to build a stable economy when the farmer's income is cut to the bone. Why spend millions of tax dollars on the economy of other countries when our own economy is in danger? It doesn't seem reasonable to import meat with the excess we have, then turn around and pay grain storage fees for excess grain which could be used to fatten our own beef. For every head of imported beef we have 70 to 80 bushels of excess corn stored.

I don't believe cattle feeders want or expect legislation in the form of subsidies, for that is just money out of our own pockets and is no cure at all. What we do want understood is that the United States cattle feeder cannot compete against foreign beef with the price picture what it is in the United States today. Especially when they cannot compete if retail stores feature foreign beef the American public knows nothing about.

We have always felt you have done an able job for the people of southwest Iowa and we will continue to support you. I felt you should hear from us for we need a good farm economy to continue raising educational levels. I hope you will find it possible to enact some legislation to support the minority group farmers now find themselves in.

Very truly yours,

DELMAR GOOS.

Children Have a Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the Congress we must all have an abiding concern with respect to the health and welfare of our armed services. I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a very noteworthy endeavor of the Air Force Aid Society program CHAP—Children Have a Potential—benefiting the handicapped children of Air Force personnel. About 9 million children in the United States under 21 are physically and mentally handicapped. At least 100,000 of these handicapped are children of Air Force personnel. Unfortunately, many service families do not have the financial means to care for retarded children. CHAP offers financial assistance in the important medical research for greater enlightment and treatment of their afflictions as well as to carry out a specialized education program.

The program is administered at base level by the Family Services Advisory Council. The Family Service Committee, with the aid of both Air Force medical personnel and voluntary civilian doctors, have been making a careful survey of the problem. The Air Force Aid Society does not propose to relieve a family of the responsibility of caring for a handicapped child. But, in addition to a firm medical program, they do propose to assist in educating the child by either sending him to a school for the handicapped or establishing such a school if the number of children on a base warrants it. In this education endeavor alone since 1962 CHAP has assisted 663 children at the cost of $121,307.

In addition, through the Henry H. Arnold Educational Fund, the Aid Society furnishes scholarship aid for Air Force children, whose parents would not otherwise be able to send them to college. In the academic year 1962–63, 570 scholarships were awarded. This year approximately 800 children are benefiting from the program, at the cost of $227,218 in grants and $198,906 in loans.

On the 10th of February, the First Annual Air Force Ball was held in New York City to benefit this very worthwhile Air Force Aid Society—CHAP—program. Due to tremendous personal effort in behalf of the committee members, united interest of leaders of commerce, industry, publishing, banking, the communications industry, and patriotic organizations, the ball was a great financial success. This action and others similar to it appeal to everyone with a heart and conscience, and deserves the attention of the Members of Congress to point out whenever possible the great need for concern with respect to the health and welfare of the handicapped children of our armed services personnel.

How the News of the Asassination Was Received at Lakeside School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under the impact of shock and emotion there were many public utterances made by prominent persons immediately following the announcement of President Kennedy's tragic assassination which in the light of the full facts may well have been regretted. I refer to the false assumption that extremist groups were responsible. Too many people jumped to too many conclusions too quickly.

However, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Dexter Strong, headmaster of Lakeside School in my congressional district, were not such and remain today as a superb example of how a disciplined and educated mind can react calmly, dispassionately and yet with deep feeling in an hour of crisis.

In reading the school's paper I came across this account of how the news of the assassination was received together with the words of Mr. Strong to the student body on that day of great national tragedy. The article entitled "Memorial Service Held," speaks for itself and under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herewith:

MEMORIAL SERVICE HELD

News of the President's death by assassination reached the school shortly before first lunch and was announced immediately. At 2:30, the entire school assembled in the chapel for a brief service, conducted by Mr. Strong.

The text of his address follows:

"The morning has been so much like a bad dream that I thought it wise for us to convene for a few minutes, if only to come to grips with reality.

"The facts are by no means all before us yet, but the ones we know clutch at both our hearts and minds like cold and bony hands. John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, is dead, shot down by an assassin.

"Our first reactions are those of shock and disbelief. Perhaps mercifully, man finds it almost impossible to comprehend fully an event of this kind at the first instant. In fact, for moments it seems to go away. We turn to the telephone, or to lunch, or to the desk, and come back a minute later thinking perhaps it was all a nightmare. But it is not. Starting right now, we must each of us, as Americans or simply as human beings, absorb it, assess it, and act upon it.

"After the shock our first conscious reaction must be a personal one. A young woman has been widowed, two children left fatherless, and an older Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy, who have already lost one son in war, have lost another. Certainly our thoughts and prayers are with them.

"I hope we know soon who the assassin is. I say this not because I thirst for his punishment, but because, until we know who he is, we cannot really have a full understanding of where we are. Guiteau, the man who shot President Garfield, was a disappointed officeseeker, mentally unbalanced and acting on his own. Czolgosz, McKinley's assassin, was also a loner. In Lincoln's case, almost a hundred years ago, the situation was more serious, not only because, as the Civil War came to an end, the country was at a crisis in its history, but because Booth was part of a larger conspiracy.

"If this man is caught, there are three possibilities, none of them pleasant. He may be insane or some kind of crackpot. We would deplore this, but we could understand it. He might be the agent of a conspiracy of the extremists on either wing. Even this I think we could cope with, directly and promptly. Far more difficult to face will be a discovery that he has acted as a result of the bitterness and hate that have crept into our political life. If this is the case, then, we, as a nation, should indeed look to the soundness of our political health.

"You will discover soon, if you have not already done so, that there will be another development almost immediately, the cold

assessment of what this does to the whole political structure. One can assume, I am sure, that the first reaction of the people all over the world will be the same as ours, shock and sympathy, but there will be many who will begin at once to think of how this will affect them personally. The stock market closed at once for fear of panic. Imagine the political evaluation going on in the minds of a Nixon, or an appointee of Roberty Kennedy, or a Democratic Congressman. Perhaps, for a few days, political maneuvering will be kept behind the scenes, but I warn you that it will begin soon, and much of it will seem to you callous and calculating.

"One thing we have to fear is fear. When President Franklin Roosevelt died in office, the sense of loss was more profound because we were still at war and so many people in the country had never known any other President than Roosevelt. We soon found that the best words to remember were his own, the ones he used in 1933, when he told us that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself.

"One of the greatest virtues of our form of government is that, in a crisis like this, the authority of the Presidency passes peacefully and quickly to new hands. The Constitution provides the plan, and the spirit of the people supports the transition. Lyndon Johnson has already taken the oath of office and is no longer Vice President. He is the President of the United States.

"If we are good citizens, then our thoughts about John F. Kennedy were aimed, during his political career, at his decisions and his judgments and the way he performed the duties of President of the United States. Our praise was not aimed at the office, nor was our blame aimed at the office. So it must be now. The office of the Presidency goes on, and I trust that we will all continue to respect that office. In due course, Mr. Johnson will have to deal both with his political friends and with his political opponents. For the moment it is our duty to rally behind both the man and the office.

"I have one last suggestion to make. Suspend judgment on John Kennedy and let history decide the part he has played in the fortunes of our country. There will be many who will not follow this advice. You will find the airwaves and the newspapers full of summaries of Mr. Kennedy's career, judgments on his successes and on his failures. I suggest we wait. We know now simply that he was a young and forceful man, a courageous fighter, and remarkably successful in the struggle of politics. But we cannot know for a long time, in full perspective, whether his administration has been good or bad for this country, whether his foreign policy has moved us toward peace or away from it, whether we are stronger or weaker as the result of his efforts. We can have our opinions but we cannot know—not yet.

"I trust that in a crisis of this kind we can all play our parts well, as citizens of the United States and as understanding and sympathetic human beings."

PRAYERS

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in whose hands are the living and the dead; we give Thee thanks for all those Thy servants who have laid down their lives in the service of our country. Grant them Thy mercy and the light of Thy presence, that the good work which Thou has begun in them may be perfected.

Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from bitterness and hate, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endure with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. Amen.

The Lord's Prayer, followed by the benediction.

Too-Obliging Retailers and the Credit Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous clippings of an article which appeared last Sunday, February 23, in the Chicago Tribune, written by Joseph D. Hutynan of United Press International, discussing the problem of credit addiction among purchasers who cannot resist deceptively easy credit terms they cannot really afford. Mr. Hutynan, who frequently covers the activities of the Committee on Banking and Currency for UPI, has captured the essence of this problem in his excellently written article, and I am happy to call it to the attention of the House, as follows:

TOO-OBLIGING RETAILERS AND THE CREDIT ADDICTS—CONGRESSWOMAN HAS A PLAN TO CURB BOTH

(By Joseph D. Hutynan)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Representatative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, is worried about a new kind of addict—the one whose eyes become glazed at the sight of a credit charge plate.

He (or she) is the daring consumer who is buying a $700 stereo on credit in one store while another store is back home repossessing his refrigerator.

His main problem: Merchants keep filling his life with unlimited credit—and he just forgets to say "when."

Mrs. SULLIVAN, who heads the House Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, calls this problem buyer the "credit addict."

"The credit addict is a very serious problem," she said in an interview, "because he gets in over his head, declares personal bankruptcy, and then the stores raise prices to collect his debts—from you and me."

Federal court records show that the number of personal bankruptcies shot up from 53,136 in 1954 to an estimated 175,000 during the current fiscal year. Consumer installment credit has skyrocketed to $53,700 million—up about 130 percent from 10 years ago.

Mrs. SULLIVAN says the Nation's economy, with its no-money-down buying opportunities, must take much of the blame for credit addiction.

She is not opposed to credit buying, but believes sloppy credit policies of merchants exploit the weaknesses of some consumers, turn them into credit addicts, and raise a serious economic problem.

Mrs. SULLIVAN offers this program for taking the credit addict out of circulation.

Methods for investigating credit ratings must be improved. She said that the chronic buyer may be delinquent on 10 accounts but usually keeps 2 paid up for reference purposes, and stores seldom check beyond the 2.

Business or Government should set up a national credit agency to provide detailed information on all consumers. She says existing local bureaus do not delve deep enough into the consumer's background.

State legislatures should outlaw the garnishing of wages—the act of going into court and claiming part of an employee's salary for an unpaid debt. Said Mrs. SULLIVAN: "If the merchant is stopped from resorting to this, he may be a little more careful about extending credit."

Congress should pass a credit disclosure bill requiring merchants to show exactly how much interest is charged on credit purchases. Mrs. SULLIVAN said this would deter the buying impulse.

Schools and parents should spend more time teaching young people to be responsible consumers.

Biggest Farm Subsidy Payments Go to Small Percentage of Prosperous Large-Scale Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appears in the March issue of the Reader's Digest. Dr. Edward Higbee is the author of it.

The article follows:

FAREWELL TO THE SMALL FARM

(By Edward Higbee)

(NOTE.—Edward Higbee, Ph. D., was from 1938 to 1946, soil conservationist and senior agronomist in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and is a recognized authority in the field. He has served as consultant to a number of South and Central American governments, and is today professor of land utilization at the University of Rhode Island.)

Government subsidies have proved to be more of a stimulant to big agriculture than an aid to the small farmer. In fact, subsidies are helping the small farmer to become a surplus commodity.

Our farm-subsidy program—underwriting crop prices, controlling the acreage planted, and taking land out of production—now costs U.S. taxpayers $5 billion a year, and is a colossal failure.

The program cannot succeed because it fails to come to grips with this fundamental fact: U.S. agriculture is in the midst of a technological revolution which is rapidly transforming farming into big business, requiring large capital, extensive acreage, expensive machinery, and astute business management. The impact of this revolution is making the traditional small farm obsolete, and eliminating the need for subsidy program.

The subsidy program was begun as a device to help bring the income of low-producing farmers up to a "parity" with other groups in our society. But today the astonishing fact is that the biggest subsidy payments go to a small percentage of prosperous, large-scale operators—already better off than most taxpayers who are footing the bill. Meanwhile, low-income farm families get little, if any, support.

President Eisenhower recognized this aspect of price-support programs when he commented to Congress: "The chief beneficiaries of our price-support policies have been the larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports."

WHAT IS A FARMER?

On the basis of production there are three major groups of American farms. In the last sensus year (1959) there were 800,000 farms in the first group, marketing commodities worth anywhere from $10,000 to $500,000 or more annually. These are the successful and highly successful farms. Though they make up only 22 percent of the total number of farms, they produce 72 percent of all crops and livestock, and they get the lion's share of the subsidy payments.

In the second and larger group are the 1,300,000 farms—35 percent of the total—that market commodities worth from $2,500 to $10,000 a year. The operators of these farms are largely depressed. Their average net income from farming was only $1,740 in 1959. But they earned an average of $1,816 outside agriculture, and as a group are already more than halfway out of farming.

In the third group are the 1,600,000 farms—43 percent of the total—which market produce worth more than $50 and less than $2,500 a year. Their whole output is barely more than 5 percent of the national total. Their operators average only $217 net income from agriculture, while averaging $2,884 from other sources. The majority of these farmers are part timers, retired men, or hobbyists; others are impoverished rural people who if they were in the cities would be on welfare.

A lot of the concern about the poor farmer stems from thinking of this third class as real farmers. But to class them as such is like lumping children's lemonade stands in with supermarkets; on that basis the whole grocery business would look so sick that even the A. & P. would qualify for Federal aid.

It is understandable that the farmers in these last two groups clamor for Federal help. It is understandable, too, that their voices are heard, for together they make up 78 percent of U.S. farmers. But—and this is the thing our farm programs have never recognized—subsidies cannot save them. They produce such a small part of the national output that crop price supports add little to their incomes. The technological revolution has made them obsolete, surplus, as farmers.

ONE PLOW, $7,000

To get the full impact of the revolution in agriculture, come with me to one of the elite farms that produce at least $500,000 worth of commodities a year. (There are 1,200 in this category; 21,000 other farms have annual sales of between $100,000 and $500,000.) We see a huge diesel tractor with a four-bottom two-way plow that runs by night as well as by day. The tractor sells for $32,000 and the plow for $7,000—more than the total value of most farms in the middle group including all livestock and implements. But the machines are so efficient that an operator who has enough land cannot afford to be without them.

Now take a look at a mechanical cotton picker in action. It gathers as much fiber as 40 pairs of human hands. And look at that man baling and loading 10 tons of hay in an hour, sitting down; 20 years ago 2 men working with pitchforks couldn't have done that much in a whole afternoon.

In 1910, it took 147 man-hours to produce 100 bushels of corn; today some top farmers in the Corn Belt raise 100 bushels of corn with less than 4 hours of labor. Where once there were horse-drawn and mule-drawn implements, today there are tractors and airplanes. The latter are considered the most efficient spreaders of fertilizer and pesticides where large acreages require quick, uniform treatment.

EMPTY FARMHOUSES

But large-scale farming demands ever-larger capital investments and expanding acreage. As a result there has been a steady growth in size and value of farms, and a reduction in numbers. In 1935 there were 6,800,000 farms. In 1959 the number had shrunk to about 3,700,000—an average loss of 129,167 farms a year, 10,764 each month, 359 every day. Drive on any highway in the United States and you'll see proof: empty farmhouses and barns, former small farms that have been combined to make one large one. Prof. R. H. Blosser of Ohio State University has determined that the costs of growing corn can average $61 per acre on a 160-acre farm, but only $54 per acre on a 640-acre farm—a difference that can run one man out of business while paying a profit to another.

Against the mighty tide of the agricultural revolution we have a politically oriented, totally unscientific program of aid. When Congress passed the first bill calling for Federal participation in farm marketing affairs back in the 1920's, President Calvin Coolidge vetoed it with the remark: "Government price fixing, once started, has alike no justice and no end." But farm leaders soon got their way. Since then, regardless of which political party has been in power, the taxpayer has become increasingly committed to paying bigger subsidies.

The spending, which began as a temporary relief idea, has now gone into orbit and become the third largest item in the Federal budget—exceeded only by defense and interest on the debt. Over the decade 1952 to 1962, the total loss on commodity programs reached $22.1 billion. For 1961 alone the cost reached $5.2 billion. For 1963 it was nearly $5 billion.

WHO GETS THE MONEY?

In 1963 the Government support price on cotton was 31.7 cents a pound, on wheat $2 a bushel, on corn $1.25. These prices, based on what inefficient farmers require, were roughly double the cost of production by efficient mass production farmers. Such high support prices pull fresh capital into agriculture from outside sources, and thus help to pile up the surpluses.

And who gets the money? It goes mostly to those who need it least. For example, a group of 296 big cotton growers received more than $30 million in Government price-support loans on their 1960 crops—an average of $100,000 each. One producer, Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., received $1,236,000—and also qualified for $11,409 from the Government for reducing its corn acreage. This is an income subsidy—for one of the most progressive and prosperous segments of the national economy.

Meanwhile, there are the distressed farmers with their small production. The fact is that there is no reasonable way to raise their incomes as long as their share of the market continues to go down. The program of crop subsidies, acreage controls and price fixing cannot bring relief to those farmers who are without sufficient land, capital, and business ability to swim with the tide of the revolution.

What then is the solution? There is none that will not hurt some farmers and benefit others. We can sympathize with people who do not have capital to develop their land yet who cling to the soil "because we like farm life and we don't know what else to do." But they are trapped—no farm program can remedy their situation, and most of them know it.

The real solution is twofold: First, we must end all programs of agricultural price supports, price fixings, parity incomes, production subsidies and the soil bank. This would restore the free market to farm operations.

Second, we must help marginal farmers prepare for jobs in industry; this means we must encourage industrial growth so that there will be jobs for them. Truly, the most critical problem of our time is a deficiency of city jobs, not a surplus of farm production.

Meanwhile, third-class farmers, the 1,600,000 who average 13 times more income from off-farm sources than from agriculture should be dropped from consideration as genuine farmers. Eliminating them from the official farm family is not a heartless suggestion. These people serve only as padding in a census of agriculture. For the majority of them farming is a sideline. The few who really need jobs would be better off in industry, where someone else can supply the capital to create satisfactory opportunities.

Ending the futile subsidy-and-controls program would save the American taxpayers more than $5 billion a year. And it would accomplish two desired aims with one stroke: it would do away once and for all with the myth that price supports can be of real help to the small farmer, and it would signalize that at long last American agriculture had come of age, that it is a vigorous and self-sustaining factor in American life.

A Government-Business Team That Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1964, the Middle Tennessee Jaycees were host to Mr. Roy Gootenberg, Director, Office of Trade Missions, Bureau of International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce. Mr. Gootenberg's visit to Nashville was an unqualified success. He discussed with leading businessmen the Commerce Department's new program of sending distinguished American businessmen abroad to promote American products.

Recently, in the December 1963 issue, The Reader's Digest carried an article on the trade mission program. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues this article by Andre Fontaine entitled "A Government-Business Team That Works":

A GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS TEAM THAT WORKS

(By André Fontaine)

These new trade missions promise to increase U.S. exports and bind the Western world closer together through the powerful ties of free enterprise.

A California manufacturer of industrial machinery has more than a million dollars in new business with France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom, thanks to a new kind of teamwork between our Government and private business. Similarly, a Pennsylvania producer of petrochemical processing equipment is building a $4 million plant in India as a joint venture, and American publishers are selling paperback books in Malaya. The cost of the program to the taxpayers is negligible compared to the profits and the benefits to the free economy of the West.

This unusual business-Government cooperation was started by the Department of Commerce to help stop the drain of gold from the United States by increasing sales of U.S. products abroad. At the time, only one American manufacturer in 20 did any export business. To the smaller manufacturers, export business was too unknown and too involved with the red tape of licenses, foreign exchange and credit. Roy F. Gootenberg, appointed director of the program for the Bureau of International Commerce, set out to help businessmen overcome these obstacles. He has succeeded beyond his most optimistic hopes.

This is how the program works. Commerce Department field offices around the country ask businessmen in their areas what they'd like to sell. Soon proposals flow into Washington—one man has some used textile machinery he'd like to dispose of, another wants to sell a couple of tugboats, a third wants to license an agency to sell his auto brake linings. Meanwhile, reports from abroad show what products are needed where—Italy, for example, wants computers and automation equipment; Japan, machine tools.

Gootenberg and his staff now organize a trade mission composed of five or six businessmen and two men from the Department of Commerce. Mission members must meet tough qualifications; they must be expert in a specific business area; they usually have some experience in foreign trade; they must give promise of being good ambassadors. Moreover, they must have both time and money, for they receive no pay. The Government grants them only travel expenses and a living allowance of about $15 a day. Everything else comes out of the member's or his company's pocket. The average mission, Gootenberg figures, costs the Government $35,000 to $50,000, and each member $500 to $800, plus the salary he may lose for the 2 months away from his job. Nevertheless, there are always many more businessmen wanting to serve than there are assignments.

Once selected, the mission members come to Washington for what one has called "the best briefing I've ever had—and that includes intelligence briefings during the war." They receive a quick, thorough survey of the politics and economy of the countries they'll visit; a short course in export regulations and Commerce Department credit-checking facilities, how to work with an interpreter, how to conduct meetings with foreigners. They and the two men from the Commerce Department then fly to the host country, where U.S. Embassy and Commerce Department officials have been lining up businessmen with proposals they want to discuss.

The members of the American mission may not do business for themselves. Though every other country's trade missions are composed of men out to get orders for themselves, American mission members are ambassadors for all U.S. business, including their competitors. Robert Kell, for example, heads the Grey Hosiery Mills in Bristol, Va. On his mission to Greece last year he saw some business possibilities about which he informed two of his competitors. Both began negotiations for joint ventures with the Greek firms.

Often mission members' know-how helps not only U.S. businessmen but foreigners too. On a mission to the Philippines last fall Lester L. Wolff, food-marketing expert, saw where huge cattle ranches and vegetable farms had flourished until the Japanese destroyed them during the war. He knew that the Philippines, despite great resources, were not self-sufficient in food, that food stores were tiny, primitive and high priced. An idea took shape: why not start a completely integrated food operation, starting with revived ranches and farms, proceeding through slaughtering, packing, warehousing, trucking to eventual sale in supermarkets?

When he got back to the United States Wolff lined up a group of men with capital, and now a $50 million joint venture with Filipinos and Americans each investing half is in the offering. Wolff is confident it will make the islands more self-sufficient, lower food prices and bring profits to both U.S. and Filipino investors.

Often mission members, by being on the spot, can solve a problem that has frustrated both U.S. and foreign businessmen. One of the biggest textile manufacturers in Greece told Robert Kell he had ordered $3 million in textile machinery from a U.S. firm, but some hitch in Washington had been holding things up so long he was about to place the order elsewhere. Kell phoned the U.S. Embassy, which, in turn, phoned Washington. In 48 hours the hitch was cleared up and the contract signed.

"You have done us a wonderful favor," the Greek told Kell. "We wanted to buy the machinery from America, but were at the point where we couldn't wait any longer."

Trade-mission members offer foreign businessmen an unparelleled chance to broaden their knowledge. The mission to Italy last year included Ray Ellis, an electronics expert from Raytheon Co.; Eugene Grabbe, of Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., a specialist in computers; and Dean Burnett, of Leeds & Northrup Co., a graduate electrical engineer. All three visited Italian plants and gave freely of their knowledge. Burnett told the Italians about new furnaces used in America for heat treating metals. Grabbe told both steel and chemical manufacturers how they could improve productivity by using the latest developments in U.S. computers—and not only those made by his own firm. Ellis did a similar job in electronics factories.

On the other hand, mission members often broaden their own knowledge. On his return from a mission to the Netherlands early in 1963, Sam G. Adler, Jr., department store head from Savannah, Ga., told Gootenberg, "I found a shopping-service technique that's better than anything in this country. I'm going to copy it whole in my store, and I'm going to make money from it."

After they leave the host country, the trade missioners visit 10 to 12 U.S. cities to report to businessmen on what they have learned. Sometimes they bring back more business proposals than they took over.

One of the most notable jobs in getting other businessmen involved in export trade was done by Louis Spilman, editor and publisher of the Waynesboro, Va., News-Virginian. Spilman was on the mission to West Germany last year as an expert on printing machinery, but while there he kept in mind the industries of Waynesboro. When he got home he told the Virginia Panel Corp., which makes computer panels and had done export business only in England, about opportunities he'd noticed. The company is now selling its products in Germany also.

Spilman talked to executives of a General Electric plant that makes automatic-control equipment. As a result, the Waynesboro plant, together with another in Lynn, Mass., has established an export division in Germany to service the whole European Common Market.

He convinced chiefs of a Reynolds Metals plant they were missing a bet. They now are setting up an export department to sell aluminum products in Germany. He was also asked by Germans to find an automatic fresh-egg-vending machine they could buy—he did—and a particular kind of rustproofing material—he did. All this was a far cry from printing machinery.

The purpose of the missions is, of course, to get those who have never done any export trade to start. It seems to work. The Malco Fabrics Co., of Brockton, Mass., had never done any export business when Dan Matthews, its president, whent to the Boston meeting held by missioners to Greece. He heard a business proposal that interested him, got in touch with the Greek firm and completed a profitable deal. He wrote Gootenberg, "Without the help of your department I doubt we would have entered the export market at all."

Another executive told Gootenberg what the mission program had done for his company: "Less than 5 years ago our exports amounted to approximately 6 percent of our domestic business. Today, with joint ventures in Italy, Israel, and Mexico, our total international sales equal 33 percent of our domestic business. We're aiming for 100 percent."

Every businessman I have talked with is excited about the program. Over and over they tell the same story: foreign businessmen are eager to get American products and American know-how. But there is more than a vision of new business in their enthusiasm. They are proud of their part in a program that is binding the Western world closer together through the powerful ties of free and flourishing enterprise.

Address by the Honorable Luther H. Hodges Before North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, our distinguished Secretary of Commerce, delivered a splendid address Saturday night, February 29, 1964, at a dinner given by the North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce at Gastonia, N.C., honoring three outstanding young men in North Carolina.

I was privileged to attend the dinner and hear Secretary Hodges speak. It is my feeling that the Members of the House will find his address most interesting, and under previous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE NORTH CAROLINA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, GASTON COUNTY YMCA, GASTONIA, N.C., 8 P.M., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1964

It is a pleasure to be able to join the North Carolina Jaycees in honoring these three outstanding young Tar Heels. To each of them, I etxend my warmest congratulations.

We need more of these dynamic young leaders in North Carolina and in the Nation. I hope all of the members of your junior chambers of commerce throughout the State will be inspired by their examples of personal achievement and community service. I hope this banquet will imbue your organization and your membership with a new determination to make the most of the challenges that are facing us at every level of our social, economic, and political life. I would like to discuss briefly one of these national problems.

President Lyndon Johnson, in his state of the Union message declaring war on poverty, said:

"Poverty is a national problem, requiring improved national organization and support. But this attack, to be effective, must also be organized at the State and local level and supported by State and local efforts."

The problem of poverty in the United States, in one sense, is unlike the poverty problem of the world. In the first place, what is considered poverty here would be looked upon as relative affluence in many parts of the world.

But this does not make it any less painful and demoralizing to be poor in America. On the contrary, it is much easier to bear poverty when everyone else is poor. It is less degrading and less frustrating than to live in a wealthy society and be unable to give your family a decent living—by the standards of the society they know.

There is no denying some of the harsher facts of the poverty that exists in our country.

There is real privation in a family with six or more children trying to live on less than $2,000 a year. That's less than $39 a week with which to feed, clothe, house, educate, pay the doctor bills, and do all the necessary things for six or more growing children. And, right now, there are more than 1 million American children living in such families.

These youngsters are deprived of the opportunity to live an American childhood, and they are very likely to grow up lacking both the skills and the motivation to earn more than $39 a week for their own children. Much of the poverty that remains in this affluent society of ours is self-perpetuating poverty.

These 1 million youngsters are among the 35 million Americans who live in families receiving less than $3,000 a year or live alone on less than $1,500 a year. Altogether, there are more than 11 million children living in the 9 million poor families.

The choice of these income figures to define poverty is necessarily somewhat arbitrary. It ignores nonmoney income, such as the food grown on a farm or in a family garden. It is also a fact that it costs less to live in rural North Carolina, for example, than in a big city, such as Chicago.

But there is no doubt that the really poor in our society must be numbered by the tens of millions. The Bureau of the Census in the Commerce Department is the world's greatest authority on population statistics, and one of the Bureau's experts has calculated how many people have so little income that they can qualify for welfare assistance under the laws of the State where they live. By this minimum yardstick, nearly 24 million Americans are poor.

In our city slums, in our rural sharecropper shacks, in the camps of migrant workers, on our Indian reservations, around long-closed mine shafts, there is real privation, frustration, and degredation. There is disease and delinquency and crime. There is poverty that is real and painful and seemingly hopeless.

Yet, unlike most of the world, the United States has the resources to provide a decent standard of living for all of its people.

Never before in human history has a nation been capable of generating the enormous amounts of wealth we can now produce in the United States. In the last 3 months of 1963, our total production of goods and services reached the almost incredible rate of $600 billion a year. This is an increase of $100 billion from the level 3 years earlier. It is an addition to our gross national product equal to twice the gross national product of Japan.

Seventy million Americans had jobs last year, and average earnings in manufacturing rose for the first time above $100 a week.

Corporate profits also set alltime records—totaling $52 billion before taxes and $27 billion after taxes. And the after-tax rate for earnings at the end of the year was more than 50 percent above the recession low 3 years earlier.

Perhaps the best measure of our Nation's well-being—per capita personal income—set a new mark last year. By the end of 1963 it has climbed to an annual rate of $2,500—or about $300 more per American than in the early months of 1961.

Nineteen sixty-three was the best year in history for most Americans, and 1964 is going to be even better. The largest Federal income tax cut in our history will, in a few days, begin to pour $800 million a month into consumers' pockets, as an immediate result of the reduction in tax withholding. And, when the full $11½ billion tax reduction comes into effect, it will add, year after year, an estimated $35 to $40 billion more gross national product, $25 to $30 billion more consumption, and $5 to $7 billion more in business profits. I witnessed the signing of this tax bill in the White House on Wednesday last and it was an historic occasion.

We have a country which can afford to begin the final assault on poverty and inequality of opportunity among its people. We have the productive capacity, and with the tax cut we should move rapidly toward a full employment economy. But, as we move to this new, high ground in our economic history, we find that the problem of America's poor is not fundamentally unlike the poverty problem in other countries.

It is estimated that $11 billion more income each year would raise all of our poverty-stricken families out of that category. This is not a large sum in our economy. Last year the personal income of the American people totaled $463 billion.

But an $11 billion dole, which we could easily afford as a nation, would not solve our U.S. poverty problem—any more than doles would solve the problem of poverty in India or other underdeveloped countries.

The fundamental problem of the underdeveloped countries is to develop the productive capacities of their people; it's a problem of human resource development.

This has been illustrated in Japan, which has always had very meager natural resources and which saw much of its industry destroyed in World War II. Yet the Japanese have been able to rebuild their country and increase their national wealth by an amazing 10 percent a year, because they are a well educated and highly motivated people. Most of them have the skills demanded by a modern industrial society and they are willing to work hard to build a better life for themselves and their children.

Our problem is not essentially different. If we are to break the cycle of poverty in which millions of Americans are trapped, we must help them and their children—especially the children—develop their individual capacities to do work which will earn them decent livelihoods.

There are those, of course, who cannot be helped to become productive members of society. Some are too old, and their most urgent need is for assistance in paying their hospital and medical bills.

Others are totally disabled or mentally incompetent. And these can be helped only with sympathetic care and support—in their families and in their communities, utilizing what ever public and private resources are necessary.

But many of our elder citizens want to work and can do useful work. Their mental health as well as their slim pocketbooks require more opportunities for part-time and full-time work.

And there are millions who suffer from some physical or mental handicap who need not be barred from productive employment, forced to accept public or private charity, and denied their personal dignity and sense of individual worth. With proper rehabilitation and training they can earn their way.

There are even more Americans whose poverty is due not to age or to physical impairment:

Farmers whose eroded soil and mule and plow have no place in today's highly mechanized agriculture.

Miners whose picks and shovels have been replaced by powerful cutting and digging machines.

Women who cannot work because there is no place to leave their small children while they are on the job.

Negroes who lack adequate education and training, or if they have the education, are barred by discrimination from jobs that pay decent wages.

These are some of the elements of this national problem—and national disgrace—of poverty amid the riches of America.

But, as the President has pointed out, there can be no exclusively national solution to this problem. The attack must be carried out in our local communities, in virtually every community and State in the Nation.

For southerners the local responsibilities are especially heavy. Our region has nearly half of the Nation's poor.

Our southern Negro citizens have not been able to realize their full productive potential. We have tended to small farms and low-skilled industries. And our educational effort has not been adequate to the needs of an industrial society.

Here in North Carolina, according to the last census, two-fifths of our families fall in the poverty category, rather than the one-fifth that is the national average.

Forty percent of North Carolina's 1 million families earned less than $3,000 in 1959, the income year covered by the 1960 census. About 150,000 of these were Negro families and 250,000 of them were white. And, of the quarter of a million North Carolinians who live alone, 60 percent had incomes of less than $1,500.

For nearly one out of every four North Carolina families counted in the 1960 census, the family income was less than $2,000 a year. That means nearly a quarter of a million tar heel families whose earnings averaged less than $39 a week.

Western North Carolina is part of the great Appalachian region, which contains many prosperous communities, but which is essentially a large underdeveloped country of some 16 million people. In this area, illiteracy runs up to 30 percent of the population of some counties. For the area as a whole, 1½ million in the 9 million persons over 25 are unable to read and write.

What's more important today, however, is not the number of people who cannot read and write, but the number of people who can, yet are "functionally illiterate." These are the people whose elementary language skills are so inadequate that they are unable, for example, to pass the mental qualification examinations of the selective service program.

No one would contend that fully one-third of our North Carolina young men are mentally deficient. Yet in 1962, 34.1 percent of them failed the Selective Service's mental qualification test.

This is a reflection, not upon the inherent ability of our people, but upon the quality of the education we have been giving our youth.

We ranked 43d among the States with our 34.1 percent failing to pass the mental qualification test. Virginia was ahead of us, with 29.9 percent rejected. South Carolina was at the bottom of the list with 51.8 percent rejected.

Contrast these figures with 2.7 percent rejected in Minnesota and 4.6 percent in Nebraska.

Yet North Carolina's State government ranks third in the Nation in the percentage of its revenue devoted to education. In

Nebraska, the State pays only 6 percent of its total public school costs. In North Carolina, the State pays 70 percent.

I think this suggests that we must do a better job of arousing support for our public schools at the local level. Our people must realize that even greater sacrifices must be made if we are to develop North Carolina's human resources to the fullest; if all of the youth of the State is to have an education adequate to our times.

The large number of young men failing the selective service tests points up the possibility of doing something about their deficiencies at the point of detection. Instead of sending these young men home to stumble ill-prepared through life, perhaps we should put them in special training programs through the military services or some other public organization.

If we continue to accept the existence of large numbers of young men who are not qualified to help defend their country, we saddle ourselves with large numbers of men who will be of little value to our economy, or to themselves, in our modern technological society.

The State of North Carolina is pioneering in the development of new approaches to these difficult educational and social problems that breed poverty and hold back the development of the State. Governor Sanford's work in establishing the North Carolina Fund, which is mobilizing private grants for special education projects, is a very exciting development. So is his effort to help North Carolinians work together to provide equal job opportunities for our Negro citizens.

The present strength of our economy and the bright outlook for the future sets the stage for what could be a new economic and social era for the American people. We can now begin with determination the long overdue rescue effort on that one-fith of our American families still living in relative poverty.

We have the wealth, we have the talent, and we have the opportunity to move ahead with a realistic program to wipe out poverty in the United States. All we need is the determination to do it. All we need is enough people willing to take the leadership in this realization of the American dream.

I'd like to challenge you here tonight to help out in our social and educational problems—at the local, State, or National levels—wherever you can best serve.

Each of you is properly ambitious. Each of you wants to make a success, and most of you will, I fervently hope. But position and money will mean little to you in the long run unless in your hearts you know that you have served others as individuals or groups—unless you have served your community or your government.

Jaycees are made up of a marvelous lot of folks like you and the future of this great State and this great country are assured if you mix a little sentiment and charity and public service with your work.

By your active participation in the Jaycees, you have marked yourselves as potential community leaders. It is up to you to take hold of these difficult problems and, working with others in your communities, give of the best of yourselves for your fellow men and your country.

These are exciting times in which to live. We have probably never faced more problems, but I am sure we have never had greater potential for solving them.

Our greatest resource is young people like you. If you face up to the challenges before you, there is nothing America need fear, nothing America cannot do to set an example for the world of freedom, justice, and prosperity for all.

Thank you.

Robin Hood War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Washington Industries is disseminating a compilation of the National Industrial Council which discloses among other facts that there are 13 Federal Government civilian employees for each 1,000 of the 190 million Americans. The suggestion made was that there be less Government spending and more Government economy in order to make the recent tax cut meaningful.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 2.5 million Federal Government payroll there are others who contribute to the cost of Government. All in all, 30 million people, or almost 150 persons of each 1,000 Americans receive regular direct checks from the Federal Government, and millions more get side benefits or are employed in programs in which the Government has a dominant financial hand.

For example, the Armed Forces total 2.7 million which is 14 persons for every 1,000 Americans. Also, there are 6.8 million people on relief which represents more than 35 persons out of every 1,000 Americans. There are 13 million people who are recipients of farm program benefits and there are 8.4 million persons getting Government surplus foods.

These statistics, it is true, indicate the cause of the evergrowing size and cost of the Federal Government. There are now only 5 non-Government workers for every one Government worker. However, in the face of President Johnson's unconditional war on poverty in America the answer to cutting down on the Federal payroll in reality is stopping new programs. I refer to programs that have never been acted on by Congress and other requests of the President for new programs. In the President's plan to conquer poverty billions of dollars and thousands of new Federal employees are involved.

As for poverty, experience proves it will increase if the line is not held on Federal spending because on the heels of the recent $11 billion tax cut there is a very serious danger of a loss in buying power of wages and also pensions, social security payments and everything of value that is payable in dollars.

President Johnson said on January 15 to some senior citizens, "We are going to try to take all of the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the 'haves' and give it to the 'have nots' that need it so much."

I do not think that is the proper answer to poverty anymore than Robin Hood had the solution in his day. One danger of fighting poverty is inflation. Prosperity can never be created by Federal deficit spending. Instead it will create more poverty than we presently have if a policy of increased Government spending is not stopped.

Is the war on poverty what is intended? Or are we in a battle of winning an election next November? Robin Hood was popular with the people, but he never raised their standard of living.

Safe for Diversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include a pertinent analysis of our present ridiculous foreign policy written by Dr. Robert Morris.

Dr. Morris' article follows:

SAFE FOR DIVERSITY

(By Robert Morris)

U Thant, the Secretary General of the U.N., said in January: "The war we have to wage today has only one goal and that is to make the world safe for diversity."

Our late President in his important American University speech said: "And if we cannot end our differences, at least we can help to make the world safe for diversity."

President Johnson's first state of the Union message read: "For our ultimate goal is a world without war, a world made safe for diversity."

Two days later Dean Rusk said: "The reality of a world of great diversity with many centers of power and influence is coming into better focus."

"Diversity" in their context, of course, is the difference between communism and liberty as we have known it. When the United States guarantees a world safe for diversity, it is assuring the leaders of the Soviet Union that it is working for a world safe for communism, at least to the extent that it now exists. It is certainly an abandonment of the traditional American policy of the extending of liberty and freedom. It is an official embrace of "peaceful coexistence."

But it does not take this analysis of the use of the "safe for diversity" phrase to demonstrate that the State Department has surrendered the goal of "victory" in the world struggle. Our official policy, as we have written before in this column, is to work for a merger with the Soviet Union under the framework of the United Nations. Our policy planners call it our "convergence policy." This "safe for diversity" tag is a more euphemistic way of saying what might arouse the American people to the true nature of our policy.

A glance around the world, and at the home front, quickly reveals that we are not making the world safe for diversity in the conventional sense of that word. Only Communist diversity is being extended.

For instance, when President Tshombe disagreed with the U.N. and our State Department on the degree of autonomy within a Congolese Federation, he became the object of U.N. jets and mortars supplied by U.S. Globemasters.

Here in the United States, dissenters from our executive policies are equated with "hatred," and a prominent columnist has

written that 21 million American belong in mental institutions because of their views.

Meanwhile, Khrushchev must be jubilant with all these assurances. He "never had it so good."

He has assured Mao Tse-tung in these words, on July 14, 1963: "We (the Soviets) fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but we are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

Despite these and other assurances and despite the patent collaboration between the two partners in crime in Cuba, Zanzibar, Yemen and in other Soviet target areas, our so-called experts keep accentuating the "complete" split between the two. Only in this way can they rationalize for the American people what are obvious defeats being sustained in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Zanzibar, continental Africa, Cyprus, Brazil, British Guiana and, indeed, all over Latin America.

Thus, while we work to make Khrushchev's diversity safe, he works to eliminate the diversity between us.

A Visit to Arlington Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1964, the UAW-GM subcouncil delegates paid a visit to the graveside of our late, lamented President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

This expedition to Arlington National Cemetery was the highpoint of a union business meeting which was held in Washington at that time. Many of the members who attended were deeply touched by the following prayer. After it was called to my attention by several members of this group from Bristol, Conn., who were at the meeting, I thought that I would like to share it with my colleagues who remember, as I do, and as all Americans do, the wonderful man who was our 35th President:

OUR PRAYER

In the short time John F. Kennedy led us as our Nation's President, he instilled vision that enabled us to see a brighter, more secure future for all, thought that made clearer our purposes under Your guidance, leadership that gave hope and inspiration for peace, and he worked endlessly to free the minds and hearts of mankind everywhere.

As we stand here, Father God, at his final resting place, we ask Your guidance and inspiration in carrying on Your work as did President Kennedy so that we as a people and a world continue to move forward as he moved us forward: to a growing, strengthened peace, to brotherhood and fellowship between all people, to a clearer vision of those things which are amiss in our social and economic order, to the lasting will to go on working to correct them, and to help all those who suffer wrong and hardship in any way.

Bring solace to his widow and children and the other loved ones of his family who, more keenly than we, mourn his passing.

All this we ask, according to Your will, in this, our prayer.

Cattlemen Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, unfair, low-cost production of foreign beef dumped on the U.S. market can wreck our dynamic beef cattle business.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at the 67th Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association meeting at Memphis, Tenn., on January 29, 1964. I urge the Congress to earnestly consider these resolutions:

IMPORTS—1

Whereas imports on beef are at an all-time high; and

Whereas these heavy imports are seriously depressing our domestic cattle markets; and

Whereas a portion of these imports is of primal cuts which severely damage our domestic price structure; and

Whereas the production potential of beef in certain countries exporting beef to the United States is virtually unlimited; and

Whereas the American producers and feeders are obligated to pay high fixed costs associated with labor, land, local, and Federal taxes and other expenses over which he has no control, which are higher than those of his foreign counterpart; and

Whereas the stability of the American beef industry is essential to the growth and welfare of the entire American economy in all States; and

Whereas continued price depression will inevitably result in removal of capital from the United States to foreign points with concurrent employment losses; and

Whereas the American producer taxes himself to develop an expanded market for his product; and

Whereas in recent years the foreign producer has benefited from our expanded market out of proportion as compared with the benefits derived by our domestic suppliers; and

Whereas quotas so large as to be disastrous to the American producer and feeder, and unacceptable to the American public, may well set into motion restrictive forces which in the long run will have unfavorable impact upon exporting countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association in convention at Memphis, Tenn., January 29, 1964, recommend to the Congress, the State Department, and the Department of Agriculture that quotas on imports of beef and beef products into the U.S. ports of entry be established with principal exporters at levels substantially less than those in recent years; and be it further

Resolved, That composition of imports be considered so as to embrace in future quotas cooked and cured meats and sharp reduction in importation of primal cuts; and be it further

Resolved, That should a growth factor be involved in any negotiations, it be at substantially less than the full amount, a provision to encourage the American producer on a continued basis to use his own funds, time and energies to develop the domestic market for beef and use of our surplus feeds; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Members of Congress, the Cabinet, and all affected agencies, government and nongovernment, together with heads of government of exporting countries.

IMPORTS—2

Whereas our present import duties on beef products are inadequate as a protection for our domestic cattle industry; and

Whereas the duties on beef and beef products are scheduled for consideration at the upcoming trade negotiations at Geneva this year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently request our negotiators at Geneva entirely to delete beef and beef products as items for consideration at the forthcoming negotiations.

LABELING

Whereas meat imports are becoming a substantial supply of our meat consumption; and

Whereas the American consumer needs to be made aware of the origin of such products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association in convention at Memphis, Tenn., January 29, 1964, demand that proper legislation be enacted to insure labeling of all imported meats and meat products as to their point of origin.

The Los Angeles Industrial Fair and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 5, and 6, 1964, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce is sponsoring the first Los Angeles Industrial Fair and Congress. More than 25,000 businessmen and industrialists from the Western United States are expected to attend this unique 3-day conference. The theme of the event will be the problems and opportunities of growth in southern California.

Sessions of the congress will focus on what business leaders can do to contribute to the orderly and mature growth of the southern California industrial community, management's responsibilities to higher education, industrial modernization and other topics.

The fair will exhibit many new consumer products which have been derived from space and defense research and development programs. Industrial products, equipment and services will be shown along with action displays and demonstrations. The winning entries in the industrial design competition will also be exhibited.

I commend Mr. Oscar T. Lawler, president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Knox Bourne, chairman of executive committee of the Industrial Fair and Congress and the many others who have worked so hard to make this event a success. Their efforts are an important contribution to the progress and prosperity of Los Angeles and southern California.

Steppingstones in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following article by Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, U.S. Air Force, commander, Space Systems Division—AFSC—which appeared in the September–October 1963 issue of Rendezvous. General Funk briefly reviews our space efforts and discusses some of the military implications of space exploration.

The article follows:

STEPPINGSTONES IN SPACE

(By Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, USAF, Commander, Space Systems Division (AFSC))

In reaching toward space, the United States has set its national sights on the biggest objective in its history.

While size in itself is not always a virtue, bigness has become characteristic of this Nation. From modest beginnings, men of bold spirit pioneered this country; men and women of courage and vision have persevered against every frontier—geographic, scientific, technical, and social—to make the United States the powerful nation it is today. And, to draw an obvious parallel, these same characteristics—boldness, strength, foresight and the flair for adventure—are the very attributes needed today in our effort to extend national capabilities into space itself.

Further, the word "bigness" becomes lost in the expanses of space, but only by thinking big, planning big, and doing big can we hope to make a dent in the vastness of space.

Yet there is no question but what we have made a dent—and a substantial one, at that—in cracking space barriers in the fewer than 7 years of the space age.

A simple statistical listing of U.S. space accomplishments since the military put Explorer I into orbit, in January 1958, will run more than 20 pages in a pocket-size book. We have completed Project Mercury on a high note of success, and we are heavily involved as a nation in the Gemini and Apollo programs which will lead us to the moon and enrich our space knowledge and experience.

I believe, therefore, that we can say in all honesty that we have made a good beginning in our technical assault on the unknown of space. To the present time we have been successful in putting more than 125 scientific vehicles into space. We have experience with gadgets designed to increase our knowledge of the space environment and with prototype systems aimed at the attainment of communication, navigation, observation, and meteorological space capabilities. Overall, we have multiplied our resources, enriched our technologies, and acquired the basic foundation of experience essential to the enlargement of new capability.

The economic effect of our space ventures also has become apparent in the first generation of the space age. In 1957, for example, the United States spent about $175 million for space purposes. In 1959 the figure was $862 million. In 1961 the space budget amounted to $1.8 billion. In first year 1963 the total exceeded $5 billion. The 1964 figures will be even larger.

By 1970 it is estimated that Government space expenditures may approach $14 billion annually. Further, when we consider the chain reaction that results from technological developments, it is not likely that the anticipated $70 to $80 billion to be expended in space programs over the next decade will represent but a fraction of the total economic impact on our Nation. Whole new industries are being created, and in these first years of the space age more than 150 examples of new products and new processes contributing to our social and physical welfare have been identified as resulting from space-related activities. I do not doubt that this figure will triple or quadruple during the next 10 years.

A U.S. business executive was quoted recently as predicting that the space-associated business may soon overtake the automotive industry as the largest in the world. In the same vein, it has been estimated that by 1970 the space industry will employ one out of every four scientifically and technically trained men in America.

Yet I am not surprised that people frequently ask: "Why do we want to go into space?" It is a valid question and to reply "Because it is there," is not a sufficient answer. Essentially, there are four good reasons for our interests in space. First, to increase national prestige, and the importance of this I am sure is evident; second, to acquire knowledge; third, to benefit human welfare; and fourth, to strengthen national security.

Naturally, we in the military are concerned primarily about defense and security, yet we recognize that all four reasons are related and—to some degree—interdependent, just as our civil and military space efforts are complementary and mutually productive. Vice President Johnson has put it this way: "The future of this country and the welfare of the free world depend upon our success in space. No one person, no one company, no one Government agency has a monopoly on the competence, the missions, or the requirements for the space program. It is and must continue to be a national job."

From the military view, of course, responsible as we are for the defense of the Nation, we in the Air Force recognize that space is a new dimension that may be of critical importance to our future security. Just as the airplane and the ballistic missile have altered military weapons and tactics in recent years, the progress of space technology has dictated that we again reappraise our military attitude and aptitude. At the same time, however, we must remember that mankind's entry into space has not changed the philosophy underlying our Nation's basic military strategy; namely, that if we want to preserve peace and freedom we must possess the capability and the determination to do so.

Gen. B. A. Schriever, who directed the Nation's ballistic missile development program and now heads the Air Force Systems Command, has put it this way: "There is the same obligation to counter aggression in space as there is on the land, on the seas, and in the atmosphere."

In other words, remaining strong enough and responsive enough to prevent war is still our job, and this capacity for effective deterrence is just as vital in the space age as in the air or missile age. The manner in which we can best assure this deterrence is the key question we face today. To answer the question and resolve any doubt, we must overcome the hazards and the hostilities of the space environment, we must cope with the costly business of gaining useful space experience, and we must—perhaps—rethink traditional ways of performing military missions.

One of the pressing problems to be solved is how to develop and employ effective space systems in a timely manner. We live in a day of fast-paced technological progress. It took 112 years to develop photography, 56 years for the telephone, 35 for the radio, 15 years for radar, 12 years for television, and 5 years for the transistor. Similarly, jet aircraft were more than a dozen years in the development stage, the atomic bomb took 6 years in a crash effort, and the ballistic missile was produced in just under 5 years.

This trend imposes on the military planner a new and demanding requirement for technical responsiveness. If we are going to plan, define, and produce systems that will not be overtaken by the events of time, technology, and circumstance, we must do more than simply compress development leadtimes. We must now, in fact, reduce our leadtime on foresight.

No crystal ball is over crystal clear, but we must discipline ourselves to look to the future both imaginatively and realistically, to seek fresh ideas, and—if necessary—to overhaul traditional ways of doing our jobs. At the same time we have to forecast the enemy's intentions, his capabilities, and his actions, gearing our own development schedules so that our technical superiority and aerospace leadership will be assured.

In the past we have tended to neglect the military applications of technology. This practice has not proved fatal, but it has been costly. Time in which to catch up is not likely to be a characteristic of any space-age conflict.

Progress is measured not by technology alone, but by the application of technology. In this respect direction must influence discovery, and decisions must get the same emphasis as developments.

In short, we are aware that we must decide where we are going, and we must begin to acquire deeper practical experience in our space ventures. This is fundamental to any effective military space posture we hope to fashion.

Of course, experimentation and exploration, as ends in themselves, are luxuries the military services can ill afford. We benefit heavily, therefore, from the investigative programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. But our goal is to transform space projects from expensive curiosities to useful, reliable, and economical military instruments. And to make such meaningful advances in the space arts we have to first gain experience, under realistic conditions.

To this end, we in the Air Force Space Systems Division are engaged in a five-point program * * * our "Stepping Stones" to space.

First, we are continually increasing the extent of our working partnership with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. While there are distinctions between military and non-military needs in space, just as there are in any realm, there are a great many areas of mutual concern and benefit between NASA and Department of Defense programs.

For example, whether we launch a satellite to inspect the space environment or examine another satellite, we must be skilled in launching techniques, in command and control, and—perhaps—in the recovery of the space vehicle. For whatever purpose we send man into space, we must be assured of his ability to survive there, to function there, and to return safely.

To date, the great majority—well over 90 percent, in fact—of U.S. space achievements have depended on the boosters developed by the military, and on the facilities and the support of the Air Force resources. In national space programs such as the Mercury orbital series, the Ranger projects and the Mariner Venus probe the Air Force has provided the boosters and conducted the launches. We have participated in the complicated ground-level work of matching payload to booster, of insuring the performance of booster, and—in the Mercury program—developing the astronaut safety system.

We now foresee a clear opportunity during the next several years, for the Air Force—in turn—to benefit from the use of certain payload vehicles developed by or for NASA. For

example, an agreement has been signed between the NASA Administrator and the Secretary of Defense which will insure the most productive use of the Gemini vehicle in the national interest. The purpose is to meet the needs both of NASA and the Defense Department without unnecessary duplication of effort. Gemini is the next step in the national lunar expedition program and will be used to demonstrate the feasibility of rendezvous in space. The Air Force, incidentally, will provide the Agena spacecraft (powered by the Bell Agena rocket engine) which will be the target vehicle for this orbital "get-together," and will provide the Titan II booster to place the Gemini capsule in orbit.

The partnership approach to the Defense Department's military space needs and NASA's nonmilitary responsibilities is a logical course to follow in the fulfillment of common space objectives. It is elemental to our mutual quest for space experience.

Second, we in the Space Systems Division intend to continue using existing technologies and available hardware to intensify our knowledge of the space environment, and to do so with particular attention on the military functions we seek to perform in space.

Generally, these near-term military space objectives fall into two classifications. On the one hand, we want systems that will lead to an improved overall U.S. military superiority irrespective of what actions any other nation may take in the use of space.

On the other hand, our interests must simultaneously be directed toward the development of those systems that may be required to counter, in a timely and effective manner, any actual or imminent strategic advantage an aggressor nation might acquire through the application of space technologies. The day might arrive, for instance, when our ability to counter a threat from space might prove decisive to free world security.

Third, in our five-point program, we must continue the vigorous development of those building blocks that add up to a sound and comprehensive space capability. The trend today is toward standardization and a narrowing of our space objectives. This is indicative of our growing maturity in the space business. In following this trend, our emphasis on "basics" certainly becomes even more important.

For example, the limited power of space boosters, derived as they have been from ballistic missile technologies, has cramped our ability to match the Soviets in the size and weight of their space spectaculars. In working to overcome this deficiency, we have followed a course which will enrich our national program with a family of standardized launch vehicles possessing not only sufficient power to meet our needs, but also versatile and flexible enough to serve a variety of military and civil needs along the entire space spectrum. The NASA Saturn series is designed to serve the sophisticated needs of scientific, exploratory space requirements. In the Air Force we are developing the Titan III standardized space launching system which, by mating the flight-proven Titan II with newly developed solid boosters, will provide a total lift-off thrust of more than 2 million pounds, enough to place 25,000 pounds into low-earth orbit. We are also engaged in the development of large solid propellant motors leading to a 260-inch diameter motor capable of 6 million pounds thrust.

This past July we passed an important milestone in this direction when a 120-inch solid propellant motor, built by the United Technology Center, was successfully test fired. This 250-ton motor, standing 75 feet tall on its static firing test pad, burned approximately 2 minutes and produced more than 1 million pounds of thrust.

Two of these motors will provide the lift-off power for the Titan III space launch system, and the research and technology inherent in their development will contribute to the even larger solids of the near future.

Fourth, our program calls for continued experience with those space programs that already have been proven feasible and beneficial. These—among others—include weather, communications, and navigational systems.

Our measure of success in these ventures, and an index to the rate of our overall space progress, can be deduced from an appraisal of the degrees of reliability we are attaining.

For example, last June 30 the 200th Thor was launched at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. In the course of the Thor's career it has achieved a 93-percent reliability record as a space booster. It has worked successfully in 108 of the 116 firings in which it was used in combination with various upper stages. And it has been 97 percent successful as a first stage booster for the Agena spacecraft.

In payloads, as in boosters, reliability rates are climbing. The 100th Agena satellite vehicle was launched this past July 12. It was the 78th to achieve orbit since the February 28, 1959, launch when an Air Force Agena become the first satellite to be placed in polar orbit.

Of 92 launches where the Agena separated from the booster and its rocket engine ignited as programed, 78 successfully attained orbit—a .947 batting average.

This average increased to .956 for the last 50 launches leading up to the Agena century mark.

And, in the recovery of satellites from orbit, we achieved a 75-percent success record last year and this rate has since improved even more.

We believe that these figures speak well not only of the success of our space activities, but indicate as well the quantity and the quality of the experience we are acquiring.

As for the fifth in our series of stepping stones, we consider it essential to devote our best scientific, technical, and managerial efforts toward solving such difficult problems as maneuvering in space, assuring safe reentry, accomplishing precise landing and reusing of space vehicles.

Because we think of space as an extension of atmosphere, it is easy to also think of space missions in terms of operations within the atmosphere. Yet, literally and figuratively, there is a "world" of difference. As an example: If half of a jet plane's weight was taken up by fuel, that plane could make approximately 15,000, 15 degree turns in the air. But a spacecraft with 50 percent of its on-orbit weight in fuel, traveling 17,000 miles per hour, could make only one 15 degree turn. Further, shifting direction in space means changing orbit. These are just a few of the difficulties we face in trying to solve the problem of maneuvering in outer space.

Similarly, reentering the atmosphere at high velocities from space means we have to cope with severe problems of heating; to assure precise reentry and landing for a space glider such as the X-20 Dyna-Soar demands split-second control and precise navigation in order, for example, to bring the vehicle down within the narrow 10-mile-deep reentry corridor aerodynamically stable enough to fly.

Finally, since well over 98 percent of the $1,000 per pound cost of our payloads in orbit today is represented by the booster, or other aerospace ground equipment and facilities, it is clear that if we are going to cut costs we must devise ways of salvaging and reusing the booster and, if we want to reduce costs still further, to develop means of using the payload vehicle over again.

These five points represent the slate of our space activities during the years just ahead. To some extent, the current and projected NASA programs will satisfy certain of these tremendous requirements.

But because of the inherent differences between military and nonmilitary missions, there are space goals that appear peculiarly military and can reasonably be met only by military oriented efforts. For example—rendezvous. The military value of space rendezvous is difficult to assess at this time. It may turn out to be less important—or much more important—than one thinks today. In any case, whatever its future value or need, it is one thing to rendezvous with a friendly satellite in a controlled and predetermined orbit, and quite another thing to rendezvous with an uncooperative vehicle that might be equipped to take evasive action or be boobytrapped. Further, rendezvous for the purpose of inspection is of little value unless we are equipped to capture a satellite or otherwise negate it. Such would be uniquely military jobs and we prepare to do them properly only by putting a military "twist" on the rendezvous development capability.

Communications in space is another example of military needs not met by present or planned civilian projects. A military communications system in space must be global in coverage; it must function 24 hours a day; it must be jam proof; its ground stations must be reasonably invulnerable and—preferably—mobile; and it must be capable of functioning effectively in any "last ditch" situation when communications with our forces around the world must be insured.

At present the Air Force is working with the Army and the Defense Communications Agency on the development of a system of space communications employing several random satellites at medium altitudes.

These examples serve to illustrate why military requirements in space, as in any other medium, are more stringent than nonmilitary needs. The military, in time of war or under threat of war, must operate in an antagonistic climate. A system must not only work reasonably well under generally favorable conditions, it must work without fail and under adverse conditions. To put it another way, a military system should be able to do anything a civil system can do—but do it better.

In advertising copy today, there seems to be a tendency to make a virtue of being second best. A certain telephone company, for example, has sponsored magazine advertisements pointing out that their company is second in the commercial telephone business. But then, there are thousands of private phone companies in this country. A certain car rental firm boasts of being second in the field, but there are hundreds of agencies renting and leasing automobiles. A woman's magazine boasts that it is second in home readership.

True, there is no reason to be ashamed of being second in fields where competition is keen and where there are many contenders. But in space the United States is competing with only one nation, and being second is the same as being last when there are no third parties in a contest.

Certainly, we who are involved in the U.S. space program have no intention of letting our Nation take second place. This is why billions of dollars and tremendous resources are being invested in the NASA and DOD space programs. Approximately $1.65 billion of the fiscal year 1964 Defense Department research and engineering budget is programed for space purposes. This accounts for more than 20 percent of the total 1964 research and development program and exceeds, for example, total DOD expenditures for the development of strategic weapons.

At our own Space Systems Division in Los Angeles, we manage a budget of slightly over

$1 billion. Better than 96 percent of this amount is represented in some 300 prime and associate contracts we hold with 80 major U.S. companies doing business in 19 States. In addition to the prime and associate contractors, there are literally hundreds of companies—large and small—working as subcontractors or suppliers on space projects. Space is, clearly, a rapidly growing business.

Further, space is not only big business, but important business. It is a national effort, with a scope as broad as space itself and a significance related directly to our welfare and our security.

A few years ago we had an abundance of ideas but little technology. Today we have a multiplicity of technologies, but insufficient experience to support the programs essential if we are to insure our proficiency in space and our competence to cope with problems of defense in the ripening space age of tomorrow. Our job, therefore, is to take full advantage of the resources, the knowledge, and the capabilities of this Nation's Government-science-industry team; to advance our national space programs through maximum NASA-DOD cooperation; and to simultaneously enrich the space knowledge and experience necessary to fulfillment of the military's obligations for the future defense and security of the United States.

There is an ancient Chinese proverb that says: the longest journey begins with a single step.

The United States has taken much more than a single step in the journey into space, and our pace is quickening as we garner experience and acquire greater confidence.

Yet it is obvious that we still have a long way to go and there are many obstacles separating us from the goals we seek. We shall be successful only insofar as we are able to turn these "stumbling blocks" into "stepping stones" and transform a fledgling capability into full-fledged achievement.

Poll of Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed a poll in the Second Congressional District of Florida, and I take this opportunity to include the results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This five-question poll was mailed to some 20,000 residents of Duval County, Fla., which comprises my congressional district, and it received wide publicity through the various media, for which I am extremely grateful.

The results of the poll:

1. Should Government expenditures be cut to offset proposed tax cut? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

2. Should the pending civil rights bill be enacted? Yes, 18 percent; no, 82 percent.

3. Should there be a domestic "Peace Corps" in the United States? Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

4. Should the Panama Canal be turned over to the U.N.? Yes, 8 percent; no, 92 percent.

5. Should Red China be recognized by the United States? Yes, 9 percent; no, 91 percent.

Members of Congress in the Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, entitled "Member of Congress in the Reserves," written by Col. John T. Carlton, U.S. Air Reserve executive director, Reserve Officers Association, Washington, D.C., which appeared in the January 29 edition of Army Times:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN THE RESERVES

(By Col. John T. Carlton)

Continuing reports reflecting upon the service of Members of Congress in the Nation's Reserve forces are a disservice to the cause of national security. They are even symptomatic of a sort of sickness on the subject.

When Congress passed the Reserve Forces Act in 1954, it sought in various ways to emphasize the vital necessity of this citizen-reservists concept of national defense. Coupled with a system of incentives, therefore, was the strong medicine of example. The law therefore specified that service in the Reserves would not be considered Federal service in the sense that reservists would not be barred from any other government position, or civil occupation.

This simply put into effect a longstanding custom. Former President Truman already had served more than 30 years in the Reserves, including the approximately 17 years he served in the Senate, and later in the White House. The Nation has a history of national leaders also being reservists.

Short memories we have. A little bit of a storm was attempted recently, and it required a number of Members of Congress, as well as ROA, to bring the question back into perspective. Among many other responses, Representative JIM WRIGHT, an Air Force pilot of some note, asserted that it would not occur to him as a Congressman to ask men in his district to serve in the Reserves, and make themselves subject to callup for war, and at the same time exempt himself.

We are inclined in these times—if not in all periods of history—to be influenced more by example than by precept. The value of the testimonial has not been excelled in solid salesmanship.

There has been a marked advance in the stock of the Reserve forces in the past 10 years. A major element in this improvement has been the existence of the Capitol Hill units, and the active participation of more than 150 Reserve officers in Congress in the training programs. By their example, these among the 535 men and women representing this entire great Nation have a vast, and wholesome, effect upon the mores, the attitudes, and the compulsions of the American people. The reservists, and the Reserve leaders, have been encouraged by their interest and their participation.

They are the prestige, bellwether individuals in the Reserve forces. The persistent effort to discredit them and their service, whether intentional or not, cannot be viewed as anything less than a blow at the entire Reserve forces programs which are essential to national security.

We can be thankful that these Congressmen got where they are by virtue of stout hearts and steady nerves as well as competence. Those who are deserving of their commissions are not likely to quit.

Civil Rights and Civil Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward F. Cummerford of the New York bar wrote a very interesting and thoughtful article under the caption, "Civil Rights and Civil Wrongs," for the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

The article, aside from its sound logic, has special appeal to this humble Member of the Congress, who has long been pleased to refer to these civil rights bills as civil wrongs.

The Honorable Ernest W. Graves, a valued friend and a member of the law firm of Welch, Gibbes & Graves, of Laurel, Miss., was so impressed with the article that he wrote the editor of the American Bar Association Journal as follows:

EDITOR, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, *Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR SIR: Mr. Edward F. Cummerford's article in the February 1964 issue entitled "Civil Rights and Civil Wrongs" deserves the careful consideration of every thinking attorney and citizen in the Nation, regardless of sectionalism, political stripe or philosophy. He has earned the plaudits of Americans everywhere in suggesting that the house should not be burned down in order to get rid of the mice. Mr. Cummerford obviously has the courage of his convictions in taking such a logical, yet unpopular approach to his subject. Let's hope that no revolutionary agitators have chained themselves to his law office door in protest.

If the sound, fury, and hysteria now accompanying the Government-sponsored perversion of constitutional law and liberty continues at the present ridiculous rate, George Orwell's novel may well have to be reentitled "Nineteen Sixty-Five." Mr. Cummerford realizes that it's later than we think.

The Journal is likewise commended in carrying this article which reminds us that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. Liberals from coast to coast will probably demand that all copies of the issue be burned simply because you allowed the other side of the question to be printed.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST W. GRAVES.

Mr. Speaker, in turn I, too, was impressed. So much so that in order that the article may have wider distribution I am including it herewith as part of my remarks.

The article follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL WRONGS

(By Edward F. Cummerford)

(NOTE.—While no decent person will defend racial or religious hate, Mr. Cummerford writes, it does not follow that every possible action taken to eliminate them is either good or necessary. Indeed, he argues, the drive to wipe out discrimination and bias may ultimately lead to the destruction of individual liberty.)

In his novel of some years ago called "Nineteen Eighty-Four," George Orwell depicted in frightening detail what life would be like in Britain in the year suggested by his title. A monolithic tyranny had come to power and had destroyed every semblance of freedom. Under the absolute and brutal rule

of a dictator called "Big Brother" men and women had been reduced to the level of dehumanized automatons. No longer were they permitted to act—or even to think—for themselves. Rational thought processes and normal methods of expression had been supplanted by monstrous perversions called "doublethink" and "newspeak." Basic privacy as we know it had been eliminated completely. Fantastic devices for spying were in constant use by the agents of Big Brother so that one never knew, even within the confines of his own home, when he was being observed. Any thought of revolt or disobedience was readily dissipated by the terrifying warning: "Big Brother Is Watching You."

Yet, some will say, this was merely fiction and Americans need have no fear that such eventualities will ever come to pass in our land. Let us not forget that many times in the past fiction writers have foretold things to come with uncanny prescience. In general, nations lose their freedom in one of two ways. The first is by violence, either from within or from without; bombs, machine-guns and the like do the job. The second is far more subtle and insidious; this is the slow, gradual process of evolution. By stages, freedom is chipped away and so gradually that few are aware of the real meaning of the process until it is, perhaps, too late. As each little bit of freedom is taken away, the highest and noblest motives are given and the "best people" in the land give their wholehearted approval. Their intentions may be of the very best, but of such is the greatest superhighway of them all constructed.

NOBLE EXPERIMENTS SOMETIMES END IGNOBLY

In recent years this country has been subjected to an onslaught of so-called civil rights activity. These modern conceptions of civil rights do not refer to the basic freedoms enumerated in the Bill of Rights of our Federal Constitution such as freedom of religion and freedom of the press, but are concerned rather with a relentless drive to wipe out "discrimination" and "bias" based on race and religion, mainly the former. While no decent person will defend racial or religious hate, it does not follow that every possible action taken to eliminate them is either good or necessary. Prohibition was termed a "noble experiment" but it did more harm than good, for the simple reason that it abridged personal freedom without sufficient justification. The same basic error permeates much of the civil rights activity now in vogue. To condemn these activities no more makes one a proponent of bias than to oppose prohibition made one a bootlegger or a drunkard.

This drive to eliminate discrimination is largely a product of the years following the close of World War II. Generally it consists of litigation, legislation, and actions, lawful and otherwise, all purporting to have the same basic objective: the wiping out of bias. In the legislative field the typical pattern has been enactment of a statute with an enforcing agency. Althouhg these antibias laws vary in detail from one jurisdiction to another, they usually declare illegal discrimination in such areas as employment, housing, public accommodations and resorts, public transportation, and sometimes education. About half our States, and some municipalities, now have such laws, many with enforcing agencies. In New York, for example, the basic statute was passed in 1945 and created as the enforcing agency the State commission against discrimination, which came to be called simply SCAD. Recently its name was changed to the State commission for human rights.

Invariably these agencies begin their work in an unobtrusive manner but with the passage of time they often become increasingly aggressive, seeking more powers, asking broader areas in which to operate and harsher punitive measures for alleged offenders. Some have stated very candidly that if enough complaints are not filed to keep them busy, they will go out searching for examples of bias. Frequently they query employers as to the proportions of races and creeds in their employ; they scrutinize employment applications to see if there are any questions deemed discriminatory;[1] they scan advertising by hotels and resorts to ferret out language that might be a subtle cloak for bias. These commissions, in short, seem to view their scope as ever widening. For example, in 1961 Ogden R. Reid, the then chairman of SCAD, said that he desired legislation to give his agency power to deal with bias in promotions as well as in initial hiring procedures. The trend is, unmistakably, in the direction of more and more power for these agencies. As SCAD said in one of its recent publications: "While no complaint has been too minor, no objective has been too large".[2]

Sometimes the activities of these agencies verge on the absurd. In one instance the owner of a little barbershop on Long Island placed a sign in his window reading "Kinky haircuts $5." SCAD, neither amused by his crude attempt at subtlety nor deterred by the ancient maxim de minimis non curat lex, took immediate steps to punish him. Several years ago the State of New York deleted the item "color" from the various details of personal description on drivers' licenses on the ground that that information was discriminatory. While such nonsense hardly merits comment, I cite it as an example of how far such notions can be carried.

In general, however, the activities of the antidiscrimination agencies are more ominous than amusing. In 1961 the press reported that the Philadelphia Commission on Human Rights had warned 17,000 employers in that city that they must not follow merely the letter of the antibias statutes but be prepared to show that they "really believed in the spirit" of such laws. Recently a civil rights committee of the New York County Lawyers Association advocated strengthening local laws against bias in housing by publicizing proceedings to embarrass the accused; should this not suffice, the committee concluded, "consideration might be given to the traditional criminal sanctions."[3]

A REVOLUTIONARY DECISION IN THE SECOND CIRCUITS

In addition to antibias statutes, there is now a marked trend toward litigation to accomplish related aims. Such suits invariably are filed in Federal courts, using the 14th amendment as a catchall foundation. In the recent case of *Taylor* v. *Board of Education, etc., of New Rochelle*,[4] the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit held that where the student body of a public school had over the years, because of neighborhood changes, evolved from predominantly white to predominantly (94 percent) Negro, the Negro pupils could apply to the Federal court for transfer to a school whose racial makeup was more in accord with their preferences, irrespective of school boundaries or distances involved. This was in spite of the fact that the city and State involved had never required any segregation in public schools, and the board of education concerned vigorously denied that any racial considerations entered into the mapping of school districts.

The New Rochelle case represents one of the most revolutionary and far-reaching decisions ever handed down in this country and its ultimate effects are beyond conjecture. Similar suits are pending against school boards throughout the land, all predicated on the theory that too high a ratio of Negroes in a school, even though the mere reflection of a particular neighborhood's racial patterns, is an evil and must be corrected by force of law.

The dissenting opinion of Judge Leonard P. Moore in the New Rochelle case should be read carefully in its entirety, for it cogently analyzes the false premises on which the decision is based and notes the results it is likely to have. Judge Moore observed:

"Regardless of protestations to the contrary, the effect and implications of the decision below are to place the operation of the schools of the country in the hands of the Federal courts or a single judge. His personal views as to those pupils who should be granted or denied transfers will control; he alone will decide what racial mixtures satisfy his concept of integration. Of necessity he will have to pass upon district lines if he chooses to permit neighborhood schools to continue. His decrees will cause schools to be built, altered, abandoned. Attendant thereto might even be an indirect fixing of the city's school tax rate to accomplish his bidding."[5]

Other possibilities, in addition to those Judge Moore suggests, spring to mind. May a student who feels that racial bias has kept him from a position on an athletic team, or from a part in a school play, or has been the reason for a poor grade in a course, thereupon approach the nearest Federal judge, seeking redress? If Federal judges can dictate the drawing and altering of school boundary lines and the racial composition of student bodies, why may they not, by the same logic, determine the racial composition of a residential neighborhood by appropriate decrees and orders directed to realty agents and landlords? Can it honestly be maintained that the Founding Fathers, in their almost parenthetical reference to "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish"[6] in the Constitution, intended that a Federal district judge should exercise such frightening power over the affairs of a local community which had little or no voice in his selection and has absolutely no say over his tenure?

Almost with each passing day new and strange events are reported in connection with this inexorable drive to wipe out bias. Private property is seized and held by mobs; "sit-in" demonstrations are conducted in State capitol buildings, city halls, board of education properties and the like. Racial pressure groups dictate to private employers what the racial makeup of their payroll shall be, and to school boards what the racial makeup of the student body shall be. Crude pressure is exerted against private clubs because of their membership policies, and threats are heard to abolish them altogether.

What is most distressing about all of this is that those elements in the community which should be the most responsible—the press, the clergy, educators—yea, even the bench and bar—view these examples of mob action as something good, and even give them their full support and encouragement. One cannot avoid wondering if they have reflected on the proposition that if a mob can take over a lunch counter because it dislikes the policies prevailing within, it can, by the same token, take over a church or a publishing plant, or a university which has incurred its displeasure.

In New York City, which often serves as a bellwether for other places, some amazing things have been taking place along these lines. Members of minority groups (generally considered to mean Negroes and Puerto Ricans) may now apply for transfer to another school, even many miles away, if the racial balance in the school they attend does not suit them. Large numbers of such students are transported daily in buses at great expense to the taxpayers. Several months ago a "mock antidiscrimination hearing" was conducted in New York City at which children, selected from appropriate racial backgrounds, acted out the parts of a would-be Negro tenant and a callous white landlord who refused to rent her an apartment. That

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

innocent children, of any race, should be used as pawns in these weird sociological chess games is nothing short of reprehensible.

TEACHERS ARE TOLD WORDS TO AVOID

In 1961 the New York City Board of Education issued a directive to teachers in its system to stop using certain words and expressions which might prove offensive to minority groups. Among the proscribed expressions were "low socioeconomic," "fear of walking" [in certain neighborhoods], "complete apathy of parents" and—believe it or not—the expression "dedicated teacher."

Thus, in about two decades, we have passed in rapid succession from the novel to the startling and from the startling to the grotesque. Into our repository of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, whose very foundation stones are the maximum freedom of thought and action for individuals with minimum restraint and interference by Government, some new and strange concepts are being infused. What is more alarming is that they are being accepted, passively and unquestioningly, by most of our populace. Liberty is being subordinated to equality. A type of absolute egalitarianism, riding roughshod over personal privacy and individual freedom, has become the order of the day. Matters that formerly were well within the realm of personal choice and decision are now branded as criminal or tortious, with the punitive police power of government standing by. Private business and social dealings now must contend with the Government as an uninvited third party, overseeing and checking what private citizens do and even how and what they think.

When bureaucrats not chosen by the people can warn us to obey the "spirit" of laws or face penalties; when a Federal district judge can sit as the absolute overseer of a local community's affairs; when school teachers are muzzled and coerced; when our citizens cease to be free individuals and become merely "ethnic groups" to be manipulated according to some sociological dictum; when our law and our courts become merely the extensions of the sociologists' workshops; when government can invade the hearts and minds of men to search out their subtlest motivations and innermost thoughts; when all of these things come to pass in our land of the free, it is high time we asked ourselves just where we are headed.

The most significant recent developments center on proposed Federal legislation in this field. If such laws were to be enacted, the National Government would be given jurisdiction and powers in areas never previously regarded as coming within its ambit. The erosion of State and local authority would be tremendously accelerated.

The hour already is late. We may be, even now, in the twilight of our liberty, standing on the very threshold of the type of era envisioned by Orwell. When liberty is taken from some, it tends ultimately to fade for all. When that dreadful day arrives, there no longer will be any need to argue about discrimination for we shall all be joined together in the terrible equality that is slavery. As Justice Sutherland observed a quarter of a century ago:

"For the saddest epitaph which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time." [7]

---

[1] Among items held improper are the applicant's birthplace, the birthplace of parents and spouses, original name (if name was changed), country of citizenship, and the maiden name of wife or mother.

[2] "Future Imperative," published by SCAD, 1961, pages not numbered.

[3] Bar Bulletin, New York County Lawyers Association, March–April, 1962, p. 165.

[4] 294 F. 2d 36 (1961); cert. den. 368 U.S. 940 (1961).

[5] 294 F. 2d 36, 50.

[6] U.S. Constitution, art. III, sec. 1.

[7] *Associated Press* v. *NLRB*, 301 U.S. 103, 141 (1937).

Senator Keating Receives Humanitarian Award From Jamaica Post, JWV, and Calls for Bold Near East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a truly significant event occurred in my district on January 26 of this year. I refer to the occasion when a great Senator from the State of New York—KENNETH KEATING—made a historic address on the crucial situation in the Middle East, and was presented with the annual Humanitarian Award of the Gould-Hirsch Jamaica Post No. 90, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, as "an outstanding American who, in a lifetime of public service, has fought for all minorities and supported Israel in her struggle to persevere and grow as a nation."

However, Mr. Speaker, for me the occasion is memorable in still another respect, for it also marked the installation of Dr. Karl Applbaum as commander of this active and outstanding JWV post. Dr. Applbaum is an outstanding religious, community, and veteran leader. He is a Reserve Army chaplain, who served in World War II. A noted rabbi and lawyer, he is active in the Reserve Officers Association of the United States as well as in countless religious, civic, professional, fraternal, and veterans causes.

As one who came to pay tribute to both Senator KEATING and Dr. Applbaum on that Sunday evening, January 26, I could not help but recall another historic occasion—the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel—when Dr. Karl Applbaum delivered the invocation in the House and his brother, Rabbi Sidney Applbaum, delivered the invocation in the U.S. Senate. I do not know of any other time in the history of our country when two brothers delivered the invocations in both Houses of the Congress and at such a significant time, too—the celebration of Israel's anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I should mention another feature of the evening—the presentation of special citations of merit to 12 members of the post for their "dedication to the service of the community." Among those who received this coveted tribute was Henry Albert, who rose from the ranks in the post to become an outstanding national commander of the JWV. Another recipient was Past County JWV Comdr. Jack Cottin, who did a magnificent job as chairman of the night's ceremonies. The others to whom the award was presented were: John Basile and Katherine Bitses, owners of the Bellaire Castle where the event was held, two Americans of Greek extraction who have done so much to help the JWV in their fight for a better America. Morris Gimpelson, also a past county commander, now director of the Queens office of the State motor vehicle department; Max Almosino, past commander of the post; Morris Baum, a past county commander; Allan Ehrlich, a former county commander now dutifully serving as quartermaster of his post; Leonard Gleichenhaus, a former senior vice commander of his post; Bert Ordan, past post commander, now adjutant; Max Rosenfeld, another former county commander, and beloved 85-year-old Sam Semler, a hero of the Spanish-American War who is still very active in post affairs. Three women were also honored with these awards of merit. They are Clara Gimpelson, past county president of the auxiliary; Elsa Baum, member of the second husband and wife team of the post, who is coeditor with her husband of the post newspaper; and Rosetta Rawson, president of the auxiliary.

The high point of the evening, Mr. Speaker, following the presentation of the Humanitarian Award, was Senator KEATING's stirring speech. In it, he stressed the dangers to peace that exist in the Near East and the shortsightedness of our State Department in not recognizing the dangers of the situation. He outlined a three-point program to prevent Nasser's expansionist plans from "setting the Middle East ablaze."

In introducing Senator KEATING, Dr. Applbaum called him a shining example of what is good, what is true, and what is valuable in the American way of life. It is significant, too, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Applbaum, a prominent figure in the Democratic Party, said in speaking of a distinguished Republican Senator from the State of New York:

There are times when one's appraisal of another shall not be influenced by partisanship. This is particularly true in the case of a man of Senator KEATING's stature in the good fight for freedom and human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of Senator KEATING's remarks on the Middle East situation need no elaboration by me. They are cogent, astute, and offer a guideline for a policy which our State Department and the administration cannot afford to ignore. So that all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives can become fully cognizant with the proposals offered by this great Senator, I, under unanimous consent, insert the full text of his talk at this JWV installation in the RECORD:

Dr. Karl Applbaum, officers and members of the Jamaica Post of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, on this occasion of the receipt of the Jamaica Post's annual humanitarian award, I find it difficult to express how proud—how deeply moved I am. The words "Thank you" seem so inadequate, but of course, I do thank you from the bottom of my heart.

This is an experience I shall always cherish—always remember. To be given a humanitarian award is to me the highest possible honor. It is as if I had been weighed in the balance of human good will and been found to be spiritually sound. I am deeply honored by this visible expression of your trust in me. I shall do my

best—I promise you—to continue to deserve it.

At the outset, I would like to mention something that I know you are all interested in—my bill to grant a national charter to the Jewish War Veterans which passed the Senate late last year. I wish I could give you some really definite news. All I can say is, that it is still pending in the House.

That phrase "pending in the House"—I know how frustrating it is. But nevertheless, it is an important and necessary side of our form of government. Anything you as citizens can do with your own Representatives in the House to help expedite this bill will certainly be appreciated.

Our get-together tonight is a reunion of ex-soldiers. And you know when ex-soldiers get together what they talk about—women.

I wonder if you've heard the story of the two young ladies, one English and one French, who visited America for the first time. As their ship entered New York Harbor and they saw the magnificent skyline of Manhattan, the English girl said, "I never saw anything as magnificent as those buildings. They must be taller than the pyramids. They must have thousands and thousands of rooms in them."

"Yes," agreed the French girl, "and hundreds of thousands of great big, wonderful American men."

Well, there are still hundreds of thousands of great big, wonderful American men scattered all over the world fighting the cold war that is no longer so cold. Every day, it seems to me, a new crisis arises. In the last few days there has been the Panama crisis, the Zanzibar crisis, the Tanganyika crisis. But none of these, in my opinion, hold the potential danger of the recent summit conference of the Moslem rulers.

I believe we are moving into a time of real crisis in the Middle East. I am particularly disturbed by the fact that our Government does not appear to be sufficiently alerted to the dangers posed by that meeting. As so often in the past, there seems to be a feeling that America's commitment to a free and secure Israel can be shrugged off by reliance on procastination and platitudes.

Nasser of Egypt, as I see it, is determined to revive the sweeping empire of Saladin. He wants this new conglomeration of states to stretch from Turkey around the Mediterranean to the Straits of Gibraltar. He hasn't actually come out and said so, of course. But I have no doubt, in the Egyptian archives, there is a blueprint of infiltration and conquest with deadlines worked out and strategy detailed.

Nasser's whole attitude points to this. He has imported foreign rocket experts and is building up Egypt's missile capability. He has acquired, from the Soviet Union, ships capable of firing ship-to-shore missiles. He is developing rocket power.

This threat to our friends in Israel is continually being brushed off—brushed under the foreign policy rug would perhaps be a better way of expressing it.

While we continue to drift, the menace of a hot war in the Middle East grows apace. It is time we adopted a firm policy. Only a firm policy—only some forthright statements of intent—will cool down the rising tempers of the Middle East. For instance, we have not yet come out and stated—not in so many words—that we consider the water of the Jordan River essential to Israel's continuing growth. I know that we side with Israel on this question and will resist any attempt to sabotage this magnificent effort.

But, without a firm statement from us, that one question alone, could set the Middle East ablaze.

I do believe—that if the tragedy should occur—we would go to Israel's assistance. But now is the time to act. Now is the time to prevent it. Now is the time to make crystal clear what our position is.

It is high time for our Government to pull the fuse out of the Middle East powder keg. It is the task of all of us to do what we can to stimulate our Government officials to view the plight of Israel with at least the same alarm that they view Indonesia or the Berlin wall. Actually, in my opinion, the danger of war in the Middle East is greater and more immediate than our Government officials realize.

Perhaps Attorney General Kennedy might stop off there on his way home. It would at least show Nasser how deeply we are concerned. It would certainly give him pause.

It seems to me, in our Middle Eastern foreign policy there exists what I call the interpretation gap. I mean the gap between what our policy actually is and how other nations interpret it to be.

In other words, we do so much hemming and hawing, other nations just don't believe we mean what we say. When we do act, they are taken completely by surprise and behave as though we were to blame for confusing the issue.

This saying one thing and meaning another reminds me of a story going the Washington rounds.

A young and attractive schoolteacher decided to get married rather hurriedly. There was some question as to whether she could get away for a honeymoon until a girl friend came to her rescue and offered to act as substitute for the couple of weeks the bride and groom were away.

On the newly married couple's return, a welcome-home party was given them. At this party someone started to introduce the husband to the girl who had acted as substitute. "Oh," he interrupted, "I know Miss Jones very well. She substituted for my wife on our honeymoon."

That story is a more apt illustration of our Middle East policy than appears on the surface. We do not intend to deceive. I do not think that we are deliberately saying one thing and meaning another. We just don't seem to be able to say what we really mean—to convince other nations that, under certain given circumstances, we do mean business.

I am sure that our diplomats are the most truthful, the most straightforward in the world. But for some reason a lot of foreign nations don't count on what they say. Which reminds me of the middle-aged husband who called his youngish wife to say that he wouldn't be home till late. "Can I count on that?" she asked him.

The people of Israel as well as the Arabs may be confused by our attitude. On the one hand, they know that America has traditionally been a friend and supporter of Israel.

They know how much American Jews have done and are still doing to build Israel. I think in their hearts they are convinced that America will not let them down. But they can't understand why America won't come right out and say so. Surrounded, as they are, by enemies on every hand they are naturally fearful of our 11th-hour diplomacy.

As a result of the uncertainty and doubt about U.S. intentions, Israel has had to build up its own military resources against possible aggression. I don't think I'd be far wrong in saying probable aggression.

The threat of encirclement is very real to Israel. The Israelis are understandably nervous and apprehensive. The slightest Arab action could trigger Israeli reaction—could result in open war. This is a very unhealthy state of affairs. And, as I see it, the remedy is obvious. We must not wait until the bombers are assembled, the missiles focused with warheads set, before we make our position clear—100 percent clear. We must act while the initiative is still in our hands.

Therefore I believe three steps should be taken without delay:

1. A direct and forthright statement should be made by the President that America is determined to maintain Israeli independence—and block any threat to that nation's independence.

2. The U.S. Government should join with England and France in a tripartite guarantee of Israel.

3. The President—just as the Pope has done—should consider paying Israel a state visit.

A visit by the President would do two things. It would be a symbol to the Israelis, of our country's interest and concern. It would be a hands-off warning to the Moslem nations. It would be a convincing gesture, to say the least of it. So far, we have obviously not been convincing enough to Nasser and his bully-boys—that we do—in the last resort—mean business.

I have long contended that we should go one step further where Nasser is concerned and cut off his foreign aid, until he stops spending huge sums on military supplies and equipment.

Nasser—according to the best information available to me—spends some $428 million annually on his armed forces. It would be a very pointed gesture to him and one he would certainly understand, if we cut his foreign aid until this investment in armaments was channeled into projects of much more importance to the Egyptian people and less danger to world peace.

We know that Israel, by her very existence, is a showcase to less fortunate peoples of what a free government can achieve. We know that Israel has shown itself to be a laboratory of progress—an island of dynamic achievement to the countries around her.

It is my firm conviction that Israel will stand—will remain a firm rock in the surrounding turbulence—will be a proud bastion of free government against which Nasser and his ilk will crash in vain.

Let Nasser dream his nightmarish dreams. Israel achieves, Israel builds, Israel reclaims. The Middle East is a better place, a more civilized place, because Israel gained free and independent nationhood.

Finally, let me thank you again from the bottom of my heart for your generosity to me in making this award which I shall always cherish.

Tax Reduction Now a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the tax reduction is now a reality and Congress deserves much credit for it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a brief statement regarding the tax-reduction bill which I issued soon after it cleared both houses of Congress.

The statement is as follows:

I am very pleased to learn that the $11.5 billion tax reduction bill, the largest tax cut in the Nation's history, has finally been passed by Congress.

This legislation will provide a much needed tax cut on both individual income and corporate income to benefit all taxpayers. The tax reduction will be translated into an immediate decrease for the average citizen in the amount of money to be withheld from his weekly paycheck. This means

that the purchasing power of all will be increased.

The tax cut voted by Congress will add greater strength to the Nation's economy and will help to increase production and reduce unemployment.

Throughout my campaign for Congress 2 years ago, I vigorously advocated a tax cut for the people. My theory at the time was that a tax cut would stimulate the U.S. economy to the extent that it would increase the output of goods and services by many billions of dollars and that this would, in turn, expand the economy and provide more tax revenue to make up the loss to the Government. This is now about to become a reality.

I feel proud that my pledge to the people of eastern Connecticut has been upheld and that my views on the need for a cut in taxes have been reaffirmed by Congress.

The Next Development in Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, now that the tax cut has been signed into law, the attention of the Nation is swinging to inflation control and monetary policy in order to secure the promised benefits of the tax cut. The question of monetary policy will be the big economic issues of the next few months, and may even take a prominent place among the important issues of the 1964 presidential campaign. The Federal Reserve System sets our Nation's monetary policy.

Mr. Dolph Simons, of Lawrence, Kans., has written a clear and compelling editorial, in the Lawrence (Kansas) Daily Journal-World, on the Federal Reserve System: the role it plays in our national life, and the need to keep partisan politics out of the System. Mr. Simons is highly qualified to speak on this crucial matter. He has been a vigorous force in the development of midcontinent America, and now serves with great distinction as Deputy Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, 10th District.

I commend Mr. Simons's editorial, of January 23, to the attention of my colleagues here in the Congress. And along with the editorial, I include an excellent news analysis of the development of the monetary policy issue by Edward Cowan from the New York Times of March 1, together with a clear technical explanation fo the workings of the Federal Reserve System written by George Shea from the Wall Street Journal of March 2.

Taken together, these three pieces provide an excellent background for understanding the next development in economic policy.

The editorials follow:

[From the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, Jan. 23, 1964]

NO PLACE FOR POLITICS

Wright Patman, a Democratic Congressman from Texas, is recognized as a legislative watchdog on matters concerning money and banking. He is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and he works hard at the job, frequently to the distress and dismay of bank accountants and bookkeepers who are required to file with the committee voluminous special reports of operating costs and procedures.

Although the Texan may irritate and annoy officials in banks and in the Federal Reserve System, most bankers will agree that his diligence and his dedication have served the country well. Bankers don't love him but they respect him. They have more than a little fear of his power, and they realize than an able and sharp-nosed critic keeps them on their toes. With Patman on the prowl, officials are not likely to become smug, careless, fat or lazy.

This week the committee chairman began hearings on bills he has proposed, to remodel the Federal Reserve System which for 50 years has served as the trustee of the American public to watch over money and credits, and to keep the people's money sound. Patman has proposed several changes in the system, primarily changes which would make the Federal Reserve more subject to political influence and which would bring the System closer to the administration in power.

After 50 years, the Federal Reserve perhaps may need some changes; revisions which possibly would make it more compatible with today's problems of finance than those existing in 1913 and 1935, the 2 years in which drastic major legislation was passed by Congress to provide "ground rules" for the System. Some of Patman's recommendations may be reasonable but they mostly appear to be unnecessary or undesirable for best management.

The great danger comes in allowing political control to get a foot in the door of the guardhouse of U.S. money.

Nearly every country in the world has a central bank which is a government bank, a "bank for banks," and an institution which controls money and credit. These central banks are charged with keeping money sound and, to try and control credit for the best interests of the country.

In all of these nations the government in power, whether it be a congress or a parliament or a chamber of deputies, has the power of collecting taxes and spending public money. Normally, any government is extremely anxious to keep the money of the country sound and dependable, because without sound money the country is injured.

In the United States, as elsewhere, the Government in power decides on taxes and where the money goes. The Federal Reserve System has nothing to do with that. Its assignment is to serve as a bank for the Government, a bank to issue currency, to control the supply of money and credit, to keep private bank reserves at a safe margin, and to determine discount rates which have a compelling effect upon rates of interest charged by private lending agencies.

The record of the Federal Reserve System in the United States is out in the open for anyone to see and examine, and it has been a record of which the country can be proud. In spite of wars, great deficit spending by several national administrations, resulting imbalances of trade and diminishing gold stocks, and depressions and inflationary periods, the money of the United States has remained sound.

Today the dollar is the most respected money unit in the world. Nearly one-half of all the monetary gold owned outside of the United States is stored in one vault in New York City.

Why? Because the nations of the world have more confidence in the stability and soundness of finances in America than they have in any other country. And this, in turn, is almost entirely due to the cautious, wise, astute and careful management of the Federal Reserve System.

The system has seven governors in Washington who are appointed by presidents to long 14-year terms to provide continuity and to avoid stacking by any administration. The 12 different banks in the system have boards of directors composed of 3 bankers elected by the member banks in the district, 3 industrialists elected by the banks, and 3 public members appointed by the Washington board of governors. These are the trustees who supervise the reserve banks and determine policy.

Politics and partisanship do not exist in the elections or appointments, and every U.S. President to date has almost meticulously followed a handsoff policy, recognizing the importance of maintaining a banking system entirely independent of political domination.

It will be a sorry day for the public if the time comes when district, State and national political party chiefs can determine who shall serve as trustees of the public's money. Immediately the Nation would find a situation wherein the tax-spending and the bill-paying departments would have the power to create and manipulate the money used to pay Government bills. Devaluation and printing-press money would be a constant threat.

The Federal Reserve must not object to any changes or improvements which would lead to better accounting, better service or better operation. But the public and Congress will serve themselves well if they strongly and effectively oppose any measures to allow increased political control of the system.

Congressman PATMAN currently is proposing that the President-appointed Secretary of the Treasury should be the chairman of the Federal Reserve. For those who want the continuation of a sound dollar, this would be a dangerous change.

Other changes he asks for include: Increasing the Board of Governors from 7 members to 12 members which would give the current President an opportunity to add 5 friendly members at one time; shorten the terms of appointment to 4 years, thereby increasing current administration control; elimination of the Open Market Committee which presently influences cash reserves of banks thereby increasing or lessening funds for loans; retire FRB stock now held by member banks which provide operating capital and gives banks a sense of participation; provide direct appropriation of operating funds from Congress rather than paying for operations out of System earnings; permit commercial banks to pay interest on demand deposits; auditing by the General Accounting Office instead of by the bank's own auditors and independent accounting firms whose findings now are submitted to both the Senate and House Banking Committees.

The United States has been blessed for a half century with a strong Central Bank that has helped our country avoid many of the depressions, devaluations, tragic booms and national bankruptcies which have occurred elsewhere. For the continued good of the Nation it should remain strong, independent and unweakened by political connivance.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 1, 1964]

U.S. CREDIT POLICY EXPECTED TO BE NEXT ECONOMIC ISSUE

(By Edward Cowan)

The great debate on fiscal policy is over, at least for the moment. Congress has accepted the administration's proposition that a planned, temporary budget deficit, through tax reduction, is a desirable way to stimulate the economy.

The administration rallied to its cause a host of conservative allies from business and finance—men who traditionally have believed that the Government's outgo should not exceed its income.

It is doubtful that they will go along with the White House in what may be the next big economic issue: monetary policy.

Already, there have been verbal sallies to the effect that a lesser availability of credit, and higher interest rates, may soon be in order, if they are not now overdue.

IMPORTANT FACTORS

The fact of tax reduction and the increase in the British bank rate last week, from 4 to 5 percent, are bound to elicit further advocacy along these lines. Important influences, of course, will be whether the higher British level of interest rates attracts much money from the United States and whether the stimulus of the tax cut leads to symptoms of a general upward price movement.

Tight money was the prescription for domestic inflation in the 1950's. So far in the 1960's the argument for higher interest rates has been primarily to keep investment dollars at home. The country's persistent international payments deficit has been caused in part by an exodus of funds seeking higher returns abroad.

The stimulus of tax reduction will be offered, in fact it already has been, as an argument for tighter credit and higher interest on both major counts—averting domestic inflation and keeping dollars from flowing abroad.

Two such suggestions were heard last week. One came from Charles Walker, executive vice president, of the American Bankers Association. Dr. Walker a specialist on monetary matters, was the Treasury's top economist in the second Eisenhower administration. Before that, he was with the Federal Reserve bank of Dallas.

The other plea for tighter credit came from the Federal Reserve bank of New York. Alfred Hayes, as president of the bank, is statutory vice chairman of the 12-man Federal Open Market Committee, the Federal Reserve's policymaking body. Also on the committee are the seven Federal Reserve Board members and four of the presidents of the other 11 Reserve banks.

Dr. Walker, Mr. Hayes, many other bankers and some economists, believe that the Federal Reserve, in its desire to foster expansion of the economy and reduction of unemployment, has allowed the commercial banking system to pile up too much credit.

Even more disturbing to this group is a fear that the Federal Reserve will not tighten credit enough now that the 2-year, $11.5 billion tax cut is law.

The infusion of this additional purchasing power into consumer and corporate wallets may generate inflationary pressures, it is feared. Already, the tight-money school says, the public—consumers, banks, corporations—is awash with money and near-money securities.

STATUS OF TREASURYS

Treasury securities, for example, especially short-term ones, are considered near-money because they can be readily sold in the market.

Among stanch antiinflationists such as Dr. Walker and the Reserve Board's chairman, William McChesney Martin, resisting depreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar amounts to a moral cause. Monetary policy is their instrument of virtue.

To be sure, they offer down-to-earth arguments based on economics, such as avoiding a boom-and-bust cycle and preserving the dollar's international preeminence.

But, as Henry C. Wallich, the Yale professor who was an economic adviser to President Eisenhower, observed last week, "in the eyes of labor, monetary policy has yet to find grace."

There is considerable concern among those who favor tighter credit that President Johnson is more committed to the Populist easy-money tradition of his native Texas than to "monetary discipline."

Contributing to this suspicion was the following passage in the President's economic report to Congress last January: "A strong upswing after the tax cut need not bring tight money or high interest rates."

Mr. Johnson said "it would be self-defeating to cancel the stimulus of tax reduction by tightening money." "But," he added in a sentence that commanded less attention, "monetary policy must remain flexible so that it can quickly shift to the defense if, unexpectedly, inflation threatens or the balance of payments worsens."

There are those who believe that the first two of the quoted sentences reflected Mr. Johnson's—and his economic advisers'—true disposition and that the subordination of the third sentence is meaningful.

It should be noted that Dr. Walker found fault with the guideposts on other grounds, chiefly unworkability and the danger that they will lead to deep administration involvement, if not dictation, in wage and price decisionmaking.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 2, 1964]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

If the Federal Reserve Board, as is reported from Washington, seeks to follow a passive policy in dealing with the economic stimulus from the tax cut just signed by President Johnson, the effects will show up sooner or later in the weekly banking figures, just as an active policy always shows up.

The Board's officials are reported to feel the tax cut is likely to stimulate business so much it may bring about an inflationary price trend, a kind of development they feel at all times they should try to prevent—just as they feel they should always try to act in opposition to a deflationary trend. However, in the present instance they are said to hope they won't need to take overt action. They hope, rather, that if an inflationary trend sets in it will stimulate business borrowing enough to raise interest rates of its own accord. Then the rising costs would automatically tend to put a lid on new borrowing and therefore on the rising prices.

Such a passive policy would differ substantially from the normal approach. Usually the Reserve Board sets policy in a specific direction, even though in pretty general terms. For instance, it may decide to seek to produce in the credit markets a condition of active ease, which tends to produce low borrowing costs, or of just plain ease, or mildly or strongly restrictive.

The tool most frequently used for such control of credit is purchases or sales by the Federal Reserve System of U.S. Government securities; purchases add to the lendable cash of commercial banks and sales subtract from it. More lendable cash tends to produce lower borrowing costs. And the usual approach of the committee that carries out the policy is to set a target for the net lendable cash of all banks together, after subtracting the borrowings of any of the banks from the Reserve System; there are almost always some banks that need to borrow.

For instance, in recent months the target seems to have been a net cash figure of around $100 million or a little above that. A year ago and until almost midyear the target appeared to be above $250 million. There have been times when the target was a minus figure; that is, less lendable cash than borrowings. Such occasions were those when the Reserve authorities felt there was an inflationary trend that needed to be fought.

Whatever target is set, the Reserve System has to take pretty continuous action to make sure the figure is held on target. For instance, if the target is $100 million in net lendable cash and the banks keep increasing their loans and thus using up this cash, the System must continuously buy additional Government securities in order to replenish the banks' cash. Even if the target is zero, that is, borrowings and lendable cash about equal, the System must take action: If the banks keep lending more, the System must buy to keep the net figure around zero, and if the banks' old loans are being repaid faster than new loans are being made it must keep reducing its holdings of securities to prevent lendable cash from rising above borrowings.

This brings up the question how the System can ever avoid taking overt action. There is one circumstance when it can do so. If it has set a target and put the net cash figure at the desired amount, and then the banks as a whole neither increase nor decrease their outstanding loans, the System can come close to taking no action. In that case, except for weekly irregularities and seasonal changes, the net cash total will tend to remain about unchanged.

But if the Nation's businessmen are borrowing more than they're paying back—or paying loans back faster than they're borrowing—inaction by the System will surely be reflected in changes in the net lendable cash of the banks. If customers' borrowings keep growing and the System does nothing, the banks' net cash will tend to fall and if bank loans keep falling the net cash figure will tend to rise as long as the System does nothing.

Or the System can avoid overt action, not by doing nothing, but by doing less than would be needed to offset fully the trend of bank lending. In this case, too, the trend of banks' net cash will be in the direction opposite from that of banks' lending, but the cash figure will move more slowly than the loans.

Therefore, if the officials are right in believing the trend of loans is going to be up this year, and if their policy is indeed going to be to take less than fully offsetting action, the net cash figure will begin to slant downward. Such action would be in contrast to the usual steady performance of the net cash figure around one level.

Of course, as is always the case, there will be many week-to-week irregularities, and it will be some time before any visible trend shows up. The System's committee which operates the buying and selling of securities is highly experienced in the field, yet very frequently comes up against unexpected changes in the money markets with which it cannot cope in the week they take place. In such cases it must take offsetting action subsequently.

Not only would this kind of passive policy, if that is what is being planned, sooner or later begin to show up overtly in the weekly figures on bank's net cash, but if the trend of loans does become strongly upward the System will be forced in time into even more overt action. For if loans rise fast enough to push up interest rates they will reach a point where the Reserve System will have to permit the 12 District Reserve banks to raise the discount rate they charge banks that borrow.

That's because otherwise the commercial banks would simply borrow at the unchanged discount rate, and make adequate profits by relending these sums to customers without raising their own rates enough to discourage such borrowing. The policy of letting credit become tighter of its own accord would be partially ineffective.

And a discount rate boost would be unquestionably overt action. The fact is that, being able to control credit to a substantial extent, the System cannot escape being held responsible for the course of credit and of interest rates.

GEORGE SHEA.

Fifty Thousand Jobs Going Begging in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the New York City Labor Department showed that from 50,000 to 54,000 jobs were going begging for lack of qualified applicants. It has long been my belief that an emphasis on job vacancies in the economy is as important as attention to the number of persons unemployed. This information on job vacancies in New York City is dramatic evidence of the need for a statistical series on job vacancies that will help to put the unemployment problem into better perspective and provide a means to develop a sensible training and guidance program.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the New York Times of March 2 describing the New York City Labor Department's report, in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY THOUSAND WHITE-COLLAR JOBS HERE ARE FOUND TO BE GOING BEGGING

(By John C. Devlin)

The city's labor department reported yesterday that 50,000 to 54,000 jobs—the bulk of them white collar—were going begging for lack of qualified applicants.

James J. McFadden, the department's acting commissioner said this labor vacuum, plus a drop in the need for manual workers, should serve as a marker for the board of education in its appraisal of vocational high schools.

"Two out of three of the city's 3.5 million employees have white-collar jobs," Mr. McFadden said. "The number of white-collar jobs last year increased 35,000. But the number of production or blue-collar jobs decreased by 15,000."

His disclosures were contained in a report titled "Job Activity in the New York City Labor Market."

It follows a report that the board of education is studying the city's 29 vocational high schools to determine whether they are meeting the needs of the modern world and the needs of today's youths.

The labor department's study was based on a survey of 150 New York City business concerns, most of them in Manhattan, employing 100 to 20,000 persons. The range included banks, financial and insurance companies, manufacturing concerns, and utilities.

"The results of the survey show there is a great turnover in jobs in New York City," Mr. McFadden said.

"The business firms surveyed reported that new hires in 1963 amounted to 13 percent of their total employees. When applied to New York City as a whole, this would indicate that between 450,000 and 460,000 jobs were filled in New York City in 1963."

He said the survey showed where the jobs are and also the need to train pupils to qualify for them.

"The real growth in jobs in this city is in office jobs," he went on. "And at a time when 50,000 to 54,000 jobs are going begging, we have 77,000 high school dropouts, whose ages today are 16 to 24 years, who are unemployed.

He emphasized that jobs went with education and that something must be done to match both the needs of the employers and the needs of the unemployed.

Among vacancies in jobs he listed are those for file clerks, typists, and secretaries able to take dictation and to type accurately.

The city's 1963 unemployment total was placed at 247,500. This compared with 238,300 in 1962, an increase of 11.3 percent.

Mr. McFadden spoke on the WCBS television program "Newsmakers."

Carl Shipley's Political Arithmetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the respected chairman of the District of Columbia Republican Committee, Carl Shipley, has made some important arithmetical computations. Their subject—a voting analysis of the 1960 presidential election and what it portends for the 1964 campaign—will be of considerable interest and utility in the days ahead.

Mr. Shipley revealed the results of his electoral examination during a recent speech before a banking group here in Washington. For their value and timeliness, I take pleasure in sharing the following excerpts from Mr. Shipley's remarks with my colleagues in the House:

"GOP WILL WIN IN 1964"—EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, GOP CHAIRMAN CARL SHIPLEY TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 17, 1964

Political arithmetic, the change in Democratic leadership in the White House and the foreign affairs mess, portends a GOP victory in the 1964 presidential election.

POLITICAL ARITHMETIC OF THE LAST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION (1960)

In 1960 Nixon received 34,108,546 GOP votes; Kennedy received 33,815,073 Democratic votes.

But Kennedy also got 406,176 Liberal Party votes in New York, which gave him a 110,000 vote edge over Nixon.

In 1960, whose candidate won the States? GOP, 26 States; Democratic, 22½ States.

In 1960, whose candidate won the counties? GOP, 1,851 counties; Democratic, 1,182 counties.

In 1960, who won the congressional districts? GOP, 228 districts; Democratic, 206 districts.

Despite these arithmetical evidences of popular choice, the GOP candidate lost. The electoral vote count was: GOP, 303 electoral votes; Democratic, 219 electoral votes; Byrd, 15 electoral votes.

Why? Because under our electoral system, it's winner take all, State by State. The 538 (537 in 1960) electoral votes are apportioned among the States in accordance with their representation in Congress, and each State is a unit.

Where did the GOP lose? In six big cities.

New York: The GOP had a 407,452 vote lead in New York State outside of New York City. We lost the city by 791,118 votes—which lost the State and its 45 electoral votes.

Newark: The GOP led by 37,000 votes in New Jersey's 21 counties, but lost Newark by 59,000 votes—which lost the State and its 16 electoral votes.

Philadelphia: The GOP had a 220,000-vote majority in Pennsylvania's 67 counties, but lost Philadelphia by 331,000 votes, which lost the State and 32 electoral votes.

Detroit: The GOP led in Michigan's 84 counties by 224,880, but lost Detroit by 311,721 votes, which lost the State and its 20 electoral votes.

Chicago: The GOP led in Illinois' 102 counties by 447,000, but lost Chicago by 456,000 votes—which lost the State and its 27 electoral votes.

House, if we had got all registered voters in those six States to the polls on election day. Look at the figures:

State	Number of votes GOP lost by	Registered voters not voting	Percentage in safe GOP territory
New York	383,666	590,214	72
New Jersey	22,000	300,183	63
Pennsylvania	116,326	681,000	67
Michigan	66,841	931,903	62
Illinois	8,805	741,061	69
Missouri	9,980	376,578	64

We are now working hard to register every voter in those States and in the District of Columbia; 1964 will be different.

On top of this, potential voters not even registered, in three of the six vital States, were as follows:

Pennsylvania	2,000,000
New Jersey	1,053,889
Illinois	1,486,491

This is why we are working so hard to register every voter in the District of Columbia.

TREND SINCE 1960 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Philadelphia: In 1962, our loss was cut from 330,000 in 1960 to 105,000, and the GOP carried Pennsylvania by 450,000 votes. In the 1963 Philadelphia mayor's race, the GOP lost by only 63,000, and in Pittsburgh we did very well.

Detroit: In 1962, the GOP reduced the Democratic majority by 50 percent.

Chicago: In 1962, the GOP elected a sheriff in Cook County. With his 1,200 deputies, the GOP will not be counted out in 1964.

Newark: In 1963, the GOP cut its loss in Newark from 59,000 to 16,000, won the lower house of the legislature, and increased our majority in the upper house by 50 percent.

Baltimore: In 1963, we changed our 1960 loss by 97,000 votes to a 5,000 vote victory and elected a GOP mayor. We carried the Negro wards.

Kansas City: In 1963, we cut our 1960 loss by 39,000 votes to only 1,800 votes, and the Negro wards voted Republican.

The GOP won municipal elections in 1963 all over the country—Indiana, Kentucky, Pennsylvania. The tide is running our way.

Since 1961, the GOP has had a net increase in State senate seats of 58, State legislature seats 149, county courthouses 197.

We have GOP Governors in the great urban industrial States of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Ohio.

There are signs of a real two-party system in the 11 States of the Old South. We have 11 GOP Congressmen, 41 new GOP members in State legislatures, 80 GOP members of city councils. This trend will continue.

THE BIG ISSUE

The real hair-shirt Lyndon Johnson must wear in the 1964 contest is the Democratic record. After all the 1960 oratory and promises, we have no cold war victories, loss of Zanzibar, the Panamanian revolt, De Gaulle and Red China, South Vietnam, Cyprus, Cambodia, Malaysia, Cuban trade, failure of the Alliance for Progress, and NATO in disarray.

THE "WHEELER-DEALER" ISSUE

As the Bobby Baker affair continues to unfold, there is developing a public image of Lyndon Johnson as a "wheeler-dealer." The stereo set, the L.B.J. TV station advertising, and similar revelations, are steadily smudging the Johnson image. Americans want a President who is more than a mere politician, or just a producer of "gimmick" budgets and vote-catching promises of something for everyone. Americans want a strong moral leader, who is capable of putting right ahead of popularity.

Anderson Youths Express Hatred for Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star of February 26 printed a letter from some students at the Madison Heights High School, Anderson, Ind., which I think should be of interest to the Members of this House and to the readers of the RECORD.

The article follows:

CONSERVATIVE YOUTHS AT ANDERSON PROCLAIM HATRED FOR COMMUNISM

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

We are conservatives. We are members of such organizations as Young Americans for Conservative Action and Young Americans for Freedom.

We do hate. We hate—not Communists—but communism, the most life-taking disease ever to come upon the face of the earth. We hate seeing our God blasphemed against, our religion ridiculed. We hate seeing people constantly put into slavery—a slavery from which few escape. We hate seeing our Government drift toward the same policies that communism and all forms of socialism use as their foundation.

Yes, we could be called "hate groups." But so could have been the founders of our country when they fought the suppression by tyrants. We can go back to the crusades. Weren't these, then, too, hate groups?

We prefer to call such organizations as ours "love groups." This may sound somewhat contradictory, but we think not. We love God; we love our fellowman and respect his life and rights; we love our country.

Today we are fighting a battle against the world's alltime great psychologists. They use "mental tactical warfare," and we use threats. They demand something two times the size of what they want; we give them half—just what they wanted. Who are "they?"

"They are the godless Socialists who are gradually taking over our way of life.

Just as soon as we perfect a bomb—one that may be better than Russia's—she wants us to be friends—on her terms. Hence the test ban treaty.

While British doctors are still fleeing socialized medicine, we are proposing it.

There most certainly is no immediate answer for America's racial problem, but the sooner all of us band together as partiots, the sooner a solution can be found. This solution cannot and will not be found in force. We all should be proud of our race, our color and our creed (if it's moral).

We have been called hate groups and fearmongers. We do hate wrong, but we don't sell fear. We simply show the progress of the Communist conspiracy, which already has overtaken three-fifths of the world, and is stealthily encroaching upon us.

Yes—we hate. We hate having to feed the people who have threatened to bury us—especially do we hate the selling of wheat to the U.S.S.R.—below what the free nations can purchase it for. Why give our enemies the breaks?

Please. Let's not feed, finance, and assist, the gravediggers who are going to bury us—alive.

America, wake up and fight.

C. RICHARD HERITAGE,
JAMES L. DOENGE II,
DAVID BIXLER,
Pupils at Madison Heights High School, Anderson, Ind.

Prayer in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our public schools and public officials must be permitted the freedom of seeking divine guidance—publicly if they so desire.

The following concurrent resolution by Senator Timmerman was unanimously adopted by the South Carolina Senate and House. This excellent resolution is most timely and I commend it to all of the Congress:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 671

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution making lawful the requirement of offering a daily prayer to Almighty God in the public schools

Whereas the people of the State of South Carolina and of the entire United States are shocked and dismayed over a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States declaring that the requirement of offering a daily prayer to Almighty God in the public schools is unconstitutional; and

Whereas the elected Representatives of the people of this State cannot believe that this represents the true intent of those who drafted the original Constitution which has served us so well during perilous times of the past; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that this matter should be resolved by inserting into the U.S. Constitution a mandate in unequivocal language that a daily prayer may be required in the public schools in all of the States; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the question should be presented to the legislatures of the several States for their consideration in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Constitution providing for amendment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which shall be amendment XXIV, as follows:

"AMENDMENT XXIV

"Notwithstanding any statute of the Congress or of any State of the United States or of any decision of any court to the contrary, it shall be lawful to require the offering of a daily prayer to Almighty God in the public schools throughout the United States"; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and to each Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress from South Carolina.

The Noiseless Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD a significant editorial concerning the Bobby Baker case which appeared in the February 27 issue of Chicago's American:

THE NOISELESS SCANDAL

Much as the American reading public would like to know how Bobby Baker got so rich as a Senate employee, Baker himself isn't about to tell. In his appearance before the Senate Rules Committee Tuesday, the former secretary to the Senate Democratic majority refused 125 times to answer its questions, invoking constitutional protections including the fifth amendment—meaning that he was afraid his answers would incriminate him.

Then Baker's spectacular secretary, former Tennessee beauty queen Carole Tyler, followed her boss to the stand Wednesday and was even less communicative; she wouldn't answer anything, beyond identifying herself. The investigator's next step, presumably, will be to see if Baker and Miss Tyler have exposed themselves to contempt-of-Congress charges. The committee's main job, however, is not to punish Baker—that's up to a civil court—but to find out all it can about his complex financial dealings and what Congress can do to prevent any similar abuses.

The case goes considerably beyond Baker's own get-rich-quick deals. It involves the integrity of Congress, which is why we would welcome some sign of concern from President Johnson and high administration officials about the case; they have shown remarkably little so far.

Among other influence scandals in Washington, the Baker case is remarkable for two things—the seriousness of the charges and the relative lack of excitement about them. In the case of Sherman Adams, former President Eisenhower's assistant president, the sums involved were trifling in comparison. Adams was charged with receiving a few thousand dollars' worth of gifts, including a rug and a vicuna coat, from Boston industrialist Bernard Goldfine; Baker is accused of misusing his connections to build up a $2 million personal fortune. Yet the Adams case stirred up far more excitement than Baker's troubles have.

There were reasons for that, of course. Adams kept his own case in the headlines for months by stubbornly refusing to quit after the Goldfine scandal broke; Baker lost no time ducking out of his Government post when things got hot. Adams' post was far closer to the Presidency and his influence on Government affairs was far more direct than Baker's. Still, even Adams' enemies never charged that he was consciously out to enrich himself by abusing public trust. That is exactly the accusation against Baker, and it is a deadly serious one.

There is a vast difference between a stubborn, self-righteous official unable to see anything wrong in his conduct and a clever, self-

serving manipulator, whose dealings involve many others in and out of Government. We're a lot more concerned about the latter than the former, and we wish the administration would get concerned about it, too.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 29, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

PRESENT FOREIGN POLICY IS DANGEROUS; THE INEVITABLE RESULT IS DISASTER FOR OUR COUNTRY, BUT THE PEOPLE CAN FORCE A CHANGE

A casual check of the news of the day makes it clear that American prestige has never been lower. The world picture is not pleasant. The indecision of the administration in developing foreign policy is creating worldwide confusion and rising anti-Americanism. Here is what is happening around the world and the inevitable conclusion if we continue the present course:

1. Africa is close to a continentwide explosion with country after country in revolt, spurred on by the Communists. In Zanzibar a Castro Communist-trained agent openly led the revolt, U.S. representatives were kicked out, and then we recognized the new regime. The State Department could see nothing wrong in giving respectability to a Communist-oriented government and emphasized that it did not consider the ousting of the third secretary of the U.S. Embassy an expulsion from Zanzibar and said that it would not interfere in the recognition preparations that were well advanced at that point. The State Department does not consider Zanzibar to be Communist influenced in spite of the ties of its leaders to Castro's Cuba and that it has now been named a "peoples' republic," the official designation of all Communist countries. Such an attitude can only result in making Zanzibar the Cuba of Africa which will serve as a staging area for Communist subversion and aggression to bring about a takeover of the Congo and the rest of Africa.

2. Indonesia, which owes its existence to our help and generosity, is thumbing its nose at us and defying us to prevent its conquest of Malaysia. Unless we take a strong stand isn't it reasonable to suppose that Sukarno will overrun Indonesia and set the stage for the loss to the Communists of all of the Far East, including the Philippines?

3. Cambodia: A country on which we literally forced U.S. aid, is now swinging to the Communist camp and is likely to sign a pact with Red China and become a Communist Chinese satellite.

4. Laos: We forced a Communist-dominated coalition government upon it. The Red takeover there is now almost complete.

5. Thailand: Formerly a solid pro-Western ally. Our indecisive policy and our courting of the Soviet Union is slowly swinging it to the Communists.

6. Vietnam: A keypoint in the tragedy of failures in foreign policy. 15,000 American boys are fighting there and many of them have died. There is strong rumor that Vietnam will be abandoned after the November election, and if that happens the Communists will take over and the Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam will have died in vain.

7. Pakistan: Once one of our firmest allies in Asia. It is now lining up with Red China because of our flirtation with India with every likelihood that Pakistan and Communist China will soon sign a mutual security pact and the free world will have lost another ally.

8. India: In spite of the billions we have given India, it still sides more often with the Soviet Union when the chips are down in choosing between the free world and the Communist line.

9. Red China: We see all the signs that the American people are being softened up to accept the admission of Red China to the U.N. and the recognition of the Communists by the United States. This will mean the abandonment of free China on the island of Formosa under the subterfuge of adopting the principle of two Chinas and the eventual loss to the Communists of the whole area.

10. Algeria: We gave stature and prestige to its pro-Communist ruler, Ben Bella. Now he leans more and more to the Soviet Union and could be instrumental in enveloping the larger part of North Africa and making the Mediterranean a Communist sea. In this same area, Libya, which owes us its very existence, has served notice it will not renew its treaty with us for airbases.

11. Cyprus: We have already agreed to turn the Cyprus question over to the U.N. where Soviet Russia will probably dictate the settlement. It will be to her advantage to foment the civil war, create hostilities between Greece and Turkey, both our allies, and eventually to give Russia what she has always wanted, control of the Black Sea.

THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

South America is tottering. There is every evidence that we are being prepared for: (1) The internationalization of the Panama Canal under control of the U.N. giving veto power over its use to the Soviet Union. (2) Recognition of Castro with resumption of trade and diplomatic relations. The United States is hardly in a position to prevent other countries from trading with the Communists in the face of our own sale of wheat to the Soviets. Recognition of Castro will set the stage for a complete takeover in British Guiana, Venezuela, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and the rest of the hemisphere.

This will complete the Communist's primary goal—encirclement of the United States, making us powerless to resist any ultimatum handed to us by Khrushchev. After that, mopping up the rest of the world to complete Communist domination will be easy. Australia and New Zealand, isolated on the underside of the world, will be peanuts for them. We are already being prepared for the recognition of Hungary and East Germany. England and France, blissfully unaware of the true face of the Communist conspiracy, cannot stand without a strong America.

Is this a frightening picture? It is meant to be. It is the future we can look forward to if we continue to follow our present course. Need it happen? No. The United States still has the means and the power to regain the leadership of the free world. All that is lacking is the will. A change in our foreign policy will make the difference. We can strengthen the determination of our allies by taking a firm stand against Soviet Russian imperialism. Freedom will be on the march again when we stop appeasing the Communists, when we stop financing the Communists, when we take bold steps to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. Will we do it? Not under the course the present leadership is following. But I have faith in the American people. I believe they resent using foreign relations to win elections. I am confident we will not face the tragic conclusions outlined above because when the people have all the facts they will force a change in policy before it is too late.

Personal Efforts of Peace Corps Volunteers in Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the third anniversary of the founding of the Peace Corps.

The occasion provides us with an opportunity to commend the men and women of the Peace Corps, and its able Director, the Honorable Sargent Shriver, for a job well done.

In the 3 short years of its existence the Peace Corps has proved its value both to the United States, and to the underdeveloped nations of the world.

First, the Peace Corps has directly assisted the economic development of peoples less fortunate than we are. It has helped them make for themselves and their children, the kind of progress which the United States has come to represent in the world.

Second, the Peace Corps has shown the world that Americans, young and old, are willing to make significant personal sacrifices in order to help others. This has strengthened America's image, and furthered our foreign policy aims.

Third, the Peace Corps is providing our Nation with a pool of individuals who possess valuable knowledge and skills gained by working in countries where only limited numbers of Americans previously have visited.

Fourth, the Peace Corps is providing a worthwhile outlet for the creative idealism of our people. It is directing the fervor of youth and maturity into channels where personal effort can have recognizable significant effect.

To illustrate this last point, I include in the RECORD at this point, part of a State Department field report on the activities of some of our Peace Corps volunteers in Thailand:

PERSONAL EFFORTS OF PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS IN THAILAND

Peace Corps volunteers teaching English in provincial cities and towns have brought about a phenomenal increase in the number of upcountry Thai high school students who receive American field service scholarships for 1 year's study in American high schools. They have accomplished this by publicizing the program in their cities and towns and by giving intensive coaching after school to the students in their communities who are likely candidates.

Before Peace Corps, there was much less interest in these scholarships and it was mainly confined to Bangkok students. Last year the number applying jumped to 400. Seventy-two received scholarships. This year 1,700 students took a much more difficult qualifying examination. Six hundred passed this preliminary test and more than 150, many of them from provincial towns, are expected to receive scholarships.

Brady Beaton, a group II vocational agriculture teacher from Lordon, Ky., is engaged in preparing the first Thai textbook for teaching animal husbandry, with the enthusiastic support of the ministry.

In a group of villages located in a remote area near the Laotian border, where sugar is the main crop, Dave Perry from Berkley,

Mass., a group IV rural community action volunteer, took the problems of the villagers directly to the responsible officials and was able to effect an immediate 20-percent increase in the price paid by the local sugar monopoly to the villagers for their sugar. Five hundred families benefited from this. Also, whereas the villagers formerly had to wait more than 3 months for their cash, he was able to bring about a change whereby they now receive it upon delivery of their crop.

The staple diet in Dave's village is fish sauce on rice. Because Dave insisted on having his fish sauce cooked to avoid the hazards of liver fluke (a major medical problem in rural Thailand) the Thai family with whom he lives and an increasing number of others have come to prefer the cooked sauce over the raw and dangerous sauce they have eaten all their lives.

Roy Klaviter, from La Salle, Minn., did such a bang-up job in a provincial Thai hospital that the doctor in charge was convinced that he should become a doctor. As a result of the medical director's encouragement over the last year, Roy has applied to the medical faculty of Chulalongkorn University to study medicine when his Peace Corps tour ends this June. The Thai Government will give him a scholarship in recognition of his Peace Corps service.

Art Crisfield, from Seaford, Del., one of the original volunteers to come to Thailand, has become the most sought after and successful teachers of English as a foreign language in Thailand. His Thai at this point, after extending his Peace Corps service in Thailand another 6 months, is so fluent that he can and has made impromptu 15-minute speeches in Thai without any preparation.

Fred Perry from Woodland, N.C., is writing the first textbook on the raising of field crops in Thailand and his book will be used by the Ministry of Education as a standard student text.

Lin Compton, group II physical education volunteer from Columbus, Ohio, recently made a one and a half-hour speech in Thai about the United States and its new president before a group of 1,000 students.

Noel Kobayashi, from Gardena, Calif., a group II laboratory technician, stationed in southern Thailand recently wrote a song designed to promote tourism in the lovely but unpublicized southern coast. His song was so popular that he was requested to sing it on a nationwide TV program.

Billy Williams, a group II volunteer from Boston, Ga., is teaching a course in economics entirely in Thai.

Christopher Sanford, from Gibsonia, Pa., is teaching a course that he himself has written for elementary students exposed to the study of English for the first time.

Randy Shaffner, from Winston-Salem, N.C., is compiling a dictionary of the northern Thai language and is helping to edit a book on the northern hill tribes.

In a subsistence level village where there was no income to the farmers, RCA volunteer Philip French, of Washington, Ohio, persuaded 60 families to start home gardens. Phil obtained the seed, fertilizer, and insecticide from Thai Government sources for them and instructed them how to plant and care for a variety of vegetables. The harvest was successful and all the families reacted favorably to the improved diet and sold sufficient of their excess crop to provide some cash income for the family. However, with some feeling of frustration, Phil reported that the villagers failed to heed his advice to save seeds for planting this year and now Phil is faced with doing the whole thing over again. But he did demonstrate to these families that their own Government can be useful to them.

Linda Byam, an English teacher from Whitehall, Mich., is stationed in one of the most isolated assignments in Thailand, 30 miles across sand dunes from the nearest large town or 8 hours by boat. Despite her isolation, Linda, who is a talented artist, has not only become an integral part of her community but is also busily engaged in her spare time in writing and illustrating children's books for her students.

Tex Lierly, from Fort Smith, Ark., is living in an isolated village in the rain forests near the Malay border, which few officials have ever seen. In addition to working with the villagers on their agricultural and road problems, Tex has become the unofficial doctor of the community even though his only medicines are malaria suppressives, bandaids and aspirin. He uses this new distinction to improve sanitary conditions in the village and is busily engaged in selling malaria suppressive tablets so as to create a fund which will provide water seal privies for the entire village.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that these examples of the kind of dedicated work being accomplished by our Peace Corps volunteers in Thailand will serve to illustrate the pervading spirit of the Peace Corps which has made it such a universal success.

Hawaiian Legislature Supports Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, on February 24, 1964, adopted a resolution supporting the civil rights bill passed by the House of Representatives and now pending before the Senate.

The resolution points out that racial discrimination and oppression will continue to cause great dissension, discord, and disturbance through out our Nation, while their elimination would strengthen our Nation and improve our image abroad.

Mr. Speaker, we in Hawaii are proud of being referred to as the "Paradise of the Pacific," but through painful experience we know it takes work, effort, and a cooperative spirit to build good race relations. It does not happen by accident. In addition, we in Hawaii are very much concerned about the image we create abroad, for as the westernmost State of our Nation we know we present a showcase of American democracy to visitors from the Pacific and Asian nations as well as those from all over the world.

The House Concurrent Resolution 3 of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii reads as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution urging Congress to enact civil rights legislation

Whereas our Nation was founded on the concept of equal rights for all; and

Whereas racial discrimination and oppression has resulted in depriving a significant segment of our Nation of their equal rights; and

Whereas this racial discrimination and oppression has caused and will cause great dissension, discord, and disturbance throughout our Nation; and

Whereas the elimination of this racial discrimination and oppression would strengthen our Nation and improve our image abroad; and

Whereas the various States in our Nation have been unwilling or unable to eliminate this racial discrimination and oppression; and

Whereas civil rights legislation presently before Congress would aid in the elimination of this racial discrimination and oppression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1964 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact the civil rights legislation before it; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE and the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senators from the State of Hawaii, and to the Honorable THOMAS P. GILL and the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, U.S. Representatives from the State of Hawaii.

Appropriations for Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert into the Appendix the text of a statement I am submitting to the House Committee on Appropriations in regard to the budget request for soil conservation, particularly watershed protection, for the coming fiscal year:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, SECOND DISTRICT, CONNECTICUT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to present a brief statement to this distinguished committee concerning the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service for the 1965 fiscal year.

In the budget submitted by the President to Congress in January of this year, a sum of $204,042,000 is requested for the Soil Conservation Service programs and activities for the coming year. This is nearly $2 million more than for the current fiscal year. There are five specific services listed, each one of inestimable value to the country, particularly the rural areas. These services are: conservation operations, watershed protection, flood prevention, Great Plains conservation program, and resource conservation and development.

All of these programs and services are highly important. They include soil surveys for conservation purposes, river basin surveys for watershed protection, planning and starting pilot projects for conservation of resources which are designed to enhance the level of economic activity, flood prevention projects and the like. These programs and projects are very helpful in soil-building and soil and water-conserving practices. Our farmers could not undertake such programs on their own because of their limited resources.

In Connecticut, the rapidly changing land use has created additional needs for these technical soil conservation services. Until recent years, the demands for technical assistance through local soil conservation districts originated on commercial farms. In the last few years there have been many requests to the State Department of Agriculture and natural resources from local planning and zoning groups, conservation commissions, service clubs, and other public organizations seeking assistance in planning land use developments.

Of particular interest is the watershed protection program for Connecticut. Our very able State commissioner of agriculture, the Honorable Joseph N. Gill, recently informed me that six watershed projects have been approved for operations in the State of Connecticut. Of these two are in my congressional district: Furnace Brook-Middle River, in Stafford, and the Spaulding Pond Brook, in Norwich. Incidentally, the Spaulding Pond Brook was involved in a disastrous flash flood just about a year ago, on March 6, 1963, which caused six deaths and the destruction of several millions of dollars of property. The cost for the construction work on these six Connecticut projects for this year is estimated at about $3 million.

In the President's budget message, a sum of $65,848,000 is requested under new obligational authority for watershed protection for all such projects in the country. This is an increase of $2,309,000 over the previous year. Commissioner Gill, however, pointed out in a letter to me that these funds are not sufficient to provide the technical assistance now being requested of the Soil Conservation Service and that additional funds are needed for that purpose.

Furthermore, the budget request for watershed planning funds is about $1 million less. A reduction in these funds would seriously delay the watershed planning program in Connecticut, where there are six unserviced applications at the present time. In this instance, too, two of the unserviced applications are from my district: the Moosup River in Windham County and the Oxoboxo River in New London County. These programs are extremely important to us.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I cannot emphasize too strongly what this watershed protection means for Connecticut. I urge you to provide adequate appropriations for these programs. Reducing such funds or providing insufficient funds does not constitute economy but a loss of valuable resources and protection of property and land. We must do everything possible to preserve and protect our resources for the welfare of our Nation, now and in the future.

Are Welfare Programs the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there occurred in the Washington Post of Wednesday, February 26, a news story containing some remarkable statements by a responsible official of the administration, Mr. Patrick Daniel Moynihan, Assistant Secretary of Labor. If the gentleman was quoted correctly, he stated: "It—welfare—has made poverty more endurable instead of providing a door of escape from it" and that welfare "corrupts" its recipients. He said that in eastern Kentucky, "some people have been on welfare for three or four generations." He also said that welfare is "rotting" the poverty stricken of America. He went on to say that the big problem is discovering who the poor really are. "We're so big and so much less organized than other countries that communities do not know who their poor are," he explained. Then he added: "In certain profound ways American poverty is a political instead of an economic problem."

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues because it is a remarkable reflection of some of the points of view put before Congress by Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee on the very day it was carried by the Post. Referring to such pockets of poverty as eastern Kentucky, we members of the committee stated that massive doses of Federal spending have been tried since the 1930's without significant success. We also pointed to the difficulties of defining poverty. Mr. Moynihan stressed the need for education, as demonstrated by the draft rejects, a point on which we are wholly in accord.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear so responsible and well informed a view from a high official of the Johnson administration. We Republicans recognize that the dole is not the whole answer to unemployment. That the basic problem is indeed economic rather than political—or should be—and that the answer lies in manpower retraining and education.

I therefore submit the article for publication as follows:

ANTIPOVERTY ARMY LEADER SAYS: WAY OUT OF POVERTY FOR A MAN IS A JOB

(By Sue Cronk)

Welfare is "rotting" the poverty stricken of America, a member of the Johnson administration's antipoverty "army" charged Monday night.

"It (welfare) has made poverty more endurable instead of providing a door of escape from it," Assistant Secretary of Labor Patrick Daniel Moynihan told 25 interns of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation race relations project.

Moynihan, whose family lived on welfare on the West Side of New York City during the depression, said welfare "corrupts" its recipients. In eastern Kentucky, for example, "some people have been on welfare for three or four generations," he said. "The only way out of poverty for a man is employment."

Residents of Appalachia and those on Indian reservations already have been rotted by welfare, he said, "and the Negro community is on the verge of being rotted."

Since employment for Negro males has become increasingly difficult to obtain "because of rampaging technology that no longer needs anyone with a strong back," he added, "the most important fact of poverty in America is, without question, Negro poverty."

Last June, he noted, when youth unemployment reached its highest proportions in recorded American history, there were twice as many unemployed Negro teenagers as white.

For many of them, military service wasn't an opportunity to earn a living, Moynihan said, because the majority of Negroes who take the selective service achievement test—geared to a seventh or eighth grade level—fail it.

One-fourth of them fail it despite having been graduated from so-called "separate but equal" high schools.

Some 2,500 draft rejects—both Negro and white—were reinterviewed to determine the cause of their failure, he said, "and without any question they were products of poverty."

"They were uneducated sons of uneducated fathers, unemployed sons of unemployed fathers." Almost half of them came from families of six or more children.

Moynihan, who is working closely with R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the administration's "unconditional war against poverty," also told his biracial audience that "the illegimacy rate is destroying the Negro community."

"Ten percent of the Negro population today are children," he said, pointing out that in Chicago the number of women on aid to dependent children rolls has risen from 55,000 to 185,000 in the last decade.

While poverty is more striking among Negroes—80 percent of the Negroes in the South are poor, for instance—it is by no means confined to them, Moynihan indicated.

The big problem, he said, is finding out who really lives in poverty, "We're so big and so much less organized than other countries, that communities don't know who their poor are."

What we do know is that the United States is probably "the only major industrial country in the West where a considerable number of people [an estimated 40 to 50 million] live in poverty," he said.

"Nowhere in England today, for instance, would you find millions of people living in urban and rural slums," Moynihan said.

This is not because England is more prosperous, but because "in certain profound ways" American poverty is "a political instead of an economic problem. We don't have to have this poverty, but we do."

NASA's University Training Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration recently released the names of 131 colleges and universities that will participate in their graduate training program for the academic year 1964–65.

This program of higher education in the aeronautics and space field was started in 1962. At the present time some 900 graduate students are in training under NASA grants to 88 schools. This year nearly 1,100 additional students will begin work on doctoral degrees in space-related areas under the grants which will be received by the 131 schools located in 47 participating States. I was pleased to note that among these are two great universities from my own State of Maryand—Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore and the University of Maryland in College Park.

Participants in this graduate-training program is space-related predoctoral studies will be selected by the various universities and enter the program in September of this year. The number at

each school varies from 2 to 15 depending on the number of doctoral programs available in the space-related areas, the adequacy of the school's facilities, and the extent of its participation in space activities.

Under the NASA grant, each graduate student chosen for the program receives remuneration in the amount of $2,400 for 12 months of training. In addition, there is an allowance for dependents of up to $1,000 a year depending on the policy of the university administering the funds. The student is assured of 3 years of predoctoral study, if he maintains a satisfactory record.

NASA Administrator, James E. Webb, has stated that:

> The predoctoral training program is making excellent progress toward its major objectives—helping to meet the Nation's future needs for highly-trained scientists and engineers. It is heartening to note that the large number of schools participating this year indicates the interest of our universities in strengthening their graduate programs in space-related areas.

I would like to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for instituting this predoctoral training program involving participation by our colleges and universities in research and development in space. It is my feeling that the institution of programs of a similar nature in other scientific fields would alleviate the situation now existent in our country where positions requiring advanced training and education cannot be filled due to the lack of qualified personnel.

Food Stamp Program Praised: Expansion Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program has been discussed for many months and in many areas of the country. The program is still on an experimental basis. The experiment started in eight selected areas. The program has been enlarged and now reaches into 43 areas in 22 States.

Legislation is pending before the House Committee on Agriculture which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the program into all areas of the Nation.

Through this food stamp program we can carry on "the war against poverty" and through this program we can provide food for hungry Americans. It is almost unthinkable that any American should go hungry when our warehouses are bulging with vital food.

Through other programs perhaps a hundred million people living in many nations of the earth are receiving vital food from the abundance we have harvested from our fields and ranches; yet there are many Members of this Congress who are willing to close their eyes to the poverty and the hunger that exists throughout this Nation of ours. Many Members of Congress, however, have appeared before our committee and wholeheartedly endorsed the food stamp program. I congratulate and commend them.

In the month of November 1962, the food stamp program was set into operation in my home county. Officials of our department of public welfare, our board of county commissioners, and others were anxious for the food stamp program to be put into operation and I was assured that the experiment would be properly conducted. I therefore requested the Secretary of Agriculture to start the program in Nash County.

At my request, the director of the Nash County Department of Public Welfare has just given me a report which I now submit for the RECORD, in the hope that all Members of Congress will take time to read and to consider the facts, figures, and conclusions set forth in this report.

I am also submitting for the RECORD a communication dated October 17, 1963, which indicates how the program has been operated and it further clearly indicates that the people of the county are pleased with the accomplishments.

Our director of public welfare told me yesterday that an FBI agent has spent 3 weeks in Nash County checking and doublechecking, in an effort to ascertain if there were any abuses involved in the operation of the program or if the purposes of the program were being unlawfully defeated by either recipients, merchants, or others. I was advised that after working for 3 weeks in the county, the FBI agent reported that he had not discovered any fraud or corruption of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, this report indicates that 8,269 persons in this one North Carolina county would be suffering the pains of hunger but for this food stamp program. If any Members of this body have any doubt as to the success of the food stamp program and the urgent need for its expansion, I hope that they will explore the situation in an effort to obtain full and accurate information which should be helpful to them in making up their minds. I shall continue my efforts to secure the passage of legislation authorizing the expansion of the program into all areas of the Nation where it is needed.

The aforementioned material follows:

NASH COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Nashville, N.C., February 29, 1964.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: At your request I am submitting some information and comments relative to the pilot food stamp program which has been in operation in Nash County since November 1962.

As you know we have a population of approximately 61,000 and we are in an agricultural area which means that employment is high during the summer and fall months and very low during the winter months. Many of our unemployed people who are classified as day laborers are not eligible for unemployment compensation nor are they able to secure employment. For many years this has been a serious social problem because many of these people have not had the proper educational training or job training for them to compete in the labor market.

In 1963 I made a study of the first 131 tenant farm families who applied for food stamps. Twenty-one percent of these could not sign their names to the applications.

We began certifying families in October 1962 and the sale of food stamps in November 1962. We experienced steady growth and reached our peak the month of March when the cash sales amounted to $45,262 and the bonus coupons amounted to $52,874, making the total food available $98,136. This amount of food went to the homes of 1,560 families including 8,269 persons.

One of the main things I like about the food stamp program is that these persons were using the initiative to secure funds to make a purchase of stamps and by doing so were able to more than double their purchase power in the food market. This enabled the families to keep their dignity and to feel that their government was interested in their well-being. This also meant that the merchants were experiencing a normal trade of $98,136. Had the welfare department issued this amount of free food from a warehouse the merchants not only would have lost this amount of business but the families would not have purchased food until the full amount of free food had been consumed. During the first year of operation the families purchased $295,843 worth of stamps and they received a bonus of $273,085. The gratifying thing to me is I know the children in these families had $568,928 to strengthen their bodies for future citizenship in a great nation. I think the following example illustrates the value of food stamps and is worth noting.

Last month we had one of our aid to the permanently and totally disabled cases receiving $58 per month; her daughter, son-in-law, and seven children, who had been living in another State came to live in the home because employment was no longer available for the head of the family. The aid to the permanently and totally disabled case was purchasing $12 in stamps and receiving $6 bonus for a total of $18. We were able to change the certification to 10 in family and they purchased $26 worth of stamps, received a bonus of $64, and were able to buy $90 worth of food.

These type cases are coming up daily and we are able to handle these as emergencies and the local grocerymen can provide immediate food from their shelves for these families. In February 1964, 1,660 households received $106,068 in food stamps. This has been our peak month since the program has been in operation.

I have heard many comments that it is one of the finest programs we have in operation through the welfare department. I personally feel that I can see more tangible benefits from the food stamp program than any program we have in operation.

I am attaching hereto a copy of the letter which the Federal project supervisor secured with volunteer comments from a cross section of our population. These observations were freely given according to my information and I know most of these personally and I believe they were sincere in making these statements. I hope that those in a position to evaluate the food stamp program will study it carefully and gather many facts for I am thoroughly convinced the facts will sell the program. We have had some problems but I do not consider them too serious and if we were to handle any program costing an excess of a half a million dollars I would expect to have problems.

I have been director of public welfare in Nash County for 29 years and during this time have had the opportunity to administer the surplus food program and the food stamp program. From every respect I think the

food stamp program is more desirable. I believe the food is used to better advantages and offers more of a variety and in my judgment it moves more surplus food from the market.

Yours very truly,

Jimmy,
J. A. GLOVER,
Director.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION DIVISION,
Rocky Mount, N.C., October 17, 1963.

To: Mr. Russell H. James, Director, Area Office, FDD, AMS, USDA, Atlanta, Ga.

From: Sam W. Pope, project supervisor, Rocky Mount, N.C.

Subject: Publicity—statements concerning Nash County food stamp program.

In regard to your request for statements to be incorporated in the press release concerning our program, we, at first, experienced some delay because Mr. Glover was out of town and not available for consultation. No statement was obtained from Mr. Brown, commissioner of North Carolina Public Welfare, because he has been in Washington for several days.

The present edition of our Nash County paper, the Nashville Graphic, carries an article with comments on the food stamp program which has been of considerable interest throughout the county. Therefore, I am attaching a copy.

A statement concerning the program was obtained from Mr. Glover and several other interested individuals throughout the county, and they are as follows:

J. A. Glover, director, Nash County Department of Public Welfare: "The food stamp pilot program is meeting a definite need in Nash County helping to provide adequate diets in sufficient quantities. Parents from low-income families have reported that they have had sufficient food with a variety for the first time in years. Grocerymen have reported seeing families carrying home cereals and fresh milk for the first time. Mothers have reported children sleeping more soundly and that they get along better at home and school. A neighbor reports that an aged person is now getting more food and looking better. These are some of the advantages which have been called to my attention. To me it is the best plan yet devised to help fill a serious gap in our economy and help meet a need in our democratic society."

Frederick B. Cooper, Jr., vice president, Peoples Bank & Trust Co., Nashville, N.C., banker, farmer, business, member of Nash County Board of Commissioners, Nashville, N.C.: "The food stamp program has certainly served a good purpose in this county, both as a means to help those families with very low income and those in need during periods of minimum work availability as well as moving some of our agricultural abundance. We apparently are reaching most of our needy families and the program seems to be getting along quite smoothly. Besides providing not only more, but a greater variety of food for the recipient families than they might otherwise have received, it has helped to stimulate Nash County's economy especially during the winter months, normally a period of low economic activity."

John A. Woods, manager of Thomas & Howard, wholesale grocery, Rocky Mount, N.C.: "In helping those families needing food, the food stamp program has also been beneficial to the community. Since many different food items are available to them, it has been a means whereby the families could improve themselves. By being able to choose these foods themselves, better use can be made with less waste by each family toward meeting their own particular food pattern and habits. It is serving such a fine cause in providing hungry children with more food. I have a great deal of respect for those people in the Welfare Department who administer the program, and I feel that they are doing all they can to improve its effectiveness and follow its purposes."

Arnold L. Adams, wholesale grocer, Arnold L. Adams Co., Rocky Mount, N.C.: Mr. Adams stated that he "knew that it had helped many of his retail accounts and was meeting a need in Nash County."

However, he does not want his name used unless in conjunction with other grocers or in a general group listing.

F. D. Bissett, farmer, general merchant, and former member of Nash County Welfare Board, Spring Hope, N.C.: "This is one of the finest programs that has been available to help the Welfare Department carry out its purpose of looking out for those citizens of Nash County in need. The program did a wonderful job last winter when work was not generally available and there was very little for a laborer to do. By providing regular items of food for these people, it takes its place as one of the best things to 'hit this county' at a time when some assistance was needed. Our people in such unfortunate circumstances not only lived better but remained more healthy as evidenced by less sickness and lower doctors' bills. There is no doubt in my mind that this improvement in health and the increase in their level of energy has helped to make better citizens."

C. E. "Bill" Joyner, retail grocer, Red & White Supermarket, Nashville, N.C.: "It is a shame to think that in a land of abundance such as ours that not all of its people can have a share, to the extent that every family should have an adequate amount of food. So, it is gratifying to see the needy people of our country buy fresh milk and cereals and a variety of other foods for their hungry children. Time has helped these families to adjust their diets to the better amounts of food and with time, we will also see a beneficial effect on the attitudes of their children. More energy to live by will increase a child's interest and incentive to use and improve his opportunities."

Mrs. Phyllis Gail Joyner, 1110 Aycock Street, Rocky Mount, N.C., recipient: "Well, we have certainly eaten better since getting the stamps. It has been a blessing for my family. With seven children and a small amount of money, even when I learned to stretch my food dollar, I could not give them all the different kinds of food that they needed.

One of my neighbors also gets the food stamps. Besides having more food for her small, hungry mouths to eat, she saw a real noticeable change in the behavior of one of her girls. This girl had been terribly touchy, highly nervous, and something of a problem, but after getting the greater variety of foods, she gained weight, lost much of her tenseness and had a better living and playing attitude."

W. E. "Bill" Griffin, retail grocer, Red Oak, N.C.: "The story of Jenny and Otis C. Upchurch, affectionately known as 'Dummy' has demonstrated to the community of Red Oak, the necessity for, and the effectiveness of such a program as that handled through the Nash County food stamps. The assistance that 'Dummy' has received in this manner has been a godsend to him and his wife. He is one of our very finest deaf and dumb citizens and commands the respect of us all for his willingness to work, his friendliness, and his efforts for making the most of what he has. He has been in this community about 15 years and attends the First Baptist Church in Rock Mount every Sunday. Since he is now partially disabled, the food stamps are fulfilling a necessity for some type of supplement to his small income. This extra food-purchasing power permits him to buy the quantity and variety of food necessary for himself and his wife."

Mr. Griffin also stated that since he realized the limitations, as well as the necessity, for assistance and a welfare program, that he felt that this method of providing food for the needy was one of the most effective to be used that he can remember.

Upon contacting Mrs. Chappell to reauthorize the Crossroads Super Market since the death of her husband, this story, unsolicited, and was voluntarily given, as a community example of what the food stamp program was doing for the needy of Nash County.

Mrs. W. R. Chappell, retail grocer, Crossroads Super Market, Castalia, N.C.: Mrs. Chappell well remembers the day last winter when one of our recipients, a woman with five children, sent a note to the Crossroads Store, pleading for some food for her family and promising to work in any way she could as soon as her children were well—two were down with measles. Mrs. Chappell took the food to the home and suggested that the family apply for certification in the food stamp program. When the food stamps were gotten, the recipient came and bought enough food to use up one-half of her coupons and Mrs. Chappell again delivered the groceries and returned the mother home as is the policy of the Crossroads Super Market. "The sight of the children clamoring into the car almost before it stopped to grab something to eat from the bags of food and the sound of children's voices calling from the house and crying for food would have touched the heart of anyone. This was one of the most pitiful experiences I've ever had and Nash County can thank the Lord for a program that will take care of situations such as this."

A Challenging Year for the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Representative OREN HARRIS, has written an illuminating article which appeared in the January-February issue of Progressive Railroading published in Chicago under the direction of Phil Murphy.

Entitled "1964—A Challenging and Promising Year for the Railroads," the article is particularly timely. I commend it to my colleagues, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR—A CHALLENGING AND PROMISING YEAR FOR THE RAILROADS

(By U.S. Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas)

The senseless, savage assassination of President John F. Kennedy has catapulted Lyndon Baines Johnson into the post of Chief Executive at a crucial period in our Nation's history, posing many questions among businessmen who had been planning forward confidently for 1964.

Characteristically, President Johnson has moved swiftly and surely to make the moves that would assuage, insofar as possible, the economic impact of the national disaster which robbed the Nation of a popular leader on November 22. The new President's moves have done much to remove doubts in the business community. It detracts not one whit from the memory of J.F.K. to note that there was only a slight hesitation in the economy, as a result of the monstrous act. Rather, it is a tribute to the leadership and astuteness of his successor.

In the few hurried weeks he has held office, President Johnson, with whom I served in the House of Representatives for some years, has proved again the great wisdom of our Founding Fathers. If ever we have seen the value of having an able and experienced standby as Vice President, in case of emergency, certainly we have experienced it in the capable manner in which Lyndon Johnson has held the reins of Government since the tragedy struck.

Already, businessmen in general and perhaps most of them, have come to feel that, in President Johnson, there is a man in the Chief Executive's office who will carry on toward the economic goals of his predecessor, and will even press forward to attain higher goals in the future. And we know—from his past training and career, as well as his spoken assurances—that President Johnson always will act in the context of our finely balanced system of separation of powers. He will respect Congress and congressional prerogatives. Nevertheless, this will not prevent the White House and Capitol Hill from cooperating on projects, plans, and policies that will result in the continued growth of the economy and redound to the glory of our country.

BUSINESS WILL CONTINUE TO GO FORWARD IN 1964

What may be the results, in 1964, from the standpoint of the overall economy, the transportation industry generally, and railroads in particular?

While I have no private crystal ball, I do have the opportunity, as chairman of an important congressional committee, to get the views of the experts in many fields, both as they testify before committees and as they brief Congressmen in private sessions.

Any prediction I might seem to make really is not a prediction. It is what the economists and statisticians call a projection. This is merely an assumption that, given approximately the same factors, there will be a continued extension of present economic, commercial, transport, and other developments. A projection is based on a study of what has happened and what is happening in the economy and an analysis of what probably will happen as a result of present developments. It takes past and present history into account and extends that into the immediate future. A projection is based on what is known of human nature, too. None of the projections takes into account what might happen in case of a great natural catastrophe, the terrible unleashing of H-bomb war, or other possibilities which may not appear to be probabilities. But we must base our lives on probabilities.

Looking at what has happened in the economy in 1963, and in preceding years, and basing our projections on an extension of the same factors, we can assume, I believe, that the new year will see continued upward movement in the economy.

During 1963, gross national product, which is the sum total of all goods and services produced by everyone at work, has moved up steadily, if not spectacularly. By the end of the third quarter, gross national product, as measured on an annual basis, was $31 billion higher than it was during the last quarter of 1962. It is past the $585 billion a year rate now, and gives every indication of hitting the $600 billion a year rate sometime this spring.

Also during 1963, as in 1962, total personal income has gone up during every month. This is the statistical measurement which gives us the total money paid to everyone in the society (wages, salaries, dividends, insurance claims, pension and annuity payments, etc.). In the last month of 1963, the personal income figure, on an annual basis, stood at the highest total in the Nation's history. As noted, there was steady growth all during 1962, and 1963, and even 1961, for that matter.

One result of the high personal income, and more people at work than ever before in U.S. history, has been recordbreaking sales at retail. The sales have hit close to the $250 billion a year mark during several months of 1963, and economists believe that the year's total will be some 6 percent over the 1962 total.

While consumers, as such, have been showing great optimism about their future in this Nation, businessmen have been just as forward looking. Capital spending went up to record highs in 1963. All the surveys of capital spending intentions indicate that businessmen are projecting a 3- to 5-percent increase in capital spending in 1964.

When we consider the fact that, during our entire recorded economic history, we never have experienced a depression or a recession while capital spending was trending upward, we may well come to the conclusion, that in spite of many problems in 1964, there will be continued prosperity and continued economic growth.

It seems obvious that, given the same conditions that have existed and perhaps even adding the probability of a $11.2 billion tax cut, total personal income in the United States will go up measurably in 1964. And given the same incentives, and perhaps an even more favorable economic climate, it is possible that capital spending will go higher than is projected.

Besides higher retail sales, higher personal income means many things in the U.S. economy. It means more travel. It means a greater movement of mail and goods and the need for more services in every field.

NATION IN A PERIOD FILLED WITH CHALLENGES

It seems evident to me that, barring any disastrous and unforeseeable development, the Nation stands this new year on the threshold of a period filled with challenges and promises.

The challenges, of course, are all around us. President Johnson wisely, in my judgment, has put the great emphasis on human needs, emphasizing the fact that we must find more jobs for the unemployed and must work to see that, out of our abundance, everyone obtains minimum needs as to food, clothing, and housing. The problems and challenges are both individual and social, which includes legislative and administrative work on the part of Federal officials.

In our system—the free enterprise system which has proved to be so flexible, resilient, and rewarding for the greatest number of people—we face the constant challenge of seeing to it that even while the economy changes and grows, neither individuals nor groups inside the vast economy are not penalized unfairly.

This is no easy task for our legislators, our national leaders, or for those who labor in any of the fields which touch the lives of our people. The vast changes that have taken place, and will be taking place, as a result of a constantly expanding population, a veritable whirlwind of new industrial and mechanical developments (which we call automation), and changes in the viewpoint of millions of our people—all these demand study, new approaches, new regulations and new laws, and constantly new agonizing appraisals.

As we know, during the lifetime of a mature man, the aviation industry has grown from an infant in swaddling clothes into a transportation giant. The movement of goods by barge, encouraged by the government (and I mean, local, State and Federal governments) likewise has increased phenomenally in the past four decades. The trucking industry has grown with startling rapidity.

Meantime, the railroads—which only a few decades ago represented virtually our sole means of personal and industrial common carriage—have had to adjust to the changing competitive picture. It is a tribute to rail management and labor that the adjustments have been made and that our vast rail system still is intact, and showing remarkable vitality, in spite of the great changes represented by the growth of competitive carriers.

The development of "piggyback" has been only one of a number of innovations that has enabled the railroads to show vitality in the competitive struggle. Use of larger boxcars, containerization, and other innovations also show the managerial resiliency of those who have led us toward greater heights of achievements in the transportation field.

THE LAW MUST SPONSOR PROGRESS

As I pointed out in a speech (in October), at the American Railway Progress Exposition, the law of itself has not brought the progress discernible in the field of communication and transportation. Progress in raising our standard of living is through research, invention, development and production, for no law invented the telephone, the radio, the diesel, or any of countless industrial techniques which serve our people so well.

Yet, there must be law that will permit or sponsor such progress, and guide it for the benefit of all our people.

The law, in and of itself, may not bring progress. But archaic laws certainly can impede progress. This is why we in Congress have been taking a long, hard look at some of the laws which may not be in accord with a modern approach to our transportation system, and its problems.

In April 1963 the late President John F. Kennedy strove to document what he termed basic deficiencies in our transportation regulatory system. He called on Congress—in an historic message on transportation—to take steps which he outlined. These were designed to change laws so that more progress and more competition might result in and among our various transportation segments—rail, highway, air and water.

I introduced in the House two bills which had been prepared by the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a substantial portion of the President's recommendations. We on the committee held hearings on these two bills during the months before the close of the 87th Congress, and began anew last January, when the 1st session of the 88th Congress convened. I introduced substantially the same two bills again in the 88th Congress.

During most of 1963, we held hearings on these measures. We had begun "marking up" specific legislation when various developments, including the President's tragic death, intervened.

I believe that we can get back to consideration of the salient features of this legislation in the second session. Many people have asked about President Johnson's views on the transportation proposals of his predecessor. Insofar as I know, he is as wedded to these ideas as was John F. Kennedy and will speak for them on the proper occasions in the future. In general, as we know, President Johnson has embraced the Kennedy economic programs and, in fact, has gone beyond them in some respects. While I cannot say that his accession to high office will "speed up" our committee's consideration of these important proposals, I can declare, on the other hand, that the new President certainly has no desire to slow down our considerations.

President Johnson—as was President Kennedy—is well aware of the legislative prerogatives and understands that on issues that affect many industries and many consumers and people generally, Congress must move only after great deliberation. I can give assurance that I have wanted to go into the many problems connected with the progress of our transportation system, in all its phases and facets. I have been particularly interested from the standpoint of the general public interest, for I believe it is to the benefit of the country that we

have privately owned means of transport and that these various privately owned systems compete vigorously, on terms as fairly as Congress can legislate and the Interstate Commerce Commission can regulate, so that all the people will be served. The alternative, as I have noted before, is nationalization. This is not an alternative I or most other Americans desire.

COMPETITION IN TRANSPORTATION MUST BE DEVELOPED

I have expressed myself clearly before that I feel we have not yet adequately tackled this problem of really developing competition among our several modes of transportation to our great advantage as a nation. Regulatory agency heads told our committee that, as to minimum rate legislation, we should place everyone involved under their jurisdiction. They recommend that we have more regulation, rather than deregulating, where possible, and depend on competition.

I couldn't believe then, and I can't now, that those who have been unregulated in the past, including the farmers, and bulk commodity operators, would sit by and allow themselves to be brought under regulation. Our committee some years ago refused to bring the poultry industry under regulation, since it would have completely rearranged that industry. Since then, the industry has developed rapidly, and, according to the Department of Agriculture, poultry is more economically available to the U.S. public today, in relation to other edible meats and foods, than it was when Congress refused to bring the industry under regulation.

I do not believe in regulation just for regulation's sake. If the shipping interests and the public can be protected, and if equality of treatment of the various modes of transportation can be provided with less regulation, then I believe the way for us to move is indicated plainly.

I have been strongly impressed by the assurances of railroad presidents, before our committee, that if given the chance, through passage of the minimum rate legislation, they will make a determined effort to give every inland town the rate advantages now enjoyed by waterway ports, in many bulk commodities. I believe that other legislators have been influenced by these assurances.

I believe that a successful start will be made in the House of Representatives on these problems in this new year. In my judgment it will result in a bigger and better year for all forms of transportation, and for the people as a whole.

There is little question in my mind but that 1964 will be a prosperous year of steady economic growth. I feel sure that the railroads, which have shown flexibility and resilience, will meet the challenges ahead and will make even greater progress in 1964 than in 1963, in many diverse directions. The year that is ending has been an extremely good year for the railroads, everything considered, and management wisely is making plans to build on the firm foundation of general economic prosperity. We in Congress will be striving to do our best for all the modes of transportation, and for all our people, in the context of our free enterprise system.

Antidumping Trade Expansion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is apparently preparing to give more concession to overseas competitors by way of lowered or completely eliminated customs quotas and antidumping restrictions.

Amongst the many items chosen for this experiement in economic disaster is the tool and specialty steel industry.

The attached brief by H. Sturgis Potter, vice president in charge of sales for the Carpenter Steel Co. of Reading, Pa., tells the story of the dangers involved in this anticipated trade expansion program.

It proves that trade for the sake of trade is unsound both as a national economy and as a creator of job prosperity.

In a world rapidly becoming equipped in even the most primitive of nations to produce all kinds of competitive products each nation must reevaluate the impact of trade upon its domestic economy.

The very nature of our economy demands the use of payroll dollars in our domestic marketplace. More than three income producers are dependent upon the initial payrolls provided by production of goods. When a steelworker loses his job three others are adversely affected. Specialty steel is only one of the many items on the agenda for the GATT meetings on trade agreements.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Potter and many others including myself are not desirous of closing our borders to either peoples or goods. We are concerned however, with the false promise of prosperity through world trade in competitive goods where competition can only be met by curtailment of employment of workers. There can be no competition between economics when the prices of products are controlled by costs freed by laws, customs or taxes. The only answer to this type of competition is lower wage scales, automation or bankruptcy.

An admitted 50,000 job loss in steel proves beyond a doubt that the Nation's producers cannot compete with the new facilities built overseas, often with U.S. money.

Those who say "compete or get out of business" seem to forget that even in our own economy we have had to pass antitrust, antimonopoly, minimum wage and maximum hour laws, health regulations and other safeguards to keep the competitive status between industries, areas, and States somewhere near an even keel.

If we force our industries to compete with the unequal economics of our trading "pardners" we can only hope for unemployment, monopolies in one guise or another and in the end we will be forced to raise tariff walls to survive.

This was pointed out by the late President Kennedy's action in increasing tariffs on glass in 1962. The industry had complained for over 20 years about the imports of glass. When the domestic industry had reached a point where it was headed for complete annihilation, the President increased the tariff on glass to a figure higher than it was in 1932—prior to the so-called reciprocal trade agreements acts. In fact, the figure topped the famous Smoot-Hawley protection tariff.

No one in his right mind wants to eliminate trade. By the same token the fact that Pennsylvania has about a half million persons on relief with more pockets of poverty than any State in the Union save one—West Virginia—certainly calls for a reappraisal of our trade economy.

The promoters of free trade are, in the main, profiteers in the movement of goods not in the production.

What gains can we claim for the American economy when Studebakers are made in Canada and sold in the United States.

We are told that Canada or for that matter, Japan, West Germany, and so forth, all buy more from us than they sell us. This could easily be true and still cause this Nation irreparable harm in its job economy.

The German Embassy has just issued Bulletin No. 3, Volume VIII, bodly proclaiming that U.S. exports to Germany were much greater than exports from Germany to the United States.

Dollarwise this is true; in fact the figures show $1,800,000 imports from the United States with $966 million imports to the United States.

However, a close analysis shows that 48 percent of all its imports from the United States are farm products. The rest can be traced to raw materials and aid goods, military suppliers for both Germany and U.S. troops use.

Amongst imports we find coal from the United States which is used by the U.S. military and paid for by U.S. taxpayers.

This is true in the whole import-export picture. If this was not true and our balance of payments were some $5 billion exports more than imports we would soon have every nation in our debt instead of the other way around.

In fact, Fort Knox would be filled with all the world's free gold instead of this Nation making coverup deals to bolster our gold supply.

The truth of the matter is simple: We cannot compete on price alone. In the old days we could ignore the imports from Japan, Hong Kong, and other low-wage areas because of the inferiority of products produced in the low-economy nations. This is no longer true. We are being invaded by products of the greatest functional design and use at prices that retail less than our prices wholesale.

The picture painted by Mr. Potter should be studied by all Members of the House.

BRIEF BY H. STURGIS POTTER

My name is H. Sturgis Potter. I am vice president, sales, of Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa., and chairman of the Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee. The Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee is composed of 20 U.S. specialty steel producers concerned with foreign trade in these products.

Imports of tool steel and stainless steel are statistically enumerated under alloy steels in subpart B of schedule 6 of the U.S. Tariff Schedules. Specific item numbers are designated in our brief.

At the outset, we emphasize that the condition of foreign trade in specialty steels are rapidly deteriorating from the standpoint of U.S. producers; that there are several causes for this adverse trend, predominant among which are a wide foreign employment cost advantage and increasing foreign productive techniques and capacity; and that the effect of the present trend is to endanger the sur-

vival of a highly specialized industry which is essential to the national defense.

CONDITIONS OF FOREIGN TRADE

The following clear trends in specialty steel foreign trade have developed in recent years:

(1) Imports of all shapes and forms of specialty steel have captured an ever-increasing share of the domestic market and have now reached a level of injury to the industry;

(2) Imports of certain shapes and forms of specialty steel of particular commercial significance have increased at an especially alarming rate; and

(3) Export markets have diminished and the relative trade balance deteriorated over the past several years.

Imports of stainless steel will reach an estimated level of 40,000 tons in 1963, an amount equal to 5.2 percent of domestic shipments. When this volume is contrasted with an imports-to-shipments ratio of 0.6 percent in 1955 and with a ratio of 3.7 percent in 1962, the extent of import acceleration can be understood. Even more striking is the realization that stainless steel imports are 300 percent more than they were in 1959.

Recorded tool steel imports now represent 11.6 percent of domestic shipments, although as recently as 1955 the relationship of imports to shipments was only 3.5 percent. In point of fact, however, the estimated 10,000 tons of 1963 tool steel imports which can be identified under current classification procedures grossly understate the true extent of penetration. For example, this figure does not include any portion of alloy ingot imports, aggregating approximately 9,000 tons in 1963; any portion of alloy wire rods; aggregating approximately 500 tons in 1963; nor does it include any die blanks, imports of which are at a level equal to 25 percent of domestic die blank production. We have estimated conservatively that inclusion of a correct share of these imports would demonstrate that total tool steel imports now exceed 15 percent of domestic shipments. Penetration to the extent of 11.6 percent portend serious injury; a level of 15 percent and more transforms this threat into fact.

The nature of the foreign trade condition into which domestic specialty steel producers have been thrust is further clarified by analyzing imports of certain steel shapes and forms which are the heart of the specialty steel market.

Stainless steel sheets make up by far the largest share—more than 80 percent—of all stainless steel imports. The 1963 level of 28,000 tons represent approximately 15 percent of domestic shipment; it represents more than twice the 1962 imports of this product; and it represents more than 13 times the 1960 level. The import developments regarding stainless steel sheet represents an excellent example of the impact of tariff rates on imports. Alloyed sheets and plates were among the relatively few products on which tariffs were reduced during the "Dillon round" negotiations, and the demonstrated rate of import growth since that time has been significantly influenced by this reduction. Moreover, the recognized existence of a tariff loophole involving polished stainless steel sheet, since closed by act of Congress, further evidences the connection between low tariffs and increased imports. It should be explained, however, that imports of stainless sheet have continued to rise since the elimination of the loophole (more than 4,000 tons were brought in in November, for example) so that it is obvious that it was not the principal contributing factor.

Bars account for the greatest volume of identifiable tool steel imports by far, and here again the rate of increase demonstrates the extent of foreign penetration in the major customer markets. High-speed tool steel bars, accounting for 20 percent of the domestic market by volume and 33⅓ percent by value, had an imports to shipments ratio of only 0.34 percent in 1955. Estimates for 1963 indicate aggregate high-speed tool steel bar imports of 1,203 tons, representing 6.2 percent of domestic shipments. The alarming rate of increase is graphically demonstrated by chart T-5 of our brief.

While imports have absorbed a rapidly increasing share of the domestic specialty steel market, the U.S. export markets have deteriorated and their virtual disappearance seems likely under present conditions. The most important fact to keep in mind regarding tool steel exports is that they have not been significant since the United States supplied the industrial might for the Allies during World War II. Today exports represent only about 1 percent of domestic production.

Domestic stainless steel producers have seen a 10-to-1 favorable trade balance reduced to 2 to 1 since 1957. More important, however, is the likelihood that our favorable balance will disappear in the immediate future as markets for principal exported products evaporate. The reason for this disappearance is simple. Our chief exported stainless product is hot rolled sheet, a semifinished product for further conversion, but not yet ready for fabrication. This market had been open to the United States since foreign producers did not have the hot work mills available to satisfy their home market demand. This capacity has now been developed and is sufficient to meet demand in those countries where there has been an export market.

CAUSES OF U.S. TRADE DISADVANTAGE

Three factors have combined to create the adverse conditions of foreign trade in specialty steel:

(1) The extreme employment cost advantage enjoyed by foreign producers of specialty steel;

(2) The greatly improved plant and technological resources of such producers; and

(3) The failure of foreign demand to keep pace with the growth in foreign capacity.

Although all three of these factors are important, by far the most significant is the employment cost advantage. Japanese employment costs, including fringe benefits, were 63 cents an hour in 1961, compared with $3.99 per hour in the U.S. steel industry. It is not surprising that Japan accounts for approximately 80 percent of the stainless steel imports entering the United States, and that Japan is occupying a steadily increasing share of the domestic tool steel market. The preponderance of tool steel imports continue to enter from Canada, Sweden, and Austria, and the employment cost disparity between these nations and the United States is also substantial.

It is fundamental that employment cost disparities generate the greatest impact on those products requiring the greatest labor input. Specialty steels fit this description. The production of tool steel involves between 10 and 30 times as much labor per ton as tonnage steel, and an average of 10 times as much labor is required per ton of stainless steel as per ton of tonnage steel. The reason for this extremely high labor input inheres in the nature of specialty steel products, as I will explain more fully later.

It is an unwarranted and unrealistic assumption that U.S. producers can overcome this labor cost advantage through superior productivity. The high labor input requirement and the scope of the cost differential alone prevent any narrowing of the gap. For example, U.S. workers would have to be six times as productive as Japanese workers in order to equalize the cost disparity.

The fact is, however, that we simply do not have any advantage in production techniques. Foreign mills are of the most modern character, having been largely developed since World War II. The postwar European and Japanese recovery is acknowledged as one of the most significant developments of this era, and the steel industries of these nations have led the way.

The absence of a productivity advantage is no fault of U.S. specialty steel producers who are continuously improving their techniques and facilities to achieve lower costs and to make products suitable for broader uses. We submit that annual expenditures for plant and product research and development by U.S. producers compare favorably with those made by other industries.

A third contributing cause for our current trade posture is the extreme pressure upon a fully developed foreign capacity to find outlets in the face of a decelerating growth in demand for specialty steels. In our brief, we cite authoritative reports that 20 percent of all Japanese production was exported in 1962 and that nearly all of its projected capacity increase for 1970 will be forced to seek export markets. In the ECSS, the widely publicized increased steel duties are symptomatic of a growing demand-capacity squeeze facing the European nations.

These three contributing forces create a single irreversible advantage accruing to foreign producers in specialty steel competition for customers in their home markets, in third nations and in the United States: foreign specialty steel prices cannot be met by United States mills. As a result, imported specialty steels sell in the United States at between 15 percent and 50 percent below the same shape and grade of domestic tool and stainless steels. This is the ultimate reason for our market decay and our currently imperiled position.

THE IMPACT OF IMPORTS

The present import rate, and certainly its continuation, threatens domestic specialty steel mills and their employment. In a broader sense, such a threat to continued survival imperils the national interest.

The inherent characteristics of the specialty steel industry make it especially vulnerable to low priced foreign products.

As the name of the industry implies, it is a specialty industry; its products are highly specialized and are normally tailormade to satisfy explicit needs. As explained at length in our brief, tool steels and stainless steels require high alloy content to the extent that they are in reality a wholly different product from tonnage steels. This point cannot be overemphasized, since it is the high alloy content and the need to meet specifications for which tonnage steels are inappropriate that cause the high relative labor content in our products and the overall high costs of production.

The second fact contributing to our particular vulnerability is that we are an independent industry. More than 50 percent of all domestic stainless steel shipments of each shape and form are from companies and mills which produce little or no tonnage steels and tool steel producer's exclusive reliance on specialty steels is even greater. As a consequence, the production of specialty steels cannot be subsidized by the production of more profitable items.

The direct impact of imports on domestic specialty steel mills has already been substantial. We estimate that at the current import rate 2,000 job opportunities are lost annually to direct and indirect imports of tool steel and that the current annual figure for stainless steel is approximately 3,600 job opportunities. Since a large number of specialty steel mills are located in labor surplus areas, the overall economic effect is even greater than our estimates disclose.

The impact of specialty steel imports, however, goes far beyond its effect on this industry—and the communities in which it operates. Because of specialized characteristics touched upon earlier and fully explained in our brief, specialty steels are vital to our national defense. These characteristics include extreme hardness, toughness, machin-

ability, resistance to decarburization and corrosion, resistance to the softening effects of elevated and extremely low temperatures and a high strength to weight ratio. Tool steel is essential to the making, shaping and forming of products made from other steels, products made from other metals and products made from all other raw materials. Not a weapon in our defense arsenal could be made without tool steel.

Stainless steel also has significant strategic uses, including missile and rocket frames and parts, aircraft structures, atomic reactors and turbine blades. Obviously, there are significant nonmilitary uses of stainless steel, and these uses account for a high proportion of domestic shipments. As foreign stainless steel captures an increasing share of the U.S. market, however they reduce the domestic productive capacity for both strategic and nonstrategic stainless steel.

Over the years, the specialty steel industry has gained a recognized expertise in the development of the high alloy exotic metals which are so vital to our defense effort. Research and development by U.S. speciality steel producers have led the way to the majority of significant metallurgical innovations in recent years. Tool steel technology, for example, was in large part responsible for the research and development which made possible the production of other strength steels for use in the pressure hulls of the Navy's nuclear submarines.

Tonnage steel mills generally lack the specific technological knowledge and capacity to meet the demands for tool and stainless steel. To be sure, the component raw materials can be and are stockpiled, but the reservoir of knowhow cannot. It would indeed be ironic if the United States made adequate provision for a store of raw materials but permitted imports to dispose of the technical knowledge essential to the production of vital specialty steels.

In summary, the content, characteristics, uses and importance of tool steel and stainless steel clearly establish these products as wholly different from tonnage steel. Certain of these characteristics, already mentioned, make them substantially more vulnerable to import penetration, as has been proven.

It is regrettable that tool steel and stainless steel are statistically, but not legally, identified in the U.S. Tariff Schedules. Nevertheless, we are certain that the Commission will recognize their independent nature and importance.

In the announcement of these hearings, published by the Trade Information Committee on October 21, 1963, four subjects were listed as being of particular interest to the Committee. Before concluding I would like to comment specifically on each.

(1) As to reductions in rates of duty which the United States should seek to obtain from other nations, we welcome any such assistance for our exports as a matter of general policy, but as a specific for our present problems we must reemphasize that our hope lies in protection of domestic, not expansion of, foreign markets.

(2) The above comment is appropriate and is submitted as to non-tariff barriers imposed by other nations.

(3) We consider the possibility of the elimination or reduction of U.S. import duties on tool and stainless steel mill products as the most serious and potentially the only insuperable problem facing our industry today.

(4) No other U.S. import restrictions on tool and stainless steel mill products should be offered for modification at this time.

In view of the foregoing, we respectfully urge the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to recommend to the President the reservation of all tool and stainless steel mill products, as identified in our brief, from the list of articles to be considered for trade agreement concessions.

PARTICIPATING COMPANIES—TOOL AND STAINLESS STEEL INDUSTRY COMMITTEE

Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp.
Armco Steel Corp., Armco Division.
Bethelehem Steel Co.
Braeburn Alloy Steel Division, Continental Copper & Steel Inds., Inc.
The Carpenter Steel Co.
Crucible Steel Co. of America.
Eastern Stainless Steel Corp.
Firth Sterling, Inc.
Jessop Steel Co.
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Stainless and Strip Division.
Joslyn Stainless Steel Division, Joslyn Manufacturing & Supply Co.
Latrobe Steel Co.
McLouth Steel Corp.
Republic Steel Corp., Alloy Steel Division.
Sharon Steel Corp.
Simonds Saw & Steel Co.
Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp.
Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.
Vulcan-Kidd Steel Division, H. K. Porter Co., Inc.
Washington Steel Corp.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address by Dean Merritt A. Williamson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Boston University has called to my attention an address by Dean Merritt A. Williamson of the Pennsylvania State University College of Engineering delivered at the dedication of Boston University's new College of Engineering.

Since this thoughtful speech is pertinent to contemporary engineering problems, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION ADDRESS, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, BOSTON UNIVERSITY, BY MERRITT A. WILLIAMSON, P.E., DEAN, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

I was indeed delighted to receive President Case's invitation to come to Boston University to give an address of dedication for the new quarters of the newly announced College of Engineering. This gives me an opportunity to talk about a subject that is very near and dear to my heart and to get on public record some of my current thoughts concerning the interrelationships of engineering and society and the role of engineering education and its influence on the world of tomorrow. To have the opportunity publicly to deliver one's self of noble thoughts and sentiments in indeed welcome, but I am more gratified by the opportunity to visit Boston University and to meet for the first time many of your scholars and administrators. It is also a pleasure to see again so many of my engineering colleagues from New England, not the least of whom is my erstwhile associate, Dean Arthur T. Thompson.

Engineering activities certainly predate the first historial records. Dean Emeritus Finch of Columbia in the introduction to his book, "The Story of Engineering," has written: "Community services, at least in their simplest forms, were essential to the birth and development of civilized life. The remote ancestor of the modern engineer emerged when it was recognized that certain men had special abilities and skills in providing such material fundamentals as shelter and temples, water supplies and transportation." Engineers and engineering have been with us for many centuries and have played an important part in shaping our present society. Although histories are generally not written from this point of view, it can be shown that technology has profoundly influenced man's changing ideas as well as his material environment. Engineering and innovation are inseparable. In fact, the word "engineer" was not derived from engine but rather from the French "ingenieure" which in turn was derived from the same Latin root that gives us the words "ingenious" and "ingenuity."

But I do not want to talk about the past. What I want to talk about is present-day engineering. Engineers are not working in the past but rather in the present; and they are working diligently, and perhaps too unobtrusively, in order that we may all live in a world of greater future material welfare. Engineering is a profession with its face to the future, but I am getting ahead of myself.

I should like to define engineering.

The most widely accepted definition of engineering is the one adopted in 1962 by the Engineers' Council for Professional Development. This reads as follows:

"Engineering is the profession in which a knowledge of the mathematical and natural sciences gained by study, experience, and practice is applied with judgment to develop ways to utilize, economically, the materials and forces of nature for the benefit of mankind."

Engineering is not science as many persons including some educators seem to think. Engineering is not the same thing as applied science. Engineering is much more than the application of science. Science aims at the discovery, verification, and organization of facts and information.

Scientists uncover and describe the phenomena of nature. Scientists may on occasion even apply this knowledge. Engineers, however, do much more. The key words in the above definition are study, experience, practice, judgment, utilize, economically, benefit. There is an element of art in engineering. The practice of engineering is not just the routine application of known scientific principles. I like the short definition which says that engineering is the art of applying science. "Science makes it known; engineering makes it work." The essence of engineering is design, innovation, purposeful creativity—not just the uncovering of new relationships and properties of matter for intellectual satisfaction, nor doing something unusual just to produce something new and different.

Although the engineer works in the area of technology, he is generally not called a technologist, and it is incorrect to call him a technician. This latter is a term almost universally reserved for a person who, working for scientists or engineers as a capable assistant, carries out their designs and reduces their schemes to practicality by applying principles commonly known in the area of their particular technology. A technician will prepare final drawings, set up instrumentation, run test equipment, and often supervise craftsmen in the construction of a new device. The technician may well be creative and ingenious too, but it is the engineer who takes the risk and bears the ultimate responsibility for the work done.

We need a new word for engineer and I hope some day the profession will have the courage to adopt one. The engineers about which I am talking are not those who go on strike against the airlines, or picket building sites, or repair television sets, or set up and arrange equipment for radio or television broadcasting. The professional engineer works for the benefit of mankind and lives up to standards set by the licensing boards in every State in the Union. The engineer is a professional man. As in the other professions, he must have a background of education; his work must be primarily intellectual in character; he works for more than just remuneration; he is ever conscious that as a trusted public servant he has a concern for the life, health, and safety of the society he serves; he subscribes to a code of ethical behavior; and he must pass State examinations to demonstrate his practical competence. The man I am talking about is far more than a hired hand who happens to have high skills and narrow competence. His is the responsibility to speak up and to speak out and to rid his profession of the incompetent and the dishonest.

Engineering is a learned profession and deserves its place in a great university along with other professional areas. West Point was founded in 1802 primarily to train engineers for the Army. Norwich University, the first private military college in the United States, founded in 1819, offered courses in engineering from the start. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was founded in 1824 to train engineers in civilian life. The list of institutions which recognized over a hundred years ago that engineering was a legitimate area of scholarly pursuit includes Union College, Harvard, Yale, and the University of Michigan. Although engineering has a noble tradition, there is no compalency among engineering educators. There is probably at present no area within our universities in which there is more soulsearching, more ferment, more experimentation going on than in our engineering colleges. Almost overnight (as educational matters go), a spate of advanced knowledge descended on us resulting from research made possible by the expenditure of billions of dollars. The fields of science to which the engineer often turns for his raw materials are expanding their funds of knowledge at a fantastic rate. In spite of this, the engineer often cannot find the knowledge which he needs to solve an important pressing problem. When this happens he must often do the research himself. Research is not the exclusive province of the scientist as some persons seem to believe.

Having talked about engineering, I should now like to talk about engineering education. In my opinion there is a lot of loose thought and loose talk about what constitutes a proper education for the practice of engineering. Clichés abound. I have observed that some of the most vocal people have never practiced engineering a day in their lives. Some of the so-called authorities can not call themselves engineers legally and many were never educated or trained as engineers.

It has been stated that engineering knowledge becomes obsolete rapidly but that scientific fundamentals are timeless, and the conclusion is drawn that one should study only fundamental principles. This sounds so good that everyone applauds. But it could just as accurately be stated that scientific knowledge becomes obsolete but that engineering fundamentals are timeless. Let's take a closer look at "obsolescence" and "fundamentals."

Factual information learned today in school and college is still valid tomorrow or 50 years from now if it was adequately tested and if it was derived from experience. The problems which will arise in the future, however, probably will not require a knowledge of these facts valid as they may be. New facts must be continually sought and learned. To repeat, the old knowledge is valid and sound but it just isn't useful anymore. But this can happen in science as well as in engineering. It is often erroneously assumed that engineering courses deal only with facts and therefore they become obsolete rapidly. Engineering courses that are at all progressive are concerned with the method of approach to problem solving; the method of getting facts and applying them,

in just the same way that science is concerned with teaching the methods of science. It is the methodology which is important, because this is applicable from problem to problem and does not lose its validity with time. There is great confusion on this point. Because engineering is essentially practical, it is false to assume that engineering education equips people only to produce immediate results and neglects entirely the fundamentals on which one can build a secure future practice.

One thing is certain, however, the methods used, and the equipment and materials available are always changing. The engineer must know how to keep up to date in his field. An increasing sophistication and an increasing depth of knowledge and appreciation are required of those who continue to be productive as engineers. This fact has led many educators to argue for more than 4 years at the undergraduate level. This is but a step away from the proposal to relegate engineering studies to the graduate level which one may enter only after any good broad liberal 4-year baccalaureate program. This is good for an argument in both professional and educational circles. I have serious doubts about the validity of any comparisons made with other professions which are taught only at a graduate level. In the first place one must realize that engineering is dynamic and creative and that the engineer lives and works on the fringes of the unknown. Every day he must take calculated risks. In the absence of known data, he must design with factors of safety. This is not, as some seem to believe, because the engineer is ignorant or has not had a sufficient grounding in science; but rather because, if the answers are known or if they can be calculated with certainty, then this is not a job for an engineer. From my observations an inordinate length of time spent in bookish pursuits without contacting "real" problems from the "real" world demanding solution within a given time and cost limit, provides no preparation at all for a career as a practicing engineer. Do not misunderstand me. Graduate work is becoming more and more essential for the modern practice of engineering, but a man must still practice and work on real problems before he can be called an engineer. No engineers are graduated anywhere from either undergraduate or graduate schools. Only potential engineers are graduated. We must be ever alert to the possibility that creativity and imagination may be very effectively stifled by bookish problems composed to illustrate the methods being taught. If the engineering teacher has not practiced or is not at least doing consulting, the vital contact with reality is much more difficult to maintain.

The engineer, as I have portrayed him, must be ingenious and creative; well qualified by possessing a workable knowledge of fundamentals; and skilled in actual practice. But he must be more than this. He must recognize that he is now and will continue to be the person through whose work the shape of our material society is altered. He must be alert to the many facets of working in the real world where his actions have impacts on people. The designs of equipment must be such that men can ultimately operate and control them. The structures erected must comply with safety standards and must meet legal requirements. Political units such as boroughs, cities, States, and nations all have their regulations which must be either followed or changed through due process of law. The engineer must not hesitate to speak out and to advise his management or his client when he feels something is being done contrary to the best interests of the people. He needs to have a strong ethical code. He must understand the dangers of wrong conduct. He must be prepared to take a strong stand even if it may run counter to self-interest. This requires considerations appropriate to the realm of value judgments which form a large part of the contact of the humanities and social science subjects. The engineer, however, must be far more than merely well informed in a bookish sense. His studies in the nontechnical area must somehow affect his outlook and become a part of his continued concern. The engineer is never a lone worker. He gets results through people and he must appreciate that others think differently than he does. He must also appreciate that emotion is a genuine factor to be reckoned with, and that engineering logic does not always govern the decisions made. He must know the practical art of dealing with people to produce results. In his college curriculum he needs to study whatever he can that will help him to live and to understand. This cannot be done effectively through superficial survey courses; they must come to grips with real issues and somehow affect his whole being.

How to teach these lessons meaningfully is an age-old educational problem. It seems in engineering, however, that the example of ethical teachers who unhesitatingly reflect fixed standards of right and wrong conduct is most important. The young engineering students must be provided the opportunity to be influenced by such professional men. If subject matter proficiency becomes our only concern, we cannot prepare whole people who will be a credit to our profession. A broad spectrum of interests and acquaintances is necessary for the development of a fully professional man. An engineering college as a fully accepted and integrated unit in a great university such as Boston University provides an excellent setting in which young men and young women may be given the best start on the road to engineering success of the future.

Perhaps you may think I have painted the engineer in much too glowing terms. True there are many engineers today who are far from the ideal, but is not this true of other professions as well? Perhaps you think I have made the qualifications too broad. I do not think so. As we move into the future I believe that more and more we must rely on accurate interpretation of technical data. As more research is done in the area of the social sciences, the engineers will be ready to apply these results directly. We need people in positions of responsible decisionmaking who have the training and outlook of the engineer; that is, the vision to see and plan ahead in ways both practical and achievable within the funds and time available. It seems to me that engineers will gravitate to positions of influence whether any of us like it or not. My greatest concern is that our engineers of the future do, in fact, have a breadth of understanding coupled with a knowledge of their limitations, a desire to improve themselves, and the humility to be effective leaders.

The engineering curriculum of the future with its continued demand for rigor, its emphasis on fundamentals of scientific and engineering methodology, its inclusion in a workable way of the humanities and social sciences may well become the liberal education of the future.

I believe engineers as a class measure up as well as any other professional people to the definition of the liberally educated man which was given in chapter III of the book entitled "General Education in School and College," published by Harvard University Press in 1952. This definition is as follows:

"The liberally educated man is articulate, both in speech and writing. He has a feel for language, a respect for clarity and directness of expression, and a knowledge of some language other than his own. He is at home in the world of quantity, number, and measurement. He thinks rationally, logically, objectively, and knows the difference between fact and opinion. When the occasion demands, however, his thought is imaginative and creative rather than logical. He is perceptive, sensitive to form, and affected by beauty. His mind is flexible and adaptable, curious and independent. He knows a good deal about the world of nature and the world of man, about the culture of which he is a part, but he is never merely well informed. He can use what he knows, with judgment and discrimination. He thinks of his business or profession, his family life, and his avocations as parts of a larger whole, parts of a purpose which he has made his own. Whether making a professional or a personal decision, he acts with maturity, balance, and perspective, which come ultimately from his knowledge of other persons, other problems, other times and places. He has convictions, which are reasoned, although he cannot always prove them. He is tolerant about the beliefs of others because he respects sincerity and is not afraid of ideas. He has values, and he can communicate them to others not only by word but by example. His personal standards are high; nothing short of excellence will satisfy him. But service to his society or to his God, not personal satisfaction alone, is the purpose of his excelling. Above all, the liberally educated man is never a type. He is always a unique person, vivid in his distinction from other similarly educated persons, while sharing with them the traits we have mentioned."

To produce this liberally educated engineer is a lifetime work. We in the universities can at best merely point the way and hopefully inspire our students to carry on under their own momentum. The university environment can contribute much of assistance in fostering this idealistic concern for society. We in engineering must lean heavily on our colleagues in other areas to provide those influences which are so vital to the cultured man but which are so difficult to achieve through our highly sequential and often quite specialized courses. This is why I have such great hopes for an engineering college within an institution such as Boston University.

The engineering colleges in this country embrace a wide spectrum of philosophies. This is good. We need many approaches and we need ocntinuous experimentation. Each institution can play an important role. It will not be many years before the Boston University College of Engineering has established a unique place and has generated an identity of its own. In dedicating this new building today, by recognizing the value of engineering not only in the broader society but in the more limited society of the university, you are off to an excellent start. To all of you at Boston University, on behalf of the visitors here present and all of your many friends and colleagues elsewhere, I bring you greetings and wish you the complete fulfillment of all of your ambitious plans.

President Johnson's First Live TV Press Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence carefully summarized President Johnson's first live TV press conference. I am sure that millions of Americans who viewed the conference

last Saturday will agree with Mr. Lawrence that the conference was a resounding success:

JOHNSONS DIGNIFIED PRESS CONFERENCE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson handled himself just right in his press conference Saturday—the first to be shared simultaneously with a television and radio audience.

There are theatrical temptations and political dangers in appearing before a mass of listeners over nationwide networks. Mr. Johnson didn't try to be a Bob Hope or a Jack Benney or to use the applause-getting methods of any other TV star, but presented himself simply as an earnest, dignified President of the United States. In choosing not to be a showman, he may not have won the Beatle-minded, but he probably earned the respect of mature citizens. The sharp and witty innuendoes of political combat, moreover, were omitted, as this device sometimes alienates as many as it attracts.

The President's answers were clearly expressed, and he was both tactful and diplomatic in avoiding the pitfalls of extemporaneous comment which have embarrassed some of his predecessors.

Mr. Johnson appeared a changed man from the days when he was majority leader of the Senate or Vice President. He showed the weight of his responsibility. He was calm and restrained and was exceedingly careful to choose every word he spoke.

Take, for instance, the President's way of dealing with the Panama problem. He said he was willing to "discuss anything, any time, anywhere" and to make "adjustments" when diplomatic relations with the Panamanian Government have been restored, but he made it clear that this country would not make any "precommitments." This plainly means that the decision whether to agree to a revision of the existing treaty with Panama will not be made before but after the whole subject has been explored in conferences between the two Governments.

On domestic politics, Mr. Johnson was equally restrained and chose his words carefully. He preferred, for example, not to involve himself in the techniques of a court trial and said merely that he wouldn't comment on the Bobby Baker case until the hearings have been concluded and the Senate committee has made its report. Beseeched for an educated guess as to who his Republican opponent in the Presidential race might be, Mr. Johnson quietly replied that he himself hadn't been nominated as yet and that these were matters for the conventions to decide.

But when asked about the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill, Mr. Johnson didn't hesitate to state unequivocally that he stands behind the bill as it passed the House. He denied that he had promised to compromise on this or any other section. But, of course, this doesn't preclude the Senate and House conferees from making compromises while assuming that the President will have to go along anyway if it's the best thing that can be done to assure final passage.

Mr. Johnson was seated during the press conference—a return to the custom of the Presidents of two or more decades ago. He seemed at ease and didn't give the impression that he was delivering a speech but that he was merely conducting a conversation with the correspondents who were interrogating him.

Asked about his first 100 days in the Presidency which last Saturday completed, Mr. Johnson said he had as Vice President sat in on 35 meetings of the National Security Council, including the Cuban-missile crisis, and that he had been reasonably close to the operations of the Presidential office in the last 30 years, but that he had derived many different impressions now from this awesome responsibility.

Unquestionably, Mr. Johnson's long familiarity with the governmental scene is one reason for his adroitness in answering questions as well as his respectful attitude toward those who disagree with him or ask questions with embarrassing implications.

Whether the topic was the political or military strategy to be pursued in the Vietnam muddle or the requested amplification of his recent remarks in Los Angeles in which he referred to the dangerous game being played by the aggressors in southeast Asia, the President was as cautious as any career diplomat in his selection of words.

Mr. Johnson didn't care to say now whether he will engage in a TV debate with the opposing presidential candidate next autumn. He said merely that he will cross that bridge when he comes to it. This leaves him with plenty of opportunity to decide either way, depending on the circumstances existing at campaign time.

Lyndon Johnson has learned in his 30 years of experience on Capitol Hill that it's never wise in politics to make a superfluous statement or to issue one long before it is actually necessary. On the whole, Mr. Johnson's demeanor at his TV conference with the press, if continued, will give an image to the public of a hard-working, cautious, and sincere man whose mistakes, when they occur, will not seem to be due so much to a lack of conscientious effort as to the turns of fate in a topsy-turvy world.

Seapower Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a recent speech given in Seattle points up the urgent need for an Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority. Our merchant marine is facing grave problems, and the Commission proposed is urgently needed. The justification for assistance now was pointed up clearly and persuasively by Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, in a recent address in Seattle before the Propeller Club.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR SEAPOWER SUPERIORITY

(By Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America)

It is a pleasure to be in Seattle once again. And I would like to take this opportunity to express publicly to Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON, on their home grounds, the gratitude and appreciation of the private shipyard industry, in all parts of the United States, for their continuing, vigorous attention to the maritime and defense problems of the Nation. In equal measure, our thanks go to Congressman TOLLEFSON—the people of this great State have every reason to be proud of this hardworking, effective Member of the Congress.

It is too bad that more of our citizens do not share their concern about the declining state of the Nation's seapower capability. By seapower capability, I include both naval and merchant ships. As a matter of fact, in the view of experts, seapower capability is more than submarines, naval vessels, missiles, and armament; to them, it includes merchant ships, trade and commerce, shipyard capacity, and the ability to use geography and the seas in the pursuit of national purposes as well.

To a very great extent the development of the United States can be attributed to this premise. Since early Colonial days, when the general court of Massachusetts in 1641 proclaimed that the building of ships was "of great importance for the common good," ships—both merchant and naval—and shipping have been a cornerstone of national policy. The recent Cuban crisis was the latest in a long series of historic emergencies in which seapower capability was a governing factor.

President Kennedy once informed the Congress that "a line of destroyers * * * may be more useful to our real security than the multiplication of awesome weapons beyond all rational need."

Only recently, President Johnson noted that "a strong merchant marine is a guarantee of national security and a guarantee of economic stability."

These two statements by Chief Executives of the land must be added to those of all who have preceded them in the White House. Without exception, since George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate on Saturday, warned against reliance on foreign ships and foreign nations to serve the trade and commerce of the United States, every President of the United States has certified to the American people that our country must maintain supremacy on the high seas.

Unfortunately, this impressive body of cumulative wisdom is being ignored with an alarming degree of public and official indifference. The proceedings of the authoritative U.S. Naval Institute, in June of last year, contained a very startling article entitled "Our Merchant Marine Is Dying and Nobody Seems To Care." In the foreword to that article, Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy (retired), who distinguished himself as a naval officer and as Chief of Naval Operations, said:

"Unless there is a reversal in the decline of the American merchant marine in the immediate future, one of the greatest assets of the American economic structure will die a death of neglect. A shipping industry cannot be built overnight, as the Soviet Union has discovered. But they have found that a strong shipping industry is a tremendous national asset. The United States had better do something about its merchant marine. If we don't do something soon, we will not have a merchant marine. And someday when it is too late to take corrective action, we may fervently wish we had."

With regard to the U.S. Navy, here are the warnings of the distinguished Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, which is chairmanned by one of the most knowledgeable of our citizens on defense matters, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia: "It is a statistical certainty that if this country continues with a shipbuilding program which reflects past history our Navy will cease to be an effective military instrument * * * [and] * * * our Navy, if we can judge by the past, is on an inexorable march toward its own destruction as an arm of our foreign policy and as an effective agency for national defense."

And, here is a late assessment of the U.S. merchant marine by a private, independent research agency: "In view of the depreciated state of the maritime industry and the scope and nature of the programs designed to assist it, there appears to be little likelihood that our national goals * * * will be realized in the next decade * * * [and] * * * it appears that the state of readiness of the U.S. merchant marine to serve in time of national emergency is marginal at best, and declining."

Unfortunately, these inadequacies in our depleting arsenal of seapower resources have not yet been officially recognized—let alone dealt with. To date, only a handful of Navy officials, a small group of U.S. Senators and Congressmen, and a few citizens, here and elsewhere, have sounded the alarm—and regretfully their call for effective action is like a whisper in the wilderness.

Blame does not rest with any particular group or political party—it is the fault of all Americans. It is the fault of those who are complacent or shortsighted. It is the fault of those who are unwilling to speak out about the survival of freedom for all mankind. It is the fault of those who indulge in budgetary expediency, risking thereby our national capacity to survive against an enemy who has sworn to destroy us.

That enemy—Soviet Russia—is taking no such risks. With vigorous dedecation of purpose and massive expenditures of money, she is rapidly moving to challenge the supremacy of the United States on the high seas. The Soviet Union now possesses a strong navy and a modern merchant marine. As a seapower, she is second only to the United States. But she possesses an overwhelming numerical supremacy under the sea. The Soviet armada of 400 submarines outnumbers our sub fleet 4 to 1. It will be remembered that Hitler, with only 57 submarines, sank 519 allied ships in the first 6 months after the United States entered World War II. Again, Russia has 400 submarines—some nuclear powered and some equipped for ballistic missile launchings.

Soon, as a consequence of an enormous merchant ship construction program now in progress, Russia's influence on the trade routes of the seas and on historic trade patterns might well be dominant.

Moreover, the Soviet Union possesses one of the world's largest and most modern fishing fleets, and is unsurpassed in the basic field of oceanographic research. The occupants of the Kremlin clearly recognize the importance of the sea. All of this tremendous seapower buildup and activity in terms of both naval and merchant fleets is but part of our avowed enemy's plan for world domination—a clear barometer that they seek to win the world revolution of ideas.

This serious situation prompted the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate—which normally does not become involved in maritime and naval affairs—to caution that: "Not only is the national security of the United States at stake, but so too is the collective security of the entire free world." From that warning one could reasonably conclude that if the space race to the moon is worth billions of dollars, surely the maintenance of supremacy on the seas for freemen is worth an infinitesimal fractional part of the same amount. The world revolution of the 1960's will not be won or lost in outer space, it will be decided here on planet earth with seapower as the crucial balance between victory and defeat.

Implicit in the old saying: "You pay your nickel and take your changes"—is the thought that "you only get what you pay for." With regard to seapower, we, as a nation, have been spending a nickel, figuratively speaking, and harboring the hope that the test between United States and U.S.S.R. capabilities on the high seas will never come or that the test can be met by some other means. In either event, we are taking our chances—accepting potluck—and as has already been said, thereby risking the national security of the United States and the collective security of the entire free world. We are confronted with a powerful opponent who is intent on playing for the highest stakes—our survival. Like it or not, we are already in the arena. All elements of preparedness for survival should therefore be adequate and never deficient in any respect.

To arrest the continuing erosion of our seapower assets, our organization has urged that President Johnson appoint an Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority. This Presidential Commission, as we see it, would be composed of knowledgeable persons from both public and private life. It would recommend steps to insure that the United States continues to maintain supremacy on the high seas. It might also prepare suitable legislation for submission to the Congress. As we told the President, new and imaginative actions and legislation are needed, as never before; if the lessons of past history are to have lasting significance; if our seapower deficiencies are to be corrected promptly and resolutely; and finally if the coming challenge of the Russians on the high seas is to be met effectively and successfully.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, February 24, 1964, marked the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. I join with the millions of friends this cause has in the free world to commemorate this event with deep reverence.

Americans of Estonian origin or descent reaffirm and adhere to American democratic principles of government in observing their independence day. Let this tribute signify that the Republic of Estonia is by no means a forgotten nation in the hearts and minds of those in the free world who cherish freedom to make their own decision, live their own lives, and to shape and govern their own destinies.

The liberty of Estonia was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in June 1940, notwithstanding solemn treaties and agreemnts of nonaggression. Strongly opposed to foreign domination, Estonians all over the free world are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had rightly and deservedly enjoyed for many centuries in the past. While their homeland has suffered under the political tyranny of a Communist regime, yet these industrious, sturdy, brave, self-determined people in the free world, together with other refugees from behind the Iron Curtain, have relentlessly continued their fight with communism against all odds. If we can help them, let us do so now.

I am hopeful that during this session, the House will pass legislation, among which is my House Resolution 375, establishing a special committee to assist captive nations by peaceful processes to regain their national and individual freedoms.

Justice and Unions in Union County, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, by experiences have put me in contact with many communities in which blind prejudice and ignorance abound even today. This is nowhere more evident than in attitudes toward the administration of justice and the rights of workers to bargain collectively.

Contrary to the situation which was prevalent in years past in some of our more advanced communities, people now know the many advantages which result from the organization of labor.

Fortunately, not all communities remain in darkness or regale in their rejection of enlightenment. Most localities realize that everyone benefits from better working conditions, better pay systems, greater industrial safety, and increased economic welfare and security which come to unionized workers. Even unorganized workers enjoy the same benefits by virtue of the existence and accomplishments of labor unions in their communities.

Yet, in Union County, N.C., the dominant attitudes are antiunion and antijustice—a clear manifestation of the correlation between the two frames of mind.

To illustrate how disgusting the situation there is today, February 1964, I wish to quote from an advertisement against unionism which appeared in the leading newspaper of that county. It is attributed to the otherwise unidentified "Citizens Committee of Union County," and appeared in the Monroe Enquirer, on February 13, 1964:

STRANGERS IN OUR COUNTY

We are concerned over the prospects of the formation of a union at one of our largest plants in Union County. We view these efforts with alarm because we know the effects of union organization in other peaceful and prosperous communities and we sincerely believe that it means the loss of good relationship between citizens in our plants, as well as loss of work, lower net earnings, and the breaking of longstanding traditions in our community of personal contact and cooperation among all. These losses can happen here as they have in other communities in our State.

We feel that Union County citizens have enjoyed unusually steady work, with little loss of time and as a result have had steadily increasing and dependable wages.

We question the judgment, intentions, and sincerity of these strangers in our county who are trying to disrupt traditionally good relationships among our industrial citizens.

We know our industries have the best interests of our county and its people at heart and it is our honest belief that the formation of a union cannot improve our county or its citizens, but would eventually bring only one result—direct losses to our people in less take-home pay, ill feelings,

cold and impersonal treatment of workers, and possible long, bitter strikes during which there will be no work and no pay.

With pride in the past and confidence in the future we urge all citizens of our county to think carefully before taking any step that would be harmful to the best interests of their community, their families, and themselves.

Therefore, it is not surprising that, in Monroe, N.C., the seat of Union County, Mrs. Mae Mallory is being railroaded to jail on a mysterious charge of kidnaping. Mrs. Mallory, like labor unions, is persona non grata in Monroe and Union County because of the prejudices of the community. Her fate, like that proposed for unions, is to be banished from Union County by reason of the guilt of the people who dominate the community. That guilt is the product of engaging in the heinous offense of condemning people and organizations for daring to oppose the status quo.

Mae Mallory's cause and that of the unions, will prove to be the tests upon which Union County must judge itself even as it judges them. It will be the basis for the Nation's and the world's judgment upon the county.

Johnson's Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent column on President Johnson's health message which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, February 23. The column was written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, one of America's most distinguished physicians and an associate editor of the Times.

In the column, Dr. Rusk applauds the appointment of a Presidential Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Strokes. I look forward to the deliberations and the final recommendations of this Commission, since we must find some medical research solutions to these diseases which cause two-thirds of the deaths in this country every year.

Dr. Rusk also discusses President Johnson's proposals for new and expanded programs in the area of vocational rehabilitation. Although we have made remarkable progress in this field during the past decade—from 55,000 rehabilitated in 1954 to an estimated total of 121,000 in the current fiscal year—we still have a long way to go.

The legislation proposed by President Johnson would broaden the authority of State rehabilitation agencies so that they could provide services up to a maximum of 6 months, or 18 months in the case of the mentally retarded, and then determine the employability of an individual. Under the present statute, there must be a determination of employability after the medical and psychological evaluation of a handicapped person.

The new legislation would also authorize Federal grants for the construction and operation of sheltered workshops for the handicapped. Special provisions are included for the building and staffing of residential quarters for mentally retarded persons who are capable of gainful work but have no home.

I have had a longtime interest in mental retardation and I am convinced that through the provisions of this new legislation thousands of mentally retarded people can be restored to productive living.

The column in the New York Times follows:

JOHNSON'S HEALTH PLAN—PROGRAMS TO REDUCE DISEASE RATES AND REHABILITATE PATIENTS DISCUSSED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last Sunday this column was devoted to a discussion of President Johnson's proposal for hospital insurance for the aged in his recent health message to the Congress.

Among the other important aspects of that message was his announcement of a new Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Strokes to recommend steps to reduce the incidence of these diseases.

These diseases were the cause of 71 percent of all deaths in the United States in 1961.

The Commission, to be composed of distinguished scientists, practitioners, and citizens, will complete its study by the end of the year, the President said.

RESEARCH AND APPLICATION

Two objectives of the new group will undoubtedly be the coordination of research efforts and the development of recommendations for bringing new knowledge from the laboratories more rapidly to the bedside for clinical application in patient care.

The President also advanced proposals to increase vocational rehabilitation services for the physically handicapped, mentally restored and mentally retarded.

Ten years ago through the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954, Congress established a new national objective of restoring 250,000 disabled Americans to employment each year. In doing so, Congress recognized that this objective could not be achieved immediately because of the lack of trained personnel and facilities. It, therefore, provided Federal funds for the first time for the training of personnel and building of facilities.

That these investments are paying rich dividends is evidenced by the fact that the number of disabled persons rehabilitated under the public program of vocational rehabilitation increased from 55,825 in 1964 to an estimated total of 121,000 for the current fiscal year.

NEW SERVICES URGED

President Johnson has now called for new features for this program that mean needed services for thousands more of our disabled this year.

One change would be to provide services to determine the vocational potentials of disabled persons.

Under the present law, State rehabilitation agencies must decide after final evaluation of a handicapped person whether that person will be employable when the services are completed.

As a result, large numbers of disabled youths and adults are now denied services because there is no reasonably certain way of knowing in advance how the individual will respond to services.

The bill would permit State agencies to go ahead and provide services up to a maximum of 6 months (or 18 months in the case of the mentally retarded) and then determine whether the person will become employable.

SEEKS FEDERAL GRANTS

A second feature of the bill is authorization for Federal grants to help construct and equip workshops and vocational oriented centers for the handicapped. The funds would be available to both voluntary and public agencies to pay an average of about one-half of the cost of such facilities.

The program would be similar to that of the Hill-Burton program in which Federal grants are available for the building of hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation facilities.

In addition grant funds would be available to help with the cost of staffing during the initial year of operation.

The bill makes special provisions for including in some workshops residential quarters for retarded persons who are capable of working but have no home. These provisions of the legislation are essential to any concerted effort to decrease the number of mentally retarded admitted to State institutions and to maintain them in their own communities.

FEASIBILITY AND ECONOMY

Demonstration projects by organizations for the mentally retarded, many of which have been aided by grants from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, have shown the feasibility and economy of this proposal.

We can never expect widespread development of the sheltered workshop facilities until there is Government aid available to build, staff, and operate them.

The legislation also contains several technical provisions.

Among his major objectives, President Johnson has pledged his administration to unconditional war on poverty in America. Physical and mental disability along with delinquency, crime, and the loss of productive capacity are among the fundamental causes of poverty. Ratios for physical disability, mental illness, and mental retardation are highest among our low-income families.

The proposed amendments to our vocational rehabilitation law are fundamentally for the elimination of poverty.

President Johnson is to be commended both for advancing these proposals and for his new Commission on heart disease, cancer, and strokes.

America the Beautiful—How Long Without Clean Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary difficulties faced by those who are concerned with the critical problem of water pollution is that the subject does not lend itself to either conversation or writing. It is without glamour. Hardly anybody points proudly to the disposal plant in a community, as vital as it is to public health, industrial growth, or convenience.

But writing in a poetic vein about an unpoetic subject is Miss Susan Skelton, an honor student in the freshman class of Auburn University, Alabama. Miss Skelton is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Robert B. Skelton of Auburn. Miss Skelton has won prizes for her writing in statewide contests twice and this essay

is one of them. Believing my colleagues will enjoy reading this fine piece of writing, I include it in the RECORD:

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—HOW LONG WITHOUT CLEAN WATER?

(By Susan Skelton)

(Susan Skelton, of Auburn, is a pretty 17-year-old high school senior already making a national name for herself. She recently won a $1,000 top award in national essay competition by tackling a topic of extreme interest to valley residents, and to all America. "America the Beautiful—How Long Without Clean Water?" was her subject. The contest was sponsored by the ladies auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for the 27th year.

(Susan won first place in Alabama Auxiliary contests 2 previous years. She is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Robert B. Skelton, 426 Scott St., Auburn. Her father is head professor of the Department of Foreign Languages at Auburn University. Some 30,000 essays were submitted in the contest that Susan won.

(She has maintained a straight A average at Auburn High since the start of her freshman year. Susan is a member of the National Honor Society and is its local scholarship chairman.

(She is a feature editor of her school newspaper, Tiger Tales, and belongs to Quill and Scroll. A charter member of the Auburn High Science Club, she has been a winner in several science fairs and is now vice president of the Southeastern Alabama Regional Junior Academy of Science.

(After high school? "I plan to enroll at Auburn University in the School of Science and Literature," said Susan. "With my varied interests, I haven't yet been able to decide upon a major."

(Susan is oldest of the Skelton youngsters. Her brother, Tommy, is 13, and she has twin sisters, Becky and Missy, 10 years old. Her winning essay, presented here, also appears in the September issue of the National Bulletin, monthly magazine of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary.

(Susan is now a freshman at Auburn University, where she continues to be an honor student.)

These are the duties thrust upon me by mankind and by nature: to moisten dry throats; to cool and cleanse begrimed, perspiring bodies; to turn the mighty wheels of industry; to bring life to parched and unproductive soil; to nurture the first green shoots of spring; to bring freshness to the dusty earth of summer; to wash away the wastes of man; to drive the heat from the feverish brow; to carry the traveler to the other shore; to serve the recreation-seeker and the sportsman; to inspire the painter and the poet. Without me life itself would vanish from the land, its last vestiges buried forever in the choking dust.

Nature is an easy master to serve. She actively assists me in fulfilling my obligations to her children. When her creatures have slaked their thirst, they leave me still fresh and pure to serve their brethren. I am drawn into the vast expanse of sky, flung about by the winds, and then returned to the dry earth below. The valleys, like thirsting mouths, receive me with gratitude; the arid plains joyously expose themselves to my refreshing caress. Nature knows well the vital importance of my presence.

Man, by contrast, is a tyrant to his servant and a traitor to himself. He demands to drink, but not before he has tainted me with poison. He desires to bathe, but not until he has contaminated me with refuse. Because of his folly, apathy, and greed, I am abused, wasted, deprived of my vigor, and then expected to do his every bidding. Where once I surged with pride and strength, I now lie shallow, polluted, and impotent. The soil that I once moistened that it might bring forth crops, I now carry away, leaving the young plants to shrivel and die. The valleys for which I once cared so tenderly, I now flood savagely and destructively. The plains that I used to water so carefully, I am abandoning to the mercies of the sun and the wind. Like a violent, raging beast, I am helplessly destroying that which I was meant to sustain.

My burdens have become nearly impossible to bear. I flow black, reeking, and poisonous with sewage of which I cannot possibly dispose. Detergents cause me to froth like a rabid dog. Insidiously contaminated with invisible, tasteless bacteria, chemicals, and radioactivity, I mislead the innocent with my apparent purity, beguiling them to drink deeply of me.

What irony it is to see unsuspecting human beings, miserably ill because of me, wash down their antibiotic capsules with more of me. The insecticides, fertilizers, and factory wastes are as heavy a burden as guilt. And yet, it is not I, the carrier of impurities and diseases, that must accept the blame for the victims. Their own kind has made me what I am. I was conceived to be the bringer of life and beauty. My purity was meant to reflect the purity and majesty of nature. Now my sullen, discolored surface is a fit mirror for the ugly face of irresponsibility.

Despair seizes me as I watch the fishes die in my murderous hands. It grasps me unrelenting as I tempt the disappointed children to cast aside their garments and their elders' warnings. These unhappy young ones would only trade the heat of summer for the harsher heat of fever.

I watch their flushed faces gaze longingly into me. Unable to quiet myself, I murmur a soft invitation. This is the dangerous agent of destruction that I have become. Man has perverted me into a mockery of what I was intended to be and an obstacle to what I was intended to do.

I appeal to man in his own name and for his own benefit. For myself I have no concern. Were the whole human race to become dust, the sea would nevertheless thunder on the shores; the rain would yet fall against the earth; the everlasting ice would still crown the highest peaks. Yet every man with the strength of his country in his mind, the welfare of mankind within his heart, and the demands of the future before his eyes must assume this concern for himself. While the problem is complex and unpleasant, and the solution tedious, costly, and laborious, the stakes could hardly be higher, the need for action more compelling, or the consequences of neglect more disastrous. Although my fate does not rest in my own hands, man does have the inherent ability to rise above himself and appreciate rather than ravage the bounties of nature. The time is fast approaching when he must either plan for his survival or perish as a result of his own folly and shortsightedness. The alternatives that present themselves are painfully clear:

If the people wantonly disregard my warnings, the future will be darkened with problems, even as I have become with pollution. A desolate scene will greet the eyes, an abominable odor the nostrils, and an oppressive silence the ears in the landscape of the years to come. Along the banks of man's sources of drink and bath will lie the putrefying carcasses of fishes, mingled with untreated human wastes and permeated by reeking factory chemicals. Ugly to look upon and unhealthful to consume, I shall bring death, not life, to the countryside, and sickness, not satisfaction, to the thirsty.

Yet if the citizens will but rise above their selfish interests and torpid indifference, I can once again fulfill my mission. Freed at last by their individual and collective efforts, I shall be able to resume the role that is rightfully mine; to assuage the thirst of cracked lips and dry throats; to cool and cleanse men and beasts; to restore life and beauty to the land. Then shall I flow sparkling and pure from sea to shining sea.

Our Flag Was Not Raised in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a remarkable statement on the real meaning of patriotism as viewed by one American citizen whose valor we commend but the significance of which many will misinterpret.

On February 4, 1964, Mr. Adger Emerson Player, in a strife-torn situation at the American Embassy in Ghana, at great peril to himself and with much personal humiliation, prevented our American flag from being desecrated in an anti-American demonstration.

Normally, and perhaps with much personal gain, another but dissimilar person might have accepted and profited from such commendation as Mr. Player received merely by remaining silent.

This, Mr. Player did not do, as the following letter so dramatically indicates.

Webster defines patriotism in terms of love and devotion for one's country. Obviously we need not fear that where such patriotism prevails defense of our flag is safe.

But love and devotion are not abstract terms to be commended and then dismissed; they are interwoven into the practical and meaningful everyday activity of our national life: a father's interest in making a living for his family, a mother's concern as she looks into a baby's eyes and wonders about its future, a young boy or girl who seeks fulfillment after having been told ours is a land of equal opportunity—and people everywhere across this great country of ours who yearn for the practical realization of freedom, justice, security, and human dignity. These, indeed, are the qualities that insure real love and devotion for one's country.

I am confident that in our affluent American society such patriotism that flows through the veins of Adger Player and 20 million other Negro Americans will survive in spite of police dogs, fire hoses, and merciless bombings.

But let us not mistake on whose side the vitality of America lies. Not with those who with false symbols and bigotry spread hate, deny simple constitutional rights to others, and insult the inherent dignity of the individual. Rather, our strength lies on the side of those who with nonviolence and passionate devotion to our country's most noble purposes have set out to prove ours is a God of love, and brotherhood is achievable in our lifetime here in our motherland.

It is up to us in Congress where a civil rights program is pending to make sure that the American flag in Ghana was not again raised in vain, but in deeds as in symbol flies majestically over us all.

Mr. Player's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I have been the subject of much publicity since February 4, 1964. Although unaware of all the various interpretations of my action of raising the American Flag in Ghana, I am concerned that some quarters in the United States and abroad—not fully in sympathy with the aspirations of the American Negro—may be interpreting that action in a way detrimental to the increasingly vigorous struggle that we American Negroes are now waging for full equality of opportunity in the American society.

President Johnson wrote that I "have the gratitude of freemen everywhere who respect the principles and ideals for which our flag stands." The American dilemma is still the contradiction of racial bondage, injustice, and inequality as practiced by some Americans with the American principles of liberty, justice, and equality. I would like to set the record straight regarding what I consider the true meaning of my action.

My action was something that any American—black or white—would have done. However, my raising of the flag decreases in real significance when compared with the real acts of heroism and sacrifice by countless American Negroes who since August 1619 and continuing through today have lost their lives because they asserted their God-given rights as human beings and as Americans. I did only what American Negroes have been doing from the very beginning of the history of the United States—loyally defending the country that our ancestors made along with other Americans of all origins and races. This is our country in every respect. We have a a perfect right to defend it. In addition, we must honor those Negro Americans of yesterday who sowed American and foreign soil with their lives so that generations of today and tomorrow may reap the rewards, benefits, duties, and responsibilities of free men and women. These—our ancestors—were real heroes and courageous American Negroes whose names have been hidden in America's history far too long.

I feel most Americans still have to experience that as Negroes and whites interact in work and pleasure, they discover that they have the same cultural and historical foundations and the same aspirations and ambitions for themselves and for their country. I feel most Americans still have to realize that Negro Americans are determined to obtain full equality of opportunity in every facet of life in the United States.

White Americans must allow the American dream of equality, freedom, and justice to live in their hearts and to be reflected in their everyday actions toward their black brothers. It will never be enough to pass civil rights laws and to speak in glowing terms about the patriotic deed of one American Negro. White Americans must demonstrate as much love for their black fellow Americans as they do for the red, white, and blue American flag. Yes, we—American Negroes—are loyal to the United States. This proven loyalty in no way diminishes our firm resolve to be accepted as Americans in the fullest extent. We will share in the privileges, rights, and responsibilities as completely free American men and women.

I hope that all the words of praise for my deed in raising the American flag in Ghana will be translated now in the United States into respect and full acceptance of American Negroes. If this full respect and acceptance does not take place, then one must draw the sad conclusion—as many American Negroes and other people throughout the world will—that the American flag was raised once again in vain.

Sincerely yours,

ADGER EMERSON PLAYER,
American Embassy, Accra, Ghana.

New School in Orrington, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the community of Orrington, Maine, recently built a new schoolhouse to better serve the educational needs of the young people of the township.

Miss Libby Vanyush, an eighth grade pupil in the Center Drive School, put her thoughts into an article which was printed in the Orrington Gazette, a publication which is presented to each citizen of the town by the Orrington Jaycees. Libby is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Benedict Vanyush.

We point with pride to Orrington and its accomplishments toward better education for its citizens. More communities across our land could well follow this example. Little Libby's article expresses her own deep appreciation for this fine new school. Such appreciation, eloquently expressed by this young teenager, warms the heart of every citizen. Our best wishes are extended to Miss Libby for a very bright future.

The article follows:

CENTER DRIVE SCHOOL

(By Libby Vanyush, eighth grade student)

In a remote area of Orrington is one of Maine's most modern schools. It is the new school on Center Drive, which is now attended by the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades of Orrington.

It is located among birches and pines in a large field which is also used for a playground. Many of us would not be surprised if we should see a deer or two in the field beyond our window, or in the birches which surround our school.

The school is very beautifully designed, modern, frame structure. The exterior is redwood with a natural wood finish.

The skylighted corridors, glassed walls, and lovely windows make all the classrooms bright and cheery. The windows are also a temptation to daydreamers, but who can resist that view?

The school facilities consist of eight classrooms, one of which is used as a library and audiovisual room, an auditorium, a kitchen, an office, a teachers' room, a janitor's room, and basements.

The classrooms are all large in size, well lighted and artistically designed. They have plenty of blackboard space and pegboards in the back of the rooms which can be used for displays. Two walls have been dedicated to bulletin boards which are painted light blue and golden yellow. These cheery and well-selected colors blend harmoniously with the interior of the classrooms. The colors give a feeling of warmth and have a relaxing effect.

The ceilings also add great beauty to the interior. Cathedral ceilings relieved by skylights are used in the corridors and auditorium, meeting the sloping ceiling of the classrooms, and giving a graceful line affect. The skylights economically provide light for the corridor and classrooms and give the corridor a modern, bright, and clean look. The natural wood beams supporting the ceiling heighten the modern line.

The auditorium is a large multipurpose room, which serves as a cafeteria, gym, auditorium, and on Fridays a music room. The auditorium ceiling is made of the same type of material as the classrooms, but is much higher. As a gym it is equipped with baskets for basketball, which we are now using with care, because the windows are not yet protected.

We are all proud of our new school and think it one of the loveliest and most modern schools in this State. Orrington should be very proud to have such a beautiful, modern school.

Experts on the Federal Reserve Question Its Present Structure and Functions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee is now holding hearings on the Federal Reserve System. Last week we heard from six outstanding economists. Excerpts from the prepared statements of three of these witnesses were put into the RECORD by the gentleman from California, the Honorable RICHARD T. HANNA. Today, I would like to place into the RECORD excerpts from the prepared statements of Prof. O. H. Brownlee, of the University of Minnesota; Eli Shapiro, of the Graduate School of Business of Harvard University; and Paul Samuelson, of MIT. These three experts in our economy's money system testified last week, on February 26 and 27.

Professor Brownlee:

I support the proposals to (1) grant banks membership in the system without requiring them to hold Federal Reserve stock, (2) eliminate the prohibition against the payment of interest on demand deposits, and (3) permit banks to pay interest on deposits made by the Treasury and charge for services rendered to the Treasury.

Professor Brownlee also stated:

Monetary activities have contributed to economic instability not only because of using the wrong targets but also because of acting as if the future could be known more accurately than we can now predict it * * * the indirect evidence combined with accepted theory favors a policy of increasing the money supply at a constant rate. This permits setting clearly targets for total bank reserves relatively far into the future. The Open Market Committee not only can be abolished; its function can be abolished as well.

Professor Shapiro:

Since policy decisions are made by different agencies * * * stabilization strategy requires coordination among the agencies to insure the pursuit of a common end. For if one agency takes price stability to be the critical goal and pursues policies appropriate to the attainment of that goal, while other agencies deem full employment or economic growth to be the more important objective of policy, we will observe conflicting policies which may indeed prevent the at-

tainment of any of these goals. For example, if the Central Bank, in its interest in price stability, maintains a monetary policy which dampens demand, the fiscal policy of the Government in attempting to offset this policy will be forced to run larger deficits.

I tend to support the following recommendations * * * put forth by the Commission on Money and Credit:

The Federal Reserve Board Chairman and Vice Chairman should be designated by the President from among the Board's membership, to serve for 4-year terms coterminous with the President's.

The Federal Reserve Board should consist of five members, with overlapping 10-year terms, one expiring each odd-numbered year; members should be eligible for reappointment.

Occupational and geographical qualifications for Board members should be eliminated.

The present form of capital stock of the Federal Reserve banks should be retired.

The determination of open market policies should be vested in the Board.

Professor Samuelson:

1. The present Federal Reserve System * * * has evolved toward becoming a tolerably effective central bank. * * * Further evolution is both inevitable and desirable, particularly in making the Federal Reserve a responsible institution in the American political structure.

2. Lack of coordination between monetary, fiscal, and debt policies as determined by the Executive and Congress with monetary credit, interest, and debt-management policies as determined by Federal Reserve policy can lead to shortrun crises and to costly longrun ineffectiveness. Yet, at this stage of Federal Reserve evolution, there is nothing to prevent tragic recurrence of such undesirable conflicts. It has been more of a lucky accident, than an inherent feature of present legislation and practice, that the United States has been able to avoid costly friction; but not even with our lucky combination of personalities and events, has our economy been spared some cost attributable to lack of unified monetary policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Speaking as an American economist, cognizant of our peculiar evolution of institutions and practice, I do not now recommend such a drastic change. Perhaps in the coming decades, we may evolve toward a similar system. The most important changes needed now seem to me to be the following:

(a) The 14-year terms of the Board members are too long. Staggered 6-year terms would seem none too short. Perhaps 4 years would be better.

(b) The Chairman of the Board of Governors should definitely be appointed by each new President, and should serve at the pleasure of the President.

(c) The present Open Market Committee gives too much representation to the regional banks, too little to the executive branch. At the most, there should be the President of the New York Federal Reserve bank and one rotating President from the other 11 banks on it.

(d) If an irreconcilable conflict between the Executive and the Federal Reserve were to ensue, it should be made clear that the Federal Reserve must yield, albeit with the right to full protest to both Congress and the public. The sole exception to this ultimate yielding should be in the case that Congress by explicit resolution of both Houses releases the Federal Reserve from its showdown subordination.

I have not tried to spell out the legislative details of the above recommendations and have deliberately left my wording general. The above recommendation, I believe, preserves the proper kind of independence of the central bank: like the House of Lords, it should be able to delay innovations, to smooth down the volatile changes of public opinion and of thin majorities. But the central bank should never be thought of as an island of isolated power, as a King George defending the economy against the dragon of inflation and frenzied finance. As Edmund Burke said nearly two centuries ago: "The age of chivalry is dead—that of responsible, democratic government has succeeded."

Constitutional Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I too, wish to congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for his raising the question of possible abrogation of constitutional rights. I too, received a letter from Mr. Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, along with several memorandums attempting to document the infractions of constitutional rights alleged in his letter. Many of these documents have been inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, whether we are considering the case of Mr. Hoffa, or Mr. Cohn, or of any other citizen charged with any crime, two things stand out clearly in my thinking: The first is the extreme difficulty that there is today in obtaining sufficient evidence to convict. Countless hours of work and of observation; of detailed examination and evaluation; as well as searching out and interrogation of witnesses are required. It is a colossal job to amass sufficient evidence to prove guilt beyond reasonable doubt and to obtain the evidence required therefor, particularly if one is dealing with a clever, organized, and knowledgeable person.

The second point, however, is that under our system of law a man is innocent until proven guilty. We believe in the intrinsic worth of an individual and in the general concept that it is far worse to punish a man for a crime which he did not commit than to free a man for a crime which he did commit.

In these days when the tentacles of the Federal Government reach increasingly into the daily lives of each of our citizens, the protection of the individual against his government and autocratic action thereof becomes ever more important. Whether we are considering laws dealing with income taxes, labor legislation, religious rights, freedom of expression, property rights or civil rights, we must guard carefully against overzealous or overreaching action by our law-enforcement officers.

The gentleman from Nebraska has made a contribution in bringing these serious allegations to the attention of the Congress. On the surface the allegations would suggest that the Justice Department has gone far beyond the fine line which separates the rights of a defendant to conduct his separate defense and the rights of the public to obtain the facts. I was disturbed by the charge that a U.S. marshal had invaded the records of the defendant, and his files, without a warrant or other legal basis. I was further disturbed by the allegation that the Jencks Act had been avoided and the further allegation that the Government was in a position to change testimony without notification to the defense as the trial progressed.

Mr. Speaker, the point raised by the comments of the gentleman from Nebraska and by the allegations of Mr. Zagri must not be considered in light of the defendant. Nor do I make these comments in defense of the defendant, whom I do not know, but rather because of the serious questions they raise with regard to the autocratic power—and its use by the Attorney General—which the charges raise. I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will give these allegations its serious attention.

Mr. Johnson Presides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the London Daily Telegraph. It is a fine tribute to President Johnson and clearly shows the respect and confidence with which our English friends regard our great and beloved leader:

MR. JOHNSON PRESIDES

President Johnson yesterday delivered to Congress his first address on the state of the Union. It does not seem very likely to be his last. To emerge from the relative obscurity of the Vice Presidency, a man whose apparent limitations were more obvious than his strengths; to behave in the most testing circumstances with courage, dignity and good sense; to gather swiftly and surely into his own hands the reins which his predecessor was forced by tragedy to drop; to take up as his own all the tasks to which his predecessor had addressed himself; to pass triumphantly through one ordeal after another; what an achievement his has already been. We may measure it by the fact that we follow his doings no longer with apprehension and forbearance but with secure confidence.

When Lyndon Johnson and John Kennedy were contending for the Democratic nomination it was Kennedy who was sometimes regarded as the cool and uncommitted politician, Johnson as the radical popular tribune with fire in his belly. Succeeding events have tended to obscure or even reverse this judgment. Yesterday's address vividly recalls and confirms that part of it which relates to Johnson. Here is President Kennedy's programme, and more so. Were President Kennedy's policies in fact dictated by circumstances? Were they such that no President could conceivably choose others? If not (and surely they were not) then President Johnson had the chance of modifying some and dropping or reversing others. More than the chance, he had every excuse; for some of them, however right or

necessary, will bring him little but trouble, more brickbats than bouquets.

Yet here we see him marching straight ahead. The Kennedy momentum is maintained, even increased. Nothing has been abandoned, nothing emasculated. Hospital insurance for old people; President Kennedy repeatedly tried and failed to get this enacted; undaunted, President Johnson tries again. Civil rights for Negroes; controversy about this bill, even the enactment of which will hardly appease the Negroes, must jeopardise other legislation dear to the new President's heart. No matter, he presses on undeterred. To the Kennedy program he adds proposals of his own, amounting, in his own words, to "an unconditional war on poverty."

To sugar the radical pill he offers a few concessions. He relies on frugal administration to make welfare expenditure palatable. He relies on reduced production of atomic explosives to make possible not only this expenditure but also sizable cuts in taxation. His address is perhaps not dissimilar to what Roosevelt might have said today had he been alive and active.

Economic Report: A Political Campaign Piece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the latest campaign handouts paid for by the taxpayers is the President's Economic Report. This is pointed out by Henry Hazlitt, in the current issue of Newsweek magazine, under a column headed "Inflation and Statism."

With the permission of the House, I submit it for consideration:

BUSINESS TIDES—INFLATION AND STATISM

(By Henry Hazlitt)

From time to time I have contended in this column that there is no need for a Council of Economic Advisers, and no excuse for an annual Economic Report. I wrote on January 28, 1952, for instance, that the report "consists mainly of giving 'scientific' and 'economic' reasons for what the President has done or wants to do for political reasons. * * * [It] is administration propaganda paid for by the taxpayers."

This year's Economic Report is just one more example. It is an out-and-out campaign document. We learn from it that the Eisenhower administration just couldn't do anything right. For instance: "Federal outlays leveled off early in 1957 and then declined, just at a time when expansionary policy was needed to avoid a downturn." Then, again, between 1958 and 1960: "Federal policy was restrictive and wholly inappropriate to a period of insufficient demand." And so on.

CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT

All the comparisons in President Johnson's own 18-page Economic Report (summarizing the council's 283-page report) boast of the progress since "early 1961"—i.e., since the Kennedy-Johnson administration came in. "Our record $100 billion expansion since early 1961 has carried us past important milestones in the march toward a better life. * * * In the nearly 3 years of unbroken expansion since early 1961: gross national product is up 16 percent, measured in constant dollars," etc. And remember: "An expansion as long, strong, and free of excesses as the one we are now experiencing does not just happen. * * * Government has steadily pursued fiscal and monetary policies designed to promote recovery, accelerate expansion, and encourage business and consumer confidence: in 1961, when the administration's quick antirecession program got recovery off to a flying start," etc.

I shall not here attempt to check back on the validity of the comparisons that the Economic Report makes with conditions in the Eisenhower administration. I shall merely mention one comparison that it does not cite: in the 8 Eisenhower years, unemployment averaged 4.9 percent; in the 3 Kennedy-Johnson years, it has been 6 percent.

Yet the new Economic Report concedes that, "by all odds, the country's No. 1 economic problem is persistent unemployment." How does the administration propose to solve this? It proposes to solve it by the method that has persistently failed in the past—more monetary inflation.

TAX CUT AS PANACEA

Its great reliance is on the $11 billion tax cut. "Speedy passage of the tax cut * * * will provide a net fiscal stimulus, taking both expenditures and tax cut into account, that will be three times as great in 1964 as in any of the years 1961, 1962, and 1963—will, in fact, provide a greater net stimulus to the economy in 1964—to jobs, production, income, and profits—than in any other peacetime year in history. * * * The tax cut will give a sustained lift, year in and year out, to the American economy. When fully effective in 1965, it will send well over $11 billion annually coursing through the arteries of the private economy."

It is clear that this $11 billion is to consist entirely of deficit spending—that it is to be created by issuing $11 billion of new money and credit. To make this quite plain, Mr. Johnson says: "It would be self-defeating to cancel the stimulus of tax reduction by tightening money."

Not once does the report suggest that any part of our unemployment may be caused by wage rates or labor costs already above marginal productivity levels, or that any adjustment may be needed. Instead it proposes remedies—e.g., "higher overtime penalty (wage) rates"—calculated to make the unemployment worse.

The remedies that the Economic Report prescribes for all our economic ills, in brief, are more deficits, more inflation, more controls, more statism. Not once does it dawn on the authors of the report that the Government has caused our chronic unemployment, caused the balance-of-payments deficit, and caused our slow rate of economic growth, by precisely the nostrums it is advocating as a sure cure for these maladies.

Need To Investigate the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was passed by the Los Angeles County Federation of Republican Women on February 26, 1964, and I have been requested to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION PASSED FEBRUARY 26, 1964, BY LOS ANGELES COUNTY FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Whereas the State Department was responsible for the repatriation of Presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald after he had renounced his citizenship for communism; and it even financed his return from Russia; and

Whereas State Department personnel have played a major role in engineering the series of Munichs, in nuclear agreements, grain deals, unilateral disarmament projects, and other attempts at peace through appeasement; and

Whereas State Department predilection for pro-Communist dictators, and aversion to anti-Communist regimes have been responsible for the diplomatic crises, the appalling messes, and the continued losses in Korea, Laos, Cuba, Berlin, Vietnam, Cambodia, Panama, and other Latin American countries; and

Whereas the dismissal of Otto Otepka, for furnishing Congress with necessary information, signaled the end of effective security within the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Federation of Republican Women urge a thorough and immediate investigation of the Department of State, from top to bottom, by the Congress of the United States.

Rights and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the March 2, 1964, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times. As one who supported civil rights legislation, I in particular want to point out what the editorial emphasizes—that certain responsibilities must be accepted along with additional civil rights. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITY

The civil rights bill is now in the Senate, having passed the House. A considerable debate is expected. In some quarters the expectation is that the debate—or filibuster, if you will—could run until late in April or early in May.

The atmosphere of this filibuster cannot possibly be improved nor can the opportunity for equitable resolution and passage of this controversial civil rights measure be tempered by episodes such as the recent actions in the area of civil rights.

The trouble in Princess Anne, Md., where State police, using snarling police dogs, clubs and firehoses fought a pitched battle in the streets with Negro students is one such example.

It is equally deplorable, in principle, for civil rights groups to threaten a continual round of harassment of Chicago's public school system to emphasize and underline points already made.

Lawrence Landry, leader of the recent school boycott, has threatened such action.

We think this is wrong.

Wrong because such harassment stifles the efforts of those trying to solve the problems that must be solved.

Wrong because mass absenteeism costs a school system dearly in terms of dollars. That deprivation must, inevitably, increase the difficulty of maintaining and raising the standards of education.

Wrong because mass absenteeism deprives the child of what he needs most, time in school.

Wrong because such tactics destroy the very fabric of discipline in the schools.

Wrong because the tactics of destruction are not the tactics of freedom.

The privilege of equal rights is a solemn one. It belongs, according to the Constitution of the United States to everyone. This has not been followed in the past. It is in the process of being followed now. The country is in a period of great and significant change.

Easily forgotten in the heat of this change is the simple fact that the privilege of equal rights carries with it the burden of responsibility. Rioting in the streets, harassing a school system, advocating violence and defiance of the law, meeting change with brutality is an abandonment of that responsibility—no matter who does it. It is time that both sides in this time of change accept the responsibility that equality demands.

Confusion in the House Banking and Currency Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of confusion in the House Banking and Currency Committee as to what rules we are operating under.

At the start of this Congress we adopted some rules but no one seems to know just what they are, at least I do not. The chairman, Mr. PATMAN, at the time said that he would never use the subpena power except by a vote of the whole committee or a subcommittee. So far as I can find out such a vote has never been taken in any executive session of the full committee or any subcommittee which was held according to the rules. This means that such a vote would not be good if the chairman simply called enough majority members on the phone and got their consent. I feel it has to be a regular meeting of the full membership of the subcommittee or full committee including the Republicans.

On February 7, 1964, a letter went to the presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks over Mr. PATMAN'S signature as chairman. I hereby quote that letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1964.

As a part of our general review of the structure and operations of the Federal Reserve System, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee desires to obtain certain relevant financial information from the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks. No suggestion of conflict of interest has been made to the committee. However, we feel it is incumbent upon the committee to survey the income and asset position of each of the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks at periodic intervals. As a consequence we would appreciate your providing the following information at your earliest convenience.

(1) Your personal income and breakdown by each source during each year or part thereof of your tenure as president of a Federal Reserve bank, and for each of the 3 years prior thereto.

(2a) A detailed breakdown of your security holdings at a date 6 months prior to your taking office as president of a Federal Reserve bank.

(2b) Your security holdings at the present time.

(3) Identify in detail the nature of your association or affiliation with any banking or financial institution and or any nonfinancial business enterprise.

Thank you for your cooperation in our investigation.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, no Republicans knew about this letter and several of the Democratic Members whom I asked said they had never heard of it. It was apparently done by the chairman alone. I did not find out about it for a week. I then sent a letter to the Presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, which I quote:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1964.

Mr. ALFRED HAYES,
President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HAYES: Earlier this month the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN addressed a letter to you to give certain information relating to the sources of your personal income and a detailed breakdown of your holdings of securities. The information regarding income is to cover the period of your presidency and 3 years before and the data on your security holdings is to commence 6 months prior to your presidency. Other information is also requested.

This letter was signed by Mr. PATMAN as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives but the fact is that the full committee was not informed of this contemplated action. I think this is a perfectly outrageous request and if I were president of a Federal Reserve bank I certainly would not comply with it.

This letter is to let you know that the request does not have the approval of many of the committee members and I do hope that you will not comply with it, or at least hold off complying for a while for further developments.

Most of the minority members of the committee are out of town this week but as soon as they return I plan to get them together and talk this over. I intend to bring the matter up in an executive session when the full committee meets.

The question of a subpena under our rules would have to be voted on by either the full committee or a subcommittee thereof. As this whole investigation develops it seems to me that Mr. PATMAN makes his rules as he goes along but I know some of us will fight any subpena action—even before the House itself if necessary.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE E. KILBURN.

Mr. Speaker, in attempting to find out what the minutes of our original organization executive session show, I asked the clerk of the committee for a copy of them. He later informed me they were in Mr. PATMAN'S possession and he would not give them to me. I then wrote Mr. PATMAN the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1964.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I respectfully request a copy of the minutes of the executive sessions of our committee in the 88th Congress having to do with issuing a subpena. If you cannot, under the rules, give me a copy, I would like to have these minutes available to me to look over.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE E. KILBURN.

He replied on February 26, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1964.

Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLARENCE: In reply to your letter of February 20, I shall be very glad to talk to you about these matters at your convenience.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that he said nothing about letting me see the minutes. I quote herewith rule XI, clause 26 of the rules of the House:

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of its committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees. Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent therewith.

(b) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

No one knows when the chairman will ever have an executive session of the full committee and this question of our committee rules should be straightened out promptly. Our committee is fast becoming a laughing stock among the people familiar with its operations. Since I was elected a Member of the House and a member of the committee just the same as Mr. PATMAN, I feel I have rights in this matter and I propose to exercise them.

I called a meeting of the Republican members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and we got out a joint statement signed by every single minority member. It is as follows:

MR. PATMAN GOES FISHING

Early this month Mr. PATMAN, as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, wrote to the president of each Federal Reserve bank asking for "(1) your personal income and a breakdown by each source during each year or part thereof of your tenure as president of a Federal Reserve bank, and for each of the 3 years prior thereto, (2a) a detailed breakdown of your security holdings at a date 6 months prior to your taking office as a president of a Federal Reserve bank, (2b) your security holdings at the present time," (3) identify in detail whether or not the man had ever been employed by or held stock in a bank or financial institution or had been affiliated with any nonfinancial business enterprise.

This letter was never considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency or by a subcommittee thereof. It apparently was dispatched by Mr. PATMAN alone though worded as coming from the Domestic Finance Subcommittee.

Mr. PATMAN states, "No suggestion of conflict of interest has been made to the committee". This being so, what reason does Mr. PATMAN have for delving into the personal affairs of the presidents to the extent contemplated in this letter? If Mr. PATMAN has information warranting a demand for detailed financial reports covering periods, in several cases, before the president became associated with the Federal Reserve banks he should have shared such knowledge with the other members of the committee whose cooperation would have been forthcoming promptly.

In view of the manner in which this encroachment on the personal affairs of the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks was issued it can only be concluded that Mr. PATMAN has embarked on another "fishing expedition" with no assurance that the personal affairs of the Federal Reserve bank presidents will not be exposed to the public gaze of the curious.

The presidents of the Federal Reserve banks are men of high caliber and extensive technical training. They are closely supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and at least annually are required to report their indebtedness to the Board. By Board regulation they can have no outside affiliations or own bank stocks.

It seems unfortunate that one Member of the Congress can subject these men to such whimsical personal harassment.

CLARENCE E. KILBURN, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, EUGENE SILER, PAUL A. FINO, FLORENCE P. DWYER, SEYMOUR HALPERN, JAMES HARVEY, OLIVER BOLTON, W. E. BROCK, ROBERT TAFT, JR., JOSEPH M. MCDADE, SHERMAN P. LLOYD, BURT L. TALCOTT, DEL CLAWSON.

Feeling that this matter should be talked over with the top members of the committee I tried to arrange a meeting with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], and myself. For some reason the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] felt this was a secret meeting so he has refused to attend.

Personally, I would much prefer to have the matter brought up before the full committee, and open to the public as far as I am concerned.

Since this committee is a creature of the House it seems to me that the House is entitled to know the facts and the conditions under which we are attempting to operate.

I would also think that the House Administration Committee would be interested to get an example of the arbitrary way the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is spending the taxpayers money that they give him for the committee. Then the next time he comes before the House Administration Committee they can better judge the merits of his request for funds.

The Taming of the Gerrymander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the public press during the past week, regarding the Supreme Court decision on congressional redistricting in Westberry versus Sanders.

The Christian Science Monitor of February 26 carried a very interesting feature article on this important subject, entitled "The Taming of the Gerrymander."

This article points out that a great many of the disparities in congressional apportionment comes from geographical problems, rather than from the efforts of country folks to "avoid being outnumbered or outslickered by concentrations of city folk."

I recommend it to you for your consideration:

WEST COAST REPORT: THE TAMING OF THE GERRYMANDER

(By Harlan Trott)

SAN FRANCISCO.—California's political menagerie has its share of gerrymanders.

But none of these 38 geographical monsters outmatches any of the others very much in population size.

The Supreme Court's recent opinion on congressional apportionment opens up a fascinating vein for hard-rock exploration all through the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific West.

California, on the whole, is quite uniformly balanced on this score. The average number of residents for the State's 38 districts is 414,000 and most of them are pretty much in line.

It's the geography of the problem that is especially fascinating—something the West has a great deal of.

In surveying the Western States in the glare of the Supreme Court ruling, you get the impression that the disparities in congressional apportionment stem mainly from geographical problems. And less from efforts by country folk to avoid being outnumbered or outslickered by concentrations of city folk.

Take Oregon, for example. What does Gov. Mark Hatfield mean when he remarks that the issue of equitable population representation "points up the inevitable clash between the theoretical and the practical"?

You almost have to see a map of Oregon. Draw a straight line from the Columbia River south to California and everything east is the second congressional district.

It's the smallest by far in the ratio of people to representation. Representative AL ULLMAN (Democrat), of Baker, has 265,164 people in his constituency. But to shake hands with them all he would traverse two-thirds of Oregon and still not step over his district line.

Representative EDITH GREEN, (Democrat), of Portland, has a quite different problem in her third district. She only has to drive around Multnomah County to greet all the voters. But she has about twice as many hands to shake because her constituency holds 522,813 residents.

So when Governor Hatfield speaks of the inevitable clash between the theoretical and the practical, he is talking about geography to some extent. "One of our districts (Mr. ULLMAN'S) occupies more than 50,000 square miles and is larger than Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island combined," says Mr. Hatfield.

California's Second District is like Oregon's Mr. ULLMAN'S. It runs from a little north of the latitude of Los Angeles to the Oregon border, a long thin strip pressed against the sunset side of the Sierra Nevada. a stretch comparable to that between Maine's Passamaquoddy Bay and the Chesapeake Capes. Some going.

There has been talk of redistricting Oregon to equalize things between Mrs. GREEN'S compact Third District and Mr. ULLMAN'S waving-wheat and cattle-browsing second district. A bill was drafted proposing to extend the Second District boundaries to encircle some of the residents in Oregon's remaining three districts. This did not work out.

Actually giving Mr. ULLMAN more constituents would have made his district even bigger. To shake all the outstretched hands along enlarged western boundaries, he would have to cross the Cascade Range.

His present west boundary is a natural one. Any extension of it to the west would compound the voters' isolation problem.

But when it comes to how far a politician has to go to shake a hand, Congressman WALTER BARING, Democrat, of Nevada, must travel the longest mile in the West. He has the whole of the Nation's fourth largest State to traverse. There are more square miles to trudge than hands to shake.

The 1960 Nevada census shows there are 285,278 residents. But Nevada is growing very fast percentagewise. Already political leaders are speculating on how Nevada would look when it had two congressional districts, instead of being a district-of-the-whole.

Secretary of State John Koontz says it might be practical to just draw a straight east-west line midway across the State. This would strike a fairly even population balance between Nevada's two expanding population centers, Reno and Las Vegas. The districts would each encompass about the same proportion of outlying population in the cities lying due east from Reno and Las Vegas. Mr. Koontz says it wouldn't make much difference where his native city of Goldfield ended up in the redistricting. The population is only about 400. The exodus began soon after the termination of the Nelson-Gans lightweight championship bout over 50 years ago. But other parts of Nevada are growing faster percentagewise than California or even Arizona.

Commerce Secretary Hodges, Johnson Administration in Buzzsaw of Lumber Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, for months now a battle has been raging in the lumber industry over the proposal for revised lumber standards establishing dimensional differences between dry and green lumber. Benefits to the producer and the consumer have been prophecied by the proponents. Dire consequences to the green producers have likewise been forecast.

The lumber industry has, in recent years, suffered a loss of domestic market to imports, principally from Canada. The manufacturers must improve and diversify their product and aggressively seek new markets. On the other hand, the economic impact of proposed changes on the industry or substantial portions thereof cannot be disregarded. Our efforts must be directed to helping the whole industry and we must be careful in trying to solve immediate problems that we do not create new and more serious ones.

This is a complex and technical problem, difficult to understand. It is important to my district that it be understood and solved properly. The article which follows by A. Robert Smith has appeared in Oregon papers and is an able exposition of the problem:

COMMERCE SECRETARY HODGES, JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION IN BUZZ SAW OF LUMBER DISPUTE

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—A titantic tussle over the proper size of a two by four has caught the Johnson administration in a buzz saw of powerful political pressures.

What started as a relatively dull economic question has mushroomed into a fight between aggressive economic interest groups who in turn have drawn into the battle such prominent political figures as Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Ways and Means Chairman WILBUR MILLS, one son of President Roosevelt and a brother of the late President Kennedy, the law firm of one of President Johnson's closest advisers, and a cadre of liberal and conservative Congressmen who have chosen sides.

The man in the middle of all this is Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges.

At issue is whether the Commerce Department should change the Government's standard for lumber to permit the thickness of a dry two by four to be shaved to 1½ inches. For years the standard thickness, required by FHA-approved housing and local building codes, has been 1⅝ inches.

The reduction of an eighth of an inch could mean millions of dollars in profits or losses to competing elements of the softwood lumber industry which supplies most of the wood that goes into housing construction. Advocates of the change estimate it would save $100 million a year in housing costs. They pointed this out last week to the President's new adviser on consumer matters, Mrs. Esther Peterson.

NLMA LEADS FIGHT

Leading the fight for slimmer boards is the National Lumber Manufacturers Association in behalf of a number of the largest producers of kiln dried lumber, notably Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., which is already producing the slimmer boards in anticipation of their acceptance in the near future, according to Random Lengths, the authoritative lumber trade paper.

Opposing the change is Western Forest Industries Association in behalf of its member companies which produce what is called green or unseasoned lumber.

Green lumber, shipped by water or rail from the Northwest to markets in the East and southern California, loses its moisture gradually through the air as it stands in lumber yards or after it has been used in construction. Dry lumber is normally more costly because it is seasoned in a large kiln then shipped in boxcars to its markets.

The proposed new standard would allow only dry lumber to be reduced in size. It's based on the conclusion that a 1½-inch dry board is as strong or stronger than a 1⅝-inch green board, as determined by laboratory tests. Adoption of the new standard would mean that builders could use a 1½-inch dry board of a 1⅝-inch green board interchangeably.

The change would allow dry producers to get more boards per tree, to reduce the cost and time of drying, and to ship more boards per boxcar at a rail transportation saving. Green producers fear the price advantage they now enjoy over dry lumber would be converted into a disadvantage—and much of their market would be wiped out.

BIG COMPANIES BENEFIT

Chief beneficiaries among lumber producers would be the large landowning companies, such as Weyerhaeuser, Georgia-Pacific, Pope & Talbot, which already own the trees from which they hope to cut greater numbers of boards, making each tree more valuable. This increased value is taxable at the relatively low capital gains rate, a factor which further enhances the value of slimmer boards to timber owners.

Dry lumber producers who rely primarily on purchasing Government timber would benefit less, it is assumed, for the increased value of each tree would result in higher competitive bidding during timber sales.

The recommendation for slimmer boards was formally presented to Secretary Hodges last August by the American Lumber Standards Committee, composed of representatives of lumber retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers, railroads, contractors, architects, construction engineers, and wood-use industries. The green producers, claiming the American Lumber Standards Committee is stacked against them, have put up such a fight that Hodges has delayed acting on the proposal long after its advocates thought it would be adopted.

STANDARD POLITICAL ISSUE

On January 31, Hodges listened to a 45-minute plea for swift action led off by Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers, who said:

"Unfortunately, this new standard has apparently become a political issue to some and, we fear, has been subjected to review and delay on that basis rather than on its technical and economic adequacy."

Among other groups joining the National Lumber Manufacturers Association in their appeal to Hodges were the American Institute of Architects and the National Association of Home Builders, which claimed slimmer boards would "tend to reduce the cost of housing (and) at the same time it will enable us to build a better house." Also favoring the change are the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, National American Wholesale Lumber Association, Southern and Western Pine Associations, California Redwood Association, and West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

Opponents promptly asked for equal time. Among those making this request were Speaker MCCORMACK, and Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusettes. Their interest is in protecting the Boston port terminal interests that handle green lumber arriving by ship. Hodges promised them a hearing.

Opponents have also aroused Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California. As chairman of a Small Business Subcommittee, Representative ROOSEVELT fired off a letter to Hodges January 28 relating complaints from California lumbermen which "indicate a movement is underway by large organizations in the lumber industry which could ultimately eliminate smaller organizations."

This is "contrary to the public interest," said ROOSEVELT, threatening to hold congressional hearings if they "appear necessary." He asked Hodges to comment on the following five complaints he has heard:

1. The new standard would discriminate against green lumber.

2. The American Lumber Standards Committee is not broadly representative of the lumbering industry and is dominated by monopolistic interests.

3. The economic impact resulting from the proposed standards will cause hardship, particularly among smaller lumber companies.

4. There has been no demonstration that a change would benefit the consumer.

5. The conception and promotion of the new standards is in violation of law.

Hodges hasn't answered ROOSEVELT's letter yet. The Congressman, who may run for the Senate in California this year, is applying pressure to a Department in which his brother, Franklin Jr., is No. 2 man as Under Secretary.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association, for its part, hired the highly touted law firm of Arnold, Fortas, & Porter. The second of these partners, Abe Fortas, is confidante of President Johnson.

The same day Congressman ROOSEVELT wrote Hodges, Fortas' partner, Thurman Arnold, gave the National Lumber Manufacturers Association a legal opinion in which he said it was absurd to contend, as some had, that the proposed standard would violate the antitrust laws by discriminating against green lumber.

STANDARDS RIDICULOUS

"It is like saying that a master plumbers' association could not adopt better standards for high grade wash basins because this would discriminate against, and put a competitive handicap on, cheaper, low grade wash basins," Arnold wrote. "It is like holding that standards could not be adopted for paint because it would improve its quality and thus put a competitive handicap on wallpaper manufacturers."

Arnold characterized legal objections to the standard as "legal imbecilities."

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has been stimulating its friends in Congress to urge Hodges to act favorably on the standard. Among them are Representative WILBUR MILLS and other conservatives.

Western Forest Industries Association has been rallying its friends, including Oregon's liberal Democrats in Congress, to urge equal consideration for green lumber.

The Johnson administration is looking for a way out of the buzz saw.

The Late M. P. Bouslog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 last, one of the most lovable and unique characters it has ever been my privilege to know departed this life. His name was Martin Perry Bouslog. It was my privilege beginning back when I was a high school boy in Gulfport, Miss., to know Martin Perry Bouslog for more than half a century. Mr. Bouslog was a successful land lawyer and abstractor. He was possibly one of the finest experts in the field of land matters in the whole Southland.

But I like to think of him as a friend of man and a gentleman in the finest sense of the word. I think I can truthfully say that he enjoyed the confidence and respect of all people with whom he came in contact either socially or in the business world.

He was a credit to his profession and a benefactor of mankind. Moreover, he was a great American of the old school whose word was his bond and whose fellow men were his friends.

The Southeastern Oil Review, a newspaper published in Jackson, Miss., carried the following account of his death:

STROKE IS FATAL TO M. P. BOUSLOG

Martin Perry Bouslog, prominent abstract lawyer and pioneer abstractor in Mississippi, died following a stroke last Wednesday at Baptist Hospital in Jackson.

Mr. Bouslog, 84, son of W. H. Bouslog, second mayor of Gulfport, was the last living

charter member and founder of the National Title Insurance Association and at his death was compiling a book on the early days of the organization. He was vice president of the Oil Review Publishing Co., publishers of Southeastern Oil Review.

Mr. Bouslog began abstract work in 1899 in Bay St. Louis under the trade name of Mississippi Land & Abstract Co. He moved to Mississippi City, then county seat of Harrison County in 1901. Three years later, with the removal of the county seat to Gulfport, headquarters were established there. He then incorporated under the name of Mississippi Abstract Title & Guaranty Co., this being the first incorporated abstract company in Mississippi and was qualified to write title insurance in 1909. From 1904 to 1915 the company maintained offices at Gulfport, Pascagoula, Meridian, Hattiesburg, and Jackson.

In 1911 Mr. Bouslog promoted the organization of the Louisiana Abstract & Title Guarantee Co. and as executive vice president actively managed and directed the work and development of the company. He completed abstract plants and sectional indexes for 17 counties of Mississippi; 1 each in Alabama, Illinois, and Indiana; 3 in Florida; and 7 in Louisiana.

From 1930 to 1938 he took contracts from the U.S. Government through the Departments of War and Justice to make abstracts for lands acquired by the United States in the construction of 26 dams in Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio Rivers in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio.

Since 1939 from the date of the discovery of oil in Mississippi, Mr. Bouslog engaged in general title work in Mississippi and Alabama connected with the exploration for and development of oil and gas production.

A native of Winamack, Ind., Mr. Bouslog spent several years in New York and traveled throughout the country on business.

Services were conducted at 2 p.m., February 7, at Lang Funeral Home in Gulfport with entombment at Southern Memorial Park Moseleum.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Ruth E. Bouslog and one sister, Mrs. Olive B. Todd, of Gulfport.

Untold Story of Wheat Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been most difficult to rationalize the sale of grain to the Communist countries, especially when you consider the various pronouncements by the Government. Mr. Victor Riesel, in his column published in the New York Journal-American of February 27, 1964, throws a great deal of light on what occurred behind the news in connection with grain sales. His column follows:

VICTOR RIESEL: INSIDE LABOR—UNTOLD STORY OF WHEAT CRISIS

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 27.—The untold inside story of the wheat shipping crisis reveals that high Department of Commerce officials allowed themselves to be browbeaten by the Soviet Government into permitting U.S.S.R. purchasing missions to set U.S. foreign trade and transportation policies.

The story begins at an unreported conference early last October in the office of the late President Kennedy. With him were Secretary of State Rusk, Commerce Secretary Hodges, Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds and a captain representing the U.S. Maritime Administration. They discussed the wheat deal and its shipping problems.

At one point, when someone said there just would not be enough American ships to carry the grain to the Soviet bloc ports, Mr. Kennedy replied: "Well, let's see." He then began listing American vessels on a long yellow pad. It is important to note here that one of the ships he listed was the 100,000-ton super tanker, SS *Manhattan*.

When he completed listing the available U.S. craft Mr. Kennedy said: "We obviously have enough carriers of our own to ship the wheat."

Not long after this meeting he asked Jim Reynolds to telephone Anthony Scotto, International Longshoremen's Association vice president; Paul Hall, Seafarers' International Union chief, and Joe Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, and to advise them that Mr. Kennedy would in a few hours announce the wheat deal with the Soviets. The President wanted the labor leaders to be among the first to know of his decision.

On October 9, President Kennedy said that the wheat would be "carried in available American ships, supplemented by ships of other countries as required."

The waterfront union leaders agreed to break their boycott of Soviet-bloc shipments because the late President asked them to do so in the national interest and with the absolute understanding that all surplus grain—not just wheat—would be offered first to U.S. shippers. This meant the bulk of the cargoes would be carried by American craft. Thus, the American shippers and their employees, would have been handling far more than the mere 50 percent now demanded by waterfront labor.

This was corroborated on October 11 by a document little known to the public. It is Current Export Bulletin No. 881 of the Department of Commerce. It said, in effect, that all grain should be shipped in American freighters and tankers and no such cargo was to be loaded on a foreign-flag vessel without prior Department of Commerce permission.

Specifically mentioned, in addition to wheat and wheat flour, were barley, corn, sorghums, oats, rye, cotton, tobacco, and vegetable oil. There was simply no reference to a 50-50 cut with foreign shippers.

There was fairly smooth sailing until November 13. Then came Current Export Bulletin No. 883. This announcement suddenly referred to a 50-50 share of wheat and wheat flour shipping with foreign-flag craft. Bulletin 883 also, for all practical purposes put the other commodities in the holds of foreign shippers.

This bulletin started the uproar. American shippers and waterfront union leaders were furious and began to talk seriously of boycott action on the docks. Then they discovered that they were getting far less of the business than 50 percent. They were only getting 38 percent and were not even sure of that tonnage in the future.

This meant the loss of thousands of potential jobs for U.S. merchant seamen. The United States was not only losing the wheat cargo business but the grain shipments as well. One company, for example, has sold 200,000 tons of corn to Hungary and shipped it all in foreign-flag freighters. Another sale was made of 50,000 tons of rice to the Soviets. Some 40,000 tons of it already have been earmarked for foreign fleets.

With peppery Thomas (Teddy) Gleason, Longshoremen president, as their spokesman the waterfront unions blew their stacks. They launched the boycott.

Then came a series of secret parleys between Department of Labor officials and union chiefs. At one of those conferences a Government spokesman disclosed that the Russians had taken certain ships—including the huge tanker Manhattan—off the list of available American ships drawn up by Mr. Kennedy in October. The Soviets simply said they would not permit them into their harbors. They threatened to kill the entire wheat deal if the United States did not go along and permit the foreign ships to carry the bulk of the cargo.

They bluffed. Their bluff was not called. The Commerce Department capitulated and reversed the other branches of Government though it knew the Soviets needed the wheat and other grains and were simply trying to save some money on the deal, befriend other nations, and humiliate the United States.

Panama Canal Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Caleb Lee Lipscomb, president of the Lipscomb Agricultural Supply Co. in Springfield, Mo., has made a thoughtful and provocative suggestion regarding the Panama Canal problem. Since it seems obvious that the present administration is foundering in its efforts to solve this dilemma, I wish to place Mr. Lipscomb's letter in the RECORD. I hope it will be read by the Latin American desk at our State Department:

LIPSCOMB AGRICULTURAL SUPPLY,
Springfield, Mo., February 13, 1964.

Hon. DURWARD HALL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HALL: I enclose the opinion ballot concerning the Panama Canal problem. This is a real tough problem for someone like myself to give any opinion on. We simply do not have sufficient information to know what should be done.

Using the limited information available to me, or at least that which I have been aware of, I think negotiations should be started immediately with the Panama Government as to what should be done with the Canal Zone. I do think, however, that we should not make any concessions to them whatsoever in regard to what we will do if the 1903 treaty is to be honored. This is to say, if they are not willing to accept the alternatives we offer to them, then I think we should pursue the treaty to its fullest extent even if it means sending in sufficient armed forces to support our stand. I feel we should offer to sell the canal to these people at the total sum we have spent in developing it. If it is in excess of the $40 million paid to France and the $367 million spent to construct it, then whatever the excess is to be added to this and offer to sell it to them for cash. If they cannot, or will not, come up with the the cash to pay off the loan and let us move out, then by all means enforce the 1903 treaty to its fullest extent.

If they should be able to come up with the sufficient amount of cash to pay us off and let us move out, then I think we should immediately make arrangements to develop a new canal ourselves and our sale of the canal to them should stipulate that we should have the continued use of the facilities for the passage of our merchant and military fleets.

It is regrettable that a group of high school students would aggravate this situation. It is unquestionably necessary at this time,

that all dependents of the people that are American citizens be returned to the United States and these students be placed in a school system in this country where they can be more properly supervised. This would leave only those people working directly on the canal with no dependents living on the zone. I personally feel we have taken far too much from everyone and it is time for us to call a halt even if it means using our military strength to support our decisions.

Yours truly,

CALEB LEE LIPSCOMB,
President.

Appeal Brief Filed on Behalf of Former Congressman Johnson, of Maryland, With Respect to Speech-and-Debate Provision of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix I wish to include therein a part of the appeal brief filed on behalf of former Representative Johnson, of Maryland, by George Cochran Doub, an eminent Baltimore attorney. This appeal brief is concerned with the constitutional provision protecting speech and debate of Members of Congress provided such speech or debate is made in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the pending business of the Congress, we tend to forget the great tradition of liberty embodied in the provision of section 6 of article I of the Constitution that speech and debate in the Congress may not be questioned elsewhere. That provision vests in the tribunals of the House of Representatives and the Senate exclusive authority to inquire into, and to punish, unethical or improper conduct of Members of the Congress with respect to speech and debate.

Recently Congressman Thomas F. Johnson, of Maryland, was indicted, tried, and convicted in the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland of conspiring to defraud the United States by making a speech for compensation on the floor of this House and of violating a conflict-of-interest statute. Congressman Frank W. Boykin, of Alabama was convicted of comparable charges in the same case.

A part of the appeal brief filed on behalf of Mr. Johnson in the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit by his counsel, George Cochran Doub, a former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, asserts that there has never before been a criminal charge made by the Government which attempted to attack a speech made in the Congress and under the speech-and-debate provision of the Constitution only the House of Representatives had jurisdiction to make, and to hear, the charge that Mr. Johnson made a speech in this House for compensation. The brief further asserts that the motivation of such speech, its purpose, its content, and its republication elsewhere are all within the constitutional provision and, therefore, the Federal court had no jurisdiction of the conspiracy charge. The brief analyzes the scope and significance of the speech-and-debate provision and the great events of English parliamentary history leading up to the establishment of its principle in the Bill of Rights of 1688.

If Mr. Doub's analysis of the constitutional provision is correct, the executive and judicial powers of the Government in the Johnson case have trespassed upon an ancient and established privilege of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I deem this material to be of such importance that I place it in the RECORD at this point:

EXCERPTS FROM THE APPEAL BRIEF FILED ON BEHALF OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON OF MARYLAND WITH RESPECT TO THE SPEECH-AND-DEBATE PROVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION

ARGUMENT

"The district court had no jurisdiction over the conspiracy charge contained in count 1 of the indictment under the speech-and-debate provision of article I, section 6, of the Constitution."

By pretrail motion Johnson moved to dismiss the conspiracy charge of the indictment upon the ground that it violated the provision of article I, section 6, of the Constitution, that "for any speech or debate in either House they [Members of Congress] shall not be questioned in any other place." The district court denied the motion on the ground that this constitutional provision only applied in civil and criminal prosecutions for libel, slander, treason, and sedition, and therefore, the Constitution did not bar a criminal prosecution charging a conspiracy by a Member of the Congress to make a speech in either House for profit.

It is submitted that at the threshold of this case in denying the motion to dismiss, the district judge violated a clear, unambiguous declaration of the Constitution because the allegations of the conspiracy charge with respect to Johnson's speech in the House of Representatives did plainly question speech or debate in any other place; that there is no legal authority in the United States, and none in England since the Bill of Rights in 1688, in support of the drastic limitation the district judge attempted to write into the constitutional provision; that his restriction is in conflict with two Supreme Court decisions; and that his decision disregards numerous other Supreme Court decisions that, under the separation of powers' principle, the judiciary may not inquiry into the motives of Members of the Congress as to their official acts; and that the district judge has struck a crippling blow at an ancient and cherished principle of constitutional liberty.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

The constitutional issue is this: Do the charges that, as a part of a conspiracy, Congressman Johnson collaborated with others in the preparation of a speech in the House of Representatives for profit and caused the reprinting and distribution of copies, violate the constitutional provision that speech or debate may not be questioned except in the Congress? Did the executive power by these accusations question the speech in any other place or are they outside the scope of the constitutional principle?

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AND ITS ANCIENT LINEAGE IN THE HISTORY OF CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY

The principle embodied in article I, section 6 of the Constitution was not clearly established in British parliamentary history until the Bill of Rights in 1688. In the appendix to this brief entitled "Appendix—Part I," there are reviewed the landmarks of the great struggle between the House of Commons and the Crown finally resulting in the establishment of the principle of liberty as to speech and debate in Parliament.

In America even before the Federal Constitution, the parliamentary privilege as to freedom of speech was deemed so essential that it was embodied in the Articles of Confederation of 1777; in the Maryland Declaration of Rights of 1776; in the constitution of the State of Massachusetts in 1780; and in the constitution of New Hampshire in 1784.

At the Federal Constitutional Convention the pertinent clause of article I, section 6, was adopted without opposition. Only two proposals with respect to the provision were offered and these were not accepted. William Pinkney proposed that it be provided that each House should be the sole arbiter of the extent of the privilege. Madison advocated that the extent of the privilege should be delineated. It will be found that the constitution of almost every State of the Union now contains a constitutional provision that speech and debate in the State legislature may not be questioned or impeached elsewhere.

IN SUSTAINING THE CONSPIRACY CHARGE OF THE INDICTMENT, THE DISTRICT COURT VIOLATED THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

The concise constitutional declaration that "for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place" is clear and unambiguous. It is absolute in its categorical imperative. It admits no qualification; it concedes no exception. The principle proclaims the exclusive authority of the House and Senate to inquire into the propriety or legality of speech and debate within their Chambers. They, and they alone, may charge, hear, acquit, convict or impose sanctions with respect to such matters. The constitutional principle contests no power of the Congress; it admits and reaffirms the power. It is a complete denial of any power or authority to the executive and to the judiciary in the area of speech and debate in the House of Representatives and the Senate. The prohibition is absolute.

Section 2 of the third article of the Constitution provides that the judicial power shall exend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, etc. The authority and powers of the Federal courts, stem, therefore, from the Constitution and in making this grant of judicial power, the Constitution, the source of that power, carefully denied to the courts any authority in the area of speech and debate in the Congress.

The scope of the constitutional prohibition depends upon the meaning of the word "question," particularly as it was used in 1789. Clearly the draftsmen of the Constitution used the word to mean "impeach" or "inquire into" or "to be the foundation of any accusation or prosecution, action, or complaint."

The bill of rights of 1688 stated that speech or debate "ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament." The declaration of rights of 1776 of Maryland provided that "speech or debate ought not to be impeached in any other court or judicature." The bill of rights of 1780 of the State of Massachusetts and the constitution of New Hampshire said that speech and debate "cannot be the foundation of any accusation or prosecution, action or complaint, in any other court or place whatsoever." There can be no real distinction in meaning between the concise language of the Declaration in the Federal Constitution and the broader language of the earlier English bill of rights and of the Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire constitutions. All had their source in the same historic struggle for freedom of speech in the

legislative branch of Government; all were directed to the same end, to assure that freedom. In *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U.S. 168 (1880)), the Supreme Court quoted the provision of the bill of rights of Massachusetts, its evident purpose to make clear that, although the Massachusetts provision was broader than the concise declaration of the Federal Constitution, in meaning they were synonymous.

The accusation of the Government that, Congressman Johnson conspired to defraud the United States, by collaborating with others in the preparation of a speech, by making a speech for compensation in the House of Representatives and by ordering and distributing copies of it, violated the prohibition of article I, section 6, that speech or debate in the Congress may not be the foundation of any prosecution elsewhere.

1. Acceptance of the Government's contention to the contrary would mean that the consituional prohibiion should be narrowly interpreted to insure that it does not protect alleged criminal conduct with respect to speech or debate in the Congress. Yet, this great constitutional privilege has been universally interpreted liberally to achieve its fundamental purpose and never before has any American court attempted to qualify, condition, or limit its full constitutional scope. In *Coffin* v. *Coffin* (4 Mass 1., 27), the Supreme Court of Massachusetts said:

"These privileges are thus secured, not with the intention of protecting the Members against prosecutions for their own benefit, but to support the right of the people, by enabling their Representatives to execute the functions of their office without fear of prosecutions, civil or criminal. I, therefore, think that the article ought not to be construed strictly, but literally, that the full design of it may be answered. I will not confine it to delivering an opinion, uttering a speech, or haranguing in debate, but will extend it to the giving of a vote, to the making of a written report, and to every other act resulting from the nature and the execution of the office. And I would define the article as securing to every Member exemption from prosecution for everything said or done by him as a Representative, in the exercise of the functions of that office, without inquiring whether the exercise was regular, according to the rules of the House, or irregular and against those rules. I do not confine the Member to his place in the House; and I am satisfied that there are cases in which he is entitled to this privilege when not within the walls of the Representatives' Chamber.

Mr. Justice Miller's opinion for a unanimous court in *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U.S. 168 (1880)), said as to the opinion in the Coffin case:

"This is, perhaps, the most authoritative case in this country on the construction of the provision in regard to freedom of debate in legislative bodies, and being so early after the formation of the Federal Constitution, is of much weight. We have been unable to find any decision of a Federal court on this clause of section 6 of article I though the previous clause of the same section concerning exemption from arrest has been often construed.

"It seems to us that the views expressed in the authorities we have cited are sound and are applicable to this case. It would be a narrow view of the constitutional provision to limit it to words spoken in debate. The reason of the rule is as forcible in its application to written reports presented in that body by its committees, to resolutions offered, which, though in writing, must be reproduced in speech, and to the act of voting, whether it is done vocally or by passing between the tellers. In short, to things generally done in a session of the House by one of its Members in relation to the business before it."

The Supreme Court also said in that case (p. 205):

"The House of Representatives is not an ordinary tribunal. The defendants set up the protection of the Constitution, under which they do business as part of the Congress of the United States. That Constitution declares that the Senators and Representatives 'Shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.'

"Is what the defendants did in the matter in hand covered by this provision? Is a resolution offered by a Member, speech or debate, within the meaning of the clause? Does its protection extend to the report which they made to the House, of Kilbourn's delinquency? To the expression of opinion that he was in contempt of the authority of the House? To their vote in favor of the resolution under which he was imprisoned? If these questions be answered in the affirmative, they cannot be brought in question for their action in a court of justice or in any other place. And yet, if a report or a resolution or a vote is not speech or debate, of what value is the constitutional protection?"

The Great Almoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, many are now speculating whether we are on the eve of another round of inflation. The reason for this is found in the vast spending programs being advocated by the administration, including back-door spending. Columnist Raymond Moley analyzes the situation in his column in the current issue of Newsweek magazine. Mr. Moley's article follows:

THE GREAT ALMONER

(By Raymond Moley)

A number of generally prudent businessmen have greeted President Johnson's protestations of economy with something like enthusiasm. They have believed not only that Mr. Johnson has talked about economy but that in his budget he has used the ax to cut below the anticipated $100 billion level to bargain prices of $98.4 billion for fiscal 1964 and $97.9 billion for 1965. That's what the headlines said. But we must read the fine print to get the reality. And the best of the fine print I have seen is the speech to the House by CLARENCE CANNON, the venerable chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, delivered immediately after the presentation of the Johnson budget.

CANNON pointed out the vital distinction between the expenditure budget and the new obligational authority budget. He said:

"Congress acts upon the new obligational authority budget. * * * Congress does not act directly on the more widely known expenditure budget. * * * The important longrun barometer to spending is the trend of new obligating authority." This is "higher not lower than the current year * * * it does not point to any lasting reversal of the upward trend of Federal spending."

WELFARE, UNLIMITED

With CANNON'S wise admonition in mind, I have tried, with the aid of a skilled analyst, to determine how Mr. Johnson plans to become the superalmoner of all time. A complete compilation of all the proposed costs of welfare activities is impossible because there are so many pockets of welfare in almost every Government agency. But a careful examination of the budget reveals the amounts spent and proposed to be spent in certain categories which I include under the term "welfare."

These are housing and community development; health, education, and welfare, including social insurance; labor, veterans, and the new attack on poverty. Several new programs have been added under these categories since 1960.

New obligational authority (hereinafter designated at NOA) in 1960 and was $25.5 billion. For the same and added programs for 1965 the NOA estimate is $37.9 billion.

Some apologists have told us ad nauseam that nothing much can be done about spending because the costs of defense have been and will be so high. I suggest a comparison between welfare NOA and all other Federal authorizations. For 1960 the figures were $25.5 billion for welfare and $75.6 billion for all other authorizations. For 1965 the NOA for welfare is set at $37.9 billion and all other, including defense, space, and foreign aid, at $97.7 billion.

Thus the increase for welfare is 48 percent. The increase for all other is 29.8 percent.

BIG 1964 SPENDING

CANNON points out with supporting facts that the Johnson expectation of $93 billion revenues for 1965 is totally unrealistic. He also points out the oldest budgetary contrivance in history. The Johnson budget builds up supplemental requests for 1964 to make the picture for 1965 look much brighter. Thus spending or the expectation of spending in 1964 whets appetites in an election year.

An example of this is in the estimates for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The President requests or will request, according to his budget, authorizations of $2.2 billion for 1964 and $749 million for 1965. This excites the interest of contractors and others who will figure in the election prospects. It will also sweeten the voters in the large cities in this election year. Few politicians ever look beyond the next election.

In his speech CANNON refers to a favorite object of his ire, backdoor spending. One instance is a supplemental $1.4 billion for the urban-renewal program. "There may be others," he adds. This is, he says, "inexcusable, indefensible, and irresponsible practice."

Finally, there are those who say that what we save in defense we ought to spend on the public sector. But spending, for any purpose, money we do not collect in taxes means inflation. That takes from the very people who get the handouts as well as those who need and expect no Government help.

Outstanding Military Editor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although military expenditures consume the major part of our Federal budget and have for many years, there are relatively few full time good military analysts available on daily newspapers, magazines, radio and television networks and other media.

One of the most independent, courageous, and honest reporters for many years has been Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, who regrettably retired on February 1, 1964, as military affairs editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Over a period of many years I have often had occasion to deal with highly technical, confidential and controversial matters with General Phillips and basicaly, without exception, he was a straightforward, hard working, honest reporter.

The readers of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch will truly miss the analytical independent thinking and writing of General Phillips and we in the Congress will also be the poorer. I hope that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch will obtain the highest class replacement for General Phillips because his shoes are very difficult ones to fill.

I take this occasion to pay my respects to a retired military officer who after retirement became an outstanding journalist. The absence of his writings will weaken the dialogue which those of us are engaged in as to how to improve America's military strength.

The Rochester Jaycees and Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Rochester (N.Y.) Jaycees currently is conducting its Second Annual Foreign Affairs Week. The observance opened with a banquet on Sunday, March 1, attended by over 500 persons at which the principal speaker was the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams.

The efforts of this committee's young men and women to broaden community awareness of foreign policy are commendable and worthy of note by the House. This special week serves as an appropriate occasion to acknowledge the year-round activities of the committee in contributing to a better public understanding of international affairs.

The committee seeks to encourage frank and informal public debate of foreign policy issues by forming discussion groups of 10 to 15 people. These groups meet monthly in the homes of their participants.

The committee provides each group with a moderator or discussion leader and informational materials prepared by national foreign policy experts. Members of the committee, also arrange for foreign visitors and students to attend meetings of the discussion groups.

Since the first group was started in 1961, under the leadership of Joe U. Posner, more than 40 groups have been formed and are now active. The program has grown to the point that it now involves upward of 750 participants, foreign students, and Committee workers.

I want to pay credit to the continuing accomplishments of the Rochester Jaycees Foreign Affairs Committee.

Through its initiative a cross-section of the Rochester area community has become interested and informed in the field of foreign affairs.

Those who are leading the committee today deserve personal recognition. I commend Executive Committee Chairman Merwyn M. Kroll; national foreign affairs chairman for the U.S. Jaycees, Sanford A. Gradinger; Foreign Affairs Week Cochairman Basil Elmer and Glen W. Jennings, Jr.; and all the other Jaycees who have joined with them in serving our country through this worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned that Governor Williams was present for the official opening of Foreign Affairs Week in Rochester. It was my pleasant assignment to introduce him at the banquet.

Governor Williams delivered a timely review of matters affecting his special area of geographic interest, Africa. I am sure my colleagues will want to read Governor Williams' appraisal of current conditions in the African countries and study his comments on what we may look for in the future of this developing area of the world.

Governor Williams' appraisal follows:

AFRICA'S PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS

(Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs)

The Rochester Jaycees deserve high credit for their commendable efforts to make foreign affairs a part of the lives of the people of this area, and I am happy to be here with the Nation's largest chapter of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and its friends. It's not well known—and perhaps better so—that I was a member of the Washington Junior Board of Commerce when I was first in Washington. While I didn't exactly leave under a cloud, after I won the luncheon door prize 2 weeks in succession I was too embarrassed to show up again.

Believe me, I am greatly impressed with your efforts to bring people together into discussion groups to personalize foreign issues, and I wish you well with your plans to expand this program throughout New York State, the Nation, and eventually overseas, wherever junior chambers exist.

It is not difficult for me to believe that such an ambitious project could originate in Rochester. This city and its environs have long had a reputation for being an informed and forward-looking community. The fact that the Rochester Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations boasts 5,000 members and is the largest in the country speaks for itself. In my own field, Africa, I am pleased to note the University of Rochester is becoming increasingly concerned with the human investment African students represent and with African affairs generally.

There is an increasing need for all American communities to inform themselves on foreign affairs, as you in Rochester are doing. The complexity of our world relationships grows daily, and more-than-routine efforts on our part are required if we are to put events abroad in proper perspective.

This is particularly true when we consider Africa, whose impact as a new force in the world community is still relatively new. In the early part of this century, it was understandable that Americans were little aware of Africa's role in the world. We had no colonies there, and we knew little more of Africa than what we heard from missionaries or seamen who had been to the so-called Dark Continent.

For the last two centuries, most of Africa had been subjected to colonial rule and the needs of non-African nations. The continent had little or no say in its own affairs. Indeed, Africa was the classic example of a continent divided by powerful nations seeking wealth and spheres of influence. It was, in brief, a supplier of men and women who were enslaved in distant lands, a source of raw materials which significantly strengthened the economies of colonial powers and a market for goods manufactured in non-African countries.

With its recent rebirth of freedom and independence, however, Africa is changing rapidly. We in America cannot afford to be ill-informed and little concerned about that continent.

There are 10,000 American missionaries throughout Africa; 2,250 U.S. Peace Corps volunteers are making real contributions to the development of 17 African countries; and we are assisting Africa through AID, Food for Peace, and Export-Import Bank loans.

In terms of national self-interest, we have an important strategic interest in Africa. That continent faces the much-traveled Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Indian Ocean shipping lanes, and it shares control of such key passages as Gibraltar, Suez, and Aden. A friendly Africa provides a protective flank to Europe and is important to the success of the Atlantic alliance. Its important airfields have great strategic value, and the Communists have given evidence of how much they would like to have access to them.

Africa is important for economic reasons. It is a wealthy continent, and one day its full potential will be realized. Africa already produces nearly all the world's diamonds, more than half of its gold and cobalt and a fifth of its copper. It produces such rare metals as tantalite and germanium, which are critical to the advance of modern technology. In addition, its countries are major exporters of coffee, cocoa, hides, skins and vegetable oils. U.S. trade with Africa and our investments there are rising each year.

We also are interested in Africa because of its growing importance in world affairs. Africa's 35 independent countries constitute nearly one-third of the membership of the United Nations, and the United States has diplomatic relations with each of them.

In view of our expanding relations with Africa, I feel it imperative for Americans to be better informed about African affairs.

For that reason, I have chosen to speak tonight on Africa's problems and progress. I am sure Americans are increasingly aware of Africa's problems, but I am less confident that the average American knows as much about the political, economic, and social progress modern Africa is making.

A prominent young African statesman recently wrote: "Africa, in these last 5 years, has been cutting new trails. Anyone who has hacked his way through a forest undergrowth knows that you cannot go far without some scratches and even some blood on your legs."

Certainly, recent headlines from Africa bear out the truth of that statement. There have been—and still are—quite a few troubles in Africa during this period of transition. And, if the history of developing countries is a true guide, one can predict that there will be more disturbances, both in independent Africa and in yet-to-be-independent Africa.

In the last few months, we have read about revolts in Zanzibar and Gabon. There has been fighting between Algeria and Morocco

and between Ethiopia and Somalia over border issues. There have been troop mutinies in Tanganyika, Uganda, and Kenya. There have been uprisings in Congo and Rwanda. There have been anti-American demonstrations in Ghana. And there are such potential trouble spots as Southern Rhodesia, South Africa, and the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique, all of which have a long way to go to resolve important issues between blacks and whites.

These trouble spots pose serious threats to peace and stability in that part of the world, and some of them have overtones that could lead to worldwide problems if they are not resolved quickly.

At the same time, I do not think we should seize upon present unrest in parts of Africa as a valid excuse to denounce Africans generally as unable to govern themselves. Africans, I might point out, have not generally condemned the more developed nations as unfit to govern themselves, even though the Western World perpetrated such practices as segregation, genocide, and colonialism. Instead of reaching quick conclusions on Africa, it would be more productive if more of us in the United States and the free world took a greater interest in the causes of Africa's problems and sought additional ways to help Africa move forward in true independence. The desire to make rapid progress in Africa's most cherished aspiration.

As we view Africa today, what is needed more than anything else is perspective—the ability to see the continent as a whole; to explore the causes fundamental to African unrest; to measure Africa's progress as well as its problems; and, finally, to see clearly how best to cope with the longrun challenge of Africa. Too often we view Africa as do blind men gathered around an elephant to examine it, and we get only part of the truth. We think of Africa in terms of a trunk, a leg, or a tail, and we fail to get an overall picture of what is happening throughout that continent.

What are some of the basic problems causing African unrest? Let me answer that by asking you to think as an African. If you were the leader of a young African nation today, what issues would be foremost in your mind?

Certainly, you would be concerned with the problem of preserving your country's freedom and protecting your national interests. At the same time, your people would urge you to be concerned with progress toward independence in still-dependent Africa, and you would encourage all steps directed toward obtaining self-government for all peoples on the continent.

As an African leader, you would have to explore every possible avenue—governmental and private—that showed promise of helping your country and its people make economic and social advances. You would be fully aware of the serious difficulties Africa faces: an average annual income of only $120 for the continent as a whole; a 15 percent literacy rate; a low life expectancy—one out of every five Africans dies before reaching puberty; a low agricultural productivity rate—the world's second largest land mass accounts for only 5 percent of the world's agricultural products; massive problems of malnutrition and disease; inadequate transportation and communications facilities.

When you gathered your human and material resources to tackle these problems, you would discover a shortage of investment capital; a lack of trained technicians, professional people, and administrators; all too few businessmen, large or small; a serious shortage of industrial production upon which to build.

You are conscious of young students returned from Paris, London, Moscow, or the United States, who haven't yet faced the hard realities of national development and who think there's an easier, quicker way to solve your country's problems. You know you have to move fast enough to get them on your side, and you must show results. You can't seem to be following a conservative program.

But despite these problems, pressure are upon you to provide progress because your people saw independence as a passport to rapid improvement. And, as a political leader, you realize your political opponents will never permit the people to forget that you promised or implied that your administration would provide this better life.

Obviously, you need help, but to whom do you turn? You can turn to your fellow African leaders and work out some cooperative endeavors, but for the most part they face the same difficulties as you. If you take a really objective view, you are aware that the long-term prospects of your cooperative endeavors are not sufficient to produce the needed results. All of you are starting with approximately the same handicaps.

In the light of these monumental problems faced by Africa's developing nations and their leaders, it is remarkable that there have been so few troubles thus far. Of the 31 new nations that have attained sovereignty in Africa since the end of 1951, only the Congo and Algeria had any serious difficulties during the transfer of power. Not only was Africa's overall record good while the new states were gaining their freedom, they have made a considerable amount of progress in the early years of independence.

A heartening degree of progress has been achieved in the political sphere, and Africans can take great pride that the preponderant share of this progress is being made without foreign help.

There has been important regional and economic cooperation in Africa. One highly significant forward step is the successful formation of the Organization of African Unity. This body came into being last May at the historic African Heads of State Conference at Addis Ababa. It is now a 34-member, Africa-wide organization, embracing all independent states except South Africa. The OAU has already begun to function as a vehicle of continental political, economic, social, and cultural cooperation.

Of particular importance is the fact that the OAU is helping Africa over some of the rough spots encountered by all new nations. It does so by providing a forum in which Africans can work out inter-African problems without outside help or interference. African leaders are deeply concerned with their continent's troubles and are determined to use their own resources to solve their problems. This determination was well illustrated last week by Nigeria's Prime Minister Balewa in his welcoming address to the Lagos meeting of the OAU Council of Ministers, when he said:

"Africa has in recent months had its moments of trial and is likely to continue to have them for some time yet * * *. The task before you is to devise ways and means of resolving these crises within our organization without resorting to outside help, with all its complicating consequences * * *. We now appreciate more than in the past that we are our brother's keeper and that whatever affects one of us, affects us all."

Although the OAU was formed when most new African governments were less than 4 years old—and the organization itself has not yet reached its first birthday—it has recorded a number of remarkable accomplishments. It played a significant role in stopping last fall's hostilities between Algeria and Morocco and helped to work out the peace agreement just reached between the two countries. It recently helped arrange a cease-fire between Ethiopia and Somalia. It has approved steps that Tanganyika may employ to draw upon the military forces of other African countries to assist it in maintaining internal order. This is a remarkable record for an organization less than a year old. It is all the more impressive when we remember that it has been accomplished by relatively new nations.

In the economic field, the pace of developments in recent months has overshadowed the slow rate of change that took place over many decades of the past century. But, as is true in our own country, quiet and steady improvement is much less newsworthy than the latest crisis. Nevertheless, demonstrable progress has been made by individual countries and by the continent as a whole.

Nigeria, which has about one-fifth of Africa's total population, is a case in point. That country's gross national product has risen at an average annual rate of 3.8 percent since 1950—a slightly higher rate than our own for the same years. In total agricultural production—which is the basis of most African economies—its 1961 level was 23 percent above that for the 1952–54 period. It increased its electric power production ninefold between 1947 and 1962—from 86 to 750 million kilowatt hours. In cement production, Nigeria's output rose from 113,000 metric tons in 1958 to 426,000 tons in 1962—an increase of almost fourfold in 4 years.

At the risk of your displeasure, let me cite brief statistics from just a few other countries. Although not a lively topic, I think evidence of Africa's economic progress is important for us to recognize.

Between 1958 and 1962, Ethiopia's manufacturing index rose from 100 to 156 and its power production nearly doubled, rising from 79 to 151 million kilowatt-hours. In the same years, Ethiopia's neighbor, Sudan, increased its cotton production from 125,000 to 185,000 metric tons; its total exports from $125 to $227 million.

In east Africa, between 1958 and 1962, Tanganyikan cement production rose from 346 to 398 million metric tons; its meat production rose 24 percent, from 125,000 to 155,000 metric tons; and its diamond exports were up 25 percent from 515,000 to 647,000 carats. Tanganyika's neighbor, Uganda, raised its electrical output 65 percent during the same period, from 278 to 454 million kilowatt-hours and its coffee production went up 50 percent from 92,000 to 138,000 metric tons.

Let me also give you one example of educational progress. In the west African country of Liberia between 1950 and 1963, the number of schools rose from 270 to 800; the number of teachers from 684 to 2,594; the number of pupils from 24,000 to more than 77,000; and the money put into education rose from $410,000 to $4.5 million.

Africa is also demonstrating progress in its international trade. Excluding South Africa, the continent's exports increased by some 30 percent from the mid-1950's to 1962. The 1953–55 average of African exports was about $4.2 billion annually, while in 1962 that figure rose to nearly $5.5 billion. This, in turn, has enabled Africa to buy more abroad for development purposes.

African States have entered into a variety of new relationships with the former European metropoles—relationships which preserve valuable cultural ties and common economic interests, while recognizing the sovereignty of the new nations. Nigeria, Ghana, and the other major former British dependencies are now full members of the Commonwealth of nations and continue to share in the Commonwealth trade preference system and sterling bloc financial arrangements. Similarly, many French-speaking African

States share preferential trading arrangements and the franc zone with metropolitan France. These are voluntary relationships from which African States can withdraw if they feel it is in their interests—and some have done so.

In addition, 18 African States have forged new economic ties with the six European members of the European Economic Community—the Common Market. In their special status as associated overseas countries of the EEC, these African States share in reciprocal reduction of import duties and benefit from substantial economic assistance extended by all the European member states through a European Development Fund.

The Economic Commission for Africa, a U.N. body operating under able African leadership and largely staffed by Africans, has begun to have a vital role in Africa's economic planning. In particular, it is building a philosophy of regional economic growth and a program of regional projects to discourage narrow, nationalistic economic enterprises which would waste scarce African resources and capital.

A new African Development Bank has recently been established under stimulus of the Economic Commission for Africa, and its authorized capital of $250 million will be subscribed by the African nations themselves. Here, again, emphasis will be on economic projects that transcend national boundaries, such as river valley development and international transportation and communications.

The recent International Coffee Council meeting in London is another example of the ability of a number of African countries to work effectively together and with Latin American coffee producers. The Council was able to reach an agreement on sales quota increases that meets the needs of both consuming and producing nations. Furthermore, it is hoped that increased sales of coffee by African and other nations will arrest the recent rapid increase in coffee prices.

This is a somewhat extended catalog of facts and figures, but it shows that solid progress is being made in Africa. It demonstrates why I can conclude these remarks with a vote of confidence in Africa.

Africa has a promising future, one, I believe, that will be fulfilled despite shortrun setbacks and disappointments. It is a continent of great potential, and its people have high aspirations and are willing to work to attain them.

American foreign policy in Africa is predicated upon a long-range view of African developments. Running through it is the philosophy that politically and economically strong and independent countries in Africa are not only in the best interests of that continent, but also in the best interests of the United States.

While we have moral and humanitarian desires to help less fortunate nations, the improvement of their economic and political stability protects American interests as well.

This is true because as African countries increase their ability to protect their independence, they become truly nonalined. Consequently, seeking their own destinies, they will reject subordination by a foreign dynamism, which communism demands.

In his first state of the Union message, President Johnson recognized that fact when he said we must help free nations develop their independence and raise their standard of living. This is what American policy is designed to do in Africa, and we are pleased to be contributing to the promising progress African nations are making today. I am confident those nations will cope with their problems and continue to make impressive progress in the future. We all have a stake in such progress.

Nice Work if You Can Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD, the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of March 3, 1964, and material from U.S. News & World Report of March 9, 1964:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 3, 1964]

NICE WORK IF YOU CAN GET IT

The brazenness that prevails in the Johnson administration's Bobby Baker set is disclosed in the incredibly raw stunt whereby Bobby's fee-splitting pal, Jose Benitez, was allowed to resign his $17,000 a year job with the Government only to be taken on immediately at $75 a day as a "consultant" in the same field he previously had been tilling.

Benitez, former Democratic chairman of Puerto Rico, had been on the administration's payroll as Deputy High Commissioner of the trust islands of the Pacific. He wasn't chucked out by his boss, Secretary of the Interior Udall, because of the Baker scandals, but resigned with Udall's blessing. Then Udall took him right back at the $75 a day stipend as consultant to the Department on the trust islands.

You don't have to be very sharp at figuring to discover Benitez can make more off the taxpayers as a consultant than as a salaried official. If he works 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year, he collects $19,400.

Benitez and his wife were cut in for about $250 a month on contracts for meat imported from Haiti. It was necessary to wangle a taker for the meat and an import permit from the Department of Agriculture. Baker and Benitez are good wanglers. The permit was granted and a buyer found. The payments represent a "finder's fee." Baker also is on the finders-keepers deal.

In the Washington game of finding neat payoffs, Benitez, in his latest transformation into a consultant, has certainly found an accommodating gull—namely, the taxpayer.

THE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS OF THE BOBBY BAKER CASE

The official record discloses the many avenues investigators are trying to follow in the Bobby Baker case.

Questions—all of them unanswered—probe into everything from intricate finance and influence peddling to party girls.

The far-reaching nature of the Bobby Baker inquiry was spread on the record February 25 when the principal witness appeared before Senate investigators.

Robert G. Baker refused more than 100 times to answer questions concerning dealings that reportedly made him a millionaire twice over while he was on the Senate payroll.

But the range of questions—all of them unanswered—provides important clues to the wide variety of activities the Senate investigators are trying to run down in the Baker case.

Mr. Baker was asked many questions about his business connections while an employee of the Senate. He was asked, too, about party girls, gambling concessions, betting on horse races, abortions, collection of large sums of cash for a political candidate and his relations with Government agencies.

The former secretary for the Senate majority parried the questions by invoking constitutional protection. He accused the Senators of invasion of his right of privacy, and said they were conducting a legislative trial.

Another tight-lipped witness at the investigation was Nancy Carole Tyler, 24-year-old former beauty queen from Tennessee. Miss Tyler, who was Mr. Baker's private secretary in the Senate and now works in his law office, declined on February 26 to answer any questions about her employer's activities.

Possible charges of contempt of the Senate against both Mr. Baker and Miss Tyler were mentioned by some members of the Senate Rules Committee, which is conducting the hearings.

MUTE ABOUT GIFT

One of the first questions fired at Mr. Baker concerned the gift of a stereo record player to Lyndon B. Johnson when he was Senate majority leader. Don B. Reynolds, a Maryland insurance agent, has testified that he gave the set to Mr. Johnson at Mr. Baker's suggestion after receiving commissions on the sale of insurance policies on Mr. Johnson's life.

President Johnson has said that he understood the stereo set was a present from Mr. Baker, with whom he had been accustomed to exchanging gifts.

Mr. Baker was asked: "Mr. Reynolds, while under oath, testified before this committee concerning this hi-fi gift. He produced certain canceled checks and invoices. He also testified that he purchased $1,200 worth of television time on a TV station in Austin, Tex. * * * Did you have any part in that transaction?"

Again: "Can you tell this committee if you know whether or not that transaction testified by Mr. Reynolds took place?"

When Mr. Baker declined to answer, the Senators went on to other matters.

While on the Senate payroll, he was asked, "Were you employed by meat importers in connection with the exportation and importation of their meat, and did you receive some $4,000 for that in 1962, and a lesser amount in 1963, as testified?"

Shown a document dated February 1, 1963, Mr. Baker was asked to verify that it showed that on that date "you had a net worth of something over $2 million." He was asked also "the source of that net worth" and that part of it which was in excess of his net worth when he took office.

ABOUT A STADIUM CONTRACT

The questioning moved on. "Did Mr. Don Reynolds make a payment back to you of $4,000 of the commission received on the performance bond of a contractor in connection with the District of Columbia Stadium?"

Trying to uncover whether Mr. Baker used his office "and the facilities provided therefor" for personal business dealings, a Senator asked:

"Have you rendered assistance to contractors, businessmen, and others who may be doing business with the U.S. Government in the way of providing entertainment facilities for them in any of their dealings with Government officials—and by 'entertainment facilities,' I refer also to personnel, including party girls?"

The Senators drew a blank when they asked about testimony that Mr. Baker and his associates had borrowed from a Maryland bank $100,000 that "could not be withdrawn from the bank," and that the deposit slip was submitted to the Small Business Administration as part of the requirements for a loan.

As the hearing continued, Mr. Baker was asked these questions:

"On at least one occasion, did you not dispatch Walter Jess Stewart, the Senate employee, in an official Senate automobile to carry supplies to your Carousel Motel in Ocean City [Md.]?"

Did he not telephone a deputy commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration "to ask for a review of a decision by the FHA on a Puerto Rican housing development?"

"Did you not seek to secure gambling concessions for yourself and others from officials of the Dominican Republic?"

Did one Edward Levinson, identified by committee investigators as a Nevada gambling figure, "with your help secure a $4 million bank loan in order to build a 14-story addition to the Fremont Hotel in Las Vegas, Nev?"

Mr. Baker also was asked if he had any part in furthering the deportation proceedings against one Ellen Rometsch," identified as the wife of a West German Army sergeant on a diplomatic mission in Washington.

The witness was queried next about a report that he went to California in May 1963, to argue the case of a racetrack concession leased to a charitable organization headed by the Murchison family—oil-rich industrialists in Texas.

SEX ISSUE RAISED

As the questioning continued, a sex angle was introduced.

"Do you recall or wish to state how many people you referred to a Puerto Rican doctor for the performance of abortions?" Mr. Baker was asked.

"Did you furnish this doctor's name to any Senate employes or any Senators?"

"Can you tell this committee whether or not you have had any business dealings whatsoever with one Joseph Fabianich, who is now serving time in Leavenworth prison on white-slave charges?"

The interrogation also touched on Mr. Baker's reported role in raising campaign funds for Democratic candidates.

The witness was asked about a published report that "in one instance you relayed word to Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire, who turned down the offer, that you knew some people who would pick up his $10,000 in campaign debts."

The investigators also introduced the name of Fred Black, identified earlier as a management consultant involved in some business deals with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Baker was asked: "Did not Mr. Fred Black give you $10,000 in cash in $100 bills in an envelope at the Carlton Hotel in Washington, these moneys to be delivered to one of the Presidential candidates for use in his campaign in 1960?"

And next: "Did not Mr. Black state to you at the time of delivery of the said $10,000 in cash in $100 bills that $90,000 more would be coming for the same purposes to aid a candidate in the 1960 election?"

CALLS AT U.S. EXPENSE?

Mr. Baker was questioned at length about long-distance telephone calls made from his office. The Senators sought to ascertain whether the calls were on Senate matters or in connection with Mr. Baker's own business activities.

Among the places the witness was said to have called were Milwaukee, Puerto Rico, Miami, Las Vegas, Dallas, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Beverly Hills, Calif.

One question: "Did you use Government telephones, or did you arrange in person to place horse-race bets with one 'Snags' Lewis, a person well known to the police of this city as a bookie?"

In another inquiry, Mr. Baker was asked if he had made a trip by plane with his secretary, Miss Tyler, and Mrs. Rometsch, to New Orleans, Dallas, and Miami on private business while he and Miss Tyler were on the Senate payroll.

The name of Serv-U Corp., a vending-machine firm which has figured importantly in the Baker case, was introduced: "Did you use your official position * * * to secure for the Serv-U Corp., of which you were one of the principal owners, business from North America Aviation Co., a company engaged almost entirely in Government-contract business?"

Mr. Baker was asked, also, if he had any part in obtaining a favorable tax ruling from the Internal Revenue Service for the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., of Milwaukee, in which "you were, or are, a substantial owner of stock."

RECORDS WITHHELD

At the outset of the hearing, Mr. Baker refused to turn over to the committee personal records which the Senators had asked to see.

The witness protested that the documents requested by the committee "could be used to incriminate me."

The former $19,600-a-year Senate employee came to Washington 20 years ago from Pickens, S.C., to be a Senate page boy. At the peak of his career, he was regarded as one of the most influential men on Capital Hill.

Mr. Baker resigned his position last October after Senators began looking into his various outside activities.

The committee had just as little success in trying to draw information about Mr. Baker from his secretary.

Among the questions Miss Tyler was asked—and declined to answer—were:

Had she performed any duties "of a private character" for Mr. Baker while she was a Senate employee?

Did she ever deliver money to any persons for Mr. Baker?

Had Edward Levinson, previously identified with Las Vegas gambling interests, visited Mr. Baker's office?

Miss Tyler repeated the same answer to these and other questions: that they were "an invasion of my right of privacy" and and that to answer them "might tend to incriminate me."

Spend or Save?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, too much has been written and said about the possible good effects of the tax reduction legislation and not enough about the possible evil effects of this bill coupled with the necessity of reducing Government expenditures in order to prevent rapid inflation. David Lawrence, in his editorial in the U.S. News & World Report of March 9, 1964, emphasizes some of the problems which this country faces in connection with the enactment of the tax reduction bill. His editorial "Spend or Save?" follows:

SPEND OR SAVE?

(By David Lawrence)

Adam Smith, British economist, in his famous book entitled "The Wealth of Nations" written nearly two centuries ago, warned against the tendency of governments to pile up debt and then cheat the people by devaluing the monetary unit.

Have times changed? Have we abandoned the artifice by which the dollar is depreciated and its purchasing power steadily reduced?

A tax cut has just been granted to the American people, and they are told that, if they spend their extra money, it will provide a stimulus to business. The same argument was advanced in the 1930's, when for nearly a decade the Government spent billions of borrowed money. This was called pump priming. But it didn't materially reduce unemployment. Not until the outbreak of World War II did unemployment end. Thus did an artificial stimulus bring prosperity.

Then, after the big war, we experienced a recession. An upturn came again when the Korean war brought on a wave of Government spending.

The Nation has struggled during the late 1950's and the early 1960's to recover from the economic convulsions caused by World War II and the Korean war. We have had budget deficits in 11 out of the last 15 years.

We cannot achieve economic stability unless the Government adopts a sound fiscal policy.

The stock market rise today is to a large extent a response to the fear of a depreciated dollar. The AFL–CIO is calling for higher wage rates based on the expected benefits to business from the tax cut. Wage rises mean price rises. It's the age-old cycle of inflation.

How can there be a sound economy or a sound dollar if the Government itself doesn't practice the much-talked-about frugality and if it doesn't stop borrowing funds from the people to finance a reduction in their taxes?

The Government debt is steadily increasing. The budget is to continue unbalanced by several billions of dollars in the fiscal year beginning on July 1. The hope is expressed by administration spokesmen that the business boom will increase tax receipts and cut down the deficit. But what happens after the effects of the current tax cut wear off? Must funds be borrowed again to cut taxes and stimulate business?

The individual today is being urged to spend at once the money derived from the tax cut. But many persons will prefer to pay off debt. Others will put their money in savings accounts or buy securities.

The lesson of thrift is that it is wise to save money for rainy days—for the unexpected illnesses and vicissitudes of life. It is not sensible to spend for luxuries if one's income is just barely enough to meet ordinary expenses.

The new tax law means about $3 to $5 a week extra for families earning $10,000 a year or less. This is not a trivial sum. It will help to meet installment payments and to defray other expenses. It is questionable how much will be spent for luxuries.

Business is being told that volume will increase to such an extent that plant capacity needs to be expanded to meet the new demand. But businessmen do not plan just for a single year or for expansion of facilities in what may prove to be only a temporary boom.

There is a lack of stability in our system. We are living in an armament economy forced on us by the cold war, but this doesn't lessen the need for sound economics. The administrations in power are too much concerned with winning elections at a fixed time. The people suffer between elections.

Foreign companies today are increasingly competitive with our producers in domestic markets as well as in export areas.

A nationwide monopoly exists which fixes wages and forces prices to rise in order to absorb increased wage costs. The Government doesn't fix wages or prices except in wartime. Meanwhile, the economy is really dominated by pressure groups which keep forcing upward the cost of living, and thus, of course, the purchasing power of the dollar is reduced.

In the midst of all this, the doctrine that the Government must spend and spend

in order to elect and elect has gained ground. It is not the way to a balanced economy or to a sound dollar. For neither individuals nor governments can remain solvent by spending each year more than the income received.

It is essential that debt be paid and that the citizen who lends money to his own Government be convinced that the dollar he invests in its bonds will buy at maturity as much as, not less than, it did when originally invested.

It is necessary to save rather than just spend and spend. Expenditures by Government must be cut. Many worthy appropriations should be deferred until there is a budget balance. This must be done to protect the dollar against inflation.

President Is Only Part of Government Under Our Form of Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting editorial appeared in the San Diego Union of February 11, 1964. The article points out the weakness of many of the public opinion polls as well as how far we have come in assigning to the President powers which he does not have under the Constitution.

Under our Republic the President is responsible for only one branch of the Government, the executive. Try as he will, and as many former Presidents have, to assume all power of Government within his own hands, Congress remains an integral part of the operation of Government. It will be a sad day for the American people and the end of our freedoms if we allow any Chief Executive to preempt the responsibilities of the Congress.

As a part of these remarks I include the San Diego Union editorial, "Decisions for Ballots":

DECISIONS FOR BALLOTS: WESTERN SECURITY BIG ISSUE

A reporter walked the streets of New York and asked passersby what they knew about Lyndon B. Johnson. The name drew a complete blank. Yet at the same time national and regional polls were showing that Americans thought President Johnson was the most popular figure in the world.

This is not a reflection on people as much as on polls. Polls reflect associations of ideas or events more than fundamental emotions and reactions, and answers often depend on the shaping of the question.

Thus a national poll can show that 65 to 80 percent of the voters think President Johnson is doing well as President and give his possible opponents 20 to 35 percent votes of confidence, and yet at election time the two major parties in all likelihood will go to the polls almost even in strength.

The satisfaction in observing that President Johnson was able to get on top of his responsibilities, as the President of the United States, and that the Nation did not sink into a morass of confusion, does not necessarily translate into voting on the crucial issues of the day and which underlie presidential campaigns.

The concentration on the White House at the expense of the legislative side of Government has led to an exhaltation of an individual. The President emerges as the leader. As a matter of fact some rather ordinary men have occupied the White House, and managed to acquit themselves ably.

The Government of the United States is a massive machine, as Presidents have learned in trying to reverse its trends or reduce its size.

So much emphasis is placed on the Presidency that when a President dies, or is replaced, there is a period of uncertainty and even fear. Yet, as Mr. Johnson's experience has demonstrated, Government goes on. The people are relieved, and credit the occupant of the White House with miracles.

All of us have seen those photographs of a President, alone in a half-darkened room, brooding with his own thoughts, with the suggestion that the fate of all of us at every moment hangs with the decision he must make before he can have dinner.

It is true that the President carries a great burden, but other men have carried it, and it is true that in some crucial circumstances he alone must make a fateful decision, but he makes it, or should make it, with the advice of the most able minds the country has to offer in the search for our security.

And as every President has found, the President proposes and the Congress disposes. He can move no further than the will of Congress, and thus often seeks to circumvent it.

It is in the field of foreign affairs that the President has a much wider latitude and his decisions are more fateful. In this day and age a President largely must stand or fall on how he safeguards the security and future of the Western World.

And this is where Mr. Johnson must be most severely judged—and where he will be weighed at the polls on election day.

Whose Bread I Eat—His Song I Sing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents sent an article that might aptly be termed a classic lesson on the dangers of dependency in and out of government.

This story related by Dr. J. G. McDaniel, I think, deserves the attention of every American:

WHOSE BREAD I EAT—HIS SONG I SING

(By J. G. McDaniel, M.D.)

I remember, as a small boy in knee britches, going with my father to hear an address given by the Honorable Stephen Pace, then Congressman from the old Georgia 12th District. It was on the banks of the Ocmulgee River. There was a barbecue, and citizens, especially farmers, from all the counties gathered. This was before the First World War.

It seemed that someone in the Congress had introduced a bill that would give the farmers some money provided they did something. The Congressman vigorously opposed it. I have no idea what it was, because I was watching a "dirt dobber" making a ball of mud. The Congressman snapped me back to attention, however, when he said, "I'm going to tell you a true story about the wild hogs that once lived about 40 miles down river."

"Years ago," the Congressman said, "in a great horseshoe bend down the river, there lived a drove of wild hogs. Where they came from no one knew, but they survived floods, fires, freezes, droughts, and hunters. The greatest compliment a man could pay to a dog was to say that he had fought the hogs in Horseshoe Bend and returned alive. Occassionally a pig was killed either by dogs or a gun—a conversation piece for years to come.

"Finally a one-gallused man came by the country store on the river road and asked the whereabouts of these wild hogs. He drove a one-horse wagon, had an ax, some quilts, a lantern, some corn, and a single barrel shotgun. He was a slender, slow-moving, patient man—he chewed his tobacco deliberately and spat very seldom.

"Several months later he came back to the same store and asked for help to bring out the wild hogs. He stated that he had them all in a pen over in the swamp.

"Bewildered farmers, dubious hunters, and storekeepers all gathered in the heart of Horseshoe Bend to view the captive hogs.

" 'It was all very simple,' said the one-gallused man. 'First I put out some corn. For 3 weeks they would not eat it. Then some of the young ones grabbed an ear and ran off into the thicket. Soon they were all eating it; then I commenced building a pen around the corn, a little higher each day. When I noticed that they were all waiting for me to bring the corn and had stopped grubbing for acorns and roots, I built the trapdoor. Naturally,' said the patient man, 'they raised quite a ruckus when they seen they was trapped, but I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can just get him to depend on me for a free handout.' "

We have had patient men in our Central Government in Washington for years. They are using our own dollars instead of corn. I still think about the trapdoor and the slender, stooped man who chewed his tobacco deliberately, when he spat and turned to the gathered citizens many years ago and said, "I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can just get him to depend on me for a free handout."

Communist Party Supports Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I submit the following newspaper article which appeared recently in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. The article was written by United Press International and the dateline is Chicago, Ill. It follows:

COMMIES URGE LABOR SITDOWN TO BOOST CIVIL RIGHTS

CHICAGO.—A spokesman for the Communist Party of the U.S.A. called Wednesday for a national work stoppage if the civil rights bill is held up in Congress by a Southern filibuster.

James E. Jackson of New York, editor of the Communist newspaper the Worker, issued the call during a news conference at which he reported on a meeting of top Communists here last week.

A spokesman for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People followed with a news conference of his own and accused the Communists of "trying to jump on the civil rights bandwagon."

"A national work stoppage by the Negro workers would open a new and decisive front

in the struggle against the segregation system," Jackson said. "It would be a confrontation at the production level with the power structure itself."

It Sort of Makes You Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, later this session when the Ways and Means Committee brings before us legislation amending the social security law, it is my intention to offer an amendment excluding groups such as the Amish from enforced control under the law when requests to remain uncovered by social security is requested by religious groups.

The constant harrassment of Amish and similar tiny groups was dramatically and forcefully reported in an article by Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones in yesterday's Washington Evening Star. The article is not only timely but raises interesting points upon which we all should ponder. I insert the article at this point for the RECORD:

IT SORT OF MAKES YOU WONDER—GOVERNMENT PUTS BEATS ON THE DOLE, BUT BADGERS THE SELF-SUFFICIENT AMISH

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

NEW YORK CITY.—I am sitting in this little coffeehouse on Third Street in Greenwich Village watching the beats.

The place is a gutted-out store with bare brick walls and rough pine tables and benches. It is decorated with some far-out pieces of art, reminding you of finger painting day in kindergarten. Right in front of a strong spotlight is a raised platform of unpainted boards that holds one straight chair. You can either sit in the chair or stand and place your foot on the seat, depending on how you like to wallop the guitar.

Coffee is a dollar a mug and the entertainers make their pittance by passing around a basket. Here and there a tourist will drop in a buck, but the Greenwich Village habitues rarely toss in more than a dime. It seems to work out that the more you are with it the less you give.

Down the street and around the corner there are larger and more famous places where you can buy wine and where combos alternate with unwashed people reciting dirty blank verse with great attention to its "social protest." It is in these brassier coffeehouses that the ban-the-bomb and justice-for-Castro crowd hangs out, perhaps because there are more people to see them.

But my little coffeehouse is for the beat-Puritans. Only coffee. Only folk music.

Folk music is simple and uncomplicated, born of log cabins and campfires, and sad with unrequited love and untimely death. You watch the spectators. Long-haired boys clad in stained slacks and open shirts. Frowzy girls with unwashed hair, studied in their ugliness. And you think what a colossal joke it is that these who profess to despise uniformity have slipped into an easily recognizable uniform, the uniform of the slob.

But there is something more. Here are many able-bodied young people who not only accept but seek public welfare payments. Yet they pride themselves upon their compassion for the poor who, if they are to be helped, must be helped by the labor of someone. Here are the pleaders for peace at any price who have never tasted the horrors of war but who have concluded that no cause is worth dying for.

Here are the laughers at law, the scorners of morality, the rejectors of thrift, the scoffers at squares who work—absorbed completely in the quest for their own self-satisfaction. And they gather in this smoky grotto to stare at the ceiling, to twitch their shoulders and softly snap their fingers as the guitar men and women sing music that is easy on the brain.

So, to the Amish. Later I was at Lancaster, Pa., and a friend lent me his car so that I might drive out into the beautiful farm country where the barns are the fattest, the cattle the sleekest, and the fields the neatest in all America.

There are some striking parallels between the Amish and the beats. For both, beards are the style. Both dress peculiarly. And while the beats seek the simplicity of primitive music the Amish turn their backs on modern machinery and drive the Pennsylvania roads in their black buggies.

There are, however, a few differences.

The Amish have no divorce, no crime, no juvenile delinquency, no unemployment or old-age problems. They take care of their own. They refuse Government subsidies. They take no money for not plowing a field. They dislike insurance. If a barn burns the whole community rushes to rebuild it. Because they supply their own social security they object to social security taxes.

This has brought down upon them the wrath of the huge national bureaucracy which sees only chaos if some people are permitted to look elsewhere than to the Government for their welfare. So the Amish have been repeatedly yanked into the Federal courts. A couple of years ago Government agents even seized Amish horses at plowing time to satisfy social security judgments.

We have a system of government under which all beats are comfortable and the Amish are bullied and badgered.

It sort of makes you wonder.

Profile in Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following poem by my good friend Jack Brandfon, of Brooklyn, N.Y., about our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

The poem follows:

PROFILE IN COURAGE

PT 109 and the bad back,
Cuba, 1963, and the backdown,
ICBM and peace through strength,
Test ban treaty and Russia is severed from China,
The hundred-year-old promise to the colored man kept,
The arts honored at last,
And in the White House!
Let the blasts of the eternal trumpet cleave the air,
For arm in arm, models and friends, Jefferson, J. Q. Adams
And J.F.K. are there.

—JACK BRANDFON.

Need To Reduce Beef Imports Emphasized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a proposal, H.R. 10172, which would roll back the level of imports of beef, veal, and mutton to a level of the 5-year average ending on December 31, 1963. In view of the voluntary agreements entered into a short time ago with Australia and New Zealand, and now with Ireland, to effect a mere 6-percent reduction from the high levels of 1963, it is a matter of urgent necessity that we here in the Congress take action to bring adequate relief to the depressed livestock markets here in our own country.

I have received a letter from Mr. George E. Carlson, of Carlson Farms, Waconia, Minn., presenting comments on what a healthy livestock industry means to the entire economy. Hardship among the Nation's livestock producers is not an isolated situation—continued low prices in the livestock markets will effect all those industries which depend for a substantial share of their income on a vigorous livestock industry.

Mr. Carlson's letter follows:

CARLSON FARMS,
Waconia, Minn., February 27, 1964.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This may come as a surprise, but we in the beef industry are in big trouble. Why? Because overly generous import quotas on beef and veal are pushing domestic prices lower and lower.

After feeding the 1,200 Herefords yearly on our feeding lot, we will be forced to discontinue our cattle operation unless we get relief in the form of improved prices. There are those who will say, "A beef feeder is quitting business. So what?" Here's what: Halting our cattle business will remove about $400,000 a year in revenue from the economy of the community of Waconia, Minn.

This not only pinches the local economy, but affects the many people in various businesses who sell products and services to us, and causes unemployment. There's the breeder and calf ranchers, yearling ranchers, cowhands, feed lot operators, bankers, feed chemists, refiners, flour mills, veterinarians, farmers, truckdrivers, railroaders, stockyard men and many others whose livelihood is tied to the domestic beef industry.

Multiply our situation by that of thousands of others who are feeling the cost-price squeeze and you soon have a sick beef industry.

If the import situation wasn't bad enough, we learn that foreign aid money is now being used to set up other countries in the beef business. That's all we need. Operating at far lower costs, they can then import to us at our expense to drive our beef industry completely out of business, which would seriously damage our national economy.

All of this is caused by uninformed people in Government who simply don't know much about farming and cattle raising. Unless one has had the experience of owning, operating, and managing in the cattle farm

business, he can't possibly make a qualified decision on these matters.

A healthy, job-providing beef industry can produce sufficient beef for our own national consumption and take care of our yearly increase in population as well. To make this possible, legislation must be passed to reduce imports of beef and veal to the 1958–60 average levels, which was about 5 percent of U.S. production.

We will appreciate your studied consideration of this matter and await your reply as to what you and other Members of Congress can do to help us.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. E. CARLSON.

American Legion in Panama Canal Zone Protests Hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone Policemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was passed by the American Legion Department of the Panama Canal Zone and should be of interest to the Members of the House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION BY THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Whereas the duties and responsibilities of U.S. citizen policemen in the Canal Zone demand of the individual unquestioned loyalty and allegiance to the United States; and

Whereas these policemen must meet every securuity criteria conceived by law and regulations necessary to the safeguarding of life and property and to insure continuity and capability of operation and administration of Canal Zone activities under any circumstances by the U.S. Government; and

Whereas a Panamanian police candidate in taking an oath of office would not and could not pledge an oath of loyalty and allegiance to the U.S. Government; and

Whereas the hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone policemen would be interpreted by citizens of the Republic of Panama as another act of appeasement and reaffirmation of their demands for complete absolute sovereignty within the Canal Zone: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Department Executive Committee, the American Legion, Department of the Panama Canal Zone, meeting at the American Legion Club, February 14, 1964, To oppose the hiring of Panamanian citizens as policemen in the Canal Zone as a threat to national security of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we protest the hiring of Panamanians as Canal Zone policemen as a violation of the Canal Zone Code (title 2, sec. 147, Security Positions) which requires the use of U.S. citizens to insure continuity and capability of operation and administration of activities in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to refuse any and all requests for monetary appropriations for which any part will be used to pay the salaries of Panamanians hired as policemen in the Canal Zone; and be it finally

Resolved, That we advise all concerned of this new threat to U.S. control over the Canal Zone.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and resolution on Soviet anti-Semitism which speaks clearly on a cause for concern by all right-thinking men. I refer to the anti-Semitism now rampant in the Soviet Union which is destroying the cultural and religious identity of Jews within the U.S.S.R. Certainly this matter deserves the attention of all Americans and of the United Nations:

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL
OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT,
February 20, 1964.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The deteriorating situation of Jews resident in the Soviet Union is a source of deep alarm and concern to our community. As an expression of this apprehension, our delegate assembly, at its last quarterly meeting, adopted the resolution which is enclosed.

We bring this to your attention in the hope that every appropriate diplomatic and other action may be undertaken through our Government to halt the religious and cultural genocide being perpetrated against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. The fact that these repressive measures are in contradistinction to the status accorded other cultural and religious minorities emphasizes for us the urgency of the problem.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY M. SHEVITZ,
President.

WALTER KLEIN,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council, composed of representatives of 340 Jewish member organizations in the Metropolitan Detroit area, deplores the continuing perpetration of cultural and religious genocide against Jews in the Soviet Union by the Soviet Government. Official restrictions imposed upon the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union deny to them their freedom of worship, isolate them from their tradition and from their coreligionists in other parts of the world, and destroy their specifically Jewish spirit.

Prohibitions against the making or importation of Jewish religious objects—of prayer shawls, phylacteries, prayerbooks, Bibles, religious calendars—and against maintaining spiritual ties with coreligionists abroad, are indications of the harsh and restrictive discriminatory measures. Jewish religious and cultural life is further circumscribed by restrictions against the Yiddish theater and press, religious schools, publishing of books in Yiddish and Hebrew. Traditional burial is proscribed and much anguish is occasioned by the suffering thus imposed.

All of these restrictions are in contradistinction to the status accorded to other nationality and religious minorities resident in the Soviet Union.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to implement their often repeated concern for, and championship of, freedom for all nationalities and groups, by according to Soviet Jews the same status and conditions enjoyed by other groupings of Soviet citizens, and to restore to the U.S.S.R.'s Jewish citizens their rights to:

1. Jewish education in all its forms.
2. Continuity of Jewish cultural life through literature, theater, schools, press, publishing houses and other forms of cultural expression in Yiddish and in Hebrew.
3. Reopening of synagogues to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry.
4. Jewish ritual observance in its traditional forms.
5. Reestablishment of religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad.
6. Be reunited with their families in other lands, from whom they have been separated.

We appeal to the Soviet Government—as a matter of urgency and elementary decency—to recognize the rights of Jews to their own language, religious and cultural expression to the degree permitted to all other ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

Our call also goes out to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to use his good offices and the machinery of this world body, of which the Soviet Union is a member Nation, to act against the cultural and religious genocide being perpetrated against Soviet Jewry.

We also call upon the Government of the United States, our President, our Secretary of State, our Congressmen, and our Ambassador to the United Nations, to protest to the Soviet Government, through diplomatic and other channels, against the oppressions herein detailed.

The officers of the Jewish Community Council are instructed to send copies of this resolution to the officials above mentioned, and to take all appropriate measures to the accomplishment of these ends, independently and in concert with national agencies and other like minded groups.

Is It Wrong To Do the Best You Can?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a recent ruling by the National Labor Relations Board raises the question of whether it is wrong to do the very best you can. The ruling also raises the question as to whether ambition and superiority are to be penalized and whether mediocrity is a proper goal.

If the NLRB ruling that a union member can be fined for exceeding his work quota is to stand, there is no question that we have taken one more step toward communism and away from the private enterprise system where one individual can get ahead by doing better than his competitor.

In the February 26 issue of the San Jose, Calif., Mercury, a splendid editorial appeared with respect to this ruling of the NLRB. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial herewith:

NLRB LAUNCHES A DANGEROUS TREND

The National Labor Relations Board appears to be moving slowly but steadily toward a position where the American work-

man is to be penalized for any show of initiative and ambition.

The trend is deplorable and should be reversed.

Specifically, the NLRB has ruled, in the case of the Roofer's Union, that the union can set work quotas and fine or expel members who exceed those quotas.

Presumably, the sanction can be applied only where the work limitation is part of a negotiated contract, since another NLRB ruling, this time affecting carpenters, takes a slightly different tack.

In the case of the Carpenters, the NLRB said that a work quota could be set by a union, but denied the union the power to expel a member exceeding the quota unless it was part of a work contract. The NLRB did say, however, that a union member could be fined for exceeding a noncontract union-imposed work quota but forbade the union from collecting the fine by tapping the member's dues payments.

Take it all in all, these decisions come close to legalizing the slowdown, as pernicious a practice on the part of labor as is the speedup on the part of management. Both are morally wrong, and both are economically stupid.

The firm which can produce more at lower cost is the firm which has, in the long run, more jobs to offer. The labor union which forces up production costs too high damages the competitive position of the firm in question and jeopardizes the jobs of its members. The NLRB's work-quota rulings can do nothing but accelerate the upward cost-price spiral to nobody's ultimate benefit.

These are pernicious rulings and should be reversed at the earliest possible moment.

The Importance of Ocean Research to the Future of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD the following two-article series which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on February 23 and 24, setting forth the importance of ocean research to the future of mankind:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 23, 1964]

OCEAN RESEARCH VITAL TO FUTURE OF MANKIND—FOOD, MINERAL WEALTH MUST BE EXTRACTED TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASING POPULATION

(By Irving S. Bengelsdorf)

"An ocean is forever asking questions
And writing them aloud along the shore."
—EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON.

Every year the population of California, now 17 million, increases by 600,000. Six million every 10 years.

By the year 2000, California will have as many people as there are in Great Britain or France today.

To feed, clothe, house, find jobs, and provide energy for the almost 50 million Californians of the 21st century will require new sources of raw materials.

One of these will have to be the ocean.

BROWN CALLS MEETING

It is not surprising, therefore, that Gov. Edmund G. Brown recently called together the first Governor's conference on California and the world ocean.

For 2 days, 250 scientist, engineers, government officials, businessmen, and just plain fishermen—from all over the world—met at the California Museum of Science and Industry here.

The meeting was the first State-sponsored oceanographic conference in the Nation, and marks an important step to attain the same excellence in oceanic education, research, and technology as the State already has achieved in electronics and aerospace.

MUCH TO LEARN

There is much to learn. The world ocean covers nearly two-thirds of our globe and yet we know little of what goes on at its exposed surface or in its concealed murky depths.

From ancient times, the underwater world has been considered a hostile environment—cold, dark, and a region of high pressure. But modern technology has eliminated these shortcomings. Men can live, work, and play underwater—and in comfort.

Capt. Jacques-Yves Cousteau, director of the Institute Oceanographique, Monaco, showed a film of how his expedition settled on the bottom of the Red Sea for a month—a five-man house 35 feet below the surface, and a two-man residence 85 feet deep. And the homes were well equipped, pleasant, and comfortable.

TO GREATER DEPTHS

From these submerged homes, the residents went forth each day to even greater depths—with underwater diving equipment to work on the ocean floor.

Cousteau's experiments do not mean flourishing underwater cities are in the near future. Underwater living is expensive; his month-long research expedition cost $600,000.

But Cousteau has shown that underwater residence is feasible. Man can stay down—and farm, mine—and extract the riches and wealth of the sea.

The French scientist next plans to place a house 165 feet down. Its occupants will dive from there to the 300-foot level for a period of 4 hours' work and exploration a day.

The uses of the ocean already are many. But there is much need of improvement.

It serves as a broad highway for international trade and commerce. But new techniques are needed to speed up the flow of ocean traffic: less wasted time in port, loading and unloading by pipelines, control of damaging marine pests, etc.

And the ocean is full of fish rich in protein. Almost half of the world's population—1.5 billion people—do not get an adequate amount of animal protein in their present diets.

INCREASED CATCH ANSWER

By increasing the current world's fish catch by 30 percent, to 53 million tons, protein malnutrition could be eliminated.

But the population of the world is growing so fast one would have to double the 53 million tons of fish in the next 25 years just to maintain the minimum protein requirements.

Is it possible to haul out such staggering numbers of fish year after year? We don't know.

Dr. Roger Revelle, dean of research of the University of California and director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, points out that the research needed to answer this question and others on oceanic plant and animal life would cost several hundred million dollars.

WORTH THE PRICE

But the knowledge gained would be worth several billion dollars a year.

And the ocean contains minerals—valuable manganese, copper, nickel, and cobalt deposits are found as black potato-shaped balls strewn along the deep ocean floor.

Phosphate rock ores, useful in agriculture, occur in relatively shallow coastal waters. There may be oil under the deep ocean floor, just as there is under the tidelands.

How to extract it?

The most immediate use of the ocean is for marine recreation. Most of California's 17 million inhabitants live within 20 miles of the coastline—and they visit it for swimming, sailing, surfing, sunning, and fishing.

LIMITED COASTLINE

About 1,000 miles of coastline are suitable for recreation. And soon, within most of our lifetimes, there will be 50 million Californians.

If all 50 million came down to the 1,000-mile coastline, there would be 10 people for every foot of beach. Or, 20 human feet for every foot of shoreline.

To add to the problem, many of California's beaches are disappearing. The sand and silt ordinarily brought down to the ocean by rivers, which would have replaced the present coastline being washed away, no longer comes.

DAMS TO BLAME

Flood control dams are beautifully engineered to hold river water back—but they also keep the sand and silt bottled up. No river sand, no renewal of the beach's shoreline.

For instance, Bolsa Chica Beach, south of the city of Long Beach, was purchased by the State 5 years ago for public recreation. If the present rate of erosion continues, the beach will disappear in 10 years.

The State is considering the construction of manmade reefs at a cost of $6.5 million to try to save this recreational facility.

Artificial islands, bays, peninsulas, sand bars, etc., will have to be built to "stretch" California's beaches to accommodate its people.

But even if we had the money to do this, we don't know how. Thus, the techniques of manmade land constructions, in coastal waters also require further research and development.

OTHER PROBLEMS

And there are other problems. While it is true that the ocean is rich in resources, to whom do they belong?

Dr. Francis Christy, Resources for the Future, Inc., in Washington, pointed out that oceanic resources such as high-sea fisheries and minerals on the midocean floor are "common property natural resources"—like the air we breathe or the domain of outer space.

The question of who owns what, is not abstract. It is very real.

Within recent months, Alaska has protested the presence of Japanese and Russian fishing boats off its coast.

Ecuador resents California tuna vessels fishing its coastal water.

England and Iceland almost came to blows over North Atlantic fishing domains.

And France almost sent warships to protect its lobster fishermen threatened by Brazil.

DIVISION HEADACHE

So, the oceanic wealth is there; how to divide it will be a headache.

Our present knowledge of the ocean is woefully poor. Our maps of the ocean floor are about as accurate and detailed as the maps of the earth's surface were 250 years ago.

Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, would like to see sea grant colleges established for study of aquaculture and oceanic engineering—in the same way that land grant colleges were founded in the 1860's for research in agriculture and mechanical engineering.

The land grant colleges chiefly are responsible for America's present superior status in agriculture. Dr. Spilhaus feels that sea grant colleges similarly would insure America's preeminence in oceanic technology and research.

MEAGER FUNDS

In comparison to the annual space budget of $5 billion, oceanography operates on a relatively meager research outlay of $124 million per year.

The plea for increased Federal support of oceanographic research was echoed by Governor Brown.

"I believe it is primarily a Federal responsibility scientifically to investigate and develop the resources of the sea. The Federal Government assumes that responsibility for our land resources. It does so for space. No State has the resources to do the job. No State can assume a function which involves the national interest and security."

He also urged private industry to undertake more marine research.

"The exploration of the oceans and the mining and harvesting of their riches is a logical and suitable goal for research-oriented organizations," he said.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 24, 1964]

TEN-YEAR STUDY PLANNED TO ASSESS SEA WEALTH—VIRTUALLY UNTAPPED RICHES IN FOOD AND MINERALS COULD RESHAPE EVERYONE'S LIFE

(By Irving S. Bengelsdorf)

Water is one of the more important materials on earth. Without it life could not exist.

In the future, its virtually untapped riches could loom even larger in shaping the pattern of our lives.

And water is everywhere. In the air as clouds, rain, and snow. On the surface as oceans, seas, lakes, and rivers. Beneath the land in underground streams.

But nobody knows for certain how much there is.

Plans are underway to hold an International Hydrological Decade—a 10-year study by participating nations to observe, measure, and describe the water resources of the world—just as the International Geophysical Year (IGY) studied the earth itself.

Recently Governor Brown called the first Governor's conference on California and the world ocean—the first State-sponsored oceanographic conference in the Nation.

Most of the world's water is in the ocean. It covers nearly two-thirds of the globe.

Man has been in contact with the ocean since prehistoric time. Yet, it is only within recent years that he has begun to study oceanography—the details of the nature and behavior of ocean water, the kinds of creatures which live in it, and the interaction of ocean water with the air above it and the solid earth beneath it.

The ocean is the only great unexplored region left on earth, and is full of tremendous untapped resources—fish as food and minerals as raw materials, and, most important, ocean water itself.

STATE NEEDS WATER

For fresh water is what California needs most. Eighty percent of southern California's water needs must be imported—or produced by desalination of sea water.

In the future, huge nuclear power stations will simultaneously generate electricity and take the salt out of ocean water. They will help to solve the severe fresh water problem.

The ocean's fish could be an abundant and welcome source of food for a world in which half the population suffers from protein malnutrition.

An increase in the world's annual fish catch from the present 41 million tons to 53 million tons—an increase of 30 percent—could wipe out protein hunger among the world's present 3 billion people.

And the sea's plants are valuable. Each year, California harvests 150,000 tons of kelp, a kind of seaweed useful in food and pharmaceutical products.

It also may be possible to select and breed plants on land which could grow in the presence of salt water. One could thus save precious fresh water by using ocean water for irrigation.

The salt in the ocean isn't a complete nuisance. California markets more than one-third of all the salt produced in the world by evaporation of sea water by the sun. The San Francisco Bay area alone produces a million tons of salt per year in this manner.

And the ocean contains other minerals. Certain undersea rock formations—well beyond the tidelands—indicate the presence of submarine oil deposits. These could be immensely valuable, for in 10 to 20 years California will have to import more oil than it will produce.

PHOSPHATE OFF SHORE

Within coastal waters, less than 300 feet deep, are deposits of phosphate rock needed for agriculture on land. It may turn out to be cheaper to mine these local offshore ores than to pay the large shipping costs for phosphate rock mined far away.

Manganese is being found in unusual, black, potato-shaped lumps of metal strewn in deeper water along the midocean floor. They are being formed in the ocean at a faster rate than we could ever use them. Engineering techniques may be worked out to mine these metallic lumps economically.

And the ocean water contains exotic materials. Bromine and magnesium are extracted from sea water—the former to make a special material which is part of the tetraethyl lead "anti-knock" liquid in gasoline, and the latter to give a lightweight metal suitable for airline luggage, tables, etc.

There are many things we don't know about the ocean.

Research is just beginning on how the ocean's temperature affects our weather. Any knowledge we gain here would help in long-range weather forecasting. Hurricanes, nature's most vicious storms, always are born and mature over the oceans—never on land.

And if we could forecast ocean waves, winds, and currents better, we could increase the operating efficiency of our ships by computing the best ocean route, cutting both time at sea and fuel consumption.

Marine cargoes of the future may be carried by huge submarines, or hydrofoil craft which literally fly and skim over the water—or hovercraft which would run right up onto the beach. No harbor or dock would be needed.

So there are many fields of oceanography which require more research and development—fish, minerals, fuels, desalination, weather, shipping, etc.

MILITARY REASONS

But the real stimulus for grants of Federal funds for oceanographic research has been military, connected with our national security and defense.

Throughout our history, the ocean on either side of us has been a protective moat. It has given us the security to develop our Nation and its institutions in relative peace. But that is no more.

Ironically, it is an American development—the nuclear submarine—which has changed the ocean into a treacherous menace.

For nuclear powered submarines can travel for months at a time silently and invisibly at high speeds deep beneath the surface. And suddenly and secretly, they can launch deadly missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

And worst of all, they cannot be detected. For the usual techniques we use on land or in the air to detect objects—visible light, infrared light, or radar—just will not work beneath the water.

At present, the only way one can detect a submerged submarine, at a distance, is by sonar or underwater sound.

And this is tricky, for we do not understand many of the details of how sound travels through the water as the water's temperature, density, turbulence, and current changes. And the ocean is always changing.

GROTESQUE WARFARE

Dr. Rogert Revelle, dead of research of the University of California, points out. "The terribly opacity of the oceans makes the business of fighting submarines a grotesque kind of jungle warfare. One of the principal tasks of marine science and engineering now and in the future, is to find ways to make the ocean effectively transparent—to remove the submarine's cloak of invisibility."

It is a problem which will be with us for a long time.

Losing Our Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, are we playing right into the enemies' hands by giving up proven weapons and military hardware in the hope the Soviet Union may do likewise? There have been indications that we are actually weakening our military power and some say it is according to plan. I certainly hope not. I would hate to think that any official of the United States would deliberately weaken U.S. military posture at a time when we are faced with an enemy which has vowed to destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the American people should demand more clear cut answers from the administration and the Department of Defense as to why we are so intent of eliminating the development of manned bombers when the reliability of missiles has been seriously questioned.

As food for thought on this matter, I include as a part of these remarks, a column by George Todt in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of March 1, 1964. The article follows:

LOSING OUR PUNCH

(By George Todt)

"There will always be a future for manned aircraft"—Air Marshal Grandy, RAF—Air Force magazine, January 1964.

Will Secretary of Defense McNamara permit the funds Congress authorized for a new manned bomber to be spent?

The $52 million to get the ball rolling—contained in the new record arms authorization bill passed by the House of Representatives 10 days ago—had not been requested by the Pentagon.

Or if it had been suggested on some of the lower echelons—up to and including the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, it never got past the former Ford Motor Co. official.

We must remember that Congress, in its great good sense, voted hundreds of millions of dollars in the past for the fantastic B-70 bomber—a triple-sonic weapons system rightfully classified as being of first-strike capability.

Was that the reason why McNamara refused to spend the money?

A well-documented human events story by Allan Ryskind, which was never denied, had it that Dr. Walt Whitman Rostow, policy

planning head of the Department of State, as far back as 1960 promised Mr. K. and Foreign Minister Kuznetzkov a new U.S. defense policy.

He said we would cancel, junk, or phase out our terrifying first-strike weapons systems. This in order to reassure the Soviets that we had only peaceful intentions toward them.

Let them hit us first, if necessary, in world war III.

Rostow felt that this might reduce the normal tension of the Reds. Once assured of our honest desire for peace, he believed the Reds would quickly become "good guys" and we all would have "peace in our time" forever after.

The wily Red leaders he talked with in Moscow suggested we might show our good faith in this tidy arrangement by quickly knocking off the B-70, Skybolt, and similar first-strike items. And it was done.

Those desiring documentation of this remarkable story by young Ryskind may write to Human Events, 410 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

Ask Publisher Jim Wick for a reprint copy of the article: "Is U.S. Defense Policy Made in Moscow?" Really worth reading.

If the implications in Ryskind's article are sound, it means that the present administration—spearheaded by former Fund of the Republic official Robert McNamara—has no future intention of building first-strike weapon systems.

If this is true, then McNamara obviously will find his own reasons why the money for an effective, efficient manned bomber may not be built another time around.

Whatever his thoughts on the subject may add up to, we will find many gullible people who will imagine "Papa knows best"—and infer that it is almost a punishable crime to argue with the man who wears the hat of Secretary of Defense.

However, two other knowledgeable critics who have argued with him extensively in the past are top experts who have done their homework: General LeMay and Gen. Thomas Power, our SAC commander. Both disagree with the McNamara-Rostow military concept. We ought to have a debate in Congress about first-strike strategy.

For a New Asian Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the announcement that Secretary McNamara is again commuting to South Vietnam and with the shuffle of State Department officials assigned to responsibility in this area, the need for a complete reappraisal of our Asian policy is in order.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in a major editorial on Sunday, March 1, pointed up the need for a thorough review. This editorial very faithfully touches on the historical background of our problem in Vietnam and places the responsibility squarely at the door of the White House for giving major priority to an Asian policy.

The editorial follows:

FOR A NEW ASIAN POLICY

U.S. involvement in Asia is increasingly becoming a matter of grave concern.

Let us face it: U.S. policy in that part of the world is being challenged by friend and foe alike. We are on the defensive diplomatically and, in a peculiar sort of way, even militarily. As of now, Red China, the nation we have sought to isolate and contain, has cracked many facets of our Asiatic policy.

The broad outlines of that policy were instituted by former President Truman, who, in its support, took the United States into the Korean war. Former President Eisenhower concluded that war in a truce. Nonetheless, he accepted the general policy. In fact, Mr. Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, extended the policy.

The late Mr. Kennedy accepted the policy as has also President Johnson to date.

The policy was bipartisan in concept. Neither political party is solely responsible. Each departing administration has left commitments its successor was duty bound to honor.

Still, each administration is responsible, in turn, for the continuation of the policy, for its implementation and for its adaptation to new circumstances.

Mr. Johnson didn't make the Nation's Asiatic policy except to the degree that he supported it as a Member of Congress. Mr. Kennedy didn't either except as he likewise supported it as a Member of Congress.

It was during the Kennedy administration that the policy began to crack up. And it is during the Johnson administration that it evidences signs of collapsing.

The late President Kennedy greatly modified the policy in one respect. He agreed to the neutralization of Laos. That neutralization has been but a prelude to a Communist takeover of that southeast Asian nation. Laos became the leak in the dike. Mr. Kennedy also extended in large measure our military commitment to South Vietnam, a step which has put us in the unenviable position of risking much of our prestige in Asia on the outcome of the continuing battle against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas.

The neutralization of Laos and our worsening plight in South Vietnam have resulted in the desertion of Cambodia, a small but strategically located nation.

Mr. Kennedy extended massive military help to nonalined India when the Red Chinese invaded that land. The consequence of that action has been the virtual loss of Pakistan as our ally. That is not an inconsequential loss. For Pakistan, a nation of 100 million people, has a strong and effective army, one trained and equipped largely at our expense.

The neutralization of Laos provided a means for the supply by Communist North Vietnam of the Communist Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam. The inability to date of the South Vietnam army, equipped, trained, and advised by American military men, to eradicate the Vietcong is a factor in the apparent loss of Cambodia. That ancient kingdom is another step toward Thailand, through which Malaysia, rich in resources, is reached.

French recognition of Red China has been another blow at America's Asiatic policy as has likewise been the suggestion by President Charles de Gaulle of France that South Vietnam be neutralized.

Many signs of discontent with our Asiatic policy on the part of Asians could be cited. So, too, can other signs of discontent with our Asiatic policy by our allies.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has rejected on behalf of the Johnson administration any suggestion that we unleash South Vietnamese to conduct the same type of guerrilla warfare in North Vietnam that the Ho Chi Minh government aids in South Vietnam. He fears escalation of such tactics into major conflict, even with Red China itself. He may be right. It is noticeable, however, that neither Ho Chi Minh nor Mao Tse-tung fears the participation by North Vietnam and Red China in the South Vietnam guerrilla warfare will bring retaliatory action by the United States.

At the moment, South Vietnam is the key to our crumbling prestige in the Orient. If we fail in our efforts in that nation we fail throughout much of the remainder of Asia.

Can we afford to fail in South Vietnam?

Such failure would entail the loss of the southeast Asian peninsula in its entirety; not only Laos, South Vietnam and Cambodia but also Thailand and Malaysia. The loss of Malaysia, which includes the great seaport of Singapore, would result in the erratic Sukarno, already heavily committed to the Communist bloc, putting Indonesia in that camp.

There are many concrete reasons why we cannot afford to fail.

And not the least among them is American prestige and leadership.

Mr. Johnson inherited a policy and many situations resulting from that policy. He alone is not to blame for the rapidly disintegrating situation in southeast Asia. But he alone will be responsible if nothing constructive is done to stop the rapid deterioration of American policy in Asia.

Sending Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to Saigon for his third tour of inspection since last September is not enough. Little of a constructive nature resulted from McNamara's two previous tours.

Our entire Asiatic policy needs to be reviewed. It needs to be brought up to date. It need to be stated with clarity.

We should reevaluate everything we, as a nation, are doing or attempting to do in Asia. We should begin with the primary cause of our dilemma: Red China. Is our policy of nonrecognition the correct policy? It may be. But it should be reexamined in the light of today's facts. From that decision we should go on to the many other dilemmas with which we are confronted.

We must replace a policy which is crumbling all around us with one which contributes to the peace of the world.

That is one of Mr. Johnson's primary responsibilities as President.

A Plea for Return to National Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I spoke to a group of women concerning some of the things that I think have not been good for our country. I had so many calls from people who agreed with me and I am so eager for us to return to the principles upon which this Nation was founded, that I want to share with you a letter I received shortly after the assassination of our President. I shall not identify the writer of the letter except to say that it is from a woman. Mr. Speaker, the women of our country are eager to return to the practice of high moral principles. The letter follows:

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Federal Building,
Cleveland, Ohio

MY DEAR MRS. BOLTON: In this time of national grief and shame, it has been sug-

gested that it is perhaps time for all of us to ponder upon the immorality that exists in our country today that has led to the tragic events of the past few days. We, and the world, ask—How could such a horrible act be committed in, of all places, the United States of America?

I feel that we Americans should not permit our President to have died in vain, and that in tribute to him, we must work together to eliminate the lawlessness that has invaded our land from coast to coast and make our country a safer place in which to live.

The other day on television, HOWARD K. SMITH commented on this lawlessness and asked—Why is this so? The answer is so simple, it appears to me, that I wonder how it could possibly escape anyone. At a time when the Golden Rule has become old-fashioned and outdated, when prayers in school have become illegal, when mothers are encouraged to embark upon careers and leave their children to raise themselves, when fathers brag to their children about putting over another fast deal and padding their expense accounts, and when the law gives more protection to the guilty than to the innocent—is it any wonder there is lawlessness in our land?

And has it ever occurred to anyone that hand in hand with the advent of the psychiatrist, our crime rate and delinquency have risen to tremendous proportions? Prior to the psychiatrist, people were taught to live according to the Bible and the Ten Commandments. We were told that our conscience must be our guide and that each of us must be held personally responsible for all of his acts. Then—after World War II—there emerged upon the scene the psychiatrist, sociologist, etc., who changed all that. They stripped us of our conscience. They told us that we cannot be held responsible for any evil we do because we are all victims of our environment and victims of circumstances. They suddenly made poverty a license to kill, rape, and steal. They told us that it is inevitable that a man who is poor, who is colored, who is downtrodden, must, very naturally, perpetrate all sorts of heinous crimes upon his fellow man.

And the law, following suit, has given the criminal greater sympathy and protection than it has given the innocent. I, personally, have lost faith in our law and in our courts. I know, as does everyone else, that whenever a killer or rapist is brought to trial a psychiatrist will be brought in to declare him temporarily insane. He will then be placed in a mental institution for a short time, and then released—free to prey upon the innocent once again.

The law seems to do all it can to encourage crime and lawlessness. It gives the criminal the right to refuse to take a lie detector test. It gives the gangster and the racketeer the fifth amendment to hide behind. It gives the pervert complete freedom. And speaking of perverts—in our own city of Cleveland, the names of over 5,000 known perverts are on file with the Cleveland police—all as free as the air to attack and rape the innocent and unsuspecting at any time. Is it not time for a law to be passed to make an operation on these men compulsory, and thereby save the lives of hundreds of women and children?

Firearms are freely sold in this country and any mental defective can purchase one. The law makes no attempt to forbid their sale.

Riots and demonstrations are freely permitted, which in turn create more and more hatred and resentment.

While we fight communism all over the world, we permit the Communist Party and all sorts of odd-ball fringe groups to exist here.

The very freedoms we have always cherished in saner times, have now become our downfall. For under the guise of protecting these freedoms, we permit riots, demonstrations, acts of violence, pornographic literature and movies, the sale of firearms, and the right of a defector to return to the United States—and kill the President of the United States.

And so the question arises—what good is is to brag to the rest of the world that we are a free country when actually we are probably the least free of all, for we are at the mercy 24 hours a day of sadists and perverts who are given more protection under the law than we are.

To reiterate what President Kennedy once said, "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country." And so, in tribute to him, let us give his words substance and meaning, and ask—What can we do for our country to return to it the morality and the kind of law that can command respect from the populace—and thereby rid our country of the lawlessness that has, all over the world, become synonymous with the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

_____.

Urban Renewal Must Have Citizen Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the concept of urban renewal over the years, I have been warning that there is a growing unrest among the citizens of our country with the way in which the urban renewal program has been developing. It has been and is my contention that the abuses and mistakes made in the administration of the program at the Federal and local levels, and the problems created by the program for those citizens it was originally designed to help, must be corrected and solved if the necessary support among the American taxpayers is to be obtained. This is why I have introduced a comprehensive housing and urban renewal bill, H.R. 9771.

For the past several months I have been receiving letters from citizens in many parts of the country, indicating their concern with the present operation of the urban renewal program. I intend to bring these problem areas to the attention of Congress through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to remphasize the need for a housing bill that has the substance as well as the form of reform contained within it.

The material I include with my remarks today concerns the Oakland section of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the citizen unrest over a proposed urban renewal project. More than 3,000 homeowners, property owners, and businessmen located in the area have formed an organization known as citizens' committee to save Oakland from the ravages of redevelopment. They are concerned that their section of town would be included in an urban renewal project since there are presumably other sections more in need, and the citizens of the area are ready and willing to rehabilitate their own property and neighborhood. I would point out their interest in developing a new rehabilitation loan program on the Federal level, a major provision of the Republican bill.

I include here an article from the Oakland News of February 20, 1964, and two letters from Nathan Schwartz, Esq., whose law firm is counsel for the citizens group, outlining the citizen complaints. Pittsburgh has had an enviable record in self-help rejuvenation of the city, and in wise use of Federal funds. If citizen unrest can occur in Pittsburgh, it can occur anywhere and will continue to occur until reforms are made in both the law and the administration of the urban renewal program.

The article and letters follow:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Oakland News, Feb. 20, 1964]

"JOIN RENEWAL FIGHT," CITIZENS URGED—COMMITTEE RIPS DEVELOPERS AT MASS MEETING

Leaders of the citizens committee to save Oakland from the ravages of redevelopment sounded a call to a capacity crowd to help preserve the Oakland of today at the mass meeting in Old Holy Spirit Church.

The committee centered its attack on Chancellor Edward Litchfield, of the University of Pittsburgh, Fred Smith, of the Oakland Corp., and John Mauro and Robert Pease of the urban redevelopment authority.

Residents attending the February 12 meeting were asked to contribute funds to aid the committee in its fight against renewal plans for Oakland.

Stickers were distributed for residents to place on windows of their homes, businesses or cars.

Eugene P. DePasquale, chairman of the committee, presided at the meeting which filled the church at Bates and Atwood Streets to capacity. Many persons were turned away after the church became filled.

In the audience was a number of representatives of the urban redevelopment authority. Mr. Pease addressed the meeting when requested to do so by the audience. He asked the committee to meet with the authority.

Mr. DePasquale opened the meeting by outlining efforts made by the committee to date. He said:

"We have contacted the Rains Subcommittee on Housing in Washington; we have conferred with Congressman MOORHEAD; we have talked with Harry Blachman, of Cleveland, on numerous occasions, who has given us the advantage of his great fight in Cleveland that defeated the urban redevelopment bond issue.

"We are in contact with Mr. Ulinski, of Chicago, one of the great leaders in this fight; we have been in contact with Chamber of Commerce President Charles E. Wagnor, of Indianapolis. Mr. Wagnor took the time to send me a copy of the Reader's Digest of June 1963, and refers to page 266. Indianapolis, incidentally, is a city that did its own developing and did a first-class job without 1 cent of urban redevelopment money.

"We have put the General Accounting Office of the U.S. Government on notice of this attempt to take property that is not blighted and have written several letters to Mr. Slayton in Washington and to Mr. Jason Nathan of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Philadelphia.

"One of our speakers later this evening will discuss in detail Mr. Nathan's insulting letter, but we can assure you and Mr. Nathan that he has not heard the last from us. We have written to Senators SCOTT and CLARK and all of the Congressmen of this district,

and I might say that outside of Senator CLARK the responses have been most favorable.

"We recently visited Washington to inspect properties which have been revitalized in the Georgetown area as well as other sections of the city, and have made arrangements with the American Paint Institute for help in advising our people how to paint up their properties, both interior and exterior, so that they can be enhanced in value.

"Your committee has met almost weekly and there is never a day goes by when some of the dedicated members of the committee do not do, say, think or act in this great struggle.

"We have 5,000 signatures on our petitions."

Mr. DePasquale charged that John Mauro, area coordinator for the urban redevelopment authority, has failed to act on requests for better street lighting. The chairman charged that this was planned strategy to have Oakland declared a blighted area.

The second speaker was J. Waldo Fawcett of Oakland Avenue, an oldtime Oakland resident.

Mr. Fawcett derided the urban redevelopment authority "for suggesting that some of us may return to Oakland after the redevelopment." He said other redevelopment projects in the city indicate high costs will rule this out.

He said "it can never be proven, in court or out of court, that Pitt actually needs our homes in order to improve its present facilities as a great university."

"If our homes do need rehabilitation," Mr. Fawcett said, "we can, and under reasonable conditions will, rehabilitate them ourselves."

Mr. Fawcett said Adolph W. Schmidt, president of the Mellon Educational & Charitable Trust, is helping to show the way toward this goal by urging in Washington new legislation to help owners rehabilitate their homes with loans with a sliding scale of interest rates based on ability to pay.

Nathan Schwartz stressed the importance of individual effort.

"We will paint up, clean up, plant up, and those neighbors who refuse to upgrade their properties will be told in no uncertain terms that they owe a duty and an obligation to keep their properties in excellent condition. We would suggest to the Urban Redevelopment Authority that they cooperate in the refurbishing of Oakland by supplying us with know-how and skill in improving the properties that we are fighting to keep in Oakland."

Mr. DePasquale read a letter from Jason Nathan, acting regional director of urban renewal, in which Mr. Nathan said "I seriously question our assertion that devious methods are used in determining that the Oakland area is blighted."

Nick Diulus, treasurer of the committee, made an appeal for funds.

"We have had expenses for this committee and have asked for no money," he said. "The expenses have been paid by a few of us. We need donations * * * whatever you want to give—and anyone who donates to us at anytime can look at our books so they can see where the funds are going.

"This is not forcing you, this is coming from your heart and for your own good," Mr. Diulus added:

"This committee is not against anybody who wants to sell their property. Somebody wants your property and you want to sell it, fine. This committee is against people who want to take your property and throw you out."

Other speakers for the committee were John Hickey and Henry Rivlin, former commander of Schenley Post 663 of the American Legion.

Mr. Hickey attacked those who attribute profit motives to residents who protest renewal plans.

Mr. Rivlin blasted the power and number of authorities, which he called the biggest light on taxpbayers.

Mr. Rivlin said he had been assured by Mr. Pease that the Legion home on Bouquet Street was not to be taken over. But later, Mr. Rivlin stated, "we got a call from the attorney for the University of Pittsburgh saying they want to take over the American Legion property."

Mr. Pease spoke when asked to do so by members of the audience. His remarks follow:

"This is frankly a privilege to see such a large group here who came out to talk about this problem. I recall the meeting in October at Frank Gustine's on a hot fall day when I was asked to come out to your chamber of commerce.

"That was shortly after it was announced in the paper that your committee was formed. It said I was happy because we had been trying for a long time to get a group in Oakland so that we could decide what we wanted for Oakland. Mr. Schwartz said you need parking * * * so you need parking, we want to put it in.

"We have yet to hear from your committee on a meeting. I hope Nathan Schwartz calls me tomorrow. When I talked to Mr. Schwartz once before, he suggested four of us meet with four from his committee on neutral ground. We will meet anywhere.

"As for Mr. Rivlin's comments. I don't know anything about the Legion being taken by the University of Pittsburgh. I don't work for that authority.

"If we can get together with Mr. Schwartz and Mr. DePasquale, we'll get everybody's ideas. We want to work with you and the only reason we have slowed our planning down is because we all hope that out of this matter we will get the chance to meet with you. I hope that Nate calls me tomorrow."

GOLDSTOCK, SCHWARTZ, COHEN & SCHWARTZ,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 17, 1964.

Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Our firm represents a group of over 3,000 homeowners, property owners, and businessmen who are located in the Oakland section of Pittsburgh and have formed an organization known as citizens' committee to save Oakland from the ravages of redevelopment.

We have noticed in a newspaper story eminating from Washington and dated February 15, 1964, of your interest in the redevelopment problems and specifically in the attempt to prevent redeveloping expensive downtown shopping districts and areas that are not truly blighted when there are in fact many areas in the city that truly need redevelopment to afford the poor people housing.

In the Oakland area the properties are not blighted, are in rather good condition as contrasted to many sections of the city of Pittsburgh which have devastating conditions. However, to satisfy certain selfish interests the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh is attempting against the will of the great majority of the citizens to bring their authority to bear on unwilling citizens.

We would be happy if your committee would send an investigator to Pittsburgh to show them exactly what abuses have been taking place in this area and where a strong and forceful congressional investigation could prevent the dislocation of unwilling people so that their land can be taken and sold to a few large developers.

We congratulate you in your stand on these matters as reported in the press and look forward to working with your committee to bring order out of chaos in this very important field.

Very truly yours,

NATHAN SCHWARTZ,
Attorney at Law.

GOLDSTOCK, SCHWARTZ, COHEN & SCHWARTZ,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 25, 1964.

Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Enclosed is a copy of the Oakland News of February 20, 1964, which contains excerpts of a meeting held on February 12, 1964, by the citizens' committee to save Oakland from the ravages of redevelopment.

The meeting was attended by 500 persons; business, professional, and homeowners of the Oakland community of Pittsburgh to protest excesses and abuses of urban redevelopment.

Very truly yours,

NATHAN SCHWARTZ,
Attorney at Law.

It Might as Well Be Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the minority of the minority party and certainly a minority in the Congress who voted against the tax bill last week. It is gratifying to note that all editorial comment on the subject has not been in the nature of blind acknowledgment of the propaganda fanfare which surrounded passage of the bill.

The Chicago Daily News, in an editorial on Friday, February 28, performed a most effective public service in dramatizing many unanswered questions in the tax bill and its relationship to Federal spending and the planned deficit in the Federal budget.

The editorial follows:

IT MIGHT AS WELL BE CHRISTMAS

It will be hard for anyone to get mad at President Johnson or Congress for lopping $11 or $12 billion off the annual tax bill. Depending on the income bracket, dad can have that new suit, brother the new tennis racket, mom the new refrigerator, grandma a trip to Florida.

Indeed, Father Johnson, urging people to go right out and spend the savings, sounded more than benign—he sounded downright anxious, virtually equating spending with patriotism, and implying it would be a long, cold spring if business and individuals failed to stoke the economic furnace with this fresh fuel.

He has a right to be anxious. For what he is asking of the American people is that they spend enough to give the economy an upward spin but not enough to touch off a new inflationary spiral. He does not offer any guidelines to make this nice decision any easier.

Neither did he admit the obvious, that this concern would not have been necessary if the finished tax cut bill had approximated the measure originally proposed.

That proposal was for trims offset by reforms and governmental economies. These frugalities were mainly lost in the scramble to do something nice for the voters in an election year. The President did come back to them in his Wednesday statement. He said he was requesting reports quarterly from governmental agency heads on how they reduce payrolls.

But all that he produced that was concrete was a promise to lop another 7,500 pay-

rollers for a reduction of $30 million in the previous budget requests. That is chicken-feed.

We do not mean to blow down the happy aspects of the measure. It is bound to free capital that can buy goods and be plowed into new industrial plant, equipment, and research, and it is surely preferable to an equivalent amount of Federal make-work spending. But it is, at best, only half the job, and the longer the other half is postponed, the greater the hazard to the economy.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a flood of misinformation let loose by some opponents of the quality stabilization bill which needs clarification.

Personally, I believe the charges by some that the proponents are promoting gyp legislation smacks of intolerance or ignorance or both.

I would be the last to sponsor or support any legislation that in any way added to the costs of consumer purchasing. As a matter of fact, the evidence is all to the contrary.

No person has come forward to answer the charges of false and misleading advertising indulged in by the purveyors of untruths and sellers of inferior merchandise oftimes substituted for advertised name brand quality merchandise.

All this bill intends to do is to protect a quality product and the independent small hometown businessmen. If this was not so why would all the big chains be opposed to this act?

If this was not true why would the fight be so vicious as to label Senator HUMPHREY, Representative MADDEN, and a score of others whose fight for the little peoples is historic, as "gyps"?

Frankly, if this is not true I will be the first to denounce the legislation and do my best to defeat it.

The best answer to the criticism appears to be the junkyards filled with bargain goods that did not outlast the time payments.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I will never vote against the consumer since I am one of them.

The following is testimony on the Quality Stabilization Act:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN H. DENT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

I appear before this subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee today to help set the record straight regarding certain allegations made against the quality stabilization bill and to urge early congressional action to enact this legislation.

Quality stabilization legislation is vital to the Nation's independent retail businessmen, to the American consumer, and to the overall national economy. These hearings therefore have been extremely important in gathering information not only to aid Congress in its understanding of quality stabilization, but to inform the public as well.

Unfortunately, there has been a large-scale effort to confuse the quality stabilization issue. In some areas, this effort has led to misunderstanding about the legislative aims and economic effect of quality stabilization. What is doubly unfortunate, certain agencies of our Government, in their appearances before this subcommittee, have added to rather than reduced this misunderstanding.

I refer specifically to the false and erroneous conclusions derived by the press from statements and press releases issued on behalf of Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, regarding his testimony before this subcommittee.

Testimony given here based on information furnished by the Justice Department and the FTC have given rise to the following charges concerning quality stabilization:

First, that the bill is price-fixing legislation.

Second, that if enacted this bill would result in higher prices to the consumer—19 to 27 percent was the range of increase cited.

Third, that the bill if enacted would emasculate our antitrust laws.

It is ludicrous, to say the least, to charge the bipartisan congressional group sponsoring and supporting quality stabilization with urging passage of legislation which would fix and raise prices and undercut our antitrust laws.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SHOULD CORRECT RECORD

Certainly the Department of Justice and the FTC, as responsible executive agencies, have a duty toward this committee to clarify the record on these charges.

But whether these agencies step forward, or not, these charges must be answered. Ludicrous as they are, they reflect on quality stabilization and its sponsors.

Briefly then, one by one, let us reply to these charges.

NO PRICE FIXING UNDER BILL

First, newspaper reports stated that Mr. Dixon, in his testimony on behalf of the FTC, charged that the quality stabilization bill was price-fixing legislation. These reports were based on a press release issued by the Commission in advance of Mr. Dixon's testimony. Yet, under examination by the subcommittee chairman, Mr. Dixon admitted that the proposed bill would not fix prices. Quite the contrary, said Mr. Dixon—and I quote: "This protection is built in. If a man had absolutely monopoly—if he sold all the canned peaches in America, if he was the only source, he couldn't fix the price under this bill."

The fact is that the provisions of quality stabilization do not apply unless a product is in free and open competition. As matters exist on today's market, price can be and is established on house products by all producers who control their own retail outlets. Only the producer who does not control his own retail outlets does not have a voice in the resale of his branded goods. And his primary outlets—the victims of discrimination under present law—are the independent retailers.

Mr. Dixon conceded all this under examination. Quoting directly from the record, Senator HARTKE asked: "In other words, what you have here, you have certain of these people who today are in this field of establishing prices, isn't that true?"

Mr. Dixon's reply was: "That is correct."

STOPS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDEPENDENTS

In brief, if there is price fixing in the market, it exists under present law. What the quality stabilization bill proposes is that independent brand-name producers and independent retailers be put on equal footing with their competitors.

The second charge raised in testimony given by Mr. Dixon, based on information and data provided by Justice Department surveys, was that passage of quality stabilization would mean higher prices to the consumer.

Here again, Mr. Dixon's testimony under subcommittee questioning refutes publicity stemming from his advance press release. Mr. Dixon conceded that the Justice Department survey on which the higher price charges are based was—and I again quote—"merely an index * * * that is what it is worth, no more and no less."

And how, we are entitled to know, was material contained in these indexes gathered? In 1956, the Justice Department sent investigators into eight cities to look for so-called savings opportunities on selected items. And upon this hit-and-run survey—certainly there can be no other description for such an unscientific, limited study—rests the whole basis for the Justice Department 19 to 27 percent increased cost estimate. In 1959 the Justice Department was forced to admit that "it has not been our contention that savings of 27 percent were possible on all items within the retail outlets surveyed. The survey merely disclosed that such savings were available on the specific items surveyed to those prudent consumers interested in best buys." Surely the Congress is entitled to more carefully prepared evidence than this from an executive agency—especially the Justice Department—when we seek information upon which to base legislation.

NO PRICE RISE UNDER BILL

The truth of the matter is that quality stabilization would not increase cost to the consumer, but would raise and increase the quality of goods offered in the market. As was pointed out in examination of other witnesses, the consumer is today being subjected to outrageous markups on many items being sold by some mass retailers under current bait-switch marketing tactics. These are the very marketing tactics that make passage of quality stabilization so essential to protect the American retail economy and our consuming public.

Finally, there is the question of whether quality stabilization would emasculate our antitrust laws. This charge is certainly 180° opposite what the bill proposes and would accomplish. Witnesses opposing the bill themselves admitted that—in the words of Mr. Triggs, of the Farm Bureau—"in the long run competition will still prevail" under quality stabilization.

STOPS MONOPOLY HURTING CONSUMER

Actually, a primary argument in favor of quality stabilization is that it will supplement our antitrust and monopoly laws in a vital area of the economy. Quality stabilization would meet the changing conditions of the Nation's marketplace. And unless remedial legislation is enacted, current market conditions will ultimately kill off our independent retailers, breed monopoly, and eliminate free competition. Mr. Dixon himself admitted under examination that today's antitrust laws are not fast enough, effective enough, or adequate to cope with today's retail marketplace.

If time permitted, I could go into greater detail replying to the charges arising from Mr. Dixon's testimony. But for those who would better understand the quality stabilization bill, I recommend the testimony given before this subcommittee be fully read. I believe a careful reading will bear out the fact that some of the best arguments given in behalf of the bill were provided by opposition witnesses under subcommittee questioning.

So much for the charges leveled against quality stabilization. It is unfortunate that these charges have clouded to some extent the real issue involved in this legislation. And that issue is whether the Congress will act to provide assistance to an American independent retail economy in deep trouble. Incontrovertible evidence presented to this subcommittee points up how serious is the plight of our Nation's independent retailers. Anyone who doubts the need for congressional action would do well to examine the cold statistics concerning independent retail

business failures in recent years. And the need does not stop there.

INDEPENDENTS ARE DYING

With the drying up of independent retail outlets, our Nation's small- and medium-sized, brand-name manufacturers are also endangered. Fewer retail outlets mean that these brand-name manufacturers are increasingly dependent on a limited number of large mass merchandisers for sale of their products. Thus, the circle of monopoly spreads wider, and the shutdown of independent retail businesses has a drastic effect on competition in other segments of the economy. In the end, the American consumer and our entire free enterprise economy will fall victim to this spreading economic disease unless it is checked by remedial action.

Action is needed, and it remains for the Congress to provide it. We have studied and restudied every aspect of this legislation. There can be no reason for further delay. This is the sixth year that the Congress has dealt with quality stabilization, and to quote Congressman OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House committee, examining the bill:

"In recent years, our committee has held 24 days of hearings, covering almost 2,500 pages of a printed record, has heard well over 150 different witnesses, has received almost 500 supplemental statements and memorandums, and has held numerous executive sessions during which the bill has been thoroughly analyzed, considered word by word, and, in short, gone over as thoroughly as has been the case with any bill that has ever come out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in my entire experience on the committee. In my opinion, this bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation presently before Congress."

Considering the amount of time put into studying this legislation, there can be no doubt but that Congress recognizes the existence of an economic crisis in our Nation's retail economy. And while opponents step forward to criticize quality stabilization, the record clearly shows that none has proposed any workable alternative toward dealing with this crisis.

But Congress cannot afford the do-nothing attitude toward this issue that some quality stabilization critics seem to favor. Something must be done. If the quality stabilization bill is not a panacea for all the ills of the retail economy, it is at least a step toward remedying the worst aspects of the illness.

We who favor this legislation welcome the free exchange of ideas concerning what can be done to strengthen our free enterprise retail system. The quality stabilization bill is our proposed solution—what do the opponents of this legislation offer?

In conclusion then, the problem creating the need for legislation has been clearly shown. The legislation itself has been studied and discussed over a long period of time. It is time now to move on this bill—to bring the debate to a close and the issue to decision. Congress should act to approve quality stabilization—and quickly.

Wheat, Lard, and Baloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the monumental troubles that have been caused by this administration's insistence of selling wheat to Russia, I believe the editorial from the Long Island Daily Press of February 28, 1964, does more to put the whole matter in perspective than any other comments of recent times. Therefore, I wish to spread it on the RECORD:

WHEAT, LARD, AND BALONEY

We sell surplus wheat to Russia on the theory that it's more sensible to get Russian money for it than to spend our own cash keeping excess grain in storage.

We are now about to sell lard to Cuba, and there is a convenient explanation for that, too. It is the fact that we never banned the sale of food or medicine. We won't ship the lard to Cuba, either. Instead we will deliver in Canada and let the Cubans arrange their own transportation.

So there is always a way to make a buck with the enemy when the enemy wants to buy food.

Communist money doesn't smell. What does smell is the pretension that we sell food and drugs because we love humanity and can't bear to see it sick or hungry.

Is there much real difference between selling food and selling guns? Both help keep a regime in power. In fact, having foodstuffs to distribute can be extremely potent in maintaining a dictator.

Our actual policy appears to be that trading with an enemy is OK when he pays a good price for something we think we can safely let him have. Who wants baloney?

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial published in the Pittsburgh Press of February 21, 1964, regarding the quality stabilization bill.

The Press editorial would seem to indicate that the special interest opponents of quality stabilization unfortunately have taken in some elements of the Nation's press with their misleading propaganda line concerning this legislation.

We who support quality stabilization are ready and willing to debate and discuss its merits. We believe the bill is vitally needed legislation if our independent retail market is to survive. We are not only willing to debate this issue, but we would welcome the opportunity to air these issues before the public.

We have pointed out time and again that although quality stabilization may not be a cure-all for the ills of the retail marketplace, it is at least an honest effort to strengthen the independent retailer in his struggle for survival against giant monopoly merchandisers and cutthroat operators. Surely the Nation's newspapers, the Pittsburgh Press included, cannot argue with that aim.

Yet quality stabilization is under attack today not on the basis of its actual provisions, but rather those of a "straw bill" created by the propaganda mills of its opponents.

The attack made by the Pittsburgh Press obviously derives from this "straw bill" approach to the quality stabilization issue. Certainly the editors of our country's newspapers have the right, if not the positive duty, to speak out on important legislation pending in Congress. But the public has a right to expect that these editors will take the time and effort needed to analyze and understand the issues involved in such legislation.

I, therefore, urge the Press editorial writers to put aside any preconceived notions about quality stabilization and to shunt aside the boilerplate propaganda disseminated by opponents of this bill. Study this bill—and begin by taking a hard look at the serious economic problem which quality stabilization seeks to remedy.

Does the Press recognize the real dangers posed to the free marketplace by the growing threat of retail monopoly? Have that newspaper's editors studied the evidence contained in the hearings held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee regarding the present plight of the retail market? The committee's final report said that passage of the bill is "essential to the survival of hundreds of thousands of small, independent businessmen."

Are the editors aware of the boast, made before a congressional committee by a representative of one of the giant retailers, that within 10 years fewer than 50 companies would control our entire national retail economy? Does the Press believe that such extinction of free competition and the small retailer is in the best interests of the American consumer or our national economy as a whole?

Does the Press disagree with quality stabilization? Then let that newspaper's editors propose some other effective way to keep alive free, independent competition in the Nation's marketplace, and to prevent a monopoly takeover of our retail system by giant mass merchandisers.

Most important of all, is the Press familiar with the real steps proposed by quality stabilization as a remedy for our retail ills? Curiously, the Press editorial did not contain any explanation for readers of the terms of the bill—only the broadly stated conclusions and opinions of others.

Quality stabilization would strengthen the competitive position of the small and independent retailer by giving brand-name manufacturers the same rights over their products as are now exercised by chainstores selling their own private label merchandise. The bill is voluntary, in that no manufacturer would be compelled to come under its provisions, nor would any distributor or retailer be made to sell any product.

Sponsors of quality stabilization hope that it will help curb one of the most serious threats to our small, independent retail operators—that of competitive misuse of brandnames by cutthroat operators. It is obvious that such a curb would also benefit the consumer by helping to maintain better marketing standards, and to preserve a competitive retail market.

Finally, let me ask the Press' editorial writer whether he seriously contends that the broad bipartisan group of Senate and House Members, sponsoring and

supporting quality stabilization, are guilty of advocating—I quote here from the editorial—"a gyp."

In my opinion, name calling of this sort performs no useful service toward real public understanding of a serious economic issue. It serves only to prejudice public attitudes without providing any information whereby the people can reach their own conclusions on an issue. The fact is that few economic proposals ever received the widespread bipartisan support that is being given quality stabilization. Sponsors and supporters include stalwart Democrats like Senators HUMPHREY, MCCARTHY, and HARTKE, and stalwart Republicans like Senators SCOTT, KUCHEL, and MORTON. In all, 24 Members of the House of Representatives and 11 Senators are sponsoring quality stabilization. I am proud to be included among that number. The Press urges its readers watch Pennsylvania Members of Congress who are sponsoring this vital legislation. These Members include Senator SCOTT, Representative FRANK CLARK, and myself. I ask more—not simply that Pennsylvanians watch us on this issue, but that they take the time to contact us to be informed on quality stabilization, what it means, and why its sponsors are working for its enactment into law. And in particular I might ask the Press' editorialist to take the trouble next time to check with the sponsors of legislation—those who know—before accepting the propaganda line of those whose special interests oppose its passage.

U.S. Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted a series of articles on aspects of the tremendous space program in which the United States is now engaged. The articles were written by Paul Martin, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Gannett News Bureau, and express graphically the magnificent challenge of the new exploration that faces our generation.

Our Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has begun hearings on the programs which face the National Aeronautics and Space Exploration in the coming year. We have been making a thorough review of these programs.

I believe that the newspaper work of Mr. Martin does a great deal to convey to the people the excitement of this program. He has drawn a detailed picture of youth, the vigor, the accomplishments in recent years, and the difficulties ahead.

I offer the first of these articles for the RECORD:

U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

(By Paul Martin)

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA., February 23.—"This is the edge of space. This is the jumping off place for infinity."

These dramatic words are used to describe the U.S. Space and Missile Center here at what used to be known as Cape Canaveral, Fla.

The bright young managers put on an impressive demonstration for visitors. Here is what you see at the cape:

A world-of-tomorrow spaceport with 37 launching pads, service towers, concrete blockhouses, fuel tanks and underground silos scattered over a 17,000-acre sandy promontory into the Atlantic Ocean.

A Government-and-industry team of scientists, engineers and technical administrators, mostly under 40 years of age, civilian and military, absorbed in a fascinating new industry with limitless horizons.

Beyond the security gates, a backup community of earthbound mortals living in new ramblers and motels among the palm trees and hibiscus flowers of Cocoa Beach in the fastest growing part of Florida.

Before the spacemen came, the cape was inhabited mostly by muskrats and waterfowl. Today more than 20,000 workers are engaged in various activities of the Space Center. This is expected to grow to 35,000 in the next year or two.

The average age in Brevard County, where the cape is located, is only 26 years. The population includes perhaps the highest percentage of technical talent of any county in the Nation.

The last time I visited the cape was in spring of 1958. America was behind then in the space race. The Russians had put up the first two man-made earth satellites.

The outlook today is entirely different. The United States is ahead on most counts—rocket power, payloads in orbit, guidance, variety of boosters, number of spaceshots, and diversity of scientific information.

"We started here 6 years ago with Explorer 1 and a 31-pound payload," observed Albert F. Siepert, Deputy Director of the NASA Space Center. "Last month we put the world's biggest payload into orbit."

The Saturn I rocket that lofted 38,060 pounds on January 29 is America's biggest operational booster. There have been five Saturn I's fired to date, all 100 percent successful.

Its first stage produced 1.5 million pounds thrust in a cluster of eight engines. We do not think the Soviets have anywhere near that amount of rocket power.

This compares with 360,000 pounds thrust for the Atlas missiles that launched our first spacemen into earth-orbital flights.

The changes at the cape since 1958 are remarkable.

One blockhouse serving a Saturn I launch complex is built to withstand a 50-megaton blast within 500 feet of ground zero.

A 1,000-foot tunnel between a Titan launching pad and another blockhouse contains 1,300 miles of communications lines.

A central communications center receives information from all around the world no more than 2 seconds late.

Color movies in slow motion were taken of the recent Saturn launch by 30 cameras mounted directly on the launch platform; the cameras were protected against heat and blast by panes of quartz crystal.

In the last 6 years, the United States has fired 176 successful spaceshots with a variety of military missiles or space rockets including Redstone, Jupiter, Thor, Delta, Atlas, Agena, Centaur, Titan, and Saturn.

"We made 100 Atlas shots before we put the first man into orbit in a Mercury capsule," Siepert said. "We will have 25 Titan launchings before we send 2 men up in a Gemini capsule. We will fire 10 Saturns before we try to go to the moon."

This progress is based on men and money, the tremendous industrial capacity of America, and rapidly improving knowledge, materials, and technology.

It has served to dispel an earlier notion that the Russians had a bigger booster capability derived from some mysterious "exotic" fuel.

Not so, say NASA officials. The Soviets simply started earlier, planned for bigger rockets and learned through trial and error—the same way we have.

If anything, the United States is ahead in rocket fuel due to a new technique using liquid hydrogen as a propellant for upper stages of the Atlas-Centaur and Saturn boosters.

Liquid hydrogen delivers 30 percent more thrust than the RP-1 jet fuel (kerosene) used in the first stages of most of our liquid-fueled rockets.

But liquid hydrogen must be kept under conditions of intense cold or 420° below zero prior to using. They have found a way at the Cape to keep 125,000 gallons in a storage tank without losing more than 70 pounds in a normal day, or less than one-half of 1 percent by volume.

Private Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in 1928, one of the great figures sitting on the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Brandeis, wrote that "the right to be alone is the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man."

The right of privacy is under consistently heavy assault, Mr. Speaker. This precious right has been appreciably constricted over the years to the point that it seems that we are on the fringe of an Orwellian era. A recent article in a news magazine contains the statement that there are, for example, 10,000 electronics transmitters in operation each day eavesdropping as the citizens of this Republic transact their personal and public lives.

In this connection, two matters that have come to light in recent weeks deserve attention, Mr. Speaker. Both deal with the surveillance of the mails. Two editorials in the Washington Post discuss these outrageous situations. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I place these two editorials at this point in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PEEPING AT THE MAIL

It turns out that Roy Cohn said no more than what was true when he charged the other day that the Federal Government had ordered a watch on all mail addressed to his lawyer. An assistant U.S. attorney prosecuting the perjury-conspiracy case in which Mr. Cohn is a defendant admitted the fact in court on Saturday. Federal District Judge Dawson denounced it as "shocking."

In a mail watch, the Post Office is supposed merely to inspect envelopes, noting the name and address of each writer to the subject of the watch. Post Office authorities assert that they do not delay delivery of the mail by this procedure. They also assert that they do not open any first-class letters or read the contents by any electronic or other device. Mail watches are frequently undertaken at the request of law enforcement agencies.

But it is hard to understand what assistance a mere mail watch can give to law enforcement. Its principal effect, we sur-

mise, is to create a great deal of anxiety—anxiety that a list of correspondents is being compiled and may be used for some sinister purpose, anxiety that, despite the protestations of the Post Office Department, the contents of first-class mail are being inspected.

As a matter of fact, that anxiety is much more widespread than it ought to be in a free country. A Post Office Department which admits mail watches is not fully believed when it denies opening the mail; and in the same way a Federal Bureau of Investigation which admits tapping a few telephones in violation of the law is not fully believed when it denies tapping many telephones.

Nothing is more calamitous to the climate of a community than pervasive distrust and anxiety of this kind. If the law does not specifically forbid mail snooping as it forbids wiretapping, it ought to be amended to do so. Confidence in the privacy of communications is too valuable to Americans to be breached for the sake of a minor aid and convenience to the police.

OPEN LETTER

We are the recipients of a billet doux in the form of a post card from the postmaster in New York, advising us that he is holding mail matter addressed to us from a foreign country which the Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department has determined to be Communist propaganda. Good. It sounds interesting. The postmaster has whetted our curiosity.

Until recently, we have been accustomed to receiving mail matter addressed to us without intervention by the postmaster and without the benefit of the Customs Bureau's opinions respecting the contents. It seemed to us that we were getting along quite satisfactorily in this old-fashioned way, determining for ourselves the character of the stuff in our mailbox and deciding whether to put it in the wastebasket or the file cabinet or show it to our neighbors and friends.

Old-fashioned as this method of handling the mail may seem, it is nevertheless thoroughly American. And in simple truth it safeguards the security of the country a great deal better than keeping Communist propaganda concealed. Newspapers, universities, Government officials—Americans in general—need to know what the Communists are saying and doing—in order to formulate their own judgments intelligently.

We get a great deal of mail we don't want—without ever being asked by the postmaster if we want him to deliver it to us. But this particular piece of mail seems to be so important that he wants special instructions. He presents us with a return-addressed, franked post card asking us to let him know whether to deliver the publication or not and whether to deliver all publications of the same type or not.

The postmaster's inquiry, coming as it did in postcard form, was open to the scrutiny of the postman and of anyone else who happened to see it. So there is no telling how many people have now been informed that we are on the mailing list of a publication considered communistic by the Customs Bureau; and the reply, being in postcard form, will let an indefinite number of busybodies know whether we want to receive such a publication.

This puts a pretty formidable barrier in the way of our getting the publication and judging it for ourselves. We do not even know whether some other inquiring agency of the Government may be compiling a list of all those subversive enough to want mail disapproved by the Customs Bureau—or whether the House Committee on Un-American Activities may not some day make use of the list as proof positive of treason.

We think this whole procedure is an abomination. We think it apes the Communists from whom it is supposed to protect us. We think it mocks American pretensions to freedom and degrades the principles of the Bill of Rights. We think it disarms Americans and deprives them of knowledge they need. This insulting paternalism is the consequence of an act of Congress expressing nothing but distrust and contempt for the American people. Let the Customs Bureau go back to collecting customs. Let the Post Office Department go back to delivering the mail—without asking silly questions. And let Congress remember that the society for which it legislates is a free society.

Our Uncivil Treatment of Civil Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column of February 13, 1964, by Paul Harvey. Mr. Harvey's column is distributed by General Features Corp.

I believe he has said a number of things that have needed to be said for a long time.

The column follows:

OUR UNCIVIL TREATMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS

(By Paul Harvey)

You and I would not think of treating the servants in our kitchen the way we treat our civil servants.

A businessman with money is respected.

A politician with money is suspected.

In business, reciprocity is necessary, prudent and wise.

In politics it's called "a deal."

You make a gigantic mistake in business, you declare bankruptcy.

You make a gigantic mistake in politics, you and your family are permanently disgraced.

The businessman offers a bribe, "that's business."

A politician accepts a bribe, "that's a crime."

Defenders of this double-standard insist that what politicians do is "public," what industry does is "private." Why?

Does that defense really make sense when the consuming public pays for the hanky-panky in industry as surely as the taxpaying public pays for the politician's boondoggle?

Another thing: It's smart for a "working man" to get more than he's worth for working less than he's able.

But the politician is expected to "sacrifice," to accept less than he's worth, but be always "on duty."

And who ever heard of time-and-a-half for a Congressman?

A factory hand tries to get in to see the chairman of the board and he'll get old waiting.

In politics your door is expected to be open all the time, you are expected to be available to anybody.

That's not all: In business, longtime experience is an asset, an endorsement, a virtue.

In politics too long and you're a "hack."

A businessman's careless remark would never get out of the board room.

A politician's total image is crucified by one intemperate utterance quoted out of context.

The press contributes to this double-standard; let's admit it. There are too many "it has been rumored" accusations about politicians which get printed on the front page and retracted, if at all, somewhere in the want ads.

If you are in one business and buy stock in others, you are "diversifying."

If you are a politician with outside income, you are "profiteering."

If you give a few hours to the community fund you are hailed as a selfless, public-spirited citizen.

A lawmaker sacrifices precious months out of his year to attend legislative sessions and you wonder "what's he getting out of it?"

The Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare recently published a report called "Ethical Standards in Government." It was the judgment of the committee that ethical standards among public officials are generally higher than those prevailing in so-called private business.

In a republic we elect men to do our deciding for us.

Theoretically we elect our best men. Actually we tend to elect men our own size.

How is it that we presume to demand of these ordinary creatures such extraordinary conduct?

Winter, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago the Association of American Colleges was founded and dedicated to a basic premise that has been the benchmark of education in this country since the turn of the century. That premise has been the preservation and fostering of a strong and vigorous policy of liberal education throughout the country.

This is an age distinguished by momentous intellectual achievement, by an exponential growth of human knowledge especially in science and technology. The ideals of liberalism in American education are rooted deeply in our country's tradition. They have been nourished by the labor, sacrifice, and hopes of our emigrant forebears who instinctively knew that freedom without knowledge was a phantasm, that liberty divorced from truth was a travesty of human values.

Dr. C. Easton Rothwell, president of Mills College, Oakland, Calif., in the 1964 midwinter Bulletin of the college, has set forth an important and lucid summation of what liberal education is, what it means to all of us now, in these days filled with fears, anxieties, and tension, and tomorrow, when our children—if we are wise enough—can enter with sureness into a new era of human achievement.

I urge my colleagues to read closely what follows:

WINTER 1964

AN IMPORTANT GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

The year 1964 marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Association of American Colleges. It has been set aside in many of the Nation's more than 1,500 colleges for rededication to the guilding aim of that association—liberal learning, the fruit of liberal education.

The need for liberal learning has never been greater, so rapidly has the Nation grown, so swift has been the multiplication of its problems and responsibilities, so large has been the expansion of man's knowledge and of the means for bringing it to bear upon his life. There is also a need, however, to state afresh the meaning of liberal education, to free it from the encrustation of distortion and cliche that over the years have tended to obscure it. Its values and achievements must be reasserted also to counter a tendency, arising from new experience and knowledge, to diminish man's stature and his hopes for the future.

THE AIM OF LIBERAL LEARNING

The central aim of liberal learning is to liberate the intellect and spirit of man, thus to free him from the meanness and meagerness of mere existence. To this end, a liberal education helps a person to break through the mold of preconception and custom in which he may have been reared so that he may choose his values and goals in the freedom and knowledge born of emancipation. It thus enables him to rediscover himself in a nobler and larger aspect, a process to which George Washington referred when he used the epithet "liberal" as the ultimate compliment for his finest officers.

"In liberation, man acquires the power to multiply and explore choices so that the world ceases to be a little place trimmed to dimensions of one's private experience."

TO VIEW ONE'S SOCIETY IN UNIVERSAL DIMENSIONS

Liberal learning, by freeing man's intellect, expands his horizons. It removes the barriers of parochialism and leads him toward an affinity for all that is human. It removes the blinders of his mind and thus provides the opportunity to understand the physical universe and life within it. In accomplishing this, liberal learning does more than equip an individual to attain excellence or the perfection of intellectual character. It forces him to look deeply into his society and his world, to see them whole and in relationship to one another.

Viewed thus, liberal learning is a dynamic that animates the intellectual community in its entirety. Man cannot acquire it by inheritance or accept it passively as a gift of free society. It is a creative and sometimes painful process that must transpire within the individual. It is continuously and actively liberating. It endures because those whom it has enlightened and inspired arouse these qualities anew in each succeeding generation.

AWARENESS IS FREE FROM PARTITIONS

There is no area of learning that is not an integral part of a liberating education. Disparities between subjects are more apparent than real. The gap between the humanities and the sciences, for example, that began to develop in the 19th century and reached a climax in the 20th, prompting C. P. Snow to write "The Two Cultures," is a problem of language and concept within the intellectual community. He who looks at man's learning in the whole recognizes a bond between scientific and humanistic studies. He acknowledges immediately the contribution to awareness that has come from scientific discovery. He discerns the intellectual liberation that has been provoked by Archimedes, Galileo, Darwin, Einstein, Max Planck. He knows also that today's scientist leans increasingly upon learning in areas other than science. Working at the edge of certitude, he searches amidst philosophical assumptions and hypothetical laws of behavior for the elusive answers to his queries. Scientist and humanist are united in the quest for liberation from ignorance.

Equally united are the artist and the critical thinker. When the medieval university looked to Hellenic Greece for the inspiration of its curriculum in the liberal arts, it fastened upon reason as the central force in the growth of man. It was not until the golden age of the Medici in Florence that the critical spirit dependent upon reason and the creative spirit expressed through the arts were again brought into cooperative harmony. Still there are those today who regard the development of the intellect as the highest order of learning. Some even look upon the arts as escape from the ardours of the intellectual life.

ART AND REASON

In terms of the growth of awareness, the argument seems futile. Like other fields of learning and expression, the fine arts are a measure of man's perception of his own significance and that of the world. They help him to recognize beauty and to improve his capacity for expressing it. They provide revealing insights into meanings that might otherwishe remain obscured behind clouds of words and logic. In turn, the fine arts draw inspiration and nutriment from life—life as it is lived, life as it is revealed and comprehended through all branches of learning.

Liberal education has met serious challenge in our time from the growth of knowledge about human behavior and from a conjunction of forces that have had the seeming effect of diminishing the stature of man. Psychology has dissected man's reason and found it to be diluted by irrationalities. Other sciences of human behavior have demonstrated the low levels of reason at which large numbers of human beings live. They have exposed the great influences of environment upon the destinies of men and women by comparision with those of formal education. They have shown how little thought and how much accident, predisposition, and pure emotion are involved in human judgments and decisions.

AN ANTIDOTE FOR HUMAN FAILURE

Some critics have gone farther. Discouraged by man's success in discovering the means for his destruction without corresponding success in perfecting the means to prevent it, they have reduced man from an heroic figure to a pathetic victim—a "mortal creature in an absurd world." To those who make such criticisms, the exponents of liberal learning reassert the achievements of liberal learning. Learning through the ages has brought man an ever-increasing awareness of his complexities and inner paradoxes. He has surmounted them by understanding them, and by discovering ways to master them. He knows that the great potential of education is still to be attained.

Man has striven through generations to surmount the cruelties and destructive forces of his own invention. He has not always succeeded, but in the continuing stuggle, he has improved his capacities to cope with them. He has opposed to man's meanness the values learned from education and experience by which man can triumph over himself. Whether he has succeeded or failed in this endeavor, he has often risen to that nobility of spirit that lies within the potential of every liberally educated human being. By some of his achievements he has demonstrated the beneficent as well as the creative power of his learning. For tyranny he has substituted law; for disease, the means of cure and prevention; for erroneous conceptions of the heavens, a growing understanding of the universe.

THE BROAD COMPASS OF LIBERAL LEARNING

Liberal learning, with a compass as broad as humanity, forms a natural bridge between the civilization of the West and other civilizations, some ancient, some young. A comprehension of the differences and interactions between these cultures is indispensable to liberal education in today's world. It is the knowledge and creativity born of interaction that will aid in the search for answers to the problems of mankind, and the mysteries of the universe. This new and compelling dimension of awareness can be neglected only at the risk of ignorance and of peril to man and his society.

THE PLACE OF LIBERAL LEARNING

Liberal learning should be the central function of every school, college, and university. It should be the guiding force of adult learning. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. In too many circumstances the large purposes of liberal education have been lost in a jungle-like growth of courses. Some institutions, although professing to practice liberal education, have permitted both the curriculum and the academic community itself to become weedy with modes of living and learning that are antithetical to liberality of mind and spirit.

Fortunately, there exist within the United States excellent colleges and universities that stand as beacons to the goals and practices of liberal learning. These institutions recognize that "knowledge is not a subject to be taken, but an activity to be undertaken." They know that man's ongoing struggle to be liberated is what holds the finite and the infinite together," that the struggle is necessary because without it we would be something less than human. They perceive the goals of liberal learning and practice continuously the means for bringing them to realization.

THE CONDITIONS OF LIBERAL LEARNING

Learning takes place most readily where there is an intimate meeting of minds, where discourse is unhampered by haste, numbers, or mechanical devices. Its natural habitat is the tutorial session, the seminar, the small class. Nonetheless, when colleges and universities have truly caught the vision of liberal learning, their relative sizes and particular characteristics have become less important than the atmosphere of learning that pervades them. It is less important than the human beings who study and teach within them, less important than the trustees, officers, and alumni who share the responsibility of seeing that the vision becomes real.

We at Mills College happily join in rededicating ourselves to liberal education.

C. EASTON ROTHWELL,
President, Mills College.

JANUARY 1964.

P.S.: The sources of the quotations are, in order, as follows: Mark van Doren, "Liberal Education," 1943; Archibald MacLeish, address at the dedication of the Center for Harold Taylor, "Essays in Teaching," 1950, and John Sloan Dickey, an address to the board of trustees and alumni council of Dartmouth College, 1960.

For those who may be interested in further reading there is an ample and very helpful literature about liberal education. It will soon include a volume of the addresses given at the 50th anniversary meeting of the Association of American Colleges in Washington, D.C., January 1964.

Cattle Industry Urges Meat Imports Limited to 1960 Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Shenandoah, Iowa, more than 5,000 midwest farmers and cattlemen united in a plea to Congress to hold

back the flood of beef imports. The mass meeting, which overflowed into the streets of the southwest Iowa community, was called by the newly formed Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action.

The wave of foreign beef imports which has upset the cattle market was the principal target of the speakers and the listeners. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George Mehren was booed when he told the mass meeting—

We did a job, an honest job, the best job we could do.

I do not think the administration has done a job, and many of my colleagues feel the same way. It was proven yesterday the midwestern farmers and cattlemen do not think the administration has done the job.

The result of that mass meeting, which once again pointed up the seriousness of the meat import situation, was a resolution calling upon this Congress to enact legislation limiting fresh, frozen, canned, or cured beef and veal to the 1960 level. The resolution also urged the cattle industry to take effective action toward orderly marketing and production as well as production more nearly commensurate with consumer demands.

I am placing the resolution adopted yesterday into the RECORD and hope that each Member of the House of Representatives will read it and see the importance of legislation:

It is the consensus of those attending this meeting that attention must be called to the chaotic and serious financial straits in which the cattle industry finds itself, and that this condition affects not only everyone connected with the cattle industry but many other segments of the Nation's economy.

Be it hereby declared, that the Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action respectfully petitions the Congress to limit, by legislative action, imports of beef and veal, fresh, frozen, cooked and/or canned or cured, to levels in pounds approximately equal in volume to the level of 1960, approximately 775 million pounds, or 4.9 percent of domestic production that year.

We further recommend and urge that the cattle industry take effective action toward orderly marketing and production, as well as production more nearly commensurate with consumer demands.

Be it further resolved that we as a committee urge all organizations to join with us in a united effort to accomplish our objective.

It is our solemn belief that through cooperation, understanding and mutual respect, the meat industry from producer to consumer can face a future that will be profitable and satisfactory to all.

Industry Retraining May Solve the Overtime Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of unemployment continues to deeply disturb many of us. The hearings on double overtime as a possible remedy have raised many questions as to the effectiveness of such an approach and particularly have pointed out that additional training is needed in certain skills. If this training is provided the overtime problem may begin to solve itself. In this connection an article published on February 29, 1964, in the Christian Science Monitor reporting on the Human Engineering Institute experiences in Youngstown, Ohio, is an excellent example of what one industry is doing to retrain its employees. This appears to be an exemplary project and one which should be called to the attention of the Nation. For this reason, I am including the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STEEL MILLS SPONSOR RETRAINING SCHOOL

(By George R. Reiss)

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.—Concerned by rising shortages of trained manpower in the midst of spreading unemployment, huge sums are being spent in a unique training program to upgrade workmen's skills.

That's the work being done by the Human Engineering Institute, an unusual nonprofit educational institution with branches in four Midwestern States and two cities in Ontario, Canada.

"Our work," said Richard W. Doran, director of the institute's Warren-Niles, Ohio, center, "is evidence that enlightened managements are recognizing that they can modernize and automate their plants and equipment. But they cannot get the full efficiency from these plants unless they also update and upgrade the skills of their employees.

"RESPONSIBILITY RECOGNIZED

"It is evidence that these managements are recognizing a responsibility to help their men to help fit themselves for better jobs and to avoid getting left by the wayside as automation advances."

The Warren-Niles center is handling upgrading training work for 16 companies in the Youngstown area, including steel, glass, electrical, machinery, and steel fabricating and other firms. The other centers also retrain employees for many companies.

One big firm in this area, which has thousands of workmen still on furlough, said it could employ 3,000 skilled electrical technicians within the next 5 years if it could find them, but has little hope of locating men who could fill the bill.

DEVELOPED AT REPUBLIC

Human Engineering Institute is the child of Dr. Joseph S. Kopas, training counselor for Republic Steel Corp. Dr. Kopas, in the early 1950's got the idea that tremendous technological advances in industry, especially in basic steel, were vital but would leave many good workmen out of work because they were untrained for the more exacting supervisory, production, and maintenance jobs.

The problem was how to raise the skills of these employees. Many had rather limited educations, and a wide variety of ages and backgrounds, experience, and skills. Most couldn't meet the enrollment requirements of many of the conventional training schools.

Dr. Kopas' approach was different.

He conceived of classes taught by skilled supervisors from the sponsoring industrial plants. These would be given "quicky" courses in instruction. The enrollees would attend 1½-hour classes one or two evenings a week.

Instructors would discuss the subjects in the terminology of the mills and use practical examples, rather than the theories of the conventional training schools. The students would absorb what they could and there would be no formal tests or examinations to pass later.

And the best part, the students would be able to talk with their instructors in their plants on problems rising in the classrooms.

IDEA SPREAD

Dr. Kopas took his idea to Charles M. White, then president and chairman of Republic Steel. Mr. White enthusiastically endorsed the idea, threw Republic's support behind it, and even chipped in $40,000 of his personal funds to launch the idea. The first classrooms were set up in Cleveland, graduating 110 students the first year.

The idea quickly spread and other companies were invited to enroll their students, companies paying the costs. The cost is reportedly $150 per student per school year.

In 1962, some 4,683 employees from 23 companies in the United States and Canada completed one or more years of training, and 160 finished 4-year training programs.

Since that time, the schools have greatly expanded and extended the number of companies served. For example the Warren-Niles center, outgrowing a school facility it built in 1957, built a new unit costing about $300,000 and still uses the old building as an annex.

OTHER FIRMS JOINED

Among some of the companies which have enrolled students are Republic's competitors, such as Sharon Steel Corp. and Copperweld Steel Co. Others include firms in other lines, such as Commercial Shearing & Stamping Co., a steel fabricator; E. W. Bliss, a machinery manufacturing firm; General Electric Co., Mahoning Glass division, an electric lamp plant; and many others.

Among the subjects taught are electrical equipment, hydraulic equipment, mechanical equipment maintenance, production techniques, technology of steel making, etc., and numerous others.

Target for Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago's American has written an excellent editorial urging the assignment of the proposed $80 million National Environmental Health Center in Chicago.

I should like to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. It is my hope that Chicago's bid for this very important facility will win support and approval.

Mr. Speaker, this excellent editorial follows:

TARGET FOR CHICAGO

Governor Kerner goes to Washington some time this month to try to convince President Johnson that Chicago is the ideal place for locating the proposed $80 million National Environmental Health Center. The center, which will study health effects of air and water pollution, pesticides, radioactivity, and other environmental contaminants, would occupy 1,000 acres and employ 5,000 persons.

Kerner will be armed with facts which make a strong case for locating the center here, including a white paper prepared for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by Dr. Franklin D. Yoder, State public health director, with the assistance of university scientists, businessmen, and political leaders.

But as Illinois learned in bidding for the $50 million National Aeronautics and Space

Administration's electronics center which went to Boston, such concrete evidence must be backed by political persuasion. This is why Illinois congressional leaders should join Kerner in urging the health center's location in Chicago. It should be a bipartisan effort, and, if successful, both sides can take some credit for getting it here.

The competition for the health center is much tougher than it was for the NASA site. Boston is said to be in the bidding for it; so is North Carolina, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, all with powerful delegations in Congress.

Among the advantages Kerner can list for locating the center here are:

Chicago is the medical heart of the Nation, with one out of every five of the country's doctors receiving part or all of his training here.

Chicago is centrally situated, in a setting well suited for environmental health research, from Lake Michigan and the nearby Mississippi River to a bistate (Illinois and Indiana) air pollution problem and a complex of universities and laboratories engaged in comparative research.

But it should also be emphasized that Illinois is not getting a fair share of Federal building programs, especially when compared to its tax yield. The Governor is reported to be "hot under the collar" because the bulk of these contracts are going to New England and California. We hope our congressional representatives get steamed up over this situation, too. It is time to point out that Illinois is tired of being bypassed. If it takes this kind of argument, supported by a battery of facts, to convince Washington, then it should be used.

Logic indicates the center should be located in Chicago, and coupled with a little political persuasion, there is a good chance it will be.

Bulgarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 85 years ago the people of Bulgaria attained their independence after centuries of domination by the Ottoman Empire.

For 66 years the Bulgarian people maintained their independence and developed their nation.

In September 1944 Soviet armies invaded Bulgaria and established a Communist puppet government. This Communist government was imposed by Soviet bayonets and the people of Bulgaria lost their independence. The last legitimate link to their independence was broken in 1946 when King Simeon was expelled from the nation by the puppet Communist regime.

The Bulgarian people are captives of communism—a fate they share with millions of other captives behind the Iron Curtain.

However, the spirit of independence, the desire for freedom, and the determination to persevere in the face of centuries of Ottoman rule inspired the Bulgarian groups in exile wage a relentless struggle against the Communist oppression of their homeland. The people of Bulgaria silently and effectively maintain their aspirations for legitimate independence. In Bulgaria itself they lack freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of political activity. In their hearts they steadfastly look forward to the day when their country will be free from the yoke of communism.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on this day we salute the people of Bulgaria, recognizing their steadfastness and their desire to wage a victorious struggle against the Communist regime which dominates them. Bulgarian Liberation Day is celebrated throughout the free world in a manner that cannot be celebrated in Bulgaria itself.

Bonanza Welshers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, performers on the television program "Bonanza" contracted to appear in Jackson, Miss., on February 1 and 2 in connection with the Mississippi Commerce and Industry exposition. Prior to their scheduled appearance, the performers received a telegram from a group of racial agitators based at Tougaloo College. The agitators protested the fact that the "Bonanza" stars were scheduled to appear before a respectable, but segregated, audience of fine Mississippi citizens.

Promptly acquiescing to the extremist position of the agitators, the "Bonanza" stars failed to honor their binding contract. I would like to call to the attention of the House the reaction of two Mississippians on this subject. One, by Mr. Ernest Watson, appeared in the January 30 edition of the Jackson Times, Jackson, Miss., and the other, by Mr. Edgar T. Crisler, in the Port Gibson Reveille, Port Gibson, Miss., on January 30, 1964. The editorials follow:

[From the Jackson Times, Jan. 30, 1964]

EDITORIAL BY EARNEST WATSON, GUEST EDITORIAL WRITER

Mayor Allen Thompson, of Jackson, Miss., has given vocal expression to a long overdue movement in the making, namely: of getting the people of Jackson and of the South to let the sponsors of "Bonanza" know displeasure over the stars of that television program snubbing Jackson because tickets were not being sold to Negroes to attend the WJQS promotion: Mississippi Commerce and Industry Exposition.

When one Negro, one Japanese, one Arab, or one anybody can cause conflicts like this with one telegram representing a minority group, it is later than you think.

We are sure that if the Negores want to bring the stars of "Bonanza" to Jackson with an all-Negro attendance at the Coliseum, that the facilities of that building can be made available with proper arrangements and that no white will protest.

It is time for the whites (with a capital W) to become vocal against such incidents, and vocal where it hurts, such as with the sponsors of "Bonanza"; namely, the Chevrolet Co. Negroes have used the boycott extensively, even on Jackson retail stores, without cause whatsoever except to select small ones which such boycott would hurt.

This Nation, not just the South, has a real problem, and this is it: Already slaves due to African tribal wars, victorious chieftains sold captive Negroes to white traders who sold them in this country for slaves.

Transplanted from an African savage culture, the American slave Negro when freed, became a race wthout a culture and without racial pride, because the only culture the second generation knew was the white man's culture ,and the only city, county, State, or Nation, the white man's also. Naturally, the Negro has and wants to adopt the white man's ways; he has no other culture into which to integrate.

Thus, the American Negro today is one of the greatest problems of the times: He does not want to colonize like Chinese, Italians, Jews, or any race with its own background and own culture handed down from generation to generation, because the American Negro has no such culture or background of his own: Only the white man's way which he has inherited through environment.

Too, the Negro is the only race perhaps in the world whose blood will not mix with white without frequent freaks in skin pigment. Too, interbreeding with Negroes invariably means breeding down instead of up. For instance, where are there instances of white blond, blue-eyed children resulting from such mixtures? Invariably, they take after the Negro side, noticeably to the point of identification as Negroes. Exceptions are rare. It's like to trying to make a white cow out of a black Angus. It's a matter of genetics that is even followed in the laws of Nature among fish, birds, and animals by natural instincts. Whoever heard of a white pigeon and blackbird mixing in outdoor life? Yet, domesticated, penned up, or integrated, so to speak, barnyard fowls will mix and create freaks of both feather and anatomy on occasions.

Also, it seems the Negro wants to be legislated into a white man. The white man did not make the Negro black, and he cannot make him white. It's a matter of genetics that even the Communist agitators cannot change * * * the same Communists who do not want Negroes in Russia.

In America, Negroes have the greatest opportunity on earth for them. Negroes must learn, like whites have, that the individual must make his own mark in the world, and then he will be accepted on his merits by both races, as have many Negro notables in sports, music, education, and other fields of endeavor with whites as some of their stanchest champions. But the Negro race cannot be legislated, organized, nor unionized into a social, economic, celebrity or white status in a package deal embracing every black man.

Many Negroes thoroughly realize this, but Communist agitators fan flames without reason, and now the whites must begin to "throw their weight around" too with television sponsors and in other directions to counterbalance such action as that taken by the "Bonanza" stars, and it is high time.

If the Negro want to leave the South, that would be the best thing the South could have; then it would become a white man's paradise, comparatively speaking.

If the remainder of the Nation wants to secede from the South, that also would be a windfall whereby the South would rise to the occasion, put in its own factories, spend its money in the South, and become an economic paradise.

Meanwhile, let's all let the Chevrolet Co. and its "Bonanza" stars know that a large part of their market and their livelihood is in the South—among the whites. It is a good start, as it is now very apparent that whites in the South must become very vocal to offset the influence being wielded by one Negro sending a telegram.

In conclusion why, don't the Negroes bring the "Bonanza" stars to the coliseum with

only Negroes to be seated? Apparently, one telegram could secure their services.

The question is: Do the Negroes want to see these stars, or do they want to cause conflict?

If they really want to see them, it should be apparent with the influence they wield, they should be able to bring them to Jackson, and deny the whites the right to see them.

We herewith call upon coliseum officials to publicly state that the facilities of the coliseum are available on the customary terms to any Negro group who want to pay the price and bring the "Bonanza" stars to the coliseum with only and all-Negro seating arrangement.

Meanwhile, we suggest any all-Negro hotel or motel in this area also extend its facilities to the "Bonanza" stars and let's see if they accept.

If the Negroes need financing, apparently all they need do is to call upon the Chevrolet Co. for funds.

Let's do this thing right.

Let's see what happens.

Meanwhile, we suggest that every white person who sees this editorial, write his own version in a letter, clip this and attach and send to the Chevrolet Co. Perhaps it will help the Chevrolet Co. decide what to do about the whole situation; might even cause them to book their "Bonanza" stars in the coliseum; then we could snub them by staying strictly away.

P.S.—And now a bearded beatnick from New Orleans has added insult to injury by waiting until thousands are seated in the coliseum before announcing that Negroes had talked him into not appearing for the March of Dimes from which Negroes benefit.

Who booked this beatnick in the first place?

After this incident, whites should not donate a dime to any fund until it is certified that not a cent will go to benefit Negroes directly or indirectly. Let them raise their own funds and benefit in proportion. Dick Gregory could be helping do that instead of agitating.

Negroes claim they are poor, but every Negro household in Jackson has been asked, and practically bullied into, paying $5 per month dues to the NAACP. So let the NAACP, watchdog of the South, finance Negro funds for their needy.

In every handout proposition, Negroes muscle their way to the head of the line. But what do they contribute?

This is the call upon the proper officials at this time, to certify total contributions by the Jackson Negro community to the United Givers Fund, and any other fund from which Negroes benefit directly or indirectly.

How much has Negro individuals, Negro churches, Negro doctors, dentists, lawyers and ministers; Negro funeral homes and all other Negro sources, lodges included, contributed to any of these causes? How much has Tougaloo College, or its student body or staff, contributed, while maintaining a hotbed of communistic-styled agitation.

Yet, at an event to benefit the entire community and being donated to by whites, entertainers for the March of Dimes were intimidated by Negroes.

It is high time to use "reverse English" on his situation.

Anybody who rents the coliseum should have the right to say who attends.

This same right applies to Negroes if they want to rent it and have their own shindig.

The coliseum was built to be used for various events. Negroes should have a right to use it on customary terms and bar whites if they see fit.

And we have never heard of them being denied the right to rent it.

Nor have we heard of Negroes having the desire to rent it, but they are playing "dog in the manger" and don't want anyone else to rent it.

With all the sympathy being shown, Negroes should have no trouble bringing America's biggest stars to the coliseum.

And if the seating arrangement were all-ebony, of course that would not be called segregation any more than last Sunday morning's service at a Negro Baptist church was.

There is one catch and Negro leaders know it: Negroes would not support it financially strong enough to make it profitable.

Some good Negroes might suffer from some suggestions made herein, and that's fine. When they have suffered enough, they will run these Negro agitators back North where they belong and the Negro and white community will resume normal relationships toward peace, prosperity, educational and economic advances to which these agitators have contributed nothing but confusion and dues demands.

[From the Port Gibson (Miss.) Reveille, Jan. 1, 1964]

INTEGRATION OR DISINTEGRATION

If we would attempt to write a treatise on "courage" we could hardly include the three manly men—the Cartwrights of "Bonanza" TV fame—nor would Al Hirt be among the number. The Cartwrights reneged on their contract to perform at the Commerce and Industry Exposition in the Mississippi Coliseum February 1 and 2 at Jackson. Hirt, and his jazz trumpet, were to perform at a March of Dimes benefit Saturday night also in the coliseum, and he chickened out—all because the audiences were to be "jest white fokes."

Tom Etheridge wrote in the Clarion-Ledger, among other things, that ironically, the famous Cartwrights portray he-men of courage and honor on television every Sunday night—heroes who brave all manner of dangers and threats in routine manner. But now, they stampede when the NAACP whispers "boo" off camera.

As for Hirt, when he heard the words segregated audience, it didn't seem to matter how he hurt the worthy cause—he picked up his trumpet, and all 315 pounds of him scampered back to New Orleans—leaving about 4,000 persons who paid admission to hear him and his orchestra.

The next who refused to come upon the Jackson scene is James E. Webb, head of the Nation's space program. He was to be the featured speaker at a banquet honoring the legislature. But, low and behold, the protests from the integration group evidently went to the top political ears—and Mr. Webb was unable to come. His case is not so surprising, in view of the fact that some of our top politicians are willing to surrender American rights over many parts of the globe. They have been so soft that no one can blow the beard off Communist Castro in Cuba, while he peddles his wicked poison to Latin American countries. In Panama, we may yet surrender some rights in connection with the Panama Canal, but still use our tax money to support the Government which is turning against us like a viper. We are even going to aid Russia's crumbling economy—which will allow that Godless regime to further worm its way into areas closer to us where they may continue in their work to destroy us. In the U.N. we allow little African nations, where they have just quit eating one another, and have just started wearing clothes, to come in and have a vote equal to ours. And in the House politicians will soon vote on an iniquitous measure which coud destroy our system of government in taking away rights from everyone, and setting up a government of tyranny—just because it's under the name of civil rights. But just think of the bloc votes in some areas.

It's about time the conservative white people of the United States join together to stop the hysteria on integration—in which communism plays a big part—before the disintegration of our great republican system of government.

A Great and Good Man Passes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1964, Rabbi Abraham Kalmanowitz died in Miami, Fla., at the age of 73.

It was my privilege to have known Rabbi Kalmanowitz and to have personal knowledge of the great work of rescue and teaching in which he was engaged throughout his life. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following eulogy which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 17, 1964:

CHAMPIONED AN ODYSSEY OF 600 JEWS

The autumn of 1939 ushered in one of the darkest periods of human history. On September 1, Adolf Hitler's armored hordes had crossed the Polish frontier; in less than 3 weeks, the entire country had been overrun. World War II burgeoned into the bloody blight that was to encompass the world.

Uprooted by the racing Nazi panzers, millions of Poles fled. Caught in the vortex was one of orthodox Jewry's most famous and venerable yeshivas—the Mirrer Rabbinical Seminary. Only 20 miles from the Russian border, it was especially vulnerable because of the Russo-German nonaggression pact signed only a month before the invasion.

Rabbi Abraham Kalmanowitz, a towering figure of wisdom among the Polish clergy and president of the yeshiva, had long seen the handwriting on the wall. When the war tides began to engulf his country, he came to a bold and dangerous decision: To move the entire university to a place of safety, not only to preserve lives but to keep kindled the light of learning among his people.

Thus began the almost unbelievable trek of nearly 600 teachers and students across Russia, Siberia, and into China itself, a journey that was to eventually end in America, the ranks of the wayfarers depleted, but the lamp of learning still burning brightly.

Rabbi Kalmanowitz died Saturday night at Miami, Fla., at the age of 73, still involved in rescue work—this time a program to get Jewish scholars out of the Arab lands. His career mirrored a truism he once expressed himself in recalling the amazing odyssey that he engineered in far-off Poland:

"Man himself is nothing, and does nothing. It is the spirit of man which does. For us that spirit knows that in the end the oppressed will always stand over the grave of the oppressor."

FLEEING AND FLEEING

Rabbi Kalmanowitz came from a family dedicated to learning. His father and grandfathers, and their fathers and grandfathers before them, were rabbis. In 1927, although still only in his thirties, he was elected president of the Mirrer Yeshiva, considered by many the greatest Talmudic university in the world. Later he became its dean.

When hate touched off the guns, Rabbi Kalmanowitz made his decision and moved the university's staff and entire student body

to Vilna (now Vilnius), then to an uneasy haven at Kovno, Lithuania, where studies once more were resumed.

But the rabbi knew that the only hope for his flock lay in putting distance between them and the enemy. After a year at Kovno he decided to go to Stockholm, Sweden, his head full of rescue plans. Recalling the aerial trip years afterward, he confessed:

"I was so scared I said the 'Vidui,' the prayer of those who expect to die, because the Nazis were shooting down every plane then. They shot down the plane carrying Isaac Gitterman of the Joint Distribution Committee and killed him."

In Stockholm he wangled transportation to America. Here, he became a familiar sight in the Halls of Congress, the State Department, and any other agency that would listen to his pleas. His flowing beard, white by now, he begged the Americans to help him get his brood to Shanghai.

They called it "madness," he said. "How can you get money or help to them," they asked. "With God's help," I answered. "The Lord speaks out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, of the thick darkness, with a great voice, and it is ceaseless."

SCRAPS OF PAPER

The British had one lone representative left by then in Lithuania, and the rabbi prevailed upon the State Department to get the British official to certify all 575 of his teachers and students as Polish citizens. The exit visas were only scraps of paper, but with them the fugitives got the Japanese consul in Kovno to issue transit permits to Japan and the Dutch consul to give them entry visas to Curacao in the West Indies.

"I had to get money to them quickly," the rabbi said. "Their ranks were swollen to over 3,000 people, refugees who were on their coattails. But they took them along. They even carried the sick on their backs. They crossed all of Russia and all of Siberia. In Vladivostok 15 were arrested by the Russians because they stared out of the train window too much. I had to rush bribes in order to save them."

Eventually they reached Kobe, Japan, set up their school again, and resumed teaching. The suspicious Japanese kept them under close surveillance, thinking them spies, and sent investigators to their camp. The investigators wound up by calling them "holy idealists" and getting them extra rations.

After the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, the little community was bundled off to Shanghai. There they improvised printing presses from stones and turned out 38,000 books by this primitive method. "While Hitler was burning books and bodies," Rabbi Kalmanowitz said, "the men of Mirrer who had traveled 16,000 miles from Lithuania to Shanghai were using stones for printing presses to keep the light of learning alive."

"They remained there for 5 years. I feared they would die from either starvation, Japanese guns, or American bombs. I set up my own underground to send them money, and not 1 cent was lost. And I begged the Vatican and the Swedish and Swiss Governments to help them. They did. They probably saved their lives."

ROOTS IN BROOKLYN

Concerned as he was with his yeshiva, Rabbi Kalmanowitz also devoted his time to the cause of persecuted Jews everywhere. He spearheaded a number of campaigns to this end, visited the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House and once appealed directly to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. From the latter he received a wire:

"Will visit refugee centers and bring toys for children, too."

The war over, Rabbi Kalmanowitz brought the entire school—teachers and students—to America, where, their long exile over, they established the Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute, now housed at 1791 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn.

In 1948 the rabbi went to Morocco, where he founded a network of schools and brought back a selected group of students for training. His graduates teach in various American cities, as well as in France, Argentina, Uruguay, and Morocco. More than 100 of them are survivors of the long hegira.

In 1959 the college established a high school which called for another building, now awaiting completion, and costing $1 million. Rabbi Kalmanowitz was at a conference in Miami on this project when he was taken ill.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Minna Kalmanowitz; three sons, Moses, Israel, and Bezalel Kalmanowitz; three daughters, Mrs. Rachel Birenbaum, Mrs. Dvora Svei, and Miss Meita Kalmanowitz, and 28 grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held at 2 p.m. today at Mirrer Yeshiva. The body will be flown to Israel for burial.

EARL G. TALBOTT.

Bulgarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute today to the people of Bulgaria and to Americans of Bulgarian descent. On March the 3d, 86 years ago, this noble nation obtained its freedom—an occasion which ended 500 years of foreign oppression of the Bulgarian people.

Today, Bulgarians celebrate that independence, yet sadly they must note that their country is now caught under the Communist yoke. But hope is joined with sadness—hope that once more, these people may lift off the heavy burden of tyranny and walk the road of freedom.

Through their long history, the Bulgarians have made an important contribution to European civilization and have withstood their right to independence and freedom against powerful empires and foreign cultural influences. The Byzantine Empire could not assimilate this nation. The Ottoman Empire crumbled, but the Bulgarian people survived. March 3, 1878, opened the way for the Bulgarian people to join the community of European nations once more.

But tragedy followed this grand attainment. On September 8, 1944, Bulgaria was invaded by the Russian armies, and a Communist-controlled government was established. Bulgaria became a Soviet satellite.

Yet the hope and faith in liberty has still survived in the Bulgarian people, as it has in all of the subjugated peoples of the Soviet Empire. Through suppression and through tyranny, that flame has burned.

The Bulgarian National Council of America each year organizes solemn observances of Bulgarian Liberation Day in this country. The people of Bulgarian descent in America have not forgotten their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I cherish the hope, with all Americans, that this noble nation may regain its just bounty—freedom, and that this day shall not be long in coming.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Education Congress of 1963 and Our Universities of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a notable address delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL], before the University of Missouri Alumni Association at its annual luncheon on March 3, 1964:

THE EDUCATION CONGRESS OF 1963 AND OUR UNIVERSITIES OF TOMORROW

(By WILLIAM J. RANDALL, U.S. Representative, Fourth Missouri District)

Dr. Mayes, now our new president-elect of the association for the ensuing year, Mr. Schooley, Mr. Gordon, fellow-alumni, ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure to be with you today. First I want you to know I am an alumnus of our university and not an interloper. I hope I am a loyal alumnus, and I think I can prove that because when my only daughter was ready to go to college, I told her she was at liberty to attend any university of her preference, but made it pretty plain it would have to be the University of Missouri. Memories of my years at our university were pleasant ones indeed and that is another reason why it is so good to be with all of you today.

Since the last meeting of this group there has passed from our midst one who loved our university so much that he was made an honorary alumnus. Claude M. Houchins was not a Missouri graduate but he became inspired by its history and steady course of progress. He grasped the vision of a greater university and became one of our most consistent and generous contributors. He recently bequeathed his entire estate to the University of Missouri and became the largest contributor, second only to J. C. Penney. In respect to the memory of one who loved our school so much that he gave it all his wordly goods may we now observe a moment of silence to honor Claude Houchins.

Thank you.

If I have a theme for today it will center around the record of the 88th Congress on education and then a few closing remarks about some of the problems of higher education in the years ahead. Instead of an exaggeration I think it is a reasonable observation backed up by the facts to say that the year 1963 was the biggest year in educational legislation for over a decade. Adding the library bill passed early in 1964 makes it a little hard to be guilty of exaggerating the progress made in such a short space of time. The 88th Congress will go down in history as a remarkable and significant one for education or, as President Johnson put it, the 1st session of the 88th Congress will go down in history as "The education Congress of 1963."

Congress last year became the whipping boy of the press. They said we had not moved fast enough and we are dragging our feet. Actually this was not true. We might have been a cautious Congress or, better expressed, a "Stop, look, and listen Congress." In the field of education instead of a do-little Congress, the true picture as far as education is concerned is that the Congress was a dedicated group working actively, intensely, and as the record shows effectively, to legislate in that vitally important area of American life—education.

I know you people are well informed and know that you know what I have said is true. My only purpose in choosing this theme today is that there might be a little publicity go out from this meeting or you might remind others of the quantity and quality of educational legislation passed last year. Now let's examine some of the specifics of just what this legislation tried to do and how it proposes to do it.

First, by whatever name it may be called, let us refer to H.R. 6143, known as the Higher Education Facilities Act. It is truly a major piece of legislation that will help all institutions of higher education expand their facilities both on the undergraduate and graduate level. Undergraduate schools are to be accorded grants of $690 million over a 3-year period which must be matched to help build facilities such as classrooms and research facilities. This has been appropriately called the "brick and mortar" act. I hope it is more than that and that it will stimulate the colleges themselves and even the alumni, like all of us here today, to impress upon the entire public of the need for more private interest in this area of education. This bill provides that 22 percent of these particular funds go to aid public community colleges and technical institutions. This means that the local community will become more aware of the ever-growing responsibilities to provide college education at community level.

Graduate education has not been neglected in this bill. $145 million in outright grants were authorized to help universities expand and extend existing graduate facilities and set up new graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. One of the important byproducts of this program will be to provide for the training of more and better college teachers and provide for more professionals in the crucial sciences and prepare for the increase by expansion of one of our greatest national resources—intellectual creativity.

H.R. 4955 is the second enactment in 1963 which was of great importance as a followup of the old National Defense Education Act of 1958. It extended and expanded the old act. Not only was provision for the authorization of student loans renewed, but was increased so that more students can receive help to attend college. This expanded loan program will enable some 70,000 to 90,000 additional students to attend college each year under an expanded loan program. Graduate fellowships were expanded and increased. Certainly, this was a valuable piece of legislation.

A third national education bill passed last year was the Vocational Education Act of 1963, H.R. 8720. Before its passage there was little doubt that our country's vocational education was lagging far behind its potential. The purpose of vocational education is to prepare youngsters for actual jobs and thus assist in fulfilling national manpower needs. We like to think of higher education as something almost universal today, but that is not really true. About 8 out of every 10 young people do not obtain a college education. Here was an area where Congress decided that by Federal aid it could do something down at the grassroots level to give education a real shot in the arm. The old program had been concentrated on agricultural training. The new program will provide for new and different training needs; $1,031 million over a 5-year period was authorized to the States to help them prepare young people for actual existing and anticipated job opportunities in a world which is increasingly automated and technical. This is a sort of legislation that will help with the high rate of dropouts and even enable students to earn wages, while at the same time go on with their schooling on the high school level. This was adapted to five demonstration or pilot areas in depressed regions of our country, mostly in Appalachia.

Still another important piece of legislation was the amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act. Specifically these amendments will permit youths 16 years of age and older, who may not be in school, who are inadequately prepared for employment to partake in a program of testing and job counseling and guidance and look to future schooling to prepare them for some needed work. Also, contained in this bill is a literacy program for adults who may be unlettered or illiterate, to acquire this fundamental tool for work in our modern world.

Another most important piece of legislation was the enactment of the Health Professions Education Assistance Act, H.R. 12. What I think happened was that the Congress at long last took notice of this Nation's growing lack of doctors and dentists and other professionals in the crucial health fields. The bill contained a construction aid provision so that medical schools can enlarge their facilities and provide loans for students which, we hope, will attract more young people into these professions. It is a reasonable conclusion to predict from 12,000 to 19,000 new persons will be attracted into these fields yearly.

But, the Congress did not stop with these mentioned, but went even further and enacted S. 1576, which might be said to be in the field of special education because it had to do with the training of the mentally retarded and other handicapped children. It was called the Mental Retardation Facilities Act and provided not only for facilities but for the training of more teachers and for study of the methods of educating physically and mentally handicapped youngsters. It also provided for extensive research into this neglected phase of education.

Although strictly speaking, the Library Services Act, S. 2265, may not come directly under the heading of "education legislation" the amendment in January 1964 to the old 1956 Library Services Act was really a legislative act in the furtherance of general education. The reason for this is that this act will provide educational benefits to countless numbers of people who can never go to colleges or universities and who will never be able to take advantage of the National Defense Education Act, or even of the Vocation Education Act, and who may not have enjoyed a high school education but nonetheless will have access to books and the knowledge contained in books. This bill will give the States aid on a matching basis to construct public library buildings while the old 1956 act provided for

benefits only to rural areas where there were antiquated library facilities or none at all. This new bill opens up the previously excluded urban areas to Federal aid to develop library facilities. The amounts of money authorized have been significantly upped.

Finally Congress, in January of this year, did not overlook the extension of another very important source of Federal assistance which would have expired. I refer to Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, known as the impacted areas bill. Both of these were extended for 2 years, and continue the important program of Federal assistance for the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools that are crowded by the presence of children of Federal personnel.

The wealth of education legislation passed by the 88th Congress ranges far and wide over the broad spectrum of American educational concerns. All the bills that were passed were patterned in direct response to actual and present demands for education by the people of our Nation. Yes, your Government did act on these topical education fields in 1963, but its task is by no means finished. The Federal Government must continue to play its legislative role in helping education in a complex society to fulfill the complex needs of our people, the Nation, and the world.

Before I sit down I would hope to take a minute or two to point out a challenge which I think exists to all of us who are interested in the area of education. Perhaps it should be described as the educational problems of the future, but by whatever description, I mean the challenging problem contained within the demand to give a college education to ever-increasing numbers of our young people.

The single biggest economic and social fact in American life today is growth. Our population expands from 2.8 to 2.9 million people every year. How long it will go on and where it will end, nobody knows. To show how it has affected our university—in the 1930's the enrollment was well under 4,000. It was in the 4,000 range in the 1940's; today, it is 21,800, with 15,000 on the Columbia campus.

So whether it is due to the war babies of the 1940's, or to just the overall population explosion, each and every year there are ever-increasing thousands of high school graduates who want to receive college degrees. Whatever the reason, it is a good thing these young people want a higher education because we are in a complex world and our international affairs have created a demand for thousands more young people educated in literally hundreds of specialties not limited just to science and math. We are told the number of students seeking a college education will nearly double in this decade. Faced with this challenge it seems time and I know it is necessary for every citizen to make up his mind that he is going to have to do a little more, and yes, this means pay a little more for education. But, it seems this support can come not from just one place but from four different but complementary levels, which I will mention briefly at this time.

1. Self help: This begins at home. The day when a local high school graduate can travel a few miles down the road and pay some nominal laboratory fee is gone. Also, the day is gone when a college education at the State university, except for the item of housing, costs no more than a high school education. The bidding by high school graduates for a chance to enroll in our colleges and universities is too great for this sort of thing ever to happen again. The fact is students and their parents must be prepared to help shoulder increasing expenses of modern education knowing that the returns will be commensurate with this great sacrifice.

2. A second source of help will be from the States. And interesting and yet not too well known fact is that the University of Missouri depends upon less than 50 percent of the total budget from State money. In 1962, only 44.4 percent of the university's budget was from the State of Missouri appropriations. But, individual States must continue to share responsibilities for educating citizenry. Missouri presently has 650,000 elementary students, 225,000 high school students, and 75,000 college students. This is our State's most outstanding resource and I am proud to say that my own Fourth Congressional District is one of the Nation's better educated congressional districts with a median of 11.1 years of school for adults compared with the national median of 10.6 years.

3. The third party in this four-way effort is, of course, the Federal Government and I don't think we need to dwell further on this effort because I don't think there can be any question but that the Federal Government met its responsibilities in this area during the past year. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, or the so-called brick and mortor bill, has been the object of the highest of praise by President Johnson when he described it as "the most significant education bill passed by Congress in the history of the Republic." I think the 88th Congress can truthfully say it reversed the downward trend of Federal assistance which began in 1952. Between 1952 and 1962 Federal help for elementary and secondary schools had dropped 25 percent and for higher education about 50 percent, but that was taken care of, I submit, rather effectively by the 88th Congress.

4. Now this brings us then to the 4th leg of the table. Recapitulating: 1. Self-help. 2. State help. 3. Federal help; and 4. Alumni help, and I refer to everyone in this room. Of course all of us belong to or are included within each of the first three segments of our society, that is, through tuition dollars we help pay the costs of educating our sons and daughters in colleges and universities; through our tax dollars we help both the State and Federal Governments. But, what I mentioned earlier, I must repeat, that the only way to meet this challenge for the huge but unpredictable numbers that will come to the campus gates for a university education, is that we will have to do a little more—yes, pay a little more.

I mentioned a moment ago that only 44.4 of the university's budget was from State of Missouri sources. That means 55.6 percent must come from other sources. At the present time only 10 percent of this comes from gifts and endowment income. I don't believe it is a classified matter or to any degree confidential that the university receives approximately $4 million in contributions annually. But, my message today is that private gifts must be stimulated. Public money alone cannot meet the challenge in the future. By 1980, it is estimated our university will have an enrollment of 40,000. It will not have to wrestle with this student population alone but will be increasingly called upon for various research services not limited to the old type agricultural experiment sort.

I am saying that based on facts, it is my opinion we will all have to increase our efforts as alumni—as former students of a great institution of learning—to increase our education, helped mold our lives, and to a large extent, made us the men and women we are today. I am not saying alumni support has been lacking in this country. It has been spontaneous and generous but it is no longer adequate. The problem has grown. The challenge has increased. And, in response, the support of alumni groups for their alma mater must grow proportionately.

This means more than an occasional donation or contribution to a fund or drive. Today the challenge is too great for that and the stakes are too high. University education will need the continued study and proportionately growing support of each and everyone of us.

We are the product of the American educational system. If we do not support that system what right have we to seek such help from others? How can we expect such contributions from others?

Education is not merely an end in itself but a public investment—an investment in our citizens, our Nation, and the future of America. No one can make a better investment for himself or his children, or his children's children, than to insure the students of today, who will be the leaders of tomorrow, the opportunity to enjoy a brighter, happier, prosperous, and, we pray, peaceful future.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1963, containing a statement by myself on the subject of Ukrainian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 46th anniversary of the proclamation issued by the National Council at Kiev, declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic.

On January 22, 1918, after a long struggle with their Russian overlords, the Ukrainian people announced to the world that henceforth their fate would be determined by themselves. This, Mr. President, was an historic event. Since the mid-17th century the Ukrainians had slaved under Russian masters; now they would be free to enjoy the advantages of national freedom and personal liberty.

But, unfortunately, the citizens of this land had but a brief time—less than 3 years—to enjoy independence. In 1920, establishing a pattern which was to repeat itself in many of the smaller Eastern European nations, the Soviet Union coldbloodedly overran the Ukraine and proclaimed her people liberated. Mr. President, we know very well that "liberation" by the Soviet Union means the end of human lives and human liberty.

Subsequently the Soviet Union followed a consistent policy of premeditated colonialism in Eastern Europe. It usurped the right of self-government from the unlucky peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. It encroached upon the freedom of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Its bloodspattered tentacles turned Poland and Albania into slave states. Mr. President, these are only a few of many examples.

The Ukrainian people have suffered greatly under Communist rule. After the peasants refused to join the Soviet-established collective farms, close to 5 million people died in an enforced famine. Over 2,400,000 Ukrainians were forcibly deported to unknown parts of Siberia.

Mr. President, in my State of Pennsylvania there are a large number of people of Ukrainian birth or descent. I have had the good fortune to know many of these citizens, and understand their dreams, their dedication to their former homeland, their fervent desire to retain their colorful and centuries-old traditions.

The Ukrainians have never forgotten their national heroes. Many Ukrainian organizations and individuals worked hard for legislation—now public law—to authorize a statue in honor of Shevchenko, the famous Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter. I am told that the ground for the Shevchenko Memorial here in Washington will be dedicated during this year. We can all view with much inspiration this unquenchable desire by the Ukrainians to keep alive a national heritage.

Mr. President, I join my fellow Americans in bringing congratulations to the Ukrainian people and in the hope that the freedom we enjoy in the United States can become a way of life for all the lands cow controlled by communism.

Bearings and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most essential elements of our entire defense mechanism is a strong and dynamic ball and roller bearing industry. Not a truck will run, an airplane fly, or a ship sail the seas unless we have ball and roller bearings. Bearings in some form are almost as old as the wheel itself and just as essential to the progress of mankind.

Recently, Mr. John N. Cole, of the law firm of Maguire, Cole & Bentley of Stamford, Conn., appeared before the Trade Information Committee urging that bearings and components be reserved from the GATT negotiations. He has presented a most forceful argument for protection of our national defense productive needs. In addition Mr. H. O. Smith, secretary-manager of the Anti-Friction Bearing Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York City, filed a brief with the committee further pinpointing the need for this reservation. This is all too mindful of the old story of "for want of a nail the battle was lost."

I urge a careful reading of the following brief:

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF RESERVATION OF ANTI-FRICTION BEARINGS AND THEIR COMPONENT PARTS FROM GATT NEGOTIATIONS

The commodities of interest and their tariff schedule item numbers are:

Antifriction balls and rollers, TSUS item No. 680.30.

Ball or roller bearings and parts thereof, TSUS item No. 680.35.

Antifriction bearings are precision mechanisms whereby sliding friction is changed to rolling friction, thus eliminating many of the barriers to high speed in revolving parts of machinery. Basically, the conventional bearing consists of (1) an annular ring; (2) a row of balls or rollers in a "cage" or "separator"; (3) an outer annular ring, with one ring revolving around the other by means of the rolling elements (balls or rollers). There are many different types and subtypes, each made to suit a certain condition or set of conditions, including such factors as the amount and directional force of the load to which it is subjected, the speed of its revolutions, the temperatures under which it must operate, and the space in which it must be installed. There are many thousands of different sizes and types of antifriction bearings performing vital functions in millions of machines—automobiles and trucks, trains and aircraft, cranes and tractors, ships and machine tools, military hardware and missiles, dental drills and power saws, and a multitude of other uses.

Estimated 1963 sales of antifriction bearings, balls or rollers, were approximately $900 million.

The producing companies make one or more of the four general commodity lines—ball bearings, roller bearings, balls and rollers—in varying combinations.

The Anti-Friction Bearing Manufacturers Association (AFBMA) has 39 members, who are listed in schedule A. Their 1963 sales amounted to approximately 90 percent of total industry sales.

THE REASONS FOR RESERVING ANTI-FRICTION BEARINGS, BALLS AND ROLLERS

I. No product is more vital to national security than antifriction bearings.

II. In spite of the high production and management standards of the bearings industry, domestic production is being replaced by imports at an alarming rate.

THE INDUSTRY IS ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Antifriction bearings are the life blood of U.S. industry. Without antifriction bearings, there could be none of our modern machinery.

Even if there were no imports, there would be serious shortages of antifriction bearings in case of war or serious emergency. Such was the case before and during World War II and during the Korean war.

The U.S. bearings industry was far from adequate before Pearl Harbor, as shown by a report on a meeting of the Industry Defense Committee held at Washington on March 11, 1941, attended, among others, by Mr. William L. Batt, director of production at OPM, and Major J. F. Early, representing the Department of Defense. A spokesman for the industry reported that there was "abundant capacity for particular lines, such as autos, trucks, tractors and farm machinery, but that there is a shortage in aviation lines and in aircraft roller bearings which are precision specials." Such shortages existed in spite of the fact that there had been an increase in production man-hours of 230 percent from January 1939 to January 1941.

The minutes of another meeting of the Industry Defense Committee held October 2, 1941, and attended, among others, by representatives of OPM and the Defense Department, report a discussion of the new bomber program and tank requirements and then tersely state that "after receiving the figures from the Aircraft and Ordnance Departments, the discussions indicated that there was not sufficient capacity in the [bearing] industry for certain sizes and types to meet the program." The minutes include the following statement:

"Major Early summed up his discussions by stating that there are two problems that called for prompt action; namely, (1) meeting immediate needs, and (2) obtaining overall requirements by months and to do some long-range planning with the solution of the problem in the hands of the industry. Major Early stressed the fact that the situation is assuming critical proportions and prompt action has to be taken."

A memorandum of a meeting scheduled by the Army Air Corps Unit held at Dayton, Ohio, in March 1942, states:

"[Captain] Carney stated requirements of aviation (including Navy, lend-lease, etc.) for bearings in different categories. Representatives of companies presently engaged in manufacturing aircraft bearings stated present production and projected production July 1, 1942, January 1, 1943, and July 1, 1943. Many shortages appeared."

The serious inadequacy of the bearings industry to meet the prewar emergency requirements and the wartime requirements is further confirmed by a war production report prepared by Mr. Howard Sauer of that agency, who was active in the emergency efforts indicated by the discussions referred to above. Mr. Sauer's report includes the following statement:

"Common types of bearings were always sold almost entirely from manufacturers' and dealers' shelf stocks. These had always taken care of spot demands from all types of users. The depletion of these stocks early in the war became a real and serious problem. Machines and vehicles of all types were affected by this stoppage and inestimable damage was done to the civilian economy, war production, and transportation. Further, bearings production itself was affected by the exhaustion of shelf stocks because when conditions became desperate on a certain size, a short run was required and this retarded overall production."

The extent of the strain upon the industry involved in meeting World War II requirements is reflected in the increase in industry sales from $94,800,000, in 1939 to $143 million, in 1940. There was another wartime period of bearing shortages in the early stages of the Korean war because of the great increase in the military and civilian requirements for bearings which resulted in an increase in industry sales from $298 million for 1950 to $625 million for 1951.

The vital importance of a nation's bearing industry to its very existence is shown by the persistent and costly efforts of the Allies to cripple the German bearing industry in World War II and by the equally impressive efforts of the Germans to protect the industry.

The plant of one company in Schweinfurt was the object of 15 different bombing raids.

The German bearing industry was vulnerable in that a large part of its ball production was concentrated in a single plant at Ebern, near Schweinfurt.

The crucial situation of the Germans, caused by Allied bombing, required their utmost efforts in salvaging and rebuilding. This work included a dispersal program under which the bearings industry was reinstated as well as possible in numerous small towns around Schweinfurt. In spite of such efforts, the output of bearings was greatly reduced, with serious consequences for the German war effort.

A very cogent consideration concerning the World War II and Korean War shortages of bearings is that the domestic industry was, on both occasions, in a much better position to meet the emergency demands than would be the case with the domestic industry under present conditions. The bearings industry before World War II and the Korean War was virtually self-sufficient as distinguished from the present-day large-scale participation of foreign suppliers. Consequently, the inability of the industry to meet demands was in no way due to the necessity of replacing foreign sources of supply, as today would be the case, but was entirely caused by the tremendous expansion in requirements for defense and essential civilian needs.

THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IS BEING REPLACED BY IMPORTS

Applicable tariff rates have been cut drastically since 1930. The rates on bearings have been cut from 45 percent ad valorem and 0.10 specific to 15 percent ad valorem and 0.034 specific. The rates on balls and rollers have been cut from 45 percent ad valorem and 0.10 specific to 12½ percent ad valorem and 0.04 specific. The rates in effect since 1930 are shown on schedule B.

There was no reduction in rates in 1960. This association participated in the hearings before the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information in 1960

and urged that there should be no further reduction because of the importance of the industry to national security, as the association urges upon this committee at this time.

The dollar amounts of annual imports from individual countries for the period from 1958 through 1963 are shown on appendix C. That table shows an increase in total imports for the period of 590 percent and an increase in Japanese imports of 46,140 percent. In other words, 1963 Japanese imports were 460 times as much as 1958 Japanese imports.

The import figures for Japanese ball bearings, which have constituted the principal type of Japanese bearing imports, were as follows:

1958	$16,914
1959	1,449,621
1960	2,313,561
1961	3,172,076
1962	6,256,592
1963 estimated (11 months)	8,496,824

As shown by these figures, there has been a constant forward surge of Japanese ball bearing imports.

It should be noted that the Japanese import figures in this brief are based upon the so-called home market values. Such figures are far below the price levels of the domestic industry. Accordingly, the fact that 1963 Japanese imports are stated in the amount of $9,872,254, necessarily means that domestic sales of a much greater value, probably in excess of $17 million, were replaced by the Japanese imports.

Apart from constituting a threat to the national security, Japanese bearing imports are further detrimental because of the resulting injury to the domestic industry with serious consequences for both employers and employees. Analysis of the character of the Japanese imports clearly shows, that as a result of concentration upon a particular segment of the bearings market, the resulting damage is concentrated upon those who are engaged in that segment of the business.

Most of the Japanese imports have been ball bearings having an outer diameter measurement of from 30 to 52 millimeters and being of ABEC standards 1 and 3. Such bearings are sold in large quantities for use in such items as small electric motors, automotive equipment, household appliances and agricultural equipment. This particular segment of the bearings business has been most attractive to the Japanese manufacturers because it offered sales in large volume to original equipment customers, thereby involving a minimum of selling and engineering expenses. It is estimated that the Japanese have captured approximately 20 percent of this segment of the bearings business. The consequent loss of business by the domestic industry is clearly shown by figures reported to the Business and Defense Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. According to those figures, sales for the category of bearings designated as "Over 30–52 millimeters O.D. BEC 1 and 3" amounted to 48,823,793 units for the first 6 months of 1962 as compared with 41,717,822 units for the first 6 months of 1963.

While total imports increased by 590 percent from 1958 to 1963, the increase in the domestic industry production was only 53 percent and the exports of the industry increased by only 74 percent.

In 1960 this association brought to the attention of the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information the increase in Japanese bearings from $510,720 for the first 6 months of 1959 to $1,508,232 for the first 6 months of 1960. We then stated that the flood of imports was well advanced; that the situation was a serious one and was rapidly becoming very much worse. The 1959 figure now appears minor in comparison with the figure of $9,872,254 for Japanese imports for 1963.

THE REASONS FOR THE INCREASE IN IMPORTS

The general increase in imports of bearings and the extraordinary increase in the imports of Japanese bearings are readily explained. Paradoxically, this highly critical defense industry is highly susceptible to foreign competition.

The basic factor, as with industry in general, is, of course, the lower labor cost in the foreign industrial countries. Starting with this incontestable premise, the contributing conditions are the international standards of antifriction bearings; the high labor content in manufacturing costs; the modern machinery and methods widely employed abroad, largely as a result of U.S. financial aid; low shipping costs in relation to value, and assistance to foreign exporters through various types of government and private arrangements.

The disparity in labor costs has surely been urged upon this Commission so strenuously that there is no occasion to add further tables and estimates. In view of the considerable uncertainty regarding Japanese labor costs, reference may properly be made to the statement issued in 1963 by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development entitled "Japan in the Free World Economy," which states, after reviewing the numerous Japanese fringe benefits (p. 24):

"We have been unable to arrive at any reliable estimate of Japanese labor costs that takes account of all these factors. It seems clear that comprehensive figures would not show Japanese labor costs, per hour of work, to be so low as is suggested by the comparison of regular cash wages alone. Nevertheless, Japanese labor costs per hour are probably somewhat below those of Italy, i.e., about half the cost of labor in Germany and France, and about a fifth to a fourth of the U.S. cost."

With such favorable conditions, it is easy to understand why the relatively unimportant bearings industry which existed in Japan until recent years was one of the industries selected by Japanese planners for "rationalization" as a result of heavy capital investment to complement U.S. financial aid and with production directed in large measure in the direction of the U.S. market.

This association brings to the attention of this committee grounds for belief that the Japanese bearings industry, with Japanese Government assistance, is engaged in industry practices, in its efforts to invade the U.S. market, which violate the principles of free competition prevalent throughout the U.S. economy. It is generally recognized that U.S. concepts of free competition have not been adopted by Japanese industrialists.

The prevalence in Japanese industry of government and private control is acknowledged by the Committee for Economic Development in its above-mentioned study, which states (p. 34):

"Government economic regulation is clearly more pervasive in Japan than in the United States. Moreover, a much larger sector of industry is controlled by business complexes and business associations than in the United States."

Numerous articles in the Japanese press indicate that there is reason to believe that such government and private arrangements have been employed for the purpose of increasing Japanese bearing exports. Thus, an article in the Japan Times of January 29, 1962, states: "It was long ago that six major bearing companies of Japan established self-controlling measures for the orderly export of some of the bearings demanded by consumers."

The article goes on to say that the measures were enforced at the sanctioning of the Fair Trade Committee and the International Trade and Industry Ministry. The article then names six bearing companies and states that "they have set up the Japan Bearing Export Council for joint self-controlling and the organ is studying the oversea markets to stabilize prices of exported Japanese bearings."

Another newspaper article reporting private industry control with government assistance, appearing in the Yomiuri on October 16, 1961, reported on a program for the allocation of the manufacture of particular parts, in order to accomplish the cost savings that would result from mass production. The article mentioned that the plan had the approval of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry.

It is submitted that the facts justify an expectation of further aggressive selling efforts on the part of the Japanese industry and further increases in their percentage of the U.S. market, if tariff rates continue at their present level. The past success of the Japanese manufacturers, as well as other foreign suppliers in increasing their U.S. sales, indicates that the existing duties present no barrier. Any reduction of the duties would only accelerate the rate of deterioration of the domestic industry.

As stated above, the Japanese suppliers have largely concentrated on a few standard large-volume sizes. Their success in this area against the background of their modern facilities, excess capacity, and concerted industry effort, with government assistance and guidance, furnish every reason to anticipate the broadening of their attack on the U.S. market.

Under the circumstances which have developed in the bearings industry, in large measure because of past drastic reductions in tariff rates, it would be reasonable to expect U.S. manufacturers to have developed foreign branches and this has actually been the case with a number of outstanding U.S. companies. It is to be expected that their number will increase. It is obvious that such companies are in a position to fight fire with fire and to import low-cost bearings into the United States to compete with other low-cost imported bearings whenever circumstances call for such a policy. Such a development would furnish the domestic industry's sales and threaten the industry's war potential.

A further respect in which increasing imports threaten the national security concerns the very extensive research programs being conducted by individual companies and through industry sponsorship. A review of the new uses to which bearings are being put in modern military equipment is enough to demonstrate the importance of constant research and improvement.

The bearing industry has spent millions of dollars on the problem of prolonging the life of a bearing by overcoming the factors of fatigue. Study of the causes of fatigue and overcoming them are of vital importance to success in the missile and spacecraft fields.

Costly and intensive research programs have been required to meet the ever-increasing aircraft performance requirements for the jet age, to satisfy the missile and space industries, to produce the superquiet bearings required for electric motors and pumps in the new nuclear submarines.

The above are merely examples of the great amount of research activity that is expected of the domestic industry and which the domestic industry is willing and ready to perform. The ability of the domestic companies to continue and expand such research activity will, at the least, be placed in doubt by a continuance of the increasing rate of imports.

We submit that it would be contrary to the national interest and unfair to these domestic companies which have assumed such extensive research programs, and accompanying cost increases, to give another assist, by way of further tariff reduction, to the already overfavored foreign manufac-

turer who has no concern with such research work.

CONCLUSION

The Anti-Friction Bearing Manufacturers Association submits that the President should reserve antifriction bearings, balls and rollers from the coming GATT negotiations, and that, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, this Committee should recommend that the President take such action. Such special action should be taken under the provisions of section 232(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 that "no action shall be taken * * * to decrease or eliminate the duty * * * on any article if the President determines that such reduction or elimination would threaten to impair the national security."

The extent of the Nation's reliance upon the domestic bearings industry has been indicated by actual experience before and during World War II and the Korean war. Even starting with a self-sufficient domestic industry, the supply of bearings was insufficient for military and essential civilian needs as demonstrated by the fact that the struggle for a supply of bearings that was going on in March of 1941 was continuing in March of 1942 with serious shortages still continuing.

In 1960, against a background of 1959 imports in the amount of $10 million, this association urged upon the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information, not only that there be no further reduction in tariff rates, but that such rates be increased for reasons of national security. While there was no further reduction in tariff rates, the request for an increase in rates was denied, and, since that time, imports have increased in volume to an estimated figure of $19 million for 1963.

This association respectfully urges that antifriction bearings and components be reserved from GATT negotiations, in the association's efforts to maintain that preparedness that is essential to the safeguarding of the national security as contemplated by Congress. Accordingly, this association calls upon this Committee to take action within the area of its responsibility in recommending reservation from the GATT negotiations.

Respectfully submitted.

THE ANTI-FRICTION BEARING MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

H. O. SMITH, *Secretary-Manager*.

SCHEDULE A—MEMBERS OF THE ANTI-FRICTION BEARING MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

The Abbott Ball Co., Hartford, Conn.

Aetna Bearing Division of Textron, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

American Roller Bearing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Auburn Ball Bearing Co., Rochester, N.Y.

The Barden Corp., Danbury, Conn.

Brenco, Inc., Petersburg, Va.

Chain Belt Co., Downers Grove, Ill.

The Fafnir Bearing Co., New Britain, Conn.

The Federal Bearing Co., Inc., Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearings, Inc., Detroit, Mich.

Freeway Washer & Stamping Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

General Bearing Co., West Nyack, N.Y.

Hartford Steel Ball Co., Inc., Hartford, Conn.

Hoover Ball & Bearing Co., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Hyatt Bearings Division, General Motors Corp., Harrison, N.J.

Industrial Tectonics, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Keystone Engineering Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Kilian Manufacturing Corp., Syracuse, N.Y.

Link-Belt Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Marlin-Rockwell Corp., Jamestown, N.Y.

McGill Manufacturing Co., Valparaiso, Ind.

Messinger Bearings, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc., Keene, N.H.

National Bearings Co., Lancaster, Pa.

New Departure Division, General Motors Corp., Bristol, Conn.

New Hampshire Ball Bearings, Inc., Peterborough, N.H.

Norma-Hoffmann Bearing Co., Division of Universal American Corp., Stamford, Conn.

Orange Roller Bearing Co., Inc., Orange, N.J.

Pioneer Steel Ball Co. Inc., Unionville, Conn.

Rollway Bearing Co. Inc., Syracuse, N.Y.

Rotek, Inc., Ravenna, Ohio.

SKF Industries, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Smith Bearing Division, Accurate Bushing Co., Garwood, N.J.

Sterling Commercial Steel Ball Corp., Sterling, Ill.

The Superior Steel Ball Co., New Britain, Conn.

The Timken Roller Bearing Co., Canton, Ohio.

The Torrington Co., Torrington, Conn.

Universal Ball Co., Roanoke, Va.

Winsted Precision Ball Corp., Winstead, Conn.

SCHEDULE B.—*Tariff rate changes since 1930*

	Bearings		Balls	
	Ad valorem	Specific	Ad valorem	Specific
	Percent		*Percent*	
1930	45	0.10	45	0.10
1939	35	.08	35	.08
1945			25	.08
1948			25	.04
1950	17½	.04	12½	.04
1956	16½	.038		
1957	15½	.036		
1958	15	.034		

Schedule C.—Imports

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963 [1]	1963 [2]
Canada	$381,380	$1,426,623	$1,528,865	$1,644,439	$2,177,565	$2,006,577	$2,188,993
Sweden	373,043	910,174	783,129	540,948	486,098	284,930	310,832
United Kingdom	442,634	2,002,573	1,234,982	801,091	1,409,510	1,527,247	1,666,087
West Germany	1,033,008	3,126,847	2,395,346	2,177,372	3,680,328	3,140,634	3,426,146
Switzerland	236,160	337,813	543,965	514,543	662,247	470,211	512,957
Spain				14,003	41,860	62,130	67,778
Italy	73,499	59,372	173,480	130,094	246,822	369,999	403,634
Japan	21,349	1,988,585	2,813,431	3,738,071	6,711,235	9,049,567	9,872,254
France	125,565	355,405	345,597	287,322	387,131	478,892	522,427
Norway		150	3,086	366	2,179	873	952
Denmark		333		1,012	2,280	7,446	8,122
Netherlands		1,544	7,250	1,269	34,912	4,906	5,352
Belgium	361	2,342	4,692	2,574	3,575	3,193	3,483
Austria	102,934	184,936	366,375	269,475	387,985	254,789	277,951
Republic of South Africa				104	38,283		
Czechoslovakia			771	704			
India			1,017			1,135	1,238
Mexico			2,372			500	545
Country of origin unknown			448				
Ireland		968	625				
Australia			118				
Total	2,789,933	10,397,665	10,205,549	10,123,387	16,272,010	17,663,029	19,268,752

[1] 11 months.
[2] Estimated by adding 1/11 of 1963 11 months' figures.

Americans Do Not Cry Alone—Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tribute to President John F. Kennedy by Dr. G. T. Mitau be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Dr. Mitau is chairman of the Department of Political Science of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn. He was in Washington with a group of foreign journalists at the time of the assassination, and his eulogy, given shortly afterward was printed in the Macalester College magazine.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS DO NOT CRY ALONE

(By Dr. G. T. Mitau)

All day they had come to pay their respects to the fallen leader. Governors, Senators, Congressmen, judges, and then the Ambassadors from a hundred nations.

It had been a gray and rainy day in Washington on Saturday, as if the sky wanted a share in America's grief and in the heartache of the entire free world.

Finally it was our turn. Along with our 15 foreign journalists we walked slowly past the ceremonial guard at the grand portal of the White House. Inside the silence seemed overpowering—a tragic contrast with the laughter and joy of happy children that must have echoed through this house only hours ago. We had good reasons to be proud of our Nation's first family.

The line of mourners wound its way slowly through the diplomatic reception room on toward the east room.

The President's flag-draped coffin, the guard of honor, and the four tall candles seemed to constitute the center of the world. Somehow one could sense the hearts of millions of people reaching out to pay homage to a courageous man who had given his life for his country.

Our minds went back to that cold winter morning on January 20, 1961, when John F.

Kennedy delivered his inaugural address. To words that then sounded strong and full of promise were now added new dimensions of prophecy and tragedy.

"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

Like so many other men of great talent and intellect, John F. Kennedy was a man of many facets. Though born to wealth and comfort, he understood the discontent and the impatience of the American Negro with the slow rate of progress towards full equality and human dignity. He viewed their struggle as the most poignant moral crisis that the American people had to resolve and resolve now. He lacked no empathy for the problems of the poor, the underprivileged, the sick in body and mind, for the aged, and for those in need of jobs and skills.

His fight for social justice was persistent and principled. He fully realized that while man might not be able to "fashion the good society," he could catch "an unforgettable glimpse of it."

An untiring advocate of peace, this intellectually brilliant and sensitive man had warned his fellow countrymen and the world that "together we shall either save our planet or together we shall perish in its flames." He prudently insisted that at the bargaining table our patience shall be "nearly inexhaustible" and "our hopes for peace unfailing."

One short line of prayer to thank God for the good that his servant had done, one last glance over the shoulder to fix for life the quiet dignity and pathos of the occasion, and we must leave the East Room.

In the executive wing of the White House are located the offices which form the physical nerve center for presidential leadership—the President's own oval office, the cabinet room, the officers of the personal staff—the men closely involved with the President in the enormously complex and intricate process of day-to-day policymaking.

Now only 24 hours after the assassination, Mr. Kennedy's office looked bare and cold. Gone was the famous rocking chair, all of his books, papers, and personal effects. It was difficult to recall without tears the picture of that little 3 year old, peeking from beneath the desk and romping about the room while his Dad was engaged in affairs of state. Le roi est mort, vive le roi—the King is Dead, Long Live the King.

Our group had come from many lands, our skins were of all shades, our religion encompassed diverse faiths, our politics differed. But as we moved through this silent house we found ourselves united in a spirit of love, and of reverence and of unspeakable sadness.

The Americans in our group suddenly realized that our country was not crying alone. John F. Kennedy's humor, heart, and humaneness, his capacity for wisdom and inspiration, his energy and his dedication had earned him the admiration, respect, and affection among men of good will throughout the world.

As we left the silent, brightly lit house to go back into the rainy November night, the challenge of President Kennedy's inaugural seemed more appropriate than ever: "With good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our needs, let us go forth, to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

Appeal Brief Filed on Behalf of Former Congressman Johnson, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the very important appeal brief filed by George Cochran Doub on behalf of former Representative Johnson, of Maryland, under the speech and debate clause of the Constitution.

Mr. Doub's appeal brief on behalf of Congressman Johnson continues:

Tenney v. *Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 372, 377, involved the charge that members of a California legislative committee had violated a civil conspiracy law of the United States. The opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter for a unanimous Supreme Court rejected the contention of the Government that the constitutional privilege did not extend to an accusation that legislative conduct was done for a dishonest or corrupt purpose or in violation of a Federal law.

2. The contention of the Government that the constitutional provision should be interpreted as limited only to the protection of the content of a speech in Congress but not to one having a criminal motivation is at war with the language of the Constitution and its basic historic objective because that provision denies any jurisdiction to any court in the limited area of speech and debate in the Congress. In order to prevent a malicious or unjustified or improper charge from being made by the executive power—and so the humiliation and intimidation of the elective representatives of the people in the exercise of their official functions—the Bill of Rights and later the Constitution prohibited the executive from making any charges, valid or invalid, justified or unjustified, by vesting the exclusive authority as to such matters in the tribunals of the Senate and the House. These matters were put beyond the pale of the King and the King's men. The prohibition was absolute.

If the Founding Fathers had intended that the constitutional provision be narrowly interpreted, as the Government contends, it may be assumed that they would have said so and in such event the provision would have read: "for the content of any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place" or "for any speech or debate in any House which is not made for a criminal purpose, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

The history of constitutional liberty emphatically repudiates the restrictive interpretation claimed by the Government. That history makes clear that it prohibition was intended to enable the elective representatives of the people to speak in the legislative branch of the Government free from any possibility that they be degraded, intimidated, discredited, or oppressed by any accusation of the executive power impeaching speech or debate in any other place. As Blackstone said: "The privilege of Parliament was principally established in order to protect its members not only from being molested by their fellow subjects but also more especially from being oppressed by the power of the Crown."

3. The position of the Government in the district court was that, when a Congressman makes a speech "for an illegal or corrupt purpose, the reason for the immunity afforded by the constitutional privilege ceases." In effect, the Government claimed it is free to charge, and the judiciary to hear, an indictment of a speech provided the executive alleges criminal or dishonest motivation. Under its theory, the test of the application of the constitutional prohibition is whether the executive claims a dishonest or criminal purpose. This is constitutional hearsay.

First. The constitutional prohibition is not cast in terms or propriety or impropriety or rightful or wrongful purpose, or lawful or criminal purpose. On the contrary, the prohibition is absolute.

Second. In Tenney, decided as recently as 1950, the Supreme Court explicitly rejected the contention of the Government that its claim of an unworthy, dishonest, or criminal purpose avoids the privilege. It pointed out that the principle would be of little value if Members of Congress could be subjected to the burdens of a trial or to the hazard of a jury's speculations as to motives, and it concluded (p. 378): "Courts are not the place for such controversies, self-descipline, and the voters must be the ultimate reliance for discouraging or correcting such abuses."

Third. The constitutional prohibition, first defined in the Bill of Rights of 1688, largely came into being by reason of the prosecutions of members of the House of Commons for alleged unlawful speech in the House. Under the Government's naive concept that the constitutional prohibition does not apply when the Department of Justice charges that a speech was made for a criminal purpose, the prosecution of members of the House of Commons could have been maintained even after enactment of the Bill of Rights.

The Government's reasoning, if accepted, would mean that the executive could even charge that a speech was treasonous or seditious or criminally libelous (assuming there was no constitutional definition of treason and Congress had adopted a sedition act or a criminal libel act) because in each of these instances the Government would be entitled to assert as it did below that "when a Congressman perverts his power and uses it for an illegal or corrupt purpose, the reason for the immunity afforded by the constitutional privilege ceases."

Fourth. The Government attempted to separate the inseparable when it claimed in the district court that it was not challenging the content of the speech but only its venal purpose. The motivation of speech or debate is so related to content, they are indistinguishable for no words are spoken or written without a purpose. The effort of the Government to distinguish between an attack upon the spoken word and an attack upon the criminal purpose of the word involves sophistry as well as an invitation to the emasculation of the constitutional principle.

4. The district court attempted to evade the clear prohibition of article I, section 6, as well as the decisions of the Supreme Court in Kilbourn and Tenney, by holding that it applied only to libel, slander, treason, and sedition, and, therefore, it did not apply to a charge of conspiracy (App. 55). Since no English or American court had ever before made such a ruling the district court attempted to rely upon textbooks on constitutional law (app. 55). These writers say that the constitutional prohibition precludes actions of libel, slander, treason, and sedition (which were of the kind involved historically in the development of the constitutional principle). Not a single textbook, however, suggests, directly or by inference, that the constitutional provision should be deemed limited to these particular forms of action. The text writers evidently believed that they were mentioning all known forms of civil and criminal actions which could attempt to question speech or debate. If the ruling of the district court were accepted, the unrestricted principle of the Constitution would

become drastically limited, if not sterilized, for its jurisdictional barrier against criminal prosecutions by the state for speech or debate would serve little purpose. The state could as readily intimidate and oppress the elective representatives of the people by the threat of a conspiracy charge as in the case of a treason or sedition charge.

Finally: The only way the Government could even attempt to question this speech or any other speech is by way of a charge under this conspiracy statute. The collaboration by a member of Congress with others in the making of a speech, the making of a speech in the Congress due to self-interest or for personal gain and the distribution of copies of a speech are not substantive offenses under any criminal law of the United States. The Government and the district court conceded that the constitutional provision precludes the Government from making a charge of treason, sedition or criminal libel with respect to a speech made in the Congress. Yet, this concession is meaningless because the constitutional definition of treason precludes any charge of treason from being leveled at speech or debate; there have been no sedition laws in the United States since 1800; and there has never been a Federal criminal libel law. Thus, the Government's interpretation of the limited scope of this historic constitutional principle if accepted, would effectively sterilize if from any utility or significance in the world in which we now live because the executive would be free to charge, and the judiciary to hear, an accusation that a Member of Congress conspired to defraud the Government by making a speech in the Congress for a gratuity or for profit.

5. In sustaining the conspiracy charge, the district court attempted to rely upon the fact that Congress has enacted statutes making it an offense for Members of Congress to accept bribes in connection with their action, vote or decision (app. 54). The pertinency of these statutes in not involved in this case because Johnson was not charged in this indictment with violating any of these statutes or comspiring to do so. If the Government had done so, it would be our position (1) these statutes could not be construed as applying to speech or debate because they carefully refrained from including them, and (2) even if it had wished to do so, Congress could not, under the Constitution, enact a statute making it a criminal offense for a Member of Congress to collaborate with others in the preparation of a speech in the Congress or to accept compensation for making such a speech. Such an exercise of Congressional power could only be found in an unambiguous, definitive statutory declaration and even then it would be unconstitutional.

The Church and the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my reply to a letter from a sincere but, in my opinion, misguided minister of a fine Protestant denomination.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
March 4, 1964.

DEAR MR. ———: I have read with interest your letter of March 2, in which you urge me to vote for and use my influence to pass without amendment the pending civil rights bill, H.R. 7152.

In the last paragraph you say you will be interested in knowing the way I vote and hope that I will not be a party to filibustering at the expense of the American people.

I regret that I cannot share your belief that the pending civil rights bill would, as you say, promote the welfare of our own Nation and benefit our world image. I think that the bill was born of political expediency and rocked in the cradle of racial violence; that it contains violations of the Constitution which I have taken a solemn oath to support and uphold; that it contains provisions that are unfair to all property owners; and, last but not least, that it is a trend to a centralized form of government which could eventually end in dictatorship. Therefore, I intend not only to vote against it but to oppose it to the best of my ability.

I do not question your good intentions to promote the civil liberty of the nonwhites through this unconstitutional means, but I hope you have not forgotten the old maxim, "Hell is paved with good intentions."

Our present form of Government has lasted longer than any present form of government in the world. The reason that it has lasted is because of the wonderful wisdom of our Founding Fathers in placing limitations upon the powers of the central Government, leaving all others to the sovereign States that formed a new Union or to the people thereof. Historians are agreed that those who framed our Constitution had enjoyed an unexcelled preparation in the study of political science and political history for the job to be done. Gladstone, one of Great Britain's truly great Prime Ministers, said that their product was the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man. Those who framed the Constitution knew the dangers of tyranny and eventual dictatorship that were inherent in a strong central government. So they framed a Constitution which they thought would safeguard them against such dangers. But many Virginians, led by the eloguent Patrick Henry, felt that the job of safeguarding the rights of the States and of the people had not been accomplished and they urged the Virginia Convention of 1788 not to ratify the Philadelphia Constitution. It was only because of the tremendous influence of George Washington, the cold logic of James Madison, and the firm promise of Madison and others that protective amendments would be offered to the Constitution to preserve personal freedom, that a majority voted to ratify the Philadelphia Constitution—and, even then, it was ratified by a slim majority.

I know that you are as grateful as I am for the religious freedom written into the first amendment, as otherwise there might not be today a Baptist church, to which I belong, or a Brethren church, to which you belong. It goes without saying that you want to preserve in full vigor the first amendment, which also assures you of freedom of speech and the right to petition Congress.

But the biggest issue debated in the Virginia Convention of 1788 was whether or not the new Union would be a Federal Union; namely, one composed of sovereign States, and of strictly delegated powers, with all other powers reserved to the States or the people thereof. That very fundamental and essential principle of government was embodied in the 10th amendment. The bill that you advocate does violence to that amendment. No one believes stronger than I in the Jeffersonian principle of equality, which includes equality in the sight of man as well as equality in the sight of God. But nothing could do greater violence of the Jeffersonian term "all men are created equal" than to interpret it to mean "created with equal physical strength, equal brains, equal right to an abundance of physical possessions, etc." What that term meant—and all that it meant—was:

1. That God is our Creator and He has endowed us with certain inalienable rights.

2. That in the Republic which we plan to establish all citizens should enjoy equal political rights. That included the right to participate in Government, the right to acquire and possess property, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Implicit, however, in those fundamental rights was the necessary restriction that they must be enjoyed in a manner that would not impinge upon equal enjoyment of similar rights by others.

We now have on the statute books ample State and Federal laws to protect all of the political rights, guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution including the 14th amendment. The enforcement of those laws would be a bit more tedious than would be the case under the pending civil rights bill. Under existing law a charge of a violation of a civil right is an offense that must be established in a court of competent jurisdiction, whereas under the pending civil rights bill it can be established by the ipse dixit of a Federal bureaucrat. Again, when a man under existing law is accused of a civil rights offense which carries a criminal penalty, he is entitled under the Constitution, to a trial by jury. This cherished constitutional right would be denied by the pending bill.

In conclusion, I respectfully suggest that the fundamental reason why our form of government has lasted longer than the present government of any other nation, and why under it we have enjoyed more personal prosperity and political freedom than the people of any other nation, is because the Founding Fathers, in their great wisdom, combined a maximum of political freedom with the very definite assumption that we were a Christian nation. They founded a representative democracy upon a belief in God and His inspired word as recorded in the Holy Bible and they believed that our form of self-government would include the self-government of Christian character which would prevent us from turning liberty into license.

You ask in the second paragraph of your letter that I break with tradition. As long as I have the honor and privilege of serving you in the Senate, I shall never break with the traditions which I have described above because if I do, I feel that I would be inviting the utter destruction of the 10th amendment and the bulwark of independent and sovereign States that now stands between us and an ultimate dictatorship.

Faithfully yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

National Football League Says It Won't Show Friday Games on National TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the National Football League

indicated plans earlier this year to broadcast five professional football games on Friday night television across the country. This announced action certainly posed a grave threat to every city and town in the United States whose high schools have regularly scheduled football games on Friday nights. This type encroachment by television could well turn this local spectator sport into a shamble across the Nation, thereby depriving the American public and our American youth of the wholesome advantage of this competitive sport.

I would like to bring to the attention of this body the very timely legislation, H.R. 10176, introduced on February 27 by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, T. A. THOMPSON, which would preclude such commercial broadcasts on Fridays. This proposed legislation no doubt caused the National Football League commissioner to withdraw his plans for such television broadcasts this year. There is no existing statute, however, which would prevent future plans for the same purpose; therefore, it is my sincere hope that a sufficient number of Members of the House will look into the provisions of H.R. 10176 by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman THOMPSON, with a view toward passage of this needed legislation during this session as a permanent and positive protection for the high schools of the Nation.

In this regard, I commend to the attention of the membership the following article which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, March 3, 1964.

NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE SAYS IT WON'T SHOW FRIDAY GAMES ON NATIONAL TV—SCHOOLBOY TEAMS BENEFIT BY MOVE—REPORT OF TV PLAN BY PROS HAD STIRRED CONGRESSIONAL AND SCHOLASTIC CRITICISM

(By Gerald Eskenazi)

The National Football League, under attack in recent weeks by high school and collegiate associations for plans to televise Friday night games, said yesterday that its Friday league games would not be shown nationally.

A virtual agreement had been reached by the Ford Motor Co. and the American Broadcasting Co. to show five Friday night contests during the season.

As soon as ABC's plans were made known, the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations sent telegrams to Senators and Representatives in Washington attacking the television plans.

The associations maintained that about 85 percent of all high school games were played on Friday night, and that the televising of NFL games at the same time would damage the national scholastic program.

GIANTS' GAME INVOLVED

Yesterday's announcement by Pete Rozelle, the commissioner of the NFL, said that at least one Friday night game had been scheduled, at least two Monday night games were on tap, and that there would be two other night games.

The New York Giants are the team involved in the Friday night telecast. They will play in Yankee Stadium September 25. The opponent has not been announced.

A spokesman for Rozelle said that the game probably would be televised only to the city of the Giants' opponent.

The NFL announcement did not lessen the high school federation's plans to "protect itself," according to Clifford B. Fagan, the federation's executive secretary.

In Chicago, Fagan said:

"We're grateful there will be no national television. But we don't want to have to continually depend on pro football's good graces to save us. We will continue to press for Federal legislation that expressly prohibits national television on the night that most schools throughout the country play."

SCHOOLS ARE ALARMED

"Quite frankly," he continued, "we are alarmed that we are not protected. We have received about 3 dozen telegrams from Senators and Congressmen about our position. All were favorable to our cause. We will continue to press during this session of Congress for protective legislation."

On Saturday, Representative T. A. THOMPSON, Democrat, of Louisiana, said in Washington that he planned to submit a bill that would prohibit the telecasting of professional games in areas where school games were being played.

The NFL has stressed that the plans for the Friday telecasts were independent of the league. The NFL recently signed a $28.2 million contract for 2 years with the Columbia Broadcasting System. But, the NFL said, ABC's telecasts would have been made under contracts with individual clubs.

Both the NFL and J. Walter Thompson—the advertising agency handling the Ford television account—strongly denied that congressional pressure had brought about the NFL decision.

A spokesman for the agency said reports that the network would televise the Friday games "had been premature." The spokesman said, "had there not been so much publicity, the deal probably would have gone smoothly.

Rozelle, in his statement, made no mention of the pressures put on the NFL after reports that the Senate antitrust subcommittee was being asked to investigate.

He disputed the contention that the purpose of the Federal legislation passed in 1961 (governing pro football telecasts) was to protect high schools.

"No mention is made of high schools in the legislation," Rozelle said.

The NFL teams that will play on Monday night are the Detroit Lions, who will play on September 28, and the St. Louis Cardinals, with a game scheduled on October 12. No opponent for either team has been selected.

The NFL said the teams would play Monday night because of scheduling difficulties. The Cardinals, for example, would be required to play their first five games on the road if they did not get the Monday date. The Lions' September 28 date was their only available home date during the first 3 weeks of the season.

It is not known when the two remaining night games would be played.

Communist Party Activities on College Campuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues another outstanding column by Mr. Thurman Sensing in his weekly column "Sensing the News." The title of this column is "Responsibility on Campus," and is concerned with the increasing number of Communist Party officials who are being invited to speak on college campuses across the country.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse the comments contained in this article by Mr. Sensing. Those who are encouraging issuance of invitations to Communists to speak on college campuses generally come from the ranks of intellectual leftwingers in our colleges and universities. They maintain that they are promoting academic freedom when they invite the leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to lecture on their campuses to young and immature minds—even though FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has issued his sternest of warnings lately about the Communist drive to subvert the minds and morals of our young people, especially on college campuses.

Here is Mr. Hoover's answer to those who justify Communist lectures on the false notion that they are preserving academic freedom:

It is indeed ironic that Communist Party speakers whose minds and thoughts and actions are in no manner free—should demand the opportunity to parrot the Moscow line to young Americans under the guise of academic freedom. Academic freedom is not an instrument for the perpetuation of conspiratorial ideologies. Nor is it an agent of self-destruction—a freedom to destroy freedom. As a free-flowing channel of truth and knowledge, academic freedom is not obligated to carry along the silted tributaries of lies and distortions of known Communists.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column by Mr. Sensing be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSING THE NEWS

(By Thurman Sensing)

RESPONSIBILITY ON CAMPUS

Would a medical school invite an abortionist to address student doctors? Would a municipal firefighting school allow an arsonist to state his views? Would a college of business administration give a platform to an embezzler?

The answer to each and all of these questions is, of course, "No." The lawbreaker and the criminal mind, the conspirator, and the knowing doer of evil have no place in a teaching institution.

Then why should a Communist official be allowed to address the students of a university on university property? Again, the logical answer is that such a person should not be permitted to use a university for his nefarious purposes.

Yet in North Carolina, where the legislature enacted a law banning the appearance of Communists at State facilities, liberals have teamed up to condemn the legislative act. They preach the silly notion that academic freedom is somehow impaired if a Communist is not given the same platform offered to respectable citizens. How absurd can people get?

The Communist point of view is not just the point of view of another political party. The Communist is, by virtue of his beliefs, and the conspiracy in which he is engaged, an enemy of free society.

Well, some persons may say, we should know our enemies. Indeed we should. But it isn't necessary to submit to a propaganda speech in order to understand the nature of the Communist movement and its goals. The overall Communist position is to be found in the writings of Lenin, Stalin, and its contemporary theorists. Any student can go

to the library and learn the character of the Communist doctrine. He can read the speeches of Nikita Khrushchev, who heads the international conspiracy as well as the Soviet State, and those of lesser Communist officials.

As a matter of fact, nothing prevents those persons in North Carolina, who think students should be exposed to real live Communists, to hire a hall in the town of Chapel Hill or elsewhere and have Communist Party officials give speeches for students to hear. There's no law against that in North Carolina.

What the North Carolina law bars is the use of State property as a platform for Communists. It prevents Communist officials, such as National Party Chairman Gus Hall or National Committee Member Herbert Aptheker, from being given the honor that is associated with an appearance at a State university.

Whatever speakers are chosen to address a university student body should be there because they will contribute to the education and well-being of the students. To be asked to give a speech at a university, in North Carolina or elsewehre, is commonly and rightly regarded as a privilege and an opportunity. Neither the privilege nor the opportunity should be extended to a Communist, who detests all our American values and who seeks the overthrow of the Republic, by violence if necessary.

Aside from these considerations, there is the fact that Communists do not speak the truth and do not believe in it. This is part of the Communist philosophy. Communism says that truth is merely a function of the party's needs; it is manipulated to meet the demands of the party.

Therefore, a university that gives a Communist an opportunity to address a student body is knowingly allowing untruth to be voiced on campus for the express purpose of indoctrinating youth or distorting real situations and values.

University authorities should realize that to allow such a situation to prevail is a betrayal of the parents' trust—indeed of the trust of the people of the State who support the university. To say that denial of opportunity for Communists to tell lies is a denial of academic freedom is to have a tragically warped idea of what freedom is.

The legislature of North Carolina undoubtedly will come under continuing heavy bombardment from liberals who want to reopen the campuses to Communist speakers. But the legislature is on sound, logical grounds. It should stick to its guns and educate the dissenting educators if that is necessary.

What is most important about our universities is that our American values be protected, for they are part of our national heritage. To encourage lawbreakers and conspirators to twist student thinking is to allow the undermining of the foundations of our free society.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the many valuable contributions being made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the Voice of Democracy contest which is conducted each year and in which high school students throughout the United States participate for four scholarships.

Mr. Henry E. Chatham, Jr., a senior at the Meridian High School, Meridian, Miss., and a resident of my district, is the winner from my State this year. I am proud to insert his speech, "The Challenge of Citizenship," in the RECORD today. I am certain the Members of the House will be interested in the thinking of this fine young man on this vital subject and I highly recommend that they read his speech:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Henry E. Chatham, Jr., Meridian High School, Meridian, Miss.)

The first 1964 American baby is now more than a month old. Statisticians say he will live at least until 2035, perhaps even longer. And he will lead a good life. He will begin work later, work fewer hours, and retire earlier than his father did. This mythical child, this product of statisticians, has been cast into the most affluent society known to man. By sheer accident, by some quirk of fate, he is an American citizen.

Citizenship in the greatest nation on earth has a challenge behind each of many doors: doors which if opened wide and the mysterious unknown back of them faced squarely, lead to the better life. And the better life for all peoples is an ultimate but not an unattainable goal for mankind in this troubled world.

Let us consider two of these doors. The first is that of education—education not for the rich or the poor, the humble or the mighty, but for all. This really is the pinnacle of all learning—that the opportunity of education be given to everyone: the retarded child, the average child, the child prodigy. But with the door to education unlocked, our mythical child must accept this challenge of knowledge himself, the challenge to learn, to develop his own potential to its fullest. He must realize that his education is the key to the better life for himself and those who come after him. The recent words of President Johnson are all too clear: "Let us declare unconditional war on poverty." In the name of young citizens of America, let us also declare unconditional war on ignorance.

Let us now consider the second door, that of understanding. How often we venture from the paths of logic, quibble over misunderstandings and argue when only our definitions differ. By what scale shall our mythical child weigh this unknown measure called understanding? This is a scale which cannot be measured with rod or sounding line. Rather, it is as a boundless sea. Our young citizen is challenged to dip his cup into this sea.

In the words of Kahlil Gibran, "Say not, 'I have found the truth' but rather 'I have found a truth.'" By the same token we shall say, not "I have found understanding," but rather, "I met the soul of understanding walking upon my path."

If we say this and adhere to what we say, we will open the door to understanding and thereby accept the challenge of American citizenship.

Christmas Activity Report, 1963, the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the outstanding work of the Ladies of the Salvation Army Auxiliary of Washington, D.C., under the able leadership of their president, Mrs. Richard Blackburn Black, is commendable and worthy of note by the Senate.

At Christmastime, as well as throughout the year, the ladies of the auxiliary, together with the Salvation Army, work long hours in behalf of the needy. The year-round activities of these dedicated ladies contribute greatly to the welfare and happiness of the underprivileged, particularly to the children of the community.

I want to pay tribute to the continuing and effective accomplishments of this splendid group of ladies and to their devotion and dedication to mankind. The people of Washington have every reason to be proud of these lovely ladies whose slogan is: "Togetherness for Others." I am sure my colleages will want to read the "Christmas Activity Report for 1963," recently released by the Salvation Army, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Salvation Army National Capital Division Christmas activity report, 1963

	Washington	Alexandria	Arlington	Fairfax	Prince Georges	Total
Families given Christmas baskets or food orders	1,998	585	402	557	765	4,307
Number in families	11,778	3,986	1,689	4,456	4,085	25,994
Checks given aged and infirm	686			138	675	1,499
Dinners for lone individuals	438					438
Mothers selecting toys	1,827	520	331	557	765	4,000
Children receiving toys	8,117	830	1,268	3,342	3,055	16,612
New toys distributed	10,944	1,180	1,167	10,026	3,055	26,372
Dolls given	1,700	160	50	527	400	2,837
Stockings filled and distributed	8,000	110		3,426	2,000	13,536
Shoes and clothing given	250	145	170	1,377	225	2,167
Persons visited and given gifts in hospitals and institutions	3,567	251	409	256	263	4,746
Hospitals and institutions visited	13	4	2	2	3	24
Workers visiting hospitals and institutions	106	56	9	6	22	199
Parties held in neighborhood centers	13	9	3	4	3	32
Children attending parties	1,000	550	169	120	252	2,091
Adults attending parties	805	150	45	46	51	1,097
Candies and gifts given at parties	3,815	700	214	166	303	5,198
Total served by the Salvation Army	26,641	5,912	3,750	9,735	8,606	54,644

The Salvation Army Christmas dinner fund was aided most extensively by radio station WMAL and WMAL-TV. Radio station WWDC also gave financial support toward

providing Christmas dinners for the aged and infirm. Throughout the National Capital area, the total program was coordinated with the Christmas Bureau of the Health and Welfare Council.

Christmas toy centers were open from December 18 to December 24, in Washington, Alexandria, Arlington, Falls Church, and Prince Georges County. In addition to Salvation Army staff, many hundreds of volunteers, particularly from the Salvation Army Auxiliary provided the necessary manpower.

As in previous years several thousand dolls were dressed and 13,536 stockings filled by interested friends, office groups, business firms, Government departments, clubs, et cetera. These were all distributed at the various toy centers to the parents of the families investigated and approved for assistance.

The metropolitan and county newspapers were most generous, as were the radio and TV media in publicizing the entire Christmas program.

U.S. Coast Guard: Routine Duty, Dramatic Rescue Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1964, the aging Coast Guard cutter, *Coos Bay*, after about 27 hours of struggle through a raging mid-Atlantic storm, staged a dramatic rescue of survivors from a British freighter, the SS *Ambassador*. The men of one of our finest services treated as only routine a job that bespoke the best traditions of the sea in their heroic efforts against overwhelming odds. Gale winds and 30- to 40-foot waves impeded their efforts to help the crew of the distressed and foundering vessel.

On the same day that this notable event took place, I and other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and many other Members of this House were urging an authorization bill for a firm beginning to restore our Coast Guard to its proper status. Equipment and facilities authorized by that bill are part of a long-range program to enable this great service to meet today's needs and build it up for the future.

We noted the modesty of the Coast Guard requests. We felt that much more was needed than was asked for. As a small token of our recognition of their great needs we urged, and the Congress agreed; that the 1965 authorization should carry not one, but two, high endurance cutters, and eight, instead of six, medium endurance cutters.

Coos Bay was built in 1940. She was one of a class of seaplane tenders, built for the Navy before our entry into World War II. She was not designed for the work she is now doing.

Coos Bay was a hand-me-down from the Navy after war's end.

She has performed nobly under the skillful hands of her Coast Guard crew.

But is it not time we strengthened the strong arms of the Coast Guard by giving her more modern muscle, designed specifically for increasingly difficult tasks?

I urge all Members of this House to read the following account of a great rescue by a great service, which appeared in the National Observer on March 2, 1964:

HEAVY SEAS, HIGH DRAMA, AND COAST GUARD COURAGE

(By Peter T. Chew)

PORTLAND, MAINE.—At 6:19 a.m., e.s.t., on Tuesday, February 18, the U.S. Coast Guard weather ship *Coos Bay* steamed warily southeastward off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland through wraiths of fog, snow flurries, and mountainous seas, her youthful crewmen on the lookout for drifting icebergs.

The vessel was bound for Portland after more than 3 weeks of weather patrol on Ocean Station Bravo in the Davis Strait off Laborador. Suddenly, Michael Hamrick, a 19-year-old seaman radioman, adjusted his earphones, leaned forward, and rapidly decoded an emergency message from the grain-laden British freighter *Ambassador*, 370 miles to the south:

"*Ambassador:* Position 38.04 north, 52.37 west. Request standby. Have lost engine. Breakdown. Urgent all ships."

Thus began a high adventure in raging North Atlantic seas that ended early one morning last week when the slender white *Coos Bay*—her superstructure bristling with twirling radar antennas—glided into wind-whipped Portland harbor. She bore the body of the *Ambassador's* enigmatic master, Capt. Harry Strickland, 52, of Portsmouth, England, wrapped in rough canvas—and an air of mystery. She also carried 11 of the *Ambassador's* polyglot crewmen who complained bitterly about the conduct of their officers, most of whom drowned in a frantic attempt to get away from their stricken ship.

TELLERS OF THE TALE

From Comdr. Claude W. Bailey, 48, the *Coos Bay's* precise, peppery skipper, from his 134 officers and men, and from public and private statements by the *Ambassador's* shaken survivors, it is possible to reconstruct the busy hours that followed receipt of that first distress call in the *Coos Bay's* cramped radio shack amidships.

From the instant Seaman Hamrick took the *Ambassador's* first message, things moved fast aboard the *Coos Bay*. John McCaslin, radioman first class, sitting beside Hamrick at a high-frequency transmitter, immediately flashed the message to U.S. Coast Guard headquarters in Washington, D.C., which relayed it by teletype within seconds to the commander, eastern area, U.S. Coast Guard, high in the customhouse building on the Battery in New York City.

A seaman ran to Commander Bailey's cabin with the news. "Listen sharp for any further traffic," snapped Commander Bailey, jumping up from his breakfast table and reaching for his phone to the bridge. A few minutes later, another call from the *Ambassador* reached the *Coos Bay*. Then at 6:38 a.m. came the words:

"Please come fastest. S O S position 38.04 north, 5837 west."

On receipt of the first message, Commander Bailey had ordered the junior officer on the bridge to change course and plunge due south at "best speed" toward the freighter, now foundering in 40-foot seas, and 65-mile-per-hour winds some 600 miles southeast of Halifax, Nova Scotia.

CALLING ON A COMPUTER

Eastern area headquarters authorized Commander Bailey's course change, then its celebrated search-rescue command center went into action. A giant IBM 305 Raymac computer spun out the names of half a dozen ships that could be within a 100-mile radius of the *Ambassador*, and transmitted the names to the *Coos Bay*.

Among them was the Italian luxury liner, *Leonardo da Vinci*, under the command of Capt. Oscar Ribari. The Italian Lines ship, with 500 passengers bound for New York City, was 50 miles northwest of the *Ambassador*, bucking the heaviest weather Captain Ribari had experienced in 31 years at sea. The Italian captain headed immediately for the freighter.

Search aircraft were even now roaring down runways—U.S. Air Force C-54's from Bermuda, Coast Guard C-130's from Argentina, Newfoundland, and Royal Canadian Air Force CL-28's from Halifax.

Because the *Coos Bay's* new course now carried her through the trough of the waves, she could make good time despite the heavy sea and her top speed of 18 knots was cut by only 3 or 4 knots. Even so, Commander Bailey figured he wouldn't reach the *Ambassador* for 24 hours. His estimated time of arrival: 6 a.m., Wednesday.

"Our job, once we arrived, would be to act as on-scene commander of all air and sea search and rescue units," said Commander Bailey last week in his spartan cabin aboard the *Coos Bay*. Commander Bailey ordered his executive officer, Lt. Comdr. George Maloney, to draw up a coordinated search-and-rescue plan, thus leaving him free to handle the ship and oversee the entire operation. In the vessel's combat information center, Maloney and his men—bracing themselves with handholds against the violent rolling of their limber, flat-bottomed ship—worked with mathematical tables, maps, and weather data, predicting such things as the drift of the *Ambasador* and, later, of the freighter's liferafts.

Ens. Erwin Chase, 31, a powerfully built Coast Guard veteran from Rockland, Maine, organized six volunteer swimmers. Next morning they would don black neoprene "wet suits" and be prepared to go overboard in the rescue operation. Commander Bailey ordered still other crewmen to prepare all manner of rescue lines. Chief Gunner's Mate Fred Diefenbacher, a New Yorker, checked out his .30-caliber shoulder line throw gun for firing lines to the *Ambassador*. The gun, a Springfield rifle, employs a grenade cartridge to propel a 13-ounce steel slug, spearheading hundreds of feet of wire-thin, braided-wax nylon cord, the cord unwinding at bullet speed from its tin canister attached to the rifle near the trigger. Once the cord has been caught by crewmen on the target ship, a heavier rope—to which lifejackets and rubber liferafts can be affixed—is attached to the light line and hauled across.

Hour after hour, the *Coos Bay* fought her way southward, as scores of messages flowed into and out of her radio shack—to the aircraft, to other ships, to headquarters in New York City.

The situation had one mitigating circumstance, reasoned Commander Bailey, a stocky, bespectacled man with 30 years' experience at sea in everything from yachts, tugboats, and Army transports, to Coast Guard cutters. The *Ambassador's* pilot told him the freighter was smack in the warm water of the Gulf Stream. On the other hand, Commander Bailey's experience also told him that lifeboats and liferafts couldn't live in such seas, the worst he'd ever sailed through. The big, lumbering passenger liners and freighters now converging on the foundering freighter could probably do little. And 24 hours was a long time.

ABANDONING SHIP

The signals from the *Ambassador* grew progressively weaker as Tuesday morning wore on. At 11:46 a.m. she sent a last message: "Situation dangerous. Might not last 8 hours. Now abandoning ship." Throughout the rest of the day, the *Leonardo da Vinci*, first on the scene, stood by the *Ambassador*

But because of her huge size, the passenger liner was unable to pull alongside. In the evening, the 10,000-ton Norwegian ore ship *Fruen* reached the scene and the *Leonardo da Vinci* resumed her voyage to New York.

When the *Coos Bay* reached the *Ambassador* at 9 a.m. Wednesday, the *Fruen* was lying 200 yards to leeward of the freighter. The Norwegian vessel's crew had already hauled five crewmen to safety on a line, but had snapped two of her three lines in the process. The first men to clamber aboard the *Fruen* said that 14 men, including all the *Ambassador's* deck officer, had been lost the previous day when their liferafts had swamped. The other men, including the captain, had also tried to escape in rafts and had been pitched into the sea, but had managed to make it back aboard the *Ambassador*. There they had spent Tuesday night huddling in the lee of bulwarks on the bow of the darkened, wildly creaking-ship, rolling and heaving in the huge waves.

Wednesday morning, the *Fruen* fired its last rescue line to the *Ambassador*. During the next few hours, four more crewmen were tugged through the sea to safety—then the line parted.

IT WAS UP TO US

"The *Fruen* radioed that he had no more line to put out," recalled Commander Bailey. "She stood off to watch. Now we knew it was up to us." There were still 12 men aboard the *Ambassador*, including Captain Frickland. The British ship was listing so steeply that the men had to climb from handhold to handhold. The lee deck was awash, and the seas were breaking heavily on her hatch covers.

The *Coos Bay* maneuvered her bow close to the bow of the listing freighter. Gunner's Mate Diefenbacher braced himself forward, raised the line-firing rifle to his shoulder, and fired. The line whistled across to the freighter; the *Ambassador's* crewmen pulled it in. The *Coos Bay* sent a 15-man rubber raft across on the heavy line. Because of its lighter draft, and high, wind-catching superstructure, the *Coos Bay* drifted with the wind faster than the derelict. So to keep in line with his quarry, Commander Bailey had to maneuver his ship smartly, all the while being careful not to crash into the other vessel.

With the *Coos Bay* drifting away from the *Ambassador*, the men appeared reluctant to climb into the bobbing raft.

At last five men got in. Moments later, an enormous wave swept three of them overboard, sending two swirling away toward the stern of the freighter. "Keep these men in sight at all costs," shouted Commander Bailey from the flying bridge. Then another wave swept the last two men away. "That was the only time—well, that was a bad moment," said the *Coos Bay*'s skipper last week.

The *Coos Bay* revved her engines and sped after one of the men who'd been swept 500 feet away. Ensign Chase and his men were suited up and ready, standing by a 10-foot-wide scramble net slung over the side near the forward part of *Coos Bay*'s main deck.

ANOTHER MAN SAVED

When the ship reached the struggling crewman, Ensign Chase climbed down the net, followed by David Balous and Ken Shanhotz, both young seamen; all three wore lifelines. *Coos Bay* was making a complete roll every 8 seconds, so one moment they were being dunked, the next they were yanked 10 feet out of the water. They had to hold on with one hand, and try to get a line around the crewman from the *Ambassador* with the other. Meanwhile, they were getting slammed against the side of the ship. They finally wrestled the crewman up the net.

By this time, lookouts had spotted another man floating under the stern of the *Ambassador*. They threw him a line, which the man caught, and towed him 100 feet clear of the stern. Suddenly he was in trouble; his line had tangled around his arms, rendering him helpless; then a wave tossed him between the scramble net and the side of the *Coos Bay*, and the line became entangled with the net.

David Bichrest, a 22-year-old 130-pound boatswain's mate third class, was standing off to one side. He heard a voice shout: "Someone get down there with a knife." Without waiting to hook up a safety line harness, he climbed down the net, diving past the other three exhausted swimmers. In the pounding seas, he managed to cut the merchant sailor free. Suddenly both men were swept up and away from the *Coos Bay*, Bichrest struggling to keep the other man's head above water.

A PLEASED EXPRESSION

"This man I went after was an Arab," Bichrest said last week. "He was an old man, and he seemed to be praying. He had a pleased expression on his face like he didn't care if he was going to die. I was screaming and cursing at him, trying to bring him out of it. He had a big bang on his head and that didn't help him none either."

Bichrest managed to get a line under the old man's arms, but they were still drifting away from the *Coos Bay*. "We'd gone about 30 feet," says Bichrest, "but that can look like 30 miles in that kind of water. I heard someone shout for me to come back. But you don't leave somebody like that. It's just not natural. I wouldn't have left him for anybody." A few minutes later, Ensign Chase managed to get another line to Bichrest and the two men were hauled in.

The other three *Ambassador* men had meanwhile managed to scramble back aboard their sinking ship. Commander Bailey circled his 311-foot-ship around like a busy terrier, and took another run toward the freighter. Ten men to go.

The sky, which had been overcast all day, was now darkening. Since the ships drifted at different speeds, the *Coos Bay* could not lay close long enough for more than one line to be passed at a time; so the *Coos Bay* decided to make a series of passes at the *Ambassador*, with gunner Diefenbacher shooting over his line on each pass.

On the first pass the maneuver was successful. An *Ambassador* crewman tied Diefenbacher's line around his waist, jumped into the sea, and was rapidly hauled to the swimmers who helped him up the net.

As soon as the first man was on board, Commander Bailey whipped his vessel around for another approach, Diefenbacher fired another line unearringly across to the *Ambassador*, and the second man came over. From this point on two men were hauled across on each pass by the *Coos Bay*. "This worked well enough," said Commander Bailey, "until the next to the last trip when there were four men remaining on the *Ambassador*. Suddenly, we saw all four men jump overboard tied on the line and it was too late to stop them." The *Coos Bay* was drifting onto the wreck and nothing could be done but to get them on board as quickly as possible.

When the first of the four men was halfway across the few hundred feet of turbulent water, his head suddenly slumped forward and he appeared to lose consciousness. The unconscious figure was Captain Frickland.

HE USED A SLIPKNOT

Dr. Charles T. Dolan, a U.S. Public Health Service physician assigned to the *Coos Bay*, said: "Captain Frickland's face was blue, and there was no pulse when he was brought aboard." The doctor quickly cut away the line from around Captain Frickland's chest. Mysteriously, he had tied a marlin spike hitch, or slipknot, which apparently grew tighter as he was yanked through the waves. One of his men said: "I told him not to tie that kind of knot." Later, crewmen reported that the captain had had a "kind of glazed expression" on his face before they'd all jumped overboard. All attempts at resuscitation failed, and Dr. Dolan pronounced him dead.

With the *Ambassador* now evacuated, Commander Bailey left the *Fruen* to keep the unlighted freighter under observation to warn passing ships, then sped off to search for a liferaft that had been spotted by an aircraft 26 miles away. Later he found the empty raft and continued with the search until Thursday evening when, with the weather worsening, he called it off. The Dutch salvage tug *Elbe* arrived and attempted to tow the *Ambassador* away, but she went down on the end of the towline. The *Fruen* proceeded on her way to Rotterdam and the *Coos Bay* started its long 5-day voyage home through foul weather.

What happened aboard the *Ambassador* up to and following the arrival of the *Fruen*, the *Coos Bay*, and the handful of other ships that stood by or searched the area, is less clear and is now the subject of an investigation by the British Board of Trade. But during the voyage to Portland the survivors talked freely with their rescuers, and spoke up bluntly at a press conference on their arrival here. They contend the deck officers provided little or no leadership during the harrowing hours.

The hero of the *Ambassador*, the men agreed, was David Burdette, 17, of Hull, England, a cadet officer at sea for the first time. "If it weren't for that kid, I wouldn't be here today," said Zeke Mobondo, of Liverpool, to reporters here. Burdette recounted that he had jumped into a raft with nine other men and the raft had been swamped. "They started panicking," he said, "and I was scratched all over my face by crewmen clawing at me. Finally, I grabbed a rope at the side of the ship and hauled myself aboard. The others returned to the ship the same way. I yelled to the men to keep calm; they quieted down. Then I started looking for an officer aboard the ship but couldn't find one. I went to the bridge; no one was there. I went to the captain's quarters and found the captain in his bunk. He said to me, 'I thought everyone had abandoned ship.' "

WHISKED AWAY TO ENGLAND

The *Ambassador* survivors were whisked back to England within hours of coming ashore, and Captain Frickland's body was removed from the ship and carried to Maine Medical Center here for the autopsy. Dr. Wilbur Leighton, Cumberland County medical examiner, announced late in the week that the captain had died "accidentally by drowning." A few days ago, his ashes were scattered from a little fishing schooner on Casco Bay, at the request of his wife in England.

When the week was over Commander Bailey relaxed at last. It wasn't his province, he made it clear, to discuss the actions of the *Ambassador's* officers and men. But, as for his own crew, he was recommending Bichrest for the highest peacetime Coast Guard award, the Gold Lifesaving Medal, and was naming several other officers and men for commendations. He did answer one question about Captain Frickland, however. Was it not strange for the man's family to request such a burial? "Not at all," he said. "It's a fitting way for a man who follows the sea. And I shall order likewise."

Tribute to Rev. Joseph Murgas, Priest-Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, February 17, 1964, marked the centennial birthday celebrations of Rev. Joseph Murgas, noted American Slovak priest-scientist. I was pleased to learn that the first tribute paid to this priest who greatly enriched our country with his vast contributions to religion, education, art, science, and fraternalism was in my State of New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story sent to me by John C. Sciranka, American Slovak journalist of Passaic, N.J., who knew Father Murgas personally. The story appeared in the Dobry Pastier—Good Shepherd—official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, which was founded 53 years ago by Father Murgas. I, too, pay tribute to this great genius.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSAIC ST. MARY'S PARISHIONERS FIRST TO PAY TRIBUTE TO FATHER MURGAS ON HIS CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY

On Sunday, February 2, during the pre-Lenten program at St. Mary's auditorium, First and Monroe Streets, Passaic, N.J., a tribute was paid to the Reverend Joseph Murgas, priest-scientist, inventor, artist and fraternalist, whose centennial birthday will be observed starting on Monday, February 17, by all Slovaks throughout the entire year.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, P.A., pastor, was guest of honor at the entertainment program, accompanied by his assistants, Rev. Stephen Hlavatovic and Rev. Bernard P. Prusak, also Rev. Francis Bischoff of the Pope Pius XII High School.

Brother James Kosan, S.J., of Fordham University, N.Y., was a special guest.

A Slovak play was presented by the Slovak Dramatic Circle consisting of the following cast: Stephen Veliky, Rudolph Sugra, Mrs. Paul Kopchak, Mr. and Mrs. William Miklovic, Mr. and Mrs. John Nemec, Mr. and Mrs. John Dubravsky, Andrew Kurnath, Joseph Madar and Mrs. Joseph Bartos. Father Hlavatovic is moderator of the circle and Prof. Anthony A. Suchon, organist, music director.

A special feature on the program was a tribute to Rev. Joseph Murgas, noted priest-scientist who was honored by six American Presidents for contribution to wireless telegraphy and 17 other inventions for which he received U.S. patents.

John C. Sciranka, American Slovak journalist, who knew Father Murgas personally spoke on his vast contributions to religion, education, art, science, and fraternalism. Mr. Sciranka recalled that the late Father Emery Haitinger, later monsignor, who was pastor of St. Mary's parish, aided Father Murgas in founding the Slovak Catholic Federation of America on February 22, 1911, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., where Father Murgas labored from his arrival to America in 1896 until his death in May 1929.

The Slovak Catholic Federation of America with the aid of American Slovaks erected an Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome, whose cornerstone was blessed by the late Pope John XXIII on May 13, 1963, and Pope Paul VI received 600 American Slovaks on September 14, 1963, in the Vatican, when the institute was blessed by Cardinal Tisserant.

Sciranka, however, pointed out that Father Murgas gained a reputation as a creative genius for his original and valuable contributions to the development of the remarkable innovations of transmission by wireless telegraphy. Shortly after the dawn of the 20th century, the eyes of the entire communications world were drawn of Father Murgas' experiments. In 1904 his first patent for the "Murgas System of Rapid Wireless Telegraphy" was sold to the Universal Aether Co., of Philadelphia. For the purposes of public test of Father Murgas' system, $18,000 was appropriated to erect a 200-foot transmitting tower in North Wilkes-Barre and a similar one in Scranton, 19 miles away, the first of its type ever erected.

First test of the tower was made in September 1905, which was witnessed by many prominent officials. Lt. Comdr. Samuel Robinson, of the U.S. Navy, represented the naval communications and reported favorable results to U.S. Secretary of the Navy Bonaparte. The test made headlines in the American press. Father Murgas was visited by the famous Marconi because his system was more superior. Historians claim that through Father Murgas' efforts Wilkes-Barre almost became "a birthplace of radio."

Father Murgas headed the million-dollar drive for the establishment of the first Republic of Czechoslovakia. It was during that period that he came in contact with all the Slovak parishes in America, Catholic and Protestant. President Calvin Coolidge offered him a membership on the U.S. Radio Commission. He was also cofounder of the Congregation of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius, who teach in our parochial schools.

After this tribute to Father Murgas, the entire assemblage, led by Monsignor Romanak stood up and sang, "Kto za pravdu hori" (Who for Truth Aglowing) a special national hymn in tribute to his memory. Passaic Slovak parishioners were the first in America to pay tribute to this noted priest-scientist on this his centennial birthday anniversary.

A Liberty Ship was named in his honor through the efforts of the late Reverend George Malinak of St. Gabriel's parish, Pittsburgh, Pa. Also, a radio station was named for him in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, where a postal stamp was issued honoring him.

Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and other radio programs paid tribute to this great priest-scientist, founder of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

The Late Kathryn Furculo

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join members of the Massachusetts delegation and other colleagues who have risen to pay tribute to the memory of the late Kathryn Furculo, wife of the former Congressman and Governor, who died recently in Boston after a long and tragic illness.

Mrs. Foster Furculo was a gracious and charming lady.

She was a gifted human being who gave unsparingly of her time and talent for a number of worthy causes. Among these were activities in behalf of the mentally retarded, those stricken with polio, muscular dystrophy, and cystic fibrosis.

At all times, however, she was a wonderful mother of five who viewed her official responsibilities as part of a wider role as wife of a government official. She brought sincerity and sense to everything she believed in, and one high honor she received gave indication of the impact she had.

She was named as a lady of the Equestrian Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher by the late and great Pope John the XXIII.

This is one of the highest papal honors and one that was certainly deserved.

But more than anything else, I remember at this time the charm, the personal interest, and the devotion of Mrs. Furculo. I will miss her, and I want to extend my deepest sympathies to her husband and five children.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important article about the Genocide Convention. It was written by Jessie Halpern, Washington correspondent for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, and will appear in subscribing newspapers on or about March 6, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Jessie Halpern, J.T.A. correspondent in Washington)

With a twist of irony, further confused by what appeared as a legislative-executive breakdown in communications, the White House this week turned down a senatorial appeal for Presidential "leadership" in pushing U.S. ratification of the aging United Nations Genocide Convention.

The complexities of the situation now seem to have grown to overwhelming proportions. Last July, Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to the President, made it known to congressional leaders that the White House very much wanted Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention.

With this understanding, a month ago, a group of 10 Senators, headed by Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, wrote President Johnson, asking for his help in the matter, saying: "It is generally recognized that only a strong appeal from the President will bring this measure to debate and a vote in the Senate."

When Senator SCOTT received an answer this past week—not from the President, but from Frederick Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations—his upset reaction was understandable. In form fashion, the State Department had confirmed "this Government's dedication to the convention's purpose" and continued, "it is the intention of the administration to ratify the Genocide Convention upon receiving the advice and consent of the Senate."

Quipped dejected Senator SCOTT, who felt that President Johnson never saw the letter urging White House help in the pressing matter: "It was probably given the same treatment as letters requesting the President to accept a can of salad oil or to crown a beauty queen."

But the White House immediately disagreed with Senator SCOTT's assumption. A White House spokesman emphatically noted that "no President will ignore 10 Senators who write to him. Many in the White House saw the letter," the spokesman added. "It (the answer) went through six drafts; the only problem was how to answer it."

While the perplexed senatorial group feels they "do not know what next we must do in this matter," White House contention is that they must get the support of key Republican conservatives. Specific recommendations were for enlistment of support from Senators EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of IOWA, and GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont. A Presidential spokesman noted also that the "White House feels Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, can only bring ratification of the Genocide Convention before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he knows he has the votes for it."

Though genocide has been a punishable international crime set forth as such by the United Nations 13 years ago, and though the United States was instrumental in drafting it, the U.S. Government, and particularly the Senate, has treated the ratification issue as an "orphan" for too long. The major present issue, as far as Senator SCOTT is concerned, is this "conspiracy of silence by those who apparently don't care."

At a time when the Nazi trials in Frankfurt are again raising questions addressed to the conscience of the world, White House treatment of the senatorial appeal letter appears equally ironical.

Last September, Senator FULBRIGHT wrote Louis Shecter, of Baltimore, who has worked long and hard as chairman of the American Jewish Congress' committee for ratification of the Genocide Convention. The Fulbright letter stated: "It is my impression at the moment * * * that the situation in the Senate has not yet developed to a point where a two-thirds vote is likely. Under these circumstances there is serious doubt whether the national interest would be served by promoting a debate at this time which might lead to a defeat of the Genocide Convention on grounds quite extraneous to the subject matter."

Senator SCOTT decided action based on several factors was necessary. He knew that no U.S. President since the convention was drafted had really put his shoulders behind this issue. It had also been pointed out to him by Mr. Shecter that, without a presidential push, the convention had slim chances for ratification. The problem of waiting for a majority to pass it only led to the good possibility of letting the issue die. And, of course, as Mr. Shecter had further noted, no Senator had really ever said he was against the ratification.

Why then should the White House suddenly appear as a partner in "buck passing" when appealed to for leadership in Genocide Convention ratification?

One certainly must hope that the reasons are not tied up with the need for southern democratic support in the administration's forthcoming campaign. President Johnson has given his unequivocal support to the civil rights bill. This has, of course, called forth the wrath of southern politicians. And it is many of these same politicians who are afraid that U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention will make it applicable under domestic law to civil rights issues. It is also significant that though Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman FULBRIGHT supports aspects of international cooperation, his record on domestic civil rights leaves much to be desired.

Beyond the current White House-Senate confusion remains a consideration of undoubtedly greater importance. This is the question of active moral commitment by the United States to the ratification. Until the issue is stripped of its political implications and brought entirely into a realm of moral consideration, it appears that U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention will continue on its way into unhealthy oblivion.

Speech of Congressman Barry, of New York, on "What's New in the Federal Civil Service?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROBERT R. BARRY, Republican, of New York, was the speaker at the technical meeting of the Federal Accountants Association of New York City held on February 14, 1964. Mr. BARRY delivered a most informative, interesting, and inspiring presentation entitled "What's New in the Federal Civil Service?"

This very information speech covers a variety of subjects currently of tremendous interest to Federal employees, including beneficial legislation, automation in the Federal service, the employee union movement, the current austerity program affecting the number of Federal employees, and many other items of interest to the Federal employee.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Congressman BARRY's speech:

WHAT'S NEW IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE?

Public administrators are found of emphasizing the three essential elements in administration—men, money, and materials. Arguments as to which of these is most important are rather futile in view of the fact all three are indispensable. No programs are administered without financial support, without supplies, equipment, and materials, and certainly not without manpower.

It is the manpower aspects of the Federal Government that I have been asked to discuss with you tonight. This I am happy to do, partly because my own personal interest in the public service extends back over a good many years, and partly because there now appears to be a greater interest in matters relating to the Federal service than has existed for a good many years.

WHY INTEREST IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE INCREASES

I can think of at least three good reasons for this increasing interest in and concern about the Federal service. The first is its sheer size—approximately two and a half million men and women. There is a popular misconception to the effect that all of these so-called bureaucrats are located in Washington, but nothing could be further from the truth As a matter of fact only about 10 percent of them—some 255,000—are in the Washington metropolitan area, while the vast majority are in the field service, scattered throughout continental United States or, indeed, throughout the world. Last year, there were 183,633 Federal civilian employees stationed in this State, but the number in oversea employment was almost as great—some 33,089 stationed in U.S. territories, and 127,489 in foreign countries, making a total of 160,578.

Another reason for this increasing interest is that the original civil service law and the Commission which was established to enforce the law are approximately 80 years old, an anniversary which has been noted with appropriate ceremonies. In still another way, the fact that the Commission has become of age has been noted. After years of having segments of its organization scattered all over the city of Washington, the Commission now has a fine new home in Northwest Washington. For the first time in many a year, the whole agency is now together under one roof. More than that, the Commission now has exceptionally fine and capable leadership. There have been other good Commission members and Commission Chairmen in the past, men who were sincerely devoted to the public service, but none has been more able or more effective in his efforts on behalf of the Federal service than John W. Macy, a career man with a long and distinguished record in the service which he now heads.

Probably most important of all is the fact that, today, the public service is confronted by a multitude of important and challenging problems, some old and some new. Questions relating to compensation, political activity, retirement conditions and benefits have long been with us and may always be, but there is a grist of challenging new problems. There is much interest today in the effect of automation on employment (or unemployment) but within the Federal service itself, there is serious concern about these matters. New problems are presented with regard to the proper role and function of unions among Government employees, and significant changes have recently taken place within this area.

Employee organizations have been greatly strengthened and benefited by actions taken by the Executive. One observes great interest in and concern about health benefits and other so-called fringe benefits; in fact, it has been said that, now that the principle of comparability with regard to compensation has been established, with appropriate arrangements looking toward its continued observance, the attention of the employee organizations is likely to be concentrated largely upon these fringe benefits. As the percentage of professional people in the service steadily increases, these people find that a good many problems confront them, not merely questions of compensation, but of conditions of work, and the maintenance of an environment that is conducive to high grade professional activity. We are concerned now, as always, about the image of the public service, and the attitude of the public toward the service. The prospect of reductions in force looms as a possible consequence of the economy moves of the administration, and may later be required if, as a part of this economy drive, the departmental appropriations for the next fiscal year are reduced by the Congress. And there are many other important questions, some of which will be considered, if time permits.

PAY LEGISLATION

In the last year or two, there have been important changes in the Federal service, some arising from legislation enacted by the Congress, others from actions taken by the administration. The new pay legislation is by all means the most important legislation in the personnel field enacted by Congress.

COMPARABILITY PRINCIPLE ESTABLISHED

Pay legislation always creates difficult problems in the Congress. There is, to begin with, a certain amount of prejudice against Government people. Not only do pay raises involve spending more money—which is always distasteful to some people—but they almost inevitably present serious political problems for the Members. Although most

of the Members realize that the Federal Government cannot recruit and hold in its employ the corps of able, trained, and skilled people that it must have to do its work unless reasonably adequate salaries are paid, they cannot, as a practical matter, raise salaries in the middle income and the top executive groups (in which the shortages of qualified personnel are greatest) unless they also raise salaries in the lower brackets. These raises may at times be difficult to justify, but they have to be made. The people in these brackets are far more numerous; not only do all of them have votes but their friends and relatives as well have votes. At the other end of the scale, the Congress cannot (or at least it never has been willing) to raise executive salaries (except cabinet officers and Supreme Court judges) to a point where they would equal or exceed their own. This is understandable, but it does create something of a problem at a time when the supply of highly qualified professional and technical personnel is severely limited.

As a result of these conflicting influences, pay raises have for many years come rather infrequently. Even those which have been passed have tended to be a bundle of compromises, lacking the logic of adherence to any basic principle or plan. Many serious minded people, including Members of the Congress, have realized this deficiency. Numerous study commissions, created for the purpose of making surveys and recommendations, found State and local government pay better than that for top jobs in the Federal Service. Most recent of these was the Randall Commission, the chairman of which was himself a successful businessman possessing both a considerable amount of Federal experience and a praiseworthy understanding of the basic problems in Federal personnel administration. This Commission recommended considerable increases in the rates of pay for Federal workers—not by guesswork or on the basis of pressure group influence, but on the basis of the principle of comparability.

This was a new idea in the development of Federal pay scales. It used to be a sort of axiom that "of course, Government cannot afford to pay salaries that come anywhere near equaling what persons of similar training and ability could earn in private industry." This idea was taken for granted and accepted as a matter of course. Here was a business leader saying that Government not only could but must equalize its rates of pay with those of industry, job for job across the board, if Government was to obtain and hold in a tight labor market, the manpower that it needs must have to perform its responsibilities in the modern world of science, technology, space, and automation. Not only should the rates of pay be revised and upgraded on this basis, but there should be established on a permanent basis, a mechanism for annual review and adjustment so that, once this basis is achieved, it can be maintained in the future.

The Kennedy administration, to which this report was submitted, accepted the basic philosophy of the report, and gave it full support. After extensive hearings in the Congress, the legislation was reported out and passed during the 87th Congress. The pay raise was divided into two parts, the first of which became effective immediately, the second of which became effective on January 1 of this year. This legislation was applicable to the regular Federal civilian service. This was fine, but it provided a solution for only a portion of the Federal pay problem. It soon became apparent that other pay legislation would have to be enacted. Various compromises had been made in the course of consideration of this legislation about which the postal workers were not too happy, feeling that their increases were to small. (The only way in which more could be given for these positions was to cut down on the top jobs for which, if comparability was to be achieved, the needs were great). Of course, had unlimited funds been available, both groups could have been satisfied, but the administration and the leadership had established an arbitrary ceiling with respect to the total cost of the bill.

Rather quickly some serious inequities in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 became apparent. It was even contended by some that these inequities were so serious as to have produced a morale problem among the Federal civilian personnel. The existence of inequalities was not surprising when one considers that the legislation applies to so many people in so many different situations. These were the provisions most frequently cited by the employee leaders as being inequitable and unjust.

(1) Certain employees who had been promoted prior to the effective date of the act actually made less than those promoted after that date. (Example: Employees in the top steps of grade 15 who were promoted to grades 16 or 17 may lose as much as $1,270 a year in salary.) The reason for this was that those promoted under the act were guaranteed a cash increase equivalent to a two-step raise on their previous grade. Employee leaders asked that those promoted at least a year prior to the effective date be given this same consideration.

(2) Waiting periods for in-step raises now are longer than they were previously, particularly for those in the lower grades.

(3) The amount of in-step raises in grades 4 and 5 were less than they were previously.

(4) Postal employees with long service were not getting all the longevity credit toward higher pay, to which they were entitled.

(5) The "level of competence" provision for Federal classified employees, under which their work has to be above average and not just satisfactory in order to rate an ingrade pay increase was objected to. It was urged that it be eliminated or revised to prevent unwarranted denials of such increases.

BILLS AFFECTING PARTICULAR GROUPS

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, several bills dealing with these matters were introduced, and new pay raise legislation is now before the Congress, with the full backing of the administration. This comes about in two ways. Reference was made earlier to the problem as it involves top level people in the executive branch, Members of the Congress and the judiciary. H.R. 8986, the bill to accomplish these changes, consists of five titles, as follows:

(1) Provides increases for Classification Act empoyees, employees in the postal field service, those paid under the Foreign Service Act, physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees. The several pay schedules involved would replace those otherwise effective in January 1964, contained in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. That act, as has been noted, contains legislative directives and guidelines for the implementation, on a permanent and continuing basis, of the principle of salary comparability between comparable levels of work in the Federal Government and private enterprise.

II. The Federal Legislative Salary Act, increases salaries for Senators and Representatives, the Speaker of the House, congressional employees and heads and assistant heads of legislative branch agencies.

III. The Federal Executive Salary Act, increases salaries of Cabinet officers, under and assistant heads of departments, heads and assistant heads of independent boards and commissions and certain other appointive offices.

IV. The Federal Judicial Salary Act, increases salaries of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of Circuit and District courts, judges of certain other courts and some other positions in the judiciary.

This much needed legislation was not enacted during the first session. At the end of the session, it had been reported out of the House committee, and was pending before the Rules Committee. It seems to be a fairly safe assumption that the bill will be passed and signed. The majority leadership stated that they felt sure that the bill would be approved this year, and suggested April or May as likely dates of enactment. President Johnson expressed the hope that action might be completed in time for the new act to become effective on July 1.

Questions such as this rarely seem to stay settled, even when the necessary legislation has been enacted. Some Members were never really sold on the idea of comparability. One Senator was reported to have said privately, "I'm getting sick of hearing the word 'comparability.' It's a four-bit word coined by some bureaucrat in the Civil Service Commission to justify outrageous pay requests for high salaried bureaucrats." Another observed that he was reminded of the Biblical quotation, "He who hath shall be given." Now, though the system is less than 2 years old, it appears that it is going to be reexamined under a cooperative arrangement between the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. It is reported that one group will examine the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in checking salaries of private jobs and relating them to the Federal service, while the other will look into the use made of Bureau of Labor Statistics data by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission in recommending salary adjustments to the President and the Congress. One Senator complains that two standards are being used in setting levels of compensation—local rates for blue collar workers, and national averages (which are higher) for administrative personnel.

After these problems involving the civilian personnel generally and the top level position in the three branches of Government had been settled or moved toward the prospect of a settlement, the Congress had next to tackle some other important pay problems. The pay of the armed services personnel had not been revised and upgraded for several years. This was done in the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963. Then the problems of the civilian personnel in service outside the Continental United States had to be attended to.

Some of the teachers in Germany and elsewhere were thoroughly disgusted with the amount of the increase which they received—a mere pittance, they called it—and proceeded to give evidence of their dissatisfaction by returning the pittance to their Congressman or to the agency by which they were employed, with some sarcastic note raising the question as to whether they—the Congress or the agency—could afford to do so much. It was the policy to return these remittances to those who sent them, if a usable address could be found.

The maintenance of the comparability principle is the second influence working toward further pay legislation. As stated above, the 1962 act provides that, whenever the Bureau of Labor Statistics annual wage and salary data indicates the need therefor, the necessary revisions in pay rates shall be presented to the Congress for its approval. While it is not likely that such needed changes will meet with any serious opposition, it is well-established that, under our system, no public funds can be expended for this or any other purpose without formal action by the Congress appropriating them.

FRINGE BENEFITS

Now that the comparability principle has been written into law in such a manner as to

more or less assure its observance on a continuing basis, attention appears to be shifting to another aspect of the Federal pay problem, namely, the question of fringe benefits. Of these, there are many different types. For illustrative purposes, perhaps two items will suffice, one relating to health benefits, the other to travel. Both were enacted last year, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

Health benefits: Public Law 88-59, approved July 8, 1963, amends the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefit plans. Eliminates the requirement that employee organization plans must have been in operation on July 1, 1959, and permits employee organizations to apply for approval as carriers of health benefits plans through December 1963.

Travel: Public Law 88-146, approved October 16, 1963, amends the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to authorize payment of travel and transportation expenses to student trainees when assigned, with or without promotion, upon completion of college work to positions for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage. Prior law limited such payment to student trainees who were promoted upon graduation.

A compilation prepared by the U.S. Civil Service Commission at the end of the first session shows a considerable number of bills in this general area upon which some action was taken. Although none of them was enacted into law, it is quite likely that some may be enacted during the current session. For example, one bill (H.R. 4837) would establish a procedure for payment of back pay to persons improperly separated from the Federal service. This passed the House and is pending in the appropriate Senate committee. H.R. 6910 extends to other agencies of the Government the authority now possessed by the military departments to settle claims against the United States by members of the uniformed service and civilian officers and employees for damage to or loss of personal property incident to their services. This bill passed the House and is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. And there are many more dealing with such subjects as dual compensation, health benefits and travel, hazardous pay, premium pay, and retirement benefits.

One of the local newspaper writers on Federal personnel matters has suggested that, when pay raises have been achieved, employee unions may sidetrack the question of pay, using the time to gain fringe benefits.

THE POSTAL WORKERS

Next to the Department of Defense, which has approximately 1¼ million civilian employees, comes the Post Office Department with half a million. I defer to no one in my admiration for and appreciation of the enormous service which the members of this devoted group of public servants render to me personally and to the Nation. Because they are well organized, and effective in making known to the Members of the Congress their desires and needs, they have for many years exerted a very great influence in determining the form and content of Federal pay legislation. When I say that the effort to meet these needs has tended to produce a certain amount of imbalance in the Federal pay structure, I do not for one moment wish to minimize the importance of the postal service or the needs of the thousands of man who perform its tasks. But I do insist that these demands present a problem, not only to me but to every Member of the Congress.

The Congress, in its consideration of pay legislation—as in other matters—is charged with responsibiltiy for safeguarding the national interest, for looking at the problems which come before it in the broader context of the Nation as a whole. In considering the 1962 pay legislation, that broader context was the need for adopting a pay plan that would provide two things: (1) a living wage or better, in terms of the economy of the sixties, for all Federal employees, regardless of the amount of training and preparation required for their respective jobs; and (2) a salary schedule for top level administrative, scientific and professional personnel that would enable the Federal Government to recruit and hold in its employ the number of highly trained specialists necessary to perform its technical and scientific work in the new age of space and technology. As in so many difficult situations, it is relatively easy to state the problem, and difficult to find an answer that is fair and equitable to all concerned.

Here, briefly, is what happened in 1962. The proposal submitted by the administration, while granting increases at all levels—some of them fairly substantial increases—emphasized reform of the salary structure, and the urgent need for higher ceilings for top level personnel, in conformity with pay rates for men of comparable training, experience, and ability in private employment. Even though adoption of this plan would make more difficult their own recruiting efforts, business leaders generally supported the administration proposals. The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings and produced a new bill based largely on the old pattern—large increases in the lower grades and meager increases at the top, thereby ignoring the essentials of the administration plan. This change increased the annual cost of the legislation from an estimated $212 million to about $700 million.

In other words, it was going to cost more than three times as much, without accomplishing the major objectives of a better and more orderly pay structure for the Government as a whole. What happened in resolving this conflict was the adoption of a compromise which, like most compromises, was satisfactory to no one. The increases for the top jobs were less than most informed people thought desirable, while those in the lower grades were higher than had been recommended but lower than those who hold these positions felt that they were entitled to. This, I suppose, is a more or less inevitable result when, after careful and prolonged consideration of a difficult problem, men of good will attempt to work out reasonable and equitable solutions for the claims of competing groups.

Nothing that I can say will make happy those who were disappointed in the result of the deliberations. My purpose here is to try to help all parties at interest to understand the problem which confronted the Congress, and how, on the basis of extensive study and analysis, the effort was made to arrive at the solution that seemed possible of accomplishment under the circumstances and that was calculated to the serve the national interest.

REDUCING THE NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

In January, as the 88th Congress assembled for its 2d session, and as the plans and proposals of the new administration were made public in the message on the state of the Union and in other ways, emphasis was placed on such widely publicized issues as tax reduction, civil rights, and the war on poverty. The President had already taken steps to enforce a vigorous program of economy and efficiency in all the Federal departments and agencies, and this has a definite bearing on the subject of this discussion.

In inaugurating this program, the President placed each agency head on notice that he was to practice all possible economies consistent with the maintenance of high standards in service to the public. They were asked to find ways of doing more work with fewer employees. In a speech in Houston on January 10, the Postmaster General expressed the position of the administration in these terms:

"In our domestic affairs, President Johnson has stressed from the very beginning, that the expenditures of Government in this administration will be handled with utmost thrift and frugality. The taxpayer is going to be assured of a dollar's value for every dollar of his money spent.

"The expenses of every Federal agency are being trimmed to the bone. For the first time in a decade the growth in Federal employment will be halted—in fact, there will be fewer people on the Federal payroll next year than in fiscal 1964.

"In the Post Office Department we shall cut our employment by 5,000 by June 30. This will be achieved by leaving vacated jobs unfilled. Our economy measures will not result in impaired postal service. We expect to handle our rapidly growing volume of mail by improved management techniques and harder work all around. Employee productivity has been increasing steadily in the postal service and we intend to bring about even further gains.

"President Johnson's stress on efficiency and frugality in Government does not mean that essential and desirable programs will be cut back or halted. It is essential that within the context of efficient management we move forward."

This statement indicates clearly what the basic objectives of the program are—to keep Government employment from growing, rather than to achieve any sizable reductions. No slashing of essential programs is contemplated. There will be no wholesale reductions in force. By a policy of accretion, many vacancies occurring in existing positions will go unfilled, thereby making possible—at least for a time—a halt in the further growth of what some people love to refer to as "the bureaucracy." By better management, the effort will be made to get more for our tax dollars, and to prevent new growth in Federal payroll.

In spite of the very restrained and moderate manner in which the Johnson program was presented, its announcement created a certain amount of concern, not only in Washington officialdom, but among Federal employees. It was frequently stated that "nothing like this has happened in the last decade," but this was not true.

It has happened, in fact, on several occasions. President Eisenhower reduced Government employment four times in his 8 years in office—in 1953, 1954, 1955, and again in 1958. The reduction in the first 3 years amounted to some 201,000 positions. President Kennedy added some workers in each of his 3 years, but there were still 40,000 fewer civil servants in 1963 than there were in 1953—despite a population growth of 31 million. The Federal payroll has been relatively stable since the end of World War II, remaining at the 2.5 million mark.

ELIMINATING DISCRIMINATION

I want to turn now to some Federal personnel problems of a quite different nature. Much of what I have been saying has dealt with one aspect or another of the pay problem, but having in mind the old adage to the effect that man does not live by bread alone, I want to comment briefly on a few of the problems that concern all of us who are in or who have to deal with the Federal personnel system.

In still another way, these problems differ from those previously discussed. We have been concerned with questions regarding which legislation has been enacted, but not all questions have a legislative base—at least, not at first. When they first arise, the executive branch has to deal with them as best it can, under existing laws, but if the problems persist and existing laws are inadequate, new legislation may be obtained at a later date. The nature of some of the current problems was suggested by the

Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in an end-of-the-year survey when he wrote: "Insistence on equal employment opportunities, stepped-up quest for quality applicants, major innovations in career development of Federal employees, and a program for increasing productivity, highlight U.S. Government developments." It is to some of these problems that I would now like to direct your attention.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN WORKERS

One longstanding problem in this field has involved equal pay for women workers. Since 1945, many attempts were made to enact legislation prohibiting discrimination in wages because of sex. Until 1962, no such bill passed either House. In that year, however, equal pay measures passed in both Chambers but never reached conference. That legislation would have established a new structure for the administration of the act, and different standards of coverage, as compared with those prescribed under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. On June 10, President Kennedy signed into law the Equal Pay Act of 1963, praising—as he did so—"those Members of Congress who worked so diligently to guide the Equal Pay Act through" and heralding it as "another structure base to democracy." This problem has, to be sure, been more notable in private employment than in the Government service, but even in Government, this type of discrimination still exists. A survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission as recently as 1962, as a part of President Kennedy's program to eliminate discrimination from the Federal service, produced evidence of discrimination against women workers, both in the appointing process and in consideration for promotion to more responsible and better paying positions.

These figures from the survey report showed conclusively that women in the higher grades especially are confronted with almost insuperable barriers in many agencies:

The agencies' percentage of requests for males only was 56 percent for jobs in grades 5 through 8, 69 percent for jobs in grades 9 through 12, and 94 percent in jobs in grades 13 to 15. In contrast, the agencies specified "males only" in only 16 percent of jobs in grades 1 through 4.

The Director of the Commission's Bureau of Recruiting and Examining declared that these figures are "difficult to defend or justify," as indeed, they are.

Public attitudes with regard to such a matter as this change slowly, almost imperceptibly so, but they do change. President Roosevelt had one woman Cabinet member throughout his tenure, and President Eisenhower had one for a brief period. President Kennedy appointed more women to important positions in the Federal service than any of his predecessors, but not enough to forestall the complaints of women's organizations that women were still grossly underrepresented in top level positions in the service. President Johnson has now indicated (January 29) his intention of doing something about this situation, announcing that—as a first step—50 qualified women would be appointed to important positions in the service within a month. Such a move, if followed by other similar appointments in the future, as vacancies occur, could have a significant influence in breaking down the existing barriers.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Under legislation already on the books, the administration has continued the drive to eliminate discrimination in employment in the Federal service, on account of race, in both the civilian and military branches of the service, and in the personnel practices of Government contractors. Presidential committees have been functioning in each of these areas for some time, to hear complaints, apprehend violators, and to take steps—legal or otherwise—to correct existing malpractices and obtain full compliance in the future.

This is, in these days, obviously a very sensitive area within which to work. Most Americans agree that the Negro and other members of minority groups deserve a better break with respect to education, jobs, housing, and access to public accommodations than they have had in the past, but before this can be achieved, the effect of generations of prejudice and repression, of "keeping the Negro in his place" has to be overcome. This is not easy, for it involves basic changes in a long-accepted way of life. These changes present many practical difficulties.

Members of minority groups are at present very sensitive, and are apt to see or to think that they see discrimination where in fact none exists or was intended. Some seem to expect, not equality of treatment, which is their right, but preferential treatment, and complain if they do not get it. Conversely, some whites complain that they are discriminated against because their skins are not black—and so it goes.

LABOR UNIONS AMONG FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Although organizations of Federal employees developed in shore establishments and installations as far back as the Jacksonian Era, it long continued to be generally assumed that labor unions and labor union tactics had little or no place among Government employees. Government—at least the Federal Government—was somehow different from private employment, and Government was or was supposed to be a model employer. Teachers, now organized in the larger cities, long shied away from union membership just as professional people still do, on the ground that such membership and the tactics of the unions are not becoming to or in keeping with the dignity of either the person or the job of the professional man or woman.

Now, in the midsixties, when labor unions are finding their influence dwindling or threatened in many long unionized industries, and when other industries are proving hard to organize, unionism in the Federal Government seems to be flourishing. These are some of the recent developments. Just a week before he was elected President, in 1960, the late President Kennedy wrote in a letter: "I have always believed that the right of Federal employees to deal collectively with the Federal departments and agencies in which they are employed should be protected." Although resistance to unionization had been gradually weakening, its decline during the 3 years was very rapid. It may even have been so rapid as to justify the statement that it was spectacular.

The basis for this generalization may be found in these important developments during recent years. In January 1962, the President signed two Executive orders designed to improve relations between management and employees in the Federal service.

The first of these provided for a broad system of official recognition of Federal employee unions which became effective on July 1; the second directed the Civil Service Commission to issue by April 1 a plan for a new system for disposing of employee appeals. Both of these were the result of recommendations made to the President by his task force on employee-management relations in the Federal service, headed by them Secretary, now Justice Arthur J. Goldberg who, in presenting the report to the President, stated that its recommendations charted the most significant advance that had been made in the field since the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912. As the President signed the order, he stressed the fact that the public interest remains the dominant consideration, and expressed the belief that employee-management relations would be strengthened by the orders.

A second important development occurred almost exactly 1 year ago when, on February 27, 1963, the Comptroller General ruled that Government workers may have their union dues deducted from their paychecks by their Federal agencies—in other words, that the checkoff system might be used with respect to Federal employees. This ruling somewhat unexpectedly gave unions a right they have sought for many years. Union leaders believe that it will strengthen their position in attracting new members. The ruling came in response to a letter from the Civil Service Commission raising such questions as these: whether agencies could charge for the cost of this service, and whether the President could set a uniform charge for the service. The Comptroller General had previously held that a checkoff system could not be established without specific legislative authorization, but the Congress had enacted such legislation in 1961.

The third point that I would make here is not so much a new one as a report of a delayed reaction to the first. Jerry Klutz recently reported in the Washington Post that the first critical reactions to the President's union recognition order were being heard on Capitol Hill. Although administration spokesmen rejected the idea, suggestions were being made that this was merely a first step, which would lead to militant unionization of all Federal employees, then the closed shop, collective bargaining on issues within the jurisdiction of the Congress, and finally to slowdowns and strikes such as those which have of late crippled the French and other governments. Since Federal employees are forbidden to strike both by law and by the constitutions of their unions, this seems hardly probable.

THE PROFESSIONAL MAN IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

In this speech, long though it may be, I can touch upon only a few of the problems of our Federal service. Since all of us are professional people, the problems of the professional person in the service is one topic that should certainly not be overlooked. The general assumption appears to be that there are no problems in this area. So we have been acting on theory that, should some arise, they will probably go away if we do not worry too much about them. Personally, I do not like this approach.

What are the wants and needs of the professional person in Government? The experience of a small group of top level Federal professionals that I know about may shed some light on this question. This group met once a month for a period of nearly 2 years, at the Brookings Institution in Washington, in an effort to do two things: (1) to identify the problems of the more than 200,000 Federal professionals in the country, and (2) to figure out what could be done about them. Very early in their deliberations it became apparent that there are many problems, and that very little attention is being paid to them.

In the first place, the professional employee in Government has had no spokesman. Although each professional man belongs to various professional groups in his field—accounting, law, engineering, physics, chemistry, or whatnot, these organizations are largely composed of and are dominated by and render service primarily to members who are in private employment or in the universities. There is in each of these national organizations a contingent—sometimes a sizable contingent—of those who are in the Government service, but virtually no attention is given to their problems or their needs. This, the representatives of the associations frankly admitted when they met with the members of the organizing group.

Their findings in this respect were reinforced in conversations with Members of Congress and congressional staff people. Two former staff directors of the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service assured them that the Members were perfectly willing to help the professionals, but that nobody ever told them (the Members and the committees) what the professionals wanted. These findings lead to a decision—very reluctantly made, I assure you—to form a new organization, the Federal Professional Association, chartered under the laws of the District of Columbia, and formally launched at an all-day conference held in November 1962. Now slightly more than a year old, the association has been trying to lay sound foundations for future growth. It now has about 1,000 members, 9 chapters in existence, and as many more in the process of development. There has been nothing spectacular in its development but the prospects for the future look quite encouraging.

This is not the time or place for me to enter into any lengthy discourse on the organization, development, and program of the new association. Suffice it to say that it aspires to be of service to the professional people in Government who have no desire (or even a willingness) to join a union to protect their interests, and to do what it can to strengthen and improve the Federal service. It does not intend to concentrate on pay problems although, of course, it will appear at proper times before the appropriate committees to express the views of professionals on pending proposals in this field. It hopes rather to emphasize such questions as conditions of work conducive to research and writing, to better procedures than now exist for assisting persons who find themselves the victim of unfair or arbitrary administrative action, or who are detrimentally affected by the contracting out of work which could and probably should be done by Government personnel within the agencies. And since professionals, like all humans, grow old and have to retire, it will interest itself in improving the retirement system as it affects professionals.

One of the things that became apparent very early in the deliberations of the association's organizing group was that a good many Government agencies have never learned how to treat professional people, or how to obtain from them the maximum return for salaries paid and efforts expended. Professional people cannot be treated like hired hands; they cannot, that is to say, if they are to produce high-grade work. Perhaps they have something of the qualities of the prima donna about them, but they do require suitable working conditions, freedom from annoying and harassing administrative details, and a congenial atmosphere in which to work.

They require an administrative setup in which research and writing is approved and encouraged, not frowned upon or merely tolerated as an expression of an idiosyncrasy on the part of the employee. Professional personnel, if they are to grow and develop, must be encouraged to do research, to write and publish professionally, subject only to such restrictions and restraints as are unavoidably connected with the use of materials classified for security reasons.

These things Government agencies need to learn and I trust will learn as in this new age of science and technology, Government and Government personnel daily become more deeply involved in technical problems of the highest complexity and of great moment to the future well-being of our country.

AUTOMATION AND THE FEDERAL SERVICE

In many contacts with Federal people, I gather the impression that they, no less than individuals in private employment, are deeply concerned about what automation may do to them and their jobs. I presume that there is no aspect of modern life whose consequences are more talked about and less understood than that of automation. Since a good many of the members of this audience are professionals whose work seems especially likely to be affected by automation in an important way, it seems appropriate for me to devote a few remarks to the governmental aspects of this fascinating subject.

In the first place, governments have been slow—much slower than management in private industry—to visualize what automatic data processing can mean for them, and to avail themselves of the financial savings and benefits which it offers. Even so, current surveys show considerable progress in this direction, and further development may be expected in the future at an accelerated pace. Like any important development, adjustment and change will be required.

Some individuals will be hurt, but by careful advance planning, and by programs for the training and retraining of the individual employees whose present jobs are diminished or abolished, the personal injuries can be held to a minimum and progress can be made from which all will benefit, and in this I include even the relocated employee.

This is one of those things that we have to take in our stride. Banshee yowls, and outbursts of rage and vituperation have never been particularly successful in solving problems, and I do not anticipate that they will be here, although they have already been tried, and probably will be again. The most extensive users of ADP in the Federal Government have been the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Commerce (particularly in the Bureaus of Census and Public Roads), the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, now being joined by the Post Office Department in which the processes of automation are being rapidly advanced. In all agencies, ADP is being used for payroll and accounting operations. The experience thus far was summarized at the 1963 National Conference of the American Society for Public Administration, in which these points were stressed:

First, ADP systems, on a large scale, have an enormous potential for employee dislocation, unless manpower planning accompanies technical planning.

Second, if the impact on employees is to be minimized, innovations in personnel management may be required.

Third, retraining can also be highly important in adjustment of employees. IRS found early in its planning that attrition would not be sufficient to reduce employment in the affected work units.

Fourth, encouraging employees to relocate presented the most difficult problem. Because of personal and financial responsibilities, fewer employees than were anticipated were willing to move.

In addition, the point is emphasized that in the future, the Government employee must be far more flexible and adaptable to change and innovation than in the past. The chance that a man can follow the same type of activity through all the years of his working life is very slim; on the contrary, the probability is that the employee of the future will be engaged in several different types of work, very likely in as many different locations, in the course of his working lifetime.

Because automation is so new, and there has been so little opportunity to study and evaluate its effects, there is a movement underway right now to establish a broadly representative 32-member study commission to deal with the economic and social dislocations resulting from automation, possible arms reduction and changes in defense spending. The findings of such a body should, in due time, be of quite as great significance to Government people as for those in private employment.

THE FEDERAL SERVICE: ITS IMAGE AND ITS GOALS

The image of the Federal service

I know of no more suitable way of bringing these remarks to a close than to say a few words on a matter of serious concern to every person in this room—the image of the Federal service and its goals. The government worker has never, in any society, either ancient or modern, been a particularly popular or admired individual. On the contrary, the government worker has, all too often, been looked down upon and spoken of in disparaging terms as being some sort of parasite on the back or in the hair of the body politic. He has often been characterized as not being very able, not very ambitious or industrious (or, obviously, he would not be a government worker), and sometimes not very honest. This time-honored sterotype of the government worker does gross injustice to the vast army of able and devoted men and women who today make up the Federal civil service.

This problem of the attitude of the public toward its public service personnel has long been a matter of concern. The late Professor and Civil Service Commissioner Leonard D. White made a study of the subject and published a book about it a quarter of a century ago. Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, as Chairman of the Commission, organized and directed a nationwide campaign to get the story of the public service to the people. Currently, within the last few days, the Brookings Institution in Washington has published an important volume on "The Image of the Federal Service," as a part of the report on its 5-year study of the Federal service and its problems. Obviously, this is not the sort of problem that can be solved by legislation, although occasionally, there are ways in which legislation can be helpful. This report will, I am sure, be carefully studied to see what action the Congress might take that would be helpful and constructive.

The pursuit of excellence

Just as many thoughtful persons have been concerned about the popular image of the public service, many are also concerned with what may be called the pursuit of excellence. How is our National Government, with its important domestic responsibilities, and its foreign responsibilities emanating from its position as leader of the free world, going to get its proper share of the best minds, and the best trained minds to carry on its work in this new age of science, technology, automation, and space? This is not a problem that can be solved either by wishful thinking or by exhortation.

There are at least three important prerequisites of a better public service. The first is better pay, and this, we are all happy to note, has been and is being achieved. The second is the recognition of merit, and here, also, important progress is being made. I have been much impressed this year, as I have in former years, as I have read in the papers of the important contributions made by many individuals in the Federal service. The practice of giving public recognition for conspicuous achievement is something relatively new and recent, but I like it. Here are the Stockberger Award, the Jump Award, the Flemming Awards, the Civil Service League Awards, the Rockefeller Fund Awards, and the awards for outstanding women workers—to mention only a few. This recognition of accomplishment is important, and I believe that it contributes greatly to the realization of our goal of achieving excellence in the public service.

An examination of the life stories of the recipients of these awards, and of the contributions that they had made is, indeed, impressive. Here are found, in the work of these men and women, the evidence of significant contributions not only for the benefit of all Americans but very often for the benefit of all mankind. As I ponder over

these stories, I like also to remember that it is only a few of the more outstanding employees in the Federal service who are so recognized. For every one who is, there are dozens, scores, hundreds, perhaps even thousands more who inconspicuously, day by day, perform their assigned tasks competently, efficiently, and with the high standards of integrity that characterize the Federal civil service.

I salute these people—you and your coworkers, here and elsewhere around the country. All of this is a part of the effort to improve the image of the public service and of achieving excellence in it. No one has expressed this idea better than O. Glenn Stahl, himself a distinguished career man in the Federal service, at a conference on achieving excellence in the public service, held in Philadelphia a few months ago, when he said:

"Our public servants are far better than the average citizen appreciates, but they must be still better than that. We cannot hope for respect without meriting it, but neither can we achieve excellence without respect. Both excellence and honor must move forward side by side; every step to improve personnel and performance must be accompanied by a step to generate public pride and recognition of accomplishment.

"Only with a renewed determination to deal forthrightly and resolutely with the continuing problem of the prestige of public employment can we expect to close the remaining gap between the real quality of Government personnel and the ideal required by our times."

Hon. Clark W. Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1964, the rice farmers of Texas, in appreciation for work well done, gave a testimonial dinner in honor of our colleague, the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON and Mrs. Thompson.

It was an outstanding event and was attended by more than 1,200 friends of the Thompsons. The grand ballroom of the Rice Hotel in Houston was filled to overflowing and many who sought admission had to be turned away.

One of the principal speakers at this dinner was the Honorable Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture. In addition to saying some very complimentary things about his associations with Congressman THOMPSON, the Secretary delivered a major policy address on the subject of foreign trade.

Trade is vital to agriculture. The production of more than 60 million American acres are exported. Without an export market American agriculture would suffer severely and because a healthy agriculture is so basic to a healthy America, our Nation would suffer.

A major problem facing agriculture trade today is the Common Market of Europe and it will not be long before the so-called Kennedy round of trade negotiations takes place. Every American should be interested in our current trade situation and how we plan to move forward in securing the greatest possible successes for our country out of the "Kennedy round."

Secretary Freeman has distinguished himself in many ways, but in no area has he carried on more vigorously and with greater understanding of the problems than he has in agriculture trade. The speech he made at CLARK THOMPSON's dinner is particularly timely, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN

This is a critical year for agriculture and particularly for agricultural trade. Preliminary talks leading to the opening of general trade negotiations in May of this year have been underway for some months. Decisions which will be made in Geneva this year in the trade negotiations will have a critical effect on American agriculture and on farmers in the United States for many years to come. These decisions are turning out to be difficult to make.

I refer, of course, to the negotiations which have come to be called the Kennedy round of general trade negotiations arising out of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The trading countries of the world and the agricultural producers in these countries are truly at a crossroads in 1964. They may choose to travel the high road of trade expansion, of fair and liberal and outward-looking trade policies, or they can choose the low road of restrictive, inward-looking, self-sufficient agricultural and trading systems.

If the commercial trading nations of the free world take the high road, it can mean expanded export markets, increased sales for U.S. farmers, and a better day for the world's consumers. If the trading countries take the low road, it will mean higher costs to their consumers, lower standards of living, political differences arising out of economic protectionism, and a far more difficult world to live in.

I want to discuss these questions tonight not only with rice producers and rice millers who are here at this meeting, but through you with farmers all over the country. The question of trade is one which affects all of our farmers to a greater or lesser degree. Even though rice exports may be governed by regulations in foreign markets which are different from those which govern feed grain exports, the principles which can improve farm incomes and enhance the living standards of the world are the same from commodity to commodity and throughout the world.

I want to ask a few questions tonight and then seek to answer them. In this fashion, we can best pinpoint some important facts in what has come to be a somewhat confusing picture.

1. Are agricultural exports important?
2. Why is it that trade negotiations involving agricultural products are so difficult?
3. Has the emergence of the European Economic Community changed things in regard to agricultural trade?
4. Do we oppose the European Economic Community or obstruct it?
5. Do some of the European Economic Community's current practices and negotiating proposals represent a serious threat to the American farmer and his markets?
6. What are these negotiating proposals, and why do they threaten our legitimate rights?
7. Do we have negotiating proposals?

The answers to these questions are difficult, but they are crucial to the agricultural trade negotiations, and the outcome of the issues raised in these questions is as important to American farmers as the outcome of our own domestic agricultural policies.

1. Are agricultural exports important? They are exceedingly important—more than at any time in our history to farmers and to the entire Nation. Exports provide markets for over 60 million producing acres; they greatly ease the problems of production adjustment. Exports strengthen market prices and improve farm incomes. Farm products for export provide jobs for around 1 million farmworkers, and many thousands of additional jobs for those in towns and cities who transport, store, process, and otherwise service our food and agricultural industries. Agricultural exports selling in the world market for dollars add to the plus side of our international accounts at the rate of $4 billion a year—twice the dollar export rate of 1955, before most of today's market expansion efforts were undertaken.

Not only do agricultural exports aid our own economy greatly, but they are one of the greatest expressions of American progress and American ability as seen in foreign lands. Today, the products from American farms are helping to feed and clothe more millions of the world's people than ever before, and this fact speaks loudly and clearly for our free and competitive agriculture.

Because agricultural trade is important, agriculture is included in the general trade negotiations. There is a very simple logic behind the decision to tie all products together in the negotiations. It will benefit both sides to do this. It was to use agricultural concessions where possible to secure industrial concessions, and to use industrial concessions where possible to secure agricultural concessions. This procedure is at the very heart of the decision to coordinate the agricultural and nonagricultural trade negotiations. It makes good negotiating sense and gives us a stronger hand. Europe is not basically an agricultural exporter. We have comparatively little to offer her that is attractive in the agricultural concession area. But Europe is a heavy exporter of nonagricultural products and there is ample opportunity for exchange.

2. Why is it that trade negotiations involving agricultural products are so difficult?

There are certain historical reasons. In the United States and throughout the world, the farmer has always been the low man on the economic totem pole. As governments have introduced measures to improve the incomes of farmers relative to other economic sectors, there has grown up a whole system of restrictions protecting domestic production in all countries by shutting out trade. I do not exclude the United States from this difficult situation, although our agriculture is protected far less than the agriculture of other countries. In the United States, however, farm families on the average earn incomes only 55 percent as high as the average for families working in other economic sectors. The same thing is true in Europe. This situation can and must be improved both in the United States and in Europe. But it cannot be improved simply by building a wall around the agriculture of a country or group of countries, thereby restricting the flow of trade. Yet that has often been the first approach to our farm income problems. And it is one we must still reckon with.

There is also the fact of the technological explosion. The immense improvements in agricultural productivity, especially in the United States and in Europe, have brought the pressure of agricultural surpluses to bear on farm prices and farm incomes. Also, this rising productivity has led many countries of the world to believe that they can become self-sufficient in agricultural production even though they have failed to do it in the past. This has long been a goal in some areas. So, on the one hand, the tendency to protect the farmers from the price consequences of increased output leads to

trade restrictionism. And, on the other hand, the prospect of increased productivity rekindles the desire of many countries of finally becoming self-sufficient.

3. Has the emergence of the EEC changed things in regard to agricultural trade? The EEC, or Common Market, is an economic union of six western European countries. It aims eventually to eliminate barriers to trade between its members. It must harmonize different economic systems and price levels. When this is done, the EEC—on economic matters—will look and act as a single nation. In the trade negotiations, they will act as one in negotiating with the rest of the world, including the United States. They are trying to do what we did when we adopted a common constitution—they want to be six in one. Clearly, the EEC has changed things, and we need to take account of the new problems which have resulted.

4. Do we oppose the European Economic Community or obstruct it? Does the United States seek to undermine its agriculture? Absolutely not. The United States has supported and nourished the European Economic Community. In principle, the countries of the European Economic Community and the United States have agreed that we can improve the welfare of our farm people and improve our trading relations with one another at the same time. We all subscribe to the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the GATT. We work together for a stronger free world.

But as so often happens in human affairs, it is easier to agree upon objectives than it is to agree upon ways to attain them. It is difficult to accomplish all we seek. As a result, certain practices and new systems have come into existence, and others are being discussed which would not appear to further the trade objectives we seek.

The United States, and particularly the Secretary of Agriculture, has often been charged with unreasonable demands upon other trading countries and especially on the European Economic Community. It has been said in Europe that we seek to flood their markets with the products of U.S. farms, and to replace European farmers. This is simply not true. Let us look briefly at what the United States really wants in the agricultural negotiations.

What we have asked for is exactly what we are willing to give, namely, fair access to the markets of the world based on trade in a recent representative period. Our present negotiations on beef imports are an example of this. United States beef imports have climbed spectacularly in the last several years. They are influencing domestic prices and farm income. But the United States is not arbitrarily slamming shut its door on imports. We are negotiating with our principal suppliers access arrangements which will recognize our situation and their market needs. These market share arrangements will allow imports to continue to enter the United States up to recent representative levels, and to expand as our total market grows.

The United States and other exporters now supply a share of Europe's markets and the markets of the other trading nations. What we ask in the future is that the agricultural trade policies being undertaken not be designed to reduce our opportunities to share in those markets on a fair and reasonable competitive basis. We ask that the interests of the efficient agricultural producers of the world be accounted for in the agricultural and trade policies of other countries.

We have the greatest sympathy for the problems of European farmers. Our farmers have much in common with the farmers of Europe. We hope that Europe's farmers will prosper and that their markets will expand and their income rise along with the income of U.S. farmers. We seek an opportunity to show, therefore, that it is to the mutual advantage of importing countries and exporting countries to share the world's agricultural markets and that the end result would be better farm incomes and higher living standards throughout the world.

5. Do some of the European Economic Community's current practices and proposals represent a serious threat to the American farmer and his market?

The only possible answer to this question is "yes." Some of the erosion of the American market has already begun. Exports of wheat flour to the EEC countries dropped by 40 percent in 1963; exports of poultry and poultry products declined by 64 percent in 1963. Import restrictions for grains which are under discussion within the European Economic Community could seriously damage our markets for wheat and feed grains. And a negotiating plan has been proposed which would have the effect of basing the agricultural trade negotiations upon a system of agricultural policies and levies which would seriously threaten markets we have served for many years.

6. What is this plan and why does it threaten our legitimate markets?

The newspapers in recent weeks have written a great deal about a negotiating plan for agriculture developed by the European Economic Community. Our knowledge of this plan is in many respects incomplete but we know enough about it to be very concerned about its effect upon the United States and upon the trade negotiations generally.

In essence this plan seeks to turn all import duties or other import barriers on agricultural products, in all negotiating countries, into variable levies of the kind now applicable in the Eureopean Economic Community. It would seriously alter the present system of agreements and practices worked out over many years, and replace them with a new system.

As I understand it, this is not the kind of negotiating proposal which would make for progress. Instead we need a more practical proposal which recognizes and respects the different kinds of farm support systems in the world and the different kind of import barriers which protect them. It is not reasonable to expect to impose one system on all countries of the world, no matter how appealing that system may be to those who have devised it. We need a plan which can result in the reduction of fixed import duties, in greater access to markets, and in reduction or elimination of discrimination among supplying countries where it is practiced.

The rights of third countries of access to markets have been painfully negotiated over the years. They are the starting point for further negotiations. If they are swept away, the fair and legitimate trade interests of the rest of the trading world will go with them. This must not be allowed to happen.

7. Do we have a negotiating proposal?

I do not approach these matters in a negative way—to obstruct progress. It is useless to point our finger at others if we have no proposals of our own. Instead, we must approach these important trade negotiations positively, recognizing the problems of others sympathetically and not rejecting out of hand the needs of other countries for a sound domestic farm policy which meets their needs.

To do this, we must first find a way to negotiate under the new circumstances resulting from the EEC; then we must actually negotiate. As realistic people, we are not trying to redesign the world's commercial trading system; instead we are searching for a negotiating plan, recognizing the differing needs of all countries to protect their farm income programs.

In my considered judgment there is such a practical workable system. We in the USDA have worked long and hard on such a plan. Its basis is very simple. Its aim is fair market sharing based on long-standing practices, adjusted to new conditions resulting from the European Economic Community and recognizing her problems but also the interests of third countries as well. Such a negotiating plan recognizes that all countries have rights. It would embody certain well-established international trading principles and goals.

Here are its elements:

1. Fixed import duties should be reduced substantially. If the negotiating countries adopt a general rule for reducing fixed duties, that rule should cover agricultural products as well as industrial. Any items too sensitive to permit lower duties would qualify for an exception for farm products as for any type of product.

2. Variable import levies—a new device widely used in the European Economic Community and in some other European countries—should be included in the negotiations in a meaningful way. But variable levies cannot be reduced as fixed import duties can, so we must find an alternative means of trade liberalization. Negotiated trade access through arrangements for both domestic producers and exporters to share equitably in expanding markets would be the basic approach for grains, meats, and certain other variable fee items.

3. For certain products, quantitative restrictions or state trading impede trade. Where these barriers are used for the protection of farm income programs, improved access for imports should be negotiated again through fair market share arrangements similar to those which would be negotiated for variable levies. Where the nontariff barrier does not perform a critical function in the protection of farm income, however, we believe the barrier should be removed as quickly as possible.

These proposals are already before the world. They are in fact a part of the common language of trade liberalization aimed at creating balance between the legitimate protection of domestic farm income by various countries on one hand, and expanded international trade in agriculture products on the other.

Let me explain in a little more detail what I have in mind. The fixed import duty is the most common form of protection in the world. It is still the prevalent form of protection here in the United States. We are willing to consider reducing our fixed import duties on agricultural products if we can get adequate payment for them abroad—we don't intend to give anything away—and if the domestic situation permits a cut. We think other countries should be willing to do the same.

We recognize, however, that for many commodities the fixed import duty is not the principal form of protection used. Variable levies, quantitative restrictions, and state trading are different, and they require different methods. There are these and a host of other devices which, singly or in combination, give the protection which was once required and which we all seek to reduce in these negotiations for our common good. Nontariff barriers cannot be excluded from negotiations simply because they are not tariffs. The most sensible way to include them in the negotiations is to negotiate market-share arrangements for products covered by such systems. Even here I see no need for any one form of arrangement. It should fit the needs of the countries and commodity with which we are dealing. The International Wheat Agreement and the market-sharing arrangements proposed by the United Kingdom in meats and cereals are important precedents.

The essence of each arrangement, however, would be an assurance given by the importers to efficient outside countries that these producers would have the opportunity to

compete with domestic producers for a fair share of the domestic market. This market share would be based upon imports in a recent representative period, and it would provide for expanded imports as the total market grows. It does not admit exclusion from markets, either by direct quotas or by adoption of domestic policies which have that effect.

For some commodities—cereals and meat and dairy products come immediately to mind—these market-share arrangements may have to be quite elaborate. They may require new multilateral agreements involving all major importers and exporters. They may cover areas of national policy not now subject to international commitments—such as support prices or noncommercial sales. They might require all the developed countries of the world to make substantial contributions to the less developed countries by way of food aid.

The core of such arrangements, however, would be the assurance given by importers to exporters that they will not be shut out of the dollar import markets through the application of restrictions at the frontier.

I repeat that agricultural markets can grow, as they must, only if the agricultural negotiations can make progress—only if the key can be found to a liberal and progressive negotiating plan.

I have set before you tonight such a negotiating plan: to reduce tariffs; to guarantee fair and reasonable access to markets where tariff reduction is not applicable or possible; to remove nontariff restrictions at every opportunity.

This is a negotiating plan the world can understand. It does not involve the writing of a new language for the agricultural talks. It does not build the trade negotiations around any particular domestic agricultural system, but rather adapts the trade negotiation plan to the main systems of protection and duties of all the trading partners in the world. It starts from where we are. It builds on the successful negotiations of the past. It benefits all nations—developed and less developed alike.

Finally, it is a plan for trade liberalization, and that is what the trade negotiations are all about.

It would require tariff cuts; it is not at all clear that other proposals would do this.

It would assure markets to efficient producers and would require some limit to the measures encouraging inefficient production.

It would expose the trading practices and the domestic farm policies of the free world to the test of the high principles under which the trade negotiations were launched.

It would inject new strength and vigor into the world's established commercial trading system, a system which has served man well through the ages and which continues to offer best promise for effective and rewarding distribution of his production.

As we move forward in trade talks, we need and want the advice and the support of farm groups in the United States. I assure you of the strongest possible representation of your interests, from the President on down. I have high hopes for a successful outcome, for expanded markets, and for better farm incomes as a result.

Never before in trade negotiations has agriculture received so much attention and consideration. Agricultural trade had the vigorous attention of President Kennedy; it now has the vigorous attention of President Johnson. As a result, agriculture and industry are together in the trade talks. This is the policy of the U.S. Government. With the help and support of agriculture and industry, I am optimistic that this united front can be turned into the most successful trade negotiations in history.

Address by Hon. Wilbur D. Mills at Appreciation Dinner for Hon. Clark W. Thompson, Houston, Tex., January 31, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, another principal speaker that evening was to be our colleague, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, the distinguished chairman of our Ways and Means Committee. Regretfully, he had to miss the dinner due to illness in his family. The able general counsel of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Leo Irwin, delivered the speech in the absence of Chairman MILLS.

Under previous consent I also insert it in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILBUR D. MILLS, AT APPRECIATION DINNER FOR HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1964, AT RICE HOTEL, HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. Toastmaster, Clark and Mrs. Thompson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

This occasion which brings me to the great State of Texas is surely one of the most welcomed and pleasant privileges which I have experienced in many, many years. It is said—and with some wisdom—that politicians always enjoy talking to people. This is more particularly true when the subject is one which is deemed important to our fellow citizens; when the people to whom we are talking are our friends and neighbors; and when the person about whom we are talking is an admired and respected friend and colleague.

The situation here tonight has all of these ingredients. Next to my native Arkansans, there are no friends to whom I would rather talk than my neighboring Texans. There is no farm product of more importance to our economy—both locally and nationally—than rice. And, above all, there is no Member of the Congress more deserving of commendation and tribute, and whom I would rather honor, than my dear and good friend, CLARK THOMPSON.

I can well understand why there are so many distinguished leaders from both business and agriculture here tonight, because I know the very high esteem in which CLARK THOMPSON is held by all those who know him or have been associated with him. I have personal knowledge of his high standing among his colleagues in the Congress; your presence attests to the regard in which he is held by his constituents and neighbors. My own presence here gives me the opportunity and the privilege to review and pay tribute to some of the more outstanding contributions which CLARK has made to the economic and political strength of this part of the country and to the Nation as a whole.

It has been my very high good fortune in the years past to have become extremely familiar with the exemplary works and deeds of our beloved and admired friend. For a long time, while CLARK was a leader in the Agriculture Committee of the House, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Rice, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Family Farms, I watched and admired the quiet and modest, but inspiring, and effective way in which he secured enactment of legislative milestone after legislative milestone according recognition to the significance and importance of rice in the farm sector and in the food sector of our total economy.

Those of you here tonight whose primary concern is with the rice economy of your area and mine need not be reminded that agriculture legislation relating to rice has come a long way in the past decade and a half. We have traversed this road largely because of the sustained efforts of the gentleman from Texas, CLARK THOMPSON. It is not merely happenchance that the historic legislative enactments which have advanced the cause of rice, and all those many individuals, families, and businesses which benefit from it, bear the name of CLARK THOMPSON.

A glance at the program announcing this dinner discloses a very brief review of some of the more recent measures which he authored and steered through the Congress. It is there indicated that 2 years ago, largely because of his efforts with the President, the national rice acreage allotment was increased by 10 percent, and since that time, he has led the fight in maintaining this increase. He was also instrumental in having the national acreage rice support price increased, and just a few days ago, the House of Representatives passed a bill permitting the transfer of acreage allotments in the case of the death of an individual.

Going back even further, I recall his sponsorship of the bill in the 84th Congress which increased the then existing rice acreage allotments by 5 percent and which made other beneficial changes relating to rice in the Agriculture Agreement Act; the bill in the 85th Congress in 1957; the Rice Marketing Quotas Act of 1959; and I could continue to list these for a long time. Truly, Clark Thompson is the "architect" of our agricultural policy with respect to rice, and it is with good reason and justification that he is recognized as the spokesman for the rice industry in the U.S. Congress.

Now what is this product which has merited so much of the time and energy of our friend, CLARK? What is its status in the farm economy and the total economy? And of what significance is it to this section and to the entire United States? I am sure that you here tonight know the answers to these questions far better than I because while I have been closely associated with activities with respect to rice for many years, you are the real experts on this subject. Even so, Mr. Toastmaster, I believe there might be some interest in recounting just a few brief facts which have come to my attention in refreshing my recollection on the significance and importance of this great farm product to our part of the Nation.

We can well begin with the fact that rice is a major crop of the Ninth Congressional District of Texas and the major food crop of Texas. The Department of Agriculture reported that in 1962 more than 11 million hundredweight of rice was produced in that district, which represented 71.7 percent of the total production of the State of Texas.

And Texas in 1962 was tied with my own State of Arkansas for the top production State of that year, each having produced 16,401,000 bags. However, in the year just closed, the State of Texas led the Nation in rice production, with 18,394,000 bags out of a total production of 70 million bags.

It is interesting to observe that rice, which is the most extensively grown food crop in the world, is also, in our own country, the most highly mechanized crop in the world. The yield per acre in the United States for 1963 was 3,962 pounds, but in the State of Texas it was 4,025 pounds. The total U.S. production of 70-plus million bags for 1963 was a record high for the second consecutive year, representing 6 percent above the pre-

vious record and 40 percent above the 1957–61 average. This larger crop was the result of higher yields, since the acreage harvested was less than last year. The yield per acre for the United States in 1963 was 236 pounds above the previous record and 645 pounds above the 1957–61 average. These statistics show how our efficiency in the production of this most important food crop continues to improve year by year.

The cash return to the United States and to the rice producing States is evidence of the significance of this increasingly important food crop in our total economy. In 1962, farm marketings of rice in the United States amounted to over $332 million, and the marketing of the Texas crop was over $82 million, or about 6 percent of total receipts from all crops in the State. However, these overall marketing figures do not show the total picture by any means, since they do not indicate the thousands and thousands of families and businesses which depend upon the production, milling, and marketing of rice for their livelihood.

We are all, of course, vitally interested in the outlook in the 1963–64 rice situation and in what might be expected on both the domestic and the international front. As just reported by the Outlook and Situation Board of the Department of Agriculture about a week ago, the dominant features in the 1963–64 rice situation are, first, the record large crop and, second, some uncertainty in the export outlook. Domestic demand for rice in 1963-64 is expected to continue its upward trend, and we are told it may total about 29.5 million bags. But while it is expected that exports might set a new record of 38 million bags, the export estimates are subject to more than usual uncertainty. This is because of several factors, including the situation in Indonesia—which is normally a major buyer of the United States rice—and as to what might be expected with respect to rice purchases by the Soviet Union and the Eastern European bloc countries.

We are told by the Outlook and Situation Board that the worldwide purchases of grains by the Soviet Union and the bloc countries recently has led to speculation that they may also be potential rice buyers. A further, but more long-term, factor with respect to the export outlook has to do with regulations recently promulgated by the European Economic Community (EEC) which are to go into operation on July 1, 1964. While these regulations probably will not have any pronounced effect on U.S. exports during the current marketing year, they will undoubtedly give preferential treatment to rice-producing countries in the Common Market—meaning France and Italy—when they do become effective.

A look at the total statistics for 1963 with respect to supply, domestic use, and exports of rice shows in bold relief the importance to the U.S. ricegrower of exports. Thus, of the total supply for 1963 of 77.9 million bags, which consists of 70.1 million of new production and 7.7 million of carryover, the domestic consumption, including that for food, for seed, and for industry, accounted for 29.5 million bags while the exports accounted for 38 million bags. I cite these figures to indicate the vital stake which the rice-producing section of the United States has in our total international trade picture.

It will be recalled that one of the major policy objectives of the Kennedy administration was enactment of legislation which would give the President the authority which he would need to deal with the EEC in the next several years. The Committee on Ways and Means reported and the Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which not only gives the President authority which he will need in this regard, but also gives to him weapons which he can use to help prevent discrimination by foreign countries against U.S. farm products in foreign markets. Very strong language was written into that act in section 252, with respect to such matters. Our distinguished honoree here tonight played a major part in helping to shape the trade expansion legislation which was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means and which I think will prove to be of marked significance to this Nation in its trade relationships with other nations during the years to come.

Mr. Toastmaster, this was just one of the many highly significant pieces of legislation which the Committee on Ways and Means has reported since CLARK THOMPSON became a member in January 1962. I know that it was as a result of a great deal of thought and careful consideration that CLARK decided to shift from the Committee on Agriculture to the Committee on Ways and Means. I am extremely glad that he decided to make this move. He has been one of the stalwart members of the committee and has rendered outstanding service in the several fields of our endeavor during the past 2 years.

I do not know of any time in the recent history of the United States that the Committee on Ways and Means has been busier with high-priority legislation than has been the case during these 2 years. Major revenue legislation has been enacted in each of the years since CLARK became a member and particularly important in that regard are the Revenue Act of 1962 and the pending revenue reduction act, H.R. 8363, which has now been reported by the Senate Finance Committee and which is expected to pass the Senate and go to conference very shortly. Many sections of this bill, which will provide the largest tax reduction in the history of the United States, bear the handiwork of our distinguished friend, CLARK THOMPSON.

Other measures which the committee reported and which became law and which CLARK has helped to shape are the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which reworked our 30-year-old, outmoded classification schedules; the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, which revised our welfare legislation and gave the States more power to deal with abuses; the Tax Rate Extension Acts of 1962 and 1963, and a very broad variety of other measures. So it is that when CLARK moved from the Agriculture Committee to the Committee on Ways and Means, he moved into an area where his many talents and qualifications outside the area of agriculture could be brought to bear on fiscal, tax, tariff, and social security problems intimately affecting his own district and the entire United States.

However, CLARK did not by any means lose his interest in agriculture when he came to the Committee on Ways and Means. On the contrary, that interest has continued to manifest itself, as evidenced by the fact that the most recent rice bills to pass the Congress continue to bear his name. On those very few occasions when CLARK has not been in attendance at the almost continuous sessions of the Committee on Ways and Means—and I must say he is one of our most conscientious members—it has usually been because he was appearing before the Agriculture Committee or was at the Department of Agriculture conferring with either the Secretary or other officials in behalf of the rice industry and the other agricultural interests of the Ninth Congressional District of Texas.

Mr. Toastmaster, I could go on at length about the virtues of our mutual close friend. His quiet and gentle manner and his big heart might be misleading to one who did not know him well. These virtues might be taken by the uninitiated as a mark of an easy-going man. However, those of us who have had the privilege of working with him know that he stands like the Rock of Gibraltar when the going gets rough. I recall a comment made by the late Speaker Rayburn to one of his administrative assistants. He said, "Whenever you get in real trouble, you look up, and there will be CLARK THOMPSON coming to you." Mr. Toastmaster, I could have made the same statement as our late beloved Speaker—whenever we have had real difficult issues in the committee, CLARK THOMPSON always stands fast for what is right.

Mr. Toastmaster, I have always thought that it was a great gift to an individual to be possessed of a ready wit, a keen wit, and the ability to use it at crucial times. I can say without reservation that CLARK's keen wit and high good humor have often brought the Committee on Ways and Means "back to earth," so to speak, when tempers were on edge over some difficult point on which convictions on both sides ran strong.

As I have indicated, I could go on and on over the virtues and the accomplishments of our esteemed, admired, and respected friend and colleague. I need not do so, however, because those of you whom he has represented so well and so faithfully for so many years are aware of these many fine virtues. I consider it a high honor to have attended this dinner this evening, and I know that CLARK will continue to merit your confidence and your support and that he will serve you, the Ninth District, and the Nation faithfully and effectively for many years to come.

Independence Day Celebration of Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of the Kingdom of Morocco, and on this memorable occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Hassan II; and His Excellency, the Moroccan Ambassador to the United States, Ali Bengelloun.

Strategically situated, with coastlines on both the Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea, Morocco has played throughout the centuries an important role in world politics. The Arabs conquered Spain and threatened Europe through Morocco in the eighth century. Both Spain and France considered this land of high mountains, fertile valleys, and arid steppes important enough to occupy. Even American forces in World War II found it the gateway to North Africa and Europe. Now independent, Morocco continues to be a nation of consequences, linking African affairs with those of Europe. Furthermore, its Atlantic coastline is considered as one of the boundaries of the Arab world, which stretches from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf.

Morocco, granted sovereignty by the Protectorate States in 1956, has steadily progressed with its development in the intervening 8 years. Because 70 percent of the 12 million people derive their living directly or indirectly from the soil, emphasis has been placed on agricultural projects. With the help of American foreign aid, the Moroccan Government has combated insects, is building a large irrigation project in the

northeast which will, by 1975, irrigate 140,000 acres, and has trained many in agriculture, engineering, and industrial development. Because of severe droughts in 1960 and 1961 and the devastating earthquake in 1960, the United States has also provided surplus foodstuffs to a grateful people. Most of this wheat, though, is doled out, not as relief, but as wages. In a joint effort between our Government and Morocco, development projects are initiated to provide jobs for the unemployed, projects beneficial to the nation as well as to alleviate immediate hardships of the people. These laborers then receive, as salaries, cash from the Moroccan Government, and wheat from the United States, thus assuring them food as well as money to buy other necessary commodities.

The Moroccan Government has also initiated a development scheme to provide accommodations for the hundreds of thousands of tourists who are now discovering this exotic land. Morocco is rich in antiquities and picturesque scenery to satisfy all visitors. Fez, one of the traditional capitals, contains many structures of the Arab and Berber dynasties of old. Rabat, on the other hand, is modern, with skyscrapers and a European culture. For the photographer, the Atlas Mountains afford exquisite shots, with its snowcapped tops and deep ravines, silhouetted against magnificent sunrises and sunsets.

The land of Morocco also contains abundant minerals. For this reason, a new 3-year plan will be inaugurated this year, designed to process these natural resources for export and domestic consumption. One such project will be an industrial combine which will manufacture annually 400,000 tons of fertilizer, 350,000 tons of iron-ore pellets, 25,000 tons of sulphuric acid, and 2,700 tons of copper.

Progress, then, is apparent everywhere. Its rapidly expanding cities and towns, its industrial plants, its agricultural schemes, all denote a prosperous future for the Moroccan people. I am proud, therefore, to be able to extend my congratulations to the Moroccan Government and people on their eighth anniversary of independence.

Line of Succession for the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many suggestions have been advanced on the matter of line of succession for the Presidency. A simple, ingenious, and down-to-earth proposal has been advanced by a very good friend of mine, Mr. L. E. Sellers, of Chipley, Fla. Mr. Sellers is a distinguished newspaper man and a civic leader. I am pleased to submit his letter for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

L. E. SELLERS,
Chipley, Fla., February 18, 1964.

Hon. BOB SIKES,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Service organizations (American Legion, VFW, etc.), elect more than one vice president. So do many other clubs and civic groups.

If the plan has merit for such organizations, it should likewise have merit for the United States to elect more than one Vice President.

The first Vice President could serve in the same capacity as the Vice President now serves, with the second Vice President moving up in succession should the President die or become incapacitated.

This would end, once and for all time, all this talk about who would serve.

All three candidates could be chosen in the usual manner, at the conventions and at the polls.

Should the third man ever become "second in line" so to speak, he at least would be an officeholder elected by all the people and not by a segment vote or be a political appointee.

Perhaps the idea has merit, maybe not. Perhaps it has been suggested many times already and rejected equally as many times.

Sincerely,

EARL.

Resolution of Lithuanian Council of Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we have in America, many citizens of Lithuanian descent, who are rightfully concerned over the plight of their relatives and the country of their origin presently under the yoke of Communist tyranny. The Baltic countries generally have been encouraged by the Presidential proclamations on their behalf and with our captive nations resolutions here in the Congress but we must not allow Russia to add more to her captives. The world must be reminded of the tyranny and oppression upon these captive nations.

On February 16, 1964, the Lithuanian Council of Miami adopted a resolution which I feel I should commend to my colleagues in the House:

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI,
Miami, Fla., February 16, 1964.

RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI

(Resolution adopted by a meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of Miami, on February 16, 1964, at Miami Lithuanian American Citizens Club in Miami, Fla., to commemorate the 46th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918)

Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, enjoyed a free and independent existence from 1918 until June 1940 when the Soviet Union by chicanery, subversion, and force invaded and occupied the country, and still rules and oppresses the Lithuanian nation to this day; and

Whereas the Government of the United States strongly denounced the unlawful Soviet seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, and rightly does not recognize the illegal annexation and Moscow-imposed rule of these countries; and

Whereas with the attention of the world focused on the new African and Asian nations which were liberated from colonialism with the aid of the United Nations and have joined the community of free and independent States, the plight of Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied nations has largely been neglected: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request and urge our Government to instruct the U.S. delegation of the United Nations to place the case of occupied Lithuania and the other Soviet-captive nations before the committee on the abolition of colonialism and the liberation of all nation's and peoples from foreign rule and oppression, principles for which the Soviet Union avowedly stands, the necessary evidence for presentation of this case is complete and ready in the report of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States Into the U.S.S.R., United States House of Representatives; be it also

Resolved, To urge our Senators and the Members of Congress from our districts to support the introduction by the United States of the case of the Baltic States and other Soviet-enslaved nations before the appropriate body of the United Nations; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; and copies thereof to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Senators from our State; the Congressmen from our districts; and the local press.

Done this 16th day of February 1964 at Miami, Fla.

A. D. KAULAKIS,
Chairman.

Mrs. J. BUKAVECKAS,
Secretary.

Tobacco Smoking as It Affects Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Advertising Association of the West, meeting recently at Bakersfield, Calif., adopted a resolution concerning the recent widely publicized report on tobacco smoking as it affects advertising.

I believe this group took a very timely and realistic stand on this matter. Their attitude is mature and in the public interest and they should be commended for it. I am therefore inserting a copy of their resolution into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING USE OF TOBACCO

Whereas national attention has recently been given to the report of the U.S. Surgeon General on the subject of cigarette smoking and the uses of tobacco; and

Whereas the members of this association, collectively and individually, are always most interested in public welfare and the health of the public; and

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission is now considering certain steps that will affect the advertising of these products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Advertising Association of the West does recommend that advertisers of tobacco products should immediately take steps to prepare and put into use a code of

advertising practice, which will insure that all such advertising as is prepared and as is shown will subscribe to the best interests of the health of the American people and the American economy.

Further we recommend to the Federal Trade Commission that no precipitate action be taken, which might limit the right of advertisers of such products to tell their story with full regard for truth in advertising, good taste in advertising, and in recognition of the fact that the consumer or user, as an American citizen, does enjoy the privilege of freedom of choice on what he buys and what he uses.

The Mounting Scandal of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, following the publication in the March issue of Reader's Digest of an article by me pointing out abuses in the administration of the urban renewal program, I have received a large volume of mail from all parts of the United States revealing additional abuses of the rights of people, similar in nature to those mentioned in the article.

Further, a news item in today's paper states that the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in testifying about urban renewal before a Senate committee, referred to the "digestibility" of this "disruptive and dramatic" program; and one of the committee members expressed the hope that the "ruthlessness of some planners and local urban renewal groups" can be restrained.

Because of the widespread interest in this issue, I place the Reader's Digest article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

THE MOUNTING SCANDAL OF URBAN RENEWAL

(By JOHN DOWDY, U.S. Representative, of Texas)

(NOTE.—Representative JOHN DOWDY, Democrat, of Texas, has been studying urban problems—including redevelopment—for 10 years. And this past year, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, he has been investigating Washington, D.C.'s own urban-renewal program. He has also conducted independent surveys of the program as it operates in other cities.)

Before you vote to accept Federal aid to improve your city, consider the extravagance, favoritism, and misuse of power that have attended urban renewal elsewhere in the Nation.

More than a decade ago Congress created our Federal urban-redevelopment program, which pledges the U.S. Government to pay two-thirds of the net project cost of buying up and clearing slums and rundown business areas, then building anew. Under the program more than 1,300 renewal projects have been started in 679 cities.

Many big projects have been carried out competently, but in a shockingly large number, costs have skyrocketed. Charges of graft, favoritism, waste, arbitrary and illegal use of power have risen to a roar. Two congressional committees are investigating. And there is plenty to investigate as the program continues to grow. The U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), having swallowed up $4 billion already, is asking Congress this year for authority to spend $3 billion more for urban renewal.

The handling of Erieview project No. 1 in Cleveland touched off much of the furor and shows the proportions of the mess. When this 96-acre project was proposed, almost everybody in Cleveland found it appealing. The project would, it was argued, provide an immense number of jobs, eradicate slums, diminish crime, straighten out traffic, renew Cleveland's famous old Euclid Avenue business section, and add new buildings and enterprises to the tax rolls—mostly at the expense of the American taxpayer.

By law, the HHFA in Washington would pay planning costs. After the old buildings had been bought up and razed, after the land had been regraded and new services installed, Cleveland could sell or lease the cleared tract to a private redeveloper of its own choice. Such a sale would inevitably be at far less than the cost of buying and clearing the condemned area—but the HHFA would absorb the lion's share of the resulting loss. It would even pay for relocating displaced families. With an offer like that—a standing offer to any city under the urban-renewal law—how could Cleveland lose?

There was, however, one hitch. Urban-renewal regulations state that Federal aid in demolition jobs can be given only to areas containing structures not worth saving. Most of the 118 buildings in the Erieview area had been judged sound by Cleveland housing inspectors. Some were new. So how could the project be made eligible for $33 million in Federal aid? Cleveland officials hoped they had an answer. According to testimony before the House District of Columbia Subcommittee of which I am chairman, they arbitrarily reclassified 84 of the 118 buildings as "substandard"—including 3 valued at $900,000, $840,000, and $660,000.

Then, in the autumn of 1960, a party of Government employees from the regional Urban Renewal Agency office in Chicago briefly toured the Erieview project site. According to a later report by Congress official watchdog, the General Accounting Office, they did not look inside any of the buildings, but when they left they had endorsed the city's reclassifications and thereby sealed the doom of 105 buildings worth $26 million.

Property owners were stunned. How could buildings previously certified as sound suddenly be branded hazardous? For example, as the GAO report shows, Cleveland housing inspectors had found only minor violations of the city code in an eight-story masonry building valued at $660,000—principally, certain doors lacked self-closing devices and the cellar needed to be cleaned up. But at once, before the owner could act, the property was classified "substandard" and scheduled for acquisition and demolition. A sound 12-year-old, one-story brick-and-block building valued at $80,000 and having only a few minor violations (for example, in "the pointing of the chimney and the venting of the toilets") met the same fate. Many such rulings were made.

One of the property owners, Mrs. Teresa Grisanti, went to court. She said her doomed building was sound (a local housing inspector had said so just 2 months earlier); her lawyer stated that the claim that the "area was blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating is contrary to fact, arbitrary, capricious, and constitutes a gross abuse of discretion." He further asked in what way her building was detrimental to the public health, welfare, or safety of the area. The city's lawyer objected to this question, and the objection was sustained by the judge, who ruled that since the city council had approved the Erieview plan there was nothing he could do. The Ohio Supreme Court found "no debatable constitutional question" and refused to hear the appeal.

It was as a result of the Cleveland uproar that Congress sent the General Accounting Office to check for waste in the $33 million of Federal grants and loans already poured into the city. The GAO report was devastating: "Our review shows that only 24 buildings in the project were substandard because of building deficiencies which could not be corrected through normal maintenance. The URA's criteria are so vague that a city may designate any of its buildings for demolition, even though far less costly methods may accomplish the objectives of urban-renewal legislation."

The pattern was a familiar one to our subcommittee, which for 9 months had been investigating the local urban-renewal program in Washington, D.C. This is the largest such program in the country—under it, 60 percent of the city is scheduled for long-range redevelopment. One slice of this vast venture is the $20 million Columbia Plaza project. Consider this story as it unfolded in our subcommittee's official findings:

By January 1959, the contracting firm of Antonelli & Gould had bought more than half of a valuable 9-acre tract of downtown Washington property near the State Department, intending to develop it with private funds. Old residential and business structures were demolished; plans were drawn for a diplomatic city, combining much-needed chancery offices with residential apartment dwellings. But, meanwhile, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA) had other ideas. Working backstage with the National Capital Planning Commission, the RLA produced an agreement that the area should not be privately developed. All appeals were ignored.

Instead, the RLA had selected another group of redevelopers, the Columbia Plaza Corp. Faced with having its land condemned (by then it owned 90 percent of the area), Antonelli & Gould sold out. Then, the moment the Columbia Plaza Corp. took over in November 1961, the RLA applied for and received a $6 million Federal loan and grant—your tax dollars and mine—for the execution of what private industry had long been willing to do without Federal subsidy.

This deal brazenly ignored the law's requirements as to what kind of property can be taken over by urban renewal. When our subcommittee challenged the RLA to justify its actions, five men gave contradictory testimony. For example: The RLA appraiser had said the property contained 68 buildings. But a subcommittee investigator produced dated aerial photos showing that 15 percent of the buildings had already been razed on the day the RLA appraiser claimed to have examined them. Somebody obviously was not telling the truth, so we turned the case over to the Justice Department for prosecution.

Urban renewal abuses in Washington and Cleveland raise questions that touch on countless projects throughout the Nation.

1. The program is prodigal in its spending of Federal taxpayers' money. As in Cleveland, if a city council votes to go ahead with a renewal plan, URA puts up additional money to buy and clear the property, grade the land, and install services. Then the city sells or leases the prepared tract to a private redeveloper, usually without competitive bids and almost always at a loss. The URA makes the city an outright grant of two-thirds of the loss (three-fourths, if the city is small).

The city is supposed to pay the other third, but rarely pays in cash. URA credits it with the cost of schools, streets, sewers, and other work linked with the project. Often the link is remote. New York City, for example, was allowed a credit of $2,718,908 for a plaza at the Lincoln Center for the Per-

forming Arts. Perth Amboy, N.J., was given credit for a facility it planned to build later. The GAO reports are full of such cases.

2. The program operates like Robin Hood in reverse. It approves the taking of property by police power from ordinary citizens and selling it by advance arrangement to other, often wealthy, private citizens at prices frequently as low as 30 percent of acquisition cost. That 70-percent writedown constitutes a huge subsidy which robs taxpayers everywhere for the benefit of chosen redevelopers.

For example: In Washington, D.C., according to Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, the city's redevelopment agency paid the D.C. Transit System, of which O. Roy Chalk is president, $1,266,605 for some property, then later leased it back to his Chalk House West, Inc., for 99 years at a bargain rental of $43,221 a year.

Some of these deals extend subsidized housing to middle-income families and so widen the scope of the welfare state. When it was begun 15 years ago, Washington's slow moving $100 million Southwest Urban Renewal Area B project was supposed to provide housing at $17 per room per month. Instead, as Representative JOHN KYL, Republican, of Iowa, says, "The area is full of super-duper glass apartments which rent for $175 per month and up, unfurnished."

3. It forces poor but independent homeowners into subsidized public housing. A well-known Washington judge, E. Barrett Prettyman, spoke eloquently of the people in a well-kept area doomed because it failed to meet modern standards. "What if its owners and occupants like it that way?" he asked. "Suppose they are old fashioned and prefer single-family dwellings; suppose they like small flower gardens, believe that a plot of ground is the place to rear children? Or suppose these people can't afford to own more modern homes? The poor, the slow, the old, the small in ambition have no less right to property than the quick, the young, the aggressive. Are such questions to be decided by the Government?"

Urban renewal in practice seems to displace, most often, poor Negroes. Declared Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, "The pattern in the District of Columbia in this regard follows the national pattern, so much so that urban renewal has come to mean 'Negro removal' in the minds of those it was intended to help."

Adds the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Catholic archbishop of Washington: "We gain nothing by tearing down slum housing if we force the residents to create new slums elsewhere by overcrowding."

In Alexandria, Va., the Durant Civic Association is struggling desperately to prevent destruction of a neighborhood of neat, clean, older houses, owned and well kept by thrifty Negroes whose families have lived there for as long as 100 years. "Where can our people buy equal housing with the money they will get?" asks A. Melvin Miller, the attorney leading the fight.

4. Urban renewal ruins thousands of small business enterprises, many of which could survive and even flourish under programs to rehabilitate rather than raze their areas. Many concerns lease their premises; when urban renewal uproots them, the owners of the buildings receive fair market value for the property, but the renters get nothing for the worth of their going businesses (which includes goodwill, customers, etc.).[1]

Moving to new neighborhoods where they are not known often means tragedy and heartbreak, especially for older merchants. A study by Brown University showed that 40 percent of the shops uprooted in the Providence, R. I., urban-renewal program had to go out of business. By 1970, it has been estimated, more than 200,000 small businesses will have been closed by urban renewal—a catastrophe largely overlooked in rosy descriptions of these programs.

5. The program encourages landgrabbing and hasty starts on ill-conceived projects, often followed by long periods of stagnation. About 20 percent of all projects are abandoned. Seventy percent of all land seized so far has not yet been put to the use designated.

Boston, for instance, now has 19 urban-renewal projects involving $227,960,000. When the books of the Boston Redevelopment Authority were examined by State auditor Thomas J. Buckley, he reported: "The principal result of BRA operations has been the creation of numerous parking lots on valuable lands, which have been rented to private operators at a fraction of their value. Land owned by BRA is not subject to real estate taxes; and therefore the delay is construction has cost the city thousands of dollars in tax revenues."

During the period of Buckley's audit (late 1957 to early 1963), approximately $1,675,000 was paid to various contractors for maintenance and major repairs to property scheduled for demolition. Buckley was unable to find a single case in which this work was done under contract resulting from competitive bidding.

6. Urban renewal programs often enrich slum owners. A slum landlord can split single apartments in two and then, because of crowding aggravated by demolitions elsewhere, charge huge rents. Finally he sells out to urban renewal, and since slums pay high returns per square foot of space, he receives a handsome price. He takes his bonanza, pays a 25-percent capital gains tax, buys another slum, and waits for urban renewal to buy him out again—ad nauseam.

7. The HHFA in Washington—given remarkably broad discretionary powers—runs the urban renewal show. Once a city council applies for and receives Federal aid on a project, it must subordinate itself to Federal laws and regulations, under the threat of forfeiture of Federal funds. Worse, communities with their own master plans for private building suddenly find the plans within the renewal area frozen for the life of the Federal project—sometimes for as long as 40 years.

Once a program is started, no one is free from condemnation on whim. If but one small structure in a block of five buildings can be declared substandard, all houses or businesses in that block can be condemned for urban renewal. Thus, local initiative to improve property is throttled, and blight is accelerated by the very law designed to cure it.

8. Community development programs may be used for the extension of political power by whichever party is in the saddle. The United States Chamber of Commerce cites two recent instances in which the administration asked 2,400 city mayors to use their influence for passage of legislation. One was a foreign aid bill, the other the plan to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. "If this political alliance between the cities and the Federal Government were to become fully effective," the chamber warns, "the national two-party system would almost certainly be impaired, and the effectiveness of local voluntary organizations would deteriorate."

These are a few of the major complaints against federally subsidized urban renewal. Flaws in its operation have become so obvious that even the lure of "something for nothing" is losing its charm. In some cities, such as Los Angeles and Richmond, Va., city councils have rejected projects after vigorous civic protests. In others, such as Dallas and Lincoln, Nebr., voters have turned down Federal aid by 2-to-1 margins.

S. Howard Evans, principal architect of the highly effective community development program of the United States Chamber of Commerce, says, "The responsibility for redeveloping and revitalizing a city belongs to the people of that city, and to nobody else. Redevelopment is essential, but it must be an orderly self-help program, not a gigantic blitzkrieg. Genuine new life for a city can only be generated from within. It cannot be granted from above, or imposed from the outside by drastic action which destroys the very civic values it must have to succeed. People in cities all over America are rediscovering the classic truth that 'free Federal money' costs far too much."

Congress must now take a full, hard look at the entire Federal urban renewal program, which, to date, has fallen far short of its goals. It must insure that adequate housing is made available to families displaced by urban renewal—one of the major points President Lyndon B. Johnson made clear in calling for a "revised" program. We must end the waste, favoritism, and arbitrary use of power that helps the greedy and hurts the needy. These are the minimum steps that must be taken before a new "crash" effort in urban renewal is allowed to send still more billions down the slippery political sluiceways.

[1] See "Bulldozers at Your Door," "The Reader's Digest," September 1963.

One Quick Step, and a Hop Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an editorial column, "One Quick Step, and a Hop Away," which was written by Mr. Malcolm A. Johnson and appeared in the February 23, 1964, issue of the Tallahassee Democrat, one of Florida's leading daily newspapers.

Mr. Johnson is one of the most knowledgeable, clear-thinking and outstanding newspapermen of the Southeastern States. In this article he deals with the action of the Supreme Court of the United States in ruling that congressional districts within a State must be substantially equal in population. I hope that each of my colleagues will read Mr. Johnson's commentary of what could take place as a result of this decision.

The article follows:

ONE QUICK STEP, AND A HOP AWAY

(By Malcolm B. Johnson)

Just one quick step and a hop, now, and our Federal judiciary will be in a position to declare any number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives vacant, then proceed to dictate district lines in such a way as to separate your Congressman from his electorate and influence.

This assumption of power by appointive, life-term judges over the constituency of the directly elected Representatives of the people should bother you—unless you are naive enough to think a moral lawyer-politician gains supreme wisdom and benevolence when someone puts a black robe on him.

The Supreme Court of the United States kicked over 175 years of contrary rulings last week to decree that our Constitution, although it reads the same as before, now means districts from which a State's congressmen are elected must be substantially

equal in population; and if they aren't, the Federal courts can do something about it.

Since the Court conceded population equality among districts can't be achieved precisely (even through its omniscience), it left undeclared just how much inequality equals practicable equality.

As in the plague of cases involving apportionment of representation in State legislatures these past couple of years, the issue of population equity in this matter of lining up congressional districts is secondary.

No one will argue that we have lawmaking representation anywhere near proportionate to population, although we might debate whether that is the primary consideration in our system.

We could argue, too, about whether the disparities give us bad government, or if their elimination—if possible—would improve it; but that argument has been lost in mass of arithmetic surrounding the issue, and it might be good to recall that we were warned by either Alexander Hamilton or James Madison in an unsigned Federalist paper that "nothing can be more fallacious than to found our political calculations on arithmetical principles."

THE GRAVER ISSUE

The graver question today is whether the courts should, for any reason, move in on the hitherto exclusive legislative business of making representation adjustments indicated by population growth and shifts. Until a generation ago, few judges would claim the Constitution gave them any right to make or change law when it seemed to them that constitutional lawmaking agencies were moving too slowly or in the wrong direction. The Constitution hasn't been changed, but they've been declaring more and more power for themselves.

This is the point at which we might try to anticipate the quick step and the hop which could bring us a judicial tyranny unless someone hobbles the Supreme Court in its eager rush.

The quick step is almost on us. Already pending before the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal is an order of three appointive Federal judges who actually laid down an apportionment of representation in the Oklahoma Legislature because divisions by the legislature, under the State constitution, and by the elective Oklahoma Supreme Court didn't suit them.

It is generally agreed among shoulder-shrugging lawyers that, sooner or later, the Supreme Court will say that lower Federal judges, or the Big Court itself, can allot those seats in State legislatures. It logically follows that, having done it once, they can do it whenever an imbalance of population is shown—which in a growing, shifting State like Florida could be about once a year.

Then would come the hop, and not a very long one:

The reasoning behind the ruling last week that Georgia has an unconstitutional lineup of congressional districts is exactly the reasoning in the earlier cases on State legislature representation. So, if the Supreme Court says how many delegates to the Oklahoma State Legislature must come from each county or group of counties, it would hardly blanch at decreeing which geographical areas of the various States may send delegates to the U.S. House of Representatives.

IF YOU HAD THE POWER

Now, almost any small group of intelligent men could sit down and give us congressional districts and State legislature representation more nearly proportionate to population than we have—if they were clothed with the arbitrary power to do it; but who wants to grant any little group that kind of arbitrary power?

The minute those nine men on the U.S. Supreme Court decide they can decree the constituency of the U.S. House of Representatives they will go even beyond the making of laws into the very realm of making government.

Specifically, an unscrupulous majority of five on the Court could, right now, shift the line of succession to the Presidency by cutting House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK out of his Massachusetts district (which has nearly 25 percent more people than another district) and making him run in a predominantly Republican district. If he lost, the House would have to elect a new Speaker who would become President if anything happened to Lyndon Johnson.

More plausibly, a Supreme Court conspiracy could bring chaos to the seniority system, on which the whole House is organized and operated, by gerrymandering older members into districts where they would have to run against each other or would be at a disadvantage.

A really clever redistricting, such as might come from judges who learned about political machinations in their youth, could even maneuver out of office a chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules, or of Judiciary, or Appropriations, or Armed Services or others who might be obstacles to their desires or to the ambitions of executive or military cronies. Merely entertaining a series of harassing suits that could knock a Congressman out of his district might be enough to whip him into line.

TIME FOR CHECKS AND BALANCES

There are just lots of ways a Supreme Court with this kind of power could gain the top hand in Washington, all in the name of giving the people more equal representation.

But such things needn't happen. Our proud system of checks and balances can head off any such flagrant abuse of power—if we still have such a system in operative condition.

The House could bow up and refuse to recognize court-made districts and men elected from them by exercising its constitutional authority to pass on qualifications and elections of its own Members; but that would require an election contest in the districts, where enforcement of court orders would be a stronger influence on ballot arrangements than efforts to hold the status quo.

Also, Congress has power to remove judges by impeachment if it catches them at such tactics. And it can limit judicial authority by statute, or by proposing to the States a constitutional amendment to supersede a bad court judgment (the only amendment respecting the judiciary we've ever adopted, the 11th, was for that very purpose).

It's amazing that we haven't heard a loud demand in Congress for bringing some of these checks and balances into play since the Court stuck its nose into this business last Monday. It would be even more amazing if we found there haven't been a good many cloakroom strategy conferences along this very line.

For those who might scoff that the fine men on the U.S. Supreme Court wouldn't think of any such skulduggery, we might recall that Thomas Jefferson said: "It can never be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united."

Change the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have been much impressed by a series of articles relative to the imperfections of the draft, which appeared recently in one of New York City's leading newspapers—the New York World-Telegram. I feel that in publishing these articles, this crusading newspaper has performed a valuable public service in calling attention to the pressing need for updating the draft law to meet present day military manpower requirements.

As the sponsor of H.R. 10211 in this House—a bill which is identical with S. 2432, the proposed legislation introduced in the other body by Senator KEATING, and which calls for the establishment of a commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act—I was particularly pleased and impressed by the objective approach of these articles, and by the well-documented inequities which were found to exist under the present law.

Because I feel that these articles by Lee Townsend present a highly effective review of the inequities and shortcomings of the draft—inequities and shortcomings which should be called to the attention of Members of the Congress, because of the valuable background material in the series on the need for updating the Universal Military Training and Service Act—I ask for unanimous consent to have the first of this excellent series of the New York World-Telegram articles on the draft printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WHAT'S REALLY WRONG WITH THE DRAFT

"Avoiding the draft is no more immoral than avoiding rain puddles."

A STUDENT.

"Attitudes toward the draft are an invitation to national disaster."

A MANPOWER EXPERT.

"Guys never get called for physicals but I got taken. Is that justice?"

INDUCTEE AT FORT DIX.

(By Lee Townsend)

A Queens inductee, who knew little more about the draft than the fact that he was caught in it, recently gave this evaluation of peacetime conscription:

"It stinks."

Detailed study of this Nation's so-called universal military training program shows he's right.

In its 15-year history, the peacetime draft system has taken the few and left the many.

In an elaborate attempt to be flexible and fair it has often favored the rich over the poor, the shrewd over the naive, the highly educated over the unlettered, the unsavory over the wholesome and, most recently, the married over the single.

It has taken men out of good civilian jobs and left others to stand on unemployment lines.

It has made most youths feel there's nothing wrong in avoiding military service. It has made the few who get drafted feel they are members of a very unlucky minority.

Postwar conscription has grown up to be a Government giant whose eyes are far bigger than its stomach. It has growled menacingly at every young man since its birth in 1948 but it has gobbled up only about 15 of every 100 New York males registered for the draft in all that time.

And this figure includes everyone inducted here during the Korean war, the 1961 Berlin crisis and every other emergency of the atomic age.

Selective service currently gives Uncle Sam only 7 percent of his fighting men. And there is no conclusive proof that it is very

effective in bulldozing men into other branches of the service to avoid the draft.

Strip away the rumors and myths about selective service—and there seem to be more of these around than draftees—and you have this simple fact:

If you can reach 26 without putting on a military uniform, chances are you never will wear one unless there's a war.

A man can artfully avoid a call to patriotism if he reaches the "magic age" of 26 by keeping a school deferment, an "essential job," a wife—or even, in some cases, a psychiatrist.

The most popular way to stay out of the Army—at least if numbers are any indication—is to flunk out. Induction stations tell about half the men hauled down for preinduction examinations that they are not physically, mentally or morally fit to be drafted.

Right now in this city there are nearly 200,000 draft-age men in this group of rejectees—twice the number of New Yorkers currently in any military uniform * * * even those in Reserve and college ROTC units.

FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DRAFTED LAST YEAR

With so many safely tucked away in one loophole or another, it's no wonder a Brooklyn draftee—one of the 5,500 men drafted here last year—said in an interview at Fort Dix:

"There are about 10 guys in my neighborhood who never even got called for physicals, but I got taken. What kind of justice is that?"

At the beginning of last month, this city of nearly 8 million people, had only 1,500 men ripe for the draft—hardly a large enough crowd to cause a good rush-hour subway jam.

These men were the only ones in the ages currently being inducted—22 to 26—who weren't deferred, exempt or unfit. And only 568 of the 1,500 had been examined.

A group of Columbia students interviewed a few days ago said frankly that they thought there was nothing immoral about avoiding the draft through legal means.

Sophomore Mike Teitelman—one of the 25,000 New Yorkers with school deferments—said avoiding the draft was no more immoral than "avoiding stepping in rain puddles. No one wants to step in puddles or be drafted."

DRAFT IMMORAL

His classmate, Michael Flug, said: "The draft itself is immoral. Any refusal to cooperate is justified."

Dan Colbert, another sophomore, felt it was no more wrong to stay out of "than it is immoral to try and pay the minimum taxes that you owe."

One student said dodging the draft was "all part of the American game. It's played with the realization that you'll eventually be taken, but it's your duty to avoid it if possible. If you give in, you have no American spirit."

Dr. Eli Ginzberg of the conservation of human resources project at Columbia called the current attitude toward the draft an "invitation to national disaster."

A history major said he planned to earn his doctorate which, he said, should keep him deferred until he's 26. A science major boasted he would teach until he was 26 and skip the draft.

TEN THOUSAND DEFERRED

There are currently 10,000 New Yorkers deferred for what draft boards determine to be essential industry jobs.

They include high school and college science teachers and some language teachers. Also certain mathematicians, tool and die makers, patternmakers, physicists, glassblowers, and men in a host of other jobs.

If these men keep these jobs until they're 26 they will "have it made," as they say in the Army.

Selective service registrants who receive certain deferments—such as the ones for schools or jobs—have their draft liability extended from the age of 26 to 35.

Therefore, many youths think eventually they will be called, no matter how long they keep a deferment. This isn't true. Before anyone over 26 can be drafted, every eligible man under that age has to be taken.

And a New York draft spokesman said, "Selective Service officials are certain that all manpower requests of the military short of a declaration of war can be met by unmarried registrants not yet 26 years of age."

A Presidential order issued last September allows you to stay a safe distance from the draft if you take a wife.

SIX THOUSAND MARRIED

This has already taken nearly 6,000 New Yorkers from the pool of available men, with the number guaranteed to rise sharply.

The new "out" has also created a situation which points up one of the inequities of the Selective Service System.

With husbands joining the thousands of other untouchables, draft officials predict that the pool of available men here will drop to the point that men of college age soon will be eyed for induction for the first time in years. At present the lowest age of call is between 22 and 23.

Local draft boards have the undisputed authority to determine whether each job and school deferment should be renewed in the national interest.

Faced with a shortage of readily available men, it would be possible for draft boards to decide certain students would best serve the national interest in uniform, while others are allowed to stay in the classroom.

This also means that some students soon may be taken out of college while others who came before them not only finished their undergraduate work undisturbed but were allowed to go on to graduate school—if they had the money.

RUBBERSTAMP RENEWAL

There are other paradoxes, inequities, and inconsistencies in the draft which give good cause to wonder why it has gone virtually free from organized criticism so long and has been renewed with rubberstamp regularity every 4 years by Congress.

For instance, a man who avoids service because he is morally unfit to wear a uniform need do nothing to serve his country. But a man who is a sincere conscientious objector usually has to work 2 years at a nonprofit, often menial job in return for the right to stay out of the Army.

Last week, the Pentagon announced it would study the draft laws and procedures with an eye to possible reforms. But military officials made it clear there was little chance the draft would be abolished.

Since the beginning of the Korean war, slightly more than 175,000 New Yorkers have been inducted, less than 15 percent of the 1.3 million males registered with the Selective Service System here.

With 5,000 men now entering the New York draft reservoir each month—about twice the number who are leaving the pool—chances are draft-eligible males of tomorrow will have even better than an 85 percent chance of never answering "Greetings."

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the very excellent speech of Arthur J. Campbell, of Deadwood, S. Dak., winner of the 1964 Voice of Democracy Contest in South Dakota.

Arthur is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert V. Campbell, and a sophomore in the Deadwood High School. His speech, "The Challenge of Citizenship," is as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Arthur Campbell, Deadwood, S. Dak.)

Challenges—they meet man every day the world over. The mountaineer scales a peak because it is there. Doctors fight the challenge of disease and astronauts circle the earth hoping to conquer challenging space. But, Americans, there is an even greater challenge facing us today—a challenge so often forgotten in the whirling pace of the 20th century, yet one so important it demands our full strength and talent. If, when confronted with this challenge, we respond we will remain free—free thinking, free acting, but if we turn away from the challenge, America's entire concept of freedom and its entire way of life will be lost as we absentmindedly look on—for the challenge of which I speak is the challenge of citizenship.

Not every citizen of every nation is presented with this challenge. One look will tell you why.

Look at the faces of the commoners in other lands. There are few smiles as they toil and sweat for a government and ideal that binds them in the shackles of servitude and inequality. They exist merely for the benefit of the state.

To these oppressed, America means a chance to become more than a common slave—a chance to dream the dreams of an unshackled individual with individual worth—a chance not only to dream dreams of success and greatness but to actually fulfill these dreams for, you see, in America the Government is a servant of the people; not the people a servant of the Government. America is truly the stronghold of freedom.

Because these things are true—because our Nation represents rights and democracy and because our ideal is exclusive, we are presented with a challenge. How do we preserve and protect this ideal that makes us indiivduals? This is the challenge of citizenship.

We find the answer to our question in history. What about our forefathers, those who passed the torch of freedom to us? Were they Casper Milquetoasts or Mr. Do-Nothings? When they saw tyranny closing in about them did they shrink from the challenging call to freedom or relax in their easy chairs and wait for Joe to do something? No. They fought a hard fight and many of them gave their lives to regain freedom from the jaws of tyranny. But that was not all. Those early Americans used their freedoms too. They spoke against those things which slowly would undermine the principles for which blood was shed. They considered who could best lead them and they had the interest to go to the polls and vote for these candidates. Through civil war, world wars, turmoil, and confusion—for nearly 200 years our American ideal of freedom and individual worth has endured. Now in the 20th century we too must meet the challenge of citizenship by using our freedoms wisely.

It is said we never really appreciate anything unless we work and fight for it. Then work and fight for freedom we must. Around us too are those forces which would slowly undermine our way of life—corruption, tyranny, complacency. Around us are the millions who look to you and me, Americans, as the protectors of individual worth and freedom. There is the generation yet to come. Let us not pass on to them an America in which freedom is past tense because we did not meet the confronting challenge

to preserve, protect, exercise, and pass on our heritage.

We must meet the greatest challenge in a world of challenge. Will you join me in the meeting of this challenge—the challenge of citizenship.

New Florida Times-Union Building Honors Century of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for 99 years my hometown daily newspaper, the Florida Times-Union, published in Jacksonville, Fla., has been a leader in the growth and development of Florida and the South. It has taken its place among the great newspapers of this country. Recently it was announced that the Times-Union and its afternoon companion, the Jacksonville Journal—a bright and lively, well-written sister newspaper—would construct a modern $11 million plant to house the editorial, business, and mechanical departments of the Florida Publishing Co., publishers of the two papers.

This new building will be built on the shores of the St. Johns River in downtown pulsing Jacksonville, the gateway to the space age, and the South's most progressive business and financial city. It will take its place in Jacksonville's expanding downtown redevelopment program which was accomplished primarily with private funds and local funds, not Federal loans or grants.

I commend to the Members of the House of Representatives the Florida Publishing Co., which goes forth with great enthusiasm and respect into its second century of leadership in the fourth estate.

An editorial from the Friday, February 28, 1964, issue of the Florida Times-Union follows:

GROWTH IS A CHALLENGE TO GREATER SERVICE

The magnificent new building soon to rise as an addition to Jacksonville's growing skyline, housing the most modern facilities and equipment which technical advances can provide for the publication of the Florida Times-Union and the Jacksonville Journal, represents the realization of a long cherished dream.

The 11-story tower and adjoining production building, occupying a 9-acre site between Riverside Avenue and the St. Johns just west of the Acosta Bridge, will add striking new beauty to Jacksonville's midtown development which has won for the city national recognition, and which testifies to its economic strength and vitality.

The new building should be well on its way to completion on January 1, 1965, when the Florida Times-Union will begin the observance of a full century of service to Jacksonville and the vast area of north Florida and south Georgia where its readership extends and where its influence is felt.

The Florida Publishing Co. naturally takes pride in its record of growth in fulfilling its function as a mirror of the growth and development of the city and region it serves. The daily newspaper, more than any other institution, reflects the life and character of the community, and its success is measured directly in its accurate fulfillment of that responsibility.

The ownership and management of the Florida Publishing Co. and every member of the staff who dedicate their time and talents to the production of the best newspaper possible are therefore keenly conscious that the overriding concern of their efforts is the "end product," a newspaper which meets the needs of its readers for information, thought-provoking comment and entertaining features, presented in attractive format and reliably delivered to their hands.

Those who now carry the responsibility of serving the readership of the Florida Times-Union are custodians of a rich heritage from those who, over the past century, have contributed so much to the building of an enterprise which is synonymous with the growth and progress of the community.

The beautiful new physical plant to house the operations, therefore, is not an end within itself, but a symbol and challenge to ever greater service.

As expressed by Robert C. Millar, president of the Florida Publishing Co., "the development of the best newspaper men and machines can produce is the responsibility of which we are most conscious."

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 23, 1964, the American-Lithuanian community of Lowell met to adopt a resolution in commemoration of the occasion. The resolution is a fine statement of the principles involved in the long battle to achieve freedom and independence once more for the embattled people of that gallant nation. Under unanimous consent I include the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN COMMUNITY OF LOWELL, MASS.

Lithuanian resolutions committee having assembled at DLK Vytautas Club, 447 Central Street, Lowell, Mass., on February 23, 1964, to commemorate the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, the members of the committee, as well as the American-Lithuanian community of Lowell, unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

"Whereas the people and the Government of the United States believe in inalienable principles of individual and national freedom and dignity as enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union in pursuance of secret agreement between Stalin and Hitler in 1940 invaded, occupied and subjugated three independent Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia; and

"Whereas Soviet occupation forces, Red Army and secret police have conducted and continue to conduct an elaborate plan of genocide, aiming at destruction of the peoples of these three Baltic nations by executions and mass deportations to remote regions of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union through her representative in the United Nations and at other international forums has been passing as the protector of all subjugated peoples, especially former colonies in Africa and Asia: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we the Americans of Lithuanian descent in Lowell do hereby express our gratitude to the Government of the United States of America for its support of Lithuania's cause for freedom and for its refusal to recognize the occupation and illegal annexation of Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Soviet Union; and

"Resolved, That we Americans of Lithuanian descent are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their liberation and national independence; and

"Resolved, That the Government of the United States approve or endorse no agreement which would in any manner accede to the outgrowth of any past, present or future Soviet aggressive action; and

"Resolved, That the Government of the United States take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the Soviet Union's policy of colonialism in Eastern Europe and to force the Soviet Union to withdraw its occupation forces from the Baltic States; and

"Resolved, That the copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Representative of the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall and the Honorable Edward M. Kennedy; the Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Bradford Morse and to the press."

LOUIS PIULAUSKAS,
Chairman.
EDWARD J. BAUMEL,
Secretary.

First District of Michigan Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, a strong interest in public issues was indicated by the heavy response to my questionnaire, sent out to voters in the new First District of Michigan.

The recipients of my questionnaire were selected without regard to neighborhood or party affiliation.

It is significant that voters favor the overall record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration by over 4 to 1. This is heavier than the Democratic-Republican breakdown in this predominantly Democratic district. Of course, as the election nears, partisan feeling will increase and the margin can be expected to narrow.

On foreign policy issues, the voters favor our assisting South Vietnam's fight against the Communists, and U.S. support of the U.N. But, evident from comments added to responses, there is much confusion and dissatisfaction over our Cuba policy. Much of this appears to be an emotional response, an irritation arising from Castro harangues,

Communist terrorist activity in Latin America, allied trade with Cuba, and the mere fact of Castro's presence in Cuba.

On domestic issues, medicare under social security draws strong bipartisan support. It is not only a popular issue but reflects a need Congress should not ignore any longer. The vote on a Domestic Peace Corps reflects concern with urban poverty, school dropouts, and teenage unemployment. The civil rights bill is supported by better than 2 to 1, but considerable uneasiness in the race relations field is shown in the attitudes on question 8.

I think the Congress must face the problem of Presidential succession. A better law of succession is obviously favored by the public, judging by the vote and the many supplemental comments. At the very least, we should provide some method of filling the vacancy in the office of Vice President:

Results of questionnaire—Congressman Lucien N. Nedzi, 1st District of Michigan

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor the overall record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration	72.5	17.6	9.9
2. Do you favor our fight to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control?	70.2	16.4	13.4
3. Do you favor our present policy regarding Cuba?	31.8	60.3	7.9
If not, would you favor—	*Percent*		
A tougher policy?	79.7		
Resumption of diplomatic relations?	20.3		
4. Do you favor continued U.S. financial support of the United Nations?	79.1	13.3	7.6
5. Do you favor medicare for aged under social security?	79.1	14.9	6.0
6. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps to work on local community projects?	64.8	21.8	13.4
7. Do you favor the administration's civil rights bill?	56.2	27.2	16.6
8. Do you think integration is being pushed—	*Percent*		
Too fast?	55.5		
Not fast enough?	14.1		
About right?	30.4		
9. Do you favor changing the order of Presidential succession so that the Secretary of State, rather than the Speaker of the House, is next in line?	61.2	24.4	14.4
10. Do you favor having your Congressman poll you for your views?	91.3	2.8	5.9

11. If you are a Republican, please indicate your first and second choices among the following men mentioned for the Republican nomination for President:

1st choice:	
Nixon	34.3
Goldwater	18.2
Romney	17.4
Scranton	11.1
Rockefeller	9.0
Other	8.9
2d choice:	
Romney	24.9
Nixon	24.3
Scranton	21.1
Goldwater	11.4
Rockefeller	11.4
Other	8.8

12. If you are a Democrat, please indicate your first and second choice among the following men mentioned for the Democratic nomination for Vice President:

1st choice:	
Kennedy	35.3
Stevenson	29.0
Humphrey	19.8
Shriver	11.0
Wagner	2.4
Other	2.4
2d choice:	
Humphrey	24.5
Stevenson	24.2
Shriver	23.0
Kennedy	21.1
Wagner	5.3
Other	2.0

L.B.J. Must Get Tough, Disown Peace Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York News of February 7, 1964:

WORLD AFFAIRS: L.B.J. MUST GET TOUGH, DISOWN PEACE ROLE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Pity L.B.J. He feels compelled to run for reelection on his predecessor's peace policy just when that policy's bankruptcy is filling the international air with explosions.

From Panama to South Vietnam, by way of France and Africa, the result of the policy of abdication pursued by the Kennedy administration is bursting out all over and demanding action of Kennedy's successor.

It is not his fault. He, like so many supporters of the past administration, was simply taken in by the fallacious assumption of the New Frontiersmen. This was that appeasement of, and economic aid to, the U.S.S.R., Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, etc., would keep these countries, if not totally quiet, at least within limits.

This included the belief that American advisory action in Vietnam would contain communism until such time as all Vietnam could be reunited and neutralized. It implied that communism, having secured the neutralization of once pro-West Laos, would refrain from seeking to take over that country.

ESPOUSE APPEASEMENT

In short, the New Frontiersmen who swarmed into the White House and the State Department in 1961 started acting on the assumption that soft answers, plenty of baksheesh, a little time and, above all, the renunciation of the use of power by the United States and its major allies (even while Red Russia and Red China were continuing to stir up trouble wherever they could) would gradually end the cold war.

And now history is once more revealing the reality behind the dream: World order can exist only when it is enforced; if not by a world authority (which does not exist), then either by us or by the enemy. Otherwise, as at present, there is no world order.

What we are seeing in Panama, Zanzibar, the Yemen, South Vietnam (with more to come) is the anarchy that occurs when two great powers, Red Russia and Red China, promote it by all possible means, while the others, the United States and Britain, wring their hands and do nothing but protest.

The United Arab Republic intervenes in the Yemen in defense of the UN, Indonesia grabs Dutch New Guinea, confiscates British property, and destroys the British Embassy in Jakarta, Panama "demands" control of the canal and—finally—the Soviets shoot down another unarmed American airplane with impunity.

ACTION DEMANDED

All this, as I said, is very disturbing to President Johnson.

He may shortly have to give up the current comedy and send many more Americans to South Vietnam; as soldiers, not just as advisers and chauffeurs. He may have to stir up a revolution in Panama. He may have to order the 7th Fleet to stop or even sink Indonesian ships carrying soldiers to attack Malaysia.

In short, he may have to start acting more like a Texan and less like a frightened atomic scientist of the "rather Red than dead" school. How such a change would affect his election chances I cannot venture to predict. It would certainly delight a great many million Americans sick at heart of over 20 years' appeasement of the Soviet Union and restore our allies' confidence in us.

And it would enhance L.B.J.'s place in history.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda drive against the quality stabilization bill has resulted in many newspaper editors leaping to a fixed opinion before they looked at the real issues involved in this legislation.

Fortunately, however, there are many editors who still take the time and trouble to carefully examine economic and legislative problems before reaching any editorial conclusions. In this regard, the Rochester, N.H., Courier, in a recent editorial entitled "Protection for Consumers," provided its readers with a carefully reasoned statement regarding why quality stabilization deserves the support of the country's buying public.

Quality stabilization is proconsumer legislation, and I urge those interested in this issue to read the Courier editorial stressing this point. With unanimous consent, I therefore insert this editorial, appearing in the January 16, 1964, edition of the Courier, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROTECTION FOR CONSUMERS

Basic consideration in a bill such as quality stabilization, now before Congress, must be: Is it good for the country and its consumers? We have to choose between two policies.

On one side is the great majority of the nearly 2 million independent retail businesses, along with a very sizable bloc of Congressmen, particularly those who have had personal experience in retail stores, who believe the bill is good for consumers.

On the other hand is a comparative handful of giant retailers associated in a group called the National Association of Mass Merchandisers, which for some time passed as the National Association of Consumer Or-

ganizations. These people have few roots in the communities they serve.

Allied with them are some theoretical people who never met a payroll or personally tested an economic theory, but who believe they know how business and competition should work. They are supported by some editors who read too quickly.

Because consumers have seen for themselves that competition helps them, the opponents have chosen to fight by trying to label quality stabilization the opposite of competition: price fixing. It is no more price fixing than the setting of prices on house or private brands by many of America's reliable chains. But some economists and editors are unwilling to admit that a house brand which can only be bought at the same price in every store selling it is sheltered from price competition.

Quality stabilization would not prohibit any of these stores, or even the discounters, from obtaining and selling goods at whatever prices they can obtain. What it would do is prevent unethical merchants from using quality brands as "bait" or "switch" merchandise to entice customers into their stores to sell them high-profit goods of questionable value.

Surely quality stabilization is in the interest of consumers, because it protects the household budget from inferior products.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the House adopted a resolution proclaiming 1964 as See America Year, I wrote to the officials of each of the 20 cities and towns in the Fifth Massachusetts District urging them to use this occasion to stimulate interest in the tremendous treasure of historical and recreational facilities in our area. The response to my letter has been most exciting. Recently I received a letter from Mrs. Louise K. Brown, the town historian for Bedford, Mass., outlining the historical points of interest in this lovely old New England town. Under unanimous consent I include Mrs. Brown's letter and the resolution of the Bedford Board of Selectmen endorsing See America Year in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A PROCLAMATION

Bedford is one of the oldest towns in New England, having been established as early as 1635, and incorporated in 1729. We have standing in different parts of the town many old houses which were built by the settlers of the wilderness just a few years after the founding of Plymouth and Cambridge. All these ancient dwellings are in excellent condition. At least four of them were the original garrison houses maintained as defenses against the Indians in King Philip's war. The main roads which lead across the town are substantially the same roads which were laid out by the mother towns of Concord and Billerica, and after the incorporation, by the new town of Bedford.

The beautiful Common in the center of town is part of the original common lands given by the Founding Fathers toward the incouragement of the town. The white church on the Common is the ancient meeting house built after the style of Asher Benjamin. Surrounding the Common, and making a square, are old homes which date back to over 150 years, maintaining the original architecture inside and out, and proudly kept by their owners. Close by the Common are the Fitch Tavern, where the minutemen of our own town gathered on April 19, 1775, and where the minutemen of Reading, Woburn, Billerica, and other towns met before marching on to the battle at the north bridge. Opposite the Common is the home of the first minister of Bedford, built in 1730. This house was to become, in the early days of the Revolution, the gathering place for the minutemen of this area. Still called the Domine Manse, it is much as it was almost 250 years ago.

All along the Great Road, and close by the Common, are interesting and well-kept homes which date back to the day of the stagecoach, the little carriage shops, the first stores, the first post office and library. Several houses have painted or stencilled walls, possibly done by Rufus Porter. Facing the Common is the old town hall, built in 1856, with a curving stairway built after the manner of the Bullfinch churches and halls. The town hall has been remarkably well kept, and although built to house the center school as well as the hall, it still serves the town well as Bedford's administrative building.

The town's proudest possession is the old Bedford flag, carried to Concord on April 19, 1775, by Bedford Minuteman Nathaniel Page, and now the oldest flag in the United States. It is kept in a specially constructed vault in the historical society's wing of the public library. The Bedford flag was almost 100 years old on the day of the Battles of Concord and Lexington, and, strangely enough, it seems better known in the distant parts of the country than in our own New England.

We may not have a battlefield in Bedford, nor the home of a famous general, but we do have a New England town such as other communities are spending millions to reconstruct. In Bedford, we do not need to rebuild or to restore, but to keep the precious colonial town we have.

Now, therefore, we the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Bedford, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim Bedford's endorsement of See America Year, 1964, and welcome visitors from around the world to Bedford.

ALAN D. MAIER,
Chairman.
CHANDLER H. STEVENS,
Clerk.
WARREN K. LEWELLEN,
JOHN F. PERKINS, Jr.,
NICHOLAS J. GENETTI.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, by act of Congress, this is national Save Your Vision Week, a period in which Americans are urged to protect what is perhaps our most precious natural asset.

Much has been learned about the protection of our vision in recent years, and with reasonable precautions, most Americans can avoid the disaster of losing sight.

We are urged to have regular physical examinations to safeguard our general health. We are urged to see the dentist twice a year to protect our teeth. Let us hope that more and more of us will adopt the practice of annual visual examinations to protect our sight.

Dutch Envoy Gets Warm Goodby After 13 Years in Post in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the good fortune of knowing Dr. and Mrs. Jan Herman van Roijen are indeed sorry that they are to soon leave Washington. For 13 years, Dr. Roijen fought for Dutch interests as their Ambassador and he was one of the most respected Washington diplomatic personalities.

Max Frankel of the New York Times interview Dr. van Roijen before he left and the resulting column is one which all of those who have known the Ambassador's warmth and frankness will want to read. I am sure that we who deal in government policy regret his departure and hope that both he and Mrs. van Roijen will not stay away long.

The interesting comments follow:

DUTCH ENVOY GETS WARM GOODBY AFTER 13 YEARS IN POST IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—This capital has been bidding an especially bubbly farewell to Dr. Jan Herman van Roijen, who taught it again that big men come from little countries.

Slight and precise, polite and correct, diplomatically dressed but often undiplomatically frank, Dr. van Roijen has served here for more than 13 years as Ambassador of the Netherlands. He has fought for Dutch interests with the administration of four Presidents, but in each era he has been among the most admired foreign officials here and one of the most respected Washington analysts of any nationality.

His admirers believe they pay him the highest compliment by saying he is a superb diplomat and still an honest man.

Intellectual honesty, more than gregariousness or other cocktail-party talents, is the Ambassador's own standard of excellence. He believes that the diplomat, like any advocate, must recognize and contain the prejudices of his position.

DEALT WITH INDONESIANS

The practice of what he preaches has appeared time and again in his defense of Dutch objectives against Indonesia. Dr. van Roijen was a principal negotiator in paving the way for Indonesian independence and in arranging for the transfer of Netherlands New Guinea to Indonesian control.

Despite these long and exasperating diplomatic bouts, he has retained the confidence of the Indonesian anticolonials. And, although his Government resented U.S. pressure in the New Guinea affair—a pressure that left most of the Dutch with a bitter taste, he says—the Ambassador has understood Washington's self-interest. He has

even conceded that in an American's place, he might have felt the same.

In surveying his years here, he says that America's friends wish that Washington would not preach quite so much to others about freedom, self-determination and morality in general.

Ambassador Van Roijen, who is 58 years old, will leave Tuesday on his way to duty in London. He says he will take with him a great confidence in United States diplomacy. He does not subscribe to the view that Americans are only slowly maturing and learning their responsibilities in the world.

SAYS UNITED STATES HAS BEEN WISE

In constitutional and other respects, he points out, the United States is not so young and its performance since World War II has been wise and moderate and usually generous.

Perhaps some of this sympathy is inherited. The Ambassador's mother was Albertina Winthrop, a direct descendant of John Winthrop, one of the early Governors of Masachusetts. His father, also a diplomat, was the Dutch Minister here from 1927 to 1933.

The Van Roijens are selling their 300-acre farm retreat in Warrenton, Va. They have been unable to persuade any of their four children to remain in the United States as hostages to assure a regular parental visit.

But the Ambassador still has a brother living in this country and even without an excuse, he remarks, he would not be able to stay away for long.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships that are awarded as the top prize.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Following is a copy of the winning essay of Miss Jo Anne E. Hubbard, R.D. 1, Pulaski, N.Y., who is a resident of my district. We are all proud of her and I congratulate this outstanding young lady whose essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Through the ages man has conceived many aspirations, hopes, and ideals. He has strived for numerous goals, projects have been commenced and finished, battles have been fought and won. And throughout all this, one intangible quantity remains the most sought after, the most difficult to obtain, the soonest lost. That almost indefinable quantity is freedom.

We, as citizens of the United States, have achieved a state of freedom. But this accomplishment can not be accredited to the present generation of youths. Our ancestors won our liberty in the American Revolution, established our liberty in the Constitution, and have preserved our liberty through the furious War Between the States, and the Great World Wars.

The American youth of today is allowed citizenship in a Government of freedom because his forefathers responded to liberty's cry for help. Today, however, her anguished cry is not as easily heard. The young citizen's ears are plugged by indolence and indifference. He becomes mentally fat and complacent, feeds on the blood and tears of his forefathers, and therefore draws the lifeblood from liberty.

This situation can be cured by the realization that citizenship is a challenge. Though there are no visible traces of smoke and no distant booms of cannon, our liberty is slowly being pierced by the bayonets of hate. Perhaps the cruelest stab was that which pierced through the life of one man and into the heart of every responsible American citizen. As the body of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy lay in state, thousands of Americans slowly passed the coffin. Some knelt in prayer * * * many wept * * * and the tears were not only for the dead President and his grieving family, but for themselves, and for a nation suddenly aware of its apathy.

The death of President Kennedy was a tragic blow rendered by chance. But the tragedy could become much more hopeless if we as citizens do not learn from the example of President Kennedy's life. He was himself a "profile in courage," a citizen who responded to freedom's challenging cry. He was loved and respected not only in the United States but in democratic nations around the world. He created an image in the mind of the rest of the world representative of every American—an image of youth, lightheartedness, gaiety, but also strength, intelligence, and responsibility.

As the American youth grows older he must maintain the image of our dead President. He must keep the Nation strong and honorable. He must never fail liberty when she calls, no matter how dark the night, or how desolate the corner of the world in which she is threatened. He must make citizenship a new-found challenge, rather than an inherited drudgery. Only then, regardless of where he may be, can he hold his head high and state, "Civis Americanus sum."

I am an American citizen.

JOANNE HUBBARD,
R.D. 1, Pulaski, N.Y.

Another Administration Goof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, recently we recognized the Communist regime of Zanzibar, after the Zanzibar Government had tossed our representatives out of its country because of our delay in recognizing it. In other words, we were blackjacked. This, in spite of the fact that the new Dictator of that country had just finished murdering several hundred of his former political opponents.

Last Friday's Washington Star had some apt editorial comments on this:

ZANZIBAR TIMING

So now we have recognized Zanzibar's revolutionary regime and established diplomatic relations with it. This we have done, along with Britain and several Commonwealth nations, just after having had our representatives kicked out of the place because of our Government's delay in establishing ties.

If we were going to come to terms with the gang of Reds running this primitive little island, could we not have avoided the appearance of having been blackjacked into doing so? Whatever the excuse for this goofy bit of timing, we have been made to look wholly ridiculous. Whatever the performance was, it wasn't apt.

Americanism by Mail Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, two of my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Speer of the Anchorage Resort near Bemidji, Minn., have called my attention to a recent editorial broadcast over radio station KBUN in Bemidji. There may be an element of tongue in cheek in the editorial, but it also has a clear message of truth and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

KBUN COMMENTARY, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

People frequently ask, "where do you get your information?" "Where do you get all these facts and figures?" And the answer is simple. Reading material by the bushelful crosses the desk of any editorial writer every day of the week. Reports from all over the world, reams of propaganda, bales of statistices, and bundles of political speeches all find their way to our desk. The job of editorializing is simply one of putting opposing points of view side by side, looking for the prejudiced and the omitted and forming an opinion somewhere in between.

Now, in all of these hundreds upon hundreds of mailing lists, in all of this research material, we believe there are three books which have never received the attention which is properly due them. They are not small books by any means. The largest runs to 1,714 pages and weighs a heftly 5 pounds. The next largest is 1,342 pages in length, and the smallest consists of 551 pages but they are larger pages than either of the others. Certainly these three colorful books would rank high on the best-seller list if they were sold. Instead, they are given away. Free for the asking.

What we are talking about is the big three of the mail order world. The Sears, Wards, and Spiegel catalogs. And, of all the political, business, and labor propaganda which comes by mail, these three are certainly the most interesting.

They are an endless source for browsing on a cold winter evening and from the three you can find things to buy ranging all the way from a 9-cent box of tacks to a $6,500 diamond ring. One of them even offers a choice of 53 breeds of pedigreed puppies all the way up to a Sealyham Terrier or Afghan Hound at a mere $200 each.

But we believe the greatest value of these books has never been realized. Now, even a casual observer must realize that the United States and Soviet Russia are engaged in a contest. It isn't really a race for the moon or a battle for Olympic gold medals. The real race is to see which nation can swap places with the other the fastest.

While the Soviets lean a little toward free enterprise every day, we are rushing pell-

mell toward socialism. While the Soviets are acquiring real estate all over the world in the best imperialist fashion, we are working overtime to give ours back. And this is where the three books come in.

As a cold war weapon we believe the Sears, Wards, and Spiegel catalogs would be devastating if they were to be distributed to Russia. They have everything in them that Russia lacks—from seat belts to pony saddles, from hair bows to hats by Lily Dache and Mr. John, from padded brassieres to reducing pills, even fertilizer and farm tools.

Now if the Russians were given a look at these wonderful wish books, we know they would want some of those goodies for themselves. They would either buy like crazy and thus help our dwindling gold supply, or they would try to mimic the society which can produce so much affluence. Socialism would be out, free enterprise would be in, and we might then find that our own liberal, socialist-oriented planners who constantly want to ape the Soviets would have to plug for free enterprise once again in the United States.

We think it's worth a try. Sears alone, prints 10 million of those books and we believe a few million scattered around the Soviets and their satellites would be far more effective than Presidential coloring books. Or even the Voice of America. For these three are the free, enterprising, Voice of America.

Trouble for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, countless numbers today are attempting to promote international amity and good will through our people-to-people programs. Progress is being made, but too slowly. It becomes increasingly difficult for those in this movement to understand a foreign policy that tolerates aid to those nations who brazenly state that they will bury us.

Israel today is in serious trouble. It has repeatedly attempted to negotiate its differences, live at peace and share its scientific and practical knowledge of development with its Arab neighbors.

Arab leaders apparently have no desire for friendly cooperation and give no indication they are interested in improving the lot of the great masses of underprivileged. They do appear intent on preparing for an all-out war on Israel.

This is pointed out rather forcefully in the following editorial, appearing in the York (Pa.) Dispatch recently:

TROUBLE FOR ISRAEL

Dozens of meetings were staged throughout Algeria this past weekend for the express purpose of stirring up hostility toward Israel.

The Algerian National Assembly said Algeria must give full support to the Palestine Revolutionary Organization which, it added, will spearhead "an armed liberation struggle against Zionist bands."

Recent Arab activity, capped by the blatant Algerian agitation, bodes an even more difficult future for the Israelis and the whole Mideast.

Yet, many of the Mideastern nations belong to the so-called neutralist-pacifist bloc.

In the light of their undisguised hostility toward Israel, the Arabs' pose of neutrality—which is contrived to indicate some sort of a broadminded, peacemaking spirit—is a pure sham.

The Arabs stand convicted by their own words: They are not peacemakers, or neutralists; they are opportunists.

The Right To Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there are those elements in our country who want to deny the right to pray to the majority of Americans.

One of the bulwarks of our Republic is the belief of the majority in God. It is interesting to note that, contrary to some of our fuzzy-minded appeasers, Communists have ordered a campaign to end religion, as reported in last Monday's Baltimore Sun.

It is, therefore, most refreshing to submit also an editorial by David Lawrence from the U.S. News & World Report of March 2, on the right to pray.

The articles follow:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 2, 1964]

REDS ORDER CAMPAIGN TO END RELIGION—PRAVDA DETAILS DRIVE FOR ATHEISM; PARTY OFFICIALS CRITICIZED

(By Ernest B. Furgurson)

MOSCOW, March 2.—The Soviet Communist Party has ordered a campaign to wipe out stubborn religious believers by stepping up atheist agitation at every level of education, work, and social life.

Pravda detailed the program today in an editorial charging that too many party officials have been "indifferent and careless" about religious life around them.

They forget that "in our country religion is an ideological enemy that openly proclaims an ideology alien to the scientific and Communist outlook and brings harm to society" the party organ declared.

ATTACK IS OUTLINED

It outlined an attack that would place atheistic specialists in schools and universities, farm and industrial organizations, party cadres—virtually into every waking hour of the Soviet citizen's day.

The program is a followup on a recent session of the ideological section of the party Central Committee, headed by Secretary Leonid F. Ilyichev.

A scientific institute of atheism will be created directly under the Academy of Social Sciences, which in turn is a subsidiary of the Central Committee of the party. It will supervise atheistic work, train experts, organize conferences and seminars and build up contacts with foreign atheists.

ATHEISM TO BE STRESSED

Beginning next school year, part of the student body will specialize in atheism at universities and pedagogical higher schools. Chairs of scientific atheism will be created in universities and high schools, and teachers' refresher schools in Moscow and Kiev will have new atheistic departments.

The industrial and agricultural branches of the Communist Party will organize individual sections of atheist propaganda at every level.

The Young Communist League, trade unions, cultural officials, and others must be involved. The program must attract more scientists, teachers, physicians, writers, journalists, and humanities students, Pravda went on.

COMPETITION IS PLANNED

A competition for the best works on atheist themes in painting, films, literature, and other arts will be organized.

The party even will attempt to organize new types of family celebrations to challenge the ceremony and holiday togetherness associated with religion.

Antireligion will become an essential part of social life not only at party, union, and school functions, but also within the factory itself, on the farm and on construction sites, the newspaper said.

DRIVE IS NOT NEW

The Soviet antireligious drive is not new, but has always been part of Communist dogma. It has periods of slumps and is often renewed with speeches and widespread press agitation.

The campaign described today is an effort to break this cycle of indifference of party and other leaders. Many of them will now have atheistic propaganda as their principal full-time assignment.

Particularly intense activity is common before and during religious holidays. A special antireligious party conference was called in Moslem Tadzhikistan during the recent fast of Ramadan, and the more widespread drive now begun comes just before Christian Easter and Jewish Passover observances.

ISOLATION FROM SOCIETY

The Central Asian Party session in Tadzhikistan was primarily intended to organize agitation against Moslem believers in that area, but evidence that it has had its effect against other sects there was seen in today's Pravda Vostoka, party paper of the Uzbek Republic.

It told of the conviction and "isolation from society" of three Evangelical Christian Baptists. The defendants were described as being influenced by "hardened loafers" who ran an underground headquarters in the Moscow suburbs.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 2, 1964]

THE RIGHT TO PRAY

(By David Lawrence)

Plainly, a constitutional amendment has become absolutely necessary to clear up the confusion that has arisen as a result of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States banning prayer in the public schools.

For the American people do not know now whether their children can lawfully be given in the classroom the very instruction in morality and righteous living which is so essential to the proper upbringing of American youth.

We may today be equivocating if we try to apply the High Court's ambiguous words in its decisions on prayer in the schools. Some interpretations would appear to permit the reading of parts of the Bible as a "historical" or "literary" study. Public-school principals, in various States, have already indicated a desire to experiment with such devices. But how can we be sure whether the "historical" or "literary" does not invade the area of religious teaching?

It is much more sensible to rely on a clearly written constitutional amendment which emphasizes the difference between voluntary and compulsory prayer in the schools or in ceremonies conducted under Government auspices. The provision in the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," should be continued but there should

be a clear definition affirmatively stating the basic principles safeguarding "the free exercise" of religion.

Prayers are offered at the opening of sessions of the Senate and the House and of the Supreme Court itself. These are an official part of the proceedings. Under the Court's decisions, is it at present constitutional for any form of religious exercise to be conducted in buildings financed with Government funds?

Each individual has a right to pray. This right does not vanish when the individual participates in a governmentally supported proceeding.

The argument that has influenced the Supreme Court is that any practice of theism—to utter prayers expressing a belief in God—is in itself equivalent to "an establishment of religion," and that to let school children express a belief in God as they pray at the beginning of a school day is to make it a Government-directed or Government-sponsored undertaking which is allegedly prohibited by the Constitution.

But there is a distinct difference between volition and compulsion. The atheist has a right to abstain from participation in any prayer, whether or not God is mentioned. He has no right, however, to interpose his beliefs in a manner that forbids others to worship God as they please—"the free exercise" of their religion.

It is no answer to the problem to say that the right to pray can be adequately exercised in the home or at church services. For the value of prayer once a week in a church, where the attendance covers all ages and large numbers, is not as great as the everyday impact of prayer on the minds of children of the same age in a small classroom. Here the teacher can promptly supplement the prayer with lessons explaining morality and integrity, thus inculcating in the minds of boys and girls at an impressionable period in their lives a respect for fellow human beings, a respect for honesty as opposed to cheating, a respect for the rights of others as opposed to intolerance and selfishness.

Indeed, how can our youth be trained in those ways of living which will help to prevent juvenile delinquency and crime unless in some way reverence for the Supreme Being is instilled?

The importance of prayer in the schoolroom is primarily that it is strengthened by group psychology and that it is an everyday, rather than a once-a-week, stimulus to better living.

It is being asked: Is there a right to pray during proceedings held in any Government building? If it is constitutional for certain individuals within the Government itself to organize collectively in trade unions—for private purposes—while others refrain from joining, how can it be persuasively argued that there should be no right of individuals to choose to pray collectively in a school provided by local government? Certainly an individual may pray in silence, but the benefit of articulation by the group is then lost.

Let the new constitutional amendment make it clear that prayers can be conducted in the classroom on a voluntary basis and that those who do not wish to attend may be excused or temporarily released.

The problem has too long been neglected. Early action is as vital as the "war on poverty" or the war on crime. For the right of young and old to pray together voluntarily in any building or facility provided by Government—Federal, State or local—is essential to the fulfillment of the objectives stated in the preamble of the Constitution: To "promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Atomic Industry Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a Billerica, Mass., firm, the P. F. Avery Corp., is acquiring an increasingly fine reputation for its work in the atomic energy industry. This highly specialized, technical, and demanding field is one more area in which the skilled personnel of the Massachusetts area are making an important contribution to space age technology.

Recently, the Boston Sunday Herald carried a fine article on the accomplishments of the Avery Corp. and under unanimous consent I include the January 26, 1964, article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

P. F. AVERY CORP. WINS BIG SUCCESS ON ITS SPACE AGE INDUSTRIAL WORK

A New England firm is winning wide renown in the atomic industry field. Its specialties cover maximum quality control of welding, engineering, precise manufacturing and complete testing operations in such intricate fields as the nuclear, high-vacuum, space, and commercial.

This fast-growing organization that is helping to spread New England's fame for superior quality in its services is the P. F. Avery Corp., of Billerica, Mass.

In the nuclear phase of its activities, Avery concentrates on reactors, cores, demineralizers, spent fuel containers, instrumentation, valves, shielding elements, and end pile loops.

In the high-vacuum part of its business, it provides particle accelerators, vacuum vessels and components.

Avery's space specialties cover launching equipment, centrifuge hydraulic catapult and aerospace simulators.

Commercially as in many other areas Avery has also met with considerable success in autoclaves, stills, and towers.

Avery attributes its accomplishments to its careful designing, close control of welding, engineering, manufacturing, and testing operations. The company size permits flexibility and optimum communications.

This firm has 200-ton capacities for: Heavy machining, precision welding and complex assemblies. Metals welded include carbon, alloy, stainless, aluminum, inconel, titanium, zirconium and beryllium. Avery's clean room provides the opportunity for dust-free, temperature and humidity control as required. Nondestructive testing is provided: Magnetic particle, zyglow, dye penetrant, ultrasonic, X-ray, vacuum testing and hydrostatic up to —5,000 pounds per square inch.

The Avery Corp. is currently building a number of nuclear spent fuel shipping containers of 100 tons or better. They will be used at the time of refueling for the safe containerizing and shipment of spent fuel to the reprocessing depots and return to the powerplants for completion of the cycle.

One of their recent awards was the order to design, manufacture, and test to the most exacting standards the reactor vessel and pressurizer for the new MH-IA barge mounted nuclear powerplant. This is the first floating electric powerplant that utilizes a nuclear power reactor as its source. It can be towed to any port in the world to provide or augment electrical power for wartime or emergency conditions. There is enough power in its output (10,000 kilowatts) to supply the needs of a city of 20,000 inhabitants.

When the first atomic-powered electric station was built at Rowe, Mass., the P. F. Avery Corp. was selected to manufacture the instrumention structures.

The atomic-powered U.S.S. *Long Beach* also has Avery nuclear reactor internals.

The President That Few Really Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of our time is recovering from a serious illness. Former President Herbert Hoover, now nearly 90, has over the years gained the affection of the American people for his many services to the Nation and to humanity.

Mr. Hoover has survived a bitter depression, which was not of his making, and has met with equanimity the years which followed.

He has constantly grown in stature in the hearts and minds of his countrymen for the way in which he has met adversity and has continued to do his duty to his country and his fellow man.

Mr. Herbert G. Klein, editor of the San Diego Union, in a column about Mr. Hoover, recently pointed out that "it would be an inspiration for America if leaders on both sides of the aisle in Congress took some time and told the world about the real Herbert Hoover." I would recommend to my colleagues that it would be worthwhile indeed to pay tribuate to the living Herbert Hoover instead of waiting to praise a memory.

Mr. Klein's article follows in full:

THE PRESIDENT THAT FEW REALLY KNEW

(By Herbert G. Klein)

In all its history, this Nation has known few men quite like "The Chief."

Few men have been more defamed. And few men have come back to win more affection.

The Chief is a former President, first and foremost. But he also has picked bugs out of potatoes, mined gold in California's Mother Lode country, been acclaimed as an engineer and an author, led missions to conquer famine in Europe, directed a program to effect economy in Government, and served his country in many other unheralded ways.

The Chief, of course, is Herbert Hoover.

Americans have known Hoover has a public figure for a half century. But strangely, few Americans know the really human side of the former President.

Hoover's image is of a stuffy man, stiffly wearing an old-fashioned double-breasted suit. A high, stiff collar was his trademark for years.

But when I last saw The Chief a couple years ago, he was seated on a folding chair working at a card table in a small, rough cabin in the redwoods of his beloved Bohemian Grove, north of San Francisco. He was wearing an old sweater, a beatup straw hat and rough shoes.

This was the Hoover who loved the woods and fishing. There is the story told by a close friend of Hoover's, Richard Berlin, the newspaper executive, about the time his grandson was taken fishing with Hoover in Canada. Berlin cautioned the boy that good manners called for Hoover to be called "Mr. President" or perhaps on better acquaintance, "Mr. Hoover."

Berlin introduced the boy and then had to leave the room. He returned to find his grandson calling the 31st President of the United States "The Chief." "We're now close fishing friends," Hoover explained. "I told him friends call me 'The Chief.' "

At 89, Hoover has lived longer than any former President except John Adams, who died at 90. He has kept active throughout these years.

"Nobody has any right to retire," he says. "You should take some job that will benefit the community, even if you don't get paid for it. Otherwise a person just sits around talking about his pills and his ills. Naturally he talks to the neighbors who will answer with accounts of their pills and ills. I don't go along with that."

Most recently, Hoover has been working on two volumes about past international conferences. He has had plans for a book on the late Senator Robert Taft.

Hoover was the victim of partisan attack during the Depression of the 1930s. But he shows no partisan remorse. His book on a Democrat, "The Ordeal of Woodrow Wilson," was a sympathetic biography. He became perhaps a closer friend of former President Truman than of former President Eisenhower. And one of the men whose friendship he enjoyed most was a former political opponent, James Farley. After leaving the White House in 1932, Hoover did not return until Truman called him in 1946 and invited him "home." He was as delighted as a tourist.

"To me Herbert Hoover is one of the most patriotic and unselfish men I have ever met," Farley says. "He was humble and modest to a fault and never had his real image projected to the American people. I always was amazed he showed no bitterness from our political bouts."

Both Farley and Hoover live in New York's Waldorf Towers. For years they have enjoyed perhaps the most honest, political conversations between two party statesmen anyone has known. "I was always frank and so was he," Farley says. "We sought nothing from each other and could do this. What we said to each other will die with both of us."

Hoover has been described by one friend as a man who keeps his friendships in repair. And he enjoys a regular routine with friends. Standard, for example, was a Monday lunch with the late columnist, George Sokolsky. Sunday evening frequently has been set aside for dinner and canasta with William Nichols, publisher of This Week magazine, and Mrs. Nichols.

Christmas Eve also follows a set pattern. He invites friends in for tree decoration he personally supervises even as to how the tinsel is applied.

Hoover amazes opponents at canasta or gin rummy by remembering every card. But a man who was trained as an engineer, as Hoover was, must develop his mind to retain facts.

Nichols believes these last 3 weeks have been cheerful for Hoover despite his illness. He read a light book, "The Incredible Journey," which featured a Siamese cat. And Hoover's daughter-in-law brought him a Siamese kitten as a pet recently.

Hoover was delighted. Typically, he named it "Cat."

Friends believe Hoover keeps alert because he loves children and fishing. He wrote a wonderful little book about fishing a year or so ago.

"Fishing is a chance to wash one's soul with pure air, with the rush of the brook, or with the shimmer of the sun on the blue water," he wrote. "And it is discipline in the equality of man—for all men are equal before fish.

"Next to prayer, fishing is the most personal relationship of man."

For Presidents he said, fishing "is a constant reminder of the democracy of life, of humility and of human frailty. It is desirable that the President of the United States should be periodically reminded of this fundamental fact—that the forces of nature discriminate for no man."

Hoover has 6 grandchildren and 11 great-grandchildren. He spends more time personally answering letters from children than any other man in his position. And a letter from a youngster gets his serious consideration. One, for example, asked about the chances of a woman becoming President.

"As a generalization, the men have not done too good a job of government in the world * * * and the chances for women are thereby increased," he answered. "With good wishes to you if you are a candidate for President about 30 years hence."

One of Hoover's greatest prides has been the Boys Clubs of America. During more than 25 years as a director, he has seldom missed a meeting. He regards them as a key weapon against delinquency.

Hoover keeps pace with the times. His most recent public appearance was at a luncheon honoring Astronaut Gordon Cooper. In his informal remarks he linked the astronauts with Lewis and Clark, Perry, Lindberg and Byrd. "Each of these men has added pride, strength of spirit and character, a greater learning to our country and has inspired our youth to greater ambition," he said.

I wired him before Christmas and asked if he had any message for the world. He replied:

"Christmas again reminds us of the message of peace and good will brought to mankind nearly 2,000 years ago. * * *"

Again he was current.

It would be an inspiration for America if leaders on both sides of the aisle in Congress took some time and told the world about the real Herbert Hoover. It is a tribute he deserves.

The Late Susan Edwards Wagner

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Mrs. Robert F. Wagner, wife of the mayor of the city of New York, has brought great sorrow to us. I know that I express the sentiments of the people of the 22d District of New York, my constituents, when I speak these words.

Susan Wagner was dearly loved, not only by the people of New York City, but by countless persons in countries throughout the world. She was noted for her active work in many charitable organizations; she was selfless in her devotion to her duties as the First Lady of New York City; her concern for others was genuine and sincere. As first lady and hostess of Gracie Mansion, her hospitality and innate kindness earned for her the respect and admiration and affection of all who knew her. She will be sorely missed and her good works will long be remembered, for she made many outstanding contributions to our city and State of New York.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mayor Wagner and their sons, Robert and Duncan. Mrs. Wagner was a great lady, a wonderful wife and mother. Her husband and sons have suffered a grievous loss; our thoughts and prayers are with them in this time of grief and sorrow.

Grants Now Available Under New Program To Train Teachers of Handicapped Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, in a supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we included an appropriation of $11,685,000 to inaugurate a new program of grants to colleges and universities and State educational agencies to train teachers in the specialized skills of teaching all categories of America's handicapped children. There are an estimated 5 or 6 million children of school age in this country who are denied the opportunity to learn at their capacity because the specialized teaching skills they require are just not available. These include the retarded, the deaf, the crippled and emotionally disturbed, the blind or visually impaired, those with heart disease, epilepsy or other debilitating conditions, children with speech impediments, and so on.

A comprehensive program to help all of these children receive their educational birthright was first proposed to the Congress in a bill I introduced on August 30, 1957, on the last day of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, as H.R. 9591 of that Congress. The text of the bill—the first general bill on this subject—appears at page 1174 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1964, in connection with the appropriation we passed that day to bring this idea to fruition. The background of this legislation—how I came to introduce the bill and how it was drafted and the facts on which it was based—was presented by me in a 20-page report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the same day I introduced the original bill, August 30, 1957.

HEW ANNOUNCES PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING GRANTS

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of the Congress at this time the announcement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the procedures which are being established to award the grants for the coming school year under the funds we have just appro-

priated in Public Law 88-268, approved February 10, 1964.

The enabling legislation which authorized the appropriation of the funds was Public Law 88-164, approved October 31, 1963, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, recommended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Title III of this act, Training of Teachers of Mentally Retarded and Other Handicapped Children, not only continued the recently established programs for training teachers of the mentally retarded and of the deaf, but brought in all additional categories of handicapped children. It differs from my original bill primarily in that it does not also include among the exceptional children it would benefit that small but vitally important group of youngsters who are endowed with exceptional gifts—the gifted children. Educators usually include them among exceptional children, and my bill would have included them, also, in the program of training teachers professionally equipped to bring out the full educational potential of all categories of exceptional children.

So, of course, I will not consider my objective completely achieved in this legislation until we have also established a grant program to train teachers of gifted children.

My original proposal had one other important difference from the legislation we finally enacted last year. Under my 1957 bill, the grants would have gone directly to the individual teacher—preferably an experienced classroom teacher who would be encouraged to go back to school for this postgraduate specialized training. As finally enacted, however, the grants will go to colleges and universities and State educational agencies which will, in turn, make the selections of the recipients. In many cases, these will be 4th-year undergraduates. However, I hope that the emphasis will be directed primarily at fellowships for teachers already experienced in classroom work. The best teacher for a handicapped child is a good teacher, skilled in her profession, and then given further specialized training which capitalizes on her own extensive teaching experience.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement this week from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare outlining the manner in which the money will be distributed under the new program is as follows:

HEW ANNOUNCES PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING GRANTS

The U.S. Office of Education announced today it is ready to receive applications for $14 million in grants to train teachers and for research to aid an estimated 5 million handicapped children.

Notifications have been sent to institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, and nonprofit education and research groups with instructions on how to apply under terms of the Mental Retardation and Community Health Centers Construction Act passed last year.

In a recent supplemental appropriation, Congress made available $11.5 million to combine with $2.5 million appropriated in 1963. The act provides that $11.5 million of the funds be used to train teachers and their supervisors, researchers, and other specialists in the field of the mentally retarded, the crippled and emotionally disturbed, and children who because of impaired health require special education. The act also includes those with speech, hearing, and sight defects.

One million dollars was appropriated for research projects and $1.5 million for a separate program for training teachers of deaf children. The latter program also will be administered by the Office of Education, but will not be brought into the overall program of aid for handicapped children until July 1.

Grants may be made to colleges and universities and State educational agencies so that they may provide full-year fellowships or traineeships and also short-term traineeships. One-year grants may be made to colleges and universities to encourage the development or expansion of teacher training in areas of the handicapped that now have no teacher training or in which training is insufficient.

Fellows will be paid $2,000, $2,400, or $2,800, depending on their level of graduate study. One-year trainees—who must be college seniors—will receive $1,600 and short-term trainees a maximum of $75 a week. Only fellows will be given dependency allowances.

The Office of Education will make support payments to institutions to defray the costs of the program: $2,500 for each full-year graduate fellow and $2,000 for each full-year trainee.

Program funds will be allocated to the States on the basis of population, with up to $100,000 for larger States and up to $25,000 for smaller States. The grants to encourage development or expansion of particular teacher training programs may not be allocated to State educational agencies.

Stipends may be awarded to present or potential teachers, supervisors, researchers, or other specialists in the education of the handicapped. Applications from institutions of higher education and State departments of education to the Office of Education will be passed upon by advisory committees. An overall Advisory Council made up of general educators and private citizens, set up by the Commissioner of Education, will assist with the determination of general policies.

Grants for research may be requested by the nonprofit organizations and local public and private school systems as well as by States and institutions of higher education. Research and demonstration projects will deal with the problems in the education of handicapped children.

Rewarding Indolence, Penalizing Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have enjoyed a pleasant and rewarding interchange with our distinguished colleague from Washington, the Honorable WALT HORAN. Congressman HORAN represents a constituency that is highly agricultural and since I enjoy the same privilege we have a common interest which has often led us to a discussion of the so-called plain people of Ahmish who have contributed so much to the life and philosophy of Lancaster County, Pa.

With that preface I am happy to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. HORAN for calling my attention to the article in Monday's Evening Star by Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "It Sort of Makes You Wonder."

Mr. Jones holds up to view the completely opposite ways of life exemplified by the Greenwich Village "beatnicks" and our Ahmish brethren. The "beats" refuse to turn a hand toward earning a livelihood but spend most of their time criticizing the rest of the citizenry whose taxes through public assistance keep them in idleness. The Ahmish, on the other hand, refuse public assistance in all of its forms and are currently involved with the Federal Government because of its insistence that they pay social security taxes as the price of their inclusion under an insurance program that is unwanted and which they insist runs counter to their religious precepts. What a system, as Mr. Jones points out, that encourages the indolent and punishes the frugal and thrifty. But read the complete article to get the full impact of this impossible situation:

IT SORT OF MAKES YOU WONDER—GOVERNMENT PUTS BEATS ON THE DOLE, BUT BADGERS THE SELF-SUFFICIENT AMISH

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

NEW YORK CITY.—I am sitting in this little coffeehouse on Third Street in Greenwich Village watching the beats.

The place is a gutted-out store with bare brick walls and rough pine tables and benches. It is decorated with some far-out pieces of art, reminding you of finger-painting day in kindergarten. Right in front of a strong spotlight is a raised platform of unpainted boards that holds one straight chair. You can either sit in the chair or stand and place your foot on the seat, depending on how you like to wallop the guitar.

Coffee is a dollar a mug and the entertainers make their pittance by passing around a basket. Here and there a tourist will drop in a buck, but the Greenwich Village habitues rarely toss in more than a dime. It seems to work out that the more you are with it the less you give.

Down the street and around the corner there are larger and more famous places where you can buy wine and where combos alternate with unwashed people reciting dirty blank verse with great attention to its "social protest." It is in these brassier coffeehouses that the ban-the-bomb and justice-for-Castro crowd hangs out, perhaps because there are more people to see them.

But my little coffeehouse is for the beat-Puritans. Only coffee. Only folk music.

Folk music is simple and uncomplicated, born of log cabins and campfires, and sad with unrequited love and untimely death. You watch the spectators. Long-haired boys clad in stained slacks and open shirts. Frowzy girls with unwashed hair, studied in their ugliness. And you think what a colossal joke it is that these who profess to despise uniformity have slipped into an easily recognizable uniform, the uniform of the slob.

But there is something more. Here are many able-bodied young people who not only accept but seek public welfare payments. Yet they pride themselves upon their compassion for the poor who, if they are to be helped, must be helped by the labor of someone. Here are the pleaders for peace at any price who have never tasted the horrors of war but who have concluded that no cause is worth dying for.

Here are the laughers at law, the scorners of morality, the rejecters of thrift, the scof-

fers at "squares" who work—absorbed completely in the quest for their own self-satisfaction. And they gather in this smoky grotto to stare at the ceiling, to twitch their shoulders and softly snap their fingers as the guitar men and women sing music that is easy on the brain.

So, to the Amish. Later I was at Lancaster, Pa., and a friend lent me his car so that I might drive out into the beautiful farm country where the barns are the fattest, the cattle the sleekest, and the fields the neatest in all America.

There are some striking parallels between the Amish and the beats. For both, beards are the style. Both dress peculiarly. And while the beats seek the simplicity of primitive music the Amish turn their backs on modern machinery and drive the Pennsylvania roads in their black buggies.

There are, however, a few differences.

The Amish have no divorce, no crime, no juvenile delinquency, no unemployment or old-age problems. They take care of their own. They refuse Government subsidies. They take no money for not plowing a field. They dislike insurance. If a barn burns the whole community rushes to rebuild it. Because they supply their own social security they object to social security taxes.

This has brought down upon them the wrath of the huge national bureaucracy which sees only chaos if some people are permitted to look elsewhere than to the Government for their welfare. So the Amish have been repeatedly yanked into the Federal courts. A couple of years ago Government agents even seized Amish horses at plowing time to satisfy social security judgments.

We have a system of government under which all beats are comfortable and the Amish are bullied and badgered.

It sort of makes you wonder.

Tax Reduction Means More Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent editorial in the March 9, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report, the outstanding columnist and editor, David Lawrence, explains in pointed language why tax reduction by a government that has a monstrous debt and operates at a loss is fiscal irresponsibility. As Mr. Lawrence says, such policies of borrowing to meet the operating costs of Government cheapens the dollar even more.

I continue to believe that most Americans will see through the false political appeal of promised programs paid for by mounting debt for this country. In good times we should confine Government spending to Government income. If the President refuses to do this Congress should require it by law. In this objective the Appropriations Committees should play a leading role.

I commend the reading of Mr. Lawrence's editorial to all citizens.

SPEND OR SAVE?

(By David Lawrence)

Adam Smith, British economist, in his famous book entitled, "The Wealth of Nations," written nearly two centuries ago, warned against the tendency of governments to pile up debt and then "cheat the people" by devaluing the monetary unit.

Have times changed? Have we abandoned the artifice by which the dollar is depreciated and its purchasing power steadily reduced?

A tax cut has just been granted to the American people, and they are told that, if they spend their extra money, it will provide a stimulant to business. The same argument was advanced in the 1930's, when for nearly a decade the Government spent billions of borrowed money. This was called pump priming. But it didn't materially reduce unemployment. Not until the outbreak of World War II did unemployment end. Thus did an artificial stimulant bring "prosperity."

Then, after the big war, we experienced a recession. An upturn came again when the Korean war brought on a wave of Government spending.

The Nation has struggled during the late 1950's and the early 1960's to recover from the economic convulsions caused by World War II and the Korean war. We have had budget deficits in 11 out of the last 15 years.

We cannot achieve economic stability unless the Government adopts a sound fiscal policy.

The stock market rise today is to a large extent a response to the fear of a depreciated dollar. The AFL–CIO is calling for higher wage rates based on the expected benefits to business from the tax cut. Wage rises mean price rises. It's the age-old cycle of inflation.

How can there be a sound economy or a sound dollar if the Government itself doesn't practice the much-talked-about "frugality" and if it doesn't stop borrowing funds from the people to finance a reduction in their taxes?

The Government debt is steadily increasing. The budget is to continue unbalanced by several billions of dollars in the fiscal year beginning on July 1. The hope is expressed by administration spokesmen that the business boom will increase tax receipts and cut down the deficit. But what happens after the effects of the current tax cut wear off? Must funds be borrowed again to cut taxes and stimulate business?

The individual today is being urged to spend at once the money derived from the tax cut. But many persons will prefer to pay off debt. Others will put their money in savings accounts or buy securities.

The lesson of thrift is that it is wise to save money for rainy days—for the unexpected illnesses and vicissitudes of life. It is not sensible to spend for luxuries if one's income is just barely enough to meet ordinary expenses.

The new tax law means about $3 to $5 a week extra for families earning $10,000 a year or less. This is not a trivial sum. It will help to meet installment payments and to defray other expenses. It is questionable how much will be spent for luxuries.

Business is being told that volume will increase to such an extent that plant capacity needs to be expanded to meet the new demand. But businessmen do not plan just for a single year or for expansion of facilities in what may prove to be only a temporary boom.

There is a lack of stability in our system. We are living in an armament economy forced on us by the cold war, but this doesn't lessen the need for sound economics. The administrations in power are too much concerned with winning elections at a fixed time. The people suffer between elections.

Foreign companies today are increasingly competitive with our producers in domestic markets as well as in export areas.

A nationwide monopoly exists which fixes wages and forces prices to rise in order to absorb increased wage costs. The Government doesn't fix wages or prices except in wartime. Meanwhile, the economy is really dominated by pressure groups which keep forcing upward the cost of living, and thus, of course, the purchasing power of the dollar is reduced.

In the midst of all this, the doctrine that the Government must spend and spend in order to elect and elect has gained ground. It is not the way to a balanced economy or to a sound dollar. For neither individuals nor governments can remain solvent by spending each year more than the income received.

It is essential that debt be paid and that the citizen who lends money to his own Government be convinced that the dollar he invests in its bonds will buy at maturity as much as, not less than, it did when originally invested.

It is necessary to save rather than just spend and spend. Expenditures by Government must be cut. Many worthy appropriations should be deferred until there is a budget balance. This must be done to protect the dollar against inflation.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a voice of democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships that are awarded as top prizes.

I am proud that the Kentucky winner is Mr. John M. Meisburg, of Louisville, and I think that his speech merits the attention of the Members of this House and all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I submit Mr. Meisburg's speech herewith.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By John M. Meisburg)

Last November the people of a South American country met the challenge of citizenship in a way that startled the world.

The place: Venezuela. The event: The presidential election.

As the nation prepared for the election, December 1, 1963, it became clear that this would not be an ordinary election. Five times snipers attempted to assassinate President Betancourt. Boats and planes were hijacked. Banks were robbed and millions of dollars of property was destroyed. Handbills fluttered down from mysterious planes. Strange voices came from the radio. Said the voice: "Those who dare to vote on election day, December 1, may die." Said the handbills: "Stay in your homes on election day." For a month the Castro-Communists were at work, terrorizing the citizens of a free country.

Put yourself in the place of a Venezuelan citizen. Would you take the easy way; the safe way? Or would you carry out your responsibility and vote?

The people of Venezuela gave their answer in one of the most dramatic victories ever scored for democracy in South America: Ninety-five percent of the eligible voters of Venezuela did go to the polls on December 1, 1963! Ninety-five percent of the citizens of Venezuela risked their lives to meet the

challenge of citizenship in a manner that virtually crushed the Communist movement in that country.

Just 3 years ago the United States held a presidential election. But our election was completely different. There had been no Communist terrorism, no vandalism, no hijacking of boats and planes, no murders, no threats against potential voters by Communists or anyone else. Never before had a people been so free to elect the people that govern them.

And did the American citizens take advantage of this freedom? They did not. Nearly 40 percent of the eligible voters of our country stayed at home on election day 1960—a puzzling surrender of the priceless right to vote.

Some may argue that the challenge of citizenship is more urgent in Caracas or in Berlin than it is in the United States today. But, in truth, the challenge to American citizens is even greater. For we, as Americans, must meet the challenge of citizenship not only for ourselves and our future generations, but for an anxious world seeking an answer; a world in revolution seeking an example of democracy in action.

And the American example? It has been tarnished. And not mostly by the missile gap, or Russians in space, but mostly by American citizens not meeting the challenge of citizenship here at home.

It's not easy to persuade South Africans to discontinue apartheid when American citizens in Mississippi continue racial violence.

It's not easy to persuade emerging nations to become democracies when only 64 percent of the American citizens vote in a national election.

It has been said that it is easier to die for democracy than it is to live for democracy. Yes, American citizens today are facing a challenge different and more menacing than any challenge faced by the citizens of any other generation. The threat of subversion moves within our borders—the enemy within—communism. J. Edgar Hoover, in his great book, "Masters of Deceit," tells us that when the Communists took over Bulgaria the party membership was less than 1 percent of the national population. And the same was true of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary. The Communist Party in America has been stronger in numbers than it was at the time it seized power in Russia in 1917. And it is working now, around the clock, to undermine the American way of life.

The citizens of Bulgaria failed to meet the challenge to their citizenship and their country fell prey to a ruthless Communist dictatorship. The citizens of Venezuela met the challenge to their citizenship and their country remained free.

Which path will we choose? The challenge is clear. The Soviets predict that the next generation of Americans will live under communism—a way of life that is anti-God and antiman. Only we as citizens can render the final verdict.

If we fail to recognize this clear danger to our freedom and peace, then America may fail. It is our duty to realize that the coin of citizenship is not one-sided, but contains responsibilities as well as privileges.

American citizenship means more than just obeying the law, paying taxes, serving on a jury or in the Armed Forces. It means voting in every election and voting responsively. It means an active interest in Government. It means personal belief in the democratic heritage of equality. It means, in short, complete dedication to the cause of freedom.

As John Kennedy said last June, "Law alone cannot make men see right. It is a time to act in your local legislative body, in the Congress, but above all, in our daily lives."

Only in this way can we meet the challenge of citizenship.

Cut Revenues To Reduce Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting to note the number of columnists and Members of Congress who are now hedging their vote on the so-called tax reduction bill. It becomes increasingly evident that there is to be no curtailment of Government expenditures. In fact, the deficits for fiscal 1965 may well be twice the amount provided for in the President's budget in which case inflation will exceed or entirely wipe out any benefits which the individual might gain through the tax reduction legislation. Mr. Gould Lincoln's column, appearing in the Washington Star of March 3, follows:

CUT REVENUES TO REDUCE SPENDING

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Kennedy-Johnson tax bill is now a law. It was initiated by the late President Kennedy and pushed through to final action by President Johnson. The $11.5 billion tax reduction is retroactive to January 1, 1964. In simple words, the reduction has begun—on income taxes, including the Federal taxes on corporations and businesses. Within days, workers of all kinds will begin to feel a reduction in their withholding—an increase in the amount of money they take home in their pay and salary envelopes.

The impact of the new tax law will be both economic and political. If the measure proves good for the Nation's economy, leading to more production, more jobs, and less unemployment, and to better business generally, it will prove politically good for the party in power. It's as simple as that—what's good for the American people is good for the administration in charge of the White House. Under President Johnson's leadership, old predicted timetables for action on the tax bill went by the board. Consideration of the bill—including hearings—in the Senate Finance Committee went ahead without undue delay—as did debate in the Senate itself.

AWARE OF DRAG

The measure received strong support from Republicans and Democrats alike when the showdown came. Bitter-enders did not vote against the tax bill because they did not think a tax cut was due. They voted as they did because they believed that an effort should be made to cut Government expenditures and balance the Federal budget before the tax cut was made. That was the attitude of many Republican Members of Congress. However, they were fully aware of the drag which the heavy taxation has been placing upon the Nation's economy for years. They were willing for that reason to take the bill. This was the attitude, for example, of Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, a ranking member of the Finance Committee and a student of tax laws for years in the House and Senate. While he was a member of the House Ways and Means Committee he played an important part in framing the so-called pay-as-you-go tax withholding system, one of the most valuable devised since the income tax was written into law.

Much will depend on what the American people, including business and labor, do with the tax cut. If the cut is followed by a new cycle of wage and price increases, or by a new round of increased State and local taxes, it will be difficult to find the hoped-for expansion of plants and factories and the hoped-for creation of millions of new jobs. Indeed, the cut might be followed under such conditions by great inflation and devaluation of the dollar.

Also involved is the need of holding down Government expenditures and Government spending if disaster is to be avoided. Senator CARLSON is fearful of what 1965 may bring unless the Johnson administration sticks to its announced intention of cutting and saving everywhere it can. If the result of the tax cut should not be a reduction of unemployment, there is likely to be demands for a huge public works program financed by the Federal Government. With the national election over, such demands might be difficult to turn back.

SEE EFFORT ON SPENDING

Senator NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire Republican, also voted for the tax bill, giving as his reason a belief that by its passage it will reduce or at least curtail Government revenues. If revenues are reduced, Senator COTTON hopes that Congress will itself put the brakes on Government spending. In other words, it is better to start cutting Government revenues if you can't cut Government spending. This is a kind of backhanded way of going about fiscal responsibility. Explaining his position, the New Hampshire Senator said:

"In the past I have agreed with many who wrote to me, much as they would like tax relief, we must cut our spending first. That is the sensible way. But unfortunately, our present all-embracing, multipurpose Government is neither responsible nor sensible. There is something about big Government that makes its heads grow power-mad and money-mad. The billions roll in so easily that it becomes a case of 'easy come, easy go.' If a tax cut must await a budget cut, there will never be a tax cut. If you were to say to your happy-go-lucky young son, who has come to regard Dad as an inexhaustible money supply, 'I must cut your allowance and I'll do it as soon as you reduce your spending'—how long would you have to wait?"

Senator COTTON said we must not expect too much from this tax cut, but that the law contains some good points and needed reforms.

Cutting taxes to reduce Government spending is a new wrinkle in tax legislation.

Statement of Representative Milton W. Glenn of New Jersey in Opposition to Any Further Duty Cuts in Scientific Glassware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my strong opposition to any further duty cuts in scientific glassware, which is a very important item to the welfare and economy of my south Jersey area, and accordingly I have sent my statement to the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Mr. Christian A. Herter, which I would like to place in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MILTON W. GLENN OF NEW JERSEY IN OPPOSITION TO ANY FURTHER DUTY CUTS IN SCIENTIFIC GLASSWARE

I wish to oppose any further duty cuts on scientific glassware when competitive advantage is already enjoyed by foreign glassware makers over U.S. firms. Capitalizing on a formidable price advantage caused by lower production costs, foreign glassware manufacturers increased their shipments to this country by an average yearly gain of 132 percent between 1950 and 1962. The same price differential has enabled foreign producers to capture export markets in Latin America and other free world areas where U.S. glassware products once found willing buyers.

The U.S. producers' share of world trade in scientific glassware products has been declining for some years, while the European Economic Community countries have increased their share of the world market from 45 percent to 47 percent. Naturally, cost advantages account for the decisively lower price at which foreign glassware enters the U.S. market duty paid, to take a rapidly increasing share of the U.S. market. This also explains the similarly decisive low prices at which the foreign producers are swiftly capturing the U.S. industry's share of the export market.

It is my opinion that any further reductions in U.S. duties will quickly accelerate the sharply adverse U.S. import trends in scientific glassware—driving the U.S. industry out of its only remaining market (at home), and out of existence in a short period of time.

My south Jersey area has been famous for the production of glassware for generations, and particularly in the very important production of scientific glassware. This is very specialized work, performed by hand, and calling for the highest order of glass-making skill. These artisans have been following this trade for generations and are very proud of their vocations. They make scientific glassware for use in all categories, including biology, chemistry, physics, metallurgy, pharmacy, medicine, and surgery. To a great extent the industry consists of small plants, numbering approximately 40 or 50, in addition to several of the large nationally known producers. It has been estimated that there are approximately 10,000 people in the Bridgeton, Vineland, Millville glass manufacturing area that are dependent on the production of glass products for their livelihood. Already several of the plants have closed due to foreign competition and, with further reduction in the duties, we can look for more closings and layoffs. There is no question but that the existence of a fully developed, economically strong, and technically sound scientific glassware industry is of basic importance to the growth of the Nation's total research activities and its position of technical leadership in the world. This can no longer continue to be so, however, if we are going to continuously lower tariffs. It is my opinion that once we lose our position and destroy the incentive for a future generation of artisans in this field by closing plants and laying off employees, we will no longer have the benefit of these highly skilled people in this line of our scientific manufacturing endeavor.

It is very well to endeavor to lower trade barriers with foreign nations, but certainly not at the expense of the destruction of segments of our industry and the increase of unemployment rolls with skilled artisans who would never be satisfied or even capable of undertaking training in any other vocation, particularly by men in the middle age group who have taken a lifetime to qualify in their particular skill.

I urge you to consider these factors in the current negotiations and forbear from proposing any further tariff cuts in this very specialized industry. In fact, I cannot urge you too strongly to actively oppose any further tariff cuts.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech prepared by Miss Patricia M. Herbst, of Phoenix, Ariz., for the Voice of Democracy contest, which is sponsored each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. A copy of Miss Herbst's speech, which imparts an inspiring message for all Americans, follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Miss Patricia M. Herbst)

Mankind today stands on a summit, with his hands outstretched in quest of the heavens. At his feet lie vast new realms, conquered by his persistence and ingenuity. The challenge of knowledge and broader horizons beckons him further. But all his accomplishments, all these fresh worlds are useless—useless unless mankind accepts the greatest challenge of all—the challenge of citizenhip. For it is in meeting this summons that man determines what he will be, and equally important, how he will use his remarkable achievements.

Science and the ever-widening vistas of learning have wrought immense changes in our thinking, our mode of life, and in the very core of our existence. And as these forces gain momentum, man tends to forget the concepts and principles which have enabled him to achieve such greatness. The challenge of citizenship is one such basic idea, for it is the challenge of self, the striving for fulfillment that has motivated men of all ages.

What is this citizenship? In essence it is developing the best that is within ourselves and then sharing it with others. Citizenship combines the perfection of all that man is or can be with a yearning to share. True citizenship is membership in humanity.

Youth today asks, "What can I, as one individual, do for my country?" Our only answer can be that for us, citizenship is a personal commitment. We must challenge ourselves and citizenship will challenge us.

As the generation of today—we are challenged—challenged to be strong in leadership; to be faithful in allegiance to the principles which animate us; challenged to be filled with the enthusiasm of the young and to heed the experience of those who have shown us the way; challenged to remain at all times an individual but never to separate ourselves from the needs of others; challenged to think well, to act justly and kindly, to participate actively in worthy endeavors, to live with integrity; challenged to drive the seeds of prejudice, misunderstanding, and apathy from our hearts; challenged to find the truth and never to lose it; yes, challenged to develop an inner peace that will spread through an anxious waiting world.

This is citizenship; citizenship as lived by people like Helen Keller, a symbol of hope to the afflicted the world over; Jacqueline Kennedy, who returned to a mourning nation its lost pride and dignity; and Dr. Thomas Dooley, a man of selfless service and dedication throughout his life. The call is universal, its examples are commanding.

Let us be the best—the best of all that's within us, for God, our country, our neighbor and ourselves. By accepting the responsibilities of citizenship and of self; we cannot help but influence others to follow in our steps.

Our future beckons us. Hear America summoning—it is the challenge of citizenship, the challenge to all humanity for the voice arises from every heart.

Statement of American Quicksilver Institute to the Trade Information Committee, Washington, D.C., February 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the excellent statement of S. H. Williston, president, American Quicksilver Institute, to the Trade Information Committee, Washington, D.C., February 26, 1964. He presented a similar statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission on the same date.

In his statements, Mr. Williston pointed out that the domestic quicksilver mining industry is at a very low ebb despite the highest U.S. consumption rate in history. Production in this country, he points out, is at the lowest rate in 14 years, with the United States depending on oversea supplies for 80 percent of civilian requirements.

Mr. Speaker, Nevada has one of the few remaining operating mercury mines in the United States. This mine has an outstanding record of production both in war and in peace but in the event that the current relatively low tariff rate on mercury is reduced, it might be forced to close, with the resultant hardship upon a community mainly dependent on its income from the mining of quicksilver.

The following statement presented by Mr. Williston is one which deserves the careful consideration of Congress and the Government:

My name is S. H. Williston. I am president of the American Quicksilver Institute, a trade association which has, since 1958, represented approximately 90 percent or more of total U.S. mercury production.

There are two extensive studies of the mercury industry made by the Tariff Commission at the request of the Senate which give an excellent review of the industry as a whole. The first was in 1958 and the second was in 1962. While I will touch very briefly on the older history of the industry I will not repeat any of the material in the Tariff Commission studies except to briefly bring them up to the present.

The present tariff on mercury of 25 cents a pound ($19 a flask of 76 pounds) was established in the very early 1920's and the

rates have not been changed since that time. At the time of their establishment they were the equivalent of an ad valorem duty of approximately 40 percent on the foreign price. Due to inflation in the United States and depreciation of the U.S. dollar, this duty now represents less than 8 percent ad valorem on the present market price of mercury.

When World War II opened there was a small mercury industry representing about one-half of the U.S. requirements. In World War II Italy, the world's largest producer, was a member of the Axis and Spain, the second largest producer, considered itself a "nonbelligerent" member of the Axis. The U.S. industry was called on to supply all the requirements for the United States and its allies, including Russia, and successfully did so under price ceilings and without subsidy or premium prices so far as the greater proportion of the production supplied by the major producers.

At the end of World War II the two major European suppliers drastically reduced prices to prewar levels and increased their exports to the United States in an apparent effort to destroy the domestic producers. In this, they were largely successful as, at the opening of the Korean war, mercury production in the United States had dropped to its lowest level since 1860. The U.S. Government seemed not concerned.

With the advent of the Korean war domestic producers were reluctant to increase production and it rose only to approximately one-fourth of the levels of the early 1940's, or about equal to the preware levels. In 1954 the Atomic Energy Commission developed a requirement for mercury in the separation of isotopes and withdrew approximately 50 percent of the total strategic stockpile metal and "contracted" for most of the European production.

At the same time the Government initiated a program for the production of domestic and Mexican mercury at an arbitrary price below the average cost of U.S. production with glowing terms related to the "maintenance of the mobilization base." Newcomers to the industry, encouraged by Government action, spent approximately $8 million, according to industry estimates, under the encouragement of this guarantee. These newcomers lost everything they put into the venture, except one which managed to break even. The annual gross value of the total production of the whole industry was less than the amount lost in these few years.

At the end of the program the Government reluctantly purchased one-sixth of its reported objective, which was turned over to the AEC. The number of U.S. mercury operations and total production has dropped steadily since that time. In 1958 there were 12 producers and the production was some 38,000 flasks a year. In 1962 there were 5 producers and a production of some 24,000 flasks a year. As of today there are 2 producers and the production during the final months of 1963 was at a rate not much above 12,000 flasks a year. In 1963 U.S. consumption of mercury was at an alltime high, probably in the vicinity of 73,000 flasks. The rate of production in the closing months of the year was below any year since 1950 and prices were at their lowest for the same period of time.

Labor costs in the mercury mining industry make up approximately 60 percent of total operating costs. Wage rates in the industry are eight times as high as they were when the duty was first established. Prices, on the other hand, are only three times as high. Federal, State, and county taxes, and industrial accident insurance alone now cost more than the total labor cost of 20 years ago.

In 1962 the AEC, no longer requiring all its mercury inventory, declared 50,000 flasks excess. This was done with a minimum amount of publicity. After disposing of some 6,000 flasks as a gift to other Government agencies, in early 1963 this material was turned over to the General Services Administration with instructions to declare the material surplus to be sold under the Surplus Disposal Act. Fifty thousand flasks of mercury is only slightly less than total annual U.S. consumption. Congressional committees, advised of the disastrous effect this would have, not only on the domestic industry but on world industry, prevailed on the administrative agencies to withdraw this material from the market and replace it in the strategic stockpile from which it had been removed. It is the industry's belief, unconfirmed in any way, that one dealer had advance information of this proposed disposal and, by selling below the market and then utilizing these sales to establish a minimum price, forced American quotations below the cost of production of any domestic producer. Domestic mines were forced to discontinue almost all of their exploration and most of their development work and, even under these conditions, only two were able to survive.

Domestic industry has found through sad experience that whenever U.S. production reaches or exceeds 50 percent of U.S. consumption they can count on decreased world price and heavy foreign imports until enough domestic mines have been forced to close so that foreign producers again have more than half the American market.

If the U.S. quotation for mercury had been $10 lower than it was over the last 2 years I greatly doubt that even the present two operating mines would have been able to survive, and once shut down, I greatly doubt that anyone would have been brave enough to have attempted to reopen them.

The Spanish mines have the world's four largest, newest, and most modern multiple-hearth furnaces (enlarged capacity of the best U.S. practice) purchased from the United States and installed by American engineers. The Italians have the four largest, most modern rotary furnaces, again copied from American practice, built and installed by American engineers. In addition, Spain has a wage rate not much over one-eighth the U.S. rate and the Italian mines' wage rate is not much over one-fourth the American rate. The grade of ore mined in the United States today closely approximates the grade mined in Italy but is only one-third the grade mined in Spain.

While I have no absolute knowledge, I am inclined to believe that even our Spanish and Italian competitors would regret seeing the American industry close its doors. Over the years they have enjoyed more than half our market and, at the present moment, are probably called on to supply five-sixths of our market, and at the same time are able to take advantage of all the technological improvements which the domestic industry is forced to make if it hopes to survive.

Under the Trade Agreements Act it is proposed to cut the protective tariff on mercury by 50 percent. If this had occurred last year I doubt if I would be here today. There would be no industry for me to represent. If the tariff were to be cut this year to an equivalent of 4 percent ad valorem from its present 8 percent ad valorem, I think it would be almost suicidal for anyone to venture exploration or development money in the hope of producing mercury over any long period of time within the United States.

What's Good About Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second of a series of weekly accounts which I intend to insert in the RECORD to call attention to the vast activities of our foreign aid program. By these articles, I hope to illustrate specific projects where our AID dollars have been spent wisely and have contributed greatly to the well-being of many of the peoples of the world.

Too often American foreign aid is presented by the mass media which reach the people of this Nation as a "package" program. Too often it is represented by a chart of percentages and dollar signs, not relating those percentages and dollar signs to money well spent in the building of bridges, roads, schools, conservation of natural resources, creation of employment and other projects which help the people of many nations to help themselves. Too often the American people are not kept informed of the great assistance AID lends to individual countries in unpublicized, but vital, programs involving joint cooperation between the receiving country and the American AID program. Examples of this cooperation to build needed facilities deeply impress me and, I feel, negate many of the criticisms of AID as a "giveaway."

Last week, I inserted in the RECORD an account of the coordination of the American AID program and the Bolivian people to build a desperately needed water system, which is now the backbone of existence in a remote Bolivian village. This week, I would like to call attention to a combined project of the American and Moroccan Governments to combat starvation and to create employment. This is another essential AID program toward a free and secure world.

A "SUCCESS" IN THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM: THE NATIONAL PROMOTION PLAN

Morocco. Capital, Rabat. Area, 171,300 square miles (estimated). Population, 11.6 million (estimated). Density per square mile, 69. Geography, humid coastal plain, two mountain ranges, and arid steppes and desert interior. Economy, agriculture and phosphates. Gross national product, 766 billion francs (estimated). Per capita income, $143 (estimated).

Picture a land of 172,000 square miles, within whose borders are deserts, barren steppe lands, arid plains, and towering mountain ranges. Picture also this land with 12 million people, 70 percent of whom derive their living directly or indirectly from the soil. This is Morocco.

Because of the seasonal nature of the crops, employment is sporadic, but plentiful. A severe drought in 1960–61 suddenly changed this precarious balance. Insufficient rain and surface water caused tremendous crop failures, depriving thousands, in some areas 50 percent of the population, from any work. The Moroccan Government, heavily burdened

with trade deficits and Government expenditures, was unable to create sufficient jobs for the unemployed destitutes. Development projects, stressing water production, had been proposed to provide immediate work for the starving population while at the same time developing the country in order to create jobs for the future. But the necessary funds for these schemes were not available.

The U.S. Government, recognizing the seriousness of the situation, began immediate steps to alleviate the desperate straits of this country by joining forces with the Moroccan Government to combat underdevelopment and unemployment in a plan called "national promotion." The Government of Morocco initiated development projects for schools, irrigation networks, soil restoration, wells, reforestation, and markets, paying one-half of the laborers' wages in cash. The United States paid the other half, but with wheat. In this way the work force was assured both money and food.

In the 2½ years just completed, the "national promotion plan" has provided for 54,997,340 man-work days, initiated 3,790 projects, and afforded jobs for 65,000 unemployed workers, on a rotation basis. In its first year alone official figures show that the program completed, among other things, the construction of 597 miles of irrigation canals, 577 miles of roads, 33,000 acres of soil conservation work, and the building of 1,200 schools.

The United States has assisted the program with supporting assistance loans for certain projects, such as dams and irrigation canals; but the principal success factor has been the 350,000 metric tons of surplus wheat which the people of Morocco have received. This joint operation continues today to help build more schools, canals, and dams, to show how American foreign aid may be used successfully for the development schemes of a less-developed nation.

Baker Mystery Broadens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of February 27, 1964:

BAKER MYSTERY BROADENS

The more Bobby Baker tries to cover up, the more he seems to reveal. As things now stand, accusations and insinuations of all sorts of shady activity on his part remain unchallenged. In declining to answer 121 questions before the Senate Rules Committee, he even drew the line on describing his official duties when he was secretary to the Senate majority. To do so, he contended, might tend to incriminate him.

Baker is within his rights in seeking shelter behind the fifth amendment. Few would dare to tamper with those rights, although the committee counsel, L. P. McLendon, did wonder out loud if the time hasn't come to deny public officials the amendment's protection.

Nevertheless, Baker's fast run for the shelter puts him in an exceedingly bad light. The often-asked question, "Who is he protecting?" takes on more force, with the broadened line pursued by the Senate probers. And a man who refuses even to deny that he dealt with call girls and abortionists as well as with lucrative Government contracts has surely diminished whatever sympathy he might otherwise have enjoyed.

The embarrassment to the administration is already deep, and threatens to grow worse. If there had been hope that this was another minor affair comparable to Sherman Adams' bad judgment in accepting gifts when he was President Eisenhower's aid, that hope must be fading fast. Baker's wheeling and dealing, in a sensitive position obtained at the behest of the then Senator Lyndon Johnson, obviously ranged far and wide. The public is and ought to be curious as to which of his deals were part of his job as a Senate functionary, which were contributing to his private fortune, and whether these two types of deals overlapped. A thorough inquiry into possible conflict of interest could be illuminating as to the general level of Washington morality.

There are limits, of course, to the Senate committee's capacity to pursue the inquiry. The chairman long ago went on record against investigating Senators, some of whom might reasonably be expected to know what Baker was doing as the Senate's hired hand. In the light of that declaration, it is somewhat surprising to find the questions asked Baker ranging as widely as they did.

There are other agencies, however, with broader investigative powers than the Senate committee. We hope they are used to the fullest, to get to the bottom of the mystery that now shrouds the whole Baker case. If nothing more is done than to chase Baker and his secretary behind the fifth amendment at a public hearing, the odor of whitewash will be strong enough to smell up the whole election campaign.

The Other Side of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion lately about the role of tax exempt foundations in our society; there have been charges that they are a convenient way of avoiding taxes.

The other side of the picture is that these foundations do a great deal of good in many sectors of our society and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the Wall Street Journal of February 10, 1964, detailing the accomplishments of one such foundation:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 10, 1964]

THE MELLON MILLIONS: HOW A WEALTHY FAMILY PUTS FORTUNE TO WORK FOR BENEFIT OF PUBLIC—FOUNDATIONS SPUR PITTSBURGH'S RENAISSANCE, AID COLLEGES, HELP CREATE NATIONAL PARK—MAKING PHILANTHROPY A CAREER

(By John F. Lawrence)

PITTSBURGH.—This city's clean, modern downtown, the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., and the national park at Cape Hatteras, N.C., all owe their existence in large part to a fortune amassed in Pittsburgh beginning in the last century.

The fortune is that of the Mellons, one of the Nation's richest families. The wide range of undertakings aided by the Mellon millions—activities which include scientific and educational enterprises as well as civil, cultural, and recreational projects—points up the pervasive influence great fortunes continue to wield in U.S. life.

This influence is sometimes overlooked in a day when many of the problems facing the country seem so vast that only Government agencies have the resources to cope with them. But the fact is that private wealth still is taking on many big jobs for the public in the United States.

Paul Mellon, who with his cousin Richard King Mellon, guides the affairs of the Mellon family today, believes that in some instances private interests can carry out public projects more easily than governmental bodies. "Foundations and individuals can make decisions to act on things that are slightly controversial faster than governments because the machinery is less," says 56-year-old Paul Mellon. "I think that's the usefulness of private wealth."

LIBRARIES AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford are the names that leap to mind first in any consideration of the role of great fortunes in the United States. Andrew Carnegie, among other things, built 1,946 free public libraries around the country. The Rockefeller Foundation, one of several major philanthropies of the Rockefeller family, has given away $705 million in its half-century of operation, more than 40 percent of this in the fields of medicine and public health. The Ford Foundation, once described as a large body of money surrounded by people who want some, has dispensed more than $2 billion since its founding in 1936; about half the Ford grants have gone to educational experimentation.

But while the Mellon name may not make the headlines too often, the scope of the activities in which the family's fortune has been put to work is impressive—as is the fortune itself.

The Mellon wealth originated with Thomas Mellon, who came to this Pennsylvania region as a boy from Ireland in 1818. Thomas started a real estate and banking business that two of his sons, Andrew and Richard, built into a massive financial empire. Paul and Richard K. Mellon, the present heads of the family, are, respectively, the sons of Andrew and Richard.

The total of the Mellon fortune has never been disclosed, but some of the stockholdings of the family and of various Mellon trusts and foundations have become publicly known through proxy statements and informed estimates. The value of these investments alone is now about $2.5 billion.

BIG GULF, ALCOA HOLDINGS

A key holding, worth $235 million, is 40 percent of the stock of Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. here, which grew out of Thomas' original banking enterprise. The bank provided early financing for Gulf Oil Corp. and Aluminum Co. of America, and the Mellon fortune now includes 32 percent of Gulf's stock, worth $1.7 billion, and 30 percent of Alcoa's stock, worth $476 million. Other big investments are Koppers Co. ($31 million); Carborundum Co. ($25 million); General Motors Corp. ($23 million); and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. ($10 million).

Richard K. Mellon, a trim, graying 64-year-old who is known as R.K. and who is so shy and reticent he studiously avoids publicity, devotes much of his time to the family's business interests. He is a director of Gulf, Alcoa, Koppers, GM and the Pennsylvania Railroad and serves as chairman of the Mellon bank.

But for Paul Mellon, as unassuming as R. K. but a bit more outgoing, philanthropy is just about a full-time job. "He's made a career of learning how to give money away." says an associate. Paul, who wears horn-rimmed glasses and favors somber-hued double-breasted suits, travels regularly between Pittsburgh, New York, and Washington on philanthropic chores. His base is Wash-

ington, where he heads the National Gallery, a $70 million gift to the Nation by his father, who was Secretary of the Treasury from 1921 to 1932.

Members of the Mellon family have numerous personal philanthropies; for example, last November Paul Mellon gave $500,000 to an endowment fund for the Pittsburgh Symphony. But most of the family's giving is done through foundations.

GIVING AWAY $300 MILLION

The Mellons have six major philanthropic foundations: The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, established in 1930 by Andrew; the Old Dominion and the Bollingen Foundations, established in the 1940's by Paul; the Avalon Foundation, established by Paul's sister, Mrs. Ailsa Bruce; the Richard King Mellon Foundation, set up in 1947 by R. K. and his sister's Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation. The foundations have given away more than $300 million, but their assets still add up to $194 million. Gifts from the foundations last year totaled more than $18 million.

The operation of the foundations and approval of specific grants rest in the hands of independent boards of trustees, but the grants clearly reflect the general areas of personal interest of the Mellons. The funds in most cases are administered by long-time associates of the family.

For the most part, Mellon foundations have sought to avoid being the sole donors to any groups or projects, choosing instead to back undertakings that can gain broader support. "There's a trite foundation phrase for this—we call it seed money," Paul Mellon explains. "You provide an example that might stimulate others to copy and get other foundations going. You can do more with your money that way."

In line with this thinking, his father provided the money for the marble building and the nucleus of a collection for the National Gallery; subsequent benefactors have added to the collection and contributed funds. On a smaller scale, the Mellons helped launch the annual summer Three Rivers Arts Festival here in 1960. It includes open-air displays of paintings and band concerts in the newly rebuilt area at the point where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers join to form the Ohio. "If you can get it started, it will be carried on," says Paul.

Public parks have been an important interest of the Mellons. The A. W. Mellon Trust has been a major backer of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, a private organization that buys up land to preserve forests and provide potential public park areas. Another Mellon park project, the Cape Hatteras Park, illustrates how private wealth can sometimes work faster in such matters than governments.

HELPING PITT

"After World War II," relates Paul Mellon, "I heard from friends in the National Park Service that there had been a move to buy up a lot of Cape Hatteras for a national park, but it had bogged down and there was a road planned that would have brought hotdog stands and that sort of thing. We got interested, flew over it and made up our minds in a few months." The upshot was that the Old Dominion and Avalon Foundations matched North Carolina State funds to purchase the land for a national park.

The Mellons have channeled millions of dollars into education. The University of Pittsburgh alone has received $87 million worth of Mellon grants over the years, including $13.6 million from the A. W. Mellon Trust to establish a graduate school of public health in 1948. Paul's Old Dominion Foundation, which has assets of $52 million, has made two-thirds of its gifts to education, with nearly a score of colleges among the recipients. His Bollingen Foundation has spent over $10 million to translate foreign scholarly works into English and to support other scholarly projects. The A. W. Mellon Trust, since 1959, has given $300,000 to Pittsburgh public schools and the Carnegie Institute of Technology to develop advanced placement and other programs for bright students in elementary and secondary schools here.

Many of the Mellons philanthropic undertakings have been concentrated in their native city of Pittsburgh. Mellon Institute, housed in a colonnaded structure that occupies a full block near the University of Pittsburgh, was set up in 1913 to do nonprofit industrial research. The institute is credited with stimulating many companies to create their own research departments. Its professional staff, which now numbers 303, developed the first gas mask used by U.S. troops in World War I, coordinated the development of synthetic rubber in World War II, and did some of the earliest work on smog control.

Through his gifts of money and his powerful behind-the-scenes influence, R. K. Mellon has played a key role in the transformation of Pittsburgh's downtown area from a smog-blanketed huddle of grimly old buildings to a bright, airy section filled with skyscrapers and pleasant park spaces. R. K.'s foundation disbursed $16.9 million to various organizations and projects here through 1962, and many of the grants were directly related to the city's renaissance. One local executive contends—perhaps a bit strongly—that without the efforts of R. K. and other Mellons, "Pittsburgh might well be a ghost city today."

In 1943, while still in the Army (he eventually rose to the rank of major general in the Reserve), R. K. helped form the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. This civic body has led the effort to remake Pittsburgh. R. K.'s foundation has given $209,000 toward the support of the organization. It has also donated $178,000 to the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association.

SPARKLING FOUNTAINS

R.K.'s fund joined with two other Mellon Foundations to make the family's most visible contribution to the new Pittsburgh-Mellon Square Park in the heart of the city's downtown. The foundations gave $4.3 million to acquire and clear the land for the park, whose benches and sparkling fountains have made it a favorite noontime gathering place for Pittsburgh office workers.

Local businessmen credit R.K. Mellon's influence, in most cases exercised through his aids or officials of companies the family holds interests in, with building support for key smog control measures adopted here in the late 1940's. Edward R. Weidlein, then head of Mellon Institute and now retired, drew on the institute's work in the field to formulate an antismog ordinance for Pittsburgh. When the three railroads operating in the city successfully sought an exemption from the ordinance for their steam locomotives, R.K.—in part because of his position as a director of the Pennsylvania Railroad—was able to persuade the roads to reverse their stand and switch to diesels in the city, Mr. Weidlein relates.

Though the Mellon Foundations operate independently and claim not to coordinate their functions to any great extent, the family is tied together in T. Mellon & Sons, an informal organization with no legal standing or assets that was established by R.K. in 1946. It bears the name of his grandfather's original banking enterprise. T.M. & S., as it's known in the family, occupies spacious, warmly paneled offices high in a modern office building on Mellon Square.

FAMILY CLEARINGHOUSE

Outsiders often have ascribed great powers to T.M. & S., but Paul Mellon says it is little more than a family discussion group—"a form of clearinghouse for the family." There are monthly meetings at which family members and their associates discuss developments affecting Mellon investments but make no formal decisions.

Despite the pressure of their business and philanthropic activities, the Mellons find time to enjoy the pleasures of wealth. R.K., who attended Princeton for only a few months before starting his business career at the Mellon bank, has a farm at Ligonier, Pa., from which he commutes 50 miles to his office in Pittsburgh, and another in Georgia. He hunts big game and spent 2 months in Europe last year.

Paul, who holds bachelor's degrees from Yale and Cambridge, has his main home in Upperville, Va., some 50 miles west of Washington. He breeds racehorses there and thinks one of this 3-year-olds, Quadrangle, may be a prospect for the Kentucky Derby this year. Paul likes to spend a month abroad each year, mostly in England, and he and his second wife, whom he married in 1948, 2 years after the death of his first wife, are spending this month at their home on Antigua in the Caribbean. They also have homes on Cape Cod and in Washington and New York.

Their New York address will change soon. "My wife is fond of building things," says Paul Mellon, "so I'm building her a new house in New York on East 70th Street."

More Censorship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States had great hopes for our $150 million Ranger program, which was dealt a severe blow when, somehow, we failed to photograph the moon. A very disturbing article by William E. Howard, in the February 15 issue of the Long Island Press, charges that NASA refuses to reveal a report that would give some insight as to the reason for the failure:

REPORT WITHHELD ON RANGER FIZZLE

(By William E. Howard)

The space agency is keeping secret a sharply critical report which could shed some light on why the $150-million Ranger program failed to photograph the moon.

Written 14 months ago by a group of National Aeronautics and Space Administration scientists, the report is a step-by-step analysis of the way Jet Propulsion Laboratory, in Pasadena, Calif., conducted the program. The report stemmed from an investigation of the failure of Ranger 5 in October 1962.

"The investigators showed glaring deficiencies in JPL's management of Ranger and in its technical approach," one informant said. "Its criticism was so brutal no wonder NASA suppressed the report."

The group headed by NASA electronics expert Dr. Albert J. Kelley made specific recommendations for correcting the management of the laboratory and gave detailed instructions to insure the reliability of future spacecraft.

These recommendations and instructions have now assumed considerable importance in the light of the Feb. 2 malfunction of Ranger 6's television cameras as it crashed into the moon's Sea of Tranquility.

Were the instructions carried out or ignored?

There is no way of answering this question with the Kelley report being kept secret. NASA officials refuse to discuss the issue or make the report public.

James E. Webb, NASA administrator, told a press conference this week he would not release the report. "We have a continuous process of examination of the totality of these programs. Not one of these reports is definitive. And if these reports have to be written against the kind of examination the public will make, it will not contribute to the most effective prosecution of the program."

A second board of inquiry is looking into the February 2 failure and Webb said he would not release its entire report either. "We'll release enough so that you can have an authoritative report insofar as we know it of what has happened and what we propose to do about it."

Friday, on the board's recommendation, NASA indefinitely postponed the flight of Ranger 7, which was to have made another lunar television attempt at the end of this month.

NASA has taken the video camera package from the spacecraft and sent it to the Radio Corp. of America, which designed and built the equipment for laboratory analysis. The Ranger 6 cameras failed to turn on for the crucial photography of the lunar surface during the last 10 minutes of the 66-hour flight to the moon.

If the Kelley report is any indication, however, the public won't get much from the new inquiry. The agency put out a press release on December 19, 1962, titled "Ranger Improvement Program." The only mention of the Kelley findings was contained in this paragraph:

"Following its intensive 1-month study of the Ranger system, the board of inquiry found that certain improvements could be made in Ranger spacecraft design, construction, system test and checkout which would contribute to increased flight reliability. Steps are being taken to make these improvements."

At the time, there were rumors that there would be a top-level management shakeup of JPL, which is operated by the California Institute of Tehcnology for NASA at an annual fee of $1.2 million. JPL, however, during that December succeeded in flying Mariner II past Venus. This squelched criticism of the laboratory. The craft was based on the Ranger design, NASA said, "demonstrating the basic soundness of the Ranger spacecraft design concept."

Voice of Democracy Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year more than 250,000 high school students took part, competing for the four scholarships awarded as top prizes, the final winners of which will be decided here in Washington when the winning participant from each State is present the evening of March 10.

The winner from Virginia this year happens to come from my congressional district. He is Michael Alex Krieger, of Martinsville, and he has written such a fine and outstanding paper on the subject of democracy that I would like to have each of my colleagues and, better still, every American read it, for it sets forth principles handed down to us by our forefathers and which I feel we would do well to adhere to in our daily activities here in Congress.

The paper follows:

Those who would make democracy live and America strong, step forward and be counted. The cry goes out for the mobilization of America's might, the forces of democracy. The citizen-soldiers march forward, their stride lightened by the nature of the weapons carried upon their shoulders and within their hearts—the vote, the word, the press, the freedoms, the past glory and that to be. Smiling, healthy, happy soldiers, marching always onward, upward.

It's a lie.

The design of America's democratic republicanism is such that being a poor citizen is quite easy. To be a freeman is less a privilege than a task. The redtape that strings together government bureaus is knotty and tangled. The performing of such natural functions as being born and dying must be certified. Having once obtained permission to build a house, a fellow must obtain a permit to tear it down. Tax forms, the long and the short of them, demand time and attention, and, really, are quite a nuisance.

This, also, in its restricted scope, is false.

To be a freeman in America's social system is not enough. Laws and armies assure freedom for American citizens that they shall always be free to be free citizens of a free nation. But American citizenship is not enforced. Being free to vote, a man is free not to vote; being free to speak, a man is free not to speak; being free to print his opinions, a man is free not to print those opinions. Thus, mere freedom does not constitute the essence of democracy—freedom alone is anarchy.

To be a responsible freeman in America's order of things—there is the privilege; there is the challenge. Big government means big responsibility, and government begins with the people. Without the mutual consent of free people, there is no democracy; without responsibility, there is no freedom.

When freemen are responsible, freedom is sustained. Government belongs to the people only so long as the government serves them; and government serves the people when the people exercise freely and fully the rights and privileges guaranteed them within the framework of their government.

This is fulfilling the philosophy of democracy—that freemen in a free environment can govern themselves responsibly, with integrity.

Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues the following short poem which recently appeared in the Naugatuck Daily News. I feel that its message will be communicated to all who read it:

The following anonymous poem has been circulating around the Nation in recent days:

"A letter from Heaven." Special delivery from Heaven. To the Kennedy family. From John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Sorry I had to leave right away,
I look down and smile at you every day.
Little Patrick says to say "Hi",
I love you, I'm happy,
So please don't cry.
And Caroline I'd like to say,
How proud Daddy was of you that day.
When you stood like a lady
And watched me go by,
And doing as Mommy, you tried not to cry.
Little John, now you're the big man,
Take care of Mommy the best you can,
You were just a soldier
—That salute was so brave
Thanks for the flag that you
Put on my grave.
And Jackie, I had not time for goodbyes,
But I am sure you could read
The "Farewell" in my eyes.
Watch over our children.
And love them for me,
I'll treasure your love through Eternity.
So please carry on as you did before,
'Til all of us meet on Heaven's bright shore.
Remember I love you, remember I care,
I'll aways be with you,
Though you don't see me there.
Love,

JACK.

Procter & Gamble and the Clorox Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Advertising Association of the West, meeting in conference recently in Bakersfield, Calif., took a positive position on the recent move by the Federal Government to force the Procter & Gamble Co. to divest itself of the Clorox Co. It is the view of the advertising association that a complete review should be made of this action to determine "its value to the public and to our American system of free enterprise."

The association has expressed some sound views and I call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution passed at the association's meeting:

RESOLUTION BY THE ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF THE WEST

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission has issued an order to the Procter & Gamble Co. to divest themselves of the company which they acquired, known as Clorox Co., on the ground that while controlling said company the interests of the American consumer were adversely affected; and

Whereas the Advertising Association of the West assembled in conference in Bakersfield, Calif., believes that such action disregards the right of private enterprise to operate in a free and democratic manner; and

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission in such action has apparently failed to recognize that mass production and mass advertising has always in the history of marketing worked to the advantage of the consumer, and has succeeded in lowering the prices for products by virtue of increased sales; and

Whereas we believe that the Federal Trade Commission by such action has wrongly assumed the legal authority to determine which kinds and how much advertising is useful or wasteful: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Advertising Association of the West requests a complete review of this action by the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and Congress from the standpoint of its value to the public and to our American system of free enterprise.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to insert in the RECORD the winning speech from the State of North Carolina in the Voice of Democracy contest, in which over 250,000 high school students participated throughout the country in a program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This year's winner from North Carolina in the State contest is a constituent of mine from Greensboro, N.C., who will participate in the national contest, Miss Marsha Breed.

I had the pleasure of hearing Miss Breed deliver her address at a meeting of the George F. Preddy Post of the VFW of Greensboro, N.C., some time ago, and it was certainly a fine occasion for me and all others present. I was very much impressed with the depth, meaning, and feeling which Miss Breed developed in her presentation of her address, "The Challenge of Citizenship." I am sure that the Members of Congress will read with appreciation and interest this inspirational speech, and I commend it to their attention:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Marsha Breed)

Our present citizenship is a result of the basic rights and freedoms of our heritage. Citizenship means patriotism, voting, paying taxes, and being an active member in our own community. All these things tell us what citizenship is, but what is the challenge of citizenship?

As citizens of this country we need to become more fully aware, and awareness requires thought, aware of the opportunities offered by our Government and of the fallacies in our Government. Our thoughts and our resultant actions need to be relevant to the principles of our democracy, formed 200 years ago, and at the same time meaningful to our present society.

It is an individual responsibility to find how each of us is best suited for service. Not all of us can join the Peace Corps, or hold a public office, but all of us can work toward a united fraternity by showing brotherly love and concern for our neighbors. We can, and must be a thinking nation, alert and responsive to our country's needs. We are essentially a self-governing nation. We should keep it that way by exercising our greatest freedom—thought.

Our era seems to have turned from the self-reliant attitude, to the group adjustment plan. The group molds our way of life. We say, eat, wear, do, and think just as the group dictates. We accept and believe what we hear from TV and radio. Our minds are saturated with advertisement and shrunken from disuse. We seek security, not self-mastery, or even self-realization. Do we not have a great challenge before us? The challenge of changing our mental stagnation into a pool of fresh new ideas and concepts? Can we afford to sit back and accept the prefabricated opinions of others? It is not hard to let the leaders of our country form our opinions and do our thinking for us; but that is not the principle upon which America was founded.

Philip Wylie states it in this way:

"If we Americans do not start to think we shall presently become a nation of superficial men and women, identical, interchangeable. Our elected leaders will become exaggerated examples of the mediocrity of our masses. And then we will no longer be free, or self-governed, or even want those rewarding responsibilities."

This prediction cannot come true if we, as Americans, accept the challenge of becoming a thinking nation, with each citizen willing to cooperate, and to finally create a beginning toward world peace.

Broadened Disaster Loan Program by SBA Now in Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, on February 5, last, signed into law an amendment to the Small Business Act, making disaster loans available to many small business concerns that had suffered a substantial economic injury because of a natural disaster.

The broadened provisions of this law are now in operation and available to small business concerns injured by natural disasters.

Administrator Foley, of the Small Business Administration, has issued a press release concerning the broadened provisions of this new law and under unanimous consent, I include this press release in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley today issued a disaster declaration making commercial fishermen and small businesses suffering substantial economic injury as a result of the Great Lakes smoked fish botulism occurrence last fall eligible for SBA 3-percent disaster loans.

"The broadened disaster loan program authorized by the new legislation (S. 1309) signed yesterday by the President is now in effect," Mr. Foley said, "and our field offices will begin processing these loan applications as rapidly as possible."

In his disaster declaration, Mr. Foley said:

"As a result of the death of several persons from botulism poisoning, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on October 25, 1963, issued a statement warning the public against the eating of smoked fish caught or processed in the Great Lakes area.

"The reaction of the public was to stop purchasing this product and other smoked fish almost entirely. This led to an almost total paralysis of the fishing industry including fishermen, processors, distributors, wholesalers, and retailers, and many of those affected are small business."

To bring relief to these businesses, Congress amended the Small Business Act to include them in the disaster loan program of SBA.

In his instructions to SBA field offices putting the new disaster loan program into effect, Mr. Foley said that the interest rate would be 3 percent and the maximum term 20 years. The amount of each loan will be determined by the economic injury sustained, and the cost of reestablishment or continuation of the business on a reasonable basis.

Loan eligibility will not be confined to small businesses in the Great Lakes area, but applies equally to any small business which can prove substantial economic injury as a result of the botulism scare, Mr. Foley said.

Proceeds of product disaster loans will probably, for the most part, be for working capital to support the business until it is reestablished, Mr. Foley said. Loans will normally not be made for the replacement of equipment, but will be made for the purchase of equipment necessary to process properly a product to insure its fitness for human consumption.

Mr. Foley said that the new legislation will also permit SBA to declare other disasters of a similar nature which may occur at a later date.

He also pointed out that the new legislation will permit SBA to make disaster loans to small businesses suffering substantial economic injury because of any type of natural disaster, when either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture has found that a disaster exists. Previously, such loans could only be made to businesses suffering substantial injury because of drought or excess rainfall.

Now, SBA will be permitted to make disaster loans to small firms suffering substantial economic injury because of freezing, or any other type of natural disaster.

Rehabilitation of Our Fishery Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I am submitting to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in connection with its hearings on my bill, H.R. 7710, to set up a program for assisting States in rehabilitating their fishery resources:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, SECOND DISTRICT, CONNECTICUT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, ON H.R. 7710

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am very happy to have the opportunity to present a brief statement to this distinguished committee concerning my bill, H.R. 7710, which is being considered today.

My bill is identical to S. 627, sponsored by Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, my good friend the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD. The bill, as you well know, was passed by the Senate last July.

I am very pleased that your committee is now considering this legislation, and my purpose here today is to urge you as an emphatically as possible to report it out favorably and to bring it before the House in the very near future for final action.

This measure seeks to establish a program for assisting States in building up their

commercial fisheries through research and development projects. It would authorize the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States in undertaking various projects designed to develop or improve their fishery resources. This would be a 5-year program, costing $5 million annually, to be allocated among the States on a proportionate basis with a maximum of 10 percent and a minimum of one-half of 1 percent for each State.

In addition, the bill also provides for funds for special projects of an emergency nature in communities suffering a failure in its fisheries due to a natural disaster, or for communities where a new commercial fishery can be developed where none had previously existed. This sum is limited to $500,000 during each of the first 2 years and $750,000 during each of the next 3 years.

The total cost of this program over the entire 5 years would thus be $28,250,000. While this is a substantial amount of money, I am convinced that it would be a very worthwhile investment in building up and developing an important resource which we have unfortunately sadly neglected. When we consider the fact that in recent years the United States has dropped from second place among the leading fishing nations of the world to fifth place, then the need for this legislation becomes clear. The assistance to be provided under this bill is designed to help our fishing industry in increasing its production and utilization of local fishery resources. It will also help provide larger supplies of fish for consumption.

The projects to be considered will, I believe, be of such nature as to meet the needs and requirements of the States in developing or rehabilitating their fishery resources. In one State it may mean helping to develop fish farms, in another State it would require setting up experimental fish hatcheries, in a third it might be stream clearance for fishing, and in still another it would provide for the construction of a modern pier.

In Connecticut we have a situation now in the town of Stonington which is an excellent example where such aid would be of inestimable value. Stonington was formerly a major and thriving fishing harbor, in fact one of the great fishing ports along the Atlantic coast. The great fishing fleet operating out of Stonington has steadily declined over the years, but there is still a sizable remnant left. Unless we take steps to revitalize this fishing fleet by providing modern docking and processing facilities, the fishing industry of Stonington will die out. This will constitute a loss not only to the community of Stonington, but to all of Connecticut.

The commercial fishing industry at Stonington can be revived through the construction of a modern pier to service the fishing fleet docking there, and from which these vessels could operate. At the present time, the hard-pressed fishing vessel operators find that it is not feasible for them to make the necessary investments needed in shore facilities.

It is estimated that such a pier at Stonington would cost approximately $300,000. The State of Connecticut has approved a self-liquidating bond issue in the amount of $150,000 for the construction of a pier, and town officials have agreed to raise $50,000 as the community's share. Thus, some two-thirds of the cost is assured, with the hope that the Federal Government would make available the remainder.

Under this legislation, I believe it can be done. At any rate, this is the kind of a project that would seem most worthy. Approval of this bill would be of help to the town of Stonington in realizing its goal of a new pier and the rehabilitation of its fishing industry. But even more important is the fact that it would make possible for its fishing industry to once again become prosperous.

In the New London Day of February 15, 1964, where my bill and its importance for Stonington is discussed, there is the following observation:

"If Connecticut commercial fishing can be revitalized, the significance of it all extends far beyond Stonington and any immediate nearby shore communities. Handling the product ashore provides employment and new business for many persons when the fisheries prosper.

"Commercial fishing, offshore, is a rugged and demanding occupation and, in these days, it is self-evident that men willing to endure the hard work, long hours, inherent dangers and highly unpleasant weather conditions expect to make an adequate living from it. If they cannot, they accept jobs that will pay as much ashore and the industry loses. To make a steady and adequate income, modern docking and processing facilities are urgently needed. It is as simple as that."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, here is an excellent opportunity where you can render a great service to a community by enabling it to survive and to prosper, and all at a very modest cost of some $100,000. This can be accomplished through the adoption of the legislation at hand, either my bill, H.R. 7710, or the Senate bill, S. 627. It matters not which of these measures you approve, as long as you approve such a bill and you provide the States with the necessary help to revitalize and encourage the commercial fishing industry of the country. We cannot afford to lose industries or to dissipate our resources.

Two Good Books for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, because some segments of the liberal press discredit books with which they do not agree, it is refreshing to place in the RECORD last Monday's editorial from the New York Daily News, commenting on two new books, "Diplomat Among Warriors," by Robert Murphy, and "The Big Man," by Henry J. Taylor. Both authors are outstanding Americans with broad experience in diplomacy.

These books are "must" reading for every American who wants to keep his freedom.

ATTENTION, L.B.J.

We don't know whether President Lyndon B. Johnson reads many books, or what types of books he prefers.

If he doesn't read another book this year, though, we hope he'll catch—virtually from cover to cover—"Diplomat Among Warriors," by Robert Murphy; Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, N.Y.; 470 pages, 37 illustrations; $6.95.

Mr. Murphy is a great career diplomat who retired recently (to go into a well-paid, we hope, position with the Corning Glass Co.), and who in this book of memoirs has set down most of the lessons he learned and the adventure he had from the time he first went to work for the State Department, April 23, 1917.

Murphy really got into his stride in 1940, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt picked him as a special secret Presidential agent to scout out the situation in French north Africa. Continental France was in Hitler's power at the time, and Roosevelt was yearning to get us into World War II, and he had a hunch that north Africa would be a good place to bring French troops back into action.

From that time on, Robert Murphy was in on most of the big diplomatic victories and defeats of the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations.

His comments on some of the latter should be must reading, we feel, for the next half-dozen Presidents and the next 12 or 13 Secretaries of State.

Roosevelt's "great design"—to give "Bloody Joe" Stalin everything he wanted after World War II in hope that he would then become a decent fellow—impressed Murphy as idiotic. Time proved him to have been right.

Our neglect to win the Korean war—which Gen. Douglas MacArthur or any of his successors could have done—is another sad episode in Murphy's book.

His remarks on the Berlin airlift of 1948–49 are highly instructive. He and Gen. Lucius D. Clay, U.S. military governor in West Germany, wanted to challenge with armed force the Soviet blockade of the old German capital. Timid souls in Washington prevented this, and Murphy calls "deceptive" our eventual "victory" via planes endlessly carrying in supplies.

Murphy is equally scornful of U.S. observers who lack confidence in Nationalist Chinese President Chiang Kai-shek, think Red China is inevitably here to stay, and want to abandon the Formosa bastions of Quemoy and Matsu.

Altogether, this is a hardboiled, realistic book by a brilliant veteran of U.S. diplomacy. It probably won't be long before our liberal commentators are calling Murphy a warmonger. That almost always means that the fellow thus smeared is one to whom the rest of us should listen.

Concerning another book just published, we'd say—Attention all aspirants to high public office, especially in presidential election years such as 1964.

This one is a novel—"The Big Man," by Henry J. Taylor, Random House, New York, 312 pages, $4.95.

Mr. Taylor is a distinguished foreign correspondent, political columnist, and former Ambassador to Switzerland. His only son, correspondent Henry Noble Taylor, was killed in a tragic episode in the Congo, soon after Belgium freed that unhappy area.

"The Big Man" is the story of a buildup for a major-party Presidential nomination. It is loaded with inside dope on how these things are handled, the mistakes that can be made, the shrewd moves that can succeed or fail as fate decrees, the kinds of propaganda that do and do not work, and so on.

Political connoisseurs will have a lot of fun guessing who this novel's main characters might be in real life, as happened with Allan Drury's great political novels "Advise and Consent" and "A Shade of Difference."

The average reader will get much political inside stuff and lowdown from "The Big Man," and read a colorful, hard-hitting, fast-moving story to boot.

Some liberals are already rapping this novel—a fact which, as in the case of Robert Murphy's memoirs, is a high reccommendation.

Hospital Care to Aged Through Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last November I, along with all other Members

of Congress, received a communication from the Health Insurance Association of America. In its letter and purported summary of facts, the HIAA argued against legislation to provide hospital insurance to the aged through social security on the grounds that present methods are sufficiently effective.

Since receiving this document I have had the opportunity to evaluate the contentions and allegations it contains. The distortions I have discovered shock me. It may be helpful to my colleagues if I share with them my analysis of the claims of the HIAA relating to the ability of private insurance plans to meet the needs of the Nation's aged.

ADEQUATE PROTECTION

Existing programs, according to the HIAA, "provide adequate protection of our people."

How does this claim stack up against the actual facts?

While "adequate protection" may be hard to define, one reasonable measure might be how the protection available to older people compares to that held by the younger population. According to HIAA testimony before the Ways and Means Committee last November, it seems that the benefits provided in policies for the aged are about one-third less than the benefits provided to the younger population. In order to grasp the full significance of this fact, one must remember that average spending by aged persons for hospital and nursing home care is more than three times that by younger persons, and care of people over 65 is more than twice as much as that of the rest of the population. This hardly adds up to a picture of "adequate protection."

EXTENT OF COVERAGE

In July 1959, the HIAA estimated before the House Committee on Ways and Means:

> By the end of 1960, just 18 months hence, 65 percent of the aged needing and wanting protection will be insured; by the end of 1965, 80 percent of these people will be insured; and by 1970, 90 percent will have such insurance.

In July 1961, the HIAA told Congress:

> In 1969, the proportion of those at ages 65 and over who will have health insurance will be at least 60 percent, may well be as high as 75 percent, and most probably will reach 68 percent.

These predictions and projects have confused the issue, carefully avoided the key question of quality of coverage, and distorted the facts.

And now, in the material distributed to Members of Congress, the HIAA states that 10,300,000 aged—or 60 percent—had some form of voluntary health insurance in 1962. The U.S. Public Health Service, in the national health survey, has found that only 9.1 million, or 54 percent of the aged, had some form of voluntary health insurance between July 1962 and June 1963.

The methodology employed by the HIAA in surveying and reporting is subject to serious question. For one thing, the HIAA projects coverage data applicable to policyholders of all ages and applies to the aged. An additional serious distortion occurs when the HIAA assumes duplication of coverage among the aged to be similar to that of the total population.

This is not the first time that HIAA coverage figures have been in error. In September 1956 the HIAA estimated 68.3 percent of the population with hospital insurance. The Social Security Administration's study of health insurance coverage by age and sex, September 1956, showed this percentage to be 63.6.

In July 1958 the HIAA estimated 71 percent of the population with coverage. The Health Information Foundation's household survey at that time showed the percentage to be 65.

In the July-December 1959 period, HIAA estimated 72 percent with hospital insurance. The U.S. National Health Survey found only 67.1 percent with such coverage.

It appears the validity of HIAA estimates is improved when the result is reduced by about five percentage points.

The Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Special Committee on Aging has announced it will begin hearings in April of the coverage of our older citizens under Blue Cross and other private health insurance plans. The committee will go into such matters as the number with coverage and the quality and scope of such coverage. I am anxious to see how the findings of the committee investigation compare with the assertions of the Health Insurance Association of America.

PROTECTION DESIGNED TO MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS?

The communication we received from the HIAA concludes with this sentence:

> The voluntary system, with its ability to design its protection to meet individual needs, supplemented by existing local and State programs, can far more effectively meet these needs than a massive, new Federal program of standardized benefits.

The facts indicate that the opposite is the case—that it is the needs of the insurance industry that are being met by the coverage now being offered to the aged. Even in so-called open enrollment schemes, as in all other forms of individual and family insurance and as in the State-65 plans, strong underwriting limitations inevitably appear to the disadvantage of the aged. There is at least a 6-month waiting period on coverage of preexisting conditions. There are lower limitations on lifetime benefits, while for the younger population, the benefits are not lifetime but are in maximum force for each illness or for each calendar or illness year. There are coinsurance and deductible provisions which impose additional burdens on the aged which do not appear in coverages available to the younger population. There are various other underwriting devices employed to reduce the risk of the carriers. These include arbitrary ratesetting at levels so high, with built-in reserves so substantial, as to entirely eliminate any risk of loss to the carrier. There is plenty of risk left to the insured.

The conclusion—the claims to the contrary of the hucksters notwithstanding—is inevitable. Voluntary health insurance simply does not have the ability claimed for it. It cannot provide the aged with the protection they need. Older people have substantially larger than average hospital and other health care needs. They use three times as much hospital care as the younger population, and they have special need for long-term care.

Their incomes are generally much lower than those of the rest of the population. Voluntary health insurance, with its ability to design its protection to meet individual needs of the aged has, in fact, designed protections for the aged which provide fewer benefits at higher costs and with more stringent underwriting considerations than those available to the rest of the population.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the Members' attention the speech selected as the first-place winner in the Illinois State Voice of Democracy Contest. Its author is Miss Linda Banning, a 17-year-old girl from Rochelle, Ill. After reading the text of her remarks, I am sure you can readily understand the reason she was singled out for this honor.

Her insight into our national problems and the necessity for finding a solution to them, reflects thought and perception far beyond the comprehension of most teenagers. Furthermore, she has leveled a challenge to all Americans, both teenage and adult, which if met would do much to improve our way of life.

Speaking as her Congressman, I know I speak for all citizens of Illinois when I commend this young lady for a most articulate and thought-provoking presentation. The text of her remarks follow:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Linda Rae Banning, senior student, Rochelle Township High School, Rochelle, Ill.)

Citizenship of the United States of America challenges me, you, and roughly 180 million other Americans. To me, a 17-year-old white girl in a rural community, citizenship says one thing; to an aged Negro who has seen virtually no progress in civil rights during his lifetime, it says another; and to a countless number of segregationalists in Mississippi, citizenship says still something else. And yet I am an individual—a single unit—and must tell you the demands that citizenship makes upon me.

Citizenship—the principles which I embrace as an American citizen—challenges me to learn, to understand, to grasp. Citizenship demands that I, and I alone, decide what I feel is just, and having made this decision, strive to bring the action I advocate into being through peaceful, yet deliberate behavior. Citizenship demands that I understand the needs for change and yet see the danger in it. I must realize the need for Federal control, and yet see the folly in uncontrolled central power. Citizenship challenges me to read, to comprehend, the complex social, political, and economic forces which inhabit our community, our Na-

tion, indeed, our world. For these forces, and my reaction to them, will shape my life, or perhaps my death. Thus, I must learn.

Citizenship offers me another challenge—to love. To love my America, for you see I am free—free to laugh or to cry, free to praise or to scorn, free to walk or to run, to speak or to remain silent, to love or to hate. Yet, I must love; I am challenged to love, for hate and its blindness will undermine all those principles for which countless millions—and one—have fought and died. Yes, I love my family, my friends—yes, you, you—and yet this is not enough. For I must reach, and touch, and help that small Negro child who asks, "Mommy, do white puppies hate us, too?" Yes, I must love.

Citizenship offers me still one more challenge—that, to live—not to exist, not to vegetate, but to live. To live to learn, and having learned, to teach; to love, and having loved to spread love to others; to help, and having helped, to motivate others to help their friends, neighbors, fellow countrymen. For my life, although a gift is mine, and I must use it, work it, live it to my greatest capacity. After seeing a poem by a 16-year-old girl I found myself wondering at the hopelessness of life:

"A rather dull pencil on an open book
A half empty cartridge in a pen
A weary voice droning on and on
A neatly written homework paper
A ticking clock on a drab gray wall
And out of nowhere the sudden question:
'Is this my youth? Is this my life?'"

And suddenly I realized that my youth, my life, my citizenship, my America, is what I make it. The assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy made me wonder, "Why?" "What a waste of human greatness." And yet, perhaps, President Kennedy served America greater in his death, for we now see—or should see—that we, either through our action or our lack of action, had a part in his death. We did not learn; we did not love; we did not live. We let hatred grow and prosper and finally strike—we, you and I. Thus I must live.

Consequently, citizenship in the democratic Republic we call America challenges me to learn, to understand, and grasp, to love to all my potential and to live to my greatest capacity. Simply, citizenship challenges me to learn, to love, and to live—to learn to love to live.

Commerce "E" Award to Seaboard World Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure today, March 3, 1964, to be present at a ceremony at the Department of Commerce when Seaboard World Airlines, Inc., Seaboard World Building, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Jamaica, N.Y., received the much-coveted "E" Award of the Department. The presentation was made by the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary.

I am indeed proud that this outstanding organization is located in the Seventh Congressional District of New York which I have the honor to represent. My sincere congratulations go to Richard M. Jackson, president, and all his personnel.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the citation:

Seaboard World Airlines, Inc. has achieved a dramatic expansion of air cargo export shipments through an intensive program of promoting overseas trade for U.S. industry. The airline has found markets abroad for nonexporting firms, aided them to participate in trade fair and trade center exhibits, arranged business contacts, advised them on foreign merchandising, financing and credit in addition to providing many other services. This program, which has helped to develop outstanding exporters, reflects credit on Seaboard World Airlines and its employees and has contributed materially to the economic growth of the United States.

The 202d and 203d Atlas Launches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1964, a satellite employing a U.S. Air Force Atlas/Agena combination was launched from Point Arguello in California. About 1 hour later, the Air Force successfully launched another Atlas from Cape Kennedy in Florida.

A newspaper headline recording these events might have said, "Ho-Hum—Two More Atlas Launches," as in fact a newspaper in Santa Maria, Calif., did in recording a similar Atlas ICBM launch many months ago.

Aside from the fact that these two launches marked the seventh time that an Atlas missile had been launched from both the east and west coasts on the same day, they were in fact rather routine flights, but not ones we should take for granted. These particular launches were the 202d and 203d Atlas flights and I call your attention to them because of their deep significance to the Nation's defense and space exploration programs, and to the economical well-being of a sizable segment of our Nation's population.

I am proud of the fact that the Atlas which was developed by the U.S. Air Force and which is being used in space applications by both that service and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is manufactured by General Dynamics/Astronautics in San Diego, Calif. I am also proud of the fact that Atlas, originally a weapon system conceived and developed under the greatest pressure in order to add to the effectiveness of the Nation's deterrent capacity, has proved itself a most vital machine, so capable and so reliable that it has been designated to carry the brunt of the Nation's space exploration ventures for years to come.

Atlas has more scheduled launches during the 1960's than ever before for missions of the Air Force Systems Command and NASA, a demand so great that a new standardized Atlas space launch vehicle called SLV-3 or Atlas-3 has been designed. This standardized vehicle will produce lower long-term costs while increasing flexibility and flight reliability. Development of this standardized vehicle is an excellent example of how existing space systems can be improved to satisfy new requirements. Improvement of a flight proven system such as Atlas is inherently more efficient and economical than designing new vehicles for new missions. Research and development costs are already expended and Atlas has certainly proven its reliability.

During 1964, Atlas will be used as the launch vehicle for a wide variety of the Nation's deep space and Earth orbiting flights. These will include launches of Ranger vehicles to the Moon, Mariner vehicles to the vicinity of Mars, Project Fire, atmospheric reentry test vehicles for the manned Apollo program, an eccentric orbiting Earth satellite for geophysical observations and launches of the Centaur orbiting high energy space system which is also built in San Diego.

The Centaur spacecraft, developed at the same facility which produces the Atlas, proved the feasibility of liquid hydrogen as a rocket propellant in its highly successful flight last November, and it is the U.S. universal orbiting high energy space system suitable for peaceful NASA missions or potential future DOD applications. The Centaur is readily adaptable for uses on NASA and DOD developed boosters as well as the Atlas.

Research now in progress can insure the technological growth of the Centaur necessary to retain U.S. leadership in space for many years to come.

What does all this mean as far as the significance of Atlas to the Nation is concerned? First of all, the Air Force deserves our highest commendation for the courage it took to develop the country's first ICBM. The fundamental concepts of the Atlas missile were considered quite daring during its original development phase. Many eminent scientists and engineers were frankly and openly skeptical about its chances of success. But it worked, and the Air Force officers as well as industry's representatives who had the courage to develop it initially deserve a great deal of credit which in most cases has so far been denied them. Their foresight gave us an ICBM which added its strength to the Nation's deterrent profile in a far shorter period of time than is usually necessary to bring a new weapon system into being.

The task of creating this new weapon system, and the task of constructing its operational bases, both of which were handled by the Air Force and General Dynamics Astronautics, represent a triumph of American teamwork.

You may not remember that the first Atlas flew in June 1957; that the first Strategic Air Command operational Atlas flight took place in September 1959; and that the first Project Mercury manned orbital flight was in 1962. You may not remember that Atlas was the first missile to hurl itself into orbit in December 1958, broadcasting President Eisenhower's Christmas greeting from special communication equipment in its nose cone. You may not remember that Atlas placed the first American payload on its path to the moon in April 1962, or that Atlas still holds a world's record

for distance for a ballistic missile, well over 9,000 miles, and that this record was set in July 1961.

What you probably do remember is that Atlas successfully launched the four U.S.-manned Mercury orbital vehicles. You may also be aware of the fact that the Atlas base activation program was not quite finished when the Cuban crisis came about in the fall of 1962, but that Air Force/industry teamwork was again brought into play to produce operational readiness for a significant number of Atlas launch facilities ahead of time to add significant weight to the country's firm stand in the face of Russian threats.

This was another example of Atlas coming through, doing its job quietly but extremely effectively.

Atlas has served the Nation as a good soldier, both as a defensive weapon and as a space vehicle.

During the early phases of the Mercury program, the seven astronauts visited the Atlas plant in San Diego. At a meeting with astronautics employees, Astronaut Gus Grissom admonished those present to "Do good work." The fact that these highly motivated and highly skilled individuals have done good work is apparent—the role of the Atlas ICBM has expanded far beyond it's original concept; the company, working in concert with NASA, has developed the Centaur vehicle; new ways of further improving the Atlas are being used at the present time to make the proved vehicle even more efficient, for instance:

Studies indicate that an Atlas using 30 percent by weight fluorine-oxygen mixture called flox could achieve a 88-percent increase in payload for 100-nautical-mile-high orbits, and a 65-percent payload increase for certain other combinations. Studies like this, which could result in improved performances and decreased cost, prove that companies like the one which developed the Atlas are truly a national resource, bringing together creative thinking and sound management which are essential ingredients in the successful pursuit of our space efforts.

There are people who claim that the Atlas missile is being made obsolete by other newer vehicles, but this is obviously not true. Some of the earlier Atlas operational launch facilities may well be phased out in the relatively near future, but these are the ones which were constructed very early in the Atlas operational program with the single aim of providing the Air Force with functional ICBM's at the earliest possible date—time being the principle consideration.

Those launch facilities are very poorly protected from potential enemy attack, and it makes real sense to maintain only those launch facilities which afford the greatest amount of protection and are, therefore, the most economical—when the total missile force is sufficient to deter attack.

But even as the early Atlas launch pads are phased out, new applications for the versatile Atlas are being developed, new projects are being designated for Centaur.

Looking forward to continuation of these highly successful and valuable programs, it seems appropriate on the occasion of the 203d Atlas launch to pause and single out those individuals, companies, and branches of the military service which have been responsible for this accomplishment.

Based on the record, this same Air Force-industry team is capable of solving the increasingly complex systems development problems that face us in the future, in space, so that some day this team may be responsible for another routine headline which says "Ho-Hum—Another Manned Space Vehicle Left Its Launch Pad Today."

It Depends on Whose Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been many instances of violation of the constitutional rights of Americans by this administration. We all recall the leak of material about a witness who put the finger on Bobby Baker; we have the uncontrovertible evidence that, in Tennessee, counsel for one of the defense witnesses has been constantly watched; and now we learn, in New York, that the sanctity of the mail has been violated.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post indicates that even that newspaper is shocked:

PEEPING AT THE MAIL

It turns out that Roy Cohn said no more than what was true when he charged the other day that the Federal Government had ordered a watch on all mail addressed to his lawyer. An assistant U.S. attorney prosecuting the perjury-conspiracy case in which Mr. Cohn is a defendant admitted the fact in court on Saturday. Federal District Judge Dawson denounced it as shocking.

In a mail watch, the Post Office is supposed merely to inspect envelopes, noting the name and address of each writer to the subject of the watch. Post Office authorities assert that they do not delay delivery of the mail by this procedure. They also assert that they do not open any first-class letters or read the contents by any electronic or other device. Mail watches are frequently undertaken at the request of law-enforcement agencies.

But is is hard to understand what assistance a mere mail watch can give to law enforcement. Its principal effect, we surmise, is to create a great deal of anxiety—anxiety that a list of correspondents is being compiled and may be used for some sinister purpose, anxiety that, despite the protestations of the Post Office Department, the contents of first-class mail are being inspected.

As a matter of fact, that anxiety is much more widespread than it ought to be in a free country. A Post Office Department which admits mail watches is not fully believed when it denies opening the mail; and in the same way a Federal Bureau of Investigation which admits tapping a few telephones in violation of the law is not fully believed when it denies tapping many telephones.

Nothing is more calamitous to the climate of a community than pervasive distrust and anxiety of this kind. If the law does not specifically forbid mail snooping as it forbids wiretapping, it ought to be amended to do so. Confidence in the privacy of communications is too valuable to Americans to be breached for the sake of a minor aid and convenience to the police.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this year the Massachusetts Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars was won by a young lady from Melrose, Mass. Miss Sheila C. Nevin's fine winning effort on the subject "The Challenge of Citizenship" is one of the best discussions I have seen of the importance of individual effort in achieving a more civilized world. Under unanimous consent I include Miss Nevin's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Sheila C. Nevin, 45 Appleton Street, Melrose, Mass.)

In contrast to the general uproar in Congress that morning, a young Senator from Kansas silently took his seat at the impeachment trial of a President. Though his eyes were fixed on his briefcase and his forehead wrinkled in obvious meditation, Edmond Ross could feel the piercing pain of every eye glaring into his wearied face. These eyes sought what they could not find in Ross' numbed expression. Would this Senator, who was the determining factor in the attempted removal of President Johnson, vote "guilty" or "not guilty"? Finally, the oral balloting began. A few minutes later, amid utter and desolute silence, the full, distinct, and unmistakable cry "not guilty" resounded on the bleak walls of Congress. Ross, by following the mandates of his conscience, had determined not only the future of a President but also his own. In his own words, and I quote, "I almost literally looked into my open grave. Friendships, position, fortune, everything that makes life desirable to an ambitious man were about to be swept away by the breath of my mouth, perhaps forever."

Edmond Ross was given a challenge—and because he fought nobly and gave freely of all he had—he gained the victory. He succeeded where so many of his contemporaries failed.

With this dramatic story in my mind I try to make application to my own life. Am I accepting the challenge of citizenship? Of what does "challenge" consist? I have always considered a challenge as a force which tends to draw forth all the best that I have to offer. It is something more desirable than mere pleasure. It is something almost sacred in the eyes of an individual.

Citizenship is a challenge. But how much can I do? I certainly can't run for office and I don't have the right to vote. I don't even have my driver's license yet.

But there are many things I can do. I can begin to work a little longer, a little harder, and with more purpose than I have done. And by doing so, I will begin to learn, to understand, and to love the goodness that surrounds my life.

For in learning—learning the facts which constitute the truth—learning about other people, other ideas and ideals, most important, learning about myself and learning why I am what I am, and why I am where I am, and where I want to go, and how to get there; then, through this basic knowledge I will begin to understand how we are all alike and yet so different—so perfectly and individually molded. And through learning and understanding I will begin to love * * * to love the very essence of life itself. And then my heart will be drained of the poison that can hurt, subordinate and even hate other creatures. And in its place will be developed kindness, tolerance, and service toward my fellow beings. This is my way of accepting the challenge of citizenship.

The Great Almoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to an incisive critique of the 1965 budget by Raymond Moley which merits the attention of every Member of the House. The article follows:

THE GREAT ALMONER

(By Raymond Moley)

A number of generally prudent businessmen have greeted President Johnson's protestations of economy with somthing like enthusiasm. They have believed not only that Mr. Johnson has talked about economy but that in his budget he has used the ax to cut below the anticipated $100 billion level to bargain prices of $98.4 billion for the fiscal 1964 and $97.9 billion for 1965. That's what the headlines said. But we must read the fine print to get the reality. And the best of the fine print I have seen is the speech to the House by CLARENCE CANNON, the venerable chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, delivered immediately after the presentation of the Johnson budget.

CANNON pointed out the vital distinction between the expenditure budget and the new obligational authority budget. He said:

"Congress acts upon the new obligational authority budget. * * * Congress does not act directly on the more widely known expenditure budget. * * * The important long-run barometer to spending is the trend of new obligating authority." This is "higher not lower than the current year * * * it does not point out to any lasting reversal of the upward trend of Federal spending."

WELFARE, UNLIMITED

With CANNON'S wise admonition in mind, I have tried, with the aid of a skilled analyst, to determine how Mr. Johnson plans to become the superalmoner of all time. A complete compilation of all the proposed costs of welfare activities is impossible because there are so many pockets of welfare in almost every Government agency. But a careful examination of the budget reveals the amounts spent and proposed to be spent in certain categories which I include under the term "welfare."

These are housing and community development; health, education, and welfare, including social "insurance"; labor, veterans, and the new attack on poverty. Several new programs have been added under these categories since 1960.

New obligational authority (hereinafter designated as NOA) in 1960 was $25.5 billion. For the same and added programs for 1965 the NOA estimate is $37.9 billion.

Some apologists have told us ad nauseam that nothing much can be done about spending because the costs of defense have been and will be so high. I suggest a comparison between welfare NOA and all other Federal authorizations. For 1960 the figures were $25.5 billion for welfare and $75.6 billion for all other authorizations. For 1965 the NOA for welfare is set at $37.9 billion and all other, including defense, space, and foreign aid, at $97.7 billion.

Thus the increase for welfare is 48 percent. The increase for all other is 29.8 percent.

BIG 1964 SPENDING

CANNON points out with supporting facts that the Johnson expectation of $93 billion revenues for 1965 is totally unrealistic. He also points out the oldest budgetary contrivance in history. The Johnson budget builds up supplemental requests for 1964 to make the picture for 1965 look much brighter. Thus spending or the expectation of spending in 1964 whets appetites in an election year.

An example of this is in the estimates for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The President requests or will request, according to his budget, authorizations of $2.2 billion for 1964 and $749 million for 1965. This excites the interest of contractors and others who will figure in the election prospects. It will also sweeten the voters in the large cities in this election year. Few politicians ever look beyond the next election.

In his speech CANNON refers to a favorite object of his ire, "back-door spending." One instance is a supplemental $1.4 billion for the urban-renewal program. "There may be others," he adds. This is, he says, "inexcusable, indefensible, and irresponsible practice."

Finally, there are those who say that what we save in defense we ought to spend on the "public sector." But spending, for any purpose, money we do not collect in taxes means inflation. That takes from the very people who get the handouts as well as those who need and expect no Government help.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Sunday, February 23, to be the principal speaker at the commemoration of the 46th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian Nation, held under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council at St. Peter's Hall in Kenosha, Wis.

I can report to you that this is a group of dedicated Americans who are well aware that the hopes of freedom for those of their ancestors still residing in Lithuania under Communist domination against their will is closely allied with the policies of the United States of America. Under permission previously granted I include with my remarks this resolution which was adopted unanimously by the group present at the meeting:

RESOLUTION BY AMERICANS OF LITHUANIAN ANCESTRY

We, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, residing in the Kenosha, Wis., area, met in a meeting called by the Lithuanian American Council on February 23, 1964, at St. Peter's Hall, to commemorate the 46-year anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian Nation, did make and adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union illegally seized, annexed, and began sovietizing Lithuania and the other Baltic States, depriving their peoples of their human and property rights, and still occupies and rules these nations to this day; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States denounced this criminal aggression by the Soviet Union and has firmly refused to recognize the Soviet rule in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

"Whereas the Soviet keeps seeking ways and means, direct and indirect, to gain recognition of its illegal colonialism in the Baltic States, for this purpose recently offering a nonaggression treaty between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact bloc, and an agreement to settle all boundary disputes without the use of armed force: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge our Government to be wary of entering into any agreements with the Soviet Union which would imply the recognition of the Soviet rule in the presently captive states, freeze the present boundaries and territory designations, and/or preclude the possibility for the Lithuanians and other captive peoples to use whatever means would be necessary and available at an opportune moment in order to rid themselves of the onerous Soviet yoke and regain their freedom and independence; be it also

"*Resolved*, That we request our Government to place the matter of the liberation of the world's newest colonies—occupied Lithuania and all the other Soviet captive countries—before the United Nations and demand through the United Nations immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops, ruling apparatus, and colonists from Lithuania and all the other captive nations.

"*Resolved*, That we send this resolution to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, to the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, to the Senators from our State and Members of Congress from our districts, and to the local press."

VLADAS SKIRMUNTAS,
Chairman.
ZENONAS LUKAUSKAS,
Secretary.

"I Shudder To Think What Our Country Would Have Done Without Our Reserves"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening a packed banquet hall at the Sheraton-Park heard an outstanding address by a great lady. Many of us in Congress were privileged to be present on this occasion. It was the annual midwinter meeting of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. The occasion was the acceptane by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of the 1964 Minuteman Award from that organization. Her address was forceful, stimulating, and highly interesting. It must be cataloged as a significant contribution to the

cause of an adequate defense supported by a strong Reserve program.

Mrs. SMITH was formerly a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve. She knows the subject of Reserves intimately. Interestingly, her address dealt substantially with congressional service in the Reserves and her treatment of this subject is lucid, helpful, and encouraging. Particularly do I invite attention to this fine address of those who have questioned the Reserve programs or who would, in other ways, weaken the defenses of the Nation. Mrs. SMITH's able statement makes sense and is a recognition of patriotism in those who serve in uniform whether as a Regular or a Reservist.

The address follows:

"I SHUDDER TO THINK WHAT OUR COUNTRY WOULD HAVE DONE WITHOUT OUR RESERVES"

(Address by the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, U.S. Senator)

Major General Frank, officers and members of ROA, distinguished guests, my colleagues in the House and Senate, and friends, I am highly honored by the Minute Man Award. I accept it with great pride and deep sincerity. I shall always treasure it, just as I have treasured my association with the Reserve and my legislative and administrative efforts on the Reserve.

I am particularly happy to have the presentation made by my good friend, RALPH YARBOROUGH, the distinguished Senator from Texas, a reservist himself. RALPH, I deeply appreciate your kindness.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson has had a distinguished Reserve career. He was decorated in World War II as a Naval Reserve officer for heroism with the Silver Star.

And let me be even more specific. All during his service on Capitol Hill—in the House, in the Senate, as Senate majority leader, as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, and as the Vice President—he remained in the Naval Reserve proudly and never with any shame or embarrassment.

His predecessor, President John F. Kennedy, was a Naval Reserve officer all during the time that he served in the House and the Senate—and he, too, was proud of his Naval Reserve status which he retained during his congressional service.

And I would be remiss if I did not mention the third Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, who proudly retained his status as a colonel in the Army Reserve all during the time that he was on Capitol Hill, both as a Member of the Senate and as the Vice President.

I was particularly proud of Harry S. Truman, who, in his delightfully and characteristically frank manner, last year in no uncertain terms expressed his disgust with those who contended there was a conflict of interest in a Member of Congress being in the Reserve. What a refreshing contrast he was to those of faintheartedness when the heat was on.

Now I don't want to make this praise one-sided, and leave the Republicans out. I point with pride to the fact that Richard M. Nixon proudly retained his officer status in the Naval Reserve all during the time he served on Capitol Hill as a Member of the House, of the Senate, and as the Vice President.

Further, the Republican vice-presidential nominee in 1960—Henry Cabot Lodge—proudly retained his officer status in the Army Reserve all during the time that he served on Capitol Hill as a Member of the Senate.

In fact, Henry Cabot Lodge personified the spirit of Members of Congress when he resigned from the Senate during World War II—gave up his Senate seat—to go on active duty for war service. There were several others like Jimmy Van Zandt and Al Vreeland who did likewise.

Members of the Congress who are also active reservists are making a major contribution to national security. Their attendance at drills furnishes a daily testimonial, and inspiration, to the whole Reserve program and is a contributor to the substantial prestige the Reserve Forces have earned, not only in the military establishment, but throughout the national community. ROA has given significant support to the programs.

I also should like to compliment your association upon its vision in planning for development in the Nation's Capital of your Minute Man Memorial Building. This magnificient undertaking assumes a broader significance because it is to be built with your members' contributions, given voluntarily, by those who understand this vital military tradition and its value to posterity.

In a democratic republic, the people need to be continually reminded of the value of their freedoms, and of their obligations to serve this freedom. ROA members justly take pride in the fact that, as true volunteers in what must be our eternal vigilance, you again are leading the way to establishment of a great and living national shrine for a vital national commitment through the historic military tradition of the United States.

I am deeply concerned with the trend of derogation of the military. As in any group, there are dangerous men and bad actors among the military. But as in most groups, they are very much in the minority. I have had my personal experiences with some of them. I know how ruthless they can be. I know how they can conduct campaigns of vilification—how they can make pious denials before congressional committees—and a few years later, after it is too late, how the commentator-columnists to whom they have fed their vilification and prodded to echo that vilification, belatedly realize and confess privately that they have been used and then apologize to those who have been vilified.

I know that there are militarists who dangerously advocate reckless warfare. I know that there have been militarists who defy law and order. I know that there are militarists who charge our Presidents with being traitors selling our country out to the Communists.

I know that there are these dangers and evils among some militarists—but they are very, very rare indeed—and seldom do such irresponsible militarists rise to any position of any great authority. They are so rare that never has militarism presented a danger of dictatorship to our country or even the slightest risk of a military takeover and the usurpation of our traditional civilian control of the military.

I know that there is a strong military-industrial complex—the kind that President Eisenhower warned against in his closing days as President. I know that we have to guard against that complex getting too strong in its pressures on both the executive branch and the legislative branch of our Federal Government.

But I also know that the military-industrial complex has not reached proportions beyond the control of the public—and especially an aroused public opinion expressing itself at the polls. I know that this military-industrial complex will never control the executive branch or the legislative branch regardless of how many retired generals and admirals work for defense contractors—and regardless of how many members of Congress are in the Reserve.

It has become quite the vogue of some to have two favorite whipping boys—the military and the Congress. These detractors are by no means limited to the press. They are to be found not too infrequently in the Pentagon among the smart young men who have never experienced war responsibilities.

Some of these smart young men have come to regard and treat admirals and generals as though they are errand boys to be seen but not heard. The higher the rank the more the delight in the derogation and humiliation that is heaped upon the very men who led the forces that saved our country in war time, while some of their smart young detractors were growing up back in the safe confines of this country that bombs did not touch—or even before some of these smart young detractors were ever born.

Now Congress has long been the traditional whipping boy—but in the acquisition of a companion whipping boy in the military—a very juicy and special target has been gained—the citizen-soldier in the Congress. I won't belabor a defense of the reservists in the Congress for they are fully capable of taking care of themselves. And if they can't take care of themselves—if they are improperly in the Reserve—if they are taking undue and unethical advantage of being in the Reserve—then the electorate will take care of them at the polls.

What does disturb me is the broader picture of the trend of derogation of the Reserve—of the citizen-soldier—the minuteman, if you please. It is somewhat like the days prior to World War II when many people ridiculed reservists on 2-weeks training duty as playing war, when contemporaries of active and conscientious reservists laughed at the reservists and derided them.

I shudder to think what would have happened to our country had the pre-World War II Reservists been so faint-hearted and so thin-skinned that such derogation would have caused them to leave the Reserve. Thank God, they had the fortitude and patience to stick to their Reserve guns and not give in.

I shudder to think what our country would have done without our Reserves to call up in the Berlin crisis—for history's first use of the Reserves for cold war purposes—for a show of force and determination to get the message loud and clear to Khrushchev. I am certain that he would never have backed down on his Berlin threat had it not been for the callup of our Reserves.

I shudder to think what our country would have done without our Reserves in the Cuban crisis and the nuclear confrontation in which Khrushchev backed down. For example, what would our Air Forces have done without the magnificently immediate response of the Air Force Reserve?

Yes, the detractors of the Reserve—those who say there is no need for a Reserve—those who would make errand boys out of our top military men—can attack the military and the Reserve all they want to—but I don't think the American people can be fooled as to the importance of our military Reserve.

Yet, we must face up to facts and to realism. At the years go by after a war and after a threat to our national security, there is the tendency of those who have not known war or who have had made so litle sacrifice in war or been so little inconvenienced by war, if at all—to forget the need of the military and the Reserve—or to regard them as an unnecessary cost in time of peace and to be ridiculed.

Therein is a mission for your organization and for each of your members individually. Therein is a minuteman mission for each of you—to protect your country's national security through constant education and reminder of the civilian population of the importance of military strength, and particularly that strength embodied in the Reserve.

We must always maintain civilian control of the military. We must always fight against military arrogance—and no one

knows more about military arrogance than I do—and I don't believe that anyone has fought and stood up to military arrogance more than I have.

But equally we must fight against civilian arrogance that seeks to so cynically derogate and humiliate military leaders who not only have risked their lives for their country but whose intelligence and judgment is at least the equal of those arrogant smart young men, who derogate them, and whose experience is far superior to these young men.

For if we do not fight such civilian arrogance as much as military arrogance, then so surely our military leadership and establishment will degenerate into that of second-class "yes men" who never have a thought of their own—or if they do, don't dare speak it for fear of repercussions—just as was the case in the fear-paralyzed U.S. Senate in the early fifties.

No one has more caustically crossed swords with the military than I have—and no one has felt the whiplash of the retaliation of the military more than I have. But in that open controversy with the military, I have gained—rather than lost—respect for our military leaders in uniform—at least for those who speak their minds themselves and openly instead of hiding behind the cloak of commentator-columnists—and I gladly rise to their defense, not so much for them personally, as for their crucial importance to the national security of our country.

God bless them.

L.B.J.'s Great Economy Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, every now and then, poking a little fun at certain subjects reveals how ridiculous are the actions of some politicians.

In last Sunday's Washington Star, Arthur Hoppe twits about the electric light and telephone bills of President Johnson's:

ECONOMY AND THE ELECTRICITY BILL—OL' ELBIE SAVES $4.32 ON LIGHTS BUT OWES $167,000 FOR TELEPHONE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, friends. How y'all tonight? Welcome to "Just Plain Folks," the rib-ticklin' tee-vee adventures of the rootin-tootin' Jay family starring ol' Elbie Jay, the friendliest wrangler ever to wrangle his way out of Texas.

As you recollect, ol' Elbie, his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, and their two cute tads, L'il Bird and Bye-bye Bird, have moved into this fancy white house back East. As we join up with ol' Elbie, he and his faithful sidekick, Sancho Pierre, are in the Oval Room. And as you can see, it's right dark in there this evening.

ELBIE. Now just you wait, Pierre, till I hitch my chair up to this here desk. There now, you can light the match.

PIERRE. Coudn't I turn on the lamp, Chief? Just for a minute?

ELBIE. Now I ask you, son. How's it going to be if some sneaky, snoopin' reporter (and I love them all) peers in the window and catches us using up expensive electricity like it was going out of style?

PIERRE. Well, I suppose it wouldn't help your image of economy and frugality.

ELBIE. Right. That's what I keep tellin' Birdie Bird, when she gets fancy and wants to eat by candlelight.

PIERRE. What's wrong with eating by candlelight?

ELBIE. What's wrong with eating in the dark? Economy, son, economy. Now light the match and hand me that there bill I got to sign. What's it for?

PIERRE. (lighting match). Let's see. Oh, it's that $50 billion defense appropriation.

ELBIE. Fine. There. They don't call me the fastest ball point west of the Pecos for nothing. Now, no sense wasting that match. While you got it lit, get me somebody on the telephone to howdy with. How about that camel driver in Pakistan? Wait. First get me Senator RUSSELL down in Georgia. I want to tell him how I saved another $4.32 this month on electricity.

PIERRE. I forgot, Chief. You've got one more bill here.

ELBIE. What's it for?

PIERRE. It's for $167,342.23. From the Telephone Co.

ELBIE. Well, pay it out of that coffee can labeled "Pin Money for Cheering Up Old Friends."

PIERRE (as match burns fingers). Ouch. Chief, do you really think economizing is worth the effort?

ELBIE. Pierre, son, economy is a wondrous thing. Last month, I saved $4.32 on electricity. Them fine gentleman on Capitol Hill was mightily impressed by what a careful frugal, trustworthy man I obviously am. So, because I saved $4.32, they are now about to cut the taxes $11 billion. Isn't that wondrous? And now you make sure our reporter friends get a copy of that there bill.

PIERRE. The telephone bill?

ELBIE. The electricity bill, you cottonhead. Sometimes, son, I don't think you know a thing about economy in government.

Can Elbie keep up his lonely battle to save money? No matter what the cost? Tune in next time, folks. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say: "Take care of the pennies loud enough and the dollars'll take care of you."

The Domestic Investment Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, there exist in our country many highly able and well motivated persons who, because of wide experience and keen insight, develop excellent ideas and plans regarding improvements in our society. In recent days we have seen much discussion of ways to provide higher living standards for persons caught in pockets of poverty. And we are searching for new ideas.

Let us consider the following suggestion for establishment of a Domestic Investment Bank—an idea developed by an astute gentleman whose thoughtful work merits serious attention.

THE DOMESTIC INVESTMENT BANK

The key to any program attacking poverty should be the establishment of a Domestic Investment Bank to function internally in generally the same manner as the World Bank does internationally.

There are two fundamental problems. One is to move industrial and commercial activities (as well as supporting services) into depressed areas or pockets of poverty. The other is a matter of training the poverty stricken to apply new skills as these activities are generated. Without facilities in which to apply skills, training programs are futile.

Experience shows that absent a totalitarian society, large scale resettlement programs are not successful. Therefore the problem is to reactivate pockets of poverty.

In my opinion the attack is not off to a good start. I am not privy to current discussions and hope I am in error. But most of what I have heard and read indicates that the major impetus to date has been directed toward what I would call palliative rather than curative measures.

By palliative measures I mean such items as welfare payments, stepping up social security, medicare, and unemployment benefits. I would also include in this category the camps that have been suggested, as I understand it, for those who cannot meet selective service standards.

These measures alleviate hardship on a temporary basis. They will always have a necessary place because contemporary society must take care of the infirm, the handicapped, etc.

With the enormous resources and energies available to America, we can, of course, virtually erase poverty here if a comprehensive attack is made on it.

A domestic investment bank could accomplish and coordinate much of this largely on a self-liquidating basis.

In effect, this was what the United States was able to do in Western Europe after World War II. If I remember correctly during the 4 Marshall plan years (1949–52), we laid out about $13 billion. I imagine a large percentage of this is recoverable to the American taxpayer as loans are repaid. I do not have figures handy. In any event, this is relatively cheap for the defense value alone. We now have strong buffers between us and Moscow. Certainly, standards of living have improved enormously.

The World Bank is a more sophisticated approach to the same fundamental problem on a global basis. Our commitment to it is about $6½ billion. We have just agreed to another half-billion for the International Development Association. We (alone) have put some $4 billion into Latin America since the war. Our commitment to the Alianza is for $20 billion.

If we can do these things for others, we should be able and willing to do them for our own citizenry.

Some of the foregoing international programs work; some are in trouble; but there is nothing mysterious about them. They are all aimed at improving standards of living. This is done on an area-to-area, project-by-project basis whenever it is felt that the economy of the area in question will be improved by the project under consideration.

Note also that the World Bank, which has been highly successful in this field, makes money. I am not suggesting that each project should be self-liquidating in a domestic attack on poverty. I believe however that the cost of such an overall program need not be exorbitant and might even show a profit.

A domestic investment bank is feasible both politically and financially. Obviously, the Keyserling theory of going back to war production planning, cataloging resources, and then administering the economy as in the war days could not possibly get through this Congress.

But a "bank" is respectable. The financial community might participate. If private American financial institutions saw fit to underwrite an offering of the Inter-American Development Bank, why not a domestic

bank? The securities of such a bank could be made tax exempt (like municipals) if private participation was to be encouraged.

I believe the World Bank is prohibited by charter from making an investment where the ability to repay is shaky. This standard would have to be relaxed—but not completely.

The bank could make credits available on the following basic criteria:

(a) A "pocket" of poverty must be involved.

(b) The investment or credit will tend to raise living standards in the community in question.

(c) All local governments as well as private entities would be eligible as borrowers.

(d) Ability to repay either directly or through the local taxing power should be a, but not the sole, criteria.

(e) I would give this bank (or whatever) the authority to guarantee loans made by private institutions. This is a very important exercise of a power we have largely overlooked in our international institutions except for the Eximbank.

(f) I would not distinguish between "big" business and "small" business applicants. Many of these projects are reasonably massive and would require big business.

(g) The loan guarantees of local governments should be encouraged.

(h) Rates should be low and terms lengthy where needed. All conditions should be flexible.

(i) Vital would be the extension of credit as part of the package for use in training prospective employees of the facility.

I doubt whether poverty and substandard living conditions in the various pockets of poverty throughout the country are subject to one or even a dozen stereotyped approaches.

We ought to encourage regional entities to study local conditions to evolve or pass on projects which will suit their individual needs. These should be submitted subject to approval by the Bank.

Centralized authority being what it is, these regional units should be small. Project recommendations should flow upward—and not be imposed from above. The Alianza got away from this principle. This is, I think, the basic reason it is not working well.

I think this Bank should also be engaged in continuing research. Generating economic activity in depressed areas is only half of the problem. The people of all areas must be equipped to take advantage of job opportunities offered.

I have mentioned earlier the problem of training. I do not mean to minimize the fact that we are spawning a generation of illiterates who are coming out of our high schools with no marketable skills.

No doubt there remains a place for the biceps, but this market dwindles in relative importance as technologies improve. Ten or fifteen years ago it might have been enough that a man was willing to swing a pick. Now he must be able to operate power-driven machines—or a computer. Obviously higher degrees of skilled training are necessary.

There is no need to repeat dreary statistics. I am certain that the people who are trying to pull together a program are aware of this matter and are seeking avenues of solution.

The trouble with this situation is both political and informational. We are going to have to undo damage that has been created by our welfare, social service, and relief laws and their administration. To many people, welfare subsistence has become a profession. They literally cannot afford to take a job. This is downright silly. It has the additional vice of opening up all such programs to attack—and in a society with conscience, welfare and relief programs are a necessity.

I suspect that a great part of the difficulty stems from a psychology generated during the New Deal. The tragedy of the depression and attendant suffering led us to champion the rights of people—to a job, to subsistence, to medical care, to housing and clothing. Without denying these rights, I do not believe they should be automatic. With these rights go responsibilities.

The able bodied should not be permitted to make a career out of welfare. This is a responsibility which we have not emphasized.

I believe that a tougher approach and overhaul of the entire welfare structure is overdue. I also think that most people would welcome it as part and parcel of the President's campaign against waste.

I also feel that the administration would have a much better chance of explaining and implementing an educational program if it were coupled with a tougher approach on welfare.

Both public information on the problems of education and training and financial assistance to schools and vocational training programs can more easily be accomplished through a bank than otherwise. Perhaps the image is a false one but it exists as a strong one.

I suspect also that there is a good deal of misinformation as to who, why and where are the poor. There are literally millions of jobs to be done in this country and millions of people who sincerely want the work. What prevents these people from getting work?

One reason is that the jobs are not where the people are. Bringing the jobs to these people is a primary function of a domestic investment bank. But there are others.

I have discussed increased training programs. But training for what? This is the question they have tried to answer in Philadelphia. This should be a function for the bank's research department.

I suspect—without having analyzed it—that in addition to the welfare structure, we are operating under often antequated systems of laws. In Connecticut, for instance, it is unlawful to put a power tool, even a lawnmower, in the hands of anyone under 18 unless this is done in the home. The original purpose—to prevent child labor—may have been worthy. The present effects are not.

In addition, therefore, to the need to rehabilitate the welfare structure, other so-called social legislation should be reviewed in the same light—a research job, perhaps, for the bank.

In short, all relevant data should be maintained current.

There are other devices that should augment the operation of such a domestic investment bank. For example:

(a) Local areas have successfully used preferential tax treatment to attract new industry and have assisted in plant construction and obtaining sites. I see no reason why the Federal Government should not do the same.

(b) Allocation of defense contracts to depressed areas would help. There are valid objects—higher costs, lack of skilled manpower, etc. But perhaps in conjunction with (a) above and with bank help it might work particularly if the contracts are of sufficient duration to permit plant amortization.

(c) Training and educational programs have been mentioned. In this connection—and perhaps irrelevant here—it has always galled me that our schools are vacant for roughly 3½ months a year and our teachers presumably moonlighting during the summer months. If the Federal Government is going to subsidize education, I feel this waste should be eliminated.

(d) The Federal Government ought to do more to spur activity in those areas affected with the social welfare which, at the same time, do not hold out the threat of assembly-line automation. These are housing, highways, schools, hospitals, etc. These services in turn attract industrial and commercial activity. The bank can be of enormous assistance to these programs.

Urban renewal is perhaps the most vital activity of this type. From what I have seen of it, urban renewal requires overhaul.

With adequate condemnation laws, it is not hard to tear down slums. The difficulty comes in rebuilding. We create extremely valuable property when we destroy obsolescence in our cities. A domestic investment bank could be most helpful in financing a program of intelligent rebuilding.

At the same time, these huge concentrations in metropolitan slum centers ought to be decentralized. Replacing cold water flats with high rise apartments as in Harlem changes nothing in the long run. Where are these highly concentrated people all going to find jobs?

(e) In spite of the fact that large-scale resettlement does not seem possible, some consideration should be given to moving people out of depressed areas on a small scale to places where they can find productive work. A domestic investment bank, or perhaps the employment service might consider some kind of relocation loan program to help people move.

There is a great deal of activity in the District of Columbia as to poverty. All of it is concentrated on what I have referred to as the palliative approach. More welfare—manufactured and artificial jobs for dropouts, etc. I do not deny the importance of temporary relief measures, but I would argue that they are utterly lacking in reaching permanent solutions to the problems of poverty.

My major reasons for suggesting a bank can be summarized briefly:

(1) To stimulate additional economic activity in depressed areas and pockets of poverty.

(2) Frankly, because a new political gimmick to dramatize the problem and some of its unpleasant aspects is required. Informed people have long complained about inadequate schooling to no avail. A bank is respectable.

(3) To assist in a program of upgrading skills.

(4) To take the curse off a more firm welfare program.

(5) To maintain and correlate data.

(6) To assist in other related areas—such as tax relief, etc.

How AID Helps Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the March 2 issue of the Washington Daily News, Virginia Prewett tells us how Yankee-hating, pro-Communist Miguel Arraes is making strides to obtain the Presidency of Brazil in 1965. She also shows how large AID programs have played a part in promoting his candidacy:

LEFTISTS PUSH ARRAES FOR PRESIDENCY

(By Virginia Prewett)

Yankee-hating, Yankee-baiting, 47-year-old Miguel Arraes, Governor of Pernambuco in Brazil's northeastern poverty belt, aspires

to be the first President of Brazil elected by stealing the credit for achievements of the Alliance for Progress.

Senor Arraes' radical leftist supporters, who include the Brazilian Communist elite, have started a national campaign to make him the far-left candidate for President in 1965. Senor Arraes was first picked a year ago by Brazil's Communists as the man to get them into national power through the polls in 1970.

Their support helped him become mayor of Recife, Brazil's third largest city, in 1959, and Governor of Pernambuco in 1962. In recent weeks, they have speeded up by 5 years their plan to make him President.

HARD CAMPAIGN

A hard-hitting campaign, especially in the underdeveloped states of Brazil's northeast, far south, and far west, promotes Senor Arraes as the man who made Pernambuco's landlords quadruple the minimum farm wage. This actually means little, since most farm labor works on crop shares or on contract.

Senor Arraes' supporters claim that as part of his get-tough policy toward the United States, he abrogated all Alliance for Progress programs when he took office, then had his aggressive state officials harry the U.S. Agency for International Development for greater benefits.

AID spokesmen in Washington categorically deny this. AID assistance to Pernambuco has proceeded "without interruption and normally" since it first began, they say.

CREDIT GIVEN

The new Arraes-for-President drive gives him credit for improved social and economic conditions in Pernambuco that the Arraes government actually had only a minimal part in.

In most of the programs, U.S. loans or grants have directly financed the larger share. The Brazilian contribution has been split three ways—among a regional agency financed by Federal funds, by the Federal Government itself, and by the state government.

The United States loaned around $200,000 for Recife's water system, for which Senor Arraes takes full credit. AID financed over half of a $1.5 million low-cost housing project that provides 700 new homes for Recife, and over half of a $3 million literacy campaign affecting 100,000 adults.

OVER HALF

The United States also provided more than half the financing for a $1 million Pernambuco health program, $9 million of a $20 million industrial development project, nearly 66 percent of a $200,000 water supply improvement program, and 25 percent of a $4.8 million homesteaders project.

The new AID-sparked activity has brought hundreds of millions of new cruzeiros, many new jobs and greatly increased purchasing power into Recife. Even a U.S. national weekly recently lauded Senor Arraes for this without mentioning the significance of the AID program.

The Baltic Republics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I have always had the greatest admiration for the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. I have many friends, especially in my district who have come from these countries, particularly Estonia, since the Soviet seizure. They have become splendid American citizens, proud of their heritage and proud of their adopted country.

The great American melting pot has performed its wonders and they and their children are and will be very important segments of the American scene, and yet it is so important that we do not forget that these three great nations are not Russian. As time goes on, I am fearful that this will be forgotten. It is therefore important that action be taken on my House Resolution 375, as well as the resolutions of many of my colleagues, setting up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Along this line a recent editorial in the New York Times is noteworthy. It is entitled, "Freedom in the Baltic," and follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1964]

FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC

A forceful reminder that Soviet Russia, which has written "anticolonialism" on its propaganda banners, is today the biggest colonial power in the world is provided by two nations which faithfully and hopefully observe their independence days this month though now reduced to Russian colonies. They are the Baltic States, Lithuania and Estonia, which together with Latvia, shook off the Russian yoke after the First World War only to become again victims of Russian imperialism in the Second.

Their hopes for regaining their liberty are sustained by their continued recognition as independent nations by the United States and other Western Powers. But they live between hope and fear. The growing independence of the East European satellites appears to inspire a new urge for freedom in the Baltic States as well, especially in the youth no longer cowed by Stalinist terror. But the growing Russification of their homelands makes it a close race between national survival and national extinction.

Results of a Weak Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the February 20, 1964, issue of the Buffalo Times Herald. The editorial is as follows:

RESULTS OF A WEAK FOREIGN POLICY

It appears that the United States is reaping the reward for its weak, almost fawning foreign policy.

Through a good number of years since the end of World War II, we have been so anxious to please that we have shared our production and our financial might with nations, allies and avowed enemies alike, across the face of the globe. In almost every case as soon as we have strengthened the recipients of our taxpayers' largesse to the point where they began to feel self-sufficiency, they have turned on us in one fashion or another. Nevertheless we have gone blindly on, forcing our charity upon them in many ways, in many instances buying luxuries for foreign heads of state while our national debt built up to the point where we are the most indebted people in history.

We have been so anxious to appease that we have allowed ourselves to negotiate away our position as a world leader in commerce as well as in free world policy. In recent weeks we have been threatened in Cuba, we have been threatened in Panama despite our honorable treaty rights. We have been sharply rebuffed by the British in regard to trade with Cuba. We have been placed in a bad position in Laos and in Cyprus, both areas where many believe we have no business under the circumstances.

In our eagerness to establish a one-world policy of trade, we have placed domestic producers at the mercy of foreign competition, which in may cases is directly subsidized by the very producers who are losing the domestic market. What chance have our cattlemen, for instance, of competing on the worldwide market when American products are subject to restrictions not imposed on products imported into this country? What chance have we of influencing our allies not to trade with Cuba while we rush to trade with Russia. This is no more sensible than trying to keep the kids from playing with the bear cubs while we pet and feed the papa bear. Why should we be so naive as to expect the Reds to pay for shipments of wheat in money and good will? How much have we received of our lend-lease which played such an important part in setting Russia's feet on the path to world domination?

There are many things about world trade and world diplomacy that we do not know. However there are a few facts about human behavior with which we are familiar:

1. The best neighbors are those who share a well-kept fence.

2. You don't gain the respect or confidence of a man who has promised to blow your house up by going his note at the bank to buy dynamite from you at wholesale. All you will earn is a reputation for being a sucker.

3. When you guarantee to help support all your neighbors whether you have anything for yourself or not, you are automatically headed for trouble.

Can it be that dealing with people in the millions is so much different from dealing with them individually that all basic rules of human behavior must be ignored?

It has been well demonstrated that when Uncle Sam stands up for his rights the entire world respects him. Why then, must he continually come out on the short end in conference table negotiations?

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the Jewish community within the Soviet Union is suffering under increasing persecution. In connection with this appalling situation, the Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit recently adopted the following resolution for which I take this opportunity to put it into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council, composed of representatives

of 340 Jewish member organizations in the metropolitan Detroit area, deplores the continuing perpetration of cultural and religious genocide against Jews in the Soviet Union by the Soviet Government. Official restrictions imposed upon the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union deny to them their freedom of worship, isolate them from their tradition and from their coreligionists in other parts of the world, and destroy their specifically Jewish spirit.

Prohibitions against the making or importation of Jewish religious objects—of prayer shawls, phylacteries, prayerbooks, Bibles, religious calendars—and against maintaining spiritual ties with coreligionists abroad, are indications of the harsh and restrictive discriminatory measures. Jewish religious and cultural life is further circumscribed by restrictions against the Yiddish theater and press, religious schols, publishing of books in Yiddish and Hebrew. Traditional burial is proscribed and much anguish is occasioned by the suffering thus imposed.

All of these restrictions are in contradistinction to the status accorded to other nationality and religious minorities resident in the Soviet Union.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to implement their often repeated concern for, and championship of, freedom for all nationalities and groups, by according to Soviet Jews the same status and conditions enjoyed by other groupings of Soviet citizens, and to restore to the U.S.S.R.'s Jewish citizens their rights to:

1. Jewish education in all its forms.
2. Continuity of Jewish cultural life through literature, theater, schools, press, publishing houses, and other forms of cultural expression in Yiddish and in Hebrew.
3. Reopening of synagogues to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry.
4. Jewish ritual observance in its traditional forms.
5. Reestablishment of religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad.
6. Be reunited with their families in other lands, from whom they have been separated.

We appeal to the Soviet Government—as a matter of urgency and elementary decency—to recognize the rights of Jews to their own language, religious and cultural expression to the degree permitted all other ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

Our call also goes out to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to use his good offices and the machinery of this world body, of which the Soviet Union is a member nation, to act against the cultural and religious genocide being perpetrated against Soviet Jewry.

We also call upon the Government of the United States, our President, our Secretary of State, our Congressmen and our Ambassador to the United Nations, to protest to the Soviet Government, through diplomatic and other channels, against the oppressions herein detailed.

The officers of the Jewish Community Council are instructed to send copies of this resolution to the officials above mentioned and to take all appropriate measures to the accomplishment of these ends, independently and in concert with national agencies and other like-minded groups.

Is History About To Repeat Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think our world prestige has ever been lower than it is today and, yet, the Johnson administration persists in its policy of appeasement. David Lawrence, in the February 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report, tells us how history may yet repeat itself, if we do not stand firm so that we can regain some of the respect which we have lost and are still losing, by our present anemic policy:

DEFINING THE "COLD WAR"

(By David Lawrence)

History sometimes repeats itself. In 1937, the Western Allies refused to heed the pleas of President Franklin D. Roosevelt that aggressors be quarantined. Previous proposals that an economic blockade be imposed on the Fascist dictators also failed to secure allied support. Disunity in the West and policies of appeasement furnished the basis for the miscalculation by Hitler that brought on World War II.

Today our principal allies—Great Britain and France—are deaf to our pleas for unity in the Western Alliance. The British Government insists on furnishing economic help to Castro's Cuba. The French Government, also motivated by a desire for trade, openly embraces the aggressor government in Red China. Appeasement is in the air again.

At the very time that Castro defies the United States—as he cuts off the water supply for the Guantánamo Naval Base—the British Prime Minister arrives in Washington and, after conferences with the President, announces to the press that Great Britain is to extend long-term credits to Russia and will continue to trade with Cuba.

It is time to make clear to our allies what the cold war really means. For it is a worldwide war being waged by the Communist government in Moscow with the object of subverting and overthrowing democratic governments everywhere.

We are too often inclined to regard the doctrine of "communism" itself as the sole evil. But, actually, communism is an effective instrument, a tool, in the hands of tyrannical and unscrupulous rulers. Irrespective of what economic philosophy may be fostered, the fact remains that communism is being utilized to overthrow governments established by free peoples everywhere and to bring those countries within the Soviet orbit.

We are often importuned to pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence with the Moscow Government—by which is meant that we are expected to tolerate subversion and infiltration.

We cannot safely coexist, however, with a government whose aim is to overthrow us.

Just 30 years ago, we formally recognized the Soviet Government, and the record since then has shown repeated violation of pledges given us at that time. Attempts at infiltration and subversion by the Communists have been frequent.

Our own Government, under this and preceding administrations, has striven to maintain a military peace. But, at the same time, we have been confronted with threats from missile bases which the Communists erected after they conquered our neighbor, the Cuban Republic.

We must not flounder in the cold war. We should carry on the fight vigorously every day. And we can do so only by telling the truth incessantly to the Russian people and to the whole world.

We know the hostile purpose of the Soviet Government toward us—it is evident in acts recorded nearly every month of the year. We should not gloss over these happenings as mere "distresses"—the word that President Johnson used a few days ago.

We have witnessed violations of written and oral agreements by the Soviets. There is no way we can coexist with a dishonest and treacherous government.

Military force is an effective weapon, and we need to be militarily prepared in every way. But this is not the only force available to us. Psychological warfare—especially through the constant employment of moral force—is equally important.

The most effective form of communication in the world is by word of mouth. Our story can be told in dozens of ways so that it will gradually reach the people of the Soviet Union.

The social doctrines of communism constitute the biggest barrier to economic progress today for the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Their opportunities to achieve the standards of living of the free countries of the world are being frustrated by the practitioners of communism in the Kremlin.

We are not the enemies of the Russian people. We are not concerned with what ideological views they may choose to express. But we do know that there can be no peace in the world while an autocratic government—unfriendly to us—is in power in the Soviet Union.

Although we will have these intervals of so-called peace, we must face the fact that, as long as a dictatorship prevails in the Soviet Union, the people of the United States will never be certain from day to day whether or not a military conflict will emerge, either in a limited war or a nuclear war.

Our enemy is Communist imperialism. It is directed by men who do not believe in God and hence do not believe in morality or in common honesty.

Neither we nor our allies should appease the Communists, or we shall again find ourselves in the middle of a major war.

Elizabeth Parkhurst, Connecticut Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year's winner of the annual Voice of Democracy contest in the State of Connecticut is a young woman from my congressional district, Miss Elizabeth Parkhurst, of Chestnut Hill. He is a junior at Lyman Memorial High School in Lebanon, Conn.

The Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Miss Parkhurst will be the guest of that organization in Washington during the annual meetings of its department commanders March 7–10, and she will attend the congressional banquet on March 10 at which time the national winners will be announced. The commander of the Connecticut Department, VFW, is Frank A. Sturges, Jr. Needless to say, that I plan to attend and hope that our State entry will emerge as the national winner.

In the meantime, I am very pleased to insert into the RECORD Miss Parkhurst's speech, entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship," which I desire to bring to the attention of all my colleagues. Connecticut is very proud of this young lady and the views she expreses. Her speech is as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Elizabeth Parkhurst)

The word "citizenship" refers to the state of being a citizen, that is, being entitled to

certain rights and privileges and fulfilling the reciprocal responsibilities. The full meaning of citizenship involves not only rights but also responsibilities. No conception of citizenship is valid that refuses to recognize this paradox.

The rights and responsibilities linked with American citizenship are familiar to everyone. The citizen of the United States has the freedom to work where he pleases, worship as he pleases, say what he wants to say, and think what he wants to think. He has the right to choose his own leaders and to disagree with them. He is guaranteed protection in time of war, and he is guaranteed an open trial when he is accused.

He has the responsibility to vote, to support the political party of his choice and its ideals, to serve in the Armed Forces (if he meets certain qualifications), and to protect his Constitution. The American citizen has the right to be free and the responsibility to assume his freedom.

Is the challenge of American citizenship related to these rights and responsibilities? Most certainly it is.

The real challenge of citizenship is the challenge for every American to find in himself the ability to allow all other Americans the freedom to fully enjoy the rights and responsibilities due his citizenship. The challenge of citizenship is the challenge for one man to recognize the humanity in all other men. Stated more simply, it is the challenge for every American to allow all other Americans to be Americans.

We practice religious freedom. We take pride in being able to worship as and if we want to. Yet have we never spoken harshly of a person whose religion is very different from ours? Have we never questioned a candidate on his religious convictions?

We believe that all races are equal. We hold fast to the conviction that all people should have equal rights and equal opportunities. We may look with disgust at prejudice in another part of the country, yet do we not sometimes hesitate to sell property to a person of another race in our own town, for fear that property rates might go down?

We have always had free and open trials and impartial juries. We would expect nothing less for ourselves if we were accused, regardless of our guilt. We could serve quite impartially on the jury trying some anonymous citizen of petty theft, or even another citizen of grand larceny; but could we, could any American find it in himself to serve impartially on the jury that would have tried Lee Harvey Oswald, or that is to try Jack Ruby?

When, and only when, every American can find in himself the ability to allow every other American the freedom to fully enjoy the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, will the greatest challenge of citizenship be met and conquered. Then, and only then, will we truly have liberty and justice for all. Then, and only then, will the challenge of citizenship be less of a challenge and more of a fulfillment of being.

The Way To Cure Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, nationwide discussion of domestic economic complications reveals the necessary interest in making use of our free enterprise system to alleviate our economic soft spots.

The Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., in an editorial of Thursday, February 27, effectively and succinctly discusses this subject in a practical fashion and suggests an often overlooked formula for curing poverty. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point:

THE WAY TO CURE POVERTY

The alleviation of poverty has been a major objective since civilization began. But a strategic goal must be accomplished by a tactical plan—that is, a method of achieving the wanted end. President Johnson's idea is to do it by heavily increased Federal spending for a multitude of projects.

Henry Hazlitt, one of the clearest writers on economic matters, in a Newsweek article says: "The way to cure poverty is not through inflation, share-the-wealth schemes, and socialism, but by precisely the opposite policies—by the adoption of a system of private property, freer trade, free markets, and free enterprise. It was largely because we adopted this system more fully than any other country that we became the most productive.

"The way to combat the remaining pockets of poverty is to keep this system; to reduce government intervention instead of increasing it; to reduce government spending and punitive taxation—in brief, to increase the incentives to the initiative, effort, risk taking, saving, and investment that increase employment, productivity, and real wages."

It may be that direct Government tax spending is needed in a few distressed areas. But overall, the weapons Mr. Hazlitt advocates are precisely the ones we must depend upon.

The Meaning of Disability to the Individual—By One Who Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement presented by Mr. John F. Nagle, chief of the Washington office of the National Federation of the Blind, to the Conference of Coordinators for Employment of the Physically Handicapped, sponsored by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Medical Service Division, September 8, 1961, titled "The Meaning of Disability to the Individual." This is an excellent paper—the most meaningful and forceful on the subject I have ever read.

My administrative assistant and I have known Mr. Nagle for many years. We regard him as one of our closest friends. Mr. Nagle lost his sight at the age of 13 and thereafter attended Massachusetts Perkins School for the Blind, graduating in 1934. He studied journalism at Boston University for the next 3 years, later switched to law and received his LL.B. degree from Northeastern Law School in 1942. Four years later he was awarded the B.A. degree in public affairs from the American International College. Meanwhile he was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1943 and to the Federal bar the following year, and settled down to a full-time law practice in Springfield, Mass., which was to claim his professional attention for the next 14 years.

During the years 1956–58 Nagle became, successively, recording secretary of the Greater Springfield Association of the Blind, a member of its executive board, president of the Associated Blind of Massachusetts, and a member of the executive committee of the National Federation of the Blind. In 1958 he received a Governor's appointment to the advisory board of the Massachusetts Division of the Blind, and in the same year was named by the NFB to its Washington staff.

The extraordinary range and variety of Nagle's activities for the organized blind of the national federation may be suggested by a representative sample of recent undertakings. They include appearances before various committees of the House and Senate to testify on every significant bill affecting the blind on which hearings are held; trips to State conventions of the organized blind in all parts of the country to present speeches, reports, and panel talks; active participation in numerous other group conferences and meetings, such as a recent regional convention of the National Rehabilitation Association and a Washington Conference of Coordinators for Employment of the Handicapped—where he delivered the statement on the meaning of disability to the individual which was subsequently sent to all coordinators throughout the Nation—press and radio interviews, almost daily meetings with national legislators and Federal administrators—and, not least important and time consuming, a constant flow of correspondence with blind people, plain and official, across the land.

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND?

In the summer of 1940, a handful of blind men and women from seven States met at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to inaugurate a new and unique voluntary association. The fruit of that historic meeting was the National Federation of the Blind, the first nationwide organization in America open to all sightless persons—truly a federation of the blind, by the blind, and for the blind.

Since that modest beginning, the national movement of the organized blind has grown steadily in numbers, strength, and influence. In 1963 it had a membership of 37 State affiliates, and was recognized by sightless people the country over as their principal means of collective self-expression—the voice of the independent blind.

Two factors in particular share the major credit for the remarkable growth and success of the National Federation of the Blind; its philosophy and purposes, and the quality of its leadership.

The federation believes that blind people are essentially normal human beings—that blindness in itself is only a physical lack which can be met and mastered, not an impairment of mental powers or psychological stability. Therefore all arbitrary barriers and discrimi-

nations—legal, economic, and social—based on the false assumption that the blind are somehow different from those with sight must be abolished in favor of equality of opportunity for all who are blind. Because of their intimate first-hand experience with the problems of blindness—and because they too have the constitutional right to organize, to speak for themselves, and to be heard—the blind themselves are best qualified to lead the way in solving their own problems. But the general public should be made aware of these problems and asked to participate in their solution. These are the fundamental beliefs upon which the National Federation of the Blind bases its philosophy and programs.

Following is the text of the statement:

To assist physically disabled persons to secure employment is doubly beneficial—it is a benefit to the employee, who is given the opportunity to earn a living (perhaps his first opportunity) and it is a benefit to the employer who obtains a competent, responsible, reliable worker.

We of the National Federation of the Blind highly commend the Civil Service Commission for its foresight in establishing the program of the Coordinators for the Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

But the people who have earned our deepest gratitude are the ones who have made the system work—Dr. Chapin, Carl Murr, and all the others in the Medical Division offices here in Washington and throughout the country—who transform the hesitant but hopeful inquiries of handicapped persons into the chance to qualify for job eligibility—and you, the coordinators, hundreds of you, who work with the disabled applicant to actually help him get the right job.

You coordinators—ordinary men and women—not trained and skilled in the problems and techniques of the disabled—but experts in the urgent need that each man has to earn his own living, to pay his own way; experts in the need of Government service for able, willing workers—understanding and patient, untiringly persistent—we thank you for your service to disabled people.

The final statistics indicating the numbers of physically disabled people now working through your efforts are important only in their real significance—a proof of the opportunity given to men and women who, like yourselves, wanted, not special privilege, but only the opportunity to demonstrate their worth and to be of worth—to themselves, to their families, and to the Nation.

We thank you.

I am totally blind. I have been totally blind for the past 32 years—since the age of 14.

According to the generally accepted stereotype of the blind man, I should not be blind—in fact, I have no right to be blind.

I am not a religious person.

I am completely inept with handwork. When a student at the Perkins School for the Blind, I made six unsuccessful attempts to learn to make cane chairs; the baskets that I made were always lopsided and my clay vases were monstrosities. Any minor repairs in my home are made by my wife, Virginia—and "minor" here means any at all.

I am not at all musical. I couldn't carry a tune if my life depended upon it.

Nor do I have a phenomenal memory.

I am an ordinary, average person, differing from others only to the extent that I lack the physical ability to see. In all other respects I am the same.

I, like the man with sight, am a combination of differing capacities and capabilities; varying talents and aptitudes. And, like the sighted man, I am a confusion of contradictions, I am ambitious—and at times lazy. I am selfish and greedy—and at times unselfish and generous. Sometimes I become angry over trivialities—and at times I amaze myself with my patience.

I want always to be able to provide for my family's every need; I want to be recognized as an employee of value, a friend of worth, and a person of consequence in my community.

I have dreams of grandeur—I want to have a share in making the world a better, safer, happier place for everybody—for all mankind, including myself.

Yes, I am a normal person with a total visual loss. I share with all men the capacity for greatness—and the capacity for villainy, success, and failure, joy and discouragement.

In describing myself I describe all men with a physical disability; the thoughts I express are not uniquely mine, but they are the thoughts of all men with a physical impairment—a physical loss—a physical difference.

I who am blind—we who are physically disabled—we are no better and no worse—nor, are we more or less than the rank-and-file in any community in America—we are a cross section of mankind in any community in the world.

If I seem to overargue the case for the normality of the physically disabled person—it does not indicate lack of conviction in my case—but rather, a realistic recognition that I am challenging the misinformation, misconceptions, and misbeliefs about blindness which are as old as man—and as current as this morning's newspaper.

Throughout the centuries blindness has been regarded as a condition of utter helplessness—a kind of difference which set a man apart—which made a man neither fish, flesh, nor fowl but a blind man.

This has been the curse of blindness from the beginning of time; it is the curse of blindness today. Not the condition itself—not the loss of sight itself and the limitations it imposes upon the individual, but the attitudes of people toward this condition and the limitations, restrictions, and exclusions that these attitudes impose upon the individual who is without sight.

Since we live in a sight-oriented society, of course, there are problems resulting from blindness. But, it is my belief that these problems can be eliminated altogether or substantially minimized by adequate substitutes—by special tools and devices—evolved methods and developed techniques—and above all else, imagination and ingenuity—persistence and determination.

I am blind. I cannot read print—but I read braille—and have read more books in my life than most of my sighted friends.

I am blind. I cannot read the newspapers—but, I listen to radio broadcasts—and believe I am better informed than most sighted people with whom I converse.

I am blind. I have problems crossing streets—but, the thousands of sighted people who are killed in traffic each year indicate that the problems—and the perils—are not exclusively those of the blind man. In fact, it seems to me that because I am blind and aware of the hazards of fast and unpredictably moving traffic, I am more cautious than my sighted fellows and so I operate with less peril than they as they dash wildly in front of approaching cars, not using the sight—or the brains—they have.

It has taken me many years to realize the real problems of blindness; to properly evaluate them and to separate them from the artificial problems. It has taken me many years to realize that possession of sight does not mean such a person is free from all limitations, disabilities and problems; that possession of sight does not guarantee fulfillment of all hopes and aspirations; nor, does lack of sight mean that fulfillment of all hopes and aspirations is unattainable.

If I seem to stress and emphasize the substantial normality of the blind person—of the physically disabled person—and I do—it is because I believe that all who would assist such individuals must accept this as an unquestioned truth; must accept it as a demonstrated, proven fact and this conviction must be so firmly rooted that it is apparent in all relationships with such people.

The newly blinded person, filled with self-doubt, crushed by the weight of misinformation and misconceptions about blindness, must be reassured—not be words which, though intended as encouragement, are words which urge acceptance and resignation—but the newly blinded person must and will be reassured by attitudes—attitudes which recognize the existence of the real problems resulting from blindness—attitudes which also recognize that the person has the capacity and the ability to meet and to solve these problems.

The loss of hope is the greatest loss resulting from blindness—not the loss of sight. If hope can be restored—if the newly blinded person can be convinced that he can function fully, though blind—all adjustments necessary to offset the limitations of blindness can be made successfully, qualified only by the individual's capacity and capabilities.

The man who is newly blind can adjust to the circumstances of his disability if he has the will to do so; if he is given an accurate understanding of the nature of the loss he has sustained; if he is given a true appreciation of the limitations imposed upon him and the almost limitless possibilities still available to him; if he is given information about the tools and techniques available to eliminate or to reduce such limitations and if he is given sufficient training by qualified instructors in the skillful use of these tools and techniques.

The existence—even the sudden occurrence—of a physical disability need not ruin a man's life but his attitude toward it may.

The glib phrase is "to restore self-confidence" but there is a need for much more than this—for the man who is suddenly immobilized to a bed or chair has lost much more than self-confidence.

A person who must have help to go to the bathroom has lost dignity—and suffers bitterly though silently from this loss.

A person, proudly self-sufficient and economically independent for a period of years, who suddenly discovers that, not only is he unemployed, but he is considered by all surrounding authorities as unemployable—that he must apply to public or private charity to feed, house, and clothe himself and his family—such a person has lost self-esteem—and the concerned and affectionate pledges of family and friends to take care of him do not abate this loss, but accentuate it.

Loss of dignity, loss of self-esteem, loss of pride in one's ability to function as head of a family and to provide adequately for its wants and its luxuries, loss of all hope, absolute certainty that life with meaning and purpose has ended—these, and not the physical loss—the loss of sight—will destroy a man's life. These, and not the physical disability, are the forces that will destroy all possibility of rehabilitation and restoration to normal living; to the assumption or the resumption of all of the privileges, duties, and responsibilities of full and fruitful living.

What does blindness mean to me—a blind person? How does the condition of blindness affect my life? What are my problems as I, without sight, try to function to the fullest extent of my being in a highly competitive world—a world oriented, organized, and operated for men with 20/20 vision?

First, of course, as a person, I have the same problems everyone else has—to earn a living, to pay my bills, to be a success in my job, to be a social, contributory being—and all of the other worries which are an inseparable part of everyone's daily existence.

As a blind person, I have all of the foregoing plus other problems which are attributable to my blindness.

The waitress who asks my sighted friend if I want cream in my coffee believes that, since she cannot communicate with me with her eyes—she cannot communicate with me at all.

The well-intentioned drunk who tried to lift me onto a bus one night—in the belief that I, blind, was much more helpless than he, drunk. It was late at night—I was returning home after attending a class in law school after working all day.

Although I now represent a national organization before committees of Congress, there were those who, when I was engaged in the general practice of law, did not believe me competent to represent their interests adequately on a $50 claim in a small claims court action.

Although I have worked continuously for the past 24 years and earned my living, I have always encountered much difficulty when I have wanted to buy a drink for my sighted friends or take one of them to lunch—even though I was merely returning a courtesy previously extended to me.

Although I have been successfully employed over the years as a braille transcriber, a subassembler in a factory, a practicing lawyer, and as the representative of the National Federation of the Blind in Washington with a wide diversity of duties and functions—I would still expect, if I were to seek employment, to encounter much difficulty in finding the kind of work I wanted to do, at a salary commensurate with my education and experience.

These are my problems as I try to function as a blind man among sighted men. These problems and many more of a similar nature are the problems of all blind people as they try to live normal, worthwhile lives.

The waitress who believes that, because I cannot see—I can neither hear nor talk.

The drunk who believes that, because I am blind I am also helpless—and this belief is too generally shared by his more sober fellow citizens.

The potential client who, although he sees my office walls covered by licenses and diplomas attesting to my qualifications as a lawyer; although he has read of my achievements as a lawyer in the newspapers and discussed these achievements with me, still doubts my competence to handle his petty claim because, in spite of all evidence to the contrary—a lifetime filled with prejudices and misinformation will not allow him to believe that a blind person really can possess any competence at all.

My friends who deny me the pleasure of buying them a drink or lunch deny me the right to share on the basis of equality with them—and to live and function as an equal member of our interdependent society. They deny me this, not because I am poor—for I am richer than some; not because they are not thirsty and hungry for my friends usually are—but because I am blind.

Although blind men and women today are engaged in just about every occupation and profession—although they are engaged in just about every imaginable economic endeavor either as proprietors, practitioners, or employees—the blind man seeking establishment in a profession or employment in a business or industry still encounters the same cordial reception, the same praise and admiration, the same assertion that the employer has no jobs the blind person can do, the same refusal to give the blind person the opportunity to demonstrate what he can do.

These are my problems as a blind person. These are the problems of all blind persons.

In summary—I have tried to set forth, frankly and clearly, my views as a blind person on our topic: "The Meaning of Disability to the Individual."

The real problems of blindness are not of the physical limitations caused by the loss of sight.

The real problems of blindness are the result of the attitudes of people toward the loss of sight—toward those who are without sight—and I believe that these attitudes, not the actual physical loss, transform blindness from a disability into a handicap—from a disability for which satisfactory adjustments may be made, to a handicap which only enlightenment and understanding can abate.

I, who am blind—we who are blind—have a complaint—but ours is not a complaint that we are blind, but rather that we are thought to be helpless because we are blind.

Ours is not a complaint that there is a lack of jobs that we can do, but rather that there is a lack of those who will hire us to do the jobs that we can do.

Ours is not a complaint that life owes us a living, but rather that life owes us a fair opportunity to earn a living, and to live with pride in our work, dignity in our status, and decency in our standards.

Ours is not a complaint that we are refused special treatment, but rather that we are refused equality of opportunity.

And finally, our plea and our goal is not that we be sheltered and protected from the tumult and the turmoil of the world, but rather that we be allowed to share with all others in the duties and the responsibilities for making it a better place for all mankind—including ourselves.

U.S. Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer for the RECORD the second in a series of articles by Paul Martin, chief of the Gannett Bureau, on the manned space flight programs which our Nation is undertaking.

Mr. Martin's article describes the care with which our people at Cape Kennedy are planning and putting together the Gemini mission. He notes, for example, that theoretically there are hundreds of failures which might occur during such a flight, and it is part of the work to take every possible precaution to make the flight successful.

U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

(By Paul Martin)

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA., February 24.—The glamour programs of spacework are the manned space flights.

We may learn more from scientific satellites. But there is something awesome and challenging about sending human beings out to probe the mysteries of the universe.

The age of celestial travel began for America on February 20, 1962, when Lt. Col. John H. Glenn flew around the earth three times. Since then three other astronauts have made successful earth orbital flights.

The next goal of the NASA Space Center here is to send up two men together in a single spacecraft known as Gemini. They are expected to remain aloft for up to 14 days.

This launch is scheduled for late 1964 or early 1965. The basic booster will be an improved Titan II rocket with 400,000 pounds' thrust powered by storable propellants.

The Gemini two-man space capsule looks like the front of a bucket seat compact car with no back seat. It is very compact indeed. You have more room in a Volkswagen.

"These men will be living in it for up to 2 weeks and performing all bodily functions," said John Mitchell of the Gemini flight crew support mission. "It is not designed to be coeducational."

He pointed out that there are more than 600 theoretical failures could occur during the two-man space flight.

"We can't afford to make mistakes," Mitchell said. "We are investing millions of dollars in this, and more importantly, the lives of two men."

Unlike the one-man Mercury capsules, the Gemini spacecraft will not be sealed.

Tied to a tether line, in a condition of weightlessness, the astronauts will be able to open the door, go outside, and walk around their spacecraft.

They may inspect the heat shield to see that it is properly secured, and do a variety of things. It's all part of the experiment to find out how men can move around and operate in space.

The next phase of the Gemini program will take place late in 1965—rendezvous in orbit with another bit of space hardware launched by an Atlas-Agena booster.

This will test whether spacecraft can find one another and maneuver together at orbital speeds of 17,000 m.p.h. in the trackless wastes of space.

The Agena carrying around 5,000 pounds, primarily fuel, will be subject to control either from the ground or inside the Gemini spacecraft.

Used as an upper stage on the Atlas, Agena was the first rocket developed by NASA with a shutdown and restart capability.

This is important for sending a spacecraft to a distant planet, but not essential for putting a payload into Earth orbit. A speed of 24,500 m.p.h. is needed to break free of Earth's gravity for a trip into outer space.

The Agena's engine may be turned off in space. It can be placed in a parking orbit around the Earth. Then upon command from the ground, it can be fired again in the right trajectory for interplanetary travel.

It was an Atlas-Agena rocket fired on January 30 which made the recent successful 66-hour trip to a landing on the Moon, but its television cameras failed to send back pictures.

When this fault has been detected and corrected, NASA intends to send another picture-taking expedition to the Moon in its series of Ranger shots.

Much of the experimental work going on at the cape today is aimed at the national space goal of a manned lunar landing by 1970.

"We need 2,000 hours experience in orbiting men around the Earth before we try to put a man on the Moon," a NASA official observed. "We have 39 hours now."

NASA fired eight spaceshots last year. This year they expect to get off around 24 or 25. The flight schedule includes:

Three more Ranger shots with Atlas-Agena rockets to make impact landings on the Moon and send back pictures and other scientific data.

A Mariner spacecraft to Mars sometime in late 1964 with an Atlas-Agena booster.

A Surveyor capsule to the Moon to make a soft landing in 1965, do core drilling and chemical sampling, send back pictures and ata on particles of energy on the Moon.

A sophisticated upper stage rocket known as Centaur is being developed for the Surveyor series.

Centaur will have an extremely accurate guidance system. It is fueled by liquid hydrogen, has a shutdown and restart capability, and develops 30,000 pounds thrust compared to 15,000 for Agena and 7,500 for Delta, upper stages of the Atlas-Agena and Thor-Delta boosters.

If the edge of space here at the cape seems sandy and windblown, the prospects in outer space are much more forbidding.

Albert F. Siepert, Deputy Director of the NASA space center, says that insofar as we have been able to ascertain, there is not a living thing anywhere on any of the other planets in the solar system.

NASA sent a Mariner spacecraft on a flyby of Venus in 1962 that went into orbit around the Sun.

The spacecraft sent back information that Venus is dry, sandy, and entirely overcast. The average temperature is 600° F. night and day. In the cloud cover, it ranges from 200° at the edge to minus 30° in the center.

The Moon, on the other hand, is entirely clear. It has no atmosphere like the earth, and its gravitational pull is only one-fourth as strong as the Earth. The Moon is thought to be a good place to observe the rest of the solar system.

Food Stamp Plan Needs Further Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 4, the House Committee on Agriculture voted to report the food stamp plan. My vote in committee was against reporting the bill to make the plan permanent because this matter needs a great deal more study to determine whether it is truly superior to the direct food distribution program.

Basically I believe that the food stamp plan contains many factors which make it preferable in some areas to the present direct distribution program. However, at this time, I have very grave reservations over the wisdom of expanding this program from its present pilot project status until we know much more about how it is going to work and what the long-range costs are going to be.

In the State of Washington, Mr. Speaker, we have had a pilot food stamp project underway in Grays Harbor County for more than 6 months. The director of the State of Washington Department of Public Assistance, L. L. Hegland, has been good enough to keep me informed of the progress of this pilot program and the difficulties they are experiencing with it. Several weeks ago Mr. Hegland sent to me a complete report on this pilot project and I feel my colleagues will be interested in this revealing information.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Hegland expresses very sincere doubt about the expansion of this program. I, too, feel that it would be very unwise for Congress to charge our Nation's farmers one-half billion dollars for a permanent food stamp plan until we have had more conclusive evidence that it will accomplish the purposes for which it is intended.

Mr. Hegland's letter and supporting data follow:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE,
Olympia, Wash., February 18, 1964.

Hon. CATHERINE MAY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MAY: Because of your interest in the programs involving surplus commodities and the stamp plan in the State of Washington, I am enclosing:

(a) A report comparing direct food distribution and food stamp distribution in the State of Washington.

(b) A copy of the food stamp questionnaire summary which was conducted in Grays Harbor County in which we mailed to all nonrecipients who had used the direct food distribution program a questionnaire. This report shows that over half of the people who no longer participate are unable to do so because of the limitation of their cash funds. Bear in mind that these are people who are not on assistance.

(c) A statement of the participation since the inception of the food stamp program.

On the basis of the survey and the fact that approximately only one-third of the eligible people in Grays Harbor County are using the stamp program, we have some real question about the expansion of this program. Basically, the surplus commodity distribution program was designed to do two things—use up surplus foods and supply a more adequate diet to persons of low income. It appears that the food stamp program accomplishes only a part of this, and the direct food distribution program does a much more adequate job both on using up surplus commodities and of being available to a larger number of low-income people.

If I can provide you with any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

L. L. HEGLAND.

MEMORANDUM, FEBRUARY 3, 1964

To: L. L. Hegland.
From: Mary Lou Everson.
Subject: January 1964 food stamp data.

For your information the data for the January 1964 participation in the food stamp program in Grays Harbor County are given in the table below. For your convenience the current month's data have been added to those for prior months:

	Total	Recipients of assistance			Nonrecipients
		Total	Continuing	Noncontinuing	
Persons issued food for August 1963	3,608	1,894	1,582	312	1,714
Persons participating in food stamp program:					
1963—September	1,016	782	736	46	234
October	1,187	814	773	41	373
November	1,078	784	751	33	294
December	1,100	793	745	48	307
1964—January	1,181	870	811	59	311

STATE OF WASHINGTON DIRECT FOOD DISTRIBUTION AND FOOD STAMP DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

America's farmers—using highly efficient techniques—are producing more food than can be consumed in this country or exported. Yet, there are Americans who have inadequate diets because of insufficient income. This situation prompted the Federal Government to explore several means of reaching two important national objectives:

1. Safeguarding the health of the Nation's low-income families through better nutrition.

2. Increasing the flow of foods from the Nation's farms to the consumer.

The direct food distribution program and the pilot food stamp program are two alternatives that are currently in operation in the State of Washington.

The department of public assistance administers both programs which are sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The direct food distribution program was inaugurated in May 1961 and achieved a statewide basis in July 1961 and the pilot food stamp program started in Grays Harbor County, September 1, 1963, replacing the direct distribution program in that county.

HOW THE PROGRAMS WORK

The direct food distribution program is operated through stores maintained by the State department of public assistance. Families certified as eligible by the county offices obtain their food issue directly from 1 of 30 direct distribution stores plus 27 subsidiary distribution points (tailgate operations) located in outlying areas of population concentrations. The U.S. Government donates the food issued to the needy families.

The food stamp program operates through normal channels of trade.

Families receiving authorization from the county offices and electing to participate exchange about 70 percent of the money they could normally be expected to spend for food for coupons. The value of the coupons received is greater than the amount paid for them. The difference represents bonus coupons contributed by the U.S. Government to the program.

The families use the coupons to buy food in retail stores at prevailing retail prices. Except for a few imported items, the coupons may be used to purchase any food in the retail store. Retailers are authorized to accept coupons by the Department of Agriculture and agree to abide by the rules of the program in accepting and redeeming coupons. They redeem the coupons through banks or through authorized wholesalers. Banks, in turn, process the coupons through the Federal Reserve System.

The conditions of eligibility are nearly identical for the two programs. In each, families receiving public assistance and having cooking facilities are eligible. Other families may be eligible provided their income and resources do not exceed prescribed amounts. The amount of income allowed depends on the size of household. For example, in either program a single person is allowed up to $123 monthly income, a two-person household $159, four persons $232, and seven $319.

The two programs differ slightly in the amount of resources that are exempt. For the direct food distribution program a single person is allowed $200 cash savings and/or marketable securities while households of two or more persons are allowed $400. In the food stamp program, a single person is allowed $323 and multiple person households are allowed $400 plus the maximum allowable monthly income (which depends on household size) in exempt resources.

WHAT PARTICIPANTS GET

The amount of food which a family receives through direct distribution depends on such factors as the number of persons, the amount of each item that a person might be expected to consume and the availability of donable foods. During October 1963, the kinds of food issued and the average amounts and value issued a person for 1 month were:

Item	Pounds	Value
Butter	1.35	$0.97
Nonfat dried milk	1.62	.32
Dry beans	1.58	.47
Milled rice	1.29	.39
Peanut butter	.65	.23
Cornmeal	1.71	.26
Flour	3.57	.42
Lard	.90	.19
Canned chopped meat	1.75	1.04
Rolled wheat	.97	.19
Cheese	1.17	.64

The average total value of a person's 1-month food supply was $5.06 in October.

The value of bonus coupons issued to families varies, depending on such factors as normal patterns of food consumption, family size, and income. These amounts were arrived at by the State department of public assistance in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The amount each family pays for coupons is geared to the amount it could normally be expected to spend for foods included in the program. For families of the same size, the purchase requirement increases as income increases. Conversely, the amount of bonus coupons decreases for families of higher incomes because such families are better able to afford better diets from their current resources. Some examples of required amounts paid and value of bonus stamps for nonassistance households are:

Size of household	Monthly income	Amount paid	Bonus stamps
2	$55	$18	$18
2	105	32	14
5	10	6	52
5	55	24	48
5	105	46	42
5	265	92	24

For assistance households the monthly purchase requirement is generally a percentage (65 or 70) of the food standard allowed by the Department, which is based on the age and number of household members. The value of bonus coupons is $6 per person for households with from one to four persons and $4 for each additional member.

Coupons may be used to purchase any food item in a retail store except coffee, tea, cocoa, bananas, and food clearly identified on the package as imported. They may not be used to purchase on food items, such as alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, soaps, pet food, vegetable seeds, etc.

The average value of bonus stamps for a 1-month issue in October 1963 was $5.71 per person.

PARTICIPATION

Some idea of the relative participation in the two programs can be obtained by comparing the change in Grays Harbor County participation under the food stamp program from participation under the direct food distribution program a year earlier to the year-to-year change in direct distribution participation for the rest of the State. The number of person-months participation for the September–November period during 1962, 1963, and 1963 participation as a percent of 1962 participation for Grays Harbor County and the rest of the State were:

	Grays Harbor County			Rest of State		
	September–November 1962 (person-months)	September–November 1963 (person-months)	1963 percent of 1962	September–November 1962 (person-months)	September–November 1963 (person-months)	1963 percent of 1962
Total	10,032	3,281	32.7	350,286	378,544	108.0
Continuing assistance	4,390	2,260	51.5	166,483	184,187	110.6
Noncontinuing assistance	1,113	120	10.8	32,479	28,178	86.8
Nonrecipients	4,529	901	19.8	151,324	166,179	109.8

These data indicate that participation in the food stamp program is significantly less than participation in the direct food distribution program, particularly among the recipients on noncontinuing assistance and low income families not receiving assistance.

WHY LOWER FOOD STAMP PARTICIPATION

Although available information is insufficient to assess their relative importance, a number of factors appear responsible for the lower food stamp participation.

1. Some families, both recipients and other low-income families, believe they are unable to participate even though eligible because of the cash outlay involved. Some are living on a credit basis and are unable to get enough cash on hand. The income of others may be received in small amounts and used up as rapidly as it is obtained.

2. Some families think that the purchase requirement is too high. Some old-age assistance recipients don't think that they spend as much as they would be required to spend on food stamps on food normally. Others believe that they need part of the purchase requirement for other purposes such as rent, clothing, etc. The 12-percent ratable reduction in GA, DA, and ADC probably reduces that portion of their grant available for food by more than 12 percent because costs of such items as rent, fuel, utilities, etc., are inflexible.

3. Of the nonassistance persons who applied from August through November, over half who had been receiving direct distribution foods were denied or withdrew their application for food stamps even though the eligibility requirements for food stamps are a little more liberal. This is likely due to administrative differences in determining eligibility. For food stamps careful documentation of the amount of income and resources is required in every case while for direct distribution the applicant is required to sign an affidavit in which he states the amount of his income. In both instances there is an interview with the caseworker in which his eligibility is reviewed.

4. Some persons are deterred from participating in the food stamp program because they believe that the processes involved are too complex.

5. In the food stamp program there have been active attempts to promote participation such as advertising, contacting nonparticipants, etc. These activities would tend to increase participation over what it would be without them.

COMPARISON OF THE TWO PROGRAMS

At this point in our experience it is difficult to compare the two programs; however, some of the points which seem to be pertinent are:

1. The low-income person or public assistance recipient receiving direct distribution has more freedom of the use of his income to buy school supplies, etc., than does the person who is required to tie up part of his money in monthly food coupons. On the other side, the tying up of a given amount of money in monthly food coupons helps the family to budget an adequate amount of its low income for food.

2. The use of bonus stamps in place of money in public grocery stores seems to be a deterrent to food stamp participation. However, some persons have also complained about having to pick up their groceries in direct distribution food stores and the fact that the commodities are clearly identifiable as issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture may also be a deterrent.

3. Recipients of food coupons can obtain a greater variety of food and have better diets. The U.S. Department of Agriculture states that "the food stamp approach is more effective in lifting the quality of diets of needy families than the commodity donation program." However, recipients of direct distribution also have an opportunity to purchase a greater variety because some of their basic foods have been supplied.

4. For persons participating in the food stamp program the more needy benefit the most since the value of bonus stamps increases as a person's income decreases. In the direct distribution program, persons with income just under the maximum for eligibility receive the same amount of food as persons with less income.

5. Although the total resources added to the community by the direct food distribution program is greater because of the larger participation, the cash which is added through bonus stamps by the food stamp program provides a greater boost to the local economy. The value of the bonus stamps is redeemed by local banks through the Federal Reserve System.

6. More of the needy families in the community are served by direct food distribution. Some of the difference in the number of nonrecipient families served by the two programs is the result of differences in methods of certification. However, fewer public assistance recipients participate in the food stamp program even though certification procedures are identical.

7. Based on the experience to date, it costs the State less to administer the food stamp program than the direct distribution food program. The overall administrative costs are less and, in addition, the U.S. Department of Agriculture pays a portion of the administrative costs.

8. Since the bonus stamp purchases are subject to State taxes the food stamp program provides a source of revenue for the State.

9. Some families with little resources or income who are able to get by with the help of direct distribution foods may not be able to obtain the cash for participation in food stamps and as a result may require assistance.

MEMORANDUM, FEBRUARY 17, 1964

To: L. L. Hegland.

From: Mary Lou Everson.

Subject: Food stamp questionnaire summary.

Attached is a summary of replies to the questionnaire mailed on January 15, 1964, to nonrecipient households who received direct food distribution in Grays Harbor County for August 1963. A copy of the questionnaire is also attached. The summary is based on the questionnaires received on or before February 17, 1964, since most of the responses appear to have been received by that time.

The proportion of questionnaires which were returned is exceptionally high for a mail survey. There were 206 or 49 percent

of 420 possible questionnaires completed (36 were returned as undeliverable).

The responses were checked in all ways possible to assess their accuracy. Although the answers that would be given by households not completing the questionnaire might change the results, it appears that the results are sufficiently accurate to support the following conclusions:

1. The vast majority of those persons receiving food stamps prefer them to direct food distribution (49 of the 51 households indicating that they are getting food stamps prefer them to direct food distribution).

2. The vast majority of households who are not getting food stamps and who would not be getting direct food distribution are now making too much money (80 percent of those answering).

3. The vast majority of those who are not getting food stamps but who would be getting direct food distribution believe that they do not have enough money (96 of 106 households checked one or more of the following answers: "Not enough money at one time," "Need money for paying bills," or "Need money to buy other things"). Nearly half (17 out of 41) of the households who would not be getting direct food distribution also responded in a similar manner.

TABLE 1.—*Disposition of January 1964 mail questionnaires to nonrecipient households receiving direct food distribution for August 1963 in Grays Harbor County (as of Feb. 17, 1964)*

Disposition:	*Number*	*Percent*
Mailed	456	100
Completed and returned by Feb. 17, 1964	206	45
Returned as undeliverable by Feb. 17, 1964	36	8
Not returned as of Feb. 17, 1964	214	47

TABLE 2.—*Preferred program of nonrecipient households receiving direct food distribution in Grays Harbor County for August 1963 who received food stamps*

Preferred program:	*Number*	*Percent*
Total	51	100
Direct food distribution	2	4
Food stamp program	49	96

TABLE 3.—*Reasons given by nonrecipient households receiving direct food distribution in Grays Harbor County for August 1963 for not participating in the food stamp program—Mail questionnaire, January 1964*

Reason for not getting food stamps	Total	Would be getting direct food distribution now		
		Yes	No	Unknown
Total	155	106	41	8
(a) Making too much money to get them now	40	6	33	1
(b) Don't have enough money at any one time to buy food stamps	92	79	8	5
(c) Need money for paying bills	87	68	14	5
(d) Need money to buy other things	72	60	9	3
(b), (c), or (d) in combination	118	96	17	5
(e) Can't prove how much I make	16	14	2	0
(f) Too hard to use food stamps	36	30	6	0
(g) Don't know how to get stamps	20	16	3	1
(h) Don't use as much food as I would have to buy	23	20	3	0
(i) Buy at commissary	1	1	0	0
(j) No longer live in Grays Harbor	1	0	0	1

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS.

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Assistance to Underdeveloped Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Mr. Leonard H. Goldenson, president of the American Broadcasting Co., last night projected a new and significant idea to assist the underdeveloped nations of the world. I believe that his address before the International Radio Television Executive Society should be available to the many Members of Congress who share his interest in this problem. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the text of his address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LEONARD H. GOLDENSON, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO. AND AMERICAN BROADCASTING-PARAMOUNT THEATERS, INC., DELIVERED BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL RADIO TELEVISION EXECUTIVE SOCIETY AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, ON MARCH 4, 1964

In accepting the 1964 Gold Medal of the International Radio & Television Society, I am reminded of the Biblical proverb: "Before honor is humility." Tonight I feel both.

Honor by what has been said here.

Humility in the knowledge that no individual in broadcasting can be awarded a medal for his work alone. It takes a team of devoted colleagues who back him up to make such an award possible. I feel so strongly about this, that I hope you will permit me to say "thank you" to the men and women of the American Broadcasting Co. and our affiliates whose aid and support you have recognized in the honor you have given me.

This is only the fifth Gold Medal awarded by this distinguished broadcasting organization, yet the event already is becoming a tradition. This is another reminder of the youth of our industry. But what a robust youngster it is—the greatest disseminator of information and ideas the world has ever seen, and the greatest advertising medium in history.

Even more than its predecessor, the printing press, broadcasting has brought a revolution in communications. With almost 62 million television sets and 215 million radio sets in the United States, we have experienced this revolution personally and have actively participated in it. And now, in renewed wonder, we watch the rapid transformation in communications taking place around the world, just as it has in our own country. Today, no one knows the number of radio sets in use throughout the world—they are probably too numerous to count. But we do know that there are some 72 million television sets outside the United States and over 1,200 television stations.

It is particularly appropriate and meaningful that this organization changed its name several years ago, intentionally adding the word "international" to its title. For I am convinced—as I am sure you are—that the word "international" has an increasing significance for our industry. It heralds the opportunities and the challenges that we—as communicators—face in this modern, rapidly expanding, scientific age.

The communication revolution of broadcasting is extending beyond the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia, and Japan. In Latin America great strides are being made, although no nation south of our borders in the Western Hemisphere has its entire country linked by television networks as we know them. The developing nations in Africa, in the Middle and Far East, and in Asia are slowly overcoming a complexity of obstacles and will inevitably build their own communications systems.

There is perhaps nothing so incongruous as a television set in a mud hut or slum shack. But this incongruity does exist in many countries around the world. There is nothing in these developing nations like the saturation coverage of television that we have achieved here in our network operations. But in these countries transmitters are going up, sets are finding their way into homes, schools, village squares and in other places where our revolutionary medium can reach beyond the economic elite. The television set in the mud hut or slum shack and the transistor radio in the rural village may do more to change the world more quickly than any development since the invention of the wheel.

In many of the developing nations, radio and television are starting to help millions of people overleap the centuries. In India, for example, rural villagers are catapulting from the Middle Ages to the 20th century as they learn modern agriculture techniques by radio. In Guatamala, a great effort is being made to double the literacy rate by instruction on television.

High in the mountains of Ecuador, radio was used recently in isolated Indian villages to test the effectiveness of the medium in a self-help program, and with magnificent results. In El Salvador, in Brazil, in Nigeria, and in Lebanon, radio and television are recognized and used as indispensable teaching tools in building modern societies.

There are many other examples I could cite where our 20th-century marvel of instant communications is allowed a leap forward. Millions of people are benefiting from what has been called "the advantage of being late." They want now what has taken us centuries to achieve.

The question of how to help more than a billion people move from varying stages of development into the rewards and the responsibilities of the modern age is one that concerns not only those billion people, or their governments, or our Government. It concerns us in our industry, in this room.

Whether or not these millions can telescope the centuries, how they choose to try, and what they do if their leaders fail them and if they fail themselves, are questions that will probably decide the future course of civilization in the second half of this century. And the answer to these questions will help determine whose grandchildren will be living under what form of government.

I believe that radio and television must play a major role in this historic development because communications and education are fundamental to building new societies. The universal longing and demand for higher living standards, for education and for self-determination will not allow this development to take centuries. It must be done in decades or less.

The developing countries are discovering that this quickened pace requires the use of modern methods of communication and education to create the men and women they need for the building of their own society. It would require an herculean effort to build all the schools, classrooms and laboratories and to train all the teachers needed in these nations as we have done here and in Western Europe over the past 200 years. Fortunately, there are some new educational shortcuts—audio-visual aids, inexpensive books, programed instruction, and most of all, radio and television.

A full utilization of instant communications as a development tool faces many problems. Some are awesome. For example, within the range of the 200 television transmitters operating in the areas of the developing nations, there are 250,000 communities without electric power. These obstacles to communication, to education, must be overcome, and perhaps not in the same sequence of development experienced in our own country. Perhaps the widespread use of low-cost transistor radio and television sets, free from dependence on the powerline, may result in many of these communities learning through radio and television even before they are provided with the basic power of electricity.

In addition to the many stubborn physical and economic barriers, another critical need that must be met if broadcasting is to fulfill its promise in this global effort is the need for skilled dedicated men and women technicians, producers, writers, directors and managers—all the skills that join together to make broadcasting in the United States the greatest communications force in history.

And it is in helping close this conspicuous human gap that we in this country, in this industry, can play an important part.

We do not have, by any means, a monopoly in all broadcasting skills and I sincerely hope we will never believe that we cannot learn from others. But our industry does have the largest group of trained personnel in creative, technical, production, and management abilities.

As broadcasters we must be dedicated to the worldwide communications revolution. We must, if you will, form a kind of industry peace corps and be prepared, if asked, to share our abundance of collective knowledge with broadcasters in the developing nations. For as we help them, we help ourselves and both of us help to expand communication opportunities for every section of the world.

We must always keep the doors open, encourage and look for opportunities where we can be of assistance. But in so doing, we must treat those we seek to help as equals, as partners in broadcasting, as fellow communicators.

If we do not learn this lesson in sharing, of helping our colleagues throughout the world, others will. The Russians, the Chinese and now, the Cubans will try to move into the vacuum. They are adapt at their techniques, are cunning with their skills. Should we fail to cooperate, they have an

opportunity to take over, to convert the communications revolution to their own design—to make radio and television in many parts of the world a government dictated function instead of an operation of freedom and private enterprise.

We in the broadcasting industry here should not be only spectators. We should not be content with just reporting the emergence of these 1 billion people on our news programs or documentaries. We should accept willingly the task of advising and passing on of the fruits of our own experience.

This assistance should not be left solely to government. Governments deal best with other governments. If we want to see the private sector of developing nations strengthened, then we in the private sector of our country must take some responsibility for the work that needs to be done.

At ABC, through our international division, we have already taken some first steps which we hope are significant in sharing our knowledge and experience with emerging broadcasters in other lands. The efforts that have given us the most satisfaction include:

Establishing partnership and business arrangements with 48 associate television stations in 21 nations; providing on-the-job training for foreign television personnel in our owned and operated stations; sending overseas consultants, advisers, and task force teams to work with our partner stations for periods of from a few weeks to 2 years; and aiding in the establishment of a Central American television network, linking five Central American nations and Panama; conducting, in cooperation with the Department of State, a series of seminars for station personnel from 32 nations; cooperating in achieving the first live program transmission linking the United States, Canada, and Mexico; the Argentine and Uruguay; Syria and Lebanon; Costa Rica and Nicaragua; and the United States and Japan.

It is said progress is not an accident, but a necessity. And so it has been with us. Realizing our efforts have been small compared to the challenge, we at ABC have nevertheless watched these seeds of help grow into impressive progress carried on with self-reliance and determination by our friends overseas. And let me stress that our programs of international cooperation are with broadcast facilities that are essentially privately owned, privately operated.

Radio and television are neutral media. They can be used to entertain, disseminate information and present conflicting social and political thought, or they can be used by a Fidel Castro for marathon propaganda harangues. In too many countries, the dictator's stranglehold has been tightened by control of communications. The first assignment of today's coup d'etat is to seize the radio and television stations.

What many of these one billion people we mentioned earlier will see and hear by radio and television will depend on who controls the governments; and this, in time, will depend on what has happened to those mud huts, those rural villages, those crowded cities.

The forerunner of social development is knowledge. Jefferson once wrote: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be."

The illiteracy rates of many countries present mountainous barriers to social advance. In cooperation with our associates in Central America, we hope to start, on these privately operated stations in that area, a pilot series of locally produced programs teaching the fundamentals of education—reading and writing. These programs will be directed toward adults as well as children. We don't expect to achieve a dramatic reduction in illiteracy overnight, but we do expect to demonstrate the ability of broadcasters to help solve one of man's greatest problems.

We hope, also, that this will be another demonstration of the fact that members of the broadcasting industry—who are often unjustly criticized—can help make a more than transitory contribution to the betterment of society.

The darkness of ignorance and poverty is being pierced daily by new shafts of sunlight throughout the world. Our industry has done much in this effort, but it is only a beginning. We owe it to ourselves and to our concept of freedom to establish in our industry something like a Broadcast Corps that, similar to the Peace Corps, can work in harmony and cooperation with the broadcasters of the emerging nations.

Our own future may well depend on how much we pledge to do in the days to come.

All in a Day's Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, those in the House of Representatives who have a particular interest in the U.S. Coast Guard and its outstanding work, will be interested in an account of a rescue at sea witnessed by a lady from San Francisco, Mrs. Marie E. Campbell:

ALL IN A DAY'S WORK?

Because we decided to take a little drive on Saturday afternoon, May 11, 1963, to enjoy the luxury of a recently purchased car, my husband and I were privileged to witness one of the most dramatic and thrilling sights of our long lives.

Driving north from the Fleishhacker Zoo, we reached the highway opposite the west end of the Golden Gate Park, and decided to park and watch the waves on the beach, something we love to do. (Here in San Francisco, we always capitalize the word "Beach"—to us it is such a definite place, just as our Ferry Building.)

We were looking for a good place to park, when my husband said "There is a fishing boat, very close in. I think it is in trouble." So we parked and went to the seawall at the widewalk's edge to watch. Sure enough, the boat was drifting closer and closer to the beach. The wind and waves were violent. I wanted to call the Coast Guard, but my husband said "They patrol constantly, they will know about it by now." None of the passersby seemed to realize what was happening.

Then we saw a young man watching through binoculars, and asked him what he thought of the situation. He replied, "They have their ship-to-shore out, so they have evidently called for help. Their anchor is out, but not holding, as they have lost at least 300 yards while I have been watching. There are three men in the cabin. They are definitely in serious trouble."

Later, much later, we learned he was a reporter from the Beverly Hills News, Los Angeles. He was in San Francisco to cover the "integration march" and had been notified of this boat in trouble. He managed to get some very good movies.

After a period of time that seemed endless to me while watching the little boat being mercilessly buffeted by the waves, a helicopter arrived: First it hovered over the boat and dropped a ladder toward a man who had appeared on deck, but the ladder streamed straight out. The wind and waves were unbelievable for the "peaceful" Pacific Ocean.

"It certainly must be a sturdy little ship to take the pounding it is taking," my husband remarked.

The helicopter moved north quite a distance away. It seemed as if it were parallel to the boat instead of in front of it, and we could not understand what was going on. Ten minutes more of drifting toward the beach and it would be too late. Then we discerned a line leading from the "copter" to the boat, while the former hovered very low over the water, seemingly completely stationary. But evidently the line had been secured and the "whirlybird" was holding the boat steady.

When the huge waves would hit the boat broadside and it would seem to turn right over, it was horrifying. Once I actually screamed, thinking it was gone this time, surely. And then I prayed "Dear Father, if it be Thy will, help these men in their desperate plight." I raised my eyes from the prayer, and oh, miracle, was the boat in a different position? Was it actually moving? Dear God, You heard me—and maybe many others, maybe the fishermen's loved ones who might by now have been notified of their danger—maybe the dear ones of those in the helicopter. If that line snaps back into the propeller, if the strain is too much for the motor * * *. Slowly, steadily, without the knowledge of the watchers (who by now numbered hundreds, plus police on horseback and motorcycles to keep the jammed traffic moving) the helicopter was actually towing the disabled boat through the monstrously high breakers. Just a fishing boat, yes, very small in comparison to an ocean liner, but the weight pulling against the line with the tremendous waves and wind must have seemed unconquerable resistance to the helicopter.

Then way off beyond the buoy, we saw a Coast Guard cutter, just "laying to." I asked my husband "Why don't they come in and help?" To me it looked just as small as the craft in trouble. This shows how very close in on the shoreside of the buoy the latter was. He answered "Why, they couldn't possibly come within that buoy. They are a much larger ship, and they would be wrecked."

Watching from the seawall I got so terribly cold, I had to go back to the car. It wasnt' easy to see from the car now, as traffic kept stalling in front of it. "If I am so cold" I though, "what about those poor souls out there, being tossed about by that merciless wind?" Born and raised in San Francisco, I had never been to the beach on a colder, windier day.

Minute after minute went by. Sometimes they seemed to be making progress. Sometimes a huge wave slapped them broadside and momentarily they disappeared from sight. Sometimes they appeared to be completely still, not gaining, not losing.

But that precious, wonderful helicopter, with unbelievably brave, calm men (or maybe only one? That's hard to believe) kept that boat as steady as if it were being towed on a lake, gradually, oh, so gradually, veering toward the waiting Coast Guard cutter, now keeping vigil near the buoy. When we realized they were making headway, we said "If only they don't capsize now, they would be much worse off than when close to shore."

Even that far out, the waves were mammoth. Now as the distance between the two crafts slowly lessened, I saw how much larger the Coast Guard cutter actually was. It circled and maneuvered and bobbed high, then way, way down, just as the little fishing boat was doing. As we get terribly seasick, we agreed we certainly wouldn't want to be out there on any kind of a ship.

At last they seemed to be making contact. The cutter came very close for a few minutes, evidently trying to pass a line to the little boat. Then they went way back, away from it. What were they doing?

The helicopter seemed to be stationary. Then we realized it was holding the boat steady while a new tow was being attached. Once again the cutter went way back, then crossed in front of the fishing boat, and under the line the copter was holding taut. Of a sudden the little boat started to lose ground, streaming way out from the cutter, and we thought they had lost it, but it was just taking slack from the new line.

At last at long last, they started steadily north toward the Golden Gate. The helicopter stood by for some time, then started toward the beach. As it flew over the many parked cars whose occupants had been watching this thrilling drama, it dipped and circled and I just knew it was doing a victory dance, it had won against the elements—that long, sustained, nervewracking duty was ending successfully—it was over.

"Well done," I wanted to shout. I wanted to shake their hands. I wanted to show them my appreciation, my admiration, my awe at the impossible task they had accomplished, and all I could do was stand and watch, and wave to them with a feeling of futility and frustration, knowing they couldn't see nor realize how deeply thankful my husband and I felt toward them.

Driving home, I felt completely drained. What then of the feelings of those men who had rescued the three today?

All in a day's work, for the Coast Guard? Maybe, but that little victory dance the copter did, meant to me that they might be men of steel, men of iron nerve, but also men with a tremendous sense of the value of human life—sensitive, wonderful men, who should be made aware someday of our tremendous admiration and gratitude.

To that end, I have written this epistle.

MARIE E. CAMPBELL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Did Shakesper Really Write Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, dissent from majority views is one of the great privileges of our democracy. Sometimes, as with the opinions of Mr. Justice Holmes, the firm foundation of the dissent eventually brings about its acceptance by the majority.

There is a lively dissenting body of opinion about the authorship of the plays which are generally attributed to William Shakespeare. The reasons why these plays should be credited to Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, provide a fascinating study for people of literary bent. In the traditional American spirit of fair play, therefore, I am appending herewith a statement by my friend, Francis T. Carmody, long a student of this problem. I am sure that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find this script, which forms the basis of a TV debate on channel 13 in New York, forceful, engrossing, and persuasive.

DID SHAKESPER REALLY WRITE THEM?

It is now official in the United States. With the appointment of a Shakespeare Anniversary Society to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the birth of the author of the Shakespearean works by the President of the United States (New York Times, Feb. 23, 1964, sec. 2, p. 1), our acutely culture-conscious government has joined England in the perpetuation of what Henry James labeled the "most successful fraud ever practiced on a patient world," to wit, the myth that the illiterate son of a Stratford malt dealer who was born 400 years ago wrote the most sublime works of the human spirit. To make sure that no unorthodoxy on the subject be permitted, Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Library, in whose violently orthodox pronouncements on the authorship question can be detected the desperation of a suporter of a losing cause, has been appointed vice chairman of the committee. To make matters worse, the unsuspecting Ford Foundation, no less, has been hoodwinked into the fraud by providing a gift of $250,000 to implement the decisions of the committee.

That this official position should be taken by our Government on the basis of existing evidence relating to the authorship of the Shakespearean works is a cause for national shame.

Instead of celebrating the birthday of this fatuous pretender to the authorship of the world's most immortal drama and poetry, the President would have been better advised to appoint a committee of uncommitted scholars and lawyers to make an objective evaluation of the evidence relating to the authorship—a task all too long avoided by Shakespearean scholars. For in truth, of all the "candidates" for the authorship, the Stratfordian Shaksper (as his name was most frequently spelled) is definitely the least likely, and the only wholly impossible, claimant. At least all the others could write.

There is absolutely no evidence that Shaksper had even a rudimentary education or was literate. The only writings of his ever known to exist are six unsimilar signatures. He left Stratford for London when about 20 years old, and while there, there is some evidence that he was connected with the theater and may have played some unknow role in two or three plays. That is all, except that he returned to Stratford before the publication of the great majority of the plays, a rich man, and thereafter continued his quest for money by lending money, buying up the Stratford tithes, seeking a coat of arms and suing debtors for as little as two pounds. When he died in 1616, half of the plays remained unpublished and yet he made no reference to any literary works in his will, which bequeathed small sums to individuals and his second best bed to his widow. There is no record of any payment ever having been made to him for any literary works, no letter to or from him has every been found, and in the year of his death there was no reference to his passing in any of the literary chronicles. At least one of his daughters was illiterate. Nor does there exist one single contemporary reference to this man as the author of anything. Not until the publication of the First Folio Edition in 1623, 7 years after his death, did anyone, even with obvious tongue in obvious cheek, even imply that he wrote the works.

If this man wrote the world's greatest literature, what reason could there be to destroy the manuscripts, none of which has survived even his death?

There is only one person who could possibly have written the works, who was of the proper age, had the requisite education and knowledge of court life, the sports of noblemen, the law, Greek, Latin and French, etc.—and that is Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, who is increasingly recognized by intelligent and objective people as the real author.

Born in 1550 of the oldest lineage in England, he became a royal ward on the death of his father in 1562, was tutored by his uncle, Arthur Golding, the first translator of Ovid into English, and was graduated from Cambridge at 14 and Oxford with an M.A. at 16. He studied law for 3 years at Grey's Inn. He was a favorite of the Queen, fought for her in the northern rebellion, in the lowlands, and captained his own ship in the battle of the Spanish Armada. Many verses under his own name are extant, some in the sonnet form with definite Shakespearean analogies. He was known as the best for comedy in his day, yet none of his comedies remain—at least not under his name. As the leading member of the court he was not allowed by Elizabeth to write under his own name in view of the foibles of the court portrayed in the plays, many of which concerned regicide and other politically explosive subjects.

As Lord Great Chamberlain, he held the canopy for the Queen at royal processions (see Sonnet 125: "Were't aught to me I bore the canopy"). That he wrote under a pseudonym is obvious for many reasons, and he bewailed his anonymity in the sonnets. See especially Sonnet 76.

He had a dark lady, the Queen's lady-in-waiting Ann Vavasor, and Mantua, Padua, Milan, Venice, sites of so many of the plays, were all familiar spots to him.

At least most lawyers will agree that a prima facie case has been made for Oxford—there is no fatal defect in his qualifications. It is now time for the scholars to descend from their ivory towers and either rebut the presumption of his authorship with solid evidence or proceed to find an author worthy of the works. Meanwhile, as representative of many thousands of lawyers and as president of the Shakespeare Oxford Society, the writer challenges Mr. Wright to support the claims of the Stratford man in a television debate on channel 13 in order to enlighten his constituents, we the people, as to the claims of the birthday boy as the author of the Shakespearean works.

The FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, evidently because of the insistence of certain pressure groups that the House civil rights bill is not strong enough many apparently are unaware that it is a stronger bill than that originally recommended to the Congress by the late President Kennedy. For instance, it contains an FEPC bill, which was not in the original Kennedy omnibus Senate bill. From time to time during the 18 years that I have been a Member of the Senate efforts have been made to get the Senate to pass a bill of that character but always without avail. Some sections of the civil rights bill, and especially that dealing with voting, are supposed to be aimed at the South. But FEPC is of national application and it has been so repugnant to both businessmen and labor organizations throughout the Nation that a majority of the Senate has never been won for its support. It is objected to by management because it takes from management its essential discretionary powers over employment of those best

suited to make a success of the business. It is objected to by labor organizations because it would destroy organized labor's cherished right of seniority, in addition to requiring the replacement in some instances of white workers by nonwhite. Yet that very FEPC bill is title VII of H.R. 7152, which will be the next order of business in the Senate.

The Senate leadership has virtually acknowledged that it has no chance to impose cloture on an FEPC bill, but it still predicts that the Senate will pass such a bill and many organizations, including the National Council of Churches, are urging the Senate to do so.

In the leading article of the Richmond News Leader of Wednesday, March 4, its brilliant editor, James Jackson Kilpatrick, who is vice chairman of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government and in that capacity has devoted much study to constitutional questions, analyzes the essential provisions of title VII of H.R. 7152 in an editorial entitled "The Bill and the Employer."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILL AND THE EMPLOYER

The pending civil rights bill goes to the Senate wrapped in some strange phenomena, but none is stranger than the curiously docile attitude of employers toward it. Have they read title VII of the bill? Do they clearly understand what the proposed Equal Opportunity Commission would mean to them, and to their employees, and to the operations of American business and industry?

We suspect that most employers have no real comprehension of this sweeping section of the bill. It may be that American businessmen have succumbed to the same pestilential emotionalism that has affected so many otherwise sensible persons. Or perhaps their attention has been concentrated on the public accommodations section. Or maybe they are just sick and tired of reading about the whole thing. In any event, only a handful of employers appear to have awakened to the drastic impositions the bill would put upon them.

One problem may be that title VII, the equal employment opportunity section, simply is too long for most busy men to read. It runs to more than 22 full pages. Even so, we submit that no bill now before the Congress more urgently demands their careful scrutiny.

The object of the bill as a whole is to reduce race consciousness; but this section can succeed only in vastly increasing race consciousness.

The purpose is to insure full enjoyment by the Negro of his rights and privileges; but this would be accomplished by jeopardizing long-established rights and privileges of others.

Title VII is predicated upon the commerce clause of the Constitution; yet it would directly affect hiring, firing, and promotion practices in local establishments having as few as 25 employees.

The bill would engraft onto the Federal bureaucracy an entirely new permanent agency, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, with an originally authorized budget of $10 million. The National Labor Relations Board reached this level just 5 years ago.

Labor unions and employment agencies would be placed under the same restrictions and requirements imposed upon employers. They too would be drastically affected by this bill.

As passed by the House, title VII does not prohibit discrimination merely by reason of race, but also by reason of "religion, sex, or national origin." Necessarily, records would have to be kept to reflect all this information.

The equal employment provisions would not apply to the States and their subdivisions, to bona fide private clubs, or to religious institutions. Otherwise, every employer of as many as 25 workers, and every union of as many as 25 members, would be covered.

What all this boils down to is that a brandnew "unlawful employment practice" is being created. A brandnew Federal agency is to be brought into being, with all the familiar trappings of rulemaking power. The act provides for the same posting of notices required under minimum wage laws. Every employer and every union would have to maintain and to preserve "such records as the Commission shall prescribe"—and we may be certain such records would be voluminous.

Yet in the whole bill, there is not one line to guide or to restrict this Commission in determining "discrimination," which is what the bill is all about. Are quota systems to be imposed? Are employers to face rebuttable presumptions that they are engaged in unlawful practices if in every phase of their operations, fewer than half of their workers are women, or fewer than 11 percent are Negroes, or fewer than 5 percent are Jews?

The thousand questions raised by title VII are not merely rhetorical questions; these are serious questions that have received far too little consideration by the employers and unions so intimately affected by the bill. We urge them to penetrate the fog of civil rights and to study this bill as a matter of binding, permanent law. In the pretty name of "equal opportunity," the sponsors have raised an illusion that has enchanted a great part of the country. But the bill is a mare's nest; and the opportunities it would create would be chiefly opportunities for Federal harassment and for new and more bitter racial tensions.

Oceanic Research and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are becoming more and more conscious of the importance of the study of oceanography and the effect which a thorough knowledge of the oceans will have upon the future of the world and our country in particular.

Over three-fourths of the surface of the world is covered by oceans and, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, they have been a great source of food that has never been fully exploited nor are we fully aware of the great potential of the oceans as a source of minerals so important to our economy.

Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., technical assistant to Director, Office of Science and Technology, Office of the President, recently gave a very scholarly address before the Governor's conference on "California and the World Oceans" in Los Angeles, Calif.

In this paper, he summaribes oceanography and its importance and I commend its reading to you.

OCEANIC RESEARCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

(Address by Edward Wenk, Jr., before the Governor's conference on "California and the World Oceans," Los Angeles, Calif., January 31, 1964)

INTRODUCTION

Governor Brown, other officials of the State of California, my fellow colleagues, guests, it is a genuine privilege to participate in this symposium—to examine in the spirit of conference the diverse interests and problems which relate to "California and the World Oceans." Residents of this State are fortunate to have among its leaders, those with vision and initiative to explore these implications for the lives and welfare of its citizens. The Nation as a whole will benefit. For apart from factual information that participants will carry away from this session, the sponsorship of such an inquiry by a State executive reflects an essential strength of American political processes. Those with common interests, such as in California's oceanic development must seek local remedies to local problems.

At the same time, this conference meets in appreciation of the pervasiveness of nature, for the ocean environment which must be understood for wise solution of these problems is not circumscribed by State or even National boundaries.

These problems, incidentally, are of two kinds—problems in natural science and problems in political science. But barriers to progress fall into three categories—these two problem areas and a third—because of the additional difficulty of communicating wisdom between these "two worlds." In preparing this address, I came to the belief that my assignment—to discuss oceanography in the context of public policy—may prove uncomfortably provocative. Other speakers, concentrating on special topics such as fisheries or mineral resources should encounter in this diversified audience only a few other experts who might contest their arguments. But in the domain of public policy, everyone is an expert.

I shall endeavor, however, to review the more conspicuous objectives for translating knowledge of the oceans to fulfill our collective national goals, and the manner in which the Federal Government has responded during the past few years to these challenges. I shall also discuss the processes of public policymaking which encompass priority setting of research budgets, and barriers to progress as I see them at a Federal level. I shall conclude with a few suggestions toward their solution which may call for action at the State level.

HISTORICAL ORIGINS

From this Nation's infancy, the oceans have had a vital influence on our economic and political development. It is an influence, however, that reflects a curious contradiction. The sea has acted as a buffer against aggression. Behind this moat, it was possible to develop rich physical and human resources of a continent, isolated from pressures of neighbors less well endowed. The sea has simultaneously acted as a medium of communication, facilitating exchange of both merchandise and culture that has served as well at home and fostered our prestige abroad.

Despite these ocean-oriented beginnings, our national awareness of the importance of the sea has waxed and waned. For example, our peacetime merchant marine reached a peak tonnage in 1810, then de-

clined; that tonnage was not again exceeded until 1845. A subsequent higher peak in 1860 was not matched until 1920 when the Nation put to good advantage freighters hastily built for military transport. Even with a surge immediately after World War II, a period of decline has occurred since. I should add that in the past, our merchant fleet earned a substantial share of world trade as much because of its quality as its size.

Our indifference to the sea has also been reflected in our lagging development of oceanic research. To be sure, our seafarers have been characterized as romantic men of action rather than of reflection. Yet, our Nation achieved notable firsts in oceanic research. Benjamin Franklin first mapped the Gulf Stream; Nathaniel Bowditch published the first technical treatise on navigation; in 1838, Wilkes explored the South Pacific, and in 1852, Perry the North Pacific. Matthew Fontaine Maury in 1855 undertook the first systematic charting of surface currents and winds.

But American oceanography did not fulfill its early promise. Especially upon the advent of steam, it drifted and declined. Those who used the oceans no longer critically needed information on winds and currents.

In 1927, the first of three important inquiries was undertaken by the National Academy of Sciences into the health of this branch of science. Inadequacies revealed by their report stimulated private endowments for Scripps and Woods Hole Oceanographic Institutions, laboratories on both coasts, which have provided muscular scientific leadership ever since. The momentum did not continue. Surprisingly, even after the importance of submarine warfare to our military strength was so amply demonstrated during World War II, the requisite research to understand the subtle but critical nature of the fluid environment once more declined. In 1951, a second Academy study called for new Federal sponsorship of research, but only in additional amounts of three-quarters of a million dollars annually. Then in 1957, when a number of Federal agencies recognized how seriously they were falling short in fulfilling their statutory missions because of a still feeble oceanic research enterprise, they requested a third study by the Academy. Under chairmanship of Dr. Harrison Brown, professor of geochemistry at Cal Tech, the analysis that emerged set forth a clear set of goals; equally significant, their report proved an effective catalyst in developing a broader base of public support.

INVIGORATED OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH TO MEET NATIONAL GOALS

In unequivocal language, the report called for a sharp increase in Federal support of research if indeed the Nation was to meet contemporary opportunities and the challenges of foreign scientific eminence.

Arguments for strengthening support of oceanographic research to meet broad national goals included:

(1) Maintaining military defense.

(2) Strengthening basic research—as a source of information for a variety of practical applications, and of hard fact to support policymaking; in other words, a long-range investment against the unforeseen.

(3) The development and intelligent conservation of biological and mineral resources in the world oceans, and in domestic waters.

(4) Protecting the ocean environment against accidental pollution.

(5) Collecting oceanic data essential to meteorology, without which accurate weather forecasting is limited to short time intervals.

(6) Fostering technical assistance to newly developing nations, especially to help those suffering protein deficiency to look to the sea.

(7) Developing international law related to rights of sovereignty transit, fishing, and conservation.

(8) Protecting property, and safety of life on or in proximity to the sea.

(9) Assisting the U.S. fishing and shipping industries, and offshore oil, sea mining and recreational industries.

These considerations were far from new. They were already spelled out in statutory mission requirements of nearly 20 Federal agencies; the first such act—establishing the Coast and Geodetic Survey—goes back to 1807. But the October 4, 1957, Soviet launching of Sputnik I heightened the awareness of a new era wherein our military security, our prestige, our world leadership broadly depend upon science.

As restated by the Academy, this rationale found eloquent endorsement by a number of Members of Congress, especially Congressman GEORGE MILLER of California and Senator WARREN MAGNUSON.

Because no other source of funding or leadership was evident to meet these needs, the National Academy of Science proposed that the Federal Government assume the responsibility. They urged that the fiscal year 1958 Federal expenditures of about $32 million for oceanography be immediately increased, and after a 10-year surge of ship construction, that annual budgets be sustained at about $78 million. $867 million would be required over the decade of the 1960's.

In 1960, a policy study on ocean sciences by the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics estimated that annual research levels needed to meet national goals should aim for a target in 1970 closer to $160 million per year. In June 1963, a comprehensive analysis prepared for the President by his Federal Council for Science and Technology of long-range goals and programs estimated that expenditures of $350 million annually would be required by 1972 to meet the multiple national interests which relate to the sea.

This Federal report is also significant for its unprecedented statement of a unified and a coherent sense of purpose:

"To comprehend the world oceans, its boundaries, its properties, and its processes, and to exploit this comprehension in the public interest, in the enhancement of our security, our culture, international posture, and economic growth."

THE FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC POLICY

Any implementation of such a goal assumes meaning only in the broader context of public policy. As a nation, we intend to maintain a vastly superior military capability. Because of its potential for security, we also intend to maintain a scientific establishment without peer. There is no clearer expression of these priorities and intentions than the budget. In fact, it is in making choices amidst competition for funds that policy is frequently made. Jerome Wiesner once said that the budget is an elegant, one-dimensional representation of all the multidimensional and competing needs and aspirations of the Nation. By no more direct means can the President dramatize his choices.

Recent growth of federally funded research and development is a clear yardstick of how essential we regard science and engineering as both the cutting edge and the vehicle of policy.

Expenditures have grown from $3.3 billion in 1955, 4 percent of the Federal budget, to $15.3 billion proposed for fiscal year 1965, 15 percent of the budget. Eighty-five percent of these funds—in budgets of Department of Defense, AEC, and NASA—are intended to maintain security. The importance of this area is clear and the Federal role is clear.

This year, we enter an exceedingly significant era of transition. The President is proposing a leveling off of defense R. & D., and space appropriations. The 20 percent per year growth rate for the last 5 years comes to an abrupt end.

Several factors are involved, and it is necessary to examine the finer grain of public policy to comprehend the basis for this action. First and foremost, as Dr. Wiesner has stated before the Congress, "while the characteristic of constant change (and growth) continues to dominate scientific activities, we may have reached a point of relative stability in that aspect of our technology—the development of weapons for military purposes—which has stimulated our scientific progress over the last 10 years." Our present superiority in weapons is based on a massive destruction capability of nuclear weapons, a quickened response time of electronic warning communications, and a delivery system permitting retaliation anywhere in the world in 30 minutes. New research ideas that previously warranted this continued growth in the military R. & D. enterprise are not warranting development at the pace they were previously.

To understand these implications fully, it is necessary to distinguish between funds for research and funds for development. Their motivation is different; processes of internal priority setting are different; processes for the conduct of these two activities are different, and decisions as to total levels of support are arrived at differently. While both research and development are leveling off, the most severe deceleration is in the military development component.

Looking to the future, the 15 percent of Federal development expenditures devoted to the nonsecurity area may grow, but its rate and direction must depend on a new set of public decisions related to economic and social needs rather than military.

Another consideration related to fiscal policy arises from budget guidelines and principles enunciated by President Johnson in his January 21 message to provide ample assurance to the Congress of our determination to keep costs under tight control:

1. "Spending by the Federal Government by itself is neither bad nor good—bad where it involves overstaffing of Government agencies, or needless duplication of functions, or poor management, or public services which cost more than they are worth, or the intrusion of Government into areas where it does not belong. It can be good when it is set to work efficiently in the interests of our national strength, economic progress, and human compassion."

2. "An austere budget need not be and should not be a standstill budget."

Let me close this discussion of the tapestry of public policy by noting several new steps in the executive branch focused both on enhancement of the decisionmaking process and on effective implementation through improved management.

First, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology, in concert with the White House Office of Science Adviser and the President's Science Advisory Committee represent an unprecedented capability of providing scientific and engineering advice to the President relevant to policy decisions at the White House level.

Secondly, working through the Federal Council for Science and Technology, the Government is developing a highly effective mechanism for coordination, by which a plurality of agencies having diverse missions that call on the same pool of scientific disciplines and the same pool of trained manpower can plan ahead and plan together.

Third, we are developing techniques of long-range planning so as to improve our understanding of the optimum mix of funds, facilities and manpower for effective conduct of research, and the long-term development of these resources to assure their availability when needed in quality as well as quantity.

Finally, we are planning on the principle that most R. & D. is publicly funded but privately performed—that the singular strength of our R. & D. enterprise is in large part due to the contribution, interplay and interdependence between Government, universities, and industry.

CONGRESSIONAL PARTNERSHIP IN DECISIONMAKING

To move on to a second entirely separate point regarding policy—it should be recalled that whereas the Executive proposes, it is the Congress that disposes. For the Congress is a full partner in the processes of policymaking. In our democratic form of government, it is the Congress that reflects the consensus of the American people as a whole. By its own studies, processes of hearings to elicit competing and colliding views from special interests, from expert witnesses and from the general public, and by investigations wherein it maintains surveillance over the Executive, the Congress tests the acceptability of Executive proposals and the effectiveness of implementation after assent.

In some instances, the Congress itself has seized initiative to develop policy and programs. Regardless of where the proposals originate, congressional support is crucial to action. For the Congress must appropriate funds and uses the budget to exercise its own judgment of priorities.

Congressional decisions on appropriations has been a significant factor in the recent fortunes of President Kennedy's oceanographic budget proposals.

A highly significant development in the Congress this year has been their undertaking of a special investigation of R. & D. spending under Congressman CARL ELLIOTT. Sparked by an awareness of unprecedented growth in funding, amidst a good deal of public confusion about objectives and processes, this study and one by Congressman DADDARIO are exceedingly welcome avenues to better and broader congressional understanding, especially on the manner in which science and engineering underpin almost all Federal programs and impinge on policy.

THE PRESENT POSTURE IN OCEANOGRAPHY

It is this framework of public policy that management of our oceanographic program can be examined as an exercise in applied political science.

The National Academy of Science Report of 1958 called for expansion in a $32 million a year activity to meet the visible scientific opportunities. Initiative was also taken in the Congress to "get the show on the road." What has been the Executive's response to this challenge?

Some growth was evident in fiscal year 1960 and 1961 appropriations. But immediately after his election, President Kennedy transmitted a supplemental budget to the Congress in which he explicitly requested fiscal year 1962 funding for oceanic research be raised to $105 million from $62 million the year before. Funding grew in fiscal year 1963 to $124 million. But despite Presidential requests for continued expansion in fiscal year 1964, congressional appropriations just equalled fiscal year 1963 levels.

In the fiscal year 1965 budget set before the Congress just 10 days ago, President Johnson has asked Congress for $138 million in oceanography.

If the Congress responds favorably, then during the past 5 years the Federal Government will have invested $134 million in new ships to construct a fleet expressly for oceanographic surveys and research for the first time in this Nation's history. These ships should begin to replace the inadequate, obsolete conversions we previously were obliged to employ. We will also have invested $39 million in new shore facilities. Most important, the annual support for the conduct of research and associated instrumentation will have grown from $15 million in fiscal year 1959 to $83 million for fiscal year 1965.

While these funds are not a large fraction of Federal R. & D. budgets, their size and growth must be measured in terms of the exceedingly small initial nucleus of activity. For this reason, these investments had a particular policy objective. In 1961 when President Kennedy made an intense review of our national capability, he decided that sound future growth made urgent the remedy of two serious shortages—trained scientitsts capable of specialized work in oceanography, and modern facilities—ships, computers, laboratories and instruments. We have thus concentrated our resources to improve the base of research, education and training on which this Nation can draw in the future to meet whatever requirements for an accelerated program that circumstances of practical need may require.

We especially wanted to strengthen the minuscle base of only 2,000 junior and senior scientists. We were persuaded that any systematic attack on the vast unknown areas of the ocean as the prelude to utilizing the ocean more effectively for man's benefit, critically required expansion in our small cadre of well-trained manpower. Parenthetically, we have recognized that only about 10 percent of our research investigators have been trained as oceanographers. The vast majority were trained in classical disciplines of physics, geology, biology, and have subsequently redirected their interests to problems in their field associated with the sea.

In short, because of the comparatively primitive state of this field in relation to its potential for the Nation, President Kennedy made a deliberate decision in 1961 that funding was required at a rate somewhat greater than for support of science across the board. This was a highly significant policy decision that should insure that this Nation will never again allow intellectual hibernation in our quest for knowledge and understanding of the sea. That momentum continues in fiscal year 1965.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1965 BUDGET

The $138 million oceanographic budget is consistent with stringent guidelines established for the budget as a whole. Nevertheless, this sector has been carefully tailored to maintain a growth in the effective cutting edge of research: The conduct of research and associated instrumentation is projected to grow to $83 million compared to $71 million in fiscal year 1964 and $59 million in fiscal year 1963. For research to grow 38 percent in 2 years while the program as a whole grew only 11 percent has been at the sacrifice mainly of new ship construction. It reflects a decision to hasten completion and evaluation of the new ships already funded so as to gain the benefit of seagoing experience with these floating laboratories and thus not perpetuate unexpected deficiencies in the first ship of a class by blindly building duplicates. Moreover, we are now on the threshold of a revolution in engineering of research tools. The new generation of oceanographic scientists may find advantages to unmanned buoys, aircraft, special platforms such as FLIP, submarines, and a host of other novel approaches that may influence future capital investments.

The fiscal year 1965 budget for oceanography, outlined in the appendix, reflects other policy considerations. First, when considered agency by agency, the primary source of growth is the Navy. This reveals a stronger determination to comprehend the environment in which our sea-based nuclear deterrents must operate and in which an increasing number of nuclear-propelled Soviet submarines now prowl. Budgets of some other agencies show little growth from last year, to some extent a reaction to congressional views. For in a tight budget year, operating officials are understandably reluctant to propose expansion in elements that have been consistently unpopular on Capitol Hill.

In any discussion of oceanographic budgets, it is important to note that there are many other activities not catalogued under this rubric which contribute directly and indirectly to the advance of knowledge and to expansion of the requisite resources of manpower and facilities. Research in classical disciplines cut across oceanography: in genetics, in geophysics, atmospheric sciences and water research, and contribute important fragments of answers to questions about the sea. The Navy's hydrodynamics and ASW program and NSF's Mohole do likewies in development of engineering knowledge concerned with building and operating ships, structures, vehicles and equipment.

In the training area, President Kennedy and now President Johnson put great stress on needs to broaden fellowship opportunities, facilities and improved geographical distribution of educational excellence for graduate study in engineering, mathematics and physical sciences. With congressional action favorably completed on parts of that program, and others now awaiting action at this session, an unparalleled opportunity exists in the area of ocean engineering for "new starts" of graduate students and for development of new curricula and training facilities.

POLICY DECISIONS FOR MANAGEMENT

While the budgets represent policy decisions on program balance and level, there has been a second dimension of Federal policy related to management. The stimulation of oceanography has been deemed in the national interest. But components of research are the responsibility of a number of separate agencies, and not the dominant responsibility of any single one. Along with a policy decision of increased support, there was also a decision made on how the program would be implemented. Alternatives were considered between strengthening programs in the agencies already having authority and jurisdictional interests, or excising this jurisdiction from each and combining these interests in a new Federal department of oceanography. Because of the relevance of research to the broader missions—defense, fisheries development, protection of public health, improved weather forecasting, etc., the first alternative was selected. Coordination then became essential. The Federal Council for Science and Technology, a new instrument of Government first established in 1959 as a "science cabinet" was given this responsibility, and it has exercised this function through its Interagency Committee on Oceanography.

We now regard the ICO as an evolving model of cooperative Federal effort, and a refutation of the belief that our departmental structure of government defies coordination. The ICO has reached a stage of development where (1) each year, a single national program reflecting efforts of 20 agencies is developed and presented as an integrated, Government-wide budget, categorized by agency and function; (2) annual increments are matched to a long-term plan which includes a statement of national goals, of agency roles, of ships, facilities and man-

power needed for achievement of objectives; (3) participating agencies plan ahead and plan together, establishing optimum levels of support, balance between fields; (4) programs are reviewed to minimize unwitting duplication and especially to identify gaps whose correction is vital to total effectiveness; (5) focal responsibility is assigned groups or agencies to fill these gaps; (6) oceanographic data are centrally collected, standardized, and distributed; (7) ship schedules are published in advance to permit efficient sharing and utilization of facilities; and (8) governmentwide manpower requirements and recruiting are coordinated.

I should also add that the long-range plan in oceanography is the first one developed for any field of science and has been a source of experience that is being widely applied.

Success for this activity can be attributed largely to the ICO chairman, Assistant Secretary of the Navy James Wakelin, to dedicated efforts of ICO members and to staff for generating a new pattern in Government wherein concern develops mutually for what is in the national interest as well as what is in the agency interest.

THE LOOK AHEAD IN FEDERAL OCEANIC RESEARCH

With 5 years of steady R. & D. growth, this should be a year of analysis—of stocktaking—a critical prelude to the future: to identify those scientific areas that would yield productively to more concerted attack, and those where knowledge is most urgently required so that we can more aggressively exploit the ocean for man's benefit, both for security and for our national welfare.

Federal patronizing of all scientific disciplines is motivated not as science for scientists, but because science serves mankind. The manner in which it will serve is often unforeseen, and the Federal Government as a policy matter is determined to support the present national investment in research and broaden the geographical base around centers of excellence for education and training in engineering and the sciences—to be sure that we are ready to meet the unexpected with research competence and specialized manpower ample in quality as well as quantity. Oceanographic research will continue to gain support in that broad context, at levels consistent with sound growth in this Nation's scientific enterprises.

It is clear that we are committed to a maturing program of research to enhance understanding about the oceans. But how about oceanic engineering development?

It is here that we see, within the R. & D. matrix, that except for defense and fisheries activity, our main efforts have been at the "R" end of the spectrum. In a sense, we are on the threshold of opportunity for oceanic development—to convert some of the dreams of ocean exploration and mining, of fish farming, into realities, to meet economic and social needs of the Nation. We will need sound ocean engineering, creative in concept, but practical in considering economic justification.

Who will pay for these developments? This is not at all clear. Most of these areas that transcend security are in the private sector of our economy. Will they need additional incentives for private investment? Is there a Federal role of investing seed capital in the national interest to encourage this development if the payoff is too remote to prove attractive to private investment?

It is here that we see such choices are not questions of research to be answered by scientists, but questions in the area of public policy—with decisions to be made by the Nation acting through their representatives.

BARRIERS TO PROGRESS

What factors may impede realization of this potential?

First and foremost, I would suggest inadequate depth to interest and to understanding of these policy issues by the general public and even by special interests. Last year the Congress did not convene hearings to examine the fiscal year 1964 program, the long-range program or issues related to oceanography as a whole. On the other hand, there were significant cuts in the mineral resources area in the Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines, with severe dislocation in the ICO coordinated program, because the President had proposed that these agencies undertake this portion of the program. Also, the National Science Foundation was assigned a major role in future oceanographic research. Their fiscal year 1964 budget proposal of $589 million took a major cut in the House to $323 million, and was restored to only $353 million in conference. Oceanic components were seriously jeopardized, yet few outside of the Executive branch undertook defense of their budget.

The second problem relates to coordination. While the Executive undertakes to develop a single coherent program of its 20 constituent agencies, the program is fragmented when reviewed by some 30 appropriation subcommittees in both Houses; it becomes vulnerable to cuts anywhere without reference to the program as a whole. This year we hope to assist the Congress in its budget review by having each agency submit a copy of the ICO report on the Governmentwide program, along with the agency's budget.

A third barrier lies in our not successfully blending together participation by industry with that of universities and Government. This triad of contributions has proved to be our source of technological supremacy in military defense; it is being vigorously exercised in our maturing space effort. Mutual suspicions between universities and industry must be eased if the unique contributions of each by enhanced engineering of research tools are to be fruitfully employed to bring oceanography into the 20th century.

A fourth barrier lies in the continued shortage of scientists and engineers to work on problems in the sea—particularly of those individuals who combine high training with talent for research, for program management and bold engineering leadership. Specialists are needed because most research in the oceans is problem-oriented; but we need more able generalists who can see forests as well as trees, and who can lead the Lewis and Clark expeditions of the 20th century.

A fifth barrier lies in historic lack of communication between research interests and regulatory bodies. We have taken many important legislative and administrative steps to conserve our resources. These decisions should be reevaluated in light of new data on resource reserves, on new principles of dynamic conservation, but especially in light of scientific results which can illuminate policy issues and reveal whether regulation, say of fishing techniques, reflect understanding of the total marine ecology. In a sense, we need better techniques for introducing feedback to the regulatory process so that it becomes more than a device for maintaining the status quo.

Yet, a sixth barrier lies in problems of staffing Federal, State, and local governments with their share of topnotch scientists and engineers. We have been fortunate to have exceedingly able people in Federal oceanographic research posts—men who understand both research opportunities and techniques for making a cumbersome bureaucracy work. If government is to play such a vital role in funding research in the oceans, and in utilizing results to make policy, government must be able to attract and retain more of its share of talent. There has been too long a deprecation of those who choose public service as a career. Steps of broader understanding are needed to assure that even if this activity is not sought for a lifelong career, the mobility in and out of government to industry and universities should be reciprocal. Disparate salary remains part of the problem, and continued steps are needed to assure equitability in compensation.

ISSUES BEFORE STATE GOVERNMENTS

To summarize—this Nation has vacillated in the past in its interest in the sea. The Executive has made a decision to comprehend it—to explore it—to exploit it for man's benefit. Such public policy decisions in a democracy must be endorsed through a consensus expressed in the Congress. To maintain our security, to help the hungry of the world to nutritional health, to develop our resources, to protect the oceans from pollution, to utilize their mystery and charm for recreation in an increasingly crowded and urbanized society—these are our goals. But to employ the oceans for man's benefit, and to dispose its resources as between competing uses wisely, it is necessary to forecast the manner in which acts of man impinge on his natural environment. To forecast accurately, man must understand his oceanic environment. Research is the key to that process.

I have listed some barriers to progress. Their correction must be a matter of public information, debate, and decision. Their resolution may well deserve and even depend upon action at State levels as well as at Federal levels.

In the first instance, it is necessary to bring together the users of our ocean resources with those who make public policy—and this makes sense at different levels of government because many local problems require local remedies. By such processes, it should be possible to anticipate problems in resource utilization before they arise, and, as in the case of pollution, become dangerous and exceedingly costly to correct.

It is the users of oceanic resources, and policymakers, who must generate more strenuous requirements on science as a partner in economic development and in intelligent decisionmaking. In fact, I cannot foresee the advance of oceanographic research in areas other than security, without such initiative. The historical deterioration of oceanography when we converted from sail to steam is a case in point. When user-needs vanished, research became sterile. In turn, scientists should illuminate the opportunities with more than platitudes—and communicate in practical language that users understand. Engineers and economists must work with scientists to translate these opportunities to realities.

As needs and opportunities become more visible, their diversity will also become evident. It will not be possible or desirable to solve these problems exclusively in Washington. The States may be obliged to take more initiative to fund research to meet their local problems. States may also establish coordinating mechanisms so that diverse elements of State government may move toward common goals. Through continuing conferences as this auspicious symposium, the public can be better informed; and industrial, academic and government interests and expertise blended together.

The State of California is richly—even uniquely—endowed with competence in both the oceanic sciences, and in engineering technology. It is in a position to translate new discoveries effectively to meet specific requirements. It has both public and private institutions which can contribute from a variety of experiences to solution of problems in natural science and in political science.

With Governor Brown's leadership, this symposium may be the first bridge. It may prove the catalyst for an effective course of future action that may well show how the Nation may more wisely exploit its heritage of oceanic resources.

National oceanographic plan budget

[In thousands]

	Actual, fiscal year 1963	Estimated, fiscal year 1964	President's budget, fiscal year 1965
A. By agencies:			
Defense	$55,475	$54,631	$66,619
Commerce	23,645	23,752	20,486
Interior	16,104	16,509	19,652
National Science Foundation	19,700	20,200	20,600
Atomic Energy Commission	3,516	4,167	4,730
Health, Education, and Welfare	4,108	2,855	3,280
Treasury	511	1,152	1,822
Smithsonian Institution	607	605	881
Total	123,666	123,871	138,070
B. Functional areas:			
Research	46,410	58,722	69,143
Instrumentation	6,658	6,386	9,110
Ships	37,250	27,387	21,350
Surveys	18,036	21,916	25,014
IIOE	5,802	5,582	3,979
Facilities	8,875	2,937	8,420
Data Center	635	941	1,054
Total	123,666	123,871	138,070

Individual agency budgets

[In thousands]

Agency and function	Actual, fiscal year 1963	Estimated, fiscal year 1964	President's budget, fiscal year 1965
Defense, total	$55,475	$54,631	$66,619
Navy, total	54,850	53,557	65,506
Research	19,900	26,426	32,278
Instrumentation	5,500	4,455	6,649
Ship construction	18,200	8,200	9,100
Surveys	9,600	12,944	14,704
IIOE	1,300	803	250
Facilities		233	2,000
Data Center	350	496	525
Army, total	625	1,074	1,113
Research	625	1,074	1,113
Commerce, total	23,645	23,752	20,486
Coast and Geodetic Survey, total	23,412	23,519	20,203
Research	394	839	650
Instrumentation	768	973	850
Ship construction	14,400	13,000	9,000
Surveys	7,505	8,109	9,101
IIOE		125	75
Facilities	265	332	360
Data Center	80	141	167
Weather Bureau, total	183	183	233
Research	173	165	208
Data Center	10	18	25
Maritime Administration, total	50	50	50
Research	50	50	50
Interior, total	16,104	16,509	19,652
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, total	15,320	15,494	18,210
Research	9,747	11,757	13,499
Instrumentation	70	120	150
Ship construction	2,650	3,107	1,700
Surveys	20	20	40
IIOE	102	154	154
Facilities	2,651	915	2,500
Data Center	80	141	167

Individual agency budgets—Continued

[In thousands]

Agency and function	Actual, fiscal year 1963	Estimated, fiscal year 1964	President's budget, fiscal year 1965
Interior,—Continued			
Geological Survey, total	$496	$498	998
Research	476	474	778
Instrumentation	20	24	150
Surveys			20
Facilities			30
Data Center			20
Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, total	238	464	262
Research	238	257	262
Facilities		127	
Ship construction		80	
Bureau of Mines, total	50	53	182
Research	50	53	104
Instrumentation			48
Ship construction			
Surveys			30
Data Center			
National Science Foundation, total	19,700	20,200	20,600
Research	9,200	10,600	12,000
Ship construction	2,000	3,000	1,500
IIOE	4,400	4,500	3,500
Facilities	4,000	2,000	3,500
Data Center	100	100	100
Atomic Energy Commission, total	3,516	4,167	4,730
Research	3,501	4,142	4,705
Data Center	15	25	25
Health, Education, and Welfare, total	4,108	2,855	3,280
Public Health Service, total	4,058	2,805	3,230
Research	1,558	2,230	2,505
Instrumentation		45	45
Surveys	700	530	680
Facilities	1,800		
Office of Education, total	50	50	50
Research	50	50	50
Treasury, total	511	1,152	1,822
Coast Guard, total	511	1,152	1,822
Research			60
Instrumentation	300	769	1,218
Ship construction			50
Surveys	211	313	439
Facilities		50	30
Data Center		20	25
Smithsonian, total	607	605	881
Research	448	605	881
Facilities	159		

James Preston Williamson, Successful Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, South Carolina and the Nation have lost a very distinguished and dedicated citizen in the passing last Sunday of Mr. James Preston Williamson of both Belton and Greenville, S.C. Mr. Williamson rose from humble beginnings to president of a chain of grocery stores in South Carolina and finally as vice president and regional director for an enlarged chain of stores extending across the Southeast.

Mr. Williamson was not only a successful businessman, but he was also noted as an eminent and highly respected civic leader in his community and throughout South Carolina.

As a businessman, he brought many innovations to the grocery business and attained particular acclaim for the high quality of the personal service to customers which he fostered in all of his stores.

Mr. President, I feel a deep personal loss in the passing of this great citizen, and I wish to honor his memory here today by having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials, one from the Greenville News of March 3, 1964, and another from the Greenville Piedmont of March 2, 1964. Both of these editorials pay high tribute to Mr. Williamson and his many deeds of honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 3, 1964]

JAMES PRESTON WILLIAMSON

The saga of the rise of James Preston Williamson, of Belton and Greenville, from the smallest of beginnings to a position of regional leadership in the highly competitive grocery business would be enough to give his friends and fellow citizens great pride, if that were all of the story.

But his business success is only a part of the story of the fast-paced, dynamic, productive and full life of the late Mr. Williamson. His full name probably surprised most people when they read it in the news story of his untimely death, for to one and all he was "J. P." Williamson, or just plain "J. P." The latter was sufficient identification, for there was only one.

In almost every major effort or project for the improvement of the community and many for the State as a whole, the name of J. P. Williamson was someway connected, most often in the background during the last 20 years of his life.

Though he had the gift of inspired personal leadership and the knack for getting things done personally, he probably was at his best in choosing leaders, delegating to them authority to do a job and backing them to the limit.

He practiced this in his business and he based his bid for success on high quality, accessibility, and as much personal service to the customer as the size of the operation permitted. As an executive he missed most the daily associations with store personnel and patrons.

He practiced it also in his civic and public service. For many years he was in the forefront, dreaming of plans for progress and daring to put them into effect. For instance, he served twice as president of the Greenville Chamber of Commerce and as first chairman of the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission.

In later years, his interests were so many and so broad in scope that he let others take the lead, but the word that J. P. Williamson was behind a cause meant that he was backing it all the way and it was usually enough to insure its success.

Only those immediately involved know that for many years Mr. Williamson had been spending most of his time doing things

for Greenville, for South Carolina, and his fellow citizens. He did them quietly and quickly in a manner which matched his almost brusque, staccato but soft speech. Once they were done, he wanted nothing more said about them.

A simple case in point was his involvement in the "stop polio" campaign of the Greenville County foundation and the county medical society. As a foundation trustee, he gave his full support at every step.

He solved the problem of getting Dr. Albert Sabin, discoverer of the oral vaccine, to Greenville to help assure success of the local and statewide program by dispatching his personal executive airplane to carry a delegation to Cincinnati to persuade the brilliant man to come.

On the appointed date, Mr. Williamson again sent his plane to pick up the busy scientist at the end of his workday and return him the next morning in time to resume his research and studies at the usual hour.

This was to him small, but big to others and entirely typical. Just as typical was his promotion of private aviation during his years as an active and expert pilot before World War II, when he was a top officer in the Civil Air Patrol, and afterwards when aviation generally began to boom and private planes for executive use became commonplace.

Thus by example and leadership did he influence the course of events for the betterment of the community, State, and region. He never sought, even shunned public recognition, but when Clemson College conferred upon him in 1959 the well earned honorary degree of doctor of industry, there wasn't a member of the class who was more elated over the feeling that accompanies commencement. On that occasion his capacity for warm personal relationships, his character and contagious enthusiasm were at their delightful best.

These things, like his gallant fight for life against desperate odds when his final illness struck, gave insight into the soul of a man of spirit and courage and a great personality.

It is not right to say that any man is indispensable, and J. P. Williamson would dispute it. But he is irreplaceable in the community which is so much better for his having lived and worked in it.

All of us who knew him have lost a dear friend and the community has lost a great benefactor. We shall miss him and we grieve with his family as we offer our deepest sympathy.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Mar. 2, 1964]

J. P. WILLIAMSON DIES

James Preston Williamson, vice president of Winn-Dixie Stores, was a man who never lost touch with the ultimate and decisive contributor to his astounding mercantile success—the customer.

He started in the grocery business in Belton in a day when a merchant pleased a customer, completely pleased him—or lost him. That was in the early twenties.

Satisfaction for the customer was his credo. It was reflected in the first grocery he operated, being the leading one in the community. It was reflected in his and his associates making that first store the nucleus of a chain of food stores. It was reflected in consequent mergers that made his chain a partner in an enterprise that extended supermarket service throughout the southeast and which satisfied, pampered, and guided into new areas the eating habits of a vast region.

Mr. Williamson died in Greenville—his adopted home—yesterday. Death brought to an end a career which was marked by a basic dedication to fair dealing, a desire to put bright, clean, efficient, and accessible stores where need existed and the courage to try innovation if it promised benefits to his customers.

Constituent Writes on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are most anxious to receive mail from their constituents back home, for it helps us to appraise and evaluate the feelings of our people. I can sense from my mail that the American people are becoming very restive over our deteriorating situation throughout the world. We are suffering one defeat after another—at the conference table, in the rice paddies of South Vietnam and on the streets of Panama. The Atlantic Alliance has some gaping holes, and the once isolated Red Chinese are the beneficiaries. We talk about an economic blockade of Castro's Cuba, but we open up the floodgates by trading ourselves on an ever-increasing scale with the Soviet Union upon whom Castro depends for his lifeblood.

Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Elbert H. Miller, 1416 Lincoln Avenue, Pekin, Ill., has taken the time to "write his Congressman for the first time," and I should like to include the full text of his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD; for the thoughts and sentiments he expresses so well are being repeated over and over in increasing tempo throughout my congressional district:

PEKIN, ILL.

Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MICHEL: I am ashamed to admit that this is the first time I have written to you. I must admit that I am one of those "lethargic Americans" who complains a lot but does nothing. Now that I have broken the ice, I hope to do better in the future.

Although I am an engineer by profession and know nothing about political science or law, I and my wife are both deeply concerned over our foreign policy. When evaluating our policies and their results, since World War II, it seems to me that the free world has steadily and surely lost ground to communism. More alarming than ever, it appears that we are capitulating at a constantly higher rate. When I pick up the local paper, the front page is full of trouble—Cambodia, Zanzibar, Cuba, Laos, South Vietnam, Panama, Cypress. It is obvious that our programs of aid and advice such as it is, have not worked, time after time. In fact, I can recall no successes since perhaps Greece right after World War II.

In my research work, when we try something new and it fails two or three times we discard that method or process and try something new. Why won't this idea work in Government also? I see no percentage in making the same mistakes over and over again. We would be better off to do nothing than to do something which apparently damages us rather than helps us.

I do not mean to accuse any one person or administration for the mistakes of the past. Those are "sunk costs" so to speak. I believe that we should stop worrying about who did what and concentrate on the future. Also, I get the feeling that many of our officials are afraid to tell the truth and admit our failures. We are not children, neither are we blind. We can stand the truth and want to know it even when it is bad. As far as its impact on our foreign image, I don't believe we fool anyone abroad either. Everyone makes mistakes, there is no crime in that.

I feel that we should:

1. Stand firm against communism and give not one more inch. I feel that the attitude held by some that, "A balance of power among the great powers of the world will end the cold war and solve all our problems" is pure suicide.

2. Agree to no more coalition governments. I don't believe there is any such thing. They are either for us or against us.

3. Either win the war in South Vietnam or get out.

4. Stop aid to any country who supports or condones communism in any form.

5. Stop trading with any Communist country. If not this, for Heaven's sake don't find fault with those who do, e.g. British buses.

Respectfully yours,

ELBERT H. MILLER.

Franconia College, New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the opening of Franconia College in New Hampshire last September revealed another inspiring example of the response of the business community to meeting the challenges of today's educational needs.

When the financing arrangements for opening this 2-year college appeared doomed, 10 New Hampshire banks immediately stepped in to offer their resources for furthering educational opportunities in New Hampshire. Three State savings banks located in Manchester, Littleton, and Laconia joined with the Berlin Savings Bank & Trust Co., Colebrook Guaranty Savings Bank, Siwooganock Guaranty Savings Bank, Lisbon Savings Bank & Trust Co., Plymouth Guaranty Savings Bank, Whitefield Savings Bank & Trust Co., and Woodsville Guaranty Savings Bank in underwriting a $325,000 mortgage which enabled Franconia College to open its doors last fall to 85 students representing 15 States and three foreign countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the February issue of the Savings Bank Journal entitled "Backing by New Hampshire Bankers Stimulates Development of College," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKING BY NEW HAMPSHIRE BANKERS STIMULATES DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGE

The story of Franconia College in New Hampshire is one of ambitious plans, perseverance, and strong community feeling.

It is also a story which reflects the enterprise and imagination of 10 of New Hampshire's financial institutions, including 3 of the State's mutual savings banks: Manchester, Littleton, and Laconia.

Several years ago, the trustees of Dow Academy started mapping plans for a new, 2-year college to be located on the site of the former academy. A 15-year, $7 million program was adopted to set the wheels in motion.

Even before the basic designs were taken off the drawingboards, a New Hampshire resort hotel—with property and facilities that were tailormade for the new college—became available for immediate purchase.

It offered more than adequate faculty and classrooms, over 100 sleeping rooms, a large dining room, a modern and completely equipped kitchen, plus 250 acres of land including a 9-hole golf course, tennis courts, swimming pool, bridle paths, and three cottages for administrative use.

Converting a summer resort into a year-round college campus would take work and ingenuity. Desks and blackboards, library facilities, and workshop equipment would have to be installed. The main building would have to be winterized. In all, however, this property would amply serve the college during its formative years, and eliminate the need to construct a completely new campus.

Time was essential for two reasons. The seller had established a deadline, and the date scheduled for the college opening (September 1963) was less than a year off.

Good fortune smiled upon the project. A benefactor offered $325,000 to finance the entire cost of the operation, and the commitment was made.

In the midst of the transactions, the benefactor died, leaving no written instructions of his wish to finance the college. Doubts arose and hopes diminished of meeting the 1963 opening.

At this point, the board of trustees of Franconia College turned to the State's savings banks for help.

Experienced college officials, realtors, appraisers and bank representatives set the value of the property, as a college site, in excess of half a million dollars. Some estimated its value at about three-quarters of a million dollars. Notwithstanding, no single financial institution would take on such a mortgage.

Manchester Savings Bank started the ball rolling. It would favorably view a plan that had the participation of other financial institutions, particularly if they were from the northern part of the State and neighbors of the college.

Littleton Savings Bank, 6 miles north of Franconia, readily agreed to join the project and also offered help in selling it. Other banks were approached. The buying deadline was met and quick decisions were made. The $325,000 mortgage was underwritten by 10 banks in record time.

In addition to Manchester, Littleton, and Laconia Savings Banks, the following New Hampshire institutions participated in the mortgage: Berlin Savings Bank & Trust Co., Colebrook Guaranty Savings Bank, Siwooganock Guaranty Savings Bank, Lisbon Savings Bank & Trust Co., Plymouth Guaranty Savings Bank, Whitefield Savings Bank & Trust Co., and Woodsville Guaranty Savings Bank.

On September 15, Franconia College opened its doors to a class of 85 students, representing 15 States and three foreign countries. John Fallon, Holy Cross and University of Michigan graduate, attorney at law and student of international relations, former provost at Nasson College, is its first president. "We are a college which stresses individual growth and self-reliance," he said. "For this reason, we are especially pleased that we are building the college by ourselves, and are grateful to the banks for showing such faith in us."

Dean Robert G. Greenway, University of Washington graduate and candidate for a doctorate at Brandeis University, expressed these aims: To develop a 2-year institution with one program to provide preprofessional or specialized vocational training, and another to give a liberal arts foundation to students who will transfer later to a 4-year institution.

W. Grant McIntosh, vice president of the school and well-known New Hampshire businessman, is directly responsible for the development program, and is the person who forged the successful financial transaction with the 10 New Hampshire banks.

The students of Franconia are already taking an active part in local affairs and community work programs. Letters and applications from all parts of the country indicate that classes will probably double by the fall semester. Other hopes for expansion are being realized at this writing.

In years to come, Franconia College will turn out professional people and businessmen who will serve their communities and enrich the lives of their families. The story would not be the same if a group of bankers had not viewed a financial transaction with their hearts as well as their heads.

Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority Is an Effective Instrument in the Economic Life of the Keystone State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, one of the many economic tools employed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylavnia in developing its economy is the Pensylvania Industrial Develpoment Authority, commonly referred to as PIDA and under the chairmanship of John K. Tabor, secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Commerce.

On January 21, 1964 Secretary Tabor made the following announcement:

HARRISBURG.—Secretary of Commerce and Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority Board Chairman John K. Tabor today announced that the PIDA Board gave tentative approval for industrial loans totaling $396,800 to 8 projects which are expected to create an additional 841 new jobs for Pennsylvanians with a total payroll of $2,663,404. The applications for the loans were approved today by the PIDA Board at its monthly meeting.

The board also gave approval to three applications by local industrial development agencies for credits on loans made by the communities when they were required to supply 20 percent of the project cost.

The credits were made possible by an amendment to the PIDA law passed by the 1963 legislature. The change was made to make more community money available to the older, successful local industrial development agencies who had been operating when the 20-percent participation for communities was required. Under the present law, the local communities are now required to supply 10 percent of the loans for manufacturing projects.

The Greater Pottsville Industrial Development Corp. will receive credits of $40,000 and $20,000 to help finance additions for the Quartite Creative Corp. and the United Metal Cabinet Corp., respectively. The Greater Erie Industrial Development Corp. will receive a credit of $14,905.42 to help finance a new building for a manufacturing company.

In other actions of the board, six loan applications for a total of $498,920 were given final approval.

The following are the loan applications which were given tentative approval by the board:

Allentown: An application by Lehigh's Economic Advancement Project, Inc., for a loan of $69,200 to be used by the Allen Electronics, Inc., for the construction of a new building to house expanded manufacturing operations. Within 3 years, an estimated 134 new jobs are expected to be created.

Another application by Lehigh's Economic Advancement Projects, Inc., for a loan of $36,000 to be used for the construction of a new building for expansion purposes. An estimated 68 new jobs are expected to be created within 3 years.

Beaver Springs: An application by the Beaver Springs Area Development, Inc., for a loan of $14,000 to be used by J. R. Davis Manufacturing Co. for an addition for expansion. Within 2 years, an estimated 20 new jobs are expected to be created.

Berwick: An application by Spirit, Inc., for a loan of $41,600 to be used for acquisition of a building to house manufacturing operations, which will, within 2 years, create an estimated 51 new jobs.

Pittston: An application by the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce for a loan of $46,000 to be used for acquisition and renovation in a removal of a manufacturing operation from out of State. This project will create an estimated 95 new jobs within 1 year.

Another application by the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce for a loan of $20,000 to be used by WIPCO, Inc., for a project which will create an estimated 35 new jobs within 1 year.

Scranton: An application by the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Co., for a loan of $70,000 to be used for the expansion of an existing industry. An estimated 338 additional jobs are expected to be created within 5 years.

Winber: An application by the Community Development Association of Winber for a loan of $100,000 to be used by Bestform Foundations of Winber, Inc., in an addition for expansion of present facilities. Within 2 years, an estimated 100 new jobs will be created.

Final approval was given by the Board for the following loan applications:

Altoona: An application by Altoona Enterprises, Inc., for a loan of $96,000 for the construction of a new building to house an expanded manufacturing operation.

Berwick: An application by the Berwick Industrial Development Association, Inc., for a loan of $120,000 to be used by the Fulton Manufacturing Co., Inc., in an addition for expansion.

Huntingdon: An application by Huntingdon Business & Industry, Inc., for a loan of $48,000 to be used by Gerbo Footwear Corp., for an expansion project.

Pottsville: An application by the Greater Pottsville Industrial Development Corp. for a loan of $80,000 to be used by the United Metal Cabinet Corp. for an addition to present facilities.

Scranton: An application by the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Co. for a loan of $84,000 to be used by A. Leventhal &

Sons, Inc., for expansion and relocation purposes.

Washington: An application by the Washington Industrial Development Corp. for a loan of $70,920 to be used for the construction of a new building to house expanded manufacturing operations.

Great Lakes Fisheries Need Help Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, legislation of great importance to the commercial fishing industry of the United States currently is under consideration in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee began hearings on this subject on Tuesday, March 3, and I was privileged to submit the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, in contrast with the huge outlays for farm subsidies over the years, our expenditures for assistance to the fisheries of this Nation have indeed been meager. Congress has appropriated billions for price support programs, conservation payments and other benefits for the producers of food from the land. We have too long neglected the producers of food from the water. The United States has dropped from second place to fifth place among the fishing nations of the world and our commercial fisheries rank among our most seriously depressed industries.

I congratulate your committee for focusing attention on this problem. Before you are numerous bills authorizing Federal grants to States for research and development projects beneficial to the commercial fisheries of this Nation.

I strongly recommend enactment of such legislation.

At the same time I believe that it is necessary to emphasize that these research and development programs look to the future. They are essential to halt the deterioration of our fisheries and to promote their future growth. In my judgment, however, the economic plight of our fisheries, particularly those of the Great Lakes, demands that we also consider more immediate forms of assistance to the fishermen and other people who depend on this industry for their livelihood.

As Representative of a congressional district with a long shoreline on Lake Superior, the largest of the Great Lakes, I have an intimate knowledge of the distressing conditions that have plagued the fishermen and fish processors of that vast area. Let me cite a few statistics, furnished to me by Gerald E. Eddy, director of the Michigan State Department of Conservation. From 1949 to 1960 the value of the annual production of fish from U.S. waters of the Great Lakes declined from almost $14 million to around $7 million. The volume of the fish caught during those years remained fairly stable, declining 13 percent while the value of the catch declined 43 percent. Due largely to the depredations of sea lampreys, low-value fish have replaced high-value fish in the Great Lakes catch.

The eel-like lampreys invaded the Great Lakes through the Welland Canal in the late 1940's. They virtually destroyed the trout, whitefish, and other high-priced species. Our commercial fishing industry was threatened with extinction. I need not dwell too long on the lamprey problem. This committee is well aware of it. Our people will always be grateful for this committee's approval of the lamprey control program being carried out by the Great Lakes Commission in cooperation with Canada. Our people have been heartened by the progress made in ridding Lake Superior of lamprey through chemical treatment of tributary streams where they spawn. This, too, is a long-range program, however. Fewer trout with the telltale lamprey wounds are being caught in Lake Superior and the lake is being restocked. But production of high-quality fish is still severely restricted and will be for several years.

Another cruel blow was dealt the Great Lakes fishing industry last fall when several deaths from botulism poisoning were traced to smoked fish from our area. The evidence indicated that deadly toxin developed in the fish through careless handling in transit after it left the processing plant. No blame attached to either fishermen or processors but they were the ones who were hurt. The Food and Drug Administration issued a strong warning against Great Lakes smoked fish. It then imposed rigid standards on the industry, requiring that smoked fish from the area be frozen and kept frozen until purchased by the consumer. The FDA thus forced drastic changes in the traditional methods of processing and merchandising this product.

All this had a disastrous effect on the Great Lakes fishing industry. As the market for their catch virtually vanished, the fishermen kept their boats tied up and processors shut down their plants. Some 20,000 worker layoffs were reported in the industry.

In a parallel situation a few years ago the Department of Agriculture made indemnity payments totalling $8½ million to cranberry growers to reimburse them for financial losses resulting from an FDA finding that some of the 1959 cranberry crop had been contaminated through misuse of a chemical weed killer. The Comptroller General ruled that the languge of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 was sufficently broad to allow such payments to be made from the 30-percent share of customs' receipts appropriated annually to the Department of Agriculture. Section 32 provides that this money may be used, among other things, "to reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption."

In 1954 the Congress passed the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, transferring section 32 money derived from fish imports to the Secretary of the Interior for research programs to benefit domestic fisheries. From the $5,340,000 available for this purpose during the current fiscal year, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has programmed projects in the Great Lakes region costing $538,800.

I wrote to the late President Kennedy last fall and urged that the administration consider an indemnity payment program for Great Lakes fisherman, financed by section 32 funds. In its reply to my letter, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries said that legislation would be necessary before such a program could be undertaken because the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, unlike section 32 itself, contains no authority for payments to producers.

I have, therefore, introduced H.R. 9784, a bill to authorize payments to reestablish the purchasing power of American fishermen suffering temporary economic dislocation. Enactment of this bill would clear the way for indemnity payments to the Great Lakes fishing industry similar to those made to restore the purchasing power to cranberry growers 5 years ago. It is my understanding that this committee has requested reports from the appropriate departments on my bill and similar bills which have been introduced by others. I urge you to request the departments to expedite their reports so that no time will be lost in extending assistance to the Great Lakes fishing industry in its time of need.

As for the bills before you this morning, I reiterate my support of them in principle. They all propose a program of Federal matching grants to the States for commercial research and development projects.

* * * * *

I do have some reservations, however, about the allocation formula in the bill passed by the other body, S. 627. The committee report states that the funds will be allocated among the various States on the basis of a formula designed to give each State a share proportionate with its commercial fishing activity as compared with the total commercial fishery activity of the United States. At first glance this appears to be a fair and equitable arrangement. But closer study reveals that the allocations are to be based on the value of each State's catch of fresh fish and the value of all "manufactured and processed fishery merchandise" during the 3 most recent calendar years. This was a period of deep depression for the Great Lakes fishing industry, due to the high toll taken by lampreys of the high-value fish and the loss of markets for lower value species during the botulism scare.

The Great Lakes States are further discriminated against by provisions in S. 627 permitting an individual State to receive as much as 10 percent of the entire fund and offering any State, no matter how insignificant its fisheries, a minimum grant of one-half of 1 percent of the total amount. The effect will be to give most Great Lakes States the minimum grant of $25,000 each. The same amount goes to States remote from large bodies of water such as Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia. A footnote to a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries table in the Senate report says these States were given minimum allocations although the Bureau has no record of their having commercial fishing or manufacturing.

Two States, California, because of its large processing industry, and Alaska, would qualify for maximum 10-percent grants of $500,000 under S. 627. Massachusetts would receive $450,000; Texas, $324,000; Louisiana, $267,500; Maine, $240,000; Florida, $239,500; Washington, $227,500; and Virginia, $208,000.

While recognizing the importance of commercial fishing to these coastal States, I believe that a 5-percent ceiling on the amount of grant any one State could receive, as recommended by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in its report on similar legislation during the 87th Congress, would be more equitable. To avoid dissipating a considerable portion of the funds among States with negligible commercial fishing activities, we should not fix any minimum grant.

In addition to the $5 million annually that would be allocated under the formula, section 4(b) of S. 627 authorizes the appropriation of $500,000 for 2 fiscal years and $750,000 for 3 additional fiscal years to an interstate cooperative fund administered by the Secretary of the Interior. In the distribution of this money the Secretary would be required to give priority to any State that is either experiencing a commercial-fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes or is in a position to develop a new commercial fishery.

In its January 8, 1964, report to this committee recommending enactment of S. 627, the Department of the Interior called this a "highly desirable provision" because it would enable the Secretary to act expeditiously and effectively to alleviate the effects of a natural disaster to a fishing industry. The lamprey invasion of the Great Lakes is the type of natural disaster for which additional assist-

ance could be provided under this program. I, therefore, concur in the Department's view that the provision is "highly desirable." It should be emphasized, however, that the allocations under this provision are to be made entirely at the discretion of the Secretary. Creation of the disaster fund does not overcome the basic inequities in this bill that discriminate against the Great Lakes States.

A Comparatively Inexpensive Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most articulate spokesmen on behalf of our private enterprise system is Joseph T. Meek, executive secretary of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and editor of its publication, Retail News Briefs.

In commenting upon the most critical need of the day, namely the training and preparation of men and women for jobs in our private enterprise system, Joe Meek has compared this challenge to the much more expensive Urban Renewal program. His pointed remarks are of particular significance because of the need of our Negro citizens to prepare for and secure employment.

Joe Meek's timely comments on this subject follow:

A comparatively inexpensive urban renewal program, one that has a chance of getting off the ground without huge taxes and without Federal controls, is the one which simply involves teaching the "new population" in our cities how to get a job, hold a job, want a job. On top of that, this program can save huge sums of money.

It's a combination welfare and school program. It has already cut relief-welfare costs in Cook County by about $31 million (giving the State one of its biggest hopes for avoidance of huge tax increases in 1965). It teaches tens of thousands of citizens how to read, to write, to figure, to want jobs, to have pride in working, to stay at work and away from relief rolls. It could even go so far as to necessitate a certificate of a try before an applicant could get relief.

What price urban renewal, what price all the brave plans in the world, if the big, swelling population is trained only for idleness and relief; if it is accustomed to live in tax-built dwellings as wards instead of renters? This department doesn't believe urban renewal has a chance anywhere—at any cost—unless the new people of many of our cities are given a chance to be productive citizens.

To have an income, to be proud of work, to want to work, is the only essential for a customer. Black, white, yellow, brown—creed and/or racial origin, all customers react to good merchandising, to promotions, to fair credit, to drama, to color, to desire. The only worrisome change in a neighborhood is not in the color or the race; it's in the ability of the individual to not only want a job but have the qualifications to fill it.

There's a lot of nonsense about neighborhood renewal. The realism comes in the grubby, costly job of giving tomorrow's customers a chance to be customers and not wards of the State. The cost of the former would be infinitely less than the cost of the latter—in not alone your money, but in self-respect, in the retention of the Republic.

Urban renewal, based on any other premise, can only beautify at the expense of the taxpayers. It comes at the expense of thousands of dislocated and disillusioned small business men hustled away, relocated into oblivion, or seduced into silence. You can never recompense the sturdy neighborhood businessman for years of goodwill, dedication to neighborhood building, and reputation.

This is not a Chicago program. Everywhere, where population rolls are swollen but volume is down; everywhere where the big talk is "let Government do it"; ability to get a job and hold it must come first.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if government spent one-fifth as much for education for jobs as it contemplates doing for urban renewal?

Corn Belt Electric Co-op Marks Silver Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartiest congratulations to the Corn Belt Electric Co-op of Bloomington, Ill., on their silver anniversary. I also extend best wishes to my good friend Ted Hafer, the co-op manager.

The Spoon River Co-op and the Illinois Valley Co-op are two electric cooperatives serving my district, and like Corn Belt, are very much interested in getting electricity to the farms. In addition, these central Illinois co-ops I feel are similar in their desires to move rapidly toward operation independent of the Federal Government. I think this is most commendable.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include at this point an article appearing in the February 19, 1964, issue of the Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph, followed by an editorial from that same paper dated February 22, 1964:

CORN BELT ELECTRIC CO-OP MARKS SILVER ANNIVERSARY—LONG WAY FROM WICKS, CHIMNEYS

(Paul Hudelson)

Twenty-five years is a generation.

The Corn Belt Electric Co-op started its second generation yesterday afternoon at the Co-op building.

Over 500 patrons and their wives were on hand to celebrate the silver anniversary of their cooperative, and to pay respects to several founding incorporators, directors, employees and others who helped get things rolling in 1938–39.

Some of these folks are still active in the administration of the co-op, others are still users of the electric services furnished now to some 6,300 meters in McLean, De Witt, Logan, Macon, Piatt, Tazewell and Woodford Counties.

SCROLLS PRESENTED

Of the original nine incorporators and directors, Ethel Moon and Walter Risser are deceased. Parchment-like scrolls were presented to all 25-year "old-timers" who were present. W. B. Ellis, Homer Jackel, Harry A. Miller and Ivan H. Snow (present secretary-treasurer) received their scrolls from Ted Hafer, manager—and another 25-year man.

Co-op attorney W. R. Bach read the known list of some 150 of the sign-up volunteers—and at the close of the meeting, almost a third of these had called for their parchments. Bach is also of the silver anniversary "class."

Secretary Snow, in his annual report, mused at the early concern of the founders concerning power use. "We were afraid that we might not be able to get enough cooperators to use even the (then) minimum 40 kilowatts per month. In recent months, use has been as high as 750 kws. in our system."

DECADE OF PROGRESS

In other reports, the financial statement compared 1963 with 1953 and showed a co-op revenue increase from $733,000 to $1,203,000. The patronage capital has been accumulated to about 60 percent of the assets of the co-op. The REA loan is currently down to approximately a million dollars, said Snow.

Electric power use has increased steadily, Hafer noted. In 1963, the co-op members used 48,399,000 kilowatt-hours. Attorney Bach reviewed recent statements made in a popular digest magazine, as well as other past and current criticism made public in recent months. He reemphasized the position of Corn Belt Electric—and co-ops in general—in the current co-op-utilities situation in Illinois.

John J. Knuppel, attorney for the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives, used parts of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address as a parody of the electric power struggle touched on earlier by Bach. The issue, reported and editorialized on these pages in the past, seems to stem around a "range war" type of "fencing in," according to Knuppel.

FIRST FAMILY

Attitudes on both sides, legislation in Springfield, and the authority and powers of the Commerce Commission are major components of any settlements, it was noted.

Co-op employees present who were honored were: Don Allen, Glenn L. Meeker, Beulah M. Miller, R. E. Reiman and Forrest G. Stahly.

As Mr. and Mrs. Frank Nelson mused: "We've come a long ways from wick trimmers and lamp chimneys." They were the first family to have lights in the system back in August 1939.

[From the Bloomington (Ill.) Daily Pantagraph, Feb. 22, 1964]

CO-OP ESCHEWS SUBSIDY

The Cornbelt Electric Cooperative made a significant announcement at its 25th anniversary meeting recently. The board of directors declared, "We believe that today the Cornbelt Electric Cooperative does not need any subsidy which might be afforded by 2 percent money and in conformity with such beliefs have refrained from borrowing from REA." Expansion and development come from revenues.

The board also explained that the last money borrowed from REA was at a time when the cost of money to the Government was less than 2 percent and that therefore the board does not think those original loans were subsidies. This loan is being paid off on or ahead of schedule, according to the official report.

The board did observe that in sparse areas of low member use, the low interest rate is still necessary to insure and support area coverage.

All power used by the Cornbelt Electric Cooperative is purchased from the private utility companies in this area, thus making the electric co-op one of the largest customers of private utilities.

The co-op board stressed in its philosophy that it is owned and controlled by the consumers who live in central Illinois and that it is in no sense a governmental agency.

Capital credits are passed on to the members using the electricity.

The only justification of governmental help is in areas where private business cannot or will not fill the need. This is the case when rural electric cooperatives were formed.

A corollary is that Government should pull out as rapidly as new enterprises can go it alone. It is good to know that the directors of the Cornbelt Electric Cooperative agree and that they are moving rapidly toward operation independent of the Federal Government.

Case Against Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a committee of the Organization of American States has confirmed U.S. charges that Castro's Cuba trained and supplied the guerrillas who recently tried to overthrow the legal Government of Venezuela. It is evident that Castro's machinations pose a threat not so much to us as to our Latin American neighbors. It is our responsibility, however, to see that emerging democracies such as Venezuela can direct their resources toward economic development free from the harassment of Cuba-trained mercenaries. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the February 27 issue of the Washington Post which candidly points out the real danger of an ostrichlike attitude to Communist Cuba.

CASE AGAINST CUBA

The solemn judgment against Cuba handed down by a committee of the Organization of American States has one enormous virtue. It comes at a fortuitous moment when there is an increasing European tendency to shrug off Castro as a neurotic U.S. obsession—a tendency, it should be added, that fumbling diplomacy here has helped to abet. The OAS report makes it clear that Cuban subversion is not an empty fantasy, and that concern about Castro is not confined to the United States.

The record should underscore what is involved. Four influential Latin American countries (Uruguay, Argentina, Costa Rica and Colombia) have joined with the United States in confirming charges that Cuba did indeed train guerrillas and ship arms with the purpose of overthrowing the elected Government of Venezuela.

European skeptics may well dismiss the charge, pointing out that the CIA also engaged in similar activities at the time of the Bay of Pigs. Yet it should be noted that the U.S.-backed effort, no matter how ineptly handled, was aimed at the restoration of democratic self-government in Cuba. It is one thing to say that the Cuban invasion was wrong in conception and execution, but quite another to excuse subversion practiced by a totalitarian dictatorship by equating it with support for prodemocratic Cuban exiles. Indeed, those who condemned the United States for its violation of international law are hardly in a position to wink away Cuban violation of exactly the same principle.

What is involved in Venezuela, let it be stressed, was not outside help to oppressed opponents of a brutal despotism. Rather, it was outside help to terrorists whose chief aim was to destroy democracy in order to create the proper climate for guerrilla warfare. That effort failed, and a freely elected and progressively minded government remains in firm control of Venezuela.

Paradoxically, some countries—notably Brazil and Mexico—are using the fact of failure to justify inaction by the OAS. The terrorists were defeated, they say in effect, so why not forget about the whole thing? This is very much like excusing an attempted murder on the ground that the assassin had poor aim. Indeed, the same two countries did break relations with the Dominican Republic when it was demonstrated that the Trujillo dictatorship plotted an attempt to murder President Betancourt of Venezuela.

It is not yet clear what the OAS will do about the finding against Cuba. Certainly the United States ought to move carefully and avoid at all costs any showdown vote that would break the OAS. The OAS judgment provides an opportunity for some badly needed U.S. leadership in explaining that the dispute over Cuba does not involve the shipment of British buses to Havana—but instead the shipment of Belgian guns to Venezuela. Presented with force and maturity, this argument might help to shape a consensus that even Brazil and Mexico could support.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MARTN of Nebraska. It is with pride that I present herewith, for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, the speech written by my constituent, Miss Constance Cass of Alliance, Nebr. Miss Cass' speech won the State of Nebraska "Voice of Democracy" contest, and it will be one of those considered in the final judging for one of the four scholarships awarded by the Veterans of Foreign Wars who conduct this nationwide contest.

It is a pleasure to make this speech available to my colleagues. In these times, it is important for us all to pause and listen to the "Voice of Democracy":

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Connie Cass, Alliance, Nebr.)

On April 19, 1775, a shot rang out that was heard around the world. It was fired by the minutemen at Concord as they fought to free their country from the tight bonds of England.

On November 22, 1963, another shot was heard around the world; John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of our United States of America was assassinated. Lee Harvey Oswald, the man suspected of this assassination, was a citizen of this country for 24 years.

But this man was a citizen in name only. He moved about in the freest society on the face of this earth. So long as he did not violate the rights of others, he was privileged to think, do, and act as he liked. But while this underdeveloped, immature, and selfish person demanded his rights, he showed little concern for his responsibilities.

With the privileges and rights of citizenship, one of the highest honors bestowed on man, come some very important duties which must not be overlooked or someday our children and grandchildren will grow up not knowing what it is like to be a citizen of a free country such as ours. Do we want to tell them how great our country used to be, or do we want to teach them how to preserve this great Government and to thank God that their fathers had enough knowledge to know their rights, and enough courage to accept their responsibilities.

How many of us ever consider citizenship as a challenge? We go through life thinking of citizenship as something owed to us because of our birth. But who is it that owes us this precious gift? Our fathers fought and died that our land and the people in it might be free. It is up to the true American citizens to perserve this great heritage.

Hence, an important challenge of citizenship is the exercising of our voting privileges so that we might select men who we think are well qualified economically, politically, and intellectually, to operate the machinery of our government. But as power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely. We have representatives to run our government, but there is little danger of their abusing this privilege if we preserve our constitutional checks and balances.

But the men who actually make the laws are not the only ones who have to obey them. Every citizen living within the boundaries of the United States or its territories must abide by these laws. The judicial branch of our Government is in charge of enforcing them for without sanction, there is no democracy.

The purpose of citizenship is the betterment of the lives of men and women, through the enlargement of their opportunities, and their intellectual, moral, and spiritual well-being. The glory of America is that it has held this vision for all the people. We must help each other keep America strong and free. We must be vigilant and conscious of our responsibilities to that heritage which is our Constitution. We must all work together to keep the spirit of America in the hearts of men and women who claim citizenship in this land. If we can keep this spirit, America will always be strong enough morally and physically, to withstand any type of attack that may be made. This is our challenge of citizenship.

H.R. 9652: In Defense of the Defenseless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the 19th century English poetess, Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote:

The child's sob in the silence curses deeper than the strong man in his wrath. ("The Cry of the Children," 1844, stanza 13.)

All too often in today's society such sobbing may be the indication of injury inflicted by a man's or woman's wrath. I refer to the callous cases of child cruelty.

The physical abuse of children by their parents or others responsible for their care is clearly a crime, and appropriate statutes exist for the punishment of those found guilty of intentionally injuring a minor. However, many instances of child abuse never come to the attention of the authorities.

An editorial in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle on February 11 discussed the criminal cases of outright cruelty which go undetected and the cause of their concealment. I quote an excerpt from this excellent editorial, entitled "'Battered' Children":

Because of their contacts with families, practicing physicians are closely related to the problem of medical neglect or physical abuse of minors. Yet many physicians do not want to refer such suspected cases to authorities because of the legal restrictions of the physician-patient relationship.

Mr. Speaker, this matter concerns me deeply, because it involves the need to protect those who cannot protect themselves. Further, it is a matter that concerns Congress, since child abuse legislation affecting the District of Columbia is presently pending in the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has introduced H.R. 9652, a bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children. I solidly support this legislative proposal.

I have the pleasure to serve as a member of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which the gentleman chairs. I know firsthand his dedicated desire to see this Congress enact legislation which would require doctors or hospitals to report suspected child abuse cases to the police. The bill would require such reporting and would guarantee immunity from legal suits for those making the reports.

It should be noted that this measure has gained editorial support from an important broadcasting company in Washington. In early February, WMAL, WMAL-FM, and WMAL-TV offered the following statement of opinion to their viewers and listeners:

CHILD ABUSE

The Commissioners have, quite rightly, ordered the Corporation Counsel's office to draft corrective child abuse legislation. Congressman MULTER, of New York, has already introduced a bill to provide mandatory medical reports of suspected physical abuse cases.

The Multer bill would require doctors to report suspected cases to police and would grant legal immunity to doctors from any civil or criminal action that resulted from their reports.

Ten States now have child abuse laws. Children of the District need similar protection.

We have repeatedly urged legislation to cure this repugnant crime. A WMAL news and public affairs documentary last December proved the dire need to protect children against willful physical abuse and led to the proposed legislation.

The House District Committee should receive in the near future a child abuse bill from the Commissioners. We hope the bill is compatible with Congressman MULTER's bill, so lengthy hearings will be unnecessary. Swift passage of corrective legislation is plainly in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of the House will acquaint themselves with the problem of child abuse in the District of Columbia and pledge their support to the early enactment of H.R. 9652 in order to provide for the protection of children who suffer at the hands of angry adults.

An Odor of Police-State Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Mr. William S. White appeared in the Washington Post of March 4.

Mr. White does well to call our attention to the gradual use and acceptance of police-state methods in the United States. This, of course, is in direct contravention of the fourth amendment to the Constitution written in the Bill of Rights, which reads:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The law and civil rights are applicable to all citizens, not just to the good guys. The law is supposed to be blind and metes out justice with equity to all alike.

The column referred to follows:

AN ODOR OF POLICE-STATE METHODS

(By William S. White)

An unpleasant odor of police-state methods—of instances of illegal wiretapping and of Federal snoopery over the mail of private persons—is arising from the vicinity of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The victims of these episodes have been, of course, either highly unpopular or even "bad" men, in the minds of many. This superficial circumstance, however, is wholly irrelevant to the deep, root fact that this abuse of the Federal investigative power is fundamentally alien to a free society. It is mortally offensive to the constitutional guarantees of freedom and privacy which above all it is this same Justice Department's responsibility to shelter rather than attack.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the Department's head, owes a duty to his position and to the American tradition not simply to put a stop at once to every form of this unfairness. It is his obligation as well to punish those officials involved in it—resolutely and pitilessly.

HAS HIGHER FUNCTION

For the Department of Justice has one function even higher than that of fighting crime and subversion. This is the lofty duty to protect and defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the people—including the bad people—under it.

Though there is no evidence that the Justice Department has been running actually wild in this area, it is all the same a fact that recent examples of extra-legal Federal action against so-called baddies are troubling many reasonable men, most noteably in the U.S. Senate.

Roy Cohn, the New York lawyer under Federal indictment on perjury and conspiracy charges, complains that his mail is under Government surveillance—a clear and undeniable violation of his basic rights as a defendant in a criminal case brought against him by that same Government. Justice Department spokesmen first deny any Federal mail watch on their behalf. Subsequently, they are compelled to admit the truth of Cohn's complaint; they then blame it on an assistant Federal prosecutor.

A Federal judge, Archie O. Dawson, feels obliged publicly to denounce the incident as "shocking"—as indeed it is, in spite of the fact that Cohn in his day was an eager part of the pack of professional accusers of other men who gathered around the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin.

Edward Levinson, a Las Vegas, Nev., gambler—albeit, a perfectly legal gambler under the laws of that State—says before a Senate committee investigating the Bobby Baker case that Federal authorities "bugged" his telephones. This sort of thing has repeatedly been condemned by the courts of this country as a dirty business.

It is disclosed at the same time by United Press International that Nevada Members of Congress had gone to President Johnson—himself a lifelong antagonist of all forms of illicit Federal snooping—to protest reported Federal wiretapping in both Las Vegas and Reno, even before the Levinson affair. UPI reports that Senator HOWARD CANNON, of Nevada, had then been assured by a Justice Department official that there would be no Federal wiretapping in that State.

HANDED SUBPENA

And to add to all this unpleasant and disturbing business, Levinson, in the midst of his appearance before the committee in the Baker case, is handed a subpena in an income-tax investigation by a Federal agent who invades the very Senate without its knowledge or permission to work this blatantly intimidating unfairness to a Senate witness.

The point to be stressed in all this is that good intentions are no substitutes for correct Federal procedures. For unless the constitutional rights of all of us—including, and even particularly including the Cohns and Levinsons, whatever their real or alleged sins—are kept safe, the rights of none of us can be guaranteed in the end.

The understandable and proper desire of Federal agents and prosecutors to enforce the law must not be further confused with the fateful duty of these agents and prosecutors to uphold something else called the Constitution of the United States.

Pearson's Whitewash of L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times has carried Columnist Drew Pearson's column for a good many years. In their issue of March 2, 1964, they expressed their concern over Columnist Drew Pearson's whitewash of the Bobby Baker scandal. The Capital Times editorial, entitled "We Don't Go Along With Pearson's Whitewash of L.B.J." follows:

WE DON'T GO ALONG WITH PEARSON'S WHITEWASH OF L.B.J.

Elsewhere on this page will be found an article by Drew Pearson in which he gives President Johnson a clean bill of health in the Bobby Baker scandal.

Pearson has occupied a curious role in this investigation. He is usually taking the lead in exposing wrongdoing in Government. But in the Baker scandal his efforts have been aimed principally at exposing the witness who has made the most damning case against the President's tieup with Baker—Don Reynolds.

The Capital Times does not go along with the Pearson effort to absolve the President

from responsibility in this case, particularly the effort to unload Baker on to the late Senator Kerr who cannot speak in his own defense.

The fact is that Lyndon Johnson, like Bobby Baker, has become a millionaire on his public salary. His family has a monopoly on TV in the capital city of Texas, Austin. This city has 100,000 more people than Madison but has only one TV station while Madison has three commercial stations and one educational station.

The President has said that he received the celebrated stereo set as a gift from Baker. But Don Reynolds has testified that he was asked to give it to Johnson as part of the deal in which he sold the LBJ Co. $200,000 worth of life insurance on Johnson.

Reynolds also testified that he was asked to buy $1,200 worth of advertising time on the Austin station, which he did. The President has offered no explanation at all of this charge.

Chairman Jordan of the investigating committee has said that Reynolds offered documentation to prove his charges.

The fact is that the investigation, which went on tiptoes from the outset, has been stopped cold. Baker has thumbed his nose at the committee and has been treated with kid gloves, as has his secretary, the beauty queen he set up in a lavish Washington house.

If the President were concerned about geting at the truth in this case, he would urge Baker to testify. For 8 years Baker was his man in the Senate. And Baker reported to him when he was Vice President.

For Pearson to write a column such as is published on this page today simply adds credence to the story that is being circulated throughout Wisconsin by the Republicans—that Pearson is being influenced by the fact that the President has appointed his (Pearson's) stepson to a high position in the Post Office Department.

Sharon Joy Browning, Montana Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, this year's winner of the annual Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Montana is a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Sharon Joy Browning, of Great Falls, Mont.

The Voice of Democracy contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Miss Browning will be the guest of that organization in Washington during the meetings of the department commanders and will attend the congressional dinner on March 10 at which time the national winners will be anounced. The department commander of Montana is Mr. Phillip C. Montegna. It will be my great pleasure to be at the banquet and I hope that our State winner will be announced as a national winner.

I am proud to commend to the reading of my colleagues the very fine speech by Miss Browning:

"President Kennedy has seen; now we have hope." How many times I heard that simple comment during my summer stop in Germany, and how much it has broadened my concept of the great challenges attached to American citizenship. The late President's utterance, "ich bin ein Berliner," swept away the doubts of millions, and left in its stead—hope. But hope must be fed or its flame dies, and the people of Berlin look anxiously toward America for leadership, support, and decisive action. Nor is Berlin an isolated example—in Vietnam, China, and countries of Africa and South America, the United States has become the symbol for democratic freedom.

Today travel from one country to another requires only a few hours; no longer is the picture of America dependent only upon its ambassadors, its diplomats, and the cold words of a written text. Today the vacationer, the actor, the student—each plays a "live" part in painting the picture of our democracy to the other peoples of the world.

Never before has the individual's interpretation of the challenges of citizenship been so nakedly on exhibit. Before my visit to Berlin, if anyone had asked me what my duties as a citizen were I might have given the old textbook answers—to vote, to be informed, to pay taxes, to take an active part in Government, and to respect and obey the laws of the land. But now we—you and I and every other American—must stop thinking of these as an easy answer to the question. We must know them as never before; we must practice them as never before; and we must be prepared to answer for any laxness on our part—not just to our State or Nation, but to the world. Each of us is on display. The manner in which we carry out the rights and privileges of citizenship in a free democracy will determine whether that democracy will expand—or even if it will survive.

One of the most difficult, yet most vital challenges of citizenship is to develop individualistic answers to the following four questions: First, each of us must know what democracy is; secondly, why we believe in it; third, how we can support it; and finally, where we can strengthen it. There is no one correct answer to any of these questions; they all require the personal thought and interpretation of every American.

The dictionary still defines a citizen as "an inhabitant of or dweller in any city, town, or place." But no longer can we think only of our home, our city, our State, or even only of our Nation. The world must live as a family if it is to survive. America is the recognized haven of democracy, but she is only as strong as the people who support her. It is incumbent upon my generation to carry the great American message to every corner of the globe—to become true disciples of democracy. This is the challenge of citizenship.

The Poverty of Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the February 27 issue of the McDonald County Press of Noel, Mo., carried an editorial by Editor Ralph W. Pogue entitled "The Poverty of Prosperity." I commend Mr. Pogue for having the courage to write such an editorial and I hope that Members of the House, as well as the producers of the NBC "Today" show, will take time to read it:

THE POVERTY OF PROSPERITY

After watching the Today show portray the "abject poverty" of Kentucky hillfolk, I am the more convinced that the popular definition of "poverty" is all wet. I am the more sold on Ambrose Bierce's definition that poverty is "a file provided for the teeth of the rats of reform." In other words we become aware of poverty, in direct proportion to the current demand for votes to elect more scoundrels to public office. If NBC in New York City must exhibit its interpretation of poverty then it need go no further than the slum tenements of its own East Side.

Poverty cannot be defined as merely the state of being poor. As I get it, the Pilgrims who landed on "the rock" were poor as Jobs turkey (the Biblical cliché of poverty supreme) yet they were happy to shake off the shackles of servitude. That is to say, they were poor but free. Actually they escaped one form of bondage to conscript themselves to another. Time and experience has proven that.

When it comes to portraying poverty among hillfolk I am naturally prejudiced by my own experience. Having been born and reared in the Ozark hills, and having spent a good portion of my early working years in close association with families of the more remote sections, even during the depression, I can truthfully report that I never saw any of these people go hungry. That does not mean that all escaped the pangs of want. By and large they were a proud, happy, and resourceful people until convinced by politicians that they were living in poverty and needed to be "saved" by Uncle Sam.

By popular classification, Henry David Thoreau lived in poverty his 2 years at Walden's Pond. Yet, no American has equaled the wealth of his philosophical observations recorded there. It was as if he had lived the last phrase of these immortal words of Bacon, "Prosperity doth best discover vice, but adversity doth best discover virtue."

This brings up another quote—this from Thoreau himself, "The luxury of one class is counterbalanced by the indigence (poverty or want) of another."

And so it is today and probably will be anon. The fortunate prey upon the unfortunate. The politicians convince us of our dire need then promise Utopia, not for our benefit, but for theirs—to keep their snouts in the swill trough of public loot.

If our leaders really were conscientiously interested in the future of the Nation then they would propose permanent programs of conservation and rehabilitation of our natural resources instead of continued exploitation at the expense and lifeblood of the people. The best that they have been able to come up with so far consists of ill-planned and poorly effected "crash programs" destined only to whoop up the economy in trouble spots until the rabble rousing has subsided and a more normal system of wealth by stealth can be resumed. The big scar on Kentucky's hill land—wholesale exploitation for the benefit of a few—should not have been tolerated in the first place.

This is the big crime of man versus man. Here is the basis for your true poverty. It exists in its most virulent and insiduous form among not the poor but the middle class. The schoolteacher, the politician, skilled laborer, the newspaper publisher, the clergyman, doctor, lawyer, banker, merchant, chief—here is your poverty-stricken class today. Here you find exploiters and the exploited one and the same, schismatic in awareness of right but hopelessly serfs of wrong. The affliction: In order to succeed they must submit to the gods of power and mammon.

Bob Burns, tall-tale teller from Van Buren, Ark., once told how his folks down in the hills of Arkansas were so poor that in order to not waste ammunition, his uncle Wofford had one of the boys run ahead to feel of a

rabbits ribs before papa shot it and brought it in for the table.

If those hill boys can run that fast, then they are a sight richer then we middle-class specimens of the "affluent society," for we can't even climb a flight of stairs without puffing.

A Comparison of the U.S. Constitution and the U.N. Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize-winning essay of a constituent of mine, Miss Nancy L. Bulger, of La Canada, Calif., which compares the U.N. Charter with our U.S. Coristitution. It is easy to see why Nancy has won two prizes with this essay; and I commend it to my colleagues:

A COMPARISON OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

To compare the U.S. Constitution and the United Nations Charter we must first understand the origin and the reason for the existence of these two documents—then justify their existence today.

After the War of Independence in America, our forefathers knew they had to have a stronger Central Government. That is why they agreed to think out and write our Constitution. They fully realized that this was absolutely necessary in order to protect and preserve for future generations the freedoms, and liberties they had found in the New World. Delegates from all the States met in Philadelphia in 1787 to write the Constitution of the Federal Government to meet the needs of the Union. Great American patriots like George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and Benjamin Franklin guided the framing of our Constitution, which today is the supreme law of our country.

Many years later in the fall of 1944, four countries—China, Russia, Britain, and the United States—met at Dumbarton Oaks near Washington, D.C., and worked out plans for an international organization. This plan was in accord with the previous declaration made in January 1, 1942, known as, the Atlantic Charter, for the purpose of cooperating to work out the compromises to end World War II. This international organization was formed with a purpose to maintain peace and security and to develop friendly relations among people of all nations—with respect for the rights and freedom for all. The first draft of the charter was written in 1943 by Lee Pasvelsky, a Russian born economist in our State Department and he was later assisted by Alger Hiss, a convicted perjurer, Harry Dexter White, and Vyacheslov.Molotov. These are the men whose hearts and minds guided the framing of the United Nations Charter, which today is becoming more and more the supreme law of the world.

It is interesting to note that the U.S. Constitution and the United Nations Charter both begin with the same five words, "We, the people of the United States," and "We, the peoples of the United Nations," and hereafter these words the documents become entirely different. However, let us look further in our Constitution, its purpose is to "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The Charter through a collective organization of members is determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to develop friendly relations among nations with respect for the principles of equal rights and self determination of peoples, and to be a center for bringing about harmony among nations. But the important difference lies in the manner in which these two documents shall bring about their purposes. Herein lies the true comparison of these two thought-provoking documents. In purpose they both sound eloquent in their language, but let us compare them more closely.

Under the Constitution of the United States, our representatives are elected by the qualified voters, under State laws, with some age, residence and citizenship restrictions. These representatives may be removed from office upon disqualification by impeachment, and may not hold or enjoy any office of honor or trust in the United States. Other elected representatives may be removed from office by the power of the secret ballot, which is one of the bulwarks of our Republic.

The United Nations Charter provides for six permanent organs and sets forth the functions of each. They are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. Each member nation of the United Nations has a representative in the General Assembly with one vote. This Assembly appoints the five permanent members of the Security Council, and also the Secretary General. Any one member may vote "no" and veto any action, thereby making it very difficult for any true agreement. Under the Security Council, the United Nations may take over our Army and Navy and operate them in any action they decide in order to maintain international peace and security. The Security Council has the right to call to arms our military forces, dispatch and operate them under a United Nations force. The Security Council may call upon any member to provide armed forces, and instead of our President being Commander in Chief of our military forces, the Military Staff Committee, composed of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council, directs the armed forces placed at its disospal. Many known enemies are admitted to the Security Council.

Under our Constitution the powers of Government are limited. The States, or the people retain possession of all the rights that the Constitution does not give to the Federal Government. All those born in the United States and subject to its laws are U.S. citizens. They are also citizens of the State in which they live. No State can make or enforce a law injuring the rights of a citizen. No State can take away any man's life, liberty, or property, except as the laws order. Furthermore, no State can refuse anyone the full protections provided by its laws. The United States will protect a State against riots and insurrections if the Governor requests it. Neither individuals, nor their homes or possessions can be seized or searched without a sworn warrant telling exactly whom or what to seize or search. No one can be tried for a major crime unless a grand jury says there are grounds for a trial. Life, liberty, and property cannot be taken from anyone except through authorized legal procedure. When a man is accused of a crime, he is entitled to a prompt trial with an unbiased jury, and he must be present when witnesses speak against him. It is also his right to have a lawyer to defend him. Our Constitution sets up courts under the Supreme Court.

The U.N. Charter provides for vast expansion of governmental powers. It may take over a country or a territory and set up its own authority. It neutralizes countries and then disarms them. It sets up the political, economic, social, education, and religious problems of the captive country under a Trusteeship Council system. There is no voice of the people or by the people in this power of the charter.

In chapter XIV of the charter, the International Court of Justice is spelled out very clearly. This Court shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, and all members of the United Nations are parties to this International Court of Justice. If a member fails to abide by a ruling of this Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may decide what course to follow.

In the charter there is no mention of a trial by jury. This omission is serious in that the right of an individual to prove his innocence is denied. Americans may be placed under United Nations arrest, trial, and punishment, and world law may be enforced. All individuals will be brought under United Nations "law" and subject to arrest, trial, and punishment under United Nations criminal courts. This enforcement of a world court upon Americans is in direct violation of the rights guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

Our Constitution gives the President the power with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present agree. This Constitution, plus the laws and treaties made in carrying it out, is the highest law of the United States. All legislative, executive, and judicial officers, Federal and State, must swear to support the Constitution.

Under the provisions of the United Nations Charter, chapter XVI, "Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any member of the United Nations after the present charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it." No party to any such treaty or international agreement, which has not been registered, may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations. Should any conflict between the obligation of members of the United Nations and obligations under any other agreement, their obligation under the United Nations Charter shall prevail.

The preamble to our Constitution sets forth the purposes for which this great document was designed. "In Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

The Secretariat of the United Nations Charter was established as the administrative body of the organization. One of the duties of the Secretary General is to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion threatens the maintenance of peace and security. The Secretary General is appointed by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council, and he appoints the staffs of the Economic and Social Council. The powers of this organ may make reports with respect to international, economic, social, cultural, educational, health, religion, and related matters. The Economic and Social Council may take appropriate steps to obtain reports from agencies and make arrangements to take any steps necessary to effect its own recommendations.

The Constitution of the United States gave our country a new kind of government, which was strong enough to stand the stress and strain of two foreign wars. It began to serve a nation of 13 weak States or colonies in America, and has continued to serve for a nation of 50 States—stretching from across the ocean. As a young nation we were primarily engaged in agriculture during the

days of the birth of our Constitution: today, our Nation is the greatest agriculture and manufacturing Nation in the world, and the wealthiest. It has been necessary to change the Constitution very little, and the form of government it insures us is without parallel in the world today. Because we adopted the U.S. Constitution our country developed without revolution or a military dictatorship from a weak undivided union to strength and unity; from anarchy to civil order; and from death to a people seeking freedom and liberty.

The United Nations Charter is truly a pattern for foreign policy. The original planning of this international organization started in 1939 in our Department of State. This organization superceded the old League of Nations, which was unable to prevent the aggressions leading to World War II in 1939. The United States refused to join the league. The league's assets and property, valued at $11,700,000, were turned over to the United Nations. There is nothing new in the United Nations Charter which did not exist in the old League of Nations, which this country rejected. The United Nations Charter has given Russia the opportunity to build a wall against freedom and liberty in Berlin. The peace making effectiveness of this organization during the past years is dubious. Communism has spread over almost the entire world. While its member nations fail to pay their assessed share of the cost of this organization, the United States subsidizes Communist nations so they may continue to be represented. It fails to encourage respect for human life and freedom, and it falls short of its aim to bring peace and harmony among nations. Many captive nations today who cry for freedom and liberty have fallen under the yoke of communism with the help of the United Nations.

The Constitution of the United States has served as a model for the forming of Republican governments on both sides of the Atlantic, and today it is the oldest written form of government existing in the world. It gives the individual the dignity, freedom, and liberty and then sets forth to protect it for him and preserve it for his heritage.

It is important that the liberty and freedom our Constitution gives us is not traded for the stamps of the U.N.

Panama Canal: Red Shadows Evident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the 1956 crisis over the Suez Canal Company, which resulted from the nationalization of that British-French owned Egyptian corporation by Egypt and the ensuing abortive attempt by Great Britain and France to regain this property, the echoes of these actions have continued to reverberate from Panama.

It was immediately evident then, and has been ever since, that in the operations of the world revolutionary movement for world conquest, such events as those that occurred in Egypt and Panama were not isolated incidents but parts of a splendidly planned and carefully coordinated program for securing control of strategic trade routes.

As usual, Constantine Brown, in the February 29, 1964, issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., written from his vantage point in Rome, Italy, reflects an objective perception that is rare among our publicists.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 29, 1964]

RED SHADOWS EVIDENT IN CYPRUS—U.S. POLICY OF TOGETHERNESS REMAINS DESPITE HEADWAY OF RUSSIA AND CHINA

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—From the Caribbean to the Mediterranean and from southeast Asia to east Africa there is bloodshed and trouble. The West, taken by surprise, after the few weeks of relative calm following President Kennedy's assassination, seems at a loss as to how to handle the situation.

Somalia, the Congo, and the other newly born African states have become war zones. So has South Vietnam. In Malaysia we may also soon witness an equal upheaval. Cyprus threatens to become the Mediterranean Cuba, just as Zanzibar has become the Indian Ocean's Castro-land.

In every one of these bloodbathed areas the hands of Moscow and Peking can be clearly seen. The United States and her allies have been living in a kind of political euphoria because of the apparent schism between the U.S.S.R. and Communist China. The suggestion of some Kremlinologists that this was only a personal quarrel between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev—no different from that between Tito and Stalin—is pooh-poohed by American policymakers. It is even described as antiadministration propaganda by professional bellyachers. Yet, it is obvious that Peiping and Moscow are working hand in hand in their efforts to hit what they call Western neoimperialism. While there is unity of purpose in the Communist camp, the free nations are suspicious of each other's motives and are each pulling their own way.

Despite the obvious Communist cooperation in a war in which the United States is the main target, America's basic policy continues to be togetherness with those who have vowed to destroy this country. Cyprus is in danger of being Castro-ized. The British say, as they did during the 1956 Suez crisis, "There are ominous undertones of Russian exploitation and pressure." The Soviet Embasy in Nicosia has been active in a behind-the-scenes campaign which has reopened the present strife between the Greek and Turkish populations on the island. The Russian Ambassador has convinced President Makarios, whose sympathies toward Britain and America are, at best, lukewarm, to stand firm against the proposals for a NATO truce force. America's only role, in the past, in Cyprus has been to provide millions in economic aid. He has compelled us to submit the Cyprus affair to the United Nations.

It is only obvious that it won't be long before Russia will start playing an important part in the affairs of the unfortunate island. Whether blue-helmeted United Nations forces will enter the island or not seems to many European obtservers to be immaterial. What is certain is that Russia will take an active part in the pacification of Cyprus. President Makarios himself will have to go eventually and a Castro-type Cypriot will be put in his place. There are already a number of pro-Communists in the Makarios government.

In the Congo, the situation has again become chaotic. The Peiping-trained former Minister of Education, Pierre Mulele, is leading the Congolese guerrillas called the Congolese Communist Youth. The bands are well organized posses. They have, in addition to poisoned arrows, machineguns and mortars. They follow the Chinese strategy of hit-and-run attacks and have to their advantage the element of initiative in a vast territory of 60,000 square miles which cannot be policed by the meager Government forces. According to experts the Congolese Government would need the help of at least twice the present number of United Nations police to bring even a temporary semblance of order in the chaotic Congo.

A shaky truce has been arranged between the warring Somalis and the Ethiopians. It is interesting to note that the Somalis were provided with $30 million worth of modern military equipment by Moscow last year. Russian officers are training the Somali bands and making them into a real army. Some 300 Somali young men are being trained in Russian military schools specializing in guerrilla warfare.

In southeast Asia, the Chinese and Russians have also a common purpose—to dislodge all remaining Western influence from that area. Russian war material and Chinese officers are helping. President Sukarno's Indonesian Army is larger than the entire British Army committed to the four corners of the world. Indonesia has also a navy superior to what Britain, Australia, and New Zeland can afford to send to those waters. Their hope, in the event of a showdown with Mr. Sukarno, is the U.S. 7th Fleet.

The cooperation between Communist China and the U.S.S.R., despite the nasty words Mr. Mao and Mr. Khrushchev are flinging at each other, is as close as ever when it comes to the elimination of the free West. Yet both London and Washington continue to be lulled by the euphoric belief that because the Russians have not broken off the disarmament conference at Geneva, "togetherness" is on the horizon and we must leave no stone unturned to make it a reality.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning speech written by Miss Toni de Salvo of Reno, Nev., entered in the Voice of Democracy Contest which is conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars each year. This year 250,000 high school students participated in the contest, competing for the four scholarships that are awarded as top prizes.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

I am a very new citizen of the United States. When I first came to this country from England 6 years ago, I was left awestruck. The towering skyscrapers, the modern conveniences, and the magnificent natural beauty of this land captivated me; and I knew at once that I wanted to make my home here and wanted my children to be America's children—the products of a prospering, democratic society.

It has taken me 5 years to prepare myself for citizenship in the United States, and those years of study were not the easiest I have spent. Yet I have learned much, and I hope what knowledge I have gained will help to make me a worthy citizen.

There are many things one must know before he can be considered adequately prepared for citizenship. This honor, especially for a naturalized citizen such as I, car-

ries with it many responsibilities. In studying for my citizenship papers, I discovered some of these very important obligations. Every American should be thoroughly familiar with them, and should live in accordance with their restrictions if he aspires to be a truly worthy citizen.

One of the first things I learned upon entering this country is that America is founded upon the principle of some freedom for all, not all the freedom for a privileged few; and to insure this liberty, the founders of our country made our freedom relative, not absolute. In order for a citizen to be assured of his rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, he must be willing not to infringe upon anyone else's rights in this respect. For every freedom a citizen exercises, he must also fulfill a duty; and for every responsibility he may be certain of a corresponding privilege. When each of us accepts and meets up to this challenge that citizenship offers, we will all be able to live contentedly in a smoothly run country.

I also learned that laws, the means by which we are accorded our freedoms and responsibilities, play an important role in the challenge of citizenship. It is the attitude with which you and I, as citizens, treat these laws that is so vitally important to the maintenance of our democracy. If even one person disregards a law, no other individual may be adequately assured that his rights to freedom will not be violated. Thus, each person, after having helped to pass a law into effect, should not simply obey that ordinance, but should respect and openly support it.

Each American should also consider it his duty to uphold the image which our democracy has created. Adhering to the moral codes which our society has set forth will not only give other countries less reason for disapproval and even open ridicule, but may ultimately prevent the possible decay of our own Nation. And we must solve our internal problems before we can hope to show other countries the way to freedom and universal harmony.

Yes, democracy places a great burden on her citizens, but we are willing children. This challenge is an honor and a privilege, for by accepting it, and meeting vigorously its responsibilities, the citizens of the United States of America will be able to preserve the great way of life which we enjoy for posterity, and keep our country the mightiest in the world.

I have been given a distinct honor in being allowed to become a citizen of the United States. I have taken the oath of allegiance in all seriousness, and I hope to be a good citizen. I have accepted the challenge of democracy and of citizenship; but it is a challenge well worth taking up, for it offers the key to a good way of life—the way of freedom, justice, humanity, and equality for all.

Five Thousand at Shenandoah, Iowa, Beef Industry Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a news article from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil Council Bluffs, Iowa, which states facts and the purpose of the Shenandoah, Iowa, meeting held there last Monday.

The depressed cattle prices have already driven many cattlefeeders to the wall, and many more will go the bankruptcy route unless President Johnson and the Congress take the necessary steps, and soon, to ward off the impending crash, which will be severely felt by our entire Nation.

Seventeen Members of the House have already joined me in introducing identical bills to my bill H.R. 10099, which limits all meat imports to 50 percent of the last 5-year average. I invite many more to do so.

The editorial follows:

[From the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil, Mar. 2, 1964]

NEED WORD FROM THE WHITE HOUSE: 5,000 AT SHENANDOAH BEEF INDUSTRY PROTEST

(By Warren T. Francke)

SHENANDOAH.—Thousands of cattle feeders crowded Shenandoah Monday to take action on the plight of the beef industry.

The throng would have given the city a holiday atmosphere except for the business-like faces and serious talk that dominated the day.

The turnout neared 5,000 at midday, before the arrival of Govs. Harold Hughes of Iowa and Frank Morrison of Nebraska and assistant U.S. Secretary of Agriculture George Mehrens of Washington.

Glenwood banker, John Dean, opened the morning session by emphasizing "we're not trying to lay the blame on any one door. We want to take positive action to improve conditions in the cattle industry."

UNIFIED ANSWER

But, industry spokesmen had a unified answer to the problem of beef imports. Their position aimed toward the White House.

"We won't have legislation," U.S. Senator JACK MILLER of Sioux City said in a taped speech, "unless the President turns on the green light."

W. B. Quigley, Valentine, Nebr., lawyer and rancher, said, "We must organize. We must not forget the need for unity if prices go up one or two dollars in the next few weeks.

"We want only protection to operate * * * not charity."

Attorney General Evan Hultman, of Iowa, advised the crowd, which packed Mayfair Auditorium and spilled over into the old armory and into Shenandoah Streets, to "stand up, speak up and act up constructively."

Hultman suggested each man make individual protests and demand Federal legislation putting beef imports back to pre-1962 levels.

Taped remarks by Congressman BEN F. JENSEN, Republican of Exira, suggested the meeting adopt a resolution showing the "plight of the cattleman and stating a minimum on imports."

Missouri was represented by Secretary of Agriculture Frank Marquardt.

He advised the Iowa organizers of the meeting, the Cattle Industry Committee headed by Bob Buffington, of Glenwood, that "Missouri stands fully behind you."

The auditorium audience included Iowa Secretary of Agriculture L. B. Libby, Iowa Farm Bureau President Merrill Anderson, Ralph Baker, of Valentine, Nebr., chairman of the board of the Sand Hills Cattle Association, and many other high ranking agricultural personages.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Industry leaders led a panel discussion, "What's Wrong With the Cattle Industry," in the afternoon.

They answered questions posed by those attending.

At the morning session the Johnson administration's decision to buy beef in an attempt to ease the cattle price crisis was described as appeasement.

Nebraskan Quigley was one of several persons who declared government beef buying will not solve the problem.

Quigley said the buying program diverts the supply of meat but doesn't reduce it.

Glenwood's Buffington declared, "We don't want handouts." He said government buying at the best would create "a very temporary upturn in prices."

Buffington said "the committee seeks legislative action to control imports."

A St. Joseph, Mo., banker, Jack F. Killackey, said bankers, the transportation industry and packers all are in for trouble if cattle prices remained depressed.

COMPLETE EMBARGO

Killackey advocated an immediate and complete embargo on meat imports.

He said "this would bring certain penalties under the Geneva agreement on tariff and trade," but "it would give us a chance to catch our breath.

"It would be easier for the Government to turn off the supply than to buy beef, and taxwise it would be cheaper in the long run," said Killackey, vice president of the First National Bank of St. Joseph.

A resolutions committee was drafting recommendations to offer for endorsement of the meeting later in the day.

OMAHAN SPEAKS

C. W. Means, vice president of the Stock Yards National Bank of Omaha, said large banks are seeing the effects of the cattle price crisis in loans to feeders passed on to them by country banks.

The best advice a banker can give cattlemen, said Means, is to improve business practices and "use their pencils more."

Means said that some feeders, hopeful that prices will go up, are holding their cattle too long, letting them get too heavy and then marketing at prices less than those which more desirable weight animals would have brought.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, a young lady from my district, Miss Andrea Allain, of Eliot, Maine, recently was selected as Maine's contestant in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I know Members will be interested in reading her prize-winning essay "The Challenge of Citizenship."

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

To face the challenge of citizenship, one must have all of the following traits: interest in the happenings of the day, not just in his immediate circles but also around the world; activeness in his society; and dedication and resourcefulness to the service of his society.

In discussing each of these characteristics, I come first to interest, which I place above all of the others in facing the challenge of citizenship. A person could not be truly active, dedicated, or resourceful unless he was interested. People are not born with definite interests; they develop them through environment. If a young person is influenced by an adult to realize his own personal value and duties as a citizen, he develops an interest in that citizenship and usually strives to face that challenge. A person

should attempt to understand the events happening in the world. He should consider the views of all factions involved in disputes and interpret for himself his own beliefs.

Activeness is the second quality necessary to meet the challenge offered by citizenship. A person is not dedicated or resourceful unless he is active in his interests. By "active," I don't mean simply physical presence, I mean participation and support. If a person finds an interest, he should cultivate that interest and use it to improve himself as well as others. One who is active in his citizenship is a person who is well informed and is prepared to meet his own problems, should they involve small town or large city; school board or Congress. Without activity in an interest, a person's talents are wasted and he has avoided the valuable challenge offered to him.

I come now to dedication. It takes dedication to truly exhibit interest and activity. Facing the challenge of citizenship and striving to support and assist our Nation in its forward movement takes dedication. Important members of our Government have this dedication but this is not sufficient to uphold our country. It is the common man, the layman, who must be dedicated and through this dedication help our country to grow and improve.

For my last quality necessary to face the valuable challenges offered to Americans, I have chosen resourcefulness. One who is truly dedicated to an interest is well informed on that interest and is capable of contributing valuable information and ideas to promote that interest. If Americans had not been able to solve their national problems we, as a country would never have reached the high degree of importance in the world which we maintain today.

In conclusion, I believe that in every American who has been taught to love his country and to realize his value as a citizen, there lies the strength to face these challenges of citizenship. Everyone does not exhibit all these characteristics strongly, but I do feel that most Americans have the traits that I have mentioned. It is through the ideals of interest, activity, dedication, and resourcefulness, held by the people of America, that our country has come to be a world power. I don't believe the young people of today are changing. I feel that they will face the challenge of citizenship and help strengthen our country in its service to the peoples of the world, as good citizens of our Nation have always done.

The Courts: A Jury of Peers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, many times this past year I have voiced my support for legislation which I felt would help alleviate some of the problems that confront our Nation's youth.

I believe that future historians will look upon this Congress as one that fully realized the importance of our young people and took constructive actions to insure their stable growth and provide them with the opportunities that they deserve and must have.

As we all know, much of the credit for action in this area justifiably goes to our late President. He sent the first youth message to Congress and was instrumental in initiating action on many of our youth programs. I am happy to see that President Johnson plans to continue and add to this worthwhile venture.

The problems of America's younger generation are so large as to be of national concern.

For example, recent reports indicate that the problem of youth crime continues to grow in alarming proportions. During the last 14 years juvenile delinquency has increased faster than the juvenile population. In 1962 more than 1.4 million Americans under the age of 25 were arrested. Persons under 18 represent 43 percent of all arrests for serious felonies, such as auto theft, burglary, and assault.

Clearly, this problem is of such magnitude that the use of Federal programs to help alleviate this alarming situation is not inappropriate. However, we must not forget that many localities are helping their young citizens with farsighted, comprehensive programs. I am proud to say that one such program that has caused great national interest is a program that was initiated in my hometown in Indiana. In the 1 year that Judge Harold R. Johnston has been on the bench in Vigo County, Ind., he has substantially modernized local arrangements for handling juvenile offenders.

He was instrumental in obtaining an $88,000 county appropriation for a new detention and rehabilitation center. He has updated the probation system and is currently heading a movement to construct a youth recreation center in the area. His most unique innovation was the creation of a program whereby teenagers compose juries that try crimes committed by juvenile offenders. Under this arrangement the teenage juries recommendations are given to judges, and many times their verdict is accepted and imposed on the young offender by the court.

It is hoped that the emotional impact of sitting in court in judge of their peers will have a double benefit for the young people involved.

First, it provides an invaluable on-the-spot lesson in civics. Second, it is felt that juries of this type will serve as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency. These younger people seem to be tougher on the juvenile offender than are juries composed of older citizens.

Judge Johnston has made a great contribution by initiating this program. He is truly a leader in this field. At this time I ask the Members of the Senate to join with me in tribute to this dedicated man who has added greatly to our campaign to reduce youth crime.

The January 20 issue of Newsweek magazine has an excellent story on this program, and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURTS: A JURY OF PEERS

Quietly the jurors filed last week into the small, gray-walled Terre Haute courtroom and heard a simple case: a defendant admitted shoplifting, a 98-cent key chain in a department store. With the evidence and instructions from the court in hand, the panel repaired to an adjoining room to decide what punishment to recommend. Up to a point, it was strictly routine. But the trial was a milestone in Terre Haute's fight against juvenile delinquency. Each juror was only 17 years old, the same age as the defendant.

The idea of letting teenagers be judged by their peers was the nub of an all-out campaign by Vigo County Judge Harold Ralph Johnston to hold down teenage miscreancy in his Indiana bailiwick. When Johnston, an earnest, 37-year-old lawyer, took office a year ago, juvenile crime was increasing alarmingly—and nobody in the city of some 75,000 seemed to be doing anything about it.

New look: Johnston set out to make changes. While engineering an $88,000 county appropriation for a new detention and rehabilitation center, he modernized the community's probation system, modified the policy of holding kids behind bars ("We cut detentions by 90 percent"), and began persuading civic leaders to finance a place for restless teen groups to gather after dark. But his boldest move was to bring teenagers into a general juvenile court as jurors for the first time.[1]

With encouragement from Terre Haute's school officials, 210 ordinary pupils volunteered for jury duty. "We don't want * * * the football stars and class leaders," Johnston says. "We want Joe Blow, the C student."

As the first jury of pupils—three boys and four girls—tried its first case last week; the youngsters were intently serious. "Sure wish I had a tranquilizer," Bob McGilvrey quipped nervously after being chosen as foreman. McGilvrey, a senior at Honey Creek High, led the jury to its verdict: the 17 year old who filched the key chain should be put on probation until his 18th birthday, deprived of his learner's driving permit, and sent to night vocational school.

The decision—which under the law could be no more than a recommendation—was accepted and enforced by Juvenile Referee Herbert R. Gerdink. The verdict on the experiment itself was highly favorable. For the juvenile jury, McGilvrey said: "Adults are judged by their peers. Why shouldn't teenagers be? We can understand the problems of teenagers. I think we'll be fairly harsh, because we don't want adults to form the wrong idea of us." In his chambers, Judge Johnston gave his view: "In 4 years almost 1,000 students will have been trained and many of them will have sat as jurors * * *. The idea is preventive * * *. The mere emotional impact of sitting in court and seeing another of their age in trouble may impress them."

[1] Other cities—Jacksonville, Fla., and Frankfort, Ky., for instance—have successfully experimented with teenage juries in municipal and traffic courts.

The Battlefield at Olustee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague, the gentleman, from Florida, D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, on February 22, 1964, at the Lake Oakland Cemetery, Lake City, Fla., com-

memorated those 15,000 Confederate youth who fought in the fiery Battle of Olustee 100 years ago in the War Between the States. Mr. MATTHEWS paid tribute not only to those gray-clad men who died in the defense of their country, but also to all other Americans who have sacrificed their lives for their Nation in the history of the United States. In these times of troubled peace, it is good to remember the men who have died in this Nation's many yesteryears of war. I commend Mr. MATTHEWS remarks to your reading:

DUTY CALLED—THEY ANSWERED

(Talk by Congressman D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, at the memorial service commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Olustee of the War Between the States, Lake City Oakland Cemetery, Lake City, Fla., Saturday, February 22, 1964)

A hundred years have passed since the roar of the cannon was stilled on the battlefield at Olustee.

More than 15,000 gray-clad Florida youths marched away to the War Between the States, and we are here today to honor their memory by honoring those who lie in this hallowed ground.

As we lift the curtain of the past, we think of the pain and suffering that attended that great conflict—we think of the thousand native sons who were killed in action—the 5,000 who were wounded—the 5,000 who died of hardship and disease.

The action at Olustee was one of the fiercest of the war. Confederate casualties were nearly 20 percent of the force engaged. Federal casualties doubled that loss.

With the sun at its meridian, the opposing armies trudged down the sandy roads and through the marshes to that fateful ground a few miles east of here. As the sunlight slanted through the pines, the bloody, 6-hour battle was fought and a great Confederate victory gained.

The commanding general and his troops were commended by the Confederate Congress "for the skill and gallantry displayed in achieving the signal victory."

What brings a man to take arms against his own brother? Most of these men of the Gray and of the Blue were not professional soldiers. These men were not seeking war.

These soldiers who lie silent here responded to the bugle note of war because of their devotion and because it was their duty.

They responded to the challenge:

"So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
So near is God to man,
When Duty whispers low, thou must,
The youth replies, I can."

Here they lie, heroes of another century.

Duty called—they answered.

They left home, loved ones, worldly pleasures. They forfeited security, riches, comfort, happiness.

They met hardship, deprivation, suffering, death.

Some were learned, wealthy, and privileged.

Some were unlettered, poor, and humble.

The majority were men of the common mold, yet, "The heroic cannot be common." These heroes were, then, uncommon men.

They did not die in vain. Their mortal lives ended 10 decades ago, but a great nation has risen from their devotion. A vast multitude calls them blessed.

Duty called—they answered.

These fallen warriors have been silent a hundred years. Could they speak, what would they say? "The most sublime word in the English language is duty."

Yes, that is what they would say.

"Freedom of the press does not mean violation of fair and objective reporting."

"Freedom of religion does not mean hostility of government to religion."

"The right to assemble peaceably does not mean the right to foment strife, riots, and contempt for law."

Yes, that is what they would say.

"You who have received much from this country; have you given something in return?"

"You, the living, must take the torch from Olustee and keep the flame of freedom burning."

Yes, that is what they would say.

These men at rest here did their duty.

When duty called—they answered.

We can best pay tribute to them by doing our duty.

Let us from this day forth determine to lead lives of greater nobility and heed the admonition of the Prophet, "Fear the Almighty. Keep His commandments. This is the whole duty of man."

May we, in solemn contemplation of this hour, determine within our hearts to do our whole duty.

Then we may, as they, gain immortality, for—

"The sweetest lives are those to duty wed,
Whose deeds, both great and small,
Are close-knit strands of an unbroken thread,
Where love ennobles all.
The world may sound no trumpet, ring no bells,
The book of life the shining record tells."

Preferential Treatment for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report which I would like to bring to the attention of not only all the Members of the House, but particularly, to the attention of the Senators.

It is headed, "One City's Rules on Hiring for School Jobs" and the story relates that if a Negro and a white person both apply for the same job in Pittsburgh's school system, the Negro will automatically get the job.

This is a deliberate downgrading of the white race in order to curry favor with the minority bloc voters and this attitude is only the beginning of the treatment whites can expect if the steamroller of the civil rights bill gets underway.

I, for one, would hate to have the job of explaining to my constituents why I supported a measure that has this attitude as its central theme. I hope, too, the Senators who now have a chance to defeat this unconstitutional bill, will ask themselves how they could possibly explain supporting this attitude.

The article follows:

ONE CITY'S RULES ON HIRING FOR SCHOOL JOBS

PITTSBURGH.—If a Negro and a white—with equal qualifications—apply for any job in the Pittsburgh public schools, the Negro will be hired. This was announced February 27 by the board of education.

An official described it as a policy of "conscious preferment" of Negroes to "redress imbalances" in the racial mixture of school employees. He said Negro teachers are being placed in predominantly white schools so the white children can get a firsthand look at Negro professionals.

Your World and Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, emphasis in communications media necessarily dwells on the problems of foreign affairs, and a major trouble spot is southeast Asia.

Columnist Michael Ward, writing in the Suburban Life, La Grange, Ill., on February 27, comments upon the problems in that area of the globe, and directs our attention to the views of our distinguished colleague, Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut. In view of the concern which the American public has in conditions in that area, I feel this article is of great timely value:

YOUR WORLD AND MINE

(By Michael Ward)

Whether we like it or not, the stakes are high in southeast Asia and the free world cannot afford to lose any more ground in that strategic area. A Communist conquest of southeast Asia would almost certainly result in a serious shift in the world balance of power.

In fact such an occurrence would definitely imperil our own ability to survive as a nation.

A review of past events indicates the gravity of the situation there and how our position has become weak instead of strong.

The coalition government in Laos exists in name only. The fact is that the Royalists—supported by the neutralist forces of Gen. Kong Le—have been weakened by the offensive actions of Prince Souphannavong's Pathet Lao forces.

We have withdrawn from Laos, but the North Vietnamese have not. The tripartite supervisory committee can operate in the the non-Communist sections of the country, but not in the areas controlled by the Communists.

Cambodia has terminated relations with the United States and Britain because Prince Sihanouk believes that the Communists will eventually rule Asia. In short he wants to get the best deal for himself and his people.

Then too the war in Vietnam has gone from bad to worse since the overthrow of the Diem regime last November. There have been two coups since Diem's fall. South Vietnam cannot afford any more coups without destroying herself.

Despite the bleak picture, Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut is convinced that the United States can stop communism from engulfing southeast Asia.

In this month's issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report, DODD has proposed a series of countermeasures designed to achieve that objective. They are:

The United States must bolster the Khanh government in South Vietnam if the war against the Vietcong is to be successfully prosecuted.

We must assure the world that we will not abandon Southeast Asia, that Vietnam will not be neutralized and that the United States will not participate in a conference to neutralize Cambodia.

Encourage the South Vietnam Government to produce a white paper documenting the fact that the Vietcong guerrilla war is planned, led, and organized by agents of Ho Chi Minh. A similar one should be prepared by the anti-Communist elements in Laos detailing the repeated violations of the cease fire and Geneva Treaty by the Pathet Lao.

Allow the South Vietnamese to carry the war into North Vietnam and reject the Red ground rule that wars must always be conducted in free world territory, never in Communist territory.

Permit defectors and refugees from North Vietnam to establish front movements for the liberation of North Vietnam and supply them with the necessary propaganda facilities. Ho Chi Minh conducts his activities in the south under a liberation front organization that has representatives in 15 countries.

When the Communists attack again in Laos, the United States should assist General Phoumi and General Kong Le to counterattack, encouraging them to secure at least the southern half of the country including the Laotian panhandle which Ho Chi Minh uses to send men and supplies into South Vietnam.

Danger to Savings From Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following release to the various newspapers in the hope that the plight of our American workmen and industries will be called to the attention of the people in all walks of life:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT today warned the Congress of danger to savings from tax cuts which may well be sent abroad by American industry for investment in foreign nations for plant facilities to displace U.S. exports as well as automation to displace domestic employment.

DENT said that the rush to foreign shores by U.S. industry is caused by foreign restrictions (other than, but including tariffs) against U.S. imports, the desire for cheaper wage levels in foreign countries and the lack of protective covenants by U.S. customs which allow these same U.S. companies to import back in the United States the products of the foreign plants (Studebaker, Burroughs Business Machines, Singer Sewing Machine, Royal Typewriter, etc.).

This means that the market money of the little taxpayers saved by the tax cut may well go into payrolls for foreign workers and into foreign profits for runaway U.S. industries.

The latest plant movement is Kaiser with a new aluminum rod and cable mill in West Berlin. The plant will cost $3,500,000 in American money.

Kaiser is a major producer of aluminum electrical conductor material in the United States and this plant will displace exports to Germany from the United States. Kaiser is also building a modern aluminum fabricating mill at Koblenz on the Rhine, through a subsidiary—Kaiser Aluminum-Werke, G.m.b.H. This plant will make the exporting of these products to Germany a thing of the past.

At the same time this information came across my desk, the State Department and Agriculture Department made an announcement of a new beef import deal which allows Australia and New Zealand to ship increased beef and mutton in 1965 and 1966.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture recently said that our beef import position was untenable, the action pushes aside the serious complaints of the U.S. beef industry. (This is the only beef market in the world unprotected.)

Beef imports have increased from 18 million pounds in 1958, to over 517 million pounds in 1963. Total beef and mutton imports were 577 million pounds in 1963, and will increase to 582 million pounds in 1966. The sop to the U.S. farmer is contained in a 4-percent cut for 1964 for obvious reasons, however, this is ultimately picked up by a 6-percent increase in both 1965 and 1966.

The State Department has thus assured the foreign exporters that they will share equitably in U.S. market growth, according to the National Milk Producers Association.

This association blames the imports for depressing the price of all dairy cows, retarding the rate of culling and thereby increasing the milk supply which is thrown out of gear by the enormous amounts of import beef at prices lower than our U.S. costs.

Added to this is the grave situation caused by imports of cream and cheese, further depressing the milk market and increasing costs to the Government for surplus stocks.

An announcement by the Dunn Corp. on the liquidation of the Wyandotte Worsted Co., carries the following statement:

"We are enclosing with this letter a copy of our liquidation catalog on the Pittsfield Division of the Wyandotte Worsted Co.

"This plant, which at one time employed more than 500 people, has died. Not from old age, not from inadequate management or inferior equipment and certainly not from lack of interest on the part of employer or employee. This fine mill, which meant the livelihood of 500 American citizens, has been killed by foreign imports.

"I am sure you will realize that far more than 500 people have been affected by the closing of this plant. The merchants of the city of Pittsfield will suffer as well.

"The purpose of my letter and in sending you our catalog is to bring your attention to the serious need for curbing foreign imports, not only in textiles, but on other goods that are in direct competition with American industries.

"We cannot long stand competition from foreign mill owners who pay their labor slave wages. It is an economic truth that we cannot sell goods for less than it costs to make them.

"Our standard of living is the highest in the world today. I urge you to keep it that way by voting for higher tariffs on goods coming in from foreign countries that are in direct competition with American industry.

"It is a fine and charitable thing to be your brother's keeper, but it simply does not make sense to starve your own family so your neighbor across the sea can be well fed. May we have your views on the above?"

The Portland Press Herald editorial which follows ought to be a warning to the negotiators at the GATT Conferences (Christian Herter, George Ball and company), that the press may awaken to the serious threat to our way of life, free enterprise, free labor and above all—our entire economic well-being.

It should be a warning to the political parties of the need for action to protect our jobs and domestic production against unfair trade practices.

The following is from the Portland Press Herald:

"A year ago everyone—well, almost everyone—was hailing the praises of the European Common Market, what it could do to lift living standards, especially if Britain joined, and the necessity of giving President Kennedy wide powers to regulate U.S. tariff rates in negotiations with the enlarged and growingly prosperous continental trading area.

"Right now the bloom is off the rose, with President Charles De Gaulle giving Britain the bum's rush, while the Common Market boosts its tariffs in a way to exclude many of our agricultural products. Not only are Europeans critically revaluating the Common Market, but hostility to freer trade is rising in this country, as Europe and other world areas step up their low-cost exports of manufactured goods to the United States. In this atmosphere President Kennedy will find it difficult to dicker with aggressive traders overseas who raise barriers of all kinds against American products.

"Maine is especially hard hit by the new protectionists, plus those pouring an immense flood of manufactures into U.S. markets, and we had new evidence of it last week in the case of Guilford Industries, whose president is H. King Cummings of Newport.

"During a period when the deck has been stacked against the making of cotton and woolen textiles in New England, Guilford Industries has been expanded into a three-factory operation (Newport, Guilford, and Eastport) employing at times nearly a thousand Maine people in turning out woolen yarns and textile goods. But last week Mr. Cummings was forced to tell his employees at Newport that largely because of a 'heavy load of imports' he will be forced into adjustments reducing the scope of his operations there. Fortunately, he hopes that the workers displaced can be given other employment or absorbed in his plants at the other two towns. (The congressional answer to this competition is another $370 million to be paid to textile millionaires. How silly can we get.)

"This is a serious matter for a town the size of Newport, and so far as Maine is concerned, it is not an isolated result of the changing world trade picture. Rising shoe imports not long ago helped force the closing of an Auburn shoeshop that had functioned there for decades. The Maine poultry industry has been hit between the eyes by the sliding duties imposed by the Common Market against exports to West Germany of frozen poultry. The competition of Asian cheap cotton imports with the products of Maine's cotton textile mills has long been an economic fact of life here. The same is true of the clothespin industry, the economic mainstay of several Maine towns.

"There is a vast difference between free trade and freer trade. During what might be called the protectionist era of this country, a strong movement developed in favor of free trade as a reaction against higher and higher U.S. tariffs manipulated purely to protect special interests in the United States. The late, great Prof. Frank Taussig of Harvard University could give innumerable reasons for abandoning protective tariffs, and gradually they have been greatly lowered. Yet with the diffusion of technological progress, accompanied by immense disparities in wage levels, there is more to be said today for the kind of adjustments of trade barriers that will make trade freer without causing damaging dislocations to towns like Newport and Auburn and goodness knows how many more. We trust this is also the feeling of the administration, and of Congress."

Mrs. Robert F. Wagner

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join in

this tribute to the memory of Mrs. Robert F. Wagner.

This wonderful first lady of the city of New York was a shining example of graciousness in all she did. Hers was not an easy task in trying at all times to draw the line between the public and private lives of the Wagners. In one of her few public statements she said that she felt it was her job to lessen the strain and provide more leisure time for her husband, the mayor.

Susan Wagner believed that Gracie Mansion, the lovely white mansion overlooking the East River, belonged to all the people of New York, and she threw it open to charitable and civic groups. At times she was the guide for tours of schoolchildren and other groups.

Mrs. Wagner's death is a real loss and I join my colleagues in extending my profound sympathy to Mayor Wagner and his two fine sons.

A Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place before the House an article about a man whose career should be an inspiration to all, and especially to those upon whom some physical handicap has been visited. The man of whom I speak is Milton K. Cummings, of Huntsville, Ala., a fine human being, a loyal Democrat, an enlightened businessman, and one who typifies the American success story. The article is from the Nashville Tennessean Sunday magazine of January 19, 1964. I commend it to you:

NEW THRONE FOR A COTTON KING

(By Louise Davis)

Why success yanked Milton K. Cummings out of the crowd and set him at the top of north Alabama's industrial heap is a mystery to him.

But he can pinpoint almost to the minute the melodramatic turning point in his fortune.

It was late one night in 1936 when he was summoned to the bedside of his employer, a Huntsville cotton merchant named Shelby Fletcher, who was dying of a heart attack.

Hurriedly, in the presence of a lawyer, the stricken man dictated his will, and Cummings hopped downstairs to type it. When Fletcher had signed it, he died.

And Cummings was heir to $5,000, the nest egg out of which he built a multimillion-dollar fortune and the biggest industry in north Alabama, one that now employs 3,252 men and women.

But the genius of Milton Cummings—the ability that has made him a symbol of the "New South"—is his skill in switching from a way of life that was to the way of life that is.

His transition from the cotton business to space engineering (he is head of Brown Engineering Co. in Huntsville, chief supplier to NASA at Redstone Arsenal) is a model for businessmen of the South, bankers say.

His awareness of the businessman's obligation to participate in government, his sense of duty toward training workers of his region for new type jobs has set him apart.

"Milton Cummings personifies what has happened in the South in the last generation," Sam Fleming, president of Nashville's Third National Bank, said.

"He changed from cotton to a business with a future when the time for change came. He has ability and courage. He is quite a man."

Cummings himself, who has been called the No. 1 citizen of Huntsville, views his 52 years as a great gift, given to him to prove a greater philosophy. That, despite the fact he lost one leg to osteomyelitis when he was 4 years old and had to learn to walk with an artificial leg.

"I am perhaps the happiest, the most grateful man in the world—grateful to friends and to God," he said recently in the sparkling white office of his space-keyed building at the outskirts of Huntsville. "There is no way I could duplicate my career without the support of both of them."

His boyhood struggles tied him close to laborers. He talks their language, encourages their friendship, wins the affection and support of employees of all ranks.

"I see so much suffering," he said. "I know the problems of the poor.

"Why I should be pulled out of their midst, I don't understand. Why I should be afflicted with the loss of a leg, or blessed with a prosperous cotton business, and then the this business, I don't understand."

But he makes it his business to understand all that is going on about him. He reads every news magazine and reliable newspaper he can get his hands on, analyzes the influence on business of scientific, social, political developments.

Getting outside his own mind, setting aside his own opinions is the great trick in making a decision, he said.

"That is one of the things that Mr. Fletcher, my benefactor and first employer, taught me," Cummings said. "He taught me to be realistic, to be conscious of what other people are thinking and doing, to set aside my own personal opinion and try to assess the present situation.

"Having assessed it, I try to set a sound policy for the future and take a financial position to support that decision."

Scientist Wernher von Braun, citing Cummings' impact on the region, particularly his help in establishing the Alabama Research Institute in Huntsville, called it an example of "the most inspiring thing the free world can display."

Vice President Johnson asked Cummings to take the lead in a new approach to equal employment opportunities. Auburn University last year cited him for his contribution to "Alabama and the Nation as industrialist, civic leader, and humanitarian."

Cummings, whose father and grandfather grew up in Huntsville, was born in Gadsden, Ala., in 1911. His family soon moved to Texas, his mother's native State. There he suffered osteomyelitis and had one leg amputated just below the knee. When the family moved back to Huntsville and he was still on crutches, he ran errands for his father, who worked for a cotton merchant.

"It was the crutches that made Mr. Fletcher notice me," Cummings said. "When I graduated from high school, when I was 16, in 1928, he offered me a college scholarship, including all expenses paid at Harvard Medical School or wherever I chose to go."

Cummings had thought he would like to be a doctor, and the offer was tempting. But he turned it down.

"I told Mr. Fletcher my parents had taken care of me as a crippled child, and now it was my obligation to take care of them. I thought I had to start making money right then."

Fletcher gave him a job as clerk in his cotton business in the fall of 1928. He made $75 a month.

Cummings learned the dramatic lessons of the depression. People he had known as leading citizens of the town, some of them wealthy when he was in high school, were in the bread line 4 years later.

In 1936, with his $5,000, the young man went into the cotton business for himself at age 25. He soon became the most successful cotton merchant in the area, buying cotton from farmers and selling it to mills.

By 1953, Cummings decided the cotton business was a thing of the past, and he got out of it.

"I didn't feel that President Eisenhower, Secretary Benson, or the American farmer really understood the agricultural problems of the day," Cummings said. "Their policy showed they favored lower farm prices and uncontrolled production, inviting disaster for cotton, and for farmers in general."

He devoted the next 4 years to managing his investments in the stock market, with highly satisfactory results.

But there was something arid about that sort of success. He missed working with other men.

And while his own fortune climbed, a struggling Huntsville firm, Brown Engineering, floundered. In 1957, housed in an old cotton mill in a shabby part of town, the company had 212 employees and was practically bankrupt.

In 1958, board members asked Cummings to take over the presidency for 3 months—long enough to save the company until they could find a man with engineering experience.

Cummings accepted the challenge, breathed such life into the business that board members asked him to take over the job as permanent president.

Cummings was fascinated by the possibilities. He built it into the most diversified, largest machine shop in the South for the space program. The company designs and builds over 1,000 of the component, custom-built parts that go into space vehicles for NASA.

"We do it from the drawing board to the finished product," Cummings said. "Many times the things we build are being built for the first time ever. We are part of the ground support for the missile system."

Cummings poured more than $1 million of his own money into the sick business, and the loans he made outreached Huntsville and Nashville banks and made him a steady customer at New York's largest.

By 1961 he had begun construction of three new buildings for office space, laboratories, machine shops, and testing areas that are now spread out over an 80-acre site.

Cummings still shakes his head at the unlikely position he is in—he, with only a high school education, head of a vast engineering company.

His method is to seek out the best man for each job—including scores of Ph. D.'s—and concern himself with making the financial end of the operation click. He takes pride in the fact that the average age of his employees is 32.

A former championship tennis player (he won State competitions regularly and gave demonstrations of his tennis-playing skill at Army hospitals during World War II to show amputees they had nothing to fear) he still plays and excellent game of golf.

But the challenge of business has almost crowded golf off the schedule.

"I don't enjoy golf enough to want to get away from the job," he said. "I always have the proposition before me: Are you doing the best you can for the trust of the 3,250 people who work here, and for the stockholders?

"You couldn't be exposed to something like this and enjoy a yacht in Florida. Brown Engineering is a part of me now. I wouldn't be happy anywhere else."

He is in the thick of so many fundraising drives, local and national campaigns for im-

proving health, education, and employment in his region that two typed pages won't hold the list.

But his devotion to the Presbyterian Church, as deacon for 23 years, and later as elder, has been the pivot.

This business success itself is proof of the practical wisdom of Christianity, he is convinced.

"There never has been a time that I put public interest above my own that I did not gain," Cummings said. "Dollars should be the byproducts of good service.

"I believe this: We are our brother's keeper."

When the then Vice President Johnson last spring notified all companies with Government contracts that they were to make a survey of practices regarding employment of Negroes, Cummings grabbed the bull by the horn.

He not only made the requested survey and listed all of the methods his company is taking to help train and make employable more Negroes. He banded together 16 business firms—Government contractors, for the most part—to take positive action to give Negroes equal opportunity for employment.

The report was completed November 20, and 2 days later, at the very hour of President Kennedy's assassination, Cummings was in Vice President Johnson's Office, submitting the 30-page report and discussing it with one of Johnson's assistants.

"Johnson became President while I was in his office," Cummings said, glancing at the one portrait in his office: an autographed photograph of President Kennedy.

But Cummings' zeal in providing equal job opportunities for Negroes has stirred the wrath of many conservative Alabamians—Gov. George Wallace in particular.

Cummings is accustomed to political blasts against him on front pages. He thrives on political fights—once even served out an unexpired term in the State legislature.

Part of his value to north Alabama is as liaison man between Huntsville and Washington.

Business takes him to Washinton about once a month, and to "the cape" (Kennedy now, Canaveral before) about once every 3 months. His company has offices at "the cape" as well as at Houston and Huntsville.

He is at much at home in the Senate dining room in Washington (with his good friend, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Huntsville) as he is in the Huntsville Country Club.

His friendship with Senator SPARKMAN is so close that the Senator and his wife and daughter spent the night at the Cummings' stately, white-columned home to hear election returns when SPARKMAN ran for the vice-presidency, with Adlai Stevenson, in 1952.

"Life magazine was there to cover the victory party," Cummings said. "Of course, it never happened."

"Milton likes to work in the background in politics," Mrs. Cummings said. "He loves entertaining friends—politicians, company people—here at home. There is hardly a day that he doesn't bring somebody home to lunch."

One of Huntsville's handsomest antebellum mansions has been the Cummings home for 16 years. They brought up their son and three daughters there.

But now that their children are grown, the Cummings are making another big switch. They will soon move into a bright new one-story home they have built on a 1-acre lot nearby.

Last summer, when Auburn University gave him an honorary Ph. D. degree in recognition of his work for the improvement of the region, two plane loads of Huntsville businessmen flew down for the ceremony, and dozens of others drove there.

Nothing in his career—not even the transformation of Brown Engineering from a $130,000 business in 1958 to a $5,200,000 business today—has made Cummings prouder.

The president's office, the office of the crippled boy who turned down a chance at becoming a doctor so that he could support his parents, has a new title on the door: Dr. M. K. Cummings.

Federal Jurisdiction for Attack on the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation providing for Federal jurisdiction over persons charged with attacks upon the life of the President, Vice President, and successors to the Presidency.

The tragedy of last November 22 has made it clear that our laws need to be tightened to insure uniform prosecution of those charged with attacking the lives of our Chief Executives or their successors.

This proposed legislation has been drafted after long study and consideration in cooperation with Dr. Arthur Lenhoff, professor emeritus of the University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.

Following is an explanation of the background of my bill:

FEDERAL JURISDICTION FOR ATTACK ON THE PRESIDENT

I. WOULD FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER MURDEROUS ATTACKS ON THE LIVES OF THE PRESIDENT, PRESIDENT-ELECT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND OFFICERS NEXT IN THE ORDER OF SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE, BE EXCLUSIVE OF THE JURISDICTION OF THE STATES?

(a) The first question which comes to one's mind is whether Congress can establish exclusive Federal jurisdiction over such attacks. Such Federal criminal jurisdiction might be territorial. This means that only Federal courts would have jurisdiction where the locus of the offense was in the District of Columbia, Territories or Possessions of the United States, and so forth, under the exclusive authority of U.S. Government. This part of Federal criminal jurisdiction is here not in point.

It cannot be overlooked that Federal criminal jurisdiction has also evolved on a nonterritorial basis. It may be recalled that such jurisdiction emerged where antisocial conduct has concerned fields of Federal administration such as taxation, or of preeminent interest in the safety of the country such as jurisdiction over high treason and sedition. Likewise, protection of the interest in the integrity of the administration have supplied such jurisdictional basis. See, e.g., criminal jurisdiction over bribery of Federal officers or over resistance or obstruction of Federal process.

These illustrations point to misconduct of such a peculiar kind which is not paralleled in the field of the common law. Bribery of Federal officers is not paralleled by a common law crime of officers of a State or its subdivisions.

However, the substantial interest of Federal Government has led to the assumption of Federal jurisdiction over particular misconduct which by itself is also sanctioned by the penal law of the States. The famous decision in *Cunningham* v. *Neagle*, 135 U.S. 1 (1890) illustrates this point. See also the decision *Barrett* v. *U.S.*, 82 F. 2d 528 (C.C.A. 7, 1936) concerning the murder of a special agent of the predecessor of the FBI. The defense made an attack on the constitutionality of the Federal statute establishing the crime, upon the ground that the prosecution of murder falls within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State (of the locus). This attack was rejected with reference to the Supreme Court decision in the *Neagle* case supra.

(b) The tragical events surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy prove that State enforcement of criminal misconduct which by itself constitutes a common law crime is at times insufficient. Such State action might even be frustrated because of territorial limitations on the authority of State officers. In matters properly within the scope of highest national interest, Federal Government should have exclusive authority to legislate, to investigate, and to adjudicate certain criminal conduct.

(c) However, under our Federal system the administration of criminal justice rests principally with the States. See the emphasis laid on this point in *Screws* v. *U.S.*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945) and *Bartkin* v. *Illinois*, 359 U.S. 121 (1959). And see Mr. Justice Black (joined by Justices Reed, Frankfurter, and Douglas) dissenting in *Rutkin* v. *U.S.*, 343 U.S. 130 (1952). He said: "Extortion, robbery, embezzlement, and offenses of that nature are traditionally matters of local concern." He referred to *Jerome* v. *U.S.*, 318 U.S. 101, 105 (1943) where it was said "* * * that those considerations gave additional weight to the view that where Congress is creating offenses which duplicate * * * State law, courts should be reluctant to expand the defined offenses beyond the clear requirements of the terms of the statute."

(d) However, such statements show on the other hand that the fact that the unlawful conduct constitutes a common law crime such as homicide or robbery does not preclude Congress from making it a Federal crime. Sending threatening letters; e.g., a letter containing any threat to take the life of, or to inflict bodily harm upon, the addressee or any other person close to him, constitutes a common law crime. Cf. Clark and Marshall, "A Treatise on the Law of Crimes," 772 (2d ed. 1912). However, Congress felt it necessary to establish such threats against the President of the United States and successors to the Presidency as a special Federal crime. See 18 U.S.C. 871 (as amended by Public Law 87-829, Oct. 15, 1962).

The great bulk of such congressional activity in the field of criminal law rests upon the constitutional power of Congress to enact laws "necessary and proper" in the execution of the powers instrusted to Congress. U.S. Constitution, article II, section I, clause 7. See Schwartz, "Federal Criminal Jurisdiction," etc. 13, "Law and Contemparary Problems", 643 (1948).

(e) Naturaly, as a result State courts have refused to bar a second trial even though there has been a prior trial by Federal courts for the same unsocial conduct, and so have Federal courts acted in the converse situation. See e.g. *Bartkin* v. *Illinois* (1959) supra, and *U.S.* v. *Lanza*, 260 U.S. 377 (1922). This means that the second prosecution by a different Government; e.g., that of a State, does not violate the constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy. See the decisions just cited.

(f) The results derived from the current line of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court are borne out also by the interpretation of the jurisdictional provisions of the United States Code title 18, "Crimes and Criminal

Procedure." The basis is section 3231 of this code. This section consists of two subsections. The first, originally derived from R.S. section 711 reads:

"Section 3231. District courts: The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States."

But this is followed by the second subsection taken from R.S. section 5328 which reads:

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

In *Sexton* v. *California*, 189 U.S. 319, 324 (1903) the U.S. Supreme Court said:

"Assuming that, but for this section, the State court be without jurisdiction, we are of the opinion that it takes the case out of the provisions of other sections of the R.S. (Revised Statutes) namely * * * section 711 (now the first subsection of 18 U.S.C. 3231), section 5328 (now the second subsection of 18 U.S.C. 3231). (The last mentioned) section 5328 must be construed as creating an exception to the general rule declared in these other sections in regard to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. The New York Court of Appeals placed the same construction on that section in a very well-reasoned opinion prepared by Andrews Ch. J. in the case of *People* v. *Welch*, 141 N.Y. 266, 277 * * *."

Likewise, in the recent decision *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 501, note 10 (1956) the Supreme Court said:

"The office of the second sentence (of 18 U.S.C. sec. 3231) is merely to limit the effect of the jurisdictional grant of the first sentence. There was no intention to resolve particular supersession questions by the section (sec. 3231)."

II. WHY CAN STATE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION BE EXCLUDED?

(a) As mentioned before, the U.S. Supreme Court drew heavily in the Sexton case supra on Chief Judge Andrews' opinion in *People* v. *Welch*, *supra*. This was a case dealing with a State prosecution based on a death resulting from criminal negligence on the part of a pilot operating a ship on the Hudson River. The highest court of New York affirmed the concurring jurisdiction of the State. Said the court (141 N.Y. at 273):

"* * * It is obvious that to exclude the jurisdiction of the State courts over matters within their ordinary jurisdiction, the intention of Congress to exercise this power should be distinctly manifested and that the legislation relied upon to deprive the State courts of jurisdiction should be clear and unambiguous. There can be no presumption that State authority is excluded from the mere fact that Congress has legislated. There must be express words of exclusion, or a manifest repugnancy in the exercise of State authority over the subject."

The court of appeals considered, therefore, the jurisdiction of the New York courts to prosecute and to convict the accused for manslaughter ("N.Y. Penal Law" sec. 1052) as not ousted by the specific provision of the Federal Criminal Code, R.S., section 5344 (18 U.S.C. 1115) [establishing a Federal crime of a pilot to cause by his negligence the loss of a person's life].

(b) Where the field is one of dominant national interest and responsibility and Congress has enacted legislation pursuant to the power delegated to it by the Constitution such as the "necessary and proper" clause—article 1 section VIII, clause 18—it can be argued that thereby State legislation although enacted in a field traditionally within the legislative power of States, is superseded. Traditional has been the view to leave the definition and sanction of local offenses to the States. But is an attempt on the life of the Chief Executive of the Nation as merely local as an attempt on the life of Mr. Smith or Mr. Jones? Is not the national interest in the life of the holder of the Presidential office so dominant that congressional legislation based on this interest must, even in the absence of a specific statement to this effect, be assumed to preclude enforcement of the law of a State dealing with the crime of intentional killing of a human being within its territory? The fact that legislation on homicide falls within a field "traditionally occupied" by the States does not entail the consequence that the State must have concurrent control, but does require that the intent of Congress to exclude such control must clearly be manifested.

See e.g., Mr. Justice Douglas speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court in *Rice* v. *Santa Fe Elevator Co.*, 331 U.S. 218, 230 (1947):

"So we start with the assumption that the historic police powers of the States were not to be superseded by the Federal act unless that was the clear and manifest purpose of Congress. (Citing cases.) Such a purpose may be evidenced in several ways. The scheme of Federal regulation may be so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it. (Citing cases.) Or the act of Congress may touch a field in which the Federal interest is so dominant that the Federal system will be assumed to preclude enforcement of State laws on the same subject. *Hines* v. *Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52. Or the State policy may produce a result inconsistent with the objective of the Federal statute. *Hill* v. *Florida*, 325 U.S. 538."

(c) Naturally an examination of the legislative history of the proposed bill to punish murderous attacks on the holder of the Presidential office and persons designated to take such office, might show, that taken as a whole, Congress intended to give Federal authorities and courts an exclusive control over the subject matter so that no room has been left for any action by the States. However, the numerous controversies with which courts had to deal on the question of concurrent criminal jurisdiction of the States show that a positive statement to the effect that the Federal Government has preempted the subject would make such controversies superfluous. Thus, it would be advisable to insert an express provision in the act under consideration that the Federal authority to prosecute and to adjudicate the crime shall be exclusive of any other authority.

III. AT ANY CASE PRIORITY OF FEDERAL PROSECUTION SHOULD BE SECURED

If, against the suggestion, concurrent jurisdiction of the States were not eliminated, some care should be taken that the simultaneous prosecution of the criminal assault in jurisdiction, both Federal and State, should be avoided. For several reasons: Here only a few of such reasons may be mentioned. As the Oswald case shows, State investigation leaves much to be desired from the standpoint of proper, if not due, process of law. Furthermore, the usual practice in turning over a prisoner while he is serving a sentence, e.g., Federal one, to the authorities of the other jurisdiction, e.g., the State, for the purpose of his standing trial there, can, of course, not be followed when death penalty is the punishment. In addition, double prosecution in different jurisdictions is source of procrastination and confusion; for different administrative agencies investigate on the basis of different laws and different standards without a real, mutual assistance and disclosure.

The exclusion, clearly stated in the act, of any other authority than the Federal one, is therefore highly desirable.

However, if this suggestion were not followed, it should at least be provided in the act that upon the request of the attorney for the Federal Government charged with the investigation and prosecution of the crime, a district court may issue an order restraining all authorities of the State in which the crime was committed from prosecuting any investigation or proceeding until further orders of the court. See for a similar restraint in order to protect the priority of Federal proceedings, the provision in 28 U.S.C. 2361.

IV. A FEW CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

The proposed legislation proceeds upon the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal courts as basis.

The use of 18 U.S.C. 1114, for the subject here under discussion is not advisable. This provision deals with murderous attacks on a judge of the United States, U.S. marshals or other officers "while engaged in the performance of their official duties" or "on account of the performance of such duties." The bill in contemplation should not be restricted to the protection of the incumbent or prospective holder of the highest office against murderous attacks committed upon them while performing their function or because of their functions. The lives of the President, Vice President, or the officers next in succession to the Presidential office should be protected, regardless of time and place of their functions. To illustrate, an attack upon the President while taking a weekend rest calls for no less a sanction than an attack made upon him in the White House or at an official reception.

Threats against the President, Vice President, etc., to take the life or to inflict bodily harm are already sanctioned in 18 U.S.C. 871.

Increase in Use of Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, an announcement by Mr. Jackson Busby, president, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., which follows holds out hope for my district and western Pennsylvania for a great increase in the use of coal, as well as a boost in our efforts to rehabilitate our industrial capacity.

The program demonstrates the faith of these companies in the people and the institutions in the great State of Pennsylvania.

We look forward to better days:

STATEMENT BY JACK BUSBY

Ebasco Services, Inc., has been awarded the construction management contract for the gigantic Keystone generating station, it was announced today by Mr. Jack K. Busby, president, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. The local utility and three other investor-owned electric utilities are building the 1.8-million-kilowatt powerplant in the western Pennsylvania coalfields near Indiana, Pa. Construction work will start this spring, and the plant will become operational in 1967.

"Ebasco has extensive experience in the construction of thermal, hydro, and nuclear powerplants and has worked in all parts of the United States and in 60 other countries," said Mr. Busby. "Since its founding in 1905, Ebasco has held contracts for plants representing 37.5 million kilowatts of generating capacity."

The new Keystone station, which will consist of two 900,000-kilowatt generating units, will be owned jointly by P.P. & L., Philadelphia Electric Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co. and Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.

The Keystone station is part of a 3-phase, $350-million construction program being financed by 18 investor-owned electric companies serving 30 million people in 8 Eastern States and the District of Columbia. Other phases provided for a second minemouth plant to be built near Morgantown, W. Va., by Allegheny Power System, and the construction of more than 600 miles of 500,000-volt transmission lines linking the various systems.

"The coordinated program reflects the efforts of the utility companies to overcome distance and State and service area boundaries in their quest for improving efficiencies and maximum use of electric power facilities." said Mr. Busby. "In this case, the fortunate ready availability of a concentrated supply of low-cost fuel—sufficient for the life of the Keystone plant—is expected to produce fuel economies of such magnitude as to make long-distance transmission of power over extra-high-voltage lines to eastern markets highly advantageous. The companies, by the further linking of systems and facilities, will also realize benefits through a reduction in their individual reserve capacity requirements and through the savings inherent in larger, more economical units."

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a nationwide Voice of Democracy contest with more than 250,000 high school students participating.

I am proud to announce that a young man from the Detroit area was selected the winner from the State of Michigan. He is Mr. Joey Blaine Reagan, 19221 Oakland, Detroit, who is a student at Pershing High School.

As the winning State contestant, Joey will come to Washington, D.C., for the final judging during which time he will compete for one of four scholarships that are awarded as top prizes.

Joey's essay, titled "The Challenge of Citizenship," gives all of us a practical lesson in democratic action. I, therefore, present it the Members of Congress and to all Americans for their consideration and evaluation:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Joey Blaine Reagan, Pershing High School, Detroit, Mich.)

A car races down a newly constructed highway at 65 miles per hour. The driver is oblivious of traffic lights and the dangers of two-lane driving. Coupled with the speed and absence of obstructions is the saving of precious time. This is the miracle of modern turnpike and freeway driving. As the driver moves along, let us look back, back 5 years when this engineering marvel was a quiet residential district.

The members of a humble middle income family, who have sought for 13 years to make their home a permanent residence, relax after a day's labor. The family's earlier life was beset by financial difficulties, indeed even before there were children. But through opportunity and hard work, the four members of the family now represent a bustling brevery of good cheer and ambition. I know because I am a member of that family.

As we quietly sat in the living room on a sunny Thursday afternoon last June, a car stopped abruptly in front of our home. I immediately noticed that the car bore the emblem of the State highway commission. As I watched, a tall young man emerged from the car. My father met him at the door and allowed him to enter. Through the course of a discussion with him, we learned that the highway commission wished to purchase our home in order to make way for the construction of a new freeway. Our visitor's job was to offer to owners of land and homes along the route of the new freeway a certain sum of money. And since our home was the last not as yet acquired by the commission, he was very anxious to have us accept. The sum offered represents what in the Constitution of the United States is called "just compensation."

Just compensation is given whenever the State exercises its right of eminent domain. The amount offered is based on what is allocated for comparable homes in comparable neighborhoods. My father objected. The offer did not consider the improvements we strove hard to achieve: Shrubs, sidewalk, screens and storm windows, and many others. The offer did not consider the inconvenience which the family would be compelled to endure. The offer did not include anything beyond the assessed valuation of the land and house. Yes, friends, my father rejected the offer. The consequence that now faces us is a trial before a jury.

Even though we rejected the State's offer, we were not antagonistic nor did we question the State's right to take our home. What we did think of was our right and the rights of others, for at this point we were faced directly with the challenge of citizenship. What is the challenge of citizenship? In this case or any similar to it, there are two paths of action. Either we could have been like the citizen who would say, "The Government is too big; it is too strong and it is always right," that person who would shrink from doing something different, or we could be like the citizen who knows, cherishes, and uses what Abraham Lincoln called "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." We use our Government. That trial represents what is guaranteed to every citizen in the great doctrine: "—to petition for redress of grievances." To win at that trial is not the issue. The issue is: Have we met our challenge? Too often good citizenship means merely doing what you think you're supposed to do, like W. H. Auden's Unknown Citizen who "was found by the Bureau of Statistics to be 'One against whom there was no official complaint': 'Was he free?' 'Was he happy?'" The question is absurd: "Had anything been wrong, we certainly should have heard."

Win or lose, I will be proud that I have done my part to meet the greatest challenge of all, the challenge of citizenship.

The Old-Fashioned Virtues Gave Us Our Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, not too many years ago there was a thing called patriotism in America; there was a time when a man took pride in being a man, in hitching his wagon to a star and then through his own toil, and sweat and hustle, he would reach his goal. It was this pride, this determination, this self-respect which made our Nation great and gave us our strength. What is happening to these old-fashioned virtues in today's world of beatniks and Communist-inspired breakdown of our morality?

Some food for thought on this matter is contained in an excellent editorial in the Washington World of March 9, 1964. It is called "Return of the Square" and I include it here as a part of these remarks:

RETURN OF THE SQUARE

C. H. Brower, distinguished president of the advertising firm of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, made a recent speech that contained remarks especially appropriate amid present-day agitation for civil rights, a 35-hour week, fair employment practices, and aid for the underprivileged. They enunciate clearly some of the words of wisdom the past has taught us but which seem seldom remembered today.

What he said is so pertinent, so needed, that we reproduce here a portion of his memorable address:

"I'd like to discuss a few six-letter words. First, the word "square," Back in Mark Twain's day, it was one of the finest words in our language—among the top 10 on any lexicographer's hit parade. You gave a man a square deal if you were honest. And you gave him a square meal when he was hungry. And when you got out of debt, you were square with the world. And that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

"Then a lot of strange characters got hold of this honest, wholesome word, bent it all out of shape and gave it back to the children. Now everyone knows what a square is. He is the man who never learned to get away with it. A Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. A guy who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else can. A boob who gets so lost in his work that he has to be reminded to go home. A character who doesn't have to spend his evenings puttering in a basement workshop and his weekends scraping the bottom of a boat because he's putting all that elbow grease and steam into doing a satisfying job in the job he's getting paid to do. A fellow who laughs with his belly instead of his upper lip. A slob who still gets all choked up when the band plays 'America, the Beautiful.' A square, strictly from Squaresville.

"His tribe isn't thriving too well in the current climate. He doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, cornercutters, sharpshooters, and goofoffs. He's burdened down with old-fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage, and thrift. And he may already be on his way to extinction.

THE PEOPLE HAVE CHANGED

"He and all the rest of us are living in a country today that is quite different from the one that we were taught to love. Parents have successfully defended in court their children's right to ignore the flag salute. Faculties and student bodies have found it distasteful to take an oath of loyalty to their country. And the U.S. Military Academy has found it necessary to place a sign beside its parade grounds at West Point reminding spectators that it is customary for men to remove their hats at the passing of the banner that was once unashamedly referred to as "Old Glory."

AND THE GOVERNMENT

"The force of government is now directed more fully toward the security of the weak than the encouragement of the strong. In business, it is said the way to survive is to

emulate the turtle * * * grow a hard shell and never stick your neck out.

"The United States was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world had ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility, and freedom. We created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people, and for the people * * * an idea that is still being bought today.

"It is hard to find a basic idea that America during the last 50 years has exported. From our most mortal enemy we have bought the idea of a strong government for weak people.

"Most of all, we have been gullible patrons of the export firm of Sigmund Freud, who has sold us the idea that all men are born feeble, that we should abandon our ancient disciplines as too stark for the poor souls that we are, and to seek our salvation through group support.

"It is not funny that today our colleges are loaded with youngsters who are hardly prepared for high school—kids who cannot do simple arithmetic and who cannot spell simple words. This, too, was an import—the idea that the dull discipline of the three R's was disturbing to little Johnny's ego. So we got real scientific and went to work on the poor little kid and his id, with the result that today hardly any school that really is a school is without a class in remedial reading.

"Always tearing down these days. Never building up. Always knocking. Belittling. Downgrading. A sneer rather than a grin. A mocking laugh rather than a belly laugh. Poking fun at other people rather than at ourselves.

"And what, by the way, ever happened to laughter? Once we were a laughing nation. We laughed easily and deeply. The corn may have been as high as an elephant's eye, but we laughed, and it was good for us. We laughed at Lincoln and Mark Twain. We laughed at Will Rogers because he made us laugh at ourselves.

"We refer to our humor as sick, sick, sick, and it is, is, is. Mother used to get cards on Mother's Day, expressing in some way the fact that she was loved and wanted. Now if she is lucky she gets a card that shows Whistler's mother flat on her back and a caption that reads, 'You're not the only one who's off her rocker.'

"Maybe cutting down a cherry tree is a square thing to do; and maybe throwing a dollar across the Rappahannock is a waste of money rather than a test of strength; and maybe nobody stands up in boats any more, but there are lessons to be learned in all of them, and schoolbooks are for learning.

"Today, our country still has a choice. I believe it has already begun to make that choice. I believe it is going back to its old beliefs in such things as ideas, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion, and even hard work."

The Rule of Law in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, lately there has been a great deal of discussion about extending the war in South Vietnam to North Vietnam. A letter appeared in the New York Times of March 4, 1964, which indicates the serious consequences of such a course. The writer of the letter, O. Edmund Clubb, was Consul General in Peiping from 1947 to 1950 and Director of the State Department Office of Chinese Affairs from 1950–52. I urge all my colleagues to read this important letter:

NO NORTH VIETNAM WAR—U.S. COMMITMENTS TO RENOUNCE USE OF FORCE RECALLED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Speaking to the U.N. General Assembly on December 17 last, President Johnson said that "the full power and partnership of the United States is committed to our joint effort to eliminate war and the threat of war." He said further that "we are more than ever committed to the rule of law—in our own land and around the world."

Now Secretary of Defense McNamara makes another urgent trip to Saigon, and it is noised about that military action against North Vietnam is being contemplated to save the situation in South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese, unable to deal effectively with the enemy at home, are obviously in no condition to undertake a foreign expedition: The ground invasions, the air strikes, the naval blockade of North Vietnam would have to be American.

This would clearly be belligerent action. There is discussion of possible dangers of escalation, of what Peiping and Moscow might do, but there is practically no reference to the law of the matter.

SETTLING DISPUTES

There is, of course, law involved in the hypothetical case under discussion. The United States is committed by the U.N. Charter to settle its international disputes by peaceful means, and our experience on the occasion of our relatively mild intervention in Lebanon in 1958 should teach that the United Nations would hardly ignore so violent a breach of our international contract as is reputedly now under consideration.

And we should be doing violence to yet another commitment, made long ago, to renounce the use of military force for the settling of international disputes. Note the operative clauses of the General Pact for the Renunciation of War, signed by the United States and various other nations at Paris on August 27, 1928:

"Article I. The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"Article II. The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

UNITED STATES PRIME MOVER

The U.S. Government was a prime mover in bringing that international instrument into being—a fact reflected in its popular designation as the "Kellogg-Briand Pact." A total of 63 nations ultimately subscribed to the document.

The one American qualification submitted in interpretation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact was that it did not "restrict or impair in any way the right of self-defense." But it could hardly be argued convincingly that American military action against North Vietnam would be in self-defense.

Is war, then, again to be legitimatized as an instrument of national policy? In the course of its quest for a world governed by law, in its participation in the effort of the U.N. "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" (in the words of the U.N. Charter), surely the United States will not contend that, in the pursuit of our national objectives, we should be justified in making war on North Vietnam in disregard of international covenants to which we are a party?

No fail-safe device could save us from the shattering political consequences of so grave a misreading of the present sentiments of mankind.

O. EDMUND CLUBB.

NEW YORK, *March 1, 1964.*

Dedication of the John P. Oldham Elementary School, Norwood, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor and privilege for me to participate in the dedication ceremonies of the John P. Oldham Elementary School in the town of Norwood, Mass., on Sunday, March 1, 1964. The new school is located on Prospect Street on a 12½-acre site and will have a capacity of 480 pupils.

The school was named in honor of John P. Oldham and credit for recommendation of the naming of the school should go to Selectman John A. Abdallah. The latter, a very good friend of mine was personally acquainted with the Oldham family, and in his remarks at the ceremony the background of the Oldham family and their great contributions to the town of Norwood was explained by Selectman Abdallah.

John P. Oldham served the town of Norwood in the capacity of auditor and registrar of voters from 1887 to 1915. From 1915 to 1937 he was employed by the Norwood school system and retired as supervisor of custodians, school buildings and grounds, on December 21, 1937. In recognition of his long and faithful service to the public schools, the Norwood School Committee entered the following in their official records:

After 37 years of uninterrupted service in the work carried on in the public schools of Norwood, Mass., we know that you must feel that you have played a very important part in and contributed in no small way to our public school program. Ever mindful of your generous, cooperative, and enthusiastic spirit in your work, it is with regret that we note the departure from service of one whom we shall long remember.

The residents of the town of Norwood, their public officials, and all who are connected with this program should be congratulated for the fine work they contributed to make this project a reality.

Under leave, I include the list of those who served on the John P. Oldham School Building Committee and the Norwood School Committee; also information concerning the dedication ceremony and a fact sheet with statistics about the school:

DEDICATION OF JOHN P. OLDHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

JOHN P. OLDHAM SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

Joseph R. Olshan, Chairman; John A. Abdallah, Mrs. John P. Dixon, Mrs. Robert E. Hemman, Ambrose J. Kelly, Arthur B. Rod-

gers, Francis X. Sheehan, Jr.; Elizabeth V. Syverson, Secretary; Dr. Philip O. Coakley, Superintendent of Schools; Stoner Associates, Architect; Edward Goverman, General Contractor.

NORWOOD SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Francis X. Sheehan, Jr., Chairman; John J. Cavanaugh, Joseph F. Curran, Henry W. Diggs, William F. Egan, Mrs. Robert E. Hemman, Joseph R. Olshan, Elizabeth V. Syverson, Clerk; Dr. Philip O. Coakley, Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Kevin P. Barry, Principal, John P. Oldham School.

DEDICATION CEREMONY

Elementary school concert band, elementary chorus.

Rev. Father Nifon Abraham, St. George's Syrian Orthodox Chruch.

Mr. Joseph R. Olshan, chairman, building committee.

Building committee members, school committee members, chairman, board of selectmen, Mr. Thomas K. McManus; general manager, town of Norwood, Mr. Walter A. Blasenak; superintendent of schools, Dr. Philip O. Coakley; principal, John P. Oldham School, Mr. Kevin P. Barry; architect, Mr. George Stoner; general contractor, Mr. Edward Goverman.

Members of the Oldham family: Mrs. A. V. Murphy, Miss Theresa G. Oldham, Mrs. Patrick Costello, Mrs. John J. Coakley, Miss Helen E. Oldham, Mrs. Sigmund Laschenski, Mrs. Horace Humphrey.

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Member of Congress (introduced by Mr. John A. Abdallah, chairman, program committee).

Most Rev. Jeremiah F. Minihan, pastor, St. Catherine of Siena Church, Auxiliary Bishop of Boston.

Joseph R. Olshan, chairman of building committee; Francis X. Sheehan, Jr., chairman of school committee.

Elementary Chorus, Elementary School Concert Band, audience.

Rev. Walton D. Moffitt, First Baptist Church.

Guides: sixth grade pupils—John P. Oldham School.

Refreshments: Henry O. Peabody School and Oldham School PTA. Floral arrangements: Wayside Flowers and Simoni's Flowers.

FACT SHEET

Name and location of school: John P. Oldham Elementary School, Prospect Street, Norwood, Mass.

Name of architect: Stoner Associates.

Name of engineers: structural, Robert M. Rumpf Associates; mechanical, Francis Associates; electrical, Francis Associates.

Name of owner: Town of Norwood, Mass.

Name of general contractor: Edward Goverman.

Location of school: Prospect Street, Norwood, Mass.

Type of school: Elementary school.

Size of site: 12½ acres.

Capacity: 480 pupils.

Area of building: 39,500 square feet.

Volume of building: 440,000 cubic feet.

Space per pupil: 82 square feet per pupil.

Cost of construction: $650,000.

Per pupil cost: $1,350.

Square foot cost: $16.50 per pupil.

Cubic foot cost: 89 cents.

Date contract was awarded: Architect-owner February 26, 1962; owner-contractor June 4, 1962.

BUDGET

General contract	$650,000
Architect's fee—including clerk of works and engineering	59,000
Equipment	61,000
Contingency	25,000
Total estimated cost	795,000
State reimbursement (40 percent)	318,000
Cost to town of Norwood	477,000

Method of payment: Cash.

Government Policies Shape Our Potential for Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, by way of more enlightenment on the current cattle crisis affecting all of our cattle-producing States, I would like to insert this editorial from the Southeastern Poultry Times of March 4. The editorial discusses some added effects of the cattle crisis hitherto unmentioned.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT POLICIES SHAPE OUR POTENTIAL FOR PROFITS

(By John F. Yarborough)

Have you given much thought lately to the "going price" of beef—either on the hoof, or in the supermarket? Before you shake your head and begin wondering whether this poultry editor has gone soft, stop and think about the question a moment.

Although it has always been particularly difficult to relate our poultry prices with happenings in the red meat field, it is generally understood that beef is our biggest single competitor. Fluctuations in the price of beef and other meats do have a bearing on our own demand-price situation. Likewise, external factors; that is, factors which have a bearing on production but are beyond the control of cattle, hog, and lamb producers, are matters that should concern poultrymen.

The U.S. cattle industry is today wallowing in a trough of low prices which has been fomented by two separate and distinct elements of administration policy. The first, needs little explanation here. There is hardly a producer of meat animals or poultry in this country who hasn't felt the pinch of higher grain and soybean meal prices.

Just to demonstrate the point, soybean meal was selling at Decatur, Ill., for $51.50 per ton in mid-January 1961. The price at the same central point in mid-February 1964, was $72.50. Secretary Freeman's high support price edicts pushed the price to this level. Chicago corn (No. 2) was bringing $1.12 in early 1961. A week ago it was more than 10 cents per bushel higher.

The administration's State and Agricultural Department chieftains must share the blame for the other major stroke of injustice to American meat producers. Weak-kneed, wishy-washy opposition allowed the Common Market countries to backhand U.S. poultry out of Western Europe and now, to compound the injury, the same sort of inaction and kowtowing has allowed our friends to the southwest—Australia and New Zealand—to soak up a major share of the U.S. market for beef, veal, and mutton.

Australia, which as recently as 1958 shipped 32 million pounds of red meat to the United States, last year boosted its sale to the astounding figure of 577 million pounds.

Not only have Australia and New Zealand carved out a big chunk of our market, they have also been granted a share of the expanding market in years to come. True enough, these two countries, as a sop to the anguished complaints of U.S. producers, have agreed to hold their exports to the United States in 1964 at no more than their record shipments of 1962 and 1963. But, beginning in 1965 they can boost their shipments by 3.7 percent with a similar boost the following year.

So, how do all these political machinations affect the price of chicken?

Just look at the broiler market any day you choose and you will get part of the answer.

The shutup and sellout agricultural policies of this administration usually seem far removed from the everyday factors that affect the broiler or turkey price. But the final results are just as close as the meat case in your supermarket. Cheap beef increases the pressure on the poultry industry.

In a free market the poultry industry needs no props and no supports—just an equal chance at the consumer. But today neither poultrymen nor cattlemen are free. They must contend with unreasonable Government management of feed ingredients and they must do interminable battle with a bureaucracy that either knows little, or cares even less, about the integrity of the American farm producer or his position in trade at home or abroad.

Adequate Space for House Members and Administrative Assistants Desired for More Effective Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of addressing the Texas Breakfast Club at the Congressional Hotel. Mr. Larry Jones, of Austin, Tex., who is Deputy General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, is president of the club.

My talk was as follows:

The vastness of the Federal Government is a fact of life that concerns us all. Big government—like big business, big finance, and big labor—frightens the less hardy soul.

Most of us accept bigness as an inevitable development of our age. We may not like it, but there it is.

Long ago, I for one felt that big government was here to stay, and I have attempted in whatever way I could to make it efficient and responsible to the will of our people. In the Congress, I am certainly not alone in seeking these objectives. I believe that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives is just as sincerely working toward these goals as I have been. But we are tremendously handicapped.

We are too frequently forced to accept other people's reports on legislation before the Congress. We are not adequately staffed to have proper evaluation made regarding legislation that comes before us. It is my belief that Congress needs a vast increase in the number of technical consultants and legal and economic advisers to report directly to the Congressman they work for. As it is today, we of the Congress are too often presented with information that is slanted favorably toward special interests.

Our world has become so specialized that it is actually impossible for any one man to cover adequately all of the subjects that come before us. Some committee reports run 300 or 400 pages. They are full of research material on a particular subject, but what Congressman has the time to digest and evaluate all of the information and misinformation which is thus available to us?

If we were properly staffed—each Congressman with two or three additional competent and well-trained aids—to help us arrive at correct decisions by studying the subjects we necessarily must vote on, I don't believe that some of the legislative mistakes that take place now would be possible. I

think that we would certainly minimize the margin for legislative blundering.

In my 35 years' experience in the Congress, I have come to the conclusion that practically all Members desire to be more knowledgeable than they are on bills that do not come before their own immediate purview. As it is, we get legislation presented to us, or we get lobbyist material forwarded to us—let us say—on salmon fishing in Alaska. Now I like salmon—whether it's from Alaska or someplace else—but if I have to vote on some regulation or legislation concerning it—on whether its fishermen should be subsidized or not—whether the Japanese or somebody else is affected by my vote—I am concerned, because I fear that I have been unable to give adequate consideration to the matter at hand. And so it is on down the line—on one subject after another.

I do not by design slight any particular subject that comes before us, but there are just so many hours in a day, and although I work practically a 7-day week, I simply do not have the time to study sufficiently the myriad and varied proposals that come before the Congress. Think of it—11,296 bills were introduced in the House of Representatives last year—645 of these were passed. Thirty-nine joint resolutions were also passed. Most of these laws I am confident are for the good of the country, but there are others that had no business becoming law. Now if I had in my office an economist and a legal adviser—and if every other Member had the same qualified assistance to screen proposed legislation and evaluate it—you may rest assured that the quality of our national laws would improve. And some of the "sleeper" amendments and special interest laws that eventually come back to embarrass the Congress never would have passed—if the Congress had been adequately staffed as I now propose.

I have not been talking to hear myself talk. This whole business is as serious as anything that confronts the American people. The bigness of Government that I spoke about is here to stay. It is going to be intelligent, well-managed bigness—or it is going to be catastrophic. Since we in the Congress will be required to give the new guidelines in the form of new legislation, we must go about the task intelligently. This we cannot do unless we are buttressed by those equipped to help us research these issues.

As it is now, too frequently the Congress accepts what is handed to it by various lobbyists—and even representatives from Federal agencies and regulatory bodies. Sometimes this information is excellent—but every now and then we discover to our dismay that we are being advised by someone—even in the Government—who has a special ax to grind. He may have been suggested for his post by the particular industry that spawned him.

With the kind of staffing for an individual Congressman—as well as an increase in the professional staff of our committees that I have in mind—it just does not follow that we would fall for some of the organized misinformation that too frequently comes our way. Our specialists, counselors, and economists would warn us that such and such a proposal would work to the detriment of the people and to the advancement of a particular special interest group. If what I have in mind were to be put into effect, it would be more difficult to ignore or bypass needed legislation favorable to the country at large.

Today we have a Federal debt of something over $300 billion. Before many years this debt could double unless we are adequately informed about how we are spending our money—who is asking for it—who is receiving it—where we are wasteful—and where we are prudent. And how much does it cost us as taxpayers to pay interest on an ever-increasing debt? (As an aside, may I state that if we had kept interest payments down as they were under Roosevelt and Truman, the national debt would be $40 billion less.)

So sold am I on my proposal—it is certainly not a radical one—that I believe it imperative that we get on with the business of increasing our congressional research here and now. Before this Congress adjourns, I am going to present to the Congress legislation looking toward this proposition.

Moreover, knowing how crowded we have been and how crowded we will remain despite the new congressional office building that will open sometime this year, I here and now propose that a new House Office Building be constructed in the area of the other three House Office Buildings in order to provide sufficient office space for all 435 Members of the House and their expanded staffs.

It is my belief that any money we would spend for help to staff our Congress adequately and to house that staff would come back tenfold in (a) cutting down the possibility of legislative blundering; (b) reducing the amount of special legislation passed for special interest groups that do not deserve the favors they derive, and (c) accelerating the passage of worthwhile legislation desired by most of the American people.

We cannot get too much knowledge about the intricacies and difficulties of our scientific age, and we cannot expect to cramp our congressional scholars, counselors, and advisers with inadequate quarters. Let there be more light—and let there be room for the lamplighters.

Lumber Standards Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the genial master of comic phraseology from South Dakota, Mr. BERRY, obviously has not been fully informed of my own participation in the matter of the lumber standards controversy. While I am not sure he will have an open mind about it, I hope that perhaps after he has read the complete text of the statement which I released to the press on this matter, he will have a clearer understanding.

I merely want to emphasize that anyone who would oppose this procedure is obviously not one who wants to have the full economic impact of any possible changes considered, and who would wish to rush something through for the benefit of special interests as against full consideration, with no favors to anyone, as a proper form of procedure.

The press release follows for the information of all my colleagues:

LUMBER STANDARDS HEARING POSTPONED

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, announced today that he was postponing lumber standards hearings by his Small Business Subcommittee because Commerce Department officials had given him solid assurances of full protection for all segments of the lumber industry.

ROOSEVELT, chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution, had planned the opening of hearings on "The Impact Upon Small Business of Proposed Changes in National Lumber Standards" on March 3.

The Department of Commerce will circulate the proposed lumber standards change for comments to a list of over 20,000 establishments and individuals.

ROOSEVELT said that "Commerce has pledged careful consideration of all comments received, including the findings of this subcommittee, before it takes any further action." He added that the hearings by his subcommittee would be opened after the Department completes evaluation of the comments received.

The California Congressman said that assurances received from the Commerce Department included the following points:

1. Reopening of the list of those to whom the proposed standards change will be sent for comment. This list, previously closed on October 28, will be reopened until March 16 to allow all interested parties to be included.

ROOSEVELT said that examples of those not previously included on the list are trucking and maritime interests. Both these groups and others have informed the subcommittee that they want the right to submit comments.

2. An industry-by-industry evaluation of the comments received. For example, comments from large lumber manufacturers, small lumber manufacturers, and various classes of wood users will be analyzed separately in their appropriate categories.

ROOSEVELT said he is convinced that "the frequently expressed fear that the so-called poll would be run as a popularity contest was not well founded."

"The Commerce Department has assured me that the most careful consideration will be given to the comments in view of the interests making them," he said. "Sheer numbers are not controlling."

ROOSEVELT added that the Department "is not seeking mere yes or no answers. It desires affirmative suggestions and information concerning the workability, equity, and economic impact of the proposed standard."

3. Reconstitution of the American Lumber Standards Committee. The scope of representation on the American Lumber Standards Committee is under active study by the Department of Commerce and the Justice Department. Representative ROOSEVELT pointed out that he had been assured that his subcommittee and the ALSC itself would also be consulted concerning the makeup of the committee. A concrete proposal for reconstitution is being developed and will be submitted to the courts for their concurrence.

4. Minority views and adequate explanation to be included in submission of proposal. When the proposed standard is submitted for comments for use in evaluating the proposal, the views of both the majority and the minority within the American Lumber Standards Committee will be submitted, together with an explanation of each, by the Department of Commerce. ROOSEVELT pointed out that this procedure should prevent the confusion that might arise if the standard were submitted without a representation of minority views or adequate explanation.

5. Authority to promulgate the proposed standards. ROOSEVELT said that, contrary to some opinions, the American Lumber Standards Committee cannot put its proposal into effect. "The law gives that power to the Secretary of Commerce," he said. "I have the utmost confidence in the judgment and objectivity of Secretary Luther H. Hodges."

ROOSEVELT said that hearings will be opened when Commerce has supplied the subcommittee with its completed evaluation of the industry-by-industry comments.

"The Commerce Department has assured me that it will take no action until the

subcommittee has had the opportunity of first holding full hearings and then submitting its findings to the Department," he said. "From my study of this matter, I am convinced that the most meaningful hearings can be held after the industry's comments have been fully evaluated.

"The controversy this proposal has engendered among so many diverse interests makes it essential that the most searching evaluation and the most thorough public discussion be undertaken before any final decision is made," ROOSEVELT concluded.

University of Massachusetts Team Undefeated in General Electric College Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the student team from the University of Massachusetts won high honors last Sunday night by defeating the student team of the University of Arizona, thus becoming the 13th General Electric College Bowl team to retire undefeated for its intellectual capabilities.

The General Electric College Bowl provides millions of viewers every Sunday throughout the Nation with a look at an intellectually stimulating contest between teams of college youths in America. The teams apply their skills in answering a wide variety of questions designed not only to test each team member's intelligence, but also his or her alertness and accuracy. As in any physical sport the College Bowl requires the highest degree of teamwork and cooperation between each team and the moderator.

Mr. Speaker, the winning team from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst reflects the high academic capabilities of this great Massachusetts university. I know I speak for my colleagues in the Massachusetts delegation when I say that the team is to be highly commended for defeating the University of Arizona by a wide margin and winning a position of honor as retired champions with the 12 other nondefeated teams in the 5-year history of the General Electric College Bowl. I want to congratulate members of the University of Massachusetts team, Miss Susan F. Tracy of Dedham, David E. Mathieson of Amherst, William J. Landis of Northampton, and Michael Berrini of Burlington, Mass. They have given an excellent accounting of themselves and their university.

Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I include with my remarks a news story from the Springfield, Mass., Union of March 2, giving an account of the enthusiasm at the University of Massachusetts after its team won the General Electric College Bowl.

The news story follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS CAMPUS CHEERS SCHOLARS

AMHERST.—A University of Massachusetts team appearing on the "College Bowl" television show Sunday crushed its opponent from the University of Arizona, 360 to 35. It thus earned a total of $10,500 in scholarship money for the university in five successive appearances on the quiz program.

The team is the 13th out of 200 that has competed during the General Electric Bowl's 6-year history to "retire" undefeated. A team is limited to five victorious games.

Rutgers is the only other State university to do so.

Present in the television studio for the team's final appearance were University of Massachusetts President and Mrs. John W. Lederle and Mrs. Beatrice Madeira, widow of the team's coach, Albert Madeira, former associate professor of English at University of Massachusetts, who was fatally stricken last month while shoveling snow.

Team members are William Landis of Northampton, captain; Susan Tracy of Dedham; Michael Berrini of Burlington, Mass.; and David Mathieson of Amherst.

The students won $9,000 in scholarships donated by the sponsor. An additional $1,500 was donated by Kimball's Department Store of New York City.

The University of Massachusetts quartet also defeated teams from the University of Dayton, Rollins College, Iowa State University and St. John's University.

Team coordinator was Daniel Melley, University of Massachusetts editor. Arrangements were handled by William Deminoff, University of Massachusetts editor of publications

A victory celebration was held in New York City by University of Massachusetts alumni. The Amherst campus went wild, according to a university spokesman.

Students jammed into a large auditorium in the Student Union to watch the program.

This afternoon at 1:30 special ceremonies in front of the Student Union will honor the quick-witted quartet. Besides President Lederle and the University of Massachusetts band, a representative of the Governor's office will be present to offer congratulations.

The War on Poverty Must Rehouse the Slum Dweller—New Private Enterprise Housing Weapon Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called on Congress to wage war on poverty, and has called attention to the fact that millions of low-income families in our cities, towns, and rural areas are ill-housed and that this is the major cause of slums.

The war on poverty must rehouse the slum dwellers. The Federal urban renewal program has provided no housing for slum dwellers, especially those living in the slums of the smaller cities and towns, yet millions of families live in homes of such poor condition, as the President said in his housing message, that the health of those who occupy them is endangered. These homes do not have adequate heating, or even complete sanitary facilities.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10251, to amend section 305 of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special assistance functions by purchasing mortgages on single-family dwellings for low-income families insured under section 221(d)(2) of such act in order to provide housing for slum dwellers who are not being provided decent, safe, and sanitary housing under the present Federal urban renewal program.

I am hopeful that my bill will make a major contribution to providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for our low-income citizens under private enterprise. I hope the Congress will support my plan which does not call for subsidies, and does not require years of very expensive planning largely paid for by the Federal Government.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 10251

A bill to amend section 305 of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special assistance functions by purchasing mortgages on single-family dwellings for low-income families insured under section 221(d)(2) of such Act in order to provide housing for slum dwellers who are not being provided decent, safe, and sanitary housing under the present Federal urban renewal program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the national housing policy, set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, calling for (1) the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing, and (2) the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family is not being achieved by the present Federal urban renewal program.

SEC. 2. Section 305 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, or sell, any mortgage covering a single-family dwelling for occupancy by a low-income family which is insured under the provisions of section 221(d)(2) of this Act on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1964. The total amount of purchases and commitments authorized by this subsection shall not exceed $220,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

On Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, an 80-year-old Californian, a descendant of the original pioneers and herself to some extent a pioneer, has had bred into her the spirit of patriotism and love of country which has helped to make this Nation great. She has expressed these feelings in a poem which has received wide circulation in California and which won her a trip to San Francisco as a prize.

I beg leave to insert it in the RECORD:

ON GUARD

(By Anna M. Priestley)

Our land is blessed above all other lands.
Two mighty oceans clasp it in their hands.
Its lakes are jewels, lying on its breast.
Its mountain peaks wear snow crowns on each crest.
Its history is written in old trees.
Canyons tell secrets of the centuries.
Its soil grows grain enough to feed the world.
Its flag spells freedom when it is unfurled.

Our country's sons have fought around the earth
Wherever tyranny has had its birth.
The love of liberty of those brave men
Is strong in hearts today as it was then.
We live because of others who have died
To leave us an inheritance of pride.
Of all the gifts America can boast
The spirit of its people counts the most.

Courage and faith were bred into the bones
Of those who laid our land's foundation stones.
We must not fail those hardy pioneers
Who fought the wilderness and their own fears.
May we, their heirs, forever keep in sight
The principles for which they dared to fight.
God give us strength to guard our heritage
And be content with freedom as our wage.

Planning the Moon Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the third and the last of a series of articles by Paul Martin, chief of the Washington bureau of the Gannett newspapers, describes the detailed planning of the moon mission which will be the principal goal within this decade of the U.S. space exploration program.

We in Washington often become involved with the technical details of the planning, and overlook the dramatic and exhilarating challenge of exploration that faces our people. Or we are influenced by those who write gloomy accounts focused narrowly on their own concerns or worries about the moon program as it seems in competition with some more favored project.

But the truth is that the challenge of outer space arose because man, through his energy and perseverance, has, in this century for the first time, attained the power to explore this vast region. This generation does not intend to founder in the backwater of space, to quote the words of our late President.

Mr. Martin, through his perceptive and thorough research and explanation of the practical measures underway at Cape Kennedy, through his lucid and careful exposition of the varied manned space flight programs, has performed a fine public service. I offer this third article to complete the series:

PLANNING THE MOON MISSION

(By Paul Martin)

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA.—The ultimate goal of our national space program as presently planned is to send three astronauts to the moon and back by 1970.

The man in charge of this project at the U.S. Space Center here is Col. Rocco A. Petrone, 37, a West Pointer who played tackle on the Army team of 1946, and a native of Amsterdam, N.Y.

He claims the manned lunar landing should not be regarded as "just a stunt." It is part of a diversified program for achieving a capability for exploring and operating in outer space second to no other nation.

"We have become a space power similar to the British maritime power of the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries," he said. "We must be willing to take on new challenges.

"Man has been known through the ages by the tools he developed. The better the tools, the better we live. That is what we are doing here at the cape—developing new tools of the space age."

Petrone believes the greatest practical benefits may lie in the field of communications and reconnaissance.

"If people around the world could see each other and talk to each other, it could dispel a lot of fear and prejudice," he observed.

He foresees little military value in using large space platforms as a bomb dropper for huge multimegaton terror weapons.

"You could accomplish that mission better with the missiles we already have," he declared. "You couldn't control it any better than what we have now."

The Government today is spending $5 billion a year on space activities.

Petrone said $1 billion a year is going into research, facilities, and hardware for the manned lunar landing.

Across the shallow Banana River from the present space center on the cape, the Government is building an entirely new moonport on 87,000 acres of Merritt Island at an estimated cost of $500 million.

Some 4,000 construction workers are employed there now; it will grow to 8,000 as the work develops.

This will be the fabrication site and launching site for the man-on-the-moon project.

A central factory costing $100 million will be the largest building in the world, twice as large as defense headquarters in the Pentagon.

The factory will have four vertical bays where workers can assemble four huge Saturn V rockets at the same time, protected against the weather.

It will take 5 months to check out each hand-tailored rocket.

When one is ready, it will be moved to a launching pad along with a service tower weighing 6,000 tons by a large land-crawler moving at a rate of 1 mile per hour.

A control center located 3 miles from the launching pad won't need heavy concrete protection against the blast and heat.

The man-on-the-moon program is known as the Saturn-Apollo project. Saturn is the launch vehicle, Apollo the three-man spacecraft.

Saturn V, which won't be ready before 1967 or 1968, will stand 360 feet in height.

That's as tall as the Eastman Kodak Building in Rochester, St. Paul's Cathedral in London, and about two-thirds the height of the Washington Monument.

It compares with 180 feet for the Saturn I, America's biggest operational booster to date, which put up the world's biggest payload on January 29.

Saturn V will be a three-stage rocket developing 8,700,000 pounds thrust in all.

That is far more rocket power than any other nation is known to possess. It compares with 1,590,000 pounds for Saturn I, and 360,000 for the Atlas missiles that put up our first astronauts in earth orbits.

The first stage of Saturn V will develop 7.5 million pounds from five engines in a cluster powered by RP-1 jet fuel or kerosene.

The second stage, using liquid hydrogen in five Pratt & Whitney J-2 engines, will generate a million pounds and burn for 8 minutes.

A single third-stage J-2 engine, also fueled by liquid hydrogen, will have 200,000 pounds thrust with a shutdown and restart capability in space.

Saturn V will be able to loft a 240,000-pound payload into earth orbit, send 90,000 pounds to the Moon, or 70,000 pounds to Venus or Mars.

Atop all this will be the Apollo spacecraft.

The spaceship also will have three sections, each with its own built-in rocket power for travel and maneuver, including:

1. A command module where the three astronauts will sit most of the time during the long 66-hour journey to the moon.

2. A service module containing storable propellants for the the equally long flight back to earth.

3. A lunar excursion module with landing gear built by Grumman Aircraft in New York for descending to the moon's surface.

The landing craft will fire retro-rockets to throttle down to zero to effect a soft landing on the moon.

Although three astronaunts will take the long space journey, only two will make a physical landing on the lunar surface.

They will have to flip a coin or draw lots to decide who does this.

The man who remains behind will fly in orbit 25 to 50 miles above the moon's surface, awaiting return of the other two.

His instructions: Watch the instruments, observe the moon, return to earth alone and report if anything goes wrong.

The two who make the lunar landing will carry their own environment with them. They will have spacesuits to protect them from the sun, with oxygen and cooling elements.

"The first mission will be a very short one, perhaps only 4 hours," said Colonel Petrone. "The men will get out and walk around, taking as many samples as possible.

"Then they will get back in, detach the landing gear and leave it behind, and fire at the right time with fuel on board to meet the mother ship in orbit. It will take 20 to 40 minutes to effect a rendezvous.

"The two men will transfer back to the command module. They will drop the lunar spacecraft, and fire fuel in the service module to start the journey home."

This hazardous adventure started with 6 million pounds. It will be coming back with three men in a 10,000-pound capsule.

The astronauts must make some very precise calculations on the way home. They must fire at the earth, and come within a corridor only 50 miles wide.

If they miss, they will go floating off into infinity.

London Economist Looks at Gerard Piel's Approach to Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the London Economist on February 15, 1964, published a searching editorial on the issue of economic development assistance to the underdeveloped world. Endorsing the views expressed by Gerard Piel, the publisher of the Scientific American, in a speech in New Delhi, the Economist points out that "development in the poorer countries that are most ready for economic breakthrough—is at present being held back most largely by lack of ability to pay their imports; and

that help to meet this could be supplied by the rich countries at singularly little cost."

Furthermore, the Economist quotes Mr. Piel, to point out that foreign aid programs would "generate demand for the products of neglected and vital sectors of American industry, including the heavy machinery builders and the machine tool industry."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial:

[From the London Economist, Feb. 15, 1964]

THE PROBLEM OF PROBLEMS—THE FIRST STEPS THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN TOWARD ORGANIZING EXTENDED AID TO POORER COUNTRIES ARE OBVIOUS, BUT ARE BEING IGNORED

"It is quite clear," said Sir Alec Douglas-Home at Toronto this week, "that the problem of problems in the years ahead is the disparity of wealth between the rich nations and the poor." He devoted much of his speech to what has rightly become one his main themes, now that he has hopes that the cold war may be thawing. With the division of wealth in the world broadly coinciding with the division of color, we would be living uncomfortably close to something like a white man's 1789, unless the liberalism of this generation can enable "the poor and discontented to see the prize before them of the fullness of life." Unfortunately, the Prime Minister did not make clear any new ideas on how this generation should accomplish this. Nor can it be said that very much emerged from the debate on international aid which the opposition was staging in Parliament even as Sir Alec spoke; labor just said that it would set up a minister to deal with the whole matter. The world's poor ask for bread, and we will probably give them Mr. Arthur Bottomley.

Yet the first steps that should be taken toward organizing a new, coherent, and much extended system of international aid are really fairly obvious. They would surely be implemented if ordinary people could be brought to understand both the urgency and the economics of the matter. But politicians rarely explain the urgency in sufficiently specific terms, partly because they are afraid of being undiplomatic to the Afro-Asians; and they almost never speak straightly about the economics, because international Keynesianism is still not regarded as respectable. It is at the nonpolitical level that most sense is still being talked. There need, therefore, be no excuses if we now jump directly from a speech by Britan's Prime Minister to one just issued by an itinerant American who has become an impassioned advocate of international aid—to the speech by Mr. Gerard Piel, publisher of the Scientific American, at the award of the Kalinga prize in New Delhi.

His estimate is that the total rate of investment in underdeveloped countries at present does not exceed $20,000 million a year, of which less than $4,000 million is financed by what he defines as net aid from rich to poor nations. This $20,000 million a year, which is less than one-fifth of the armaments outlay of the rich nations, is insufficient to cause development to go forward at a pace that will rescue developing countries from the usual, harsh, historical necessity of forcing savings out of their people.

FORCED SAVINGS

"Because history is so largely written by its beneficiaries," we probably understimate the extent to which past development has been achieved only because some capitalist class or authoritarian government has been able to sit hard on the heads of those who were hurt by the first changes. This was true of England in the industrial revolution, where egregious Victorian moralisers have almost certainly obscured the pain and rebellion of the early days, as men were coerced out of the old Britain of unenclosed yeoman agriculture into the scientific new Britain of the slag heap and the mill-prison. It was true of the United States where, "although historians continue to celebrate the frontier," the primary fodder for industrial revolution was largely furnished by 35 million steerage immigrants; and where the American Negro's present determined drive affords another reminder for Americans of "how the savings for the development of their country were corralled." In the Soviet Union, the bitter costs in coercion of its brief and brutal industrial revolution are now admitted by Russians themselves, although it is still pretended that the costs were due not to forced development but "to foreign invasion, counterrevolution and the cult of personality." The picture has been a fairly consistent one of the first workers and peasants in a developing economy having seething cause for discontent, and of growth-hungry authority comporting itself pretty roughly to suppress it.

If today's underdeveloped countries have to go through similar periods of bitterly resented coercion before economic development is completed, the coercion is less likely to be exerted by a capitalist class than by their governments. On present trends it therefore seems very probable that "the next few years will see the developing countries, one after another, come under authoritarian leadership." Authoritarian African and Asian governments are liable to be extremely excitable and uncomfortable partners on the world scene. The rich countries, in particular those who have stakes in the one-crop and mineral-extracting economies of the preindustrial poor nations, must anticipate that the fervor of the heated new nationalisms will be turned against them. This proliferation of authoritarian regimes among the poor may constantly increase the danger of war.

The maddening thing is that Western statesmen of this generation, even those who rightly recognize this as our biggest danger, do not see how easily it might be avertible. For the economics of the matter are by now much less gloomy than historical pessimists might suppose. For the first time in history it is probable that existing technology is now equal to the task of accelerating the increase of production ahead of the growth of population everywhere in the world. It is, no doubt, far too simple to imply that because $4,000 million a year of aid underpins a total of $20,000 million a year of investment in the poorer countries, aid five times as large would underpin $100,000 million of it; and that $100,000 million a year of investment would be just about adequate to get development really moving, because some committee of experts from some underdeveloped countries has at some time said so. Wild estimates of that sort should be avoided. But what is clear is that development in the poorer countries that are most ready for economic breakthrough, of which India is the most obvious example, is at present being held back most largely by lack of ability to pay for their imports; and that help to meet this could be supplied by the rich countries at singularly little cost.

BETTER AID

The cost to rich countries of the present inadequate trickle of aid is fearfully exaggerated, in rich countries' own eyes, by what Mr. Piel calls "Sunday economists" (but this paper would prefer to call noneconomists), who have not wakened up to the difference between real costs and budget accounting costs in the modern world. There are two ways in which this thought barrier can be broken through. One, which arouses Mr. Piel's own enthusiasm, is by tied or barter aid. He told his Delhi audience that they could draw great comfort from the fact that the case for foreign aid, although not a popular cause in Congress, has "nonetheless found direct resonance and firm support in the second most powerful economic interest in our political system. This is American agriculture."

With less than a million farms in the United States pouring out enough calories to feed a thousand million people, the U.S. Government has found it actually to be politically popular to sell food surpluses abroad under Public Law 480. Under this law, food surpluses are sold to underdeveloped countries like India at world prices, but the American Government takes payment in nonconvertible currency which it then lends back to India again. The American farmer gets paid in dollars by his own Government; that Government is paid by running up an admittedly pretty bogus blocked credit abroad, but is also assuaged by finding in its own budget accounts (to quote Mr. Piel) "savings in price support acquisitions, storage, and interest" of surprisingly large amounts; the depressed shipping industry picks up extra revenue, the multiplier effect spreads through the underemployed American economy, and everybody is as happy as the lark. Looking forward hopefully to the problems of industrial readjustment if America's armaments spending starts to decline because of "the acquisition of overkill," Mr. Piel sees every case for similar foreign aid programs that would "generate demand for the products of neglected and vital sectors of American industry, including the heavy machinery builders and the machine tool industry, whose domestic business proceeds in cycles of chickens today and feathers tomorrow."

If barter aid is the easiest way of breaking through the thought barrier, then by all means let barter be resorted to; but orthodox bankers should be the first to realize that a convenient way of avoiding barter is to be found in a 2,000-year-old device called money. The real answer to the "problem of problems" of this generation is to proceed at last to the invention of a proper international monetary system, one that would allow Keynesian policies to work across frontiers instead of merely within them. The underdeveloped countries should be given, on a discriminatory basis, large annual injections of purchasing power through the International Monetary Fund in terms of some new international unit of account. Those who object to the expense of this should be told by weekday economists that there are in fact only two senses in which this credit could cost anybody anything.

ECONOMICS, MORALS, AND POLITICS

First, it would cost the underdeveloped countries themselves something if the automatic covering of their import gaps so removed internal discipline from their own governments' economic policies that economic stimulation was pushed past the stage of genuine development into disruptive inflation. This can certainly happen, but it could also very easily be stopped if the central international organization creating the credit showed any financial courage at all. Secondly, the initial cost to richer countries of such an aid scheme would show itself in an increase in their balance-of-payments surpluses, paid for by the transfer to them of these new and convertible international units of account; this is not a form of aid which would be likely to worry Sunday economists unduly.

After a while, of course, these export surpluses forced upon the richer countries would involve some real costs, if they impose new inflationary pressures upon them. But it is important to remember the orders of magnitude involved. If some such credit system enabled poorer countries to spend an extra $5,000 million of new foreign exchange a year, this would double the present total of international aid to them; but it would add

less than 4 percent to the total value of demand entering into international trade, and much less than 1 percent to the total of demand falling upon richer countries' resources from the internal expenditure of their own national incomes. As it would be given out in a way that would actually improve Western countries' recorded balances of payments, instead of worsening them, this extra demand might in at least some Western countries prove more useful in promoting expansion than deleterious in threatening inflation. In that event, Mr. Piel and other enthusiasts would be actually and soberly right in saying that a large extension of aid would bring economic benefit to the rich as well as to the poor.

But even if the economics of the matter for the richer countries were rather worse than neutral, the morals and politics of the case for expanding aid are transcendentally urgent. Historians will look back upon the failure to improve the international currency system, to fit it for international Keynesian policies, as the most extraordinary economic failure of this generation. They will regard it with the same blank astonishment and impatience as most educated people today regard the failure to follow internal Keynesian policies at the beginning of the 1930's. And this time, as anybody who follows events in Asia and Africa must know, the penalties of ignorant inertia could be so fearfully much greater. How can pressure be mobilized on slow-moving Western politicians to make them recognize this?

Mrs. Bolton's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last week our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, FRANCES P. BOLTON, observed her 24th anniversary as a Member of Congress.

The Cleveland Press observed the occasion with an editorial paying the respects of the community to this great and gracious lady.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD:

MRS. BOLTON'S CHOICE

Back in 1939, Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON found herself a widow after more than 30 years of married life. She was past 50; her children were grown and she had enough money to live in comfort.

Faced with these circumstances, many women would be convinced their lives were over and would spend their time traveling, playing bridge, or simply waiting for old age.

Mrs. BOLTON, of Lyndhurst, did none of these. She ran in a special election to fill the 22d District seat of her late husband in Congress. She did so well that this week, at the age of 78, she started her 25th year in the House representing half a dozen East Side wards and 10 suburbs.

Fellow Republicans saluted her—among them her son, OLIVER, who represents the 11th District with Lake, Geauga, Portage, and Trumbull Counties.

Mrs. BOLTON has been more than just another Congressman. She is devoted to her district and spends more money working at her job than she gets in pay. She is a leader in the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Most of all, Congresswoman BOLTON is a reminder to other women that usefulness is never over until you think it is.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships that are awarded as the top prize. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The winning contestant from Arkansas is Mr. Phillip Byrd, Little Rock, Ark., and a constituent of mine. I am very proud to insert in the RECORD his winning speech for I think Mr. Byrd has ably, but succinctly, developed the subject and that his remarks on citizenship are inspiring and meaningful. I feel certain that the Members of Congress, and others, would enjoy reading them:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Phillip Byrd, Little Rock Central High School, Little Rock, Ark.)

We, the Americans of the 20th century, will be remembered as long as civilization exists. But, our efforts and accomplishments will go down as the history of a great nation only if we meet the challenge of citizenship.

Citizenship in this Republic is accompanied by countless freedoms—freedoms we are constantly aware of in our daily lives. Each day we pray without fear of persecution. We vote in elections, choosing our Chief Executive and our lawmakers. We select our schools for the development of our talents. We plan our careers with no authoritative interference. While half the world starves, we have food in abundance; and while many men are but pawns of their governments, we have the freedom our forefathers fought to give us, and our fathers fought to keep for us.

If we are to meet the challenge offered citizens of a great democratic state, we must face up to the obligations of all freemen. We must realize that for a nation to remain free, its people must take the responsibility to keep that God-given freedom. The citizens of Athens were free for many years until such time came that they wanted to give nothing to the state, but wanted the state to give everything to them; the freedom they wished for most was freedom from responsibility; and because they were negligent in their obligations of state, they suffered the loss of their freedom. The charge to see that we of our great democracy do not meet with this same fate rests in our hands.

When our forefathers undertook to carve a nation out of a vast wilderness, they were faced with a great challenge. Before them lay many obstacles. But despite the unpredictable and often severe weather, the insurmountable terrain, the hostility on both sides of the Atlantic, the United States of America emerged an America of free people.

But being free does not mean the struggle is over, that our security and might are forever assured. Today, we are faced with an even greater challenge, the challenge of American citizenship. The United States is the wealthiest nation in the world. We have the world's highest standard of living. Many things which seem unattainable to peoples of other nations are but routine in our daily living—and so it is with our citizenship. Are we taking it lightly? Are we failing to remember that many have given their lives so we can walk the streets without fear of being arrested because of our religious beliefs, without fear to assemble publicly, without fear to criticize a duly elected official?

As we face this challenge, we assume certain duties. Along with the privileges afforded by American citizenship, these duties must be performed before we can truly be worthy of our freedoms. Because we as Americans enjoy these freedoms, we must respect the dignity of every man, for his personal rights are as sacred as ours. We must hold high the responsibility for honest elections in our representative government. We must vote as intelligently as possible—free of all prejudice and greed. Then we must respect our public officials so they may best perform their duties. If we do these things, remembering that as long as a people fulfills the obligations of freemen, the Government will remain a servant of the people, as our forefathers intended it to be.

As we probe into the future with its complex problems seeking solution, we must remember that our enemies' strongest allies are our indifference of spirit, our weakness of will, and our compromise of principle. On freedom's side stand the enduring strength of our forefathers, a steadfast faith in our way of life, and a firm resolve to defend our precious heritage. The people within a nation lose their freedom when they take it for granted, believing it can be safeguarded without constant vigilance, hard work, and self-denial. Our determination to be free, though challenged by cold wars and nuclear threats, is the price of liberty. With God's help, we shall fulfill the challenge of citizenship by paying that price.

The Need for a New Trade and Embargo Policy With Communist Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, events of recent months have pointed up once again the crying need for a reexamination of present trade practices and policies with the Communist nations and for the drawing up of a firm statement of principles based on that study. It is not only the American people, but the entire world, that has now become completely confused by the vagaries and inconsistencies of U.S. policies.

Clearly these policies are entirely ineffective today and are leading to misunderstandings and differences of opinion with other nations of the free world, which may well jeopardize the structure of NATO and other relationships with free nations unless action is taken to clear them up. A place at which we might start would be with a reevaluation and revision of our entire policy toward the black listing of ships visiting Cuban ports and the Johnson administration's new policy, put into effect in December of 1963, under which ships may be removed from that black list. The facts are that at the present time there are 200 ships on this black list and since December 38 ships have been removed from the black list, but even with this

removal there has been a net addition of 2 ships to the black list since the first of December 1963. This shows clearly that our black listing policy is not working and that since the revision in our policies, there has been a net increase of ships, other than Russian ships, visiting Cuban ports, rather than any decrease. This is not surprising in view of the lax provisions under which blacklisted ships can now be removed from the list. Of the total of 38 such removals, 6 have been British ships, and 14 have been Greek ships. It should particularly be noted that the pledge given by the owners, in order to remove such a ship from the black list, specifically excludes any commitment that ships already chartered for Cuban trade will be withdrawn before the termination of their charter if such charters were entered into before December 16, 1963. Such charters may in some circumstances last 2 or 3 years. The feeling of many in Congress, in which I share, is that this removal procedure should itself be removed and that we should extend our embargo policy insofar as U.S. ports are concerned to the ships of any registry which continue to visit Cuban ports after a warning period of 2 or 3 months, regardless of the terms of outstanding charters. Those ships would have an option to make their choice one way or the other, and we could look for some net decline in the number of ships from our allies using Cuban ports and helping to sustain the Communist effort in Cuba, which is being strengthened by this trade.

At the same time, a reexamination of our entire trading policy with Communist nations in other parts of the world should be studied and new principles clearly stated and instituted. A good place to start on this project would be to reconsider the decision forced upon the Congress by President Johnson on Christmas eve, under which the Export-Import Bank and presumably other financing sources are specifically permitted to guarantee the credit of Communist nations on shipments of wheat or of any other products for which export licenses are granted. If the wheat sale proposal had been submitted to and considered by the Congress and it had stuck to the original terms of cash on the barrel head, one half American shipping, and guarantees against diversion to Cuba, it might have been acceptable to many Americans.

However, the idea of guaranteeing Communist credit, of increasing subsidies on such oversea shipments, and of otherwise taking steps to assist the faltering agricultural economy in Russia is wholly abhorrent to them. But with such attitudes officially endorsed, we can not be surprised at the decision of Great Britain and other nations to indulge in Cuban trade to their heart's content as witnessed by the recent bus sale and by the present discussion of French truck deals which may soon materialize.

These are just a couple of examples of the inconsistencies and confusion which dominate the whole question of U.S. trade policy with the Communists at the present time. If we don't know where we stand or where we are going ourselves, it is hard to see how we can expect the rest of the world to understand us or to cooperate with us in our efforts. There is little time to be lost in correcting this situation because the ramifications in our relationships with other nations are themselves as dangerous and upsetting as the increased strength given to Communist Cuba.

Sensible Advice From a Swedish Uncle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Gunnar Myrdal, the famous Swedish economist, has written the following article which appeared in the February 8, 1964, edition of the New Republic. This wise man has some excellent advice for us as we begin the war on poverty in America.

He advocates a Marshall plan to eradicate poverty.

The article follows:

THE WAR ON POVERTY

(By Gunnar Myrdal)

(NOTE.—Ever since he published "An American Dilemma," 20 years ago, the Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, 66, has been accepted as a sort of wise and benevolent uncle by Americans. It is said of Dr. Myrdal that Americans will willingly listen to harsh things from him that would anger them coming from almost anyone else. Last week, Dr. Myrdal flew in from Stockholm to open a conference on "Poverty-in-Plenty" that marked the 175th anniversary of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. Refining and elaborating some of the arguments in his recent book, "Challenge to Affluence" (Pantheon), Dr. Myrdal chided the United States for being the rich country that preserves pockets of poverty through outmoded fiscal practices, and consequently has the worst slums and is least generous in giving economic security to its senior citizens, its children and its sick.)

Having to live with large pockets of poverty-stricken people in their midst is not a new experience in the American Nation. Right from slavery the masses of Negroes formed such pockets, both in the rural South and in the cities South and North. Such pockets were also formed by other colored people who immigrated to work as laborers from Asia, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. Most American Indians in their reservations were also poor and isolated as they are today. There were also, as there are still, pockets of poor whites, ordinarily of old American stock, who lived by themselves in abject poverty and cultural isolation.

I believe it is important to have in our minds this broad picture of the historical reality of American poverty as a background to the discussion of the problems facing us today. The regular, prosperous Americans have become accustomed to living with unassimilated groups of people in their midst, about whom they know in a distant and general way that they are very poor. The fact that in earlier times they themselves lived under the risk of being thrown out of work and losing their livelihood, if only temporarily, made it easier for them to feel unconcerned about the people who more permanently were enclosed in the pockets of poverty. Otherwise, the existence of all this poverty in the midst of progressive America stood out in blunt contradiction to the inherited and cherished American ideals of liberty and equal opportunity, as these ideals increasingly had been interpreted, particularly since Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal.

Automation and other changes are all the time decreasing the demand for unskilled and uneducated labor. Standards are rising fast even in household and other menial work. Something like a caste line is drawn between the people in the urban and rural slums, and the majority of Americans who live in a virtual full-employment economy, even while the unemployment rate is rising and the growth rate of the economy is low. Except for a lower fringe, they experience a hitherto unknown security, for it is a tacit understanding in America, as in the rest of the Western World, that a recession will never again be permitted to develop into anything like the great depression. But there is an underclass of people in the poverty pockets who live an ever more precarious life and are increasingly excluded from any jobs worth having, or who do not find any jobs at all.

I want to stress one important political fact. This underclass has been, and is largely still, what I have been accustomed to call the world's least revolutionary proletariat. They do not organize themselves to press for their interests. The trade union movement comprises only about one-fourth of the workers, mostly its upper strata who in the main belong to the prosperous majority. To a relatively higher extent than normally they do not register and vote at elections—even apart from the large masses of Negroes in the South who are prevented from doing so.

In very recent times we have seen one important break of this empirical rule of the political apathy of the poor in America. I am, of course, referring to the rebellion of the Negroes in southern and northern cities. Without any doubt, this is a true mass movement—so much so that the Negro leaders in the upper and middle class have had to run very fast to remain in the lead, as have, on the other side of the fence, the administration and other whites responsible for American policy.

I am not at this time going into the question of how this movement, so exceptional to what has been the pattern of passivity on the part of the poor in America, has come about. But I should mention two things about which I am pretty sure. One is my belief that the outbreak of this rebellion just now is not unconnected with the high and, as a trend, rising rate of unemployment, which as always runs much higher—about double—for Negro workers than for whites. Another thing of which I am convinced is that this movement will not abate unless very substantial reforms are rapidly undertaken to improve the status in American society of its Negro citizens. I am optimistic enough to forecast that in the next 10 years the Negroes will get legal rights equal to the white majority, and that these will be enforced. What will still be needed are, in particular, social sanctions to defend the Negroes' equal opportunities to employment, against the resistance of trade unions more than employers and the business world, particularly big business. And even when all this is accomplished, the Negro masses will nevertheless continue to suffer all the lasting effects of the disabilities and disadvantages of their poverty, their slum existence and their previous exclusion from easy access to education and training for good jobs.

Indeed, it is easy to understand why some of the Negro leaders, and some white liberals, are now raising the demand for a new Marshall plan to make good the effects of the maltreatment in America of the Negroes from slavery and up till this day. Never-

theless, I am convinced that this demand for a discrimination in reverse, i.e., to the advantage of the Negroes, is misdirected. Nothing would with more certainty create hatred for Negroes among other poor groups in America, who have mostly been their bitterest enemies as they have been the only ones who have felt them as competitors. Moreover, special welfare policies for Negroes are not very practical. Negro housing cannot very well be improved except as part of a plan to improve the housing situation for poor people in general. The same is true of education. Special welfare policies in favor of the Negroes would strengthen their exclusion from the main stream of American life, while what the Negroes want is to have equal opportunities.

What America needs is a Marshall plan to eradicate poverty in the Nation. This is a moral imperative. The unemployed, the underemployed and the now unemployables are also America's biggest wastage of economic resources. The poor represent a suppressed demand which needs to be released to support a steady rapid growth of American production. The goals of social justice and economic progress thus are compatible. A rapid steady economic growth is impossible without mobilizing the productive power of the poor and clothing their unfilled needs with effective demand. The existence of mass poverty in the midst of plenty is a heavy drag on the entire economy.

The statistics on unemployment in America do not tell the whole story. Besides the 4 million unemployed there are the workers who are only part-time employed, those who have given up seeking work, and all the underemployed. It is an ominous fact that even the prolonged upturn in production from 1961 and onward has not implied a substantial decrease in the rate of unemployment. Nobody seems to expect that the continuation of the present boom will bring down unemployment to a level that could be considered even to approach full employment. And nobody assumes that there will not be a new recession, if not this year then the next. It is reasonable to expect that the unemployment rate will then reach a new high point. There are definite signs that the trend is rising.

For this there are explanations. I believe it is important to stress that none of the specific explanations put forward makes a rising trend of unemployment inevitable, or could by itself prevent the attainment of full employment. Only in conjunction with each other do these influences have the present disastrous result. If, in the sixties exceptionally, many young workers enter the labor market, this should not necessarily mean more unemployment. Production could expand rapidly enough to absorb them, and all the new workers could have been properly educated and trained so that they fitted the demand for labor as it has been changing. Long ago, Prof. Alvin Hansen and other economists, including myself, used to think that in rich countries, where capital is plentiful, a rapid population increase would rather act as a spur to expansion. It would stimulate the demand for new housing and all the goods and services accessory to housing, and for new schools, teachers, and productive capacity.

Likewise, automation should not by itself lead to unemployment if output expanded enough and the labor force were adjusted to fit the change in demand, caused by automation itself among other things. There are countires with full employment that have an equally rapid pace of automation. There, automation is viewed as driven forward by the scarcity of labor and as resulting in higher productivity of labor, higher earnings and a rising consumers' demand for products and services: in America, as a cause of unemployment.

OUR CHANGING SOCIETY

What type of society are we moving toward in the modern rich countries? A continually smaller part of our total labor force will be needed in agriculture, manufacturing industry, heavy transport, distribution of commodities, banking, and insurance. If we could countervail Parkinson's law, which for various reasons is working with particular force in America, even many sectors of public service would demand less labor.

It is the serious lag in adjusting the education and training of our labor force to the needs of this new society which is the general cause of the situation where we have serious overemployment in some sectors of our economy, at the same time as there is an uncomfortable large and growing residue of structural unemployment and underemployment that cannot be eradicated by an expansion of our production that is feasible.

Against this background it is easy to establish the broad lines of the policies that we will have to apply in order to cure our economic ailments. Huge efforts will have to go into education and vocational training, not only on the higher levels but on the level of grade schools and high schools. Particularly will we have to lift the level of elementary education for the poor people in the urban and rural slums, who are not now getting an education that fits them to the labor market. We must at the same time undertake the retraining of the older workers who are continuously thrown out of jobs without having the abilities to find new ones in our changing society.

I see it as almost a fortunate thing that America has such vast slums in the big cities and smaller ones in the small cities; so many dwellings for poor people that are substandard; so many streets that need to be kept cleaner; such crying needs for improved transport. To train unskilled workers to do such jobs should be easier than to make them teachers or nurses.

INCREASED PUBLIC SPENDING

It should be stressed, however, that a primary condition for success is rapid and steady economic expansion of the national income. Without an increased demand for labor, no efforts for training and retraining workers on a mass scale can succeed. This is the important argument for the view that expanding the economy is the essential thing. Expansion is, in a sense, the necessary condition for any effort to readjust the supply of different types of labor to demand.

A common characteristic of all the reforms directed at raising the quality of the labor force and eradicating poverty in the midst of plenty is that the increased expenditure will be public expenditure. Even when poverty is gone, when there is little or no unemployment or underemployment, a relatively much larger part of the Nation's needs will have to be met by collective means. In the future society toward which we are moving, where our productive efforts will increasingly have to be devoted to the care of human beings, health, education, research and culture, and to making our local communities more effective instruments for living and working, public spending will be an ever larger part of total spending. This is because it is not very practical and economical, and in most cases not even possible, to rely on private enterprise for filling these types of demands.

This brings up the problem of balancing or not balancing the Federal budget. Large sections of the public and Congress hold, on this question, an opinion that has no support in economic theory and is not commonly held in other advanced countries: that, in principle, expenditures of the Federal budget should be balanced by taxation.

A recent experience from my own country Sweden must seem curiously up-side-down to Americans. In a situation of threatening overfull employment and inflationary pressure, the Swedish social democratic government, which has been in power almost a third of a century, felt that it needed to put on brakes, and decided to raise taxation to a level where, for a while, we actually had a balanced budget in the American sense. The politcal parties to the right of the party in power criticized the government fiercely for overtaxing the citizens, and insinuated that thi was a design to move our economy in a socialistic direction, by robbing the citizens and private business of the funds they needed. So differently can the problem of balancing the budget appear in two otherwise very similar countries. In fact, you have examples nearer at hand. When the railroads were built in America, the Federal Government favored the railroad companies in various ways, which occasionally broke the rule of balancing the budget.

The analogy that a nation must handle its purse strings with the same prudence as an individual is false. An individual is not in the position to borrow from himself. Moreover, if the implication is that the Government should not borrow even for productive purposes, it is a rule which no private householder follows, or should follow, if he is wise and prudent. And we know that there has been a huge increase, both absolutely and relatively, of private borrowing, by business as well as by consumers.

This does not mean that Congress should not carefully weigh each dollar that is spent and each dollar that is taken in by taxation or other means. But the weighing should be in terms of progress and welfare for the Nation. I can see no virtue in America having decreased its national debt in postwar years to half its size compared with the national income, while abstaining from undertaking a great number of public expenditures that would have been highly productive from a national point of view. America has been satisfied for a whole decade with a rate of growth of only a little more than 1 percent per head, and with unemployment rising to the present high level. In the interest of public enlightenment I would wish my American colleagues to spend a little more of their time disseminating some simple truths about budget balancing and related issues. America cannot afford to remain the rich country that has the highest rate of unemployment, and the worst and biggest slums, and which is least generous in giving economic security to its old people, its children, its sick people and its invalids.

Scientific Data for the Seventies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Earl W. Lindveit, of the American Council on Education, recently delivered a stimulating talk about the needs for scientific manpower in the coming years.

Dr. Lindveit spoke at the ninth annual aerospace power symposium, sponsored by the Utah Wing of the Air Force Association at the Hotel Utah in Salt Lake City. Distinguished panels examined the challenges of the 1970's in industry, education, national security and travel. Dr. Lindveit, who has served as a professional staff member with the Con-

gress, was a member of the panel on the educational challenges.

As one who has been concerned about our deep national involvement in scientific research and development, I would think it appropriate if all Members noted Dr. Lindveit's pertinent comment that our needs in scientific education reflect the fact that the most crucial scientific problems can today be undertaken only with intricate and expensive equipment and highly trained personnel.

His comments follow:

SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER FOR THE SEVENTIES

(By Earl W. Lindveit)

It is a pleasure for me to appear with you today in a discussion of the education challenges of the 1970's. My remarks in this broad area are concerned with what appear to be some of the significant developments relating to manpower needs at both the professional and technical level. Before proceeding with this rather speculative look at the future, however, I would like to comment briefly on where we find ourselves today.

INTRODUCTION

In his book "Science and the Modern World" Alfred North Whitehead made the observation: "It is the business of the future to be dangerous; and it is among the merits of science that it equips the future for its duties." I believe that this quotation has relevance in our present discussion because we live today in a space age of advanced technology and critical national security problems. In large measure the effectiveness of our Nation's scientific effort is influenced by the availability of highly skilled scientific and technical manpower. The major needs for such personnel increase continually in response to our expanding economy, growing population, and rising standard of living. Scientific and technical manpower shortages, therefore, represent limitations on the potential scientific advancement of the United States.

The Federal Government is the major participant in our national science program. Science plays a key role in many activities of the Federal Government because in addition to its resonsibility for science programs derived from constitutional authority, it is the agency best equipped to act in many matters relating to economic and social welfare needs. Government expenditures for scientific research and development increased from $74 million in 1940 to approximately $15 billion during the current fiscal year 1964.

The Federal Government's suport of scientific research and development activities at colleges and universities has grown from about $15 million per year in 1940 to the present level of $1.5 billion. That partnership generated primarily by wartime needs has become firmly established and mutually dependent—a relationship in which each partner relies critically upon the other. The concept of federally owned and contractor-operated research centers has grown significantly since World War II and universities are major participants in the management of such installations.

Generally speaking, federally sponsored research activities at educational institutions fall into the following categories: (1) the conduct of research by university scientists, primarily in the support of undirected basic research; (2) Government contracts with selected universities for mission-directed basic research or applied research necessary for development in a specific area; and (3) research and development—usually in military, space or atomic energy fields—performed in Government-owned and university-managed research centers.

Government sponsorship of scientific activities also has as one of its goals the support of graduate students for advanced training in the sciences. Some of the Government agencies involved in such programs are the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, National Institutes of Health, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Sometimes agency support is given in the hope of providing future manpower for its programs, as in the space program, or to increase the manpower supply in a given area of science, as in medical research. Other support has only the broad support of science as its goal.

SCIENCE EDUCATION

To some extent, even science training contains some of the elements of danger I quoted from Whitehead a moment ago. For example, there is a danger in the pattern of training science students that population growth and increased pressures on both public and private educational facilities will result in a proportionate decline of the numbers trained. Failure to enlarge and improve our educational systems in proportion to need would result in a lower quality of science education as well as decreased opportunity for adequate early science training.

Occupational groups in short supply require the highest development of technical skills and utilization. Moreover, manpower shortages have important implications that bear upon the Nation's educational system. Formal education has become increasingly necessary to meet the professional demands of scientific research and the training of adequate numbers of scientific and technical personnel requires sound educational systems at each successive level of training.

The National Science Foundation described its 1961 report, "Investing in Scientific Progress," as a furtherance of the 1960 report of the President's Science Advisory Committee titled "The Scientific Progress, Universities and the Federal Government." This PSAC report, you will recall said that "we should and could increase the number of Ph. D.'s each year in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences to reach 7,500 in 1970."

The NSF report, on the other hand, was essentially a 10-year forecast of the Nation's science needs to meet national welfare, security, and prosperity requirements. It pointed out that by 1970 our population is expected to grow by 20 million persons and that, while 6,600 doctorates in science and engineering were granted in 1960, the potential for such degrees by 1970 will be 13,000. The report notes, however, that "if the science and engineering population is to continue to grow in both quality and numbers, the growing need for laboratories, equipment, and staffs must be met. Otherwise overcrowded facilities and teacher shortages will force curtailment of enrollments, and decrease in quality of the education." An indication of the implications of NSF's projections can be seen in the following required future national investments: (1) Professional staffs at colleges and universities must increase from 100,000 in 1961 to 175,000 in 1970; and (2) facilities for these staffs must increase from $150 million in 1961 to $350 million in 1970.

In a paper presented at last December's annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Prof. Fletcher G. Watson of Harvard University's Graduate School of Education commented on the education of teachers of science. He asserted that the comprehension and orientation of science teachers "is crucial to the final outcome of learning by the pupils." The number of science teachers in secondary schools now exceeds 100,000, with at least 10,000 more required each year; additional thousands are required by elementary schools. Professor Watson regarded as highly desirable such new NSF-sponsored science courses as the Biological Science Curriculum Study (BSCS), Chemical Education Materials Study (CHEMS), and the Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC). He noted, however, that even after the considerable attention that had been given to such programs, a National Science Foundation meeting of small-college biology faculties in 1962 found that half of those present knew little or nothing about the Biological Science Curriculum Study program. A similar meeting of physics professors, also in 1961, found two-thirds uninformed about the Physical Science Study Committee program. Professor Watson expressed concern that "many able students planning to become science teachers are enrolling in programs of courses that fail to provide them with even the knowledge required to teach the new science courses sponsored by the National Science Foundation for secondary schools." He encouraged action to establish "collegewide committees to examine carefully what is being done in science and in pedagogy to educate science teachers, to propose improved courses and patterns of courses, and to develop needed instructional tools in the form of texts, films, TV tapes, and programed instruction."

In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee in 1962 the National Science Foundation outlined some of the important elements in improving science education. These included needs to (1) improve the competence of teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering; (2) provide thoroughly modern materials of instruction and courses of study; (3) provide specialized kinds of experiences in science for high-ability secondary school and college students; (4) provide support which will enable the most talented of the science graduate students and established scientists to obtain the finest advanced training possible; (5) provide the specialized facilities and equipment which are peculiarly necessary to scientific study; and (6) provide the public with an understanding of science so that it can fulfill its role in a democratic society in the most meaningful way.

While each problem area is significant, some individual alleviation as noted earlier has come from such NSF-sponsored programs as: (1) teacher institutes; (2) modern courses of study in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering; (3) special training for secondary school students and college students of high ability; and (4) support of science graduate students and advanced scholars. Additional assistance has come from the National Defense Education Act in the areas of specialized facilities and instructional equipment and in the development of science-education leadership for State and local school systems.

The National Science Foundation also noted in its testimony essentially "unsolved problems in science education." One of the most important of these concerned the training of technicians. Over the past 20 years the swift progress of science had resulted in a significant gap between the numbers of professional scientists and supporting technicians. Still to be resolved, however, are problems having to do with how many technicians are needed, what kind of training they should receive, and what kind of ideal educational system is needed to train them. The Foundation noted the "growing conviction that a major effort is needed in the training of technicians."

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The first annual "Manpower Report of the President"—now required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962—pointed out that the professional and technical worker occupational group, the fastest growing of all major occupational groups, has a rate of employment growth more than three times the average for all others. It has been estimated that by 1970 this group of highly skilled occupations will account for more than half of all available job opportunities. An important aspect of this growth is that the most rapidly expand-

ing occupations generally require the most education and training.

There has been a growing awareness of the importance of science and engineering technicians, not only to assist and therefore improve the utilization of scientists and engineers but also to contribute to the progress of all sectors of the economy. Unlike the lengthy highly skilled training periods of professional scientists and engineers, the output of technicians could grow significantly in relatively few years, given adequate training programs and facilities.

With our coming large increase in population it is important that new workers entering the labor force have adequate technical training available to help adapt them to the changing needs of our economy. Many younger workers will need technical training to meet these challenges; many older workers will need retraining to update their skills for new jobs.

A national technician training program of adequate proportions to meet future national needs would require the expansion of organized preemployment training in a broad variety of secondary, postsecondary, technical institutes and junior and community colleges, exclusive of armed services technician requirements. Such an undertaking would also include substantial construction of facilities, operating expenses, teacher training and retraining, revised and standardized curriculums, and guidance programs.

The 1960 National Science Foundation Study, "Scientific and Technical Personnel in Industry," estimated that an annual employment rate of about 550,000 technicians is required in order to maintain the current overall industry ratio of technicians to scientific and engineering personnel, about 0.7 to 1. Obviously, maintaining the status quo will not be adequate for the future and a more realistic ratio in terms of national progress appears to be on the order of two technicians for each professional.

About 60,000 full-time students are now enrolled in technician training programs under title VIII of the National Defense Educational Act, the primary source of Federal assistance in technician training. Through 1963 about 30,000 students had graduated from secondary and postsecondary title VIII programs; 16,000 more students will complete such programs in 1964.

The year 1963—a significant one for education legislation generally—was also an important year for vocational education and I would like to comment briefly on some of the vocational education features of the major education legislation enacted, Public Law 88-204, the Higher Education Facilities Act, and Public Law 88-210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963. It should be noted that one of the strong influences in passage of the Vocational Education Act was the report of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, "Education for a Changing World of Work," completed in the fall of 1962. However, the act also reflects a strong conviction on the part of Congress that the problems of youth and work are here to stay and that they must be met with a determined national effort to further education relating to the changing world of work.

The Higher Education Facilities Act provides $50.6 million (or 22 percent of its overall funds) for fiscal year 1964 and for each of the following two fiscal years for construction grants to public junior colleges and technical institutions. No more than 40 percent of the development costs of the project will be paid for by Federal funds; State or local sources will finance the remaining costs. Funds will be allocated among States according to a formula which includes income per person and the number of high school graduates in the States. State commissions will be responsible for the administration of State plans.

The Vocational Education Act authorizes a new permanent program with appropriations for State vocational education programs totaling $581 million over a 4-year period, beginning with an increase of $60 million in fiscal year 1964 and rising to $225 million in fiscal year 1967. These sums would be in addition to the approximately $57 million now spent annually by the Federal Government on vocational education programs. Funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of population groups and a per capita income factor.

The new funds may be expended for State and local vocational education programs under a broadened definition of vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment.

The area technical education program, authorized by title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, was made permanent by the act at the current $15 million authorization.

The Vocational Education Act also permits the States to spend new funds for the construction of area school facilities.

The act extends the National Defense Education Act for 1 year, until June 30, 1965, and increases the amount available for student loans from the present $90 million to $125 million in the current fiscal year and $135 million in fiscal year 1965.

Among the features of the new legislation designed to keep vocational education abreast of the labor market are: (1) Periodic review by State boards of vocational education of utilization of Federal funds in relation to State manpower needs; (2) administration of State programs in cooperation with public employment services; (3) establishment of an independent advisory committee to advise the U.S. Commissioner of Education on the national administration of the program; and (4) the appointment of a national advisory council in 1966 to make recommendations to the Congress regarding improvement of the program.

INFLUENCES OF THE FUTURE

While it is difficult to view with accurate definition and focus the complete manpower picture of the 1970's several major influences seem to stand out—space and automation.

President Kennedy's national commitment "of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth" by the end of the decade was reaffirmed by President Johnson in his state of the Union message last January. It remains a national goal. President Kennedy's address to the Congress on May 25, 1961, also included the following significant statement:

"This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material, and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread."

Testifying before the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee on November 21, 1963, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, then Director of the Office of Science and Technology, was questioned about reports that by 1970 one out of every four American scientists would be working for the space program. Dr. Wiesner replied to the question with the following statement:

"Preliminary analysis of the manpower requirements of the NASA by the Office of Science and Technology indicates that not more than 5 to 10 percent of all U.S. scientists and engineers and 10 to 15 percent of all U.S. research and development professionals will be engaged directly or indirectly in NASA projects by 1970 assuming a NASA expenditure in 1970 of $6 billion. It must be acknowledged, however, that during fiscal years 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965, the increase in numbers of professionals supported represents a significant proportion of the total growth of the national scientific and engineering manpower pool."

On January 4, 1964, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced that nearly 1,100 students at 131 colleges and universities in 47 States would participate in its predoctoral graduate training grant program for the academic year 1964–65. NASA's goal in this program is an annual output of 1,000 Ph. D.'s, with a level of 4,000 in training to meet this goal.

In an address on the Role of the University in Meeting National Goals in Space Exploration (November 1, 1962), NASA Deputy Administrator Hugh L. Dryden stated: "Our educational institutions bear a major responsibility for the success of our national effort to explore space. Our universities and colleges are called upon to produce a body of scientists and engineers of unexcelled competence."

NASA's sustaining university program is geared to augment and complement sponsored research and in-house activities in support of its agency mission through the use of: (1) predoctoral training grants to increase the future supply of scientists and engineers required in space-related science and technology; (2) facilities grants to help universities provide facilities needed for space research; and (3) research grants to strengthen universities and enable them to increase their role in support of NASA's program.

The other major influence I mentioned was automation. One of the most important aspects of automation is that it replaces unskilled labor with smaller numbers of highly skilled people. In today's specialized world of work there seems to be no substitute for specific skills and abilities. In purely monetary terms, the Department of Labor has estimated that a high school graduate earns $30,000 more in his working lifetime than does the high school dropout and $64,000 more than the grade school graduate. A college degree, on the other hand, will average an additional $100,000 over this period.

A 1962 report of the National Education Association, "Automation and the Challenge to Education," stated that technological changes in recent years had eliminated 200,000 jobs in the aircraft industry although total business increased. Steel production in 1960 was equal to that of a decade earlier but jobs decreased by 80,000. Since World War II railroad productivity increased by 65 percent but job losses amounted to 540,000; during this same period soft coal industry productivity increased by 96 percent yet jobs decreased by 262,700.

The changing nature of work requires continuing changes in concepts of education. New technology creates jobs of a type unknown before, leaving behind many of the outmoded skills of an earlier day, and future population pressures together with national requirements will serve as both cause and effect in continuing the process.

SUMMARY

To summarize briefly, the scientific manpower needs of the 1970's also include continuing needs for: (1) More graduates of academic institutions having high standards of accomplishment; (2) improved quality of teaching and educational programs; (3) curriculum developments to keep pace with new requirements, including expanded opportunities for technician training; and (4) improved counseling programs to insure early identification of those with scientific and technical talent and provide them with sound career guidance. All of these ongoing needs, it seems to me, reflect appropriately the following excerpt from the 1947 Steelman report, "Science and Public Policy," one of the landmark studies of our national science program: "the day of the attic laboratory has passed. The most crucial scientific problems can now be undertaken only with intricate and expensive equipment and through the cooperative efforts of research teams trained in diverse disciplines."

Conclusion of Appeal Brief of Former Congressman Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the conclusion of the appeal brief on behalf of former Congressman Johnson which has been written by the eminent Baltimore attorney, George Cochran Doub:

It is significant that throughout our history, Congress has never attempted to enact legislation trespassing upon article I, section 6, but on the contrary, Congress has jealously guarded its exclusive constitutional authority in this area. Furthermore, there has never been at any time, anywhere, a prosecution of a Member of Congress under the Federal bribery statutes, or a prosecution of a member of any State legislature under comparable State bribery statutes, charging a violation of such a statute by making a speech for compensation. Accordingly, there was no substance to the notion of the district court that the enactment of bribery statutes indicates that the speech and debate provision of the Constitution should be curtailed. In effect, the district judge attempted to exalt collateral inapplicable legislation above the Constitution.

The district court also disregarded the fact that the constitutional prohibition applies to the allegations as to the reprinting and republishing of the Johnson speech.

The court may take judicial notice that all speeches made in the House or the Senate are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and duly published as a House or Senate document and thus made accessible to the public. Any speech embodied in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD thus becomes a public document. Public documents may be reprinted by the Public Printer by order of any Member of Congress on prepayment of their cost (44 U.S.C. secs 71, 72, 79, 82, 162, 163, 185).

It was under these statutory provisions and the rules of the House that appellant, as a Member of the House, ordered printed copies of his speech for distribution. Since the reprinting of a public document contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is done under the authority of the Congress, that reprinting and republication are within the constitutional immunity (*DeArnaud* v. *Ainsworth*, 24 App. D.C. 167, 5 L.R.A. (N.S.) 174).

The notion of the district judge that Johnson's speech in the House of Representatives "was but an incident of the conspiracy charged" (App. 56) does not bear scrutiny. The charges with respect to the speech in the House of Representatives on June 30, 1960, are as extensive as those with respect to the visits to Justice after March 15, 1961. Certainly the charges with respect to the speech constituted an integral and substantial part of the alleged conspiracy.

At the trial more witnesses testified with respect to matters relative to the speech than to the visits to Justice in the following year. Counsel for the Government and counsel for Johnson made extensive arguments to the jury with respect to this speech. For the district court to say that this speech was only an incident of the conspiracy is incredible sophistry because, if the constitutional prohibition as interpreted by the Supreme Court in Kilbourn and Tenney can be circumvented by such a conspiracy charge as this, it would become of little value.

The district judge said it would "subvert" the constitutional principle for it to preclude punishment of Members of the Congress for their unlawful acts (App. 56). As the Supreme Court said in Tenney, this was not the objective of the constitutional provision. That provision does not prevent Members of Congress from being punished for unethical or improper conduct with respect to speech or debate; it merely establishes the exclusive jurisdiction of the tribunals of the Senate and the House to impose punishment.

Finally, Mr. Justice Story was undoubtedly correct when he wrote in his "Commentaries on the Constitution" (p. 630):

"The next great and vital privilege is the freedom of speech and debate, without which all other privileges would be comparatively unimportant or ineffectual. This privilege also is derived from the practice of the British Parliament, and was in full exercise in our colonial legislation, and now belong to the legislation of every State in the Union as matter of constitutional right."

Let us not forget Mr. Justice Frankfurter's words in *United States* v. *Lovett*, 328 U.S. 303, 319: "It must be remembered that legislators are ultimate guardians of the liberties and welfare of the people in quite as great a degree as the courts." And so appellant submits that, as the Supreme Court made clear in Kilbourn and Tenney the great concept of liberty of speech permits no qualification, no limitation, and no large or even small intrusion by the State. As Representative Slade, of Vermont, said on January 18, 1840, in the House of Representatives as to another matter:

"The rule before us may seem to some a very small affair; but smaller encroachments on popular rights than this have grown to a fearful magnitude. The history of all usurpation shows that the disposition for encroachment uniformly increases with its acquisitions of power."

II. In sustaining the conspiracy charge of the indictment, the district court violated the constitutional principle that under the separation of powers doctrine, the judiciary may not question the motives of Members of the Congress.

As long ago as 1810, Chief Justice Marshall on behalf of the Supreme Court, declared in *Fletcher* v. *Peck*, 7 Cranch 87, 130 (without reference to art. I, sec. 6 of the Constitution), that the judiciary was not competent to inquire into the motives of the Members of the legislative branch of the Government in enacting legislation or whether they acted corruptly or with self-interest or under undue influence. He even went so far as to say, "If the majority of the legislature be corrupted, it may well be doubted, whether it be within the province of the judiciary to control their conduct" (p. 130).

Since *Fletcher* v. *Peck*, the principle that the judiciary may not question the motives of Members of the Congress has been deemed fundamental under the separation of powers doctrine. *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423, 455; *Hearst* v. *Black*, 87 F. 2d 68, 72 (C.A.D.C., 1936); *Townsend* v. *United States*, 95 F. 2d 352 (C.A.D.C., 1938); *Eisler* v. *United States*, 170 F. 2d 273, 279 (C.A.D.C., 1948); *Barsky* v. *United States*, 167 F. 2d 241, 250 (C.A.D.C., 1948) (all holding that the rule of absolute immunity protected Members of Congress from liability for their act or speech "even though knowingly false or wrong").

The vitality of the principle was reiterated by the Supreme Court as recently as 1950 in Tenney where the Court reaffirmed the holding of *Fletcher* v. *Peck* (p. 377), "that it was not consonant with our scheme of Government for a court to inquire into the motives of legislators, has remained unquestioned" (citing *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423, 455). The district court was unable to reconcile its position in this case with these landmark cases.

BRIEF APPENDIX

Part I. History of the development in England of the principle of liberty of speech and debate in Parliament.

In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries the first order of business of a new House of Commons was a petition to the Crown that it recognize for the duration of the House, the ancient privileges of the House, including the right of free speech. These petitions implicitly assumed that parliamentary privileges were a matter of grace subject to grant and limitation by the Crown.

In 1512 Richard Strode, a member of Commons, was prosecuted by the Crown in its courts and fined and imprisoned for allegedly having a financial interest in a bill to regulate certain abuses connected with the tin industry. On a petition by Strode to the Parliament an act was passed annulling the judgment against him and providing that in the future all suits and charges that might be brought against him and his accomplices "for any bill, speaking or reasoning of any thing concerning the Parliament to be communed and treated" be considered void. For a century a dispute raged whether this was a private or public act; in 1629 the judges declaring it a private act applying only to Strode's case, but the Parliamentarians in the struggle with Charles arguing that it was a public bill.

In 1576 Peter Wentworth made his great speech in the House of Commons and there for the first time the claim was made that freedom of speech had a fundamental, entrenched place in the Constitution, entirely removed from its historic status as a privilege dependent upon the grace of the Crown and subject to definition by it. Among other things Wentworth said:

"Mr. Speaker, I find written in a little volume these words in effect: 'Sweet indeed is the name of liberty and the thing itself a value beyond all inestimable treasure.' So much the more it behoveth us to take heed lest we, contently ourselves with the sweetness of the name only, do not lose and forgo the value of the thing. And the greatest value that can come unto this noble realm * * * is the use of it in this House.

"I was never of Parliament but the last and the last session (i.e. 1571 and 1572), at both which times I saw the liberty of free speech, the which is the only salve to heal all the sores of this Commonwealth, so much and so many ways infringed, and so many abuses offered to this honorable council * * * that in my mind * * * hath not been a little aggrieved. * * * Wherefore, to avoid the like I do think it expedient to open the commodities that grow to the Prince and whole state by free speech in this place.

"I conclude that in the House, which is termed a place of free speech, there is nothing so necessary for the preservation of the prince and state as free speech, and without it it is a scorn and mockery to call it a Parliament House, for in truth it is none, but a very school of flattery and dissimulation, and so a fit place to serve the Devil and his angels in and not to glorify God and benefit the Commonwealth * * *.

"Free speech and conscience in this place are granted by a special law, as that without the which the prince and state cannot be preserved or maintained.

"It is a great and special part of our duty and office, Mr. Speaker, to maintain freedom of consultation and speech. I desire you from the bottom of your hearts to hate all messengers, tale-carriers, or any other thing, whatsoever it be, that any manner of way infringe the liberties of this honorable council. Yea, hate it or them, I say, as venomous and poison unto our Commonwealth, for they are venomous beasts that do use it."

It has been said that this was the most remarkable speech hitherto conceived in the Parliament of England. "No one—at least,

we know of no one—had previously thought these questions fearlessly through to the simplicity and clarity of Peter Wentworth's conclusions. He was wrong, utterly wrong in his own generation; but the future hallowed his doctrine. He, indeed, as much as any of his colleagues, shaped that future."

When Wentworth was called to account by a committee appointed by the House, including all Privy-Councillor members and other officials, and interrogated as to abusive language he had used with respect to Queen Elizabeth, he took the position that, if the committee was acting on behalf of the Crown, he would refuse to answer any questions because they had no right to interrogate him; but, if they were acting as a committee of the House, they had such authority and he would willingly answer. Wentworth was convicted and imprisoned in the tower, but it is significant that even at that early time his punishment was imposed by the House and not the Crown.

In 1629, by order of Charles I, Sir John Elliott, Denzil Holles, and Benjamin Valentine, members of the House of Commons were prosecuted in the Court of Kings Bench, after Parliament's dissolution, for speeches made in the House which the Crown deemed criminal and seditious. The accused pleaded to the jurisdiction of the Court, maintaining that the offense, if any, had been committed and was punishable only in Parliament and in no other court. "Words spoken in Parliament, which is a superior court, cannot be questioned in this court which is inferior." The King's Bench convicted the members of the House and imprisoned them, Judge Sir William Jones observing: "We are the judges of their lives and lands; therefore of their liberties."

This decision contributed greatly to the growing opposition to Charles, and the Commons never forgot this unwarranted invasion of their privileges. In 1641, the earliest opportunity they had, the Commons adopted resolutions declaring these entire proceedings against their members a breach of parliamentary privilege. The Civil War prevented further action but after the Restoration, the case was reopened and on November 12, 1667, the House of Commons, to remove all possibility of misunderstanding in the future, adopted a resolution declaring Strode's Act of 1521, attempting to guarantee freedom of speech, a general law declaratory of the "ancient and necessary rights and privileges of Parliament." On November 23, 1667, the Commons declared the specific judgments against Elliott and the other members illegal and breaches of privilege, and later the Lords ordered the judgment of the King's Bench reversed.

Immediately after the Revolution of 1688, Parliament enacted the Bill of Rights providing: "that the freedom of speech, and debates, and proceedings in Parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament." This enactment became the source of the comparable provision of the U.S. Constitution and the constitutions of the States.

In 1689, the House of Commons summoned two judges of the King's Bench to its bar to answer for a judgment they had given adverse to the claim of the privileges of the lower House involving matters other than the freedom of speech. After hearing their defense, the Commons resolved that Judge Pemberton and Judge Jones by "giving judgment to overrule the plea to the jurisdiction of the Court of King's Bench * * * had broken the privileges of the House" and for their breach of privilege they were ordered into custody.

The vigorous assertion of parliamentary privilege by the House of Commons and its establishment in the Bill of Rights did not mean that improprieties committed by members of the House went unpunished. An offer of a bribe to, or its acceptance by, a Member of Parliament for any matter connected with his parliamentary duties was deemed an insult to Parliament. Even as early as the 17th century, the House of Commons repeatedly sat as a tribunal to hear charges that its Members had accepted bribes.

It has been accurately said by one authority that, "After the revolution of 1688 and the consequent Bill of Rights, the privilege of freedom of speech and debate in Parliament was never again seriously questioned or denied." Ever since, for almost 300 years, freedom of speech has protected Members of Parliament from any civil or criminal proceedings with respect to speech or debate by the Crown or the courts and we have found no case in England where the Crown has ever attempted to impeach a speech by way of a conspiracy charge or otherwise.

New York City Housing Authority's 30th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following fact sheet issued by the New York City Housing Authority on February 20, 1964, on the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the authority.

The housing authority is to be highly commended for helping to make New York City's people among the best housed in the world and for recognizing—throughout its history—that houses are for people to live in. Chairman William Reid is a highly competent administrator and we who live in New York look forward to many more years of fine service from him.

The statement and fact sheet follow:

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY NEWS RELEASE

"After three decades, public housing remains the only means by which a family of low income can move into a recent apartment in a suitable environment, at rents it can afford to pay," Chairman William Reid said today (February 20) on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the New York City Housing Authority.

"While much was accomplished during this period—130,540 new apartments, for an estimated population of one-half million persons in 120 developments—substantially much more funds for public housing will have to be provided by the Congress and State legislature, if we are to make any progress in reducing the huge backlog of applications of ill-housed families," Mr. Reid said.

"If we are to live up to the moral commitment of our Federal, State, and municipal governments, our legislators will have to start thinking in terms of providing financial continuity instead of the present procedure of sporadic grants which keep planning and construction in a state of doubt and insecurity.

"In the war on slums, it could very well be that the shame of this generation is that the New York City Housing Authority, which has the capacity and experience to build 25,000 units each year, has, because of insufficient funds, been able to build an average of only 6,000 units per year," Mr. Reid asserted.

"Indicative of the present plight of the low-income family is the number of applications the authority received in 1963—97,568—and the number of families it was able to accommodate—11,115."

"Last year's total was the largest number received in a single year in the past decade," Mr. Reid added.

"We wish to use this occasion to acknowledge with deep appreciation the understanding, support, and leadership given the authority by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, the most vigorous and loyal exponent of low-rent public housing in the Nation today," Mr. Reid concluded.

CRISIS

At the present time, there is a minimum of 325,000 families living in substandard or grossly overcrowded accommodations in New York City. More than one-half of these New York City families have incomes below $3,000 a year. The total family earnings of 80 percent of these 325,000 families is less than $5,000 a year.

New York City has a backlog of 200,000 low-income families who cannot move from their present inadequate quarters unless and until they are provided with subsidized low-rent apartments. Fifty thousand of these low-income families are elderly single persons.

HOUSING IS PEOPLE

The authority considers its responsibility to be beyond that of merely building new housing. Housing is people, and so it has developed a vast network of community facilities which are available to tenants and to the surrounding community as well. The authority caters to preschool and school-age children, young adults, adults, and senior citizens. At the present time, it has in operation: 94 children's centers; 83 community centers; 45 centers for elderly citizens; 23 school-age centers; 34 child health stations; 12 clinics covering mental health, geriatrics, and related subjects; 10 school annexes; and 8 libraries.

In recognition of the growing need of our senior citizen population for low rent housing, Mr. Reid disclosed that the authority now has over 25,000 senior citizens living in its developments. Also, that more than one out of every four apartments now under construction, or in planning, is specially designed for the elderly (6,792 apartments out of 23,851 apartments).

At present, there are six developments designed exclusively for the elderly. Two are expected to be opened in April, Gaylord White House, located at East 104th Street and Second Avenue in Manhattan, and Van Dyke II, Powell Street and Dumont Avenue in Brooklyn.

Chairman Reid pointed out that the New York City Housing Authority was the first such agency in the United States to appoint a full-time staff in the field of intergroup relations. "Our present population ratio is 42 percent white; 40.1 percent Negro; 17.3 percent Puerto Rican; and 0.6 percent others."

BUILDING FOR BETTER LIVING

The authority currently has in operation 120 developments containing 130,540 units for more than a half-million persons. In addition, the authority has 46 developments under construction and in planning, with 23,279 units for an estimated population of 80,000 persons.

When the present program is completed, the housing authority will have 171 developments containing 157,974 apartments for more than 600,000 persons. Of this 69,772 units are federally aided, 52,205 units are State aided and 35,997 units are city aided.

In the process of constructing the 120 developments now in operation, the authority tore down 79,222 slum dwellings.

"In building new housing, the authority seeks to provide the most suitable environment for our tenants," Mr. Reid stated. Our 120 developments occupy 2,045.4 acres of land. Of this only 330.9 acres or 16.2 percent is devoted to buildings and the remaining 1,714.5 acres or 83.8 percent is devoted to landscaped areas, play areas, walks and sitting areas in park-like settings.

THE SUMMING UP

"The authority is proud of its many contributions but the greatest of them is the exciting opportunity it offers for a better life.

"New York City owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to all the public officials, private citizens and organizations who contributed so much over the years to the cause of public housing. This occasion should also serve as a reminder that if we are to remain faithful to the ideals of our predecessors in this work, we will have to revive their spirit and determination for the monumental challenge that lies ahead."

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY: MEMO TO EDITORS

Re: 30th anniversary of the New York City Housing Authority.

From: Oscar Kanny, director of public relations.

February 20, 1964, is the 30th anniversary of the founding of the New York City Housing Authority and the inception of public housing in New York City. Following is some general background information for your use in preparing stories on this occasion.

CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR EVENTS

February 20, 1934: Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia filed a certificate establishing the New York City Housing Authority with the State board of housing as provided under the municipal housing authorities law of the State of New York. The authority held its first meeting. The original members appointed by Mayor LaGuardia were: Langdon W. Post, chairman; Louis H. Pink; B. Charney Vladeck; Mrs. Mary K. Simkhovitch; and Rev. E. Roberts Moore.

November 1, 1934: Demolition began for the first public housing project to be built in the United States, first houses on Manhattan's Lower East Side at Third Street and Avenue A. The project entailed the remodeling of a group of old tenements, and was carried out on a shoestring basis since the authority had no real resources for carrying out its job of improving housing conditions for families of low income. Most of the land for first houses was acquired from Vincent Astor on a purchase money mortgage for the entire cost, and the remainder acquired with money borrowed from Bernard Baruch, also on a mortgage. Both transactions were unquestionably motivated far more by a spirit of philanthropy than of business, although the mortgages were subsequently paid off in full. The demolition and construction work was done with the aid of several relief agencies, and salaries for the authority's small staff were met through the sale of materials salvaged from buildings being demolished, the authority's sole source of income for several years.

February 1, 1935: Start of construction for first houses.

December 16, 1935: First houses opened for occupancy as the country's original public housing tenants moved into the first of 123 apartments provided in the project.

March 17, 1936: Court of Appeals decision (*NYCHA* v. *Muller*) confirmed right of condemnation for public housing and slum clearance purposes.

July 5, 1936: Construction started for Harlem River houses, one of two public housing projects built in New York City directly by the Federal Government as part of the P.W.A. program. The other, Williamsburg houses, started September 8, 1936.

September 1, 1937: The U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (Wagner bill) established the Federally aided public housing program, authorizing the Federal Government to provide loans and subsidies to local housing authorities, which were entrusted with the actual initiation, construction, and operation of the housing projects.

June 30, 1938: New York City occupany tax law enacted to provide subsidies for city-aided public housing program.

August 1, 1938: Start of construction of Red Hook houses, first New York City public housing project to be built under 1937 Housing Act.

November 8, 1938: Housing amendment to State constitution authorized State and municipally aided public housing programs.

September 8, 1939: New York State public housing law enacted to provide State-aided program authorized under constitutional amendment.

September 10, 1939: Construction started for Vladeck City houses, first wholly municipally aided public housing project to be built in the United States.

April 26, 1941: Construction started for Fort Greene houses, city's first State-aided project. Fort Greene, 3,501 apartments, is the largest project built by the authority.

December 20, 1945: Construction started for John Lovejoy Elliott houses, first public housing project to be started after the war. Up to its postwar program the authority had built 16,840 public housing apartments in New York City.

February 27, 1946: Public housing law amended to permit city to establish temporary housing program for veterans in cooperation with Federal Government, and construction started on Jamaica Bay houses, first of eight such temporary projects to be built providing a total of 8,600 temporary units.

August 28, 1947: Board of estimate authorized first phase of no-cash-subsidy program, originally established as a limited subsidy program.

March 11, 1948: Board of estimate authorized no-cash-subsidy program as such to make full use of city's housing credit and provide housing for families earning too much for fully subsidized public housing, not enough for new private housing.

August 15, 1949: Housing Act of 1949 amended 1937 act to revive federally aided public housing program, and to provide separate slum clearance and redevelopment program (title 1).

August 27, 1951: Authority began closing temporary projects.

October 9, 1952: Board of estimate authorized authority to revive no-cash-subsidy program, the last of the original 21 projects having been completed in June 1952.

December 15, 1952: Housing Authority police force came into existence with the swearing in of 47 patrolmen.

March 1, 1954: Construction begins on Bay View houses, first development under part IV no-cash-subsidy program.

March 1, 1956: "No-cash-subsidy" construction program continued to meet the needs of families in the $5,600- to $7,000-income bracket.

May 1, 1958: Housing authority reorganized as a new three-man, full-time authority to direct New York City public housing.

PROGRESS UNDER NEW THREE-MAN AUTHORITY

1959: Completed 7 housing developments in year, providing a total of 4,913 new apartments which were occupied by 19,500 persons. Began construction and planning of 51 other developments to provide 39,000 additional apartments for 160,000 residents. Revised architectural designs of buildings to reduce their institutional appearance, and established policies providing more apartments for the elderly and for larger families. Created intergroup relations unit and social consultation unit. Raised annual income limits for continued occupancy.

1960: Three more developments added to construction program, bringing total to 54.

April 28, 1960: New York State public housing law amended by the State legislature permitting the NYCHA to sell or lease no-cash-subsidy developments to sponsors of nonprofit cooperatives.

December 3, 1960: Ninety-two public housing developments completed and fully occupied by 109,278 families with 433,000 persons. Ground breaking of Franklin D. Roosevelt houses.

March 8, 1961: Mayor Wagner announced tentative approval for the sale of four developments for conversion into nonprofit cooperatives. They were Luna Park, Franklin, Baisley Gardens, Rosedale houses.

November 3, 1961: The Nation's first health maintenance clinic for the elderly was opened in Queensbridge houses, Long Island City, Queens. It was designed to provide a free preventive medical program exclusively for the aged. It offers complete physical examinations, counseling, referrals for specialized treatment, social services, and limited therapy.

January 23, 1962: Ground was broken for Gaylord White House, Manhattan, the first development designed exclusively for the elderly.

March 14, 1962: Under Mayor Wagner's rehabilitation program, the first building was opened for occupancy in College Point, Queens. It was also the first structure designed exclusively for the elderly.

March 28, 1962: The Nation's 500,000th federally aided public housing dwelling unit was opened at McKinley Houses in the Bronx.

April 11, 1962: Opening of Audubon Apartments, Manhattan, the city's first "vest-pocket" public housing development. Under Mayor Wagner's program, the deteriorated portion of a city block is replaced by a relatively small public housing development and the block's still valuable private housing and commercial structures are retained. This avoids the need for large-scale relocation, preserves the positive features of the neighborhood and stimulates further community renewal.

May 21, 1962: Opening of the first rehabilitated single room occupancy brownstone at 251 West 103d Street, Manhattan.

October 9, 1962: The first completed housing accommodation opened in the West Side urban renewal area was the rehabilitated building at 54 West 94th Street, Manhattan. It formerly consisted of four deteriorated single room occupancy buildings. This was the first completed action by any city agency in this area.

April 8, 1963: Temporary State Commission on Low-Income Housing appointed by Governor Rockefeller to study low rent public housing.

April 26, 1963: New York State public housing law amended making it mandatory for municipalities to furnish the same police and fire services to tenants of public housing as they do all other residents in the city.

September 9, 1963: A low-rent housing demonstration grant of $750,000 was authorized by the HHFA to demonstrate the practicability of purchasing structurally sound three-story buildings for the purpose of providing large apartments for large families.

December 31, 1963: Taxes or payments in lieu of taxes paid to the city since the inception of the Authority reached a grand total of $72,340,000.

PAST AND PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE AUTHORITY

The New York City Housing Authority is composed of three members appointed by the mayor who designates one as chairman. The chairman serves at the pleasure of the mayor and the other two members are appointed for 5-year terms. The members serve alternately as vice chairman and member.

A complete list of all present and past members of the housing authority follows:

Present members: William Reid, chairman, appointed May 1, 1958; Ira S. Robbins, member, appointed May 1, 1958; Francis V. Madigan, member, appointed May 1, 1958.

TERM OF OFFICE

Former chairmen: Langdon Post, February 20, 1934–December 1, 1937; Alfred Rheinstein, December 17, 1937–October 9, 1939; Garard Swope, December 11, 1939–January 26, 1942; Edmond Borgia Butler, May 2, 1942–July 1, 1947; Thomas F. Farrell, July 1, 1947–September 15, 1950; Philip J. Cruise, September 15, 1950–April 30, 1958.

TERM OF OFFICE

Former members: Mary K. Simkhovitch, February 17, 1934–February 17, 1948; Msgr. E. Roberts Moore, February 17, 1934–October 8, 1944; Louis Pink, February 17, 1934–May 6, 1935; B. Charney Vladeck, February 20, 1934–December 31, 1937; Nathan Straus, March 25, 1936–October 19, 1937; Lester B. Stone, December 1, 1937–December 15, 1937; Edward F. McGrady, December 15, 1937–February 16, 1941; William H. Davis, December 11, 1939–January 26, 1942; Hugh S. Robertson, June 2, 1941–April 14, 1942; William Wilson, May 2, 1942–February 19, 1958; Frank R. Crosswaith, June 22, 1942–April 30, 1958; John S. Parke, October 8, 1944–August 13, 1954; Thomas J. Shanahan, February 17, 1948–February 19, 1958; James Felt, June 3, 1955–December 31, 1955; Abraham M. Lindenbaum, January 30, 1956–April 30, 1958.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks of speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The Revolution in Military Professionalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many years ago I had the opportunity to observe Mr. Zuckert's initial steps in his career in the service of his country. A graduate of the Harvard School of Business Administration, his ability and training were evident to those of us who observed his first assignment as my assistant in the War Department and later as one of the first Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force. Later he served with distinction as a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It was no surprise to many of us that the late President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara would take advantage of his experience and ability by appointing him Secretary of the Air Force in 1961 where he has since met the challenges of our changing times with distinction.

His recent speech in St. Louis is a clear reflection of the wisdom that he brings to bear on the problems that he faces each day.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, before the Harvard Business School Club of St. Louis, Mo., on Wednesday, February 26, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REVOLUTION IN MILITARY PROFESSIONALISM

Anything moving as rapidly as advancing technology in America today and the fast-paced management job in the Pantagon should be looked at with a stroboscope, which is a way of making anything rotating at high speed look as though it were standing still. It's done with flashing lights.

We should have a stroboscope to study the revolution under way in the military profession in America. The very fact of our interest in the subject is evidence of the revolution, because America started out as a Nation determined to put military things aside. We wrote into our Constitution restraints on military influence, drawing on our English heritage, colonial experience, and what seemed to us to be the lessons of the 18th century political philosophers in Europe.

Nevertheless in 1802, the new Nation established West Point, the same year the British established Sandhurst, and 6 years before the French established St. Cyr. The latter two schools studied our Civil War in depth for its military lessons long before its centennial made it fashionable in the United States.

The quality of the military leadership shown on both sides during that war served to reinforce the confidence of the American people in their system of keeping our military small and poor between wars, and training good men. There would always be time, they felt, to raise, train and equip adequate military forces when war threatened. They had good reason to feel this way because of their two-ocean wall of defense.

Everyone knows that day is gone. One of the first marks of the revolution in the military profession is the revolution in basic national policy of the United States. We once believed we didn't need military forces, except in war. Then we went through a period in which we deliberately sank our own battleships because we thought arms caused war. Now we maintain the most powerful armed force in the history of the world as a means of preventing war.

This national policy revolution is a consequence of the incredible expansion of science and technology, together with their exploitation for Communist control of great masses of humanity and vast areas of the world.

Continuous military preparedness has meant a revolution in organization for defense, in the resources available for arms, in the techniques of managing those resources, in military planning, training, and operations, and in the lives of the people who make the military their profession.

It is moving so fast it almost takes a stroboscope to examine it.

A slow pace of life was once characteristic of military posts. The rest of us tended to forget our military people, and left them to their own devices. We provided reasonable housing and a few amenities and some social-security-type benefits to make up for the difference in military and civilian pay. We expected them to study on their own what they might need to learn to defend the country.

It is neither easy nor wise to forget them today. We have more men permanently in uniform nowadays than the total population of the 13 Colonies, which so feared a federal standing army that they put safeguards against it in the Bill of Rights.

We are currently spending more each year on military preparedness than the total revenues of the Government of the United States for the first 115 or so years of its existence.

For the first century and a half of our national existence, the professional military man was content with a bachelor's degree from a military academy. Then, except for the possible interruption of war, he could expect to spend most of his life on a military installation studying hard on things of very little interest outside his military community.

He learned a lot about strategy and tactics, studying history, and enjoying the physically active life imposed by the predominately field exercise type of preparaton for war.

Now look. A bachelor's degree is only a beginning. Three service academies can't begin to meet the need for officers trained in an ever broadening military science and a constantly lengthening span of most of the rest of science.

The Air Force alone has some 300 Ph. D's in uniform and many thousands of others with advanced degrees. About 150,000 officers and airmen are undergoing some kind of formalized training all the time. It is schooling which involves intellectual effort undreamed of in military circles through the first century of America.

The modern military man probably spends less than half his professional life on a base or post. He lives, studies, and works among civilians, with whom he shares both his sciences and theirs.

He has to provide himself with planned physical exercise because he has more use for a slide rule than he does for a horse. He still studies history, he has to study a whole lot more than history to find firm guidelines in developing strategies to employ the most significant weapon of his time, the thermonuclear warhead.

Military power is fundamentally, or has been historically, the business of movement of men and the concentration of their weapons. The latter were progressively stones, arrows, spears, guns, and a wide variety of explosives to be hurled at an enemy. Movement was by foot, camel, elephant, horse, and the motor vehicles from which weapons could be used in ground warfare, and at sea, by ships and subsurface vehicles from which explosives could be thrown.

Over more than a score of centuries, the one really significant revolutionary change in war was the introduction of gunpowder, about the 14th century.

The modern revolution in war stems mostly from the revolution in, or development of the means of utilizing stored energy—engines and concentrated explosives. In World War I, the submarine, which had first been used in the Civil War, and TNT, were significant factors which symbolized revolution. In World War II, it was the airplane and the atomic bomb.

The revolution continues, and speeds up. The B-29 was the most advanced bomber of World War II and even it had to be modified to carry the atomic bomb. That plane, or its equivalent fully loaded weight of 133,000 pounds, can be lifted by the B-52 to an altitude 2 miles higher than the B-29 could attain by itself, and at double the speed.

The B-52 is the backbone of our strategic retaliatory fleet, and a number of these planes are continuously airborne on 24-hour flights. During the Cuban crisis, a fleet of more than 1,100 airplanes was on 15-minute alert, each one able to carry explosive power greater than all of the bombs dropped by allied aircraft during World War II. Normally, 50 percent of the B-52's are on 15-minute alert. Each has targets assigned. Each can survey damage, strike or not strike, return if ordered. Crews can discriminate between targets in such a way as to limit collateral damage—for example, keep down damage to populous areas. The very long range aircraft required for strategic bombing have great versatility for other missions, including continuous reconnaissance of oceans and the rims of all the continents.

When World War II started, people thought the speed of sound was the ultimate speed barrier to manned flight—nothing could go faster and remain whole. Today, we have one bomber and three fighter-interceptor type planes which fly at more than twice the speed of sound. Next year, we will have a plane, the F-111, which actually changes its wing geometry in flight and so performs

efficiently in the speed range from 200 to 1,400 miles an hour and from ground level to 12 miles up. It could cross the Atlantic without refueling.

Before the end of this year, we will have the C-141 jet transport in service. It is the most versatile military cargo aircraft ever seen. It gives us a new capability to move men in order to concentrate weapon power, the classic method of war. Modern techniques of missilery, however, also permit a concentration of weapon power by hurling explosives across oceans as easily as the ancient ballista hurled stones over a wall.

These explosives are a million times more powerful than those products of seven centuries of development effort with which we entered World War II. No part of the world is beyond the range of missiles or aircraft, and no structure of man can withstand the power of the explosives they can deliver.

Expansion of the destructive power of weapons, however, is but one area of revolutionary change in the military profession. Modern airlift enables us to move combat-ready ground units to any part of the world on almost no notice, with air cover keeping ahead all the time. The traditional military functions of communication and observation are also transformed.

Foot soldiers whisper to each other across mountains, airmen receive orders in flight halfway around the world, and the men who man the ballistic missile early warning system radar stations peer a thousand miles into the arctic night in never-ending vigil.

On the other side of the world, American military men are trying to help an ally combat an enemy who combines the modern techniques with the most ancient ones of stealth and cunning, so while military professionals have to master new methods, they must continue to practice the old, including the use of sharpened sticks.

At the same time, some of their professional colleagues are working on plans for a vessel to sail in a wholly new medium for man, the space beyond the buoyant effect of earth's atmosphere. The project is called the manned orbiting laboratory. By it, we expect to develop techniques for living in space and to determine the possible defense ramifications of manned vehicles at orbital heights above the surface of the earth.

The military profession has been stretched from sharpened sticks in rice paddies to vehicles in space, and the duty includes everything in between, from budget analysis to mach 2 fighter gunnery, and disarmament negotiations.

The stretching has also extended military studies far beyond the military community. The isolation of the military post or station is no more. The threat of nuclear annihilation concerns everybody. This and the interlocking relationship of statecraft, military craft and science brings the best military and the best civilian brains in a score of fields into concert. They work together in the design of strategies, in management of resources, and in the development of new weapon and support systems.

Civilian and military professionals are continuously engaged in a unified design effort toward a pattern of military preparedness which will assure the growth of freedom and retard the threat of thermonuclear war.

Their combined effort is making progress. The power of our strategic retaliatory forces so reduces the probability of gain for an aggressor using thermonuclear weapons that we dare to believe the danger of their use is receding.

At the same time, we have to expand our capabilities for stopping wars at levels of intensity below that of the exchange of megaton missiles. We want not only to prevent escalation of these wars to megaton destruction but also to prevent the aggressive use of military force in any form which constitutes a threat to the freedom of ourselves or our allies.

This objective we call deterrence, and it is one of 10 guidepoints, or checklist items which a group of civilian and military professionals—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—recently defined as components of an adequate defense policy.

The checklist was developed for Air Force use in trying to foresee how to apply over the next decade the fruits of technological advance to the requirements of defense. The result was a definition of defense objectives and military capabilities which reflect very clearly the revolution in military professionalism.

Another item on the list was arms control. Its study becomes a professional requirement for the military man because it is a necessary part of the defense package. Current military planning must provide for forces not dependent upon nuclear testing or other restrictions to which the nations may agree in their search for mechanisms of peace. They must be forces which are stabilizing in effect and not provocative either through vulnerability or other characteristics. Modern military forces must have built-in assurance against unauthorized or premature employment, and they must be adaptable to monitoring and inspection roles as these may emerge. The technology which provided the means for utilizing of the energies of war—engines and explosives—may lead to the control of war itself.

A third item is crisis management, which simply means the ability to keep an intense international crisis from bursting into war, or a low intensity war from escalating to higher dimensions of conflict. It calls for effective warning and response capabilities.

Controlled response capability is next on the list. Deterrent forces, to be effective, must be prepared to respond to any crisis or provocation at an appropriate level of military power. We must be able to respond at a level of intensity and quantity of force which we determine. We want to retain initiative and press for settlement of issues on freedom-serving and peace-building terms.

Multiple options, the fifth item, are necessary to give effect to the active response or to deterrence—through ability to retarget. Multiple delivery systems, selectivity of both strike characteristics and targets, and versatility of employment of both forces and weapons in either a strategic or tactical role.

Survivability has to be checked next in order for deterrence to be credible, and as a matter of defense. It covers hardening and other forms of local protection of weapon systems against preemptive attack, ability to penetrate enemy defenses, and immunity to sabotage, clandestine operations, and capture.

Damage limitation, the seventh item, means the ability to limit the collateral damage generated by either side. It calls for accuracy of targeting and delivery and the ability to assess quickly and accurately damage to an enemy. It is obtained in part by targeting military points, not centers of population. It includes systems which can neutralize targets at safe distances, and also passive defense measures, including civil defense programs.

Flexibility, next on the list, is a key element of any force structure. It has specific meaning and application to organization, equipment, rapid deployment capability, and adaptability to a wide range of requirements.

The list contains one new term in military planning, a timing and power factor called threshold of negotiation. It has to do with the definition of objectives, acknowledgment that destruction of an enemy nation is not an objective, recognition of consequences of unrestrained war, and it reflects both the will and the means to stop war at the lowest point of intensity consistent with the objectives.

Termination capability was the 10th item. It includes all the other capabilities. It also implies forces still able to fight after being hurt, or, as the military planners say, forces recyclable in a degraded environment. It calls for an intelligence capability to assure timing initiative, power to counter escalation by increasing power, and provision for post hostility responsibilities.

These guidepoints are as much symbol and segment of the revolution in military professionalism as are mach 2 aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles, or $50 billion budgets and a war-ready military establishment in peacetime.

The obligations which rest upon our military people and the complexities of their duty make the military profession a very strenuous and demanding one. Even this quick "strobe" examination shows that the people who wear the uniform of our country's Armed Forces today have to be tough-minded and flexible at the same time. They do not permit the traditional convervatism of a professional bureaucracy such as the military to slow their adoption of new ideas, methods, and equipment.

As President Johnson once said in another context, independence and survival in today's world depend upon trained professionals. We put a heavy load on our military professionals. I believe they can and will continue to carry it.

Remarks by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz at Opening Session of American Bankers Association's Symposium on Employment, February 24, 1964, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the thoughtful remarks delivered by the distinguished Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, before the American Bankers Association assembly on February 24, 1964. The occasion for Mr. Wirtz' comments was the opening of a Symposium on Employment sponsored by the American Bankers Association and held in Washington, D.C.

The text of Secretary Wirtz' talk follows:

Thank you, Mr. Alexander. Secretary Dillon, President Kelly, and gentlemen, there has been something of a change. I suppose there are few occasions where you move from a meeting one day with the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and assorted unions for the maritime industry, to a meeting with the American Bankers Association. With that move in mind and thinking, too, of Mr. Alexander's reference to the dangers of the statistics with which I am about to deal, I am reminded of the observation that the law of averages is only a matter of proving that if you are standing with one foot in the refrigerator and the other foot on the stove, you are, on the average, comfortable. That is the way I feel this morning.

I count apologies the poorest and worst sort of introduction to a speech, and yet I do have a certain respect for the art of forensics, and a very great respect for this audience. I hope you will indulge my simple word of apology this moring, because as of 9:30 last night I was in Miami on a quite different mission and didn't get back here until 1 or 2 o'clock this morning. And the attempt to develop in the meantime an adequate basis for filling in this morning has left me with a feeling of apology; I simply want to express it and ask not your indulgence but your understanding of it.

We are going too fast. I think continuously these days of James Thurber's observation that man is simply moving too fast for a world that is round, and before very long there is going to be a great rear end collision, and the object that is coming up behind is man. So really all I can do this morning is talk with you a little, if I may, and tell you a little about the address I should like to have made to you if I had had more time.

You will understand that these will be random thoughts. They will be divided into three, not divisions, but rough areas of projection. I would like to talk, first, about this matter of what unemployment is, and how significant we count it to be; then I would like to talk about some about the relationship of hours of work to employment and unemployment; and then, perhaps most particularly, of the relationship of employment and education, because this relationship seems to me to be so basically important.

NATURE OF PROBLEM

Now, let me say a little about an attempted evaluation of the nature of the unemployment problem, and of the significance of it. Mr. Alexander suggested that we might anticipate a certain debate here between the structuralists and the expansionists. It is very hard for me to accept that. There was a suggestion that that might end with a certain degree of "a plague on both your houses." My approach to it is quite different. I say a blessing upon both your houses.

It seems to me that it is obvious that the problem of unemployment has to be met through attention both to the necessities for expansion, and to the matters which we have identified as those of structural unemployment.

I don't propose to enter upon that argument because it seems to me that most of the argument simply drains off steam for the whistle—the steam that could be better put to the boiler.

The answer is: We have to move on both problems.

I think that the evaluation of the problem of unemployment is complicated by a semantical bad habit that we have. Whenever we can find a single word that covers a number of things, and particularly whenever we can find a single statstic that may cover a number of things, we leap from the single word and single statistic to the conclusion that we have a single problem; which isn't bad enough until we take the additional step of feeling that there must be a single answer to it, at which point our words and our thought processes have done us in quite severely.

I think of the unemployment problem as by no means one problem at all, but quite a number of them, and I would like to talk a little bit about the essential parts of the problem. I would like to speak, just briefly, about the attitude that unemployment isn't nearly so important as some people may think it is. That becomes, in one form, a doubting of statistics upon which the various reports are based. I know that there is going to be some discussion of that this morning, and I shan't go into it except to say that I think that there is no question about the validity of the statistics.

DANGEROUS APPROACH

The problem is rather about the interpretations which are placed on the statistics. There is one kind of evaluation of unemployment with respect to which I feel myself reacting perhaps emotionally, and that is the attitude which says that a little unemployment isn't bad if it is going to prevent a lot of inflation. That seems to me, at a time when we are using only 87 percent of our plant capacity, and only 94 percent of our manpower, an intolerable approach, especially in a period in which we have had stability, particularly as far as wholesale prices but also retail prices are concerned, a period of stability such as that of the last 5 years.

I reject flatly the proposition that the concern about stability can be met only by crippling our growth, by maintaining as a brake against inflation the unemployment of some 3 or 4 million people. I count that view intolerable.

To whatever extent there is a discounting, too, of the fact of unemployment on the grounds that the unemployed in this country do better than the fully employed in a good many other countries, I find no basis in reason for it. I do not believe being poor in America is any better by virtue of the fact that being poor is a lot worse in other countries. I find the only valid measure of poverty or accomplishment in terms of our own potential for making things worthwhile, and for making life worthwhile in this country. I don't count the fact that unemployment or poverty is measured differently here than it may be in other countries as in anyway diminishing that fact. Let me put my point this way: We talk about people in families with incomes of less than $3,000, as being in poverty situations. I think they are, despite the fact that this is hardly enough to cover the bare essentials of life. It is said that unemployment is not too serious if everybody has a job. Well, that does not seem to me to be enough. I would naturally worry about unemployment if it meant starvation, but I worry about it equally if it is only that degree of unemployment or underemployment which permits a family to fall apart. That casuality seems to me just as bad as the first one. As far as poverty is concerned, I repeat that I do not believe it is any less severe or less to be concerned about in this country because of its comparison with the situation in other countries.

Now, I should like to say, more broadly and more generally than that, that it does seem to me that we properly evaluate and understand the unemployment situation only if we view it in terms of the relationship of the economics to the concepts by which we live, by which we guide ourselves in this country. I assume that means centrally the opportunity of the individual to exploit fully whatever potential he may have, and that we measure unemployment and employment by that measure. In fact, more generally, if there is a single thread to the thoughts I have in mind this morning, it is that we should evaluate these matters of employment and unemployment in terms of their relationship to the social and political and scientific aspects of life in this country.

COMPLEX PROBLEM

Now, as to the various unemployment problems that we face, rather than a single one, these problems are now being increasingly identified through a breakdown of the seasonally adjusted monthly figure. I should at this point be delighted if there was some basis for throwing away the seasonally adjusted decimal point monthly unemployment figure. It does nothing any more except measure the relationship of this period to the periods which come before it. It is important for that purpose but it conceals the variety of problems which we face. When we say that 5.6 percent of the people in this country are unemployed, it diminishes greatly the degree of the problems as far as the popular and public understanding of it is concerned. When we say that there are 4 to 4.5 million people unemployed in a nation of 188 million people, which is, by and large, doing very well by itself, it is very hard to arouse enough concern about it. We are at the point now where unemployment may, in my judgment, become built into our economy because we have let it become a habit, and part of the reason it has become a habit is because it is tied up in these "one" figures. When you point beyond them to some other things, then the problem begins to emerge.

First, there is the fact that over 15 million people last year were unemployed at one time or another. That is 15 million people in this country. It is not enough to reduce these people to the point of starvation to be concerned about them. It is perhaps enough that the girl in that family was the one member of her graduating class in high school who couldn't buy the right kind of dress to go to the graduation ceremonies. That is not my definition of poverty, or of unemployment, but I would like to suggest that it is the kind of measure that we ought to be taking into account.

So, in one way, to one degree or another, over 15 million people were unemployed at some time during the year last year.

And then, of course, there are figures for the various unemployment problems which show, for example, that among minority groups, unemployment is not 5 percent, but about two times that. There are figures which show that among the young who are members of the work force, the unemployment figure is not 5 percent but three times that.

Then there is another group of figures which casts some light upon the extent to to which the employment needs of this country are being met in one form or in another.

You have your pencils and I would like to run through very quickly a list of figures that show where jobs have been coming from for the last 6 years.

SOME FIGURES

In the last 6 years, between 1957 and 1963, there has been an increase in the number of wage and salary jobs in this country, leaving out the farm sector, of 4,300,000 jobs. That is in 6 years. The increase included in that number which results from Government positions, is 2 million in round figures, almost all of it at the State and local level and most of it in connection witht he schools. That leaves 2,300,000 jobs.

Next there is an item of 800,000 jobs due to Federal, State, and local government procurement programs. Put it in or out as you please, and I draw no moral from it, but by one approach you would subtract from those figures those jobs which are the result of government procurement programs, and that would bring you down to 1,500,000. Then, in this last 6-year period, there has been an increase of 700,000 in jobs connected with not-for-profit institutions. That brings you down to 800,000.

And then there has been, in the increase in jobs during these past 6 years, 600,000 of them which are part-time jobs. That means that the private sector of the economy, leaving out that part of it which is working for the government and for nonprofit institutions, has produced in the last 6 years, 200,000 full-time jobs.

That is the total increase, the net increase.

Now, I don't need to even interrupt to point out that as far as I am concerned this is not a set of figures directed to a proposition that there should be more government supplying of jobs. Gentlemen, exactly the opposite. As far as I am concerned, full em-

ployment is never going to come from any set of government programs. It is going to come from the development of strength as far as the private sector of the economy is concerned. And it bothers me greatly that in the last 6 years, the total increase in the number of full-time jobs contributed by the private sector of the economy, leaving out government and nonprofit institutions, has been 200,000 jobs.

Now I am cheered by the fact that this figure is today infinitely better than it would have been a year ago, because in the last year there has been an increase of about 500,000 jobs. So what I have given you is the 1957 to 1963 comparison. 1957 to 1962 would have shown a loss. (Now I am talking about full-time jobs throughout here.)

There has been an increase of about 500,000 full-time jobs in this last year, which may mean that we are on the way up. But I want to stress the fact—as part of an analysis of the situation of unemployment today—that a principal part of our problem has been that the private economy has not been functioning at the rate which is necessary in view of the rapid increase in the size of the work force.

Were this earlier, and were the report at this point less cloudy as far as the tax program is concerned, I would, of course, point out that this is exactly the reason that we need the tax reduction program. I hope that it will help greatly as far as the elimination of this problem is concerned.

HOURS OF WORK

Now, there are a few things about some of the other details of the unemployment situation. I would like to point out a few things about the relationship of the hours problem to the problem of unemployment. I suppose it is only a measure of foolhardiness or a suggestion of perversity that I would go, 3 days ago, to talk to the AFL-CIO Executive Council about my opposition to the 35-hour workweek, and talk to you here today about my support of the proposition that there should be a larger penalty for overtime, when neither view is popular in either quarter.

But I am very much concerned about the distribution of the hours of work. I read in one of the newspapers this morning—I will identify it only by saying it is a paper I think of as having the largest gap between the validity of its editorial and its reportorial comments. There is an editorial in one of the morning papers which says that when you force an employer to cut or eliminate overtime, you are also telling the working man he can't work as much or make as much money as he is able to make.

Well, poppycock. The rest of the proposition is that when you don't supply a man with an opportunity for work, you are also telling him that he is not able or he can't work as much or make as much money as he is able to.

What we are trying to do is to find that balance between work and leisure, that relationship or that distribution of work which will provide the fullest opportunity to the fullest number of people, to do the work which they want to do.

There is pointed out in another article in one of the columns in another of the papers this morning, what has been happening to the workweek over the period of the last 50 or 60 years.

There has been a sustained but not very rapid dimunition in the number of hours in the work year for the whole of this century, at least. The workweek has been going down in length about half of one percent a year as a result of one thing or another.

Now, that is not a very good statistic, because it went down very rapidly during one period of time, or during two periods of time, and recently it has been going down less. But my point is that there has been in the experience of this century an evolution in the distribution of man's time between work and no work. That process is still going on.

I think it is an open question as to the extent to which there should be legislative affecting of the result. I think, as you know, that a legislative program by which we would reduce the workweek to 35 hours would be a mistake. I am, at the same time, very much concerned about a situation in which 15½ million people were working more than 40 hours on an overtime basis, and 4½ million were unable to find work which they were looking for. I think there is something out of joint. I would hope that it is a matter which would be worked out in the private sector of the economy. If it is not, it seems to me that it is a matter to which we must attend legislatively.

OVERTIME

President Johnson has, accordingly, made a recommendation to the Congress which is that this matter of overtime should be reviewed on an industry-by-industry basis, by tripartite committees, and that there should be an increase in the penalty rate for overtime, where it is determined in a particular industry that an increase in the overtime rate from time and a half to double time would do two things: (1) would increase employment; and (2) would not result in any excessive cost increases.

I think that proposal deserves and demands consideration. I do not think we have resolved yet this matter of the distribution of man's time between work and leisure. I don't think that we have worked out the perfect distribution of work among the people in the country. I don't think that the answer to those is going to come by any means entirely from law.

I do not think that there is the same necessity today of looking at this matter legislatively as there was in 1937 and in 1938. But I don't need to go further into details of that particular problem.

Now, finally, I should like to talk about the relationship of unemployment and education, because it seems to me that here is the most fruitful opportunity for immediate advance on the employment problem. I would like to give you a few more statistics which suggest something of the relationship of lack of education and unemployment in this country today. These statistics can be read several ways, and I will want to point that out in mentioning them.

The unemployment rate for individuals today with less than 5 years of school is 10.4 percent. Those in the work force who have less than 5 years of school are 10.4 percent unemployed.

Those with 9 to 11 years of school are 7.8 percent unemployed. Those with 13 to 15 years of school are 4 percent unemployed, and those with 16 years or more of school have an unemployment rate of 1.4 percent.

I repeat that if there was more time we could go into a number of the possible explanations of this, but this salient fact stands clear. There are others that are of a related kind.

CRISIS FOR UNSKILLED

In 1962, the educational attainment of unskilled nonfarm laborers was less than 9 years. Employment for that group over the last 10-year period has declined by 3½ percent. This is a difficult figure, and I consider it quite illuminating and, therefore, I would like to be clear about spelling it out.

If you take the unskilled nonfarm labor classification, where there is an educational attainment of less than 9 years, employment over the last 10 years has declined by 3½ percent.

On the other hand, if you take clerical and sales workers whose educational attainment in 1962 was more than 12½ years, their employment has increased by 14 percent between 1952 and 1962.

Then if you take professional and technical workers with an educational attainment of 16 years, employment for them during this 10-year period has increased by 62 percent.

These figures are perhaps only the statistical confirmation of what we know to be obvious in general, which is that the developments in the economy are such that there is a closer and closer incidence between education and employment and between lack of education and unemployment.

There is another factor in this situation, another set of statistics which I am not going to give because I have already talked longer than I intended to, or than the circumstances I know warrant.

Another set of statistics will show a very close correlation between unemployment of an individual and the unemployment and lack of education of his father; or, summarizing the point, unemployment in this country today is becoming an inherited characteristic and it is being inherited not through the physical genes, but through social genes of lack of education, slums, and so on and so forth.

I am not sure how much poverty we can eliminate as far as the adult generation is concerned. I know that if we could get poverty and unemployment out of the American bloodstream, as far as I am concerned the place to start is with the educational program.

Rather than emphasizing what can be done as far as larger employment resulting from a change in the overtime rates are concerned, I would like to suggest to you that the single largest possibility of immediate attack upon the unemployment situation would come from getting 2 million teenagers out of the work force. There are almost 3 million of them between the ages of 14 and 19, who are out of school and in the work force.

As far as I am concerned, this is the most fertile area for moving immediately on a fuller employment problem, because I do not think most of those 3 million ought to be there. I think the number ought to be cut down by about 2 million, and that those 2 million, instead of being in the work force, should be in school getting the kind of preparation they need for the employment which lies ahead.

If we could accomplish this in one way or another, it would have three effects: First, it would develop a guarantee against future unemployment by preparing these boys and girls more fully for the jobs that lie ahead; second, it would take their competition out of a work market in which they are today competing with breadwinners and so on; and third, it would make education the biggest industry in the country, which it ought to be.

EXTENDING FREE COMPULSORY EDUCATION

I should like to suggest for your consideration the proposition that there ought to be, at this point, an additional 2 years added both to our free education system, and to our requirements of compulsory education. It is not just more education of the same kind that all of these people have been getting, but 2 years more which in a good many cases would include advanced vocational education, as well as preparation for college.

Here is what we have done in this country: Over 100 years ago, about 150 years ago now, we started developing this idea of free education. We eventually came up with the idea of free education through high school. We made it, almost all, preparation for college. But that didn't matter too much because those who matriculated either went on to college or went into a work force where there was plenty of work for unskilled workers. It is not the situation today.

Then we did another thing: We provided by law in most States that boys and girls must stay in school until they are 16. Those

two actions met the needs of that time, the need for education up to 16 years, and free education up through the high school level.

The needs, gentlemen, have continually changed in the last century and a half. The needs today are for people with more and, in some cases, a different kind of education from what has been supplied before, and the needs are for free education which would carry them through the additional, I think, 2 years.

The money involved here would not need to be supplied directly. In most cases I think it would be better applied probably through a scholarship or preferably a loan program of one kind or another.

I think it is against what I grew up by. People get an education and jobs in this country depending upon the income of their parents. I am ashamed by the facts I find when I look at the list of high school graduates in this country, line them all up according to the incomes of their fathers, and find that if I take those in the top 30 percent of the graduating high school class in this country, the top 30 percent measured by their fathers' income, 46 percent of those boys and girls go on to college.

If I take the bottom 30 percent measured by their parents' income, their fathers' income, 12 percent of them go on to college. It isn't fair and it is bad business.

I would like to suggest that in the long run we will approach the employment problem most effectively, the actual employment goal most effectively, if we attend to the basic problem of the relationship of education to employment.

BREAKING THE HABIT

We have it in connection with the training program, but we have it most basically in connection with the educational program, and I think there is a great deal to be done about getting unemployment out of the American bloodstream. I don't think that there is any reason for it as a habit.

I point out that the more we look at it the more we find that unemployment, poverty, and ignorance all go together. We might as well hit them at one point or another. So far as I am concerned, the best way to hit them is in connection with their educational matter.

May I say only this: Let us consider spending time not only on the problems of wheat, or strikes, or something of that kind, but rather on the attempt to find out what it is that explains the fact that at the height of the greatest success story in the history of man there are 4½ million people in this country who can't find something to do.

Spending as I do much time on this problem, it is a matter of the greatest encouragement that the American Bankers Association convenes in this symposium session for a discussion of this problem. Not we, gentlemen, but you, will answer the problem in the long run.

There is another axiom or a little piece of poetry that I think about most often in connection with endeavors of what are here called public service. It is a measure of the limitations of what we can do about it. It is, I think, Goldsmith's couplet: "How small a part of all that human hearts endure, that part which kings and laws can cure."

I would hope that the challenge of this meeting by those of us who are with the government, would be that the matter of full employment is primarily and basically a matter which must be left to the private economy, to the private community, to the strengthening of the private economy. I hope you realize that we conceive of a government function as being only that residual function which it is necessary to exercise when the rest of it doesn't work.

Thank you very much.

Hypocrisy and Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 20, 1964, issue of the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., printed an excellent editorial on the so-called civil rights legislation entitled "Hypocrisy and Fraud." This editorial particularly points up the recent comments by a very courageous and capable Representative from New Hampshire, the Honorable LOUIS C. WYMAN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRISY AND FRAUD

Among the cherished rights of the American people is the secret ballot. This is a right of a voter. It is not the right of a member of a legislature.

The votes of legislators—whether in city council, State legislature, or National Congress—are matters of record. They are public when they are cast, and they remain on the record to which officeholders point with pride and opponents view with alarm.

The votes cast for the civil rights bill in the House of Representatives some day will come back to haunt the men who cast them. This is our opinion. It is also the opinion of a Member of the House. This Member is not a southerner. He represents a district in the rock-ribbed Yankee State of New Hampshire. His name is LOUIS C. WYMAN, former attorney general of New Hampshire, former president of the National Association of Attorneys General and twice chairman of the standing committee on jurisprudence of the American Bar Association.

Representative WYMAN said that if a secret ballot had been taken in the House, the civil rights bill would not have received 50 votes. But the ballot was not secret. It was on the record, and the record said 290 in favor and only 130 opposed.

Most of the opposition came from southerners. The southerners were not afraid of the consequences of taking a position to uphold the Constitution and the rights of the people.

We cannot say what motivated all the others who voted for the bill. Some of them may sincerely believe that Government coercion is justified in any and every sphere of human life. They may really believe that the principles of American freedom are out of date. We cannot say.

We can say, however, on the basis of a speech which David Lawrence quoted with approval in his syndicated column from Washington, that Representative WYMAN, of New Hampshire, does recognize the truth and is not afraid to tell it.

The legislation, Mr. WYMAN said, "makes a mockery of the Constitution * * *. To uphold it I am compelled to vote against this bill. * * * It is hypocrisy compounded by fraud upon the people to ignore these basic truths because some Members believe there are more votes for their reelection to be found in perpetuating the fraud than in protecting the constitutional rights of the people—all the people, both white and colored, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and unbeliever * * *. There are still many private rights in America that under our Constitution are beyond the power of Government to regulate, and one of these is the right to pick and choose one's associates, one's friends and one's customers in private business. * * * Make no mistake about one thing—that we are dealing with an iceberg here. Nine-tenths of public opinion on this legislation has never been shown on the surface. When people realize what an invasion of their private rights is here involved—and they will come to realize it as time goes by should this ever become law—we can rest assured that as surely as there will be an 89th Congress a vote in favor of this bill will come back to haunt those who did so."

The civil rights bill goes next before the U.S. Senate. A filibuster is expected. In the full discussion, we pray that the American people will prevail on their Senators not to scrap the Constitution for the sake of conforming to a passing fad, the greatest fraud yet attempted among a once free people. We speak of the fraudulent attempt to set up compulsory equality, which is a contradiction in terms.

Legion Opposes Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of the American Legion is to be commended for a very excellent article he wrote for his organization's magazine. At a time when extreme elements are making reckless attacks on the President and on our free institutions, the statement by the commander of a great veteran's organization on this subject deserves the highest commendation.

I include herewith, Mr. Speaker, an editorial by Mr. Walter S. Farquhar from a recent issue of the Pottsville Republican:

LEGION OPPOSES EXTREMISTS

Daniel Foley, national commander of the American Legion, wrote in his organization's magazine, in part as follows, not long ago:

"At a time of rapid change and recurring crisis in national affairs, one factor remains constant. The loudest noise and most confused counsel continue to come from extremists.

"By extremists I mean those individuals who would save America by forsaking its free institutions, those who, in the conviction that theirs is the only right view, have lost sight of—and faith in—the fundamental processes of self-government.

"You know the type as well as I do. They claim to have the one true answer to every problem. They talk of setting aside the law when it offends them. They are quick to cry treason, slow to admit error, and indifferent to arguments and facts that do not support their beliefs. They are not really leftists or rightists—but simply modern anarchists—though many of them would be shocked at the idea.

"There are two basic flaws in their brand of extremism. It violates the spirit and traditions of real Americanism. It seeks a course of action that is bound to fail.

"Now more than ever before, Americans need to keep their values in clear focus. Our resort must be to reason, not to emotion; to persuasion, not to violence; to perseverance, not to panic. It isn't necessary or desirable that we all think alike. It is essential that we espouse our differences reasonably with good will and due regard for other opinions.

"Honest disagreement honorably expressed cannot divide Americans. But disagreement waged with weapons of fear and hate and bad faith can cost us not only our unity but our character and purpose as a free people.

"Abraham Lincoln in a previous era of strong feeling said 'There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law.' By the same token, there is no grievance now that cannot be voiced and fairly met within the tested channels of the democratic system.

"I often wonder if those who advocate extremism really understand the enormity of their disservice to their country.

"The citizen who defies the law or falsely demeans the motives and authority of governmental institutions is helping Khrushchev's cause, not America's. The citizen who seeks recourse to hatred or violence as the answer to the Nation's problems is turning away from an acceptable and workable American solution.

"By practicing responsible Americanism, this American Legion of ours has served as a stabilizing force in the Nation's life. We stand today as a buffer against extremism of both the left and the right. This is a position in which every Legionnaire may take pride.

"We neither need nor want rigid conformity. Nor can we permit a few overzealous and unreasoning individuals to overbalance the commonsense and judgment of the people.

"Ours is a big country with big and perplexing problems. The answers do not come easily—they will not come at all if substantial numbers of Americans permit themselves to be led into the extravagances of hate and fear."

That speech expressed faith in the true spirit of democracy and the ultimate commonsense of the American people.

There is a difference between a patriot and a patrioteer. The patriot loves the institutions of his country and will fight for his flag, right or wrong or any other way. The patrioteer is a professional, who seeks self glory and appoints himself a vigilante to force conformity on other Americans.

Commander Foley is profoundly correct in citing the American Legion as a buffer between unreasoning extremes. That is true Americanism. Without such principles, America could sink into the same police state Russia always has been under both the czars and proletariat.

A Turning Point in Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, during the Senate's deliberations on the tax bill, those of us in charge of the measure worked very closely with the officials of the Treasury Department. Having been so closely associated with these men for an extended period of time, it is my opinion that they represent the finest in public service. I have never received such cooperation as was extended to me in the course of the proceedings on the tax bill by everyone at the Treasury Department with whom I was in contact. This applies to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and to all of his assistants and aids.

One of these gentlemen to whom I refer is Under Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler. Mr. Fowler is due as much credit as any one individual in this Nation for seeing to it that the tax bill was enacted into law. He has recently delivered an excellent address on the new tax law and on the place of fiscal policy in the overall economic program of this Nation. Under Secretary Fowler addressed the 14th Annual Midyear Conference of the Tax Executives Institute here in Washington on Monday, March 2. His address is one of the most enlightened essays on this particular tax law and the general field of tax law and economics which I have ever read or heard. So that others may have the opportunity to read this informative speech by Under Secretary Fowler I am informed by the Public Printer that this manuscript will make approximately 6¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $562.50. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TURNING POINT IN TAX POLICY

(By the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury)

The new currents that have emerged in the last 2 years mark a turning point in national tax policy. Indeed, they have added a new and meaningful dimension to national economic policy. In any event, the tax policy embodied in the Revenue Act of 1962, the administrative liberalization of depreciation in the same year, and the Revenue Act of 1964 which became law last week, in the financial and economic context to which they are related, represents a significant milestone in American political and economic history. In signing the Revenue Act of 1964 President Johnson reflected the view held by many, including his predecessor, the late President Kennedy, that the tax bill "is the single most important step we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II."

What has happened is that in the crucible of intense national debate, tax, and fiscal policy have finally been accorded a positive role in our political and economic system—particularly to nurture a dynamic, productive private enterprise sector. A new meaning and reality, and a promising frame of reference, have been given to the declaration of policy in the Employment Act of 1946. That policy, it may be recalled, directed that the Federal Government, in promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, shall coordinate its plants, functions, and resources for creating and maintaining these conditions "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare."

The Revenue Act of 1964 and related tax measures in 1962 reflected a national will to mount an effective program of tax and fiscal action responsive to this policy. That program truly represents a turning point in national tax policy; it is tax reform in the "economic" sense; it adds to the battery of instruments of monetary, credit, and budget and expenditure policy the recognition of yet another powerful governmental tool to be exercised for our economic welfare and national strength.

As an active participant during the last 3 years in the process of formulating and translating various proposals into the reality of law and decision, I must, naturally, plead guilty to any charge of being biased in favor of these three measures in their related context. Like every other observer or participant, if I had my own way there may be some features I might have fashioned somewhat differently. But regarded not as the last word but as an important first step they constitute an affirmative effort to attune tax and fiscal policy to the requirements of a functioning economy in a private enterprise system.

Regardless of one's feelings about the wrongness or rightness of the new directions taken, all must admit that national tax policy has become, since 1960, one of the liveliest topics of public interest and policy determination. If full and intelligent discussion of critical political decisions is a measure of the strength and vitality of the democratic process, the millions of words in debate and commentary on these tax measures are a net gain for us all. If translation of ideas from the drawing board of the scholar or the panel discussions of both the experts and practical men of affairs into the concrete reality of positive governmental action is a measure of the effectiveness of a dynamic political system, the breakthrough in the past 3 years of the logjam on national tax policy should be reassuring.

In light of that breakthrough, it is worthwhile to make at least a preliminary appraisal of these tax policy actions and their significance.

It seems preferable to speak of all three tax measures referred to rather than view the recently enacted tax bill in isolation from the Revenue Act of 1962 and the modification by the Treasury Department in that same year of the tax treatment of depreciation. The three are a package reflecting a new body of tax policy. Together with related budgetary and expenditure policy for fiscal 1964 and 1965 they represent an integrated exercise of positive fiscal policy.

Naturally, the tax bill and the related measures mean different things to different people, depending upon their background and special sphere of interest. It is for the tax lawyers and technicians to analyze the bone and sinew of these measures as they apply in day-to-day transactions. It is for the structural tax reformers, the press, law faculties and, even, the Treasury Department, to underscore the defects that remain—and there are many—in the relief provisions of yesterday that have become the loopholes and special preferences of today. For my part, I shall try to appraise the particulars in which this new body of policy seeks to employ our knowledge of tax and fiscal policy, in the words of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

I. A NEW VENTURE WITH AN ANCIENT TRADITION

Tonight, let us put to one side for the moment our special interests and specialized expertise and borrow a vantage point from a simpler era when the all-embracing phrase "political economy" was in current use. Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," observed that:

"Political economy, considered as a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator, proposes two distinct objects: first, to provide a plentiful revenue or subsistence for the people, or more properly to enable them to provide such a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and, secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with a revenue sufficient for the public usage. It proposes to enrich both the people and the sovereign."

In a very real sense the new tax policy embodied in the three measures represents just

that—a bold effort to adapt national fiscal policy to enable the people of the United States to provide a plentiful revenue for themselves by extracting in modified patterns of taxing a revenue sufficient for the public use, thereby enriching both the economy and the public treasury.

President Johnson referred to the new tax policy as "A bold approach to the problems of the American economy." It was a bold approach. But it was not a new or novel one. It was in an ancient and honorable tradition that finds many echoes in the history of other peoples—instances in which the government, by modifying a repressive tax system, sought to give new impetus to private transactions.

Confirming what the late President Kennedy emphasized in recommending the tax program a year earlier, President Johnson said:

"We could have chosen to stimulate the economy through a high level of Government spending. We doubted the wisdom of following that course. Instead, we chose tax reductions, and at the same time we made conscientious and earnest attempts to reduce Government expenditures."

Putting it another way, President Johnson noted that "By taking this course we have made this bill an expression of faith in our system of free enterprise."

For Congressman WILBUR MILLS, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, there was a similar assessment of the new law's meaning. Last week he said:

"Let me take this opportunity to restate the implications of the Revenue Act of 1964 for the fiscal policy of the United States. As I said last September, this legislation meets the requirements of fiscal responsibility. It is part of an overall program to conduct the finances of the Federal Government in such a way that a balanced budget can be achieved in an economy which is growing rapidly, providing adequate employment and investment opportunities, making full use of its capital and human resources, and giving the fullest possible play to the initiative and venturesomeness of the private sector of the economy."

Senator RUSSELL LONG, second ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee and floor manager for the tax bill in the Senate, summarized his reaction in these terms:

"Perhaps the most unique aspect of the bill is that it reinforces our private enterprise system. By reducing the level of individual and corporate taxation we are giving the free enterprise segment of our society an opportunity to take up the slack which many of us believe has arisen in our economy because our tax system has in large part up to his time still been geared for a wartime, rather than peacetime economy. By this action we are giving the private enterprise sector of our economy the opportunity to provide the growth we need in the years ahead to improve our competitive situation abroad, to offset at least in part the increasing unemployment that we face, and to provide for a better and more prosperous America for all of us."

In the minds of both proponents and opponents of the legislation something very significant that can be truly termed "a turning point in tax policy" has occurred. While it is tempting to sit back and simply watch how it works out, there is an obligation, now the debate is over, to analyze the meaning of this contemporary decision. This is so, not only because of the current importance and magnitude of the action undertaken, but also because of the rather overwhelming national consensus it signifies and its portents for the future, particularly if its results prove beneficial to the national economy.

Past failures to do anything about the general complaint concerning the tax system shared by everyone have been explained by the statement that "The existing tax system persists not because we are agreed in support of it, but because we are unable to agree on how to change it."

Finally, this logjam on national tax policy has been broken. A meaningful national consensus has developed. Two new massive revenue acts have become law in 18 months, embodying a reasonably cohesive and consistent approach. The proposed Revenue Act of 1964 was voted last week on successive days in the House and Senate by majorities approaching 4 to 1 following intensive debate in voluminous detail during the preceding 13 months. In the end, this measure, strongly backed by two Presidents in a Democratic administration, became law with a substantial measure of bipartisan support, with majorities exceeding 2 to 1 in both Houses on both sides of the aisle. Moreover, it is difficult to recall an instance in the Nation's peacetime history when its political brains and leadership from all sectors of the private community—business, labor, financial—have been in such general accord on a key economic policy as that which supported the enactment of the tax bill.

This support came to the bill from diverse sectors and points of view on many differing rationales and motivations. It is is also remarkable that the diminishing opposition became increasingly divided in its point of view, with part of its finding little comfort in the status quo, and another part, fearful of change, united only in skepticism that the majority had chosen the means most appropriate to worthy objectives.

Moreover, the national decision embodied in all three of these tax policy determinations—the act of 1962, the administrative liberalization of depreciation, and the Act of 1964—has very long-term implications. These were not "quickie" tax measures taken on the spur of the moment to meet a temporary or passing situation. They represented action responsive to a long-felt need, long overdue—truly a turning point in national economic policy—considered and permanent in nature.

Nor are these long-term implications limited merely to the results of the action taken. This may be no mere pause in a movement to be resumed in the previously held direction. It may well be a turning point at a crossroads. Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committe, a principal architect of the bill, said last week before its final passage:

"As a result of the Revenue Act of 1964, we will have a Federal income tax much more in tune with our times. But times change. We should all of us be alert to such changes and be prepared to make further tax adjustments, if these should be necessary and desirable, in the interest of a healthy growing economy and sound management of the Government's finances. Indeed, preserving the gains for the economy and for Federal finances, which we can confidently expect from this bill, may both permit and require additional tax reductions in the not too distant future.

"Whether or not we will realize the opportunities for further tax reduction will depend in great part on how well Government expenditures are controlled."

In the wake of passage a generally agreed sentiment would have it that income tax rates have been too high for healthy economic growth and that the door should be left open for further cuts later if this one works the way we expect it will.

Leaving to the future the question of how far and how fast we travel down the particular route chosen, the support of this new tax policy expresses a deep sense of national purpose—a determination to move the country forward to greater economic strength, vitality, growth, and effectiveness. It reflects a desire to do away promptly with idle manpower and unused or obsolete capacities, inadequate demand and investment, a succession of substantial budgetary deficits, and imbalances in our international payments.

Why and under what circumstances did this deep sense of national purpose emerge, and why did it fasten upon tax policy? Only through examining the perspectives of our contemporary economic problems and the tax policy setting of the last few decades can we arrive at understanding.

II. ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES—1957–62

The euphoria of a recordbreaking 1963 in gross national product, industrial production, employment, profits before and after taxes, and countless other indexes summarized in the economic report of the President transmitted in January and confirmed by the current economic indicators for February have not caused the national desire for the recently enacted tax bill to abate one whit.

There was no serious suggestion that the investment tax credit—the centerpiece of the Revenue Act of 1962—be repealed. The principal legislative concern was how it could be improved by the elimination of a provision in the earlier act that deprived it of nearly one-half of its contemplated effectiveness by requiring that newly acquired assets be depreciated from a level of 93 percent rather than 100 percent. There was no suggestion that administrative liberalization of depreciation, announced in July 1962, be reversed; there was only some expressed desire that the liberality of that administrative action be confirmed by legislative enactment.

Even some of the major opponents of tax reduction last spring had second thoughts. In a speech last October, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, former Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, noting his serious reservations of some while back, put the situation in realistic terms:

"As things stand now the prospect of tax reduction has been so thoroughly built into the expectations and planning and to some extent also into the financial commitments of individuals and businesses that it would be seriously deflationary to call it off."

What this all adds up to is that 1963 witnessed an active response in the economic community to a new financial environment of which the new directions in tax and fiscal policy were an important and significant component. No one can tell how much of the 1963 advance can be attributable to the tax policies put into effect in 1962 and anticipated for early 1964. It is sufficient to note that the economic policy mix of which tax and related expenditure policy was the keystone, provided an environment that has combined in this expansion to provide a higher rate of economic growth, greater price stability, and greater increase in employment than in any previous nonwartime expansion.

The fact that there was an overwhelming refusal to return to the tax policy outlook that preceded the recent initiatives should give some pause to those who will describe with penetrating hindsight why and how it should have been done differently.

The eradication of long existing flaws in the field of equity and simplification—and there are many—that remain in the Federal income tax system had to give way to a priority for and major emphasis on the overall national economic aspects of tax policy. This was determined by the President, the Treasury, and the Congress, because of disturbing developments in our national economy since 1956 which cried out for first consideration.

The innate strength of the United States in the last half of the fifties was marred by deterioration in confidence in the vigor, growth potential and competitiveness of the

American economy on which so much depends.

Recoveries from recessions failed to reach a satisfactory rate of utilization of resources, much less sustain the desired pace over appreciable periods. Even more disturbing than a tendency to ever more frequent recessions was the fact that periods of expansion of the U.S. economy were marred by higher peaks of unemployment, lagging growth rates, budget deficits, and continued unfavorable imbalances in our international payments. What are some of the specific elements in the economic background that led to the new tax policy initiatives?

Take the matter of unemployment. With an average rate of unemployment of 6 percent from 1958 through 1960, a sustained recovery that by now has stretched almost over a 3-year period, still finds our rate of unemployment stuck firmly at the intolerable level of 5½ percent. In fact, not more than once in 76 consecutive months has unemployment dropped below the 5-percent level. This unemployment looms as an increasing threat. True, our economy is producing more than 1 million new jobs a year. But that is not enough. We need 5 million additional jobs in the next few years to meet the rapidly expanding youth force that is pouring into the labor market in increasing numbers, to provide opportunities for those idled by technological advances, and to reduce the unemployment of some 4 million people in our country today ready, willing and able to work—who cannot find jobs.

While our national growth rate in 1963 has been at a level of 3.8 percent in constant dollars, we cannot forget that from early 1955 through 1962 it average 2.8 percent, comparing unfavorably with regular rates in Western European countries of 4, 5, and 6 percent—or even our own 4-percent trend in much of the period prior to 1955.

Our balance-of-payments deficits for the last 2 years have been in excess of $2 billion a year—a considerable improvement over the $3½ to $4 billion annual deficits that characterized the years 1958–60, but still a serious problem, and one we are moving firmly to solve.

There have been deficits in the Federal administrative budget in 5 of the last 6 years, totaling $31.7 billion.

Much of the total was due to a $12.4 billion deficit in 1959, resulting from an unanticipated recession.

In 1956 and 1957 business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. Thereafter it receded to roughly 9 percent. The rate of increase in our stock of business plant and equipment substantially diminished after 1957, falling to less than 2 percent a year, compared to 4 percent a year in the 1954–57 period. There was also a disturbing rise in the proportion of our machinery and equipment which is more than 10 years old in the later part of the decade. A survey of the age of machine tools in the United States, by the American Machinist magazine, showed 64 percent to be at least 10 years old. Similar equipment over 10 years old in France, Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R.

Between 1955 and 1960 there was a sharp decline in the rate of increase of productivity per worker and per hour from that of the earlier postwar period.

With the exception of the depression, no period of comparable length in this century has witnessed such a disturbing underutilization of productive resources in the United States as the period preceding the new tax policy initiatives of 1962–63. And, surely, at no time since the United States became a major indsutrial power has it so risked its leadership because of obsolescent productive plants and equipment.

To meet this accumulation of economic woes, the choice of tax policy as the key weapon follows logically from an analysis of the political and economic limitations on alternative options.

Growth itself might have been achieved by a massive increase in Federal spending well beyond the necessities of mounting defense and space costs. But the President decided against that course because of the political preference to which he and the Nation firmly hold. To depend upon massive increases in Government expenditures as the primary reliance for a higher level of economic activity is to consciously expand the role of Government in making and carrying out economic decisions. In that situation, an ever larger proportion of the Nation's labor and money would be used directly by the Government. The Government's activities as a buyer, lender, or donor would determine in larger and larger part the use of labor and capital even in the private sector of the economy.

In his tax message of January a year ago, the late President Kennedy made his clear and unequivocal choice, saying, "In today's circumstances it is desirable to seek expansion through our free market processes—to place increased spending power in the hands of private consumers and investors and offer more encouragement to private initiative."

"The most effective policy, therefore, is to expand demand and unleash incentives through a program of tax reduction and reform, coupled with the most prudent public policy of public expenditures."

Economic analysis supports this political preference in today's circumstances when inadequate investment in the private sector is a major reason for lagging growth, stubborn unemployment and balance-of-payments difficulties. From 1957 to 1962, in real terms, Federal purchases of goods and services rose more than 13 percent, total national output went up more than 16 percent, consumer expenditures went up more than 17 percent, State and local government expenditures went up 28 percent, but plant and equipment spending declined by more than 1 percent. Secretary of Labor Wirtz recently estimated that increases in jobs, leaving out those on farms, totaled 4.3 million from 1957 through 1962. Of these, 2 million occurred in the government sector—almost all State and local; 800,000 were due to government procurement programs; 700,000 were found in nonprofit institutions; 600,000 were part-time jobs, leaving that part of the private sector not doing government work with a net job creation of 200,000 in the 6-year span.

Given the political and economic reasons for directing national policy initiatives to the private sector of the economy, there was another alternative to tax policy—the increased use of credit and monetary tools in an attempt to provide still lower interest rates and substantially increased supplies of money and credit. But, as the late President Kennedy pointed out in his address to the Economic Club of New York in December 1962, "Our balance-of-payments situation today places limits on our use of those tools for expansion."

For the first time stubborn balance-of-payments deficits pointed toward restrictive policies—at least boosting short-term interest rates or imposing penalty taxes on foreign portfolio investment to keep U.S. funds from flowing abroad. The combination of full convertibility of currencies in the Western World beginning in 1959 and external deficits limited our option to those of an open economy in contrast to a pre-1957 situation in which we could largely act as if we were in a closed economy. In addition to limiting a reliance upon monetary and credit policy as a means of expansion and growth, the balance-of-payments situation led to increasing emphasis on stepping up private investment at home—both as a means of increasing productivity and lowering costs so as to attain a stronger position in markets at home and abroad and as a means of attracting investment dollars to stay home or flow to the United States.

Here again two factors stood in the way and both pointed toward tax policy as an answer. Idle and obsolete capacity has for some years held back a floodtide of investment in modernization and expansion that the Nation has long needed. Well over 10 percent of our overall industrial capacity has remained idle during much of the time since 1957 because of lack of demand, despite a substantial improvement in rate of utilization early in the current expansion. Moreover, corporate profits after taxes, even after the early expansion of 1961, remain below former levels as a percent of investment capital, of sales, or of the corporate portion of gross national product.

All of these factors combined to encourage a search for ways and means of making tax policy serve economic needs—both domestic and international.

The alternatives seemed either to be to drift into a way of life at home contrary to our traditional preferences or a withdrawal from our responsibilities abroad for sharing in free world security and development. We were neither content to assign to Government our primary reliance for a higher level of economic activity nor to admit that our economic prospects no longer could attract investment from capital sources at home and abroad, or that our efficiency would no longer enable us to achieve equilibrium in our balance of international payments.

TAX POLICY PERSPECTIVES (1939–62)

There were other reasons for a decision to utilize tax policy to meet these economic problems that emerged in the late fifties and carried over into the early sixties. The income tax system had not been fundamentally changed since 1954 and, indeed, represented largely a carryover of wartime rate scales imposed to restrain demand and equalize sacrifice and, in no sense, designed to maximize economic growth in the private sector unrelated to Government procurement—quite the contrary. Yet, the levels and magnitude of Federal income taxation were of such a character as to inevitably play a major role in the functioning of the private economy. They had been necessitated by World War II and maintained to avert postwar inflation until the Korean war required their reaffirmation. They were carried over into the continuing cold war and maintained at a high level despite the changing character of aggregate demand from excessive to inadequate, the weakening of private initiative reflected in the diminishing scale of business fixed investment, and the ever-tightening constriction of the high rates on consumption as advancing income levels pushed an increasing percentage of the population into ever higher tax rates on marginal income.

It was as though the Nation had dismantled all of the machinery established to live with the excessive demands and drives of war—such as price and wage control, allocation of scarce materials, rationing and regulation of consumer credit—and forgotten to do anything about tax rates imposed for the same reason.

World War II made the income tax into a mass tax. Until 1939, after a quarter century of the existence of the income tax, there were only 4 million returns filed—4 percent of the population (14 years and over)—with rates scaling from 4 percent on taxable income below $4,000 to 79 percent on income in excess of $5 million. But with the war the income tax became a vital fiscal weapon. In the words of Professors Surrey and Warren:

"Almost overnight it changed its morning coat for overalls. Its membership spread from the country club district down to the railroad tracks, then over to the other side of the railroad tracks."

Forty-five million individuals were filing taxable returns by 1945 with the initial rate at 23 percent. At the same time the top corporation rate rose to 40 percent with an excess profits tax added. Instead of revenue from these two sources of approximately $2.2 billion in 1939 the individual income tax and the corporate income tax yielded $27.5 billion in 1948. In the postwar period individual tax rates declined from a 23- to 94-percent scale to a 16.6- to 82.1-percent scale, and corporation rates were fixed at 38 percent. Also, married couples were permitted to compute their tax on a split income joint return method which resulted in their total tax being equal to twice the tax on one-half of their combined income. Exemptions were increased to $600.

But the Korean war brought a reversal, pushing the individual rates back up to 22.2- to 92-percent individual scale and a 52-percent corporate scale on corporate incomes over $25,000.

Even the passing of the Korean war and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 brought little change in rate scales. The first bracket rate for individuals on the first $2,000 became 20 percent with the top bracket being 91 percent. The corporate rates—a 30-percent normal tax and a 22 percent surtax on income over $25,000 making a combined rate of 52 percent on the latter income—were continued on a year-to-year basis.

However, the tax actions taken in 1954 did recognize that the reduction of tax barriers to long-term growth was an appropriate economic objective of tax reform. In addition to permitting the expiration of the excess profits tax, minor individual rate reduction, some reduction in excise taxes and many technical changes, the law recognized the need for tax incentives to invest in plant and equipment.

This recognition took the form of a provision allowing a more rapid writeoff of depreciable assets in the earlier years. Also the 1954 act permitted current deductions for research and development expenses and permitted a dividend credit in the belief—which experience has proved questionable—that it was necessary to assure needed equity capital. Indeed, President Eisenhower in his first state of the Union message said: "We must develop a system of taxation which will impose the least possible obstacle to the dynamic growth of the country."

In a somewhat prophetic commentary Dr. Dan Smith, then Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, said in 1955: "In turning to reforms designed to reduce tax barriers to economic growth, one preliminary comment may be appropriate. The question is sometimes asked as to why any relief of this sort is needed when the economic system has grown as spectacularly as it has over the last 15 years. A little reflection brings out the obvious point that the growth of the last 15 years has been in an environment characterized by war, threats of war, emergency defense programs, and inflation. All of these artificial stimuli have served to foster and, in many instances, to finance economic expansion. As one looks forward to normal growth, the importance of restoring normal incentives and removing punitive tax provisions becomes clear."

Indeed, a predecessor in my current office and good friend, Under Secretary of the Treasury Folsom, said in the fall of 1954, in appraising the 1954 tax law: "In any case, in a growing and changing economy, tax revision is necessarily a continuing task. We also look forward to future tax reduction since we appreciate fully the severity of our present tax burden and believe that its reduction is essential to the continued prosperity of the country. However, we also believe that additional tax cuts must wait upon further reductions in Federal expenditures."

They never came and neither did further tax reduction.

In 1955 a Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, chaired by the Congressman WILBUR MILLS, conducted an examination of "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability."

Notwithstanding the valuable stockpile of proposals on a national tax policy for growth, the years from 1954 to 1961 saw no tax policy changes of substantial economic significance.

We continued to retain a high-rate income tax on the economy of the country, regardless of its impact on the initiative of individuals, on the investment of capital, and the consuming power and habits of the general public.

However, the concurrence of economic problems that emerged in clearer view in the latter part of the last decade was bound to bring increasing attention to tax policy as one of the avenues to the achievement of generally agreed national economic goals.

For example, both candidates for the Presidency in 1960 in their speech references to tax reform stressed the need for changes that would stimulate economic growth, with President Kennedy giving repeated and especial emphasis to tax revision that would encourage plant modernization and expansion.

The report of President Eisenhower's Commission on national goals, released in late 1960, stressed tax policy as a high road to the achievement of economic growth "at the maximum rate consistent with primary dependence upon free enterprise and the avoidance of marked inflation." The Commission urged that "public policies, particularly an overhauling of the tax system, including depreciation allowances, should seek to improve the climate for new investment and the balancing of investment with consumption."

And, as many of you in the room will recall, despite the lack of broad public and popular attention to the subject, the yeast for tax policy changes was working among the scholars, practitioners, and private organizations closest to the subject.

In 1959 a major study of the income tax was conducted by the House Ways and Means Committee, under the chairmanship of Congressman WILBUR MILLS. Panel discussions and hearings on papers from some 180 leading experts were held in late 1959 on "Ideas and Suggestions Submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on the Broad Subject of Revision of the Federal Income Tax Structure." In announcing the inquiry into opportunities for constructive reform Chairman MILLS stated that "The immediate objective of income tax reform is reduction in tax rates without sacrificing revenues required for the responsible financing of government." He listed first among the objectives of tax reform "a tax climate more favorable to economic growth," followed by "greater equity through closer adherence to the principle that equal incomes should bear equal tax liabilities; assurance that the degree of progression in the distribution of tax burdens accords as closely as possible with widely held standards of fairness; an overall tax system which contributes significantly to maintaining stability in the general price level and a stable and high rate of use of human and material resources; a tax system which interferes as little as possible with the operation of the free market mechanism in directing resources into their most productive uses; and greater ease of compliance and administration."

IV. CHANGING DIRECTIONS OF TAX POLICY

Against this background of contemporary economic perspectives and the history of Federal income tax policy as it relates to our economic well-being, let us summarize some particulars of changing direction that make the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964 and the administrative liberalization of depreciation a turning point in tax policy.

1. First and foremost, these measures evince a new national determination to give tax and fiscal policy a positive role in our political and economic system—to affirmatively utilize tax and fiscal policy in the words of the Employment Act of 1946 "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare."

The three measures have been primarily designed to contribute to a substantial increase in the level of economic activity at the initiative of the private sector—both consumers and investors. This increasing activity will utilize more fully our growing labor force, our expanding technology, and our increasing quantities of capital, in a market economy in which these uses will be determined by private decisions of both consumers and investors. These tax measures will increase the profitability of business, the rewards of labor in take-home pay, and the incentives for the investment of both capital and human endeavor.

In coordination with other policies these tax measures will greatly increase the prospects of combating successfully unacceptable levels of unemployment; they will aid in and reduce the cost of public and private programs for reducing poverty, eliminating depressed areas, and facilitating an adjustment by management and labor to both the dynamics and disciplines of a modern industrial society.

These three measures are also tailored to deal in many ways with our external financial relationships, exemplified in our balance-of-payments problem, and in association with a policy of expenditure control, to bring the Nation back to balanced budgets or surpluses.

Of course, these three measures are not the end, but a beginning, particularly if they prove reasonably successful in the achievement of these objectives. There will always be an unfinished task of adapting our tax and fiscal policy to the changing economic environment in a manner that will strengthen our economy and maintain our preferred pattern of economic organization.

In a society where an increasingly large percentage (now about 27 percent) of annual income is drawn off by Federal, State, and local government—a national tax policy to promote a dynamic private sector is fundamental if the Nation is to benefit from rapid growth and hold its position in world affairs by remaining competitive with other industrial economies. The magnitude and the distribution of the Federal tax burden, as well as the totals of Federal expenditures and the national debt which condition its overall impact, from now on will be a primary object of public attention. To make an intelligent use of tax and fiscal policies to help insure a prosperous economy and adapt a tax system to the vigor of the economic institutions which represent the American way of life will be the objective of both political parties, the Federal executive and the Congress, and leaders from all walks of life.

2. These measures are a positive attempt to use tax reduction to combat economic slack and sluggishness and pave the way to more rapid economic growth.

Studies show that, given the tax system and income tax rates of 1954 through 1962, the American economy, working under conditions of full employment, would provide a substantial budget surplus. This revealed that the Government's tax and fiscal policy, reflected in the budget and tax rates, was exercising a restraining effect upon demand and activities in the economy. The fact

that the mixture of tax rates and spending levels was actually restrictive, even though the budget showed deficits, pointed to the existing tax structure as a drag on the economy, slowing down growth and choking off expansion short of the levels that would give full employment and utilization of the Nation's industrial capacity. It also pointed to tax reduction as a means of eliminating that drag and stimulating the economy to a higher rate of activity as a means of achieving balanced budgets in a full employment economy. Also tax reduction could be used to stimulate the modernization of plant and equipment that would provide increased productivity in addition to a fuller utilization of resources. Also, the fact that the previous years of slack had been marked by increased rates of Federal, State, and local public expenditures, and personal consumption expenditures, but relatively static investment levels pointed to the choice of tax reduction as a weapon to deal with a lagging economy.

As a result of the measures taken the overall weight of taxes on the private sector is in the process of being considerably reduced. The reductions under the recently enacted tax bill reduce individual income tax liabilities by about 19 percent or $9.2 billion. The changes in corporate tax rates under the bill, together with 1962 reductions under the investment credit, the liberalized modification of the investment credit in the act of 1964, and the revised depreciation guidelines, also reduced corporate tax liabilities by 19 percent $4.75 billion.

The combined effect of this reduction of approximately one-fifth of income tax liabilities—the largest in our tax history—will provide a marked economic stimulation to both consumption and investment.

Apart from, and in addition to the effect, beginning this month, of an infusion of dollars and incentives into the private sector, these measures have already provided an important psychological thrust, as witnessed by the performance of the economy in 1963, particularly the latter part. A healthy economic recovery and growth depends heavily upon the confidence, initiative, incentive, optimism, and industry of the private citizen and the private business sector. That tax reduction will be a tonic to reduce sluggishness and slack has been and will continue to be demonstrated.

There is important substance in Chairman WILBUR MILLS' recent assertion that "Preserving the gains for the economy and for Federal finances which we can confidently expect from this bill may both permit and require additional tax reductions in the not too distant future."

3. These three measures, particularly the Revenue Act of 1964, add new, but little understood, dimensions to the importance of coordinating tax policy with budget expenditure, monetary and credit policy and debt management, particularly in dealing with economic slack, deficits in our international balance of payments, and incipient threats of inflation.

For example, by coordinating tax reduction with expenditure control, it becomes fiscally responsible to reduce taxes as either a long or short term economic stimulant in times of recession or slack when there is likely to be a budget deficit, as well as in times of budget balance or surplus. This willingness to reduce taxes, despite the existence of a budget deficit, should be sharply distinguished from the economic theory that the purpose of the tax cut is to create a deliberate budget deficit to obtain economic motive power. The tax cut was the objective—not the deficit. All of us would have preferred to push a tax program involving substantial tax reduction against a background of budget balance or surplus. But we were willing to push tax reduction despite a deficit because of its anticipated effect, particularly when there was a policy of expenditure control accompanying it that looked to budget balance or surplus when the economy approached satisfactory employment levels.

Ofttimes, in the course of debate and controversy surrounding the issue of whether it was wise to reduce taxes in a period of substantial budget deficit, yet substantially unused resources, the importance of correlation between policies was overlooked. It was necessary to stress continually the coordination of policies. For example, in describing the program early in February last year I stated that it had "two main elements: First, a substantial net reduction in Federal taxes, through a meaningful lowering, in several stages of tax rates * * * and; second, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy expands in response, the allocation of a substantial part of the resulting revenue increases toward eliminating the transitional deficit."

The action of President Johnson in presenting an administrative budget for fiscal 1965, the period in which the act will begin to become fully effective, providing for expenditures slightly less than the budget requested for fiscal 1964 or expenditures projected for that year, gave concrete reality to the importance of relating tax reduction to expenditure policy.

But there are other important correlations between tax policy and other elements of general economic policy. We have seen why under current balance-of-payments conditions tax and fiscal policies ought to be preferred to monetary policy in providing fresh incentive and continuing stimulation. But, given this stimulus from tax and fiscal policy, monetary policy and debt management can be used with greater flexibility in avoiding inflationary pressures or increased outflows of capital. While tax policy struggles to overcome the slow growth that dulls investment incentive, fosters inefficient work spreading, maintains high-unit costs, and presses upon profit margins, thereby retaining capital flows in the United States and sharpening our competitive abilities, monetary and debt management policies can be used more effectively to discourage outflows of short-term capital and dampen tendencies to inflation.

Just as we learned in World War II to correlate tax policy with other instruments to meet the extraordinary demands of hot war, we must constantly search for the policy mix that includes a tax policy related to other instruments to meet the ever-changing conditions that will affect a free economy in the type of open world in which we live.

The same coordination of tax policy with other policies to combat unemployment is necessary because many of the unemployed do not have the right skills, are not in the right places, or otherwise lack access to the jobs that are open.

The tax program now adopted, with the related policies of expenditure control monetary and debt management, seeks to establish a financial environment suitable for the sixties so that we can take full advantage of the gathering forces for economic progress both at home and abroad. By a proper coordination of our new tax and fiscal program, debt management, monetary policy and balance-of-payments policy we can make this tax program a key to resolving the interlocking goals of domestic growth and external stability that are inseparable from one another in the open competitive environment in which we and our trading partners and friends in the free world now live.

4. These three measures give body to a positive policy of reversing the hampering effects of the tax system on investment incentives and materially strengthening those incentives to provide increased jobs, increased productivity and competitive efficiency, and a vigorous economic growth.

The new investment incentives include: The investment credit of 1962, together with the 1964 revision eliminating any reduction in depreciation basis to reflect the credit, the 1962 revised depreciation guidelines, the proposed reduction of overall corporate rates from 52 to 48 percent and the normal tax rate on the first $25,000 of corporate income from 30 to 22 percent, and the reduction of individual rates on unincorporated businesses, and the unlimited carryover of capital losses for individuals at a rate of $1,000 a year. The cumulative effect of these changes is to give a dramatic shift in emphasis on investment in our tax system.

These changes have greatly increased the after-tax profitability on investment. They have shortened dramatically the period of risk or payout on new investment. They have greatly increased internal cash flow, particularly for small business units where availability of capital is an important limitation on the growth and development of enterprise.

Each of these changes is important separately. For example, the change in the administrative rules concerning depreciation does more than reduce the guideline lives for machinery and equipment to conform to up-to-date practice; it incorporates a new set of rules that permit the businessman much greater freedom in fixing his preferred life for machinery and equipment, provided only that his actual replacement pattern conforms to his estimate in a reasonable period of time.

This policy together with the investment credit and lowered rates of business taxes will not only result in increased modernization and stepped-up growth in existing product and service areas; they should speed the translation of product developments from the laboratory to the production and distribution line in an ever-faster cycle and help to provide inviting outlets for new technology, incentive, processes, and ventures which mean new jobs at home and new markets both here and abroad.

But it is the total or combined effect that should be decisive.

By increasing the profitability and lessening the period of risk of new investment these measures adopt the most effective way to make more attractive the investment decisions which are not being taken today. They make today's marginal investment the acceptable venture of tomorrow. They open the door wide for new technologies and new products and services which, if they are developed with their new markets, create new demand, additional investment and new jobs that would never have been available before.

5. These measures seek to effect a balanced tax reduction—one purposely designed to provide both additional consumer purchasing power and direct investment incentives.

This balance served not only to satisfy the requirements of equity in a direct distribution of benefits but also important economic objectives. It was felt that both approaches—tax reduction to stimulate both consumption and investment—interacting together would achieve a more dynamic and sustained growth than would result from a reliance on one method to the exclusion of the other.

The recently enacted tax bill provides a substantial stimulus to consumer purchasing power. Of the reductions to individuals amounting to $9.2 billion, it is expected that eventually about $8.6 billion will be spent on additional consumption. The largest share of the individual reductions will go to those with incomes of $10,000 and less, who need it most, who account for close to 85 percent of all taxable returns, and who are likely to put a large part of their tax reduction into the spending stream. This

is where the customers live. Under the recently enacted bill they received nearly 60 percent of the overall individual reduction, with their share of the individual tax load being decreased from 50 to 48 percent.

The consumer expenditures generated by the increases in take-home pay resulting from the tax cut to individuals will set in motion the familiar economic process in which money is spent and respent throughout the economy and ultimately increases consumer spending by several times the amount of the initial tax cut—the so-called multiplier factor. That strong and sustained rise in consumer demand—and thus in markets and profits for business—will further bolster the direct tax incentives to investment. To encourage investment in job producing facilities, stressing of consumer demand is required. The purchasing power of the consumer must be increased to effectively utilize present productive capacity so that additions to productive capacity will be worthwhile or replacement of obsolete high cost capacity desirable.

The operation of direct investment incentives will add to the total of consumer purchasing power in the hands of additional jobholders, suppliers, etc. This process adds an accelerator effect to the process of growth that will flow from the tax program. The interaction of these two facets, with the one aiding and abetting the other, is of vital importance, giving the program a balance that is, perhaps, the most important and overlooked aspect.

6. The Revenue Act of 1964 makes a reduction in income tax rates the primary objective of income tax reform in both the "economic" and structural senses.

This tax policy signified a recognition of the fact that current high tax rates from top to bottom, both individual and corporate, were too repressive for maintenance as a part of our permanent tax structure.

The law expresses a national conviction that these high tax rates on income, increased to meet the needs of war, now hold back growth and lead to distortions in the tax structure.

About half of the act's provisions will reduce income taxes by a gross total of $12.4 billion annually when the program is fully effective, of which about $11.7 billion is allocated to reduction in individual and corporate rates, leaving only about $700 million of tax reduction as a consequence of other structural changes. The remaining provisions, of a base broadening nature, will increase revenue by a total of $835 million a year, more than offsetting the structural changes that lose revenue, and leaving a net total tax cut of $11.5 billion.

The significance of this overwhelming Executive and Legislative choice of a policy that utilizes rate reduction as an instrument of both "economic" tax reform and structural modification for purposes of equity seems to have been overlooked by many commentators who choose to define tax reform only in terms of base broadening.

It is true that the act of 1964 fell short of the target projected by Presidential proposals of $13.6 billion of rate reduction in a bill with net tax reduction of $10.3 billion. This was largely accounted for by the refusal of Congress and the public at large to accept the restriction on itemized deductions in the so-called 5-percent floor proposal which would have produced additional base broadening revenues of $2.3 billion. However, the picture is much less gloomy if one considers what might have happened to the tax base if net tax reduction had been primarily or substantially devoted to carving out new deductions, credits or other erosions of base which give preferences depending upon the source of use of income or the position of the recipient.

The Revenue Act of 1964 represents a decision to arrest the gradual erosion of the tax base through special preferences and privileges for certain groups of taxpayers. The design of the future, if the policy of the 1964 act is followed, will be the provision of necessary revenues at the lowest possible tax rates whenever tax reduction or base broadening opportunities are presented. This is a commendable switch from the old pattern of opening new "loopholes" in the existing structure with the inevitable result of increasing pressure upward on existing rates or passing up the opportunities of tax reduction or increased income tax generation to reduce the rate scales.

This adoption of rate reduction as the primary objective of both net tax reduction as well as base broadening means that the Nation has reincorporated in its tax system a reassuring allegiance to the principle of rewards—the leaving of increased percentages of income after taxes with all those who invest additional effort and capital in economic activity. In short, the profit motive, personal and corporate, has been recognized and invigorated as an objective of tax policy. The reduction of rates, up and down the scale by leaving an additional higher percentage of earnings with both individual and corporate units should spur the additional investment of both capital and human effort and a natural desire to make the most effective use of both, tending in turn to minimize the misallocation of resources inherent in any tax system.

7. The two enactments represent a new determination by the executive and the Congress to associate a search for greater equity and structural improvement in the tax system with efforts at economic tax reform, thereby opening the door to periodic and persistent improvement of the structure of the tax system as it is adapted to an ever changing economic environment.

There were strong voices and many counsels of expediency that urged a course of foregoing any concern with equity and structural modification rather than risk or delay "economic" tax reform. The pressures for "quickie" tax cuts even of a temporary nature will be recalled.

Nonetheless, those sponsoring and proposing permanent changes in the tax structure to better adapt it to the economic challenges of the sixties concluded that, while an overriding priority should be given to economic tax reform, any permanent change in the system to that end should be designed and associated with a solid effort to improve the equity and structural soundness of the system. As a consequence, the revenue raising structural changes accomplished under the two acts of Congress represent major improvements in the equity of the tax system and the revenue losing provisions are designed, by and large, to relieve especial hardships beyond the reach of rate reduction and achieve a careful balancing of the benefits.

If base broadening is the test of tax reform in the structural sense of eliminating special preferences, then the past 18 months have witnessed a real turning point in tax reform in a structural as well as an economic sense. Revenue raising structural changes in all previous revenue acts since 1940 total approximately $600 million—the total from 1953 to 1961 was less than $200 million. The nearly $1.7 billion of revenue raising changes in the two recent acts not only increased the equity of the income tax system; the revenue raised by them has been turned back into rate reductions and investment incentives so as to accomplish a measure of economic tax reform in addition to that achieved through net tax reduction.

Structural reform in the 1964 act included, for example, limitations on tax advantages accruing from group term insurance, bank loan insurance, sick pay exclusion, casualty loss deduction, the utilization of personal holding companies, multiple corporation provisions, gifts of future interest, aggregation of mineral properties for charging depletion, and the realization of capital gains on sales of real estate resulting from excessive depreciation. In addition, deductions of certain State and local taxes that were difficult of uniform and equitable administration, and the dividend credit which greatly advantaged the large investor have been eliminated.

To these examples of structural reform should be added from the 1962 act provisions that—

Extended considerably reporting requirements on dividends and interest income;

Provided a basis for curtailing many abuses in the expense account area;

Eliminated the tax avoidance device of converting ordinary income into capital gain through the sale of depreciable personal property;

Substantially reduced the tax advantages of mutual thrift associations over competing financial institutions resulting from tax-free accumulation of earnings as bad debt reserves;

Provided for current taxation of the earnings of cooperatives;

Allowed salvage value up to 10 percent of the cost of the original asset to be disregarded in determining allowable depreciation deductions—reducing the likelihood of disputes in this area between taxpayers and tax administrators.

Provided for the taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance companies on underwriting, as well as investment income, and provisions in the field of foreign taxation that:

Make U.S. shareholders currently taxable on tax haven earnings of foreign corporations controlled by them.

Tax dividends distributed by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations in industrialized countries at the full domestic corporation income tax rates—less, of course, a credit for foreign taxes.

Tax profits from sales of U.S. patents to foreign subsidiaires at ordinary rather than capital gains rates.

Remove tax advantages previously granted to investment companies created abroad.

Restrict the exemption from U.S. tax of earned income of American citizens establishing residence abroad.

Revenue raising resulting from base broadening is not the only test of tax reform in the structural sense. Many modifications of key provisions, such as those in the recent bill dealing with stock options, personal holding companies, interest on deferred payments, minimum deposit and bank loan life insurance, and group term life insurance are more important for their long-range significance than their current consequences in recapturing revenue. Nonetheless these modifications remove or limit special privileges and preferences that are no longer considered equitable or necessary.

Also, the recently enacted law involves the introduction of structural innovations which are designed to improve the equity of the system and will qualify in many minds as structural reform even though they lose revenue rather than gain it. Some examples are: the introduction of an averaging system to meet the problems of bunched income; the splitting of the first individual tax bracket into four brackets to provide some differentiation for the over 50 percent of our taxpayers whose income falls entirely in the previous first bracket; the adoption of the minimum standard deduction to provide special relief for those with very low incomes without the wastage at upper levels that accompanies the competing approach

of raising exemptions; the additional deduction for employee's moving expenses whether or not reimbursed by the employer; and the removal of the 2 percent consolidated returns tax.

Perhaps the public debate of the issues involved in base broadening and other structural changes, apart from net tax reduction and rate reduction, is as important as the changes themselves. Many issues that were heretofore debated only by experts have been placed under legislative and public examination. The public and the Congress do not always agree with the experts. If, after a proper debate, the solutions that the experts and technicians propose do not secure legislative acceptance, then others may be devised.

The important fact is that both of these bills carry forward the effort to secure equity and structural reform in association with attempts at "economic" tax reform.

8. The three measures represent the first effective resort to tax policy as a means of sustaining expansion and reducing the frequency of cyclical recession.

The impact of the 1962 tax actions and the prospect or anticipation of the 1964 act have contributed importantly to sustaining a period of economic expansion for 37 months. The recent enactment casts an optimistic glow for the indefinite future. When contrasted with the preexisting pattern of ever-shortening periods of expansion, the last one before this being 25 months, the likelihood of achieving the longest one in peacetime history, with tax policy playing an important role, is bound to focus continuing attention on tax policy as an important measure of economic stabilization.

Congress is apparently unwilling to delegate any of its responsibility to the President to raise or lower tax rates for a temporary period in a pattern prescribed in advance as a measure of economic stabilization. This understandable reluctance will, however, place an added premium on alertness in both Congress and the executive to utilize timely tax action as an antirecession tool, particularly in periods when resort to monetary and credit stimulus is precluded by balance-of-payment difficulties.

In conclusion, I shall resist the temptation to prescribe my own particular program for near term developments in tax policy. There is a very good reason for this modesty—I have no program.

Indeed, it seems fitting to pause a while and see how the changing directions in tax policy just described actually work out in practice before deciding on the next steps.

At least, the American businessmen whom you advise and represent ought to be fully assured for the time being by recent events that our tax policy is to help and encourage them to do more and profitable business, create more jobs, and put more dollars to work.

But, the turning point in tax policy represented by the changing directions of the last 2 years has a pressing longer term significance to those who have special qualifications and responsibilities in the field. Theirs will be the never ending task of employing their special knowledge of tax and fiscal policy within the framework of the national decision now taken to utilize this instrument "for the common defense and the general welfare." The burden will be heavy on scholars, legislators on the tax writing committees and elsewhere in the Congress, the executive branch, leaders of business and labor, and the tax executives and experts represented here tonight. For tax policy formulation is truly an ever-unfinished task in a changing world. It will be a constant, ever-abiding responsibility for analysis, citizen education and decisionmaking in the democratic process.

But as recent developments in tax policy indicate, where men of good will and concern for the national interest, in Government and out, seek a meaningful consensus on a tax policy that serves the entire nation, rather than special groups, that responsibility can and will be discharged.

Television Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently, I brought to the attention of the House a TV viewing poll conducted by the Los Angeles Times. This survey contradicted results of a supposed national poll which was taken by the A. C. Nielsen Co. The Los Angeles poll points up the need for closer scrutiny of the rating firms and a look toward over representation of the rural areas.

Parts of the Los Angeles poll follows:

TELEVISION SURVEY—TIMES READER PANEL QUESTIONNAIRE NO. 26, NOVEMBER 1963

PURPOSE

The purpose of this survey was to find out:

1. The general acceptance of the programs and commercials that are new this fall, and the extent of television viewing as compared to last year.

2. The extent of usage of the TV Times, and suggestions for improvement.

3. The readiness of the public to accept pay TV, their opinion of it, and how much they would be willing to pay for it.

4. The volume of existing color sets and UHF sets, and the intention to purchase in the near future.

SUMMARY

Of the 99 percent Times reader panel homes that have TV sets, more than one-third have more than one working television set.

The programing this fall is favorably accepted, however, one-fourth of the panel considers the commercials worse than last year's; and almost half of the men and more than a third of the women are watching television less this year.

The TV Times is used by 90 percent of the homes with television, and more than half of the women and about half of the men use it 5 to 7 nights a week. The most frequent suggestion for improvement is better description of programs, while two out of five households think that it does not need any improvement at all.

The panel is evenly split on whether they think pay TV is a good idea or not, however, only one-sixth would definitely want pay TV if they could have it tomorrow.

They would like better programs, but are apprehensive of the cost and don't want to spend very much. Many would like more information about pay TV.

A definite increase in the number of homes with color television sets is indicated, while UHF is not gaining much acceptance.

TIMES READERS REJECT NATIONALLY TOP RATED PROGRAM

According to the October 28, November 11, and December 2 issue of Broadcasting, "Beverly Hillbillies" has the highest rating nationally. However, while it did not achieve a top 10 rating on the favorable list, both men and women of the Times reader panel named this program among their top 10 least liked programs.

Of the least liked programs, a particular western, or westerns in general were mentioned by 20 percent of the women and 13 percent of the men. Both men and women ranked Judy Garland and Jerry Lewis on the unfavorable list. Crime and violence programs were mentioned by 12 percent of the women, and the same amount of men mentioned panel and quiz shows unfavorably.

Question 7. What television programs do you like the least?

[In percent]

	Men	Women
Any particular western or westerns in general	13	20
Beverly Hillbillies	9	12
Judy Garland	7	11
Jerry Lewis	8	10
Panel and quiz shows	12	8
Crime and violence programs	5	12

The Wolf in "Rights" Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Augusta Chronicle of Augusta, Ga., has printed in its March 3, 1964, issue an excellent editorial entitled "The Wolf in 'Rights' Clothing." This editorial makes many good points that should be of interest to the Members of this body, and makes some particularly appropriate comments on the very eloquent comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the CBS program "Face the Nation."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WOLF IN "RIGHTS" CLOTHING

News accounts of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL's appearance on "Face the Nation" Sunday, help to confirm one of the principal points made by the Senator: The American public has not really been told what is contained in this far-reaching piece of legislation.

United Press International took seven paragraphs to tell what RUSSELL said about the prospects of compromise and the strategy that could be expected from opponents and proponents of the bill. But nowhere did it mention his comments on the content of the bill.

The Associated Press devoted 10 paragraphs to RUSSELL's views on legislative strategy and lobbying in the civil rights battle, and only 2 to his explicit expressions of concern over how the bill would affect the American people.

Neither wire service made any mention, so far as we can determine, of Senator RUSSELL's repeated assertions that (1) the public is not aware of what this measure would mean to individual Americans, and (2) if the public was aware of this, it would demand that the Senate reject the House-passed bill.

The fact that this did not appear in the national wire service stories goes a long way toward explaining why the public is poorly informed on one of the most significant pieces of legislation ever to appear on the calendar of Congress.

Public discussion of this bill has been so fraught with emotionalism and politics that the real issues have been largely obscured. The communications media are not altogether to blame for this, because proponents of the bill want the battle to be fought on an emotional level. But we would be less than honest were we not to admit that the press has been a party to the failure.

Virtually every American, including himself, is in favor of civil rights, Senator RUSSELL reminded his interviewers Sunday. And, he added, some of the voting provisions in the proposed bill are legitimate protections of civil rights.

But the bulk of the bill now before the Senate is, as Georgia's senior solon described it, "a massive blow against our system of government."

How many Americans want their Senators to vote for a measure that denies the owner of a private business his right to rent his rooms, sell his goods or serve his meals to whomever he chooses?

How many Americans favor a law that gives a Federal bureaucrat the unprecedented authority to cut off Federal services from taxpayers who paid for them whenever he decides that discrimination is being practiced in their State?

How many Americans want a new Washington bureaucracy set up to dictate the hiring, firing and promoting practices of private employers under a sweeping FEPC provision?

How many Americans want to break down the normal processes of law, in order to push so-called civil rights suits ahead of other business in Federal courts?

How many want their Federal tax dollars to be used against their State and local tax dollars, in Justice Department suits to force desegregation of State and local publicly owned parks, pools and beach facilities?

These are some of the things Senator RUSSELL was talking about. The anticipated Senate filibuster on the civil rights bill, he explained, is not just an attempt to talk the legislation to death, but an attempt by opponents of the vicious measure to bring its dangers to the attention of the American people.

One incident that occurred in Washington last week will illustrate the truth of Senator RUSSELL's charge—and the strength of his position.

Congressman FRANK CHELF, a liberal Kentucky Democrat, is a member of the House Judiciary Committee. As one who signed the commtitee report urging passage of the civil rights bill, he is officially one of its authors. But it was not until last week that CHELF got around to reading the bill he had signed. When he did, this was his reaction:

"I'm against everything in this bill in its present form. It's an awful bill. I hadn't realized how bad it is.

"It will, in my opinion, extend Federal domination over business, industry and over individual citizens in a manner never before attempted since the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

"It will destroy the constitutional checks and balances between Washington and the States."

Johnson Wins Victory: Opposes Restriction on Import Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that many people in the United States are missing a main point in the current crisis affecting the domestic livestock industry, and that point is that the Johnson administration is strongly opposed to all restrictions on imports and will do anything to defeat them.

Thankfully, some newspapers in the United States are realizing this and are saying it publicly, such as the Wall Street Journal of March 6.

I recommend this story to my colleagues in the hope they may carry it back to their districts and tell their people.

The article follows:

SENATE KILLS BID OF GOP TO CURB IMPORTS OF MEAT: JOHNSON WINS A BIG VICTORY

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

WASHINGTON.—A Republican drive to curb meat imports was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 46 to 44.

The amendment, proposed by Senator HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, was a key issue in the Senate farm debate and its defeat is one of President Johnson's biggest congressional victories so far. The administration is strongly opposed to any restrictions on beef imports and went all out to defeat Senator HRUSKA's proposal. The key factor in the administration victory was probably the fact that Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD, a Montana Democrat up for reelection, sided with the administration despite heavy pressure from cattle producers in that State.

Senator METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, followed his lead, and that was enough to provide a margin of victory. Most other Western States Democrats voted with Republicans on the issue.

The cattle industry has been long demanding some relief from foreign imports to halt sliding meat prices. In the month ended February 17, beef prices averaged $18.10 a hundred pounds, down from $18.60 a month earlier and from $20.40 a year earlier. Senator HRUSKA would have stopped much of these imports by applying mandatory quotas limiting incoming meat to about 540 million pounds of beef and veal annually. This compares with about 920 million pounds of beef and veal that would be allowed into this country under recent U.S. agreements with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland, the three heaviest deliverers of beef into the United States.

The success of the Hruska amendment would have undoubtedly dealt a deathblow to the pending cotton-wheat measure, but its defeat pretty well clears the way for final Senate approval of the bill, perhaps today.

The cotton portion is designed to increase consumption by allowing textile mills, through Government subsidy, to buy domestically grown fiber at a price close to that paid by foreign purchasers. That price currently is about 8.5 cents less than U.S. buyers pay. The wheat section would establish an overall price of about $1.77 a bushel to farmers who voluntarily limit production. Without that new law, it is thought that farmers' wheat prices would fall to about $1.25 a bushel for want of production controls.

Senator MANSFIELD's vote against the Hruska amendment was a particularly difficult one for him to cast because, in a separate piece of legislation, he has proposed stiff import quotas for beef. During yesterday's debate, he conceded that "politically, my position (against the Hruska amendment) may not do me much good."

He said that the Senate Finance Committee has agreed to hold hearings on his bill and urged other Senators to be patient. But Senator HRUSKA argued, probably correctly, that with an intervening civil rights filibuster and a congressional rush for adjournment in time for the summer political conventions, Mr. MANSFIELD's bill won't be acted upon.

As the final tally was announced, Mr. MANSFIELD obviously wasn't elated that his and fellow Montanan METCALF's votes had provided the margin.

The vote seesawed back and forth as the clerk read through the list of 100 Senators. Only four Republicans sided with the Democrats, while Mr. HRUSKA picked up support not only from western Democrats but from such dairy-State legislators as Democratic Senators PROXMIRE and NELSON of Wisconsin.

Although most southern Democrats were striving to defeat the meat amendment in order to protect their cotton legislation, the southern forces weren't completely united. Senator HRUSKA picked up support from both Georgia Senators, RUSSELL and TALMADGE.

Resolutions of the New York Board of Rabbis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the New York Board of Rabbis is an association of Jewish spiritual leaders in New York City. Among its many functions is the responsibility for conducting a chaplaincy program in hospitals, penal and correctional institutions, youth shelters, and homes for the aged. As one of the largest representative rabbinic bodies in the world, the New York board also serves as a force for civic betterment and social responsibility. At the board's annual meeting it adopted four resolutions concerned with the situation of Jews in other countries. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolutions dealing with the Jews in the Soviet Union; the Middle East; Genocide; and the Jews in Iraq; which were adopted by the New York Board of Rabbis, January 29, 1964.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL SCENE

1. JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

At this season of the year, our thoughts are on the forthcoming Passover holidays. We hope that the Soviet leaders will make facilities available for the baking of matzoths (unleavened bread) and for their distribution in sufficient supply to satisfy the needs of the religious Jews in time for the Passover. If such facilities cannot be readied in time, the New York Board of Rabbis stands prepared and eager to send a supply of matzoths for the Jews of the Soviet Union.

We appeal to the Soviet Union to grant Jews religious freedom. The enrollment of the yeshivah (seminary) in Moscow has now been reduced to 1 student, in contrast to last year's enrollment of 14. It is inconceivable that, in a Jewish population numbering millions, there should be only one person interested in attending the seminary. A yeshivah of one student is but a mockery of an institution. If the technical obstacles were removed and if prospective students were not discouraged by overt and covert means, many more Jews would take advantage of the opportunity to study and become religious functionaries.

In the present-day U.S.S.R. there is a great demand for and shortage of prayer shawls, prayer books, Bibles, phylacteries, and other religious articles that are used both in home and synagogue. Since there seems to be no means of satisfying that demand within the Soviet Union itself, we hope that the Soviet Government will allow the importation of these religious objects without any hindrance.

The Soviet Government has recognized the need of religious groups within its borders to maintain contact with their coreligionists elsewhere. Toward this end, a delegation of Russian Orthodox clergy visited the United States last year and a group of Protestant clergy has been received officially in the U.S.S.R. Soviet Moslems are allowed to make pilgrimages to their Holy City Mecca.

However, no such permission has been granted the Jews. Contact with Jewish groups outside the U.S.S.R. has been forbidden; no group of Jewish clergy has been invited to the Soviet Union, nor have Soviet Jews been permitted to make religious pilgrimages to their Holy City Jerusalem. We again appeal to the Soviet authorities to permit its citizens of the Jewish faith at least the same religious right accorded other citizens of the U.S.S.R.

We hopefully trust that the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of religion will be accorded the Jews in the Soviet Union, enabling them to practice the faith of their fathers and the traditions of their religion.

2. THE MIDDLE EAST

The New York Board of Rabbis hails the recent pronouncement of our Government declaring that our policy in the Middle East is based on the principle of "insuring the security and integrity of the individual states of the area—including Israel." We commend its support of Israel's water development plan as set forth within the framework of the regional water development project recommended by the late Eric Johnson.

The cause of justice will be served my making constructive use of the God-given resources of water for this area. Israel's proposed plan for utilization of these resources will in no way jeopardize Arab access to the lifegiving waters. Any plan which will redound to the benefit of the entire area for the benefit of Jew and Arab alike, should be encouraged.

3. GENOCIDE

The New York Board of Rabbis strongly urges the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention of the U.N. which outlaws mass annihilation of any group. Our Nation, which has historically supported the cause of human rights, has been derelict in advancing this important doctrine, which has already been supported by many free nations seeking to express the conscience of mankind in this crucial issue.

4. THE JEWS IN IRAQ

We call upon the United Nations to investigate the most recent discriminatory legislation against Jews in Iraq requiring that every Jew report to Iraqi authorities within 90 days to submit proof of Iraqi nationality. This latest restrictive measure against Jews allows the government arbitrarily to deprive Jews still residing in Iraq of their citizenship and control of their property.

This discrimination contravenes the U.N. declaration of human rights and the declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance now being considered by the U.N. Subcommission on Prevention and Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Not since the Nazi era has any government enacted legislation openly based solely on religious criteria.

President of Africa-American Institute Writes on Present Situation in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article in the New York Times magazine of February 9, 1964, by Waldemar A. Nielsen, president of the African-American Institute:

AFRICA IS POISED ON THE RAZOR'S EDGE

(By Waldemar A. Nielsen)

In one of the most ironic episodes of recent history, the leaders of three new nations of East Africa—all of them former colonies of Great Britain—appealed for British troops to put down mutinies in their armies. Through prompt and effective British response, order seems now to have been restored.

The lightning chain of events illuminated for a vivid and frightening moment the utter frality of civilian, constitutional government in these newborn nations. Seen in the context of mounting signs of stress in every part of Africa in recent months, the disorders arouse an urgent question: Are these "growing pains" or the beginning of a collapse of stability in Africa?

The first thing to be said is that in one sense the troubles occurring in Africa have for the most part been quite ordinary and not unexpected. Push aside the fly-whisks, the beaded hats, the feathered dancers, the Watusi warriors 7 feet tall and the unfamiliar names and places and it becomes clear that the new African states are going through the process—and the mistakes—which new states, especially those conceived in revolution, have normally gone through.

Even the oldest of the newly independent nations of Africa is but 7 years old; and 25 of the 35 have yet to celebrate their fourth birthday. Thus, in terms of parallels with American history, Africa is in the 1790's. That was the period when we physically drove out of the country and into Canada a good portion of our opposition, tarred and feathered some who remained and expropriated (legally and illegally) the property of not a few. We oppressed the native tribes, saw corruption flourish in our new officialdom and denounced the idea of foreign military bases on our soil.

We took large quantities of foreign aid and credits, while simultaneously denouncing the greed of those who offered it. We applauded every revolution anywhere, declared our firm intention to remain neutral and aloof from the struggles among the then great powers, and issued holier-than-thou statements on the political and international troubles of other nations.

We passed the Alien and Sedition Acts, which made it a criminal offense to organize to oppose measures of the Government or to speak ill of the Congress or the President. The Jeffersonians complained bitterly that the Federalists had created a one-party state and were resorting to illegal measures to smash all political freedom.

In the end, the United States found its way back to democracy and the fulfillment of the ideals of its revolution. Africa, too, in the end must find its own best means of governing itself. However, there are at least three debits which may make the achievement of unity and stability even more difficult for the new nations of Africa than it was for the United States.

The first debit, internal military problems, did not immediately arise to plague our new Union. It was 70 years before civil war put the durability of our constitutional system to the crucial test; and our military has honored the principle of civilian control from the start. But the Congo had Katanga in its first year; Algeria and Morocco began a border war on the heels of independence; and military revolts, including those recently in east Africa, have already occurred in more than half a dozen of the new African States.

In weak and unstable nations, military elements are often the single strong, organized and disciplined factor. In situations of instability, they move toward power. That has been a marked tendency in Africa—and may become increasingly so.

A second problem of special difficulty for the new African States is a hangover from the era of colonialism—namely, a network of borders and boundaries which makes no sense at all. Africa's political map was essentially drawn in the late 19th century by European statesmen sitting in European conference rooms—totally without reference to African realities. Natural geographical boundaries were ignored; and old, well-established and often proud language and ethnic groups were split up by arbitrary and artificial lines. The present rash of border disputes—notably between Ethiopia and Somalia, between Somalia and Kenya, between Togo and Ghana, between Morocco and Mauritania—is one obvious and inevitable result.

Regrettably, frontiers are more easily traced than erased and it will require miraculous statesmanship and forbearance on the part of the African nations if these fateful markings are rationalized without the fighting of hundreds of battles and the death of thousands of men.

The third factor working against the unity and progress of the new states is also a leftover from the past—tribalism.

To a large degree the tribe is still the social, psychological, economic, and even governmental reality in much of Africa. It is the embodiment and the fortress of primitivism and the past. To modernize and stabilize the new states, means will have to be found to reconcile tradition and change, to shift loyalties from the tribe to the nation, and to convert the tribes into building blocks rather than roadblocks to progress.

But this is especially difficult because tribalism, which might have been greatly weakened by the influences of modernism over the past century, was preserved and fortified by the policy of indirect rule—of governing through the traditional chiefs—which was followed by the colonial powers. Useful as it was as an efficient means of controlling

subject peoples, the policy had the effect of entrenching and reinforcing ignorance, superstition, stagnation, and separatism.

If one is inclined to be pessimistic, one can catalog quite a long list of other difficulties. Poverty, though not so bad as in some parts of Asia, is still serious and widespread. Population, as in all of the underdeveloped areas, is increasing rapidly, too rapidly. Sickness and disease are particularly common in the tropical areas and availability of medical care is as limited as anywhere in the world. Illiteracy is perhaps greater in Africa than in any other major region.

On the economic side, Africa is caught in the same vast downward spiral of prices for the commodities which it sells to the world as are Latin America and Asia. Foreign private investment understandably is not venturing into Africa in any substantial quantity at present and Africa is at the bottom of the list of continents receiving American foreign aid. Increasingly great numbers of hopeful young people from the countryside gather around the mushrooming cities in quest of jobs—jobs which are not there. Their discontent and disillusionment is just beginning to be felt.

But the key problem, and the key danger for Africa, lies in the possibility of outside intervention in such a destructive way—as in the eras of slave trading and colonialism—that the continent will be left prostrate. To a very considerable degree, whether this occurs could turn on either of two factors: the role of Soviet and Chinese policy with respect to the area, or—the ugliest specter of all—the possibility of a major race war in South Africa.

The surprising fact, up to now, is that Soviet programs on the whole have had little success in Africa. Ideologically, although "African socialism" is a phrase in great currency, Marxism has had little attraction for Africans. With the exception of Ghana, there is hardly an African country which can seriously be called Marxist in its thinking or its avowed objectives.

Operationally, the Soviet's efforts on the whole and up to very recently have been a fiasco. In the Congo, after a most vigorous attempt to establish their influence, they were thrown out, body, pamphlet and checkbook. Guinea, Mali and other countries were receptive to offers of Soviet help after they won independence. But Russian efforts to provide economic aid produced rapid disenchantment on the part of the Africans, followed by a turning back to Western aid and relationships.

Soviet efforts to undermine and paralyze the United Nations have aroused strong and general resentment on the part of the Africans. The Chinese attack on India in 1963 similarly produced sharp and critical reactions from many areas, especially east Africa. More recently, incidents involving African students in Bulgaria and Moscow have made Africans in all parts of the continent fully aware of the existence of racism in the Communist-bloc countries.

Despite these setbacks, however, the Soviets have not given up. The recent arms agreement with Somalia has dangerously altered the strategic balance in east Africa. The meaning of the recent coup in Zanzibar is not yet fully clear, but there is evidence of serious Chinese and Soviet involvement. In the Congo the current disorders in Kwilu Province again clearly show a Red thread in the pattern. In South Africa, Communist penetration of the protest organizations, already deep, grows deeper.

The Chinese, too, independently of the Russians, have been active. The Angolan and Mozambique liberation movements have, in recent weeks, decided to accept aid from Peking after failing to get encouragement from the United States. The recent tour of Chou En-lai through Africa has laid a basis of relationships upon which further activity will undoubtedly be built.

Figures recently gathered in a careful private survey of the movement of young political refugees through Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika, the principal exit of the underground railway for refugees from southern Africa, reveals that about 1,000 such refugees have passed through in the past 2 years. Of these, some 900 have gone on for training to Cuba, China and the Soviet bloc. Only one-tenth have come for education and training to the United States or elsewhere in the West. Recent outbreaks in various parts of Africa appear to have been led by Soviet-trained Africans. As Africans trained in Communist-style agitation and propaganda begin to return to their home countries in coming months and years, their presence could mean severe problems for the newly independent governments.

The other great danger is the brewing trouble in southern Africa, where the last act of the drama of independence is about to be played. In Angola and Mozambique, rebellion is already underway and active fighting can be expected to spread rapidly.

In Southern Rhodesia, it is still not impossible that some evolutionary means of increasing African political control will be found. But it is just as likely that major violence could occur within the next few years.

It is in South Africa, however, that the great danger both for Africa and for the world simmers. As matters now stand, it seems inevitable that a massive and hate-laden race war will rip that country to shreds. When it does, the emotions of all Africa will be electrically engaged. In a predictable sequence, as the killings and atrocities mount, great waves of feeling will be stirred throughout the underdeveloped areas of the world, among colored people everywhere and among the Western countries, particularly the United States.

In such circumstances it is difficult to imagine that the great powers will not be drawn in. If they should become involved, the United Nations, hobbled as it is by financial stringency, may not be able to mount a peacekeeping operation adequate to head off a direct confrontation.

Despite this ominous outlook, there are some basic facts about Africa that give reason for hope. Indeed, in the view of many knowledgeable observers, Africa, of all the underedeveloped areas of the world, is theoretically the one in which real economic, social, and political progress is the most likely.

It is inherently a rich continent and has natural resources sufficient to support substantial economic growth. And, unlike the Indian subcontinent, for eaxmple, population pressure is not yet a matter of desperate and immediate concern.

A great new energy has been released by the independence movement in Africa. There is a mood of determination to overcome the servitude of the past and to modernize every aspect of society. Unlike some of the other impoverished regions of the world, Africa is not characterized by cynicism, fatalism, or lassitude. There is excitement and a freshness of spirit. In time, it could, of course, be wilted by frustration but at present it constitutes a vast potential for progress.

There is also an almost universal hunger and demand for education. Africans in rapidly increasing numbers are going to school and more and more at the higher levels are going abroad for training. Those who have come to the United States have been both capable and hard working. Despite shifting to a very different educational system and despite personal and social adjustments, they have made remarkable academic records. On the whole, even in our best colleges and universities their grades are as good as or better than those of American students at the same institutions.

The first major contingent of African graduates from American universities will begin to return home this coming June. Thereafter the flow will grow each year. Nations that were launched into independence, sometimes with only a handful of college graduates in the entire country will shortly have dozens—and before long hundreds—of qualified people whose presence in the management of affairs will make itself immediately and constructively felt.

Particularly important for the future of Africa is the caliber and outlook of the new leaders who have come to the fore since independence. Nyerere of Tanganyika, Kaunda of Northern Rhodesia, Mboya of Kenya, Azikiwe of Nigeria, and Touré of Guinea are among the most impressive personalities to have appeared on the world scene since World War II. They began as vigorous natural leaders of independence movements, leading those struggles with courage and flair. And following independence they have settled down capably and earnestly to the long, hard task of nation building.

Despite a meager educational background in some cases, their natural talents have enabled them to become not only effective national leaders but increasingly effective figures in international affairs. To a remarkable and reassuring degree they have moved from revolution to responsibility. In Africa the more radical leaders have steadily been losing ground and influence to the more moderate figures.

The Addis Ababa Conference of African states last year was an exceptional demonstration of the maturity and world outlook of the participants. It would be hard to name another international meeting of recent years whose results were as positive and productive.

Indeed, the practicality, the flexibility of mind, the openness to new ideas, and the basic commonsense of African leaders are their distinctive mark. Compared with the other emerging continents, Africa carried into the modern age a less burdensome baggage of history, of self-pride, of destructive ideology, and of encrusted social structure to impede progress.

Thus, if determined, hopeful and hard-working human beings can transform the poverty and disorder of a potentially rich continent, then there is good cause to feel optimistic about the longer future of affairs in Africa—if the Africans are permitted the time and the tranquility to accomplish their task.

But, taking into account all the current difficulties as well as the many small beginnings of constructive development, it would appear that in the short run the prospects for stability and advancement are disquieting, though not bleak. There is no likelihood that parliamentary democracy will soon become rampant on the political scene, and indeed all but 5 of the 35 independent African states have already abandoned all pretense of it. But if means are found to maintain discipline and control of national military forces, the chances for internal order and, in turn, for some general progress are moderately good.

However, if it is difficult to see clearly even the short-run prospects for peace and progress in Africa, it is utterly futile to undertake prognostication over the long run.

The whole vast continent is tremblingly poised on the razor's edge between peace and calamity—between one of the most inspiring possibilities of human liberation and progress in all history and one of the ugliest eventualities of chaos and international danger.

The Civil Rights Bill: A Program for Legalized Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with the analysis of the so-called civil rights legislation as presented in a radio discussion between Mr. Loyd Wright, past president of the American Bar Association, and Dean Clarence Manion. This program was broadcast over the Manion Forum on February 23, 1964. It is entitled "The Civil Rights Bill: A Program for Legalized Wrongs."

I ask unanimous consent that this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL: A PROGRAM FOR LEGALIZED WRONGS

(Loyd Wright, past president of the American Bar Association)

Dean MANION. Ladies and gentlemen, over this microphone last week, Congressman AUGUST JOHANSEN, of Michigan, explained why he could not, in good conscience, vote for the so-called civil rights bill. As he predicted, that bill has passed the House and is now pending in the U.S. Senate.

Certainly, it is one of the most ominous and comprehensive pieces of legislation ever presented to the Congress of the United States. From my own prolonged investigation of this bill, I can assure you that it is extremely complicated—even for lawyers. And yet, it will ultimately affect every person in the United States whether he or she understands the law or not.

If this bill passes, you—and I do mean you—will eventually have to hire a lawyer to fathom the impact of this legislation upon you, upon your business, and upon your employment. This being so, I think you should learn something about it now—before it is passed—and, consequently, determine whether you think this bill in its present form is the humanitarian piece of legislation that its proponents say it is.

With me here today, for the purpose of giving you some of this advance information, is one of the most able and distinguished lawyers in our country. Loyd Wright is the senior member of one of the most reputable law firms in California. He is past president of the American Bar Association, and he has recently made an intensive study of the so-called civil rights bill. Mr. Wright, you are very welcome to the Manion Forum.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you, Dean Manion, I am proud and very happy to be on your forum.

Dean MANION. Mr. Wright, I know that you are just as much opposed to this civil rights bill as I am, and I have been very interested in the study that you have prepared, along with Mr. John Satterfield, also a former president of the American Bar Association, called the Blueprint for Total Federal Regimentation, which is your analysis of the civil rights bill (single copy, free, from Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., suite 520, 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.).

Now, before we get into specifications, why not tell me in a general way why you are opposed to this legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Dean, I am opposed to it because, first, it is not American in concept. Secondly, I believe that it is the result of evil influences, specifically, the Fabian-Socialist influence. Thirdly, it is not necessary—we have the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and of 1960 which the Attorney General has used repeatedly with great success.

Now, if this bill were just for civil rights—if it were a bill contemplated to set aside the wrongful action of scheming election officials who prevent people from voting who have a right to vote—neither John Satterfield nor I would have anything to say. But that is not the case. It is a plan for complete regimentation of the people of the United States.

Dean MANION. That, apparently, was the conclusion of a number of Congressmen on the House Judiciary Committee. I notice that you have in your hand the dissenting views of these Congressemn, in which they outline a number of rights which will be taken away by this bill, which is supposed to confer rights and to protect rights.

It would be interesting, I think, if you would just read the list of the rights that will be taken away, as they are described by the dissenting Members of the House Judiciary Committee. Why don't you do that?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will. But, first, may I make this observation? These dissenters, six in number, are all fine lawyers. They have studied this bill. They heard all the evidence, if there was any. I agree with everything they have said. Now the "rights" they say will be taken away are:

"1. The right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press 'discrimination or segregation of any kind' 'at any establishment or place,' as delineated in the bill (secs. 202–03).

"2. The right of homeowners to rent, lease, or sell their homes as free individuals (secs. 601–02).

"3. The right of realtors and developers of residential property to act as free agents (secs. 601–02).

"4. The right of banks, savings and loan associations and other financial institutions to make loans and extend credits in accordance with their best judgment (secs. 601–02).

"5. The right of employers 'to hire or discharge any individual' and to determine 'his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment' (title VII).

"6. The seniority rights of employees in corporate and other employment (title VII, title VI via sec. 711(b)).

"7. The seniority rights of all persons under the Federal civil service (sec. 711(a)).

"8. The seniority rights of labor union members within their locals and in their apprenticeships programs (title II, title VI via sec. 711(b)).

"9. The right of labor unions to choose their members, to determine the rights accorded to their members, and to determine the relationship of their members to each other (title VII, title VI via sec. 711(b)).

"10. The right of farmers to freely choose their tenants and employees (title VI and title VII).

"11. The right of farm organizations to choose their members, to determine the rights accorded to their members, and the relationship of their members to each other (title VI and title VII).

"12. The right of boards of trustees of public and private schools and colleges to determine the handling of students and teaching staffs (title IV, title VI, title VII).

"13. The right of owners of inns, hotels, motels, restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms, soda fountains, motion picture houses, theaters, concern halls, sports arenas, stadiums, and other places of entertainment to freely carry on their businesses in the service of their customers (title II, title VI, and title VII).

"14. The right of the States to determine the qualifications of voters in all Federal elections and many State elections (title I).

"15. The right of litigants to receive even-handed justice. (A complainant under this bill can have the Attorney General, at the taxpayers' expense, represent him. But the individual accused, justly or otherwise, has to defend himself at his own expense) (sec. 101(d), title IX)."

(From "Unmasking the Civil Rights Bill" Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc.)

Dean MANION. Personally, I think that is a very comprehensive list, Mr. Wright, and I am sure that the audience does, too. These are rights that are affected, that are taken away, in fact, by this so-called civil rights bill which is generally represented as legislation to confirm rights and to protect rights.

Now, if there is anybody not affected by this bill adversely—not included in this list—I certainly can't think of them offhand. Do you think, Mr. Wright, that we can depend upon the Supreme Court to weed out of this bill its unconstitutional features?

Mr. WRIGHT. No. I am sorry I have to say that, Dean Manion. We must depend upon the Senate. Now, let me give you the reason why I think that the Supreme Court will not do it. We have five members of the Court who have consistently invaded the field of legislation, who have consistently woven into their decisions many ideological and philosophical considerations that have nothing whatever to do with the law.

Indeed, the last appointee recently said, in substance, that the Supreme Court should not rely entirely upon the law, but it should take into consideration also, the sociological impact. Well, our profession and the businessman must rely on stare decisis and we cannot expect the Court, because of its legislative complexion and its decisions, to be of any help.

BILL WOULD CREATE RAMPANT BUREAUCRACY

Dean MANION. Certainly we are going to need some help in this bill because, as I see it—and if I am wrong about this you may correct me, Mr. Wright—there is nothing in this bill which sets up any boundaries to the inquisitorial and enforcement powers of these agencies which will enforce it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Nothing whatever. You might, for instance, have a Bobby Baker in charge of the enforcement of this bill. It's very conceivable.

Dean MANION. Everything would be up to his own judgment?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, up to his own judgment.

Dean MANION. You see, my friends, one of the things traditionally required of legislation which delegates power of enforcement is a line of brackets and boundaries within which the enforcement body must confine itself. The legislation should not give administrative agencies a carte blanche to wend their way through your business and through your rights at random, and at will. But now, as I understand it, Mr. Wright, this bill does give the Government such a carte blanche without any legislative bounds or restrictions whatsoever.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is my sad and considered judgment, Dean Manion, that if this bill passes, the American individual will be as much controlled as is the poor Russian under the Soviets.

Dean MANION. Well, that is a pretty bleak prospect for the generality of the American public who have been told that this is a bill to protect equal rights. Now, what about labor unions, Mr. Wright? What can they look forward to under this bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. Complete control. Domination of their policies. Upsetting of seniority. And the forceful taking into unions of persons who are, perhaps, not adequate or eligible.

Dean MANION. How about a union member, for instance, who is out of a job, and is

entitled by his union seniority to be next called in to take a vacant place. Under this legislation, can he be shunted aside and perhaps a nonunion member be selected to come in and take the vacancy?

Mr. WRIGHT. Very definitely.

Dean MANION. I do not believe that union people understand the far-reaching implications of this legislation in that respect. What about the so-called public accommodations section that they have talked so much about, Mr. Wright. What does that have reference to?

Mr. WRIGHT. It has reference among other things to every housing, lodging, boarding house. The law provides, however, that if there are only five that occupy a place, it shall not apply. Now, it seems to me that if it's good for five, or for six, it ought to be good for four. But, it is contrary to the principle of freedom under the law as we have struggled for it from our forefathers. If this law becomes a law in fact, we will turn the clock back beyond the time when our forefathers fought for freedom. From dignity of the individual under the rule of law, we will go back to the rule of men.

Dean MANION. Well, that is unfortunate. I think you said, too, at the outset, that everything that this bill aims at has already been established by law—passed in previous years, 1957 and 1960. So the only purpose of this bill, as I see it, would be to extend power to the Federal Government and to centralize that power. Is there very much else aimed at in this bill, in your opinion?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; not in my opinion. If it dealt only with civil rights, that would be one thing, but this is an evil bill, conceived by some conspiracy to accomplish what the Fabian-Socialists want accomplished in this country.

Dean MANION. In other words, they have used the suceptibility of the public to "equality" and "equal protection" as a cloak to mask their purpose which is to establish centralized Federal control in defiance of the Constitution. Is that true?

Mr. WRIGHT. Absolutely. That's a fact.

Dean MANION. I want to thank you very much, Mr. Wright. I was very glad that I was able to contact you here at the midwinter meeting of the American Bar Association Convention for this timely interview on this piece of very threatening legislation.

Ladies and gentlemen, don't think that this bill doesn't have an impact upon you. It does, and unless all of us sit up and take notice, the Constitution will be torn to shreds by the enforcement of this so-called civil rights bill, which is really a bill to destroy rights. Please get in touch with your Senators and do what you can to stop the passage of this evil and misleading piece of legislation.

Federal Reserve System Should Be Audited by GAO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the appropriations process, with its cumbersome machinery and sometimes irritating delays, survives because it safeguards the fundamental right of the people to control the operations of government through their elected representatives. It is part of the system of checks and balances that protects the rights of the people.

What happens when an independent agency gets away from the democratic system of checks and balances is amply illustrated by a comparison of the salaries of Federal Reserve officials and those of other top governmental officials—as shown in the table that follows.

Only the President of the United States is paid more than the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is paid almost twice as much as the Chief Justice of the United States. A vice president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank is paid more than the Vice President of the United States. The Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is paid more than the Secretary of State. The auditor of the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank receives a higher salary than the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The General Counsel to the Board of Governors is paid more than the Attorney General of the United States. All 12 Federal Reserve bank presidents are paid more than the Secretary of the Treasury.

Why do such glaring inequities exist? Because, although the taxpayers pay the Fed's salaries, they have no say in determining what those salaries should be. Only the salaries of the Governors are fixed by law. All the rest are determined by the Federal Reserve Board and the regional banks. In fact, except for the Board's staff, salaries are set by the directors of each Federal Reserve bank, two-thirds of whom are elected by private bankers. In other words, instead of Congress, the representatives of private bankers are appropriating Federal funds, subject only to the veto of the Board of Governors.

GOVERNMENT BONDS PAID TWICE

The Federal Reserve System is the most blatant example of backdoor financing in the history of the United States. It has an unlimited budget, and in 50 years it has never had to go before Appropriations Committees or even be audited by the General Accounting Office, or any other independent auditor. Whenever the Fed wants money it buys Government securities with the credit of the Nation. It does not pay for these securities; the Government pays for them. But the Fed still collects the interest. Even though the Government has already paid for these bonds once, they are still carried as part of the national debt, and the Treasury is forced to pay the Federal Reserve over a billion dollars of taxpayers' money in interest charges each year.

NO CONTROL OVER FED'S EXPENSES

Last year the Fed's unearned interest on Government securities came to over $1 billion, or 99 percent of its total income. The Fed can spend however much it wants of this billion dollars of taxpayers' money. It does not have to ask for anybody's approval or account to anybody afterward.

During the hearings that the Banking and Currency Committee is holding on the Federal Reserve System, witnesses from the Fed have repeatedly said that they were insulted that anyone should impugn their honesty and competence by suggesting that they should be audited by the General Accounting Office or come under the appropriations process.

This line of argument misses the point entirely. I am not, never have, and I hope, never will accuse these men individually or collectively of dishonesty or incompetence.

But in a democracy it is up to the representatives of the people to decide how much money the Government should spend and for what. Area redevelopment is a laudable and important program, but that does not mean that the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston should unilaterally decide to spend taxpayers' money to hire specialists in labor restraining and resources development, and contribute Federal funds to regional booster groups.

Honesty is not enough. How many agencies, staffed with honest and sincere men would willingly suggest that their budgets be cut or that someone else take over part of their duties? No matter how honest officials are, if they are not responsible, they will be irresponsible. If officials do not have to account to anybody for their actions, they will grow to consider themselves sacrosanct, endowed with a special wisdom to govern the people; they will dismiss each waste as a little thing of no importance, and shroud their actions in secrecy and mystery to avoid criticism and to preserve their special position; and all the while they will honestly think they are doing right.

I think we should look very carefully at how the Federal Reserve spends the money it takes from the taxpayers without audit or appropriations, to see if it is not time for the Fed to be responsible for its expenditures:

Annual salaries of the principal Federal officials including the highest paid officials of the Federal Reserve System, Jan. 5, 1964

President of the United States	$100,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	70,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago	55,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Philadelphia	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Cleveland	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Richmond	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Atlanta	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Dallas	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, San Francisco	40,000
First Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Kansas City	37,500
Vice President and senior adviser, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	37,500
Chief Justice of the United States	35,500
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Boston	35,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, St. Louis	35,000
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	35,000
Vice President of the United States	35,000

Annual salaries of the principal Federal officials including the highest paid officials of the Federal Reserve System, Jan. 5, 1964—Continued

President of the Senate pro tempore, when there is no Vice President of the United States	$35,000
Speaker of the House of Representatives	35,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	35,000
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	32,500
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	31,500
First Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, Kansas City	30,000
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	29,000
Vice President and General Counsel, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	28,500
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	28,000
Adviser to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	27,500
First Vice Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Boston, Philadelphia, Richmond, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco	27,500
First Vice President and General Counsel, Federal Reserve Bank, Atlanta	27,500
Vice Presidents (two), Federal Reserve Bank, New York	27,500
U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Representative in the Security Council	27,500
U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization	27,500
Ambassador at Large	27,500
Chiefs of Mission, class 1, Foreign Service	27,500
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, San Francisco	26,500
Adviser to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	26,000
Secretary of the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	26,000
General Counsel, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	26,000
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	26,000
Assistant Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	25,500
Circuit judges, U.S. Courts of Appeals	25,500
Chief judge and associate judges, U.S. Court of Claims	25,500
Chief judge and associate judges, U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	25,500
Judges, U.S. Court of Military Appeals	25,500
Director, Division of Research and Statistics, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	25,000
Director, Division of Examinations, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	25,000
First Vice Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Cleveland, Minneapolis, and Dallas	25,000
Vice President and Senior Adviser, Federal Reserve Bank, Richmond	25,000
Vice President and Cashier, Federal Reserve Bank, Philadelphia	25,000
Assistant General Counsel, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	25,000
Secretary of State	25,000
Secretary of the Treasury	25,000
Secretary of Defense	25,000
Attorney General	25,000
Postmaster General	25,000

Annual salaries of the principal Federal officials including the highest paid officials of the Federal Reserve System, Jan. 5, 1964—Continued

Secretary of the Interior	$25,000
Secretary of Agriculture	25,000
Secretary of Commerce	25,000
Secretary of Labor	25,000
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare	25,000
Deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Deputy Representative in the Security Council	25,000
Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council, United Nations	25,000
Chiefs of missions, class 2, Foreign Service	25,000
U.S. Representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development	25,000
U.S. Representative, European Communities	25,000
U.S. Representative on the Council of the Organization of American States	25,000
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	25,000
Director, Office of Emergency Planning	25,000
Associate Directors (2), Division of Research and Statistics, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	24,500
Senior Vice President—Economic Research, Federal Reserve Bank, Kansas City	24,500
Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, Dallas	24,500
Assistant Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	24,250
Adviser, International Finance, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	24,000
Director, Division of Bank Operations, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	24,000
Vice President, General Counsel, and Secretary, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago	24,000
Vice Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: New York and Chicago	24,000
Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	23,500
Adviser, Research and Statistics, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	23,500
Assistant General Counsel, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	23,000
Vice President and Secretary, Federal Reserve Bank, St. Louis	23,000
Vice President and Cashier, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago	23,000
Vice Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Cleveland (two), and Chicago	23,000
General Auditor, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago	23,000
Medical Director, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	23,000
Economic Adviser, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	23,000
Chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia	23,000
Legislative Counsel, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	22,500
Vice President and Secretary, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis	22,500
Vice President and Secretary, Federal Reserve Bank, Dallas	22,500
Vice Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Cleveland, St. Louis	22,500
District judges, U.S. District Courts	22,500
Judges, Tax Court of the United States	22,500

Annual salaries of the principal Federal officials including the highest paid officials of the Federal Reserve System, Jan. 5, 1964—Continued

Judges, U.S. Customs Court	$22,500
Director of the Bureau of the Budget	22,500
Comptroller General of the United States	22,500
Under Secretary of State	22,500
Deputy Secretary of Defense	22,500
U.S. Representative in the Trusteeship Council, United Nations	22,500
United States Representative in the Trusteeship Council, United Nations	22,500
Chiefs of missions, class 3, Foreign Service	22,500
Director, Office of Science and Technology	22,500
Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	22,500
Administrator, Agency for International Development	22,500
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission	22,500
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency	22,500
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	22,500
Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	22,500
Members of Congress	22,500
Postmaster, New York	18,250
Postmaster, Chicago	17,750
Postmaster, Philadelphia	17,500
Postmaster, Cleveland	17,000
Postmaster, Kansas City	15,900
Postmaster, Boston	17,500
Postmaster, St. Louis	17,500
Postmaster, Atlanta	15,000
Postmaster, Minneapolis	18,465
Postmaster, Dallas	18,465
Postmaster, San Francisco	18,500
Postmaster, Richmond	14,075

In looking over the listing of salaries, bear in mind that those of officers and employees of the Federal Reserve banks are fixed by their respective boards of directors, subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Salaries of members of the Board's staff are fixed by the Board. All other salaries listed are fixed by law.

The Country Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues might stay abreast of the domestic cattle crisis in the Midwest, I ask reproduction of the attached editorial comment from the Omaha World-Herald of March 3. The editorial was written in the wake of a meeting of 5,000 to 6,000 people in the industry hastily called at Shenandoah, Iowa, and reports the resolution reached at that meeting.

The article follows:

THE COUNTRY SPEAKS

The "voice from the country" is being heard today in Washington.

The voice rings loud and clear, and carries the weight of logic.

We refer, of course, to what happened at a hastily called meeting at Shenandoah, Iowa, on Monday.

Ranchers, feeders, farmers, bankers, businessmen and State and Federal officials formed a gathering which the Iowa Highway Patrol estimated at between 5,000 and 6,000 persons—enough almost to double the population of Shenandoah. The overflow of an auditorium which seated fewer than 1,000 clustered at other points to listen through a public-address system to a long list of speakers.

At the conclusion they sent to Congress a plea which can be boiled down to: "Roll back the imports of beef which are crushing the American cattle industry."

The resolution which these mid-Americans sent to Washington is a terse, reasoned document.

It calls upon Congress "to limit, by legislative action, imports of beef and veal, fresh, frozen, cooked, and/or canned or cured, to levels in pounds approximately equal in volume to the levels of 1960, approximately 775 million pounds, or 4.9 percent of domestic production that year."

And it takes note of the consequences of some domestic overproduction which the imports have aggravated by calling upon the cattle industry to "take effective action toward orderly marketing and production, as well as production more nearly commensurate with consumer demands."

Observe that the men who met at Shenandoah did not demand that Congress shut off all beef imports. They are willing to concede a reasonable share of the American market to foreign producers, but they want it set at a figure they can live with. They want it stabilized, so that it won't again grow into a flood.

Here and there a voice pops up to blame the cattle industry's troubles solely on the industry. "Overproduction," they say. "Too many cattle here at home."

The analysis is valid—to a point. But this problem has been faced and disposed of by the cattle industry, without outside help, since the days of the Chisholm Trail.

But, as Cecil W. Means, vice president of the Stockyards National Bank, told the meeting in Shenandoah, the rapidly rising tide of imported beef has confronted the cattle industry with "an added imponderable it has never had to face before—an unanswerable question.

"We do not know to what extent or how fast meat imports are going to grow."

The voice from the Midlands now is telling Congress in effect:

Put a reasonable limit on imports, and we'll take care of the rest of our problem.

This is wise counsel which the Congress will heed if it wants to save the cattle industry and all of the economic life of America which is dependent upon it.

The Real Culprits in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished news columnist Mr. David Lawrence has written another outstanding column analyzing the real difficulties we face in South Vietnam. This column, as printed in the Evening Star of March 5, 1964, is entitled "The Real Culprits in Vietnam: U.S. Viewed as Failing To Face Up to Aggressions of Peiping, Moscow."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL CULPRITS IN VIETNAM: UNITED STATES VIEWED AS FAILING TO FACE UP TO AGGRESSIONS OF PEIPING, MOSCOW

(By David Lawrence)

The cold war is getting hotter, but the United States is not facing up to the real enemy. A lot of talk is heard about intensifying America's military action in South Vietnam, but not a word of denunciation is being uttered by the Government here about the acts of aggression being committed in southeast Asia and other parts of the world by the Communist regimes in Peiping and Moscow.

The American people are disturbed about the South Vietnam situation. Many Members of Congress are debating it, and the controversy will doubtless become a campaign issue. It is being suggested on Capitol Hill that the United States ought to pursue the war to a finish or get out of southeast Asia.

What generally seems to be overlooked in Washington, however, is that the real culprits are the Soviet Union and Red China. There probably would be no war between North and South Vietnam today if the Communists were not supplying the arms and munitions and the technical advisers trained in guerrilla warfare. The fact that the North Vietnamese are supposed to be irregulars and guerrillas seems to be accepted as an excuse for avoiding the real issue—the placing of responsibility on the governments which are financing, training, and supporting the guerrillas.

The phrase cold war nowadays is, for the most part, supposed to imply the use of subversion and infiltration rather than military action. Yet in various parts of the globe the Communists are actually behind the military movements. The fact that the Soviet Union became involved in establishing missile bases on Cuban soil led to what has been described as a real crisis in Latin-American affairs. But even though the missiles have been withdrawn, there has been no letup in the Soviet Union's military support, and there is official confirmation of the fact that Cuban troops are being trained by Russian technicians. A recent report by the Organization of American States shows clearly an attempt by the Soviet Government to use Castro's apparatus as a means of overthrowing the Government of Venezuela.

Whether it is in Latin America or in Africa or in southeast Asia, or even in Cyprus, the handiwork of the Communists is visible to the naked eye. But the Western governments seem too much inclined to ignore the center of responsibility for these troubles and to prefer to consider them as local.

What complicates the situation is the bungling of foreign policy in the United States, Great Britain, and France. There is a failure to come to grips with the basic problem—whether the Soviet Union and the Red China regimes are going to be permitted to continue their acts of aggression against the free world, their interference with the operations of independent governments, and threats to the peace of the world. It is often suggested that the matter be taken before the United Nations, but this organization now is under the control of the Communist bloc.

Nevertheless, the sentiment here in Washington is that the United States should make its fight in the court of public opinion throughout the world. The feeling is growing that, even though a blunder has been made in the sale of American wheat to the Soviet Government—an action which precipitated an increase in British, French, and Spanish trade with Cuba—it is up to the United States to use every resource at its command, including economic power, to draw a line between the free world and the slave world.

There are supposed to be approximately 15,000 American troops in South Vietnam. Already, American casualties number nearly 200 dead, and many more have been wounded. Congress has not authorized the Armed Forces of the United States to go to southeast Asia, as is customary when a military action is pursued. The reason given is that American troops are in South Vietnam at the request of the government there. But while this has accounted for the utilization of American military forces in some instances in the past, there usually has been a movement to get an authorization from Congress, as the Constitution requires.

Economic pressure can be employed as a powerful alternative to military action. The big decision that will have to be made by countries like Great Britain and France is whether the pursuit of material gain is more important than the use of an economic boycott to stop the buildup of Communist strength in various parts of the world.

Unless action is taken to fix the blame publicly and to arouse world opinion, the United States will sooner or later find itself forced in to a shooting war. This can be avoided by taking firm and resolute steps now to mobilize world opinion against the two governments—the Soviets and Red Chinese—which are responsible for the many local wars throughout the globe.

Chandler, Henderson County, Tex., Takes on New Drive With Municipal Water Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the hometown in which I grew to manhood in Henderson County, Tex., the town of Chandler, is not a new town. A post office was established there, called Stillwater in the early 1870's, but the name was changed to Chandler with the coming of the railroad in 1880. By the 1960 census its population was 715. Since the depression of the 1930's and the mechanization of agriculture, its growth has been very slow.

Now, with a matching area redevelopment grant, a municipal water system is being built at Chandler. The town is growing; business houses are being built, but more important, homes are being built. This pickup has been noticeable enough that the Athens Weekly Review, which under the driving editorship of Dick Dwelle has become one of the fast growing county seat newspapers in Texas, in its February 13, 1964, edition carried the lead editorial commending Chandler for its rejuvenation, its spirit and its growth, under the title "Chandler's New Spirit."

As a tribute to the people of my hometown, I ask unanimous consent that the

editorial from the Athens Weekly Review of February 13, 1964, under the title "Chandler's New Spirit" be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANDLER'S NEW SPIRIT

When progress begins to take shape in a community, there are few that are left in the wake. Most are absorbed by the tide and simply add to the force that is working for progress.

Chandler has enjoyed the addition of a number of lovely homes through the years. Yet, there seemed to be little real townwide spirit.

Things are changing, however. Perhaps it had its beginning when the people decided they wanted a waterworks. Of course, one progressive move does not make a community of action, but there has to be a starting place and that may have been it.

Last week we read in the Review, and proudly so, that the people of Chandler had come through with flying colors in the United Fund campaign. The total was $529.70, by far the largest sum that Chandler has ever contributed to the fund.

One successful fund drive, just like one progressive community action, does not determine what a community is or will be. But when the people in a community are doing something for themselves and then raise money to do for others, it demonstrates that their interests in doing are aroused.

We are happy to see it and we know that the people of Chandler must be pleased to see their town on the move.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an essay written by Miss Joan Tonn, of Morris, Minn. This essay was prepared in conjunction with the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest. Each year the VFW asks our young people to reflect and express themselves on the fundamental aspects of our democratic processes. That they do reflect and can express themselves is admirably demonstrated by Joan Tonn. "The Challenge of Citizenship," written by Miss Tonn, was awarded first place in the State of Minnesota. I am proud to count her among my constituents. I recommend her article to you:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Freedom is a personal thing. Recognition of this is essential if we, as citizens of one of the greatest countries this world has ever known, are to accept this challenge of citizenship.

I'm certain that you have all heard the phrase, "Well, I know something should be done, but what can I do?" If you listened carefully, you realized that this statement actually questioned the ability of the individual to accomplish anything. This passive attitude, which has become characteristic of many Americans, is one which should greatly concern us all.

What is the basic cause of this passive attitude? I believe that it is essentially a lack of knowledge. This challenge of citizenship is especially great for that individual who wants to participate, at least in a small, intelligent way, in the control of his nation's fate; but who holds back his opinions because he feels he has not the training or influence to speak effectively.

This condition was dramatically demonstrated at the time of the assassination of our late President, John F. Kennedy. Suddenly, the knowledge of every facet of the Office of the Presidency became extremely important. Many of us wondered who followed the Vice President in the line of succession, if any certain man would assume the duties of Vice President, the procedure of selecting Cabinet members, and many other questions.

Naturally, those seemed small considerations in the wake of such a great tragedy. However, we soon realized that many of the principles of our Government which we had taken for granted for so long, were now assuring the continuity of that same government.

However, a simple acceptance of that fact is not enough—for those principles were not born of themselves. They were established by citizens of the United States—citizens with enough foresight and confidence in the future of their nation to provide for its safety.

How are such principles established? There are two prerequisites for such action—interest and knowledge. Because we live in a democracy it is extremely unlikely that an individual would completely lack an interest in his government. Thus, the stumbling block is usually a lack of knowledge. Americans have many methods of participation in government, such as initiative, referendum, and recall. However, the most basic form is still the right to vote. It is a privilege which is sorely abused by many Americans, either through misuse or by failing to vote at all. Much has been said of the subject of the responsibility of voting, but it seems that it has accomplished very little. The same people continue to vote for the candidate, party, or issues for which their husbands, wives, or fathers voted. They give little or no regard to the competence of the individual; nor do they take the time to really inform themselves on both sides or even one side of the issue at hand.

The average man or woman can have a powerful effect on the national scene once the realization strikes home that no voice goes unnoticed, particularly if it is raised in an intelligent question, objection, or praise. The unorganized civilian is potentially the greatest force of all. There is a politician's maxim that election victories are scored by those who realize that votes are counted one by one. So then, the only thing holding us back from achieving our highest aspirations is ourselves. We must never underestimate one another for an inspiring example can achieve marvelous things. With interest and knowledge we can make our own destiny.

The challenge of citizenship, then, is recognizing the fact that freedom is, indeed, a personal thing. And with that acceptance, we should join with the anonymous author who wrote: "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I ought to do. And what I ought to do, by God's grace I will do."

JOAN C. TONN.

International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation in opposition to H.R. 8864, International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963.

This letter was offered for inclusion in the record of the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee on this legislation, but the hearings had already been printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1964.

Re H.R. 8864, International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The American Farm Bureau Federation, comprising a membership of 1,628,295 farm and ranch families located in some 2,700 counties of 49 States and Puerto Rico, is opposed to the enactment of this legislation. We opposed the ratification of the coffee agreement last year.

We believe that the administration was unwise in negotiating the agreement as was the Senate in ratifying it. We are opposed to commodity agreements or arrangements in principle because, by their very nature, they are trade restrictive rather than expansive, and in every case so far, have redounded to the disadvantage of the United States.

We stated in our letter of March 12, 1963, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that international commodity agreements usually allocate markets on the basis of some historical performance which penalizes efficient producers and hoists an umbrella of protection for the inefficient. Expansion of trade and consumption or use is retarded and may be decreased in the interest of maintaining a certain level of prices.

We have witnessed just such a result with the current coffee agreement. Supplies have been held off the market through export quotas, and prices have skyrocketed. American consumers have borne an additional cost of $350 million per year.

Since the agreement came into force, coffee prices have risen nearly 50 percent and are still rising. Our Government tried in a feeble manner to get the export quotas expanded and, after months of talking obtained a 5-percent increase. This small increase has been ineffective in slowing the advance in prices. As a consequence of this advance in prices, coffee consumption in the United States has declined and probably will continue to decline as prices advance further.

It should be borne in mind that the rise in coffee prices is not necessarily reflected back to the coffee farmer. In most countries the farm price of coffee is supported by government at an incentive level and, except for occasional weather reductions, production is rising in all of the important producing countries. Thus, the chief beneficiaries of

the recent rise in coffee prices are the government treasuries which levy heavy taxes on exports.

Last year when the agreement was before the Senate for ratification, U.S. Government officials stated that the purpose of the agreement was to prevent coffee prices from falling below the 1962 level and that it would be impossible for prices to rise more than 5 to 10 percent. It was also stated that the U.S. Government through its voting power (40 percent of the votes allocated to importing countries), could control the action of the Council. It has been demonstrated by the recent actions of the Council that the U.S. Government is virtually helpless in getting an increase in the quotas. It requires two-thirds affirmative vote of both the importing and exporting countries to achieve any change in the export quotas. Therefore, the United States is very limited in its power to obtain an affirmative action. Even a negative vote by the United States can be overruled if the other participating countries wish to pursue the voting process through three votes on the same question. (See article 14(2) I.C.A., 1962.)

The bill now before the committee provides authority for our Government to require certificates of origin on all imports and reexports of coffee, and to control the imports from nonparticipating countries if the Council so orders. With coffee prices rising and with many countries now producing more coffee than they can legally export under their export quotas, the temptation to traffic in forged export certificates is great. Any disputes arising out of this sort of situation will rest with the United States to settle, and, however the dispute is settled, the United States will be blamed by one country or another. The United States will not make friends by controlling the imports of nonparticipating countries. Coffee imports into the United States have always been free of duty and free of other restrictions except during wartime.

Now it is recognized that if the Congress should fail to enact this legislation, the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 might become inoperative or even expire. To us, this would not be a calamity but would afford an opportunity for our Government to dissociate itself from an international agreement in which it should not have become a participant.

For the reasons given above, we respectfully recommend that the Senate not pass H.R. 8864.

It will be appreciated if you will incorporate this letter in the hearing record on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

Secularism on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Shelby Daily Star of Shelby, N.C., has printed in its February 25, 1964, issue an outstanding editorial entitled "Secularism on the March." This editorial calls attention to the fact that the Congress must act to halt the rising tide of secularism in this country which has been spawned by recent Supreme Court decisions against prayers in our schools.

I ask unanimous consent Mr. President, that this editorial, which is addressed to the Members of the Congress, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECULARISM ON THE MARCH

Opening Monday of a Federal court action against voluntary prayers and Bible reading in a Pennsylvania school system is a showdown move demanding of rapid counter-action on the part of Congress.

It's a question now of who can beat whom to the punch—the American Civil Liberties Union or the God-fearing members of the United States Congress. And those Americans who believe that God has a rightful, a meaningful and a vital place in the classroom, the Pledge of Allegiance, the National Anthem and the National Motto have been badly outpunched since 1962.

The overly sensitive minorities and their atheistic cohorts have made tremendous secular strides since 1962. In 1963, for instance, the U.S. Supreme Court took an 8-1 stand for the concept that the Government must maintain "strict neutrality" in religion.

Congress is yet to be heard from. But hear from it we must.

The Supreme Court's decision of June 17, 1963, banned the Bible and the Lord's Prayer on a compulsory basis from America's public schools. Justice Clark held in the majority opinion in that case that, although Bible reading and prayer may seem a slight breach of the wall between church and state, "The breach that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent."

So the trickling stream of secularism became a raging torrent on Monday when the Pennsylvania mother and father went into Federal court to protest voluntary Bible reading and prayer in the school attended by their children.

The Supreme Court in its 1963 decision very carefully refrained from ruling on voluntary devotionals in which all students participate, or selective devotionals from which objectors could be excused.

Now it looks as if a misguided citizen will not be satisfied until the Supreme Court explores and rules upon the voluntary aspects of the matter.

Justice Potter Stewart, the lone dissenter in 1963, wrote that, "A refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism."

U.S. News and World Report editor David Lawrence writes this week that, "Plainly, a constitutional amendment has become absolutely necessary to clear up the confusion that has arisen as a result of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States banning prayer in the public schools."

South Carolina's junior Senator, STROM THURMOND, writes that a movement called project prayer aimed at moulding public opinion in favor of such an amendment claims such famous names on the board of directors as Walter Brennan, John Wayne, Ronald Reagan, Roy and Dale Rogers and Rhonda Fleming.

The real action must come from within the Congress. Fortunately, there are signs of activity. The House Republican Policy Committee, for instance, recently adopted a resolution endorsing passage of a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary Bible reading and prayer in public schools and other public institutions.

Republican Representative FRANK BECKER of New York has 143 of the 218 signatures he needs to have a discharge petition force a proposal out of the Judiciary Committee and onto the floor of the House.

This noble effort may die on the congressional vine unless there is a groundswell of grassroots opinion in favor of stemming the tide of secularism with a plainly worded but forceful constitutional amendment.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

We Are Guardians of an Altar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, many eulogies have been written about the many sides of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy since he was a man of many sides, many talents and many interests. One of the true measures of greatness of this man has been not his concern with presidents, potentates and power wielders, but rather his concern with the least among us—the physically and mentally handicapped men and women, boys and girls of this Nation. His concern was real and from the heart. It never flagged.

One of the most touching eulogies to come to my attention, which I include in my remarks, pertains to the side of Mr. Kennedy devoted to the welfare and independence of the handicapped. It was written by Mr. William P. McCahill, executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, who has had ample opportunity to observe Mr. Kennedy's concern, at first hand, over the past months. The eulogy appears in the Committee's monthly magazine, Performance.

I know that the article sums up my own feelings at the loss of this friend of the handicapped, this friend of all humanity. And I am sure it sums up the feelings of all Members of Congress, and millions of other persons:

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED—WE ARE GUARDIANS OF AN ALTAR

In retrospect, the 2 years, 10 months, and 2 days of the Kennedy administration were rich in blessing for the handicapped of America. As all America adjusts to the tragic reality of our national black Friday, it is worthwhile to go back to the invocation of our annual meeting, April 27, 1961, where the Senate Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, said:

> "We are watchers of a beacon
> Whose light must never die;
> We are guardians of an altar
> That shows Thee ever nigh."

In the post-Cuba confusion of that morning, Attorney General Kennedy, speaking for his brother, the President, said: "This is a matter that is very close to his heart (the President's) and except for the events of the last 10 or 12 days he would be with you this morning. He would be here because he knows personally the great problems and difficulties that the handicapped face. I don't think that there is any question that if it had not been for his experiences during the war and being badly wounded and incapacitated that except for those experiences and, being incapacitated for so many years, that he would not be President of the United States at the present time. He certainly would not have written his book, 'Profiles in Courage,' which won a Pulitzer Prize, except for the fact that he was incapacitated."

On September 6, 1961, the President issued a policy directive to heads of executive departments and agencies, the subject: "Policy for Employment of the Physically Handicapped." It restated the previous Eisenhower policy and made it plain that the New Frontier expected its officials to take the lead in providing employment for qualified handicapped workers.

On Valentine's Day, 1962, the President met at the White House with General Maas to honor the National Association of Broadcasters for its support of the handicapped program. Before the radio and TV mikes, he said: "Today we are changing the name of this committee from 'Physically Handicapped' to 'Handicapped' because we do want to emphasize the great importance of hiring people who may have suffered some degree of difficulty mentally. These people deserve our wholehearted support and cooperation in making it possible for them to live useful and fruitful lives." The President issued an Executive order that day placing this change into effect officially.

At the annual meeting in May 1962, following a report by Dr. Leonard Mayo, Chairman of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, representing President Kennedy, opened his remarks by saying:

"If you've been reading your newspapers or listening to your radio or TV, you know that the cause of equality for the handicapped is close to the President, just as it is close to the entire Kennedy family."

On March 1, 1962, President Kennedy sent a message to the International Rehabilitation Seminar meeting in Washington, saying:

"This certainly is God's work and your associates are to be commended for the dramatic and dynamic part they have played in the increased interest in international rehabilitation."

An overflow audience which spilled into the crowded outer lobby of the departmental auditorium on May 9, 1963, heard President Kennedy say: "I want to express my very great appreciation to all of you who have worked in this most important and deserving field." In a remark almost prophetic, he later said: "There are a lot of acts of courage which are done in the flash of the moment, but the most commendable and admirable acts of courage are those which go on day in, day out . . . (David Hall) has shown it, the general has shown it, and I am glad to be among those who live it."

The President's personal contact with the Committee came to a dramatic climax on November 7 when he spoke on the White House lawn to some 75 State chairmen and secretaries, then meeting in a training workshop. At that time he said:

"I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you to Washington. We appreciate what you are doing in the States and I think that it gives us a better idea, this kind of meeting, of what way we might be helpful. This is a matter of great interest to all of us. I hope we will define "handicapped" so that we do make a major effort on all those who are handicapped.

"We are now working particularly hard and in recent months in the Government on the hiring of the mentally retarded, here, and all over the Government. The Civil Service Commission with the cooperation of the various departments of the Government is giving this particular attention.

"We also have a program here for those whom we regard as mentally restored, those who pass through a difficult period but who are fully capable of carrying their burden. In addition, as you may know, the Civil Service Commission itself gives some of its tests in braille so that those who are blind may occupy a useful place in society. I hope we can do more in the National Government, and I hope you will do more in your States. I hope private industry and labor will also realize that those who are handicapped frequently are more than compensated by their desire to be useful and play a gainful role. Of course, the key is to maintain full employment to the extent that we can in our society. If we have a pressure for jobs, then those who are, in a sense, in the edge who are handicapped in some way find it easier for them. So the central responsibility, of course, is to try to develop a climate in this country where there is as close to full employment as we can get it, and then to give particular attention to those who are handicapped, it seems to me, and also those areas of the United States which, because of technological change, have left a good many men adrift—thousands in some parts, particularly in the older coal mining sections. This is not directly in your area of responsibility, but it is still tied into those who have been handicapped in one way or the other.

"I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you. I hope you have a few minutes to look through the White House and to see that this is where a good deal has happened in the past, and we hope, even a little in the future."

General Maas presented to the President the new Seal minus the word "physically." After accepting the Seal, the President stepped down into the crowd and shook hands with as many of the visitors as time would allow. The President then returned to his office, there to continue his many responsibilities which go on day in and day out.

And now he is gone—all too soon laid to rest with the other hero dead.

It is up to those of us who remain to continue in "God's work," to continue as guardians of an altar of patriotism on which John F. Kennedy laid down his life. As we continue in this work, we do so strong in the knowledge that President Lyndon B. Johnson himself is personally familiar with the handicapped.—W. P. Mc.

A Successful Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that foreign aid is an indispensable pillar of American policy in shoring up the defenses of the free world. But when we come to consider the substantial cost, some voices are raised to question the effectiveness of this

form of assistance in building up the economic strength of the recipient countries.

The State of Israel offers a striking example of the decisive contribution of American aid, on the nongovernmental and as well as the governmental level, in placing a new and underdeveloped democracy on the road to self-reliance.

The degree to which Israel has made good is dramatically reflected in the fact that it has established its own little point 4 program to provide technical assistance and scientific guidance to a great majority of the 50 or more countries which attained their independence after the State of Israel came into being in May 1948.

One of the most important single factors in Israel's remarkable progress has been the Israel bond campaign which has enrolled more than a million Americans as partners with the people of Israel in the development of its economy. This program not only symbolizes the unflagging American interest in and sympathy with the historic enterprise of the rebuilding of the ancient Jewish homeland, it also testifies to the idealism, the courage and the industry of the many hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees who have come to Palestine to escape the savage blows of mass persecution in Europe.

With the aid of Israel bonds, they have established a unique record of nation building. Industrial production has increased fivefold since Israel became a state. Agricultural production has quadrupled. Its export trade has multiplied 12 times in the last 15 years. Roads, harbors, and railways have been built. Pipelines for oil and pipelines for water have been laid and the limited natural resources of the country such as phosphates, oil, copper, potash, and bromine are being exploited on an increasing scale.

Mr. President, the people of Israel are going forward to create a homeland of freedom and peace for their fellow Jews and to contribute to the progress of the rest of the world as well as of their Arab neighbors. The concerted effort which Israel has made to develop its human resources has earned for it the role of pilot plant or showcase for other emerging nations.

Within the past year, Israel has begun to redeem the first Israel bonds which were issued 13 years ago. The beginning of redemption has resulted in an impressive upsurge of confidence in the State of Israel and its bonds. It is noteworthy that many financial institutions have shown an increasing readiness to consider Israel bonds as an area for investment. More than 300 banks have purchased Israel bonds, in addition to more than 500 international and local unions and joint union councils. Israel bonds have been bought by numerous insurance companies, pension and welfare funds, building funds, and the like.

Israel has just launched a new bond issue in this country—the third development issue. Funds from this new issue will be utilized in the same constructive way as the previous ones, to develop the economy, to absorb immigrants, to reclaim and settle the barren areas in the Negev and elsewhere in the country. They will aid in the economic growth of a land whose rebirth has a dual purpose: The revival of the ancient ideals of the Jewish prophets, combined with modern industrial and scientific development under the aegis of democracy.

The history of Israel bonds is an illuminating example of how foreign aid can work, when wisely administered, just as the economic growth of Israel should be a striking example to other undeveloped nations mustering all their resources for growth.

National Heroine, Mary Lee David

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, an act of outstanding heroism occurred recently in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. Mary Lee David, of McHenry County, while serving as a babysitter in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Knutson in Woodstock, risked her life to save the lives of their three children when the Knutson home was gutted by fire. Only 16 and a junior at the Woodstock Community High School, Mary Lee lives at the Woodstock Children's Home.

Ignoring danger to herself, Mary Lee braved intense heat, smoke, and flames to carry 16-month-old Tina Knutson from the burning home, having already removed the two older children to the out of doors and safety. Mary Lee clutched the tiny child in her arms and dived through both the regular window and the closed storm window. Mary Lee and Tina suffered only cuts and minor injuries, but mute testimony to the proximity of tragedy is the singed hair on the backs of their heads.

Mary Lee's calm and courage in the face of disaster threatening three helpless children has been recognized by the entire Woodstock community. In unprecedented action, Mayor Thore Emricson and all members of the Woodstock City Council voted to honor her with the official City of Woodstock Award. This is the highest honor the community can bestow on any organization or individual, and it has been bestowed only once before. In addition, commendations have come from many community organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Moose, and Kiwanis. At this time, the American Red Cross is formulating plans for its recognition of Mary Lee David.

Mr. Speaker, I call this act of selflessness and courage to the attention of my colleagues and to all those throughout the Nation by whom the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read. Truly, Mary Lee David is a young American woman of whom our entire Nation can be justly proud.

Résumé and Brief for H.R. 9650

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, every now and then we have a chance to put remedial legislation before the Congress that will do all good and no harm. I place the bill I sponsored January 16, H.R. 9650, in this category.

A brief résumé of the bill will help the Members to better understand the inequity we wish to correct:

RÉSUMÉ AND BRIEF FOR H.R. 9650, INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN DENT, JANUARY 16, 1964

This bill affects those members of public employees retirement systems in States where social security coverage is acquired by "the divisional method." Under this method there are two groups or classes of membership in the retirement system. In one group are those who were presently employed when social security coverage was first made available and elected social security coverage. In this group are also included all those who entered public employment after social security was first made available and all those who changed their election when they were permitted to do so by amendments to the Social Security Act. In the other group or class are those who were presently employed and did not elect social security coverage and who did not change their election since.

Seventeen States, including Pennsylvania, are authorized to cover their public employees by the divisional method. The program was initially established in Pennsylvania in 1956. Those who were presently employed prior to May 28, 1957, had the privilege of electing social security coverage retroactive to January 1, 1956, or of electing not to be covered under social security. Those who entered service after May 28, 1957, were required to be covered. Some of those who were presently employed prior to May 28, 1957, and elected not to be covered by social security subsequently changed their election either in 1959 or in the period from August 1961 through December 1962 when amendments to the Social Security Act permitted them to do so. All these members who acquired social security under any of the above provisions are called "joint coverage members." All not covered by social security are called "single coverage members."

H.R. 9650 permits single coverage members to change their previous vote on election of social security coverage from "no" to "yes" and thereby become "joint coverage members."

The bill, by deleting "1963" and inserting "1966," would merely set a new date, December 31, 1965, before which the single coverage members could make the change. The social security amendments in 1961 permitted them to make such a change prior to December 31, 1962.

In Pennsylvania's School Employees' Retirement System approximately 15,000 school employees out of a total membership of approximately 130,000 are "single coverage members."

In the Pennsylvania State Employees' Retirement System approximately 5,000 State employees out of a total membership of approximately 85,000 have chosen to remain "single coverage members".

In the third class cities there is an undetermined number who also chose to be single coverage members. This number can

be determined only by a survey of each of the third class cities, but the Pennsylvania Bureau of Social Security for Public Employees is receiving communications from such municipal employees inquiring whether they can now elect social security coverage.

These single coverage members did not choose social security coverage for a number of reasons:

1. They had social security coverage through other employment than in the schools, State or municipality.

2. They would become eligible for social security benefits as dependent wives or widows through their husband's coverage.

3. They were not sure of the benefits of their being covered by social security because of their husband's membership in the Railroad Retirement System.

4. They could not acquire sufficient quarters of coverage at the time of establishment to be eligible for a benefit.

5. They resented the reduction of public employees retirement allowances because of the offset established in the joint coverage plan.

In fact, the offset reduction played a significant role in the decisions of many of those who did not elect social security coverage. Under the joint coverage plan when a public employe retired at an age when he could and did receive social security benefits, his retirement allowance is reduced by 40 percent of the social security benefits he receives. For example, if his retirement allowance were $300 and his social security benefit were $100, his retirement allowance would be reduced by $40 (40 percent of $100) and he would receive only $260 as his reduced retirement allowance together with his social security benefit of $100.

In many cases there was so little difference between the employees total retirement income from social security under joint coverage in the public employees retirement system plus his retirement allowance reduced by the offset and his total retirement income from social security under other coverage (or as a dependent of a covered spouse) plus his full retirement allowance without offset that it was not to his financial advantage to elect social security coverage in the public employees retirement system.

For example—a male employee with a retirement allowance of $300 per month and a social security benefit of $100 under joint coverage in the public employees retirement system would have a total retirement income of $360: Reduced retirement allowance—$260 ($300 minus 40 percent of $100) plus $100 social security benefit; $360.

If the same male employee had social security coverage through employment outside of his public employment which entitled him to a social security benefit of $50, his total retirement income would be $350. Unreduced retirement allowance of $300 plus his social security beenfit of $50.

In the above example electing joint coverage would have meant only an additional $10 per month. It would take a number of years of retirement during which he would be receiving an additional $10 per month to recover the additional social security taxes he would have to pay if he elected social security coverage under the public employees retirement system.

Now legislation has been enacted in Pennsylvania which creates a new class of membership called dual coverage and joint coverage members may elect to eliminate the offset reduction in their retirement allowance. This legislation becomes effective on July 1, 1964, and those who so elect will, upon retirement, receive the full retirement allowance without offset reduction and the full social security benefit to which they are entitled.

It now becomes financially advantageous to virtually every single coverage member to elect social security coverage. Without the offset reduction the total retirement income from public employees retirement and social security will be increased so substantially that it will be to their advantage to elect coverage even though they will have to pay the social security taxes retroactive to January 1, 1956.

For example, in the case of the male employee in the example above—if he elects social security coverage under the public employees' retirement system his total retirement income would be $400—uinduced retirement allowance of $300 plus social security benefit of $100—rather than the $360 he would receive under the previous State legislation. This will be $50 per month more than the total retirement he would receive through his coverage outside his public employment of $350. At $50 a month in additional benefits he would recover the cost of the additional social security taxes in a very short period following retirement.

In addition every amendment to the Social Security Act since social security coverage became effective for public employees in Pennsylvania in 1956 has made it increasingly more advantageous for single coverage members to elect social security coverage under the public employees retirement system. All these are capped by the recent Pennsylvania legislation permitting the elimination of the offset reduction.

H.R. 9650 makes it possible for "single coverage" public employees in Pennsylvania (and perhaps other States) to greatly improve their total retirement income.

The Pennsylvania State Education Association supports passage of this legislation.

Prof. Klaus Pringsheim on U.S. Policy in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World's well known weekly feature, "Opinions From the Hill," Prof. Klaus Pringsheim has set forth a thoughtful and penetrating analysis of U.S. policy in South Vietnam. I commend it to my colleagues here in the Congress:

OPINIONS FROM THE HILL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Klaus H. Pringsheim was born in Berlin, Germany, emigrated as a 9-year-old boy to continue his education in England, and at 16 moved on to Japan where he stayed until the end of World War II. For 12 years he was a teacher of the German, Japanese, and English languages, spending 4 of these years at the U.S. Army Language School in Monterey, Calif., as an assistant professor of Japanese. He served in the U.S. Army for 4 years and became a U.S. citizen in 1952 in Richmond, Va. Later he entered UCLA and there obtained his A.B. in political science, graduating Phi Beta Kappa. Subsequently he obtained five consecutive Ford Foundation fellowships to do graduate work in East Asian studies at the East Asian Institute of Columbia University. He obtained the certificate of the Institute and an M.A. in comparative government at Columbia University in 1959. He is currently completing his Ph. D. dissertation in the department of public law and government at the same institution. He was lecturer in German at the University of Hong Kong and lecturer in comparative government at New York City College and has also widely lectured in Europe, Asia, and the United States. Specializing in contemporary Chinese politics and foreign policy, he went to Hong Kong in 1959 for dissertation research and came to Kansas University from Hong Kong in September 1961. He is now an instructor in Kansas University's Department of Political Science and a member of Kansas University's East Asian Studies Committee. He has published one book on Sino-Soviet relations, and a series of articles and monographs on Japanese and Chinese politics in scholarly journals in the United States, Europe, and the Far East. He married Mrs. Hsiuping Pringsheim, a Hong Kong girl, in 1962 and now lives at 700 Indiana Street in Lawrence.)

Next to the cold war confrontation with the Soviet Union and our humiliating inability to banish communism from Cuba, the most vexing foreign policy problem faced by the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations during the past 10 years, has has been their failure to enable successive governments of South Vietnam to achieve the defeat of Communist insurgency in that country. The continuing frustration of this South Vietnamese-American common aim has recently been dramatized by the announcement on February 26 that Mr. Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, has suddenly resigned his important position in the Johnson administration. It is generally known in Washington that Mr. Hilsman felt that his policy recommendations were frequently overruled or ignored or that he was not even consulted when important decisions in the area of his responsibility were taken. His resignation is therefore almost certainly a reflection of his dissatisfaction and/or disagreement with the Johnson administration. To this we add Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's various contradictory statements on the state of affairs in Vietnem when, in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, he continued to insist that things were going well. However well intentioned, these have contributed to the general public loss of confidence in the Johnson administration's ability to handle our Vietnamese commitment successfully. While President Johnson does reaffirm that we shall not abandon our friends in Vietnam and that the Communists are playing a dangerous game in their stepped up guerrilla operations and anti-U.S. personnel terror, the Senate majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, on February 19 urged the Johnson administration "to encourage rather than spurn French efforts to negotiate with Communist China for the neutralization of southeast Asia. Senator MANSFIELD added that a major commitment of American lives to the 10-year-old guerrilla war is not now justified and that we should therefore welcome a negotiated settlement, at a time when it has become abundantly clear that the war cannot be won by the methods now being employed and that it is probably slowly but surely being lost.

The Government's lack of candor in regard to the Vietnamese situation has been a disservice to millions of Americans who have been led to believe that our efforts have been progressing successfully, and that by 1965 (or as the latest McNamara release puts it "* * * before the end of 1965") we will be able to go home and leave the rest of the task to the Government and army of South Vietnam. One rather suspects that if present trends continue neither the army nor the Government of South Vietnam are likely to survive until 1965. But, whatever the objective situation in South Vietnam may be today (and the contradictory reports which emerge seem to indicate that no one can really be too sure about this), it is surely time that President Johnson went beyond his vague generalizations at UCLA last week, and took us into his confidence, so that we will be better able to understand precisely what our policy

now is, and what, if any, realistic alternatives are open to us. A continuation of the present policy of equivocation, self-contradiction, and propaganda can only be helpful to the enemies of the United States, who seize every opportunity to use our own words against us. It would also be helpful to the Republican candidates and noncandidates who hope to unseat President Johnson in the upcoming presidential elections. The "mess in Vietnam" has been a favorite topic for all leading Republican spokesmen for months, and as Senator DIRKSEN stated on February 27 will be used as a major foreign policy issue in the presidential campaign. The sooner President Johnson reveals what the Government's policy will now be and why, the easier it should be to gain substantial support for such a policy, before it becomes too much of a domestic political football. The following are generally regarded as the five major policy alternatives open to the Government at this time:

1. Complete American withdrawal from Vietnam; this would most likely result in a complete Communist takeover and the consequent loss of U.S. prestige all over Asia and the world, plus the complete loss of Cambodia, Laos, and possibly the rest of southeast Asia. It is therefore not a realistic alternative.

2. A continuation of the present policy of military and economic aid, with some 15,000 U.S. military advisors attempting to help the South Vietnamese Army to defeat the Communist Vietcong. It is difficult to surmise why such a policy should be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past, but given the unacceptability of the other four alternatives, it is the most likely policy for the immediate future.

3. The commitment of major U.S. military forces (Marines, Army, Air Force, Navy) in an all-out attempt to achieve military defeat of the Vietcong guerrilla units. Some military men shudder at this prospect, pointing out that the French tried this and failed and that it is unlikely that we could do any better, even if we could find the enemy which it has been virtually impossible to do whenever large-scale operations against the Vietcong have been undertaken. The Johnson administration also seems to fear adverse domestic reaction to the dispatch of troops at this time.

4. A massive attack by U.S. naval and air units on the "privileged sanctuary" of North Vietnam where the Vietcong supposedly derive their supplies, manpower, weapons, and the organizational direction for their operations. An alternative suggestion along this line is an "American blockade" of the North Vietnamese, similar to our "quarantine" action against Cuba, in an attempt to strangle North Vietnam by economic pressure. Apart from the fact that a Sino-Soviet "airlift" and truck convoys could nullify a blockade, observers on the scene frequently point out that the principal support for the Vietcong is derived from captured U.S. weapons and supplies, and from hundreds of thousands of Vietcong sympathizers among the rural population of South Vietnam, rather than from North Vietnam. The use of South Vietnamese guerrillas in North Vietnam has also been suggested as a potentially helpful measure, but South Vietnamese ineffectiveness against Vietcong guerrillas even in territory nominally controlled by the South Vietnamese Government makes this a most doubtful proposition.

5. The neutralization of South Vietnam, along lines similar to Laos, with the possible mediation efforts of Gen. Charles de Gaulle to secure Communist China's agreement to such neutralization. Few observers expect "neutralization" to be anything more than a temporary face-saving device for the West, so that we can exit gracefully from the scene, knowing full well that a Communist takeover by infiltration, subversion, or coup d'etat would follow fairly closely upon our departure. Such a decision would be politically disastrous for the Johnson administration right now.

When I recently submitted the above five alternatives to some one hundred of my students at the University of Kansas they voted as follows:

	Percent
1. For withdrawal	4¼
2. For continuation of the present policy	6¼
3. For U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam	45½
4. For U.S. military action against both South and North Vietnam	31½
5. For neutralization	12½

If these sentiments are representative of how the majority of Americans feel about the Vietnamese dilemma, and that may well be, President Johnson will increasingly be pressured to take vigorous military action. If he expects to be elected President in 1964, he must then either yield to this pressure or come up with convincing arguments why he rejects alternatives 3 and 4. In my view, only an almost total collapse of the South Vietnamese position would persuade Secretary McNamara and President Johnson that risking greater U.S. involvement would be justified. We may therefore soon be told the hard, sad facts of life in regard to the Vietnamese situation: that there is no military solution to a 20-year-old dilemma which is basically social and political; that we are not prepared to commit a large military force to a jungle war which provides little chance for decisive military engagements; that President Johnson's economic program does not provide for another Korea, and that we do not consider victory in Vietnam to be so vital to our world position, that it would be worthwhile to risk Chinese or Soviet Russian large-scale intervention.

A recent Moscow Tass report warned that U.S. military action of the kind contemplated above was "a venture fraught with the most serious consequences." President Johnson thus probably feels that it would be inexpedient during a presidential election campaign to start what would undoubtedly soon be called "Johnson's war" by the President's Republican opponents. Messrs. Nixon, Rockefeller, Goldwater, et al., could then offer to "go to Vietnam" if elected. Since it is not possible to ascertain at this moment whether a particular policy choice led to Mr. Hilsman's resignation and Senator MANSFIELD's trial balloon, the President can now no longer afford to keep us in the dark or leave us to the mercy of Secretary McNamara's erudite equivocations. The time for greater candor on Vietnam has come, and I for one hope that for the sake of his own political future President Johnson will find the courage to tell the American people the unvarnished and unequivocal truth. If he does, this will gain him our respect and in some cases, our support, which he surely needs at this critical juncture. If nothing else, the President must make it clear to the panacea-hungry public that there are no "easy solutions" to the staggering problems of the global war against communism and that our failure to act vigorously is a matter of prudence rather than of indecision or the inability or unwillingness to face a challenge. In his televised press conference on February 29 President Johnson stated that too much speculation on the situation in Vietnam did our cause there a disservice. I could not agree more and would add that the best way to terminate such speculation is by fully and candidly informing the American people of our assessment and our plans there (within the limits of security) as soon as Secretary McNamara returns from his latest fact-finding mission to the area.

Resolutions Adopted by the New York Board of Rabbis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to several very significant resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the New York Board of Rabbis, on January 29, 1964. This association of Jewish spiritual leaders is one of the largest of its kind in the world. In addition to conducting a chaplaincy program in hospitals, homes for the aged, youth shelters, and correctional institutions, the board devotes its efforts toward social and civic betterment. I heartily and personally endorse their stand in their battle for human rights.

The resolutions follow:

CIVIL RIGHTS

The New York Board of Rabbis calls upon the Congress of the United States to adopt President Johnson's civil rights program. We urge the President and his colleagues in Government, as well as the citizens of the land, to do all they can through enforcement and through the power of leadership to see to it that the evil of segregation be removed and the deprivation of civil rights be ended as speedily as possible.

RACIAL JUSTICE IN SYNAGOGUE POLICIES

Cognizant of the failure of our country to confer full and equal rights for all its citizens, and recognizing the special role that religious groups play to help in the correction of this failure, we call upon the synagogues of our city and State to confront the issue of race and to bring to bear upon it the religious principles enunciated by their national movements.

We urge the synagogues of New York to continue to implement a program of action to achieve the following goals: (1) To teach the principle of racial justice in the congregations' educational, cultural, and worship programs; (2) racial justice in the congregations' cooperative relations with other institutions; (3) racial justice in the lives of individual congregants.

IMMIGRATION

The New York Board of Rabbis welcomes the recent statement of our President in support of changes in our immigration laws which will remove the discriminatory legislation based on the national, ethnic, and racial origins of prospective immigrants.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

America's system of public education is not fully meeting the needs of our citizens, or of the Nation as a whole. Outmoded school facilities, understaffed school personnel, and the lack of adequate material endanger the quality of education for our society.

Throughout American history there have been programs of Federal aid to public education. Because we regard our system of education as crucial to the preservation of democracy, we urge the enactment of legislation that would provide for increasing Federal assistance for this purpose.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

In a time of rapidly increasing longevity and rising medical costs, our society cannot

ignore the plight of millions of elderly citizens who cannot meet the expense of serious or protracted illness.

Medical care for the aged is a right to which all citizens are entitled by virtue of living in an enlightened society. The requirement to demonstrate the inability to pay before receiving medical care infringes upon the dignity of people who desperately need this aid.

We therefore urge the enactment of Federal legislation to finance such medical care for the elderly within the framework of the social security system.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

We express our wholehearted support of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which will slow the spread of nuclear weapons to countries which do not now possess them. It will diminish the danger of new radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests and will give nuclear nations an opportunity to develop confidence and trust in one another.

We urge the United States to continue and intensify its efforts to control the nuclear arms race. We further call upon Congress to expand the constructive work in which the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is now engaged.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The rate of unemployment poses a continuing problem to America. The expanding population, the influx of young people into the labor market, the reluctance to hire older people and the impact of automation combine together with other factors to make unemployment an ever-present danger. The challenge of this complex problem demands an overall plan by Government, labor, and management which will devise means and procure necessary funds to meet the problem. This is in consonance with the Jewish concept that the highest degree of righteousness is to procure work for a fellow man, thereby helping him to become self-sustaining.

POVERTY

Millions of our citizens have been living in substandard conditions of housing and general impoverishment. The better things of life, even the modest necessities that so many take for granted, have not reached into their way of life.

We heartily endorse President Johnson's call for an all-out struggle against poverty in America. We urge that an all-out program to combat poverty deserves the highest kind of financial support so that every American citizen may be raised to a level of economic adequacy.

We also endorse Mayor Wagner's call for a program to combat the vast areas of poverty in our city and State. This, too, requires the highest kind of financial support and cooperation among local, State, and Federal agencies to assist in the development of a concentrated program of improved housing, adequate employment and provisions for medical care for those impoverished of our State and Nation.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

At this season of the year, our thoughts are on the forthcoming Passover holidays. We hope that the Soviet leaders will make facilities available for the baking of matzohs (unleavened bread) and for their distribution in sufficient supply to satisfy the needs of the religious Jews in time for the Passover. If such facilities cannot be readied in time, the New York Board of Rabbis stands prepared and eager to send a supply of matzohs for the Jews of the Soviet Union.

We appeal to the Soviet Union to grant Jews religious freedom. The enrollment of the Yeshivah (seminary) in Moscow has now been reduced to 1 student, in contrast to last year's enrollment of 14. It is inconceivable that, in a Jewish population numbering millions, there should be only one person interested in attending the seminary. A yeshivah of one student is but a mockery of an institution. If the technical obstacles were removed and if prospective students were not discouraged by overt and covert means, many more Jews would take advantage of the opportunity to study and become religious functionaries.

In the present-day U.S.S.R. there is a great demand for and a shortage of prayer shawls, prayer books, Bibles, phylacteries, and other religious articles that are used both in home and synagogue. Since there seems to be no means of satisfying that demand within the Soviet Union itself, we hope that the Soviet Government will allow the importation of these religious objects without any hindrance.

The Soviet Government has recognized the need of religious groups within its borders to maintain contact with their coreligionists elsewhere. Toward this end, a delegation of Russian Orthodox clergy visited the United States last year and a group of Protestant clergy has been received officially in the U.S.S.R. Soviet Moslems are allowed to make pilgrimages to their Holy City, Mecca.

However, no such permission has been granted the Jews. Contact with Jewish groups outside the U.S.S.R. has been forbidden; no group of Jewish clergy has been invited to the Soviet Union, nor have Soviet Jews been permitted to make religious pilgrimages to their Holy City, Jerusalem. We again appeal to the Soviet authorities to permit its citizens of the Jewish faith at least the same religious right accorded other citizens of the U.S.S.R.

We hopefully trust that the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of religion will be accorded the Jews in the Soviet Union, enabling them to practice the faith of their fathers and the traditions of their religion.

THE MIDDLE EAST

The New York Board of Rabbis hails the recent pronouncement of our Government declaring that our policy in the Middle East is based on the principle of "insuring the security and integrity of the individual states of the area—including Israel." We commend its support of Israel's water development plan as set forth within the framework of the regional water development project recommended by the late Eric Johnson.

The cause of justice will be served by making constructive use of the God-given resources of water for this area. Israel's proposed plan for utilization of these resources will in no way jeopardize Arab access to the lifegiving waters. Any plan which will redound to the benefit of the entire area for the benefit of Jew and Arab alike, should be encouraged.

GENOCIDE

The New York Board of Rabbis strongly urges the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention of the U.N., which outlaws mass annihilation of any group. Our Nation, which, which has historically supported the cause of human rights, has been derelict in advancing this important doctrine, which has already been supported by many free nations seeking to express the conscience of mankind in this crucial issue.

THE JEWS IN IRAQ

We call upon the United Nations to investigate the most recent discriminatory legislation against Jews in Iraq requiring that every Jew report to Iraqui authorities within 90 days to submit proof of Iraqui nationality. This latest restrictive measure against Jews allows the Government arbitrarily to deprive Jews still residing in Iraq of their citizenship and control of their property.

This discrimination contravenes the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance now being considered by the U.N. Subcommission on Prevention and Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Not since the Nazi era has any government enacted legislation openly based solely by religious criteria.

It Sort of Makes You Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a column in the Washington Evening Star of March 2, 1964, written by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, caught my attention. I want to commend it to all the Members of the House and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Our beloved America is a great country and has many times demonstrated a capacity to withstand assaults upon the foundation which has made this Nation the envy of most enlightened people in the world. The most recent attack on the cornerstone of our national foundation is being made by a curious element of young people who profess to reject the basic ethics that are an integral part of the American system. This basic American ethic—call it moral principles or whatever you wish—is hard to positively identify, and perhaps even more elusive than ever today, but it is first of all based upon a belief in God. The founders of our country and framers of our Constitution seemed to take it for granted that Americans believed in God, although the Constitution carefully provided the individual freedom to practice the religion of his choice and positively prohibited the establishment of a state religion.

Other recognized virtues that were emphasized in our literature and our schools were honesty, thrift, morality, having and holding a job, patriotism, and service to neighbors and fellow citizens. It seems we may be laying aside some of these characteristics of Americanism for status symbols such as the size of our home, the size and number of any automobiles, or where and how we spend our leisure hours and our vacations.

With this in mind, it is not peculiar that we should have young people protesting the current American scene. Young people like to protest, and this is fine when older people lose touch with changing times and are unsympathetic to new ideas, and possibly setting bad examples by their own actions. I am at a loss to interpret the objections of the bearded, unwashed, uncombed, unemployed beatnik-type portion of our younger generation. It is gratifying that the portion is small. If they have a message, I am not with it. The message does not come through.

The message from the millions of bright-eyed, well-groomed, ambitious, intelligent young men and women in America does come through. They want

a chance to be what they can with the attributes with which they were endowed. America owes them no more. We are failing as parents and members of this generation if they have less.

Mr. Jones contrasts the irresponsibility and world-owes-me-a-living attitude of the present beatnik with the independence and self-reliance of the Amish farmers of Pennsylvania. It is no doubt true that American agriculture would not have achieved the magnificent accomplishment of providing Americans with the cheapest and highest quality food supply in the world if all farmers had adhered to the horse-and-buggy methods of the Amish. It would be interesting to know, however, if adherence to many of their independent and self-reliant virtues might have kept our country more in the image of the Declaration of Independence which we profess to admire.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the column written by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IT SORT OF MAKES YOU WONDER—GOVERNMENT PUTS BEATS ON THE DOLE, BUT BADGERS THE SELF-SUFFICIENT AMISH

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

NEW YORK CITY.—I am sitting in this little coffee-house on Third Street in Greenwich Village watching the beats.

The place is a gutted-out store with bare brick walls and rough pine tables and benches. It is decorated with some far-out pieces of art, reminding you of finger-painting day in kindergarten. Right in front of a strong spotlight is a raised platform of unpainted boards that holds one straight chair. You can either sit in the chair or stand and place your foot on the seat, depending on how you like to wallop the guitar.

Coffee is a dollar a mug and the entertainers make their pittance by passing around a basket. Here and there a tourist will drop in a buck, but the Greenwich Village habitués rarely toss in more than a dime. It seems to work out that the more you are with it the less you give.

Down the street and around the corner there are larger and more famous places where you can buy wine and where combos alternate with unwashed people reciting dirty blank verse with great attention to its "social protest." It is in these brassier coffee-houses that the ban-the-bomb and justice-for-Castro crowd hangs out, perhaps because there are more people to see them.

But my little coffeehouse is for the beat-Puritans. Only coffee. Only folk music.

Folk music is simple and uncomplicated, born of log cabins and campfires, and sad with unrequited love and untimely death. You watch the spectators. Long-haired boys clad in stained slacks and open shirts. Frowzy girls with unwashed hair, studied in their ugliness. And you think what a colossal joke it is that these who profess to despise uniformity have slipped into an easily recognizable uniform, the uniform of the slob.

But there is something more. Here are many able-bodied young people who not only accept but seek public welfare payments. Yet they pride themselves upon their compassion for the poor who, if they are to be helped, must be helped by the labor of someone. Here are the pleaders for peace at any price who have never tasted the horrors of war but who have concluded that no cause is worth dying for.

Here are the laughers at law, the scorners of morality, the rejectors of thrift, the scoffers at squares who work—absorbed completely in the quest for their own self-satisfaction. And they gather in this smoky grotto to stare at the ceiling, to twitch their shoulders and softly snap their fingers as the guitar men and women sing music that is easy on the brain.

So, to the Amish. Later I was at Lancaster, Pa., and a friend lent me his car so that I might drive out into the beautiful farm country where the barns are the fattest, the cattle the sleekest, and the fields the neatest in all America.

There are some striking parallels between the Amish and the beats. For both, beards are the style. Both dress peculiarly. And while the beats seek the simplicity of primitive music, the Amish turn their backs on modern machinery and drive the Pennsylvania roads in their black buggies.

There are, however, a few differences.

The Amish have no divorce, no crime, no juvenile delinquency, no unemployment or old-age problems. They take care of their own. They refuse Government subsidies. They take no money for not plowing a field. They dislike insurance. If a barn burns the whole community rushes to rebuild it. Because they supply their own social security they object to social security taxes.

This has brought down upon them the wrath of the huge national bureaucracy which sees only chaos if some people are permitted to look elsewhere than to the Government for their welfare. So the Amish have been repeatedly yanked into the Federal courts. A couple of years ago Government agents even seized Amish horses at plowing time to satisfy social security judgments.

We have a system of government under which all beats are comfortable and the Amish are bullied and badgered.

It sort of makes you wonder.

Rev. Charles H. Neff, Man of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is very hard to find words adequate in expressing one's self about the death of one who was a real friend and for whom you had the deepest and most affectionate feeling. That is the case when I learned of the passing of the Reverend Charles H. Neff, pastor of the Old Tennent Presbyterian Church, Tennent, N.J. Tennent Church is located at the site of the Battle of Monmouth and has interred in its churchyard British and American soldiers killed in that historic victory of Gen. George Washington.

Dr. Neff served this church for close to 40 years and he kept alive the principles for which our soldiers fought in the War of Independence. He was a stanch American and to his sturdy Christian faith he added a stern discipline for what is right and honest. With it all he had a tender and compassionate heart and a gentle sense of humor which won him the devotion of all who knew him. His death is a serious loss to the community where he served so faithfully and well but his memory will endure forever and his simple honest faith in the goodness of God will have its influence on generations yet to come.

The editorial appearing in the Freehold Transcript of March 5, "Rev. Charles H. Neff, Man of Faith," eloquently describes the character of this fine man.

REV. CHARLES H. NEFF, MAN OF FAITH

Charles Harnish Neff, pastor of the Old Tennent Presbyterian Church for the past 38 years, was a man with a rare and priceless quality. He was able to reserve the glories of the past in such a way that they made the present more real and the future more hopeful. Called from seminary to serve this most historic congregation, he spent his entire ministry artfully blending the homiletic, pastoral, and social style of such illustrious predecessors as Gilbert and John Tennet, George Whitfield and Dominie Simms with a quite modern and enlightened sense of the tremendous changes occurring both in our 20th century world and our rapidly changing Monmouth County.

With country shrewdness, scholarly devotion to learning, indefatigable Christian piety and a receptively vibrant wit, he made the visits of school day-trippers, casual tourists, and history buffs alike a satisfying and memorable experience. With his other worldly wisdom and his endless patience, he guided the families of his parish through the joys and pains of marriage, vocational choice, child rearing, community service, bereavement, doubt, and catastrophe to a more steadfast trust in the God who rules lovingly over all.

To fully appreciate what this man has mean to our county one must speak to 10,000 different people and one must remember that for the last third of the ministry he worked without the support of his life partner and with the hourly devastation of debilitating physical illness. Blessed are the people who are given such a man for a pastor. They have been given the special task of living the present in the light of what God has done in the past; and living it with faith.

Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships that are awarded as the top prize.

I am proud to announce that the winner from the State of Ohio is from my congressional district, Mr. Robert Heydorn, 3076 Markle Drive, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio. His winning speech reads as follows:

CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Bob Heydorn)

My voice echoes from a survivor of two millenniums, an essay called Politics. I am history's great authority on the state and the role of the citizen, for I am Aristotle, a citizen of my own right in the city-state of Athens in the third century of Christ.

Western philosophers now say that the first true ideas of what I called democracy appeared in our Greek civilization. It was I who pioneered the very concepts of individualism that are responsible for the modern

philosophies concerning the nature of man. Yet, much has changed.

In our Athens, citizens were a select lot. They were rich—inheriting citizenship as well as wealth. Men were either quite wealthy or quite poor—the middle class was not of primary importance. Only my class, the rich, could afford education, so social opportunities were blocked to most by ignorance. There was great challenge to the monied class, for they were erecting an entirely new form of government. But then again we had little else to do. By far, the largest class was the poor, yet they had no power whatsoever in deciding their destiny. Their only challenge was to exist.

As I look upon this ever-changing world from my place in eternity, I can see easily the panorama of changing government, and when I take a glimpse at this wandering planet earth, I see the effects of change embodied in the United States of America, a progressive Nation within what is now termed the free world.

Now there is a true challenge to all of mankind. For now, native born and naturalized, regardless of wealth or education, have the right and the privilege to exercise a ballot for freedom held so precious by a few of us in Athens. In Greece, the challenge was for the wealthy, for citizenship represented the paragon of responsibility. And now in the western world, responsibility is delegated to all—the supreme trust in the individual. A plan of this nature requires wide-spread public education, a national interest and certainly an abundance of daring. For 174 years this noble experiment has perpetuated, and during this span the new concept of the citizen has steadily progressed. However, this experiment can be destroyed and in much less time. Again, I emphasize that citizenship is the challenge of responsibility. All must desire and possess education and become informed of issues if a country is to be sure of an intelligent electorate. There must be a national interest with a genuine desire to exercise one's right and privileges by the ballot and in the courts. And citizens must have the daring to see that a deserving neighbor is extended the same rights and privileges as they.

A true democratic republic is a challenge to each citizen. Where we of the past have failed, you of today must succeed. Test your democracy, join mine and be buried in the annals of eternity, hold true to ideals and meet the challenge of your noble undertaking as a responsible citizen.

Federal Power and Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial entitled "Federal Power and Civil Rights Bill," written by Mr. C. L. Dancey, editor, in the Peoria Journal Star of March 5, 1964, in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FEDERAL POWER AND CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

A lot of heat is going to be generated in debate on the civil rights bill in the Senate of the United States—much of it by people who don't know a thing about the proposed laws.

The truth is that by any sober judgment of proper processes and the functions of a democratic government, this is a terrible bill. And, as we see it, the truth is that unless someone can come up with a better one that will accomplish the same purposes, it ought to be passed.

The bill is a scary one in terms of the doors it opens for wide abuse of powers. As one direct example, it gives the President power to administer what amounts to mass punishment on whole States and sections, the innocent as well as the guilty, without anything resembling a due process of law to even decide the merits of the case.

It makes the President, or more precisely one of his anonymous, faceless bureaucrats into a prosecutor, jury, and judge over whether or not discrimination is involved in certain circumstances—with the arbitrary power of shutting off Federal funds into a whole district or State—technically because one person committed one act that he regards as discriminatory.

This provides a legal basis for a Federal Government to run amuck with power.

Most of its provisions make it very easy to various forms of business activity to get involved in litigation—and very hard to conclude that litigation.

Now settling such issues in court is the fairest way to get a result, but unhappily, we live in an age where going to court on a matter that hamstrings the conduct of any economic operation involves such delays, usually, that the result can be a much heavier automatic economic punishment inflicted on the innocent than would be the legal penalty inflicted if he were found guilty promptly.

So, that scares people, too.

In short, we are setting up a system where it will be pretty easy to get a raw deal.

However, the raw deal is not automatic.

There are powerful moral reasons and powerful reasons of practical politics why this power should not be abused.

Indeed, the civil rights bill would not be in any serious trouble, and much of its opposition would melt away if we had not had too many recent examples in which this kind of power has been abused.

We have had it become too fashionable for powers of the Federal Government to be used to punish people and to threaten people in matters that had nothing whatever to do with the purposes and restrictions involved in the law which bestowed the power originally.

It is that history which makes the powers involved raise the hackles on the necks of so many people in the U.S. Senate, and gives them pause.

You can get a raw deal out of this law, administered by a Federal authority with its own purposes that have nothing to do with civil rights.

However, that "maybe" fact must stand up face to face with a fact that has no "maybe" about it. Many Negroes are getting a raw deal right now. In matters of employment, voting rights, schooling, etc., they go before agencies where one man or one commission serves as "prosecutor, judge, and jury" and gives them a raw deal without appeal to due process.

We can and have an obligation to run the risk of putting ourselves in that position in order to help get the Negro out of it.

He's already accustomed to the kind of treatment we are merely afraid of in "maybe" and imaginary dimension.

The simple fact is that with the vast sums now in the control of the Federal Establishment, and the vast powers other than money, new grants of power are not our problem. Our problem is placing this power in respectful hands where it will not be abused.

The possibilities of such a law are a long way from the realities of it, if we react as a united people against dictatorial methods and misuse, and a long way from it, regardless, when those possibilitities have been diluted by the power of practical politics.

At the same time, a massive abuse of the power of election boards, employers, and others against the Negro by discrimination is not a possibility but a living reality.

Something must be done about it—and the risks involved must be run.

The alternative of accepting a real evil and condoning it is unthinkable.

—C. L. DANCEY.

The Dangers of a Premature War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic administration has once again suceeded in making a slogan out of what should be a carefully planned and executed program to alleviate the burdens of our poorer citizens. An editorial in the February 1964 issue of Fortune calls attention to the dangers inherent in a war against poverty which is ill conceived and haphazardly administered by the Federal Government. The private sector of our economy has been fighting poverty for years with limited Federal guidance and constraints. The problem is not completely solved, to be sure, but before we assent to a new series of public programs let us make sure that we consider our priorities with care and that the proposed new programs will not increase poverty by restraining general economic progress. I hope my colleagues will study the fine suggestions made by the editors of Fortune:

LET'S NOT HAVE A "WAR" AGAINST POVERTY

President Johnson in his state of the Union message found a simple phrase to express a growing concern of Americans: he said we must fight a "war against poverty." The goal would be "not only to relieve the symptoms of poverty, but to cure it—and above all, to prevent it." Most of the comment on his speech seems to applaud the "war," accepting it as an obvious and long-postponed duty of an affluent society. But unless we understand that a Federal effort to eliminate poverty is more novel, more complex, and more hazardous than putting a man on the moon, we can do this society—including its least privileged members—a lot more harm than good.

Who are the poor? The first impulse of a statistical age is to answer with round numbers. The poor, it is widely said, are the 30 million Americans who live in "income units" with less than $2,000 a year. This statistic conceals enormous differences in the actual condition of groups that make up the 30 million. An aged widow living on $1,800 a year in a small town is not in the same situation as a widow and four children living on welfare payments in Los Angeles. The 30 million also includes those whom Senator GOLDWATER has in mind when he demands an inquiry into the "attitudes" of relief recipients and suggests that those who are physically able be "put to work to earn their benefits." Governor Rockefeller, approaching the problem very differently, stresses the circumstances of the poor rather than their attitudes. He speaks of "minority groups * * * with no experience, no training. They come to a big city, and these people are lost."

In many cases it is impossible to say to what extent attitudes of shiftlessness are created by circumstances of poverty or vice versa. It is dangerous to make sweeping assumptions either way and to base public policies on these assumptions. If we remove from relief recipients all pressure of individual responsibility for their poverty, then we may condemn to permanent dependence many who might otherwise escape. If, on the other hand, we step up the pressure of personal responsibility, many will fail to meet the challenge.

Quite possibly, President Johnson's specific proposals will include some programs that the Federal Government can properly undertake. One such may be the effort to revive the distressed areas of Appalachia. But the sloganeering atmosphere of an election year will make it difficult to choose among proposals. In this context the President's word, "war," is unfortunate. Wars are conducted under the sole direction of the Federal Government. In wartime we suspend considerations of what's good for the economy. Yet it is the production system that attacks the causes of poverty most effectively—a fact strangely omitted from President Johnson's speech. Decade after decade the incidence of poverty in the United States has been diminished, not by Government programs but by an advancing private economy.

A single-minded "war" on poverty might produce legislation that would damage the economy in a way that would actually retard economic progress—and the reduction of poverty. To take one possibility; many employed people are poor; a $2-an-hour minimum-wage law would promise to raise them above the poverty level; but, in fact, the probable effect of such a law would be to increase unemployment and swell relief rolls.

Instead of oversimplifying the problem in a phrase, we need to break it up into its components and deal with them piecemeal. Medical care for the indigent aged hasn't much in common with retraining workers displaced by automation. Private charity, corporate philanthropy, local government efforts to relieve distress should all be stepped up beyond their present levels. Such efforts to meet the multiple forms of poverty one by one should not be drowned in a slogan which suggests that a "war on poverty" is the prime and direct responsibility of the Federal Government.

Commemoration Subscribed to by All the Christian Churches, of Perry Hall, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I include therein a Christian commemoration subscribed to by all the Christian churches of Perry Hall, Md.:

To the Churches in Perry Hall:

Stricken with grief and sorrow at the untimely death of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, the clergymen of the Perry Hall ministerium join with their countrymen in prayers to Almighty God for Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the other members of the Kennedy family.

In this hour of despair we ask all communicants to join in corporate penitence. May we reflect upon the responsibility we all must bear in this national tragedy.

Let us unite in prayer with all Christian men throughout the world for our Nation, its leaders, and its new President.

Rev. EVAN J. BARTELL,
St. Michael's Lutheran Church.
Rev. HARRY E. BRUNETT,
St. Paul's Episcopal Church.
Rev. JOHN P. BUCHHEISTER,
Perry Hall Methodist Church.
Rev. W. T. DURR,
Perry Hall Presbyterian Church.
Rev. CHARLES K. RIEPE,
St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church.
Rev. LUTHER STEARNES,
Camp Chapel Methodist Church.

The 1963 George E. Stringfellow Cancer Editorial Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, April is Cancer Control Month. Throughout the United States and its possessions an intensive educational campaign is to be carried out in an effort to enlist every American in the fight to stamp out an invader, so far unconquered by medical science, which this year will cause the deaths of some 284,000 American men, women, and children. The latest report of our Surgeon General without equivocation confirms the American Cancer Society's position over many years on the causal link between lung cancer and cigarette smoking and calls for appropriate remedial action.

It is but another incentive to spur on this drive to find the basic causes and perhaps the definitive cures for cancer. In this crusade the American Cancer Society, which last year allocated nearly $12,500,000 for research has the approval and cooperation of the National Cancer Institute. It has the support of 2 million volunteers, who visit hundreds of thousands of homes and bring encouraging messages of progress and hope.

The fight is not theirs alone. It is a challenge to all of us. Therefore, today I am urging that we get behind the cancer crusade with our money and our various talents so that the day of success may be brought that much closer. Of the 59 divisions of the American Cancer Society, none is more active than the New Jersey division, which has the support of the State's residents and raises more than $1 million annually to carry on the cancer fight. The division also receives great support from the State's newspapers which participate in an annual contest for the George E. Stringfellow Cancer Editorial Awards. Named for the first president of the division, two plaques are awarded yearly, one for weekly papers and one for daily papers.

It is my great pleasure to announce to you the winners of the 1963 contest and ask their inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD. The 1963 daily winner written by Frank R. Oliver, Union City, N.J., Hudson Dispatch, "Relentless Fight Against Cancer":

RELENTLESS FIGHT AGAINST CANCER

While greater public attention than normally is given during the month of April to the fight against the scourge of cancer there is a segment of the population that throughout the year is conducting a relentless battle against a disease that kills one person every 2 minutes.

Mainly the reasons for this greater concentration on a crusade for better health are to encourage more persons to become alert to the causes of cancer and to make a financial contribution to the program of American Cancer Society which is constantly sponsoring projects, tests and more tests in an untiring pursuit of a complete cure.

Hudson and Bergen County chapters are an integral part of the national campaign that is aimed at cornering completely a curse of humanity. Few, vicariously or otherwise, have not felt the sting of this death-dealing malady. Some know about cancer from personal experiences. They are those who have witnessed the long suffering and death of loved ones. Others only know of it through what they read. The stories are poignant, moving, heart-rending and usually lead to persons making generous contributions of time, money or both in a major volunteer humane effort. The battle is made more urgent by the knowledge that rolls of victims of cancer grow constantly. While major advances have been made, more study, more procedures, more education are essential if the numerous already cataloged sarcomas are to be arrested and eradicated.

A major breakthrough has been effected by science and in order to insure further progress considerable amounts of money are required. This year Hudson County chapter, under direction of County Supervisor John Deegan, is seeking to raise $80,000. Last year the $55,000 quota was oversubscribed. In Bergen County the goal has again been set at $200,000 with Mrs. Walter Grebenstein of Cliffside Park as county chairman. Mrs. Rosemary Yurich of Fort Lee is heading the campaign in East Bergen. The chapter last year raised $187,000.

This money, that is raised by an army of volunteer workers, has done much to provide a more hopeful outlook for those unfortunates stricken with cancer and members of their family. Because these funds have made possible more skillful surgery, more refined radiation and more effective drugs one of three cancer victims is being saved today. During the past decade almost 1 million persons have been "cured" each year. That is they showed no signs of the disease 5 years after treatment ended. Each year the number is increasing. More than half are being cured through surgery and the rest by X-rays, or surgery plus X-rays. Many among them were the wise and lucky ones who, alert to the symptoms of cancer, underwent regular checkups and their cancers were still localized when doctors went to work and were able to check the spread of the virluent, destructive disorders.

And while scientists search most everywhere for new drugs, new methods for battling cancer, societies such as those in Hudson and Bergen Counties are doing their utmost to bring relief to the patients within their areas and to ease the burdens of heads of households where the malevolent malady has made felt its force.

The societies are aware that economics can become a crisis to a distraught family. Home-costs care for a patient such as drugs, treatments, nursing, and hospital equipment, are far beyond an average family's financial means. A comfortable cash resesrve can become depleted in a short space of time. A family with little or no cash reserve is in

desperate straits. Making those stricken as comfortable as possible is a major task of local cancer societies. To carry out their missions of mercy effectively they have organized a homemaker service, nursing service, a motor corps to transport patients to doctors and clinics and numerous other functions in the name of humaneness.

These selfless groups are deserving of every ounce of help the public can spare. So when a volunteer approaches you for a contribution, please be as generous as possible.

The 1963 Weekly Winner—written by Les Malamut, Union Leader, Union, N.J., "To Face the Need":

TO FACE THE NEED

The best answer is to face it.

We must face the need for research and for funds to conduct that research.

We must face the need to know what it is we fear and how our fears can be tempered by reason and education.

We must face the need to eliminate the silence and the darkness—we must learn about it, talk about it, write about it, do something about it.

For it is the light of knowledge that helps the cancer crusade volunteer raise the funds that help the researcher raise the odds that help the physician raise the hopes of the patient.

For it is the light of knowledge—not mute fears multiplying with ignorance—that sends us to a physician for a medical checkup annually, that makes us face the need to learn cancer's danger signals, that directs us to the doctor if one of these signals lasts longer than 2 weeks, that tells the cancer patient more and more people like him are being saved each year.

"What are the odds the growth is malignaht?" we asked the doctor a year ago. In fear * * * with halting words * * * for the patient was the one we hold most dear—and the reply would be more important than any we had known. The doctor told us.

There were more and more questions—the ones we posed, those from her and from our children, those from cherished friends. There were questions about surgery, about treatment, about radiation therapy, about time.

Dreaded at first, the answers we received brought enlightenment (surgery to remove, radiation to destroy) * * * then hope (early detection was most important) * * * then confidence (survival rates were with us).

There had been fear and gloom and winter when we left for the hospital. But spring had come when we returned—the grass was green, there were hints of blossoms on the trees, the bulbs sprouted anew with life.

So there were tears of joy.

And there was gratitude to those who had brought enlightenment through money, through research, through education, through compassion.

They had faced the need.

Information about obtaining educational literature, acting as a volunteer in Union's Cancer Crusade or making a contribution can be obtained from the chairman, Mrs. Walter M. Hildebrandt, and the cochairman, Mrs. Edmund Hamill.

Iowa General Assembly Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith House Concurrent Resolution 3, recently adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa in special session:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the current livestock market prices are disastrously low resulting in a depression of Iowa's total economy; and

Whereas the recent red meat imports voluntary agreements with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland do not contribute to a sound agricultural economy; and

Whereas the President of the United States has the executive authority under the existing law to administer meat imports; now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, the Senate concurring, That the General Assembly respectfully request the President of the United States to base agreements on a level no higher than the import average of the year 1958 through 1962; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress from Iowa.

We, Robert W. Naden, speaker of the house of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, chief clerk of the house, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the house and senate of the 60th general assembly in extraordinary session.

ROBERT W. NADEN,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Congressional Hearings on South Vietnam—20 Questions for Better Public Understanding of the Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last October, I called for a full congressional review of the war in South Vietnam and the role of the United States in it. Today I repeat this request. I suggest that it is our obligation, as citizens and as elected representatives, to call upon outside experts, as well as the Government spokesmen who have heretofore monopolized information on this conflict. Americans risking their lives in this wartorn country have described this war an "an endless tunnel"; we must know whether this is so, or whether something can indeed be done to insure that our sons do not repeat the tragedy of Dien Bien Phu.

In the 2 years that American troops, money, and supplies have been pouring into South Vietnam on a large scale to advise and support the South Vietnamese in their death struggle with the Communists, we have heard many conflicting reports about our function in southeast Asia. On a Monday not long ago the American public was told that the Communists had made considerable progress in the past few months; on Tuesday, the same authority claimed that the anti-Communst South Vietnamese had made considerable progress in the past 2 weeks; and on Wednesday, we heard, from the same source, that "things have never looked so bad." Is it any wonder that speculation is rife?

A month later we are told that the basic military problem is in South Vietnam itself and that action in North Vietnam will perform no miracle. A few days after that another high-ranking official reveals that in the last few weeks, a deliberate buildup of heavy weapons from North Vietnam has been observed.

I support America's commitment to maintain southeast Asia's independence; what is more, I want to see that this commitment is carried out. I recognize that there is no magic cure for the crippling virus of Communist guerrilla warfare. I say merely that we have got to take our hands away from our eyes. For 2 years or more we have been playing blindfolded against a team that sees clearly. Yet we cannot wish the Communists out of southeast Asia. Isvestia declares that we are now changing the rules of the game. Just what are the rules and what is this deadly game? More important, what are the stakes?

The American people and their representatives have a right to know the answers to these questions. Over 200 Americans have lost their lives in this tragic conflict. Hundreds of millions of dollars have poured into South Vietnam, along with uncounted millions of dollars in planes, supplies, and weapons for our own troops. While we have been blindfolded, the Vietcong have gained almost complete control over the Mekong Delta, which used to be a key rice-exporting area, and have made alarming gains in the central provinces where we were confident of South Vietnamese control. In 1962 and 1963, we have now learned, the Vietcong captured enough American-made weapons to arm practically their entire force.

Recently a New Yorker sent me a letter from a relative stationed in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD. In order to spare this disheartened young man from any possible punishment for speaking his mind, I have omitted any identifying information from his letter. He writes as follows:

The article you sent about the Army-Air Force battle was terrific and 100 percent true. We see it every day and it's a crying shame. There are so many things going on here that you wonder how the United States ever won a war; it is a very poorly run war, believe me. The Army mentioned the Mohawk, saying they are testing it over here with 8 planes. They had 15 originally but have only 5 now, the rest were all shot down and they cost $1 million each.

They are designed to do the same job our planes do and although they are slightly faster and carry a little firepower, they are the biggest waste of money the country has seen. The helicopters they speak so highly of are being shot down daily due to their vulnerability. The statistics they come up with do not reflect what the fighting man knows is the truth. The soldiers are almost refusing to fly without Air Force fighter cover, when they go in with choppers only they run into a wall of enemy fire every time. It's only the wheels who are pushing Army air, the men on the ground who need the help, want fighter cover. It's a fact that the choppers are shooting up their own people. They have 18- and 19-year-old kids

running the machineguns and when they get into the landing zone they squeeze the trigger and don't stop firing until they're on the way home. Consequently they shoot anything in their path, Vietcong, friendly troops, other choppers, it's a crime. They forget to mention the nighttime. Every night 10 to 20 forts are attacked by the Vietcong and there is no possible way to defend them, choppers can't fly at night, so the Air Force goes out to them. By bombing and strafing around the forts almost every one has been saved because of air support. Every day we're losing more ground to the Vietcong, they're getting stronger, smarter, and better equipped * * *. Most of the Americans here are doing more harm than good, living in Saigon at a fancy hotel, swimming pools, making extra money by flying once a month. I could tell you stories for an hour about the waste here, maybe I will sometime. Of the 16,000 men here, 10,000 are 100-percent useless. But that's another story. What we should do is pull out 90 percent of our people and keep the money coming, the war would go no different and the Vietcong will not be able to kill more Americans at least. You can't imagine what a mess this place is, the industrial might of America forced to fight on guerrilla terms is outclassed, it's going to take the Vietnamese themselves to win this one.

How many Americans are receiving letters like this which predict that the war will be lost by the end of this year? How can we put an end to the undermining of morale, the fearful rumors, and crippling speculation about this war unless the Government brings questions like this out into the open and provides honest answers?

When one hears in one breath that we are going to stay in South Vietnam to the finish, and in the next that we are going to withdraw in less than 2 years, one has difficulty understanding just what we do intend to do. When our President tells the North Vietnamese that they are "playing a dangerous game," we would like to know just what that means, and not have to rely on inspired newspaper speculation.

What is more, if this is a primarily South Vietnamese war, why is not it up to the South Vietnamese command to determine whether terrorist or guerrilla or other activities in North Vietnam would be useful. Do not Secretary Rusk's recent comments, downgrading the usefulness of such actions, explode the myth that the South Vietnamese are running this war?

When at last a regime appears in South Vietnam that recognizes that this war is primarily a political affair, that the South Vietnamese people are the key to its successful completion, we want to know what they are doing to win over this warweary peasantry.

People are not satisfied with word that "the proper course is being followed" in South Vietnam. What is the proper course? concerns them much more.

I am therefore sending to the Defense Department and the Department of State 20 questions about the present situation in South Vietnam and the actions now being taken to improve it. These are important questions, and in my views, they should have full and frank answers. The Congress and the American people want the answers.

Obviously, no one wants military secrets to be disclosed, but neither do we want vital information about our Nation's policies to be withheld in an unwarranted security cloak. The people have the right to know where we are going and what we are doing in Vietnam. Answers to these questions are imperative to clear up the confusion and provide the information which is now lacking and which is essential if future policies in this area are to enjoy the united support and understanding of the public and the Congress. Perhaps these questions cannot be answered until the present on-the-spot evaluation is concluded but certainly promptly thereafter we should be informed.

These 20 questions are:

First. Is the strategic hamlet program being continued? How many such hamlets are now in existence? How many have been overrun by Vietcong forces since their establishment? What is being done to insure beyond doubt the security of these hamlets in the future?

Second. What areas of South Vietnam are today under the control of the Communists?

Third. How many anti-Communist village leaders have been assassinated by the Vietcong since January 1, 1962?

Fourth. How many weapons have been captured from the South Vietnamese by Vietcong since early 1962? On a weekly basis, how many have been captured since November 1, 1963? How many have been recaptured?

Fifth. What is the average cost per month of American participation in the war in South Vietnam? What is the cost of military assistance and other payments to the South Vietnamese? What is the cost of direct U.S. activities?

Sixth. How many American planes and helicopters, flown by American personnel, have been shot down over South Vietnam in the past 2 years?

Seventh. To what extent is the Vietcong operation self-sustaining and independent, and to what extent is it supported or sustained by elements outside South Vietnam?

Eighth. What is being done to cut off Vietcong supply lines from other nations? Has the Ho Chi Minh trail been blocked?

Ninth. What action has been taken on Cambodian Prince Sihanouk's proposal to seal Cambodia's borders against Communist guerrillas? What action has been taken to seal Laotian borders against Communist forays?

Tenth. What is the estimated size of all Vietcong forces today?

Eleventh. Who are the leaders of the Vietcong? Where do they come from? Are they North or South Vietnamese? Where are they trained? To what extent is Red China supporting the Vietcong operations?

Twelfth. How many American personnel in South Vietnam, military and civilian, have been wounded or killed as a result of Vietcong action?

Thirteenth. If a decision is made to undertake any kind of action against the North Vietnamese, will it be made by the United States Government or the Government of South Vietnam? Will the Congress be consulted?

Fourteenth. Is the United States seriously considering neutralization of Vietnam along the lines negotiated in Laos?

Fifteenth. What actions are being taken to stabilize the present regime in South Vietnam politically and economically?

Sixteenth. How many American officers have resigned in protest against the course of events in South Vietnam? Have they been allowed to make public statements?

Seventeenth. How many American troops can be withdrawn from South Vietnam by the end of 1965? How many will have to remain? What will their functions be?

Eighteenth. Who has primary responsibility on the ground for U.S. actions and policy in South Vietnam?

Nineteenth. What efforts have been made to secure support and assistance from other free nations in Asia in defeating Communist encroachments in South Vietnam?

Twentieth. What effect would a Communist takeover in South Vietnam have on the U.S. strategic position in the Far East?

Let me again make clear that I do not want our Government to make a public reply on points where answers could jeopardize the course of military activities. But military security must not become an excuse for withholding information needed by the Congress and the American people for a full understanding of what our present objectives are and how they can be achieved in an increasingly critical area of the world.

There is already mounting evidence that the lack of information and the wide speculation on policy are undermining morale on our side and are helping the Communists considerably more than a clear and factual statement of the situation and of United States and South Vietnamese policies would do.

Growing Straight and Strong Into the Light of the Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me deep satisfaction to know of the intense interest aroused in people across the land by many of the issues coming before the Congress for consideration.

To me, it means that our democracy is working; that people are willing to take out time and energy from their other pressing concerns and give thought to the improvement of their country.

The other day I received a letter from one of my constituents urging me to support the land and water conservation fund bill. This letter was so beautifully written and contained such lovely sentiments that I am taking the liberty of including it in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD so that others may get as much enjoyment and satisfaction from reading it as I have received.

The letter follows:

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
February 12, 1964.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROYBAL: I have never written to you before, nor to any Representative, but I find now a sense of responsibility and duty to myself, to you, to all my fellow men to write this letter.

I received a circular in the mail today asking that a letter be written to tell you, my Representative, to please support the land and water conservation fund bill (H.R. 3846).

I ask you for myself and for all the people I know and all those I don't know to please support legislation to save what I think of as the freedom and majesty of America, the embodiment of our democratic principles.

One cannot walk through a forest without sensing the strength and freedom of the trees, stretching up to the sun, into the sky, without feeling that our country was founded and dreamt of by our predecessors to be like those trees, to be able to grow in the sun and in the open air, to stretch and be free and strong.

I think there will be no more Whitmans, no more Thoreaus, Emersons, Robert Frosts, no more poets, and no more music, and really no more meaning to the everyday life we lead without the trees, and the majesty of mountains above the trees, and the lichen that grows on the rocks beside a mountain stream encircled by trees.

I think of progress and profit and reasons that would never justify the trees being cut but help to explain to me why they could be cut, and then must go back to the basic feeling I have—that to preserve America's nature is to preserve America, her freedom, her growth, her openness, her essence and reason for being.

Democracy is worked for and is only good when we, the people, strive each day to care and to appreciate the responsibility we all have to make it work.

Where I think of the forest and the trees and the order and silent striving of nature, and the triumph that I feel when I drive through a tunnel at Yosemite and see, unbelievable but actually real, Half Dome standing majestic in the sun—and then the feeling of what America is, and how truly great and big and grand, and how I must, as a part of this greatness, be as big and as open as Half Dome standing there in the sun.

At the risk of sounding overly dramatic and perhaps even "corny" I have written to you. But how unimportant some petty fear of perhaps being laughed at or thought to be foolish, how really unimportant when I think that even one single tree could be cut down, cut off from its roots, a tree which can never be replaced, that I, in my lifespan, can never see grow high into the sun, can never feel that sense of timelessness that I feel with the redwoods.

I am armed with my pen and hopes, but you are in Washington, in the House of Representatives, and your vote and your caring will truly decide the lives of many people (as well as trees) and also, if what I feel I learn about democracy and my country from America's nature is true, then we must not only preserve her natural resources for recreation but because here is our example, our teacher, our way marked out, clear and real of how we must guide ourselves to be straight and strong to grow up into the light of the sun.

Very sincerely yours,

KAREN D. LEMOS.

Daniel Flood: A Modern Daniel Webster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, former President Theodore Roosevelt once remarked that the only compensation for enduring the burdens of public life is the occasional opportunity to render a worthwhile public service. The congressional career of my distinguished and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is featured by a series of tremendous achievements, for example, his investigation of the secret Katyn Massacre in World War II of Polish Army officer prisoners of war by Communist forces.

A recent mighty achievement by him has been the clarification of interoceanic canal issues and defense of the treaty-based sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. In numerous addresses to the House, both eloquent and masterly, he has rendered a service of the first magnitude of importance to the Nation and, in fact, to the entire world. Moreover, his collected addresses on the Panama Canal and other Caribbean matters are unique in U.S. history and will rank him with some of our greatest statesmen in Isthmian history, along with Roosevelt, W. H. Taft, Elihu Root, and John Hay.

It was, indeed, gratifying to read in the February 16, 1964, issue of the Sunday Independent of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., of the honor recently bestowed upon him by the military committee of the Sovereign Order of St. John of Jerusalem, in which he is described as a modern Daniel Webster.

The indicated article follows:

A special meeting of cabinet officers and members of the military committee of the Sovereign Order of St. John of Jerusalem last Thursday paid tribute to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD recently in Washington, in recognition of his stand on the Panama crisis.

The meeting was presided over by Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby (ret.), former chief of intelligence for Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Others who paid tribute to the Congressman were Brig. Gen. J. Harry LaBrum (ret.); H. E. Emilio Nunex Portuondo, twice President of the Security Council of the United Nations; Lt. Gen. P. A. Del Valle (ret.); Prince Michel Sturdaz, former Minister of Foreign Affairs in Rumania; Col. Tnourot Pichel.

The order announced that it deplored the lack of interest and support of subjects and projects vital to the interests and safety of the United States, and voted a tribute to the Congressman for his defense of the Panama Canal. The dinner adopted this statement:

"To DANIEL FLOOD, the modern Daniel Webster:

"Throughout the history of our country great crises have produced great leaders. This principle is aptly illustrated in the 1964 world crisis over the Panama Canal, which is now the key target of the international Communist conspiracy for the Sovietization of the Western Hemisphere.

"As a student of history, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, recognized this danger and in 1957 started upon a series of addresses in the U.S. Congress that are now full of historic meaning.

"'VALIANT CHAMPION'

"Exploring the significant aspects of one of the gravest geopolitical situations in the world, with the abundance and thoroughness of genius, this Democratic Congressman from Pennsylvania has become the most valiant champion in Washington and the Nation for the defense of U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

"Basing his arguments on irrefutable documentations, he has clarified the issues and developed a program of remedial actions that are of inestimable value to the United States and indeed, to the entire world.

"Delivered in Congress with the force and eloquence of our greatest parliamentary orators and statesmen, his addresses have, by reason and logic alone, provided the United States with a statesmanlike leadership at a time of gravest crisis, which has won the respect of his opponents, the admiration of his colleagues, and the support of all loyal and patriotic American citizens. He is, indeed, a modern Daniel Webster."

Federal Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for many citizens of these United States to understand the actions of our Federal Government, particularly what motivates those in charge of administering the law. The question is frequently asked, "Are the Federal laws administered equally among all the citizens of the Republic or are they administered upon a political basis?"

This question is strikingly pointed up in an editorial which appeared under date of March 2 in the Gulfport-Biloxi Daily Herald, a highly respected newspaper in my congressional district. The uniformly esteemed editor of that paper, Mr. Eugene Wilkes, is in no sense a radical of either the right or left. He is just a good American who believes in this Republic of free men and desires to see this Republic and its heritage preserved for future generations. As one who subscribes to his philosophy of Government, I submit the editorial for the attention of the administration as well as the public generally.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL ACTION

There are many problems in a Republic that may not be understood by the general public, but to us one of the most difficult to understand is the trouble facing the United States and the Florida East Coast Railroad because of a strike on the latter's line.

The strike has been going on for about 1 year and 200 acts of alleged sabotage have taken place during that time. The Federal Government is now sending the Federal Bureau of Investigation into the area to try to find out who is responsible for the bombings that are taking place.

The Daily Herald is not accusing the strikers, railroad, or any others for the acts of vandalism that have been occurring, but it

is blaming the Federal Government for not taking some action to protect the railroad which is serving Cape Kennedy missile center.

The United States sent an army of marshals into Mississippi to see that one Negro was admitted to the University of Mississippi, but it takes a year for it to do something about efforts to wreck trains on a railroad that is strike-bound. Four hundred marshals to get one man into a school, but not any effort to protect a railroad that is delivering defense material to a test area.

A question we would like to ask is? Who it is that sees that 400 marshals aid a Negro getting into a school, yet does nothing to aid the United States in its defense efforts?

Mellowing Soviets Renew Attacks on Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while administration leaders continue to try to sell the American people on coexistence with communism because the Soviet Union is mellowing, and we are told by our British allies that we should help strengthen Russia because a comfortable Communist is less aggressive, news dispatches from the Soviet Union detail a new and vigorous attack on religion and belief in God.

Apologists for communism simply will not recognize the fact that the Communist goal has never changed. It is a system dedicated to the enslavement of all the peoples of the world. It is not a political party, but a conspiracy. It does not honor treaties or agreements and uses lies, deceit, murder, and subversion as weapons in spreading Soviet imperialism.

When, Mr. Speaker, are we going to have a leadership which will honestly call communism what it is and deal with it as an enemy?

Dr. Robert Morris points out how some forces in this country are taking actions which strengthen the Communist war on religion in the following column:

MELLOWING ATHEISM

(By Robert Morris)

An official Moscow announcement tells us of the new Communist campaign to eradicate religion from Soviet life. Pravda announces that atheist action groups are to be set up in all cities and towns to press for the elimination of all vestiges of religion.

This is another manifestation of the "mellowing" image of the Soviet Union which our policy planners are foisting upon us. While the Soviet Union establishes an Institute of Scientific Atheism under the Academy of Social Sciences, to implement this drive, the effective policy-molding influences in the United States continue to assume that Khrushchev's forces are undergoing an "evolutionary" change in direction.

By way of meeting this wholly fanciful evolution, our Supreme Court, which reflects the "world community" goal of our planners, is secularizing our own society as vigorously as our mores will permit.

Our Declaration of Independence correctly sets forth that we derive our authority as a nation from the "Laws of Nature and Nature's God" and that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Yet the judges of our highest tribunal hold that government must be neutral between atheism and religion. With this newly discovered premise, they then proceed to hold for the atheist in every one of the school prayer and related cases.

As a result, the wholesome influence on our society of the recitation of a simple nondenominational prayer or Bible reading by schoolchildren is now being denied us. The obvious result of what these judges have wrought will be the establishment of atheism as the state religion.

Our Chief Justice, who generally runs ahead of the other policy molders, has dramatized this trend by telling Congressmen who were framing legislation to inscribe "In God We Trust" over the Supreme Court Building facade, that such an inscription would mar the "symmetry" of his Court.

Thus, the new world being shaped for us falls into perspective. The trend is everywhere apparent and particularly in Soviet target areas. This week we saw the domination of U Thant and his top assistant, U.N. Under Secretary General Vladimir Suslov, the tough Soviet czar of the Division of Security Council and Political Affairs, extended into the Mediterranean. The news, as I write this, is that the U.N. Security Council has introduced a resolution empowering U Thant, and not the Security Council, to establish a peacekeeping force in Cyprus.

This, of course, is the domain of atheist Suslov, former assistant to atheist Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister who performed the eyeball-to-eyeball lie at the time of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

A fatuous footnote appears on the news story reporting this U.N. action: It says that the Soviet Union might veto the resolution. I await only a statement from Adlai Stevenson saying that the Cyprus solution is a victory for patience and firmness.

Cyprus Time Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the situation in Cyprus grows increasingly grave. Not only have Great Britain and the United States failed to provide a solution to the problem within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance, but also there is no evidence that the United Nations has as yet come any closer. Meanwhile, communal warfare increases; antagonism between Greece and Turkey mounts; the Soviet Union and Communist elements find ever larger scope for interference; and the influence of the United States on both of our NATO allies is drastically reduced.

Mr. President, there is obviously no ideal solution for Cyprus; no solution that has as yet been suggested has any where near universal support. What is more, the real problem is not alone a short-term end to fighting, but a long-term solution for the peaceful government of the island.

One proposal that has been offered is a very radical one. As put forward by A. N. Spanel, chairman of the International Latex Corp., it calls for outright purchase at a fair appraised value of all Turkish properties in Cyprus and resettlement of the Turkish minority with full recompense in Turkey. The proposal is a drastic one that may evoke strong protests both from the Turkish Cypriots and from the Government of Turkey. On the other hand, Mr. President, it is just possible that such a crucial move may be the only way to put an end to a smoldering and unhappy feud that is endangering the lives of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots and jeopardizing peaceful relations between Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, I strongly urge that this proposal be explored in depth, to determine whether it is in any form feasible or desirable as a long-term solution to the deeply disturbing crisis in Cyprus.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of a recent statement by Mr. Spanel on this issue.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF A. N. SPANEL

Many a man has died of blood poisoning that started with a scratch. Let us hope that this will not be the fate of NATO lacerated as it is by Cyprus. Yet the danger is real and the United Nations appears to have no solution that can be deemed to be permanent in character. NATO, already weakened by Western disunity, will therefore continue to exist under mounting threat until an enduring solution for Cyprus is found and promptly implemented.

Indeed, the situation is so grave that Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, who is certainly no alarmist, writing from the Paris office of The New York Times expressed this ominous note:

"The world has become so used to hearing about trouble in Cyprus that it isn't aware how desperate the current crisis is. Every day it gets worse despite U.N. pacifying efforts.

"Neither Athens nor Ankara wants things to slip over the brink but they are on the verge of doing so. Neither can control its own advocates on the island and Archbishop Makarios is no longer master of a situation he misguidedly helped create. Extremists are in the saddle.

"Time is running out; we are near the brink of disaster. NATO has found itself unable to dam the threatened tide despite all efforts by Secretary General Stikker.

"Both sides—the 80 percent Greek majority and the 20 percent Turkish minority—are preparing for a showdown and both sides are interested in gaining the support of their conationalists, the mainland Greeks and mainland Turks. The extremists are not seeking to avoid war: they prefer it."

It is in this context that we present the following article which details a constructive plan for solving the explosive Cyprus problem. Written by Mr. Eliahu Ben-Horin, historian and authority on Mediterranean affairs, it merits urgent consideration by free world governments and NATO.

THE CYPRUS TIME BOMB

(By Eliahu Ben-Horin)

No one, howsoever optimistic, can possibly believe that the present deliberations on Cyprus can produce either lasting peace on that island or a definitive solution for the highly complicated problems that confront it. Even if a neutral "police force" is agreed upon, it will be just one more fragile palliative, a costly palliative both politically and financially. An international garrison of

10,000 men will reportedly cost $50 million for a 3-month stay. And when the 3 months are over?

The political "expenditure," moreover, will run much higher. The Cyprus crisis has already provided Moscow with an open door for intervention in the Eastern Mediterranean and for playing the part of "the defender of the oppressed" against alleged imperialistic designs of the West. Two members of the NATO alliance, Turkey and Greece, are at each other's throats. It is clearly a situation where temporizing can bring little or no improvement and is likely to further aggravate a spreading crisis.

Only a permanent solution can insure the future of Cyprus and remove the danger of intercommunal strife and terror on the island, and quench the sparking of a possible war between Greece and Turkey which may spread into a much larger conflagration.

There are those who have suggested the separation of the two incompatible Cypriot communities—the Greek majority and Turkish minority—by partitioning the island; but it is extremely doubtful whether partition would work in this case—and not alone because of the determined opposition of the Greek Cypriot majority which actually controls the Government. For if the island is cut in two, the chances of the Republic of Cyprus ever developing into a viable state would greatly diminish. Moreover, the Turkish Cypriot community is not concentrated geographically but spread all over the island. Partition of Cyprus would therefore entail considerable internal migration and settlement. Let us therefore consider another solution:

(a) The establishment of an international commission to appraise the full value of all real estate, goods, business enterprises, and established professional practices such as medical, dental, legal, etc., that are now owned by Turkish Cypriots; permitting the Government of Cyprus to buy all these properties for their appraised cash values. Then,

(b) The prompt resettlement of the 100,000 Turkish minority people in Turkey.

To be sure this is a radical step, but no less a constructive one. It offers not merely a temporary expedient but a lasting solution. Indeed, a much greater and deeper conflict between Greece and Turkey was once before successfully resolved in this very fashion. After World War I, over 2 million Greeks and Turks were transferred and resettled in an exchange of populations. It has had a most beneficial effect on the relations between the two countries and peoples. Fortunately, to achieve similar results in the case of Cyprus 100,000 people would be moved, not 2 million.

At the moment, passions run high on both sides, creating a hostile atmosphere for appeals to reason; but emotionalism cannot be permitted to govern explosive political situations. When the problem of Cyprus is considered soberly on its merits, we believe the following conclusions will be clear:

(1) Turkey is interested, no less than Greece and the Western democracies in peace and stabilization in the Eastern Mediterranean. (2) With Cyprus now an independent nation, Turkey would have no valid reasons—political, economic or strategic—to oppose a Greek-populated Cyprus. (3) Turkey has more than enough room to absorb the 100,000 Turkish Cypriots. (4) The latter would find a new life among their own people and better economic, cultural and moral conditions, with more security, than they now enjoy in Cyprus. (5) The sizable financial investment in their resettlement—which would have to come from international sources—will bolster Turkey's economy.

Cyprus would be the gainer from this solution as would the NATO partners, Greece and Turkey—as would the Free World at peace.

It is time for a bold attempt to defuse the Cyprus time bomb charged with so much that is sinister.

Gordon Quimby, New Hampshire Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, American citizenship carries it with many rights and privileges, but it is the responsibility of every citizen living in our democracy both to use our freedoms and to make certain that all Americans are able to use these freedoms. Gordon Quimby of Concord, N.H., from my congressional district, has won the New Hampshire statewide Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and his speech well states the importance and urgency of protecting the rights and privileges of all Americans regardless of race, creed, or color. Currently competing in Washington for one of the top four national scholarship awards, Gordon is to be commended for his ambitious initiative, thorough preparation, and fine work in competing in this outstanding contest for young Americans made possible by the far-sighted leadership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am proud to present Gordon's speech, as follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Gordon Quimby)

Noah Webster is not the only one who has defined citizenship. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Walt Whitman, Robert Frost, and every other American leader or author who has attempted through words or actions to define what it means to be an American has defined citizenship.

But what is citizenship in 1964? I believe that it is the rights and privileges enjoyed by every citizen. And what are these rights and privileges? They are those things enumerated in the Bill of Rights, restated in Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address," held up daily by our ambassadors as symbols of freedom. But they are also those things which so many of us take for granted and forget about as seemingly unimportant or not worth the bother. The right to worship freely; the right to assemble; the right to speak freely; the right to go behind a curtain and vote for whomever we please; the right to a trial by jury; the right to be considered innocent until proven guilty—these are the privileges that make American citizenship something sacred.

But are these blessings free and without obligation? Many of us would like to think so. We enjoy those privileges which are most advantageous and set aside those which cause us discomfort or which inconvenience us. How many times have we failed to vote because of the weather? Or failed to express an opinion on some important issue because someone else would do it. I believe that the privileges of citizenship carry with them certain obligations and responsibilities which most of us overlook.

What are these responsibilities? The first is simply to use the privileges which have been given us, that is, to make use of the right to express an opinion, to get out and vote.

On the other hand, the second duty of citizenship is more subtle—protecting the rights and privileges of all citizens. Every citizen must be aware of any infringement or denial of the rights of any other citizen. Each of us has a responsibility for another kind of citizen, those who have lived for generations within the borders of the United States, for those who are citizens in name only—the American Indian, the Negro, the Oriental, the Latin-American,—the people who suffer daily the horrors of economic, political, and social discrimination, yet from whom we demand taxes and military service on the grounds that they are citizens. Our responsibility is to obtain full citizenship privileges for them too.

Still a third and more indirect responsibility: this is the duty of every citizen, both native or naturalized, to become wholly American. I mean by this to understand and enter into the American culture—its English language, its history, its government; in short, to become an American person.

In other words, we as citizens, enjoy numerous and wonderful rights and privileges, but on the other hand we often shirk the duties which these freedoms carry with them. The United States of America is the greatest nation in the world, but her people—you and I—can easily succumb to the worst foes of freedom: apathy and irresponsibility. Let us, as responsible and active citizens, reexamine ourselves and our citizenship and show the world that democracy and freedom, indeed, go hand in hand.

McNamara's Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 6, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star, there appeared an editorial indicating that Secretary McNamara's conduct of the Defense Department has reflected on his integrity. I think it is important to call this article to the attention of my colleagues and the public. Under unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

MCNAMARA: VIETNAM COMMUTER

Secretary of Defense McNamara is going to visit Vietnam for the fourth time. He has been practically commuting from Washington to Saigon in recent months.

Some wag is bound to suggest that perhaps the new policy needed there to improve matters is to "keep McNamara at home."

There is a more serious matter before us that involves a whole new attitude involving the basic honor and integrity of high public officials in accounting to the American people on matters involving blood. It ought to be as sacred as accounting accurately about money, at least.

On his previous trips Mr. McNamara has returned each time to tell us how things were going and express optimism about the future * * * followed quickly by some new disaster or revolution in Vietnam.

Recently, he admitted that things were not going well, after all, and they weren't going well when he said that they were.

The bland admission is as stunning as the fact. Apparently "kidding" the American people along about a war in which our future

and the lives of 16,000 Americans are directly involved is proper.

Apparently, even Mr. McNamara has now been in Washington so long that he feels that as long as he keeps honest books in the Defense Department, this sort of reporting to the American people in no way involves his personal honor or integrity.

And apparently nobody cares about this, or the manner in which the wheat deal to Russia was grossly misrepresented, or the bad faith involved in the present farm bill both in overriding the referendum decision and in advertising it as "voluntary" by trick measures, or a host of things which in another day would have immediately compromised the basic integrity of the officials involved and ended their public careers.

Integrity seems to have gone the way it went in the days of monarchy—if you have the power, who needs personal honesty or integrity in dealing with the public?

And the public seems to accept these new rules. As long as they are accompanied by ever-fresh promises of more and more for more and more—without asking if those promises can be trusted either.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my young constituents, Craig Schindler, of Riverside, Calif., has distinguished himself by winning the Voice of Democracy Contest for the State of California. Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conduct this nationwide contest, and the winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging. Here these fine young Americans will compete for four coveted scholarships.

It is a distinct pleasure to call Craig Schindler's excellent essay to the attention of my colleagues as follows:

The streets were deserted and silent. The breathing pulse of a nation had stopped. The American flag—symbol of a great and prosperous nation—flew at half-mast. The date was April 15 1865. The President of the United States had been fatally shot.

Yet, it was said that Abraham Lincoln had not died in vain. It was said that he had lived and died to preserve a union of democratic men not only to free a race of men, but to free all men from the chains of bigotry, prejudice, and hatred.

Today, 100 years later, we have again seen the flag fly at half-mast. And Americans say that John Fitzgerald Kennedy has not died in vain. Yet, it was from the same festering shackles of bigotry, prejudice, and hatred, which Lincoln fought, that men are created who have burned crosses, bombed churches, spat on Government officials, and calmly assassinated another President of the United States.

These things could not happen in America—but they did, they have, and they will unless Americans realize that citizenship is not a gift which they can squander, but a threefold challenge. First, we are challenged by an obligation to the past, to Valley Forge, to Gettysburg, to Pearl Harbor—an obligation not only to men like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, but to Smith, Gonzales, Goldstein, and nameless thousands who have sacrificed not for a great country, but to make this country great. Thus, we have a debt to pay—the sacred heritage we received at birth.

Second, you and I and all Americans are challenged by the future—to insure for the unborn millions the survival of a government based upon the sacredness of the individual.

Finally, we Americans have an obligation to the present—to the men who are living and dying today for America, to the soldier in Vietnam, to the Peace Corp member in Africa, to a man who was shot down in the streets of Dallas, and most important, to ourselves. For we must eradicate the diseases of ignorance, prejudice, hatred, and indifference within ourselves. Education, equality, love, enthusiasm—these are great words, but they are only words unless the individual, you and I, give them meaning.

The challenge of citizenship is indeed great. The courage of life is not as spectacular as that displayed in a final moment, but it is often far more trying. We cannot all die for our country, but let us live that all men might live in freedom, in equality, in love. The Lincoln Memorial is built of concrete and it will endure. But the ideals for which Lincoln died are in danger of collapse. Therefore, let us build the Kennedy memorial not in a park—but in the minds of men; not of concrete, but of concrete actions. The challenge of citizenship is truly ours.

Farm Bill Overrides Referendum Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Mr. Charles Dancey appeared in the March 4, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star. The article points out that the Senate action on the farm bill was a shocking performance. I suggest we all take a good look at this bill when it gets to the House. Under unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

NEW FARM BILL A GOVERNMENT POWER GRAB

The way in which bitter committee opposition suddenly faded away and the farm bill is being rammed toward passage without public awareness or debate suggests that a very effective substitute for Bobby Baker has been found for getting measures approved.

This bill is likely to become law before most people realize the unbelievable boldness involved and recognize that the administration now plans to simply ram ahead and jam down the farmer's throat, without referendum, the same kind of controls that farmers' refusal to endorse in overwhelming numbers in the famed wheat referendum.

We do not pretend to understand this bill and its effects in detail, and we don't feel very apologetic about that. It seems rather obvious that for 30 years we have been having a series of farm plans which even the authors did not understand.

We aren't sure "how it will work" for the simple reason that the shrewd authors of previous legislation, supposedly designed to "'save the small farmer" and to "hold down production" and to "avoid surpluses" were obviously confused, so that results have been to wipe out the small farmers largely and produce the greatest surpluses in history.

Not exactly what they said they had in mind.

However, this new bill seems clearly to be a straight out power grab for Federal control of the wheat farmer, completely. It is more a boldfaced grab than the referendum proposal, in that it doesn't even give them a chance to vote.

It would place every wheat farmer over a barrel, while still piously proclaiming the program is voluntary. That bit of chicanery hits an all time low in integrity for the Agriculture Department, which has, until now, maintained a reputation for integrity through all the farm programs efforts.

The program would put a farmer out of the export business and out of sales to mills for human consumption products unless he joins the program involving the certificates, etc., for such sales.

He doesn't have to join to feed his wheat to livestock, but livestock feed wheat is strictly a minor grain, that only involves something like 5 percent of production.

So the wheat farmer has a voluntary choice under this bill of knuckling under a system wherein the Federal Government takes over the management of his farm in detail, and obviously in expanding detail—or of going out the normal wheat business altogether.

This is vicious, dangerous, unnecessary and uncalled for.

It is a giant step, taken hastily and as quietly as possible, to change the whole philosophy to one of outright, spreading, Govenrment management of agriculture at a time when such practices have been proven a failure in all their varied applications all over the world.

It is a step to paralyze the initiative and ingenuity of American farmers making the basic product for the bread on the American table, and bring to end the productivity gains we have been making by a broad stroke—just at the time when we face a 90 million increase in population in the next 30 years when all the productivity we have been worrying about will be our salvation.

It is an act of bad faith in view of the referendum and its result.

And it is hard to see any reason or purpose in such an action except a pure, stubborn, driving hunger for power.

Secretary Freeman and his bright ideas were completely repudiated by the farm communities—70 percent here in Illinois. The juiciest offers of Federal cash ever made only produced the first, great refusal on the part of farmers to accept the cash and give up controls. Freeman was regarded as a bust, whose program had flopped.

And what has happened? He's back with the same program, only with a club in his hand this time, and no more referendums.

The only change is a gimmick whereby they can, if they are careless of their integrity, pretend that the program is voluntary.

It is about as voluntary as a program for newspapers would be that involved only newsprint and the communications lines. You would have a choice of accepting Federal dictation in detail or doing without those two items without which you can't exist.

It's the same thing.

This is not just a bad bill. It is a shocking performance.

C. L. DANCEY.

A Critical Need for More and Better Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems in my congressional district is the need for more and better housing. New York, like other large cities, has a large percentage of substandard housing. We still have a critical shortage of housing in our city in spite of 326,000 new housing units between the period of 1950 and 1960. Our Federal Government must help to provide more low-income and middle-income housing, and we need to improve and make habitable the thousands of substandard housing units.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my recent testimony before the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Commmittee in behalf of the administration's Housing and Community Development Act of 1964:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 26, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the Housing Subcommittee, I am glad to have this opportunity to testify in support of the administration housing bill. As you know, I am a former member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have always taken an interest in housing legislation which is so important to meet the needs of the people of our cities.

The housing bill submitted by President Johnson fully carries out the wholehearted commitment of the Democratic Party to the cause of better housing and better neighborhoods for families of every income level. One of the first major bills submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy just after his inauguration was the Housing Act of 1961, which made major improvements in our housing programs and included the largest increases in authorization proposed for many years. President Johnson's housing bill, submitted just 2 years later, is in some ways even larger, reflecting the growth of these programs under a sympathetic administration. For example, the number of low-rent public housing units aimed at helping those in greatest need is somewhat more than twice the number in the 1961 act. I am heartily in favor of that provision, which is important to my congressional district, and while I recognize that there is strong opposition to this program from some quarters, I am confident that this committee will succeed in putting through a substantial increase in the level of operations of low-rent housing. Certainly, they can count on my vote just as they have been able to count on it in the past.

New York, like other big cities throughout the country, has a large percentage of substandard housing. In our city, 1 person in 12, or about 640,000, live in these substandard dwellings. There is a great need to replace some and to repair others. It is estimated that about 1 out of every 4 of the city's apartment units is in a deteriorating condition, and most of these apartments house low-income families. Other low-income groups, at a disadvantage insofar as housing is concerned, are our elderly and minority groups. New York, as other large cities, has a great influx of minority-group families, seeking relief from social and economic hardships. These economically and socially handicapped people spend the highest percentage of their incomes on rent. They must have better housing if they are ever to better their standard of living. They cannot move from their present quarters—and they are doomed to continue in substandard housing, until subsidized low-rent apartments are available to them. Our President has called for a "war on poverty" and I know of no better way to begin than by improving the unfortunate housing conditions of these low-income families. Of approximately 80,000 families in New York City on public welfare last year, one-half were living in slum housing and their need for better housing is urgent.

We still have a critical shortage of housing in our city in spite of 326,000 new housing units between the period of 1950 and 1960, one-third of them low rent. The Federal Government must help to provide more low-income and middle-income housing—rentals that families with low incomes can afford—and we need to improve and make habitable the thousands of substandard housing units.

We have in our city thousands of single elderly persons with low-incomes—a large portion of them having only their small social security check as income, and others dependent on public welfare. The provisions of this bill for single elderly persons, as well as couples with low incomes, has my strong support.

Letters come to me daily from residents of my congressional district, asking me for assistance in locating better housing. They are pathetic letters—most of them from low-income families who have been waiting 5 or 6 years, or even much longer, and who have filed and refiled their applications with the New York City Housing Authority. Some of these families come to my New York congressional office to speak to me personally. You would find it difficult to believe that the conditions they describe actually exist. And yet they do exist. It is not uncommon for me to hear of 8 or 10 members of one family living in two crowded rooms; of a large family sharing one bath with two or three other families, or sharing one stove with other families. Infants and children suffer colds and more serious illnesses in winter due to lack of heat; an elderly and ill couple is unable to get outside to fresh air in a park or to shop for themselves because illness or infirmity prevents the strenuous walk to and from their third or fourth-floor walk-up. A mother is sick with fear for her youngsters sleeping in their crowded, unsanitary quarters which are infested with rats and roaches. Some of the occupants of these quarters don't know what it is to have hot water or adequate lighting.

So while a great deal has been accomplished in New York, we must seek additional Federal funds for public housing.

One of the most heartening provisions of the bill is the greatly improved provision for families displaced by urban renewal. This is a problem which the Congress has wrestled with in the past, and I believe we all recognize that we have not yet found the full answer. However, the major forward steps taken by this bill will go a long way toward providing equity for those displaced from their homes. The bill provides rent-supplement payments for displaced low and modest-income families over a period of 2 years to assure that they can afford decent housing by paying no more than the same 20 percent of income which is typical of more fortunate families in the higher income brackets. The bill also recognizes the special problems of displaced small business firms by paying $1,000 to help them get established in a new location. In addition to the existing provisions in law which meet moving expenses, there is also a further $1,500 severence payment for small business firms which do not reopen. The plight of families and small business firms displaced for any reason is one which weighs on the conscience of all of us in the Congress, and this bill will go a long way toward meeting that obligation. I only regret that these relocation benefits are necessarily confined to housing programs when, as a matter of principle, they should also apply to highway construction and other government-aided building—but I recognize that this is the jurisdiction of separate committees. I can only hope that these other committees will follow your lead in providing relocation benefits as they have in the past.

One of the great innovations of the 1961 act was the program of below market interest rates for rental and cooperative housing for moderate income families. I am sure that this committee agrees that this program fills a vital need and has made a promising start. The President's bill makes some refinements in this program which should help it serve the public even better. At present, it still has adequate dollar authority, but, of course, this will be used up before too long. When it is, I am sure this commitee will see to it that additional funds are provided and I pledge my support in that effort when the time comes.

Another provision of the bill which I want to single out for a special commendation is that which removes the dollar ceiling on the authorization of low-interest financing for housing for the elderly. Again, this is a program aimed at an urgent and growing need which has been in existence for only a few years, but which has already proven its value. Of course, the funds for these loans still must be provided by appropriation, but this provision will eliminate one step in the process and make it easier for us to help provide good housing for older people at rents they can afford.

Mr. Chairman, this is a lengthy bill with many outstanding good features in it. I will not take the committee's time to go through all of them because I am sure that you know from my record that I am an unwavering supporter of housing legislation, particularly that aimed at the needs of low and moderate income families. These families can only look to their Government for help. Let me just add that another important benefit which will come from this bill is the boost which it will give to employment. Unemployment is still a serious problem in this country and nowhere is it greater than in the hearts of our large cities. The construction of all kinds as provided for in this legislation will give jobs and incomes to many, and thereby help our entire economy.

Thank you, Chairman RAINS, and members of the subcommittee for this opportunity to express my support of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1964.

Save the IDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has expressed what many other newspapers have done recently in their concern for the International Development Association. It is certainly true when they say that "a refusal by the House to accept legislation which has been approved by the Senate

will have far-reaching consequences."

I hope that we in Congress can indeed save IDA as multilateral means to finance the programs of the less developed countries.

The article follows:

SAVE THE IDA

The House of Representatives should be persuaded to reconsider its tentative rejection legislation that would permit the United States to join with other advanced countries in supplying the International Development Association with the resources it requires to operate after 1965. Affiliated with the World Bank, the IDA makes loans on generous terms to the poorer nations which find it very difficult to finance their programs for economic development.

A refusal by the House to accept legislation which has been approved by the Senate will have far-reaching consequences. The efforts to place economic assistance on a multilateral basis will be dealt a serious blow and worse still, many of the programs on which the less developed countries rely to raise living standards may have to be abandoned. The more implacable enemies of foreign aid in the House will not be disturbed by the mischievous results of their handiwork. But there is a large and more responsible majority which will respond to a vigorous appeal on behalf of the IDA.

Washington Post Opposes Interest Equalization Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in its March 8 edition the Washington Post expresses its strong opposition to the interest equalization tax proposal which passed the House last week. The Post calls the tax "a disguised form of currency devaluation" and says it is "a clumsy and ineffectual measure." I agree completely with the Post when it says the bill should be subjected to "rigorous scrutiny" in the Senate. The editorial follows:

TAXING FOREIGN ISSUES

If the size of the margin by which a bill passes the House were an index of its virtues, the interest-equalization tax would stand very high. But that is hardly the case. The bill, which would seek to stanch the outflow of capital funds by raising the cost of floating foreign securities in the United States, has two serious flaws. As a deterrent to foreign borrowing it is far more effective as a piece of pending legislation than an accomplished fact. And its success hinges on the doubtful assumption that the current interest-rate differentials among the non-Communist countries will be maintained.

It is ironic that the bill commanded the support of all save three of the House Democrats because they feared that their failure to pass it would precipitate a large outflow of funds. But if there is to be a sudden hemorrhage—and it is hardly obvious why there should be—it will also occur if the bill is enacted. For until now, the sharp decline in the volume of foreign issues floated here has been due to uncertainty about true yields or costs of raising funds.

Once this uncertainty about yields is dispelled, the foreign borrowers can be expected to reenter the American money market in force. And if the recent rise in the British bank rate is followed by a trend toward higher interest rates on the continent, the attractiveness of that market will be enhanced despite the imposition of the tax.

As a disguised form of currency devaluation, the interest-equalization tax is a clumsy and ineffectual measure. If this country must violate its principles by denying foreign borrowers access to its money markets, a capital issues committee, armed with discretionary powers for limited periods of time, can accomplish that distasteful task with dispatch and justice.

It is doubtful whether the interest-equalization tax will reach the Senate before autumn, and when it does it should be subjected to a far more rigorous scrutiny than it had in the House.

Miss Marjorie Gilmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Providence Visitor, Providence, R.I., for February 28, 1964.

The article is a profile on Miss Majorie Gilmore, a truly dedicated person and one of the small group of pioneers in the care of the mentally retarded:

VISITOR PROFILE: DEVOTED TO RETARDED

(By Patricia M. Hird)

On the shores of Wallum Lake, high on a hill, is a cluster of neat gray-green buildings, trimmed in white and colonial in motif, nestled in the middle of a vast apple orchard.

Approaching the estate, two things immediately catch the eye: a small gold cross shining in the sun atop one of the buildings and a picture window full of children's toys and playthings in the large main house. A wrought-iron sign tells you this is Pine Harbor School.

It is a rather extraordinary school founded by a rather extraordinary woman. The school is for retarded children who are classed as trainables (25 to 49 IQ) and severely retarded (less than 25 IQ).

The founder of Pine Harbor School is Miss Marjorie Gilmore, who has devoted the last 30 years of her life to the care and training of noneducable exceptional children. "Very few schools will take a child who isn't educable," Miss Gilmore said as we toured the snow-covered grounds. "Up until this year, I don't know where there would be another school that would take a child at birth and let him remain through adulthood."

Although very reluctant to talk about herself and her years of service to others (Miss Gilmore kept turning the conversation back to the children at Pine Harbor), I learned that she is a native of Warwick and a graduate of the Roosevelt Hospital School of Nursing in New York City.

After her graduation, Miss Gilmore did public health work involving children and infants for the Sloan Medical Center which is now part of the New York Medical Center.

She hinted at some of the excitement she experienced as a public health nurse when she told of delivering a baby in an ambulance stuck in an elevator under the 59th Street Bridge.

"There was so much noise, I couldn't attract the attention of the attendant in the front seat," she explained, her blues eyes sparkling through her quiet reserve.

The Rhode Island nurse was borrowed for a time by Roger Williams Hospital to open its maternity department according to the techniques used at Sloan Medical Center. She then returned to New York, but in 1930 was back in Rhode Island founding the first Pine Harbor School as a summer camp for normal children with feeding problems on the old Goddard estate in East Greenwich.

The school was later moved to Barrington, but because of the frightening destruction of the 1938 hurricane, Miss Gilmore decided to look for a better location. In April 1942, she purchased the Singleton Orchards on Wallum Lake. "We changed it from a tree nursery to a human one," she smiled warmly.

After 2 years, the need became apparent for a school for retarded children (Miss Gilmore had been working during the winter months at Bradley Hospital). A leading neurologist from Boston's Childrens Hospital visited Pine Harbor and was so impressed by what he saw, Miss Gilmore said, that "children started pouring in."

However, she has set a limit of 70 children because "I felt any more than that, they would be handled wholesale; and I wanted to know every scratch that was on every child."

"I have children from almost every State now," she added.

The 14 buildings that comprise Pine Harbor have been renovated and furnished in such a way that the school has a warm, homey atmosphere rather than an institutional one. There is a delightful little schoolhouse, gaily decorated play-rooms, dormitories, a large airy dining room and a little chapel building completely equipped for Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish services. Mass is said here twice a month.

Bishop McVinney, she continued, takes a great interest in retarded children and on April 17 will officiate at confirmation ceremonies at Pine Harbor. "Every Catholic child here will have been confirmed," she said proudly.

Miss Gilmore said that nowadays people do not hide their exceptional youngsters away as they used to but "so many people will say: 'I completely break down when I see these children.' "

"But," she added, "if they work with them long enough, they are just like any other child that needs loving care."

"People ask whether we steel ourselves, get hardened to it. There isn't a child here who doesn't put up his arms for a good night love. Last Christmas, not one nurse went off duty until her children received their toys. Those who were off came back to be present when their children opened theirs."

Miss Gilmore has a deep devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary which "has grown with my work with the retarded." Although she doesn't have time for active hobbies, she collects rare and exquisitely crafted Madonnas from all over the world. She also has every original Hummel that has been produced, including two unfinished pieces that were in the kiln when Berta Hummel died. They are kept on display in glass-encased cupboards in her beautiful new "dream home" just across the street from the 817-acre school.

Although aided by a 35-member staff including a business manager, Miss Gilmore has not retired into her quiet nest in the woods. She is the vigorous president of the Providence Diocesan Council of Catholic Nurses, a member of the Rhode Island Governor's Committee on Children and Youth and the Governor's Interdepartmental Subcommittee on Mental Retardation.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize-winning work of the winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest by Miss Norma Lee Kerns who is from Moundsville, W. Va., in my First Congressional District, which is also my hometown.

Each year the VFW conducts such a contest. This year, over 250,000 high school students participated competing for the four scholarships that are awarded as the top prize. Miss Kerns is now in Washington to compete in the national finals to be held tomorrow evening at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

I only wish it were possible here in the RECORD to add a picture of Miss Kerns. She typifies the all-America girl in appearance and supports its ultimate in performance.

Miss Kerns is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Kerns of Moundsville. She is a member of the National Honor Society, National Thespian Society, high school band, Y-Teens, Future Teachers of America, pianist at Calvary Methodist Church, director of the church choir, member, youth choir and Methodist Youth Fellowship of which she is president, president of the Wesleyan Sunday School Class and subdistrict MYF, recording secretary for the Order of The Rainbow for Girls, and is an accomplished singer.

I am extremely pleased that this young lady comes from my district and take great pride in her accomplishments. I wish her well in the finals tomorrow night.

The following are Miss Kern's own words of what citizenship in this great Nation means to her:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Norma Lee Kerns)

As a resident of the United States of America, I enjoy all its freedoms and privileges. I can worship as I please, I can read what I choose, I can speak what I feel, even if it is critical of the Government. I have the privilege of leading my own life because my privacy is not invaded by the Government. All these inalienable rights are mine because I am a citizen of the United States. I belong to America and America belongs to me. I am proud of this heritage, proud to possess these rights, rights which are mine only as long as I deserve them. This is the challenge of true citizenship. A citizen has his choice of how he meets this challenge. He can be like the jellyfish which lets itself be tossed to and fro by the currents of the sea, having no goal in life but mere survival; or he can be like the salmon which does not let even the rushing currents stop it from fighting its way upstream until it reaches its destination. It is up to each individual to meet the challenge.

Today more than ever the United States is under great strain. We are fighting communistic and socialistic powers. I, a citizen, must not take these threats of outside powers lightly, for they can endanger all of us. I must speak what I feel and keep informed so that I may better understand my country's problems and the leaders' decisions. We, the citizens, are America and we determine what America's future will be. If we become lax, then America will become lax. As citizens of the United States, one way we can exercise our powers is by voting. Our Nation can be compared to a large house with the citizens as the foundation. If the foundation is not strong, the house will fall. Thus if our citizens are not strong the country will fall, becoming clay in the hands of waiting communistic leaders. It is the duty of strong citizens to keep informed and to exercise their voting privilege. I am only a teenage citizen and must become older before I will obtain certain privileges, such as voting; however, we as youth of this country must prepare ourselves to be the America of tomorrow. As someone once said, "A nation who forgets its past must relive it." By studying America's history, I can more adequately prepare myself to help America to remember its great past and thus to construct an even greater future.

For the future, there must be well-trained and dedicated doctors, lawyers, ministers, and educators who will continue the work of those of today. We, the youth of today, are these potential leaders and must prepare ourselves. We must keep America the free and independent nation it now is. We must grasp the educational opportunities which are before us, and meet this challenge of citizenship; thus insuring not only our own inherited rights, but also the rights of our children and our children's children.

Sugar Loaf Preserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, many people have ambitious dreams but few of these dreams ever become reality. In 1899 Gordon Strong looked upon Sugar Loaf Mountain in Upper Montgomery County, Md., and dreamed of buying it to give to the people for a sanctuary. He spent a lifetime working to make that dream into a reality. Now, 10 years after the death of Gordon Strong, the dream is almost complete through the efforts of 12 public-spirited citizens who took over his legacy and formed Stronghold, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, in 1946.

These 12 men who compose the board of trustees of Stronghold, Inc., are: R. Paul Smith, president, of Hagerstown, Md.; Judge Charles W. Woodward, Rockville, Md.; Donald McCormack, John C. McCormack, C. R. Gutermuth, and Edward K. Jones, all of Washington, D.C.; Charles F. Bowers, William T. Delaplaine, Adm. Allen G. Quynn, and Parsons Newman, all of Frederick, Md.; James L. Karrick, Jr., of Gaithersburg, Md.; Elmer M. Pusey of Chevy Chase, Md.

The Washington Post in the January 5 issue paid tribute to the achievement of these gentlemen in carrying out the wishes of Gordon Strong. Under permission to extend my remarks I insert here the Post story written by Sterling Seagrave and titled "Benefactor's Sugar Loaf Preserve Complete But for a Few Slices":

BENEFACTOR'S SUGAR LOAF PRESERVE COMPLETE BUT FOR A FEW SLICES—STRONG'S DREAM OF GIVING MOUNTAIN TO PUBLIC A LEGACY OF YEARS

(By Sterling Seagrave)

Gordon Strong's remarkable ambition to buy a mountain and give it to the people is now almost complete, 10 years after his death.

Sugar Loaf Mountain, standing like a sentinel out of the rolling plain of upper Montgomery County, is now owned entirely by Stronghold, Inc., except for several slivers of land retained by local people.

One of the last pieces missing from Strong's great dream was deeded over to Stronghold in the final week of December. The trustees of Strong's corporation are understood to be negotiating quietly and patiently for the other sections that will make the dream complete.

Nearly 50,000 people visit Sugar Loaf Mountain each year. They come upon the sentinel peak in much the same way Strong did in 1899.

Today, an hour out of Washington on the new Interstate Route 70-S brings you in sight of the mountain. It rises abruptly from the plain, covered with timber half naked in the winter, a glistening white mantle covering its sides.

No other hills adjoin it. Sugar Loaf is a geological anomaly. Turning from the super highway at the Route 109 interchange, turning again in the small farm and antique town of Comus onto Route 95, you arrive in Strong's quaint little village of Stronghold, ringed by rail fences and trees.

Here the care that Strong exerted in preparing his mountain for the public is evident. There are small lettered signs, unobtrusively telling the rules of the mountain and directing the visitor up the mountainside.

The road is paved, but narrow and winding.

Covered now with a light crusted blanket of snow, the road sweeps steeply up past the Georgian mansion Strong built for himself and his wife on the first low shoulder of the mountain.

Still farther up, the visitor comes upon the first major lookout. Crafted in native stone and mortar, it looks out over Montgomery County far below and the rolling farm lands, stretching back toward Washington.

At the next lookout, a stone circle which looks as if it was built by the Druids, you can see White's Ford on the far Potomac, where Lee's Army splashed across. Two bronze 12-pound Civil War guns stand on the lookout facing White's Ford.

"That's to keep the Johnnies from coming across again," Strong once said.

The road winds upward for nearly a mile. Then you come to the most impressive lookout, where a massive structure of boulders, resembling a powder magazine, shelters picnic tables of rough hewn logs and provides a staggering view of Frederick County and the Catoctin Mountains in the blue-hazed distance.

Here Strong provided parking areas, discreetly bulldozed from the rugged hillside. And here a footpath of logs and flag rock leads up through giant boulders toward the crest, 1,281 feet above sea level.

Reaching the summit, you find a flat, wooded area flanked by rocky points where you may balance tentatively on the edge of the sheer precipice, the wind howling, inhaling a view that sweeps from Baltimore to Washington.

Children and the elderly appreciate the view the most, it is said. That perhaps explains why Strong felt such a dominating urge to protect this mountain as a sanctuary.

Almost 3,000 acres have been accumulated by Stronghold, which has been under the supervision of Donald A. McCormack, of Riggs Bank, since Strong's death.

The nonprofit corporation was formed in 1946. When Strong died in 1954, his will made the mountain a formal gift to the public.

Rustic, almost Gothic in its solitary, boulder-strewn grandeur, Sugar Loaf Mountain stands as a symbol of a man who found something too good and too big to keep to himself.

L.B.J. Opens Drive for Latin Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted an article in the Washington Post of February 20, 1964, entitled, "L.B.J. Opens Drive for Latin Unity." The article described the preparations for the President's trip to California to meet with the President of Mexico and also the planning that is being done now in regard to the observance of the third anniversary of the Alliance for Progress in March.

The article states that in the meeting between the two Presidents the future of the Alliance for Progress will be discussed and that "Lopez Mateos is expected to stress that the Alliance could be improved through greater concentration of aid on the grassroots level."

I found this language very significant and it carried a special meaning because a new program is underway under the Alliance that stresses the grassroots approach by means of small impact-type projects that put needed items, in return for self-help measures on their part, right into the hands of the villagers in Latin American. This new program, now underway in 22 States, directed by Mr. James Boren, Special Assistant to the U.S. Coordinator, is on a local and State participation level, with private U.S. organizations like the junior chamber of commerce, Lions, Exchange Club, etc., actively taking on projects to help peoples in our sister republics.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Idaho is among these participating States. A meeting was held on February 3 in Boise with a group of representatives of civil organizations, educators, business leaders, labor leaders, professional leaders, as well as representatives of local and State government. When the program was presented to them, they appointed a study group to consider the formation of a committee to participate. That committee was formed and is now functioning in an alliance with Ecuador. Already one project is completed, another underway and more have been requested.

I am delighted that my State is active in this program that is designed to meet immediate needs of people in our sister republics. I hope the idea spreads further across the length and breadth of the Nation.

The article follows:

L.B.J. OPENS DRIVE FOR LATIN UNITY—SEES LOPEZ MATEOS FRIDAY TO STRESS ALLIANCE SUPPORT

(By Dan Kurzman)

President Johnson will inaugurate this week what may turn into an intensive campaign to convince Latin America that the United States will continue to back the Alliance for Progress vigorously.

President Johnson's meetings with Mexican President Adolfo Lopez Mateos Friday and Saturday in Palm Springs, Calif., will provide the administration with its first forum in this campaign to underscore this country's close ties with Latin America.

This first step may be followed up in mid-March with what is hoped will be a dramatic manifestation of Washington's unflagging support of the Alliance. The White House disclosed yesterday that President Johnson is considering a conference here of all U.S. Ambassadors stationed in Latin America to coincide with the third anniversary of President Kennedy's history-making announcement of the Alliance's creation.

These preliminary moves to reassure Latin America that the United States has not lost interest in the Alliance will serve, it is hoped, to dispel doubts expressed by some Latins that the Johnson administration backs the program as strongly as his predecessor.

Since the President took office, the Alliance has been overshadowed by U.S. embroilment in hemispheric political crises. The Panama Canal Zone riots of January 9 and 10, followed by the dispute over the controversial 1903 Panama Canal Treaty and Panamanian charges of aggression against this country, have helped in some degree to revive memories of U.S. intervention in Latin America.

Nor has U.S. preoccupation with Cuban pinpricks, such as the shutting off of water supplies for Guantanamo Naval Base, contributed to the availability of time for active promotion of the Alliance.

OTHER CRISES CUT TIME

Crises in other parts of the world, including Vietnam, Cyprus, and Zanzibar, have further reduced this time.

Moreover, such crises have not been eased by the confusion inherent in the reorganization of the State Department's administrative structure under a new regime.

Even more important has been the salient fact that the Alliance, in the eyes of many Latin Americans, was embodied in the person of President Kennedy. His death thus left a psychological vacuum that no man or government could easily fill.

President Johnson will meet Lopez Mateos under highly favorable circumstances. For the United States and Mexico today have achieved a level of understanding that both countries consider the highest in their modern history.

Since President Kennedy visited Mexico City in 1962 to be greeted by huge, cheering crowds, relations have improved perceptibly as the result of an agreement that was reached last year in the dispute over the Chamizal territory on the Texas border long claimed by the Mexicans.

No important decisions of a substantive nature are likely to be reached at the Palm Springs meetings. For one thing, there are few outstanding problems between the two countries, to be solved. For another, Lopez Mateos's term of office will end later this year.

The future of the Alliance, however, will be fully discussed, Lopez Mateos is expected to stress that the Alliance could be improved through greater concentration of aid on the grassroots level.

He is known to feel that more Latin peasants should benefit more directly from the Alliance, and that this could be made possible through more extensive use of the multination Inter-American Development Bank.

Cuba will also probably be discussed, with both Presidents agreeing to respect each other's position. President Johnson is not likely to press very hard, if at all, for a severance of Mexican diplomatic relations with Cuba. Mexico supported the U.S. blockade of Cuba during the 1962 missile crisis, but has generally not taken a hard line toward that country.

Lopez Mateos is certain to ask for new U.S. assurances that some permanent solution will be found soon to the problem of the crop-killing excessive salt content of the water Mexico is drawing from the Colorado River. Only temporary solutions have been reached since President Kennedy's visit to Mexico.

Nor is Lopez Mateos expected to miss the opportunity to appeal to President Johnson to use his influence in preventing the imposition of new pending trade restrictions on Mexican goods.

A Major Tax Structure Overhaul and Our Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, while out in the district I represent—California's first—I gave an address before the Sonoma County Taxpayers Association, in the Veterans Memorial Hall at Santa Rosa, on two extremely vital matters of concern to the American people—taxes and education.

Gentlemen, the overwhelming response I received led me to believe that my colleagues and the public, in general, would be interested in this approach, and I am therefore including this speech in its entirety below:

CHANNELING THE TAXPAYERS' REVOLT

It is a real pleasure to be here tonight. I have looked forward to it for a number of good reasons, not the least of which was to see my many good friends here. But mainly, I welcome the chance to talk to you about taxes.

You know, when I voted in favor of the income tax cut last month, some of my constituents wrote to me to ask why I had changed my position.

You may recall that the tax cut was before the House last September. I voted against it at that time because it was too early to determine how much we could cut the 1964 budget and the administration didn't want to guarantee that spending would be controlled in the 1965 budget.

Last month, after we had cut $6½ billion from the 1964 budget and President Johnson had presented a new budget that was lower than President Kennedy's, I voted for it.

This reminded me of a story one of my colleagues told when he was accused of changing his position. He said an elderly couple was driving down the road in his district in their elderly car.

The wife looked across the front seat at her husband and said: "You know, Henry, we never sit close together any more. We used to sit close every time we went for a drive."

Henry glanced over from the driver's seat and said: "Well, I haven't changed my position."

And this is the way it is with me and the income tax cut. I was for it all along. I didn't change—the administration did.

Today, I have a few comments to make regarding taxes. Some people feel that the tax cut will make people feel happy through this election and a few more to come. To me, this was not the purpose of the bill.

The purpose of the tax cut was primarily to spur the Nation's economy. I tend to believe that this was somewhat overplayed and that only part of the expected economic surge will be realized.

To me, the real reason for this tax cut was to return this $11½ billion to the private sector, to provide capital for growth and expansion, to increase job opportunities of a more permanent nature. Further, it was mandatory that we revise our tax rate structure to permit more equitable competition with other economic unions forming throughout the world.

For every dollar California taxpayers pay to the Federal Government, they get back 79 cents in services, according to the Congressional Quarterly. It is obvious to anyone that those dollars will buy a lot more in services if they are left here in the first place.

If any State in the Union can afford to pay its own way, it is California.

So, my first announcement to you tonight is this: This is not the last of the big Federal tax cuts If I and a growing number of responsible Congressmen have anything to say about it, this is just the beginning of a major tax reform—hopefully at all levels of government. The major aim of this tax reform is to return Federal tax sources to State and local governments so they can handle their own problems—all directed toward reducing the unbearable load of our real property taxpayers. And to provide a broader tax base to support our schools—our cities, counties, and other units of local government where the demand for service actually occurs.

My own theme is "Home Rule."

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate; and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

My motto is "Strong local government is the foundation of our Republic." No one can dispute the fact that our educational system, based on home rule, or call it local control if you will, is the greatest in the world. And no one can dispute that our educational system, along with our American system of individual initiative and responsibility, has given our people the highest standard of living in the world.

Yet, our educational system is primarily supported by one of the most limited tax bases available to government—the property tax. Those who earn money pay the bulk of their income, corporate, and excise taxes to the Federal Government. These same people pay the bulk of their sales and use taxes to the State. But the property owners, and this includes many people on retirement incomes, who have already paid for their children's education, pay most of the support for our schools. The objective we must all work for is to equalize the tax burden by providing a tax program that properly considers the mobile population problem.

Some will say that the answer is to go to the Federal Government for help from its vast sources of income. And I say to you that to ask for Federal help is to ask for Federal control. I firmly believe it is constitutionally and morally obligatory to maintain a decentralized system of education in America.

I say this without reservation. Federal control has followed Federal aid in many areas. Frankly, the personnel and agencies of Government would not be doing their job if the contingencies for disbursement were not maintained. I would cite further, the Supreme Court of the United States:

In 1942, a case was argued over whether a farmer could accept Government supports but refuse to abide by the attendant Government acreage controls. Justice Jackson, writing the majority decision against the farmer (*Wickard* v. *Filburn*), said:

"It only appears that, if he could get all that the Government gives and do nothing that the Government asks, he would be better off than this law allows." He further said, in a general vein: "It is hardly lack of due process for Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

This, of course, does not preclude the Federal Government recognizing its responsibilities under the impacted area, National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation programs.

It is my firm conviction that the solution to our school problems * * * and many of our other problems * * * is to permit home rule to prevail. We must remove tax sources from the Federal Government and return them to the States. The States, in turn, must overhaul their tax structures or revise revenue allocations to provide a broader tax base at the local government and school board level. These new funds could be used as a new source of revenue or relief to the ad valorem taxpayer.

This will give you the funds to meet your own responsibilities. At the same time, I pledge to work for more spending cuts at the Federal level so we can afford to repeal these tax sources. I would, however, remind you that we must take into account a major problem of concern to many of us—the national debt. We must come forth with a positive program to retire this debt. I am currently conducting research toward this end.

Individual and community responsibility is the backbone of this country. If and when this is gone, all is lost. We would become mere automatons under a socialist master.

A great taxpayer revolt already is building up in this country. My correspondence, and that of my colleagues, shows this. Property owners, of course, are the most concerned. Those of us who subscribe to the philosophy of doing everything possible to permit the private enterprise system to flourish are most encouraged with our successes this far. (Tax cut and foreign aid—more emphasis in the private sector.)

Our first step is to channel this taxpayers' revolt in the right direction. We must provide proper leadership. We must solicit the cooperation of all representatives of Government and organizations such as the Sonoma Taxpayers Association.

So I am proposing to you tonight a resolution. A resolution that I hope will be adopted by every school board, village, city, county, special district, and civic body in this district. I am going to send a copy to every one of these bodies and urge that they endorse it.

Further, I am going to send copies of this resolution to all of my 434 colleagues in the House of Representatives. I will ask that they endorse it and likewise send copies to all the local government bodies in their districts.

Now, I would like to read to you what this resolution says:

"HOME RULE AND TAX REFORM RESOLUTION

"Resolution urging revision of tax structure among the various levels of government

"Whereas all local governments in the United States of America are firmly committed to the advancement of the principles of home rule and local self-determination; and,

"Whereas these precious principles of American local government are meaningless unless the counties, cities, school districts, and other special service districts concerned have available tax sources for financing local governmental functions; and,

"Whereas, with home rule, there invariably comes the necessity of home responsibility and the challenge of home achievement since the fulfillment of home rules does not involve the denial of governmental services to the people nor does it involve their being furnished at substandard levels; and,

"Whereas the common property tax is now the universally overloaded mainstay of local government finances with the inevitable result that self-sufficiency of local governments is seriously hampered; and,

"Whereas local governments need additional independent sources of revenue in order to enable proper home rule performance of governmental services; and,

"Whereas strong local government is the foundation of our Republic: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* by———, That support is hereby expressed for the allocation of specific tax sources to local government; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That support is hereby expressed for an immediate revision of the tax structure at the State and Federal levels with the single goal of returning tax sources to local units of Government, thereby enabling said local governments to be more self-sufficient in their own right."

If you concur, I will solicit your support. This resolution, I feel, will set the stage for action by the Congress and all levels of government. I personally feel that the first major step in this tax reform could be the Federal excise tax.

The Federal excise tax on telephone service, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, leather goods, amusements, etc. was levied during the Korean war. It was promised that it would expire 2 years later.

But for more than a decade, this tax has been extended year after year. The administration and the Congress has broken faith with the people time after time. In reality, this tax should have been the first to go. It provides Federal income of some $13 billion a year, not a great deal more, relatively speaking, than the recent income tax cut.

To illustrate that possible repeal of the excise tax is not just a dream, I have talked to the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee about it. This is the committee that handles tax bills. I fully believe we can look forward to action to implement these objectives.

It is my plan to continue working with the First Congressional District's schools, cities, counties, as well as the League of California Cities, the County Supervisors Association, the National Association of County Officials in Washington, and any volunteer organization dedicated to the cause of fiscal integrity to advance this tax reform concept.

I would like to just touch briefly on the President's proposed budget to advise interested people of some improvement that could and should be made. We will urge:

1. Proceeds of the sale of Government assets should be listed in the budget as revenue, rather than as a reduction of Federal spending, thereby reflecting a more accurate budget picture.

2. Establish a Bipartisan Commission on Federal Expenditure policy to study the following areas: (a) Establishment of spending priorities among Federal programs; (b) appraisal of Federal activities to determine those which retard economic growth; (c) improvement of Federal budgeting process; (d) examination of Government functions which could be better performed by the private sector of our economy; (e) review of Federal responsibilities to determine which could be performed more effectively and efficiently at State and local levels; (f) determination of proper level of user charges and other fees charged the public for special Government services; (g) improvement in Government operations to increase efficiency.

3. Evaluate and reorient the whole network of Government price supports toward a free market economy for agriculture: (a) Reject the repudiated doctrine of "supply management."

4. In adjusting to the technological revolution—education and training will become increasingly vital to the social progress of our Nation. The Government should: (a) Encourage in every way possible, the expansion of business training programs; (b) existing private programs to guarantee long-term private loans to students should be improved upon and extended; (c) accelerate and extend vocational, apprenticeship, and manpower development and training programs; (d) coordinate and modernize Health, Education, and Welfare's vocational education program, Labor's apprenticeship program and military vocational training; (e) review draft law provisions as they impede education and employment of young men; (f) eliminate redundancy and inconsistency among Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the unemployment insurance program, and the military manpower training programs; (g) amend tax laws to permit tax deduction for education or training in either academic or vocational subjects at the post-high-school level; (h) provide incentives for companies to plan for technological changes by, among other measures suggested herein, encouraging States to broaden merit ratings under unemployment insurance laws; (i) encourage States to permit individuals undergoing training or retraining to receive unemployment compensation up to normal amounts and limits; (j) consider disqualifying from unemployment compensation workers who refuse referral to training without good cause.

5. Antitrust: Favor establishment of a Commission on Antitrust Laws to review U.S. laws and procedures as they affect growth, foreign economic policy, and the national security.

6. National emergency strikes: (a) Recommend that a joint congressional committee be established to study all aspects of industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts with a purpose of shaping new legislation to deal with national emergency strikes; (b) urge that organization of tripartite labor, management, and government committees on local, regional, and industry basis be pressed.

7. Encourage profit sharing by employees: (a) Encourage export expansion.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the issue of medical care for the aged under social security is again becoming a current topic of conversation. I have received hundreds of letters on the subject in the last several weeks. One of these is from a constituent of mine who has lived in a country with a Federal medical care program. I feel that her firsthand knowledge of the operation of such a system is important as we consider this legislation.

Her letter follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
February 24, 1964.

Representative M. G. SNYDER,
House Office Building.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: We were with you from the start. But after tonight's TV program on the King-Anderson bill, I was finally really ready to write.

All the reasons listed against the present bill are valid. But for me, a very new citizen and native of Vienna, Austria, there are even more.

I grew up with medicare in its full development. This means that little old ladies go to the doctor every week because of the other little old ladies they meet there and also because it is all free. The doctor gets a set amount for each patient for every 3 months; regardless whether he saw him once or 100 times. All drugs are free as long as they are on the list approved by the government. The doctor is so swamped with people who just want to relieve the monotony of their lives, that he can't possibly give his patients the individual care and attention they need and deserve. They have to see up to 200 patients a day. The paperwork takes up so much time that more often than not it requires extra help. All of this leads people to seek the doctors who don't take part in the plan, but they still have the money taken out of their paychecks.

People like my mother, who is an artist, aren't covered at all. Most people, who can't afford to pay all, pay the difference between social security rates and private costs in order to get longer hospital days, better drugs, etc.

Let us not vote for this terrible system. Keep the United States the land of the free.

You are doing just fine. Keep up the good work and please, vote "No" on medicare and all such demagogic legislation.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. C. GENE FOLLIS.

Central Livestock Association Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Central Livestock Association Inc., held its annual convention on February 13, 1964, and adopted a number of pertinent resolutions, among which was the following, relating to imports and exports of livestock products. I wish to call attention to this resolution, which clearly states the position of this important agricultural organization:

RESOLUTION ON A WORLD TRADE

A

We fully recognize the importance of world trade to the United States of America. The expansion of international trade is of paramount importance to prosperity, security, and solvency.

Recognizing that approximately one-sixth of the agricultural production of the United States, valued from $5 to $6 billion annually, is now being shipped to foreign countries, and that the Federal program, which underwrites around $1½ billion of our agricultural exports, accentuates our problem of unfavorable balance of payments, and further recognizing that the development of the European Economic Community, with its plans for free trade and self-sufficiency within its borders is not made with the best interests of the United States in mind, we must realize that our foreign markets for agricultural products are, therefore, in jeopardy. Negotiations with Comomn Market countries to improve our position relative to foreign trade must continue.

It shall be the duty of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., to take cognizance of every move contemplated and made by those charged with the responsibility for the development and administration of the foreign trade program, and be prepared to act as a unit in guarding and protecting the interests of its members against the importation of livestock, meat, and meat products in such quantities as to threaten serious injury to our domestic industry.

B

Recognizing that the production of red meat represents the most important single segment of the agricultural economy of the United States, and that the current levels of imports of meats are causing an extremely adverse economic impact on our domestic red meat industry, and are also causing the loss of millions of dollars to the Nation's economy, and that this situation also places in jeopardy an adequate supply of wholesome red meat for the consuming public of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That no tariff concessions be granted on livestock, wool, meat, and meat products at the coming Geneva trade talks; and be it further

Resolved, That both the legislative and executive branches of our Government take immediate action to provide reasonable protection for the domestic livestock industry from these imports through negotiations with exporting countries and through the enactment by Congress of laws to provide adequate tariffs and the establishment of a meat import quota system.

Washington Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we shall be dealing shortly with a review of the Federal service, the men and women who compose it and the compensation which is provided to them.

Not long ago, I had the opportunity to read an excellent article written by a constituent, Raymond W. Stahl, secretary in the claim department of the Travelers Insurance Co. Mr. Stahl wrote his article for publication in the Travelers Beacon, the employee publication. He had served for four and a half months as a public affairs fellow under the sponsorship of the Brookings Institution, assigned to the International Security Affairs Office of the Department of Defense.

Like a counterpart from his company, Mr. James Hallett, who had served a

similar fellowship, Mr. Stahl came to have a high regard for the energy, imagination, industry, and patriotism of these Government employees. Some of his comments are frank and direct, and they underline the problems of recruiting of executives which have caused serious study in Congress.

He points out effectively, however, the way in which our Federal employees often are called upon to meet the pressure of schedules and deadlines and do so with dispatch and efficiency. In his conclusion, he feels that weaknesses are overestimated, while the strengths go unrecognized.

I was happy to have this informed and detailed commentary, and I believe that Mr. Stahl's remarks deserve to be called to the attention of the Members:

WASHINGTON OBSERVATIONS

(By Raymond W. Stahl)

As we approach another national political campaign, we are already hearing some familiar expressions from the presidential hopefuls. From one party comes: "We must clean up the mess in Washington." On the other side of the political fence, the message is: "This country will continue to move ahead only if the present administration is continued—don't change horses in midstream."

Of course, there is no doubt that the activities of the Federal Government vary with the influences of the party in power, and perhaps more particularly with the personality and conviction of the President. But it seems to me that the public has a collection of erroneous impressions regarding the extent to which any incoming President or reelected incumbent can, in fact, control the operations of the Federal agencies.

Even more evident is the apparent lack of real understanding of the kind and caliber of people who comprise these agencies. Make your own survey, and I predict that you will find among your friends and associates a rather common belief that the average Federal Government employee is a wastrel who could not survive in a business enterprise, that there are repeated glaring examples of frustrating inefficiency in our Washington bureaucracy, that the net effect is that many of our tax dollars are going down the drain (perhaps even into private pockets), and that if we could only start all over again, we would have some dramatic changes, starting with the discharge of at least one-half of all the people now on the Federal payroll.

Except for the exposure of many of us to past military service, there are relatively few people in the business sector who have had any real personal experience on which to base opinions of the efficiency of the Federal Government operations. The rather low opinion held by most of the public about the efficiency of Government, and more particularly Government employees, is all the more surprising when one considers the performance of the Post Office and Internal Revenue Departments, which have the largest, most regular contact with our society. Most people will agree that both of these are very efficient operations, considering the vast character of their complex functions.

In brief, despite the proficiency of these and several other departments which are much exposed to the public view, there is a widespread, rather settled dissatisfaction with the performance of our Federal system.

BROOKINGS SPONSORS PROGRAM

One organization which recognizes the need for greater mutual understanding between the worlds of business and Government is the Brookings Institution. Brookings has for more than 35 years sponsored nonpartisan research in areas of economics, foreign policy, and Government. The luster of its reputation is untarnished, largely because of its policy to avoid national publicity. The objective research activities conducted over the years by Brookings staff members and sponsored associates has had a substantial yet indirect influence on legislation, urban development, changes in regulatory practices and improved budget controls. Indeed, the list of accomplishments is far too long to record fully here.

Four years ago Brookings sponsored the first of the current series of public affairs fellowship programs, designed to draw executives from the business and the labor communities for personal exposures to working assignments in the major Federal agencies in Washington. In this fashion Brookings provides a unique opportunity to improve understanding between Federal career executives and the public affairs fellows, with the emphasis placed upon the similarity of their management responsibilities and their mutual interdependence.

The first impression gained from this exposure, and one which is never thereafter forgotten, is the sheer size of our Government system. There are about 5 million people on our Federal payrolls, approximately half of whom are military personnel. About 10 percent of the civilian employees are located in Washington, with an equal number overseas. The remaining 80 percent are distributed throughout the 50 States. From an organization standpoint, there are about 70 departments or major agencies, divided into some 1,800 major subdivisions. The personnel requirements range across some 15,000 skills—from astronauts to zoologists—including almost every imaginable talent. As we know all too well, the total cost of these Federal operations is about $100 billion a year.

POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS FEW

It is important to recognize that only about 3,000 positions are filled by political appointments, while about 98 percent of the civilian personnel are career employees. The political executive is a passing figure on the stage. Typically his tenure is from 2 to 3 years. He comes into office knowing little about the complex, often gigantic organization he has been appointed to lead. He "learns his way around" only after about a year of frustration, and usually returns to private life shortly after he actually begins to be effective. He turns the reins over to a successor who resumes the cycle. This fairly typical pattern illustrates that most of the burden for the operation of these various agencies is necessarily shouldered by the career executives who have come up through the ranks, civilian as well as military.

What kind of people decide to devote their lives to a civil service career and eventually emerge as executives in these various departments? It has generally been found by the public affairs fellows that the personnel in the Federal agencies look, act, and perform on the job much like the personnel and management staff of most business corporations. If there is any obvious difference, it is that the average career civil servant is stimulated by a sense of patriotism. He knows that he is working at a task, no matter of what dimensions, that in some way affects the future destiny of his country. I found this to be quite evident in the Department of Defense. There is a constant awareness, often voiced, that the decisions being made directly relate to the security of our Nation. This kind of influence does in fact produce a sense of dedication to duty which is all too infrequently found in the business organization.

Much of the same can be said about most of the people who occupy the key political positions. It is fortunate that each administration, regardless of political affiliation, has been able most of the time to fill these policymaking jobs with people who are, in fact, well qualified to undertake the important obligations of the offices. One exception to this is the inability of most Presidents, the present administration included, to find a sufficient quantity of young business executives between the aged of 35 and 50, to fill key posts. Few executives at these age levels are willing to risk the sacrifice of interrupting their careers at this crucial point in their progress. Nor are they anxious to enter the "fish bowl atmosphere" of a political position, particularly when they recognize the problems of maintaining appropriate press relations, and the burdens of assuming leadership of organizations with which they have little or no familiarity.

EDUCATORS AND LAWYERS

The present administration has turned to educators and lawyers, to fill jobs that admittedly are more suitable to individuals with business backgrounds. However, educators and lawyers are in supply for these positions, primarily because there are certain prestige factors in having some record of public service which most often enhances the future careers of these individuals.

There is another factor, more subtle in nature. Business leaders on the whole are critical of big Government and one implication is an aversion to become part of it. To be sure, there are many illustrations of Federal activity which impose upon the business community. On the other hand, many Federal activities are the natural result of an expanding population, plus the increasing demand for more Federal services.

Like it or not, big Government is here to stay. With that comes the need for sound management principles in order to maintain and increase efficiency, and it is these areas in which the political executive with a business background can make the most effective contribution.

One basic difference between civil service careers and careers in business is the rather rigid legal structure of the personnel systems in the Federal agencies. These include several pay systems as well as limitations on recruiting. For example, civil service recruiters must hire not only qualified people but also must give preference to veterans who are candidates for employment.

Further, measurements of performance are even less readily available than in the business enterprise. Another exception is the lack of prestige. The successful business executive is respected in his community and is generally well regarded. On the contrary, the successful civil service executive must, as one puts it, "fight for ones self-respect." There are also financial limitations, particularly at the executive level. The highest possible salary under the present regulations is $20,000 per year, available only to a very small number of executives (approximately 300 at the present time).

CONGRESS HAS SALARY BILL

Pay adjustments lag behind changes in the economy. At present, there is a bill before Congress to modify substantially the civil service pay grades, particularly at the higher levels. Our group of Public Affairs Fellows tended to agree that the incomes paid to the upper echelon of the career civil servants were indeed below comparable salaries in business, taking into consideration the substantial burdens of the offices held by these people. This is not the consensus, however, as respects the low and middle grades where incomes are at least competitive with industry. The sick leave and retirement programs are quite adequate. One real problem is advancement of the more able individual. By and large, advancement is "by the numbers" based on length of service. But at the higher levels, it is evident that capable men can and do emerge at fairly rapid rates.

Examples of Federal pay raises now being considered

The job	Present annual pay	Proposed annual pay
President of the United States	$100,000	$100,000
Chief Justice of the United States	35,500	45,500
Vice President	35,000	45,000
Speaker of the House	35,000	45,000
Supreme Court Justices	35,000	45,000
Circuit court judges	25,500	35,500
Cabinet members	25,000	35,000
Members of Congress	22,500	32,500
District court judges	22,500	32,500
Comptroller General of the United States	22,500	32,500
No. 2 men to Cabinet members	21,000	30,500
Heads of large agencies, such as General Services Administration	21,000	30,500
Architect of the Capitol	20,700	29,500
Librarian of Congress	20,000	29,500
The Public Printer	20,000	29,500
Heads of smaller agencies, such as Selective Service System	19,000	26,500
Top civil service post (GS-18)	20,000	24,500
Bottom civil service post (GS-1)	3,245	3,385
Average post office clerk or carrier	5,045	5,495

The career civil servant who has ascended to the executive level must necessarily have almost artistic talent as a practical politician, in the most complimentary sense of that term. As a member of a Federal agency, his primary obligation is to carry out the activities of his department under the broad directions of the Secretary of the Department. And, of course, the President. But as he makes decisions and goes through his day-to-day activities he is subjected to a wide variety of influences and controls which must always be kept in mind.

Most of the time he is not making unilateral decisions affecting only his agency. Whatever his department, there are other Federal agencies who have a legitimate interest in most of his decisions, which in some instances are cooperative decisions. For example, a decision made in the Department of Defense in connection with a foreign country will necessarily involve other Federal agencies, particularly the State Department. In such an instance, there must be interdepartmental cooperation that extends to essentially every message and communication on the subject, as a part of the decisionmaking process. Even more difficult are the decisions that involve competitive agencies. There are many problems which arise where two or more Federal agencies, each having a legitimate interest, find themselves handling common problems in which overlaps of functions and authority and strong differences of opinion are present.

ACTIONS CONSTANTLY CHALLENGED

Of course, many of the decisions and actions of the Federal agency executive are constantly being challenged. The result is often litigation in which the bureau chief finds himself before the court system. Even more frequently, his decisions are constantly being exposed to review by the Attorney General's staff and by the legal counsel in his own agency.

The bureau chief or executive is also a natural target for the members of the communication media. This includes not only the members of the press, television, and radio, but also reporters of trade journals who have a particular interest in the affairs of specific departments of Government. One subsequence is that the career executive finds his decisions on major issues exposed to public view, frequently subject to critical debate with little or no opportunity for rebuttal. Indeed, when the decision is based upon factors which are subject to security measures, he may be completely precluded from expressing response to adverse public criticism. And always the members of the fourth estate are intrigued by the personal lives of these public leaders and quick to capitalize on social activity which may stimulate public interest, whether favorable or unfavorable to that individual.

There are a host of other pressures and influences. The career staff of the agency, as in private business, frequently develops proposals and programs which are urged upon the executive for favorable consideration and must be dealt with. He is besieged by letters, telephone calls, and personal visits from members of both friendly and unfriendly interest groups, particularly when a major bill involving his agency is before the Congress.

COMMUNICATIONS IMPORTANT

In dealing with the Congress, the career executive must maintain communication with at least six major congressional committees plus their subcommittees. These include House and Senate legislation committees, appropriations committees and operations committees, plus the Government Accounting Office. Finally, he is exposed to some contact and pressures from the National, State and local headquarters of the major political parties.

It is in this atmosphere that he must operate. You will recognize many similarities with environment of the business executive and yet obviously the career civil service executive's world is different. To be effective he must be an expert in building alliances adept at bargaining, and satisfied ultimately to accept compromises. Critics of the system point out that the results frequently lack rationality and that innovation is suppressed. From the standpoint of the career executive most would tell you that he is unable to satisfy any one of the forces that must be considered when he is making his decisions. Each influencer, typically, is honesty motivated, but obviously it is impossible and undesirable that the Federal executive attempt to satisfy them all.

When one is exposed to this structure as a neophyte on a temporary assignment, the impression at the outset is that he will never be able to do anything worthwhile. But each of the Public Affairs Fellows has very quickly discovered that this is not true. Each Public Affairs Fellow has a specific assignment with fixed responsibilities. Of course he is at the mercy of his new associates and totally dependent upon them. I found that without exception the cooperation was nothing short of astonishing. Since these associates were quite accustomed to breaking in new people introductions and the identification of individual responsibilities were accomplished in short order. This spirit of cooperation prevailed not only within the Department of Defense, but also in contacts with the members of the other Federal agencies with whom I became involved.

MEET TIME SCHEDULES

I was also impressed with a general sense of determination to meet production schedules. There were many illustrations of this. For example, each time the President or a major Federal executive has a meeting scheduled with officials of other governments it is necessary for departments having an interest in those discussions to prepare the necessary briefing papers. This process imposes severe time schedule problems, and yet they are met almost uniformly.

Similar activity is involved in meeting the schedules of presentations of budgets and legislative matters to congressional committees. These time schedules are met at the cost of long hours and frequently weekend activity with surprisingly little grumbling. And, of course, there are frequent emergencies—from large to small in character—which cannot be anticipated and place heavy burdens not only on the management staff but also the clerical staff of these agencies. Illustrations of this type of situation range from the seizure of American tuna boats by a South American country last spring to the compelling complexities of the discovery of missiles on Cuba. Such problems must be dealt with with dispatch and effectiveness.

There is no question about the fact that there is a mountain of redtape, some dead wood in the agencies and plenty of opportunity for procrastination and delay in reaching decisions. But my own brief personal experience has served as a vivid demonstration to me that in general the weaknesses in our Federal agency system are overemphasized, while the strengths are taken for granted.

The future of this country, ranging from the solution of its economic problems to the preservation of the security of our Nation, is largely in the hands of our civil servants. We should be grateful that there are so many capable people bringing to their day-to-day tasks a dedication at a level which is truly unsurpassed, even in private industry.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 7, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, of Texas)

MARCH 7, 1964.

HOW PEOPLE ARE FOOLED ON BUDGET CUTTING

Budget juggling, always a clever manipulation in making it possible for the administration and Congress to please everybody, is being worked overtime now. A good illustration of how it works is the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia, passed by the House this week. This is the process which permits the spenders to show that they are getting things done and the savers to point out a cut has been made.

Total budget estimate for the District of Columbia	$357,702,300
Committee recommendation	338,205,200
Apparent cut in budget	19,497,100

So we saved $19,497,100. Ah, but there is a joker in the deck. The $338,205,200 approved for District appropriations for 1965 is $25,089,538 over the appropriations for fiscal 1964. Instead of saving $19 million plus, we are actually increasing spending by $25 million plus. This will be the same formula for all appropriations bills and the result will be then that there is not going to be a cut in spending, as the administration promised, but rather an increase in spending.

Money for the District Department of Public Welfare was upped $2,746,645. Aid for dependent children of unemployed persons is up $310,375 and 25 new positions have been added to this division alone. Much of the need for this increase is because of the continued rise in illegitimacy, a seemingly permanent problem in the District due in part to financial encouragement given in this area by the social planners and do-gooders.

COST OF PEACE CORPS UPPED $13 MILLION

The House approved H.R. 9666, to increase appropriations for the Peace Corps by $13 million. I am deeply concerned, and said so

in the House, about sending young Americans overseas under a foreign policy that fails to protect and defend American lives and property. We are sending 6,976 young people abroad as Peace Corps volunteers, many of them to countries hostile to the United States.

Just two examples: Cyprus with 22 Peace Corps volunteers. Not only are American lives endangered, but there is a very ticklish diplomatic situation in which the U.S. allies are involved. Just one wrong word from an inexperienced, eager Peace Corps worker could plunge the Nation into a dangerous incident. Ghana has 139 volunteers from the Peace Corps. This is the country which is openly pro-Communist and has staged some of the most recent violent anti-American demonstrations. The Government there makes no secret of its contempt for us and its sympathy for the Communists.

A total of 555 volunteers have been returned to this country before their assignment was up. Of these 339 were returned for personal adjustment reasons which included inability to adjust, behavorial problems, insistence on marriage not compatible with Peace Corps service, resignations, and involuntary operations. This was the only explanation given in the report.

THE ILL-ADVISED INTEREST EQUALIZATION ACT

The Interest Equalization Act of 1963, advocated by the President and Democrat leaders to solve the imbalance of payments and gold outflow is self-defeating and will only accentuate the problems. Proponents refuse to recognize: (1) that our money invested privately abroad earns money and returns to the United States; (2) that we must keep our money market free of government dictation; (3) that our foreign giveaways directly accelerate gold outflow, and (4) that our trade program is not reciprocal because others do not lower their tariffs to match ours and flood our country with goods. Instead they impose a new tax on U.S. purchasers of foreign stocks or bonds. The tax ranges from 2.75 to 15 percent for maturities of 3 to 28½ years. All the witnesses at the hearings and most of the Republican members of the House disapproved this short-range attempt at a solution which now may well obscure the permanent and basic solutions necessary.

DALLAS CHILDREN FURNISH AN INSPIRATION

A most prized presentation was made to me. I received a booklet prepared by the second grade class of Mrs. Elizabeth Lutz at the White Rock School. The hand-made booklet was called "Our Forefathers and the Words They Gave Us." It contained, in the children's own handwriting, many of the great truths upon which our freedoms are founded. In their letter to me, they said:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALGER: We are Mrs. Lutz' second-grade class at White Rock School. We have each made an American booklet just like the one we are presenting to you. We love our country. Thank you for serving us."

America has lost too much of this simple, child-like faith in our country. We have made patriotism a dirty word. From this work by these children all of us may learn a powerful lesson about the importance of returning to the old-fashioned virtues of patriotism, pride in ourselves, faith in our great Nation. I thank these youngsters. I am proud to serve a community which inculcates such sterling qualities in our young.

MEETING WITH NEW YORK AFL-CIO UNION

This week I was happy to speak to 1,000 shop stewards of District 65, Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, AFL-CIO, in New York City. Two of the union officials had appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in support of the hospitalization (medicare) bill. They accepted my challenge to invite me to one of their meetings. It was a good experience for me, and I think, for them. I do not know that I made any converts to the side I presented, but the free and open discussion was the best example of our American system at work—in which men and women of good will may disagree and strongly support each point of view without hatred, rancor, or violence.

Investigation Pertaining to Tile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum submitted by Mr. Enoch R. Rust, chairman of the Tariff Subcommittee on Stone, Glass, and Clay Coordinating Committee, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL-CIO, CLC, before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee in the matter of their investigation pertaining to various types of tile.

I believe Mr. Rust's statement is worthy of consideration by my colleagues and I commend it to them for their perusal:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Enoch R. Rust, international vice president of the United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL-CIO, CLC.

I appear also as the chairman of the Tariff Subcommittee of the Stone, Glass, and Clay Coordinating Committee. This coordinating committee consists of seven international unions, all affiliates of the AFL-CIO. Our total membership is 250,000. Based upon an average of four in each of the 250,000 families, we have 1 million American directly dependent upon the stone, glass, and clay industries which are under contract with these international unions.

The officers and membership of these international unions have become deeply concerned over the present trends in the international trade situation and the adverse effect it is having upon the welfare of our membership. We want to thank you for this opportunity to come here and express ourselves.

Acting independently we felt the sound of our voice would just about equal the squeak of a mouse in the great State of Texas. We, therefore, discussed our problems jointly and found them to be on a parallel in all of the seven groups. We then united into one organized group in order to give emphasis to the gravity of our problems.

During the years of 1959, 1960, and 1961, the Tariff Commission held peril point and escape clause investigations and hearings in the matter of excessive imports of ceramic, mosaic floor, and wall tile (investigation 7-100).

In 1959 these imports amounted to 24,620,000 square feet. In 1960, 28,337,000 square feet and in 1961 they showed a slight decline to 25,289,000 square feet. On the basis of this volume of imports and their effect upon domestic industry and employment, this Commission found they caused serious injury and, therefore, recommended to the President that relief be granted through an increase in duties. A promise of voluntary quotas was made by the Japanese and the recommendation was refused.

Immediately following 1962 imports of ceramic mosaic floor and wall tile surged back to 37,373,000 square feet. Based upon import figures for the first 8 months of 1963, they will reach the astronomical heights of approximately 45 million square feet. This displaced approximately 2,000 production jobs last year with an approximate payroll loss to the already sagging American economy of approximately $10,400,000, for tile that would have been produced had it not been for these imports. Supervisory and clerical salaries displaced by these imports would increase this amount by millions of dollars more. Payroll based on union hourly earnings less 17 cents.

While the American market for this item has enjoyed normal expansion, mainly due to the organized research and promotion of the Tile Council of America (organization of domestic producers), as well as the individual efforts of other major domestic producers, the domestic producers did not enjoy any of this new market. But instead domestic sales dropped 1,972,000 square feet from 39,158,000 square feet in 1959 to 37,286,000 square feet in 1962. At the same time domestic inventories increased from 9,568,000 square feet to 10,473,000 in 1962. If anyone should doubt this, they should take a walk through these factories. I have and the only way you can tell the color of the ceiling is because of the aisles.

Now, we take a look at what imports have been doing. On a percentage basis during 1959, foreign imports were 24,620,000 square feet or 62.9 percent of domestic producers sales. In 1962 they were 37,373,000 or 100.2 percent of domestic sales. The 1963 figure will be much worse.

This portrays the most important facet of the trade and fade picture. None of the expanding market is being enjoyed by domestic industries. This is definite proof the serious injury to this industry that you found in your 1959, 1960, and 1961 investigations not only still exist but has been compounded. We therefore, can find no reason why the U.S. Tariff Commission would not only retain this item on the reserved list—but again recommend relief through increased duties. It is quite clear that the present duties are too low to afford domestic producers an equal opportunity to share in our own markets. This is not the American way of doing things. You might disagree and say "this is only a part of the mechanics or our competitive system." Competition is a two-way street. When one competitor has a stick and the other a machinegun, competition no longer exists. This is where we find ourselves when you take into consideration the wide wage Japanese ceramic tileworkers.

I am sorry that I do not have the correct employment figures on all ceramic tile locals in the United States. But by taking a sampling, I am sure we were able to arrive at an approximate average. Olean Tile Co., Olean, N.Y., and local 151, July 1962, had 404 production workers. At the present there are only 325. Contract negotiated in January 1962—2½-cent wage increase or less than 2 percent. Three cents in 1963—less than 2 percent.

Mosaic Tile Co., Zanesville, Ohio, local 79, July 1962, had 861 production workers. January 1, 1964, only 671. Contract negotiated November 30, 1963, no general wage increase for first year. Second year, a 2-cent wage increase for all bonus workers, and 3 cents per hour for all maintenance and nonbonus workers. (This latter group consists of approximately 15 percent of employees.) A 3-cent increase per hour for all bonus workers and 5 cents to all nonbonus workers. First year, no wage increase, fringe benefits less than 1 percent. Second year, less than 2 percent, third, approximately 2 percent.

Jackson Tile Co., Jackson, Miss., local 401, July 1962, had 250 production workers. January 1964 they employed only 140. This remaining 140 employees are on a 34- to 36-hour workweek.

Last negotiations 2-cent-per-hour wage increase over a 15-month period.

As the cost of living in the United States continues to rise, workers in this industry are entitled to, and will seek, wage increases, at least in relation to the rise of the cost of living. In order to maintain present living standards, through wage increases, the workers in this industry in 1962, increased production by 9.5 million square feet above that of 1960, with approximately 9 percent less workers in the work force. This cannot be repeated. The time will come when industry will demand wage cuts—when this becomes a reality the health and stability of the American purchasing market will start deteriorating at a much faster tempo and it won't be long then until there will not be a market left to fight over.

The American purchasing power has already suffered through indirect wage cuts and there are strong indications that this situation is becoming worse. All evidence in this matter plainly and clearly demonstrates that the importer is not satisfied with equal market opportunity, but will not stop until he has it all. Under the unfair advantages expressed above as the record will show, he has been able to capture practically the entire market in cities such as St. Louis, where imports amounted to 1 million square feet in 1962. This is an inland city.

The importer already having an unfair advantage by being able to sell his tile at prices 15 to 25 cents per square foot below domestic producers is still not satisfied.

FREIGHT RATE APPLICATION

The importer has filed application after application with port authorities pleading for still another advantage through lower freight rates. This in my opinion brings into clear focus the indisputable intent behind this action—all of the market, through the complete destruction of domestic competition.

On January 1, 1963, application No. C–13246 was filed by the importer with the Transcontinental Freight Bureau asking for cheaper rates on imported tile from west coast ports to Minneapolis, St. Louis, and North Kansas City, Mo. The Mexican Request Docket No. 8261 sought a rate of 70 cents per hundred pounds on 80,000 pounds from Houston, Tex., to Kansas City, recently established rate 90 cents on 80,000 pounds from the Rio Grande crossings to St. Louis, Mo. This request was protested by dometic producers. Public hearings were held in early October 1962. The proponent in this case claimed all he was trying to do was to compete with the Japanese tiles in St. Louis and stated that he needed this reduction in order to meet this competition. The request was granted. Why? On SPFFC Docket No. 8261 the shipper and member line are using this same rate structure to undersell the Mexican tile imports. It is important to note that the domestic competition was not mentioned. Apparently they think we are already dead and they have only to fight over the spoils.

GLAZED WALL TILE ALSO HURT

Glazed ceramic wall tile, TSUS 532.24 (pt) has, up until recently been the bread-and-butter item to the ceramic tile industry. It has served as a crutch by absorbing some of the impact of excessive imports of glazed and unglazed ceramic mosaic floor and wall tile.

Now, the threat of having the crutch kicked from under us is evidenced by the following statistics. The total of all types of ceramic tile imported during 1962 amounted to 85,778,900 square feet. Forty-five million square feet of this was glazed wall tile TSUS 532.24 (pt). The estimated overall imports (based on first 10 months) for 1963, will no doubt surpass 100 million square feet. 54-million square feet of this will be 41¼ by 4¼ glazed wall tile. An increase of approximately 15 million square feet over 1961 imports of this item. This adds extra stress to the necessity of TSUS 532.21 (pt) remaining in a reserved satus. The 100 million square feet of ceramic tile imports would have created approximately 4,000 jobs had they been made in America, and would have created a direct payroll of approximately $20 million (fringe benefits included).

Gentlemen, we have demonstrated here that the importers already have the lion's share of our market, that they already enjoy unfair trade advantages and what we believe their intent to be. Now we leave it up to you. Unless the Tariff Commission deems this industry unimportant, we can see no way it can change its position from that of 1961, by finding that serious injury does still exist in this industry and again recommend the relief which is long overdue.

Again, I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear here before you, and assure you that any consideration you give our problem will be deeply appreciated by the American men and women who have dedicated their lives, long ago, to the manufacturing of beautiful ceramic mosaic floor and wall tile.

Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, many words have been written and many more have been spoken in criticism of the 1st session of this 88th Congress. We have heard it denounced by critics as a foot-dragging Congress. I believe my colleagues will be pleased to know there are some who have an appreciation of the work of the Congress and I submit for their information an article from the January 6 issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly titled "Salute to Congress: The Record Is Better Than the Critics Pretend":

SALUTE TO CONGRESS: THE RECORD IS BETTER THAN THE CRITICS PRETEND

The legislative branch of the U.S. Government, perennial whipping-boy of all who seek unbridled power for the Executive, has been getting its lumps again lately. Back in New Deal days, F.D.R. used to lash out at "Martin, Barton, and Fish"; a decade later Harry Truman vented his wrath on the do-nothing 80th Congress. However, the 88th which recessed briefly on Tuesday after winding up a wearisome first session, has suffered the most far-reaching abuse. From commanding positions on television and in the press, the whole liberal establishment has heaped scorn upon the Nation's lawmakers. According to one noted journalist, their reputation "has sunk lower than a snake's belly." The public's attitude toward Capitol Hill, added Stewart Alsop, "is a mixture of indifference, amusement, and contempt." Even the Ford Foundation subtly threw in its 2 cents worth when it disclosed last week a grant of $85,000 to the American Assembly of Columbia University, to finance a scholarly study of "An Effective Congress."

As the Ford Foundation seems to suspect, there is indeed a crying need for fresh enlightenment—chiefly among the strident critics cited above. Contrary to their misguided views (which, by the way, would have appalled the Foundling Fathers and delighted George III), the U.S. Constitution has endowed the legislative branch, not the Executive, with authority to make the Nation's laws. The White House may propose; Congress, in due course, disposes. In the session that has just drawn to a close, moreover, the process of deliberation, while frustrating to some observers, has scarcely proved a waste of time. For example, by carefully weighing pros and cons, the House Ways and Means Committee produced a tax reduction bill far superior to the original draft of the Treasury. In other cases protracted debate has prevented the hasty enactment of legislation which, on closer scrutiny and second thoughts, turned out to be ill-conceived, unnecessary and unwise. Across the board it has heightened the public awareness of issues. The 88th Congress to date may not have passed many laws, but, within its own bailiwick, it have given the country tolerably good government.

Those who measure such things strictly in terms of quantity are not likely to agree. Probably not since 1932, when a Democratic Congress chose to balk a Republican President at every turn, has the legislative process moved at so slow and (at least to some) painful a pace. Despite heavey pressure from the administration, the lawmakers passed neither the civil rights nor the tax bill. The House Ways and Means Committee took no action on so-called medicare, the scheme to provide the aged with hospital and nursing home care through new payroll levies under social security. Federal aid to public schools remained a dead letter. Where Congress showed unexpected vigor, as in the case of foreign aid, the results were calculated to please neither the White House nor its spokesmen in the fourth estate.

Hence the shrill chorus of denunication, which, in recent weeks, has echoed loud and long. A look at the record, however, suggests that Congress deserves something better. In terms of what they achieved, as well as what they balked at, the lawmakers have done well by their constituents. The tax bill is a case in point. Originally designed to restore confidence after the stock market crash of 1962, the measure took 18 months to clear the House Ways and Means Committee. While vexing to the Executive, which repeatedly warned of the dangers of recession, the delay has had no visible effect on the stock market, or on employment, production and trade, all of which lately have reached new highs. It has given Congress time to ahalyze, and to reject, some of the doctrinaire soak-the-rich proposals with which the Treasury version was loaded. What has emerged from the weighty deliberations of the committee is far from ideal—Barron's still leans to the view that budgets should be balanced before taxes are cut. However, both philosophically and fiscally, the new bill makes more sense than the old.

With respect to other pending measures, delay has proved equally salutary. Many months ago the White House telecast an emotional appeal for medicare, which, save for Chairman WILBUR MILLS and some equally levelheaded colleagues on Ways and Means, might have swept to passage long ago. Now that the Nation has had the opportunity to weigh alternatives—especially after recent hearings on Capitol Hill disclosed that the program will cost far more than the official estimates—the chances are that cooler heads wil prevail. By the same token, despite recurrent pleas of impending crisis, Federal aid to public schools has failed to make much headway in Congress. Notwithstanding the absence of such assistance, State and local governments each year have managed to stave off the crisis, which, with the population explosion fizzling out, has grown increasingly remote.

No law, most people would agree, is preferable to bad law. By this yardstick alone, all the foregoing suggests, the legislative

branch of Government rates high marks. Moreover, though the political pundits somehow have failed to mention the fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD boasts a positive side. As a necessary part of the lawmaking process, Congress enjoys sweeping powers of investigation. In recent months it has put them to good use. The persistent probing of Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Alabama, helped shed some badly needed light on the murky origins of the TFX contract award; it also led to the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee months ago unmasked the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, with which Presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was somehow connected, as a Communist front in the pay of Havana. The Senate Rules Commitee right now is delving into the tangled financial affairs of one-time secretary to the Senate majority Bobby Baker, an investigation which has rippled far and wide.

As for actual legislation, the 1st session of the 88th Congress did more than pass its customary quota of bills. Unlike any of its recent predecessors, it launched a determined effort to correct the excesses, and undo some of the damage, of statutes already on the books. The bitter struggle waged by the House to curtail foreign aid succeeded in whittling the annual appropriation to the lowest level in years; it also underscored the scandalous fact that the program has become a grabbag proffered to nations which, in theory and practice alike, are hostile to the United States. For the first time in living memory, Congress also sought to crack down on the freewheeling Rural Electrification Administration. Finally, it flashed an overdue warning to the Federal Communications Commission and other overzealous regulatory bodies. So far, it told the FCC in effect, and no further.

Like the do-nothing 80th Congress, which endorsed the Truman doctrine, approved the Marshall plan and cut taxes, the 88th thus is likely to deserve well of history. The same can hardly be said of its detractors, who, in their zeal to manipulate the future, have shown an unlovely bias toward the present and disdain of the past. "The less government we have the better," said Emerson well over a century ago. The truth of that statement has just been reaffirmed.

The Peaceful Road to Communist Serfdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have shared the concern of many Americans that we might be lulled to sleep by the Communist lure of peace until we find ourselves one day in an indefensible position.

There are those who decry any warnings of this sort, saying that those who make them are warmongers or alarmists. Yet many of us believe that the best safeguard against war is to remain strong and firm in purpose. It is with this in mind that we urge continued wariness of Communist peace offensives, for there is no reason to believe that this purpose or ultimate goal has changed.

I believe that the Elks magazine of March 1964 has done a great service to the entire United States in publishing a most courageous and well written article by Bruno Shaw on this most important subject. I ask unanimous consent to place this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Elks magazine, March 1964]

THE PEACEFUL ROAD TO COMMUNIST SERFDOM

(Behind the now-you-see-it, now-you-don't peaceful coexistence pose of Comrade Khrushchev lies a permanent and insidious threat to the West: legitimate Communist political machinery in Western Europe that seeks to undermine Western unity and ultimately to seize power in behalf of the Kremlin.)

(By Bruno Shaw)

"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it," George Santayana, one of America's respected sages, wrote many years ago. The New Year message from the Soviet Union's Premier Khrushchev to the heads of all Western nations, calling for a treaty for the renunciation of war as a means of solving territorial disputes or questions of frontiers, emerges through the mists of the past as a latent nightmare.

Should we believe that the U.S.S.R. is at last ready to foreswear war as an instrument of national policy? Should we believe that if the military threat of Soviet imperialism is somehow reduced we can consider Communist expansion halted, at least momentarily? Let's first heed Santayana's warning and have a look at the past in considering these questions.

Only a few decades ago the governments of 62 nations, to the eventual sorrow of their peoples, hoodwinked themselves with a nobly conceived but wholly visionary treaty to outlaw war. It was the brainchild of U.S. Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg and was titled "Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy." It was signed in Paris by 15 nations on August 27, 1928. Forty-seven additional nations became parties to it by ratification in the following months. Among them were the Soviet Union and the then-free countries of Europe which the Soviet has since enslaved behind the Iron Curtain: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, as well as several nations which the Soviet has since destroyed altogether—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

Japan and Germany were among the 15 original signers. And Secretary of State Kellogg was awarded the Nobel Peace prize the following year for what was called "his most important achievement—bringing about the signing of a multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war."

While the democracies disarmed themselves almost to the point of defenseless under the euphoric delusion that world peace would be maintained under this grandiose treaty, the totalitarian nations of the time, planning to conquer the world even as the Soviet is planning to do now, increased their armaments clandestinely and otherwise to mighty proportions. And so, following the Pact of Paris of 1928 which outlawed war; Japan invaded and took Manchuria in 1931; Italy attacked Ethiopia in 1935; Germany and Italy on one side, Russia on the other, intervened in the Spanish Civil War in 1936 in which a million or more Spaniards were killed; Japan invaded China proper in 1937; and in 1939 the most devastating war in all history began.

Now comes Comrade Khrushchev offering a repeat performance of a treaty to "renounce resort to war as a means of settling territorial disputes," with no conceivable means for its enforcement—the same lullaby with which the democratic nations of the world once before sang themselves to sleep while their enemies plotted their destruction.

You and I will simply dismiss the Khrushchev proposal as one more piece of specious Soviet propaganda. But our Government is not equally at liberty to do so without danger of providing Moscow with further ammunition for its hollow protestations in behalf of total disarmament and peaceful coexistence. To ignore the Khrushchev note or to reject it out of hand would make it seem to many of the newly independent and uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa, most of whose people and leaders are without a shred of understanding of what either communism or democracy really mean, that we are inflexibly determined not to consider any proposal from the Soviet, no matter how well intentioned it might be.

We must also bear in mind that arms, however necessary they may be, are not a sufficient defense against Soviet expansion. An insidious effort is being made, day and night, to undermine the institutions of Western society, to emasculate the defensive machinery of the free world.

Drew Middleton, chief of the Paris Bureau of the New York Times, in a recent column reported that because of recent exchanges of peace messages between the United States and the Soviet Union, anti-Communist members of legislatures in some countries of Europe wonder whether we know where the Communist menace really lies. "Let a Communist Party gain power, or even share a coalition." he quotes one official as saying, "and you will be quickly reminded of the true aims of communism. All the divisions or Polaris submarines in Europe won't prevent the Communists from taking that country out of NATO."

It is inevitable in the present state of world affairs that our counteraction to Soviet propaganda has, on occasion, had the result of "damning us whether we do or whether we don't," because of the precarious balance of power that exists in the governments of our NATO allies, whose cooperation is essential for the preservation of world security. It sometimes results, too, in a fantastic distortion of our image in the eyes of many neutral nations which, unhappily, mistakenly view the East-West struggle merely as a battle between two intransigent giants who would do well to sit down at a conference table and resolve their quarrels peaceably, at once.

These considerations loomed large in the decision of our Government to become a signatory to the test ban treaty to prohibit nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, underwater, or in space. The same result could have been achieved (since the test ban treaty is as unenforceable as was the Pact of Paris) merely by a verbal agreement among the three principal nuclear powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom. Signing of the treaty by a hundred or so non-nuclear-power nations (more than 50 of which are agglomerations of primitive African and Asian tribes) was quite meaningless, except for propaganda purposes, in this highly sophisticated field.

Nevertheless, on the theory that it could do no harm and might be a first step toward securing more meaningful commitments from the Soviet that could lead to a less explosive tinderbox world, the United States too the lead, joined by Mr. Khrushchev, in beating drums in behalf of the test ban treaty.

Among those who are skeptical of the usefulness of the treaty, and who are not certain that it will do no harm, is former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. He points out that twice before the Soviet has used the tactic of alternating a peace offensive with hot or cold war: once through the "Stockholm peace petition" and again by means of the "spirit of Camp David." Neither, declares Mr. Acheson, demonstrated the slightest bit of change in Soviet aims.

Now, the former State Department head says, we are undergoing a third application of the same treatment, with the test ban treaty being cited as a first step to broader agreement with the Russians. Disagreeing with this notion, Mr. Acheson points out that it is wholly unsupported by any evi-

dence whatever, and that it is quite certain the Russians will gain a great deal by getting others to believe that they can now let down their guard because the hoped for détente—the relaxation of tensions—is already here.

What Mr. Khrushchev is engaged in is a softening up process, with alternate applications of carrot and stick, in Western Europe. In recent months it has been mostly carrot. But it is easy for the Soviet to change to the stick overnight. Lenin's dictum that communism can be achieved only by violence and war has been tempered by today's more cautious Soviet leaders because of the terrible destructiveness of thermonuclear weapons. This, however, means no détente. It means only a change in tactics without change in the Soviet's ultimate aims or basic strategy. It means greater reliance upon political warfare than shot and shell, for the time being.

If all Mr. Khrushchev really wants is a pledge from the United States to renounce war for the solution of territorial disputes, then what he is asking for is completely superfluous. He already has this in the Charter of the United Nations to which all member states, including the United States and the Soviet Union, are pledged, because paragraph 4 of article 2 of the charter says: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

But the Soviet Premier isn't really interested in a pledge from us not to commit armed aggression. He knows as well as we do that we will not do so. His real objective is a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the East European Soviet satellite countries of the Warsaw Pact. Why? Such an agreement would validate Communist control of the nations behind the Iron Curtain and guarantee Soviet domination of them for the future. Such a guarantee would help the Soviet to continue its program of internal subversion and revolution wherever opportunity offers anywhere in the world. The Soviet attitude toward the West was succinctly described by President Kennedy as: "What's mine is my own, and what's yours is negotiable."

In the Soviet view, all non-Communists fall into two categories. They are either "progressive," meaning that they follow or endorse the Soviet point of view, or else they are "reactionary." There is nothing between.

It is sometimes puzzling to Americans unacquainted with Communist dialectic when they read of national bourgeoisie in one country being branded in the Soviet press as reactionary, and precisely the same kind of people elsewhere praised as progressive. The explanation is quite simple. The domestic attitude of a business, social, or political group is of no consequence to the Soviet. It can be humane or savage, liberal or reactionary, honest or crooked. All that matters is that it should be progressive. If it refuses to follow Soviet policies and purposes it is reactionary. When it joins the anti-imperialist front it becomes progressive.

Never since the end of World War II has there been so precarious a balance in the affairs of Europe as exists today. Conservative leaders in many European countries fear that any relaxation of suspicion of Soviet actions and intent will encourage collaboration between liberal and leftwing non-Communist groups with the Communists. And once the Communist Party acquires a balance-of-power position in a coalition government, even though it may be only a small minority, they warn, that country is in mortal danger.

Liberal and leftwing non-Communist groups, on the other hand, charge that most governments of Europe have a long history of favoring the fortunes of a wealthy, tight-knit oligarchy at the top of the heap at the expense of the vast majority of the population below; that reforms promised in their constitutions have been disregarded by a succession of governments which have made promises but have not kept them; and that their only hope of obtaining some measure of tax, regional home rule, and economic reform is to try the experiment, no matter how risky, of cooperating with the Communist Party of their own country in order to create a sufficiently powerful parliamentary bloc to compel their governments to comply to a reasonable extent with their demands.

It would be wrong not to consider this reasonable if all that was involved were the dialog and power plays in internal politics. But the security of the West is also involved. A look at the political alinements in some of our key NATO allies reveals how dangerously thin is the margin of European security at this time.

Norway and Sweden would jump at a chance to reduce their NATO budgets and commitments. Both would be happy to use the test ban treay or the exchanges of peace messages between the United States and the Soviet Union as proof that the need for defense in hot or cold war has diminished to a point where their military budgets should be reduced drastically.

France's commitment to NATO comprises a division and a half in Germany, plus two squadrons of fighter interceptors. But the French fleet has already pulled out from the NATO Mediterranean command, and there is talk by France of a reduction in NATO land and air forces, even though France's present commitments are smaller than they should be and are only a tiny fraction of the cost to the French people that ours are to us.

A further threat to NATO is the avowed intention of President de Gaulle to develop a French nuclear capacity. This could very well throw NATO into total disarray, for it would give France the ability to start a nuclear war, but not enough power to finish it.

The rank and file of French workers who are Communists (40 percent of the labor force of the Renault automobile plant, for example, are Communist) do not think of themselves in terms of their party taking orders from Moscow. They see their party simply as a spokesman in their behalf. Actually, 75 percent of all French Communists are of the Catholic faith, yet because of the Communist Party's tolerance of religious belief in France as a political tactic in that country, and the French Communists' own tolerant view of the party program, they find no incompatibility in this circumstance.

The peril here lies in the fact that the hard-core leadership of the French Communist Party is loyal to Moscow, and that in the event of an irreconcilable clash between government and workers, the French masses might be persuaded into an irreversible surrender to Communist leadership.

The French Communist Party, in obedience to Moscow's directives, had fought bitterly against accepting Marshall plan aid and denounced it as an attempt by the United States to subjugate Europe. Later, they demanded that France repudiate NATO, calling it a preparation for war by encirclement of the Soviet Union.

French Government spokesmen warn that the coalition between the anti-Communist French Socialist Party and the Communist Party in the 1962 elections, which delivered the Communists 67 out of 485 seats in parliament instead of only the 7 they would have had on their own, is a grave peril. Aggravating it, they say, are the recent test ban treaty (which France did not sign) and the seeming desire of the United States to enter into more treaties with the Soviet Union. The French Communists are using these activities to prove to the French people that a détente is already in existence, that communism is respectable and patriotic. And, buttressed by the apparent relaxation in the cold war, they are making a strong and successful drive to regain the large membership the Communist Party had until the election of President de Gaulle in 1958.

In Italy the shaky government of Premier Aldo Moro is a coalition of the Democratic Socialist Party, the Communist Party, and the left-wing of the Christian Democratic Party. Defection from the coalition on the part of any one of the three groups in parliamentary vote on a major issue, such as increasing the national defense budget, opposed by all the left wing parties, could overthrow the government.

The Italian Communist Party vote is 25 percent of the total voting population of 8 million and it has been increasing in every election. Here the Communists are about 90 percent Catholic. In Italy, as in France, the nominally Catholic Communist sees nothing inconsistent in his position, as he, too, looks upon the Communist Party not as an arm of Moscow but only as an agency that battles ceaselessly for economic reforms promised by other parties and governments but never delivered. In Italy, moreover, the Communist Party under the leadership of Palmiro Togliatti operates a Titoist sort of communism, and on occasion it has expressed views contrary to the Moscow party line.

In Greece, the Communist Party as such was outlawed, but in 1951 its members organized the United Democratic Party (EDA), the same old Communist wolf in sheep's clothing. Communist strength in Greece, as in many other West European countries, owes its strength in large measure to the unrequited needs and demands of its people, for whom the Communists are the most active articulate spokesmen.

There have been hopeful signs of decreasing Communist influence in Greece in recent years, brought about by the broadened economic and social horizons of the extremely reactionary Greek leadership that has been in power since the end of World War II, and by the Communist Party's own actions, such as its leadership in the civil war in Cyprus, which have brought discredit upon it.

In nations such as these, communism seems to have more than one hue. A party member may have aims no more insidious than to improve the lot of his family and coworkers. But Moscow is waiting in the wings, if it is not already dictating party policy, ready to seize any opportunity to use puppet party leaders to disrupt Western unity. The ultimate goal remains world domination by the Soviet.

In Britain the problem is somewhat different. There is an active, noisy Communist Party, but except for its ability to make bad situations worse in time of trouble, it is politically insignificant. The danger to the cause of Allied defense in the United Kingdom stems from the Socialist Party's program, which is basically neutralist. Britain long since did away with the draft as a means of recruiting her armed forces. The commitment of Britain to NATO is so small now, as a result, that if she were called upon to defend her interests in Malaysia or elsewhere, she could do so only by withdrawing some of her presently too-small forces in NATO.

Harold Wilson, brilliant and keen-witted leader of the British Labor Party, will become Britain's Socialist Prime Minister, the first in 14 years, if his party wins the national elections, which must be held before the end of 1964. He has publicly avowed that he will "denegotiate"—that is, repudiate—the Nassau Agreement in which the British Government agree to the placement of an American Polaris missile base in Britain.

This could unhinge the entire NATO program, and it could destroy, even before plans are completed for it, the proposed NATO multilateral force. This is a planned fleet of

20 surface vessels, each carrying 16 to 20 Polaris missiles, to be manned by our NATO allies, provided they are willing to bear their proportionate share of its cost and maintenance.

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko has proposed to Secretary of State Dean Rusk that further peace steps be taken based on the test ban treaty. He suggested these as a starter: reduction of armed forces leading to total disarmament, setting up observation posts on each other's territory to guard against surprise attack, signing of a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the members of the Warsaw Pact, and marking out a denuclearized zone in central Europe.

Mr. Rusk replied that the United States was prepared to study the Russian suggestions. But he pointed out to Mr. Gromyko that one of the immediate causes of tension in Europe that required cleaning up was the Soviet Union's attitude on Berlin and Germany. When Mr. Gromyko responded that Berlin and Germany were separate items and that they could not be included in any discussion on relaxation of tensions, Mr. Rusk promptly informed him that, without prior solution of the Berlin-Germany problem, it would be impossible to get at the root of any other problems.

Despite Mr. Rusk's forthright attitude in this instance, many leading European statesmen continue to be disturbed by the effect on their people of American-Soviet exchanges of peaceful intent. They believe that these may be construed either as weakness on the part of the West or, even worse, as a sign that the people of the free world need have no hesitation in throwing caution to the winds. They warn that the Soviet is interested in negotiating only two kinds of treaties. The first: those which will recognize and validate the status quo of all Soviet territorial conquests to date. The second: those which have no practical method of implementation, such as outlawing war, pledging talks about total disarmament, abstention from launching atomic weapons in outer space, and so on.

State Department officials concerned with Soviet affairs are of the opinion that the absence, for the moment of calumny and vituperation from Soviet declarations about the United States does not mean that we can afford to persuade ourselves that there is a genuine thaw in the cold war or that peaceful coexistence is just around the corner.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, whose knowledge of Soviet treachery was acquired through sad personal experience, makes no bones about Soviet activities in Europe. Mr. Khrushchev has been brutally frank, he says, in telling us that Soviet troops are in Europe for a political purpose, and that the Soviet is determined that all Europe, West as well as East, will "enjoy the blessings" of communism. The future safety of the free world depends upon the willingness of the West to remain steadfast in defense of its freedom.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Labor Paper Supports Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the quality stabilization bill has been misunderstood by many of those who have written about it or commented on it. Recently, however, my attention was directed to an article appearing in a northern Indiana labor publication, the Beacon, which has caught the import and meaning of the bill in a more than usual way. In order that Members of the Congress and others beyond the circulation of this publication may have an opportunity to read the cogent description of the way in which product quality often deteriorates in the absence of legislation such as that the quality stabilization bill proposes, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE DISCOUNT VISE, QUALITY IS SQUEEZED OUT

Every housewife knows the important part of any "bargain" is quality, not price.

An interesting question has been raised in the debate on the quality stabilization bill, now before Congress: What happens to quality of a national brand name product when it is used by discounters in ruthless price wars and bait-and-switch advertising?

The answer is well-documented in congressional testimony:

First, the product becomes profitless to the established independent merchants, and is abandoned by them. Then, as the discounter against control of the lion's share of the retail market for the well-known brand, the manufacturer finds himself caught in a vise. The discounter exerts relentless pressure for an ever better deal. With virtual monopoly control, now that the established retail outlets in the community have been destroyed, the discounter, too, may threaten to abandon the product unless the manufacturer comes to his terms.

In order to meet the demands of the discounter, the manufacturer must cut costs or get out of the market.

His first move has been to try to increase plant and marketing efficiency. But there is a minimum price to discounters below which a manufacturer cannot go without cutting the quality of the product. If he reaches this point and the company still cannot make a profit, he is likely to do some or all of the following:

Cut the number of quality inspectors along the assembly line, substitute cheaper labor and otherwise reduce the payroll.

Reduce requirements for accuracy of fits and dimensions of working parts to reduce the cost of waste.

Substitute cheaper, inferior materials.

Eliminate extra coats of protective exterior finish.

Cut down the number of fastenings, seams, weld spots, rivets, screws, etc.

Under these conditions the consumer, the community, the economy, labor, the manufacturer, the ethical retailer—all take a beating. Quality is lowered and maintenance costs skyrocket; wages and jobs are lost; a brand name reputation for value is depreciated, and the community has lost the service of those ethical merchants who have had to go out of business in the face of ruthless competition from giant discount chains.

This is only one aspect of a dangerous economic situation which has led a large number of Congressional leaders from both parties to sponsor the Quality Stabilization Bill. The bill is designed to give practical effect to a unanimous Supreme Court decision that the manufacturer of a national brand name product has a continuing property right in that name; that he should have the right to protect it from abuse or misrepresentation.

Proceedings in Memory of Hon. Francis E. Walter in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the proceedings in memory of the Honorable Francis E. Walter in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, in which the Honorable Thomas J. Clary, the Honorable Ralph C. Body, and the Honorable George A. Welsh, participated. The memorial tribute reads as follows:

JUDGE WELSH

Judge CLARY. This court has been convened in a short special session to honor the memory of a man who was a great American and who was a great friend of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the late Honorable Francis E. Walter. One of his friends for decades was my esteemed colleague, Judge Welsh, and I am going to ask him if he will not say a few words about our late and lamented friend.

Judge WELSH. Judge Clary and guests, I first met Congressman Walter immediately after his election. He came the year after I left the Congress to come on this bench. I was a Republican; he was a Democrat. I followed his activities closely because I had mutual friends that were associated with him most intimately, and we grew into a little compact group of mutual friends of varying political views but with harmonious objectives as to the way our Nation should press forward in certain fields. He was such a genuine person that no matter what division of thought there was between him and his friends, there was never anything but the warmest personal contact between him and those friends.

I think—and I am saying this with words that I weigh very carefully—based upon my own experience of 10 years in the Congress and my familiarity with Congressmen from the 48 different States that then existed, that there was never in my memory a better Congressman than Francis E. Walter. He was a Congressman who had as his first objective the welfare of the whole Nation and secondly a keen desire to serve his own district, which was pardonable, and for which he was chosen. A Member of Congress is a representative or ambassador from his district, and he cannot always set up his own personal views against the views of his district. If he does, he won't be a Congressman very long.

He was the second member in seniority on the Judiciary Committee. Congressman CELLER is the chairman and Frank came second, and he was a tower of strength in his work on that committee. His work there was not as spectacular as his work on the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, but it was work that was far more important, if I may say so, and it required the use of the judgment that he possessed, his forward-looking views, and his philosophy of human government. He had that to a great degree.

That position on the Judiciary Committee made him especially helpful to the Federal courts; and Judge Clary, I think it is a fine thing for you to recognize the work that he has done in his position on the Judiciary Committee in behalf of the Federal courts.

His views were respected because he had such vast experience. He was not just one vote on that committee. When Frank Walter spoke and advocated something, people knew that he was speaking from experience and from the desire to be of real service to the judiciary, and I as a member of the judiciary and as a former Member of Congress want to pay that respect to Frank E. Walter.

I have visited Congress regularly, and I have gone back to the floor of the House to meet some of the old survivors from the vast army of friends that I used to have on both sides of the hall, and when I did, I was the guest of Congressman Walter, and we would lunch together, and we would go around and call on mutual friends in the Congress, and in those journeys and wanderings around it was of interest to me to see the affection that came to him from what down in the country we used to call the hired help, the men who perform the routine duties of Congress—the page boys, the different clerks, the elevator men—all who helped make Congress livable physically. Their eyes would light up, and the smile that would come to their faces would show the spontaneous affection that they had for him. He never was aloof in any way, and they just greeted him as a young man would greet a father. That was the attitude that they had toward him. It was a great tribute to him.

Now he is gone, and I don't know who will succeed him, whether there will be a special election or not, but the State of Pennsylvania has lost a valuable representative of the State in Congress, and the Nation has lost a true American.

Just in closing I would like to say this: The work that he did on that Special Committee on Un-American Activities was in a

sensitive field. You have to be on that floor to know just how sensitive it is. You have the great cities of the East, you have the Great Plains States, you have the Southern States, and you have the whole mountain area, and local views are very strong in those vast areas, and what seems reasonable and sensible and logical to you and me sitting here in this great eastern seaboard city of Philadelphia seems just the opposite in some of the Plains States and up in the Northwest. Whichever way you move on that committee you will have opposition, and if you are not personally cordial and friendly and fair, you will make personal enemies. He had opposition, but he made very few personal enemies. He couldn't help but make some. The angel, Gabriel, if he had a task of that kind, would make enemies on the floor of that Congress. He got through with no battle scars coming from unfriendly warfare, and he did great work on that committee, and while I couldn't go along with him on some phases of it, I can say that our objectives would be the same and we would still be able to pull together on most of the hills.

He has gone and we will miss him, and I want to say—speaking now as a brother Member of Congress—that I appreciate the holding of this memorial service and having an opportunity to put these thoughts upon the record.

Judge CLARY. Thank you, Judge Welsh.

We have a judge with us this morning who comes from Berks County, which adjoins Northampton County, and I would like to have another distinguished colleague of mine, Judge Body, say a few words about our late friend.

JUDGE BODY

Judge BODY. Chief Judge Clary, it was my pleasure to know Tad Walter, as he was familiarly known to the people of his area and our area, for only a few years, but I knew him at long distance for many years prior to that, since I was a member of the bar. I knew many lawyers and judges who knew him, and through them I felt that I knew him well.

I think of several occasions that stand out in my mind with regard to the late Congressman. One of them was quite recent, when my son-in-law was graduated from Dickinson Law School, and Tad was there, and we were walking down the sidewalks of Carlisle talking about some matters, including the next appointee to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

As my colleague, Judge Welsh, has suggested, he was very much interested in good government and men to occupy high positions. He had a very high regard for the lawyers, that he knew real well, and one of them that I also knew well was Ned Fox, one of Pennsylvania's outstanding lawyers, a past president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, who came from Easton, and who died a few days after we had that conversation. I also know Carleton Woodring, one of the judges in Easton. He and the Congressman were very close friends, and I know that Carleton will miss the Congressman. It was never my pleasure to meet any of the members of the Walter family, but I know that he must have made a great contribution to them and also to the people that surrounded him.

I felt the impact of his mental strength on a number of occasions in various places because of the position he occupied in Washington. When Tad Walter took up the cause of the Federal court—or whatever cause he took up—he put it through, and I have never heard anybody—judge, lawyer, or layman—say anything adverse to him.

I am glad that I can say a few words here with you this morning, Judge Clary and Judge Welsh, to help honor our esteemed friend. We all regret his passing, and I know that not only the three of us here, but the whole U.S. district court joins with us in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his family and to his dear friends.

JUDGE CLARY

Judge CLARY. Thank you, Judge Body.

Judge Welsh, I am going to tell a story now which I haven't told before to anybody. I was in Washington on the 19th of February of this year on important court business. I was in the Supreme Court Building and saw the Administrator of the Courts, Mr. Olney, and from there I walked over to the Old House Office Building, and I walked into the Congressman's office to extend my greetings to him through his talented administrative assistant, Mrs. Ruth Miskell. I told her that I wouldn't hold her but for a minute, that I merely wanted to send word to the Congressman that having been in Washington, as usual, I dropped by to extend my regards, and to my amazement she said, "Would you like to see him?" He was in his office that day for the first time in weeks or months.

My son was with me, and I had the opportunity to present him to the Congressman. The Congressman invited us into his office, and busy as he was, he spent a half hour with us reminiscing about many things, and one of the things he said very casually was, "You know, in addition to this chest condition of mine, I have leukemia." He said it just as casually as if he said he was going out to the ball game; and he wasn't afraid, and I am sure that he knew what was coming. That was the last time I saw him, though I have corresponded with him since.

One of the great attributes of Tad Walter was his loyalty to his country and to his State. He never passed Statuary Hall in the Capitol without pointing out to his companions the statue of the first Speaker of the House of Representatives, who came from his own congressional district, Frederick A. Muhlenberg. He would point it out and tell the dramatic story of how that clergyman exhorted his flock to join the American cause for independence, who took off his clerical garb and showed himself in the uniform of a major general of the Revolutionary forces.

On the 26th day of May of this year Congressman Walter was 69 years of age, and practically the first 10 pages of this copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with tributes from both sides of the hall, and they tell better than I ever could of his contribution to the welfare of his district, his State, and his country. These pages disclose that he and one other person of a special subcommittee were primarily responsible for the development of the Marshall plan, which did so much to save Western Europe from communism. That is something I never knew, and I think that is a wonderful tribute to a great statesman. He hated hypocrisy, as we all know, and I recall the warmth of his nature and his friendliness.

I want to pay tribute to his work on behalf of the courts. He was in the forefront of the fight to raise judicial salaries. It was he who fought for improvements in this building when conditions were such that we couldn't get improvements, and it was he who fought—side by side with others, of course—but it was his direction, I believe, that brought about the final decision to build a new courthouse at Sixth and Market Streets. For that, of course, we will always be grateful.

I have lost a personal friend. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has lost a most forceful proponent of the work of the judiciary on the Judiciary Committee and on whatever facet of Congress it was necessary to approach for the advancement of the court of this district. America has lost a great statesman. Pennsylvania has lost a great son and citizen; and on behalf of the court, and with the acquiescence of you, Judge Welsh, and you, Judge Body, I shall direct that the minutes of this meeting be transcribed and filed in the permanent records of the court and that a copy be sent to his family.

Judge WELSH. I am glad you are doing that, and I heartily join in that request.

Judge CLARY. This special session is adjourned.

(Adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)

Does NASA Need a New Research Center?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a thought-provoking editorial written by Mr. William J. Coughlin, which was published in the Missiles and Rockets magazine, February 17, 1964, raising questions regarding the proposed NASA research center. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT BOSTON CENTER

We have now entered a suspenseful 45-day period in which Congress must decide if it will act on the latest recommendation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration regarding its proposed electronics research center.

Last year, NASA proposed that the $50 million center be located in the Boston area. Congress asked the space agency for further justification of the center and its location.

After a series of presentations by other interested areas, NASA Administrator James Webb has reaffirmed the agency's choice of Boston as the preferred site—to the surprise of almost no one.

NASA will be permitted to proceed on this basis if the recommendation is not vetoed by Congress within 45 days.

We favor such a veto.

We favor it on an issue far more fundamental than that of location. We do not believe NASA has submitted convincing proof of the need for such a center.

We have read the space agency's detailed justification. We have talked to responsible electronics authorities in both industry and Government. We have, within the past week, talked to corporate officers of a number of electronics firms in the Boston area. These have been firms which, in some cases, have supported the move to bring a NASA electronics center to Boston.

More than one of these officials has admitted, in effect: "We do not see any requirement for such a center. But if there is to be one, and it appears there is, then we want it in the Boston area."

The reason for this is frankly expressed self-interest. Many Massachusetts electronic firms at first feared, and openly opposed, establishment of the Center in their backyard. The reason: concern over competition for scientific talent.

On further examination, this fear faded with the realization that establishment of the Center nearby undoubtedly would lead to more business for firms in the Boston area.

Despite NASA pledges that its principal concern would be inhouse research, the history of such enterprises in the past indicated it soon would be turning to more ambitious projects.

It is not surprising, therefore, that a number of Boston area firms have campaigned both quietly and effectively in behalf of the Center. More of a surprise, perhaps, is the fact that some of those who have been most active in this campaign will answer with an honest negative the basic question of whether such a center really is needed.

That NASA needs an additional electronic capability, particularly one to provide increased reliability, is not questioned. But NASA has not built a convincing case that this capibility should be isolated in one corner of the Nation, far from the NASA Centers deeply engaged in manned and unmanned flight programs.

If funds are to be provided for this purpose, they should be devoted to strengthening electronic know-how at the program-oriented Centers where it is directly applicable.

NASA's own plea in support of the proposed Center, that electronics makes up at least 70 percent of each space vehicle, is in itself an argument for building this capability at the existing Centers, not at an academic cell placed conveniently near the fine universities of the Northeast.

A further argument against the proposed new facility is that it comes too late in time to contribute in any substantial manner to the Apollo program. If we can go to the moon without it, we can do a number of other things without it. Under any NASA budget, and particularly under the present severely restricted space agency budget, the proposed Electronic Center is a luxury we can ill afford. Congress should act to kill it during this 45-day period.

Our deep concern continues, not only with this facility, but with the proliferation of organizations in the university, nonprofit, and Government fields which are doing work which can be done more effectively by private industry.

The necessity of staying in business, and showing a profit to the stockholders at the end of the year, is a powerful motivating force toward an economic and effective operation.

Consider, then, the recruiting advertisement in the New York Times on January 26 on behalf of the U.S. naval laboratories in the Washington, D.C., area. This offered a promising future "free from the job-permanence worries that plague the defense industry these days."

We suggest you read that novel and interesting thought again. The naval laboratories—the naval laboratories, mind you—are free of the uncertainty surrounding a fluctuating military budget. Nor is this just research activity. At the Naval Propellant Plant, for example, "they manufacture, inspect, test, and deliver missile propulsion units, too."

Industry frequently concerns itself with the role of the nonprofit corporation. Yet Dr. C. W. Halligan, president of Mitre Corp., had a word to say in a recent issue of Industrial Research which might be very applicable to the Navy activity described above. He said: "The company must not take on work that can be done more appropriately by other available sources. The company must avoid extending the scope of its work into areas that belong to others. This is especially true of the proper fields of industry, such as detailed design and manufacture."

We suggest that the Navy, engaging in the manufacture of missile propulsion units while attempting to lure talent from industry with promises of freedom from the "job-permanence worries" plaguing that same industry, is perverting the free enterprise system it serves.

Someone should be horsewhipped for this, as the country editors used to say. Then another country implement, the ax, should be used on NASA's proposed electronic research center, on the U.S. naval laboratories and on a great many more of these swollen parasites on the free enterprise system.

WILLIAM J. COUGHLIN.

Economists Playing With Our Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a recent issuance of the new $1 Federal Reserve note has brought interesting and thought-provoking comment from the Lima (Ohio) News in its issue of February 29, 1964. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMISTS PLAYING WITH OUR LIVES

The new $1 Federal Reserve note has aroused much comment since it first appeared in circulation recently. Unfortunately, most of the comment has to do with the relatively unimportant artistry of the bill's design.

If you read the fine print, you'll discover it is the first currency in U.S. history that can accurately be labeled "flat money." The new notes simply state: "The United States of America—One Dollar." Older notes state: "The United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand XXX dollars."

The latter at least offered some hope that there was enough gold at Fort Knox to back up the piece of paper in hand. The new note makes no pretense at such backing.

True, the new issue is considered legal tender for all public and private debts—but makes no claim to being "redeemable in lawful money at the U.S. Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank," as does our other currency.

Attempts are being made to alleviate concern over the new "flat" money (money that has no inherent value). A number of so-called "economists" claim the Nation has survived flat money before. And they point to the issues of paper currency in 1813 to 1814.

But these issues were not legal tender. In addition, most were convertible into U.S. bonds, with interest and principal both payable in gold. Even so, these "greenbacks" depreciated from the beginning and, at one time, reached a gold value of less than 39 cents.

Another contention by the "experts" is that since the new notes are included among the liabilities for which the Federal Reserve banks must maintain 25 percent reserves in gold, the new dollars are in a way, backed by gold. This balloon gets pricked by FRS Chairman McChesney Martin's past assertion that the Federal Reserve would use all its gold if necessary to meet foreign demand claims. Where would this leave our domestic dollars?

We can arrive at a worthwhile and equitable solution by asking some pertinent questions and giving their answers.

First, why was it considered necessary to print fiat money? To further inflate the Nation's currency, of course. Why was further inflation necessary? Because of the disappearance of dollars into foreign markets. What causes this flow of dollars and gold away from the United States? Among them, foreign-aid and the very inflation generated by fiat money.

What steps, then, can be taken to correct this dangerous situation?

First, we could kill the foreign giveaway program and thereby drastically reduce this outflow of unproductive dollars. Secondly, there must be an immediate end to unbalanced budgets and a rapid start made toward paying off our national debt. This would withdraw from circulation a good share of the inflationary fiat money.

Lastly, every American should have the right to own gold, if he chooses. This would protect the citizen against the politician's fiat money whims; and would force the Government to adhere to a sane fiscal policy.

The "economists" have been playing with our earnings and our lives long enough. Now let's return to reality.

Special Delivery From Heaven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a poem written by Cynthia Rowe, of Seton High School, commemorating the death of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

The emotions of a great people are expressed in their poetry. I am delighted to include this poem by Cynthia Rowe among the tributes of the American people to President Kennedy:

SPECIAL DELIVERY FROM HEAVEN TO THE KENNEDY FAMILY FROM JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Cynthia Rowe)

Sorry I had to leave right away.
I look down and smile at you every day.
Little Patrick says to say "Hi."
"I love you, I'm Happy,
So please don't cry."

And, Caroline, I'd like to say,
How proud Daddy was of you that day,
When you stood like a lady
And watched me go by,
And doing like Mommy, you tried not to cry.

John-John, now, you're the big man;
Take care of Mommy the best that you can.
You were just like a soldier;
That salute was so brave.
Thanks for the flag that you put on my grave.

And, Jackie, I had no time for Good-byes,
But I'm sure you could see
The "Farewell" in my eyes.
Watch over the children
And love them for me,
I'll treasure your love through eternity.

So please carry on as you did before,
Till all of us meet on Heaven's bright shore.
Remember I love you, remember I care;
I'll always be with you,
Though you don't see me there.
Love,

JACK.

An American Gestapo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a series of recent events emanating from the executive branch indicates that police-state methods are being used against American citizens. This has disturbed many, including William S. White who, in last Wednesday's Washington Evening Star, hit this type of un-American activity:

PASSING SCENE: AN ODOR OF POLICE-STATE METHODS

(By William S. White)

An unpleasant odor of police-state methods—of instances of illegal wiretapping and of Federal snoopery over the mail of private persons—is arising from the vicinity of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The victims of these episodes have been, of course, either highly unpopular or even bad men, in the minds of many. This superficial circumstance, however, is wholly irrelevant to the deep, root fact that this abuse of the Federal investigative power is fundamentally alien to a free society. It is mortally offensive to the constitutional guarantees of freedom and privacy which above all it is this same Justice Department's responsibility to shelter rather than attack.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the Department's head, owes a duty to his position and to the American tradition not simply to put a stop at once to every form of this unfairness. It is his obligation as well to punish those officials involved in it—resolutely and pitilessly.

HAS HIGHER FUNCTION

For the Department of Justice has one function even higher than that of fighting crime and subversion. This is the lofty duty to protect and defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the people—including the bad people—under it.

Though there is no evidence that the Justice Department has been running actually wild in this area, it is all the same a fact that recent examples of extra-legal Federal action against so-called baddies are troubling many reasonable men, most notably in the U.S. Senate.

Roy Cohn, the New York lawyer under Federal indictment on perjury and conspiracy charges, complains that his mail is under Government surveillance—a clear and undeniable violation of his basic rights as a defendant in a criminal case brought against him by that same Government. Justice Department spokesmen first deny any Federal mail watch on their behalf. Subsequently, they are compelled to admit the truth of Cohn's complaint; they then blame it on an assistant Federal prosecutor.

A Federal judge, Archie O. Dawson, feels obliged publicly to denounce the incident as shocking—as indeed it is, in spite of the fact that Cohn in his day was an eager part of the pack of professional accusers of other men who gathered around the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin.

Edward Levinson, a Las Vegas, Nev., gambler—albeit, a perfectly legal gambler under the laws of that State—says before a Senate committee investigating the Bobby Baker case that Federal authorities bugged his telephones. This sort of thing has repeatedly been condemned by the courts of this country as a dirty business.

It is disclosed at the same time by United Press International that Nevada Members of Congress had gone to President Johnson—himself a lifelong antagonist of all forms of illicit Federal snooping—to protest reported Federal wiretapping in both Las Vegas and Reno, even before the Levinson affair. UPI reports that Senator HOWARD CANNON, of Nevada, had then been assured by a Justice Department official that there would be no Federal wiretapping in that State.

HANDED SUBPENA

And to add to all this unpleasant and disturbing business, Levinson, in the midst of his appearance before the committee in the Baker case, is handed a subpena in an income-tax investigation by a Federal agent who invades the very Senate without its knowledge or permission to work this blatantly intimidating unfairness to a Senate witness.

The point to be stressed in all this is that good intentions are no substitutes for correct Federal procedures. For unless the constitutional rights of all of us—including, and even particutarly including, the Cohns and Levinsons, whatever their real or alleged sins—are kept safe, the rights of none of us can be guaranteed in the end.

The understandable and proper desire of Federal agents and prosecutors to enforce the law must not be further confused with the fateful duty of these agents and prosecutors to uphold something else called the Constitution of the United States.

Little Nations Mock Our Useless Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. John Chamberlain appeared in the March 9 issue of the New York Journal.

This article presents a new theory as to our problems and one well worth considering. It may well be that our defense techniques are too big and too untried and that we are suffering from a case of giantism. It may be that we will become the modern Gulliver and that we will be destroyed by the Lilliputians of today who are already nibbling us, maybe to death.

LITTLE NATIONS MOCK OUR USELESS POWER

(By John Chamberlain)

So we have a new secret jet aircraft that can fly 2,000 miles an hour at 70,000 feet. But does that make Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, Fidel Castro, or Sukarno shake in his boots? How could it?

The fact is that the more formidable our armaments become, the more powerless we are. The reason is that we are desperately afraid of our own strength. We are fearful of undertaking even the smallest of military operations lest we escalate the skirmish into something which might require the use of a couple of our big sticks.

So we continue, as the saying goes, to be nibbled to death by two-bit countries that can hardly offer an air force of DC-3's to counter our new three-times-the-speed-of-sound plane.

It is a fantasy world in which a military budget of $50 billion a year can't cope with the likes of Zanzibar, North Vietnam, and Cuba. Castro laughs at our atom armory and our mighty air fleet. What would really cause him to flip would be the news that we had sold some old condemned planes and some sawed-off shotguns to anti-Castro-ites in Nicaragua, meanwhile granting belligerant rights to a democratic Cuban council situated somewhere in the Caribbean.

We live in an age in which all of the old military axioms are neglected. In the old days, a power such as Soviet Russia would think twice before committing some 20,000 of it's trained military men to an island that could be blockaded by a great naval power with bases only a few miles away. But today, islands are all the rage.

The Communists have moved in on Cuba and Zanzibar, and are making eyes at Cyprus. And this despite the fact that they control the seas nowhere.

Since the investigating committee of the Organization of American States has authenticated the report that Fidel Castro landed a cargo of submachine guns and automatic rifles in Venezuela in an attempt to disrupt the recent presidential election in that country, there would be perfect reason for imposing a total inter-American blockade of Cuba that would dry up all commerce with the island.

Maybe such countries as Mexico and Brazil wouldn't commit their ships and air force to the blockade. But if some of the Latin American countries are willing to follow the lead of Venezuela's Betancourt in promoting a quarantine of Cuba, why should Washington desist? It would not be unilateral action by the possessor of the biggest armory of atom bombs and the fastest jet plane in the world.

One supposes, however, that we are too fearful of our own strength to lend or lease a bit of it to a small nation like Venezuela. In South Vietnam we have not dared to train a counter-guerilla force capable of giving the Communists a dose of their own medicine in North Vietnam. We act neither by the old military axioms nor by the new ones. And the mice continue to nibble us to death everywhere around the cold war periphery.

Just recently I dipped back into the history of the Cuban crisis of the late 1890's. Even before we became embroiled with Spain over the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, we recognized the exile government of the Cuban patriot Jose Marti. We permitted him, as a legally justified belligerent, to buy arms, to recruit volunteer troops, and to do other things which Khrushchev always permits his recognized "forces of liberation" to do wherever they are.

Why doesn't the Johnson administration brush up on the history of our recognition of Jose Marti? With the help of Venezuela, and the recognition of belligerent rights, the anti-Castro Cubans might still win their own fight without requiring Washington to dust off any classic military axioms of Clausewitz.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the results of my questionnaire of December 30, 1963, which was mailed to a cross section of the constituents of my district. Of a mailing of approximately 70,000, 16,000 responses were received.

The results follow:

Questionnaire results

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should the presidential electoral college be changed?	65	21	14
2. Do you believe the United States should support a free Cuban government-in-exile?	45	44	11
3. Should Government spending be cut to compensate for any Federal tax reduction?	92	4	4
4. Do you favor medical care for the aged by—			
(a) Increasing socil security taxes to finance such care?	29	65	6
(b) Expanding present Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) legislation?	26	58	16
(c) Or do you favor private, voluntary medical plans with no Federal involvement?	78	17	5
5. Do you believe that foreign aid spending should be—			
(a) Reduced substantially?	88	9	3
(b) Increased?	4	93	3
(c) Expanded in Latin America?	35	53	12
(d) Approved to countries with Communist governments?	2	94	4
6. Do you believe the international Communist conspiracy is a threat to the internal security of the United States?	85	11	4
7. Which of the following farm programs do you favor—			
(a) Rigid controls and quotas on individual production, mandatory land retirement—a strictly regulated farm economy?	6	86	8
(b) Moderate and flexible price supports, voluntary large-scale land retirement—a gradual withdrawal of Government from the farm economy?	91	3	6
8. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation—			
(a) To protect the right to vote?	87	10	3
(b) To enforce school integration?	28	64	8
(c) To give permanent status to the Civil Rights Commission?	31	51	18
(d) To use the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution to enforce access to public accommodations?	27	60	13
9. In your opinion, is the United Nations effective?	42	51	7
10. Do you favor Federal funds for—			
(a) Public elementary and high school construction?	39	59	2
(b) Public elementary and high school teachers' salaries?	20	77	3
(c) Aid to private elementary and high schools?	18	79	3
11. Do you favor congressional approval of $195,000,000 for the civil defense shelter program?	19	71	10
12. Should the United States grant diplomatic recognition to Red China?	14	80	6
13. Do you believe Congress has delegated too much authority to the President and his executive agencies?	58	32	10
14. Do you favor salary increases for—			
(a) Federal employees, Members of Congress, and Federal judges?	24	56	20
(b) Only Federal employees?	20	57	23
(c) Only Members of Congress and Federal judges?	9	68	23
(d) None?	51	30	19

New York Times Urges Congress To Take Joint Economic Committee Report As a Guide to Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a March 7 editorial entitled "Light on the Economy," the New York Times takes note of the annual report of the Joint Economic Committee released March 2 and calls it one of its most intelligent and thoughtful efforts. Pointing out that both the majority and minority views are happily free of hyperbolic cliches the Times says that both sides have done their economic homework, with the minority offering alternative solutions to the problems posed by the balance of payments, poverty, and unemployment.

As the senior minority member of the committee, I heartily second the conclusion of the Times that legislative debate and decisions on economic policy will be enhanced if the committee's report gets the attention it deserves from Congress.

Under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the New York Times in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIGHT ON THE ECONOMY

Congress Joint Economic Committee has no legislative powers. But its members have conscientiously sought to educate themselves and the Nation on the problems confronting the economy. Its latest study, a review of the President's Economic Report, is one of its most intelligent and thoughtful efforts. Both the majority and minority views are happily free of hyperbolic cliches. Instead, they offer concise critiques that reveal a thorough acceptance of modern economic theory.

The Democratic majority generally supports the stimulative policies of the administration. However, it calls for more stress on international cooperation in eliminating the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit and for the maintenance of monetary expansion as long as there is no clear threat of inflation. It also points out that the passage of tax cuts does not lessen the need for basic reforms of the tax structure.

The minority offers alternative solutions to the problems posed by the balance of payments, poverty and unemployment. Senator JAVITS adds a series of new proposals to enlist private enterprise in the fight against poverty.

This report makes clear that both sides have done their economic homework. They do not pretend to have all the answers, but they make a contribution by shedding light on the problems and by their clear-cut statements of differing viewpoints on how to solve them. Legislative debate and decisions on economic policy will be enhanced if the committee's report gets the attention it deserves from Congress.

What Policy in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of February 26, 1964:

STRAIGHT ANSWER NEEDED—WHAT IS POLICY IN VIETNAM?

When an official with the prestige of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, speaks on foreign policy it must be assumed he represents the administration or is seeking a public reaction to a policy matter the administration does not wish to offer itself.

Senator MANSFIELD has publicly urged support for the French proposal to neutralize southeast Asia; spoke against military intervention by the United States in South Vietnam, and said the national interest requires no further commitment in that area.

His proposals gain weight as policy statements because President Johnson also has said he will listen with sympathy to French proposals of neutrality for southeast Asia.

The picture, however, gets cloudy fast. The President also has said we will not withdraw from southeast Asia, "because we are not willing to yield that part of the world to * * * communism." In Saigon, Ambassador Lodge has predicted a long and continuing struggle.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara meanwhile has been ordered to make his second visit to Saigon to survey the anti-Communist operation and possibly recommend changes in our policy there.

Obviously the United States is planning a major policy change toward involvement in South Vietnam but the official word hasn't reached all the troops yet.

If the United States withdraws its support to soldiers of free South Vietnam, or if it neutralizes the area, Peiping will win its first major victory in the lukewarm war.

More is at stake than the freedom of 14 million persons in South Vietnam. Red China must prove to other communistic nations that its hard line against democracy is a winning one, further discrediting the current soft sales pitch used by Russia. The loss of South Vietnam as a beginning would be the loss of freedom for 240 million persons in all of southeast Asia.

Neutralization? Nobody can be naive enough to believe it is anything but a hunting license for Communist guerrillas. An international conference, with Chinese Reds participating, set the true neutrality of Laos. Yet Communist guerrillas still are waging a war in Laos and apparently winning.

The last thing the United States can afford to do is back down from its policy of giving technical assistance, instruction and materiel to free nations defending themselves from Communist attacks.

Instead of trial balloons, the public is entitled to a straightforward statement of U.S. policy in southeast Asia as well as hard facts on how the battle for freedom is going.

Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed a wheat-cotton bill on Friday, March 6. I have had many inquiries as to differences in the Senate bill and the Purcell bill which is still pending before the House Agriculture Committee. The Purcell bill was forwarded from the Wheat Subcommittee to the full Committee on Agriculture without recommendation.

A brief summary follows:

Provisions	House bill (H.R. 9780), known as Purcell bill, pending now before House Agriculture Committee, without recommendation	H.R. 6196, known as Cooley cotton bill, as amended by Senate to include wheat
1. Years applicable	2 years without marketing quotas (1964 marketing quotas turned down in referendum May 21, 1963, and bill suspends marketing quotas in 1965). Mandatory program thereafter.	Same.
2. Support level	For 1964 crop: $1.30 loan, 25-cent export certificate on 500,000,000 bushels: 70-cent domestic certificate. For 1965 crop: 65 to 90 percent of parity on domestic supports; 0 to 90 percent of parity on loan and export certificate.	For 1964 and 1965 crops: 65 to 90 percent of parity on domestic supports; 0 to 90 percent of parity on loan and export certificate. (NOTE.—Legislative history in Senate indicates a 70-cent domestic certificate and a 25-cent export certificate on the 1964 crop.)
3. Repeal authority to set price supports from 75 to 90 percent of parity in the event that marketing quotas are not proclaimed.	No	Yes.
4. CCC sales price	105 percent of support price on noncertificate wheat (or $1.30) plus carrying charges.	Same.
5. Eligibility for price support	Contingent on compliance with wheat allotment and diversion.	Same.
6. Marketing quotas	No; farmers turned down in 1964 and bill suspends in 1965. Marketing quotas in effect for 1966 and subsequent years.	Same.
7. National allotment	For 1964 crop: 49,500,000 acres. For 1965 crop: Not less than 49,500,000 acres.	Same.
8. Million-acre reserve for additional allotments subtracted from 49,500,000-acre allotment.	No	Yes.
9. Anfuso amendment (history loss)	Suspended for 1965 crop. In effect for 1964 and 1966 and subsequent crops.	Same.
10. Storage of wheat under bond to avoid loss of history under Anfuso amendment.	No	Yes; applicable only to 1965 and subsequent years.
11. Acreage diversion	Yes; equal to difference between 55,000,000 acres and national allotment in 1964 and 1965. Additional diversion allowed up to 30 percent of allotment or 15 acres. Rate of diversion at 20 percent of normal yield times noncertificate loan price. Diversion contracts for 1 year. Diverted acreage devoted to conserving uses or oilseed crops at lower rate.	Same.
12. Transfer of allotments allowed in event of natural disasters.	No	Yes.

How HEW Helps Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared on March 5 in the Walden, N.Y., Citizen Herald, in my district.

This article brings up the silly side of big Government. It would be quite funny if it were not so depressing. After all, the jokes are all well paid for by the American taxpayer. Maybe this is a rather high price for humor.

The article follows:

HOW HEW HELPS US

When the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was organized the American people were assured it was to be a vital arm of Government, deeply concerned with grave problems within the field of its jurisdiction.

Undoubtedly it has addressed itself to such problems, but it also has built up a bureaucracy that has had plenty of time and taxpayer money to indulge in some of the most ridiculous frivols in American Government.

For example, if one isn't hep to watching a football game with a practiced eye, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will step in to prevent any possible embarrassment. HEW has a pamphlet, available to anyone free of charge, giving instructions in this vital subject. It is entitled: "How to Watch a Football Game."

Are you having trouble bowling? Maybe you're baffled by the mysteries of the score sheet. If so, your worries are over; HEW will provide you free with an unabridged edition of "Bowling Scoring."

And what about roller skating? Don't just put on skates and head for the nearest sidewalk. First write to good old HEW and get your copy of a free pamphlet on how to roller skate. Better get one; you've been paying for it.

The game of bridge apparently has come into the scope of health, education, or welfare, for HEW has written a pamphlet, yours for the asking, on how to play bridge.

Not oblivious to the problems of the lonesome male, HEW has compiled prolific information on girl watching into a handy manual. Under the title, "Directory of Girls, Category 18," labeled "The Untouchables," this definition by HEW should prove interesting: "The girls that have a tendency to cry easily or have chronic complaints or appear to be nervous most of the time are the emotionals."

Under classification 19, "The Unmentionables" are defined as follows: "The unmentionables are not in the watchable category because they are generally those girls out of the past and you don't mention them to the wife or current date."

These are but a few examples of how the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is spending your money in its massive program to improve the health, the education and the welfare of the American people.

Panama Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's handling of the explosive Cuban crisis has been exemplary, as an editorial in the March 2 issue of the New York Journal-American pointed out. He has met provocation with patience and strength.

PANAMA POLICY

President Johnson displayed a combination of fairness and firmness in outlining, at his press conference Saturday, the administration policy toward Panama.

The President emphasized what he had said before—that we are prepared to talk with Panama anywhere, any time, any place, but we will not commit ourselves in advance to any action or pledge, such as specific changes in the Panama Canal treaty.

Mr. Johnson said it is quite possible that a treaty which dates from 1903 needs review in 1964. If Panama acts to restore diplomatic relations which it broke off in petulance and because of political expediency, the United States is willing to talk but it is not willing to negotiate under the gun.

The President's attitude was calm and reasonable. Is it too much to expect that Panama will follow suit?

Christian Science Monitor Praises Republican Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee issued a lengthy statement analyzing poverty in America and offering seven suggestions for dealing with it. I was pleased to note that in its March 2 issue the Christian Science Monitor took note of our proposals and praised them as "useful touchstones for any poverty program." The Monitor also praised the Joint Economic Committee minority for "launching suggestions instead of just hurling the darts of criticism."

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

REPUBLICANS VERSUS POVERTY

With President Johnson's message on poverty coming soon, the Republicans are not just crying politics but offering an anti-poverty program of their own.

This is all to the good. As legal historian Mark De Wolfe Howe wryly said the other

day, "Surely it's constitutional to be poor. But that doesn't make poverty a virtue." If politicians begin to compete in eradicating poverty, the result can be the choice of the best methods rather than the mere exploitation of partisan advantage.

Methods are extremely important. For the experts seem agreed that much American poverty will not vanish with the wand of increased employment or productivity. For such reasons as age, race, education, there are families with what sociologists call poverty-linked characteristics. According to the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty, "Unless remedial steps are undertaken, there will be considerably more poor even with a more affluent America."

The Republican proposal, advanced by the six Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, recognizes that the war on poverty will cruelly deceive the poor and their children unless it is new in concept and embraces programs which hit at the root causes of poverty rather than its symptoms. One of its seven points urges "developing each program, including those concerned with regional development, to insure that benefits will accrue directly to families and individuals living in poverty."

These will be useful touchstones for any poverty program. Congress has shown that, after a year of stagnation, bipartisan efforts could put through something as revolutionary as the tax-cut bill. It would be unfortunate if the expected stimulus to economy made the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Now there is a chance for similar bipartisan action to help the poor. By launching suggestions, instead of just hurling the darts of criticism, the Republicans run their usual risk of being labeled "me too." Never mind. This is a cause in which everyone can honorably unite—and for which the best thinking on both sides in Congress should be fully used.

A Letter to the President and to Congressman Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter sent to President Johnson, which speaks for itself, as follows:

SHENANDOAH, IOWA,
March 2, 1964.

The public meeting held in Shenandoah, Iowa, yesterday was a convincing demonstration of the tremendous depth of concern that the Midwest has for the future of the cattle industry. This meeting was organized by our committee within the past 10 days. It was a spontaneous, nonpartisan meeting of all segments of this essential industry. The thousands of participants listened patiently and attentively to the explanation by Assistant Secretary Mehrens of the administration's position regarding imports, but they were not convinced that there is any sympathy for or understanding of our position in Washington.

You are quoted in a current farm magazine article as having said that you "know what it is when millions of farmers go through the economic wringer," and that you are "not going to let it happen again." If this is indeed a true statement of your position, we urge you to act now by helping us to implement the resolutions unanimously adopted at this meeting and endorsed by the leaders of all major farm and livestock organizations who were present and in full accord.

You are further quoted as having said that "Farmers still aren't getting a fair shake out of this economy," and that legislative action is the way that is always best. We realize that legislation is the only way to curtail and control imports, and that such legislation cannot be enacted without the support of your administration. We urge you to lead us in this desperate battle for the survival of our industry by placing the full power of your office in support of these resolutions.

Be it resolved:

1. It is the consensus of those attending this meeting that attention must be called to the chaotic and serious financial straits in which the cattle industry finds itself, and that this condition affects not only everyone connected with the cattle industry but many other segments of the Nation's economy.

2. Be it hereby declared that the Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action respectfully petitions the Congress to limit, by legislative action, imports of beef and veal, fresh, frozen, cooked and/or canned or cured, to levels in pounds approximately equal in volume to the level of 1960, approximately 775 million pounds or 4.9 percent of domestic production that year.

3. We further recommend and urge that the cattle industry take effective action toward orderly marketing and production, as well as production more nearly commensurate with consumer demands.

4. Be it further resolved that we as a committee urge all organizations to join with us in a united effort to accomplish our objective.

It is our solemn belief that through cooperation, understanding and mutual respect, the meat industry from producer to consumer can face a future that will be profitable and satisfactory to all.

Respectfully,

BOB BUFFINGTON,
Chairman, Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action.

Also I include a letter to Chairman MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee which also speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker our bill restricts by 50 percent the average annual quantities of all meats of all kinds and in all forms of packaging and of all live meat animals imported into the United States from all foreign countries during the past 5-year period ending on December 31, 1963.

We are pleased to report that much support for our bill is being manifested nationwide.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1964.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 25, 1964, I introduced H.R. 10099, "to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States". Subsequently, 17 colleagues introduced identical bills, all of which have been referred for action to your committee.

Mr. Chairman, the cattlemen's and feed merchants' plight is already desperate, and further financial damage is inevitable even if relief legislation were enacted immediately.

Thus, every moment of delay postpones the solution.

Therefore, we, the undersigned authors of the meat import restriction bills before your committee, do earnestly petition you to call for hearings now, either by the full committee or by an appropriate subcommittee.

We can supply you with sufficient witnesses from widely scattered feeding areas of this important industry who can describe the critical situation that exists due to the present unrestricted importation of meat and meat products into the United States.

Respectfully yours,

BEN J. JENSEN, Member of Congress; CHARLES HOEVEN, Iowa; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; JOHN KYL, Iowa; MEL LAIRD, Wisconsin; HENRY SCHADEBERG, Wisconsin; WILLIAM VAN PELT, Wisconsin; ROBERT MCLOSKEY, Illinois; JAMES QUILLEN, Tennessee; J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado; JAMES WEAVER, Pennsylvania; RALPH BEERMANN, Nebraska; E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota; DON CLAUSEN, California; DURWARD HALL, Missouri; WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Wyoming; WILLIAM BRAY, Indiana; and RICHARD ROUDEBUSH, Indiana.

Washipgton: Man of Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 23, I had the privilege of listening to an address by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore City, to the Asbury Methodist Church Bible Class in Salisbury, Md., at a service honoring the birthday of our first President, George Washington.

Mayor McKeldin has singled out the significant quality in the character of our first President that our country so desperately needs in its citizens and in its leaders today. That quality is integrity.

Mr. McKeldin's address contains for us a timely message, and because I feel it ought to be read by the membership of this body, I have requested permission to insert the text of the speech in the RECORD.

ADDRESS OF MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, ASBURY METHODIST CHURCH BIBLE CLASS, SALISBURY, MD., FEBRUARY 23, 1964

Washington is the mightiest name on earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation.

The speaker of those words was Abraham Lincoln; and after such a tribute from such a man, praise from a lesser source must seem flat, stale, and unprofitable.

I shall not, therefore, abuse your patience by trying to pay tribute to George Washington—who am I to praise him after what Lincoln has said?—but invite you, instead, to consider with me what aspect of this man's character it is most profitable for us to study 232 years after his birth.

Almost a hundred years before Washington was born the shrewd, if somewhat cynical, Spanish philosopher, Balthasar Gracian, had written, "Things have their period; even excellencies are subject to fashion."

To my mind "fashion" is not the right word; but I agree that all forms of excellence do not make the same appeal at all times. For instance, in 1964, only a minority of

Americans have need to emulate Washington's endurance. What have we to endure that is worthy of mention by comparison with the dreadful ordeal of that winter at Valley Forge? Not many of us have need to imitate his physical courage, for we are not called on to find our way through a pathless wilderness filled with lurking savages, or to face the steel-tipped ranks of Howe and Clinton.

But it is now, it has always been, and I am firmly convinced it always will be well worth our while, indeed, our high duty to study and, as far as we can, to imitate one facet of this man's character. This aspect of Washington is his massive integrity.

Critics agree that Parson Weems made up that story about the hatchet and the cherry tree, but fiction or not, it described one of the man's conspicuous traits. I say nothing as to the child, but from his early manhood on I believe that it was literally impossible for George Washington to tell a lie. Of course, he could be mistaken; he was only human, and any man will make misstatements when he has been misinformed. But that is merely error, not lying.

Conscious, willful duplicity was not in this man's character—and what a lesson that is for our times. Those foolish officers who wished at the end of the war to make him king of America, had served under him, some of them for years, but they knew nothing about him. They could not believe in the existence of the man who appeared before Congress in the State House at Annapolis, surrendered his commission, and resumed the status of a private citizen. But that man, not the Commander in Chief, was the essential Washington.

Have you ever stopped to think that of the three great revolutions of modern times, the American, the French, and the Russian, only the American was finished by the same men who began it?

A revolution is finished when the government it has overthrown is replaced by a permanent new one; the American Revolution, for instance, was finished when the Constitution of the United States went into effect in 1789.

Mirabeau and his friends who launched the French Revolution were swallowed up and lost in the storm. Kerensky and his friends, who forced the abdication of the czar of Russia, were hurled from power. But the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention in 1787, and who became the first head of the new Republic in 1789, was the same man who took command of the unorganized militia around Boston in 1775.

There is only one possible explanation of this. It is the Nation's utter confidence in the integrity of its leader. True, he was not alone. Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Franklin, and the rest were regarded as honest patriots; but only one was looked upon as the very sign and symbol of honesty, as honesty itself. Other qualities had made him first in war and first in peace; but it was integrity that made him first in the hearts of his countrymen.

Was there ever a time when this quality was more urgently needed than it is at this moment? All around the world today we see princes, potentates, and powers unblushingly avowing the dreadful heresy that the end justifies the means. They shamelessly do evil that—they say—good may come. But it does not come. "God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." It is true of nations also; when they sow treachery, falsehood, and deceit the harvest they reap shall be of like kind, "some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold," but the least ample to bring woe and misery upon that land.

Yet if we are honest with ourselves can we lay the flattering unction to our souls that this wickedness is the monopoly of foreigners? I, for one, cannot do so. I have seen too many instances in which men in high places by consent of the American people and therefore supposed to be speaking in their name, have said things that later were proved to be untrue. I do not deny that these men, or some of them, were inspired by what they sincerely believed to be good motives; but I am firmly convinced that whenever an American statesman, of whatever rank, resorts to duplicity, he sows the wind. I know that in some cases we have already reaped the whirlwind, and if we continue to follow any such policy I gravely fear that eventually we shall reap the hurricane.

But when my mind is invaded by such fears I find no small consolation in this anniversary. For this day is a reminder that these woes are not inevitable. Here is the conclusive proof that power does not always corrupt, that glory does not always breed arrogance, that a man may be raised to the topmost pinnacle of fame, yet swear to his own hurt and never change.

And this man was an American, first in our hearts indeed, but still your countryman and mine. Here is one great source of our pride, and here by the same token should be a stern call for our humility. It was our country that produced this one, but who among us has the boldness to claim that we have produced another who is his equal? It was not an American, but the English poet, Byron, who summed it up best when he put this question:

Where may the wearied eye repose
When gazing on the great;
Where neither guilty glory glows,
Nor despicable state?

And then answered himself in lines that I quote as the best picture of the Father of our Country:

Yes—one—the first—the last—the best—
The Cincinnatus of the west,
Whom envy dared not hate,
Bequeathed the name of Washington,
To make man blush there was but one!

Les Goates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the books written by historians, novelists, philosophers and poets may line our bookshelves, but over there on the couch is the daily paper, and it is probably opened to the sports page. I do not know what the readership of sports pages is compared with other reading material but I will hazard that a big percentage of the Nation's readers at any given time are concentrating on the sports page.

In the West for more than four decades, there has appeared in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, the column "Le's Go" by Les Goates, its far-famed sports editor. As with other youngsters of the Intermountain States, the "Le's Go" column helped teach me to read. Some of the first words I learned to read were: "Babe Ruth," "Jack Dempsey," "Zack Wheat," "Herb Pennock," "Walter Hagen," "Big Bill Tilden," "Ira Dern." From Les Goates I learned that Jack Dempsey was actually "the Manassa Mauler," that a basketball was a "casaba," that a football was a "pigskin," and I understood that when a pitcher was "on the mound," he "toed the rubber."

Les Goates retired last month at the age of 70, after 44 years during most of which time he wrote about sports, although in most recent years, he has written a general column in order "to give the younger fellows a chance on the sports page."

He is one of the West's authentic gentlemen, understanding, able, considerate, deeply religious and perhaps above all an exemplary father of exemplary children.

His last column was published in the Deseret News on February 7, 1964. Typically, it was lighthearted, philosophical and scrappy. I have the pleasure of submitting it to this RECORD.

RETIREMENT—NOT QUITTING

(Les' Go by Les Goates)

On the occasion of his 91st birthday, Justice Holmes said, "The rider in a race does not stop when he reaches the goal. There is a little finishing canter before coming to a standstill. There is yet time to hear the kind voices of friends saying 'Good race.' And to say to one's self: 'The job is done'."

The postrace canter is much like retirement. It is the easing off, the slowing down, the moment of contemplating what happened.

As we write this final chapter to many thousands over a period of 44 years, we begin to see some splendid compensations in going into retirement, all of which seem to echo the grand old maxim: "It is better farther on."

Retirement gives us time to "cram for the finals" so that when the time comes to wrap the draperies of our couch upon us and lie down to pleasant dreams, those dreams will be pleasant. They will be all the more pleasant if we can cross the bar on our own power, and up to the last departure can look any man in the eye and say, "So what?"

Yet, in a way, retirement can be depressing. When a man has worked in the office in close companionship with the finest people in all the world for 44 years, he begins to walk around the place like a fellow with money in the bank. He has had all the good things so long, it is time he stepped aside to make room for a younger and more vigorous man. It is good that we should share our joys.

It requires considerable self-discipline and dignity to carry on after this abrupt change in position and status. The retired worker does well to forget about this leisure business and keep working at something. Like the frog that fell into the church, if he keeps paddling he can whip up a solid base on which he can sit back and croak.

Idleness wearies our brains as well as our bodies because man naturally is disposed to think and act constructively. It is important that he figure out some kind of drudgery to occupy his retirement leisure.

Retirement from work often antedates illness. This bears out the thesis that one of the greatest sources of gratification in life is work, and that its loss may have tremendous phychological impact.

So, as this still wideawake oldster, 70, closes his newspaper career with a swan song on retirement, he is not worried. He will be looking ahead, planning and writing. He does not expect to avoid the physical handicaps of age but hopes to elude the bad behavior traits of some oldsters who become bitter and disillusioned. The best way to bypass these barriers is to keep close to the heart of youth.

Unlike the old athlete who never knows when to hang up his togs, the worker should be able to tell when he is slowing down.

Warning signs are flashed to him at every turn. He should take heed. Here are some of the signals he can pick up if he is in tune:

Is it hard for him to remember where he parked the car or left his hat? Does he deliberate and take his time on little tasks that formerly were easy? Does he tend to resist new ideas? Has he given up trying to get ahead intellectually and in other ways? Does he continually harp on "the good old days" and live in the past?

Closing quote: "To be 70 years young is sometimes more cheerful and hopeful than to be 40 years old."

—JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

The Hundred Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as President Johnson completed his first 3 months in office, the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, March 1, struck a balance sheet upon his actions as Chief Executive. As the editorial below points out, the new President's score is high indeed:

THE HUNDRED DAYS

President Johnson marked the completion of his first 3 months in the White House by his first full-dress news conference, complete with live TV. It fell short of success. Such organized conferences are not Mr. Johnson's medium of communication; he seems far more concerned to suppress "speculation" than to provide illumination.

Yet the unhappy agglomeration of platitudes produced by the conference did not offer a fair or realistic basis for judging President Johnson's performance in office, or his capacities. His "hundred days" include positive accomplishments, and raise questions that were barely touched upon in the awkward meeting between the President and the massed press.

The term, "hundred days," derives its historical significance from Napoleon's return from Elba, and his brief resumption of the French imperial throne. That was a busy 3 months; it ended at Waterloo.

In American politics, however, the practice of summing up a President's initial performance goes back to the hectic hundred days of 1933, when bill after bill, executive order after executive order, poured out of the White House, and Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal began.

Mr. Johnson succeeded to the Presidency under conditions quite different than those of 1933. There was no economic crisis—quite the contrary. Foreign affairs, 3 months ago, held many explosive elements, but none of them appeared, then, to be at flash point. The grimmest aspect of Mr. Johnson's entry into the White House was the tragedy that carried him there—the assassination of President Kennedy and the doubts, fears and hatreds that event aroused.

In meeting this troubled domestic climate, President Johnson conducted himself admirably. His words and actions (including the establishment of the Warren Commission to investigate Mr. Kennedy's death) were reassuring. He supplied a sense of continuity of administration and policy that was necessary at the time while he soon made it clear that he would take his own line on many matters.

This line was one of attempting to heal some of the divisions that had arisen over the past few years. And although he has been at least as committed as his predecessor to strong action for racial equality, this tense issue has lost a little—even if not much—of its bitterness.

Mr. Johnson's methods have helped speed up legislative action in Congress, too. They have brought better relations between Capitol Hill and the White House, and better prospects for a body of real accomplishment by the present Congress.

The biggest question mark presented by the Johnson hundred days is, of course, foreign affairs. Here a variety of crises have exploded all over the globe; several of them have had humiliating aspects for Americans; nearly all of them are dangerous. President Johnson inherited these problems; they are not of his making. In tackling them there is as yet little evidence of success, but it is too early to say they represent failures of the present administration's policy. It may be many months before an accurate balance sheet can be struck on Mr. Johnson's actions in this field; that accounting, however, will be the most important of all appraisals of the hundred days.

The Perils of Acting Civilized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones appeared in the Washington Star of March 9. It is rather refreshing to some of us who have been hoping for a little muscle in our foreign policy and our State Department.

It seems that we are not quite ready in this modern world for sweetness and light, promoted by pink teas with cookies.

Something must be added, and that is to stop trying to be loved, and insist on being respected.

The article follows:

THE PERILS OF ACTING CIVILIZED—DO-GOOD ATTITUDE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IS BLAMED FOR ATTACKS ON AMERICA

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is America approaching that degree of gentleness and irresolution that will render her incapable of surviving in a jungle world?

Have we grown so tolerant of misbehavior among the neutrals, so ready to turn the other cheek to our rampaging enemies, and so intent on peace at any price that we are nudging the world toward a climactic war, a war we may not win?

In short, are we suffering from an overdose of civilization?

A world in which highly civilized men are safe is, of course, devoutly to be wished. It it nice to think that the meek will inherit the earth at this particular time. But the meek haven't been doing so well recently.

The brutal truth is that gutty aggressors can lick the pants off defensive sportsmen. The Marquis of Queensbury rules aren't worth a whoop against the man coming at you with a broken bottle.

It is now being admitted, even in Washington, that America's foreign policy is in "disarray." "Disarray" is a precious bit of Harvardese meaning "a mess." It is in a mess not because the framers of our foreign policy were stupid, but because they suffered from a very persistent illusion.

The illusion was that if we consistently out-do-gooded ourselves the nations of the world would flock to our banner out of gratitude, and admiration. This miscalculation may have had its genesis in one of the noblest and wrongest political theorists of all time—Woodrow Wilson.

"There is such a thing," wrote Mr. Wilson, "as a nation being so right that it does not need to convice others by force that it is right."

Were we wrong in our treatment of Cuba? We delivered her. We were her best customer.

Were we wrong in our treatment of Panama? We delivered her, too. Before we came the only asset the isthmus had was a 40-mile railroad over which apprehensive passengers hurried through swarms of Anopheles mosquitoes.

What evil had we done to Zanzibar? The Americans were booted out, including our diplomatic personnel. And we turned right around and recognized the new regime at the suggestion of that master of tribal psychology, Soapy Williams.

All over the world mobs are descending on American embassies. They used to simply attack the U.S. information libraries. But now our Ambassadors flee for their lives. Is this part of a pattern? You bet your sweet boots.

The pattern is the systematic humiliation of America. It is humiliation in progressive degrees, from little humiliations to steadily larger ones. The aim is to convince our friends that we are weak and irresolute, the uncommitted that we are a paper tiger, and the people of the Communist countries that worldwide victory for their leaders is inevitable. The campaign has been doing fine.

Why have we behaved so feebly? Because we are so civilized that the possibility of atomic war fills us with horror.

There is another popular piece of Washington gobbledygookery—"escalate." We threw away victory in Korea because we were afraid a bombing above the Yalu would "escalate" into World War III. For the same reason we didn't push a corridor through to Berlin, although the Russians were acting in defiance of all solemn agreements. And in the fall of 1962 we pulled our punch in Cuba and thus junked the Monroe Doctrine.

Has no one in Washington been reading history? Hitler was permitted to remilitarize the Rhineland because the timid British and French feared that if they opposed it matters might "escalate" into World War II. At that time, militarily, Hitler had practically nothing.

Hitler claimed that each new aggressive move would be his last, but he stressed that any opposition would bring total war. So he murdered Dolfuss, took over Austria, grabbed Sudetenland and the Polish Corridor. Each time Britain and France fell back, fearing escalation. And when the inevitable breaking point came Hitler was strong and they were weak.

If we don't stand up for our rights pretty soon World War III will be a cinch. Because by perpetually showing weakness we won't end the possibility of incidents. We will simply insure larger and more outrageous incidents until we must choose war or total surrender.

The time has come to say to the Panamanian:

"Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across the fence we'll return the body."

The time has come to say to Ghana's Nkrumah:

"The fleet will be in tomorrow. The marines will march down to our Embassy be-

hind the bands. You be there to tell us whether you want the place closed. You've already seen your last gift dollar. And if we lock the Embassy you've seen your last trade dollar."

If we do not start saying these things we will be in total war in 10 years—without any friends.

How Long Do We Take It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world today Uncle Sam is fast becoming Uncle Sap. Last night's Evening Star had an excellent article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones on how little it takes for us to stand up so that we can regain some of the respect we have lost under the administration in power since January 1961.

The article follows:

THE PERILS OF ACTING CIVILIZED—DO-GOOD ATTITUDE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IS BLAMED FOR ATTACKS ON AMERICA

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is America approaching that degree of gentleness and irresolution that will render her incapable of surviving in a jungle world?

Have we grown so tolerant of misbehavior among the neutrals, so ready to turn the other cheek to our rampaging enemies, and so intent on peace at any price that we are nudging the world toward a climactic war, a war we may not win?

In short, are we suffering from an overdose of civilization?

A world in which highly civilized men are safe is, of course, devoutly to be wished. It is nice to think that the meek will inherit the earth at this particular time. But the meek haven't been doing so well recently.

The brutal truth is that gutty aggressors can lick the pants off defensive sportsmen. The Marquis of Queensberry rules aren't worth a whoop against the man coming at you with a broken bottle.

It is now being admitted, even in Washington, that America's foreign policy is in "disarray." "Disarray" is a precious bit of Harvardese meaning "a mess." It is in a mess not because the framers of our foreign policy were stupid, but because they suffered from a very persistent illusion.

The illusion was that if we consistently out-do-gooder ourselves the nations of the world would flock to our banner out of gratitude and admiration. This miscalculation may have had its genesis in one of the noblest and wrongest political theorists of all time—Woodrow Wilson.

"There is such a thing," wrote Mr. Wilson, "as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right."

Were we wrong in our treatment of Cuba? We delivered her. We were her best customer.

Were we wrong in our treatment of Panama? We delivered her, too. Before we came the only asset the isthmus had was a 40-mile railroad over which apprehensive passengers hurried through swarms of Anopheles mosquitoes.

What evil had we done to Zanzibar? The Americans were booted out, including our diplomatic personnel. And we turned right around and recognized the new regime at the suggestion of that master of tribal psychology, Soapy Williams.

All over the world mobs are descending on American embassies. They used to simply attack the U.S. Information libraries. But now our ambassadors flee for their lives. Is this part of a pattern? You bet your sweet boots.

The pattern is the systematic humiliation of America. It is humiliation in progressive degrees, from little humiliations to steadily larger ones. The aim is to convince our friends that we are weak and irresolute, the uncommitted that we are a paper tiger, and the people of the Communist countries that worldwide victory for their leaders is inevitable. The campaign has been doing fine.

Why have we behaved so feebly? Because we are so civilized that the possibility of atomic war fills us with horror.

There is another popular piece of Washington gobbledegookery—"escalate." We threw away victory in Korea because we were afraid a bombing above the Yalu would escalate into world war III. For the same reason we didn't push a corridor through to Berlin, although the Russians were acting in defiance of all solemn agreements. And in the fall of 1962 we pulled our punch in Cuba and thus junked the Monroe Doctrine.

Has no one in Washington been reading history? Hitler was permitted to remilitarize the Rhineland because the timid British and French feared that if they opposed it matters might "escalate" into World War II. At that time, militarily, Hitler had practically nothing.

Hitler claimed that each new aggressive move would be his last, but he stressed that any opposition would bring total war. So he murdered Dolfuss, took over Austria, grabbed Sudetenland and the Polish Corridor. Each time Britain and France fell back, fearing escalation. And when the inevitable breaking point came Hitler was strong and they were weak.

If we don't stand up for our rights pretty soon world war III will be a cinch. Because by perpetually showing weakness we won't end the possibility of incidents. We will simply insure larger and more outrageous incidents until we must choose war or total surrender.

The time has come to say to the Panamanian:

"Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across the fence we'll return the body."

The time has come to say to Ghana's Nkrumah:

"The fleet will be in tomorrow. The marines will march down to our Embassy behind the bands. You be there to tell us whether you want the placed closed. You've already seen your last gift dollar. And if we lock the Embassy you've seen your last trade dollar."

If we do not start saying these things we will be in total war in 10 years—without any friends.

The Systematic Humiliation of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have always liked the forthrightness of Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the caption for these remarks was dug out of the body of his splendid article as it appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star. Mr. Jones, along with a lot of us, has reached the conclusion that our foreign affairs are not only in disarray, they are in an unholy mess. And while he does not say so in so many words he must be as disgusted as the rest of us with the administration's attempt to sell the Nation the idea that we are held in high esteem around the world.

This able columnist quite properly identifies our foreign policy as the result of the illusory idea that we can win friends and influence people simply being nice to everyone, and without the slightest idea—perish the thought—that we should ever expect a little respect and cooperation for all the dollars we have scattered over the face of the earth.

In the current situation Mr. Jones lists Cuba, and Panama as classical examples of our ineptitude and asks just what we did to merit the slaps we have received from these pipsqueak loudmouths. As he says it, we "delivered" Cuba and we were always her best customer. In like manner we delivered Panama and have kept her on her feet economically and politically ever since. Going back a few years he then puts his finger on our real trouble; namely, a morbid fear that these minor annoyances may be fanned into a larger conflagration and cites our timidity in Korea and at the Berlin wall to illustrate his point. In a word, we have telegraphed our fear of an international holocaust to the point where we may have precipitated it by inviting a series of nose tweakings by irresponsible, newly emerged nations who have concluded that even though our gun may be loaded we will always be afraid to pull the trigger.

I have always advocated firmness—ala John Foster Dulles—as the only foreign policy that will work. There is not a single nation in the world today that dares challenge us in battle and in so many cases their good opinion is not worth the price we have been offering for it. What we need is a large dose of the brinkmanship which Mr. Dulles proved will work and then settle with these pint-size nuisances in the pattern Columnist Jones advocates for Panama:

Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across the fence we'll return the body.

And I submit that such a policy of firmness will work regardless of the squawks of outraged dictators and the plaintive whining of so-called allies of the nervous-Nelly type.

But read all of Mr. Jones' column. It is really savory fare for those who still believe in the Monroe Doctrine and this thing we call sovereignty.

THE PERILS OF ACTING CIVILIZED: DO-GOOD ATTITUDE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IS BLAMED FOR ATTACKS ON AMERICA

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is America approaching that degree of gentleness and irresolution that will render her incapable of surviving in a jungle world?

Have we grown so tolerant of misbehavior among the neutrals, so ready to turn the other cheek to our rampaging enemies, and

so intent on peace at any price that we are nudging the world toward a climactic war, a war we may not win?

In short, are we suffering from an overdose of civilization?

A world in which highly civilized men are safe is, of course, devoutly to be wished. It is nice to think that the meek will inherit the earth at this particular time. But the meek haven't been doing so well recently.

The brutal truth is that gutty aggressors can lick the pants off defensive sportsmen. The Marquis of Queensberry rules aren't worth a whoop against the man coming at you with a broken bottle.

It is now being admitted, even in Washington, that America's foreign policy is in "disarray." "Disarray" is a precious bit of Harvardese meaning "a mess." It is in a mess not because the framers of our foreign policy were stupid, but because they suffered from a very persistent illusion.

The illusion was that if we consistently out-do-gooded ourselves the nations of the world would flock to our banner out of gratitude and admiration. This miscalculation may have had its genesis in one of the noblest and wrongest political theorists of all time—Woodrow Wilson.

"There is such a thing," wrote Mr. Wilson, "as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right."

Were we wrong in our treatment of Cuba? We delivered her. We were her best customer.

Were we wrong in our treatment of Panama? We delivered her, too. Before we came the only asset the isthmus had was a 40-mile railroad over which apprehensive passengers hurried through swarms of Anopheles mosquitoes.

What evil had we done to Zanzibar? The Americans were booted out, including our diplomatic personnel. And we turned right around and recognized the new regime at the suggestion of that master of tribal psychology, Soapy Williams.

All over the world mobs are descending on American Embassies. They used to simply attack the U.S. Information libraries. But now our Ambassadors flee for their lives. Is this part of a pattern? You bet your sweet boots.

The pattern is the systematic humiliation of America. It is humiliation in progressive degrees, from little humiliations to steadily larger ones. The aim is to convince our friends that we are weak and irresolute, the uncommitted that we are a paper tiger, and the people of the Communist countries that worldwide victory for their leaders is inevitable. The campaign has been doing fine.

Why have we behaved so feebly? Because we are so civilized that the possibility of atomic war fills us with horror.

There is another popular piece of Washington gobbledegookery—"escalate." We threw away victory in Korea because we were afraid a bombing above the Yalu would "escalate" into world war III. For the same reason we didn't push a corridor through to Berlin, although the Russians were acting in defiance of all solemn agreements. And in the fall of 1962 we pulled our punch in Cuba and thus junked the Monroe Doctrine.

Has no one in Washington been reading history? Hitler was permitted to remilitarize the Rhineland because the timid British and French feared that if they opposed it matters might "escalate" into World War II. At that time, militarily, Hitler had practically nothing.

Hitler claimed that each new aggressive move would be his last, but he stressed that any opposition would bring total war. So he murdered Dolfuss, took over Austria, grabbed Sudetenland and the Polish Corridor. Each time Britain and France fell back, fearing escalation. And when the inevitable breaking point came Hitler was strong and they were weak.

If we don't stand up for our rights pretty soon world war III will be a cinch. Because by perpetually showing weakness we won't end the possibility of incidents. We will simply insure larger and more outrageous incidents until we must choose war or total surrender.

The time has come to say to the Panamanian:

"Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across the fence we'll return the body."

The time has come to say to Ghana's Nkrumah:

"The fleet will be in tomorrow. The marines will march down to our Embassy behind the bands. You be there to tell us whether you want the place closed. You've already seen your last gift dollar. And if we lock the Embassy you've seen your last trade dollar."

If we do not start saying these things we will be in total war in 10 years—without any friends.

Solution to Poverty Problem: More Jobs Not More Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the March 6 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat puts its finger on the nub of the poverty problem: What we need to do is upgrade the skills of the unemployed and give our free enterprise system room to create more jobs, not pile one vote-getting welfare program on top of another. We should, as Assistant Secretary of Labor Patrick Moynihan recently pointed out, direct our efforts at creating jobs and not at temporary stopgap welfare programs which merely perpetuate the problem by making poverty endurable. Welfare programs are noted for their failure to eradicate the problem and have, in Secretary Moynihan's words, "rotted individual initiative." I hope my colleagues will give this perceptive editorial the kind of study it deserves before we aimlessly vote for more welfare programs instead of carefully analyzing the nature of the problem and the various ways in which it may be solved.

The editorial follows:

JOBS: ONLY CURE FOR POVERTY

With the remark, "Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear so responsible and well-informed a view from a high official of the Johnson administration," St. Louis' Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS did a most unusual thing the other day.

One of the leading Republicans of the House, he had reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper story presenting the views of Assistant Secretary of Labor Patrick Moynihan, a Democrat, on the poverty problem of this country.

It was headed—"Anti-poverty-army leader says: Way Out of Poverty for a Man Is a Job."

Perhaps to clear politics out of the situation, it should be noted that Mr. Moynihan's family lived on welfare on the West Side of New York when he was a child, as did many Democrats and Republicans during the Great Depression of the 1930's.

Essence of Mr. Moynihan's remarks was that the war on poverty, which President Johnson has called on the Nation to fight this year, stems from failure of the myriad of welfare programs tried over the last three decades to eradicate it.

In eastern Kentucky, for example, he said "some people have been on welfare for three or four generations." The same thing holds true throughout much of Appalachia. It can undoubtedly be found in many of our largest cities.

Welfare, Mr. Moynihan declared emphatically, is "rotting" the poverty stricken of America—has already rotted residents of Appalachia and those on Indian reservations "and the Negro community is on the verge of being rotted."

One of the questions raised about Mr. Johnson's antipoverty drive, if not opposition to it, is that the poor in the United States live better than the poor have ever lived anywhere before. Mr. Moynihan wouldn't deny it. Welfare, he argues, "has made poverty more endurable instead of providing a door of escape from it."

Relief is not only self-defeating as a cure for poverty; it is self-perpetuating.

Doesn't that explain why this richest country on the face of the earth, which supports its poor in better style than any other, is "the major industrial country in the West where a considerable number of people live in poverty"?

In Mr. Moynihan's candid opinion, American poverty is a "a political problem instead of an economic problem. We don't have to have this problem, but we do."

Piling more welfare on more welfare to win elections, only prolongs the agony and "rots" people on relief generation after generation.

"The only way out of poverty for a man is employment," Mr. Moynihan rightly says. Jobs don't come from political panaceas but from the dynamic functioning of free economy.

We can well understand why Representative CURTIS liked Mr. Moynihan's views so well he wanted them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They give us, too, the hope that, if he is listened to, this antipoverty crusade of the President may not be betrayed into another gigantic boondoggle.

Silence Is Not Golden—Joint Chiefs Must Be Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union entitled "Joint Chiefs Must Be Heard":

SILENCE IS NOT GOLDEN—JOINT CHIEFS MUST BE HEARD

The members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are being described as the "Five silent men." By law, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the principal military advisers to the President of the United States. By present practice, they have been supplanted by a single Chief of Staff, and a civilian at that.

The National Security Act of 1947 and the Reorganization Act of 1958 specifically pro-

vided against a single Chief of Staff, a single uniform or a single service, a large Joint Chief of Staff organization, and a national general staff.

But what is the situation today?

Robert H. Barnum, national president of the Navy League of the United States, points out that while the law originally limited the Joint Staff to not more than 100, it has been changed until today it totals nearly 2,000 persons.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff has been reduced, or almost drowned, under the weight of a civilian bureaucracy that has usurped military decisionmaking, and as Mr. Barnum says:

"Naval Intelligence, as an organization, has been destroyed. G-2, of the Army and Air Force Intelligence, as organizations, have been seriously torn apart. The Central Intelligence Agency is being worked upon, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff 'Intelligence Group' seriously cut, all by administrative action.

"We have, like it or not, a single supply agency, a single military intelligence agency, a single communications agency, a single press and speech censorship agency, a single atomic support agency and a single National Security Agency."

Administrative individuals without military background, experience, education, and often without understanding, are making some of the most serious if not the most critical decisions affecting the country's security.

Out of the welter of civilian bureaucracy, one bureaucrat emerges as undisputed boss, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

As Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S. Navy retired, has shown, the five members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when meeting as a body bring together a total of 178 years of varied military experience tested in both war and peace. By contrast, Mr. McNamara has had 3 years as Secretary of Defense plus a couple of years of wartime service as an Army captain specializing in finance and management.

The phrase "the Pentagon says" suggests a voice of military authority. Such is not the case. The voices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not heard in America—unless Congress brings them before its committees. Congress has a duty to air their military opinions on every point of the military budget and on every question of weapons and strategy.

A Letter From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at different times during the year I get letters from classes of young people in the schools of my district. The one I insert in the RECORD today comes from a geography class in my hometown of Davenport. The letter is self-explanatory. I would like to say, however, that I believe it is admirable to have the young people in this country as interested in the welfare of this country as is indicated by this letter:

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
February 12, 1964.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: Our class are studying Yugoslavia and came across the question of whether to give economical and military aid to Yugoslavia.

We would like to inform you that we are thoroughly against giving aid for these purposes. We feel the people of the United States should be given food before the people of Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia's geographical position could be easily attacked by Russian forces. In case of war they would close off her seaports. Yugoslavia would be blocked off from our help.

We would like your opinion on this question.

Our class thanks you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

MR. MUSKER'S SEVENTH-GRADE GEOGRAPHY CLASS
MARY CATO,
Class Secretary.

False Colors: Coal Surplus Debunks Security Excuse for Hiking Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, all of us from coal-producing States were shocked at the action of the Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall in fixing greatly increased daily quotas of imported residual fuel oil. This action further erodes the economies of those States incorporated in the new-found term "Appalachia." This action alone will further reduce the number of men employed in the coal mines of my State and will further erode the economy of West Virginia.

It would appear that we have reached a time in our national life when the economic gain of one area of our country to the detriment of the economy of another section is applied with all recklessness and the drive to obtain an advantage dollarwise in one section of the country to the distinct disadvantage of another section of our country is now applauded rather than frowned upon.

Mr. Speaker, I sat on a special subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business reviewing the oil import program of our country and religiously attended every meeting and every session of that committee. I was amazed to hear representatives of certain sections of our country who were willing to trade our national security, and yes, the bare essentials in certain other sections of our country for a good business deal. The fiction under which the mandatory oil import program is administered can no longer be tolerated. The Congress must act.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial written by Mr. Thomas O'Brien Flynn of the Wheeling Intelligencer of Wheeling, W. Va., an area of my State not so much touched by the economic difficulty of coal, clearly sets out how false is the premise of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to permitting increased residual oil imports.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert that editorial with my remarks:

FALSE COLORS: COAL SURPLUS DEBUNKS SECURITY EXCUSE FOR HIKING OIL IMPORTS

The coal industry is not making much headway in its effort to obtain relief from the competition of imported residual fuel oil. Instead of reducing the flow, the Government is increasing it. For the new fuel year beginning on April 1, Interior Secretary Udall has fixed a daily quota of 638,000 barrels of imported residual for the east coast, which compares with the current authorization of 575,000 barrels.

In announcing this decision Mr. Udall said it is "consistent with the national security objectives of the total oil import control program," because it "takes into account the continued decline in domestic production of this fuel and an anticipated substantial increase in industrial activity."

Domestic production is declining only because the price at which this type of imported fuel oil can be sold makes the market unattractive. So that if even nothing but the oil industry were taken into consideration the national security argument would sound a little lame. But when it is considered that we have unlimited sources of coal and that increasingly effective and economical means of delivering this fuel to the east coast are available, the argument loses all force.

We could shut off the flow of imported residual fuel oil altogether without endangering the national security in any way. Power is something we have an abundance of. Indeed, the less dependent we are on imported fuel, the stronger our security. So that, aside from what advantage east coast consumers enjoy because of the pricing influence of imported fuel, the only effect of a liberal import policy is to depress domestic industry and destroy American jobs.

Has No One in Washington Been Reading History?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, what this country needs are more editorials similar to the one appearing in the March 9, 1964, issue of the Washington Star by Jenkin Lloyd Jones. All I can say is that it is terrific and hope that everyone has a chance to read it. For that reason, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

THE PERILS OF ACTING CIVILIZED—DO-GOOD ATTITUDE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IS BLAMED FOR ATTACKS ON AMERICA

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is America approaching that degree of gentleness and irresolution that will render her incapable of surviving in a jungle world?

Have we grown so tolerant of misbehavior among the neutrals, so ready to turn the other cheek to our rampaging enemies, and so intent on peace at any price that we are nudging the world toward a climactic war, a war we may not win?

In short, are we suffering from an overdise of civilization?

A world in which highly civilized men are safe is, of course, devoutly to be wished. It is nice to think that the meek will inherit the earth at this particular time. But the meek haven't been doing so well recently.

The brutal truth is that gutty aggressors can lick the pants off defensive sportsmen.

The Marquis of Queensbury rules aren't worth a whoop against the man coming at you with a broken bottle.

It is now being admitted, even in Washington, that America's foreign policy is in disarray. "Disarray" is a precious bit of Harvardese meaning "a mess." It is in a mess not because the framers of our foreign policy were stupid, but because they suffered from a very persistent illusion.

The illusion was that if we consistently out-do-gooded ourselves the nations of the world would flock to our banner out of gratitude and admiration. This miscalculation may have had its genesis in one of the noblest and wrongest political theorists of all time—Woodrow Wilson.

"There is such a thing," wrote Mr. Wilson, "as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right."

Were we wrong in our treatment of Cuba? We delivered her. We were her best customer.

Were we wrong in our treatment of Panama? We delivered her, too. Before we came the only asset the isthmus had was a 40-mile railroad over which apprehensive passengers hurried through swarms of Anopheles mosquitos.

What evil had we done to Zanzibar? The Americans were booted out, including our diplomatic personnel. And we turned right around and recognized the new regime at the suggestion of that master of tribal psychology, Soapy Williams.

All over the world mobs are descending on American embassies. They used to simply attack the U.S. Information libraries. But now our ambassadors flee for their lives. Is this part of a pattern? You bet your sweet boots.

The pattern is the systematic humiliation of America. It is humiliation in progressive degrees, from little humiliations to steadily larger ones. The aim is to convince our friends that we are weak and irresolute, the uncommitted that we are a paper tiger, and the people of the Communist countries that worldwide victory for their leaders is inevitable. The campaign has been doing fine.

Why have we behaved so feebly? Because we are so civilized that the possibility of atomic war fills us with horror.

There is another popular piece of Washington gobbledegookery—"escalate." We threw away victory in Korea because we were afraid a bombing above the Yalu would "escalate" into world war III. For the same reason we didn't push a corridor through to Berlin, although the Russians were acting in defiance of all solemn agreements. And in the fall of 1962 we pulled our punch in Cuba and thus junked the Monroe Doctrine.

Has no one in Washington been reading history? Hitler was permitted to remilitarize the Rhineland because the timid British and French feared that if they opposed it matters might "escalate" into World War II. At that time, militarily, Hitler had practically nothing.

Hitler claimed that each new aggressive move would be his last, but he stressed that any opposition would bring total war. So he murdered Dolfuss, took over Austria, grabbed Sudetenland and the Polish Corridor. Each time Britain and France fell back, fearing escalation. And when the inevitable breaking point came Hitler was strong and they were weak.

If we don't stand up for our rights pretty soon world war III will be a cinch. Because by perpetually showing weakness we won't end the possibility of incidents. We will simply insure larger and more outrageous incidents until we must choose war or total surrender.

The time has come to say to the Panamanian:

"Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across the fence we'll return the body."

The time has come to say to Ghana's Nkrumah:

"The fleet will be in tomorrow. The marines will march down to our Embassy behind the bands. You be there to tell us whether you want the place closed. You've already seen your last gift dollar. And if we lock the Embassy you've seen your last trade dollar."

If we do not start saying these things we will be in total war in 10 years—without any friends.

Decline of the United States—And Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, May Craig—the famed lady reporter—wrote a pulsating piece of journalism that appeared in the February 9 issue of the Portland Sunday Telegram. This article, a critical exposition of our temper and our times, has won widespread attention, having been reprinted in several publications, including the March 2 issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

The character and content of May's article has drawn comment from coast to coast, and in order to avail my colleagues the privilege and opportunity of examining this penetrating article, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DECLINE OF THE UNITED STATES—AND FALL

WASHINGTON.—Unless there is a change, deep-down, in the American people, a genuine crusade against self-indulgence, immorality, public and private, then we are witnesses to the decline and fall of the American Republic.

Death on the highways, a pack a day, cheating from top to bottom in our society, get-rich-quick breakup of the family, faltering in foreign policy, reckless debt—these have destroyed nations before us, why should we think we can take the path and change history?

Look around you and everywhere you see lack of principle and steadfastness in the right and brave. The disgraceful cover on the recent issue of Time magazine and its palliating story of sexual immorality adds adult consent to the looseness of our youth, already far down the road of delinquency, shiftlessness, derogation of virginity in our girls who will be the mothers of tomorrow.

There is no financial morality in our Government—charge it, is the accepted practice.

Around the world they think they can take our money with one hand and slap us in the face with the other. We talk of our "leadership," but we are apparently incapable of giving leadership.

One listens with dismay to the campaigning for the Presidency that is going on. Oh, for a crusader to call us back to dignity and strength and austerity.

What was that last word? "Austerity," plain living and high thinking, putting our money into the real things of life, not mink-handled saucepans and three cars in every garage; public servants who are not Bobby Bakers. Schools for the young, care for the elderly, strength so that none will dare attack us, a worthy succession to those men with feet wrapped in bloody bandages at Valley Forge to give us liberty. How have we used the liberty they bought for us so dearly?

Because it is unpleasant to think of unpleasant things, we say the Soviet Union may be changing its determination to bury us. Red China is bad, of course, but maybe not Khrushchev. Halfheartedly we send American men to die in jungles,where we do not have the guts to go in to win or to stay out.

We sell wheat to Russia to save her from a demonstration that communism cannot produce enough food for its own people. If we do this to get rid of surplus wheat, which we have already subsidized and which we will subsidize again to give it to the Communists cheaper, we might try discouraging the production of surplus wheat and remember the old-fashioned private enterprise where one grows for the market, not the Government storage bins.

We faltered in Cuba and now she is the homeland of subversion of all Latin America and Africa. Where will we find a strong man to lead us—would we vote for one if he campaigned, crying in the wilderness that we come and be saved—from ourselves? We could have saved Cuba for freedom, and saved ourselves and the rest of Latin America from this nest of communism, but we did not. Around the world they do not believe what we stay, they look at what we do.

The United Nations was founded in this country. Now it is a messy combination of polyglot nations, old and new, grabbing for our money and ignoring our half-hearted arguments.

The idea of letting a small nation of fewer than a half-million people, utterly inexperienced in governing itself, unproved as a stable, honest state—letting them in within a few days of their establishment; we might at least insist on a period of probation.

The United Nations itself should be forced the financial honesty, by the United States refusing to keep on paying the bills while many get a free ride while outvoting us. The idea of letting in Red China in the face of the charter which says "peace-loving nations." True, we are against letting Red China in but all we do is get out our handerchiefs and weep into them while the majority in the U.N. does as it pleases.

We waste untold sums on useless defense, and fail to keep ourselves truly strong in all fields, to be able to fight small as well as missile wars.

We sign test ban treaties with known enemies, known defaulters on treaties, that we will not test as we may need to. Why should we put our defense in such an agreement? If our defense experts—not Businessman McNamara—say we need to test, then let us test without asking permisison of friend or foe.

We fiddle-faddle in southeast Asia, and may be ignominously pushed out. Maybe we should never have gone in there, let the Reds take it—but there is one thing for sure—if we go in anywhere we should go in to win.

We are losing the respect of the world and respect is more necessary to a nation, as to a person, than affection. We get little affection from the people we have helped over the years—and we are losing respect.

Nobody respects a fumbler, a weak man, a wabbler, in policy or deeds.

First every one of us has to clean out weakness and selfishness and immorality of all types. Then choose leaders who with strength, and principle, and intelligence will lead us to where we can have self-respect and respect of others.

Would we elect such a man if he campaigned on such a platform?

The Pay Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President is calling for economy in Government, cutbacks in Federal personnel, reductions in Federal spending, and other means to save the taxpayers' dollar, it is imperative that everyone show some consistency on a national level.

How can we in good conscience approve a pay raise for everyone on the Federal payroll at this time? Let us listen to the demands of the people and stop these unnecessary expenditures. Is our generation not responsible for the Federal deficits it is incurring.

The proposed salary increase contains many inequities, and is fiscally unsound. I intend to support the citizens of my district and the Nation who are demanding economy in Government—which brings about real tax reduction without deficits—and will oppose the enactment of this legislation.

The Tribune-Democrat of Johnstown, Pa., has made several pertinent remarks about the pending bill, and I would like to include the editorial as part of my statement:

CONGRESSIONAL PAY BOOST UNWARRANTED

The House Rules Committee last week cleared for House action a bill for more than half a billion dollars, to raise the pay of 1.7 million Federal civilian employees—and Members of Congress—from 2 to 44 percent. The $10,000 congressional raise is in the highest bracket.

At a committee hearing seven Representatives testified for the bill, using the argument that the pay for Federal employees should be comparable to that in private industry; and that the pay for Congress should be at least comparable with that of assistant secretaries of departments. But the lone objector, Representative H.R. GROSS, an Iowa Republican, seems to us to have made a better argument.

Representative GROSS said Congress had just approved an $11.5 billion tax cut, to be financed in part with borrowed money—and which will permit Members of Congress and the Federal bureaucracy to retain a larger part of their own earnings like every other taxpayer. "Now," he said, "you want to compound that felony by borrowing the money to give ourselves a pay raise. I wonder how long we can do things like this without the people rising up and throwing some of us out."

"I've often wondered the same thing," murmured the Rules Committee Chairman, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia.

The principle of comparability of pay for Federal employees with that in private business and industry neglects certain factors, such as assurance of tenure in the career service, no fear of layoffs, and excellent health insurance and pension rights—the latter far better than most private employees enjoy.

As for the comparability of legislative salaries with those of high-ranking executive officials, we know of no other legislative body where that principle prevails. We might add that the Federal Government has no difficulty in obtaining the services of very outstanding men for these positions, and that there are few Members of Congress who had to be coaxed to run even when the salary was much smaller than the $22,500 now paid.

There is one other thing that ought to be mentioned. Though a minority of the Members of Congress has consistently insisted that it do its assigned job of controlling the purse strings, and keep the costs of Government from exceeding revenues, a majority has permitted 26 years of deficits out of the last 32 years—and the national debt as of last Friday morning was $310,304,350,588, nearly $6 billion more than it was a year ago.

Among the general powers the Constitution assigns to Congress, the first is to levy taxes and pay the debts; or, in other words, to establish a sound fiscal policy, without which governments invariably run aground. Congress as a whole has done a pretty poor job in this respect, and should not be rewarded for it by a 44-percent raise in pay—or any other raise. When it begins to act as the trustee of the taxpayers' money and gets the budget back in control, a merit raise might be in order. It isn't now.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the winning speech from the State of New Mexico in the VFW Voice of Democracy contest from Mr. Michel W. Lowry, 363 Tyler Road NW., Albuquerque, N. Mex., entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship."

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

The challenge of citizenship lies in a book. It is a book which can be found anywhere, and everywhere. The span of topics includes anything, and everything. The book is the United States and it covers every aspect of the American way of life. Chapter headings range from government to science, from philosophy to the arts, from religion to economy.

Yet with all this variance of material, this book is not at all haphazard in its arrangement. Its entire development follows the very clear outline of the table of contents, the Constitution. Also, even the most unrelated sectors seems equally pervaded by the ideals expressed in the introduction, the Declaration of Independence.

This is a book dedicated to freedom. Imbodied within it lies the challenge of citizenship.

This challenge lies in the fact that our country is ever changing, the chapters are being lengthened, additions are being made. As the authors of this book we as citizens must follow the outline of the Constitution and strive our utmost to maintain the ideals and fulfill the goals upon which our country was established.

Our progress must be constant and everlasting, but without the constant and everlasting initiative of every citizen, this progress must inevitably slacken. Individual Americans form the words of the past, the actions of the present, and the hope of the future. Truly this is a government of the people, for without the people nothing could ever be written, nor anything done.

At the same time, while the ultimate importance resides with the individual, each of us also has certain social responsibilities to consider. We must conform to the various laws and customs of our community. In a sense, in a very real sense, these laws and customs are the spelling and grammar rules which we must use in writing our book.

It is also our responsibility to maintain the harmony of the great American book. This does not mean a harmony of opinion, for any good book welcomes diversity in the search for truth. Yet this diversity of method does not preclude the unity of purpose. To advance, we must view all sides of every question but we must also retain our proper perspective and keep uppermost in our minds the goals presented in the introduction to this book, the Declaration of Independence.

We must also refrain from specialization in our practice of citizenship. The challenge of citizenship exists in every sector of our way of life, not just one. Certainly all of us must participate in Government. We must understand the issues, know the candidates, and vote intelligently. But we must also contribute to the history, to the education. We must be active in forming the culture, the philosophy, and the religion. We face the challenge of maintaining excellence in every segment of the American civilization. One bad chapter can make a third rater out of a potential best seller; and likewise the decay of one chapter of our book can relegate the entire work to the shelves of obsolescence.

Our book is a great one. It is bound more tightly than any other in history, a binding composed of freedom and individual initiative.

Yet in all its uniqueness it is but one member of a far greater library, the collection of the books developed by all civilizations in all places, throughout all history.

Ours is indeed the brightest work in the entire library, but bright works have become tarnished many times in the past, as shown by Egypt, by Greece, and by Rome. The glow of our book can be made eternal only through the never-ending efforts of all Americans.

Wild Shot at Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in their Saturday, March 7 editorial, "Wild Shot at Foreign Aid" the Detroit Free Press states the case for the International Development Association. The editorial follows:

WILD SHOT AT FOREIGN AID

In its enthusiasm to waylay foreign aid expenditures, the House of Representatives shot the wrong horse.

The House sent back to committee an administration request for a $312 million contribution to the International Development Association (IDA). Recommitting a bill usually means death.

The appropriation was dead ended because lawmakers are understandably irked with the overall foreign aid program. But IDA is foreign aid with a difference.

IDA is operated by the World Bank to provide long-term development loans at liberal interest rates. It is a useful tool for both the United Nations and the United States in helping underdeveloped countries.

The United States doesn't pay the entire bill. The $312 million was just our share.

Some 16 other nations would contribute $438 million for a combined total of $750 million to operate the IDA for fiscal years 1966–68.

Without the U.S. contribution, it seems probable that other nations also will refuse their shares and the IDA will have to close up shop at the end of next year.

It is unfortunate that some of the accumulated resentment of foreign aid rubbed off on IDA.

These are loans, not grants, for economic not military projects. The loans are made only to projects established as economically sound.

Critics say IDA cuts down American control of the funds. But it also gives the United States some influence in the expenditure of funds contributed by other countries. That's the way with cooperative programs and we should do nothing to discourage international cooperation in providing foreign aid.

A minimum of arm twisting might achieve a reversal. Hopefully, the administration will make the effort on what is after all a rather small program. Only 11 vote switches would get the House to change its decision.

The measure already has Senate approval.

An Open Letter to Amerika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the following open letter written by one of my constituents, Mr. George Vekulich, was published recently in the Madison Capital Times. It expresses with profound eloquence and humility the bewilderment of a first-generation American over the endless civil rights dialogue in these United States.

What puzzles the writer is how a 1st generation American, like himself, can achieve acceptance in our society so relatively easily while a 10th-generation, native-born Negro is still waiting to immigrate.

I should like to put this same question, if I may, to some of my colleagues and I include the full text of the letter here in order that you may have all the background as well as the corollaries to his perplexing proposition:

MADISON, WIS.

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERIKA

I have been eavesdropping on the great dialog of our time—the conversation between Negro and white in America. I listen on the one side and then on the other, and the dialog goes on and I am perplexed.

My family has been here in Amerika (which is how they spell it) only since a little before 1927. My father was Slav, and my mother Romanian. I was born in 1927. I was raised, because of circumstances including something called the great depression, with my maternal grandparents. I could not speak English until I was 7 years of age.

In the old country accents I learned from my people what they held this country to be. Amerika was the place where no policeman came in the night to break down your door and take you away. Amerika was the place where you could talk a foreign tongue and still have credit at the corner grocery. Amerika was the place where the old countrymen thanked their God that their kids would never see the nightmares left behind.

Amerika was the high school football team where a quarterback yelled out signals in croatian to confuse the native-born defense. Amerika was a faded portrait of Franklin Delano Roosevelt hung on the wall and worshipped as a shrine. Amerika was the place where the streets weren't really covered with gold but there was plenty of work for those willing to cover them with brick. Amerika was a promise. She asked only that you keep her laws, do her work, and fight her wars. My foreigner father reckoned it a good deal.

If it held true for us with our outsize noses, our gypsy blood and funny speech, I thought it held true for everybody. A lot of us took long boat trips back to Europe with guns and beliefs and K rations to make sure that it held true for everybody.

I am now in what is considered the prime of life, even for a gypsy. I have an American wife, four American daughters and an American mortgage. I would have it no other way, and I am thrice blessed. But it occurs to me that after all, I am a first generation American and while I thank the country for such gracious consideration for a Johnny-come-lately, I must tell you that it troubles me deeply when a newcomer as myself can achieve acceptance in our society so relatively easy and that a 10th generation native-born Negro is still waiting to immigrate, so to speak.

I represent that generation of Americans with one foot in the Old World and one foot in the New. I thank you and this country for permitting me to leap and join you. It is good of you and it is fair and it is, as my father said, what Amerika is all about.

Now I ask you, in the good God's name, why you will not extend the same privilege to a Negro who has been here longer than my family, who can contribute to your greatness as much as my family and who has been waiting so long and so patiently for your hand.

He, too, has one foot in the Old World and one in the New. I have a big nose, he has a dark skin. I ask you, in God's name, what difference does it make? We both have hearts and minds and souls.

GEORGE VUKELICH.

Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last year I ran a survey of my district asking what people would do with a tax cut. It was my opinion that we were making the tax cut sound too large to individuals. When they found how little it was for them individually many people replied, "Don't cut the taxes, pay the bills."

The tax cut was larger than originally anticipated. The Detroit News did a survey as to what people would do with the money. I am happy to enclose the following article written by Jane Schermerhorn of the Detroit News, and to point out that, in general, while it didn't buy the mink coats, people are still happy to receive it:

BIG TAX CUT DREAMS SHRINK AT FIRST CHECK

(By Jane Schermerhorn)

Little old 4 percent—the Federal tax cut that is supposed to sweeten the wage earner's paycheck—is getting a second look from some Detroiters.

While the bill to reduce the withholding tax from 18 to 14 percent was still on the drawing boards in Washington, many who would benefit lived in a dream world.

But this second look gives evidence that the $4 to $5 extra, the cut means to the majority, is something less than a windfall bringing mink coats and champagne suppers.

Mrs. Bonnie Valeri, a secretary, of 15460 Lesure, sighed and put away the fashion magazine she'd been reading.

JUST HOT FUDGE

She said, "The tax cut looked so good in print that I was planning to buy my first Christian Dior outfit. Guess I'll settle for a couple extra hot fudge sundaes a week."

But, Mrs. Valeri added, she really was grateful for even the littel bit extra she'll get and said, "My husband is putting his tax cut in his company's stock savings plan and someday we'll appreciate it even more that way."

Arthur Hug, a warehouse foreman at Hammel Moving & Storage, 5415 Conner, had more immediate use for the extra dollars:

"I've got six children," Hug said, "and I asked the company bookkeeper to figure out for me exactly what the cut will mean to me in a year's income. My wife and I decided the amount will just about take care of tuition for our 13-year-old at Regina High School."

A fellow worker, Wayne Smith, who was about to climb into the long-distance moving van he drives, paused to talk about little old 4 percent:

"Guess the smart thing would be to save it but that's pretty hard to do nowadays. For me, it means being able to treat my wife and three children to an outing a couple times a month."

Then Smith put his foot on the starter and was on his way to South Bend and St. Louis and to give a bit of thought on just what form the first family outing would take.

An expert in matters of the pocketbook, Mrs. Laura Spencer, a salesperson in Crowley's handbag department, knew precisely what she'll do with her tax cut.

"I've been thinking of buying a new rug for my apartment and that's where my added dollars are going." Mrs. Spencer used her lunch hour that day to buy a neutral tone wool carpet, on time.

INTO THE KITCHEN

Mr. and Mrs. William C. Sewell, 19010 Wormer (he's a tranformation builder at Detroit Crane Co., Inc.,) fitted his tax cut right into their present budget under the heading "kitchen remodeling project."

Barbara Polanoski, secretary to a GM official, thought about golf on summer Saturdays and winter ski junkets when she received her slightly larger paycheck.

"You know," she said, "I like golf and skiing and spending a little more than I can afford on clothes and I'll probably go on doing just that. But the little extra will make me feel a little less guilty while I'm about it."

MIDAS TOUCH

There were some Detroiters who said it had been so long since they could count on any extra money that their larger paychecks looked as if Midas had touched them with gold.

"My money will go for new outfits for my wife and two kids," said Stanley Hibner, 5329 Field, a Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel waiter. "And then, as time goes by, the family will take a trip together."

More cautious is Jack E. Edwards, 34361 Lincoln, Dearborn, a steel roller, who observed that it costs as much as a man makes to get along these days, "So," he said, "I've asked the company to continue taking out the same withholding amount as usual. That way I figure I won't wind up with a headache when I go to pay my income tax in 1964."

It seemed in the banking tradition when Mary Iris, proofworker at Detroit Bank and Trust Co.'s Kercheval-Van Dyke branch, said she intended putting her paycheck increase into her savings account.

Somewhat less in the banking tradition, though, was her plan: "After a year I'll draw out what I've saved and go to Disneyland."

Who Says "Yankee Go Home"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of February 13, 1964 entitled "Dangers Coming From Within":

DANGERS COMING FROM WITHIN: WHO SAYS "YANKEE GO HOME"?

For many years a campaign has been under way to prepare Americans for the surrender of the Panama Canal, on the grounds it is no longer vital to our defenses, and our position there is an affront to Latin American sensibilities.

A similar campaign is under way to convince Americans that Guantanamo Bay on the Island of Cuba is not necessary to the defense of the Caribbean, the Panama Canal, or to the United States.

Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in a recent talk in Akron, Ohio, said:

"Never before has Guantanamo as a naval base been more important to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere than it is at this very moment. Guantanamo is one of the largest natural deepwater anchorages in the world. It has been built up by the United States into one of the most complete overseas bases."

He said it is vitally essential as a naval base for protection against the largest undersea fleet in the world, that of Communist Russia. If we surrender Guantanamo, the Caribbean will not be an American lake but a Communist lake.

Fidel Castro is trying to isolate the base. He is cutting off its water and clearing a large area of land around the base, planting it with cactus, and then ringing it all with Soviet-constructed military installations. Thus, he is harassing us until we give up, as many liberal-radicals, and others duped by their propaganda, already think we should do.

General Hittle says we tend to look at Cuba as an island some distance off the shore of America, when actually it is deep within the Western Hemisphere.

"It extends," he says, "well westward from the southern part of Florida. The western tip is west of Washington, D.C., it is west of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Cincinnati, and Akron. It is not pleasant to realize that Akron, Ohio, in the heartland of America, has in fact been outflanked by the Communist seizure of Cuba."

As the commander in chief of the VFW, Joseph J. Lombardo, remarked, "With the Kremlin controlling Cuba, it is no longer a case of the enemy at the gates—the enemy is now within the gates."

To contend that Guantanamo and the canal, with a hostile Soviet force in Cuba and Communist ships and submarines in the Caribbean, are less valuable to us now than when they were built, is absurd.

The slogan "Yankee, go home" now seems to bear a made-in-America label.

The Cardinal and His Angels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a poem written by my good friend, David Gimbel, of Brooklyn, N.Y. This poem has been dedicated by Mr. Gimbel to his eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing. Cardinal Cushing is this year celebrating the 25th anniversary of his episcopacy. I am happy to join in this tribute to the cardinal who has shown such an interest in all retarded children:

THE CARDINAL AND HIS ANGELS

(David Gimbel)

Richard Cardinal Cushing is striving for a tomorrow,
That will lift the veil of pity in every house of sorrow.
For retarded children everywhere neglected, hidden, and hurt.
Have been cast into a field of scrap from the moment of their birth.

Yet the're all his darling angels for oh so many years
He walks among his charges to wipe away their tears.
He lights a million candles and teaches them to pray
And faces grow like Christmas bulbs that brighten every day.

The parents of these angels all truly understand,
That this man whom God brought forth, is their children's dearest friend.
His every word is filled with love and always tries to teach,
That prayer and love of God is in everybody's reach.

In St. Colettas where these children dwell, he comes to bring them joy
And they climb all over this saintly man, yes every girl and boy.
And it is worth a fortune if one could only see
For their eyes just sparkle like the stars and hearts are filled with glee.

Now when he leaves these children, there's a lingering spirit of delight,
And so they slumber sweetly throughout the entire night.
As for the shepherd of these lambs, he will get his just reward,
In a place reserved for angels, in the kingdom of the Lord.

"Compromise in Democracy: The Politics of the Legislative Process"—An Address by Deborah Partridge Wolfe, Education Chief, House Committee on Education and Labor, University of Florida, February 28, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "Compromise in Democracy: The Politics of the Legislative Process," delivered by Dr. Deborah Partridge Wolfe, the Education Chief of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, at the University of Florida, Gainesville, on February 28, 1964.

Dr. Wolfe, who is on leave from her position as a professor at Queens College, New York, is serving with great distinction as the education chief of the committee on which I serve.

I think that Members will read with interest her excellent discussion of the nature of a legislative process.

The text of Dr. Wolfe's address follows:

COMPROMISE IN DEMOCRACY: THE POLITICS OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

(By Deborah Partridge Wolfe)

Much has been said in deriding the role of the politician in our American life. Few have truly understood his role and many have exaggerated his errors. The obstacles are formidable. There has always been and I suppose there always will be a chasm of misunderstanding between those who govern and those who are governed. In our country this misunderstanding has taken the form of an exaggerated disdain for politics and politicians.

Now, I would be the last to declare that our politicians, our political system, our Government, and especially our national legislature are perfect vehicles for the representation of the public will and the accomplishment of the public weal. Let me put it to you, however, that it is both unrealistic and dangerous for the American people to persist in believing that our Government is run by incompetents and idiots.

It is unrealistic because it is untrue. It is dangerous because, as one great scholar wrote [Robert Luce]: "Disdain of politicians should be left to dictators. Democrats [with a small 'd'] cannot afford the luxury of such malevolence. If most politicians deserve disdain, then our democratic way of life perishes for lack of leadership. If they suffer it undeservingly, then our Western way perishes for lack of loyalty to its key institution, the legislature."

What is it about politicians that arouses such distaste? Aside from venality, the most frequently cited indictment, I believe, concerns their methods, and most particularly that pernicious technique, compromise.

COMPROMISE

Oh, what mountains of abuse have been heaped on that poor word "compromise." How many daggers have been plunged into

it, from Gilbert and Sullivan's quip about "apologetic statesman of a compromising kind," to Elbert Hubbard's trumpet call that only the weak compromise, never the strong. A man named Kaufman once wrote: "Compromise is never anything but an ignoble truce between the duty of a man and the terror of a coward." And even the poet prays: "From compromise and things half done, keep me with stern and stubborn pride" [Louis Untermeyer].

The curious thing about this contempt for compromise is the selective way in which most people apply it. In their everyday lives almost everyone tacitly agrees with Samuel Johnson that "life cannot subsist in society but by reciprocal concessions." The man who molifies his wife in some argument—and which one of us has not—or the woman her husband, is compromising. The teacher who accepts a smaller salary than he thinks his due is compromising. When business and labor sit down to bargain over the terms of a contract, does not their final agreement evolve out of compromise? We exist in a pluralist society in which autonomous groups working through a common government can arrive at governmental decisions only through bargaining. Few condemn the ethics of such conduct for themselves. Yet when Congressmen use the same technique for national purposes, they are accused of perfidy.

George Bernard Shaw struck off some typically pithy comments about this kind of hypocrisy. One Joseph Burgess had run for Parliament on the Labor Party ticket and had lost because he refused to compromise on some issue. Wrote Shaw:

"When I think of my own unfortunate character, smirched with compromise, rotted with opportunism, mildewed by expediency, blackened by ink contributed to Tory and Liberal papers, dragged through the mud of (local) elections, stretched out of shape with wirepulling, putrified by permeation, worn out by 25 years' pushing to gain an inch here or straining to stem a backrush there, I do think Joe might have put up with just a speck or two on those white robes of his for the sake of the millions of poor devils who cannot afford any character at all, because they have no friends in Parliament. Oh, these moral dandies, these spiritual toffs, these superior persons. Who is Joe anyhow that he should not risk his soul occasionally like the rest of us?"

Some will protest there is a difference between compromising mere material interests and compromising principles. I agree. There are subjects on which I cannot bring myself to bargain. Civil rights is one of these. For me, this is a matter of the deepest and most profound principle.

In the main, however, I must go along with James Madison's shrewd observations. He noted that men tend to throw a sacred mantle over their material interests. Yesterday's personal interest frequently becomes today's holy principle, endowed with attributes of abstract, pure, and unsullied justice, which cannot be yielded without some wrench of conscience, some sense of guilt.

This happens, of course, to both sides. And inevitably the two must come to some mutual accommodation. Prof. T. V. Smith speculates that when this occurs "it is in the nature of the case that both sides will objectify * * * their guilty feeling, fixing it upon the nearest appropriate object. Near enough for blame always stands the politican, as representative. He who arranges the compromises becomes easily enough the double scapegoat of this natural and dual transfer of guilt."

IN THE NATURE OF POLITICS

Whatever the psychology of the situation, political compromise does suffer an undeservedly wicked reputation. For the essense of politics, and especially democratic politics, is compromise; one is inextricably and forever bound to the other. The art of peacefully resolving disputes—that is what politics is all about. When honest men hold honest though differing views, the only alternative to compromise—to accommodation, if you will—is coercion. Insofar as we succeed in compromising the differences that inevitably arise among men in any society, by that much do we prevent the return of men to the rule of naked and brutal force.

"Legislatures," writes Professor Smith, "are the readiest exemplars of the process of compromise. This is a humble but honorable view of the democratic process. Nothing is to be gained by not being realistic. Legislation always has been and always will be compromise. Thus to settle peacefully conflicts of interest that might be fought to the death is civilization; to do it gracefully on the basis of equality is democracy; to do it with good humor and with mutual regard is magnanimity."

You and I must unite in convincing the American people that no matter how platitudinous it sounds politics really is the art of the possible. They must be brought to realize that social conflicts are seldom resolved by the ideal because in this world each side sees the ideal differently, though with equal sincerity. Our task, the legislative obligation, is to create from contradictory positions an area that will satisfy both, or at least not leave either so dissatisfied as to prefer insurrection.

Therefore, compromise takes place because it is necessary, possible, and thought to be profitable. And by profitable I mean, of course, profitable to both sides. There is a story of a judge who sentenced an elderly man to a total of 135 years in jail for various offenses. When the prisoner broke down in tears at the judgment, the judge's heart softened. "There, there," he said, "I don't want to make it hard on you. Just serve as many years as you can." That is not the kind of compromise I had in mind, although it is occasionally the kind some people end up with.

My remarks have been rather general to this point. Now let me try to bring the legislative process to life for you with a practical example.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Last year Congress passed a Vocational Education Act designed to enlarge, extend, and improve vocational education programs throughout the Nation. The bill was handled in the House of Representatives by the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am education chief, so I have some knowledge of the sweat and tears it took to produce the final product.

Congress spent more than 8 months of effort on this measure, but even before it reached us it had already taken quite a pummeling in the executive branch. We can assume that various educators, educational organizations, and labor officials were consulted. We may be certain that the vocational education experts in the Department of Labor reworked the proposals through many drafts. Undoubtedly the Bureau of the Budget refashioned it somewhat, and the White House staff and the President himself probably left their marks on it, too. Out of all this pulling and tugging emerged a collective executive branch judgment as to what was both necessary and possible.

A bill incorporating the President's proposals was introduced in the House of Representatives, referred to the Education and Labor Committee, and assigned to our General Education Subcommittee. This group held public hearings off and on from March 26 to April 24. It heard favorable testimony from the Secretary of Labor, other administration officials, educators, State and city officials, the Urban League, and the American Veterans Committee. It listened to opposition by a spokesman of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. A labor representative told the subcommittee the bill did not ask for nearly enough funds. A local director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People insisted upon enactment of a fair employment practices law as well as other provisions to prevent discrimination in job training.

Now the hearings are completed; the subcommittee really settles down to business. It must now rewrite the bill to fit its collective point of view and its judgment as to what is necessary and possible. First, however, we can expect the majority members to get together to work out their differences of opinion so as to present a unified front. Out of this give and take a majority position emerges. The minority, meanwhile, is probably taking similar precautions.

Now, on to the executive session of the full subcommittee. The bill is read line by line. At the appropriate place the majority and minority offer their amendments. There is some discussion. The staff counsels members in whispers. Each side looks for weaknesses in the other's ranks for immediate or future exploitation. Votes are taken, and the clerk reads on.

FINAL READING

Finally the reading is over. The essence of the bill is still there, but its shape is decidedly altered. The disagreements—first among Democrats and Republicans separately, then between Democrats and Republicans as groups—have resulted in significant new language.

Now, on to the full committee where the process is repeated. The Republicans put forward their case. They claim the subcommittee ought not to have adopted authorizations larger than those proposed by the administration. The majority holds firm on this issue. The Republicans offer an anti-segregation amendment. On this the Democratic ranks split a little, but the amendment is beaten by a narrow 15-to-4 vote. Another minority proposal, to earmark funds for a pilot vocational education program for youth in the District of Columbia, is also barely rejected, 16 to 14.

On June 6 the committee votes out the bill, and on June 18 the formal report is made to the House. It takes almost 2 more months, however, to maneuver the measure through the Rules Committee and onto the floor for debate.

This happy event comes about on August 6. The Republicans once more offer their anti-discrimination rider, and again it is rejected. Another amendment, to bring parochial schools under the program, is also defeated. Finally, the House brings the bill to a vote for passage and the result is a satisfying 377 to 21 victory. The size of the majority is heartening, for it implies a relatively solid consensus of both parties and most factions of the House.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Meanwhile, the Senate has other ideas. And to complicate the matter still further the administration has also revived its position on a number of items. As it emerges from the Senate's bargaining process, the bill is considerably wider in scope than the House version and different in numerous details. Members of both Houses now settle down in conference to work out yet another series of compromises.

It is not easy. The struggle begins on October 29 and drags on through November. Giving up something here, insisting on an item there, the conferees painfully battle their way through the act. A cold December arrives, and still the work is not finished. Indeed, the two Houses are still far apart on several controversial issues. There is a real danger that agreement will not be reached. The President now takes a hand and helps persuade the conferees to settle their differences before adjournment.

At last, on December 10, the conferees emerge with an overall agreement. The measure is now a vast amalgam of compromises.

The House, for example, had provided for allocation of vocational education funds on a straight population basis, whereas the Senate had come up with a formula favoring the poorer States. The conferees accepted the Senate version, but added a restriction whereby no State would receive more than one and a half times as much as any other.

For vocational education grants the Senate had authorized $252 million more than the House. The conference settled on a figure that just about split the difference.

CONFERENCE COMPROMISE

The Senate had introduced into the bill a 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act. The conference compromised on a 1-year extension.

The Senate had put into the bill a 3-year extension of the impacted areas program, including the District of Columbia. The conferees accepted a 2-year extension, but knocked out the District. And so it went, item after item, bargain after bargain, accommodation after accommodation, compromise after compromise. By December 13 both Houses had adopted the conference report by overwhelming majorities, 82 to 4 in the Senate and 301 to 65 in the House of Representatives.

What kind of a law did the Nation get out of this long and intricate process of give and take? It did not get an ideal law. There are a number of amendments I personally would have dearly loved to see adopted.

No, it is not a perfect law, but it is a good law, a law that will accomplish much for the Nation, a law that will help to alleviate our desperate poverty problem, a law that will bring hope to many a needy youth.

Above all, out of the scores of large and small compromises, we have forged an act of legislation that enjoys firm and widespread support.

The story of this bill is very little different from that of most other great enactments. Each is a symbol of yet another series of accommodations, just as our basic law, the Constitution, was the product of momentous compromise. Surely, that is the essence of the democratic process.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has for a number of years conducted an excellent program known as the "Voice of Democracy Contest." Many high school students participate in this program. It makes them ever conscious of their duties and responsibilities as American citizens.

Mr. William Graff, who resides in Denver, Colo., was the winner from my State. It is my hope he will be able to receive one of the four scholarships offered by the Veterans of Foreign Wars as the top prize.

The prize-winning speech of Mr. Graff stresses the responsibilities of citizens. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. His winning speech reads as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

We have studied, and during our lifetime learned of the growth of this country to the richest, most advanced, and most powerful nation this old world has ever known; materially, that is. We also know that science and invention have made not only great but phenomenal strides. I wish we could be as sure that our moral and ethical fiber were as strong as our technology. All of these inventions have made war more terrible, peace more difficult, life more complicated, and the need for responsible citizenship more desperately urgent.

Everyone agrees that we have made far more advances in the scientific world than we have made in the realm of morals and ethics. Spiritually we have not kept pace with our progress in the modern world; here is where I feel our trouble lies.

The human conscience, which has been drugged by the technological progress of the last 50 years, has to wake up. We are now at the place where we see progress simply must be made in the realm of responsibility of morals, ethics, and character, if civilization is to be saved.

The time has come when we, the future citizens of America, must face the Nation's biggest problems—the human problems. We can no longer afford to leave them in the hands of the politicians, the social workers, and the philanthropists. I have no quarrel with the way they are handling these problems, however, the job yet to be done is big, and it's going to get bigger and more complicated because we face not only the challenge of survival in a nuclear age but also the challenge of maintaining the heritage our forefathers have given us—life in a free and democratic society.

A strong responsible citizenship has never been more vital to this country than it is today. A nation is always changing. It never stands still and it never stays the same. It is always being built or torn down. So it has always been throughout the history of nations, and so it is today.

The United States has become the strongest, the most vigorous, the most dynamic nation that this old world has ever known. From a follower, this Nation became an equal, then a leader, and finally the leader of the entire world. Now our leadership is being challenged. We must survive that threat as we have survived other threats in other times.

Our leadership is being challenged on many fronts: military, industrial, agricultural, ideological, and educational. These challenges will be met—and overcome. But only with the cooperation of all of our citizens working to the utmost of our capabilities.

I have talked about the problems and challenges of citizenship, but I have not really defined my concept of it. It is more than paying taxes and voting. A good citizen is one who gladly accepts his responsibilities to and for himself, his family, his community, his school, his State, and his Nation.

A good citizen is one, who develops his own capacities to the utmost; who exercises the greatest freedom granted to him under him our system of government—one that is denied him in communistic countries. That is his freedom of choice. One who accepts the fact that his achievement or lack of achievement is the direct result of the choices he has made. A good citizen supports, guides, and—yes—educates his family.

A responsible citizen supports his community, his State, and his Nations. He does this through his attendance of the meeting of local city councils, school boards, PTA meetings. He talks to or writes to his Representatives in Federal or State Government, letters of information, approval, or protest, depending upon his beliefs. In other words, he takes his citizenship at least as seriously as his golf game. This is a good citizen. We need more of them.

Citizenship is an individual thing. And it is the individual work in community groups, local organzations, and various other associations that accomplishes lasting results.

Our excuse when we fail to meet this social obligation is that "we have no time." However, anyone of us could take upon ourselves the responsibility of good citizenship as we are, in our present status, and it would make our lives more exciting and more satisfying. No time.

Did you ever stop to think that most of the world's great men have achieved their true life's work, not in the course of their needful occupations, but in their spare time?

A tired-out rail splitter, bent over his books by candlelight, preparing for his future, instead of snoring or skylarking like his fellow workers. Lincoln cut out his path to later immortality in his spare time.

An underpaid and overworked telegraph clerk stole hours of sleep, trying to crystalize into reality some fantastic dreams in which he had faith. Today the whole world is benefiting by what Edison did in his spare time.

An instructor in an obscure college varied the drudgery he hated by spending his evenings and holidays tinkering with a queer device of his at which his fellow teachers laughed, but Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone—in his spare time.

All of us have spare time. Why not use it in the kind of work that will pay wonderful dividends in the future; participating in school and community affairs; working with others; teaching by example the importance of integrity, intelligence, and responsibility.

The American way of life that started out as a great experiment, which the rest of the world felt would never last was—and today is the inspiration for all the little peoples of the world. Our concern is that this inspiration will exist tomorrow as well as today for the American way.

Civil Rights Remarks of Richard M. Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1964, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon delivered a speech in Cincinnati, Ohio, in which he discussed civil rights.

Because he spoke openly and forthrightly about civil rights, Mr. Nixon's talk has gained widespread attention.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Nixon's speech on that occasion because I think the points he makes will be of interest to the Congress and the public.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY RICHARD M. NIXON, CINCINNATI, OHIO, FEBRUARY 12, 1964

In this election year Republicans will be urged by some to out promise the Johnson administration on civil rights in the hope of political gain. I am completely opposed to this kind of political demagoguery. Making promises that can not be kept—raising hopes that can not be realized—are the cruelest hoaxes that can be perpetrated on a minority group that has suffered from such tactics for a 100 years.

I think that the Republican Party should stand forthrightly on these principles:

1. We are proud of our record from the time of Abraham Lincoln to the passage of the first civil rights legislation in a 100 years under President Eisenhower.

2. We shall continue to lead the fight for equality under the law for all Americans, including not only our Negro citizens but other minorities who because their numbers are less are sometimes overlooked—the Puertó Ricans, the eastern and southern Europeans, the Central and South Americans, the Mexicans, and our American Indians.

3. But we are a party that was founded on the principle of the rule of law. Abraham Lincoln led the Nation to war to maintain the rule of law in our land.

4. The encouragement of disrespect for law through mass demonstrations, boycotts, and violation of property rights, in the long run. harms rather than helps the cause of civil rights. Some justify such tactics on the ground that they may hasten the passage of laws. But, at the same time, these tactics destroy the will of the people to obey those laws.

5. We disapprove of the spectacle of public officials lending the prestige of their office to extra-legal pressures on the part of any minority or majority group. This encouragement of disregard for law and for the rights of other people and other minorities will plague the cause of better understanding among the American people for years to come. It negates or makes suspect the right of petition, the right of peaceful assembly, and the orderly process of law.

6. We stand for the rule of law and reject mob rule.

7. The only rights worth having are the rights created in the law, by lawful means, and which exist for all Americans equally and equitably.

8. We reject the idea that the way to reduce high Negro unemployment is to increase white unemployment. We stand for a program that will increase job opportunities for all Americans.

9. We oppose segregation in our schools either by law or in fact. But this problem must be dealt with in an orderly transition. We believe it is detrimental to both Negro and white children to uproot them from their communities and to haul them from one school to another in order to force integration in an artificial and unworkable manner.

10. Now that a new civil rights law will soon become a reality, we need a national program which will increase understanding among our people, the will to obey that law and other laws, and which will reduce the hate fomented by professional extremists and political demagogs.

A law is only as good as the will of people to keep it. The hate engendered by demonstrations and boycotts have set Americans against Americans and have created an atmosphere of hate and distrust which, if it continues to grow, will make the new law a law in name only.

It is time for responsible civil rights leaders to take over from the extremists.

The People's Choice, Mr. Whatshisname

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe has come up with another solution on campaigning, which is both humorous and historical. His column in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 5 follows, together with his column of March 6:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Mar. 5, 1964]

THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE, MR. WHATSHISNAME

(By Arthur Hoppe)

For months, Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. GOLDWATER have been slogging through the slush up in New Hampshire, day in, day out. And now they're both saying the whole primary will never prove a thing. Unless they win.

Nonsense. The whole primary has already proved a great truth: Both gentlemen should have stayed home.

This great truth is based on cold statistics: The latest polls. For the latest Lou Harris Survey, for example, shows that after 2 long months of arduous, dedicated campaigning from one end of the State to the other, Mr. Rockefeller has dropped 7 percentage points. And Mr. GOLDWATER has gone down 10.

Conversely, Mr. Nixon, who hasn't set foot in New Hampshire lately, has shot up 8 points. And Mr. Lodge has skyrocketed into the lead. But then he's had the overwhelming advantage of having spent the entire campaign halfway around the world in Vietnam.

So I feel we have at last rediscovered a great truth about how to wage a hard-fought political campaign—a truth which can perhaps best be summed up in a single word: "Don't."

As you know, this discovery was first made by Mr. William McKinley, "The great innovator," in the 1896 presidential campaign, which he waged from his front porch in Canton, Ohio. On the other hand, his opponent, Mr. William Jennings Bryan, hustled all over the country meeting voters and making speeches. Naturally, Mr. McKinley clobbered Mr. Bryan. And that this lesson has been lost is one of the great tragedies of American politics.

Look at New Hampshire. In January, the polls showed Mr. Rockefeller beloved by 23 percent of the State's Republicans. So he happily goes up there and covers the pot-luck-supper circuit "to get to know the voters better." And, unhappily, they get to know him.

So the gentlemen voters start saying things like: "Can't abide a feller who calls me 'fella'." And the ladies add: "Why doesn't he stay home with his and her children?" And now Mr. Rockefeller's beloved by 16 percent.

In Mr. GOLDWATER's case, 29 percent adored the way his keen, analytical mind solved the complex issues of our day. So he went up there and made keen, analytical speeches solving the complex issues of our day. Like: "Call out the Marines." And now he's adored by 19 percent.

Well, we members of the William McKinley fan club only hope our politicians have learned their lessons this time. And that henceforth we will be spared speeches, handshakes, and getting germs all over our babies. As I see it, any astute politician will simply announce his candidacy, take the next boat for Tibet and win in a landslide.

For, after all, politics is just like real life. Only more so. And you know how it is in real life when it comes to winning friends and admiring people. Personally, I think old Mr. Will Rogers summed it up best when he said: "I never met a man I didn't like."

Me neither. It's when you get to know him that the trouble starts.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Mar. 6, 1964]

WIN FRIENDS, BE A CHEAP POLITICIAN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

How about that? Our attorney general, Mr. Mosk does not want to be our U.S. Senator because he loves his friends.

He called a big press conference to announce this. "Every poll taken," he says sadly, "indicates I would win." But he cannot be our next Senator, he says regretfully, because the primary campaign alone would cost $628,320. "And," he says, "I am unwilling to impose on my personal friends to give and to raise that tremendous amount."

What friendship. What sacrifice. Of course, Mr. Mosk has known all along what the campaign would cost. So, obviously, he must have made the agonizing decision months ago. But, obviously, he kept it secret to spare his friends embarrassment. And all along he has just hoped for the worst. What a moving story.

Imagine how it must have been for him during last month's frenzied convention of the California Democratic Council, which met to endorse a candidate. Delegates wearing "Win With Mosk" buttons were swirling this way and that under "Mosk for Senator" banners. And all along he must have been sitting in his campaign headquarters, head in hands.

"Oh," he moans, "what if they endorse me? I shall have no choice but to be our next U.S. Senator. And my poor friends, whom I love more than ambition, will have to cough up $628,320. Which I know they can ill afford."

"Great news, chief," cries an aid, rushing in. "The convention has endorsed your most bitter opponent, Alan Cranston."

"Huzzah," shouts Mr. Mosk. "We are over the first hurdle. Break out the refreshments. Let's have a big defeat party."

"More good news," cries another aid. "Jimmy Roosevelt, who might have thrown you his votes, has withdrawn in favor of Cranston."

"Good old Jimmy," says Mr. Mosk, a tear in his eye. "I knew we could count on him."

"Best of all, Chief," gloats a third aide. "Governor Brown and every top Democrat in the State say if you run against Cranston and split the party they'll do likewise to your head."

"My cup," says Mr. Mosk happily, "runneth over. My secret strategy to secretly save my friends $628,320 is paying off. Defeat, men, is in the bag."

But here an aid comes dragging in, his face a mask of tragedy. "I don't know how to break the bad news, Chief," he says slowly. "But our polls still show you clobbering all other candidates, 142 to 1."

"Oh, no," gasps Mr. Mosk. And after he is restrained from throwing himself on a pair of fingernail scissors he decides he has no choice but to hold a press conference, withdraw and reveal all. Which, as you know, he manfully did.

Isn't that a heartwarming story. I'm sure Mr. Mosk's many friends are overwhelmed by his frugality in their behalf. But poor Mr. Cranston, now that he's the front runner. Oh, I'll bet he doesn't have a friend left in the world.

Congressman Flood Offers His Views on the Panama Canal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the American people an excellent article that appeared in the February 24, 1964, issue of the Wilkes-Barre Record that sets out the views of one of our

highly respected Pennsylvania Members Congressman DAN FLOOD of the 11th Pennsylvania Congressional District.

Congressman DAN FLOOD is to be congratulated in calling the Panama issue so forcibly to the attention of the American people. He has done a magnificent job of pointing out the basic issues and problems, and I highly recommend this article to all Americans.

When history of this hemisphere is written, DAN FLOOD will certainly be remembered for his foresighted approach and willingness to state the facts regardless of partisanship or administration.

The article follows:

WORKABLE TREATY: CONGRESSMAN FLOOD OFFERS HIS VIEWS ON PANAMA CANAL ISSUE

EDITOR OF THE RECORD:

Your recent editorial, "Question on the Canal," presents issues that are both timely and fundamental. I heartily agree with you that our people have a right to know the facts. Because of that I shall write at greater length than would otherwise be appropriate.

The January 9, 1964, Red-led and directed Panamanian assault on the Canal Zone sparked a tidal wave of discussion by many of our citizens, including writers and other publicists, who are not well informed as to canal matters, either as to the history of th Panama Canal or the simplest facts about interocpanic commerce.

NINE POINTS

Lest the ensuing enthusiasm and hysteria about a second canal divert due attention from the problem of the Panama Canal, I shall summarize some facts:

1. The steady growth, since 1914, in the volume of traffic and tolls of the Panama Canal completely establishes the necessity for an adequate Isthmian canal.

2. The Panama Canal is a fine canal now, but it is approaching saturation and obsolescence.

3. We know it will work, how to maintain and operate it, and how to provide for its major increase of capacity, and operational efficiency without the negotiation of a new canal treaty with Panama, which are paramount considerations.

4. We have a workable treaty for the Panama Canal granting the indispensables of undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and canal.

5. We have had to defend that sovereignty and jurisdiction by the use of force—an action absolutely necessary to protect the lives of our citizens in the Canal Zone and to save the canal itself from sabotage and destruction.

6. We have experienced the abrogation by treaty amendments and nullification by Executive actions of vital aspects of the 1903 treaty by policies and practices in direct opposition to the 1923 position of Secretary of State Hughes, who considered any surrenders by any administration, any Secretary of State or any President, as unthinkable.

7. We have no treaty for a canal at another location except with Nicaragua, and such site would also require treaties with both Costa Rica and Salvador, and possibly, Honduras.

8. We would have to be prepared to defend a canal in any location from "lawlessness and disorder" (Hay-Paunceforte treaty) as was done at Panama in January; and it must be obvious that if we do not stand firmly at Panama we will not stand elsewhere.

9. For new treaties we would have to consider the questions of indemnity and annuity payments to the nations involved for the grant of the necessary sovereignty and jurisdiction over the affected area, for the purchase of property from individual owners in the right-of-way, and for provisions of defense installations, the total cost of which would be large.

COMMISSION PROPOSED

From the above it must be obvious that the solution of the problem of formulating a wisely reasoned interoceanic canal policy should not be allowed to be confused through emotional attachments or by the special interests of canal promoters but must be based upon merits of the various proposals.

For such task, our Government imperatively needs an independent, broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission composed of the ablest men that can be mustered to make the necessary studies, reports and recommendations.

To this end, Representatives BOW, HOSMER, CLARK W. THOMPSON and myself, all of whom have studied the canal subject, introduced bills to create the needed commission. Until such an independent commission is created and put to work, the canal situation will remain chaotic.

I trust that you will apply your editorial pen to the task that now faces our Nation and lead in a national campaign of sorely needed enlightenment. I shall look forward to future editorials.

At an early date, I plan to make another major address on canal matters, and trust that you will help pass the word to the Nation.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Put Our Welfare Above That of Foreign Competitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of this Congress will be interested in an editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on March 5, 1964. It points out that the Washington Post is sad because the Tariff Commission is protecting the west coast chromic acid industry against imports from Australia. I think, as this editorial points out, our countrymen should come first and this same tactic must be applied to our meat producers who are being hurt by the import of foreign meat into this country.

The editorial follows:

AUSTRALIA FIRST

"Two weeks ago, the Austrians accepted a 'voluntary' quota agreement restricting their imports of beef into the United States," says the Washington Post, "And now the damage is compounded by a most unfortunate decision of the Tariff Commission in a case involving the dumping of chromic acid."

Damage to whom?

Supposedly, damage to the Australians.

The Washington newspaper is sad because the Tariff Commission, in protecting the west coast chromic acid industry from ruinous competition, unjustly punishes a friendly nation which has only one chromic acid plant.

We do not pretend to know the economics of the American chromic acid industry.

But if that industry got as raw a deal as did American cattlemen, then we propose three rousing cheers for the Tariff Commission—and for any and all American officials who put the welfare of their countrymen above that of foreign competitors.

Situation in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania today in his presentation on Panama.

Too few Americans have the knowledge and the concept of the depth of this serious problem possessed by the Honorable Daniel Flood.

I admit I have tried to catch up on the real issues behind the present dilemma in Panama but find I am still far behind the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

In researching this matter I came across an article by the editor of the Progressive which I believe fits into today's discussion. I ask that it be made part of my remarks at this point:

TRAGEDY IN PANAMA

Less than 3 years ago, the editor of the Progressive, then a rank novice in the field of Panamanian affairs, returned from a brief swing through that country with the warning, published in these columns, that "time is running out in Panama." It seems inconceivable that the State Department, with its long and intimate exposure to the problems of Panama and its battery of trained personnel on the spot, could not have anticipated and prevented the bloody tragedy of the past month.

The causes of conflict run deep; the flag-raising incident, while intrinsically important to the sensitive and nationalistic Panamanians, was in this instance only the spark that ignited long-smoldering grievances shared by every shade of political affiliation among the people of Panama.

The heart of the problem is the fact that the Panamanians feel, with considerable rightness, that despite recent improvements in relations, their country is a protectorate of the United States and they are colonial subjects of Yankee imperialism. They deeply resent the American presence "in perpetuity" and the American status in the Canal Zone "as if sovereign"—concessions wrung from the infant, defenseless republic by the United States more than half a century ago.

Bitterness runs high when the Panamanians contemplate the contrast between life in the 10-mile wide strip that is the U.S. Canal Zone and the rest of Panama. The zone strikes the visitor as a well-manicured country club, with beautiful homes, spacious lawns, and an abundance of golf courses, tennis courts, bathing beaches, and fishing facilities—all for the exclusive use of Americans. Across the road are the squalid slums and grinding poverty of Panama.

Equally significant is the arrogant attitude of many of the 36,000 Americans stationed in the Canal Zone. Their snobbish treatment of the people of Panama wounds the sensibilities of many Panamanians who want to be friendly to the United States. Too many Americans behave as if they were indeed colonial masters of an inferior peo-

ple. The forbidden raising of the American flag at Balboa High School by thoughtless youngsters egged on by jingoistic parents is but one of many instances of the colonial mentality.

It seems clear enough that Communists and Castroists fanned the fires of violence once the clash began last month, but it is equally clear that the fire was lit by Americans. Nor can one ignore the role of Panama's rightwing oligarchy. This ruthless, often corrupt ruling clique—a few dozen families who maintain an iron grip on the country and own 50 percent of the tillable land—has long sought to magnify conflicts between the United States and Panama in order to divert the people of Panama from acting to correct the miserable conditions that keep them chained in desperate poverty.

The relationship between the United States and Panama had improved measurably under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, but in the absence of more basic revisions of U.S. policies, tension began to build up anew last year. Our Ambassador, James S. Farland, appointed by Mr. Eisenhower and retained by Mr. Kennedy, urgently notified the State Department in the spring of 1963 that anti-United States sentiment was on the rise and that pro-Castro forces stood ready to exploit any incident that might develop. Farland, who was immensely popular with the Panamanians because he treated them as human beings, resigned last August, reportedly because he had received no reply to his dispatches to the State Department and because of differences over U.S. economic aid policies. It seems incredible that the Department did not reply to his warnings; it seems equally unbelievable that, as the New York Times reported, Farland, after resigning, hung around Washington for a month for the customary "debriefing" but was not questioned by Department officials about the mounting tensions in Panama.

When the crisis came, President Johnson handled it well. His first concern was to stop the violence, which resulted in 21 killed and 463 wounded, and he successfully conveyed that urgent need to Panama President Roberto Chiari by telephone. Mr. Johnson then dispatched a high-level mission to Panama to negotiate a truce and discuss a settlement. Peace was restored through the combined efforts of both countries and the Inter-American Peace Commission of the Organization of American States.

The restoration of peace, however, resolved none of the conflicts and met none of the grievances of Panama. Both sides agreed to try to achieve a lasting settlement, but the United States stubbornly balked at Panama's insistence on revision of 60-year-old treaty. We believe that no agreement can endure, and provide self-respect for both countries, that does not grant Panama a significant measure of partnership in control of the canal. We agree heartily with the judgment of former President Eisenhower's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, long a student of problems in Panama, that the United States should negotiate an agreement for "joint United States-Panama management," for which we would "train Panamanian personnel gradually."

The blood-and-thunder outcries to "stand firm" and "yield nothing" that come from characters like Senators BARRY GOLDWATER and EVERETT DIRKSEN strike us as dangerous, self-defeating, and immoral. Far sounder was this counsel to the country from Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD: "We are a great and powerful Nation, but we are not a Nation of bullies. It is not for us alone to establish who is right or wrong in this incident."

New Policy on Trade With Communist Bloc Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there were press reports that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce intends to adopt a new policy statement on trade with the Communist bloc, to in effect urge a weakening of existing trade curbs with Red nations.

I believe this would be a very ill-advised move and have written Mr. Edwin Neilan, president of the chamber of commerce, to express my opposition.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Chamber:

MARCH 9, 1964.

Mr. EDWIN P. NEILAN,
President, U.S. Chamber of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. NEILAN: According to recent press reports, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at its annual meeting April 29, 1964 is planning to urge adoption of a new policy calling for a loosening of trade curbs with Russia and the Soviet bloc.

I am frankly amazed that responsible chamber leaders would try to foist on their members this policy based on the anemic arguments often used to justify weakening this Nation's controls on East-West trade. These arguments are a genteel way of saying "Let's grab our share of the profits.

No American businessman could find a better way to let Kremlin leaders breathe easier than to advocate bailing out a floundering Soviet economy through trade, and I want to register my most emphatic objections to this proposed chamber of commerce move.

It is reported that the policy proposal is based in part on the argument that if we loosen our trade controls with Russia and go along with the wishes of West Europeans, we can more easily persuade the allies to tighten up on some of their trade, say, with Cuba.

As a close observer of East-West trade for a number of years as a Member of Congress, in my view this argument is completely without merit. The entire history of COCOM (the free world machinery set up to coordinate strategic trade with the Communist bloc) shows that the COCOM countries have made few concessions to the United States in return for our concessions. It has been a one-way street. We have always given in for the sake of "harmony among allies" while the list of strategic goods barred from sale to the Communists get smaller and smaller.

I am at a loss to see how even more hapless backsliding by the United States now would persuade the Allies to cut back their trade with Castro or any other Communist. On the contrary, every U.S. concession is used as a pretext to get still more Red business. Certain of our Allies apparently believe a fat Communist is less dangerous—a palpable fallacy—and our attempts to be "conciliatory" will be a futile gesture.

As if our COCOM experiences were not convincing enough, U.S. wheat sales to the U.S.S.R. and European satellites have jarringly demonstrated that every feint we make toward relaxed trade simply brings a new avalanche of European business deals with Communists in Cuba and elsewhere.

In my view, current trade curbs, although not as effective as many would like, are a great improvement over the situation that would exist without steady U.S. pressure for tighter curbs. U.S. pressure, halfhearted though it may be after the huge grain sales and other transactions with the Soviets, has unquestionably been a major factor in limiting Allied trade with the Red bloc to a minor 4 to 5 percent of total Free World exports, and thus limiting Red influence in the councils of Europe.

In the Allied mind, East-West trade is an indivisible whole—deals for grain and buses are equally permissible, despite the U.S. administration's doomed attempts to split the two. The more consistently the United States stands against permissive trade, the more effective our attempts to limit Allied trade will be.

Next, the Chamber policy is reportedly based on reasoning that the U.S.S.R. cannot be crushed by American reluctance to trade, so why not trade?

There have been to my knowledge no claim that West trade controls will "crush" the U.S.S.R. Such arguments are attempts merely to muddy the waters. The U.S.S.R. probably can continue along without collapse at a reduced growth rate without expanded Western trade. There is ample evidence, however, the U.S.S.R. cannot hope to modernize rapidly and to advance ambitious growth plans without European and American financial, technical, or commercial boosts. The U.S.S.R. is desperately seeking long-term credits, agricultural commodities, chemical machinery, and technical data from the West. Without Western trade, the Kremlin planners cannot make good their boosts to overtake and bury western society. Yet the Chamber apparently wants to expand this very trade.

Evidence indicates that unsolved Soviet economic problems, not good will toward men, have actually forced so-called "peaceful coexistence" on Kremlin leaders. For example, Nikolai Podgorny, a top Central Committee official, stated March 3, 1964, that the Soviet Union's hopes for raising its living standard would be doomed if its "peaceful coexistence" policies collapsed. I am at a loss as to why the chamber of commerce proposes to bail the Kremlin out, and thereby make the Soviets less "peaceful."

The West can afford to ignore East-West trade. Generally only a few industries benefit here and there in the free world. The economic health of West European countries or, for that matter, our own, does not depend on profits from the Reds.

On the other hand, it is not too much to say that much of the fate of future Soviet economic development rests on what the Kremlin can beg, borrow, buy, or steal from the West.

Also, the plain fact is that Russia doesn't have the cash to greatly expand trade with the West. Only long-term credits can allow significant increases, and it is hard to see how even the most dewey-eyed "detents" advocates could favor this sort of investment on a society dedicated to our obliteration.

Thirdly, the chamber's proposed policy implies that the lure of trade with the United States could induce the Soviet Union to make other agreements this country seeks, and that trade thus could be a political tool for the West.

The only agreement worth its salt with the Soviets, as I am sure you agree, is a Communist decision to call off its obsessive campaign of worldwide subversion, guerrilla support, and troublemaking. If trade concessions could basically alter Soviet aspirations

to dominate the world, it could be helpful to consider such a course of action. Unfortunately, however, concessions do nothing of the sort. They simply reinforce the party machine's will and economic means to eventually overthrow the West.

For these reasons, I strongly believe that relaxed East-West trade can only harm, and not help, the welfare and security of the United States. I would therefore urgently recommend that the chamber of commerce reconsider its policy in this regard.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of remarks I made to the House of Representatives on February 10, 1964, regarding fallacies involved in relaxing East-West trade controls, upon which the administration has based its weakening stand toward allout trade and credit with Communist enemy nations.

Sincerely yours,

GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

A Tax on Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Chicago Sun-Times carries a most timely editorial on the adverse effects of the administration's farm bill which was ramrodded through the Senate last week.

In view of the fact that the House has shown considerably more independence and better judgment on most occasions, I place this most timely editorial into the RECORD hoping that it will be properly studied by my colleagues in the House:

A TAX ON BREAD

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 10, 1964]

The Senate has passed a farm bill that would impose a virtual tax amounting to 1 cent on every loaf of bread purchased by a housewife. It would force wheat processors to pay part of the cost of supporting wheat at a Government-set price. This would be passed along to consumers.

The bill is so bad that both Illinois Senators voted against it although they are seldom together on domestic issues.

The bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture tremendous power over all areas of farming. Farmers showed last May 21 what they think of this sort of control. By an overwhelming vote they turned down proposed wheat controls.

The new bill would force millers to buy a 70-cent certificate for every bushel of wheat processed to help pay the subsidy.

Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, who once was in the baking business, said this figures out to a penny a loaf to the consumer. It takes 5 bushels of wheat ($3.50 in wheat certificate) to make a barrel of flour. A barrel of flour produces 300 1-pound loaves of bread. Said DIRKSEN:

"Under this bill, what, in effect, the Government is saying is, 'add 1 cent per loaf of bread, no matter whether you add it to the miller or the baker or how you do it.'"

The bill also creates a new type of subsidy in cotton. Originally a subsidy was given certain cotton producers. To compensate for that in the international market, a subsidy was given exporters. To compensate for that and protect domestic mills against competition from synthetics, a subsidy for the mills is proposed. But if cotton can be protected against synthetics, why not protect leather producers against the new plastics, steel producers against aluminum?

The cotton subsidy bill and the wheat bill were paired together for political purposes by the administration in the belief that the inducement of extra income for farmers even at the price of loss of liberty would be helpful in a political year.

The administration is wrong. The farm bill should be roundly defeated in the House. If there are those from Illinois in that body who need more reasons than those cited here we advise them to talk to either DIRKSEN or Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

Bobby Baker and ARA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, even the fine hand of Bobby Baker has gotten to the ARA with another bust. In last Friday's New York Herald Tribune, Dom Bonafede tells us how a $70,000 loan for a plant in West Virginia has faltered:

BAKER HEARING: $70,000 U.S. LOAN FAILURE

(By Don Bonafede)

WASHINGTON.—A $70,000 loan given by a Federal agency to house a plant in Beckley, W. Va., for Melpar, Inc., an electronics supply firm promiently mentioned in the Bobby Baker investigation, was called a failure yesterday.

Officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Commerce Department acknowledged the loan was approved February 5, 1963, and that the plant, scheduled to open last November, has yet to start production.

Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, and N. Joe Rahall, wealthy radio station operator, have both played major roles in inducing Melpar to establish in Beckley.

ARA spokesmen said the plant, situated in a depressed, high-unemployment area of the State, was expected to provide new jobs.

"But it's a failure as far as we are concerned," reported a high-ranking ARA official. He explained that the primary purpose of ARA industrial loans is to create employment.

Mr. Rahall's name was recently introduced into the Baker investigation when he was listed in the records of the Senate Rules Committee as having indorsed a $10,000 bank note for Mr. Baker, former Senate majority secretary. Mr. Baker, used the money to pay back $10,000 he had borrowed from him, Mr. Rahall said.

It was a law suit over the vending machine contract at Melpar's plant in Falls Church, Va., that signaled the start of the Baker investigation.

Ralph Hill, owner of Capitol Vending Co., charged he paid Mr. Baker $5,600 to secure and maintain a contract at the Falls Church plant.

Then, according to Mr. Hill, Mr. Baker used his influence with the directors of Melpar to break the contract after he (Mr. Hill) refused to increase the cash payments.

In testimony before the Rules Committee, Edwin M. Bostick, president of Melpar, acknowledged his friendship with Mr. Baker. Asked why he had given the plant's vending machine business to Capitol, he replied, "I am a friend of Baker, I like him very much, I thought he was a decent person, and I did it as a favor to him."

He denied, however, that he had terminated Capitol's contract in deference to Mr. Baker.

He also testified that three of Mr. Baker's friends and business associates were on Melpar's payroll as consultants: Fred Black, Washington representative for North American Aviation, Inc., until his recent dismissal; Thomas Webb, Washington representative for the Murchison interests, and Francis Law, partner of Mr. Webb's in an industrial relations firm.

The names of Messrs. Webb and Law have frequently been in the West Virginia newspapers lately because of a timber deal in which they are involved. They were recently leased 70,000 acres of State timberland for processing by the West Virginia Natural Resources Department. However, strong opposition has been voiced by the State's sawmill operators.

Both of West Virginia's Democratic Senators, Mr. BYRD and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, have reported they knew nothing about the transaction.

An assistant to Mr. RANDOLPH said the Senator was disturbed when he first heard of it.

Senator BYRD, a member of the Rules Committee, asked committee investigators to determine if Mr. Baker was in any way connected with the Webb-Law partnership in the timber deal. Later, he reported he was satisfied the former Senate aid was not involved.

Mr. Baker, it was learned, was in Charleston, W. Va., last Monday. Rush Meadows, a Charleston businessman, said he had an appointment with Tom Harris, an oil and gas executive, who was unexpectedly accompanied by Mr. Baker.

"I never met Baker and was surprised to see him with Harris," Mr. Meadows related. He said Mr. Baker left him and Mr. Harris and went to the Daniel Boone Hotel to meet Mr. Rahall.

ARA records showed that the $70,000 Federal grant was made to the Beckley Business Development Corp., a locally owned group formed to encourage industry, in order to build a plant for lease to Melpar.

A member of the development organization said yesterday in reference to the plant's delayed opening, "There's a lot of hard feeling here."

Daniel Schwartz—Florida Winner of VFW Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure this afternoon to meet an outstanding young man, Daniel Schwartz from Coral Gables, Fla. Dan and representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars visited my office and I had the opportunity to congratulate Dan as the winner of the Voice of Democracy contest from the State of Florida.

This was the 17th annual Voice of Democracy contest and 53 winners—1 from every State, the Canal Zone, Japan, and the District of Columbia—have

gathered in Washington to honor the top winner. Understandably, the competition was keen. In Florida, out of about 10,000 entrants, there were 385 district winners; these then went to the State competition, where Daniel Schwartz, the winner, was selected to represent the State by a distinguished panel of judges.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is performing an outstanding public service in providing the incentive for our young people to take an affirmative view of our great Government and to expound on the principles of freedom and democracy.

My heartiest congratulations to Commander Bob Brockmann, of VFW Post 5718, of Coral Gables, the sponsoring post for Dan Schwartz; to Mrs. Gloria Lane, his debate coach at Coral Gabels Senior High School; to Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Schwartz, of Coral Gables, who must be very proud of their son; and last, but certainly not least, to Dan Schwartz, a fine young citizen with a very bright future.

His winning speech "The Challenge of Citizenship" is a forceful blueprint for citizen action in the fight for freedom. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Daniel Schwartz, Miami Fla., Coral Gables Senior High School, Coral Gables, Fla.)

In the 18th century, the French philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau, stated: "As soon as public service ceases to be the chief business of the citizens, and they would rather serve with their money than with their persons, the State is not far from its fall."

Those stirring words caused me to ask myself if perhaps our great Nation was not headed for its fall. One can find much evidence to support this theory.

Today we are all involved in a world where it seems to be easier to find excuses for not doing things in place of doing those things ourselves. We have been blessed with a government run by the people, but yet how many of our people do take an active part in this government? Mr. Rousseau's statement is most apropos today. For example, people prefer to contribute money to a political party rather than giving up their time in working for it.

Consequently, this apathetic attitude is carried into the voting booth. It is detrimental in two distinct ways: First, it causes people not to even reach the booth, and, second, it causes those who do vote to be uninformed of both the issues and the candidates.

It certainly seems a shame that all throughout the country there are elections in which less than 10 percent of the people exercise their privilege of voting, a privilege that the millions of people under communistic rule would almost give their lives for. But even more of a shame, is the fact that those who do exercise their privilege, do it in a haphazard manner. Surveys taken across the Nation have shown that large percentages of the voting populace are familiar with neither the issues nor the candidates. All of this is due to the millions of people who constantly use the phrase: "What does it mean to me?" as an excuse for such apathy.

Now is the time to remedy this situation before our Nation also falls. We have before us a cause-and-effect relationship. The cause is a combination of indolence and apathy, and the effect is an uninformed populace. We must remove the cause, and thus eliminate the effect. It is not a question of the information not being available; for we have great mediums of communication, newspapers, periodical literature, radio, television, books, and pamphlets, as well as the fine work put forth by the many veterans' administrations plus the many service clubs. All of these mediums exist solely for the purpose of benefiting mankind in such a manner. They provide all the information necessary to establish an informed electorate. However, all of this is for naught unless we, the people, take advantage of these sources of information.

Of course, I fully realize that there are many other responsibilities which make up good citizenship. If you took a survey of the average men on the street to see what they consider good citizenship to be, you would get various answers. Some would say good citizenship is serving in the military; others might say it is paying your taxes; and still others would say that it is supporting charity organizations, belonging to service clubs, working for the faith of your choice, or in other words, being a good neighbor to your community.

Every one of these answers is quite true. However, if our people continue with their apathetic attitude toward their government, then all of these forms of good citizenship will not save our Nation from utter destruction, for uninformed voters are the greatest evil of a free society.

Now, more than ever, in the wake of our recent great national tragedy, let us strive to save our Nation from falling. We must reunite and take a greater interest in our Government. We must read and be up to date on all issues. We must exercise our privilege of voting in an intelligent manner. Let us visit our capitals, and see our government at work. We must all be willing to make any personal sacrifice necessary to become an informed populace and thus, save our Nation from its predicted fall. We must heed the words of Mr. Rousseau and thus give a little less of our money and a great deal more of our time and effort. In short, let us all realistically face up to the challenge of citizenship.

Roosevelt Strikes Out at Concentration of Food Industry and Calls for Immediate Study of Food Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his recent farm message called for the establishment of an Agricultural Marketing Commission to study the problems of marketing in the food and agricultural industry.

The Subcommittee on Distribution of the Select Committee on Small Business, under the chairmanship of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, has looked into various aspects of these problems. There exists a great deal of information and evidence which certainly would be of great value to this important study Commission which the President has proposed.

In the February 1964 issue of the Oregon Independent Grocer, there appears an illuminating article, commenting on Congressman ROOSEVELT's position, strongly supporting President Johnson's proposal for a study on food marketing, and urging that a prompt and comprehensive study be made on the effect of food prices of a "few giant corporations" and chainstores.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

ROOSEVELT STRIKES OUT AT CONCENTRATION OF FOOD INDUSTRY AND CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE STUDY OF FOOD MARKETING

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 3, 1964.—Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, today urged a prompt study be made on the effect of food prices of a "few giant corporations" and chainstores.

"We must not allow a few giant corporations to dictate to the consumer the prices he must pay for his daily bread; the forces of competition within our economy must be preserved," Congressman ROOSEVELT stated.

Strongly backing President Johnson's call last week for a study on food marketing, Representative ROOSEVELT pointed out that investigations by his congressional subcommittee had already uncovered evidence of increasing concentration in food distribution.

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, on the floor of the House last Saturday said: "We need a thorough study by a group of competent and impartial experts to help us get answers to some of the questions which perplex us. We need to understand what is taking place in our marketing system so that we can devise public policies and programs to guide it in serving the public interest."

Representative ROOSEVELT is chairman of the Distribution Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, which deals exclusively with distribution of goods in the American economy

He pointed out that because of evidence of "disturbing amounts of increasing concentration" the subcommittee had tentatively placed further studies of the effects of vertical integration upon the food industry on its current agenda.

Listing 34 Federal court and Federal Trade Commission cases presently being studied by the subcommittee, Representative ROOSEVELT pointed out that a great number of firms had been recently found guilty of price fixing, rigged bills, boycotts, and illegal allowances.

"The record substantiates the President," he said. "These practices must be stopped."

Representative ROOSEVELT pointed out that hearings have been held on a bill he introduced last year to prevent further vertical integration in the sale or production of meats, dairy, and poultry products.

His subcommittee has held extensive hearings and studies on the problems of concentration and integration in the food industry and in 1960 recommended strengthening of antitrust laws and of government enforcement agencies.

Pomona's New Public Safety Building and Underground Civil Defense City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, Dr. Edward Teller, the distinguished nuclear physicist, performed a

historic act in dedicating the Pomona Public Safety Building, located in Pomona, Calif., in the 24th Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing.

The significance of this dedication lies in the fact that this is a unique building. It is designed as an underground communications center for use in normal times and as a self-contained municipal headquarters in time of emergency, either natural or man made. Because all posts in the building, which serves as police and fire headquarters, are constantly manned, the switchover from everyday operations to emergencies can be effected in a matter of seconds.

The building has two stories above ground and one below, which houses the communications facilities, and is linked to the adjacent county courthouse with an underground tunnel. The below-ground level has its own water supply, its own sewage system, and its own recirculating air filter system, giving it complete protection from nuclear fallout. Adequate underground food rations and sleeping quarters to last 150 people for 14 days are always at the ready.

The building was constructed at a cost of $1,500,000 mostly with city and partly with county and Federal funds. The Federal Government contributed one-half the cost of the underground construction because it will serve as an area headquarters for civil defense.

In his dedication remarks, Dr. Teller said that 95 percent of the people of the United States could survive nuclear attack and enough property could be saved to enable the country to recover quickly, if adequate civil defense preparations were made.

Dr. Teller praised Pomona for its leadership in providing underground civil defense facilities and quickly adaptable emergency communications beneath its new building at a time when, he said, such leadership is badly needed in the United States.

The most dramatic feature of the building is its labyrinth of underground facilities and passages. The whole city council or Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors could meet there in emergency and conduct their business with no necessity for any except electronic contact with the outside world to transmit commands. The underground ceiling is an 8-inch-thick concrete slab with two tiers of reinforcing bars. The exterior walls around the underground city are 12 inches thick, also with two tiers of reinforcing bars.

Besides serving in normal times as headquarters for Pomona's peace officers and firemen, the public safety building houses the city jail and is the central communications hub for fire and police calls, the city telephone system, the teletype system, water level telemetry monitors, public works calls, and serves various civil defense functions.

The people of Pomona are justifiably proud to show the way to the entire country with their foresight in construction of this beautifully designed and utilitarian building.

Mrs. Mae Gurevich, Inspiring Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent and inspiring speech delivered by Mrs. Mae Gurevich, vice chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee, at the Women's Division 13th Annual Political Conference, Monday luncheon honoring Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Esther Peterson at the Schine Ten Eyck Hotel, Albany, N.Y., on March 2, 1964.

The speech follows:

"Women," said President Lyndon B. Johnson, "have the imagination, initiative, and ingenuity that I like." We like you, too, Mr. President. We like the appointment of today's guest of honor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, as Presidential Assistant for Consumer Affairs. We like the Presidential order to install at least 50 qualified women in important Federal posts. We like the breakthrough for women in aviation. We like the President's first appearance before a press club, at the Women's National Press Club in Washington this coming Wednesday (March 4). We like very much to contemplate a woman in the Cabinet and in a top administrative post. We like the encouraging atmosphere which will permit women to make more lustrous and significant contributions to our Nation, our State, and our party.

But not every woman wants to hold a public office, a Cabinet post, or be an ambassador. There are millions of unsung Democratic heroines who pride themselves, and in whom we take pride, on a very necessary doorbell ringing job well done, a telephone squad job which affected the important decision of a school board election, or a bond issue for civic improvement, or the election of a Democratic town supervisor.

But the opportunity for every woman to work effectively toward a more conspicuous political role presents itself immediately. Every fourth year we enjoy here in our great land, among the many benefits, favors, and rights, the recurring American political phenomenon known as the presidential campaign.

Mr. Webster defines "campaign" as a series of connected activities designed to bring about a result. We all know that the first in the series of activities to bring about our desired result is to rally the citizenry to the polls. Women eligible to vote today outnumber the men by almost 4 million. In the last presidential election, 22½ million women, eligible to vote, did not exercise this privilege. Therefore, the women of our party have been charged with the momentous responsibility and the earnest duty of getting out the vote. Find the Democrats, register them, and gently but firmly get them to the polls. The VIP—voter identification program—is the long-range aim of the national committee to increase registration by at least 10 percent above the 1960 figure. Cities and States all across the Nation have already reported effective methods employed toward the achievement of this goal.

The Democratic Party in this State has enjoyed increasing success with each passing year. Areas which have been regarded as safely Republican for a century or more have been penetrated. More and more Democrats are running for office and more and more are being added to the roster of elected Democratic officials. As soon as you get back home, initiate your campaign. Mobilize your forces; plan your strategy. On the golf course, at the bridge table, in the beauty parlor, the supermarket, at the PTA meeting, be ready to spread the Democratic gospel. Be ready with Democratic ammunition for the apathetic one-third of this Nation's voters who never go to the polls.

The Democratic Party serves the interests of all the people. Democratic leadership consistently seeks new development and new growth, more and better jobs, greater health, more education. It is vital, not only to the American people, but to the peoples of the world as well, that the programs, leadership and progress of the Democratic Party continue.

As leaders in the Women's Division of the New York State Democratic Committee, we welcome the challenge, accept the obligation and invite all the Democratic women throughout the length and breadth of our great Empire State to join the VIP corps.

I know of no finer memorial to President John F. Kennedy than an overwhelming, landslide victory for President Johnson, the man whom he chose for his qualities of leadership, forcefulness, cool-headedness, ability and experience. President Lyndon B. Johnson, of whom it has been said and written that few men in American history have come to the Presidency so well prepared for the task.

I know of no finer memorial to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman than the election of a good and able Democrat to the U.S. Senate, which he served so well.

Toward these ends, we pledge anew our loyalty, our devotion and our efforts to a vibrant, valiant and victorious Democratic Party.

What Is Our Trade Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we criticize our allies for trading with the Communists, yet President Johnson insists that we sell wheat to the Soviet Union—if necessary, on credit. Harry Rosenfeld, in last Saturday's New York Herald Tribune, criticized the ineptness of our present policy:

THE REDS WE TRADE WITH

(By Harry Rosenfeld)

There's no need to go around saying that the United States, leader of the free world, doesn't have a policy on trade with Communist nations.

We all know there is a policy. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, last week in a speech to a labor union convention in Washington, said there was.

In essence, it is that we trade with the Communists in nonstrategic goods: (1) for humanitarian reasons; (2) to make money; (3) to make politics.

On the other hand we don't trade with other Communists because: (1) they are subverters and aggressors; (2) they are trying to communize the world violently; (3) they are not susceptible to the politics we are trying to make.

In the first group, there is the Soviet Union (to make money; it is anti-Peiping and anti-Stalinist); Yugoslavia (it is a nonalined Communist state, and has behaved reasonably at times); Poland (relatively independent of Moscow, and besides the forebears of many Americans came from there.)

Others in the East bloc are included, too, because they show some signs of independence which we want to encourage (making politics).

In the second group, there is Red China (promoter of world revolution, subverter in southeast Asia, aggressor in India); North Korea (we fought a war against it); North Vietnam (subverts South Vietnam, Laos). For these three no trade at all—not even the food and medicines that Americans can sell to Cuba.

Castro's Cuba is all by itself. Americans can sell, but not ship, unsubsidized foods and medicines but nothing else, including nonstrategic goods.

This is because Cuba is a subverter in the Caribbean and threatens the security and stability of other nations, in Mr. Rusk's words.

The aims of American policy, in which trade then becomes a weapon. Mr. Rusk said are threefold: to prevent Communist expansion, to reduce danger of war, to encourage the Communists to independence and more open societies.

Opportunity to implement these aims arises, Mr. Rusk said, because "the Communist world is no longer a single flock of sheep following blindly behind one leader.

It's happening in the West too, worse luck and sometimes it is called polycentrism.

Western Europe's trade with Cuba, despite Washington's embargo, did not need the inspiration of America's wheat deal with the Soviets. The will was there; the way was smoothed by the U.S. example.

Since we are trading freely with Russia, it must be Mr. Rusk's view that the Soviet Union is not a subverter. But even as we were dickering with the Soviets last November, they blocked a U.S. Army convoy en route to West Berlin.

The administration was quick to write it off as a local incident. After 52 hours, it had outgrown whatever locality it might have had, and proved to be another move by the Soviets against the "security and stability" of West Berlin.

You can pick the part, any part, of the world, if you wish. Last week, the State Department taxed Moscow, along with Peiping and Hanoi, with responsibility for the aggressions in Laos.

But neither these two samples nor the fact that Moscow supports Havana with about as much money each year as the United States pours into South Vietnam suffices for it to be cast into the outer darkness of no trade at all. There is a difference, it appears, between subverter and he who does so at one remove.

If this be policy, our allies can't read it.

The United States, a superpower, reacts fitfully to events in a dangerous world. Before we expect others to follow our lead, we should be more sure of what we want and why, and what we are willing to do to get it. It applies to other things beside trade also.

Archaic Draft Law Needs Changing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent series of articles in recent issues of the New York World-Telegram by reporter Lee Townsend, speak eloquently and impressively of the need for changing the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The objective approach of these articles, and their well-documented revelations of the inequities which exist under the present law, commend themselves to the attention of Members of the Congress.

To correct the inequities in the draft law, I have sponsored H.R. 10211 in this House. My bill is identical with that introduced in the other body by Senator KEATING—S. 2432. Both bills call for the establishment of a Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training with a view to suggesting corrective legislation to meet the needs of present-day military manpower requirements.

I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of having the first of the World-Telegram series on the draft law printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on Wednesday, March 4. In view of the importance of this subject to our national interest, I now ask unanimous consent to have the second article by Lee Townsend printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram, Jan. 16, 1964]

DRAFT REJECTS 55 OF 100 HERE

(By Lee Townsend)

"I managed to fail my hearing test by sitting where I could see the dials."—A machinist.

"Today's military rejects include tomorrow's hard core unemployed."—John F. Kennedy.

"I flunked the mental test because I knew nothing about mathematics or mechanics."—Man with a master's degree.

They call the Army's archaic building at 39 Whitehall Street an induction center. But statistically, it's more of a rejection center.

In this edifice thousands of New Yorkers who can't win deferments from their draft boards find the solution to their draft problems.

About 55 of every 100 New Yorkers who walked through the doors of the pre-Civil War structure last year flunked the test that separates the soldiers from the civilians.

Nearly half the rejects were considered mentally unqualified to perform the thinking of a GI—a fact that draftees who spent 2 years field-stripping rifles and cigarette butts might find hard to swallow.

Most of the others disqualified were rated physically unfit for the peacetime Army—the only military service which relies on the draft for manpower. This group of rejects includes such unlikely candidates as college athletes and strapping laborers.

Depending on the circumstances, a trip to Whitehall Street may win virtually airtight guarantees of draft immunity for homosexuals, alcoholics, lawbreakers, and men with emotional problems.

Men who can't speak English—and this includes many from the city's Puerto Rican community of nearly 700,000—usually are rejected at the induction station.

Shortly before his death, President Kennedy voiced deep concern that on the national level half of the men reporting for preinduction examinations were found unqualified for military service.

And earlier this month, President Johnson, equally disturbed by the rejection rate, ordered draft examinations to be given to most men reaching the draft registration age of 18. Now men are usually tested at 22 or 23, from 1 to 3 months before they are scheduled to receive draft notices.

The President hopes earlier detection of defects will aid in rehabilitating the unfit.

During the first 11 months of last year, more than 20,000 of the 37,000 New Yorkers reporting for draft exams were stamped unfit for service. And many of the 16,400 rated qualified started a new search for deferments.

The alarming reject rate means that American men are in bad shape or the peacetime Army, placed in a choice hiring position, is picking the cream of the crop and sending the rest back to the home fires.

There's truth to both conclusions.

Doctors at the induction center insist that the physical exam which more than 7,000 failed here last year is virtually the same as that given 5 or 10 years ago—and the physical reject rate has not changed much in that time.

They say the medical standards change only during war.

STIFF PHYSICAL

Officials agreed that the physical is as thorough an exam as most men ever get—and for many it's their first. One doctor at the center said the medical is as stiff as the one for West Point.

Since 1957, the Army steadily has been tightening its mental requirements to keep out men with the lowest IQ's. More than 10,000 of the 1963 New York rejects were in this category.

Capt. John Nienstadt, executive officer of the induction center, said studies have shown that the men with the lowest mental potential are often the ones who get into the most trouble in service.

He said since the mental standards have been made higher, all but one of the Army's seven or eight disciplinary barracks have been closed and the number of courts-martial has been reduced greatly.

The move obviously has been a good one for the Army, but not necessarily for the country as a whole.

Last September, Mr. Kennedy said: "Many of the recent rejectees now are looking for work and unable to find it. They make up a large proportion of the alarming total of unemployed youth * * *. Today's military rejects include tomorrow's hard core unemployed."

MASS PRODUCTION

Although Whitehall St. officials admit the assemblyline testing—as many as 9,000 men are processed at the center in some months—has the "faults of mass production," they say seldom are men taken into the Army with disabilities that should have been caught at the induction station.

There are exceptions. A man 6-feet-8, 2 inches more than the height limit, reported to Fort Dix recently.

He said that at the induction station, he was told to step off the scale * * * and his height was measured from the floor. He got out of the Army after 2 months.

There are also stories about men who feign or exaggerate ailments to keep out of service.

A young expert on medical machinery bragged that he managed to fail his hearing test by arranging to sit in the sound booth in a position where he could see the dials and give readings indicating he was deaf.

Lt. Robert Blanchard, who served as an administrative officer at the induction center until his release from the Army last month, said some men deliberately try to fail the mental test, but they seldom succeed.

He explained there are a number of questions which anyone who has stayed alive for 18 years would have to be able to answer. The people who try to fail, usually answer these questions wrong too, so they're caught.

FLUNKS WITH MA

Blanchard said he knew of one case, though, in which a man with a master of arts degree honestly flunked the mental test

and stayed out of service. The man scored high in some parts of the examination but knew nothing about mathematics or mechanical matters.

Last year more than 2,750 New Yorkers were rejected on psychiatric grounds—nearly three times the national rate.

This group includes alcoholics, homosexuals and sexual deviates.

Officials said the Army has eliminated the famous automatic psychiatric interview in which all men were asked such quick questions as "Do you like girls? Do you like boys?"

Now, psychiatrists talk to about 40 percent of the men—those who indicate a history of emotional problems. The interviews last up to a half-hour.

A man undergoing private psychiatric care is asked to submit a report from his psychiatrist including an opinion on how the patient would adapt to military service.

REJECT HOMOSEXUALS

The Army psychiatrist may rule that the man should be rejected, accepted or deferred pending the outcome of private treatment. Anyone who can stay safely deferred in his psychiatrist's care until he's 26 will have one less problem on his mind.

Obvious homosexuals are rejected promptly. Borderline cases are interviewed by a psychiatrist who has spent years studying New York's densely populated homosexual community, its jargon, hangouts, and mannerisms. A short interview can usually determine whether the man is truly a homosexual, officials claim.

Men who claim to be alcoholics usually need a record of arrests or hospitalization for drinking in order to be disqualified. Information on men with criminal records is sent to Washington, where it is determined whether they should serve or not. Last year nearly 600 men stayed out of uniform on moral grounds here.

Even though the Army calls the tune at the induction center, a shrewd draft avoider could find a way to put his time in the building to good use.

A foreigner who can speak English, for instance, might get away with pretending he can't.

Officials concede it would be possible for a man nearing the age of 26 to refuse to fill out the standard security questionnaire on constitutional grounds at his preinduction exam and avoid the draft by doing so. Everyone who refuses to answer the security questions is thoroughly investigated.

ACADEMIC QUESTION

The man might not be inducted until the lengthy investigation is completed. If he reaches his 26th birthday first, his loyalty would become an academic question to the peacetime Army.

The city's growing pool of nearly 200,000 draft-age military rejects includes 135,000 classified as 4–F, not qualified for any military service. Another 60,000 are 1–Y, qualified only in a war or national emergency.

These figures would be even higher except that some men initially rejected are retested and found acceptable.

A Brooklyn youth not long ago sold his car, paid off some loan sharks who were after him, and told his girl to "get lost," all because he was scheduled to be drafted.

But when he got to the induction station he was disqualified. So he bought a new car, renewed his financial connections with the loan sharks, and got his girl back. Then he was examined again and drafted.

By this time he was so fed up he did everything he could to get out of the Army. He finally made it when he tried to commit suicide.

The Voice From the Country Speaks—Our International Politicking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to the skyrocketing foreign meat imports into our country, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives two editorials which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on March 4, 1964:

THE COUNTRY SPEAKS

The voice from the country is being heard today in Washington.

The voice rings loud and clear, and carries the weight of logic.

We refer, of course, to what happened at a hastily called meeting at Shenandoah, Iowa, on Monday.

Ranchers, feeders, farmers, bankers, businessmen, and State and Federal officials formed a gathering which the Iowa Highway Patrol estimated at between 5,000 and 6,000 persons—enough almost to double the population of Shenandoah. The overflow of an auditorium which seated fewer than 1,000 clustered at other points to listen through a public-address system to a long list of speakers.

At the conclusion they sent to Congress a plea which can be boiled down to:

"Roll back the imports of beef which are crushing the American cattle industry."

The resolution which these mid-Americans sent to Washington is a terse, reasoned document.

It calls upon Congress "to limit, by legislative action, imports of beef and veal, fresh, frozen, cooked and/or canned or cured, to levels in pounds approximately equal in volume to the levels of 1960, approximately 775 million pounds, or 4.9 percent of domestic production that year."

And it takes note of the consequences of some domestic overproduction which the imports have aggravated by calling upon the cattle industry to "take effective action toward orderly marketing and production, as well as production more nearly commensurate with consumer demands."

Observe that the men who met at Shenandoah did not demand that Congress shut off all beef imports. They are willing to concede a reasonable share of the American market to foreign producers, but they want it set at a figure they can live with. They want it stabilized, so that it won't again grow into a flood.

Here and there a voice pops up to blame the cattle industry's troubles solely on the industry. "Overproduction," they say. "Too many cattle here at home."

The analysis is valid—to a point. But this problem has been faced and disposed of by the cattle industry, without outside help, since the days of the Chisholm Trail.

But, as Cecil W. Means, vice president of the Stockyards National Bank, told the meeting in Shenandoah, the rapidly rising tide of imported beef has confronted the cattle industry with "an added imponderable it has never had to face before—an unanswerable question. We do not know to what extent or how fast meat imports are going to grow."

The voice from the Midlands now is telling Congress in effect:

Put a reasonable limit on imports, and we'll take care of the rest of our problem.

This is wise counsel which the Congress will heed if it wants to save the cattle industry and all of the economic life of America which is dependent upon it.

AT CATTLEMEN'S EXPENSE

What opened the door to Austrialian and New Zealand beef?

Vermont's Senator AIKEN says the answer lies in a U.S. promise to absorb the meat the two countries had been sending to Britain, providing they would help Britain to enter the European Common Market.

He goes on to explain that Britain didn't get into the Common Market because Charles de Gaulle torpedoed the arrangement 14 months ago. But the U.S. agreement to buy the beef stuck—and now the American cattlemen are stuck.

As ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator AIKEN is in a position to know what goes on in international politicking.

Who's President, If?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks a Senate subcommittee has been hearing testimony on the very important issue of succession to the Presidency. A number of proposals are under consideration and I am hopeful that some action can be taken soon.

One of our leading newspapers, the Buffalo Evening News of Buffalo, N.Y., recently had an excellent editorial which suggests an approach that might be helpful in resolving the problem. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial, dated March 7, 1964:

WHO'S PRESIDENT, IF?

The deeper one digs into the many angles of the presidential succession puzzle, the more worrisome becomes the possibility of our being plunged into a first-class constitutional crisis one of these days.

For one thing, there is the present lack of any Vice President—of anyone in continuous daily training to take on the immense job of the President in the event of his death, assassination, physical breakdown, or other disability.

The succession law makes the House Speaker next in line in case of any such eventuality, but this emergency solution is not at all the one we need as a permanent procedure. What we need is a regular method for filling the Vice Presidency whenever it is vacant, as it has been 15 different times for a total period amounting to more than 37 years, or one-fifth of our national history.

But beyond this, the Constitution and the laws are obscure as to what would happen under numerous other contingencies.

Say a presidential candidate dies on election eve, and his name wins anyway. Who then can the electoral college elect? Anyone it likes? Or must it pick the Vice President-

elect and then, whom does it elect to his office? Or does the buck pass to Congress?

Or what if a winning candidate for either top office dies after the people have spoken but before the electors have met to cast their ballots? Or what if the death occurs after the electors have voted but before the ballots are counted and certified by Congress?

And there is also that puzzler—which the last three Presidents and their prospective successors have settled to their evident personal satisfaction through voluntary agreements—about who declares the President disabled if he is so stricken that he is unaware of his disability. And who then pronounces him well and able to resume his office when the disability has been removed? Suppose he only thinks he is well, but is suffering hallucinations? Once a Vice President becomes President can the President legally take the office back?

Some of these problems could be solved by statute right away, and others by constitutional amendments, if Congress could agree on what to do. Unfortunately at present, the House at least is in a delicate box, for to change the succession law at all would likely be regarded by hypersensitive Speaker McCormack as an insult to him. Thus it is only in the Senate that the problem is getting much serious study—but there seem to be almost as many different ideas on the subject as there are Senators.

So we wonder if the best approach of all is not the one by Senator Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who proposes assigning the whole ball of wax to a 12-member Hoover-type commission, composed of six eminent citizens from public life and six from private life. This would have the virtue of dramatizing the urgency of the problem, and also of focusing national opinion on one recommended set of solutions.

And that in itself would be all to the good, for this is one of those rare cases where almost any solution is better than none. In other words, it is far less important to have any particular set of rules than it is to have everybody know in advance what the rules are. The worst solution is just to drift along until some awful day when we wake up and discover that our President or President-to-be is dead or disabled, and that we not only don't know who is to take over, but we aren't even sure who has the authority to decided.

Is This Route Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. K. Robert Hahn, president of Lear Siegler, Inc., in Cleveland, has called attention to an editorial which recently appeared in Aviation Week.

Because I feel that its import is great, I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

Is This Route Necessary?

(By Robert Hotz)

The Soviet Union has been extremely anxious to establish a Moscow-New York nonstop airline route for at least 4 years. The United States has blown hot and cold on this proposition, depending on the changing temperature of the cold war. President Lyndon B. Johnson now faces a decision on whether a bilateral air agreement for a Moscow-New York airline operation is in the best interests of the United States and should be implemented, or whether this project should be shelved diplomatically for the foreseeable future.

In any project where the Soviet Union pushes hard for achievement, even to the point of offering small concessions as trading bait, it behooves the leadership of this country to scrutinize our own interests carefully before making any agreements. This is because it is indeed a rare case when the basic interests of Soviet imperialism coincide with those of this Nation. Invariably, when the Soviets press hard for an agreement, they do so only because they see substantial advantages for themselves at the expense of their free world foes.

We think this is the case in the New York-Moscow air route. The United States stands to gain very little from such an operation and the Soviets stand to benefit substantially. The first question that should be examined by U.S. policymakers is whether there is really any need for such a route. It certainly is not warranted on the basis of the traffic involved, either current or potential. At present, only about 100 Soviet tourists a year are allowed to visit the United States. Any substantial increase in this flow is unlikely, as the Communist leaders of the U.S.S.R. cannot maintain their fictitious picture of the benefits of life in the alleged "workers paradise" if they allow large numbers of their citizens the opportunity for invidious comparisons with life under capitalist systems, particularly in this country. There is a reverse flow of about 15,000 U.S. citizens a year visiting Russia. But after personal experience with the limited path the tourist is allowed to tread under the policing of Intourist, and the artificial exchange rates, we doubt the U.S.S.R. will become a major attraction for U.S. dollars.

Thus the profession of Gen. Egveny Loginov, Aeroflot's chief who has done a remarkable job on its transition to the jet age, that his chief interest in the New York route is "to make a profit" has a rather hollow ring. Most Americans now visiting Russia drift there as part of a broad swing through the continent, and would not be interested in a nonstop service between the Kremlin and Statue of Liberty.

Several European airlines provide service for these visitors from Moscow to all major European tourist centers. All of the legitimate New York-Moscow traffic could be handled by authorizing annually a few special charters to Aeroflot and Pan American World Airways, holder of the U.S. franchise to Moscow.

The U.S.S.R. couldn't care less about the economic aspects of this route. It is interested primarily in the political and military advantages this operation would provide, and these are substantial. It would provide an absolutely secure line of communication, now lacking, for the elaborate Soviet espionage apparatus in this country to feed its material and people back to Moscow. It would also provide an excellent weekly reconnaissance, particularly electronic, of the U.S. air defense system, much in the manner the Germans flew over England with their commercial Zeppelin Hindenburg in the mid-thirties. It also would be a diplomatic keystone in the Soviet scheme to establish better aerial pipelines to Cuba and extend channels of subversion throughout South American with new Aeroflot routes.

About the only possible benefit to the United States we have heard advanced during the protracted negotiations over this route is the rather vague premise that this would help establish our sincerity as a peace-loving nation that really wants to get along with the Communist world. Based on the international record of the past 25 years, we think it is the Soviets who need to prove their sincerity on this point, not the United States. Aside from all of the major international fabrications perpetrated by the Soviet Union in recent years, the record on civil aviation alone has shown clearly how fruitless these interchanges are for this country (Aviation Week Sept. 30, p. 21). The Soviets always are given an opportunity to see more of our operations than our delegations are of theirs. The recent experience of FAA Administrator Najeeb Halaby and his group was no exception. U.S. mission personnel have yet to inspect a major Aeroflot maintenace facility or fly operationally in anything except their obsolescent Tu-104 and Tu-114 transports.

It is also typical of the Soviets that when they began their diplomatic campaign with the late President Kennedy for this air agreement, they offered as trading material two U.S. Air Force airmen who had been shot down illegally outside Soviet territorial waters, and imprisoned illegally. Another bit of Soviet propaganda apparently aimed at baiting the United States into an agreement is their outrageous claim that their Tu-114 turboprop transport is so superior to Pan American's equipment that this country is ashamed to allow competitive trial on the New York-Moscow run. The flight-proven facts are that it took Nikita Khrushchev 12 hours and 20 minutes to fly Moscow-Washington nonstop in a Tu-114, while U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk made the same trip aboard a Boeing 707 in 8 hours, 30 minutes. Pan American's Boeing 707-321C would carry a full load of 125 passengers, cargo and baggage from New York to Moscow in 9 hours, 15 minutes eastbound and 10 hours, 15 minutes westbound.

The Soviets profess to be skeptical of the Boeing 707's capability to make the Moscow run nonstop, although it has done so and Pan American is now operating a weekly nonstop service with this model 707 from New York to Buenos Aires. This covers 5,445 miles, compared to 4,660 miles from Moscow to New York.

Until the Soviets present more bona fides on their willingness to exchange civil aviation data fairly and comply with international technical standards by joining the International Civil Aviation Organization (instead of just maintaining that their standards are equal), and until the United States can find some less nebulous benefits from this operation, we think President Johnson would be well advised to shelve this project and devote attention to advancing this Nation's commerce and diplomacy more tangibly.

The Disgraceful Bobby Baker Probe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a congressional investigation is supposed to find out the facts. It is obvious that in the other body, where the chairman of the investigating committee is a former partner of Bobby Baker and the Secretary of Commerce, there has been quite a bit of foot dragging, to put it charitably.

In the March 6 edition of Long Island's Newsday, Don Smith enumerates what has not been looked into thus far. Suffice it to say this is absolutely disgraceful.

The Loose Ends in Baker Probe

(By Don Smith)

Washington.—The Senate Rules Committee is trying to figure out where to go next

in the Bobby Baker case, but still has not cleared up several conflicts in previous testimony. Loose ends abound in the case, but it is questionable if they will ever be tied into a neat package.

The Justice Department has been carefully sifting all testimony gathered by the Senate committee and has been staging its own quiet look into Baker's affairs. But unless the Department presents the matter to a Federal grand jury many of the issues may never be cleared up.

Baker, who could shed some light on these issues and resolve some conflicts in testimony, has refused to answer questions. His secretary, Carole Tyler, and a business partner, Edward Levinson, have also clammed up. Two other Baker associates may be brought before the committee, but they are also expected to keep quiet about their deals with Baker.

Still in a murky twilight area are these issues and conflicts:

Call girls: Two Republican members of the committee, HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania and CARL T. CURTIS of Nebraska, have charged that prostitutes played a major role in Baker's business success but no witnesses have publicly testified about this matter.

Page boys: A former page, Boyd Ritchie, has said he was ordered by Baker to pay $50 a month to a page in the Air Force but asked Lyndon Johnson, then Vice President, to intercede on his behalf. None of the pages have been called to testify.

Television advertising time: Insurance man Don B. Reynolds has testified that he sold $200,000 worth of life insurance to Johnson when Johnson was majority leader of the Senate and in return he had to buy air time on Johnson's Austin station. Reynolds said that a White House aid and long-time Johnson associate, Walter Jenkins, had a hand in the arrangements. Jenkins, in an affidavit filed with the committee, has denied any knowledge of the advertising arrangements. Republicans have urged that Jenkins be called to explain the conflict of testimony but no decision has been made by the committee and no other advertisers or television station personnel have been called.

Campaign funds: CURTIS has asked Baker about contributions to the National Democratic Committee over which Baker had custody until 1961. Baker refused to answer. No officials of the national organization have been called.

Abortion: Reynolds has testified that when a woman customer asked him about a possible abortion, he recommended that she talk to Baker. Reynolds said he didn't know what the result of the contact was but that months later the woman stopped him and thanked him for his advice. Baker refused to answer when asked if he had referred persons to a Puerto Rican doctor for abortions.

West Virginia timber deal: Baker business associates Thomas Webb and Francis Law were given timber-cutting rights on State-owned lands in West Virginia, reportedly in return for helping to bring industry into the State. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, a member of the committee, has denied any part in this transaction and has said the move of two Melpar Co. plants into his State was not due to help from Baker. Baker was closely associated with Melpar and its president, Edwin M. Bostick. Webb and Law have testified but they were questioned about the timber deal.

The stereo set: Reynolds has presented bills and canceled checks showing he paid for a stereo set given to Johnson. He said Baker urged him to send it to Johnson. The President has said he thought the stereo set came from Baker. Reynolds maintains that Johnson must have known who actually gave him the set because of the bills. Baker refused to testify about the matter.

Hotel-restaurant deals: Baker was involved in some Howard Johnson hotel-restaurant deals in North Carolina with Commerce Secretary Hodges and Hodges was also in business with Rules Committee Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, in other Howard Johnson restaurants but no persons have been called to testify about Baker's interests in this area.

The Carousel Motel: Murchison associate Robert F. Thompson has presented to the committee a letter in which he offered to buy the Carousel Motel for $1,500,000 in November 1962. Baker's Carousel partner, Mrs. Gertrude Novak, testified she was not told of the offer and that the motel was finally sold for less money to the vending machine company, Serv-U, in which Baker holds a controlling interest with Fred B. Black, Jr. Mrs. Novak also testified that Baker kept huge bundles of cash in his Senate office.

Haitian meat deal: Baker's law partner Ernest Tucker has testified that commission money from a Haitian meat deal went only to Baker. William Kentor, a Chicago meat importer who has been paying a half-cent a pound commission to the Baker-Tucker firm, said all checks were made out to the firm as a firm and not to Baker alone. CURTIS has suggested that the whole arrangement was a cover to mask a payoff to Baker from the wealthy Murchison family of Texas for his assistance on legislation. Baker, in addition to the commission from the importer, has been guaranteed up to $30,000 a year from the meat company itself.

Capitol Vending Machine Co.: This company said it paid $5,600 to Baker to get their machines into Melpar plants and Baker then turned around and had them kicked out so the Interstate Vending Machine Co. could come in. Interstate officials have said they had to buy 100 machines from the Serv-U firm as part of the transaction. Capitol touched off the whole Baker investigation when it filed a civil suit against Baker.

D.C. Stadium: Still clouded are details of the award of the stadium building contract to Matthew McCloskey, a Democratic Party fundraiser. McCloskey huddled with Baker and others in Baker's Senate office and promised that a performance bond insurance deal would go to Reynolds if McCloskey got the job. Baker was listed as an officer of Reynolds' insurance outfit and was paid $4,000 by Reynolds when the firm got the performance bond business from McCloskey who built the stadium.

Gambling: Baker, Levinson, and two Miami men, Benjamin Sigelbaum and Jack Cooper, were interested in bidding on gambling concessions in the Caribbean. Baker set up meetings with officials who ran the hotels in which the casinos were located. It has not been determined what investment, if any, Baker has in any gambling casinos in the Caribbean or in Las Vegas where Levinson has a hotel.

Land deals: Baker, Scott I. Peek, a former aid to Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, and SMATHERS were involved in a land investment in Florida which has been paying them better than $1,000 a year since 1957. SMATHERS explained the deal to the Rules Committee but his explanation has never been made public. Peek is to testify shortly.

Bank and stock deals: Baker has been linked with more than 59 loans from 22 banks involving just under $3 million. Many of the loans were secured by stocks bought with the funds borrowed. One loan, a $54,000 disaster loan Baker received from the Small Business Administration for repair of the Carousel after storm damage, has been questioned by some Senators.

The Serv-U Co.'s overnight success: This vending machine firm, headed by Baker and Fred Black, Jr. (former consultant for North American Aviation Corp.) replaced older established vending outfits in some North American plants and has leaped from a shoestring outfit to one with a capitalization of more than $3,500,000. Other Serv-U stockholders include Levinson, Sigelbaum, and Cooper

Carole Tyler's role: Baker's secretary, Miss Tyler, lived in a $28,000 townhouse Baker owned and was listed as his cousin. There has been no explanation of a trip she and Baker made with Mrs. Ellen Rometsch to New Orleans and then to Florida in 1962. Mrs. Rometsch, the former wife of a German soldier stationed in Washington, was a hostess at the Baker-owned Quorum Club, a small bar in a hotel near the Capitol which had a large clientele of lobbyists and Senators. Mrs. Rometsch has been identified as a prostitute who plied her trade in the top levels of Government.

Foreign Policy in a Rapidly Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of his receipt of the 1963 Silver Quill Award from the National Business Publications Association, Gen. Lucius D. Clay made some important comments on the nature of our foreign policy in a rapidly changing world. Pointing out that the increased strength of the countries decimated by World War II and the growing number of newly independent nations require alterations in our policy, General Clay called for a "careful reappraisal of our foreign policy which has been carried out for many years by both political parties."

Under unanimous consent I include General Clay's remarks, delivered at the February 6 dinner, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF GEN. LUCIUS D. CLAY IN RECEIVING THE 1963 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, FEBRUARY 6, 1964, THE SHERATON-PARK, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, Fred, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen—between the music and Fred's words—I am very deeply touched. I'm also, of course, honored to receive the Silver Quill from the National Business Publications and I am grateful to Fred Kappel that he came here to present this award and, I can only say of his overly kind introduction, that it comes from a friend and a friendship that I value very much indeed.

If it is true that a man is known by the company which he keeps, then I may say that my reputation has been made tonight as I join the distinguished group of men who have been honored with this award.

When our Army chorus sang "Old King Cole," I couldn't help but think of some 35 or 40 years ago when we used to sing it in Panama with a stein of beer beating time as the words rolled out. But, I would have to say this, if the generals have gotten so that they say the Army has gone to pot instead of saying it has gone to hell, then it has gone to hell.

I also had quite a profound and lengthy speech to make tonight, but standing in the receiving line with the wife of our Chairman, Mrs. Watson, she said to me: "Are you going to speak very long tonight?" I said, "Well,

reasonably so," and she said, "Anything you say under 10 minutes will be better than anything you say after 10 minutes." I shall try to live up to her recommendations.

Last year, Mr. Kappel spoke to you on the Challenge of Universal Communication and the contributions that a Telstar satellite could make in improving world communications and, in reading his speech, I could not help but think of the tremendous communication facilities which we have available here at home. And yet, how difficult it still remains for us to really communicate with each other.

It has been my privilege to have served the Government in several capacities over many years and also to have had the opportunity to be part of the business community. In serving Government, I learned not only to appreciate the complexity of its operations but also to have a great respect for those who devote their lives to government service. It is too often the tendency of the business community to think of the Government employee as lacking in ambition and drive—on the other hand, too frequently the Government employee looks upon the business community as being composed of those who place profits above service and who think very little of the welfare of their country as a whole. Personally, I found very little difference in the abilities and dedication of those who work in government and those who work in business and industry. Thus, to my mind, both of these opinions, to the extent that they exist, are wrong. And yet, they do exist to an extent which makes it difficult for mutual understanding and confidence. Perhaps the business community must accept a larger share of responsibility for this lack of understanding. Concerned as it is with its own specific problems, it does not devote sufficient time to convince others of its recognition that business can succeed and prosper only in a United States with a growing economy living in a world of peace.

I realize that our national business publications are for the most part specialized publications serving our major industries and that their basic concern is with the problems which confront the specific industries which they serve. Nevertheless, they are also a part of the free press of a free country and, thus they must accept the responsibility which are those of a free press. They too must be concerned with the improvement of communication and the development of better understanding—not just within the industry which they serve—not just within the business community—but also between the business community, government and the American people. Perhaps at no time in our history has there been a greater need for such understanding.

Of course, no country is ever entirely free of problems, and today we are faced with some very difficult problems here at home. And yet, we can face them with the confidence of a free people who have learned self-discipline, who have learned how to govern themselves and who live in a still expanding economy which has given us for many years the highest standard of living that has ever been enjoyed by any other people. It is an economy which appears to be entering into a new period of growth, particularly if those Senators who could not be here tonight do what we all think they should do.

This gives us a further opportunity to solve the problem of unemployment—which has resulted, in part, from our ability to produce more with less manpower—to thus achieve a major step in the war against poverty. And, in finding a solution to this problem, we may also do much to solve our civil rights problem—the intensity of which has been increased by lack of opportunity for economic betterment for so many of our Negro citizens. More importantly, we know this problem is wih us and we are taking steps so that it will be a decreasing problem in the passing years.

While these are major problems, which are dicult to resolve, as we look around the world it is difficult to find any other nation with internal problems more subject to solution and less threatening to its way of life than are our own. Nevertheless, we can no longer live alone, nor can we continue to grow and prosper unless there is peace throughout the world.

The security provided by our ocean barriers began to disappear with the advent of the long-range bomber and was lost forever with the development of intercontinental missiles. Thus, we have learned since World War II, that events anywhere affect our economy and our way of life.

We live in a world in which there is still too little mutual understanding and in which better communications and understanding are more important than ever before. To a world left in chaos by World War II and threatened by Communist takeover, we provided both the leadership and the financial aid to enable other free peoples to regain economic opportunity and political stability, to restore the courage and confidence which made such recovery possible. We also provided directly or indirectly supported military screens around the periphery of the world—thus preventing its eploitations by force or by threat of force. And, as we had the political leadership and maturity to undertake this task is something in which we can take great pride. It was a grand concept and it did make it possible for the great free-world countries—lying prostrate in the aftermath of war—to again become great and independent. However, as was to be expected with their recovery, they are no longer willing to follow the leader. Their governments must now take into consideration their own national aspirations and desires. Perhaps the great concept which made free-world recovery possible may have become at least partially outmoded. Many of the countries which we helped to become strong and independent again no longer agree with us as to the importance of this concept or as to how it should be attained. We no longer have the uninamity of thought and action which we did have and which we would like to have in the free world.

I have no suggestion as to how we may establish a better understanding and closer cooperation than now exists among the great free nations, except to say that the need for this understanding and cooperation is as pressing as ever. We live in a world of change in which perhaps the major change since World War II has been the restoration and strength in power of the great countries of the free world and this is a change which we must recognize. Perhaps it indicates that the time has come for a careful reappraisal of our foreign policy which has been carried out for many years by both political parties. Perhaps the time has passed in which regional agreements for mutual security or for mutual economic improvement can be effective—in view of the many differences in the national aspirations of the nations which enter into such agreements. Perhaps the time has come in which we cannot direct our efforts to help and please so many but must rather determine those countries in which our mutual interests do not conflict with their national interests and do suffice to provide a basis for close and lasting friendship.

However, the real point that I would like to make is that, no nation can have a successful foreign policy unless it expresses the views and beliefs of its people.

Mr. Kappel last year pointed out our need for broad unity of purpose and that it could only be established in dialogue and debate. Perhaps nowhere is there greater need for unity of purpose than in our foreign policy which, to succeed, must reflect the moral conscience, the ideals and the aspirations of our people. We have much to contribute to maintaining peace and political stability throughout the world, we have much to lose if we fail.

We in the business community should be the first to realize that our ability to grow and prosper requires a sound foreign policy which maintains close and friendly relations with other great free countries and works in close cooperation with them to maintain freedom wherever it exists and peace throughout the world. We must not rest content in the hope that others will create such a policy but must take part in the dialogue and accept our share of the responsibility for its development. Thank you once more for the honor you have given me tonight.

The Citizen's Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest among the nation's high school students. This year 250,000 young Americans participated in the contest. For the final judging when top awards of four scholarships are given to the four national winners, the winning contestant from each State is brought to the Nation's Capital as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This year's winner from the District of Columbia is James Beard, of 4956 Neptune Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. I should like to insert in the Record his winning speech, titled "The Citizen's Responsibilities":

THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

(By James Beard)

A government which is in the hands of the people necessitates an intelligent population so that it will function smoothly. Democracy, of its very nature, gives the people the reins and at the same time allows for the development of each citizen's individual personality. Most people know our Government grants the freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly; but this freedom of individual development is perhaps the greatest of the freedoms democracy affords. Taking advantage of the opportunities available to us, we can become any kind of citizen we wish. We can be a citizen who has the zeal of Patrick Henry when he declared, "Give me liberty or give me death." Or, we can go to the other extreme and be only the "sunshine patriot" of the propagandist Thomas Paine. But with the fullness of patriotic development we should protest as Daniel Webster did: Don't consider me only a Massachusetts man. Don't consider me only a northerner; but do consider me an American.

Although we all are not as well known as these famous patriots, and we probably will not make such an indelible mark in the events of our country's history as these men have, our country still gives us the same benefits and in equal quantity as it gave these men. These men, however, realized that they owed their success to our country, just as we do. We owe a lifelong debt to our

country because we have our pleasant existence and we owe every success to the freedom endowed to us by our country.

Realizing our debt, we think that the best way to repay it is by being a good citizen, doing what our country asks: so we pay taxes, vote, don't litter the streets and serve in the armed forces. Knowing that we do all these simple things, we feel satisfied within ourselves. But, have we really made repayment to our country? We have perhaps alleviated a little of our country's problems. However, we must also realize that as we become conscientious, well read and active Americans, we can be not just a spectator of government, but a participator in government. How do we become conscientious Americans? Perhaps knowing the fundamentals of our Government set down in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence is the best way. To be ever mindful of what we as Americans believe would definitely create a greater feeling of friendship with our fellow countrymen. Our forefathers who laid foundations for the country spoke for all Americans that were and were to be. In the Declaration of Independence they wrote, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." If the realization of the meaning of this statement serves as a motivation for action toward our fellow citizens, one of our country's greatest problems, that of civil rights, would be eradicated. Should we experience the force of such a realization, we would be repaying our debt.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a fine essay on "The Challenge of Citizenship" written by Miss Ann Lewis Booker, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Booker, of 2833 General Pershing Street, New Orleans, my home city. Miss Booker's essay won first place in my State of Louisiana as the top speech in the "Voice of Democracy" contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the National Association of Broadcasters. Miss Booker, who is a senior this year at Ursuline Convent in New Orleans, wrote her prize-winning essay in competition with about 3,000 other high school students in Louisiana.

As a result of her splendid essay, Miss Booker joined 49 other State winners in this contest and winners from the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and Japan, in a week-long, all-expenses-paid trip to Valley Forge, Pa.; to Philadelphia, and then to our Nation's Capital. The Louisiana Association of Broadcasters also awarded Miss Booker a $200 cash scholarship for her winning speech. She will compete with the other 52 winners for one of the four national scholarships awarded by the VFW this week in Washington.

On her visit to Washington, Miss Booker visited the White House, the U.S. Capitol, the grave of the late President John F. Kennedy in Arlington Cemetery, and many other points of historic interest in the Nation's Capital and its environs. She has written a most thought-provoking speech for the contest, and I am happy and proud to commend it to my colleagues as a fine example of the devotion and dedication of our young people to their country.

The essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Miss Ann Lewis Booker, New Orleans, La.)

Behold the citizen. He is the coalminer standing up and crying out for better working conditions at the union meeting. He is the young man just made 21 as he enters the voting machine for the first time. He is the drowsy doctor rushing to the hospital at 3 a.m.; the lawyer debating his conception of justice in court; the news reporter working hours overtime to keep the public informed during national crisis. He is the Red Cross volunteer working to accommodate the hoards of people after public disaster. He is the espionage agent lurking behind enemy lines hated by his own countrymen for his treachery.

Behold the citizen. He is the dazed young man who holds the 8 pound bundle of life in his arms as the words, "It's a girl, Mr. Taylor," ring through his ears. He is the same unselfish father 22 years later who steps into the background and hears this same child say to another, "I take thee to be my lawful wedded husband."

Behold the citizen. He is the nuclear scientist pouring hours over the solution to the atomic problem. He is the writer meticulously gathering every bit of information for his next novel. He is the captain of the football team working out strategy for tomorrow's game, the math major giving up his time to help a failing classmate. He is the civics student learning of the principles on which this Nation was founded.

Behold the citizen. Foreigners watch him with admiration. They see in him a self-confident friend bursting with energy and vigor. They see him as part of a giant nation taking the helm, leading the world in the ideals of fraternal friendship, scientific advancement, and effective democracy.

Behold the citizen. He is the Boy Scout who stands at attention as he sees the Stars and Stripes flying halfmast. He is the astronaut meditating a few last minutes on those same Stars and Stripes before rocketing into the unknown. He is the martyred soldier lying on the battlefield as his troops march on to victory.

He is to be found in the office, on the beach and at church. Right now he is writing a cookbook, he is writing history. He is running a grocery store, he is running the shipping industry. He is fixing your TV set. He is fixing the Atlas missile.

He is the vitality that makes this Nation great. He is every man and any man who recognizes his responsibility to be courageous and has the courage to accept his responsibility.

Behold the citizen.

Supersonic Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the development of a supersonic transport has been the subject of considerable interest and concern, and also debate and controversy. Construction of a supersonic transport, the Concorde, was first announced by the British and French, and more recently, our aircraft manufacturing industry responded to a bid proposal to build an American SST. Three of the major airframe manufacturers, Lockheed, North American, and Boeing, responded to the proposal and they have already expended large sums primarily in areas of research, study, and design.

Although there are questions with regard to the economic feasibility of producing a supersonic aircraft, there is also the feeling that we cannot afford to default our responsibility and surrender the long acknowledged leadership of our aircraft industry. If we are to preserve our national prestige and remain in the forefront, it is vital that we progress in this area. We have the capability and superiority to accomplish this, beyond question.

It is significant to note that even though our SST program has advanced only to the preliminary planning stage, payments to reserve delivery position priorities have now been made for 75 of our American-built planes. This confidence is displayed not by our own U.S. carriers alone, but by 10 foreign airlines that have made deposits for the purchase of the SST.

Recently, Mr. Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., president of Trans World Airlines, expressed his views on the supersonic transport program at a press conference in Los Angeles. His comments were widely quoted, and I believe they merit the attention of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD Mr. Tillinghast's statement appraising the SST program.

U.S. SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT IN DANGER

(Statement by Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., president, Trans World Airlines)

I should like to refer this morning to a matter of some national urgency. It concerns the supersonic transport program of the United States. I fear that, unless a major overhaul of the U.S. program is made very soon, America's dream of a successful supersonic transport will die on the drawing board—with it America's historic world leadership in aircraft design, manufacture, and export.

There are many fine things about the U.S. program developed by the Federal Aviation Agency, but there are at least two big errors in policy, either of which, if permitted to continue, could be fatal. The errors in policy are not technological, for we have no doubt that the aviation industries of California, Washington or other States can produce the finest supersonic airplane in the world. The fatal mistakes are economic in nature:

1. First, the Federal Government's insistence that the manufacturers put up at least 25 percent of the estimated $1 billion needed to develop such an aircraft. The truth is that they just do not have that kind of money. Having in mind that none of the builders of subsonic commercial jets—the ones we're flying now—has so much as broken even on them it is completely unrealistic to expect them to take such a gamble.

2. The second mistake is the Government's insistence, before it really knows what the economics will prove to be, on recovering its share of the development cost. The Government plans to get its money back in the form of royalities from the airlines. This, too, may doom the program, it may well

price the American product off the market, in favor of the cheaper and royalty-free British-French supersonic aircraft, the Concorde, which will cost around $10 million, compared to between $25 and $40 million for the U.S. supersonic transport—all figures subject to escalation.

NEED FOR GOVERNMENT SPONSORSHIP

When it comes to the SST, debating the relative merits of private enterprise versus Government sponsorship is a waste of time. In fact, there is no time for a national debate. Of course, we wish that the U.S. program could be undertaken on a strictly private basis, without the need for Government assistance. It is largely on this basis that the U.S. aircraft industry has produced generation after generation of finer commercial aircraft and achieved undisputed world leadership—to a point where this industry has become one of America's prime sources of export.

In the case of the supersonic transport, a combination of circumstances calls for direct Government action. One obvious reason is that traditional Government support will not be forthcoming indirectly through the military, because the Department of Defense is not at this time undertaking a military supersonic transport program. (Although it must be understood that any civil development will certainly have valuable military application.)

An immediate need for direct Government action is the fact that the financial requirements and risks are so vast as to be way beyond private industry's reach. Another factor—one that forces our hand in this matter—is the action of the British and French Governments. They have teamed up to underwrite the entire development of the Concorde, and they do not plan to recover any of their investment in the sale price of the aircraft, or from royalties. Rather, they expect to recoup their investment by creating a gigantic new industry and capturing a new world market for France and England, and by dominating international air commerce.

So you cannot realistically discuss the supersonic transport solely in terms of private enterprise. To do so suggests that our private sector (with its markedly higher labor costs) compete with the combined financial resources of the British and French Governments. This our private sector simply cannot do.

NATIONAL URGENCY

Yet, the hard fact of life remains: our European friends are stealing the march on us, and—unless America acts decisively—they are going to corner the world market for supersonic planes. The consequences of U.S. default are unthinkable:

(1) Loss, perhaps for all time, of U.S. leadership in aircraft manufacture.

(2) A multibillion-dollar loss to our national economy. U.S. aircraft production has provided work for some 5,000 aircraft, engine and components manufacturers and suppliers and jobs for tens of thousands.

The production and sale of commercial transport aircraft have pumped $7 billion directly into the national economy just since the dawn of the jet age in 1958. About 20 percent of this accrued from sales abroad.

The economic impact of aircraft manufacture in California is reflected in the fact that Convair, Douglas, and Lockheed alone have accounted for some $4.7 billion in transport aircraft sales since World War II.

As we look into the supersonic era, we see a global market exceeding $10 billion in the 1970's. The head of the FAA says a total of 30,000 to 45,000 management, engineering, and manufacturing personnel would be employed on the supersonic transport for a 15-year period. He adds that if there is no continuing major transport market, this force of talent wil be faced with a "costly and unhappy conversion to other work which may or may not be available."

(3) Accentuation of the U.S. gold-flow problem by becoming a buyer instead of a seller of supersonics would seriously hurt our country. The U.S. airlines are going supersonic. We've got to. And if we have to go to Europe to get them, it will be tantamount to delivering $10 million in gold bullion across the Atlantic for every Concorde we fly back home.

4. Impairing the competitive ability of the U.S. airlines by subjecting them to the grace of their competitors for the sinews of competition. (Both Air France and BOAC are Government controlled.)

5. Reduction of the effectiveness of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, the U.S. airlines' military airlift reserve program, due to the U.S. airlines' SST's, which will inevitably be assigned to CRAF, not being U.S.-designed, U.S.-tooled, U.S.-built, U.S.-stockpiled, U.S.-serviced and U.S.-maintained.

U.S. CHALLENGE

The challenge to the United States is clear. It is to design and build an SST which is:

1. Technically superior, so that it can compete effectively against the Concorde at a higher price, which is inevitable because our labor rates are about twice those in Europe;

2. Priced competitively, so that the airlines can afford to buy it;

3. Economically efficient, so that the airlines can afford to operate it; and

4. Timed competitively; that is, built on a schedule which is reasonably competitive with the Concorde.

This means that the Government must overhaul its present program drastically. It must enlarge its developmental commitment, recognize its investment as a safeguard, indeed a stimulant, to the national economy and security, and keep vigilant against foot-draggers.

We at TWA have felt this sense of urgency for some time. It motivated us to make a commitment for the first supersonic aircraft to be built in the United States.

If any may think I have been unnecessarily "viewing with alarm," let me remind you that the inroads of foreign manufacture on our aircraft industry are already real and substantial. In the last few years, U.S. airlines have received or placed orders for more than $700 million worth of foreign built aircraft, engines, and spare parts. These include Viscounts, Caravelles, BAC 111's, CL 44's, etc.

We ourselves have found it necessary to order four Concordes. We may find it necessary as a matter of protective insurance to commit for additional Concordes. Beyond this, we have not yet found it necessary to look overseas for our airplanes.

The $700 million which other airlines have so far seen fit to commit to spend abroad may well be the first trickle through a leak in the dike, presaging a flood tide of American gold flowing to foreign coffers if our Government does not recogniez the problem and act effectively to correct it.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Foreign Policy—Resolution of Maryland Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 26, 1964, the Senate of Maryland adopted a resolution, the first sentence of which reads as follows:

The Senate of Maryland is deeply concerned over the foreign policies of the United States and the low ebb to which this great country has come in the esteem and affection of the rest of the world.

I submit, Mr. President, that the deep concern expressed by the Senate of Maryland reflects the disillusionment of all Americans with our foreign policy. Yet, those charged with the administration of our foreign policy seem only to defend the mistakes of the past in preparation for the defeats of the future.

The trouble with our foreign policy seems to be that we do not have a foreign policy. We do not have clearly defined goals, and our methods are not designed to achieve victory. The American people deserve something more than the insults and embarrassments which our country continues to suffer throughout the world.

Our economic aid program has been costly and has won us few friends. Our military commitments have been met with failure and have made us many enemies. Recently, the President announced plans to review our entire foreign policy. I commend the President for recognizing the need for a complete overhaul of this policy. It is my sincere hope that this review will be comprehensive and will result in new ideas and new methods for achieving clearly defined goals.

If we continue on our present course, we can expect the American people to raise their voices in opposition to American foreign policy. The resolution adopted by the Senate of Maryland reflects this growing opposition. Mr. President, in order that my colleagues may be apprised of the feelings of the members of the Maryland Senate on this question, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 1, adopted by the Senate of Maryland on February 26, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 1

A resolution of the Senate of Maryland concerning the foreign policy of the United States

The Senate of Maryland is deeply concerned over the foreign policies of the United States and the low ebb to which this great country has come in the esteem and affection of the rest of the world.

This senate is part of a general assembly which since the year 1635 has carried forward the best traditions of representative government. It represents more than 3 million loyal and patriotic citizens who love and are devoted to the United States of America. Our concern stems from the fearful and apologetic approach of this Nation in its foreign relationships. Today our few friends disregard us, and our enemies—who are legion—range from active dislike to positive hate in their hostility to us.

The current crisis in Guantanamo Bay is simply the latest in a long and dreary series of diplomatic defeats. Throughout the world our citizens are killed, our private property is expropriated, our people are spat upon. The United States—great, proud, vital Nation that it is—responds with words in "a memorandum suggesting a mild disapproval of you." The Senate of Maryland proposes that the issues are too important and the stakes are too elemental to depend any longer upon Gilbert and Sullivan diplomacy.

Consider the record.

In Cuba an armed international communistic conspiracy is firmly entrenched only 90 miles from our shores. For a few brief days in the fall of 1962, following weeks during which our leaders denied the obvious threat, this Nation responded as of old. However, Russian troops still infest the island and Russian armaments are still in evidence. This small island has become a cancer of totalitarianism pointing at the very heart of the Western Hemisphere. Agents trained there are now exporting their venom and poison to all parts of the world. Treaties solemnly entered into with the United States are broken at will and there is seemingly no end to the insults this country will absorb from the Island of Cuba.

In Panama Communist-led riots, with overtones of Castro chicanery, threaten the greatest bastion of our foreign and military policy—the Panama Canal. When the United States in mild answer mentions a possible reduction in the amount of foreign aid funds paid to Panama, we get back the fantastic threat to complain to the United Nations that we are guilty of economic retaliation. To date in its dealings in the latest episode in Panama this country seems only to have suggested in a telephone message "that we talk things over."

In Berlin we allowed a massive wall to be erected separating the East and the West. The fact that this was contrary to treaty obligations matters not at all, and this country has permitted the continuation of this travesty upon the rights of supposedly free people.

On the Continent of Africa the new nations that have been formed with the active support and intervention of the United States have now turned upon the democratic and republican institutions in the name of which they were created and are demonstrating anew that democracy is a way of life and not a form of organization.

Russia seemingly with impunity kills American aviators so that since 1950 upward of 60 American aviators have lost their lives to Russia.

In Zanzibar our diplomats are arrested. In South America a former Vice President was spat upon. A former President canceled a trip to Japan in fear of a violent reception.

It does no credit to the free world and accomplishes no good for the preservation of democratic institutions that the United States should cower in its tents at these provocations. There are those among us who counsel this type of moderation for fear of war. They forget that for 18 years the initiative in the issue of war or peace has been with Russia and not with the United States. They forget the decade during which Britain and France appeased the dictators (the decade "while England slept"), to no avail except to strengthen the course of evil. They forget that a job in Cuba which might have been easily accomplished in the spring of 1961 at the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, now will be imcomparably, harder, and the job becomes still harder with every passing day.

The Senate of Maryland proposes that we put an end to our customary policy of appeasement, that we reassert our historic Monroe Doctrine, that we uphold our country and our people. Only an America that is respected and free from contempt can lead the world to the rule of reason in international affairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That we propose to the United States and to all its officials and agencies the basic reexamination of the foreign policy of this country to the end that the rights and dignities of our people and of our institutions be asserted and defended wherever threatened; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate of the Senate of Maryland be requested to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

By the senate, February 26, 1964.

Read and adopted.

By order, J. Waters Parrish, secretary.

WILLIAM S. JAMES,
President of the Senate.
J. WATERS PARRISH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Say It Isn't So

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal was headlined "North Woods' Woes—Mining,

Lumbering Ills Bring Poverty to Upper Peninsula in Michigan—Jobless Rate Rivals Appalachia's." I feel the unfortunate headline and opening paragraphs of the story create a false impression of our beloved Upper Peninsula. It is entirely inappropriate to compare the Upper Peninsula to Appalachia. As the accompanying editorial from the Escanaba Daily Press points out, this is "poverty by association."

Unlike Appalachia, the Upper Peninsula has continued to develop its natural resources and expand and improve its facilities to encourage and enlarge a thriving tourist industry. Michigan's Upper Peninsula has been blessed by nature's contribution and man's preservation of an abundance of forests and inland lakes surrounded by the largest and purest body of fresh water in the Nation.

Certainly, we have had and continue to have problems. We are plagued by seasonal unemployment, but this situation is improving and steps are being taken by the people of the Upper Peninsula to correct it. I can assure the people of the United States that the Upper Peninsula has much to offer—both in the way of recreational facilities and resources and other requisites for industrial expansion. Fortunately, the Wall Street Journal article did go on to mention these facts. However, to set the record straight, I include both the Wall Street Journal article and an excellent editorial from the Escanaba Daily Press which correctly portrays the Upper Peninsula as a land of opportunity and emphatically not a "Little Appalachia":

[From the Wall Street Journal]

NORTH WOODS' WOES—MINING, LUMBERING ILLS BRING POVERTY TO UPPER PENINSULA IN MICHIGAN—UPPER GREAT LAKES' JOBLESS RATE RIVALS APPALACHIA'S; AREA FIGHTS FOR RECOVERY—AWAITING JOHNSON'S PROGRAM

(By Frederick Taylor)

IRONWOOD, MICH.—Four decades ago this city on the western boundary of Michigan's Upper Peninsula had 20,000 people and 18 busy iron mines within the city limits. Reveling in prosperity, officials erected a $450,000 city hall replete with marble entryway and swimming pool.

Today Ironwood has only 9,000 citizens, every mine is boarded up, and officials complain the city cannot afford the $30,000 a year needed to maintain the city hall for 10 employees. "We could run this city a whole lot cheaper out of an office over a drugstore if we could find someone to take the 'marble shack' off our hands," says City Manager Kenneth E. Long.

Ironwood's plight is shared, to some degree at least, by a broad area embracing the entire Upper Peninsula, or U.P. as it is called, and the northern one-third to one-half of Wisconsin and Minnesota. In this upper Great Lakes region, the slump in iron and copper mining over recent decades has brought widespread joblessness and poverty. The collapse of large-scale lumbering and the difficulties of marginal farmland in the area have added to its woes.

Despite such problems, which approach those of Appalachia, the Great Lakes area has received far less national attention than has the Eastern mountain region where unemployed coal miners keep jobless totals high. Appalachia, of course, is far more populous. Its 16 million people in 9 States compare with only 1.3 million in the 53 troubled counties in northern areas of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. And the poorest in Appalachia are much worse off than their counterparts in the upper Great Lakes area, few of whom go hungry or shoeless. But problems of the Great Lakes region are severe.

INCOMES LOW, JOBLESSNESS HIGH

Unemployment rates, for example, typically run twice the national average in both the Great Lakes area and Appalachia. One Upper Peninsula county posted a 28-percent jobless level recently. And, in both regions, incomes of about 30 percent of all families fall below $3,000 yearly, comprising the group the Government designates as the poor.

A big question in the minds of people here is whether President Johnson will remember them when he delivers his message to Congress, perhaps this week, outlining his "war on poverty." President Kennedy, shortly before his death, had planned to meet with Governors and Congressmen of the three States to talk over steps to alleviate the area's problems. An upper Great Lakes study commission, perhaps similar to the Appalachian Regional Commission set up by Mr. Kennedy, has been discussed.

Whether or not President Johnson singles out the upper Great Lakes area for special Federal attention, the region's problems won't vanish overnight. A closeup look at the Upper Peninsula graphically points up the deep-seated nature of the area's difficulties. And it shows how the people there are fighting to pull themselves out of their economic slump.

THE TOLEDO WAR

The Upper Peninsula's 16,500-square-mile area is nearly one-third of Michigan. It's been a treasure house for American industry for more than a century, yet it remains little known outside the State except, possibly, as the setting for much of Longfellow's "The Song of Hiawatha." Its only land connection is to Wisconsin, of which it was once a part during territorial days. Congress gave the Upper Peninsula to Michigan in a compromise settlement of the "Toledo war," a border skirmish in 1835 between Michigan and Ohio over a strip of land which now includes the city of Toledo.

The Upper Peninsula long was a major asset to Michigan, but now it has more troubles than you can count:

While Michigan's population more than doubled since 1920, the Upper Peninsula's dropped 8 percent to 306,000.

At the peak of iron output around 1920 there were more than 150 mines at work on the three Upper Peninsula ranges—the Marquette, Menominee, and Gogebic—employing 15,000 miners. Today, only 15 mines still operate and employ fewer than 4,000. At the height of the copper boom here, some 20,000 miners worked more than 100 mines. Today, only 9 mines still operate, employing 3,000.

Lumbering and allied wood-using industries today provide the equivalent of 18,000 full-time jobs, the largest Upper Peninsula industry. But that's less than one-third of the payroll years ago.

People in the Upper Peninsula exult when the unemployment rate gets down to a mere 6 percent, as it did last October when the State as a whole, enjoying a great auto year, dropped to 3.5 percent. But as winter began closing in on the Upper Peninsula unemployment began climbing back toward the "normal" rate of 12 to 15 percent.

Most of the peninsula's problems stem from the law of supply and demand. Great natural riches still remain, though it's often not economic to develop them. By one estimate, only 10 to 15 percent of copper in the Upper Peninsula has been mined. Since 1845, Upper Peninsula copper mines produced 10.9 billion pounds of copper, more than the entire world's output last year. At one time more than half of all world copper production came from the peninsula.

The underground copper mines of the Upper Peninsula lost their competitive edge as mining companies were forced to dig deeper to tap rich veins. They began to close when open pit mines in the Southwestern United States and overseas exploited lower grade ores to produce cheaper copper.

Roughly the same thing happened in iron mining. Since 1854, more than 800 million tons of Upper Peninsula iron ore have been produced, equal to a year and a half of current world output. Even so, there are estimates that more than twice that amount still remains in the hills of the peninsula. But the underground iron mines became less and less profitable as they went deeper. Higher grade veins were opened in Canada, Venezuela, Liberia, and elsewhere. Meanwhile, Minnesota's Mesabi Range, also troubled by the exhaustion of rich underground ores, got the jump on the Upper Peninsula by developing enriching and pelletizing processes to make open-pit iron mining economical.

The virgin forests which once covered the Upper Peninsula provided, along with mining, the attraction that boomed this area nearly 100 years ago. First pine, and then hardwood forests were logged, but, by the start of World War II, cutting of these virgin stands was over. Today the Upper Peninsula remains 89 percent forested, but the trees—mostly fast-growing aspen and second-growth hardwoods—provide little lumber.

Despite this gloomy economic history there are faint signs the tide is beginning to turn. For one thing, Upper Peninsulans, after decades of apathy, are beginning to recognize that any improvements that take place will largely be of their own doing.

STUDYING SEWERS AND SENILITY

Ironwood, for example, has just spent $8,000 (with another $16,000 from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency) for a 294-page study of the city that covers everything from sewers to senility of the population, complete with recommendations for improvement. "The very fact we've got this study shows a reversal of attitudes of the past," says City Manager Long.

In Gogebic County, of which Ironwood is part, a committee called the Gogebic Organization for an Industrially New County, or Go, Inc., was formed recently. It quickly raised $118,000 from local sources to spur industrial development. Another outfit now active after a decade of somnolence is Operation Action, a group of Upper Peninsula enthusiasts from here and elsewhere in the Midwest. It is headed by Dr. Edgar L. Harden, president of Northern Michigan University at Marquette, and Walker Cisler, president of Detroit Edison Co. and chairman of Fruehauf Trailer Co. They are persuading prominent businessmen to give time and money to help small Upper Peninsula firms. Detroit Edison, for example, has loaned an executive to a small Iron River toymaker as manager to help straighten out its problems.

There also are signs that major Upper Peninsula industries are regaining a portion of their once robust health. Calumet & Hecla, Inc., is proving out a new and possibly rich copper ore body in the Keweenaw Peninsula. The company says samples indicate "a grade of one substantially higher than anything that has been mined in the district for the past 20 years." Eighty miles away at the $70 million White Pine mine, opened in the mid-1950's by Copper Range Co., producer of 75 percent of the Upper Peninsula's copper, the company has just spent $2 million sinking a 2,200-foot shaft to reach a new copper vein about a mile from its present 400-foot-deep mine.

PELLETIZING IRON ORE

The Upper Peninsula's iron-mining companies are also stepping up development and expansion of open-pit mines to make low-grade ores competitive through enriching and pelletizing processes. Hanna Mining Co. recently expanded its beneficiation plant at its Groveland mine near Iron Mountain, more than doubling its capacity to 1.5 million tons annually. Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., with partners McLouth Steel Corp., Inland Steel Co., and International Harvester Co., just finished construction of concentrating and pelletizing plants at an open-pit mine at Palmer, creating 300 new jobs as well as about 700 jobs during construction. This plant and mine, along with two other similar ventures since 1958, represent an estimated $100 million capital outlay by Cleveland-Cliffs and its partners.

Last December, Cleveland-Cliffs and McLouth announced plans for the first pelletizing of iron ore from underground mines. They plan to build a $15 million pelletizing plant to process underground ores from the Mather mine on the Marquette Range, increasing output to 2.4 million tons a year by 1966, up from 700,000 last year. The project will add 400 permanent jobs, say the companies.

If it is successful, the pelletizing of underground ore could keep many underground mines operating. The project was made possible by a 1963 Michigan law which, in effect, lowers the tax collected on underground ores, making them more competitive, after pelletizing, with open-pit ore.

As a result of all these plans, the outlook is for increased shipments of enriched iron ores from the Upper Peninsula. Such ores now account for 30 percent of total iron ore shipments, up from less than 1 percent in 1950. Iron officials say this means a better chance the Upper Peninsula iron mining industry can survive and grow.

PULPWOOD GROWTH

The peninsula's biggest industrial growth in the long run is likely to take place in the timber business, particularly pulpwood. The cutting of trees for lumber has dropped to 10 percent of what it once was, but pulpwood cutting is growing and has enormous potential. More than 680,000 cords (a cord is 128 cubic feet of wood) were cut last year, up from 550,000 cords in 1954. Ray E. Pfeifer of the Michigan Department of Conservation calculates that the pulpwood cut could double right now without overcutting and that the Upper Peninsula's forests eventually should support five times as much forest-related industry as in recent years.

About 75 percent of the pulpwood now cut is shipped to mills in Wisconsin. But peninsular groups are trying to stimulate more local processing. The staff of Michigan Technological University was instrumental in getting Celotex Corp. to invest more than $20 million in a plant and timber lands at L'Anse, where the company now makes insulation board out of Upper Peninsula hardwoods by a process developed at the school.

In the immediate future, it is the recreation business that looks most promising. Estimates of what tourism now brings to the Upper Peninsula annually range up to $140 million, or nearly one-third of total retail sales and services in the area. Spurring the tourist business are two relatively new links with the mainland—the 5-mile-long Mackinac Straits Bridge to lower Michigan, finished in 1957, and the Sault International Bridge to Ontario, opened a year ago.

As tourism grows, changes are being made. Prof. Robert W. McIntosh, specialist in tourism at Michigan State University, estimates there are more than 1,350 motel and resort businesses in the Upper Peninsula today, up from 977 in 1955.

TOURIST FACILITIES STILL LAG

But the Upper Peninsula still suffers from a lack of modern facilities for visitors. Too many of the restaurants are of the "Dot's Eats" variety and too many of the sleeping accommodations date back to the tourist cabins of a bygone era. Many Upper Peninsula towns have an air of having stood still since the 1920's, as indeed many have.

The Upper Peninsula belies complaints that the United States is running out of recreational areas. Despite more than a century of mining and logging, a visitor can drive for miles without a glimpse of cutover land or rubble left by mining. Vast stands of hardwood now cover once-denuded pine forest land. There are dozens of sparkling lakes without a campsite. Not even a discarded beer can spoils miles of sandy beaches along the Great Lakes.

To capitalize on these resources, the Upper Peninsula is trying to lengthen its tourist season by attracting winter visitors. With its heavy snowfall and long winter, the peninsula is developing into a major ski area. This winter there are 14 resorts operating, up from 8 in 1955, and 2 others are being built. Some Milwaukee and Upper Peninsula businessmen have received a $625,000 loan from the U.S. Area Redevelopment Administration to build a new resort at Copper Harbor at the tip of Keweenaw Peninsula. Its cost is expected to be $1.4 million and it will provide 100 full-time jobs.

[From the Escanaba Daily Press]

SAY IT ISN'T SO

The Wall Street Journal in a featured front page article this week headlined: "Mining, Lumbering Ills Bring Poverty to Upper Michigan—Jobless Rate Rivals Appalachia's."

Bill Veeser, vice president (sales) of Upper Peninsula Power Co. of Houghton, saw the article and blew his stack. Veeser is immensely informed on the Upper Peninsula's economy. He has worked with it in the important business of electric power supply long enough to know its weaknesses and its strengths.

He believes the Wall Street Journal article created a false impression of the area it described. "When I got through reading it," he said "I'd cooled off a bit, because the story isn't as bad as the headline. At the end it tells about progress in the Upper Peninsula, but the headline is very hurtful and I know we'll get calls from financial people in the East. They'll say: 'How come you have such an optimistic outlook in your prospectus for financing when the Wall Street Journal says the area is as bad as Appalachia?'"

Veeser is painfully correct. This is poverty by association. Appalachia is currently America's symbol of destitution, a southeast mountain area whose unemployed coal miners are ill equipped for modern industrial employment and whose homeland provides too little of it anyway. Their ragged children peep from behind burlap in thousands of news pictures and the American reaction is shameful. It makes mockery of the American boast of an affluent society, say social critics.

To say that the conditions in the Lake States (specifically northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan) "rival Appalachia" is to exaggerate. The two areas are very different ethnically, geologically, climatically, educationally, socially, and economically.

The Lake Superior area has serious economic problems, but to visit Ironwood and project its mining problems as the norm for the Upper Peninsula is misleading. It is the only Upper Peninsula iron range not amenable so far to modern mining technology that is creating new pelletized iron industry on the Marquette Range, and, to a lesser degree, on the Menominee Range.

The Wall Street Journal says "The Upper Peninsula long was a major asset to Michigan, but now it has more troubles than you can count; while Michigan's population more than doubled since 1920, the Upper Peninsula's dropped 8 percent to 306,000."

Why not accentuate the positive? In the 1960 census it showed a population gain for the first time in two decades.

Wilderness and Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, much has been written and much has been spoken about the need for legislation in the field of conservation. Time is not on our side in the effort to protect and make wise use of our public lands. The New York Times last Sunday had an excellent editorial on two important conservation measures which still face this Congress: one is the wilderness bill and the other is the land and water conservation fund bill. I ask that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1964]

WILDERNESS AND RECREATION

Behind the effort to enact the wilderness bill and the land and water conservation fund bill—the two most vital pieces of conservation and recreation legislation before Congress this year—is recognition of a dread alternative: once the primeval lands fall under the bulldozer's blade, they are forever lost.

This year alone, more than a million acres are expected to succumb to urban sprawl. That is a genteel word for it. The scarred countryside could be more accurately described, in the title of a recent book, as "God's Own Junkyard."

Secretary of the Interior Udall has rightly called these bills "pieces of landmark legislation which will be remembered for years to come." The wilderness bill would strengthen the barriers against encroachment by any source, public or private, on primitive areas. The land and water conservation fund bill would provide the means to acquire Federal and State lands and waters to meet the needs of our growing population for outdoor recreation.

The bill to establish a "national wilderness preservation system" is sound in its essentials. But it can be strengthened in some of its details. The Senate-approved bill does not allow mining in a designated wilderness area except by Presidential permission; this ought to be added to the House bill. Exist-

ing park and wildlife areas should be included in the wilderness system, and provision made for future acquisition.

Wilderness and recreation are two sides of the same golden coin. The great growth of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, as Dr. Howard Zahniser, executive director of the Wilderness Society, has declared, "is not a threat to wild-life-refuge protection or wilderness preservation." The two activities are companions, not rivals.

The parks, the forests, the shorelines, the sparkling waters, and the wildlife of our outdoor heritage are not merely to be preserved for those who would gaze upon them from some distant horizon. These are for the people, and for their heirs. Enactment of the two conservation bills is the best means to preserve the irreplaceable against encroachment.

The Growth and Production of Tobacco Is Significant to U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, tobacco farming and the tobacco industry is one of the largest and most important of our domestic agricultural and industrial products.

In 1963, 503,733 farms harvested 1,151,529 acres of tobacco in the United States. The estimated value of this crop on the farm market was more than $1 billion in cash receipts from all tobacco farm marketing. The Department of Agriculture figures show that tobacco was the ninth ranking farm commodity in sales in our country in 1962.

Tobacco manufacturing from this farm product amounts to more than $8 billion each year.

The total taxes for city and county—Federal and State—are, according to Treasury reports, $3,270,565,589.

In Tennessee there are 16,834 tobacco farms. In the district I have the honor to represent, there are 3,442 tobacco farms—the Fourth District being the second largest tobacco-producing district in Tennessee. In the 19 tobacco-producing States in our country, there are 189,976 farms.

So, Mr. Speaker, the value of tobacco is indeed significant to our U.S. economy.

The Department of Agriculture has provided me with information on tobacco production—and I have also been interested in a report on important tobacco-growing districts as shown in the March 6, 1964, issue of the Congressional Quarterly.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD a table from the Congressional Quarterly, showing the important tobacco-growing districts within the Nation, including the number of farms in the various districts of the 19 tobacco-producing States.

The table follows:

Important tobacco-growing districts

State and district (1964 boundaries)	Name of Representative	Number of tobacco farms
Alabama		55
2d [1]	Grant (Democrat)	50
8th	Jones (Democrat)	5
Connecticut		263
1st	Daddario (Democrat)	253
2d	St. Onge (Democrat)	10
Florida		2,365
8th	Matthews (Democrat)	584
9th	Fuqua (Democrat)	1,781
Georgia		7,966
1st	Hagan (Democrat)	1,805
2d	Pilcher (Democrat)	1,343
3d	Forrester (Democrat)	110
6th	Vinson (Democrat)	25
8th	Tuten (Democrat)	4,673
9th	Landrum (Democrat)	10
Indiana		826
7th	Bray (Republican)	5
8th	Denton (Democrat)	111
9th	Wilson (Republican)	700
10th	Harvey (Republican)	10
Kansas		10
2d	Avery (Republican)	10
3d	Ellsworth (Republican)	
Kentucky		44,508
1st	Stubblefield (Democrat)	3,551
2d	Natcher (Democrat)	6,222
3d	Snyder (Republican)	15
4th	Chelf (Democrat)	6,779
5th	Siler (Republican)	8,378
6th	Watts (Democrat)	12,734
7th	Perkins (Democrat)	6,829
Louisiana		10
1st	Hébert (Democrat)	10
2d	Boggs (Democrat)	
Maryland: 5th	Lankford (Democrat)	2,745
Massachusetts		121
Missouri		305
6th	Hull (Democrat)	290
8th	Ichord (Democrat)	15
North Carolina		77,731
1st	Bonner (Democrat)	7,355
2d	Fountain (Democrat)	12,814
3d	Henderson (Democrat)	13,423
4th	Cooley (Democrat)	10,244
5th	Scott (Democrat)	12,915
6th	Kornegay (Democrat)	3,022
7th	Lennon (Democrat)	10,520
8th	Jonas (Republican)	1,497
9th	Broyhill (Republican)	2,765
10th	Whitener (Democrat)	270
11th	Taylor (Democrat)	2,906
Ohio		1,405
1st	Rich (Republican)	5
2d	Clancy (Republican)	
3d	Schenck (Republican)	125
4th	McCulloch (Republican)	155
6th	Harsha (Republican)	905
7th	Brown (Republican)	10
10th	Abele (Republican)	205
Pennsylvania		375
6th	Rhodes (Democrat)	15
9th	Dague (Republican)	335
16th	Kunkel (Republican)	20
19th	Goodling (Republican)	5
South Carolina		16,255
1st	Rivers (Democrat)	983
2d	Watson (Democrat)	437
3d	Dorn (Democrat)	5
5th	Hemphill (Democrat)	85
6th	McMillan (Democrat)	14,745
Tennessee		16,834
1st	Quillen (Republican)	8,344

Important tobacco-growing districts—Con.

State and district (1964 boundaries)	Name of Representative	Number of tobacco farms
Tennessee—Con.		
2d	Vacant	1,021
3d	Brock (Republican)	505
4th	Evins (Democrat)	3,442
5th	Fulton (Democrat)	76
6th	Bass (Democrat)	3,371
7th	Murray (Democrat)	65
8th	Everett (Democrat)	10
Virginia		17,342
1st	Downing (Democrat)	10
3d	Gary (Democrat)	40
4th	Abbitt (Democrat)	5,716
5th	Tuck (Democrat)	8,090
6th	Poff (Republican)	480
7th	Marsh (Democrat)	125
8th	Smith (Democrat)	120
9th	Jennings (Democrat)	2,761
West Virginia		510
3d	Slack (Democrat)	15
4th	Hechler (Democrat)	485
5th	Kee (Democrat)	10
Wisconsin		350
1st	Schadeberg (Republican)	35
2d	Kastenmeier (Democrat)	115
3d	Thomson (Republican)	200
Total		189,976

[1] Based on State districts in 1960: at present, all Alabama Congressmen run at large.

Moment of Meditation in Public Schools: Bill Enacted by Maryland General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Maryland General Assembly adopted at its 1964 session a bill requiring that all students in the State of Maryland shall be present to participate in opening exercises on each morning of a schoolday and to meditate silently for approximately one moment.

Since the decisions of the Supreme Court, prohibiting the use of prayer and Bible reading in our public schools, many States have turned their attention to this matter. I am convinced that a great majority of the American people disagree with the decisions of the Court. Yet these decisions represent the law of the land and must be obeyed. There are some who say that the decision of the Court prohibits any religious devotion in any public place. Others say that the Court meant only to prohibit those prayers drafted or selected by State officials. The fact is, Mr. President, that there is not a clear understanding of what the Supreme Court decisions mean.

Unless and until Congress acts to clarify the present confusion with respect to prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, the individual States will have ample justification to proceed on

this matter themselves. The result will be a different interpretation of the Constitution in each State of the Union. The bill adopted by the Maryland General Assembly represents one approach to the problem, and I ask that the text of this bill be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, on June 19, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 92, proposing an amendment to the Constitution which would permit the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in the public schools. Similar measures have been introduced in the House of Representatives. I think it is imperative that hearings be scheduled on this legislation and that Congress take action to end the confusion which now exists in our country with respect to the use of prayer in our public schools.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE BILL 80

An act to add new section 98A to article 77 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 edition), title "Public Education," subtitle "Chapter 7. Schools," to follow immediately after section 98 thereof, providing for a daily period of silent meditation for the students of every public elementary and secondary school in the State and relating also to prayers, the reading of scripture, and the free exercise of religion in the public schools

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland,* That new section 98A be and it is hereby added to article 77 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 edition), title "Public Education," subtitle "Chapter 7. Schools," to follow immediately after section 98 thereof, and to read as follows:

"98A. Principals and teachers in every public elementary and secondary school in this State shall require all students at these schools to be present and participate in opening exercises on each morning of a school day and to meditate silently for approximately one moment; provided that no student or teacher shall be prohibited from reading from the holy scripture, praying or any other expression of the free exercise of his religion."

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That this act shall take effect June 1, 1964.

FISCAL NOTE.—Not required on this bill. Fiscal Research Bureau.

Explanation: Italics indicate new matter added to existing law. [Brackets] indicate matter stricken from existing law. Capitals indicate amendments to bill.

By Delegate T. H. Lowe.

Chamberlain Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since first becoming a Member of Congress to solicit the views of the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan early in each session of Congress. I recently received the computer tabulation of my eighth annual questionnaire and I hasten to make the results public. It is especially noteworthy that while 56 percent favored the recent tax cut bill, 85 percent said that Federal spending should be cut to compensate for the loss of revenues due to the $11½ billion tax reduction. Furthermore, 77 percent said that they were opposed to any further increases in the Federal debt ceiling. This response leaves little doubt that the public demands a cut in Federal spending and an end to budget deficits.

I would also point out the response to questions about proposals to alleviate unemployment which revealed that 27 percent favored, while 55 percent opposed, the 35-hour workweek and 33 percent favored and 50 percent opposed the attempt to discourage overtime work by requiring doubletime wage rates for such work. Because of the industrialized character of the Sixth District, I believe that these figures are significant.

The wheat deal was another topic that evoked a decided opinion with 76 percent saying that credit should not be extended to Communist countries purchasing U.S. surplus wheat. From the time this wheat deal was in the rumor state, I have expressed my disapproval of it, and I am gratified that so many are in agreement. This substantiates the position of those of us who have twice voted not to grant such credit and questions the wisdom of the administration in forcing Congress to meet as late as Christmas Eve in order to defeat the previous decisions of the House.

As in Congress, the foreign aid program was given a critical review by those answering the poll, with 54 percent stating that the program should be decreased and 20 percent that it be discontinued altogether. And in reading over the many individual comments added to many thousands of these questionnaires, I find there is also great concern over the present conduct of our foreign policy. There is widespread agreement that it lacks direction and firmness.

The questionnaire results follow:

Chamberlain questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not sure
Do you favor—			
1. Changing the present line of Presidential succession (Speaker of the House now succeeds Vice President)?	48	35	17
2. Civil-rights legislation to—			
Insure equal access to public accommodations?	65	21	14
Protect voting rights in Federal elections?	90	4	6
Enforce public school desegregation?	51	32	17
Give permanent status to Civil Rights Commission?	36	33	31
3. Proposals to alleviate unemployment by—			
A 35-hour workweek	27	55	18
Requiring double-time wage rates for overtime?	33	50	17
4. The administration's request for—			
Domestic Peace Corps?	40	38	22
Youth Conservation Corps?	59	22	19
Federal mass transit aid program?	17	49	34
Increased area redevelopment program?	36	38	26
New Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs?	19	54	27
Increased national debt ceiling?	8	77	15
5. Federal tax reduction at this time?	56	31	13
6. Curtailing Government spending to compensate for the loss of revenues if tax reduction is approved?	85	7	8
7. Amending the Constitution to permit Bible reading and prayers in public schools on a voluntary basis?	80	15	5
8. Renegotiating the 1903 Canal Zone Treaty with Panama?	37	44	19
9. Giving the President authority to extend credit to Communist countries purchasing surplus wheat?	14	76	10
10. Providing medical care for the elderly by—			
Percent			
Increasing social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65 (King-Anderson approach)? 25			
A tax credit for Federal financing for private insurance for both medical and hospital care for those over 65 (Bow bill)? 21			
No Federal participation in this field? 27			
Other or not sure 27			
11. The President has requested $3,400,000,000 for foreign aid next year ($400,000,000 more than this year). This program should be—			
Percent			
Increased 3			
This level 17			
Decreased 54			
Discontinued 20			
Not sure 6			

The Old Soldier Is Ill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an editorial from the Manila Bulletin, the leading English-language paper of the Philippine Islands, which expresses very well, I think, the deep affection and esteem in which General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is held in the Philippine Islands. This affection and esteem, of course, is shared by Americans, indeed by freedom loving people around the world:

THE OLD SOLDIER IS ILL

There are, in the Philippines as elsewhere around the world, hundreds of thousands of veterans of the last World War who are following with anxiety developments in the ailment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, now at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

It is conceivable that there is no American more beloved and more greatly honored and respected than General MacArthur, as far as millions of Filipinos are concerned. A great portion of his brilliant military career has been indissolubly linked with Philippine history, as field marshal here during the Commonwealth era, as Commander of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Far East during the dark early days of World War II and as liberator of the Philippines upon his triumphant return at the head of the Armed Forces in the Pacific, and as United Nations Commander in Korea under whom our Philippine Expeditionary Force to Korea served.

A legendary figure in his lifetime, in the Philippines as in the United States, General MacArthur has endeared himself to uncounted millions by his Greek god traits and demeanor, by his irreproachable character in public and private life, by the felicity of expression in his pronouncements and addresses some of which are bound to live for all time among literary gems, and, above all, as a military genius whose service to his countrymen and to the cause of democracy had to be marred by his unfortunate dismissal by President Truman.

Now 84 years old and in retirement, he has been rushed to Walter Reed Hospital at Washington, D.C. for medical checkup of abdominal ailments. Many prayers are being said here as they must be elsewhere, for his early recovery so that people the world over who look to him as the symbol of democracy—triumphant and love of country unsullied—may continue steadfast in their faith and firm in their resolve to carry on the good fight for freedom with dignity for all mankind.

After the Shots: The Ordeal of Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gripping pieces of current historical writing that I have ever read appeared in the March 10 issue of Look magazine. It is by a noted journalist, Fletcher Knebel, entitled "After the Shots: The Ordeal of Lyndon Johnson." I commend it to every American:

AFTER THE SHOTS: THE ORDEAL OF LYNDON JOHNSON

(By Fletcher Knebel)

(No other President in U.S. history was thrust into office with such brutal abruptness as Lyndon Baines Johnson. Other Vice Presidents who followed assassinated Chief Executives had at least some time to accommodate their thoughts. Abraham Lincoln lingered for hours after being shot; James A. Garfield, for 11 weeks; William McKinley, for 8 days. But John F. Kennedy's life was ended by a bullet in the brain, and Lyndon Johnson probably became our 36th President while speeding to a hospital at 70 miles an hour. This is the untold story of Johnson's ordeal—his first 14 hours as President of the United States.)

November 22, 1963: 12:29 p.m. as the open Lincoln convertible moved leisurely on sloping Elm Street below the Texas School Book Depository building, Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson thought how clear and sparking was the Dallas air. She was seated in the rear, between her husband, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, on her right, and U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, on her left. In the front seat was the driver, Texas Highway Patrolman Hurchel D. Jacks, and Secret Service Agent Rufus W. Youngblood. They were in the fourth car in the motor procession; the second car carried President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy and Texas Governor and Mrs. John B. Connally, Jr. The temperature was in the sixties, and throughout the motorcade, there was a lighthearted air befitting a successful political excursion. In one car, Texas Congressmen ALBERT THOMAS and JACK BROOKS bantered over a "census" of unfriendly sign holders they were taking. Assistant White House Press Secretary Malcolm Kilduff joked about the building's name, School Book Depository. YARBOROUGH felt vaguely relieved, glad to leave behind the tall downtown buildings.

November 22, 1963: 12:30 p.m. Secret Service Agent Youngblood, a thin, balding Georgian with an easy drawl, had just marked the local time on the flashing Hertz-Chevrolet time-temperature sign atop the book depository building. Because Vice President Johnson worried about keeping to schedule, Youngblood checked the time with his wristwatch.

A moment later, at perhaps 12:31 p.m., there was a sharp report. To most, it sounded like a firecracker. It did to Lyndon Johnson. It also did to an aid, Clifton C. Carter, riding in another car.

But others chilled. Texas Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ, who had been hunting recently, thought it came from a 30-caliber rifle. Congressman THOMAS, who had been in the House of Representatives the day in 1954 when Puerto Rican nationalists fired from the galleries and wounded five Congressmen, thought, "My God, another Puerto Rico." Lady Bird Johnson was sure it was gunfire—three shattering explosions that seemed to come from over her right shoulder. Driver Jacks felt a slight concussion and turned to look back to his right.

Lyndon Johnson can't recall hearing the last two shots, for in the pause after the first report, Youngblood whirled around, grabbed Johnson's right arm and pushed him toward the floor.

"Get down," Youngblood shouted at Mrs. Johnson and Yarborough. The agent half-vaulted over the front seat and threw his 175-pound, 6-foot frame over Johnson. The two men ended in a jumbled heap, half on and half off the back seat. Between them was a walkie-talkie set that Youngblood had strapped to his shoulder. Yarborough and Mrs. Johnson leaned forward, their heads bowed as though in prayer.

"Let's get out of here," Youngblood yelled to Driver Jacks. "Close it up. Follow the car in front."

The receiver crackled in Youngblood's walkie-talkie. It was Agent Roy Kellerman's voice in the Kennedy car ahead. "Take off. We're going to Parkland Hospital. Follow us."

Immediately behind Johnson's vehicle was a Secret Service followup car, in which agents were riding with slightly opened doors. When the shots rang out, Agent Thomas L. Johns jumped out and ran toward the Johnson car. But it already had speeded up. Johns was left temporarily stranded.

From beneath Youngblood's body, Johnson asked, "What's happened?"

"I'm not sure," said the agent. "But something serious has happened in the Presidential car." Youngblood feared the worst. He'd seen an agent in the Secret Service car just ahead rise and aim a submachine gun toward the Book Depository building. He'd seen commotion in the Kennedy car, and over the side of the Johnson convertible, he'd seen spectators running and throwing themselves on the ground.

Johnson, who later tried to reconstruct his own thoughts during these minutes, could remember only that he believed something terrible had happened. He had seen nothing untoward ahead, but Youngblood's sudden blow on his right arm and now the weight of the agent's body on his, bespoke the fear of calamity. He trusted the Secret Service agent and knew intuitively that he should follow instructions.

"Can you tell whether anyone's hit in the President's car?" Youngblood asked Jacks. The driver couldn't make out. The whistling wind prevented further conversation between front and rear seats, for Jacks was now going 70 miles an hour on the Stemmons Expressway. Despite the speed, he tried to keep only a few yards behind the bumper in front of him.

Youngblood's radio crackled again. It was Emory P. Roberts, assistant agent in charge of the White House Secret Service detail. "Rufe, keep your man covered," ordered Roberts.

Instinct and experience now prompted Youngblood to say to Johnson, "I don't know how bad it is yet in the President's car, but you'd better prepare to be acting President as soon as we get to the hospital."

Johnson did not reply. Yarborough and Lady Bird, still hunched forward, were silent. The wind lashed at the open convertible. A bit later, Youngblood spoke into Johnson's ear, "When we get to the hospital, you follow me. We're going in fast."

"OK, fine." Johnson's voice was calm.

November 22, 1963: 12:36 p.m. Five leading cars screeched to a halt at the emergency entrance of Parkland Hospital. It was now about 5 minutes since the shots were fired. They had come 3.5 miles from Elm Street. Youngblood lifted himself off Johnson and backed out of the car.

Johnson followed at once. He stood on the walk, pulling at an arm, massaging his chest, flexing his arms. He did so because of the cramped position in which he had been riding, but onlookers promptly assumed he had had a heart seizure. Within minutes, word was broadcast to the Nation that Johnson, who had a heart attack in 1955, was thought to have been felled by another attack. Panic rumors raced across the United States. (In an Omaha, Nebr., movie theater, the manager stopped the film and announced, "President Kennedy has been assassinated, Governor Connally shot, and Vice President Johnson has suffered a severe heart attack.")

But Johnson was walking swiftly into the hospital, surrounded by Secret Service agents. Another agent escorted Mrs. Johnson as she left Senator YARBOROUGH and followed her husband. Agent Roberts pushed ahead. As he ran past the Presidential car, Roberts saw a gaping, bloody wound in Kennedy's head. This thought flashed through his mind: "We've got a new President to protect." Roberts ran to the reception desk, asked a nurse for a room for Johnson that would be secure and had a phone. She led him a few steps to the minor-medicine-and-surgery suite, consisting of a large room and a smaller backroom. Three patients were being treated. The nurse hurried them out.

The Johnsons, with seven Secret Service escorts, moved in at once. Youngblood posted two agents at the door. "Don't let anybory in unless you know them," he ordered.

"How is the President?" Johnson asked Emory Roberts. Roberts shook his head. "I don't think he'll make it," he said. Privately, he felt sure that Kennedy was dead, but that was for the doctors to determine.

The inner area in which the Johnsons stood with Youngblood and two other agents was a tantiled, soundproofed room divided by white curtains into eight cubicles. In each cubicle was a treatment table or cart. The room was weirdly bright from overhead fluorescent lights. One window overlooked the backyard; the other, the ambulance dock at the emergency entrance.

"Pull the blinds," Youngblood ordered another agent. The lowering of the venetian blinds accentuated the garish illumination within. Johnson leaned against the inner doorway, sniffing at a vapor inhaler that he often uses to clear his nasal passages. The area was hushed. Agents spoke in lowered voices.

November 22, 1963: 12:38 p.m. Down the hallway, there was wild confusion after Kennedy and Connally were wheeled into "trauma rooms" 1 and 2. Newspapermen fought for telephones. The corridors heaved with politicians, policemen, doctors, nurses, and White House staffers, many weeping and all seeking accurate information in the storm of rumor.

In this uproar, a White House officer unobtrusively moved into the hallway near Johnson's room. He was the man with the "football"—White House slang for the bag containing the top-secret codes by which the President, and only the President, can order the great nuclear weapons launched in case of war. The officer had been riding in a motorcade car not far from President Kennedy. Now, he switched to Lyndon Johnson and took up his post outside minor medicine and surgery. The infinitely complex mechanism of the U.S. Government was silently shifting gears.

In the minor-medicine suite, a Signal Corps technician got lines open to Washington and to Air Force 1, the Presidential plane waiting at Dallas' Love Field. Agent Roberts, 20-year Secret Service veteran, had a hunch that dwarfed his other thoughts: Johnson must be gotten back to Washington at once. He called Secret Service headquarters in Washington. It promptly agreed. Nobody could know what was afoot. There might be a conspiracy to wipe out all top Federal officials. From then on, Roberts' sole aim was to get Johnson to Washington as fast as possible under heavy protection. Roberts called Col. James Swindal, pilot of the Presidential plane, told him to be prepared to return to Washington. Swindal quickly ordered more fuel. He had only a light load for the Boeing 707's scheduled flight to Austin, Tex. The Air Force colonel also asked Dallas police for more security, and, within minutes, the big transport was ringed by 20 policemen.

Four Texas Congressmen, all friends of Johnson, were admitted one by one to the bare Johnson retreat. They were Thomas, Brooks, Gonzalez, and Homer Thornberry. Recently named a Federal judge, Thornberry was a Johnson intimate. Johnson's face lit up when he saw him, but he shook his head. "This is a time for prayer, if there ever was one, Homer," he said.

Agents brought chairs and offered them, but the Johnsons preferred to stand. Moments passed in silence. GONZALEZ moved to the other side of the room, afraid that he might seem to be intruding. He couldn't take his eyes from Johnson's immobile face. GONZALEZ heard an agent say of Kennedy, "Yes, yes, I think it's all over." Cliff Carter went to a hall vending machine, brought black coffee in paper cups for the Johnsons.

Youngblood phoned Austin, Tex., and Washington to order Secret Service guards for the two Johnson daughters, Lynda Bird, a student at the University of Texas, and Lucy Baines, a student at Washington's National Cathedral School for Girls. As it turned out, Lynda had gone to the Governor's home in Austin to be with the Connally children. In Washington, Lucy was in her school gym with the entire student body, praying for Kennedy. As the Reverend Edward Schneider, the school chaplain, prayed aloud, a wave of sobs moved through the girls like a moaning wind.

In minor surgery, Mrs. Johnson asked to see Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Connally. An agent and Congressman BROOKS escorted her through the corridor, marked in the center by a foot-wide, redtile strip. Ladybird found Jacqueline Kennedy in her blood-stained pink suit. They stood mutely in grief, and Mrs. Johnson found the look in the younger woman's eyes almost unbearable to witness. Then she went to Mrs. Connally, a friend for years. They had been together in victory and defeat with their husbands, and they embraced in that strange mixture of companionship and sadness that requires no words.

In the Johnson area of minor surgery, a nurse in a blood-spotted white uniform entered, carrying two small brown-paper bags. These, she explained, were Governor Connally's clothes. Under hospital regulations, someone had to sign for them. "How about his money?" asked Carter. "It's at the desk," replied the nurse. Carter signed the slips.

November 22, 1963: 1:13 p.m. Agent Roberts brought the word from trauma room 1 that all had feared—President Kennedy was dead. Roberts, a tall man of quick speech and movements, hurried on:

"We don't know all the ramifications of the shooting. We don't know, but maybe it's part of an overall plot. We need to get you back to the plane and to Washington as quickly as possible. We ought to leave at once."

Johnson's mind harked back to the Lincoln assassination, when conspirators plotted to kill other Government leaders as well. Johnson turned to Youngblood. "What do you recommend?"

Youngblood was blunt. "We should evacuate this hospital right away, get on that plane and get back to Washington," he said. "We don't know whether this is one man, two men, a gang, or an army. The White House is the safest place to conduct the Nation's business."

Thornberry agreed with the agents, but Johnson said he first wanted an opinion from Kenneth O'Donnell and Lawrence O'Brien, two long-time confidants of President Kennedy. Roberts hurried out, found O'Donnell and brought him back to the new President. O'Donnell's face was tight with grief. He said simply, "Mr. President, the President is dead."

Johnson gripped his arm wordlessly. O'Donnell told Johnson that he agreed with the Secret Service, that Johnson should return at once to Washington. Johnson asked him to please call Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, brother of the slain President. O'Donnell nodded and left.

Youngblood whispered to Agent Johns, instructing him to go get an unmarked car for a swift ride to the airport.

Johnson turned to Cliff Carter. "Get Valenti, Liz, and Marie," he said. "Find them and get them to the plane." Carter left in search of Jack Valenti, a public-relations adviser; Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, Mrs. Johnson's public-relations secretary; and Marie Fehmer, Johnson's personal secretary.

At this moment, Johnson felt torn. He did not want to go before Mrs. Kennedy was ready to leave with the President's body, but he was being pressured to do so by everyone. Conscious both of history and of political criticism that might arise later, he turned to his wife. "Bird," he said, "why don't you make some notes on all this?"

Mrs. Johnson reached in her purse for notebook and pencil. From time to time thereafter, she scribbled her impressions of events on the Nation's Black Friday. Unbidden, Thornberry also began making notes—with the time of various incidents indicated. Later, on the plane, Cliff Carter would dictate more notes to Marie Fehmer, and Secret Service agents, at Johnson's request, would jot down their own chronicles. All these later became the basis of the White House log.

In trauma room 1, where John F. Kennedy's body lay under a white sheet, Malcolm Kilduff, the assistant press secretary, found O'Donnell, and asked permission to announce Kennedy's death to the press. But O'Donnell declined to make the decision, sending him instead to the new President, in company with Agent Kellerman.

"Mr. President," said Kilduff, "I should announce the death of President Kennedy. Is it all right with you?"

Johnson hesitated a moment. "No, Mac," he said. "I think we'd better wait a few minutes. I think I'd better get out of here and get back to the plane before you announce it. We don't know whether this is a worldwide conspiracy, whether they are after me as well as they were after President Kennedy, or whether they're after Speaker MCCORMACK and Senator HAYDEN."

By law, House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK was now next in line for succession to the Presidency, followed by aged Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, President pro tem of the Senate. Kilduff agreed to withhold the announcement of Kennedy's death until after Johnson left the hospital.

But the word was already out, official or not. At about that time, a newspaperman walking past the parked convertible in which Johnson rode to the hospital heard the car radio blare: "The President is dead."

O'Donnell returned to help Johnson get ready to leave. But now Johnson demurred. "I can't leave without Mrs. Kennedy," he said.

"She won't leave without the body," O'Donnell replied. "That will take time. I think you'd better go."

As Secret Service agents moved out with Johnson, Congressman GONZALEZ suddenly found himself in a thronged corridor with two paper sacks. One contained Governor Connally's pants, shirt, and socks; the other, his blood-stained, bullet-pierced coat. Cliff Carter had thrust them on the Congressman when he left to round up other Johnson aides. In trauma room 1, GONZALEZ saw Mrs. Kennedy, sitting alone and desolate, the blood of her husband still caking her gloves, pink suit, and left stocking.

GONZALEZ thought of a boyhood-learned line from "Rimas," by the 19th-century Spanish poet, Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer. In English, it translates roughly as: "Oh, God, how alone the dead are left." He thought of the abrupt transfer of the panoply of Presidential power, and soon he was walking in a daze toward the exit, still clutching the paper bags.

(At this moment in Washington's Senate Office Building, Senate Rules Committee staff investigators were quizzing Don B. Reynolds, Maryland insurance agent, in secret session. Reynolds was giving information that linked Lyndon Johnson to a phase of the explosive Bobby Baker case. A staff member left the room for a moment, heard that Kennedy was dead, returned without disclosing the news. Reynolds kept talking—unaware that the man he was discussing was now the President.)

Youngblood hurried Johnson out the emergency doorway. Mrs. Earle Cabell, wife of the Dallas mayor, saw Johnson completely surrounded by Secret Service men. She realized with a start then that the rumors were true—Kennedy was dead.

Johnson was propelled into a waiting unmarked four-door sedan that belonged to Dallas Police Chief Jesse E. Curry. With Youngblood, Johnson got in the back seat. Thornberry sat in front with the chief, who was to drive. Three agents and Congressman BROOKS were to follow with Mrs. Johnson in another car.

"Chief," said Youngblood, "go as fast as you can, but avoid the routes we came over if possible."

As the car started forward, a man waved from the sidewalk. "Wait for me," he

called. Youngblood didn't recognize him. "No, keep going," he shouted. But Johnson knew who it was—Congressman THOMAS.

"No," said Johnson, "stop and pick him up."

THOMAS slid into the front seat, and the car moved swiftly away from the hospital. Youngblood pushed on Johnson's shoulder. "Get down below the window level," he said. "All right?"

"Fine," said Johnson. They rode in silence a moment, the car picking up speed. Several motorcycles joined them, the first of many that would gravitate toward the chief's automobile en route to Love Field. "Homer," said Johnson, "come back here and sit with me."

As the car raced at 60 miles an hour, Homer Thornberry crawled over the front seat and placed himself between Johnson and the left window. Now the new President had a man on each side of him. Chief Curry sounded his siren once, but Johnson and Youngblood both objected, and the siren was stilled. Motorcycle police cleared intersections ahead. From Parkland Hospital to Love Field was 3.4 miles.

Youngblood's walkie-talkie was still strapped to his shoulder, and he raised Air Force One. "Get ready for us," he said. "We're only a couple of minutes away." Then an afterthought: Johnson wanted to make sure that Air Force flight steward Paul Glynn, who had been on the Johnson plane, would transfer to Air Force One. Glynn was already there, said the plane's communicator.

November 22, 1963: 1:30 p.m., Air Force One was parked near gate 27 on Love Field's east wing, an area shielded by buildings and a brick wall. As they drove up and stopped, Youngblood said, "I want us to run up the ramp." They did so, hurrying through the cordon of police and trotting up into the plane. Agents promptly lowered all shades in the aircraft. Johnson aides soon began to arrive.

In the Presidential compartment of Air Force One, Johnson avoided Kennedy's big chair. Instead, he sat across the aisle at a table. He was joined by Mrs. Johnson and Congressmen Thomas, Brooks, and Thornberry. At once an argument began. Johnson wanted to fly to Washington and take the oath of office there. The Secret Service favored this course, too, not wishing to delay for a ceremony. At the same time, Johnson declined to take off until Mrs. Kennedy and her husband's body were aboard. In that case, the three Congressmen all argued for an oath-taking on the ground in Dallas. "You've got to take the oath now, Mr. President," THOMAS said to Johnson. "Suppose there was weather trouble, and it took 3 or 4 hours to get to Washington. The United States can't wait that long."

Thornberry and BROOKS agreed. Actually, from fragments that all had heard on the radio, they feared panic might seize the Nation. The New York Stock Exchange Board of Governors already had closed the exchange, following a spectacular market break that erased $11 billion in stock values in 26 minutes after the news flash of the shooting reached the exchange floor. In the end, Johnson agreed to be sworn in before leaving—provided Robert Kennedy agreed.

November 22, 1963: 1:35 p.m. On the plane's phone, Johnson called the Attorney General through the White House switchboard. The dazed, sorrowing brother was walking about his rolling country backyard in McLean, Va., with Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone. Kennedy took the call over the telephone near his swimming pool. It was 1:35 p.m. in Dallas, 2:35 in Washington.

Johnson offered his condolences, then asked if Kennedy had any objection to his taking the oath of office right away. Kennedy replied that anything that was desired would be all right with him. Well, asked Johnson, who could swear him in? Kennedy promised to find out and call back.

Kennedy called Deputy Attorney General Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, who was at his desk in the Justice Department. Katzenbach said any officer empowered to administer a Federal oath could officiate. Kennedy relayed this information to Johnson in Air Force One.

November 22, 1963: 2:15 p.m. Johnson decided to try Federal District Judge Sarah T. Hughes, an old political supporter. A call was put through to U.S. District Attorney H. Barefoot Sanders, who said he would try to reach her. He did, at 2:15 p.m. She had just reached home from the Trade Mart, where she had been among those awaiting the speech that Kennedy never delivered. She said she could get to the airport in 10 minutes. The 67-year-old judge got in her red sports car and drove to Love Field. On the way, she realized she had no copy of the constitutional oath, and she decided to make do with what she could remember of it.

Meanwhile, Cliff Carter called Katzenbach in Washington to get the text of the constitutional oath. Katzenbach already was studying his annotated copy of the Constitution, and he flipped to the tab marked "Presidency," then dictated to Marie Fehmer. Jack Valenti read back the copy to Katzenbach for a check on accuracy.

Now, Mrs. Kennedy arrived at the plane. The casket with her husband's body was brought aboard by three devoted aides, helped by Secret Service agents. The burden was placed in the after compartment, not far from where Johnson sat. Jacqueline Kennedy seated herself near the coffin. The chill of death was upon Air Force One.

While waiting for Judge Hughes, Johnson summoned O'Donnell and O'Brien. The two loyal aides of President Kennedy noted that Johnson was not sitting in the Kennedy chair, but at the card table across the aisle. Johnson said that, as repugnant as it might be in this moment of sorrow, they must begin to act. They must quickly show the Nation and the world the basic continuity of the U.S. Government—a theme he was to stress throughout the arduous days ahead. "You can't disrupt the institutions of this country with an assassin's bullet," was the way Johnson put it then. He leaned toward the two stricken men.

"The Constitution is putting me in the White House," Johnson said to them, "but there's no law that says you've got to stay there with me. But I need your help—badly. And not just now, but from now on in."

He said O'Donnell and O'Brien were the two chief symbols of Kennedy's authority, and they must remain with him for an orderly and united transition. The two men assured him they would stay as long as needed. O'Brien was amazed at Johnson's composure, his delicate balancing of compassion for the Kennedy group with the decisiveness required for new leadership.

Johnson drank water and caffein-free coffee. At the gates of Love Field, Judge Hughes was halted by police until a motorcycle man went to the Presidential plane to confirm her story. Then she got an escort across the field.

In the plane, the judge embraced the Johnsons, old friends of the Texas political wars.

They were ready for the ceremony. Johnson asked Kilduff if the press should be admitted. Kilduff said yes, and brought three newsmen aboard as pool representatives. About 30 people crowded into the small Presidential cabin. It was hot, stuffy, humid. There was a moment of uncertain waiting. Then Mrs. Kennedy entered, blood still streaking her suit and left stocking. Breaths were held, not a word was said. Her large eyes, mirroring shock and bewilderment, roved over the crowd. Johnson drew her gently to his left side, placed Mrs. Johnson on his right. Judge Hughes stood before him with Marie Fehmer's typewritten copy of the oath. Johnson sipped a glass of ice water.

Then he spoke to Army Capt. Cecil Stoughton, the White House photographer and the only cameraman aboard. "We've got everybody in now," said Johnson. "Is this all right?"

"No, sir," said Stoughton, motioning with his hand, "you'll have to move back just a bit."

Stoughton began shooting the first of nine black-and-white pictures with a 50-millimeter camera with extra-wide-angle lens and flash attachment. Kilduff started the plane's tape recorder. Judge Hughes's hand holding the oath trembled. Just then, Larry O'Brien gave her a small Bible. It had been thrust into his hand by Sgt. Joseph Ayres, a member of the plane crew, who had found it in a cream-colored case resting on the bookshelf beside John Kennedy's bed.

November 22, 1963: 2:38 p.m. Judge Hughes held out the Bible. Johnson placed his left hand on it and raised his right hand. He repeated after the Judge: "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Of her own volition, although it is not found in the Constitution, Judge Hughes added: "So help me God."

Johnson repeated: "So help me God."

Johnson kissed Mrs. Kennedy softly on the cheek and whispered, "You're so brave to do this, and I'll ever be grateful to you." He turned and kissed his wife, then embraced Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln, Kennedy's personal secretary. The crowd began to disperse.

"Let's get this plane back to Washington," said Johnson firmly. Moments later, the great jet engines began their ear-shattering whine. Colonel Swindal, with Lt. Col. Lewis Hanson as his copilot, taxied toward the runway. The wheels left the ground at 2:47 p.m., Dallas time. Swindal cruised northeast at normal high speed, but gained time because the four ground radar control stations passed him over the airways at top priority. He would have reached Andrews Air Force Base in 2 hours 5 minutes, but he slowed down near the end to avoid landing before the scheduled 6 p.m. Washington time. Thus, the flight took 2 hours 13 minutes.

As the plane left the runway in Dallas, Johnson switched on the TV set in the Presidential cabin. He felt out of touch with the world. But the picture was blurred, and he had to wait until later for good reception. Sitting with Mrs. Johnson, he called Mrs. Rose Kennedy, mother of the slain President, at the Kennedy compound in Hyannis Port on Cape Cod. When the phone was answered, he said, "I wish to speak to the President's mother." He got Mrs. Kennedy on the line, but the connection went bad, and he had to hang up and try again. The second time, the reception was good.

"Mrs. Kennedy," he said, "I wish to God I could do something to help you." Then he choked with emotion and handed the phone to his wife. "Here's Lady Bird," he said.

"Oh, Mrs. Kennedy," she said, "we feel as though our hearts had been cut out." She paused. "But all of us must remember how fortunate the Nation was to have had your son as long as it did."

"Thank you, Lady Bird," said Mrs. Kennedy.

Then the President called Mrs. Nellie Connally at Parkland Hospital. Both of the Johnsons talked to her and learned that Governor Connally had a good chance to pull through. But he was still in surgery.

Johnson turned quickly to the tasks ahead. He summoned the three Texas Congressmen and his aids, began ticking off what needed to be done. He wanted three men to meet him at Andrews, share the heli-

copter ride to the White House and brief him on current world trouble spots: Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and McGeorge Bundy, White House National Security Assistant. He wanted to meet the Cabinet and legislative leaders that night. He wanted certain calls lined up. He wanted to prepare a statement to read at Andrews. Mrs. Johnson made notes as he talked.

Some of his wishes could not be met. He'd forgotten that Rusk and five other Cabinet officers were over the Pacific on a mission to Tokyo. Their plane was turning back now, but would not land in Washington for many hours. The Cabinet meeting was reset for Saturday morning. There were phone calls to Walter Jenkins, Johnson's trusted aid in Washington. Bill Moyers, O'Brien, and Maj. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, Presidential military aide, all took a hand in arranging the meetings over the plane's phone. Valenti and Mrs. Carpenter helped work on Johnson's statement, which he scribbled on the plane's stationery. Marie Fehmer typed it.

Mrs. Carpenter reminded Mrs. Johnson that she too would have to say something in Washington. "Well, I just feel as though there's been a dreadful nightmare, and somehow we must have strength," said the First Lady.

"Then that's just what you should say," said Mrs. Carpenter, making a note of the remark.

Johnson, downing more cups of caffeinfree coffee, mused aloud to his friends about the dilemma facing him. In the next few hours, he had to show the world, especially Nikita Khrushchev, that U.S. leadership continued with firm resolve. At the same time, he could not do anything that would appear to intrude on the bottomless sorrow for President Kennedy. It was a hairline to tread. "It's the Kremlin that worries me," he said. "It can't be allowed to detect a waver or a bit of hesitancy. Khrushchev is a man of quick and short memories, and he's asking himself right now what kind of a man I am. He's got to know he's dealing with a man of determination, anxious for peace, but not afraid to stand up for his Nation."

There was also economic concern after the market collapse. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve System were preparing statements designed to stiffen confidence and forestall any ruinous speculation against the dollar. Johnson had to be brought abreast of these moves.

While the new President worked, Mrs. Kennedy maintained her vigil beside the casket in the rear compartment, just a few feet away. With her sat her husband's devoted friends and aids, O'Brien, O'Donnell and Dave Powers. She consoled them. "You were with him at the start and you're with him at the end," she said. They winced to realize that it was a frail young woman who was comforting the supposedly tough Irish politicians from Massachusetts.

With Johnson, there was still the matter of security. He told Youngblood that after landing by helicopter on the White House lawn, he would go to the Vice-Presidential Office in the Executive Office Building across the street, then later to his home, The Elms, in the Spring Valley section of Washington. Youngblood protested. "We want you in the White House," he said. "That's the best place to protect you, Mr. President."

"That would be presumptuous on my part," said Johnson. "I won't do it."

"Well, my job is to think first of security."

"I realize that," replied Johnson, "but you can protect The Elms too, can't you?"

Youngblood said they could, and so it was settled. Johnson would not stay at the White House that night. Agent Johns called Washington and had Johnson's regular phones at his home disconnected. Three numbers were in the directory, and the agent could envisage the phones ringing constantly. All lines now were channeled through the White House switchboard.

The landing at Andrews posed a problem. Johnson decided that in the first few hours, the new administration had to operate in a goldfish bowl to give the Nation confidence. He got word to Andrew Hatcher, assistant press secretary at the White House, to permit normal full press coverage. "I want the world to know," Johnson told his aids, "that while the leader has fallen, the Nation isn't prostrate."

When the sleek blue-and-white Presidential transport rolled to a halt at Andrews, the casket had to be transferred to an ambulance before a nationwide TV audience. Then Johnson had to speak his piece, standing bareheaded in the night air before the glaring arc lights. He read 57 words from a small white card:

"This is a sad time for all people. We have suffered a loss that cannot be weighed. For me, it is a deep personal tragedy. I know the world shares the sorrow that Mrs. Kennedy and her family bear. I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help—and God's."

November 22, 1963, 6:17 p.m. As Kennedy's body rolled toward the Bethesda Naval Hospital, Johnson climbed into the Presidential helicopter with McNamara, Bundy, and Under Secretary of State George W. Ball. Mrs. Johnson, Liz Carpenter and several aids rode with them in this first of three copters. They landed on the back lawn of the White House at 6:17 p.m.

"Liz," said the President, "you go with Lady Bird and help her all you can."

Mrs. Johnson rode in a limousine to The Elms, where more than 100 reporters waited. She made a brief statement that she had prepared on the plane, then walked up the steps, to be embraced by her daughter Lucy. She called Lynda in Austin, then went into the kitchen to supervise the cooking of a fried-chicken dinner.

Johnson walked from the helicopter to the White House situation room, where Bundy and intelligence officers briefed him before a large map of the world. Then, under guard, he walked across the street to his old Vice Presidential office, No. 274, in the ancient, baroque Executive Office Building, which U. S. Grant once called a mixture of all the architectures of Europe."

At his desk, Johnson wrote two longhand letters, one to Caroline Kennedy and one to John, Jr., the now-fatherless children of the slain young President. A flurry of appointments and phone calls followed. At 6:55, he met with Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

At 7:05, he got a call from former President Harry S. Truman. At 7:10, he called former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. At 7:29, he called Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director and the dead President's brother-in-law.

November 22, 1963, 7:40 p.m. He met with the congressional leaders and repeated what he had been saying to others. He needed their help. They must unite, present one face to the world, forego party differences for awhile.

He tried to reach Herbert Hoover, but the ailing former President was already asleep. He talked with Senator Edward M. Kennedy, younger brother of President Kennedy; with Speaker McCormack; with Senator Richard B. Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; with Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg.

A call to Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, provided the only humor in the long ordeal. He thanked Funston for closing the exchange. "Thanks, Mr. President," said Funston. "Nobody has complimented the stock exchange for anything in a long while."

At 8:06, he met with three aides and ate a bowl of soup, his first food since breakfast. He received a telegram from Senator YARBOROUGH, with whom he had been at odds. It pledged unity among feuding Texas Democrats.

At 9 p.m., he was driven home, a 15-minute ride. In the big house that he had purchased from party hostess Perle Mesta. Johnson embraced his wife and daughter, then faced a situation familiar to millions of late-working husbands.

"I've got some fried chicken for you," said Mrs. Johnson.

"Darling," he said, "I should have called you from the office. I had something to eat there."

He seated himself in a special chair designed for him by Dr. Janet Travell, President Kennedy's physician. (Johnson had consulted Dr. Travell about a back ailment in 1962. She had also ordered a slight build-up of his right heel.) He relaxed now with old friends: Dr. Willis Hurst, Emory University heart specialist, Mr. and Mrs. Horace Busby, Valenti, Moyers, and Carter. But it wasn't quite the same—and never would be again. He was the President of the United States now, and even his old friends exhibited an unfamiliar restraint, a deference, an added bit of courtesy. As they sat in the terrace room, with its high windows, he chatted about the day's events and what lay ahead. Once, while sipping a glass of low-calorie orange juice, he noted the photograph of another Texas, the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, hanging on the wall. Rayburn had been his political mentor for almost 30 years, had been at his side in Los Angeles when he decided to accept the offer of the Vice-Presidential nomination. He raised his glass to the picture.

"Well, sir," he said, "I sure wish you were here tonight." In another man, it would have been considered a flight of histronics, but his old friends knew how intensely Lyndon Johnson wished that Mr. Sam were there to give him comfort and advice.

His daughter Lucy came to the room, took her father's hand and said three words aloud: "I love you." Then they whispered together for a minute or so while his friends looked away.

At one point, Johnson asked for Secret Service Chief James J. Rowley, who was sitting with other agents in an adjoining room.

"Jim," he said, "I don't know how your shop operates, but Youngblood deserves something—a decoration, a promotion or whatever you do. He was great. If I'd been in his spot, I don't think I'd have had the nerve to knock the Vice President to the floor."

Once the TV set was turned on, but the first pictures were of Jack Kennedy playing with his children at Hyannis Port in happier days.

"Oh, God, no," said Johnson, "I can't take that. Not now."

So they turned to another channel, and later Johnson was wryly amused at pictures of his early life. But he soon tired of television and, for a long while, he just sat and talked quietly with his friends. Finally, after midnight, Johnson bade the others good night and went up to his room. Carter, Valenti, and Moyers were to stay the night, and, after a few minutes, they too retired to their separate bedrooms. Each man was just unbuttoning his clothes when the room phone rang. It was the President. "Come on to my room," he said. "I want to talk to you."

Each man redressed and walked to the master bedroom, with its beige paneling, its paintings of Texas scenes by Porfiro Salinas, and its French-provincial furniture. A TV set faced the bed, but it was not on. Johnson was in bed in his pajamas, propped up

by pillows. Newspapers and secret CIA intelligence reports littered the bedspread.

"I want to talk some more," he said. "We've got a lot of work ahead. I want to think out my agenda." And so the three men sat on chairs and helped plan an hour-by-hour schedule of what Johnson should say and do on Saturday. He pounded at his theme—unity, continuity, a smooth transition of power in one of the Nation's cruelest crises.

Occasionally, Johnson's mind flicked back over the day of tragedy. He couldn't get over Jacqueline Kennedy's unflinching courage. Once, he said, "At a time when we showed the world our ugly, seamy side, she revealed and symbolized our nobler side. We should always be grateful to her for it." It was almost 3:30 a.m. when the conversation finally ended.

"Well, good night, boys," he said. "Get a lot of sleep fast. It's going to be a long day tomorrow."

November 22, 1963: 3:30 a.m. President Johnson recalls that he fell asleep almost immediately after his aides left. Bill Moyers remembers something else. As he opened the window, in the bedroom that had been assigned to him, he saw Secret Service agents patrolling the grounds, their forms shadowy in the pale night light. It struck Moyers full force then. The President tonight was not John F. Kennedy, but Lyndon B. Johnson.

At that moment, Kennedy's body was leaving the Bethesda Naval Hospital to lie in state in the White House East Room.

And at that moment, in a closet of Congressman GONZALEZ' Washington apartment, rested the two brown-paper bags containing Governor Connally's clothes. GONZALEZ had been swept up in the swift departure, bags and all, and he had brought the sacks to Washington.

The panoply of power had been transferred—but not without wounds that would scar men's hearts until the day they, too, died.

An Arm-Twisting Exposé

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress the following news item which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1964. The article follows:

Food stamps emerge as Johnson's key weapon to win approval of major farm laws.

To obtain support of city Democrats for cotton, wheat, and tobacco bills, the White House promises all-out support for a generous nationwide food stamp plan. House Democratic leaders pledge a hard drive to knock out a provision, objected to by urban interests, that would require States to pay half the cost. Instead, they'll push for Uncle Sam footing most of the bill, estimated at $360 million annually.

Because planting time is so close, many city legislators agree to support a quick House vote on the income boosting but still controversial cotton and wheat proposals, approved by the Senate last week. But to make sure of enthusiastic administration support later on food stamps, they are blocking action now on the tobacco proposal, providing for major Federal research spending on smoking health hazards.

Not only the Farm Belt prestige of President Johnson but the effectiveness of oft-rebuffed Agriculture Secretary Freeman ride on quick congressional approval of the cotton-wheat bill.

Panama Canal Crisis: Glib Correspondents Have No Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my studies of interoceanic canal history and problems, I long ago learned that, when grave crises over the Panama Canal occur, the ensuing public interest tends to follow a general pattern that unfolds in predictable ways. The reasons that such prophecy is possible are that the underlying questions involved relate to the choice of sites and types and that all proposals have advocates who compete, with arguments and counter-arguments, setting forth the advantages and disadvantages of each idea.

Among the ideas that periodically reappear as "new" ideas for solving the problems of transisthmian transit are proposals for shiptunnels through mountains to afford greater security from enemy atack. Another fantastic idea is for the construction of a ship railroad to haul vessels overland—an idea as old as the practice of the ancient Greeks on the Isthmus of Corinth. Such freakish proposals are stimulated by hysteria over "security" and "national defense" evoked by the advent of nuclear warfare, causing many to lose sight of the prime purpose of a canal—the safe, convenient, and economic transit of vessels.

Other canal proposals include those of modernizing the existing Panama Canal, the construction of a second canal at Nicaragua or elsewhere, and the construction of a new Panama Canal in the Canal Zone of so-called sea-level design, which would require tidal locks near the Pacific end where the tidal range is greater than that at the Atlantic end.

One of the ridiculous arguments used against the Nicaragua project was that barnacles falling from vessels crossing Lake Nicaragua would be killed by the fresh water of the lake, loosen, and eventually fill up the lake. The principal contention on the part of advocates of canals at sea level was, and still is, the fallacious assumption that a canal of such design could not be destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I thought that I knew all the arguments for various canal proposals, especially those for a vast excavation job in the Canal Zone known as the sea-level project, but a new one has been discovered. Two young Washington reporters, Roland Evans and Robert Novak, in the February 26, 1964, issue of the Washington Post, presented a delusive justification for this proposal: that top officials in Washington wish it constructed in order to eliminate odious comparisons between the clean, well-kept Canal Zone townships and "slum infested Panama City." This, Mr. Speaker, is the contribution to history by these two enterprising journalistic geniuses who some weeks ago visited Panama for a few days and suddenly found themselves experts on the subject of "ugly Americans" in the Canal Zone, who, in fact, live under no better conditions in the zone than they would in the United States for those of comparable education and skills.

In a statement to the House on January 21, 1964, under the title of "Evans and Novak: A Plan for Panama?" I took strong exception to a previous slanderous attack by these two writers on our citizens in the Canal Zone. Their latest effusion does not indicate that they have learned anything of value in the interim but, instead, that they have become increasingly confused in the wake of their own propaganda. Moreover, their statements are so malicious and evince such ignorance that I feel impelled to comment again on their most recent article.

First, as to "Washington's proposal that Panamanians be placed on the Canal Zone police force for the first time," this is not an action that can be dismissed as "one small attempt at reform" but as a serious and incredible breach of security in the law enforcement organization charged with heavy responsibilities for protecting the Panama Canal. These writers suggest that the addition of Panamanians to the police force would be a "halting first step" to "reduce tensions in the Canal Zone," a "slow and gradual" process, and "mainly symbolic." They wholly ignore the fact that the United States employs thousands of Panamanians in nonsecurity positions in the maintenance and operation of the canal. The two writers commend some Panamanians who were loyal during the January assaults and with this I concur. They fail, however, to disclose that some Panamanian employees of the Panama Canal Company joined the mobs attacking the zone; and some of them actually fired into the zone. The way to reduce tensions is not to employ aliens without allegiance to our country and its flag as defenders of law and order and protectors of the canal but, according to no less an authority than George Washington, to put only Americans on guard; that is to say, only U.S. citizens whose Government is charged with responsibility. If Panama cannot prevent Red infiltration and leadership of Panamanian mobs how can it prevent infiltration of Panamanians who might be placed in security positions in the canal organization? The questions involved are entirely too grave to be decided on the basis of maudlin sentiments and I am sure that the appropriation and investigating committees of the Congress would like to know who "in Washington" originated this "small attempt at reform."

Second, as to "colonial minded Americans" in the Canal Zone "shouting bloody murder" against Panamanians being placed on the Canal Zone Police Force, I can categorically state that they

do not have to shout from the Canal Zone. The bizarre proposal to hire Panamanians as members of the police force, which I condemned on the floor of the House of Representatives as being "tantamount to treason," has aroused the righteous indignation of many of the most experienced officials of our Armed Forces, active and retired, and vigorous patriots, especially among veterans organizations, all over the Nation, who have expresed and are still expressing, ther opposition to such employment of Panamanians in the most vigorous terms.

Third, in regard to elimination of the "juxtaposition of the spick-and-span Canal Zone with the slum infested" areas of Panama City as a "constant source of irritation," these two writers fail to compare the degradation in the slums of Panama City with the palatial homes of Panamanian leaders in the best parts of the city. These houses are palaces as compared to all residences in the Canal Zone including the Governor's house, which was built during the construction era at Culebra and later moved to Balboa Heights. In view of these facts, I would ask if these two propagandists are trying to shield some of their wealthy hosts and hostesses in Panama by comparing the tragedies of Panama with what are nothing more than wholesome living conditions in the Canal Zone necessary to attract and hold skilled employees in canal service, which are indispensable for health in the tropics? I would suggest that these young pundits study the life of General Gorgas and his work in the Canal Zone, including the sanitary and health conditions in Panama before and after the U.S. occupation of the zone.

Fourth, as to my being the zonians' "leading mouthpiece on Capitol Hill, predictably protesting more shrilly than anybody else," I am proud of the part that it has been my privilege to play in this crucial matter and of the vote of confidence of the House of Representatives—388 to 12—in support of views that I presented in opposition to flying the Panama flag over the Canal Zone. I knew that such concession would prove a veritable box of Pandora's; and the results developed as predicted.

Fifth, with regard to infiltrating the Canal Zone Police Force with Panamanians being a "reform supported by important officials in both the State Department and the Pentagon," I would ask who, if in fact any, are these "important officials" and what are their qualifications to speak on the matter? It took only one Oswald to kill President Kennedy. It would take only one trained infiltrator, of which Panama now has many trained in Cuba and elsewhere, to blow up a lock. Why the advocacy of such a stupid and dangerous practice? The United States has successfully protected the Panama Canal during three great wars and this was done as provided by law with only U.S. citizens in security positions. Who would say that this would have been the case had aliens been employed in security positions in the canal organization, especially since Panama became a hunting ground for Reds?

Sixth, as to the article's cleverly disguised attempt to create the impression that a cleavage exists between Chairman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN of the Panama Canal Subcommittee and myself, this does not impress me and, I am sure, will not impress her. Both she and I are harmoniously working for the best interests of the United States and not for any special elements in, or on the fringes of, our Government. For the distingushed chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], I have nothing but praise.

Seventh, concerning the Evans-Novak plan to rotate employees of the Panama Canal, this would be about as ridiculous as rotating the employees of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Union Pacific Railroad, or our vast civil service organizations. What is urgently needed are more able, well-informed, higher executives in the Panama Canal organization, especially engineering and operating, who win their promotions on the basis of superior performance rather than because of an obsequious acquiescence in policymaking decisions of uninformed "miners and sappers" in Washington.

Eighth, as to our U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone being a "political pressure group" this is one capacity that they do not possess, which, in a large measure, accounts for the failure of our Government, the Congress as well as the Executive, to take timely preventive actions that could and should have been taken to avoid the situation that now confronts our country at Panama and imperils the peace of the world.

Ninth. In regard to the assertion of the two writers that a canal at sea level, which would require tidal locks, lateral dams, and elevated reservoirs on both sides of the main channel, would not need protection, this is not only completely untrue but is altogether naive. It supplies an excellent example of the danger of a little knowledge when coupled with a fascile pen. Any true statesman in dealing with a subject of the magnitude of the Panama Canal would inevitably consider the problem in terms of the gravest conditions of peril in war as well as peace. Any type of canal that can be constructed can likewise be destroyed. If not defended in time of peace, it will be destroyed through sabotage and violence as is evident from the January 1964 Panamanian assaults. If the Panama Canal is not the keystone in the arch of Western Hemisphere defense and security, why has Soviet policy through the years been directed, and is still so directed, toward the complete liquidation of U.S. ownership and control of the strategic waterway? The moment the United States leaves the isthmus, Communist revolutionary power would step into the vacuum. Let us be realistic and not be led around as if we were a nation of sheep.

Mr. Speaker, such writers as Novak, Evans, and their ilk in our country, their employers and exploiters, are the prime causes of much of the trouble that has developed in the isthmus because of their failures to write objectively and truthfully. Wittingly or unwittingly, they have served as obvious tools of certain elements in and near our Government, which, through the process of erosion of our rights, powers, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, seek to transfer jurisdiction over that strategic crossroads to the United Nations or other international body. Since this has been the long-range Soviet objective since 1917, such articles on the Panama Canal as those that have been written by Novak and Evans in the Washington Post place these two writers in the position of supporting the long-range objectives of the international Communist conspiracy as regards the control of strategic waterways. Truly they are the "ugly Americans" in the Panama Canal picture and should be so identified.

The indicated article follows:

GLOOM IN PANAMA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The hysterical reaction set off by one small attempt at reform in the Panama Canal Zone raises doubts that tensions there can be eased in the foreseeable future.

The Zonians, the colonial-minded Americans who work for Uncle Sam in the Canal Zone, are shouting bloody murder over Washington's proposal that Panamanians be placed on the Canal Zone police force for the first time.

Actually, no reform can completely eliminate the potential for trouble in Panama. The juxtaposition of the spick-and-span Canal Zone with slum-infested Panama City is a constant source of irritation that periodically can be fanned into violence by Communist agitators.

That is why top officials in Washington are unanimous in believing that the Panama Canal, a lock canal vulnerable to sabotage, must be replaced by a sea-level canal that needs neither elaborate security precautions nor a permanent American community in residence. But if work on a sea-level canal begins now and progresses rapidly (all of which is highly unlikely), we still would depend entirely upon the old canal at least until 1976.

In the interim, the United States must try to reduce tensions in the Canal Zone. And the inclusion of 30 to 40 Panamanians on a newly expanded police force of about 300 men (compared with the present 180) would be a halting first step.

First reactions to this were encouraging. Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, of Missouri, chairman of the House subcommittee handling Canal affairs, entered no objection when Army officials tipped her off in advance.

As soon as the word was made public, however, the shrieks of the outraged Zonians carried to Washington. Mrs. SULLIVAN was inundated by telephone calls from the zone, protesting that not even the best Panamanians could serve two countries.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, the Zonians' leading mouthpiece on Capitol Hill, predictably protested more shrilly than anybody else. "The proposal raises serious questions as to subversives in our Government," FLOOD told the House.

And in the zone itself Zonian spokesmen were adamant in private discussions with Army officials. First they argued that no Panamanian could be trusted with a badge and gun. Then they argued that no Panamanian, even if trustworthy, ought to be made to take up arms against Panamanian countrymen.

Strangely enough, some Zonians concede that the zone's Panamanian employees stayed loyal during the rioting. One electrical shop worker stayed at his post round the clock to keep the locks operating, not even

letting his family know whether he was dead or alive. But to the Zonians, such loyalty still does not qualify a Panamanian for parity with Americans.

It is natural that the Army is not running too hard into this Zonian headwind. The addition of Panamanians to the force will be slow and gradual.

Even this step is mainly symbolic. What really has to be done is the rotation of Canal Zone employees between the zone and the United States—a reform supported by important officials in both the State Department and Pentagon. If a tour of duty in the zone were held to 6 years, the Zonians would be finished as a white settler class—and as a political pressure group.

Based partly on their experience with the police force affair, administration officials are not ready to risk proposing a rotation plan. Even Mrs. SULLIVAN, no stooge for the Zonians, is flatly opposed to rotation.

With the sea-level canal a distant mirage and immediate reform unlikely, the outlook in Panama today is gloomy. Thanks to the Zonians and their friends on Capitol Hill, the status quo will prevail there. In fact, interest in Panama is likely to fade until the next incident of Communist-fanned violence.

L.B.J. Scores High in Tennessee Editor's Assessment of the President's First 100 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson's first 100 days in office mark a momentous period in the life of our Nation and it appropriately has been the subject of widespread analysis and evaluation in the Nation's press. Among the outstanding contributions to this study is an editorial which appeared in the March 3 issue of the Cookeville Citizen.

The Cookeville Citizen is one of the important newspapers of Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. The Citizen's editor and publisher, Coleman A. Harwell, is a seasoned observer of the political scene and one of Tennessee's best-known and most highly regarded newspapermen.

Under unanimous consent I include Editor Harwell's editorial on the assessment of President Johnson's administration in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AN ASSESSMENT OF L.B.J.'S FIRST HUNDRED DAYS IN OFFICE

President Johnson's first hundred days in office, marked last Saturday, have inspired considerable thought and discussion, and grading, of his record to date.

The score adds up about as follows:

Domestic affairs: Excellent.

Foreign affairs: Inconclusive.

Politics: Excellent.

The experts are predicting that foreign affairs will be the major issue in the coming presidential election. Supporting this contention is the latest Gallup Poll. This opinion gage shows that 44 percent of the people questioned put international problems at the top of the worry list for 1964. This would seem to create a problem for President Johnson in November, as his rating on foreign affairs appears to be the only questionable one at the moment. However, the very fact that this is listed as the biggest worry may result from his remarkable success in the other two fields. His record is so unassailable that one must look elsewhere for problems.

Taking a look at his score on domestic matters, one finds it impressive by any standard. The major achievements are enactment of the tax cut bill and adoption of a $97.8 billion budget which was less than last year's. The first shows his ability to get congressional action the other reveals executive capacity. Both reflect strong policies as well as the ability to carry them out.

On further legislative matters he seems to have the situation well under control. This is true of the most difficult of all, the civil rights bill. He has stated a vigorous policy—"to protect the constitutional rights of every American * * * to press forward with legislation, with education, and with action, until we have eliminated the last barrier of intolerance." And he appears to be well on the way to success in this, too.

President Johnson has revealed calm judgment coupled with decisive action in succeeding to the Presidency. He has been a model of tact and compassion in the personal tragedy of which he was a part. He has adopted, with full credit, whole segments of the Kennedy program, and has given them support as wholehearted as though they stemmed wholely from his own policy. He has also added important programs, principally his attack on poverty and its attendant ills, which have long awaited the master touch of a sympathetic and determined politician.

In economizing on military spending, he has taken a forthright attitude, even though it has made some politicians and others unhappy. And he has shown a sharp eye for other economies, some of them small, to be sure, but understandable. And they add up.

In the political sphere, he has shown the master touch. He has repaired injured friendships, cemented old ones, made new ones, and now is high in the esteem of capital and labor, the minorities and the majorities, both rural and city folk and, despite his strong appeal to otherners, he is still as solid as ever with southerners. While winning a smile from millions who will notice a few extra bucks in their paychecks each week, he seems to have blunted the longtime GOP assault on Democrats as spendthrifts. The one hope his enemies nurtured—of tying Bobby Baker to his coattails—has fallen flat. As evidence of the plight of his would-be opponents, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER last week made reference to the contest in 1968 as thought 1964 were already in the bag. Which it seems to be.

But lest President Johnson slip carelessly into overconfidence, which one in his job, especially if he once won a senatorial race by 87 votes, is not apt to do, there is the world beyond our borders, which is forever teeming with problems, most of which plague us.

The most difficult of all at the moment, and likely to be for a long time, is Vietnam. We have more than 15,000 military advisers there and are spending $1 million a day keeping the war and the national economy going. There are three alternatives for us there, none of them attractive.

We could call it quits and pull out; we could carry the war to North Vietnam, just as their Communist guerrillas are bringing it South; we could step up our activities in South Vietnam itself.

Weighing against a decision to pull out is the almost certain sequence that all of Southeast Asia would go Communist, America would suffer a devastating blow to its prestige, and by the same token, roaring Red China would become the bully boy of the world, which it is close to being already.

More tempting is the next alternate of sending forays into North Vietnam. At present, the Vietnamese under our guidance are fighting a basically defensive war. The Red Vietcong, on the other hand, carry on a relentless war of assault, which means Vietnamese troops must be many places if they are to stop the enemy. The big damper on mounting an attack into North Vietnam is that Red China leaves no doubt that she would respond with troops, as she did in Korea. And Russia, though having recently refused to furnish military aid in the war, has let it be known she would do so if the fighting spread northward.

The third alternative, therefore, seems most advisable at the moment. In that, as in the others, it is irritating to find President de Gaulle of France siding with Russia for a "neutralization" policy. This, we have reason to fear would actually mean a Communist domination as in Laos and Cambodia.

There are other problems beyond our borders—Africa, Berlin, the Arab world. And there is our old friend, President Ayub Khan of Pakistan, who has had billions from us, telling Chinese Premier Chou En-lai that America is losing prestige in the East because we will not force India to give Kashmir to Pakistan. And there is our new and most detested enemy, Stinky Castro, still blowing smoke rings 90 miles toward the United States of America. He also reminds us of other problems to our south, including our former protege, Panama, which is having a presidential election this year, too.

If President Johnson's score is inconclusive in foreign affairs, it will be difficult to find fault with him at this point. Though he has been criticised by some for speaking out too soon on what we intend to do, for instance, in Vietnam, he merits praise for his restraint in the face of many provocations, and for not being egged on by his critics to make rash moves.

If, as seems to be true, he has adopted a policy of building a strong organization and knowing the ground before he acts, his score will almost certainly be favorable in the months to come. That, of course, must be hedged against events over which he can have no control. But he has already revealed effectiveness in foreign affairs in an area on which he is well prepared, Mexico. His recent consultations with that country's President have gone far to cement friendship with our next door neighbor to the south, and thereby impress any others in the hemisphere who may be impressionable.

And that, as of now, seems to add up to the L.B.J. score. Where a mark has been made, it is preponderantly favorable. That is all that could be reasonably expected. It speaks well for America in meeting the critical problems following a President's assassination—it speaks eloquently for the man who has led the Nation in doing so.

Incidentally, there are three other marks that should be noted. They've been made by the ladies of the family—Ladybird, Linda Bird, and Luci Baines. They are, without doubt, superlative.

Leading Citizens of Various Organizations Urge Enactment of H.R. 8986, a Bill To Increase Federal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the National Civil Service League released

today statements from a number of distinguished business and industrial leaders voicing strong support for increasing the compensation of U.S. Cabinet officers, Senators and Representatives, and the Federal judiciary. Specifically, these men were commenting on the recommendations of the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, chaired by Mr. Clarence B. Randall, which submitted its report to President Kennedy last year, recommending a salary of $50,000 for Cabinet officers in place of the present $25,000 maximum, $35,000 for Senators and Congressmen in place of the present $22,500 level, and $60,000 for Supreme Court Justices in contrast to the present $35,000.

Proposals for advancing top Government salaries to levels more commensurate with their responsibilities are now under consideration by the Congress. The Federal budget recently submitted by President Johnson included funds for this purpose.

Last year, in connection with the Randall study, the league sponsored a broad survey embracing some 400 national leaders in business, education, journalism, and the professions, which reflected a strong consensus that salary levels for Cabinet officers, Senators and Representatives are seriously inadequate and should be moved sharply upward. More than half—52 percent—of those participating expressed judgment that Cabinet members should receive annual compensation of at least $50,000 or higher. Just about half were in favor of at least $35,000, or an even higher level, for Senators and Representatives. It may be noted that congressional salaries have not been adjusted since 1955.

According to Bernard L. Gladieux, chairman of the league: "The league stands for efficiency, quality, and economy in the public service. It actively supports all measures designed to improve public management and reduce the cost of Government by better administration. However, fair and adequate compensation for top policy and managerial posts is prerequisite to an efficient and responsive governmental system. The league is convinced that our national leadership is seriously underpaid for what is expected of them. Current pay levels do not recognize the heavy weight of their responsibility and do not represent equity in terms of advancing national salary standards.

"The results of last year's survey, the statements released today, and the many other expressions of citizen opinion directed to the League indicate the public generally is coming to appreciate the fact that appointment or election to high office should not be limited preponderantly to those who can afford to make substantial monetary sacrifice for the privilege of public service."

The statements, arranged in alphabetical order, follow:

Ralph E. Ablon, chairman and president, Ogden Corp.:

As a businessman and as a citizen, I strongly support the recommendations of the National Civil Service League concerning increased salaries for Cabinet officers, Senators and Congressmen, and the Federal judiciary. * * * Increasing salaries to levels more commensurate with their responsibilities for the welfare and security of the Nation will have two major effects on our governmental operations. First, superior men, regardless of their personal wealth, will be more readily attracted to public service. Second, and even more critical, superior public servants, once attracted to Government roles, are more likely to stay on their jobs as long as they are needed instead of as long as their savings hold out. (Complete statement is attached.)

Winthrop W. Aldrich, board of directors, Rockefeller Center, Inc.:

It has been my conviction for a very long time that the salaries paid by the Federal Government to Senators, Congressmen, Supreme Court Justices, and other high officials of the Government have been inadequate when compared with the salaries of similar office holders in large State and municipal governments. Moreover, the competition of our business, philanthropic, and educational corporations for men of outstanding ability has made it more and more difficult to attract qualified individuals into the service of the Federal Government. I believe that the recommendations made by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems to Congress over a year ago were no more than adequate to insure the payment of salaries commensurate with the vital responsibilities assumed by these officials. (Complete statement is attached.)

John D. Biggers, chairman, finance committee, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.:

In general, I believe that these important Government officials should receive salaries commensurate to those they could earn in private business or professions. These men in Government hold very important positions affecting the welfare of our Nation and the lives of its people. I do not think we should expect them to make serious financial sacrifices when asked to leave private life and accept Government service.

Roger M. Blough, chairman, United States Steel Corp.:

First-rate people do not accept public service exclusively for the pay it offers. Public service should be in part, but not in unreasonable part, its own reward. It would be a sad day for America if men and women were no longer willing to make some sacrifice in order to serve in high office of government * * *. But we Americans, I am afraid, have been abusing a good thing. We have, for too long, been expecting too much for too little from members of the President's Cabinet, Members of the Senate and the House, and the members of the Supreme Court * * *. Despite the pressures of inflation, the salaries of these officers have lagged far behind those of people in other walks of life * * *. So I believe that the increases recommended by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems should be enacted into law.

Harold Boeschenstein, chairman, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.:

We cannot expect men of proven ability to uproot their lives and business or professional careers and to expose themselves to the pitiless glare of constant press and congressional scrutiny and, at the same time, also require a substantial reduction in their income. More and more, this will tend to concentrate available talent into two categories: those for whom even inadequate compensation is more than they can command in private life, and those of independent means for whom the amount of compensation is relatively immaterial. This is a great danger for the future of our democratic process.

Lucius D. Clay, senior partner, Lehman Bros.:

While the honor of serving in the Cabinet, in Congress, or in top Government posts should still be the principal incentive, salaries should be adequate and, in some degree, comparable with those paid in the business world, which they are not today * * *. If we want sound government efficiently administered, if we want a Congress understanding of the complex society in which we live, we should be prepared to provide adequate compensation which, in the long run, will save far more than the extra cost.

John Cowles, president, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune:

It seems quite plain that compensation for top jobs in the Federal Government has got badly out of line with pay scales not only in private industry but in State and municipal governments, university and public school administration and faculties, and comparable activities. * * * We are almost in the position of asking private individuals, when they are appointed to such high positions, financially to subsidize the Federal Government (through their acceptance of cut-rate compensation) at the same time that they take on tremendous burdens of responsibility on the Nation's behalf. And in some cases, where individuals of outstanding talent lack private financial sources, we deprive the Nation of the services of the best men available for specific positions. (Complete statement is attached.)

Henry Ford, chairman, Ford Motor Co.:

Many able citizens have made great personal sacrifices to answer the call to Government service. But the attrition has been great as these conscientious men and women have been forced to return to their businesses or professions to meet their personal and family obligations. * * * Our need for excellence in Government must not be thwarted by salaries which are unrealistic. If it is essential that we obtain the best men in top echelons of Government—and it is—it also is essential that we pay them adequately. To save money by paying them less is the greatest extravagance we could commit. I believe that the salaries recommended by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems represent the least we can afford to pay our top officials. (Complete statement is attached.)

Clarence Francis, industrialist:

We have been blessed in the past by having excellent patriotic citizens answer the call, but I believe the time has come for upward adjustments in the salaries for top-ranking officers. I refer to the Cabinet members, our Senators, our Congressmen, our judiciary, and our top-ranking policymaking civil servants. Commonsense indicates that we must attract capable men and hold them in service. I am convinced that this can be accomplished only if the compensation is realistic. I therefore strongly favor a revision of salaries in the top echelons of our administration. (Complete statement is attached.)

G. Keith Funston, president, New York Stock Exchange:

We cannot hope to solve the numerous complex problems facing our country today unless men and women of outstanding ability continue to be attracted to high-level positions in the Federal Government. Consequently, government salaries at top echelon levels must be sufficient to allow talented individuals to accept these positions without undue financial sacrifice on their part.

C. R. Smith, president, American Airlines:

It is unfair, both to the individuals concerned and to our country, to require competent men and women to make substantial

financial sacrifices in order to serve in our Government. Our country is neither poor nor niggardly. We can afford to pay for the reasonable worth of services given to the Government and should do so, as a matter of basic and continuing policy. By doing this, we will make it easier for good citizens to serve and we will reasonably insure better government.

T. S. Petersen, director, Standard Oil Co. of California:

Increased salaries for Cabinet officers and Members of Congress are in order. Such action should be followed by increasing salary levels for other appointive and executive positions so that they would be attractive to top qualified men throughout the country. I believe it is false economy to continue these low salaries. Our Government needs top performance in the management of its affairs.

Sidney J. Weinberg, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.:

Low pay in Federal Government service is a tremendous handicap in securing the right and best men for career service. I have learned, while in Government, to have a profound respect for the civil servants in our Government. I wholeheartedly endorse the Randall report on Federal compensation. In order to raise the salaries to Federal workers it must first start at the top, such as for Cabinet members, Senators and Congressmen, and the judiciary. These salaries are pitifully low for the high responsibilities they carry. (Complete statement is attached.)

FULL STATEMENTS TO NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE

ROGER E. ABLON, PRESIDENT, OGDEN CORP.

As a businessman and as a citizen, I strongly support the recommendations of the National Civil Service League concerning increased salaries for Cabinet officers, Senators and Congressmen, and the Federal judiciary. Increasing salaries to levels more commensurate with their responsibilities for the welfare and security of the Nation will have two major effects on our governmental operations. First, superior men, regardless of their personal wealth, will be more readily attracted to public service. Second, and even more critical, superior public servants, once attracted to Government roles, are more likely to stay on their jobs as long as they are needed instead of as long as their savings hold out.

Any one with an appreciation for the massive responsibilities of our Government leaders in Washington must be deeply disturbed by their present inadequate level of compensation. Thousands of men in our society with jobs calling for more limited skills and scope of responsibility are paid many times what our top public servants receive.

I am convinced that, both on grounds of equity and in the national interest, salaries for our high-level Government personnel should be moved sharply upward. Measures now under consideration by the Congress would still not remove financial sacrifice from the price a Government official pays to serve his country. Nor would the proposed increases remunerate these officials in any way comparable to pay scales in private business. But this financial sacrifice by men in our public service should be placed at a more reasonable level in order to afford adequate financial protection for men of their station. They should be paid enough to live comfortably and to afford to send their children to college, to build security against old age and disabling illness, and to meet other financially exhausting requirements.

WINTHROP W. ALDRICH, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ROCKEFELLER CENTER, INC.

It has been my conviction for a very long time that the salaries paid by the Federal Government to Senators, Congressmen, Supreme Court Justices and other high officials of the Government have been inadequate when compared with the salaries of similar officeholders in large State and municipal governments. Moreover, the competition of our business, philanthropic and educational corporations for men of outstanding ability has made it more and more difficult to attract qualified individuals into the service of the Federal Government.

I believe that the recommendations made by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems to Congress over a year ago with regard to the salaries of members of the Cabinet, Senators, Congressmen, and Supreme Court Justices were no more than adequate to insure the payment of salaries commensurate with the vital responsibilities assumed by these officals. Surely when one takes into consideration the general level of salaries now existing outside of the Federal Government service, it would not be unreasonable to pay Supreme Court Justices $60,000, Cabinet Members $50,000 and Senators and Congressmen $32,500 per annum, as recommended by the Advisory Panel.

Moreover, it would seem that if Senators and Congressmen were paid more adequate salaries, the problem of conflict of interest which appears to exist in Washington today would become much less a matter of concern.

ROGER BLOUGH, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.

Regardless of the many shades of difference in their political beliefs, citizens imbued with concern for the quality of their National Government stand united, I believe, on one proposition: The American people want first-rate operation of the three separate but coequal branches of the Federal Government. This they want so that the Federal Government will serve the people in the most prudent, efficient way possible. This they want so that our Government will shine out in the world as vivid proof that our system of representative government continues to work and can adapt, without sacrifice of its basic tenets, to swift and momentous change.

Good organizational structuring of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government can help in the attainment of this objective; but attainment depends, above all, on first-rate people in positions of foremost governmental responsibility. First-rate people do not accept public service exclusively for the pay it offers. Public service should be in part, but not in unreasonable part, its own reward. It would be a sad day for America if men and women were no longer willing to make some sacrifices in order to serve in high office of Government.

But we Americans, I am afraid have been abusing a good thing. We have, for too long, been expecting too much for too little from members of the President's Cabinet, Members of the Senate and the House, and the members of the Supreme Court.

Even taking into account the public-service factor I have alluded to, it seems to me that the salaries now provided for those important offices are not commensurate with the imperative need to attract and to hold first-rate people. And neither, I believe, are the salaries commensurate with the current responsibilities imposed on those offices in a great and growing nation with increasingly complex governmental problems, domestic and international.

I subscribe, therefore, to a recommendation by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems.

Along with a great many other citizens, I am vitally interested in applying the brakes to mounting Federal expenditures. But I believe this should be done by skillful administration and by retrenchments of Federal spending programs that have outlived their usefulness, become too swollen or rigidified for efficient management, or placed the Government in the position of doing things for the people that the people could do better and more economically for themselves. Certainly it should not be done at the expense and sacrifice of the principal officers of our Government.

Despite the pressures of inflation, the salaries of these officers have lagged far behind those of people in other walks of life. * * * In simple fairness, therefore, some long-overdue correction of this situation should be effected promptly.

So I believe that the increases recommended by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems should be enacted into law; I also believe that citizens with concern for the quality of Government may wish to make it clear, through communications to their Senators and Representatives and to the editors of their newspapers, that these increases have their support.

GEN. LUCIUS D. CLAY, SENIOR PARTNER, LEHMAN BROS.

Federal Government embodies the most complex administrative task ever undertaken by man. It can be efficient only if it attracts and holds top administrators. Moreover our Congress, which demands the full time services of its Members, likewise needs to attract able men who can serve unworried by financial considerations.

While the honor of serving in the Cabinet, in Congress, or in top Government posts should still be the principal incentive, salaries should be adequate and, in some degree, comparable with those paid in the business world, which they are not today.

If we want sound Government efficiently administered; if we want a Congress understanding of the complex society in which we live, we should be prepared to provide adequate compensation which, in the long run, will save far more than the extra cost.

JOHN COWLES, PRESIDENT, THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR AND TRIBUNE

It seems quite plain that compensation for top jobs in the Federal Government—Cabinet members, Supreme Court justices, Senators, and Representatives, heads of important agencies, and advisers to the President—has got badly out of line with pay scales not only in private industry but in State and municipal governments, university and public school administration and faculties, and comparable activities.

It is surely a glaring anomaly, for example, when the manager of a municipal power and water system is paid more than Cabinet members who manage Federal affairs dealing in billions of dollars, more than Supreme Court justices charged with the guardianship of our Constitution, and almost twice as much as Congressmen who make our Nation's laws.

We are almost in the position of asking private individuals, when they are appointed to such high positions, financially to subsidize the Federal Government (through their acceptance of cut-rate compensation) at the same time that they take on tremendous burdens of responsibility on the Nation's behalf. And in some cases, where individuals of outstanding talent lack private financial resources, we deprive the Nation of the services of the best men available for specific positions.

The upgrading of top Federal salaries proposed by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can only be regarded as a step in the right direction.

HENRY FORD, CHAIRMAN, FORD MOTOR CO.

I have just learned that your organization (National Civil Service League) is supporting legislation to increase the salaries paid our leading Federal Government officials, such as Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, and Supreme Court Justices.

You have my heartiest endorsement of this effort and my best wishes for success.

The security, the well-being and, indeed, even the survival of our Nation depends upon the abilities of our principal public servants. We can have an efficient, well-run Government—one which provides the taxpayer with a full measure of service for his tax dollar—only if we provide compensation to governmental leaders which will permit Government to attract and to hold the services of our most capable citizens.

Many able citizens have made great personal sacrifices to answer the call to Government service. But the attrition has been great as these conscientious men and women have been forced to return to their businesses or professions to meet their personal and family obligations.

The work of the public servant will not, and possibly should not, pay as well as that of private citizens. It seems proper, in our society, that our citizens should be called upon to make sacrifices to serve their country. But we must not expect them to sacrifice too much. Certainly we should pay thm at least enough to meet the neecssary expenses incident to their station in Government. To the extent that we fail to meet this minimum standard, we limit the top positions in Government to men of private means, and we lose the services of able men whose life-long devotion to public service has made it impossible for them to accumulate private means.

Our need for excellence in Government must not be thwarted by salaries which are unrealistic. If it is essential that we obtain the best men in top echelons of Government—and it is—it also is essential that we pay them adequately. To save money by paying them less, is the greatest extravagance we could commit. I believe that the salaries recommended by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems represent the least we can afford to pay our top officials, and I earnestly hope that the Congress will see fit to adopt these recommendations.

CLARENCE FRANCIS, INDUSTRIALIST

I have been advised that your organization (the National Civil Service League) is engaged in activities designed to develop public support for adequate compensation for Federal employees. This is a worthy endeavor. The responsibility of maintaining the American system is very great. Not only are procedures but principles involved, and any job analysis would indicate the complexities of these responsibilities and clearly demonstrate that the positions indicated should be delegated only to qualified men.

To assume these tasks, a man must be dedicated, he must be motivated first by a compulsion to serve. The compensation is not and should not be the primary motive. However, to ask any man to serve for a dollar a year, or for an unreasonably small compensation, is wrong.

We have been blessed in the past by having excellent patriotic citizens answer the call, but I believe the time has come for upward adjustments in the salaries for top-ranking officers. I refer to the Cabinet members, our Senators, our Congressmen, our judiciary, and our top-ranking policymaking civil servants. Commonsense indicates that we must attract capable men and hold them in service. I am convinced that this can be accomplished only if the compensation is realistic. I therefore strongly favor a revision of salaries in the top echelons of our administration.

SIDNEY J. WEINBERG, PARTNER, GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO.

I have been very much interested and impressed with the report of the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. I was in Government service for over 5 years in World War II with the War Production Board and during the Korean crisis with the Office of Production Management as a $1 a year man. My principal responsibility in these organizations was the recruiting of top personnel for these and other Government organizations. I believe I know the problem.

Low pay in Federal Government service is a tremendous handicap in securing the right and best men for career service. I have learned, while in Government, to have a profound respect for the civil servants in our Government.

I wholeheartedly endorse the Randall report on Federal compensation. In order to raise the salaries of Federal workers it must first start at the top, such as for Cabinet members, Senators and Congressmen, and the judiciary. These salaries of the Cabinet, Senators, Congressmen, and Federal judges are pitifully low for the high responsibilities they carry.

I understand that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported out a bill granting some increases, but not enough and not what was recommended by the Randall committee. I hope when the House and Senate committees and Senate hears this matter that they will restore the salaries to more near the Randall committee recommendation, which is sorely needed and soon.

The following letters and a telegram are in further support of this measure. They are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1964.

Congressman J. H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I have urged Congressmen to support the amendment to be proposed by you relating to title III (Federal executive salaries) of H.R. 8986, the bill to adjust rates of compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. The amendment would raise the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from level III to level II, as proposed in the original administration bill, H.R. 8716.

The American Legion is satisfied that the Morrison amendment will restore a proper balance as between heads of executive agencies, and is more in keeping with the basic intent of the legislation. As concerns comparability of responsibility it must be kept in mind that the Veterans' Administration's budget is third highest among Federal agencies and the VA is the third largest employer of all departments and agencies of Government. The VA is, in fact, larger than 8 of the 10 Cabinet departments, the heads of which would receive compensation in accordance with section 303(a) of H.R. 8986, or level I.

Considering the magnitude of its operations, there is no question in our minds but that level II should apply in the case of the head of the Veterans' Administration. We are concerned particularly, however, that there be no act of an official nature that would in any way tend to downgrade the significance of the Veterans' Administration's mission or the importance of the Administrator's position.

I sincerely and earnestly hope that other Congressmen will join with you in this effort to retain a proper relationship among the heads of executive agencies, and especially as concerns the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sincerely,

DANIEL F. FOLEY.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1964.

Hon. J. H. MORRISON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Disabled American Veterans supports H.R. 8986 as reported. We also support an amendment which will be offered by you that will move the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from level 3 to level 2 and the Deputy Administrators from level 4 to level 3.

We feel that this grade advancement is justified since the Veterans' Administration has the third largest budget and is the third largest employer in the United States. It also administers the largest medical and hospital program as well as the largest insurance company in the country.

Further, veterans and their families constitute 47 percent of the population, and we feel the vastness of this program justifies the advancement in the grade levels.

Your favorable consideration of H.R. 8986 and the Morrison amendment will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 7, 1964.*

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Gas Association has long believed that proper compensation and other appropriate financial incentives have an important bearing upon the quality of men attracted to Federal service. Compensation has also an important effect upon their job satisfaction and sense of security once appointed. Generally speaking, Government salary ranges in the upper level have been too low. Congressmen, Senators, and regulatory Commissioners are compensated at a level inconsistent with their workload or with the great responsibility they are being given. Further, the salary ranges of the abovementioned group leave little room for improvement in the salary structure of key staff personnel.

This belief was expressed in a report of AGA's special committee of executives on regulatory affairs, dated March 7, 1961, and was approved by the association in that year. According, on behalf of the American Gas Association, we wish to express to you our support of H.R. 8716 (Federal employees salary bill).

ED PARKES,
President, American Gas Association.
R. A. HORNBY,
Chairman, Special Committee of Executives on Regulatory Affairs.

Louis W. Kaufmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Louis W. Kaufmann and Lt. Louis W. Kaufmann, Jr., on the passing of one of Staten Island's most foremost citizens, Louis W. Kaufmann.

Louie Kaufmann was "Mr. Real Estate" of Staten Island. The high regard in which all segments of his industry, the banking industry, the legal field,

and the county, city, and Federal Government, held him was a source of pride to all Staten Islanders.

He will be missed by all who knew him, but his wife and son may take some comfort in the knowledge that his good life will be rewarded in the next.

Citizen Participation and Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the views of a prominent citizen of California pertaining to an aspect of municipal life too often overlooked in our great scientific age.

Mr. Eddy S. Feldman is a member of the California and Illinois bars, past secretary for Furniture Manufacturers Association of California, presently manager-director, Los Angeles Home Furnishings Mart, member of the coordinating Council of the California Apprenticeship Conference, vice president of the Furniture Trade Advisory Council of the California Institute for Men, member of the Los Angeles Board of Municipal Art Commissioners, and various community and civic groups.

His timely remarks, made last December at the annual conference for citizen participation in city affairs in Los Angeles, follow:

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE CULTURAL LIFE OF THE CITY

(Remarks by Eddy S. Feldman, member, Los Angeles Board of Municipal Art Commissioners, December 14, 1963)

I. CONDITIONS OF THE WORLD AROUND US TODAY

Before we can talk intelligently about the cultural resources of the city of Los Angeles and a program for more effective citizen participation, we must take note of a few conditions in the world today which make it different from the world of yesterday.

First, we live in a society of superaffluence. Allowing for exceptional areas, the citizens of Los Angeles generally share this abundance. For thousands of years, mankind has earned his bread by the sweat of his brow. Our moral, religious, and legal systems are built upon an economy of scarcity. This is all a thing of the past. All that remains is how to get the wealth we can produce to the people who need it: we must find out how we can apply our unused capacities to the unmet needs of the world. And our moral, religious, and legal systems will have to adjust to the new facts.

In the second place, we are witnessing a tremendous population explosion, not only in the underdeveloped countries, but in some of the more developed countries like our own. It threatens to overwhelm us. In this city arrive 47,000 persons a year. According to City Planning Director, John Roberts, 2,646,000 people were living in Los Angeles as of September 30.

Thirdly, there is a bimodal grouping of power—not necessarily Communist versus capitalist. Rather, it is democratic versus totalitarian. Until recent times the struggle between these power blocs has been waged primarily in military and economic arenas. With the release of atomic energy outmoding war as a means of acquiring and holding power, that power must be sought in other ways—as, for example, by attracting the minds and loyalties of men through the cultivation and promotion of matters cultural.

Finally, we now have instantaneous communications. Everyone in the world can observe what happens at any other point in the world at the moment it is happening. No longer do hours, days, weeks, months go by before one part of the world knows what another part has suffered or enjoyed. These communications are not simply by way of the printed word (requiring laboriously acquired literacy), for everything that happens is there for everyone to see through television and Telstar. The affluence of others is obvious to the nonaffluent.

II. THE NEED FOR A CULTURAL PROGRAM

When we think of what all these changes imply as to urban living, we had better not fail to think of them in relation to the meaning of human life and existence, itself. We want the good life and we evidently want it in cities, so we have to arrive at some conclusions as to what is the good life and to determine how it is to be brought about in our city.

I take it that this good life must mean not only the satisfaction of our physical needs, but of our spiritual, emotional, and mental needs, as well. We do not live by the aforesaid bread alone. So, while we must satisfy the pangs of physical hunger, we must also provide sustenance for our eyes and ears and touch, and we must provide an existence, as well, for those who are capable of satisfying those less tangible needs. Those who are so capable are not infrequently called artists. As they are citizens, taxpayers, and employers of the product of others, the city has its obligation to them, too.

Exposure to the cultural programs provided in a city may also provide, in a day when it is the skilled and artistic who will be more financially secure, the incentive and knowledge to succeed in daily existence, and inspire latent genius to become patent and thus to benefit the community.

Increasing free time implied by superaffluence (and we have ample statistics available to prove that everyone is working less hours and that a good many more people are not working now who used to work) places a burden on the artists to provide us with the means of using that free time and turning it into meaningful leisure time. This free time is increasing with alarming rapidity, what with automation in the city and technological progress on the farm. I have not referred to the usual shibboleths about reduction in juvenile—or adult, for that matter—delinquency. However, Mayor Yorty at his press conference on November 13, in response to a series of questions on pornograph and crime, commented at one point:

"Public opinion, if properly marshaled, probably would be more effective than any other weapon that we have today, and so long as people patronize those who deal in this sort of smut and so long as our hands are tied by legal restrictions, there isn't too much we can do, except try to elevate the standards of our people through education so they don't care for that particular type of entertainment."

Incidentally, by a cultural program I do not mean a recreational program. In the field of recreation we think of utilizing our time and energy by pleasurable activities which improve our physical being but do not necessarily add to our store of knowledge or wisdom. Those activities which stimulate our minds and do add to our ability to enjoy life more and give significance to it because we see more, observe more, sense more, evaluate better, may be termed cultural activities. It is important to maintain the distinction.

III. THE EARLIER SOURCES OF CULTURAL SUPPORT

In earlier times, the artist was supported by the State, then by the church. When the church, in the Middle Ages, began to yield some of its power to secular authorities, these secular authorities assumed some support for the arts. With the decline of royalty, in more modern times, the arts were less heavily supported by courts and more by private patrons. This support has continued to the present day. The arts, sad to say, have hardly ever been able to support themselves.

Today, while there are elements of all these institutions supporting arts and artists, there is a more significant patron: the people themselves. They may support the arts not so voluntarily and, indeed, unknowingly, through their tax contributions.

IV. THE PRESENT CULTURAL PROGRAM OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

A. Visual arts

The city of Los Angeles is not without concern for and program of the arts. Back in 1903, a group of citizens organized themselves into the municipal art commission for the purpose of making Los Angeles a city beautiful. It was concerned about the cleanliness of the streets, the planting of trees, the layout of buildings and their design. In 1911 this commission was incorporated into the city charter and its work is now administered through the Los Angeles Board of Municipal Art Commissioners. This board is responsible for the design of all public buildings, for the design of street furniture and for the acquisition and location of the city's art works. Under the art program of the board is the operation of Barnsdall Park, including the all-city art festival. This year, too, the city council established a Shakespeare Committee to celebrate the quadricentennial of the birth of William Shakespeare.

B. The performing arts

In addition, the city carries on an extensive program in music, providing band concerts, choral concerts, chamber music concerts, ballet recitals, support for the Hollywood Bowl, the Los Angeles Philharmonic Symphony, and several community symphony orchestras.

C. The total budget

The 1963–64 budget for the municipal art department is $244,956. To this amount should be added $55,000, listed, somewhat embarrassedly, in the overall budget for "advertising, publicity, and patriotic purposes." The city spends, therefore, less than $300,000 annually for cultural purposes out of a total amount of $271,025,417 per year, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent. (Even so, it is one of the most generous cultural budgets in the United States.) Put in another way, we spend $21 per person per year for police protection ($54 million) and but 10 cents a year per person for culture. By the way, the police budget for 1963–64 did not include any funds for musical equipment.

V. THE PROPER FUNCTION OF A CITY IN PROVIDING A CULTURAL PROGRAM FOR ITS CITIZENS

There is no question that the city has a proper function in this matter. This function should be recognized as an important aspect of municipal government and not in an apologetic way, either.

We have noted the changing patronage methods supporting the artist in today's changing world. There must be a reevaluation of the means by which these needs are to be fulfilled.

The city should lead the way to this restudy and reevaluation.

A. Citizens should find out what facilities the city provides on a cultural level—and use them.

B. Citizens should concern themselves with the work of the art commission—attend its meetings, make suggestions for, and where possible, participate in its work. (Note, please, that although the art commission is supposed to acquire works of art, not one penny has ever been appropriated to purchase anything of this nature.)

C. Citizens should demand from their city what they cannot provide for themselves by themselves culturally. Every part of the city, too, is entitled to be exposed to cultural program on a high level—not just a few fortunate sections of this large metropolis.

D. Citizens should impress their needs through demands on city officials and upon those who would want to be city officials. Recently, in the city of San Francisco, the matter of culture was a mayoralty campaign issue. The music and art critic of the San Francisco Chronicle, Mr. Alfred Frankenstein, on October 27, 1963, reported an interview with the two leading candidates and on Wednesday, October 30, the Chronicle in an editorial elaborated upon his observation that "this is the first political campaign in local history wherein the arts and what to do with them have been an issue." The newspaper might have added this was one of the first times anywhere that these subjects were discussed in this milieu. The conclusion was reached that both candidates were courting the culture vote.

What a remarkable thing—to recognize that there is such a thing as a culture vote. But this does exist and the culture voters will lend prestige to officeholders and seekers, will work hard for their election, and provide them important financial support. The culture voters have only to be encouraged.

E. The administration should lead the way in creating and expanding cultural programs—it is not elected simply to follow tested and unimaginative pathways. Budgetary limitations do exist, it is true, but vigorous fostering of imaginative programs can have the effect of mobilizing both legislative and popular support for them which will redound to the credit of the leadership. The administration may not always be aware of the desires of the populace to be involved—yet all that may be needed is simply the inspired call to action. Today's meeting is surely one example of response. And again, noting an observation of Mayor Yorty at his press conference, this time on November 20, about the zoo and the work done by the zoo committee: "I'm very proud of this evidence of civic spirit on the part of these people that proves that it can be done in Los Angeles when we get our citizens interested and find a way for them to channel their desire to help this city in a constructive endeavor."

VI. CULTURAL PROGRAMS AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Need I point out what is so obvious: that cultural development does not depend upon any artificial emphasis upon race, creed, or color; that to the contrary true cultural development forges the way to the understanding of the irrelevance of these qualities in the getting along—and upward—of human beings, one with another.

George Bernard Shaw once said that "In an ugly and unhappy world the richest man can purchase nothing but ugliness and unhappiness."

A strong civic cultural program properly conceived, expanded, supported, and accomplished through the efforts of citizens and politicians who band together will surely help to bring the good life about.

Henry R. Roemer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues newspaper articles on the retirement of a distinguished citizen and American—Henry A. Roemer—from the board of directors of the Sharon Steel Corp., Sharon, Pa.

Mr. Roemer is a leader and pioneer in the steel industry and has devoted much of his time and talent to the betterment of the Shenango Valley where Sharon Steel is situated.

His association with the steel industry had its beginnings when as a youth he served as a waterboy in steel mills.

Mr. Roemer joined Sharon Steel during the dark days of the depression. Under his guidance, the company prospered and so did the valley.

This man of great abilities and qualities will never slip into obscurity. Despite his retirement, Mr. Roemer is a man who will make himself available to lend whatever assistance he can to his community, the Nation, and the steel industry.

Following are the fine tributes to Mr. Roemer which appeared in the Sharon, Pa., Herald, and the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator:

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, Feb. 29, 1964]

HENRY ROEMER RETIRES

Henry Roemer is retiring from his official position as chairman of Sharon Steel's executive committee but it seems to be safe to assume that he is not quitting the steel industry entirely—that is, severing all connections with an enterprise which he founded many years ago and which he developed and made productive over the years.

"Uncle Henry," as he is known to his friends, has been and still is a major figure in the steel industry. He is, in more ways than one, Sharon Steel. He is a product of the Mahoning Valley and everyone in this district can be glad that while he was building industrial enterprises of various kinds he chose never to wander far from this section of the country which has benefited so much from his many works.

"The grand old man of steel"—this is the way in which Mr. Roemer is known to steelworkers here and wherever else the furnaces are boiling. Little wonder—he has been associated in one way or another with the industry for the last 64 years.

Like many other pioneers in steel, Mr. Roemer learned the b usiness the hard way—by going to work at the old Anna blast furnace at Struthers when he was 14 years old. He had just finished the ninth grade. At 23 he was assistant superintendent of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Campbell Works and he didn't stop there.

It seems unnecessary to point out that what the young Mr. Roemer lacked in the way of higher education he more than made up in aggressiveness, determination, in ability to handle perplexing problems and natural intelligence which would not be denied. He was not only a steelmaker. He was also an organizer, businessman, and financier of no mean ability. This combination was hard to beat.

One of the outstanding events in Mr. Roemer's career was the purchase of the Carnegie-Illinois Farrell Works which was to have been dismantled. Now Sharon Steel has about 2 million tons annually of open hearth capacity.

Mr. Roemer's interests have been widespread but he has never failed to lend a hand for worthwhile causes in his own district. He is nearly 80 years old. He deserves to enjoy a pleasurable retirement while keeping himself available as Sharon Steel's No. 1 consultant.

MAN OF STEEL

Henry Roemer's announcement of his retirement plans has an air of unreality about it. Sharon Steel Corp., which he headed for so many years, has been so much of Henry Roemer and Henry Roemer has been so much of Sharon Steel, it never occurred to us there would be a day when the two would not be synonymous.

Accordingly, like a lot of other people, we suspect we'll have difficulty adjusting to the separation when Mr. Roemer's present term on the corporation's board draws to a close. It will take some doing mentally to ring down the curtain on a 33-year-long association—perhaps love affair better describes it—which has meant so much to this community.

There is no question, of course, that Mr. Roemer deserves the reward of retirement. His has been a lifetime of work stretching back to his youth when as a waterboy he slaked the thirst of other men of steel in mills primitive by the standards of the great modern plants he later was to erect. And when he wasn't busy making steel (which was almost never), he spent his time in helping the towns he lived in or in extending a supporting hand to the people he worked with.

If, as we observed at the outset, there is a quality of unreality about the announcement, it is because we don't believe men like Mr. Roemer—strong, courageous, active, talented, always giving of themselves and still searching for more to give—ever really retire. Neither the heart nor the mind will permit it—and we're all the better for their rejection.

We wish for this great man all that he desires in retirement. We are comforted by the thought that even though he no longer daily will be found at his desk, he never really will be far away.

HENRY ROEMER TO RETIRE FROM SHARON STEEL

Henry A. Roemer, who molded Sharon Steel Corp. into one of America's great steelmaking establishments, announced his decision today "not to be a candidate for reelection" to the company's board of directors.

As a director, Roemer has served as chairman of Sharon Steel's powerful executive committee, and played a key role in all major financing decisions to rebuild the company into a prime specialty steel producer.

Roemer's announcement, in effect, means that after 33 years of service with Sharon Steel, he is planning to step into retirement. The annual meeting of the company has been called for April 24.

SERVED SINCE 1933

The "Old Man," as he is affectionately known throughout the steel industry, relinquished management reins of Sharon Steel in October 1957, after serving as chief executive officer, chairman, and president. He had served in those capacities at various times since January 1, 1933.

Although Roemer had given up the chairmanship and presidency in 1957, he spoke with a big voice in the company's affairs as active head of the board's executive com-

mittee, and showed up for work every morning. He also is a consultant to the company's current chief executive officer, D. W. Frease, board chairman and president, and was instrumental in bringing Frease, a knowledgeable steelman himself, into the Sharon Steel fold.

One of the shrewdest steel executives in the industry, Roemer built a reputation as a "doctor" of sick steel companies. He came to Sharon at a time when the entire country was, in his words, "in a state of disturbance" brought about by the Wall Street market collapse of 1929. He served Sharon Steel through the dark days of the deep depression; through the trying period of World War II, and the difficult times following the readjustment brought about by conditions of war.

After weathering the great depression, Sharon Steel's total sales, from 1940 through 1957 under Roemer's careful management, totaled $1,781,922,000. Net earnings for the same period amounted to $82,380,200. Dividends paid to stockholders amounted to $44,657,543, while payrolls to employes totaled $524,857,450.

AISI DIRECTOR

Long concerned with the problems that periodically have confronted the steel industry, Roemer kept his finger on the steelmaking pulse as a director of the American Iron and Steel Institute for 21 years and as a member of its executive committee for 18 years. He was a member of the old executive committee of the National Association of Flat Rolled Steel Producers; chairman of the sheet steel group from 1921–31; chairman of the industry's wire group from 1927–31, and chairman of the hot and cold rolled strip producers from 1931–37.

Roemer continues to show keen interest in the technological changes that are helping to push the steel industry to new greatness. Sharon Steel was the first steel producer in America to install Stora Kaldo steelmaking facilities that are now in operation at the Roemer works.

Sharon Steel Corp., formerly the Sharon Steel Hoop Co., was a relatively small concern deeply in debt to bondholders and banks which intensified problems of that period when Roemer came to Sharon. Upon his arrival, he discovered a crew of very fine and capable men and women—an organization which he kept intact. Roemer likes to say it was "those fine people working harmoniously together who pulled Sharon Steel out of the trough of depression."

The acquisition of various companies by Sharon Steel helped not only to increase the steelmaking capacity, Roemer has said, but improved the situation in various ways.

COAL, COKE ACQUISITIONS

Primarily through Roemer's efforts, Sharon Steel purchased the Rachel Mine, now Joanne Coal Co., near Fairmont, W. Va., with its vast acreage of valuable coal, and the operation has been very successful. A short time later, he acquired the byproduct coke plant, with additional acreage of highly-valuable coal, at Fairmont. Roemer then was able to establish a long-term lease on the modern byproduct coke plant at Morgantown, W. Va., and this has also proven successful and profitable to Sharon in supplying its coke requirements.

On January 2, 1936, Sharon purchased a substantial interest in Pittsburgh Steel. The acquisition forced Roemer into the position of president and chief executive officer of that company, a post he held until December 31, 1943, after Sharon had disposed of its stock interest in the company.

There were many additions and improvements made at Sharon Steel during the time until December 9, 1945, when Roemer purchased for Sharon the then Farrell Works of Carnegie-Illinois, located in Farrell, which had been ordered dismantled and moved out of the valley.

In December 1945 Roemer arranged for the acquisition of Bopp Steel Co., Dearborn, Mich., through an exchange of stock and early in 1946 he acquired, by the same method, total assets of Brainard Steel Co., Warren, Ohio.

During his long association with Sharon Steel, Roemer has been a director of many institutions, including banks, one railroad, and one airline, and various other companies in or connected with the steel industry.

Among his many citations and honorariums is the degree of doctor of humanities conferred upon him by Dr. Will Orr, president of Westminster College. In 1938 he was decorated by Gov. George Earle as being the outstanding labor-management man in Pennsylvania.

This Is Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of March 8, 1964:

THIS IS ECONOMY?

Amid all talk of the need for less spending, the House of Representatives is well on its way to pushing through a whopping salary increase bill for a variety of Federal employees, including Senators and Representatives.

The average post office letter carrier and Government secretary would get about $450 more a year.

But for Members of the Congress, the increase would be $10,000. It would boost their salaries from $22,500 to $32,500. That is a 44 percent jump.

There are increases for others, too. The Speaker of the House, Vice President, and Supreme Court Justices would find their pay boosted to $45,000. It now is $35,000.

A host of others would get in on it, including subcabinet officials, deputy and assistant secretaries, and agency heads whose pay would be raised from about $21,000 to $30,000.

So, although Representatives and Senators are not the only ones affected, the spotlight is on them because whether they or the others get the increase or not depends on how Members of the Congress vote. It is strictly up to them.

There is always the possibility of a Presidential veto but Johnson already has given the measure his blessing. He included $455 million in his budget message to take care of the pay boosts.

The House Rules Committee passed the measure by an 8 to 3 vote. The only dissenters were Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat of Mississippi; and Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa. Early approval is expected in the House after which the measure goes to the Senate.

Considering that as recently as 1955 congressional salaries were $12,500, plus a $2,500 expense account, the proposal now to boost them to $32,500 is even more significant. The last $10,000 increase took effect in 1956.

One theory has been that the pay increases are needed to attract capable persons to the job who would demand more money. So far there never has been any dearth of candidates.

Rising costs of living are noted on all sides and there are periodic pay increases all along the line. But none even approaches the 44 percent which Members of the Congress are about to vote for themselves.

Does that sound like wielding the pruning knife, which it was said must be used if the recently enacted Federal income tax cut is to mean anything besides more deficit spending?

Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Government restrictions on the importation of residual oil are imposing a serious burden on the economy of New England. We who represent the northeast section of this country have been struggling for several years to lift these controls, or at least to permit the importation of a larger supply of this critical fuel.

But for the time being we have failed. Last Thursday, the Department of the Interior issued new quotas for the next 12 months, and they are only slightly higher than the unsatisfactory quotas to which we have been subjected in the past.

New England economy cannot much longer stand this economic injustice. We have demanded an end of these intolerable controls, and our just pleas have fallen on deaf ears.

So that our problem can be understood better elsewhere in this great country, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks an editorial from the March 9 issue the Boston Herald, entitled "The Oil-Stacked Cards":

THE OIL-STACKED CARDS

When President Johnson turned his oil policy responsibilities over to the Secretary of the Interior we hailed this divestiture of an apparent conflict of interest. Now we are not so sure. For the handling of the national oil policy is firmly in the hands of dedicated oilmen. The oil and gas industry, in Texas and elsewhere, is in sympathetic hands at the Department of the Interior.

This came about when Joe T. Dickerson of Tulsa was appointed Director of Interior's Office of Oil and Gas. Mr. Dickerson has been active in the oil industry since 1923, has been executive vice president of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, has himself been an active oil lobbyist and was recommended for his Government post by the National Petroleum Council.

His appointment is by itself overweighted on the side of the oil industry. But the overweight becomes yet more so by the fact that Mr. Dickerson's immediate superior is John Kelly, Assistant Secretary in Charge of Minerals since 1961, who is also a lifelong oilman and still owns large holdings, though the actual operation of them is in the hands of others.

This situation alarms a good friend of President Johnson. Senator PROXMIRE of Wisconsin has taken the floor twice recently to condemn this industry-slanted Government setup. "True conservationists and the American oil consumer have about as much chance of a fair break out of this lineup in

the Interior Department with its new sovereignty over the oil industry as the Beatles have of being in President Johnson's Cabinet," the Senator comments.

And New England is not getting a fair break. Residual oil, New England's important cheap fuel, remains under tight import restrictions, sharply increasing its cost and seriously dislocating the market. Despite established proof that the restrictions are illegal and unjustified, they remain, and only last Thursday the Interior Department reasserted the continuation of the import quotas. The department simply granted a pacifier in the form of an increase in the daily quotas from 210 million barrels to 233 million. The Beatles are evidently not getting Cabinet jobs.

Residual oil imports are of no intrinsic importance to the domestic industry. But residual curbs are part of the general restrictions on petroleum imports, and the U.S. oil interests want no tinkering with the program.

With the record of the retention in the tax cut bill of the full high depletion allowance for oil, the President will be politically hurt if the oil industry gets its way on residual, too.

The President is being subtly reminded of this by the 12 Republican Congressmen from New England who have addressed a sharp letter to the President and to Secretary Udall decrying the crutch so faithfully supplied to Texas oil.

Politics—more especially politics played by the soft coal industry—has denied New England, New York and Florida justice on residual oil. It is the business of these injured areas to expose this triumph of politics over justice.

Mrs. Susan Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the East Side News in tribute to the late Mrs. Susan Wagner. As the editorial by Abraham Schlacht expressed the feelings and deep sorrow of many, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the East Side News, Mar. 6, 1964]

IN MEMORIAM: MRS. SUSAN WAGNER, 1909–64

The people of the East Side are in deep mourning over the untimely death of Mrs. Susan Wagner, late wife of our great mayor.

They find it difficult to believe that she is gone, for her smiling image appears to be everywhere.

They shall remember her for her devotion to her family, for her graciousness and charm, for her sense of compassion, and for her unswerving fidelity to the city's best interests.

Notwithstanding the glamor of her distinguished husband's office as mayor, she preferred the serenity and love of home to the turbulent excitment of the political arena.

Mrs. Susan Wagner was truly all mother and wife to her beloved ones.

As first lady of New York, she was a delight as a hostess to royalty, to diplomats, and statesmen alike, and to the numerous organizations which came to see her on tour at Gracie Mansion and on visits to city hall.

To the residents of her community in the Upper East Side, she was regarded as one of their own, respected as freind and neighbor.

At no time did she permit the prestige of her husband's office detract from her true simplicity of character.

Her strength of character and equanimity of mind can be discernible from the spiritual upbringing in which she was reared.

The residents of the East Side, as well as millions of others, will miss her passing.

We shall never forget her innate esteem for all people.

De devoutly pray that her memories will be a source of inspiration to her family and friends everywhere.

May the soul of Mrs. Susan Wagner repose in peace.

Problem of Beef Imports Could Become More Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, foreign meat imports can bankrupt our farmers and ranchers. This is becoming more evident every day. The administration has agreed to token rollbacks of meat imports, but as most of my colleagues know, this is not the answer. The problem of meat imports must be solved by legislation if the administration continues its fence-straddling attitude. I would like to insert into the RECORD a story which appeared in the March 5 edition of the Omaha World-Herald to the effect that even a foreign trade specialist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture realizes the problem of beef imports can become more serious in the next 5 to 10 years:

UNITED STATES CAN'T BE ONLY OPEN MARKET; IMPORTS PROBLEM MAY GET WORSE

(By Howard Silber)

A U.S. Department of Agriculture foreign trade specialist warned Thursday that the problem of beef imports "could become more serious in the next 5 to 10 years than it is today."

Dr. Louis M. Smith, Jr., said "the world supply of beef, especially potential exports to the United States, will probably continue to increase considerably."

"This will be particularly true if foot-and-mouth-disease problems in South America are overcome," said Dr. Smith.

His conclusion: "The United States cannot afford to be the world's only open market for beef."

Dr. Smith, director of the livestock and meat products division of the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service, was a panelist at the Omaha Chamber of Commerce's 16th annual National Livestock Conference at Ak-Sar-Ben Coliseum.

The foreign trade specialist said a new development in Argentina may push the door open for more beef imports from that country as well as Brazil. And, he declared, "Brazil has the greatest beef production potential in the world."

The development is a single-cooking process. In the past, because of foot and mouth disease, the United States has required that most beef imported from Argentina be cooked twice—first in that country and again here. Because of this, most Argentine beef—except for canned corned beef—went into baby foods, soups, and the like.

WARM AND SERVE

Now, said Dr. Smith, one Argentine plant has been licensed for the single-cooking process. There is no need for its product to be recooked in the United States.

And the prospective result is that roast and similar cuts of beef "can be cooked in Argentina, frozen as roasts and sold to the restaurant, hotel, or even retail trade in this country," he said.

"Once here, the meat need only be warmed and served," Dr. Smith continued.

"We don't know what will happen with this process, but it certainly bears watching," he declared.

Dr. Smith said this sort of competition to domestic beef is not likely to be asserted for a year or two, at least, because of unusually heavy slaughter in Argentina. "But Argentine beef supplies will increase," he predicted.

ANOTHER THREAT

Development of a light cure for beef—which would make the South American product available to sausage makers and other processors in this country—is also a potential threat, he said.

"The Argentines are working very hard on this," said Dr. Smith.

Dr. Smith closed his remarks by saying that the recent beef import agreements concluded with major suppliers "should be most useful to U.S. cattle producers and help develop more stable marketing conditions in world beef trade."

Another panelist, Lyle Liggett, public relations director of the American National Cattlemen's Association, termed the voluntary beef quota agreements with Australia and New Zealand ineffective and said "reasonable import restrictions are necessary if the cattle industry is to recover from its present depression."

He particularly attacked the recently concluded agreement with Ireland.

"The Australia-New Zealand agreements were bad enough," he declared, "but the precedent-establishing deal with Ireland can be even worse."

The reason: While Australia and New Zealand beef exports to the United States will be reduced slightly in 1964 and 1965, exports from Ireland will increase over the 1962–63 level.

Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my pleasure to learn that a constituent in my district is this year's Washington State winner in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars nationwide Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. The winning writer in Dennis Potter, who lives at Duvall, attends Blanchet High School, and was 1 of more than 250,000 students across the country to participate in this year's competition. For his winning script, Dennis chose the title, "Challenge of Citizenship." Although only in his teens, Dennis has written on the all-important subject of citizenship with such clarity and understanding that I recommend his script to Americans of all ages. I would especially like to share it with other Members of the House of Representatives. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be entered in the RECORD:

CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Dennis Potter)

On November 22, 1963, the world was suddenly brought to the realization that an eternal peace, true liberty and freedom from oppression are yet to be attained.

The assassin's bullet struck not only the head of the President of the United States, but also the heart of all citizenship. For it was a crippling blow to the integrity of our citizenry.

We have been brought to the realization that the very existence of social problems and prejudices is detrimental to the American way of life.

The maladies of government and society are a challenge to citizenship. It is the duty of the American citizen to right the wrongs of our Nation, to heal the wounds of society, and to mend the shredded cloak of morality.

But before we can meet the challenge to citizenship we must meet the challenge of citizenship.

The citizen rules this Nation. It is each individual acting alone that enables this Nation to act as one.

Solving and maintaining the solutions of the problems of society is the responsibility of the American citizen.

Many passive, unconcerned individuals are not accepting the responsibility nor exercising the rights of citizenship. Still others are only part-time citizens meeting their responsibilities every 4th year. This is a problem, a marked weakness in our Nation. The people are the foundation of this Nation and when the foundation gives way so does the superstructure.

Racial discrimination, accidents, insanity, alcoholism, care for the aged, graft, crime—all these problems and others ad infinitum shall not be solved until the ideal of citizenship is found is the majority of the population, and our Nation shall never attain the perfections if pursues until all the people, openly and adamantly, pursue the same perfections—true liberty—eternal peace and freedom from oppression for all.

Many of you are earnestly concerned with your responsibilities. Many of you actively practice true citizenship.

You have met the challenge of citizenship. Your duty is in continuing to meet this vital responsibility.

But there still remains the unconcerned, passive individual who scoffs at the responsibilities of self-government.

The man who walks past deplorable Negro ghettos, yet does not see them. I refer to the person who hears of discrimination, crime, and corruption, yet does not hear the ominous note they strike.

If only they realized that with a united citizenry working together for the gradual alleviation of all these problems, their goal could be attained. It would take perseverance and determination.

Yet, if everyone were to seek out and grasp at the opportunity to learn anything of national or local concern through any reputable means from the local newspaper to the Government Printing Office, the first and major step toward meeting the challenge of citizenship—that of a well-informed and concerned public—would be accomplished.

This final step would be inherent in man himself, that of utilizing his knowledge, his own moral soundness and judgment in acting in every facet of his citizenship from the voting booth to Capitol Hill.

With each and every person making the best possible decisions in all matters we would obviously be headed toward the zenith of perfection itself. The challenge has been made.

We must strive for true citizenship—one eye must be constantly focused on this Nation's Capital, one hand must always be poised for action so that by acting in the best interests of all we might attain perfection, if not for ourselves, then for the generations to come.

Children die in war, suffer in bondage, and are buried by oppression—let us give our children peace to live in, liberty to grow in, and freedom from oppression to excel in.

Japan Shows What a Free Agriculture Can Accomplish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Japanese agriculture is free and unfettered by government, and it is making an impressive record. The eminent columnist, Roscoe Drummond, recently wrote a piece which he captioned "Lesson for the Red," telling how Japanese farmers, without the benefit of Government supply management or controls in any form, are doing well.

It might also be captioned "Lesson for America," as the United States keeps dabbling in Government control schemes. The latest example is the wheat certificate program which is apparently about to be rammed down the throats of the U.S. farmer.

Last summer Secretary Freeman spent a month touring Communist-bloc countries, where supply management has been a dismal failure. This summer he might profit from a look at Japanese agriculture, where the marketplace system is working wondrously well.

Text of Mr. Drummond's article:

JAPAN'S FARMS: LESSON FOR THE REDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

TOKYO.—You only have to take one look at what the efficient independent Japanese farmers are doing to expand the food resources of these overpopulated islands to wonder why Khrushchev and Chou Enlai don't send their Communist experts to Japan to see how it's done.

Fewer Japanese farmers are growing more and more varied food all the time. They are increasing productivity per acre all the time. Japanese farm income, though lagging behind industrial income, is steadily going up.

When you consider the shortage of tillable land on these four small islands in terms of a population that will reach 100 million soon, it is evident that the food requirements of Japan are far more difficult to meet than the food requirements of either Red China or the Soviet Union.

Under Communist collectivism neither Red China nor the Soviet Union is meeting its food needs. Each is falling behind.

What Communist collectivism is failing to do for Red China and the Soviet Union, the uncoerced individualism of the Japanese farmers is doing fabulously for these teeming islands.

There is no government operation or control of Japanese agriculture. There is no collectivization of the Japanese farmers. The Government does not tell him what to grow, how much to grow, or where to grow it.

Japanese farmers produce for private profit at prices determined by an overwhelmingly free market. And how they are producing.

Overall Japanese farm production is up nearly 40 percent over 10 years ago. Milk production has grown more than 400 percent, the supply of eggs nearly 300 percent. Japanese beef has become a widespread staple in the nation's diet.

Average income per farm household has risen from $740 to $1,900 per year in the past 10 years.

When the Japanese farmer cannot do everything for himself by himself, he turns to his farm cooperative, which is democratically run by the farmers for the farmers.

The life of Japanese farm families is becoming less burdensome. TV antennas sprout across the countryside.

Japan has its farm problems, of course. Farm youth is being lured to the cities for more attractive employment. The farm labor force is declining and this makes is imperative to raise labor productivity. Farm units are too small, an average of 2½ acres.

But 90 percent of all Japanese farms are owned by the individual farmers and they are working them prodigiously.

While Khrushchev set out to raise Russia's wheat production by Communist methods and failed, the Japanese set out to raise their rice production by private farming—and succeeded brilliantly. Ten years ago Japan was importing a million tons a year.

Today Japan has made itself almost completely self-sufficient in rice production. It did it through the miracle of the enterprise of the individual farmers.

Manned Air and Aerospace Craft and U.S. National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the public discussion of the relative defense importance of manned and unmanned mechanisms moving through space, I have been struck by the continued pertinence of an article written last year for the American Security Council, and distributed in its Washington Report. This paper was prepared by Dr. James D. Atkinson, president of the American Military Institute, who is an associate professor at Georgetown University and a research associate of its Center for Strategic Studies. Dr. Atkinson has written widely in the field of military affairs, and I believe his comments, which I include under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, will be of interest and value to the Members of the House:

MANNED AIR AND AEROSPACE CRAFT AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Dr. James D. Atkinson)

Throughout military history, no search has been more persistent than the search for the ultimate weapon, the impregnable position, the invulnerable force. Now in America in this decade of the 1960's, the search seems finally to have centered on the ballistic missile as the "invulnerable" answer to the complex problems of defense which beset us.

Underlying this missile strategy is a quantity theory of warfare. It assumes that x numbers of missiles directed against y targets will equate with absolute deter-

rence. But now, and especially in the future, armaments competition is not solely quantitative. The United States might, for example, be able to convince the Soviet Union that we can and will maintain superiority in the production of missiles. We are unlikely, however, to convince Soviets that they will be unable to achieve scientific and technical breakthroughs which might give them overall military parity and perhaps even superiority at some period in the future.

Within the next decade, both the United States and the Soviet Union can be expected to devote strenuous efforts to countering or neutralizing threats posed by the ICBM and the IRBM. Should Soviet efforts prove successful even to a limited degree, the present and projected numerically superior missile capability of the United States may be largely neutralized. Conversely, the possession by either the United States or the Soviet Union of a manned, continuously powered, nonorbiting space craft would have a strategic impact quite without relations to quantity.

All of this is not to say that missiles are worthless. They may be most useful, but they are inherently inflexible and thus should be complemented and supplemented by the flexibility provided only by manned systems.

It is to say that we must avoid the Maginot-line thinking which assumes that a future war (or its prevention) is based on a ballistic missile exchange. Despite the most careful mathematical measuring and weighing, warfare does not develop according to preconceived images.

The current debate over the RS-70 will alone have served a useful purpose if it causes us to rethink the entire question of manned air, aerospace, and spacecraft. During and beyond the next decade, there appear to be vast new possibilities for using manned systems in preventing general thermonuclear war and in controlling limited and unconventional warfare. VTOL's (vertical takeoff and landing), convertiplanes, air cushion vehicles, very low level peneration aircraft, ultra-high-altitude aircraft, aerospace and spacecraft—all indicate the expansion of ideas, the development of tactics, and the utilization of technology in support of strategy that can be applied to present and to future modes of conflict facing us.

In the coming decade and, even more importantly, in the years beyond, manned systems will offer these significant advantages over missiles:

1. Operational capabilities: Among these are an unpredictable flight pattern; a superior ability to carry out electronic countermeasures and to operate foxing devices to foil enemy defenses; an enhanced versatility, notably standoff capability, propulsion systems absed on nuclear fuel or, perhaps, on fuel cells; and an enhanced reliability factor as a result of the ability to improvise and to make repairs in flight.

2. Controlled launch: Manned air or aerospace craft can be launched in response to a low-grade equivocal warning and can later be recalled. This permits a significant safety cushion with reference to unverified warnings for which missiles cannot at all be launched, but which should require a controlled reaction on our part.

3. Show of force: Manned systems provide the show of force so often important in deterring a potential enemy military move. This role is automatically denied to missiles. The importance of the show of force in maintaining the general peace has often been demonstrated. The display of strength through the deployment of obvious military power has a psycho-political value which can scarcely be obtained from missiles buried deep in underground silos. The rapid response and controlled presence of a squadron of RS-70's, for example, would give significantly observable evidence of U.S. intentions to safeguard the peace in a threatened area.

4. Sustained information gathering: Missiles are incapable of reporting what has been accomplished by their strikes. Manned systems can do more than just report their own mission achievements; they also can supply continuous assessments of missile strikes, target damage, shifting of mobile targets, and the like. The side with such continuing information fights with clear vision, the other side fights blindfolded. Such sustained information gathering can best be performed—and in most instances only be performed—by manned air or aerospace craft.

5. The "mix factor in deterrence." The variety of our possible choices of action adds immeasurably to an enemy's complications in preparing responses to our capabilities. The mix compounds the task of the enemy. This makes deterrance meaningful. There are many uncertainties and unknown factors in working out the problems of offense versus defense, since the acid test is—and only is—actual war. Hence those things which complicate the enemy's task set up cautionary signals for him. Those things—such as complete or even too great a reliance on missiles—which simplify this problem, reduce his uncertainties and unknown factors. Such simplification may tempt the enemy to deliver a surprise attack. Above all, the mix is significant in the load factor which it places on a potential enemy's defense structure. The Soviets are not all powerful; there are many limitations on what they can do. Every time we force another defensive requirement on them, it limits their capability in the development of qualitative breakthroughs in offensive weapons.

While manned systems can be expected to take on increased importance in the next decade and beyond, there are three areas that seem worthy of special note. These are:

1. Low-altitude penetration aircraft: Increasingly, it would seem that very fast and ultra-low-level aircraft will have high survivability in face of enemy defense capabilities. Advances now on the horizon in terrain avoidance equipment suggest that low-altitude penetration aircraft will have very great utility in unconventional, limited, and general war situations.

2. Carrier aircraft: Deployed aircraft-carrier-based forces appear to be less vulnerable to surprise attack, particularly to ballistic missiles. Carrier-based aircraft will in many cases be more efficient than land-based aircraft because of the geographic considerations involved. In fact, carrier aircraft may be the door opener for land-based aircraft in an area in which it is desirable to assist forces friendly to the United States. Additionally, carrier-based aircraft can put up a maximum air effort immediately upon arrival in an area. This latter factor can be expected to have increased importance in the sublimited challenges with which we will be confronted in the coming years. The contribution of carrier task forces to the mix is likewise important since there is much evidence to suggest that no small portion of the Soviet military effort is directed toward countering them.

3. Manned "low space" and space craft. The X-15 rocket research aircraft has flown at 314,750 feet. Manned aerospace or "low space" craft will be operational at altitudes well in excess of this figure in the next 10 years. Such craft will possess obvious attack capabilities. Equally important will be the intelligence capabilities which will flow from the operation of manned low space craft.

In the 1960's and 1970's, the outer space environment offers intriguing new possibilities for the exercise of power by the United States in the interest of maintaining peace. Manned systems in space have the potential for controlling the communications utility and the military threat of attack from space. Thus, for example, the United States might well preclude a trouble-inciting nation from effective functioning on earth and from conducting operations in and from space.

The military exploitation of space will require large expenditures and much vision. Most of all it will require the abandonment of the naive belief that we can treat space as a peaceful arena while the Soviet Union actively pursues a course in which the scientific side of space is merely incidental to the military.

SUMMARY

Whether one envisions manned systems operating at very low levels, at high altitudes, in low space, or well out in space, present and projected technological advances indicate that manned systems are not obsolescent. Rather they will assume new and higher roles in the make up of a credible strategic deterrent, and in winning and rendering harmless limited or unconventional wars.

The creative, competitive thrust of the American free enterprise system offers us significant advantages in the research and development of the material for advanced manned systems. The American heritage of drive-to-win offers equally great advantages in the area of human resources. These factors do not guarantee success. They do offer the potential—if we have the will to develop and employ them—for victory.

Our present policies with reference to research for and development of manned weapons systems will—if continued—jeopardize the future security of the Nation to an irretrievable degree. Equally dangerous for the future is the temptation held out to the Soviets to play the game of strategic blackmail, or, worse, the temptation to gamble on a first strike against America.

What's Good About Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed that what we are seeking to accomplish in our foreign aid program is a mutual effort on the part of the United States and the receiving country to develop new resources in order to build the kind of society and economy which will eventually be self-sustaining. We trust that this effort will assist nations to keep in step with the modern world, to realize their potentials economically, and to realize political self-determination. This is the third in a series of articles which I hope to insert in the RECORD in order to provide new insights into the AID program by familiarization on a project-to-project basis.

The manner of implementing foreign aid in a specific country depends to a large extent on their potential and level of progress. Most often qualified managerial and technical personnel are lacking. Take the Philippines, for example—an advanced country which covers an area of 115,600 square miles, with a population of 29,600,000. Its gross national product in 1962 was $3,880 million with a per capita gross national product of $121. It is a primarily agricultural country with a hot, humid climate in the low-

lands and varying temperatures in the highlands.

In major manufacturing, it is limited to the textile industry. The Philippines has benefited from 50 years of American sovereignty and its potential has led to a strong emphasis on joint effort with the Philippine Government complementing our aid with local funds.

A good example of this approach is the Industrial Development Center—IDC—whose objective, when it was established in 1954, was to stimulate systematic industrial growth, particularly in small and medium businesses, by providing needed industrial know-how and managerial, supervisory, and technical skills.

In this pursuit IDC has performed a variety of useful functions. In the financial realm, it has provided financial counseling and project evaluation, besides the administration of productivity loans for new operations or foreign equipment. On the engineering and plant level, IDC has employed American know-how both to solve technological problems through such techniques as inplant audits and analysis of inplant engineering and general management and to facilitate labor productivity through such techniques as job evaluation programs and workflow charts. On the management plane, thousands of Filipinos and also foreigners have benefited in skills, attitudes, and knowledge from tours abroad and from the different training services—seminars, workshops, courses, and discussion. On the publicity side, its published matter: reports, magazines, brochures, and leaflets have been well distributed, while its technical library of 20,000 volumes has served students, and business, and industrial personnel.

Now that the Center is firmly established, AID along with the Philippine Government, has begun relinquishing as of February 15 of this year its interest in IDC to a privately operated Philippine foundation which will continue its functions and retain some of the present personnel. As with all AID projects, a terminal date, in this case 10 years, will be met, although some interest and support will continue through fiscal year 1965.

AID is quite pleased with the Industrial Development Center—and well it might be. During its short life it has helped substantially the founding of small enterprises in the islands. Through joint projects such as this one, our country is helping the Filipinos to help themselves build a vigorous private enterprise system.

More Scientific Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, over the years my subcommittee has considered many aspects of the Government information problem. One of the more important issues we have looked into is the flow of technological and scientific information. The White House has announced that steps have been taken to help solve this information problem. The following announcement outlines this important action:

The White House announced action by the Federal Council for Science and Technology to make results of federally sponsored research and development more readily available to industry, universities, scientists and engineers. Through this interagency agreement, unclassified technical reports and translations generated by all Government agencies, and not containing proprietary information, will be uniformly indexed and made accessible through a single agency. Plans are also being developed for this agency to provide current awareness information on who is doing what research, where, and with what Federal funds. Requests will also be met for explicit scientific and engineering information by referral to appropriate specialized information centers.

To implement this plan, the Department of Commerce will take immediate steps to strengthen its clearinghouse function authorized by Congress through Public Law 81-776, and now being performed by its Office of Technical Services. In addition, arrangements are being made to link the clearinghouse with Smithsonian's Science Information Exchange and the National Referral Center for Science and Technology at the Library of Congress.

These steps to provide a single point of contact for Government activities in the physical and engineering sciences will complement services now available through the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library. Such measures represent a major step toward strengthening and coordinating the various science information activities of the Federal establishment and will be of major importance in assisting American industry to benefit from defense and space research.

The Federal Council for Science and Technology is a body of senior policy officials from eight Federal departments and agencies that serves with the Office of Science and Technology to assist the President in developing Government-wide plans and policies relating to scientific research and development.

Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology is Chairman of the Council.

Recommendations for this broadened clearinghouse function were developed by the Council's Committee on Scientific Information, Lt. Gen. William J. Ely, Chairman.

A Tribute to John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last month the Catholic War Veterans of the District of Columbia placed a bronze memorial plaque on the pew where our late, beloved President Kennedy worshiped when he attended services at St. Stephen's, his parish church.

During the ceremonies which attended the unveiling of the plaque, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph F. Denges, pastor of St. Stephen Martyr Church, spoke in commemoration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as President and parishioner.

Because of the heartfelt warmth and dignity of this tribute to President Kennedy, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Welcome Catholic War Veterans of the District of Columbia, and friends of our late beloved President—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

We have answered the call to pay honor to a man that will go down in history as a patriot; dedicated to the high ideals of democracy; imbued with a spirit of genuine zeal for things that are uplifting, fine and beautiful.

He left an image to all of us—yes, and to all the world, of true citizenship. He was especially influential to the youth of our beloved country, who were inspired and fired by his vigor in pursuing the intellectual pursuits of life. He assumed leadership in the struggle against the common enemies of man—tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself. He consecrated his life, without counting the cost, to establish peace throughout the world. He was a patriotic martyr for the good of his beloved country.

As a worshipper of St. Stephen's Church, he wanted to attend divine services as a regular member, not desiring any preferential treatment because of his high office. He was a humble man, endowed with a deep sense of faith and love for the holy sacrifice of the Mass. At Holy Mass he always used his missal and participated with the other members of the parish in dialog Mass.

He was always most gracious and considerate. On one occasion—the Feast of the Ascension, I met him at the door of the church. After greeting me cordially he said, "Father, I wish to apologize for being five minutes late today." The last time he came to St. Stephen's was October 16, 1963—the day of public prayer for our beloved Nation, ordered by him.

On the day of his assassination, November 22, we had a High Mass offered at St. Stephen's at 6:30 p.m. for the repose of his soul. And since that day, in memory of this great leader, we have lighted each night the large beautiful stained glass window in the front of the church.

We wish to thank all the Catholic War Veterans of Washington and other posts who have come here today to unveil and dedicate the plaque placed here in his honor. We wish to thank all his friends—and especially Father Shaeffer and the Boys Choir of St. Andrew's Church, Silver Spring, Md., for rendering such beautiful and appropriate music on this solemn occasion.

Let us conclude by saying the simple prayer of his beloved bereaved wife—Jacqueline—"Dear God, please take care of your servant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy."

Current Status of Labor Programs in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, the Honorable George L-P Weaver, has written me recently of developments in labor's role in the Alli-

ance for Progress. I am confident my colleagues will find of considerable interest his report on the Current Status of Labor Programs in Latin America, issued as of February 28, 1964, which I include herewith:

CURRENT STATUS OF LABOR PROGRAMS IN LATIN AMERICA, FEBRUARY 28, 1964

Remarkable progress is now being made on labor projects within the Alliance for Progress. The construction of workers' housing through trade union cooperatives is spurred on by a pledge of $56,250,000 from AFL–CIO affiliates' retirement and welfare funds, supported by 100 percent AID housing investment guarantees. From these funds, a $10 million AFL–CIO loan, added to $4 million supplied by the Mexican workers, enabled the Graphic Arts Workers of Mexico to inaugurate the building of 3,104 housing units for their members. Another AFL–CIO loan in the amount of $3 million, together with $6 million to be supplied by AID, will be used to finance the establishment of a workers' bank in Peru; the Inter-American Development Bank will undertake the financing of the initial administrative costs to the extent of $100,000 for a 2-year period. These are among the most dramatic programs now in process under the aegis of the American Institute for Free Labor Development Social Projects Department. The IDB has earmarked another $15 million for union housing projects in Columbia, Bolivia, El Salvador, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic through the American Institute.

The American Institute for Free Labor Development has been in operation for 20 months, under the sponsorship of the AFL–CIO. The institute works closely with the free and democratic trade unions of Latin America and is dedicated to improving the lot of the rank and file workers and the environment in which they live. It has also been able to secure the active cooperation of governments and of business.

The Institute at the present time has two principal activities. The first is education and the results have been impressive: 3,668 labor leaders have received training under a hemisphere-wide system which includes education centers in 12 Latin American countries—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras (Regional Center for Central America and Panama), Jamaica (Regional Center for the English-speaking West Indies), Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela; 206 leaders have been trained at the center in Washington in a course which includes 3 months of intensive study followed by 9 months of paid internship in the respective home country working on specific union projects.

The second activity of the American Institue is in assisting trade unions in Latin America to develop feasible projects for presentation to local, private international, or U.S. Government sources of financing. The results of the activities of the Social Projects Department are described above. The Latin American trade union requests for assistance on projects which would engender a high ratio of "self-help" effort now number 108, covering housing, medical, producer and other forms of cooperative development, as well as vocational training, workers' banks and community type projects. The requests for housing alone would amount to loans of $330 million, if fully implemented.

Labor is becoming an integral part of the Alliance for Progress machinery; the creation of the Special Committee of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council on Labor Affairs will accelerate this effort through the decisions of the second meeting of the IA–ECOSOC in Sao Paulo, November 1963, following the recommendations of the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor held in Bogotá in May 1963 (the first such meeting in Latin America). The Committee on Labor Affairs will carry out the principles of the Charter of Punta del Este and the recommendations of the Labor Ministers (Declaration of Cundinamarca), "with special attention to the suggestions and measures concerning the role of ministers of labor and democratic trade unions in national programs for economic and social development."

(See the report on the first meeting of the committee held in Lima, Peru, Jan. 31–Feb. 6, 1964.)

It is clearly the U.S. purpose that the workers of Latin America have the opportunity to share increasingly in the benefits of the Alliance programs through their creative participation in the development process in order to accelerate the necessary change and reform. There exists within the U.S. Government today an almost unprecedented degree of unanimity and collaboration for the purpose of achieving this objective. To secure this cooperation a bold departure was required. Early in the days of President Kennedy's administration, a unique organizational structure was devised and was operating successfully within a very short time, harnessing governmental and private initiatives, primarily of organized labor in this country, and eliminating problems of jurisdiction.

The efforts and interests of the various agencies of the U.S. Government have reached a high degree of coordination through an interagency Latin America Labor Committee, established by the Secretary of State in 1961. The committee examines specific problems in the Latin American labor area, reviews the general effectiveness of overall labor activities of the United States in Latin America, and proposes complementary action as appropriate. It is charged with keeping activities under continuing review in order to insure that recommended programs are carried out and needed modifications are made to meet changing circumstances.

Some of the projects in which the IDB is participating are illustrated above. Examples of earlier projects include loans for workers' housing in Argentina, Chile, and Colombia. Other organizations are participating, notably the International Labor Organization and the Pan American Union. The ILO has extensive activities on both regional and national bases and also administers labor projects in the amount of $11 million financed jointly by the special fund of the United Nations and by the Latin American countries themselves; these projects include the provision by the ILO of experts for a total of 2,200 man-months.

National trade union advisory committees are being established in the various countries of Latin America, pursuant to agreement in IA–ECOSOC. An Inter-American Training Center for Ministry of Labor Personnel which is in the process of being created in Lima, Peru, and other regional training centers such as the center for research on vocational training in Montevideo, are indicative of the new initiative of labor in the Alliance for Progress.

Foreign Steel Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the rapid increase in foreign steel imports is a matter of great concern to this Nation. I wish to include as part of my remarks a statement made by Rudolph Smith, of Denver, executive vice president of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., before the U.S. Tariff Commission on February 20, 1964. Mr. Smith calls attention to the adverse effect of these imports on the C.F. & I., and similar steel companies.

The main plant of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. is located in my district in Pueblo, Colo. This is a subject in which I am intensely interested. I feel that we should take every possible step to protect our domestic steel industry from these foreign imports.

Mr. Smith's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY RUDOLPH SMITH, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COLORADO FUEL & IRON CORP., DENVER, COLO., BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I am Rudolph Smith, executive vice president of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. I started to work for C.F. & I. at our Pueblo, Colo., steel plant in 1927 and have held such jobs as engineer, superintendent open hearth department, works manager, and vice president operations. I am deeply interested in the welfare of steelworkers.

C.F. & I. has a vital interest in the forthcoming GATT negotiations as a member of the American steel industry and, more specifically, because of the adverse effect of the import-export imbalance upon our company in particular. We welcome this opportunity to present the facts underlying our position to this Commission.

There will, of necessity, be some duplication in the matters covered by our statement and statements made earlier by representatives of other steel companies, because the basic facts pertinent to our industry in general are equally pertinent to our company. We will try to minimize duplication by limiting this statement to carbon wire rods, wire and wire products, and deformed concrete reinforcing bars, and also by relating the problems created by imports to C.F. & I. in particular.

C.F. & I. has been manufacturing and distributing steel and wire products since before the turn of the century and now has plants at Pueblo, Colo., South San Francisco, Calif., Trenton and Roebling, N.J., and Palmer, Mass. The importance of C.F. & I. to the Rocky Mountain area in particular and to other areas is considerable in terms of the employment furnished, products produced, and the general welfare. C.F. & I. products serve the basic industries of the West, such as mining, agriculture, transportation, construction, and others, as well as reclamation and defense projects. It is of vital importance to the employees of C.F. & I., its shareholders and to the general public that our company remain strong and vital in both its western and eastern divisions. In this regard, reference is made to the fact that the Department of Labor has classified Pueblo, Colo., and Palmer, Mass., as areas of substantial unemployment.

Steel imports into the United States reached an all-time high in 1963. This fact alone merits serious consideration when tariff reductions are discussed. It is particularly significant for C.F. & I. in view of the tremendous scope of imports of products covered by this statement.

Let us consider the import situation relative to these specific products, as shown on page 11 of our brief. There were 305,000 tons of wire rods, wire and wire products, and reinforcing bars imported in the 5-year period 1933 through 1937; only 23,000 tons in the 5-year period 1943 through 1947; and 8 million tons in the 5-year period 1958 through 1962. As a consequence, in this lat-

ter period, an average of 12,000 U.S. steelworkers per year were displaced by foreign steel imports.

U.S. exports of these same product categories, on the other hand, were 823,000 tons in the 5-year period 1933–37; 2,750,000 tons in the 5 years of 1943–47, and only 308,000 tons in the period 1958 through 1962.

The highest employment of American steelworkers in producing wire rods, wire and wire products, and reinforcing bars for export was an average of 4,000 per year in the 5-year period 1943 through 1947. In the years 1958 through 1962 exports provided employment for an average of only 460 steelworkers per year.

This trade imbalance is also reflected by the present position of American steel producers in relation to the world steel market. The U.S. share of the world steel market has steadily declined from 46 percent in 1950 to 25 percent in 1962. More specifically, the U.S. share of the world trade in the products which are the subject of this statement has also declined in the face of an increasing world market.

Imports of the basic product lines covered by our brief were about two million tons in the year 1962, which would have provided employment for over 14,000 full-time steelworkers. American exports of these same products in 1962 were only 96,000 tons. Further, the exhibits to our brief show that in 1962 imports accounted for substantial portions of the domestic market. Imports of foreign wire rods represented 39.2 percent of the domestic consumption of this product by the United States. With respect to other product lines, imports are now supplying the domestic market to the following extent:

Percentage of U.S. Domestic Consumption—1962

Commodity:	*Percent*
Wire nails and staples	46.1
Drawn wire	8.3
Reinforcing bars	20.4
Woven wire fence	38.9
Barbed wire	47.6

When it is considered that 38 percent of C.F. & I.'s production at its fully integrated plant in Pueblo consists of products covered by our brief, and that there is an even greater percentage in wire and wire products produced at its other plants, the adverse impact of imports upon this company is both obvious and serious.

Several factors have contributed to the trade imbalance faced by this company and other steel producers. The fact that the tariff rates of the United States on steel products have declined steadily from 1930 has made our country the prime target of excess foreign production. U.S. tariff reductions on all steel products during this period have averaged more than 50 percent. On the other hand, tariff rates imposed on many steel products by other countries have been substantially higher than the rates of the United States. In addition, ECSC countries have recently increased their tariff rates to 9 percent. There are also numerous and highly restrictive foreign nontariff barriers, some of which are listed in our brief, and the imposition of foreign tariffs on a CIF basis rather than on the f.o.b. value creates an average increase of 10 percent in foreign over United States effective tariff protection.

The average hourly employment costs of steelworkers in the United States are much higher than those of other steel producing countries, as shown by the tabulation on page 28 of our brief. It should be stressed that C.F. & I. recognizes the importance and skills of its steelworkers and willingly assumes a strong responsibility for the economic well-being of it people. The American steelworker has achieved a remarkably high standard of living and we have no desire or intent to reduce that standard. However, the trade imbalance in steel constitutes a threat to the living standards of these steelworkers. Further encroachment of foreign imports on U.S. domestic markets can only lead to greater unemployment in the steel industry, and particularly in the product categories discussed in this statement.

In recent years, foreign countries have constructed entirely new steel plants or modernized numerous existing facilities. U.S. financial and technical assistance has helped make many of these projects possible. As the steel capacity of these countries exceeded their domestic requirements, the countries began to distribute an increasing part of the excess production to U.S. markets. Low tariff rates, higher prices of American steel products, and general freedom from nontariff barriers, were conducive to their plans for export expansion. Also, some foreign producers have followed the practice of selling their products in the U.S. market at prices lower than in their home market. The foreign producer in addition has the advantage of having his home market protected by higher tariffs and nontariff trade barriers.

World steelmaking capacity exceeds world demand, and with new steel capacity being added, foreign steel producers will continue to intensify their export sales. Further it can be expected that foreign countries will continue to protect their domestic steel producers as evidenced by the recent ECSC tariff increase.

C.F. & I. and other American steel producers have taken vigorous action to meet the competition of foreign steel and have attempted to bring about a more equitable balance between imports and exports. C.F. & I. has worked diligently to increase the volume and profitability of its sales, and particularly in wire rods, wire and wire products, and reinforcing bars. Large capital expenditures have been made to modernize our plants and increase their efficiency. Manufacturing operations have been consolidated, some marginal product lines have been eliminated, our research program has been broadened, and an aggressive sales program for both domestic and export markets has been maintained.

I have attempted in this statement and in our brief to provide information which will be of assistance to the Commission in preparing its advice pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act. In this connection I have noted that the act specifically refers to an investigation of the conditions, causes, and effects relating to competition between foreign and domestic producers of particular articles.

I submit that the information presented demonstrates that the domestic steel industry—and particularly companies such as C.F. & I producing wire rods, wire and wire products, and reinforcing bars—has been seriously and adversely affected by the large imports of steel and the great imbalance between imports and exports. I further submit that the trends in imports and exports which I have attempted to describe can only mean that the imports and the imbalance will increase, if certain corrective measures are not taken.

Therefore, I respectfully recommend that the Commission advise the President that there generally should be no further reductions in duties on steel products. As to modifications of duties and import restrictions, I suggest the following:

1. Tariff and nontariff trade barriers among the steel producing countries of the world should be equalized. If necessary to accomplish this objective, U.S. duties should be increased and in the case of barbed wire, which is presently duty free, tariffs should be imposed.

2. In the case of products such as wire rods, wire nails, and barbed wire, where American steel producers have lost 40 to 50 percent of their domestic market, quantitative limitations should be imposed upon imports as an interim measure to correct the imbalance.

We believe that the steel industry of the United States must be kept strong in the interest of preserving our national well-being. We further believe that the several members of the steel industry have exerted their best efforts in the face of discriminatory conditions in order to keep this industry at the highest possible level. We now request your assistance in correcting the conditions which are presently restricting the efforts of the steel industry to achieve this objective.

Again, we wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to appear before this Commission and for your courtesy and attention.

United States the Target: Heat on in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

UNITED STATES THE TARGET: HEAT ON IN VIETNAM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—The Vietcong Communists are miscalculating the fiber of Americans.

They are counting on the U.S. public at home getting so frustrated with this seesaw war that it will want American troops pulled out as the going gets tougher.

The new tactic of the guerrillas is to center terror bombings on U.S. military personnel who are advising the South Vietnamese, and on their wives and children.

Obviously their purposes are these:

To panic the families of U.S. forces and diplomatic staff.

To cause an evacuation of dependents which would have a most depressing effect on the Vietnamese Government and people.

To persuade the American people that this struggle is too much for them.

And to undermine the morale of American Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

These tactics are not succeeding here. I doubt they are having the effect which the Communists hope they will have in the United States.

But there is every evidence that the guerrillas intend to continue to aim their terror expressly at the Americans in their effort to paralyze U.S. policy.

Three times in recent weeks separate bombings have been directed at U.S. personnel; once in a softball stadium where Americans predominated; again at a downtown movie theater where Americans made up the entire audience. There were deaths and injuries both times.

The third bombing was a highly sophisticated pinpoint attempt to deplete a group of U.S. specialists essential to security—the demolition corps.

This was the technique: Two Communist agents attached a suspicion-looking object to the outside of a house occupied by an American officer. When the officer noticed it on his arrival home, he took the proper and expected action; he summoned a demolition detail. When they arrived in their jeep, a bicyclist pedaled by and aimed a

grenade at their car. Fortunately it bounced off the windshield and exploded a 3-foot hole in the yard.

When the suspicious object was removed from the side of the house, it was found to be a grapefruit wrapped like a bomb. It was a decoy. The Communist's target was not the house, not the young army officer. It was the crucial demolition detail whom they had lured to the scene, tried to kill—and bungled.

These are grim and ugly incidents. There is no reason to expect that the Vietcong will discontinue them until they can no longer operate with impunity anywhere in South Vietnam. Special teams of United States and South Vietnamese security guards are giving added protection to American residents. But the dangers are just beginning.

What is most encouraging is that the terror bombings are not terrorizing either U.S. troops or their families. There are more than 2,000 wives and children of U.S. military and diplomatic personnel in South Vietnam. So far not more than two have said they would elect to go home. The others have showed no sign of wanting to leave.

This is why I say the Communists are miscalculating the American stamina. Their campaign of terror is not only failing to intimidate; it is clearly having the opposite effect among Americans at every level here. They more than ever are determined to see it through. I would hope—and expect—that most people in the United States would respond the same way. I know that some Americans at home tend to think of this struggle as a hopeless, meaningless war too far away to bear on the vital interests of the United States.

It isn't true. At stake is not only the freedom and independence of 14 million South Vietnamese from a Communist takeover. Their freedom is important but the crucial stage is the security of this gateway to all Southeast Asia, where 200 million free Asians feel the hot breath of Communist China's imperialistic ambitions.

The Communists are aiming their terror tactics at the Americans because they know that without U.S. forces helping South Vietnam, they can unhinge this gate—and have their way.

The 70-Hour Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of March 9, 1964:

THE 70-HOUR WEEK

In Washington, a congressional committee has been listening to arguments for and against the idea of placing an additional penalty on overtime. The idea is that if the Government forced employers to pay double-time for overtime—or even more—the few hours of overtime here and there could be consolidated into some new jobs.

Perhaps the lawmakers ought to call in the postmasters. The Washington Star reports the Budget Bureau has discovered that "many thousands" of substitute post office clerks are working up to 70 hours a week—all at straight time. The regular employees have had their overtime extended, too.

The Star further reports that while the post office workers apparently hold the overtime records, other departments are working a lot of overtime, also.

What's the reason for this? Principally it is that President Johnson has promised that the Federal payroll will not increase in numbers. As this was to be in the interest of economy, and as the work is being done and paid for anyway, it looks like a subterfuge. The money is being spent, even if new employees aren't getting it.

By contrast, the businessman's reasons for not hiring new workers in preference to overtime are many and valid. He doesn't have to fool anyone as the Government is trying to do.

Some overtime is the result of emergencies and rush orders. Some occurs because there are no qualified applicants available. Some is worked because no extra machines or shift time are available to fill the volume of orders. Sometimes an employer avoids hiring a new worker because he knows he would soon have to lay him off when a peak has been passed. Absenteeism also often necessitates overtime.

An additional penalty for overtime work would make goods more expensive for all of us, of course. It probably would make a few jobs, and might destroy some. It could cut the take-home pay of many millions.

If the Government really believes in eliminating overtime to make new jobs, what's going on in the post office?

Our Absurd Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, when farm programs become more ridiculous there is no doubt the Democrats will direct the absurdity. For over 30 years they have been doing an excellent job of reducing American agriculture to the most impossible position of being directed in every move by Washington desk farmers, many of whom have never seen an honest-to-goodness American farm. The once mighty free American agricultural plant is slowly being Sovietized through the process of making free farmers wholly dependent upon the Federal Government.

Soon we will be asked to pile absurdity on absurdity by approving an impossible cotton bill to which has been added a more impossible wheat bill and the American buyers and taxpayers as usual will foot the bill.

As a part of these remarks I would like to call attention to the comment in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, "Subsidies Galore," and one from the Wall Street Journal, "Accent on Absurdity." The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune]

SUBSIDIES GALORE

Under stiff White House pressure, the Senate has approved a bill authorizing new subsidies for cotton and wheat. The measure now is in the House where the Johnson administration hopes to twist enough arms to bring quick approval. Any delay in enacting it into law involves the risk that the bill will be too late to affect this year's crops, which means the administration would have no new handouts to dangle before rural voters in the election campaign.

The proposed cotton program is such an economic absurdity that even the committee chairman, Senator ELLENDER, a Louisiana Democrat, was opposed to it. He agrees with the American Farm Bureau Federation that if Secretary of Agriculture Freeman would administer the present law properly—which means lowering price supports—there wouldn't be any need for a new program and the taxpayers could be saved some money.

The Agriculture Department is caught in a dilemma of its own making because it raised the support price after the Kennedy administration took office and now has cotton running out of its ears. Having stimulated production with high prices, it would be simpler and sounder to undo this mistake by lowering supports to discourage overproduction and make cotton more competitive. But the administration's solution is to pile on more subsidies.

The Senate bill does propose to lower suports from 32.47 cents a pound to 30 cents a pound for the first year, after which the Secretary would have authority to raise or lower them within prescribed limits. But growers of more than 10 acres of cotton who agree to reduce plantings by a third are to get a bonus of 4.5 cents a pound. And growers of 10 acres or less—well over half of all growers—are to be guaranteed 34.5 cents a pound without any cut in acreage, which is a reward to the small, inefficient producers at the expense of the larger, more efficient ones. Moreover, under certain limitations growers may exceed their reduced plantings by 10 percent to produce cotton at the export rate of 24 cents a pound.

But exporters still are to receive a subsidy, as at present, so American cotton can compete abroad at lower world prices. And a new subsidy is to be granted handlers so that domestic mills can buy our own cotton at the same price paid by foreigners. Thus the Government proposes to spoon feed the cotton industry with what in effect are four different subsidies.

The wheat program is a warmed-over version of the same one farmers emphatically rejected in last May's referendum. It guarantees a high price for that portion of the crop consumed domestically and a lower price for export wheat for those farmers who submit to planting controls. But instead of being mandatory, the program this time is being promoted as a voluntary plan, although the price guarantees are purposely set so high that the majority of farmers probably could not afford to stay out of it.

Shortly after taking office, President Johnson issued a statement suggesting he was seeking better farm programs and asking, "How can we use the pricing mechanism of the free market with more vitality than presently?" The obvious answer is to stop finding new ways to subsidize the farm economy. Agriculture and taxpayers generally will be better off if the House rejects this bill.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1964]

ACCENT ON ABSURDITY

With the Federal farm program sinking to new depths of foolishness, farmers may be nearing the day when they'll need protection against their would-be political friends.

The program's increasing accent on absurdity is especially evident in the wheat-cotton bill now wending its way through Congress. Seldom has any legislation seemed so well contrived to create costly confusion.

Take the wheat provisions of the bill. A year ago the wheat farmers rejected an administration plan for the tightest Federal regimentation ever, accompanied by a vast increase in the redtape of regulation. Farmers then began holding down their planting, preparing for the first time in decades for something vaguely like a free market.

But the farmers' friends in Washington were unwilling to let that come about. Their solution? Just push through the same program but label it voluntary instead of compulsory.

In addition to a basic support price, each farmer who cut his acreage by 10 percent or so would get certificates to cover an export quota and also a domestic sales quota. If he sold his wheat to a domestic processor, the processor would have to buy the certificates from the farmer. If he instead sold the grain to an exporter, the exporter would have to buy his certificates.

Any farmer could participate or not, as he chose. If he decided to stay out, he would have several choices. He could let his wheat stand in the field or rot in storage, or he could treat it as low-price animal feed. For the usual sales channels would be closed to him.

The reason is that the program would compel processors and exporters to participate; they would have to buy certificates to cover the wheat they purchased. By now most farmers, processors, and exporters must question the claim that the program would be voluntary.

That claim is no more convincing than the argument that the wheat program would save the taxpayers a lot of money. The theory is that processors and exporters, through their purchases of certificates, would assume part of the cost of supporting wheat prices. In reality, the processors would pass along the cost of the certificates to consumers in the prices of their products. And in case the politicians have forgotten, consumers and taxpayers are pretty much the same people.

In cotton, the situation is no less silly. First, Federal supports priced cotton out of world markets, so the U.S. Government began subsidizing exporters. But this made it possible for foreign textile mills to buy U.S. cotton and still undersell American textile mills right in their own backyard. So the Government now proposes yet another subsidy to aid the U.S. mills. If two wrongs did not make a right, it's hard to see how a third will help matters much.

For the cotton grower, too, things would become more confusing. If he agreed to cut his acreage he would get one support price. If he planted his present acres, he would get a lower support. And if he wanted to grow cotton for sale at the lower world market price, he could increase his acreage by around 10 percent.

One of the more ridiculous aspects of all this is that, like the rest of the farm program, it chiefly helps those the politicians are least interested in helping. It ought to be clear that the larger, more efficient farmers, with their lower costs, are the ones who benefit most from the high product prices the programs are intended to bring. The less efficient but politically popular family farmer still has a hard time of it—but the politicians' promises encourage him to hang on.

Some in Congress, nonetheless, presumably view the cotton-wheat bill as a powerful magnet for votes in an election year. But there is a growing number of urban voters, too. One man aware of this is Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, who urged the other day that Congress "end once and for all the fantastic and costly surpluses bulging in Government warehouses." Mr. WILLIAMS is a liberal's liberal, but he's also a representative of largely urban New Jersey.

If such pressures grow great enough and the farm program continues to plumb new depths of nonsense, the farmers one day may face not an orderly transition to a free market but a wrathful explosion.

Forgotten Yemen War Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that many of our distinguished commentators have not neglected to emphasize the ironic and damaging circumstances which still prevail in the Kingdom of Yemen.

The U.S. Government actually recognized a Nasserite regime in establishing diplomatic relations with the Yemen rebels. This was not a popular, internal revolt which could claim our sympathy.

The struggle for power goes on, and the United Arab Republic continues its large military operations against the Royalists in an attempt to protect the prony nationalist government it forcibly created.

Mr. William S. White, writing in the Washington Star of Saturday, March 6, has written a timely piece on the subject. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FORGOTTEN YEMEN WAR GOES ON

(By William S. White)

A forgotten war, a 17-month-old war of aggression, still goes on against the ragged, barefoot little kingdom of Yemen in the Middle East.

The invading forces of Nasser Egypt, supplied with Soviet-made tanks and bombers again the rifles and machineguns of the Yemeni royalists, are larger now than 10 months ago, when Egypt agreed to a United Nations-inspected "disengagement" that is no disengagement at all.

Indeed, the United Nations observation mission in Yemen has just conceded that in the single brief period January 3-February 18 Egypt increased its forces by 1,000 to 2,000 men. Young Prince Abdurraman Ben Yahya of Yemen, who is in the United States for what looks to be the lost cause of interesting the Western World in Yemen's plight, says 38,000 Egyptian troops are now in his country.

MILLION IN CAVES

One million of his countrymen, he adds, are now living in caves for shelter from Nasser bombers sent by the Soviet Union. Yemen's already pitiably small supply of arms is running out, for reinforcements from Saudi Arabia are obstructed under the U.N. "cease-fire." Rarely has an emissary come to this country in so hopeless a state of affairs. The Royal Yemen Government is no longer recognized, either here or in the United Nations. The so-called democratic revolution which dislodged it—with the massive help of Egyptian military forces—was granted, during the Kennedy administration, an American recognition which necessarily is now maintained.

The Prince, therefore, has no official status here; there is no one to whom—officially—he can put his case. What he hopes for, nevertheless, is some indirect assistance for Yemen, by which he really means some decision by Washington to put pressure on Nasser to cease his attacks.

How the United States could now reverse itself is not easy to see, for the water of much irrevocable history was flowed under the bridge since this country bought the view that the revolution against the Yemen royal regime was what it was presented to be—an honest, local uprising to procure a more democratic society.

What was not understood then was that the revolution was in fact a Nasser export. What is now crystal plain is that though American recognition was granted to the new regime on condition that Nasser then arrange to withdraw his forces, he has increased them instead.

Monarchal governments—even such a pathetic little tribal "monarch" as was involved in Yemen—are not popular any more. Anybody who comes along with the claim that he represents a "forward-looking" reform to get rid of such old-fashioned arrangements is automatically looked upon with favor. Royalty has a hard time getting a hearing, as the royal regime in Yemen did in this instance.

It is, at all events, not too late to examine this case example of how sincere Western advocates of free government in the State Department are taken in by phony revolutions pumped up as movements for "freedom and independence" by the foreign agents or collaborators of Moscow.

A bit more reserve before we granted recognition so many months ago would have changed the whole picture. Nasser might now be back in Egypt instead of beating down the tribesmen of Yemen, crying slogans that everybody must be "forward-looking" while Soviet weapons are driving a helpless, ignorant, and hopeless people much further from real freedom than they have ever been before.

ARRIVE IN 6 DAYS

For the truth is that within 6 days of the outbreak of what was advertised as an authentic, home-grown revolt against the Yemen royal government by democratic forces, Egyptian troops were on Yemen's soil. They had to come by sea—and 6 days is the minimum time in which to mount such an amphibious operation from Egypt. If this did not show whose "revolution" this really was, what did it show?

Finally, we could usefully look back a bit further than all this. We could look back to 1956, when this Nation joined the Soviet Union in the United Nations in condemning as an "aggression" against Nasser Egypt the attack made in actual self-defense by the British, the French and the Israelis to try to strike Nasser's throttling hands from their lifeline, the Suez Canal.

When Nasser Egypt attacks somebody it is never aggression under the peculiar definitions of the United Nations.

Homeowners Honor Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my contention, and justifiably so, I am convinced, that the 26th Congressional District of California is quite outstanding. Something has just happened which is so unusual and dif-

ferent, I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues.

The Garden Park Estates Homeowners Association, representing a development of 1,900 homes at present, and developed by S. & S. Construction Co., recently expressed their appreciation for their well-balanced community to the developers, Nathan and David Shapell. I want to extend to my friends and constituents, Nathan and David Shapell, my sincere congratulations. They are to be commended for their efforts and for their obvious understanding of responsibility and public duty in their chosen field.

A news article of the presentation follows:

HOMEOWNERS HONOR BUILDER

Expressing appreciation for their "well-balanced community," Garden Park Estates Homeowners Association saluted the developers this week with presentation of a special plaque.

The award was presented at a Greenbrier Inn luncheon by Leo Pennington, president of the homeowners association.

Accepting on behalf of S. & S. Construction Co. was Nathan Shapell, the firm's president.

EXCELLENCE

The plaque lauded S. & S. "for excellence in home construction, community development, and customer service" to the West Garden Grove area.

Bud Kent, founder and board member of the homeowners group, acting as board member, said cooperation between residents and the developers has resulted in settlement of several zoning disputes which otherwise might have stalemated.

He pointed out that Garden Park Estates with its 1,900 homes (3,000 when finally completed) is considered a well-balanced community, what with careful placement of commercial sites, shopping centers, and major freeways flanking the area.

MANY AWARDS

Shapell said his firm has received numerous awards in the past, but that he considers the association's plaque the most important "because it came from the residents of the area."

The luncheon was attended by homeowner association board members, their wives, and representatives of the land and construction developers.

Kathy Fugiel: South Carolina's Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars conduct a Voice of Democracy contest among high school students.

This year, Miss Katharine (Kathy) Fugiel of Route 1, Wadmalaw Island, was the winner in South Carolina.

The Palmetto State can well be proud of this fine young scholar. Her brilliant article shows the Nation the kind of dedicated young Americans South Carolina produces.

Her stirring article speaks for itself. I believe it is one which every member of the Congress should read. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert her article for the information of this body:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Katharine Tupper Fugiel, Wadmalaw Island, S.C.)

The game has begun.

Each spectator anxiously watches every play, every movement. At first his interest is a passive one. Then, when the ball is only inches away from the goal and a touchdown is only moments away, perhaps one play away, the spectators get up on their feet. There are shouts, cheers, encouragement. It is then realization comes that spectators play the game, too.

In America each citizen is a member of the team. The team is our Nation and its laws are the rules of the game. The game could not be played with one of these elements missing. Without players there is no team, and without responsible citizens there is no nation. The combined efforts of the team supplies the individual players with the means for accomplishing their goals, and without the welding force and direction of effort which a nation supplies, we could not, as individuals, achieve, or hold for long, those aims and objectives which we have in common with our fellow citizens. Without rules there could be no game, only chaos; without the laws of government there could be only anarchy, and the "laws" of the jungle would prevail among men in place of order and equal justice.

There will be one or more players who are able to give an added ounce of strength and will and self-sacrifice. Often, this team member will be chosen as the captain because he symbolizes the united efforts of the team. Through respect or admiration his fellow teammates are willing to follow him.

In the same fashion do citizens select leaders in whom the national needs and motivations are crystallized. A citizen should not select the grandstand player who deliberately seeks the cheers of the crowd as his representative, or elect as his leader a man who is moved by personal ambition rather than the common good. The selection of leaders and representatives, whether for local or national government, is one of the most important challenges that a citizen must face. A citizen's right to vote must be exercised with all his intelligence for it is here that he can lose all his rights. If a leader leads his nation to destruction and defeat is only he to blame? By whose will, by whose vote, by whose acquiescence—silent or not—did he become a leader?

Of course, there is the season's schedule in which the school team meets the challenge of other teams. The challengers of a democratic nation may be a Communist or totalitarian government. The challenge our Nation faces is not always from without. For instance, the right of a citizen to govern himself may be challenged by other citizens who believe that they know best what is good for all the people. Daniel Webster defended the citizen's right to self-government when he said, "it is the people's government, by the people, for the people, and answerable to the people."

The player must keep early hours for rest, control his appetite and diet, and take exercise and rigorous training in order to give his best for each game. So, too, the citizen must keep watch and ward over his nation to protect it from political corruption, crime, vice, and open disregard for the laws. Each game has the ever-present referee to maintain honesty and fairplay among all the players. Belief in God gives America the courage and assurance that "might does not make right" and that justice will triumph in the end.

At this very moment you are on the offensive. The ball is yours. How long will you keep it? How long will the rights and privileges of a democracy be yours? If there are one or two slackers on the team, or a few lazy and spiritless players, you will lose the ball and the initiative. When you are on the defensive protect your goal and hold that line. If you persevere you will get the ball again.

So let us prize our citizenship for it can be more easily lost than won again. Take a lesson from the oath of the Athenian young man took more than 24 centuries ago. Let the freshness and spirit of this oath be a challenge to every citizen of this Nation:

"We will never bring disgrace to our city, we will fight for our ideals, quicken the public sense of civic duty, and transmit this city, not less but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

Back to Reality in Borneo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a pertinent editorial, the March 6 Chicago Daily Tribune directs attention to the obvious failure of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's overpublicized junket to India 2 weeks ago. This editorial points up the complete collapse of administration foreign policy. We all recognize the public relations smokescreen that is being used to detract the attention of the American public from the appeasement, defeatist foreign policy complex of this administration.

This editorial quite properly exposes the facts of life in one of the major Asian crises:

BACK TO REALITY IN BORNEO

Fortunately for Attorney General Kennedy, his campaign against Jimmy Hoffa is going better than his campaign to stop the jungle warfare in Borneo. The cease-fire which he announced with a good deal of fanfare in January officially collapsed on the same day that Hoffa was convicted.

Peace talks between Indonesia and Malaysia broke down, according to Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio, because Indonesia wanted gradual disengagement while Malaysia wanted full withdrawal of Indonesian volunteers from Malaysian territory before the talks continued. The Malaysian demand is unrealistic, Subandrio said, because Indonesia does not have control over these volunteers.

Well, it's convenient enough for Subandrio to say that his government can't do what it clearly doesn't want to do; namely, to pull its guerrilla fighters out of the Malaysian state of Sarawak. But if this is true, then what business did President Sukarno have promising a cease-fire in the first place? More to the point, what made Mr. Kennedy think that Sukarno's promise meant anything? The best that can be said for him is that he was fooled into accepting a bum check.

In fact, the Indonesian volunteers could not last very long in enemy territory without help from home, and it is therefore much more likely that Sukarno could enforce a withdrawal or a cease-fire if he

wanted, and that Subandrio is merely making up excuses. In this event, Mr. Kennedy fell into a deliberate trap which he should have foreseen. Sukarno's word has never been good any longer than it suited his purpose. And his purpose now is to grab the Malaysian part of Borneo and thus satisfy his nationalistic followers and divert attention from the mess he has made of the domestic economy.

Malaysia now plans to take its troubles to the United Nations. This, as it must realize, is the agency which quieted Sukarno's aggressive demands for West New Guinea—by giving it to him. The outlook is hardly cheering for Malaysia or for world law and order.

Tobacco-Health Research Is a Federal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I think it important that this Congress approve legislation authorizing research aimed at providing the maximum assurance of health for tobacco users. In facing the problem we can assume that confirmed smokers will continue to smoke, thus causing a national health problem. We need to learn how to make smoking safer. We need to know what substances in tobacco smoke cause lung cancer or other disabilities. We need to know whether the cancer-producing compounds come from the nicotine in the tobacco or from the use of chemicals and fertilizer or from a combination of these or other factors.

We must also give consideration to the welfare of the tobacco industry upon which 17,000,000 Americans depend for all or part of their livelihood.

The answer lies in research. If there are characteristics in the tobacco plant that should be strengthened or eliminated, we want to know what they are.

Under leave granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Asheville Times, of March 3, 1964, which points out the need for further tobacco research:

TOBACCO-HEALTH RESEARCH IS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

One cannot escape the feeling that the Government report on smoking and its relation to lung cancer and other diseases has had a greater impact on the public than earlier ones. Although the Federal findings were not based on new research, merely being a reexamination of studies here and abroad and an assessment of their significance, their issuance in December has become a turning point in the health-tobacco problem.

Reaction to the report has ranged from "so what?" to calls for a law that cigarettes carry a virtual skull-and-crossbones label. The joke of the day went something like: Well, Joe, did you read the report about smoking? Sure did, Sam, and I've quit. Quit smoking? No—quit reading.

Since the main villain in the statistical links to lung cancer and heart troubles was with cigarette smokers, and those who inhaled when smoking, the thought of many smokers who wanted to smoke but remain on the safe side turned to such tactics as smoking less, trying to smoke without inhaling, or switching from cigarettes to cigars or pipes.

It is becoming fashionable in some circles for women to try cigars or pipes. Stylish jeweled pipes are entering the market to encourage this trend.

Classes on how to stop smoking have been organized. There also was the suggestion that classes be formed to teach smokers how to stop inhaling, an idea we hope will be pursued.

A medical journal published in Minneapolis reported a majority of 60,000 doctors answering a questionnaire (sent to 192,000) said they have quit cigarettes or switched to pipes and cigars. About 80 percent of the physicans said they had smoked at some time but 52 percent said they now do not smoke at all.

Many smokers, of course, feel that medical proof remains inconclusive and have made no change in their habits. Proof that there has been an overall decline in consumption is in the dip in cigarette sales taxes reported in Ohio and New York City at the end of January. There was some curtailment of production at North Carolina's cigarette factories, where officials discounted it as somewhat normal in the after-Christmas season.

Since this State has a bigger economic interest in tobacco as a crop and the manufacture of cigarettes than any other, it hopes for an honorable way out of the dilemma. Governor Sanford set the theme with a statement that expanded research is needed to find out what factor in cigarette tobacco—if any—is a health hazard; secondly if such factor is isolated, find out how to eliminate it during the growing or processing of tobacco.

Even the Surgeon General admits that further research is needed. A bill to provide Federal funds for a more exhaustive research into the question was sidetracked in the House Agriculture Committee, but the chairman, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, is maneuvering to get it back on the tracks. Some opponents argue that it is the industry's responsibility now, not the Government's.

However, the Government has quite a stake in the question, for its revenue from tobacco taxes has been in the billions for many years. The spending of Federal money to clarify the health hazard in the smoking issue is fully justified, and we hope that action on the tobacco research bill will be prompt and an early start can be made in hunting the answers to a many-faceted question about which many persons—even those who have quit smoking—have many doubts.

Diamond Jubilee of Orange County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1889 the Legislature of the State of California created Orange County by separating the southeast section of the then-existing Los Angeles County at the San Gabriel River. This action culminated a drive initiated by Orange County leaders as early as 1848. How appropriate that 75 years later the Bureau of the Budget should have taken the steps necessary to create for Orange County a metropolitan area status separate from Los Angeles.

I trust the Members of this august body will indulge a prideful reference, then, to the diamond jubilee celebration being opened in the great and beautiful county of Orange. Proud of the great heritage of the ranchos that marked the beginning of man's organized efforts to realize the bounty of her rich soil. The county still counts among its industrious agriculturalists and civic leaders the progenitors of the Yorba family. The first Yorba entered Orange County in 1769 in the company of Spaniards led by Don Gaspar de Portola. The Mission of San Juan Capistrano was established in 1776 on the first leg of the first California highway known in those days as El Camino Real—the Kings Highway.

Soon the territory now known as Orange County was a mission plus a cluster of ranchos. The names of which flavor the nomenclature of cities, streets, and institutions; Rancho San Juan de Santa Ana, Rancho Los Bolsas, Rancho La Habra, Rancho Los Alamitos. In all some 22 ranchos flourished in the area. When California became a State there were only two settlements in all of the county; one being in San Juan Capistrano and the other in Santa Ana. Now the estimated population of the county is a little over 1 million, with over 25 cities.

Having passed through a period of high density farm and orchard activity with an industry base dominated by oil extraction and processing in the period from the formation of the county up to World War II, the immediate history has been one of dynamic growth which coupled expansion of population with the location and development of diversified industry, commerce and services. While the average rate of growth in the United States for counties as a whole between 1950–60 was approximately 18.5 percent and the average for the State of California was 48.5 percent; the rate of growth for Orange County was about 290 percent. This experience speaks highly of the natural and manmade climate of Orange County. We have a view of the future which is exciting and challenging. The demonstrated ability and readiness of the responsible leadership of Orange County to meet and solve the problems brought by the dynamics of change and growth does great credit to the county, cities, and other political subdivisions which are under law required and authorized to keep the problems under control by planning and by executive action.

Today the diamond jubilee celebration is in full sway in the city of Huntington Beach. This celebration is highly justified and most timely. It does great credit to the executive secretary of the Huntington Beach Chamber of Commerce, William Gallienne, that he led the sponsoring group for the observance of this significant milestone in the history of a great county in a great State and a great Nation. In my absence from my home district, I send my warm congratulations and salutation to this festive occasion.

Remarks by Senator Hayden Following Presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, last night the Congress and the State of Arizona received a signal honor when Arizona's distinguished and beloved senior Senator, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, was presented with the First Annual Congressional Award given by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This award consisted of a most beautiful plaque and, what I am sure will be even nearer and dearer to the Senator's heart, a $1,000 check made payable to the CARL HAYDEN Scholarship Fund at Arizona State University. As we all know, Senator HAYDEN is a man of few words. However, in replying to the words of presentation and acclaim for his tireless and dedicated service to our Nation, he made a speech so significant and so enjoyable that I wanted to share it with all those who were not fortunate enough to hear him deliver it in person.

The Senator's speech follows, and I am sure it will be appreciated and valued by everyone who reads it:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HAYDEN FOLLOWING PRESENTATION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS CONGRESSIONAL AWARD, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1964

I thank you for this wonderful award and the kind words that went with it. Certainly there is no group in America whose good opinion I value more highly than that of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am particularly glad to be here with the winners in the Voice of Democracy contest. These young people are able to speak out for America. They guarantee that we will have some good voices saying some sensible things for many years to come.

As the recipient of its First Annual Congressional Award, I believe that it is due to the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to make known to them the background of the man who is receiving it for the first time.

I am the son of Charles Trumbull Hayden, a Connecticut Yankee, born in 1825, whose grandfather served in the War of the Revolution and who, as a boy, talked with veterans of that conflict which made our Nation possible. As a young man, he went west and in 1848, left Independence, Mo., with an ox train, the wagons loaded with goods to establish a mercantile business in Santa Fe. En route he met Illinois and Missouri veterans returning from the war with Mexico, and some of his supplies were requisitioned to meet their needs.

Ten years later, after the Gadsden Purchase, he hauled a stock of goods to Tucson to establish a business there. On one occasion, in southwestern New Mexico, his parked wagon train was besieged by a large band of Apache Indians who were driven off by the arrival of a troop of cavalry.

The Confederate invasion of New Mexico made it impossible to bring merchandise from Independence, so my father had to drive across the plains, purchase goods in the East and ship them by sailing vessels around Cape Horn to San Francisco, and then transship them to San Diego or Guaymas, where he sent his mule teams to get them.

He would be driven between Tucson and San Francisco in his own ambulance and it was on one such trip that he met my mother who was teaching school in Visalia, Calif. Her uncle, who was a 49'er, wrote that there was a need for schoolteachers in California. On her way out, the then Union Pacific Railroad train had to stop twice to let herds of buffalo cross the tracks.

My mother, Sally Calvert Davis, was a native of Arkansas, whose ancestors also fought in the War of the Revolution. One of them served as a sailor on a privateer out of Baltimore in the War of 1812. She had two brothers in the Confederate Army, one of whom was killed in the battle of Shiloh, one of the bloodiest battles of the War between the States. A Union regiment camped on my grandfather's farm, and burned his fence rails for their camp fires. She said that she owed a debt to the Confederacy which could be paid by marrying a Yankee and fixing him for life. He liked the fixing and took her to Arizona—where I was born.

I can add that my mother's first cousin, Andrew Jackson Halbert, was badly wounded at the battle of Shiloh. When I was a boy, I was walking up the street with him one day when we met Tom Gregory, a Union veteran. Cousin Jack said, "Tom, do you know what day this is?" Tom didn't know. Cousin Jack then said, "This is the anniversary of the battle of Shiloh. We were killing Yankees that day. We had about 5,000 killed by this time that morning."

During most of my boyhood in Arizona the Apaches were on the warpath. I can remember seeing their signal fires on the mountain peaks, and also remember when a sword was presented to Gen. Nelson A. Miles at Tucson in gratitude for the capture and deportation to Florida of Geronimo and his band of hostile Apaches. Why the name of that murderous old villain was shouted by paratroopers when they jumped is a mystery to me.

I was a student at Stanford University when war was declared against Spain in 1898. I learned that Maj. Alexander O. Brodie, a graduate of West Point, had been chosen by Theodore Roosevelt to raise a squadron of the 1st U.S. Volunteer Cavalry (later known as the Rough Riders) in the territory of Arizona, and I hurried home to enlist. Before I arrived, the quota had been filled, which was lucky for me because the troop which I wanted to join was left in Tampa, Fla., to take care of the horses, and suffered from malarial fever, while the rest of the regiment went on to Cuba to win the battle of San Juan Hill.

When Colonel Roosevelt became President of the United States he appointed Colonel Brodie to be the Governor of the territory of Arizona. One day in 1904, when I was managing our flour mill and general merchandise store in my native town of Tempe, I received a letter from Governor Brodie inviting me to see him when I came to Phoenix. When I met him the Governor said that the National Guard company in Tempe was in a bad way and that unless I became its captain it would be mustered out of service. When I protested that I had no military experience to qualify me to be a captain, his reply was, "You are a gentleman."

I talked it over with my young friends and 32 of us enlisted at the same time in Company C, 1st Regiment of Infantry, National Guard of Arizona. Shortly afterwards I was elected by them to be its captain. We soon learned about the National Rifle Matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, and proceeded to clear off the sagebrush for a 1,000-yard rifle range. Our rifle practice paid off because thereafter about half of the Arizona team at Camp Perry were members of my company.

At Camp Perry I shot a possible with a Springfield rifle. I hit the bull's eye 15 consecutive times at 900 yards. I can add that it was with the help of the members of the National Guard of Arizona that I was first elected to Congress in 1911.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I voted to declare war on Germany in April, 1917. Not long afterwards three Members of that body entered military service. Augustus Gardner, of Massachusetts, became a major of infantry and died in the service in January 1918. Royal Johnson, of South Dakota, as a lieutenant of infantry, was wounded in the Argonne. Fiorello LaGuardia, of New York, who went to the public school in Prescott, Ariz., and whose father was an Army bandmaster, became a major in the Army Air Service and rendered excellent service in Italy. He afterwards became the mayor of New York City.

Shortly after their departure from the House, President Wilson issued an order forbidding Members of Congress from entering the Armed Forces. But, in 1918, Newton D. Baker, the Secretary of War, went to Europe to look over the battlefronts. The Assistant Secretary was not aware of the President's order so four of us Members of the House entered the service before the lid was again put on.

Tom Connally, of Texas, became captain and adjutant of infantry, Marvin Jones, of Texas, was a private in the tank corps, and Albert Johnson, of Washington, a captain in the chemical warfare serivce.

I was made a major of infantry and assigned to duty at Camp Lewis in the State of Washington. At the age of 41, I had a hard time keeping up with the younger men in my battalion, but the division was ready to go overseas when the armistice was declared. Like all others who had completed training, we said that the Kaiser heard we were coming and decided that it was time to end the war.

So in January 1919, I returned to the House of Representatives, and it was not long until those who had served in the First World War and their widows and orphans asked for help to adjust their grievances. This I did with the aid of an able secretary, Jack Gavin, who had served in General Pershing's headquarters at Chaumont, and was a stenographer at the Peace Conference at Versailles.

By 1924, a number of the veterans of the war with Germany had been elected to the House of Representatives. They joined in a demand that a committee for World War veterans be created. When that was done, John Garner, the Democratic minority leader, came to my office and insisted that I resign from the Committee on Public Lands and become the ranking minority member of the new committee. I objected to making the change and Garner said, "Are you bigger than the Democratic Party?" He then explained that some of the new Congressmen who were veterans violently objected to the selection of a Tammany Democrat, who was not a veteran, to be the ranking Democratic member of the committee, and that I was the only Democrat who had longer congressional service than he.

So I became the ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on World War Veterans Legislation on January 14, 1924, and upon which I served until I was elected to the Senate in November 1926. From the start it was a busy committee which aided in the enactment of legislation beneficial to veterans and to their widows and orphans.

In 1934, I made a trip to the Far East. In China there were armed guards on all of the railroad trains and soldiers everywhere one went. The Japanese had recently conquered Manchuria and I did not see a railroad bridge without a machinegun enplacement or a railroad station that was not surrounded by a barbed wire entanglement.

Previously, I had been in Europe where I saw the carabinieros in pairs all over Spain,

and the blackshirts everywhere in Italy. On my return to Arizona, I told my people that from what I had seen and what I had heard of the actions of Hitler in Germany, it was evident that we were heading into another world war and that I was ready to vote for more battleships and every other form of preparedness for a war that was sure to come.

The Second World War did come and those who served in it, and in Korea, make up most of the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that great organization whose award I am honored to receive this night.

No words can ever say how much I appreciate being the first to receive this high honor, but I know you will agree there is a higher honor and you all share it with me. Yes, the real award for serving America is the knowledge that you have served her, and you never finish with that kind of service. It runs from the cradle to the grave, gives purpose and direction to our lives.

Today we stand firm against the forces of communism and will keep right on standing firm. With men like you on the alert we have the assurance of constant support and maintenance of a strong Military Establishment. At the same time, we know that this generation and those to come will not only defend America, but will keep her forever worth defending. Again, I am grateful for the Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award. I am honored to accept it on behalf of all Members of Congress and all citizens of the Nation who foster the American spirit in war and in peace.

I thank you.

Meetings on the Civil Rights Question at the University of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Students of the University of Hawaii, and various interested groups and individuals, recently sponsored a highly successful series of meeting in Hawaii on the national civil rights problem. They invited prominent national speakers on both sides of the question who presented their viewpoints to many thousands of students and members of the community. On February 17, Mr. John Ali, representing the Black Muslims, spoke. He was followed on February 19 and 20 by Dr. Martin Luther King of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and James Farmer of CORE. The final participant was William J. Simmons of the White Citizen's Council of Jackson, Miss.

All speakers were treated with courtesy and subjected to questioning. The net result of this series was a wider understanding of problems in racial relations foreign to Hawaii, and a far greater sense of involvement in the great human struggle of this generation.

I am very proud that our people in Hawaii, and particularly our young people at the university, have so graphically demonstrated not only their deep commitment to equality and human values regardless of racial extraction, but also their faith in a calm and rational approach to any explosive human problem.

On February 20, a group of community leaders, many of whom participated in the symposia, issued a statement which expressed the sense of those present on Hawaii's role in the struggle for human rights. I include this statement in the RECORD:

CIVIL RIGHTS STATEMENT

Approved unanimously by those in attendance February 20, 1964, at East-West Center who include:

Simeon Acoba, ASUH Civil Rights Week Committee.

Dr. Abraham K. Akaka, chairman civil rights commission.

Theodore Akana, Hawaii Government Employees Association.

Harry Boranian, AFL–CIO Central Labor Council.

Charles Campbell, Leilehua High School, coconvener of consultation.

J. C. Cavanagh, Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

George Chaplin, editor, Honolulu Advertiser.

James Dooley, AFL–CIO Central Labor Council.

William H. Ewing, editor, Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

Marva Garrett, NAACP.

Representative Thomas P. Gill, U.S. House of Representatives.

The Reverend Donald Graff, catholic diocese.

Dr. Thomas H. Hamilton, president, University of Hawaii.

Robert Hasegawa, Civil Rights Commission.

Milton Hibden, Radio–TV Broadcasters Association.

The Reverend Lawrence S. Jones, president, Honolulu Council of Churches, coconvener of consultation.

Dr. Robert Kamins, Civil Rights Commission.

Bernard Levinson, Temple Emanu-El, Civil Rights Commission.

Robert C. Loveless, Honolulu Christian College, coconvener of consultation.

Jeannette Miller, editor, Ka Leo O Hawaii.

The Reverend Norito Nagao, Honpa Hongwanji Mission.

Constantine Samson, ILWU.

Gary Yamagata, president, Associated Students of University of Hawaii.

CONFERENCE STATEMENT

1. America is a young country with a rich heritage. Men and women of many races, creeds, and nationalities have shared in building this Nation. The greatest hope of American democracy lies in the realization of "the American Dream" in which each individual receives recognition based on merit. "Respect for the individual" should not be merely a "dream." It should mean that every man and woman has equal rights before the law: equal opportunity for employment and promotion; equal opportunity to vote and hold public office; equal opportunity to be educated, to rent or buy a home or obtain lodging and to participate fully in community affairs. These goals are at the core of our democratic society.

Our racial differences do not mean that some are inherently inferior to others. The eminent anthropologist, the late Franz Boaz said, "If we select the most intelligent, imaginative, energetic, and emotionally stable third of mankind, all races would be represented."

2. Detachment and lack of involvement in the civil rights struggle is not a policy which we of Hawaii should follow. It is our conviction that we cannot assume that this crucial issue affecting our Nation is not our problem. It is our concern, if for no other reason than that together we are Americans facing one of the most critical periods in American history.

3. Hawaii has an obligation to bear witness to the rest of the Nation. We do this not out of a sense of self-righteousness, but with deep humility, for we are aware that race relations in Hawaii are not without need of improvement. However, it is a fact that Hawaii is one of the few areas in the world where people of varied racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds have learned to live and work together without serious friction. It can be done. Our late President John F. Kennedy recognized this fact then, upon arrival in Hawaii to present his civil rights program to the Nation, he said, "This island represents everything we are and hope to be."

PROPOSALS

1. That the leaders of our State, in education, government, labor, business and industry, religion, the mass media, and community groups, on their own initiative develop and implement means of increasing awareness on the part of Hawaii's people regarding America's "freedom movement," in order that we might have the mature realization that what affects the rest of the Nation affects us.

2. That we assembled here follow up with similar consultations within the areas we represent to discover more specifically how our first proposal can be implemented within our ranks.

3. That we in Hawaii address ourselves to the remnants of racial discrimination within our own State, seeking to devise adequate solutions immediately.

4. That we in Hawaii increasingly explore more direct ways to relate ourselves to the civil rights movement on the mainland, bearing witness and sharing in the burdens of those who are oppressed.

5. That we assembled here endorse the civil rights bill which passed the U.S. House of Representatives recently, and that we call upon the U.S. Senate also to pass the bill in the same form; and that we assembled here urge individuals and organizations throughout Hawaii to communicate with as many mainland friends as possible to enlist their active support of the passage of this bill.

6. That we, upon the call of the conveners of this conference, convene another conference of this nature for the purpose of reviewing the progress made and instituting further action in the civil rights struggle.

Charges of Unfairness in Draft Law Mount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recent issues of the New York World-Telegram have factually portrayed the need for changing the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military and Service Act.

I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker of having the New York World-Telegram series on this vital matter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on Wednesday, March 4, and the second article on Tuesday, March 10.

The inequities in the draft law which the articles discuss must be of concern to all of us in the Congress. In this respect I call the attention of my col-

leagues to the bill I have sponsored—H.R. 10211 in this House—legislation which is identical with that introduced in the other body by Senator KEATING—S. 2432, seeking to correct these conditions.

Both my bill and that of Senator KEATING call for the establishment of a commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training for the purpose of suggesting corrective legislation to meet the needs of present-day military manpower requirements.

Draft law reform is increasingly imperative, Mr. Speaker, and this has been effectively highlighted in the New York World-Telegram series, the concluding article of which I now, under unanimous consent, place in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a forthright, hard-hitting editorial that appeared in the same newspaper calling for drastic and realistic changes in the draft law:

DRAFT REFORM LIKELY, CHARGES OF UNFAIRNESS MOUNTS

(By Lee Townsend)

"A rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair system of filling the ranks of the Army."
—Senator WAYNE MORSE.

"The present system has too long been extended as a matter of course."
—Senator KENNETH KEATING.

Faced with mounting evidence that the peacetime draft is unfair, Washington is finally taking a hard look at the Nation's highly selective system of Selective Service.

In rapid succession this month, President Johnson and the Pentagon took steps that might lead to the first major reforms in the postwar draft since its inception 15 years ago.

And yesterday, five Republican Senators, among them KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, joined to introduce a bill calling for a review of the draft laws.

"The present system has been too long extended as a matter of course," KEATING said. "Some of the present inequities in the draft system have been called to my attention by an ever-increasing number of letters from New York State and other parts of the country."

The President ordered induction examination to be given, wherever possible, as soon as youths reach the age of 18 instead of at the age of 22 or 23, which is the current practice.

The White House hopes that early detection of disabilities will lead to corrective measures. And this, it is hoped, will lead to a reduction in the number of 3.5 million draft-age Americans who so far have managed to escape military service because they are "unfit."

Just last week the Pentagon announced a sweeping study of the draft with an eye to major reforms. The brass gave no hint about what steps might be taken to improve the Selective Service System but made it clear there was little chance the draft would be abolished.

Defense experts argue that, in order to scrap conscription entirely, the size of our Armed Forces would have had to undergo a sizable reduction—and no such reduction is anticipated. In fact, most officials seem to feel that it would be impossible to think of a nation getting by without some form of conscription—even though this country never had a peacetime draft before 1940, Canada still doesn't have it, and England got rid of it in 1960.

The Nation's elaborate Selective Service currently can take credit for providing only about 7 percent of America's military force of 2.7 million.

And up to half of the 200,000 draftees are actually volunteers. These are men who ask that their names be pushed up on the draft list, usually because they figure, rightly or not, that military service is inevitable and so they might as well get it over with.

Conscription has been cited for bolstering our Armed Forces indirectly by bulldozing men into the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force to avoid a draft notice. But with enlistment periods for all services usually set at 3 years, there's no evidence that men have flocked to recruiting stations in great numbers just to avoid a 2-year stint as a draftee.

RESERVE VERSUS DRAFT

It is generally conceded, however, that the Army Reserve program, in which men may fulfill their active duty military requirements in 6 months, has thrived solely as a substitute for the draft.

Local Selective Service authorities point out that an important part of their job is to provide a pool of readily available men in case of national emergency.

They say many men, who now are "better serving their country" with deferments and exemptions can be called into uniform in time of need.

Yet during the Berlin crisis in 1961, tens of thousands of reservists—among them former draftees—were called back to duty because there was not time to draft and train new men.

At one point, the Army admitted that more than 1,000 of these men were recalled erroneously.

Although draft calls increased sharply during the crisis, there was a serious question raised as to how successful Selective Service is in delivering men to meet the instant emergencies of the atomic age.

The vital questions about the effectiveness of Selective Service were not answered when the fourth extension of the draft law swept through both Houses of Congress last March.

In fact they were hardly asked.

The House of Representatives debated mainly whether the life of the law should be reduced from 4 to 2 years. It wasn't.

The Senate didn't even handle this issue. Debate there took two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and about 10 minutes.

Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE delivered the only real blast against the peacetime draft. He said, "Selective Service remains just as discriminatory in its selection as before, and just as unfair to the young men of the Nation.

"It is astonishing to me that in a Pentagon building with the so-called whiz kids and slide ruler minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful and completely unfair system of filling the ranks of the Army."

WIDER SCOPE EXPECTED

The Selective Service Director, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, and Col. Paul Akst, New York City draft chief, have indicated that reforms are likely to expand the scope of the Selective Service System, not reduce it.

For instance, draft experts here feel more should be done to divert many skilled men, now deferred or exempt, to useful positions in the military or in national industry. Such provisions now are made in the case of doctors, who are called into service when there is a need for them.

One high draft official said, "Such a policy would aid in balancing the scales in the minds of persons who do not qualify for deferment before age 26 and enter military service."

It also has been proposed that men be drafted right after high school rather than in their early 20's, as is usually done now. Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, pointed out, "We are drafting men between 23 and 26 with jobs and leaving younger men without jobs."

So far, most reforms are strictly talk. And the draft forecast for the near future remains: Good luck for the many, tough break for the few.

There is no guarantee that the forecast won't be the same in 1967, when the Universal Military Training and Service Act comes up again for passage * * * and the first babies born under peacetime conscription start trying to beat the draft.

CHANGE THE DRAFT

Can anything be done about the awful tragedy of the draft?

In a nation that believes in equal opportunity, in equal sacrifice, in equal sharing of the responsibilities as well as the benefits of citizenship, the draft is a dangerous joke.

It is riddled with favoritism and class. Instead of creating a proud democratic tradition of service, it is something to be avoided by any means, fair or foul.

Those who finally serve feel they are victims rather than standard bearers. What this does to their morale and to the moral fabric of this country is inexcusably sad.

The draft, as it is now constituted, cannot be tolerated by any citizen with a shred of patriotism.

For some years, this newspaper has advocated genuine universal military service. For everybody.

If there is a physical barrier to serving in the Armed Forces, let the young citizen participate in some civilian service for his country.

Everyone should do his part. That is the basis of true universal military service.

But weak politicians have built a thick coating of privilege around the draft. As Reporter Lee Townsend dramatically showed in his series in this paper last week, the draft today is a mockery of decency.

There is even grave question of the need of any draft. Only 7 percent of the Nation's Armed Forces come from the ironically named Selective Service.

Whether the services can get enough men without conscription is, however, a military and not a civilian problem.

The draft itself is up to all of us.

There are positive developments in the making. President Johnson has expressed alarm over the high rate of rejection of young citizens and has ordered an investigation.

Most significant recent move is that of Senator KEATING, of New York, who is asking a complete inquiry into every phase of the draft mess.

These two investigations, executive and legislative, need top priority. We hope interested citizens of all ages write their Senators and Congressmen to speed the inquiry.

There are so many thing wrong with the draft that almost anything would be an improvement.

Now, for instance, would be a good time for all judges who have added to disrespect for the military by sending delinquents into service instead of jail, to stop this ridiculous practice.

And now also, it might be wise for the old draft leadership in Washington, the officers who ran the system during World War II, to step down and give a fresh point of view a chance.

The draft must not be allowed to continue the way it is.

Even as we all seek improvements to make the draft a tool of government rather than its master, young Americans are dying in Vietnam and Panama.

We Must Understand Our Own System if We Are To Defeat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the only way freedom will lose out to communism in the world struggle is if the people do not understand our own system of private enterprise, capitalism. Our greatest strength is that we are a free nation in which every person may rise to whatever heights his own initiative and ambition carry him, yet how many are there in America today who fail to understand the most fundamental facts as to what our Republic is and how it functions?

Mr. Speaker, if we are to survive in the world struggle the American people must become knowledgeable. If we are not to be ruled, we must rule.

Washington Columnist Henry J. Taylor wrote an excellent article on this subject which was reprinted in The Washington Post of March 16, 1964.

The reprint follows:

POLITICAL PUSHOVERS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Since the following comments by Washington Columnist Henry J. Taylor are reflective of identical editorial thought on the part of Washington World, we share our quill this week with Mr. Taylor.)

While two out of three American colleges and universities do not require the study of American history and most don't require it for entrance, we say we're a nation prepared to defend its heritage and liberties.

We're to outlast the indoctrinations of the Soviet Union like that. We'll be lucky if the bottom doesn't fall out of our boat.

Moreover, 1 out of 4 teachers' colleges fail to require any study of American history and more than half ignore it even for entrance.

We always need more buildings, more personnel, more money for education—but what kind of education? No wonder there are inroads against loyalty to our country, appreciation of what we have here and the sacrifices for which we are indebted evermore.

Our Republic stands firmly on four cornerstones:

One. The Bill of Rights—government by law with respect for the individual versus the state or crown. Men died to give us that liberty. Other legions died to preserve it. We are their heirs. They have no other heirs but ourselves. But you have to understand American history to understand this.

Two. A broad moral code which involves individual responsibility based on the precept that one man's rights end where another's rights begin. But you have to understand American history to understand this heritage.

Three. The opportunity for individual accomplishments. The primary factor in American life is our self-faith.

Out of self-faith, out of a clear vision and an unshakable confidence in his heart, the American man believes he can stand up to his times. His credit is character. His funds are faith and hard work. His purposes is the American way of life. But there are no fixed and frozen classes here. As millions advance, they bring other millions up with them. But you have to understand American history to see why making our Government sound like the people's keeper is reactionary, not liberal.

Four. A basic education of all citizens so that we may better assume the responsibilities of free citizens in a representative democracy. Yet, how can this be possible if we are not required to understand the story of the birth and development of this Nation, unique in all the world, and its consequences?

The best counteroffensive to communism is a thorough understanding of American history. Socialism? There is a great difference between being socialminded and being socialistic. Many note that difference is eroded now by too much emphasis on personal rights and not enough on personal responsibility.

As one result, we are a pushover for political oratory and excessive taxation. We contemplate healing the world while we are not decently governing ourselves.

We are faced by Communist enemy powers indoctrinating their own youth with an attack on all we hold dear. They achieve this relentlessly in the merciless, mechanized robotlike (but successful) voice of the fanatic.

In our essential counterattack, it would be helpful if alumni—state and private—wrote the deans to ask if American history is a required subject for either entrance or graduation, or both, and if not, why not, and when, at long last, it is going to be required.

South Vietnam Gag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American public is naturally concerned with the recurring complications in Vietnam. They should be properly informed of the policy in that country in relationship to our overall foreign and defense position.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial of Sunday, March 8, very properly questioned the absence of sufficient information to evaluate the South Vietnamese situation, and I place the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members:

SOUTH VIETNAM GAG

For the second time in 10 months a gag has been applied to military personnel serving in South Vietnam.

The latest muzzle instructs the military to say nothing detrimental about the new government in South Vietnam. The order was issued just prior to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's departure from Washington for Saigon.

Last June an order went out from the U.S. Continental Army Command instructing military personnel in South Vietnam to say only good things about the war in that area.

The truth is hard to come by in South Vietnam. The governments there—any of the three recent governments—have made a habit of avoiding the truth. Information from the U.S. military has, in the past, been a balance against which the government statements could be weighed.

What Gen. Paul D. Harkins, commander of the American forces in Vietnam, has to fear that would cause him to circulate yet another military gag order is not known.

The basic truth about South Vietnam is pretty well established. The United States is in an unholy mess in that area and it is not the fault of the military forces of the United States.

The fault lies with the politicians and foreign policy experts who put the military into an impossible situation, jeopardize their mission with vacillating policy and then try to fool everyone by saying things are going well.

Chain Saw Treatment for Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago Sun-Times editorial of March 5 suggests that the water incident at Guantanamo indicates that if there is the will Castro and Communists in general can be effectively dealt with. I agree with the views expressed in this editorial and submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

CHAIN SAW TREATMENT FOR CASTRO

Fidel Castro now says he's willing to turn the water back on at the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. He should be ignored. This water episode should serve as an example of the proper way to deal with him and the Communist problem in Cuba.

The best thing that any American has done concerning Cuba in the past few weeks was the action of Guantanamo's commander, Adm. John D. Bulkeley. When Castro ordered the water valve closed in retaliation for the arrest in Florida of some poaching Cuban fishermen, Adm. Bulkeley ordered the water pipe cut with a chain saw.

The action was a dramatic way of showing that the United States does not need anything from Castro, not even water for the naval base on Cuba. The reverse is true. Cuba needs the good will and help of the United States and the free world. Castro wants to turn the Gitmo water back on because he needs the revenue he gets from it. He needs the foreign exchange from wages paid Cuban workers on the base. When he cut the water, this payroll was cut in half.

Castro not only wants to sell water to Gitmo, he says that in return for trade arrangements he is willing to start paying for some of the foreign properties he grabbed when he turned Cuba Communist. Big deal.

Castro is somewhat in the position of a thief who fell down a well while running away with a farmer's prize pig. He says he's willing to pay for the pig if the farmer will pull him out of the well. For Castro is deep down an economic well.

Cuba's economy is sagging. Cuba has pledged deliveries of sugar, including long-range commitments to the Soviet Union, that one economist has figured out amounts to more than double expected production. Cubans are being promised shoes and clothing—not cash—to induce them to help in the harvests. This indicates an extreme shortage of consumer goods. "Che" Guevara, the imported Communist mastermind, admitted as much recently.

"The people are constantly asking for food, shoes, clothing, all the consumer goods necessary to life," he said in a radio speech monitored in Miami. "A balance must be struck."

The balance Castro has in mind would be struck by getting help through trade from the productive nations of the world. That is why he seeks trade. The answer of the free world should be "no." The economic noose should be tightened until Castro and his Communist cohorts are overthrown. Help from the free world merely sustains him while he makes Communist subversive warfare on the free world. While Castro shorts his own people he has funds to spend fomenting trouble in other Latin American countries. Only last December, the same Che Guevara boasted that Cuban saboteurs and money were being used to overthrow seven Latin American countries.

Venezuela has proved her case before the Organization of American States that Cuba landed a supply of arms on the Venezuelan coast as part of a plot to overthrow the constitutional government. Castroite activity was obvious in the Panama turmoil. A plot to overthrow the Government of Honduras was uncovered last month.

Castro tries to divert attention from all this by his bland pretension that he wants and deserves normal trade relations.

Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, a possibility for the Republican presidential nomination, had an answer for this in an Associated Press interview Monday. He proposed a strict quarantine including, if necessary, the use of force to cut off Russian oil shipments to Cuba.

The next day, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said much the same thing. The United States, Nixon said, should impose a selective embargo on foreign companies that do business with Cuba; the United States must do what is necessary to bring Castro down, "short of invasion and blockade." Nixon added that a naval blockade to shut off Soviet oil might become necessary later.

Scranton and Nixon are saying things that must be said. The American people have shown they will back up a tough policy toward Castro. They showed it when President Kennedy moved to the brink of war over Cuba in 1962. They showed it in their reaction to Admiral Bulkeley's chain saw answer to Castro.

The United States and its allies must apply the chain saw treatment to Castro. Scranton, Nixon, and Senator Barry Goldwater have spoken plainly about Cuba. It is time President Johnson did, too.

The Farm Work Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the January 25 issue of the Frederick (Md.) Post carried an editorial on the farm work force. I believe this information on the unemployment situation in our farm communities will be of interest to my colleagues in the Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Frederick (Md.) Post, Jan. 25, 1964]

THE FARM WORK FORCE

On the American farm, it is not simply unemployment as it is in the rest of the economy, it is shrinking employment. Employment that will not be recovered, for farm production is rising with less and less workers every year.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture figures for the past year confirm this conclusion only too well. For 1963, the farm labor averaged 6,519,000 workers—well below the 5-year average (1957–61) of 7,284,000. It was also a drop of 200,000 from 1962.

The 1963 farm work force was made up of 4,736,000 family members—farm operators and family members working without wages—and 1,783,000 hired workers. Farming, except on the huge commercial enterprises, is still a family way of life though the product of the family farm is decreasing as the commercial farm products increase.

Annual averages of farm wage rates for all specified hiring arrangements were up moderately in 1963 in all States. The hourly wage rate, without room and board, was $1.05 per hour. It was less than $1 an hour in 12 Southern States and in New Mexico and West Virginia. It exceeded $1.25 an hour in nine States.

Profitable farming has become big business. The family farm more often than not is a marginal operation, sustained by a combination of farm and factory work. Those who stay on the farm do so both out of love of the life and fear of the alternatives.

Filipinos View the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I inserted a statement on the award of the Philippines Presidential Golden Heart to Director Sargent Shriver of the Peace Corps, and included the citation and speech which accompanied the presentation.

Today, as a sequel to those remarks, I should like to include two editorials from Philippine newspapers on the Peace Corps. They indicate the kind of approval that this U.S. "people-to-people" aid program is meeting around the world:

[From the Manila Evening News, Feb. 26, 26, 1964]

GOLDEN HEART FOR SHRIVER

When Amelito R. Mutuc, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, pinned the Golden Heart Presidential Award yesterday on Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, he was merely giving formal expression to what millions of his countrymen feel about the Peace Corps.

There is no denying that the young Americans who have come to the Philippines did—and continue to do—a superb job as good will ambassadors. More than anything else, these dedicated men and women succeeded in erasing the unsavory impressions created by the ugly Americans in our midst. Their zeal and devotion, their willingness to sacrifice, and their genuine desire to help are obvious to all. By their work on the barrios and in the more inaccessible localities, the Peace Corps volunteers are giving the Filipinos a true picture of the American people and are sowing the seeds of friendship and understanding between the Philippines and the United States.

As the leader of these volunteers, Sargent Shriver epitomizes the spirit that energizes and activates this wonderful, praiseworthy group. The decoration that he received from our grateful Government is inadequate thanks for all that the Peace Corps has done in this country. But the Golden Heart stands as an enduring, imperishable symbol of the appreciation that the Philippine people feel.

More important, the award stands for the esteem and respect of the Filipinos for the man who made the Peace Corps possible—the late, lamented President John F. Kennedy.

[From the Philippines Herald, Sunday, Nov. 24, 1963]

"KENNEDY'S CORPS" AS NEW NAME FOR PEACE CORPS

The one great and overriding obsession of the late President John F. Kennedy was to promote the cause of peace throughout the world. Even early in his campaign for the U.S. Presidency, he already gave an intimation of his great feeling in this regard when he singled out the challenge of peace as the on challenge on the New Frontier which cuts across all other challenges—the one problem which overshadows all other problems.

GREATEST CHALLENGE

"We are not satisfied with so-called peace that is merely an interval between two wars," he said. "We want a peace in which the funds now poured into the destructive forces of armaments may be channeled into the constructive results of disarmament—into great multination efforts to eradicate disease, harness rivers, eliminate illiteracy and exploit the frontiers of space."

When Kennedy assumed the U.S. Presidency, one of the first important acts of his administration was to create the Peace Corps—an organization of volunteer workers for peace. This organization has since made its impact felt around the world.

Today, Peace Corps volunteers are found in almost every section of the world, particularly in undeveloped or underdeveloped areas, extending to people the benefits of their skills in various tasks and occupations and helping promote and enhance feelings of friendship and goodwill. The Philippines has its share of these volunteer workers and the Filipino people have nothing but the highest praise and admiration for their selfless dedication to their mission. Not a few of these ambassadors of peace and goodwill had died in accidents or adversity while performing their good work.

FITTING TRIBUTE

The Peace Corps perhaps best symbolizes the late President's great love for peace and dedication to its cause. Nothing could be more fitting, therefore, than that its name should now be changed to Kennedy's Corps, by way of tribute to Kennedy's labors for peace, if not to set the organization itself in a more meaningful perspective. Let the world henceforth identify this worthy effort with the name of the man who made it possible—the man whose one great obsession in life was to see all the peoples of the world joined in brotherhood and peace.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to insert the winning speech submitted by contestants in the State of Connecticut in the Voice of Democracy Contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The speech entered by the winner, Miss Elizabeth Parkhurst, Meadow Lark Dairy Farm, Chestnut Hill, Conn., reads as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

The word "citizenship" refers to the state of being a citizen; that is, being entitled to certain rights and privileges and fulfilling the reciprocal responsibilities. The full meaning of citizenship involves not only rights but also responsibilities. No conception of citizenship is valid that refuses to recognize this paradox.

The rights and responsibilities linked with American citizenship are familiar to everyone. The citizen of the United States has the freedom to work where he pleases, worship as he pleases, say what he wants to say, and think what he wants to think. He has the right to choose his own leaders and to disagree with them. He is guaranteed protection in time of war, and he is guaranteed an open trial when he is accused.

He has the responsibility to vote, to support the political party of his choice and its ideals, to serve in the Armed Forces (if he meets certain qualifications), and to protect his Constitution. The American citizen has the right to be free and the responsibility to assume his freedom.

Is the challenge of American citizenship related to these rights and responsibilities? Most certainly it is.

The real challenge of citizenship is the challenge for every American to find in himself the ability to allow all other Americans the freedom to fully enjoy the rights and responsibilities due his citizenship. The challenge of citizenship is the challenge for one man to recognize the humanity in all other men. Stated more simply, it is the challenge for every American to allow all other Americans to be Americans.

We practice religious freedom. We take pride in being able to worship as and if we want to. Yet have we never spoken harshly of a person whose religion is very different from ours? Have we never questioned a candidate on his religious convictions?

We believe that all races are equal. We hold fast to the conviction that all people should have equal rights and equal opportunities. We may look with disgust at prejudice in another part of the country; yet, do we not sometimes hesitate to sell property to a person of another race in our own town, for fear that property rates might go down?

We have always had free and open trials and impartial juries. We would expect nothing less for ourselves if we were accused, regardless of our guilt. We could serve quite impartially on the jury trying some anonymous citizen of petty theft, or even another citizen of grand larceny; but could we, could any American find it in himself to serve impartially on the jury that would have tried Lee Harvey Oswald, or that is to try Jack Ruby?

When, and only when, every American can find in himself the ability to allow every other American the freedom to fully enjoy the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, will the greatest challenge of citizenship be met and conquered. Then, and only then, will we truly have liberty and justice for all. Then, and only then, will the challenge of citizenship be less a challenge and more a fulfillment of being.

Lithuanian Independence Day Address by Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as he has in the past, my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., has cut through the maze of Washington doubletalk concerning the issue of captive European nations. Celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day in Cleveland, Ohio, last Sunday, Congressman TAFT reiterated his belief that any impending political moves aimed at an eventual East-West detente not be at the expense of a further delay in granting independence to the millions of captive peoples in the Soviet bloc.

Congressman TAFT's remarks follow:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR., OF OHIO, LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the clergy, Dr. Backis, distinguished guests, and my Lithuanian friends of the Cleveland community, may I first thank you for the opportunity of sharing with you today this celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day. I am honored and pleased more than I can say to have this opportunity of joining you on such a joyous yet solemn occasion. I know of my father's previous appearances here with your group; and I know of his interest in the problems of your country, of your problems in this country, and of his warmth and his concern for this community and your part in it. I also wish to thank you for the most enjoyable singing, and Dr. Backis for what I am sure were most kind remarks. The language barrier, at least at the outset, prevented me from enjoying them as fully as I might have.

This, of course, is the 46th anniversary of your independence and I understand that it is also over 700 years since Lithuania became a separate state. Thus, this month you celebrate many anniversaries which I am sure are dear to you and the object of your deep devotion. Lithuania as a country, of course, is more than 500 years older than our own United States, and it is significant that during the last few days I have been circulating around the State of Ohio helping to celebrate the birthday of one of our greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln was an American devoted to the principles of freedom for which I know you stand for your nation and for all people. Slavery is slavery in any language, by any name in any area of the world. This is something that Americans have recognized and must continue to recognize regardless of their ancestry or we will have lost the great mission and the great heritage that has come to this country. While this Nation has been dedicated in the past to freedom for its citizens, we have not overlooked the importance of freedom throughout the world. This latter ideal is one to which we must and will firmly adhere.

Your organization, by its very nature, is concerned with problems of Lithuania and problems of Lithuanians in this country. But I am sure the problems with which you are dealing and the purposes to which you are dedicated, you recognize have even wider scope. Unfortunately, during the last year we have seen the invidious spread of Communist activity with its resultant tyranny from Cuba into Central America, Panama, Brazil, and Venezuela; from China into Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia; and most recently, from sources that to some extent at least we can identify as originating in our own hemisphere, into Zanzibar and Tanganyika. The cancerous growth that started in Eastern Europe has thus spread throughout the world and faces us all as citizens of the world with major decisions and a major responsibility that we must not and cannot forget.

The tragedy of Lithuania in 1940 was only a forerunner of deeper tragedies yet to come and it still stands as a warning on this, your Independence Day, to those who would let down our guard toward the threats that we face from the Communist menace. It is to the credit of your group, and indeed of the groups that represent all of the captive nations in the United States, that you will not allow this to happen; you will not forget. You bring to our minds continuously what has happened in history, and, indeed, if we are to make progress in the future, we must learn from the lessons of history.

At the outset, let me make it clear to you that I do not consider myself an expert in the areas that we discuss today. But I nevertheless welcome the opportunity to visit and to talk with you because I feel that your problems are problems that should greatly concern all America. Our heritage, our beliefs and our interests are deeply involved with the Baltic and eastern European states and their ultimate freedom. In the case of the Baltic states, we recognize that they stand in a special category in that there is absolutely no color of right to hold these nations in subservience. The principle of self-determination for which Americans have stood from the very beginning of our country has never been more flagrantly violated than in your case. Your state is not even a puppet. Your state has been completely absorbed; swallowed up (or attempted to be swallowed up) within the Communist bloc.

In speaking about this problem, perhaps I feel so strongly about it because I recall, as some of you may know, that my father's first connection with this matter came very close to the time of your independence in 1918. He was a member of the Relief Commission under Mr. Hoover and worked in the Eastern European States, the Baltic States, Finland, and Hungary. I know that nothing gave him more pride than the accomplishments that we were able to achieve in Europe at that time. Even today I find that while I may still be thought of as young by some people, I certainly don't so consider myself when I realize that I have a son who is today in Africa serving in the Peace Corps in Tanganyika in the very area where the Communist menace is again threatening.

What I would like to talk to you about today is what should be the foreign policy of the United States with regard to the captive nations. I believe these policies should be constantly in our view and subject to our examination and reexamination. It is my belief that the primary role we as American citizens can play is to demand and obtain a clarification of the thinking of this country on the matter of our attitude toward the captive nations. This clarification should come from the President and from the Secretary of State. It should be examined and tested in the crucible of public opinion of the people of the United States. The broader

the debate, the more likely we are to be united and firm in the courses we decide to pursue as a nation. The inherent strength of our democratic form of government has been its requirement and its ability to establish a consensus of opinion on matters of national and international policy through a free and open debate on these matters. Only as we understand these issues and establish a preponderance of public opinion, can we as a nation best use our ability, our resources, and our efforts toward the objectives and aspirations of ourselves and of those who share with us the goal of a free world.

One of the most serious problems that we are facing today in this country with regard to foreign affairs, and particularly with regard to the problem of international freedom about which we are talking, is the problem of confusion. Some degree of confusion is inevitable, perhaps, in a year in which we have a presidential election and other political contests. In these remarks I shall try not to be political, although, of course, I myself am engaged in a political contest such as inevitably occurs in a country which has free elections. But I think it should be noted that unfortunately, there has been no really clear statement of our direction and of our policies in the cold war during recent months or even during recent years. Particularly, the fate and the plans for the captive nations seem to be in doubt. The American people and the world are confused as to whether the United States has not abandoned the policy of standing for the principle of freedom and for the principle of self-determination which has guided our policies in the past.

You will recall that in 1952, President Eisenhower pledged aid by every peaceful means, and only by peaceful means, for the right to live in freedom. President Eisenhower stated that the containing of communism is largely physical and by itself an inadequate approach to our task, and that there is also involved the need to bring hope and every peaceful aid to the world's enslaved people. Later, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles made our position even clearer when he stated, "The captivve people should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations. They must know that they can draw upon our abundance to tide themselves over the period of economic adjustment which is inevitable as they rededicate their productive efforts to the service of their own people rather than of exploiting masters." Yet, in the discussions during 1963 and during this year, there have been no reassurances from our leadership that these policies remain our primary objectives. To the contrary, in discussing the nuclear test ban treaty, for instance, the President stated that the Under Secretary has made it clear that any nonagression arrangements across the division of Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests, rather than saying we will not enter into a nonagression pact with the Warsaw powers. And, unfortunately, in his state of the Union message, more confusion than clarity was put upon this whole problem by President Johnson when he spoke of making the world safe for diversity.

What does "safe for diversity" mean? What are the implications of this? It is time this should be spelled out by the administration. Does it mean coexistence? Does it mean accommodations? Just what is meant by making the world safe for diversity?

We should have clear thinking and a clear policy on our part right down on our own doorstep in Panama, an area that has been of primary concern from both a military and economic standpoint to the United States. Instead,, we find that we have allowed the stitution to deteriorate in spite of warnings from our own people, and that we have not taken steps to try to correct what appears to be continued subversion from Cuba. Further, we find that we are apparently so careless that when our Ambassador, who had been Ambassador to Panama for several years, resigned in August of 1963, he states he was not debriefed by either the State Department or the Central Intelligence Agency, and his opinion and counsel were not sought by either Agency.

In examining the role of a world organization such as yours, and its possible effect on U.S. foreign policy, we must first recognize that the President of the United States is the person primarily responsible for the formation of foreign policy. Further, it should be understood that the executive branch of our Government is responsive to public opinion.

The Baltic and Eastern European Americans have, in the past, been of invaluable assistance to the executive branch of our Government in discrediting phony claims of the Communists. Unfortunately, however, in periods when the United States seemed to be seeking a detente with the Soviet Union, and the present seems to be such a period, we have tended to put such weapons as we have in the captive nation organizations on the shelf and not use them.

Today, executive policy seems to depend upon three factors. First is the balance of nuclear terror approach. Secondly, there is the factor that the over-all prevailing state of Soviet-American relations generally determines our attitude toward our Baltic and Eastern European relations. Perhaps this is inevitable because the political structure of the Soviet bloc and Russia's complete dominance of it mean that U.S. relations with Eeastern Europe and the Baltic region will be governed by a line established in Moscow. Thirdly, there remains the factor that in American policy there is a desire to continue to take advantage, where possible without affecting overall American-Soviet relations, of any political ferment that exists in the area. Captive nation groups have certainly been most helpful in this regard and they should continue to be used since they can continue to be of very great assistance.

Unfortunately, the present attitudes of our Government do not seem to be any different from what they have been in the last 2 or 3 years. There was an expression of this just a couple of years ago before the Foreign Affairs Committee when the Assistant Secretary of State, William R. Tyler, said, "The systematic expansion of contacts and activity which would tend to maximize U.S. and Western influence in that area, and demonstrate our interest in the people's welfare, help to sustain their national traditions and aspirations, keep them in touch with Western thought, and help them preserve a true perspective on world developments in all fields of human endeavor and achievement." This is a very fine goal and one I think we should be continually pursuing, but I am afraid we have talked about it more than we have actually been working upon it. In addition, we must not, in pursuit of other policy reasons such as the nuclear threat and a desire for a detente, lose sight of our over-all goals and principles as I mentioned at the outset of this address. In speaking of improved relations and increased trade, we should, in dealing with the Communist bloc, continue to demand and charge the price of hope of freedom, increased autonomy for national groups, and recognition of human rights and dignity within those captive nations.

Your voice, and the voices of all those who understand the present weakening trends, may be essential to prevent the executive branch from overlooking the principles involved and relying on vain promises in an all-out quest for reduction of international tension. Nor should your efforts as an organization be limited to the President. The function of Congress in foreign policy is secondary, it's true. But it is extremely important. It is particularly important to groups such as yours, for our history has shown that the Congress, as a constitutionally designated voice of the people, has naturally been the main focal point of pressure groups seeking particular goals. The most important function of Congress in foreign policy problems has been that of a concensus, a public opinion builder, and this has been particularly true with regard to Baltic and Eastern European problems.

Beyond this public-opinion-forming function, there also are specific powers of Congress relating to the consent by the Senate to treaties, appropriations for military and foreign aid purposes, power to effect trade through embargos and tariffs, and matters such as we voted on Christmas Eve, 1963; that is, whether or not we were going to guarantee credit of the Communist nations when we ship wheat or other goods to them. It seems to me that this action by Congress was a joke. In the very same bill in which we were spending $3 billion in order to defeat communism and promote freedom in the world, we attached a rider to permit at least $300 million of credit to be guaranteed for wheat sales being made to Communist countries. This conflict is absolutely beyond comprehension and the attitude of groups such as yours in opinion forming throughout the country can be an important one in pointing out such errors and preventing their commission. Your group may well be a determining one in the future course of trade and financing policies in regard to the Soviet and its satellite nations, and it is up to you to take the lead. On such issues; the captive nations can and should become the sounding board for our Government policy.

Beyond specific policy questions, your continued efforts for the preservation and, hopefully, for the strengthening of the traditions of all captive nations; your backing of the Select House Committee to Study the Captive Nations, w'th particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red control; and the means by which the United States can assist, by peaceful progress, in trying to alleviate the present plight of the captive nations, are all objectives that should be pushed and can, with your support, be successfully adopted in the Congress. Nor should you drop your efforts or your support of the proposed Freedom Academy which has been considered for many years. I, myself, have introduced such a Freedom Academy bill and there will be committee hearings on it in the very near future. I think we should establish such a Freedom Academy so that we will have men in high levels of our Government who are trained and who know the basic nature and the basic threat of communism dealing with the Communist menace.

But most of all, as I have indicated, it is important that you continue to insist that increased contact, trade, and recognition, if given to the Communist-dominated governments of the captive nations and if given to Soviet Russia itself, be with a guarantee of increased liberty and independence. We must make it clear once again that there will be no sacrifice of principle by America for expediency, and no bartering of freedom for some temporary false security.

The Right To Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the U.S. News & World

Report for March 2, 1964, points up the necessity of a constitutional amendment to clear up the confusion over the Supreme Court ill-advised ruling banning prayer in the public schools:

THE RIGHT TO PRAY

(By David Lawrence)

Plainly, a constitutional amendment has become absolutely necessary to clear up the confusion that has arisen as a result of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States banning prayer in the public schools.

For the American people do not know now whether their children can lawfully be given in the classroom the very instruction in morality and righteous living which is so essential to the proper upbringing of American youth.

We may today be equivocating if we try to apply the High Court's ambiguous words in its decisions on prayer in the schools. Some interpretations would appear to permit the reading of parts of the Bible as a "historical" or "literary" study. Public-school principals, in various States, have already indicated a desire to experiment with such devices. But how can we be sure whether the historical or literary does not invade the area of religious teaching?

It is much more sensible to rely on a clearly written constitutional amendment which emphasizes the difference between voluntary and compulsory prayer in the schools or in ceremonies conducted under Government auspices. The provision in the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," should be continued, but there should be a clear definition affirmatively stating the basic principles safeguarding the free exercise of religion.

Prayers are offered at the opening of sessions of the Senate and the House and of the Supreme Court itself. These are an official part of the proceedings. Under the Court's decisions, is it at present constitutional for any form of religious exercise to be conducted in buildings financed with Government funds?

Each individual has a right to pray. This right does not vanish when the individual participates in a governmentally supported proceeding.

The argument that has influenced the Supreme Court is that any practice of theism—to utter prayers expressing a belief in God—is in itself equivalent to "an establishment of religion," and that to let school children express a belief in God as they pray at the beginning of a school day is to make it a Government-directed or Government-sponsored undertaking which is allegedly prohibited by the Constitution.

But there is a distinct difference between volition and compulsion. The atheist has a right to abstain from participation in any prayer, whether or not God is mentioned. He has no right, however, to interpose his beliefs in a manner that forbids others to worship God as they please—the free exercise of their religion.

It is no answer to the problem to say that the right to pray can be adequately exercised in the home or at church services. For the value of prayer once a week in a church, where the attendance covers all ages and large numbers, is not as great as the everyday impact of prayer on the minds of children of the same age in a small classroom. Here the teacher can promptly supplement the prayer with lessons explaining morality and integrity, thus inculcating in the minds of boys and girls at an impressionable period in their lives a respect for fellow human beings, a respect for honesty as opposed to cheating, a respect for the rights of others as opposed to intolerance and selfishness.

Indeed, how can our youth be trained in those ways of living which will help to prevent juvenile delinquency and crime unless in some way reverence for the Supreme Being is instilled?

The importance of prayer in the schoolroom is primarily that it is strengthened by group psychology and that it is an everyday, rather than a once-a-week stimulus to better living.

It is being asked: Is there a right to pray during proceedings held in any Government building? If it is constitutional for certain individuals within the government itself to organize collectively in trade unions—for private purposes—while others refrain from joining, how can it be persuasively argued that there should be no right of individuals to choose to pray collectively in a school provided by local government? Certainly an individual may pray in silence, but the benefit of articulation by the group is then lost.

Let the new constitutional amendment make it clear that prayers can be conducted in the classroom on a voluntary basis and that those who do not wish to attend may be excused or temporarily released.

The problem has too long been neglected. Early action is as vital as the "war on poverty" or the war on crime. For the right of young and old to pray together voluntarily in any building or facility provided by government—Federal, State, or local—is essential to the fulfillment of the objectives stated in the preamble of the Constitution: to "promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Medical Care for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, with previous permission, I submit for the RECORD the text of my testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on the administration's medical care for the elderly proposal, H.R. 3920:

TESTIMONY OF CARLTON R. SICKLES, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, ON H.R. 3920, SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, JANUARY 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest two basic reasons for supporting the administration's plan for medical care for the elderly.

First, it is better for a person to pay about $13 a year while he is working for a wide range of health insurance benefits when he retires, than to pay from $100 to $300 a year when he is not working for much more limited benefits offered under a private insurance plan.

Second, it is better for citizens of Maryland and other States to have elderly residents covered by nationwide, prepaid, contributory health insurance benefits system than to require the States to dip deeply into their tax revenues to finance the cost of a medical care welfare program for a restricted number of its older citizens.

These two considerations affect my colleagues from the other States as well. If only for these reasons, this committee should give the whole House an early opportunity to vote on the bill under consideration today.

There has been a great deal of expert testimony before this committee documenting the needs of older people for assistance in meeting the high costs of medical care, especially care in hospitals. I am in complete agreement that the need is urgent, and that all older people should be able to obtain medical care without depleting their lifesavings to pay insurance premiums or having to pay the catastrophic costs of a long illness, and without the requirement of a welfare means test.

I would like to stress two aspects of the medical care issue in my testimony today: First, the generally lower incomes of older people, making it difficult for them to meet the costs of their medical needs; and second, the importance of the provision in the bill for skilled nursing home care, which perhaps has been lost sight of in the stress on the high cost of hospital stays. I would like to discuss these aspects in terms of the situation in Maryland.

We may generally divide our older citizens into four groups:

First, those dependent on Government assistance to meet their medical needs whether it be the Old Age Assistance program (OAA), or the Medical Aid to the Aged program (MAA). There were approximately 15,000 recipients of this aid in Maryland in 1962 or about 7 percent of our 230,000 elderly people over 65.

Second, a group of elderly with incomes below what the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics describes is needed for a modest but adequate living, but not receiving public assistance although many may be eligible for it. Very few of the elderly in this category have private insurance. Those that do, have high-cost low-benefit policies. About 33 percent of our elderly Marylanders were in this category in 1962.

Third, is a group whose income is near or above the modest but adequate level but who have difficulty meeting the high costs of private health insurance and the costs of long-term serious illness. Within this group, almost all of the older citizens cannot afford, without help from resources other than income, the health services to meet special needs; for example, they cannot afford long-term stays in nursing homes. Over half of the people in this group have some form of private insurance, but it constitutes a major drain on their limited resources, and is often inadequate coverage. The better Blue Cross hospital plan in which Maryland's elderly who require health insurance may participate, costs over $260 per year per family. About 50 percent of our elderly Marylanders are in this category.

Finally, here is a fourth group whose income and assets enable them to both meet the high costs of health insurance and handle a financially debilitating illness. The small group comprises the remainder of our elderly citizens.

Let us focus attention on those elderly in the second category who live in or near poverty. The income levels in Maryland for qualifying for medical assistance for the aged make it very difficult for many citizens who need help to receive benefits. The limits for eligibility for the Maryland MAA programs are $1,140 for an individual and $1,560 for a couple or approximately $95 per month for individuals and $130 per month for couples. Under this severe income limitation, we find situations, for instance, in Baltimore, where among those elderly families who are living in poverty with incomes of less than $2,000 about one-third could not qualify for MAA on the basis of income. In view of this, it is understandable that the Baltimore City Commission for the Aged, the Republican mayor of Baltimore, and the Democratic city council president have endorsed the administration's medicare bill.

Another problem arises because many of those whose income is so low that they could qualify for MAA, do not apply for the program. Of course, most States, including Maryland, have factors affecting eligibility other than income. Although the Maryland

MAA program has no relative responsibility clause, nor property lien clause, it does limit personal property including the case value of life insurance. It is my feeling that the principal reason keeping older persons from applying for this public assistance is their unwillingness to experience the feeling of shame, loss of dignity, and invasion of privacy associated with the means test.

Indicative of this, is a recent article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun regarding a meeting between the City Health Commissioner Dr. Farber, and officials of the medical profession, regarding how to reach over 8,000 people in Baltimore whom, it was thought, needed MAA assistance, but had not applied for the program. The medical profession's answer to this problem is to shift the means test from the welfare department to the health department, and somehow through this magic formula eliminate the objections of our proud oldsters.

This same article discusses the problem of "urging more doctors to accept aged patients in the program." Evidently, problems have arisen regarding MAA beneficiaries who could not locate physicians to care for them in some parts of Baltimore. In order to correct this situation, I have been informed that the Baltimore City Medical Society has circulated a memo to its members, urging them to participate in the MAA program, and stating that while it (MAA) may not be perfect, it is better than the socialistic alternative now before Congress.

Another shortcoming of the MAA program as it operates in Maryland is the practice whereby MAA patients admitted to hospitals for treatment become staff patients and thereby lose their choice of physicians. Their regular physician can care for them in the hospital only if he agrees not to receive payment for his services.

In fairness to members of the medical profession, it should be noted that they are supporting efforts being made to liberalize the MAA program by the addition of nursing home care which is not presently available and by more flexible income limitations. As in other States, however, the realities of the demands on a State budget sometimes force a delay in needed programs. In the recent session of the Maryland General Assembly, the State health department recommended the inclusion of flexible income limits for the chronically ill, and increased dental and eyeglass care under the MAA program and requested $150,000 in State funds to pay for these improvements, but unfortunately, this item was deleted from the budget.

The question which, of course, arises is why can't the State of Maryland be more liberal in their standards of eligibility and also in the extent to which they meet the costs of these health services, especially for the poverty stricken. The fact is many of the States, including Maryland, are making a real effort to provide more medical care for the aged. But, the burden is heavy and the extent to which they can go—in the judgment of the State officials—has real limits. Mrs. Margaret Schweinhaut, chairman of Maryland Commission on Aging, noted recently that 4 years ago, the State appropriated $3½ million for hospital care of the indigent; last year, it appropriated $11 million for this purpose. And this cannot be the end to increased costs.

Mrs. Schweinhaut referred to the hospital costs analysis survey made by the Hospital Council of Maryland which indicated the present cost of hospitalization for one person per day now averages $35.34, a rise of $4.25 in 1 year. All States, including Maryland, are confronted with the need for increased appropriations in the face of their limited sources of revenue. These costs are increasing despite the large share provided by the Federal Government in meeting medical aid to the aged costs.

If the King-Anderson bill is enacted, Maryland and other States would not be burdened by these millions of dollars in State costs and all their senior citizens who needed these services could avail themselves of these benefits. In addition, the elimination of the "needs test" under the social insurance proposal would eliminate most of the burdensome costs of administration and do away with the need of a bureaucracy compelled under present circumstances to invade the privacy of our senior citizens.

In discussing the circumstances of the aged in the first three categories I established earlier, I would like to focus on one particular aspect of the bill I do not believe has been given the importance it merits in the discussions thus far. This is the provision in the King-Anderson bill for up to 180 days of nursing home care and up to 240 visits for home health care which would meet the needs of many elderly patients at a low cost.

Few elderly people can meet the costs of nursing home out of their own incomes. Nationally, 3 out of 4 elderly families and 9 out of 10 elderly individuals would be unable to pay as much as $250 monthly for nursing home care.

The actual costs in Maryland for nursing home care are higher than $250. The average cost for an indiivdual in a skilled nursing home in Maryland would be closer to $350 a month.

For those on public assistance (OAA) Maryland now pays $135 a month for routine care in a nursing home, somewhat more if special attention is required. For example, if the patient needs to be fed, Maryland will pay from $6 to $8 daily, or about $200 a month. Most operators of nursing homes maintain that these payments do not meet the full costs. As I mentioned earlier, the MAA program does not provide any payments for nursing home care so this is a serious gap in the program.

What about private insurance? Under the Maryland Hospital Service Blue Cross plan, a person is entitled to 70 days of hospital care and/or 2 days of nursing home care for each hospital day not used. Of course, the premium for this policy is over $260 per year putting it beyond the reach of many of our elderly citizens. Certainly such costs would be very difficult to meet for those individuals with incomes under $1,500 per year and would be equally difficult for those couples with incomes under $3,000.

Of the two nationwide insurance companies covering the largest number of aged policyholders, one, the Continental Casualty, does not provide nursing home expenses at all, and the other, Mutual of Omaha, provides $5 a day for 55 days.

Although I have stressed the factors of poverty among the aged and the nursing home provision, it should be clear that I support all the provisions in the King-Anderson bill for the benefit of all of our elderly citizens.

I am not impressed by the argument that a small fraction of wealthy persons among those of age 65 and over who could pay for their own medical costs would come under the provisions of this bill. They need not avail themselves of the benefits if they are opposed in principle.

In any case, they are equally entitled to the protection of such legislation, if enacted, as they are entitled to equal treatment in the courts, and police protection against threats to persons and property. All of us, not only the present aged, face the prospects of ill health if we live into the later years. It is a common danger that needs to be met by nationwide measures.

At present it is said with much truth that only the very poor and the very rich can get the wide range of basic health services they need.

The average elderly person in our country who has worked, raised a family, paid taxes, throughout his working years, has earned the right to be helped when in his old age, he needs such help. The younger generation certainly prefers to provide for the future now rather than become a charity case in the future. Let us pass legislation on behalf of both groups; let us pass this long overdue legislation this year.

Put the Brakes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Economist newspaper chain in Chicago, last Wednesday, March 4, directed its readers' attention to the size of Federal and State gasoline taxes, as well as to the key question of whether the taxpayers are being intelligently served by the highway expansion program.

There are many questions to be answered at this stage of our Federal-State highway program, and it would be well for us to review them at this midpoint, so that the taxpayers might be spared the cost of duplication or unnecessary facilities, with funds still needed for obvious motor transportation improvements.

I insert the editorial for the attention of the Members:

PUT THE BRAKES ON

In his quarterly report to stockholders and employees of the Standard Oil Co., President John E. Sweringen says that Federal and State gasoline taxes now add 50 percent to the price of gasoline to the consumer.

Gasoline taxes also are paying three-quarters of the present $71 billion program of the 41,000-mile Interstate System of superhighways, he added. Under this program the Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the cost and the States 10 percent.

Now the Illinois Highway Commission, created by the legislature last year, is scheduled to consider recommending a boost in the Illinois gas tax rate from 5 to 7 cents a gallon. Such a boost would cost motorists and truck owners $60 million more than the $270 million they now pay with the 5-cent rate.

Instead of proposing another boost in the rate, the commission should consider ways and means for reducing the cost of highway construction. The Interstate System, when proposed in 1956, was to cost $27.6 billion, but after 5 years the figure was raised to $41 billion. Efforts are underway to expand the system an additional 14,000 miles. That means higher Federal gas tax. Mr. Sweringen observed:

"We strongly support a good highway system in the interest of all citizens, and we agree that gasoline taxes should help pay for the system. But there should be limits, imposed by good judgment. Overly ambitious highway programs can be self-defeating, developing massive problems of maintenance, obsolescence and financing.

"When taxation of a single product—gasoline—has reached the rate of 50 percent, and more is being suggested, American motorists could hardly be blamed for objecting to additional taxes on gasoline or demanding more efficiency and economy in the highway programs they are playing for."

With which the motoring public will agree. Building highways that become death traps parallel to toll roads or realining routes only a few years old because special interests want the change, make for waste of funds, as does the condemnation of more land than is needed for grade separations, expressways and similar projects.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I offer the following prize-winning essay written by my constituent Miss Carol Clark, of Ringgold, Ga. This essay received the first prize in the State of Georgia in a contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Carol Clark, Ringgold, Ga.)

Awaken, America. Our world is changing. It is fearful, exciting, challenging. Many doors beckon us, the youth of America. Opportunity seems to be knocking many places at the same time. But we pause to study each entrance, for the door through which we pass must open the storehouse of free thinking; must preserve with vigilance the marvelous fruits of our American way of life. The key to that door is good citizenship.

Good citizenship is the heart of our great country. It is the mystic organ that pumps the lifegiving stream of courage and conviction to nourish the vital organs of liberty. It is the pulse of democracy.

There are many foes that would stop the beat of this heart. One of the most ominous of those is communism—a deadly disease that pollutes the bloodstream of truth and justice. Communism would deafen our ears to the needy cries of the hungry people who look to America for life sustaining aid. It would sever the hand that stretches out in friendship to the oppressed. It would silence the clarion call of the voice of freedom throughout the world. Communism would sap the strength of a healthy body of people who believe implicitly in the individual rights of men.

Indifference is another enemy of good citizenship; indifference to duty, to civic responsibility. We must love our country honestly and unashamed, and actively devote our energies to her. We must stand ready to fight, and, if need be, to die for our country. And, even more important, we must live for her. We, the youth of America, have without effort fallen heir to citizenship. In an incredibly short time we will be voters, we shall choose our leaders. What other country in this whole world has such a precious heritage? It's time for some clear thinking about these responsibilities. We must take a real and active interest in politics and Government affairs. We must dedicate ourselves to our country in whatever profession we serve. Our votes must elect leaders who stand firmly and unquestionably for the principles that have made America the greatest country on earth.

Citizenship is an educated heart. Our Nation calls for the highest knowledge and skill we can attain.

Citizenship is a charitable heart. "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." America reaches out in compassion to share her wealth with people in all countries of the world. But the merciful hand that holds the bread to starving people can wave the banner of friendship for all to see.

Citizenship is a spiritual heart. "In God We Trust" is more than a slogan on our coins. It is the foundation upon which our country was built. It is a measure of our success as a Nation. High moral and spiritual character is essential. It begins in our homes and is nurtured by our churches and schools. The sanctity of our homes and churches is of the utmost importance.

Citizenship is a flame that glows in the window of freedom. But a flame that is not carefully tended becomes a thing of terror. Fanned by the winds of deceit, prejudice, and hatred, it will consume the sturdy timber of truth and decency, and leave barren the fields of freedom. We must lovingly feed the flame with the fuel of tolerance and understanding, that its beam may serve as a beacon of encouragement for the nations behind the Iron Curtain, and light the way for nations stumbling in the dark to find the safe path to freedom.

Our glorious past is an inspiring record of courage, sacrifice, and bravery. Our future will be what we make of our opportunities today. With God's help, let us work and pray that the heart and soul of America may forever beat loud and clear for freedom and justice for all peoples everywhere.

Federal Salary Increases for Classified and Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a statement made by Secretary-Treasurer John C. Kabachus of the International Association of Fire Fighters in support of the proposed salary increases for classified and postal service employees. John Kabachus is one of the most able men in the trade labor movement. He is respected because of his sound views and good judgment. He has dedicated his life and efforts on behalf of the firefighters of this Nation.

The International Association of Fire Fighters, organized February 28, 1918, representing approximately 115,000 full-time, professional firefighters, wishes to go on record in support of the proposed salary increases for classified and postal service employees.

Because the international represents firefighters who are employed by the Federal Government as well as more than 1,100 municipalities, we are well aware of the inequities that exist between Federal firefighters and firefighters employed by other jurisdictions.

The IAFF Research Department conducts annual surveys on salaries and working conditions of firefighters throughout the United States covering firefighters employed at Federal, State, and private installations and more than 1,200 municipalities, and thus has more information on the salary disparity that exists in this area than any other group.

These data are sources of information for the salaries of firefighters in U.S. cities, as listed in the Municipal Year Book, published by the International City Managers' Association. In addition, these data are used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor.

In support of our position we have complied the salaries paid to first-class firemen in all cities ranging in population from 100,000 to 150,000 which have responded to our salary and working conditions survey conducted in early 1963. The 100,000 to 150,000 population range was selected because a large proportion of the Federal firefighters are employed at installations or live near metropolitan areas that are within this population range or larger.

Had we included cities above this population range, the disparity between salaries of firefighters in municipalities and firefighters employed by the Federal Government would be even greater, due to the fact that there is a tendency for salaries to be higher in larger metropolitan areas. We feel that this is a fair comparison; in fact, we are being quite conservative.

The results of this study indicate that the average city in this population range paid its first-class firefighters $5,534 a year, as of January 1963. This does not include extra pay for service time—longevity rates.

It must be remembered that during the year negotiations take place between local affiliates of the international and the various municipalities. In order to get some idea of the percentage of increase in salaries that has taken place during the past year, the January 1963 salaries were compared with salaries in the same cities of this population group which have thus far responded to our 1964 survey.

Because almost 75 percent of the cities in this population bracket, which have responded to our 1963 survey, have already responded to our current survey, any deviation in the average rate of change for the remaining 25 percent would be so minute that it would have little effect on the average rate of increase that has been computed for the cities which have thus far responded.

We find in our computation that the average rate of increase in salaries of first-class firemen in these cities was approximately 3 percent. When consideration is given to this percentage increase that has taken place during the year, the average city in this population group paid its first-class firefighters $5,700 annually by the end of 1963.

A first-class firefighter in the Federal service is classified at the GS-4 level. The present salary for a grade 4 in the first step is $4,215 or $1,485 below the average salary paid to his counterparts employed by the municipalities.

Because the Federal firefighter is required to work 60 to 72 hours per week, he receives an additional 10 percent of

his base pay if he works a 60-hour week or an additional 20 percent if he works a 72-hour week—altogether too little for working overtime. Even if we assume they all received the additional 20 percent of base pay, their total salary in the first step of grade 4 would be $5,058 per year or almost $650 per year less than his counterpart employed by the municipality. At the same time, we must remember that through the efforts of the International Association of Fire Fighters the length of the workweek in the municipality has been reduced considerably, and in the larger metropolitan areas the trend is toward a 48-, 42-, or 40-hour week. When this is taken into consideration, the existing inequity becomes even greater.

The passage of H.R. 8986 would be a move in the direction of reducing not only this inequity but in general the gap that exists between salaries of persons employed by private industry and those employed by the Federal Government.

Let us now turn to some of the responsibilities and requirements of the firefighter's occupation. It is well known that the firefighter is responsible for the protection of human life and property, even at the expense of his own safety.

The National Board of Fire Underwriters, a national organization of capital stock fire insurance companies, which employs a group of experts for establishing standards in fire protection, had this to say of the educational requirements of firefighters:

Fire service cannot remain static; its failure to modernize in equipment or apparatus, or to learn how to combat new fire hazards must, under the laws of progress, result in a retrograding in the service to the public.

A fireman's education must include such features as spontaneous ignition, the probability of flammable gases being liberated, the action of water on certain chemicals and the possible influence of other chemicals on the fireman himself, to prevent his being knocked out or even killed by breathing dangerous fumes.

Preventing fires is of vital importance to the fireman. But this prevention must go further than a mere preachment against carelessness. It must involve an intimate knowledge of some of the scientific facts of fire—the relationship of heat, oxygen and combustible material. To this must be added other semitechnical facts as to gases given off, heat produced, volatility, solubility in water and other characteristics of materials found in commerce.

Special schools of instruction have been set up in practically every State in the Union, consisting of short courses provided by a State college or university.[1]

These requirements are universal and apply to firefighters whether they are employed by municipalities, States, or the Federal Government.

The municipalities have long recognized the responsibilities and the professional nature of the fireman's occupation. This is made obvious by the fact that the firefighter's occupation has been rated high on municipal job evaluation schemes. By this, I mean ranked with professional and skilled people.

On the other hand, the Federal firefighters have not fared well. They have been placed near the bottom rung of the ladder. They are in the same classification with occupations that require less advanced education, training, and acquired skills.

We are not saying that the salaries of these other occupations are not justified; in fact, we recognize the fact that they also lag behind their counterparts in private industry. We are only attempting to emphasize the fact that, while municipalities have recognized the requirements and demands of the firefighting profession, the Federal Government has not.

In conclusion, we are asking that this body take a step in the direction of correcting these existing inequities as provided for in the comparability principle embodied in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962.

A major step can be taken in this direction by the passage of House bill No. 8986.

[1] Quoted information obtained from NBFU bulletins Nos. 234 and 236.

An American Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mrs. Marie Cousland Carpenter, has forwarded to me a prayer which she composed and which I think is lovely. I would like to place it in the RECORD for the edification of those who read it:

AN AMERICAN PRAYER

O Almighty and eternal God,
Thou source of law and life,
We invoke Thy holy guidance
In these times of stress and strife.

Let the leaders of our Nation
Never yield, but press their plan
To elevate in this great wide world
The place of every man.

Let each member of our Nation
Forget this not—But bear in mind
That in the heart of each true American,
Rests the future of mankind.

Grant, that true to our Constitution
We shun the unworthy and seek the good,
And place above all things else
The virtues of true brotherhood.

Let us never be content to live for self,
But with dignity, honor and speed
Develop each God-given talent
In Thy honor—for mankind's need.

Implant the principles of courage and justice
Deep in each American mind;
In our hearts instill love for our fellowman,
In whom Your divine likeness we find.

Let us never be slaves to the narrow mind;
May prejudice ever from us depart,
Mindful that race, religion and political creed
Must never ill feelings start.

Help us to think, to speak and act clearly.
Keep us from every and all transgressions.
May our thoughts, our words and all our deeds
Advance, not retard, all mankind's needs.

Amen.

Patman and Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House will be interested in reading the following objective article from the financial section of the New York Times of March 9, 1964:

PATMAN AND RESERVE—POLICIES OF FEDERAL SYSTEM SURVIVING WAR OF WORDS LED BY CONGRESSMAN

(By M. J. Rossant)

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN'S all-out war against the Federal Reserve System has been loud, furious, and totally ineffective. Mr. PATMAN, who appears to have been conducting a vendetta against the Federal Reserve for many years, sought to make the money managers more responsive to the administration's economic policymakers. But he made more friends for the Reserve than for his own cause.

This was largely due to the Texas Democrat's overzealousness. Instead of concentrating on the Reserve's relationship to the administration, he persisted in flailing away at all sorts of targets, real and imaginary.

Mr. PATMAN lambasted the Reserve for its present monetary policy. He could not resist attacking the Reserve for spending money on entertaining foreign bankers. He created other diversions by seeking information on the personal finances of Federal Reserve bank presidents and by demanding Government audits of the Reserve's books.

CRUCIAL ISSUE

These excursions detracted attention from the crucial issue of whether monetary policy should be subject to political control. The Reserve's present policy or the private lives of its officials have no bearing on this question.

As the regulator of the Nation's money supply, the Reserve can exert a powerful influence over economic conditions. For this reason, Mr. PATMAN feels that it should not be allowed to operate independently. Rather, he argues that monetary policy must be coordinated with the other economic weapons in the hands of the administration.

The notion that central banking is too important to be left entirely to central bankers has many adherents. They feel that the administration, which is responsible for overall economic policy and can be tossed out of office by the voters, must have control over monetary policy. But few of them were willing to aline themselves with Mr. PATMAN in his personal war with the Federal Reserve.

Under the circumstances, the Reserve has had no trouble defending itself. Its officials recognize that failure to cooperate with the administration would invite a serious attack on their independence, so they have been careful to maintain good relations.

Although the Kennedy administration had previously supported some of the proposals for reforming the Reserve recommended by the Commission on Money and Credit, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon gave his blessing to the present state of affairs. In testifying last week before Mr. PATMAN'S committee, he rejected proposals for reform and claimed that he could not conceive of "any closer relationships than those that have characterized the Treasury and the Federal Reserve during the last 3 years."

But many economists would prefer to spell out the division of responsibility and cement the relationship.

Eli Shapiro, professor of finance at Harvard University's Graduate School of Business Administration, who served as codirector of research for the Commission on Money and Credit, argues that "the present structure of our Federal Reserve System contains many vestigial remains which positively do it no good and, in point of fact, lead to suspicion as to its ultimate motivations."

According to Professor Shapiro, it "is desirable that the central bank's activities should be harmonized with the other stabilization activities of the Government." He would not go as far as Mr. PATMAN in bringing the Reserve under the control of the administration, but he does suggest that the President be given the right to name his own chairman and endorses other reform measures proposed by the commission.

Prof. Paul Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also urged that the Reserve be made a more "responsible institution in the American political structure." He observed that "it has been more of a lucky accident than an inherent feature of present legislation and practice that the United States has been able to avoid costly friction; but not even with our lucky combination of personalities and events, has our economy been spared some cost attributable to lack of unified monetary policy."

In proposals for carrying out reform, Professor Samuelson goes along with some suggestions made by the Commission. The objective, he says, should be to make the Reserve something like Britain's House of Lords, which "should be able to delay innovations, to smooth down the volative changes of public opinion and thin majorities."

Professor Shapiro supported the proposal made by James L. Robertson, a Federal Reserve Board governor, to establish a separate banking commission that would have responsibility for banking examinations and supervision. This would leave the money managers free to conduct their primary task of managing money.

But these criticisms of the present relationship failed to get the hearing they deserved. Mr. PATMAN's indiscriminate attack, his belaboring the Reserve for its practices and performance, succeeded only in obscuring the major issue of reform. The battle over who is to control the Federal Reserve is still to be fought.

Gov. David L. Lawrence—Mr. Democrat of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 7, 1964, at the ADA Roosevelt Dinner in Pittsburgh, Mr. Democrat of Pennsylvania, former Gov. David L. Lawrence, spoke eloquently of President and Mrs. Roosevelt and drew an interesting parallel between the first hundred days of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency and the first 100 days of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency.

The remarks of the Governor follow:

REMARKS OF FORMER GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE, ADA ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER, PENN-SHERATON HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1964

I have always looked forward to these Roosevelt Day dinners with pride and eagerness, because they honor the memory and works of one of history's greatest men and also because they give me the opportunity to once again see so many old friends and coworkers in the liberal cause, some of whom were with me in the vanguard of the Roosevelt movement more than three decades ago. I am proud that the Americans for Democratic Action here in Pittsburgh has maintained the tradition of honoring Franklin Roosevelt every year, just as the Allegheny County Democratic Committee has continued celebrating his birthday each January 30. These affairs demonstrate that we remember the man and what he stood for—as well we should—and that we recognize the continuing need to carry on the work of achieving the kind of world for which he devoted his life.

It would be appropriate, in the years ahead, if these observances honor as well the memory and deeds of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose assistance to her husband and whose activities of her own, have made our lives and millions of others richer and wiser and better. As President Johnson observed about Mrs. Roosevelt this past Wednesday, "poverty was her concern, peace was her hope, people were her passion, just as they were the concern and the hope and the passion of her husband."

We meet tonight 31 years after Franklin Roosevelt's first hundred days had begun, and a week after Lyndon Johnson's first hundred days have been completed. The parallels in the approach and the motivations of these two men are noteworthy and impressive.

Both assumed the Presidency in times of crisis and both acted with a decision and a sureness which gave confidence to the uncertain and optimism to the sick at heart. In his first 3 months in office, Franklin Roosevelt rescued a nation and Lyndon Johnson had the task, in the words of the New Republic, "To unify and reassure the Nation and our allies, establish a feeling of continuity, help assuage our grief, and get things going again."

For Roosevelt, the task required innovation and experimentation, bold new ideas and a determination to move swiftly. His challenges were most domestic, yet in those first hundred days he met with dozens of foreign leaders whose own countries were tottering and on the brink of collapse. Hitler used the chaos in Germany to seize control, and communism threatened many of the staid capitals of Europe—indeed it threatened an America with millions unemployed, with tens of thousands foreclosed from their homes, and with bankrupt corporation and money-poor banking institutions. But Franklin Roosevelt convinced this country, in these first days of his Presidency, that it could survive and prevail, and so it did. Had it not been for him, and for such great leaders of labor like Phil Murray, John Lewis, Sydney Hillman, and Dave Dubinsky, the Red tide might very well had swept over this Nation and freedom, as we know it, destroyed for all time.

While the Roosevelt era extended long after those first terrible and challenging days, it was then that his leadership was indelibly established in America and throughout the world.

In the case of Lyndon Johnson, he had the Presidency thrust upon him with a jolting, unbelievable abruptness in a time of domestic social upheaval and in a world capable of self-obliteration. Pressures for broader economic and social justice at home were powerful and persuasive, while worldwide competitions for power and influence had created dangerous problems in many of the continents of the globe. The numbing shock of President Kennedy's assassination brought confusion and consternation to much of humanity, and fear and uncertainty was abroad in a world of grief.

In his first hundred days, President Johnson made it clear that America's ideals and its purposes remain firm and inviolate, that the struggle for peace with freedom is going forward without pause or falter, and that the dedication to economic progress and social justice is undiminished and undiluted. Indeed, he has never ceased to remind us of his determination to continue the Kennedy program, and the record of his first 3 months is unmistakable evidence that he is holding to this determination and giving it solid achievement.

He has proved that he is a man who gets things done. He is a persistent, resolute, strongminded man, rooted in the populist tradition, skilled in the craft of government, inspired by the greatness of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, and certain of America's capacity for progress and leadership.

In his hundred days, he has proved his mettle, and made clear that he moves along the liberal pathway, ignoring the roadblocks and shunning the detours.

It is natural, I suppose, that he should remind us of Roosevelt, whom he served so ably, and that his program should identify itself with Kennedy, because he helped conceive that program and was always committed to it. But he has an identity of his own, a reputation for accomplishment, an irresistible persuasiveness, not to mention a tremendous appetite for long hours of hard work. He also has the ability and the wisdom, indispensable in government, of enlisting able men to his cause. There is no better example of this than our speaker this evening, whose counsel and energies have been on constant call and who has helped make the Johnson hundred days the proud and productive ones they have been.

All of which speaks well for this Nation, and its future.

It is a testament to our greatness as a people, when a former teacher from the Texas flatlands carries on the work largely started by a country squire from the banks of the Hudson—work that was moved forward by a farmboy from Missouri and invigorated and enlarged upon by the brilliant grandson of Irish immigrants.

There is every reason for us to believe tonight that Franklin Roosevelt would be proud of this Nation, pleased with its progress, happy about its growing maturity, confident of its leadership.

When that is so, we can all take satisfaction that the work he began so well—although still unfinished—is going on and this Nation and all the world is the better for it.

And that, in truth, is the most fitting memorial we can possibly provide and the only one Franklin Roosevelt would ever have wanted.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by David J. McDonald Before the Economic Club of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Monday, March 9, Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, delivered an excellent address to the Economic Club of Detroit.

I ask uanimous consent that the text of Mr. McDonald's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This opportunity to address the Detroit Economic Club is a most welcome occasion.

As the spokesman for union workers who make most of the Nation's steel—and a major portion of its aluminum, too—it brings me into an area which consumes vast amounts of both metals, not only in production of autos but for many other products which make Detroit an industrial center of the world.

As president of the United Steelworkers of America, I have considerably more than an academic interest in such matters.

We want you to be prosperous—to go booming along to new auto production and sales records, not only this year but every year. For in our union we are keenly aware that, in large measure, your well-being is a good barometer of our own.

We know, as you must, that if you are not making and selling automobiles, we are not making the steel which goes into those automobiles.

This is by no means a one-way street.

We know, too, that wherever steel is made there is a large market for the finished Detroit product, in compact or king-sized variety and quite often in both.

So keep 'em rolling, Detroit, and we'll all be better off for it.

There is a basic economic fact in the close relationship of better times in Detroit and the steel industry.

That fact is that, in the highly complex society in which we live today, the well-being of each integral part—be it labor, Government, business, industry, or minority group—is necessary to the well-being of the whole.

There can be no double standards in our way of life, in which one section of our country or one segment of our society enjoys prosperity and plenty while another area and its peoples suffer deprivation and want.

Neither our economy nor our cherished free capitalistic system can survive if such conditions are permitted to exist.

Unfortunately, we are confronted with poverty amid plenty in our Nation today. That intolerable condition ranges from poverty of opportunity to the bitter, grinding want such as that now being endured in the coal mining areas of Kentucky and in other areas where even hope is all but gone.

I do not relate this merely to shock you—it is all too true, as a recent national television documentary showed with shocking clarity.

After that documentary I heard people say that they had turned it off, because they couldn't endure witnessing more of that which they didn't want to believe.

In a sense, they were turning their backs on a responsibility which we all must share—the responsibility of making certain that poverty vanishes from our land and that all major domestic problems are erased with it.

These problems cover a wide range, from chronic unemployment to adequate civil rights practices, and hospital and medical care for our elder citizens.

The need for solution is not bound by geographical or philosophical limits. In fact, it cannot be. It is not labor's problem alone, for labor cannot solve it alone, however well-intentioned and well-directed our efforts may be.

It is the problem of all of us and in how we address ourselves to it rests our own fate.

We will require new techniques and new thinking to accomplish the purpose. And we must consider ideas for what they are worth, rather than reject them because of the source.

In short, we need mutual effort of the type labor at all times is prepared to give, as the United Steelworkers of America already have demonstrated.

A few short weeks ago, a distinguished spokesman for the Nation's steel industry told you of the Human Relations Committee concept and its worth in the relations of our union and steel management.

I don't intend to belabor the point.

I fully subscribe to his views—with these reservations.

Neither I, nor anybody else knows, whether the Human Relations Committee will be equal to the massive problems we still face. But I hold high hopes that with this concept as the springboard into a new era of labor relations, we will be equal to the task of making the necessary improvisations to meet changing needs and times when, and if, the occasion should arise.

Certainly this device has been equal to the task to date and its success is far more desirable than the periodic tests of strength which all too frequently characterized our relationships in the past.

Most significantly, the human relations concept is conclusive evidence that mutual effort is possible and its rewards are great for all parties concerned.

That includes the Nation, as well as the steel industry and its union workers.

The Human Relations Committee is a continuous process, just as steelmaking is a continuous process. And it covers a wide range of subjects, all of which concern the economics of people as much as the economics of the industry those people serve.

On the plus side for the industry it has brought a period of reasonable production stability, without the boom and bust cycles which were part and parcel of the old days of crisis bargaining under deadline pressures.

On the plus side for the workers it has brought a degree of job and income security I doubt would have been seriously discussed much less achieved under the old conditions.

It is worthy of note also that this concept required no relinquishing of rights or prerogatives by either of the principals. The union hasn't grown any softer and I know from experience that neither has management. We haven't abandoned our right to strike but the new concept has lessened the necessity of using this ultimate weapon.

And I am sure that our face-to-face discussions haven't resulted in one change of registration, from Republican to Democrat, or vice versa.

The only thing anybody has yielded is rockfast attitudes and built-in hostilities—and we both have profited as a result.

We found at the outset that things we believed firmly to be so, simply were not so at all and thus we were better able to arrive at conclusions deemed fair and acceptable to both parties.

Because of this mutual awareness of common problems and the responsibilities involved we were able to tackle the problem of human displacement by machines and to incorporate ideas into our contracts designed to counteract the impact of automation.

This brought into being for the first time in an industry as big as steel the 13-week extended vacation plan, a benefit designed solely to create more job opportunities in a period of rapid technological change.

The benefit also applies in the can industry where it first was negotiated and in aluminum plants where we hold contracts.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the extended vacation plan is not intended to create more leisure time, or to provide the opportunity for moonlighting.

It is designed solely to provide job and income security for our workers—an objective which is steadily becoming a national concern as the pace of technological change grows more swiftly.

I want to digress here to say that, in my opinion, the so-called problem of moonlighting is vastly overrated, and can be swiftly corrected where it is proven to exist if employers exercise their social responsibilities.

It is simple enough to eradicate by asking a job applicant if he is otherwise employed. In the organized mass employment industries, union security rules take care of the problem with no strain and with singular success, particularly in times of high unemployment such as exist today.

Returning to automation, I want to make it clear that we do not oppose technological changes for to do so would be to oppose progress, and this I shall never do.

Industry has a right to automate. In fact, it must keep pace with technological change in order that we can maintain our position as the bastion of world freedom. The Big Bear just over the North Pole is automating and so must we, or be reduced to the status of a second-rate nation.

But while we do not oppose automation we demand a fair share of its emolument for the workers.

This is not selfish, nor shortsighted. It is realistic.

Our people—in Detroit, as in Pittsburgh and elsewhere—must be fully employed at decent wage standards for a very fundamental reason.

And that reason is that only human beings have the purchasing power to buy the goods our industries produce and our business sells.

The most sophisticated devices can do almost everything else, but they cannot replace

the human element as the purchasing power at the end of the production line.

In that respect human beings still are and always will be in the driver's seat in our economy. To believe otherwise is to indulge in Model T thinking in a jet-propelled age.

People who work for hire, for hourly wages or salaries, in unions or unorganized, represent all but a relatively minuscule percentage of the entire purchasing power of our Nation.

Organized labor itself forms a significant part of the markets which consume and use the goods our industries produce.

Labor's gains have been reflected in increased buying power and translated into a general advance of the Nation as a whole. Many of the objectives for which we struggled and won now are an accepted part of the way of life of most of the Nation—except in those areas where labor has been exploited and general depression has been the result.

We can say that by raising our standards we have contributed to our national economic and social growth. The Nation, as a whole, has benefited, including most of you in this room.

The late Henry Ford is credited with creating the auto assembly line and mass production of the vehicles which put the horse out to pasture and horsepower under the hood.

But even at what now seems ridiculously low prices, the auto industry didn't really shift into high gear until workers' income standards were raised to the point where ownership of an automobile was within reach of almost everybody.

So it is necessary, for selfish reasons or selfless reasons, that we address ourselves jointly and sincerely to the problem of providing full employment with adequate income to all who desire jobs.

And it is necessary to harness automation to our needs before it runs away with us. I repeat that there is no profit in production without purchase, and those sleek new cars now pouring off your assembly lines are completely valueless unless there is a human being able to pay to climb into the driver's seat.

Opinions on the impact and ultimate effect of automation are as varied as the processes which have been developed. Some economists say technological change will create more jobs than it eradicates. A spokesman for an industry involved in the manufacture of automated processes states flatly that at least 40,000 jobs a week are imperiled.

A research institute noted for its conservation declares that processes in being, or on the planning board, will shake society to its very roots and may ultimately require changes in the college educational system to introduce teaching of new professions to replace those soon to be outmoded.

I don't know the ultimate answer but I do know that we have tried to take positive steps to cushion the shock at a time of negative approaches to the problem. We have been able to do so because industry has recognized the mutual interest and has assented to the changes we sought at a cost it was able to bear.

Our approach as demonstrated in the 13-week extended vacation plan has been a reduction of work periods on an annual basis because we believe, as organized labor does, that a reduction of work with no loss in pay is a worthy solution to the problem.

We don't claim that this is the only solution, but thus far it is the only answer anyone has come up with.

I know that the mere suggestion of reduced work periods without loss of income strikes an extremely sensitive nerve here. But I assure you that the thought is infinitely less painful than the reality of heavy unemployment and the consequent damage to the economy, in which you as well as the rest of us will suffer.

We cannot endure human displacement indefinitely unless we are prepared to accept the alternative of supporting those so displaced as unwilling wards of the state and assuming the impossible tax burden this entails. We do not want a nation of kept people.

I don't believe our democratic system could survive under such conditions.

Let me underscore this point, by the numbers. By the numbers of steelworkers, if you please.

At the outset we expressed pleasure at the seeming prosperity of the Detroit area because it also meant better times for us.

It has brought better times in steel—but only relatively. While production of steel has gone up steadily over the past year and may hit peaks untouched for years in 1964, employment has not kept pace.

There are some 123,000 fewer workers in basic steel in 1963 than there were in 1957 and 160,000 fewer than were employed only 10 years ago.

Production of more than 150 million ingot tons of steel would be required in 1964 in order to provide jobs for as many steelworkers as were employed in 1953.

Overall our union membership, in steel, aluminum, can, fabricating, mines, smelters, Great Lakes shipping and every other productive phase where we hold contracts, has dwindled since 1956 from more than 1,200,000 to about 950,000 dues-paying members.

Most of these workers have been casualties of technological change which includes closing of obsolete plants as well as the erection of new mills where computer processes replace work crews.

The end is not yet in sight. With new techniques such as oxygen furnaces and continuous casting, more jobs will inevitably be forfeited.

This represents far more than a loss of dues income to a union.

It represents a staggering loss in potential purchasing power to the economy.

Now Detroit likes to sell autos. In fact, it must sell autos.

For Detroit, our loss of members represents a probable loss of customers for new or used cars.

I can think of no more vital reason why Detroit—as well as the rest of the Nation—should be awakened to the portent of automated idleness and concerned with the necessity of a mutual effort to solve the problem.

Unemployment for any reason and in any numbers is a terrible deterrent to national growth. Yet it has become chronic in recent years with the prospect that it can only become worse unless we act cohesively and sensibly to check and correct the trend.

There is growing awareness among industrial leaders that a reduction in work periods is an inevitable palliative for unemployment in this highly automated age. And there is a dawning recognition that our labor-management problems must of necessity branch out into sociological fields.

The sociological aspects embrace civil rights as well as unemployment, as they properly should for one problem is irrevocably tied to the other. Detroit like most large cities has felt the pangs of the civil rights crisis as the Negro asserts his American right to equal treatment.

So-called unskilled jobs usually vanish the fastest under the impact of automation. The Negro worker, largely through no fault of his own, is most numerous both in the unskilled job classifications and in the total unemployment percentages.

I believe, and I have so testified before a Senate committee, that many of our civil rights problems would be solved if our problems of full employment first were solved.

By providing job opportunities and training people to fill them, regardless of creed or color, we hit at the nub of the civil rights problem. We provide a degree of economic freedom to match social freedom.

Beyond the fact that every American is entitled to equality, is the fact that the exercise of prejudice and bigotry is a fearful waste of potential talent and ability. We cannot afford such waste, at home or in our relations with the world.

There is no force on earth which can bury us but our own mistakes. And I believe the most monumental mistake we could make would be to ignore the necessity of insuring equality for all Americans in all respects.

I can say that it is to the everlasting credit of the steel industry that it has joined with us in an effort to eliminate discrimination at the plant level and that the Human Relations Committee is addressing itself continuously, and I hope successfully, to the problem wherever it may exist.

In this and in many other ways, the union and the steel industry have joined in mutual efforts designed to benefit both. The most recent example is a joint effort to insure fair trade practices and to eliminate "dumping" of foreign steel on American markets.

We believe in free world trade and we have no fear of fair competition but we join with the steel industry in opposing any practices which put our own industry at an unfair disadvantage and thus jeopardize the jobs of American workers.

I have dwelt at length on the value of mutual effort, as exemplified in the human relations concept in our relations with 11 of the major steel producers of the land.

I must mention, too, another example of mutual effort which has been closely watched and widely hailed as an unprecedented advance in labor-management relations. That is the long-range sharing plan drafted by our union with the Kaiser Steel Corp.

It is unique in many respects, including the fact that it voluntarily introduces public representation for the first time into labor-management affairs. It also provides a return to the workers on any savings effected through the use of men, material and machines and, in another precedent for steel, provides a degree of protection against the loss of jobs through automation.

It, like the Human Relations Committee, has been outstandingly successful thus far but it remains an experiment which will require more time to properly evaluate.

We take justifiable pride in these examples of mutual effort. But that is not enough. In this country we need total effort to surmount our problems. And total effort means government participation if we are to achieve our common goals and objectives.

A labor-industry-government effort was instituted by the late President Kennedy and has been continued in good use by President Johnson.

This is the President's Advisory Committee on Labor and Management of which I am a member. So is your illustrious industrialist, Henry Ford II.

I believe, and I am sure that so does he, that this committee has made worthy contributions to the common good, although it is made up of widely divergent personalities holding widely divergent views.

The point to be remembered is that the existence of this committee proves that different philiosophies can be put to collective use in the common interest.

And it is surprising, indeed, how such seemingly insurmountable differences can be narrowed down when face to face, free exchanges of ideas and views is possible, whether this be on human relations or presidential committee level.

The involvement of Government is absolutely necessary in affairs of grave concern to our Nation. Certainly neither labor nor management, working apart or together, can

hope to achieve objectives of long-range value to the Nation unless there is Government interest and support.

That applies to fair foreign trade or unemployment.

There is an erroneous impression that we, and other unions, favor Government intervention into and consequent control over our affairs.

This is absolutely absurd.

We recognize that Government has the right to act at any time in what it deems to be the public interest. But we prefer in labor-management relations to work out our own problems, wherever possible, through the processes of free collective bargaining.

I do believe that the chances of solving our common national problems are considerably enhanced when labor, management, and Government all are sighted in on the same target.

There are a few other illusions I would like to correct before I close.

The first of these is the idea that our union blindly insists on imposing some so-called pattern of wage and social benefits upon all and sundry plants with which we hold contracts.

It is true that we seek the best for all of our people, but it is most untrue that we seek the impossible. Our union always is mindful of, and seeks to make reasonable accommodations to special problems, where these problems are proven to exist.

Nor do we attempt to exercise a voice in the pricing policies, or the profits of the companies with which we have contract relations. We do not want any part of these, or any other rights of management.

We do want our plants and factories to be profitable. We are very well aware that in our democratic capitalistic system, profitable operation is necessary to keep people at work.

There may be one final illusion limited largely to this audience.

And that concerns the idea that I may have something to say about what the United Auto Workers will seek, or perhaps achieve, in the forthcoming negotiations.

The answer is that I do not have anything to say and I will not.

That is a problem which concerns the Auto Workers and the industry.

I hope that it can be resolved amicably and fairly.

Finally, I do not expect to find all acceptance of my ideas in this forum but I do hope that these expressions will generate ideas of your own on the need for solving the common problems.

The time has come for all of us to consider ideas for what they are worth, rather than where they originated.

We must consider that we are in another industrial revolution with the prospect of a social upheaval which may change the world for centuries to come.

In previous eras of great industrial change there always were new lands to settle and cultivate. Today our new frontiers must be established with our brains, rather than with the plow and rifle.

That will take massive intellectual effort.

It is time we all put our minds to the task.

Modernization of Federal Salary Systems

SPEECH

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate I wish to make two points; then I will yield to the majority whip, who will consume about half of the time remaining.

I hope that on tomorrow we will not hear any more of this facetious, preposterous, non sequitur argument that "there are many candidates back home in my district who want to run for Congress" and therefore we should not raise salaries. This has been said a half dozen times today, and I hope we will not hear it tomorrow.

Are those people who make this argument saying that the office of a Member of Congress ought to go to the lowest bidder—that we should reduce the salary to $20,000, to $15,000, to $12,00, to $5,000, and so long as there is one man who says, "I will run for Congress," we will lower it some more?

Then you might have a social occasion and you say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I want to present your Congressman, the only man we could find in nine counties who would go to Washington for this salary we are offering." Logically, if this argument has only validity, that is what we are saying. I think you could get people to run for Congress, if you would, who would pay the U.S. Government $22.500, and those who want real economy here and to improve the Federal fiscal position maybe believe that is something we ought to do, but I will tell you the kind of people we would get, if that is what you are talking about. You would get the kind of people that we do not want in Congress. So I hope, gentlemen, that we will not hear any more of this argument tomorrow.

I said this was a management bill. We have heard talk about the deficit and we do have a deficit, and I am going to do all I can to balance the budget around here.

But let me tell you why this argument is not particularly valid. Let me cite you a case history: In the Defense Department is a man whose responsibilities include, among others, the detailed examination of all aspects of a major weapons system and he must isolate decisions which will be required in the next 5 budget years and be ready with prudent alternatives. These decisions involve hundreds of millions of dollars. This man is a GS-18, at $20,000 a year. He came here from a top executive position with an aircraft maker where he received about $40,000 a year. Every month or so people from industry come in and say to him, "We want you as vice president at $40,000 a year."

So far he has been dedicated. However, when the day comes for him to go, if we take away the hope that we are going to give him a decent salary, you can send all the Members you want down there to say to him, "Let us tell you about our deficit and let us tell you about the national debt and let us tell you about what great trouble the Government has." This fellow, if he has a family and is going to send his children to college, if he can get a better job, unless he is dedicated, is going to say, "I do not care. You go and tell that story about that Federal debt and that deficit and all of the rest of the troubles the Government has to someone else."

I have case histories and I have a dozen of them of people who have been presidents of corporations and who are sought after every month by private corporations to leave their jobs at double and triple their salaries. They hang on because they want to serve the Government. Yet we have had more and more turnover in these critical positions and we lose these men at just about the time they begin to produce for the Government. These positions I might add carry very little honor or prestige.

As the National Association of Manufacturers said:

> If a business were losing money because costs were too high, it might consider hiring some new department heads to cut costs—pay them well for doing it and thus balance the budget.
>
> But not Government.

This is a bill that will do something for the taxpayers and help us to get the kind of Federal Establishment we can all be a little more proud of. I hope the Committee of the Whole tomorrow will support our committee in the particular amendments that are going to be offered and, rollcall or no rollcall, that we will pass this bill, because it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time remains to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the majority whip.

Resolution Opposing Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a resolution which has been approved by Ward 3 of the South Carolina Democratic Party in Laurens, S.C., in support of the position being taken by those of us who oppose the so-called civil rights legislation. This resolution has been approved by the Laurens County Democratic Convention and is being forwarded to the South Carolina State Democratic Party Convention which will be held on March 25, 1964.

I appreciate, Mr. President—and I know I speak for all of us in opposition to this power grab legislation—the strong words of encouragement and support which this resolution lends to our cause.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAURENS, S.C., *February 22, 1964.*

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SOUTHERN SENATORS IN STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Whereas it is the prerogative and duty of citizens interested in the common good and welfare of the people to communicate to

their representatives in the Congress their feelings and opinions on far-reaching and momentous proposals, and

Whereas in these troublous times, it is apparent that the workshops of the sociologists and the rampagings of extremists are dictating to our courts and being joined by them in trying to change the very way of life of all men overnight, and

Whereas it is obvious that the so-called civil rights bill soon to be debated by the Senate of the United States is the result of high-pressure motivated by a purpose conceived in venegeance and turmoil, nurtured in a vicious climate of exploitation and promoted by ruthless political maneuvers for personal and group advantages that would strip the people of personal, social, civic, civil, and business freedom and liberties and set-up a Gestapo-type of organization of marauders that would run roughshod over the minds and hearts of men and reduce to shambles the very foundation upon which this great Nation was founded and built: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this Democratic Party convention here assembled in Laurens County voice its condemnation of the so-called civil rights bill; further be it

Resolved, That a communication be sent to each of our United States Senators telling them of our support of their stand against the vicious bill.

To be sent to State Democratic convention.

Vietnam Need: Winning the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, for years now some of us have been saying that the only way to win the war in Vietnam was for the Central Government to win the loyalty and allegiance of the people. An article by Takashi Oka in the March 9 issue of the Christian Science Monitor points this out very well, and I include it herewith:

VIETNAM NEED: WINNING THE PEOPLE

(By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—To gain victory in South Vietnam's frustrating war against the Communist guerrillas, there must be a shift in emphasis from killing Communists to winning the people.

This is a view widely shared by Vietnamese and Americans with long experience in combating the Vietcong, the Communist guerrillas.

Trite and worn as the phrase "winning the people" may sound, and as many times as lipservice has been paid to this slogan, it is still the irreducible minimum for winning victory, these observers say.

"For 3 years the Pentagon has emphasized military measures—killing the Vietcong," one knowledgeable source commented.

"We've killed thousands of Vietcong, according to our statistics, yet those 45 Vietcong battalions still remain.

"What we have got to do is to get the villagers to defend themselves—motivate them to defend themselves. This will take care of the small unit actions that form the bulk of Vietcong attacks today. Then the regular army can concentrate on the large action—the 300- or 400-men attacks—which villagers obviously can't come with."

The problem is how to motivate the villagers. Some months ago a survey was conducted to determine what a villager actually wanted. The list boiled down to four essentials: first, physical security; second, economic opportunity; third, local self-determination; fourth, the rule of law.

It was obvious that the Communists could not provide any of these four requisites except in a limited degree over limited periods of time. It was clear that the Government of South Vietnam as then constituted also failed to perform this task.

But the government was and is in a far better position to do this than the Communists. And when and as it does, it has a legitimate claim on the loyalty of the villagers.

In another, more recent survey, 33,000 people in a single critical province near Saigon were interviewed. Many grievances against the government came to light.

But the surveyors found that the interviewees also had an active antipathy toward the Communist guerrillas in their midst. In some villages, interviewees supplied rosters of resident Communists at considerable risk to themselves.

Potentially, therefore, the villagers were not "attentistes"—fence sitters. They had definite ideas as to how they wanted the government to function. And to the extent that the government actually did function in this manner it could begin to regain ground lost during the final years of the dictatorial Ngo Dinh Diem regime.

As for the argument that the war should be carried to the north, thoughtful observers here say that it sounds like a panacea which does nothing to solve the primary problem—winning the allegiance of the people in the South Vietnamese countryside.

The war must be fought and won in the south, whatever may happen in the north, these observers say. And in their view this war is in the highest sense a political war. Military means are useful only as this basic fact is recognized and applied.

Panama and the Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of meeting with my good friends of Centreville, Md. This meeting, which was so ably arranged and led by Mrs. David Williamson, evidenced the interest and concern of fellow Marylanders about this country's foreign and domestic policies. While there, an article published in the Queen Anne's Record-Observer was called to my attention. The article, written by Capt. Philip W. Reeves, discusses the timely topic of Panama. The captain, who is a master mariner, has seen the canal many times while sailing from New York to California. Therefore, he speaks from a personal knowledge of the situation and his feelings merit examination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the discussions now going on about the Panama Canal, it might be of interest to review, briefly, the canal history. In 1534 King Charles V of Spain ordered a survey made for a proposed canal across the isthmus.

In 1855 the Panama Railroad across the isthmus from Colon on the Atlantic side to Panama City on the Pacific side, was completed. It is said that a man died for each crosstie in the railroad track. At that time yellow fever was the curse of the tropics. Until the canal was completed passengers and freight were transshipped across the isthmus on this railroad.

Actual construction of the canal was started by the French in January 1880. The French Canal Co. had a concession granted by the Government of Colombia in 1878.

The Panama Railroad, the canal rights and properties of the French Canal Co. were bought by the United States for $40 million in 1904.

The Isthmus of Panama is the principal and most important part of the Republic of Panama. It was originally a part of the Republic of Colombia. Panama was established as an independent Republic at the time when the United States was negotiating for the purchase of the canal properties from the French. The new Republic was made possible by the backing of the United States.

The newly created Republic of Panama granted by treaty, to the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, a right-of-way across the isthmus 10 miles wide and 50 miles long. The Panama Railroad is in this zone. The United States paid the Republic of Panama $10 million and agreed to pay each year, starting 9 years after the treaty was ratified, the sum of $250,000 gold. Since then this sum has been increased until today it is about $2 million.

The treaty with the Republic of Panama was ratified February 26, 1904, and work started on the canal by the U.S. Army Engineers under General Goethals. Panama and the Canal Zone were cleaned up and the yellow fever brought under control. Today sanitary regulations are very strict and the Canal Zone is one of the healthiest places in the world.

When the U.S. Engineers took over the construction of the canal they found that a sea level canal was not practical on account of the difference in the height of the tides on the Atlantic and Pacific sides of the canal. On the Pacific side the tides are 28 feet on the Atlantic side, 4 feet. This is why a sea level canal cannot be built across the isthmus here or in any other location.

Thousands of contract laborers, mostly West Indian Negroes, were brought in to work on the canal. A tough crowd who were kept in order by the Canal Zone police.

The population of the Republic of Panama is a mixture of races. Spanish the official language. Population in 1955 was 911,400.

Panama exports some bananas, coffee, and tropical products. Her main source of income of course, is the canal payments and what business is brought there by the ships using the canal. Most of the local merchants are Chinese or East Indians.

The University of Panama is a small college in the city of Panama. It is doubtful if it would be an accredited college by our standards. The teaching staff like so many others is dominated by Communists who are the plotters and instigators of most of the canal troubles. The student riots that we hear so much about are standard Communist procedure in all Latin American colleges.

The Communist professors and politicians believe that they can steal the canal from the United States by following the example set by Suez. That the politicians in Washington will submit peacefully to their takeover of the canal. All kinds of arguments will be offered in the United Nations to justify their claim. No doubt the Panamanians are taking into consideration the failure of the United States of America to do more than talk about the so-called nationaliza-

tion or the theft of many private U.S. corporations doing business in Cuba, Mexico, and South America. There is, however, a big difference in the Panama situation. The Panama Canal Zone was sold to the United States of America for $10 million. The United States of America also purchased the assets of the French Canal Co. for $40 million, and then spent many more millions of the U.S. taxpayers' money to build the canal.

The canal has been operated successfully now for 50 years. It has been impartial and efficient. It belongs to the people of the United States of America and we intend to keep it, no matter what the Castro-type Communists or the debating society of the United Nations say.

It is time for our Government to call a halt to appeasement. Our appeasers in Washington have caused us to lose the respect of all Latin America, whose cry is "Go home, Yankee."

Let's get rid of the appeasers and keep the canal.

PHILIP W. REEVES.

CENTREVILLE, *February 20, 1964.*

President Johnson's Achievements During His First 100 Days in Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD two newspaper articles which laud President Johnson's achievements during his first 100 days in office. Both the Atlanta Constitution and the Milwaukee Journal have noted the President's impressive and wide-ranging undertakings and have labeled him a formidable candidate in the November elections.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 3, 1964]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST 100 DAYS SHOW LIVELY RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

President Lyndon Johnson observed his first 100 days in office with a press conference Saturday televised to the Nation. He was cautious and restrained in his appearance but the record shows that his achievements have been considerable. Tough battles still lie ahead but it is reasonable to assume that he will be the Democratic nominee to succeed himself.

The President has set a work pace that has amazed official Washington and he has succeeded in breaking the logjam of legislation of a Congress suffering from paralysis. There is justified worry about his ability to hold up physically under the intense activity to which he subjects himself. Thus far, however, he shows no signs of heavy strain.

Since December, the record is impressive.

He prevented further cuts in foreign aid appropriations and pushed through two major education bills. The House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly the toughest civil rights bill in a century. It is a good bet he will succeed in getting it through the Senate after a wearying delaying action.

Last week the $11.5 billion tax bill cleared both Houses after more than a year of delay and debate. It was initiated by President Kennedy, but Johnson gets credit for pushing it through. Millions of Americans will take note of that this week.

On foreign policy, the President still has not achieved major successes and the GOP is criticizing in generalities. He is wrestling with Cyprus, South Vietnam, Panama, Cuba, Zanzibar and De Gaulle. Problems with our allies must be resolved and the rebellion against foreign aid will be tough in Congress. The House's veto of the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association, an agency dealing in loans, not grants, is a major blow to the Nation's foreign policy.

On the record, the President's first 100 days look good. He is carrying out the Kennedy program to move the Nation forward. If he succeeds, he will be a formidable candidate for any Republican to beat in November.

THE PRESIDENT'S LIVELY 100 DAYS: MR. JOHNSON HAS SCORED SOME SOLID GAINS ON LEGISLATION, IS PLAGUED BY FOREIGN TROUBLES BUT REMAINS FORMIDABLE

(By John W. Kole)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson passed the 100 day mark Saturday. It has been one of the most intense periods of Presidential activity in the Nation's history.

There have been substantial achievements in the form of major legislation passed by Congress, but there also has been a considerable amount of froth emanating from the oval office at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Naturally, there is sharp disagreement among Democrats and Republicans on Mr. Johnson's record since he was elevated by tragedy and violence last November 22.

But there is no debate that he certainly will be the 1964 Democratic nominee—if he can hold up physically under the incredible pace he has set during his first 3 months as President.

He began his campaign Thursday with a literal bang, on a quick trip to Florida where he set off a blast, at Palatka, that began construction of a cross State barge canal, then flew on to Miami Beach to deliver a hard-hitting speech on civil rights to some 3,500 gathered at a Democratic fund-raising dinner.

BIG DAY IN 6 MONTHS

Party chieftains already are planning a huge 56th birthday party for the President in Atlantic City, N.J., 6 months from now on August 27, the day scheduled for acceptance of the Presidential nomination at the 1964 national convention.

Incumbency in itself is enough to establish the President as the favorite against whatever candidate the Republicans nominate in San Francisco in July. Moreover, some GOP pros concede ruefully that they may have a more formidable foe in Mr. Johnson than they had in Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Johnson won his first political campaign—a race for a congressional seat—in 1937 running on Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal and that political concept, tempered by Texas conservatism, has dominated his philosophy since.

As Mr. Johnson has said many times, Mr. Roosevelt was "like a daddy" to him. Even though F.D.R. has been dead almost 20 years, his continuing strong influence is evident in such Johnson programs as the "unconditional war on poverty."

While it would be an exaggeration to compare the President's first 100 days with that startling bundle of 1933 New Deal achievements in the depth of a massive depression, Mr. Johnson's legislative record has been impressive.

In December, he prevented further deep cuts in foreign aid appropriations and broke a frustrating logjam over two major education bills.

Early last month, the House overwhelmingly adopted the strongest civil rights bill in almost a century. It still faces a southern filibuster in the Senate, but most congressional observers feel it will pass without drastic revision.

Last week, the $11.5 billion tax cut bill cleared both Houses and was signed by the President. Its economic effects still are being debated, but no one disputes that the political impact of a tax reduction which averages 19 percent for individuals will help Mr. Johnson.

The President has stolen the Republican thunder on economy in Government. Anxious for renewal of their attack on the New Frontier after the holidays, the Republicans were astounded when the President announced that he would submit a reduced budget.

Last week, the 20 GOP Members of the House Appropriations Committee attacked the President's so-called economy drive as a myth and his budget as "a figure juggler's dream that only serves to conceal more and more planned spending."

However, conservatives admit privately that this stance of fiscal responsibility has hurt them.

Yet, there is no question that Mr. Johnson is trying to ride on both sides of the fiscal fence. A phrase from his first economic message demonstrates this. We can, he said, have "efficiency with expansion, frugality with compassion."

LEGITIMATE ECONOMIES

But even in this area the verdict is fuzzy because there are some legitimate cutbacks in defense procurememt—no small task when one considers the power of the military-industrial complex.

Also, the budget makes a meaningful shift of funds to the antipoverty campaign, although liberals contend that it is far from sufficient.

The Johnson froth, along with his extremely sensitive hide, has been partially responsible for some of his problems with the press.

His campaign to save a couple of thousand dollars a month by turning off lights and making the White House look uninhabited in the process has been the butt of dozens of jokes. And the speech in which he complained about "what some of the bellyachers say" was widely regarded as a barrel of platitudes.

For example, he summed up U.S. foreign policy by saying that "all we can do is expect to do what is right, what is honorable, what is enlightened—and that we are doing."

Critics also have noted that Mr. Johnson offended only the atheist vote by urging the construction in Washington of a fitting memorial to God. And, they point out, his pledge to put 50 women in top Government jobs in 30 days just hasn't been fulfilled.

Recently the Republican attack has centered on Mr. Johnson's handling of foreign policy. Despite the large amount of time and effort the President has spent on foreign matters, his record of achievement on these has not been as good as his domestic record.

SON OF OLD CONFEDERACY

Republicans have made much of the problems in Cyprus, South Vietnam, Cuba, and Zanzibar. However, if the administration's defense has left something to be desired, the Republican remedies have lacked specifics, too.

Whatever the judgment on Mr. Johnson's policies, no one disputes the fact that his ascension to the Presidency drastically alters the 1964 campaign.

Before the assassination, GOP conservatives were confidently trotting out theories,

charts, and statistics on how Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, could dethrone Mr. Kennedy.

Although most observers contended that Mr. Kennedy had to be considered a heavy favorite against any Republican in 1964, the conservatives argued that a winning coalition could be forged by sweeping most of the South and holding the Midwest and Far West votes that almost elected Richard M. Nixon in 1960.

Even before the assassination there was substantial doubt whether the Republicans could sweep the so-called solid Democratic South despite the resentment over civil rights which had been focused on the Kennedy brothers.

Since Mr. Johnson is the first full-fledged representative of the old Confederacy to hold the Presidency in almost 100 years, there now is speculation whether the Republicans can get any of the 128 southern electoral votes, even the 33 that Nixon got in 1960.

The President has history in his favor. During this century only two Presidents have been dethroned by the voters. And Mr. Johnson is not expected to face the party splintering that toppled William Howard Taft or the depression which crushed Herbert Hoover. He probably will have peace and prosperity on his side, a tough combination to beat. Mr. Kennedy managed it in 1960, but not against an incumbent.

Despite the magnitude of their problems, the Republican tacticians are plunging ahead and a new strategy is beginning to emerge. It assumes that Mr. Johnson can be cut down in the North by reducing the Democratic pluralities in the cities and piling up margins in the suburbs and outstate areas.

This strategy is designed to mine the rich lodes of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and California. These 5 States have 159 electoral votes (270 will be needed to win). Mr. Kennedy took all of them except California.

One recent poll indicated that Mr. Johnson would get at least 60 percent of the votes against any of the major Republican candidates. In some quarters there is talk of a Democratic landslide.

The major uncertainty at the Democratic convention will be the selection of a Vice-Presidential candidate and that will be up to Mr. Johnson. The leading possibilities are Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, a brother-in-law of President Kennedy; Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the late President's brother; and Minnesota Senator Hubert Humphrey.

ACTION ABOVE IDEAS

Perhaps the most depressing aspect for Republicans is the way Mr. Johnson is dominating both Washington and the news. He seems to defy nature with his whirlwind 18-hour days. His constant telephoning already is a legend here. Columnist James Reston put tongue in cheek and predicted that the President would give up the instrument for Lent.

Despite his success so far, Mr. Johnson's relations with Congress will be watched closely. It is not unfair to say that he hopes to accomplish many of the things Mr. Kennedy talked about. If Mr. Johnson can't do it with his wealth of congressional experience, observers here wonder whether anyone can.

Mr. Johnson has brought a drastic change to the style of the Presidency and with his homespun manner he never will have quite the Kennedy rapport with the intellectuals. He is more a man of action than of ideas. But he is a hard-nosed politician who is willing to stand or fall on his accomplishments.

"If he finds that a 10-gallon hat helps him * * *" a British newspaper commented, "so much the better for 10-gallon hats."

Would We Let George Do It Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have just had the opportunity to read a most impressive and eloquent address which was delivered on February 26, 1964, before the Pilot Club of South Carolina by Mr. Julian Metz. Mr. Metz is the executive director of the Greater Charleston (S.C.) Chamber of Commerce.

The address is entitled "Would We Let George Do It Now?" and is based on some very wise words of advise which the Father of our Country, George Washington, tried to leave with us many years ago.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Metz's speech be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD WE LET GEORGE DO IT NOW?

When I was invited to speak tonight the suggestion was made that I consider a generally patriotic theme. That suggestion, in itself, gave me encouragement. From what I read, and what I hear on the network programs about the goings-on in our Federal Government and the supergovernment of the United Nations, I was beginning to believe that the terms "patriot" and "old fogey" are virtually synonymous. I realize, of course, that there are still many red-blooded men and women who thrill at the sight of the Stars and Stripes, and the sound of the Star-Spangled Banner. Their spines tingle as they say with pride the Oath of Allegiance, and their hearts beat a little faster when they read of the heroic struggles of our forebears as they carved a civilization out of a wilderness. It is not uncommon to find a few moist eyes in a gathering when we sing about "America the Beautiful," and we rightfully become reverent when we sing that last stanza of "America" which is in reality a prayer for the survival of our liberty.

When I began pondering the possible approaches to such a theme I thought about those courageous men and women who sailed almost uncharted seas, taking with them their few wordly possessions to a new land. They began a new life by chopping down trees to build homes. You see, there were no FHA loans available and there was no public housing. They planted their crops and managed to survive the rugged winters without the benefit of seed loans, soil banks, and parity payments. When they wanted to move westward their trains of covered wagons moved slowly across the continent without the aid of interstate highways or the Interstate Commerce Commission. When they felt that it was right and proper to throw off the yoke of British tyranny they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. When the going was rough they went to their knees in prayer, and when things were going well they gave thanks to almighty God. In short, they depended upon work and faith to make their dreams come true. Many died in the process but the survivors redoubled their efforts and their determination.

It was in such an environment that George Washington was born. His grandfather had come from England in 1657. When George was 10 years old his father died, leaving six children to their mother's care. There was no life insurance, no social security, and no aid to the dependent children—but there was land and a desire to work as long as necessary to cultivate it. When he was 15 years old George went to Mount Vernon to live with his half-brother, Lawrence, who had inherited the greater part of his father's estate. There he took advantage of the opportunity to study, and during that first year at the age of 15 he began working as a surveyor. The story of his adult life is well known to all, so I will not dwell on his successes as a military commander and as a statesman.

If I may paraphrase, "I come not to bury Washington or to praise him." Nor do I come before you to entertain you. In fact, I fear that I shall be a little disappointed if you enjoy my remarks tonight, for I believe that the time has come for us to face the facts of our present life. If we face those facts realistically they should make us a bit uncomfortable to say the least.

It is my humble opinion that if George Washington were alive today he would have little or no chance to be nominated, much less elected, to the Presidency. I shall not ask you to agree with me—I simply ask you to listen and I challenge you to form your own opinions.

Of Washington's "110 Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation," 25 make some reference to the idea that there is some inequality among men. Would either of our political parties tolerate such radical thinking? Suppose at a press conference he followed his rule No. 79—"Be not apt to relate news, if you know not the truth thereof." If he were approached by a minority group with a demand for laws requiring their admission to places of private business he might quote his rule No. 68—"Go not thither, where you know not whether you shall be welcome or not." With emotions rising in the wake of a heated demonstration he might even turn to Congress and say as he did in rule No. 58—"In all causes of passion admit reason to govern," and finally, his last rule was "Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

I submit to you that this man Washington was a conservative, an isolationist, a rightwinger, an extremist, and a superpatriot—hardly regarded as complimentary terms these days.

Let us imagine that we have just turned on our television sets and candidate Washington is making a campaign speech. He is commenting on some subversive propaganda, aimed at an underprivileged group and anonymously distributed. We hear him say:

"That the address is drawn with great art and is designed to answer the most insidious purposes. That it is calculated to impress the mind with an idea of premeditated injustice in the sovereign power of the United States, and rouse all those resentments which must unavoidably flow from such a belief. That the secret mover of this scheme (whoever he may be) intended to take advantage of the passions, while they were warmed by the recollection of the past distresses, without giving time for cool deliberative thinking."

He continues:

"And let me conjure you, in the name of our common country, as you value your own sacred honor, as you respect the rights of humanity, and as you regard the military and national character of America, to express your utmost horror and detestation of the man who wishes, under any specious pretenses, to overturn the liberties of our country, and who wickedly attempts to open the floodgates of civil discord.

In the 1964 campaign such blunt comments would not be calculated to win the great bloc votes of the NAACP, CORE, and other advocates of "civil rights."

On the subject of sectionalism we might hear him say:

"In contemplating the causes which may disturb our union, it occurs as matter of serious concernment that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations, Northern and Southern, Atlantic, and Western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection."

This sort of comment certainly would not endear Washington to the news media—especially those behind the so-called paper curtain.

On the subject of bureaucratic rulings where existing laws are not strong enough to suit the liberals he might say:

"Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."

To those appointed or elected officials who are never satisfied with the powers granted them under our Constitution he might well respond:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their constitutional sphere, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predomintaes in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument for good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

No doubt he would offend the Justices of the Supreme Court and lose the votes of all atheists by such a comment as:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

Certainly he would alienate the brain-trusters, the something-for-nothing clan, and the we-only-owe-it-to-ourselves group with this bit of philosophy:

"As a very important source of strength and security cherish the public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible; avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursement to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts, which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden, which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate."

Of course, you realize that these are Washington's words, not mine. I have not consciously or intentionally taken any out of context for the purpose of distortion. Certainly these words were spoken under circumstances quite unlike those of 1964. Nevertheless, they were spoken in opposition to threats which continue to exist today. Such terms as "civil discord," "misrepresentations," "encroachments," "public credit," and so on are not new to us.

But times have changed now. We are no longer a struggling young nation of 13 States. We are a mighty power and we have grown strong by following those sound principles which Washington espoused. But do we follow them now? What of our relations with other nations? Washington predicted of our future that we would be a free, enlightened, and a great nation. He advised us to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all." He also cautioned us that "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influences the jealously of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government." Have we heeded his advice? I think not. What would be Washington's reaction if he could today walk into the United Nations Assembly and hear in some foreign tongue a vilification of the American people and their Government? What would he think about the current movement in the World Council of Churches to accept the coexistence of religion and atheism? What would he think of the Supreme Court's decision that prayer and Bible reading have no place in our public schools? I think he would say that the American spirit is dying of malnutrition. Franklin Roosevelt once said, "But if the spirit of America were killed, even though the Nation's body and mind constricted in an alien world, lived on, the America we know would have perished."

Let us here resolve that we shall revive and rejuvenate that American spirit. Let us inject the vitamins of patriotism into the bloodstream of our American life. Let us insist that our children learn of the heroism of Washington, Jefferson, Lee, Calhoun, and the many other distinguished true Americans. Let us by word and example show our young people that they do not have to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. Let us preach and teach the doctrine of self-reliance and do away with the frantic search for security. There can be no economic security without economic freedom. There can be no freedom to succeed without the freedom to fail. Success cannot be guaranteed by legislation. America will be strong again only when individual citizens accept their responsibilities as their forefathers did. We must recapture the spirit of Lexington and Concord, of Valley Forge and Bunker Hill.

In short we need patriotic, dedicated, adequate men and women. The poet, Clarence Edwin Flynn, describes the adequate man as follows:

The need of the world is the adequate man,
The man who is ready, who knows, and who can,
The man who can rise to the need of the hour
And meet it with courage and knowledge and power;
The man with a mission, the man with the grace
To fill without flinching his God-given place;
The man with a conscience, the man with a mind,
Kind enough to be strong, strong enough to be kind.
The man who is master of what he must do,
With the will and endurance to follow it through;
The man who is fearless his pathway to plod,
Because he is consciously walking with God;
The man with the wisdom to choose and decide
With a justice unfailing, a sympathy wide;
The man with a vision, the man with a plan—
The need of the world is the adequate man.

George Washington was such a man.

In my opening remarks I recognized that there are still those in whose hearts burn the fires of patriotism. There are still those who believe that "In God We Trust" is a good motto. There are those who believe that a country founded on faith must be steadfast in that faith in order to survive. To those of you who agree with these closing remarks I commend that last prayerful stanza of "America." Those words should be ever in our hearts and daily on our lips:

Our Fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, Our King. Amen.

Bob Sikes Speaks Ably of Ideals He Lives by and Land Which He Represents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Recently, our beloved colleague and dean of the Florida congressional delegation, the Honorable ROBERT F. SIKES, spoke in my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla. He delivered a stirring and significant speech on the progressive northwest section of Florida and also on his philosophy of living. It is a pleasure to salute him for the statement of his ideals, which he lives by and which make him the great man he is; also to pay well deserved tribute to the magnificent area which he represents. I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a column of March 10, 1964, by the esteemed and learned editor emeritus of the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr. reporting on the speech by Congressman SIKES.

NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S GREATNESS

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

"West Florida has 400,000 residents and is moving powerfully ahead. It has problems

but is not afraid of them, because it can conquer them."

When Congressman BOB SIKES spoke recently before the Jacksonville Civitan Club he called history to his aid to supply an apt description of what has been developing in northwest Florida during the last past three or four decades.

He dug into the delightful little book, "When Man Comes to Himself," written by Woodrow Wilson while he was president of Princeton University and writing and talking his way into the Presidency of the United States.

It was a most appropriate illustration. Mr. SIKES is a man who knows extremely well the district he represents in Congress. He is thoroughly familiar with the magnificent terrain—its area for profitable crops and other products, its soil for a variety of crops, and its vast possibilities for recreational and tourist developments.

When he quoted the Wilsonian conclusion about what happens to a man "when he comes to himself," he knew what he was talking about.

"It is a very wholesome and regenerating chance which a man undergoes when he comes to himself," he quoted the distinguished educator-politician. It is not only after periods of recklessness or infatuation when he has played the spendthrift or the fool, that a man comes to himself.

"He comes to himself after experiences of which he alone may be aware: when he has left off being wholly preoccupied with his own powers and interests and with every petty plan that centers in himself; when he has cleared his eyes to see the world as it is, and his own true place and function in it.

Northwest Florida has learned from experience that there is no fixed time for a man to come to himself. This area of outstanding advantages has seen times which would be certain it seemed to bring periods of abnormally good times that would attract the world to its feet. But to no avail.

There was the Frisco era of about 40 years ago. The coming of the extension of the railroad to the port of Pensacola couldn't be seen as anything but the harbinger of greatness.

But the hopes of unheralded developments faded, and the people of that beautiful and attractive area speedily diminished.

Mr. SIKES is fully cognizant of all of this story. He knows northwest Florida from the pre-Civil War days, when that area was the summer tourist mecca for a large part of the South, when people moved to and from the shores in caravans.

The story of how the leaders in all walks of life put forth their utmost efforts to build northwest Florida into attractive greatness. He knows the story of their failures and their successes.

Now he sees the march forward of the change that promises to make of northwest Florida a land such as has been visualized down through the decades, which promises to fill the generations long beliefs and expectations.

In concluding his story of the greatness of the northwest Florida areas he tried to tell the Civitans that an area "rich in history has found itself and is moving powerfully forward," Mr. SIKES said.

He told a good story all right, but the feature which could be appropriately given a great deal more interest is what he said about problems, that northwest Florida has problems but is not afraid of them because it can conquer them.

That's the way good citizens of high character, belief in themselves and pride in their American heritage talk.

It is so very different from the man who came to be the president of one institution of higher learning 4 or 5 years ago.

The first freshman class he inducted he gave this advice:

If you don't find it profitable to labor in the territory where you are now engaged, pick up and move to where the grass is greener, and the going is easier.

This educator was brought to Florida as a character builder.

Mr. SIKES' idea is different from that. He knows that areas of greatness are those which are built by and on the character of intelligent, loyal human beings who love the land from which they sprang.

Love for one's true God and his fellowman is the thing that counts for most in life. Purity in heart is essential to the finding of the quality.

Address by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke Before South Carolina General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the members of the South Carolina General Assembly were privileged to have the former Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, as a guest speaker in the statehouse on March 3, 1964. Admiral Burke's very candid and eloquent remarks have drawn much praise in South Carolina. I am, therefore, pleased, Mr. President, to call to the attention of my colleagues two editorials on the admiral's remarks and also excerpts from his speech as reprinted in The State, of Columbia, S.C., on March 8, 1964.

One of the editorials is from The State of March 8, 1964, and is entitled "We Need To Know the Enemy." The other editorial is from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., on March 5, 1964, and is entitled "Burke's Good Counsel."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these articles be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Mar. 3, 1964]

THE RED THREAT—COMMUNISM EVALUATED

(By Arleigh A. Burke)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following excerpts are taken from a speech delivered March 3 before the South Carolina General Assembly by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, former active service, director of the Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University.)

WESTERN TRADE AIDS SOVIETS

In Europe, where there now prevails a healthy state of affairs from the economic point of view, we find that many of our traditional allies have policies at odds with ours. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, founded upon and once characterized by unity of outlook and singleness of purpose, has begun to loosen. We now find that our allies insist on selling buses, trucks, and equipment to our Communist enemies, and rationalize their actions by saying that failure to take advantage of the economic opportunities in the Communist world would mean financial loss. We sell wheat to the Soviet Union. It is easy to argue that buses and trucks and chemical plants have no military value, but only the naive will fail to see that to the extent Communist economics are relieved of having to utilize their scarce resources for the production of such equipment, the more able they will be to build up their aggressive military potentials, and the more able they will be to continue subversion and disruption on a worldwide basis.

WE FLOUNDER IN ASIA, AFRICA

In Asia our position has been badly eroded: Laos, South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Indonesia continue to be areas of great concern. Through lack of clarity and uncertainty of purpose, U.S. foreign policy has failed to protect this vulnerable area against the inroads of Communist tyranny.

On the continent of Africa, beset with primitive tribal disorder and great economic and political birth pangs, turmoil and not stability is the order of the day. In hitherto unimportant countries such as Zanzibar, Communist agitation has been blended with local and national unrest to produce a dangerous—some would say disastrous—situation.

As Chou En-lai's visit forcibly illustrates, Africa has become a major target for Communist penetration. Communist influence has already become an important factor in the anti-Western and anti-American policies with which we are now confronted in Africa. Proof of this is offered by the recent events in Zanzibar, where just a few Cuban-trained revolutionaries staged a bloody takeover, demonstrating their intention to turn that tiny island into an African Cuba—another Communist "people's republic."

NONPEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Anyone who analyzes the content of peaceful coexistence will soon find that it is but another complex strategy designed to bring about the capitulation of the West. The present leader of the Communist camp, the Soviet Union, has openly proclaimed the policy of peaceful coexistence, not because it desires peace with the Western World, but because it hopes to lull the West into a sense of false security, thus taking advantage of the inherent desires of the West for a genuine and lasting peace.

Far from having any relationship to the word "peace," peaceful coexistence is a Communist stratagem designed to carry the Communist revolution to the final overthrow of the free world and the establishment of a worldwide Communist rule. The Communists insist that the meaning of peaceful coexistence is that we renounce the use of force of any kind in opposing the Communist worldwide revolution.

DOUBLE DANGER FROM CUBA

From our problems in Cuba there are two basic lessons:

First, in a geographical as well as a strategic sense, it is of primary importance that the United States keep the waters of the Caribbean open to free world commerce and free from Soviet bases.

Second, and more important, the elimination of Communist governments from Latin America is the essential strategic objective to be achieved if this Nation and the whole hemisphere are to endure as we know them.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Mar. 8, 1964]

WE NEED TO KNOW THE ENEMY

Our survival—personal as well as political—may hinge on how thoroughly we study communism and its threat to freedom.

Here in South Carolina, as in much of the Nation, it is that study of communism which is needed if we and our successors are to withstand the continuing onslaughts against our Republic and the capitalist system. Patriotism and purpose are present in ample supply, but we need more preparation in terms of understanding the nature of the Communist conspiracy.

The South Carolina General Assembly was reminded of this need only a few days ago by one of the Nation's foremost defenders of the faith. Former Chief of Naval Operations, Arleigh A. Burke, called upon the lawmakers to give thought and action to task of making the next generation aware of its

responsibility in a dangerous world. He urged that attention to world affairs in general and the Communist threat in particular be given a high priority in the academic field.

That priority can be realized, he said, "by moving the teaching of international relations, of the contemporary challenge of communism, and of the economics of free enterprise into the center, not the sidelines, of the program for high school and college students."

Admiral Burke praised the work being done by the University of South Carolina through its Institute of International Studies. He was especially complimentary of the seminars conducted by the institute at this and other universities for the training of high school teachers of the social studies. (Just such a training course is scheduled again for the university in the coming summer, when attention will be devoted to the free enterprise system and the contrasts between democracy and communism.)

South Carolinians can be proud of the commendation from an American of Admiral Burke's stature, capacity, and manifest love of country. But we cannot rest on past or even present achievements. We must pursue even further the goal implicit in these words of the admiral:

"Understanding of the gravity and consequences of the Communist movement by the American people can be acquired only by education—factual, honest, objective education."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Mar. 5, 1964]

BURKE'S GOOD COUNSEL

Addressing the South Carolina General Assembly Tuesday, Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy (retired), urged a realistic U.S. policy toward Latin America.

Knowing Arleigh Burke's straightforward style, we are confident that he made a strong impression on the legislators. The admiral isn't a partisan of any cause other than the cause of the United States. He is independent and dedicated. The Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies that he heads is an intellectual powerhouse for a strong America.

Because of his record, Admiral Burke's counsel on Latin America commands respect. He contends that our country faces grave danger in the lands to the south. He told the general assembly that the "only answer is for the United States to establish a policy that we will not permit a Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Admiral Burke is not the kind of man to favor a quick finger on the trigger. He made clear that the intelligent application of limited force may be required to protect this Nation from mortal danger.

Many people have said much the same thing. Admiral Burke's temperate exposition of this truth, grounded in knowledge of the facts and the heavy responsibilities he has borne in war and peace, make his case for a strong policy toward Latin America especially compelling.

Wheat Sale Will Bring in Little Soviet Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we were given many reasons why the sale of wheat to Russia was a good thing. One of the most important, supposedly, was the fact that it would have a favorable effect on our gold reserves. Alice Widener, writing in the March 9, 1964, issue of the Washington Daily News, has a different idea. Under unanimous consent, I include her editorial at this point:

WHEAT SALE WILL BRING IN LITTLE SOVIET GOLD

(By Alice Widener)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk said in his major foreign policy speech to the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, February 25, that "from a Yankee trading viewpoint, we are not unhappy about swapping surplus foodstuffs for gold and hard currency which help to balance our international payments."

This statement calls attention to some generally held misconceptions which need clarifying.

Anent the sale of U.S. wheat by private American firms to the Soviet Union for gold, many Americans mistakenly believe that large amounts of gold actually will be deposited in our U.S. repositories and that our national gold holdings will thus be physically increased.

It is most unlikely, however, that even a few ounces of Soviet bullion will find their way into our home-owned gold stock.

The "Yankee benefit" to which Secretary Rusk refers is of a kind that results from making a double minus into a plus; that is, the U.S. taxpayer—subsidized sale of wheat to the Soviet Union for hard currency (dollars) will repatriate some U.S. dollars to our country and thereby lessen foreign demand for our gold.

SMALLER DEFICIT

In this way, there results a decrease in the deficit of our international payments. But this decrease, though tantamount to a gain, is a different kind of gain from that generally conceived in the literal sense by the layman.

Certainly, if a debtor reduces his debt he is better off. But he is not in the same good position as a person who does not owe at all and who is gaining assets.

As a matter of fact, it seems the for gold aspect of the U.S. wehat sale to the Soviet Union is mostly a figure of speech.

It also is arguable that Americans will not benefit as greatly in "Yankee trading" through direct wheat sales to the Soviet Union as they might have benefited from indirect sales through international merchants.

To pay for the U.S. wheat, the Soviet Union probably will sell gold in London and other markets outside the United States for a better dollar price than they could obtain if they sold gold directly to the U.S. Treasury.

INTO THE POOL

A certain amount of the Soviet gold will go into the London gold pool in which we own a share.

But all of this share will not be transferred into U.S. repositories; rather, most of it will be used for gold price stabilization and for sales of gold to other countries.

There is also a widely held misconception that the private firms selling wheat to the Soviets will receive Red gold which eventually will be transferred to Fort Knox and other U.S. repositories.

But our laws prevent American firms—except jewelers and certain industrial users of gold—from owning gold.

PAID IN DOLLARS

The American firms selling wheat to the Soviet Union will be paid in U.S. dollars owned or acquired by the Soviet Union.

Are U.S. paper dollars the same as gold?

If there occurs a grave national or international crisis of some sort—either financial or military—what will be the worth of paper dollars at the end of the credit period extended to the Soviets?

Moreover, as our gold reserves continue to dwindle and descend nearer and nearer to the mandatory 25-percent backing for our currency, will payment in paper dollars be the same as payment in gold?

Nothing is more complicated than international monetary problems and I don't pretend to be an expert on the subject. All I know about it is the layman's history lesson that gold—the actual physical untarnishable metal—is a good and safe financial asset which in times of crisis is the best one because it is internationally desired and accepted.

This is why the advanced nations of Western Europe today—wise in the troubled ways of this changing world—have sought and are continually seeking to increase their gold reserves.

Foreign Policy Strategy, Broadcast Editorial Over Station WBTV, Charlotte, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been much impressed with an editorial analysis of U.S. foreign policy as presented in a broadcast editorial over station WBTV in Charlotte, N.C., on March 6, 1964. The editorial is entitled "Foreign Policy Strategy."

I ask unanmious consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY

In a speech to a union labor citizenship conference, Secretary of State Dean Rusk tried to explain what some of our allies in Europe have been calling the double standard in American foreign policy.

Some of the embarrassing questions asked by these allies are: Why does the United States sell wheat to Russia and try to stop other nations from trading with Cuba? Why does this country continue to give large-scale aid to Yugoslavia, a demonstrated Communist ally of the Soviet Union? Why is similar aid given to Poland?

We find it very hard to agree with the Secretary's answers to some of these questions. It is difficult to see the difference between our sale of wheat to Russia and Britain's sale of buses to Cuba. In either case a Communist enemy is being helped.

The wheat sale to Russia is especially inconsistent. Since Khrushchev has apparently given up the hope of defeating the United States by military means, he has clearly indicated that his attack continues on the economic front. Yet the inability of the Socialist economy to feed its people is its most conspicuous failure, and it is right there that it may collapse and give the free world the victory. By selling wheat to the Soviet Union, we rush in to prop up our declared enemy at his weakest point.

Continued aid to Yugoslavia is equally puzzling. On every important issue in the United Nations Yugoslavia has without exception voted with the Soviet Union and against the United States.

Poland is another strange case. It is quite probable that the people of Poland wish they could side with the United States, but as long as the Gomulka regime is in power, the people will have nothing to say about it. The Polish vote, like Yugoslavia's, will go with the Soviet Union.

The Secretary stated three objectives of U.S. foreign policy: to prevent extension of the Communist Empire, to seek agreements that reduce the danger of war, and to encourage independence and open societies within the Communist world.

With these purposes we have no quarrel, but some of the means of attaining them seem to be self-defeating. On most fronts we are on the defensive. There is no assurance that any war, cold or hot, will be won with defensive tactics. When we move in to any international situation, we should go in to win or we should not go in at all.

General MacArthur's formula for any war is still good: There is no substitute for victory.

Speaker John W. McCormack: One of God's Noblemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very human, factual, and timely article appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of March 8, 1964. This article about our beloved Speaker illustrates the magnificent character, the staggering responsibility, and the outstanding human attributes of JOHN W. MCCORMACK—destined to be one of the greatest Speakers of the House this Nation has ever known. Mr. Speaker, you have brought a warmth of friendship to Washington, a cordiality to your office and a graciousness never yet equaled. Mr. Speaker, these intangible qualities of rare understanding, courtesy, and genuine concern for difficult and perplexing legislation make easier our insuperable tasks under the American system. Mr. Speaker, our Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, is a humble man of God and certainly one of God's noble men.

NO TUB THUMPER FOR JOHN MCCORMACK—SPEAKER RESTS ON HIS LAURELS

(By Wilfrid C. Rodgers)

WASHINGTON.—Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK holds the most thankless job in the Nation—and loves it.

A few months ago, the man who came off the South Boston streets to become the second most powerful man in the Nation, and next in the succession line to the Presidency, was being set up as the fall guy.

The administration's legislative program was having rough sledding in the House. The blame naturally fell on Speaker MCCORMACK.

This is part of the job, a facet that must irritate. But if it does, no one ever hears Speaker MCCORMACK complain.

Then the House acted. It took the lead in passing the biggest tax cut in the modern history of the Congress.

It pushed through a civil rights bill—the strongest in modern history.

And it isn't finished yet.

But who gets credit for this Herculean effort?

Not Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

It is a political peculiarity that when the same party controls the Executive as well as the Congress, blame for defeats tends to be placed on the Congress.

When victories in the legislative program are scored, the praise goes to the Executive.

But there is another major factor in this public blame and/or praise.

This is a city of tub thumpers.

It used to be that any freshman Congressman or Senator needed a strong assistant who knew politics and the folks back home.

This is still essential, but overshadowing such a staff set up these days is the need for a publicity man.

There are few freshmen Congressmen who don't have one.

Even lower echelon public servants make sure they have a staffer with public relations experience to put across the right image, to bluff off blame, to sing the praises of the incumbent.

But Speaker MCCORMACK is one of the few elected officials in the Nation's Capital who never has had and probably never will have an imagemaker, a publicity man of any kind.

He believes strongly that a man's record in Congress—whether he be a freshman or the Speaker of the House—is the longrun criterion of success.

Privately he has insisted since the present Congress first met that when the record was written, this House would go down in history as a great House.

President John F. Kennedy agreed with him. In fact, President Kennedy during his last public appearance in Boston, at the Democratic fundraising dinner at the armory, had a prepared speech saying just that and pinpointing JOHN MCCORMACK as the man who would make this Congress a great one.

But Senator TED KENNEDY, who introduced Speaker MCCORMACK, who in turn was to introduce President Kennedy, beat the President to the punch.

TED in his introduction of the Speaker said almost exactly what the White House had earlier released as the text of President Kennedy's speech.

When it became President Kennedy's turn to speak he had to speak off the cuff.

But his prepared remarks spoke his feelings.

President Johnson also appreciates the unpublicized work of Speaker MCCORMACK.

He knows that his political future may well be determined by the record chalked up by the Congress.

For this reason, and also because he and JOHN MCCORMACK are close friends, there is an intimate liaison between the two.

The pair run a neck-and-neck race as to who uses the telephone the most. And many of their telephone calls are to each other.

They both—having been close to the late Speaker Sam Rayburn—think alike politically. They both seem to thrive on long hours and hard work.

But when it comes to press agents, Speaker MCCORMACK puts his foot down.

He is as allergic to press agents as he is to answering personal letters through a secretary.

Speaker MCCORMACK still pens his own personal letters in a strong penmanship fashioned in the Boston public school system.

Ghana Foreign Aid a Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Star of March 11, and comes from the pen of Mr. Richard Wilson.

I am especially intrigued by the sentence in the headline, "Second Thoughts Seen Bothering Those Who Urged Volta Dam and Smelter." Well, unfortunately, second thoughts may be bothersome but they are not very useful in foreign affairs. It does little good to discover that we have put a Communist dictator on his feet and paid for another victory for Khrushchev and Mao. These little mistakes can never be recalled or straightened out after the event.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should take a good hard look at our State Department.

The article follows:

GHANA FOREIGN AID A MISTAKE—SECOND THOUGHTS SEEN BOTHERING THOSE WHO URGED VOLTA DAM AND SMELTER

(By Richard Wilson)

How foreign aid can go astray is being demonstrated in the West African Republic of Ghana. Some serious second thoughts are now bothering officials who insisted, against advice to the contrary, on building an aluminum smelting and power complex on the turbid Volta River in the former British colony.

It is too late to do anything about the Volta River dam itself. The construction is too far along. But it is not too late to reconsider the aluminum smelter facilities, and that is exactly what is now concerning both Government officials and the private aluminum interests whose financing the Government is guaranteeing in this project. Something around $100 million is involved in this part of the undertaking, backed up by the U.S. Government directly or indirectly.

President Kennedy would not credit those who tried to tell him that the government of Kwame Nkrumah was a godhead oligarchy denying commonly accepted human and political rights and growingly oriented to the Soviet Union. There was too much emotion involved. Nkrumah was an American-educated African who had risen to head a freed colony. We would help the colonially oppressed rise to new standards of life, aline Ghana with the United States and improve our position in all of Africa by this fine example of constructive American generosity.

But the project has gone sour because it is now evident, more than 2 years after the decision to go into it, that we are dealing with an authoritarian government which is increasingly hostile to the United States. The Nkrumah government is not merely uncommitted, it is decidedly cool to its benefactor. Nkrumah is no Nehru, and Ghana is not India.

One of the interesting aspects of the Ghana decision in the first place was the active interest of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who was a close adviser to his brother in all important affairs. There was a sort of Ghana cult. The Department of State printed and distributed laudatory propaganda documents about Ghana which sound ludicrous in the light of later events. Ghana was pictured as an African republic with increasing ties of friendship to the United States, and Nkrumah was a reformer fighting reactionary interests of his new country with broad popular support.

None of this characterization happens to be true. The Peace Corps has been invited—not officially, of course—to consider leaving Ghana. What the Peace Corps actually is doing there merely supplements the public school system and loads some of the cost of this Ghanaian function on the United States. Demonstrators have stormed the American Embassy. Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai has been given a lavish reception. The press of Ghana publishes a contant barrage of virulent attack on the United States. The New York Times reports

that diplomats in Accra "have concluded almost unanimously that the country is rapidly becoming an undisguised Marxist state."

The outlines of all this were visible 2 and 3 years ago and U.S. officials cannot claim they were not forewarned. If it is true that Ghana is a "second Cuba" or is "rapidly becoming an undisguised Marxist state," then we should recognize what we are doing. We are helping Ghana become a self-supporting member of the Communist bloc, and not merely the Moscow but the Peiping branch.

It may be, as some would argue, that Ghana's ties with communism will come unstuck, and that if we perserve we will finally emerge with a true friend. Any one who has been in Ghana cannot help having reason to believe, however, that the hostility toward the United States far transcends any temporary power alinements. Under the best of possible conditions our influence there may never be strong.

Are Fat Reds More Friendly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, which appeared March 10, 1964, entitled, "Are Fat Reds More Friendly?"

WE FEED OUR ENEMIES—ARE FAT REDS MORE FRIENDLY?

The British Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, in justifying increased trade with Cuba and the Soviet bloc, says contented Communists are easier to deal with than hungry ones.

That is a mischevious statement. A hungry Communist is one who has not the power or equipment to take what he wants or enforce his will on others.

So even the United States, let alone Great Britain and France, seems to be rushing headlong into trade deals with our avowed enemies, presumably to fill the bellies of their peoples and take the fight out of them.

President Johnson says he would be "very happy" to explore the possibility of increased trade with the Russians, though he leaves considerable confusion as to just what he means.

The "have-not" nations do not win modern wars against "have" nations, and countries without adequate resources cannot effectively sustain over long periods of time the economic, financial and subversive pressures needed to collapse the will and governments of their neighbors.

Red China is restrained by two things, the power of the United States and her own lack of development, not by whether her people are hungry or have full stomachs. The more progress Red China makes, the more dangerous will she become, not only in helping to maintain pressures on free countries but in direct military blackmail against the United States.

The Moscow newspapers are filled with the reports of economic weaknesses in their economy, of the almost paralyzing breakdown in their vast bureaucratic system, and the Soviet Union is buying wheat from the United States and hopes to buy fertilizer plants and much other industrial capacity from the Western nations.

So, while the Russians belly is partially empty, as you might say, the Russian bear offers the olive branch of peaceful coexistence.

What would be the attitude of the Soviet Union today, if it had the industrial and military capacity of the United States, and it had completely solved the bureaucratic puzzle by which it attempts to guide every single facet of a modern society?

You could be sure the United States would be challenged at every turn, and we would be fighting for our life against pressures that would seem to continually offer alternatives of war or retreat.

The trade that England and France are doing with Cuba, and their extension of long-term credits, indicate their conviction that Premier Fidel Castro will be around for a long time and the United States really is not going to do anything about it.

The Communists' bellies in Cuba are to be filled. Will a prosperous Cuba be less dangerous to her Latin neighbors than a rebellious, hungry one?

The Communist bear will have no compunctions about biting the hand that feeds him.

The Civil Rights March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, recently television station WBTV in Charlotte, N.C., presented an editorial relating to the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was done in connection with a threatened march on Charlotte by a group of supporters of the legislation.

The editorial is so well done that I desire that it be read by our colleagues and others throughout the United States. Therefore, under unanimous consent I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

For the same reasons that we opposed the march on Raleigh last year, we feel an obligation to express disapproval of the proposed march on Charlotte this Saturday by students and faculty members of nine neighboring colleges.

First, Government by intimidation of legislative bodies is alien to the American system of representative government.

Second, Charlotte offers no possible objective for such a demonstration.

But aside from these, the announced purpose of the march is to stimulate favorable sentiment, not for civil rights, but for the particular civil rights bill now before the U.S. Senate.

This bill in our opinion is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever to be considered by Congress. We get the impression, therefore, that those who intend to demonstrate in favor of it have not read it, or even a summary of it.

If the group planning this march were uneducated and irresponsible, their purpose might be understandable. But they are not. They are all people with education at the college level, for the planners include both students and faculty members.

This bill calls for one of the most sweeping grants of power ever made to the Federal Government. This grant would not be made by the legitimate means of amendment but by simple legislation based on distortion of certain conveniently vague phrases of the Constitution. We suggest that those planning the march pause long enough to read both the civil rights bill and the Constitution of the United States.

Some of the Federalist papers would also make good reading for any who plan to demonstrate in favor of this bill that would destroy more rights than it would protect.

The interstate commerce clause, which was intended to grant power to regulate commerce among the States, would be used as a weapon to force compliance with the public accommodations section. Any student of government can see the possibilities for unchecked tyranny in that provision.

Vicious as that clause is, it is mild compared with the paragraph that makes any person, business, or institution receiving Federal aid in any form, directly or indirectly, subject to the regulations of the bill. When you consider the number of agencies dispensing Federal money, you can see how far-reaching this part of the bill would be.

Our Negro citizens have been winning many rights. From all indications, they will continue to win more. To sharply reduce the total heritage of rights for which they are fighting is a strange contradiction. If this bill passes, the first-class citizenship they long for will not mean nearly as much as it does now. We urgently suggest that, before these students and faculty members embark on such an ill-advised plan, they go to the library and bone up on what it is all about.

The Railroad Crisis Is Back To Plague Congress Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, when Congress for the first time in history tried to invoke compulsory arbitration upon the railroads and the railroad unions of our Nation a few months ago, I voted against this bill because I thought that it was the first step in the direction of compulsory arbitration and that it really would not solve the problem that was facing our Nation.

The developments which have taken place since that time have verified my beliefs and this same struggle is now back to plague Congress again. If it were not for the intervention of Congress, it is my opinion that this struggle might have been resolved long before this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks a letter from some of the leaders of the largest railroad operating unions:

MARCH 10, 1964.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For more than 4 years the railroad operating unions and the Nation's railroads have been embroiled in a national dispute over work rules. The railroad corporations threatened to set off a national transportation tie-up by forcing changes in working conditions and earnings on the 200,000 men who man the trains. To avoid a national crisis, Congres enacted a compulsory arbitration law covering two of the

issues—locomotive helpers (firemen) and crew consist—and also prescribed a 6-month negotiating period for the other issues involved.

The compulsory arbitration board established by Public Law 88-108 instituted procedures to eliminate 50,000 jobs of firemen, brakemen, and switchmen. Savings to the railroad corporations would run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually, according to the companies' figures. The impact on our economy from loss of these 50,000 jobs is disturbing to contemplate.

Arbitration proceedings dealt only with the major manning questions. The other issues, which too frequently were termed "secondary" remain unsettled after 6 months of negotiations at the national level under the law. The other issues involve such basic money items as paid holidays, overtime, expenses away from home, night shift differential pay, and inequities in earnings. It is paradoxical that such issues should defy settlement at a time when the Dow-Jones rail stock average is at an alltime high; railroad profit statements glow with record earnings; and, prospects for the future were never brighter.

The carriers' hope for a further windfall, if the dispute could be forced back to Congress, explains why these remaining issues have gone unsettled. Railroad management representatives now await an excuse to force the dispute back to Congress for more compulsion.

Compulsory arbitration has been a pleasing experience for the corporations, although it is inconsistent with their policy of less governmental regulation. Management's desire for more compulsion is seen in the summary rejection by the carriers of every concerted and individual move by the organizations toward settlement. For 6 months, the unions, meeting as a unit, tried to reach a national settlement with railroad representatives. The only result was a management suggestion that settlement be delayed and another commission established.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen tried to meet separately with the carriers, but was rebuffed. The carriers also refused to join with the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen to send the issues back to local properties for settlement.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen submitted a settlement proposal February 17, prior to the time the law expired. Management told the National Mediation Board that it would not even meet with the unions involved to discuss this proposal which had been advanced at the suggestion of the Mediation Board.

The Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen also submitted a proposal for settlement and was similarly rebuffed.

The Switchmen's Union of North America advised that it was ready to make substantial movement toward a settlement. The Switchmen's Union of North America move was rejected.

Clearly, the issues are stalled by a willfully constructed wall of adamancy. Joint handling at the national level brought only suggestions for delay from the railroads. Separate proposals for individual attempts for settlement were likewise rejected. The carriers' unconscionable refusal to bargain forces upon the organizations the burden of exploring new approaches to a solution of these issues.

It is our purpose, with this letter, to advise Members of Congress that we will seek to establish procedures for settling all outstanding issues without involving Congress and in an effort to preserve free collective bargaining. Should any small "brush fires" result, the carriers may attempt to enlarge them and to precipitate again a national crisis.

It is our firm resolve, however, not to initiate a national transportation crisis.

Very truly yours,

H. E. GILBERT,
President,
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

NEIL P. SPEIRS,
President,
Switchmen's Union of North America.

ROY E. DAVIDSON,
Grand Chief Engineer,
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

LOUIS J. WAGNER,
President,
Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen.

Real American Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the New York Daily News appeared the following expressions of opinion which I should like to share with my colleagues:

THE INQUIRING FOTOGRAPHER

(By Jimmy Jemail)

THE QUESTION

If you were President Johnson, what would you do to reverse the series of defeats we are suffering all over the world?

Where asked: Bronx Kiwanis Club.

THE ANSWERS

S. Peter La Rosa, West Hempstead, attorney: "First, we should have a consistent foreign policy, something we've never had. It should be in the hands of career diplomats, not political appointees. These men have spent their lives in the diplomatic service. They know the score. And we should rid the State Department of pinkos."

Brig. Arthur Crayton, Salvation Army: "Perhaps we should reaffirm our faith in God. George Washington prayed on his knees, but we are not allowed to say prayers in public schools. Speaking personally and not as a Salvation Army official, I would rather see this country risk a nuclear war than accept the godless life of communism."

Donald A. Kroner, Hartsdale, N.Y., president, Bronx Kiwanis: "The average citizen must make himself heard. All of us are fed up with the losing fight against communism. We should let Congress know how we feel. We are not afraid. This was proved when President Kennedy mobilized our armed forces. The country backed him 100 percent."

Harold L. Fischler, North Woodmere, executive: "We must forget appeasement and get back to the American way. History has repeatedly shown that appeasement usually leads to war. Our foreign policy has been in the hands of political appeasers. The United States is sneeringly called a paper tiger. We deserve it. I'm tired of turning the other cheek."

Joseph I. Wolfe, Grand Concourse, auto dealer: "Adopt a more realistic foreign policy. The hell with the so-called American image. We're afraid of offending world opinion, so everyone slaps us down, knowing we'll turn the other cheek. I'm sure Americans will back the administration in any force it uses."

Fred N. Dagavar, Pelham Manor, TV dealer: "First, reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine. Then blockade Cuba and stop all commerce, even the English buses. Allow only food and medicine to go in. Step up the war in Vietnam and win it. If we win in these two areas, things will fall in line. Even De Gaulle will stop snooting us."

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Charles Visits Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently we were fortunate in the visit to Greenville, Tex., of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force—Installations and Logistics—the Honorable Robert H. Charles. While visiting Texas, Mr. Charles toured one of the major industries in my district, the Temco Aerosystems Division of Ling-Temco-Vought. On March 5, 1964, he was the guest of the Greenville Chamber of Commerce at their annual banquet meeting.

Mr. Charles brings a wealth of experience in industry to his present assignment as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, and we greatly appreciated the opportunity for him to visit industries in the State of Texas. His remarks at the banquet were particularly fitting, and I wish to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT H. CHARLES, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS)

The annual meeting banquet of the Greenville Chamber of Commerce is an exciting and fitting climax to a day of touring important and interesting industrial activities and, as we say in Pentagonese, being briefed on the job being done. I have been in that large ringed building for 3 months now, and I am still being briefed about 110 percent of my waking hours. I did not say working hours, nor did I say how many hours I was awake during my working day.

And this gives me the opportunity to tell you what an important position I hold. I'm just a country boy from the Middle West, and so I was pretty impressed with everything—particularly me—when the President of the United States appointed me to a position where the prefix before my name is "Honorable." Even the boys back home were impressed. They had an article on the front page of the local newspaper, complete with a large likeness of me which I had, with great prescience, provided them. But Washington—my that's a sophisticated city. I rushed home, panting, on the day of the announcement, to see the paper. I couldn't find anything on the first runthrough and, believe me, after finding nothing on the front page, that runthrough was pretty thorough. Finally, my 14-year-old boy, who has better vision for small print, found it. Here it is on page 19 of the Washington Star. I'd like to read it to you.

Now I'll be serious for a while. But don't count on it lasting forever.

One thing I like about Texans is that you people are not in the least hesitant about showing off your wares or talking about them. What I saw today was most impres-

sive. Coming from Texas, there is no wonder President Johnson thinks big; there was no wonder that your own Mr. Sam thought big; There is no wonder RAY ROBERTS (Honorable, that is) thinks big. Unless one does, there is no way to cope with the bigness that is Texas or the important accomplishments of people and the organizations you create here. I am also much impressed by the fact that Greenville has grown more since 1950 than it grew during the previous 50 years. You see I have been doing my homework.

Things do not just happen; men make them happen. This is more than apparent in your city. This outstanding growth not only in population but in all the things needed to make a city modern—schools, churches, hospitals, parks, recreation facilities, modern retail establishments, thriving industrial concerns—came to Greenville because you people worked together, particularly in your chamber of commerce, to make sure your city prospered as it grew.

I am a chamber of commerce man myself. I have worked on many committees of the chamber in my hoemtown, St. Louis, and have served on the board of directors of both the St. Louis City and St. Louis County chambers. I believe in the work a chamber of commerce does. I know that planning for the future—for tomorrow, next week, next month, next year, and 10 years from now—is important. Without this planning, communities cannot have an orderly growth. We must look to the future—we must plan for it—it is important because, as Charles Kettering once said, "I must be interested in the future because that is where I'm going to spend the rest of my life."

No community can be built and planned by one man. It takes the planning and action of many people. It takes an organization. In the case of community planning and development, organizations like the chamber of commerce.

And the very moment you drive through a city you can tell what its citizens have made of it. It is either pale and wan or it is robust, dynamic, and vital; and in either instance, you can find the chamber behind the complexion of the city.

True as in community planning is planning for our future airpower. What has been done is history but what must be done is in the future. And since my present job is with the Air Force, I am certain that you will expect me to tell you something of how the Air Force is conducting its business of maintaining the world's greatest deterrent force.

Recently, Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert made a speech in which he outlined 10 elements that must be taken into account by those responsible for the construction of our military forces and the application of our military power.

This was a major policy statement on the part of the Secretary and early in the speech he said, "The real problem is to measure the whole force—all the weapon systems—against the requirement. But defining the requirement is not easy. That is when you have to go beyond and behind all the panacea prescriptions. You must be certain that you have defined the mission before you try to select the hardware. In simple terms, you have to decide what you want to do with your military forces." I might add, what you want to do and how.

The 10 elements are: arms control, crisis management, deterrence, flexibility, controlled response, multiple options, survivability, damage limitation, threshold of negotiation, and termination capability. Each of these, as Mr. Zuckert pointed out, is different but to some degree overlapping. They are not all new concepts but they are being brought together and used in a new way to determine what future forces might be like in line with the kind of analysis of the Defense Department is now making.

By way of a short explanation of each of these elements, "arms control" means we must provide for forces that are not dependent on nuclear testing or any other type of restrictions to which we as a nation may agree. Similarly, these forces must possess built-in assurance against accidental, unauthorized, or premature ue. Of great importance is that they be stabilizing, in effect, and not provocative either because of vulnerability or other characteristics.

The second element, "crisis management," is related to arms control. It provides the ability to keep any crisis, even an intense and long-lasting one, from exploding into war. It is intended to prevent low intensity conflict from escalating into higher dimensions of war, and requires military forces with specific warning and response capabilities. A carefully tailored military power, sound nerves, and good intelligence are required.

Our primary national objective is "deterrence" of war, whether general war or a lesser conflict. To insure deterrence, we must maintain our ability to discourage an aggressor from starting war, at any level, because of our obvious strength to crush it. Topmost on the list is strategic nuclear deterrence. Our first need, and we have it, is a force great enough to inflict unacceptable damage upon an aggressor who initiates nuclear attack. On the other hand, we don't want to be caught with no choice but all-out nuclear response, and have to be prepared to respond at a lower level of war, or to a lesser provocation than nuclear attack. So, other capabilities or qualities to handle cases of aggression other than nuclear must be built into our force. Several such qualities are needed and they make up the remaining seven items of the list.

The first of these, and the fourth of the 10 elements, is "flexibility." This is possessing the capability to be flexible in the use of our forces; to be able to deploy forces anywhere in the world to meet the full range of possible crisis situations of war requirements, from brush skirmishes to general war. It means: Fit the forces to the job.

Closely associated with flexibility is "controlled response." Maintaining military forces to keep the peace makes no sense unless we possess the ability to adapt our military response to the requirement. It is difficult to state this need better than Secretary Zuckert did when he said, "We must be able to respond at a predetermined level of intensity and quantity of force in order to retain initiative and press for settlement of issues on freedom-serving and peace-building terms."

But we must have a choice of forms of response. We must have "multiple options" built into the forces providing alternate target plans, ability to change the target on command, multiple delivery systems including manned and unmanned vehicles, selectivity of the kind of strike and the targets and versatility of employment in both our strategic and tactical missions.

No. 7 on the list is "survivability." Survivability of our forces and weapons systems is needed for deterrence to be credible, and must be real to provide defense. It covers prelaunch protection against nuclear attack, and the ability to penetrate defenses. It includes immunity to sabotage, clandestine operations, and capture.

To maintain peace through military power requires an element "damage limitation." It calls for the ability to limit damage inflicted on the enemy by us, or on us by the enemy. We must be accurate in our targeting on the enemy and must have defensive systems which neutralize their weapons at a safe distance. In addition to passive defense measures, we must know exactly how much damage we have inflicted on the enemy. Striking at enemy military forces and not population centers results in a certain amount of damage limitation.

A new term in the field of military requirements and planning is "threshold of negotiation." In Mr. Zuckert's words, "It reflects determination to stop war at the lowest point of intensity on favorable terms." It is based on knowing what those terms should be and in acknowledging that destruction of an enemy is not the objective. It is based on the fact that unrestrained warfare is unfavorable to both sides—militarily, politically and socially.

To stop a war, we must be capable of doing so. This is the last point on the list, "termination capability." According to the military planners, it implies that our forces will still be able to fight after being hurt and able to counter escalation at each higher level of intensity with increased power. Forces must be under control at all times and have the intelligence capability to insure initiative at the proper time as well as provision to assume posthostility responsibilities.

Air Force planning is now adjusted to meet its responsibility in all of these things. While maintaining the greatest striking force in the world, much is being accomplished to assist the Army in its tactical missions. Greater cargo- and troop-moving air fleets are being built to permit, not only the Air Force, but our other military forces to be where they are needed and when, any place on the globe. We are continuing our development of missiles, and our space efforts. We are not now facing any gaps, nor do we intend to in the future.

There is another element, not in the planning of our forces, but in the way in which we acquire our military hardware, that I would like to touch upon; and I think it is particularly appropriate in view of the large percentage of your activity which is devoted to the development and production of military hardware.

But before getting into this subject, I should first give you my credentials for doing so. I am an expert in the field of materiel—in procurement—in negotiation. My background in these areas is impressive. For over 18 years, I was with McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and during that entire period, I was constantly involved in the negotiation of major contracts with the Air Force and Navy. This was my specialty, if you will.

I cannot recall winning one negotiation. Now don't get the idea that my expertise is limited to the negotiation of Government contracts. I went to Yale. In fact, I spent 7 years there. I had a tougher time getting through than most. And each fall, as Connecticut College for Women kicks the winning point after touchdown—that is, if they need to—I keep wondering why I went to Yale. But last fall, I decided to put my superior negotiating skill to work. I was tired, every year, of losing a bundle on the Yale-Princeton game. And last fall, Princeton was known to be better than Yale by at least three touchdowns. So genius struck. The week before that game, Princeton was to play Harvard. Well, Harvard had beaten Dartmouth by 4 points and so had Yale. This obviously made Harvard and Yale equal. So I wheedled my Princeton tormenters into the following proposition: whatever differential there was in the score of the Harvard-Princeton game would be reflected in our Princeton-Yale bet. It was a natural. Princeton would beat Harvard by about 28 points, and I would end up with bets on Yale plus 28 points when Yale played Princeton. Well, the Harvards turned out to be the geniuses rather than I. Instead of losing by 28 points, they beat Princeton by 14. The rest is history. It was as if Navy had spotted Texas 14 points. I won't mention any other service academy game.

You see before you the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations and Logistics—an expert in negotiation—the only Yale man who, last fall, gave any points to Princeton. But we experts are stalwart men. Ever since then, I have been balancing a lightweight wallet with a stiff upper lip.

Now that I have established my expertise, let me discourse learnedly on a favorite Pentagon subject these days and I will be serious again for a while: $50 billion is what we are currently spending each year for defense and about half of this is spent in acquiring aircraft, missiles, ships, tanks, etc. This procurement thus represents about 25 percent of our national budget. It represents over 4 percent of our gross national product. By any standard, it is enormous. And it is our duty, while acquiring the things we need for our defense, to do so as economically as possible. Many of you are familiar with what we are doing to this end. For example, we are using cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts as rarely as possible because this type of contract, where the profit is fixed at the beginning of the contract and is not affected by whether the contractor does well or poorly, is not conducive to an atmosphere of fiscal responsibility. We estimate that the taxpayer loses 10 percent on each such contract. But more important, we are trying to get competition into our procurement; and on this we estimate that the taxpayer saves 25 percent as compared to noncompetitive procurement. I know these estimates are hard to prove, because you don't perform a contract on one basis and then redo it on the other. But there is some pretty hard evidence to prove the thesis.

I had personal experience with one, and I will describe it. The dollars I will mention are a ratio of the actual amounts, to protect the innocent. Because of the time urgency of this particular item, the Government sought to get it from the only company whom they thought could deliver within this tight time schedule. The lowest figure we could get out of this company was $18 million. We were just about to sign the contract when another separate element in the overall system was delayed, and this gave us time to obtain competition. So what happened? The company with which we were negotiating reduced its price; but another competitor bid $13.6 million. The reduction was 24 percent. Looked at another way, the noncompetitive price was 32 percent higher than the competitive price. I might add, lest I be misunderstood, that both companies were oldline reliable outfits who had been the leading companies in their field for decades. I should also add that the winner of this competition is doing a fine job on this work and is making a profit. So you can draw your own conclusions.

And why should he expect it to be otherwise? Competition is one of the cornerstones of our abundant economy. The emphasis on competition and on incentives are, to me, the two most important factors which set our system apart from most other economies. Unlike Europe (at least until recently) and many other areas, we have antitrust laws instead of cartels, and free trade instead of tariffs between States. Freedom from cartels and tariffs, both of which represent serious constraints on competition, have for decades given American industry the advantage of being forced to be efficient. The effect of competition is nothing new. As pointed out in "The Agony and the Ecstasy," one of the primary spurs to the greatness of both Michelangelo and Da Vinci lay in their running competition with each other. The absence of competition leads not only to poor work and high price, but even more important, to a shutting of the door on new ideas. Without it, you simply do not know what the other fellow can do, either with respect to quality, reliability, delivery schedule, or price.

I know that any statement concerning the marvelous abundance of the American economy is subject to challenge. But, like the old southern judge (non-Texan) who was often in error but never in doubt, let me say that our emphasis on competition and incentives is responsible, perhaps more than anything else, for the abundance. Surely, we are not abler people than exist elsewhere. After all, most of us are descendants, to quote Emma Lazarus, of the "wretched refuse" of some other "teeming shore." Surely, we are no longer a frontier nation in the physical sense. Nor is it greater natural resources. What distinguishes our economy is our reliance on those twin stars of a free market—the Gemini (blue, that is) of our economy—competition and incentives.

Now, why am I telling you how well we are spending your money? In reality, I am not.

I am leading up to telling you how you can help. It is this. Roughly half of the dollars we spend with industry; that is, with the prime contractors like Ling-Temco-Vought, are in turn spent by those companies with subcontractors and other suppliers. And, in turn, a sizable portion of that half is spent with subcontractors, and so forth. So our efforts to procure at the lowest sound price represent only half the battle, even in the procurement area. And I strongly suspect that defense industry has not yet given the attention it should to this area. I can only look in the mirror as a case in point. For over 18 years, I was associated with a prime defense contractor. And although I was in a position to do so, I did not pay too much attention to the buying end of the business. Now that I have something to do with the procurement of over $10 billion per year—which makes me quite a procurer—I view this end of the business quite differently. I urge you in Ling-Temco-Vought to do likewise—to get competition to the maximum extent, to challenge the person who, quite honestly and sincerely, asserts that there is only one company who can do a certain job. When challenged, more often than not, this assertion proves false.

One final thought. Perhaps the most important team we have at our disposal is the team of industry, Air Force, and community, joined together to insure we will maintain our position of strength—military strength to insure the peace.

Cooperation of this kind has done much to make of Greenville the city it is today. Do not for a minute think I'm not aware of the industrial activity and its value to your city, which is in no way connected with the military. The fact remains, however, that of the some 4,000 factory employees in Greenville, over half of them are employed by Temco Aerosystems Division of Ling-Temco-Vought.

Here are some interesting facts on the activities of Temco Aerosystems in Greenville. From 1952 through 1963, their total sales were $197 million; 99 percent of these sales were to the Air Force. During that same time, their total payroll was $98.3 million. For the years 1961, 1962, and 1963, their average yearly payroll was approximately $13 million for 2,500 to 3,000 employees.

In 1950, the total yearly industrial payroll in Greenville was $2.2 million, but in 1961 it had grown to $20.4 million and the estimate for 1963 is $24 million. During this same period of time, 1952 through 1963, your retail sales have jumped nearly $10 million a year, from $26.9 million to an estimated $36 million. The Ling-Temco-Vought plant has provided over half of your total industrial payroll each year, and it, along with other industry, the improved farm economy and, I suspect, some increase resulting from your enviable location in a recreational area, have been responsible for these impressive and enviable figures. They came as a result of the community cooperating with a firm having the technical knowledge and ability to build a plant which could produce things needed by the Air Force. And we have all benefited. We in the Air Force, because we got things we needed, the company and its employees because they could produce them, and the city because of what the activity did for its size, position, and economy.

I understand there have been other benefits resulting from this teamwork; for example, the increase in the length of the runways at Major Field from 5,500 feet to 8,000 feet. This gave the city a fine airport, it gave Temco a better facility in which to function, and it gave the Air Force a better product because Temco could function better.

So, ladies and gentlemen, it has been my great privilege to be with you tonight and to speak at this annual meeting banquet of your chamber of commerce. I congratulate the new officers and wish them luck in their new jobs and the retiring officers for the fine job they have done. I congratulate the entire city for the job it is doing through its chamber.

Education in Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the hardships of the unemployed and the elimination of depressed and poverty-stricken areas are problems of grave concern facing the American people today. In my opinion, the war on poverty must be fought on the battlefield of education. This was the basic recommendation laid down in the Galbraith plan and included in the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission.

Unless we get at the real root of the trouble which is basically one of ignorance and lack of education, it is foolhardy to believe that the poverty enemy can be overcome. Willard L. Hawkins, superintendent of schools in Garrett County in my district, has written an excellent analysis of this situation and the need for educational opportunities in the poverty-stricken areas. Superintendent Hawkins writes from experience since Garrett County lies within the boundaries of the Appalachian region. I believe my colleagues will find his article, "Education in Appalachia," of interest and submit it here to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EDUCATION IN APPALACHIA

(By Willard L. Hawkins)

"I do not believe you can find poverty in any community in the world where the people are educated." This is the essence of a statement by Mr. John Galbraith, economic adviser to the late President Kennedy. Conversely it is doubtful if there can be found prosperity in a community where the people are uneducated. The Appalachian area represents all or some portion of 10 States involving approximately 15 million people. It is not exactly a homogeneous area. There are geograhpic and industrial differences as well as differences in economic potential. The differences range from the Pittsburgh metropolitan area of nearly a million people to Dawson County, Ga., with 1,200 people, calling for different solutions to different problems.

But there are more likenesses than differences among these people as shown in the very excellent report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, headed by

Mr. John L. Sweeney. The No. 1 uniform finding of the Commission was the relatively low level of educational and vocational achievement of the people. The other findings of the Commission no doubt stem from this fact and relate to the high infant mortality, the lack of adequate employment services, the lack of adequate educational and recreational facilities and programs, the dependence upon welfare payments for family incomes, the high rate of absenteeism in employment due to disabling illnesses, the lack of adequate public libraries or none at all, the low standard of sanitation, and others. For these conditions the people of this area should not generally be condemned. Theirs is a condition that has resulted from lack of opportunity for needed education and training and one that has worsened over the years as they have been hard put to cope with their changing and declining economy based upon the once-prosperous coal, timber, and agriculture industries.

Through the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and other organizations of lesser magnitude efforts are being made to appraise the needs and conditions of the people of Appalachia and to take steps on numerous fronts to improve the economic welfare of this large underprivileged segment of our society. Whatever the needs might be for immediacy in improving the living standards of these people there is not likely to be any long term or permanent solution to the problems faced by them other than through appropriate and adequate education. This applies in particular to the young who are now in school as well as those who will be in school in the years to come. It applies also to many young adults who could profit by additional and appropriate educational opportunities. Here we must think of the best educational programs that top leadership and adequate funds can provide. We must replace where such conditions prevail, the poorly trained teacher with the Nation's lowest salary scale, the inadequate and outmoded buildings, the poorly equipped classrooms, the lagging curriculum, the lack of vocational training, the lack of adequate guidance and library programs, the lack of opportunities for higher education for those who can profit by it, and any other limiting factors with conditions just opposite from these that will result in the best in education for people who need it most.

Here the need is for a broad educational program ranging from kindergarten through the public junior college. Here the need is for special schools for the physically and mentally handicapped, for vocational schools for both boys and girls, for public junior colleges for the boys and girls with academic ability, and for schools for adults. The need is for school plants and equipment to replace the obsolete. The need above all is for the best salary scale to attract the Nation's best teachers and educational leaders who might bring to these communities a new inspiration for learning and one that will put a new price tag on the value of education to the individual and the community.

In the war on poverty which President Johnson so commendably proposes to wage, nothing is likely to produce the reward that will come from lifting the educational level of the people living in the areas of poverty in this Nation. Whatever is spent wisely in the field of education will be harvested many times over through the development of human resources that will increasingly enable these people to become productive and contributing members of our society.

Any program for an all-out attack on illiteracy and the lifting of educational standards throughout all Appalachia calls for both money and leadership. The time has perhaps arrived when the school administrators throughout Appalachia should come together in a meeting motivated by a common cause, that the children in this area shall have educational opportunities just as good as the children in the most economically favored communities of our country. An organized effort on the part of the many school leaders represented in the Appalachian area should prove to be most fruitful. The war on poverty must be fought mainly with dollars on the educational front. Just as the federally impacted areas, or the colleges in their quest for construction funds, or school districts needing vocational education aid, or schools receiving NDEA appropriations look to the Federal Government for funds, so must the school districts of Appalachia look to the Federal Government for funds adequate in amount to provide the educational opportunities so badly needed throughout this area. This would seem to be our surest way of converting this vast area from one of a national economic liability to one of a national economic asset, and of providing these people with opportunities for happier, fuller, and more fruitful lives. This would seem to be the surest way to win the war on poverty. Isn't it about time we get started?

Legion Post Stimulates Youth Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many organizations sponsor and encourage athletic activities for the young people of the Los Angeles area, and I would like to commend three of these groups in particular today.

Under the auspices of the Farmers Insurance Group American Legion Post 707, and cosponsored by the Southern California Grocers Association and Pepsi-Cola bottlers, a baseball tournament will be held this year during the Easter vacation.

This tournament goes beyond the scope of the regular little league type baseball and I think my colleagues will find the project of interest.

Conducted by International Junior Baseball, Inc.—a youth movement of 7,000 boys, managers, and coaches—the Easter tournament will send a top ranking team of 12-year-old boys to play in a grand championship playoff with a team from the State of Washington. This later event will take place in the Los Angeles Coliseum on July 4, 1964, prior to the American Legion fireworks show.

The winning team from the championship July 4 game will be rewarded with an all-expense paid trip to Hawaii as guests of American Legion Post 707.

Mr. Speaker, I think all parties to this most worthy project are deserving of mention. I am sure the President will be delighted to see his urging of more athletic activities for young people taken so seriously in Los Angeles, and I hope cities and towns in other parts of the country will consider similar programs.

American Legion Post 707, the Southern California Grocers Association, and the Pepsi-Cola bottlers have been commended in resolutions passed by both the city and county of Los Angeles. I know many of my colleagues will also wish to express their admiration for this youth project. excellent article on the subject was en by Paul Zimmerman and printed in the Los Angeles Times on January 15, 1964. I reprint that article at this time for the further information of those interested in youth activities:

TEENAGERS IN EASTER EVENT

(By Paul Zimmerman)

Now a new touch is being added to teenage baseball.

Under the auspices of International Junior Baseball, Inc., a nonprofit organization, a southern California tournament is going to be held during Easter vacation for teams made up of 12-year-old boys.

The goal for the victorious team is a game in the coliseum July 4 as a part of the big fireworks show there. Dick Pittenger, director of special events for the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, which stages the show, made the announcement Tuesday.

The local champions will go up against a representative from the State of Washington for a trophy put up by Casey Stengel, manager of the New York Mets, and a trip to Hawaii.

This game feature of the Legion fireworks show is not new, but the Easter tournament is, and Pittenger envisions a national championship in the coliseum in the not too remote future.

The Southern California Grocers Association and the local Pepsi-Cola bottlers have agreed to cosponsor the teams in the Easter tournament to select the champion through elimination play.

LOST BY SHUTOUT

"We decided on this program to strengthen southern California's chances," said Pittenger, "after the visiting Washington team pinned our ears back, 9 to 0, a year ago."

Why 12-year-old players?

"Surveys show that is the age when young ballplayers really become coordinated," said Pittenger, "and before they move into more mature phases where youngsters begin to lose their enthusiasm for this type of competition."

Pittenger organized the first 12-year-old game as a part of the Legion's coliseum July 4 show 4 years ago, bringing a Honolulu police-sponsored team here to face a southern California group.

Featured on the Hawaii team was a girl pitcher, Casey Ishamoto. She was such a sensation that national magazines featured her across the land.

"That was our first and last girl," said Dick. "We're growing up now. A national championship will be next."

A Small Businessman Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, although it remains to be seen what action Congress will take on the proposals to lower the workweek to 35 hours, H.R. 3102, and the double overtime bill, H.R. 9802, I believe it is our duty to refer both bills to one of our semiactive investigating committees for internment in a manner not unlike the Domestic Peace Corps, ZIP code numbers, and other ill-advised

theoretical schemes that are best remembered for their ability to incite adverse public comment.

One of my very substantial constituents, who employs a dozen men or so, has, I believe, expressed the sentiment of the small businessman on H.R. 3102 in a manner which is both amusing and alarming. He writes:

The 35-hour week bill, H.R. 3102, if passed would throw at least one-half of the small businessmen out of business. In order to organize and administer a 35-hour week, the small businessman would have to work 70 to 80 hours, so we figure why bother, liquidate, get a job ourselves causing more unemployment and maybe a 15-hour week. Nice dream?

Let's Pretend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent editorial, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier points to several examples of how leftwing intellectuals and State Department officials play the dangerous game of "Let's Pretend." As the Courier explains, these individuals promote the great delusion that everything is all right throughout the world, when in fact U.S. foreign policy has been a dismal failure. The Courier editorial reads as follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY BRINGS ONLY FAILURE

"We had in Dallas a graphic demonstration of what our opponent's philosophy can do to a twisted mind grown sick upon it," Allan Drury says in the current issue of the Reader's Digest.

"Communism," he notes, "has been spreading hatred and violence for almost 50 years. Yet despite the steadily mounting evidence of its nature, there have been many Americans, some in very influential positions, who have desperately pretended that the Communist conspiracy is just a nice group of misguided people with whom we can get along if we keep treating them with decency—a decency they cannot understand and do not respect."

Drury's article is entitled, "The Dangerous Game of 'Let's Pretend.'" And it is a game that is played in far more instances than Drury cites.

For example, great emphasis has been placed on the claim that President Kennedy in 1962 made the Soviet Union back down during the Cuban missile crisis. In retrospect, however, it is clear that the Soviet Union obtained exactly what it wanted—a U.S. guarantee not to invade Cuba. Thus, the Communists have obtained the Western Hemisphere base for subversion which they desired. Yet we continue to pretend that this was a great American victory.

Furthermore, we like to pretend that aid to pro-Communist rulers around the world is justified because it keeps them from joining the Communist bloc outright. Yet the petty tyrant, Sukarno, is preparing to launch a war in southeast Asia by attacking the new Malaysian Federation. It is impossible to see how he could be more anti-American if no aid at all had been given.

We like to pretend that a conciliatory policy will win friends among agitators. Yet the decision to permit the Panamanian flag to fly over American territory in the Canal Zone probably did more to encourage Panamanian agitators than anything else we could have done.

We like to pretend that every new nation in Africa is prepared for parliamentary democracy and that savages will quickly become devoted to constitutional government. But the record shows that this concept merely opens the way for Communist subversion, replacing the old colonialism by a Communist dictatorship.

These and other great delusions are promoted by an influential group of leftwing intellectuals and State Department officials whose devotion to American survival must be questioned. Never in the history of the world has a policy of failure been so persistently promoted with such specious arguments. But we pretend that everything is all right.

Cattlemen Facing Economic Distress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in line with my efforts to unite my colleagues in seeking a solution to the meat import problem, I wish to call attention to an article from the New York Times of February 20, 1964, written by Mr. Wallace Turner. Mr. Turner's evaluation of this situation is factual and totally realistic. I commend it to you for your serious consideration:

CATTLEMEN FACING ECONOMIC DISTRESS

(By Wallace Turner)

SAN FRANCISCO, February 19.—The western cattle business was pictured today as going through an extensive shakeout under the influence of growing meat imports and changes in the buying structure of the retail meat business.

"The strength of the chainstore buyers is such as to force meatpackers to buy as cheaply as possible," said Paul Blackman, chairman of the Western States Meat Packers Association. "Unfortunately, we find that some of the cattlemen can't survive under these conditions."

The packers themselves, 18 months ago, were well involved in cattle raising and feeding operations, he said, but now have almost entirely withdrawn from it.

The comments of Mr. Blackman and of L. Blaine Liljenquist, the packers' association president, were made at a press conference at the Sheraton Palace Hotel this morning as the association's 18th annual convention opened.

All across the West in the last year, cattlemen have been caught with heavy losses. In November, sales in Denver, for example, losses of $20 to $70 a head were reported by Colorado feeders. Many of the complaints made then in Denver were directed to the buying practices of chain stores, which forced down prices.

Some of this was confirmed today in the press conference by Mr. Blackman, who said that buying methods had so changed the packing industry in the last 15 years that today the power was in the hands of a few buyers representing the chain stores.

"The livestock people are taking a terrible beating," he said. "When some of them cash in their herds this year, they will be flat broke."

A lot of this economic distress will force the inexperienced cattlemen out of the market, he said.

TREND IS WEIGHED

"The dentists and doctors and lawyers will be spending more time in their offices," he said. "Where these people will fall by the wayside, the business will come back into the hands of the professional cattlemen."

A further depressing effect on the livestock market has come with the rise in imports of meat from such big producers as Australia and New Zealand. Total imports amounted to 11 percent of domestic production in 1963, said Mr. Liljenquist.

However, the pressure of demands from cattlemen has brought about negotiation of agreements that will hold imports from Australia and New Zealand to the 1962–63 average, Mr. Liljenquist said.

Meantime, he pointed out, the American per capita consumption continues to rise. He said that in 1940 this figure was 55 pounds of beef, and now it is 97 pounds.

Do Not Count Barry Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that Illinois Republicans are still in Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S corner and expect the man from Arizona to come out fighting in the second round.

The reason for this can be best expressed by reading a letter from one of my constituents and an editorial by John Chamberlain. John F. Schmidt, of Peoria, Ill., coauthor of the New Federalist, and an outstanding attorney, sent me a copy of his letter to a personal friend. This letter endorses the GOLDWATER philosophy of working for closer accord with our friends. Mr. Schmidt feels in this way, democracy will triumph without war.

The editorial to which I referred earlier is by the conservative columnist and author John Chamberlain. The article appeared in many papers throughout the country and was published under the following headline in the February 10, 1964, issue of the Tampa (Fla.) Times.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letter and the editorial at this point:

WHY CONSERVATIVES SHOULD BACK ATLANTIC UNION.

NOVEMBER 11, 1930.

DEAR WALT: This letter is prompted by your oft-repeated objection to Atlantic Union, based on the fact that so many of the European countries are so strongly Socialist that you would not want to be united with them. This objection strikes a responsive chord in me, too. As you know, I am a GOLDWATER Republican and so am appalled and dismayed at the amount of socialism present today in our free societies, and the speed with which all of us are moving toward more collectivism rather than less.

Arguments that one person finds persuasive will not necessarily convince another, of course. Nevertheless, because your basic philosophy and principles are a lot like mine, I shall attack the problem by explaining why Atlantic Union appeals to me—not in spite of my conservatism, but because of it.

First, my above reference to free societies: Included are Europe's Socialist nations, not

because they have free market economies, but because they have a political framework which permits of change via the ballot box. This last is the critical characteristic, because there is hope as long as the potential for change exists. You and I know that communism deprives its opposition of all political rights, so that once communism acquires control, the prospect of peaceful change is reduced to substantially nothing.

Occasionally, we of the Atlantic Union persuasion hear an objection that Socialist nations cannot federate with free-market nations. I understand that your objection is not that they cannot, but that they should not. It is, of course, obvious that they can, because Canada has the proof of this. National Review for September 24, 1963, sets forth this commentary:

"Two adjoining Canadian prairie Provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan, are in instructive contrast. Alberta has the fastest economic growth rate in the nation, Saskatchewan one of the slowest. Alberta is debt free, Saskatchewan is heavily in debt. Alberta is bringing in a medical care plan based on voluntary participation that has complete support from the doctors, insurance companies, and the public at large. Saskatchewan last year introduced compulsory medicare—provoking a doctors' strike, driving scores of badly needed doctors out of the Province permanently—which was settled only through a compromise that left an atmosphere of hatred and suspicion. Alberta has the most conservative government in Canada; Saskatchewan is ruled by the only outright Socialist regime in the country."

Proving what? First, these two widely divergent economies live side-by-side on a peaceful basis, neither being a military threat to the other because they are members of the same federal government. Second, they provide the best possible proof of the superiority of a free economy. Granted, this proof is not automatic, because truth requires that its proponents speak out in its behalf. But the situation in Canada effectively eliminates the argument that the prosperous economy had an unfair advantage in the form of a stabler currency, or better protection against foreign invasion, or better access to world markets and resources—and many other points that apologists for socialism bring up. Because so many of the conditions affecting the economies of Alberta and Saskatchewan are exactly identical for both, it becomes much easier to demonstrate that freedom accounts for the difference in their prosperity.

Now, just as the geometry teacher can prove that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points but cannot make everybody believe it, so the Alberta-Saskatchewan case does not automatically convince everybody that a free economy produces greater prosperity than a regulated one. However, it certainly makes it much easier to convince many people than would be the case if those two provinces were entirely unrelated and separate political entities. If we who advocate freedom take proper advantage of this situation, we can conceivably make a few more friends for economic freedom.

Applying the Canadian example to the North Atlantic Community, surely we can federate economies that vary widely in their basic attitudes toward government regulation. We can, but should we?

We should because we would thus have an excellent labortaory for experimenting in social legislation. I personally am certain that the freer economies would prove their superiority so convincingly that the people in the more strictly regulated economies would be forced to relax government regulation more and more, step-by-step. Certainly it would be easier to convince the voters of the advantages of freedom, and and voters could then elect more free-enterprisers to office, who would then vote more and more government restrictions out of existence.

OPEN THE WAY FROM SOCIALISM

Another reason for uniting with even the socialistic but politically free nations is to keep open the avenue of return to a free economy. Our Atlantic union would enjoy a free press, and so it would be far more difficult for the government-control advocates to deprive their people of the truth. Since the truth is invariably on the side of freedom, it is important to me that we keep the lines of communication open.

When we shrink from federating with more socialistic nations because we dislike socialism, we tend to forget that there are many free-enterprisers in the socialist nations. A union of the free would strengthen the hand of freedom in socialist nations in several ways. It would give outspoken freedom advocates the same ammunition we now have in Canada, discussed above. Union guarantees of freedom of the press would promote a free interchange of information, which is bound to strengthen freedom if we avail ourselves of the opportunity.

On the subject of conservatism in Europe, see William F. Buckley's piece in National Review for November 5. (I well appreciate that Buckley's extreme nationalism could not accept an Atlantic union, but Mr. Buckley provides me, in virtually every issue of National Review, with many potent arguments for Atlantic union—whether he likes the fact or not.) Buckley is fearful, as am I, of Italy's going Communist from within. If that happens outside an Atlantic union, we will suffer a terrible and perhaps irreversible loss. If it were to happen within an Atlantic Union, there would remain a chance to reverse the process.

Another potent reason for an Atlantic union is the stimulus it would give to freedom by helping to solve many of our present problems that drive us to ever-increasing government regulation. Unemployment is usually considered a strictly internal problem—and I would continue to look at it that way in most respects. However, a basic cause of unemployment is the interference with trade achieved by national laws.

SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT, EASE TAXES

The Common Market has shown that the lifting of national trade barriers can stimulate trade. I feel sure that the free trade area of an Atlantic Union would go a very long way toward solving unemployment throughout such a union. This would greatly ease our tax burden, as is evident from the fact that half of our Illinois taxes pay for unemployment relief without curing the problem. If we could put most of those people to work, we would increase the usefulness of the population as a whole and simultaneously rid ourselves of a lot of bureaucratic machinery, in addition to cutting taxes.

Clarence Streit pointed out years ago that, in our present interdependent economies, nationalism and socialism go together.[1]

This is true because extreme nationalism creates problems that would be largely solved through union (common defense, trade, currency). Then we attempt to solve those problems with more and more government controls. Actually, people like us, who favor a free economy, should decide whether we want freedom or unlimited nationalism; we cannot have both.

One argument I hear often is that Federal union with the poorer, socialist nations will drag us down to their level economically. We know, however, from our own experience and that of Canada that this is simply not true. Furthermore, within an Atlantic federal union, nationalism can be a powerful factor for freedom. Once we have the political framework for solving our strictly common problems (citizenship, trade, currency, defense, and communications), we can depend on strong nationalist sentiment to prevent overcentralization of power in the Atlantic union government.

Some critics like to point to the centralization of power in our United States of America, since 1932 and say that the same thing will happen in the proposed Atlantic union. There are several answers to that objection. Our own United States of America was the first actual federal union, and we have learned much about federation since 1789. An Atlantic union constitution would probably be more specific in defining the delegated powers than was done in our Constitution in 1787. Also, one reason for the increase in power in our Federal Government was the fact that, for a long time now, we have been trying to solve international problems on a nationalistic basis, and the job cannot be done that way.

As a former isolationist, I confess to having been impressed greatly by Christian ethics. I hear fellow Christians argue for nationalism from a Christian base, and to me this is false Christianity. Jesus rejected nationalism, and that fact is so clear and obvious that I find it absolutely impossible to defend unlimited nationalism on the basis of Christian doctrine. To me, the matter has to be resolved on a moral basis first. Just as I am not a nationalist purely for the sake of nationalism, I am also not an internationalist for the sake of internationalism.

From my viewpoint, adherence to Christian precepts makes for the maximum of human freedom, so I would solve the nationalism versus internationalism question on the basis of "Which way makes for the greatest degree of freedom?" I feel guilty myself about pointing an accusing finger at others and criticizing them (and I have done this), because I hear Isaiah thundering at me, "A people * * * which say, stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose."

Fifty years ago, isolationism could be practiced without endangering the freedom of the entire world, whether it made economic sense or not. But today, the worst tyranny in history stands ready to conquer the world. We can no longer afford the luxury of keeping the free peoples divided.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SCHMIDT.

PEORIA, ILL.

GOLDWATER AND STREIT AREN'T FAR APART

(By John Chamberlain)

Continuing my home work I've caught up with the complete text of BARRY GOLDWATER'S long piece of foreign policy in Life magazine. And, as I had suspected, what GOLDWATER says about foreign policy is not what his detractors, both Democratic and Republican, say he says about it.

The suspicion, indeed, has been noised abroad that BARRY GOLDWATER is a dangerous character who would push us to the brink of war in no time. "The housewives won't vote for him," so a housewife said to me the other day. But if the housewives will read what GOLDWATER actually says, they will discover a marked correspondence between his ideas and those of Clarence Streit, the peaceful soul who wants to save the world by federating the Atlantic democracies into such a strong community that the Communists would never dare attack it.

Clarence Streit's view, which he sets forth in the January issue of his magazine, Freedom & Union, is that John F. Kennedy began his term of office wisely, with an approach

---

[1] See "Nationalism Means Nationalization," May 1950 Freedom & Union; reprint available from our office.

to "Atlantic partnership" built on a strengthening of NATO. To cement the partnership Kennedy setup his early meeting with De Gaulle. But in Streit's opinion Kennedy made a fatal mistake of continuing on from Paris to Vienna to do some explorative "summitry" with Khrushchev. This miffed De Gaulle. And "Le Grand Charles" was further miffed when Kennedy, after his famous American University speech, turned to dealing over the heads of the West European nations with Moscow.

The trouble with this approach, according to Streit, is that it hands Khrushchev just what he wants, a weakened NATO alliance. It enables Moscow to use divide-and-rule tactics in its diplomacy.

Well, so much for Clarence Streit, whom nobody ever accused of being a warmonger. Now as to BARRY GOLDWATER. What GOLDWATER proposes is, quite simply, to lead from strength without being bellicose about it. He doesn't propose getting out of the U.N. as it is at present constituted, but he thinks the U.N. is primarily useful to the West "as a forum in which to discuss Communist violations of the charter." In terms of peace, says BARRY, "I view the NATO alliance—the Atlantic community—as a far more practical tool than the U.N."

As BARRY GOLDWATER sees it, we are now rapidly isolating ourselves by our current policies. The French are going off in one direction, the British in another. Nobody wants to support us in Vietnam, nobody respects our efforts to blockade Cuba, everybody laughs at us when we are insulted in Panama, in Ghana, and by a 2-day-old "people's republic" in Zanzibar. We are being pushed back into "Fortress America"—only it isn't much of a fortress in an age of intercontinental missiles.

"The Atlantic alliance," says GOLDWATER, "could change the course of world affairs." It would need, for its protection, a NATO force with a commander empowered to use tactical nuclear weapons, on order from the NATO political authority, in case Europe was about to be overrun by numerically superior hordes. Naturally GOLDWATER does not think a strong NATO would ever have to use atomic weapons, for a strong NATO would never be challenged by a Communist nation which is unable to feed itself.

A lot of housewives are for Clarence Streit. For consistency's sake they ought to be for GOLDWATER, too.

Virgil Gray Barton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce to the Congress the sudden passing on Friday, March 6, of Virgil Gray Barton, a dedicated and able public servant. He passed away in the service of his country while on an official trip to Houston, Tex.

Gray Barton was born, reared, and educated a Texan; but he was first of all a servant of the American public and the American farmer.

He called Overton, Tex., his hometown and was educated at Southwest Texas State College.

Gray Barton entered the Federal service 25 years ago as an employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He came to Washington in 1950 and served since that time in administration of farm price support programs.

At the time of his passing, he was Administrative Chief of Farm Price Support Regulations. His duties were to develop price support regulations and handbooks for rice, other grains, and cotton. These duties he performed efficiently and well.

He was well known, admired, and liked by my constitutents in the Texas rice industry, and I considered him a personal friend.

We will miss Gray Barton. We extend condolences to his dear family and share with them their grief.

Ambassador White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to express my hearty approval of the announcement that the President will appoint Mrs. Katharine Elkus White an Ambassador in the near future, because I cannot think of anyone in either party, Republican or Democrat, who is more worthy of this responsible assignment. Mrs. White happens to be a Democrat and a good friend of mine, although she opposed me a few years ago in my campaign for reelection to Congress. She is devoted to the best interests of the people and she has a record of public service which few can emulate.

Mrs. White's father, Abram I. Elkus, was a constructive public servant and was appointed by Woodrow Wilson as Ambassador to Turkey, and it is abundantly clear that Mrs. White has inherited the zeal and ability of her famous father in the service of our country. I have no doubt, whatever, that she will perform her duties with zeal and fidelity and will be an outstanding representative of the United States wherever she may be assigned.

It is with great pleasure and pride that I append to these remarks an editorial appearing in the Red Bank Register under date of March 11, entitled "Ambassador White." This editorial will express the views of the citizens in the community where she lives:

AMBASSADOR WHITE

The culmination of an outstanding career came to Red Bank's Mrs. Katharine Elkus White last week when President Johnson announced that he has appointed her to an ambassadorship.

Mrs. White, a Democratic Party leader and chairman of the New Jersey Highway Authority, was included among 10 women selected by the President for high-ranking posts.

Thus, once again Mrs. White has brought great honor not only to herself but to her hometown, county, and State as well. The President, looking into Mrs. White's past accomplishments, must have concluded that she was indeed qualified to represent the United States to an as yet unnamed country.

For Mrs. White, a former Red Bank mayor, the honor no doubt meant much for two reasons—the first that she was following in the footsteps of her late father, Abram I. Elkus, Ambassador to Turkey during the Woodrow Wilson administration, and the second that women were being selected for important posts by the administration.

Mrs. White is to be congratulated on her new assignment. We look for her to meet the many responsibilities of her new office.

Statement of Joseph J. Lombardo, Commander in Chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 I was privileged to present to the distinguished members of the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives, Joseph J. Lombardo, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

I am proud of Mr. Lombardo as a fellow member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in my own county of Kings. I am privileged to represent him in the Congress since he resides in my district with his wife and three children.

I am honored that this great national organization has chosen as its leader a man who had a distinguished combat record with the Marine Corps in World War II. As a former infantryman I know the commitment of loyalty and courage which he made in the perilous combat zone of the Pacific.

Mr. Lombardo is a distinguished member of the bar of the city of New York and has been admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In our community he is regarded as a leader, a man of great devotion to his church, and a fine American who has never forgotten the debt we owe to the veterans who manned the battle stations which saved our freedom.

His term as National Commander was preceded by a record of illustrious service in county and State offices and a particularly effective contribution which he made as National Judge Advocate General.

I know that all Members of Congress who attended the colorful dinner tendered on the night of March 10 at the Sheraton Park Hotel were much impressed by the tenor and sincerity of the speech delivered by Mr. Lombardo to that audience.

Our district, our State, and our Nation, are truly proud that this outstanding veterans' organization is so ably led by such a man as Joe Lombardo. The statement he made before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House articulates most clearly the credentials which he has for the high position he holds and

I am pleased to submit it for the information of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH J. LOMBARDO, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first, I want to express my deep appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and your outstanding committee for granting the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States the privilege of this special hearing and permitting me to present some of the highlights of our current legislative program. We know that all of you are extremely busy and we appreciate the fact that your presence here this morning signifies your interest in veterans' affairs and your interest in the viewpoint and objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

As you may have observed, I am accompanied this morning by 53 Voice of Democracy winners from the 50 States, District of Columbia, Japan, and the Canal Zone. The Voice of Democracy program is a broadcast script writing contest for all high school students. We believe this particular program is an outstanding example of furthering the great purpose of the VFW to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom, upon which this great Nation was founded and has been preserved. Tonight, at our annual dinner, the national Voice of Democracy winner will receive a $5,000 scholarship award; second place winner will receive a $3,500 scholarship award; third place winner will receive a $2,500 scholarship award; and the fourth place winner will receive a $1,500 scholarship award.

I am also accompanied to this hearing by a large group of my comrades. These men represent the leadership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Most of them are elected national officers and elected leaders of our State organization—men from every State in the Union. Among our national officers are those who are moving toward the top and those who have served at the top and who continue to serve in active advisory capacities. In addition, we have many comrades—prominent and successful in their communities—who are giving generously of their time and effort as members of important national committees. All are assembled in Washington for our annual conference of national officers and department commanders. I am sure I speak for them in extending their personal thanks for the privilege of this special hearing. I hope that sometime today you will have an opportunity to meet them. I know they are anxious to meet and know you better. I am pleased to acknowledge that their leadership has produced the largest membership, for this time of year, in the long history of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

For the benefit of the new members of this committee and to refresh the memory of you who are busy with other problems, may I take a minute or two to explain the origin and purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It was founded in 1899 by a small group of returned oversea veterans of the Spanish-American War who believed there was a need for an organization of men who had served their country overseas during time of war. Since that humble beginning the VFW has grown to an organization of approximately 1,300,000 members in some 10,000 posts located in every State in the Union, the Territories, and some foreign countries. Our membership, as indicated, is restricted to men who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces on foreign soil or in hostile waters during some war, campaign, or expedition for which a campaign badge or medal has been authorized. In addition, we have an outstanding ladies auxiliary with 400,000 members.

We are proud of the quality, as well as the quantity, of our membership and find it difficult to resist pointing out that many of our members have achieved outstanding distinction in many fields, including public affairs. We are proud that the President of the United States, as well as many Members of Congress, holds membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Many Members of Congress have furnished outstanding leadership to our organization at the post, district, State, and national levels.

The common purpose of our organization is to "Honor the dead by helping the living." To achieve this objective, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—over the years—has initiated many activities and programs. High on this list is our national home for widows and orphans, located at Eaton Rapids, Mich. This home, founded in 1926, is a model in the care of young people.

Another program of great value to veterans is our national rehabilitation service, which has provided counseling and claims service to millions of veterans and their dependents. Our rehabilitation service is, and has been, available to all veterans regardless of whether they are members or eligible to membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Ranking high in the activities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is our community activities program, with which you, Mr. Chairman, and many members of this committee, are familiar. Last year, approximately 10,000 posts and auxiliaries sponsored and undertook more than 500,000 community activity projects throughout the United States. We believe this program helps to build a stronger and better America and breathes life into our motto "to honor the dead by helping the living."

Immediately following our national convention, our national legislative committee met for the purpose of considering the resolutions adopted by the convention and to outline the highlights of those resolutions in a concise and comprehensive program. I chose as my legislative chairman an outstanding VFW member, three times commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and a member of the Congress for 22 years. Of course, I am referring to our good friend, James E. Van Zandt.

Briefly, I wish to discuss with you the highlights of the evaluations of this committee. The highlights are the result of serious study, free discussion, and open debate involving approximately 300 resolutions adopted by the last national convention, held in Seattle, Wash. It was the judgment of these committee members from all sections of the United States that the highlights covered in their program are worthy and deserving of top priority during the current fiscal year. This does not mean, however, that other items in our overall program are to be neglected, but that special consideration should be given the key objectives.

Our No. 1 key legislative objective for this year is the establishment of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate. I fully realize that this is a matter for the determination of the Senate and I only want you to know that it is our longstanding admiration and respect for the House Veterans' Committee which has demonstrated beyond any doubt the great need for an equivalent committee in the Senate.

Our second key objective is additional nursing home beds for long-term care of chronically ill veterans. I cannot heap enough praise on your special subcommittee, headed by Robert E. "Fats" Everett, which worked so long and diligently probing into and establishing the need for these additional beds. We, in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, are fully aware of what prompted the late President Kennedy to authorize 2,000 nursing home beds the evening before your full committee was to meet and report H.R. 8009. The VA hospital system is one of the foundation stones in the structure of veterans' benefits and rights. We realize it is a constantly changing program. The aging citizen is a national concern and we are extremely pleased that this committee and the House have unanimously endorsed the Veterans of Foreign Wars view that the aging veteran is a special national concern as expressed in your approval of the nursing home care bill, H.R. 8009. I assure your committee and the House that I am vigorously urging every member of the VFW to do everything within his own limits to persuade his U.S. Senators to approve H.R. 8009 before the 88th Congress adjourns.

Our third key objective deals with the pension program, often referred to as the hottest veterans' program before the Congress. I am proud of the magnificent record of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for taking the lead in seeking liberalized pension legislation, especially for the veterans of World War I. Our World War I bill is H.R. 33, introduced by past Commander in Chief DICK ROUDEBUSH, now representing the Fifth District of Indiana, and is distinguishable by its provision for an additional 10 percent for those who served overseas or in hostile waters during wartime.

A new phenomenon in recent years is the vanguard of World War II veterans who have already reached age 60. In addition, thousands of other younger veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have been struck down by accident and disease and are on the pension rolls permanently and totally disabled for the rest of their lives. Cognizant of these facts, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is the sponsor of H.R. 9665, a bill which would liberalize the existing pension program covered by Public Law 86-211, both for living veterans and their widows and dependents. We realize the demands upon our Government are almost limitless and we know there are rarely simple solutions or pat answers to the many comprehensive problems which come before the Congress. We, in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, however, earnestly solicit your favorable consideration to liberalize the existing income limitations and increased pension payments for those unfortunate veterans who are at the lower end of our economic and social scale. We know that with more than a million World War I veterans on the pension rolls that improvement of the existing program will help these veterans who served during World War I more than other group. We are hoping for favorable consideration of H.R. 9665 in the very near future.

Our fourth major objective deals with veterans' preference and calls for vigorous opposition to attempts to weaken and eliminate veterans' preference in the Federal civil service. I am aware that legislation dealing with this program is not referred to this committee but rather comes under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. May I take this opportunity, however, to advise the Congress of the increasing alarm of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to the rising number of cases that have come to our attention which would weaken or eliminate veterans' preference in the Federal civil service. Since most State veterans' preference laws are modeled along Federal lines, it is feared by many that any weakening of the Federal civil service will mean the eventual repeal of veterans' preference for hundreds of thousands of veterans employed in State, county, and local government agencies. Your support of this objective to resist any effort to weaken the Veterans' Preference Act is strongly requested.

I will not discuss in detail other legislative objectives of our organization, but certainly I want to bring some of the points to your attention for favorable consideration. They include the following.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Elevate Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Cabinet status.

COMPENSATION

Continued favorable consideration of compensation rates for the service-disabled, including dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE

Additional VA hospital and medical treatment facilities for the aging veteran population.

Outpatient treatment for all veterans entitled to permanent and total disability pension payments.

EDUCATION

Educational assistance, similar to that provided under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, to children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability.

BURIAL FLAG

You are doubtless aware of the reduction in the size of burial flags issued by the Veterans' Administration. We understand the Department of Defense declined to direct a similar change. We believe the original intent for the flag to be of sufficient size to fully drape the casket should continue to be honored. The reduction of the flag from 5 by 9½ feet to 4½ by 7 feet represents a 33-percent decrease in the square area of the flag, but a savings in cost of less than 9 percent. We hope the Congress will act favorably on H.R. 9427 introduced by Congressman ROUDEBUSH to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to restore the burial flag to its original size.

EMPLOYMENT

Continue veterans' preference in classifying and referring veterans for job placement and training by veterans' employment service in local State employment offices throughout the Nation.

INSURANCE

With respect to the insurance program, there may appear to be some inconsistency in our two objectives concerning this program. Successive national conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have endorsed reopening the NSLI program for all veterans for a period of at least 1 year to permit the obtaining of up to $10,000 worth of Government life insurance. Included in this group are a large number of service-disabled veterans whose disabilities prohibit their obtaining commercial life insurance. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is deeply concerned over this development and strongly urges this committee and the Congress to make this insurance available to the service disabled, not only for a period of 1 year, but on a continuing basis as provided in our Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. sponsored bills, H.R. 9717 and H.R. 9810.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, approximately 300 resolutions were adopted at our last national convention. I have discussed a mere handful. I would like, therefore, to have a digest of these resolutions made a part of my remarks at this point so that the record will fully reflect that all of our resolutions were presented to this committee and the Congress for your study and consideration.

Since my discharge from the Marine Corps in 1945, I have been active in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. and veterans' affairs. In particular, I have carefully observed the deliberations and accomplishments of this committee. It has been called to my attention that there are a few individual veterans whose distorted concept of truth apparently impels them, on occasion to malign certain members of this committee. I wish to take this opportunity to make it clear for all time that these misguided individuals do not speak for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Those of us who are close to the scene know there are more glamorous assignments than the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. is extremely grateful for the efforts of this committee and I want to personally thank all who have contributed to the establishment of the most generous veterans' program in the world. It has taken a lot of hard work and we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars appreciate it.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, we want you and your committee members to know that we strongly oppose the recommendation of the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that this committee be abolished.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me remind you and your committee members that our annual dinner honoring Members of the Congress who served in the Armed Forces will be held tonight at the Sheraton Park Hotel. More than 400 Members of the Congress have accepted an invitation to attend this outstanding event. The reception will begin at 6 p.m. The dinner will start promptly at 7 p.m. As you know, our first VFW Congressional Award will be presented to the dean of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, for outstanding service to the Nation.

We are looking forward to having you with us.

Thank you again for your kindness to me here this morning.

Foreign Aid Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, no man in or out of Government is more familiar with the lavish foreign aid program than our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [OTTO E. PASSMAN]. He has written an extremely important article entitled "The Foreign Aid Mess," which appears in the February 1964, issue of the New Guard, the magazine of Young Americans for Freedom. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

A MISGUIDED, DISAPPOINTING EXPERIMENT: THE FOREIGN AID MESS

(By OTTO E. PASSMAN, U.S. Representative from Louisiana)

Foreign-aid dollar diplomacy, which is now costing taxpayers of the United States about $10 billion a year (including interest charges on the money borrowed to give away), unquestionably is, and long has been, the most misguided, disappointing, and expensive experiment in foreign relations ever undertaken by this or any other Nation.

The foreign-aid program is being handled, overall, through 37 different departments and agencies of our Government; and it is of such magnitude and complexity that not only is it uncontrolled and, in its present form and scope, uncontrollable, but it is literally beyond the realm of human understanding.

Billions of dollars are being dispensed each year to practically every country of the world; this year, for example, of the other 112 countries, America is granting assistance to 100 governments. And, in this process, through the so-called mutual security program alone 2,157 different projects (not counting the vast number of subprojects) are being financed—any, if not most, of them having but little, if any, practical justification, an observation which is even more true insofar as the matter of serving the best interests of the United States is concerned.

LOST GOALS

It is an irrefutable fact that the United States has either lost sight of the goals it supposedly pursues with foreign aid or pursues contradictory goals.

Furthermore, our assistance creates envy and resentment by its bestowal and disillusionment and hatred by its refusal, and:

U.S. aid often encourages the development or perpetuation of socialism by leaders anxious to maintain power through the tightening or clamping of government controls on practically all facets of life in their countries.

U.S. aid frequently never gets any further than the ruling class in a country.

Often, if not actually usually, the United States gets no recognition for the good our aid is said to accomplish.

Massive aid is given to Communist countries, other unfriendly countries and so-called neutralist countries.

Military aid—which, incredible though it is, is going this year into 68 different countries—does not keep nations from falling under the Communist yoke.

And, of particular significance, foreign aid is a major factor in the alarming flight of gold from the United States and in our Nation's dangerous balance-of-payments deficit.

WEAK DOLLAR

During the early years of the foreign aid program the dollar was regarded as a super-strong currency, despite the fact that the United States had a deficit balance-of-payments position in every year beginning with 1950 (through 1963 with the sole exception of 1957, when we experienced a surplus balance of payments of approximately one-half billion dollars).

Since 1958 the dollar has been growing weaker, and one of the major reasons for this deterioration has been the outflow of gold from our Nation. On December 31, 1957, the gold stocks of the United States amounted to about $22.9 billion; but, since that date, our gold stockpile has been diminishing steadily, and at the end of last September it amounted to $15.6 billion—a drop of around $7.3 billion in a little more than 5½ years. During this same period 52 countries—each one a recipient of U.S. foreign aid—purchased from the Treasury about $7 billion of U.S. gold.

It is obvious that one of the primary reasons why foreign nations have been able to purchase our gold is the fact that the United States, through the "mutual security" phase of foreign aid for the same period of a little more than 5½ years, extended some $12 billion in economic and military assistance to these same 52 countries. This financial assistance by the United States in turn released the revenues of these 52 nations to be used in any way they saw fit, and obviously one of the ways was to buy some $7 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

GONE GOLD

The result is that today, with callable foreign claims of some $23 billion outstanding against us, our $15-plus billion supply of gold is almost $20 billion short of the amount needed to meet these claims, if they were made, and maintain the 25-percent gold backing that is required for our own currency and deposits.

This is indeed a dangerous situation, one which we cannot continue much longer to ignore. Whether our creditors can maintain confidence in the dollar, while we insist on being so reckless, is certainly seriously questionable.

But, so long as the executive branch of our Government, with the approval of Congress, continues foreign aid as the major phase of our foreign policy, it is imperative that the

program be tightened up and brought under at least a semblance of control. Toward this end, we should concentrate whatever assistance we give to fewer countries with well-planned projects. We should curtail the aid program substantially in some countries and dispense with it altogether in other countries—and this is especially so in the African area, where the former "mother countries," or metropoles, which are generally tied to these newly formed nations by common languages, trade agreements, and substantial investments, should bear the responsibility for whatever financial assistance is required.

The time for us to act is now, for it is indeed later than many of our citizens seem to think.

The Continuing Need for Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the Congress of this Nation must become fully aware of and that is the fact that our rural economy is sick and sinking lower and lower. The level of income in our rural areas is only half of that of the national average and unless something is done to revive our rural economy our Nation will suffer grave consequences.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with these remarks an article written by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Congressman from the State of Texas and a personal friend of mine, which describes very effectively the job that needs to be done in our rural areas.

The article follows:

THE CONTINUING NEED FOR RURAL REDEVELOPMENT

(By WRIGHT PATMAN, U.S. Congressman from Texas)

During the 1950's, 1,500 of the Nation's 3,100 counties showed a decline in population as did most communities of less than 2,500 persons.

Displaced farmers and rural people by the millions packed up and headed for the cities to look for work.

Today, many of these same people, ill-equipped by training and handicapped by age, are forced to eke out a living at poorly paid unskilled jobs. And many of them cannot get any work at all.

The march of technology has created this strange paradox in our land. On the one hand, it has produced a standard of living for many which was undreamed of a generation ago; while on the other hand, it has destroyed the economic base of hundreds of rural areas. Thus, in the midst of the greatest prosperity the country has ever known, there is widespread depression and unemployment.

The deterioration of rural counties began with the mechanization of farming. But, it was a gradual process until after World War II. Now it has reached a critical point.

Unless we reverse this trend, we can expect that in a few years there will be more than 600 counties—one-fifth of the Nation's total—which will be little better than "poor farms." And it will cost taxpayers billions of dollars in relief payments to support the destitute inhabitants of these economically blighted areas.

It is obvious that agriculture as a base for supporting the economy is woefully insufficient in all but a relatively few of the Nation's rural counties. In 1961, per capita farm income was $1,373, of which $474 came from nonfarm sources. In comparison, per capita income of the nonfarm population for the same year was $2,345, or 41.4 percent greater than the average net income of farm people.

Some prominent economists and business leaders believe that the solution to the rural problem is to move unemployed and underemployed farmers and rural people to the cities. This attitude demonstrates a tragic refusal to face up to the realities of the situation or to understand the serious implications it presents not only to the future welfare of rural communities, but to our cities as well.

Generally, our cities have more problems than they can handle now, including unemployment, housing, and schools. They cannot be expected to welcome thousands of displaced ruralities to aggravate their already serious problems.

Moreover, a great number of the rural unemployed have strong ties to their local communuities, and understandably refuse to pull up stakes to join the trek to the cities where they would face a future with little hope. In my opinion, it makes better sense to help rural people develop new opportunities at home. And this can be done through the cooperation of government and people. We have made a good start in this direction.

The results since early in 1961 when the administration and Congress launched a nationwide rural redevelopment effort are impressive. More important than Federal assistance, however, is the amount of funds and effort that local people have invested in rebuilding their communities.

A survey by the Rural Electrification Administraiton of the activities of rural electric systems in rural area development shows that rural electrics helped launch 402 projects between July 1961 and December 1962. These pojects involved more than a quarter-billion dollars in financing, of which more than 90 percent came from non-Government sources. These projects are providing 30,000 new jobs plus another 20,000 indirect jobs.

The funds made available for redevelopment by the Government represent "seed corn money" and, in the great majority of cases are in the form of loans which must be repaid with interest.

As a result of these new programs, there are millions of dollars worth of new factories, new homes, new water systems, new sewer systems, and new recreational facilities giving hope and a better life to rural areas. Thousands of new jobs are helping to stem outmigration.

As might be expected, these programs are often greeted with cries of waste and subsidy by a claque of critics. But, of course, this is no surprise to rural electric members who have heard the same charges hurled at their program for more than a quarter of a century.

One of the most important of the redevelopment programs has been singled out as the target of especially vicious attacks. These critics generally support subsidies for big business, but they are opposed to the ARA program (which makes loans to create new jobs in distressed areas) despite the fact that ARA loans must be repaid to the Government with interest.

If the program does not get additional support from Congress this year, it will be extremely handicapped. Applications for ARA assistance from distressed areas far exceed funds authorized. Unless Congress approves legislation pending before it to provide more funds for loans, plans for developing new job-producing enterprises will have to be abandoned in many rural areas.

That would be a severe blow to the hopes of distressed sections of our Nation—and to President Johnson's war on poverty.

How this Nation can neglect area redevelopment in America while at the same time distributing billions of dollars to be used for similar purposes in foreign lands, is something that many good and sincerely patriotic Americans cannot understand.

Experience of the last 2½ years shows that this approach can produce successful results, and indicates that helping local people solve their own problems is the most practical and economical way to keep much of rural America from becoming a ward of the state.

I am proud that the Nation's rural electric systems are providing important assistance in rural redevelopment. They recognize that they have a vital stake in the survival of rural America since they serve in 80 percent of the Nation's counties.

Basically, rural redevelopment is much like the rural electric story—doing a job local people are unable to do by themselves.

The combination of local initiative and Government loans brought modern electric living to rural areas.

This same combination can save rural America from economic collapse.

Fate of U.S. Wool Textile Mills Depends on State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, our domestic wool industry has more and more been pushed to the wall by imports of low-cost wool products.

An article appearing in the February 29, 1964, issue of the Commercial Bulletin makes some penetrating observations with respect to this undesirable condition, and for the benefit of my colleagues I introduce this interesting piece to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FATE OF U.S. WOOL TEXTILE MILLS DEPENDS ON STATE DEPARTMENT

As of today, February 29, 1964, there is scarcely a wool textile mill in the United States running full time, and many wool textile workers are not getting a full week's pay.

At a time of unprecedented prosperity and productivity in the wool industry of the world, our domestic wool industry, far from enjoying prosperous times, is fighting for its very existence.

Hundreds of wool textile mills who furnished employment, paid taxes, found themselves unable to cope with the deteriorating situation caused by excessive and increasing imports from low-wage countries, aided further by internal subsidies and gimmicks.

Dismayed by the lack of promised effective action by our Government, and discouraged by the bleak future, mill after mill closed its doors, and tens of thousands of textile workers, many middle aged and over, were forced to seek employment elsewhere—a tragic number unsuccessfully.

The domestic textile mills which exist today have survived a period of attrition which, over the last 8 years, has reduced by half the U.S. wool textile plants, machinery, and workers.

These survivors, large and small, are the tough, knowledgeable, well-equipped and financed remains of a once great U.S. wool textile industry; yet, large and small, they are in trouble.

From now on, to employ a mixed metaphor, I will call a spade a spade, and let the chips fall where they may.

The principal reason for the distressful condition of the U.S. wool industry can be directly attributed to the inability of our State Department to appreciate our problem and take the necessary action to correct it. The solemn pledge of a President, the categoric statements of administration officials that imports of wool fabric must be restrained by every means necessary, the deep concern and unstinted efforts of many Members of Congress, mean nothing to these officials who dogmatically refuse to take strong, effective action to carry out the negotiations requested years ago by President Kennedy. Wary of offending other nations, fearful of retaliation, our affairs are handled in sad contrast to the pragmatic, forceful attitude of national self-interest of their foreign counterparts.

The wool textile industry can take hope, however, in recent events which could bring about a turning point in our affairs.

Wool industry leaders, exercising courage, initiative, and manifest ability held a series of meetings with industry representatives of foreign countries to explore the problem. These culminated in a meeting in Rome last December, at which the wool textile industries of the EEC, EFTA, and the United States agreed that a government-to-government agreement on wool textile imports is necessary. Another meeting is scheduled for Paris next month.

Last Tuesday in Washington, industry representatives met at breakfast with a congressional delegation of Senators and Congressmen, chairmaned by the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and attended by such senior Members as the Honorable CARL VINSON. They reviewed our problem and the lack of effective action by the administration, and pledged their support and earnest efforts in our behalf with President Johnson.

The wool industry of the United States has never taken a parochial view of its problems, or its relations both with the sophisticated and the less-developed nations. The generosity and good will of the United States to all free people can never be questioned.

We realize that fair and equitable trade between nations is a great force for peaceful coexistence. We also realize that an excess of imports, damaging to an industry or industries of another nation and a threat to the welfare of its citizens, can lead only to eventual, often bitter and acrimonious, retaliation.

We do not seek to bar our markets from our friends abroad, but we do insist that nations of good will voluntarily seek to negotiate with us on fair and equitable quotas on imports of wool fabrics, apparel, and other wool products, with which our wool industry can live and prosper.

If this cannot be done, and soon, I urge the administration to initiate immediately, bilateral or multilateral negotiations. I urge these be conducted in a forceful atmosphere of our national self-interest, to save from extinction, not only the wool textile industry of the United States, but our great wool-growing industry—both essential to our economy and national security.

President Johnson, at the signing of the tax bill, is reported to have said, "No one can bury us or bluff us or beat us so long as our economy remains strong." The wool industry of the United States is being buried by an avalanche of imports of wool textile products. This segment of our economy is not strong.

If the administration intends to take strong, positive action to correct this, now is the time to do it. If the administration continues to maintain a weak and vacillating position it can only end in frustration and further deterioration of the wool industry, then in justice to our industry we should know this. I cannot believe that President Johnson will allow this situation to continue. Convinced of our industry's need for prompt and effective action, I believe he will demand that negotiators be appointed, who with strong convictions of the justice of our position will negotiate with firmness and fairness to bring about the result so long sought and needed by our industry.

Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, Has Impressive Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

WHO IS BILL SCRANTON?

The above question appears often in the articles of newspaper columnists and other commentators as they start to assess the various potential candidates for the Republican Party's presidential nomination. The implication in the question is that Mr. Scranton's prospects suffer because he is not well known nationally.

However that may be, Bill Scranton is the Governor of Pennsylvania, now entering the second year of a 4-year term, and yesterday he went before the Pennsylvania General Assembly to give an accounting of his first year in office, to discuss the budget for the next fiscal year, and to outline his objectives for the new year.

On the whole, it was a commendable performance. The record thus far is good. The State enters 1964 with a budget surplus and although it is proposed to spend $59 million more in fiscal 1964–65 than in the current year, this can be done without additional taxation. It can be done as the result of administrative austerity, the budget surplus, and improving economic conditions.

The fact is that in his first year the Governor had the foresight to obtain new taxing authority to carry him through at least 2 years without the necessity of asking for additional levies. The sales tax, boosted from 4 to 5 percent last year, is providing enough revenue to finance all but $78 million of the State's costs of public education, which will take almost 51 percent of the general fund budget in fiscal 1964–65.

While the Scranton administration proposes to spend a record $1,168 million in the next fiscal year, the Governor's report indicates that the funds are well administered and that the State is making a real effort to hold costs to an absolute minimum.

But the Governor's message is notable for more than its fiscal accounting. It also reports on last year's industrial progress, an improving economy (reflecting a national upturn if nothing more), expanding human services, and more progress in education than we can recall in any single year in Pennsylvania's history.

Much of the groundwork for that progress had been laid before Mr. Scranton took office. Nevertheless, he got the program through the legislature and raised the additional money needed to finance it. The results are that local school districts are getting more State help than ever before, teachers are better paid, three more educational television stations will be on the air within another year, the State board of education has been revamped, and the first application for a State-supported community college will be considered this week.

As for the future, Governor Scranton suggests nothing more than a determined effort to follow up on what he has begun. He outlined six major objectives for this year: a legislative program including constitutional revisions, further improvement of the machinery of government, a greater effort to expand industry, greater public understanding of State government, the achievement of a higher level of political maturity, and better race relations statewide.

These are laudable goals toward which all Pennsylvania should cooperate loyally. They are more than enough to keep the young Governor busy through this and 2 more years.

But if he should be drafted by his party for the presidential nomination (the only basis on which he has expressed any interest), the best answer to the question, "Who is Bill Scranton?" is to be found, we believe, in his performance as this State's chief executive. The performance to date is impressive.

Take Your Politics Seriously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this major election year we must still recognize the fact that a number of our citizens will succumb to apathy and remain indifferent to their political obligations.

The Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., in an editorial of Thursday, March 5, very effectively and concisely directs our attention to the need for political intensity on the part of our citizens. I insert the article into the RECORD at this point:

TAKE YOUR POLITICS SERIOUSLY

What happens when a refugee comes here from a subjugated part of the world? He often kisses the earth of the good old United States and vows he will be forever grateful for his freedom. This is the first reaction—but what transpires after the initial feeling of ecstasy?

Most Americans or their ancestors came from oppressed lands. As time passes, too many of them, through indifference, add fuel to the flames that fired government domination in the lands of their forebears.

A lady and her son recently visited East Germany. One thing a relative there impressed on the son was, "take your politics seriously or you will lose your freedom like we have here." He told the boy that lack of interest in government is what brought about their subjugation. This incident brings home the danger of lack of interest in government.

It takes effort to preserve freedom, otherwise power-hungry minority groups gain control. Vigilance is the only weapon able to block such infiltration.

Political groups seek such power by using the government as a gift bag. Unless the people are alert to such methods which were used in Europe, and are now being promoted in the United States, they will find themselves burdened with a bureaucratic yoke and unable to free themselves.

We Americans as a whole have high ideals, generous hearts and great energy. We must be vigilant to preserve freedom for ourselves and those who will follow.

New Plane Bolsters Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "New Plane Bolsters Defense," from the San Diego Union of March 6, 1964:

WELCOME SURPRISE: NEW PLANE BOLSTERS DEFENSE

Announcement that the United States has developed the world's most advanced aircraft came as a welcome surprise to the American public and many Members of Congress.

The Lockheed-built A-11 has been tested "in sustained flight at more than 2,000 miles an hour and at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet." It was described by President Johnson as an interceptor plane.

If it can be used for that purpose, as it is now configured, it is understandable why the Senate Armed Services Committee refused to approve $40 million to develop an improved manned interceptor.

Development of the A-11 began in 1959 under the Eisenhower administration, supposedly as a reconnaissance plane to succeed the U-2. The U-2 captured world attention in 1960 when Francis Gary Powers was shot down during a picture-taking mission over the Soviet.

The U-2 is believed to have attained altitudes of up to 90,000 feet but it was much slower than the speed of sound, or mach 1. The A-11 apparently can fly equally high at mach 3. But from its configuration (stubby wings, needlenose) it hardly can be sufficiently maneuverable to be of much use as a manned interceptor in its present design. This would indicate the A-11 at present still is a reconnnaissance plane with interceptor potential.

The success of the Sky-Spy or Samos satellites appears to have reduced the necessity for manned flights over some points of the world. Conversion of the A-11 into a true interceptor would seem a logical step. Modifications undoubtedly are necessary because problems faced by the pilot of an interceptor are vastly more complicated than those encountered in a photo-reconnaissance flight.

However, development of the A-11 indicated a breakthrough in the metallurgical processes of fabricating titanium as a heat-resistant metal. This, plus the obvious success of Pratt-Whitney's J-58 jet engine, should give us a good start on developing the supersonic transport.

The potential of the A-11 as an interceptor cannot be ignored. It undoubtedly will be a valuable addition to our defense arsenal. The A-11 came from the drawing board into reality in less than 5 years, a remarkable but still time-consuming achievement. Development of missiles capable of performing all the multiple duties of manned aircraft may take even a longer period. That is why it often is unwise to scrap projects entailing manned aircraft in the belief nuclear weapons will be ready overnight to replace them.

The A-11 disclosure emphasizes that new developments will continue through the year, so there is not now, and never will be, the ultimate weapon.

At War on the Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, by way of continuing interests in the current cattle crisis, I would like to submit this editorial taken from the March 10 issue of the Omaha World-Herald, a newspaper in Nebraska that is particularly aware of and highly informative on the plight of the cattle industry threatened by foreign meat imports.

Calling the Nation's attention to the plight of the cattlemen was bound to draw fire from the liberal press because the industry for years has been jealous of its independence, refusing to admit Federal programs, preferring to go it alone on the good old free enterprise system.

As everyone knows, the cattle industry is involved in an international poker game where its well-being is the stake. When it protests being in this game, and not allowed to draw cards, it is immediately attacked by the one-worlders.

This editorial covers such an attack made by an eastern publication. The publication, by the way, seems as far out of touch with the realities of the cattle crisis as it is possible to be.

I believe the World-Herald editorial handles this attack extremely well. In addition, its answer is a complete refutation of the charge made in the magazine and sometimes mentioned in Capitol conversations.

I respectfully draw the attention of my colleagues to this editorial. It is as follows:

AT WAR ON THE RANGE

As was inevitable, the counter-attack has begun.

Free-traders, one-worlders, and assorted advocates of New Frontier foreign policy are taking pot shots at this newspaper and other spokesmen of the West and South in their fight to save the beleaguered American beef industry.

Some of these volleys have come, strangely, from the cattle country itself. Others have come from areas where interest in livestock usually is confined to the doings of the bulls and the bears.

One of these, with whom we choose to joust today, is the able and respected editor of Barron's magazine.

In an editorial in the issue of March 9 he writes in part:

"Myths, so the saying goes, die hard. Yet even a true believer in the legends of the West must admit that recent history has shaken his faith. From every corner of the old frontier—from Dodge City, Tombstone, and other places fabled in story and song—the Nation's cowpokes have been raising a wholly uncharacteristic cry for help. While their rugged forbears were willing to go it alone against all kinds of hazards, natural, and man-made alike, today's cattlemen are evidently a different breed. Threatened by a mounting flood of imported beef, they have sought to stampede Congress into coming to the rescue. Last Thursday, indeed, on the issue of whether or not the United States ought to decree strict quotas on imports of meat (the Hruska amendment), they lost the showdown on the Senate floor by only two votes."

That's no whimper you're hearing from the Old West, podner. That's a clatter of hosses' hooves and the roar of six-guns. The cowpokes have plumb lost patience with the varmits that sneaked in on their range from across the border, and they aim to drive 'em out and keep 'em out, even if they have to put up barbed wire to do it.

If you know your Old West, podner, you know how these cattle wars always turn out. Better get over on the right side before the lawman starts sightin' along that thar rifle barrel.

Now if we may descend for a moment from the realm of allegory to the world of fact:

As our critics are saying (as if it were a truth newly discovered), the cattle industry has always been a boom and bust business. The cattlemen don't object to that. They have never asked for price supports or a dole.

They just don't want to get into a bust and bigger bust routine, and that is what they are up against so long as they are faced with open-end, no-limit foreign competition.

Another thing our critics are saying: The imported beef is mostly lean, commercial-grade stuff. Fit only for hamburger, weiners, and the like. American cattle growers don't market beef like that, so (quoting Barron's) "naturally foreign sources emerged to fill the gap."

Want to bet that American cattlemen wouldn't fill that gap if they had the chance? They always used to. Trouble is, they can't compete with cattle raised on 25- or 50-cents-an-acre range by 25-cents-an-hour labor.

The foreign sources didn't move in to fill any gap. They moved in with the kind of cattle they have, and grabbed enough of our market to feed the average American for more than 1 month of each year. One of these days, if the blessings of free trade continue, they will make a major move into the American fat-cattle market too. Wait till our Peace Corps, point 4 experts and other doers of good teach them how to raise corn—or our Department of Agriculture persuades them to accept more taxpayer-subsidized feed grain.

The cattle crisis is, of course, a part of a broader crisis brought about by the policy of undiscriminating free trade. High-wage Americans are being placed in direct competition with low-wage workers in other lands whose factories are just as efficient as ours. So we go to Switzerland for watches, Italy for typewriters, Japan for sewing machines and radios, Germany for cameras, and Canada for Studebakers.

Barron's concludes its piece with these words: "In political wheeling and dealing, the consumer sooner or later winds up as the forgotten man. Only the free market can or will look out for his interests."

We love the consumer, too. But after he loses his job, where is he going to get the wherewithal to buy all this wonderfully cheap foreign stuff?

VFW Honors Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to attend the annual banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in honor of Members of Con-

gress held on March 10 at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington, D.C. Each year, this very respected veteran organization recognizes some Member of the U.S. Congress for their services to the cause of veterans.

This year, the Veterans of Foreign Wars saw fit to honor a gentleman who has given the best and most years of his life to public service, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Senator HAYDEN's remarks in accepting the annual congressional award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HAYDEN FOLLOWING PRESENTATION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS CONGRESSIONAL AWARD, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1964

I thank you for this wonderful award and the kind words that went with it. Certainly there is no group in America whose good opinion that I value more highly than those of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am particularly glad to be here with the winners in the Voice of Democracy contest. These young people are able to speak out for America. They guarantee that we will have some good voices saying some sensible things for many years to come.

As the recipient of its first Annual Congressional Award, I believe that it is due to the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to make known to them the background of the man who is receiving it for the first time.

I am the son of a Connecticut Yankee, born in 1825, whose grandfather served in the War of the Revolution and who, as a boy, talked with veterans of the conflict which made our Nation possible. As a young man, he went west and in 1848, left Independence, Mo., with an ox train, the wagons loaded with goods to establish a mercantile business in Santa Fe. En route he met Illinois and Missouri veterans returning from the war with Mexico, and some of his supplies were requisitioned to meet their needs.

Ten years later, after the Gadsden Purchase, he hauled a stock of goods to Tucson to establish a business there. On one occasion, in southwestern New Mexico, his parked wagon train was beseiged by a large band of Apache Indians who were driven off by the arrival of a troop of cavalry.

The Confederate invasion of New Mexico made it impossible to bring merchandise from Independence, so my father had to drive across the plains, purchase goods in the East and ship them by sailing vessels around Cape Horn to San Francisco, and then transshipped them to San Diego or Guaymas, where he sent his mule teams to get them.

He would be driven between Tucson and San Francisco in his own ambulance and it was on one such trip that he met my mother who was teaching school in Visalia, Calif. Her uncle, who was a 49'er, wrote that there was a need for school teachers. On her way out, the then Union Pacific Railroad train had to stop twice to let herds of buffalo cross the tracks.

My mother was a native of Arkansas whose ancestors also fought in the War of the Revolution. She had two brothers in the Confederate Army, one of whom was killed in the battle of Shiloh. A Union regiment camped on my grandfather's farm, and burned his fence rails for their camp fires. She said that she owed a debt to the Confederacy which could be paid by marrying a Yankee and fixing him for life. He liked the fixing and took her to Arizona—where I was born.

I can add that my mother's first cousin, Andrew Jackson Halbert, was badly wounded at the battle of Shiloh. When I was a boy, I was walking up the street with him one day when we met Tom Gregory, a Union veteran. Cousin Jack said, "Tom, do you know what day this is?" Tom didn't know. Cousin Jack then said, "This is the anniversary of the battle of Shiloh. We were killing Yankees that day. We had about 5,000 killed by this time that morning."

During most of my boyhood in Arizona the Apaches were on the warpath. I can remember seeing their signal fires on the mountain peaks, and also remember when a sword was presented to General Nelson A. Miles at Tucson in gratitude for the capture and deportation to Florida of Geronimo and his band of hostile Apaches. Why the name of that murderous old villian was shouted by paratroopers when they jumped is a mystery to me.

I was a student at Stanford University when war was declared against Spain in 1898. I learned that Maj. Alexander O. Brodie, a graduate of West Point, had been chosen by Theodore Roosevelt to enlist a squadron of the 1st U.S. Volunteer Cavalry (later known as the Rough Riders) in the Territory of Arizona and I hurried home to enlist. Before I arrived, the quota had been filled, which was lucky for me because the troop in which I wanted to enlist was left in Tampa, Fla., to take care of the horses, and suffered from malarial fever, while the rest of the regiment went on to Cuba to win the Battle of San Juan Hill.

When Colonel Roosevelt became President of the United States he appointed Colonel Brodie to be the Governor of the Territory of Arizona. One day in 1904, when I was managing our flour mill and general merchandise store in my native town of Tempe, I received a letter from Governor Brodie inviting me to see him when I came to Phoenix. When I met him, the Governor said that the National Guard company in Tempe was in a bad way and that unless I became its captain it would be mustered out of service. When I protested that I had no military experience to qualify me to be a captain, his reply was "You are a gentleman."

I talked it over with my young friends and 32 of us enlisted at the same time in Company C, 1st Regiment of Infantry, National Guard of Arizona. Shortly afterward I was elected by them to be its captain. We soon learned about the national rifle matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, and proceeded to clear off the sagebrush for a 1,000-yard rifle range. Our rifle practice paid off because thereafter about half of the Arizona team at Camp Perry were members of my company.

At Camp Perry I shot a possible with a Springfield rifle. I hit the bull's eye 15 consecutive times at 900 yards. I can add that it was with the help of the members of the National Guard of Arizona that I was first elected to Congress in 1911.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I voted to declare war on Germany in April 1917. Not long afterward three Members of that body entered military service. Augustus Gardner, of Massachusetts, became a major of Infantry and died in the service in January of 1918. Royal Johnson, of South Dakota, as a lieutenant of Infantry, was wounded in the Argonne. Fiorello LaGuardia, of New York, who went to the public school in Prescott, Ariz., and whose father was an Army bandmaster, became a major in the Army Air Corps and rendered excellent service in Italy. He afterward became the mayor of New York.

Shortly after their departure from the House, President Wilson issued an order forbidding Members of Congress from entering the Armed Forces. But, in 1918, Newton D. Baker, the Secretary of War, went to Europe to look over the battle fronts. The Assistant Secretary was not aware of the President's order so four of us Members of the House entered the service before the lid was again put on.

Tom Connoly, of Texas, became a captain and adjutant of Infantry; Marvin Jones, of Texas, was a private in the Tank Corps; and Albert Johnson, of Washington, a captain in the chemical warfare service.

I was made a major of Infantry and assigned to duty at Camp Lewis in the State of Washington. At the age of 41, I had a hard time keeping up with the younger men in my battalion, but the division was ready to go overseas when the armistice was declared. Like all others who had completed training, we said that the Kaiser heard we were coming and decided that it was time to end the war.

So in January 1919, I returned to the House of Representatives, and it was not long until those who had served in the First World War and their widows and orphans asked for help to adjust their grievances. This I did with the aid of an able secretary, Jack Gavin, who had served in General Pershing's headquarters at Chaumont, and was a stenographer at the Peace Conference at Versailles.

By 1924, a number of the veterans of the war with Germany had been elected to the House of Representatives. They joined in a demand that a committee for World War veterans be created. When that was done, John Garner, the Democratic minority leader, came to my office and insisted that I resign from the Committee on Public Lands and become the ranking minority member of the new committee. I objected to making the change and Garner said: "Are you bigger than the Democratic Party?" He then explained that some of the new Congressman who were veterans violently objected to the selection of a Tammany Democrat, who was not a veteran, to be the ranking Democratic member of the committee, and that I was the only Democrat who had longer congressional service than he.

So I became the ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on World War Veterans Legislation on January 14, 1924, and upon which I served until I was elected to the Senate in November 1926. From the start it was a busy committee which aided in the enactment of legislation beneficial to veterans and to their widows and orphans.

In 1934, I made a trip to the Far East. In China there were armed guards on all of the railroad trains and soldiers everywhere one went. The Japanese had recently conquered Manchuria and I did not see a railroad bridge without a machinegun enplacement or a railroad station that was not surrounded by a barbed wire entanglement.

Previously, I had been in Europe where I saw the carabinaros in pairs all over Spain, and the Blackshirts everywhere in Italy. On my return to Arizona I told my people that from what I had seen and what I had heard of the actions of Hitler in Germany, it was evident that we were heading into another World War and I was ready to vote for more battleships and every other form of preparedness for a war that was sure to come.

The Second World War did come and those who served in it, and in Korea, make up most of the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that great organization whose award I am honored to receive this night.

No words can ever say how much I appreciate being the first to receive this high honor, but I know you will agree there is a higher honor and you all share it with me. Yes, the real award for serving America is the knowledge that you have served her, and you never finish with that kind of service. It runs from the cradle to the grave, gives purpose and direction to our lives.

Today we stand firm against the forces of communism and will keep right on standing firm. With men like you on the alert we have the assurance of constant support and maintenance of a strong Military Establishment. At the same time, we know that this generation and those to come will not only defend America, but will keep her forever

worth defending. Again, I am grateful for the Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award. I am honored to accept it on behalf of all Members of Congress and all citizens of the Nation who foster the American spirit in war and in peace. I thank you.

Where's U.S. Prestige?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in his book "The 20 Years Crisis," author Carr purports that the basic problem of utopian theories for world peace lies in the fact that none of these theories recognize the forces of change as a necessary element in the conduct of world and human events.

It is time we recognized the forces of change and channel them into peaceful and constructive directions. A free enterprise system such as we have in this country is a system which must allow change to take place in a constructive and orderly manner rather than attempting to keep the lid on the boiling pot until it results in an explosion.

The damage of ignoring these forces is evident in recent events which have occurred throughout the world indicating that U.S. foreign policy is in need of some constructive changes.

I submit for inclusion here an editorial from the January 20 issue of the Frederick (Md.) News which clearly points out the seriousness of the situation:

WHERE'S U.S. PRESTIGE?

There hasn't been much said since the 1960 campaign about U.S. prestige abroad. That was one of the main points of attack then against the Eisenhower administration. Its victim, Richard M. Nixon, refrained in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors from discussing it last April. He felt that as the strongest nation in the world, it is our responsibility to lead, not to follow the forces of freedom.

But it is not the forces of freedom alone that are low on America today, it is the upstart nations encouraged by the Soviet Union's policy of aiding so-called wars of liberation. Look at Zanzibar, for instance, the latest in a number of tiny nations that has spat in Uncle Sam's eye with impunity.

The revolutionary President, Abeid Karume, personally led a group including his foreign minister and soldiery and put the highest American representative in the country, Frederick P. Picard, 3d, who was acting as charge d'affairs, under house arrest. Then Karume placed Donald K. Peterson, a third secretary in the U.S. Embassy, also under house arrest, and detained the four American newsmen on the island. This was Karume's way of expressing his anger that the United States had not rushed to recognize his government. He released them 24 hours later.

There was also Prince Norodom Sihanouk, of Cambodia, who decided he wanted no more of the U.S. foreign aid, after riding the gravy train for many millions, and deciding that neutrality would serve his nation best while southeast Asia was a battleground. He wants international guarantees of his country's neutrality similar to Laos, where Communists have continued their armed occupation of a large part of the country.

Closer to home, there was the burning and trampling on the American flag in the recent rioting in Panama definitely linked to Castro agents who appeared with bombs and rifles the minute that flag incident occurred.

Instead of worrying about U.S. prestige abroad, these and other incidents show that our concern should not be with what may be popular for the moment, but what is right for the United States in the long pull. Compromising our principles has brought the United States to a low estate indeed when such things can happen.

Older Than the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we in Hartford, Conn., take great pride in being the home of the Hartford Courant, which this year observes its 200th anniversary. This makes the Hartford Courant the oldest newspaper in the United States, preceding, in fact, the independence of the Nation itself. Such continuity should not go unnoticed and indeed the publisher of Time magazine has caused it to be commented on in its March 13 issue. It is an interesting account of this historic event and I believe it should be called to the attention of the Members:

OLDER THAN THE COUNTRY

The news from Boston was sketchy and unconfirmed. Still, no newspaper that took pride in its independence could ignore it. So the Connecticut Courant, in Hartford, boldly displayed the item: "We hear from Boston that last Thursday evening, between 300 and 400 boxes of the celebrated East India tea, by some accident which happened in an attempt to get it on shore, fell overboard—that the boxes burst open and the tea was swallowed up by the vast abyss."

When that historical incident from America's past appeared in the Courant in the issue of December 21, 1773, the paper was already a veteran of 9 years. It had staked a proud and exclusive claim to a title that it still holds. This year the Hartford Courant observes its 200th anniversary, a chronological fact that makes it the oldest newspaper in the United States [1]—an institution some 12 years senior to the Nation itself.

FARMS FOR LEASE

Today, American schoolchildren commit to memory the names, dates and events that the Courant once committed to print. In 1765 the paper published a wrathful editorial ("The most arbitrary monarchs in the universe") and suspended publication for five weeks to protest the Stamp Act just enforced by England. Thomas Paine's revolutionary tracts were carried in full in the Courant; so was the Declaration of Independence—on an inside page, and under the mildest of headlines: "A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America."

George Washington was not only the subject of Courant stories, he was a reader and advertiser. On March 14, 1796, he bought half a page in the paper to offer some of his Virginia farmland for lease to "real farmers of good reputation, and none others need apply." Thomas Jefferson sued the paper for libel after an 1806 Courant accusation that he had secretly bribed France to win its support. He lost his case in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Courant's founder, a traveling printer named Thomas Green, piloted his paper for only three years. Then he rejoined a brother in New Haven, surrendering command of the Courant to Ebenezer Watson, one of his own printers. Young Watson enlisted the Courant in the cause of independence, but he did not live to see the dream come true or his paper prosper. Smallpox killed him during the Revolutionary War, leaving his young widow Hannah, mother of five, to manage the shop. She managed well. In 1778, when the Courant's paper mill burned to the ground, Hannah talked the Connecticut general assembly into sponsoring a statewide lottery, and from the proceeds ($31,000) she was given $5,000 to rebuild the mill.

The Courant continued to prosper, but in a diminishing corned of a rapidly expanding national map. As soon as the Republican Party was founded in 1854, the Courant joined it, and has never left. The paper has since broken ranks to endorse only one Democrat for any office. It urged Hartford to elect Thomas Spellacy for mayor in 1935. The Courant's influence in its own bailiwick can be measured by the fact that Spellacy was elected.

SATISFIED

Hartford and Connecticut now describe the horizon of a paper that in another century made compulsory reading for U.S. Presidents. Its causes have come to be on the parochial side. Where once it opposed women's suffrage, direct election of U.S. Senators and Franklin D. Roosevelt, now it fights for fluoridation and the council-manager plan. Where once it championed the right of the American Colonies to be free, today it opposes the right of a Hartford movie theater to eject the Courant's movie critic.

Wire services and syndicated columnists are relied on to report what goes on outside Connecticut. But in its own yard, the Courant can't be beat. In Willimantic, Old Saybrook, Simsbury and other familiar towns, the paper keeps up an industrious network of 13 bureaus, 25 staffers and more than 100 correspondents. One of the more dependable of these, Alice "Clover" Pinney, retired only last year after 54 straight years of covering Farmington, Conn., during which time she never missed a single fire.

NO MORE REVOLUTIONS

The Courant's present publisher, John R. Reitemeyer, 65, joined the paper as a part-time reporter in 1921, worked his patient way to the top by 1947, and has since addressed himself to the task of overtaking the afternoon competition, the Hartford Times.

A mere 147 years old, the Times is a Democratic daily in a Democratic city. It has led the Courant in circulation for 40 years, but the gap is closing again; circulation now is 128,500 to 124,000. In Reitemeyer's careful stewardship, the Courant is not likely to play a role in any more revolutions. It seems satisfied to remain the best paper in Hartford, Conn., and the oldest paper in the United States.

[1] A title contested, with considerable spirit and flimsy documentation, by the Philadelphia Inquirer, which can trace its ancestry back to 1829—or 65 years after the Courant's birth.

British Expert Terms Fat-Red Theory a False Basis for Trade With Cubans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, additional evidence is at hand that people in Western European countries who oppose trade giveaways and credit to Communist countries are speaking out to oppose their freewheeling governments on this issue.

The following article from the Washington Post, March 9, 1964, is an example of voices who are questioning the fallacies that fat Communists are nicer, that trade with Communist nations necessarily leads to political detente, or that expanded East-West trade can be independent of political factors.

These voices can help us budge the attitudes of West European politicians toward solid, needed trade curbs to Communist countries if we back them up. The administration is making a tragic error in not pushing hard enough. Its irresolute, halfway policy—sales of enormous quantities of wheat to the hard up Soviets, but timid scolding of the British for their Cuban bus sales—is a proven flop. We should get out and muster support from among the substantial body of Western European opinion which realizes the grim necessity of using trade as a political weapon against the Communist threat, in the same way that Communists would surely use trade against us if they had enough economic strength to do so. Let us not, as the administration is hinting, wreck our own trade controls simply because West European governments at the moment will not go along with stiff controls.

The article follows:

BRITISH EXPERT TERMS FAT-RED THEORY A FALSE BASIS FOR TRADE WITH CUBANS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON, March 8.—One of Britain's leading authorities on the Soviet Union took issue today with the thesis that a fat Communist was less dangerous than a lean one.

Writing in the London Sunday Times, Prof. Leonard Schapiro castigated both Prime Minister Douglas-Home and the Labor Party leader, Harold Wilson, for seeking to apply what he termed a fallacious argument to trade with Cuba.

To contend that the Soviet Unon is more reasonable because it is fatter, Schapiro said, "attaches quite unreal importance to the relationship between what the population of Russia wants and the policy pursued by its leaders."

The overwhelming reason for discernible changes in Soviet policy, he contended, is the existence of nuclear weapons and the inadvisability of actions that might lead to armed conflict with the United States.

"No amount of trade with Cuba," he asserted, "is likely to produce the kind of factors which in the case of the Soviet Union may in time lead to closer and more harmonious poltical relations.

"On the other hand, to ignore the very natural apprehensions of our ally, the United States, about the shoring up of a power which is avowedly dedicated to spreading Communist rule over the American continent, may lose us much more than we should ever gain from the profits of Cuban trade."

Schapiro did not exclude trade with Communist countries, but called for the weighing of political factors first. He opposed an economic boycott designed to starve Cuba on moral grounds.

"But quite apart from morals," he added, "the fact that the capitalist powers are repeatedly called upon to feed the Socialist countries is a more powerful argument against communism than all the books in the British Museum."

Schapiro's attack was the second made recently on the British fat versus lean Communist argument. Writing in the Guardian last week John Grigg, the former Lord Altrincham, took much the same line against what he called wishful thinking.

Are We Really Saving 25 Cents on the Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the past the sole-source procurement of materiel by the Department of Defense has in some instances been much more expensive than it should have been. In many instances, competitive bidding would have resulted in a very definite saving to the taxpayer. Some of our colleagues have been diligent in determining such instances and pointing them out. However, to condemn the whole practice of sole-source procurement in all cases would not result in a net savings to the taxpayer. The fact that this important question must be solved with moderation and with an eye to the elements involved in each case is set forth very ably in this editorial by C. W. Borklund appearing in the Armed Forces Management magazine of January 1964. The editorial follows:

ARE WE REALLY SAVING 25 CENTS ON THE DOLLAR?

(By C. W. Borklund)

Mr. Secretary, we don't buy your contention that you're saving 25 cents, at least, on every dollar converted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement. We don't say you are wrong. We just say you haven't proved it yet, and won't until you finish the story.

The key to whether you are correct or not revolves around the word "sound" in your expression "lowest sound price." This is an appropriate subject for an issue of Armed Forces Management loaded with reports on maintenance. These and related fields have a lot to do with our complaint.

Unless and until these factors are an integral part of your cost reduction analysis, your 25-cents-on-the-dollar figure is suspect. We have been harping on this soft spot for several months now. Latest indication it probably still exists has come to us from Lear Siegler, vice president, R. W. Richardson summarizing a talk he gave late last year at a Navy-industry seminar.

He wasn't necessarily indicting, as we are, your thesis, but he covered the subject extremely well. Here, in part, is what he had to say:

"Maintenance action—planned or unplanned, integrated or unintegrated—can only go to work on the product it receives from the procuring agency. If this product is a victim of what I call the low-bid fallacy then the best maintenance management in the world can only make a bad situation just a little less bad.

"We can and do use judgment in our personal procurements. (We know we can't afford to buy the cheapest bacon. It's mostly fat.) As individuals and as a nation we seem to be continually getting the terms 'cost' and 'price' confused in the defense business. * * * The fault is no one's and everyone's—a combination of contradiction and confusion, politics and pressures, idealism and insanity.

"Price equals acquisition dollars, or today's selling price haggled out in the bazaar.

"Cost equals total or ownership cost, or the combination of acquisition price plus cradle-to-grave support expense.

"For a long time * * * end-item procurement has been based largely on the low-bid criterion. Superficial savings are analyzed and awards made solely on this basis. The very important cost distinction between acquisition (and) ownership—a ratio of as much as 10 to 1—is neither considered nor encouraged. (Yet) if * * * price represents only one-tenth of total cost, surely total cost (is) the only valid (criterion for) procurement award. (In our personal affairs, I trust it would not occur to any of us to measure the cost of matrimony on the basis of the $2 license fee.)

"Consider the recent procurement of a standard attitude indicator—a real small flea on the weapon system elephant. This indicator (bought from two sources) was designed and qualified to the same MIL spec, utilized by the same aircraft, maintained by the same people, flew the same missions throughout a 1-year period.

"Initially X-type indicators were priced at approximately $3,000 each. Y-type, which was bid as a result of a breakout decision, had an initial price of $2,000. However, (because Y cost three times as much to maintain as X) the support cost for keeping * * *brand X in the field for a 5-year period totals $3,400,000 (while) Y has cost $8,500,000. Extend this to cover a 10-year period, a reasonable life expectancy for the aircraft involved, and the difference is appalling.

"Then we have the situation where, in the name of economy and competitive bidding, one of the services decides to procure, on a second- or third-source basis, equipment that is substantially equal in maintenance cost. A case in point is a second-source procurement of 500 pieces of a $1,000 component which showed a price saving of $10,000 over the bid price of the original supplier. But the additional cost to introduce and support the second source was $73,000—a net loss of $63,000.

"Then on a repeat procurement for the same item yet a third vendor had the lowest quote. His bid was lower than those from the two prior sources by $46,000 but the associated support cost to accept his product logistically was in excess of $63,000. Again a net loss to the military—in this case $20,000.

"So far the Government has saved a minus $83,000 through the economies of a distorted misconception of competitive bidding. The only good thing you can say is that they are losing less for each new supplier they add. As the old saying goes, they only lose a little on each one but they make up for it in volume.

"Competition will exist in fact and true economy will be achieved only when the best product has been engineered and proven to meet the optimum combination of price and quality; when a fully comprehensive specification has been written and when all bidders are bound to guarantees of full compliance. After award there must be continuing

measurement and compliance assurance, with financial incentives for superior performance and corresponding penalties, even including termination, for failure.

"Present ASPR regulations stress competitive low bid * * *. It seems highly unlikely that present procurement practice will change until the ASPR's are expanded and the military services are directed to analyze and justify each procurement on the basis of total cost.

"In forecasting total cost, it is necessary (that we develop data and skill to prepare skillfully) a maintenance cost study, or logistics study, to be incorporated with the initial or acquisition price."

As Richardson points out, without ASPR changes few military buyers are likely to award many contracts on anything other than the lowest bid price—particularly in the face of the heat wave from your cost reduction program. There are too many pressures to do things the easier way.

But, as Richardson adds, in what amounts to the plea to the field echelons to put pressure on the front office, "It is time we told the Congress and the taxpayer (and, adds Air Force Management, 'Secretary McNamara') that we need their support to save them money—and that we are prepared to prove how we can do it.

"They must be convinced that we are not against competition, per se; that we recognize real competition as a necessary and healthy process which will force lower costs. But it only works when you are competing apples against apples."

An Arms Race in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing concern of many citizens over the Vietnam crisis is reflected in editorial comment of our leading newspapers.

Chicago's American, in an editorial Saturday, March 7, ponders one aspect of the Vietnamese situation that the administration should well have looked into some time ago.

I insert the article for the attention of the Members:

AN ARMS RACE IN VIETNAM?

While the United States has been threatening to get tougher in South Vietnam, the Communist Government of North Vietnam has been getting tougher. It has decided, apparently, that if the United States is willing to let the guerrilla warfare go on and on, it isn't, and accordingly it has been pouring increased numbers of larger and more modern weapons south to its embattled Communists in South Vietnam is an effort to bring the war to an end.

This arms speedup was announced in Washington by Secretary of Defense Robert A. McNamara just before he took off for South Vietnam at the head of an inspection team which is going to consider, again, what this country should do about the situation there. McNamara said the situation was grave. He pointed out also that the new weapons which the Communists are getting have been made in Red China.

So it comes down to this: The real contest in Vietnam obviously is between Red China and the United States, and the Chinese Communist Government is putting it on the basis of arms production. The United States surely ought to be able to win that sort of contest with the comparatively unindustrialized Red Chinese. So why don't we supply the South Vietnamese anti-Communists with so many superior weapons that the North Vietnamese Communists will seem almost unarmed by comparison.

If it is argued that this might offend the Red Chinese, the fact is that they are already offended with the United States to the point of incoherence. Anyway, if they are willing to take the risk of arming the North Vietnamese against us, shouldn't we be ready to take the risk of arming the South Vietnamese even better?

"The Republican Challenge: A Call to Leadership"—Address by Governor Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Governor Scranton gave an excellent address before 1,400 members and guests at the Economic Club in New York City on March 3, 1964.

Bill Scranton received a standing ovation as he finished, which was a real tribute to his leadership.

I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people these main portions of Governor Scranton's address:

SCRANTON BIDS GOP TAKE LEAD

Our political parties are, in many ways, curious creatures.

Both of them are formed through the alliance of men, their loyalties, their aspirations, their emotions, their highest ideals, their basest desires.

In the course of history, each party is propelled toward a peculiar role in American politics. Conviction, opportunity, connivance, political skill, happenstance—all of these have contrived to determine on the shifting national scene which party has stood as the majority and which as the minority.

The fact is that in almost every moment of the past 32 years the Democratic Party has been the majority party in America.

The fact is that the time has come to say that, by the rules of the game, that majority party is to be held accountable for the failures which dot the national landscape.

The fact is that the deadlock in the Democratic Party is the chief reason for the deadlock in American democracy.

The forces which have combined to become the Democratic Party are forces which by their very nature collide in deadlock. It is a party of dreams on the one hand; and of reaction on the other.

BLOCKED BY REACTIONARIES

The party when it dreams has noble thoughts of shining cities, equal opportunities, and social progress. The party when it governs is hamstrung by its reactionaries, who smash the dreams and leave the political landscape strewn with the broken promises of a deadlocked party.

Denial of civil rights to the American Negro has, of course, been a critical shortcoming of our society for many years—including the years of the Roosevelt administration. But, until recently, this has been a quiet crisis. By its very nature, the Democratic Party has been incapable of dealing with a social crisis in the kindling stage. A roaring fire is demanded before they can act, and in the case of civil rights they cannot act even now.

What is the upshot of this deadlock?

The liberal and theoretical wing of the party, frustrated by continued impotence has resorted to proposals more notable for their trappings than for their relevance to real problems.

Time after time, that party has responded to probelms with answers which not only are not solutions, but have the additional bad effects of needlessly proliferating the Central Government and doing violence to our Federal system.

All of this because of the deadlock within the party.

The Democratic Party has gone back to the sterile approaches which for 30 years have failed to solve our most pressing national problems.

The first sign of this return came with the new Federal budget.

First, that document bowed to conservative elements in the party by appearing to show a decrease in Government spending. But then, to keep warm the spirits of the liberal enthusiasts, word was spread that the magic interworkings of the budget provided for no decrease at all.

In the recent tax bill we have seen the effects of the Democratic deadlock. Tax reform joined expenditure cuts on the scrap heap, and only the politically attractive tax cut was enacted.

Nowhere today, however, are the calamitous results of the deadlock more apparent than in the struggle for effective civil rights legislation. I confess to tremendous pride in my fellow Republicans in the House of Representatives. They got civil rights out of committee, and they voted 4 to 1 in favor of the bill. Without their votes the Democratic majority would have once again been unable to act.

Where, then, stands the Republican Party in relation to this deadlock which for three decades has all but paralyzed our society?

Is there any evidence that the Republican Party, if it were to become the majority, could effectively lead America and avoid the present dreary impasse?

In the first place, I believe that when the history of this era is finally written, men who treasure the Federal system and the American concept of checks and balances will rise to cheer the Republican Party.

We are the conservative party in this Nation, and we are proud of it. But we are a conservative party which understands what Edmund Burke meant when he said that "a state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."

The Republican Party gave us the Morrill Act which set up the land-grant colleges, the schools that became our great State universities of today, renowned the world over for the excellence of their teaching and their research.

But the Republican Party did not put the Federal Government into the business of running the State universities.

The Republican Party pledged, in its very first platform, the one upon which Lincoln ran, to build a railroad to the Pacific. It redeemed that pledge. But it did not put the Federal Government into the railroad business.

On and on the record runs. Through all the years the Republicans served the Nation as the majority party, they made their best contributions when they were conserving America's principles by solving America's problems.

PATH FOR CONSERVATIVES

They (Republicans) must make it clear that they do not believe America's problems will disappear if we all merely wrap ourselves in the Stars and Stripes. They must make it

clear that true conservatives will have nothing to do with the forces of reaction.

The whole point of Republican insistence on strong State governments is the Republican belief that State government can in many areas accomplish more and do the job better than the Central Government can.

To prove that contention more than a platitude, the Republican Party must devise imaginative and exciting means to give the State governments the financial strength to conquer many of the grim problems that threaten our society.

For instance, why can't the Federal Government turn over to the States a percentage of the taxes now collected by Washington?

—Why can't we devise a method of expanding the State's share of the national tax dollar?

The answer is that of course we can.

We can devise in a hundred different bold new attacks on the problems of America and we can do it without going outside the framework of the Constitution and the Federal principle.

But none of these things, our recent history makes clear, can be achieved by the deadlocked Democratic Party.

Progress, today, can be achieved only through the Republican Party.

As a Republican, I say to my party:

Let us show what free men can do to shape their own destiny.

Let us solve the deadlock in democracy.

Let us begin to act like a majority party and in so doing we shall lead America to her finest hour.

Jewish Telegraph Agency Reports on Need for Congressional Review of Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the growing public interest in the need for an objective review of our immigration policy is reflected in a column written by Jessie Halpern, Washington correspondent for the Jewish Telegraph Agency. As this article relates, there has not been such a systematic review by Congress in over 40 years. Miss Halpern's article follows:

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF IMMIGRATION POLICY

On the eve of the 80th annversary of Hias, there is perhaps no issue more complicated or timely for American as well as world Jewry, or one which demands as much attention, enlightenment and action, as the reform of outdated U.S. immigration policies.

The blatant injustices of the archaic system and the power of rigid adherents to ancient policy speak for themselves. The tireless efforts of knowledgeable and concerned legislators and scholars on behalf of immigration reform are less well known.

Too obvious is the sorry realization that there has been no constructive review of U.S. immigration policy in over 40 years. Additionally, since the end of World War II, Presidential efforts to abolish from immigration policy the odious "national origins" quota system have failed.

In 1953 the only statutory combined committee in Congress—the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy—came into existence. Chaired by the harsh, unbending late Pennsylvania Democrat, Francis E. Walter, coauthor of the McCarran-Walter Act, the pressing needs for reforms made little headway. But when the late President Kennedy last July publicly urged the repeal of immigration quotas, new hopes were aroused. Ironically, of the last budgetary request made by President Kennedy on November 21—1 day before his assassination—the only item concerning legislative requirements which was not passed was that which would have given the stalemated joint committee the meager sum of $104,460 to have a staff and pay for operations. Committee action would continue to stagnate.

Unfortunately, the efforts of one of the most well-informed, but little-recognized fighters for immigration reform, Democratic Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN of Ohio, have, over the years, been thwarted and eclipsed by ignorance or stubbornness. Of primary significance had been the power of Congressman Walter. The public had been deceived into thinking that FEIGHAN whisted Walter's tune. However, since Walter's death this past year, Representative FEIGHAN has been elevated to the chairmanship of the struggling Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. In addition, he is now ranking majority member of the House Judiciary Committee, headed by New York Democrat, EMANUEL CELLER.

In immigration reform matters, FEIGHAN had had to contend with lack of funds, a paucity of general knowledge in this complex area, and vestiges of hard-core opposition from congressional Members as well as demographers who adhere to population standing room only concepts.

Back in 1957 Congressman FEIGHAN presented a proposal to Congress which sought a new and selective method to distribute authorized but unused quota numbers, eliminate the national origins system, emphasize the desirability of bringing to the United States yearly persons with important technical or professional skills, provide a haven for victims of totalitarian aggression, and to reunite families and relatives. Since then FEIGHAN has continued to remind legislators of the antiquated immigration laws, but has failed to get necessary congressional support.

President Kennedy's appeal to Congress last July called for the gradual elimination of the quota system. The main proposals in the bill were: (1) That existing quotas be gradually reduced at the rate of 20 percent per year with a reserve pool for redistribution; (2) that natives of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any one year; and (3) that upon recommendations from a seven-man immigration board, the President be authorized to reserve up to 50 percent of unallocated quotas for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent for refugees affected by sudden dislocation.

While less articulate on the matter than his predecessors, President Johnson strongly supports the late President's proposals. Among the first groups the new President met with this year to discuss immigration reform needs were representatives from the Joint Distribution Committee, United HIAS, the American Jewish Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, the National Community Relations Advisory Council, and the Anti-Defamation League. However, there has been no White House Action since then.

There is no doubt among observers of the national scene that the future of action on immigration reforms hinges on the effectiveness of Congressman FEIGHAN in his new role of joint committee chairman. FEIGHAN has realistically emphasized the need for action in the matter and the equally important requirement for educating Congress as well as the citizenry. He is now confidently assuming the leadership in a battle which he previously fought with little help. At the same time he knows his efforts must be directed toward an immigration system which will best benefit the United States both domestically and internationally.

Certainly the impact of the necessary U.S. immigration reforms upon world Jewry would be more than of passing significance. Reforms would especially aid Jews in Eastern Europe desiring to flee from communism—when such emigration is allowed. Remnants of Jews originally from the Soviet Union and now residing in Far Eastern areas such as Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Malaya would also be justly affected, as would be the future of Jews born and now residing in problematic situations in African countries.

One further important consequence of the implementation of reform proposals would be the elimination of gross financial burdens too often imposed upon families seeking to immigrate and reunite with relatives in the United States.

It is hoped that present congressional preoccupations with civil rights, farm, taxation, foreign aid, and other matters will not overshadow the overdue need for urgent action on the reform of our present antiquated immigration laws.

Baker Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in line with the old saying "There's no place like home," I would like to add that there's certainly no place like home when it happens to be Baker, Oreg., which, I am proud to say, is my hometown.

Its idyllic setting in the valley of the Blue Mountains, a sportsman's paradise, its diversification of industry, from raising top-grade beef, to lumber, agriculture, and mining, and its colorful history are aptly described in an article featured in the February 1964 issue of the magazine Cascades, which I would like to insert in the Appendix for the interest of my colleagues. I am sure that, after reading this article, they will understand my great pride in being able to call myself a native of Baker. I would also like to extend an invitation to my colleagues to come and see this magnificent Baker country for themselves.

The article follows:

BAKER COUNTRY

Baker, beef, and the Blue Mountains are more than idle alliteration in a rugged eastern Oregon country known for its rich tradition and individualism.

To know Baker, Oreg., is to recognize it as the hub of an area which boasts top-grade beef, lumbering, mining, agriculture, and a paradise for highland sportsmen. The names of nearby towns tell a descriptive story of the area's diversification.

It seems natural that this rich cattle country would have a town named "Hereford." The only surprising element is that Angus

cattle have not been so honored. Sawmill Gulch and Pine are town names that describe lumber; the towns of Lime and Granite do the same for mining; and for agriculture, there are Richland, Rye Valley, and Pleasant Valley.

For a composite picture of the country, add the names of such geographic landmarks as the Blue Mountains, Hells Canyon, Burnt River, and the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area of the Wallowa Mountains.

The city of Baker, population 9,528, elevation 3,440, is located on Highway 30, the "Oregon Trail Route" and is a commerce and distribution center for the resource and industry development of Baker County. Baker City Manager Fred Dyer says: "Although always known for its colorful history, Baker has received high acclaim today for diversification of its economy and its unique recreational opportunities."

In the vernacular of the range, some of the largest ranches in eastern Oregon are only a rope throw away from the Baker city limits.

The first beef—a white shorthorn bull and three cows—arrived with the first settlers in 1862. From the early years when beef cattle were driven over the Rockies, the industry began to grow. The severe winters of 1880 and 1881 caused Baker County to suffer heavy losses of its range cattle. Ranchers realized that winter supplemental feed was needed and from that time on hay production and storage became a way of life.

With improved breeding and better marketing procedures, the cattle industry in Baker County has grown rapidly. Today, well over 50 percent of the total agricultural income in Baker County comes from the production of fine commercial herds of Hereford and Angus range cattle. Equally important, some of the finest breeding cattle in the Nation are located here. It is not mere chance that the Oregon Cattlemen's Association selected Baker for its 50th anniversary celebration last November.

For other segments of the economy it is necessary to leave the range. In driving the streets of Baker, tree-lined with elm, cottonwood, and ash, in scanning the immediate foothills, there is little evidence of any forest land. Yet, a few short miles to the mountain slopes of the east and west are vast stands of timber. There is over 6 billion board-feet of timber in the county of which 80 percent is national forest land. Over 80 million feet a year are available for cutting and mills in Baker have maintained a busy pace. Commercial cuts include white fir, spruce, and larch, but the primary source of lumber is ponderosa pine.

The story of the mountains does not end with timber. Long before timber—about 200 million years ago according to geologists—the Bald Mountain region in the Blue Mountains emerged from the primal seas. Later, low lying land and seabed were thrust up by forces below the surface around Baker's present site.

All of this might be considered academic except that this early formation created fault areas where the basalt and granite-limestone deposits were intermixed. To miners this meant precious minerals.

The ancient rocks of the Blue Mountains which produced gold, silver, and copper also contribute slate, marble, high-grade limes, and building stone. Large deposits of high purity limestone are found in Baker County. One lime-processing plant near Baker has a 200-ton daily capacity. With something like 2,000 uses in modern industry, chemical lime is being produced here at a high rate for increased use in the manufacture of acetylene gas, for bleach in the pulp industry, for the treatment of pollution, and as a water purifier and softener.

Resource extraction alone does not complete the story of the highlands as any sportsman who has been to eastern Oregon will verify. The story of mountain recreation is also one of diversification.

To the west of Baker is the Elkhorn Range of the Blue Mountains. Located within this range is the Anthony Lake region, which boasts fishing and camping in the summer and excellent skiing in the winter. The Anthony Lake ski resort, built in 1962, has already established itself as one of the finest in the Pacific Northwest. Powder snow, reliable ski seasons, a bunny tow, a warming lodge, a 3,300-foot Pomalift tow to the 8,000-foot elevation level, and a new intermediate ski tow have combined to make this area a skier's delight.

To the east of Baker is the Eagle Cap Wilderness area of the Wallowas, home of big game hunting and superb fishing. Beyond this region is the famous Snake River with the Oxbow and Brownlee Dam Reservoirs, and the famous Hells Canyon, deepest on the North American continent. The canyon, which was carved 7,900 feet by the turbulent force of the Snake River, offers one of the last frontiers in the country.

But it was a challenge rather than a scenic splendor to the hardy and courageous pioneers who traveled the old Oregon Trail over a century ago. Leaving the "farewell bend" of the Snake River these weary travelers edged along the foothills until they reached the "Valley of the Lonesome Pine" where many of them settled.

The settlement was named Baker City in 1862, in honor of Senator Edward D. Baker, one of Oregon's first Senators. Only a few months before the Senator, also a colonel, had been killed leading his troops in an early engagement with the Confederate forces at the Battle of Ball's Bluff on the Upper Potomac. The county, valley, and city were all renamed Baker in memory of the valiant Senator.

Baker Valley early became the meat and bread basket for the miners who rushed to the gold camps at Auburn and Sumpter a few miles away. Auburn's population rapidly grew to over 5,000 and became the county seat.

The people in Baker felt, however, that lawless Auburn was not a suitable site for county government. One early morning in the spring of 1868 a few citizens drove up in a wagon, took all the county records out of Auburn, and announced as they left that Baker was the new county seat.

A State election later that year formally voted the county seat to the city of Baker. The decision proved to be well-founded. As gold mining waned, and rumors of success in other areas came forth, Auburn died a rapid death. Only a few ruined stone walls remain today, as Auburn, named for the town in the poem "Deserted Village," went the way of other gold meccas in the West.

The town of Sumpter, apparently named after Fort Sumter by miners more interested in seeking wealth than in the correct spelling of the town's name, survives today with logging operations as the primary support for its population of 88. Although Sumpter burned to the ground in 1917 and was partially rebuilt, an old exposed walk-in bank vault still remains as a reminder of the gold era. Located in the Sumpter Valley is the ghost town of Granite, which, with its population of one, is the smallest incorporated city in the United States. Cornucopia, another old gold town, seems to belie its Latin meaning "horn of plenty."

The gold towns declined but Baker survived and grew with the resource and industry development of the area. Bill Flynn, Pacific Northwest Bell manager, points out that this is typified by telephone growth. In 1898 the Baker exchange was established with 40 subscribers placing a few calls per day; contrast this with today's 4,657 telephones and an average of 29,000 calls per day.

The Valley of the Lonesome Pine lives on.

Today few areas in the West can match the rich heritage, balanced economic development, and rugged setting of the colorful Baker country.

In Defense of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Representative SILVIO CONTE which appeared in the December 30, 1963, issue of Washington World.

I believe this is an excellent statement of the rationale behind the U.S. foreign aid program.

In defense of our foreign aid program, Representative CONTE points to its innate strength—the fact that it is not a giveaway program, but one which is aimed at helping people help themselves.

This philosophy of self-help is a fundamental part of our American heritage. For this reason, Representative CONTE believes the American public continues to support the foreign aid program despite severe opposition to it in Congress.

The complete article follows:

(By Representative SILVIO O. CONTE)

The United States, whether we have willed it or not, is the leader in the march of the world's millions toward a new destiny. This leadership is not due simply to our wealth or to our military might. It is also based on the strength of our ideas, our tradition of independence and respect for individual dignity.

As the standard bearer of freemen's aspirations we have the responsibility of justifying our leadership. This we must do, not by aggressive threats or pious speeches, but by deeds that represent the nobility of freedom and the enduring strength of peace-loving people.

In no way do we exercise this leadership more effectively than in our foreign aid program. Those who seek to end this program, or emasculate it to the extent that it cannot operate successfully, are unrealistic. They do not recognize the responsibility of leadership that the United States must maintain, nor do they acknowledge the humanitarian traditions of the American people. They are blind to the need to strengthen our security and to the economic opportunities that are open to us.

It is to the credit of the American people that they continue to support the foreign aid program despite the shrill criticism and the "meat ax" examination that some Members of Congress take toward this unique instrument of American foreign policy.

Nationwide polls continue to indicate this basic support. The Gallup poll early in 1963 showed greater support for the principle of foreign aid than 6 years ago. Another poll, taken in October after drastic cuts in authorization voted by the House showed a 4 percent increase in acceptance by the American people over an early summer sampling.

A recent survey revealed overwhelming support among the business community.

This support rests in large measure on a concern for other people's welfare felt by the American people. The merchant in Massachusetts, the housewife in California, the farmer in Wisconsin many not always clearly understand the details and procedures of foreign aid but they do have an innate instinct for the truth. They do sense what their Government is trying to do—to help other people help themselves.

Whether this takes the form of a loan to build a dam, a grant to teach a skill, food to feed a child, or a survey to study an investment, it means we are seeking to help emerging nations to maintain their independence; to help them remain free to create their own destinies; to develop themselves economically; to wipe out illiteracy; to reduce poverty; to conquer disease; to offer hope.

The American people understand these things because the objective are no more and no less than what we have historically wished for ourselves and for the world. To continue this aid is to keep faith with our heritage.

These are not handouts; they are not dimes dropped in a tin cup, and they are not blank checks. Our capital assistance can create the industries that will provide the jobs, funds that will finance the banks and the savings and loan institutions that will enable a family to own a house, to buy a farm and pay for them at reasonable rates of interest. Thousands of families that might never have had the chance to own a home today are living in decent dwellings, purchased through newly created savings and loans associations financed by our capital.

Homes, schools, clinics, hospitals, universities, community centers, laboratories, fertilizer plants have been constructed. Water, power, and transportation projects have been launched; credit and labor unions have been established; roads built. All of these things have meant and will continue to promise a better life for the people of the underdeveloped countries.

This sort of peaceful, constructive effort enhances the security of the people of the developing countries—and of Americans. But the surface has hardly been scratched. We should not lessen the effort now.

The success of the foreign aid program in three countries—Greece, Israel, and Taiwan—points to another reason for continuing foreign aid—our commerce. In foodstuffs, for instance, these countries that were once so dependent on our aid have become paying customers of the United States. Greece has increased her imports from the United States from $2 million in 1958 to $4.3 million in 1962. Israel increased hers from $7.6 million in 1958 to $17.5 million in 1962. Taiwan's commercial imports rose from $3.1 million in 1958 to $24.5 million in 1962.

What has happened in these three countries can happen in others if a strong and flexible foreign aid program is maintained. The underdeveloped nations of the world today are the great markets of tomorrow. The millions of potential customers, however, cannot buy our goods or anyone else's unless they are able to increase their incomes and purchasing power.

The congressional criticism of aid stems from disillusionment and frustration. Foreign aid cannot—and could never—solve all the problems that the United States faces in an increasingly complex world.

Those who refuse to understand aid—or who expect too much of it—vent their feelings by slashing appropriations. What is missing from all this criticism is constructive argument. No one proposes an alternative.

About Those Dealer Offers of John F. Kennedy Half Dollars at Premium Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker several days before the President signed the bill sponsored by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN to authorize the coinage of the John F. Kennedy half dollar, a coin dealer advertising in one of the numismatic publications offered to sell 1964 Kennedy half-dollars from the Denver Mint for $3.75 each. He offered rolls of 20 of them for $70; 5 rolls for $325; 10 rolls for $625; and 50 rolls, or 1,000 coins—at a face value of $500—for the price of $3,100. Underneath these offerings were the words in parentheses "delivery when available."

How any dealer could offer such bargains before either the Philadelphia or Denver Mint had begun producing the coin—even before the bill authorizing it had been signed into law—has been a mystery to many coin collectors and to other citizens who so deeply admired President Kennedy and want to see daily reminders of his greatness as a man and as a President. The idea of having to pay a high premium to obtain a John F. Kennedy coin is repugnant to all of us.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, which has jurisdiction in the Committee on Banking and Currency for, among other things, legislation dealing with coins and currency, I have received inquiries from citizens throughout the country asking how they can buy one or two of the coins as mementos of a much-loved President—without having to pay $3.75 or any other such fantastic figure.

Consequently, I placed before the House on February 4 the plans of the Treasury Department for distributing the coin so that the public would have a chance to acquire them at face value. None of the new coins will be placed on sale until at least 26 million of them have been minted, and have been distributed by the Federal Reserve banks to commercial banks throughout the country for release on a nationwide basis. The date of public sale has since been set for March 24 in the city banks, and March 25 for country banks. The banks, of course, are to release them at face value, 50 cents each. No dealer will be able to obtain them directly from either the Philadelphia or Denver Mint. If any dealer is able to obtain quantity supplies of the coin for sale at a premium, it will only be through arrangements made by the dealer with a particular bank.

BANKS HAVE SOMETIMES CHANNELED COINS TO DEALERS IN BULK QUANTITIES

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, some banks have been willing in the past to obtain bulk supplies of newly issued coins for dealers for sale to collectors at a premium, perhaps with kickbacks to the bank itself or to a bank employee. In view of the acute shortage of coins for regular commercial needs—a shortage from time to time in the past year on a three-shift 7-day-a-week basis—it is intolerable that huge quantities of uncirculated coins from previous years have been hidden away in bulk lots for subsequent sale a few at a time to collectors at a premium. So far as I can determine, there is no law to prohibit banks from using and abusing their privileges in obtaining bulk quantities of coins from the Federal Reserve System in order to provide merchandise for coin dealers and hoards for heavy "investors" in uncirculated coins. I understand the Federal Reserve banks are now considering various measures for discouraging local banks from making bulk quantities of scarce coins—scarce in the sense that we need them for other purposes—available to coin dealers, when stores and all other businesses, and particularly the vending trade, are finding it almost impossible to get all of the coins they need for efficient operation.

Under the circumstances, I think it is safe to say that if we find the John F. Kennedy 50-cent piece going out of circulation and into dealers' hands, we will certainly take whatever steps are necessary, through hearings or legislation, or both, to meet the problem.

REPRESENTATIVE PATTEN FORWARDS A NEW JERSEY NEWSPAPERMAN'S SUGGESTIONS

In this connection, our colleague from New Jersey, Representative EDWARD J. PATTEN, has forwarded to me some interesting suggestions made by the chief editorial writer of the New Brunswick Daily Home News, Mr. Alexander M. Jones, who has been crusading in his paper for the widest possible distribution of the Kennedy half-dollar—and who submitted a formal petition to Congress on it. Both he and Representative PATTEN share my concern that the coin not be permitted to become an article of merchandising promotion for dealers seeking to profit from the public's love for the martyred President.

These suggestions are: "Have the Federal Reserve pledge banks seeking the Kennedy halves that none will be sold in bags; have banks follow a one-coin-to-a-customer policy for the first month or so, until everybody that wants a Kennedy half has one; supply each post office with a number of the new coins, with instructions to all personnel that they be sold on a one-to-a-customer basis—before bank distribution."

MINT DIRECTOR EVA ADAMS ASKS BANKS TO COOPERATE

In my discussions in recent weeks with the Director of the Mint, Miss Eva Adams, I have been impressed with her conscientious desire to make sure these new Kennedy coins get into general circulation, rather than into a few hands. On March 3, she wrote to the president of the American Bankers Association, Mr. William F. Kelly, asking the cooperation of the Nation's banks in preventing

dealers "or anyone else, particularly speculators" from obtaining the new coins in large quantities or trying to sell them at a premium above face value. I am sure that when the importance of this matter is brought before them, the banks will cooperate.

I submit herewith, Mr. Speaker, the letter Miss Adams sent to the ABA president, as follows:

OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF THE MINT,
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1964.

Mr. WILLIAM F. KELLY,
President, American Bankers Association, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KELLY: I write with the hope of enlisting the cooperation of the American Bankers Association and, through you, that of the commercial banking system in connection with the nationwide release of the Kennedy half dollars.

Through arrangements worked out with the Federal Reserve banks, it has been agreed that March 24 will be the date they will begin their shipments of the new half dollars to the commercial banking system. This means that the coin will be available in most city banks on March 24, and in country banks a day or two later.

Is it possible for you to send out a notice to your membership urging banks throughout the country to do everything possible to prevent dealers, or anyone else, particularly speculators, from obtaining them in large quantities or trying to sell them at a premium above their face value? This will permit the major portion of the new half dollars to be made available to individuals and for regular coinage purposes.

If the commercial banks will endeavor to restrict the sale of bags or rolls of the new coins to customers known to have an actual exchange need for them, this should do much to prevent an undesirable situation from developing. In this connection, and as a means of preventing speculation in mint-sealed bags of this new coin, all of our shipments to the Reserve banks are being made in plain, sewn bags which contain no markings to identify them as being of mint origin.

The mint is now placing in the Federal Reserve banks and branches an initial supply of 26 million pieces of the new coin, and before the calendar year is over an additional 64 million will be produced and shipped, periodically, to the Reserve banks. This is approximately the same quantity of half dollars released for general circulation last year. Also, it is approximately the extent to which our limited coinage facilities can be made available to meet the exchange needs of commerce for this particular denomination.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

EVA ADAMS,
Director of the Mint.

ABA PRESIDENT WILLIAM F. KELLY PROMISES BANK COOPERATION

Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a memorandum issued yesterday by the president of the American Bankers Association to the chief executive officers of all ABA member banks, forwarding a copy of Miss Adams' letter to him and expressing his promise that the banks will cooperate.

Mr. Kelly's memorandum follows.

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., March 11, 1964.

To the CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF ALL ABA MEMBER BANKS:

I am attaching for your information a copy of a letter from the Director of the Mint concerning the release of the new Kennedy half-dollar coin. You will note that the Director of the Mint asks that commercial banks "do everything possible to prevent dealers, or anyone else, particularly speculators, from obtaining them (the new half dollars) in large quantities or trying to sell them at a premium above their face value."

Commercial banks have experienced great difficulty during the last year in obtaining sufficient coins of all denominations to serve the needs of commerce. Unless the new Kennedy half dollar is used to meet the circulating requirements of commerce, an acute shortage of this denomination coin will undoubtedly occur since the Mint Service intends that the new coin supply current coinage needs.

Commercial banks, therefore, in the interest of maintaining the supply of circulating coinage to serve the needs of business, are requested to use their best efforts to prevent the new coins from being accumulated in large quantities in the hands of collectors or dealers who may hold them for future sale at premium rates.

I have assured the Director of the Mint that commercial banks will cooperate with the Treasury Department in this matter, and I will be glad if you will add the support of your bank in view of our vital interest in an adequate supply of circulating coins.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KELLY,
President.

NINETY MILLION KENNEDY COINS TO BE COINED IN 1964

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 26 million 50-cent coins to be placed on public sale on March 24 and 25 through all of the banks of the country, an additional 64 million of the John F. Kennedy coins will be minted this year, and millions of them will be produced every year thereafter for at least the next 25 years, unless Congress in the meantime should change the design of this coin by passage of a new law.

Therefore, there is no reason for them to become scarce and thus valuable from a numismatic standpoint. I think many Americans will want to save the first one they receive, as a memento or perhaps as a pocketpiece, but if the mints fulfill their mission in producing coins this year and in coming years, we should see these coins in such abundance that they will soon lose their novelty, as did the Franklin D. Roosevelt dime.

But until that happens, I think we must take every possible precaution against commercialized profiteering on a coin intended to honor a President who devoted his entire life—and gave his life—in the service of the American people.

The mint intends to distribute the coins to the Federal Reserve banks in plain bags. I think it would be useful, as Congressman PATTEN's constituent suggested, if the Federal Reserve banks were to pledge banks not to sell them in bags, or, it might be even more effective to have the Federal Reserve banks themselves take the coins out of the bags and forward them to the commercial banks in wooden boxes or any other type of package, so that there is no such thing as a $500 bag of these coins when they arrive at the banks. I welcome Mr. Kelly's action in forwarding Miss Adams' letter to the individual banks, and in endorsing its plea for cooperation.

Senator Goldwater and the Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an excellent editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Senator GOLDWATER and the Missiles." It well bears the reading and thought of all who question the route of our missile and national defense programs:

SENATOR GOLDWATER AND THE MISSILES

Many so-called political liberals try to picture Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as some kind of horrible, screaming, screetching, wild-eyed extremist of the right who is always ready irresponsibly to drop some kind of false and blockbusting attack on any political opponent who happens to be within range of his supposed poison spears. One national TV network frequently superimposes a linedrawing caricature of the Arizona Senator on the screen when one of its newsreaders or news analysts is discussing GOLDWATER. This drawing could be of some fiend incarnate, or a Dracula-type of vampire that sucks the blood of human beings.

Actually, Senator GOLDWATER usually is quite calm in his manner of utterance. His most devastating blockbusters often are uttered as if they merely were casual asides in whatever conversation he happens to be carrying on; in fact, sometimes they are. One air commentator remarked the other day that the Senator could come forth with a blasting charge in a manner and tone of voice that would be the same if he were dusting a speck of lint off the collar of his coat.

A few mornings ago, a TV network reporter was carrying out his usual prosecuting attorney and fingerpointing type of cross-examination of Senator GOLDWATER. The subject was the latter's casual remark in New Hampshire that our intercontinental range ballistic missile system is undependable and that the Government "really should tell the people something about its undependability." The reporter's questioning was along the line that since Secretary of Defense McNamara had denounced Senator GOLDWATER for his utterance, the GOLDWATER utterance automatically became false and unpatriotic and a lot of other things.

So, the Senator calmly deflated his interrogator by listing high defense authorities who have to some degree or other made statements about undependability of our intercontinental missiles; statements that are in support of what Senator GOLDWATER said. He suggested that since the interrogator was a reporter (real reporters might raise some questions as to that) he could find documentation for the Goldwater statement in unclassified statements of the following persons:

1. Gen. Thomas Power, head of the Air Force Strategic Air Command.
2. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff.
3. Lt. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., Deputy Commander of Air Force Systems, whose utterances came out just a few hours before Senator GOLDWATER made his statement.
4. And in some of Secretary McNamara's own congressional testimony as to the uncertainty of our long-range missile system because it never has been given an actual hard test, either as to the missiles or the pads or silos from which they are fired.

What Senator GOLDWATER said is quite true. All of these gentlemen at some time or other have stated publicly, or in congressional

testimony made public later, just about what Senator GOLDWATER attributes to them.

Senator GOLDWATER emphasized that confirmation of his statement could be found in unclassified material because some of his opponents had implied that as an Air Force Reserve major general he had "pipelines" into Pentagon information and was (presumably unpatriotically) making public, material of value to the enemy. That, of course, is absurd. Further, undependable does not necessarily mean no good.

But, pipeline or no pipeline, it is time that the people were told a little more about the dependability or lack of it of our missiles and our missile delivery systems. Certainly, Russia is well informed. Our own belief is that the admirals and generals in the Pentagon—whose lifetime career is dealing with war and its weapons—know more about these things than civilian Defense Secretary McNamara and his civilian whiz kids.

And they seem to be on Senator GOLDWATER'S side.

Liberty, Not License

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of a newspaper to accept advertisements criticizing public officials without running the risk of libel.

I am pleased to say that Newsday, one of America's prominent newspapers, published in the Fourth Congressional District of New York, took the occasion to speak not of the right of the newspapers but of their responsibilities. I think this should be brought to the attenion of the Congress.

The editorial reads as follows:

LIBERTY, NOT LICENSE

The Supreme Court of the United States, by unanimous vote, has reversed a $500,000 Alabama judgment for libel against the New York Times and four Negro ministers—a decision that upholds and broadens the freedom of the press. Criticism of public officials, however scarifying, is given legal sanction unless the criticized offical can prove the statements were made with deliberate malice. In the lustier days of American journalism, malice was the rule rather than the exception. Nowadays, scarcely a handful of newspapers deliberately set out to destroy a man in public office or ignore the precepts of truth and fairplay. The overwhelming majority do their best to state the case with honesty.

The action against the Times and the clergymen was a punitive one. It was based upon an advertisement, published March 29, 1960, attacking southern segregationists and pointing out the plight of the Negro. John P. Patterson, Alabama's Governor at the time, and four public officials sued for libel, for a total of $3 million. The case decided by the Supreme Court the day before yesterday involved L. B. Sullivan, a Montgomery city commissioner in charge of the police. He said he had been improperly accused of illegal activity.

In essence, this suit like the others was an effort to frighten newspapers into silence, both in their news as well as their advertising columns, about the shameful situation that then obtained in Alabama and substantially still does. This effort has now failed, and the right of the press to speak its mind has been sustained.

More freedom carries with it the requirement of greater responsibility. This applies not only to the careful researching of news stories and editorials so that no innocent person is harmed. It also applies to the right of privacy of the individual. Some New York City newspapers used to collaborate with divorce lawyers to print lurid charges in advance of trial, in effect encouraging the defendants to settle rather than face more embarrassing publicity. Such pre-trial stories now are forbidden by law.

As a prize example of privacy violated, there is the Lindbergh case. After the tragic kidnaping and death of his brother, baby Jon Lindbergh was being driven to school by his mother, Anne Morrow Lindbergh. A car filled with photographers from a New York City paper forced her to the side of the road and took pictures of the child. This was the last straw. Charles and Anne Lindbergh left the United States for a period of years—driven out by those who scorned their privacy.

Liberty to report and comment honestly is not license to exceed the bounds of decent or responsible conduct. American newspapers, given a broader charter by the court, must live up to higher standards of adherence to the principles of good journalism.

Quick Action Needed on Flood Control for Chartieris Valley and Ohio River Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the U.S. Congress the tragic flood conditions again causing great loss in the Chartieris Valley, Pa., and the Ohio River and its tributaries.

This high loss both in lives and property, loss of homes and businesses, loss of public utility and municipal facilities is needless, and it occurs every year.

I strongly urge the U.S. Bureau of the Budget give prompt action to approve the necessary funds recommended by the Chief of Army Engineers, after study and favorable report by the U.S. District Engineer Office for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

The flood-control plan for the Chartiers Valley approved by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers has provisions for financing jointly by Federal, State, and local Governments. The Bureau of the Budget, the officials of Allegheny County, and the local boroughs and townships should promptly agree and act. The time for action is now.

An article on "Costly Floods—Again," in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette follows:

COSTLY FLOODS—AGAIN

At this time last year, residents of the Chartiers Creek Valley were cleaning up the mess left by the annual spring flood. High waters had forced 300 families from their homes and left an estimated $5 million in property damage.

Now this familiar tragedy is being replayed. Waters are spilling into homes and industrial plants in the Cargnegie-Bridgeville area in the worst flood to hit the Pittsburgh area in 10 years.

And what has been done during the last year to prevent a recurrence of this annual misery? There has been much futile talk by public officials, but no corrective action. The U.S. Corps of Army Engineers has approved a flood control plan for the Chartiers Valley which would be financed jointly by Federal, State, and local governments. But public officials here can't agree upon which agency will put up the local share of the money.

In contention is the question of who will pay the $5.2 million required to relocate a big sewerline of the county sanitary authority which follows the valley and crosses the creek 18 times. The sanitary authority says it won't pay any part of the cost of relocation and the county commissioners have stalled on the issue, with Chairman William D. McClelland arguing that there is a financial problem because the county is helping to finance a new stadium on the north side.

This project should be pushed even if the county has to borrow the money to finance the local share of the costs. It can well afford to invest $5-million-plus in a project that would prevent the annual loss of millions of dollars in flood damage. Failure to do so could result eventually in the abandonment of the area by industry. Industries in the flooded area employ 5,950 people. If they are driven out, the county will lose substantial tax values.

The argument over whether the county or the sanitary authority should pay for sewer relocation is really an issue of tweedledum or tweedledee. In either case, the cost falls upon the county's taxpayers, whether through sewage charges or direct property taxes. Here is another instance in which petty bickering over financial responsibility could produce financial loss far greater than the disputed amount to be invested in a vitally needed public project.

Chartiers Valley is not the only area threatened by floods. Pittsburgh and other cities along the Allegheny and the Ohio Rivers are also expected to suffer damage. But the Federal Government even now is spending more than $100 million on a new Kinzua Dam at the headwaters of the Allegheny as a further investment in flood control.

Thus, there is hope that gradually the threat of floods in Pittsburgh will be ended. But how much longer must the people of the Chartiers Valley pay the terrible price of shortsightedness by the public officials chosen to represent them?

Baynard Kendrick and H.R. 9623

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, since my election to the House of Representatives I have received hundreds of letters, not only from the Third District but all over the State of Florida urging passage of the King-Anderson bill. I am sure my colleagues have received in somewhat the same number, communications of this nature, also. During the month of January I introduced H.R. 9623 to eliminate the requirement from the law that the receipt of more than $1,200 by recipients

of old age and survivors insurance would deny to such persons the right to receive such social security benefits. The introduction of this legislation has brought many favorable comments from senior citizens all over the State of Florida.

One of these letters, I believe, deserves the attention of my honorable colleagues and I have received permission from the writer to insert it in the RECORD. You will be interested in the biographical sketch of this gentleman whose life record appears in "Who's Who in America:"

Kendrick, Bayard Hardwick, author; born Philadelphia, Pa., April 8, 1894; son of John Ryland and Julia (Lawton) K.; educated at Tome School, Port Deposit, Md., and Episcopal Academy, Philadelphia; married Edythe Stevens, 1919; children—Baynard, Edythe, Julia. Secretary Selden Cypress Door Co., Palatka, Fla., 1921–27; President Trades Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1928; general manager, Peter Clark, Inc., New York City, 1929; general manager Bing & Bing's Hotels, New York City, 1930–31; free lance writing since 1932. Enlisted in Canadian Army within 1 hour after Canada declared war, August 1914; served in C.E.F., 1914–18. Awarded 1914–15 Star, Canadian War medal, British War medal; the Robert Meltzer Award, 1951, the Spearhead Medal from 3d Armored Division Club, 1951. Consultant to staff, Old Farms Convalescent Hospital for Blinded Veterans, U.S. Army, Avon, Conn., during World War II; sighted adviser and honorary life member, Blinded Veterans Association. Recipient of plaque from Gen. Omar N. Bradley for service to blinded veterans of World War II. Member Authors League, Mystery Writers of America, Inc. (1st president), Washington Square Association. Democrat. Episcopalian. Mason. Clubs: Carolina Yacht (Charleston, S.C.); Marshall Chess (New York City). Author: "Blood on Lake Louisa," 1934; "The Iron Spiders," 1936; "The Eleven of Diamonds," 1936; "The Last Express," 1937; "The Whistling Hangman," 1937; "Death Beyond the Go-thru," 1938; "The Odor of Violets," 1941; "Blind Man's Bluff," 1943; "Death Knell," 1945; "Out of Control," 1945; "Lights Out," 1945; "Flames of Time" (Literary Guild selection), 1948; "The Tunnel," 1949; "You Die Today," 1952; "They Never Talk Back" (with Heinrich Treffich), 1953; "Blind Alies," 1954; "Reservations for Death," 1957; films: "The Last Express," 1938; "Eyes in the Night" (starring Edward Arnold and Ann Harding), 1942; "The Hidden Eye" (Edward Arnold), 1945; "Bright Victory" (starring Arthur Kennedy and Peggy Dow); "Clear and Present Danger," 1958; "Hot Red Money," 1959; "The Aluminum Turtle," 1960; "Frankincense and Murder," 1961. Contributor to magazines. Books have been transcribed into Braille. Historic columnist Tampa (Fla.) Tribune. Office: care Paul Reynolds, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. Kendrick is one of the millions of Americans who have given greatness to this land and now in retirement years is forced to live in poverty and fear of lack of ability to pay medical expenses incurred for illness. These proud Americans are in need of relief which would be given them in the passage of the King-Anderson bill and my bill H.R. 9623.

The letter follows:

BAYNARD KENDRICK,
Leesburg, Fla., January 24, 1964.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: According to the Orlando Sentinel (Jan. 23, 1964), you are presenting legislation to Congress which would enable those over 65 to earn any additional income they can without jeopardizing their social security benefits.

I will be 70 on April 8, 1964, and inasmuch as my life record is set forth in detail in "Who's Who in America," I am hopeful that the following short résumé of my own experience may furnish you with additional ammunition to promote this most vital piece of legislation. As a "Dollar a Year" man I spent 4 years as academic consultant to the U.S. Army, on the rehabilitation of the blinded veterans, during World War II. Out of which came my book "Lights Out," made into the movie "Bright Victory," all the proceeds going into the formation of the Blinded Veterans Association (over $25,000). I am sighted advisor, and hold honorary life membership card No. 1 in that organization today. At the request of President Truman, and the late Adm. Ross McIntire, I spoke at the kick-off of Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, in Washington, when "Bright Victory" was shown there in 1952.

My wife, Edythe, and I were awarded social security of $169.60 per month in 1959, when she became 63, and I 65. After a cataclysmic series of operations in Washington, which exhausted all our savings and sent me to the National Institutes of Health for 4 months, the doctors ordered me back to Florida. We moved here to Leesburg in March 1960, renting this house for $85 per month and have been here since then.

Recurrent fevers sent me into the University of Florida Hospital at Gainesville shortly after, and desperate with no medicare, and no VA due to my service in the Canadian Army, I got a $500 advance on another mystery ($450 net less agent's commission). I turned this out in 7 weeks by working 14 hours a day. After refunding 2 months social security—$339.20—the net to me for the book was $110.80! (By flying to New York on borrowed money, I was able to sell this serially to the Chicago Tribune-New York Daily News syndicate for $4,500 net, which paid out the hospital, and gave us a little over. If I had run 1 day over into another month, I would have had an additional $169.60 to refund on social security!) I, of course, paid income and social security taxes on this for the year.

My ill health continued, and it was obvious that with steadily mounting doctor's and hospital bills, I had to get some additional source of income quickly, or apply to the local welfare. After consulting with the social security office, I was able to obtain a job with the Tampa Tribune writing a Sunday historical column "Florida's Fabulous Past," at $25 per week. After 2 weeks, the manager of the Orlando social security office, Mr. McLeod, wrote me that if I received five checks in any month, and any other royalties came in from past work, I would lose my social security for that month. I immediately had payment changed to two checks a month for $50 each.

During 1961, and 1962, I received a net option of $2,250 each year on my Duncan Maclain books about a blind detective, from Desilu for a television show, which never materialized. What did materialize was that the Tampa Tribune was carrying me as a correspondent instead of an employee, and was not deducting my social security tax of 92 cents a week. When my accountant, and the Orlando office asked them to file amended returns and pay the back share of social security (which I had paid) they refused to do so, claiming that I was not an employee, in the face of dozens of letters in my possession indicating otherwise.

On January 1, 1963, after continuing this column during a year and a half of TB which confined me to my home, and a cancer operation where I was forced to sign a pauper's oath and enter the University of Florida Hospital as an indigent, the Tribune agreed to put me on the payroll as an employee with proper deductions—under condition that I sign a waiver of all fringe benefits, although there had been no change in my status whatsoever. This I complied in, and have drawn proper pay checks with deductions for 52 weeks in 1963, and my income has been rendered on a W-2 form, instead of the 1099's as in 1961–62.

In spite of endless conferences with me and my attorney, Walter Warren, of Leesburg, our social security payments were stopped without warning as of July 1963, and will not be reinstated until I have repaid 23 months—$3,900.80. We are existing on the charity of friends, and I might point out, if I succeed in getting a job with enough to live on, I will not be able to repay this until 23 months after I am 72. It will be several months more before Mr. Warren can complete the necessary steps to get this matter into a Federal court. In my present state of health, it is doubtful that I can last that long. Meantime our entire income is $100 per month from the Tampa Tribune.

Respectfully yours,

BAYNARD KENDRICK.

CC to Hon. DANTE FASCELL

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Migrants: Our Forgotten Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 13, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a recent article in St. Joseph's magazine published in Oregon, paints a vivid and moving picture of the plight of America's more than 2 million migrant workers and their families. The author, Cyril O'Brien, pays a well-deserved tribute to the courageous fight of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to improve their living and working conditions.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Brien's article, "The Migrants, Our Forgotten Citizens" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIGRANTS: OUR FORGOTTEN CITIZENS

(By Cyril O'Brien)

America's frontier of human misery is a three-pronged migration of some 2 million unhappy souls summoned by progressive harvests out of the Southeast and West up the seaboards, and out of Texas into the Rocky Mountain and Central States where they scour orchards, fields and cabbage rows to maintain a standard of living akin to medieval poverty.

Negroes, Puerto Ricans, families of Mexican extraction, poor ex-farmers, they are the domestic migrant farm workers. A lonely anachronism of a crueler day, they were described in recent congressional hearings as "the poorest of God's poor in our affluent industrialized society."

Nomads, they journey under conditions below what is sometimes accorded to animals. Uneducated and literally magnets of prejudice, they are unwelcome in ordinary communities Unreachables, they suffer their silent lives beyond the pale of public view and thereby fail to arouse a flicker of public sympathy or chagrin

They are politically impotent and are excluded by name from the protection of our basic labor and social laws

It is these domestic migrant farm laborers whom Senator HARRISON A. "PETE" WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, has chosen at his constituents at large.

Few of them are aware he exists, let alone the risks of his political career he takes to afford the migrants even the elementary advantages of American citizenship.

Forty-four, World War II Navy pilot, father of three girls, two boys, amiable, easily met, the junior Senator from the Garden State has an extensive academic background built at Oberlin, Columbia Law School, Georgetown, and Rutgers, his State university. In all, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey would seem well equipped to pilot the most controversial of legislation on Capital Hill.

He found few dissents when he adroitly pushed through a measure to make it safer to buy securities. There wasn't a trace of acrimony when he guided a mass transportation bill to give communities matching funds to let them update antiquated commuter lines.

When he tackled a package of measures to improve the lot of the migrant farmworkers he had to barter, cajole, banter, smile, and frown to have one single bill made law.

Farm and business lobbies so influential they could outweigh a Presidential appeal to Congress found strong favoring voices in the House and Senate, in letters from the Senator's constituents and from homestate confidants who would have him lay off.

Infighting and blunt obvious obstacles were born to stop his bothersome meddling by which he would upset the status quo of misfortune supporting America's greatest single industry, agriculture.

A Congressman from WILLIAMS' homestate, to play up to the local producers association, ran home posthaste for a personal investigation of New Jersey's managed contract migrant work-camps.

"Why, WILLIAMS is exaggerating," he reported. "The migrants have it fine."

The Congressman had ignored, not seen, or possibly didn't know of, shameful migrant housing found by his own State investigators. (New Jersey, despite its few incompassionate, is one of the kindlier States in dealings with migrants. State Labor Commissioner Raymond F. Male and his Bureau of Migrant Labor headed by Charles G. Yersak have made strong moves to provide the migrant protection and comfort locally which the Congress has failed to guarantee nationally.)

It was in the still-unsettled bracero law conflict that the picture of the fight to be waged was made clear.

A Korean war emergency measure, the bracero law provides for importation of Mexican low-cost labor and depresses even more the paltry average $1,000 annual wage of the migrants. This January 1, 1964, the law was to have died, but for the seventh successive time the farm lobby had an extension measure ready in plenty of time and prolonged the farm subsidy at least another year.

But the farm and business lobbies let their guards down. What the American Farm Bureau Federation, National Beet Growers, International Apple Association, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association and others had not done was to take the so-called church lobby seriously enough.

The House last May rejected the extension.

"Those damn do-gooders have put one over on us," said the farm lobbyist as he stormed out of the Capitol.

There was little time or opportunity for Senator WILLIAMS or his side to crow. Quickly, the growers-producers-farmers had another 1-year extension bill in the Senate, but before it breezed through, Senator WILLIAMS and Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, another Democrat, from Minnesota, managed to tag it with an amendment. It insisted simply that the American migrant workers would be offered work first, at the same pay and working conditions afforded the contract-protected Mexicans. The House approved the extension, but stripped it of the domestic migrant protection clause. There's not much doubt that the extension will become law, although WILLIAMS may have strength enough to first have his amendment reinserted.

Well aware of the opposition, WILLIAMS expects little quarter. To set up a farm employment service for migrants and insure a steady stable labor force from among the migrants, he faced powerful interests who opened a campaign of untruths aimed at arousing the entire farm community against one of the cornerstone farm bills.

The agriculture lobby didn't even represent all of the farmers, and certainly not the interests of the smaller ones, WILLIAMS interjected.

Not all of agriculture rallied at once against the New Jersey lawmaker. Long before WILLIAMS was a Senator there were kindly farm operators who cared for the migrant at considerable cost or even risk—for some migrants have little concern for private property, even their own. To other growers, the outright justice of WILLIAMS' efforts got through and abated opposition even if it didn't win adherents. The National Grange, for instance, said it was time to chuck the bracero Mexican worker program. Some fruit and vegetable producers were pointedly against child labor. Yet, the biggest farm lobby bucked the stringent, it thought, dangerous-work limitations of the same bill—out of concern for the income of the low-income families.

It took self-delusion for lobbyists to claim righteousness and question a law that would keep grade-school children from a blighted career in the cabbage patches.

Even with existing statutes requiring children under 14 to be in school when in session, the young migrants manage to be exceptions to that law. On the road to distant harvests or caring for younger children they are usually of little interest to the local school board in whose jurisdiction they simply happen to fall for a few months, or weeks.

Today, under Federal law a child is allowed to work in the fields at any age when school is not in session. Moreover, there are very few adequate State laws, even to protect children from harmful farmwork.

WILLIAMS could close that gap in our Federal and State laws and keep the young from dangerous machinery and employment, whether school is in session or not. It would bind youngsters under 14 not working on a family farm. A 12-year-old working close at home or with his parents could pick during school vacations.

"How vividly I recall," said Cassandra Stockburger, director, migrant children's education project, National Child Labor Committee, "our dismay when a young mother of five, all under 6, brought only her three youngest to the day-care center.

"When I asked about the two oldest boys who were 5 and 6, she answered, 'Oh, Billy and Johnny, I won't be leaving them with you any more. They're old enough to pick.' "

There was the 9-year-old girl I found one hot July ironing in her chicken coop cabin. She had been picking in the beetfields all morning.

"I hate it * * * I hate it * * *" she told an interviewer, "but I gotta pick beets * * * I gotta earn a living * * *."

There are about 400,000 children under age 14 who accompany parents on these migrations. Those who don't work are tended by the very old or ill who are locked in shacks, automobiles or even car trunks.

WILLIAMS could protect them by day-care centers and facilities on a Federal-State funding program.

Few on the outside of rural life realize that many farmers never meet their migrant employees. Wage and work negotiations are handled by crew leaders or farm-labor brokers.

Fearful, facing hunger if bumped from their jobs, migrant families are at the mercy of the crew leaders. If the leader chooses to cut back on pay, overcharge the farmer, demand kickbacks from the cowed migrant, he can conduct his extortion with relative impunity.

Granted, WILLIAMS adds, that most crew leaders are honest, but he'd make it risky for the handful of the meanest. The Senator would license them. Caught cheating the farmer or migrant they'd be fined and ushered out of the business.

Father John A. Wagner, of San Antonio, Tex., and the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, told the Williams Subcommittee on Migratory Labor that no group of Americans has the cards stacked so against them as the migrants.

Caught in a vicious circle of ignorance and poverty they are batted by circumstances right back into the middle of the ring the moment they try to break out. Migrants are nomads because their subsistence income has chained them to the crops no matter how they try and cry to stay at home.

Such a man is Augustine Castillo, 56, thick-chested, leather-faced, he has been picking and traveling since he was 6 or 7. He has a wife, two grown children. In 1963 he traveled 6,000 miles to get work. From January through April, when he talked to the Senator, he had earned a total of $15.

Castillo and two other migrant workers had come to Washington with Father Wagner, 1,600 miles from San Antonio, to testify.

They sat straight as polite young school boys in the big leather-backed committee chairs, then shed every trace of timidity as they moved to the hearing table.

"Everyone wants a warm place to come home to," Castillo said, "but often after 10 or 12 or more hours in mud and rain you return to a migrant shack that is cold, leaking and sometimes shared with rats and mice."

Traveling to the harvests is as bad. Whole families find rest stops in open shelters without doors and windows. Often there is only a sand floor on which they throw canvas and blanket.

"Sometimes, we get in under a garage or gasoline station," Castillo explained, "and sometimes they run us off."

A proposal by WILLIAMS would provide a larger staff for the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce its recently tightened controls on public and private carriers of migrant laborers. Another recommendation introduced only weeks ago would make it well worth a farmer's while in tax benefits to build decent housing for his laborers. But there has not been found a sure way to provide protection and comfort for the migrant families when they are on the road.

Perhaps the National Advisory Council on Migrants, a kind of governmental guardian angel, might come up with an answer—when and if the faculty is ever approved by Congress. At this moment, the council, to assure the poor farmworkers will never be forgotten again, is as much a dream as WILLIAMS' other fancies; migrant unemployment compensation, rights to collective bargaining, and a system under which migrants can vote, and make at least some politicians responsible to them.

Father James L. Vizzard, S.J., probably the most knowledgeable veteran of the migrant legislative wars, thinks we are still greenhorns on the trail of social justice for farm labor.

Director of the Washington office of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, often the spokesman for Protestant and Jewish colleagues, Father Vizzard could mark off definite, sound achievements. First, the migrant public health act now brings doctors, examinations, clinics, and vaccination for children into camps where physicians were too often called too late. It is the only migrant proposal made law, and the only significant farm labor legislation passed since the 1930's.

Hardly a coup, but a substantial gain is the fact that the hardships of the farm laborers are becoming publicized. School, church, and social groups are enlarging their volunteer efforts to help. The Department of Labor is training some migrants for higher skills. The lobbyists who would once have asked anything in the name of free enterprise speak more judiciously lest they arouse public opinion and harvest stronger migrant labor protection laws.

Yet, Father Vizzard thinks that one of the biggest breaks for the migrant is the appearance of Senator WILLIAMS. Before his arrival the isolated attempts at corrective action seemed arid. WILLIAMS has now provided a focal point upon which the efforts of many people and associations can be centered.

"To our goals, he has added the element of hope, even optimism," Father Vizzard once said.

"If these bills which you propose become law," he told the Senator, "this Nation need no longer blush at the neglect and gross injustice in the treatment of the migratory labor force. These poor have no voice for them and I presume to thank you in their name."

Weeks later, the prominent Catholic Star Herald (Camden, N.J., diocese) said in a lead editorial: "We cannot praise Senator WILLIAMS too highly for what he has achieved * * * for the migratory workers have no political party. Even organized labor has discovered how unrewarding and dangerous efforts to organize them can be.

"What Senator WILLIAMS has accomplished was not for votes but because he is a good man, because in his heart he felt compassion for the downtrodden."

For the second successive year, the Senate has somewhat shared that compassion. The House has not been sympathetic. In 2 years, only the child labor bill got to the floor and its opponents followed it even there to hinge on it a crippling amendment and cause it to die at the last gate without even a vote. In contrast, the same House acts with vigor in processing the bracero employer-favored legislation.

There is a National Service Corps bill to create a National Domestic Peace Corps. It got by the Senate and needs only a rule now to get to the House floor. The measure to license crew leaders also seems to stand a fair chance of passage. Father Vizzard, Father Wagner and others supporting Williams consider the service corps so important they rate it a probable milestone in migrant labor help. Without the teams of volunteer workers it would provide to reach out and help the migrants they might still remain for decades in their deadening poverty.

This year, the legislative experts on the migratory labor subcommittee think, there's a good chance for many of these proposals to go all the way.

Behind the laws there's the will of a growing number of legislators and such groups as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Bishops' Committee for Migrant Workers, Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, National Council of Catholic Men, National Council of Catholic Women, national Catholic college groups and others.

The Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches, National Council of Parents and Teachers, National Council of the Churches of Christ, Lutheran, Unitarian, and Jewish groups have made their militant support known.

WILLIAMS needs them all, and faces the fact that the church lobby will not be the most likely to perform the legislative miracles.

It's not that farmers are all villians. The problem is an agricultural status quo by which costs and prices are set and under which the fate of the migrant is taken for granted.

"The test of our society is not whether we can keep a majority of our people well fed and well housed but whether we can do for all what we can do for a few," Senator WILLIAMS not long ago told the National Council for the Spanish Speaking in Kansas City, Mo.

The occasion was a dinner in honor of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., during which he was presented the first Father Raymond McGowan Award. It was simply for the role and risks he, WILLIAMS, had taken to bring about what society should have accomplished a half century ago.

Harry Jackson—Wyoming Artist and Cowboy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 13, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Wyoming painter and sculptor, Harry Jackson, concluded a very successful one-man show at the Smithsonian Institution Sunday. The exhibition opened February 10 and was to have terminated February 28. However, it proved so popular that it was held over for another week and concluded on March 8 after having been viewed by 108,000 people.

The caliber of the product created by Artist Jackson—who I might add is a former cowboy from the town of Meeteetse in northern Wyoming—can be measured in an article by the art critic of the Evening Star, Mr. Frank Getlein. Commenting in the Star's February 9 edition, Mr. Getlein said of the artist:

> What Harry Jackson has done is to make western art, both painting and sculpture, and anyone knows that among the very few things that really are forbidden by an establishment worth it sanctions is western art.

Of "The Range Burial," Mr. Jackson's mammoth 10- by 21-foot painting that was the feature attraction of the Smithsonian show, Mr. Getlein had this to say:

> Ordinary lookers at art * * * can get pure pleasure out of "The Range Burial" and its related sculptures.

For the benefit of those who enjoy western art and who might have missed the Getlein article or the exhibition, I ask unanimous consent that the Frank Getlein column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORK OF MAJOR AMERICAN ARTIST ON VIEW AT NATIONAL MUSEUM

(By Frank Getlein)

In our time an awful lot of nonsense is put out about the artist "daring" to do

something never done before, such as painting by total immersion or making sculpture out of recapped tires.

Actually, of course, it is impossible for the artist to "dare" in the way the word is commonly used. Whatever idiotic device of exhibitionism he comes up with, there is a large and loaded art establishment ready to acclaim his breakthrough and burden him with cash on the barrelhead for having defied the art establishment. Somehow.

That's why it comes as a shock to find a contemporary American painter who really has defied the establishment. His name is Harry Jackson; he's a reformed abstract expressionist, and a big picture of his, "The Range Burial," 10 by 21 feet, goes on view tomorrow at the Smithsonian, 10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., along with a group of bronzes and sketches associated with the major enterprise.

RISKY THEME

What Harry Jackson has done is to make Western art, both painting and sculpture, and anyone knows that among the very few things that really are forbidden by any establishment worth its sanctions is Western art.

The theory is not only that there can't be any more Western art, but that there isn't even a West. The world consists solely of 57th Street, upper Madison Avenue, the East Side generally, and the end of Long Island. In addition, there used to be a place called 10th Street but that's faded away, to be half replaced by dear old Rutgers over in New Jersey.

Harry Jackson comes by his Western fancy honestly enough. He ran away from his Chicago home at 14 and grew up in Wyoming. After World War II, he went to New York and joined the abstract expressionists, having learned about large canvas as a union theatrical scene painter. The establishment had kind things to say about his work and regards his present ways as treason.

GROUP IN SPACE

Ordinary lookers at art, on the other hand, can get pure pleasure out of "The Range Burial" and its related sculptures.

The relationship is not one of copying the sculptures. The two things are different. The sculpture, in reasonably small scale, is beautifully done. The group around the open grave are a figure composition rarely seen in bronze in our time, free standing, with air among them, fully realized as individual pieces and as group. The only contemporary sculptor remotely related is Giacometti, who, in some works, employs the same kind of group-in-space effect.

The huge painting, although the subject is the same and several of the characters are the same, is entirely different. Space itself is a great part of the difference. It spreads out to the sides and behind the group and seems limitless. Flat prairie and gray sky touched with silver lights seem to go on forever. The viewer is drawn into the space as he looks. He is surrounded and immersed. It is about then that he recalls the importance of space in the American experience. The sheer endlessness of it has been to us as the forest was to the Germans or the sun to the Greeks. It is very heartening to see that basic American space treated once more by an American painter.

The other chief work in bronze is "Stampede," 5 feet across of galloping steers, two working cowboys and one being dragged to his death, the same presumably, who is buried in the big painting. Again, there is a suggestion of restless and endless motion in the heads and horns.

The show announces the arrival of a major artist in a strictly American mode.

Physical Fitness: Good Health, Good Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 13, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the United States there is an ever-growing interest in physical fitness. It is a well recognized fact that a growing and vigorous nation needs a healthy and robust citizenry. Fortunately, in our country we have been able to keep high standards of health and sanitation and general physical well-being. It may be that we have not put enough emphasis on strong bodies, which is one reason why many organizations, such as the American Chiropractic Association, have been striving to encourage correct posture among our people, especially among our children.

For many years, the American Chiropractic Association has observed the week of May 1–7 as National Correct Posture Week. There is nothing more basic to good health than good bodily posture.

The importance of starting with the young people to encourage good posture and physical development was recently stressed by Stan Musial, the newly appointed director of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, who urged early physical fitness training in the home. He said:

This business of having a strong body isn't something you get overnight. You have to start early and work at it. If you do, it has wonderful carryover values.

Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, Director of Industrial Relations, of the American Chiropractic Association, Washington, D.C., has written a cogent statement which is entitled "Good Health, Good Posture." I ask permission to have this excellent article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of our American people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. EMMETT J. MURPHY

Contributing to national health and welfare by improving individual posture is the sole aim of the American Chiropractic Association when it annually sponsors—from May 1 through May 7—National Correct Posture Week.

This is the time when chiropractors use every means of publicity to draw public attention to this primary aim of chiropractic. They believe, preach, and practice that good posture and good health go together.

In that belief we are in complete agreement with every branch of the healing arts, and we are sincere in our constant efforts to cooperate with all Americans in improving the standards of our national health.

It has been most encouraging to note that many agencies of our Federal Government have been in the vanguard of those advocating correct posture as a definite aid toward sound health and long life.

All recruits are familiar with the basic teachings of our Armed Forces which stress correct posture—not only on the parade ground, but elsewhere. These teachings stress correct posture as a means of physical, mental, and emotional well-being.

SPOKESMEN AGREE

It is important to remember that good posture means much more than simply standing straight. Good posture is that position of the body in any activity in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort.

On this one point all spokesmen of all branches of human endeavor have agreed for hundreds of years that correct posture is one of the most important paths to good general health.

This viewpoint is shared by medical and chiropractic authorities, public health workers, nurses, psychiatrists, the armed services, pediatricians, and specialists in industrial relations.

TEST YOUR POSTURE

Good posture is a result of holding your body in a balanced position. The easiest way to attain it is to think of an imaginary line running from the tip of the skull through your neck, shoulders, hips, knees, and insteps. When the head is bent forward, the abdomen thrust out, or the back bent, the line of gravity is shifted, and a strain placed on muscles to keep the body from falling.

To test: Stand with back to wall with head, heels, shoulders, and calves of legs touching it, hands by sides. Flatten hollow of back by pressing buttocks down against the wall. Space at back of waist should not be greater than the thickness of your hand.

Stand facing close to wall, palms of hands touching front of thighs. If chest touches wall first, your posture is probably excellent, or at least good; if head touches first, it is only fair; if abdomen touches first, your posture is really bad.

STANDING

When you stand straight your head should be balanced and erect. Your shoulders are relaxed and low; your chest is held high. Your lower back should curve to just a slight degree. Your abdomen should be flat. Have your knees straight but not stiff, and feel your weight in the outer borders of your feet.

SITTING

You should sit with your feet flat on the floor. Do not slump in a chair, but keep your back straight and your abdomen flat. As in standing, your head should be erect and well balanced. When you lean forward, lean from the hips, not from the waist.

WALKING

Movement should start at the hips. Your head and upper part of your body should remain at right angles to the ground. Swing your arms freely. Look ahead, never down. Point your toes straight ahead. Knees should be relaxed and free.

OFFICIALS ENDORSE POSTURE WEEK

Without the wholehearted cooperation of the American people, National Correct Posture Week would be a meaningless phrase.

It is the wonderful assistance of schoolteachers and school authorities, of State legislators, of Governors and mayors, of Members of the U.S. Congress, and of the people themselves that has made National Correct Posture Week an increasingly important observance in the United States.

Every year more and more officials at the city and State level proclaim its observance officially.

The active members of the American Chiropractic Association lead in observance of National Correct Posture Week, because the

science of chiropractic is dedicated to the elimination of postural faults which rob human beings of the health they should have.

Scranton Praised as Campaigner—Fellow Pennsylvanian Admires Man's Traits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, of the Pennsylvania Republican National Committee, 134 Cherry Lane, Wynnewood, regarding Gov. William Scranton which appeared in the Arizona Republic, Thursday, February 20, 1964:

SCRANTON PRAISED AS CAMPAIGNER—FELLOW PENNSYLVANIAN ADMIRES MAN'S TRAITS

(By Harold Carroll)

A Republican national committeeman from Pennsylvania yesterday described Gov. William Scranton as one of the great campaigners in modern American politics.

Dr. Robert L. Johnson said Scranton, a member of a prominent Pennsylvania family, is "one of the greatest campaigners I have ever seen."

Johnson, former president and chancellor of Temple University, said Scranton's personality is more sparkling than such GOP campaign stalwarts as Wendell Willkie and others. Willkie ran against President Roosevelt in 1940.

"Scranton is thoughtful; he has a charming personality; nobody will push him around," said Johnson, one of four original executives of Time magazine and its first advertising director.

Johnson and his wife are vacationing at Casa Blanca Inn, Scottsdale.

Johnson, in an interview, said Scranton would probably be a favorite-son candidate at the Republican National Convention in July at San Francisco.

Would Scranton toss his hat into the presidential ring before the convention?

Johnson thinks that Scranton will stick by his guns and not declare himself a candidate. But, Johnson added, Scranton would consider an "honest draft" for the presidential nomination.

Johnson praised Scranton's record as Governor. Scranton took over the Governor's chair in January 1963.

Scranton's administration has provided additional funds for education, hospitals, and mental institutions despite inheriting a $32 million deficit, said Johnson.

Scranton succeeded Democrat David Lawrence, former mayor of Pittsburgh, to the Governor's mansion.

Johnson said Scranton's wife, Mary, is a definite political asset to the Governor.

"She is the best woman campaigner I have ever seen," said Johnson. In addition, she is very articulate and has a winning smile, he added.

Johnson said he thought all of the oft-mentioned candidates, including BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, would make excellent candidates for the nomination.

Johnson said he admires the Arizona Senator and agrees with a great part of his political philosophy.

He said he supports GOLDWATER's position on the nuclear test ban treaty. GOLDWATER voted against the treaty.

"It took a great amount of courage for him [GOLDWATER] to vote against the treaty," said Johnson.

Johnson said he wondered whether GOLDWATER or Rockefeller would have enough delegates to be nominated after the third ballot.

If not, he opined, the party may find itself in the position of having the candidates select the candidate.

Outer Space: A Breakthrough for International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people, the excellent article by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal, January 1964 issue. Richard Gardner received his B.A. degree from Harvard College in 1948 and his LL.B. degree from Yale University in 1951. As a Rhodes Scholar, he earned a Ph. D. degree in economics from Oxford in 1954. In addition to his State Department post, he serves as the Deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

The article follows:

OUTER SPACE: A BREAKTHROUGH FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW

(NOTE.—Can the nations avoid an outer space stampede? Can they develop ground rules to prevent conflicting claims and international violence? Mr. Gardner asserts they can and outlines the constructive steps which have recently been taken to insure order in outer space. He suggests that the expanding network of cooperative arrangements in space will form the basis of further developments in this new field of international law.)

A question of concern to lawyers and diplomats is whether nations, as they increase their activities and interests in outer space, can develop adequate ground rules to prevent conflicting claims and international violence.

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, speaking before the General Assembly on December 2, 1963, expressed the view that in the half dozen years of the age of space "there has been enough social invention to sustain the hope that outer space will not be chaotic."

On the desks of the 111 members of the United Nations as Ambassador Stevenson spoke was a draft Declaration of Legal Principles which the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had unanimously decided to submit to the General Assembly.

This declaration is a formal expression of the mutual restraints and reciprocal concessions which the members of the United Nations are prepared to accept in the sixth year of the space age. It does not include everything that every member of the Outer Space Committee would have wished. Rather it comprises the total area in which the interests of all members overlap. The declaration was approved by the First Committee of the General Assembly on December 5 by acclamation.

CHANGE IN SOVIET ATTITUDE IS NOTED

Until recently the Soviet Union had refused to agree on a document embracing what was agreeable to all sides, but rather had insisted on a compresensive legal code along the lines of the Soviet "Declaration of Basis Principles," which contained a number of provisions which were totally unacceptable to non-Soviet countries. The Soviets had adopted a similar attitude in the nuclear test ban negotiations, insisting on a comprehensive ban on their terms. Happily, it has now changed its position and a limited treaty banning tests above ground had been signed.

In addition, on October 17 the General Assembly passed a resolution by acclamation which solemnly calls upon all states "to refrain from placing in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction" and "installing such weapons on celestial bodies." This resolution and the limited test ban, which together prevent an extension of the arms race in space, reflected the change in Soviet attitude which was necessary for agreement on the limited common positions represented by the Declaration of Legal Principles.

The result is a significant step toward the creation of laws in outer space. Ambassador Stevenson described the character and status which the United States ascribes to the principles in the declaration when he said: "We believe these legal principles reflect international law as it is accepted by the members of the United Nations. The United States, for its part, intends to respect these principles." Ambassador Fedorenko immediately afterward stated: "The Soviet Union, for its part, will also respect the principles contained in this declaration if it is unanimously adopted."

DECLARATION'S OPERATIVE PARAGRAPHS ARE OUTLINED

The declaration contains nine operative paragraphs, the first four of which were already contained in somewhat modified form in General Assembly Resolution 1721 (XVI). The declaration reaffirmed this resolution by declaring:

That the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried on for the benefit and in the interests of all mankind,

That outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law,

That outer space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation, by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means, and

That activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried on in accordance with international law, including the Chapter of the United Nations, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation and understanding.

The fifth principle is new. It declares:

"States bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space, whether carried on by governmental agencies or by nongovernmental entities, and for assuring that national activities are carried on in conformity with the principles set forth in this declaration. The activities of nongovernmental entities in outer space shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the state concerned. When activities are carried on in outer space by an international organization, responsibility for compliance with the principles set forth in this declaration shall be borne by the international organization and by the states participating in it."

The Soviet Union had originally insisted on the principle that space activities shall be

carried out "solely and exclusively by states." This provision, which would bar private enterprise from space activities, was an attempt to impose Socialist principles on an important sector of human activity and was an obvious attack on Telstar and our communication satellite legislation. The United States saw no reason why private enterprise should be prevented from flying in space any more than it is from sailing on international waters.

On the other hand, we were willing to reaffirm our view that a state bears international responsibility for its activities in space and for the activities of its nationals. We were also willing to reaffirm that space operations carried on by private parties require Government authorization and continuing supervision. Accordingly, the fifth principle contains these two provisions.

The sixth principle declares:

"In the exploration and use of outer space, states shall be guided by the principle of cooperation and mutual assistance and shall conduct all their activities in outer space with due regard for the corresponding interests of other states. If a state has reason to believe that an outer space activity or experiment planned by it or its nationals would cause potentially harmful interference with activities of other states in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, it shall undertake appropriate international consultations before proceeding with any such activity or experiment. A state which has reason to believe that an outer space activity or experiment planned by another state would cause potentially harmful interference with activities in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space may request consultation concerning the activity or experiment."

The Soviets had insisted that prior discussion and agreement must take place on any measures to be undertaken by a state which might in any way hinder the exploration or use of outer space for peaceful purposes by other countries. This principle would have effectively extended the veto into space.

One can imagine the difficulties that would result from a multilateral clearance system. Space exploration could be slowed down or halted entirely by redtape or political obstructionism.

The principle finally agreed upon is fully in accord with existing U.S. practices as reflected in the handling of our West Ford experiment. Project West Ford placed a large number of tiny filaments in a shortlived orbital belt around the earth. The purpose was to determine the feasibility of using filaments as passive reflectors to relay communications.

Project West Ford was carefully considered in advance by both the President's Science Advisory Committee and the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences. The full details of the experiment were made known well in advance and discussed with interested scientists from other countries. While some expressed concern, there was no serious scientific objection to the experiment on the grounds that it would impede radio astronomy or other scientific research.

We are prepared to undertake similar consultation for other scientific experiments. With the passage of the partial test ban, testing in outer space has been, of course, eliminated from the list of possible experiments which might cause potentially harmful interference.

The seventh principle of the declaration deals with the status of objects launched into outer space. It states:

"The state on whose registry an object launched into outer space is carried shall retain jurisdiction and control over such object, and any personnel thereon, while in outer space. Ownership of objects launched into outer space, and of their component parts, is not affected by their passage through outer space or by their return to earth. Such objects or component parts found beyond the limits of the state of registry shall be returned to that state, which shall furnish identifying data upon request prior to return."

The analogies to maritime and aviation law in the earlier parts of that paragraph are obvious.

The eighth principle deals with the thorny problem of liability. Obviously no paragraph, however artfully drafted, could attempt to cope with all the issues of liability. But a beginning has been made. The principle states:

"Each state which launches or procures the launching of an object into outer space, and each state from whose territory or facility an object is launched, is internationally liable for damage done to a foreign state or to its natural or juridical persons by such object or its component parts on the earth, in airspace, or in outer space."

This principle is broadly framed and covers personal injury, loss of life, and property damage. It covers accidents occurring on the earth, in airspace, or in outer space.

The last principle covers return of astronauts, as the seventh had dealt with return of objects launched into space and their components. It declares:

"States shall regard astronauts as envoys of mankind in outer space, and shall render to them all possible assistance in the event of accident, distress, or emergency landing on the territory of a foreign state or on the high seas. Astronauts who make such a landing shall be safely and promptly returned to the state of registry of their space vehicle."

SOME SOVIET PRINCIPLES ARE OMITTED

Several principles which the Soviets insisted upon earlier are not present in the operative sections of the declaration. They had sought to prohibit the use of outer space for "propagating war, national or racial hatred, or enmity between nations." The United States was understandably skeptical about discussing this subject in view of the fact that the Soviet Union, after initiating lengthy negotiations on war propaganda in the 18-nation disarmament conference in Geneva, refused at the last minute to sign the declaration which had been unanimously agreed upon. This issue was solved by inserting into the preamble a reference to General Assembly Resolution 110(II), which condemned "propaganda designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression." Resolution 110(II), which the preamble declares as "applicable to outer space," contains a provision, important for democratic countries, which requests action by the government of each member "within its constitutional limits."

The most objectionable Soviet principle declared that the collection of intelligence from space is "incompatible with the objectives of mankind in the conquest of outer space." The United States made it clear from the outset that it would accept no principle along these lines. The fact is, of course, that observation and photography from outer space are consistent with international law and the United Nations Charter, as are observation and photography from the high seas. Moreover, space observation can contribute to the reduction of the risk of war by accident or miscalculation inherent in dealings with a closed society. Observation from space may someday help the United Nations monitor an armistice or patrol a border. It may play a part in the verification of a disarmament agreement. Even Premier Khrushchev, according to C. L. Sulzberger in the New York Times of July 15, 1963, admits that satellites can be used for disarmament inspection.

MILITARY SPACE PROGRAMS HAVE THEIR PLACE

In the end, no provision on intelligence from space was inserted in the declaration. But discussion of this problem raises another and larger question. Should there be a principle that prohibits military activity of any kind in space? The U.S. Government believes not.

The attempt to build peaceful space cooperation and a regime of law for outer space does not eliminate the need for military space programs to maintain the security of the United States and the free world. There is no inconsistency in moving simultaneously on both fronts. For the foreseeable future, we need military space programs to help keep the peace and civilian space programs to help us live better in peace.

The test of the legitimacy of a particular use of outer space is not whether it is military or nonmilitary, but whether it is peaceful or aggressive.

DETAILED AGREEMENTS REMAIN FOR THE FUTURE

The next order of business is the formulation of detailed international agreements on the subjects of liability for space vehicle accidents and assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles. On December 5 the First Committee approved by acclamation a resolution which calls for the prompt preparation of these agreements and requests the Outer Space Committee to report the results to the next session of the General Assembly.

Beyond this, the area of international cooperation based on mutual interest will continue to grow:

U.N. members have made an impressive beginning through the International Telecommunications Union to tackle the technical problems involved in using outer space for telephone, radio, and television communication. The work recently completed in November by the Space Radio Conference of the ITU provided sufficient allocation of frequency bands for space communications for the next 10 or 15 years and adopted procedures relating to the use of these allocations. The U.S. Government and the Communication Satellite Corporation have begun discussions with other governments and foreign communications entities on the creation of a single, global commercial system of communication via satellite—a system in which all members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies will have an opportunity to participate in ownership, management, and use.

The World Meteorological Organization has begun to lay the financial and organizational basis for an ambitious program of world weather forecasting and research, making use of both satellites and ground-based instruments.

More than 60 countries have worked cooperatively with the United States in actual flight experiments, in terrestrial activities in direct support of orbiting experiments, or in cooperative training programs.

The United States and the Soviet Union have concluded a bilateral agreement calling for the coordinated launching of weather satellites and the exchange of weather information, the coordinated launching of satellites to map the weather's magnetic field and cooperative experiments with communication satellites.

And lastly, the United States offered a new possibility of cooperation with the Soviet Union and others when President Kennedy stated in the General Assembly on September 20: "Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending some day in this decade to the moon, not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all humanity." On December 2, Ambassador Stevenson told the General Assembly: "President Johnson

has instructed me to reaffirm that offer here today."

From these and other cooperative arrangements on specific functional problems, as well as from agreements on legal principles, we hope to develop a regime of law and order in outer space.

Dr. Max Seham Documents "Discrimination Against the Negro in Medicine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the civil rights hearings before the Judiciary Committee last summer, evidence was presented that caused Chairman CELLER to call the American Medical Association's attitude on integration "reprehensible."

I think the American Medical Association should be subject to criticism—

He said.

Dr. Max Seham, physician of Minneapolis, has documented the shortcomings of the AMA in the field of human rights in an excellent paper entitled "Discrimination Against the Negro in Medicine."

This is the shameful story that caused the Medical Committee for Civil Rights to picket at the AMA convention in Atlantic City last June. I hope the medical profession will soon acknowledge that it, too, has a moral responsibility to help create equal opportunity for all Americans.

The article follows:

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE NEGRO IN MEDICINE: A PARADOX IN DEMOCRACY-BATTLE FRONT ON INTEGRATION

The treatment accorded the Negro physician over the past century by the American Medical Association and its component societies is a shameful record of social injustice in American medicine. Although more subtle and less publicized than that of discrimination in other social and economic areas, the record is one of Jim Crowism in every aspect of the practice of medicine. A study of this record reveals that the organized medical profession—both the parent association and its component societies—has turned its back on the rightful demands of their Negro colleagues to obtain adequate medical education, to get an equal opportunity to serve their fellow Americans, white or black, to partake as members, and to be allowed to give adequate medical care to their patients in first-class hospitals.

Moreover, the individual Negro physician has been socially snobbed and professionally degraded. He has been barred from the medical seminars without which a physician stagnates, excluded from medical conventions, and denied the right to become a member of hospital staffs without which it is almost impossible to practice modern medicine.

The American Medical Association was organized as a humanitarian society in 1847 dedicated to "promote better health for all the people. Thereafter, each president in assuming office, swore to dedicate himself to improve the health standards of all the people and to champion the cause of freedom in medical practice." But not until 1949 was the first Negro physician, Dr. Peter Murray, elected as a delegate of the society.

The first president of the American Medical Association in 1847 opposed the admission of a Negro delegate on the grounds that Negro physicians were not qualified. In 1895 the Negroes organized their own association, the National Medical Association, because, "The AMA slammed the door and shut us out, and we had no other alternative but to organize." Prior to 1939, Negro physicians were labeled "colored" in the AMA's medical directory.

It was only at the insistent objection by the NMA that the AMA finally dropped this label. Not because of a change of heart but because of public clamor, the Negro physician was offered a crumb of equality, so-called science membership. He was allowed to sit in the last rows and listen but was excluded from voting or from any active participation. Moreover, if a meeting was held in a Jim Crow hotel, he was not permitted to attend.

In 1939 for the first time, the house of delegates concerned itself with this overlooked social problem, and drew up a resolution that year which reads, "that every component county medical society has the right of self-government in local matters, including membership, by which arrangement many Negro physicians now hold membership in the AMA, that respecting governmentally directed health projects, the board of trustees emphatically deprecated discrimination against any competent and qualified doctor because of race, color, or creed, which interfered with his right as a Negro physician to serve those who desire to consult him."

At the same time that the house of delegates appeared to approve of antidiscriminatory practices, it negated its democratic resolution by disapproving one from the New York delegates, urging the house to declare its belief that "membership in component societies of this association should not be denied to any person on the basis of race, creed, or color."[1]

The question arose again in 1944, and another resolution was born. "The house of delegates feels that the Negro physicians of this country should be offered every possible opportunity to improve their medical qualifications. It would urge component societies to extend all aid that is practical to the Negro physicians in their communities to the end that the quality of service rendered by them to their people may be steadily improved. It is recognized, however, that the decision as to membership in the component county societies or on hospital staffs is outside the jurisdiction of the AMA and is a matter of local concern."[2] Here, as before, the AMA rationalizes its position by passing the buck to the State and local societies.

In 1948, the president of the AMA, Dr. Roscoe Sensenich, made this statement: "The American Medical Association for 100 years has directed its efforts to the improvement of medical service and the broadest distribution of its benefits to the public." Ironically it was about this time that the father of the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Walter White, was run down by a white doctor while crossing the street in Atlanta, Ga. He was quickly admitted to a "white hospital" for treatment. However, when it was found that he was Negro, he was taken across the street to a Negro hospital. He died there shortly afterward.

In 1948 and 1949 the New York group again raised the question of race restriction. In answer, the AMA House of Delegates disapproved a resolution which recommended a change in the constitution of the American Medical Association:

"The association to provide that no component society 'shall exclude any qualified physician from its membership by reason of race, creed, or color,' provided the applicant shall meet the medical requirements for membership.[3]

In the meantime during the Truman administration, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Oscar Ewing, in his report on "The Health Needs of the Nation," stressed inadequacies relating to Negro health needs. Through persuasion on the merits of the case and without legal pressure he opened for the first time the doors of the Gallinger Municipal Hospital in Washington to Negroes. The AMA in 1949 realized that it was on the spot in the public eye and since it did not wish the total alienation of the Negro medical profession, it made the grand gesture, and for the first time elected a Negro, Dr. Peter Murray, as a delegate. This was a historic occasion and the AMA made the most of it by publicizing it as a proof of its democratic ideas and principles.

In 1950, the AMA adopted the following resolution: "That constitutent and component societies having restrictive membership provisions based on race, study this question—with a view to taking such steps as they may elect to eliminate such restrictive provisions."[4]

This resolution was not binding on the local medical societies. A doctor cannot become a member of the AMA, the national body, without first being a member of the local medical society. Therefore, where exclusion has occurred, it stems from an action of the local society and not the AMA.

On January 28, 1952, the Medical Society of the County of New York passed a resolution condemning the city's voluntary hospitals for excluding Negro physicians from hospitals, from staff appointments and from internships. The result of all this was that the society named a Negro as it president. At about the same time the Supreme Court decided the now well-known Gaines and Sipuel cases which were responsible for the opening of the doors of 10 southern medical schools.

Over the next 10 years the cold war continued. The NMA stubbornly refused to give up its inalienable rights and at every annual meeting of the AMA, it either appeared before the house of delegates or wrote letters asking to be taken into full membership. But the AMA always answered, that it was not its responsibility to dictate to the State or local societies and continued to write resolutions that were mere token gestures toward antidiscrimination.

At the 1961 meeting, the president of the Negro association, Dr. Vaughan C. Mason, asked, "Why cannot the AMA police local and State societies to make them give more than "limited membership to Negro physicians?

In several Southern States, he said, Negro physicians are invited to participate only in scientific sessions and not in other matters. This is "unethical, immoral, undemocratic and un-American," Dr. Mason maintained.

"Membership in a local medical society is usually a prerequisite for attaining the right of practice in a local hospital. If Negro physicians cannot join the local or the State society, then they usually cannot work in hospitals."

"Although limited membership is offered in some Southern States, in South Carolina and Mississippi Negroes are not admitted on any level." He urged the AMA to handle this problem.

At the same meeting for the first time a president of the AMA, Dr. Leonard Larson, was invited as the main speaker. In introducing Dr. Larson, Dr. A. Montague Cobb made some very pointed statements. He said that: "The NMA was formed because in 17 Southern States the Negro physicians could not join the medical societies of their areas. From 1895 to 1950, the AMA took a

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

position of hostility. It was unwilling to touch upon the matter of discriminatory membership policies." In his long address, Dr. Larson evaded entirely the criticism of the AMA by Dr. Cobb.

Finally, in the summer of 1963, the worm turned. Their patience exhausted, disappointed with foot-dragging of gradualism, a biracial committee of physicians, dentists, and other medical workers organized to appear in behalf of the civil rights bill as it related to medicine and to explain why this committee picketed the AMA conventions.

At his appearance before Representative EMANUEL CELLER's Committee on the Judiciary, Dr. Walter Lear gave the background of the picketing in these words: "The committee's first project was to make an appeal to the AMA to speak out against racial segregation and to give equal opportunity and human dignity to all colored physicians. We are particularly aware of the tragic impact of racial segregation on the health of the Negro people * * *. The picketing of the AMA was used only as a last resort to drag the AMA out of its den of indifference over many years."

The correspondence between Dr. Lear and the officials of the AMA reveals the attitude of the AMA hierarchy on discrimination against the Negro physician.

A letter addressed to Dr. George Pfister, president of the AMA, on June 12, 1963, raised the same few questions that had been asked many times before:

Question 1. "Will you use your considerable personal and organizational strength for terminating the racial exclusion policies of State and local medical societies?"

Answer. "The AMA, by action of its house of delegates, has a longstanding policy of nondiscrimination for membership in the association and constituent societies. Many Negro physcians are members of the AMA. Dr. Peter Murray, a Negro, was a member of the house of delegates for 12 years. One resolution, adopted in 1950, recommended that 'constituent and component societies having restrictive membership provisions based on race, study this question, with a view to taking such steps as they may elect to eliminate such restrictive provisions.' The decision as to membership in the county medical societies or on hospital staffs is outside of the jurisdiction of the AMA and is a matter of local concern." [5]

Question 2. "Will you make available direct membership in the AMA to Negro physicians who are denied membership in their local societies because of their race, as has been requested for years."

Answer. "Direct membership in the AMA as suggested here is not made available to anyone, white or nonwhite. Membership is contingent on membership in a State or local society and should not be changed for the purpose of favoring any group."

Question 3. "Will you actively oppose the 'separate but equal' clause of the Hill-Burton Act which provides Federal construction grants to hospitals and other health facilities when this act comes up for renewal in Congress in the next few months?"

Answer. "This question will be referred to the council on legislative activites which considers all matters pertaining to testimony before congressional committtees."

Question 4. "Will you instruct your representatives on the joint commission on accreditation of hospitals to vigorously urge that racial integration of patient services be added to the minimum standards for hospital accreditation?"

Answer 4. "The question will be referred to the joint commission for consideration."

A day before the picketing in June 1963, an appeal was made to Dr. W. Annis, president elect of the American Medical Association, to speak out unequivocally and immediately against racial segregation and discrimination: "Your comments on our specific questions of a week ago offer little hope, if any, of prompt and constructive resolution of these problems. The time has come for the medical profession to play a special and important role in assuring equal opportunity and human dignity for all its citizens."

The answer to this letter was made by Dr. Percy Hopkins, the chairman of the board of the American Medical Association: "It is unfortunate that this incident has tended to obscure the achievements in medical science being reported at this meeting, which will improve the health of all people regardless of race. For many years, the AMA by action of its house of delegates has had a strong policy opposed to discrimination in membership in the AMA and its constituent State and county societies. A Negro physician, my friend, Peter Murray of New York, served for 12 years as a member of the AMA policymaking house of delegates, and today Negroes serve as officers of county medical societies. Many nonwhites are employed by the AMA.

"It is the unequivocal policy of the AMA that every person in the Nation should receive the best possible medical care regardless of race, color, or creed and regardless of his financial circumstances."

To sum up briefly the attitude of the AMA:

(1) The AMA has never appeared before any congressional committee in favor of any civil rights bill.

(2) The claim that the AMA had taken an unequivocal stand against discrimination of the Negro physician was made in 1944 and 1950. The resolution called for the State and local societies to use their discretion, suggesting but not directing that "societies study this question with a view to taking practical steps to eliminate such restrictive provisions."

(3) A significant part of the statement is this: "In the matter of national memberships, they say they could not change their membership provisions for the exclusive purpose of favoring any group."

(4) After a carefuly search, I have found not a single statement to the effect that discrimination against and segregation of the Negro doctor is morally wrong, and humanly indecent.

At the adjournment of the committee hearing, Representative CELLER summed up his impressions by saying, "I would say personally, the attitude of the AMA and its failure to give full devotion to the principle of integration is to my mind reprehensible."

The evidence amounts to an impeachment of the moral integrity, tolerance, and sense of fairplay of the medical profession officially and individually.

Ministers, priests, rabbis, and social workers are throwing themselves into this fight, but where are the leaders of the AMA and their component societies? I have yet to read in an AMA editorial or a presidential speech a word of sympathy or encouragement for the Negro physicians in their fight for a fair deal in the practice of medicine. The record is one of resolutions followed by inaction, double talk with taken gestures, and the passing of the buck by the AMA to its component societies. Although some progress has been made for the sins of the past, American medicine needs to step up its pace.

It is common knowledge that some medical schools still practice "quotas" although some deans may deny this. Too few Negro physicians have full membership with voting privileges in hospitals and medical societies. As William Faulkner said in 1956, "To look anywhere in the world today and be against equality because of race and color, is like living in Alaska and being against snow."

Year after year the AMA has consistently ignored the representations of the NMA. It has behaved as though the problem was nonexistent or unworthy of positive action. In minutes of the House of Delegates, the AMA has always been in the process of studying the matter but never doing anything about it. Repeatedly it offered the same alibi on the grounds that this was not the responsibility of the national organization.

In the more than a century of its existence, the AMA has never before been picketed by an exclusively medical group. The 1963 incident was a dignified and quiet procession of a biracial group of physicians and dentists without any physical incidents. The signs the marchers carried were symbolic of a grim determination of 5,000 Negro physicians to take part in the community dialog. The new leadership is no longer meek and afraid. They demand full equality and nothing else. They will no longer tolerate the heel of discrimination. Their accumulated and deep seated resentment against the many sins committed against them, has finally exploded into overt demonstrations. The AMA did not like it, the city in which the picketing occurred was embarrassed, the hospitals are on the defensive but this is a grim defiant challenge that will no longer be appeased by double talk.

The white members of the medical profession have been to complacent and unconcerned about the professional plight of their colored colleagues. The time is now, not tomorrow, for the rank and file to play a positive vigorous part in this crucial fight for equal rights and human dignity for the Negro physician, for his right to receive an adequate medical education to get an internship and post graduate training, in "white" hospitals, for the right to practice medicine in the way every white physician wants to practice in the community of his choice.

---

[1] Digest of Official Actions: American Medical Association, pp. 483–484. 1939.

[2] Digest of Official Actions: American Medical Association, 1944. p. 485.

[3] Digest of Official Actions, 1948. p. 485.

[4] Digest of Official Actions, 1950. pp. 485–486.

[5] House Action, June 1944.

They Never Die—Poetic Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 13, 1964

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a moving tribute to President John Fitzgerald Kennedy appeared recently in the North Dakota Quarterly, published by the University of North Dakota. It was written by Dr. Richard Beck, professor of Scandinavian Languages and Literatures at the University of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the poem printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY NEVER DIE

(By Richard Beck, dedicated to the memory of President John F. Kennedy)

They never die who light in hearts of men
The divine flame, which, star-like, leads them on
To nobler vision and to greater heights,
Into the dawn
Of the blessed day, which seers and poets past
Have seen arise—and rise it shall at last.

Such can not die, for truth will never die,
Nor justice, nor man's faith that peace shall reign,
Eternal like the flaming stars on high.

The Hazleton, Pa., Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 13, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, with all the talk these days of an increased role for the Federal Government in the economy of this Nation, it is heartening to hear about localities overcoming economic adversity without outside assistance, least of all from distant planners in Washington. One such locality is Hazleton, Pa. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial relating Hazleton's story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAZLETON, PA.

Add Hazleton, Pa., to the list of unsung heroic communities.

Along with many other localities whose exploits in overcoming economic adversity without outside aid have gone virtually unacclaimed, Hazleton has conclusively proved that self-help—rather than Washington gold—provides the soundest means of achieving economic rehabilitation.

Eight years ago Hazleton was dealt a cruel blow when a hurricane flooded its coal mines, knocking most of them out of commission permanently and throwing half of its work force out of jobs. Instead of bemoaning its fate and appealing for Federal assistance, the community's 40,000 residents rolled up their sleeves and plunged into an intensive bootstrap recovery program.

Under the vigorous leadership of the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce an organization was formed with the appropriate title of "Can Do Corporation" to entice new industrial enterprises to locate in Hazleton. The funds to support offers of 100 percent financing of new plants were raised locally through contributions by utilities, banks, stores, and individuals and through the sale of bonds.

The effort paid off, handsomely. Today, Hazleton has 14 new manufacturing companies and 4,000 new jobs have been created, reducing the unemployment toll to a respectable 8 percent.

It is too bad that the successes of communities like Hazleton are ignored by Federal planners. The latter seem bent only on extravagant spending of taxpayers' funds in trouble spots rather than recommending the tried-and-true self-help formulas for solution of economic ills.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Indiana's Aerial Arm of the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 14, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, an article in the February 1964 issue of the AOPA Pilot, monthly journal of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, calls attention to significant achievements by Indiana's Aviation Division.

As the article illustrates, aircraft owned by Indiana have been used for criminal investigation, traffic safety, and emergency search and rescue missions.

The work of this division will be of interest to my colleagues. Hence, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA'S AERIAL ARM OF THE LAW

(By Jerry Marlette, AOPA 25803)

Preoccupied with the problems of his congregation, the minister was burning up the highway considerably faster than he intended, and than the law allowed. Soon he heard the shriek of a siren behind him, and saw the flash of a red light in his rear view mirror. Sheepishly, he pulled over to the side of the road.

While the Indiana State Police trooper was making out his speeding ticket, the minister asked him where his patrol car had been parked. The trooper answered that he had been on a county road just off the main highway, and that a police patrol plane had clocked the minister's car across the white speed check lines some 5 miles back down the highway, and had radioed him to make the arrest.

As the trooper handed him the ticket, the minister wryly remarked, "Well, at least this proves one thing I've believed for years—somebody up there is watching me."

An apocryphal tale? Perhaps. Lt. Robert Myers, chief pilot for the Indiana State Police, will neither confirm nor deny the story, although he admits that it may well be true, and adds that this "white line" operation is, unfortunately, the only contact most citizens have with the entire Indiana State Police department.

However, disgruntled drivers to the contrary, this patrol is only one part of the aviation division's overall mission. For classification and record keeping, the division groups all flight operations under six general headings; personnel transportation, criminal investigation, traffic, emergency and rescue, survey, and miscellaneous. To carry out these assignments, the aviation division uses a helicopter, a Beach *Bonanza* and two Cessna *Skyhawks*.

Personnel transportation was one of the original primary functions of Indiana State Police aircraft, and accounted for the most hours flown for several years. The planes have been used to fly department officials on post inspection trips (averaging two posts a day by car, their average jumped to nearly five by using the planes); to training schools at the various posts and at colleges and other police departments (the Indiana department in 1948–49 conducted a year's training school for the Kentucky State Police); and to police conferences throughout the eastern United States. Technicans and other personnel have also been flown on various department missions, and a number of trips have been flown with elected State officials.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that while at first many department personnel were admittedly leery of flying, through years of noting the time saved by flying and because of the aviation division's perfect safety record, rarely now is any hesitation shown when a department member is assigned air transportation.

Criminal investigation is probably the most important assignment of department aircraft, and includes flying which often could be listed also under one of the other headings. Investigation activities include such varied operations as the transportation of laboratory technicians to crime sites, where they can analyze dental structures, fingerprints, and other identifying characteristics; preserving evidence by taking aerial photos of a crime site from the helicopter, thus avoiding disturbing the scene of the crime; and actual aerial searching for bank robbers, car thieves and other criminals.

Lieutenant Myers can point to a filing cabinet full of criminal incident reports involving department aircraft; some dangerous, some humorous. One incident Lieutenant Myers still wonders about occurred several years ago, when two teenage boys armed with a .22 caliber rifle broke into a cabin and held the frightened housewife inside as hostage at gunpoint. Several hours later, her husband came in, but, seeing the armed boys, ran for help. Although one of the boys emptied the rifle at Lieutenant Myers, fortunately the policeman escaped unharmed.

Now it was the boys' turn to be frightened, and they ran into a nearby woods. Climbing a big tree near the center of the woods, they quickly disappeared into the thick foliage. Within an hour, Myers and another trooper had the helicopter over the woods, and made a thorough aerial search of the area. However, even under the powerful downdraft of the rotors, the leaves were too thick to see anything in the trees, and a ground search proved equally fruitless. Finally giving up, Myers made a careful check of the 'copter for bullet holes before going on to the next areas as he wasn't sure the 'copter hadn't been shot at. Captured the next day, the boys denied firing at the 'copter; to this day. Myers isn't convinced, and still shuddders at the thought of what one bullet would do to a rotor blade.

At the other extreme, Myers flew the 'copter into north central Indiana one afternoon to help search for a rape suspect. Being advised by ground control that the suspect was believed to be in one of several large fields, Myers began a slow, steep approach to the largest one, about half a mile straight ahead.

Some 100 feet off the ground, he was surprised to see a figure jump up right in front of him, wildly waving its arms. He immediately hovered the copter, and the figure came toward the machine, finally dropping to its knees some 50 feet away. Myers landed, and with revolver in hand approached the still kneeling figure. As he came near, it raised its face, and Myers saw it to be a teenage boy, white-faced with fright. The boy pleaded with him, crying his innocence and begging for protection from the armed posse searching for him.

Myers called in the search commander, and the boy led them to a shotgun he had thrown away when the copter let down over his hiding place. When asked why he had run, the boy again cried he was innocent, and had become scared and fled when the troopers came to his home. Then, when he saw the copter, he realized how futile was his flight when the copter could come out of nowhere and land right on top of him, and surrendered immediately. Myers didn't have the heart to tell him that he was actually making an approach to the next field, as directed by ground control, and didn't see the boy until he popped up ahead of him. The story does have a happy ending, however, the boy was later proven innocent of the charge.

The principal traffic duty is, as mentioned above, the "white line" patrol. In this method of checking highway traffic speeds, two sets of white lines, spaced 660 feet apart, are painted across State and Federal highways throughout Indiana. At irregular intervals and on all types of roads, the lines admittedly serve as a constant warning to potential speeders, much as do the similar radar lines on city streets. Speed checking is much the same as the city methods, except that here a stopwatch and calibrated chart are used, and the nearest patrol car is radioed to make the arrest. Begun in 1955, the method was court tested immediately after its inception, and the courts ruled it valid. On heavy traffic days, 30 to 35 speeders will be caught by each patrol plane.

One of the biggest traffic problems anywhere in the United States is faced by the department and other Indiana police agencies each Memorial Day, when close to 200,000 people crowd into the Indianapolis Motor Speedway for the annual 500-mile race. This monumental traffic jam is handled by nearly 1,000 State troopers, Indianapolis and adjoining town police, sheriff's officers, and auxiliary police. Supervising this vast force is a command post manned by State, local, and county officers located high in the control tower inside the Indianapolis Speedway. Serving as the eyes of this post are the four department aircraft, the copter constantly circling the immediate vicinity of the track, the Bonanza and the two Cessnas patrolling the outlying areas. The aircraft, through a complex three-way FM radio hookup, are in constant touch not only with the command post but also with all patrol cars and many walkie-talkie equipped foot officers, thus preventing potential traffic jams from developing by rerouting traffic as necessary.

Emergency and rescue flights have covered a wide range. Division planes delivered plasma and medicine to emergency hospitals following tornadoes at Coatesville in 1948 and at Shelburn a year later, and during the severe floods along the lower Wabash River in 1950 and the tributaries of the White River in 1958. They also served as aerial spotters during these and other floods, directing boat rescue teams to isolated persons, and dropped feed to marooned animals.

The helicopter has been especially useful in rescue work, with its ability to set down anywhere there is sufficient space to clear its rotors. During the 1958 flood, the copter made a number of "sneak-in" landings in heavy rain and high winds to pick up persons trapped by fast rising water. In one case, Myers evacuated an entire large family in several trips.

One little known use of the copter is in accident investigation, where it is able to not only assist in the aerial search but also to deliver rescue and investigation personnel direct to the crash scene. During the investigation of the 1959 Electra crash at Tell City, the copter was used to help trace the crash pattern, take aerial photos, assist civil engineers in plotting the exact site of the crash, and to coordinate the ground search for pieces of wreckage.

The aviation division, in conjunction with the Aeronautics Commission of Indiana, maintains a record of all aircraft accidents within the State.

In July of 1960, Lieutenant Myers and the copter made local aviation history by dropping fully equipped skin divers into an Indianapolis lake. The purpose of the test was to determine if divers could be airlifted to water accident scenes, thus saving critical minutes over surface transportation. Two divers were dropped from heights of between 3 and 35 feet, and in each case jumped successfully and safely, found a victim on the lake bottom, and brought him to the surface. After one jump, Myers dropped a life vest on a long rope, and towed both rescuer and rescued a quarter mile to shore.

Survey missions include purely observation flights, such as those to determine unusual traffic conditions and their possible solutions, and photo flights. Occasionally another State department will borrow a plane and pilot for some special survey: highway, flood control, and water resources engineers especially have found the copter to be the perfect answer to the problem of prolonged examination of particular sites.

Under the miscellaneous heading are grouped test, pilot training and proficiency, and public relations flights, such as occasional air shows and airport dedications.

The aviation division began operations in 1947, when a staff lieutenant and then Sergeant Myers, flew just over 100 hours in a 1947 North American Navion. Two years later, this plane was replaced by a 1949 Ryan Navion A, and in 1951 Myers became chief pilot, with another trooper assigned as his assistant.

In the fall of 1955, the Navion was succeeded by a Beech F-35 Bonanza. Other additions to the fleet included a Piper Super Cub in March 1956; a Pipe Tri-Pacer in March 1958; and the Bell 47G-2 helicopter in April 1958. In July 1959, the two Pipers were replaced by two Cessnas, a 150 and a 172, which in turn were replaced by the two Skyhawks in November 1962. A Bell Ranger superseded the 47G-2 in May 1963.

The number of hours flown by division aircraft has shown a steady increase each year, from 1947's estimated 110 (exact figures unavailable) to 233 in 1950, 520 in 1955, and 2,217 in 1960. The 1961 total slumped to 1,845 hours, due to prolonged stretches of bad weather and pilot sickness, but in 1963 the four aircraft logged 2,341 hours.

Primary pilot assignments are Myers flying administrative and special missions in the Bonanza and the Bell helicopter, and Sgts. Paul Vogel and Kenneth Kirk handling the white line patrol in the two Cessnas. Myers will average some 500 hours per year, while the speed patrollers will average about 800 each.

Within duty requirements, Myers attempts to keep all pilots current in all aircraft by means of periodic aircraft rotation and proficiency flights at outstate posts.

Pilot requirements, while not unduly rigid, still assure a trooper's having a good basic flying background. A pilot applicant must possess a commercial pilot rating and a current medical certificate, although consideration will be given a private pilot with over 500 hours; if accepted, he will be allowed 90 days to get his commercial rating (with due allowance for bad weather and duty assignment if necessary).

All aircraft are restricted to day VFR flight conditions, although an aircraft caught out after sunset may continue on to its destination, and occasionally service emergencies may require the copter to operate in minimum conditions. Conservative, possibly, but the division points with pride to its outstanding safety record: no serious injury or fatality to any pilot or passenger in over 1,000 hours of flying.

Today, looking back on the aviation division's accomplishments during the past 17 years, division personnel wonder how the Indiana State Police ever operated without aircraft. More important, Lieutenant Myers and his staff believe they have just begun their operation, and that they can greatly increase their usefulness to the department during the next decade.

And one final word of warning: if you're ever driving on an Indiana highway, remember—somebody up there may be watching you.

Address by Governor of Kentucky on Public Accommodations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 14, 1964

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, of Kentucky, before the Kentucky House of Representatives, in support of a public accommodations bill pending before the Kentucky Legislature.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-Journal, Mar. 11, 1964]

TEXT OF GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS ON PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

FRANKFORT, KY.—The text of Gov. Edward T. Breathitt's address to the house of representatives:

"On this occasion I am grateful for the opportunity to ask your help in resolving a great moral issue—the right of every Kentuckian to have access to public accommodations without regard to the color of his skin. This is an issue which the people's representatives should decide, and it is an issue upon which the people are entitled to an answer in both houses of the general assembly.

"As a candidate for Governor, I pledged myself to submit this matter to the general assembly, and to abide by their decision. There is now in effect an Executive order, issued by my predecessor. I have stated, and I state again, that when the two houses of the general assembly act on the question of public accommodations, I shall rescind the Executive order.

"My predecessor intended his order as a temporary rather than a permanent solution to the problem. So do I. But I think—indeed I deeply believe—that those who must daily suffer humiliation and the denial of basic human rights have a right to ask you and to ask me to protect their basic rights. I have not shirked this challenge, and I do not believe that you will shirk it. I recommend that the house and senate set the amended Kinkead bill for a special order of business for the same hour this week."

A FAIR HEARING

"This action will insure a fair hearing on this bill and I will rescind the executive order prior to the vote.

"Kentucky's constitution states that arbitrary power exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority. We must face the fact that some of our fellow Kentuckians are born, grow up, live out their lives and die without ever having known what it is to be free from arbitrary power—a power to exclude them from the basic decencies and amenities of our community life—simply because their skins are dark.

"When decent, respectable, law-abiding Kentuckians cannot eat a meal in a good restaurant, cannot lodge in a decent motel, cannot enjoy themselves as others do, then they are not, in any meaningful sense, free men and women.

"The legislation which is before you for consideration does not give to our fellow citizens any new rights. It simply protects those rights which they already possess because they are human beings, created in the image of a good God. The Declaration of Independence stated in 1776 that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights—including, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

RIGHTS OF ALL MEN

"Thomas Jefferson and his associates did not proclaim the rights of white men, or black men, or yellow men. They proclaimed the rights of all men. Today, in America and in Kentucky, we are seeking to make good on the promises of Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence.

"In recent years we have heard a great deal about States rights. We must recognize that States rights also involve State responsibilities, and that a failure upon the part of Kentucky to protect the basic human rights of her citizens is but an open invitation to the Federal Government to intervene in this area to an ever-increasing extent.

"State legislation pending before you would make it possible for State tribunals to deal with discrimination in places of public accommodation. I do not believe that those who believe in States rights will relish a situation in which the Attorney General of the United States and the Federal courts will be charged with the sole responsibility for enforcing human rights in Kentucky.

"I have no desire at this time to engage in a labored or extended discussion of these issues. Repeatedly I have made my sentiments known. In good conscience, however, I must appeal to you to join with me in facing up to one of the great moral challenges of our time. The scores of letters and calls which I have received from clergymen, priests, rabbis, and devoted religious laymen have etched upon my heart a moral imperative to make this appeal."

THE SHADOW OF EXCLUSION

"Let me put it as simply as I know how. Suppose that any one of you, along with the members of your family, were compelled to live your daily life under the awful shadow of exclusion and discrimination in your own hometown? Suppose that any one of you were compelled to face the daily shame and humiliation of service denied in eating places, sleeping places, and other places of public accommodations. Under such circumstances, you would, as I would, feel wounded and violated, caught in the toils of an arbitrary power.

"I say to you, from the deepest convictions of my heart, that you and I cannot claim for ourselves rights and opportunities which we will not claim for all of our fellow-citizens, regardless of race or color.

"Let us not hide behind the shelters of anonymity. Let us not duck or dodge this great moral challenge. Let us tell the whole world that in Kentucky the Golden Rule is written on the books of law and in the hearts of men.

"Once we have mustered the courage to make this decision, the mists of prejudices will clear away, the kind and generous people of this State will accept our decision, and our children will point to this hour as a landmark for human decency in the history of a great commonwealth."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Speech by Lynn A. Townsend, President, Chrysler Corp., at a Luncheon Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to find two closer friends in the community of nations than Canada and the United States. Although each of our nations has definite and different ideas of its role in the world and the steps it should take for its own betterment, our mutual respect has never wavered.

We have solved a great many problems between ourselves without permanent rancor and with good grace.

Recently, in a speech before the Empire Club of Canada in Toronto, Ontario, Mr. Lynn A. Townsend, president of Chrysler Corp., outlined another way in which Canada and the United States can further cooperate in the production of automobiles and their components to the advantage in both our nations.

I think Mr. Townsend's remarks are significant and important to our future, and I recommend that my colleagues pay them close attention:

ADDRESS BY LYNN A. TOWNSEND, PRESIDENT, CHRYSLER CORP., AT A LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, ROYAL YORK HOTEL, TORONTO, ONTARIO, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

Those of us who live in the Detroit area regard it as a great advantage to be so close to Canada. And for me personally, coming over to Toronto is like coming home, because a few years back, when I served as group vice president for international operations at Chrysler, I spent a great deal of time here in Ontario, as well as in the other provinces. So it is a very special pleasure as well as a great honor for me to be privileged to speak here in Toronto at the Empire Club. And I hope to make the best possible use of that privilege by presenting for your consideration a few thoughts concerning the great economic opportunity that lies ahead for the people of Canada and the people of the United States.

I am going to assume that there are some things about Canadian-American relations that you and I are quite familiar with, things we can take almost for granted. Before this audience, for example, I hardly need to expand on the old, familiar theme concerning the trust between Canadians and Americans that is symbolized by 3,000 miles of unfortified and unguarded border. I don't have to repeat the well-known facts concerning the trade that flows in unparalleled volume both ways across that border. And I don't have to comment on the many benefits we share in this part of the world as the result of living on the Great Lakes—which are beyond comparison the world's greatest single freshwater system and which provide us with a superb means of low-cost transportation right into the industrial heart of the continent.

We also take it for granted that we are good neighbors—living on opposite sides of the street, perhaps, rather than next door to one another—but still very good neighbors indeed. No one, as far as I can remember, has ever spoken of a good neighbor policy for Canada and the United States, because between such old and such good neighbors there is just no need to use the words.

But there are other things that we may not take quite so much for granted. We don't necessarily accept as axiomatic, for example, the need for gearing our two economies more closely together than they are at the present time. We don't necessarily agree without any argument or qualification that investment in Canadian industries on the part of business concerns in the United States and on the scale of the last two decades is an unqualified blessing for Canada. And even if we did agree perfectly on our economic goals—we might find it a bit difficult to agree on ways and means of proceeding from here on to make progress toward those goals.

In my opinion, the time will probably never come when Canadians and Americans will agree on everything, and I don't think any of us would really like to see that kind of agreement. We Americans don't even agree among ourselves, as you may have heard, and neither do you. I hope you and we can preserve the differences within our two countries as well as the cultural and political integrity that keeps us distinct from one another in our values and our ways of life. Without those differences, life in this part of the world would certainly be far less interesting than it is.

All this is quite apart from the complex and difficult problems we share right now as economic partners on this continent. And with all our differences in approach, I think you and we realize that we owe it to each other to try to work more effectively and more frankly, as partners should, to find better solutions to those problems. Every Canadian businessman I know would probably agree with me, and many of them have said as much, that you and we just can't expect to pull away forever from the natural magnetic lines of economic attraction that underlie our business relationships.

The businessmen of Canada and the United States are going to be forced by plain, ordinary, good business judgment to find ways of avoiding some of the wasteful duplications in production and distribution that exist at the present time. We are going to be forced by our own commonsense and elementary business logic to act in line with what we all recognize—that our two countries form a natural market of magnificent size and potential, a market that should not be broken in two by artificial political barriers. And sooner or later we are going to be forced to realine our operations so as to gain for the people of Canada, and the people of the United States, who buy and use our products, more of the benefits of mass production and mass distribution.

I think we all know these things. We know that the course of economic evolution in North America is in the direction of a continental pattern—and when we think together about progress in that direction it is imperative that we be guided by a continental concept.

Prosperous as we both are at the present time, the status quo is not good enough for either of us. We aren't either of us measuring up to our full potential—and we both have our problems.

For one thing, both countries are faced with serious deficits in their international payments. These deficits have persisted over a considerable period, and on both sides of the border we are concerned about doing something to bring about a consistent balance in our international accounts in the years ahead. And perhaps the most practical thing you and we can do about this problem is to stand side by side in the forthcoming round of negotiations on tariff and trade. We have a common interest in gaining access to the growing world markets on something like an equal basis with the countries we have both helped so greatly to become strong.

As Mitchell Sharp said so well and so forcefully in Chicago last June, "since the war Canada and the United States have taken the lead in negotiating for the reduction of trade barriers and the expansion of trade on a nondiscriminatory multilateral basis. Our objectives remain the same, but they must now be realized in a world in which Europe has reestablished its place and instituted regional economic arrangements, a world in which the frustration of agricultural trade has been recognized as a major problem and in which the less developed countries are pressing for new and special measures to meet their trade and development needs."

As we work together to liberalize trade, and as we support one another in making constructive recommendations affecting the general problems of tariffs and trade in the world at large, it is well to remember that certain inhibiting barriers to trade still exist between Canada and the United States. But it is not my purpose to get involved in that thorny subject here today. What I would like to do is to explore one possible way for the businessmen of Canada and the United States to help unleash the combined force of our two interrelated systems of free enterprise. If that can be accomplished we can both move out into the rapidly expanding markets of the world more efficiently and effectively than we can on the present basis. And by so doing we will both be in a position to do something practical about those adverse balance-of-payments situations we have in common.

In making my suggestions, I am going to restrict myself to what I know best—the economics of the automobile business. And I will do so in the hope that if these suggestions are useful in making the Canadian-United States automobile complex more efficient and more competitive in world trade, the same approach may be of use in other sectors.

Let me begin by indicating briefly the dimensions of the total world opportunity for the North American automobile industry. In 1963 Canada and the United States built 9,734,911 cars and trucks. Of this total, 9,108,678 were built in the United States and 626,233 in Canada.

Total world production in 1963, according to a preliminary estimate of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, was 20,699,000 cars and trucks. This means that in the past year Canada and the United States together accounted for 47 percent of world production—whereas 10 years ago, in 1953,

our two countries accounted for 75 percent of world production—which in that year was only 10,436,544 vehicles. In other words, our production of motor vehicles here in Canada and the United States has been growing, but world production has been growing at a much faster pace.

In the years immediately ahead, the share of world production accounted for by Canada and the United States will probably continue to decrease. Whether that share will continue indefinitely to decrease will depend in part on what we do together to increase our effectiveness in the design, production, and marketing of motor vehicles.

A conservative estimate would anticipate a combined United States and Canadian production by 1970 at 11 million cars and trucks. And though it is much more difficult to estimate production outside of this continent, it appears easily possible that world production outside of Canada and the United States will reach the level of 13 million cars and trucks by 1970. This would mean a world total of motor vehicle production in the neighborhood of 24 million units by 1970.

The challenge that appears right on the face of these facts is clear for anyone to read. What they tell us is that the world automobile industry is generating new mass markets everywhere. And when mass markets are being created at the present pace, the efficiencies and cost savings resulting from large-scale manufacturing are also being created. To hold our own against the growing efficiency of automotive production in Western Europe, and the cost and price advantages resulting from the economies of scale, we in the automobile industry—in the United States and in Canada—are going to have to make an all-out effort. More particularly, we are going to have to avoid some of the wasteful duplication in the North American automobile industry that up to now has been a luxury we could afford.

You in Canada were the first to call attention to the inefficiency caused by the parallel production in Canada of car lines and car components already being produced in the United States. Many of you have read the scholarly, thorough, and well-informed Royal Commission report on the Canadian automobile industry written by Dean Bladen of the University of Toronto after many months of investigation and published in 1961.

As you know, Dean Bladen began his report by pointing out realistically that Canada's once strong position in the export of motor vehicles had weakened as the result of the development of large-scale automobile industries in Europe and the protection of those industries by tariffs and other trade barriers. He then analyzed in depth and detail the benefits as well as the drawbacks experienced by Canada in being associated with the U.S. automobile industry. As the result of his study of the economics of the industry on both sides of the border and in Europe, he was impressed by the very substantial cost penalties incurred in Canada by the established practice of building cars and components for a limited and protected market. He found that it was impossible for the Canadian automobile manufacturers to realize anything comparable to the economies of scale enjoyed by their United States and European counterparts.

His facts and his logic brought him inevitably and inexorably to the conclusion that if the Canadian automobile companies were ever going to make themselves competitive in costs with the U.S. automobile companies—to say nothing of the European companies—they were going to have to find a way of obtaining a high volume of sales outside of Canada. And a start in this direction might be made, he decided, by liberalizing the "Canadian content" provisions of the 1936 tariff. Without going into the complex technical features of his proposal, let me just summarize it by saying that it would tend to give companies outside of Canada duty-free access to the Canadian market in return for increasing the manufacture in Canada of automotive components—whether or not those components were actually used in cars or trucks assembled in Canada.

In making this proposal, Dean Bladen was hoping to encourage not only freer trade in automotive products but was also hoping for a start toward the development in Canada of automotive parts manufacturing on something like the scale that he had found was necessary to be competitive in cost. In other words, if Canada could begin to produce greater quantities of certain automotive components—such as transmissions, engines, frames, springs, batteries, tires, stampings, and the like—and begin to be less concerned with the assembly of full lines of cars, some progress might be made in the direction of achieving optimum volume for the Canadian automotive industry as a whole. Once Canada achieved that volume, she could begin to bid on equal terms for a bigger share of the total North American market for automotive products. And in the long run this specialization of effort would increase Canada's exports and help to balance her international payments.

The most immediate result of the Bladen report was the removal, as he had recommended, of the Federal excise tax of 7½ percent on passenger cars. This was a progressive move toward encouraging the purchase of cars and widening the automobile market in Canada. And I hope we in the United States will find it possible someday to follow your lead and eliminate our own 10-percent excise tax on cars and trucks.

What happened last October, when your Minister of Industry announced his plan for remitting import duties on motor vehicles and components, was undoubtedly the most important single step taken in many, many years to strengthen the Canadian automobile industry and in turn the entire Canadian economy. Although Mr. Drury made no reference to the Bladen Report when he announced the remission of the duties plan, it seems clear that it is a logical outgrowth of the Bladen recommendations. What the plan holds out as incentive is that to the extent Canadian automobile companies increase their exports—in excess of exports in the year ending in October 1962—they will be forgiven their import duties on an equivalent value of vehicles and components brought into Canada.

I cannot speak for the other automobile companies, but for Chrysler Corp. I can say that the Drury plan is providing a very strong stimulant to our business imaginations. If, without dislocating our present patterns of supply and production too abruptly and violently, we can begin to bring across the Detroit River from Winsdor, for example, a greatly increased volume of automotive parts for assembly into our U.S.-built cars and trucks—and if, in return for this volume of Canadian-built components, we can ship into Canada an equivalent volume of parts and vehicles duty free, we can begin to realize a substantial saving in a very short time.

In this connection, I would like to make absolutely clear my own belief that the immediate financial benefits realized by any one company as the result of the Drury plan are relatively insignificant compared with the longer-range benefits to the people of the United States and Canada growing out of a freer exchange of goods and services across our border. Any liberation that can be achieved from the constricting limitations of tariffs will help the businessmen of the United States and Canada move toward a more logical integration of production and distribution on this continent. And this in turn will mean improved efficiency, more jobs, better values for consumers in both countries, and faster growing markets for our products throughout the world.

I would like to say at this point that I am not arguing for absolute free trade—or for the immediate wiping out of the tariffs between our two countries. That may come in the course of time. But you and I know that protection has had its usefulness to Canada and to the Canadian automobile industry. And now that the decision has been made to exchange somewhat less protection for somewhat greater competitive strength and greater access to foreign markets, great care must be exercised so as not to disrupt existing arrangements too suddenly.

Even before the Drury plan was in effect, we at Chrysler were buying automotive components in Canada for our United States plants. And at the same time, part of the needs of our Canadian plants in Windsor were being supplied by our own and other U.S. sources. In the years ahead, with so many of our facilities being located in the Detroit-Windsor area, we are in an ideal position to move toward an even closer integration of our Canadian-United States operations. This should bring many benefits to the people of our two countries.

As a result of the Bladen report and the Drury plan, a start has been made toward what should eventually prove to be a highly rewarding interdependence of the Canadian and United States automotive industry. No one can say, of course, that the evolution initiated by these first encouraging moves will be smooth and easy, and entirely free from difficulties. There are bound to be problems of the kind that almost invariably arise from the disturbance of long-established patterns of employment, trade, and investment. But a bold move has been made toward something better and economically sounder than we have had. And the job now is to keep the process of evolution in motion.

It may help, as we enter this period of evolution, to have some idea of the goals we would like to move toward. And, to this end I would like to describe very briefly what the Canadian automotive industry might look like 20 years from now—in the year 1984.

To begin with, the new cars on the streets of Toronto in 1984 will probably be identical in their nameplates, styling, and specifications with the cars over on the other side of the lake on the streets of Buffalo. Long gone will be the days when it was considered necessary to build in Canada virtually the full range of models built in the United States.

By 1984 we can hope, with good reason, that assembly plants, parts factories, stamping plants, supply depots, research facilities, and training centers in Canada and the United States will be located not primarily on national lines at all but in a logical economic and geographic relationship to resources, ease of transportation, and markets. And by measurements like these, Toronto, Montreal, and Windsor are just as logical locations for a wide range of automotive manufacturing as Detroit and Kenosha and Cleveland.

It is possible that by applying this kind of economic logic, some automobile companies may decide to build in Canada their entire supply of a few basic components—such as frames, engines, transmissions, springs, and so on. This could mean that somewhere in Canada, and probably in Ontario or Quebec, by 1984 there may be at least one engine plant producing a million engines a year. There may be 1 or more plants building transmissions at the optimum rate of 500,000 units a year. And sourcing in Canada of these and other components in this kind of volume will mean greater total automotive production and more employment than would be generated

by a continuation of older patterns of nonspecialized production.

By the same logic, assembly operations may also be located in Canada. In 1984, some assembly plants in such cities as Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, Windsor, and Vancouver could be building cars to serve certain sections of the United States as well as sections of Canada. And, of course, they would also be building cars for shipment to other parts of the world. It would not be at all surprising to me if, in another 20 years, something like 10 percent of total United States and Canadian automotive production—including components—will be exported, as compared with only about 3 percent today.

By 1984 we can expect Canada and the United States to divide the total automotive production of the two countries more nearly in proportion to their population than they do at the present time. Canada's population is now about 10 percent of the population of the United States—but the value of Canada's automotive production is about 5 percent of that in the United States. Through the greater efficiency achieved by specialization and increased volume—and through improved access to the markets of the world—there should be no doubt of Canada's ability over the long run to achieve virtual parity with the United States in automobile production.

All of this will take time. And it will also take patience and a willingness to look beyond immediate inconveniences and frustrations to eventual benefits. As Dean Bladen says, "Immediate preoccupation with the shortrun problems of the industry must not inhibit consideration of some longrun possibilities." Success in moving toward the more rational organization of the automobile industry in our two countries will also require confidence on the part of U.S. automobile men in the consistency of governmental policy in Canada. If they were to become skeptical about something like the Drury plan, for instance, and should begin to look upon it as a short-term expedient, motivated by political considerations, they might be reluctant to source all or even a substantial share of an automobile component in Canada. No automobile company can ever afford to put its complete reliance upon one source without strong confidence in the continuity of supply at a reasonable and stable cost.

What we have in the making is the equivalent of a common market in North America. In its first stages, some years from now, it will probably be limited to the trade of our two countries, but eventually, as Mexico and then other countries in this hemisphere become strong enough to trade on freer terms, the scope of that tariff-free area may expand. We have congratulated ourselves for so long on our unguarded frontier and our unparalleled volume of trade that we may have become somewhat complacent, and insensitive to the need for change. The countries of Western Europe, on the other hand, when it became clear that their economic future was being mortgaged by economic nationalism, began more than a decade ago to take steps to free their borders of tariffs and to make possible for their industries the economies of scale through access to wider markets.

Right now Canada and the United States find themselves at about the same stage in grappling with this new concept of a continental economy that the six Common Market countries reached in 1953, when they took the first step toward the Common Market by establishing the European coal and steel community. The important thing is that here in North America we have got hold of a new idea. And as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "Man's mind, once stretched to a new idea, never returns to its former dimensions."

I think all of us, Canadians and Americans alike, were pleased with the spirit of the meeting a few weeks ago in Washington, of Lester Pearson and Lyndon Johnson. The communique issued at that time seemed to promise closer and more effective means of consultation between our governments in the future than in the past. Reaching effective agreement on the kind of economic policy we have been considering today is far more difficult than reaching agreement on the use of the water in the Columbia River, but with enough good will and good sense it can be done.

I was impressed recently by an editorial in the Toronto Globe and Mail which, after discussing in a cool and rational way the problems of Canadian economic policy, concluded with these words:

"Let us make conscious decisions about the direction of national policy, recognizing what is involved and facing the consequences boldly. Let us decide if we are in favor of independence or interdependence, economic nationalism or economic integration. And having decided, let us design our policies accordingly and move with determination and decision, instead of drifting and hoping for the best."

From what I know of Canada, I believe the decision will be made, if it hasn't already been made, in favor of moving out boldly toward vigorous and unlimited economic expansion and a great and satisfying future for the Canadian people. And being as fond of your great country as I am, I couldn't be more pleased.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, 6 more American servicemen lost their lives over the weekend in Vietnam, bringing to 199 the number of American troops who have fallen in the dirty little undeclared war in that nation.

But Vietnam is not the only battleground of the 14-year cold war. Americans have lost their lives in virtually every continent and clime in a war, the ferocity of which has at times matched the confrontations of World War II and Korea.

The Republican policy committee has compiled a chronology of U.S. aircraft attacked by Communists since 1950. Under the heading "Lest We Forget," are enumerated the incidents which have accounted for the lives of 96 American servicemen and the wounding and injury of dozens of others outside of the war in Vietnam.

This chronology, I feel, is important to the dialog on the cold war, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the memo, "Lest We Forget," be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Republican Memo No. 10, Mar. 12, 1964]

LEST WE FORGET

April 8, 1950: Unarmed Navy Privateer shot down over the Baltic Sea; 10 crew members missing.

November 6, 1951: Navy Neptune patrol bomber disappeared on a U.N. weather reconnaissance flight over international waters off Siberia after Soviet planes fired on it; 10 crew members missing.

July 31, 1952: Navy PBM Mariner on routine patrol over Yellow Sea severely damaged by two Chinese Communist Mig 15's; two crewmembers killed, two injured; plane made it to Paengnyong-do, Korea.

January 18, 1953: P2V-5 Neptune forced to ditch in Formosa Strait off Swatow, China, after being fired on by Communist shore batteries; six crewmembers misisng, although Navy had reason to believe that two may have been alive.

March 10, 1953: T-34's in U.S. Zone of Germany about 7 miles west of Czech border fired on by two Mig's; one shot down, landing in Germany.

March 15, 1953: RB-50 attacked by Mig 15, 25 miles off Soviet territory and about 100 miles northeast of Petropavlock (Kamchatka). One Mig of two-ship formation fired on U.S. plane, which returned fire. No damage to either plane. U.S. plane returned to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska.

July 29, 1953: B-50 shot down over the Sea of Japan, 1 man recovered, 16 lost.

March 12, 1954: One Mig 15 fired on two Navy planes, damaging tail of one. The two U.S. Navy AD's were from the Mediterranean-based carrier *Randolph* and were fired on over or near the Czechoslavakian border. The Communist plane was Czech. No casualties.

July 25, 1954: Two Skyraiders from the U.S.S. *Philippine Sea*, searching for survivors of a British airliner downed in South China Sea, July 23, 1954, by Chinese Communists, were fired on by two Chinese fighter planes (LA-7's). The American rescue planes returned the fire and downed both Chinese planes. No American casualties; 10 persons lost, including 3 Americans on British airliner.

September 4, 1954: Navy P2V Neptune patrol bomber was shot down over high seas, 40 miles from Siberian coast. The P2V was attached to Patrol Squadron 19 out of Atsugi, Japan, and was shot down by two Russian jets; one dead, nine survivors. Location: Sea of Japan.

November 7, 1954: RB-29 shot down by Russian Mig's over North Hokkaido, 10 survived—1 dead.

February 5, 1955: RB-45 escorted by 12 F-86's on reconnaissance mission over Yellow Sea attacked by 4 North Korean Mig's; two Mig's shot down. No casualties.

February 9, 1955: Navy carrier-based AD Skyraider was shot down by Communist antiaircraft fire while giving aerial cover during evacuation of Chinese nationalists from the Tachen Islands. A few days earlier a P2V Neptune was fired on with minor damage from flak in its wing section. No casualties in either case.

May 10, 1955: 8 F-86's on patrol mission over international waters off the coast of North Korean attacked by 12 to 15 Mig's; 2 Mig's shot down with pilots bailed out, a third Mig seen diving straight down trailing smoke. No U.S. casualties.

June 22, 1955: Navy P2V Neptune patrol bomber was attacked by two Russian Mig's over international waters in the vicinity of St. Lawrence Island. The plane was on a routine flight from Naval Air Station, Kodiak, Alaska. One engine was set afire and plane crash landed off St. Lawrence Island; three crew members injured, eight unharmed.

August 18, 1955: Unarmed T-6 trainer shot down by ground fire from North Korea, crashed near demilitarized zone. Air Force pilot and Army observers' bodies returned to U.N. control 5 days later. C-47 searching for T-6 fired on but returned safely.

August 22, 1956: P4M Mercator shot down off coast of Communist China (Wenchow), with 16 abroad missing; 4 bodies recovered;

other 12 were presumed dead and this was announced August 31, 1957.

June 12, 1957: Naval aircraft on routine training flight off Chinese coast in Formosa Straits area were fired on and slightly damaged by Chinese Communist antiaircraft fire. Plane damage minor, no personnel injuries.

March 6, 1958: F-86 on local training flight shot down by North Koreans in the area of the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea; pilot survived and returned.

June 27, 1958: Unarmed U.S. Air Force C-118 transport plane shot down in Soviet Armenia by two Soviet Mig fighters. The nine crew members reported they were intercepted by the Mig's and set afire at 15,000 feet. All were returned to their home station at Wiesbaden, after a flight from Teheran on July 8.

September 2, 1958: C-130 shot down in Soviet Armenia; 17 aboard—all missing; U.S.S.R. returned remains of 6 bodies—4 identified, 2 unidentified.

November 17, 1958: Mig's fired on RB-47's, one over Baltic, one over Sea of Japan. No damages; no casualties.

June 15, 1959: P4M Mercator on routine training flight off Korean coast, 85 miles east of Wonsan, North Korea, was fired on by two Mig fighters. Plane badly damaged but returned safely to Air Force Base, Miho, Honshu, Japan. Tailgunner seriously wounded, no other casualties.

July 1, 1960: RB-47 shot down over Barents Sea; four dead or missing—two captured by Soviets and returned to United States.

May 17, 1963: U.S. Army helicopter checking flight border markers shot down by North Koreas, crashed in demilitarized zone; two crew members still prisoners of North Koreans.

January 28, 1964: T-39 transport-trainer with three pilots, strayed over East German border and was shot down by East German fighters; three killed—remains of three returned.

March 10, 1964: RB-66B on training flight strayed into East Germany and shot down by Russian fighter 30 miles from border. The three crewmen survived.

This list does not include U.S. aircraft attacked by the Communists in South Vietnam.

Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a growing opinion that the Bobby Baker case will be an important factor in the coming campaign.

The Washington Evening Star of March 12, 1964, printed an excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Whitewash" which follows:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Lyndon B. Johnson?

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don R. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored—at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought $1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a $100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had "any knowledge" of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employe at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody made the arrangements. Why is the committee so afraid to explore the matter?

Whitewash is a useful commodity for sprucing up fences and outbuildings. But it serves only one purpose in this instance—to leave in the public mind a deep and fully justified suspicion that the Senate Rules Committee is trying to cover up a major scandal with far-reaching ramifications.

Proposed National Holiday, November 22, in Memory of the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the La Porte County Labor Council of the AFL-CIO in La Porte, Ind., at a recent meeting passed a resolution asking for the establishment of November 22 as a national holiday in memory of the late President Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of that resolution in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF LAPORTE COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO, LA PORTE, IND.

Whereas President John F. Kennedy, the youngest man to ever become President of the United States of America, sacrificed his life for the Nation;

Whereas he devoted his time and efforts as President to the cause of freedom in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas he always expressed his concern for the welfare of humanity through his efforts and actions to build a better society in which to live;

Whereas as the first Roman Catholic to ever become President of the United States, he showed no favoritism to the Catholic Church, thus dispelling many doubts and fears of other religious groups;

Whereas he proved himself to be an untiring and fearless leader and never retreated when the cause of justice and freedom were at stake; and

Whereas we have suffered a great loss through his untimely death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the La Porte County Labor Council, AFL-CIO go on record as requesting and petitioning the Congress and Senate of the United States to declare November 22 of each year as a national holiday.

JAMES L. KINTZELE,
President.

First Man To Break 9 Seconds for 100-Yard Dash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The fastest man in the world today is Robert Lee Hayes, of Jacksonville, Fla., a student at Florida A. & M. University in Tallahassee, Fla. Mr. Hayes is one of the country's outstanding athletes and is currently the holder of the world record in the 100-yard dash and in the 60-yard dash. He is a great representative of young America. I am happy to include the following article about Bob Hayes from Time magazine of March 13, 1964, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FIGHT FOR A FRACTION

What is a tenth of a second? It is one-eighth of a heartbeat, one-thirtieth of a sigh, one-twenty-one billionth of a lifetime. It is, literally, the blinking of an eye—an insignificant instant to people who measure their lives in minutes or months or 40-hour weeks. But not to Robert Lee Hayes, 21, a husky sprinter from Florida A. & M. University. Hayes is the world's fastest human, a title he holds by virtue of the fragile fact that he can run 60 yards or 100 yards a tenth of a second faster than anybody else who ever lived.

PIGEON TOED AND KNOCK-KNEED

Bob Hayes' mother remembers that he was a late walker and the slowest diswasher in the family. Jake Gaither, Florida A. & M.'s football coach, recalls the first time he saw Hayes run: "I had to smile a little. He was pigeon-toed and knock-kneed, and he sort of wobbled. 'Jake,' they told me, 'you've got to teach that boy how to run.' But then I saw how he left those defensive backs behind, and I said, 'Let him alone. He'll do all right by himself.'" That was 4 years ago, and Bob Hayes still does not act like a man in much of a hurry. He yawns a lot, and he never stands when he can sit. He is taking 5 years to finish college. He has trouble keeping his weight down, and he still runs pigeon-toed—so much so that he is forever stabbing himself ("usually in the big toe") with his own half-inch-long track spikes.

But nobody makes fun of Bob Hayes any more. Outdoors in St. Louis last June, he ran the 100-yard dash in 9.1 seconds, clipping 0.1 second off Frank Budd's world rec-

ord. Indoors in New York 3 weeks ago, he sprinted 60 yards in 5.9 seconds for still another world record. In 1½ years, outdoors or indoors, Hayes has lost only two races.

RABBITS AND GUNS

By trade, Hayes is a halfback, not a sprinter. He earns his keep at A. & M. (room, board, tuition, and free laundry) toiling autumns for Gaither's padded legions; he scored 11 touchdowns, leading the team to an 8–2 season last year, and he might already belong to some pro football club if 1964 were not an Olympic year (he has been drafted by both the Denver Broncos and the Dallas Cowboys). Even in track skivvies, Hayes still runs as though he had a football tucked under his arm—head bobbing, shoulders rolling, elbows flailing. Unlike such "rabbits" as Germany's Olympic champion Armin Hary, Hayes has never learned to get the jump on his field by anticipating the starter's gun. He frequently is the last man off the blocks, or close to it.

But once he is in motion, Hayes accelerates like a dragster. Within 40 yards, he is moving at top speed. Then, as if he had flipped a switch, he goes into overdrive—a kind of higher-than-high gear, in which he actually seems to be flying along about 3 inches off the ground.

The track meets are moving outdoors now. This week Hayes will run his first 100 of the spring at the Florida AAU Invitational at Miami. Hayes' Coach Dick Hill has his star practicing starts every afternoon, blasting out of the blocks time after time, fighting to pare a tiny fraction of a second off the time it takes him to get in motion. "It's a matter of reflexes," says Hill. "It takes a runner one-one hundredth to one-tenth of a second to react to the starter's gun. The idea is to get Bob to react as instantly as possible." And one day Hayes will get a perfect start—the gun and the first driving step in the same tick of time. Both Hayes and Hill are certain of it. "When that day comes," says Hayes, "I'll do 9 flat." "He'll do 8.9," says Coach Hill. "And he'll do it this year."

Letters From Students at Hill School, Thermopolis, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it is sometimes tragic that adults, with all their mature intellect, cannot retain a portion of that wonderful simplicity and uncluttered logic of children. In youth can be found the beautiful and unquestioning belief in God and country that emanates from a faith uncompromised.

I have received, Mr. President, a number of letters written by students of Hill Elementary School in Theromopolis, Wyo.; letters that are expressions of the desires of children to be free to express their belief in God and country in the classroom or out. The letters are, in my mind, welcome auguries to the continued strength of our national character, and they bring to my mind the Biblical prophecy: "And a little child shall lead them."

Many are signed with but a first name. Others attest to the initial attempts of those in the lower grades to try their hand at writing.

I believe the letters are relevant not only to the discussion of my amendment to the U.S. Constitution pertaining to the relationship of church and state but also the broader and often propounded query: "Where are the youths of today headed?"

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letters from Hill School in Thermopolis, Wyo., be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country and we want it to stay free. What can we do to help keep our country free? We want to have the liberty to read the Bible if we want to or to pray when we want to. Please push an amendment so we can do so.

From,

JULIE BROWN.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love this free country. We want it to be that way. We don't like communism.

Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in schools and other public places.

We want our world to be free.

Love,

MICHAEL EMERSON.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free.

Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in schools and other public places.

Respectfully yours,

TERRY WILEY.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We are sad that we cannot pray in my room. I will pray for you. Help us to pray in school. Please send a letter to me, OK?

Love,

PATRICIA TALMAGE.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray.

Love,

DANNY YOUNG.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in schools and other public places.

Love,

JILL FEDDERSEN.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. We love God and so do others.

Love,

BRIAN GALYAN.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We want to be under God and have a free country.

We come to America to be under God.

We want to keep communism off our land.

We want to read the Bible and pray in school.

DOUG BENDER.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We want to be under God and to have a free country.

We came to America to be under God.

We want to keep communism off our land.

We want to read the Bible and to pray in school.

Love,

RICKY LYNN KIRKENSLAGER.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and to pray in school and other public places.

From,

GREGORY.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free from communism. We elected you. Do something about it, please.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN RALPH.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: I love our free country of America and I want to stay free from communism. My teacher says that they shouldn't tell us not to read the Bible and that we shouldn't have to read it. I am willing to fight communism when I am older. I want every cent of our land kept safe. We thank our National Guard and Army. Let's fight for God. Please help us.

EDDY GOODE.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. And no one is going to stop us. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in school and other public places.

Love,

DIANE RICHARDSON.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in schools and other public places.

Love,

CRAIG CAVALLI.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want it to stay the way it is.

We love our Nation and we hope to keep communism off our land.

We want to keep it free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in schools and other public places.

We elected you. Please help us.

Love,

JUDY ANNE MCKENNA.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: I came from Korea. I like it better in America. Help us.

Love,

STEPHEN CHRISTLEN.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our country. Please help to keep communism off our land.

Love,

KEVIN BAY.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We pray for our country to keep free. We want the communism to keep off our land. We like to read out of the Bible. We want our Nation to be free. We love the Lord.

Love,

JO ELLEN LEE.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in school and other public places.

Love,

LANETTE SESSIONS.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We want to pray and read out of the Bible. We do not want communism to come on our land. We want to keep our Nation free.

Love,

POLLY SPATZ.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: I like to go to good new club and here is the memory verse John 3: 76:

"Ye must be born again."

I like that memory verse, and I like our free land, and I want to keep it that way.

Love,

CAROL KINNAMON.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free from communism. Please push an amendment for our liberty to keep God in schools.

Love,

JAMES DELAP.

HILL SCHOOL,
Thermopolis, Wyo., January 28, 1964.
Hon. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: We love our free country. We want to keep our Nation free. Please push an amendment for our liberty to read the Bible and pray in schools and other public places.

From,

TED LYE.

No Pork Barrel for Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the determining factor in awarding research and development contracts must be nothing more or less than professional competence.

As the New York Times has so practically and correctly stated it:

No more artificial—or stultifying—yardstick for allocating future grants could be established than one compounded of geography, academic, and corporate empire-building and old-fashioned pork-barrel politics.

And as the Times has concluded:

The only valid test is what work needs to be done and where can it be done best.

Mr. Speaker, this article makes an important contribution to a debate which all too often loses its perspective, and I include it for our colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1964]

NO PORK BARREL FOR RESEARCH

The growing amount of Federal funds devoted to research and development is provoking an unseemly battle for shares of the pie. Congress is threatening to cut down on outlays unless they are more evenly distributed. It has the support of businessmen and educators, including scientists, who agree with Representative CARL ELLIOTT's Committee on Government Research that too much research is concentrated in too few States.

No more artificial—or stulifying—yardstick for allocating future grants could be established than one compounded of geography, academic, and corporate empire-building and old-fashioned pork-barrel politics.

There is no doubt about either the big flow of research funds or their uneven distribution. The Government, which has been increasing its outlays by almost 20 percent a year, is now spending over $15 billion, most of it in California and a comparative handful of Eastern States. This same pattern applies to scientific grants. Over $900 million a year is being channeled to colleges and universities, with 40 percent of this total awarded to only 10 institutions.

Political pressures have not been entirely absent from the allocation of research funds. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's peremptory decision to locate its proposed $60 million electronics research center near Boston after Senator Kennedy's campaign pledge that he could do "more for Massachusetts" is one such example.

In general, however, professional competence, not regional favortism, has been the basic reason for the research concentration. This ought to be the determinant in all cases. The only valid test is what work needs to be done and where can it be done best.

Washington's predictions of achieving a leveling-off in science spending will be upset if Congress insists on dividing up grants in pork-barrel fashion. The result will be waste, duplication and much bigger expenditures. For if money is allocated to institutions and firms simply because they have been neglected, funds will still have to be given to the competent groups now doing most of the research.

Science must not become a pork barrel. It does not merit a blank check from the Government any more than do farmers or the defense industry. In fact, greater caution and judgment must be used in selecting promising areas of research as well as in choosing the most capable researchers. Any other course is sure to increase the quantity of research with no improvement in its quality.

Catch in the Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that all editorial comment on the subject of the recently enacted tax bill has not been in the nature of blind acknowledgment of the propaganda fanfare which surrounded passage of the bill. I was one of the minority of the minority party who voted against the bill on the floor of the House.

The Palos Regional, Palos, Ill., in an editorial on Thursday, March 12, dramatizes points that may not have been understood by the general public, and I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

CATCH IN THE TAX CUT

Among the objectives of the much publicized cut in Federal taxes that has gone into effect is the encouragement of business and

industrial expansion. Over the next 2 years, the tax rate on corporations with taxable income of over $25,000 a year will be reduced from 52 to 48 percent. The tax rate on corporations with less than $25,000 of taxable income will drop from 30 to 22 percent in one step.

If the Government's rosy estimates of the results of these cuts are borne out, people's incomes will be up $32 billion, jobs will increase by 1.4 million and corporation profits will go up $2.4 billion. The Government is depending upon increased activity which it believes will follow the tax cuts to produce the necessary tax revenue, if deficits and inflationary increases in the Federal debt are to be avoided.

There may be a catch in this plan. For decades in schools, colleges, and public life, a great deal of assiduous effort has gone into convincing people that profits are neither necessary nor desirable. As inflationary pressures have built up, so have demands that cost increases be absorbed out of profits. For many years, corporate income, after taxes, has virtually stood still. Little wonder that there has been a slowing in growth and investment. The big question now is, will this pattern change? Will there be a recognition of the fact that profits are the foundation of employment, production, payrolls and tax revenue?

Garden Park Estates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, there has been a dramatic increase in homeownership in the United States. In large part, the reversal of the ratio of rental and homeownership from 80-percent rental as compared to 20-percent ownership that marked the pre-World War II era, and the present approximate 80-percent homeownership and 20-percent rental is due to the Federal programs of the Veterans' Administration home loans and the Federal Housing Administration home loans. The vigorous responses of the construction industry to the opportunities of these programs is worthy of comment.

Although there have been instances where the construction quality has been unsatisfactory and in a few isolated instances, morally shameful if not illegal, by and large to the credit of the construction industry, they have brought to the homeowners a high level of quality construction, liveable floor plans and home improvements that have contributed high efficiency to the housewives of America.

Since in this activity, as in most human events, the failures and disappointments are so often highlighted, it is a pleasure to bring to the attention of this House an awards luncheon held by the homeowners of the Garden Park Estates honoring the builder and developer, Mr. Nathan Shapell. The resident home buyers of the Shapell project presented the builder with a plaque lauding the S. & S. Construction Co., of which he is president, in these words, "For excellence in home construction, community development and customer service."

Garden Park Estates presently includes 1,900 completed homes and will be an integrated community of 3,000 homes when it is completed. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure to report favorably on the reaction of the consumer to one of the most important projects in which he invests. We feel sure that Mr. Shapell and his company would like to believe that the honor extended to them by their customers is an indication of the respect and acceptance of the products of most of the builders and developers in Orange County and in southern California.

Does the Administration Protect the Consumer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1963, I voted against H.R. 8864 which was designed to carry out the obligations of the United States under the coffee agreement. I recall that on page 4 of the report a letter from President Kennedy was included which stated in part:

> I want to assure you this administration intends to protect fully the interests of the American consumer.

Evidently the current administration does not hold these views as evidenced by rising coffee prices. On this point, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, appearing in the March 16, 1964 issue:

THE COFFEE CARTEL

Mrs. Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, told a House subcommittee the other day she is getting complaints about rising coffee prices from housewives throughout the country and expresses the opinion they may react by drinking less coffee or changing to substitute beverages. She conceded coffee prices are too high. Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Missouri Democrat, and chairman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, also expressed concern. She said that coffee which cost 65 cents a pound in supermarkets last summer now is in the 78- to 82-cent range.

The subcommittee also heard testimony along the line dispensed recently by the Brazilian Coffee Institute. John F. McKiernan, president of the National Coffee Association, said the fundamental reason for the price rise was severe weather damage to the Brazilian crop. Jerome Jacobson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said that although prices have gone up too rapidly and too high, the quota system under the International Coffee Agreement cannot be blamed because "quotas don't put coffee berries on the trees."

Quotas may not put berries on trees, but they certainly keep coffee from coming into this country from the huge surplus that exists in world supplies. The coffee surplus is so big, in fact, that it is sufficient for normal needs in all the consuming countries for 18 months. Yet, prices have been rising since the coffee agreement was drawn up more than a year ago.

That agreement, embracing 59 producing and consuming countries, is nothing more than an international price-fixing mechanism operating by means of an export quota to create artificial shortages. Chief beneficiaries are the Latin American coffee-producing countries, which won support for the scheme from our own State Department as another way of giving them foreign aid along with the Alliance for Progress.

Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Ohio Republican, tagged it properly when he told the House last November the scheme "puts the United States into a sort of cartel that will hold up the cost of coffee at the expense of the American housewife." Representative JOSEPH M. MCDADE, Republican, of Pennsylvania, has charged the agreement would cost Americans $350 million in higher prices.

The Senate Finance Committee, by a vote of 8 to 7, the other day, approved a bill to provide some enabling legislation in connection with the agreement. It is said that if Congress fails to enact this bill the coffee agreement might become inoperative or expire. This prospect certainly would not be viewed as a calamity by American housewives who have discovered what the agreement means to their food bills.

It is impossible to overlook the hypocrisy of an administration which has made a great show of "consumer protection" and is busy decrying coffee prices which have risen precisely because it signed the United States into a cartel to nick the American consumer.

Crested Butte, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, one of the projects of the U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce is a program to encourage added numbers of travelers from foreign countries to visit the United States. Among these promotions is one called "Ski Country, U.S.A.," a bid to have the thousands of European skiers to discover the beautiful and challenging ski trails from New England to California.

I am advised by friends that skiing has become one of our fastest growing sports, and that the demand for new areas has been growing just as fast. Since the end of World War II, the State of Colorado has been meeting the demand with a development of ski areas that can only be called exciting. Beginning with a solid nucleus of established ski areas, the boom began as the once famous mining town of Aspen began its meteoric rise as a culture and recreation area. Other mining towns and areas found the formula successful. With the richest mines long played out, and the demand for lower grade ores almost non-existent, many mining communities were virtual ghost towns. But the advent of a ski area transformed a number of them almost overnight. Aspen, of course, is internationally known, but names like Brecken-

ridge, Vail, and Crested Butte are becoming known to skiers everywhere.

Crested Butte is typical of the boom in Colorado ski areas. The old mining town has become a colorful mixture of turn-of-the-century architecture, old mining shacks, and modern A-frame chalets. The old ore bucket tramways are forgotten as the scene is now dominated by the ultramodern telecar gondolas that deposit their passengers at the top of their favorite runs. Dotting the valley below 12,175-foot Crested Butte Peak are luxury accommodations that were unknown, even in Crested Buttes mining heydays.

But these are manmade wonders, and one is never allowed to forget it as the magnificent, peaceful majesty of Colorado's mountain peaks dominate all about them, and remain the real attraction to man and his thoughts.

Why is a Brooklynite pitching for Colorado? Very simply, Mr. Speaker. Through the courtesy of the U.S. Government I was fortunate enough to be stationed at Camp Carson, Colo., as a member of the 104th Infantry Division. Once you have seen the beauty of this great mountain State it is hard to forget it.

Senator John Glenn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial on the candidacy of Col. John Glenn from the RFD News, Bellevue, Ohio, of March 9, 1964:

SENATOR JOHN GLENN?

We believe Astronaut John Glenn will easily win over his Democratic opponent, Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, in the primary and capture a U.S. senatorial seat when he runs against ROBERT TAFT, JR., in November.

Senator YOUNG, it appears to us, will lose the primary due to the unfortunate (to him) situation caused by the fact that John Glenn is an Ohioan and wishing to enter politics must of necessity run in his home State. If Glenn happened to be a native of Oklahoma or New Jersey or what have you, he still would have run this year. It is just happenstance that he's running against STEVE YOUNG.

Why is Glenn running in the first place? We refuse to believe the political gossip that he was talked into it by Bobby Kennedy or anyone else in Washington. He is seeking public office because he firmly believes politics will always be politics until more young men from all walks of life make the big leap into the battles of the ballot box.

Glenn will beat YOUNG in the primary because there are many Ohio Democrats who would like to reward Senator YOUNG with another term but believe that if the younger generation is going to take an active and nonpassive part in politics it must know that younger, qualified people can be nominated and elected.

Those who criticize Glenn for running seem to be in two categories * * * Republicans who want YOUNG to be the candidate because they feel BOB TAFT can easily beat YOUNG but not Glenn, and those who doubtless would be praising Glenn to the skies if he were running on their ticket.

As for the criticism that Glenn should have started several notches lower than the U.S. Senate, what about that great Republican general with absolutely no political experience who ran for the Presidency in 1952 and 1956, and won?

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Paul Martin, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Gannett News Service, recently wrote two special articles dealing with the question of poverty in America and the means to eliminate it. The first article discusses the data on which the administration's estimates of poverty are based. The second provides some additional information on the statistics on poverty in America.

Both articles are useful for putting the problem into better perspective and I include them in the RECORD under the unanimous consent of the House:

POVERTY

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—The administration campaign against poverty is based on income data obtained in a census survey of 25,000 households across the Nation.

The Census Bureau says there are 58 million households in America, including 47 million families and 11 million unrelated or single persons. A household is defined as a house, an apartment, or any dwelling unit.

The sample of 25,000 amounts to roughly 8 households for each of the 3,000-odd counties in the country. It means the census takers called at the door of 1 out of every 2,320 households.

The Bureau conducted its sample survey in March 1963, seeking information on personal income for the 1962 calendar year.

Occupants were asked to volunteer information about what they received from all sources, including wages and salaries, cash farm receipts, interest, dividends, rents, annuities, alimony, social security, veterans' compensation, unemployment benefits, public assistance, and any other income.

Census takers got an 86 percent response from the 25,000 households. Only 14 percent of the individuals questioned declined to reveal their personal income or gave inadequate information.

This survey is the basis for the startling allegation in the President's economic message of January 20 that 35 million Americans, or one-fifth of all families in the United States, are living in poverty today.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers adopted as an arbitrary definition of poverty "a family whose annual money income from all sources was $3,000 a year (before taxes). This is a weekly income of less than $60."

The Council said: "Measurement of poverty is not simple * * * by the poor we mean those who are not now maintaining a decent standard of living."

The President's economic advisers relied on a Social Security Administration study showing that in 1962 a low-cost family budget for a nonfarm family of four persons cost $3,955, and an economy-plan budget cost $3,165.

The Census Bureau claims that its 1963 income sample is backed up by the much broader 1960 decennial census when income data was obtained from 1 out of every 4 American households. The last census was based on 1959 earnings.

Since that time, the Commerce Department shows the gross national product has increased by $101 billion, personal income has gone up $79 billion, and per capita income has gained from $1,904 to $2,125 in 1963, or a gain of $221 per person since 1959.

The 1960 census obtained its income data in the same manner as the 1963 sample survey—by asking individuals to volunteer information about the extent and sources of their personal income.

These findings were cross-checked with other Government records, including Federal income tax returns of the Internal Revenue Service, and social security records on payroll withholding taxes for old-age insurance.

The Census Bureau says it got 95 percent verification of its voluntary income data in the 1960 census by matching with other Government records, and 87 comparability on the March 1963 sample.

However, Treasury and Justice Department officials have testified to Congress that:

As much as $20 billion a year of illegal income is obtained by the underworld from gambling, narcotics, and other illicit activities.

Up to $5 billion a year in dividends was not being reported for income tax purposes prior to recent changes in the revenue code.

Millions of dollars in cash payments go unreported and untaxed in the form of tips to waiters, bellhops, bartenders, etc.; fees to professional people, and cash receipts for farm products.

On the lower end of the income scale, a welfare investigation in the Nation's Capital 2 years ago disclosed that 66 percent of the cases checked on aid to dependent children rolls and 57 percent of general assistance cases were not eligible for relief.

Most of the ineligibilities were due to additional sources of income or family support which were not being reported to social workers who certified the cases for welfare payments.

Federal investigators have found there is a general disinclination on the part of many families to report the full extent and sources of their income to any Government agent when it might affect their eligibility for relief, unemployment, or social security benefits.

POVERTY

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—The campaign against poverty represents a Government effort to find new ways for lifting the level of low-income families in America.

It follows the old New Deal pattern of the 1930's. The President's Council of Economic Advisers said in their 1964 report:

"Social legislation of the New Deal * * * marked a turning point by recognizing a national interest in the economic well-being and security of individuals and families.

"The task for our generation is a comprehensive long-range attack on the poverty that remains. A new federally led effort is needed."

It is not primarily an unemployment problem, since a majority of the persons considered to be poor are not even in the labor market. They include old folks, children, and disabled persons.

The war on poverty, however, grew out of the general racial disturbance when the administration realized that a lot of people who are out of work and on relief are Negroes, Puerto Ricans, or Mexicans.

In years of ever-increasing prosperity, relief rolls have gone up 32 percent since 1955. Negroes and Puerto Ricans have crowded into big cities of the North in search of a better way of life. Many of them arrived without jobs, skills, or housing.

A White House official said offhand that "80 percent or more of the poor families in America are nonwhite."

The President's Economic Council contends that census figures show only 22 percent of poverty cases are "nonwhite," although "almost half of all nonwhite Americans are poor."

The economic report said racial discrimination reduces their employment opportunities, while deficiencies of education and health depress their earnings.

The Council adopted as an arbitrary definition of poverty any family whose money income from all sources before taxes is $3,000 a year or less.

Under this definition, the administration says 35 million persons,, or one-fifth of all American families, are living in poverty today in the wealthiest Nation in the world.

Based on census figures, the Council says the legion of the poor breaks down into these categories:

Thirty-four percent are over 65 years of age; 55 percent have no children uner 18.

One-third are children; 9 million under 12 years of age have mothers who work outside the home.

Forty-three percent of the total income of poor families comes from Government payments for welfare, unemployment, workmen's compensation, veterans benefits, and social security.

Fifty-four percent live in cities, 46 percent in rural areas. Forty percent of all poor families have some equity in a house.

On a geographical pattern, 47 percent live in the South, 25 percent in the north-central region, 17 percent in the East, 11 percent in the West.

By occupation, 74 percent of all domestic servants are considered to be poor, 56 percent of farm laborers, 45 percent of farm owners or operators, 23 percent of nonfarm laborers, and 22 percent of nondomestic service workers.

The statistics require some explanation. Government officials note these exceptions:

FARMERS

The Census Bureau says its figures deal only with cash income. Where farm families do not have to pay rent or buy food, their income is understated; many are living above the poverty level.

OLD FOLKS

The Council of Economic Advisers reports more than half of all persons over 65 have cash incomes above $3,000 a year. Other oldsters have adequate savings to support a decent standard of living. Many own homes.

YOUNG PEOPLE

In addition to minor children, low-income families include a lot of young people who are just getting started in life or a business career.

INFLATION

The Council says that in the general prosperity since 1947, poor families have declined from 32 to 20 percent of the total population.

At the same time, the Consumer Price Index has gone up 40 percent, while the value of the dollar has declined 17 cents, or 30 percent.

Inflation has been particularly injurious to older persons and others living on fixed incomes. It is a contrary influence to the Government campaign against poverty.

As wages and salaries have risen since the war, the Government has collected more taxes from higher incomes. The graduated income tax collects revenue on fixed dollar levels, without regard to diminishing value of what the dollar will buy.

SUBSIDIES

The Council said "poverty would be more prevalent and more serious" if many families were not already getting some kind of benefit payments from the Government.

Approximately 45 million Americans get benefits under four major Government programs costing $30 billion a year including:

Nineteen million persons collecting $16 billion a year from Federal old age, survivors, or disability insurance.

Four million, three hundred and sixty-four thousand veterans received pensions or compensation amounting to $3.8 billion in fiscal year 1963; total benefits for the veterans population of 22 million run around $7 billion.

Eight million persons on relief costing nearly $5 billion annually.

Six million and two hundred thousand who received approximately $3 billion in unemployment benefits during 1963.

The Federal-State unemployment insurance system covers 77 percent of all workers in paid employment today while 90 percent of all wage earners are under social security. Average benefits in 1963 amounted to $924 a year for a retired worker, or $1,565 a year for a retired couple.

RELIEF

Welfare rolls are the hard core of the poverty problem today. Persons on relief in the United States would fill a city the size of New York. They number three times the total population of the State of Connecticut.

The Economic Council said: "Escape from poverty is not easy for American children raised in families accustomed to living on relief. A recent study of aid to dependent children recipients found that more than 40 percent of the parents themselves were raised in homes where public assistance had been received."

More than 4 million persons receive aid to dependent children today, 2½ million are on old-age assistance, 775,000 get general assistance. The average payment per family on ADC is $129-a-month, with some States ranging up to $197 monthly. The national average for aid to the aged is $62 a month. It runs up to $95 in some States.

I Should Put My Wife on the Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take great pleasure in including an article by Herb Pike in the Successful Farming magazine of recent date, entitled "I Should Put My Wife on the Payroll."

Having known Herb and his good wife for many years, and having spoken at a coffee in my honor at the Pike farm home where neighbors gathered to meet me, and after hearing Herb sing his wife's praises, I agree completely with him that he should put his wife on the payroll, and I am sure every reader of this article will agree. So Herb, now you are stuck with your own proposition.

The article follows:

I SHOULD PUT MY WIFE ON THE PAYROLL

(By Herbert Pike, Iowa farmer)

I married an executive. She had done time as an English teacher, then worked on a city newspaper. If I don't put her on the farm payroll, she might start looking for an outside job to absorb her talent and energy.

If ever there's a natural man-wife partnership it is in farming. And lucky is the farmer who picks a good partner. My wife sometimes asks, "How did you know, when you took me away from my city job, that I'd make such a good workhorse?"

Every man expects his wife to be housekeeper, interior decorator, official hostess, social secretary, diplomat, foreman of the junior crew, taxi driver, tutor, and nursemaid.

But a farmer expects and usually gets much more. His wife must also be receptionist, "directionist," stenographer, bookkeeper, market reporter, weather forecaster, researcher, extra man, home cannery manager, locker plant chief, poultry expert, and mobile lunch canteen operator.

Mind power is fast replacing muscle power in farming. Time was when a poor manager was able to compensate for this weakness by hard work, by putting in longer hours. Now, machines have replaced so much manpower that management of capital is more important than hard, physical work.

Credit, too, is extended on the basis of the farmer's managerial ability, as well as his collateral. Agricultural prophets see no reversal in the direction farm units are taking toward greater size and complexity. It's the intangibles of farming which will separate the men from the boys in operating the farms of the future.

Taxwise, creditwise, and efficiencywise, the modern farmer is going to have to keep better records and be more businesslike in his methods. This is a real opportunity for division of labor between man and wife. Farmers need help with record keeping, analysis of their business, and someone to pre-read reams of agricultural information and sift it down to their own needs.

Who is better qualified to fill this important staff position than the farmer's wife? Most women are better fitted for office work than men—they are neater and have more patience. A good many farm women have had commercial training and business experience. Many have had more education than their husbands. Managing the farm office combines with household tasks and care of children much better than an off-farm job or outside farm chores, such as raising chickens. A wife who has real responsibilities in the farm business can go ahead on her own, instead of just being on call.

A knowledgeable wife is valuable as a consultant, a sounding board; someone with whom to talk things out and brainstorm new ideas. She ceases to be a competitor in spending limited resources for unnecessary consumer items. This is a problem with many young couples who are trying to accumulate initial capital so necessary in farming today.

Middle age and the orbituary notices of some of my contemporaries make us realize that my wife may be a widow some day and need to know more about running a farm. It is a fact that women may be expected to outlive their husbands from 4 to 8 years. Why? Because women not only have a longer life expectancy but are usually younger than their husbands.

Too, there are several legal advantages in having the wife a full-fledged operating partner in the farm business.

If the farm were incorporated, both husband and wife could be put on the payroll, build up pension rights, and be entitled to sickness and accident benefits the same as any other employee of the business. Partnership insurance could be carried on the key members of the firm. These costs are deductible by the corporation, yet the benefits are not taxable to the employee. Profits can be dispersed as salary bonuses or left in the firm.

Today's farm office assistant needs a place to work and something to work with. A separate room for an office is ideal. But at least she needs a desk where she can work without interruptions. She needs a place to store records and reference material. This can vary in splendor from an orange crate to a fireproof file.

Your chief of staff, like today's tractor operator, is entitled to some mechanical aids—an adding machine and possibly a typewriter. There are good used ones available for a small outlay of cash. You can justify a $30 investment in labor-saving equipment, the experts say, for each minute saved per day. If you can bypass the drudgery of adding long columns of figures by hand, you can spend your time where it counts the most—on record analysis and planning.

How does one keep tab on subject material? We have alphabetically arranged file folders for each subject: Building, cattle, concrete, corn, etc. For a numerical code refer to the article; "A Top-Notch Filing System," page 32, Successful Farming, December 1963.

Farm magazines, best source of current information, are stacked on shelves until the end of the year; then articles of value are filed in the subject file.

Clipboards headed crops, livestock, farm policy, etc., are good for holding current information until it can be read. Spring clips with magnetic bases are handy for holding memos in the car, in the shop, or near the telephone.

We try to keep original records as close to the source of information as possible. Crop weights are recorded by fields in a book in the scale house. Farrowing records originate on a tag over each pen, are transferred into a permanent book later. Farm gasoline to be used for highway travel is recorded in a notebook on the visor of truck or automobile. I also carry a diary in my shirt pocket for meter readings, livestock counts, planting dates, harvest dates, and oral agreements. Machinery manuals are kept where most often needed—in the farm shop, in a covered file box.

It is encouraging to see that an increasing number of farm couples are securing capital, organizing efficiently, and employing both men and machines to advantage. They have the ability and the time to pursue the intangibles in farming, to keep adequate records, and to make sound decisions.

Debauchery of the Legislative Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Rules Committee has an inescapable duty to investigate whether two of its employees, one of whom had occupied the highest staff position in the Senate, were faithful to their trust. President Johnson is deeply involved in this inquiry as Baker was his chief assistant. However, it did not seem to matter to the majority that Sherman Adams was President Eisenhower's assistant.

There is a serious possibility that this investigation may come to an innocuous end or it will be sidetracked. However, vigorous insistence by the public and an active press will keep the investigation open. I was pleased to see in the March 12, 1964, issue of the Washington Star an editorial exposing the attempts of the committee chairman to sweep the matter under the rug.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker, because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Lyndon B. Johnson?

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don R. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored—at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought $1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a $100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had any knowledge of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employee at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody made the arrangements. Why is the committee so afraid to explore the matter?

Whitewash is a useful commodity for sprucing up fences and outbuildings. But it serves only one purpose in this instance—to leave in the public mind a deep and fully justified suspicion that the Senate Rules Committee is trying to cover up a major scandal with far-reaching ramifications.

Soviets Shut Down Bakery for Matzoth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago the Soviet authorities announced that they would permit the opening of a matzoth bakery in Moscow to serve the Jewish community.

Now we learn that this small service has been discontinued. Only 2 days following its opening, the bakery was closed last Friday for alleged "sanitary reasons." The fire department ordered the establishment closed for business after the bakery had produced not nearly enough of the matzoth to meet the needs of devout Jews during Passover.

This incident is yet one more indication of the regime's continuing discrimination against the Jewish cultural and religious traditions.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert Mr. Henry Tanner's account, appearing this morning in the New York Times, at this point in the RECORD. The article follows herewith:

SOVIETS SHUT DOWN BAKERY FOR MATZOTH

(By Henry Tanner)

Moscow, March 15.—Moscow's only matzoth bakery has been closed by the Soviet authorities after only 2 days of operation.

Chief Rabbi Yehuda Lev Levin, said today that the bakery, which had been set up in a rented dwelling, had been closed temporarily and for sanitary reasons. He appeared to hope that he might get permission to reopen it later this week.

The bakery was opened last Wednesday to produce the unleavened bread for Passover, which begins March 28. According to unofficial Jewish sources, it produced only 220 pounds of matzoth on the first day and a similar amount on Thursday.

Members of the Jewish congregation said the closing on Friday was at the request of the fire department. The action came at a time when it had become clear that there would not be nearly enough matzoh to satisfy the need of devout Jews during Passover.

There were angry scenes at the Central Synagogue this morning as elderly Jewish men and women, who had come to collect their share of matzoth, had to be turned away emptyhanded.

Many of these persons said they had turned in the flour for their matzoh at the synagogue and had been promised an equivalent amount of unleavened bread.

Now they have neither flour nor matzoh, they said. Flour is fairly difficult to get in Moscow these days and buyers often have to queue for limited quantities.

Matzoth supplies are also reported to be insufficient in Leningrad and Kiev, two other Soviet cities with large Jewish populations. In Leningrad the Central Synagogue has not been able to make matzoth even though it has its own baking facilities, according to unofficial reports.

Georgia is the only part of the country where matzoh has been baked in approximately sufficient quantities in past weeks, private reports said.

The Central Synagogue in Mocow was permitted to improvise a bakery to alleviate the plight of devout Jews since state-run bakeries were ordered to stop baking matzoth 2 years ago.

There has been no ban on the baking of matzoth by individual families. If a person bakes more than is required for his own needs and sells the surplus, however, he is breaking Soviet laws against private commerce.

Last year three persons were given jail sentences for the illegal sale of matzoh.

SUPPLIES FROM ABROAD

Earlier this month Georgi Lieb, president of the congregation of Moscow's second synagogue, said he expected shipments of matzoth from abroad to alleviate the shortage.

He said that about 10,000 pounds of matzoth would be sent from Denmark by Dr. Isaac Levin of New York, president of the American section of Agudus Israel, and that 1,500 pounds would be sent by Britain's chief

rabbi, Dr. Israel Brodie. There are also reports of offers from Belgium and Israel.

The Soviet authorities are reported to be allowing private shipments from abroad.

"The Challenge of Citizenship"—A Speech by Daniel J. Lutenegger, of Burlington, Iowa, the Winning Contestant From Iowa in the Annual "Voice of Democracy" Contest Conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the winner from Iowa in the VFW's "Voice of Democracy" contest this year is Daniel J. Lutenegger, 2019 Sunnyside Avenue, Burlington, Iowa. His speech, "The Challenge of Citizenship," reminds all of us how the "little things" which many people tend to take for granted or ignore altogether, are the very essence of greatness out of which this country has developed and grown strong.

His speech is an admonition to heed the little things and to make the most of them. I take pleasure in calling this speech to the attention of my colleagues. His remarks follow:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Dan Lutenegger)

Little things. Thousands of little things have made America and the entire world what they are today. Through the years it has been the average person strengthened by an inner fortitude and determination, who has laid the foundation for events which have shaped the world. Take, for example, the scared little boy, who stuck his finger in a dike in Holland and saved his town from being flooded; the scientist, who dropped an apple and discovered the laws of gravity; the little man who flew a kite and stated the fundamental elements of electricity. Such actions are like puny, shriveled seeds which grow and mature until finally they result in something worthwhile. See what these small beginnings have brought us—light bulbs, modern appliances, space travel, anl so on.

Likewise, it is these little things that form the challenge of citizenship. Too often when we think of the good citizen, we think of a man like John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who seemed to give everything, even his life, for his country. Indeed, the history books are full of men such as this. They died at Bunker Hill, at Bull Run, at Gettysburg. They died in the Pacific, on the shores of Iwo Jima, in the skies over Korea. Heroes like these, whose names will live forever, produced our image of the good citizen. But in our dreams we forget that it is the ordinary citizens, playing ordinary, everyday roles that make America strong. To remember this in my everyday life, wherever I might be, whatever I might be doing, is my challenge and the challenge of every American citizen.

But how about today? First of all, the most important factor is an interest in the well-being of our Nation, a sense of responsibility that has grown and thrived throughout our lives.

Responsibility is essentially an awareness of little things and herein lies the challenge of citizenship. Do we obey traffic signals? Do we do our share of work at home? Do we do our best in school? Do we play a team game? Do we volunteer to do a job that needs doing? These are what good citizens do. Everytime a citizen does these little things and many other like them, he is helping to make our country stronger. Remember, a nation is no stronger than its weakest citizen. Our history proves this. It reflects what we have done as a team, as a group, not as individuals.

Likewise, I personally am merely a small cog in the wheel, but I help it to run efficiently and if I would break, the whole wheel would be weakened. As a member of a new generation, I am the lifeblood of this Nation, but if I would be poisoned or infected, the entire Nation would be poisoned. Democracy is no longer a cause in America that must be won with guns and heroes; it is an example that must be lived by every hard working and responsible citizen.

Furthermore, on the more positive side, suppose each of us spent a little more time every day in reading the news and keeping abreast of current events. The result would be a new America, vigilant and strong, but ever humble. This is still another way of how I personally can be a working member of our Republic. Instead of just trying to "stay afloat" I can strive for goals that are better, higher, and more noble, trying to improve self, community, and nation. Only through such efforts and accepting the challenge of citizenship can the American of today meet the impact of world challenge.

Thus, the challenge of citizenship is putting myself out just a little bit at home, at school, or on the job. It means doing everything well and not being influenced by the crowd. In this little way, like the boy who stuck his finger in the dike, I personally can help to break the bonds of prejudice, apathy, and suffering which constrict America through their evil influences. After all the soul of America, founded on order, courage, justice, and tolerance, is composed of little men with little ideas, but men who have the great fortitude and unique generosity to carry out those little ideas in their everyday lives. This is the American challenge. This is the challenge of citizenship.

Wheat Sales to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many of us have pointed to the dangers of U.S. wheat sales to the Soviet Union, even while our Government has protested Allied trade with the Communist bloc.

But what would happen if the shoe was on the other foot? Ray Henle, editor in chief of Three Star Extra, carried nightly over NBC Radio Network, raised that provocative question on his broadcast of March 6, 1964.

What if the United States wanted wheat and sent out feelers to the Soviets in hopes of making purchases? Could we expect the same treatment we are now giving the Soviets?

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to Mr. Henle's broadcast by inserting it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THREE-STAR EXTRA BROADCAST: MARCH 6, 1964

(By Ray Henle)

Can you imagine what the situation would be, with respect to trade with the Soviets, if the tables were turned? Rather easy to figure it out, isn't it? If the United States and the American people were short of wheat, short of machinery, short of practically everything that meant better living for us * * * and the Soviet Union and the Russian people had an abundance of wheat and machinery and the rest of worldly goods * * * and the American people and the U.S. Government put out feelers that they would like to buy wheat and machinery and the other things, what would the Soviet Government do? Run over itself to offer us wheat and other things? With credit terms and shipping in any old kind of bottom just to get it to us in a hurry? Open the floodgates of trade without any price attached thereto?

Well, hardly. More likely we would be presented with a set of counterdemands. Get out of Berlin, get your troops home from Europe, button up your bases, withdraw from Vietnam, come to terms on disarmament. Those likely would be a few. The Soviets would use their advantage to further advance their world aims and their foreign policies. Can anyone doubt that?

Merely to state the likelihood gives a picture of how little we in this country tie our God-given advantages to a program of wringing from our opponents concessions which would advance our lofty world aims of freedom. Instead we rush with open hand—our chamber of commerce plans to come out for even more liberal trade policies—our Government just can't do enough to show our opponents how really nice we are—wanting nothing in return. Not even a better chance for our lofty principles to succeed. It's a funny world.

H.R. 10412

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will be interested in the bill (H.R. 10412) I introduced to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deduction for rent, taxes, or interest incurred for the use or occupancy of an industrial plant financed by tax-exempt obligations.

The objective of my bill is to put a stop to a very clear case of abuse in using tax-exempt industrial development revenue bonds for financing industrial plants and facilities for lease to private persons. I refer to the arrangements between a corporation and a municipality under which the corporation which leases the facility from the municipality itself buys the tax-exempt bonds issued in the name of the municipality to finance the acquisition of the industrial plant. Such a corporation is obviously able to do its own financing without governmental aid. It uses the municipality as a go-between to gain access to tax-exempt financing. This devious route enables it to enjoy both a rental reduction reflecting the interest savings derived from the tax exemption of the bonds and tax-exempt interest income, despite the fact that its investment in the bonds is subject only to the risk inherent in its own business.

My bill embodies the recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, created by the Congress in 1959, on which the gentle-

man from North Carolina, Congressman FOUNTAIN, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Congresswoman DWYER, and I have the honor to represent this House. The Advisory Commission is composed of members actively representing both executive and legislative branches of all levels of Government in our Federal system which gives its recommendations a balanced quality.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its report on Industrial Development Bond Financing, has identified a variety of abuses which require urgent attention and has outlined for the States some guidelines for keeping industrial development bond financing within tolerable limits. Hopefully the States will act promptly. I know that the financial officials of a number of States are actively at work on this problem under the able leadership of the comptroller of the State of New York, Arthur Levitt. However, when the leasing corporation itself buys the tax-exempt bonds, the misuse of the municipal tax exemption privilege is so brazen, that the remedy cannot wait for action by numerous State legislatures. It is for this reason that the Advisory Commission urged the Congress to act at once in this limited area. This explicitly is the purpose of my bill.

The abuse of the tax exemption privilege of municipal bonds has concerned many Members of this House for several years, and increasingly so. The financing technique, invented just a quarter century ago by a Southern State for the purpose of attracting industry, has now spread to nearly half of the States and is under consideration in several others. If competition for industry subsidized by the Federal income tax exemption is allowed to spread unrestrained, State and local governments will neutralize one another's efforts and the public investment, including the substantial loss of Federal income tax revenue, will have been largely wasted. In short, the entire development is potentially self-defeating.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing radically new or revolutionary in a community's efforts to attract business and industry within its borders to provide employment and help to support local government. When, however, it seeks to achieve these ends at the expense of other communities, and the U.S. Treasury, to the detriment of its own fiscal stability, the practice cannot be allowed to continue unregulated. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that despite our crowded calendar my bill will receive early attention.

Competition in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the March 6, 1964, edition of the Titusville Herald, Titusville, Pa., points out the seriousness of the problem of "dumping" and the need for remedial action.

The editorial is as follows:

COMPETITION IN STEEL

Competition from overseas continues to plague the U.S. steel producer. Imports of certain kinds of steels have increased in recent years to the point where some domestic fabrications have been completely excluded, according to steel men, from their own local markets.

Mills here have tried to counter this influx in appeals to the U.S. Tariff Commission. Under the law the Commission can raise duties if the offended industry can prove "dumping." This term is applied to any foreign producer who sells to U.S. customers at lower prices than he charges at home.

Now a new urgency has arisen. The Common Market has raised its duties on imported steels by 50 percent. The nutcracker is in operation at both ends. It will become harder to export into Europe, while mills there go on beating competition in this country by dumping low-cost steels.

Something, obviously, will have to give. U.S. steel producers carry an enormously heavy wage cost load. The industry can do so only if its products are marketed in crisp fashion. Any serious slowdown could force retrenchment.

Though raising tariff barriers has been the traditional response to conditions like these, mankind has come to recognize this as the lamest response. Possibly the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations will help solve the dilemma.

Eat "Top-of-Iowa" Beefsteak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the old axiom "It Pays To Advertise."

Even the "better mousetrap" theory of the beaten path would not work unless somebody tells the prospective consumer.

Thus, I am delighted to reveal today through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the action of the Iowa Senate last week in passing a bipartisan concurrent resolution dealing with one of Iowa's greatest products, sirloin steak.

At one time or another each of you have eaten delicious tender Iowa beefsteak, whether or not you realized it at the time. Now, Iowa beef producers will alert you to your opportunity to do so with knowledge.

Iowa corn contains the richest nutrients, and when it is fed to cattle, the meat produced therefrom is the most tender, the most succulent, you can hope to find in any market or restaurant on earth.

So, treat yourselves, ladies and gentlemen. Insist on "top-of-Iowa" sirloin next time you desire a tasty steak. If your store or restaurant does not have it by that designation yet, you may still be buying Iowa-fed meat, only tell your supplier you would like to have the certified article next time around.

The text of the Iowa Senate concurrent resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

(By Hansen, Elijah, Lucken, and Griffin)

Whereas the price of beef is of concern both nationally and locally in the United States; and

Whereas one of the goals of lawmakers, economists, and beef producers is to locate new markets for the sale of beef; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin has promoted the sale of Wisconsin cheese and the State of Idaho has promoted the sale of Idaho potatoes; and

Whereas, such cuts of meat as New York cut, New York strip, and Kansas City steaks are known throughout the United States; and

Whereas the Iowa Beef Producers' Association originated the idea of naming a new steak to promote Iowa, its great beef industry, and the sale of beef; and

Whereas a Des Moines restaurant oeprator, Lyle McNabb, originated the idea for a steak cut from the top of the sirloin; and

Whereas the Iowa Beef Producers' Association conducted a contest in 1962 to name and promote the sale of the sirloin cut; and

Whereas Iowa's newly designed steak was presented to the public at the annual meeting of the Iowa Beef Producers' Association on April 18, 1962; and

Whereas Mrs. Richard Bogner, Fairfield, Iowa, was awarded the prize for naming the steak "Top of Iowa" and received 50 pounds of "Top of Iowa" steak for submitting the name; and

Whereas Iowa has been slow in comparison to other States in promoting products for which the State is known throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa recognize the Iowa Beef Producers' Association for its effort in promoting the "Top of Iowa" sirloin and that each member of the general assembly encourage and give unlimited support to all efforts promoting the sale of the "Top of Iowa" sirloin so that "Top of Iowa" will become known throughout the world as one of the choice prime beef cuts and the State of Iowa will be known as the producer of "Top of Iowa."

Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., in their edition of March 12, 1964:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay

McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, long-time aid to Lyndon B. Johnson?

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don R. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored—at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought $1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a $100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had "any knowledge" of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employee at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody made the arrangements. Why is the committee so afraid to explore the matter?

Whitewash is a useful commodity for sprucing up fences and outbuildings. But it serves only one purpose in this instance—to leave in the public mind a deep and fully justified suspicion that the Senate Rules Committee is trying to cover up a major scandal with far-reaching ramifications.

DeMolay Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, since the Order of DeMolay was founded on March 18, 1919, more than 2,400 active chapters serving nearly 3 million young boys have been established throughout the world dedicated to the principles of building better citizens of teenage youth.

The organization, named in honor of Jacques DeMolay, the last grand master of the Knights Templers, who was burned at the stake in 1314 as a martyr to loyalty and tolerance, is a nonprofit corporation governed by an international supreme council composed of over 200 outstanding Masons located around the world. DeMolay membership is open to any boy of good character, who is between the ages of 14 and 21. Although DeMolay chapters are sponsored only by Masonic bodies or individual Masons, it it not necessary that a boy be a son or a relative of a Mason to belong to DeMolay.

Programs under the general DeMolay slogan of "Building Better Citizens" include career guidance, community project cooperation, safe-driving campaigns, charitable fund drives, blood donations, civil defense projects, and work in the chapters to emphasize the virtues of filial love, reverence, courtesy, comradeship, fidelity, cleanliness, and patriotism.

International DeMolay Week in Arkansas is being celebrated from March 15 through March 22, and in honor of the DeMolays of Arkansas, Gov. Orval E. Faubus is issuing a proclamation that I include with these brief remarks on the occasion of this DeMolay observance:

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greetings:

Whereas the Arkansas State Council, Order of DeMolay, is observing the 45th anniversary of the international youth movement, the Order of DeMolay, on March 18, 1964; and

Whereas DeMolay is a character-building organization dedicated to the purposes of helping young men 14 to 21 years of age to become better sons, better citizens, and better leaders; and

Whereas the youth group is well known for its charitable projects, community services, and healthy social activities; and for providing our young men with the desire for realizing greater goals and achievements; and

Whereas recognition should be given to the many contributions made by DeMolay toward this guiding influence in the molding of today's young men for a better world of peace and brotherhood tomorrow:

Now, therefore, I, Orval E. Faubus, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim the week of March 15–22, 1964, as "DeMolay Week" in Arkansas in honor of DeMolay's meritorious service toward the communities, State, and Nation; and by the authority invested with me do urge all citizens of Arkansas to pay suitable tribute.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Arkansas to be affixed. Done in office in Little Rock, Ark., this 17th day of March 1964.

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.
KELLY BRYANT,
Secretary of State.

Choosing a Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Charles Bartlett in his column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, March 10, 1964, made some rather startling statements regarding the selection of the Vice President at the 1960 Democratic convention in Los Angeles. His article on choosing the Vice President follows.

In the same vein, Doris Fleeson, in her article in the Evening Star on March 10, also covers the question of selection of the Vice President on the Democratic ticket for 1964. Her column follows:

ON CHOOSING A VICE PRESIDENT: JOHN F. KENNEDY DIDN'T EXPECT JOHNSON TO ACCEPT SECOND PLACE

(By Charles Bartlett)

The Democratic write-in votes for Robert F. Kennedy in New Hampshire will not diminish the prospect that President Johnson will be less crowded in the choice of his running mate next August than John F. Kennedy was when he picked Mr. Johnson in 1960.

Robert Kennedy was prepared for over 3 weeks to respond to the White House's instructions regarding the write-in campaign in New Hampshire. He sent word to the President twice through Kenneth O'Donnell that he would repudiate the movement if Mr. Johnson wished. The reply came back on both occasions that he should do nothing. His effort to discourage the movement was finally made on his own initiative.

The meaning of this deference to the White House was that the Attorney General has rejected any strategy of endeavoring to stimulate demonstrations of sympathy to pressure Mr. Johnson to take him on the ticket. He is not, as some have reported, plotting any conspiracy to win the second spot.

The initiative in the New Hampshire write-ins was taken by a Manchester specialist in political public relations, Robert Shayne, who is perhaps closer to the Johnson camp than he is to the Kennedys. Shayne did it because he sensed that the popular mood was already there and because he felt that Mr. Johnson, for his own success in the November elections, should be induced to consider Robert Kennedy as a running-mate.

Shayne was actually obliged to buck some of the State's leading Kennedy Democrats in order to start this campaign. The party faction headed by Bernard Boutin, a key figure in the Kennedy race of 1960 who now commands the General Services Administration, was already involved with the vice-presidential candidacy of Maine's Senator EDMUND MUSKIE.

This was one evidence that the team of the late President did not turn with monolithic vehemence to advance the career of his younger brother. As the calendar moves away from the tragedy of last November, the element of sympathy in the political support for Robert Kennedy will yield increasingly, as it should, to unemotional appraisals of his merits.

The Kennedy vote in New Hampshire, and other manifestations that may emerge from other primaries, will be as incapable of tying the hands of the Democratic conventions as Senator Estes Kefauver's sweep of the primaries in 1952. The incontrovertible power of selection resides with the President, who will have generous latitude and time to make his choice.

Fears that Mr. Johnson may be crowded in this process gain irony from the circumstances through which he himself attained the vice presidential nomination. John Kennedy had decided several days before his own nomination that his running-mate would be Senator STUART SYMINGTON, whose exertions toward the presidential nomination had been completely free of the vitriol which marked the Johnson effort.

Arrangements for this ticket had been set through intermediaries but Mr. Kennedy was impressed by counsel that he should try to soften Mr. Johnson's bitterness with the gesture of offering him the second spot. All who advanced this advice agreed that the Texan would never accept the second place, but they argued that the offer would solace his pride and render him more conciliatory in subsequent dealings.

In this spirit Mr. Kennedy made the offer to Mr. Johnson on the morning of July 15, 1960. In a response that belongs in history with William Seward's surprise acceptance of Abraham Lincoln's invitation to be Secretary of State, the Texan seized the offer and held fast to it through uncertain hours of shocked reaction within the Kennedy camp.

Past paths of the vice-presidency are so varied as to suggest that the honor lies

beyond the reach of calculated cunnnig. There is no clearcut method of awarding the nomination, running of it, or avoiding the charges of maneuvering toward it.

Mr. Johnson seems likely to enjoy a relatively free choice that will rest until August among the Democrats like a gleaming apple of discord.

DEMOCRATIC POWER STRUGGLE: NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY WRITE-IN SEEN PREMATURELY REVEALING STRIFE

(By Doris Fleeson)

Democrats are coming out of the New Hampshire primary with egg on their faces.

This is apparent even before the returns are counted in the write-in campaign for Robert Kennedy for Vice President. When that campaign was belatedly enlarged to include an indorsement of President Johnson for President, if only made matters worse.

The national party has been forced into a premature acknowledgment that it has a power struggle on its hands which could threaten its success in November. It will read more about it now and very probably will like it less.

It is not a struggle between good guys and bad guys or hard noses and soft noses. It is simply a very human development inherent in the situation since November 22, last, when the Kennedys were untimely ripped from the high places they had achieved with such effort and expected to enjoy for a long time.

At the time it was quietly reported that the successor President and John F. Kennedy's brother, the Attorney General, did not like one another and would have a hard time adjusting to the changed situation. It was assumed then, as now, that Johnson would take command strongly and be renominated without question.

The monkey, said the politicians, then, is on Robert Kennedy's back and what will he do about it. What has happened in New Hampshire is an attempt to shift that monkey to Johnson's back by forcing him to accept Robert Kennedy on his ticket.

Whether or not it was done in all innocence of the President's views is moot. Already incidents and accounts supporting both sides are available. Possibly the write-in was conceived merely as another wreath on President Kennedy's grave.

But the timing is right. The memorial mood of the Capital and presumably of the country has not passed but is subject of course to the erosion of time. Mood is important in the intensely human trade of politics.

Groaned one Democratic Senator of long experience: "If I didn't positively know that Styles Bridges was no longer with us, I'd be sure he arranged that write-in business." The late Senator Bridges managed New Hampshire politics for years with lethal effect on the Democratic opposition in the State.

President Johnson and the Attorney General have behaved with dignity and circumspection in a situation both understood. The President quickly sent the Attorney General on a diplomatic mission of the type Robert Kennedy had many times made for his brother. Similar marks of confidence were showered on Sargent Shriver, a Kennedy brother-in-law. An inevitable result was discussion that Johnson would take Shriver for Vice President to avoid having to take Robert Kennedy. Few insiders really thought, however, that Shriver would seek first place at Robert's expense.

President Kennedy did not carry New Hampshire in 1960. But with the death of Senator Bridges, Republicans there split into warring factions and Democrats in 1962 elected a Governor and Senator. They have been confident of carrying the State this fall.

Atomic Reactor in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the following article is an account of Alaska's only nuclear power generating plant, which is at Fort Greely, in the interior of Alaska, and is a testimonial of achievement by the Corps of Army Engineers. I find that it is also a stimulant to the imagination as respects the potential for the use of nuclear energy as a source of fuel and power for the future in remote arctic and subarctic areas.

The article to which I refer, and which I commend to the attention of my colleagues, appeared in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on March 10, 1964.

FRIDAY MARKS NUCLEAR POWER'S SECOND YEAR IN ALASKA AT FORT GREELY GENERATOR

Friday will mark nuclear power's second year in Alaska.

On that date in 1962, "criticality" was attained for the first time at Fort Greely, the site of Alaska's only nuclear power generating plant. It was a cold day at 38 minutes past midnight for a force that lights the sun to be born on Alaskan tundra. Thermometers outside registered 40 below. The wind that had piled up the big snowdrifts had calmed a lot.

By going critical, the Fort Greely plant gained status among the elite pioneer plants, products of an infant science that has dominated the times since Hiroshima. The plant was among the first reactors to go critical and first 50 to go critical to produce electricity.

Army Engineers had several reasons for choosing Fort Greely as the site for the pioneer development. It it located on the far end of a long fuel supply line. In the 20-year operational life of a steam plant, the savings in fuel shipping costs will be about $7 million, an amount exceeding the cost of construction by $200,000.

The second reason for choosing the site at Greely related to its Arctic-like cold weather. Army Engineers believe that nuclear power holds significant promise for civilian and military development of Arctic regions.

The third reason is related to the needs of Fort Greely for electricity and heat. The product of the plant was needed.

FUEL MAKES DIFFERENCE

The important difference between a nuclear power generating plant and other kinds of steam plants lies in its bulk size of fuel. Fifty pounds of U-35—enriched uranium—is enough fuel for more than 12 months continuous operation. The half hundredweight has the energy equivalent of a tanker full of 60,000 barrels of fuel oil, or the equivalent of a billion, 400 million pounds of coal.

The plant was years in its planning stages. The decision to build a stationary medium size plant in the field was made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1954. In 1955, the Alaska district engineer was instructed to choose a site for the plant in his district. Fort Greely was proposed and accepted as the site in 1955. In July, 1956, the corps contracted with Alco Products Co., Schenectady, N.Y., to fabricate the innards of nuclear section of the plant. The design provides for component parts within the size limits for air cargo, for ease of delivery to the more incessible sites. The entire nuclear heart of the Greely plant weighs 250 tons. Some components weigh less than a pound and some weigh more than a ton. Weighing in at 1 pound each are the fuel components—the logs for that fireplace. The uranium is spread like peanut butter between two sheets of stainless steel. The element is one to be treated with marked respect.

Consruction of the Greely plant started in in the spring of 1958, 4 years after planning for it had begun. The main construction contract was held by Peter Kiewit Sons' Co., Omaha, Neb., while subcontracts were held by Grasle Co., Fairbanks, and Rainier Co., Seattle, Wash.

VAPOR CONTAINER

One of the important construction features of the plant was the item called a vapor container, a structure 80 feet high and 35 feet in diameter housing the reactor and associated equipment in a cocoon of steel, water, and concrete. It is designed to keep radioactive vapors from escaping under all conditions whatsoever. The concrete barriers are 5 feet thick and they are supplemented by steel and water. Water provides effective shielding and its costs are low. The reason for this muscular cocoon is a fuel of the kind to be treated with marked respect.

The precautions prescribed by the Corps and built-in the plant were more than ordinary safety standards would require. They were added however, because the force that lights the sun is not yet to well known down here.

The reactor at Greeley incorporates a pressurized water system to harness the heat of nuclear fission. The water circulates around the reactor at 1,200 pounds pressure per square inch, a factor raising the boiling point of water and making it easier to control. The pressurized water runs through a secondary water circulating system heat exchanger, turning the latter water into steam to be run through a turbine to generate electricity—2,000 kilowatts and to add the equivalent of 2,000 kilowatts in British thermal units to the post's heating system.

The night the plant went critical for the first time, there was an air of suppressed excitement among the men there who had contributed to that payoff. Carl Eielertson was the Alaska district's resident engineer who supervised the construction. The post commanding officer was there and many contractor personnel. Major Richard Harris, was in charge of the men loading the reactor. He explained to those who didn't know what would happen when controlled fissioning began.

"There is nothing to hear or see," he said. "When this thing clicks," he said pointing to an instrument, "you will know we have a critical reaction."

The clicking started at 12:38 a.m., on March 13, 1962.

Panama Crisis: High Panama Officials Prevented National Guard From Preserving Public Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 months have passed since the January

9–11, 1964, Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone. The bloody violence of those outbreaks of lawlessness and disorder, though not well publicized in the mass media of the United States, are well known on the isthmus and are documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In a statement to the House in the RECORD of January 31, 1964, under the title of "Panamanian Outbreak, January 9, 1964: What Really Happened," I quoted a reliable summary of facts. Though what happened is now a matter of history, its consequences are still felt, and will continue to be felt for a long time. It is clear that the Government of Panama as now constituted was unable or unwilling to control Red-directed mobs attacking the canal enterprise and U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone. In this connection, it should be recalled that Deputy Thelma King, Red member of the Panama National Assembly, at the start of the recent outbreak, urged Panamanian mobs to violence and called upon the members of the National Guard to join the mobs in attacking the Canal Zone.

Among the most outrageous aspects of the January disorders was the failure of Panamanian authorities to use that country's National Guard to maintain public order and their reckless charges of aggression and crimes against humanity against U.S. forces that defended the lives of our citizens in the Canal Zone and prevented injury to the canal itself. The Panamanian charges resulted in an inquiry on the scene by an International Jurist Commission of Geneva, Switzerland, which was summoned by the Panama Bar Association. The hearings for this inquiry, which was conducted on the isthmus, will, in due course, be the subject of a report by the International Bar Association.

In the hearings before these inquiring jurists, it was established that Eloy Benedetti, counsel of the Panamanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, told the Commission that orders to the Panamanian National Guard prevented it from acting to quell mob violence because of the farfetched plea of the Panamanian Government that it wished to avoid friction between the guard and the Panamanian people and that it feared that the U.S. forces would shoot members of the National Guard. Yet these same officials—the President of Panama and his associates—have insisted and demanded ever since these bloody riots that the United States agree in advance to negotiate a new treaty which would have the effect of abrogating existing indispensable treaty requirements for U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity as granted in the 1903 treaty. As to this, a half century of operation of the canal has shown full sovereignty to be absolutely necessary for success of the enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, the alleged fears of U.S. forces firing upon members of the Panamanian National Guard are entirely groundless and altogether absurd. It is important for citizens of the United States and other nations as well as of Panama to know that the military police of our Armed Forces in the Canal Zone and the National Guard of Panama have worked in close harmony, with joint patrols. Not only that, higher officials of the Panama National Guard and of our own forces have long enjoyed close and friendly relations. It is, indeed, fortunate that the International Commission of Jurisists made their inquiry on the scene because this enabled our own officials in the Canal Zone to present many facts that have been concealed. The action of the highest officials of Panama in preventing the National Guard from making any effort to suppress the murderous mobs constitued on the part of these officials acts aiding and abetting the violence and deaths that ensued. This is the naked fact and should be disclosed to all.

The following special dispatches from Panama City, Republic of Panama, merit careful reading by all concerned with the tragic consequences of the January Panamanian outbreak:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1964]

INTERPRETIVE REPORT: PANAMA'S EFFORTS BOOMERANG

(By Marguerite Higgins)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA, March 13.—Panama's effort to pin charges of "crimes against humanity" on the United States in connection with last January's rioting have—so far—boomeranged.

The International Jurist Commission, composed of a Swiss, a Dutchman, and an Indian, were invited here with a great show of confidence by the Panamanians, who predicted an anti-Yankee report. But the Jurist Commission now gives every sign of concluding that it is Panama that is most guilty of aggression and dubious international behavior on the bloody nights of January 9, 10, and 11. The findings of the jurists will in due course be subject of a report by the International Bar Association.

According to sources close to the International Commission, the Panamanian Government made a major miscalculation. It did not know that the United States had proof to show that at the height of the mob attacks on the zone—when some mobs were 5,000 to 10,000 strong—the Government of Panama instructed its national guard "not to interfere" or attempt to control the crowds variously equipped with rocks, rifles, machineguns and Molotov Cocktails.

The U.S.'s proof consisted of tape recordings of these do-nothing instructions as radioed to the national guard by the Panamanian authorities. And when the Panamanians attempted to deny such instructions, American officials simply played the recordings for the assembled lawyers and witnesses.

These instructions, which kept most of the ordinarily tough, efficient Panamanian guard in their barracks, had the effect of giving the rioters freedom to wreck, shoot and burn at will. And this abdication of control was described by one of the international jurists as "an eye opener as to where the guilt really lay for the degree of violence which was all out of proportion to the provocation—however real it may have been."

The jurists, who conducted the examination like good trial lawyers, were also unfavorably impressed, according to authoritative sources, by the elastic Panamanian yardstick toward the facts. For example, Panamanians claimed at first that all demonstrations were "peaceful" and the demonstrators unarmed. But the Americans were able to produce concrete evidence showing that more than 580 bullets had been pried out of the walls, ceilings and floors of the Hotel Tivoli alone. This old-fashioned hotel was a major defense point for defense of the zone and the bullets pried out of its walls included ammunition that fitted elephant guns and machineguns.

The hearings of the International Commission were notable in that it marked the first time that the United States—after a long silence—finally made a case showing Panama to have been the aggressor by burning and wrecking inside the Zone. Panama was itself accused of crimes against humanity in the brutal beating of American citizens in Panama City, including a woman who had no relation to the zone.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1964]

ORDER TO GUARD WITHHELD

PANAMA, March 10.—Panamanian authorities gave no orders to the National Guard to control rioting along the Canal Zone border during the January disorders, a committee from the International Commission of Jurists was told early this week.

An authoritative source said today that the Foreign Ministery counsel, Eloy Benedetti, told the Geneva Commission the orders were withheld because the national administration wanted to avoid friction between the National Guard and the Panamanian people.

Another reason was that the Government feared U.S. troops would shoot National Guard members, thus causing worse trouble than actually occurred.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 11, 1964]

PANAMA CANAL COMPROMISE REPORTED NEAR

A Latin American diplomat says Panama has agreed to restore diplomatic relations with the United States and to confer on differences over the Panama Canal.

U.S. sources said a compromise agreement between the two countries was near but had not been reached.

The diplomat, who could not be identified last night, said a U.S. request for rewording of the proposed agreement, set forth by an Organization of American States committee, had delayed its announcement. He declined to elaborate on the last-minute U.S. request.

APPROVAL NEEDED

In Panama, however, Foreign Minister Galileo Solis described as premature any reports Panama had agreed to reestablish diplomatic relations with the United States. He did concede the two countries were near agreement on a formula to end the deadlock.

The proposed agreement was worked out by a special OAS mediation committee. To become effective it must be approved by both countries.

The diplomat said Panama had accepted the OAS-drafted formula.

The agreement reportedly calls for both countries to appoint special representatives to discuss and negotiate, without limitations or preconditions, the difference between the two countries.

Meanwhile in Panama, the United States has charged Panama with aggression in the recent Canal Zone rioting, according to an authoritative source.

COMMISSION MEETS

The U.S. move was a countercharge to an earlier charge of aggression by Panama concerning the actions of U.S. troops and police in the January 9–11 rioting that left more than a score dead and more than 200 wounded. Four of the dead were U.S. soldiers.

The American aggression charge was made Saturday before a session of the International Jurists Commission summoned by the Panama Bar Association to hear additional charge the United States had violated human rights in the canal crisis.

At the same time, the source said, a top-ranking Panamanian official admitted before the jurists that the Panama National Guard, which handles police duties, was ordered to remain in quarters during the rioting.

The United States has contended from the outset the National Guard's failure to intervene allowed Panamanian mobs to get out of hand.

Japan Will Take No Precipitate Action on Red China—Assurance by Ambassador Takeuchi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, Japanese Ambassador H. E. Ryuji Takeuchi addressed the Commonwealth Club of California and made some very interesting observations about the industrial progress of Japan as well as their devoted friendship with the United States.

Excerpts from the talk as published in the Commonwealth follow:

JAPAN WILL TAKE NO PRECIPITATE ACTION ON RED CHINA—ASSURANCE BY AMBASSADOR TAKEUCHI

(From address by H. E. Ryuji Takeuchi, Ambassador of Japan)

Today's changing Japan seeks to play a constructive role in Asian and world affairs.

Economically, Japan is well into a period of extraordinary growth and expansion, with a gross national product growing at about 9 percent a year for the past decade, which has brought Japan to rank fourth among the free world's industrial economies.

However, Japan's economy has been changing. It is no longer based on abundant cheap labor but is geared to foreign trade.

We must trade to live. We must import food, raw materials, machinery, and manufactured goods. And we must export processed and manufactured goods. Our principal economic resource is our people—their skills and inventiveness, their ability to apply modern technology, and their capacity to compete in world markets.

Our foreign commerce is also changing. We still buy raw materials from you—cotton, wheat, soybeans, and the like, but we also are buying more capital goods from you and from other industrialized nations.

As our economy grows, our wages and purchasing power rise, and our import requirements become more diverse. Similarly, we are diversifying our exports. We lead the world in shipbuilding, and we are among the leaders in optical, photographic, electronic, steel, and other highly specialized manufacturers.

As an Asian power, we have a vital role in expanding commerce and speeding economic development in south and southeast Asia.

These regional affinities are natural and can only grow stronger. Japan has recent memories of its own struggle for economic development.

JAPAN WELL AWARE OF TRADE HARDSHIPS

For all these reasons, a pillar of Japanese foreign policy is the expansion and liberalization of world trade. Our aim recently has been to liberalize various exchange restrictions. We welcome the invitation to full membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). We are prepared to press for reciprocal reductions in barriers to trade—including tariffs and quotas, whether imposed by others or voluntarily adopted by ourselves.

Japan is aware that freeing of international trade will cause hardship by exposing vulnerable, inefficient, and noncompetitive industries to stiff competition in world markets.

It would be necessary to adopt, in the transitional period, certain exceptional measures which would prevent a sudden serious dislocation of our economy. We believe, however, that the international division of labor will be universally beneficial if it is intelligently managed in the context of expanding world commerce.

We welcome all measures of international cooperation which may contribute to this process, including steps to eliminate across-the-board barriers to trade and steps to improve international liquidity.

There are, I think, some popular misconceptions about snake-dancing Japanese students, anti-American agitation in some quarters, and other manifestations of violent political emotion in my country. These things occur—but their news value lies in the fact that they are political aberrations.

They are no more representative of Japan than occasional explosions of civic lawlessness represent your country—regardless of foreign headlines.

UNITED STATES MOST ADMIRED IN JAPAN

Japan is committed to political democracy. The Japanese people have freely and consistently elected moderate, progressive governments. It will also interest you to know that public opinion polls in Japan invariably show the United States as the most admired and popular foreign country.

We Japanese believe in free debate, the sanctity of individual rights and opinions, the rights of political minorities, and in self-government under a rule of law.

Japan's 1947 Constitution contains a section—article 9—through which the Japanese people forever renounce war and abjure the maintenance of military forces.

A world in which threat of force is outlawed by all nations is not within immediate reach. It may be true that Japan's contributions to free-world defense should be larger. This is a matter that Japanese people will have to resolve through their democratic process.

I cannot believe, however, that Japan—or America—must abandon all hope for a world in which national security will be realized under universal law.

JAPANESE TRADE WITH CHINA MAINLAND

Japan, like a number of Western European countries, makes a distinction between economic and political relations. We may trade with a country, as we do with mainland China, without necessarily exchanging diplomatic representation.

Our trade with mainland China is based fundamentally on practical commercial considerations. In 1963, our exports to mainland China were approximately $60 million. They are expected to increase gradually in the future. The Japanese Government permits Japanese firms to extend some credit to China under certain conditions.

SENTIMENTS TOWARD CHINA DIFFER

Because of the difference in historical, geographic, economic, and cultural background, Japanese and American sentiments toward the Chinese continent are different. Ten centuries ago, Japan built its civilization upon the Chinese culture.

Before the Second World War, the Chinese continent was an important source of raw materials for the Japanese economy and an important market for Japanese products.

JAPAN LOOKS FOR PEACE

The Japanese people have always known that the Chinese were by nature peace loving and intelligent and for many centuries succeeded time and time again in freeing themselves from the oppression of foreigners and their culture. It is for these reasons the Japanese people have considered unfortunate that the Chinese continent fell under an oppressive Communist regime and friendly relations between the Chinese and Japanese people were broken off.

The news of French recognition of Red China was received with relief by many Japanese, because it created in the minds of these Japanees a hope for a break in the hitherto impenetrable barrier.

Some Japanese believe, through recognition, the Chinese leadership will become peaceful and reasonable.

However, Japan's leaders are fully aware that this issue is not quite as simple. The Japanese Government will not take any precipitate action on this issue; and a close and frank exchange of views will always be maintained with her friends, particularly the United States.

There are no irreconcilable conflicts in aim or interest between Japan and the United States.

As an Asian member of the free world community, Japan sees itself as a partner, not a competitor, in constructing a more stable, viable, and prosperous world community based on justice.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (Elliott J. Spear): Free yen exchange in near future?

Answer: I expect freer system for yen but no rate change.

Question: Has Japan found satisfactory source replacing China for iron and coal?

Answer: Yes—United States and Canada.

Question (J. H. Clinton): To what extent are hostile demonstrations Communist provoked?

Answer: Difficult to say. Communists try to start and expand such incidents daily.

Question: Would Japan like to trade with Red China? With Cuba?

Answer: Trade with China is important and we'd like to expand it—under restrictions as to strategic materials. I see no sudden change. We've depended on Cuban sugar and finding substitute source is hard.

Question (J. O. Kinert): Will Chinese Communist regime be overthrown from within?

Answer: I don't think Chinese people will stand many years of communism. Change will come.

Question: What are Japan's relations with Russian fishing fleets?

Answer: We catch too many fish for Soviet liking; they try to limit us. We negotiate every year. It's difficult.

Question (J. Hart Clinton): Plans for exchange of newsmen between Japan and Red China?

Answer: I read that Japanese Association of Newspapermen and Chinese contemplate exchange of five to eight reporters. It may materialize but how much freedom our reporters will have in China—how free their reporters will be to inform Chinese people—is question. We'll demand reciprocity.

Question (E. L. Merica): Do Japanese families generally favor marriages between their daughters and American sons?

Answer: We leave it to the daughters.

Question (Roy P. Newell): Poor in United States represent one-fifth. What percentage of poverty in Japan?

Answer: President Johnson defined poverty as family with income under $3,000. On that scale, 95 percent of Japanese live in poverty.

Question: You don't consider that poverty?

Answer: Poverty often depends on mentality.

The Very Soul of This Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Federal judge, Frank Wilson, in the Hoffa trial at Chattanooga has reaffirmed the sanctity of the judicial process and the respect of the court and our system of justice has been improved and strengthened. All the Nation is saluting a very great Federal judge—Judge Frank Wilson—for his comments at the time sentence was imposed.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, March 14, and of the Nashville Tennessean, also of recent date, commending Judge Wilson, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 14, 1964]

THE VERY SOUL OF THIS NATION

The sentence meted out to James A. Hoffa for attempting to rig a Federal jury was accompanied by an eloquent statement on the role of the courts in the American system of government. Long after the details of the teamster leader's activities have faded, U.S. District Court Judge Frank W. Wilson's affirmation of justice will be part of the literature of the law.

"You stand here convicted of seeking to corrupt the administration of justice," he told the defendant. "You stand here convicted of having tampered, really, with the very soul of this Nation. You stand here convicted of having struck at the very foundation upon which everthing else in this Nation depends, the very basis of civilization itself, and that is the administration of justice, because without a fair, proper and lawful administration of justice nothing else would be possible in this country."

Judge Wilson's words were in the noble line honed to a fine edge by the Anglo-Saxon legal tradition. "A city which has no regular courts of law ceases to be a city * * *. Justice is the health of the State"—these fundamental ideas are as true today as when Plato stated them.

Nothing shocks the democratic conscience more than an attempt to tamper with the courts, through corruption of juries, bribery of judges or in any other way. And fortunately for our country, the cases in which such attempts have succeeded, especially in the Federal courts, are few and far between. When Martin T. Manton, senior judge of the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals, was tried in 1939, the presiding judge said: "The charge of conspiracy to sell justice, made against an appellant Federal judge, is hitherto unprecedented in the 150 years of the Federal judiciary." Nearly a quarter of a century later, New York State Supreme Court Justice J. Vincent Keogh went to jail for taking a bribe, another case which outraged his fellow judges as well as his fellow citizens.

It is precisely because we look to the sanctity of the courts—even more than we do to the legislative and executive branches of government—that we are aroused by efforts to fix judges or juries. The courts are often the last repository of our rights; again and again the courts have safeguarded the lonely individual or minority.

That is the underlying meaning of Judge Wilson's statement in the Hoffa case: "If a conviction of such an offense were to go unpunished and this type of conduct and this type of offense permitted to pass without action by the court, it would surely destroy this country more quickly and more surely than any combination of any foreign foes that we could possibly have."

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Mar. 13, 1964]

JUDGE WILSON COVERED THE CRUX OF A JUDGMENT

Federal Judge Frank Wilson has sentenced Mr. James Hoffa to a total of 8 years in prison and fines totaling $10,000 for jury tampering. Three codefendants received 3-year terms.

Then, in a subsequent action, Judge Wilson levied a contempt citation against one of the defense lawyers, Mr. Jacques Schiffer, sentencing him to 60 days in jail and assessing him a $1,000 fine.

Thus the jury tampering trial of Teamster leader Hoffa and the others in Chattanooga came to an end. The case, of course, is not ended. Mr. Hoffa and the others will appeal. Should the appeal go all the way to the highest court, it may take 2 years or more before it is ended.

Mr. Hoffa has stood in judgment and been judged and it is doubtful if any commentator could add much in summary not covered by the words of Federal Judge Wilson, who said to Mr. Hoffa:

"You stand here convicted of seeking to corrupt the administration of justice itself. You stand here convicted of having tampered, really, with the very soul of this Nation. You stand here convicted of having struck at the very foundation upon which everything else in this Nation stands, the very basis of civilization itself, and that is the administration of justice, because without a fair, proper, and lawful administration of justice, nothing else would be possible in this country * * * everything that we call civilization depends ultimately upon the proper administration of justice itself."

Mr. Hoffa came away from court crying injustice. He is fully aware that only the appellate machinery of justice can save him now; that the enormous power he is able to wield and the enormous sums available to him as chief of the Teamsters Union are at last for naught.

The stocky, arrogant labor leader may hold his fief of power together for a time, but its structure is showing cracks and more dissident voices are sure to be raised. The jury verdict has ferried Mr. Hoffa across his personal Rubicon.

As for Mr. Schiffer, the stormy, leather-lunged counsel for the defense whose actions in major part seemed directed at goading the court into anger and error, he has learned the price of his tactics.

Distinctly and at length, Judge Wilson cited from the record a series of actions which assaulted the integrity of the court, including charges that the judge was conducting "star-chamber proceedings and a drumhead courtmartial," and accusations of "Stalinism, Hitlerism, etc."

In the trial, Judge Wilson showed the utmost patience, but at the end he sternly noted that Mr. Schiffer had made a deliberate and willful attack on the administration of justice. Such misconduct by an attorney, the judge said, would be calculated to destroy all respect for this court if such misconduct went unnoticed and unpunished.

It can be said that public admiration for the judge's role in a trying and difficult case is all the greater. Despite a case that would try the patience of Job, Judge Wilson has tempered justic with mercy in pronouncing sentence.

The sanctity of the judicial process and the respect of the court has been upheld and punishment meted out. The convicted will have their review, but regardless of that outcome the process of justice is the stronger for having demonstrated that attempts to subvert it are never viewed lightly.

Open Letter to the Poverty Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent us his message on poverty today; it is therefore timely to have the following "Open Letter to the Poverty Fighters," from the La Cygne Kansas Journal. The letter speaks for itself. It is a pertinent and compelling statement by the excellent editor of the Journal, R. R. Rose. I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress, and most especially to Sargent Shriver, the head of the antipoverty campaign.

OPEN LETTER TO THE POVERTY FIGHTERS

The owners of three small La Cygne businesses were found to be in violation of Federal wage-hour laws here recently and it cost them several thousands dollars each to satisfy the Government.

They were in violation of the laws on the books and thus the action was probably justified. However, in one case a man was penalized not for failing to pay the proper wage scale, but, as it worked out, for failing to properly show it on his books. Another man who, through the sympathetic understanding of an employee, was acting in the employee's best interests, was penalized for supposedly depriving the employee of his rights.

The law, in the main, no doubt is just and protects many workers in big cities from employers who would profit at the employee's expense. But how does it work out in Tinkerville, Okla., or La Cygne, Kans.?

In these small rural towns the remains of that once flourishing breed—the rugged individualist—is still trying to operate his own little business. He expects little more than a decent living for long hours and burdensome responsibilities. He does more than one man's work himself and hires help he can afford.

The owner and his employees work together to make the business pay them all a living wage. All are usually over 21 when they agree on wages and working conditions that seem fair and within the employer's ability to meet.

The employer cannot force unreasonable conditions on his employee because the small towns are close enough to larger centers that the wage competition is fierce. There are few secrets in a person's life or business in a small town. His life and his business are pretty much an open book; and the employee knows it if his employer is profiting unreasonably from his labor.

The employee wants to live in a small town. He accepts lower wages by choice in order to raise his family in the atmosphere of the small rural community. He has a job at a living wage and he is satisfied.

Now comes the man with made-in-Washington blanket rules to cover everyone on how a business is to be conducted and what the employee is entitled to. The rules do not allow for the small employer's ability to pay. They do not provide for the owner being left with as much for a long week's work as he pays one of his employees. The employee is instructed in his "rights." If the business cannot operate under Government

rules and big competition, the employee still has his rights but no job.

The number of unemployed is an ever-present problem. Automation in the great industries promises to relieve many more workers of their jobs. Has anyone ever made an effort to compute the number of jobs that have been lost to the heavy hand of government in small businesses?

Thrown into competition with big business and always at a disadvantage because of their smallness, the operators of these small businesses and industries quit and they and their former employees are competing in the already overtaxed job market.

Sons of small businessmen don't follow in their fathers' footsteps. They have already seen that the rewards are not worth the candle. They enter the competition for jobs in the cities.

Because of the loss of trade drawing power when a business quits, other of the town's businesses find it more difficult to show a profit, and the pace accelerates. Multiply it by tens of thousands and flow of the small town self-employed and their employees to the labor market in the larger centers becomes an item to reckon with.

The Small Business Administration was set up to help small businesses. The ideas the authors of the bill had as to what constitutes a small business may be a far cry from what constitutes small town small business. Would they believe that many of these really small businesses could have survived, and collectively hired a big share of the Nation's workers?

We talk of fighting poverty, of helping the depressed rural areas and of spreading the blessings of our multibillion-dollar economy throughout the land. But the trend continues in the other direction. Fifty percent of all domestic output in produced by 150 firms, concentrated for the most part in large centers. Two-thirds of all productive assets are controlled by about 500 firms. Is it any wonder that self employment has dwindled to only 20 percent of the population?

All rural areas and all the people in them are not necessarily poverty-stricken—far from it, but the Government itself is helping create this condition which it now seeks to alleviate.

Real, meaningful, money-in-the-pocket concessions to the very small businesses and industries in the small towns would bring thousands of people out of the job market and back into the ranks of the self-employed and the employer. It would encourage those industries too small to automate and too small to successfully compete with "big business" to locate in the depressed rural areas and hire people.

It would be pretty hard to favor them more than enough to give them an even break with the big operators.

Maybe rewarding them for each satisfied employee on the payroll instead of penalizing them would help.

Can't an effort be made to help all segments of the economy? Aren't 50,000 small businesses and industries giving one, two or a half dozen people employment almost as important in the total economy of the country as a few big businesses employing the same number?

Coal by Wire Pushed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal by Wire Pushed," which appeared in the March 9 issue of the Madisonville Messenger.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL BY WIRE PUSHED

The idea of coal by wire, which is a modernistic name for an electric generating plant at the mouth of a large coal mine, has been talked for years.

Now, in at least two mammoth projects, this idea is about to be put into practical use. We note that Commonwealth Edison Co. of Chicago is putting $100 million into a mine-mouth steam electric plant near Springfield, Ill.; and a trio of private utilities in western Pennsylvania is building an even larger facility at the mouth of a huge mine.

What has made the project feasible, it appears, is the recent perfection of some ultra-high voltage cables that have been needed.

The Illinois facility will be situated within a mile, via conveyor belt, of the mouth of a huge underground mine. It will produce more than a million kilowatts of power and send it 175 miles to Chicago—over a pair of 345,000-volt transmission lines.

The Keystone plant will have a capacity of 1,600,000 kilowatts and will send it to the heavily populated east coast by 500,000-volt circuits.

This development is of more than passing interest to an area like ours, where so much "steam" coal is produced for electric utilities.

To the big cities that will be able to get their power by wire it has some large advantages. For this is the "cleanest" power available. The coal dust and smoke will be many miles—perhaps hundreds—from the congested urban areas that are already burdened, in many cases, with smog problems.

In the larger sense, this piece of progress is more automation. What it will eliminate entirely is a lot of coal handling by railroads and bargelines. Spotting such developments in the future, some railroads in mining areas have already come up with an "integral train" setup which saves coal shippers money by having a complete trainload of coal travel direct from the mine area to the designated steam-electric plant and return for a like load.

And, while the two coal-by-wire projects are tremendous single developments, they will still represent only a tiny fraction of the total steam-electric power output of the Nation.

But this may be one of the ways in which coal can successfully compete in the future with nuclear-powered electric generating facilities.

The 175th Birthday of the U.S. Customs Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with a unanimously passed resolution of Congress and Presidential proclamation, the U.S. customs service is sponsoring activities marking the 175th year of its establishment in 1789. At the same time, a great many trade associations, societies, brotherhoods, and benevolent organizations are cooperating in making a success of "U.S. Customs Year, 1964."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the March 7, 1964, edition of the New York World Telegram—an editorial saluting the Bureau of Customs on the occasion of its anniversary. I am applauding the magnificent work of the customs service especially in helping to make visiting tourists from abroad feel welcome when they arrive at the gateway of New York.

The article follows:

KEEP SMILING

This is "U.S. Customs Year" because the Government's Customs Bureau is observing its 175th anniversary.

The Bureau was created by the fifth law passed by the first Congress. President Washington signed the measure July 31, 1789.

Customs officials have figured out a half dozen or more ways to mark the anniversary: Special cancellation stamps in some post offices, a 4-cent commemorative postal card, dinners and mettings. A sketchy history for the public schools, a paperback book.

We are pleased to take note of these events and to hail the long-lived Customs Bureau.

But, judging by the scattered reports of friends and acquaintances who travel, we think the best way for the Bureau to observe this historic date is to keep up the good work. Time was when we heard bitter complaints about the treatment of tourists returning from abroad.

In the last couple of years, there seems to have been a large improvement. For this, we say extra congratulations.

Wilderness and Recreation: A Need for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a New York Times editorial of March 8 speaks directly and persuasively to the need for enacting the two major pieces of conservation and recreation legislation before Congress—the wilderness bill and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The need for both measures is urgent. In the field of recreation the usable resources are lagging far behind the Nation's population growth. In the field of conservation priceless wilderness areas are in danger of being modified and even destroyed.

Wise investment today—as provided for in these bills—will return vast dividends tomorrow. But failure to act without further delay may mean opportunities lost forever.

As the Times editorial states the case so well:

The parks, the forest, the shorelines, the sparkling waters and the wildlife of our outdoor heritage are not merely to be preserved for those who would gaze upon them from some distant horizon. These are for the people, and for their heirs. Enactment of the two conservation bills is the best means to preserve the irreplaceable against encroachment.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to our colleagues' attention and urge prompt action by the Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1964]

WILDERNESS AND RECREATION

Behind the effort to enact the wilderness bill and the land and water conservation fund bill—the two most vital pieces of conservation and recreation legislation before Congress this year—is recognition of a dread alternative: once the primeval lands fall under the bulldozer's blade, they are forever lost.

This year alone, more than a million acres are expected to succumb to urban sprawl. That is a genteel word for it. The scarred countryside could be more accurately described, in the title of a recent book, as "God's Own Junkyard."

Secretary of the Interior Udall has rightly called these bills "pieces of landmark legislation which will be remembered for years to come." The wilderness bill would strengthen the barriers against encroachment by any source, public or private, on primitive areas. The land and water conservation fund bill would provide the means to acquire Federal and State lands and waters to meet the needs of our growing population for outdoor recreation.

The bill to establish a "national wilderness preservation system" is sound in its essentials. But it can be strengthened in some of its details. The Senate-approved bill does not allow mining in a designated wilderness area except by Presidential permission; this ought to be added to the House bill. Existing park and wildlife areas should be included in the wilderness system, and provision made for future acquisition.

Wilderness and recreation are two sides of the same golden coin. The great growth of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, as Dr. Howard Zahniser, executive director of the Wilderness Society, has declared, "is not a threat to wildlife refuge protection or wilderness preservation." The two activities are companions, not rivals.

The parks, the forests, the shorelines, the sparkling waters, and the wildlife of our outdoor heritage are not merely to be preserved for those who would gaze upon them from some distant horizon. These are for the people, and for their heirs. Enactment of the two conservation bills is the best means to preserve the irreplaceable against encroachment.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, of California, to Residents of the California 14th District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to practically every family of registered voters in the California 14th Congressional District. We have received a very heavy response to this questionnaire, and my office has been deluged with returned completed questionnaires and accompanying correspondence. Many citizens not only answered the questionnaire, but also wrote detailed comments on the bottom or back of the questionnaire, or on supplementary sheets. I have spent many hours personally reading all of these comments, and they have been most helpful. I feel very strongly that a Congressman can better represent his constituents if he knows the views of his constituents on important issues pending before Congress, than if he makes no effort to ascertain these views.

The tabulation of the questionnaire has now been completed, and the results are summarized below. This involves 24,265 questionnaires which were returned. This is more than the number of people who are contacted by the Gallup Poll when it takes nationwide polls.

1. Would you favor legislation prohibiting racial discrimination in places of business which serve the public, such as theaters, restaurants, hotels, motels, and retail stores?

Yes, 13,224 (54.5 percent); no, 8,788 (36.2 percent); undecided, 2,247 (9.3 percent).

2. Do you believe the U.S. Export-Import Bank should guarantee the credit of Soviet Russia and other Communist countries in connection with the sale of wheat and other commodities to such Communist countries?

Yes, 3,383 (13.9 percent); no, 17,757 (73.2 percent); undecided, 3,121 (12.9 percent).

3. The assassination or attempted assassination of the President or Vice President is a State crime. Would you favor legislation making it a Federal crime?

Yes, 21,349 (88.0 percent); no, 2,079 (8.6 percent); undecided, 836 (3.4 percent).

4. Would you favor legislation which would restrict the interstate sale of firearms by mail-order houses by requiring the seller to obtain an affidavit that the buyer is over 18 years of age, has not been convicted of a felony, and is not mentally incompetent; and by requiring that a copy of this affidavit be filed with the local police department?

Yes, 19,604 (80.8 percent); no, 3,670 (15.1 percent); undecided, 988 (4.1 percent).

5. Would you favor legislation to increase the overtime wage rates above their present level of time and one-half?

Yes, 5,316 (21.9 percent); no, 17,209, (70.9 percent); undecided, 1,741 (7.2 percent).

6. Would you favor legislation reducing the standard workweek from 40 hours to 35 hours?

Yes, 7,794 (32.1 percent); no, 14,125 (58.2 percent); undecided, 2,342 (9.7 percent).

7. A bill is pending before Congress which would authorize veterans of World War I to receive a pension of $100 per month, unless they have other income exceeding $2,400 if single or $3,600 per year if with dependents. The estimated cost of this program the first year, according to the Veterans' Administration, would be $1,266,247,000. Would you favor this bill?

Yes, 7,574 (31.2 percent); no, 14,037 (57.8 percent); undecided, 2,652 (11.0 percent).

8. A bill is now pending before Congress which would increase the salary of Members of Congress from $22,500 per year to $32,500 per year. Would you favor this 44 percent increase in congressional salaries?

Yes, 4,155 (17.1 percent); no, 17,900 (73.8 percent); undecided, 2,208 (9.1 percent).

9. Would you favor a modification of our immigration laws to base admission requirements for immigrants on their skills rather than their country of origin?

Yes, 11,294 (46.5 percent); no, 7,883 (32.5 percent); undecided, 5,083 (21.0 percent).

10. Would you favor a continuation of the program under which Mexican Nationals are allowed to come into the United States to assist in harvesting our farm crops if a certificate is first issued by the U.S. Secretary of Labor that sufficient domestic labor is not available to do the type of work involved, and that prevailing farm wages will be paid?

Yes, 19,491 (80.3 percent); no, 3,403 (14.0 percent); undecided, 1,369 (5.7 percent).

11. Would you favor legislation to establish and finance a Youth Conservation Corps, patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's?

Yes, 15,631 (64.4 percent); no, 5,115 (21.1 percent); undecided, 3,518 (14.5 percent).

12. The Department of the Interior has proposed a $4.1 billion Pacific Southwest Water Plan under which approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet of water per year would be taken out of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and pumped through an aqueduct for use in Arizona. Would you favor this proposal?

Yes, 2,517 (10.4 percent); no, 17,474 (72 percent); undecided, 4,272 (17.6 percent).

Facing Narcotics Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the recent report of the President's Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse has resulted in some controversy. There are many who feel that this report is behind informed opinion rather than ahead of it and that it ignores important medical and sociological facets of the problem.

An informative and well-written letter commenting on the report recently appeared in the New York Times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 21, 1964, issue of the New York Times together with a letter to the editor of the New York Times from Charles R. Foster and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The letter and editorial follow:

FACING NARCOTICS PROBLEM: NEW APPROACH CONSIDERED NECESSARY FOR CONTROL OF ADDICTION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is not surprising how little national attention the recently released final report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse has received. This report dodges the basic issue in narcotics—is addiction a crime or an illness?—in trying to satisfy everyone and offend no one.

The Commission report completely ignores the important 1963 study by the New York Academy of Medicine which advocated a major overhauling of Federal narcotic laws and regulations and which urged that doctors be allowed to determine the type of treatment.

Moreover, the Commission's report disposes of all foreign experience in three-fourths of one page. The fact that Great Britain has only about 500 (United States over 50,000) addicts is ascribed to a "lack of cultural susceptibility." Actually the British problem is tiny because addiction has been kept firmly in medical hands and the police want to keep it there.

The report also recommends the enactment of a far-reaching new Federal program of civil commitment, patterned after the recent California and New York laws. Under such a law the addict would be committed to the care and custody of the Attorney General for an indeterminate period not to exceed 5 years. He would be institutionalized for at least 6 months and then sent out on parole.

In practice this system, as shown in California, may lend itself to abuses and may be too visionary.

The narcotics addict is a weak, sick person who needs help with his illness. The present enforcement philosophy of the Federal

Bureau of Narcotics, which to a large part is still reflected in the Commission's report, holds back progress in the control of addiction. New approach is needed placing primary emphasis on the medical, social, and psychological components of the problem.

CHARLES R. FOSTER.

WASHINGTON, *February 16, 1964.*

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1964]

CLINICS FOR NARCOTICS

The recent death in City Prison of a young New Yorker with a narcotics history tragically dramatizes the inadequacy of present narcotics laws, as a letter on this page emphasizes today.

A large body of research has shown that the arrested addict—the user of drugs, as distinguished from the bigtime seller—is a sick person in need of medical and psychiatric treatment if he is ever to function in society. But the law says that if drugs or "the works" (the crude instruments of drug injection) are found on a person, he is as guilty as any ordinary criminal and must be jailed.

A situation in which even one prisoner dies because no doctor is available is a reproach to the city. That there have been five such deaths since 1961 is a disgrace. Both the commissioner of hospitals and the commissioner of correction favor a proposal for a central prison hospital facility, properly equipped and staffed, so that all sick prisoners, including addicts, can first be admitted there for treatment.

Basically, narcotics addicts ought to be treated as the sick people they are, not as criminals. That this approach is at long last gaining support is clear from a resolution introduced in the city council establishing clinics throughout the city for the controlled distribution of narcotics to addicts. The proposal is certain to antagonize those who favor the punitive over the medical approach. But we will never find a solution unless we experiment—and outpatients clinics may be one solution.

USDA Doubletalk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most undesirable portions of the Johnson administration's certificate wheat bill is the provision to retain the CCC resale formula on surplus wheat stocks at 105 percent of support.

One of the major reasons this provision is so devastating is shown in the following portion of a radio script, prepared and broadcast by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.:

USDA DOUBLETALK

But let's look into the background of the defeat of the 115-percent provision. And we should remind you that many things go on in the cloakrooms and behind the pillars and in the offices there in Washington. We've been told, for example, that people from the U.S. Department of Agriculture systematically went the rounds telling the Senators that 115 percent wasn't important. The gist of their arguments was that the Commodity Credit sales just follow the market. They said that CCC sales don't have any effect on the market prices. All the Senators heard the story over and over again. And 115 percent was defeated and that's 10 to 15 cents a bushel farmers won't get on their wheat.

So the Senators who believed that argument (none of ours did) must be puzzled and upset when they read the paragraph on page 6 of USDA's own publication the "Wheat Situation" for February. Its release date is March 7.

And it says that prices of most classes of wheat have climbed well above loan rates. Then it explains, and we quote directly, "CCC sales, however, have tempered the price rise. * * * In fact, CCC resale price has practically established the market price for Hard Winter wheat. This price is computed at 105 percent." That's quoted directly from the USDA publication.

So you see, how can anyone tell what is kernel and what is chaff? On the one hand, the USDA people go to the Senators and tell them that CCC sales don't have anything to do with making wheat prices so 115 percent for farmers is defeated in the Senate. But on the other hand, USDA's own offical publication factually states that CCC sales are holding wheat prices down through the use of the 105-percent formula.

No wonder many people are puzzled when they are faced with exactly opposing stories coming from one and the same source. Those who know wheat are clear on the facts though as evidenced by those 34 Senators who voted to raise CCC ceilings to 115 percent.

A Community Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of school dropouts and unemployable youth certainly is of concern to every thoughtful and responsible citizen and in many communities throughout the country something is being done to help these youngsters. As the following Chicago Sun-Times editorial of March 14 points out, it is not the Federal Government but the local community that is best fitted to meet the problems of these youngsters. The Congress should give careful thought and study before approving the establishment of Federal work schools for those who have failed the Armed Forces mental test.

A COMMUNITY PROBLEM

The task force assisting R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., head of the administration's "war on poverty," has hit upon a device to obtain names of youngsters who they are sure need special education and vocational training. The task force will use the lists of those rejected by the Armed Forces for failure to pass the mental tests given at induction. Shriver's group would give these youngsters the opportunity to enter special Federal work schools—the assumption being that if they have failed the Armed Forces mental tests they will fail any mental test and need help.

Shriver's task force is somewhat off base in its assumption. Failure to pass the Armed Forces mental test is not a dependable measure of a man's intelligence.

The basic test given to all applicants and draftees at induction measures the ability of an individual to acquire military training. The passing mark for this test varies within the different branches of the Armed Forces.

Nor are the testing procedures wholly reliable. The General Accounting Office notes that the Navy had to discharge 1,900 of its men (at a cost of $1,245,000) in 1962 because they were mentally unqualified for military service after they had passed these same tests.

Moreover, the Navy, for one, raises and lowers the mental test passing marks to suit the pressures of manpower requirements. This fact alone, it would seem, would eliminate this test as a reliable standard for judging a man's intelligence.

There is no need for the Federal Government to take on a task better done by the community. The officials and educators of any community can easily find out who their problem youngsters are. The list of high school dropouts is a good source.

As a matter of fact, the community is better fitted to train these youngsters for jobs that exist in the community area than the Federal Government.

There are programs operating in Chicago that do just that. Job Opportunities Through Better Skills (JOBS) is an example. It is federally financed and administered by the YMCA and other groups. JOBS trains high school dropouts for jobs waiting to be filled in the Chicago area. It has no difficulty finding applicants. Bruce Cole, director of JOBS, says the program is successful and can be applied to any community where there is a need.

Singling out those who have failed to pass the Armed Forces tests—in view of how the tests can and do vary—is an unfair and very likely wasteful process.

The problem of how to help the high school dropout gain the necessary special help he needs is a local problem. It can be solved, as is now being proved in Chicago. We repeat what we have said before: Community problems are almost always better served when the community—not the Federal Government—takes it upon itself to do the work.

Is NASA Bungling Too Much?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the February 16 issue of the Florida Times-Union carries a very interesting article, entitled "Is NASA Bungling and Wasting Too Much? Onlookers Wonder." I am glad to request that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

IS NASA BUNGLING AND WASTING TOO MUCH? ONLOOKERS WONDER—IT'S $100 MILLION HERE AND $20 MILLION THERE; ONE CAPSULE HAD 720 THINGS WRONG WITH IT—526 DUE TO SLOPPY WORK

(By Bem Price)

At age 5 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has the solar system for a playpen and dollars for building blocks.

No one denies NASA's accomplishments in placing satellites into orbit nor that the man-in-space program was a tremendous achievement.

But there is a continuing official concern in Washington about NASA's high cost.

By 1970, NASA will have spent—at the current rate—somewhere between $35 and $50 billion in establishing U.S. preeminence in space, a program which envisions a manned landing on the moon.

In its first 5 years NASA's budget has expanded from $348 million to $5.1 billion and the agency is asking for $5.3 billion for fiscal 1965.

NASA has approximately 32,000 employees. It pays the highest salaries of any Federal agency and has more people (349) in appointive jobs paying $16,500 to $21,000 annually than any other two Federal agencies.

In a report to Congress the House Space Committee said it understood that "our national space program is one probing into many unknown and uncharted areas and that NASA must be allowed a certain flexibility in the manipulation of funds.

"Nevertheless the committee has become seriously concerned with the relatively high rate of reprogramming * * * this trend, if unchecked, carries the potential for gross abuse and mismanagement of funds."

In addition, the House committee has complained that NASA's increasingly complex programs are creating a fear that Congress may lose control over expenditures.

One result of this fear has been the introduction of a bill by Representative JAMES G. FULTON, Republican of Pennsylvania, to create an inspector general's office for NASA.

FULTON said there is "a vital requirement for objective examination and evaluation of NASA's programs and operations."

The General Accounting Office, Congress overseer of spending, has reported that NASA contributed to the wastage of about $100 million in connection with the Centaur rocket and the Advent satellite program.

Centaur was scheduled by NASA for its first flight in January 1961. It flew successfully on November 27, 1963—2 years and 11 months behind schedule. The Centaur has cost $537 million so far.

The General Accounting Office released a report last October which said a miscalculation about the weight the Centaur could lift had forced cancellation of the Defense Department's Advent program.

While waiting for development of the Centaur the Defense Department had been spending $4 million a month on Advent, designed to carry out 16 scientific investigations in space.

Beyond this, NASA has had some expensive failures.

Six of the Ranger shots, designed to send operating television cameras to the Moon, have failed. Each failure has cost around $18 million.

Then there was Mariner I, which was to investigate the atmosphere around Venus. Failure to insert a hyphen in the guidance formula, so NASA has said, caused the rocket to veer off course. It was destroyed. Cost: $20 million.

The year-by-year record established by NASA shows that the space agency has yet to complete a major program on schedule or at the original cost estimate.

For example, Project Mercury, which sent six astronauts into space, was roughly a year behind the original schedule. It was expected to cost $200 million. The final NASA report said it cost $384 million.

NASA explains:

"In attempting to do something which has never been done before, you cannot escape the necessity for establishing goals which are sometimes based on insufficient information."

NASA has its share of major problems, of course, and in its final report on Project Mercury, the agency stated:

"A list of those general and technical areas that appear to be either the source of, or a major contributing factor to the problems that repeatedly cost the project time and money would include design requirements, qualification practices, definitions of standards, tests and validation procedures and configuration management. The conditions are not unique to this project, but represent those that generally exist in the aerospace field."

There were stories of mismated wirings and tubes installed backwards. One Mercury capsule had 720 things wrong with it when it was checked out at Cape Canaveral, now Cape Kennedy, the report said, and 526 were directly attributable to lack of satisfactory workmanship.

Pasadena, Calif., scientists reported launch vehicles had been delivered with water in the fuel tanks and loose soldering left around which in the weightlessness of space would float and cause short circuits.

Some were critical of what they said was NASA's constant changing of designs and specifications.

"At any time," one said, "that too many new features in design and technology are added to a product, you are going to have many that will not be satisfactory."

One physicist commented that NASA had become a training ground for scientists, fresh from the universities, and these young scientists often were inclined "to push the state of the art."

"The temptation to undertake advanced things is so great," he said, "that few are willing to be restrained by considerations of technology."

Mr. J. Merrill Anderson, President, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Stresses Farm Bureau's Commonsense Approach to Solution of Problems in American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 9, Mr. J. Merrill Anderson, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, and 100 Farm Bureau leaders, representing the counties of the State, met with the members of the Iowa congressional delegation at a dinner meeting in Washington.

Mr. Anderson's remarks at this dinner are noteworthy for their clarity and soundness in outlining a commonsense approach to the solution of many of the problems of American agriculture.

These recommendations, most of which are already pending in bill form, demand the close scrutiny of all of us who are interested in seeing that American farmers have the opportunity to carry out their responsibilities in the production of food and fiber with as little Government interference as possible.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I present Mr. Anderson's remarks as they were made at the banquet. They are worthy of study:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT J. MERRILL ANDERSON, IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, AT CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 9, 1964

We have just heard two excellent presentations by Congressmen HOEVEN and SMITH. These men are in positions to know what they are talking about through their own experiences in serving on the Agriculture Committee and the Appropriations Committee. We do appreciate, Congressmen, your taking the time to organize these thoughts for our benefit, your contributions to this meeting, and your cooperation throughout the years.

We know the congressional delegation is going to miss you, Mr. HOEVEN, after this year. We in the Iowa Farm Bureau are going to miss you. We have always found you willing to give us information and to help us whenever you could. You have listened to our point of view and given it serious consideration. When you found you couldn't vote with us—and these times have been relatively few—you have told us frankly and openly why you couldn't.

It is not my intention to amplify the statements that have been made. Nor is it my intention to repeat or contradict them. I do want to review briefly the position of Farm Bureau members in a couple of areas. We realize that you Congressmen have many groups and individuals contacting you, and many pieces of legislation to keep close to. We thought you might appreciate just a brief review of our position and our reasons.

The outlook for agriculture is both grave and promising. Some immediate problems are very real. Livestock prices have been extremely low this year, and cattle feeders have not done well for several years. We have an overcapacity to produce in agriculture, and our surplus production coupled with ever-rising farm expenses is putting a real squeeze on farm income.

Actually, the farmers of Iowa have done fairly well incomewise over the last few years, but some of this income has been due to extraordinary crops. I shudder to think what would happen to Iowa farm income if we should have a small corn crop the same year we have livestock prices like we have had this year.

On the promise side, we are convinced that agriculture is a growth industry. There is increasing demand for our products both at home and abroad. The U.S. poulation increase is estimated to be roughly 40 million by 1975—just 11 years away. Foreign markets for feed grains, soybeans, and wheat have been on the increase. No one has yet thought of putting a supply control on scientific progress, so it is reasonable to assume that we farmers will continue to gain greater technology and thus do an even better job of farming in the years ahead. Consequently, surplus problems will probably be with us even in 1975. These dramatically increasing markets for food and fiber, however, certainly hold out some promise for a healthy agriculture in the future. Since our efficiency or know-how is equal to or greater than that of any other industry, these tremendous assets must not be underestimated.

In recent years, the farm program has been less controversial within our organization. I have never seen Iowa Farm Bureau members more united on farm programs than they were this fall at our annual meeting. Opinions have jelled. Let me outline very briefly what the consensus of opinion is.

Farm Bureau members believe in the private enterprise system. We recognize the possibility of making the system work better through certain types of Government activity in fiscal and monetary policies and some others. However, farmers are convinced that we must not jeopardize the dynamic nature of our market—or the efficiency of our business—through extensive Government regulation. Government regulation and unnecessary redtape could easily destroy our developing markets at home and abroad and our ability to compete in these markets. This must not happen.

We do not want Government price supports extended to any new commodities. We do want a program that will help us move from where we are to a freer agricultural economy.

We are opposed to compulsion. Programs used in this transition should be voluntary, and the definition of "voluntary" is important, too. It is perfectly possible for a so-

called "voluntary" program to contain incentives so great that they become economically compulsory. This may come about either through extensive incentives or penalties.

We favor the continued use of price supports on storable commodities at levels that will be insurance against drastically low prices, but not so high as to increase production or interfere with the market function. For example, we are concerned that the present soybean price support is so high that it will be an incentive to produce and will cause trouble in the soybean industry. This support level should be reduced. It could be reduced without affecting farm income. Income to the soybean farmer must come from sales in the marketplace, not from Government price support. That price support should be only a floor—an insurance against temporarily depressed prices.

We would eliminate allotments and quotas and depend upon land retirement for the temporary production regulation needed. Land retirement—with emphasis on whole farms—offers the only possibility of production regulation without rigidity of quotas.

We also believe the market must be protected from the dumping of Government make it illegal to sell Government stocks at less than 115 percent of the support price. It makes no sense to pile up Government stocks in storage and then, because the bins are too storage and then, because the bins are too full or because of political whims, push these stocks onto the market, disrupting and depressing prices. There is no question but what the dumping of corn has had an influence on present livestock prices. We had grain pushed onto the market at bargain prices—with subsidized freight. It was fed. The results are plain to see.

Most Iowa farmers are opposed to compensatory payments, because we believe these only shift the problems of one commodity to another. We have seen what happened in the livestock market. We produce corn today with an incentive rate at $1.25 per bushel. We feed it at a price of $1.10 per bushel. Is it any wonder we're in trouble? Most of the cattle and hog feeders I know are desperately concerned that payments will be spread to livestock in the next livestock price slump. We know that with these would come quotas and—we feel—an ever-continuing program for livestock, with even more disastrous results than those we've had for crops.

Compensatory payments paid on individual commodities would mean that price support would become ceilings. Therefore, as farm costs rise—and we see no reason to expect them not to continue rising—farmers would not be able to increase their own net income.

Studies from the Center for Agricultural Adjustment at Iowa State have often been quoted in regard to what would happen if farm programs were withdrawn. It is not usually noted that the center made no attempt to estimate the adjustment in production that might come from the dropping of quotas and allotments by those people who are now producing to maintain their base and receive payments.

A recent report by the center compares four types of programs: unrestricted production, direct payments, mandatory controls, and a land retirement program similar to that proposed by farm bureau. Of the four programs compared, the farm bureau program was estimated to result in the highest net income to farmers. The cost to the Government was from $100 to $300 million more than unrestricted production or mandatory control programs, but it was approximately a billion less than direct payments. For what it's worth, these estimates conclude that the program farm bureau supports offers the highest income at the lowest cost to Government of the programs being given serious governmental consideration. I have the figures from this study with me if anyone would care to look at them after the meeting.

Now for a word about fiscal policy. As all of you know, farm bureau opposed the tax cut until there were assurances that the budget could be brought into balance. Apparently, the same sort of opposition was offered by the majority of Congressmen until President Johnson pared the budget somewhat and promised strenuous efforts to cut it even further.

There are those who are critical of the President. They feel that his efforts to reduce expenditures are negligible and merely in areas that show the most. I do not know whether this is true or just political talk. Regardless, now that the tax cut is effective, I feel we should assume that the President meant what he said and that he will make every effort to balance the budget under the revenue now available. If he can do this he will have rendered a tremendous service to this country. Regardless of political party or political leanings, s urely there is agreement that old-fashioned thrift is not out of date, that fiscal responsibility is still sane, and that bureaucracy for bureaucracy's sake is an inexcusable waste and burden.

I do not think the President can afford to fail in this commitment to balance the budget. Our balance-of-payments program is too sensitive. The possibility of inflation is too great. One of the reasons agriculture cannot afford to go further with the payment program because it is so expensive. These payments alone, extended to the major commodities, could make it impossible for the President to make good on his promise to the Nation. If the administration, the Congress, and the people as a whole, by working together, can bring Federal Government expenditures in line with revenue at the new tax rates, we will indeed have made a significant step forward by reducing taxes.

Many other issues could be discussed. We are concerned about beef imports, about the possible extension of minimum wage regulations to agriculture, and many others. While we are concerned, we are also optimistic. We believe the business of farming has a future. We plan to be part of that future.

We have faith in our republican form of government and in our democratic principles. We commend the Iowa congressional delegation for the excellent job you are doing in representing Iowa in a dignified way and in a maner which reveals deep concern for the national interest. We want to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to you and to pledge our support in accomplishing the goals and objectives so vital to Iowa and to America.

Subsidies Galore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a Chicago Tribune editorial of last week which clearly states the case for rejection of the administration's wheat-cotton bill:

SUBSIDIES GALORE

Under stiff White House pressure, the Senate has approved a bill authorizing new subsidies for cotton and wheat. The measure now is in the House where the Johnson administration hopes to twist enough arms to bring quick approval. Any delay in enacting it into law involves the risk that the bill will be too late to affect this year's crops, which means the administration would have no new handouts to dangle before rural voters in the election campaign.

The proposed cotton program is such an economic absurdity that even the committee chairman, Senator ELLENDER, a Louisiana Democrat, was opposed to it. He agrees with the American Farm Bureau federation that if Secretary of Agriculture Freeman would administer the present law properly—which means lowering price supports—there would not be any need for a new program and the taxpayers could be saved some money.

The Agriculture Department is caught in a dilemma of its own making because it raised the support price after the Kennedy administration took office and now has cotton running out of its ears. Having stimulated production with high prices, it would be simpler and sounder to undo this mistake by lowering supports to discourage overproduction and make cotton more competitive. But the administration's solution is to pile on more subsidies.

The Senate bill does propose to lower supports from 32.47 cents a pound to 30 cents a pound for the first year, after which the Secretary would have authority to raise or lower them within prescribed limits. But growers of more than 10 acres of cotton who agree to reduce plantings by a third are to get a bonus of 4.5 cents a pound. And growers of 10 acres or less—well over half of all growers—are to be guaranteed 34.5 cents a pound without any cut in acreage, which is a reward to the small, inefficient producers at the expense of the larger, more efficient ones. Moreover, under certain limitations growers may exceed their reduced plantings by 10 percent to produce cotton at the export rate of 24 cents a pound.

But exporters still are to receive a subsidy, as at present, so American cotton can compete abroad at lower world prices. And a new subsidy is to be granted handlers so that domestic mills can buy our own cotton at the same price paid by foreigners. Thus the Government proposes to spoon-feed the cotton industry with what in effect are four different subsidies.

The wheat program is a warmed-over version of the same one farmers emphatically rejected in last May's referendum. It guarantees a high price for that portion of the crop consumed domestically and a lower price for export wheat for those farmers who submit to planting controls. But instead of being mandatory, the program this time is being promoted as a "voluntary" plan, although the price guarantees are purposely set so high that the majority of farmers probably could not afford to stay out of it.

Shortly after taking office. President Johnson issued a statement suggesting he was seeking better farm programs and asking, "How can we use the pricing mechanism of the free market with more vitality than presently?" The obvious answer is to stop finding new ways to subsidize the farm economy. Agriculture and taxpayers generally will be better off if the House rejects this bill.

Luster Rubbed Off on USIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished former news commentator, Edward R. Murrow, who is now recuperating from an operation, was perhaps the

most influential director of the U.S. Information Agency since its inception. I think he did a magnificent job with this most important agency during the 34 months that he was the USIA Director. The Washington Sunday Post of yesterday carried a most interesting article on Edward R. Murrow's USIA accomplishments. Under previous permission I insert this article by Jean White with my remarks in the Appendix:

LUSTER RUBBED OFF ON USIA—ED MURROW'S VERY PRESENCE GAVE OUR WORLD "VOICE" NEW STATURE

(By Jean White)

When he came to Washington as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Edward R. Murrow brought along a reputation for courage, integrity, and intelligence as a news commentator.

It is perhaps a measure of Murrow's success in the post that his personal reputation did not shrink in 34 months in a Government job. If anything, some of his prestige and luster rubbed off on the USIA.

The USIA directorship has not been exactly a reputation builder. In little more than two decades, the Agency has had five names and a dozen Directors. It is a sitting target for congressional critics who don't like an abstract painting sent overseas or a certain paragraph amid millions of words published.

Since the USIA can't tell its story at home, the American public usually hears about the Agency only when it has made a big mistake. It has no lobby to press Congress for funds. Its product is for export only. It deals in intangibles, and the results can't be summed up in a graph for an annual report.

BEYOND ARITHMETIC

Murrow himself put it this way a year ago: "But it is very difficult to measure success in our business. No computer clicks, no cash register rings when a man changes his mind or opts for freedom."

It is almost as difficult to measure the success of Murrow's USIA stewardship from early 1961 until he resigned in January to recuperate from an operation for lung cancer.

He did noticeably improve the product, particularly in the mass media fields of films and television programs. The Voice of America doubled its power and the USIA beefed up its programs in the key areas of Latin America and Africa.

But more important, if less tangible, may have been the effect of Murrow's presence. The respected news broadcaster gave the USIA stature with Congress and the public at home. This, in turn, gave more self-respect to the staff, which had never completely recovered from the demoralizing attacks of the McCarthy era. An acclaimed professional, Murrow began to attract bright young recruits to the USIA.

Murrow became the most influential USIA Director since the World War II days of Elmer Davis and the predecessor Office of War Information. He sat in on policy decisions, had a direct telephone (the "blowtorch") to the President, and often dashed the two blocks down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. He became the President's adviser on psychological factors in the formulation and execution of foreign policy.

A perfectionist, Murrow probably didn't shake up the USIA as much as he wanted to. It is a vast operation, with nearly 13,000 employees in 106 countries. Inspiration can filter down through only so many layers of bureaucracy.

He had his frustrations as USIA Director. He tangled with Congress over budget cuts and "shoestring financing." He didn't attract as many top-talent people as he had hoped.

"But he left a better Agency than he found, and it will be still better 5 or 10 years from now because of Murrow's work," one of his aids summed up Murrow's tenure.

NINETY PERCENT PAY CUT

Thomas C. Sorensen, a career man with 13½ years with the USIA, is Deputy Director in charge of policy and plans. Until Murrow took over, the USIA had no clearly defined role or direction, he feels.

"For the first time, under President Kennedy and Murrow we had a clear mandate of what role the President wanted us to play in foreign affairs. And we were allowed and encouraged to play that role to the fullest," he says.

Murrow took the USIA job (at a 90 percent pay cut from an estimated $200,000 at CBS to a $21,000 Government salary) on the condition that he would have his say in making the policies that the USIA later would have to explain to the world. He wanted to do more than pick up the pieces after a fiasco. President Kennedy agreed, and Murrow became the first USIA Director to sit on the National Security Council.

As Murrow defined it, the job of the USIA is to make the policy and actions of the United States "intelligible and, whenever possible, palatable." He operated the Agency on the philosophy that truth is the best propaganda, even when it hurts.

The USIA has reported the story of racial violence in the United States in the larger context of a democracy working out its problems. As might be expected, this approach drew congressional criticism. Some Senators asked Murrow whether it was wise to show weaknesses.

"We cannot be effective in telling the American story abroad if we tell it only in superlatives," he replied.

A NUCLEAR ROLE

On the policymaking level, the USIA played a key role in the timing of the resumption of U.S. nuclear testing in 1961. Murrow asked for as much time as possible to capitalize on the moratorium break by the Russians. The USIA also wanted a chance to explain why the United States was forced to resume tests itself.

During the 1962 Cuban crisis, the USIA saturated communications channels with messages documenting the American position. In a single week, 50,000 pictures of the Russian missile sites were air-expressed overseas.

The USIA even drew blood from the Communists. Last June, the Moscow radio accused the Agency of provoking "sleepless nights in Socialist countries."

As USIA Director, Murrow was in command of a vast operation using seven media of communication: radio, television, movies, press, books, exhibits, and the arts. Some 600 million persons see USIA documentary films each month. The Agency places 500 TV programs each year in more than 60 countries.

Its wireless news file carries 10,000 words daily and it publishes nearly 70 magazines and some 20 newspapers. There are more than 180 USIA libraries. The Voice of America broadcasts 789 hours a week in 36 languages.

THE LAST 3 FEET

The USIA has nearly 1,500 officers at posts overseas, and Murrow cut down their paperwork and told them to wear out shoe leather rather than typewriter ribbons.

"I once heard him tell a group of staffers that it was no miracle of communication to send a message by Telstar," an aid recalls. "He said it was that last 3 feet between one man and another that matters in getting a message across."

All was not sweetness and light for Murrow and the USIA. He had to fight budget cuts. He lashed out at Congress for a $15 million cut last year.

"We are being outspent, outpublished, and outbroadcast," he said in a speech. "We are a first-rate power. We must speak with a first-rate voice abroad."

Murrow had his faults and made mistakes. He didn't like administrative work but he tried to learn all phases of the USIA operation. He did his homework for congressional testimony and sat through all the hearings rather than just making an appearance.

The 55-year-old Murrow often joked about being the old man of what he called the "New Zeal" administration, but he set a pace with a 15-hour day. He told a friend: "I have never worked harder in my life and never been happier. I haven't had such satisfaction since the days of covering the London blitz."

Boyle Speaks Out Against Residual Fuel Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have from time to time taken the floor of the House of Representatives to speak out against the uncontrolled flow of low-cost foreign residual fuel imports into this country. I have repeatedly brought to the attention of the House of Representatives how this foreign residual fuel oil's invasion of the American energy market takes away from domestic energy sources and particularly coal many of the opportunities to retain some of the longtime users of coal. In 1959, President Eisenhower issued an Executive order limiting the amount of this foreign residual oil that could be brought into coal market areas. Since that time, there has been a systematic erosion of that Executive order to the extent, that the latest action of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall permitting an additional 23 million barrels of foreign residual oil to come into this country, which actions have substantially destroyed the mandatory import control program. Not only is the program destroyed, but this latest action by Secretary Udall did destroy the jobs of 2,000 American coal miners in the deep poverty stricken areas of the Nation. It is ironical that today we have received from the administration a legislative package to combat poverty and on March 5, 1964, to have been hit between the eyes with this order of the administration which dulls this attack on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the statement of Mr. W. A. Boyle, international president of the United Mine Workers of America, the organization which is best suited to testify how severely this action by Secretary Udall affects the jobs of American coal miners:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, Mar. 15, 1964]

BOYLE TAKES FIGHT AGAINST RESIDUAL TO L.B.J.: COAL MINERS ARE APPALLED AND ALARMED

UMWA International President W. A. Boyle once again has carried the fight against

ruinous foreign residual oil imports directly to the White House.

This time the matter has been placed before President Lyndon B. Johnson with a request that the latest increase in waste oil imports ordered effective April 1 by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall be rescinded.

As the Journal went to press, there was not yet any indication as to what action Mr. Johnson might take. It was just a year ago that President Boyle conferred with the late President John F. Kennedy on a similar matter. At that time Boyle was able to convince Mr. Kennedy to halt the proposed elimination of residual oil restrictions. Mr. Kennedy at that time informed Boyle that the administration would not permit any further increases in residual oil imports without consultation with the UMWA and the coal industry.

The UMWA, backed up by the American coal industry, much of the domestic oil industry, and the American railroads, has been fighting against harmful residual imports into coal's eastern seaboard markets for more than 10 years. It was not until 1959 under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower that the coal representatives were able to get a directive from the executive branch of Government limiting the amount of this waste fuel being dumped into coal markets. Since that time, there has been constant pressure by the international oil cartel, supported by New England Congressmen, to lift the quotas. While the quotas have not been abolished, there has been a continual increase in the amount of this fuel permitted to come into the country, primarily from Venezuela.

The latest action to up residual oil quotas came as a complete surprise to the UMWA and the coal industry on March 5 when Udall directed an increase, starting April 1, of 23 million barrels annually in the maximum amount of residual that may be brought into east coast ports of the United States. Udall was named the Nation's oil czar by President Johnson shortly after Johnson took office following the assassination of Mr. Kennedy. However, Mr. Johnson has authority to overrule Udall on such matters and this is what the UMWA and the coal industry are requesting the President to do.

The battle against the increase in residual oil imports is being fought jointly by the UMWA, the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., with which the UMWA is affiliated, and the National Coal Association, as well as railroad interests and domestic oil producers.

The UMWA argument against any increase is directed primarily at the fact that an increase would destroy President Johnson's anti-poverty program before it gets off the ground. The 63,000 barrel daily increase in oil imports ordered for April 1 by Udall would destroy the jobs of another 2,000 American coal miners in the poverty-ravaged Appalachian region.

Udall's arbitrary directive is the second such harmful action by him in a month. Just a few weeks ago, the Secretary gave his blessing to a proposal to import hydroelectric power into New York City from Canada, another plan that would bring further joblessness to American coal miners.

Udall's proposed increase in residual oil imports would create an estimated loss of $10 million annually in wages in coal areas of the Appalachian area. In addition, it would further weaken the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund by cutting down royalty payments that otherwise could be used to provide medical care, hospitalization, and pensions to coal miners and their families.

The 232 million barrels annual increase in residual oil proposed by Udall represents 56 million tons of American coal. This in turn is equal to the jobs of 22,000 American coal miners. In addition, it is estimated that the employment of approximately 11,000 railroad workers, who would otherwise be employed to haul coal, would be eliminated.

When he learned of Udall's action, President Boyle sent the following telegram to the Interior Secretary with a copy to President Johnson:

"The coal miners of America are appalled and alarmed at your intention to add to the poverty in the Appalachian region by increasing the residual oil import quotas by 23 million barrels. This increase, unjustified by any economic logic, strikes coal miners with a crushing blow to and hopes for job and income stability. It is inconceivable that an administration which declares its dedication to the alleviation of poverty would allow an action which brings unemployment to an additional 2,000 coal miners and which takes over $10 million in wages from the coal miners of this Nation. We challenge you to explain to those impoverished people in Appalachia why you are willing to further deprive them of an opportunity to share in the prosperity of this Nation."

Joseph E. Moody, president of NCPC, and Stephen F. Dunn, president of NCA, both plasted Udall's latest action in statements issued at the time of the increase order.

Moody termed the Udall order "astounding" and "completely unjustified." Moody noted that the ordered increase was made despite the fact that consumption of residual oil from all sources—foreign and domestic—declined by 2 percent in the first 11 months of 1963. The NCPC president also noted that the price of residual oil on the Atlantic coast has remained stable, proving that there is no shortage or undue demand for the product.

Moody reiterated that the arbitrary action of Udall proves conclusively that control of oil imports must be established under law and called on the Congress to act promptly to approve legislation pending in both Houses on the matter. The legislation would limit residual oil imports to 50 percent of domestic consumption in the corresponding quarter of the previous year. The legislation has been publicly endorsed by 200 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate representing 35 States.

WOULD TAKE AWAY 3,000 NEW JOBS

Moody said that before Udall's announcement the coal industry had estimated it would be able to increase its production in 1964 by 10 million tons. The residual oil import increase, Moody said, means that foreign oil "which can be sold in the United States at almost any price necessary to undercut domestic fuels will be able to usurp the market for more than half of that forecast increase, or 5.5 million tons." The estimated increase in coal production for 1964 would have created 3,000 new jobs in the Appalachian region and other east coast coal-supplying areas.

Moody noted that the imports of residual oil are also harming the economic interests of domestic oil producers.

Moody said the Udall directive marks the ninth time that residual oil imports have been increased since the mandatory control program was started in April 1959. The control program was ordered by former President Eisenhower because an investigation had determined such controls to be necessary to national security.

Dunn of NCA also protested vigorously against the Udall directive and called for congressional action.

Moody followed up his blast at Udall on March 12 with a letter to Members of Congress charging that Standard Oil (New Jersey), the largest of the oil companies making up the international oil cartel, is the culprit in this conflict.

Moody said the big oil company is currently bringing into the United States 23 percent of all the residual oil imports and obviously wants this profitable arrangement to continue.

It remains to be seen what action Mr. dent Johnson, UMWA President Boyle was asked to submit a letter detailing the arguments of the UMWA and the coal industry against increased oil imports. It is understood that this letter was to be presented to the President and that in addition Mr. Johnson would have handed to him a copy of the economic survey of the bituminous coal industry which is printed in the front section of this issue of the Journal.

It It remains to be seen what action Mr. Johnson will take. He named Udall as oil czar early in his administration because he did not want to be accused of a conflict of interest in connection with any directives concerning the oil industry. Coming from Texas as he does, Mr. Johnson was long regarded in the Congress as an advocate of the interests of big oil companies.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 14, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT, MARCH 14, 1964

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

PAY RAISES MUST ALWAYS BE EARNED

The House defeated the pay raise bill (H.R. 8986). Final vote: 184 for and 222 against. The final action was taken after 2 days of extensive debate and thorough examination of all the facts. My own position was that no matter how justified wage increases are, it is fiscal irresponsibility to increase Government costs by $600,700,000 at a time of deficit financing. As responsible officials we should earn pay raises by reduced spending and a balanced budget.

I agree with the minority views, in the report on the bill, which were signed by Representatives H. R. GROSS, AUGUST JOHANSEN, and KATHARINE ST. GEORGE. These views stated in part:

"This legislation is premature, unjustified, extravagant, and inequitable. It constitutes an unwarranted raid on the U.S. Treasury at a time when our taxpayers are already heavily overburdened.

"The present economic climate reflects high unemployment, a huge Federal debt, inflation, the largest Federal expenditures to be authorized by a Congress during peacetime, and another yawning annual deficit. This is not the proper time to grant additional pay increases to Federal employees and top Government executives which will cost over $600 million annually."

Some of the pertinent arguments against the increase:

1. The total additional cost of the Federal payroll since October 1962, if the bill had passed, would have been $1,650 million annually. This would represent an 11 percent increase in Federal payroll costs in 15 months. At the same time Congress has just approved a reduction in Federal income taxes.

2. Additional indirect costs of the bill would result from an upward adjustment in the compensation of many Federal Government contractors, increasing the cost of goods and services procured by the Govern-

ment by at least 10 percent or $250 million annually.

3. Cost-of-living index has risen 7.5 percent since December 1957 while the Classification Act employees have received an average of 23.2 percent pay increases in the same period, plus a 4.1 percent which went into effect in January 1964.

4. Comparability, principal argument of the proponents, was not followed. Classification Act pay grades 1 through 7 would have advanced above the 1962 comparability, varying from 9.7 percent increase for GS-1 to 1 percent for GS-7. Pay rates in the top grades would continue under 1962 comparability.

5. Proposed increases for some officials of the House of Representatives were unnecessary, unrealistic and created additional inequities.

6. A reckless provision of the bill would have delegated unconstitutional authority to the President for fixing salaries.

(a) He could have fixed salary rates for hundreds of top governmental officials in the $26,500, $28,000, and $29,500 class.

(b) He could have assigned annual salary rates in the above amounts to "any or all offices and positions in Government which he deems appropriate." This would have gone down in history as "the presidential punishment or reward section."

(c) He would have been authority to raise or reduce salaries of officials of the of the quasi-judicial boards and commissions where independent judgment free from pressure is the backbone of their regulatory obligations.

"THEY LOVED ME IN MILWAUKEE"

Remember the old-time vaudevillian who, regardless of how much he was pelted with overripe fruit or aged eggs, was always sure his act was universally loved? He is called to mind today in some of the pronouncements of the administration regarding America's image. Statements from the White House insist we are loved around the world. They love us in Cambodia. This week they burned the American flag and wrecked our Embassy. They love us in Cyprus. Rioting Greeks destroyed American property, insulted American personnel and damaged our Embassy. (Peace Corps members in Cyprus: 22). They love us in Gabon. They shot up the American Embassy. (Peace Corps members there: 74). The Soviet Union expressed its love and admiration this week by shooting down another unarmed jet trainer which strayed (some reports say it was lured by false signals) over East German territory. Our State Department showed its loving nature by apologizing to the Communists instead of demanding the immediate return of our airmen and compensation for an act which amounts to piracy.

IS OUR FAITH IN OURSELVES JUSTIFIED?

Here is a copy of a letter I received this week:

"In reference to your newsletter of February 29, you have more faith in the American people than I have. Most people will never have the facts and if they did it just wouldn't matter. You've done your share to spread the news."

I hope this view is wrong. I want to believe that the people have not lost the wisdom and the integrity to rule themselves. The success of this Republic is founded upon the precept that the ultimate judgment of the people will be right. Given all the facts, knowing the truth, the collective decision of the people will be the right one.

Our faith in ourselves will be justified only if we assume the responsibility to judge fairly the stewardship of our elected officials, and the final responsibility of putting into public office those who believe in and will support the basic principles upon which this Government of, by and for the people is founded.

It is important to know what you are for and what you are against, and why.

The Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently the Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, signed into law two bills which erode the civil liberties of the people of New York. These bills are the now infamous "stop-and-frisk" and "no-knock" bills. Both bills are the result of a misguided view that the approach to the problem of crime and juvenile delinquency is through tougher and tougher police measures—even if they violate the Constitution. I was happy to see that the Washington Post, on March 6, 1964, published an editorial which repudiates this approach and these bills. The Washington Post wisely points out that we must deal with the cause of crime and goes on to state:

These causes are not obscure. They lie, at least in part, in degrading slums, in warping poverty, in overcrowded schools, in structural unemployment, in racial barriers to opportunity, in the vulgar flaunting of opulence, in circumstances which breed juvenile delinquents faster than the police can possibly apprehend them; faster even than barbarous correctional institutions can convert them into adult criminals.

I urge all my colleagues to read this enlightened editorial:

POLICE SHORTCUTS

Crime has become so common in American cities that the public is alarmed and aroused. City dwellers have come to feel, and not without justification, that it is unsafe to walk the streets at night; fear has become endemic. The Public sense of indignation and anxiety has become so great, indeed, that people are perhaps almost ready to look at and deal with real causes of urban crime.

These causes are not obscure. They lie, at least in part, in degrading slums, in warping povetry, in overcrowded schools, in structural unemployment, in racial barriers to opportunity, in vulgar flaunting of opulence, in circumstances which breed juvenile delinquents faster than the police can possibly apprehend them; faster even than barbarous correctional institutions can convert them into adult criminals.

It is possible to uproot and overcome these causes, although only by heroic measures, requiring much expenditure of money, effort, and imagination. But there is an obvious temptation to take the far easier and cheaper course of reducing the restraints on police activity fixed by the U.S. Constitution—the course of coping with crime by letting the police take constitutional shortcuts.

This is the course advocated here by those who believe in letting the police make arrests for investigation. It is the course chosen in New York by the supporters of the crime bills which Governor Rockefeller signed into law at Albany on Tuesday. It is a spurious course; spurious because, dealing with the problem superficially, it will not diminish the crime rate and because it entails a hidden and incalculable cost in terms of civil liberty.

One of the bills, called the stop-and-frisk bill, would permit policemen to detain a person in a public place, to demand identification and search him for weapons when they have a reasonable basis for suspecting him of having committed a felony or a serious misdemeanor. This is not as bad as the arrests for investigation committed here—under which suspects were taken to police stations and interrogated there indefinitely. But it is bad enough, empowering the police to harass and interfere with citizens capriciously, and without judicial determination of the reasonableness of their conduct. In short, it confers a dangerous power which would have been thought intolerable by the authors of the Constitution and ought to be thought so by freeman today.

The other bill, called the no-knock bill, would let policemen, with court approval, break into premises to execute a search warrant without identifying themselves or stating their business. This is expressly forbidden by statute here in the District. It has been forbidden among freemen since the 15th century. Nothing has been deemed more fundamental to freedom than the concept that a man's home is his castle. William Pitt put it in these eloquent words:

"The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter; the rain may enter; but the King of England cannot enter—all his force dares not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

Something more than sentiment or ceremony stands behind this ancient insistence that the police show their authority and state their business before they force their way into a home. It gives householders an essential protection against thugs or marauders who might try to gain admittance; it also protects the police who might be mistaken for criminals and shot down by nervous householders. But beyond these practicalities is a vital sense that the forces of authority must always be bounded and restrained lest arrogance or zeal or officiousness lead them into oppressive conduct.

Mr. Justice Brennan said it all most aptly in a case some years ago upsetting the conviction of a narcotics peddler because the police broke into his home in just this arbitrary manner:

"We are duly mindful of the reliance that society must place for achieving law and order upon the enforcing agencies of the criminal law. But insistence on observance by law officers of traditional fair procedural requirements is, from the long point of view, best calculated to contribute to that end. However much in a particular case insistence upon such rules may appear as a technicality that inures to the benefit of a guilty person, the history of the criminal law proves that tolerance of short-cut methods in law enforcement impairs its enduring effectiveness. The requirement of prior notice of authority and purpose before forcing enery into a home is deeply rooted in our heritage and should not be given grudging application."

President Johnson TV Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States talked to the American people about the "First 100 Days."

It was the voice and spirit and physical presence of a President who is not afraid to face problems, who understands the great American dream and who is prepared to make that dream come true for all our people, not just a few.

Even the Republican New York Herald Tribune determined that the President's appearance was a favorable one—in which opinion all America joins:

MR. JOHNSON ON THE 100 DAYS

President Johnson apparently found the TV interview a more comfortable medium than the mass news conference. At any rate, he managed to project last night a livelier picture of his own activities and that of his administration than had previously come through on TV screens or in the press.

Mr. Johnson was particularly good in conveying the atmosphere of the first grim days of his tenancy of the White House, of the purposes that moved him and the goals he sought—very effectively. For the rest, there was little new. His confidence in the committee investigating Bobby Baker will not be widely shared, except by Senate Democrats; his belief that he acted for the best in the numerous foreign crises that arose during the 100 days must be tested by time, and the publication of further details, before it can be accepted fully.

Nevertheless, it was good for the Nation to catch a glimpse, in this relatively informal framework, of the Johnson who was so powerful as the Senate leader and who has succeeded so well with Congress during his first 3 months. The President's intelligence and force are far more apparent in the relaxed atmosphere of a small group than under the artificial circumstances of a set speech or a mass conference. But, happily for the country, he has both.

Iowa Legislature Adopts House Concurrent Resolution Calling on President To Base Meat Import Agreements on 1958-62 Average

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, both houses of the Iowa Legislature have adopted House Concurrent Resolution 3 which calls upon the President of the United States to base meat import agreements with New Zealand, Australia, and Ireland on a level no higher than the import average of the years 1958 through 1962.

Since this same proposal has been introduced by several Members of Congress I feel that the text of this resolution should appear in the RECORD so that the Members here will know that they have this support from Iowa.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the current livestock market prices are disastrously low resulting in a depression of Iowa's total economy; and

Whereas the recent red meat imports voluntary agreements with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland do not contribute to a sound agricultural economy; and

Whereas the President of the United States has the executive authority under the existing law to administer meat imports: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the general assembly respectfully request the President of the United States to base agreements on a level no higher than the import average of the years 1958 through 1962; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress from Iowa.

We, Robert W. Naden, speaker of the House of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, chief clerk of the house, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the house and senate of the 60th general assembly in extraordinary session.

WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.
ROBERT W. NADEN,
Speaker of the House.

"See America Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, another Massachusetts city has responded to the call of "See America Year" to proclaim its support for my proposal to call the attention of Americans and foreign visitors to the unique store of historical, cultural, and recreational attractions in our State. Mayor Paul S. Vaitses, Jr., of Melrose, issued a proclamation on March 10 in response to a recent letter in which I urged the 20 cities and towns in the Fifth Congressional District to endorse the "See America Year" idea. Under unanimous consent I include the mayor's proclamation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROCLAMATION: "SEE AMERICA YEAR"—1964

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has adopted a resolution designating 1964 as "See America Year"; and

Whereas Massachusetts and Melrose have a unique treasure of history dating from earliest colonial days; and

Whereas our heritage, our traditions, and our customs are of great interest to the people of the United States and indeed, to all the world; and

Whereas an awareness of our educational, cultural, and industrial resources is of increasing importance to the economic well-being of the United States and more specifically New England; and

Whereas the increased interest in travel stimulated by the current world's fair in New York will attract many millions of people to the northeastern section of our country; and

Whereas we, in Melrose, anticipate that many of these travelers will favor us with a visit to our State and to our fair city during their tour of this area in the months ahead; and

Whereas many Melrosians will travel to other parts of our great country during the year 1964: Now, therefore,

I, Paul S. Vaitses, Jr., mayor, declare that the city of Melrose does heartily endorse the see-America concept, and I further declare that 1964 is "See America Year" in the city of Melrose.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Melrose to be affixed this 10th day of March in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

Attest:

PAUL S. VAITSES, Jr., *Mayor.*
RAYMOND H. GREENLAW,
City Clerk.

Father O'Connor Byline Stands for Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Father Patrick O'Connor is a Catholic missionary who is correspondent for the Catholic press of the country in Vietnam, and in view of the confusion and doubt over actual conditions in Vietnam, I insert into the RECORD a column that was written by Monsignor John M. Kelly, editor of the New World, the Archdiocesan newspaper of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Because of the continuing questions, doubts and contradictions that exist relative to our position in the future of Vietnam, this article by Monsignor Kelly is of great current interest, and it is my hope that it might clarify some questions as well as point out the contribution of one man in the field of journalism.

The column follows:

FATHER O'CONNOR BYLINE STANDS FOR TRUTH

Columban Father Patrick O'Connor has spent 17 years in the jungles and villages of Vietnam and surrounding areas. A missioner by vocation, and a journalist by many years of professional experience, he has long been sitting right on top of the major stories breaking in this strife-torn territory. He has reported these stories accurately and with great fidelity, while much of the press was guilty of exaggeration and misstatement regarding recent developments in Vietnam. His integrity has been completely vindicated in more recent developments in that area. He estimated the past correctly, reported present affairs dispassionately, and called the most significant shots for the future.

Yet, among the many journalists who have derided his reporting, we find a few who dwell in ivory towers, sit in plush chairs, and walk on wall-to-wall carpeting. They have probably come no closer to Father Pat's Vietnam jungles than the nearest TV set. They accuse him of pro-Catholic or pro-Diem bias.

Hear the description of Father O'Connor by a number of his more down-to-earth confreres:

"A veteran correspondent for NCWC News service and a veteran missionary in Asia, Father O'Connor has been steadfast in accurate reporting of the church in this area. More particularly, he has done an outstanding job in reporting the crisis in South Vietnam and in clearing up a distorted image of the church there in the face of contradiction from a majority of other reporters covering the scene. Even when it seemed as though he stood alone in his contentions, and was criticized by Catholic colleagues as well as other journalists, he stood his ground and provided even more precise reports, which have since been proven largely accurate. In part at least, he influenced the tide of change which has taken place in reporting from that troubled area—in some cases even a capitu-

lation. When a U.S. congressional committee was sent to South Vietnam to investigate, it was Father O'Connor who was asked to provide the committee with a summary of events there as he reported them; and this in the presence of—and without contradiction from—other members of the press corps. Such dogged determination to report the truth in spite of walls of contradiction certainly earn Father O'Connor the title of intrepid reporter and mark him a credit to the profession of journalism.

"At a time when news from Vietnam was being slanted by the daily press in America by use of such phrases as "the Catholic-dominated Government of President Diem," Father O'Conner's reports placed events in perspective as political, rather than religious, issues. He neither whitewashed or condemned Diem, but did protest against misleading stories about him which reflected more bias than fact. He did a superb job in reporting the Vietnam story as he saw it.

"Father O'Connor was one of few American reporters or publications to point out the real issues involved in the Vietnam crisis. His constant emphasis on the political nature of the dispute has been convincingly borne out by subsequent events in that country. Alone, with accuracy, strength and restraint, he has presented the true picture of the Vietnam difficulties, especially the Buddhist and Diem problems and the subsequent periods. He has continued to send articles of objective and credible worth concerning affairs in southeast Asia. He exemplifies the worth and purpose of the Catholic press in its campaign against distorted news.

"His reporting of events in Vietnam preceding the overthrow of the Diem regime was perceptive and courageous. During the Vietnam crisis, when objectivity and responsibility were virtually ignored by newsmen on the scene, Father O'Connor filed lucid, penetrating reports on the developments that led up to the overthrow and death of President Diem. The veteran correspondent at first hand probed facts, interviewed key figures and using his long years of experience covering Southeast wars and politics as a background, sent out accurate reports and unbiasted analyses. And in this he was unique. As a result of his perserverance and accuracy, the Catholic press in America stayed on top of the crisis as it developed and offered its readers comprehensive and complete coverage on Vietnam, available in no other news medium.

"During the various crises that shook South Vietnam in 1963, Father Patrick O'Connor, through clear and concise reports on that country, not only supplemented the reports of the secular news media, but in many cases, corrected the false reports of happenings during the overthrow and tragic murder of President Diem. He thus rendered a service to truth which is in keeping of best tradition of Catholic journalism.

"The year 1963 saw the tiny nation of Vietnam burst into the headlines of the world. War, revolution, and counterrevolution made it a source of news. Objective reporting from this scene was difficult. Charges, countercharges, and denials filled the secular press as religious persecution by a Catholic government was alleged. Because of the dedicated, determined, and difficult work of Father O'Connor, the Catholic press was supplied with factual, prompt information—information substantiated by future impartial investigations and historical events.

"Unlike most of his fellow Catholic journalists, operating from the relative comfort of their offices, Father O'Connor was very much on the firingline in 1963 and in more ways than one. His reports from Vietnam countered the exaggerated dispatches which appeared in so much of the press—his own facts being later upheld by such reporters as Marguerite Higgins and Joseph Alsop and by the United Nations Investigating Committee.

"At a time when the American people were being given an incredibly distorted and biased picture of the situation in South Vietnam through virtually all channels of press, radio, and television, Father Patrick O'Connor provided outstanding factual coverage. He served the highest ideals of journalism by not only reporting the facts with sources and evidence but also presenting valuable on-the-spot political interpretation. Especially after the universally confused reporting about 'Catholic persecution' of Buddhists began, he persistantly pursued the real facts, and through the Catholic press of the United States, served by his agency, the NCWC News Service, enabled Catholics in this country, at least, to keep soundly informed despite the extraordinary maze of special pleading presented by most of the general press.

"The effectiveness of his service in this regard was enhanced by his impressive energy, his awareness, the clarity and force of his writings, the speed of his reaction and reporting as the situation developed rapidly. The events in the latter months of 1963 not only abundantly confirmed his early and virtually exclusive interpretations but were eventually recognized as such by the very publications whose correspondence had been so sharply in disagreement with Father O'Connor's reports. In short, his coverage of the anti-Diem campaign was clearly the finest example of Catholic journalism not only in 1963 but in recent decades."

Father O'Connor's byline has appeared in this newspaper week after week, and year after year. As long as God gives him life, his byline will remain here. His is a single purpose—to dig for truth. It is our purpose to print the truth—ivory towers notwithstanding.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Health Care for the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in any Federal program of health care for the aging there will be a need for a program like the Kerr-Mills legislation to provide for persons of limited means who are medically indigent. In no case, however, should it be regarded as a substitute for the kind of health care program set forth in S. 2431, the bill introduced by me with Senators CASE, COOPER, KEATING, KUCHEL, and SMITH.

Experience has proved the inadequacy as well as the high cost of the Kerr-Mills program, adopted in 1960, when it is called on for more than limited use. About 88 percent of the expenditures under the Kerr-Mills Act are made in five States: New York, California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Michigan; leaving only 12 percent for the remaining States and jurisdictions in the program. New York State, which has the most extensive program and which covers those with an annual income ceiling as high as $1,800 per person and $2,600 per couple, alone accounts for about 42 percent of the total Kerr-Mills expenditures. Administrative costs are high and the major net effect of this program has been to shift a sizable share of the costs of medical care from the States to the Federal Government because of its generous matching provisions. Only 28 States now have the program in operation, and because they require a needs test and insist upon filial responsibility, a majority of the cases are welfare cases transferred from the old-age assistance program.

Thus, for the millions of aging who need adequate health care and cannot afford to get it themselves, Kerr-Mills cannot really help.

The distinctions between the Kerr-Mills Act and a Federal program of health care for the aging under social security were clearly set forth for residents of Albany, N.Y., following an address attacking the social security program by Dr. Edward R. Annis, president of the American Medical Association.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the series of articles by Robert G. Fichenberg, which appeared in the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N.Y., on February 28 and March 6, and the editorial entitled "Medicare Misinformation," which appeared in the same newspaper on February 27.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News, Feb. 28, 1964]

AMA'S "BIG GUN" FIRES A DUD IN ALBANY AGAINST MEDICARE

(By Robert G. Fichenberg)

As a capital city, Albany pretty much taks lobbyists in stride, especially during this time of the year. This week, however, we were favored by a brief but busy visit from one of the Nation's most powerful lobbyists: the president of the American Medical Association.

In what was described as a "whirlwind" tour of this area, Dr. Edward R. Annis did what the AMA pays him to do. Among other things, this is to lobby against the national administration's medicare-for-the-elderly bill.

In carrying out his assignment, however, Dr. Annis succeeded—figuratively—in doing what would have been impossible physically: he talked through his hat while putting his foot in his mouth.

According to careful notes made by our man who covered his capital district appearances, before Dr. Annis left town to continue his holy crusade, he had: (1) accused President Johnson of presenting a "false picture" to the people on medicare, which is one way of calling the President of the United States a liar; (2) blamed Governor Rockefeller for what he called a "sorry mess" in New York State's administration of the Federal Kerr-Mills medical care law—and then completely changed his tune and said the State "can be proud" of the way it uses the Kerr-Mills law, after he had been given a stern face-to-face lecture by the Governor; and (3) leveled an unpleasant label at anyone who happens to be for medicare.

According to Dr. Annis, newspaper editorials supporting medicare are "filled with the usual type of drivel and misinformation that fills the liberal press of the United States." Political leaders and pubic officials who favor medicare and refuse to buckle under to AMA pressure are "charlatans * * * as bad as the quacks of old." Governors who can't get the rickety Kerr-Mills law to solve the problem of medical assistance for the elderly in their States "misunderstand" the law and even might be trying to "sabotage" it. In the AMA book, everybody who is for medicare, from the President of the United States on down, is wrong and wicked, while everyone who is against it, from the AMA up or down, is on the side of the angels.

Dr. Annis spices his little pep talks with anecdotes, like this one, which he told to a group of Albany area doctors: "When I am in Chicago (the AMA's headquarters city) riding in a taxi, I wait until I see an elderly couple in a Cadillac drive by and then I ask the cabdriver if he wants to pay for their medical bills. 'No, sir,' says that cabdriver."

This probably never fails to draw chuckles at doctors' meetings from Albany to Albuquerque and it is typical of two of the lobbyist's chief techniques: Oversimplification and distortion.

In their feverish (to use a medical term) attempts to throttle medicare, the AMA spokesmen are making the serious mistake of underestimating the intelligence of the American people.

There usually are two reasonable sides to every issue (otherwise there would be no controversy) and this is true in the case of medicare. There are those who have serious reservations against it and make an intelligent case, just as there are those who make equally serious and intelligent arguments for it. When the chief tactics of one opponent consists of angry name calling, I would say its case must be very weak.

In simplified form, the medicare proposal that the AMA is fighting so vehemently involves the use of the social security system (through increased payments) to finance a program of hospitalization and nursing home care after we reach 65. The idea is that you pay the premiums (like insurance premiums) during your peak earning years and receive the benefits when you are retired. If you are covered by social security, then once you reach 65, you automatically are eligible for the medicare benefits which include hospitalization, some outpatient diagnostic services, nursing home care and some home nursing care. You would not have to beg, borrow or crawl to get these services; they would be yours without any red tape or embarrassment because you would have helped pay for them through your social security deductions when you were working. You would pay your own doctors' bills and choose your own doctors.

Under the Kerr-Mills law, you have to prove actual financial need in order to get the benefits, which puts this type of program into the "relief" class and would be comparable to social security payments being given the stigma of public welfare.

How about private insurance, you ask. Fine, but remember, the premiums would have to be paid out of your pension payments and if your pension is small—well, that's just too bad.

Governor Rockefeller and others have said that while they're for medicare, they'd like to see an amendment that would allow individuals the freedom of choosing between Federal and private health programs. This is debatable, but certainly not unreasonable.

The Governor is reported to have been so furious at Dr. Annis' sniping in Albany that he told the doctor that the AMA "is the strongest political organization in the United States, with the excepion of the two major political parties."

Mr. Rockefeller could have added that while most politicians would make poor doctors, most doctors make terrible politicians.

What Dr. Annis and his cohorts fail to take into account is that not all those who favor medicare are naive, foolish, stupid, bigoted, un-American and worse, any more than all those who are against medicare automatically are true-blue 110-percent Americans and the salt of the earth.

Medical opinion is not unanimously against medicare. I have talked with several doctors—members of the Albany County Medical Society—who have told me that they're strongly in favor of the medicare proposal but that they dare not say so publicly. As one told me: "The AMA and its local organizations make up the strongest trade union you can imagine. You've got to follow the AMA line if you want to get ahead. I've spent 7 years and most of my family's savings to become a doctor and if I

got out of line, the AMA could all but ruin me overnight."

This is one of the little anecdotes that you won't hear Dr. Annis telling during his antimedicare campaign tour around the country.

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News, Mar. 6, 1964]

ONE MORE PLUNGE INTO THE HORNET'S NEST OF MEDICARE

(By Robert G. Fichenberg)

The easiest way to start an argument these days and spark an outpouring of letters is to take a stand on pigeons, Cassius Clay, fluoridation, the Delmar Bypass, and medicare.

Leaving the first four topics aside, in today's column at least, I now fully realize why there's so much emotional heat and confusion over the issues of medicare and the Kerr-Mills law. Too few individuals really understand what these programs are all about and are supposed to accomplish.

On the basis of letters, phone calls, and in-person conversations I've had since last week's stories and columns on the antimedicare scare talks given in the Albany area by Dr. Edward A. Annis, president of the American Medical Association, it's apparent that there's an appalling amount of public misunderstanding—and just plain lack of knowledge—on this whole issue.

Here's why:

The present medicare proposals and the Federal Kerr-Mills law are entirely separate programs, based on entirely different concepts because they would meet two completely different types of need. They are related only in the sense that one could supplement the other in much the same way as major medical insurance (or so-called catastrophe insurance) supplements the Blue Cross-Blue Shield type of health insurance Even a cursory study of the two programs makes this clear.

Medicare is a form of social insurance, financed from premium payments by the beneficiaries. It is like social security and, under present proposals, would become part of the social security system.

The Kerr-Mills law is something else. It provides out-and-out public assistance—financed through general taxes—to those who are financially unable (and can prove it) to pay for their medical treatment and whose relatives are unable to help them. In other words, it's public welfare or relief.

When an AMA spokesman or any other critic of medicare suggests that we abandon the medicare concept and rely on Kerr-Mills to care for the medical-financial problems of the elderly, this is precisely like suggesting that we kill social security and advise all social security eligibles to go on relief (and let the taxpayers worry about the problem) or move in with relatives.

As even the most casual study of current medicare proposals will show, this program would provide only these services: hospitalization up to 90 days and/or nursing home care up to 180 days, home nursing care up to 240 days and all drugs used in the hospital or nursing home. There are several alternate proposals which would provide variations in options. However, this program would have no effect on doctor-patient relationships. It would not affect the patient's right to choose his own doctor. It would not pay doctors' bills. Only the patient's doctor could order his hospitalization and only he could order the patient's discharge.

Under this program, once an individual is enrolled in the social security program, he automatically would become eligible for medicare benefits when he reached 65, for he would have earned this right through the social security payments he had made during his working years. He wouldn't have to go on welfare—for this is what Kerr-Mills actually is—and prove he was "needy," any more than any social security recipient today has to take a pauper's oath to receive his monthly checks.

Where would Kerr-Mills fit into the medicare program? It could be expanded so that it could be used—like "catastrophe insurance"—when an elderly patient exhausts his medicare benefits, needs still further medical treatment and cannot afford it.

Any Federal medicare program would be uniform, of course, throughout the Nation, as social security is now. In other words, an elderly patient in Mississippi would receive the same benefits, based on the same eligibility rules, as a similar patient in New York.

This is not true at present under Kerr-Mills. Each State makes its own rules, the chief Federal requirement being that each State's financial assistance program must be uniform throughout its own welfare districts. Thus the eligibility rules and benefits vary widely from State to State and some States don't participate at all in this Federal-State program. Thus, under Kerr-Mills, our typical elderly patient would be much better off in New York State than he would, say, in Arkansas, and obviously infinitely better off than if he lived in a State that ignored the availability of Kerr-Mills funds.

However, even under New York State's liberal standards, an elderly person must meet certain requirements before he can receive Kerr-Mills "relief" type of medical care. In the case of a married couple over 65 who are seeking full benefits, their combined annual income must not exceed $2,600, their combined cash reserve must not exceed $1,300, they may not have any life insurance with a cash value higher than $500 and they may own no property other than their own home, their personal clothing and minimum household effects. All income and property in excess of these minimums must be liquidated for medical expenses. Under a sliding scale system, if the cost of essential medical care exceeds the remaining income, the applicant is considered "needy" for the difference between the two, providing that all close relatives certify and prove they are unable to provide any financial assistance.

As a public welfare system, this admittedly is outstanding, but it still is public relief. And it obviously would not help the many retired persons whose resources are considerably higher than these minimums, yet who by no means could afford the expenses of an extended illness. Medicare's the answer.

The AMA's chief argument against medicare is that it would be an "opening wedge" for socialized medicine. Let's demolish this argument quickly and briefly. First, most of the new hospital construction in this Nation couldn't have been accomplished without Federal (Hill-Burton Act) subsidies—and how many complaints of "socialized medicine" have you heard from medical people on this score? Second, while medicare primarily would provide hospitalization, the Kerr-Mills law provides for all medical services and and supplies, including the services of doctors, dentists, podiatrists and optometrists. This is where the AMA's "socialized medicine" bugaboo comes completely apart, for by any standard, Kerr-Mills is socialized medicine in its purest form, since the Government is completely involved in the whole medical treatment process—doctor, medicine, nursing, and hospitalization.

If this is so, you may ask, then why isn't the AMA concerned about Kerr-Mills? I wonder. Could it be because Kerr-Mills applies only to patients who couldn't afford to pay doctors' bills anyway?

Now back to the AMA's Dr. Annis. Before Governor Rockefeller, State Social Welfare Commissioner Wyman and several other State officials set him straight, the good doctor had told Albany audiences that the administration of Kerr-Mills in this State was "a sorry mess" (he later executed a 180-degree turn and said New York "could be proud" of its achievements) and he pointed to Texas and Kentucky, where he said the program is working just fine. One of our mailbag writers swallowed this line, unsubstantiated, and mentioned it in his letter.

Well, how does Kerr-Mills work in Kentucky, for example? If you live in Kentucky, are elderly, need medical treatment and can prove you're destitute and your kinfolk can't help you, the Bluegrass State will use Kerr-Mills Federal funds to provide a maximum of 10 days' hospitalization, but only if a doctor certifies that (a) your ailment is "acute," (b) it is an emergency and (c) there's a risk of death. Isn't that just fine and dandy? Can you imagine the frustration, humiliations, and bureaucratic redtape you'd have to endure under this program, and how little you'd get if you got it? Dr. Annis, of course, didn't go into these details when he was in Albany.

Nor did Dr. Annis publicly report how he was forced to eat his words and back down on his criticisms of New York State's programs after he had been personally chewed out by several of this State's highest officials. One official told him, in essence: "I'm shocked that a professional man of your standard would come into a sophisticated State like New York without even having gotten your facts straight or up to date and peddle this nonsense. This sort of performance only serves to add to the confusion over this issue."

What can be done, then, about the problem that results from our increasing population of elderly citizens and the soaring costs of medical care? The best solution would be a medicare program for the general elderly population, plus an expanded and nationally uniform Kerr-Mills program for those who either have exhausted their medicare benefits or have been public welfare clients from the start.

All statistical studies show that people over 65 generally have half the income of those under 65 and twice the medical needs. To say that private insurance alone can carry this load with the increasing number of elderly people having longer illness is the sheerest nonsense. For one thing, it would mean that health insurance premiums would shoot out of sight and most aged persons would be priced out of the health insurance market.

To say that an elderly person who becomes ill and can't afford his medical bills must be a drain on his children (who have their own medical bills) liquidate most of his assets or "go on relief" is the ultimate in heartless cynicism and raises many questions. One sample: What happens to the pensioner who does use all his savings and other assets—after he leaves the hospital? Is he to swallow his pride, move in with his children and be dependent on them for the rest of his life? Or does he go on welfare? Is this what the medicare critics mean by "the good old-fashioned American way"?

The AMA notwithstanding, let us fervently hope not.

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News, Feb. 27, 1964]

MEDICARE MISINFORMATION

In a whirlwind trip to the capital district, the president of the American Medical Association has made the best case yet for medicare.

Dr. Edward R. Annis attacked everyone in sight—the social welfare department, Governor Rockefeller and the State government, President Johnson, the press and virtually everyone who doesn't go right down the line with the AMA against medicare.

He made it clear that the AMA's well-financed campaign against medicare for the elderly through social security is a passionate crusade to the death—and perhaps beyond. No doubt about it.

Of Monday's promedicare editorial in the Knickerbocker News, he said: "It was filled with the usual type of drivel and misinformation that fills the liberal press of the United States."

Of those political leaders who favor medicare programs and thus come under the AMA's stern disapproval, he said they are "charlatans" and "are as bad as the quacks of old:"

But what of doctors who put together a powerful political lobby to block legislation? Here Dr. Annis becomes so righteous that it tears at your heartstrings: "Doctors do not like to enter the field of politics * * * but when you have opportunistic politicians making false promises, there is no choice."

Of New York State, he said it was doing a "sorry job" of implementing the Kerr-Mills medical care law (which includes the requirement of a degrading "means test" to determine whether and how much aid an applicant shall receive) and laid the blame squarely on Governor Rockefeller and State welfare officials.

But after he saw Governor Rockefeller and got the facts (Who is misinformed now, Dr. Annis?), he quickly calmed down and changed his tune. New York State, it turns out, leads the Nation in recipients, expenditures, scope and duration of benefits under Kerr-Mills. And the good doctor, fresh from his conference with the Governor, said the State "can be proud" of the way it uses Kerr-Mills for those who can prove financial need.

Obviously, Dr. Annis hasn't done his homework. Nor does he ever, it seems to us. In switching from facts to careless name calling, he may represent the powerful and tightly run AMA lobby, but we seriously question that the AMA represents the majority of the doctors in the United States.

And if it is liberal to want to save old people the pain and embarrassment of ill health and dependence on others, we accept the tag gladly.

We said Monday and say again: Medicare is nothing more or less than a means of setting aside money during one's productive years so that proper care will not be financially ruinous in the years when poor health is more of a likelihood and earning power is less than it once was.

Dr. Annis says we are misinformed. Just what part of this statement, Doctor, is misinformation? Or is it easier merely to rush around the country, playing fast and loose with the facts and calling names?

Pennsylvania State Senator George B. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the long public service and brilliant career of Pennsylvania State Senator George B. Stevenson was brough to a tragic close last Thursday when he suffered a fatal heart attack during the height of the flood in Lock Haven. Prior to his retirement in 1962, he had been an outstanding member of the Pennsylvania State Senate for 24 years and since retirement he had continued his interest in public affairs, serving as librarian of the Pennsylvania Senate at the time of his death.

The first of the four dams in the Susquehanna River flood control plan was built by the State of Pennsylvania, and named in honor of George B. Stevenson in recognition of his great interest and hard work in flood control planning. Without the Stevenson Dam, and the Alvin R. Bush Dam, recently completed by the U.S. Army Engineers, the damages from last week's floods would have been more disastrous in north-central Pennsylvania.

George Stevenson was a fine gentleman, a true friend, an outstanding legislator, and a leader among men. He will be sorely missed. The following editorial from the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express, Senator Stevenson's hometown newspaper, graphically expresses the love and respect in which this great statesman was held by his neighbors and fellow Pennsylvanians:

DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

When the Senate of Pennsylvania formally took leave of the late Honorable George B. Stevenson as their friend and colleague, they adopted a resolution which said:

"Such men are few and the senate can ill afford their loss. But they have earned the rest they now seek They have served long and well and in the estimation of all of us they have seved above and beyond the call of duty."

This resolution, adopted by the senate when Mr. Stevenson and Charles Mallery, of Hollidaysburg, retired from legislative duties 2 years ago, may well serve as the eulogy for Senator Stevenson whose life was one of public service and devotion to duty.

It was a sad, but significant, coincidence that Mr. Stevenson's death should occur at the time of a flood, the worst to be felt in his home community for 14 years, and a flood which have been far more severe and more damaging except for the work he, himself, had done over the past quarter of a century.

Many people in this area have worked long and hard to fight the menace of floods in the west branch but none of them will dispute the assertion that Mr. Stevenson began earlier and carried the burden longer, more willingly and more consistently and effectively, than others. He worked with everyone else in this great undertaking, and when others relaxed their efforts temporarily, he kept on with the sustained campaign to end flood losses, anxieties, and dangers. Much of the credit for what has been accomplished belongs to him, and his unflagging faith that hard work would achieve the desired goal. He was never lacking in hope, never laggard when hard work was needed.

What Mr. Stevenson did for flood control, he did likewise and with similar sustained conviction and willing effort, for other community projects and objectives. Few, indeed, are the constructive activities of this corner of Pennsylvania, toward which Mr. Stevenson did not make a contribution.

Mr. Stevenson was no prophet lacking in honor at home, but not all of his fellow citizens of central Pennsylvania, who knew how hard and how well he worked on their behalf in the State legislature, realized his stature as a Pennsylvanian. If he had been less self-effacing in his efforts in the legislature, less devoted to the public interest, and more interested in his own fame and fortune, there is little doubt that he could have been a candidate for statewide public office. He could have made himself a prospective nominee for Governor, if he had been less eager to achieve legislative victories that would benefit all of Pennsylvania and more concerned with gaining a public reputation for himself. He knew that the man who brings warring factions together and makes it possible for them to agree on a common objective must be modest and unselfish. He chose that role without hesitation and found his reward in the quiet achievement of valuable advances which have benefited the entire State.

In his own hometown of Lock Haven, Mr. Stevenson exemplified the same qualities he displayed so well in Harrisburg. As a schoolteacher, as a school director, as a postmaster, as a mayor, and as a legislator, he applied a keen intelligence, a winning personality, and a sturdy character, in the service of the community.

He was, in every good sense, a public servant, who labored for the welfare of the public rather than for personal advantage.

Few men earn such an epitaph.

King Paul of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 12, 1964, the funeral services of the King of the Hellenes, Paul I, were conducted in Athens, Greece, with heads of state from throughout the world including representatives from the United States. In Washington, D.C., at the Greek Orthodox Cathedral of Saint Sophia, a requiem mass was held at 11 a.m., conducted by the bishop of the southeast diocese of the Greek Orthodox Church and 10 Greek Orthodox priests, in the presence of the President of the United States, Justices of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, the Cabinet, Ambassadors and members of the diplomatic corps and many others. On Monday, March 9, the Senate unanimously approved a resolution extending deep sympathies to Their Majesties and the people of Greece on the passing of the late King Paul I and eulogized him for the many things he had done for his country and for world peace. King Paul I was late ruler of an honored and respected nation. I believe it fitting at this point that we make a part of the RECORD the eulogy read by the Rev. Father Tavlarides, which was in the form of the instructions given by King Paul to his son, now King Constantine, at the time he reached manhood at the age of 18.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

God has willed that you will someday reign over the Hellenes, over that glorious heroic and noble nation of ours. This outpouring of divine grace upon you constitutes a high honor as well as a weighty inheritance. From this day on you become my coworker in the effort to serve the welfare and progress of my people.

I am convinced that your love for the Greek people, equal to my infinite love for them, will fill your heart with the same happiness that it fills mine.

The Greek people, paying a price for their glorious history and suffering which is a result of their still continuing struggles for a better humanity, have not as yet had the opportunity either to make peaceful use of their potentialities, or to attain those standards of life that should be for them a just

and deserving reward. This is why you should lovingly give your all for them, and even sacrifice yourself for them.

My son, I charge you to make every effort to be a justice-loving, humble and untiring laborer of the exaltation and glory of Greece. Be ever the protector of the democratic principles of our form of government, as well as the defender of the freedom and the constitutional rights of Greece. Devote your whole life to the welfare of your country.

There is no more noble or worthwhile mission to which you can dedicate yourself. Remember always that it is more honorable for a King to undergo personal suffering himself, than to see his people and his country suffer or live in distress.

Work hard, my son, to prove yourself worthy of the Greek soldier, whom you will one day lead. As commander in chief of the Armed Forces, you must be guided and inspired by the glorious and heroic traditions of those who have defended the honor of our country; our Armed Forces must be respected by our friends and feared by our enemies—as proud representatives of a proud nation.

Be the guardian and protector of our Holy Orthodox Church. Draw your strength from and establish your power on the love and loyalty of your subjects. Heal insults and injuries through forgiveness; dissensions through unity; errors through truth; doubt through truth.

My son, I pray that you and my people may know days of glory in the noble race for culture and progress.

May the all-merciful Lord make you an instrument of peace, and may He in His loving kindness always protect Greece and you, my son.

Amphibious Power Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 28, 1964]

OCEANS KEY TO VICTORY—AMPHIBIOUS POWER ESSENTIAL

In a nuclear war there will be only losers. In a limited war, there will be winners and losers.

This neatly sums up the military situation in today's world. It was put this way by Maj. Gen. Victor Krulak, commander-designate of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force and former commander of the San Diego Marine Recruit Depot, in a talk before the San Diego Council of the Navy League of the United States.

No nation is going to commit suicide—but many certainly are going to commit aggression.

General Krulak pointed out that whenever we have been able to help our friends, communism has been halted or contained. He recalled the examples of Korea, South Vietnam, Formosa, and Lebanon.

Where the United States has not been able to help by supplies or reinforcements, such as in Tibet, Manchuria or Hungary, communism has successfully carried out aggression.

Communism will never make the fatal mistake of the big war, but will commit aggressions when and where it is safe to do so, and will promote other types of wars and revolutions to keep the sores of discontent and turmoil festering, sapping the strength and will of the United States.

We are an impatient people and the Communists figure that time is not on our side but theirs. Premier Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union, the other day told an Italian reporter he can sleep easily as far as America is concerned.

We have no aggressive intentions.

If the primary military problem in the area of our self-interest, other than to maintain a nuclear supremacy to make an atomic attack on the United States inadvisable, is that of the limited war, how are we to meet it?

Keneral Krulak believes the Navy-Marine amphibious team is the most effective, most adaptable, most mobile and most quickly usable force that can be applied along the rims of all the continents.

And the force can be applied to the degree needed, from a virtual pinprick to a nuclear bomb smash.

Power is useless if it cannot be applied. An amphibious force carries everything it needs—from bases to supplies to foot soldiers to bombs—and can be operated at sea indefinitely.

The Western alliance, and in fact all of the alliances in which the United States has become a partner, are essentially maritime packs. The oceans give us common borders.

The only way the borders across the sea can be sealed off from us is by our inability to reach them. What a tragic mistake it will be, if ever we abandon the ocean highways.

Demonstration on New York's Triborough Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Charleston Evening Post of Charleston, S.C., is one of the most outstanding and outspoken daily newspapers in this country. I have long been impressed with the editorial comments of this newspaper's able editor, Mr. Robert M. Hitt, Jr., and I have been particularly impressed with an editorial which appeared in the March 10, 1964, issue of the Charleston Evening Post. This editorial is entitled "Tearing Communities Apart," and lends further evidence to the already established fact that in the question of so-called civil rights agitation, the crux of the problem turns around whose ox is being gored. Mr. President, I wish to read this excellent editorial for the benefit of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial was read; and there being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEARING COMMUNITIES APART

"On to the bridge," somebody shouted and at 4:30 p.m., Friday, traffic on New York's Triborough Bridge was blocked by civil rights demonstrators who parked automobiles, scattered garbage and broken glass about and then sat down on the bridge with arms linked.

Policemen got to the scene and begged the Congress of Racial Equality demonstrators to get up and let traffic pass, but they refused to budge. When policemen began to remove the protesters bodily, a CORE onlooker said please don't drag them through the glass and garbage they had strewn about.

Assistant demonstrators began handing out leaflets to the irate motorists who were backed up, several lanes abreast, for a distance of 5 miles. The leaflet said:

"East River CORE is engaging in civil disobedience today to protest the unsafe and overcrowded schools in East Harlem. We regret to inconvenience people passing through our neighborhood on their way home to better sections of the city, but we are both very sorry and very angry about the way that Negro and Puerto Rican children are treated in the richest city in the wealthiest country in the world."

The thwarted motorists were not amused by the demonstrators who cared not a whit about trampling on the civil rights of thousands of New Yorkers trying to get home. Many motorists reacted to the leaflets by throwing garbage at the demonstrators.

The incident brought the wrath of the New York Times down on the demonstrators. "The reaction of the infuriated motorists * * * was an accurate indication of the hostility such perversions of the integration drive must arouse in even the most sympathetic of communities," said the Times. The New York Herald Tribune was not moved to editorial comment.

In its own peculiar way of analyzing problems, the Times urged the demonstrators to read what Prof. Oscar Handlin of Harvard has written about such carryings-on. His conclusion is that sit-ins and lie-downs and street demonstrations are just what is needed in the South, but that such tactics are self-defeating in such cities as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston.

"The battle for equality of opportunity is the common responsibility of all New Yorkers," reminds the Times. "It will not be won by tactics that tear the community apart."

It's OK to tear Southern communities apart, says the Times in effect, so for goodness' sake let's keep the demonstrations below the Mason-Dixon line.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following broadcast on March 5 by Bob White on the Life Line program is an excellent tribute to one of the greatest Americans of all history. The Members of the Congress and the people of the country, particularly our youth, will benefit from reading this great address:

A GREAT AMERICAN

More than a year ago, alone in his hotel residence in New York City, a man 83 years old sat down at his desk and began to write. To the general public he was already a figure out of the history books, seen mistily and often through the trick mirrors of prejudice and old, petty rancor. His country, to which he had dedicated a full life of splendid service, scarcely knew he was still alive. Once he had spoken of how old soldiers never die, but only fade away.

For 10 years he had been silent, watching his country sundered from its very soul by a constant sneering and scoffing at patriotism and virtue, then beginning to seek again for

what it had lost. In a wrenching irony wrought by little minds, that would have made a lesser man bitter, he had been called upon just once to serve during those 10 years; to settle a spiteful, squawking little squabble between two rival sponsors of amateur athletes. This, for the man who led the greatest last stand in American history, and won the only decisive military victory over communism in arms in the history of the West. This, it seemed, was all his country had left for him to do.

But Gen. Douglas MacArthur was and is too great a patriot to believe that. Even in the twilight of his life he could see that one way remained for him to serve. He could tell what he had done for America, and why, hoping thereby to show young Americans, in his own words, "that a country and government such as ours is worth fighting for, and dying for."

The memoirs of Gen. Douglas MacArthur will appear in print this year. It is hard to imagine a time when the need for them could be greater. For those who read them with the care and respect they deserve, they can give not only new insights into history but—far more important—a grander, more sweeping and more vividly personal appreciation of the meaning of patriotism. To convey that meaning is General MacArthur's objective in writing of his career, the history he has known and the victories he won. He should attain that objective as he has attained so many others down the corridors of time.

Here was a man who grew up breathing the very air of the greatest American epic of all: the conquest of the West. His boyhood was spent on the Army posts scattered far and wide over the High Plains in the time of the cowboy, the cattle drive, the "iron horse" and the marauding Indians that is still so familiar and beloved to almost every American. His father was an Army colonel at the age of 19, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor by leading to victory what military historians have called the most unbelievable charge in our military history—straight up an almost sheer mountainside at Missionary Ridge near Chattanooga, Tenn., to plant the American flag alone at its crest. All his life, Douglas MacArthur's sole ambition has been to serve his country in arms, to protect her against all enemies.

After showing brilliant military leadership in the First World War, Gen. Douglas MacArthur became the youngest Army Chief of Staff in our history between the two World Wars. Having thus reached the highest military post his country then had to offer him, with many of the best years of his life still ahead of him, he left the United States (after his Chief of Staff term was completed) to take charge of the new army in the Philippine Islands. Here, in the Far East, the rising power of the Japanese Empire was looming large, though all too many Americans ignored it. In the Philippines, almost on Japan's doorstep, the threat of aggression was ever present. General MacArthur built to meet it, using only the tools he had and the slight aid a niggardly War Department would give him. Long before the blow finally fell he knew, with a cold military certainty, that he could not repel it or ever turn it aside for long. While his countrymen still would not look and would not think, Gen. Douglas MacArthur had laid his plans for the last stand he knew he would have to make.

The Japanese assault came, in overwhelming numbers and military strength. Our fleet, battered and beaten, fell back from bomb-blasted Pearl Harbor to the ports of our own west coast. Everywhere in East Asia and the Pacific, Japanese arms surged forward to victory—everywhere, but in one place—a place called Bataan.

Six weeks after Pearl Harbor, Bataan was a smoke-blackened bit of land—one tiny peninsula, with the island of Corregidor—set in a ring of fire. The whole might of the Japanese Empire bore down upon it. The American people, starved for hope, looked across 5,000 enemy-ruled miles to that bit of land—and saw that the flag was still there.

An entire Japanese Army was flung back, crushed and broken, from the last defense line on Bataan. Japan had conquered the whole of the British and Dutch empires in Asia in 2 months covering thousands of miles and many vast islands and nations. Bataan Peninsula held out for 5 months; the island of Corregidor, for 6. Japanese armies used in other conquests had to be brought to the Philippines to reinforce their original armies of invasion, before the American guns were still. When at last the sun and the flag went down over Corregidor, its food and water were gone, though never its spirit. The next morning the sun rose at the Coral Sea, and on the first great American victory in the Pacific.

The last stand which Gen. Douglas MacArthur had planned and led had bridged all those terrible months between our greatest defeat and the first of our victories. When, on the President's direct order he left Bataan just before its fall, to take up a greater command elsewhere, he told the people of the Philippines whose liberty he had defended so desperately: "I shall return." And he did return, in command of one of the mightiest and most victorious military forces in all the long history of nations.

After the triumph over Japan, it was Gen. Douglas MacArthur who planned and carried out the enormously difficult task of transforming that unhappy land from a realm of berserk fury and ritual suicide into a free and prosperous country with a new-found respect for human dignity. To this day, the common people of Japan call him simply "The General"—the general of peace.

In the year 1950 the full power of a mighty Communist army, trained and equipped by the generals of Stalin, struck South Korea in the most cruel and open aggression since Hitler's. Due to uncertainty and appeasement in our foreign policy we had furnished it with little or no protection. The Communist advance, spearheaded by huge tanks, rolled southward. Again, as before Pearl Harbor, unwise cutbacks in defense spending had left us with only a thin military shell instead of a hard core of fighting capacity. The few garrison troops we still had in Japan were hardly ready for war.

Yet once the Communists had attacked, America knew they must be stopped; once, again, American called upon the first soldier of the Republic to halt them. (They callled it a "United Nations police action," and other nations sent Red Cross units and a few platoons. Ninety percent of the non-Korean blood and the death was ours, America's.) It seemed there would not be time to act before all South Korea was overrun. On the Naktong River the order came to stand or die. Americans held. The Communists were hurled back.

Almost from the beginning of the Korean war, General MacArthur was planning not only how to stop the Communist enemy but how to defeat him. His plan was an amphibious landing at Inchon, a Korean city in enemy hands which has some of the highest tides in the world. Nearly all of General MacArthur's advisers said the plan was impossible. He was sure it could be done—if he had U.S. Marines to lead the assault. For years little men had been bandying about the charge that there was bad blood between General MacArthur and the Marines. But in this, the most important battle of his life, he called upon the Marines to win it for him. They did. The Inchon landing was a total success.

Yet so near is night to the noontide, that within fewer months than it had taken him to win this victory, the First Soldier of the Republic was to taste the ingratitude of his Republic. A new enemy, Red China, entered the war, and at the highest levels in Washington it was decided that this was a war America must not win. It was hoped we would not lose; but the best we were to be allowed to hope for—and to fight for—was a stalemate. Never before in our history of contending for freedom had we set ourselves so small and so poor a goal.

"In war," Gen. Douglas MacArthur believed and later said, "there is no substitute for victory." The man who had held out alone at Bataan against the masters of half a world, and beaten a triumphant Communist army to its knees at Inchon, would not ask American boys to die for a stalemate. So he was dismissed from his post, one of the most shameful acts in all our history.

Upon his return to our shores, he was greeted with an outpouring of admiration and affection from the American people such as they rarely bestow or have bestowed upon anyone.

There will be last stands in the years to come as there have been in the years gone by; there will be splendid recoveries, and mighty returns, and the teaching of peace, and the transformation of defeat into victory. But to make sure that that the recoveries and the victories and the peace are ours, not our enemies, we must continue to breed the men who will shape them. There is no substitute for victory. But there must be substitutes, and equals, for Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he is gone from among us.

By taking heed to what made him what he was and is, by honoring with him the meaning and the greatness of America, we make it more likely that he will have his sucessors and that they will be worthy of him. That is the last service he can offer us. If we are proud to be Americans and hope to continue to be Americans, the least we can do is take full advantage of his last offering.

Beef Import Action Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by the president of the Washington State Cattlemen's Association.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE: IMPORT ACTION NEEDED NOW

Right now, today * * * The need for concerted action by the individuals and the associations of the beef cattle industry is greater than it has been for many years * * * perhaps greater than ever before.

The rising tide of foreign beef imports, heaped on top of our own record production of beef, has the American beef industry "on the ropes." We have lived for years with the normal variation in domestic beef production; this is part of the business, and although we can exercise only limited control over it, we can make periodic adjustments and over the long pull manage to make a fair living. But the essentially uncontrolled and rapidly increasing flow of foreign beef into our domestic market is something we cannot cope with. Unless we in the cattle business

band together in an all-out effort to correct the import situation at once, many of us will see the day when we won't have an adequate beef industry in this country and the Nation will be largely dependent upon foreign sources for its meat supply.

American farmers and ranchers have done a tremendous job of cutting production costs and increasing production per acre and per worker, but unless we are willing to sacrifice our high standard of living we cannot compete with countries where 2-year-old cattle can be produced for $6.50 per head. In spite of our efficiency of production, the longrun outlook for the American cowman is far from bright unless we can obtain some protection through a realistic tariff and quota formula for imported beef and beef products.

The consensus of opinion among industry leaders at the recent convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association at Memphis was that we do not desire to completely exclude foreign beef from our market—that we do not want Government subsidies to compensate for the difference in production costs that exists between Australian and New Zealand beef and our own—but that we do want a "fair shake" in our own market. This can best be done through a system of reasonable tariffs and quotas.

An agreement has been made between our Government and Australia and New Zealand which sets the amount of beef which may be shipped into this country from Australia and New Zealand at the average of the imports during 1962–63 plus a 4-percent increase each year starting in 1964 to keep the rate of imports in balance with our anticipated population increase. This will hold 1964 imports below the 1963 level, but it will not entirely alleviate the depressing effect on domestic prices for beef. This agreement was made by the Government without industry support. The American National Cattlemen's Association advocates pegging the import level at the average of the 5 years prior to, but not including 1963.

Beef and veal imports from Australia have increased from 18 million pounds of product in 1958 to 517 million pounds in 1963. Shipments of beef and veal from New Zealand to the United States have increased from 184 million pounds of product in 1958 to 244 million pounds in 1963. Australia has developed only about one-third of its beef production potential and is actively seeking new world markets since the expiration of its trade agreement with Great Britain. Probably we have seen only the beginning of the importation of Australian beef unless we are successful in securing tariff and quota protection.

Again I say there has never been a time when industrywide action and support has been so imperative. I urge everyone engaged in the cattle business to write to his Congressman and to Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON demanding their best efforts in securing tariff and quota protection against excessive beef imports. No need to cite a lot of figures or to use fancy language * * * simply tell them the high level of imports are killing the domestic beef industry and you expect them to use their influence to help correct the situation. It's fine for our county associations to write letters also, but in this case our need is for the greatest possible number of letters objecting to the current import situation and asking relief from it. A letter from every member of every livestock organization in the country is needed if we hope to protect our interest as individuals and to preserve our domestic beef industry for the good of the Nation.

Sincerely,

BOB HENSEL,
President, Washington Cattlemen's Association.

L.B.J. No Amateur in Conduct of Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues a most interesting and penetrating article about President Johnson's conduct of foreign affairs, written by John P. Leacacos in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The article follows:

CLEARING THE FOG: L.B.J. NO AMATEUR IN CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By John P. Leacacos)

WASHINGTON.—There's considerable guff going around about President Johnson and U.S. foreign policy these days that overlooks a few points the citizens of the Republic ought to bear in mind. To start with:

Don't sell L.B.J. short in his handling of foreign affairs. The President is one of the most astute political animals of our times. President Kennedy knew what he was doing when he had L.B.J. sit through with him at all the meetings of the National Security Council and above all at the "Excom" group that ran the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962.

The attacks on the President for the current crises on the world map are often partisan in the sense that any opposition tries to get as much mileage as possible out of criticizing foreign policies for which they have no responsibility. They are the snide asides of the Capital's ankle-snappers, who petulantly nip at the heels of the men in power, because they do not coincide with their own untested preconceptions. Washington, the sounding board of the country, is full of such phonies.

The events abroad which have exploded since L.B.J. took office in the main would have happened anyhow, no matter who was in the White House. The natural erosion of the status quo and the revolutionary turbulence is—and is going to continue to be—a constant factor for all American Presidents in the foreseeable future.

The President, moreover, brings a new quotient to foreign policy preparation: intimate legislative experience in the heart of Capitol Hill's power. White House aids and former congressional associates point out that after World War II a new and unprecedented element entered U.S. foreign policy. This was the direct participation of the Congress in authorizing and appropriating American resources on behalf of vast new programs—Greco-Turkish aid for the Truman doctrine, billions for the Marshall plan, more billions in armaments for NATO.

As a Senator and now as President, L.B.J. was and is an acknowledged expert on the U.S. budgetary process—what moneys are going to what objectives.

Finally, just as President Johnson inherited the power and prerequisites of the Presidency, so has he inherited its responsibilities and its problems. Panama, Castro, Vietnam are strict descendants of what the United States did or did not do under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. The expert and impartial rating on how L.B.J. handled or is handling these crises is this:

Panama.—Fast on the uptake in telephoning President Chiari of Panama right away. But L.B.J. got bogged down in messing around over the semantics of did we say we would "discuss" or "negotiate" revision of the Panama Canal treaty. The inside word is that L.B.J. listened with too open an ear to the 19th century "manifest destiny" routine of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, the Senate powerhouse from whom he must court for civil rights.

Cuba.—When Fidel Castro cut off our water at Guantanamo, L.B.J. got high marks for the way he reacted. He ordered the base made independent. He dampened down the burgeoning heat that could have inflated the issue into a storm. For that L.B.J. owed thanks to an old pro and Democratic sidekick, Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, who advised L.B.J. not to horse around with two-bit issues.

Vietnam.—This will be the hardnosed test. Vietnam has been a can of worms for years. Now the processes of history beyond our control—Red China, De Gaulle, combat fatigue of 20 years in southeast Asia—are bringing new configurations to the problem. But the President, first and last, is an activist; he is not the man to be content to let things ride. How and where we will ride will be made known in coming weeks. Suffice it to say that the Johnson reaction concerning Vietnam has been in course for the last month.

To sum it up: L.B.J. certainly has the instinct for foreign affairs—but not yet the experience from the seat of control. He was involved in lend-lease during the F.D.R. days. He helped start cultural relations with Russia to help crack open a bit that closed society. He has rescued foreign aid time after time. He did not achieve his ambition to be President to preside at the liquidation of U.S. power and prestige in the world.

Death of Frank H. Cortese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Frank Cortese, the business-realty editor of the Houston Chronicle, recently lost his life in a tragic automobile accident in Houston, Tex.

His death is a loss not only to the Chronicle and its readers but to the legions who knew Frank Cortese personally, in and out of his own profession. I am honored that he was my friend.

Frank Cortese was a credit to the journalism profession, a man of high integrity and extraordinary ability, whose byline will be missed in Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials and article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD: "Frank H. Cortese," the Houston Chronicle, February 21, 1964; "Frank Cortese," the Houston Press, February 21, 1964; "Memorial Fund Will Honor Frank Cortese," the Houston Chronicle, February 21, 1964.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 21, 1964]

FRANK H. CORTESE

The Chronicle's staff, and friends throughout the community, are saddened by the tragic death of one of our ablest news writers, Frank H. Cortese.

Mr. Cortese had been with the Chronicle since 1949, joining our staff immediately after he received his journalism degree from Ohio State University. He had done police and criminal court reporting, general assignments, and for the past several years had been business-realty editor.

The esteem in which his fellow newsmen held him was demonstrated by his election to the presidency of the Press Club of Houston for 1960–61. He was a member of the Catholic Church, the Elks Lodge, and was a past president of the Houston chapter, Ohio State alumni.

The same traffic accident also took the life of one of his closest friends, William R. Laufman, prominent young businessman who was active in civic and fraternal affairs and also is mourned by many friends.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Press, Feb. 21, 1964]

FRANK CORTESE

Frank Cortese had vim, vigor, and enthusiasm.

He was the positive thinking and acting sort who frequently would bust up a time-wasting discussion with "Let's do it now instead of talking about it."

He used these excellent qualities consistently for the past 9 years in becoming a top hand on the staff of our friendly competitor, the Houston Chronicle, as its business-real estate editor. Also in becoming a valued wheelhorse in the affairs of the Press Club of Houston which he led as its president in 1960–61.

A tragic, almost incredible accident on the Southwest Freeway which sandwiched Mr. Cortese's car between one coming up from the rear and another across the division rail from the front has cost the lives of Mr. Cortese and his friend, William Robert Laufman, young jewelry company executive.

Frank Cortese was a credit to the newspaper profession. We join his family, the folks on the Chronicle and his many other friends here and elsewhere in mourning his untimely death at 47 years of age.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 21, 1964]

MEMORIAL FUND WILL HONOR FRANK CORTESE

A Frank Cortese Memorial Fund has been established by the Press Club of Houston, in honor of the Chronicle newsman and former press club president who was killed in a car accident Wednesday night.

Harry McCleary, press club president, said a number of members had suggested the fund.

The nature of the memorial has not been decided. Club directors will make suggestions and refer them to Mrs. Cortese, who will have the final say.

Contributions may be sent to Paul Burton, club manager, made out to the Cortese-Press Club Memorial Fund.

Cortese, 46, of 5207 Spellman, and William R. Laufman, 31, of 4050 Tartan, were killed when their car was struck from behind by another on the Gulf Freeway.

A rosary for Cortese will be recited at 7:30 tonight in Earthman's Southwest Chapel, Sixth and Cedar, Bellaire.

Services will be at 11 a.m. Saturday at Corpus Christi Catholic Church, 4001 Cheena. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery.

Services for Laufman were held Thursday. Burial was in Beth Yushurun Cemetery.

What Is "Education"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, comes again Mr. Ralph Pogue, editor, the McDonald County Press, Noel, Mo., with a gem entitled "What Is 'Education'?" Early this month we asked and gained unanimous consent to reprint his editorial entitled "The Poverty of Prosperity." Now he sends along a galley proof of the editorial on education which is so perceptive and succinct that I wish for it to be made a part of the RECORD in order that all may read and learn therefrom the basic philosophy so necessary for those dealing with big educational problems, in this Congress and the world today. Never have I seen an editorial that so well clarifies the air for the "sacred cow" of education, precipitated by sputnik when it allegedly caught the United States with its educational "breeches down." How keenly he probes and how neatly he ties up the basic fact, that we are all interested—yet missed the boat—in differentiating between "instinct," "understanding," and "education." How beautifully he wraps the package, for those of us who divert our attention to wonder about basic philosophy and natural laws, in one package of appropriate quotes and basic understanding, beautifully displayed in writing. I commend this sane, down-to-earth definition and philosophy to the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as all Members of the Congress. It is from the March 12, 1963, issue of the parent publication datelined Noel, Mo.—the Christmas City:

WHAT IS "EDUCATION"?

(By Ralph Pogue)

Next perhaps to "poverty," education is the most overworked word in the American language. We speak of it as though we either had it or were about to get it, and we fancy it as our kids in modern classrooms cracking books under the long-faced, benigh scrutiny of salaried instructors.

Yes, we are all sold on education today—just so long as it doesn't interfere with the business of making money and as long as it can be controlled in every community by the elite. After all, education is essential if we are to keep up with the Communists and the Joneses; but we are certain to make it "hard to get" in its so-called higher form so that those who can most afford it will have the pick of jobs.

Our Government is "for" education. But, it is more interested in money. It insists that we send our children to institutions of "higher learning" but steadfastly refuses to grant parents tax relief for the high cost of such training.

Parents are interested in education as long as it doesn't increase taxes. Teachers are interested in education if the jobs are easy and the pay good. Educators are interested in education because the high standards it sets guarantees even the more incapable among their ranks lifelong pay. School directors are interested in education, second only to obtaining money, personal favors, and prestige. Politicians are interested if it will get them votes. Industry and Big Business is interested if it will produce better students of "sizzlemanship" to increase sales and profits for decaying stockholders.

Yes, we are all interested in education, and we all speak about it as though it were some magic formula or some mystic chant of space-age jargonese, the mastering of which entitles the cipherre to bonus take-home benefits. The responsibility, if ever there is any connected to it, always belongs to the other guy.

IT MUST BE ACQUIRED

We never seem to grasp the simple significance that education is something that cannot be given—it must be acquired. The educable (persons capable of learning) are abashed and challenged by what they don't know. Or, as Ambrose Bierce said: "Education is that which discloses to the wise and disguises from the foolish their lack of understanding." To the wise, education discloses how little they know; to the foolish, a little knowledge becomes a dangerous thing.

It seems grimly ironic that in an age which has fathomed far into the realm of like itself, we can't grasp the kinship of learning with instinct. The learning process is so deeply rooted in the stuff of life that it cannot be separated from the least particle. Formal education does not teach migratory waterfowl that they are wise to fly south for winter and north for summer. Formal education does not direct the swelling of plant buds in spring to form the most intricate patterns of the living landscape. Formal education does not direct the tired worker home for supper and the quiet fireside.

What is education? Education is direction; it is purpose; it is inspiration. It is the love of life and the quest to learn. It existed in all its profound simplicities and complexities long before it was named.

The source of wonder in this old world should be sufficient to inspire learning, and the human organism, with its highly-defined sense of wonder and reason, should be sitting in the driver's seat—not to exploit, not to conquer, but to be a part, a searching, sympathetic part of the great miracle. But, alas, this can come only through a complete reassessment of present human values.

OBLIGATION TO NATURAL LAWS

The old saying, "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say," applies aptly here. Mass education thus far is superficial in its determination to master techniques without facing up to underlying principles to which man is irrevocably obligated; and artificial in its impression that man is a controller rather than a component of nature. Superficial education feeds that insidious monster in man known as ego. True education counterbalances ego with humility at the overwhelming prospect of knowledge ever at hand. And, a step up from humility, there must come with increased knowledge the universal exercise of a moral attitude—a moral obligation to counterbalance our superior ability to reason. If such is not forthcoming, we are destined to fail. If we would become "educated" we must strive to recognize our place in creation and fulfill our inherent obligations to all that is within and about us, more directly our obligations to the ecology of our environment. In short, we must relearn and obey the laws of nature. Where the primitive obeyed by instinct, we must obey by yet an additional component—understanding.

We are committing wrong against this basic moral concept when we attempt to teach techniques without teaching the whys and wherefores and the complex interrelationships within the realm of nature. For example, to teach history without obtaining an understanding as to the transitory na-

ture of man's enterprises is to not teach history at all. Education is "purpose," and ultimately "awareness," the fulfillment of which is to be lived and not defined.

"The study of life," writes Edward Sinnott, "begins with protoplasm in the laboratory, but it can lead us out from thence to high adventure and to thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls. In the form of leaf and limb and in the beautiful coordination of their powers we see the first steps in that great progression which has long been marching upward from the first bit of living stuff toward some dim final goal, as yet but dreamed of, which the poet sings:

" 'One God, one law, one element
And one faroff divine event
To which the whole creation moves.' "

Disappointing Deal for Stockmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Farmer magazine published in St. Paul, Minn. Mr. William H. Kircher, editor, has hit the nail on the head with this editorial and I wholeheartedly agree with his conclusion that "Terms of USDA's January 17 meat importation agreement with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand undoubtedly was good news to the producers of beef, veal, and mutton in those countries, but disappointing to U.S. producers." I commend this editorial to my colleagues and to our Secretary of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISAPPOINTING DEAL FOR STOCKMEN

Terms of USDA's January 17 meat importation agreement with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand undoubtedly was good news to the producers of beef, veal, and mutton in those countries, but disappointing to U.S. producers.

Essentially, what has been agreed upon is this year's imports of beef, veal, and mutton from Australia and New Zealand will be limited to approximately the 1962–63 average level, or about 6 percent below the record level of 1963.

Also included in the agreement is that quantities specified for 1965 and 1966 are calculated at an annual U.S. market growth rate of 3.7 percent on the agreed limits for 1964. In other words, 1965 quantities may be increased 3.7 percent over 1964.

There is the following paragraph in USDA's announcement of the agreements:

"The agreements represent an important contribution to the stability of the meat industries of the three countries. U.S. domestic producers and Australian and New Zealand suppliers will be able to share equitably in the growth of the U.S. market."

To share as we have in our current market and to agree to share as our market expands, seems to us extremely generous.

In 1963, foreign producers supplied about 11 percent of the U.S. beef market. That was an increase of 20 percent more than 1962 and seven times more than 1956. Australia and New Zealand were the major foreign suppliers. In 1958, U.S. beef imports from Australia totaled only 18 million pounds. Last year, the total was 517 million pounds. Under the new agreement, the total beef, veal, and mutton Australia may export to us is 542 million pounds. New Zealand may export 231 million pounds.

Guesses as to how much foreign-produced meat has depressed U.S. beef price range as high as $4 per hundredweight. The extent of depression can't be accurately measured, but that it has had a depressing effect is not questioned even by USDA, although it was not until recently that USDA admitted the fact.

So what's to be done, now that the new agreement is in effect?

USDA insists that most of the decline in U.S. beef price was caused by heavy domestic production of fed beef. At a recent meeting of cattlemen in Fargo, N. Dak., we heard Hiram Drache, Clay County, Minn., feeder, agree with this contention. "We could solve our problem ourselves by not sending such heavy cattle to market," he said. "Those pounds beyond the 1,000-pound weights are costing more than we can sell cattle for. Counting all my production costs last year, I lost $23.71 a head on my cattle."

Whether Mr. Drache is wholly right can be argued, but there cannot be an argument about him being partly right. Therefore, in 1964 it appears that marketing at weights of not more than 1,000 pounds will be even more important to the economic health of the cattle business than it was last year.

Radio Station Broadcasts News to St. Louis Schools Each Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, that priceless source of congressional information on such a variety of subjects—mail from constituents back home—was responsible for my learning about a public service performed by a St. Louis radio station that is of immeasurable value to the community of St. Louis. The other morning I received a letter from a St. Louis public schoolteacher who commented on a newscast that quoted me at some length on the subject of the "credit addict." She said the entire class had enjoyed the broadcast. This puzzled me, because I knew that such a broadcast had been aired about 7:30 a.m., and I wondered how enough elementary school students could have heard it at that hour to make it a suitable subject of classroom discussion. Later, however, I found out that radio station KMOX prepares a special 15-minute program on the day's news, including an analysis in depth on some aspect of the news, for use by the public schools each schoolday morning.

I was most impressed and intrigued with this idea, and I proceeded to ask KMOX to tell me all about this service to the schools and students in St. Louis. And the story they told—a heartening one—could well be adopted by radio stations in other communities to the benefit of students and teachers alike.

This is the third consecutive year that piping to KSLH, the St. Louis Board of KMOX, a CBS-owned station, has been Education's FM station, a special 10-minute newscast, followed by a 5-minute analysis of a major news story, for rebroadcast to the upper elementary grades at 9 o'clock each morning.

In language particularly geared to the students, the broadcasts detail the names, places, and events in the news; and while the broadcasts are being made, many teachers use visual aids, such as maps and charts, to indicate where the news originated or what peoples and countries it involves. After the programs, teachers often go on to use the broadcasts as teaching springboards to discuss other current events, or geography, or history as it relates to the present.

I understand that the students in our sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, to whom these programs are broadcast, have become much more aware of what is happening in the world today, and that they have also become much more interested in gaining additional facts about local, State, National, and world affairs as a result of these broadcasts.

It seems to me that this project points to the many possibilities that exist in this country wherein private enterprise and public institutions within a community can work together to promote the public welfare. This service adds to the status and prestige of KMOX among St. Louis citizens, and I am sure that the board of education's initiative in providing this service to the students, through its own KSLH facilities, adds to the knowledge of thousands of St. Louis boys and girls and significantly enriches their lives.

"The Myth Makers," by Bernard D. Nossiter—A Review by Senator Paul Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine review by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] of an outstanding new book "The Myth Makers: An Essay on Power and Wealth," by Bernard D. Nossiter, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The Senator from Illinois is the outstanding economist in the Senate. He is a former president of the American Economic Association. He has written a very favorable review of the book. As an economic expert and specialist for the Washington Post, Mr. Nossiter has observed the Congress for years. He is a remarkably capable and perceptive reporter and economic expert.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENETRATING ACCOUNT GIVEN OF ECONOMIC MYTH MAKERS

(Reviewed by PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

Bernard Nossiter is a philosophical as well as an accurate and penetrating reporter. As he chronicles from day to day the economic events and decisions of our time, he seeks to expose the realities which lie behind the rationalizations and slogans which are used to justify them. In this essay, he seeks to determine just how applicable the description and ideal of "free competitive enterprise" is in our society. Until recently, the economic textbooks described the fixing of prices and the distribution of the product as being determined by atomistic processes in which each unit formed only a minute share of the total supply and therefore was unable to affect in any appreciable fashion the final results.

Nossiter correctly points out that this is a gross oversimplification. Many industries are instead dominated by three, four, or five giant concerns, each of which individually helps to regulate output and to fix prices—and which frequently have explicit or implicit price agreements with each other.

The result is that the economy is permeated with various forms of monopoly and imperfect competition which make the distribution of wealth and income and, consequently, of political and social power, far more unequal.

Nossiter has the courage to draw accurate conclusions from these facts; namely, how it is seemingly impossible to correct the basic injustices in our tax structure which favor the mighty, and how unionism does not at present provide an adequate countervailing power.

The author, in addition, demolishes the myth cultivated by the public relations men that the ethical standards of the corporate managers will furnish an adequate restraint against their acting in an antisocial fashion.

The trial over the price-fixing practices of the electrical machinery industry is an eloquent refutation of that contention. Similarly, reliance upon regulatory commissions is properly deflated by the author since these bodies all too often become controlled by the very groups whom they are charged with regulating.

Writing before President Johnson announced his war on poverty, Nossiter shows the dark side of American life behind the smiling picture of affluent suburbia. Along with Michael Harrington, Harry Caudill, Leon Keyserling, and Robert Lampman, Nossiter should help to stab the sleeping conscience of prosperous Americans fast awake.

Searching for something in which to place his hopes, Nossiter turns to noncoercive planning of the French type as offering the best hope for expanding production, diminishing unemployment, and decentralizing economic power.

France, Norway, and Japan have certainly made great progress in recent years with these methods. But whether this could be adopted in the United States where the mere mention of social planning arouses bitter and irrational opposition is indeed questionable.

The technical progress of the past two decades and the improvement in the standard of life of perhaps three-quarters of our population has had a narcotic effect upon rational self-criticism. Comfort is always the creator of an unthinking conservatism and in many ways the 1960's seem to be repeating the early 1920's.

But there are tasks enough to do if we would only tackle them, and Nossiter's book not only indicates what some of these are, but should also help to arouse the will to labor at them. Let us hope that we do not experience the rude awakening which burst upon us with almost apocalyptic thunder in October 1929.

Salute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1964, my good friend and esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative JOHN M. MURPHY, was honored at a "salute to St. Patrick" at the National Democratic Club in New York City. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY AT THE "SALUTE TO ST. PATRICK" NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1964

With President Johnson addressing the annual St. Patrick's Day party in Washington this year, a dual purpose was accomplished. The first was Washington's annual salute to St. Patrick; the second a fitting forum for an address to the committee by President Johnson. The Democratic congressional campaign committee scheduled this dinner 2 days late not realizing that it would now fall on St. Joseph's Day, so at the outset tonight, it is appropriate that I quote from an ancient Roman. It was all of 2,000 years ago that Cato the Elder sagely said: "The Celts devote themselves mainly to two things: Fighting and talking." Now I don't know if Cato was the noblest Roman of them all, but the old boy had to be one of the smartest. Yet, he neglected to mention one thing: The Irish will fight with or for almost anybody, but their talking is chiefly about their land.

But on this glorious day so close to St. Patrick's can we not be forgiven for dwelling upon Ireland just a bit? It has been said that blessed is he who tooteth his own horn; if so, we Irish are thrice blessed. Anyway, I'm not like one of our notable countrymen, writer and scholar George Moore, who once said that his only claim to originality among Irishmen was that he never made a speech. I have made a number, and, if the voters are willing, I hope to make a lot more. I realize, of course, that on this night I am under a terrific handicap: This being almost an all-Irish gathering, everybody will be talking and nobody will be listening.

Nonetheless, I am a politician and determined to talk if it kills all of you. Some of what I say will be enlightening, I hope. Some will be inspiring, I further hope. Some will be entertaining, I hope still further. If I strike out on all three counts, I will be allowed to go back to Washington and do penance by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from cover to cover each day for a month. And that, gentlemen, is penance.

In the weeks since that black day last November 22, I have thought many times of our late and beloved President's most quoted statement, and one that will live in our history: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." At the time it was made, this was a challenge, a call for the future. It still is, of course, yet I have thought of it also in terms of the past, and in terms of the Irish. As we all know so well, this country has been the saving of the Irish—and this in a literal sense—both as a race and as a nation.

It is common knowledge that during the Irish potato famine the population of Ireland dropped from 8 to 6 million people in a 2-year period; that the Irish were totally illiterate due to a 100-year restriction of no Irishman being able to read or write—imposed by the British. They owned no land and paid rent to British landlords and had such small plots of land that a small potato harvest, a mud shack, and maybe a pig and two or three chickens represented their entire stake in life. The Irish came to this country and were given hope for a decent life and if not for themselves, at least for their children, the opportunity to work.

Well now, what is the other side of the coin? What have we Irish done for this country? Have we paid something on account on this enormous debt we owe? As one of our own was fond of saying, Let's look at the record:

Oddly, even the Irish tend to date their participtaion in the affairs of this country from the years immediately following the great famine. True, better than a million and a half Irish emigrated in the decade after 1845, mostly to New York and Boston, and millions more followed them up to the early 1900's—so many that there was a saying, "The Statue of Liberty was sculpted by an Italian and donated by the French to welcome the Irish to the Dutch city of New York."

But the Irish were here nearly from the start. It is known that some Irish and Scotch settled along the Merrimack River as early as 1634, and in 1654 the ship *Good Fellow* arrived in Boston with 400-odd Irishmen—and even as early as that the Irish were accused of trying to take over the country. They were being accused of it as late as 1960 also.

The part of the Irish in the American Revolution has, for reasons unknown, received little attention. Historically, the Revolution has remained almost the exclusive property of the English-descended American. Yet this is by no means justified. The Irish have a very solid claim to a share in that fight. How could history ignore the propensity of the Irish for a rebellion, particularly against the Sassenach? In the general population of the Colonies, the feeling was pretty well divided, Tory and Rebel, but among the Irish, who were especially numerous in Pennsylvania, the sympathy was Rebel to a man. In the Irish Parliament, to which only members of the Church of Ireland could belong, one legislator replied to a Crown question on sympathy with the Americans by saying: "Where Irish hearts are, their hands are also."

At that time, some 35,000 Irish were arriving on these shores annually, and a good many got here just in time to pick up a musket in anger against the minions of bullheaded George III.

Some estimates say that fully a third of Washington's troops were Irish, old or new generation, and out of 731 foreign born in the Pennsylvania Line of Ireland Regiment, 361 hailed from the "ould" sod. And to anyone who might say, "True, perhaps, but no doubt they were all privates," you can firmly point out that 16 of Washington's general officers were Irishmen, most of them members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, an open-handed group which donated the then enormous sum of 150,000 pounds to the Revolutionary cause. And among the illustrious Sons of St. Patrick in those brave days were John Barry, generally called the father of the U.S. Navy, and Gen. Mad Anthony Wayne, a broth of a boy and a fighter beyond compare. And let me here inject a word for the Kellys—are there any Kellys in the house?—who, I must say, led all the rest of the Revolution's muster rolls with 695 stalwart souls.

And what about the Sullivans, a proud clan to be sure? Well, five of them were officers in Washington's army, one—John Sullivan, wrote that part of the Declaration of Independence listing the wrongs of the British, and among them were a future Governor,

judge, and attorney general of New Hampshire, and a future Governor of Massachusetts. Incidentally, three Irish-born Americans; namely, James Smith, Matthew Thornton, and George Taylor, were signers of the Declaration of Independence. Naturally, I could go on about the deeds of the clan Murphy also, but modesty forbids me.

But being that contradiction in terms, an honest politician, I will add that not every page in the Irish chapters of the Revolution was one of glory. In all candor, the Pennsylvania Line Regiment did engage in a bit of a donnybrook with the authorities, provoked by what was then called barrel fever. They rebelled against their officers, but not against the Government. The British heard about it, and being British, concluded to capitalize on the Irish disaffection in the ranks. So, they sent two emissaries into the rebel camp with a suggestion that they go over to the British. The Irish promptly hanged them as spies. (Somehow, the English never, never understood the Irish.) And, their frustrations happily removed, returned vigorously to the fray.

Nor should we overlook the contributions of two unsung heroes of Irish extraction, Patrick O'Flynn, of Wilmington, Del., and Hercules Mulligan—now there's a name for you—of New York. Patrick was a captain in Washington's army and afterwards a tavernkeeper in the manner of tavernkeepers of every era. He became a confidante of the first President, who was not averse to a dram or two on a wintry night. Hercules Mulligan was Washington's confidential agent, and in 1781 furnished a tip that helped prevent the general's capture by the British on a trip to Newport.

In the early years of this Republic, the Irish were on every level of society—in the professions, in business, and in agriculture, and in one notable instance, in inventive science. It was the son of poor Irish parents, Robert Fulton, who astonished all New York back in 1807 by setting forth on the Hudson River in a steamboat that sped along at the frightening rate of 5 miles per hour. There were slurs at the time that, of course, the Irish invented the steamboat—because they so abhored undiluted water that they wished to cross it in the least possible time. (English spite, undoubtedly, but it is a criticism that has been leveled at the Irish for these many years.)

Tis true the Irish will take a drink now and then, but only if they are alone or with somebody—and then solely for medicinal purposes. As Mark Twain once said, "Give an Irishman lager for a month and he's a dead man. An Irishman is lined with copper, and beer corrodes it. But whisky polishes the copper and is the saving of him." Nothing like going home with a high polish, either. (And there was the proper Irish lady who was asked at customs if she had anything to declare. "Nivir a bit" said she. "Then, old girl," demanded the customs inspector, "just what's in this bottle?" "Holy water," she said, "and bad cess to ye." "Holy water, eh?" sneered the inspector, sniffing the contents. "Why this is whisky." "Faith, an' it's a miracle," cried the lady.

Of course many people overlook the fact that the Irish took the whisky because their wages included whisky as part of the payment. This was all included in the labor contractors' scheme to keep the Irish in subservience. The abject poverty in which they lived also made whisky a way of helping the dreary living conditions and a future which to them seemed nonexistent. It also was a solace for a man who worked 17 hours to soothe his aching muscles with a drink or two of the hard stuff.

And there's truth too in the old Irish adage that drink is the good man's vice: some of the more notable tyrants of history—Cromwell and Hitler are two that come to mind, were teetotalers. An Irishman's instinct tells him never to trust a man who'll not take a social drink; and, as we all know, an Irishman's instinct is well-nigh infallible in all important matters.

The Irish affinity to politics, of course, is closely associated with the name Tammany Hall. It seems incongruous that Tammany Hall and New York City were dead set against the Irish in the early 1800's, however, after Gov. De Witt Clinton, of New York, realized it was the Irish affinity for hard work that made it possible for him to build his canal, and further realizing that a drastic change had to be made in the voting eligibility requirements to make this a truly great America, he initiated the movement to bring the Irish immigrants into the Democratic Party. At the outset the Irish were not eligible to vote because of the requirement that a voter be a landowner and also have 14 years' residence in this country. Tammany changed this and made the Irishman of the streets an eligible voter.

The swift and total identity of the Irish with America was marked by many and marveled at, particularly by the Englishmen. One, a J. Kent, who traveled here just after the Revolution, had this to say: "An Irishman, the instant he sets foot on American ground, becomes ipso facto an American; this was uniformly the case during the whole of the late war. Whilst Englishmen and Scotsmen were regarded with jealousy and distrust, even with the best recommendation of zeal and attachment to the cause, a native of Ireland stood in need of no other certificate than his brogue—indeed. Their conduct in the late revolution amply justified this favorable opinion, for whilst the Irish emigrant was fighting the battles of America by sea and land, the Irish merchants—labored—to increase the wealth and maintain the credit of the country."

By the time of the Civil War the Irish were not only established in America but in some parts of it, notably in the cities of the North and East, they were becoming a power. New York, of course, was and is the capital of the Irish in the United States, with Boston perhaps a close second and Chicago running third. But contrary to popular belief there were many Irish in the South even before the Civil War, principally in New Orleans, Mobile, Galveston, Savannah, and Charleston. Quite a number of them were wealthy and, as improbable as it seems in the light of Irish history, they were represented among the slaveholding class in coastal Maryland, South Carolina, and Georgia. This can be explained by pointing out that the position of the Catholic Church then was that slavery was a natural disaster, akin to war and pestilence and beyond human ability to eradicate wholly. However, in 1839 Pope Gregory declared slavery as being immoral.

Thus was it that in the South, as well as in the North, the Irish flocked to the colors when the cannon boomed at Sumter. There were upwards of 400,000 in the Union Army, some 85,000 in the Confederate. And among them were figures who will always live in American history—Phil Sheridan, the peerless cavalry leader who conquered the Shenandoah Valley for the North; George G. Meade, victor at Gettysburg; Thomas Francis Meagher, the exiled Irish patriot who led the Union's famous Irish Brigade, and the war's most colorful general, the incomparable Phil Kearny, who, in the opinion of high southern officers, whould have won the war early for the North had it not been for his untimely death.

Kearny, I might add, was the very epitome of the Irish hero—brave to an incredible degree, as handsome as he was dashing, a scholar of high attainment, a noted wit, and something of a poet. Quite a man with the ladies, too. The town of Kearny, N.J., is named after him and it is a shame that some of our Irish historical societies haven't done more to keep his name alive.

The Irish attitude toward war is neatly summed up in an incident that involved Stonewall Jackson, a very flinty type, and one of his subordinate commanders, General Taylor, son of old Zachary Taylor. Taylor, a Louisianian, reported to Jackson one day with his troops, among whom were a bunch of pellmell New Orleans Irishmen. Their discipline in camp left something to be desired; namely, discipline, and Stonewall was unimpressed. "Rather frivolous fellows for serious work," he grunted. Next day after the Hibernians distinguished themselves when the shooting started, Stonewall sought out Taylor. "I was wrong," he grunted, and rode off.

"The mad gaels of Ireland
Are a race that God made mad
For all their wars are merry
And all their songs are sad."
—C. K. CHESTERTON.

Really, however, the role of the Irish in American military history needs no reciting; it is inscribed on thousands of monuments, in cemeteries across this wide country as well as in foreign lands. Nor do I need to dwell on the Irish preeminence in the clergy, their lustrous part in the professions, particularly in the law, their contribution to letters and to education, and their bent for business. Irish success in these fields has already been acclaimed.

The Irish have always been known for their religiousness and I don't want to confuse this with devoutness. The Irish record in politics and in business has always been characterized by the purest of motives. However, the Irish devotion to God and gift of faith has been the greatest factor in bringing him through the great suffering that he was subjected to, both in his native land and this one. The story of the Molly Maguires in the Pennsylvania coalfields who righted the slave conditions and injustices to not only the Irish but to the English, Welch and Germans, is a controversial page in American history. True, the Molly Maguires murdered some company men, but it was through their efforts that minimum wages, decent working hours and safe conditions in the mines and factories emanated.

But to me, the greatest contribution we Irish have made to America is in politics. Over the years the profession, or art, of politics has been derided, unjustly, in my opinion. Politics is the management of public affairs, and the only alternative to it is anarchy. To be a successful practitioner requires flexibility, compassion, a genuine liking for people and an understanding of their imperfections, all qualities that go into the Irish character. From the start, it was apparent that the American system of politics was tailored to the Irish and they to it.

Basically, politics is people, and the Irish have a winning way with people, as even their enemies will agree.

The Irish soon discovered that, on election day, one man was every bit as good as another and maybe even a little bit better. The thoughtful among them realized, particularly during the big waves of immigration, when anti-Irish feeling ran high, that only by participation in politics could the opportunity for self-improvement be obtained. They knew, too, that commiserating among themselves was self-defeating. The signs that read "No Irish Need Apply" would not be taken down for the asking nor would the stereotype of the comic Irishman vanish unless a truer image supplanted it. So, these politicians went to work in the wards, persuading, cajoling, and on occasion, using a little muscle to get out the vote.

From the first the Irish were attracted to the Democratic Party, the party of the people from Andrew Jackson's day to this—and I like to think that, in large measure, they are the Democratic Party. No other ethnic group in this country has remained as steadfastly loyal to it for so long. Others have joined for

a time, then drifted away when the candidate or a particular stand was not to their liking. However, in 1920 Irish sentiment in this country ran so high against Woodrow Wilson because of his refusal to assist Ireland in her independence movement from Great Britain, particularly the bloodshed of the Irish War of Independence of 1916, that the Irish voted unanimously for a Republican President, Warren G. Harding, to the overwhelming defeat of James M. Cox, of Ohio. The British realized the American sentiments expressed in this election and in 1921 set Ireland free.

Nor have the bulk of the Irish been deluded by the spurious logic of the "best man" argument. They vote for principle, not personality; for people, not private interests.

In the framework of the Democratic Party the Irish swiftly challenged the old-line Republican power structure and, over the years, began to make their influence felt. It was a struggle, there were discouraging setbacks, and at times it seemed as if the task was hopeless. But as Irish names began to appear on the ballots in important elections, the mass of the Irish began to lift their heads in new self-respect. If it could be done in politics, it could be done in other fields, and now they had friends in fairly high places to help them fight the battle. The Irish could apply.

Today, we seldom think of the time when the Irish were the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. The ditchdigger's shovel has been forgotten; some of the Irish have so far forgotten it that they are Republicans. Most think the battle for recognition was won long ago. In fact, it was not. One door remained closed to the Irish, and even they felt it might never open. Again, it was the politician, often damned, seldom appreciated, who eyed the door from the standpoint of the possible.

The young, vigorous man who chose to storm this door was told that he was facing certain defeat, that he was stirring up prejudice dormant for decades, that he was chancing the destruction of his party. His instinct told him the cassandras were wrong. With charm, wit, disarming candor, and a masterful grasp of practical politics, the heritage of those ward-pounding pioneers of a century ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy removed from the White House the last sign that read: "No Irish Need Apply."

In removing it, he dramatized, to my mind, the coming of age of both this country and the Irish in it. He was the symbol of the immigrant—a symbol not exclusively reserved for the Irish.

I think that Leonard Patrick O'Connor Wibberley in a summation of his book, "The Coming of the Green," tells us the Irish contribution not only to America, but to the world:

"The Irish immigrants did what every foreign group must do to win the name American. They fought with an unrelenting courage in the economic, political, and military battles of the country. They would not give an inch. They were despised and rejected and discriminated against, but they did not make this an occasion for wailing, but only fought the harder.

"They did not desert their faith, once so unpopular, in order to gain acceptance. Nor did they forget their homeland, for though they believed that freedom began with the American coastline, they saw no reason why it should also end there. They voted in the United States with an eye to the effect on the freedom of Ireland, and in so doing they broadened the scope of American political thinking.

"The slums did not hold them. The mines did not break them. They were not lost building roads and canals in the wilderness. They were not defeated at the foot of Marye's Heights.

"It was a grand battle, indeed."

Reading Unreadiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, many civic leaders have not yet got over their shock at the realization that millions of our unemployed men and women cannot read or write sufficiently to hold down a job in this technological age. A very high percentage of them are youths between 16 and 21—many of them school dropouts. It is therefore even more shocking to discover that a great deal of the trouble starts in the very lowest grades of elementary school, where children especially from underprivileged groups are just not prepared by their home background for the entering school level. The local school authorities seemingly just do not have the resources necessary for a full scale attack on this grave problem. Federal assistance is required and the time has arrived when the Congress must face up to this issue no matter what other complicating issues are raised at the same time. There is a clear-cut need here that is urgent and should be taken care of at this session.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Warren G. Cutts, specialist for reading, U.S. Office of Education, entitled "Reading Unreadiness in the Underprivileged," which appeared in the NEA Journal, April 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READING UNREADINESS IN THE UNDERPRIVILEGED

Huh?—unh-hunh—nuttin—naw—wuh?—'cuz—unh-unh—sho!

Is this a readiness-for-reading vocabulary? Definitely not. Yet, unfortunately, these "words," with variations for emphasis and inflection—plus a few other one-word sentences and a generous sprinkling of vulgarities—comprise the speaking vocabularies of many culturally disadvantaged first graders. These and other strange noises that take the place of standard American English reflect the impoverished language background of these children.

Although listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills are only a part of the needs characteristic of language-handicapped children, they are a vital part. Without mastering communication skills, culturally disadvantaged youngsters can never unlock the doors that lead to useful, productive citizenship; they can never become first-class citizens.

The above is not to say that culturally disadvantaged children cannot communicate with each other. Some of them have developed "scat" language to a rather high level of fluency. Nonetheless, this scat talk does not belong to the worlds of books or of business—worlds which are foreign to these children. Thus, teachers need to approach English language instruction for these children as if they were teaching a foreign language.

The foreign language approach might be coupled with one used successfully by some teachers. They have used the analogy of work clothes, play clothes, and Sunday clothes to convey the concept to their pupils of a different language for a different purpose. Different occasions call for different modes of dress, they explain, and the same thing is true of language.

As inconceivable as it seems, some teachers expect mastery of reading and writing skills by children who reveal gross deficiencies in listening and speaking.

Obviously, children who lack readiness for reading in terms of their oral language development and background of experience must have a prolonged readiness program either in school or before they enter school. Six-year-olds who cannot talk coherently can scarcely be expected to begin reading as soon as they enter school.

Children whose language is limited to grunts and crudities need extensive experiences before they are ready for any formalized reading instruction.

If these children are to master the basic language skills of listening and speaking, they must have a wider range of experiences—both real and vicarious—than their more fortunate counterparts.

Such experiences should include listening to stories told or read by the teacher; taking field trips to parks, farms, zoos, airports, fire stations, and other points of interest; using and listening to tape recorders; hearing records; and seeing movies and filmstrips. In all these activities, the main objective is to provide pupils with opportunities for language experience. They must, therefore, have plenty of time to react to and talk about the things they have seen and heard.

Teacher attitude is extremely important in helping disadvantaged children. The teacher needs to realize that vocabulary and language concepts develop slowly. He must learn to accept each child as he is and to respect him as an individual. He must take nothing for granted and carefully check all his assumptions concerning the child and the child's experiences.

For example, the teacher should not assume that children are familiar with points of interest in their own cities or, indeed, within their immediate neighborhoods. Many culturally deprived children have extremely limited horizons; many have never traveled more than two blocks from home before entering school.

That children learn largely through imitation suggests another important consideration for the schools: Culturally disadvantaged children cannot be kept out of the educational mainstream without perpetuating the inadequacies that set them apart in the first place. Although culturally disadvantaged children generally cannot progress as rapidly as other children, they must have an opportunity to associate with them. (For the sake of overall progress, however, probably no more than four or five disadvantaged children should be assigned to any one classroom.)

Whatever the school's approach, something must be done to overcome the handicaps resulting from cultural deprivation, particularly as it affects readiness for reading instruction. Otherwise, American teachers and administrators must be prepared to answer for the failure of an ever-increasing number of children to master the necessary skills of communication.

If the schools are to help the culturally deprived, I believe that a radical departure from typical educational procedures and instructional techniques is needed. One such innovation might be to reach down into the preschool years to provide these children with some of the experiences which other children typically have had before coming to school.

Such experiences might be arranged through special nursery schools and day camps. Adaptations might be made, for example, from the all day neighborhood schools program of New York City.

Day camps and nursery schools can also provide an opportunity for teachers and

others to work cooperatively with parents. This is important, for if parents are not brought into the program and shown how they can supplement the school's work, teachers and parents of culturally disadvantaged children may foster concepts that are diametrically opposed to one another.

Of course, all of this would call for a larger staff and for a greater expenditure of money than at present.

More and more educators are recognizing the importance of working with culturally disadvantaged children during the early formative years. School systems such as those of Dearborn, Mich., and Quincy, Ill., are now shifting emphasis from the junior high and high school to kindergarten and first grade. This shift is long overdue and should be extended downward until it reaches into the preschool years.

Culturally disadvantaged children must be helped to accept themselves and to realize, at the same time, that different kinds of language are appropriate as situations vary. They must come to understand that without better language mastery they cannot hope to bridge the gap which lies between themselves and profitable occupations—between second-class and first-class citizenship.

Culturally disadvantaged children have much to contribute to society. Many of them are talented in music, in art, in athletics, and in other fields, but few of them have had the opportunity to reveal these talents. Most of them must depend primarily upon the school as the socializing force that can help them to find their places as contributing American citizens.

School and preschool enrichment programs may never be able to compensate fully for deficiencies in the experience and training provided by the home. Nevertheless, such programs can go a long way toward overcoming the handicap of a poor start, and without such enrichment, culturally disadvantaged children are certain to show irreparable gaps in their learning and to fall hopelessly behind the rest of society.

Medicare: For Those Who Can Least Afford the High Cost of Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the Congress will take action during this session on the King-Anderson bill to provide medical care for the aged through the social security system.

Radio station WMCA in New York City is to be commended for the following statement of editorial opinion supporting medicare, which was broadcast on February 18 and 19, 1964:

MEDICARE No. 2

If there's any group of Americans who can least afford the high cost of hospital care it's the very old. And yet it's older people who are most apt to need this care.

That's the plain and simple reason for a medical care for the aged program financed under social security. The program was proposed by the late President Kennedy. Now President Johnson has called on Congress once again to enact it.

The program, called medicare, would cost a worker $1 a month until he's 65. After he's reached that age, it would offer protection against the crushing expense of hospital care.

A majority of Americans support the program. Congress has delayed far too long in passing this measure for the security and the dignity of old age in America.

Representative Wilson's War With the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL W. RICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1964, there appeared in the Indianapolis Times an article by John V. Wilson, Times Washington bureau. In this article Mr. Wilson showed such a remarkable understanding of the work the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman EARL WILSON, has been doing and the problems with which he has been confronted, I wish to include it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It is obvious to all of us that our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman EARL WILSON, must have spent many hours in documenting the evidence he has presented to this body. No doubt many millions of the taxpayers' dollars are being saved by his efforts. The article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE EARL WILSON'S WAR WITH PENTAGON

(By John V. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—From Capitol Hill, Hoosier Congressman EARL WILSON is storming the ramparts on the huge military-defense industry establishment.

His target is the $13.7 billion annual spending by Pentagon brass hats for what they call military hardware—from paper clips to supersonic bombers.

WILSON's private war on wasteful spending has been going on for more than a decade, but the peppery Bedford Republican has stepped up the offensive in the last year.

When WILSON strides to a House microphone to "expose" a new "polecat in the woodpile"—his favorite expression—military purchasing officials duck.

WILSON, a Congressman for 21 years, has made scores of speeches on his favorite subject, filling page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and earning himself many headlines.

The one-man onslaught has brought him plaudits from fellow Congressmen and taxpayers across the country.

To his critics, though, WILSON is viewed as a grandstander seeking a personal build-up and one who is trying to take credit for Defense Department and congressional economy efforts.

This winter, WILSON uncorked a series of 13 "case histories" of hanky-panky in military buying.

Now, after a short breather, he has another 19 ready to go. You'll be reading about them in the days to come.

How did the onetime high school principal at Vallonia (Jackson County) become a controversial investigator?

It all began, WILSON recalls, when a Seymour manufacturer complained to him about 1947 that he had lost a bid on plastic bags for surplus war material.

"It aroused my curiosity," WILSON says. "We found bids being rigged so as to favor a particular bidder. Later, the man responsible was sent to prison for 5 years."

Since then, WILSON says, tips have poured in and he has become a regular reader of military shopping lists.

He frankly admits his tipsters include disgruntled bidders as well as "insiders" in the Military Establishment.

His informants, WILSON says, include "at least 50 good, dedicated, patriotic civil service" employees who "don't like what they see going on."

WILSON says he protects their identity to keep them from being fired.

Once he gets what he considers a good tip, WILSON turns it over to his staff of three "investigators."

They include his administrative assistant, Phil Cole, and two unpaid "volunteer experts." WILSON refuses to identify them other than as "outside technical experts."

He estimates they spend 100 hours a week checking on questionable military contracts, while he devotes 20 hours a week to the crusade himself.

WILSON fires off letters to military commanders demanding answers and records. He says he may also call in the Justice Department and the General Accounting Office.

Over the years, WILSON says he has tracked down more than 1,000 cases of wasteful spending and has "never drawn a blank" in his investigations.

"Time and facilities will only permit us to go into the most outstanding cases," he remarks.

One of WILSON's inside tips sent him poking in a Navy cupboard which he found far from bare.

For an office of some 100 employees, WILSON told the House he counted 2,710 boxes of paper clips, 3,000 staple removers, 3,888 ball-point pens and a 3-year supply of stationery, among other things.

He branded what he saw "one of the most flagrant examples of overstocking and waste that I have seen in my 21 years in Congress."

WILSON has made his most hay, though, in denouncing "sole source" contracts, the award of contracts without competitive bids.

He takes particular glee in reporting how costs drop when a military service takes competitive bids on items once bought from a sole-source supplier.

A recent example related by WILSON was the Navy's purchase of rocket launchers and a power supply.

After he questioned a sole-source order, WILSON insists, the Navy changed to competitive bidding, lowering the unit price from $6,500 to $1,993.

What has this David accomplished in his slingshot attack on the military Goliath?

In dollars and cents, WILSON is credited with inducing the House to cut $10 million from the defense budget last year.

Last June, WILSON pointed out to the House that the unit price of a walkie-talkie radio set dropped from $2,278 to $843 with competitive bidding. But the budget figures were still based on the higher price.

The next day, the House trimmed the Pentagon's electronic procurement request.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara contended that WILSON's speech came "after the fact, after we made the $10 million savings * * * which was known to the Appropriations Committee."

However, Representative GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, told the House, "I commend the gentleman from Indiana for his alertness in this important matter. It will be quite helpful."

And Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, of Iowa, also complimented WILSON on the work he "has been doing all during this session in going into the affairs of the military insofar as procurement is concerned."

"Some of the things that he has ferreted out are shocking to say the least," JENSEN added.

WILSON says his campaign has at least produced "a greater concept of competitive bidding, causing them to stop, look, and listen."

To back up his efforts, WILSON has introduced two bills to create a congressional watchdog committee over military purchasing and to give the General Accounting Office the final say on whether a sole-source contract may be awarded.

Both bills are still in committee.

Meanwhile, WILSON vows to "keep on exposing" military waste.

"I hope the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Defense Department will eventually realize there are a lot of rotten apples in the barrel and it is their responsibility to pluck those rotten apples out," he says.

The Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program will shortly come before this body for consideration, and it is therefore important that we understand the long-range benefits of this program insofar as our unemployed in economically depressed areas are concerned, as well as the benefits which this program has afforded our food and agricultural objectives.

The district which I have the high honor to represent in the Congress—the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia—contains two counties in which pilot food stamp projects are now being operated—McDowell and Mingo Counties. The purpose of these experimental pilot projects was to test the effectiveness of such an approach in providing additional nutrition to those who are in need, and in paving the way for substantial improvements in official efforts to make more effective use of our productive capacity in agriculture.

Under the food stamp program, Mr. Speaker, certified needy families exchange the amount of money they normally could be expected to spend for food for food coupons of a higher monetary value. The difference between the amount the families pay and the value of the coupons they receive represents the Federal contribution in bonus coupons.

Participating families use the food coupons to purchase food out of regular commercial supplies at retail food stores approved to accept such coupons. Any food, except for a few imported items, may be purchased with those food stamp coupons. Retail grocers redeem the coupons through the facilities of our commercial banking system.

Now, then, what has been our overall experience with the food stamp program? The record is worth accounting:

A special survey of the dollar volume of retail food store sales was undertaken in all eight pilot areas before and after the inauguration of the pilot projects. Following the start of these projects, sales in the survey stores increased by 8 percent, after adjustment for seasonal factors. The survey also indicated that the smaller retail stores were able to attract a reasonable proportion of the food coupon business.

A study of household food consumption in two of the pilot areas showed that families participating in the food stamp program made significant increases in food purchases and in total value of food used since the inauguration of the pilot projects. In the two areas, 85 and 95 percent of the free coupons represented increased food expenditures, with animal products and fruits and vegetables accounting for more than 80 percent of the gains in the value of food consumed.

Based on the survey results, Mr. Speaker, one can make the following evaluation of the food stamp program with reasonable certainty:

First. That the program is effective in improving and maintaining the diets of participating families—often far above the level of diet provided through the issuance of bulk commodities.

Second. That the additional food purchasing power generated by a universal or nationwide program could provide general support to the domestic demand for food and, therefore, act to bolster farm income. Certainly, an expanded program could be expected to result in an increase in the volume of food marketed through commercial channels.

In McDowell and Mingo Counties, W. Va.—areas of longtime substantial and chronic unemployment, typical of coal mining areas in the Appalachian range—the food stamp program has meant a continuing toehold on life, a program of hope for those who are participating in it.

In both of these counties, Mr. Speaker, meat sales rose almost 12 percent, sales of produce by 13 percent, and sales of groceries by almost 6 percent—and these gains were made despite the fact that there was no substantial change in the general economy of the areas, except that in McDowell County employment dropped an additional 2 percent.

In McDowell County, from May 29, 1961, when the food stamp program was first put into effect, through January 31, 1964, the value of food coupons issued amounted to $6,380,508. In Mingo County, where the program was begun on November 1, 1962, the value of food coupons issued through January 31, 1964, amounted to $1,715,485.

As of January of this year, there were 9,651 participants in the food stamp program in McDowell County, and 7,798 participants in the program in Mingo County.

The surplus food program has been a vital sustainer of life to the unemployed and underemployed who have had to avail themselves of this kind of Government beneficence. But this program is essentially one of powdered eggs, powdered milk, lard, beans, and flour.

Under the food stamp program, the coupon user has been able to purchase meat, fresh fruit and vegetables, fresh eggs, fresh milk, and a wide variety of packaged staple foods. And all of this has meant more wholesome diets for adults as well as for children.

When we improve the diets of needy families, we help to maintain morale and we afford thousands of children the opportunity to grow up as sturdy Americans while they pursue an education and prepare themselves for their futures as adults.

The food stamp program must be continued and expanded. It should be afforded to all counties where unemployment is greater than 6.5 percent of the labor force for more than 3 months out of the past 6 months. I do not think that we have any wholly suitable alternative if this affluent Nation is to extend the benefits of its great agricultural capabilities to its own needy people.

Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the young people of America are becoming better and better informed and more and more concerned about vital public issues. Recently, I learned that Mr. C. Fred Bateman's fifth-period history class at Robert E. Lee Junior High School in Lynchburg, Va., were studying proposals for changes in the electoral college system.

I asked the numbers of the class at the conclusion of their study to digest their recommendations and send them to me. The following is a verbatim quotation which I most warmly commend for its brevity and clarity:

Our suggestions for change are very simple: Involved is not a redistribution of electors, or an alteration of the number of electors; the same number of electors will be kept by each State. Our idea is to assign one elector to each district in each State. Since the number of electors is equal to the number of congressional distr·ts plus two, why not have the electors chosen by the people of each district?

For instance, in the State of Virginia if the Republican Party wins 6 out of the 10 districts, 6 Republican electors and 4 Democratic electors would be chosen. If the Republicans had the advantage, as well, in popular votes in the State as a whole, then the two remaining electoral votes would be assigned to the Republican Party. This would make the electorial box score for the State as follows:

Republicans	8
Democrats	4
Total	12

Notice the total number of electoral votes has not been changed, but the idea in this would be to give the people with the minority view some say in the Government. In our present system they have none. Also, a system such as this would decrease the possibility of there being a man chosen for the Presidency who received less votes than his opponent.

Snatching a Chicken Coop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am in possession of an editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., last August 1963. The editor shows such a remarkable understanding of the problems with which Congressman WILSON has been confronted that I want to include it in my remarks.

Congressman WILSON in his untiring efforts has revealed many instances of waste, sloppy procurement methods, an outright irresponsibility in procuring items for our defense that he is to be commended by the membership of this House.

I include this editorial in the hope that all of you will read it:

SNATCHING A CHICKEN COOP

A story turned up in the news columns last week of Congressman EARL WILSON, of Bedford, Ind., and his war upon waste in the Navy.

In one sense, it is a simple story, briefly told. In another sense, the news item speaks with telling eloquence of the times we live in.

Briefly, Mr. WILSON was tipped off in February to the Navy's purchase of radio-controlled drone targets, used in practice firing. It appeared that all of the control units for these drones were being manufactured and sold to the Navy by the Babcock Electronics Corp. of Costa Mesta, Calif. As recently as June 26, Babcock got an order for some of these units at $1,584 apiece.

Six months ago, Mr. WILSON inquired of the Navy about all this. He got the royal runaround. The contracts had been awarded to Babcock, without competitive bidding, because Babcock was the only company that could make them. Mr. WILSON asked to see the plans and specifications. The Navy said it didn't have any plans and specifications. Mr. WILSON lost his temper and began to raise some serious hell. The Navy grudgingly admitted that it had the drawings, all right. Mr. WILSON could look at them sometime, maybe.

Finally, under Mr. WILSON's unrelenting pressure, the Navy agreed to have some competitive bidding on the next order of the drone units. In mid-July, the Navy suddenly called for such bids on 10 days' notice, with only 4 days allowed prospective contractors to study the complicated technical data. Again, Mr. WILSON lost his temper. He made so much fuss that the Navy extended the bid period to August 15.

And on August 15, last Thursday, 13 firms bid on the drone units. The low bid was $702 from a responsible manufacturer. This compared with the $1,584 per unit paid Babcock on June 26, and $1,174 bid by Babcock last week. The contract has not yet been awarded, and Mr. WILSON is biding his time.

End of story. Yet no person familiar with such investigations in Washington will imagine that the story has ended at all. The mind's eye sweeps over the thick files of correspondence in Mr. WILSON's office, all dealing with the radio drone awards. One contemplates the interviews, the telephone calls, the personal conversation with Navy personnel, the maddening delays in finding the right party. Mr. WILSON fought the thing through to the bitter end, but he must have felt like a man stuck in a barrel of sorghum molasses, fighting off mosquitoes.

Singlehandedly, he compelled a saving to the taxpayers of more than 50 percent on this one item. But it took him 6 solid months of struggling with Navy procurement officers. In the end, unless we are vastly mistaken, not one single soul in the Navy purchasing establishment will receive so much as one single reprimand for this demonstrated waste, favoritism, and perversion of competitive bidding requirements.

While Mr. WILSON has thus been grappling with fog in one small area, billions upon billions of dollars have been paid out in other defense spending. The Navy's hostile and indifferent attitude toward competitive bidding on the drones raises the strong suspicion that the same attitude obtains in other areas the Congressman knows not of. And the Navy is of course not alone in tossing fat bids to favored contractors.

HARRY BYRD once compared Federal spending to a mighty river in a state of perpetual flood. As far as the eye can see, the river surges along, out of control, incapable of being channeled or restrained. The congressman with one bag of sand is a ludicrous figure, building his pitiful levee. The flood sweeps over and around and beyond him, and the spectator who can salvage so much as a chicken coop snatched from the stream may count himself a fortunate man.

Mr. WILSON has done a fine piece of work. We thank him for it. But the same people who threw this job to Babcock are sitting in their same chairs today; they will sit there every day; and Mr. WILSON has other things to do.

Must Extravagance Go On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House applauds the efforts of my colleague, EARL WILSON, of the Ninth Indiana Congressional District, in his efforts to bring about more economy in the expenditure of our tax dollars.

He has been dubbed "watchdog of the Pentagon" by virtue of his efforts to bring about the true concept of competitive bidding. It is obvious that he has spent many long hours in documenting the evidence he has presented to this House. More power to him.

I wish to include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Indianapolis Star pertaining to Congressman WILSON's exposure of waste.

The editorial follows:

MUST EXTRAVAGANCE GO ON?

There is an important key to the exorbitant cost of government in the story of the long, one-man fight against sole-source buying of military equipment, carried on over the past 3 years by Representative EARL WILSON of Bedford.

It is remarkable that Representative WILSON has been able to turn up and document case after case in which the military services have bought, or have been about to buy, items on a negotiated deal with a single supplier when there was in fact no reason why the planned purchase could not be put up for competitive bids.

But there is an even more remarkable thing about the story. The Congressman's repeated striking of paydirt in this long campaign indicates that the relevations of these expensive cases of mismanagement have not yet caused enough embarrassment in the Defense Department to bring about any basic change in the system which allows this sort of thing to occur.

Whenever Representative WILSON has proved a specific case, the agency responsible has backed off from the negotiated deal and put that item up for competitive bidding. But we have seen no indications that the Department of Defense is moving to put its house in order to prevent the error of unnecessary sole-source negotiated buying.

Lack of basic corrective action in the Department seems to be confirmed by Representative WILSON's proposal for creation of a special nonpartisan congressional committee to "ride herd" on defense purchasing. There would be little purpose in such a committee except to continue to dig out and stop, one by one, cases of wasteful and improper buying. If that is needed, then the committee by all means should be set up.

Action should not stop there, however. The goal should be to bring about a complete overhaul of the procedures by which choice is made between negotiated and competitive buying, and by which top-level supervision and control are exercised.

In order to accomplish that, it is necessary to change prevailing attitudes in the upper echelons of the Defense Department. If the top officials were determined to put an end to the wasteful extravagance of unnecessary sole-source buying, they could and would do it. As long as they are not determined to do it, it won't be done.

And what about the rest of the Government? The Defense Department is a profitable place to begin, because it spends about half of all Federal tax funds. But the other departments and agencies also may be wasting money in their procurement practices. The possibility should be investigated.

An administration bent on licking this problem would find ways to do it. Until there is such an administration, the best hope rests with Congress. Representative WILSON should continue to press this matter, for it is significant to the control of excessive Government cost. The project should have the support of the entire Indiana delegation in Congress.

Washington Determined To Force Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph last Friday.

The editorial relates to the administration's determination to force on our farmers and on the country a subsidy which neither the farmers nor the country as a whole want. As a matter of fact, the wheat farmers said emphatically in a referendum vote last year that they did not want the type of program Secretary Freeman is endeavoring to railroad through Congress.

This editorial has special significance, not alone from what it says but by virtue of the party saying it. The Daily Pantagraph is published in Blooming-

ton, Ill. It serves one of the most productive farm areas in the country. It has long had one of the most outstanding farm pages of any newspaper.

The Daily Pantagraph speaks with authority. More than that, it speaks for the farmers themselves. It is to a voice such as this that we should listen. I commend this editorial to the thoughtful reading of every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

BY THE PANTAGRAPH—WASHINGTON DETERMINED TO FORCE FARM SUBSIDIES

There could be no better time for a book on farm policies to come off the presses than now while the House is considering a Senate-approved farm bill which would clamp farmers more securely into a governmental straitjacket.

Julius Duscha, a former Decatur newspaperman who now reports for the Washington Post, has authored such a book under the title of "Taxpayers' Hayride."

Mr. Duscha tees off from the Billie Sol Estes scandal but he covers the farm program from the 1880's down through the 1963 wheat referendum.

He shows pretty convincingly that the wrong people get the "farm aid" and that the policies heretofore tried have not solved, nor even relieved, the farm problem.

Mr. Duscha offers little in the way of a solution except other forms of subsidies. He does expose the futility of the solutions, including his own, in our long experience of ignoring farm technology.

It would benefit most Members of Congress if they would read the historical part of his book before a final vote on the new farm legislation. It would benefit Mr. Duscha if he would draw conclusions based on his own facts rather than expediency, which he appears to do.

From the beginning of farm programs right down to the bill now before Congress the emphasis is placed on subsidies which put our prices so high they curtail our exports and deplete our treasury, to say nothing of the higher consumer costs we get in the bargain.

Both Illinois Senators voted against the current measure which cleared the Senate last week, and they did so in the interest of Illinois agriculture.

The Illinois Agricultural Association, under the leadership of President William J. Kuhfuss, has launched an all-out campaign against the current wheat and cotton bill. Mr. Kuhfuss points out that the bill would insert the certificate plan, which was rejected by wheat farmers last year, and would boost the price and estimated 70 cents a bushel for wheat used for food for U.S. consumers. If passed on to the purchaser this could mean a boost of a cent for a pound loaf of bread. The consumer also would pay through his Federal tax to cover the subsidy going to the farmer. Thus he pays twice under this bill which the farmers who have voted say they don't want anyway.

It seems strange indeed that Washington appears determined to force the farmers to receive a subsidy in this form whether they want it or not.

In addition to the double-barrelled cost to the consumer, there would be a 25-cent-per-bushel subsidy for all export wheat, which, as Mr. Kuhfuss points out, accounts for more than half of our wheat production.

This bill jacks up the price of farm exports to a point where we would be subsidizing not only American consumers but foreign consumers as well.

It is a roadblock in the way of the development of a sound long-range farm export program. It is an irritant to the governments of our best customers abroad.

What does it take to put some commonsense in the heads of those in the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government when it comes to farm policy?

They appear determined to pay out billions of dollars annually to people who, for the most part don't need it, to produce crops for which there is no effective market.

Oceanography Hope for Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an important editorial from my hometown newspaper, the San Diego Union. The editorial points out that the science of oceanography is one of the most important projects our Nation has underway. It offers mankind the key to unlocking huge resources of food and materials. It offers mankind a history of our planet since its creation. It is a vital science for the defenses of our Nation.

As the editorial points out, San Diego is a center of this fast growing science. Launching of the bathyscaph *Trieste* on January 17, 1964, was an important step forward in oceanography, for this machine has taken man farther below the surface of the sea than any previous device.

I am hopeful my colleagues will find this editorial helpful in creating understanding of some of the potentials oceanography offers our country.

Text of the editorial is as follows:

OCEANOGRAPHY HOPE FOR FUTURE—SAN DIEGO CENTERS LEAD SEARCH

Oceanography is one of the less publicized but most important sciences in which man is attempting to unravel secrets of the earth. Adequate knowledge of the ocean and its depths could contribute immeasurably to the world's survival.

San Diego is a world capital for oceanography. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the Navy Electronics Laboratory, and related organizations are contributing vastly to the needed knowledge about inner space.

Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, speaking here at the rededication of the famed bathyscaphe *Trieste*, explained that to understand ocean environment, and to exploit the wealth of the oceans, requires leadership from the basic fields of physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and mathematics.

As he said: "The oceans comprise more than 70 percent of the earth's surface. They are truly the last unexplored area of the earth, awaiting invasions by inquisitive man."

Only from the oceans will man be able to penetrate the earth's crust. The facts that will be found in such exploration will give the world a background of what has gone before for thousands and possibly millions of years.

Exploration of outer space has been an intriguing subject in the past two decades. The United States has made gigantic strides in such exploration and will continue to do so. We are reaching out to find what really makes a planet or a star, viewed on earth only as a mysterious bit of beauty.

Exploration of outer space will enable us to plot our future. Exploration of inner space—the oceans and the earth's crust beneath them—will spell out our past and also provide sustenance for immediate survival. Oceanography also will be a tremendous aid to free world defense.

Admiral Knoll said: "A comprehensive knowledge of the ocean depths and the physical, chemical, and biological processes that occur in the oceans will initially help us to design new and more reliable weapons systems for the defense of this Nation."

More important, as Admiral Knoll pointed out, the knowledge will aid the world to feed underprivileged people of the world by adding a vast variety of food to the diets of all nations.

Oceanography is one of the most serious and important businesses in the world. San Diego's eminence as a center of oceanography is a civic asset that will continue to develop through the years.

Naples, N.Y., Library Establishes John F. Kennedy Memorial Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, around the country in the wake of the tragic events that occurred in Dallas last November 22 communities and citizens paid their various tributes to our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

In my judgment, one of the most appropriate of these tributes was paid by the people of the village of Naples in my congressional district in upstate New York. There the people established a John F. Kennedy Memorial Fund in their local Naples library.

Certainly no one in public life did more than President Kennedy to instill a love of learning and to underline the importance of knowledge and education as requirements for effective and inspired public leadership. I know our late President would indeed be grateful for the tribute paid to him by the citizens of Naples, and I congratulate them on the leadership which they have shown. I am glad that this House has supported legislation to assist local libraries such as these, and I feel certain that the Naples library will stand in years to come as a living memorial to a great and enlightened leader of our Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose a news item from the Rochester Times Union of November 25, describing in greater detail this exemplary action:

LIBRARY FUND ESTABLISHED

NAPLES.—The Naples Library has established a John F. Kennedy Memorial Fund.

Erwin Huber, Naples library treasurer, has announced that $100 has already been subscribed to the fund.

In establishing the fund, the trustees noted that the recognition of literature which the late President regarded as of prime importance in both his personal and official life made it appropriate to establish such a fund in his memory.

The Naples Library came into being in the 3-year period of President Kennedy's administration. It is also of interest that at the time of his death, the Senate was debating a bill for Federal aid to libraries.

Automation Challenges the Puritan Ethic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thought-provoking speeches of the year was delivered last weekend by Jack Conway, executive director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, at the annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held on March 14, 1964, in New York City.

Virtually every Member of Congress works more than a 40-hour week, as do labor leaders like Jack Conway. The Puritan ethic of the goodness of work is deep in our bones. But we have to face up to the onrush of automation and its impact on the theory and practice of work, however unpalatable this confrontation may be to us.

Opinion leaders must strive to exceed themselves, to learn new facts, to do more today than was done yesterday. One of our Nation's opinion leaders is Jack Conway, a man who has already achieved a notable career in labor and in government, a man who can do "advance thinking," and who seeks to anticipate events rather than merely catch up with them.

I recommend Mr. Conway's remarks to my colleagues. Under unanimous consent, excerpts from his speech are printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMATION—LABOR—CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Jack Conway)

Today's poverty exists within a new setting. It persists—and indeed threatens to grow—at a time of massive prosperity. Its handmaidens are persistent high levels of unemployment, a decline in the kind of work generally available to the poor, and a new technology which should create well-being for all but which instead threatens the livelihoods of millions.

The new technology has been wrapped up within the word "automation." But more than this new technique is involved. This is a day of new materials and new methods resulting from the use of those materials. The new technology has hit the unskilled and the semiskilled the hardest blows, but it threatens the skilled and even the professional.

Who has not watched the construction of a modern office building? It's a wonder of planning and the new buildings seem to go up almost overnight. The secret, of course, lies in such materials as aluminum siding bolted on in a matter of a few days. No longer are bricklayers and stonemasons required for such jobs. No longer are plasterers required for inner walls which have given way to movable steel dividers bolted into place to give any room size desired.

In telephones, the polyethelene cable is outmoding the cable splicer. The adjust-it-yourself bell in your phone means fewer repairmen. In the supermarket, the checkout counter has long ago replaced the behind-the-counter clerk. Vending machines are replacing human labor everywhere. Like automation itself, these are facts of life of our new era.

In the face of these developments, much of the talk of the need for skilled workers has become a mockery, although there may be localized shortages. Despite a record volume of construction, the building trades unions complain bitterly about unemployment, and the statistics give validity to the claim. In January, some 6.2 percent of all craftsmen and foremen were jobless after all seasonal factors had been weighted.

Farm unemployment has become critical. Recently, the New York Times reported that California growers would not fight to extend the bracero program beyond the end of this year, although they will welcome an extension if Congress will oblige. Farm technology—not concerned with domestic labor—lies behind the apparent shift of view. Chemistry and agronomy have combined to breed a tough-skinned tomato which will be picked by a mechanical picker. The mechanized potato picker, the cherry picker, the carrot picker, and other such wonders are ending the need for the grueling human labor that accompanied the harvesting of the specialized crops. Unfortunately, the results also are a compost heap of discarded human labor which rots in new slums around the towns that yesterday were way stations for the migrants.

John Henry worked and worked but he couldn't beat the machine. Today's John Henrys not only are unable to compete in work terms; they cost too much no matter how low their wages. The myth says that automation comes fastest where wages are highest. But who works for less than the farm migrant? The truth is that human labor cannot compete with the machine. This is doubly true in the case of automation.

The cost of the machine may be a deterrent to automation or advanced mechanization. But once the machine comes into existence, enterprise adapts to make its use practical—or the machine is tailored to existing enterprise. If farms tend to grow larger, it is because the new technology has commanded that the process accelerate. It is no wonder that 11 percent of the farm labor force remains unemployed despite the tragically rapid decline in the size of the farm labor force. It is equally no wonder that millions of rural families on small uneconomic farms are submerged and almost totally excluded from the mainstream of American life.

Automation has been described in many ways. It is a coupling of the machines with the so-called "electronic brain." Its social impact is more important, perhaps, than the technique itself. Automation involves production without the direct intervention of human labor. It promises a revolution which may outmode work almost entirely, at least work as we know it today.

Shortly after World War I, the Czech playwright, Karel Capek, wrote "Rossum's Universal Robots," a play which captured the imagination of millions. Described in "Rossum's Universal Robots" was a world where robots in human form did the work. Today's robots are not shaped like humans, but nonetheless are taking over routine labor at an alarmingly rapid pace. And in truth most of the work of our Western world is of a routine nature.

A science fiction writer once described a world ruled by a technological elite whose power came from its mastery of complex devices which performed the needed work. Within this world, there was no work and no function for the great mass of people who were provided with a low level of sustenance and an insubstantial tinsel of entertainment and were bored even beyond tears. There is a danger that we may be headed in this direction.

Automation, of course, has hit with most profound impact in the big mass production industries. There are a million fewer production workers than a decade ago, although output is up by half. Last year was a record year for automobiles but there were 19 percent fewer employees than in 1955. In autos, each employee now accounts for 12.3 vehicles a year against 10.1 in 1955. In steel, output has again soared but employment is still at near-recession levels. Factory worker productivity now is increasing at the rate of about 4.5 percent a year and national productivity in the private sector of the economy has been rising at a record rate.

The new industrial revolution of automation has bloomed upon the American scene at a time when our labor force is increasing at a record rate. I don't want to bore you with statistics, but the fact remains that some 26 million new workers will enter the labor market during the present decade against 7.5 million in the fifties. The number of employed has increased slowly—mostly in part-time jobs and in State and local government—but the loss of jobs due to automation plus the rise in the number of workers has also created massive unemployment which plagues the Nation despite current record prosperity.

A real growth rate of perhaps 5 percent is anticipated for the coming year even with the tax cut. At best, this is expected to reduce joblessness by half a percent—if that. We run ever faster just to stand still. The AFL–CIO Economic Policy Committee recently estimated that a growth rate of from 8 to 9 percent now is required to reduce joblessness to tolerable levels.

The figures on job displacement due to rising productivity show that some 2 million jobs a year must be added just to replace jobs that evaporate. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz recently pointed out: "When America's workers return to their jobs tomorrow morning, over 4,000 of them will find that machines have moved in overnight to take the jobs they hold." The figures would indicate that we need—at the present time—some 80,000 new jobs each week to take care of our new workers, provide employment to those being displaced, and to end unemployment. The future is even more challenging.

The manufacturing plant of tomorrow was recently described in a management publication which reported that "the plant of 1970 is here in 1964." The plant described is located in Deerfield, Ill., and is owned by the Kitchens of Sara Lee. The Kitchens are a wonder to behold. They center on a computer which monitors storage; controls batch blending and mixing; computes and monitors time cycles, oven temperatures, speeds of oven conveyors, and other process equipment to insure uniform baking; monitors product changeovers of cakes; directs storage of products and assembles loads; provides records on tape and log sheets; and will eventually supervise air conditioning, heating, and other plant auxiliary facilities.

"The computer," according to the article, "will execute 180,000 warehouse instructions every 3 seconds, monitor some 300 process variables, and scan inputs from process sensors at the rate of 200 per second to a claimed accuracy of 0.1 percent. At present, it will use only half its capacity. And the plant has capacity enough to triple its production."

I will predict that by 1970 such plants will be "old hat" and many will be outmoded. It is a shame that the article did not describe employment opportunities in the new plant for now and by 1970. I venture to say that the new plant will not make much difference in the ultimate employment statistics of the community in which it is located.

Automation has reduced new employment opportunities in manufacturing to zero. The production labor force has decreased, and increases in white-collar employment in the plants are largely a thing of the past. America can no longer look to manufacturing payrolls as the basis of progress. I am all for area redevelopment programs, but even these must shift emphasis. If overall manufacturing employment has ceased to grow, the

opening of a new plant in a distressed area will do little to change the national picture. Unless there is a radical reduction in working hours over the next several years, there will be significantly fewer manufacturing jobs—not more.

Dr. Norbert Weiner, father of cybernetics, recently stated that with modern miniaturization, computers can be made smaller and still have greater versatility. Dr. Weiner once expressed the pessimistic view that the new technology offers the equivalent of slave labor and that it would bring disaster in its train. While no longer voicing this view, the noted scientist pointed out that if "applied without understanding," the computer offers cause for fright. He pointed out that routine white-collar work, such as bookkeeping and ticket selling, can already be done better by the computer. Asked if the machines of the future will take away "a lot more jobs from humans," Weiner categorically answered: "They will.".

White-collar and service industry were once hailed by industry's "Cheerful Charlies" as the source of millions of new jobs. Even if this were true, we would be headed for trouble. In the first place, the displaced coal miner of 45 cannot readily be retrained to be a typist. Secondly, the service and white-collar jobs in most common demand are low wage jobs. America simply cannot sustain prosperity on this kind of employment. In truth, however, the reverse is true. Automation means ever less work for human beings to perform.

The computer, the robot-typewriter, the modern office copying machine, the vending machine, the automatic changemaker, and the like are rapidly invading the white collar and service areas. What factory automation did to blue collar employment in the fifties, office automation will do to white collar in the years ahead. Even now, 4 percent of all office clerical are without jobs and the jobless rate is 4.7 percent for sales clerks.

The computer threatens middle management and the threat will increase as workers to be supervised decline and as more decisionmaking is programed on the computer. If the researchers are right, the computers of tomorrow will make value judgments, carry on conversations, and even program themselves.

The experience of the blue collar worker has already shown that automation does not create jobs but that it destroys them at an appalling rate. When a computer can run a bank of lathes, the skills of setup men, millwrights, and machinists are outmoded. Automation destroys far more skills than it creates. Experience has also shown that after an automated system is debugged, it requires relatively little maintenance. If it were otherwise, such systems would never be installed. Automation requires relatively few new workers for maintenance purposes or to build the new computers and machines.

We have heard much about retraining and there is no doubt that any upgrading of the labor force through these or literacy programs is worthwhile. But the question stares the retrainers in the face: Retraining for what? Many of the jobless have only limited schooling and cannot be qualified for the jobs of tomorrow even with retraining. And as one industrialist has pointed out, "You cannot force people into retraining, and after you retrain them you can't manufacture jobs out of thin air."

Retraining can make its maximum contribution in a relatively full employment economy. In such an economy, the employer is willing to assume this task without any spur from the outside. The big problem isn't training or even education, it's jobs.

America faces a new era and we had better begin to face up to that era. Dr. Weiner put the problem most cogently:

"The answer is that we can no longer value a man by the job he does. We've got to value him as a man.

"Here is the point: A whole lot of the work we are using men for is work which is really better done by computers. That is, for a long time human energy has been worth much as physical energy goes. A man couldn't generate enough energy today to buy food for his own body.

"The actual commercial value of his services in modern culture isn't enough. If we value people, we can't value them on that basis.

"If we insist on using the machine everywhere, irrespective of people, and don't go to very fundamental considerations and give people their proper place in the world, we're sunk."

The time has indeed come to reconsider our fundamental attitudes toward work and leisure. No longer can we take the view that work is the end-all of our lives. Indeed, we face difficult times ahead both in winning the new leisure now before us and in living with it.

The alternative to leisure has become massive unemployment. The director of the American Foundation on Automation, Henry J. Sibley, recently told a business conference that "we are going to have to live with a tremendous labor surplus." But this is no way for any nation to live. Indeed, no industrial nation can long survive with constantly rising levels of unemployment.

Leisure is far more desirable than unemployment, and fewer hours of work is part of labor's answer to the jobless problem. Automation, with its resulting unemployment, has already inhibited our bargaining strength and sapped our ability to organize. If we are to survive as a free labor movement—and our survival is essential to a healthy democracy—we need to tighten the labor market. Institutionally, we have a selfish motive in seeking shorter hours—our survival is involved. But far more importantly, we cannot resolve either the technological revolution nor the civil rights revolution without jobs for all. It is far better that we take part of rising productivity in reduction of hours than that we create more unemployed, more poor, more racial tensions, and more millionaires.

We have long lived by the Puritan ethic of earning our bread by the sweat of our brow. But the age that gave rise to this ethic has long gone. We now face for the first time the question of what shall be done with workers not required for the production of goods and services.

Some state that "idle hands are for the devil's work." This same argument was raised when child labor was abolished. It was the rallying cry of industrialists who fought the 8-hour day and whose families provided an excellent example by living in idleness and luxury. The cry was raised when the depression brought the 40-hour workweek. Always, those who raised the cry have refused to consider the idleness of the unemployed who were supposed to evaporate from the face of the earth until needed for some temporary task.

The administration has opposed us on the shorter workweek, but has nevertheless begun to recognize that the problem is deeper than retraining or relocating a few workers. Labor Secretary Wirtz has called for compulsory schooling until age 18 and tuition-free junior college. The object is to keep youth from entering the labor market prematurely and to better prepare them for today's jobs. We welcome this step but point out to the administration that it's up to the States to act and that it will take more than advice from the Federal Government to achieve this objective. It is, perhaps, time to set Federal education standards of school attendance as well as to provide Federal aid.

The problem of the school dropout is related to the war on poverty. Kids drop out of school too often because they get no spending money at home. The answer would seem to be a small allowance from society in return for maintaining grades. The cost would be small and the returns great.

The onrush of technology is so fast that even keeping kids in school longer is only a small part of the answer. A showdown on automation seems almost inevitable. Labor will fight harder and harder to cut down on worktime because there is no other substantive answer. Now is the time to begin to move into the leisure society—to begin a long-term period of adjustment.

A start has been made in steel where 13-week vacations every five years have been won for long seniority workers. Earlier retirement is inevitable but won't be easily won. Programs of phased retirement are now in order. Phased retirement could begin at age 60 when workers would start to work only part of the year. By the time full retirement came at age 65, the worker would be able to face full-time leisure more confidently.

The 35-hour workweek, longer vacations, earlier retirement, more schooling—all of these represent a gradual approach to the onrush of automation. By themselves, they will almost certainly prove inadequate.

Tragic though poverty, urban and rural decay, and inadequate public facilities may be, these also represent a challenge. There is much work to be done between now and the day of massive leisure. That day will be tragic if it arrives before we have created here a new "America the Beautiful." Unless we bungle the job through neglect, we will have a trillion-dollar economy within a decade. That economy, nevertheless, will be tinsel unless we use part of economic growth to meet the challenge of poverty and urban sprawl. We will learn to live with the leisure ahead only if we plan for a world in which there is massive cultural, educational, and recreational opportunity and a decent standard of life for all. We can move toward mass leisure gradually and without massive dislocation and social shock if we rise to the great challenges of today.

The impact of automation has provided to labor the possibility to rise to new heights. When the day of mass leisure arrives, perhaps our job will have been completed. For now, however, we have the job of winning that leisure and the living standards that go with it. This means we must organize in new areas, among white-collar and professional workers as well as in traditional blue collar. If we fail, America may well be threatened with internal chaos. We dare not fail, and I do not think we will. Not the least of our job will be political and legislative. Labor must carry the brunt of the fight for national planning because there is no one else to do the job. As much as anything else, automation has brought into focus the need for intelligent allocation of resources.

A Citation for Mr. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Richmond, Va., News Leader on Thursday, February 20, 1964, entitled "A Citation

for Mr. Wilson." My colleague, Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana, has been carrying on a spectacular one-man fight against wasteful procurement methods. It is obvious that many millions of dollars have been saved by virtue of his investigations. I applaud his efforts.

The editorial follows:

A CITATION FOR MR. WILSON

Last June, Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana, received a copy of a Pentagon contract for the purchase of 50 radar components, known to the military as pulse code modulators. Mr. WILSON turned a suspicious eye on the order, as he does all too frequently for the tranquility of the Defense Department.

This particular order, he found, stated that drawings of the components were unavailable, and, for that reason, the purchase was being made on a sole-source contract instead of through competitive bidding. But Congressman WILSON decided to conduct a routine check anyway. He soon found that these components had been purchased in the past, at a cost of about $2,000 each. Why, then, were drawings "unavailable"?

Mr. WILSON fired off an angry letter to Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, at that time commander of the Army's Electronics Materiel Command. He asked the general for a thorough investigation of the order. The general replied later that the component had been developed, with Government funds, by the Sperry Utah Engineering Laboratory. Manufacturing drawings of the component had been accepted, and paid for, on January 11, 1962. The Army said that the drawings did not provide the data necessary for competitive bidding. But, as Mr. WILSON pointed out, if the drawings were to be used to manufacture the components, why couldn't they be used for competitive bidding?

That wasn't the whole story. At the end of his letter to Congressman WILSON, General Stanwix-Hay wrote that an examination of the radar component had revealed that it was obsolete anyhow. It was being replaced with an improved pulse code modulator, which would be advertised for competitive bids at a later date.

In this instance, Congressman WILSON's inquiry saved the taxpayers $100,000. Similar suspicions on his part about sole-source contracts in the past have brought to light numerous examples of profligacy in military procurement. The Defense Department may regard Mr. WILSON with something less than affection, but his one-man assault on the beachhead of bureaucracy in defense purchases merits a citation for bravery beyond the call of duty, in the face of overwhelming odds. And may his tribe increase.

Dangerous Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following superb article by Allen Drury appeared in the March issue of Reader's Digest. Our Nation must face reality and adopt a forthright, positive, firm foreign policy before it is too late. I highly commend this timely article to the attention of the Congress and to the country:

THE DANGEROUS GAME OF "LET'S PRETEND"

(By Allen Drury)

(NOTE.—We cannot avoid the burden that history has placed upon us, of facing up to and turning back Communist power wherever it tries to advance. And risk of war is not a sufficient reason for refusing to consider the realities.)

The United States is in many ways the most powerful nation on earth. Its people enjoy a way of life which, despite shortcomings, gives them, generally, a more comfortable and rewarding society than that of any other people. Its supremely human form of government stumbles and blunders, yet has repeatedly proved—most recently in the smooth transition of power after the tragic murder of its President—to be one of the strongest, most stable governments history has ever known.

Yet there has developed in this land in recent years a grave and crippling hypnosis whose outward signs are easy words and comfortable slogans, a dangerous rationalizing, a determined glossing over of unpleasant truths. It induces in those who suffer from it the fateful notion that, if you pretend long enough and hard enough that certain things are not so, they will miraculously become not so.

"Let's pretend" was once a game that children played. Now, unhappily, grown men play it, and even base upon it policies of great nations—thereby throwing away bit by bit the world of stable foundation they might have if they were honest enough to face the cold reality of the world as it is. This applies to almost every problem that confronts us.

FROM X TO Z

Do we recognize, for instance, that a truly safe disarmament treaty requires adequate inspection? Why, of course we do. But see how it goes.

In year A, we demand x number of inspections. Our opponent shouts, and says No. Instead of saying firmly, "We're sorry, this is it," in year B we narrow the demand down to y inspections. This doesn't make our opponent happy, either. So in year C we reduce our position still further, to z number of inspections. And presently, when it suits our opponent's purposes to conclude in 2 weeks a nuclear test ban treaty he has been deliberately holding up for 7 years, we find ourselves—just as he has told us all along we would—down to no inspections.

The tragic thing about this performance is not that our resolution has failed us, not that we have given up the only sensible position, but that, in the process of becoming somewhat more unsafe, we have managed to convince ourselves we are still safe. We have managed, both as a people and a government, to rationalize retreat into advance, defeat into victory. And by just so much have we moved further toward our opponent's candidly declared objective—our own destruction as a free people.

WHITTLED DOWN

There is southeast Asia. We know quite well that our position there is being whittled away. It is shaky in Laos, equivocal in South Vietnam, desperate in Cambodia. We know this. But we pretend it isn't so. We pretend—and quite sincerely—that we are being stanch, standing firm, and that we will take a stand. The problem is that, by the time we do, the platform on which we take our stand may very well have been whittled down to nothing at all.

And there is Cuba. In our heart of hearts we know that the spectacle of a great nation accepting the lifting of a piece of tarpaulin on a ship at sea as proof of a pledge kept by a hostile power is a genuinely pathetic sight. But somehow we manage to convince ourselves that an opponent we know we cannot trust (for we have caught him secretively trying to put nuclear missiles in our backyard) has suddenly become trustworthy, that we were right to abandon our demand for the onsite U.N. inspection.

And in the same fashion, we think, or we guess, that 3,000—or 6,000, or 10,000—Soviet troops have been removed. Eventually we come to believe this, and once again we have managed to convince ourselves that surrender of our position has made us stronger.

NICE PEOPLE

Even more fundamentally, there is the nature of our opponent. We had in Dallas a graphic demonstration of what our opponent's philosophy can do to a twisted mind grown sick upon it. Communism has been spreading hatred and violence for almost 50 years. Yet despite steadily mounting evidence of its nature, there have been many Americans, some in very influential positions, who have desperately pretended that the Communist conspiracy is just a nice group of misguided people with whom we can get along if we keep treating them with decency—a decency they cannot understand and do not respect.

The record clearly shows that these are not nice people. They are not going to be persuaded by soft words and gentle approaches. They can be persuaded only by superior strength and the determination to use it if necessary—as President Kennedy proved in the initial showdown in Cuba. Yet there are Americans, even now, who pretend that if we just continue retreating before the Communists we will, by moving backward, somehow move forward toward a genuine and stable peace.

So it goes in other matters. There is the United Nations. We know it is in desperate straits. We know we are probably the only power with sufficient dedication to it, and sufficient financial leverage upon it, to force a revision of its policies so that it can truly lead the world to peace. And yet, rather than face the facts, many of us pretend that, if we just claim vehemently enough that the U.N. is perfect, it will somehow become so.

Such is the American attitude, baffling to our allies, self-defeating to us.

RISK OF WAR

There must sometimes come, for all of us, the staggering realization that our pretense of "Things are really going all right" just is not true. Why then do we do it? One reason is the wistful hope that all bad things will go away. A more fundamental reason is fear—the fear of having to do something about a given difficulty confronting the country, if you once admit candidly that it exists.

On many occasions in recent years, a familiar little drama has occurred. A Senator or a Representative or a member of the administration is under questioning by reporters on matters affecting foreign affairs. Sooner or later the guest advocates some strong course of action. Then: "Senator," he is asked in a hushed, disbelieving tone of voice, "do you mean you would really do that, even at the risk of war?"

And such an awesome place does this question hold in the national legendry that 9 times out of 10, instead of saying bluntly what his own intention and national integrity demand—which is "Yes"—the legislator ducks and dodges and weasels and equivocates. His interrogator retires triumphant.

That "risk of war" is a favorite bugaboo, no one can deny. It gives great support and impetus to let us pretend. But examine it for a moment.

War today is horrible beyond concept—at least the kind of war we all assume would come in a major showdown between the free world and the slave, obliterating in one fiery instant all that we hold dear. But does

that make the principles of freemen any less valid? If it does, then why don't we give up right now? Why don't we abandon the biggest pretense of all—that there is anything worthwhile in freedom, anything worth saving of this Republic which has been handed down to us to preserve and pass along? If we are so afraid of the consequences of being true to our heritage and our country, why not forget about it right now, and save all this wear and tear on the national budget and our own nervous systems?

To state the proposition thus is to demonstrate at once its absurdity. Of course we are not going to give, of course we are not going to abandon our principles and our country.

If we wish to keep this life—with all its liberties and freedoms—we must be prepared to give it up. If we wish to live, we must be ready to die. Only by being unafraid of war can we avoid war. And being unafraid of war does not mean feeling no worry or terror about it. The citizen who did not feel thus would be a fool indeed. It means being able to accept that fear and go on from there, with the courage expressed in a little-used verse of the national anthem: "Then conquer we must, when our cause it is "just."

RIGHT IS RIGHT

Of course, no sane person wants war. But, by the same token, we cannot let ourselves be bamboozled into believing that war is indeed the only alternative to surrender—that a firm, steady, unyielding, unbelligerent policy will lead inevitably to disaster. Almost more than anything else, we have to fear the idea that there is no way open to us, with all our power and infinite resources, to combat our opponent without bringing on all-out nuclear war—and that therefore we must close off discussion of other ideas and not try to develop them as cogently and effectively as we can.

The imperative first step in this latter process is to banish another contention, that there are no answers to the world's major problems—that there are, to use the parrot-phrase, "no permanent solutions," and we should, therefore, stop trying to find any. As with the fear of war, this argument can be used to paralyze all action and defeat all attempts at constructive thought. It can be used to justify doing nothing, particularly if what must be done carries with it the risk of war.

These two ideas are the most powerful weapons of today's do-nothing party: those who say we can't expect a solution in Berlin, or expect to eliminate the Soviets from Cuba, or stand firm for a truly safe disarmament treaty, or do anything, in fact, that entails any risk—because (1) there are no permanent solutions, and (2) it may mean war. If this policy is followed long enough, there will be one permanent solution—with or without war—the elimination of the United States as a free Republic and a factor in world affairs.

We must seek solutions as though we really mean to find them, because that is the job history has given us, however much we may wish it had not. It is the job of saving freedom, as we have saved it before and as we are going to save it now, for the simplest and most commanding of reasons—because what is right is right. If we are committed to the support of right, as the United States is by history, and by choice, then it does not matter how many horrors may be threatened or how many fearful weapons may be waved in our face by Nikita Khrushchev. We have to defend the right, and that is all there is to it.

If we do not, we lose all self-respect, all honor, all decency. We also, in this happy 20th century, lose our safety, our liberty, our democracy and our lives.

A TIDE-TURN MOMENT

We must be brave enough to look at the world as it is, and do the things necessary to set it on a course that truly leads to peace. There were a couple of weeks in October 1962, for instance, when we were brave like this—but where has it gone now? Dissipated on the winds of a billion words, vanished down the hallways of timorous compromise and unnecessary concession. There was a moment when we had the world united behind us—not just the free world but, one suspects, behind their jailers' backs the peoples of the slave world as well—in the great hope that we had at last turned the tide and were really going to start leading the earth up the long hill toward sanity and peace.

But we took one step—and stopped, at the moment when we had our opponent on the run, at the moment when we should have insisted, calmly but with absolute firmness, that unless U.N. inspection in Cuba was started at once, we were coming in * * * that unless Soviet troops were removed at once, we were coming in * * * that unless a revision of positions all around the world was undertaken, we were coming in. We stopped. And now, of course, when such proposals are made, there comes the cry, "You don't want a war, do you?"

Well, right now, of course, these voices may be right. The world's support has been lost, the hemisphere's support has been fragmented, the Soviet Union, having tested us with lifted tarpaulins and solemn promises, has concluded that the United States was once again just talking big. To insist upon these things in Cuba, as of this moment, might mean war.

But we should not forget, for these international crises are matters of timing, that if that October's moment had been seized and made the most of, we would really have turned the tide. We let the chance slip. But who knows when such a moment may come again?

NO CARELESS INCH

We should not be belligerent—we should simply be firm. We should be willing to negotiate with the Communists any time, any place, on any subject—but we should not be the only ones to grant the concessions and make the retreats. We should insist, without the slightest yielding, on every single right that is ours. We should never seek agreement just for the sake of having an agreement. We should agree only if by agreeing we strengthen the free world and advance the cause of freedom. And we should never, under any circumstances, give them the careless inch which with them always becomes the irrecoverable mile.

We don't have to talk tough. We just have to be tough. Every single time we give a hint of it, the Communists switch course and try some other tack; the last thing they want is an all-out frontal showdown. That is why it seems so fantastic that we should so consistently argue ourselves out of the unflinching firmness which may well be our only salvation.

It is true that firmness carries with it the possibility of great risks. But weakness carries with it the certainty of national suicide. Our opponents are not playing let's pretend. They are playing for keeps. It is time we began to play in the same spirit.

Let us take heart therefore. The passage is long and dark, but at its end the light gleams out. It awaits the brave. So let us be.

Let us achieve, finally, in all the areas of conflict where history demands of us that we show our true colors, that just and honorable peace for which our hearts, in common with those of all mankind, cry out.

A Rollcall Vote Separates the Sheep From the Goats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the "Enquirer and News" of Battle Creek, Mich., in a lead editorial of Sunday, March 15, 1964, entitled "A Rollcall Vote Separates the Sheep From the Goats," did just that. It pointed out the economy thereof in keeping with the Republican task force group. It highly complimented its own Representative in this House, and the ridiculous timing of the administration's economy messages and the tax cut on the one hand, and increased spending on the other. It separated promises from performance. Personally, I feel the editiorial overplays the confrontation of an election year, but certainly its recounting of procedural strategy is correct.

In commending this editorial to the perceptive thought of all Members of both bodies of this Congress, I wish to emphasize not only the decisive action by the House, but the principal fact that it is quite responsive to public opinion and acts with alacrity on demand. Furthermore, it would be well at this time for us to consider the suggested constructive move so that our procedures require a rollcall vote on issues where public funds are involved. To this I would add stopping the "hanky-panky" about a closed rule for Ways and Means, providing a source of raising revenue in all bills costing the taxpayer money and, finally, providing a termination date for all legislation.

The editorial follows:

A ROLLCALL VOTE SEPARATES THE SHEEP FROM THE GOATS

At least $545 million of taxpayers' money was saved Thursday when a courageous and economy-minded group of Congressmen placed a large number of their House colleagues in the middle on a new Federal pay raise measure.

Battle Creek's own Republican Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN—who would have received a $10,000 annual salary increase under the legislation—was an active participant in the movement that blocked passage of the bill. We agree wholeheartedly with Mr. JOHANSEN, who remarked earlier that it was ridiculous to speak of economy in Government, as the Johnson administration has done so often, and to then raise the salaries of 1.7 million Federal workers and Members of Congress.

Public sympathy has not been strong toward the latest Federal pay raise measure. Although the Johnson administration and the Democratic leadership in the Congress have supported the bill, reports from Washington imply that most letters on the subject to Congressmen have been against the proposal.

Confronted by an election year—in which all House Members must either run for reelection or retire—but still anxious to increase their own salaries and that of Federal employees, the Democratic leaders attempted to pull off a simple voice vote,

which is tantamount to a secret ballot since the votes are not tallied individually.

Had this maneuver been successful, there is no question but that the bill would have been passed and the public never would have known who voted for and against the measure.

But, Iowa's Republican Representative H. R. GROSS had seen the handwriting on the wall in time to muster his economy forces, which included Mr. JOHANSEN. When Thursday's voting time arrived, the Democratic leaders started to take a voice vote, but Mr. GROSS motioned for a rollcall ballot that would place every House Member on record as to his vote.

The specter of public disapproval quickly stalked through the House Chamber, for Mr. GROSS had, indeed, put his contemporaries on the spot. To force a rollcall vote, only 20 percent of the House membership present need ballot affirmatively, yet when Mr. GROSS' motion was called up, about one-half of the House voted for it.

And, when the rollcall vote was tallied, the bill was rejected, 222 to 184.

What Mr. GROSS, Mr. JOHANSEN, and the others who forced the issue have done is to demonstrate once more that public opinion—if wielded effectively—can substantially influence the deliberations and actions of those who run our governments.

If the fear of going on record in favor of an unpopular bill had not pervaded the House, the pay raise would have gone through. A number of Congressmen—who would have voted for it in secret ballot—simply didn't have the courage to stand up and be counted.

This pay increase episode has, we think, paved the way for a very constructive move in Congress. What should be started now is a campaign to require that rollcall votes be taken on all issues where public funds are involved, as well as any other questions of importance. A voice vote does, of course, save time, but it also denies to the people a chance to see how their elected Congressmen reacted when the chips were down.

We'll wager that most voters are not aware of the fact that the Constitution does not require a rollcall ballot on any matter except that of overriding a Presidential veto. This is one condition that should be changed.

Tobacco Research Blocked in Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an editorial from the Durham Morning Herald, published in my congressional district, regarding the legislation introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, to provide for a Government-sponsored tobacco research center.

This editorial points out the fallacy in delaying to report this bill from the House Rules Committee to the House floor for consideration and action. It points out in compelling terms the value of tobacco as a commodity of incalculable value to the economy of this country in the form of tax revenues accruing not only to the Federal Government but also to State, county, and city governments. In fact, as the editorial points out, these levels of government receive more from tobacco than do either the producers or the processors. Another prime consideration in favor of this legislation, pointed out in the editorial, is the complex of employment provided by the culture, manufacture, and distribution of tobacco and tobacco products.

The Federal Government has an important stake in tobacco and, therefore, has an important stake in the legislation which is presently pending before the Rules Committee.

TOBACCO RESEARCH BLOCKED IN RULES

The objections to Government-sponsored tobacco research raised by the liberal Democratic-Republican coalition which bottled up the bill in the House Rules Committee, are indeed weak. If the tobacco industry were to be the sole or even the principal beneficiary of research designed to eliminate any factors found in tobacco dangerous to health, there would be some validity in the stand that the industry should finance the research.

The taxes paid by tobacco into the Federal Treasury alone would justify the expenditure of even the highest estimate of the cost of the proposed research project, $10 million. For in 1963, the Federal Government received $2,079,200,000 from taxes on tobacco—incidentally, $750 million more than all the producers of all types of tobacco grown in the United States received. And the Federal take amounted to two-thirds as much as the value of manufactured tobacco products in 1962, the last year for which complete statistics are currently available on this point.

The Federal tax revenues are not the only tax income received from tobacco: in 1963 State governments received $1,153,290,000 and county and city governments an additional $38,075,589 in taxes on tobacco products.

Put another way, the overall taxes paid on tobacco last year ($3,270,565,589) amounted to more than twice as much as the farm market value of all the tobacco raised in the United States ($1,314,287,000). And they amounted to over $200 million more than the value of manufactured tobacco for 1962 ($3,063,497,000).

Since Federal, State, and local governments get more out of tobacco than either the producers or the processors, it is not only proper but to the Government's advantage to carry on the research.

Add to tax considerations the economic implications evident in more than a half-million tobacco farms and over 77,000 employees in 504 tobacco factories (not to mention workers in industries which sell to tobacco farmers and manufacturers and in wholesale and retail firms handling tobacco). In any other comparable situation the Congressmen who bottled up the tobacco research bill would be demanding that the Federal Government engage in research.

The Rules Committee action should be reconsidered and reversed in the overall public interest.

Articles for Possible Consideration in Trade Agreement Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, I submitted a statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission supporting the removal of fluorspar from the list of items to be negotiated at the Geneva Conference this year.

In my opinion, the fluorspar industry in this country faces complete annihilation due to the increase in imports of fluorspar from foreign countries. While the fluorspar industry may be small in comparison to other business activities in the United States, its product is most essential to our economy.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM FIRST DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

To: U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C.
Subject: Investigation No. TEA-221(b)-1. Under section 221 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, with respect to the President's list of articles for possible consideration in trade agreement negotiations.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to respectfully request that this Commission recommend to the President that fluorspar (items No. 522.21 and No. 522.24 of the Tariff Schedule of the United States) be removed from the list of items to be negotiated at the Geneva Conference this May.

Flourspar imports have and are increasing at an alarming rate. Imports for consumption have risen from an average of 426,646 short tons for the years 1953 through 1957 and from 392,164 short tons in 1958 as follows: 1959, 555,750 short tons; 1960, 534,020 short tons; 1961, 505,759 short tons; 1962, 595,695 short tons. For the first half of 1963, a total of 268,696 short tons were imported. Imports for consumption in 1962 were 18 percent over those of 1961. The increase in total imports was composed of an 11-percent rise in acid-grade fluorspar and a 35-percent increase in metallurgical-grade material. Mexico supplied 75 percent of our imports, followed by Spain with 14 percent, and Italy with 8 percent. The increase of imports of fluorspar is fast spelling the doom of our domestic fluorspar industry.

The fluorspar industry is small, but its product is essential to our economy. During the year 1956–58, when Government-stockpiling programs were in effect, about $15 million worth of fluorspar was produced annually and employment approximated 850 people. For the next 3 years, 1959–61, without Government stockpiling, annual production was between $7.5 and $9 million and employment averaged about 650. Production in 1962, also was slightly over $9 million.

Meanwhile we have encouraged the production of fluorspar abroad. We have financed mill construction and mine development. Until 1958 we awarded stockpiling contracts to foreign firms. Imports have been permitted without restriction. And, of course, our wages are much higher than those of foreign countries.

In my opinion, Senator FRANK E. MOSS portrayed accurately today's situation when in 1959 he summarized a minerals data sheet of the Department of the Interior as follows: (1) That a substantial decline in the domestic production of fluorspar can be expected with the cessation of Government purchase programs; (2) that domestic producers of fluorspar are experiencing considerable difficulty in meeting import competition; and (3) that existing tariffs are no barrier to imports of fluorspar while at the same time exports of fluorspar are of only minor importance in the economies of foreign exporting countries. Time has certainly borne out those conclusions.

Repeatedly, the fluorspar industry has sought to obtain Government assistance or additional restrictions on imports of fluorspar, but without avail.

Mine production statistics for the United States indicate that some type of aid is necessary for this small, but essential in-

dustry. From a 1953–57 average of 792,080 short tons, reaching a high point of 818,100 short tons in 1958, production has dropped to the following: 1959, 404,900 short tons; 1960, 575,700 short tons; 1961, 615,075 short ton; and 1962, 623,750 short tons. Meanwhile, as shown above, imports have risen from about 392,000 short tons in 1958 to about 596,000 short tons in 1962. A remedy must be found for this situation without delay. Surely permitting the tariff on fluorspar to be negotiated downward would only increase the problem and make any remedy more difficult and more costly. It is in the interest of the Nation that fluorspar be unequivocably removed from the list of items to be negotiated at the Geneva Conference this spring.

Therefore, I urge your careful consideration of this matter and implore you to recommend the removal of fluorspar from the list of items to be negotiated to the end that what's left of this industry may at least have a chance to be saved from complete and total destruction.

The President on TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of March 17, 1964:

THE PRESIDENT ON TV

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has no reason now to worry about himself as a performer on TV. In his interview on Sunday night he was never at a loss for words or facts, or for grammar and syntax, and he was immediately and shrewdly aware not only of the meaning of the questions put to him but of how his answers would be taken by the great audience. He showed himself to be a very formidable political man, and before he had finished, he managed to occupy a very great deal of the ground where the preponderant majority of the voters are to be found.

This is most obviously true in domestic affairs. Here he is making it extremely difficult for any of the Republican moderates, such as Nixon, Rockefeller, and Scranton, to define an issue—except to claim that they can do all the things that Johnson says he wants to do and that they can do them better than he can. This is not a very good issue against a President in office who has all the facts at his disposal and who has Mr. Johnson's experience in the operation of the U.S. Government.

So, as Senator DIRKSEN has just said, the issue must be drawn in foreign affairs. The President is quite aware that this is what his opponents will have to try to do, and it was fascinating to watch him make this very difficult for them.

The fact is that on all the continents all sorts of things are happening to which this country is very much opposed. The grand design in Europe, the Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere, the containment of Red China, the war in southeast Asia, Cyprus, Zanzibar, Gabon, and what-not—in none of these places are we prevailing or, as the juveniles put it, "winning."

Theoretically, therefore, it should be possible to make a great political issue out of the failure of so many of our policies abroad, and to blame the Kennedy-Johnson administration for the failure. But in actual practice, two things have to be given if the issue is to be made politically effective in the presidential campaign. One is that the mass of people will believe that Nixon or Scranton or Rockefeller know how to win victory all over the world because they are so much brighter or so much braver than Kennedy and Johnson. Goldwater and Rockefeller tried this out in the New Hampshire primary and they were thoroughly defeated by a man who is one of the principal administrators of the Kennedy-Johnson policy in the worst of all the trouble spots.

The other necessary ingredient in making foreign policy a capital issue is that a majority of the American voters should find themselves in the mood where they think it would be better to risk a great war in order to win than worrying along as best we can as long as the truly vital interests of the United States are not plainly at stake. The American people are not in that mood, as we can see by watching the hawkiest candidate avoid calling for a military showdown anywhere.

The President put his finger on the crux of the whole problem of our inability to have ourselves followed, often indeed listened to, in so many parts of the world. There are, he said, "people who feel that all we need to do is to mash a button and determine everybody's foreign policy. But we are not living in that kind of a world any more. They are going to determine it for themselves, and that is the way it should be. And we are going to have to come and reason with them and try to lead them instead of forcing them."

These are, I believe, among the most important words spoken by an American President since the Second World War. They recognize the reality of things. They recognize the profound change which has taken place in the power balances of the globe since the end of the postwar period. These words are the key to most of what so many find so puzzling—for example, the policies of General de Gaulle, the evolution of Latin American attitudes toward this country, our frustration in southeast Asia.

My own impression, indeed conviction, is that our people are in the mood to believe these words when they hear them from a President whom they trust completely. So, barring calamities that no one can foresee, it does not seem likely that the ripsnorting juveniles will carry the day.

Hon. William J. Green, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives has not been the same since the departure from its Hall and from this life of our esteemed friend, the late Hon. William J. Green, Jr. As a dear friend and a valued colleague, he is sorely missed.

Bill and I came to the Congress as freshmen Members together in 1945. I knew him well and admired him greatly. He was sincere, tolerant, lovable, and conscientious. He was devoted to the cause of good government and this motivated him to give of his best to his work for the people of his district, his State of Pennsylvania and his Nation. His efforts here among us stand as a monumental record of achievement.

It was always a pleasure to work with Bill Green and I count it among my life's privileges to have known him and to have been associated with such an outstanding man.

I pray that God's richest blessings may rest always with his sweet widow and his family.

Equal Justice for the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday may have marked the beginning of a new epoch in American life. Yesterday we received the President's battle plan for the war against poverty and heard his draft call on all Americans to lend their skills and their energies to one of America's great and unique missions: the abolition of economic poverty at its roots.

I hope that every Member of this body will join the long and difficult campaign against the causes of poverty. But I also hope we will not forget that poverty is like an ancient and gnarled tree; its branches will survive even while we strike at its roots. The consequences of poverty will continue to plague us although we press for the elimination of its causes.

There is one consequence of poverty we cannot turn our backs on while we attack the causes of poverty itself. This is the unequal burden borne by the poor under our criminal laws, a form of discrimination which mocks and tarnishes our efforts to create a society of truly equal opportunity.

Nowhere should the ideal of "Equal justice under law" be closer to attainment than in the administration of our criminal laws. Yet nowhere does economic status play such a critical, often irreversible, role in fixing the course of a man's life.

We have been by and large faithful to the image of blindfolded justice, and most of our laws are good laws. Yet, through inadvertence and inattention, we have permitted the scales of justice to become sensitive to financial resources as well as legal rights. With life and liberty hanging in the balance, we too often dispense criminal justice like a commodity in the marketplace.

An article in last Sunday's New York Times magazine explores this problem with clarity and compassion. Entitled "Equal Justice for the Poor, Too," it is based on Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg's James Madison lecture at the New York University Law School. I commend it to lawyers and laymen alike as a brief but incisive primer on one problem of the poor which cannot await ultimate victory over poverty.

The article follows:

EQUAL JUSTICE FOR THE POOR, TOO

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

(NOTE.—Arthur J. Goldberg has been an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court since October 1962. This article was adapted from a James Madison lecture that he gave recently at the New York University School of Law.)

Far too often, money—or the lack of it—can be the deciding factor in the courtroom, says Justice Goldberg, who calls for a program to insure justice for all Americans.

In theory, all Americans charged with a crime are, so far as the law is concerned, equal before the bar of justice in every American court. This is guaranteed by the "due process" and the "equal protection" clauses to the Constitution, and the inspiration comes from the Bible: "You shall do no injustice in judgment; you shall not be partial to the poor or defer to the great, but in righteousness shall you judge your neighbor." Justices of the Supreme Court and of many State courts take oaths to "do equal justice to the poor and to the rich."

Unfortunately, despite all these guarantees and safeguards, the poor often meet with less than the same justice as the rich (or reasonably well off) in our courts. As Justice Black has stated, "There can be no equal justice where the kind of trial a man gets depends on the amount of money he has."

It should not be forgotten that problems of equal criminal justice extend to the near-poor and the average wage earner as well as the indigent, and that such problems begin well before trial and continue after the appeal.

When the police conduct a roundup of "suspects," they generally do so in poor neighborhoods, rarely in middle-class communities. As a result, more poor than rich are arrested for crimes they did not commit. We do not know how many of these people lose or fail to obtain jobs because of an "arrest record" resulting from guiltless involvement in such episodes. Nor do we know how many poor people are even aware of their rights in such situations: for example, their right to consult an attorney, to sue for false arrest, or to have their arrest records expunged (in jurisdictions which have procedures permitting this). Moreover, psychologists and sociologists tell us that young people who are close to choosing criminal identities may have this choice confirmed by their repeated treatment as criminal types.

After arrest, the accused who is poor must often await the disposition of his case in jail because of his inability to raise bail, while the accused who can afford bail is free to return to his family and his job. Equally important, he is free during the critical period between arrest and trial to help his attorney with the investigation and preparation of his defense. In a recent case a defendant was imprisoned well over 2 years between the time he was arrested and the time he was ultimately acquitted on appeal, solely because he could not raise the small amount of money necessary for bail. This is an example of justice denied, of a man imprisoned for no reason other than his poverty.

In preparing for trial the lawyer appointed to represent an accused who is without funds generally has few, if any, of the investigatory resources available to the prosecution or to an accused with means. He may also be limited in his ability to subpena necessary witnesses to appear at trial. Under the present Federal rule, for example, a defendant with means may automatically obtain all necessary subpenas by simply paying a fee and designating the desired witness. A defendant who cannot afford to pay the fee, however, must submit a detailed affidavit stating why he needs the witness and indicating the substance of the expected testimony.

Thus, as a price for obtaining the testimony of a witness, the accused without means must do something not required either of the Government or of an accused with means: he must disclose his case in advance. This result might indeed be desirable if disclosure were required of all parties to a criminal case. But fundamental fairness and equality would seem to dictate that this should not be exacted alone from an indigent as the price of exercising his sixth amendment right to obtain the testimony of necessary witnesses.

After conviction, the defendant's financial condition may have a significant effect on whether he is placed on probation or sent to the penitentiary, on whether and when he is paroled from the penitentiary and on whether he continues to remain at liberty. Probation and parole frequently depend upon the availability of a job and/or of psychiatric treatment. These conditions can, of course, be met and maintained more easily by one who was means than by one who does not.

The alternative fine-imprisonment penalty still frequently imposed for petty offenses may also be unfair to the defendant without means. The choice of paying $100 fine or spending 30 days in jail is really no choice at all to the person who cannot raise $100. The resulting imprisonment is no more or no less than imprisonment for being poor, a doctrine which I trust this Nation has long since outgrown. Concern has even been expressed that the most serious penalty of all—death—is imposed with disproportionate frequency on the poor. Warden Lawes, who witnessed the execution of many Sing Sing inmates, remarked:

"If a wealthy man, or the son of a wealthy man kills, he is insane or deranged and usually either goes scot free or to an insane asylum. If a poor and friendless man kills, he is a sane man who committed willful murder for which he must die."

Regrettably, there are still on our statute books some substantive laws which in practice tend to operate unequally against the poor. The vagrancy laws are an example in point. Anatole France would surely have said: "The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor" from being able-bodied persons without visible means of support who do not seek employment and who are unable to account for their lawful presence. These laws, as Justice Douglas has observed, make it a crime to be poor, downtrodden and unemployed. This is reminiscent of Butler's "Erewhon," where it was a felony to be afflicted with pulmonary consumption.

Without intimating any view on whether the equal protection clause of the Constitution has any voice on these and similar problems, I will say that the courts and other organs of government, both State and Federal, have not brought their ingenuity sufficiently to bear on these crucial areas of equal justice. In some States, as in the Federal Government, the high courts have power to supervise the administration of criminal justice. This is a source of power from which much good can flow, as demonstrated by some recent decisions of our Court, the Federal courts of appeals, and some State courts in the area of equal criminal justice. Certainly the legislative and executive branches have ample powers to remedy these injustices.

In some parts of the world—indeed, in many parts of this country when men of means are involved—arrests are made whenever possible in a dignified manner. The accused is notified that he is being investigated, and he is called to police headquarters by a summons rather than bodily arrest. I am not suggesting that this can be done in every case, but it certainly can and should be done in many.

Recent studies in the area of bail have indicated that if carefully screened defendants are released pending trial on their own recognizance and treated with dignity, they will appear at trial. Think of the needless waste—to the individual, the family and the community—every time a responsible person presumed by law to be innocent is kept in jail awaiting trial solely because he is unable to raise bail money.

Careful screening and release without bail should be made the rule rather than the exception throughout the country. Again, I am not suggesting that release without bail should be allowed in every case but it should be permitted whenever feasible.

The right to counsel at trial and on appeal may prove hollow if appointed counsel is not armed with the tools of advocacy—investigatory resources, expert witnesses, subpena, trial transcript. If the right to counsel is to be given meaningful content, and if our adversary process is to retain its vitality, the appointed attorney, like the retained attorney, must be permitted to perform as an advocate. Courts are not without sources to achieve this end.

In a recent California case, for example, the State supreme court held that if "the attorney is not given a reasonable opportunity to ascertain facts surrounding the charged crime so he can prepare a proper defense, the accused's basic right to effective representation would be denied." Some courts have held that the right to effective representation includes interpreters, accountants and other needed medical and scientific aids. If representation is to be as effective for poor as for rich, it follows that services necessary to make this right effective must be supplied at Government expense to those unable to afford them.

The Government should also assume a certain degree of responsibility for assuring the poor equal access to probation and parole. It could, for example, provide facilities which would enable the parolee without means to obtain outpatient psychiatric treatment without being institutionalized and losing his job—a privilege heretofore reserved exclusively for the wealthy.

It could also experiment with the idea of the half-way house, a system under which convicted criminals might be released from prison and still remain under the care and responsibility of the Government until they have reestablished their roots in the community and have found decent jobs.

Our concern, moreover, should not be limited to the very poor alone. The Council of Economic Advisers in its recent report to the President designated the $3,000 annual family income mark as the boundary of poverty. A family of four earning this amount, if it spent a mere $5 per person a week for food and $800 a year for shelter for the family, would have less than $25 a week for clothing, transportation, school supplies, home furnishings, medical care, insurance and everything else. It is clear that if any member of the almost 10 million American families which fit into this category were accused of a serious crime he could not begin to raise the funds necessary for an adequate defense.

But, what about the family earning $4,000 or even $5,000? I would doubt whether half of the families in this affluent country could today afford an adequate defense if one of their members were accused of a serious crime. Perhaps they could raise sufficient money for bail or even for a trial lawyer, but what about an investigator, a psychiatrist or an expert in ballistics or handwriting; and what about a complete transcript to prepare an appeal and the prosecution of the appeal itself?

This is a situation that actually does confront many, many of our families each year. It was recently estimated that "annually more than a million persons stand before our judges for sentencing after conviction." Few of these people fit the misleading stereotype

of the wealthy lawbreaker well equipped to confront the legal process.

Here, we can learn much from the Scandinavian countries. The services provided there are made available to all accused persons. No test of financial capacity is applied as a condition of receiving them. Far more than the provision of counsel is encompassed within these systems. For example, in preparing the defense, the appointed lawyer may make use of Government laboratories and consult with its experts. If the accused is acquitted no effort is made to collect the cost of defense regardless of the defendant's means. If he is convicted some of the countries inquire into his means and if found financially able he is charged with some or all of the costs of his defense. In at least one country no effort is made to establish the means of the defendant or to charge him with costs even if he is convicted.

Even if we choose not to go as far as the Scandinavian countries, we should certainly consider adopting procedures whereby persons erroneously charged with crime could be reimbursed for their expenditures in defending against the charge. Without such procedures, acquittal may often be almost as ruinous to the defendant and his family as conviction.

At the very least, we should extend our provision of free legal services in criminal cases to include many hard-working people who, although not indigent, cannot, without extraordinary sacrifice, raise sufficient funds to defend themselves or members of their families against a criminal charge.

Whenever the Government considers extending a needed service to those accused of crime, the question arises: But what about the victim? We should confront the problem of the victim directly; his burden is not alleviated by denying necessary services to the accused. Many countries throughout the world, recognizing that crime is a community problem, have designed systems for government compensation of victims of crime. Serious consideration of this approach is long overdue here. The victim of a robbery or an assault has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole.

These are but a few—indeed a very few—of the areas in which equal justice is lacking. There are many others. It is said that the Government cannot be expected to equalize all economic disparities. Of course it cannot, but this does not mean that it should not try to eliminate disparties in certain critical areas like criminal justice. The real question, as put by the Attorney General's Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice is: "Has Government done all that can be reasonably required of it * * * to render the poverty of the litigant an irrelevancy."

In all candor, we must confess that Government in this country—both State and Federal—has not done all that can reasonably be required. Equal criminal justice for rich and poor alike is one of the few areas where our country follows rather than leads. If it is true that "the quality of a nation's civilization can be largely measured by the methods it uses in the enforcement of its criminal law," then this situation cannot long be tolerated. We must lead in equality if we are to continue to lead in liberty. But, while we are making efforts to equalize the treatment of rich and poor in the criminal process, we must remember that the criminal process is but one tree in a forest of poverty.

Every criminologist will acknowledge the truth of this linkage between poverty and crime. The great bulk of our prison population comes from the ranks of the economically underprivileged. A root cause of crime is economic distress and its byproducts—illiteracy and ignorance. If we are to make inroads on crime and delinquency, therefore, we must as a Government and people make inroads on poverty in America.

The recent report of the Attorney General's committee was a milestone which promises to have continued influence. The Justice Department is carrying through many of the suggestions made in that report, and Congress now has under consideration a major item of legislation emanating from it.

The Manhattan bail project, conducted in part under the auspices of New York University Law School, also holds great promise. And in the District of Columbia the entire problem of bail is being rethought; just a few weeks ago the first experiment was conducted in releasing an accused on his own recognizance pending trial.

In New Haven, Conn., a "neighborhood social-legal program" has been put into operation in an effort to confront the basic social, economic, and educational roots of legal problems. A team—consisting of a social worker, a lawyer, and an investigator—is assigned to a poor neighborhood in an effort to uncover and deal with the causes of the legal problems at their sources rather than at the litigation stage.

This pioneer program recognizes that problems of poverty cut across the conceptual lines dividing criminal from civil cases, and that the poor person must be made aware of his legal rights and obligations—whether they be in signing a lease, executing a credit agreement, settling a domestic dispute or paying taxes—before he can be expected to participate in the community as a fully responsible citizen. Programs of this sort hold great promise, especially for our urban population centers.

Our substantive criminal law is also undergoing much needed revamping, prompted in part by the American Law Institute's Model Penal Code. More attention is being paid in our law schools as well to this long-neglected area. The practice of criminal law is again becoming as respected as it was at the time of the Constitution and throughout our early history, when it was engaged in by men like John Adams, Daniel Webster, and Abraham Lincoln.

It is hoped that many more established lawyers will bring their experience, and that many more young law graduates will bring the most recent academic developments, to bear on the problems of justice. The widespread participation of the bar in the criminal process, which will result from the Supreme Court's recent decisions holding that all criminal defendants, must, upon request, be afforded representation at trial and on appeal, will bring the present inequalities of the criminal process more forcefully to the attention of the bar. This in itself is desirable, for awareness of a problem is the first and most important step toward solution.

Foreign Aid for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article by Dr. Robert Morris pointing out how our foreign aid is helping the Communists. While we are doing all we can to accommodate communism the Communist goal has not changed. As Dr. Morris points out, as late as January of this year, Khruschev is boasting about Soviet aggression and subversion. Will we wake up before it is too late, or lulled by the siren song of appeasement, are we actually going to commit national suicide?

Dr. Morris' column follows:

FOREIGN AID FOR WHAT?

(By Robert Morris)

The United States has spent more than $103 billion on foreign aid. In so doing we have not only added to our national debt but have depleted our gold reserves from $25 to $15½ billion. Largely through this aid, citizens of other countries hold $27 billion redeemable in gold—more than enough to torpedo us economically.

The people of the United States have made this expenditure generously and with patience. They were told by their leaders that this outlay was necessary "to stop communism," and yet a substantial percentage of our current aid goes directly to the Communists themselves. Communist Dictator Tito has gotten more than $3 billion in all kinds of assistance, Dictator Gomulka more than half a billion. A long list of dictators who are playing Khrushchev's game are also the beneficiaries of our largess: Sukarno, Nkrumah, Ben Bella, and a score of others in tapering degree receive foreign aid despite their flagrant collaboration with Soviet purpose.

This aid is said to strengthen foreign governments against communism. Actually 29 recipient governments have been illegally overthrown, mostly by Communist or pro-Communist forces. Even after the overthrow, all but one, Cuba, continue to receive foreign aid.

Last year we learned that, while Congress was debating whether or not to lend the U.N. $100 million, Harlan Cleveland, of the State Department, took more than $150 million from the contingency foreign aid funds and gave it to the U.N. some of which money was channeled to pay the delinquent U.N. dues of Castro and other Soviet dictators.

Back in 1958, some people used to take the position that they favored foreign aid to the extent that it implemented policy. Therefore, they were for foreign aid to Greece and Turkey, to Free China and others who were valiantly holding the tide. They were against aid for Tito and Sukarno. They thought that aid to the Communists and pro-Communist dictators did not implement our policy.

Either they were wrong then, or things have changed. Somewhere along the line our policy changed from containment or deterrence of communism to convergence with communism.

All one need do is to analyze our fundamental policy, outlined in the Rostow memorandum and other papers, to know that grants to Communist countries do indeed implement our policy. For our policy is not to stop communism but to merge with communism. Therefore, we lavish Khrushchev's helpers with assistance, relieving that grand dictator himself of many of his burdens.

We cut off foreign aid to the Dominician Republic that deposes Castro-loving Juan Bosch, to General Nosavan, of Laos, as long as he refuses to join a troika government with the Communists, to the leaders of Honduras who depose a leftist government. We reduce foreign aid to Chiang. All of this accords with the new policy: to converge with communism.

Meanwhile, Khrushchev steers to his original goal. Listen to him on January 18, 1964: "Communism is being built not only within the borders of the Soviet Union. We are also doing all we can to see that communism triumphs over all the earth."

Time To Assess Wheat Sale Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Eliot Janeway, writing in the Chicago Tribune of Thursday, March 12, thoughtfully reviews the results of the wheat sale to Russia. His analysis is less than favorable to the proponents of trade concessions to the Soviet Union, who, as a general rule, are always the leaders in the move to appease communism. Since this issue is a vital one in the minds of all American citizens, I feel Mr. Janeway's comments deserve attention, and insert the article into the RECORD at this point:

JANEWAY'S VIEW: TIME TO ASSESS RUSS WHEAT SALE RESULTS

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 11.—Now that U.S. grain shipments to Russia have been underway for some weeks, it's time to assess the net results of this famous negotiation.

Let's look back at the hopes inspired on our side of the transaction when Moscow first put out feelers last autumn.

Hope No. 1 was for a flow of gold westward from Russia, in payment for grain, that would ease our financial burdens, if not eliminate them altogether.

Hope No. 2 assumed that our grain markets would strengthen along with our currency markets thanks to this bonanza bailout from the Kremlin's purchasing agents.

Last autumn's official predictions, in fact, proclaimed that Russia's crop failure guaranteed America's trade and financial success. But the officials who made these headlines aren't likely to be displaying them now.

For what shows up in the early spring audit of last autumn's promises? Just as much trouble for our grain and money markets as was in the cards last autumn, before Russia's publicized bid to buy grain for gold raised hopes of a bailout.

GRAIN MARKET TOPHEAVY

Take our grain markets. They've been topheavy and in retreat. Last autumn's headlines about a Russian buying spree spurring a farm export boom have given way to scare stories about a farm slump. Congress, which delayed the tax bill to vote authorization of the Russian grain deal last winter, now has taken time out from the civil rights bill to take up emergency farm relief legislation.

True, the Russians have bought some of our grain for cash, and their satellites have bought some more on short-term credit. But any help it's brought to our farm economy is about over—and it wasn't much to begin with.

EXPECTED RUSSIAN GOLD

Take our money markets. When hopes were roused by the expectation of a Russian bailout, the idea was that Russia would pay by shipping gold to London—the admitted weak link in the non-Communist world currency chain. And, indeed, Moscow played up to our flair for self-delusion—by publicizing a few rush flights of gold westward.

But now, danger signals are flying again in the London money market.

It's not gold pouring in from Moscow that's making news there, but hard cash pouring out in fear of devaluation and exchange controls.

Instead of gold being in easy supply and the pound and the dollar being strong, there's a new gold speculation against the dollar as well as the pound.

RUSSIA NO HELP

It seems that Russia hasn't helped our finances any more than she has helped our crop exports. No doubt we might be shipping more grain if President Johnson had been willing to license a give-away, instead of holding out for a two-way deal (including terms of payment and shipping).

Moral: Yes, you can do business with the Russians. But it isn't always good business to try, and it's never business to bank on. For when they suspect that their trade may be helping us, they pull back—even if it means that some Russians go hungry.

Hoosier Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, back home in Indiana we are going through what is commonly termed "Hoosier hysteria." This is basketball tournament time back home. Every high school in Indiana has participated in a series of competitive tournaments to determine which team will go to the top of the heap as the undisputed champion of Indiana high school basketball. The field has been narrowed to four teams—Columbus, Huntington, Lafayette, and Rex Mundi.

It may seem strange for people to get so wrapped up in such a matter as a high school basketball tournament when there are so many national and international issues to be resolved, but this is part of the total spirit of America. It has promoted the mental and physical development of young men. It has promoted a strength-giving competition which has been good for the competitor and fan alike. It has brought a new awareness of the respect we all have for sportsmanlike conduct.

I am one of those Hoosiers who is caught in this web of enthusiasm for a great sport. My excitement has been enhanced by the fact that my hometown team, Huntington, will be one of the competing teams at the State finals in Indianapolis next Saturday. This excitement of which I speak is shown very vividly by the news story on the Vikings' win last Saturday by George Frye, managing editor, Huntington Herald Press:

The celebration began in Fort Wayne's Memorial Coliseum shortly before 9:30 p.m. Saturday and it was still going on in the wee hours this morning. The reason? The Vikings had just given Huntington its first entry in the State tournament at Indianapolis since 1945. The traffic jam in Huntington was like VJ Day all over again.

The Huntington High School Vikings is a fine team coached by an outstanding teacher and coach, Bob Straight. He is one of the best and, by example, has been all a coach should be. He is clean, and an outstanding man who has that sterling quality of leadership which produces champions both on and off the playing floor. Bob can take special pride in knowing that, although the Huntington High School records will be filled with his own accomplishments as a successful coach, day by day his boys, throughout their lives, will be writing the true history of his accomplishments—the building of men of character and worth.

His Heart Was Never Absent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following movingly beautiful eulogy to the late President Kennedy delivered on November 25, 1963 by Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein of K.A.M. Temple in Chicago:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein)

It is with a heavy heart I speak to you today. Our President has been taken from us—not by the Gentle Angel who comes to give us peace after the storms and strifes of life's weary years, not by the One who spares us the decay of age and the bemeaning of time—but by the violent one, the mad, distemperate one, the ignorant one of aggressive brawn and little brain—the satanic deputy of all that is raw and primitive in this land of ours—ignorant, violent, and primitive, yet armed with telescopic sight, and able to kill from afar, send the arrow by night and speed the pestilence by day. Unhappy land, unhappy time—that preserves the jungle heart and the troglodytic mind and arms them with the shining armor and the long thrust of science.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is cut down in the midst of life. Where was the like of him—Adonis with the mind of Nestor? A golden-haired youth who could have dallied in all the opulent pastures of great wealth and lived as riotously and elegantly as the Medicis—he gave himself rather to the service of our Republic. As soldier, as Congressman, Senator, President, he revealed a remarkable insight into the political and economic order of our society. He knew the structure of power. He knew intimately the ways in which men are guided and goaded to action. He knew the play and counterplay of forces and the mysterious wheels within wheels which make up the chain of effective command. He was a political marvel who could learn and retain an infinite number of facts about an incredible number of subjects and could sift them and concentrate them upon the problems at hand. One day when the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity was meeting at the White House, I was privileged to watch him as he walked from one meeting to another—some six in all—the Business Ethics Advisory Committee, the Labor and Management Conference, a joint committee on the New Trade bill, a Committee on the Alliance for Progress, the White House Conference on the Aged—and relate himself to the complicated agenda of each group, make excellent suggestions on the work reported and present sound advice on the next steps for each committee. I was given to understand that this 3-hour stint was only a fraction of his working day and that before he would get to bed that night there were several functions of State, several meetings with congressional leaders on

thorny matters and a vast heap of legislative and State Department memos to read, amend, and sign.

HIS HEART WAS NEVER ABSENT

But while his mind worked with incredible logic and remarkable speed, and his body sustained an energy expenditure that would have honored a platoon, his heart was never absent. He was one of the most contained men emotionally I have ever known. This was not because there was any lack of feeling. It was because he had suffused his heart into his mind. He could afford no wasteful drain of sentiment. He was completely bent on finding the necessary means to implement his vision of the good society. He would be the first to admit that he was no self-abnegating saint—that he relished ego satisfaction with the best of us, but he would likewise maintain, and rightly, that he had over the long and disciplined years sublimated that ego into community and that what remained of self-interest was enlightened and socialized.

He had style. There was grace in him and an instinct for the right measure for every purpose. His wit was dry, perceptive, often sharp but seldom cutting. He played politics as the young David played his harp—with artistry—so that the wiliest old wolves and foxes of the Senate knew that his charm was never a substitute for strength, but merely the sense of ease with which he used his power. Together with Mrs. Kennedy he had made the White House a palace of grace and beauty. He removed the last remnants of the coonskin, the spitoon, and the anti-Macassar and made it reflect, as it should, the ripe artistic heritage of our Nation.

I will never forget the visit Mrs. Weinstein and I made on the occasion of the centenary of the proclamation which ended slavery and saw these two beautiful people gracefully representing the youth, the vitality, and the power of this Nation in this home which they had made beautiful and intimate without making it parochial.

BRIGHT BROTHER—FATHER TO OUR YOUTH

It is not an accident that so many young people have come to the synagogue to mourn our President. He was their assurance that youth was not allergic to maturity, that one did not have to spend all one's youth in apprenticeship, that one did not have to be dour and solemn to be profound. He was the great arbiter between the generations. He was David hitting the bulls-eye, the Philistine Goliaths of our time with the smooth round pebbles of his incisive logic. He made political battle as exciting as a gridiron contest, and the war for social security as dramatic as Gettysburg. Through the Peace Corps he developed a most effective moral equivalent for war. The youth of the Nation have lost a father who was also a brother.

It is still not possible to accept the fact that this handsome puissant statesman in whom the forces of nature had opulently conspired to channel incredible riches of strength and wisdom is no more, that the striking profile of courage which lifted our hearts on that January day in 1961 and bare-headed cast its golden light on that bitter wintry day was the target for an assassin's bullet. It seemed as he responded to the high challenge of the hour in his crisp New England speech, that he was alined with the enduring forces of earth and that the bright armour of his genius would turn any adversary's noisome threat.

THE STAIN OF VIOLENCE IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE

This is not the time to consider the wild barbaric forces still loose in our land, the immaturity of the mass mind and the malevolent forces that play upon it—but we shall have to soon—or the gangsters, the atavistic radicals of right and left, the childish irritation with the inevitable disciplines of a highly interlaced social fabric such as ours wil' destroy us. There are altogether too many respectable people whose sins of omission and commission help to trigger the gunman's hand and supply the heady stimulation for the dynamiter's throw. We stand idly by the blood of our brother—not only when he is slain but when we encourage under specious slogans the lawless and anarchic and callous forces in our society.

You have seen the cartoon by Bill Mauldin—Abe Lincoln clutching his head in woebegone despair, as he contemplates this new martyrdom. What an ominous red thread of violence connects these century-separated assassinations. The lynch rope, the auto-de-fe faggots, the sniper's bullet—these are the blots on the bright face of the American dream. They are the present-day survivals of our jungle frontier in our land and in our hearts.

Happily we can point to the remarkable discipline of the Negro in the mass demonstrations of the past several years as evidence that even the most wronged and deprived people need not meet violence with violence, that there are great reservoirs of common decency and of Judeo-Christian reverence for life in the hearts of our people. Strange is it not that the most deprived and despoiled of our land can respond with nonviolent dignity while those who are asked to share only a little of their wealth and power maul our dignitaries and cry for Judge Lynch? We must mobilize that decency to shrink the area in which the primitive can operate—Let the blood of two emancipation Presidents be the seed of a new nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and are entitled to their full heritage under God.

Someone has said that men are things that think a little but chiefly forget. One hundred years ago the rabbi of this congregation, the beloved Liebman Adler, the father of the more famous Dankman Adler of the Adler-Sullivan team, said in his eulogy of Lincoln: "The more and more thoroughly we reminisce about Lincoln, the more do we love him and the more do we find his murder aimless and the greater do we see the loss to his own family and the Nation."

What might this dark brooding man with the infinite weariness of the burden of man's inhumanity to man say to this golden-headed colleague who now belongs with him to the ages?

But this is the hour for mourning and for prayer in our heart that God will grant comfort to the sorrowing family—to the wife—to the children, to the parents—too intimate already with grief—and to the brothers and sisters who constitute a Maccabean tribe and who in their various ways provided brilliant models of social consciousness and social services at their best.

We must take courage too, for ours is a nation too strong and resilient to be weakened by the loss of even its finest leader. It is the saving grace of a democratic check and balance system such as ours that a temporary blow to one of its powers only shifts the burden to the others until equilibrium is restored. And we have in our new president a man of great sagacity, one knowledgeable in all the varied manners and mysteries of politics and administration, and one who faithfully subscribes to the national goals of our late President.

It remains only for us to do the unfinished work—to bind and heal the wounds of our Nation, to bring the Negro and all minorities into the family estate as full brothers in fact, to make the machine in its automated dimensions our servant and not our master, to give effective education and training to all our young and finally, to keep open the channels of communication that we might achieve a just peace in the framework of a world government of the United Nations.

If we would transmute the pain of this hour into the substance of good, then must we here highly resolve that we shall achieve in our land an equality of opportunity and a general security without impounding the liberties of the people, without penalizing differences with death, without reducing the infinite variety of the human condition to the manageable categories of totalitarian necessity. This was the overreaching goal of John Kennedy's massive and brilliant thrust. Our achievement of that goal will be his most adequate and fitting memorial.

I hear an ancient voice speaking from the Book of Books—

It comes from one intimate with grief and acquainted with sorrow. He spoke to a nation whose cup of woe had filled to overflowing.

"Comfort ye, comfort ye my people—for ye have paid double for all your sins * * *
Bring now good tidings to the humble,
And bind up the broken hearted,
And proclaim liberty to the captives,
And the opening of the eyes to them that are bound.
Proclaim the year of the Lord's good pleasure
Comfort all that mourn * * *
All that mourn in Zion * * *
Give them a garland for ashes,
The oil of joy for mourning,
The mantle of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

Save the IDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the bill to authorize U.S. participation in the increase of funds for the International Development Association was recommitted by the House of Representatives on February 26, 1964. It is my feeling that the IDA presents a workable solution to many of the complex problems of foreign aid, since it would operate on multilateral rather than unilateral assistance.

A multilateral fund subscribed by many nations is the responsible way to terminate the era of unilateral grants for foreign aid, all of which are drawn from the U.S. Treasury. The IDA is a program in which other nations contribute to the burden of assisting the underdeveloped nations of the world.

An editorial which appeared in the Washington Post presents a good argument for reconsideration of the legislation concerning the operation of the IDA. I submit the editorial here for the attention of my colleagues:

SAVE THE IDA

The House of Representatives should be persuaded to reconsider its tentative rejection of legislation that would permit the United States to join with other advanced countries in supplying the International Development Association with the resources it requires to operate after 1965. Affiliated with the World Bank, the IDA makes loans on generous terms to the poorer nations which find it very difficult to finance their programs for economic development.

A refusal by the House to accept legislation which has been approved by the Senate will have far-reaching consequences. The efforts to place economic assistance on a multilateral basis will be dealt a serious blow and worse still, many of the programs on which the less developed countries rely to raise living standards may have to be abandoned. The more implacable enemies of foreign aid in the House bill will not be disturbed by the mischievous results of their handiwork. But there is a large and more responsible majority which will respond to a vigorous appeal on behalf of the IDA.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Easter and Passover observances I feel called upon to bring to the attention of my colleagues and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an act of brotherhood taking place in New Britain, Conn.

A synagogue recently damaged in a two-alarm fire is being rebuilt with the assistance of New Britain's Christian community. Probate Judge Henry J. Gwiazda has been one of the leaders of this spontaneous response of the non-Jewish friends of Tephereth Israel Congregation. As the following story from the Connecticut Jewish Ledger points out, wealth, not in money, but in friendship, brings true meaning to our lives throughout the year:

A BROTHERHOOD STORY—CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IS HELPING NEW BRITAIN SYNAGOGUE REBUILD

NEW BRITAIN.—Members of Congregation Tephereth Israel, the Orthodox synagogue of this city, have found that in their misfortune of a heavy loss in a recent fire, their wealth in having friends in the general community is a consolation which has taken on added meaning during this Brotherhood Week.

Individuals and groups in New Britain's Christian comunity have come forward with pledges of money to help the congregation attain the initial goal of $35,000 in a fund drive which got underway this week.

Probate Judge Henry J. Gwiazda has been a key figure in the response of Tephereth Israel's non-Jewish friends. It was Judge Gwizada who handed a check representing initial contributions to Frank Beckerman, chairman of the reconstruction drive.

The presentation was made at last Sunday night's general congregational meeting at the synagogue, 76 Winter Street, which mapped plans to rebuild the Holy Ark, replace four Torah scrolls and repair water and heat damage incurred in a predawn two-alarm blaze on January 11.

Benjamin Lifshitz, syngagoue president, expressed his gratification over the "strong participation of our Christian friends who are anxious to help in our reconstruction drive."

Rabbi Henry Okolica, spiritual leader, told the Connecticut Jewish Ledger that at least two churches and a number of individuals in the general community have already made contributions.

"One of the most heart warming experiences our congregation has had," Rabbi Okolica said, "was the donation we received from a former New Britain High School football star, John H. T. Blair, who is now studying on a scholarship at Boston College. He accompanied his donation with a letter in which he expressed his hope for an early reconstruction of the sanctuary."

The 200-member congregation is holding services in the meantime in the 39-year-old building's basement chapel.

One of the local churches immediately offered its premises upon learning of the fire, but makeshift use of present facilties made acceptance of this offer unnecessary, Rabbi Okolica recalled gratefully.

S. Y. Birnbaum is treasurer of the drive, Benjamin Price is chairman of solicitations, and Fenmore Feigenbaum is financial secretary. Cochairmen are Mr. Lifshitz and Henry Shupack.

The synagogue's leadership expressed the feeling this week that the type of spontaneous response the New Britain community has shown the congregation goes a long way toward affirming brotherhood in action—not only during Brotherhood Week—but the year round.

Remarks by Congresswoman Sullivan at National Consumers League Dinner Honoring Mrs. Esther Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning carried a little item about "SULLIVAN'S Mud," the homemade facial mudpack I referred to last night in speaking at a dinner honoring the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson. Since then, I have received numerous inquiries from reporters about this distinctive product—distinctive, primarily, because it is packaged in a container which actually tells the user what is in the jar.

The dinner honoring Mrs. Peterson, held at the Mayflower Hotel, was sponsored by the National Consumers League, an organization which has been battling for and supporting consumer causes since 1899. I was, indeed, privileged to be invited to participate in this event, along with Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, the other Congressional speaker, who succeeded the late Senator Kefauver as chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and who is the author of the "Truth in Packaging" bill.

In my remarks, I attempted to point up some of the glaring loopholes in our basic statutes protecting consumers, particularly in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and more particularly in the sections of that law dealing with cosmetics and also with labeling. But I also referred to the need for legislation on credit disclosure, meat inspection, commodity futures regulation, and many other areas of consumer interest, in which Mrs. Peterson's efforts will, I know, be highly effective.

Presiding at the dinner was Mr. John W. Edelman, chairman of the board of directors of the National Consumers League. Toastmaster was Mr. Wallace J. Campbell, formerly of the Cooperative League of the United States here in Washington, and now an executive of the Nationwide Insurance Co., in Columbus, Ohio.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith my remarks in tribute to an outstanding woman who is now the voice of the consumer in the executive branch of the Federal Government, as follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, AT DINNER OF NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE HONORING MRS. ESTHER PETERSON, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS, MONDAY NIGHT, MARCH 16, 1964, AT MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am delighted to join the National Consumers League tonight in honoring Esther Peterson, because Esther Peterson brings honor to a cause to which most of us here tonight have been devoting most of our lives. She brings not only honor to the consumer movement but also vast energy, sparkling imagination, great skill and remarkable effectiveness.

The fact that there is an Esther Peterson, and the fact that she has been willing to take on the tremendous responsibility of coordinating and expanding the consumer services of the Federal Government give us a feeling of real optimism tonight. Year after year and Congress after Congress, we have had the sad experience of watching so much consumer legislation wither and die because of lack of public awareness of the seriousness of the gaps in our consumer laws, and also because of lack of effective support and leadership in the executive agencies. This is not meant in criticism of the career people in the agencies; they are not politicians—they are not politically oriented—and it takes political leadership to push these things through.

Very often, the political effort has to be bipartisan. And here, once again, Esther Peterson has the skill which is needed to achieve political ends on the highest level of political morality and bipartisanship. So I hail with joy and thanksgiving the action of President Johnson in appointing a special assistant for consumer affairs and I hail his excellent judgment in assigning Esther Peterson to the task of fighting the consumer battle from a desk in the White House.

As the sponsor of much of the consumer legislation introduced in the House of Representatives in the last 11 years, I am realist enough to know that Esther Peterson's appointment is not going to mean the enactment tomorrow—or even the day after—of every worthwhile bill we have had pending on the calendar or languishing in committee. For at least a few days, or weeks, or months—let's hope it's not years—the consumer will still have to be wary and suspicious of any meat sold in intrastate commerce which is not subject to Federal inspection for wholesomeness; the consumer will still be at the mercy of sharp gyrations in prices of basic commodities in which futures trading is not subject to effective Government regulations; the buyer will still have to beware of the deceptively easy credit terms on almost anything he buys; and all of us who use cosmetics—and that includes not only women but children and men, as well—must be careful not to be the first to use any new product, because those who use them first are the guinea pigs for the rest of us.

We are tired of being guinea pigs in this area of consumer health. Unfortunately the pattern in the past has been that too many citizens have had to be made sick as well as tired—sick and tired—in their guinea pig

role before basic reforms in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Acts could be achieved.

The next time you are in a beauty parlor—you women here tonight—and the clouds of hair spray envelop everyone in the room, and float in among the cigarette smoke, think, for a moment, of your danger. That hair spray is inflammable. It is dangerous to the eyes. It can be dangerous, perhaps, to the lungs. It is one of numerous cosmetic products which do not have to be pretested for safety before being placed on the market; in addition—and this is what I mean by the danger—the Hazardous Products Labeling Act does not apply to it because, presumably, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provides all the necessary safeguards as to labeling, and so on. Esther, we are being strangled in loopholes—loopholes which, from a consumer standpoint, act like a noose.

My hope, my wish is that with Esther Peterson's help we will someday soon be able to go up to the cosmetic counter of any store in the country and know what we're buying—know what's in the product, including any ingredient to which we may be allergic, or which might be poisonous if swallowed by a child; to have the products clearly marked as to size and weight—not just cosmetics, but all consumer products—and in the case of cosmetics to be absolutely sure that the product is safe to use.

All women seek beauty all their lives. Little girls primp and raid their mother's perfume bottles before they outgrow their snowsuits. Teenagers use the artistry of Cleopatra in applying eyelash and eyebrow makeup. The older we grow the more interested we become in the cosmetics that suggest the beauty of youth. Aids to beauty are fine if they are safe and pure, and if we can afford them. But I think it is most important to know what ingredients are put in those jars and bottles and boxes and cans that we buy to make ourselves irresistible. The contents should be listed on the labels.

I have with me a good illustration of the kind of labeling we should have on all cosmetics. This is a jar of mud. Like the cigarette ad in the papers the other day, I can guarantee that no other mudpack on the market today has been proved any safer or more effective than my mud. The difference is that my jar tells you what is in the jar. No other brand can make that claim. It says on the label that it contains bentonite, glycerin, witch hazel, certified red food coloring, and perfume. I think, whether it be mudpack or lipstick, cleansing cream or astringent, deodorant or powderbase—or hair dye or hair spray—that it should be safe to use and that you should know what's in it. Is that impossible? Is it antibusiness? No more so than fur labeling, food labeling, drug labeling, or any other kind of consumer-product identification.

You may not want to use Sullivan's mud for a facial, Esther—with your skin, you don't even need it. But let's get the mud out of the consumer's eyes—by removing, through legislation and administrative action, those many barriers to the consumer's right to know—to have the facts—to be able to differentiate between products—and to be safe in the use of consumer purchases, whether they be necessities or luxuries.

Lithuanian Independence Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted at the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center rally at Western High School, Detroit, Mich., on February 16, 1964.

All freemen and all right-thinking Americans join these fine citizens of our Nation of Lithuanian descent in deploring the denial of freedom and self-determination to the Lithuanian people and to other once freemen now confined behind the Iron Curtain.

In order to bring this important resolution to the attention of my colleagues I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS CENTER RALLY AT WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL, DETROIT, MICH., ON FEBRUARY 16, 1964

On February 16, 1918, in Vilnius, Lithuania, the Lithuanian Council representing the entire Lithuanian nation announced to the world the reestablishment of Lithuania as an independent nation with Vilnius as its capital.

For almost a quarter of a century, from 1918 to 1940, independent Lithuania flourished and progressed and earned the admiration of and status in the family of the free nations of the world.

However, since 1940, Lithuania has been the victim of cruel aggression first by Bolshevik Russia, then by Nazi Germany from 1941 to 1944 and since that time the Communist colonialization of Soviet Russia.

The Lithuanian people in enslaved Lithuania and throughout the world yearn for freedom and liberty and an independent Lithuania. The emergence of the new free nations during the current era gives rise to the hope that Lithuania will soon regain its freedom. Those living in freedom cannot long deny it to others.

The hopes of the Lithuanian people are further strengthened by the knowledge that the leader of the free world, the United States of America consistently refuses to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and recognizes her as an independent nation with the rights of self-determination.

We, the Americans of Lithuanian origin, living in the metropolitan area of Greater Detroit, county of Wayne, in the State of Michigan gathered at Western High School, 1500 Scotten, Detroit, Mich., to commemorate the 46th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, at a rally sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, hereby firmly resolve to reaffirm our belief in the democratic principles of our Government and pledge our unstinted support to our President and the Congress of the United States to attain lasting peace, freedom, and justice throughout the world.

We further resolve to urge the U.S. Government to be wary of entering into any agreements with the Soviet Union which would in any way imply the recognition of Soviet rule in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, or the other captive nations and to continue its position of maintaining that Soviet rule of Lithuania and the other enslaved countries is unlawful and at the same time demand that the Soviet Union practice what it preaches regarding colonialism by immediately withdrawing all Soviet troops, ruling apparatus, and colonists from Lithuania and all other captive nations, and that our Government insist that this liberation be the basic condition for the start of any further treaty negotiations with the Soviet Union.

We further resolve to urge the U.S. Congress to hasten the passage of 1 of close to 50 Senate and House concurrent resolutions now pending in committee in both Houses of the Congress requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations requesting the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prison, and slave-labor camps, and to conduct free elections in these nations under United Nations supervision.

We also urge that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Congressmen represening Michigan in the U.S. Congress, to members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the press, radio, and television media.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, every free nation has its great moral and political leaders, men around whom the people rally, men who are leaders of their cause, from whom they derive inspiration as they struggle to achieve their goals. Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was such a man to the people of Czechoslovakia.

Masaryk came to them at a time when the people were seeking to establish the Czechoslovak Republic. A distinguished scholar and philosopher, he abandoned the ivy towers to lead his countrymen in their fight to liberate themselves and establish the Republic.

After giving up teaching in the 1880's, he returned to his native land, and there he plunged into politics. In 1889 he became the editor of a fortnightly paper, Time, and transformed it into a political weekly. Two years later he gained sufficient popularity to be elected to Parliament. In 1893 he resigned his seat "to devote himself to a crusade of moral education among the Czechoslovak people." From then on he became the real rallying point of the younger generation not only of the Czechoslovaks but of all other Slavs who flocked to Prague. He was the leader of the Progressive Party. Then he was elected to Parliament having previously served in that body. There as a bitter critic of the Austrian autocracy he incurred the intense displeasure of officials and court circles, but made a great reputation abroad.

During the First World War he became the leading Czechoslovak spokesman in the Allied countries, and in all of them he was able to enlist support for the Czechoslovak cause. Through his powers of persuasion and tactful dealings with statesmen of all ranks, the leaders of the Allied and associated powers came to regard the Czechoslovak cause as a righteous one. In 1918, when the Czechoslovak state was born mostly through his efforts, Masaryk became the unchallenged and unrivaled leader of the Republic. In November of that year, he was elected to the Presidency, and successively reelected to that office four times. In 1935, at the age of 85, he resigned and withdrew from politics. In quiet retirement he viewed with just

pride his life's work, the Czechoslovak Republic, as one of the pillars of peace and progress in central Europe. He enjoyed peace and rest for about 2 years, until his death on September 14, 1937. Today, on the 114th anniversary of his birth, we pay tribute to this great torchbearer of liberalism and democracy in central Europe, this great philosopher-statesman and liberator of the Czechoslovak people, this architect of the Czechoslovak Republic and father of his country. Blessed be the memory of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

Former Colleague Says Welfare Programs Heading Us Into Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, unless we reverse the trend we have been following for the past 30 years, the Soviets will be able to bury us without firing a shot. The tremendous increase in welfare state programs, the expansion of Federal controls into areas once considered wholly the private sector, the loss of purchasing power of the dollar through Government-caused inflation, all have moved us steadily down the road to socialism. Through our own efforts and because we have been led to believe that the way to defeat communism is to adopt its programs. Nothing could be more wrong. The only way we can defeat communism and preserve our freedoms is to adhere to the letter and spirit of the Constitution and secure the private enterprise system.

A former distinguished Member of this body, Martin Dies, Sr., of Texas, and one of the foremost authorities on the Communist conspiracies, spoke recently in Dallas and warned of the results of continuing on the road we are following. Following is an editorial critique of Mr. Dies' speech as carried in the Dallas Morning News of March 14, 1964:

WELFARE AND MARXISM

How far has the United States traveled down the road leading toward the welfare state and away from traditional American economic and political principles? According to former Congressman Martin Dies, Sr., speaking in Dallas, we've already gone a long way. The United States of America, he says, has become addicted to reckless fiscal policies—so much so that in several decades we have practically undone the honest hard work and frugality of nearly two centuries.

Citing a few examples, Mr. Dies noted that today the U.S. Government owns 27 percent of the land area of the United States. A recent inventory and appraisal of the Government's holdings revealed the astonishing fact that Washington's possessions now exceed the value of all the property of 50 of our largest cities, plus every farm—buildings and machinery included—in the country.

He also commented that today the Federal Government controls, or regulates, virtually every business in the country. Public and private debt in the United States amounts to about $1.5 trillion. "Only the Government is permitted to mortgage our children and grandchildren," Mr. Dies said.

Other facts which might be added to Mr. Dies' assessment:

The Federal Government has gone $16.3 billion deeper in debt in the last 2 years alone and next year expects to go $5 billion further in the red. A balanced budget is unforeseen until at least fiscal 1967.

Our national debt exceeds the combined debts of every other nation on earth. Foreign countries today hold claims against our gold reserves far exceeding our ability to pay.

The dollar today is worth less than half its 1939 value. What we pay a dollar for now could have been bought for 44.9 cents 25 years ago.

Public employment—Federal and State—accounts for 13.5 percent of all employment in the country.

Some 80 Government business activities are in direct competition with private enterprise and are spending at the rate of $22.2 billion a year, an increase of nearly $7 billion since 1961. In the last 3 years these Government enterprises have gone in the red $17 billion, costing the taxpayers more than $5 billion per year.

Drawing some conclusions from this picture, Mr. Dies warned that the United States, for several decades, has been "moving toward communism." He quickly explained what he meant by pointing out that communism does not necessarily mean violent revolution and immediate confiscation of private property.

Long ago the Marxists made clear that their goal in America is to undermine our economic and political principles by degrees, to make gradual inroads on capital and the rights of property. The failure of many Americans to understand this strategy and the tendency of our people to be apathetic and indifferent—accepting the very essence of communism, the inevitability of the growth of the state and the collectivization of property—are the strongest weapons we can hand the Reds in their war against freedom.

School Dropouts and Youth Crime—A Letter From Judge McMullan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on poverty yesterday outlined a broad program of action to help every American to achieve a better life for himself and his family. We are all aware of the existence of poverty in the midst of plenty in the richest country in the world, but I doubt if many Americans were aware of the extent of this problem prior to President Johnson's announcement several months ago of his intention to launch what he called "a national war on poverty," with the objective: "Total victory."

In the message to Congress, the President covered the whole broad range of issues and programs involved in a national war on poverty. His excellent statement touched particularly on what poverty means to the youth of this country. For instance, he said:

The young man or woman who grows up without a decent education, in a broken home, in a hostile and squalid environment, in ill health or in the face of racial injustice—that young man or woman is often trapped in a life of poverty.

He does not have the skills demanded by a complex society. He does not know how to acquire those skills. He faces a mounting sense of despair which drains initiative and ambition and energy.

Then President Johnson went on to say:

The years of high school and college age are the most critical stage of a young person's life. If they are not helped then, many will be condemnd to a life of poverty which they, in turn, will pass on to their children.

EXPERIENCE OF ST. LOUIS JUVENILE COURT

Mr. Speaker, the President's description of the hopelessness which afflicts untrained, uneducated teenage youth echoes the information I have received from time to time on this problem from the Honorable David A. McMullan, judge of the Circuit Court, Juvenile Division, of St. Louis. He advised me that the unemployed and unskilled school dropout presents the juvenile authorities with their most serious problems. Often, these children are referred to the court because there does not seem to be any place for them—their home conditions are deplorable—and there seems to be no interest in how they survive. They are without anything to do with their time "and that is one of the major factors contributing to their being brought into court for offenses against the law," the judge reported to me in a letter I received from him last year.

A few days ago I again heard from Judge McMullan on the seriousness of this problem in St. Louis. What he has written underscores and underlines the importance of the proposals subsequently made by President Johnson yesterday in his message on poverty, particularly the recommendations for a Job Corps, a work training program and a work study program. These proposals represent a determined attempt to get at the roots of poverty and to help these youngsters to pull themselves out of the hopelessness of their environments.

Judge McMullan's letter follows:

DAVID A. MCMULLAN,
JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
(JUVENILE DIVISION),
St. Louis, Mo., March 12, 1964.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: During the year 1963, from my position on the juvenile bench, I continued to see the parade of this community's unfortunate youth. They were brought before me for all types of law violations, from vandalism to armed robbery. Looking behind the offenses which brought them to this court, I found that many of these youngsters were school problems. Many were actual school dropouts, who had not been able to find employment. This problem of school dropouts and youth employment is critical.

The Board of Education in the city of St. Louis estimates that during the 1960's 35,000 students will leave school before high school graduation. A 2-year study of dropouts in St. Louis revealed that 55 percent of those leaving school had average or better intellectual ability and that 72 percent of those dropping out were 16 years of age or older. However, only 19 percent of the dropouts were able to enter some branch of the armed

services or find steady employment. These youth whose time is not gainfully used, either in school or at work, tend to become involved with the law, either to get some spending money or some times out of the sheer boredom of having nothing to do.

Many youngsters who lack interest or motivation for continued education leave school under the mistaken impression that they can find a job. However, figures supplied by the St. Louis Office of the Missouri Division of Employment Security do not support their confident outlook. An analysis of U.S. Census data indicates that the employment rate for the 16-to-21 youth group in St. Louis is approximately 15 percent, which is slightly above the national average; that 53 percent of the job applicants are male youths at an average age of 18.6 years, and that 36 percent of them failed to graduate from high school.

Many of these youths are the ones who are seen not only in Juvenile Court but also in our adult criminal courts. They need some opportunity to find a job, not only to financially support themselves, but also to give them the feeling that they are contributing members of our society.

My concern is increased when I consider that by 1970 the 16- to 21-year age group will be one of the country's largest age groupings. We cannot allow the high rate of unemployment to continue among these youths.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. MCMULLAN.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, we in Idaho are extremely proud of our senior Senator, FRANK CHURCH.

Senator CHURCH, in 1960, during his first term in the Senate, was selected by the Democratic Party to deliver the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention. This high honor was bestowed on an Idaho Senator for the first time in history because Senator CHURCH early in his Senate career had won respect for his oratorical ability.

Today, Senator FRANK CHURCH is winning recognition as a result of his thoughtful influence as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Senate, Here, Senator CHURCH has become a most important voice on the vital committee that is charged with guiding the legislative action on our foreign policy.

At the present time, Senator CHURCH serves as chairman of the International Organizations Subcommittee and is also a member of the African Affairs Subcommittee and the Disarmament Subcommittee.

Indicative of Senator CHURCH'S growing influence in the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Nation and the increasing emphasis his views are receiving nationally is the following interview with correspondents of the Washington Evening Star, the Detroit News, the Newark News, and the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the vital questions discussed by Senator CHURCH in this interview as it was published in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star on March 15, 1964:

ON THE RECORD: MORE FLEXIBLE FOREIGN POLICY?

Question. Senator CHURCH, the Republicans say that foreign policy will be the major issue in the coming presidential campaign. Do you accept that premise and, as a Democrat, how do you feel about it?

Answer. I think that foreign policy, in the times in which we live, will always be a major issue in a national election campaign.

As a Democrat, I welcome it. I think that the foreign policy record of President Kennedy and President Johnson is strong, and that this issue will be to our advantage.

Question. The most serious problem right now is probably Vietnam. Would you be willing to see a full-scale American debate on what course we should take in Vietnam?

Answer. Yes, if there are real alternatives to discuss. Should the President propose some change of course in South Vietnam, this would provide an occasion for extended debate. If, on the other hand, we continue to hold to our present policy, then I would not anticipate such a debate soon taking place.

Question. Do you think it was right for the United States to become so deeply committed to its present course in Vietnam, without a debate in Congress or among the general public?

Answer. I personally have always had grave misgivings over the original decision which took us into South Vietnam. If we had it to do again, I would strenuously object, and I know there are many others who would also.

Unfortunately, neither President Kennedy nor President Johnson had that option available to them. We were in Vietnam when they took over.

SUCCESS IN VIETNAM?

Question. Is it your own view that we are succeeding, or failing, now, in Vietnam?

Answer. I don't know. I am not optimistic about the outlook. If Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, is regarded by most Vietnamese people, North and South, as the authentic architect of independence from the French, as the George Washington of Vietnam, so to speak, it will be hard for us. Wars against George Washingtons are not easily won.

Question. Do you think that the way out in Vietnam may be to carry the war north into North Vietnam, or even Red China?

Answer. That is certainly not the way out. As I look at the map, that is the way in.

I would hope that we don't make South Vietnam a launching pad for another Korean war. That war cost us heavily in American lives and fortune. We were able to end the fighting only by confining ourselves to the area south of the 38th Parallel. This became the basis for the truce, but the Korean problem is still costing us half a billion a year.

One could question what has been gained, when one compares the enormous outpouring of American resources into this Korean peninsula with the real interests of the United States that have been served by our presence there.

Are we again to repeat this performance in South Vietnam, extending the war northward, inviting the Chinese down? I would have to be persuaded that the vital interests of the United States are in fact at stake, to warrant so dangerous and endless an adventure as this would be.

We need to look further ahead than our immediate frustrations in South Vietnam. If we were to make this our own war and occupy this territory with the American Army, which would be the likely next step if the war were broadened, then we must face up to the fact that we will have to seize and hold this remote region of the world with naked American power. Asiatic people would regard our holding it as a kind of American possession, however differently we viewed it.

Everything that has happened in the last 20 years demonstrates the folly of such a course.

SOUTHEAST ASIA SETTLEMENT

Question. Do you see merit in President de Gaulle's suggestion of a neutralist settlement in southeast Asia?

Answer. If this whole of the archipelago could be neutralized, including North Vietnam, then I should think that this would be positively in the American interest, as well as in the general interest of all the peoples concerned.

I am not dismayed that General de Gaulle is apparently attempting to explore the possibilities for some such political settlement. If he succeeds, it could well serve our interest and furnish us with a basis for an acceptable solution. If he fails, we are no worse off for his having tried.

Question. Do you think, then, that we should officially support General de Gaulle's search for a neutralist solution in southeast Asia?

Answer. I think that President de Gaulle does not particularly want our support. Therefore, I see no adavntage to be gained by giving him our official indorsement.

Question. There is another option we haven't discussed. Would this be a problem that the United Nations could deal with effectively?

Answer. It might be. But only if some possibility develops for neutralizing the whole of the archipelago. It is difficult for me to conceive how the United Nations could play a useful role here, if the only issue is what shall be done about South Vietnam.

PRESIDENT'S ROLE

Question. Do you think we can achieve the neutralization of South Vietnam so long as we are, or appear to be, losing the guerrilla warfare there?

Answer. It happened in Laos. It could possibly happen in Vietnam.

I concede that the prospects are dimmer if the war continues to go badly. There is much truth in General Clay's statement that nations can usually secure at the bargaining table only what they can hold in the field.

Question. Then you don't agree with the official position that to go to a neutralization formula at this point and withdraw American troops from South Vietnam would mean giving over South Vietnam to the Communists?

Answer. I am opposed to any bogus neutralization which is only a mask for a Communist takeover.

There are several neutral countries in that region that are not Communist. Laos and Cambodia are examples. In fact, I thought we had gotten over the habit of regarding neutralism as anti-American.

Where we are dealing with small countries on the fringes of China, if we insist on their taking sides in the cold war, they are very apt to feel compelled to take sides with China, and not with us. Neutralism becomes an umbrella which oftentimes can protect their independence.

NO GENEVA ACCORDS

Question. Then would you say the Geneva accords of 1962 on a neutral Laos are working?

Answer. I would say that it became obvious from the course of the fighting preceding that agreement that, without it, the whole of the country would soon have fallen under Communist control.

Question. Senator, do you find it either improper or awkward to have the U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, Henry Cabot Lodge, with a campaign being waged for the Republican presidential nomination in his behalf?

Answer. It may be awkward for him. I don't think it is awkward for the United States, as long as he attends to his duties as our Ambassador in Saigon.

Lodge is a man of great experience and ability. Mr. Kennedy's decision to send him to South Vietnam, and Mr. Johnson's decision to retain him there, seem to me to be in the best interests of the country.

I would just like to say one further word about this Vietnam problem.

President Kennedy was careful to make the distinction, some months ago, that the war in South Vietnam was their war, not ours. If their Government cannot maintain itself against the uprising, it won't be because we have failed to give it adequate advice, assistance, training, equipment, money and materials. We will put enough armament and supplies into South Vietnam to fairly sink the peninsula before we are finished.

This enormous quantity of arms, food and money had doubtlessly helped the Government, but our presence there may also be a handicap to the Government.

When one considers the general attitude of the Asian people toward Western nations, and how recently these countries have emerged from colonial control, it is hard to feature a war more difficult to win in that region of the world than one carried on under the auspices of a Western nation.

I first went into this part of the world as a young officer in the Second World War, and I stayed for a time in India. Out in the countryside of India, I never saw much distinction drawn between an American and an English uniform.

It is hard for me to believe that the people of Vietnam in the jungles and in the countryside draw the distinction we draw between American and French uniforms.

THE U.N. SESSIONS

Question. Senator, as head of the International Organizations Subcommittee, you must be concerned about what is going to happen in the next session of the United Nations.

Do you think, in view of French recognition of Communist China, it is wise policy for the United States to continue to oppose its admission to the United Nations?

Answer. I think it is necessary for us to continue to oppose the admission of Red China. I am doubtful that any change in our position, at this time, would prove beneficial to the United States. I suspect that China finds us a convenient enemy to have, and that, for internal purposes, she needs and wants an enemy.

Therefore, I am doubtful that any sudden change in our attitude would result in better behavior on the part of the Chinese Government.

Question. Do you think Red China will be admitted this year?

Answer. I am hopeful that Red China will not be admitted, despite the prospect that France may support her bid. However, we have to face the time when we may be outvoted on this issue. I only hope that, if it does happen, we will be mature enough to accept the decision of the member states on this question, and that we will continue, nevertheless, to remain a member of the United Nations, and to give it the support that its general record entitles it to have.

WHAT CAN WE DO

Question. What, then, should a responsible administration do to prepare this country and the people in this country for the prospect that you think is likely?

Answer. I think that we should begin to talk candidly about the realities in the world. To the extent that American policy is based upon myth, we disserve ourselves.

The fact is that there is a China, and that there is a Formosa. The fact is that Germany is divided into two parts. The power, the array of power, necessary to rejoin Germany, or to reinstate the Formosan Government in Peiping, is simply not present. We are not prepared to supply it, nor should we, and neither are the other countries.

If we don't begin to recognize these facts, and take them into account as we formulate American policy, we are in danger of becoming a kind of "Alice in Wonderland" in world affairs, and other nations will begin to take policy away from us and make decisions which leave us behind.

This is what De Gaulle is now undertaking to do, with astonishing rashness, and with some prospect of success.

PRECEDENT IN LAOS

Question. It has been said that President Kennedy was much more personally involved in foreign policy than President Johnson. What would you say?

Answer. President Johnson is demonstrating, in his handling of the water-pipe crisis in Cuba and the dangerous Panamanian riots, that he is capable of acting with that combination of force and restraint which is the substance of statesmanship.

Nobody will walk over Lyndon B. Johnson. At the same time, he is going to be coolheaded in his decisions, if these examples typify the way he intends to conduct American foreign policy as President of the United States.

Question. And yet, in answer to a previous question, you said that General de Gaulle was developing policies which seem to leave us behind. By "us," you seem to mean the administration which conducts foreign policy.

Answer. I was referring there to the whole American attitude, which has obtained under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and which, in the main, is still accepted on both sides of the aisle in Congress.

What I am calling for is a reappraisal of fundamental propositions that long have frozen American policy into place, both in Europe and in the Pacific.

President de Gaulle may force this reappraisal upon us, but it is much too early to say what posture President Johnson will assume with respect to these fundamental matters. He has been in the White House too short a period of time.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy concerning foreign aid is so often aired from the standpoint of liberal and conservative, Republican and Democrat, State Department and Congress. Foreign aid concerns every American citizen, for as Secretary of State Dean Rusk pointed out in a recent speech on the 100th anniversary of the YMCA at the University of Wisconsin—

Foreign policy is not a game played by those people in Washington with other governments. It is about you. It is about your home, your community, your well-being, your chance for a decent life, your safety.

And, as foreign aid is a principal instrument of our foreign policy, it is the concern of all citizens of this country, of all faiths. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have taken an active interest in our AID policies. Representatives of each of these faiths have testified frequently in congressional hearings on foreign aid. As an example, an interview appeared in a national Catholic family weekly with Father James L. Vizzard, S.J., who has long been active in efforts for international peace and speaks from a background of long study and interest in foreign policy and economic development. I would, therefore, like to commend excerpts of this interview, conducted by Mr. Harry W. Flannery, which expresses thoughts universal and appealing to peoples of all faiths:

FOREIGN AID

Question. I can understand that some foreign aid might be justified in countries where there is special need. However, so long as we have so many slums, so many poor, jobless, ill, and hungry here in the United States, it seems to me that we should take care of them before we begin trying to help people in some foreign land. Doesn't charity begin at home?

Answer. Yes, charity begins at home, but it doesn't end there. As Bishop Fulton Sheen pointed out in a talk to the White House Conference on Foreign Aspects of U.S. National Security, held in Washington, about a year ago, "It was a pagan, Terence, who said: 'Charity begins at home.' It was Christ, the Son of God, Who in the parable of the Good Samaritan said that charity begins away from home with people who are not of our race and country."

We have an obligation to take care of our own who are in need, but our responsibility doesn't end there. As the most prosperous nation in the world, we cannot ignore less favored people. The late Pope Pius XII put it this way in his 1941 Christmas message: "Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles, there is no place for that cold and calculated egoism which tends to hoard the economic resources and materials designed for the use of all to such an extent that the nations less favored by nature are not permitted access to them."

And Leo XIII, "Whoever has received from the divine bounty a large share of blessings, whether they be external and corporal or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them to perfect his own nature, and, at the same time, so that he may employ them, as the minister of God's providence, for the benefit of others."

Question. We have an obligation to people overseas, I suppose, but we can't threaten ourselves with bankruptcy by spending millions and maybe billions to help someone overseas who is probably better off if he takes care of himself.

Answer. If everyone understood what a small proportion of our annual budget and what an even smaller proportion of our annual income are devoted to foreign aid programs, I don't think anyone would be worried. We'd be ashamed.

The amount devoted to foreign aid is not generally realized because programs of military assistance to our allies and the establishment and maintenance of bases abroad are included under the general heading: Mutual Security. Sums spent overseas to build up the military potential of France, England, Turkey, Korea, Formosa, and other nations is not simply to protect these countries but also for our own defense. This is realy American aid. To include such sums in foreign aid leaves a wrong impression. National defense, here and overseas, is necessary today, but is not the point at issue.

Actually, the sum total devoted to economic development and technical assistance, which is foreign aid in the true sense, amounts to tens of millions whereas the other expenditures are in billions. Economic and technical assistance has been about $650 million a year, or about fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national product.

Think of this figure along with the fact that the United States, with 6 percent of the world's population, has 50 percent of the world's produced wealth.

Question. Why not depend on private agencies to build dams, roads, steelmills and so on—to provide technical assistance in the field and the shop?

Answer. It would be good if private enterprise did more in programs of foreign aid and development. They are undertaking some programs in some places in connection with their investments. In Venezuela, for instance, Creole and Shell have built hospitals and schools, and this sort of thing is done elsewhere by other companies.

Private industry also sometimes provides technical assistance, and it probably produces more per dollar invested, but private enterprise cannot be expected to operate in areas where there is no assurance of profit, and where the need is to provide the undergirding of an economy, building highways, dams, ports, or to help eliminate disease, create sanitary conditions. Only governments can create the basic foundations for health, education, and a new economy in field or shop.

Question. Do the people who get foreign aid appreciate it? Doesn't it really spoil them? Don't they become greedy, as: "What have you done for me lately?"

Answer. In giving charity or in fulfilling the demands of justice, you cannot look for or expect gratitude. Some things must be done because they are right. The reaction of those who get the aid is beside the point.

What's more, if you look on foreign aid as a way to buy allies and guarantee markets for our products and sources of raw materials for our defense and factories. we shall be disappointed. No one has ever bought a friend or bribed a nation into secure alliance. If our main aim is to do the things that we are obliged to do by conscience and morality, then we shall have friends; then we will have secure allies; then we will have the foundation for mutual exchange of goods and people.

Question. Does foreign aid really aid those who get it?

Answer. Most certainly. Travel over the world into the underdeveloped areas, and you'll be amazed and overjoyed at the results of foreign aid provided either by the United States directly or through the United Nations. You'll see the results in such things as improvement of water supplies in a village, sanitation facilities where they had never been before, the eradication of disease-bearing insects, the clearing of swamps, sharp declines in infant mortality, the end of malaria, the fewer cases of trachoma, an increase in the age expectancy of whole population.

You'll see people who were once starved, diseased, now healthful and happy because of improved cultivation of crops, better breeds of animals, good farm-to-market roads. You'll see the increased hope that these people have that they'll be able to take care of themselves. The picture is thrilling. It makes us realize that we have helped give new dignity to the poor, the underprivileged, the hungry, the unclothed.

Question. You've talked about foreign aid on the basis of charity, mercy, and justice. Why haven't you brought up the argument that if we don't aid the undeveloped countries, Soviet Russia will, and we'll lose them to communism?

Answer. Years ago, before communism came to Soviet Russia, an early leader of communism in Germany said that if Christians lived up to their Christian obligations, there would be no room or need for communism. Wherever Christians have not fulfilled the basic demands of their religion, wherever they have not made conscientious efforts to aid the needy, where they have allowed poverty, hunger, and disease to continue, Communists may come in and exhort the people to violence and revolution, to accept communism as the means of improving their condition.

We spend billions of dollars on the armaments of the cold war, but all these billions can buy is time—time to improve the lot of people who might otherwise turn toward communism, time to build the only effective barrier to Communist infiltration, helping people to live lives of human dignity and decency. We know that our way of life is better. We know that the Communist appeal is false and that its result is disaster. But unless we give of our wealth, our skills, our people, the door will remain open to the influence of communism.

Soviet Russia is busy in the field of foreign aid today. Should we offer the downtrodden of the world any less than the Communists? Isn't the distinctive difference between our aid and theirs, the fact that we have a genuine concern for the individual man? Communism considers the masses and ignores the individual, even sacrifices him when he dares to stand up for his rights and dignities. In our tradition and according to the principles upon which our Nation was founded and operates, we have a sincere interest in the individual—in him as our brother, in him because we have an obligation to him, a responsibility toward him.

However, I do not believe that we should aid the people of the underdeveloped nations just because it is to our national interest to do so. We should not carry on a program of technical and economic assistance only that we shall be secure. These reasons are good, but I think it is more important for us to be concerned about our fellow men because they are less favored and we are able to aid them. We have this obligation whether or not there is a Communist menace.

Question. You've testified before Congress on foreign aid along with representatives of the Protestant and Jewish faiths, and you even signed on open letter to the Congress of the United States asking for an increase in mutual security appropriations. Can this be justified?

Answer. It certainly can. Among the signers of this open letter were bishops, archbishops and cardinals of the Catholic Church in the United States.

An even more representative groups of Catholic hierarchy signed along with leading Jews and Protestants the "Declaration on World Peace" drawn up to guide this country in planning the United Nations. These included the late Edward Cardinal Mooney, the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch, and Archbishop Karl Alter. The holy fathers have again and again urged Catholics to cooperate with those of other religious persuasions in efforts to achieve world peace.

Pope Pius XII expressed himself on this point in his Christmas message of 1957 in these words: "We have already stated on many occasions that Catholics can and ought to admit collaboration with others if the action of these and the joint enterprise are such as to be of true assistance to harmony and order in the world."

All such cooperation is without any concessions on our part or on their part of basic beliefs and religious practices. We agree on the principles that guide all who believe in God. When we Catholics work with the National Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council of America and other agencies of other faiths, we all see clearly and in total unity that the objectives of foreign aid programs are demands of our moral conscience. Here, to indicate my point, is our common statement on mutual security, issued last summer:

1. The issue between freedom and totalitarian slavery in the world may well be determined by the course taken in the next few years by rising revolutionary forces now sweeping through most of the formerly dependent and underdeveloped areas of the world.

2. These revolutions of rising expectations are a manifestation of a great and urgent search for new meaning and new dignity in the lives of hundreds of millions of peoples.

3. The great challenge to the United States is to our moral purpose, and our moral purpose demands that as stewards of God-given abundance in the world's most wealthy nation, we must help with generosity and humility those nations and peoples who want to help themselves toward better lives.

4. The present moment in history confronts our Nation with an unparalleled opportunity to assume the imaginative leadership so urgently needed in waging a massive struggle against the basic enemies of mankind; namely, pervading poverty, ignorance, disease, and humiliation.

Seven Keys to Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most distinguished economists, Prof. David McCord Wright of the University of Georgia, has written a most interesting article discussing the seven types or keys to unemployment.

Professor Wright points out that the practical effect of the Keynesian revolution is to lead to an exclusive concentration upon one possible cause if unemployment and the generalization of this very limited case. The basic point he makes in his article is that unemployment stems from many different causes that require different cures. As he points out, if the United States is ever to have an intelligent economic policy, we will have to stop relying solely upon easy money or more Government spending as cures for unemployment. These remedies, he says, are of somewhat dubious nature and applicable at best in a very limited number of cases. The real problem today, according to the article, is how to deal with the basic pressure groups which are discouraging the needed investment and growth in our society.

I strongly recommend the article to my colleagues and others interested in economic policy and include it in the RECORD at this point:

SEVEN KEYS TO UNEMPLOYMENT

(By David McCord Wright)

One of the major ill effects of the Keynesian revolution has been that in all of the discussion of whether Keynes' special analysis is or is not correct, people have lost sight of the fact that even at it best the Keynesian theory does not cover all possible cases of unemployment—except by definition.

In this talk, I would like to try to restore perspective by naming a number of other possible sources of unemployment. And, as a means of stimulating interest, I will give these seven types somewhat highly colored names. The seven types or "keys" to unemployment which I will be analyzing may be described as follows. They are: (1) unemployment through miserliness, (2) unemployment through risk, (3) unemployment through envy, (4) unemployment through poverty, (5) unemployment through altruism, (6) unemployment through overasking, (7) unemployment through immobility. Let us try to discuss these each in turn.

MISERLINESS

Unemployment through miserliness or thrift is, of course, Keynes' case. In its most extreme formulation, the idea seems to be that we have already created adequate productive capacity for all our wants, and that the only reason there is unemployment is (1) that people are not consuming enough and (2) that the rate of interest is being kept unnecessarily high by a miserlike desire to hold money. In other words, all that is needed to get full employment is to have easy money and plenty of consumer spending. In a more moderate formulation, there is still supposed to be some need for increased production. But it is still supposed that all that is needed to get the investment machine going again is to have more money and more consumer spending.

To understand the weakness of this theory, we must first define basically what is the cause of unemployment. Everybody will, I think, agree that unemployment occurs when current output is not sufficient to employ the desired people at the desired wage. In other words, full employment is not just a matter of consuming goods already produced. Employment is an activity, and it is getting the output machine going that matters. You may note further that we employ a somewhat cynical definition of full employment. In effect, I believe, that full employment occurs when everyone has a job "you" think ought to have a job at wages "you" think they ought to get. Perhaps, in a more primitive society, it would be possible to give a more objective definition of what full employment is. But, in modern society, conventional ideas of who should work when, and for what, have such a wide role to play, that I do not believe any more definite statement of full employment can be made than what I have just given. We get full employment, then, under any theory when the flow of current output is sufficient to employ the desired people at the desired wage and other work conditions.

Now, taken on this basis, it will be seen that in a free enterprise society, there is a serious gap in the narrow case we have just given. Even if we assume that all investment needed has already been made, and that, therefore, all that is needed is to occupy the already-existing factories in turning out consumer goods, still one point must never be forgotten. An increase in sales under capitalism will only result in an increase in output, if businessmen decide that the increase in output is profitable. In other words, the response to an increase in sales is not automatic but filters through the decisions of businessmen concerning the future. Now if, for example, the level of expected taxes is so great, or the rate of increase of money wages is so great, that, even allowing for the increased sales, the businessman sees no net premium from increasing output, then output will not be increased. Increased spending will merely bid up prices. Demand, in other words, does not necessarily create its own supply. And a Keynesian who concentrates entirely on easy money and on spending, without any consideration of costs, is missing half of the problem.

RISK

Considerations of the type just given easily lead on to the second case—unemployment through risk. Even if there is a satisfactory present margin between cost and prices, so as normally to induce an increase in output, if the risks, political and economic, are so great that the businessman does not feel it worthwhile to increase output, then unemployment will continue. For example, in modern India, the Government has announced that it will eventually socialize nearly the whole economy. Is it any wonder, then, that the Government should be complaining that there is some lack of energy on the part of investors in building new long-range plant. Why should they build new long-range plant if they are told that sooner or later the Government will take over? The same is true if there is fear of revolution, fear of unfair—that is state-subsidized—competition or fear of excessive taxation. Lord Keynes, to do him justice, in passages to which his disciples have given all too little attention, points out the enormous importance of confidence in dealing with problems of this sort.

ENVY

It is an easy step from unemployment through risk to our third classification—unemployment through envy. If the less fortunate members of society gang up on those who are receiving differential reward, and place high progressive income taxes upon extra effort and unusual profit, then that will have the effect of paralyzing the investment process. People do not work or invest merely for love alone. There is a frequent fallacy invoked here. Because some men will do some work and make some investment at very little, or even no, net inducement, it is supposed that as many men will make as much effort and as such investment as we need. The second proposition obviously does not follow from the first. And, in attacking the investing groups either directly, or by highly progressive taxation, our modern society stands in great danger of killing the goose that laid the golden egg. Certainly, since, in our society a flow of net new investment is still a basic prerequisite for full employment, it follows that unduly to burden the rewards from such a flow is to court the very disaster which many people want to avoid. In Keynesian language, too much emphasis upon the "propensity to consume" can lead us to forget the "marginal efficiency of capital" and the "inducement to invest." Thus, while we increase spending, we may simultaneously discourage investment and find ourselves left in the same deadlock from which we sought to escape.

POVERTY

But the three cases outlined so far refer, all of them, to highly industrialized society in which by far the greater mass of needed instruments of production is already there. The typical keynesian case deals with a society which has a very large capital stock, and it is supposed that the only thing needed, to put the men to work with the idle plant, is to pass out some money and get people to spend more. Regardless of the intrinsic merits of this idea itself, it is almost ludicrously inapplicable once we really begin to think practically to most of the world today. For in about 80 percent of the modern world, the plant, which it is desired to use, simply does not exist. It is one thing and superficially plausible to propose passing out money when one has on one side a stock of idle plant and on the other a stock of idle men; but in most of the undeveloped nations of the world, one has the stock of idle men, to be sure, but not the stock of idle plant. There is no poverty in the midst of plenty; there is just poverty.

In other words, in places like Ghana, Nigeria, and many other undeveloped societies, including much of South America, one sees unemployed but educated people. Many of these people have been educated for jobs which the society cannot give. Frequently, they have been given education in politics or in the humanities which, however, excellent in themselves, do not give specific skills for the market. But even in the case of people with actual education in needed skills, the jobs may be lacking. The reason they are lacking is that there simply are not the physical facilities needed to employ that number of men in that country at the desired wage. The remedy for unemployment of this sort, which a friend of mine calls "classical unemployment"—the failure of capital formation to keep pace with population growth—is simply to increase production, but this requires a very different approach to one's thinking throughout.

We cannot in this article go into the details of the argument as to whether it is better to have state investment or private investment. Obviously, the Government can tax away money income, and directly spend the results on capital investment, thereby giving employment to the people. But such a program does not guarantee that the Government spending may be efficient, and thus full employment, merely through Government, could just be full employment digging holes in the ground. I do not mean to say that this is necessarily the case, but I do believe, and I have in other articles explained why the long-range productivity of the private pricing system is greater than that of the central government ownership plan. Let us, however, consider merely the problem as it would be presented in a society which still largely relies upon private investment. Our program in such a case has a distressingly orthodox nature. It would mean the rediscovery of such aged notions as respect for property rights, tolerance of profits, removal of taxes on incentive, and the encouragement of thrift. Because such a program does not appeal to the febrile imagination of the population of many undeveloped countries, they reject it out of hand, and find themselves plunged instead into all the vagaries of planning and inflation through forced saving. Witness at the moment the fantastic condition of Brazil.

ALTRUISM

Yet the reflections we have given lead easily into our fifth type of unemployment; that is unemployment through misguided altruism. The basis of most socialist parties is to be found in that misunderstanding of the nature of capitalist accumulation which assumes private wealth accumulation to be necessarily anti-social. We will not be able to discuss this problem here, but I wish to go on instead to a more specific application of altruism, namely the attempt to help certain underprivileged groups by imposing a high minimum wage law. Of course, anyone familiar with the facts of life must realize that there are certain types of employment which the state may be justified in pricing out of the market. But, on the whole, one cannot help wondering at the state of modern thinking which on the one hand bemoans the unemployment of unskilled teenagers, for example, or elderly people, but nevertheless, tries to get them employment by making their labor as expensive and as troublesome as possible. Unfortunately, a rise in the price of any given type of labor creates an artificial premium upon the introduction of labor-saving devices. Automation did not just come down from heaven; it is in many ways the natural response to an artificially high price of labor. And if people refuse to leave an absolete industry or area, are they not responsible for their plight?

OVER ASKING

Here we come to our sixth type of unemployment—unemployment through asking

too much especially in the case of wage demands. If money wages are pushed up faster than productivity (and those who know their statistics will have some reservations even about this computation), the results must be a special premium upon the introduction of labor-saving devices; and, thus, frictional unemployment is greatly increased. Even though one gets an increased flow of investment, this flow may not be manifested in adequate employment; because society has brought every conceivable pressure against the businessman to try to talk him out of employing people rather than machines.

IMMOBILITY

An opposite condition appears in our seventh key to unemployment; that is unemployment through immobility. It must be understood that in all growing societies, a margin of net, new investment exists; and that if this margin of net new investment is not kept occupied, there will be unemployment. But, generally speaking, the flow of net, new investment involves a flow of constant change. The new ideas which make the flow of investment profitable, and socially useful, manifest themselves in the continual change at once of the pattern of wants and in the pattern of production. As I have analyzed at length in several of my books, this involves profound social disturbance and much frustration of the stationary instinct of workmanship. Yet, if pressure groups are allowed to band together to stop the flow of change, then presto we will find that in stopping the flow of change, they have also stopped the flow of investment. And, then, we cannot be surprised if we find ourselves confronted with unemployment.

But there is another aspect to be considered. When a nation has accumulated a sufficiently large and powerful group of dug-in pressure groups, whether they are farmers, business or labor, that nation may find its productivity beginning to lag relative to the rest of the world. Efficiency earnings, in the complacent and pressure group ridden nation lag behind the efficiency earnings of the rest of the world. Under the international gold standard, one of two things will happen or both together. There will first be a gold outflow, and, secondly, there should be deflation or falling prices and money wages. However, if the society is determined not to have a deflation of money wages and prices, and, on the other hand, is equally determined not to submit to the needed adaptations, and if it goes further and still tries to maintain its old exchange rate as a matter of prestige, then there is no outlet but a progressively increasing flow of controls of all sorts gradually leading to a general drying up of productive capacities of a country, and general frustration of its instincts of workmanship. At the same time, such a country is likely to throw overboard all of its international commitments in the name of economy. And so we find the social organism gradually atrophying because no one has the courage to deal with the problem of the entrenched, vested, productive interest. Such, as I see it, was the condition of the United Kingdom in the late twenties and thirties; such we are in great danger of finding the condition of the United States at the present time.

My aim in this article is simply to call attention to how many different alternative sources of unemployment there can be. All these types can, by definition, be squeezed into the Keynesian language if one wants to use it. But the practical effect of the Keynesian system, as it is usually misunderstood anyhow, is to lead to an exclusive concentration upon one, single, possible cause and the generalization of such a very limited case. Our attitude today is much like that of those 18th-century doctors who regarded all fevers as curable by the same weapon. If you ran a fever, they opened one of your veins and bled you. True, they brought down the fever, but also they probably killed many a patient. The basic point that I want to make is that unemployment is like a fever; it can be the result of many different diseases and the medicine which kills in one case may cure in another; and still important, the medicine which cures in one case may kill in another. It is desperately important, if the United States is ever to have an intelligent economic policy in the future, that we learn to think of other aspects of the case beside mere easy money or mere spending. They are remedies of somewhat dubious nature applicable at best in a very limited number of cases. The real problem is how to deal with the basic pressure groups which are discouraging the needed investment and the needed growth. Once a sufficient flow of adaptation is forthcoming, then the reaction upon the inducement to invest will yield the needed full employment. But if we try to underwrite every pressure group and guarantee to every single work group in our society, security, and secure routine of life, then we cannot expect full employment; and what is more important, we cannot expect rising living standards for the masses themselves.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the shocking death of President Kennedy has forced the country to take a long hard look at the highest political position of our country, and the problem of succession in the event of untimely death or disability of the holder of that Office.

Although flurries of thought on the part of Congress with respect to the problem of succession have marked the incapacity of past Presidents—notably Garfield in a coma, and Wilson laid low by a paralytic stroke—no satisfactory formula for continuity of the Executive power in the event of Presidential disability or death has been found.

However, recently undertaken studies, as well as outpouring of literature on the subject suggest that we may at last be coming to grips with this crucial problem.

One of the more notable literary contributions in this area appears in the January issue of the American Bar Association Journal, which I feel comes to grips with the problem in a most responsible and analytical manner. The article, written by two top legal experts from my State of New York, calls for immediate steps toward a practical solution to this critical national problem.

A word about the authors of this well-reasoned and excellently presented article: Samuel H. Hofstadter has been a distinguished justice of the Supreme Court of New York since 1933. Before his election to the court, Judge Hofstadter was special New York assistant attorney general and one of the most prominent members in the history of the New York State Senate.

Collaborating with the justice is Jacob M. Dinnes, who has practiced law with great distinction in the city of New York since 1930. Mr. Dinnes, a noted community leader, has also served as past consultant to the committee on cities of the New York State constitutional convention, and has participated in drafting the New York public housing law. Both men have written extensively on various legal subjects.

As the learned authors point out:

The hazards of an atomic age and the anxieties of a time of continuing crisis do not brook partial solutions to the problem of Presidential succession. The need for prompt adoption of a plenary self-implementing amendment to the Constitution to fill the dangerous void in our Government system is plain.

In view of the timeliness of this subject and the vital concern of Congress in finding a solution to this problem, I call the attention of my colleagues to this most valuable article and insert it at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY: A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED NOW

(By Samuel H. Hofstadter, Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, and Jacob M. Dinnes, of the New York Bar (New York City))

For 175 years the American people have depended upon a benign providence to protect them from Executive paralysis should a President suddenly become disabled and find himself unable to perform his complex duties. The Constitution fails to specify who shall certify when a Presidential inability begins, so that the Vice President may act in his place, or when his inability ends, so that the President may resume his responsibilities.

The application of the provision in the Constitution dealing with the death of a President was effectively resolved in 1841 when President William Henry Harrison died. Despite the view of many that the meaning of the Constitution was that in such an event the Vice President was to become Acting President until a new President was elected, Vice President Tyler took the oath and assumed the office of President—not its powers and duties alone. Having been recognized by Congress as de jure President, the practice was followed by seven other Vice Presidents who found themselves in a similar situation.[1] Thus, it became "the supreme law of the land" by the custom of the Constitution, in Cardozo's phrase. The Constitution was as effectively amended—if amendment were needed—by custom as if a formal amendment had been adopted.

What is to happen, however, when a President does not die but becomes disabled, has not yet been definitely or authoritatively established. Does the Vice President become President, as in the case of death, or does he merely assume the duties of the Presidency during the Chief Executive's inability to function? How is inability determined? Who determines its onset and its end?

SUCCESSION CLAUSE IS DECEPTIVELY SIMPLE

Though deceptively simple, the succession clause—the fifth of section I of article II of the Constitution—offers no clue. It reads: "In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what of-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ficer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Do the words "the same" modify "the powers and duties of the said office" or do they modify only the words "the said office?" To put it differently, did the Founding Fathers have in mind that the Vice President take over "the powers and duties" or the "office" of President? Moreover, the word "inability" and the word "disability" do not necessarily mean the same thing. For a person may be disabled yet able to carry on his duties; and it is only in the case of Presidential "inability" that the Vice President may take over. When is disability sufficiently extensive to make the President inable? Who shall decide? Death and resignation are finalities, but people often recover from even the most severe illness. And though inability may in fact exist, yet grave doubt of its being a fact may be engendered. If the Vice President replaces the President when he dies or resigns, why is this not true when the President is removed or becomes inable, since all contingencies affecting the Chief Executive were grouped together?

We cannot find the answers in the debates of the Constitutional Convention. In an interesting study made in 1888 by Henry E. Davis, entitled "Inability of the President" (reprinted as Senate Document No. 308—December 5, 1918) the author observes: "The provision in question is matter of detail purely; no principle is involved in it, and the debates of the Federal convention, as also of the States in considering the Constitution, show an absence of any discussion of it whatever." And he remarks that, though the subject was broached by John Dickinson of Delaware, who inquired: "What is the extent of the term 'disability' [that being the form originally used], and who is to be the judge of it?", nothing followed the inquiry; and in the State conventions the inquiry was not even put.

The result is that we have in times past suffered from the lack of clear guidance in the matter of Presidential illness and resulting disability. After President Garfield was shot, the entire Cabinet agreed on the desirability of having Vice President Arthur act as President; but four of its seven members thought that Arthur's exercise of the power would make him President and thereby oust Garfield from office. As a consequence, for the 80 days that Garfield lingered before his death (between July 2 and Sept. 19, 1881), the Nation was without a competent Executive. And when Secretary of State Lansing asked Vice President Thomas R. Marshall to perform President Wilson's duties following Wilson's paralytic stroke, the latter's friends, also fearing that Marshall would thereupon automatically become President, viewed Marshall as a possible usurper.

President Wilson collapsed in September of 1919 and his term expired on March 4, 1921, almost a year and a half later. In the interval, he failed to pass on 28 acts submitted to him by the Congress and they automatically became law. During this same interval, the Senate debated the Versailles Treaty, and sought, in vain, information concerning another important matter, the Shantung Settlement. On the Executive level, 21 Cabinet meetings were called by the Secretary of State to keep the Government operating. Lansing's forced resignation because of this action may have resulted from impairment of the judgment of this brilliant President upon his return to activity. It may be that physically and mentally he was not in fact well enough to return. Yet there was no clear provision of the Constitution or statute which would have empowered an authoritative, objective inquiry on this subject.

President Roosevelt died of a massive cerebral hemorrhage during the very climax of World War II. What would have happened had the stroke caused paralysis, not death? Would the disability, however severe, have been kept confidential by the Vice President and the Cabinet in fear that knowledge of the fact might result in an ouster of the President from office? Would an emergency makeshift have been adopted? And would this have been sufficient in a time of such grave peril to the Nation?

EISENHOWER, KENNEDY REACH EXTRALEGAL SOLUTION

The ailments of President Eisenhower were normal for a man of his years; indeed, similar ailments have afflicted younger men. Their occurrence in future Presidents must be anticipated, and the possibility if not the probability of such a recurrence may not be ignored. President Eisenhower and President Kennedy sought to deal with the problem under discussion as best they could by the extralegal, informal agreement each made with his Vice President. It will be recalled that the agreement between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, made public on March 3, 1958, was adopted by President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson on August 10, 1961.

The procedures set forth in these compacts are as follows: [2]

1. In the event of inability the President would—if possible—so inform the Vice President, and the Vice President would serve as Acting President, exercising the powers and duties of the office until the inability had ended.

2. In the event of an inability which would prevent the President from so communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President, after such consultation as seemed to him appropriate under the circumstances, would decide upon the devolution of the powers and duties of the office and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended.

3. The President, in either event, would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the office.[3]

Under these procedures a disabled President can still decide that he is sufficiently recovered to resume the reins of office, although this be contrary to the fact.

This is not sound. The formidable pronouncement of judgment of inability and recovery should not be left to the patient alone when the welfare of the whole people hangs in the balance.[4] The hazards of an atomic age and the anxieties of a time of continuing crisis do not brook partial solutions. The need for prompt adoption of a plenary, self-implementing amendment to the Constitution to fill a dangerous void in our governmental system is plain.

As a solution to the perplexing and unanswered questions which the problem of a President's grave illness has posed over the years, we offer a simple formula to be embodied in a constitutional amendment. We believe it would resolve many difficulties—including portection against usurpation of power by a Vice President or others, and make provision for the contingency of the President's recovery.

1. Within 10 days after his inauguration, the President would appoint nine members by name to a "Commission on Inability," to hold office at his pleasure. This suggestion differs from other proposals heretofore made, for all the members of the Commission would be chosen by the President himself; three from the Cabinet, two from the Senate, two from the House of Representatives, and two from the Supreme Court. The Commission's sole function would be to certify the President's inability, and in due course, his ability to resume his duties.

2. The matter of the inability of the President may be submitted to the Commission by the Vice President or the Secretary of State or by joint congressional resolution. A finding of inability would require six votes, to include those of at least two of the Cabinet members and one each of the Members of the Senate, House, and judiciary.

3. Action for presidential resumption of his duties may be initiated by the Vice President, the Secretary of State, joint resolution, or the President; the Commission by majority vote may declare the disability ended.

4. The President himself, of course, may always declare his inability and in such case he may determine the end of the disability. (In the latter event, however, when the circumstances warrant, the Commission may be called into play.)

This proposal assures a tribunal friendly to the Executive yet objective and representative, since each branch of our triune Federal Government is included. The Vice President is spared the impossible burden of announcing his own succession. Potential bias against the President is eliminated by fixing the term of the members of the Commission at the pleasure of the President. In this matter, so vital to the orderly functioning of Government, it is eminently right that all the branches of Government should participate. The principle of separation of powers is not applicable here.

The doctrine of separation of powers, adopted in our country, was set forth in Montesquieu's "Spirit of the Laws." Its adoption was due in large part to the "usurpations" complained of in the Declaration of Independence. The Founding Fathers recognized that the central problem of free institutions was to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of society represented by his government.

The genius of the men who established the foundations for our democratic complex was in devising a system in which government was restrained from its own excesses. They held that there could be no freedom without restraint; and their chief expedient to implement their view was the separation of powers. As Mr. Justice Brandeis carefully pointed out: "The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency, but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy." (*Myers* v. *United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 291.)

SEPARATION OF POWERS IS NOT ABSOLUTE

The coordinate branches of government serve the American people best—and function best in relation to each other—when they respect their own and observe each other's rightful province and competence; and when they measure, correctly, the needful distance to be kept between themselves—sometimes further apart and sometimes closer together. There are times, however, when they must identify themselves by fusing their powers in joint functioning. Indeed, they need not move in proud isolation—in Cardozo's phrase. For, each of the three departments is in some measure dependent on the others, and each has power to exercise, in some respects, functions in their nature legislative, executive, and judicial. It was not contemplated that there must always be a complete separation. The imperative of national necessity qualifies the principle of separate powers.

The power of veto vested in the President "is distinctly legislative, as is also the treaty-making power and the right to advise Congress. The pardon power is judicial. The Senate shares in both the appointing and treaty power, possessing, in this respect, the character of a council. * * * As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the President may make rules and regulations for the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Government of these forces. Such regulations have the force of law." ("The Story of the Constitution," U.S. Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, pp. 37–38.) While the judicial branch is an independent and coequal department of the Government, the Senate has the power to try impeachments. And when the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice presides. Thus, the Constitution bears clear and compelling internal evidence that the Founding Fathers contemplated that all powers should mesh in effective action when the general welfare dictated. They did not intend them to be "separate pebbles in alien juxtaposition."

Various proposals in the area under discussion have been made.[5] All but two of those introduced in Congress [6] call for a constitutional amendment, without, however, complete agreement on its scope. The American Bar Association and the New York State Bar Association reach the same conclusion, in effect, as that expressed in a resolution adopted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, last year, that though an amendment is necessary, "the establishment of the procedure for determining when inability commences and the system of restoration would best be left to enactment by Congress, subject to the veto power of the President contained in clause 2 of section 7 of article I of the Constitution." [7]

We agree that an amendment is desirable, though we incline to the view of some who have studied the matter that it is within the competence of the Congress to enact the requisite legislation under existing constitutional provisions.[8] It is not at all likely that the painstaking framers of our organic law intentionally or inadvertently suffered an abortive provision in a matter of so fundamental importance. Doubtless, they contemplated that there would be implementing action by the Congress.

However, we also concur in the apprehension felt by a former Attorney General that legislation now might be subjected to attack on constitutional grounds at the very time when it would become necessary to invoke it.[9] The failure of Congress to act up to this time would lend support to such an assault. In any event, congressional inaction in the past does not augur well for action now.

Hence, we favor an amendment to the Constitution to clarify the matter authoritatively and definitively. We strongly dissent, however, from the view that such an amendment should be general in nature with implementation in detail of procedure by legislative action. In the light of the history of legislative default for 175 years, this would not be a sound course to follow. The vis inertia which has bedeviled the matter up to now may persist.

Indeed, if Congress has possessed competence to legislate under the existing succession clause and failed to do so, or if there has been a vice in it which the national legislature has ignored by failing to initiate action to amend the Constitution, the conclusion is the same. To assure an effective reformulation, a new amendment must be self-executing and must provide specifically the procedure to be followed.

Moreover, leaving the matter to implementing legislation not only sidesteps the issue but opens the gates to potentially dangerous action—as well as inaction. During a period of bitterness between Congress and the President or Vice President—such as occurred during Andrew Johnson's administration—control of succession by legislation might be highly unfortunate.[10] Whatever the procedure, it belongs in the Constitution.

The stopgap measures taken by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy to fill that void, while helpful, do not suffice. And the formula we have outlined, we believe, provides a practical solution which is fair to the President and to the Nation. We should favor any other which meets the problem. But the time to act is now.

The foregoing was written before the assassination of President Kennedy. That tragic event has pointed up an additional problem. For, when the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, there is no Vice President. To provide for the event that the new President also might die, legislation—authorized by the Constitution—has been adopted providing for a succession. Under the amendments enacted during the Truman administration, the Speaker of the House would become President. Congress has grappled several times with this problem now again in the public concern. We believe that the existing law of succession is adequate—since we must accept the impossibility of perfection in this as in other areas of legislation.

The same procedures we have outlined in the event of the inability of a President should apply when the Vice President has become President and the Speaker is in line of succession.

---

[1] Fillmore, Andrew Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, Truman and, only a month ago, Lyndon Johnson rejected the view held by many that the Vice President was expected to take over only the duties and powers of the Presidency in the stated contingencies—not the Office itself—until a new President was elected. But this view is not without substance if the succession clause is read in the light of its evolution in the Constitutional Convention. Indeed, the clause as finally adopted seems to have been the product of poor or careless draftsmanship (see 2 Farrand, the records of the Federal Convention of 1787, 186, 532, 535, 573, 575, 590, 598–599).

[2] New York Times, August 11, 1961. President Johnson has now made a similar compact with the Speaker of the House.

[3] Concerning the provision for consultation, President Kennedy's announcement of the agreement stated that "as a matter of wisdom and sound judgment" the President and Vice President felt "that the Vice President would wish to have the support of the Cabinet as to the necessity and desirability of discharging the powers and duties of the Presidency as Acting President as well as legal advice from the Attorney General and the circumstances would, under the Constitution, justify his doing so." (New York Times, Aug. 11, 1961.)

[4] "Few of us who have practiced law," Professor Arthur E. Sutherland of the Harvard Law School told a House committee in 1956, "have not had occasion to see the embarrassment arising when some person, stricken with mental illness, very naturally resents the suggestion, even when made by kind friends, that he is no longer able to carry out his ordinary duties." (Special Subcommittee To Study Presidential Disability of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 20, p. 77.) Return to duty involves the same natural impulse.

[5] S.J. Res. 19 and 125, 87th Cong.; H.J. Res. 7, 33, 35, 97, 223, 513 and 529, 87th Cong.

[6] H.J. Res. 35 and 513, 87th Cong.

[7] Report of the Commission on Federal Legislation, Record, March 20, 1962, page 191; approved by Association, May 8, 1962, Record, page 281.

[8] 42 Ops. Atty. Gen. 20–23; 67th Congress, H.J. Res. 513, 67th Cong.

[9] Brownell, "Presidential Inability," 68 Yale L. J. 189, 205.

[10] Sutherland, "Presidential Disability," N.Y. Herald Tribune, December 11, 1957; Reston, "Consensus on Inability," N.Y. Times, April 3, 1957.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Thank You, Nick McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE R. POOL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleagues about a man and his family and about their joy in being together in the springtime of a fresh year. The man is Nick McDonald, of Dallas, Tex. He is the man who is content that he captured his man, who does not feel the urge to capture any headlines. Nick McDonald is the police officer who captured Lee Oswald.

The following is Nick McDonald's story, written by Lloyd Shearer for Parade magazine, where it appeared on March 8. I know that when they have read his story my colleagues from all of the States of this Nation will want to join me in a quiet but deeply felt, "Thank you, Nick."

The story follows:

THANK YOU, NICK MCDONALD

DALLAS, TEX.—It is an ironical fact of life that the death of President John F. Kennedy has brought fortune to many.

A few days after the President was assassinated, a 21-year-old Denver student ordered 5 million key chains stamped with the Kennedy impression. Today that student is worth $250,000.

In New York a jeweler came out with Kennedy tie clips, a chinamaker with Kennedy beer mugs, a silversmith with Kennedy memorial platters.

Newsstands are still cluttered with special Kennedy magazines. Music shops and supermarkets have sold Kennedy record albums and paperback books by the million, and at least half a dozen publishers are printing books this spring of the late President's speeches, most of which were largely written by Kennedy's speechwriter, Ted Sorensen.

The bonanza has also spread to persons connected with Lee Harvey Oswald, the suspected Kennedy assassin.

The family of the Dallas police officer allegedly gunned down by Oswald, J. D. Tippit, has to date received more than $600,000 from 40,000 different people. The largest single donation was made by Abraham Zapruder, a Dallas garment manufacturer who contributed the $25,000 paid him by Life for his motion pictures of the assassination. The second largest donation, $12,000, was made by Walter H. Annenberg, publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer. This paid off the mortgage on the Tippit home.

Oswald's mother, Marguerite, has sold interviews to foreign publications, has announced a lecture tour and is reportedly working on a book.

Oswald's 23-year-old widow, Marina, has already received more than $35,000 from the public. She has hired as her business manager (for 10 percent of the take), James Herbert Martin, formerly manager of the 6 Flags Inn at Arlington, Tex. He reports that Mrs. Oswald has been offered a $50,000 advance to write a book of memoirs on a 50–50 royalty basis in collaboration with Isaac Don Levine or James Burke. The Saturday Evening Post has also offered a large sum, provided Mrs. Oswald has information to divulge that she did not reveal to the Warren Commission in Washington. Hollywood is also interested in filming Marina's life story.

One of the few principals involved in the Presidential assassination overlooked both by fame and fortune is Maurice "Nick" McDonald, 36, the Dallas patrolman who captured Lee Harvey Oswald in the Oak Cliff movie theater 90 minutes after Oswald allegedly killed the President.

McDonald is the forgotten man of the assassination. No one has offered him anything for a magazine article, a lecture tour or even a TV appearance. All McDonald received was a $10 donation, which he turned over to the Dallas police fund.

A native of Camden, Ark., happily married, father of two girls, McDonald is a big, broad (5 feet 11, 200 pounds), balding man with an almost perpetual smile.

"I'm just glad to be alive," he says. "If Oswald's gun hadn't misfired, I'd be a dead goose today. Maybe," he reflects, "Sally and the kids would have then gotten more money than I'll ever make—no doubt about that—but I'd be dead, and what good is a dead husband? Marie Tippit—she lives just a few houses from here—she'd gladly give up the $600,000 if only she had her husband back.

"Money can buy almost anything, but it sure can't bring back the dead. And brother. Let me tell you, I came that close to getting it."

NICK TELLS HIS STORY

A few weeks ago in Oak Cliff, sitting in the living room of McDonald's one-story, 3-bedroom brick home (cost $12,850—mortgage, $11,900), I asked the police officer to tape-record exactly what had happened to him on November 22, 1963.

Here are the words he spoke:

"On the day President John F. Kennedy was assassinated I reported for duty at my normal hour of 7 a.m. During November I was assigned a trainee who had graduated from the previous recruit class.

"With this recruit beside me, I went on routine patrol of my district, which is the western part of South Oak Cliff, approximately 3 miles west of the Texas Theater, where Oswald was finally captured.

"That morning was a routine day until we heard on the police radio that the President of the United States had been shot. At that time we were patrolling on Westmoreland Avenue, which is approximately 8 miles from Elm and Houston in downtown Dallas, where the assassination occurred.

"The police dispatcher ordered all police units to report to the vicinity of Elm and Houston to cordon off the district and try to find the assassin.

"We proceeded on code 3 (the emergency procedure—siren blaring, red lights flashing) to Elm and Houston. We got out of the car and ran over to a police sergeant, who told us to stand by. Meanwhile, the Texas Book Depository Building from which the shots had been fired was cordoned off and completely surrounded, and the crowd was being controlled.

AN UNFAMILIAR VOICE

"At 1:15 we went back to the car, and suddenly I heard over the police radio an unfamiliar voice, a voice not acquainted with police procedure, obviously a civilian. 'A policeman has just been shot!' the voice announced. 'A policeman has just been shot! He was driving police car No. 10 from where I am now talking.'

"When I heard that announcement," McDonald continued, "I knew at once that officer J. D. Tippit had been shot. I knew Tippit had been assigned patrol car No. 10 in district 78.

"The voice then continued: 'It looks as if the officer is dead.' When I heard that, I ordered my partner into the car. 'Let's get over to Oak Cliff,' I said. 'We're standing around here doing nothing. Let's see if we can find the guy who shot Tippit.'

"We raced to the 400 block of East Jefferson Boulevard where a sergeant and a few reporters and policemen were trying to shake a house down, to search it to see if they could find the suspect. It had been reported that a possible suspect had made his way into that house.

"I let my partner out at this location and drove my squad car around the alley, then drove up and down nearby alleys. That's the last time I saw my partner that day.

"As I was patrolling the alleys, another report came over the radio that a suspect with Oswald's general description had raced into the public library about a block away. I immediately drove to the public library on Jefferson. I got out in the alley and took my shotgun with me. I went through the side door of the library and ordered all persons out with hands up.

"Everybody inside the library came out with hands up. A teenager told me that he had just run in to tell the people of the assassination. He didn't match the police description of the unknown assassin at the time. No one else in the library did either.

"I ran back to my car. As I got in, there came another radio report. A suspect had just been seen running into the Texas Theater in the 200 block of West Jefferson. I drove on code 3 to the theater. When I got to the front, there were three or four police cars already at that location, so I decided to go to the rear of the theater. I got out of the squad car and joined three other uniformed officers at the rear of the theater, and we went in through the rear exit door. I remember that one of the movies at the Texas was 'Cry of Battle.'

A LOOK AT THE SUSPECT

"Just inside the theater we were met by a shoestore salesman who had seen the suspect run into the theater without paying for a ticket and could identify him. This shoe salesman went to the stage with me, peeped through the curtain, and identified the suspect who, he said, was wearing a brown shirt. It was Oswald. He was sitting in the back of the theater alone. There were only about 10 or 15 people in the entire downstairs section.

"The theater house lights were up at the time I peeped through the curtain, but the show was still playing. Several policemen were searching the balcony. As I stepped out through the curtain the lights became dim again, but the movie stopped.

"The two men closest to me were sitting in the center of the theater. I decided that I would search every single person in the orchestra so that I would miss no one. I walked first to these two men. I had them stand on their feet, and I searched them.

"While I was frisking them I kept glancing over their shoulders at Oswald, just in case he should make a break. These first two men were sitting about 15 rows from the screen, in the center.

"After I decided that these men were unarmed and not suspect, I walked out of the 15th row, up the aisle and entered the row where Lee Harvey Oswald was sitting. Oswald was slumped down in the second seat, third row from the rear, on the right side of the center section.

"As I got within 1 foot of the suspect, I saw he was sitting calmly with his hands on his lap. He was wearing a brown shirt, with a white T-shirt underneath, and dark trousers.

"'All right,' I said, 'on your feet.' Oswald stood up and slowly raised both his arms. As he did this, he said in a tone of resignation, 'Now it's all over.' My hands darted over his body as I searched for a weapon. Quickly they reached Oswald's waist. On his right side tucked beneath his belt was a .38 snub-nosed revolver, a Smith & Wesson—what they call a Smith & Wesson snubnose—blue steel.

"As I reached for the gun, Oswald also grabbed for it with his right hand. I shouted, 'I've got him.' With his left fist Oswald then smashed me right between the eyes as hard as he could, knocking my cap off. We both fell, fighting, into the seats, but I still had some portion of his gun in my hand, and so did he, only he had his hand on the trigger part. I remember thinking, 'He can't beat me to death with his left fist, but he sure can kill me if I let go of this gun.'

"I held on as we were wrestling for that gun. Once it came up and cut my face. When I tried to wrench it away from Oswald, he suddenly plunged it forward into my chest and pulled the trigger, but my hand over the gun slowed the action of the hammer and it only dented the primer. I could hear the snap, but no bullet was fired.

"When I heard that snap, I gave one final jerk with all the strength I had. My hand got down to the butt and I pulled the gun out of Oswald's hand. I handed it to another officer, Detective Bob Carroll, who was in plain clothes. Officer T. A. Hudson then came up from the row behind and threw his arm around Oswald's neck. Officer C. T. Walker, running from the left, grabbed Oswald's left arm. Officer Ray Hawkins ran to the row in front of us and grabbed Oswald from the front. I held on to the suspect with my left hand.

"The officers then took Oswald out of the theater and transported him to the city jail. It was then 2 p.m., about 90 minutes after President Kennedy had been assassinated.

PHOTOS TO PROVE A POINT

"When Oswald was taken from the Texas theater, I walked back to my squad car and drove downtown. There I reported to Captain Westbrook, and he escorted me to the crime lab, where pictures were taken of my face. The gun had cut it while Oswald and I had been fighting. My nose and lips were also a bit bloody from the fighting.

"The captain wanted photos taken because Lee Harvey Oswald was already hollering about police brutality. If Oswald had lived we would have presented evidence, photographic evidence, that he was resisting arrest and force had to be used to subdue him. After Oswald was arrested, no one laid a hand on him. I was the only one who hit him at any time, and that was in self-defense.

"At the time I captured Oswald, I had no idea that he had killed the President of the United States. I was fairly sure, however, that he was the man who had killed Officer Tippitt."

While all this was going on, Officer Nick McDonald's wife Sally—they were married 14 years this past February 15—was working as a receptionist for an oil company, Producing Properties, Inc., on the 35th floor of the Southland Center Building in Dallas.

"Like everyone else," she told me, "I was stunned by the news of the President's assassination. There was no radio in the reception room where I worked, so what I picked up of the happenings was piecemeal from people coming and going.

"I heard from someone that a policeman had been shot near Oak Cliff, and the first thought that came to my mind—I guess every policeman's wife thinks the same—was that it was Nick. I phoned the Oak Cliff substation immediately, and they told me it was J. D. Tippit who'd been killed.

"Then a few minutes later," Mrs. McDonald recalled, "I got a phone call from Ann Williams. Her husband Frank is on the force with Nick. He's Nick's best friend. Ann said, 'Sally, hold on to yourself. Nick's been wounded.'

"I tell you, I went numb. It was a few minutes before I could feel or think anything. I was sure my husband was dead. He'd come real close to death two times before. I'd wanted him to quit the police force. Now I cursed myself for not having insisted.

"I began to sob and cry. I guess I was nearly hysterical. People gathered around, trying to console me. And then the phone rang again. Someone grabbed it and yelled at me, 'It's your husband.' I lurched for the phone, and I heard Nick's voice. 'I'm okay,' he said calmly. 'Just got a few scratches.'

"I couldn't believe it. I thought he was fibbing, just trying to make me feel good. 'Let me speak to someone else,' I said. He put Jerry Hill on the phone, Jerry assured me Nick was all right. But I still wasn't sure. I raced down to police headquarters, and when I saw Nick standing there, breathing, I said over and over, 'Thank God. Thank God.'"

Two days later Maurice and Sally McDonald were attending the Oak Woods Christian church with their two daughters, Vicki, 13, and Michelle, 10, when, following the invocation, the minister announced to his congregation: "Lee Harvey Oswald has just been shot in the basement of City Hall."

McDonald leaned back in his pew and said softly to himself, "Oh, my God."

When Oswald died, McDonald was genuinely sorry, "I'm convinced," he says, "that Oswald was guilty. We have an eyewitness to his murder of J. D. Tippit, a woman who saw the whole thing. And I'm equally sure he assassinated the President, but certainly he was entitled to his day in court. Jack Ruby had no right to take the law into his own hands."

On January 4 of this year Nick McDonald, along with other Dallas policemen and several Secret Service agents, was assigned to guard and protect Marina Oswald, widow of the man who had tried to murder him, in North Dallas.

"In the month that assignment lasted," McDonald says, "Marina Oswald didn't know who I was. She's a fine young woman who looks after two babies. She apparently will have nothing to do with her mother-in-law, probably for good reason, and I wish her only the best. In marrying Lee Harvey Oswald I'm sure she didn't know what she was getting into. She's always been considerate, courteous, and cooperative with all the authorities."

Nick McDonald—he dislikes his given name, Maurice, and adopted the name Nick from the word "nickname"—has been on the Dallas police force 9 years. He bagan on March 3, 1955, following his discharge from the Air Force, at a starting salary of $285 a month. Currently he earns $489 a month. Because he found it rough to support a wife and two daughters and make mortgage and other finance payments on that salary, his wife also works.

McDonald was raised by his grandparents. His parents were divorced when he was 5. He attended Arkansas State Teachers College and served hitches in both the Navy and Air Force before he came to Dallas with his young bride, the former Sally Lou Plyler of Prescott, Ark.

"Police work," he says, "has become my life, and I love it more than anything else. My wife keeps nagging me to quit, but she knows I never will. She keeps thinking I'll come to some untimely end, and maybe I will. 'But after all,' I tell her, 'Who wants to live forever?'"

Padre Island Is Rapidly Being Developed as a Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate gave final passage on September 18, 1962, to my bill to create a national seashore recreational area on Padre Island, off the gulf coast of Texas.

President Kennedy signed the bill into law in a White House ceremony September 28, 1962. It was a victory for the 87th Congress, for the administration and the people, coming 4½ years after I introduced the original bill.

Today, Padre Island National Seashore is coming into its own as one of the world's great recreational and tourist attractions. Some of the reasons why this is so are outlined in an excellent article published in the Sunday, March 15, 1964, edition of the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times Features magazine.

The article, by Mr. L. A. Wilke, is captioned: "Padre Island Is Rapidly Being Developed as Park."

As author of the Padre Island bill I believe I express the opinion of the people of Texas and of all the people who will use this great recreational area in expressing appreciation to the Congress for supporting and passing the bill.

This article, published in Wichita Falls, hundreds of miles from the sun and sand of Padre Island is a tribute to those who supported this bill, and who created similar recreational areas at Cape Cod in Massachusetts and Point Reyes in California.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Padre Island Is Rapidly Being Developed as Park," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PADRE ISLAND IS RAPIDLY BEING DEVELOPED AS PARK

(By L. A. Wilke)

Padre Island, the Nation's newest seashore, probably will be first choice for vacationing Texans this year. This spit of sand, surf, and sunshine extending approximately 100 miles between Corpus Christi and Port Isabel is entering its first phase of development under the national recreational program and the National Park Service.

Most of it is still primitive today. Sand dunes piled high form most of the thousands of acres of undeveloped area on the Texas coast. But surveyors are already platting out facilities for the new playground.

In addition developers of that portion left open for commercial use have engineers laying out roads, new causeways, and communities that are expecting to surpass some of the finest Florida beaches.

William A. Bowen, longtime superintendent and planner with the National Park Service, has opened an office in Corpus Christi for the initial work of turning sandhills into campsites. Bowen, as Padre Island seashore superintendent, recently announced a contract had been let to first survey the approximately 134,000 acres which will be required for the project. In the meantime his staff is making a careful study of the entire property.

MUCH TO OFFER

"What do we have at Padre Island?" Bowen asks. "Here is a list of the things which certainly are not all we have, but when you consider Padre Island in relation to other seashores, I think these are at least some of the most important assets:

"1. Eighty miles of superlative beach with ample land area to support water-oriented recreational activities.

"2. In addition to the 80 miles within the seashore, more beach land is available at each end of the island to support fine commercial and recreational development. Your excellent county parks and fine tourists facilities on the south end of the island speak for themselves.

"3. A year-round climate. Cooler than most of the Southwest in the summer. Warmer than much of the United States in the winter.

"4. A beeline route from the east and central United States to Mexico City going right by the entrance.

"5. Fishing, swimming, boating; This gamut of water recreation activities in Laguna Madre and the gulf.

"6. People: Padre Island is nearer and more desirable than any other seashore for, generally speaking, the area from the Mississippi to the Rockies.

"7. Natural history: Birds, marine life as plentiful and as varied as one could ask for."

In outlining the initial stages of development, Bowen says the National Park Service "will devote its attention mainly to providing those facilities which generally are not provided by private capital—campgrounds, picnic areas, bathing beaches, sanitary facilities, and protection."

PAVED HIGHWAYS

Padre Island now can be reached by automobile via a county-owned causeway at Corpus Christi, at the north end, and over another county-owned causeway at Port Isabel at the southern tip. At the north end of the island there is a paved road through the sandhills to the Bob Hall fishing pier on the gulf side. Traffic from that portion down the island is over the sandy beach. Sometimes the family automobile can be driven for many miles down the island, depending upon the condition of the beach.

At the southern tip there is a paved highway extending for approximately 7 miles up the middle of the island, with an immediate extension projected. It is possible to drive north on the gulf side from the causeway to the Port Mansfield Channel, a distance of some 30 miles, in a four-wheel drive vehicle. When the tide is right the entire distance can be driven on hard-packed beach in an automobile. However, this is not recommended at the present time, except perhaps for those who expect to camp overnight or for several days among the vine-covered boondocks.

Although there is some community development on the north end of the island, this development has been carried much further on South Padre. Here are a dozen or more excellent motels, three of them in the deluxe class, service stations, drive-in grocery stores, a post office, and chamber of commerce.

Many boaters find their best way to Padre via the new Port Mansfield Channel, which cuts through the island, connecting the mainland with the Gulf of Mexico. At Port Mansfield the Willacy County Navigation District has developed a fine boat basin.

FACILITIES AVAILABLE

Located 25 miles east of Raymondville, the little town of Port Mansfield has motels, marinas and fueling facilities for both large and small boats. It is an excellent place to berth semicruisers and work boats, because of the covered docks and other facilities available. Many fishermen interested in fishing the reefs off the island in the Gulf of Mexico embark from Port Mansfield, through the cut completed last year by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. Within 15 miles fishermen can take trout, redfish, flounder and other game species from Laguna Madre, or red snapper from the banks and sails and tarpon playing in the Gulf coastal waters. In the summer there is fine fishing for both kings and Spanish mackerel.

Despite all the development now in progress on the island to make it a semitropical playground for the Middle West, it still is cloaked in legendary mystery, according to Hal Roberts, president of the South Padre Chamber of Commerce.

Many treasure hunters spend their weekends digging and searching for artifacts of other centuries. Padre's known history dates to its discovery back in 1519. Explorers looked at the long strip of land guarding the Texas coast and called it Isla Blanca because of its white sand glittering in the subtropical sun.

As other explorers from Spain, England, and France sailed across the Atlantic in search of riches in the new world, many of them hit rough waters of the Gulf of Mexico. Their crafts were too light and the wreckage was washed ashore on the sands of Padre where it has been covered over with the sand of centuries.

The island became known as Padre when Fr. Nicholas Balli was given a Spanish grant early in the 1000's. He set up a ranching operation, where only cannibalistic Indians had lived for hundreds of years. Civilization was slow to move in and only a few families tried it. During the early days of the Civil War, Confederate troops marched south to Brownsville over the island, and those who had been living there were forced to vacate. It has remained almost unoccupied except by a few fishermen in shacks until fairly recent years.

SEPARATES ISLAND

Laguna Madre separates the island from the mainland, with the intracoastal waterway system traversing its length. Here there is heavy barge traffic with freight moving in from the Atlantic seaboard and the Mississippi system.

The barges are reloaded with agricultural and petroleum products from the Lower Rio Grande Valley and northern Mexico and moved back up the canal to go into the commerce of the world.

There has been no development on the mainland south of Baffin Bay in Kleberg County, except the recent building of the boating facilities at Port Mansfield and at the mouth of the Arroyo Colorado, which serves as the Harlingen boat channel.

Most of the economy of Port Isabel, at the southern tip of the island, has been in fishing and boatbuilding, with a heavy tourist trade both summer and winter. Lately with the completion of a large new marina, many fine boats are being kept there. Another modern marina now is under construction adjacent to the coastguard station on South Padre.

Most of the original development on South Padre was by the Cameron County Park Board, which built the causeway across Laguna Madre with revenue bonds. The county also established two parks on the island, providing it with a modern restaurant, pavilion for public meetings, trailer area and cabanas and bathhouse facilities for those who want to loll in the sunshine, fish, gather shells or seek lost treasure.

Two large investment firms are now involved in the island development. First, John L. Tompkins subdivided a portion of the southern tip, where the present little town of South Padre Island, Texas, stands. Adjoining that property on the north the South Padre Investment Corp. of Austin and Brownsville owns several thousand acres of land not involved in the National Park. Plans for this development over a long range call for the building of communities with schools, churches, business houses and dwelling lots with paved streets in front and boat channels in the rear.

NEW CAUSEWAY

First contemplated work in setting up the Nation's newest playground will be in the area of the Port Mansfield channel. Steps now are being taken to construct a new causeway with revenue bonds. Meantime the Willacy County Navigation District is spending nearly a million dollars to pipe fresh water to Port Mansfield, where it can be made available to residents of the island opposite the mainland.

All highways leading into South Texas serve the area. Many of them converge in the general vicinity of Corpus Christi, or Kingsville where U.S. 77 proceeds to the Rio Grande Valley through the historic King Ranch. Other traffic comes in from the Beaumont-Port Arthur area to Corpus Christi over Highway 35, and from Austin and San Antonio over U.S. 181 and 281. Or West Texans can travel down the old military route from Laredo to the Valley and across the island.

Both the Rio Grande Valley and Padre Island had their best winter tourist business during the past season with thousands of visitors. Most of them came from the Middle West, spending several weeks. Also many of them are buying property for investment or winter homes or permanent retirement homes.

Hon. Joseph F. Feeney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we are always proud of the many young men who have worked on the staff of Members, or as a part of the organization of the House and Senate, who have taken advantage of their opportunities, educating themselves, with the ambition and determination to advance in the journey of life and who, upon going into private fields, have been successful.

Some years ago a young man became a member of the present Speaker's staff, then the majority leader, later becoming his secretary and legislative secretary. I refer to the Honorable Joseph F. Feeney, of Boston, Mass., who always has had a

strong love for the National House of Representatives.

While employed by our Speaker, "Joe" Feeney studied law and successfully passed the bar examination, and entered the private practice of law in Massachusetts with great success.

He served as assistant U.S. attorney in Massachusetts, assistant district attorney in Suffolk County of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, later appointed as a judge of one of the Massachusetts courts. As a judge of one of the district courts of Massachusetts, Judge Feeney has made an outstanding name for himself.

In my remarks I include a deserving article, entitled "A Great American, Hon. Joseph F. Feeney: Civic Leader, Veteran, Jurist," appearing in the South Boston Tribune on March 12, 1964:

HON. JOSEPH F. FEENEY: CIVIC LEADER, VETERAN, JURIST

It takes a lot of man to measure up to the mettle of the many outstanding personalities who have been forged on the anvil we know and love as South Boston.

It takes a lot of man to stand shoulder to shoulder with such "southie" products as—Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston; John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House and second in our Nation's chain of command; John E. Powers, former Senate president who has just been named clerk of the supreme judicial court of the Commonwealth, and Hon. Thomas E. Linehan, presiding justice of the municipal court for the South Boston district.

It takes a lot of man to warrant a place at the forefront of the ranks of illustrious citizens to emerge from the peninsula section of Dame Boston's acreage.

It takes a lot of man to be singled out as our "Distinguished American," to be our man of the year, our finest among the fine.

All of these things—yes, and much more—is South Boston's own son, Joseph Francis Feeney—soldier, statesman, lawyer, jurist, husband, father, civic leader, confidant to many who set the course for our country to follow * * * but most of all, friend to the people of our beloved hometown.

Joe Feeney has touched many ports as his ark sails on the sea of life; he has navigated in close waters with the great, the near-great, and the not-at-alls; he has steadied the rudder to keep his bow always on the course of righteousness.

Joe Feeney, son of South Boston, has stowed a lifetime of life and living into his 43 years. Yet, his book is only partly written on this day.

He really took the first step into his future when, as a youngster, he was introduced to the man who proved to be the inspiration of his life—our beloved John W. McCormack—and the woman whom he loved—Mrs. Harriet McCormack.

From the time he came under "The Speaker's" wing, Joe Feeney was destined to be that one among many, the person who showed others the way.

Through St. Peter and Paul's school and Boston English High School his character was being molded with the ingredients of faith, honesty, respect, dedication, and love.

Just over 2 decades ago Joe Feeney's future began to unfold when he went to work in the Washington D.C., office of Speaker McCORMACK. In a dozen years he moved from "15th assistant office boy," as he often explains, to secretary to the Speaker, and Legislative Clerk to the Congress of the United States.

Four years in the U.S. Navy during World War II helped develop Joe Feeney. As a lieutenant he served on board the USS *Wisconsin*, the first American capital ship to bombard the Japanese mainland, and was with the initial landing party at Tokyo Bay after the surrender. He earned seven battle stars for the major engagements in which he, along with his mates defied planes and bombs.

Following his tour of duty Joe Feeney returned to Washington and his service and devotion to Speaker McCORMACK. Before leaving the Nation's capital in the early fifties he had graduated from George Washington University, been legislative clerk to the House of Representatives and completed long, faithful, and valuable services to Congressman JOHN McCORMACK.

Back in South Boston in 1952, Joe Feeney became caught up in a whirling spree of action and activity which spread over 5 years. Included in this span were: named U.S. attorney, joined the staff of Suffolk County District Attorney's office as an assistant, wed Joan Carroll of Milton, listed among the top 10 most outstanding young men by the Boston Junior Chamber of Commerce, served as Marshal for the St. Patrick's Day parade, presented evidence to the grand jury to secure 10 indictments in the famous Brink's case, prosecuted many bigtime gamblers on tax evasion cases.

But, on April 25 of 1957 Joe Feeney reached the goal he must have been intended for by the Almighty. On this date, with the Speaker at his side and some 200 friends packed into Gov. Foster Furcolo's office, he was sworn in as a Special Justice of the South Boston District Court.

Then, he became Judge Feeney and had the really big opportunity of helping "his people." Thus he started the career which permitted him to guide the young and old of South Boston who had run into a bumpy stretch of life's road. The youngsters who came to the crossroads were given the benefit of help and advice from their friend; the middle agers and their special problems found his ears ready and willing; the unfortunates who were caught in their particular problems found him sympathetic and understanding.

And, from that date to this Judge Joe Feeney has always been fair to his "friends" as he tempered justice with mercy, punishment with guidance, pardon with help.

Judge Feeney has devoted himself to many things. To Speaker and Mrs. McCormack, to his wife and children, to the sometimes heart-tearing tasks which accompany the wearing of judicial robes, to the veterans and their causes, to charitable organizations—yes, to South Boston and all its citizens.

Through all his triumphs and successes, through his pleasures and smiles, Judge Joe Feeney has remained the same, humble person. His pride in his hometown and its people has never diminished; no, it has grown and grown. At one time he declared, "South Boston has given more boys and girls to religious life than any other community of its size. It has produced more statesmen, generals, lawyers, businessmen, and plain great people."

Truly, it takes a lot of man to fulfill all of these things—truly, such a man is Judge Joseph Francis Feeney, son of South Boston and the pride of its warm and friendly heart.

Passport Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Times for March 1, 1964, an article by Barbara Dubivsky, entitled "Passport Picture." It is an excellent article pointing out how the modernization of the Passport Office of the State Department under the direction of the capable Miss Frances Knight has through use of modern techniques greatly increased the speed for the issuance of passports and has made the passport a much more attractive document for the bearer to present when required. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSPORT PICTURE—MODERN METHODS HELPING UNITED STATES ISSUE A RECORD NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS

(By Barbara Dubivsky)

WASHINGTON.—Americans applying for passports seldom realize how much information they are giving the Passport Office of the State Department. This information gives a portrait of the traveling public in terms of numbers, age groups, occupations, and areas of origin and destination.

Modernized tabulation over the last decade has made more and more of these details readily available. When tallied and evaluated, they tell quite a story.

This year, the Passport Office, according to its Director, Miss Frances G. Knight, expects to issue about 1,180,000 of these travel documents, which call on all concerned "to pass (the holder) without delay or hindrance and in case of need to give said citizen all lawful aid and protection.

This expectation represents an increase of 12 percent over the 1963 figure of 1,055,504, which was 16 percent higher than in 1962. Ten years ago, the annual number of passports issued and renewed was 418,870.

Virtually all passports are issued by agency field offices in Boston, Miami, New York, Chicago, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and Honolulu. The main passport office in Washington is the center for several Eastern and Middle Atlantic States.

ELECTRONICS AT WORK

Before the documents are issued, clearance must be obtained from the Passport Office in Washington. Information regarding applicants is transmitted daily by teletype from the regional offices. The machine that types out permanent file cards on each applicant simultaneously punches a tape used to forward data to the main office and to print the same information on the passport.

Gone are the old flat-bed typewriters, the glue pots and the laundry irons previously used to piece together essential bits and pieces of these documents. In their place are modern timesaving machines and communications methods that permit agency personnel to issue passports a few days after application is made to a regional office—provided no complications arise.

Applications forwarded from clerks of Federal or State courts in districts far from a regional office require a few more days for processing, but even these rarely take longer than a week. In genuine emergencies, passports can be obtained within a matter of hours.

Most passport applications come from heavily populated metropolitan areas. In 1963, a total of 62 percent of the applicants resided in 27 such regions, with 25 percent living in the New York consolidated area, which includes several large New Jersey communities. The Northeast still has the greatest volume of passport applications, but several North Central and Pacific States have been gaining for several years.

PRIMARY DESTINATION

Barring unforeseen crises, Europe will doubtedly remain the passport holder's primary destination, with Britain, Italy, and France attracting the most visitors in that order.

Seventy-five of every one hundred persons receiving passports in 1963 went to one or more countries in Europe. Ten went to the Far East, seven to countries in the Western hemisphere, five to the Middle East, three to Australia and Oceania and one to Africa. The proportions are not expected to change significantly in 1964.

In 1964, as in previous years, more passport fees will be collected from women than from men. In 1963, a total of 685,280 passports went to women, or about 66,620 more than were issued to men.

The American housewife, perennial butt of jokesters, evidently has been laughing all the way to the Passport Office and right up the gangplank or airline ramp. In the occupation listing, she accounted for 23 percent of the passports issued last year. Only the "independent business or profession" group outpaced her. Students accounted for 13 percent; teachers, 5 percent, and clerk-secretaries, 6 percent.

MOST GO FOR PLEASURE

Travel for pleasure, which accounts for 74 percent of all passports, is increasing twice as fast as any other category of oversea travel. Only 8 of every 100 passport holders went abroad on business, 3 for educational purposes and 1 for religious, scientific, or health reasons. The rest were official travelers.

Americans traveling abroad may not be the "innocents" immortalized by Mark Twain, but they are getting younger each year. The under-20 age group increased by 40 percent last year.

The biggest age group is the 20–29 bracket, 189,500 of whom were issued passports last year. The group's 15 percent growth rate is considerably less than that of their younger brethren, who threaten to outpace them in the not-too-distant future.

Once they have traveled abroad, Americans seem eager to plan additional trips. Sixty-one of every one hundred travelers indicated that they expected to go abroad again during the 5-year life span of their passports, which are issued for 3 years and may be renewed for 2 more. Twenty-seven planned to within a year, and six within 2 years.

Although still required on application forms, information on occupation and distinguishing marks or scars is no longer noted on passports. By dropping the latter, much embarrassment is spared people sensitive about facial characteristics.

COLOR PHOTOGRAPHS

Another innovation during the tenure of Miss Knight is the optional use of photographs in color. More and more persons are submitting these in preference to equally accpetable black-and-white pictures.

The color pictures are considered not only more attractive but also more true to life, and hence better as identification. Most persons have taken Miss Knight's "Smile, please," suggestion to heart, so that one seldom sees the dreadful "mug" shots that used to be the rule.

Contrary to popular belief, an exceedingly small number, less than 1 percent, of passports is lost or stolen. Those that at first seem to be missing usually turn up in bureau drawers or coat pockets long before consular officials overseas can be persuaded to issue duplicates, a course they follow only after diligent questioning and search.

Is America Heading for Total War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Jenkin Lloyd Jones, whose column appeared in a recent issue of the Redwood City Tribune, raises some very serious questions about our foreign policy. His column entitled "Is America Heading Toward a Total War?" follows:

WITH NO FRIENDS—IS AMERICA HEADING TOWARD A TOTAL WAR?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is America approaching that degree of gentleness and irresolution that will render her incapable of surviving in a jungle world?

Have we grown so tolerant of misbehavior among the neutrals, so ready to turn the other cheek to our rampaging enemies, and so intent on peace at any price that we are nudging the world toward a climactic war, a war we may not win?

In short, are we suffering from an overdose of civilization?

A world in which highly civilized men are safe is, of course, devoutly to be wished. It is nice to think that the meek will inherit the earth at this particular time. But the meek haven't been doing so well recently.

The brutal truth is that gutty aggressors can lick the pants off defensive sportsmen. The Marquis of Queensberry rules aren't worth a whoop against the man coming at you with a broken bottle.

It is now being admitted, even in Washington, that America's foreign policy is in "disarray." "Disarray" is a precious bit of Harvardese meaning "a mess." It is in a mess not because the framers of our foreign policy were stupid, but because they suffered from a very persistent illusion.

The illusion was that if we consistently out-do-gooded ourselves the nations of the world would flock to our banner out of gratitude and admiration. This miscalculation may have had its genesis in one of the noblest and wrongest political theorists of all time—Woodrow Wilson.

"There is such a thing," wrote Wilson, "as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right."

Were we wrong in our treatment of Cuba? We delivered her. We were her best customer.

Were we wrong in our treatment of Panama? We delivered her, too. Before we came the only asset the isthmus had was a 40-mile railroad over which apprehensive passengers hurried through swarms of Anopheles mosquitoes.

What evil had we done to Zanzibar? The Americans were booted out, including our diplomatic personnel. And we turned right around and recognized the new regime at the suggestion of that master of tribal psychology, Soapy Williams.

All over the world mobs are descending on American Embassies. They used to simply attack the U.S. Information libraries. But now our Ambassadors flee for their lives. Is this part of a pattern? You bet your sweet boots.

The pattern is the systematic humiliation of America. It is humiliation in progressive degrees, from little humiliations to steadily larger ones. The aim is to convince our friends that we are weak and irresolute, the uncommitted that we are a paper tiger, and the people of the Communist countries that worldwide victory for their leaders is inevitable. The campaign has been doing fine.

Why have we behaved so feebly? Because we are so civilized that the possibility of atomic war fills us with horror.

There is another popular piece of Washington gobbledygookey—"escalate." We threw away victory in Korea because we were afraid a bombing above the Yalu would "escalate" into world war III. For the same reason we didn't push a corridor through to Berlin, although the Russians were acting in defiance of all solemn agreements. And in the fall of 1962 we pulled our punch in Cuba and thus junked the Monroe Doctrine.

Has no one in Washington been reading history? Hitler was permitted to remilitarize the Rhineland because the timid British and French feared that if they opposed it matters might "escalate" into World War II. At that time, militarily, Hitler had practically nothing.

Hitler claimed that each new aggressive move would be his last, but he stressed that any opposition would bring total war. So he murdered Dollfuss, took over Austria, grabbed Sudetenland and the Polish corridor. Each time Britain and France fell back, fearing escalation. And when the inevitable breaking point came Hitler was strong and they were weak.

If we don't stand up for our rights pretty soon World War III will be a cinch. Because by perpetually showing weakness we won't end the possibility of incidents. We will simply insure larger and more outrageous incidents until we must choose war or total surrender.

The time has come to say to the Panamanian:

"Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across that fence we'll return the body."

The time has come to say to Ghana's Nkrumah:

"The fleet will be in tomorrow. The marines will march down to our Embassy behind the bands. You be there to tell us whether you want the place closed. You've already seen your last gift dollar. And if we lock the Embassy you've seen your last trade dollar."

If we do not start saying these things we will be in total war in 10 years—without any friends.

The United States and a Changing Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last night I was privileged to attend the annual dinner of the Hibernian Society of Baltimore.

The principal speaker of the evening was the Honorable William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs. Selecting as the subject, "The United States and a Changing Europe," Mr. Tyler presented an excellent review of the progress which has been made in Europe since the end of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Tyler's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE UNITED STATES AND A CHANGING EUROPE," ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM R. TYLER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, AT THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY OF BALTIMORE, HOTEL EMERSON, BALTIMORE, MD., TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1964

I'm very glad to be with you this evening, and I thank you sincerely for having invited me. I told Mr. Duffy that I have no Irish blood in me, and thus am not entitled to wear the green on St. Patrick's Day. And yet, perhaps I may lay claim to being allowed to do so: I have been three times to Ireland in the last 2 years. The last time was with President Kennedy, and that experience convinced me that any American's heart belongs in part to Ireland.

Well, it is a very different world today from the times of St. Patrick, or 100 years ago, or even 25 years ago. We are living in a world of change. The pace of history is not even, like that of a river. Its course is marked by periods of sudden intensity in the varying fields of human endeavor, whether it be in the arts, in literature, or in the sciences. The keynote of our times is: change. All countries and all continents are experiencing in some degree the impact of new forces, generated partly from within themselves and partly by the experience of others.

I was thinking the other day that we will shortly be marking the 15th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty. Let's take a brief look at Europe as it was then, compared with the situation today. Such a comparison may serve to make us feel that, in spite of the problems we still face, the record gives us cause for some legitimate satisfaction at what has been achieved and averted, and for some hope that further progress is within our reach; that our efforts have not been in vain, and that many of the changes that are occurring are working for us.

In 1949 the economy of Europe lay in ruins.

Today the member countries of NATO account for 62 percent of the world's gross national product, as against 21 percent for the Soviet bloc.

In 1949 Europe lay defenseless but for us, under the direct threat of Soviet military aggression.

Today, the members of NATO combined have more men under arms and greater overall military capability than the Soviet Union and her allies.

In 1949, Europe was a mosaic of prostrate national units.

Today, thanks to our massive assistance under the Marshall plan, and thanks to the efforts of the Europeans themselves, Europe is becoming increasingly integrated, economically, commercially, and technologically.

National boundaries are diminishing in importance. National responsibilities are being increasingly subordinated to common responsibilities. The vision of enlightened Europeans after the war, such as: Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman of France, Konrad Adenauer of Germany, and Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, have given impetus to a new conception of the role and the destinies of Europe which, a quarter of a century ago, would have been dismissed as lunacy.

We are witnessing today the emergence of conditions which will surely result in the establishment of a partnership between the two sides of the Atlantic. Neither temporary setbacks nor hesitations can obscure the fact that common considerations of interest, of security, of responsibility toward the less developed countries of the world, are pressing the United States and Europe forward along the converging lines of a common purpose and toward a shared goal.

We are about to engage in negotiations with 60 other nations to reduce further the tariffs which inhibit trade between nations. If the free world is to benefit from the efficient use of resources, and from a more open trading system, this requires agreement in the first instance between the United States and the European Common Market, for together we conduct 90 percent of free world trade.

If there is to be an international financial system capable of supporting an increased flow of goods, this requires cooperation between ourselves and Europe.

If there is to be an adequate flow of capital to meet the needs of less developed countries, it must come from North America and Western Europe, for there are no other major sources.

Differences of view within the Western alliance should not blind us to the fact that there is complete and unhesitating unity on the basic issue of the defense of the West.

This was clearly demonstrated at the time of the Cuban crisis in 1962, and of the attempts by the Soviet Union to test the unity of the alliance by creating incidents on the Berlin autobahn last fall.

In other words, the essential political unity within NATO in terms of the East-West struggle, the prosperity of our free societies, and the strength of our defense—all this makes it possible for us to air certain differences in public without impairing the foundations of our association.

A true alliance between free peoples must be evolutionary in character. We face new challenges and new opportunities in our world of change.

I do not wish to sound Pollyannish to you. I do not underestimate the disappointments and difficulties ahead of us. But I would not be speaking frankly if I did not express to you my conviction that in the long run, the road before the free world runs forward and upward.

Now let us look for a few minutes at the changes which are taking place in Eastern Europe. There we see people who also have kindred ties with us but who were cut off from their share in European liberation and revival by the outcome of the war. In Poland, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania, Stalin envisaged a sphere of Soviet domination as a base for ultimate expansion over the rest of Europe.

The Eastern European people were sealed off from the West and held down by Soviet-patterned police apparatuses. Their widely varying economies and national institutions were forced into a single Communist mold, through which the resources of the entire area were put at the disposal of the Soviet Union. Polish coal, Rumanian oil, Czechoslovak uranium were drained off for Soviet use. The peasant agriculture of Eastern Europe was thrown into chaos and its productivity virtually killed by collectivization, to fit Stalin's blueprint of uniformity. When even native Communist leaders balked at the disregard for differing national needs, Stalin had them eliminated. To all appearances, he had succeeded in reducing the Eastern Eurpoean countries to identical satellites, only a step removed from disappearance by absorption into the Soviet Union. They formed the westward protrusion of a seemingly monolithic bloc, threatening the security of the rest of Europe from which they had been involuntarily cut off.

But this monolith endured only as long as Stalin was there to impose it; after him it began to crack. Actually, its weaknesses had begun to show already in Stalin's last years, when in 1948, the Yugoslav Communists rejected his interference and made their country independent. Since then Poland, Hungary, Albania, and Rumania in differing ways have challenged Soviet control, and throughout Eastern Europe the pattern imposed by Stalin has eroded away.

We can see many reasons why this has happened:

(1) Stalin's successors, struggling for his power, lacked his relentless grip. Furthermore, they saw that changes were unavoidable to rule Eastern Europe successfully; but in repudiating Stalin's methods they opened the gates to the forces of change.

(2) Economic difficulties, popular misery, and mounting national resentment over the years have exerted irresistible pressure on the Eastern European Communist regimes for change.

(3) The Sino-Soviet split in the world Communist movement has encouraged the Eastern European regimes to act more independently and to try to solve their own pressing problems, as the differing circumstances of each country may dictate.

(4) The strength and dynamism of the West, and Wesern economic and cultural magnetism, exerted on Eastern Europe at its very doorstep, have exerted a strong pull on the Eastern European Communist governments toward ties with the West.

(5) The example of the front-runner in change—"revisionist" Yugoslavia—has encouraged some of the Eastern European members of the Soviet camp to follow a more independent course both in relation to Moscow and in programs at home.

All of these factors played a part in the rise of strong nationalist and reformist factions in the Polish and Hungarian parties in particular, and in the outbreak of the great crises of 1956. In Poland they led to reforms that, for Communists were drastic: abolition of collectivization, withdrawal of direct Soviet control over the armed forces, a grant of considerable freedom to the church, a turning to the West for economic support. In Hungary they caused the historic uprising that pushed the Communists to the point of asserting full independence from Moscow, until the Soviets suppressed this move by armed force.

The military crushing of the Hungarian independence movement, however, arrested the tides of change only momentarily. These tides are the same forces of nationalism, economic need, demand for more freedom, and Western attraction, as before. The measures of Yugoslavia and of Gomulka's Poland have strengthened the hand of those in other Eastern European regimes who want to seek similarly unorthodox ways of making socialism work better in their own countries. More recently, the Chinese Communist challenge to Moscow's authority, apart from attracting the hardshell Albanian leaders into shifting their allegiance to Peiping, has given added impulse to the independent tendencies of other Eastern European rulers. As a result, a quiet revolution is going forward—at an uneven pace among the different Eastern European countries, it is true, but with effects that seem bound to change all of them in the long run.

Take Rumania as a leading example. Its leaders have recently revealed their intention of building up the Rumanian industrial system on a national plan of their own, in opposition to proposals of Moscow to subordinate Rumania to a scheme of Soviet-Eastern European joint development. They are turning to the West for the needed equipment. Meanwhile they have been further identifying their regime with the Rumanian nation by a new emphasis on the national culture and by some downgrading of things Russian.

In Poland, the posture of equality with Moscow assumed by the Gomulka regime in 1956 has been maintained, as have generally Gomulka's unorthodox experiments with

more freedom, individual farming, and close economic ties with the West. In trade, the Poles have recently even entered a far-reaching accord with their principal wartime foe, the West Germans.

In Hungary, the Government has been steadily easing restrictions and opening jobs and education to non-Communists in an effort to conciliate the peoples; and, to spur output, it is restorting to such unorthodox steps as encouraging private production by peasants on collective farms. It recently stopped jamming Western broadcasts, and it now permits Hungarians, by the thousands, freely to travel to the West. It is trying to shift more of Hungary's trade to the West, as well.

Czechoslovakia is tardily and only gradually discarding some of its leaders and trappings of the Stalin era. It has lightened its travel restrictions, and is seeking improved relations with the West, including the United States. For the first time in years there are no American citizens in Czechoslovak prison.

In Bulgaria, a spy trial was recently staged to warn the population against contacts with Americans. But the Government needs and seeks Western ties; it has settled U.S. claims, for example, and it invites us to exhibit at its trade fair. Though a strict police regime, it is also showing a novel flexibility in some of its economic policies, such as promotion of private production on peasant household plots.

In Soviet-occupied East Germany, even the Stalinist regime of Ulbricht, stained with the shame of the Berlin wall, is attempting to devise ways of remedying its failures by borrowing capitalist-type incentives to help its ailing economy. There are other indications that the winds of change now blowing in Eastern Europe are beginning to be felt in East Germany. The time will surely come when the people of Germany will be reunited with each other in freedom and when the heroism and steadfastness of the people of West Berlin will thus be vindicated.

These shifts and changes in the Eastern European scene have important meaning for the United States, in view of our stake in a united and peaceful Europe. If the forces of history, geography, and change are tending to pull this or that Eastern European country back into more normal contact with European life despite Communist control, it is to our interest to assist as we can. To do this, it is essential for the American public to keep abreast with the evolving realities in the eastern half of Europe and to realize that this area is not now a solid bloc of nations, as Stalin tried to make it, or merely a group of satellites of the Soviet Union. The present trend presents a challenge to us and our Western European friends to rebuild our contacts with the Eastern European peoples on a broad scale, through exchanges, trade, and other natural means.

To sum up, we are today engaged in new and changing relations with both Western and Eastern Europe.

The larger, long-range objectives of the United States with respect to Europe are constant: we want Europe to be unified, secure, strong, free, and prosperous.

As conditions in Europe change, so the means that the United States uses to work toward the attainment of its objectives must also necessarily change and evolve as the times require.

The further implication of this truth is that the attitude of the American people toward the phenomenon of change must itself take into account the march of events. In this way, we will be in a position to devise and support those policies which are best calculated to serve our own broad interests.

Iowa City, Iowa, Citizens Hit Anti-Civil Rights Bill Ad as "Offensive," "Untrue"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that many of the constituents I represent were incensed by the "$100 Billion Blackjack" newspaper advertisements which the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental Freedoms, Inc., published in Iowa newspapers last week.

Two people in Iowa City, Iowa, wrote to the editor of the Iowa City (Iowa) Press Citizen to express themselves in opposition to the tactics of this type of misleading advertising.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the letters to the editor which were written by Rev. L. D. Soens, chairman, Iowa City Human Relations Commission, and Mrs. D. H. Eggers, 1227 Pine Street, Iowa City. In inserting these expressions in the Appendix of the RECORD, I commend these citizens for speaking out so forthrightly against what they feel are offensive and untrue statements:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—ANTI-CIVIL-RIGHTS BILL AD HIT AS "OFFENSIVE," "UNTRUE"

To the EDITOR:

The political advertisement, "$100 Billion Blackjack," carried in the March 11 issue of the Press-Citizen is diabolically clever in its use (or misuse) of words and terms. Where it does not mislead in terminology it succeeds in doing so by implication.

For example, the word "dictate" is used to associate the Federal Government with every conceivable area, individuals, businesses, labor, schools, States, and municipalities, etc. It is further implied that the Federal Government is going to "interfere" with everything in these areas. No two words are more antagonistic to the average American than the words "dictator" and "interference." The clever and indiscriminate use of these words can easily slant the readers' entire interpretation of the matter at hand. This technique is not new and the need to use it indicates the weakness of the stand being taken by the organization sponsoring this advertisement.

The attempt made in the advertisement to impress the reader with terms such as "total Federal control," "omnipotent President," "dictatorial Attorney General," is likewise an obvious maneuver to distract the average American from the real issue and meaning of the civil rights bill. The basic and fundamental principles on which this bill rest have long since been established. The intention and purpose of this bill is to enforce what has already been promised to individuals and groups by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

For almost 175 years we have proclaimed these rights and yet history points out that some of the most egregious violations of these rights have been in our own United States. If the rights are genuine ones (and they are), and if they have been officially "on our books" for many years, there are probably two explanations for the all too frequent violation of them. One, the law needs to be more fully spelled out and clarified. Two, and perhaps more important, there needs to be a more effective and decisive manner of enforcing these. This latter has always been considered the responsibility of the executive power of our American Government. The need to increase the Federal executive power, within the limit of its proper jurisdiction, should not be automatically considered as "dictatorial" or "omnipotent."

The simple truth is that the rights being sought by the bill which is currently before the U.S. Senate are so fundamental to men that unless we can clarify them, enforce them, and live by them, we are endangering not just a democracy but the very foundation of any type of effective society. The advertisers of the "$100 Billion Blackjack" are guilty of seriously misleading us with their claptrap of offensive terms and words. Perhaps it should be pointed out that this technique is almost an admission of error, since they feel compelled to resort to this rather than an accurate, clear, and simple statement of their real feelings—most of which can be summed under the term of "white supremacy."

Their interpretation of the intent and meaning of the bill, with references to various titles, could, I am sure, be effectively and seriously questioned by men who are familiar with all the details of the bill itself. I leave this in the hands of those who are much more competent and I would certainly hope that such a person or group of persons would submit to the Press-Citizen a clarification of the individual charges made in the advertisement.

The issue is far too important for us to be misled, especially at this crucial moment when our U.S. Senators from Iowa and every other State will be needing the encouragement and support of all of us. We must think right and encourage right.

Rev. L. D. SOENS,
Chairman, Iowa City Human Relations Commission.

To the EDITOR:

I am writing, as I suppose many others will write, to express my disgust at the advertisement against the Federal civil rights bill which appeared in your paper on March 11. Of course we cannot deny these groups their right to express their distorted views, but such a perversion of the truth cannot go unanswered.

There is nothing in the proposed bill to alarm the fairminded person who conducts his affairs and business with equal opportunity for all without regard to color, religion, or ethnic origin. Only those who are determined to discriminate against certain minority groups within our society will be affected, and even then, unfortunately, it will affect far fewer groups and individuals and in far fewer ways than is suggested by the advertisement.

It would be impossible to even list all the distortions and outright untruths that the ad contains and still keep this letter to a reasonable length. Under cover of a "big government" smokescreen they tried to hide their racist views, but they are obvious to anyone who carefully reads the material.

Therefore, it came as no surprise to read in your paper of the same day that John Satterfield, listed in the ad as secretary of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, is a Mississippi lawyer and chief lobbyist against all civil rights legislation presented in Congress. The Des Moines Register, also on March 11, reported that he is paid $2,000 a month by the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission to do so. The sovereignty commission is a State agency, supported by public funds, dedicated to supporting segregation. Besides being one of the main sources of financial support for the Coordinating Committee for Funda-

mental American Freedom, it also provides funds for many private white citizens councils in the South.

The proposed civil rights bill is a moderate attempt by the Federal Government to secure some measure of human rights for all citizens on an equal basis. This bill is limited in who and what it can cover because Federal power in this area is limited. It is, however, an important step which we can all support by doing one thing that the ad suggests: "Write your Senators, both of them. Do it, now, today." They will also be receiving this kind of material and will be glad to know we haven't been "taken in" by it.

Mrs. D. H. EGGERS.

"The Country Editor," H. M. Baggarly, Discusses Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, able H. M. Baggarly, editor of the Tulia Herald (Tulia, Swisher County, Tex.), has won many State and National honors as a journalist. He is recognized in the newspaper profession as being one of the most able editorial writers in a weekly paper in America. Time after time his own profession has recognized his capabilities by awarding him national honors in competition with all the editorial writers in America.

Mr. Baggarly's column "The Country Editor" appears in his paper each week. The issue of the Tulia Herald for Thursday, March 12, 1964, carries another of Mr. Baggarly's forceful, hard-hitting editorials dealing with the current political situation in America. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD Mr. Baggarly's column from the March 12, 1964, issue of the Tulia Herald under the title of "The Country Editor."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTRY EDITOR

(By H. M. Baggarly)

More than 3 months have passed since that terrible November noon when a bullet struck down the President of the United States.

In those first agonizing moments, those of us who knew and loved him, those of us who believed in his ideals, his patriotism, his integrity, his burning and insatiable desire to be a great President, and those of us who seethed with indignation that such a crime should be committed against the Office of President of the United States, regardless of its occupant, with one voice lashed out at and blamed for the crime those extremist groups who had been conducting a relentless campaign of hate against our President.

Like the parent who loses a child and who perhaps blames the doctor during those first moments of shock, we laid the blame at the door of the hate mongers, those who had indicated by newspaper ad, pulpit, window card, letters to the editor, and from the lecture platform that they would shed no tears if misfortune struck down the life of the President.

We had every reason to blame the rightwing extremists. They alone had been guilty of directing hatred against the person of the President. The Communists hate our system, desire that our Government be overthrown, but it is not believed that even Khrushchev or Castro desired any personal harm to the President, that they harbored any personal illwill toward him. In fact, it was reported that tears welled up in Khrushchev's eyes when he was informed of the tragedy. And Castro reacted with a curse on the head of anyone who would do such a thing.

It is one thing to oppose a system or an institution. It is quite something else to hate an individual.

After the parent has time to recover from the initial shock of losing his child, he quickly reappraises his hasty judgment. He begins to separate emotion from fact.

So it is that now after our composure has been regained following November 22, we consider it appropriate to take a new look at the assassination, to view it, if possible, without emotion, simply as a fact of history.

After 3 months, we again ask the question, "Was Kennedy a victim of hate?"

We wish that evidence existed which might cause us to change our mind, that might cause us to charge his death to "one of those unfortunate things." We wish that if he had to die it could have been in a plane crash, that it could have been nothing more than an unhappy accident, perhaps from natural causes.

But we must admit that our initial reaction was valid.

Who was responsible for the death of Jesus Christ? Was it the ones who drew the assignment to drive the nails through His hands and feet? Was it the one who wielded the sword? Was it Pilate? Was it the Jews? Or the Romans?

The guilt lay at the feet of the society of that time that hated Him to the extent that it had decreed that He must be liquidated. Its reasoning was that the murder of one man was preferable to having the masses contaminated by His doctrine.

Those who killed Him felt righteous.

Society had given its approval to His crucifixion. The combined voice of the hatemongers who shouted in unison, "Crucify Him," were indeed the assassins of Jesus Christ. Had their cry been "Release Him," he would have been released.

Christ was assassinated by the rightwing extremists of His day. They desired to maintain the theological status quo. They resisted change even though change meant a better way.

Prior to the crucifixion of Christ, the hatemongers had caused other incidents. Christ's followers had been flogged and jailed. They had been reviled and humiliated.

Christ and His followers, had they lived in another day, would no doubt have been the victims of hate literature. They would have been heckled by anonymous telephone calls in the small hours of the morning. They would have been struck over the head and spat upon in Dallas. No doubt posters would have been affixed to telephone poles bearing the epithet, "Kill the Krist Klan."

Against this background, in this context, it would have been almost an anticlimax for some dim wit in the crowd to have taken a shot at the victim of the hate campaign.

Perhaps the most absurd comment originating since November 22 was, "Communism killed Kennedy." The Communists had no use whatsoever for a Lee Oswald. They couldn't use an undisciplined, unstable devil like him. And they don't waste their bullets on a meaningless murder, especially when they had everything to lose and nothing to gain by murdering the President of the United States. Such an act could only have united the United States against communism, to have set back their cause. It was fascism, the rightwing extreme that is system loving and people hating, that killed John Kennedy, just as it was the rightwing extreme that killed Jesus Christ.

Its philosophy that "the end justifies the means" and "to fight communism we must use their own tactics" advocates murder, if necessary to promote its cause.

Those who killed him felt righteous.

Several rightwing extremists, since the assassination, have been quoted as approving the act on the grounds that it was better that Kennedy die than to have the country turned over to the Communists.

Like the rightwingers of Christ's time, they, in the name of religion, were willing to resort to murder in order to promote what they considered "a good cause."

If rightwing religionists of Christ's time were none to good to murder, what makes us think that history can't repeat itself in this age?

During the Dark Ages men were murdered in the name of organized Christianity.

Even in our own beloved country, in New England, persons were executed for religious heresy in the name of the church.

Should word come today that Chief Justice Earl Warren had been assassinated, who could be so naive as to say that this death wasn't caused by the campaign of hate that is now being waged against him?

The Bible equates hate with murder.

Assassinations of public officials have been much more than ordinary homicides. They represent a blow against an image by a segment of society.

The ideological battle that has been going on since 1932 has been between the liberal majority and the conservative minority. Our Nation faced a crisis in 1932. The people were tired of the old order in which the masses of people were under the rule of Wall Street. The majority had been ruled by the minority—a very small minority.

We were nearer revolution in 1932 than at any time since 1776. Jobless men with hungry children are dangerous people. They aren't frightened by any term, even communism, just so long as it promises to fill hungry bellies.

A Republican victory in 1932 perhaps would have sparked revolution, had it followed the old conservative line of doing nothing, waiting for nature to take its course, hoping prosperity would somehow show up around the next corner.

People resolved in 1932 that they no longer wanted to be controlled by fate. They, along with Franklin Roosevelt, believed that there is such a thing as controlling the economic cycle that had traveled its precarious course of boom and bust through the years.

We recall right after World War II being told by some conservative oldtimers here in Tulia to get ready for the collapse of the economy which "always follows the inflation of war." In all seriousness, these men were convinced that depression had to come, that it was as inevitable as tomorrow's sunrise.

When we suggested that the Government had economic machinery set up which could act as cushions against extremes in the economic cycle, something it did not have following World War I, they laughed at us.

"No government can do anything about prosperity and depression," they said. "These are uncontrollable forces."

But the Government did do something about the economic bust which normally would have followed World War II. It has been almost 20 years since the end of World War II * * * and we have avoided both runaway inflation and depression by manipulating such things as interest rates, flow of money into the economy, unemployment insurance, social security, minimum wage laws, and the like.

And all credit for this must go to the liberal philosophy of economics.

The simple fact is, people have been better off, they have lived better during the past 30 years than ever before in the history of our country. And they aren't about to throw overboard those factors that have been responsible even though they were Government-sponsored. And the millionaires have prospered even more than the masses under liberal government. Free enterprise is in a stronger position than it was in 1929.

The election of Eisenhower in 1952 was not a repudiation of the New Deal. It was a question of personality and momentary issues. People liked Ike. They didn't like Adlai. They had been sold the idea that Truman harbored Communists and crooked cronies. They fell for the slogans "We want a change" and "I will go to Korea."

Despite the GOP platform of 1952, not one New Deal measure was repealed.

Although the outcome of the 1964 election is predictable, even if it were not so we could still bank on the principle that Americans are not going to elect any man President who doesn't pledge to continue the way of life we have had since 1932. This is another way of saying that we are going to have so-called liberal Presidents for a good many years to come.

Value of Space Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have reprinted in the RECORD, a very excellent editorial which appeared on Monday, March 9, 1964, in the Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahassee, Fla.

This editorial points out very effectively the byproducts of the huge research program which the United States has underway for the exploration of space and notes the tremendous benefits which such research has had and is having on new products and advances for civilian products and technology.

This is not merely a program to land a man on the moon but is a broad scientific program which has tremendous impact on virtually every phase of human endeavor. The advances in structural materials, methods of locomotion, medicine, diet, and thousands of other related fields have and will benefit from our space exploration program.

Such research is going to pay huge dividends for the people of these United States in the years to come.

The editorial follows:

BYPRODUCTS OF SPACE STUDY

The search for new products that might start new industries that will provide new jobs was stimulated by the surprising byproducts of space research outlined by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Homer E. Newell, Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, revealed this list to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics:

Collision-proof automobiles and other ground vehicles using impact-limited equipment techniques developed for Ranger spacecraft; rooftop paints that change color with temperatures to provide maximum protection from sunshine in summer and absorption of heat in winter; greatly reduced corrosion metals; long-lasting, heat-resistant television sets and household appliances.

There were also some health developments of possibly wide application, such as a cure for some types of stuttering; a diet that could sustain a man a month on 1 cubic foot of synthetic chemicals mixed with water (it can also reduce hemorrhoids, lower cholesterol levels and make ulcers inactive); a method of producing oxygen and food for orbiting space stations or space colonies, through the electrolytic splitting of water into hydrogen and oxygen.

Apparently, the country is on the way to reaping unexpected civilian dividends from the billions it has invested in the space program.

So That Bosses Can Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Indianapolis Star recently praised our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Representative EARL WILSON, in an editorial entitled "So That Bosses Can Boss." I commend the editor in giving due praise to our colleague who has done such a splendid job in uncovering waste in our Defense Department. The editorial follows:

SO THAT BOSSES CAN BOSS

Representative EARL WILSON, of Indiana's Ninth District, has hit an important vein of pay dirt in his persistent prodding into the awarding of defense procurement contracts.

He has begun to get into the devices by which policy actually is molded and controlled at the middle levels of the bureaucracy.

In a project in which he was joined by Representative JOE KILGORE, of Texas, WILSON inquired into the bidding preparations for two Navy procurement contracts covering overhaul of a number of World War II type planes. They discovered that access to necessary technical information was so tightly limited, and the time interval so short, that two firms which previously had performed such work held an almost insurmountable advantage. Moreover, the rules by which information was limited were arbitrary and capricious, plainly made for the purpose of hampering prospective bidders.

An especially interesting point about this instance is that the two Congressmen found no indication that instructions for a bid-rigging setup came from higher echelons. On the contrary, they concluded that the setup was established by middle-level manipulation of orders for what top officials probably intended to be genuinely competitive bidding.

"What the Secretary decides to do is often turned about face 100 percent by the time action comes at a lower level," said Wilson. "What Secretary McNamara decides to do and what is done at the lower levels are two distinct and different things. It is almost as though he puts in a piece of white paper and it comes out red."

This is a significant observation which applies not only to the Department of Defense but to the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The lines of command are fantastically long and multipronged. Often lateral lines of shared responsibility between offices and even between departments help to confuse the execution of policy.

This is one reason—though not the only one—why basic Federal polices and attitudes change so little with changing administrations. It is also one reason for the difficulties and frustrations of trying to establish more effective congressional control over the spending and the other policies of the Government.

It is not news that the situation exists. What is important is that inquisitive Congressmen have become interested in the effects on economy and efficency in the operation of the Government. A really thorough exploration, based on a genuine and urgent desire to restore more effective control from the congressional and top administrative levels, is long overdue. We hope it will be done.

Resolution on Meat Imports by the Kansas Livestock Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call to the attention of Members of the House a resolution which was adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association at its 51st annual convention held last week in Wichita. The Kansas association shares the great concern which many of us in Congress already have expressed regarding the economic plight of the cattle industry. The impact of foreign imports is proving a detriment to the domestic livestock producers and represents a large factor in depressing prices.

The Kansas Livestock Association rightfully urges the passage of legislation in the immediate future to help remedy this situation. I have joined with the growing number of Members of the House in introducing legislation to limit imports of beef, veal, and mutton, and I take this opportunity to urge the Ways and Means Committee to schedule hearings on this matter.

Following is the resolution adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association:

MEAT IMPORTS

Whereas the State of Kansas now ranks fourth in the production of beef cattle; and

Whereas the increases in the raising and feeding of beef cattle have contributed greatly to economic growth and employment in the State, and we deplore the sharing of our markets with those of other countries to the extent that it is a detriment to our own industry: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation restricting the importation of all meat to 6 percent of the total domestic consumption during the year 1963; and

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association has requested immediate enactment of Federal legislation setting quotas for limiting meat imports: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association support the endeavors of the American Cattlemen's Association in securing the restriction of imports, and hereby commend any efforts of the Kansas congressional delegation in securing the passage of H.R. 10351 or similar legislation in the immediate future.

Fourth District of Washington Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in early February I sent approximately 100,000 questionnaires into nearly every home in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington. Approximately 19 percent of these questionnaires were completed and returned to me. Many of the residents of my district took the time to enclose additional comments in explanation of their views. I am proud that the residents of my district are participating in the affairs of government in this manner.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I sent the districtwide tabulation of the questionnaire result to the President, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the tabulation, by percentages, for the information of all Members of Congress and others interested.

The material referred to follows:

4th Congressional District (12 counties)

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you think Congress should enact the pending civil rights bill?	43	33	24
2. Do you feel that if Federal income is reduced by $11,000,000,000 through a tax cut that Federal spending should also be reduced?	91	6	3
3. Do you believe the limit on the national debt should continue to be raised to permit the Federal Government to spend more than it receives?	5	91	4
4. Do you favor placing medicare for the aged under social security and raising social security taxes to cover the cost?	28	65	7
5. Do you believe the Federal Govrenment should provide financial assistance for local teachers' salaries?	10	82	8
6. Do you favor an expansion of the area redevelopment program?	9	38	33
7. Do you feel the Federal Government should help provide more modern mass transit systems within our communities?	10	77	13
8. Under consideration in Congress is a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting outdoor recreation needs. Part of the fund would be financed by admission and user fees paid by persons admitted to federally administered areas where recreational facilities or services are provided. Do you favor this proposal?	51	36	13
9. If you are a wheatgrower, do you think Congress should enact new wheat legislation this year?	[1] 43	[1] 57	-------
10. Do you think the United States should guarantee Russian credit in sales of agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union?	5	89	6
11. Should U.S. immigration bars be lowered so as to allow entry of more citizens from foreign countries?	7	84	9
12. Does the House of Representatives have your support in sharply reducing foreign aid spending?	89	7	4
13. Do you think the U.S. ownership and management of the Panama Canal should be subject to negotiation?	89	7	4
14. Do you think the United States should enforce the Monroe Doctrine to remove the Communist regime from Cuba?	17	73	10
15. Should the United States cooperate with Soviet Russia in a joint expedition to the moon?	74	11	15
16. Congress may consider legislation to discourage industry from allowing employees to work overtime. Would you favor such a proposal?	18	68	14
	38	52	10

[1] Only wheatgrowers opinion tabulated.

Let Us Stir Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the influential Washington Star in recent months has carried a number of articles favorable to the candidacy of Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania.

Many Members of Congress hope that the Governor will respond to these stirrings.

Bill Scranton can give this Nation the necessary leadership it needs to restore the confidence and respect of the United States by other nations.

Following is the editorial:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 4, 1964]

STIRRED UP

In his appearance on "Meet the Press" a little more than 2 weeks ago, Governor Scranton was asked what would be necessary to make him become an open candidate for the Republican presidential nomination. The Pennsylvania Governor replied that he needs to get "stirred up," and that so far "I haven't seen or felt these stirrings."

Something must have happened in the interim, for the Governor, in his address last night to the Economic Club in New York, sounded to us very much like a man who is both stirred up and ready to go. Having previously expressed our belief that Governor Scranton would make the best Republican candidate, we hope this is the case.

Most of the speech, in the best tradition, was devoted to an attack on the political enemy. The Democratic Party, he said, "dreams noble thoughts," but when the time comes to govern it is "hamstrung by its reactionaries, who smash the dreams and leave the political landscape strewn with the broken promises of a deadlocked party."

What does Mr. Scranton see as an alternative to this deadlocked party? Obviously, a Republican victory with the right candidate.

The Governor chose not to name names. But it requires no major exercise of the imagination to identify the GOP aspirants he had in mind when he warned against "me-tooing" the Democrats, when he said Republicans must make it clear they do not believe America's problems will disappear if we all merely wrap ourselves in the Stars and Stripes, and, finally, when he declared the Republicans "must make it clear that conservatives will have nothing to do with the forces of reaction."

All of this propels the Governor a long step forward in the Republican race. He feels the stirrings—no doubt about that. But it stops short of putting him in the shoes of an open, avowed candidate. If he wants to, he can still pull back. But we hope the Governor will stay out in the open, and that the New York speech marks at least the beginning of a serious effort to put his thinking before the country.

Governor Scranton has said that he would respond to an honest draft, and on his record he is endowed with a high order of political sagacity. We hope this sagacity is such that he does not think a draft is necessarily the equivalent of a tornado.

The Late U.S. Senator James M. Mead, of New York

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grief and sorrow at the news of the passing of a former Member of this House and a former Member of the other body, Senator James M. Mead, of New York.

Although it was not my privilege to have been able to serve in this Congress with Jim Mead, I had the privilege of knowing him well after his retirement from the Congress and, of course, I had followed his record closely during his service back in the Senate in the 1940's.

Senator Mead was one of the most beloved legislators from the Empire State. He was known from one end of the State to the other. He served all the people of the State well. He served his State, his country, and his party with great ability and dedication.

Jim Mead's political strength was always based on the confidence and support of the individual citizen, the rank and file workingman or woman, the so-called little fellow. Though his home was in the upstate area, and though he served his home district in this House with distinction for some 20 years, Jim Mead became an eloquent and effective spokesman in the Senate for all the people of our State, upstate as well as those in the great metropolitan area of the city of New York.

Mr. Speaker, in an age when it seems increasingly clear that high political office comes more readily to those of wealth than it does to those without independent financial resources, Jim Mead's career is proof not only that a man of modest circumstances can indeed rise to the high office of U.S. Senator from New York, but that when he does so, he graces that office, as Jim Mead graced it, with ability, with integrity, and with a warm and charming humanity.

We in New York will sorely miss Jim Mead. To his family, Mrs. Stratton and I extend our deepest sysmpathy in their loss.

Smokescreen on Civil Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Iowa was one of the States selected by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental Freedoms, Inc. for the publication of its full-page newspaper advertisements under the title, "$100 Billion Blackjack: The Civil Rights Bill."

What concerns many of us who fought hard and long to get a reasonable and moderate civil rights bill through the House is that this scurrilious approach is being used at a time when the civil rights bill faces a test in the Senate of the United States. It is hoped that the thoughtful Members of that body will be no more than in by the "big Government" scare than have the editors of many of the papers who carried the advertisement. As a case in point, I offer an editorial from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of Wednesday, March 11, "Smokescreen on Civil Wrongs," which exposes the ad for what it is—"a smokescreen attempting to cloud the fundamental issue of civil wrongs based on racial discrimination."

The article follows:

SMOKESCREEN ON CIVIL WRONGS

Americans are being bombarded these days with an advertising and pamphlet campaign purporting to show that the civil rights bill now before the U.S. Senate is really an attempt to expand the role of the Federal Government. One of the newspaper advertisements appeared in the Register March 9.

Spearheading the campaign is the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms. In this particular advertisement, the committee makes no attempt to uphold segregation and indulges in no racist diatribes. Its strategy is to attempt to capitalize on the fear of "big government" with such labels for the civil rights measure as "the Socialists' omnibus bill" and description of it as "a cynical design to make even the least of us, black and white, subject to the whim and caprice of Government bureaucrats."

Secretary of the committee is John Satterfield, a Mississippi native who is former president of the American Bar Association. Satterfield does not speak for the ABA in these activities. He speaks for the State of Mississippi. Satterfield is registered with Congress as a lobbyist for the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission at a salary of $2,000 a month. The sovereignty commission is a State agency supported by public funds, dedicated to supporting the segregationist way of life.

Among the recipients of funds from the sovereignty commission are the private white citizens' councils and their campaign for "racial integrity." The sovereignty commission has been one of the main sources of financial support for the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms.

We hope no one will be taken in by the "Federal dictatorship" line being peddled by this outfit in connection with the civil rights bill. The measure gives the Federal Government very little authority for dealing with discrimination that has not been exercised for years by numerous State and local governments, and in part by the Federal Government.

The measure establishes a method under Federal law for coping with discrimination in public accommodations and employment that is far less comprehensive and has lighter penalties than the State laws Iowans have been living under, in some cases for more than 80 years.

The civil rights bill passed the U.S. House by a 290–130 margin. The 152 Democrats and 177 Republicans who supported it are hardly supporters of "socialism."

The "big government" issue is in this case a smokescreen attempting to cloud the fundamental issue of civil wrongs based on race discrimination. It should not be allowed to obscure the need for further Federal action to secure human rights.

Iowa General Assembly Adopts Census Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 5 adopted by the Iowa General Assembly recently. I am sure this resolution will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

[Resolution of the State of Iowa General Assembly]

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

Whereas apportionment of the Iowa Legislature and seats in Congress are based on the U.S. census, and allocations of Federal aid are based on population formulas, it is imperative that people be counted in their voting residences; and

Whereas it appears that the present statutory rules for taking the U.S. census are very broad and administrative rules decree that servicemen overseas are not included in the count at all; and servicemen in the United States are counted where they are stationed and college students are counted where they attend college and not in the county or precinct of their voting residence; and

Whereas it appears that these persons should be counted at their place of voting residence in order to fairly apportion legislatures and Members of Congress, and to insure fairness in allocation of Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we request the Congress of the United States to give serious consideration to enactment of a statute to insure that persons are counted at their voting residence in the forthcoming U.S. census; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Iowa Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Secretary of Commerce of the United States.

We, Robert W. Naden, Speaker of the House of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, chief clerk of the house, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the house and senate of the 60th general assembly in extraordinary session.

ROBERT W. NADEN,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Firmness Toward Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I had not given too much attention to President Johnson's remarks before the OAS on Monday until I came upon the editorial in yesterday's Washington Post entitled "L.B.J. and Latin America." The Post in describing the President's redefinition of our position in regards to Panama used the derogatory phrases it normally employs when anyone does violence to its sense of omniscience in the field of foreign affairs. Critical comments such as "hopelessly inept," "mediocre," "semantic quibbling," sum up the Post's description of what to me was a firm, statesmanlike statement, setting forth the official conclusion that we have traveled as far down the road to appeasement as we intend to go. And, of course, the Washington Post will continue to be dissatisfied with anyone who espouses less than complete capitulation to those pipsqueak dictators, and, also with those who undertake to defend the sovereignty and prestige of the United States.

Addressing myself specifically to the Panamanian situation, I am encouraged by the reports dispatched by Columnist Marguerite Higgins who is on the scene in Panama City. Writing on March 13, she leads off with this statment:

> Panama's effort to pin charges of "crimes against humanity" on the United States in connection with last January's rioting have—so far—boomeranged.

And a bit farther along in her dispatch she makes this observation:

> The Government of Panama instructed its National Guard "not to interfere" or attempt to control the crowds variously equipped with rocks, rifles, machineguns, and Molotov cocktails.

In a subsequent article this same reporter pinpoints a truism in regards to our Panamanian policy—which indeed should be the basis for our overall foreign policy—with this comment:

> If Washington is to pursue a sensible policy, it is essential that the American public be mature enough to face the truth about relations with Panama in the foreseeable future, the truth is that no amount of concessions on the Panama Canal Treaty, no amount of economic aid will make the Panamanians like—let alone love—the United States of America.

And then she underscores our equivocation in our dealings with communistically oriented loudmouths like Castro

by quoting a Panamanian student leader as follows:

All that we know is that Washington is far more afraid of Castro than Fidel is of Washington. And Castro is on our side.

I do not accept the accusation that Washington is afraid of either Castro or the opportunistic leaders of Panama, even though the nervous nellies in charge of our foreign policy seem to be obsessed with the idea that we must be everlastingly withdrawn from a position of firmness. Thus it is that I am delighted that President Johnson has refused to commit this Nation beyond a willingness to sit down and talk with Panama and has reaffirmed that we are not going to surrender our sovereign rights as a prerequisite to resumption of diplomatic relations, which is of far more importance to the Panamanians than it is to us.

And who knows? Perhaps out of this Panamanian fiasco will be born a new policy of firmness in our interchange with other nations and having taken a firm stand with friend and foe alike we shall thereafter maintain our position, the wails of spineless allies or domestic appeasers to the contrary notwithstanding.

Meat Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the growing concern throughout the livestock industry over the impact of beef imports on domestic cattle prices is reflected in the resolution adopted at the convention of the Kansas Livestock Association at Wichita, Kans., on March 14, 1964.

Livestock producers view as completely unrealistic and inadequate, the recently announced voluntary import cutbacks by Australia and New Zealand. They are convinced enactment of legislation is the only solution to this problem, and I submit the resolution and invite the attention of my colleagues to it:

RESOLUTION ON MEAT IMPORTS

Whereas the State of Kansas now ranks fourth in the production of beef cattle; and

Whereas the increases in the raising and feeding of beef cattle have contributed greatly to economic growth and employment in the State, and we deplore the sharing of our markets with those of other countries to the extent that it is a detriment to our own industry: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation restricting the importation of all meat to 6 percent of the total domestic consumption during the year 1963; and

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association has requested immediate enactment of Federal legislation setting quotas for limiting meat imports: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association support the endeavors of the American National Cattlemen's Association in securing the restriction of imports, and hereby commend any efforts of the Kansas congressional delegation in securing the passage of H.R. 10351 or similar legislation in the immediate future.

Dr. Ruth E. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President recently has called attention to the need for a greater recognition of the part women have played in the professions.

I am happy to inform my colleagues that my congressional district of Oakland County, Mich., counts itself fortunate on this score.

A great many of our residents in Oakland County owe their good health and even their lives to Dr. Ruth Wagner.

Dr. Wagner retired last year after 39 years of medical practice. Recently, the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., published an article about Dr. Wagner and her early life which I think my colleagues will find interesting:

RETIRED DR. RUTH WAGNER RETAINS PHYSICIAN'S CONCERN

Dr. Ruth E. Wagner, first woman doctor in Royal Oak, often delivered babies by coal oil lamps, with the nervous father holding the lamp. "Once," she recalled, "a grandmother held the only lamp in the house. She went to the kitchen for more hot water and the lamp went with her. I was left, in total darkness, to tie the umbilical cord.

"Dr. Ruth" hung out her first shingle in 1924, at Thirteen-Mile and Rochester Roads—painting her own sign incidentally. Even that was a professional job, for she had studied medical drawing at Johns Hopkins Hospital, under Dr. Max Broedel, the best in the business.

She has lived at 315 Ellen, Royal Oak, with her longtime friend, Mrs. Thomas Gillmor, since the death of Mr. Gillmor in 1957. They have a summer place in Windsor.

"My 39 Years in Medicine"—she retired last June—were reviewed by her as speaker at the Friday meeting of the Ezra Parker Chapter, DAR, which she and her mother joined together in 1935.

But the lady doctor evidenced her continuing interest by concluding her review of the past with a warning for the present.

"I'd like to shout from the housetops: Read again Rachael Carson's best seller 'Silent Spring.' As a physician I urge it. Every word is true. You will be aware that the threat of enemies at war is no more destructive than our 'enemies' who, in the name of progress, by insecticides and herbicides to control insects and weeds, are destroying our forests, our food crops, and polluting our water supply. The book is now in paper back form, at 75 cents.

"Yes, there's something you can do about it. Write your Congressmen, urging them to vote for measures prohibiting the wholesale spraying of our farms and forests. Perhaps some salvage of wild life and flora can yet be accomplished."

ENTER DIPHTHERIA

"Soon after I opened my office," said Dr. Ruth, "a little girl became acutely ill in school and was brought to me. I took her immediately to Herman Kiefer Hospital, Detroit, where they performed a tracheotomy. Unfortunately, she died that night.

"Great alarm spread through the area, as parents realized that their own youngsters had been exposed to this deadly infection. We telephoned Lansing for aid in this emergency. By motorcycle the State police delivered several hundred doses of diphtheria antitoxin.

"Next morning we set up a clinic in Oak Ridge School. Dr. Palmer Sutton, Dr. Fred Reid and I gave shots to all children, as well as adults, who came. We worked all day and far into the night, but it was worth it. Not one person who received the antitoxin contracted diphtheria.

"Today a case of diphtheria is rare. Yet when I started practice it was quite common. So common that I frequently could diagnose it when entering the patient's home by its distinctive odor. Many cases of so-called croup turned out to be diphtheria."

LIKED WHAT SHE SAW

Dr. Ruth brought more than technical skill to Royal Oak. Wanting to get away from apartment life in Detroit, she came out to look the town over, and liked what she saw. Her deepening affection for its people over the years proved to be mutual. She was named Best Citizen of the Year in 1952 by the Royal Oak Chamber of Commerce.

Her wide range of interest includes charter memberships in the YMCA and the Royal Oak Soroptomists. For many years a clubroom was available in the basement of her office at Eleven-Mile and Center to organizations needing a meeting place. She moved into these familiar offices in 1936.

Michigan State University added her to its Distinctive Alumni in 1961. And she was chosen Top Medical Woman of the Year by the American Medical Association in 1958.

SUNNYBROOK HOSPITAL

"In the 1920's hospital facilities were extremely scarce in this area," said Dr. Ruth. "Detroit and Pontiac hospitals were usually too crowded to accept patients from Royal Oak. I decided to have my own hospital, and in 1929 bought a 100-year-old, rambling white house on Sunnybrook at Rochester. We soon had 20 beds for adults and 7 cribs for infants. It was not easy to meet all the requirements of the Michigan Fire Department Child Welfare Commission and American Hospital Association. We were indeed proud when approved by the American College of Surgeons, the highest honor a hospital can receive. I operated Sunnybrook from 1930 through 1940.

"Finally, however, came the realization that hospitals had become 'big business'. Labor costs shot up, as well as food and medical supplies. Gone were the days when we could swap medical care for a load of potatoes, a freshly butchered pig, or a few days' work in our laundry or sewing room."

She was a member of the William Beaumont Hospital staff for its opening in 1955 until her retirement.

BECAUSE OF VITAMINS

"Probably the question I have been asked most frequently over the years is this: 'How did you happen to choose the practice of medicine?'

"Well, my first love was home economics. In 1916 I was graduated with that major from Michigan Agricultural College (now Michigan State University) at Lansing. A new word, 'vitamin,' had begun to appear in articles of the day while I was still in college. It was discovered that diseases in many cases, were the result of nutritional and vitamin deficiencies. I just had to know the why and wherefor of this new theory. The logical place to find out was medical college. So I enrolled at the Detroit College of Medicine, and graduated in 1922."

ONCE A TOWN PUMP

When introducing her warning Dr. Ruth said, "Before the advent of the Daily Trib-

une," there was a town pump at about Eleven-Mile and Rembrandt. Women of the town gathered daily to exchange the news, and to fill pails with clear, pure water.

"But gone are the days when Mother Earth furnished this pure, healthful water. One of the tragedies of our time is that, in the name of progress, the flora and fauna by which nature provided purification of water, are being destroyed by man's mixing of poisonous chemicals with the waste of industry, and powerful detergents with our household sewage."

Financing the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that high Government officials are turning over in their minds the possibility of acceptance of an astounding proposal by the Soviet Union that we extend the Reds long-term credit on goods exported to them, a request that is nothing short of preposterous.

The case against extending long-term credit to the U.S.S.R. and helping to boost the Red economy on the installment plan is well stated in an editorial, "Financing the Russians," which appeared in the March 10 issue of the Los Angeles Times.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point:

FINANCING THE RUSSIANS

With straight face and excessive gall, the Russians again are seeking long-term credits from the United States in order to finance a major expansion of trade between our two countries. The idea should be rejected forthwith.

It is true that the whole question of East-West trade, to begin with, is complex. It is made even more complex for the United States to approach because of the emotional content often embodied in the popular arguments both in favor of and opposed to an increased flow of goods between the rival blocs.

But one point in the debate is simplicity itself:

Whatever the levels East-West trade may reach in the future, it would be dangerous for the free world to increase exports to Communist nations on the basis of long-term credits.

It is one thing for the United States and other Western nations to sell nonstrategic goods to the Soviet bloc for cash or gold or on short-term credit, as in the case of our recent sale of wheat to Moscow. Then an almost immediate exchange of values takes place, with each side giving and taking in what it deems to be its own best interest.

That approach can be defended.

Quite another matter is selling to the Russians on an extended installment plan, which U.S. law prohibits pending settlement of the Soviet Union's outstanding lend-lease debt.

But even once the lend-lease debt negotiations are concluded, for the United States to let the Soviet defer payment for imports over a prolonged period would amount to financing ourselves some portion of the Soviet economy's growth.

And that, of course, would be utter foolishness.

In presenting the Soviet suggestion to an American Government delegation on Friday, First Deputy Premier Alexei Kosygin declared that the Soviet Union could supply the United States with anything we now buy from West Europe—and at lower prices.

In which case, one is tempted to wonder, why do the Soviets anticipate a need for long-term credit? The fact is that anywhere Soviet goods have found their way to free world markets their quality very often has left much to be desired. And most of what the Soviet Union has to offer, the United States doesn't need.

Perhaps the most astonishing aspect of the Soviet official's suggestion was his implication that Washington should consider extending the same trade credit terms to Moscow that Moscow grants in its aid programs to underdeveloped nations. That is, on a 12-year basis at 2 percent interest.

As ridiculous as that may seem, it was perhaps no more so than the subsequent comment by the head of the American delegation that received the proposal, Under Secretary of Commerce Clarence D. Martin.

Martin said that he felt Kosygin's proposals are worth considering.

Decidedly, they are not.

Kiwanis Pennies for Sports and Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Congress a most noteworthy project that has been adopted as an official function of the California-Nevada-Hawaii District of Kiwanis International.

The project is called Kiwanis Pennies for Sports and Olympics—KPSO—and its primary purpose is to help finance U.S. Olympic teams. To participate in KPSO, members of the many Kiwanis clubs in the district are asked to donate at least a penny a week toward the cause.

The project has met with fine success. The district has already collected over $7,000 and hopes to increase that amount by at least $5,000 more by the time the first official presentation is scheduled to be made at the forthcoming Kiwanis International Convention in Los Angeles June 28 to July 2. Because of the success of KPSO, Kiwanis clubs in other districts have inquired about KPSO and at least one has started an identical project.

Kiwanis Pennies for Sports and Olympics was initiated because of a desire to have strong teams represent the United States in the Olympics and also due to the belief that financing of Olympic activities should be regarded by Americans as a special citizen undertaking which should not be turned over to the Federal Government by default.

The California-Nevada-Hawaii District is showing how this can be done in an organized and effective manner under Kiwanis Pennies for Sports and Olympics. The officers and members of participating Kiwanis Clubs merit a warm vote of thanks for their fine work.

Seneca Indians Deprived of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the Senate of the United States debates the question of civil rights, the U.S. Government is completing an act of true deprivation by the Government itself of the property rights guaranteed not only by the Constitution of the United States, article XIV, but by the U.S. treaty of 1794 with the Seneca Indians.

Stalin himself could not have broken a treaty more faithlessly than the U.S. Government, in breaking the treaty with the Seneca Nation.

The least that the Senate of the United States could do would be to stop their discussions long enough to pass the bill to truly protect civil rights as meant by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on this subject by Haynes Johnson, staff writer, Evening Star of March 17, 1964, follows:

SENECAS BITTER AS UNITED STATES IGNORES TREATY

(By Haynes Johnson)

The gates will begin to close on the Kinzua Dam in northwestern Pennsylvania this spring. The Allegheny River will rise and flood the lowlands winding through the mountains 35 miles back to Salamanca, N.Y.

As the land disappears, so will the oldest active treaty the United States has, the treaty of 1794 with the Seneca Indians. With it goes the Senecas' way of life.

Even before that treaty was signed, George Washington had solemnly pledged to the Senecas "that in the future you cannot be defrauded of your lands, that you possess the right to sell, and the right of refusing to sell your lands."

"Hear well, and let it be heard by every person in your nation," Washington wrote Cornplanter, Half Town, and Great Tree, chiefs of the Senecas, "that the President of the United States declares that the General Government considers itself bound to protect you in all the lands secured by you by the treaty * * * that, therefore, the sale of your lands in future, will depend entirely upon yourselves."

The Senecas did not sell their lands; they are being taken. What the Government had promised never would happen is happening.

CONCERN OVER TREATIES

"We are hearing a great deal about treaties these days," Senator SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, told his colleagues recently. "Concern is expressed over whether the Soviets might violate the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, or the Panamanians the canal treaty, or the Cubans our Guantanamo Base treaty. But small attention has been given to * * * one of our very oldest treaties, a treaty with the Seneca Indians.

"These people have not been compensated for the loss of their homes and lands. They are growing desperate, and angry, and they have every right to do so. * * * At a time when the Senate is about to take up historic civil rights legislation, it would be a sad paradox indeed if we did not meet this urgent obligation to the Seneca Indians."

This week the story that began 170 years ago may come to a close on Capitol Hill. In

keeping with that history of proud men and broken pledges, even the final act is obscured by greater events and surrounded by ironies.

HEARINGS TO START

Tomorrow, the Senate Interior Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on a bill to provide compensation to the Senecas. For although the dam is nearing completion and some 700 persons must move by October 1, the Indians have not yet received a penny to assist them.

But here, too, the Senecas' fate is uncertain: The bill to aid them comes up in the midst of the sound and fury of the civil rights debate. If a filibuster develops, it will further delay the final act of the Seneca story.

After lengthy hearings, the House last month passed a bill providing $20,150,000 for reparation, relocation, and rehabilitation for the Senecas. While the Senecas felt the bill did not provide enough, they backed it and urged immediate action in the Senate.

Last week, the Senate Interior Subcommittee cut the bill by 64 percent, approving only $9 million.

Although the subcommiteee met in executive session, the cuts in the bill seemed to result from a reliance on a "formula" used for Indian settlements in the West. In some Western cases, Congress used a per capita amount of $2,250 for the members of a tribe as compensation for rehabilitation.

The Senacas contend that such a formula ignores their needs—and the promise of President Kennedy to help them create a new way of life. As a spokesman said, "This explains why American Indians still believe that our Government sometimes speaks with a 'forked tongue.'"

BETRAYAL CHARGED

To the Indians, the Senate committee action only added to a feeling of betrayal. They point out, bitterly, that 3 years ago the Government gave the Pennsylvania Railroad $20 million for a 28-mile right-of-way taken for the Kinzua project.

"As if it were not bad enough faith to cut the heart out of the Senecas' treaty-protected land, a group of Senators in the Interior Committe seems intent on also cutting the heart out of Seneca hopes for an effective new way of life," said Walter Taylor, a representative of the Senecas from the Philadelphia Quakers. "This type of pennypinching at the expense of national honor we call perfidious political parsimony.

"We look for some senatorial soul searching on both practical and moral grounds. It is hard for conscientious Americans to comprehend how some Senators will work to spare citizens the burden of 11 cents each in constructive reparations for our unilateral violation of a solemn treaty.

FLOOD CONTROL DAM

"We are just hoping that the Senate will not ask us to pay the high cost of cheapness in our legislative efforts to make amends for a very great wrong."

The problems for the Senecas did not occur overnight. For more than 30 years the Army Corps of Engineers has been talking about building a dam at Kinzua to protect from flooding a vast area extending 200 miles south of Pittsburgh.

In 1938 Congress authorized a comprehensive flood-control system in the Ohio River Basin—including construction of an Allegheny reservoir and a dam at Kinzua.

Some funds were appropriated for studies and exploratory work, but nothing further was done until the early 1950's.

PROPOSAL REJECTED

In the meantime, the Senecas fought for their land. They retained Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former president of Antioch College and at one time chief engineer of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He came up with an alternative proposal in 1957 calling for construction of a dam on Conewango Creek and of a reservoir to divert water back into farmland and Lake Erie.

The Corps of Engineers rejected the proposal as too expensive and otherwise impractical. Dr. Morgan, in a letter to the late President Kennedy in 1961, contended that the Corps of Engineers was making a "hundred million blunder" because he believes construction of a Conewango reservoir will be necessary within 25 years anyway.

Undaunted, the Senecas took their case to the courts. First, in 1957, the Corps of Engineers won the right to survey within the reservation. Then the Senecas lost a request for an injunction against construction of the dam. In a third case, the courts held that Federal condemnation powers could be used to acquire lands within a reservation. And finally the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal on the question whether Congress, in authorizing the dam, showed "in a sufficiently clear and specific way" an intention to take Seneca land in spite of its treaty protection.

After construction began in 1960, the Senecas made their last appeal—to President Kennedy. In the summer of 1961 the President wrote the head of the Senecas:

"Even though construction of Kinzua must proceed, I have directed the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to take every action within their authority to assist the Seneca nation and its members who must be relocated in adjusting to the new situation. * * * I pledge you our cooperation."

PLEDGE STIRS STUDY

His pledge initiated more than 2 years of study and consultation. Encouraged by the President's word, the Senecas and public and private agencies worked to plan a new and creative way of life. Plans were prepared for relocation, for education, and for employment.

The most ambitious proposal was to create a Williamsburg-type of development—to include a reception and information center, a library and auditorium, cabins, an Indian village, a nature museum, and a theater. The Senecas themselves would be able to participate in the activities.

A large part of the money for that plan was cut in the House bill—and it has been slashed even more in the Senate version.

One of the complicating factors in the controversy lies in what is "just" compensation. To the Indians, money cannot replace their land and the land of their ancestors.

As Dema Stoffer, a Seneca woman who lives on the reservation, told a House subcommittee:

"You have seen our beautiful valleys and streams and the woods, a real Indian country, that the Senecas have loved. It is a way of life that we are being forced to forego. * * * It afforded us isolation, sanctuary, security, and now the Senecas are filled with fear and anxieties. * * * We have groped our way in the dark, not knowing if our request would be granted."

The Kinzua Dam will take 10,500 acres out of the 30,469 acres in the reservation. But the land that is being taken includes almost all of the fertile lowlands.

When the reservoir is completed, it will chop the reservation in two.

New York State now is planning a four-lane, limited access expressway through the Indian lands, which will further bisect the area.

From all sides, the Senecas face grave problems. They are proud people and they like to recall the days when the Seneca Nation was the largest and most powerful of the League of Six Nations of the Iroquois. The league ruled the East from Canada to North Carolina.

The warlike Iroquois had a genius for organization, which culminated in their confederation, or league, that endured for two centuries and in some respects served as a model for the union of the American colonies.

For more than 170 years the Senecas have relied on the pledge made by George Washington, who said: "Remember my words, Senecas, continue to be strong in your friendship for the United States as the only rational ground of your future friendship."

"I know it will sound simple and perhaps silly," George Heron, president of the Seneca Nation, told the House subcommittee, "but the truth of the matter is that my people really believed that George Washington read the 1794 treaty before he signed it, and that he meant exactly what he wrote."

The Dangerous Game of "Let's Pretend"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1964 issue of the Reader's Digest they printed an article by Allen Drury, author of "Advise and Consent." The title of the article is "The Dangerous Game of 'Let's Pretend'." This article certainly sets forth in detail how this country, by constantly making accommodations to our enemies, is not only losing friends throughout the world but in all probability, approaching a situation which may result in war.

Mr. Drury's article follows:

THE DANGEROUS GAME OF "LET'S PRETEND"

(By Allen Drury)

We cannot avoid the burden that history has placed upon us, of facing up to and turning back Communist power wherever it tries to advance. And "risk of war" is not a sufficient reason for refusing to consider the realities.

The United States is in many ways the most powerful nation on earth. Its people enjoy a way of life which, despite shortcomings, gives them, generally, a more comfortable and rewarding socety than that of any other people. Its supremely human form of government stumbles and blunders, yet has repeatedly proved—most recently in the smooth transition of power after the tragic murder of its President—to be one of the strongest, most stable governments history has ever known.

Yet there has developed in this land in recent years a grave and crippling hypnosis whose outward signs are easy words and comfortable slogans, a dangerous rationalizing, a determined glossing over of unpleasant truths. It induces in those who suffer from it the fateful notion that, if you pretend long enough and hard enough that certain things are not so, they will miraculously become not so.

"Let's Pretend" was once a game that children played. Now, unhappily, grown men play it, and even base upon it policies of great nations—thereby throwing away bit by bit the world of stable foundation they might have if they were honest enough to face the cold reality of the world as it is. This applies to almost every problem that confronts us.

FROM X TO Z

Do we recognize, for instance, that a truly safe disarmament treaty requires adequate inspection? Why, of course we do. But see how it goes.

In year A, we demand x number of inspections. Our opponent shouts, and says

"No." Instead of saying firmly, "We're sorry, this is it," in year B we narrow the demand down to y inspections. This doesn't make our opponent happy, either. So in year C we reduce our position still further, to z number of inspections. And presently, when it suits our opponent's purposes to conclude in 2 weeks a nuclear test ban treaty he has been deliberately holding up for 7 years, we find ourselves—just as he has told us all along we would—down to no inspections.

The tragic thing about this performance is not that our resolution has failed us, not that we have given up the only sensible position, but that, in the process of becoming somewhat more unsafe, we have managed to convince ourselves we are still safe. We have managed, both as a people and as a government, to rationalize retreat into advance, defeat into victory. And by just so much have we moved further toward our opponent's candidly declared objective—our own destruction as a free people.

WHITTLED DOWN

There is southeast Asia. We know quite well that our position there is being whittled away. It is shaky in Laos, equivocal in South Vietnam, desperate in Cambodia. We know this. But we pretend it isn't so. We pretend—and quite sincerely—that we are being stanch, standing firm, and that we will take a stand. The problem is that, by the time we do, the platform on which we take our stand may very well have been whittled down to nothing at all.

And there is Cuba. In our heart of hearts we know that the spectacle of a great nation accepting the lifting of a piece of tarpaulin on a ship at sea as proof of a pledge kept by a hostile power is a genuinely pathetic sight. But somehow we manage to convince ourselves that an opponent we know we cannot trust (for we have caught him secretively trying to put nuclear missiles in our backyard) has suddenly become trustworthy, that we were right to abandon our demand for the on-site U.N. inspection.

And in the same fashion, we think, or we guess, that 3,000—or 6,000, or 10,000—Soviet troops have been removed. Eventually we come to believe this, and once again we have managed to convince ourselves that surrender of our position has made us stronger.

NICE PEOPLE?

Even more fundamentally, there is the nature of our opponent. We had in Dallas a graphic demonstration of what our opponent's philosophy can do to a twisted mind grown sick upon it. Communism has been spreading hatred and violence for almost 50 years. Yet despite steadily mounting evidence of its nature, there have been many Americans, some in very influential positions, who have desperately pretended that the Communist conspiracy is just a nice group of misguided people with whom we can get along if we keep treating them with decency—a decency they cannot understand and do not respect.

The record clearly shows that these are not nice people. They are not going to be persuaded by soft words and gentle approaches. They can be persuaded only by superior strength and the determination to use it if necessary—as President Kennedy proved in the initial showdown in Cuba. Yet there are Americans, even now, who pretend that if we just continue retreating before the Communists we will, by moving backward, somehow move forward toward a genuine and stable peace.

So it goes in other matters. There is the United Nations. We know it is in desperate straits. We know we are probably the only power with sufficient dedication to it, and sufficient financial leverage to support it, to force a revision of its policies so that it truly lead the world to peace. And yet, rather than face the facts, many of us pretend that, if we just claim vehemently enough that the U.N. is perfect, it will somehow become so.

Such is the American attitude, baffling to our allies, self-defeating to us.

RISK OF WAR

There must sometimes come, for all of us, the staggering realization that our pretense of "things are really going all right" just isn't true. Why then do we do it? One reason is the wistful hope that all bad things will go away. A more fundamental reason is fear—the fear of having to do something about a given difficulty confronting the country, if you once admit candidly that it exists.

On many occasions in recent years, a familiar little drama has occurred. A Senator or a Representative or a member of the administration is under questioning by reporters on matters affecting foreign affairs. Sooner or later the guest advocates some strong course of action. Then: "Senator," he is asked in a hushed, disbelieving tone of voice, "do you mean you would really do that, even at the risk of war?"

And such an awesome place does this question hold in the national legendry that 9 times out of 10, instead of saying bluntly what his own intention and national integrity demand—which is "Yes"—the legislator ducks and dodges and weasels and equivocates. His interrogator retires triumphant.

That "risk of war" is a favorite bugaboo, no one can deny. It gives great support and impetus to "let's pretend." But examine it for a moment.

War today is horrible beyond concept—at least the kind of war we all assume would come in a major showdown between the free world and the slave, obliterating in one fiery instant all that we hold dear. But does that make the principles of freemen any less valid? If it does, then why don't we give up right now? Why don't we abandon the biggest pretense of all—that there is anything worthwhile in freedom, anything worth saving of this Republic which has been handed down to us to preserve and pass along? If we are so afraid of the consequences of being true to our heritage and our country, why not forget about it right now, and save all this wear and tear on the national budget and our own nervous system?

To state the proposition thus is to demonstrate at once its absurdity. Of course, we are not going to give up. Of course, we are not going to abandon our principles and our country.

If we wish to keep this life—with all its liberties and freedoms—we must be prepared to give it up. If we wish to live, we must be ready to die. Only by being unafraid of war can we avoid war. And being unafraid of war does not mean feeling no worry or terror about it. The citizen who did not feel thus would be a fool indeed. It means being able to accept that fear and go on from there, with the courage expressed in a little-used verse of the national anthem: "Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just."

RIGHT IS RIGHT

Of course, no sane person wants war. But, by the same token, we cannot let ourselves be bamboozled into believing that war is indeed the only alternative to surrender—that a firm, steady, unyielding, unbelligerent policy will lead inevitably to disaster. Almost more than anything else, we have to fear the idea that there is no way open to us, with all our power and infinite resources, to combate our opponent without bringing on all-out nuclear war—and that therefore we must close off discussion of other ideas and not try to develop them as cogently and effectively as we can.

The imperative first step in this latter process is to banish another contention, that there are no answers to the world's major problems—that there are, to use the parrot phrase, "no permanent solutions," and we should, therefore, stop trying to find any. As with the fear of war, this argument can be used to paralyze all action and defeat all attempts at constructive thought. It can be used to justify doing nothing, particularly if what must be done carries with it the risk of war.

These two ideas are the most powerful weapons of today's do-nothing party; those who say we can't expect a solution in Berlin, or expect to eliminate the Soviets from Cuba, or stand firm for a truly safe disarmament treaty, or do anything, in fact, that entails any risk—because (1) there are no permanent solutions, and (2) it may mean war. If this policy is followed long enough, there will be one permanent solution—with or without war—the elimination of the United States as a free republic and a factor in world affairs.

We must seek solutions as though we really mean to find them, because that is the job history has given us, however much we may wish it had not. It is the job of saving freedom, as we have saved it before and as we are going to save it now, for the simplest and most commanding of reasons—because what is right is right. If we are committed to the support of right, as the United States is by history, and by choice, then it does not matter how many horrors may be threatened or how many fearful weapons may be waved in our face by Nikita Khrushchev. We have to defend the right, and that is all there is to it.

If we do not, we lose all self-respect, all honor, all decency. We also, in this happy 20th century, lose our safety, our liberty, our democracy, and our lives.

A TIDE-TURN MOMENT

We must be brave enough to look at the world as it is, and do the things necessary to set it on a course that truly leads to peace. There were a couple of weeks in October 1962, for instance, when we were brave like this—but where has it gone now? Dissipated on the winds of a billion words, vanished down the hallways of timorous compromise and unnecessary concession. There was a moment when we had the world united behind us—not just the free world but, one suspects, behind their jailers' backs the peoples of the slave world as well—in the great hope that we had at last turned the tide and were really going to start leading the Earth up the long hill toward sanity and peace.

But we took one step—and stopped, at the moment when we had our opponent on the run, at the moment when we should have insisted, calmly but with absolute firmness, that unless U.N. inspection in Cuba was started at once, we were coming in * * * that unless Soviet troops were removed at once, we were coming in * * * that unless a revision of positions all around the world was undertaken, we were coming in. We stopped. And now, of course, when such proposals are made, there comes the cry, "You don't want a war, do you?"

Well, right now, of course, these voices may be right. The world's support has been lost, the hemisphere's support has been fragmented, the Soviet Union, having tested us with lifted tarpaulins and solemn promises, has concluded that the United States was once again just talking big. To insist upon these things in Cuba, as of this moment, might mean war.

But we should not forget, for these international crises are matters of timing, that if that October's moment had been seized and made the most of, we would really have turned the tide. We let the chance slip. But who knows when such a moment may come again?

NO CARELESS INCH

We should not be belligerent—we should simply be firm. We should be willing to negotiate with the Communists anytime, anyplace, on any subject— but we should not be the only ones to grant the concessions and make the retreats. We should insist, without the slightest yielding, on every single right that is ours. We should never seek agreement just for the sake of having an agreement. We should agree only if by agreeing we strengthen the free world and advance the cause of freedom. And we should never, under any circumstances, give them the careless inch which with them always becomes the irrecoverable mile.

We don't have to talk tough. We just have to be tough. Every single time we give a hint of it, the Communists switch course and try some other tack; the last thing they want is an all-out frontal showdown. That is why it seems so fantastic that we should so consistently argue ourselves out of the unflinching firmness which may well be our only salvation.

It is true that firmness carries with it the possibility of great risks. But weakness carries with it the certainty of national suicide. Our opponents are not playing "let's pretend." They are playing for keeps. It is time we began to play in the same spirit.

Let us take heart therefore. The passage is long and dark, but at its end the light gleams out. It awaits the brave. So let us be.

Let us achieve, finally, in all the areas of conflict where history demands of us that we show our true colors, that just and honorable peace for which our hearts, in common with those of all mankind, cry out.

School Devotionals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Jaycees recently passed a resolution dealing with the reciting of prayers and reading of the Bible in our public schools.

I feel the Members of Congress should be apprised of this act on the part of this fine organization and am, therefore, having a copy of this resolution reprinted here:

RESOLUTION, FLORIDA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

"Whereas the right to have prayer and Bible reading in public schools has been set aside by decision of the U.S. Supreme Court; and

"Whereas the Florida Jaycees are concerned that such prohibition can seriously damage the foundation on which this country was built; namely, a recognition that our society must live in proper relationship with the Almighty: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce adopt as its policy the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public institution or place.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of, God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

Adopted February 16, 1964, at the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce Winter Conference in Panama City, Fla.

Approved:

CODY L. BAILEY,
President, Florida Jaycees.

Attested:

CHARLIE QUICK,
Secretary, Florida Jaycees.

The Game of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma's winner in this year's "Voice of Democracy" contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is Robert T. Luttrell III, 809 Southwest 37th Street, Oklahoma City. It is with pleasure and with pride that I include his speech in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

THE GAME OF DEMOCRACY

(By Robert T. Luttrell)

The stands are quiet. The lights are out. A few stray remnants of programs, popcorn boxes, and coffee cups are all that remain in mute testimony to the mighty conflict that is now ended. The players have trudged to the locker room. The spectators have hustled home. The score? * * * it's not important for the game belongs to history. But just a few short hours ago the crowd was alive, the teams were vying, and everyone was participating.

Football has become typically American. One of the most outstanding reasons for its popularity is the fact that, from beginning to end, a challenge exists. Everyone realizes this and the spectators project themselves into the conflict. The team plays well because of audience participation.

Ladies and gentlemen it's kickoff time in Washington, on Capitol Hill. The whistle blows and the debate is underway. It's a vital game, and at stake are vital issues. The capacity of the stadium is more than 180 million, but only a few are present.

The players are there. They are ready to play for the fans, but few of the spectators are there. This game can't be decisive. The players represent the people but without support, without participation, they cannot know what they represent. The legislators are ready to push through to the goal line, but they need a vocal indication of what goal to push toward. It's a lonely game to play without support and there's a hollow ring to victory in an empty stadium.

Where was the capacity crowd? Many people say, "I'll read about it in the newspapers," but then it is too late.

You had a ticket. Where were you? Your ticket to the game of democracy was the ballot you cast in the last election. Did you throw away that ticket? Did you hand it in and then go home? Or did you participate in the game from start to finish? Your child is admitted free—with a participating adult. Did he miss the game because you didn't want to participate? The life blood of a democracy is the voice of the people, but you can't voice anything if you aren't in the stadium.

It's kickoff time and the stands are packed. There's the whistle beginning this, another great conflict on a vital issue. Ladies and gentlemen listen to the roar from the stands, from the people, giving incentive and support to their team. The game is over and the score is overwhelmingly in favor of the people.

The stands are quiet. It was a beautiful game, a beautiful day, a wonderful place. And tomorrow will be another game. Will you be there?

Participation is the challenge of American citizenship. It is America.

A Penny or Two Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the old adage, "Save the pennies and the dollars will take care of themselves," is well known to all of us.

Our colleague, Congressman EARL WILSON, is highly praised in an editorial which appeared in the Madison, Ind., Courier entitled "A Penny or Two Saved." I commend Congressman WILSON in his efforts to bring about a more economical procurement of our defense necessities. The editorial follows:

A PENNY OR TWO SAVED

Ninth District Congressman EARL WILSON continues to win skirmishes in his running fight with the military over procurement and sole-source buying.

A 2-year fight to force purchase of an Army airborne radio into open competition has been won, WILSON told his colleagues this week. WILSON said the Army has agreed to abide by a recommendation of Comptroller General Joseph Campbell to buy half of its fiscal year 1964 requirements of the AN/ARC 54 through competitive bidding.

The Army originally planned to buy all of the radios by sole source methods from the developer who was paid by the Government to design and perfect it. WILSON opened an attack in September 1961 against continued sole source purchase of the equipment. The case came to a climax in a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics, Paul R. Ignatius, to Comptroller General Joseph Campbell stating the Army has changed its sole source plan and will go competitive in buying the radio.

WILSON first attacked sole source purchase of the ARC 54 on the floor of the House on July 17, 1963. In that speech he said he had referred the ARC 54 case to the General Accounting Office for a full study and report.

On September 27, the Comptroller General reported to Representative WILSON in a 6-page letter which traced the procurement of the ARC 54 since its inception.

The GAO report concluded: "Every effort should be made to effect procurement of the radio sets for the balance of fiscal year 1964 on a competitive basis at the earliest possible date."

WILSON reported those findings to Congress October 7.

The GAO advised the Secretary of the Army of its findings, WILSON said, and on October 22 Campbell wrote to WILSON that, while the Army feels it must buy 853 of the radios

from the sole source developer, it will buy 882 of the same set under fully competitive conditions, thus acceding to the GAO's suggestion.

"The last price for this radio under sole source conditions was $6,000. The Army has the 853-unit sole source real going right now. When the competitive purchase is made in early 1964, we will all be able to see just how much money could have been saved by better planning, more efficient work and a more protective attitude toward the taxpayers' dollar," WILSON said.

"This is just another reason why it is imperative that the purchasing machinery of the military be completely overhauled. Here is another instance in which the Army has been forced to allow competition to save tax dollars.

"How many more are there that will go undiscovered? We need sweeping changes in procurement, and we need them now," WILSON concluded.

WILSON, our public "watchdog" in Congress, has won another important battle in the war on waste. The victory, however, is ours more than his. He has accomplished a big savings in tax dollars, which means we taxpayers are getting more for our money, which means one minute factor of the Government bureaucracy is being run more efficiently. This, in turn, will mean less cost to us taxpayers.

WILSON has made himself unpopular in many quarters through his relentless attack on waste. He has been criticized by high military officials and by political adversaries. This is a difficult thing to do for a man whose job depends on voter popularity. But WILSON has done it, and continues to do it in the interest of good Government.

We admire his courage and applaud his work. We only wish there were more like him in the Capitol to help bring down the ridiculous level Government spending has reached.

Defense Spending in a Managed Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune that pertains to our colleague Congressman EARL WILSON's efforts to expose the possible waste in Project 60.

It is heartening to know that our colleague is willing to put forth such dogged determination to get a dollar's worth of bang for a taxpayer's buck. The editorial follows:

DEFENSE SPENDING IN A MANAGED ECONOMY

Early this month Representative EARL WILSON, an Indiana Republican, warned his constituents of what he called a blood-chilling prospect. This, said the Hoosier Congressman, who specializes in exposing waste, mismanagement, and favoritism in defense contracts, is a Kennedy administration plan to buy military hardware not as needed but as the economy calls for massive pump priming.

Pentagon civilians, said WILSON, called the plan "Project 60," or, in the language of Pentagonese, "counter-cyclical procurement." In good times procurement will be cut down. "If unemployment begins to rise or if there is a desire to inject much money into a given area." WILSON reported in his newsletter, "the Pentagon will rush through orders for weapons, missiles, etc. It can withhold contracts from other areas on similar whims."

Only a few days ago, WILSON's dire forebodings about administration plans to manage the economy received partial confirmation from a most unlikely source, Defense Secretary McNamara's right-hand man, Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense. Gilpatric told a conference of newspaper editors and publishers in Chicago that the Pentagon has very definite plans to shift procurement to stimulate the economy and ease unemployment problems.

For the next several years, Gilpatric predicted, military spending, as a percentage of GNP (gross national product), will probably decline, and defense industries will face a series of economic problems, related to the changing impact of defense spending.

"We are, therefore, anxious to see that industrial capacity and skilled manpower not currently needed for defense are put to productive use," he said. "We do not want to see the availability of these important resources ignored and allowed to compound existing unemployment."

To accomplish this end, Gilpatric said the Pentagon has set up a "high level working group" which, from time to time, will give certain industries access to the secret details of McNamara's 5-year plan. This procedure, to which Congress is not privy, projects defense spending and the type of defense structure 5 years into the future.

In his exposure of "Project 60," Representative WILSON explained that these plans call for 15 procurement officials—all political appointees—to set up shop in 16 regions throughout the Nation.

"If one of these procurement commissars decides his area could use a shot in the arm," said WILSON, "he reports to McNamara, who, as you know, reports to the White House. Thus, political or economic need can replace actual need, efficiency, and low cost. The ramifications of such a plan and the consequences are as frightening as they are ominous."

In his Chicago address, Gilpatric appealed for intelligent press coverage to explain to the public the nature of the defense problems he described, including this vital one of parceling out defense contracts. The Pentagon chiefs would do better if they explained how they can clamp such life-and-death controls on large segments of the economy without congressional approval.

To the doctrine of managed news, first proclaimed in McNamara's Defense Department, the Pentagon now adds the policy of a managed economy.

CBS Looks at the Poverty Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, phrases have a way of capturing public interest, while their meaning often eludes us. Currently, the "war on poverty" expression enjoys widespread use. Yet, from the conversations I have heard and the questions I have been asked, I doubt that understanding of what is involved and what the administration has proposed runs too deep.

As I indicated in response to news media inquiries as to my reaction to the President's poverty message earlier this week, we must first analyze what is asked and then proceed to judge each item on its merit. It is not sufficient—in fact, it would be inconsistent with sound legislative process—to say, "I am against poverty, therefore, I am in favor of the President's proposals."

I said further that I shall support those programs which show real promise of inspiring individuals to help themselves. Federal action to assist the State and local communities provide the type of training and education needed to equip unemployed men and women with the skills that will suit them to today's job market will continue to enjoy my endorsement. Other programs, too, that respect individual dignity and do not attempt to solve poverty problems by making those affected wards of the taxpaying public also will get my backing.

However, I intend to oppose proposals which are mere retreads of those bureaucratic boondoggles found inadequate in the past. Just because an old idea wears a new cloak—in this case, cut of the noble fabric of antipoverty—is no justification to expose its historical failures.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is esential that the public become fully acquainted with the details of the war on poverty. Already, the news media has begun its contribution to this information imperative. I compliment them for their responsibility. It also is incumbent on those of us in Congress to utilize our lines of constituent communication in describing the elements of the proposed antipoverty legislation.

Yesterday, it was my good fortune to be listening to radio station WTOP between 8:55 and 9 a.m., for I heard an excellent commentary on the matter of poverty in the legislative framework. It was delivered by CBS News Reporter Allan Jackson on the "Morning Report" feature of that network's regular "Dimension" series.

Mr. Speaker, because the nature of broadcast information is fleeting, I take pleasure in granting some measure of permanence to Mr. Jackson's incisive examination by sharing it with my colleagues in the House through publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DIMENSION

Good morning. This is Dimension, Allan Jackson with the Morning Report, a look at a top story of the morning: The President's war on poverty.

Congress is losing no time in getting to work on the antipoverty program outlined by President Johnson yesterday. The House Labor Committee is beginning its hearings on the program this morning, less than 24 hours after the President's message went to Congress. But ultimate approval may take a little time. There is little argument over the goals of the program, but there is controversy over some of the means of achieving them.

The groundwork for the antipoverty program being taken up by the House Labor Committee this morning was laid in the President's budget message in January. He said then that he would ask for about a billion dollars to begin an all-out attack on poverty, sent to Congress yesterday, estimated the cost at $962½ million in the first year. The total, overall cost of the program hasn't been estimated, but there seems to be not so much controversy over the cost of the pro-

gram as there is over how the money is to be spent and whether it will achieve the desired results.

The basic controversy begins with the definition of poverty. The President's Council of Economic Advisers has defined this as families with an income of less than $3,000 a year, roughly one-fifth of the population. This sets a target for the program, even though a debatable one. And it leads to a second controversy.

Present legislation dealing with poverty is mostly in the nature of what is called "transfer programs"—that is funds provided for the poor for which there is no return in current services, social security, unemployment compensation, welfare payments, and the like. The Council of Economic Advisers says it would be possible, through such transfer programs to increase the minimum family income to $3,000, but this would still leave most of the roots of poverty—the causes—untouched. It is this area in which the President's new program would concentrate. He envisions steps and programs to eradicate the causes while at the same time aiding the consequences of poverty.

And here there is outright skepticism. Two major proposals of the President's program are a youth conservation corps, renamed by him as a job corps and a national service corps, in effect, a domestic peace corps. But both of these proposals have been made before separately * * * and a majority of Senate Republicans voted against both of them when they came up in the Senate, arguing that the funds could better be used in existing programs.

This is one of the controversies facing the House committee as it begins its hearings this morning.

A basic controversy already apparent in the poverty program is the question of organization. The President proposed setting up a new Federal agency, an office of economic opportunity, to coordinate the program, and to handle some parts of it directly. But several existing Government agencies are already involved in this general area, including the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, and Welfare. And, of course, each department will be reluctant to give up any of its prerogatives. In fact, it was because of behind-the-scenes debate over this point that the President's message to Congress was delayed by at least a week.

And it could come up again.

This has been Dimension on the CBS radio network, and this is Allan Jackson. I'll be back tomorrow with a look at another top story on the Morning Report.

Back to First Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following editorial, which appeared recently in the Public Ledger, published in Omaha, Nebr.

BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

Amidst all the talk of future economy in Government, it is refreshing to find a concrete act of economy right now that will save taxpayers $75.4 million a year. This accomplishment belongs to the U.S. Post Office, which expects to reduce its subsidy for parcel post by that amount through a 13.1 percent rate increase that goes into effect April 1.

This represents a substantial step toward Postmaster General John A. Gronouski's announced goal of lopping $100 million from the $650 million annual subsidy for the Department in the fiscal year beginning July 1. When the rate increase was announced, Mr. Gronouski expressed a gratification in which taxpayers will surely share.

But the public still will be saddled with a parcel post subsidy of more than $68 million annually, even after the new rates take effect. Such is the case even though Congress over the years has emphasized that parcel post shall be self-supporting. Congress, in fact, has written this into law, and the reason is simple: parcel post is used preponderantly by commercial shippers, who should be able willing to pay their own way.

Nevertheless, parcel post income has seldom come close to covering expenses. In fiscal 1962, for example, the income fell almost 20 percent short of expenses. And in some recent years the taxpayer tapping subsidy has risen as high as 25 percent of cost.

The Postmaster General is to be commended for taking a firm step in the right direction. We hope he will continue. By moving toward elimination of the parcel post subsidy altogether, he will show the way to positive Government economy. He will put the Post Office Department finally in tune with the longtime intent of the Congress. And above all, he will be saving $68 million a year for a grateful public.

The Significance of the Battle of Sabine Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a speech given by the attorney general of the State of Texas, "The Significance of the Battle of Sabine Pass," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The senior class of St. Pius X High School in Houston, Tex., has indicated their interest in having this speech appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BATTLE OF SABINE PASS

(Remarks of Attorney General Waggoner Carr before the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Sabine Pass, September 7, 1963)

In your program is a vivid account of the valor and heroism of Dick Dowling and his men in their historic victory over the Federal Navy which had a superiority of men and arms. In a short time, you will visit the Sabine Pass Battlefield Park and be able to make an on-the-spot investigation—with the aid of the new interpretive markers there—of the precise movements and positions of Dowling's men and batteries and of the attacking vessels.

My part on this commemorative program is to examine with you the significance of this battle and the results of the actions of these brave Texans as they completely routed a serious invasion of Texas. On September 8, 1863, little did these men realize that their great defense of the Texas coast would cause reverberations felt around the world.

Even before the Civil War, northern businessman realized the possibilities of the economic abundance of Texas and wanted to colonize the State with nonslave owners. They cited examples of how the German colonists in Texas who did not own slaves were prospering greatly.

Civil War came, and the feeling of Texas as the potential cotton giant of the United States still lay in the minds of the industrialists. In 1862 the cotton situation at northern textile mills was desperate. Many had closed, ruin threatened others, unemployment was high. Cotton supplied from New Orleans and other captured southern ports and the cotton seized from blockade runners proved a mere trickle to the hungry northern mills.

Industrialists investigated the possibility of securing cotton from India, but that source had been preempted by England. They decided the only one real chance to get the mills going again was the conquest of Texas. The New York Times said editorially, "Texas alone is capable, by the proper application of free labor, of producing more cotton annually than all the South ever exported by the aid of its 4 million slaves." In October of 1862, a delegation representing all New England manufacturers converged on Washington to press for the speedy occupation of Texas.

President Lincoln had his hands full trying to pacify strong lobbyists and attempting to comply with the wishes of the military.

For a time the invasion of Texas was shelved in favor of a strong Federal campaign to seize and control the Mississippi River, thereby splitting the South, however, Gen. Nathanial F. Banks was sent to New Orleans to secure troops for the impending event. Recruiting drives were conducted in the North promising not only an enlistment bonus but farm land in soon-to-be conquered Texas. Many farmers and adventurers enlisted for this expedition with the hope that a cotton-raising fortune awaited them in Texas.

After Vicksburg fell on July 4, 1863, the pressure began again to invade the Lone Star State. This time the President was strongly advised the occupation of Texas was vital to cut off trade with Europe via Mexico. On June 7, French troops had entered the ancient capital of Montezuma in Mexico. And in July, graphic stories came from the American consul at Monterrey concerning the pitiable plight of all the Unionists in Texas and how these refugees were fleeing in great numbers to Mexico to rid themselves of Confederate authority. Still more important was a dispatch from the U.S. Minister in Paris disclosing that the Mexican question had become a most prominent one in the policy of the Emperor of France, and the more the United States complained of the invasion of Mexico, the more anxious did he become to succeed. Disturbing rumors were afloat in England that there might possibly be a Franco-Confederate union.

On July 30, Lincoln wrote he wanted to get up the expedition to seize Texas for two reasons—to forestall the French in Mexico and silence the persistent lobby at home.

General Banks, at last realizing his wishes, planned his invasion. He believed the easier and faster way to attack the State at that time was by an amphibious descent on the coast near Sabine Pass. Accordingly on the last day of August, Banks ordered Maj. Gen. William B. Franklin, a veteran of the Virginia Campaigns of 1862, to take the 3d Division and one brigade of the 1st Division of the 19th Corps, board transports and proceed to Sabine Pass. Southern defenses were believed to be feeble there, and if naval vessels succeeded in overwhelming the Confederate guns, Franklin was to land his men and strike inland to the Beaumont-Houston railroad and await reinforcements. They then would proceed to occupy Houston to gain control of all the railway communications of Texas and get command

of the most populous and productive part of the State. This position would then enable them to move at any moment into the interior in any direction or fall back upon Galveston Island.

The fleet of transports and gunboats arrived at Sabine Pass, and the famous events of the battle you know.

This was the last major attempt to invade Texas. General Banks, later in November, managed to get a small foothold at Brownsville, and the Union occupation in faraway El Paso plus the seizure of a few Texas islands amounted to the only Union control in Texas throughout the war.

Much needs to be said about the invasion that did not occur. Had it happened, the lives of Texans would have been radically changed. Already faced with shortages of food and clothing without heavy fighting within the State, Texas would have suffered the despoilation that was the bitter fate of most Southern States. The invasion of Union troops, the acquisition of food to feed men and horses would have laid waste the State.

Texas women and children did not have to hide from soldiers, suffer persecution, see the immediate horrors of battle. The land remained the scene of planting and plowing and harvesting. No heavy cannon and dashing horses ruined the long, straight rows of cotton in the fields. No barns were hastily converted into hospitals where the sick, wounded, and dying were cared for with crude, improvised methods of relieving suffering. No homes were burned and possessions scattered in the wake of Union retreat.

With the invasion of Union forces, Texas would have fallen into a crisis never before felt. Enemies would be invading from all sides. Troops would have to be found to meet civilized warfare from the east while fighters would be necessary to fend off murderous attacks from savage Indians to the west. The frontier, maintained by a skeleton army of State and Confederate troops and citizens' posses, would suffer greatly. Women, children, and old folks would have met the threat of the scalper's knife and faced tortures even more than they were normally subjected to. These horrible scenes did not occur to any great extent, because of Dick Dowling and his men at Sabine Pass.

To the Texans, the Sabine Pass victory was a great boost to morale, especially since the two vessels captured, the *Clifton* and *Sachem*, had disgracefully fled under a flag of truce during the Battle of Galveston in January 1863.

At the beginning of the war, Jefferson Davis had said, "Texans, the troops from other States have their reputations to gain, but the sons of the defenders of the Alamo have theirs to maintain." Dick Dowling and his men are shining examples that this reputation was maintained. In fact, Sabine Pass is Alamo-like in its story, this ending a happy one with none injured and a victory for Texas.

To this point, 1863 had been a bad year for the Confederacy. "Stonewall" Jackson had died; there was Gettysburg; the fall of Vicksburg, and the loss of the entire Mississippi River; the abandonment of much of Arkansas—all were certainly discouraging. Then there was the defense of Charleston, the victory at Chickamauga, and the battle of Sabine Pass.

To the Confederacy, this Texas victory meant much. The South certainly would have fallen had another split occurred at that time.

Jefferson Davis was elated at the news of this stirring victory. He sent his personal congratulations and offered a medal of honor to be struck citing the "Davis Guards," as these men were called, for bravery. This was the only honor of the kind known to have been bestowed on Confederate soldiers during the war. In Davis' book, "Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," he devoted four pages to the Battle of Sabine Pass—almost as much allotted to the Battle of Gettysburg—listed the name of every man who received the medal and wrote that the heroics of the Davis Guards were without parallel in ancient or modern war.

The Confederate Congress tendered its official thanks in February of 1864.

Texas was the storehouse of the Confederacy west of the Mississippi River. So badly were goods and supplies needed from Texas, for some time factory workers, salt processors, cattle trail herders, and wagon drivers were exempt from duty with the military. With oxcarts lumbering along hot, dusty roads by contrast to iron horses belching black smoke—Texas constantly moved goods and supplies to the fronts. This transportation ran night and day, hauling cotton to the border or to blockade runners operating in neutral waters outside gulf ports—shipping salt, smoked meats, clothing, military equipment, leather goods, and medical supplies to the armies.

Cotton could buy when Confederate currency could not. Industry in the South could not keep up with Army demands; manufactured goods of all kinds had to be bought in Mexico and Europe to sustain the South. Therefore, cotton became the lifeblood of the Confederacy. With Texas isolated, the South would be doomed. Dick Dowling and his men unknowingly kept the Confederacy alive at this crucial time.

But this victory accomplished even more. When the news came to Europe, the foreign affairs of the Confederacy were aided considerably. In London, the quotations on the Confederate loan and bonds rose 2 to 3 percent. The London Times revealed that England was taking another look at this new nation and that perhaps the policy toward the Confederacy should be reviewed. It was clear that Sabine Pass had damaged Federal prestige abroad. This also opened up new hope that ties would be strengthened between the Confederacy and France with Maxmillian's government operating in Mexico, since France's interest in Texas had abated with Gettysburg and the fall of Vicksburg.

The North, resting on its laurels of victories the first part of the year, found the news of Sabine Pass had struck two vital spots—morale and money.

The lowering of morale started at the scene of battle when Union officers had to surrender to a bashful young lieutenant who was hardly dressed for so formal an occasion. Then, when the news of the number of men who captured these vessels was learned, morale took an even deeper dive.

This embarrassing defeat did much to lower the Union's own opinion of its Navy. While at times, the reports of naval men were quite verbose, these reports were vague with everyone apparently willing to pass the buck.

H. H. Bell, commodore commanding the west blockading squadron, wrote the Navy Department that the expedition to Sabine Pass had totally failed. He later reported that the form of attack carried out was different from the one he had recommended.

In much the same manner John P. Gillis, senior officer off Galveston, excused himself and requested to get away from Texas, blaming his indigestion on the climate.

Major General Franklin called the fiasco a series of misfortunes, misunderstandings, failures of ships to intercept responsible officials and give messages when they should have given them. To justify his charges, he said 200 mules were thrown overboard from the steamer *Laurel Hill* without orders from any responsible officer.

Lt. Cmdr. W. H. Dana evidently felt the Confederates didn't play fair because he said his ship, the *Cayuga* had fired toward the town where the batteries were supposed to be and got no reply from the enemy. Commander Bell felt this excuse was not good enough and told Dana to make a fuller report.

C. W. Lamson, commander of the ship *Granite City* said he was unaware at the time of the withdrawal that he was the senior officer on board.

The battle was intended to be a surprise except the rendezvous at Sabine Pass was not obeyed by all ships. The *Owasco* was in Galveston getting oil, and the commander seemed not at all concerned about the monkey wrench he threw into the surprise plans.

Lt. Frederick Crocker from Confederate prison wrote his report saying Acting Master Benjamin Weeks hauled down the flag without his authorization. Weeks' reply centered around the need of the men for medical attention since the ship's surgeon, he claimed, had climbed overboard when the shooting began and had clung to the rudder throughout the battle.

The surgeon answered the charge and admitted he climbed overboard, but only for a moment until he heard the call for medical assistance, and climbed back on board to give aid. He ended his report by saying he loved his family and country too much to do such a thing as was said of him.

General Banks, in his full report, blamed it on an engineer who had deserted from a gunboat and gave away the planned attack. Whether this is true or not actually had no bearing. Banks also blamed the failure on the shoal waters of the Sabine which did not enable gunboats to maneuver.

Aside from all this sidestepping, or as we say in Texas politics "agonizing reappraisals," New York Editor Horace Greeley summed the battle up rather well when he wrote that Major General Franklin was the "first American general in history to lose a fleet to land batteries alone."

The New York papers mentioned the battle somewhat conservatively. Harpers magazine even carried a drawing of the Federal ships in the pass. The New York Herald said that "considering the number of forces engaged, it is doubtful if any affair of the whole war can compare with the battle of Sabine Pass in obstinacy of fighting, loss of life and the amount of interest involved."

Possibly this reporter knew the full truth of what he had written. But 2 days later he certainly knew it, for gold rose 5 percent in price. This showed the Federals knew the war was going to last longer than expected. Even the City Commercial Report said the rise in gold had a very marked effect on the market for breadstuffs with a rise in price on flour.

But to realize the full impact of the news, we have to go to the London Times for the whole story.

On October 6, the Times observed: "According to the latest commercial accounts from New York, the financial position had again become seriously worse, although the papers abstain from all comment on it."

The Times went on to add: "A recovery of 2 or 3 percent in the quotations of the Confederate loan, and a revival of the rumors respecting the recognition of the South by France, are the natural consequences of the last news from America. A defeat in Tennessee, a check in Texas, a pause—to say the least—in the siege of Charleston, and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in the North, are more than enough to disturb the money market on both sides of the Atlantic."

To the North, the news of Sabine Pass meant another winter of more fighting, no cotton for the idle mills, increased blockade running of cotton from Sabine Pass and other points on the Texas coast, and more lobbyists and delegations headed for Washington. No boost in morale came from the news of Sabine Pass.

The Battle of Sabine Pass added still another glowing account in the brilliant chapter of Texas coastal defense during the Civil War.

In view of the significance of this unique and courageous action, we can truthfully and sincerely say as did Winston Churchill, "Seldom have so many owed so much to so few."

Mills in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Coffeyville, Kans., Daily Journal calls H.R. 9903 "a piece of relatively minor legislation." Yet, it says that this bill is threatening industry in the State of Kansas. Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial in the RECORD. It makes good sense and demands the attention of all of us who will soon be voting upon the measure:

MILLS IN DANGER

Flour is shipped from Coffeyville to all parts of the world.

A total of 1,834 cars of wheat were received at Moore-Lowry Flour Mills, Inc., here last year from Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, South and North Dakota, Montana, Minnesota, Texas, and Colorado.

This was turned into 2,599 cars of finished products.

Bakers in 18 States used 508 carloads of sacked flour from the mill here, and 383 bulk carloads of flour were shipped out. In addition, 842 carloads were exported to foreign countries from Coffeyville in 1963.

The Moore-Lowry Mill employs 62 persons.

This important industry and others like it in Kansas is being threatened by a piece of relatively minor legislation, H.R. 9903.

This measure would in effect free railroads to bypass the Interstate Commerce Commission in reducing freight rates for wheat, but not wheat products, notably flour.

The result, the industry maintains, is that millers ultimately would be forced to move operations out of the country's wheat belts, where they now are concentrated, and into the center of heaviest consumption.

In addition to growing 20 percent of the Nation's wheat, Kansas mills one of every seven sacks of flour produced in the United States.

Having earlier this month been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill awaits action by the full House, Senate committee approval was unanimous.

Just last week Ismert-Hincke Milling Co., closed mills at Winfield and Kingman, saying it no longer needed them because of a mill just built at Chattanooga, Tenn.

The railroads face intense competition from trucks and river barges, both of which are unregulated.

Another threat to millers lies in the tendency of railroads to voluntarily reduce the wheat rates without reducing the rates on products when they apply to the ICC.

The bill probably would injure the livestock industry also, because it is based upon locally produced feed. About 30 of every 100 pounds of wheat milled in Kansas becomes livestock feed.

The terrific expense of building new mills is in Kansas' favor.

One hopes something can be done before it is too late. The industry employs some 4,000 Kansans.

Industrial Relations at Le Moyne College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following articles from the Le Moyne College magazine of Syracuse, N.Y., are worthy of the attention of my colleagues. The articles are concerned with industrial relations and reflect the contribution Le Moyne College is making in this area.

The article follows:

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AT LE MOYNE COLLEGE

(Joseph X. Albino, 1959)

Ever progressive in the academic, and practical, field of industrial relations, Le Moyne College, launched an industrial relations seminar geared to top management in central New York in February. Future seminars are planned to follow which will be geared, respectively, to central New York labor leaders and to the representatives both of labor and management.

Directed by Dr. Irving R. Markowitz, private arbitrator in labor-management disputes, labor-management lawyer of long standing, associate professor and director of industrial relations at Le Moyne, and special lecturer of graduate studies in industrial relations at Syracuse University, the 8-week seminar is cosponsored by the National Manufacturers Association, the National Metals Trade Association, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the New York State Board of Mediation. The seminar is held on Tuesday of each week from 3 to 5 in the afternoon and costs $100 per person.

A native of New York City, Dr. Irving R. Markowitz was graduated from New York University Law School with the degree of doctor of jurisprudence and was admitted to the bar in 1933. In legal practice, he specialized in labor-management relations and labor-management law until 1953. During this period, he acted as counsel in contract negotiations, prepared collective bargaining agreements, and appeared as counsel in labor matters in Federal and State courts, and Federal and State administrative agencies.

From 1953 until February 1, 1962, he was a member of the New York State Mediation Board. He has mediated and arbitrated hundreds of labor disputes of all types, including matters involving multiplant companies of national importance. His arbitrations have included issues concerning discharges, seniority, promotions, transfers, consolidations, and all other types of personnel action and wage and salary administration, including incentive systems and job evaluation.

According to Dr. Markowitz, "This is a more advanced formal study of labor-management relations than we have ever had at Le Moyne. The college is pleased to provide additional opportunity for those engaged in industrial relations in this area to meet in the academic arena under professional/professorial guidance. Through his seminar, and those which will follow, opportunity for formal, advanced study is given to practicing labor-management personnel."

The first of the seminars, dealing with collective bargaining, is titled "Seminar in Collective Bargaining: Preparation and Techniques in Contract Negotiations." The seminar has a twofold purpose: first, and foremost, it helps advance the informational and educational background of interested leaders who are responsible for industrial relations in New York State, particularly in central New York; second, it is hoped that this and future seminars, attended by labor and management leaders, will serve as quasi-sounding boards where long-term solutions to industrial relations problems can be resolved.

In terms of subject matter, the first major part of the seminar is devoted to negotiations. The discussion concerns itself with the company and its policies as seen from the viewpoint of management, labor, union leaders, the public, the press, and the Government. Points of discussion include wages, management rights, subcontracting, promotions, and supplemental wage benefits.

Dr. Markowitz holds that, "To prepare adequately for bargaining, management must have complete wage and supplemental benefit surveys. In addition, management must understand its own employees, their needs, and their goals. And management must have a knowledge of the union representing the company's employees and knowledge, too, of the business agent or international labor representative."

The latter part of the seminar will deal with the presentation of management proposals, the consideration of union proposals, group bargaining, and behavior norms at the bargaining table. The discussion will also emphasize the best manner of using Government mediative agencies and explain Federal laws governing collective bargaining. The framework of discussion will be in terms of understanding these problems and seeking imaginative solutions for them, with a review of present proposals offered for solution by the Government and others.

During the 8-week seminar there will be guest lecturers. When deemed advisable other staff members of Le Moyne College, as well as representatives of Government, business, and labor, will be invited to contribute to the interchange of ideas. The seminar will be concluded with an informal review of the matter given throughout the 8-week course. A comprehensive critique may very well be made available for publication.

INDUSTRIAL HUMAN RELATIONS

EDITOR'S NOTE: The following is a reprint of Mr. Albino's article, "Industrial Human Relations," which appeared in the June 1963 issue of the Industrial Bulletin, the "* * * official news magazine of the New York State Department of Labor * * *." Editorial permission to reprint this article has been gratefully received.

Since 1945 men and women representing both labor and management in central New York have been participating in the Industrial Relations Institute of Le Moyne College, Syracuse, where principles of labor-management relations are taught and a cooperative attitude is nurtured.

As a community service offered by Le Moyne College, the industrial relations institute is an adult education program which was founded even before the college itself had opened its doors.

His Excellency Walter A. Foery, bishop of the Syracuse Roman Catholic Diocese, was approached with the idea that the Reverend Richard M. McKeon, S.J., who had taught industrial relations back in 1935 at St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, resign his position as Army chaplain and direct the school which, it was decided, was to be established at Le Moyne College.

In the meantime, the Reverend Gerald C. Treacy, S.J., writer and lecturer on social and industrial problems, was appointed temporary director of the institute. Offices and classroom space were made available.

A success from the very start, the institute drew 350 men—and women—representing not only labor and management, but people from all walks of life, to the first 10-week session.

To date the institute has had enrollments totaling more than 2,500 students. Classes are held at the administration building at Le Moyne Heights where modern facilities, including a library with a special section devoted to books on industrial relations, are available for the students' use.

According to the Reverend McKeon, who got his first taste of labor-management relations when working his way through Canisius College at the Bethlehem Steel plant in Buffalo, the philosophy or credo of the industrial relations institute is simply: "We stand for a better America based on Christian principles of life, an America closer to the ideals in the great charter of our liberties, the Constitution of the United States."

Based on such a philosophy, the overall contribution of the institute to the community, and more particularly to labor-management relations, has been ever spreading. The institute has worked as a catalytic agent bringing about the establishment of two other industrial relations groups, which are actually extensions of the institution's work and philosophy.

Encouraged by the success and results of the work accomplished by the institute, it was decided, that a 4-year program should be established at Le Moyne to prepare students for careers in industrial relations. It was reasoned that a program of industrial relations built around the core curriculum of Catholic theology and scholastic philosophy would prepare the graduates "to leave their alma mater well-rounded men and women—capable of making a living, but not incapable of living—rather than specialists tailored to fit a slot in industry."

The Reverend McKeon was called upon again this time to form a committee which would establish a 4-year industrial relations program and draw up a list of prospective instructors.

When the Reverend Aloysius J. Owens, chairman of the department of industrial relations, came to assume his present duties, the course outline was ready and the names of prospective industrial relations teachers were in his hands.

The second industrial relations group to originate out of the institute was the Industrial Relations Council. In 1951 Elmer C. Hughes, then executive assistant to the president of Easy Washer Co., and Nicholas Ferrante, executive secretary of the Greater Syracuse Labor Council, had completed the adult education sessions offered by the institute, but still felt a need for continued assistance and counsel.

Hughest and Ferrante consulted with the Reverend McKeon and suggested that a council of top industrial leaders be formed to meet and discuss current problems of mutual interest. Subsequently, a small group of interested men began meeting. Today the council has mushroomed to about 35 members including the top labor and management leaders in the Syracuse area, New York State mediators, State and Federal personnel directors, public representatives, lawyers, bankers, insurance men, and small business owners, all interested in advancing and nurturing good labor-management relations.

As the Very Reverend Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president of Le Moyne College, explains: "We believe that we have promoted better relations among management, labor, and government. And because one of the major problems of the twentieth century concerns labor and management relations. Le Moyne feels that it has contributed a liberal experience to its students in helping them grapple with these problems."

Though both the council and the institute are two separate organizations there is strong interplay between the two. For example, if a question is raised at an institute meeting which can't easily be answered, it is referred to the council. The council in turn bats the question around and usually comes up with an answer and additional information which is sent back to the institute.

One unionist says that the Reverend McKeon keeps his material "fresh, right up to last night's newspapers."

To appreciate fully the contribution that the institute makes to the community, and more specifically to labor-management relations within the community, it is necessary to view it as an inverted pyramid. At the point of the inverted pyramid are the rank-and-file members from labor and management who attend the 10-week sessions, first because they want to further their education and enrich their lives, and second, because their leaders and supervisors, who have attended the meetings themselves over the years, encourage them to do so.

The men and women who attend the sessions return to their positions in the community better equipped to handle the labor-management conflicts which arise. But more, they return with a fuller understanding of the historical development which has taken place in the field of industrial relations and its effect on present union-management dealings. The majority, before attending the lectures, may be familiar with certain rules and procedures in industrial relations, but because the lectures given at the institute by the Reverend McKeon encompass the entire field of industrial relations, the students are in a better position to understand the subject in its total concept as a science of human betterment. They learn, too, the problems of the people on the other side of the bargaining table.

More important, the Reverend McKeon, whose goal is "to translate love of neighbor into practice," attempts to demonstrate the Judeo-Christian principle behind all labor-management discussions. And he underlines his thinking by referring to industrial relations as "industrial human relations."

The Reverend McKeon maintains that "the challenge of today is unemployment." He says: "To give a man a job is the greatest act of Judeo-Christian love of neighbor because a man without a job is no longer free. He can't do the things he wants to do."

"What is * * * important about the institute is that you can obtain information there you will never get anywhere else," says Nicholas Ferrante. "The people at the institute represent a good cross-section of society, and it gives you an opportunity to tune in on what other people are thinking concerning current topics in the industrial relations field.

"Everything said at both the institute and the council is said in mutual respect and confidence, and as a result, people feel free to say things which they would never say while in some plush office or at a negotiations meeting," he adds.

Each year two series of courses are offered. Each course runs 10 weeks at a nominal cost. Courses are attended by about 100 people. A diploma is awarded along with grades determined by class participation, as opposed to formal testing.

At each class session the Reverend McKeon lectures on preannounced subjects such as cooperation between labor and management groups, fringe benefits, the Fair Labor Standards Act, among other subjects.

Of equal value are the question and answer periods and general discussion periods which afford students an opportunity to get answers to specific problems, and allow them to exchange ideas.

In addition to the regular classes, the Le Moyne College Institute makes speakers available to a variety of labor, management, civic, and fraternal organizations in Syracuse and throughout central New York.

The Reverend McKeon personally has lectured before groups in Rome, Utica, Oswego, Massena and as far away as Cornwall, Ontario. He has spread the word that labor-management relations are, in fact, human relations; that the health and welfare of human beings should be the prime concern of those responsible for negotiating work contracts.

The Le Moyne College Institute distributes information to all parts of the world. According to the Reverend McKeon, there is hardly a week when requests for aid and counsel are not received. Because of his work with the Industrial Relations Institute in Syracuse, he has been assigned to make study tours of Europe, Canada, and Latin America. One result of these visits has been that he is in demand as a lecturer to union, management, and other groups.

When the Reverend McKeon was in Latin America he stressed the necessity of preparing courses in industrial relations to meet the new industrial development. Since his return in 1957, seminars have been started (and) a 4-year industrial relations course at Xavier University, Bogotá, Colombia, and Catholic University in Caracas, Venezuela, has been initiated.

Is it any wonder that government authorities from throughout the Nation, management leaders from many corporations, and unionists have expressed their approval of what has been offered at the Le Moyne College Industrial Relations Institute?

The Defeat of IDA—Congress Throws Away a Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1964, the House of Representatives failed to authorize additional funds for the International Development Association. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the editorial in the Philadelphia Bulletin of February 28, 1964, with the hope that this program may be reconsidered and enacted. The editorial follows:

CONGRESS THROWS AWAY A BARGAIN

Congress has no peer when it comes to keeping friend and foe alike off balance through sudden switches, as it proved Wednesday, when the House suddenly knocked down the Senate-approved bill to keep the International Development Association in business.

IDA is, in the opinion of a good many qualified observers, one of the most economical and yet effective foreign aid devices we have ever figured out. It was a U.S. invention.

Its purpose is to make "soft" loans, to assist the poorest nations in programs helping them toward a higher economic level. This is an extension of the function of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank). The latter, one of the better successes in postwar international financing, makes loans on "hard" bankers' terms. The IDA offers—to qualified applicants—50-year loans at no interest, only a light service charge; then repayment on the most liberal terms.

This is not merely brotherly. For the free nations, it is also good hard sense. The Communist bloc has specialized in its own brand of help plus subversion among the poorest nations; IDA offers an attractive alternative. For the United States there is a special advantage: IDA funds are from an international pool.

This year it was proposed to refill the IDA fund by contributions from 17 nations. America would have put up $312 million over 3 years; the other nations would have put up the larger remainder of $750 million. But without U.S. action, the whole deal will collapse.

The losers will be many if IDA is permitted to die. Among them will be the taxpayers,

deprived by the House of one of the soundest monetary tools in our foreign policy kit.

It would be a good occasion for Congress to pedal backward swiftly from the illogical corner in which congressional enemies of all foreign aid have managed to place the Nation.

Firmness Against Aggression in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Congress Biweekly, a publication of the American Jewish Congress, on February 10, 1964.

The firm policy of the Johnson administration—as a continuation of the same policy of the Kennedy administration—is most laudable. It will be appreciated by peace-loving people everywhere.

The editorial follows:

U.S. FIRMNESS AGAINST AGGRESSION

At a time when the Arab States are proclaiming their hostile intentions toward Israel with more vigor and candor than usual, it is heartening to learn, as indicated in the recent address on "American Policy in the Near East," by Deputy Under Secretary of State U. Alexis Johnson, that the United States remains unalterably committed to Middle East stability and firmly opposed to aggression. This restatement of American Middle East policy—the first authoritative pronouncement on the question since President Johnson assumed office—should serve to ease the apprehensions that have been aroused by the latest manifestations of Arab saber rattling. For Mr. Johnson has made clear that the United States, acting in its own interests and those of the free world, would not "stand idly by if aggression is committed."

Elaborating on this theme, Mr. Johnson quoted from the late President Kennedy's general policy statement of May 8, 1963:

"The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of Israel and her neighbors. We strongly oppose the use of force or the use of direct threat in the Near East. * * * In the event of direct or indirect aggression we would support appropriate courses of action in the U.N. or on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

"I believe," Mr. Johnson continued, "that what President Kennedy said * * * lends itself to no misinterpretation: Any intended victim of aggression can count on our support."

Equally apparent, too, are the identities of the would-be Middle East aggressors; and, indeed, in the wake of Mr. Johnson's remarks, the Arab press and radio, as if to confirm that the shoe really fit, launched into a tirade of anti-American abuse, denouncing the State Department position. The chorus of outrage reached such shrill and indignant proportions that the U.S. Embassy in Beirut was moved to issue a statement explaining that Mr. Johnson's address was a "routine one scheduled weeks ago" and not meant as an answer to the resolutions on Israel adopted recently by the Arab heads of state in Cairo. As for Mr. Johnson's remarks concerning American opposition to aggression, these, the Embassy spokesman amplified, "contain nothing new and were not directed at any particular parties."

We doubt, however, whether this exegesis mollified the ruffled Arab tempers, for the Embassy statement concluded as follows: "Opposition to aggression from any quarter is a continuing world-wide U.S. policy and is no more than what is expected of any member of the United Nations." The Arab leaders, who seem to regard themselves as immune to the elementary law and morality that must govern international life, would hardly subscribe to this view. Nor would they be satisfied with anything less than a policy that gave them—and them alone—license to wage aggression with impunity. It is for this reason that the peace that now obtains in the Middle East is so shaky. And it is for this reason, too, that Mr. Johnson's address, affirming America's unequivocal opposition to aggression, is so welcome.

Alexandros Beary Gavalas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Heights area of Manhattan, which I have the honor to represent, there lives a very talented young artist who is rapidly becoming famous. He often paints in Fort Tryon Park when the weather is good, and he has given much pleasure to the residents of this area who gather to watch him while he paints.

This week, the Fort Tryon Park Fine Arts Exhibition is being held at the Hotel Taft in Manhattan, and the works of this young artist are being displayed. His paintings have come to the attention of many well-known persons who have included his work in their collections.

I include at this point an article from the New York Sunday News of August 26, 1962, which tells more about Alex Gavalas, his hopes and ambitions.

The article follows:

ARTIST, 17, BRUSHES UP ON NATURE IN THE PARK

(By Philip Roura)

Alex Gavalas, a 17-year-old high school senior, has taken the strollers of Inwood's Fort Tryon Park by storm with his paintings.

Daily he invades the park in upper Manhattan and quickly attracts a group of onlookers who comment and offer suggestions on his work. Usually with him are his mother, Mary, and father, Emanual, a chiropractor.

"I always take into consideration what people say," said Alex as he put the finishing touches to a painting of the famed Cloisters.

"Sometimes they don't agree with my style but I don't mind," he said. "My main ambition is to become a stage designer. In school, I do the designing for the plays. Painting landscapes is really my hobby."

Since they have not seen his stage work, the strollers can't offer a comparison but most agree it would have to be very good to be better than his paintings. Many describe the easy-smiling teenager as a genius. One unidentified lady, who said she was an author, likened his work to some very famous artists.

Alex paints for 3 hours a day during the summer months.

"I can't even draw a simple picture," said Mrs. Gavalas. "Even his two sisters draw things on occasion and have won school prizes."

Though he has not entered his work in any contests, Alex has written the secretariat of the United Nations for permission to exhibit his paintings in the lobby of the U.N. Building.

"I feel that people from all over the world will be able to see them in the U.N. It may lead to something big," he said.

Upon graduation from the High School of Art and Design, at 52d Street and Third Avenue, Alex hopes to enroll in New York University because they have an outstanding art course.

Alex lives with his parents and sisters at 452 Fort Washington Avenue, Washington Heights.

The Defeat of IDA—A Sad Relapse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the House of Representatives to authorize additional funds for the International Development Association was a grim mistake. The importance of this program to the United States is clearly described by the editorial which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on March 13, 1964.

The editorial follows :

A SAD RELAPSE

Sometime within the next 3 months the Johnson administration must set itself grimly to the thankless task of convincing the House of Representatives that it made a really bad mistake in voting last month to recommit a bill to add $312 million to the World Bank's subsidiary known as the International Development Association (IDA).

The vote was one more manifestation of Congress' distaste for foreign aid—a distaste which, when previously manifested late last year, marked the end of the traditional honeymoon between a new President and Capitol Hill. But this was more than a vote against an increase or for a cut in foreign aid—it was a vote against a commitment the United States made over a year ago following a joint meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

The burden of that agreement was that $750 million would be added to the lending powers of IDA, which grants loans at relatively easy terms to countries unable to meet standard rates. Seventeen countries were to contribute to this, among them the United States.

Now a vote to recommit does not necessarily spell the death of this type of legislation. But once it has been taken, such a vote virtually buries the measure unless the most energetic action is taken to drag it out on the floor again. And unless this bill is pried loose and passed by June 30, the managers of this Nation's foreign economic affairs will find themselves in a sticky position indeed.

First off. IDA is one agency that manages to inspire a relative amount of confidence among the better off nations partly because it is—as it should be—firmly guided by the World Bank, which, in turn, manages to hew

pretty closely to Western standards of business prudence.

Secondly, IDA offers one of the most promising instruments through which countries other than the United States can be persuaded to assume some of the burdens of foreign aid formerly shouldered almost exclusively by Washington. And this type of cooperative effort has long been sought as a means of easing our own balance of payments deficit. It is significant that, almost alone of the 17 nations promising to augment IDA's lending powers, only the United States at this point looks like it might have to back out.

To disown this commitment, or to stall upon it indefinitely could frustrate to a considerable degree Washington's current efforts to spread the burden of foreign aid among many more advanced nations, but that is not all. It could do so at a moment when it is very much in the interests of this country to avoid giving the impression it is doing any such thing.

In two successive editorials appearing on March 2 and 3 this newspaper underlined some of the delicate problems that will face the West this spring when the multilateral trade negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) will be carried on almost simultaneously with the new series of trade discussions pushed by the underdeveloped countries via the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

There is little doubt that the less developed states will formulate through the UNCTAD conference a series of claims on the more advanced countries well in excess of anything the latter will want to grant—whether via commodity stabilization agreements, preferential tariff treatment or a revival of the stillborn International Trade Organization, or all three of them.

Since the less developed states are also going to discuss trade with closed economies, as most Communist countries will be there to cheer them on, the West will find itself somewhat on the defensive during these sessions.

This is natural enough. It need cause no apprehension among the mercantile states, which buy vastly more from the less developed areas than all the Communist powers combined.

But, if only in the interests of keeping major trade lanes open for future generations and future expansion, the mercantile powers are obliged to discuss these problems seriously with the less developed countries. Even though plantly the better-off powers cannot go anywhere near as far as the less fortunate members of UNCTAD would like, they can probably go some distance—perhaps in the direction of freer entry for some goods—especially if it seems that by this means they may be able to rid themselves of some of the current burden of foreign aid.

It is also much in the interests of the United States to show up at the UNCTAD conference with at least an appearance of willingness to listen, to discuss, and to do what it reasonably can to meet the more legitimate aspirations of the less developed countries.

We quite agree—as noted above—that this country cannot go all the way. It could not, for example, welcome very heartily the International Coffee Agreement in the light of evidence that the main purpose of that agreement in practice has been to raise coffee prices to consumers.

But this is not to blink the fact that the Senate's failure to approve this agreement could be taken as a bad omen by a lot of the coffee producers who will be much on hand at the UNCTAD's meetings. But if failure to take this action is justifiable, the House action on the IDA funds is much less so. It could very well cost this country a great deal more in terms of foreign policy than the 208 House Members who voted to recommit it think they may be saving for the U.S. Treasury.

Rev. Henry J. Browne Presents Views of Stryker's Bay Neighborhood Council to Subcommittee on Housing of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the testimony of the Reverend Henry J. Browne, chairman of the Housing Committee of Stryker's Bay Neighborhood Council, before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on February 28, 1964.

Father Browne is a founder and past president of Stryker's Bay Neighborhood Council which was organized some 5 years ago to give the community a voice in the development of the West Side urban renewal plan on Manhattan's West Side.

A pioneer in the effort for citizen participation in urban planning, Father Browne wisely points out:

Citizen participation should be a real one, and involve in it the people affected by the proposed plan from the time of planning through the period of execution.

The experience of the Stryker's Bay Neighborhood Council led Father Browne to make a number of specific recommendations which, I hope, will guide both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Housing in their consideration of the administration's housing bill.

In my own testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing, I said that the administration's proposal for 240,000 public housing units in the next 4 years is "totally inadequate" and "a drop-in-the-bucket approach to one of the Nation's most serious problems." I urge passage of my bills H.R. 5878 to remove the limit on annual contributions to public housing, and H.R. 5877 to remove the 15-percent limitation on the amount of annual contributions allowed each State.

Father Browne observed:

New York's need for such housing is far from answered by current proposals and it should be stated that its need is for 85 percent of the suggested national total rather than the 15 percent which is now allowed to go to any single State.

The testimony of the Reverend Henry J. Browne follows:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FEBRUARY 28, 1964

(Rev. Henry J. Browne, chairman, housing committee)

The Stryker's Bay Neighborhood Council involvement in New York's West Side urban renewal plan gives it a position of experience over the last 5 years to speak of housing needs, especially as related to urban renewal. As a representative council with delegates from over 50 organizations in and around the 20 square blocks from West 87th to 97th Streets, from Amsterdam Avenue to Central Park West, it has been the formal "citizen's participation" channel between neighborhood and city. The groups represented are very mixed in character and broad in nature, including schools and social agencies, religious and political organizations, tenant and property-owner organizations, and many individual members from the community who also participate in its activities.

The council conducted many educational sessions on the plan, brought together local leadership to study its ramifications, and made regular statements of community thinking and suggestions for its adaptation to the appropriate city agencies.

The plan which it approved in June 1962, in the name of the neighborhood had made some deep divisions mostly in terms of the amounts of dwelling units which would become available in the low- and middle-income categories. Nonetheless, there was complete agreement that urban renewal was needed and hence it can be said that we have learned from experience that a planned approach to renewing a neighborhood is preferable to a chaotic, unplanned, free-wheeling enterprise approach which the East Side of our city has witnessed. A continuing urban renewal program seems to us to be a necessity.

From our experience, and from positions that we have taken in many discussions and formal resolutions we would add certain specific recommendations to any urban renewal program:

1. Citizens participation should be a real one, and involve in it the people affected by the proposed plan from the time of planning through the period of execution. No local public agency should be allowed to omit from project cost the professional staffing and other facilities required for effective participation of the citizenry of the area.

2. Physical planning should be supplemented by social planning for any urban renewal area and the citizenry must also be involved in that aspect of the change. Social institutions and relationship are affected and educational, welfare, and cultural services should be studied and planned for in advance of great physical renewal.

3. The speed of execution has great influence on the outcome of any urban renewal plan. The delays in carrying out the plan since its approval for our neighborhood has had a demoralizing effect on tenant families who have given up hope and moved, on small businessmen whose trade has been ruined, on institutions left surrounded by deterioration, on homeowners whose capital and future have been tied up. Some sort of timetable and checkups with sanctions should be used to speed up the process.

Our council's relationship to urban renewal has been from the curbstone viewpoint of a neighborhood affected by a plan. We have striven for consensus of opinion among groups of many differing viewpoints and interests. We have generally agreed on a position of concern for the needs of the families being dislocated and have kept as a primary consideration the urban renewal philosophy of preserving the existing community insofar as it is possible and desirable.

Our experience points therefore in several specific directions:

1. Private redevelopment and rehabilitation displacing poorer tenants is essential to urban renewal. To live up to the urban renewal philosophy of preserving the community, the stable families among these relocatees should be given the chance to remain within the confines of the renewed neighborhood. This requires that low-rent public housing be prepared for them to be relocated into. Moreover, such housing must be scattered and vest pocket in nature if the attraction for private development within the same general area is to be feasible.

2. A massive public housing program is essential for the continuation of any urban

renewal program and the two approaches should be well coordinated. The administration's proposal to have such a program in new, rehabilitated, and leased properties meets with our full enthusiastic backing. We see the need also of the administration's request to make low-income single people from urban renewal and other public improvement sites eligible for public housing and would add only that they might be from either standard apartments or roominghouses. An increase of the allowable amount per room in construction cost is necessary in New York City if public housing is to take care of families dislocated by public improvements, not to mention those in slum buildings. New York's need for such housing is far from answered by current proposals and it should be stated that its need is for 85 percent of the suggested national total rather than the 15 percent which is now allowed to go to any single State.

3. We would like to see the development of moderate income housing under private sponsorship as in the Federal program of section 211,d,3. It has not been used in our city and perhaps administrative and legislative changes on costs allowed might make it possible. We have been pleased with its approach to this housing need since the regulations begin with income limitations close to the real middle income of our area.

4. The many elderly being displaced in our urban renewal area points up for us that our city has yet to see use of the Federal programs for housing them under private profit and nonprofit sponsorship. We urge administrative or legislative steps to remedy this situation.

We have been concerned with relocation from the policy level to the day-to-day execution of it. We feel that initial surveys should be more diagnostic and cover social needs and be made before titletaking but not allowed to become useless from delay of execution. The administration's idea of supplemental payments after relocation to make up the difference in rentals between old and new apartments is something that we have often seen the need for. They would, however, need to be more than 1 year in extent if they were to have much real meaning.

The relocation of small stores from our area has raised the problem of "goodwill money" or "separation payments." We hail the administration's breakthrough in this regard but think that a more realistic scale of payments should be worked out on the local level. Also, the process of relocating back in the area we feel should be made more feasible in every way for the small businessmen.

The rehabilitation of the brownstones within our urban renewal area has been one of the most disappointing aspects of the plan both in meager results and time consumed. We would like to see the facilitation of a rehabilitation program, including more realistic mortgage amounts for family occupancy, to become more feasible in areas such as ours.

Section 220, with its five dwelling-unit requirements, even with special tax arrangements is proving of little service to a community interested in a strong family element taking root in it.

We endorse the administration suggestion to assist elderly homeowner residents in a special way to participate in such programs.

We know that efficient and quick processing is difficult to legislate, but we would love to see this achieved in all agencies and levels of governmental operation affecting urban renewal. Our viewpoint is necessarily a limited one, but we hope accordingly a deeper one. Municipal leaders have advocated many of the same things we have. I assure you that ours is an independent voice, and I hope one that reflects the concern of people who have learned the hard way.

The Problem in New York City's Schools Is Not Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the Gideon Chagy's editorial broadcast over station WCBS–TV in New York City on February 7, 1964.

As the editorial points out the problem in New York City's schools is not that the board of education favors segregation: The opposite, of course, is true. The problem lies with a severe shortage of funds and this is a problem which should receive the attention of Governor Rockefeller and the Republican-controlled New York State Legislature.

The editorial follows:

The unfortunate school boycott is now a thing of the past. The boycott did absolutely nothing to solve the one most important problem facing New York City schools. That problem is not integration. Well before the boycott, the board of education made it perfectly clear that it was completely committed to integration and that it was prepared at all times to negotiate the details. The critical problem is money. Unless New York City finds additional revenue for its schools, no integration plan will succeed and urgently needed improvements in education won't be made.

New York City has more than 35 percent of the State's school children, and yet it receives just over 25 percent of the State aid to schools. In fact, State aid per pupil given to New York City this year is $122 less than the average State aid per pupil elsewhere in the State.

New York City has consistently received less than its fair share of State aid. The current State aid formula bases the amount any school district shall receive on the tax value of its real estate. The formula assumes that the greater the value of a city's real estate, the greater the taxes it may impose, and therefore, the greater its financial ability to support its schools. The formula assumes that New York City with its high real estate values doesn't need as much State aid for schools as other districts. But the fact is that despite its high real estate values, New York City has proportionately less money available for its schools than do many school districts with far lower real estate values. The reason is simple. New York City has to spend a far greater proportion of its revenues for municipal services other than education than do small towns or villages. For example, New York City must spend four times as much of its income as upstate Yates County does for police protection, 8 times as much of its income for its fire department, 10 times as much of its income for sanitation, and more than twice as much of its income for welfare. New York City must also provide services which may not figure at all in the rural budget; such as air pollution and water pollution control, museums, and markets. As a result, New York City actually has less of its income to spend on education than far smaller communities where the cost of other public services is not as great.

If New York City is to get its fair share of State aid, the State aid formula must reflect the cost of big city government.

Senate Majority Leader Walter J. Mahoney said over this station's "Newmakers" program last Sunday that there was little likelihood that aid to city schools would be increased. But unless the city does get additional funds, the struggle for improved and integrated schools will be in vain. Civil rights leaders are now talking about another boycott around the end of this month. If they want to apply their energies where they will count most, they should place them behind the efforts of the board of education to get additional aid from the legislature this session. This kind of effort will do more to speed integration and—even more important—to improve schools than any boycott ever could.

Will the Cooley Cotton Bill Really Help Consumers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the Cooley cotton bill last December, I made the assertion that there is no guarantee that consumers will benefit from the multimillion-dollar payments to textile mills authorized by the bill.

An article from the March 11 issue of the Daily News Record adds to my concern on this point. I am placing the entire article in the RECORD, but call your attention particularly to the paragraph beginning with the word "Nevertheless."

The article follows:

DECRIES TALK OF WEAVERS HOLDING BACK COTTON SAVINGS

(By Sig Scheier)

Millmen who talk of holding on to any cost advantages to be provided by the one-price cotton law are doing a disservice to the industry, in the opinion of one mill executive.

Failure by mills to pass along raw cotton cost savings to their customers would confirm the recent assertions of some lawmakers and newspapers that the textile industry would gain windfall profits from the one-price law, according to this industry spokesman. Such action, he adds, would greatly hamper future efforts of the textile industry to gain a fair hearing in Washington.

Other textile sources who have participated in the industry's drive to improve its public relations image also take note of the dangers of receiving a black eye. The consumer press has tended to describe the Cooley bill as a giveaway, and frequently it has been incorrectly described as a triple subsidy.

Should these skeptics find after passage of one-price cotton that the mills had pocketed a good portion of the domestic raw cotton subsidy, there might be an outcry which would be hard to put down. The harmful effect on future tariff and quota negotiations are easy to visualize, these sources warn.

Nevertheless, the argument is raised by many mill sources that the laws of supply and demand cannot be abrogated by one-price cotton. If a cloth is in strong demand at the time the new law goes into effect, weavers cannot be expected to reduce their prices automatically below the fair market value, according to this view.

One possible solution would be to make an automatic revision of the price list—taking into account leadtime and the waste factor—and then letting the market decide the rest. But the majority of sources believe that the new prices cannot be established in that manner, but will be individually thrashed out over a period of several weeks or more, once the one-price bill is approved.

Blends have benefited as a result of this hesitancy on cotton goods. The modified rayon and cotton broadcloths continue to be extremely tight. The 47-inch, 109-by-58's, 2.77-yard, have moved at 30½–31 cents in second hands, while the firsthand price for late second quarter is holding at 28½–29 cents.

Mice Cannot Move Mountains

SPEECH

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 13, the Washington Post published an editorial whch makes an outstanding contribution to the current dialogue on Latin American problems. Although the editorial properly commends the sincerity of our intentions, and the wisdom of our approach toward hemispheric development, it points out the hard truth that "the present scale and conception is only sufficient to raise hopes without providing the means to fulfill them." The economic realities cited in the editorial are harsh; but we must face them candidly. Glowing rhetoric may serve political expediency today, but it will not contribute to meaningful development in the future. Under unanimous consent, I insert the Post editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

WHO LOST LATIN AMERICA?

No one, of course, is asking this question on Friday, March 13, 1964. Three years ago today President Kennedy issued his call for an Alliance for Progress. Surely it is understandable that the stress is on the affirmative achievements of the Alliance. They have been many and creditable, and it is not our intention to belittle good works already ununderway.

It is our intention to point out, calmly, a few realities. For in 10 years, or perhaps even less, someone may well be asking, "Who lost Latin America?" The problem with the Alliance has not been lack of good intentions; it has been the tendency to claim too much for too little, to foster the impression that it is really big enough to channel the tide of change coursing through the hemisphere.

What exactly did Mr. Kennedy say on that momentous day 3 years ago? He called for a "vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose" to meet the "staggering" problems of Latin America. Specifically, he said:

"I propose that the American Republics begin on a vast 10-year plan for the Americas, a plan to transform the 1960's into a historic decade of democratic progress. These 10 years will be the years of maximum progress, maximum effort, the years when the greatest obstacles will be overcome, the years when the need for assistance will be greatest."

Those were the words, and while money is an inadequate measure of deeds, it does give some indication of priority placed on the Alliance in the United States. What is the record?

In fiscal 1962, $1.3 billion in total economic aid was committed to the hemisphere, roughly a 20-percent increase over expenditures of the previous year.

In fiscal 1963, the sum committed was $1.1 billion, an actual diminution in the total, while thus far in the fiscal year ending next June, roughly $500 million has been committed to the Alliance.

The best measure of the scale is a comparison with the Marshall plan, which in 6 years pumped $35 billion in economic and military aid into Europe. More money—$5.9 billion—was spent in economic aid the first year of the Marshall plan than in the entire 3 years of the Alliance.

Obviously, the comparison is not exact. Money could do more in Europe because human skills and political framework made it easier to absorb vast injections of capital. But this serves to underscore how much more difficult are the problems posed by the Alliance—and how inadequate are the resources already committed.

Thus it cannot be fairly said that the Alliance—in this period of maximum effort—has been unparalleled in magnitude. Moreover, the aid figures are deceptive, because they conceal the extent to which any net increment in outside aid in Latin America has been wiped out by dropping world commodity prices.

The hemisphere republics, like other underdeveloped regions, are getting less for the raw materials they produce, and are paying more for the manufactured goods they must buy. Between 1950 and 1961, there was a total inflow into Latin America of $23 billion in private and public capital. From this must be subtracted $13.4 billion in interest, profits and dividends that flowed out of Latin America. In addition, during the same period, the deterioration of terms of trade cost Latin America $10.1 billion—meaning that the region was a net loser to the tune of $500 million.

These figures were compiled by Dr. Raul Prebisch, the distinguished U.N. economist, who has organized the forthcoming conference on world trade at Geneva. It is the contention of Dr. Prebisch, and of other economists who have pondered these grim totals, that more than foreign aid is needed to spur development in countries trapped by adverse terms of trade.

If the Alliance aid is to be meaningful, obviously it must be accompanied by a more radical attack on the commodity problem. The matter is dauntingly complex, and we pretend to no facile solutions. Nor is money alone a magic solvent. As Mr. Kennedy made clear 3 years ago, social reform and economic planning are indispensable to the success of the Alliance; it would be unthinkable for the United States to squander capital in countries unwilling to take necessary self-help measures.

What we are saying is that the present scale and conception is only sufficient to raise hopes without providing the means to fulfill them. It may be that political realities in Congress place implacable restrictions on any expansion of foreign aid or on new approaches to world trade. So be it; but let the administration discuss the program as it is—and not as glowing rhetoric depicts it.

Latin America is the fastest growing region in the world in terms of population; it is riven by nationalist passions; it lies between a world that is dead, and a new world struggling to be born. The Alliance, at existing levels, does not provide the leverage for decisive change. If the United States continues at present levels in Alliance aid and fails to mount a fresh attack on problems of trade, we must be reconciled to the risks of continued turbulence in Latin America. Perhaps that is the inescapable pattern. But better to face the unpalatable truths than pretend that a mouse can move a mountain.

Active Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the March 15, 1964, edition of the New York Sunday Times carried a most informative and encouraging article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk about the establishment of a very fine rehabilitation center at Emanuel Hospital in Portland, Oreg.

The article is a fitting tribute to the dedication and ambition, displayed by the administrators and medical staff of the hospital. Under unanimous consent, I place this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ACTIVE REHABILITATION: PORTLAND'S EMANUEL HOSPITAL BLAZES TRAIL OF SERVICE IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Fifteen months ago on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, Portland's Emanuel Hospital opened a new five-story rehabilitation center.

In the short time since, this center has rapidly blazed a trail in the development of rehabilitation services in the Pacific Northwest.

The new million-dollar, 5-story center has a 48-bed inpatient service with all of the usual components of a rehabilitation center.

The key to the success of this program lies not so much in its services but in its philosophy, which is stated simply but clearly in its operating guide.

AIMS OUTLINED

It reads: "Patients in need of intensive and specialized services to insure a more complete and rapid recovery from illness and accident during the subacute and convalescent phases can be admitted and cared for by any member of the medical staff of Emanuel Hospital.

"Only patients who can benefit from or tolerate intensive therapy will be admitted and kept in the center. * * * It is not a rest or nursing home but a place for active treatment and evaluation.

"To assist in the complex and unfamiliar techniques of an integrated program, the Rehabilitation Committee will assist, without fee, any physician desiring help.

"Multiple evaluation, consultative and diagnostic services will be available to the treating physician to assist him in returning the patient to his optimum place in society."

TREND FOLLOWED WAR

Just as specialized centers for the care of particular diseases that require specialized personnel and facilities have been developed, there was a trend after World War II to develop specialized rehabilitation centers.

Here in Portland, the rehabilitation center of Emanuel Hospital is a good example of a community center that is a part of a hospital. Patients come here from the entire Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

Although these centers provide a valuable and much needed service, the more recent trend has been to develop programs as a part of general hospitals. This is important, for

general hospitals are basic in providing patient care.

It is also within general hospitals that rehabilitation services can be brought to the patient at the earliest possible time and the damaging physical, emotional, social and vocational sequelae of severe disability alleviated or minimized.

The rehabilitation center at Emanuel Hospital is conceived as a service both to the community and the practicing physician.

OVER 500 AT SEMINAR

Following that concept this last week it held as an educational service its second annual rehabilitation seminar, which was attended by over 500 physicians, therapists, psychologists, counselors and other rehabilitation personnel throughout the area.

Particularly encouraging in the development of services at Emanuel Hospital has been the community interest and support.

Shortly after the center opened, the Oregon Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation arranged for its clients to be provided outpatient services at the center.

A few months later the center started providing services for the Crippled Children's Division of the University of Oregon. Formerly many of these children had to be sent out of the State.

Now the Oregon Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the "Easter Seal" agency, and the hospital are developing a demonstration home-care project for discharged center patients.

The center has also had close cooperative relations with the Oregon Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

LEGISLATORS HELPFUL

Oregon is fortunate in the particularly keen interest of its Members of the Congress in rehabilitation. Senators MAURINE B. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE have been stanch supporters of increased rehabilitation services and Representative EDITH GREEN is chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education that handles legislation concerning rehabilitation in the House of Representatives.

Another Representative, AL ULLMAN, is himself an amputee.

Specialized independent rehabilitation centers serve a useful function in meeting the needs of the severely disabled patient.

Our Nation, however, will never have enough of these centers to meet the needs of all patients for rehabilitation services. Nor could we afford or staff such a network of centers.

If any broad attack is to be made on physical disability, we must have not only rehabilitation centers but rehabilitation services as an integral part of general hospital care.

Emanuel Hospital in Portland is an excellent example of this philosophy.

President Johnson's Program To Get More Women Into Positions of Authority in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release and speech by me:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, in a speech on the House floor today, endorsed President Lyndon Johnson's program to get more women into positions of authority in Government, stating that "every housewife in the United States knows she can go to the nearest market and purchase a 25-cent jar of peanut butter for a quarter. She also knows that if she shops at a supermarket, she may find that same 25-cent jar of peanut butter on sale for 23 cents. Such things are intuitive with most women, which is one of the many reasons why I have personally endorsed President Lyndon Johnson's program to get more women into positions of authority in Government."

WILSON urged that some of these women be appointed in military procurement agencies throughout the country and stated, "It doesn't take genius to purchase a 25-cent jar of peanut butter for a quarter, but you have to be an official procurement expert in the employ of the U.S. Army St. Louis Procurement District to be able to purchase a $11,507.90 helicopter armament M-6 subsystem for $21,494.42, especially in quantities of 100 or more."

WILSON bitterly attacked the Army St. Louis procurement district for handing a sole-source, noncompetitive contract to Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo., for more than $2,332,440, covering the second procurement of that equipment from the same firm at an average price of $21,494.42, when that same identical equipment could be purchased for $11,507.90 from Nortronics Marine Equipment Division Northrop Corp., Boston, Mass.

WILSON blamed the waste of more than $1 million on the Army contracting officer, Lt. Col. William O'Connor, "who paid approximately $21,500 for each of 120 systems that could have been purchased for about half as much money." WILSON added that "You don't have to be a procurement expert to see that Lieutenant Colonel O'Connor wasted about $1 million of a $2 million procurement, and you don't have to be a lawyer to know that he did this with impunity because everybody knows it is no crime to waste the taxpayers' money, although it ought to be," WILSON concluded.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EARL WILSON BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 18, 1964

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, every housewife in the United States knows she can go to the nearest market and purchase a 25-cent jar of peanut butter for a quarter. She also knows that if she shops at a supermarket, she may find that same 25-cent jar of peanut butter on sale for 23 cents. Such things are intuitive with most women, which is one of the many reasons why I have personally endorsed President Lyndon Johnson's program to get more women into positions of authority in Government. I sincerely hope that the President will appoint some of these women in areas of influence with jurisdiction over agencies in the Department of Defense which are charged with the responsibility of spending the taxpayers' money for military equipment. The St. Louis Procurement District of the U.S. Army could certainly use a housewife, at least on a consulting basis, and while that district does not purchase peanut butter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the public record some facts concerning the way they go about arming our helicopters.

In June 1963, Lt. Col. William S. O'Connor, contracting officer, U.S. Army, St. Louis, Mo., handed a sole-source, noncompetitive contract identified by number as DA-23-072-AMC-117(W) to Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., 8100 West Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. This contract was originally for a total of $2,332,440 and covered 120 units of a Helicopter Armaments Subsystem called the M-6. The total contract price was subsequently increased to $2,579,331, making an average system cost of $21,494.42. It should be pointed out that this was the second of such contracts for this equipment with Emerson, giving the Army ample opportunity to review the cost factors involved. It is conclusive, therefore, that the price of $21,494.42 was not established in ignorance nor agreed to by Colonel O'Connor blindly.

Subsequent requirements for the M-6 Arming Subsystem could not be justified without competition for three times in a row to the same source of supply, so a competitive transaction was conducted under Invitation for Bid No. AMC(W)-11-199-64-8, and on Monday, March 9, 1964, bids for 234 systems were opened in public. It should be noted that the only difference between this procurement and the earlier contract was the insertion of the dynamic force of competition.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I request unanimous consent to insert the tabulation of bids recorded under Invitation AMC(W)-11-199-64-8 at the Rock Island Arsenal on March 9, 1964, which, I would like to state, came into my possession through unofficial sources since my request for this information from official channels was ignored by the commanding officer of the U.S. Army Weapons Command, Rock Island, Ill.:

Unit price, 234 systems	
Name of firms bidding IFB AMC (W)-11-199-64-8, March 9, 1964:	
Nortronics Marine Equipment Department, Boston, Mass., ¼%-20 days, bid plus $286,-270 final inspection equipment, and $53,475 special tooling, making a total bid $2,692,849—or an average price of $11,507.90	$10,056.00
American Machine & Foundry, York, Pa., net bid plus $525,-091 final inspection equipment and $137,272 special tooling, making total bid $2-962,583 here and an average unit price per system of $12,660.61	9,830.00
Sperry Utah, net, bid +$259,-447 and $104,330; total $2,-997,915; average $12,811.60	11,257.00
Schaevitz Engineering, Pennsauken, N.J., +$547,895; +$159,220; total $3,481,887	11,858.00
Avco Corp., Ordnance Division, Richmond, Ind., net, +$402,-445; +$182,955.70	12,752.88
Lear Siegler, Inc., net, +$348,-562.19, +$174,628.38; total $3,670,492.67; average $15,-685.86	13,450.00
A-C Spark Plug Division, General Motors, net, +$351,400, and $290,000	14,300.00
Kollsman Instrument Corp., Elmhurst, N.Y, net, +$413,-938; +$107,352	14,313.00
Emerson Electric, St. Louis, net, bid plus $255,452 final inspection equipment, plus $46,520 special tooling making total bid $3,818,524—average system at $16,318.47	15,028.00

Other bids: Martin Marietta $15,390; Bosh Arma $15,489; Tokheim $21,542.96; and Fairchild $22,745.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take an electronics engineer to understand that Lt. Col. William O'Connor paid approximately $21,500 each for 120 systems that could have been purchased for about half as much money. You don't have to be a procurement expert to see that Lieutenant Colonel O'Connor wasted about $1 million of a $2 million procurement, and you don't have to be a lawyer to know that he did this with impunity because everybody knows it is no crime to waste the taxpayers' money, although it ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take genius to purchase a 25-cent jar of peanut butter for a quarter, but you have to be an official procurement expert in the employ of the U.S. Army St. Louis Procurement District to be able to purchase a $11,507.90 helicopter armament M-6 subsystem for $21,494.42, especially in quantities of 100 or more.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say is that this is all water over the dam, that what money was wasted is gone, and there is no point in indulging in recriminations; however, I would like to look forward to an improved procurement situation in the various departments of the many branches of the military.

I would like to add that the Department of the Army should look to future requirements for equipment as complex as the M-6 subsystem and make sure that competitive bids are received from Nortronics, AMF, Sperry Utah, Schaevitz, Avco, and the others. The commanding officer that fails to do so should be impeached.

Rights Has Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Coffeyville, Kans., Daily Journal, speaks for itself. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD for the benefit of interested Members of Congress:

RIGHTS HAS LIMITS

The Topeka chapter of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People wants the city to include an equal accommodation clause in a proposed ordinance that would license private clubs.

Samuel C. Jackson, president of the chapter, said licensing private clubs without insuring equal accommodations would amount to official sanctioning of discrimination by the city.

"Most all of the private clubs refuse to allow Negroes and Mexican-Americans to be members," Jackson said.

Jackson said when Negroes attempt to join private clubs their names are sent to nonexistent committees and then are never recommended for membership.

For several weeks the city has been considering an ordinance which would license private clubs and permit police inspection and screening of club memberships.

Jackson is concerned only with those private clubs that would receive licenses from the city. The license is the key factor, he said.

He said many establishments become private in order to circumvent the State civil rights laws. If the city then gave a license to these clubs it would be like sanctioning discrimination, Jackson said.

Actually, these clubs become private to circumvent the liquor laws, and civil rights is a side issue.

The Negro is entitled to equal rights in public places, and his rights are insured by Kansas law.

But to extend equal rights to private club membership would be the same as requiring all private homes to remove the locks from their front doors.

If a private club is opened to everyone, it no longer is a private club.

The city should assume no control over membership except that of making sure that members are paid up and that all records are in order.

Being a Negro does not qualify a person for membership in a private club any more than being a parachute jumper does.

It would be morally right for membership committees to consider Negroes for membership on personal qualities, disregarding color of skin, but being required by law to admit certain people is a miscarriage of justice.

NATO: A Scrap of Paper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance is said to be in disarray. A more appropriate and accurate term would be anarchy. The low estate to which this once effective force for freedom has sunk is well described by Constantine Brown in the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of last Saturday:

NATO: A SCRAP OF PAPER? WEAKENED TIES BLAMED ON OUR EFFORTS TO ATTAIN UNITED STATES-SOVIET UNDERSTANDING

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—Americans in Europe who are uncommitted to Washington's harum-scarum policies exclaim sadly, "How alone we are now."

Despite assurances of American officialdom that the present misunderstandings with our European allies are temporary, the NATO Alliance has been reduced, in fact, to a scrap of paper.

The best example is the confused attempt of Washington officials to indicate that we mean to show strength in South Vietnam. Of all our 15 NATO allies whose slogan at one time was "all for one and one for all," Britain alone seems agreed to give us a modicum of moral support. All others are saying politely or bluntly, "include us out."

The New York Times published a story, apparently from its usually reliable Washington sources, that Italy would endorse a policy of strength in Vietnam. Within hours the Italian Government issued an unequivocal denial saying this country had not committed itself to any kind of support. Italy's foreign policies, it was emphatically stated, are for peace and peaceful solutions of all world problems. This should have been clear even to those Washington policymakers who wear rose-tinted spectacles. For, only a week earlier, it was announced that the American nuclear submarines in the Mediterranean would be based in Spain because political conditions in Italy did not permit them to be stationed in an Italian port.

Why this change in our complicated system of alliances? What has happened in the last few years to justify their weakening? Is the threat of Communist imperialism receding? Definitely not.

While Mr. Khrushchev may whisper instead of shouting threats there is no sign that he is modifying Communist goals. He momentarily softened his harassments on the Berlin autobahn, but at the same time he stepped up his efforts in the Mediterranean and east Africa. It will be a miracle if within the year Cyprus—as important a base in the Mediterranean as Cuba is in the Caribbean and Latin America—does not go into his corner. The Communists in the strife-torn island shouted "long live Russia" when the first Russian commercial plane landed near Nicosia and they have been throwing stones and bombs at the American Embassy. Yet, our inmixture in the island's affairs has been confined to providing some $40 million in economic assistance.

The main reason for the loosening of the Atlantic alliance is our often unilateral dealings with the Kremlin to bring about an American-Soviet political understanding despite the evidence that communism is in no way different from nazism.

The NATO was created at a high expense to the American and allied taxpayer to contain the Red tide. When it becomes obvious that this is no longer the objective of the American Government, the reason for the continuation of the 20th century holy alliance ceases to exist. We go out of our way to bail Russia out of a difficult economic crisis by selling her $300 million worth of grains. At the same time we protest vigorously when the British, French, and Spaniards, and in fact all other West Europeans, sell buses, tractors, food, and fishing vessels to Cuba. The NATO members pay no heed to our protests because they see no logic in our actions.

They initiate important economic deals with Moscow and Peiping because they feel that Washington's policies directed toward accommodation may leave them in the cold. They fear that they may have to face an eventual American-Russian alliance. This was the underlying motive of De Gaulle's recognition of Peiping, a recognition, tacitly approved by most of our allies. This also has prompted the big corporations of the Common Market countries and Britain to negotiate the sale of heavy industrial plants to Russia.

The main criticism directed at the United States, however, is that there no longer exists a cohesive foreign policy.

Experienced politicians understand that in an election year, the incumbent of the White House must wet his finger every morning to find out the direction of the ever-changing electoral winds. But it is a dangerous game to play domestic politics with international affairs.

The quality of America's foreign policy has suffered much in the last few years. The most frequent example mentioned these days is our policy in Vietnam. It is recalled that when President Truman decided to intervene in Korea he did it suddenly and obtained support from the allies after orders had been issued to General MacArthur to move in and support the South Koreans. This is being contrasted with the present vacillations and leaks to the press of the present administration.

After Deadline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare gift to be able to express humor in a serious vein. The immortal Will Rogers had such a talent. Miss Joan George, of the Caney (Kans.) Chronicle occasionally writes in this manner. Miss George is not only a woman having humor, but she is gifted with insight as well; it is apparent that she has seen through the political cloak of the recent tax cut. Under unanimous consent, Mr.

Speaker, I include Joan George's column entitled 'After Deadline" in the RECORD:

The office bookkeeper tells me that the tax cut means each worker here is going to have an average $2.30 extra to take home each week. That means our staff is going to have $30 each week to pump into the national economy.

Well, lucky me.

That extra $2.30 is good news, but at the same time it presents problems. The President says that we "little people" with our extra dollars are now masters of the economic fate of the Nation. This makes my $2.30 seem almost like a sacred trust.

Congressman JOE SKUBITZ says the tax cut, when analyzed "reminds one of a woman who forcibly squeezes herself into her Playtex girdle instead of dieting * * * a sylphlike figure may appear, but the fat is still there."

The Congressman's example is filled with truth, but it disturbs me. I had seriously thought of blowing a portion of my first tax-cut bonus on a chocolate ice cream soda.

If I can't enjoy my $2.30 without a guilty conscience, Mr. President and Mr. Congressman, I'm not even sure I want it.

A Success in the Foreign Aid Program—The University of Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the University of Nigeria will celebrate the graduation of its second class this June. Part of the funds that support the development of this university come from the U.S. AID program.

Nigeria covers an area of 356,669 square miles. The 1964 census shows a population of 55,653,000. Basically it is an agricultural country, with tropical rain and swamp forests and a high interior plateau. The per capita income is $84 per year.

As Nigeria moved from colonial status, through self-government, and finally to independence, government officials became aware of the deplorable rate of illiteracy which was prevalent throughout the state. A census taken in 1958 revealed that illiteracy rates varied from 43 percent of the population over 10 years of age in the Federal Territory of Lagos to 89 percent of those over 14 years of age in the northern region and 53 percent in the western region. The greatest deficiency was found to be a lack of trained personnel to instruct the uneducated. To alleviate this situation, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Nigeria worked closely together to establish a higher education system which would provide personnel, not only for staffing schools, but also for the government civil service and private business. One such projeet undertaken was for the creation of the University of Nigeria at Nsukka.

In fiscal year 1960, the International Cooperation Administration signed a contract with Michigan State University to provide advisers for the proposed university. That same year these advisers began to lay the foundation for the total organization and development of the school. When the University opened its doors in October 1960, there was a faculty of 13, 1 classroom, 36 senior staff houses, and 1 double hostel block to accommodate the 220 students. Today, the campus has more than 40 buildings, constructed by the Nigerian Government, to accommodate the 1800 students and 248 teachers and staff members.

By the time the program ends, AID contributions will amount to $11 million. Most of the aid is provided through contracts with Michigan State for advisers and teachers. Funds have also been made available for demonstration agricultural equipment, vehicles, books, teaching aids and materials, and the participant program, which enables promising young members of the university staff to be sent to the United States for advanced studies. Thirteen are now participating in the program while three have completed their courses and have returned to Nigeria: One, as registrar of the university; the others, as teachers of music and political science.

From the first graduating class of June 1963, 35 pursued teaching careers, 29 entered the civil service, 10 joined Nigerian college staffs, 9 assumed positions with private businesses, 5 entered the military service, and 18 continued postgraduate studies. By these figures, it may be readily agreed that the program is a "success"; for the graduates have and will become the cadre for the present and future development of Nigeria.

President Lyndon B. Johnson Addresses the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in the 180-year history of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick four Presidents of the United States have addressed our annual meeting.

As a member of the society I was privileged to be present at our annual dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on March 17 when President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed us. The President's address was received with resounding acclaim and I am pleased to commend it to the attention of my distinguished colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 17, 1964

Mr. Moran, Your Eminence, reverend clergy, Deputy Mayor Cavanagh, my old and dear friend Jim Farley, my fellow Americans: I woke up this morning and suddenly realized that the Irish have taken over the Government, and I like it. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is a distinguished Irishman from Boston named JOHN MCCORMACK. The very effective majority leader of the United States is an Irishman from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD. And wherever I turn all day long there are Kenny O'Donnell and Larry O'Brien, and Dave Powers and Dick McGuire, and John Bailey and George Reedy and Ralph Dungan, the White House Chapter of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

I am convinced that the English claim a prior excellence in the parliamentary system. There is no doubt in my mind that nothing could have been started until the Irish invented politics. So, my good friends, I greet you tonight not only as President of the United States, but as an Irishman by osmosis.

This is supposed to be a nonpartisan gathering, so I won't mention the fact that the Democratic Party is peaceful these days. As a matter of fact, it is so peaceful, the Irish may move to the Republican Party where the feuding is really going on.

Some of you may be old enough to remember the classic story that President Roosevelt used to tell back in 1938. It involved two feuding Irish societies whose principal goal in life was to hold parades and to break up each other's parades. The prime instrument of the parade in those days was a big bass drum. By sheer good fortune, one of the societies acquired a beautiful new drum, bigger and better than anything that they had ever seen, even in old Ireland. It came time for the poverty stricken group to hold its parade. Now, Irishmen are generous, and they expect generosity from each other, so the leader of the poor society went to his wealthier brethren and asked for the loan of the great big drum. He was told that he could have it on one condition. "Now, listen, Mike, you are welcome to the drum, but it cost us a lot of money and we could never replace it. So we are lending it to you on your personal honor that you take it out of the parade before you reach the corner of O'Connell Street because that is where we will be laying for you." There must be more O'Connell Streets in New Hampshire than there are in Dublin.

It always makes me a bit wary to be the last speaker on any program. Even the most attentive can get a bit weary. I remember once back in my home country a preacher was vexed because one of his congregation always went to sleep during the midst of his sermon. One Sunday while he was giving the Devil fits, sure enough his worshiper was sleeping in the front row. The preacher determined he would fix this character once and for all. He asked the congregation, "All who want to go to Heaven, please rise." As one man, they all got to their feet except the front row dozer. He kept snoring on. Then the preacher shouted at the top of his voice, "All those who want to be with the Devil, please rise." The sleepyhead came awake with a start. He jumped to his feet. He saw the preacher standing tall and angry in the pulpit, and he said, "Well, Preacher, I don't know what it is we are voting on, but it looks like you and me are the only ones for it."

It has been some years since Oscar Wilde observed that the idea that America is a young Nation is, indeed, our oldest tradition. We have built strongly and we have preserved wisely. Most of all, we have protected intact the same constitutional government for almost 2 centuries. We are one of the youngest nations in the world, with one of the oldest governments in the world. So it is an uncommon distinction for me to speak to an assembly that was organized before the American Constitution was even written. If I am correctly informed, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick chose for its first president in 1784 a very fine Presbyterian gentleman. Perhaps that accounts no less for your longevity than it does for your prosperity. But the observance of St. Patrick's Day is as old in America as the Irish themselves and some say that

they actually arrived in the sixth century. Although St. Patrick's Day owes its origin to Irish history, it has always seemed to me one in which America served in a great sense. The Irish came to America because America was the land of hope, the land of freedom, and the land of opportunity. They came in strange and unfamiliar vessels to leave a land that they loved and to brave a hazardous journey over a vast and stormy ocean, but they had a dream, a dream of freedom and dignity, a dream that a chance for a man to be a man and to maintain his family with pride, and this dream carried them through every hardship and through every disappointment.

Boston might not be Londonderry, and the Hudson might not be the River Shannon, but here a man could hold his head as high as any other, and worship his God as he chose, without ever accounting to a soldier with a bayonet, and there was opportunity, abundant opportunity for people of brave courage and people of boundless optimism, and even though very few of my ancestors ever walked by the shores of Killarney or heard the lilt of the Irish pipes, I, too, feel very much a part of this day because this is the kind of land that I want and the kind of a land I want to leave for my children.

This is why my ancesters crossed the seas and the mountains and the endless arrid plains. This is why every American regardless of his creed can bow his head in a moment of reverence on St. Patrick's Day.

In the days that have passed since I assumed this office on a day that will live in cruel tragedy, I have found our Nation's greatest strength lies in the dream of America—America the land of hope, America the land of opportunity.

All the slings and arrows of our opponents in the world have never succeeded in destroying that image. Whenever and wherever we are cursed, it is basically because the people have been misled into believing that we have strayed somehow from our dream.

To me, nothing is more important than to maintain this as a land of compassion where the sick of body can find assistance and the sick of heart can always find hope. All of our proposals and programs and all of our actions both at home and abroad must measure up to that ideal; and, when we talk of American ideals, our thoughts must be tonight of President Kennedy.

Three months ago, I had the saddest possible honor to confer on him posthumously, along with another great John, Pope John XXIII, the highest civil honor ever awarded by the President of the United States. I would like to read you tonight just a portion of the citation which I read on that occasion:

"John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, soldier and scholar and statesman and defender of freedom and pioneer for peace and author of hope, combining courage with reason and combating hate with compassion, he led the land he loved toward new frontiers of new opportunity."

John Kennedy was not the first Irishman to die in the cause of freedom, and he will not be the last. So I say to you tonight, let us never depart from the American ideal, the kind of America we want, the kind of America that John Kennedy wanted us to have:

An America that is renowned not so much for its might, but as it is for its morality; an America that is seeking justice at home and seeking peace with all nations; an America that is committed always to the force of law instead of to the law of force; an America proud of its unity, but ashamed of attempts at uniformity; an America that would remember the weak and the unfortunate; an America that would regard the existence of poverty as a challenge to be actively overcome and to do something about, instead of a social problem to be passively and privately endured; an America where the humblest citizen can speak his piece and write his thoughts and worship his God without the heavy hand of bias or government barring his purpose, or his hearing a knock on the bedroom door at midnight; an America that is both prudent and progressive, that is both frugal and courageous; an America that is eager to redeem its promissory notes of equal citizenship, ashamed that they are so long overdue, and determined that never again will they be discounted or denied in the treasury of the American conscience; an America that would always remember that in a world of power politics, smaller nations can often have the power of ideas; an America that would want the assistance of allies, but never the support of satellites; an America that would use its strength to increase hopes of peace, never using the language of arrogance to others nor whispering the language of fear to itself.

It would be an America that would set the healing and the reconciliation of nations far above all other prices; an America that is powerful without a trace of belligerence; an America that is faithful to its own national ideals without ever trying to be a moral censor to other nations; an America whose strength would save us from defeat and whose wisdom would protect us from appeasement, whose justice would save us from failure in the high enterprises of democracy where compassion is an example for the other 119 nations in the world; an America whose leadership would save us from disenchantment in the search for a just and an enduring peace.

Our exertions can make America an example of the rightness of our cause and bring its promise of peace some day to all the world. So in this spirit and in honor of all who share it, in memory of those who died for it, I am honored and proud to come tonight to extend to you the greetings of this day. As I bid you goodnight, I offer you this ancient Gaelic toast:

"May the road ever rise to meet you,
May the wind ever be at your back.
May you safely be in heaven at least one hour before the devil knows you're gone;
And may the good Lord always hold you in the hollow of his hand."

A Profit Margin Pinch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the excessive emphasis on the increasing level of corporate profits, which is indulged in by the administration as well as others, obscures the fact that the profit squeeze is still very much with us. In the first place, the gain of aggregate corporate profits over the past decade has been drastically less than the growth in other measures of economic activity. Aftertax corporate profits in the fourth quarter of 1963 were only 3 percent above the rate of mid-1959.

In addition, there has been an overall slippage of profit margins since the early postwar years. In the late 1940's, the annual average for all manufacturing ran at from 6 to 7 percent of sales. It was around 5.5 percent in the mid-1950's and has been under 5 percent in 16 of the past 17 quarters for which figures are available. For the third quarter of 1963, it was 4.6 percent.

In addition, the profits as a percentage of stockholders' equity, while improving, are still below their pre-1957 level. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1964, discussing the profit squeeze be included in the RECORD at this point:

PROFIT MARGIN PINCH: MANY FIRMS EARN LESS PER DOLLAR OF SALES AS TOTAL PROFITS INCREASE—EXECUTIVES SAY COMPETITION, OVERCAPACITY HOLD DOWN PRICES WHILE COSTS SOAR—DEPRECIATION'S ROLE DISPUTED

"Profit margins aren't keeping up because the customer won't stand for it" snaps a St. Petersburg, Fla., jeweler.

United States Steel Corp.'s profit margin—its profit as a percentage of sales—last year was a third less than in 1958 "and that was called a recession year," says Chairman Roger M. Blough.

Adds a banker in Los Angeles: "It seems companies have to operate 20 percent better than they did 2 years ago just to hold profits even."

These complaints pinpoint a pervasive fact of business life today: It's not so easy to make a dollar of net profit as the boom-time atmosphere suggests.

Profits in the aggregate are up sharply from the recent past. But their gain over the past decade has been drastically less than the growth in other measures of economic activity. And profit margins though they have crept up a bit in the past year generally are much thinner than in the fat days of earlier postwar years.

LONG-TERM GROWTH SLOW

Aftertax profits of all the Nation's corporations have spurted in the present recovery from a $19 billion annual rate in early 1961 to a record pace estimated at $27.5 billion in the 1963 fourth quarter. But this is only 3 percent above the $26.6 billion rate of mid-1959 and 10 percent above the best rate achieved in the mid-1950's.

The table below shows the gain in gross national product (total output of goods and services), personal income and aftertax profits since 1955. The figures in both 1955 and 1963 are annual rates for the fourth quarter in billions. The 1963 profit figure is estimated.

	1955	1963	Up
			Percent
Gross national product	$408.0	$600.0	46
Personal income	319.0	473.0	48
Corporate profits	24.9	27.5	10

While profits have labored up, manufacturers' sales have jumped 31 percent, to $417 billion last year from $317.8 billion in 1955.

Despite some ups and downs, there has been an overall slippage of profit margins since the early postwar years. In the lush days of the late 1940's, the average margin for all manufacturers ran at 6 to 7 percent of sales. In the mid-1950's, the average was around 5.5 percent. It's been under 5 percent in 16 of the past 17 quarters for which figures are available. And the latest figure calculated, for the third 1963 quarter, was 4.6 percent, up very little from 4.4 percent a year earlier.

For many retailers, the ratio is much lower, running all the way down to the thin penny or so the supermarket chains earn on each dollar going through the checkout counter. This is about half their average return in the early 1950's.

DEPRECIATION DISPUTE

What's causing this trend? Many stock-market analysts place great emphasis on the fact that corporations in 1963 deducted $32.4 billion from reported profits to cover depreciation; that is, wear and tear on plant and equipment, against only $18.4 billion in 1955. Thus, they contend the decline in profit margins is not as bad as it looks. Larger depreciation deductions, they say, can free a company to pay out more of its reported profit in dividends, instead of reinvesting these funds in the business.

But businessmen vehemently disagree. They view depreciation as a genuine cost. Companies, they say, don't simply pocket the sums they write off for depreciation but spend them to replace plant and equipment, which must be done and is often very costly since many types of machinery cost far more than they used to. By allowing them to deduct larger sums for depreciation, they say, the Government permits them to present a true picture of what happens to profit.

The prime pressures on profits stressed by company after company surveyed across the country, are intense and increasing competition, rising costs, and the persistent inability of many industries to boost prices.

Blaw-Knox Co., builder of industrial equipment, earned 1.7 cents on each dollar of sales last year, down from 4.1 cents both 5 and 10 years ago. The major cause, top officials say, is "the unsatisfactory relationship between costs and prices." They say gains in wages, pension costs and social security benefits since 1958 now add the equivalent of $2.38 a share of common stock a year to company costs, without benefit of compensating price adjustment. The company's net last year was $1.64 a share, down from $3.84 a share in 1958.

WESTINGHOUSE'S EXPERIENCE

Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s profit margin in 1963 dropped to 2.2 percent, half what it was 10 years earlier. Donald C. Burnham, president blames severely depressed prices on products shipped to electric utilities, and continuing low prices for consumer products.

Little businesses tell the same story.

Laments Michael Taffet, proprietor of Braverman Bros., an appliance store on Los Angeles' Wilshire Boulevard, "No matter how big you are or how long you've been in business, the only thing that counts now is how much you charge. Profits have been cut to almost nothing."

Mr. Taffet contends constant advertising of prices has "made everyone price conscious." He recently removed all price tags from merchandise he displays. "Then when people ask for the price, I can talk to them and sell them our reliability and reputation."

Selling prices of appliances, particularly television sets, have gone down markedly in recent years. A spokesman for Ford Motor Co.'s Philco Division says these "competitive pressures in the marketplace" have left margins "substantially tighter" than in the 1950's.

Another appliance firm official, noting the rising costs and slipping prices, sees "a whale of an explosion coming." He adds: "When the dust clears, some people aren't going to be around."

Overcapacity, which plagues many an industry, is a large factor barring price relief for sagging profits.

Cement makers, whose prices have been slipping because of overcapacity, provide a vivid illustration. Alpha Portland Cement Co. earned 5.5 cents on each sales dollar last year, against a whopping 17.9 cents in 1959 and 10 cents a decade ago. Lehigh Portland Cement Co.'s margin was 4.9 percent last year, against 12.5 percent in 1953.

A Medusa Portland Cement Co. official notes the impact of competition. Last year, he says, the company invested $1.5 million in service facilities, such as distribution stations, just to retain some established customers. "This is a major capital investment that doesn't increase sales, but is still necessary," he says.

EQUIPMENT MAKER SUFFERS

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., maker of heavy capital equipment, has suffered from excess capacity in many industries, its executives say. The company's profit margin, 5.3 percent of sales in 1954, has barely topped 1 percent since 1961. They add that efforts by equipment makers to obtain greater sales have brought general price deterioration.

Steel industry profit margins turned up last year to 5.4 percent from a 17-year low of 4.1 percent in 1962. But the 1963 figure was below the 6.4 percent of 1958, 7.9 percent of 1955 and 8 percent of 1950.

United States Steel's 1963 margin was 5.6 percent, up from 4.7 percent in 1962, but down substantially from 8.7 percent in 1958. Says Chairman Blough: "Since 1958, the cost-price relationship has deteriorated, and that's true after credit is given to the increase in cost savings and even true after the recent price increases." Depreciation deductions also have risen especially sharply for steel companies.

Auto makers, one of the steel industry's biggest customers, show a mixed picture. Ford's profit on sales was 5.7 percent last year. Its margin has slipped steadily since the 7.4 percent of 1959. Ford officials say wage costs, including fringe benefits, have risen 23 percent since 1958 while car prices have held steady.

UNION'S CONTENTION

The United Auto Workers contends Ford's unit labor costs have decreased since 1958 because of rising productivity.

Of course Ford's net income, like that of many other companies, has continued to increase over the years despite the dwindling return on sales. Ford last year earned a record $488.5 million, or $4.42 a share, up 7 percent from $454.2 million, or $4.25 a share, in 1955. Sales, however, climbed 31 percent, from $6.6 billion in 1955 to $8.7 billion last year.

Chrysler Corp.'s profit margin was 4.6 percent last year after being considerably lower through much of the prior 10 years. General Motors Corp. has consistently earned much more on the dollar—9.7 percent last year, 9.6 percent in 1955, for example.

Some other companies run counter to the trend, too. Many drug and chemical firms' profit ratios have remained strong. Dow Chemical Co., says earnings have risen 70 percent in the past 5 years while sales are up 45 percent.

And G. D. Searle & Co., which includes the birth control pill Enovid among its products, earned around 17 percent on sales through much of the 1950's. In 1960 the margin climbed to 20 percent and last year to a thumping 26 percent.

For sharp contrast, consider supermarkets. Acme Marekts, Inc., of Philadelphia showed a margin of 1.16 percent for the 39 weeks to December 28, down from 1.22 percent a year earlier. Paul J. Cupp, chairman and president, ascribes the slide to "competitive pressures and rising costs."

Competition is heightened, he observes, because the relatively low capital requirements of the retail food field make it easy to open new stores.

A leading Northern California supermarket chain's margin was 0.48 percent in 1962, or less than half a cent on each dollar of sales, following a persistent drop from 1.38 percent in 1955.

COSTLY REFRIGERATORS

A company official terms the rising cost involved in stocking many food products, such as the expanding frozen food lines, a major factor. Refrigeration units cost $250 a lineal foot, he notes, against $10 a lineal foot for plain shelves. And other costs are substantially more.

Variety stores chains, another high-volume industry, show a similar pattern. S. S. Kresge Co. sales soared from $295 million in 1950 to over $500 million last year. But profit margins narrowed from 6.4 percent in 1950 to 2.6 percent in 1960 to about 2 percent in 1963.

A few years ago, comments an official, the pressure was on expenses, such as wages. Kresge "got that under control by using such devices as checkout counters," he says, but now competition is exerting downward pressure on prices.

The range of rising costs is broad. Daisy Manufacturing Co., maker of air rifles and fishing equipment, moved from Michigan to Rogers, Ark., in 1958, "primarily to reduce labor costs," says Anson Beaver, vice president. The company immediately had a saving of $1 an hour in average wage rates with the $1.25 Arkansas scale. But now they are back up to $1.70 an hour and "our profit is about 4 percent of sales, against 7 to 8 percent a decade ago."

Many smaller companies bend under the burden of fighting the industry giants. While major oil companies are pushing profits higher, "many independent refiners are in the red," asserts M. H. Robineau, president of Frontier Refining Co.

Julius C. Livingston, president of Tulsa's Livingston Oil Co., which had $4.9 million in revenues last year, says competing with major concerns for manpower costs more than just higher salaries and fringe benefits. "It means we have to send our men by plane and keep them in the best hotels."

Some cost increases strike particularly hard at certain companies or industries. Waldorf System, Inc., operator of 84 restaurants in the East, bemoans "our inability to recover, in increased selling prices, the higher costs resulting from higher minimum wages."

The company had deficits in 1962 and 1963, in contrast to net profit of $386,102 in 1958. Since State minimum wage laws began to apply to restaurants about 5 years ago, "we've been hit with at least one and sometimes two increases a year. Our lowest minimum wage outside of Florida is $1.15 an hour, about 80 percent higher than 5 years ago," an official says.

Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find the enclosed correspondence of considerable interest. I applaud the forthrightness with which Col. Floyd Oles approaches the subject of congressional service in the military Reserve components. I am particularly impressed with his letter to the editor of the Washington Post which failed to appear in print because it is not in keeping with the editors' own philosophy.

I submit this correspondence for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 1, 1964.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of today entitled "Senator-Generals," is critical of Members of Congress who hold commission in the

Reserves of the Armed Forces, and claims that this conduct is in violation of the provision of the U.S. Constitution which provides, as you quote, that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House of Congress) during his continuance in office."

You follow this with a query which reads: "Is not a Reserve commission an 'office under the United States'?"

Assuming that this query is honestly made, and not merely rhetoric, I am glad to supply the information and the reply, which is definitely in the negative. It has been repeatedly held by the courts that the holding of a commission in the Reserve is not an office under the United States so long as the person so honored is not on active duty. This is of course based on the law known as the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the pertinent portion of which says: "No existing law shall be construed to prevent any member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces from accepting employment in any civil branch of the public service, etc."

Further, title V, United States Code, section 30R(c) has a parallel provision, the pertinent portion of which reads as follows:

"Any Reserve or member of the National Guard may accept any civilian position under the United States or the District of Columbia and may receive the pay incident thereto in addition to pay and allowances as a Reserve or member of the National Guard. Membership in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces or in the National Guard does not prevent a person from practicing his civilian profession or occupation before, or in connection with, any department of the United States."

This makes it clear that your quarrel, as expressed in your editorial, is not with the Members of the Congress, but with the law as it now stands, and with the express provisions of the United States Code. Before you launch into that crusade, however, I suggest that you have in mind that any "conflict of interest" thus alleged would apply with equal force to lawyers, doctors, or other professional or businessmen who are Members of Congress; perhaps with especial force to farmers, members or officers of labor unions, and those professionally engaged in such activities as civil rights, tariff revision, taxation accounting, or almost numberless other pursuits.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD OLES,
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S.A.R. (Retired).

A Business Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD the following editorial written by Mr. Rex Woods of the Arkansas City Daily Traveler. Mr. Woods has, in a few short paragraphs, formulated a thought that deserves the attention of those who voted for the administration's Federal pay raise bill.

A BUSINESS DEAL

Here we go again.

The House Rules Committee has cleared the way for U.S. Representatives to vote on a juicy pay increase of $545 million that will go to 1,700,000 Federal workers.

Members of Congress, who have final say on the bill, would get a raise of $10,000 a year. That would bring their salary to $32,500 a year.

A big pay raise sounds logical in view of the recent tax cut. If less money is coming into the U.S. Treasury certainly Government should pay higher wages. That is Government logic.

The people should be reasonable about this proposition. The taxpayer is aware that if a Congressman is paid a good salary better candidates will seek the office. (They will if the party machine gives them the go-ahead.)

A healthy pay raise may be deserved by Congressmen and we are going to go on record favoring the increase with one string attached. If the Congressmen will collect the $9,149,859,301 owed to the United States by Great Britain since World War I we'll agree to their salary hike.

That amount would cover the extra expense for a good many years. When that chunk of money had been used up they could move in on France and then Italy.

Congress goes along appropriating funds to make loans to all foreign nations, but it never collects the interest or principal. A business firm that didn't collect its bills wouldn't be giving pay hikes left and right and paying dividends to the stockholders. Let's make businessmen of our Congressmen.

Knights of Pythias Centennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1964, at the New York Hilton in New York City, the Knights of Pythias, Domain of New York, began the official observance of its 100th anniversary with a dinner attended by most of New York officialdom. Dr. Max Schenk, rabbi of Congregation Shaari Zedeck of Brooklyn and president of the New York Board of Rabbis, delivered a beautiful invocation.

Upon this momentous occasion, those Pythians gathered there in brotherhood and friendship, were honored with the following greetings from President Johnson:

GREETINGS FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

On the memorable occasion of your 100th anniversary, I am pleased to extend warm greetings to the members of the Knights of Pythias.

I commend you on your dedicated service to your communities and your Nation. Your fraternity, the first to be chartered by the Congress of the United States, has throughout the years rendered valuable assistance to public charities. Your members have through the welfare projects which you sponsor contributed to the spiritual and material betterment of our society.

I applaud your past achievements, and I hope that your future will be equally productive.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mayor Wagner delivered the following ing address before presenting a copy of his centennial proclamation to Grand Chancellor Neil M. Lieblich:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

It is a great pleasure for me to share this milestone in your history—not only as mayor of this city, but also as chairman of the honorary sponsoring committee for the Centennial celebration of your founding.

In a very real sense, the history of the Knights of Pythias for the past hundred years has been inextricably intertwined with the history of New York City. Your order has given us distinguished public servants; and your activities have supported many of the public and private charities in our city.

Although the Knights of Pythias was founded in Washington, D.C., we in New York State can claim your guiding spirit, Justus H. Rathbone as a native son. Born in Oneida County, he was the founder of the Pythian Order. Since that day in May 1868, when Justus Rathbone first met with Dr. Abram G. Levy, our city has changed greatly. Who among the 13 men, meeting in May of that year to organize the first New York lodge, could have envisioned the New York City of today. And yet these founding fathers must have had a premonition of the complex growth of our city. Their principles of friendship, charity, and benevolence have guided the Knights of Pythias through the years, and have been the touchstone for ethical leadership.

The Knights of Pythias have been in the vanguard of ethical leadership in our Nation, our State, and our city. You began by extending helping hands to the immigrants who crowded our shores at the turn of the century. You helped them to understand their strange new land, and you helped this land to recognize their contribuions. Many of these immigrants joined the Knights of Pythias. Your philanthropy encompassed our entire community. There are few New Yorkers who are unaware of your efforts on behalf of the deprived of our city.

You may take rightful pride in the pioneer Pythian Camp, whose 320 acres and 50 buildings house 1,000 boys each summer. In the spirit of your founding principles you are giving these youths from the slums recreation, good food, and decent clothing. And in the tradition of the Golden Rule, yours was one of the first camps to ignore all distinctions of race, religion, or color, and make need the sole criterion for admission.

Your Pythian March of Youth, which supports agencies striving to keep our young people on the road to useful participation in our society, is in the same tradition.

I want to mention one further unique endeavor of yours—your Rare Blood Club, which serves 57 hospitals.

I have spoken previously of the great Americans who have swelled your ranks. It must have been a day of pride when our beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt took the oath of Pythian membership in the White House. Herbert H. Lehman was also a member of your order and an active trustee of Pythian Camp. Your distinguished members are many, but the major credit for your day-to-day achievements must go to the 87,000 rank and file members in New York State—your silent army in the service of the golden rule.

May I extend our best wishes to your grand chancellor, Neil M. Lieblich whom I have known and respected for many years. His activities as a humanitarian, as a public official, and as a fraternalist have marked him as one of our finest citizens. As your leader, and as a model for us all, he deserves our gratitude and our congratulations.

As you approach the second hundred years of humanitarian service, I know that you will do your part in meeting the challenges facing us all. In solving the complex problems of our modern world, we need the personal commitment of each human being.

I am confident that the Knights of Pythias whose history is synonymous with public service will be in the vanguard of our leadership.

Responding to Mayor Wagner's address, Grand Chancellor Neil M. Lieblich made the following remarks:

ADDRESS BY GRAND CHANCELLOR NEIL M. LIEBLICH

Rabbi Schenk, Comptroller Levitt, Secretary Hilsman, Mayor Wagner, Judge Lomenzo, Past Supreme Chancellor Eisenberg, distinguished Pythians on the dais and in this great assemblage, Grand Chief Burris, our lovely ladies, my good friends all, this long awaited event is an exciting evening for all of us. We have gathered from all parts of the State of New York to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the epic founding of our fraternity, the Order Knights of Pythias: To review the exceptional record of action, achievement, and attainment of our glorious past; and to sound the clarion call to more than 86,000 Pythians to go forward and onward together.

The happy coincidence that my opportunity to serve as grand chancellor of the domain of New York came this year is one that my family and I shall long cherish and remember. It gave me the privilege to lead our order as we ended the first 100 years of our service to mankind and of our brotherly love for one another on Wednesday, February 19, 1964, and as we started the second 100 years 3 days ago. We deeply appreciate the honor you do me personally by permitting me to share the events tonight with the celebration of our centennial anniversary.

Time does not permit a detailed recital of the effort, energy, and industry that went into making this outstanding social function tonight possible. Those who labored will understand. We must, however, publicly applaud the services of our chairman, Alex Greenstein, and PSC Lippi Eisenberg, Irving Mandel, Louis Katzman, and Gabe Wechsler.

A historic pronouncement was made by our distinguished visitor from Washington, Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman, in his illuminating address tonight. Judge Lomenzo was an excellent representative of the government of the State of New York. We are indeed indebted to the mayor of the city of New York, Robert F. Wagner, for his attendance here tonight and for his kind words he knowingly expressed about our order. He has worked closely with us on the centennial celebration for almost 16 months. Of course, I am grateful for his personal references to me and I hope I shall continue to merit them. The masterful handling of the important assignment of acting as our toastmaster tonight by our eminent Pythian friend, State Comptroller Arthur Levitt, certainly merits our continued esteem and affection for him. Once more he has answered the Pythian call—and exceedingly well.

The inspiration, leadership, and direction we have been afforded over the years by our beloved Past Supreme Chancellor Leonard M. Eisenberg were again manifested tonight. My prayer is that God grant him many years of good health to be with us and to inspire the leaders of our order for a long time.

To my affable Grand Vice Chancellor Dr. Morris Smoller, I express to you and through you to the members of our Grand Council my sincere appreciation for what each of you has done during my administration to further the program we enunciated and the brotherhood we exemplify.

To the lovely ladies: Please continue your understanding of the cardinal principles of our Pythian order by sharing your husbands with us during the second century of our service.

Finally, to all my brothers, to all Pythians: We glory in the past only as a basis on which to predicate our future. The acts and accomplishments of our order in the first century of our existence are but a beacon light for the future. In the words of the poet: "The past is only a prelude," There is much to be done. Together, we can succeed. As we link our arms and as we march forward together, under the wise guidance and counsel of our Almighty God, we shall reach even greater heights in the years ahead, as we practice friendship, charity and benevolence.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address Delivered by John E. Cosgrove, Assistant Director, Office of Emergency Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of Minnesota's singular contributions to the executive branch of this Government is the Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. John E. Cosgrove. Mr. Cosgrove recently delivered an address to the Upper Midwest Executive Reserve in St. Paul on March 16, 1964. This address is a comprehensive and lucid exposition of the ongoing work of the Office of Emergency Planning, and I particularly commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask, therefore, for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by Mr. John E. Cosgrove.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN E. COSGROVE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING, BEFORE THE UPPER MIDWEST EXECUTIVE RESERVE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to have the opportunity to speak to the winter meeting of the Upper Midwest Executive Reserve. Comprising, as this group does, executive reservists from Minnesota, South and North Dakota, and Montana, you represent an important contingent on which the Federal Government would rely heavily in the event of an emergency. Minnesota is an appropriate State in which to discuss preparedness since both Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY provide strong leadership in strengthening our national security and defensive strength.

I am particularly gratified to be here today because your informal association has pioneered in the type of initiative and self-starting actions which are so useful. That is, you have taken it upon yourself to hold quarterly meetings which serve a dual purpose. They facilitate active interest and enthusiasm in the total reserve program. I have never felt that the effectiveness of the reserve can be measured solely by the numbers of people recruited or even by their standing within the industry or professional discipline they represent. It is a combination of competence and knowledge of assigned responsibility which genuinely reflects the effectiveness of the executive reserve program. In holding these shirtsleeve sessions you are both maintaining an active interest as opposed to passive membership, and you are providing a seminar of substance in which each and every individual learns more about his or her specific assignment. This is vitally important because, should the need arise, you will be in a better position to respond instantaneously and in a sure-footed fashion to your country's call.

Later in my remarks, I will say more about the reserve program in particular as it relates to our evolving emergency planning posture.

But as a backdrop, I think it is important that all of us understand and appreciate both the value and the importance of a ready reserve in the context of our total national objectives as we move through the perilous sixties in a precarious and unpredictable world.

Our task is not simple. In fact, it grows more burdensome each day as mankind perfects ever more ominous and horrible ways to cripple itself.

It took man 250 years to progress from the short bow to the long bow. Another 300 years carried him from the musket to the megaton. Less than 10 years were needed to leap from the A-bomb to the H-bomb. Our breathless, headlong rush for technological knowledge is strikingly illustrated by the fact that 90 percent of all the scientists who ever walked the earth are living in this generation.

The very destructiveness of today's weapons has made us mature rapidly. We know that today's complex problems have no push-button answers, no pat solutions. Indeed, it is a test of a man's and a people's maturity to realize that there are few easy answers. But our revolution for freedom must go on, even under trying circumstances.

This revolution begun here in 1775 is against much of what men had earlier considered inevitable; namely, tyranny, hunger, ignorance, and bigotry. The fight is more than one against, however, it is for liberty, tolerance, bread, and peace. Over the world men desiring these same things continue to carry on, with us, this good fight, in many places and in different ways. This is the revolution of freedom.

Recognition of the fight for freedom, brings forcibly to mind the great loss all Americans and all mankind suffered in the assassination of President Kennedy, a little less than 4 months ago. On November 22, 1963, the world, and the cause of peace, lost a great friend. The assassin's bullet struck down a humanitarian and a great foe of ignorance, poverty, tyranny, and bigotry. But even as President Kennedy died, and President Johnson then took the oath of office, America's continuing revolution for freedom went onward. It was to this fight that President Kennedy was dedicated and to it President Johnson has rededicated himself and our Nation.

As Congressman, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, and as Vice President, Mr. Johnson participated in the full spectrum of decisionmaking, including the formulation of national security policy. I know he will carry forward the revolution for freedom and the struggle against tyranny.

It was my privilege to be nominated by President Kennedy, and confirmed by the Senate in 1961. Since then, in the Office of Emergency Planning, I have been involved in the nonmilitary preparedness work of the Federal Government. From this vantage point, it is possible to see both the tremendous problems and the challenges in defense mobilization and the effective exertions required by all of us to meet them.

As America's revolution for freeom goes forward, we are of course opposed by those who would in some way profit from, or are otherwise, committed to tyranny, ignorance, poverty, and bigotry. This requires that America's defenses, military, and nonmilitary, be kept strong. In our civil preparedness programs we face problems as unprecedented as those which are met on the military side. These involve the possibility, however unlikely, of a nuclear war and the resultant disruption of our free economy and political life. To meet this challenge, important resources of Government, involving dozens of agencies and departments, coordinated through the Office of Emergency Planning, are constantly working to provide both political and economic continuity in any possible situation. These include the possibility of various levels of limited and/or nonnuclear conflict—a wide spectrum of possibilities.

THE NEED

The phrase "any possible situation" must inevitably cover a nuclear blow that could produce wholly unprecedented casualties and damage. For the first time our economy and society might be fragmented temporarily. Traditional Federal wartime functions might be insufficient. As never before, the United States could very well find itself in a life and death struggle to preserve the very rudiments of our political and economic systems.

Despite this terrifying reality, there are some who shrug it off as just another war. Man adapted to the horesless carriage, they say, and there's no reason why he can't adapt to new weapons. This naively optimistic view ignores the reality of the unprecedented losses that would accompany a nuclear exchange.

However, the overly pessimistic view, that we would be thrown back into the stone age, is equally false and misleading. The best information our analysis can summon indicates that even a severe nuclear attack would leave most of our vast land areas unscarred. While there would be pockets of extreme damage, much of our population, transportation facilities, communications and manufacturing capabilities would remain.

Since much of our population and its wealth of industry would survive, post-attack plans are relevant and important. Whether you and I survive may depend somewhat on chance. But whether those who do survive can pick themselves up, win the war, rebuild the Nation, and reestablish freedom in a bleeding world, has nothing at all to do with chance.

Our recovery would be in our own hands. To insure that capability we must be prepared for the possibility that some areas might have to exist at first on their own local resources. We must be prepared to get along for awhile without direct Federal controls. We must prepare methods of assessing remaining resources and ways of distributing them for the national good. Above all, we must prepare to avoid the chaos that could envelop us if there were no government authority to take charge in an emergency.

If I have emphasized the word "prepared," it is specifically to stress that advance planning is the sole key to this Nation's recovery. There is no substitute for this indispensable component of national security. Without emergency readiness plans, we could be overwhelmed by the confusion and emotional despair that would surround us in the wake of an attack.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

The concept of an exclusively Federal emergency response runs up against the stark reality of new weapons which can

cross oceans and continents in a matter of minutes.

During World War II the United States could work in the comparative comfort of the likelihood that its shores were not threatened by enemy bombardment. Adequate central controls could be developed in a national capital that was neither damaged nor disrupted by the conflict that was crippling other government seats across the seas. Today it is quite possible that the lines of Federal authority, no matter how well fortified, could be severed by intensive damage in some areas. Many localities might find themselves alone, required to struggle to their own feet without immediate Federal aid or direction.

If so, America would probably be confronted with its most crucial hour. In the absence of central leadership the hopes of the free world would be in the hands of thousands of individual citizens. The preservation of civilization as we know it today would depend on their resilience of soul and their strength of body.

That the average American would rise to the cause, there is no doubt in President Johnson's mind, I am sure, nor indeed of anyone in the OEP. The pages of American history vividly portray valor of Americans who instinctively summoned a wealth of courage and wisdom in time of peril.

Yet the complexities of the nuclear age present us with new questions. Could thousands of local civic leaders, however noble their aspirations, solve the staggering technical problems created by sudden and unprecedented devastation? Could they quickly replace an intricate economic jigsaw puzzle that had suddenly been separated or even fragmented? Could they, even with unfaltering courage, act with a unity of purpose? Would they have the facts at their fingertips with which to conserve local resources that might have to be shipped to a more crucial recovery project elsewhere?

Obviously, we cannot wait for an acid test to answer these questions. There would probably be but one chief nuclear exchange. It would be too late then to correct shortcomings. The only sound alternative is obvious; to weave a strong fabric of emergency plans throughout the State and local levels. Such a program is now being given top priority by the OEP—under the title of "The Comprehensive Program for the Survival of Government and Management of Resources."

Launching of the comprehensive program 2 years ago this February marked a shift in nonmilitary defense policy toward a tightly integrated partnership of Federal, State and local governments. In addition this new program is based on a partnership of government at all levels, with the private sector of the economy. In a word, OEP is striving to develop a State and local capability for a temporarily decentralized management of the economy in a nuclear war situation.

Here, perhaps more than in any single facet of emergency planning, the Federal Government must look to the competence of leaders of the private sector. The reason is that, unlike in civil defense, the know-how and ability to manage resources does not normally exist in government. Government does not in the main manage railroads or steel mills. Nor does it distribute fuel or food. The backbone of this free enterprise system is the private sector of our economy. Therefore, it is imperative that economic leaders, such as you here this evening, be brought into a working partnership with Government.

In comparing emergency management of resources to, and distinguishing it from, traditional civil defense tasks, I would not wish to imply that the distinction between the two is always easy to understand. We are constantly confronted, particularly at the State and local level, with the penetrating question: "At what point do classic survival actions usually identified with civil defense end, and where does resource management responsibility begin?" It is not a question susceptible to easy answers or blanket rules since conditions could well vary from area to area. To define these two compatible but distinct zones of responsibility, Director McDermott recently joined Assistant Defense Secretary Pittman, of the Office of Civil Defense, in signing a memorandum of understanding. It was discussed with the executive committee of the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors at its recent meeting. We hope this understanding provides a clear and practical basis for OEP, OCD, and concerned Federal agencies to facilitate orderly development of State emergency resource capabilities. It does not alter the concepts and procedures underlying the comprehensive program. It does establish broad guidelines for the States. It should lead gradually to precise and workable definitions of resource claimancy which, in turn, will have a beneficial impact on the work of individual task forces and in improving overall State emergency preparedness plans. In an example plan, we will seek to define primary and secondary resources as specifically as possible but we realize this will be no more than guidance to the States. The actual specifics will be developed by the States which move ahead with State emergency resource management plans through the advice of task groups in each resource area and the development of resource chapters which clearly define responsibilities for management by State and local governments in an immediate attack situation.

The memorandum of understanding between OEP and OCD recognizes that OEP will provide guidance on primary resources, OCD on secondary resources.

Now let me examine the specifics of the comprehensive program. Its strength is rooted in the same principles which guide the OEP at the Federal level. First, State and local governments are being encouraged to legislate for continuity of government. Second, these governments are being asked to assume greater responsibilities for economic readiness.

GOVERNMENT CONTINUITY

In addition to its duties in economic stabilization and resource management, each element of government must take steps in insuring its own operating capability in an emergency. This means that the Federal, the State, and the local governments should make these four moves for their respective executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

1. Insure the success of decisionmaking officials at all levels—including field offices.
2. Preserve Government records and documents essential to establish authority in a nuclear emergency.
3. Establish protected emergency relocation sites.
4. Insure that the Government can extract the maximum efficiency from its own manpower and resources in an emergency.

ECONOMIC CONTINUITY IS A FIRST NEED

Since operation of the Nation's monetary system is a traditional Federal function, the Government must be ready with sound and flexible plans that can be put to work under all types of emergency conditions. The Federal Reserve Board, for example, develops plans for the continued flow of currency and credit. It must be prepared to direct the activities of all banking and financial institutions. The Securities and Exchange Commission develops controls for the protection and stability of securities trading.

Without such protection, our economic viability and the productivity of our economy could be severely jeopardized in time of national peril.

Our ability to bounce back would depend on how quickly and efficiently we could mobilize our surviving men and materials. Since this aspect covers nearly every facet of our productive society, responsibility for the management of resources is vested in many Government agencies. The General Services Administration, for instance, manages the Nation's stockpile of strategic and critical materials based on policies formulated by OEP. Manpower mobilization is directed by the Labor Department. Plans for the distribution of food supplies are being developed by the Agriculture Department. Emergency transportation measures are under the direction of the Commerce Department.

As one example of existing plans and national policy, all retail and preretail food sales would be stopped for a period of at least 5 days following a nuclear attack, except for the most essential reasons and where perishable items are likely to spoil. This moratorium will give the States and local communities a breathing spell during which they can prepare to invoke local rationing systems. But this is only one example of the early responses that will be needed.

The management of resources is a new and challenging job, particularly for the States. It involves temporary control over distribution, allocation, and conservation of vital manpower and materials.

Examples are petroleum, electric power, food, transportation—in short, almost all of the Nation's material and human resources.

Since its inauguration 2 years ago, the comprehensive program has been gaining momentum throughout the country. OEP regional offices, even before, had worked continually with State legislatures, furnishing them with model statutes and other information on continuity of government amendments. In 25 States the amendments have been ratified by the voters.

Since the institution of the comprehensive program, early in 1962, all 50 States and 4 territories have designated emergency planning directors. Thirty of these new directors and the Governors for whom they work, have in turn set up emergency resource planning committees, and we expect that within the next 6 months these organizations will have been established initially in every State. These State programs received a boost when the Congress last December appropriated $1.5 million to assist States and local government in planning for emergency use of resources. The administrative criteria for eligibility to receive such assistance have been sent to all Governors and we are receiving a rapid response from the States. Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana, incidentally, are among the States expected to participate by contract in the very near future.

The challenge ahead, however, is still great. We are engaged in a large undertaking. Thirty-one Federal agencies, 50 States, and thousands of representative civic leaders from professions, agriculture, labor, industry, and the consumer are rolling up their sleeves from an unprecedented construction job.

Now let me establish the interdependence of the comprehensive program and our nationwide executive reserve. To put it bluntly, it can be said that in many respects the two are interchangeable. For as the comprehensive program seeks trained talent primarily from the private sector, it would obviously look first to the executive reserve. As you may know, there has been a decided shift in emphasis in the reserve program—a shift which, I should add, was long overdue in light of existing technological knowledge. You may recall that the original concept of the executive reserve aimed for an emergency organization not dissimilar from those employed during World War II and Korea. This was like putting up a biplane to defend against oncoming missiles. We had not reckoned with the requirement for decentralized capability and reserve assignments

in regional and field organizations. The launching of the comprehensive program coincides with the shift in emphasis in the reserve program and the two must obviously complement one another.

Task forces organized under the comprehensive program involve as many reservists as possible. This helps the task force to avoid mistakes which the trained reservist can more readily detect. In addition, it encourages complete compatibility with Federal agency programs. The reservist with a Federal assignment is likely to be more familiar with national problems and objectives and, therefore, can contribute valuable background and experience to task force planning.

But the advantage works both ways. As reservists become members of State and local task forces they are assured of the most timely information in the emergency planning field and the training received through their Federal agency assignment is thereby enhanced.

So as you can see, the executive reserve, with a present enrollment of about 3,100 top drawer leaders, in 14 regions of the country, figures prominently in the total emergency planning effort. We need rapidly to expand the size of most units of the NDER. It is not now strong enough. Growth in all areas is anticipated as 31 Federal departments and agencies move to respond to a mandate issued 2 years ago—specific Presidential Executive orders spelling out the emergency planning responsibility of each segment of the Federal Government as an extension of their peacetime roles.

Let me cite some examples of how we hope this total expansion will be achieved.

The Department of Agriculture is now establishing a reserve unit with an expected strength of 300 members recruited from a wide range of industries including food, fertilizer, pesticide, farm equipment, processing and other food-connected activities.

The Office of Emergency Transportation has organized a unit with an authorized strength of 300 to staff its transportation mission at national, regional, and State levels.

Other departments and agencies with comparable expansion timetables include the Department of Labor, Interior, and Commerce (including BDSA and the Maritime Administration) and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

None of us will ever forget the last national conference of the National Defense Executive Reserve, in Washington, D.C. It is particularly clear to me since I directed that conference. All, however, remember that date, October 22, 1962, because it was that evening that President Kennedy announced the quarantine of Cuba that was required by the introduction of Soviet offensive measures. I know we all remember the tensions of the succeeding week until it became clear that peace would be maintained. Perhaps more than ever before, the Cuban crisis brought home to executive reservists and to all of the American people that nuclear warfare, however unlikely, remains a possibility which we must be prepared to meet.

Another national conference is tentatively scheduled for 1965 in Washington. I venture an educated guess that the fruits of this expansion will be quite evident at that time. With respect to that conference, we have duly noted your comments and suggestions regarding the shortcomings of previous national Executive Reserve conferences. We recognize that reservists must be permitted more time for the hard but productive work of hammering out concrete assignments within parent agencies. We intend to assure that ample time is set aside for these endeavors at the next national conference for, in reality, these are the nuts and bolts of reserve duty if membership is to mean something more than the possession of a certificate.

Finally, let me stress that membership in the reserve is something more than recognition of your individual talents and skills. Those who serve the total mission of mobilization preparedness have put themselves in the front lines of the epic struggle for freedom. Your work is no less urgent because a limited nuclear test ban treaty has been signed.

As encouraging as this first step is, in the long journey toward disarmament, it alone gives no cause for relaxation. On the contrary, it is only because we are prepared militarily, economically, and socially for the worst that we can take these steps toward the best—a peaceful world with a chance of freedom for all.

This work of the executive reserve, in emergency planning, then, is for a great goal—the freedom and safety of our country, our neighbors, our children.

Second Thoughts on the Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent to me, as I am sure it is to most of my colleagues, that the House is having some second thoughts following last week's defeat of Federal salary legislation. I would hesitate to predict the outcome of these second thoughts, but I know there are many Members who would like to see further action of some sort on the pressing problems which prompted this legislation in the first instance.

Over the weekend a number of newspapers took the House to task for its failure to pass the pay bill. One of these was the New York Times, which carried an editorial in its edition of Sunday, March 15. On the same page was a column by James Reston giving his views on the need for increases in the pay of top-ranking Federal executives. Both the editorial and the column deserve the attention and sober reflection of all of us in the Congress.

Without objection I insert the editorial and column at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

INCREASING FEDERAL PAY

A shortsighted and small-minded coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats has voted down a salary-increase bill in the House of Representatives, but this decision should not be permitted to stand. The bill can and should be revived through action initiated either in the House or Senate.

The measure which deserves this second chance would raise by an average of about 5 percent the pay of a million and a half white-collar classified employees and postal workers. It would increase by somewhat more than this the pay of Cabinet members and of other top-level Federal officials, and of all Federal judges. It would lift the salaries of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500. The annual cost of the whole plan would be $545 million. It would be worth it.

It would be worth it because it is good economy to pay salaries high enough to attract topnotch men and women into Federal office and to keep them there in the face of increased competition for their services. One of the most familiar, and discouraging, stories in Washington is the loss by one Federal agency after another of public servants who are doing an excellent job, who like their work and want to go on with it, but who feel compelled to turn elsewhere for a better income.

It is perfectly conceivable that there will be an exodus from Washington of high-quality officials who cannot afford to stay unless a bill of this kind is passed. They should not be asked to make the financial sacrifice they are making—and this comment applies particularly to those in the upper levels of Government.

In the case of Members of Congress, there is a particularly strong argument for higher salaries. This is the desirability of freeing Congressmen from the need or the temptation of supplementing their Federal pay by outside work which may easily involve a conflict of interest with their legislative work. A genuinely hard-working Congressman, ready and equipped to face intelligently and conscientiously each piece of public business as it arises, is worth every bit of $32,500.

No petty political considerations should be allowed to block reconsideration of this bill.

JOHNSON'S MONEY PROBLEMS AND OTHER THINGS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—One of the persistently awkward things about the people who work for the Government in Washington is that they like to eat and have children and be paid for their hire like other members of the human race.

This has created a problem for every President since General Washington, and Lyndon Johnson is no exception. His appointments so far have been good, but he has lost several brilliant men from the old Kennedy team, including Ted Sorensen, Kenneth Galbraith, Jerome Wiesner, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the Congress has added to the brain drain by refusing to pass the administration's pay-rise bill.

Some of this drift of talent was inevitable and some of it was desirable. There is always an evacuation in every election year, and President Johnson should and will have his own men if he wins in November. But holding or recruiting talented and experienced men who are tough enough to stand up to Lyndon Johnson 18 hours a day, 7 days in the week has been made all the more difficult by freezing wages even below academic, let alone industrial or commercial levels.

PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

Part of the difficulty is that Congress has refused to raise the pay of one group of public servants unless it can raise them all. It draws no distinction between a secretary who wrestles with letters and an Under Secretary who wrestles with De Gaulle. In short, it has ignored the fact that there are too many drones at the bottom of the Government and too few brains at the top.

Also, the Congress, not unnaturally, feels that if the executives in the Government get more money, Congressmen, who also pay rent and have children, should get more too, and this would bring the across-the-board pay hike to $545 million a year, which is more than some Congressmen think the voters would be in a mood to approve after the Bobby Baker case in an election year.

So long as Congress refuses to distinguish between a postman and a scientist and between the shortage of brains and the surplus of bodies in Washington, the problem is insoluble, but there is a way to reconcile sanity with solvency.

This is to pay more for brains at the top, and lop off more bodies at the bottom. This would improve the Government at both ends, probably without the expenditure of much more money, and it has the added advantage of fitting neatly into the Johnsonian ideal of an administration that is a generous tightwad.

It can be argued, of course, though Senator BYRD would not agree, that comparatively the Federal payroll is not inflated. In the last 10 years, while the population of the country has gone up 17 percent, and non-Government employment has gone up over 10 percent, the State and municipal employees have increased by 65 percent and the Federal civil employees have gone up only 6 percent.

Thus, with the help of automation for processing checks and bonds and income taxes, among other things, there are now 13 Federal employees for every thousand Americans, whereas there were 14 a decade ago.

Nevertheless, there is scarcely an observer in or out of the Government here who would not argue that the Government is overstaffed and could be improved by judicious, or even a little injudicious, pruning.

One of these days the automobiles of the Federal employees are going to get into such a jam that the Government will simply stop and somebody will have to pave over the cars in the Federal triangle and start all over again.

If all the friends of friends who occupy Federal jobs as status symbols in the outer rooms of assistants to the deputy assistants to the directors of subbureaus in the country sections of large agencies or departments—all of them—were fired on Monday, the Government would probably purr with efficiency and enough money would be saved to pay really competent and essential people twice what they could command anywhere else.

FRIVOLITY ASIDE

The payroll for the people who really know enough to tell the great men what to do is really not very much. Though the total payroll increase for everybody amounted to $545 million a year, the proposed pay rise for the really critical executive payroll—from assistant secretaries up through bureau heads and the Cabinet—amounted to only $4.2 million. And this much could probably be saved by lopping off half the chauffeurs and making some of the bigshots ride to the office on the bus.

This is not a totally frivolous suggestion. No government is any better than its top policy advisers, and no administration needs them more than this one. It is brilliant at getting things through the Congress—probably much better at it than the Kennedy administration—but it is not so clear about what it wants to get through, and this is the job of many of the men who are now quietly negotiating their way into higher paying jobs in foundations, universities, research centers, magazines, and industries next autumn.

Invocations by Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 24, 1964, Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch delivered the invocation for the annual banquet of the National Housing Conference. Rabbi Hirsch also delivered the invocation for the banquet in 1963.

In his brief comments, Rabbi Hirsch has been able to relate religious values to the subject of housing. These invocations are eloquent in their brevity and simplicity, and I ask unanimous consent that the invocations delivered by Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invocations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION BY RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH AT THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 24, 1964

O Lord, creator of all, as we view the communities which are the work of our hands, we still hear the echo of the angry denunciation of Thy prophet of old:

"Woe to him who gaineth evil gains for his house, to set his nest on high, to be safe from the reach of harm. Thou has devised shame to thy house by cutting off many peoples." (Habbakuk 2: 9, 10.)

Oh Lord, may our society never build nests so high that we cannot see the evil consequences of our gains:

The callous cutting off of many peoples from the proper living environment conducive to fulfillment of their potentialities;

The blind obeisance to the fickle idol of economic theories which tend to favor the housing needs of the "haves" over those of the "have-nots."

The searing shame of perpetuating segregation by race and class.

Praised be Thou, O Lord, our God, for the nourishment on our tables, and for the sense of justice in our souls which does not permit us to be at ease until all men receive in adequate measure the material blessings which Thou hast intended for all created in Thine image. Amen.

INVOCATION BY RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH AT THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 25, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

O Master of the Universe, Thou who hast created man to be a steward of all Thy possessions, even as it is written in Scriptures:

"The land is mine (sayeth the Lord) for ye are strangers and settlers with Me, and in all the land of your possession shall ye grant a redemption for the land."

Even as we begin the process of redemption and renewal for our land, we are obstructed by those who have forgotten that the land and all that is thereon is Thine, and that our civilization is a monument, not to rugged individualism, but to responsible individuals, to the accumulated rewards of generations of collective effort by countless human beings.

We are perverted by our own passion for self-indulgence which has produced cities without citizens, communities without communicants, and neighborhoods without neighbors. We substitute idolatrous devotion to manmade theories of supply and demand for divine commandments to devote the earth's abundant supply to the demands and needs of our fellow men.

Give us the insight, O Lord, to know that man's spiritual needs cannot be isolated from his physical needs, that the real blight of our time is not the slum but the society which tolerates the slum, not the unemployed but the society which passively accepts human stultification, not the inadequate provisions for the elderly, but the inadequate vision which fails to see that "they shall still bring forth fruit in old age" (Psalms 92: 15), not the substandard housing, but the substandard society which stops short of guaranteeing dignity to every human being.

Instill in us, O Lord, the will to fulfill the words of the Psalmist:

"Except the Lord keep the city,
The watchman waketh but in vain;
Except the Lord build the house
They labor in vain that build it."
(Psalms 127: 1.)

Congress Should Act Promptly on President's Poverty Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposed plan to provide a Job Corps to put 100,000 idle youths to work in more than 100 camps around the country is meeting with widespread acceptance and approval. Prompt action on this proposal and the President's war on poverty program has been endorsed and urged in many areas by the press and the public.

The Nashville Tennessean, a great news journal of my State, in an editorial of March 17, 1964, has called for prompt action on this program, and under unanimous consent, I include this editorial at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT SOON ON POVERTY PLAN

President Johnson has submitted to Congress his program for reducing poverty in the Nation. The plan submitted is no halfway measure. It calls for a massive attack on the causes of poverty rather than merely on the symptoms.

The President set the pace for this type of effort when he asked Congress for the weapons with which to win a "total victory" in the war against poverty.

Mr. Johnson asked for approval of a "Job Corps" eventually to put 100,000 youths to work in more than 100 camps around the country. About half of these would work in special conservation projects to give them work experience. The other 50 percent would get training, basic education and work assignments in the training centers.

Under the whole program, almost 500,000 underprivileged youth would get a chance to develop skills, continue education, and find useful work.

One of the most attractive features of the plan is the opportunity for each American community to develop an antipoverty plan to meet its own problems and receive Federal aid to carry it out.

The Government would also help pay the cost of providing jobs in such places as playgrounds, libraries and settlement houses to youths between 16 and 21 out of school and out of work. Another fund would provide part-time jobs for students having to work their way through college.

Special phases of the program would assist poverty-stricken farm families, provide loans for small businesses to provide more jobs for low income workers, and help unemployed fathers of needy families to become self-supporting.

The program, which would be carried out by a special Office of Economic Opportunity, in coordination with other government departments, obviously is the result of a great deal of planning and research into the poverty pockets of the Nation.

The plan undoubtedly will run into some opposition from those who cannot—or will not—see that the program is no handout, but a carefully planned way to turn wasted human energies into productive channels, to the benefit of the people and the Nation.

The President's program will call for no unanticipated funds, as the money to finance it is included in the $97.9 billion budget which was sent to Congress in January.

The program will cost $962.5 million, which is less than 1 percent of the national budget, and only about 2 percent of the Nation's defense expenditures. This seems to be a comparatively small amount in relation to the long range benefit it promises to bring.

President Johnson has moved promptly to carry out his pledge to the Nation and correct poverty conditions which have no sound reason for existence. The next step is up to Congress.

Civil Rights and the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to civil rights and the arts.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE ARTS

(Statement of Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, a U.S. Senator from the State of New York)

The support for civil rights expressed by the famous pianist Artur Rubinstein and by other great artists and performing groups in response to an appeal by the NAACP should be warmly applauded. The excellent report by Henry Raymont on March 10 provides one of the finest demonstrations of the readiness of artists to accept the moral responsibility of fostering civil rights. The arts are for all mankind and the basic principle that artists are to be judged on their merits and not by their race or religion has been maintained for centuries.

The artist has always fought for the right to be free for himself as well as for the society in which he lives. No one who recognizes the prestige and the international impact of the arts in projecting American civilization can minimize the importance of art as a vital force in our country and this action by our performing artists and musicians as an expression of their support for civil rights.

The article by Henry Raymont, entitled "Rubinstein Hails Rights Campaigns," which appeared in the New York Times, March 10, follows:

"RUBINSTEIN HAILS RIGHTS CAMPAIGNS—PIANIST SAYS ARTISTS HAVE PLACE IN RACE DISPUTE

"(By Henry Raymont)

"WASHINGTON, March 9.—Artur Rubinstein said today that musicians should 'actively participate in fostering' civil rights. He praised those artists who refuse to play to segregated audiences.

"The pianist expressed strong disagreement with the thought that artists should not become involved in the race controversy.

"Discrimination on religious or racial grounds, Mr. Rubinstein said, 'is a human problem from which no one can escape.'

"The celebrated musician gave his views in an interview as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People began to circulate an appeal to leading concert artists to join a boycott of southern communities that practice segregation. Two other civil rights groups, the Congress of Racial Equality and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, have started a similar campaign.

"ONE OF FIRST TO PROTEST

"Dr. John Morsell, assistant executive secretary of the NAACP, said Mr. Rubinstein would receive a special invitation because of his well-known stand on segregation. He was one of the first concert artists to publicly protest the exclusion of Negroes from concert halls.

"There were immediate indications that the same controversy that has developed among civil rights proponents over the most effective methods would also afflict the artistic community.

"Nathan Milstein, the violinist who played here last night, said he did not believe in an organized boycott. Such a move, he said, would antagonize white liberals in the South 'and serves no useful purpose.'

"On the other hand, it was learned that George Szell, conductor of the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra, is prepared to join other artists in support of the NAACP's appeal.

"Today, Julius Katchen, the pianist, and the Marlboro Trio announced they had asked their respective managers to accept no concerts where Negroes were excluded.

"Similar steps were taken last week by pianist Gary Graffman and Leon Fleisher and by Jaime Laredo, the Bolivian violinist.

"Mr. Katchen, who plays widely in Europe and Asia, said that segregation was 'a deep source of shame and embarrassment' to Americans abroad.

"With the civil rights bill now before Congress, he asserted, 'it becomes the duty of all artists to refuse to perform in auditoriums where segregation policies are practiced.'

"Although Mr. Rubinstein did not go so far as to endorse an organized boycott, he said the young artists who had made a public stand on segregation had taken 'a right and natural step.'

"The dangers to a free society, he said, are 'apathy and complacence' in the face of injustice.

"Mr. Rubinstein said that, as a Jew, he had personally experienced the painful consequences of prejudice. He noted that only 10 years ago he was refused an apartment in New York because of this.

"Mr. Rubinstein strongly disagreed with a statement by the German pianist, Hans Richter Haaser, that musicians should stand apart of race and political problems. Mr. Richter Haaser cited this conviction as the reason why he filled an engagement in Jackson, Miss., that had been canceled by Mr. Graffman because Negroes were not admitted.

"'Musicians are human beings too,' Mr. Rubinstein said, 'and they have the same moral responsibility toward their society as everybody else.'"

An article by Theodore Strongin, entitled "Boycott Efforts in Arts Continue," which also appeared in the New York Times, March 11, follows:

"BOYCOTT EFFORTS IN ARTS CONTINUE—PERFORMERS ASKED TO CANCEL DATES IN SEGREGATED SOUTH

"(By Theodore Strongin)

"The Student Nonviolent Coproached individual performing artists and groups in the continuation of its efforts, supported by other civil rights organizations to impose a cultural boycott on the segregated parts of the South.

"The Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra, the sopranos Birgit Nilsson and Eleanor Steber, the American Ballet Theater and the Chicago Opera Ballet have been asked by John Lewis, chairman of the Students Nonvioletnt Coordinating Committee, to cancel their appearances before segregated audiences this season. The Pittsburgh Symphony is scheduled to play Sunday at Columbus, Miss. Miss Steber is to sing in Greenwood, Miss., on Monday, and Miss Nilsson has a Mississippi date in May.

"Representatives for the orchestra, for Miss Steber and for Miss Nilsson say there is no decision yet on the suggestion. Mr. Lewis reports that attempts to persuade the Chicago Opera Ballet and the Ballet Theater to cancel have failed.

"Mr. Lewis has also sent a letter to John Gassner, drama professor at Yale, asking him not to participate in the annual Southern Literary Festival, April 23-25 at the Mississippi State College for Women.

"Julian Bonds, director of communications for the committee, reports that the boycott attempts have so far been limited to Mississippi. But he says his group will probably get in touch with performers at a benefit for a segregated school, scheduled in Albany, Ga., for Saturday. Among them are Molly Bee, Mamie Van Doren, Dale Roberts, James Drury and three cast members of the TV show 'The Virginians.'

"The boycott efforts in Mississippi followed the arrest on last November 2 of two Negro students who tried to attend a concert in Jackson by the Royal Philharmonic of London.

"A folk singing group, Original Hootenanny, U.S.A., canceled a mid-November appearance in Jackson. In January, three stars from the "Bonanza" program canceled their scheduled appearance at an exposition there. Al Hirt, the trumpeter, canceled a January 25 benefit for the March of Dimes benefit. Gary Graffman, the pianist, canceled a February 27 appearance in the Jackson Municipal Auditorum.

"The pianist, Artur Rubinstein, has come out strongly against segregrated concert halls, and George Szell, conductor of the Cleveland Symphony, is said to be willing to support an appeal by the National Association of Colored People for a boycott. Julius Katchen, pianist, the Marlboro Trio, Mr. Graffman, Leon Fleischer, pianist, and Jaime Laredo, violinist, have asked their managers not to book concerts where Negroes are excluded."

NATO: A Scrap of Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to reading every Saturday in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., the weekly column by Constantine Brown, distinguished student and writer on geopolitics, who now resides in Rome, Italy. That vantage point affords a perspective not enjoyed by writers on this side of the Atlantic.

The latest contribution of Mr. Brown follows:

NATO: A SCRAP OF PAPER?—WEAKENED TIES BLAMED ON OUR EFFORTS TO ATTAIN UNITED STATES-SOVIET UNDERSTANDING

ROME.—Americans in Europe who are uncommitted to Washington's harum-scarum policies exclaim sadly, "How alone we are now."

Despite assurances of American officialdom that the present misunderstandings with our European allies are temporary, the NATO alliance has been reduced, in fact, to a scrap of paper.

The best example is the confused attempt of Washington officials to indicate that we mean to "show strength" in South Vietnam. Of all our 15 NATO allies whose slogan at one time was " all for one and one for all," Britain alone seems agreed to give us a modicum of moral support. All others are saying politely or bluntly, "include us out."

The New York Times published a story, apparently from its usually reliable Washington sources, that Italy would indorse a policy of strength in Vietnam. Within hours the Italian Government issued an unequivocal denial saying this country had not committed itself to any kind of support. Italys' foreign policies, it was emphatically stated, are for peace and peaceful solutions of all world problems. This should have been clear even to those Washington policymakers who wear rose-tinted spectacles. For, only a week earlier, it was announced that the American nuclear submarines in the Mediterranean would be based in Spain because political conditions in Italy did not permit them to be stationed in an Italian port.

Why this change in our complicated system of alliances? What has happened in the last few years to justify their weakening? Is the threat of Communist imperialism receding? Definitely not.

While Mr. Khrushchev may whisper instead of shouting threats there is no sign that he is modifying Communist goals. He momentarily softened his harassments on the Berlin autobahn, but at the same time he stepped up his efforts in the Mediterranean and East Africa. It will be a miracle if within the year Cyprus—as important a base in the Mediterranean as Cuba is in the Caribbean and Latin America—does not go into his corner. The Communists in the strife-torn island shouted "long live Russia" when the first Russian commercial plane landed near Nicosia and they have been throwing stones and bombs at the American Embassy. Yet, our inmixture in the island's affairs has been confined to providing some $40 million in economic assistance.

The main reason for the loosening of the Atlantic alliance is our often unilateral dealings with the Kremlin to bring about an American-Soviet political understanding despite the evidence that communism is in no way different from nazism.

The NATO was created at a high expense to the American and allied taxpayer to contain the Red tide. When it becomes obvious that this is no longer the objective of the American Government, the reason for the continuation of the 20th century holy alliance ceases to exist. We go out of our way to bail Russia out of a difficult economic crisis by selling her $300 million worth of grains. At the same time we protest vigorously when the British, French, and Spaniards, and in fact all other West Europeans, sell buses, tractors, food, and fishing vessels to Cuba. The NATO members pay no heed to our protests because they see no logic in our actions.

They initiate important economic deals with Moscow and Peiping because they feel that Washington's policies directed toward accommodation may leave them in the cold. They fear that they may have to face an eventual American-Russian alliance. This was the underlying motive of De Gaulle's recognition of Peiping, recognition tacitly approved by most of our allies. This also has prompted the big corporations of the Common Market countries and Britain to negotiate the sale of heavy industrial plants to Russia.

The main criticism directed at the United States, however, is that there no longer exists a cohesive foreign policy.

Experienced politicians understand that in an election year the incumbent of the White House must wet his finger every morning to find out the direction of the ever-changing electoral winds. But it is a dangerous game to play domestic politics with international affairs.

The quality of America's foreign policy has suffered much in the last few years. The most frequent example mentioned these days is our policy in Vietnam. It is recalled that when President Truman decided to intervene in Korea he did it suddenly and obtained support from the allies after orders had been issued to General MacArthur to move in and support the South Koreans. This is being contrasted with the present vacillations and leaks to the press of the present administration.

Quality, Prices, and Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a sponsor of the quality stabilization bill I of course am interested in newspaper editorial and column analyses concerning this vital legislation. Unfortunately, much that is being written and reported about quality stabilization tends to cloud rather than enlighten the public as to the real issue involved here. Indeed, special interest opponents have launched a high-powered campaign aimed at confusing the real issue. They prefer to debate and propagandize against a "straw bill" of their own invention, rather than the quality stabilization bill as it actually exists.

It is therefore encouraging to read an editorial or an interpretive column which serves to give the public a true picture of what this fight for quality stabilization really involves. Recently Mr. Ralph de Toledano, in his nationally syndicated column, wrote an incisive and informative analysis of the problem confronting the American retail economy and of the entire quality stabilization issue. I commend Mr. de Toledano's column on this subject to all those truly interested in the future of the free enterprise system in our retail marketplace. With unanimous consent, I ask that Mr. de Toledano's column on quality stabilization be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY, PRICES, AND LEGISLATION

(By Ralph de Toledano)

WASHINGTON.—A group of liberal and prolabor Senators and Congressmen are at sword's point with the trade union movement over price and quality stabilization legislation. The unions in this battle find themselves on the side of monopolistic retailers.

The public, standing in the middle, doesn't know the facts.

This is what the battle over the quality stabilization bill is about. The public must decide whether the bill is a good one or not. But the chance to make this evaluation is not offered to John Q. Purchaser. Instead, as more than one legislator (including Democratic Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY) has pointed out, a mythical "scare" bill is described by its opponents.

With so much trouble abroad in the world, it may seem picayune to get excited about the quality stabilization bill. But what you buy, what it is worth, and what you pay for it—these are all involved.

The sponsors of the bill—and they cut across Republican-Democratic and conservative-liberal lines—feel that it will protect consumers and aid small business. The opponents say that it will hurt the discount houses and raise prices. What is at issue?

It was reported recently by one of the wire services that enthusiasts for discount houses predict that by 1970, they will control "80 percent of the retail business of the country." One expert estimates that 50 percent of the Nation's retail trade will be done by 50 giant retail organizations.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said last month that "an average of 1,200 small businesses fail each month." These are the corner grocer, the appliance dealer, the druggist—none of whom can compete with the giant retail organizations.

That's the monopolistic, or antitrust, aspect of the problem. Experience shows that the discount houses compete when they are forced to, by eliminating the smaller businessman, and then revert to higher price schedules. Only competition keeps prices down—but it's an uneven battle for the small merchant.

Opponents of the quality stabilization bill, nevertheless, point to the lower prices now obtaining in some areas of the economy where the discount houses are still expanding their control. Are those prices really lower? Here's an example:

One large chain of appliance stores, selling at discount, has enough muscle so that it can order manufacturers to make special models of advertised products. These models bear the respected brand name, look the same, but are of cheaper construction. The purchaser thinks he's getting a bargain—but he's getting no more than he pays for. At least three-quarters of the chain's stock is of this kind—though manufacturers like General Electric refuse to treat their product in this manner.

The quality stabilization bill permits a manufacturer to protect his trademark. The Supreme Court has already ruled that a manufacturer who has spent time and money in research, development, and promotion of a brand or trademark has a property right in it and may protect it.

Under the terms of the bill, a manufacturer would have the right to revoke the use of his trademark if it is used for "bait" advertising. He can prevent a retailer from using that trademark if the retailer misrepresents the product (as in the case of the appliance chain I mentioned) or if he offers it for sale at prices lower or higher than those established by the manufacturer.

What the opponents of the bill fail to mention is that it is entirely voluntary and, most important of all, that it refers to the trademark alone. That is, if a retailer wishes to remove the brand name and sell the product at a discount, he is entitled to do it without running afoul of the law. The bill is applicable, moreover, in the cases of products which are in direct competition with similar products.

In terms of small businesses, this means that competition will be equalized. The giant discount organizations will still be able to offer merchandise at reduced prices,

but they will not be able to trade on the advertising efforts of the manufacturer and the sales efforts of the small merchant. The buyer will then have to make certain that what he is getting is worth the price.

The American market has been flooded with shoddy goods in the past years. I myself have bought clothing at discount houses for discount prices, lulled by the display of brand names into believing that a high level of quality was being maintained. The clothing when to pieces in a fifth of the usual time. I therefore bought 20 percent of product at what, in this instance, was 80 percent of the price.

The bargain was more apparent than real. This is what the quality stabilization bill is about—the "low prices" that are really higher.

The Beef and Sheep Men Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, cattlemen throughout the Nation are deeply disturbed over the question of meat imports, and their concern is most understandable. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 1964, edition of the Farm Journal:

THE BEEF AND SHEEP MEN PAY

"I am pleased," said Secretary Freeman of the voluntary agreement this country has just completed with Australia and New Zealand over meat imports. Judging by the cries of anger from the cattle and sheep country, he must be the only one who is.

The agreement allows these countries to ship in as much beef (and the Australians as much mutton) as the average for 1962–63. That's 6 percent less than in 1963 but 10 percent more than in 1962. Furthermore they get an increase of 3.7 percent for the next 2 years, so by 1966 they'll be sending us more than in 1963.

What the agreement amounts to is that things won't get worse but neither can they get much better.

U.S. stockmen wanted imports set at the average of 1958–63 period, or about half as much as now. Probably we could have gotten it. Why, then, was the level set so high? Simply because our Government has been trying to promote the idea of "sharing markets" around the world. We're about to go to the meeting of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) at Geneva, Switzerland, to sell the "sharing" idea. Our negotiators wouldn't want to admit that we ourselves had just put up the bars against anything. So the stockmen of the United States have been offered up as a sacrifice in our attempt to free up international trade. It's not surprising that they don't care for the role.

The cattlemen's plight is simply this: They sent 7 percent more beef to market in 1963 than in the 1958–62 period. Exports added another 1 percent. But our market can absorb an increase of only 3.5 to 4 percent without harm to prices. We brought on most of the trouble ourselves, by sending 1.25 million more cattle to market than the year before and making them an average of 19 pounds heavier (33 pounds for steers). We're keeping a record 106.5 million head out in the country, and a higher percentage of them than usual are cows, ready to produce more calves.

However, that's not the whole difficulty. At the very time of our acute distress, the Australians and New Zealanders were rushing an unprecedented quantity of meat here. In 1958, the Australians sold us only 18 million pounds of beef, but by 1963 were sending 517 million. Imports now furnish 11 percent of our entire supply. Our market has paid by far the highest prices in the world, and it has been wide open. Our tariff of 3 cents a pound has amounted to nothing.

Meanwhile, other governments are offering their farmers more protection, not less. We got a foretaste of what the Common Market intends in the "Chicken War," which we lost. Now Western Europe is trying to keep our feed grains out. Britain has recently established import quotas, as well as import prices, on both beef and pork to protect her stockmen. That's the way the rest of the world is "sharing."

It's against that picture that our Government, in an attempt to set a shining example which no one is following, permits meat imports at record levels. This, by the way, is the same Government that recently wanted to graze retired cropland acres because "we need more meat."

Actually, should we get a drought we could have a real disaster on our hands. Our import agreement can't be abrogated without 6 months' notice. We'd better all pray for rain.

What can cattlemen do about it? Well, first they will have to send less beef to market. Second, they can keep pressure on Congress and the White House for tougher import controls, even though denied them now. Third, they can refuse to be quieted by a little beef buying for school lunch programs and a Tariff Commission hearing, now likely to be meaningless. Failing all else they can resort to the ballot box next fall. That's one recourse they can't be denied, and we think they'll know what to do with it.

Modernization of Federal Salary Systems

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am aware of problems confronting our employees. I have in the past supported reasonable wage increases for our employees and helped in legislation on other matters which concern them. I have considered the needs of our employees just as I would if I were a private employer. Indeed, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has the same responsibility on wages and working conditions of Federal employees as does an employer in private industry for his employees.

I again favored wage adjustments for employees of the Government when hearings were held and the bill before us was debated in the committee last year. I do so today. However, I strongly opposed the whopping increases in salary for the legislative branch, including Members of Congress, and the high-ranking members of the executive branch, including Cabinet officers and other officials. I also opposed the big increases for members of the judiciary.

I consistently supported the proposition that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should debate and approve salary legislation for Post Office and rank-and-file classified employees. That is the responsibility of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But the salary increases for the members of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government do not rightly belong in this bill. The salary legislation affecting these latter three groups should properly go to the Committees on House Administration and Judiciary, just as they have in the past. Even so, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I can see no justification for the whopping increases proposed in this bill for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. I so stated in my minority views which are before you as a part of the committee report.

We have just passed a huge tax reduction bill and many nice speeches were made by the supporters of that bill that we should now economize. But the ink is hardly dry on that measure when now we have before us this huge increase in salaries for ourselves, the high-ranking members of the executive branch and the judiciary. This proposal certainly does not set a good example of our intention to reduce spending.

After the general debate is concluded, Mr. Chairman, I shall offer amendments to the pending bill to eliminate the salary increases for officials of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. If my efforts to divorce these from title I, which has to do with the postal and rank-and-file classified workers, fail, then I shall have to vote against the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated in my minority views which were written by me last fall, I do not argue with any Member as to whether he thinks his pay should be increased by 45 percent or if he believes similar increases should be given to the high-ranking officials of the executive branch and the Federal judiciary. I do, however, in all sincerity, call upon each Member to stand up in support of a rollcall on final passage in order that the public will know just where each Member stands.

I voted for the rule to bring this measure before us. I felt dutybound to do so because the bill came from my committee. But it should be understood that I did so because I felt certain the rule would be adopted and I could then offer the amendments to separate the postal and rank-and-file wage section of the bill from the excessive increases proposed for Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and members of the judiciary.

Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the winner of Oklahoma's State essay contest sponsored by the Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped is Miss Carol Greenwood, a resident of my district in Lawton, Okla. She is a student at Lawton High School and her essay reflects much thought on hiring the handicapped. I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Rat-a-tat-tat. Rat-a-tat-tat. The sound of a drum is inspiring. It has stimulated men to battle, rousing their spirits as they march. Rat-a-tat-tat. The drummer, playing his insistent rolls, has kept them in step as they tramp to their destiny. Even today there are drummers, but they do not play loudly nor in public. Each man must listen to his own and march accordingly. The handicapped march to a drummer that whole men can never hear. According to Thoreau, "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."[1]

"Let him step to the music which he hears." You are in a chair on the righthand side of a crowded auditorium in a growing town. It is 1952, an election year. On the stage sit several men, all political candidates. A man with twinkling eyes and a good-natured smile stands. As he strides toward the microphone, a few people notice his slight limp. The woman sitting beside you asks about his leg. Engrossed in the words and ideas of this pleasant, capable man, you do not answer. Faintly, far back in your mind, you hear the rat-a-tat-tat of a drum.

The man who stood before you first heard that drum during World War II. He heard it at the same moment a land mine destroyed half of his leg. The drum, faint at first, gradually gained volume. With an artificial limb this man relearned to march, this time to a new drumbeat. He learned well and in 1952 became the new mayor. Later he held the position of area contact representative for the Veterans' Administration. He proved that a land mine could not prevent a man with ability from keeping step with his drummer.

Up and down the piano keys run the aging fingers. Up and down the piano keys mimic the smaller ones, eagerly groping for perfection. In the background is the faint, sweet whisper of a drum. The older fingers belong to a middle-aged piano teacher who is confined to a wheel chair. Her ability as a teacher is not affected by the polio in her legs. She may never consciously pay attention to the drum, but unknowingly, she hears and heeds.

A horse neighed, car brakes squealed, a boy screamed, and somewhere far away a drum began to beat. This was the way one young man of 15 learned to march a new way. A car struck the horse he was riding, cutting his leg off just below the hip. What an enormous blow the accident was to a young boy, a blow that could have handicapped much more than his body; however, he heard the drum. Once outfitted with an artificial limb, he, too, stepped to its music; he ran to its music; he won the City Tennis Tournament to its music. Ability, a tennis racquet, and a drum made an unbeatable combination.

More than 4 million handicapped persons have fallen into step with this drum during the last 15 years.[2] These have enlisted through State employment agencies, while untold numbers have joined the growing ranks of handicapped workers on their own. They have convinced nationwide firms and small businesses alike that their ability counts, but there are thousands more still awaiting an opportunity to follow the drummer.

Each person mentioned here accomplished what he set out to do, despite obvious hardships. Perhaps this accomplishment was easier for the woman because her ability and disability were so disconnected. For the men, keeping step down their chosen paths was extremely difficult. Yet the three of them had one thing in common: each heard that special drummer, and each stepped to his music. In the words of Ella Wheeler Wilcox: "When a soul burns with a godlike purpose to achieve, all obstacles between it and its goal must vanish as the dew before the sun."[3]

What is this "God-like purpose to achieve" but the sound of a drummer, a drummer who plays for all the handicapped, a drummer whose message is courage, strength and faith? Look around you. Innumerable handicapped workers are proving that their ability counts, and each one is marching to the staccato beat of a faraway drum.

[1] Henry David Thoreau, "Adventures in American Literature," New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963, p. 583.

[2] "Fifteen Years," U.S. Government pamphlet.

[3] Ella Wheeler Wilcox, "My Book of Golden Thoughts," Racine, Wis.; Whitman Publishing Co., 1931, p. 61.

Flag Rates Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David R. Johnson, principal of Hillsboro High School, Hillsboro, Ind., has written a very moving and eloquent letter to the editor of the Indianapolis Star.

Principal Johnson praises the respect that his student body has shown for the national anthem and the flag of the United States. I believe the pupils of Hillsboro have set an example that could be followed by students of all our high schools and colleges. Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert this fine letter to the editor in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FLAG RATES RESPECT

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

In the last year I have had the opportunity to observe many students, teachers and parents at ball games when the national anthem was played.

It is a disgrace to think the American people would eat popcorn, hotdogs, laugh, kiss, talk, chew gum, stand with their hands in their pockets and worst of all not even remove their hats, while the national anthem is played. We are failing our future generations and losing our freedom by our own examples. It only takes a few minutes of our time to learn, show and teach proper respect for our American flag.

Recently I was so proud of the students and basketball team of Hillsboro High School that I almost burst with pride. They all stood at attention with their right hand over their heart, showing complete respect for our flag. Let me tell you—as I looked at our flag, I could almost swear I saw a million smiling faces asking themselves, "We deserve this kind of respect, why can't every American do this for us" I ask myself, why can't every American do this? After all it is so little for so much.

DAVID R. JOHNSON,
Principal, Hillsboro Public Schools,
HILLSBORO, IND.

Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Thursday, March 12, 1964:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Lyndon B. Johnson?

Senator Williams, Republican, of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don R. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored, at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought $1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a $100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had any knowledge of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employee at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody

made the arrangements. Why is the committee so afraid to explore the matter?

Whitewash is a useful commodity for sprucing up fences and outbuildings. But it serves only one purpose in this instance—to leave in the public mind a deep and fully justified suspicion that the Senate Rules Committee is trying to cover up a major scandal with far-reaching ramifications.

How Not To Reduce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am privileged to include a sermon delivered by Dr. W. Paul Ludwig, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, on Sunday, March 15, 1964.

It is a challenging sermon for all of us who find ourselves in a ideological confusion of social doctrines, economic theories, and political movements. This confusion has produced, out of an uncertain peace, the stark realities of a so-called cold war since the fall of Berlin in 1945.

It reminds us of our Christian background and the basic principles that we have been privileged to learn. Basically, we have a well-founded concept of what is right and what is wrong, beginning with the Mosaic code and expanded through the centuries into such documents as the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights. It should have led to a history better than we have had. I need not mention the excesses of the history in the memory of all of us.

If we, as a Christian nation, are to continue to grow, to progress, and, God granting, to wield influence, we will need all of the qualities of those "who hunger and thirst after righteousness" and, we do need, a balanced diet.

The sermon, entitled "How Not To Reduce," follows:

HOW NOT TO REDUCE

Suppose that our posterity would someday revert to the animal kingdom. That man, his appetite for righteousness vanished, would find his soul shriveling away as he stampeded through a jungle made unthinkably horrible by his technological cleverness.

Julian Huxley reminded us that a chapter in the history of earth closed with the appearance of man. In man, the Weltstoff, the essential substance of the universe, had been made to think and feel, to love beauty and truth. The cosmos had generated soul. A new chapter began, a chapter in which we all are characters. Matter had flowered into soul. Soul has now the responsibility of moulding matter.

"That moulding of matter by spirit is, under one aspect, science; under another, art; under still another, religion. Let us be careful not to allow the moulding forces to counteract each other when they might be made to cooperate."

This is a brilliant reminder of man's destiny. But it is also a distressing reminder of the difficulty we face in fulfilling our destiny. We are reasonably agreed that man is the highest order of creation; that he is different in nature and potential from the animal kingdom; that God has given him a kinship with Himself by which man is able to live in fellowship with his Creator.

The problem is that we are not left without freedom of choice and that by our personal decisions we often thwart God's promise and purpose for our lives. We not only try, we succeed in reducing the dimensions of our humanity. The course of history may be upward, but the course of individual life is full of depressions and animal reversions. The soul, instead of moulding matter as Huxley suggests, is made subordinate.

The human situation is further complicated by our vast confusion regarding the nature of religion. James H. Leuba in his "Psychological Study of Religion" lists 48 different definitions of religion. Even such a catalog could not embrace all the diversities of allegiance which constitute the driving powers of human life.

It is clear that I do not consider the religious and the godly man as necessarily the same thing. A man can have a diabolical religious faith when he worships the God of human cleverness or when the idol before which he bows is his own self-image. But these are religions, in the vulgar sense, in that they are for some people the dominating allegiance of life. They are substitutes for the suffering servant God of the cross; they are an abdication of man's position as a returned prodigal fully restored to the family of God. They are an extreme form of the confusion which causes us to inflate the man in us and to reduce the dimensions of the child of God. If we want to know "how not to reduce," we had better recommend a rather well-known prescription of a famous itinerant preacher: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled." We go not to a modern scholar but to a very old one, John Wycliffe, to investigate a shade of meaning. Wycliffe's translation puts it that "those who hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be fulfilled" or "filled full" in the sense of having realized their destiny as sons of God.

The point is that we must feel all the desperate urgency of a man who is in an agony of hunger and parched with thirst. A desire for righteousness if it is a listless, ho-hum kind of thing will result in the same quality of righteousness—a decorative, lapel-button kind of thing which makes us a voting member of the club but no real spokesman for the cause.

To change the figure, there is a reasonable suspicion that we are dazzled by what we think we see in the spiritual smorgasbord, and, by the time we get finished with our sampling and tasting, midnight has descended and we move out into the unknown with a dull ache in the pit of our soul.

If you remember the biographical novel entitled, "Sir Richard Burton's Wife," the comment of Isobel, the wife, regarding Richard's attitudes while living in Damascus will certainly come to mind: "Richard tried religions all around. Every time he was disappointed with a religion he fell back on mysticism. It was the soul wandering through space, like the dove out of the ark and seeking a place whereon to rest."

Some experts tell us that the so-called progressive ideas in child nurture have created a number of problems. The trend toward self-determination in diet has led to many embarrassments in adult life. Children who were entirely free to choose the foods they fancied have discovered that in maturity they had no taste or appetite for certain essential dishes which they had not learned to like in childhood. It is now feared that we have created a national health problem among teenagers.

Jesus has certainly seized an effective metaphor. Hunger and thirst and appetite are close to the heart of our daily experience. With vivid understanding, we apply this figure to our spiritual situation. In religious matters, too, we suffer from excessive freedom of choice in childhood, malnutrition arising from the neglect of essential elements.

Our religious decisions are not necessarily between two ideas one of which is essential and the other nonessential. Most of the time we are selecting between two essentials and our souls suffer from being half-nourished.

When Jesus was asked about the greatest commandment, His answer had two facets both of which had primary importance: "Love the Lord thy God and thy neighbor as thyself." To choose one part or the other of that command is to be a flat-wheeled Christian. This is unhappily a frequent source of conflict in the Christian Church, where 'either—or" instead of "both—and" has been the dominant mood.

The same type of temptation leads one man to emphasize worship to the exclusion of service, or service to the exclusion of worship. Or the choice is between faith and works; between justice and mercy; between work at home and work abroad; between life here and life hereafter.

This is cafeteria style faith that can pour into our spiritual system too much sugar or too much starch, too much acid or fat—until the soul sickens.

The first three decades of this century marked a tendency for church-related colleges and their denominational founding bodies to draw apart. Both churches and colleges lost by the separation; the church losing its involvement in research and science, and the college losing its motivating and organizing principle.

But in more recent years both churches and colleges are confessing their need of one another. The neglect of one by the other is now being replaced by an honest avowal of Christian purpose. This is seldom any more regarded as a sign of academic weakness or loss of freedom.

One day Emerson remarked that Harvard College taught all the branches of learning. Thoreau overhearing the comment, replied: "Yes, all the branches but none of the roots."

I am reminded of the more contemporary statement of Richard Niebuhr that "Unless our faith is rooted in the Jesus of history it is rootless."

"Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be fulfilled". Blessed are they who earnestly seek in their own religious experience for that complete union of truth and goodness that we discover in Christ Jesus.

The tragedy of most of Christendom and of an overwhelming majority of those who call themselves Christian is that the branches have become prolific and colorful, even glamorous, while the roots, because invisible, have been slowly starved, almost forgotten.

There can be no significant contribution of this church or any other, to the redemption of man unless we unashamedly confess that we have separated the branches from the root and resolve to amend our ways.

I am told that the phenomenon of fission which has become the symbol of our time will someday, perhaps not too far distant, be supplanted by the much more exciting and powerful process of fusion. Instead of generating power by explosion and separation of the atom, much greater energies will be produced by uniting atoms under incredible temperatures. With this method, the largest liners could be driven across the ocean by the energy from a half-glass of water.

This is also the new frontier of the spirit—the new but ancient frontier in which the forces of righteousness are released not through the separating but the welding of

our spiritual energies—not by fission but by fusion—not by tearing down but by building up—not by a cateteria-like picking and choosing of the things that suit us in the variety of religious offerings, but by hungering and thirsting after the truth which is Christ Jesus himself—the root of all our hope of peace and salvation.

You may remember the story of the little girl watching a parade of soldiers, who turned to her mother and said: "Someday they are going to give a war; and nobody will come."

This could have two meanings: Either that we can look forward to a Utopian state in which all our spiritual energies will be applied to righteousness, or to a state of dissolution in which there is scarcely anybody left to engage in conflict.

In either case the word of our Lord becomes starkly, frighteningly inevitable: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled."

Only in the whole message of divine love in Christ can our destiny as children of faith be filled full.

Community Service Society Looks at the Administration's Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the testimony by Barbara Reach on behalf of the Community Service Society before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on February 24, 1964.

The Community Service Society urges that the annual contributions for public housing be increased "to an amount commensurate with the obvious and desperate need." That is the purpose of my bill H.R. 5878. As I testified before the House Subcommittee on Housing, the administration's proposal for 240,000 public housing units in the next 4 years is totally inadequate.

I have also introduced H.R. 5877 to remove the 15-percent limitation on the amount of public housing annual contributions which may be allocated to any one State. The Community Service Society calls for the removal of that arbitrary limit.

The Community Service Society also suggests that the tax structure be revised to make the ownership of slum building unprofitable. In both the 87th and the 88th Congress, I have sponsored legislation—H.R. 4585—to require the owner of an apartment building or other multifamily structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition for deducting depreciation. The creation of such a reserve fund for repairs and maintenance would help to take the profits out of slums.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House and Senate Subcommittees on Housing will consider carefully the specific recommendations of the Community Service Society.

The testimony of Barbara Reach follows:

STATEMENT BY BARBARA REACH, PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON S. 2468; H.R. 9751, FEBRUARY 24, 1964

My name is Barbara Reach and I am here for the Committee on Housing and Urban Development of the Community Service Society of New York.

The Community Service Society, founded in 1848, is a nonsectarian body devoted to the preservation and improvement of family and community life. It is the oldest and largest voluntary family agency in the country, and unlike many other agencies it has always combined a broad program of social action with its services to troubled families and individuals. Almost from the beginning, its members recognized that poor quality housing can break a family, and tried to improve the appalling conditions they found among the poor of New York City. The committee on housing and urban development as a formal entity dates from 1898; it is thus the oldest citizens' housing organization in the country, and a pioneer in many respects. In New York City it has successfully promoted the establishment and enforcement of housing standards, improved zoning and city planning, programs to enlarge the supply of decent housing for families of low and middle income, and the adoption of improved practices in relocation. Many years ago the committee on housing and urban development recognized that conservation and upgrading of the buildings we now have, although a needed and valuable procedure, would never provide enough apartments for the low-income population and that private enterprise could not construct apartments that they could afford. We have therefore consistently supported the public housing programs of the city, State, and Federal governments.

Because of the short interval between the introduction of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1964 and this hearing, we have not been able to study all the provisions of the bill. My comments will therefore be confined to sections of the bill which we consider of primary importance and which we believe we are particularly competent to judge.

In our opinion, the heart of the bill is in Ttitle IV: Housing for Low-Income Families and Individuals; and Title III: Urban Renewal and Growth. Federal funds for public housing will be exhausted by the end of the fiscal year, and we welcome the intention of continuing the program. However, we consider the sum proposed in section 405 far from adequate. In New York City alone, more than 80,000 families apply for public housing every year, and more than 100,000 are on the waiting list. These applicants are people for whom the only possible escape from the slums is public housing; there is simply no substitute for it. We therefore believe that the annual contributions authrized should be increased to an amount commensurate with the obvious and desperate need.

In connection with the authorization of funds, we note that there is now a statutory limit of 15 percent on the amount that may be allocated to any one State. In our opinion this arbitrary limit does not make sense because the needs of different States vary so widely. Already more than half of the "forgotten fifth" of our people live in the cities, and the trend toward urban life is expected to accelerate. In New York City 26 percent of the population is existing below the poverty line. We therefore believe that the special problems of States having large concentrations of low-income families and an inadequate amount of low rent housing should be the primary consideration in allocating funds and that the 15 percent limit be removed from the law. The temporary New York State Commission on Low-Income Housing stressed this point in its recent report to the Legislature of the State of New York; it stressed the fact that while New York had exhausted its share of Federal funds, allocations in other parts of the country are uncommitted, and that the State has authorized the spending of almost $1 billion of State money, far more than any other State has done.

Turning to title III, we of course approve of the intention to continue the urban renewal program, but again we believe that the annual grant should be much larger than that provided in section 304.

We further believe that the time allotted to these programs—4 years for public housing and 2 for urban renewal—is too short to permit adequate planning. In brief, we believe that if the Congress is really to face up to the truly staggering housing problem, it must vote for more annual grants or contributions and longer-range programs.

Titles I, III, and IV include a number of provisions relating to relocation from urban renewal and public housing sites. Here the Committee on Housing and Urban Development is entitled to speak with particular authority, for our active interest in the subject dates back to 1905, when we make a study of the persons displaced from the site of Pennsylvania Station. I think I may say that we have been pioneers both in recognizing the seriousness of the problem and in conducting studies and demonstration projects which have led to a number of improvements in relocation policies and practices in New York City. Along with this statement we are filing with the subcommittee two studies published by the Committee on Housing and Urban Development on this subject. In our opinion relocation, properly handled, can be a humane process and in many cases can produce positive gains for the "relocatees."

We therefore approve in general the increased emphasis on relocation shown in this bill, but would like to comment in detail on a few sections.

Section 101, providing payments for 2 years to certain displaced families and elderly persons, is an interesting proposal and warrants serious consideration. We are pleased to note that those included in this program would not waive their priority for public housing. But those who may have to move at the end of the 2 years should be specifically granted their rights to the regular payments for moving expenses. The method, used in New York City, of paying a finder's fee, plus a cash bonus to the tenant, can be a useful alternative to the subsidy proposed in this section, and provisions for this method might be included in the bill.

We favor section 102, which would provide rehabilitation assistance to elderly homeowners in urban renewal areas. This provision would make it possible for a low or moderate income person 62 years of age or over who owns a one- or two-family home in an urban renewal area to obtain a below-market interest loan so that he could rehabilitate his home.

In urban renewal areas, such as Corona-East Elmhurst in Queens, there are situations where this program would be applicable.

We thoroughly support the provisions of section 401, which would permit the admission of single low-income "displacees" to low-rent housing regardless of age or disability status. At present many persons who are not disabled and who are under 62 and therefore not technically "aged", but whose needs cannot be met except in public housing, are not eligible for admission. While we recognize that the problems for the older group are often especially acute, this is not a reason to disregard the expenses and hardships of all those under 62.

We are deeply concerned that because of high construction costs new project apartments are out of reach for families at the lowest income level unless they receive public assistance. We therefore favor section 402, which in effect increases the subsidy available to local housing authorities so that more "displacees" of very low income may be admitted to public housing without their having to pay more rent than they can afford and without jeopardizing the solvency of the project. We furthermore approve sections 406 and 407, which establish the basic right to relocation and to relocation payments of those displaced from public housing sites. They have the same problems as those displaced from urban renewal sites, and the present disparity in treatment is illogical and unfair.

The Community Service Society has an outstanding welfare research organization and we believe that the society's demonstration projects over 65 years have abundantly proved their worth. On the basis of this experience, we strongly recommend adoption of sections 309 and 408, which would make possible further grants for the demonstration programs in urban renewal and low-rent housing. We note with particular approval that Federal funds could be used to pay the whole cost of writing and publishing reports on urban renewal demonstrations. Urban renewal is still in the formative stage, there are a number of possible approaches to it, and we think it very important that information about various methods and their results should be readily available to evryone who is interested. As to public housing, we hope that practical research into new methods of planning and construction would lead to improved design, a better human environment, and lowered costs.

We likewise support the programs proposed in section 701 for training the technical and professional personnel that will be in increasing demand as the public housing and urban renewal programs expand.

Section 404, which would help local authorities to make more use of existing housing by providing a realistic method of financing, would probably be of relatively limited use in New York City because of the low vacancy rate. Nevertheless, the financing formula proposed is a sensible one and an improvement over the present system. We therefore recommend it.

Section 804 we consider of great potential value. It would give nonresident owners of buildings in urban renewal areas for 1 to 11 families access to FHA mortgage insurance on terms similar to those now available for larger buildings. This would be very useful in areas like East Harlem in Manhattan. Here the Community Service Society has for some years taken part in a neighborhood conservation project, and we know of many old-law tenements of 10 units that are well worth saving, and that we believe would be rehabilitated if FHA mortgage insurance were more easily available. In a comparatively short time these small buildings could be ready to make a valuable contribution to the supply of low-rent housing. Our major housing resource continues to be old housing and everything reasonable that can be done to improve it and to extend its life should be encouraged.

Section 302, dealing with general neighborhood renewal plans, proposes a useful change in the direction of greater flexibility as to the areas to be included; we therefore support it.

The principal value of Section 306 is that it would put an end to an unreasonable situation. At present, if land within an urban renewal area is acquired for public housing it costs more than the same land would if it were acquired for middle-income housing. We do not believe there is any good reason for this disparity, and we recommend the change. The section also assures to single persons certain rights to occupancy of middle-income housing in urban renewal areas which we believe they should, in equity, be given.

As our metropolitan areas become increasingly crowded and land is developed for miles around our cities, preservation of some open space is essential for the physical and mental health of those who live in the center cities. For this reason we strongly support section 904—Open Space Program—and we urge that additional funds be appropriated this year.

To conclude my comment, I wish to call attention to two areas which the bill does not cover and which the Committee thinks are worthy of consideration by the Congress.

The first is that of social services. Our broad experience in working with underprivileged families and individuals has demonstrated conclusively that trained social workers are invaluable at every stage of a housing program—in easing relocation, in selecting tenants suitable for public housing, in preparing families for life in a new community, and in the day-to-day management of a project. We consider social services not a luxury but a necessity. If the people for whom this great effort in housing is being made are to get the full benefit of it, provision must be made to authorize the use of Federal funds for social services.

Finally, we believe that the influence of the present tax structure on housing—either the condition of existing housing or the possibilities of future construction—should not be overlooked. There have been many attacks on "slumlords," with varying results. There is no better way to end an abuse than to make it unprofitable; but at present some tax provisions actually tend to encourage owners to keep decaying and blighted buildings. We believe that a tax system might be devised that would, in contrast, tend to encourage good maintenance of existing buildings and the construction of better housing. We therefore urge that some Federal agency make a study of this whole question.

In concluding these comments on the "Housing and Community Development Act of 1964," I want to add that the Committee for which I speak is greatly heartened by the administration's recognition that the progress of the urban renewal and low-rent housing programs—together constituting one of the great social developments of the last quarter-century—must not be allowed to falter. Better dwellings and a better environment in which to live, work, and play—these are not the only means of alleviating the misery and degradation in which too many of our people exist, but they are among the foremost.

The need is great, and we hope and believe that the Congress will respond as the facts demand.

Resolution Adopted by Erie County Board of Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors, in Buffalo, N.Y., on March 3, 1964:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N.Y., be recorded as strenuously opposing any amendment of the Federal Internal Revenue Code or regulations thereof, which would effect or tend to effect elimination of the exemption on interest received from State and local securities.

U.S. Marshal Clayburne A. McLelland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Red-directed Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone on January 9–11, 1964, I received from various parts of the Nation a number of letters from loyal citizens expressing their concern over the safety of Clayburne H. McLellan, U.S. marshal for the Canal Zone judicial district.

Published reports at the time were to the effect that Marshal McLelland had arrived by air at the National Airport with plans to make a statement to the people of the country on the Canal Zone crisis, that promptly on arrival at the airport he started to give a report over communications networks, that he was promptly stopped by an officer of the Air Force under instructions, and thereupon escorted away before he was able to speak.

Subsequently, I had an exchange of letters with the Secretary of the Army, who is the official of our Government charged by the President with supervision over the Panama Canal enterprise, and with the Attorney General of the United States.

From these, it now appears that, as reported, Marshal McLelland was intercepted on his arrival at the Washington Airport by an officer of the Air Force on request of the Department of Justice. The blame for such interference is now being placed by the Department of Justice on an Air Force officer who is accused of taking the Justice Department request too literally.

In order that the legislative and investigating committees of the Congress may be informed in the premises, I include the indicated exchanges:

FEBRUARY 17, 1964.

Hon. STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The following excerpt from a letter dated February 8, 1964, is quoted for information:

"At this time we respectfully call your attention to the treatment afforded one Clayborne R. McLelland, U.S. Marshall, Canal Zone, by our U.S. State Department.

"When last seen, McLelland was—shall we say—'kidnaped' by State Department officials, as was his briefcase, upon arriving at District of Columbia's airport.

"Four days later—a private source tells us—he was shipped back to the zone, apparently 'muzzled' and without briefcase.

"The American people have a right to know what has happened to McLelland and his story."

Although the excerpt does not involve an employee of the Panama Canal enterprise, it does involve an officer of the U.S. district court of the Canal Zone and no doubt involves Canal Zone matters as well as an officer of the Air Force who met Marshal McLelland at the Washington airport and escorted him.

Because of these facts, I desire full information in the premises.

An early reply is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1964.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is in reply to your letter of February 17, 1964, to Secretary Ailes about the alleged "muzzling" of U.S. Marshal Clayburne A. McLelland of the Canal Zone.

Then Secretary of the Army Vance and Under Secretary Ailes spent approximately 1 hour with Mr. McLelland, and I joined them the latter half of this period. This meeting was at Mr. McLelland's request and took place although he had failed to keep an earlier appointment with the Secretary.

At this discussion he had a briefcase in his possession containing various documents to which he referred during our conversations. At the end, he requested our assistance in obtaining transportation back to the Canal Zone. Although his trip was entirely on his own initiative, we did find space for him on a partially empty aircraft bound for the Canal Zone the following day. To the best of my knowledge he boarded the aircraft with his briefcase intact.

I have no knowledge of any "muzzling" of Mr. McLelland. No doubt your letter refers to the interruption of a TV interview with him upon his arrival in Washington. I am informed by the authorities concerned that the officer involved, Capt. W. J. Kelly of the U.S. Air Force, was acting as a bearer in relaying a message from the Department of Justice. Under the circumstances, any additional inquiries about this aspect of Mr. McLelland's visit should be referred to the Department of Justice.

Sincerely,

HARRY C. MCPHERSON, Jr.,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (IA).

FEBRUARY 27, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In connection with other correspondence on the case of U.S. Marshal Clayburne A. McLelland, I enclose an exchange of letters with the Secretary of the Army.

Full information is desired and an early reply requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE
OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1964.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am pleased to reply to your letter of February 27 concerning U.S. Marshal Clayburne M. McLelland.

The television incident referred to was the result of an unfortunate misunderstanding. For our part, we had asked the Air Force to see that Marshal McLelland came to the Department of Justice promptly after his arrival from the Canal Zone. An Air Force officer took our request somewhat too literally. Plainly, there was no intention either on our part or that of the Air Force of preventing Marshal McLelland any chance to present his views.

Marshal McLelland spent 4 days in Washington and while he was here we arranged for him to confer with officials in the White House, State Department and other agencies. He also met with Members of Congress and following his meetings with officials, he was perfectly free to talk with anyone, including reporters. Marshal McLelland told us he was leaving pleased knowing that he had received every opportunity to present his views to all the appropriate persons.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

Foreign Steel Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, foreign steel "dumping" has been increasing greatly, and our U.S. steel exports have fallen drastically. A quick change of policy is necessary. The administration should look at the plain facts and act to prevent further depression in the steel and coal mining industries that are basic U.S. industries and two strong foundations of our U.S. economy.

I submit for the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people, an excellent article from the official publication of district No. 50, United Mine Workers of America, called the District Fifty News, in the issue of Tuesday, March 10, 1964:

"FIFTY" LABOR-INDUSTRY PARLEY RAPS FOREIGN STEEL IMPORTS

MORRISVILLE, PA.—The first labor-management conference has just been completed at the Stacy-Trent Hotel in Trenton, N.J., for the Morrisville, Pa., plant of General Refractories Co., whose employees are members of Local Union 14643, District 50, UMWA.

The session was chaired by District 50 Executive Board Member Walter Glasgow, who has been guiding all refractory industries conferences for District 50.

The conference fruitfully pointed out the pertinency of the gathering in relation to jobs and welfare of District 50 members.

It will be recalled that the idea for these labor-management conferences was conceived by International President Elwood Moffett to develop mutual cooperation and future actions to protect both the union membership and the companies under contract with our organization, with respect to the many types of problems confronting all of us today.

Since the Morrisville plant is a new, modern facility, automation problems present no grave problems for the immediate future. However, mechanization problems were pointed out. Effects of today's competitive problems and modernization versus obsolescence pointed up the fact that many brick plants have either closed or have drastically reduced work forces throughout the refractory industry.

Foreign importation problems were dealt with at great length, and this problem seemed to generate more discussion of a serious nature than any other point on the agenda.

Although refractory products themselves are not as yet being imported into the United States, the disastrous results of steel imports was emphasized. It is quite evident that thousands of steel workers have lost their jobs—probably permanently—due to the fact that steel imports have leaped from 1 million tons in 1955 to over 5 million tons in 1963, while at the same time U.S. steel exports fell from 6 million tons in 1957 to something over 1 million tons in 1963.

Naturally, this dumping of foreign-made steel into our country has affected our refractories industry, since the steel companies are the biggest refractory customers.

Note was made by Regional Director Arthur Nusser that local union 14643 at Morrisville, had passed a resolution concerning this problem, which demands that Congress act to bar imports from nations that do not pay their workers at least the equivalent of our minimum $1.25 per hour wage. Copies of the resolution have been sent to Pennsylvania and New Jersey Senators and area Congressman, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and public news media.

All local union members are being furnished copies of the resolution, and are being urged to communicate with their congressional representatives on an individual letter basis.

It was pointed out that while average adult male hourly rates in 1963 in the United States were $2.46, similar rates were only $1.01 in the United Kingdom, 86 cents in West Germany, 49 cents in Italy, and 38 cents in Japan.

It is estimated that steel import increases and export decreases have resulted in a loss of $1,500 jobs in the refractory industries, as well as $8,700,000 lost in wages annually.

Roy S. Parsons, industrial relations director for General Refractories Co., and his assistant, George Milos, effectively and dramatically pointed out the effects on company business brought on by the steel situation.

Proper participation in civic affairs was emphasized, so that political office holders may understand fully the tempo of the area's workers in these pressing matters.

Employment opportunity problems were also discussed, as was the Government's workers retraining plan program. Mr. Glasgow indicated that General Refractories Co. has always tried to operate on this theory of retraining men wherever possible, when jobs were eliminated.

The safety program now in effect was explored and found to be operating very well. There has been good cooperation between the parties in safety matters.

Those attending the conference in addition to executive board member, Walter Glasgow; region 9 director, Arthur Nusser; industrial relations director, Roy S. Parsons; and his assistant, George Milos, were: Enoch A. Biasi, assistant director, region 9; William McCann, field representative, region 9; Thomas McCall, president, local union 14643; Richard Smith, Herman Craigle, William Morse, Robert McCall, John Williams, Frank Rittzo, Ken Keller, Luther Gahagan, George Sheffler, Stanley Johnson, Ryan Washburn, Terry Frazier, Calvin McCall, Alexander Pearson, McDowell Walker, Frank McCall, and Paul Harley, all from the local union.

Additional company attendants were Leland McClure, manager of clay operations; Ray Muffley, plant superintendent; Howard Shellenberger, foreman; Quentin Walsh, foreman; and Ronald McClure, foreman.

RESOLUTION WIDELY SPREAD

A resolution was drawn up by the conferees asking that congressional action be taken to apply the Fair Labor Standards Act to incoming commerce from foreign countries. Fully executed copies of the resolution were sent to: Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America; William Scranton,

Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Hugh Scott, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania; Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania; Willard S. Curtin, U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania; Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey; Clifford Case, U.S. Senator from New Jersey; Harrison Williams, U.S. Senator from New Jersey; Frank Thompson, U.S. Representative from New Jersey; and all members of Local Union 14643, District 50, UMWA.

The resolution appears below:

"Whereas the membership of Local Union No. 14643, District 50, United Mine Workers of America, of Morrisville, Pa., is employed in the refractories industry with some 90 percent of this industry's output used in the manufacture of steel and related products; and

"Whereas District 50, United Mine Workers of America, initiated a series of labor-management conferences in this industry at the local plant and local union level, apart from and avoiding the usual pressures of contract negotiations and administration of the labor agreement, with an agenda covering several subjects—one being foreign competitive imports produced by cheap labor abroad; and

"Whereas the record shows an alarming increase of imports of steel mill products from about 1 million tons in 1955 to some 5 million tons in 1963, exclusive of manufactured steel products, and a loss of steel exports from 6 million tons in 1957 to less than 2 million tons in 1963; and

"Whereas there is a wide disparity in wage rates paid to labor in the United States and the principal importing countries as follows: average hourly earnings for adult males in the United States is $2.46; in the United Kingdom it is $1.01; in West Germany it is 86 cents; in Italy it is 49 cents; and in Japan it is 38 cents; and

"Whereas all of these foreign labor rates are not only lower than the rates actually being paid in the United States but are substantially lower than the $1.25 per hour minimum required by law to be paid by a domestic employer in the United States; and

"Whereas the increase in imports and the decrease of exports of steel alone has caused a loss of some 1,500 job opportunities and some $8,700,000 in wages in the rafractories industry alone: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That in order to protect our jobs and our American standards of living from the competition of cheap foreign labor, we recommend that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to apply the Fair Labor Standards Act (minimum labor standards) to incoming commerce from abroad as effectively as it is applied to domestic employers engaged in commerce between and among the States of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the appropriate local union officers to our employer, to the regional director, and to the international union office of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, and to each U.S. Senator and Congressman representing this district."

A Poet of Hawaii Pleases the First Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin for March 5, 1964, carries a story entitled, "Verses by Island Poet Stone Praised by President's Wife."

It tells how Lady Bird Johnson at a prayer breakfast for congressional wives, recited "The Song of Peace" by Lloyd Stone of Hawaii, and called it one of the most memorable prayers she has ever heard. I agree with our First Lady, and I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Honolulu Star-Bulletin story, which sets forth two poems by Lloyd Stone:

VERSES BY ISLAND POET STONE PRAISED BY PRESIDENT'S WIFE

Lloyd Stone, island poet, has an admirer in the White House—Lady Bird Johnson.

Mrs. Johnson, speaking last month at a prayer breakfast for wives of Congressmen, recited one of Stone's poems, "The Song of Peace," and called it one of the most memorable prayers she has ever heard.

She said she heard it sung by a group of farm boys while she was sitting in a wagon on a hillside in northern Greece 2 years ago.

The words were written by Stone while he was a student at the University of Southern California in the early 1930's and set to the music of Sibelius' "Finlandia":

"This is my song, O God of all the nations,
A song of peace for the lands afar, and mine.
This is my home, the country where my heart is,
This is my hope, my dream, my shrine;
But other hearts in other lands are beating
With hopes and dreams the same as mine.
My country's skies are bluer than the ocean,
And sunlight beams on cloverleaf and pine,
But other lands have sunlight, too, and clover,
And skies are sometimes blue as mine.
Oh, hear my song, thou God of all the nations,
A song of peace for their land, and mine."

After Mrs. Johnson recited the poem, she said, "I still remember it with the happy thought of the universality of prayer and a spirit of hopefulness."

Stone read an Associated Press story of Mrs. Johnson's recital and wrote her a letter telling her the history of the poem and enclosing another one of his works, "In This Hawaiian Net," which has a theme similar to "Song of Peace," but from the Hawaiian point of view.

"IN THE HAWAIIAN NET

"In this Hawaiian net is caught
And held for a little while, and with it you
And I. How many long agos and what
Great distances conspired to bring us here
Together at this appointed now. We must
Not miss this opportunity for friendship
Time and place have worked through centuries
To bring about. That we are not the same
In color nor in creed may be. But oh
There is so much that friends can understand.
Shall we be friends? Here is my hand."

Mrs. Johnson wrote Stone that "I am charmed to have the 'Song' you wrote in Hawaii and hope you won't mind if I borrow a line or two from it someday."

She added in a handwritten postscript, "This is indeed a memorable 'sequel' to my first hearing—and so long remembering—your 'Song of Peace' at the Greek school."

The Reluctant Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the investigation in the other body on the influence meandering of Bobby Baker leaves a bad taste in one's mouth. The Newsday editorial of March 13 insists that we must get all the facts and clear the air. Also, an editorial in yesterday's Washington Daily News insists on the same thing:

[From Newsday, Mar. 13, 1964]

BAKER PROBE MUST GO ON

The unseemly haste with which the Senate Rules Committee is attempting to close out its investigation of the malodorous machinations of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker is a discredit not only to the Senate, but to President Johnson himself.

Committee Counsel Lennox P. McLendon, a North Carolina crony of the committee's chairman, Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, claims that "there is no other evidence or witness available * * * that would not be repetitious." A look at the record contradicts such a statement.

The committee never has cleared up the discrepancies between testimony by Maryland insurance broker Don B. Reynolds and an affidavit filed with the Senate panel by White House aid, Walter Jenkins. Reynolds claims Jenkins pressured him into buying advertising time on the Johnson TV station in return for allowing him to write a $100,000 insurance policy on Johnson's life.

The committee has studiously avoided calling Jenkins to deny Reynolds' allegations under oath (an action that would lay the groundwork for possible perjury action against someone) and instead has been content with a denial in writing from Jenkins. Now Reynolds says Jenkins and Baker sought a rebate from Reynolds in connection with Johnson's $100,000 policy. Such rebates are illegal in the District of Columbia.

Still the committee doesn't see fit to call Jenkins or 12 other prospective witnesses proposed by the Republican minority. Why not? The only inference that the public can draw under the circumstances is that someone is trying to cover something up. President Johnson should be less satisfied than anyone else in the country with such an untidy end to the Baker probe. It can hardly help in the fall campaign.

Not to clear up every facet of the Baker investigation completely would be politically stupid as well as morally wrong. The President must insist that the investigation go on. If he doesn't the cloud of suspicion raised by the Baker mess will cast a long shadow in the months ahead.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 18, 1964]

BAKER PROBE—BANG OR BUST?

It is easy to holler "politics," as some Democrats are doing, in answer to Republican claims that the Bobby Baker probe is being wrapped up before it is finished. It is just as valid to accuse the Democratic majority on the investigating committee of "politics" in deciding to abandon the probe.

Politics or not, Senator SCOTT made a good case this week against the obvious intent of the Democrats to quit. His blast on the Senate floor was good enough, at least, to postpone the intent.

The Senator said he and two others of the GOP minority on the committee had a list of witnesses to be called, among them Walter Jenkins of the White House staff. An insurance man testified he dealt with Mr. Jenkins in placing advertising with a radio station owned by President Johnson's family after he had sold Mr. Johnson an insurance policy through Bobby Baker. Mr. Jenkins denied this, but not in sworn testimony before the committee.

Senator SCOTT charged that the committee, headed by Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, arbitrarily has skipped a lot of possible testimony. It has refused to follow up many of its leads. It is, he said, all set to "cut and run."

Politics or no politics, we think the public is interested in a cleanup of the bewildering Bobby Baker tangle. The Senate should be even more interested, because it is the reputation of the Senate, more than anything else, which otherwise can be tainted.

Religion Belongs in the Home and the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written to me by my good friend, Rabbi Harry Halpern, of the East Midwood Jewish Center in Brooklyn.

Rabbi Halpern's letter says many of the things which thinking Americans feel about the proposal to amend the Constitution to permit prayers in schools.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1964.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: The attempt to circumvent the provisions of the first amendment to our Constitution has come as a great shock to me and the members of my congregation, the East Midwood Jewish Center.

I am writing to you in behalf of the community in which I have had the honor of serving as a religious leader for over 30 years and on behalf of myself to voice our unanimous opposition to any attempt which may be made to defeat the clear and unequivocal mandate of the Supreme Court in the matter of religious exercises in the public schools of our country.

In a country like ours made up as it is of people of diverse faiths, the only way in which we have lived and are able to live in harmony is to mutually respect each other's religious convictions and to leave the entire matter of religion to the home and the church of the individuals involved. Any attempt to disturb this traditional American pattern would imperil the religious convictions of various groups and would cause needless and bitter controversy.

It is futile to argue that religious exercises of any kind would be completely voluntary. A child attending school is not in a position to oppose the will of a teacher or of a majority of pupils in any class. It is obvious that there are innumerable questions which would arise in connection with even such a simple thing as a Bible reading. Whether the Old or New Testament or both should be read, whether there should be readings from the Koran or from other religious literature, which portion should be read, and in the case of the Bible, which version of it should be used, whether children who choose to kneel in prayer should be permitted to do so, whether the child desiring to wear a skullcap during prayer should be allowed to do so—these are only some of the questions which would inevitably arise in considering the introduction of religious readings or prayers in the public school.

But there is even something which goes beyond the question of religion in this matter. If the attempt on the part of proponents of a new amendment were to succeed, it would mean that on every occasion when the Supreme Court renders a decision those who were dissatisfied with the ruling could conveniently circumvent its application by passing an amendment which would nullify the judicial decision. I am sure that the danger of this course of action needs no elaboration.

I am writing to respectfully request, on behalf of myself and the 1,600 families affiliated with my congregation, that you do your utmost to defeat the attempt to, in reality, amend the first amendment. Furthermore, may I respectfully request that if you are a signatory to the petition of Congressman BECKER to discharge the bill from committee that you withdraw your signature from the petition.

I assure you that what I have written is in the spirit of a love for our religious freedom and an attempt to perpetuate a voluntary and not a forced adherence to religious ideals.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Rabbi HARRY HALPERN.

"Great Decisions" Comes to New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the "Great Decisions" program sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association is a valuable contribution to public understanding of the complexities of foreign policy issues. As I have said before, an enlightened foreign policy depends upon an enlightened public opinion. Under this program thousands of citizens, using the excellent fact sheets provided by FPA, study the great foreign policy decisions facing the country. The Foreign Policy Association had conducted these programs with great success in many areas of the country. I have encouraged the residents of New York to participate because I believe it is imperative that all citizens be thoroughly informed in the area of foreign policy. On March 19, 1964, the New York Times published the following editorial commending the program:

THE "GREAT DECISIONS" PROGRAM

In 1,000 communities across the country in recent weeks, discussion groups have been meeting regularly to debate the key issues in foreign policy that now confront the United States. It is an extraordinary phenomenon—part of the annual "Great Decisions" program of the Foreign Policy Association.

Particularly in an election year—when candidates are offering shotgun solutions to world problems—it is reassuring to learn that 11,000 citizens in, for example, Salt Lake City, care enough about informing themselves to devote an evening a week to study and discussion of the FPA's objective "fact sheets." And that there is an active world affairs program in Little Rock, and in virtually every important center of the once-isolationist Middle West.

At last the "Great Decisions" program, in its 10th year, is to be extended now to the New York area. Any neighborhood, church, school or other study group can participate. The Foreign Policy Association is carrying out a valuable public service.

Ysmael Reyes Villegas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, we too often forget the past. We are prone to enjoy the present, too seldom remembering the good works, and occasionally the heroism, of those individuals who have contributed so much to our material blessings and, above all, to our freedoms.

Tomorrow, March 20, is one of those dates that reminds us of this. It causes me to think back to the time, two decades ago, when this Nation and the decent aspirations of mankind were threatened in a war raging across the world.

One of the young Americans who went off to fight in that war was Ysmael Reyes Villegas, born, raised, and schooled in Riverside, Calif., never expecting to see the Philippine Islands or to have his bravery tested there.

It is said of Ysmael that he was always happy, that he always cheered up those around him. That is why he was known as "Smiley."

It also is said of him that he was dependable, that he gave more than he received. One of his school principals remembered him in this way:

Smiley was solid, responsible. He wasn't the one who made the score, but he passed the ball to the fellow who did make it. He always sacrificed his personal ambitions for others.

It was on March 20, 1945, that Smiley made the supreme sacrifice. I would like for you to know why there is a Villegas Park in Riverside where his family still resides. I would like for you to know why this young man was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. The story is told in the official citation:

Staff Sergeant Ysmael R. Villegas was a squad leader in Company F, 127th Infantry, in action along the Villa Verde Trail, Luzon, Philippine Islands, on March 20, 1945. When his unit, in a forward position, clashed with an enemy strongly entrenched in connected caves and foxholes on commanding ground, he moved boldly from man to man, in the face of bursting grenades and demolition charges, through heavy machine gun and rifle fire, to bolster the spirit of his comrades. Inspired by his gallantry, his men pressed forward to the crest of the hill. Numerous enemy riflemen, refusing to flee, continued firing from their foxholes. Sergeant Villegas, with complete disregard for his own safety and the bullets which kicked up the dirt at his feet, charged an enemy position, and firing at pointblank range, killed the Japanese in the foxhole. He rushed a second foxhole while bullets missed him by inches, and killed one more enemy. In rapid succession he charged a third, a fourth, and a fifth foxhole, each time destroying the enemy within. The fire against him increased in intensity, but he pressed onward to attack a sixth position. As he neared his goal, he was hit and killed by enemy fire. Through his heroism and indomitable fighting spirit, Sergeant Villegas, at the cost of his life, inspired his men to determined attack in which they swept the enemy from the field.

Dowdy Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DOWDY is, as we all know, one of the most able, respected, and conscientious Members of this body. He has established an enviable reputation here because he is always honest and truthful.

He recently made a report to his constituents concerning the misnamed civil rights bill. The report includes an exposure of a sinister conspiracy on the part of leftwingers to defeat him and others who joined him in opposing this monstrous legislation. His analysis is accurate and forthright. It should be read by everyone, regardless of race, creed or color.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of the Dowdy report. It follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

The pending civil rights bill is now being debated in the Senate. Strong efforts will be put forth by all the left-wing pressure groups, the socialists, and the other extremists, including the threat of mob demonstrations, rioting, and violence, to force this unconstitutional, totalitarian bill into law.

Centralized power in Washington is their aim. Coercive tactics and blackmail will be used. To accomplish this, they favor giving the Federal Government the power, as set out in this bill, to stop old-age assistance, veteran's benefits, and social security and civil service retirement payments to any State which will not knuckle under to their demands. They want to force racial mixing in cafes, motels, hotels, roominghouses, boardinghouses, barbershops, beauty shops, etc.; they want to have authority to tell each employer how many of each race he must hire, in order to maintain a racial balance. They want to give the Federal Government the power to control your local schools, the curriculums, and the faculties. These people want to control every detail of your life from Washington.

A purge of the Members of Congress who oppose their evil schemes is a part of their plan. A fundraising cocktail party was given in Washington on February 25 of this year to raise money to purge your Congressman. News reports of the affair made some newspapers, in spite of the fact that Musselwhite tried to suppress the story. Seymour Chase, a left-wing Washington lawyer, in introducing Musselwhite to the assembly, said it was their intention to defeat the Members of Congress who led the fight against the totalitarian civil rights bill. He boasted that his group beat one southern Member 2 years ago, and they would do it again. He said that their purpose is to arrange to knock off the Congressmen one by one, and if they could succeed, they would strike fear in the hearts of other Congressmen who dare oppose their schemes.

Among those present at the party were Joseph L. Rauh, of ADA, a group of wealthy socialists who are all-out for forced mixing of the races; Richard Lyon, a cosponsor of the cocktail party, president of another group supporting forced racial mixing; Franklin Jackson, a Negro man, who, along with Martin Luther King whose views you already know, is active in organizations which have been promoting mob demonstrations, rioting, and violence; the ACLU, the organization which actively opposed my subcommittee's investigation of the activities of the Mattachine Society, which is a group of homosexuals; the organization which promoted and financed the cases in which the Supreme Court barred Bible reading in schools, and prayer in public places, which ruling I have introduced a bill to overturn; also represented was the group which is using Urban Redevelopment to forcibly take the homes of poor people, mostly Negroes, so as to use the land for their own selfish gain, to build luxury, high-rent apartments for rich people. Because I am attempting to block their selfish desires, they also joined the "purge John Dowdy drive."

After Chase told the group they could make other Congressmen fear them, Musslewhite told them that what he wanted was their money, and if elected, he would be guided by their wishes on the issues in which they were interested. He told them that the people in our district "don't know what they are," and that if he, as a liberal can beat John Dowdy, it would be a blow to conservatism. He called it a race between liberal and conservative. Evidently, he doesn't think much of the intelligence of the people he seeks to represent. As for me, I do not believe you want a socialistic government any more than I do. This shows you how power politics works in Washington. At any rate, he got their money, and they got his promise. I have always represented my constituents, and I promise to continue to do so.

Does Disarmament Lead to Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, history proves that weakness breeds war.

In a very enlightened discussion on our present peace negotiations, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, in the Long Island Press of March 14, analyzes what is really happening:

DO ARMS TALKS LEAD TO PEACE?

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

How genuine are the marathon disarmament negotiations that have been going on for years at Geneva?

I mean, are they really leading to peace or are they a coverup by the Soviets for their present inability to keep up in the arms race; to be junked as soon as the United States starts falling behind?

At present, Soviet representatives have stated that further negotiations are "practically useless," and then said they were ready to continue. U.S. chief disarmer Bill Foster insists that with time and perseverance we can bring the Russians to see that their interest lies in disarming. Even General de Gaulle assured Nikita that France is for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Is anybody being fooled?

Some people, for thousands of years, have really advocated peace although as a political movement the peace drive belongs to the 19th century. Before World War I the nations set up the Hague Court of Arbitration to substitute for war.

And in 1914 they heard the guns of August heralding the biggest military slaughter of all times.

Between the two wars, disarmament negotiations went on steadily at Geneva. Numerous ingenious schemes were produced.

The intended aggressors used these negotiations as one means of hiding their real intentions.

Invention of the A-bomb gave the United States power to impose peace and even disarmament, as long as we had a monopoly. It also increased mankind's desire for peace. For even the incurably belligerent could see that atomic, not to say nuclear, war would give neither fun nor profit.

Once the Soviets produced bombs, the disarmers in America took over. War, they said, would solve nothing and produce gigantic slaughter and ruin on both sides.

More disarmament negotiations followed.

These negotiations brought about the ban on nuclear tests from which, most, but not all, experts agree, the Soviets benefited more than the United States. For, as the stronger power, the United States is in a position to bankrupt the U.S.S.R. in a prolonged arms race.

But if Moscow really disarmed, it could no longer push communism by threats and "little wars of liberation." Nor could it hope to control Red China—or prevent it and other countries from developing nuclear weapons—unless it dropped nuclear bombs on them. Therefore Moscow is in no hurry to do anything but talk about disarmament and eager American disarmers are feeling frustrated. What should President Johnson do?

In other words, does it make sense to expect that sovereign nations will ever really yield their only reliable means of defense short of enforcible world law?

It is against this background that the Geneva disarmament negotiations should be judged.

Poll of Public Opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, recorded below are the tabulated results of my latest poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania on 14 vital issues. Certain other equally live issues were not included because they had been part of another poll.

The 18th Congressional District is made up of an almost equal number of Republicans and Democrats. It is all in the metropolitan area to the north, east, and west of the city of Pittsburgh. None of the city itself is included. The district is quite heavily industrialized along the Allegheny and Ohio Rivers and contains a large number of purely residential communities. Because of the variety of employment and economic well-being, we believe that the district provides an excellent cross section of public opinion.

Not only have these polls served as an excellent means of communication between me and my constituents, but they have proved to be a perfect antidote against pressure propaganda. We ignore all replies to our queries that are not signed by the sender.

The poll follows:

Tabulated results for poll conducted January 1964

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Should the Constitution be amended to permit voluntary Bible reading and prayer in the public schools?	87	13
2. Do you think that our crash program to land a man on the moon is worth the cost and effort?	22	78
3. Would you vote to expand our area redevelopment program?	56	44
4. Should we broaden the food stamp program?	41	59
5. The United States now permits sale of wheat and other grain to Russia by our exporters. Should the U.S. Government guarantee payment?	15	85
6. Would you vote to establish a domestic National Service Corps like the foreign Peace Corps?	51	49
7. Do you believe that the Alliance for Progress in Latin America has been worth the cost?	30	70
8. Do you favor hospital insurance for the eligible elderly financed by social security taxes?	57	43
9. Do you favor Federal financial assistance to public primary and secondary schools?	46	54
10. Should the civil rights bill contain a public accommodations feature (i.e., access to hotels, restaurants, theaters, etc., cannot be denied because of race)?	57	43
11. Do you favor cutting the Federal income tax by about $11,000,000,000?	72	28
12. Should the Congress continue to act as a brake on the President's programs?	88	12
13. Do you favor a continuation of the nuclear test ban treaty?	83	17
14. Do you agree with President Johnson that we can carry out his program and still reduce the budget?	45	55

American Teachers in Oversea Schools Sorely Underpaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters from Hawaiian teachers in schools maintained by our Armed Forces overseas, which are operated in 28 countries, employ over 6,300 teachers, and teach 150,000 American children.

All of these letters have been critical of the low level of the salaries paid American teachers in these schools, which is almost 30 percent below average salaries paid in large American cities, and of the inferior equipment in many of the schools.

On March 2, 1964, the National Education Association issued a news release regarding a suit which has been filed against the Secretaries of Defense, Navy, Army, and Air Force which seeks to require the Depeartment of Defense to promulgate a salary schedule for oversea teachers in accordance with Public Law 86-911, 1959, the intent of which was to fix salaries for oversea teachers at a level comparable to teachers' salaries in large cities in the United States.

While I cannot comment on the court case, I think that the information contained in this press release is deserving of serious consideration by every Member of Congress.

The news release follows:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SUES GOVERNMENT ON TEACHER SALARIES OVERSEAS

WASHINGTON, March 2.—Suit has been filed in U.S. district court by the National Education Association and other parties, to require the Defense Department to pay teachers in the oversea dependents schools the salaries which are required by law and the Department's own regulations.

The suit seeks to require the Defense Department to promulgate a salary schedule for oversea teachers in accordance with a law passed by Congress in 1959 which was intended to fix salaries for oversea teachers at a level comparable to teachers' salaries in large cities in the United States.

According to the National Education Association's Research Division, the salaries of teachers in large cities of the United States this year averaged about $6,660. In the oversea schools the average salary is about $4,720.

In addition to NEA, other plaintiffs are the Oversea Education Association, an NEA affiliate, and three teachers in the oversea system who are members of both organizations.

Defendants are Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. These officials and their subordinates administer the oversea schools, operated in 28 countries and employing over 6,300 teachers.

NEA contends that despite provisions of the 1959 law, the Defense Department has refused to pay salaries the law requires on the ground that annual defense appropriation acts have fixed a per pupil expenditure limit which does not permit full payment. The per pupil limit for the current year is $285, as against comparable per pupil expenditures of $320 in the big cities of the United States.

The suit challenges the Defense Department contention that the limitation bars implementation of the 1959 act dealing with salaries. It points out that this contention has not been advanced to bar full salary payments to those employees of the overseas schools whose compensation is governed by civil service statutes.

The suit points out several ways in which the Department could manage to pay the legally required salaries, and asserts that the limitation is no bar to such payment. However, the suit does not seek to interfere with any aspect of the administration of the schools so long as the 1959 salary law is followed.

The suit also requests a declaratory judgment that the per pupil limitations in appropriation acts "neither negate nor mitigate" the Defense Department's obligation to fix salaries in accordance with the 1959 law and to declare that this law requires a periodic review of salaries to maintain continuous compliance with its provisions.

At a news conference in Washington announcing the suit, Dr. William G. Carr, NEA executive secretary, made this statement:

"Since 1961, when it first became apparent that the Defense Department was not going to adjust the salaries of its American teachers overseas—in accordance with the law—the National Education Association and its affiliate, the Overseas Education Association, have been working together to correct this gross injustice."

It happened like this:

When overseas schools were first started, teachers were classified on the Federal pay scale as GS-7's. But the school year does not coincide with the civil service pay year, and many school practices do not fit into civil service procedure. Accordingly, in 1959 a corrective law—Public Law 86-91—was enacted to take care of this.

Among other things, it provided that the teachers would be paid on a schedule related to pay schedules in the United States. And the Defense Department officially interpreted this to mean that teachers overseas would be paid as much as teachers in the big cities of the United States.

In the first year of the public law—the 1960-61 school year—this was done. It has not been done since then.

Today, after nearly 3 years of effort, we have exhausted virtually every means of redress except one—legal action.

Accordingly, we have taken that action. Our attorney has filed suit in Federal district court to require the Defense Department to comply with the law and with its own regulations.

The association has not taken this action lightly. We are not happy about having to institute suit against a department of the Federal Government. But apparently this is the only avenue left open in order to correct the inequity in the pay scale of oversea teachers.

The suit—an action for a writ of mandamus—has been filed in the name of three oversea teachers, the National Education Association, and its affiliate, the Overseas Education Association. The suit is against the Defense Department solely.

Although our immediate purpose in the suit is to get the Defense Department to implement its own salary policy, this is not our sole concern. For serious barriers to quality education exist in the oversea dependents schools operated by the Defense Department, the schools which the children of our servicemen attend.

In fact, it has already been more than a year since a Defense Department survey team, made up of respected educators from the United States, was sent overseas to look at the dependent schools, look for their weaknesses, assess their strength, and recommend ways they could be improved. The survey committee was composed of:

Lynn M. Bartlett, superintendent of public instruction, Lansing, Mich.

Hazel Davis, associate director, research division, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

James E. Gibbs, Jr., chief, State school systems section, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Edward J. Meade, Jr., program assistant, the Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Waurine Walker, assistant director of teacher education and certification, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Tex.

Alva J. Gibson, chairman, Dependents Schools Committee, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Charleston, W. Va., committee chairman.

Steps have been taken toward unification of recruitment, purchasing, and administration, but nothing has been done to implement the fiscal recommendations of this report.

The physical conditions in some of the schools are still deplorable. Supply problems are still almost overwhelming. Out-of-date textbooks are still being used in science classes. Specialist teachers are still in short supply—and being cut back further in some areas. Principals are still smothered in unnecessary paperwork. Teachers are still teaching subjects in which they are fully unqualified. There are still few provisions for the education of either handicapped or superior children. And a completely unrealistic per pupil limitation is still on the books.

The National Education Association and the Overseas Education Association have consistently urged elimination of the per pupil limitation—as the Defense Department's own survey team did. The Defense Department however has continued to recommend the use of a per pupil limitation.

We hope that our appeal to the courts for justice on behalf of the oversea schools will awaken the Defense Department to its responsibilities to its teachers. Most of all, we hope it will awaken the Defense Department to its responsibilities to the 150,000 American children whose parents have been assigned to oversea duty. We appreciate fully the tremendous burden carried by our Defense Department in its primary mission.

We trust that ultimately the equity in this case, involving only a tiny proportion of the Defense Department's worldwide operations and financial resources, will be recognized by the responsible officials of the department.

The Federal Government Cannot Afford Not To Raise Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues—particularly those who voted against the pay bill—the following editorial from the New York Times of March 15, 1964:

INCREASING FEDERAL PAY

A shortsighted and small-minded coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats has voted down a salary-increase bill in the House of Representatives, but this decision should not be permitted to stand. The bill can and should be revived through action initiated either in the House or Senate.

The measure which deserves this second chance would raise by an average of about 5 percent the pay of a million and a half white-collar classified employees and postal workers. It would increase by somewhat more than this the pay of Cabinet members and of other top-level Federal officials, and of all Federal judges. It would lift the salaries of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500. The annual cost of the whole plan would be $545 million. It would be worth it.

It would be worth it because it is good economy to pay salaries high enough to attract topnotch men and women into Federal office and to keep them there in the face of increased competition for their services. One of the most familiar, and discouraging, stories in Washington is the loss by one Federal agency after another of public servants who are doing an excellent job, who like their work and want to go on with it, but who feel compelled to turn elsewhere for a better income.

It is perfectly conceivable that there will be an exodus from Washington of high-quality officials who cannot afford to stay unless a bill of this kind is passed. They should not be asked to make the financial sacrifice they are making—and this comment applies particularly to those in the upper levels of Government.

In the case of Members of Congress, there is a particularly strong argument for higher salaries. This is the desirability of freeing Congressmen from the need or the temptation of supplementing their Federal pay by outside work which may easily involve a conflict of interest with thir legislative work. A genuinely hard-working Congressman, ready and equipped to face intelligently and conscientiously each piece of public business as it arises, is worth every bit of $32,500.

No petty political considerations should be allowed to block reconsideration of this bill.

Bank Interlocks Should Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act as it relates to bank interlocks. Section 8 forbids interlocking directorates among corporations generally, and it also contains special provisions relating to bank interlocks.

The bill I introduced today would bring the bank interlock provisions of section 8 up to date by prohibiting interlocks through officers, directors, agents, trustees, employees, and substantial stockholders between banks subject to regulation by the Federal banking agencies and other commercial banks, savings banks, trust companies and savings and loan associations. This prohibition is qualified by certain exceptions in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Federal banking agencies.

The general interlock provisions of section 8 were enacted in 1914 and have remained unchanged ever since, despite the vast changes which have taken place in our commercial practices and our expanding economy. The business enterprises of 1914 were mere prototypes of today's huge, diversified, interdependent corporations.

Comparable changes have occurred in our banking structure. Yet, the bank interlock provisions were last amended in 1935.

I am convinced the time has come for a fresh look at interlocks generally—their nature, extent, and effect on competition and on our business and financial structure. I am equally convinced that clarification and strengthening of existing law is long overdue.

Interlocks pose three dangers: First, they provide a golden opportunity to restrain competition both through the exchange of plans and information, and through the exercise of common control or influence over two or more competing enterprises. Second, they are a fertile breeding ground for conflicts of interest. No man can serve two masters, and the interlocking officer, director or controlling stockholder cannot give the last full measure of devotion to the conflicting interests of two competing enterprises. Third, where leading businessmen undertake directorships of many different enterprises, it becomes increasingly difficult to give to each the time and attention it deserves and often chronic absenteeism results.

The need to revise section 8 as it applies to bank interlocks is widely recognized. The provisions of section 8 relating to bank interlocks were enacted at a time when the power of the Congress respecting interstate commerce and financial institutions was much more in doubt than it is today, and at a time when the activities of financial institutions were generally more limited than they are now. As a result, the provisions of section 8 regarding bank interlocks are quite unrealistic in today's economy. For instance, section 8 does not presently prohibit interlocking relationships between commercial banks and savings banks or between banks and savings and loan associations, or between those banking institutions and insurance companies, even though they may compete directly for deposits or investments, for mortgage financing and other types of financial activity.

On September 17, 1962, a distinguished Advisory Committee, consisting largely of leading bankers, made the following recommendation to the Comptroller of the Currency:

Interlocking directorates:

The financial structure of the Nation needs to be guarded against conflicts of interest. This means that the law and its application by the supervisory authorities should restrict interlocking directorates, and not only between competing commercial banks (as is now the case) but also between commercial banks and certain other types of competing financial institutions, notably, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. As presently interpreted, the law prohibits various specific types of interlocking directorates as between member banks but does not similarly restrict interlocks involving other classes of financial institutions to the extent desirable. Hence, there is a clear need for legislation dealing with this problem.

The prohibitions of the present law on interlocking directorates should be made applicable between banks, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, whether chartered under Federal or State law.

Even more recently, on April 10, 1963, a Presidential Committee on Financial Institutions, composed of the principal officers of the executive branch concerned with banking, likewise recommended:

Section 8 of the Clayton Act has two parts. The first part, which applies only to banks, prohibits (with exceptions) interlocking relationships between member banks of the Federal Reserve System and other banks in the same or a nearby community. But interlocking relationships among nonmember banks, savings and loan associations, and other financial institutions are not covered by the law. Mutual savings banks are explicitly exempted, as are relationships involving a member bank if the banks are not located in the same or "contiguous" or "adjacent" city, town, or village. The Committee sees no reason why these limitations on interlocking relationships should apply only to member banks.

Although the second part of section 8 deals with corporations in general, it contains a reference to banks and is therefore pertinent to the work of the committee. * * * It might be interpreted, however, as exempting an interlocking directorate between a bank and a competing financial institution even though the latter type of interlocking relationships is not covered by the first part of section 8. This committee believed that the Clayton Act needs clarification in this respect.

Conclusion 21: The Committee believes that the provisions of section 8 of the Clayton Act which govern interlocking relationships involving financial institutions should be clarified and probably strengthened.

The bill I introduced today is designed to fill these gaps in the bank interlock provisions of section 8.

While I am not introducing a bill on this subject today, comparable inade-

quacies and anachronisms exist in the provisions of section 8 which relate to interlocking relaitonships between commercial and industrial corporations generally.

These provisions are presently confined to interlocking directorates between competing corporations. This leaves glaring deficiencies. Section 8 does not prohibit one man from acting as an officer of more than one competing company, or as an officer of one and a director of another competing corporation. It does not apply to interlocks between supplier and buyer. Nor does it apply to a common controlling stockholder of two competing companies. It fails to cover indirect interlocks between competitors through a common lender.

Section 8, in a word, is as full of holes as swiss cheese. Its shortcomings have been highlighted again and again in reports by Government agencies charged with antitrust enforcement, by the Antitrust Subcommittee on the Select Committee on Small Business of this House and by legal scholars and experts.

Thus existing law leaves the door wide open to interlocking relationships between the managers of our great industrial, commercial, and financial enterprises. The twin dangers of widespread restraints of trade and conflicts of interest are obvious. As Mr. Justice Douglas, has observed:

> The web that is woven may tie many industries, insurance companies, and financial houses together into a vast and friendly alliance that takes the edge off competition. *United States* v. *W. T. Grant Co.*, 343 U.S. 629, 637 (dissenting opinion).

Accordingly, I have directed the staff of the House Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, to undertake a study of interlocking relationships between our major industrial, commercial, and financial companies, and to survey the American business establishment.

I am also considering legislation to plug the loopholes in existing general interlock law.

The House Should Reconsider and Pass the IDA Bill—A Chance To Regain Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an increase in the funds available to the International Development Association for loans is very much in the national interest of the United States. I hope that the House will reconsider its refusal on February 25, 1964, to authorize American participation in increasing IDA's funds.

I urge the Members to take note of the cogent arguments in favor of the IDA bill in the following editorial from the American Banker of March 17, 1964:

CHANCE TO REGAIN LEADERSHIP

The House of Representatives has proved itself pennywise and pound foolish in voting to cut off U.S. contributions to the multinational International Development Agency, the soft-loan adjunct of the highly successful World Bank.

But the House is to be given a chance to reconsider, in hearings before its Committee on Banking and Currency next week; and the men most concerned with the Nation's foreign economic policy are making every effort to restore U.S. support to this valuable agency.

They deserve every encouragement.

The IDA, a comparatively new organization, formed in 1960, was designed specifically to develop useful loans from the accumulation of local currencies which have been generated by the World Bank in its global activities, and to use these funds for the necessary type of development loan which is not bankable by the high World Bank standards, but which is necessary to supplement the projects which the World Bank does finance.

An example would be an IDA loan in local currency to build the access roads for a fertilizer plant built with World Bank aid.

The United States took a major role in the creation of the IDA, and committed itself to continue this leadership as a financial catalyst, mobilizing not only the financial resources, but also the hopes and enthusiasms of the less developed nations. The whole purpose of the IDA has been to generate low-interest, long-term credits, on the easiest possible terms and in the most available currencies. It was, in effect, specifically designed to be soft.

With the exertion of powerful U.S. leadership, 90 nations joined the IDA; 16 of them, in addition to the United States, agreed to shoulder the main burden of support. Last year, this country maintained its leadership by agreeing to supply $312 million of the $750 million the association needed to do its work for the year.

Now the House of Representatives has voted to pull back this commitment; if that reversal sticks, the country will be embarrassed in a most sensitive area, and this valuable organization almost surely will collapse.

The sad thing about the House action is that it struck at one of the most realistic, farsighted, and workable extensions of U.S. leadership in the aid field.

The whole emphasis of the U.S. aid program in recent years has been toward assisting the undeveloped to get to their economic feet, and toward getting other nations, both developed and underdeveloped to take up more of the load. The IDA was designed to aid this process, and has been effective in doing so already during its short life.

Particularly valuable in the IDA concept is its principle of multinationality. By operating through the IDA, the United States does not go into these underdeveloped nations as a hard-eyed lender, demanding certain reforms. Rather, the loan is processed, and the terms established, by a group of the borrower's peers. The immediate identification with the United States is dissipated, and the job accomplished without specific resentment being aimed at this country.

It is not enough to observe that the Johnson administration was caught by surprise by the vote of the House, by 208 to 188, to end U.S. support for the IDA. It should also be noted that the administration appeared to have regarded approval of the modest IDA appropriation as rather routine, for the chief administration witness in favor of the bill was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John C. Bullitt.

Next week, as the House Banking Committee takes up the IDA bill again, the administration will send up its big guns, in the persons of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas.

Their support should be enough to recover the lost initiative.

But it is to be hoped that the administration has learned a valuable lesson from this near setback which still can be averted. Given the brisk and politically invigorating climate for cost cutting in Government which now envelops Capitol Hill, the administration has to protect with special vigilance those programs which are good but not large, and which might be blown away in a puff of misdirected frugality.

Soft on Sukarno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, one reason our foreign aid program is in such trouble in the Congress of the United States is the deliberate insistence of the administration to be soft on Sukarno.

To show how deeply this cuts into the thinking of free nations, the Washington Daily News tells us how the people of democratic Malaysia are disappointed by our treatment of a tyrant.

The article follows:

"SOFT ON SUKARNO" BAFFLES MALAYSIANS—WORRIED ABOUT U.S. POSITION

(By W. D. Friedenberg)

KUALA LUMPUR, March 18.—The Government of newly independent democratic Malaysia is baffled and disappointed by the American policy of being "soft on Sukarno," Indonesia's saber-rattling president.

Ever since the farflung Federation was forged last September, it has been preoccupied with defending itself against Indonesia's avowed efforts to "crush Malaysia."

Here in Malaysia's lush, hilly capital, officials express confidence that Britain, former colonial tutor and now a Commonwealth partner, will continue to provide troops to help hunt down Indonesian guerrillas in Malaysia's North Borneo territories.

INFILTRATION

They expect no all-out Indonesian attack. But they fear continued guerrilla operations against Borneo and infiltration, sabotage, and subversion in Malaya and Singapore will force Malaysia to divert its scarce resources from development to defense and thus undermine the nation both economically and politically.

The Malaysians are convinced Indonesia will keep up its crush-Malaysia campaign until the United States orders a halt. They argue only the United States with its diplomatic arm-twisting strength, foreign aid leverage and the power of its 7th Fleet, can persuade Sukarno to be a good neighbor.

SUPERFICIAL

The Malaysians regard Attorney General Robert Kennedy's recent cease-fire mission as well intentioned but superficial, and they think the U.S. peacemaker role is ineffective if not unbecoming.

Says one Malaysian official privately: "Washington knows Malaysia is no British neocolonialist plot as Djakarta accuses, and knows which side is the aggressor in Borneo.

"If you can force Khrushchev to back down in Berlin and Cuba, why can't you help us straighten out Sukarno?"

This kind of talk, also reflected in newspaper editorials, is ruffling American diplomats here who are hard put to find converts to American policy.

STABILITY

It is doubly unsettling because the United States in fact highly regards Malaysian Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman and sees this prosperous, progressive nation as a zone of stability and an anti-Communist barrier in tumultous, Communist-threatened southeast Asia.

The admiration is reciprocal. But as the Malaysians understand it, American policy is to try to jolly Sukarno along so he'll stay in power and prevent a takeover of Indonesia by the powerful and populous Communist Party.

American officials describe American interest differently. They say the United States is concerned less, with the collapse of Sukarno, a Communist Indonesia or disintegrated Indonesia—a nation of 100 million persons—become a disaster area. Most, however, think that after Sukarno goes, the Army will handle the Communists with pleasure and Indonesia will be happily rid of both Sukarno and Communists.

What would the Malaysians like the United States to do? A good first step, they suggest, would be to get rid of U.S. Ambassador Howard P. Jones whom, they say, gives Sukarno moral support.

Next they'd like to see a total cut of U.S. aid to Indonesia.

America's Poor Showing in the Olympic Games—And What Might Be Done To Stimulate Interest in "Underdeveloped" Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent winter olympic games, and in previous Olympic games most Members of Congress, and most Americans, were deeply disappointed by the relatively poor showing by America's amateur athletes when compared to the many victories scored by the Russian representatives. One of my constituents was so chagrined over the results—not at the efforts of the American athletes themselves but at the lack of support in this country for training opportunities for youth in many of the events which are part of an Olympic games program—that she wrote to ask me what this Government could do about it. She particularly pointed out how the Russians use their Olympic victories for propaganda purposes in the cold war, and she suggested that the United States should provide the means for enabling youngsters to become proficient in all of the sports which are featured in international competition.

I replied that there is a general feeling that the Soviet Union finds many ways to subsidize their Olympic champions so that they can devote almost all of their time to training; whereas, in the United States, many of the athletes who compete must do their training in their spare time from their regular jobs. But I said there were many more aspects of the problem, and I just didn't have the answer, but that our great St. Louis athlete, Stan Musial, now the President's consultant on physical fitness, might want to study the matter and take it up with the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

I, therefore, wrote to Stan Musial and asked for his thoughts and ideas on this subject. While it is true that he is concerned primarily about the physical fitness of all Americans, not just athletes, in his new role in the Government, and particularly the physical fitness of the children we want to see grow into healthy adults, I wrote him that it seemed to me that his office was the logical focal point for a study also into this question of athletic prowess as a matter of national prestige in the Olympic games.

EMPHASIS ON UNDERDEVELOPED SPORTS

Mr. Speaker, my letter to Stan Musial on March 12 arrived at his office while he was out of Washington, and was answered by Mr. V. L. Nicholson, Director of Information for the President's Council on Physical Fitness. This was the first indication I had seen that the Council had been interesting itself in this problem under the direction of Stan Musial's predecessor in the administration, Charles B. Wilkinson. Without regard to Mr. Wilkinson's subsequent decision to go into politics, I think the idea he proposed for athletic programs is certainly worth considering and discussing, and for that reason, I am placing the proposal in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the widest possible public exposure.

One of the most interesting aspects of this proposal is its discussion of the U.S. "also-ran" or "bystander" role in the so-called underdeveloped sports—such as soccer, gymnastics, cycling, fencing, field hockey, rowing, water polo, rifle and pistol competition, equestrian events, walking, and so forth—sports which, according to this outline, enjoy nearly worldwide popularity but are generally neglected here. And, of course, many of the Olympic victories scored by the Russians are in these events which do not attract widespread American participation. The same is true with the Olympic events for women and girls.

Whether this proposal is good or bad, feasible or not, I think it is worth discussing. Mr. Nicholson indicates that the late President Kennedy at the time of his death was considering calling a group of men together to initiate the kind of foundation proposed. I am no expert on Olympic sports, but I think all of us as citizens are interested in seeing our country make a better showing in the games, and in other international sports competitions, and so I submit the text of Mr. Nicholson's letter and of the foundation proposal, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON
PHYSICAL FITNESS,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1964.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Mr. Musial is in Florida and has asked me to acknowledge your letter of March 12.

We share your constituent's concern over our performance in the winter Olympic games, and I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to the attached proposal for a national sports foundation.

The foundation idea was proposed nearly 3 years ago by Bud Wilkinson, then special consultant to the President on Physical Fitness. This specific proposal is the result of Mr. Wilkinson's discussions with the late John F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, and various sports groups.

You will note that a private foundation is suggested. This reflects Mr. Wilkinson's views. The other people who have been involved in this project agree that the foundation should be privately controlled, but some of them feel the door should be left open for possible Government participation.

As I understand it, Mr. Wilkinson's reasons for insisting on private financing were as follows:

1. The schools and colleges and the amateur sports governing bodies have indicated they would not accept Federal subsidies for sports development.

2. Government subsidization of athletics is a ticklish matter internationally, although it is common practice in some nations.

3. He believed sufficient funds could be obtained from private sources. Feelers put out by Mr. Wilkinson and others indicated that major league baseball, professional football, intercollegiate sports, and other groups would support the foundation. There also was evidence that private industry would contribute generously.

Mr. Wilkinson and President Kennedy did discuss briefly the problems of launching the foundation. The President indicated he would be willing to call together 10 or 12 influential and interested men and urge them to get the foundation started. He also indicated he would speak at a kickoff dinner for a fundraising drive.

The President's assassination and Mr. Wilkinson's resignation have delayed progress on this proposal. However, I am sure you will agree it still has great merit. Anyone who could revive the plan and put it into effect would be performing a real service for our country.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

V. L. NICHOLSON,
Director of Information.

INTRODUCTION

The late President Kennedy was an eloquent champion of increased sports participation. He continually stressed the value of activity and competition in developing strength and character, and he was acutely aware of the growing importance of sports to our national image.

"America faces a stern challenge to its international prestige in the years ahead," he wrote, "and many will judge us by the performance of our men and women in the demanding arenas of athletic competition."

We demand far more of sports today than we did a few years ago. It is widely agreed that they should be a vital force in maintaining—and improving—our physical vigor, moral fiber, and athletic stature.

Unfortunately, existing sports programs do not involve enough people in a wide enough variety of activities to accomplish these broad purposes. The proof of this may be seen on every side.

Reports by the President's Council on Physical Fitness, the Department of Justice, and other agencies and groups cite widespread inactivity and idleness as major causes of the low level of youth physical fitness and the high rate of juvenile delinquency.

The results of recent international sports competitions—and especially of the last three Olympic games—dramatize the inability of present programs to maintain our athletic prowess and prestige.

We won fewer Olympic medals (63) in 1960 than the Soviet Union won (69) on its first appearance in the games in 1952. The Soviet team won 90 medals in 1956 and 100 in 1960.

The inadequacies of our sports programs stem from limited and ineffective use of personnel, facilities, and leadership. Specifically, they may be traced to three basic causes:

1. The unique character of our overall sports program.

2. The lopsided emphasis on spectator and varsity sports.

3. The lack of well-organized and well-financed development programs, particularly in the so-called minor sports.

Our sports programs were developed in relative isolation from the rest of the world, and they differ markedly from those of most other advanced nations. There is nothing intrinsically wrong in this fact, but it poses special problems as sports become increasingly international in nature.

For instance, many of our best athletes participate largely in sports which are little known elsewhere and which play minor roles in international competition. At the same time we devote little talent or effort to many sports which enjoy nearly worldwide popularity.

One result is that we are bystanders or also-rans at many big international events. Championship meets in soccer, gymnastics, cycling, and fencing, just to name a few.

Our spectator-varsity approach to sports and the lack of development programs also are serious handicaps. They perpetuate built-in weaknesses, discourage broad participation and hinder the full and effective use of coaching and facilities.

Because of this other nations are catching up to us in our favorite events, while we still are falling behind them in theirs.

Schools and colleges no longer can ignore their obligations to do something about these problems. They must join in a renewed effort to provide more facilities and trained leadership and greater opportunities for participation and competition.

Before his death President Kennedy pledged his active support for a sports development foundation designed to achieve these ends. All of us should join now in an effort which will establish new standards of physical, moral, and athletic excellence.

THE FOUNDATION

I. Purpose: To increase participation in sports and fitness activities, to broaden recreational opportunities, and to strengthen U.S. representation in the Olympic games and other international athletic competitions, particularly in the 13 underdeveloped sports and women's sports.

II. Financing: By income from an endowment fund to be secured from private sources. Contributions to the fund would be solicited from business, labor, foundations, and individual citizens.

III. Administration: By a 10- or 12-man board of trustees sufficient in stature to accomplish the foundation's objectives. The board would be assisted by an executive director and a small executive staff, and the board would consist of persons:

(a) Knowledgeable and interested concerning physical fitness, recreation, and international sports competitions.

(b) Nationally prominent, with access to persons and organizations able and willing to support the foundation financially.

(c) Unidentified with the current sports controversy.

(d) Representative of various phases of American life and particularly of those phases which can contribute directly to the foundation's operation and objectives, such as law, business, advertising, labor, communications, manufacturing, etc.

(e) Able to underwrite organizational meetings and preliminary operations of the foundation.

IV. Methods:

(a) Approve and give financial support to worthwhile fitness, recreation, and sports development projects proposed by qualified organizations.

(b) When necessary, suggest needed fitness, recreation and sports development projects, and urge existing organizations to initiate them.

(c) Engage in an extensive public relations and promotion campaign to stimulate the expansion of sports and recreation facilities and to encourage massive participation in sports and fitness activities.

V. Specific projects:

(a) Encourage municipalities and States to build facilities, or to modify existing facilities, suitable for the underdeveloped sports.

(b) Encourage an annual national sports festival which would incorporate all of the events to be contested in the next Olympic games.

(c) Allocate to selected clubs, schools, conferences, organizations, and areas special responsibilities for development in certain underdeveloped sports, with full regard for geography, facilities, interest, tradition, etc. For example:

1. Encourage entire high school and college conferences to adopt and emphasize, on an interscholastic or intercollegiate basis, such underdeveloped sports as soccer, gymnastics, cycling, field hockey, etc.

2. Enlist the cooperation of the military services in training and developing teams for rowing, water polo, rifle and pistol competition, equestrian events, walking, etc.

3. Urge all military services to station top athletes in areas where they can take advantage of local knowledge, facilities, and opportunities for training and competition.

(d) Work with schools and colleges, the various sports governing bodies within the United States, and other qualified groups to develop competitive programs for women and girls in the Olympic sports.

(e) Promote and support the establishment of community sports, fitness, and recreation clubs.

(f) Work with all interested groups in obtaining the use of school and college facilities for sports and fitness activities in the evenings, on weekends, and during the summer months. Where necessary, seek legislation to open these facilities to the public.

(g) Stimulate the international exchange of athletes and coaches by encouraging existing organizations to conduct workshops, coaching schools, training camps, tours, and competitions.

(h) Encourage the development of comprehensive sports film libraries, with the emphasis on training films for competitors and coaches.

(i) Establish a system of national awards for persons attaining prescribed levels of proficiency in the Olympic sports or achieving prescribed levels of physical fitness.

(j) Provide clinical services to improve leadership of sports and recreation programs.

(k) Work for greater recognition of champions in underdeveloped sports through promotion of the National Sports Festival, awards ceremonies and banquets, White House and Governors' receptions, etc.

VI. Advantages, as compared to present system and proposed alternatives:

(a) Would shift emphasis to purposeful and continuous grassroots development programs, whereas it now rests primarily on team selection and travel arrangements.

(b) Would provide greater freedom and flexibility in the development and training of athletes for international competition and would permit the establishment of crash programs in sports where there is likelihood of immediate improvement, such as cycling, soccer, gymnastics, rowing, etc.

(c) Would avoid dampening—by Government subsidy—private initiative and support and making presently self-supporting activities reliant upon such subsidies.

(d) Would reinforce the U.S. tradition of relying on private action and support for sports development.

(e) Would provide stimulus and financial support for filling the gaps in national sports, recreation, and fitness programs.

VII. Implementation:

(a) Select the board of trustees.

(b) Select the executive director.

(c) Arrange interim financing.

(d) Obtain charter and tax-exempt status.

(e) Establish the executive office.

(f) Launch fundraising drive.

(g) Begin operations. The first orders of business should be:

1. A public relations campaign to explain the foundation's purposes and methods of operation.

2. A drive to gain the endorsement and support of the schools and colleges, the sports governing bodies, interested individuals and organizations, and the public.

The Uncertain Professor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is almost unbelievable that the type of professor described by William F. Buckley, Jr., in Tuesday's Washington Daily News is actually teaching our young students. He is hardly one to inspire confidence:

PROFESSOR HAS STATE WRITHING

(By Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.)

Mulford Q. Sibley is a difficult professor at the University of Minnesota, who has got the whole State to writhing. He is difficult because he is a leftwing eccentric; which it is hardly fair, when you come down to it, for an eccentric professor to be.

If only he were a rightwing eccentric, he could simply be eased out, real quiet like, and nobody would say anything; and the State legislature could lie down and go home.

But Professor Sibley's enormities are left-oriented, with the result that of course all the liberals in Minnesota, and their fellow travelers, are hot for his security; and if the State's legislators on the committee which is now looking into the question why the taxpayers of Minnesota should be taxed to pay his salary, should come up with an adverse opinion on him, they will be hanged, roasted, garroted, and drawn in two, in the name of free speech.

SENSE OF HUMOR

It appears to matter rather a lot whether Professor Sibley has a sense of humor. The State is divided into two camps on the question, those who say he has, maintaining that a rather extremist statement of his is to be taken lightly, ho ho ho, by those of us sophisticated people who know that from time to time professors will be boys, and those others, squares, who take his statement literally.

It was quite a statement, that one by Mort Sahl Sibley.

Said he, in a letter to the student newspaper last December: "Personally, I should like to see on the campus one or two Com-

munist professors, a student Communist club, a chapter of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, a Society for the Promotion of Free Love, a League for the Overthrow of the Government by Jeffersonian Violence, an Anti-Automation League, and perhaps a nudist club. No university should be without individuals and groups like these."

PERVERSE WAY

National Review, in its own perverse way, commented at the time that the only omission the professor had made in his list of desirable groups on campus was a Fire Sibley Committee.

Which now apparently exists, if not on campus, at least in Minnesota. And so once again, for the millionth time, the question is raised, what does academic freedom actually mean? There are, of course, two views of academic freedom, and the distinction is important.

The one supposes that no questions are closed. By this definition it is not a closed question whether the Communists are more nearly right about our bones of contention, or we are: we should have "one or two" (a bourgeois concession by Dr. Sibley) Communists on campus, to ply their point of view. Presumably, although Dr. Sibley apparently ran out of breath before he got to it, we should also have on campus one or two Nazis making a case for the genocidal extermination of pestilential racial minorities.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The other view of academic freedom says something like this: we do not by all means know all that there is to know about things, but some things we do know, among them that Communists and communism are barbarous recrudescences that aim at overthrowing everything we have painfully learned over the millennia about the meaning of man and man's freedom.

Subject to that general acquiescence, it is important to allow professors to advance their ideas on how to advance civilization.

The distinction, alas, is too subtle for most academic ideologists, who believe that if you have any academic freedom of the latter variety, you must have academic freedom of the former variety: and it is on the coattails of this kind of fanaticism that the good Dr. Sibley rides.

I do not know the professor, and do not know if his views about Communists, nudists, liberties, etc., are his bid for service at the "hungry i" at San Francisco, where they specialize in sick jokes.

NOT GLADLY

I do not, however, react gladly to the notion of a State legislature reaching into a college and firing people.

What should be fired—and I doubt whether this can be done by a legislature—is the idea that an atomistic academic freedom furthers the cause of freedom, individual or academic.

What should be done about Professor Sibley is that people should feel very sorry for him. And that, I suspect, is something he could not bear, less even than nudism, or communism.

The Observance of Good Friday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Connecticut has issued a proclamation setting aside Friday, March 27, 1964, as a day of fasting and prayer in our State. Through this observance of Good Friday, Gov. John Dempsey hopes we will improve our relations with our fellow men. It is with this thought in mind that I offer for consideration by this august body his proclamation:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT PROCLAMATION

Since earliest times, it has been the custom for Connecticut residents of the Christion faith to participate devoutly in the observance of Good Friday, a day for recalling the sacrifice represented by the Crucifixion and for acknowledgement of our dependence on the strength that comes only from God.

It is well that the pace forced upon us by a materialistic world should be interrupted by a period of devotion and the relegation of purely secular interests. There is in our day too little time for reflection on the importance of the spiritual values.

In accordance, therefore, with Connecticut tradition and the statutes of this State, I hereby proclaim Friday, March 27, to be a day of fasting and prayer.

Let us all, in conformance with our own religious beliefs, seek to atone to a forgiving God for our transgressions. May prayer on this day inspire in us a determination to improve our relations with our fellow men and to respond to the eternal love that God bestows on all mankind.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol, in Hartford, this 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1964 and of the independence of the United States the 188th.

JOHN DEMPSEY.

By His Excellency's command:

ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

The Hunters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, while discharging my obligations as a member of the Naval Reserve recently I had an opportunity to observe our submarine defenses in the northern Atlantic and to participate in some of the patrols. I was impressed by the dedication and sacrifices our American servicemen stationed in this land of frost and fire are making in order that we here in the United States may have the ability to know what our potential enemies in that part of the world are doing and have warning of any hostile activities that may be taking place in this very distant corner of the world.

I have mentioned on several occasions my concern over the huge submarine fleet which is being maintained by Russia. It is now estimated that one-third of this Russian submarine fleet is homeported in the Northern Arctic Sea.

If we are to survive, if our allies are to survive, the sea lanes must be kept free and open—safe from hostile undersea craft, safe from surface raiders, and safe from long range bombers that could dominate the skies over the sea.

This is the task of the men who man the patrol and warning planes over the lonely, dark, cold stretches of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. A recent issue of Skyline, publication of the North American Aviation, Inc., pays tribute to these men in an excellent article on our submarine defenses titled "The Navy's Hunter-Killer Groups Patrol the Oceans, Seeking Intruding Submarines." I believe my colleagues will find it both informative and interesting and submit it to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE HUNTERS: THE NAVY'S HUNTER-KILLER GROUPS PATROL THE OCEANS, SEEKING INTRUDING SUBMARINES

Everything in the Navy falls back ultimately on men. In antisubmarine warfare they are impatient men. For 5 years they have been patrolling the sea on aircraft carriers, on destroyers, flying in fixed-wing aircraft and hovering in helicopters.

They are the hunter-killer groups (HUK) roaming the Atlantic and Pacific day and night in a ceaseless effort to deny an ocean cover to intruding submarines. They are confident of the research miracles to come from the laboratories to aid them, but they fight now with the tools at hand, ready at any moment to respond to the voice crackling over the intercom, "I have a contact. Bearing * * *."

There are about 250 ships, 100 submarines, and 750 aircraft assigned to ASW operations. There are about 85,000 persons directly involved.

A typical HUK group is formed around a World War II carrier. The carrier, accompanied by six to eight destroyers, is on station almost 50 percent of the time. It refuels at sea and is replenished with stores and ammunition while it continues the endless patrol.

LIFE MISERABLE FOR HUNTED SUB

It's normal aircraft complement consists of about 20 S2D Trackers, carrying a crew of 4 and designed specifically for ASW operations. There are four Willy Fuds aboard, the E-1B, oddball planes that sport an overpowering radome like a mushroom canopy, mammoth radars with wings, reliable airborne relay stations.

There are 16 twin-jet SH-3A helicopters aboard, big powerful 4-man brutes that have given long legs to the ASW effort.

A handful of single-jet fighter planes provide air canopy for the HUK group.

In operation, aircraft are nearly always aloft, not relinquishing station until relieved by another group. The destroyers hover in a screening formation around the carrier, probing with their powerful sonars. Far beyond the horizon, helicopters hover over the ocean, dunking sonars under the sea, listening for the telltale sound that will signal a contract.

Sometimes the report will come in from a commercial aircraft flying between two continents. "Submarine snorkel sighted."

Aircraft and helicopters speed to the position. Destroyers wheel about to take up the hunt.

The stubby S2D Trackers are crammed with men and gear dedicated to making life miserable for submarines. A bulging searchlight is mounted on the leading edge of the right wing. There may be depth charges in the bomb bay. Under the wings are hung torpedoes, other depth charges, rockets. In a streamlined openend package at the rear of the engine nacelles smoke bombs and sonobuoys are stacked like plump sardines.

The most distinctive feature of the S2D is a stinger, a retractable boom that protrudes from the tail. It looks like a thick barber pole. This is MAD, the magnetic airborne detector. Little publicized is another piece of equipment, a sniffer that can smell out the exhaust trail of a diesel submarine.

The aircraft have a 200-mile plus speed; the helicopters have broken the 200 m.p.h mark in speed trials, but in practice they do not go in that fast. When the helicopters do reach the datum point, the suspected submarine contact area, they hover approximately 40 feet above the ocean and unreel transducer units that dangle more than 100 feet beneath the surface of the sea. If a red light starts flashing from the tail of the helicopter it is a signal from the pilot, "I am holding a contact." He has something located beneath the water, but it could very well be a whale, a submerged log, or a mass of mud.

The S2D Trackers move in, drop smoke bombs, and fly above the suspected contact. From the extended boom a magnetic field can be detected deep in the water. The lower the planes fly, the deeper the magnetic field can be detected. To keep tight contact they wheel in circles, standing on wing tips that seem almost to brush the waves.

Hovering almost 10 miles away is the Willy Fud, relaying all the information automatically to the Combat Information Center in the carrier.

Inside the S2D, if the hidden object is metal, a pen swings wildly over an oscillograph chart, and the operator calls, "Madman. Madman." Two factors, the sonar ears of the helicopter's undersea transducer, and the magnetic response of the S2D Tracker, give positive confirmation that the hidden object is a submarine.

SLIGHT CHANCE OF ESCAPE

If two MAD-equipped aircraft fly in tight figure eights above a hidden submarine, there is only 20-percent chance that he can slip out of the cordon. If three circle the prey, there is only 5-percent chance that the intruder will get out of the trap. If this should happen, the destroyers are soon charging on the scene, equipped with powerful sonars and the most potent weapons of destruction.

The Navy says little about the role of the fifth member of the HUK group, the killer submarine, but it does say that no one vehicle can successfully deal with an enemy sub under all conditions. But the teamwork of the fixed-wing aircraft, the helicopter, the destroyer, and the killer sub is a winning combination. An enemy nuclear submarine in the presence of a HUK group is in the greatest danger of its existence.

How much is realistic practice? How much is actual detection, classification, localization of real submarines? No reports are published. One of the weapons the Navy utilizes is its ability to keep the potential enemy guessing.

But it is all very real, for example, for the 2,600 men crammed within the nine decks of one of the ASW carriers. It is real for the seamen deep within the ship who stand watch in the boilerroom; for the mechanics on the hangar deck; for the daredevils on the flight deck who live in a whirl of spinning propellers and roaring jet exhaust, and thundering catapults.

It is real for the sonarman locked within a steel room in the bow of the ship, his ears hammered by the screeching sound wave, his eyes alert to the nervous blips on the scope before him.

A TOUGH FLYING JOB

It is real for the aviators who spend long hours flying "at the end of the string," bone weary, fighting the controls as they whip their aircraft about in tough punishing maneuvers. It takes 2 years of preliminary flight training before a pilot reports aboard an ASW carrier. He rides for another year in the copilot seat before he takes over a mission. According to Comd. William Rippey, Air Group commander aboard the *Essex*, ASW pilots have a tougher chore than the more glamorous jet attack fighter pilots. An ASW pilot is thinking four different ways at once. With his copilot he's got to receive all the information from inside his own plane as well as that being developed outside the plane by the helicopters and other units. He's got to evaluate, make judgments.

"It's hard, gruelling labor for these pilots. The physical exertion becomes exceptionally tough when they're flying in tight circles, holding a contact. When they land back on ship they're wrung out."

These are the men who are fighting the ASW battle today. They know the magnitude of the task, the importance of the effort. They know of the determined research program that is being conducted in order to help them.

But they are understandably impatient.

Economic Measuring Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the major measuring sticks employed to assess the state of our Nation's economic health is the sum spent each year by the American industry for plant expansion and equipment outlay.

Capital investment by industry is made only after a most careful study of a myriad of factors. One which weighs heavily in the final decision is the estimate of what lies ahead in the Nation's economy.

We have had demonstrated this week, in a most emphatic manner, that one of our country's largest industrial organizations has looked into the future and has determined it must be prepared to meet a truly remarkable increase in demand for its product.

The General Motors Corp. anounced on Wednesday, March 18, 1964, it will spend almost $2 billion in the next 2 years in a capital expenditure program. This will increase the corporation's passenger-car production capacity by almost 20 percent. Corporation officials look forward to an increase in employment of almost 50,000 jobs when the new plants are built and the added capacity is utilized.

In my own congressional district the Generla Motors plant in Marion, Ind., will be increased more than 10 percent. Another General Motors plant in Kokomo, Ind., is scheduled for the addition of 250,000 square feet of manufacturing space. At Anderson, Ind., the General Motors plants will be expanded by 450,000 square feet.

A program of this magnitude lends further support to the surveys; our national economy is spurting ahead. This huge corporation provides facts to back up these surveys. They are facts made up of brick, mortar, concrete, and steel. They represent conclusions reached after the most intensive study by men who cannot afford to be wrong.

It is an example of confidence in the future of the corporation and, more importantly, confidence in the future course of our economy.

No Haggling About a Matter of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of this year of 1964, the Corps of Engineers expects to close the gates on the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania. With the closing of these gates, over one-third of the Allegany Indian Reservation will be flooded, and as the land disappears, so, too will the treaty of the United States—the treaty of 1794—with the Seneca Indians.

It is regrettable that the Kinzua Dam project was ever approved, since there was an alternative available to the Corps of Engineers, and which engineering experts state must still be built to provide for the flood control and water supply which the city of Pittsburgh is so anxious to obtain. The ironic part is that Kinzua will not prevent flooding in Pittsburgh, but rather will be in the words of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former chief engineer of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a "$100 million blunder of the Corps of Engineers."

It is even more regrettable that the United States—who continually reminds our foreign friends and foes alike of our unfailing adherence to all commitments made in treaties and agreements—should willingly break the oldest active treaty of this Nation, but now be even more willing to refuse to accept its moral responsibility in providing just compensation for the taking of these Indian lands.

Were the lands within the Allegany Reservation which are required for the Kinzua project other than Indian land, there would be no occasion for intervention by the Congress. Acquisition thereof could proceed through the normal processes of negotiated purchase and sale, or if necessary, condemnation, as in the amount paid to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. of $20 million. In view, however, of the treaty provision which states:

> All land * * * to be the property of the Seneca Nation; * * * but it shall remain theirs, until they choose to sell the same to the people of the United States, who have the right to purchase.

The special duties which the United States owes to its Indian wards, and the precedents which have been established during the 87th Congress as to the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Sioux Reservations, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs believed that something more than usual was called for in this case.

This committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, after long and extensive consideration over a period of many, many months, approved a bill—H.R. 1794—to provide for the acquisition of rights-of-way over the Indian Reservation in New York for the Kinzua Dam project, and which would provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and eco-

nomic development of the members of the Seneca Nation.

The total cost involved in H.R. 1794 is $20,150,000 as it was approved in the U.S. House of Representatives last February. The bill provides for the payment of three classes of money to the Senecas: First, that which would be required in any event for the acquisition of interests in land within the Allegany Reservation; second, that which is necessary to compensate the Senecas for certain indirect damages which, in an ordinary condemnation action, are not compensable; and third, that which is necessary to rehabilitate and reestablish on a firm footing the Senecas' economy and to cover certain other expenses, as promised by President Kennedy.

As a part of the committee's report on H.R. 1794, there is the following statement which was signed, incidentally, by every member of the committee:

We wish to recognize the patience and understanding shown by Representative JAMES A. HALEY, chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, in pursuing the cause of justice for the Seneca Indians in their negotiations with the Federal Government.

We commend him for his undeviating perseverance in achieving a fair settlement for the Seneca Nation in accordance with our American ideals.

Because of the above, I was deeply concerned and shocked at the hasty action yesterday of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which, after only 1 day of open hearings, proceeded to cut the amount in the House-approved bill to approximately $9 million.

I cannot believe that the Senate committee acted in good conscience, for as the following editorial states, in a matter of honor, the Government of the United States should not haggle about the payment of compensation.

The courts of our land have determined that our Government has the legal right to acquire the lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation, but it has a moral responsibility in paying for breaking the treaty of 1794 with the Seneca Nation.

NO HAGGLING ABOUT A MATTER OF HONOR

Though there might have been an alternative to the Kinzua Dam in northwest Pennsylvania which will flood one-third of the Seneca Indians' Allegany Reservation—and, the Indians say, 90 percent of their residential land—this project has gone too far now to be stopped. And it will, of course, reduce the flooding of the Allegheny River down to Pittsburgh, and the Ohio beyond that.

But in taking this land the Federal Government has violated a very old treaty with the Seneca Nation, and it cannot deny this violation of treaty rights. It can, however, compensate properly the Senecas who have been deprived of their land, and provide generously for their relocation.

The Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee last week reduced a $20 million assistance bill which had been passed by the House, and cut it back to $9 million. The rehabilitation fund for the Senecas was reduced from nearly $17 million to a little more than $6 million.

Under normal circumstances, in the condemnation of land for public purposes it would be expected that the Federal Government would try to get the land at no more than its fair market value. The circumstances in this case are far from normal. And if the Senecas are disturbed by this example of Federal economy, the rest of the people of this country should be disturbed too.

The U.S. Government is guilty of abrogating a treaty with the forefathers of the Senecas, and it should pay for that offense. It should not haggle about the payment. We yield to no one in our desire for economy in Washington, but not when the honor of the United States is concerned. And it is deeply involved in this case.

Report to the People of the Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to place in the Appendix a report, which I endeavor to send to every household in my congressional district:

[No. 2]

MARCH 1964.

DEAR FRIEND: No matter how long or short a time you may have lived in our Third District, you can be justly proud—as I am—of our northern Nassau County region.

The most recently available figures published here in Washington show that our Third District of New York ranks fourth among the Nation's 435 congressional districts in the educational attainment of our residents, second in the United States in median annual family income, and well above both the National and State employment averages.

To have been able to serve the people of such an outstanding area as ours for these past 11 years in Congress is a source of great gratification to me.

Our local newspapers continue to do a fine job of keeping us well informed about public affairs. To help them perform this essential public service—to help you keep posted—I have recently inaugurated a weekly newspaper column from our Nation's Capital. My commentary on national and world affairs is distributed to every newspaper in the district. If you're not already a regular reader of your local papers, I'd suggest that you become one—it's a great way to keep yourself up-to-date on events in your community, town, county, State, and Nation.

My column will supplement my news releases on specific subjects, and this report to every family in our district. I'd like to be able to send you these letters more often, but they're not published at taxpayers' expense, and thus can appear only as funds are collected by a citizens' committee of public-spirited residents. My weekly report in the papers will serve to fill the gaps between these letters.

Now, what's going on in Washington, and in the world?

In the field of foreign affairs, I regret to state that the U.S. position has deteriorated to the point where I foresee tremendous peril to this Republic if steps are not taken quickly and firmly to correct the situation.

Do we have an American foreign policy today? We do not. We have nothing more than a confused, contradictory collection of many differing, often mutually self-defeating policies toward various countries.

Why? Because today, as the free world continues to look to us for leadership against Communist aggrandizement, some so-called experts in our State Department are obsessed with the notion that a soft, yielding U.S. policy toward the Kremlin will transform the power-hungry Russian Bear into a cuddly, harmless puppy. This fond hope defies almost a half-century of history; it ignores the long record of Red treachery in foreign relations. But that seems to make no difference to these "soft liners"—and under the Johnson administration, they have their way.

With what result? We're trying to face in two opposite directions at once.

We're supporting both sides in the cold war. While with one hand we spend billions for defense (justified only by the threat of world Communist aggression) and more billions in foreign aid to help stop Red expansion abroad, our other hand signs a test ban treaty giving Khrushchev a nuclear arms advantage, and grants U.S. credits for huge wheat shipments to Russia, relieving Khrushchev of internal pressure and of the need to send his soldiers and arms-plant workers to labor on Soviet farms.

This administration has made a tragic error. It has misinterpreted the American public's strong desire for peace to be a desire for appeasement—which history has proved time and again to be a sure road to war.

Has this "soft" attitude made the Communists our friends? Read your papers: The Reds shoot down a lost U.S. training plane over East Germany. Pro-Communists in Zanzibar expel our diplomats at gunpoint. Laos sinks deeper into the Red morass, dragging Cambodia along. Communist Vietcong guerrillas in Vietnam gain ground, and are reported to have offered a $250 bounty for every American killed. The Reds incite deportation of U.S. educators from Ghana: President Johnson is hanged in effigy in Greece.

Closer to home (as predicted in my last report to you), Castro exports men and arms to foment rebellions in Latin America. Cuban weapons are smuggled into Venezuela, where Americans are kidnaped and U.S. property burned. Castro's agitators encourage bloody riots in Panama; U.S. soldiers are killed and relations are severed for the first time in history. Castro arrogantly shuts off the water supply for our naval base at Guantanamo, which I visited in January.

Our alliances grow shakier. Our NATO "partner," General de Gaulle of France, now snuggles up to Red China. Britain's Prime Minister Home points caustically to our Government-backed wheat sale to Khrushchev, then (using our error to justify his own) defies our "blockade" by selling buses to Khrushchev's stooge, Castro.

All across the globe, our enemies are spitting into American faces, tearing down American flags, stoning and bombing American installations, shooting down American planes, stealing American property (or destroying what they can't steal), murdering American citizens—and laughing at the impotent "giant of the West."

What has our President done? He has issued a statement to the effect that we are beloved all over the world—that those who express concern about the situation are nothing more than "bellyachers."

I care far less about our being "beloved" abroad than I care about our being respected, by both our friends and our enemies.

Our superb human and natural resources, our unexcelled economic system, our long-established devotion to liberty—all these cause free nations to look to us for leadership. But true leadership demands the respect of those whom one would lead, as well as one's adversaries—and, even more important, the will to lead.

We have already lost the respect of our enemies; we are fast losing that of those we count on our side in the struggle of freedom

against slavery, because—by catering to the slave masters—our administration seems to have lost the will to exercise the strong, positive leadership which the struggle requires.

I, therefore, suggest to the President that he (1) abandon at once the present appeasement of the Soviets and their satellites, including Cuba; (2) remove from influential posts in Government those who have not learned that coddling of aggressors leads only to war; (3) make no more agreements with the Reds unless what we do is matched by enforceable concessions from them; and (4) take whatever steps are necessary, now, to regain respect for the United States, our flag, and our citizens everywhere in the world.

These who understand world communism's goals support a strong American defense system. I will continue to vote for all measures necessary to keep our country secure against enemies within and without. An effectively planned and administered program of military and economic aid to our real friends abroad is a vital part of our defense system, and I have always supported foreign aid which served this purpose.

In recent years, however, much of our money has been ladled out to governments hostile to the United States, to political grafters, and for projects of questionable value. The President has been urged to reassess our whole program, reduce our aid, and concentrate it where it will work to the best effect.

I agree with these suggestions, and I voted for the reduced $2.8 billion aid fund approved by the House—but I refused to vote for the President's amendment authorizing U.S. credits for Soviet wheat purchases. To combine in one bill financial support both for and against communism violates the whole purpose of foreign aid.

Voting for all appropriations and against all taxes may be one road to reelection, but it just doesn't make sense in terms of our national economy. Fiscal responsibility is the cornerstone of our strength and prosperity. Our Government cannot forever continue to spend more than it takes in. Deficit spending must stop; a limit must be set and observed. That's why I voted against increasing the U.S. debt limit to $307 billion (June), to $309 billion (August) and again (in November) to $315 billion—an incredible $1,750 Federal debt in the name of each man, woman, and child in America in your name.

I have always fought for tax reduction—but only if accompanied by reduced Federal spending toward a balanced budget. This has been my position as a member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee. After President Johnson submitted a budget which (on the surface, at least) trims U.S. expenditures, I voted for the tax cut—but I intend to hold the President to his promises, and will vote for no unnecessary new expenditures which will make our monstrous debt even bigger.

My proposed constitutional amendment permitting the recital of a noncompulsory, nondenominational prayer in U.S. public schools, has been bottled up (with similar bills) in a committee, for almost 2 years. I've written to the President, asking that he demand action; not having had the courtesy of a reply, I have signed the discharge petition to bring this bill to the House floor for a vote. The House Republican Policy Committee has approved the prayer amendment; one word from the President would assure the prayer bill of bipartisan support and prompt enactment.

My proposal allowing tax deductions for college tuition was beaten in the Senate by three votes, when Senators HUMPHREY, SMATHERS and HARTKE, cosponsors, switched and voted against their own bill. The President opposed it, and the AFL-CIO called it a "rich man's bill"—a ridiculous charge. This defeat denied middle income parents much needed relief. I voted for the Vocational Education and Higher Education Acts, and would have supported the Health Professions Education Act had it not been badly drawn.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has won its first round, in the House. I voted for this bill, as I have for every measure intended to protect the rights of all Americans on an equal basis, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. The real test will come in the Senate, where I trust that President Johnson' newly found enthusiasm for civil rights will persuade his 2 to 1 majority ratify our action. In the final analysis, only commonsense and understanding can make this legislation effective; neither violence nor civil disobedience is the solution.

"Medicare," the misnamed King-Anderson bill to provide very limited health services for persons 65 or older out of social security taxes, is again before my committee—and I still oppose it, as being (1) inadequate, covering only one-third of needs, or $9 per month, (2) inequitable, overtaxing younger workers to pay others' bills, and taxing millionaire and worker at the same rate, (3) costly, eventually boosting your social security taxes to 11 percent or more, (4) dangerous, further weakening the solvency of the whole social security system, now $330 billion in the red, (5) inefficient, creating new bureaucratic red tape, hiking costs and paperwork and delaying needed hospitalization, and above all (6) unnecessary, in that the Kerr-Mills Act (which I supported, and which is now in effect or going into effect in 42 jurisdictions including New York) provides more and better medical-care aid for people 65 and over who can't afford it.

By 1968, with King-Anderson medicare, you will be paying $253.50 (average) each year in social security taxes, with a like amount paid by your employer—but to provide only limited hospital and after-hospital nursing home care, plus some home health services. In contrast, the existing Kerr-Mills Act covers all these, plus doctors' and surgeons' services, private nursing, physical therapy, dental work, lab and X-ray services, prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices. Under Kerr-Mills, any senior citizen who needs financial aid for medical care can get it. I am willing to consider other feasible solutions to the problem, but up to now the administration has been adamant in its insistence on compulsion.

Because I am interested in the health problems of our older people, I would appreciate being informed of any case of a citizen 65 or over in our district who is being denied any physician-prescribed hospital or after-hospital nursing home care because he or she cannot afford such services. Names, addresses, and details will be held strictly confidential.

In the 1963 session of the 88th Congress, I was unrecorded on only 6 of the 119 record votes taken, for a 95-percent on-the-record commitment score. My 1964 record is 100 percent.

Among the votes I've cast, in addition to those mentioned above and others to cut costs of certain U.S. programs, were votes for the Equal Pay Act (equal pay for equal work regardless of the worker's sex), against the "political pork" Area Redevelopment Act, for necessary Space Agency funds, for grants for vital work in mental retardation, for a long-overdue pay hike for servicemen (who have been leaving the services in alarming numbers), against farm subsidies which keep your food prices too high, for the Clean Air Act to stem pollution, against the unneeded "Department of Urban Affairs," and for extension of the Civil Rights Commission's life.

Your response to my "Washington Report No. 1" was most heartening. Everyone who wrote to me about it received a reply, including the comedian who wrote: "Some nut sent me a newsletter and signed your name to it." I appreciate all views, and all visitors to my offices, both in Washington and in the district, are most welcome—as are your letters. I continue to be proud and honored to represent you.

Your Congressman,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the President's war on poverty plans, and have introduced H.R. 10462, identical with the administration's bill, to show my strong support.

The bill provides programs which will strike at the roots of poverty to end the vicious cycle which begins with low income and continues through inadequate education to the final point of economic incapacity. This cycle must be broken.

Assistance to the youth of our Nation is one of my primary objectives. I consider the provisions relating to the three new programs to benefit our young people, of greatest importance. I believe that the Job Corps, the work training program, and the work-study program, will prove most efficacious in opening job and school opportunities to the one-half million young Americans whose future otherwise would be filled with endless frustrations, hopelessness, and poverty. A cry of despair is heard throughout our land; it is shocking to realize that although we are the richest nation in the world, one-fifth of our people suffer cruel deprivations and lack of opportunities which in turn entrap the young in the continuing environment of hopelessness, often through generations.

The Job Corps aims for the social rehabilitation of 100,000 young men. It is emphasized that the conservation camps and job training centers which would be established in various parts of the country would serve as educational institutions rather than as mere camps for the underprivileged. The proposed work-training program would provide vocational training and part-time work for 200,000 young men and women in projects to be administered by State and local governments and nonprofit agencies. The work-study program would help our deserving and qualified young people who are now denied college education by economic circumstances. Thus we would utilize brainpower and skill presently being wasted. There are numerous other helpful provisions in the bill; among them, the authority to recruit and train volunteers for the war against poverty.

The investment we make in carrying out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 will be repaid many times over, and measured against the

inestimable benefits which will accrue to the youth of our Nation and our future economy, it is a modest one.

Congress must hear the pleas of the despairing, underprivileged people, young and old, of this Nation. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will pass this necessary and beneficial bill which will enable us at least to start the long, uphill fight against poverty, which has been aptly termed a "domestic enemy which threatens the strength of our Nation and the welfare of our people." The sooner we can implement the programs provided by the bill, the sooner we start to save the youth of our country. Our enemy, poverty, can and must be conquered.

Twenty Million Rural Folks Speak Out on Rural Electrification Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, over 7,500 members of rural electric cooperatives gathered in Dallas, Tex., last week for the 22d annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Co-op Association—NRECA. They were representing 981 rural power systems which have made—and are continuing to make—significant contributions to the progress of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD some of the resolutions which were passed by the delegates to this convention. These resolutions are the product of 10 regional NRECA meetings plus intensive study in depth by the resolutions committee of the opportunities and obstacles that lie before the rural electric cooperatives of the United States. Debated and approved by the delegates of NRECA's 981 member systems, the resolutions represent the thinking of 20 million rural people served by rural electric cooperatives:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE 22D NRECA ANNUAL MEETING

RURAL TELEPHONE LOAN AUTHORIZATION

Be it resolved, That we support the loan authorization which will be requested by the National Telephone Cooperative Association for fiscal year 1965, and urged REA to promote the extension of adequate and reliable telephone service through rural telephone cooperatives to all rural areas of the country.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Be it resolved, That Congress is urged to adopt a capital budget for Federal Government fiscal operations that will clearly distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments, such as self-liquidating REA loans and Federal power investments.

SECTION 5 LOANS

Whereas the rural electric systems are vitally concerned with and are heavily engaged in efforts to renew the opportunities in rural America for providing a decent standard of living for a maximum number of rural people; and

Whereas the section 5 loans program is in effective means of helping in instances where no other help is available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we support the principle that REA should continue to make section 5 loans which meet all legal and administrative requirements, when such loans are essential to and will make an effective contribution to economic and community development in rural electric service areas.

POWER COMPANY TAX SUBSIDIES

Whereas the power companies have collected from consumers, including rural electrics who buy wholesale power from them almost $2 billion in Federal taxes which they have kept under the provisions of sections 167 and 168 of the Internal Revenue Code; and

Whereas the Internal Revenue Act of 1962 affords another tax subsidy in the form of a 3-percent tax credit to utilities for doing what they as public utilities must do anyway, that is, add new capacity to serve their growing loads, and this windfall will amount to more than $4 billion in the next 20 years; and the tax bill passed by Congress in February contains in section 203(e)(3) provisions precluding consumers from benefiting in this tax cut; and

Whereas the power companies for years have alleged that they can supply all foreseeable power needs, with no public assistance, financial or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call to the attention of the Congress and the Federal Power Commission that there is no justification for these tax subsidies, and urge that they be eliminated.

REA APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1965

Be it resolved, That we support the President's budget request for $300 million regular authorization and $65 million joint electric and telephone contingency authorization for fiscal year 1965; provided, however, that the NRECA Legislative Committee is authorized to adjust the amounts to be requested in the event the annual survey makes such adjustment necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to appropriate the administrative funds for REA requested in the President's budget; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose any limitation on the REA Administrator in the exercise of his duties under the Rural Electrification Act, and we urge the Appropriations Committees of the Congress to eliminate the burdensome requirements imposed on REA in the 1964 reports.

INVESTIGATION OF POWER COMPANIES

Whereas some power companies are charging rates which produce substantially more than a fair rate of return on investment and use portions of their income for antirural electric and antiresource development campaigns; and

Whereas Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, has unveiled this operation in all of its despicable and unsavory detail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend Senator METCALF for his efforts and urge him to continue to expose these nefarious operations and campaigns of vilification; and be it further

Resolved, That the appropriate committees of Congress and the Federal Power Commission be urged to investigate and publicize excess earnings and their use in propaganda and lobbying campaigns, and to take steps to end these abuses.

STUDY OF CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS AND MEANS

Whereas adequate capital financing at low interest rates is vital to the future of our program; and

Whereas our capital requirements will continue to rise in the future, possibly exceeding at some future time the amounts which Congress can or will make available through REA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we approve the proposal that NRECA and REA conduct studies in depth of the future capital requirements of rural electrification and means of meeting them, including an examination of the feasibility of obtaining funds in private money markets, and an appraisal of the modifications (if any) which should be sought in REA financing.

REA INTEREST RATES AND LOAN TERMS

Be it resolved, That we reaffirm our longstanding support of the present REA interest rate and loan terms in order that the rural electric systems and the rural telephone cooperatives may be able to carry out the Rural Electrification Act, as amended, in building a better rural America.

TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

Whereas rural electric systems in most States continue to be harrassed by territorial invasions, and the resultant loss of service area and consumers make even more difficult the already burdensome task of providing dependable, low-cost service on an area-coverage basis; and

Whereas we reaffirm the unrestricted right and responsibility of rural electric systems to serve those areas in which they initiated service, and we oppose pirating of area and consumers by any other electric utility systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress and appropriate officials in State and Federal Governments be urged to take all actions available to them in exploring and promoting such measures as may be possible to protect rural electric systems against violations of territory, pirating of members, and condemnation of properties; and in particular, that they be urged to recognize that it is detrimental to the public interest to foster or to permit invasion of areas served through area-coverage loans.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION JURISDICTION

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has, in docket E-7113, issued show cause orders to three nonprofit, rural electric systems for the purpose of determining the jurisdictional status of said systems, "and those similarly situated," before said Commission; and

Whereas the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate has directed the Federal Power Commission to not expend funds in further attempts to assist such jurisdiction; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has expressly rejected this mandate of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and

Whereas the three rural electric systems, and the 400 systems which have intervened in FPC docket E-7113, have already expended $67,000 in defending themselves against FPC jurisdiction; without allowance for the cost of further proceedings before FPC and judicial appeals therefrom estimated to cost in excess of $300,000; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has suspended, or initiated investigations into, the wholesale contracts under which certain nonprofit, rural electric systems purchase power and energy from investor-owned companies; thereby imposing further costs of litigation on such systems and preventing or inhibiting the purchase by them of such wholesale power at lowest cost; and

Whereas the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was enacted subsequent to the Federal Power Act of 1935 and conferred on the REA Administrator complete authority to exercise Federal regulation and control over the electric systems which it empowered him to finance; and

Whereas the exercise of jurisdiction over nonprofit, rural electric systems, or their wholesale power contracts, does not serve the public interest, duplicates and is in conflict

with the powers and duties delegated by Congress to the REA Administrator, and is beyond the authority conferred on the Federal Power Commission under the Federal Power Act of 1935 as amended; and

Whereas legislation (S. 2028, H.R. 8023 and H.R. 8058) has been introduced in both Houses of Congress which would, by granting nonprofit electric systems an express statutory exemption from FPC control, resolve any question as to the jurisdictional status of such systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby respectfully petion the Congress of the United States to promptly enact legislation such as S. 2028, H.R. 8023 or H.R. 8058 to exempt from FPC jurisdiction nonprofit rural electric systems; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would exempt from FPC jurisdiction transactions involving the wholesale sale for resale of power transmitted from a point within or at the boundary of a State where such sale is to a customer or customers principally engaged in the retail sale and distribution of electricity to ultimate consumers in the State of such wholesale sale or adjoining States; and be it further

Resolved, That the NRECA general manager is authorized and requested to cooperate with all other groups and organizations interested in securing enactment of the above mentioned legislation or similar legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend and express our appreciation to the Dairyland Power Cooperative, the Minnkota Power Cooperative and the South Central Rural Eleceric Cooperative for defending FPC docket E-7113, and we renew our pledge of support for their support for their effort in said docket.

PREFERENCE CLAUSE

Whereas renewed attempts are being made by the power companies to destroy the principles that the benefits from the investment of the people's money in the multiple-purpose resource development should belong to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President, appropriate Cabinet members and heads of agencies, and the Congress be urged to oppose strongly all schemes that would subvert the public interest through breaching and weakening the preference clause, which has thus far prevented the Federal energy resources from falling completely under the control of the power companies.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the ability of rural electric systems to fulfill their responsibilities is directly dependent on their ability to obtain dependable low-cost wholesale energy; and

Whereas in the face of dual rates, escalator clauses and opposition from commercial power companies, the availability of G. & T. loans from REA is the only means many systems have to secure a dependable and adequate supply of low-cost energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend and support Administrator Norman Clapp for continuing his efforts on behalf of the G. & T. program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendments to the REA Act which would require any change in the present established policy of the Administrator to make generation and transmission loans; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United State to insure an effective G. & T. loan program by appropriating adequate REA loan funds to meet the needs of rural America for electric power.

LEGISLATION BY COMMITTEE REPORT

Whereas the Congress has conferred certain powers upon the REA Administrator under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; and

Whereas rural electric systems, financed by the Administrator under said act, have established the best repayment record in the history of Federal Government loan programs, and together constitute the most effective rural improvement program conceived during the 20th century; and

Whereas investor-owned utility companies, which have traditionally opposed the rural electrification program, have petitioned the Congress over a period of years for amendment of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to restrict authority for loans to construct generation and transmission facilities; and

Whereas the Congress has steadfastly refused to so amend the act as requested by the companies; and

Whereas the companies are now attempting to misuse the Federal appropriation process by petitioning House and Senate Appropriation Committees to place substantive restrictions on the REA Administrator as to G. & T. loans; and

Whereas the restrictions on REA placed in the reports of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for fiscal year 1964, will result in higher wholesale power costs and inability to construct generation and transmission facilities and will tend to deny REA financed G. & T. systems the right to interconnect with Federal power networks; and

Whereas such restrictions have the practical effect of law and thereby constitute legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully petition the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to not further restrict the REA Administrator in the discharge of the duties and to remove such restrictions as have already been imposed.

Statement of Col. John T. Carlton, Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Before the House Subcommittee for Military Appropriations, March 19, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. SIKES, Mr. Speaker, I consider a statement submitted on March 19 to the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to be sufficiently significant that it should be called to the attention of the entire membership of the Congress.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF COL. JOHN T. CARLTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we again wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to appear before you this year, and each year, to present our views in connection with appropriations for the Reserve Forces.

We are here, of course, to represent the views not of this small staff that appears before you, but of our entire membership, which includes virtually 100 percent of the leadership in the Reserve Forces of our various services.

They are dedicated, experienced officers who are responsible citizens prominent in all walks of life in their communities. In addition to being citizens and taxpayers, they are, indeed, professionals as citizen soldiers. Of course, a large number are among those who fought and led our troops in World War II and Korea, but there is among them a large segment of our most responsible youth moving forward to positions of importance in the Reserve Forces. They have given much thought to the problem of national security, and to their part in it. They are probably more aware than almost any other segment of our society of the need for achieveing adequate national security at the lowest possible cost.

Last year we appeared before you shortly after the House Armed Services Committee had conducted a thorough review of the reserve policies as a result of the Reserve Forces having been called upon twice, about a year apart, to augment our Active Forces in time of crisis. You will remember that the late President Kennedy, in speaking of this action, noted that, "For the first time our Reserve Forces have been called upon to help prevent a war rather than fight one."

We quoted from the committee report resulting from this thorough review (H. Rept. No. 70, "Military Reserve Posture," the report of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee, dated August 17, 1962), an observation which was most significant. We consider this recommendation just as valid today and deem it again appropriate to quote it:

"10. That the annual Department of Defense appropriation request for Reserve support be adequate to maintain a Reserve Force in each military department commensurate with its mobilization requirements and that the appropriation be made available without the budgetary restrictions which now preclude the most effective use of these funds. Existing budgetary restrictions established by DOD prevent shifting of these funds between various Reserve training programs and frustrates the efforts of service planners to utilize most advantageously the funds provided by Congress for maximum support of the individual Reserve programs."

Since there appears to us that in the foreseeable future there will be no relaxation of this cold war and that this Nation is faced with the continued necessity to bear costs of standing military forces, we believe the Reserves stand at the threshold of a period of even greater usefulness to this country.

Thus we are convinced that a strengthened Reserve can well be a major factor in providing the required national securty with the greatest economy to the taxpayer if the Reserve Forces are given the opportunity to rise to their full capabilities.

This is why we are so fearful of the obvious and continued trend toward the erosion of the strength and effectiveness of these Reserves Forces.

A quick review of the amount of money requested in personnel appropriations for the Reserve components of the services over the past 10 years will clearly headline this fact.

These facts alone are enough to make us strive in every way and to strongly urge your committee to halt this erosion before it goes too far.

Believe us, we know the citizen soldier stands ready to sacrifice his time and to do his duty, given the tools to work with and the assurance of a stable and viable Reserve program. Your committee is in the best position to provide these tools and this assurance.

However, Mr. Chairman, our appearance today is based upon a need that goes beyond these temporal requirements covering only the next fiscal year for the Reserve Forces of the various military services. There is in truth a continuing effort which gives threat of reaching fruition this next year to write the Reserves out of the national defense picture and to relegate them far below

any second-class standard than they have ever occupied before. When we recall the ringing tributes to the performances of the Reserves in the Berlin crisis and in the Cuban confrontation and the tributes paid to these thousands of citizen soldiers from throughout the United States by the President and by the Secretary of Defense and others, it seems utterly inconsistent that the Defense Department should consider reducing and weakening the Reserves rather than giving them greater strength, better training, and more equipment. The citizen-soldier tradition has been our basic military policy for nearly 200 years. In this day when the President is speaking about meeting social needs by cutting down on the defense budget it should not be necessary for anyone to reiterate the fact that the maintenance of Reserves cost but a fraction of what is required for maintaining comparable active duty forces.

I believe that the Congress recognizes these historic facts and will act accordingly. We feel very strongly that the Congress must do more than acquiesce in previous policy; it must take positive action to obtain some assurance that the Reserve Forces will be maintained throughout the national community as a means of providing not only a ready mobilization base but of keeping the people of the United States convinced that every individual citizen owes his personal services in times of military crises to the country and that these citizens must be prepared to give this service with competence and some hope of success. For, as Rousseau stated in the 18th century: "As soon as public service ceases to be the chief business of the citizens, and they would rather serve with their money than with their persons, the state is not far from its fall."

The following is a brief outline of our analysis of the situation facing the Reserve Forces of each of the military services resulting from the current departmental budget request. Our recommendations concern each service's appropriation and are made with a view of preventing, during fiscal year 1965, any further erosion to the Reserve Forces.

ARMY RESERVE APPROPRIATIONS

The ROA supports the fiscal year 1965 appropriations for the "Reserve Personnel Army" requested by DOD and the DA as presented in the request made by Maj. Gen. William J. Sutton, Chief of Army Reserve, in hearings held by this subcommittee on January 20, 1964, totaling $242.9 million, which includes $15.5 million for Army ROTC.

Although the DOD and DA have programed a paid drill end strength of 300,000 for fiscal year 1965, it must be pointed out that funds were requested to support only an end strength of 285,000, the highest strength it has been estimated could be attained by the end of the fiscal year 1965.

The aggressive recruiting program initiated by DA in line with the request made by Congress to reach the 300,000 end strength in the fiscal year 1964 appropriations shows a possibility of exceeding the estimated end strength of 285,000. Last year's downtrend in strength has been stopped and a continuing upward trend has been established. In line with the policy established last year it is requested, that should a supplemental budget be necessary, that it will be fully supported by your committee. The pattern previously established by your committee has served as an excellent and outstanding example of the recognition of the necessity for and desire of Congress to maintain the strength of our Reserves. The aggressive recruiting program undertaken by DA in the fulfillment of your recognition and desires is worthy of note.

ROA compliments the wisdom of this committee and the Congress in the strong recognition given the Army Reserve technician program which was covered in detail in H.R. 7179—fiscal year 1964 hearings. This program will enable personnel of the USAR units to more fully devote their time to training and be relieved of the time-consuming administrative, supply, and maintenance tasks which are essential, and which are beyond the capabilities of assigned Reserve personnel to perform during regular training assemblies. This will alleviate somewhat the extra time spent by personnel, if you will, a personal sacrifice of their own time from their regular civilian employment in order to keep their units in the best possible state of training.

Speaking of the strength of our Reserves I am deeply concerned at the attempt at the continued erosion of our Reserve Forces. I refer particularly to recent articles in the newspapers, and that is placing the lower priority Reserves in such a low place of priority for support that we will have virtually no mobilization base beyond the 22 division high priority forces, a force that would be inadequate for the support of an operation of the magnitude of Korea, a limited war operation that could very well occur again and in the not too distant future.

Remember that this 22 division force consists of 16 divisions of our Active Army and 6 high priority divisions and their supporting forces from the Reserve components. Of the Active Army divisions, five are in Europe unavailable for deployment elsewhere, likewise two divisions in Korea. If we are ever faced with the deployment of nine divisions force as we were in Korea (eight Army; one Marine), they would have to be replaced in the Conus with a minimum of delay. Where are they to come from unless we have a bigger base than the 22 division high priority force? Hence our concern over the forces in lower priority and a tendency to eventually erode them from our Reserve Forces.

With the unsettled conditions in the world today—Vietnam is one outstanding example—Cyprus, another, there is always the possibility that our forces might be needed in several areas at the same time. The necessity for an adequate mobilization base cannot be overemphasized.

NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when we were here before you last year, we were in the happy position of being able to report to you that the Naval Reserve budget, while austere, was adequate and that we had no increases to recommend, and, instead, urged your approval of the requests of the Navy Department.

While there has been a small increase in the overall money recommended in this year's Naval Reserve budget, nevertheless, the increases are not adequate to meet the requirements; they do not even offset the new cost increases.

This committee has always insisted that the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard strength be maintained. At times, the committee has placed mandatory language in the appropriation for these two Reserve components. At other times, the committee has indicated in legislation that if necessary to maintain the authorized strength, the Congress would entertain a deficiency appropriation.

We are confident that you believe with equal interest that the Naval Reserve program also should meet its authorized strength. The proposed budget now before you does not do this. Instead, it levels the Naval Reserve program off at an average strength of 125,000 officers and men for Navy's Selected Reserve. The "D" day requirements of the Selected Reserve program have been made unmistakeably clear by Vice Admiral Smedberg in his appearances before the posture hearings and other committees in the House and Senate. The requirement is for 166,000 officers and men. This budget levels it off at 125,000. We believe and hope that you insist that the Naval Reserve program be given the same support toward reaching its authorized strength that is given to other components, and that an increase in strength be appropriated for fiscal year 1965 to permit the program to grow toward meeting it. The "old saw" advanced by comptrollers that the Navy should not be given additional funds because it is unable to maintain a greater strength, simply has no validity. As of today, the Navy's Selected Reserve is at a strength of 130,000 and the Navy is being required to reduce this strength to 126,000. Recruiting programs have been slowed and qualified officers and enlisted men are being thrown out of the Selected Reserve program in order to reduce the strength to meet fiscal, not mobilization, requirements.

We, therefore, ask the committee to increase the Reserve personnel, Navy appropriation to permit an increase in the average strength for the Selected Reserve from 125,000 to 132,000. This will require an increase of $2,742,000.

Year before last, the Congress, at our request, increased the line item covering category D training from a token number to 12,000. This line item includes those officers and men in the specialist program who drill without pay, but get active duty for training with pay. All of the increase that was authorized at that time was used effectively. Last year, the budget included adequate funds for this item. This year, however, the budgeteers' axes have been swung again. This line item has been reduced substantially, when, as a matter of fact, there is a particularly urgency to increase it in the 1965 budget. This urgency resides in the fact that many enlisted men will return to the Reserve program after having completed 2 years of active duty and will be assigned to the Fleet Augmentation Divisions. By the reduction of this line item, these men will be denied active duty for training with pay. It is especially important for them to retrain their skills by going to sea annually. We, therefore, urge the committee to increase this line item to include 8,500 officers and 5,000 enlisted men. This will increase the cost by the sum of $700,000.

In this year's appropriation, another item relating to the Reserve program requires an increase which, while small, nevertheless, is of great importance to the Reserve program. This particular increase is the operation and maintenance budget under the caption "Direct program, general expenses, naval personnel." A portion of these funds are urgently needed for the maintenance of our Naval Reserve training centers which are located in every State of the Union. They cover replacement of supplies, operation and maintenance of motor vehicles, janitorial and building maintenance, increase in lease and rental costs, and replacement of minor logistical support equipment such as student chairs, typewriters, and personnel training equipment.

Mr. Chairman, our Naval Reserve training centers are maintained at a cost less than that required by the General Services Administartion to maintain their activities in a caretaker status. Each year there has been a deferral of requirements in this appropriation. In order to maintain these training centers in decent condition and to provide the services necessary for the reservists who drill in the centers, an additional $1 million is needed. We, therefore, request that this committee increase this program activity from $89,800,000 to $90,800,000 to provide these funds.

One other item in the Naval Reserve budget needs your attention. This comes under the heading of "Military construction, Naval Reserve." The Naval Reserve was the first service to commence construction of Reserve

training centers after World War II, and the construction at that time was accomplished on a most economical basis by using surplus quonset huts and contruction of that nature. Many of them now urgently need replacement. The replacement authority has been hard to get and Navy requests have been moderate. However, there are two training centers, which are not included in the present appropriation, which urgently need replacement. Their omission from the budget was due entirely to budget limitations. These training centers are located at Cape Girardeau, Mo., and Perth Amboy, N.J. We urge that they be added to the budget by increasing the appropriation military construction, Naval Reserve, by the amount of $1,200,000 for construction costs of these centers.

To recapitulate, we urge the committee to make the following increases:

Reserve personnel, Navy—increase by $3,442,000 as detailed:

Pay and allowances, active duty for training, enlisted personnel: Item 1B (1) increase to 95,270 men—increased cost, $742,000; Item 1B (4) increase to 5,000 men—increased cost, $700,000.

Pay and allowances, inactive duty training, enlisted personnel: Item 1D (1) increase to 91,050 men—increased cost, $2 million.

Operation and maintenance, Navy—increase by $1 million: Item—general expenses, Navy personnel, for proper maintenance of Naval Reserve training centers.

Military construction, Naval Reserve—increase by $1,200,000: Item—major construction, to permit urgently needed replacement construction of two Naval Reserve training centers.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Last year we enjoyed the same pleasant situation regarding the Marine Corps Reserve that applied to the Naval Reserve. This year, the budget is short of supporting the Marine Corps Reserve at its authorized strength. As has been explained to the committee, the Marine Corps has reorganized its Reserve program to provide a fourth Marine division and a fourth Marine Air Wing to the Fleet Marine Force on mobilizations. The personnel needed to man this organization is a minimum of 51,000. This strength was authorized by the Joint Chiefs and approved by the Secretary of Defense.

However, the budgeteers got into the picture and set the strength at the same level which prevailed last year, 45,000 officers and men. The Marine Corps has never had trouble in recruiting personnel strength, but it is prevented from reaching its required number of 51,000 by budgetary limitations.

It is just as important for the Marine Corps to achieve its authorized strength as it is for the Army or the National Guard or the Navy to reach theirs. We, therefore, urge the committee to increase the appropriation Reserve personnel, Marine Corps sufficiently to permit the Marine Corps to increase its strength by 3,000 men in order to grow toward its required strength. The cost of this addition would be approximately $1,200,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

The Department of Defense request is $59.2 million of which $7.85 million is for ROTC and the remainder, $51.35 million is for Reserve component personnel.

The amount requested for Reserve component personnel is slightly over $1 million more than appropriated in fiscal year 1964, all of which, and much more, will be eaten up by the 1963 pay increase. This means very simply, the Air Force Reserve is being subjected to what is commonly called program depression. In other words, this is a smaller program, trainingwise than last year by several million dollars.

This is further aggravated because of the amazing job our Reserve leaders have done in recruiting personnel in the past year. The new fiscal year will find the Air Force Reserve starting out at full authorized strength. This, of course, was not the case at the beginning of fiscal year 1964 at which time the Air Force Reserve had not recovered from the personnel losses resulting from the Berlin and Cuban callups.

From the information available to us, it looks as if this Air Force budget request perhaps will keep the flying unit program above the water level, thus this aspect can be considered satisfactory.

However, again the budget request fails to provide for 48 drills for the recovery program units or for input of nonprior service personnel. The testimony before your committee of General Moore, Director of Personnel Planning, and Colonel Twomey of the Air Force Secretary's Office brought out by questions from Congressman SIKES, has clearly indicated that the Air Force has hardened its requirements in this program but there is a great need for $3.4 million to provide for the full training program.

We would like to point out here that Congressman HÉBERT, chairman of the Reserve Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, has introduced legislation (H.R. 8760) to require 48 paid drills for these units, and General LeMay in his military posture statement before the Armed Services Committee has strongly supported this action. The climate now is finally right for providing these vitally needed drill periods for recovery units, and we respectfully but strongly urge this committee to provide the required $3.4 million.

If this money is not provided, it will compel the Air Force to pay for this added training by robbing the one remaining major program in the Air Force Reserve. This is the individual training program.

This program, vital to fleshing out the Active Forces during an emergency, has suffered serious losses over the past several years. It contains some of the finest reservists in the program, many possessing talents and skills not available elsewhere.

Last year we testified to the fact that in the several years past the individuals in this augmentation program have been afforded, on the average, only one 15-day active duty training tour every 3 years. This year's Air Force budget request will provide even fewer annual tours than previously. These reductions are hurting the program badly. Therefore, any further inroads which would be required under the current budget request to provide 48 drills for the Recovery program would be crippling indeed.

This, we feel, is all the more reason to include the additional $3.4 million in reserve personnel appropriations. This increase will bring the Air Force Reserve component up to the funding level in fiscal years 1960 and 1961. Even this, however, will not bring the program itself up to the level of those years as the increases in pay and allowances have raised the per capita cost of the program. Drill pay spaces will still be less than authorized in those years.

In summary, the additional $3.4 million for a total authorization under "Reserve personnel, Air Force" of $62.6 million is essential to the program and should be added by this committee.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, then, it is sincerely hoped that your committee will, in its wisdom:

(1) Indicate its willingness to entertain a request for a supplementary (deficiency) appropriation of sufficient "Reserve personnel, Army" funds to provide an end strength up to 300,000 in the Army Reserve should the programed strength of 285,000 be exceeded;

(2) Increase "Reserve personnel, Navy" funds by $3.442 million to provide drill pay strength of 132,000; and to increase active duty tours for category D personnel.

(3) Increase the "Navy operations and maintenance appropriations" (caption, direct program, general expenses, Naval Reserve) by $1 million for the maintenance of Naval Reserve training centers;

(4) Provide an additional $1.2 million in "Military construction, Navy" to provide replacement naval training centers at Cape Girardeau, Mo. and Perth Amboy, N.J.;

(5) Authorize $1.2 million more under "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps" to allow that service to move towards its required strength of 51,000;

(6) Provide an additional $3.4 million in "Reserve personnel, Air Force" to allow 48 drills and nonprior service manning of Air Force recovery units.

We are convinced that the demand for economy impels the strengthening of the Reserve Forces for the long-range security of the Nation. These programs give the taxpayer the most for his dollar; more importantly, perhaps, their maintenance connotes a commitment of all our citizenry to national defense.

Who Said There Are Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, one reason why Communists are making so many advances in the world today is because some of the softheads in our State Department do not think communism is dangerous. It is interesting, therefore, to read Virginia Prewett's article in yesterday's Daily News on communism in Venezuela:

PERHAPS THE INDIANS ARE TO BLAME

(By Virginia Prewett)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Under the policy line necessary to see no upheaval, hear no upheaval, speak no upheaval from Moscow, U.S. Embassy spokesmen here are hard-put to explain away the long terror campaign which Venezuela's newspapers and government attribute to the Castro-Communist underground.

"Look at those newspapermen," a U.S. Embassy spokesman said to me, indicating a group of U.S. correspondents near us at the hotel. "They're all running around looking for Communists. Why, there aren't this many Communists in Venezuela." He bunched his fingers to show how few.

"Now look," I said. "I know the State Department is pushing the detente with Moscow, but do you actually have to do Moscow's propaganda for them in Latin America?"

LOOKING BACK

Then I remembered something else heard from a State Department official recently in Washington. He had asserted that it wasn't Moscow's Communists but Red Chinese who'd sparked the famous demonstrations against Vice President Richard Nixon.

"The Caracas crowds spat at Nixon, and spitting isn't a Latin American gesture." (It is, of course, classically Latin American.) The Red Chinese must have trained the spitters, he thought. This conjured up visions of the hours the trainees must have spent learning to spit with just the right political significance.

So now I'd met another State Department spokesman having trouble minimizing Communist activities in Venezuela. Could I fail these envoys of the country of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt (Teddy and F. D.), the Kennedy brothers and the L.B.J. Ranch? No. I had to help them off the hook.

The embarrassment of my "not this many Communists" informant was compounded the very next day. Caracas newspapers carried pictures of a score of captured terrorists identified by the Venezuelan authorities as Communists.

Among the score—more, indeed, in a single bunch than my Embassy informant had fingers on his hand—was listed Jose Ramon Gonzalez, alias The Indian.

Indians. Of course. In a flash I saw how I could help our Embassy man out of his "Three-Monkey policy" discomfiture. Everybody knows that Venezuela's Motilone Indians are a troublesome lot—they've shot arrows and things at every newcomer since Columbus.

MAYBE

Maybe the Motilones, after all and not Moscow were inspiring all the terror. Maybe the captured Jose Ramon Gonzalez—alias "The Indian," aha—was the Motilone contact man. Maybe I'd even get a Pulitzer Prize for exposing this devious plot.

Till some U.S. policy change rewrites Venezuelan history again, the theory is surely the U.S. Embassy. "Three-Monkey" line is the best bet.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The DC-3: "Once Airborne, You Know You Got It Made"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 20, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all of us wish from time to time to visit the smaller cities and communities in the States we represent, and perhaps all of us with our crowded schedules have had occasion on these visits to utilize the local transport airlines. Those of us who do so doubtless have frequently ridden on DC-3's, one of the few airplanes adaptable to service in all kinds of weather, over rugged terrain, and between small and remote airports.

There are still 250 of these dependable airplanes in operation on our local transport airlines and doubtless a good many of them will be flying for some years longer.

As Civil Aeronautics Board Commissioner Robert T. Murphy testified at our Appropriations Committee hearings last year:

> In talking to the actual operators you will find there is a difference in their needs for aircraft, depending on their route structure and the place in the country they may be serving; whether they are flying over mountains, or flat terrain, or bush operations in Alaska. Maybe there is no one airplane like the DC-3 that seemed to answer all of these problems.

My distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, commented at this same hearing that no American plane designer has come up with plans for a suitable economical replacement.

DC-3's continue to have a significant role in modern air transportation. This role has been brilliantly detailed by Mr. Wesley Pruden, Jr., in the March 16 issue of the National Observer under the page 1 heading "Once Airborne, You Know You Got It Made," with the subhead reading: "A Coast-to-Coast Flight Via DC-3, Old Superliner That's Still Superplane."

As Mr. Pruden, reviewing the history of the DC-3, tells us in his fascinating article:

> It was the DC-3 that built the local service airlines in the late 1940's, just as it had put the trunk carriers in the black a decade before.

Without the DC-3 today, I can assure my colleagues, many of the scheduled stops on our local airlines would have to be abandoned until another plane just as adaptable and economical to operate on these short flights is developed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pruden's article "Once Airborne, You Know You Got It Made," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONCE AIRBORNE, YOU KNOW YOU GOT IT MADE—A COAST-TO-COAST FLIGHT VIA DC-3, OLD SUPERLINER THAT'S STILL SUPERPLANE

(By Wesley Pruden, Jr.)

Donald Douglas, who built it, calls his plane the Skytrain. Officially, it's the DC-3, and that's what the airlines call it. The Air Force designates it the C-47; the Navy, the R-4D. Pilots sometimes sneer at it, with mock scorn, as the Gooneybird, and thousands of troops who bounced around the world in its iron-hard bucket seats during World War II still swear at it unprintably.

It's the slowest airliner still in service; the top speed is 180 miles an hour, and it cruises at less than that. (The big jets often hit 600 miles an hour.) It's hot in summer, cold in winter, and the lack of pressurization, which is standard in newer airliners, makes the Gooney a drafty bird, indeed.

But, for all that, who denies that the weary, wonderful old DC-3 is the most reliable airplane anybody ever built? Answer: Hardly anybody who ever flew it, or worked on it. And certainly not me. I flew from coast to coast via regularly scheduled DC-3 service only, just to see if it could still be done. It can be. The Gooneybird is every bit the great old bucket it was when it put the two coasts within 12 hours of each other nearly three decades ago.

CLASSIC OF THE SKY

In the incredible 28 years it has been in scheduled airline service, the DC-3 has become as much the classic of the sky as Henry Ford's model T is the classic of the road. "The Gooneybird will take you there," a jetliner captain remarked fondly, "and she will bring you home. Really now, what else can you ask of a ship?"

The answers, of course, are obvious: Speed, comfort, and for the insensitive passenger with no appreciation for faithful mechanical beasts, the illusion of sitting in an overstuffed chair in his living room as he sips a dry martini.

Let them keep their illusions, the rare roast beef, the California champagne, and the time they save on their 4½-hour trips from coast to coast. The DC-3 is still a lot of fun, and soothing to nerves that constant air travel long ago rubbed raw.

But, there are problems for the DC-3 aficionado who needs to get from one ocean to the other. He either has to start in Seattle and finish his trip in Washington or Baltimore, or fly from Washington or Baltimore to Seattle; I flew it last week from west to east. First of all, you must have plenty of time; dogged by bad weather and narrowly missed connections, I still made it in a shade under 7 days. The traveler can't insist on nonstop service; I quit counting after our 46th stop. And, finally, there's no use expecting regular meals. The stewardesses on the local service airlines are just as pretty as those in the big jets, but the buffets are smaller. I got all the coffee I wanted, but would have gone hungry one night except for a sympathetic pilot who kept his engines idling while I hunted down a package of cheese and crackers in the one-room terminal at the Wolf Point, Mont., International Airport.

PERPLEXING SCHEDULE

Figuring an all-DC-3 route is perplexing, even now. I had to fly from Seattle no earlier than Friday, no later than Saturday, to make a connection from Boise to Lewiston, Idaho. West Coast's flight 312 between those cities is a Convair except on weekends.

Flying with West Coast, Frontier, North Central, and Lake Central Airlines, I made out a route with these stops: Aberdeen, Astoria, Portland, Salem, Albany, Redmond, Klamath Falls, Lakeview, and Burns, in Oregon; Boise, Idaho, and then back into Oregon to Ontario, Baker, and Pendleton; Lewiston, and Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Pullman and Spokane, Wash.; Kalispell, Cut Bank, Great Falls, Havre, Glasgow, Wolf Point, and Sidney in Montana; Williston, Minot, Devil's Lake, and Grand Forks, in North Dakota; into Minnesota to Thief River Falls; Bimidji, Brainerd, and Minneapolis; Eau Claire, Wausau, Stevens Point, Manitowoc, and Milwaukee, in Wisconsin; Chicago and Danville, Ill.; Terre Haute, Bloomington, Columbus, and Indianapolis, Ind.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Parkersburg and Clarksburg, W. Va., and, finally, Washington National Airport.

But, after days of planning, all the worrisome details of scheduling were behind me as Don Hawley, the captain on the first leg of the trip, lifted the ship off the rain-slicked runway at Seattle's Boeing Field, banked left over Port Ludlow, and flew toward the Pacific—the wrong direction, but the way the lines goes—and our first stop.

Aberdeen-Hoquiam Airport, which serves both Aberdeen and Hoquiam, was it. The airport is typical of the hundreds of U.S. airports for whom the local-service airlines are the commercial link to the world; it was the DC-3 that built the local-service airlines in the late 1940's, just as it had put the trunk carriers in the black a decade before.

It's a tiny terminal, but the runway is old and smooth. The field is a legacy of World War II, when it was built as an Army Air Corps training base. At war's end, it became a civilian field. The DC-3's that serve it were built for the war, too, and, like the field, converted after the war was over.

Douglas built more than 10,000 of the bulgy transports during World War II, and about half are still flying throughout the world. Many were destroyed during the war.

THE LONG WAY TO SPOKANE

I don't know whether I flew the most direct route possible but I tried. At the end of the third day out of Seattle, I flew into Spokane—230 miles as the crow flies. But, unlike a crow, the DC-3 is rarely allowed to fly in a straight line. West Coast Airlines (the first of four local service carriers listed on my ticket) has new F-27 propjets for those who want to go from Seattle to Spokane in a hurry.

The most annoying problem for those who are flying coast to coast on a DC-3 is the helpful airlines ticket agent, who insists on putting the aficionado aboard "a much faster and much more comfortable plane." It's cheaper, too, he points out; and, so it is. The one-way fare, using DC-3 service only, is $241.07; one-stop jetliner service, with all the frills, is a mere $185.27. That's because the DC-3 traveler is actually flying more miles to get from here to there.

West Coast Airlines, like the other 12 local-service lines, is gradually replacing its DC-3's with larger, faster planes. That's why this sentimental journey won't be possible after this year. Although the Gooneybird will be in service on some routes for years, there will soon be gaps where the only flights available will be Fairchild F-27's, Convairs, Martin 404's, and the like.

The DC-3 really goes back to 1933. Early in that year, Trans-World Airlines asked Donald Douglas if his company could build a transport plane suited to its own general specifications. TWA said it wanted an all-metal, three-motored monoplane that would fly up to 1,000 miles at 150 miles an hour. The plane should carry up to 14,500 pounds, a crew of 2, and 12 passengers.

Mr. Douglas put his engineers to work, and 2 weeks later sent two of them to New York City to show TWA the general outlines of the new plane. Some of the final drawings were made in a pullman compartment en route to New York City. TWA liked the plans, even though Douglas insisted on two rather than three engines, and Douglas agreed to build it for $125,000.

The first plane was delivered in December 1933. It was called the DC-1, for Douglas commercial, model 1. TWA took it to Winslow, Ariz., for the first tests. Crewmen put 9 tons of cargo aboard. The pilot took off, and just off the end of the runway, as soon as he retracted the landing wheels, he shut off the right engine. The DC-1 continued to climb to 8,000 feet, and the plane flew on, without laboring, to Albuquerque. TWA and Douglas knew they had the plane they wanted.

The airline suggested several changes and ordered 25 planes. Douglas made the changes, and called the new planes the DC-2 (the original and only DC-1 ever built was sold several times until the Spanish loyalists bought it in 1938; the next year, a Spanish pilot crashed it on takeoff at Malaga. Everyone walked away, but the DC-1 broke into two pieces on impact). Douglas built the 25 DC-2's for $65,000 each.

MUCH IN DEMAND

The DC-2 soon broke most of the airline speed and cargo records, and every airline wanted to buy them. American Airlines ordered several outfitted as sleepers, with which it hoped to get a large share of the luxury-pullman traffic. Douglas went to work on several other modifications; the cabin was enlarged to accommodate the bunks, and the wings were narrowed and lengthened to lift the altered shape of the plane.

Douglas called this model the DC-3. This was the plane that was to fly most airlines to solvency. The DC-3 went into scheduled service June 25, 1936. One airline executive recalled last week: "That's the day the airlines started going into the black."

Nearly all the DC-3's were conscripted for military duty in World War II, and Douglas built thousands more as the C-47. This plane, as it finally evolved, has a wingspan of 95 feet, a length of 64 feet, and can carry 24 passengers, a crew of 3, and 9,500 pounds at 160 miles an hour. The original DC-3 is powered by Curtiss-Wright engines, the C-47 by the more powerful Pratt & Whitney. General Eisenhower once called the C-47 one of the three weapons that won the war (the other two were the Jeep and the 2½-ton truck). When the war was over, most of the C-47's came home to be fitted with the trappings of a commercial airliner, renamed the DC-3, and put to work hauling civilians. Douglas streamlined a few DC-3's after the war, and called them Super DC-3's. Price of a DC-3 today: $20,000.

By the end of 1949, the DC-3's had flown more than 7 billion miles in commercial operation. The big lines dropped them only because the DC-6 and DC-7, the Convair, Martin 404, and the Constellation could carry many more passengers.

AN ARMY VETERAN

The DC-3's were handed down to the local-service lines and so was the DC-3 that I got aboard in Portland for the second leg of a long, roundabout way home to Washington, D.C. This particular plane was built in 1942 for the Army, and converted in 1947 for commercial use.

It once was the pride of the ramp at the big international airports, and this morning the 2-minute stops were in such places as Salem, Albany-Corvallis, Roseburg, Klamath Falls, Lakeview, Burns, and Boise. Only the DC-3 could get into some of these short-runway fields; 3,000 feet is plenty.

The airport at Roseburg, Oreg., is almost impossible. The final approach is guarded by three mountains. The trick is to wriggle between the first two peaks, skim over the third, and drop onto the end of the runway. It works nearly every time.

Climbing out of Lewiston, Idaho, is almost as much fun. The airport is rimmed by mountains on all sides, and we flew out at just 100 pounds under the maximum allowable load. Rather than skim over the mountain range between Lewistown and Pullman, Wash., the next stop, Capt. Hal Zemp circled twice to get plenty of altitude.

LOADS DON'T FAZE IT

"This plane," Captain Zemp said fondly, "will fly and climb with any load it can lift off the runway. Once you're off, you know you've got it made." Some of the stories about the heavy loads the DC-3 has lifted off the runways are barely believable.

Including the crew, the DC-3 is limited to 27 passengers. That's just the recommended maximum, and most airlines limit their loads to even fewer. The record load probably was set early in World War II by a Gooneybird piloted by Moon Chin, a Chinese captain.

Captain Chin was ordered to pick up a group of airline workers at Myitkyina, Burma, which was about to fall to the Japanese. He first agreed to take 30, a few more than he thought he should. Other refugees crowded around the plane, begging to climb aboard. The pilot relented, but before he could choose the extra passengers the crowd surged inside. The four-man crew counted 60 passengers; it was an incredible gamble on a soggy grass runway. The plane creaked, groaned, and staggered, but finally wallowed into the air. When it put down in Calcutta, several hours later, the crew found eight stowaways. Total abroad: 72.

These are stories every DC-3 pilot is familiar with, and these pilots rarely tire of telling them. Climbing eastward out of Kalispell, Mont., one morning last week, George Pomeroy applied extra power to get across the Rockies. "This plane wasn't really meant for flying in some of the places and some of the weather it's flown in," he said. "But it always goes wherever you ask it to go."

The DC-3 has particularly proved itself in the mountains of the West. The DC-3's of Frontier Airlines, whose routes stretch from Canada to Mexico across the roughest terrain in the United States, cross the Continental Divide 26 times a day. Turbulence is always a problem, bad weather is frequent, and, for many of the routes, the size of the airport makes the DC-3 a necessity.

A Frontier DC-3, caught in a sudden downdraft over northern Arizona, once crashed into a mountain, ripping 12½ feet off the tip of the left wing. David R. Welling, the pilot, flew it on to Phoenix to a perfect landing. An Air Force DC-3 once landed itself after the crew, unable to quench an engine fire, parachuted to safety. The fire went out and, miles away, the Gooneybird skidded into a plowed field on its belly. The damage: Two bent propellers and a few harmless dents. Once, during World War II, a battered DC-3 was outfitted with an old DC-2 wing, which was 7 feet shorter and wider than it should have been. Lopsided and full of holes, the "DC-2½" limped home without a whimper.

These are, of course, the extraordinary feats that have made the DC-3 story an authentic legend. But the real tribute to the Gooneybird is the record it has compiled as the most faithful, most reliable plane the airlines have ever sent into the sky. It isn't the perfect airplane. Pilots complain about its antiquated de-icing equipment, which consists of rubber "boots" along the edges of the wing which are expanded to break the ice that collects there. The DC-3 doesn't have the radar equipment that enables pilots of the newer planes to fly around unexpected turbulence, but it can be generously forgiving of pilot error.

The crash of a Frontier Air Lines DC-3 last week in a Montana blizzard (the first fatal accident in Frontier's 18-year history) is a grim reminder, however, that sometimes even the best isn't a match for the worst weather. And, because the DC-3 isn't pressurized, mountain flying is occasionally uncomfortable when steep climbs and rapid descents become painful to sensitive eardrums. (Stewardesses on DC-3's offer passengers chewing gum, to aid popping ears, before each takeoff.)

Ear-popping or not, these flights are the link between towns that often don't even have a bus station. And, especially in the vast States of the West, where distances are often measured by air minutes rather than miles, the DC-3 is still unchallenged.

Even passengers are different.

"Most of the passengers on our propjets are businessmen in a hurry." Sallee Pollock, a West Coast Airlines stewardess says. "They're in such a hurry to make a connection, or they're working on their books, they don't have time to talk, but on the 3 they have time to relax and talk."

Occasionally, though, a passenger tries to show his travel sophistication by making rude jokes about the DC-3. "This is the only flight I've ever been on where we have to get a running start and flap the wings to take off," a yard-goods salesman told the stewardess as he got aboard my North Central Airlines flight in Minot, N. Dak. The stewardess didn't smile. I didn't either.

An expensively dressed woman in rings and mink got on my Lake Central Airlines flight in Indianapolis, complaining about having to fly "this old piece of junk" to Cincinnati. It probably didn't occur to her to wonder why the DC-3 was the only plane deemed capable of flying through a thunderstorm to Cincinnati. By this time, I had flown too far through thunderstorms and heavy snowstorms aboard the DC-3's to consider her insult of the old plane as anything but a personal affront. I picked up a magazine and left her to her unsteady nerves.

TALK ABOUT NEW LOVES

Most air travelers know better than to knock the DC-3. It can't compete against the big jets, but why should it be expected to? How many of today's big jetliners will be flying 28 years from now, in 1992?

But, for all its derring-do and defiance of disaster, the old Gooney is steadily giving ground. Even the people at Douglas, who should love her best of all, would really rather talk about their DC-9 short-range jetliner under development. "After all," a Douglas executive said, "we're trying to sell the new one."

And the Federal Aviation Agency is seeking designs now for a plane to replace the DC-3. The local-service airlines, for whom the plane would be built, want a craft to seat from 14 to 30 passengers, propelled by propjet engines, a takeoff capability on a 3,000-foot runway, a cruise speed of more than 200 miles an hour, a cargo capacity of

500 pounds, and the ability to make a profit on the short trips the DC-3 pioneered.

But perhaps it's a mistake to call the new plane a "replacement" for the DC-3. There's really only one replacement for the DC-3, its friends argue: Another DC-3.

Wooing Western Powers by Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a scholarly exposé on the goals of communism prepared by Dr. Lawrence C. Lockley of the University of Santa Clara. Dr. Lockley's remarks are contained in his Economic Letter of March 1964 which follows:

ECONOMIC LETTER

(By Dr. Lawrence C. Lockley)

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
The devil was well, the devil a monk was he."

—RABELAIS.

Gradually, we have seen the wooing of the Western Powers by the Russian Government, and many of us have concluded that, at last, Russia has given up her dream of world conquest, and established a policy of live and let live among nations. Some agreements, long delayed by intransigent negotiations, have been reached. Failure of Russian plans to achieve manufacturing triumphs, and the inadequate harvests of wheat and other crops from the new lands have brought about semifamine conditions within the country. It seems clear to us that the Russian system has demonstrated its inadequacy to achieve economic stability when the world has no more captive or satellite countries to stoke its Moloch-like economy.

We feel, with at least superficial justification, that the failure of communism to support the population of the most advanced Communist country must surely convince the Russian power elite that a return to capitalism is necessary. The necessary reliance of Russia on the surplus production of the Western countries, we feel, may open the way for a new understanding between Russia and us and our allies. In direct negotiations there seems to be a greater warmth.

In our eagerness to be friends with everyone, we forget that the basic policy of communism is world revolution, with the overthrow of the capitalistic classes. We forget that Cuba is not an ugly manifestation of Fidel Castro, but rather, that Fidel Castro is merely the cat's paw for Russia and China. We forget the growing difficulties in southeast Asia, and in Latin America. We forget our growing misunderstanding with France. We forget Cyprus, the running brush fires in Africa, and the student riots throughout the world.

Most particularly, we forget that the cause of the conflict between China and Russia is as to the time and method of attack on the Western Powers, rather than any disagreement as to whether to attack.

Let us look at the record to see what guidance we can obtain.

The voice of Russian communism was, at the beginning, the writings of Karl Marx, particularly the strident propaganda that Marx and Engels issued as a challenge. They set the goal of economic revolution on an international scale. From the Communist Manifesto we learn that the objective of communism is the abolition of private property. "But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians."

In the final peroration of the Communist Manifesto, we learn: "The Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time. Finally, they labor everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries.

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win." As long as this statement described the aims of communism, it was difficult for statesmen, labor leaders, and businessmen to forget that the Russian doctrine was brutally adverse to the social and economic achievements of democracy and of capitalistic society. In the short time between the 1917 revolution and his death by cerebral sclerosis, Lenin made no change in the naked attack shown by Marx. Stalin probably felt that Marx's language was completely congenial to him.

But Khrushchev has inherited the whirlwind that was sowed by his precursers. He has reached a point at which world opinion becomes important to him and to the plans of the Communist Party. Nations formerly satellite to Russia have become less subservient. Agricultural and industrial plans have not been successful, and the Russian standard of living has not risen to the extent it seems necessary. Conflict between Communist China and Russia puts the entire system of satellite countries under stress. Somehow, Khrushchev must find a way of getting foodstuffs and industrial equipment from the same nations he has attacked in propaganda statements for the 6 years he has been head of the Russian Government.

Public statements and speeches rarely constitute a sound basis for learning the doctrinal position of Russia. Fortunately, we have a better source. The Communist Party in Russia has now published a new manual, "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," which is expected to give disciples of communism an authoritative statement of the nature of communism and communistic doctrine. This book is published by the Foreign Language Publishing House in Moscow, and appears to have been written during or immediately after 1960, because no bibliographic reference later than 1960 appears. The book was compiled by a group of scholars, party officials, and publicists. The writing was done by 25 Russian scholars. "Highly useful comments were also received from a number of leading party and Soviet officials." It is a difficult book to obtain in the United States, at least difficult for anyone without Communist Party connections. The basis of this volume of 891 pages is material from Marx and Engels and from Lenin. And it is the official explanation of the Communist Party. This time, we have the curious experience of communism doing the soft sell. The tone of the book is one of sweet reasonableness. The shortcomings of the opponents of communism are pointed out more in sorrow than in anger. But they are pointed out:

From the introductory remarks: "Marxism-Leninism has great merits that distinguish it from all other philosophical systems. It does not recognize the existence of any supernatural forces or creators. It rests squarely on reality, on the real world in which we live. It liberates mankind once and for all, from superstition and age-old spiritual bondage. The Marxist-Leninist world outlook stems from science itself and trusts science, as long as science is not divorced from reality and practice. It teaches that not only the development of nature, but the development of human society too, takes place in accordance with objective laws that are independent of man's will."

From page 26: "Philosophical idealism refuses to recognize the reality of the external material world, repudiating it and proclaiming it unreal and advancing instead an imagined, nonmaterial world. In contrast, materialism gives us a true picture of the world without any superfluous additions in the shape of the spirit, God, the creator of the world, etc. Materialists do not expect aid from supernatural forces. The struggle of the working class and the Communists convincingly refutes the stupid idealist lie that materialists are indifferent to ideals. For this struggle is being waged for the highest and noblest ideal of all, communism, and it produces legions of intrepid fighters supremely devoted to that ideal."

Page 133: "To be serviceable to society, an idea or scientific theory must be true. To establish whether an idea is true or false, it has to be compared with reality. But how is this to be done? This problem was rightly considered a very difficult one and for a long time philosophers could not find the correct approach to it. Marx alone succeeded in solving it. He realized the fallacy of trying to find a criterion of truth in consciousness alone, and he established that man could prove the truth, the power of his thought, solely in carrying out his practical activities. Indeed, man has no other means of establishing the truth of his knowledge except through practice. It is his practical activities—the basis and ultimate goal of cognition—that constitute the supreme yardstick with which to determine whether knowledge that has been gained is true or not. Practice is the criterion of truth."

Page 192 and the following: "The Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and the class struggle provides the key to understanding one of the most complicated phenomena in the life of human society—the state. It scientifically explains its essence, its origin and development, the replacement of certain kinds of state by other kinds, and the inevitability of the withering away of the state in general.

"Reactionary ideologists, frightened by the working people's resistance to exploitation, try to represent the class struggle as an obstacle to progress, a dangerous deviation from the normal course of social development. Nothing could be further from the truth. In reality, far from hindering progress, the class struggle is, on the contrary, the driving force of development of society. The class struggle permeates the whole history of exploiting society. Its creative, progressive significance is felt even under conditions of the 'peaceful' evolutionary development of each formation. The mass allies of the working class usually come to support the slogan of socialist revolution and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat not all at once, but gradually. Historical experience shows that a proletarian revolution may develop from a bourgeois—democratic revolution, from a national-liberation movement of oppressed peoples, from an anti-Fascist, anti-imperialist struggle of liberation. The proletarian revolution makes enormous demand on the parties of the working class. Resolute and skillful direction, carried out by the Marxist parties, of the struggle of the masses is one of the principal conditions on which the victory of the proletarian revolution depends. The

epoch of socialist revolutions is a whole stage in the development of mankind. Sooner or later socialist revolutions will embrace all peoples and all countries. Proletarian revolutions in the various countries take specific forms depending on the concrete historical circumstances, on national peculiarities and traditions. But in all countries socialist revolutions develop in accordance with the general laws discovered by Marxist-Leninist theory."

Page 560 and the following: "Despite all the wishes and calculations of reaction, its attempts to curtail or abolish democracy have called into existence powerful forces of resistance. It is precisely because the encroachments on democracy affect the interests of the most diverse classes and sections of the population that it is possible to establish a wide front of struggle for democracy in the capitalist countries.

"Unification of the democratic forces is an urgent task in all the capitalist countries—the United States, Britain, France, Belgium, the German Federal Republic, Italy, etc. In all these countries the Communists are in the front ranks of the fighters for democracy."

"N. S. Khrushchev stated in his report to the 21st Congress: 'Millions of people usually associated fascism with Hitler and Mussolini. But we must not dismiss the possibility of fascism reviving in forms other than those which have already discredited themselves in the eyes of people. Now that there exists a powerful Socialist camp, now that the working-class movement has much experience in combating reaction, and that the working class is better organized, the peoples have greater opportunities of blocking the advance of fascism. The broadest sections of the people in all democratic genuinely national forces can and must be rallied against fascism.' "

It is possible to amplify these gleanings from this interesting volume. But they would all point to the same interpretation of Communist doctrine which we can make from whatever we have already quoted:

1. Truth is not a matter of veracity, but a matter of conformity to the practice or purpose of the Communist Party.

2. Communism maintains its antireligious bias, and insists that materialist dialectics constitutes the basis of understanding.

3. The class war is still the basis of Communist Party tactics, and communism looks forward to the conquest of all democratic and capitalistic nations by revolution.

4. What Communists mean by democracy is the condition of control by an elite group who are members of the Communist Party; what they mean by imperialism is what we mean by democracy.

No matter how cordial Khrushchev may be as he wants some concession or some favor, he still sponsors a general statement of party ideology which rests on worldwide revolution. What is more, he practices what "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism" preaches. We have had a chance to watch this type of practice in our near neighbor, Cuba. We know that Castro's "revolution" brought about the departure of a large part of the leadership in Cuba—the professional men, the business leaders, and the professors. We know that many of those who remained have been imprisoned or liquidated. The Cuban people are at a point of deprivation; they lack food, clothing, medicines. Yet people from Cuba have infiltrated the working groups throughout Latin America and have apparently caused havoc from the southern border of Mexico south. This type of representation, accompanied by military equipment, is not to be expected from what little reserve of manpower and supplies Cuba herself has been able to salvage from the wrath and caprice of Castro. This is the work of the Russian and Chinese Communist Parties.

(It is strange that Russia and China are in conflict in the news headlines, but in close cooperation in attempting to generalize international revolution.)

As long as Russia needs wheat and industrial goods, Khrushchev will be friendly, at least in appearance. Soon we may expect more friendly utterances from Communist China. But in the end, both Russia and Communist China will gladly contribute toward our downfall, if they can contrive to do so. If it is to our advantage to sell wheat to Russia, by all means, let us sell the wheat. But let us not jump to the conclusion that the cold war is now over. It is no such thing.

It is difficult for anyone who comments on the passing scene to keep quiet about our foreign relations. But any comments should be made with care because much of what we think we know about foreign affairs is filtered through our news agencies—agencies which have not always been discerning and not always completely accurate. Further, it is not always possible to make all aspects of international dealings public as they occur, so that we cannot know enough to make final judgments. Indeed, no judgment on foreign affairs should be made until a long enough train of events has been observed to allow a pattern to emerge, if there be one.

A conscientious observer of our international relations now would be hard put to find a pattern in what we do. It is not clear that we, as a nation, know what our international objectives are. Are we primarily trying to contain or handicap international communism? Are we trying to maintain some kind of balance of power among nations? Are we trying to maintain markets? Are we trying to correct injustice and right wrongs as we find them in the world?

In our relations with Latin America, our Alliance for Progress program has presumed to require the remaking of social organizations as a condition of obtaining aid from the United States. Our thinking here, I believe, was that we could help right social injustice within Latin American countries, and thus make them less susceptible to Communist wooing. Yet, I think we took our stand without knowledge of the differences between these various countries; we lumped them together as interchangeable units, possibly because all but Brazil speak Spanish. We have not enjoyed continuing favorable relations with France. Our southeast Asia commitments seem to have gone very poorly, and Pakistan has recently signed a treaty with Communist China which seems to sound the death knell of our influence in this critically located country.

Libya has just served notice on us that we may no longer maintain military bases on her soil.

These several difficulties must now take second place to three new emergencies. Archbishop Makarios has not been able to control the extremists in his party in Cyprus, and we are about to see Greece and Turkey intervene—an intervention that would almost inevitably bring a wider conflict. Sukarno stands ready to invade the new Malaysia—primarily because his dignity requires that he do so. And Nasser once more is stirring the Arab countries up in the hope of starting a war with Israel.

We have sent emissaries to all these spots. It is not clear to an observer that these messengers have been given any set of common goals. It is not clear that they are all working through the State Department, or under the direction of the Secretary of State. And it is certainly not clear that they are in agreement among themselves concerning suitable solutions to the troubles they were sent to discuss.

The uninformed observer would like to be sure of two things: First, that we do have a foreign policy, even though it is not apparent to him. Second, that we are not being "taken in" by the march of the two great Communist powers. Possibly he might want to know a third point; that we are taking a stand in the arena of international politics only when our own interests are involved, rather than rushing around in a frantic attempt to mind the business of other countries.

When Mr. Kennedy was elected to the Presidency, he had a meeting with Khrushchev. This meeting convinced the Russian leader that our President was not strong enough to hold his own in competition with Communist aggression. It was not until the confrontation over missiles on Cuba that Khrushchev really understood the strength Kennedy had. He has had no such demonstration from Mr. Johnson, whose international image may have been that of a clever politician, rather than of a statesman of considerable strength.

It is surely no accident that a relatively calm international scene should become chaotic when Mr. Johnson had to assume the Presidency on the assassination of Mr. Kennedy. It is logical to expect this period of testing, and it is logical to expect that it will be done surreptitiously. But it is equally logical to expect that small groups of disruptors can develop a degree of demoralization that will take a long time and a great effort to repair. It may become important that our administration find a way of letting us know what our present foreign objectives are, and how we are getting along toward them. I suspect that an increasing number of us are worrying more and more over our international affairs.

From Gracian's "Art of Success"—translation by Lockley:

The man of reality has no community of interest with those who are shallow. Unhappy is that eminence which is not founded on substantiality. Not all who seem to be so are men of substance or integrity: There are those of fraud who, made pregnant by chimeras, give birth to delusions. There are others like them who take more delight in the dubious, even though it promises to be a fraud, just because it is big. They turn away from the certain, which, although it assures an achievement, is nevertheless small in appearance. In the long run, these caprices turn out ill, because they have no foundation in integrity. Only truth can become the foundation of a reputation, and only substantiality can enter a profit. One deceit requires many others, and thus, the entire fabric is chimerical, and since it is built on air, must soon fall to the ground. Confusion never reaches an old age. It promises enough to make him who sees it suspicious—and like that which proves too much, is impossible.

Baker Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 20, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 18, 1964, published an excellent editorial on the investigation which we are now conducting in the Senate Rules Committee. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BAKER CASE CLAMPDOWN

The partisan squabbling in the Senate Rules Committee over the conduct of the Bobby Baker investigation cannot drown out the issue which mainly concerns the public: the necessity to arrive at all the essential facts.

The 5-month inquiry into the meteoric career of the former Senate majority aid who managed to acquire $2 million in business deals has been allowed to degenerate into a political tug of war.

The Democrats, who control the committee, are bent on terminating the investigation as quickly as possible.

The Republican members accuse the Democrats of running out on the probe before it embarrasses the Johnson administration any further.

It is the Democratic position that there is no need for additional testimony in order for the committee to recommend legislation covering possible conflict-of-interest activities by Senate employees.

But it is a fact, nevertheless, that Republican members of the committee have submitted to Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN a list of 12 or more witnesses they want heard, including Walter Jenkins, a White House aid of President Johnson, and that they have been denied a chance to call them.

Senator SCOTT has charged that the committee investigators have been ordered to shun evidence concerning "party girls," political contributions, Caribbean gambling concessions, and favored purchasers of stock in a certain mortgage guaranty company.

Senator JORDAN, the Johnson administration, and Democratic Party leaders generally must recognize that an atmosphere of doubt and suspicion surrounds the Bobby Baker case and that, unless the rumors are put to rest, there will be mounting charges of whitewash.

The Democratic majority of the Rules Committee has twice decided, at the last minute, not to call off the Baker investigation. This was done last week, under rather awkward circumstances, when an affidavit popped up charging that an accountant's signature had been forged on Baker's tax returns. Another showdown on ending the probe was averted Tuesday when the chairman suddenly recessed the meeting.

This on-again, off-again course may signify Democratic realization that they will be handing the Republicans perhaps the hottest issue of the campaign by clamping down the lid on the Bobby Baker exposé. Pressure from several directions may have been exerted to stall off any peeking into delicate areas of Baker wheeling-dealing. But if there is anything relevant to the case to be brought out by further examination of witnesses, such testimony should not only be permitted but insisted upon by the committee, and the hearings kept going until every fact is produced, every doubt dispelled.

Program of First Annual Cultural Conference of the Council of the Alleghenies, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 20, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 11, 1964, the first annual cultural conference of the Council of the Alleghenies, Inc., will be held at Frostburg State College, Frostburg, Md.

This conference will bring together representatives of 26 counties in the Allegheny region. The theme of the conference will be "The Alleghenies, Their Cultural Potential: Steps Toward Its Realization."

I am proud of the efforts which are being made by this conference and I am confident that this exchange of ideas in the Allegheny region will be productive and beneficial to the entire area. I ask unanimous consent that the program of the first annual cultural conference of the Council of the Alleghenies, Inc., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM

Presiding: B. Floyd Flickinger, director of cultural planning and programs, Council of the Alleghenies.

MORNING

(Thomas G. Pullen School)

Registration: 9 o'clock.

General session: 9:45 o'clock.

Greetings: Alta E. Schrock, president, Council of the Alleghenies; Alice R. Manicur, dean of students, Frostburg State College.

Address: "The Culture of the Alleghenies," Lawrence Thurman, curator, Old Economy, Ambridge, Pa.

Discussion group meetings: 11 o'clock (room to be announced).

Leaders: J. Kenna Burke, professor of sociology and history, Potomac State College; Verne E. Chatelain, professor of American history, University of Maryland; Patrick Gainer, professor of English, University of West Virginia; Philip S. Klein, professor of history, Pensylvania State University; Harold Manakee, director, Maryland Historical Society.

AFTERNOON

Luncheon: 12:15 o'clock (Thomas G. Pullen Auditorium).

Presiding: President Alta E. Schrock.

Speaker: William Sebastian Hart, Jr., Musical director, Gettysburg Symphony Orchestra.

Discussion group meetings: 2 o'clock.

Summary panel: 3 o'clock. Discussion leaders; B. Floyd Flickinger, moderator.

Adjournment: 4 o'clock.

(The Council of the Alleghenies is an organization whose purpose is to preserve the cultural heritage and promote the cultural development of the Allegheny highlands, an area comprising parts of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.)

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Reluctant Factfinders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 21, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Washington Post in an editorial this morning performed a valuable service to the public by eloquently pointing out exactly what is at stake in the Rules Committee's investigation of the tangled affairs of Bobby Baker. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELUCTANT FACTFINDERS

The controversy in the Senate over the Bobby Baker investigation has stirred some fundamental issues. Senator HUMPHREY and Chairman JORDAN of the Rules Committee have advanced a theory that the committee should go only far enough to establish a pattern of misconduct and then should proceed with the preparation of remedial rules and legislation. Senators SCOTT and CURTIS are demanding full disclosure of the facts.

Senator JORDAN has emphatically denied that the committee has done any "whitewashing." In his speech to the Senate he candidly said that the committee had found "a pattern of activity that cannot be tolerated in the future." Yet he acknowledged that an effort was made to close the hearings last Friday after the committee had learned of new evidence purporting to show that a tax accountant's name had been signed on some of Mr. Baker's tax returns without the accountant's knowledge. That effort to end the inquiry prematurely failed. Now it is clear that the committee will look into the allegations of accountant Milton L. Hauft. But Chairman JORDAN is still pressing for a windup of the inquiry at the earliest possible moment as if he were afraid that other significant evidence would turn up.

We think the reason given—that no good can come from further exposure of the stink, as Senator HUMPHREY put it—is unsound. Of course it is important for the committee to recommend remedial action. But how can it tell precisely what that action should be until the whole picture of wrongdoing has been brought to light. Since the integrity of the Senate is involved, the country wants to know the whole truth before conclusions are drawn.

There is also at stake, as Senator CURTIS made plain, the question of proper investigative procedure. The committee's rule XIX provides that any member of the committee may request that a witness be called to testify in executive session and that the request shall be honored by the chairman unless he finds that the testimony would be irrelevant. In case of controversy over the relevancy of such testimony it is to be settled by vote of the committee.

Chairman JORDAN admitted that the Republican members of the committee had requested the calling of 16 witnesses and that none of them has been called. He admitted also that he has not passed on the question of whether their testimony would be relevant, as the rule provides. In the case of Walter Jenkins, White House aid, it can scarcely be said that his testimony would be irrelevant as his name has been directly involved in the past hearings and the truth of the allegations regarding him has never been established.

Senator CURTIS had also requested a meeting of the full committee at which the staff would present summaries and submit to questions before the committee addressed itself to the question of closing the investigation. Instead, Mr. JORDAN called a meeting to ratify the chief counsel's decision that the hearings should end. This is not the kind of procedure which builds public confidence in the impartiality and thoroughness of an investigation.

We do not know whether all the proposed 16 witnesses have testimony that should be heard. But at least the chairman ought to rule in each case whether he regards the testimony as relevant, and the committee should then have a chance to support or reject his judgment by voting on each case, as Senator COOPER has suggested. Continued flat rejection of the minority's list of witnesses would lead inevitably to charges of whitewashing and steamroller tactics.

Investigations conducted in a volatile political atmosphere need the appearance as well as the substance of fairness. The choice is not between telling the whole story and concentrating on a remedy. The public will insist on both. Now that a fight on the Senate floor has kept the door open to further hearings, we think the committee should continue on the job until all the relevant facts are in.

Square Pegs for Round Holes—Equal Employment Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 21, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nelson County (Va.) Times entitled "Square Pegs for Round Holes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUARE PEGS FOR ROUND HOLES

Anyone who looks to title VII of the Civil Rights Act—purporting to assure "equal employment opportunity"—for relief of national unemployment is deceiving himself. The act will create no jobs—beyond the appointment of five Commissioners and swarms of Federal inspectors to implement the nationwide game of musical chairs business and industry will play while these minions call the tunes and supervise the substitution of one employee for another—of a different complexion, or religion or national origin.

No more people will be going to work—just different ones.

Under this act, mere integration will not do. If a Federal inspector finds that a business is guilty of racial or religious discrimination, it can no longer employ or promote the workers it desires. Instead, it must employ and advance persons of those races and religions ordered by the inspector, and in the numbers specified.

Such Federal control of hiring and firing (which in most cases will counterbalance), promotion, demotion, and payment of employees, means the end of the seniority systems of labor unions—and ultimately, it would seem, the end of the unions themselves. It also marks the end of an employee's rights within his company.

It should also be noted that the inspector's authority covers all job classifications—common laborers and the most highly skilled secretaries, supervisors, and vice presidents. If the unions with whom the employer has contracts cannot furnish workers of the proper color or creed who have the needed skills, they must be hired outside of the union. If, even so, they are not available, the unskilled must be hired and trained—to replace those who are happy and competent in their jobs, perhaps with high union seniority.

Under such meddling—and the act gives Federal administrators the powers of prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner—our vaunted free enterprise system would no longer be free—and not long a system. Our competitive economy would not long remain competitive as more and more businesses and industries found themselves unable to control either costs or operations. Since the act does not empower the Federals to bring in the payroll money, the jobs, existing at the start of this "reform" would diminish rapidly.

Congress, you might think, would never pass such a law. But the House has, 290 to 130. And the Senate, under extreme pressure, is expected to do so—unless the prospective victims, who are all colors and creeds, rise up in force and demand of both their Senators that they vote down this bitter deception of all who want to work.

Schoolboy's Letter on Cigarette Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 21, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just received a charming letter from a 13-year-old boy in New York. It is a delightful commentary on a timely subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from Mark Stephenson of Grand Island, N.Y.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND ISLAND, N.Y.,
March 8, 1964.

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. NEUBERGER: Back in December around the 10th, we had to choose a subject for our science project and hand it in to our science teacher. I had heard a little about you and saw an article months before in the newspaper about how cigarette smoking was harmful, from Roswell Hospital.

I am 13 years old now but back when I was in sixth grade we had to write essays on smoking and its dangers. I guess way back then is when I really got interested in my project. I got a good mark in mine and decided right then not to ever smoke and to try and stop my father from it.

Well I called a cancer hospital that we have in Buffalo, Roswell Park Memorial Hospital, and asked if I could come in and talk to someone about my project. The chief pharmacist, Robert Case, invited me in and was very nice to me. He said you had written a book that I could try and get and it was easy to understand. His stuff was too technical. Well I got a copy of your book from the biggest stationary store in town, Ulbrich's in Buffalo. It was the only copy that they had and I told them to order more because people would soon be all stirred up.

I chose as my subject, "Carcinogenous Activity of Cigarette Smoke Condensate on Mice." I built my own smoking machine because there was no one anywhere (and I sure called all kinds of companies) who even had the right kind of pump that I needed. I used a bicycle pump and reversed the valve inside so that it sucks instead of blowing air out, as into a tire. With a glass Y tube fastened into a little jar I have been able to collect small amounts of tar. I buy cigarettes by the carton when I have enough money and I can put three cigarettes at a time in the glass tube. It gets a little smelly but it sure works. I wrote to all the tobacco companies for stale or misshappen cigarettes and two wrote back very polite letters but didn't have any for me. The others did not answer. The ones who answered were American and Reynolds.

Every night I paint my white mice with this sticky tar. I first put it on them January 7 and in 5 weeks they had tumors. Then I stopped it to see if the tumors would go away, like if a smoker stopped, and they did. Then I resumed the painting again. I hope to keep the mice alive until the Science Fair which is the first week in April. They sure have gotten irritable though.

With all the publicity since the Surgeon General's report came out, it kinda "stole my thunder" but it has been an interesting project. I am also drying leaves and mixing it in solutions of licorice and sugar and things to make tarless cigarettes that still have lots of flavor. I have a hand rolling machine but I don't intend to try the cigarettes out myself. This was not an original idea about the leaves, Roswell Hospital research people started it.

Up here where I live we don't have tobacco and so that is why I am writing to you. Could you suggest a place where I could get one dry tobacco leaf. I am also writing to the tobacco institute to see if they will send me a pack of seeds that I can grow a small set of seedlings in the windowsill before the fair (you mentioned that in your book). I have never seen a leaf of tobacco and would like to see what causes all the trouble as well as maybe exhibit it. I can pay some money to get the leaf if you know where I can send.

I hope that you are not too busy. I think your book was a good idea and has done a lot for many people.

Sincerely,

MARK STEPHENSON.

P.S.: I just looked around and I see that I don't have the address for the Tobacco Institute. Could you send it to me please? Thank you.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Twenty Years at Texas Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, Texas Research Foundation at Renner, a research and educational institution dedicated primarily to finding solutions to agricultural problems, is observing its 20th anniversary this month.

The story inherent in the establishment of this famous scientific institution on 57 acres in the north Texas blacklands on March 1, 1944, and in its growth and achievements during the ensuing 20 years is a heartening chronicle of the efficiency of private enterprise in solving pernicious economic and social problems.

Texas Research Foundation was established specifically to work out solutions for a number of ominous farm problems, chief of which was a decline in soil fertility that threatened eventual bankruptcy to the agriculture on millions o blackland acres in the central part of Texas.

By 1900, this decline in regional soil fertility had depressed cotton yields from three-quarters or a bale to a fourth or a third of a bale an acre. Corn dropped from 40 or 50 to fewer than 20 bushels an acre. Wheat yields slumped from 20 or 25 to 8 or 10 bushels an acre. In some areas of the central blacklands wheat had been discontinued as a grain crop.

Oats dropped from 75 or 100 bushels to only 40 bushels an acre. Pastures deteriorated. The grazing ratio dwindled from one head to the acre until four or more acres were required to support one animal.

Persistence of this decline in the blacklands after 1900 caused serious concern. All elements of business, industry, and commerce were alarmed over the decrease in revenues from farm and ranch commodities.

Dr. C. L. Lundell, who has been director of the institution since its founding, had envisioned the type of research organization needed to stem the tide of agricultural decay. In 1943, while he was on leave from the University of Michigan for wartime service with the Foreign Economic Administration, he met with Dr. Umphrey Lee, president of Southern Methodist University at Dallas, to hold a series of conferences for studying the most practical means for meeting the problem.

As a result of these conferences, Dr. Lundell joined the university's staff and presented his plan before the university's executive committee. Mr. Karl Hoblitzelle, Dallas philanthropist and theater chain executive who was a committee member, wholeheartedly endorsed Dr. Lundell's proposal and pledged support for it.

The executive committee then authorized the establishment of an institute of technology and plant industry and approved a budget of $43,941.80 for immediate purchase of land and improvements. The committee also approved an annual operating budget of $15,000 for the project.

On February 8, 1944, the board of trustees of Southern Methodist University established a division of the university to be known as the Institute of Technology and Plant Industry. The original 57-acre site at Renner had been acquired, and Dr. Lundell and three part-time employees began operations on March 1 of that year.

During the first 30 months, Southern Methodist University backed the program at Renner, putting more than $200,000 into the project. The first private support was received in these months—a $5,000 gift from Mr. G. B. Dealey, of Dallas, and one of $1,000 from Mr. John Alford, of Henderson. It became evident, however, that more financial support than Southern Methodist University could supply was needed to put the institute on a firm basis and to carry out the research essential to the success of the project.

Mr. Karl Hoblitzelle then volunteered $250,000 for expansion of the research facilities at Renner, if other business and industry in the area would underwrite the operating expenses. The offer solved the immediate problem; and Southern Methodist University on June 24, 1946, authorized the transfer of the institute's facilities and land at Renner to a new corporation known as Texas Research Foundation.

The new corporation was activated on July 1, 1946; and since that date it has functioned as an independent, nonprofit research and educational institution operated wholly by funds contributed by businessmen, farmers, and ranchmen.

The 20th anniversary points up the success of the foundation's work and the growth of its facilities into a modern scientific research center that is a powerful force throughout the Southwest in promoting farm and pasture systems based on soil and water conservation, and in demonstrating proper land, crop, and livestock management.

The foundation's annual operating budget has grown from the original $15,000 in 1944 to $452,000 in 1964, and its personnel from 4 to 40 persons, of whom 10 are Ph. D.'s. Facilities for industrial and basic scientific research and for graduate training now implement its facilities for agricultural research. The Renner headquarters in Collin and Dallas Counties presently includes more than 800 acres, of which 309 are in a demonstration farm.

During the last 20 years, foundation research has discredited a number of traditional farming practices as being armful to the land. Clean cultivation and continual row cropping, together with widespread burning of small grains stubble and pastures, accelerate the decline in soil fertility by robbing the land of its plant nutrients, humus, and organic matter.

On the other side of the ledger, positive achievements of foundation scientists in reversing the downward trend of soil fertility have contributed in many ways to the development and betterment of the agricultural economy of the region.

First, Renner research demonstrated that commercial fertilizers, contrary to popular belief, do increase crop yields in the blacklands, and that the use of such fertilizers are necessary for a sound agriculture.

In 1945—the first year commercial fertilizers were used at Renner—cotton doubled in yield, and oats made more than 100 bushels an acre. Based on these initial successes, long-term investigations were set up at Renner to determine the economics of commercial fertilizer usage. From these investigations have come specific recommendations for the use of each kind of commercial fertilizer, its correct amount and proper time of application.

Second, Renner research proved that wheat rather than perennial grass sod or legumes is the most valuable crop blackland farmers have for improving soil fertility, controlling erosion and increasing income.

Foundation scientists have proved a number of highly significant facts about wheat. This annual is a much more economical user of moisture than perennial grasses. The root system of wheat is more effective than that of perennials in conserving soil and water and in preventing soil erosion. The straw left on the land by a 30-bushel wheat crop is as valuable as the income from the grain itself.

The scientists also proved that the residues of other small grains are comparable in value to the residue of wheat. Small grains, moreover, can be grazed for winter pasture and still be managed to provide a profitable grain crop.

Third, another solution to the problem of declining soil fertility and waning crop yields lies in the proof that other fibrous rooted crops such as grain sorghum, when properly managed, are as effective as wheat in adding organic matter to the soil, preventing erosion and conserving moisture.

Under old farming systems, after the harvest of such crops as grain sorghum,

the farmer left the plants in the field to grow and draw upon the available moisture supply.

Under the technique perfected by the foundation, the plant is uprooted immediately after harvest, shredded, and the shreds then worked into the top 2 inches of soil to form a protective mulch over the surface of the land.

Using the discoveries about fertilizers, wheat and residue treatments as a base, foundation scientists have developed the Renner farming system as a counterforce against the creeping decline of blackland soil fertility.

The Renner farming system is a 3-year rotation of two fibrous rooted cash crops, such as wheat and grain sorghum, with a tap rooted crop, such as cotton, in a scientific program that utilizes commercial fertilizers and crop residue management.

Coupled with this system is the foundation's Renner pasture system, a scientific program for the use and improvement of grazing land through the production of warm season forage of high protein content and through maximum use of small grains for winter pasture.

The foundation has incorporated these two systems into its demonstration farm at Renner, a farm which has operated at a profit every year since its establishment in 1953.

Demonstration yields now compare favorably with those prevalent in the blacklands before 1900. Cotton makes from three-fourths to a bale an acre, wheat 30 to 40 bushels an acre, oats 75 to 100 bushels an acre, and grain sorghum 3,500 to 4,000 pounds an acre. Dr. Lundell believes that the annual farm income of the region would more than double if the per-acre income of the demonstration farm could be projected to all blackland farms and pastures.

The foundation's crop improvement program—notably the pioneering of corn hybrid development in north Texas and the breeding of adapted sesame and soybean varieties—has been of economic importance. From the forage program at Renner have come button clover, Ermelo lovegrass, Columbus grass, and the demonstration of the adaptability of coastal bermuda as a superior gras for hay and grazing in Texas.

Texas Research Foundation has succeeded without question in discovering ways and means to stop the downward trend of blackland agriculture. The No. 1 problem now confronting the foundation, according to Dr. Lundell, is getting those ways and means applied to most of the acres in the Texas blacklands.

Less Than 13 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the mayor of Germantown, Tenn., the Honorable Bruce Law, has recently delivered a very outstanding and eloquent address entitled "Less Than 13 Years." The address was delivered by Mayor Law before the West Tennessee Mayor's Association on February 12, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent address be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESS THAN 13 YEARS

(By Bruce Law, mayor of Germantown, Tenn.)

For quite some time I have been concerned about the future of our country. Both from a domestic and foreign standpoint. Each day, it seems that individual freedom and the free enterprise system is being chipped away by the Federal Government, while at the same time, communism continues to advance unchecked. This raises a serious question, How long can America stand under these ever-growing conditions.

For example; the defeat of the United States by the Russians in the Olympic games at Innsbruck, Austria. Where we continue to lose to the Communists simply because they operate under a different set of rules and values than we do, which was very hard for our news commentators to explain to the literally millions of foreign people who were either present at the games or watched them on the television—that America did not bring their best athletes because they are professionals, whereas the Russians did bring their best and classified them as amateurs although in reality, they are subsidized by the Government. Frankly, I am tired of playing the game according to the Russian rules. We should approach all dealings with the Communists with our best foot forward and with the idea in mind to win each and every dealing we have with them.

We need desperately to stem the tide. I hope that our local government officials will stand up and speak out for what we believe in; the man who stands for nothing, can fall for anything. And that is why I am here today, to help arouse your interest.

I don't know whether or not you have stopped to think, but our 200th anniversary as a nation is less than 13 years away. A lot can happen in 13 years: In 13 years a fortune can be made and lost and made again. It is possible for a child to go from elementary school through a college or a university. From 1946 to 1959 the Communist conspiracy enslaved over a billion people. And it is even possible that our Nation will not exist another 13 years. What is so significant about 13 years? Just this:

History shows that no democracy has ever lasted or existed over 200 years. The Greek city states and the great Roman Republic all lasted less than 200 years. This means that unless we are an exception to history, we have possibly less than 13 years left.

In 1788 Edward Gibbon completed his monumental work entitled "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

In this book he listed five reasons for the fall of this great Empire:

1. The rapid increase of divorce. The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home.

2. High taxes and the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the people.

3. The mad craze for pleasure.

4. The building of gigantic armaments when the real enemy came from within.

5. The decline of religion.

In 1776 our forefathers declared the American independence. What will we find in 1976 on our 200th birthday? Will the red stars of oppression of communism wave over our heads, or will the white stars of American opportunity? There are those who want to bury us for we have stood in the way of the enslavement of the human race.

America is truly the last bastion of freedom. Since we are the vanguard of the free world, we must strengthen what I have labeled "the three pillars of America's greatness":

1. Faith in God.
2. Constitutional government.
3. Free enterprise.

For quite some time, there has been a movement afoot in America to reduce the influence of a belief in God in the American system. These movements of course are Communist inspired and have received impetus by the Supreme Court in recent decisions. I know for a fact that many decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the past several years have aided the Communist cause in America. All you have to do to see this is to read these decisions or I invite you to read the Senate Judiciary report on the Communist leanings of the U.S. Supreme Court compiled by the chairman of this committee, headed by JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi. This report is not easy to find, but can be made available by writing any member of the committee. If we are to stem the tide, I think it is time for local officials to be in the forefront to stand up and be counted. In June of 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court said that this prayer was unconstitutional to be repeated in the school systems of New York:

"Almighty God; we acknowledge our dependence upon thee, and beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

This Court has also directed that Bible readings in schools is unconstitutional. Something is wrong in America if these types of decisions are allowed to stand. To follow the logical course of action based upon these decisions, the Supreme Court could logically scrap the Declaration of Independence, the fourth stanza of "America," and the motto on our coins which reads, "In God We Trust."

A suit has already been filed and is on its way to the U.S. Supreme Court asking that the words "one nation under God" be stricken from the "Pledge of Allegiance" to our flag. I believe that the U.S. Supreme Court has either forgotten or is overlooking their basic principles of law; namely:

1. That no court can read anything into any written document that is not set out in that document.

2. No court has the power to legislate, but can only interpret the law. Only the U.S. Congress has the power to pass Federal legislation.

3. In interpreting matters before the Court, the Court is obligated to look into the legislative intent, that is to say; in interpreting legislation, said legislation must be interpreted in the light of the body passing said laws and not in what the Court may think another Congress meant when it passed said laws, and lastly I feel that the Supreme Court in many cases has adopted the principle that the end justifies the means. Which has never been accepted as the American tradition.

In 1957 Khrushchev stated, "We Communists of the Soviet Union are atheists. I think there is no God and I have freed myself a long time ago from such a concept." In contrast to a statement made by Mr. Khrushchev and by many of the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court I would like for you to note what some great statesmen in America have said.

John Adams: "The first and almost only book deserving of universal distinction is the Bible."

Theodore Roosevelt: "Almost every man who has by his life's work added to the sum of human achievements has based his life's work largely on the teachings of the Bible."

Daniel Webster: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible our country will grow and prosper. But if we in our prosperity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how suddenly a catastrophe may overwhelm us and force us into obscurity."

All the great statesmen in American history believed that a faith in God is not to be discarded in favor of an all powerful central government.

So in conclusion of my remarks about faith in God, I should like to simply say that if our children are taught to respect the teachings of the Bible, I think the security of the future of this country is good. However, should the time come when religion plays no discernable part in the school systems of our Nation or in the Government then I say that we shall fall from within.

In many instances the political life of America has sagged below the level of the best, which should be required from our political leaders. This has become a very dangerous situation. Many of our great cities have fallen into the hands of selfish political machines who work for their own interests rather than the public good.

This must be changed if American democracy is to survive.

The time has come to cease to vote blindly for either one of the two major political parties and to evaluate each officeseeker individually, to determine if he stands for Christian principles above party loyalty.

As someone stated recently in an editorial in the paper, "America has a cause to be served, but it has become a public picnic with free coffee and sandwiches and let someone else pay the check."

To our Government and to our neighbor, let us reaffirm what we know to be true; that there is no "pie in the sky," or something for nothing; that he who wants a house must build it. That he who wants food must work for it. To those who say that work blisters their hands, we must answer that it does no less to ours. That each must pull his own weight in the boat or else give up his seat. Let us examine for a few brief moments, constitutional government.

This phrase has very complex meanings to the number of people in this Nation. However, when you stop and analyze it, it is relatively simple in nature. Up until a few short years ago, we had been protected from the evils of socialism and communism in this country by uniform decisions of the Supreme Court. These decisions constantly followed the political and economic philosophy of our constitutional writers, and forbade the Government from unduly regulating our lives. But this judicial protection for 150 years was ended by the appointment of new Justices to the Supreme Court. Right or wrong, these men have not confined themselves to interpreting the Constitution in the light of its history and language, but it imported into the Constitution social concepts which are alien to our philosophy and Government. With this change in constitutional philosophy Congress has become the last bastion for the defense of freedom against Government encroachment.

It is clear in my mind that our Constitution above all else, is a document for limiting the functions of Government. And it is supposed to be just as binding today as it was when it was first written. Our Founding Fathers had good reason for endorsing the principles of limited government.

All you have to do is turn back the pages of history to prove that the chief instrument for destruction of man's liberty was government in the hands of a few men who controlled the lives of many.

The legitimate functions of government are actually condusive to freedom. The maintenance of internal order, the national defense, administration of justice and the removal of obstacles to free interchange of goods. The exercise of these powers makes it possible for man to follow his chosen pursuits with maximum freedom.

The framers of the Constitution had learned a great lesson. They were not only students of history, but they were victims of it and they knew from personal experience that freedom depends on the effective restraint against the accumulation of power in the hands of a single authority. And that is just what the Constitution is. A system of restraints against the natural tendency of Government to expand in the direction of absolute control.

When the Continental Congress met at Philadelphia in 1787, 7 years of war, sacrifice and valor had made the colonies free of the high taxation and servitude demanded by the mother country, England. As these men sat, 1,300 years of English history looked on them.

They knew from history that throughout ages that power had served to corrupt good. They knew that one of the chief weaknesses of government was too much power vested in the executive. They knew that the most effective restraint free people could wield over the execessive and oppressive government was control of public purse strings.

But they also knew that government was necessary. Therefore they assigned themselves the task of putting together an instrument of government which would provide the maximum of individual freedom, and at the same time, secure orderly, social and commercial intercourse and protection of the people. Let's examine the main components of the Constitution's system as it was drafted.

First, is the limiting of the Federal Government's authority to specifically delegated powers.

Second, is the reservation to the States and to the people, powers not delegated to the Federal Government.

Third, is a careful division of the Federal Government's powers among the three separate branches; namely, the legislative, judicial, and executive.

Fourth, is the prohibition against impetus alteration of the system itself.

We have, in many instances, almost practically destroyed our Constitution in my opinion. The Federal Government has moved into every field that it has wished to. The State governments are excluded from their rightful function by Federal preemptives while inside the Federal Government, both the executive and the judicial branches have roamed far outside their constitutional boundaries.

The power of the Federal Government today in domestic affairs is almost unbelievable. There are a number of ways in which we can measure the powers of the Government. One is the size of it's financial operation. Federal spending is now approximately $100 billion per year as compared to $3½ billion 30 years ago. Another is the size of its activity. Today the Federal Government is the biggest landowner, taxer, employer, renter, mortgage broker, mover, and spender in all history.

Still another is the portion of the people's earnings that the Government appropriates for its own use. Today, nearly one-third of all earnings are taken each year in the form of taxes.

A fourth is the extent of Government interference with the daily lives of individuals. The farmer is a classic example of this since he is told what to grow, how much to grow and how much he will receive for his crop. The wage earner is at the mercy, in many instances, of powerful labor unions, who get their protection from the Federal Government which has refused, up to this time, to place any kind of antimonopoly legislation on the books in the field of labor. Then too, the businessman is hampered by a maze of Government regulations and in many instances, direct Government competition. You may ask the question, How did all this happen?

In part, we have been swindled. We have elevated men in political parties to power who have broken their promises. We have continued to put men in public office who propose new welfare programs and exchange freedom for security.

I am convinced today that most Americans now want to reverse this trend. I think the concern for our vanishing freedoms for the first time is really becoming genuine. Now, let us examine, for a few brief moments, the third pillar of America's greatness, free enterprise.

If I were to ask the question, "What is the primary source of America's strength?" I would probably receive such answers as the hydrogen bomb, the abundance of natural resources, the superior intelligence of our people, and the absence of powerful neighbors. All of these factors have aided us, but many other nations have had these same advantages to a greater or lesser degree. The real answer to this question is the free enterprise system under which we operate.

Although we are a relatively new Nation in the history of the world, we have produced the highest degree of culture in the world; we have more high schools, more colleges, more universities, and more distribution of the printed and spoken word than all the rest of the world combined.

America has the highest standard of living of any nation in the world. We are better fed, better clothed, and better housed than any people on earth. And our health as a Nation is unparalleled and is constantly improving; we also hold a position of moral and spiritual leadership. We have more hospitals, more charitable institutions and more churches per capita than any other nation on earth.

From a standpoint of material possessions, we have more luxuries, more comforts, and more conveniences than all the rest of the world combined. However, we are living in a changing world. We are faced with the greatest competitive battle in history. A battle between freedom and slavery. We must learn that there are no elevators in the house of success. Let us learn that a welfare state leads to complacency, and complacency leads to dependency, and dependency leads to bondage. So if we sow the seed of government as being the chief unit of society rather than the individual, then we will ultimately reap the fruit of slavery. We can endure if we hold to the fundamentals of spiritual and moral strength and adhere to the free enterprise system.

Since this is Abraham Lincoln's birthday, I should like to close with some phrases that he once penned. They represent a philosophy which can never be dismissed as being stale phrases or guides for the forgotten past. These are simple truths which govern all individuals and all civilizations, now and in the future.

1. "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift."

2. "You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong."

3. "You cannot help men by tearing down big men."

4. "You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich."

5. "You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer."

6. "You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income."

7. "You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred."

8. "You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money."

9. "You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative."

10. "You cannot really help men by having government tax them to do for them what they can and should do for themselves."

I hope that we may all remember these immortal phrases and that by recalling them we ourselves shall remain freemen.

Defects in the Federal Reserve's Policies and Organization Pointed Out by Economic Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been holding hearings on the Federal Reserve System. We have heard from a number of outstanding economists in the past several weeks. Excerpts from the statements of several of these witnesses have been published in recent issues of the RECORD. Today I would like to put into the RECORD excerpts from the statement of Dr. Clark Warburton, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Prof. Dudley Johnson, of the University of Washington; and Prof. Robert Strotz, of Northwestern University.

The excerpts follow:

DR. CLARK WARBURTON

1. I am here as an economist who has been interested for 45 years in monetary theory and the relation of banking developments to business fluctuations. I am not representing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, where I have been employed since 1934 with responsibilities that include research on the relation of banking to business fluctuations.

* * * * *

I would like now to summarize my thinking on six problems related to the bills under consideration by this committee.

2. The most needed change in the Federal Reserve Act is insertion of a suitable directive for policymaking.

As a directive for Federal Reserve policy making, I would suggest: (1) A basic guide emphasizing stability of the value of the dollar and provision of a rate of growth in money supply that will best foster continuous maximum employment and production without producing instability in the value of money; (2) location of responsibility for technical studies needed for this purpose. * * * (3) a directive for open-market operations and other actions affecting the reserve balances of member banks to provide such quantity of reserves as will best foster these objectives * * * and (4) an interim guide, pending completion of the initial technical studies, of a growth rate in member bank reserves deemed adequate to maintain an annual growth rate of 3 percent in money supply, under a prescribed definition of money, with authority for the variations deemed necessary.

Adoption of this kind of a guide and directive for Federal Reserve policy formation would make possible a relaxation of our concern for loss of gold. Their adoption would signify to residents of other countries the determination of our Government to avoid policies leading either to inflation or to deflation, and thus would reduce the incentive for foreign holders of dollars to convert them into gold.

3. Retirement of the capital stock of Federal Reserve banks is desirable.

* * * * *

4. Under present circumstances, less than one-half of the commercial banks in the Nation are members of the Federal Reserve System. However, as I stated in a study for the Commission on Money and Credit * * * "central bank relations with approximately one-half of the commercial banks should not be markedly different from such relations with the others. The basic central bank privileges—exchange of assets for currency, and borrowing in case of needs—should be available without discrimination to all banks with deposit obligations serving as circulating medium; and it is reasonable and equitable that the necessary cost of quantitative control should be distributed among all banks." * * * The simplest method of accomplishing this is to extend to all banks having deposits * * * the reserve requirements and borrowing privileges of Federal Reserve member banks.

5. The present division of basic decision-making powers between the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee is a relic from historical developments, and I favor the proposal to transfer the powers of the Committee to the Board.

With improved congressional guidelines for the making of Federal Reserve policy, there would, it seems to me, be no need for increasing the number of members of the Board, and the number might be reduced. The 14-year terms of office are much longer than those of members of other regulatory commissions, which range from 5 to 7 years, and a similar length of term would appear to be appropriate.

6. Proper administration of monetary policy is so vital to national welfare and the success of other governmental policies that it should be a responsibility of a topranking official and appropriately coordinated with the executive branch of the Government. Serious consideration should be given to the proposal sometimes made that the exercise of monetary power be lodged in one of the executive departments and therefore become the responsibility of a member of the President's Cabinet. But such a shift should not be made without adoption of a suitable congressional directive for monetary policy.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON

1. I feel that our monetary policy recently has been dominated by two considerations: One, the outflow of gold, and, two, an inflationary neurosis.

I have knowingly used the term "neurosis" because in my view the so-called inflationary behavior of prices might be more apparent than real. There is an upward bias in the price index which makes it appear that there has been inflation, so my view is that there has been too much concern recently with the presumed inflationary problem and this, together with the gold outflow, in my personal opinion, has made monetary policy very ineffective in handling our monetary problems.

* * * * *

Consequently, I feel if you look at the current monetary policy from 1961 to 1963, as I view the record, you will find that the money stock has not increased sufficiently, given the present levels of unemployment. If you look at the behavior of the money supply from 1961 to 1963, the average per annum increase has been approximately 2.9 percent. In my opinion, given the level of unemployment, this is not sufficient.

* * * * *

2. Now, in my opinion the argument for an independent monetary authority is inconsistent with the principles underlying our democracy.

To argue that control over the monetary supply should be independent of the values of certain representatives of the citizenry strikes me as ludicrous, as if Congress had created a Department of the War and Peace, and the President of the United States were to appoint a Board composed of 7 members for terms of 14 years, with terms arranged so as to have one expire every other year, this board would have exclusive jurisdiction to decide whether or not the United States would or would not go to war and its decision would be binding, irrespective of the wishes of the administration. Now, as an established monetary management, there is no reason to feel that it is so omniscient that the views of the administration should be precluded from any decision. What I am saying therefore is the political independence of the board often creates the example of separation of powers, and leads to confusion, a state of confusion.

PROFESSOR STROTZ

1. In my opinion, democratic values place a burden of proof upon those who advocate an independent central bank. By an independent central bank we mean, of course, one whose authority is substantially independent of the executive wing of the Federal Government.

* * * * *

2. The policy instruments that are available to the central bank effect all these same goals: The level of prices, our foreign exchange position, the level of employment and the rate of economic growth, but the Federal Reserve System has only one set of available policy instruments at its control and a set of diverse and often conflicting targets to try to influence. Unhappily perhaps the Board of Governors does not have complete authority and many doubt whether the control that it does have is adequate to influence these targets. There is the Federal fiscal policy, the debt policy, the wage and price policy, all are involved. Thus from every limb of the puppet go many strings held by different authorities or hands, all of whom may have different intentions as to how the puppet is actually to perform, and often in the midst of a wind storm. In such a situation, who can dispute the need for coordination of the many different puppeters? The notion of an independent monetary authority set up to achieve a particular goal, such as price level stability, is, in any practical context, very unrealistic, and highly impractical.

I do not think that the matter is simply a problem of getting the Board of Governors and the open market committee to perform well. We still have a problem of deciding what is well, and we should also note that agreement as to what is appropriate monetary policy is something that can change over time with shifts in public, congressional, and Presidential opinion, from one election to the next. It can also change as a result of changes in underlying economic conditions which may be unforeseen and uncontrolled.

3. I am disturbed at some recent pronouncement coming from the Board of Governors that indicate their concern at present about the possible inflationary effects of the recent tax cut, or the effect on our foreign trade position so that it looks as if they may wish to move in a direction that in effect would nullify the intended expansionary effects on employment that motivated the Congress to cut taxes in the first place. Should they do this, and it is within their power to do this, they would be in many ways directly contravening the intent of the legislative authority.

The University of Illinois Symphony Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a translation of a review by Israel Peña in a Caracas, Venezuela, newspaper concerning the recent appearance in Caracas of the University of Illinois Symphany Orchestra.

We, in Illinois, are very proud of the University of Illinois Symphony Orchestra, and this review will help to explain why.

I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA—EL NACIONAL, CARACAS, VENEZUELA, MARCH 6, 1964

For the first time in our history, we have in our midst a student symphony orchestra on a mission of artistic rapprochement, sowing, by its example of achievement, the seeds of culture in these southern lands. In truth, a magnificent example, not only for our students of music but also for our institutions and men of wealth who could bring about through their permanent and effective interest a similar organization in this country. The University of Illinois Symphony Orchestra, on the basis of such assistance has, in a comparatively short time, attained its present stature. Without such aid this could hardly have been realized.

In the two concerts which this young group has thus far performed, the first in the Grand Hall of Central University and the second in the outdoor amphitheater in Bello Monte, we have admired without reservation not only the works presented but the whole of the organization. Only a profound love of music and an enduring and iron discipline could bring about such extraordinary results in the few years of existence of the University of Illinois Symphony Orchestra. Polish, precision, clearness of tone, magnificent unison in the blending of the notes of the various instruments, accomplished with no forced effort, rendition from the almost inaudible pianissimo to fierce, strident cacaphony; all these and many other qualities of a great orchestra we felt present and alive as something organic, yet artistic, in the University of Illinois Symphony Orchestra under the baton of its conductor, Bernard M. Goodman, every inch a master, every inch a musician—in one word, a complete artist in the execution of his forte. And in reality, not only to him but to members of the group must go plaudits for their playing of some of the most difficult and complicated of instruments; to the oboeist, Benjamin Woodruff, to the tubaist, David Keuhn. And as for Robert Ward who played to piano solo in the "Concerto for Piano and Orchestra" by Samuel Barber, his execution demonstrated sensibility and a dynamic assurance as the principal in the performance.

We salute the youth of this great group of students who make up the University of Illinois Symphony Orchestra—we salute the marvelous youth of this great group of instrumentalists in their artistic peregrinations through these nations of the other America.

ISRAEL PEÑA.

Greek Independence Day—A Salute to Americans of Hellenic Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 143d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It was on this day in 1821 that Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Aghia Lavra and the courageous people of Greece began their struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The war raged for 7 bitter years before the heroic and greatly outnumbered Greeks won their freedom, thus ending 400 years of subjugation under Ottoman masters.

American sympathy for the Greek cause came from the eloquent words of President Monroe and Daniel Webster. The hearts of all freedom loving men were stirred by the inspired pen of the great English poet, Lord Byron, who gave his life in this struggle for freedom.

The rebirth of a free and independent Greece 143 years ago should remind us not only of the great and eternal contributions of Greece to the world and to America but also to her fierce and unwavering devotion to freedom, democracy, and the dignity of man.

The long friendship and close association of the peoples of Greece and the United States flow from their dedication to the ideas of freedom, liberty, and national independence. These bonds were further strengthened when our sons fought side by side in two world wars and in Korea to preserve these ideals.

Prostrate and bleeding from these holocausts—the flower of her manhood strewn lifeless over the world's battlefields—Greece once again displayed the courage of Thermopylae by becoming the symbol of successful resistance to Communist aggression in the eastern Mediterranean.

There are more than 1½ million Americans of Hellenic origin. As loyal and industrious citizens they have contributed notably to the development of the United States. They have distinguished themselves in all fields of endeavor, including government, medicine, law, education, architecture, business, engineering, and the arts. Through them the bonds uniting the peoples of Greece and the United States have become closer and stronger.

On this anniversary, all the people of the United States join in paying tribute to the gallant people of Greece as faithful allies and steadfast partners in our mutual stand against the forces and ideologies inimical to our concepts of freedom and democracy.

Bailing Out the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for a recent issue of Newsweek, Raymond Moley, whose wise writings have distinguished him as one of America's most thoughtful and penetrating observers, wrote a column commenting on the strange new twist which this administration is trying to sell the Congress on the subject of accelerating trade with the Communists while at the same time continuing to grant American aid in terms of billions of dollars to protect the freedoms of countries which the Communists are endeavoring to enslave. It is fittingly entitled, "Bailing Out the Soviet."

It should seem obvious, Mr. President, that even our rich and prosperous United States of America does not have money enough to help both sides of the cold war at the same time. To play the fruitless role of "Uncle Sucker" all over again in that fashion can help none other but the Communists whose aggression we are dedicated to curtail.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that the Moley article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAILING OUT THE SOVIET

(By Raymond Moley)

Nothing better illustrates the lovable but at the same time lamentable nature of the liberal mind than the eager acceptance by the administration of the opportunity to sell some of our wheat surplus to the Soviet Union. Projected as it was with an array of assumed advantages, it had some appeal. But it was the projection of a hope, not a plan.

What this glorious adventure comes down to is not peaceful collaboration. It is an action by the greatest of capitalist nations rescuing the greatest of Communist countries from its own folly. Over the world we shall not be hailed as a savior. We shall still be known by Bernard Baruch's phrase, "Uncle Sap."

When President Kennedy proposed the wheat sale at a press conference on October 9, he claimed that:

It would ease United States-Soviet tensions; it would "advertise to the world as nothing else could the success of free American agriculture"; by inference, it would "advertise" the failure of communism to feed itself; it would dispose of a lot of our surplus wheat; it would reduce our gold shortage and help the balance-of-payments problem; it would be beneficial to the businesses involved in the transaction; it would help the American taxpayer; and it would provide employment for American seamen, for the wheat would be carried in available American ships. This, indeed, was a pretty package.

ABANDONED CONDITION'S

The President gave Congress certain assurances: "These sales would be concluded by private American grain dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial credit terms."

But the banks refused to provide financing for the transactions. Then Government credit was permitted, after the pre-Christmas arm twisting by President Johnson.

Meanwhile, there was a complicated ploy in the Commerce Department. First, it was said, all the grain would be carried in our vessels. The Russians protested. Then 50 percent. Still there was trouble. And there were growls from our maritime unions. Then came the word "available." "Guideline" rates were set up which made most American vessels unavailable. These rates made the Russian cargoes undesirable business for most of the dry-cargo tramp fleet—the Liberty ships busy with foreign-aid cargoes. Tankers that sometimes enter the grain trade tend to return to profitable oil-carrying when it's cold. And most vessels in liner service are held to schedules far from Russia. This big "commercial transaction" could never be a bonanza for a nonexistent fleet of hungry ships.

Nevertheless, the Russians grumbled about some U.S. vessels having a hand in the business. Khrushchev, echoing our maritime competitors, fumed about "flag discrimination." And the Nation's press whipped American shipping for holding up the happy consummation of the deal.

BARGAIN FOR KHRUSHCHEV

Certainly Khrushchev couldn't hope to overthrow our cargo-preference law—the livelihood of U.S. tramps. But since he saw his victim, the American taxpayer, stuck for a subsidy on the wheat, why not make him pay the additional freight, too?

Why, in fact, isn't that reasonable? The Soviet Union is a leading underdeveloped nation, with lots of danger from empty-bellied Communists. By our own definition she is eminently qualified for the same shipping grant customarily given by the Agriculture Department for much less desirable beneficiaries.

And so when the Agriculture Department announced a remarkably high subsidy payment for the first Russian purchase, a lively mouse jumped out of the wheat bin. Through a gimmick in the agricultural subsidy structure, the Government had indeed finally maneuvered the taxpayers into paying to get the Russians to stop complaining about a few ships. And in that complicated deal, the Russians had to buy a lot of grain for making spaghetti and noodles rather than bread.

This whole imbroglio is a sample of the liberal pattern in program after program. Something is hastily entered into without careful planning. Then, as difficulties mount, money is poured out to show a simulacrum of success.

War on Water Pollution Picks Up Under Representative Bob Jones and His Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a proud people, justly pleased with their accomplishments, and this is as it should be.

But they also are quick to recognize their shortcomings, especially when bad conditions are honestly exposed. And when they discover these imperfections, the typical response is a remedial action in which Government and private enterprise join hands to cooperate in finding the proper solutions to the problems, each assuming that portion of the task which it can best do and for which it should be responsible.

Illustrative of this is the current campaign to conserve our national water resources.

Only a few years ago, there was genuine alarm and deep concern that the American people soon would be faced with a national crisis, due to lack of water. Nature provides the United States regularly with 8 inches of rain every year. Half of it is evaporated, used by vegetation and runs back into the seas. Only 4 inches is available to us, and now we are using almost 3 inches of it. With an expanding population, growing industry, and better incomes with more leisure for our people bent on outdoor recreation, the demand for water threatened to bring us to a catastrophic state by 1980.

The threat to our national existence and defense, public health, industry, agriculture, science, and recreation was real and is by no means diminished now. But there are growing evidences that we at last have recognized the gravity of our water problem and a concerted program to cope with it is imminent.

One of these evidences is the recent report by the Committee on Water Resources Research, a branch of the U.S. Office of Science and Technology. Under the auspices of 25 governmental agencies, scientists and technicians are making minute and exhaustive studies into every aspect of water and its uses. But all the effort basically is to restore our waterways from the open sewers most of them are now to the pure state they were when our forefathers first saw them. Dirty water is waste water and until our streams are cleaned and kept clean, the threat of a crisis will not abate.

Much of the coordination of effort to stop pollution of our water supply now evident between Government agencies, States, and municipalities, and industry is due to the efforts of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the House Government Operations Committee, of which Representative ROBERT E. JONES of Alabama is chairman.

Without fanfare and without much publicity about what it has and is doing, the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power has made notable accomplishments in the less than a year it has been in existence. It discovered that while some agencies were working to prevent water pollution, there was little coordination of effort. Much of it overlapped and there were some revelations of one agency polluting water which another agency was attempting to clean. Through efforts of Congressman JONES and his staff there now is improved cooperation and effort within the Government, including liaison with States and municipalities. Every State and territory now is alerted to the threat of a water crisis and programs for correction of water waste is underway or planned.

New industries locating on waterways now know that water pollution will not be tolerated. Older, established industries have been spurred to self-policing to correct the old custom of dumping wastes into the nearest stream, regardless of what it costs communities and people downstream in wealth or health. The Jones committee is credited widely with hastening detergent manufacturers to perfect new cleaners which do not deface the waterways.

The Jones committee has held hearings in all sections of the country. These have alerted American people and their civic leaders to what a water shortage can mean to them, their children, and the future of their cities. Within the past year, public and private organizations in the hundreds have added special groups or committees to study the water problem and find means to prevent it acclerating into reality instead of a threat.

It has been said repeatedly that prevention of water pollution has been retarded and always would be, because the subject lacks heroics or glamour. Nobody, it is added, boasts of the waste treatment plant in his town to a visitor. It is one of the triumphs of the Jones committee that it is overcoming the average American's distaste to even discuss the water pollution problem.

An aroused public opinion supporting their Government on every level is one of the most hopeful signs that a threatened national crisis for our children to cope with, may be averted. The Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power has done exceedingly well and all Americans have reason to wish its continued success.

Eulogy of Lt. Gen. George Howard Brett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on December 2, 1963, the distinguished and colorful career of Lt. Gen. George Howard Brett was terminated by death. He was a dedicated soldier and a great American who served his country well.

General Brett will be remembered, among other things, as Chief of the Air Corps in the early 1940's. He also served as Chief of the Allied Air Forces in Australia during 1942 and late that same year he assumed command of the Caribbean Defense Command.

In April 1945, he retired from active duty but was recalled 1 month later when he again served as Commanding General of the Caribbean Defense Command and Commanding General of the Panama Canal Department. He reverted to retired status in May 1946.

Believing that Members will be interested in reading the eulogy read at his funeral by his son, Lt. Col. Devol Brett, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EULOGY OF LT. GEN. GEORGE HOWARD BRETT BY HIS SON LT. COL. DEVOL BRETT, USAF, AT ORLANDO AIR FORCE BASE CHAPEL, DECEMBER 4, 1963

Mom, Uncle Bill, our family and friends of George Brett: It is my privilege to give this tribute to my father, George Howard Brett, on behalf of his family, the numerous friends he so thoroughly loved, enjoyed, and served during his lifetime.

As most of us are aware, he was born the third son of William Howard Brett in 1886 in Cleveland, Ohio. His father, as he told us with great pleasure and pride on many occasions, instilled in him an adventurous spirit at an early age. A spirit that always was curious and interested in the new, while remaining respectful of the worthwhile in the old.

Dad never finished high school, which I believe can be credited to a certain impatience to get on with more interesting persons, places, and things. Practicality took over, however, and he more than made up for this brief flirtation with a wandering spirit by doing brilliantly at the Virginia Military Institute. He graduated from VMI in 1909, after only 3 years as number two in his class—a most proud record.

He was speeded on by his ambition to become a cavalry officer and joined the Phillipine Constabulary and later the 2d U.S. Cavalry. This certainly put the shine on an already dedicated soldier. Within these fine units he not only fought hard, but as we who have listened to his many wonderful tales know—played hard as well. And I believe in this period of his life that he came to know, guide, and love his fellow man with the maturity and understanding that only combat soldiering can develop.

In those young, grand days of his life he discovered true love and soon married the wonderful woman who shared his life, Mary Devol. Like most young lieutenants he had an intense ambition to fly, which he soon achieved in 1916 by becoming one of the Nation's first military aviators—while his bride patiently waited, which was her role to play on many occasions while George Brett enthusiastically traveled the often rocky, but also interesting road of the dedicated, truly professional serving officer.

In World War I he served in France. Between the wars, as commander and instructor of men, his qualities of leadership contributed greatly to building the foundation and cornerstone of the tremendous air power which proved decisive in World War II. His leadership qualities did not go unrecognized. Just before World War II he became what was to be the last Chief of the Army Air Corps. In World War II he served with great distinction, where true to his adventurous spirit, he was the first senior Air Force officer engaged in combat. He was deputy to Sir Archibald Wavell, commander of all the forces in the Far East during the early and dark days of the Philippines and Java. Then, spending much time with his combat troops, as commander of all Allied air forces in the Far East, he succeeded in first blunting the Japanese momentum in the wilds of New Guinea.

The safety of the Panama Canal next occupied his attention. As Commander of the Caribbean Defense Command and the Panama Canal Department, he returned to an area that had already served as an important arena in his family's history. Three years of distinguished service there terminated in 1945 with his retirement.

His achievements within the Army Air Corps in terms of positions held, awards and decorations so finely won are surely known to us all—and so speak for themselves.

His role as a father, a grandfather, and in this his last year as a great grandfather, won him no medals, but no man was a finer father to his children nor ever did more to weld together a deep sense of family love and devotion—one that will certainly last through many generations. His every action had in it a purpose for their well-being. From the home on the lake, which was for their pleasure, to the stern lectures which were to make them more useful citizens, his love for them shone through like a beacon. On his very last day his thoughts and few difficult words concerned the Air Force Academy ambitions of two of his grandsons. His were words of advice. So even as death was near—which he knew but ignored—his great love prevailed over the thoughts of his own great discomfort.

His appreciation of and devotion to his many wonderful friends, of all ages and walks of life, made his life a constant pleasure, both to himself and those who surrounded him.

Gen. Stonewall Jackson, while professor of artillery at VMI, gave the cadets this motto:

"You may be whatever you resolve to be."

George Howard Brett resolved to be a fine soldier and father—and this he was.

Is Nation Safe for Air Attack?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of all of the Members of this body a very discerning article written by Gene Yoes, Jr., the publisher of the St. Charles Herald, published at Hahnville, La.

The article which was printed in the St. Charles Herald for March 19, 1964, is entitled "Is Nation Safe for Air Attack?"

In the article, Mr. Yoes discusses a trip which he recently took with a group of Louisiana and Alabama newspaper publishers. I hope that the others were as perceptive as Mr. Yoes. Over the years Mr. Yoes has made an outstanding contribution to journalism and good government in my State.

The article follows in full:

IS NATION SAFE FOR AIR ATTACK?

(By Gene Yoes, Jr.)

In the age of missiles, is the United States maintaining its ability to defend itself?

The North American Defense Command recently took a group of Louisiana and Alabama newspaper publishers on a tour of the NORAD facilities and demonstrated the abilities of this Nation to defend itself from an attack that could, if successful, subdue a defenseless nation in a matter of 30 minutes.

The United States is not safe, but it probably has the best defenses in the world against attack from the air.

Computers, manmade machines that far outdistance man in analyzing information, are the key to the defense.

Every metal object that flies over or toward this Nation is accounted for on computers. Within a matter of 2 minutes, the computers must be able to identify the flying object. If they fail, the flying object becomes a source of frantic activity which continues until the object has been identified and, if necessary, destroyed.

This seems impossible. It would be impossible if it were not for the computers.

Radar stations are situated all over this Nation. One is located near Houma, La. Each station follows the same pattern. It looks for flying objects and once one is discovered, the object is reported to computers by two methods, one utilizing telephone cables and the other microwave radio signals. The Houma radar station communicates with the computer located in Huntsville, Ala.

The computers analyze the radar information and determine such information as course of the object, its height, and its speed. Since all legitimate aircraft normally file such information publicly before takeoff, the computer and its operators can determine if the flying object is flying at a speed, altitude, and course filed by a legitimate aircraft. If identified, the aircraft is not a matter of concern. If the aircraft does not follow any known plan of speed, altitude, or course, or if it has strayed 10 miles off of known course, it is a threat to the United States.

Our defense system is organized to immediately discover the identity of the unknown craft. The computers are allowed only 2 minutes to identify the craft and after that allotted time, interceptor aircraft are allowed only 5 minutes to be airborne in search of the unknown craft. The interval of 7 minutes is a long time in this age of supersonic speed, but it is adequate to protect the Nation from all known airborne dangers.

The hunt for the unknown aircraft is not necessarily a hunt directed by a human being with normal human reactions. Our interceptor aircraft are capable of computer operation, or a combination of man and computer operation. The brain machine puts the interceptor aircraft on a collision course with the unknown aircraft, and through its radar eye, constantly corrects speed and altitude, and course to keep it there. After interception, the pilot assumes control of the ship and either makes identification or attempts to escort the unknown ships to a designated landing place.

In the history of the system, there has been no occasion for the action of destruction. If and when that time comes, the action will be taken. The computer cannot take this action and the pilot cannot make the decision to destroy an unknown aircraft. A general officer, located in Alabama, is the only man who can give the order. If the occasion arises where the order to destroy is needed, it will be given.

Destruction weapons that could be used include ground-to-air missiles, air-to-air (airplane launched) missiles, water to air (submarine launched) and conventional weapons. All are constantly in the operational stage and waiting for the signal.

In this area, the Cuba-Castro-Russia combination creates a special problem. There are known Russian aircraft in Cuba and there is a missile capability of about 20-mile range there.

This writer, with our Louisiana and Alabama publishers, were fascinated as they watched the radar and computer findings on a giant television screen. Any aircraft or metal flying object that rises from the Cuban mainland shows as a dot on the screen. Succeeding dots are used to show the course of the aircraft or flying object and the computer, on demand, gives the altitude, course, and speed of the object. Any such object that approaches the shores of the United States immediately spurs into action the detection and identification systems. These systems are in constant use, but the destruction system has not been used.

People working in the defense system say that the program of defense is not 100-percent perfect. They might be fooled by one plane which might destroy a legitimate aircraft and mimicking its flight plan. A missile could not accomplish this feat but an armed aircraft might do so and escape detection. Such an act would not consti-

tute a danger to the Nation, but could produce a local disaster. Seasoned defenders point out that their job is to protect the Nation and any danger to the Nation will involve multiple aircraft or missiles. This they can detect.

Because the Russians have a submarine capable of launching missiles, radar rings the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coastlines of the Nation. The same type of detection system is employed. Although persons operating the system did not say that the computers are capable of distinguishing between missiles and aircraft, it is logical to assume that they can. Ready for firing along our coastline are missiles to destroy missiles.

Probably the most likely point of attack in the event of an assault from Russia would be the polar region. The North American Defense Command is composed of Canadian and U.S. people completely assimilated for efficiency. Radar stations like those we have in Houma are located throughout the Nation, and even larger stations ring the Arctic region from points in the Pacific Ocean through Alaska and Canada into the Atlantic Ocean. These stations must have more critical detection devices because the real danger would come from missiles fired in Siberia. These weapons, with atomic warheads, would fly over the North Pole at altitudes of 100,000 or more miles, and impact on targets in the United States.

Just as the radar station in Houma reports to a computer in Alabama, the radar stations in the polar regions report to area computers. All of the systems and all of the computers are tied into Colorado Springs, Colo., where the central command of all of these operations are located.

The efficiency of the system for detecting missiles launched in Russia was demonstrated for newsmen at Colorado Springs where giant computers possess the ability to plot the course of any missile or missiles launched in Russia, locate the point of impact, predict the time of impact and keep a scoreboard on the progress of the weapon. At the same time, the computers are activating destruction systems that are designed to destroy the weapon before impact.

The weakness in the system is not in detecting or identifying the approaching danger. The computers are even able to demonstrate how certain they are of their information. The danger is in destruction.

Ideally, our people would like to destroy the weapons over Siberia or the polar regions. They do not have the speed and accuracy capability in their weapons. Our interceptor aircraft cannot fly far enough or fast enough to accomplish this task. They must depend on destruction over the North American Continent as the missile enters the earth's atmosphere. An error or malfunction here, at the moment preceding impact, would be disastrous. There is a confidence in our existing weapons, but military people always seek better odds. They want destruction capabilities in outer space and over the North Pole.

This is our defense system as it was demonstrated for Louisiana and Alabama. It is not flawless, but it probably is the best system in the world.

The Bobby Baker Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several important editorials on the Bobby Baker case.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Times, March 1964]

BOBBY BAKER WHITEWASH

To get right to the point, it is doubtful if a weaker, shoddier, more palpable whitewash job of investigating has been done in Washington in years than the Senate's "inquiry" into the Bobby Baker case.

The indication now is that the farce will be ended soon by the votes of Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, and others on the Senate Rules Committee, who from the beginning showed no stomach for really digging into a dirty business and giving the public the whole story.

Senator JORDAN's statements that the job has been done doesn't hold water. To take one point:

Don Reynolds, a Maryland insurance man, testified that at the behest of Walter Jenkins, an aid to the then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, he bought time on a Texas TV station owned by the Johnson family, with part of the commission he earned on sale of life insurance to Mr. Johnson. Jenkins denied this—but the committee has never called him for questioning.

Or again:

There was a story that Bobby Baker asked Robert S. Kerr, son of the late Oklahoma Senator, to label as a "gift" the sum of $40,000 Baker received from the Senator before his death. Kerr, Jr., said he knew nothing about it. The committee, as far as the public knows, again did nothing.

And, more recently, the testimony that the name of an accountant affixed to Bobby Baker's income tax return had been forged—does the committee brush this under the rug, too?

Any resemblance between this flimsy pass at the Baker story and a painstaking investigation is strictly accidental and in form only—certainly not in substance. Ever since the disclosures first broke the Democrats have been running away from them—it is, after all, an election year. Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, got a bit tangled up in the flypaper at one point—and who knows what other Senators might also if the lid really came off?

Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, a man of candor, agreed the other day the Baker case is certain to be a political issue this fall. That apparently seems a lesser evil to Senate Democrats than pressing an honest investigation which would give the public the truth in a situation that had some of the "best" names in Washington heading for the exits.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Jan. 25, 1964]

BAKER CASE CRACKS WIDE OPEN

For weeks, the Washington word was that the case of Pickens native Robert G. Baker would be given the kid-gloves treatment with a quite little inquiry designed to corroborate Senator MANSFIELD's parting summation: "His great ability and dedication to the majority and the Senate will be missed."

The planners counted not on the obdurate desire of newsmen to pursue the facts diligently, without favor, and the patient research of Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, "the conscience of Congress."

Now it appears that, according to Jay G. Hayden, "The long suppressed case * * * is about to be cracked wide open." The trigger was supplied with release of the official transcript of the testimony of another South Carolinian, insurance broker Don B. Reynolds. After portions of his testimony had leaked out, the Democratic "wall of secrecy cracked," wrote Mr. Hayden.

The three Republicans on the investigating committee—CURTIS, of Nebraska, COOPER, of Kentucky, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania—again and again moved for normal official publicity. But the six Democrats, JORDAN, of North Carolina, HAYDEN, of Arizona, CANNON, of Nevada, PELL, of Rhode Island, CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and BYRD, of West Virginia, "just as adamantly" said "No."

The Republicans have been, and are now, right. The Senate is on trial, as Senator CASE, of New Jersey, has said. It may well be that Members of the august body are not within the purview of the present committee, but the revelations dictate a relentless pursuit of truth completely detailed, no matter whom the investigators might embarrass.

The New York Times has said editorially that "Congress has no code of ethics to guide its Members on possible conflicts of interest between their private business pursuits and their duties as legislators." This is not quite true. Congress does have a code of ethics, approved by the Senate after previous House endorsement on July 11, 1958. (The complete code was published here on Thursday, January 23.) This code can be, and should be, applied to the activities of all Senators and Government employees mentioned in the committee's investigation.

Point 8 of the code instructs that Congress shall "expose corruption wherever discovered." If there is such in the Baker inquiry, the public has a right to know and the Senate a responsibility to discover.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Feb. 29, 1964]

THE COUNTRY WANTS THE TRUTH

The affairs of Robert Baker, who built a fortune of $2 million while secretary to the Senate's Democratic majority, are slowly coming to light. But it still appears that the most intriguing aspects of Mr. Baker's spectacularly successful career are not going to be probed very deeply, if at all.

There have been suggestions at various times about Mr. Baker's relations with prominent figures. But at these sensitive places the Rules Committee has preferred not to be inquisitive, drawing the curtain, as it were, over embarrassing implications. There has been conflict of testimony involving a White House aid, there have been references to Mr. Baker's handling campaign funds for Senators, and there have been questions about his associations with persons of questionable character, and about party girls. The full truth about his affairs obviously will never be brought to light as long as the committee adheres to its defensive contention that its business is not to investigate Senators.

In response to a committee subpena, Mr. Baker pleaded the fifth amendment protecting him from testifying against himself and handing over his private papers. He is entitled to that constitutional protection as is everyone else.

However, Mr. Baker also invoked the sixth amendment which guarantees the right to trial by jury in criminal prosecutions. He contends he is being subjected to "legislative trial." If this claim were valid, no committee of Congress would be on firm ground in an investigation related to legislative purposes. The resolution authorizing the Baker investigation states that the committee shall determine whether there have been conflicts of interest involving present or former Senate officers and employees. The purpose is to reform loose practices which is plainly within the scope of legislative purpose.

The investigating committee need not be defeated by Mr. Baker's refusal to testify. It has in hand already much evidence and can, if it chooses to do so, obtain more from other sources. What is needed is vigorous

and relentless pursuit regardless of what personages may be embarrassed. The country wants the complete truth, not protection of reputations.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) the Evening Bulletin, Mar. 18, 1964]

RECESSED—UNTIL WHEN?

Three choices lay before the Rules Committee of the U.S. Senate which has—more or less—been investigating the financial and other activities of Bobby Baker, ex-secretary of its majority (Democratic) caucus.

The investigation could have been pressed down every pathway until no doubt was left as to the degree of corruption or carelessness involved, and the extent to which this had infected the law-making processes.

Or, the investigation could have been choked off early.

Or, the investigation could be suspended indefinitely. There is now a recess which cynics are already suggesting will last until after election day next November.

It will seem to many that the Rules Committee has chosen the worst of the three choices if it chooses to abandon further efforts to get all the facts.

Enough has been adduced at the protracted hearings to satisfy everyone that Baker was not a desirable employee of the American people. He was a man who became a millionaire on a $19,500 salary—a very good trick if it can be done honestly—and what has been learned of the ways in which this was accomplished suggests that some Senators in both parties have not been too eager to continue the inquiry.

The possible political effects of this investigation have been self-evident from the beginning, and partisanship was seldom clearer than at the end. Senator CLARK, usually indentified with good government, found himself compelled as a Democrat to become the principal advocate for shutting down the probe, while his Republican colleague, Senator SCOTT, had the happier role of demanding that the probe continue until all pertinent information had been exposed.

But the public is not concerned with the partisan aspects. It has had a look at some of the things that go on in Senate corridors and back rooms, and it is disturbed by what it has seen. In the absence of convincing proof that the Senate has done its best to reveal the whole story, suspicious will linger that much is being swept under the rug.

The Rules Committee has an opportunity to clear the air. It should not blow the chance.

Panama Crisis: Investigation by International Commission of Jurists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD of March 16, 1964, on the subject, "Panama Crisis: High Panama Officials Prevented National Guard From Preserving Public Order," I commented at some length on a recently reported inquiry on the isthmus by an International Commission of Jurists conducted upon the request of the National Bar Association of Panama.

Because the press accounts about this Commission, its authority, purpose and scope were not complete in some respects, I requested specific information from the Secretary of State and have received a reply.

In order that the Congress, especially its appropriation, investigating, and legislative committees with cognizance over Panama Canal policy matters, may be fully informed in the premises, the indicated exchange of letters follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1964.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A new story by Bernard D. Nossiter in the Washington Post of March 1, 1964, copy attached, summarizes a Reuter's report from Geneva, Switzerland, that three observers from the International Commission of Jurists would leave on March 1 for Panama to investigate Panama's charges that the United States, during the January 1964 Panamanian outbreak, violated human rights.

Full information is desired about this reported inquiry, including the (1) name of the organization represented by the three observers, (2) under what authority are they acting, (3) what specific charges will they investigate, and (4) any instructions that the Department of State may have issued, or contemplate issuing, relating thereto.

An early reply is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1964.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am replying to your letter dated March 6, 1964, concerning the International Commission of Jurists investigation in Panama. In response to your questions:

1. The full name of the organization is the International Commission of Jurists, and the three observers are: Prof. A. N. Belinfante, professor of law at the University of Amsterdam, Netherlands; Mr. Gustaf Petren of Sweden, assistant professor of public law at the University of Stockholm and secretary general of the Nordic Council; and Mr. Navroz Vakil, attorney-at-law and former solicitor to the Government of Bombay, India.

2. The Commission sent the three observers in response to a request from the National Bar Association of Panama.

3. The National Bar Association of Panama charged that U.S. military and police forces stationed in the Canal Zone violated articles 3, 5 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These articles provide: Article 3: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person;" article 5, "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;" article 20, "(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. (2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association." It is our position that these charges are completely unfounded.

4. The United States is represented at the investigation by a team headed by Mr. Joseph Califano, General Counsel of the Army. He has been in Panama with his assistants for some time preparing to answer the Panamanian charges. The Commission observers have been hearing testimony and receiving evidence since last week and expect to conclude the proceedings shortly.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of the ICJ report on Cuba. The membership of the ICJ is shown in this report. As this is 1 of 2 copies of this report available in the Department, I would greatly appreciate it if you would return this copy when it has served its purpose.

If I may be of further help in this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Is There Any Less Need for Milk Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a very thoughtful and though-provoking article has been written by Ray Crabbs, a member of the Snohomish chapter of the Future Farmers of America.

In bringing it to my attention, Elvis Eaton, executive secretary of the Cow Milker's Association in Hoquiam, Wash., pointed out that a national magazine recently referred to farming as a "dead-end job" in listing occupations that boys and girls can look forward to in the future.

Mr. Eaton said that the educational system should be credited for having the fortitude to "list the occupational possibilities as they see them and with statistics that can show their conclusions are correct," but also asked this question:

Are we going to ignore these warnings and let the food basket of American deteriorate and eventually get into the hands of a few corporations?

What he has said prepares the way for the article which our Future Farmer Ray Crabbs has written. I ask unanimous consent to have his article, entitled "Is Milk a Thing of the Past" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS MILK A THING OF THE PAST?

Ask yourself, Is milk a thing of the past? Have you turned to something other than milk because of some statement made by a very few doctors in the United States? These are a few questions I am going to help you answer in the next few minutes.

Did you know that milk contains all of the basic food nutrients essential for a balanced diet? Milk contains on the average 106 percent of the daily minimum requirements of calcium, 40 percent protein, 33 percent iron, and 25 percent vitamin A. These percentages are on 3 glasses of milk a day, which may be obtained for a mere 18 cents.

Still in President Kennedy's latest statement he said, "10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies are in the very minerals and vitamins, such as calcium and vitamin A—most prevalent in milk."

A few years ago some people gave up milk entirely, when a few doctors said milk could cause heart trouble, because of its high cholesterol content. According to the American Medical Association this is not true. They stated that not enough research had been done to know whether fat caused heart trouble or not. They also said that cholesterol could not be cut down without proper medical supervision.

There are several reasons why.

One is, an individual cannot know how much cholesterol his blood contains until

it is determined by a laboratory test. In the same way he cannot know whether his diet has reduced the amount of cholesterol in his blood until proper laboratory tests are made.

A second reason is, a person's entire food intake must be precisely regulated to lower cholesterol. A mere substitution of foods here and there is not sufficient; in fact, it may result in a serious health problem.

There is much to be learned about cholesterol and the other aspects of nutrition. The American diet, however, provides all of the nutrients essential to good health. This nearly perfect diet wasn't accidental, it resulted from many long hours of research and know-how.

For this reason neither the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council nor the American Medical Association's Council on Food and Nutritions has seen a need to change the fat intake for the general public.

This means one thing, milk has been unjustly blamed for the increased number of heart trouble cases in the United States.

Still many doctors and people agree that it is animal fat that causes heart trouble. I ask you, can this be possible when the consumption of animal fats has dropped 44 percent in the past 40 years and the consumption of vegetable oils has risen 171 percent. It appears to me that the vegetable oils are the cause of high cholesterol and heart trouble, but I am not trying to put the blame on vegetable oils. I am, however, trying to show you that milk is not to be blamed for the high number of coronary ailments.

The doctors who disagree with this statement are the people who are hurting the consumption of milk.

In 1961 the daily per capita consumption of milk was 0.76 of 1 pound. This is only 1½ glasses a day. In 1960 the daily consumption of milk was 0.78 of 1 pound and 1959 it was 0.8 of 1 pound. In the past 3 years the consumption of milk has dropped 19 pounds, which is more than it has dropped in any 3 consecutive years since 1910.

One and one-half glasses of milk a day is not enough for many people. In fact, people may live entirely on nature's most perfect food. Dad has told me how his father lived for as much as a year at a time on milk and milk alone. He lived to be 92 years old and I am not saying that if you drink a great deal of milk you will live to be 92 years old, but people naturally live longer if they are healthy. Milk is a good way to stay healthy and in good condition.

However, for some people a glass and a half is, well, a glass and a half too much. A large number of these non-milk-drinking people would much rather buy a magic potion from a door-to-door salesman. Of course, this potion has the power to do everything from lowering cholesterol and weight to growing hair on a bald head.

It is much more serious than most people realize. In fact, according to the American Medical Association the annual "take" for these cure-all doctors or as they are more commonly called "health quacks" is more than $500 million. This money is taken from the innocent and the hopeful, who are usually the ones who can least afford it.

Quacks exaggerate small symptoms and turn normal physiological phenomena into dread signs of ultimate suffering and death. The quacks realize that most people are vulnerable to the power of suggestion, so they seek to make them sick, in order to sell their cure-all medicines to help them become well again.

The main aif of the quacks is to frighten the public into buying their products. They must make the hale-and-hearty people physiologically sick. The easiest way to do this is to tell them that the food they eat is nutritionally inadequate or may cause a serious disease.

The sales of these magic potions is a serious defect in the U.S. economy. People would be much better off buying a quart of milk and fresh vegetables, than to pay high prices for worthless medicines.

There is another serious defect in the U.S. economy; these are the unproved statements of some doctors. A few doctors have said that milk is not good for humans. Some radical doctors claim that milk is not good for infants and that infants should be raised on coffee. These statements are based on beliefs and not on proof. Nevertheless, they hurt the consumption of milk. These statements frightened the public into turning to polyunsaturated oils. Even many levelheaded dogs have been forced to eat dog food with polyunsaturated oils added.

In 1952, the consumption of vegetable oils in Europe was much higher than the consumption of animal fats. Now, the trend has changed; the European people have realized that milk is a very important part of the human diet. Humans and animals have lived for hundreds of years without the help of unsaturated fats.

Many people ask, why it is that some animals don't drink milk past infancy? There is one very simple answer to this question—most animals do not have the opportunity, while man has recognized the need for milk.

I ask you again, Is milk a thing of the past? As for me, milk will never be a thing of the past. Milk is far better today, than it was several years ago, because of our more advanced techniques of processing and refrigeration and there are several plans being considered for the future improvement of milk. One that is being considered is the solids-non-fat testing program, that would detect the exact amounts of all nutrients in milk.

However, these decisions do not lie in my hands alone; they lie in your hands and the hands of every American citizen. I know that if you carefully consider the information that I have presented to you in the past few minutes, you will realize that milk is nature's most perfect food; and that it should be a very important part of the present and future diets of our Nation.

Use and Misuse of Public Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as our population continues to grow, the need to protect our remaining recreation resources becomes more and more imperative. Unless we remain vigilant, we stand in danger of losing forever some of our most precious natural resources, and our children will not have an opportunity to enjoy that which our forefathers left to us.

There are few who have done more to promote wise conservation of our natural resources than the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], with whom many of had the privilege of serving in this body.

I noticed recently that our former colleague has not lost his zeal as a conservationist. An article by Senator METCALF in the January 1964 Sierra Club Bulletin relates how a legislative effort to help preserve our fish, wildlife and recreation resources apparently has been resolved by an administrative decision. I was pleased to note that one of my State's great conservationists, our colleague, Congressman DINGELL, was associated with the junior Senator from Montana and others in this endeavor.

In calling the attention of the House to Senator METCALF's article, I should like to remind my colleagues that he is no Johnny-come-lately in the conservation field. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1952 and during his first term, he was cited for distinguished service to conservation by the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute. As the Sierra Club pointed out in an editor's note, Senator METCALF "has earned a reputation as one of the best friends of conservation on Capitol Hill."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Senator METCALF be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD.

STREAMS AND HIGHWAYS: USE AND MISUSE OF PUBLIC RESOURCES

(By Senator LEE METCALF)

This is the story of the use—for a time—of vast public resources to damage or destroy other vast public resources. That this use, or misuse, of public resources has been stopped is a tribute to the strength and effectiveness of America's great conservation organizations, among them the Sierra Club.

With Public Law 87-61, enacted in 1956, this Nation embarked on the biggest road construction program in its history. As amended, it provided for the 41,000-mile national system of interstate and defense highways to be completed by 1972. Basically, 90 percent of the cost of this system is coming from our Federal taxes, the other 10 percent from taxes collected at the State level. By 1972, there will have been a steady flow of Federal aid money for 15 years, averaging more than $2 billion a year.

Soon after ground was broken on this expanded program, we began to realize that those farsighted conservationists of the past, who had laid out what was to become a nationwide network of recreation lands, were in reality the master highway planners of all time. This was documented by reports from throughout the Nation that present-day highway planners were indeed building on the past—through one recreation area and on to the next.

It became obvious that the public investment in the highway program was damaging valuable public fish, wildlife, recreation, and other resources. Reports were of direct and indirect damage and came from most of our States. Direct damage resulted from building highways in stream beds and from removing—for fill and for use in making concrete—the stream bed gravel that is so vital to fish spawning and fish food production. Meandering streams, lined with erosion-controlling vegetation, were bulldozed into sterile chutes, alternately scoured and silted, always ruined.

If there were no considerations except economic ones, this construction could be defended only by the economically ignorant. Much of our recreation is water based; a study in California found 80 percent of it to be. Hundreds of fishermen who spend thousands of their dollars in nearby communities are attracted to a mile of good fishing stream. If that meandering stream is replaced by half a mile of high-speed, limited access highway, these fishermen, sitting on their billfolds, will speed past the communities and go on to areas that are either

unspoiled or that have been developed with a consideration of recreation resources.

In 1962, Director Walt Everin of the Montana Fish and Game Department wrote of a highway being routed into a trout stream to avoid the cost of moving a powerline. In Utah, State engineers opposed spending $325,000 to redesign part of a high-speed highway and thereby save the sport fishery resource of part of the Logan River, where fishermen spend more than $400,000 a year. A California survey showed that the gravel being scooped out of salmon-spawning beds in Sacramento Valley to build highways produced a crop of salmon worth up to more than $1,600 an acre per year and that the average annual value to sport and commercial fishermen of salmon spawned in this region is $6.5 million.

When it became apparent that highway planners were not even consulting the agencies charged with managing the recreation resources being threatened, I introduced S. 2767 of the 87th Congress. It would have required clearance by the Secretary of the Interior for Federal aid highway projects. Acting through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary would satisfy himself that conservation of recreation resources was considered in highway plans and surveys.

Support for this measure and its successor, S. 468 of the 88th Congress, came from every part of the country. So did evidence of publicly financed destruction of public resources. Among the reports were ones from:

California: Arthur Grahame, in Outdoor Life magazine ("Are You a Sap for the Ribbon Cutters?"), wrote: "Construction of Interstate Route 80 ruined Donner Creek, a trout-productive tributary of Truckee River in the beautiful Lake Tahoe country. The Fish and Game Department didn't learn of the stream's danger until after roadbuilding had been started. Then it was too late to make changes in the contract."

New York: The New York Times editorially called attention to a proposed expressway aimed at a wildlife sanctuary in Westchester and Putnam Counties. Conservationists petitioned Gov. Nelson Rockefeller to change the proposed routing of a highway that they said would destroy 23 miles of the historic Beaverkill-Willowemoc Rivers in Sullivan and Delaware Counties.

New Hampshire: The State Audubon Society protested the routing of a highway through Franconia Notch, some of it through State recreation land that had been purchased by private citizens, many of them schoolchildren.

Massachusetts: Although recognizing that the Neponset River "in its present condition has little to recommend it from the recreational water use point of view," Publisher Henry Lyman of the Salt Water Sportsman wrote that pollution of that river 'is gradually being lessened" but that highway plans would "destroy the marsh habitat."

South Dakota: Biologists report that where there were once 1,200 miles of trout streams in the Black Hills, a renowned recreation area, there are now only 160 miles that will support trout. They attribute the major portion of this loss to highway construction and the sediment pollution it produces.

Montana: A report, published late in 1961, showed that 24 streams or segments surveyed that year had lost 78 miles of their original channel to highway and railroad construction.

Utah: Highway construction threatened both the scenic beauty and the fishery resource of spectacular Logan Canyon.

Maryland: The Baltimore Sun commented editorially on what highway builders did to the most popular trout stream in that area: "Throughout most of its length the stream has been scooped out, diverted, and generally manhandled, and the wilderness along its borders which provided much of its charm scraped off by bulldozers, the banks bare, the stream itself a river of mud."

Pennsylvania: Executive Director Albert M. Day, of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, wrote that a trout hatchery and 8 miles of "beautiful trout water" above it would be ruined from siltation and that "the blasting in this limestone area may even disrupt or ruin the springs."

As Gen. Omar Bradley put it: "If we are not careful, we shall leave our children a legacy of billion-dollar roads leading nowhere except to other congested places like those left behind. We are building ourselves an asphalt treadmill and allowing the green areas of our Nation to disappear."

Integral parts of the "green areas" to which General Bradley referred are the streams, rivers, and lakes that provide millions of Americans with recreational opportunities.

As this pressure of highway construction on natural stream values increased, nearly every major conservation organization went on record in support of legislation to counteract it. At its March 1962 meeting, the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board approved the principle of S. 2767 "because of the beneficial results that must come in the field of water pollution abatement as a necessary result of this action."

The Izaak Walton League of America, at its 1962 convention, resolved that "in highway construction, advance planning definitely provide for the protection of water resources, fish and wildlife, and recreational values, and that the costs of adequately protecting the range, the watersheds, the forests, the wildlife, and the scenic values be considered normal cost of highway construction and included therein."

Among resolutions adopted by the National Wildlife Federation in 1962 was the one headed "Public Roads":

"Federal and State highway programs are causing major problems in the management of natural resources, particularly fish and wildlife. Not only are major amounts of land being removed from agricultural use, but highway construction is disrupting streams, invading the sanctity of public parks, forests, and wildlife refuges, and creating barriers to migrations of big game herds. Some do not allow access to public lands. The National Wildlife Federation proposes the principle that highway construction be considered in the same light as water development and that fish and wildlife and recreational values be adequately considered in the advance planning of any road program and any wildlife losses be fully mitigated."

Part of my voluminous files on this subject include my own effort to determine the extent to which highway construction was threatening our rivers and streams. I addressed questionnaires to fish and game management officials in each of our 50 States. All replied.

I asked 10 questions, one of them being: "Are trout streams or other important fishing streams or lakes adversely affected by highway construction in your State? Thirty-six of the 50 States answered affirmatively, although the extent of the damage varied.

Perhaps more significant were the responses to the question: "Do you feel that additional legislation at the Federal or State levels is necessary to bring about a satisfactory degree of coordination of highway and wildlife conservation interests and objectives in your State?" To this question, fish and game management men in 41 States replied: "Yes." Two States were undecided, and seven saw no need for action in this area.

Early last year I reintroduced the bill to protect streams from highway damage, cosponsored this time by Senators FRANK MOSS, of Utah; ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska; and GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin. In the House, companion legislation was introduced by Congressmen ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana, and HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin. Congressman JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, took a different route to the same objective. He proposed to amend the Coordination Act to make it apply to Federal-aid highway projects. (The act now provides for mitigation of damage to fish and wildlife resources and their possible improvement as a a result of Federal construction projects.)

Our concern was shared by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, who has jurisdiction over the Bureau of Public Roads. After making its own inquiry into the problem and after consultation with others concerned, the Bureau of Public Roads issued an instructional memorandum last June 12. It set as its goal suitable coordination between State highway departments and the conservation agencies.

As a minimum, the Bureau order requires State highway departments to submit plans to State fish and game agencies "at an early stage," and to give those agencies "full opportunity to study and make recommendations" to the State highway department prior to submission of the plans to the Secretary of Commerce for his approval.

The memorandum set the first of this year as the deadline, after which State applications for Federal aid for highway construction "shall contain a statement that the State highway department has considered all facts presented by the State fish and game agency and the effect the proposed construction may have on fish and wildlife resources."

According to the memorandum, this statement should include:

"(1) a description of the measures planned as project expenditures to minimize the effect of the proposed construction on fish and wildlife resources;

"(2) a description of any measures proposed by the State fish and wildlife agency to accomplish this purpose, which differ from those proposed by the State highway department; and

"(3) to the extent that measures proposed by the State highway department and State fish and game agency differ, an explanation of the factors considered by the State highway department in arriving at its proposal."

Thus, administrative action apparently has achieved the objective of legislative proposals that sought consideration of fish and wildlife resources in our highway program. From now on, planning for the preservation and conservation of our streams will be a component part of highway programing from the survey stage. It will be, either under this administrative action, or under legislation that will be introduced and pressed if administrative coordination is not effective. The effectiveness of the regulation will depend upon the cooperation of those concerned with building highways and with managing our recreation resources. It also will rest on the awareness and alertness of conservationists. The demonstration of those characteristics in forcing the administrative action leaves me no reservations about the conservationists. Already there are suggestions that coverage of the Public Roads Bureau order, or subsequent legislation if it is necessary, be broadened to include State and local parks, historical sites, and recreation land around cities acquired under the "open spaces" program.

We legislate on the basis of experience. In a year or so, we will have documented experience on which to judge the effectiveness of administrative coordination.

From Welfare to Self-Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as Congress takes up the program which our President has requested so that the war against poverty may be adequately joined, I am reminded of a program undertaken in Washington State a few years ago which has been most successful.

It concerns vocational rehabilitation. Through training, a total of 1,400 persons have been taken off the welfare rolls. The program is directed by the Washington State Vocational Rehabilitation Division. Training is not limited to those with physical handicaps. The same services are extended to welfare recipients whose handicaps are not physical, but are substantial enough, to cause them to resort to welfare for their living.

This program was undertaken in 1955. Such handicaps as these are faced and overcome: lack of education, lack of motivation, lack of self-confidence, lack of skills, and sometimes simply a lack of knowing how to apply for work.

This program is helping in the President's fight against poverty. It has been supported by State funds since 1955. The question now being asked is why, when money is given out to other agencies to fight the battle of poverty, could not some of their State money be matched in order that they might work with at least a major portion of the cases on the rolls awaiting rehabilitation service. We have, in Washington, a waiting list of 1,500 persons right now, to receive the training which enabled their 1,400 predecessors to become self-supporting.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following story, taken from the Seattle Times of March 10, printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTHER OF FIVE FIGHTS WAY OFF WELFARE—EARNS COLLEGE DEGREE

(By Marjorie Jones)

Seven years ago, Alicia Carlington, alone, expecting her fifth child and with only a ninth-grade education, looked like the poorest possible risk to ever get off the welfare rolls.

She upset the odds.

Today at 28, Mrs. Carlington is a slim, attractive, confident, and articulate young matron with a college degree. She has been off welfare almost 2 years.

Mrs. Carlington has a job as a medical technologist, specializing in cytology, the study of cells. Her work involves the Pap-smear test for detection of cancer. She expects to be a registered cytologist by fall.

"I love my profession," she said, "and it's the kind of work that provides me with an opportunity of helping others."

Although she was fired with ambition, Mrs. Carlington is quick to admit she owes much to many.

"Nobody makes it on their own when they are where I was," she said with an infectious smile.

Mrs. Carlington was married at 15 and separated from her husband at 21. Her only working experience was 2 months as a waitress before the fifth child was born. She was forced to seek aid-to-dependent-children help.

Although she was told "nobody ever goes to school on ADC," she was determined to finish high school. With the aid of a counselor at a high school in Olympia, where she was living, she got six teachers to help her.

She picked up her assignments after school and returned them the next day. The teachers did the work after their regular classes.

"I was too dumb to realize what I was asking," Mrs. Carlington said. "Now I know only someone desperate would think of such a crazy thing."

Without her knowledge the counselor applied for her entrance to the University of Washington but lacking English and history she was turned down.

"I did a year's work in 6 weeks, applied and was accepted at Seattle University, but on a year's probation on the basis of my grade-prediction tests," she said.

Seattle University offered her a president's scholarship.

"It was based partly on my test score, but I'm sure there also was sympathy," she said. "I wasn't that good academically."

Mrs. Carlington moved her brood to Seattle. The going was rough.

It became rougher the next summer when she was told her welfare aid would end. If she could go to school she could work, authorities figured.

"The State division of vocational rehabilitation for the nondisabled saved the ship," she said.

John Murphy, vocational rehabilitation officer here, went to bat for Mrs. Carlington and tailored her case to fit the program.

The $100 a month she earned in her senior year, interning at Providence Hospital, helped out. She baked bread and studied the food ads "like the stock market" to make ends meet.

She was graduated in 1962, receiving the Best Student of the Year Award from the Society of Medical Technologists. She also won an American Cancer Society scholarship to attend the University of Oregon 6 months.

Mr. and Mrs. David L. Dunlap, of Olympia, her parents, cared for her children while she was in Oregon and helped in many other ways.

"I'm grateful to all who took a chance on me," she said. "More than anything, I'm glad my children will grow up in a home where education counts.

"Had I stayed on welfare I figure the chances are that two of my five children might themselves go on welfare," she said.

"And if I hadn't been able to complete my own education, I'd probably be back on welfare, too."

Need Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chronicle, Pascagoula, Miss. Mr. Ralph Nicholson, president and publisher of the Chronicle, is also president and publisher of the Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala.:

NEED PAY RAISE

Too bad the proposed increase in pay for Members of Congress and several grades of Federal employees were and maybe had to be included in the same bill.

Our concern, however, is for the underpaid Senators and Representatives. We advocate increases for them without prejudice or reference to the others referred to above.

Last week the two-part bill was defeated. Subsequently, Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, Democrat, of Louisiana, its supporter, introduced another to take care of the Federal employees but did not include anything for the Members of Congress. He said he expects the new one to pass. Whether a subsequent proposal to take care of the legislators will come later remains to be seen.

Members of the Senate and House now get $22,500 a year. The proposed raise amounted to $10,000 annually per man and would cost the taxpayers about $5 million annually. That seemed like too big an increase, even though it's chickenfeed compared with other expenditures of the Federal Government. The Peace Corps gets 23 times that much and the foreign aid program 800 times.

Congress can appropriate millions and even billions for other departments of the Federal Government, much of it essential, some of it wasteful, and arouse little public outcry.

But voting something for themselves, especially a large amount, really stirs up opposition. For this reason, many legislators who want, need, and believe they deserve more pay were afraid to vote for it. They face their constituents this year.

In this current instance the legislators followed long-established practice. A bill was introduced which if passed would have provided the big increase in pay all at once. This happened at a bad time—just after President Johnson had launched his great economy drive. There he was, turning the lights out in the White House to save money, and they were after more money for themselves.

At home the Congressmen do a successful selling job every 2 years and the Senators every 6 years when they get elected. But they failed when they tried to get something for themselves in Washington. In some respects it's their own fault.

They acted as if they never heard of the installment plan or never thought of using it for their own profit. A $2,000 increase in pay for each of the next 5 years likely would arouse little and certainly less opposition. If they tried that next time they might win.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of Senators an excellent editorial which was publishd on March 9, 1964, in the Evening Herald, of Rock Hill, S.C. The editorial is concerned with the so-called "civil rights" legislation, and is addressed to the Members of the Senate. It it entitled "Statesmanship Wanted." Originally the editorial appeared in the Aiken Standard & Review of Aiken, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTHER FOLKS SAY: STATESMANSHIP WANTED

It is widely recognized that many Members of the House of Representatives in their landslide vote (290 to 130) for the Civil Rights Act were not expressing their convictions but revealing their vulnerability to pressure and passing this hot potato on to the Senate in the pious hope that the upper House can put the chill on it.

Republican Representative LOUIS WYMAN, former attorney general of New Hampshire, is more specific on this point than most. Had there been a secret ballot, he says, the measure would not gotten 50 votes.

But the sole question now is: Can the Senate—even though opponents are prepared to talk endlessly on the subject—do more than delay this grant of extraconstitutional powers to the President and new brigades of inquisitory deputies? And, how much delay can we expect when White House strategy—for action on tax, farm, and military authorization bills first—will consume time as the convention dates draw nearer.

The outcome—when it is nothing less than whether the United States is to become a dictatorship—may well turn on the development of statesmanship where none is presently apparent. In view of existing and contrary pressures in the South and in those Northern big-city States with heavy concentrations of Negro population, we may best look to those areas of the Nation where racial issues are of the least political concern for the Moses to lead us out of an emotional wilderness in which the landmarks of justice and reason and freedom have become obscured.

If the Senate is not to yield ignominiously to the influences that numb the conscience of the House, there is much to do to accomplish desired reforms within the framework of the Constitution. The bill as it stands, conceived in deception and dedicated to Executive authority, adds to the stature of none and destroys the freedom of all—black or white or red or yellow, atheist, Catholic, or whirling dervish.—Aiken Standard & Review.

How To Begin Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hoppe, columnist, recently published two articles in the San Francisco Chronicle; one on March 9 and one on March 10, giving advice on international ethics and how to begin smoking.

His columns follow:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Mar. 9, 1964]

DO UNTO OTHERS AND TAKE COVER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

For years I've been convinced that as long as our political leaders insist on playing power politics with thermonuclear bombs, they'll unjustly blow up our civilization sooner or later. But now I've got doubts.

What gives me doubts is the current moral stand of our ethical and religious leaders. Personally, I've always looked to them longingly in hopes they'd come up with some smashing new moral breakthrough in time to save us all. Like, perhaps, "Love thy neighbor."

So when I heard the Council on Religion and International Affairs, an outfit I admire, was holding a seminar on "The Basic Issues of International Ethics," I naturally went to sit and listen. I realize it sounds like a bore. But let me tell you how it was.

There were about 40 ethical and religious leaders, all obviously highly intelligent and godly men, sitting around a long table. Each with a glass of ice water, a name card and a nice clean note pad in front of him.

The moderator, an energetic young Protestant clergyman, opened by saying there seemed to be a need to give some thought to ethics in foreign affairs. And all the moral leaders around the table nodded realistically.

Of course, said the main speaker, a distinguished Catholic professor, we must be realistic about it. And we must first decide whether a policy is politically, economically and militarily feasible. But if it's all three, he said, there's no reason we can't discuss whether it's ethical. Also.

And all the moral leaders nodded realistically.

True, said a thoughtful man in clerical collar. But we must be realistic about ethics.

For what's unethical for an individual isn't necessarily unethical for a nation. And thus our political leaders can't be held to the same code of ethics. Like when it comes to incinerating 200 million human beings with hydrogen bombs.

And all the moral leaders nodded realistically.

Exactly, said the professor happily. So it's up to the middle elite (meaning everybody at the table) to decide what's moral for our political leaders. And then convince the masses (meaning the waiter and I) of this new morality. But of course, he said again, this new morality must be politically, economically, and militarily feasible. Because we must be realistic about it.

And all the moral leaders nodded realistically.

Well, it's a difficult task our moral leaders face in trying to convert their religious principles to meet the needs of our society. Instead of the other way around. But I'm sure they'll come up with a smashing new moral breakthrough to justify the game our political leaders are playing. Like perhaps: "Love they neighbor—if it pays."

And I'm sure it's all very realistic. But I've always thought of history as a struggle between the realistic and the moralists. With each curbing the excesses of the other. And I would now like to say, as flatly and bitterly as I can, that I think the tragedy of our times is that our moral leaders have sold out.

So, as I say, I now have doubts our political leaders will unjustly blow up our civilization. Oh, I'm still convinced they'll blow it up. It's just that I'm beginning to wonder if it doesn't deserve it.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Mar. 10, 1964]

HELPFUL HINTS ON SMOKING

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The Government report on smoking has certainly had a tremendous impact on our society. For example, I personally know three people who have taken up cigarettes.

One is an elderly lady in the John Birch Society. "The Government," she says angrily between coughs, "is not going to tell me what to do."

The second is a dedicated nonconformist. "Smoking is so far out, man," he confides, scratching his beard, "that it's in."

And the third is a housewife who is so mad at her husband she's decided to show him a thing or two and commit suicide. Even if it takes her 30 years to do it.

And oddly enough, all three have discovered the same thing: it's extremely difficult to start smoking. You forget to have your after-dinner cigarette; you leave your pack in your other purse; or you just plain don't like the taste.

So as a public service to the millions of Americans who will try to start smoking in the coming years, I've written a handy little pamphlet entitled: "How to Kick the Nonsmoking Habit." Excerpts follow.

"So you want to start smoking?

It is no easy goal you have set yourself, particularly if you are a confirmed nonsmoker. The path to heavy smoking is a long and arduous one. Time and again you will be tempted to return to the carefree days when you went through life unburdened by cigarettes, matches, lighters, lozenges and a wracking cough.

"Thus at the outset, you must be sure you are deeply motivated. It is no use saying casually, 'I think I'll start smoking.' Good intentions are not enough. You must burn with a fierce desire to smoke, almost a fanaticism. Keep always in mind the esprit de corps you will one day enjoy with other smokers, a camaraderie bordering on that of Japanese kamikaze pilots.

"Now, then. You are ready to light up your first cigarette. As you take your initial puff say to yourself: 'It doesn't taste as bad as I thought it would.' Say this no matter what it tastes like. Keep saying it. Now try another puff. Keep trying. Remember that tobacco is an acquired taste. Like salamander entrails.

"In several weeks, with application, you will be ready to inhale. Take a big puff and suck it into your lungs. Be prepared for the violent reaction. For it will make you dizzy and nauseous and you will cough violently. This is the crucial point. For there are no pills or panaceas to help you through this difficult period. You must do it on sheer grit alone.

"Quick. Say to yourself: 'I do have the willpower to start smoking.' Say it over and over in the coming days. Think of the countless others who have gone through the same awful struggle. You can do it. With iron determination and a deep sense of purpose, you too can smoke two packs a day."

Well, I hope my little pamphlet helps. For it's amazing to think of the millions of Americans who have gotten through the terrible ordeal of taking up smoking without a single brochure to aid them. I just wish everybody had half that much inner fortitude. If I did, I'd quit.

Freedoms Foundation Award to Civitan Club of Greenville, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as an American who is concerned about freedom and also as a member of the board of directors of the Freedoms Foundation, at Valley Forge, Pa., I have a very high regard for the annual awards given by the Freedoms Foundation to individuals and organizations who serve to promote the cause of freedom throughout this land. I was, therefore, very much pleased to learn that the Civitan Club of Greenville, S.C., has been selected to be presented the highest award, the George Washington Honor Medal, given by the Freedoms Foundation for contributions in the category of community programs made to the cause

of freedom. The Greenville Civitan Club has been honored for its outstanding program, "Building for a Greater Tomorrow."

I commend Probate Judge Ralph W. Drake, who served as president of the Civitan Club during the period for which this award has been made, and also all of those in the Civitan Club who likewise made vital contributions to the club's excellent program, "Building for a Greater Tomorrow.' The club has indeed brought a high honor to the State of South Carolina; but, more than this, Mr. President, the Greenville Civitan Club has performed a great service to America in executing the many projects promoting freedom under the club's overall program for last year. If other groups and individuals who have concern for the future of this country and the cause of freedom would follow the example set by the Greenville Civitan Club, we would have little difficulty maintaining our freedom at home and extending it throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article from the Greenville News of February 22, 1964, and also an editorial from the Greenville News of March 1, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, Feb. 22, 1964]

CIVITANS TO RECEIVE AN AWARD: JOHN GLENN AND FOUR FROM STATE TO BE HONORED

The Greenville Civitan Club will be presented an encased George Washington Honor Medal and $500 by the Freedoms Foundation in ceremonies today at Valley Forge Military Academy at Valley Forge, Pa., home of the foundation.

The local club won first place in the community programs division of the national awards in competitions with other organizations throughout the United States for its program, "Building for a Greater Tomorrow."

The awards to the Greenville club will be made at the same ceremony at which the foundation's top award, the George Washington Award and $5,000, will go to U.S. Marine Astronaut John H. Glenn, presently seeking the Democratic Party's nomination for the U.S. Senate, from Ohio.

Gen. Lauris Norstad, U.S. Air Force, retired, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander, will receive a special Freedom Leadership Award.

Four South Carolinians and the Joanna Cotton Mills Co. of Joanna, for its publication, Joanna Way, and the paper's editor, James P. Sloan, will be among those also honored.

Receiving the awards also are Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of The Citadel, and Dr. Heyward W. Epting, of Charleston, and Dr. R. Archie Ellis and Dr. Carl Honeycutt, of Columbia.

George Washington Honor Medal Awards will go to General Clark for an untitled public address and Dr. Ellis, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Columbia, for a sermon. The latter is a graduate of Furman University.

Honor certificates go to Mr. Epting, of Charleston, and Mr. Honeycutt, of Columbia's Ebenezer Lutheran Church, for sermons.

The local club's recognition was a closely guarded secret in Greenville until yesterday.

Greenville Civitans, with their freedom-in-action program, covered 78 projects to inspire the citizens "as true Americans, to hold high the traditions and priceless heritage that are ours * * * ever proclaim the greatness of our Nation * * * and commit themselves to uphold those principles which keep us strong and free."

Probate Judge Ralph W. Drake, Civitan president during the undertaking of the projects, will receive the award and will return to Greenville-Spartanburg Airport at 10:15 p.m. today to a Civitan reception, according to William B. Price, governor of the South Carolina Civitan District.

The speak-up-for-freedom program, undertaken in January 1963, included setting up 10 lighted billboards with "Speak Up for Freedom" posters, the distribution of about 2,000 red, white, and blue lapel handkerchiefs and literature on freedom, such as voting and registration information, Mr. Price said.

The get-out-the-vote program and free rides to the polls were sponsored by the local Civitans.

The local club also conducted a citizenship education program for the 1,000 campers at the Civitan Fresh Air Camp and sponsored the citizenship essay, "Speak Up for Freedom Today," which was open to area high school students.

Also, the club presented 15 citizenship awards to local high schol students.

Mercer Brissey, current president of the local club, said, "I am extremely pleased and proud that the Greenville Civitan Club won this, the greatest award that we may receive from a national organization for the work we do in our community."

Civitan International will be presented one of the four national awards for the speak-up-for-freedom program it sponsored. Civitan President Lou Hopping, of Detroit, Mich., will receive that award.

[From the Greenville News, Mar. 1, 1964]

HIGHEST AWARD YET

Of all the awards given to individuals or groups for extraordinary contributions to good citizenship and the cause of fundamental freedom, those conferred annually by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., are the most to be desired.

There are in America at present few greater honors in any field than a Freedoms Foundation award.

Therefore, the awarding of a George Washington Medal for first place in the community programs division of the national award competitions to the Greenville Civitan Club is something no Civitan nor any other citizen of Greenville should ever forget.

Past President Ralph Drake, during whose term some 78 projects were carried out by the club, received the award in behalf of his fellow Civitans at Valley Forge last weekend. It must have been the moment of a lifetime for Mr. Drake, Greenville County's probate judge.

The Civitans are accustomed to winning awards in competition with other clubs over the Nation. But this one is something far different and more greatly to be cherished.

We congratulate the Civitans for having brought high honor to themselves and to Greenville.

The Cotton-Wheat Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the farmers do not want the pending cotton-wheat bill. Surely the voice of those most affected by this legislation is not to go unheeded.

The American Farm Bureau Federation speaks for a sizable number of our farmers. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD a press release issued on March 13 by the board of directors of this outstanding farm organization.

It follows:

THE COTTON-WHEAT BILL

CHICAGO, ILL., March 12.—The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation in its regular quarterly session here today registered "strong opposition" to the cotton and wheat bill recommended by the Johnson administration, recently passed by the Senate and now awaiting consideration by the House.

The 26-member board which represents 1,628,295 Farm Bureau families in 49 States and Puerto Rico adopted a statement which asserted enactment of the legislation would "aggravate" rather than solve current difficulties in wheat and cotton.

The board termed the bill "a misguided political effort to buy the farm vote in an election year," and further stated that "new and larger subsidy handouts are not the answer to the cotton and wheat problems."

"The Senate," the board asserted, "recognized the wasteful and dangerous characteristics of this legislation when it limited it to 2 years. It should be clear by now that the practice of enacting ill-conceived farm legislation as a temporary expedient is one of the major causes of the present farm program mess."

The statement further pointed out that:

The bill "would move in the direction of more Government supply-management control over agriculture. Farm Bureau members want to move toward less regimentation in agriculture and toward a market-directed rather than a politically directed farm economy.

"On May 21, 1963, wheat farmers voted overwhelmingly against the wheat certificate plan in a referendum. This bill is said to contain a voluntary version of that plan; however, the conditions that would be imposed on those who did not choose to participate would be such as to make a mockery out of the use of the term 'voluntary.' The certificate device would separate noncooperators from the food and export market. It could be used to depress market prices below the world level.

"There is not even a pretense that participation would be voluntary for wheat processors who would be subjected to a processing tax that can, and would be, labeled a 'bread tax.'

"Farmers said 'no' to this proposal last May. It is incredible that the Congress would seriously consider forcing this program on wheat farmers against their clearly stated wishes.

"We firmly believe that, if this proposal is enacted into law, both producers and consumers will recognize it for what it is—a scheme to regiment farmers, and a flour and bread tax on consumers.

"The cotton proposal is the most complicated Government farm program that has ever been devised. It would grant increased price support to most producers without requiring any adjustment in their acreage. It would grant the Secretary of Agriculture excessive discretionary authority. It would be tremendously expensive and the first big step toward compensatory payments for all of agriculture. The vast Brannan-type subsidies provided for in this bill cannot be justified. The acreage retirement program would be costly and ineffective. The retired cotton acres could be shifted to feed grains or soybeans without penalty and thus further aggravate the feed grain and livestock producers' problems."

The Farm Bureau favors alternative legislation which would relate price supports to market prices in a recent period and provide greater freedom of choice for producers of cotton and wheat.

Where Does Our State Stand in Support of Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, 2 years ago Donald L. Kruzner, superintendent of our King County schools in Washington State performed a valuable national service when he measured in depth the support which each of our States gives to public education.

Now he has brought that work up to date, supplying the necessary data for the school year 1963–64.

I am sure that this latest study will meet with the same acclaim as greeted his earlier study.

I ask the unanimous consent that the study of Dr. Kruzner may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DOES OUR STATE STAND?

(By Dr. Donald L. Kruzner, superintendent, King County schools, Seattle, Wash.)

California and New York rank 2d and 3d in the amount paid in teacher salaries, but they rank 25th and 38th, respectively, in their relative effort to suport public education when income, ratio of adults to public school enrollment, and total school operating costs are considered.

Mississippi and South Dakota rank 50th and 47th, respectively, in the amount paid for teacher salaries, but they rank 7th and 14th in their relative effort in terms of income, ratio of adults to school enrollment, and total school operating costs. While New Mexico ranks 1st in its relative effort to support public education, it is only able to maintain 19th place in the amount it pays its teachers.

These statements may surprise people who are accustomed to considering the amount spent for education in terms of per capita income alone. The attached study from which these statistics were taken is a measure of the relative effort adults, who are considered the principal taxpayers, make to support public school operating costs. The ratio of children in public schools to the total population is an extremely important factor in measuring the relative efforts of adults to provide good public education. The percent of children attending public schools to the total population and the relative ranking of States in this regard are shown in columns C and D of the attached table. Utah ranks 2d with 27.7 percent of its total population enrolled in public schools. At the other end of the scale at 50th place is Rhode Island with only 17.3 percent of its total population in public schools.

Another factor which is sometimes overlooked is the ratio of adults to the total population of an area, particularly since the adults in general form the taxpaying group that pays the education bills. The best single measure of this group, State by State, is the number of people of voting age. The most recent figures available were used in computing the attached table—November 1962, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, current population reports as of October 4, 1963, shown in column E. Alaska with only 45.6 percent of its total population in the income producing range is ranked 50th and New York is 2d with 62.2 percent of its total population in a position to help pay the bill for education.

The remaining population is made up of the preschool children, children attending private schools, college students, and others under voting age who may have completed their schooling or for some other reason do not attend public school. The figures in column G show the percentage of this group to total population.

Another factor in determining the relative effort of adults to provide adequate funds for good public school education is the average yearly operating expenditure per pupil. This information for the school year 1963–64 was gathered for each State and reported in a National Education Association research report issued in January 1964. New York is in first place, spends $705 per year for each child and Mississippi, in last place, spends $241 per year for each child.

It is especially interesting to note that the cost per pupil per year runs relatively high in the sparsely settled States of the mountain region which are forced to maintain smaller schools than States with more concentrated populations. It is also significant to note the low cost of education per pupil in many of the Southern States which have a high ratio of children attending public schools as compared to their total population.

The next important consideration is the school cost per pupil in relation to the taxpayer. This is referred to as the school cost per adult, shown in column J of the attached report. This figure was determined by multiplying the percent of public school enrollment to total population (col. C) by the average yearly operating expenditure per pupil (col. H) and dividing the product by the percent of people in the income earning bracket (col. E). It is a measure of the cost per pupil in terms of the number of people who pay the tax bills. Here again the costs are relatively higher in the sparsely populated States, and lower in the States in the eastern and central southern sections of the country. Alaska and Nevada with costs of $330.90 and $275.56 per year are ranked 1st and 2d, while Kentucky and Tennessee with costs of $109.41 and $121.17 per year are 50th and 49th on this scale.

Another factor to consider is the per capita income. This information, taken from the "Survey of Current Business." Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, August 1963, is shown in column L of the attached table. Nevada with $3,278 and Delaware with $3,102 top the list of States in per capita income earned, while Mississippi with $1,285 and Arkansas with $1,504 are 50th and 49th, respectively.

Probably the most significant figures on the attached table are shown in column N. These figures represent the percent of costs per adult in relation to per capita income. Note that these percentages vary from those which relate per capita income with total population. These percentages relate per capita income with the adult population. They were determined by dividing the 1963–64 school costs per adult as shown in column J by the average 1962 per capita income, as shown in column L. This is a measure of the effort being made to provide adequate funds for good public school education in terms of the ratio of children to adults as related to the average per capita income. The ranking of States in this effort is shown in column O. On this scale, New Mexico and Alaska rank first and second with 12.7 percent and 12.4 percent of their average per capita income in relation to each adult costs per child in school going to meet the costs of operating public schools. At the other end of the scale, at 50th and 49th respectively, are Massachusetts at 5.6 percent and Delaware at 5.9 percent.

The sparsely settled States in the mountain regions of the country rank highest in individual taxpayer effort measured in these terms. Likewise, many of the Southern States with small per capita incomes show a greater effort than the majority of States in the higher income brackets. For example, Mississippi, which spent only $241 per child in 1963–64, ranks 7th in relative effort, while Delaware and Massachusetts with 2d and 8th highest per capita incomes rank 49th and 50th, respectively.

The amount paid for teachers' salaries is another important factor in maintaining good public education. Statewide average figures are shown in column P for the 1962–63 school year and in column R for 1963–64. Ranking by States is shown in columns Q and S. With few exceptions these rankings parallel the rankings in the per capita income picture. Poorer States are unable to provide salaries comparable to those paid by States with high per capita incomes. While California and New York with average yearly salaries of $7,800 and $7,400 rank 2d and 3d, they rank 25th and 38th, respectively, in their relative effort to support school operating costs. At the other end of the scale we find Mississippi with $3,975 and Arkansas with $4,098 average yearly teaching salaries. Mississippi is ranked 7th and Arkansas 13th in their relative effort to support school operating costs.

The level of education maintained in every State in the Union is an important consideration to all States for many reasons, including the migration which is constantly taking place. While the Federal Government may participate in financing schools, the control of education is rightly a State function. This control has been firmly established through school district organization to keep the determination of what shall be taught at the local school district level. How it is taught is related to who teaches it, and teachers are bound to be attracted to the States which pay more attractive salaries. This situation is creating one of the greatest tragedies facing free public education in America. So long as teachers keep moving into relatively wealthy States, the cream of the teaching profession will be drained from the poorer States which are unable to maintain comparable salary schedules. And while each State has the basic responsibility for its educational program, the ability of its taxpayers to pay the bills is an important factor to be considered. If equal educational opportunity is to become a reality throughout the United States, the matter of spreading the costs of education is a responsibility the American people must accept on a national basis.

In summary, it appears obvious that there is real justification for thinking in terms of equalizing educational opportunities for children wherever they may live. Certainly such equalization is justified in terms of a formula that would take into consideration the ratio of children to adults, the amount being spent per child, the per capita income, and the relative effort being made by the taxpaying public to provide for a good level of education.

The School Assistance Act of 1961, introduced in the House as H.R. 4970 and in the Senate as S. 1021, provides for the application of this principle of equalization. It is a step in the direction of providing equal educational opportunities for all children.

This School Assistance Act also prohibits Federal control with the following specific provision:

"In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum plan of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

The act also provides that the State-local financial effort must be maintained at the

average of the previous 3 years or the State will receive a proportionate reduction in its Federal allotment. Federal allotments will also be reduced if the State-local effort is below the national average of effort and if that particular State's effort does not rise at the same rate as the national average of effort.

The provision for helping to develop equal educational opportunities with the control of education firmly established at the local school district level is an important milestone in the progress of education in America.

Comparison study of school operating costs in relation to population and income

State and region	Estimated population, July 1, 1963 (A)	Public-school enrollment, 1963–64 (B)	Percent of enrollment to total population, 9631–64 (C)	National ranking (D)	Percent of population of voting age and over to total population (E)	National ranking (F)	Percent of total population under voting age not in public schools, 1962 (G)	Average yearly operating expenditures per pupil, 1963–64 (H)	National ranking (I)	School costs per adult, 1963–64 (J)	National ranking (K)	1962 per capita personal income [1] (L)	National ranking (M)	Percent of school operating costs per adult in relation to per capita income (N)	National ranking (O)	Average salary, public school instructional staffs, 1962–63 (P)	National ranking (Q)	Average salary, public school instructional staffs, 1963–64 (R)	National ranking (R)
NEW ENGLAND																			
Maine	982,000	228,400	23.3	23	58.9	16	17.8	$378	38	$149.53	31	$1,917	38	7.8	24	$4,871	40	$5,100	38
New Hampshire	627,000	123,818	19.7	45	60.1	10	20.2	427	27	139.97	40	2,206	26	6.3	41	5,125	35	5,275	34
Vermont	390,000	83,900	21.5	37	59.5	12	19.0	387	35	139.84	41	2,005	36	7.0	37	4,970	37	5,250	36
Massachusetts	5,218,000	1,022,000	19.6	46	62.1	3	18.3	475	17	149.92	30	2,769	8	5.6	50	6,200	14	6,410	14
Rhode Island	885,000	153,500	17.3	50	58.6	19	24.1	500	10	147.61	33	2,372	16	6.2	43	6,100	16	6,300	16
Connecticut	2,666,000	542,260	20.3	43	61.0	6	18.7	552	4	183.70	17	3,089	3	5.9	46	6,750	4	7,050	4
MIDDLE ATLANTIC																			
New York	17,708,000	[2] 3,198,000	18.1	49	62.2	2	19.7	705	1	205.15	12	2,930	4	7.0	38	7,250	3	7,400	3
New Jersey	6,470,000	1,251,000	19.3	47	60.8	7	19.9	568	3	180.30	21	2,887	6	6.2	44	6,510	7	6,711	7
Pennsylvania	11,424,000	2,170,800	19.0	48	62.3	1	18.7	485	15	147.91	32	2,363	18	6.3	42	5,840	21	6,060	23
EAST NORTH CENTRAL																			
Ohio	10,173,000	2,162,663	21.3	39	58.3	21	20.4	446	25	162.95	29	2,392	14	6.8	39	6,000	18	6,100	21
Indiana	4,694,000	1,110,020	23.6	19	59.1	15	17.3	467	18	186.48	16	2,350	19	7.9	23	6,300	13	6,460	12
Illinois	10,182,000	[3] 2,185,000	21.5	38	61.2	5	17.3	479	16	168.28	27	2,844	7	5.9	47	6,535	6	6,810	5
Michigan	8,116,000	[4] 1,852,528	22.8	31	56.7	28	20.5	452	23	181.76	20	2,416	12	7.5	29	6,544	5	6,603	8
Wisconsin	4,061,000	808,000	19.9	44	58.8	17	21.3	498	11	168.54	26	2,283	21	7.4	31	5,800	22.3	6,120	20
WEST NORTH CENTRAL																			
Minnesota	3,500,000	779,000	22.3	32	57.4	26	20.3	509	9	197.75	13	2,236	24	8.8	11	5,900	20	6,300	17
Iowa	2,780,000	635,728	22.9	29	59.5	13	17.6	456	21	175.50	22	2,189	27	8.0	22	5,312	28	5,494	30
North Dakota	634,000	[4] 145,184	22.9	30	54.9	35	22.2	420	28	175.19	24	2,273	22	7.7	26	4,425	44	4,550	46
South Dakota	737,000	172,152	23.4	22	54.0	39	22.6	403	30	174.63	25	2,065	32	8.5	14	4,000	48	[2] 4,500	47
Missouri	4,328,000	900,000	20.8	41	61.8	4	17.4	419	29	141.02	39	2,384	15	5.9	48	5,417	27	5,626	27
Nebraska	1,460,000	308,500	21.1	40	59.2	14	19.7	385	37	137.22	43	2,270	23	6.0	45	4,880	39	5,030	40
Kansas	2,225,000	[5] 524,000	23.6	20	57.8	24	18.6	448	24	182.92	18	2,188	28	8.4	16	5,287	31	5,462	31
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL																			
Kentucky	3,095,000	683,500	[6] 22.1	35	[6] 60.6	9	17.3	300	45	109.41	50	1,712	44	6.4	40	4,480	43	4,620	45
Tennessee	3,694,000	882,500	23.9	16	57.4	27	18.7	291	47	121.17	49	1,702	46	7.1	36	4,363	45	4,780	43
Alabama	3,347,000	[7] 840,000	25.1	9	55.2	34	19.7	280	48	127.32	47	1,567	47	8.1	20	4,104	47	4,700	44
Mississippi	2,290,000	604,400	26.4	4	51.5	45	22.1	241	50	123.54	48	1,285	50	9.6	7	3,700	50	3,975	50
PACIFIC																			
Washington	3,050,000	701,800	23.0	28	56.5	30	20.5	515	8	209.65	9	2,485	11	8.4	17	6,335	13	[8] 6,566	11
Oregon	1,826,000	439,911	24.1	15	60.7	8	15.2	549	5	217.97	6	2,333	20	9.3	9	6,175	15	6,420	13
California	17,590,000	4,315,000	24.5	14	57.5	25	18.0	[9] 530	7	225.83	5	2,898	5	7.8	25	7,500	1	7,800	2
Hawaii	694,000	160,500	[10] 23.1	27	[10] 47.8	49	29.1	402	31	194.27	14	2,403	13	8.1	21	6,070	17	6,160	18
Alaska	248,000	[2] 59,115	23.8	18	[11] 45.6	50	30.6	634	2	330.90	1	2,667	10	12.4	2	7,400	2	8,233	1
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL																			
Arkansas	1,858,000	444,500	23.9	17	56.0	32	20.1	302	44	128.89	46	1,504	49	8.6	13	3,800	49	4,098	49
Louisiana	3,418,000	796,000	23.3	24	53.0	41	23.7	399	32	175.41	23	1,705	45	10.3	4	5,300	30	5,275	35
Oklahoma	2,487,000	585,000	23.5	21	58.0	23	18.5	351	39	142.22	38	1,905	39	7.5	30	5,260	33	5,300	32
Texas	10,323,000	2,390,858	23.2	26	54.4	37	22.4	387	35	165.04	28	2,013	35	8.2	19	5,455	26	5,550	28
SOUTH ATLANTIC																			
Delaware	476,000	99,127	20.8	42	56.7	29	22.5	498	12	182.69	19	3,102	2	5.9	49	6,375	12	6,600	9
Maryland	3,289,000	726,900	22.1	36	56.1	31	21.8	489	14	192.64	15	2,683	9	7.2	33	6,413	9	6,727	6
Virginia	4,331,000	965,000	22.3	33	52.9	43	24.8	350	40	147.54	34	2,018	34	7.3	32	5,100	36	5,300	33
West Virginia	1,778,000	450,000	25.3	8	58.4	20	16.3	300	45	129.97	45	1,810	41	7.2	34	4,600	42	[2] 4,800	42
North Carolina	4,760,000	1,183,430	24.9	12	54.3	38	20.8	320	41	146.74	36	1,732	43	8.5	15	5,175	34	5,211	37
South Carolina	2,483,000	652,600	26.3	6	50.4	47	23.3	265	49	138.28	42	1,545	48	9.0	10	4,200	46	4,425	48
Georgia	4,140,000	1,053,197	[6] 25.4	7	[6] 58.2	22	16.4	306	43	133.55	44	1,759	42	7.6	27	4,740	41	4,888	41
Florida	5,652,000	1,253,000	22.2	34	58.8	18	19.0	388	34	146.49	37	2,044	33	7.2	35	5,600	25	6,100	22
MOUNTAIN																			
Montana	707,000	164,000	23.2	25	55.3	33	21.5	493	13	206.83	11	2,207	25	9.4	8	5,275	32	[2] 5,550	29
Idaho	713,000	178,264	25.0	11	53.6	40	21.4	316	42	147.39	35	1,941	27	7.6	28	4,925	38	5,075	39
Wyoming	337,000	92,299	27.4	3	59.6	11	13.0	540	6	248.26	3	2,164	29	11.5	3	5,800	22.3	6,000	24
Colorado	1,961,000	486,910	24.8	13	54.7	36	20.5	460	20	208.56	10	2,370	17	8.8	12	5,800	22.3	5,950	25
New Mexico	1,018,000	[7] 269,134	26.4	5	50.2	48	23.4	440	26	231.39	4	1,824	40	12.7	1	5,940	19	6,162	19
Arizona	1,559,000	392,000	25.1	10	53.0	42	21.9	455	22	215.48	7	2,097	30	10.3	5	6,400	11	6,600	10
Utah	983,000	272,500	27.7	2	50.9	46	21.4	394	33	214.42	8	2,084	31	10.3	6	5,350	29	5,650	26
Nevada	368,000	114,000	31.0	1	52.2	44	16.8	464	19	275.56	2	3,278	1	8.4	18	6,401	10	6,360	15

[1] National average, $2,366.
[2] Estimated by NEA Research Division.
[3] Includes 35,000 unclassified enrollees in grades kindergarten to 12.
[4] Not cumulative but as of a specific date.
[5] Includes reentries.
[6] Voting age in Georgia and Kentucky is 18 and over.
[7] Does not include kindergarten pupils.
[8] Actual instructional staff average, October 1963.
[9] Original figures adjusted by NEA to include expenditures for school lunch and milk program.
[10] Voting age in Hawaii is 20 and over.
[11] Voting age in Alaska is 19 and over.

Sources:
Col. (A): U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports," Oct. 4, 1963.
Col. (B): NEA Research Division, "Estimates of School Statistics," 1963–64.
Col. (E): U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports" October 1962, as of Nov. 1, 1962 (voting age figures). Percentage figured in relation of col. A.
Col. (G): 100 percent less cols. C and E.
Col. (H): NEA Research Division, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1963–64."
Col. (J): Determined by multiplying the percent of enrollment to total population (col. C) by the average yearly expenditures per pupil (col. H) and dividing the product by the percent of population of voting age and over to the total population as shown in col. E.
Col. (L): U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, Survey of Current Business, August 1963.
Col. (N): Determined by dividing school costs per adult (col. J) by the 1962 per capita personal income (col. L).
Cols. (P) and (R): NEA Research Division, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1962–63 and 1963–64."

Big Brother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this era of automation the prediction of big brother's TV eye on us in 1984 seems more and more plausible. But somewhere in the tremendous invasions of personal privacy involved in such a way of life is the caution that Big Brother himself shall be a witness in a criminal case only without objection by the accused or upon the most stringent restrictions.

The delicate scales of balance when the great power of the Federal Government is pitted against a single individual is shown by the editorial from the Manchester Union Leader on March 16, 1964.

Without objection and by unanimous consent I include this editorial entitled "Today, It Is in Tennessee; Tomorrow, It May Be You," in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

TODAY, IT'S IN TENNESSEE; TOMORROW, IT MAY BE YOU

If you think the conduct of the recent trial, if you can call it that, of James Riddle Hoffa, the president of the Nation's largest union, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, doesn't deserve a full-scale congressional investigation, we suggest that you read the information from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is printed at the top of the back page of this paper today. It would be hard to imagine a more grisly destruction of an individual's right or interference with processes of justice, to which every free American is entitled, that is described by Congressman CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, and two of his colleagues, Congressman O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, and Congressman LIBONATI, of Illinois, in their comments on the Hoffa trial delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

As Congressman O'KONSKI says, the gentleman from Nebraska is absolutely right when he says, "Today, it is in Tennessee—tomorrow, it may be you." Then he adds: "There seems to be a double standard developing in this Nation on this matter of constitutional rights. It seems to be a matter of who you are—not what you have done."

In an earlier editorial this newspaper commented on the utter impossibility of Mr. Hoffa and his codefendants receiving a fair trial for allegedly tampering with the jury in a Nashville trial 2 years ago. We pointed out that the jury in the most recent trial was held under such conditions as to create the suspicion in their mind that someone was trying to tamper with them—and thus prejudiced them toward the idea that the defendants must be guilty of tampering with the jury in the previous trial.

If you add to this the fact that the Government used as its principal witness—as a matter of fact, without him they would not seem to have had any case—a man with a criminal record who was, even as he testified, under threat of Federal prosecution, you have a very unpleasant picture, indeed, one completely repugnant to every American's sense of fairplay.

Not only does this Government witness have a criminal record, but, at the Nashville trial, while in a confidential and trusted relationship with Mr. Hoffa, he was actually all the while a Government spy, reporting to Department of Justice attorneys every night. Certainly there must be serious doubts in the minds of any impartial individual as to whether or not this Government witness didn't actually attempt to entrap Mr. Hoffa and his codefendants.

It also was brought out in the trial that the Government had hired another exconvict in Detroit to "get" Mr. Hoffa. As a matter of fact, our readers will be fascinated by the accounts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the type of supersecret surveillance that the Federal agents kept over Mr. Hoffa and his lawyers during the time of the trial, itself. Apparently, with the latest types of secret sending and receiving equipment, the agents talked back and forth to each other from cars and hidden places around where the defendants and lawyers were. These conversations, in turn, apparently were monitored by someone else and are here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The overall picture that this newspaper obtains is a horribly revolting one of the entire force of the Federal Government being focused on one man in order to "get" him.

As this newspaper has said before, this does not look like justice to us. It looks like persecution by the arrogant choir-boy Caesar, the Attorney General Mr. Robert Kennedy, in a vicious determination to satisfy his own ego and convict Mr. Hoffa at any cost, regardless of what happens to American constitutional liberties in the meantime.

A newspaper reports that the chief Government attorney, after the verdict, called up the Attorney General and said to him: "We made it." What type of language is that to describe a serious situation involving the liberties, freedoms and very lives of the defendants? What cheap language. It is understood that the Attorney General smiled and was very happy and "gratified."

Convictions are not something to be smiled about. They are sometimes necessary, but they are not something you rejoice over, like making a point in a touch football game at Hyannis Port.

It is heartening indeed to the average American citizen who realizes how helpless he would be against this type of ruthless, dictatorial power exercised by the Department of Justice, to see that three fearless Congressmen—CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, O'KONSKI of Wisconsin and LIBONATI of Illinois—have the courage to stand up on the floor of the Congress of the United States and say that every man, even if he has been smeared as viciously as Mr. Hoffa, has the right to a fair trial, and to demand that the conduct of the Hoffa trial in Chattanooga, Tenn., be investigated.

We hope that these gentlemen will not only persist in this demand for an investigation but that they will be joined by other Members of Congress. As a matter of fact, not only in the interests of justice, but also for the sake of our own safety and protection, all freedom-loving Americans should also demand that the Chattanooga trial be investigated.

Iowa Legislature Adopts Concurrent Resolution Memorializing Congress To Enact Statute To Insure That Persons Are Counted at Their Voting Residence in the Forthcoming U.S. Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Legislature, meeting in a special session to reapportion the State, has adopted House Concurrent Resolution 5 calling upon the Congress to give serious consideration to the enactment of a statute to insure that persons are counted at their voting residence in the forthcoming U.S. Census.

The thinking behind this resolution is sound and I feel that Congress should give consideration to such a law. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the language of House Concurrent Resolution 5 appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it was adopted by the Iowa Legislature:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

Whereas apportionment of the Iowa Legislature and seats in Congress are based on the U.S. Census, and allocations of Federal aid are based on population formulas, it is imperative that people be counted in their voting residences; and

Whereas it appears that the present statutory rules for taking the U.S. Census are very broad and administrative rules decree that servicemen overseas are not included in the count at all; and servicemen in the United States are counted where they are stationed and college students are counted where they attend college and not in the county or precinct of their voting residence; and

Whereas it appears that these persons should be counted at their place of voting residence in order to fairly apportion legislatures and Members of Congress, and to insure fairness in allocation of Federal funds: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we request the Congress of the United States to give serious consideration to enactment of a statute to insure that persons are counted at their voting residence in the forthcoming U.S. Census; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Iowa Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Secretary of Commerce of the United States.

WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.
ROBERT W. NADEN,
Speaker of the House.

Dr. Nils P. Larsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. GILL
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, our island State has just recently lost a citizen who, for many a year, gave his full measure to our citizens. Dr. Nils P. Larsen dedicated an active and complete life to the many facets of health care in Hawaii. He was interested not only in the medical aspects of health but the social as well. There are many citizens who would not have been with us today but for Dr. Larsen's major accomplishments in preventing infant mortality. All of us in Hawaii are richer for Dr. Larsen's presence and wide-ranging interest in the welfare of our people.

It is with pleasure, as well as sadness for our loss, that I ask the inclusion in the RECORD of the March 21, 1964, Honolulu Advertiser editorial on Dr. Nils P. Larsen:

DR. NILS P. LARSEN

The citation said he deserved the Silver Star for gallantry in action for "directing the evacuation of wounded from the front-line trenches under a heavy concentration of machinegun and artillery fire, constantly exposing himself to such fire with utter disregard for his own safety."

"Five of his seven litter bearers being killed or wounded," it said, "he crawled well forward of the front elements of the 106th Infantry and, finding a wounded soldier who had lain in an exposed position for 36 hours, he carried him upon his back to safety; afterward searching the shell holes in front of the lines until all the wounded or killed of his regiment had been found."

"His undaunted bravery and devotion to his comrades inspired other men of the regiment to volunteer to aid him in this work."

All that was long ago, September 29, 1918, near Ronsey, France. Four years later Dr. Nils P. Larsen arrived in Hawaii to begin a career of unparalleled public service which continued virtually uninterrupted until his death Thursday at age 73.

He died in Queen's Hospital where for 20 of his 40 years here he had labored as medical director and pathologist and from which command post he waged a constant battle for better health and better medicine in Hawaii.

The words of the citation setting forth his heroism in France could as well apply to his years in the islands. He was ever forward of the front elements, ever bold and dauntless, and ever devoted to his comrades, the people of Hawaii.

One of his major achievements, of course, was the elevation of medicine and health on the sugar plantations. On this, the Advertiser commented in 1942 when he retired from Queen's:

"His crusade for improved sanitation, adequate nutrition, proper housing, and better living conditions on our great sugar plantations has helped place these in the forefront, with the lowest incidence of disease and mortality among American industries."

But there was more, much more. He started a school for nurses at Queen's. He established an occupational therapy service. He opened a weekly clinic which attracted national notice. He launched a clean milk campaign which reduced the infant mortality rate.

For a dollar a year he lectured on social hygiene at McKinley High School. He became an expert—a scholar in the true sense—on the medicine of the ancient Hawaiians.

He was an advocate of honest surgery, a stern foe of what he deemed too ready a tendency of some medical men to resort to surgery. He was early, one of the loud voices warning that too much fat in the diet could produce heart disease.

But medicine was only part of the world of this man with the questing, eager mind. He was a traveler and a writer and a lecturer and a color photographer of stature. National magazines published his articles. His color photos hung in major exhibits on the mainland. He was himself an etcher.

And there was a political side to his life. He was a delegate to the Hawaii Constitutional Convention of 1950. And he firmly believed that the world's salvation lay in some form of world federation.

"The only feasible way to stop worldwide chaos is through the federalist movement," he said in 1948. It will mean giving up some sovereignty, giving up the right to murder our next-door neighbor.

He had a flair for the dramatic. Once he helped compose a pageant celebrating the history of old Hawaiian medicine. And another time, with doctors from many lands present for a Pan Pacific Surgical Conference, he dressed up as an ancient kahuna to rededicate a restored healing heiau.

His life was rich in honors. Cornell gave him her fourth annual Alumni Achievement Award in 1952 for his many contributions to health in Hawaii. The Kings of Cambodia and his native Sweden decorated him. California's medical school gave him its coveted Gold-Beaded Cane Award for community service. The Industrial Medical Association gave him its William S. Knudsen Award. The University of Massachusetts gave him an honorary doctor of science degree.

Hawaii gave him love and respect, which he earned as much as any man who ever trod these shores.

He is gone and he is irreplaceable. But Hawaii is an immeasurably better place for his having been here.

Keep the Fed Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Friday, March 20, 1964, commenting on the Federal Reserve bills introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I thought the Members would be interested in reading it:

KEEP THE FED INDEPENDENT

Congress should reject efforts—now centered in a House Banking Subcommittee—drastically to alter the Federal Reserve System and end its present independence and freedom from politics. In the 50 years of its existence, the Fed has proved a valuable and indispensable agency through which the Nation's monetary policies are determined and administered.

The Fed's freedom to operate apart from "day-to-day pressures," as Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon put it, is particularly important today.

In the coming months, the Nation will be testing a novel economic theory put into law by the Kennedy-Johnson administrations. The theory calls for tax cuts in the midst of prosperity and budget deficits, and it puts the country up aaginst inflationary pressures once more. The Federal Reserve must remain free to act, if necessary, to thwart those pressures through stricter monetary policies.

Similar Fed actions in the past have not always been politically popular. They would be even less politically palatable in the months ahead. But by and large the Fed has acted for the national good; its decisions have checked inflation or encouraged expansion at home and stemmed, to some degree at least, loss of dollars and gold abroad.

Fifty years of experience shows without a doubt that the United States needs, and must demand, independence, and courage in monetary affairs. Congress must insure the Nation that such policy will be continued.

Mellowing Atheism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, being somewhat concerned with the Supreme Court decisions barring prayer and reading of the Scriptures in our public schools, I thought an article entitled "Mellowing Atheism" by Robert Morris which appeared in "The Wanderer" on March 12, 1964, was worthy of the attention of readers all over our land.

I am, therefore, inserting "Mellowing Atheism" in the RECORD, as follows:

MELLOWING ATHEISM
(By Robert Morris)

An official Moscow announcement tells us of the new Communist campaign to eradicate religion from Soviet life. Pravda announces that atheist action groups are to be set up in all cities and towns to press for the elimination of all vestiges of religion.

This is another manifestation of the "mellowing" image of the Soviet Union which our policy planners are foisting upon us. While the Soviet Union establishes an Institute of Scientific Atheism under the Academy of Social Sciences, to implement this drive, the effective policymolding influences in the United States continue to assume that Khrushchev's forces are undergoing an "evolutionary" change in direction.

By way of meeting this wholly fanciful evolution, our Supreme Court, which re-

flects the "world community" goal of our planners, is secularizing our own society as vigorously as our mores will permit.

Our Declaration of Independence correctly sets forth that we derive our authority as a nation from the "laws of nature and nature's God" and that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Yet the judges of our highest tribunal hold that government must be neutral between atheism and religion. With this newly discovered premise, they then proceed to hold for the atheist in every one of the school prayer and related cases.

As a result, the wholesome influence on our society of the recitation of a simple nondenominational prayer or Bible reading by schoolchildren is now being denied us. The obvious result of what these judges have wrought will be the establishment of atheism as the state religion.

Our Chief Justice, who generally runs ahead of the other policymoulders, has dramatized this trend by telling Congressmen who were framing legislation to inscribe "in God we trust" over the Supreme Court Building facade, that such an inscription would mar the symmetry of his Court.

Thus, the new world being shaped for us falls into perspective. The trend is everywhere apparent and particularly in Soviet target areas. This week we saw the domination of U Thant and his top assistant, U.N. Under Secretary General Vladimir Suslov, the tough Soviet czar of the Division of Security Council and Political Affairs, extended into the Mediterranean. The news, as I write this, is that the U.N. Security Council has introduced a resolution empowering U Thant, and not the Security Council, to establish a peacekeeping force in Cyprus.

This, of course, is the domain of atheist Suslov, former assistant to atheist Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister who performed the eyeball-to-eyeball lie at the time of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

A fatuous footnote appears on the news story reporting this U.N. action: It says that the Soviet Union might veto the resolution. I await only a statement from Adlai Stevenson saying that the Cyprus solution is a victory for patience and firmness.

Results of Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most important to our democratic Government that the American people have ample opportunity to fully express their views on important issues before the Congress. This is a complex and fast changing era in which we live, and it is sometimes difficult for individuals to feel a part of their Government.

By use of a legislative questionnaire I recently sought the opinion of citizens in my district on major issues. I believe effective representation in Congress depends on carefully studying pending legislation and knowing the effect such measures will have on the Nation, State, district, and individual citizen. By making their voices heard through the opinion survey, each citizen can become a participant in our governmental process.

Questionnaires were mailed to approximately 87,000 households in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee, and 15,608 answers were returned. In hopes the results of my questionnaire may be helpful to other Members of Congress, I insert the tabulations, in percentages, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Other
1. Budget: Do you believe the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	90.9	6.7	2.4
2. Bible: Do you believe schoolchildren should be permitted voluntarily to say prayers or read the Holy Scriptures in class?	94.7	3.7	1.6
3. Youth Corps: Do you favor the creation of a Federal youth program such as the Domestic Peace Corps?	30.3	54.5	15.2
4. Education: Do you favor Federal aid to education (answer all 3)—			
A. For teachers' salaries?	25.0	67.0	8.0
B. For school construction?	35.4	56.7	7.9
C. Through a tax reduction for parents?	37.1	51.9	11.0
5. Civil rights: Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation (answer all 4)—			
A. To guarantee the right to vote?	80.5	15.4	4.1
B. To enforce school integration?	12.5	83.2	4.3
C. To grant equal opportunity for employment?	54.0	38.0	8.0
D. To withhold Federal money from States permitting discrimination?	11.9	81.8	6.3
6. Foreign aid: Do you favor a sharp reduction in (answer all 3)—			
A. Foreign aid to Communist nations?	86.2	10.4	3.4
B. Foreign aid to our allies?	64.2	29.5	6.3
C. All foreign aid spending?	69.3	24.5	6.2
7. Government controls: In general do you feel there are enough laws regulating (answer both)—			
A. Business?	83.3	10.1	6.6
B. Labor Unions?	36.5	56.2	7.3
8. Farm program: Do you favor an agricultural program which has (answer only 1)—			
A. Rigid controls and quotas to regulate farm economy?	6.4		
B. Flexible price supports and voluntary land retirement?	27.0		
C. No controls, no supports—free farm economy?	55.9		10.7
9. Taxes: Do you favor a Federal income tax cut this year (answer only 1)—			
A. Without a reduction in Federal spending?	11.3		
B. Only if Federal spending is reduced?	82.7		6.0
10. Medicare: Do you favor a medical care program for the elderly through (answer only 1)—			
A. Increasing social security taxes?	17.9		
B. A tax reduction to purchase private insurance?	20.8		
C. Voluntary plans without Federal participation?	53.1		8.2

Ray Livingstone Elected President of Welfare Federation of Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Welfare Federation of Cleveland has been serving the needs and interests of the people of Greater Cleveland for the past 50 years. It serves to bring together in common cause more than 200 service organizations for community planning in the fields of health, welfare, and recreation. The federation has pioneered in efforts to bring about a voluntary coordination of organized community resources to meet the human needs of the great community it serves. This work has been widely recognized and acclaimed. Many other cities and communities of our Nation have benefited from the trailblazing efforts of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland.

The federation has elected Raymond S. Livingstone, a leader in Cleveland business and civic life, as its new president. I have known Mr. Livingstone for many years and have long admired his work as a dedicated and highly respected worker for the common good of the community he serves.

I include in my remarks a very interesting article about Mr. Livingstone and the other officers elected to lead the work of the federation:

RAY LIVINGSTONE ELECTED PRESIDENT OF FEDERATION

Raymond S. Livingstone, vice president of Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge, Inc., is the new president of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland, 20th in a line of illustrious Clevelanders who have held this top community welfare post in the last 50 years.

Mr. Livingstone, 57, who had been federation vice president the last 2 years, was elected president at the monthly meeting of the board of trustees at Halle Bros. Co. lounge, February 7, succeeding Fred M. Hauserman, president of the E. F. Hauserman Co., who had served two terms.

Elected new vice presidents are Mrs. Gilbert W. Humphrey and William D. Ginn. Mrs. Humphrey, who had been serving on the federation executive committee, has been active in health and welfare agencies since 1942, following the tradition of her late mother, Mrs. R. Livingston Ireland, who served as vice president of the federation from 1949 to 1951.

HEADS OPERA ASSOCIATION

Mrs. Humphrey is president of the Visiting Nurse Association, president of the Northern Ohio Opera Association and past chairman of the welfare federation's children's council.

Mr. Ginn, a partner in the law firm of Thompson, Hine & Flory, also had been on the federation executive committee and in addition is the new chairman of the federation's committee on older persons.

L. T. Pendleton, Ohio Bell Telephone Co. vice president, was reelected treasurer of the federation, and W. T. McCullough was named to his sixth term as executive director.

Others elected to the executive committee, in addition to the officers, are Mrs. Clark E. Bruner, Dr. Middleton H. Lambright, Jr., who is president-elect of the Cleveland Academy of Medicine; Msgr. F. B. Mohan, director of Catholic Charities Bureau; Kenneth J. Sims, mayor of Euclid, and Bruce Whidden, vice president of Central National Bank. Mr. Hauserman and Edward H. deConingh, partner in Mueller Electric Co., who also is a former federation president, continue as ex-officio members of the executive committee by reason of their continuing membership on the board of trustees.

LEADER IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

The new president, Ray Livingstone, has been a leader in business and civic affairs, both in Cleveland and nationally, for more than 20 years. Born in Pittsburgh, he was brought to Cleveland by his parents at the age of 2 and has lived here ever since. He is a graduate of Cleveland Heights High School and an alumnus of Case Institute of Technology, class of 1928.

He has been associated with Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge and its predecessor company, Thompson Products, for 35 years. In 1943 he was named the company's first personnel manager and has directed its personnel and human relations activities in the 30-year span since then. He was made a company vice president in 1942.

Mr. Livingstone has held top posts in industrial relations councils of the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Management Association, and the National Industrial Conference Board, and has just retired as chairman of the Aerospace Industries Industrial Relations Committee. He is currently a vice president of Associated Industries of Cleveland and is a trustee of the American Enterprise Institute.

HEADED COMMUNITY CHEST

He has been a leader in community health and welfare activities since 1941, having served as president of the Community Chest in 1958 and 1959 and as chairman of the chest's division A and as campaign chairman. He also has been chairman of the industrial division of the joint hospital fund campaign, vice president of Euclid-Glenville Hospital board and chairman of the hospital's fundraising campaign, chairman of the YMCA's personnel committee, a member of the boards of the Boy Scouts, the Anti-Tuberculosis League and the Citizens League and vice chairman of the Cuyahoga County Mental Hospital Commission. He was a founder of the Welfare Federation's Occupational Planning Committee, is chairman of the Development Committee of the Natural Science Museum, and serves on the boards of the Cleveland Zoological Society, and of Bluecoats, Inc.

Always active in behalf of his alma mater, Case Tech, he served two terms as president of the Case Alumni Association and has played a leading role in the Case development program. He holds an honorary doctor's degree in engineering and two citations from Case, and also was given the Community Chest's Distinguished Service Award.

Mr. Livingstone is a Scottish Rite Mason, member of the Shrine, and has been nominated for the 33d degree.

With his wife, Sylvia, he lives at 14 Lyman Circle, Shaker Heights. The two Livingstone children are Raymond S., Junior, a certified public accountant now attending Harvard Graduate School of Business, and Barbara Anne, a language teacher in a New York City high school.

County Recreation for Family Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 in Honolulu at the Western Region District Meeting of the National Association of Counties, Kenneth E. Teter, member of the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County, Wash., delivered in outstanding paper entitled "County Recreation for Family Use."

Clark County has done an exceedingly fine job in its recreation program. In fact, probably the outstanding job for a rural county in my State.

I am sure that other Members will be as interested as I was to learn of the Clark County details as presented by Mr. Teter in this extremely thoughtful and able address:

COUNTY RECREATION FOR FAMILY USE

The counties of Washington State take great pride in the traditional services provided their residents: property appraisal, tax assessment, document recording, courts, law enforcement, and other basic governmetnal services. The development and operation of recreation facilities is a relatively new responsibility of county government. While a 1937 statute first authorized counties in the State of Washington to acquire camping, scenic view, and recreation park sites; it was not until 1949 (ch. 36.68 RCW) that counties were authorized to acquire, improve and maintain park and plagyround systems for public recreation purposes and to establish county public recreation programs. The policy decisions that county administrators are making, or not making, at this time will largely determine how we meet our responsibility toward recreation.

The county which I represent, Clark County, named after a famous American explorer, proudly boasts as being the cradle of northwest civilization, the first city in the Northwest, the first school, the first sermon ever preached and probably the first public park.

In this same pioneering spirit we have accepted the challenge of our new responsibility to promote county recreation for family use. Our county administration concurs with the National Park Service philosophy that, "Recreation is the pleasurable and constructive use of leisure time. It is a physical and mental need, a necessary relaxation and release from strain. Recreation may be physical, intellectual, emotional, or esthetic; it may be active or passive; it may be engaged in virtually anywhere and at any time; it is individual, personal, spontaneous, and involves freedom of choice. Since that which benefits the individual benefits society, recreation becomes a concern of society."

In accepting the challenge of this new responsibility with more than lipservice, we've embarked on an aggressive program for the acquisition of land. The generally accepted standard for recreation facilities, promoted for example by the National Recreation Association for many years, has been 1 acre for every 100 people, but a number of the park and recreation people are now saying this is too low. In Clark County, we are striving for a ratio of 1 acre for every 75 people. This parklands inventory standard must consider projected population growth. In the past year alone, we've increased our park acreage to more than 300 percent of our 1962 ownership.

In more than a century of government from 1844 to 1963 Clark County provided fewer than 270 acres for parks. These were provided since 1935, and the 1937 authority for parks. They consist of 244 acres of natural scenic beauty, situated on both sides of the clear and shaded east fork of the Lewis River. This park is located in the approximate center of the county and about 3 miles from a historically significant community known as Battle Ground.

About 10 years ago we developed a neighborhood park for one of our rapidly growing urban communities known as Hazel Dell. This park contains 20 acres of rolling, wooded land with picnic grounds and a ballfield. More recently, the county received a gift of 5 acres on the shore of the mighty Columbia River. This beautiful waterfront property will be developed as a beach park for family use, with picnic and swimming facilities.

During 1963 Clark County acquired an additional 460 acres of recreation land for its rapidly expanding park system. There hundred acres of this acquisition are in one extensive natural area that was a gift from the Crown Zellerbach Corp. It has a mile of shoreline on a serene mountain lake where we have prohibited the operation of motorboats. There are rugged hill and canyon trails that challenge the mountaineer, and gentle meandering paths for those who wish to enjoy the peaceful natural beauty of stream and meadow. This park also has ample ground for individual picnic areas, ballfields, and other family recreational uses.

We are also developing a motorboat launching ramp on the Columbia River. A county road that meets the river at a historic steamboat landing will provide the property that we need. The other major addition is 160 acres of waterfront park that we purchased from the U.S. Government. The park is on Yale Lake, a very popular boating and fishing lake that has more than 7 square miles of water surface. This park is completely oriented to recreation associated with boating; it has no public access from the land side. It will be developed specifically for our boaters. We plan to construct a moorage, rest rooms, and picnic tables. We will also provide a drinking water system.

Of special significance in the promotion of facilities for family use, our board of county commissioners recently enacted subdivision regulations which emphasize by policy statement that in each new subdivision there should be provision for playground areas or a cash gift for park and playground purposes.

This aggressive program for acquiring park property and planned recreation development, as well as an effort to preserve open space, has been dictated by our rapid growth and the prospect of an ever greater population.

Our population has doubled since 1940 and will double again by 1980. The population growth projection for Clark County is not guessswork or fortunetelling. It is the result of applying the latest scientific tools and techniques of planning. This new process of planning is as different as the scientist in crystalography being unlike the soothsayer in crystal gazing.

As responsible public officials we recognize the need for acquiring land for public purposes now, in advance of need. We have seen our sleepy urban area suddenly awake to the startling fact that the land was covered with housing and the people had few parks, playgrounds, or open spaces for "pleasurable and constructive use of leisure time."

The population growth of Clark County's principal city, Vancouver, in common with population centers throughout the Nation, has caused the urban use of land to spill beyond the corporate limits of the city. Much of this growth is destined to eventually be annexed to the city, but some of this suburbia is, by design, intended to remain aloof from the city. This aloof group consists of city people who have moved on the "Baronial" estates of a "junior acre" to escape various features of city living. They continue to want and use city services, but refuse to be a part of the corporate body. This segment of suburbia could be identified as "snoburbia."

The social, cultural, and economic ties of these residents of snoburbia generally lie in the city from whence they have fled. They are not true rural residents in the historic sense. They are "suburban delinquents" (those failing to assume their obligations and responsibilities), living in self-imposed exile from city life.

However, the shoburbanite and suburbanite each use the city's recreation program. This has resulted in the city government asking our county government for an annual cash contribution to pay for recreation

services furnished to the noncity resident. The organized and supervised game and craft programs promoted for the city resident are frequently not suitable recreation for a rural family. Residents of both urban and rural county enjoy our parks and open space, whereas the city recreation programs often conflict with the harvestng of crops and other activities that engage the truly rural family. If we should finance a supervised recreation program, our county would not have the necessary money to acquire and develop land for family recreation use now, nor could we set aside the land that will be desperately needed in the foreseeable future. For these reasons our county administration has refused to make an allocation of funds to the city recreation program.

Clark County's recreation policy is to use its money to correct one of the worst consequences of uncontrolled urban sprawl—the disappearance of open space. We are pursuing an aggressive program of acquiring and preserving future recreation lands. Our operating park system is designed for family use by the people who typically neither need nor want the organized recreation program as offered in city parks. Our primary emphasis is on the creative aspect of recreation. By providing the land with essential facilities, the inherent ingenuity of American families will create the recreation, physical, intellectual, emotional, or esthetic, as the individual family demands. This approach to the problem of meeting the need for parks, playgrounds, and open space is doing the job. Our recreation dollar is serving today's wants and providing for tomorrow's needs.

A program of county recreation for family use enhances our environment and provides a foundation for future development of all aspects of recreation, both rural and urban, and at a price we can pay.

Clark County population growth, 1930–80

	Clark County	Metropolitan area	Percent of metropolitan area			
			Clark	Multnomah	Clackamas	Washington
1930	40,316	455,037	8.86	74.33	10.15	6.65
1940	50,127	501,550	9.99	70.80	11.39	7.81
1950	85,307	704,829	12.10	66.90	12.30	8.70
1960	93,809	821,897	11.41	63.61	13.75	11.22
1980	166,000	1,190,000	13.95	54.37	16.55	15.13

Source: Metropolitan planning commission and regional planning commission.

Population growth of urban and nonurban areas of Clark County, 1950–80 (A)

	Urban census tracts	Nonurban census tracts	Total county
Population:			
1960	63,880	29,929	93,809
1980	121,510	44,490	166,000
Numerical increase:			
1950–60	3,884	4,618	8,502
1960–80	57,630	14,561	72,191
Percent increase:			
1950–60	6.47	18.24	9.09
1960–80	90.22	48.65	76.96
Percent of county:			
1950	70.33	29.67	100
1960	68.09	31.91	100
1980	73.20	26.80	100

Agriculture and Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of both consumers and the producers of food is closely tied to an equitable foreign trade policy. In many instances the recent opposition to imports of beef has been marked with more emotion than reason, and some of the remedial actions proposed offer more problems than solutions. Consequently, it is refreshing to find a newspaper in the heart of the American cattle country that gives its readers a complete picture of imports and exports of farm products. I believe the editorial from the March 13, 1964, edition of the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal will be of general interest.

The editorial follows:

AGRICULTURE AND FREE TRADE

It is one thing, and quite understandable, for hard-pressed stockmen to rise up in wrath against the specific problem of greatly increased beef imports.

But it is another thing, and totally unjustifiable, for certain interests to attempt to translate this indignation into all-out attack on international commerce and the current move toward freer trade.

Such a distortion of the present beef crisis has begun. The Omaha daily press now sees the cattle problem as a part of a broader crisis brought about by the policy of undiscriminating free trade. The solution offered is to man the parapets against foreign trade, cower behind our oceanic moat and live in economic isolation.

This medieval idea is the surest possible route to destruction of the bountiful standard of living this country has achieved. And agriculture would take the full brunt of such a disaster.

For about 20 percent of all U.S. farm production today is exported—the output from 1 of every 5 acres harvested in this country. The U.S. Department of Agriculture figures that exports provide 1 million farm jobs over the Nation.

True, the United States imports farm products—$4 billion worth last year, most of it coffee, tea, rubber, and products not grown in this country. But the United States exported $5.6 billion worth of farm goods in 1963.

This was a mighty plus in this country's balance-of-payments battle. Without agriculture's trade with other nations the U.S. outflow of gold would be far more critical than it is. Farm products today account for $1 of every $4 of U.S. exports.

The reason for all this is obvious to anyone willing to look about him. The productive ability of U.S. farmers has far outstripped the demands of this Nation. This ability also enables most food and fiber to be produced in this country at lower costs than in many parts of the world.

A rapidly growing world population, much of it hungry, can use these products. But in order to buy them, they must be able, in turn, to sell something. This, of course, is the essence of international trade. And this is a fundamental reason why more than half the U.S. output of wheat, two-fifths of its soybeans and tallow (an important beef byproduct) and significant portions of its feed grains, poultry, and other commodities go to foreign customers.

U.S. industry, too, has reached the point that it can outproduce the needs of this country alone. Workers manufacturing products for foreign sale are good customers for Nebraska beef and other foodstuffs.

Significantly, Australia, the chief target of the cattlemen's anti-import campaign, spends $100 million more each year to buy U.S. goods than we pay for its products.

It is true that as foreign countries develop their productive capacities, and are able for a time to use cheap labor, they will be tough competitors in certain fields. But it also is true that as this takes place, the demand for a better diet and more consumer goods will rise in those countries, too.

As long as the United States can keep its wage rates and its corporate profit levels from rising faster than its increase in productivity, this country has nothing to fear from foreign competiton.

To assume that Amercan farmers and manufacturers cannot hold their own with competitors around the world is disturbingly fainthearted. To suggest that American agriculture can profit by shutting off foreign trade is dismally shortsighted.

Unfortunate Vote on Aid—A Plea for the Passage of the IDA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal has recently published an editorial deploring the House's action in recommitting the International Development Association bill. I hope Members will take note of the cogency of the Journal's plea that the House reconsider its action and pass the bill. The editorial follows:

UNFORTUNATE VOTE ON AID

The House of Representatives has taken an action that could all but wreck one of the most hopeful developments in foreign aid. It has refused by 208 to 188 to approve the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association (IDA).

The Senate previously approved the bill but the House has now sent it back to committee, where, unless presidential pressure strong enough to revive it is exerted, it will die.

There have long been complaints that foreign aid involved too many gifts instead of loans, that we carried too much of the load without help from our allies, that projects were too often approved without full study, that aid for sometimes politically oriented and that there was not adequate check on how projects were carried out.

Under the IDA program, started in 1960 European allies were brought into the joint aid program. The IDA is known as the "soft loan" arm of the World Bank, and from the start was very popular.

The bill the House shelved would have given U.S. support to a $750 million program of loans to needy nations. This country would have put up $312 million and 16 other nations the rest.

Apparently the timing in the House was unfortunate. The measure was greeted as another aid bill coming too quickly on the heels of the regular foreign aid measure. However, timing could not be helped because the nations supporting IDA had set a March 1 deadline—and if the United States had not agreed to provide its agreed share by that time the program could die. Representative REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, floor manager of the bill, saw the proposal go down before Republican and Southern Democratic votes.

IDA has been a workable and sound phase of the aid program. President Johnson should intervene to reason and get the House to reconsider its abrupt and unfortunate action.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 21, entitled "The Genocide Convention."

Ratification of the Genocide Convention should be given the prompt and serious consideration of the U.S. Senate, and I urge my colleagues to give the matter the attention it warrants:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

At a moment in history when the horrors of Nazi exterminations are again before the bar of West German and world opinion, the United Nations convention outlawing genocide should be in the forefront of national and international policy in many lands. Yet a number of countries, including ours, have failed to ratify it.

The convention was drafted in 1948, largely with U.S. encouragement. It recognized that "at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity." It declared that genocide—murder with intent to destroy a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; forcibly transferring children of the group to another group—is a crime in international law.

Early this year Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and nine other Senators urged the President to support their effort to have the United States ratify the Genocide Convention. The legislators received an equivocal reply from an Assistant Secretary of State, who declared, in general terms, that "it is the intention of the administration to ratify" upon receiving "the advice and consent of the Senate." That put matters back where they were—without a strong White House endorsement.

Since the Convention was drafted, no real drive has been put behind it. Senator FULBRIGHT has said that the situation in the Senate has not yet developed to the point where a two-thirds vote is likely.

The Genocide Convention deserves approval. It does not take away any sovereignty; it does advance the principles of the United Nations and the United States. Most of all, it is a moral commitment to international decency on a matter that has immediacy for many peoples around the world. It would be a bitter irony if in 1964, when the Auschwitz killers are on trial, the United States permitted the Genocide Convention to fade into oblivion.

Accent on Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "Accent on Absurdity," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, March 6, relative to the Federal farm program, merits thoughtful reading.

Confronted as we are with a political attempt to "railroad" the cotton-wheat bill through Congress, we should, to say the least, "stop, look, and listen" that we may be aware of the danger ahead.

The editorial follows:

ACCENT ON ABSURDITY

With the Federal farm program sinking to new depths of foolishness, farmers may be nearing the day when they'll need protection against their would-be political friends.

The program's increasing accent on absurdity is especially evident in the wheat-cotton bill now wending its way through Congress. Seldom has any legislation seemed so well contrived to create costly confusion.

Take the wheat provisions of the bill. A year ago the wheat farmers rejected an administration plan for the tightest Federal regimentation ever, accompanied by a vast increase in the red tape of regulation. Farmers then began holding down their planting, preparing for the first time in decades for something vaguely like a free market.

But the farmers' friends in Washington were unwilling to let that come about. Their solution? Just push though the same program but label it voluntary instead of compulsory.

In addition to a basic support price, each farmer who cut his acreage by 10 percent or so would get "certificates" to cover an export quota and also a domestic sales quota. If he sold his wheat to a domestic processor, the processor would have to buy the certificates from the farmer. If he instead sold the grain to an exporter, the exporter would have to buy his certificates.

Any farmer could participate or not, as he chose. If he decided to stay out, he would have several choices. He could let his wheat stand in the field or rot in storage, or he could treat it as low-price animal feed. For the usual sales channels would be closed to him.

The reason is that the program would compel processors and exporters to participate; they would have to buy certificates to cover the wheat they purchased. By now most farmers, processors, and exporters must question the claim that the program would be "voluntary."

That claim is no more convincing than the argument that the wheat program would save the taxpayers a lot of money. The theory is that processors and exporters, through their purchases of certificates, would assume part of the cost of supporting wheat prices. In reality, the processors would pass along the cost of the certificates to consumers in the prices of their products. And in case the politicians have forgotten, consumers and taxpayers are pretty much the same people.

In cotton, the situation is no less silly. First, Federal supports priced cotton out of world markets, so the U.S. Government began subsidizing exporters. But this made it possible for foreign textile mills to buy U.S. cotton and still undersell American textile mills right in their own backyard. So the Government now proposes yet another subsidy to aid the U.S. mills. If two wrongs did not make a right, it's hard to see how a third will help matters much.

For the cottongrower, too, things would become more confusing. If he agreed to cut his acreage he would get one support price. If he planted his present acres, he would get a lower support. And if he wanted to grow cotton for sales at the lower world market price, he could increase his acreage by around 10 percent.

One of the more ridiculous aspects of all this is that, like the rest of the farm program, it chiefly helps those the politicians are least interested in helping. It ought to be clear that the larger, more efficient farmers, with their lower costs, are the ones who benefit most from the high product prices the programs are intended to bring. The less efficient but politically popular "family farmer" still has a hard time of it—but the politicians' promises encourage him to hang on.

Some in Congress, nonetheless, presumably view the cotton-wheat bill as a powerful magnet for votes in an election year. But there is a growing number of urban voters, too. One man aware of this is Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, who urged the other day that Congress "end once and for all the fantastic and costly surpluses bulging in Government warehouses." Mr. WILLIAMS is a liberal's liberal, but he's also a representative of largely urban New Jersey.

If such pressures grow great enough and the farm program continues to plumb new depths of nonsense, the farmers one day may face not an orderly transition to a free market but a wrathful explosion.

A Letter From a Beef Producer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, by way of continuing interest in the present cattle crisis, and to provide a dramatic example of the disastrous effect foreign beef is having upon farmers, I want to introduce a letter written by a farmer who has been through the wringer.

The letter explains the farmer-feeder's position in the meat-producing chain, what it cost to produce beef, and the extent of one loss in this crisis.

It is my belief that once some of my colleagues who represent metropolitan centers, realize the actual amount of dollars and cents wrapped up in cattle feeding and also the speed in which a farmer-feeder can lose a lifetime of earnings, they might be more favorably inclined to act with dispatch on pending beef import limiting legislation.

Therefore, by unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD today I offer the following letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEERMANN: I see where Congressmen have asked a 50-percent reduction in imports. We sure need something done. I will show you the facts of

our operation (my son and I). We have 650 head of cattle left.

We recently marketed 31 head in St. Joe, Mo., so I will use 1 steer to show what it (the present cattle crisis) is costing us. The steers averaged 1,230 pounds.

Purchase price of steer (850 pounds at $23 per hundredweight)	$195.50
60 bushels corn at $1.15	69.00
200 pounds protein	6.00
Selling and hauling expenses	10.00
Total	280.50
Cost of production, 1 steer	280.50
Sold at 1,230 pounds at $19.25 per hundredweight	236.77
Loss per head	43.73

The loss did not include interest (on money from the bank) labor or death loss. You can see why we think something should be done.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues will have checked through the simple set of figures above, and remember that my farmer friend has another 650 head of cattle yet to market, they will see he is facing the probability of a loss somewhere in the neighborhood of $28,000. When one remembers similar loses are occurring on countless farms throughout the feeding area, one begins to appreciate the magnitude of a crisis that may eventually cost the livestock producers well over $4 billion.

Federal Trade Commission Decision on Procter & Gamble-Clorox Merger Is a Major Breakthrough in the Application of the Celler-Kefauver Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this country is experiencing the most far-reaching merger movement in its history. Fed by vast accumulations of liquid resources building up in the vaults of big business, this merger movement poses a serious threat to the survival of our competitive free-enterprise system.

For some time a joke has been circulating to the effect that General Motors is saving up to buy the Federal Government. In some ways, this is no joke at all, for General Motors holds cash and marketable securities of some $2 billion, or more than the assessed valuation of 18 of the 50 States.

What is true of General Motors is true of many of our giant corporations. Favorably treated by tax adjustments designed to encourage investment in new plants and equipment, these giant corporations are taking another route. They are using their new savings to gobble up other companies through mergers and acquisitions.

Too few people realize that this utilization of corporate funds frustrates Government efforts to stimulate investment activity and economic growth in two ways. First, it diverts corporate resources into mergers instead of the building of new plants and the development of new technical resources. Secondly, through the merger movement, economic concentration and oligopoly are increased, making our economic system less competitive and flexible. Indeed, the more monopoly or quasi-monopoly there is in America the more rigid are prices and the less incentive there is for business to reduce prices to stimulate consumer demand and business activity.

As a consequence, the Government has to step in to cut taxes and put purchasing power in the hands of consumers, to enhance demand and enable our giant industries to put unused capacity back to work. In short, the very big business elements that decry the growth of big government bring it on themselves by inhibiting the free enterprise system which should itself be doing the job of increasing consumer demand and expanding business activity.

MERGER MOVEMENT IS THE MOST PROLONGED IN HISTORY

The merger movement which began during the closing years of World War II is the most prolonged in the history of this Nation. In duration and extent, it exceeds the great merger movements of the 1890's and the 1920's. And the end is not in sight. Let me quote an article which appeared just the other day—February 4—in the Wall Street Journal. The article was entitled "Merger Fever: Companies Push Hunt for Firms To Acquire, Run Into Big Obstacles." What are these obstacles? Simply, as the subheadlines of the article indicates, that "Rivalry Thins Out Candidates—Lifts Prices." The Wall Street Journal leads off with this statement from a Philadelphia management consultant:

> Mergers are the order of the day, now that so many people are doing it. It's contagious.

Running down the article one finds a box headed "Acquisition-Minded Firm Itself Is Beseiged by Offers."

This Wall Street Journal article reflects what the facts show, that there has been no diminution in the merger movement.

CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT PASSED IN 1950 AT A TIME WHEN POSTWAR MERGER MOVEMENT STARTED ITS TREMENDOUS UPSWEEP

I am proud of the fact that my name is associated with the key antitrust statute concerned with monopolistic mergers—the Celler-Kefauver Act.

The Celler-Kefauver Act was passed in 1950, at a time when the postwar merger movement was just beginning to start its tremendous upsweep. We saw the early outcropping of this merger movement during the closing years of World War II. A temporary peak was reached in 1946–47 and merger activity declined briefly. Some of my colleagues at the time thought it unnecessary to close the gaping hole in the Clayton Act which had permitted so much concentration in American industry. Nevertheless, the late Senator Kefauver and I persisted and our efforts were finally rewarded in passage of the amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act.

History proved us right. The merger movement was destined to move toward new heights, presenting ever-increasing threats to our free enterprise system.

CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT HAS FORESTALLED MONOPOLIES

One might ask why the merger movement has persisted despite the Celler-Kefauver Act—widely considered a highly effective antitrust statute.

The plain fact is that had the Celler-Kefauver Act not been passed we would have witnessed an even greater merger movement, and most of our basic industries would have turned into virtual monopolies.

How many steel companies would we have today if the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger had not been blocked by the Celler-Kefauver Act? Judge Weinfeld predicted that the industry would have turned into a "triopoly."

How concentrated would the shoe business be and how many independent shoemen would have been forced out of business had not the Supreme Court ruled against the Brown-Kinney merger as a violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act?

What would be happening in the food industry today if the Federal Trade Commission had not mounted a strenuous program under the Celler-Kefauver Act to block mergers in such industries as grocery retailing and milk. Well over 100 cases have been brought under the Celler-Kefauver Act challenging more than 600 mergers. The act has withstood vigorous tests at the Federal Trade Commission, in the district courts, in the appellate courts, and in the Supreme Court.

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL MERGERS GIVEN SUBSTANTIAL TEST IN COURTS

There are, of course, different kinds of mergers. Economists usually classify these into three broad categories: horizontal, vertical, and conglomerate. A horizontal merger usually involves firms that have been in direct competition selling the same or similar products in the same or similar markets. The vertical merger involves the acquisition by a supplier of one of his customers or the reverse. The conglomerate merger is more complicated and may involve the merging of two firms whose business operations are different and are not easy at times to analyze; nevertheless, such conglomerate mergers may have an effect on competition and could violate the Celler-Kefauver Act as surely as the horizontal and vertical mergers.

As the esteemed majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], stated during the course of the debates on the Celler-Kefauver Act:

> A third avenue of expansion—and this is one of the most detrimental movements to a free enterprise economy—is the conglomerate acquisition. This is the type which carries the activities of giant corporations into all sorts of fields, often completely unrelated to their normal operations. In times such as these, when big corporations have such huge quantities of funds, they are constantly looking around for new kinds of businesses to enter. By this process they build up huge business enterprises which enable them to play one type of business against another in order to drive out competition.

Antitrust enforcement, as we all know, has developed on a case by case basis. It

takes time for the Commission and the courts to digest and interpret a new statute. A recent staff report issued by my able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], commented on the situation as follows:

To sum up, the merger movement of the 1950's and 1960's poses many problems for small business. During a period when the number of businesses has failed to keep pace with the growth in the economy as a whole, serious inroads are being made into the ranks of medium-sized and small business by the merger movement which tends to siphon off the more successful firms. The merger movement has pushed into postwar heights and affected a wide spectrum of industries with dairy products, paper, chemicals, petroleum, aerospace electronics, motors, textiles, and chain food distribution most prominent.

Then it concludes:

The antitrust laws, which failed to stem the horizontal and vertical merger movements of the 1890's and 1920's have had no visible deterrent effect on the conglomerate merger movement of the 1950's and 1960's. History indeed reveals a striking cultural lag in the fashioning of restraints on the growth of concentrated economic power.

PROCTER & GAMBLE DECISION FIRST TO COPE WITH CONGLOMERATE MERGERS

Just recently, however, a major decision by the Federal Trade Commission cast some light on the way in which the Celler-Kefauver Act may be used to stem the tide of conglomerate mergers. In a recent decision written by Commissioner Elman, the Commission concluded that the merger between Procter & Gamble, the Nation's largest soap and detergent company, and the Clorox Chemical Co., the Nation's largest bleach manufacturer controlling almost 50 percent of the bleach market may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly and thus violate the Celler-Kefauver Act. The decisive factor in the case was Procter & Gamble's tremendous advertising and other sales promotion advantages—advantages available neither to an independent Clorox nor to its smaller competitors in the bleach industry. Procter & Gamble-Clorox was not an extreme conglomerate merger but had some conglomerate aspects, since it was a "product-extension merger." As the Commission said:

By this acquisition, then, Procter has not diversified its interest in the sense of expanding into a substantially different, unfamiliar market or industry. Rather, it has entered a market which adjoins, as it were, those markets in which it is already established, and which is virtually indistinguishable from them insofar as the problems and techniques of marketing the product to the ultimate consumer are concerned.

In short, Procter & Gamble previously had not been engaged in the bleach business, so no competition between Procter & Gamble and Clorox was eliminated by the merger. Nevertheless, the Commission viewed the merger as damaging to competition because of the tremendous market advantages enjoyed by Procter & Gamble, which, in turn, would place the remaining bleach manufacturers in a position where they could not continue to compete effectively and new entry into the bleach industry would be discouraged.

If mergers not falling into the familiar horizontal or vertical categories are to be considered in respect to their probable effect on competition, the Commission said, the basic policy consideration which moved Congress to enact the Celler-Kefauver Act must be brought into play. The Commission listed five such factors applicable to the Procter & Gamble-Clorox merger, as follows:

1. The relative disparity in size and strength as between Procter and the largest firms of the bleach industry.
2. The excessive concentration in the industry at the time of the merger, and Clorox's dominant position in the industry.
3. The elimination, brought about by merger, of Procter as a potential competitor of Clorox.
4. The position of Procter in other markets.
5. The nature of the economies enabled by the merger.

The Commission raised the following question:

What are the consequences for competition, if in an industry, such as we have described, a firm such as Procter is substituted for the industry's dominant firm? We find that there are significant areas in which absorption by Procter is likely to affect Clorox's competitive position.

The Commission analyzed the advertising and promotional advantages of Procter & Gamble, stating:

In the first place, the record shows that in the liquid bleach industry the merger of a relatively small, single-product firm with a very large, multiproduct firm enables substantial cost savings and other advantages in advertising and sales promotion, especially in television advertising.

Because of the enormous volume of its advertising, the Commission noted, Procter & Gamble secured the maximum discounts. Such discounts were unavailable to Clorox even though it spent over $1 million a year on advertising of all kinds on television stations. Such expenditures, the Commission found, "did not entitle Clorox to discounts of any substance."

In addition:

With Clorox now a part of the Procter line, for the same amount of money Clorox spent on network television advertising prior to the merger, at least 33⅓ percent more television advertising can now be obtained.

Procter has many other such advertising advantages not possessed by an independent Clorox, much less any of Clorox's smaller rivals. The plain fact is that if the merger of Procter & Gamble and Clorox were to be permitted, it could be anticipated that all of the smaller independent rivals of Clorox sooner or later would face virtual extinction. It was difficult enough for them to compete with Clorox, since Clorox had been able to garner nearly one-half of the market for household bleach. But if Clorox were given all of the tremendous advertising discounts of Procter & Gamble it is easy to see that soon the independent bleach industry would disappear, probably by being gobbled up by the giant soap companies, three of whom control some 90 percent of the soap and detergent business of the country.

The Commission pointed to other competitive advantages Procter conferred upon Clorox:

First. Clorox distributed through independent brokers, Procter has its own direct sales force.

Independent brokers handle the products of many manufacturers and frequently carry competing brands; they have no particular interest in pushing one brand rather than another. Procter's sales force deals only in Procter products and spends considerable effort assuring these products adequate and prominent shelf space and special displays. In light of the critical role played by shelf space in liquid-bleach competition, use of a direct sales force—a device that may be fully efficient only for a multiproduct firm—would in all likelihood substantially increase Clorox's already great market power.

Second. Procter's bargaining position with retailers is greater:

That Procter is the leading producer of a number of products marketed through grocery stores may enable it to induce retailers to give favored treatment to Clorox in the crucial fight for shelf space or otherwise concede especially advantageous terms involving the retail selling of Clorox bleach. We need not go so far as to find that leverage of the kind that supports tie-in and full-line forcing arrangements may be Procter's to wield in behalf of Clorox. Given Procter's position as a well-established producer of a broad range of common grocery items—many of them must items—it would seem likely that Procter can obtain from retailers, as a matter not of coercion but of convenience or expediency, certain advantages in the display or marketing of its products which are not available to a single-product producer, such as the premerger Clorox.

Third. Procter's "breadth of experience and degree of financial strength beyond anything possessed by the existing members of the industry."

Fourth:

The barriers to entry, already very high, have been markedly heightened by the merger—to the point at which few firms indeed would have the temerity or resources to attempt to surmount them.

It cannot be overemphasized that the Celler-Kefauver Act was designed to nip monopoly in the bud. Congress wished to put a halt to the creation and extension of oligopoly. It wished to stop the development of oligopolies whether achieved by horizontal, vertical, or conglomerate mergers. Now at long last the Procter & Gamble decision promises to narrow the "striking cultural lag" in dealing with conglomerate mergers to which my colleague, the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. PATMAN] report referred. No longer can the conglomerate merger movement go forward wholly unchecked by the antitrust enforcement agencies.

The Commission is to be congratulated for its enlightened recognition of economic realities in blocking the Procter & Gamble and Clorox merger.

FTC OPINION IS NOT AN ATTACK ON ADVERTISING

The FTC's opinion in the Procter & Gamble case was in no way an attack on advertising. Indeed, it stresses the importance of advertising in our competitive economy. Rather the Commission's decision was an effort to preserve equal opportunity in the marketplace for smaller, independent firms. Advertising is just as important, perhaps even more

important, for smaller firms than for the entrenched giant. Yet advertising rates often discriminate against small firms and in favor of the dominant company. The competitive imbalance is particularly aggravated where, as in the Procter & Gamble case, the industry leader is acquired by a giant corporation with both vast resources and the inclination, based on past performance, to throw those resources into the competitive struggle.

The advertising trade journals differed considerably in their reactions to the Procter & Gamble decision. A reasoned and constructive editorial in the December issue of Advertising Age had this to say:

It will seem to a good many people in advertising that Commissioner Phillip Elman went out of his way to express an antiadvertising bias in his opinion on the case, but whether this is true or not, he raised a point which the advertising business already has ignored for too long.

* * * * *

The existing discount structure does, in the view of many, provide more than adequate rewards for bigness. Regardless of what happens in the Clorox or other cases, thoughtful people in the media business will do well to review the pricing structure of the business with great care, to determine whether it meets current conditions fairly and equitably.

Printer's Ink, on the other hand, viewed the Procter & Gamble opinion as an attack on advertising in general. In an editorial which appeared on January 17, 1964, Printer's Ink stated:

For years the insidious idea that advertising is an economic waste has been seething in Washington * * *. The FTC opinion questions some of the fundamental practices of the advertising business and companies competing within our economic system.

Printer's Ink also asserted:

Thus, the FTC has assumed legal authority to determine which kinds and how much advertising are useful or wasteful.

The Printer's Ink editorial, I believe, ignores the basis upon which the Commission acted to block the Procter & Gamble and Clorox merger; namely, equality of opportunity in advertising. Should the Commission have approved a merger which would have conveyed upon Clorox the enormous advertising advantages enjoyed by Procter, if this would threaten the existence of an independent bleach industry?

Printer's Ink also ignores what the Commission really said about waste in advertising.

First, the Commission discussed the positive values of advertising in a competitive free enterprise economy, in the following words:

Advertising performs a socially and economically useful function insofar as it educates the consumer to the broad range of product alternatives that he should consider in seeking to make an optimal allocation of his necessarily limited economic resources. Advertising, then, should stimulate competition, and by increasing the sales of the advertised product, lower the unit cost of that product.

The Commission then drew a distinction between "socially and economically useful" advertising and that designed to entrench the market power of the advertiser, stating:

Sellers who vie with one another, through advertising and other promotional activities, to create a consumer preference for their brands, may be laudably engaged in competition such as the antitrust laws are intended to protect. On the other hand, such sellers may, as here, be engaged in brand "competition" to the end only of maintaining high prices, discouraging new entry, and, in general, impairing, not promoting, socially useful competition.

Referring to the liquid bleach industry, the Commission observed:

But this [advertising] process is distorted in the case of a homogeneous product, such as household liquid bleach, produced under conditions of oligopoly, such as obtained in the liquid bleach industry. Since there is no reason (save cheapness and availability) for a consumer to prefer one brand of liquid bleach over another, there is no real need for the various manufacturers to incur as heavy advertising expenses as they do—except to protect their market shares. Heavy advertising, under such conditions, does not, in any meaningful sense, serve to broaden the consumer's range of product alternatives. Moreover, since oligopolists typically refrain from price competition, large advertising expenditures in the liquid bleach industry have not resulted in a lower unit price to the consumer. (Clorox, the most extensively advertised liquid bleach, is also the most expensive for the consumer.) Thus we have a situation in which heavy advertising benefits the consumer, who pays for such advertising in the form of a higher price for the product, not at all.

The Commission thus concluded:

In sum, the undue emphasis on advertising which characterizes the liquid bleach industry is itself a symptom of and a contributing cause to the sickness of competition in the industry. Price competition, beneficial to the consumer, has given way to brand competition in a form beneficial only to the seller. In such an industry, cost advantages that enable still more intensive advertising only impair price competition further; they do not benefit the consumer.

I believe the Commission has fairly appraised the impact of advertising power and prowess in aggravating the competitive imbalance where a giant corporation invades an adjacent market by acquiring the industry leader, thereby dwarfing the smaller competing firms.

The Procter & Gamble decision is not an attack on advertising. Rather, it represents a long stride forward in applying the Celler-Kefauver Act to conglomerate mergers which threaten to restrain competition and to create monopolistic conditions. The Federal Trade Commission is to be commended on a carefully reasoned decision in harmony with the provisions and purposes of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

Mr. Speaker, I append to these remarks an able article on advertising and the Procter & Gamble decision in the Saturday Review of Literature for February 8, 1964:

MADISON AVENUE ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS

(By Peter Bart)

Madison Avenue has been evincing a growing desire to define more specifically the role of advertising in the economy. Prominent admen have reasoned that the field of advertising would not be so widely assailed if the public understood its importance as an economic stimulant. Thus a number of admen have been trying, in their public utterances, to outline the ways in which advertising contributes to the Nation's economic health.

Unfortunately, in making their case, they have done what admen all too often do; namely, oversold their product. The extravagant economic claims that have been made for advertising have caused many an economist and businessman to wince and, more recently, have been brought some words of dissent from Federal regulators.

Some of the economic defenses advanced by the advertising community have run as follows:

1. Advertising facilitates mass consumption and thus mass production. This argument was stated most unabashedly not long ago by Norman Strouse, president of the Nation's largest agency, J. Walter Thompson, who noted: "Without mass selling through advertising, mass production and mass consumption would not be feasible. This is a simple rationale for advertising, and one which it should be possible to communicate to others in all walks of life."

Mr. Strouse's rationale rests, of course, on some serious oversimplifications. For one thing, many mass production industries such as steel and chemicals have traditionally done relatively little advertising—yet they remained mass production industries. Indeed, as Prof. Harry G. Johnson of the University of Chicago has pointed out, the economy was headed for mass production and mass consumption "well before the advent of modern advertising as we know it."

Even today, many economists would point out that the continuance of a "mass consumption economy" would depend on a wide variety of factors—such as the distribution of income—that are far more basic than advertising.

2. Advertising lowers prices. This increasingly seems to be a favorite argument among admen. The National Association of Tobacco Distributors not long ago approved a resolution praising advertising for lowering the prices of cigarettes by opening up wider markets.

The trouble with this argument is that it ignores the basic aim of advertising—to build brand loyalty that will withstand price competition. Any supermarket shopper knows that the nationally advertised brands almost always carry higher price tags than do nonadvertised, private-label goods. Neil Borden of the Harvard Business School noted many years ago in the Economic Effects of Advertising that advertising tends to cause price rigidity even in periods of general price decline.

3. Advertising encourages competition. In a recent talk, Howard Morgens, president of Procter & Gamble, argued that advertising provides the mechanism whereby all companies can compete for consumer approval in the marketplace—indeed, that advertising "forces competition." Moreover, he said, advertising, by encouraging manufacturers to take their case before the public, indirectly stimulates product improvements.

Mr. Morgens' ideas about competition received a setback recently when the Federal Trade Commission ordered P. & G. to sell the Clorox Chemical Co., which it had acquired for $30 million in order to enter the liquid household bleach business.

The basic reason advanced by the FTC was a fascinating one—namely, that P. & G., using the mechanism of advertising, would monopolize the bleach market. Advertising, said the FTC, would enable P. & G. to kill competition in the bleach business—a contention that obviously ran counter to Mr. Morgens' economic theories.

When P. & G. bought Clorox, said the FTC, Clorox accounted for 48.8 percent of the bleach market, with Purex a distant second with 15.7 percent. A multiplicity of local and regional bleach companies also were in the market with brands that sold at prices well below those of Clorox.

Under the aegis of P. & C., said the FTC, Clorox could now establish total dominance in the market by calling on advertising resources that would be unavailable to competitors.

One such resource involved discounts extended by the advertising media to their best customers—such as P. & G. Thanks to these discounts, Clorox, as part of P. & G., could obtain nearly one-third more advertising on television for the same expenditure of money. Discounts of similar magnitude extended by national magazines also would permit Clorox to get greater use from its advertising dollars.

There were other advantages as well. Clorox, as part of P. & G., could obtain superior time periods for its TV ads, according to the FTC. If regional competition in any part of the Nation became especially intense, Clorox ads could, on short notice, be substituted for those of any other P. & G. product, thus permitting extraordinary flexibility of marketing strategy.

In ordering P. & G. to sell Clorox, the FTC was careful to avoid a blanket indictment of advertising. Advertising performs a useful service to advertisers in helping them sell their goods, the Commission noted.

But in industries like household bleach, where oligopolistic tendencies already are apparent and where product distinctions are minor, the FTC held that advertising can provide a powerful force toward further economic concentration.

In bleaches, the FTC said, cheapness and availability are the only real reasons for preferring one brand to another. "Under such conditions," the FTC said, "advertising does not in any meaningful sense serve to broaden the consumer's range of product alternatives. * * * Price competition, beneficial to the consumer, gives way to brand competition beneficial only to the seller."

The FTC decision predictably raised the hackles of the advertising fraternity—especially at P. & G. But, despite such indignation, the Clorox case might serve as a useful long-range reminder to admen and, indeed, to businessmen in general.

Advertising, they would do well to remember, is not a simple, easily discernible force whose effects can be conveniently stereotyped. Its repercussions may vary according to conditions in individual markets.

Thus, in defending their trade, admen might do well to rely on the one argument that no one can refute—namely, that advertising is simply a vital and useful tool of business. In a free economy, businessmen must sell their goods, and advertising usually provides the most effective means of doing so on a mass level. Anyone who believes in free enterprise, as most Americans do, must surely sympathize with the businessman's right to use the most effective weapons at his disposal.

To be sure, prices in some cases will be raised, in others lowered. Competition will in some cases be heightened, in others lessened. It is the task of a vigilant government and a wary consumer to police businessmen's use of advertising, as happened in the Clorox case.

And it is the task of the advertising man to acknowledge that his craft is not an unmitigated social and economic blessing. Advertising, like free enterprise, is an imperfect mechanism. But it is one of the least imperfect mechanisms at our disposal.

UAW Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest an Associated Press report of Saturday, March 21, 1964, which gave an account of the United Auto Workers convention in Atlantic City, N.J. The heading urges the GOP to repudiate the radical right. Coming from a union which has its leadership as an integral part of the radical left, this is almost ludicrous.

Walter Reuther makes no pretense of being anything but a spokesman of the American radical left—as a matter of fact, the most radical wing of the radical left. He has persistently tried to tie the Republican Party to some illusive radical element in American politics while playing footsie with leftists which range in philosophy from one worlders to Communists. The cynicism of the UAW was indicated by a reference to the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers supposed "harrasment" because of their Communist ties. While trying to smear the GOP for something which does not exist, the UAW defended the Mine, Mill, and Smelters Union in a resolution which said in part:

The civil liberties of that union must be protected without regard to any affinity to the Communist movement—past, present, or future.

What a strange double standard for the UAW? Is it so strange, on the other hand? Business as usual for the American disciple of left wing extremism, Walter Reuther. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the AP article.

UAW URGES GOP TO END "RADICAL RIGHT" TIEUP

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—The United Auto Workers Union, in the first action of its 1964 convention, called upon "those leaders of the Republican Party who are engaged in a flirtation with the radical right to put a forthright end to that flirtation in the interest of both the Nation and of their party."

This action came in the wake of an address by UAW President Walter P. Reuther in which he emphasized fringe benefits would get top priority in contract bargaining later this year with the automakers.

The UAW resolution on civil rights was adopted late Friday and said that "a total break between the Republican Party and the radical right will constitute a mighty blow for democracy."

It also put the union on record against wire-tapping legislation, renewed its call for abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and opposed what it termed "continued Government harassment of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers."

Regarding the latter, it said, "the civil liberties of that union must be protected without regard to any affinity to the Communist movement—past, present, or future.

Earlier, Reuther said the UAW will put top stress on fringe benefits when they meet with the automakers this summer to negotiate new work contracts.

He outlined demands he would like the labor union to make when it sits down to bargain with General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler in June, 2 months prior to the expiration of present 3-year contracts.

Where Is Norwich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the Southern New England Telephone Co. recently published a beautiful map of Connecticut listing many places of historical interest. This map is intended to attract tourists to Connecticut who will soon be traveling to or from the World's Fair in New York.

The project is most commendable and I want to publicly congratulate the New England Telephone Co. for a job well done. I feel sure that many World's Fair visitors, after seeing this colorful map and the many historic places listed, will not want to forgo a visit to Connecticut. In this respect, the company deserves credit and our appreciation.

My only regret is that the city of Norwich, sometimes described as the "Rose of New England," was omitted. Norwich, a community of 40,000 people, dates back to the year 1659. There are many historic places, people, and events associated with Norwich. Surely it deserves to be listed in any history or map of Connecticut. I am certain that it must have been an oversight and would suggest that, if it is still possible, a correction be made, even if it becomes necessary to reprint the map. The people of Norwich and many of their neighbors throughout eastern Connecticut feel disappointed over the omission, although they understand that it was unintentional.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert into the RECORD the text of an editorial in the Norwich Bulletin of March 17, 1964, in the matter:

WHERE IS NORWICH?

In connection with its extensive and elaborate publicity campaign designed to attract World's Fair travelers to Connecticut, an extremely worthwhile project in view of the fact the Nutmeg State has so much to offer in the line of tourist attractions, the Southern New England Telephone Co. has prepared, as a public service, a colorful tourist map of Connecticut. Designed by Bern Hill, a nationally famous artist, a map locates and attractively illustrates many points of interest scattered throughout the State, described as "a scenic and historic wonderland, crowded with fascinating sights and delightful places to visit"

In the eastern Connecticut area, the map locates such outstanding attractions as the Mystic Seaport, the Submarine Library in Groton, Fort Shantok State park in Montville, Gillette castle in East Haddam, the War Office in Lebanon, the Nathan Hale House

in South Coventry and the University of Connecticut campus in Storrs. All of these, like the host of others throughout the State, are within easy driving distance of New York and should prove of considerable interest to tourists visiting the World's Fair from far-distant points.

However, in scanning this beautiful and informative map which will serve as a guide to thousands of tourists during the summer months, one is unable to find any reference to or the location of Norwich (population 39,700), a city with a historical background dating back to 1659.

We are cognizant of the fact space did not permit illustrations and descriptions of every historical, amusement, etc., site in the State, but we strongly feel the city of Norwich, with its extensive historical background, is deserving of at least a dot on any map with the name of the city identifying it.

We base our feeling on a sample list which reveals Norwich as the site of the Leffingwell Inn, a colonial museum and former inn where George Washington is reported to have stayed; the scene of the only true Indian battle in New England, marked by a boulder and placque at the Norwich State Technical Institute; the burial place of Samuel Huntington, a signer of the Declaration of Independence; of Chief Uncas, friend of the English and hereditary owner of all Indian lands in the area; of 20 French soldiers who died here while traveling from Rhode Island to Virginia during the Revolutionary war; the birthplace of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid, hero of the War of 1812 and designer of the U.S. flag; the birthplace of and final resting place of Gen. Howard Harland, hero of the battle of Antietam, turning point of the Civil War, and the home of Lafayette S. Foster, an interim Vice President of the United States, and Gov. William A. Buckingham, Civil War Governor of Connecticut.

We fully realize this unfortunate oversight was unintentional, but Norwich and its people are just as eager to serve the vast tourist public from throughout the Nation and the world as any other city, town or hamlet in Connecticut. However, in view of the oversight, the "Rose of New England" will not exist as far as the tourists who use the telephone company's map are concerned.

Canton Honors Luntz for Old Sports Feats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Center in Canton, Ohio, established a "Hall of Fame" 6 years ago and each year since a prominent citizen has been honored by election to a select group of outstanding individuals based upon past performance and the demonstration of unique ability. Last evening a prominent Cleveland industrialist and philanthropist, Abe M. Luntz, was inducted into that Hall of Fame. The Cleveland Press of today carried a feature story on this event which caught the spirit of generations past when men of purpose and determination, regardless of their physical size, excelled in the rugged contact sports of football and basketball. This honor is just one of the many deserved honors that have come to Abe Luntz for a lifetime of service to people and the community in which he lives.

By leave previously obtained, I include the article which appeared in the Cleveland Press on March 23, 1964.

CANTON HONORS LUNTZ FOR OLD SPORTS FEATS

CANTON.—A half century after he thrilled sports fans here as a pint-sized performer in football, basketball and track, Abe M. Luntz was honored as one of this city's great athletes last night.

Luntz, 71, now of Cleveland, is head of the executive committee of the Luntz Iron & Steel Co. and well known for his welfare and philanthropic work.

But last night his days as a high school boy were revived before 350 guests at the new Jewish Center here as he was inducted into the center's Hall of Fame.

Luntz was the seventh to be given the annual award which highlights the Jewish Center sports banquet each year. He was singled out for his years at old Central High School here when, despite his small size, he captained the basketball team, played fullback on the football team and starred in track.

Later, he played semiprofessional and professional football here.

Luntz has been as prominent in Canton affairs as he is in activities in Cleveland where he has made his home since 1940. He used to be president of the school board and the welfare federation here.

Among those attending the dinner were his wife, Fannie, and their five children. He was given a plaque and his name will be inscribed in the Hall of Fame of the new million-dollar Jewish Center.

Arthur B. Modell, president of the Cleveland Browns, spoke at the award dinner.

Joe McCaffery Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, for me to emphasize the high regard and stature of Joseph McCaffery in the broadcasting field at this time would perhaps be accepted as some sort of self-serving statement on behalf of those of us who stood up and were counted affirmatively on the rollcall vote for the so-called pay raise bill.

Because of this danger, I shall forgo any accolades for Joe McCaffery. His longtime record as an accurate, objective, and effective reporter and commentator needs no recommendation from me. It speaks for itself.

Over station WMAL-AM-TV, Joe McCaffery had the following comments to make on what happened when the pay-raise bill was called for a vote on the record. If more of us understood the situation as Joe McCaffery has presented it, I am sure that many of us would take a second look at the vote which was cast.

Incidentally, I received only one letter from my district in opposition to my vote.

Take time out to read these remarks of Joe McCaffery:

Everyone is now agreed that the Federal pay bill was defeated in the House last Thursday because it included a boost for Members of Congress. And, say some, this boost was too must, 44 percent.

But no one, it seems, is interested in explaining why it was so much.

Let us say that this pay boost had been reduced to 15 or 20 percent, then within about 4 years (the way things are going) there would be staff assistants in Congress earning more than the men and women who put their necks on the blocks every 2 years, there would be men and women in downtown agencies who are not required to pound the pavements seeking reelection or contribute 20 to 40 percent of their pay to social clubs in order to let everyone know they are grand people deserving of reelection, who would be getting x number of dollars more than a Member of Congress.

Congress can't wiggle a pay boost through every 12 or 18 months as do so many Federal workers, they can only take the heat once in awhile and when they do the pay boost has to be substantially higher than everyone else receives in order to stay ahead of the rank and file.

Traditionally the Members of Congress have stayed ahead, although now, apparently, thre are some who would, from the security of their civil service jobs, seek to earn more money than Members of Congress.

Federal employee union leaders who made no attempt to explain the congressional pay boost to their workers, can share the blame for the vote on Thursday.

And so can members of the Judiciary who, I am told, did nothing to back up the pay bill which would have been to their benefit.

Now with President Johnson giving the pay bill his blessing chances are good it may make it on the second try * * * whenever that may be.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 21, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 21, 1964.

Dallas, my native city, I honor thee

No community in America has been so vilified as has Dallas. A concerted effort continues to discredit the city and its people. The lynching of Dallas has been joined by noted columnists, some Federal officials, politicians, local and national, who would sacrifice the city for political advantage, well-known Communists and the Communist Party, and lately by a prominent lawyer. It is peculiar that, in spite of the facts which proved that President Kennedy was murdered by a Communist, a single thread runs through all the attacks on Dallas—that it is a city of hate, that its people are right-wing extremists. Why? Why the continued attack on Dallas? Why the repetition of untruths? Who is masterminding the massive effort to destroy one of America's greatest communities and what is the reason?

For the first time in the 10 years I have been writing this newsletter, I am repeating a previous letter. I am doing so because it was written on November 2, 1963, in defense of my city and I would not change a single word today. I repeat it now to remind the

people of Dallas of what things our city is truly made and to answer some of the filth that is being spread across the land about our city and our people. Here is what I said in November:

NOVEMBER 2, 1963

Dallas—Proud, courageous—Truly the home of the free and the brave

Dallas is second to none as an American community standing for all the highest ideals of Americanism. Its people are the finest type of citizens—courageous, courteous, determined, daring, industrious, kind, patriotic—possessing all the qualities which set apart those who founded this Nation and the pioneers who began its development. Through the years Dallas leaders have been unselfish, forward-looking, builders with giant ideas and giant abilities. Dallas has now, and has always had, one of the most effective and respected police forces anywhere in the world. Dallas has enjoyed capable, hard-working, successful administrators.

Dallas is America. Its people are Americans, remembering and inspired by the tradition of the Alamo. Dallas' contributions to business, industry, art, culture, have been an integral part of the greatness of America.

Dallas—What it is—What it stands for

1. Dallas is a community of people who believe in the individual and in capitalism.

2. No city in the Nation can outstrip Dallas in growth figures, in job opportunities, in new car registrations, in homebuilding, in tackling slum problems, in rejuvenating its blighted areas, and all on its own through private, individual initiative.

3. Dallas has never had racial demonstrations, violence against minorities, bombings, race riots that have plagued so many other communities in both the North and South without apology.

4. Dallas peacefully integrated, quietly and through its own efforts.

5. Dallas citizens of all races, religions, and economic status have joined their talents and their efforts in creating a great, beautiful, dynamic, free community.

I am for Dallas

What I said in November about my native city I have always believed, and I believe it now. Whatever the cost, whatever political consequences to me personally, I am for Dallas. I will never knowingly utter a word or commit an act that will bring discredit upon my community. The people of Dallas, all the people of Dallas, are my neighbors, to be respected, to be treated as intelligent human beings. In whatever capacity I serve I am firmly convinced that I can serve America best by serving Dallas, by doing all I can to perpetuate its strength, to correct evils when we find them, but above all in having continued faith in this city and in these people. This is the message I am carrying across America in the many speeches I am privileged to make.

War on poverty

America has always conducted a war on poverty. Our concern with raising the standard of living of all the people of the Nation did not begin with the President's message this week. The efforts of every generation has gone into creating more wealth, more opportunity, greater educational facilities, a better life, new avenues for the pursuit of happiness. This has been done by the people, not by the Government. Individuals contributed their time, talents, abilities, and dreams to the building of America. Business and industry contributed to the development of our boundless resources and created jobs for more people at better wages than any other country has ever done in the history of the world. We are all agreed on eliminating poverty. But we can do it only through expansion of the private enterprise system. The Government cannot create jobs, nor can it for long feed and clothe and house the people without taking from them their most precious commodity—freedom. The brass band approach to giving people a better life may be good for votes in an election-year, but after the ballots are in, precious few will find their lot improved. Only through the unleashing of the powerful forces of private enterprise, with less Federal dictation and less restrictive taxes, will the war on poverty be won.

The foreign aid message

The President's foreign aid message is as fallacious as his repeated statement that "we are beloved around the world" when all the evidence points to the contrary. Details next week.

Panama Canal: Focus of Red Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, after the Panamanian Red-directed mob assaults on the Canal Zone in January 1964, Hal Hendrix, Latin American correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers visited the Isthmus of Panama and wrote a series of informative news stories published in the Washington Daily News.

Because the objective revelations in this series should aid in counteracting some of the false propaganda constantly emanating from the noxious effluvia emanating from the miasmatic jungles of Panama concerning Panama Canal policies of the United States, I quote four of Mr. Hendrix's stories written in Panama City, Republic of Panama.

It will be noted in the leading article that Deputy Thelma King, Castro-admiring Red member of the Panamanian National Assembly, on January 10 in the midst of the lawlessness and disorder, led a street mob to the headquarters of the National Guard of Panama and demanded that arms be issued to the mob to fight U.S. forces inside the Canal Zone, which demand was refused. Other disclosures by Mr. Hendrix are equally significant.

The articles which follow are commended for careful study by all concerned with the problems of the Panama Canal and relations between Panama and the United States:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 24, 1964]

PANAMA FEARS GROWTH OF CASTRO-COMMUNISM

(By Hal Hendrix)

PANAMA CITY, February 24.—Among many well-educated and intelligent Panamanians there is growing concern about the mushrooming influence of Castro communism here.

It is recognized the leftist elements are capitalizing on the ultranationalist anti-American fever stemming from last month's violent Canal Zone border clash.

The fevered reaction to the January 9 incident over the Panamanian and American flags at a high school in the Canal Zone is made to order for Castro-Communist exploitation.

Castro-Communist elements have been riding happily on the ultranationalist bandwagon.

Their leaders have been in the forefront of the chorus for "unity" behind the government of President Roberto Chiari.

BELITTLED

Yet high-ranking Government officials and some prominent Panamanians outside the administration are publicly discounting the growing influence of agitators trained in Havana, Moscow, and Peiping.

Echoing them are the Panama City newspapers and radio and television stations—all of which are inclined to play down the subject.

This dismissal of what may well become a major problem for both Panama and the United States usually is wrapped in a well-meaning admonition to the visitor: "Don't confuse our nationalism with communism."

SIGNS ARE CLEAR

But the Castro-Communist handwriting is becoming clearly visible on the Panamanian wall.

If nothing else, the crisis of the last 6 weeks has served to expose the extent of penetration and activities of the Castro-Marxist factions.

The are increasing their exploitation with methodical skill.

Infiltration into educational, professional, intellectual and labor circles now is extensive.

Key infiltrators have received intensive training and indoctrination in Cuba, the Soviet Union and Red China.

They have been graduated as experts in such fields as fabrication of incendiary "Molotov cocktails," use of sabotage tools and firearms, and inciting mob violence.

FRIEND OF CASTRO

Some persons believe key figures in the shadowy movement have access to various government doors.

Bolstering this belief is the prominence of Thelma King, a national deputy, in last month's anti-American violence and her sustained activity in the field of agitation.

Miss King is an avowed admirer and close friend of Fidel Castro.

She has visited Cuba at least seven times since 1961. She was a delegate to the Communist "Peace Congress" in Moscow in 1962.

She also is a newspaper columnist, lawyer, and part owner of Radio Tribuna which during the January rioting was a principal instrument of incitement.

She has said a leftist government must be established in Panama by any means necessary.

LED THE MOB

Last January 10, practicing what she preaches, Miss King led a large street mob to Panama's National Guard headquarters to demand that arms be issued to people on the streets to fight against U.S. forces inside the Canal Zone.

Her demands were not met, but she succeeded in stirring resentment against the National Guard.

The next day she turned up in Colon and was observed inciting mobs there to violence against Americans.

There is growing speculation that Castro, following his spectacular failure to sabotage the presidential elections in Venezuela last December, chose to shift the stage of his subversive activity to smaller Panama—already simmering with built-in anti-American sentiment.

"Six weeks ago if someone told me the Castroites or Communists had a chance here, I would have said he was crazy," a prominent Panamanian executive commented. "Now, I'm not so sure. It's becoming a very serious and dangerous matter. I'm afraid."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 25, 1964]

WHO'S WHO AMONG PANAMA REDS

(By Hal Hendrix)

PANAMA CITY, February 25.—The Communist Party, as such, has been outlawed in

Panama since 1953. But Castroite-Marxists function boldly from behind two front organizations and have infiltrated deeply into others.

In spite of repeated statements by Panamanian officials that Castro-communism has not influenced the course of events here since the violent anti-American explosion 6 weeks ago, developments indicate the contrary.

Some responsible Panamanians believe the anti-American passions, whipped up by the January 9–10 riots, might have subsided by now if it weren't for the well-organized campaign by extremist elements here.

Using the big lie technique, the leftists have shouted so often and loudly that Panama's masses now actually believe U.S. troops invaded Panama last month and used tanks and guns against "the defenseless Panamanian people."

The number of fellow travelers and sympathizers is put at 5,000. The hard core is said to be well organized and disciplined.

TWO GROUPS

The two principal Communist front organizations are the Partido Del Pueblo or Peoples Party, and the hard-line group called National Action Vanguard (VAN).

Jointly heading the PDP are Hugo Alejandro Victor, who has visited Russia since the January riots, and Francisco Chang Marin, one of the top organizers of the Castroite "peasant leagues" in the interior. Marin visited in Russia and Red China in the early 1950's and again in 1959.

Leading the VAN is Alvaro Menendez-Franco, a city councilman here, who has made at least six trips to Cuba since 1960. VAN is known to be financed from Havana.

The Panama Federation of Students (FEP) has become a hotbed of the Castro communism. Its leadership is riddled with graduates and loud supporters of Cuba.

The University of Panama also embraces an organization called the Reform Front, which is financed and directed by the outlawed Communist Party. Panamanian student control has fallen into the hands of a tightly knit cluster of young men who in recent weeks have demonstrated their demagogic skills and allegance to Castro communism.

They are Victor Avila, Cesar Carrasquillo, Albert Calvo, and Eligio Salas. Avila, 25, a relative newcomer on the Red scene, is secretary general of the FEP. Earlier, he had been active in Marxist study groups at the University of Panama and in organizing pro-Cuba organizations.

Carrasquillo, 23, has been active in the Communist youth movement and also served in the leadership of the Reform Front. He left February 6 for the Soviet Union and has not returned.

Calvo, 26, has been closely associated with the Communist youth movement and is in the forefront of Marxist study groups at school.

Salas, regarded as a diligent Castroite, attends the law school at the university. He has been active in the Communist Party movement the past 3 years and is a prominent member of the Reform Front.

Carrasquillo, Calvo, and Salas all appeared in photographs given the special mission of the Organization of American States which came here to investigate Panama's charges of aggression by the United States.

Another important person in the Communist web at the university is Dr. Carlos Ivan Zuniga, a law school professor. He is legal counselor for the Pacific Coast Banana Workers Union, with about 5,000 members.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 28, 1964]

PANAMA EXTREMISTS TALK THROUGH THEIR HATS

(By Hal Hendrix)

PANAMA CITY, February 28.—The supernationalists in Panama, bolstered by leftist anti-American extremists, are spreading propaganda charges that the U.S. Canal Zone is stealing Panama's water and selling it back to the Republic.

By treaty, the United States does have water-access rights to Miraflores, Gatun, and Madden Lakes, and from the Charges River and all contributing streams for servicing the canal and its related operations. But the United States does not charge Panama for the water it receives from the zone.

Actually, no other Latin American capital has the safe and modern water system enjoyed by Panamá City and the rest of the Republic.

During the canal construction era, the United States invested $10.6 million in a water purification and distribution system to handle water needs in the Canal Zone and in Panama's two terminal cities, Colón and Panama City.

In 1946, the U.S.-built water and sewer systems were transferred to the Republic of Panama at an unrecovered cost of $669,000. Last year, the Canal Zone spent $1,562,733 to operate its water laboratories branch. More than 7 percent of the water this facility purified went to Panama.

Also, last year the Canal Zone spent $7 million for a 30-inch main to meet the increasing needs of Panamá City and its suburbs. Now under construction is a 14,000-foot pipeline costing $100,665, which the Canal Zone is building to furnish fresh water to five Atlantic-side communities in Panama.

Panama is charged only for purification of the water it gets, at the relatively low rates of 75 cents per 100 cubic feet for the first units, and 7 cents per unit for all in excess of 100,000 units.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 2, 1964]

A STORY THE AVERAGE CITIZEN ISN'T TOLD; MONEY FLOWS VIA THE CANAL

(By Hal Hendrix)

PANAMA CITY, March 2.—Anti-American hatemongers here are charging that Panama is getting grossly shortchanged by U.S. operation of the Canal Zone.

The average Panamanian, fed distorted information about the canal operations and the controversial Canal Zone treaty, believes that Panama gets virtually nothing.

BARRAGE

In face of Panama's press and radio barrage, the United States has not been able to get the factual story across to the man on the street.

No Panamanian will believe that in 1962, for example, the benefits that accrued to his country from the canal totaled $84 million.

The average Panamanian knows only, through recent published comments, that the current treaty provides Panama with an annual annuity of $1,930,000.

He doesn't know, or want to know now, that in addition to the $84 million there are other benefits which can't be easily tabulated.

These include water, public health, sanitation, tourism, trade, transportation, agricultural improvements, training in industrial and many other diversified skills and availability of technical personnel for consultation and assistance.

TRADE DEFICIT

In 1962, the last year in which there is a detailed accounting, Panama's outlay for imports ran about $130 million.

But it was able to export only about $30 million worth of products. A large share of this deficit came from the not-talked-about benefits from the Canal Zone.

Direct purchases from Panama by the Canal Zone organization and its contractors totaled $13.3 million in 1962.

For the zone commissionary alone, the administration spends an estimated $100,000 a month with Panama's producers. And the largest single supplier of milk and sugar for the commissionary is owned by President Roberto Chiari.

DOLLAR STOP

In addition to direct purchases, U.S. citizen employees of the zone administration spent $8.5 million in Panama for goods, services and entertainment in 1962.

This flow of dollars has stopped since the riots last month.

Making Jobs by Supporting Existing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has given Congress marching orders for the war on poverty in concentrating $962,500,000 on his attack to help the needy young Americans.

We have, in our congressional district, a plan of operation that could strike a blow against poverty which could be used and copied throughout the many areas of the United States; whereby it would not be necessary to spend huge sums. We have the facilities to train for new jobs, putting your young people to work. This was so aptly put by Mr. Eugene Powers, president of Thordarson-Meissner, Inc., in a guest editorial for the Mount Carmel Republican Register, Mount Carmel, Ill., on March 16:

MAKE JOBS BY SUPPORTING EXISTING INDUSTRY

(By Eugene Powers)

President Johnson's declared war on poverty puts into words a moral and social idea which has been mankind's since the dawn of civilization.

America can and must lead the free world in creating a society in which every man and woman who needs work may find employment in a decent job at a fair wage. This concept of broad social justice can be realized if all Americans will put their hearts as well as their minds into the battle against poverty.

The war against the forces which produce poverty must be waged by Americans who are not themselves afflicted by poverty—Americans who are in the position to provide the intelligence, the means, and the drive to uplift their brother Americans who are not so fortunately situated.

Poverty can be permanently eradicated only by providing jobs for people who are willing to work. Handouts and doles, however well intended, afford only temporary and partial relief and do not restore to the jobless man the dignity of labor which he must have to hold his head high and walk tall among his fellows.

Unemployment must be stamped out where it exists—and it exists to a serious extent in Wabash County. Our existing industry can provide hundreds of more jobs for those who need them—and provide opportunities right here at home for our youth. Forces have been put in motion to harness the efforts of several Government agencies and corporations holding large Government contracts to channel some of the work to our existing local industry.

Expansion of job opportunities in our existing industries which already have the know-how, equipment, buildings, products,

and financial stability is our best and most immediate chance for creating jobs.

Every citizen who wants to help his neighbor find a job can best accomplish that highly worthwhile objective by supporting our existing local industry in every way his intelligence and means will dedicate.

Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, after 2 years of work on a tax bill, the theory of which was that it would generate billions of dollars of additional purchasing power through private channels and thus increase employment, it is a pleasure to read today's papers and today's press releases and find that the expected results of the tax cut are a reality.

General Motors has just announced an anticipated $2 billion increase in expenditures for plants and equipment—over $900 million of which will be spent this year and $1 billion in 1965. In making this announcement, Mr. Donner, chairman of the board of General Motors, said:

This will represent the largest total of capital expenditures that General Motors has ever made in any 2-year period in its history—about 30 percent above what we spent in 1955 and 1956 when our last major expansion was underway. Another measure of the size of this program is that our average annual expenditures for plant and equipment in the next 2 years will be about double the annual average over the 6 years following 1956.

The record program, he explained, is needed to keep pace with a growing market for the automotive industry, which is expected to reach average annual sales levels of at least 10 million new passenger cars and trucks in the United States and 13 million outside of the United States by 1970. These levels would represent increases of 15 percent in the United States and about 35 percent abroad over current markets.

Mr. Donner said:

These planned plant expenditures may be said to be a measure of the confidence of General Motors in the future—its own future in the automobile industry—the economic future of our country—the even broader future represented by the potentialities for increased trade and investment among the free nations of the world.

About 75 percent, or nearly $1½ billion, of the $2 billion in capital expenditures is scheduled for the United States, of which approximately $700 million will be spent this year and $750 million in 1965.

Oversea expenditures for plants and equipment will total nearly $400 million for the 2-year period.

In Canada, capital outlays will amount to about $120 million during the 2 years.

In another vein, the New York Times has this to say:

THE MERCHANT'S VIEW—STRONG EASTER SALES SHOW TAX CUT IS HAVING RAPID IMPACT ON RETAILING

(By Herbert Koshetz)

The stimulus of the tax cut is already evident at the retail level.

Easter buying, which generally gets off to a slow start when the holiday falls early and weather conditions are not particularly favorable, is reported to be excellent in most areas of the country.

There can be little doubt that the extra dollars coming into paychecks this month with the drop in withholding rates are being spent.

Retailers have gotten off to a running start for the year as a whole, and it should be noted that buying sentiment was strong even before the enactment of the tax cut. In February, sales of leading chainstores registered a 15.4 percent gain over those of the 1963 month and for January and February together, the increase was 13.6 percent.

GAINS FOR BIG STORES

Department stores in the first 2 months of the year also showed good gains, with an increase of 8 percent in January and 15 percent in February. Sales in the first 2 weeks in March are also substantially ahead of last year's.

February figures, however, must be considered in the light of calendar peculiarities. As the shortest month of the year, February usually does not contain more than four Saturdays. But in leap years, with 29 days in February, an additional Saturday can creep in. Such was the case in 1964, but it won't happen again for another 28 years, or until 1992.

The tax cut came as a pleasant surprise to many consumers. This was pointed out last week by the University of Michigan's Survey Center in its latest report on consumer attitudes.

DOUBTS PERSISTED

As recently as November 1963, the survey noted, only 31 percent of the American people believed that a bill to cut taxes would be passed by Congress. In January, 59 percent became aware of the likelihood of a tax cut, but a significant number still were doubtful up to the last moment.

The Michigan survey appears to confirm other attitude studies that presage a decline in automobile sales this year. Despite the overall gain in consumer confidence, it seems that fewer families are voicing the intention to buy cars this year than was the case in January 1963.

The auto industry says otherwise. Last week, the carmakers predicted an 8-million-car year on the basis of first quarter sales.

The university study notes, however, that plans to buy automobiles might have been different if all consumers had known positively in January that they were going to get a tax cut.

On the basis of what was known, the survey shows than 14.8 percent of all families had included a car, new or used, in their buying plans for 1964. In January 1963, 17.9 percent of all families said they intended to buy a car in the insuing 12 months.

CAR-BUYING PLANS

Among the families who expected a tax cut, however, car-buying intentions were considerably ahead of what they were a year ago.

The Michigan survey indicated that intentions to buy durable household goods this year are about the same as they were a year ago, but plans to buy furniture were below the January 1963 figure.

The durable goods results may have something to do with the fact that house-buying plans this year do not appear to be as enthusiastic as they were a year ago. A survey made by the Department of Commerce in January showed that intentions of consumers to buy homes fell by a fraction.

Another survey, this one compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board using data collected by Sindlinger & Co., a marketing research concern, showed a more substantial drop in home-buying intentions.

This survey, also made in January, indicated that 3.3 percent of all consumers intended to buy a home within 6 months, compared with 4 percent a year earlier.

The Industrial Conference Board's continuing study indicated, however, that there was a perceptible decline in car-buying intentions, particularly for used cars. In its latest tally, the board found that 8.9 percent of all families intended to buy a car, new or used, within the next 6 months, compared with 9.3 percent a year before.

APPLIANCES GAIN

Among those planning to buy, 4.5 percent said they would shop for a new automobile, the same percentage as in 1963. Another 3.5 percent indicated they would look for a secondhand model, against 3.8 percent a year earlier. A little less than 1 percent said they did not know whether they would look for a new or used car.

Plans to buy new appliances, according to the conference board study, have perked up sharply since the closing months of 1963. In almost 11 out of every 100 homes visited, consumers planned to buy some appliances and, overall to buy more of nearly every type of appliance.

As for home furnishings, the conference board survey indicated that 7.4 percent of all consumers would make a furniture purchase in the next 6 months. While this figure is below the furniture purchase figure of a year ago, it is much improved over previous estimates. There appears to be some improvement, also, in plans to buy floor coverings.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a proclamation by His Excellency, the Honorable Endicott Peabody, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in connection with the 46th anniversary "of the proclamation of the free and independent national Republic of Ukraine" and also a declaration in connection with Ukrainian Independence Day, issued by the Honorable John F. Collins, mayor of Boston:

PROCLAMATION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas January 22, 1964, marks the 46th anniversary of the proclamation of the free and independent national Republic of Ukraine; and

Whereas during the past 4½ decades the Ukrainian people have never surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor given up the hope for regaining full freedom and independence; and

Whereas both our Congress and our President have recognized the plight of all captive nations by enacting legislation establishing a Captive Nations Week and calling upon the President by his proclamations to focus attention to their plight; and

Whereas the Ukraine is listed as one of the captive nations under Russian Communist domination; and

Whereas the Americans of Ukrainian descent will commemorate the 46th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence with special ceremonies: Now, therefore,

I, Endicott Peabody, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim as Ukrainian Independence Day, January 22, 1964, in Massachusetts, and urge the citizens of our Commonwealth to cooperate in its observance.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 22d day of January in the year of our Lord, 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 188th.

ENDICOTT PEABODY,
Governor.

By His Excellency the Governor:
KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

DECLARATION OF THE CITY OF BOSTON, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY HALL

Whereas, January 22, 1964, marks the 46th anniversary of Ukrainian independence; and

Whereas Americans who have always cherished freedom should call attention to the plight of the Ukrainian people and other enslaved nations; and

Whereas Americans of Ukrainian descent of the Boston area will observe this 46th anniversary of Ukrainian independence in an appropriate and solemn manner; and

Whereas it is incumbent on the people of the city of Boston to commemorate this memorable day in support of the struggle of the captive nations to regain their freedom and independence from Communist domination: Now, therefore,

I, John F. Collins, mayor of the city of Boston, do hereby declare Wednesday, January 22, 1964, as Ukrainian Independence Day in the city of Boston, and I direct that the Ukrainian national flag be raised on city hall plaza that day, as a symbol of Ukrainian independence.

JOHN F. COLLINS,
Mayor of Boston.

It Sort of Makes You Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones writing in his column recently contrasted our beatnik coffeehouse cult with the frugal Amish farmers who are among the most productive people in our land.

I believe all of us would gain a great deal from Mr. Jones' fine article in the Washington Evening Star of March 2, 1964:

IT SORT OF MAKES YOU WONDER—GOVERNMENT PUTS BEATS ON THE DOLE, BUT BADGERS THE SELF-SUFFICIENT AMISH

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

NEW YORK CITY.—I am sitting in this little coffeehouse on Third Street in Greenwich Village watching the beats.

The place is a gutted-out store with bare brick walls and rough pine tables and benches. It is decorated with some farout pieces of art, reminding you of fingerpainting day in kindergarten. Right in front of a strong spotlight is a raised platform of unpainted boards that holds one straight chair. You can either sit in the chair or stand and place your foot on the seat, depending on how you like to wallop the guitar.

Coffee is a dollar a mug and the entertainers make their pittance by passing around a basket. Here and there a tourist will drop in a buck, but the Greenwich Village habitues rarely toss in more than a dime. It seems to work out that the more you are with it the less you give.

Down the street and around the corner there are larger and more famous places where you can buy wine and where combos alternate with unwashed people reciting dirty blank verse with great attention to its "social protest." It is in these brassier coffeehouses that the ban-the-bomb and justice-for-Castro crowd hangs out, perhaps because there are more people to see them.

But my little coffeehouse is for the beat-Puritans. Only coffee. Only folk music.

Folk music is simple and uncomplicated, born of log cabins and campfires, and sad with unrequited love and untimely death. You watch the spectators. Long-haired boys clad in stained slacks and open shirts. Frowzy girls with unwashed hair, studied in their ugliness. And you think what a colossal joke it is that these who profess to despise uniformity have slipped into an easily recognizable uniform, the uniform of the slob.

But there is something more. Here are many able-bodied young people who not only accept but seek public welfare payments. Yet they pride themselves upon their compassion for the poor who, if they are to be helped, must be helped by the labor of someone. Here are the pleaders for peace at any price who have never tasted the horrors of war but who have concluded that no cause is worth dying for.

Here are the laughers at law, the scorners of morality, the rejectors of thrift, the scoffers at "squares" who work—absorbed completely in the quest for their own self-satisfaction. And they gather in this smoky grotto to stare at the ceiling, to twitch their shoulders and softly snap their fingers as the guitar men and women sing music that is easy on the brain.

So, to the Amish. Later I was at Lancaster, Pa., and a friend lent me his car so that I might drive out into the beautiful farm country where the barns are the fattest, the cattle the sleekest, and the fields the neatest in all America.

There are some striking parallels between the Amish and the beats. For both, beards are the style. Both dress peculiarly. And while the beats seek the simplicity of primitive music the Amish turn their backs on modern machinery and drive the Pennsylvania roads in their black buggies.

There are, however, a few differences.

The Amish have no divorce, no crime, no juvenile delinquency, no unemployment, or old age problems. They take care of their own. They refuse Government subsidies. They take no money for not plowing a field. They dislike insurance. If a barn burns the whole community rushes to rebuild it. Because they supply their own social security they object to social security taxes.

This has brought down upon them the wrath of the huge national bureaucracy which sees only chaos if some people are permitted to look elsewhere than to the Government for their welfare. So the Amish have been repeatedly yanked into the Federal courts. A couple of years ago Government agents even seized Amish horses at plowing time to satisfy social security judgments.

We have a system of government under which all beats are comfortable and the Amish are bullied and badgered.

It sort of makes you wonder.

Now an Iowa Banker Explains the Effect of Cheap Cattle Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, now an Iowa banker explains the effect of cheap cattle prices. I must keep returning to this critical issue time and again until Congress is persuaded that an important segment of our economy is experiencing truly difficult times, and then pass a bill to materially reduce meat imports.

Fed cattle price decline is primarily due to nearly unlimited imports of all kinds of meat.

One of my constituents has taken me to task for claiming the top echelon downtown—the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Tariff Commission—has done little about this problem. My critic points at the recent agreement between United States and the Australia-New Zealand bloc, and the meat-buying for school lunches ordered by Secretary Freeman as evidence of executive action.

What everyone else seems to know, even if my complainant does not, is that this action will have little effect, and it was this ineffectiveness I lament.

Let anybody who thinks our cattlefeeders do not have an acute problem read the following letter I have received from Oscar Otto, a respected banker. Mr. Otto is not given to exaggeration, so I can promise you that you are reading an accurate description of this sorry mess:

WHITNEY LOAN & TRUST CO. BANK,
Atlantic, Iowa, March 9, 1964.

Hon. BEN. F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress.

DEAR BEN: No doubt you have received much mail in regard to the imports of beef, and how much this has affected the market. Perhaps there are other factors which enter into the picture. I do think, however, that you might be interested in knowing about a few experiences and our customers, who have lost heavily in their feeding operations. One customer has increased his real estate loan $7,000. Another one in Exira has increased the loan on his land by $3,500 and his home loan in Exira by $2,000, in order to pick up his losses. At the present time, two more of our farmers are contemplating increasing their farm loans to take care of capital operations, caused by the drop in prices.

I would like to call attention to one Danish farmer in the Brayton territory, who lost heavily on cattle. He sat at the desk of one of our officers the other morning, crying. He has part-time work whenever possible in hauling rural mail, and referees basketball games, to bring in additional income. After he settled up for his 1963 operations we took a chattel mortgage on his machinery for $4,000, including his equity in his 1964 feeding operations, which he feels is $1,800 on new purchases of cattle. He is greatly concerned and worried over his future as a farmer

Cordially yours,

OSCAR A. OTTO,
President.

Controversy in Capital: Cultural Center Arousing Rancor Before It's Begun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, from several angles it now appears as if Congress was a little too hasty in making the determination about the memorial for the late President John F. Kennedy in view of the fact that some difficulties seem to have arisen as mentioned by Patricia Warden Reisinger in the following article:

CONTROVERSY IN CAPITAL: CULTURAL CENTER AROUSING RANCOR BEFORE IT'S BEGUN

(By Patricia Warden Reisinger)

Will Washington's proposed new Cultural Center—now designated as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—be a fitting memorial to the martyred President—or will it become a center of controversy that will rankle for years to come?

This is but one of many questions swirling around the controversial Center. Shrouded by conflicting information—or none at all—the Center has emerged in the last 2 months not as a cultural nucleus endowed by the American people, but, to some, as an ever-growing project grasping for Federal funds.

Authorized by legislation signed by President Eisenhower, the proposed Center enjoyed the encouragement of the arts-minded Kennedys. The Government agreed to contribute original the land—a specified site on the Potomac—and the Center's Board of Trustees were empowered to launch a fund-raising campaign. The building—scaled down in cost to $30 million by Mr. Kennedy—was to be built solely by private contributions under the first plan.

The estimated cost of the Center already has jumped from $30 million to at least $50 million and the land needed from almost 8 acres to 18½. New plans show a building not 6 stories but 12 stories high.

When President Kennedy last September extended the time for contributions, Representative CHARLOTTE REID, Republican, of Illinois, a trustee, was assured by other trustees that the board had no intention to request, or need Federal funds either to complete the Center or to maintain it. She had opposed the us of Federal funds declaring the center would be a more meaningful memorial if built by the people.

Now the Congress has been asked to authorize Federal assistance of $34.4 million for the Center.

Adding to the cost and the argument is the location of the Center. It would stand on a flood site and the Corps of Engineers has not been consulted as to the feasibility of placing the high priced structure on this land. The site is not easily accessible from the center city, some believe, and parking may be a problem.

A chief bone of contention is the expense of a three-story parking pavilion proposed to house 1,600 cars (at a cost of almost $10,000 per space) to accommodate patrons in the 6,450 seats in the three auditoriums.

There is considerable disagreement regarding the utility of the three large auditoriums. A half-dozen Washington theaters have closed in the last 2 years and the city's symphony has been supplemented by private funds for years. Doubt is expressed whether the city can support the Center without subsidy.

Because of an ambitious fundraising program, sponsors already have spent more than $1 million, or one-fourth of the actual moneys reeived between April 1959 and December 1963.

Of this $1 million, some $451,500 went for salaries. Cost figures up to last November 30 indicate almost $572,000 was used for promotion and public relations and an additional $42,000 for printing and publicity. The $1 million includes only operating and promotional costs, without architectural or engineering fees.

The Center has raised about $13 million, but more than half of that is in accounts receivable (pledges) and includes a $5 million grant from the Ford Foundation which will not be forthcoming until a total of $20 million is raised.

Of the $34.4 million request, $15.4 million will be derived from bonds repayable to the Treasury for the parking facilities, estimated to cost $11 million, and associated expenses.

The $15.5 million asked of Congress is slated for construction. The remaining $3.3 million is for additional land—which Congress was assured on a number of occasions, would not be needed.

The uncertainty surrounding the Center's activities has stalled, at least temporarily, sale of a prominent Washington business enterprise.

During World War II, Mrs. Marjory Hendricks created a restaurant out of a riding stable. She decorated Watergate Inn after the manner of the Pennsylvania Dutch who, to her, exemplified the four freedoms for which the Nation was then fighting. Business weary, Mrs. Hendricks last year wanted to sell. She repeatedly tried to ascertain whether the Center would require her property. Assurances were given both Mrs. Hendricks and Nicholas Kittrie, a local attorney representing a small syndicate who wanted to buy the restaurant, that it would not be needed. A tentative buy and sell agreement was reached for $900,000. Now final settlement has been postponed.

Charged with acquiring additional land now needed, the National Capital Planning Commission has asked for $500,000 to buy not only the 10,806 square feet of Watergate land, but an adjacent lot of 845 square feet. It is uncertain that the proportionate share of $500,000 proposed as payment for the restaurant would even cover the purchase of a comparable lot—to say nothing of relocating costs.

Sara Kay Bohrer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, those of use who are privileged to serve in this great legislative body consider it a great honor and from time to time receive accolades because of the service we render.

I am sure, however, if we are honest with ourselves we would have to admit that the unsung heroes of any congressional office are the staff members. I, for one, realize that in order to properly carry out my duties and responsibilities it is necessary to have loyal, efficient, and competent office help.

Not only do the services of these employees mean so much to each of us, but in a larger sense contribute greatly to the successful operation of the Congress as a whole.

I take this time today to pay tribute to a wonderful lady who on March 1 retired from congressional service after more than 30 years of faithful and meritorious service. I refer to Sara Kay Bohrer who at the time of her retirement was my assistant.

Kay Bohrer began her congressional employment with Representative Moorehead, of Nebraska, in 1930. Subsequent to that time she worked with Representative Paul Kvale, of Minnesota, and Senator DIRKSEN when he was a Member of the House. She then began a long and successful career with the Chiperfield family of Illinois, serving first with B. M. Chiperfield and continuing from 1939 to 1963 with Congressman Robert B. Chiperfield, my predecessor from the 19th Illinois District.

Kay Bohrer was very helpful to me in my first term as a freshman Congressman and did much to help me over the rough spots during my indoctrination and transition from a State legislator to a U.S. Representative. For her advice and understanding patience I shall always be grateful.

After these many years of loyal and devoted public service she is certainly entitled to a well-earned rest. I am sure members of the Illinois congressional delegation and their staffs join with the many other persons, both in and out of Government, in wishing for Kay a very pleasant and happy retirement.

ZIP Code Colloquy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the pros and cons of the ZIP code idea have been kicked around, some with serious concern and some that is less serious. I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD the editorial from the McLaughlin (S. Dak.) Messenger on the subject. The editorial follows:

We have never been red hot editorial supporters of the New Frontier's ZIP code at the post office. We have gone along with the program to the extent of putting the ZIP code on most of the return addresses on envelopes we print in our shop. Since the start of the program we cannot remember a letter that came with our ZIP code, although a lot of mail we receive has the ZIP code of the sender on the return address.

This would indicate the program isn't getting very far off the ground. People in the post office are a lot more concerned with where letters are going than where they came from.

One of the postmasters with whom we have occasion to converse says people should get on the ball with this ZIP code business because the Post Office Department is going to put in machines that will sort the mail according to the ZIP code.

It takes a lot of faith to believe somebody is going to build a machine that can read addresses. People don't make the pattern of their numbers standard enough to make a machine take the same action for each number even if by some mysterious electric

eye, impulses could be gained from marks on paper.

In fact, it appears such a machine hasn't even been invented yet. We read in one of the trade publications that the Post Office Department has just let one contract for a million bucks and one for $2 million to separate outfits that are supposed to come up with a ZIP code reading machine.

It is easy to see we are advancing. In the early days Thomas Edison invented the telephone before anybody even thought about telephone numbers. The people could have been memorizing telephone numbers instead of sitting around and they would have been all ready to go when Edison figured out how to send a voice through wire.

They could even have had the telephone directories printed.

The Cleveland Freedom Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Freedom Council, Inc., is carrying out a most useful and positive community educational program to meet the Communist challenge to American democracy. That program emphasizes a comparative study of the facts with regard to our system and way of life and that which happens when communism takes over in any country.

The council work is directed by a board of control headed by Robert T. Hexter, a well-known civic leader in Cleveland, who serves as president. Other members of the board are all well-known in the educational, religious, and professional life of Cleveland. They are Dr. George Baird, Msgr. Lawrence P. Cahill, Judge John V. Corrigan, Frank J. Farrell, Herbert W. Gaeckle, A. George Hauer, Robert T. Hexter, Hudson Hyatt, Mrs. Mazzilee Jackson, Chester J. Koch, James B. Mooney, James B. Naylor, Dr. Michael A. Pap, Joseph J. Sussen, Jr., Anthony J. Suster, Beatrice Vincent, Rita Vincent, Rev. B. Bruce Whittemore, Daniel F. Wittman, Mrs. B. Anthony Woina.

A monthly bulletin is published by the council as part of their continuing educational program. Dr. Michael Pap, internationally known educator and authority on the U.S.S.R., together with Anthony J. Suster, serve as editors of the bulletin. The February 1964 issue carries information about the important work of the council and I insert it in the RECORD with the hope other communities of our Nation may benefit from this constructive type of approach to the No. 1 problem confronting our Nation:

CFC BULLETIN: A COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL EFFORT TO MEET THE COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

FEBRUARY 1964.

THE CFC PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

On July 3, 1961, after prolonged discussion, evaluation and careful study of community needs, the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism was established.

In 1963, the name was changed to the Cleveland Freedom Council, Inc., but the purpose has not. The founders were Cleveland area citizens who felt that there was a need to emphasize the positive, unifying values inherent in the free American way and provide authoritative information on the system that has worked so diligently and so effectively to undermine the free enterprise system and dominate the world. These founders represent a broad cross section of our community of all creeds and colors. Their sole goal was to safeguard our system—not to expound any extremist view as to how to run our Government. We firmly believe that once the American people are given factual information—free of emotionalism—they will do what is necessary to repudiate Khrushchev's assertion that our children will live under communism.

As a permanent community institution, the Cleveland Freedom Council is offering a systematic and factual knowledge of the Communist ideology, tactics and methods of conquest, drawing upon the research work of the best specialists in the field. The board of controls is particularly interested in promoting a better understanding and appreciation of our liberty, the most cherished possession of man and Nation.

The need for this community service was recognized by leading citizens of our Nation. Its program, in the form of a series of resolutions serving as a guidepost for the council's work, was included in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. A5925) on July 16, 1962.

ROBERT T. HEXTER,
President, Cleveland Freedom Council Inc.

U.S. EDUCATION AND THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

Did you know that:

1. The Ohio State Board of Education adopted on July 10, 1963, a resolution urging all boards of education, administrators and teachers in the State to "provide effective instruction concerning the dangers to our way of life that are inherent in all totalitarian ideologies and practices, by contrasting their history, goals, methods and achievements with those of the democracies."

2. The Institute for Soviet Studies at John Carroll University is one of the six centers in the United States (the only one in the State of Ohio) recognized by the American Bar Association for its in-service training program for high school teachers in the area of democracy versus communism. In the summer of 1964 the institute will offer two workshop seminars for teachers, with the support from ABA and the Jaycees of Ohio.

HISTORY IS MEANINGLESS UNLESS WE LEARN A LESSON FROM IT—WESTERN AND SOVIET DECLARATIONS ABOUT THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

Joseph Stalin, November 6, 1941:

Words: "We have not, nor can we have, such aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved people of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny, and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they see fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with the domestic affairs of other nations.

Deeds: Imposition of Communist dictatorship by brutal force upon one-third of humanity, challenging the Western powers everywhere.

Nikita Khrushchev: "We have never retreated, nor do we intend to retreat, from our politicial line left for us by Lenin. We never gave up, nor do we intend to give up, our political program. That is why we tell those gentlemen who are waiting for a change of the political program of the Soviet Union: 'Wait until the shrimp whistles.' And you know when the shrimp whistles." (Pravda, Nov. 26, 1955.)

"We are against peaceful coexistence in the sphere of ideology. Historical experience teaches us that in the ideological struggle one must not trust words and declarations, one must know how to recognize who is issuing them and what they are being issued for. There can be no joking in politics. He who preaches the idea of peaceful coexistence in ideology is objectively slipping down into the position of anticommunism." (Pravda, Mar. 10, 1961.)

"The old capitalist world can no longer contribute any idea. There is no medicine that can save the decaying capitalist world. The new, militant and eager will triumph, and this new thing is the Communist movement." (Washington Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1962.)

Admiral Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired: "With the rise of Hitler and the appearance of ideological dreams of empire in both Nazi and Communist camps, it became obvious beyond discussion that American power is necessarily involved in the mainstream of world affairs. With this involvement we somehow lost the tempered, realistic estimate of the possible in human affairs. Since then our policy seemingly floundered from one unrealistic position to another. The list is dolorous: the bloodily total terms of surrender in Germany and Japan, equally frantic rearmament, withdrawal, containment, massive retaliation, massive foreign aid, diplomacy through the U.N. that can only be a forum. In the jumble of jerry-rigged policy only one strand of direction can be found: we are again at war." (Vital Speeches, Apr. 1, 1962.)

John F. Kennedy: If the self-discipline of the free mind cannot match the iron discipline of the mailed fist—in economic, political, scientific, and all other kinds of struggles as well as military—then the peril to freedom will continue to rise.

"The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same. The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are to be swept away with debris of history. Only the strong, only the industrious, only the visionary, who determine the real nature of our struggle, can survive.

"No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. No other challenge is more deserving of our every effort and energy. Too long we have fixed our eyes on traditional military needs, on armies prepared to cross borders or missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear that this is no longer enough—that our security may be lost piece by piece, country by country without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border." (Apr. 20, 1961.)

"Of course the time will come—in this we believe as firmly as in tomorrow—when the red banner of socialism will wave over the United States of America, too! It is not we who shall raise this banner but the American people will do it themselves."(Pravda, June 20, 1962.)

Mr. Foster, leader of Communist Party of America: "The workers of this country and workers of every country have only one flag and it is the red flag * * *." In other words, Mr. Foster and his party, the Communist Party, in addition to being revolutionists, openly says that the Government of and the flag of the United States has no meaning to them. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, p. A446, Feb. 4, 1946.)

HISTORICAL EVENTS TO REMEMBER IN FEBRUARY

1948—the final elimination of the democratic regime in Czechoslovakia with boldly executed Communist coup against President Beneš and Jan Masaryk, harried to his death. Result: the cold war became a dreadful reality, which led to the final division of the world: Communist, with Moscow as a center of international conspiracy and non-

Communist, with Washington as a leader of the free world.

LEST WE FORGET

The greatest tragedy which has beset this Nation in the 20th century was no doubt the brutal assassination of our President, John F. Kennedy, in November 1963. The alleged assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, proudly acknowledged his loyalty to the Marxist-Communist doctrine of hate. Brought up in the atmosphere of violence, Oswald did not need an official endorsement from the Kremlin, Peiping or Havana to commit this most hideous crime, since any crime which weakens the free world is considered by Communists a "moral" act. Knowing this, we should nevertheless shy away from any individuals or groups which advocate the application of terror to meet the many challenges to free man. One evil should not be replaced by another evil.

Mindful of history, we must constanly remind ourselves that Hitler was the most outspoken foe of bolshevism, yet his idea of saving the world from communism led to horrible tragedies leading to the death of millions of innocent victims in his gas chambers. His anticommunism did not weaken but rather strengthened the Communist conspiracy against freedom.

"In every city, in every workers' settlement and collective village, the eye is gladdened by the sight of new streets and blocks of new housing. Every year the State allots large sums to housing construction. During the years the Soviet regime has been in power, government investment in housing has amounted to almost 55 billion rubles." (Pravda, Nov. 4, 1963.)

Fifty-five billion rubles in 46 years.

In the year 1961 alone, the equivalent of 21 billion rubles ($23,878,000,000) was spent on residential construction in the United States.

Frank Barnett, president, National Strategy Information Center. Concluding remarks at seminar, John Carroll University, September 21, 1963:

"I sometimes think that if America is ever encircled and pushed to the wall by the Communists the epitaph on her tombstone might read as follows:

" 'Here lies the only civilization which perished at the peake of its power with its power unused. Here lies a nation who knew how to change the consumer tastes in cigarettes but were themselves manipulated on all of the issues that really mattered to their salvation and survival. Here lies decent people who wanted love, not empire, and got neither; who tried to trade power for popularity, and lost both. Here died a Sir Lancelot in the court of nations who, granted all this grevious flaws, was still the noblest knight of all—except, the Lancelot, crippled with an undeserved guilt complex, let his weapons fall unused and so condemned all mankind to the thousand-year night of the Russian bear and the Chinese dragon.' "

TENTATIVE PROGRAM OF CLEVELAND FREEDOM COUNCIL

1. Continued support for educational efforts of our high schools and universities, PTA and other educational institutions to meet the Communist challenge in the United States, providing them with films, reading materials, arranging lecture series on the Communist challenge to freedom.

2. Offer community leadership by sponsoring the Captive Nations Week in July 1964.

3. Arrange for public discussions of the basic problems in American-Soviet relations today, securing speakers and documentary materials to community, civic, and religious organizations requesting it.

4. Publish an enlarged bulletin with documents, authoritative statements from both Western and Soviet sides.

Cleveland Freedom Council is a community educational effort to meet the Communist challenge. The members of the board of control for 1964 give assurance of responsible leadership for this program—individuals who believe that the informed citizens of our great Nation are the best guarantors of our democracy.

Le us remember Benjamin Franklin's dictum: "They that can give us essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." We know that a nation deserves and usually gets only as much freedom as it is willing to preserve and defend.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy toward the nations enslaved by Russian communism, and take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Byelorussian people on their independence day. On March 25, 1918, these brave people proclaimed their independence, becoming a democratic republic. Despite all sacrifices, the young Byelorussian state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of Bolshevik forces. The new Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic created in its place and reoccupied by Soviet forces remains today dismembered, an administrative arm of the Moscow Government, not representing the hopes of the Byelorussian people.

Efforts by Moscow have failed to eradicate the national spirit of the Byelorussians, who have not renounced their desire for the restoration of democratic government, as embodied by the Republic which the Soviets overthrew in 1920.

March 25 is being celebrated by these stalwart and courageous people throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations. Americans of Byelorussian descent in New Jersey, as well as Byelorussian immigrants in this country, will celebrate the 25th of March this year.

It is fitting that we pause to commemorate their struggle for liberation.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Postmaster General Gronouski Dedicates World's Fair Post Office and Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski, in an address in New York City March 11, 1964, emphasized that the ZIP code program is working, that it is here to stay, and that public support is needed to make it a total and permanent success.

As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have observed how the ZIP code program is speeding the mail of large volume mailers.

Postmaster General Gronouski makes the point that this is resulting in more work time for personal mail, and the ZIP code is benefiting all the public.

I ask unanimous consent that the following address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, at the dedication of the New York World's Fair Post Office and the unveiling of the World's Fair stamp design and embossed envelope of March 11, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR POST OFFICE AND THE UNVEILING OF THE WORLD'S FAIR STAMP DESIGN AND EMBOSSED ENVELOPE, MARCH 11, 1964

Our mission here today is twofold. We are dedicating the post office that will service the greatest of all World's Fairs, and we are unveiling the stamp and the embossed 5-cent envelope that will help spread the word about this fair all over the world.

As Postmaster General, I dedicate a good many postal installations, and I unveil a good many stamp designs. But it is a unique opportunity for me to combine these functions for a single occasion, and I am happy to have an opportunity to do so today.

This is no ordinary post office. A working laboratory exhibit of the most advanced technologies in mail processing, it is distinct from any other of the more than 34,000 post offices and 10,000 additional postal stations and terminals.

Here, on one relatively small work floor, we will show millions of fair visitors how mail is processed by hand in the smallest communities—and by the latest high-speed electromechanical devices and machines yet developed for the major cities.

Why are we doing this? The business of the Post Office Department is the public's business. The mails remain this country's principal medium of communication. The World's Fair postal exhibit will be a visual demonstration of the mechanization necessary to move the mails in the immediate future.

Just as the World's Fair, itself, will symbolize man's breakthrough in the field of science, so will this post office symbolize our technological breakthroughs.

Our conservative estimate for the number of individual pieces of mail this year is 70 billion. This figure could be as high as 71 billion. The current 6-month period ending next June 30 is already showing an increase of 6 percent over a year ago.

I want to assure you that your Post Office Department has been working diligently to cope with this "mail explosion." We have a continuing research program into methods and machines that will enable the postal system to keep pace with a growing population and the growing economy on which it depends. And as we strive for higher productivity and greater efficiency, we also strive for economies that will benefit the taxpayers.

Our recently instituted ABCD program, for example, is now operating in the business sections of 268 cities and we are providing more same-day mail collection and delivery than the rest of the world combined.

Within a very few years the electronic scanning machines now being developed by private industry will provide this Nation with more efficient handling of intercity mail by reading the ZIP code numbers on letters.

ZIP code will allow us to "leap frog" mail from sectional center to sectional center, eliminating a number of manuel handlings along the way. This will save us money, speed the mails, cut down on the possibility of error, and help us keep pace with the tremendously growing volume of mail.

I know that some news reports have been tolling the death knell for ZIP code. Some declare that we are scrapping the program and others claim that we ought to scrap it.

Well, that's a lot of nonsense and I am here today to tell you that ZIP code is very much alive and healthy.

Scrapping the ZIP code program is about as silly an idea as going back to the Pony Express. ZIP code is absolutely essential to modern postal service and we could not possibly do without it.

It has been claimed that no one is using ZIP code, and yet of the 30,000 business firms that we have contacted to date 87 percent have agreed to participate in the program. Business firms account for 75 percent of all first-class mail, and these 30,000 firms account for a large proportion of all mail in this country. Time-Life, for example, with a mailing of more than a billion pieces annually, will be completely ZIP coded by July. Reader's Digest is now in the process of converting.

The key to the ZIP code process is our 566 sectional centers throughout the country. We have already activated more than 60 percent of these centers. Ultimately, they will act as modern, efficient hubs for local mail distribution and will eliminate our having to put small bags of mail on trains and dropping them off at each community.

This will simplify our operations and speed the mail by cutting down on the number of handlings at the sending end. It is vital because of the continuing decrease in railroad service. Thirty years ago we had 10,000 trains available to carry mail in the United States. Today that number has dropped to 1,200.

For large mailers to take full advantage of this system, the emphasis is on presorting by ZIP code. Modern electronic tape machines permit them to sequence their mail by the numbers and then economically presort it into large bags according to sectional centers. These bags go directly from the mailer to the various sectional centers, bypassing a number of post offices along the way.

It has been claimed that ZIP code has failed because it has not yet speeded personal mail. In reality, it is helping to speed personal mail. As we process large volumes of mail, already presorted to ZIP code destinations, much more time is available in our post offices for the handling of personal mail. And when the program goes into full operation, we will be able to provide even speedier delivery for personal letters.

Thanks to ZIP code, we are already providing speedier delivery for the large volume mailers. McCall's magazine, another major firm which is already being ZIP coded, reports that deliveries in Florida have been speeded up by 24 hours in all cases, and by 48 hours in nearly half the cases. This is a real achievement.

It has also been charged that we are ignoring ZIP code in our post office workrooms. This is simply not true. Instructions have been issued to our 15 regions across the country on manual sorting and 2 of our largest post offices—in Philadelphia and Los Angeles—have already begun to sort by ZIP code.

There is no effort on the part of the Post Office Department to fool anyone about ZIP code. The simple fact is that the more the public uses ZIP code, the more successful we will be in moving the mails. We need the help of the public so that we can provide the best possible postal service.

I am happy about the public cooperation we are receiving. From random checks that we have conducted throughout the country, we have found that approximately 22 percent of the mail from large cities is being ZIP coded—and the figure runs as high as 50 percent in the smaller communities. This indicates a public acceptance that far exceeds any experience we had in the early years of the zoning system.

In the final analysis, ZIP code is sound in principle and sound in fact. It represents our only possible solution to the coming "mail explosion" of which I spoke earlier. We must succeed because there is no practical alternative.

Since 1929, the cost of delivering the average piece of first-class mail has gone up 200 percent. That experience cannot be repeated. If we ignored the opportunities offered by advancing technology and permitted costs to continue to rise at the same rate, the 15-cent letter would be a grim reality by the year 2000.

We must move ahead. We are moving ahead.

While we are sometimes hampered in this public effort by inaccurate reporting, we are much more frequently helped by accurate, objective reporting. Two weeks ago, the Wall Street Journal carried a comprehensive, well-researched article, showing the revolutionary effect that ZIP code is already having on business mail. I am certain that this article will prompt other business firms to speed up their conversion to the program.

I am equally certain that the post office we are dedicating today, which soon will be

processing a quarter million pieces of mail daily, will have a similar effect on visitors here at the fair. We will be open for business next Monday.

And now, having dedicated this post office, the most pleasant part of my duty remains. That is to turn it all over to the Honorary Postmaster of the World's Fair—the Honorable James A. Farley.

I do so with the confidence that we are placing it in excellent hands. When Mr. Farley accepted President Johnson's appointment as Honorary Postmaster, the honor actually was ours. During his 7 years as Postmaster General under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jim Farley earned the lasting title of "Mr. Postmaster" in the minds and hearts of postal workers throughout the Nation. Many of the great advances in the postal service were instituted during his term of office.

Being an exhibitor, as well as a service agent at this fair, we have a double stake in the stamp and envelope designs which we are unveiling today.

The World's Fair 5-cent stamp shows a scene of the main mall of the fair. It was designed by Mr. Robert J. Jones of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Mr. Jones has done a wonderful job of capturing the breathtaking beauty and scope of the fair, and we hope that the stamp will stimulate attendance here at Flushing Meadows. I think, too, that the stamp will serve as an instrument of international goodwill for the United States. Its design depicts much of the greatness of America: its scientific progress, its beauty, its serenity and its self-confidence.

The maroon, embossed 5-cent envelope shows a stylized unisphere, the fair's symbol. It was designed for us by Mr. Paul D. Kennedy, of the International Paper Co.

Both the stamp and the embossed envelope will go on sale here at the fair on April 22, and throughout the rest of the United States on the following day.

During the months ahead, they will be seen by millions of people the world over. I hope they encourage many of them to come to see for themselves what a magnificent fair this is.

Thank you.

The Bible as Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues, I have been concerned by the fact that our public school children are no longer allowed to benefit from the great wisdom and spiritual guidance they might gain from a simple prayer or reading from a passage in the Holy Bible at the start of the day's educational activities. To make it legally permissible that this practice be resumed in our public school classrooms, I introduced a bill to amend our Constitution. Support for this measure from my constituents has been overwhelming and, for me, extremely heartening.

Of the hundreds of expressions about this matter I have received, only two have been opposed to school prayer. The ratio runs about 500 to 1 in favor of my proposed amendment to the Constitution.

All of us have grown accustomed to reading editorial comment on this subject, but I have just read one editorial from yesterday's edition of the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record, which I feel casts a strong light on another aspect of the school prayer and Bible-reading issue. It is among the most carefully reasoned and intelligent comments I have ever seen on this matter.

At this point, I wish to reprint the editorial and I strongly commend the Stroudsburg Record for its editorial stand.

We are proud of all our newspapers in the 15th Congressional District. I am especially grateful for the fact that, almost without exception, they are unafraid to take a stand and be counted on matters of controversy.

That is the responsibility of a good newspaper and, in my district, and in this specific instance, I feel that obligation is being intelligently and courageously met. The editorial follows:

BIBLE AS LITERATURE

The Supreme Court decision banning reading of the Bible and recital of the Lord's Prayer in required public school classroom religious ceremonies threatens to completely erase reading, study, and discussion of the Bible as great literature in public schools.

It is a natural reaction for State education departments and local school administrators to shy away from the Bible as a controversial, legal hot potato.

But Catholics, Protestants, and Jews must agree on an acceptable translation which can be taught as a necessary part of English and literature courses.

Some method of teaching the Bible's influence on literature and art is possible without engaging in theological disputes or religious teaching objectionable to any minority group.

We believe the Supreme Court decision against required religious rituals in public schools was correct. But that decision does not and should not put an end to teaching of the Bible as literature in public schools.

Amazing ignorance of Biblical names and events among high school students in Newton, Mass., was reported in "The English Journal" and Time magazine recently. After a surprise 112-question quiz on the Bible, the teacher reported:

"Several pupils thought that Sodom and Gomorrah were lovers; that the four horsemen appeared on the Acropolis; that the gospels were written by Matthew, Luther, and John; that Eve was created from an apple; that Jesus was baptized by Moses; that Jezebel was Ahab's donkey; and that the stories by which Jesus taught were called parodies."

Ninety-three percent of the juniors and seniors taking college preparation courses could not finish the Biblical quotation, "The love of money is the root of all ——."

Similar or worse scores would probably be made in other American high schools.

The whole fault does not lie with the public schools. Many Protestant Sunday schools ignore the Bible itself and use second-hand watered-down religious education material.

Many religious leaders who agreed with the Supreme Court decision said that teaching of the Bible is first a responsibility of parents and churches. But the job is not done well by either.

If public schools do not incorporate the teaching of the literature of the Bible into the teaching of English and Western literature, we will soon have a whole generation of educated students who cannot understand "The Messiah," "The Last Supper," Christmas, Easter, or the Bible itself.

Miles Laboratories of Elkhart, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Indiana is the home of many fine industries. One which has become, through its major product, a household word throughout the Nation, and indeed throughout the world, is Miles Laboratories, of Elkhart, Ind. This is the company which makes Alka-Seltzer, a product whose advertising bill comes to $10 million annually and which is familiar to all who watch TV.

The March 15 issue of Forbes, the magazine of business, contains an article describing the company's operation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S BELLYACHING?

(Miles Laboratories, maker of Alka-Seltzer, does not have much diversification. But who cares?)

Elkhart, Ind.'s, Miles Laboratories has built a good-sized business out of one of the most mundane of human discomforts. "We are," says Chairman Walter R. Beardsley, "the biggest single factor in the upset-stomach market. We push stomach distress, not colds or headaches."

Miles' Alka-Seltzer, on which the company lavishes well over $10 million worth of advertising a year, last year brought in about $51 million of Miles' $108 million sales volume. It accounted for better than half of the company's $63 million profit.

A precarious perch for so large a company? In a way, yes. But Miles shows no signs of tottering on that perch. Last year Miles earned $1.54 a share, up 16 percent from 1962 and a 161-percent gain over its earnings of a decade ago. Over the same period Miles' sales soared more than 2½ times.

This is not to say that Miles has ignored diversification. Its One-A-Day vitamin tablets, introduced in 1940, Bactine antiseptic (1950), and Chocks, children's vitamins (1960), now account for about 20 percent of sales. And Miles also markets diagnostic dip-and-read strip tests, citric acid, enzymes, radioactive blood-analyzing machines, and skin medications.

But its antidote for upset stomach is still, so to speak, Miles' bread and butter, accounting for most of its corporate growth and two-thirds of its highly successful foreign sales. Having such a good thing going for it, moreover, has kept Miles from getting any extreme ideas about the theoretical benefits of a broader product line. Says Joseph H. Hoyt, Miles' vice president for finance: "We've no intention of moving out of the field where we know what we're doing." Adds Beardsley, "We'll never consider a merger unless Miles would be the surviving company."

Moral: When you have a good thing, push it for all you're worth.

Now an American "Maginot Line"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times carried a provocative editorial recently which posed the question, "Now an American 'Maginot Line'?"

The editorial suggests that our reliance on missiles and rocketry to the virtual exclusion of other types of defense may be projecting the maginot line complex to where our national security is endangered just as France was endangered by its dependence upon the maginot line in World War II.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place this thought-provoking editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

NOW AN AMERICAN "MAGINOT LINE"?

From too many quarters for comfort come the implications that U.S. defense has put almost all its eggs in the one missile basket.

Congress has been insistent that greater effort and more money be turned into bombers and the other arms of war which are known and tested.

The military is worried by the insistence of some civilian authorities that there be a downgrading of the more conventional weapons.

The U.S. Allies refuse to be impressed by the omnipotence of rocketry, and—

In country after country around the world, there are demonstrations which reveal that U.S. critics and minor league opponents are not impressed with the overwhelming strength this Nation is supposed to have.

Pipsqueak nations give Uncle Sam the boot, and get away with it. They are encouraged by an indecision which suggests weakness.

In the multiplication of nuclear weapons there is a certain smug sense of security, which may be false, that with more than 80,000 warheads in the stockpile the strength of U.S. defensive "overkill" makes this Nation impregnable.

Congressmen are fearful that in reliance upon this fantastic nuclear concentration, a lull in further research and development may leave this Nation second rate by comparison with competitors intensifying diversification to overtake the world's most powerful country.

As Uncle Sam crouches behind his ring of missile bases, nursing his sense of security, there is a worrisome similarity to the situation of France as the world moved through the latter 1930's into the early 1940's.

Has the United States slipped into a Maginot Line posture of national defense? Might French recognition of the similarity even be responsible for that nation's unwillingness to rely upon U.S. leadership in mounting the guard against Communist aggression?

With imagination and achievement of air power, Hitler's Germany soared over the Maginot Line of defense which had been based upon a World War I concept.

Will Soviet Russia or Communist China, directed by another strong and evil man, vault the missile wall, drawing upon the possibilities of the space age to breach a defense which may prove static to the point of utter failure?

The danger which may become apparent ony when it is too late suggests a more positive approach better geared to the American tradition. A suspicion of our own vulnerability seems to have robbed us of our courage.

The hazards of stagnation within the presumed security of a nuclear circle demand that the United States examine the possibilities that a greater protection be found in a return to a spirit of bold confidence, the reassertion of national insistence upon what is right, a readiness to fight if need be.

As Uncle Sam abandons refuge behind a missile wall, the rest of the world may again recognize him as the power that used to command towering respect.

Western Europe: Economics Conquering Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that one of our most distinguished writers on geopolitical questions, Constantine Brown, now lives in Rome, Italy, and writes regularly from that vantage point. His latest contribution in the March 21, 1964, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., supplies a perceptive analysis that should be helpful to students of contemporary European trends.

The indicated article follows:

ECONOMICS CONQUERING POLITICS—RISING WEST EUROPE NEED FOR MARKETS SEEN BRINGING RELATIONS WITH REDS

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The shooting down of another unarmed plane, the troubles in Cyprus where Nikita Khrushchev is implanting his big foot, the interminable talks at the so-called disarmament conference in Geneva, America's "here it is and here it isn't" policy in South Vietnam, are all headliners for the European press.

But actually, nobody is overly concerned—neither governments nor public. There is a strong feeling—natural after the many years of cold war and "wolf" shoutings—that these temporary upheavals are inevitable in our times.

What concerns all Europeans is the economic situation and threatening inflation.

The standard of living in Western Europe is rising rapidly. This means more demands for consumer goods and also for higher wages and salaries. The governments insist on holding the line—some are successful, others are not. But everywhere, except in West Germany, these demands are backed by strikes.

European economists are giving much thought to the future. The immediate situation, they say, may be annoying but not yet serious. The "hold-the-line" steps taken by the French and Swiss Governments, where there is political stability, can succeed for a while. In Italy the situation is more worrisome because of the Government's weakness and the power of the Communist-dominated unions. But nobody here is scared any longer of the big bad wolf. A popular front government to include the Communists, say many Italians, will not suppress individualism as it has behind the Iron Curtain.

But as a long-range policy, all European economists say that Europe, which is becoming over-industrialized, must find outside outlets. The exports to the United States may be important but are only a drop in the bucket considering the continued growth of European industrial output. New Africa, with its many independent but backward countries, offers no real markets. Latin America may be able in years to come, if the political situation is stabilized, to absorb through barter some of the Western production.

The real hope of industrial Western Europe seems to be Russia, its satellites, and Communist China, with a needy population of more than a billion. This conviction that these areas will form the main outlets for the inevitable overproduction of the West has led the European governments to initiate a new policy which does not take into consideration the Communist imperialist threat or the belicose antics of the Red governments.

General de Gaulle has recognized the Peiping government. A superficial analysis by Washington officialdom and news media attributed this action to his desire to annoy America. We have become so accustomed, since the war, to see our allies jump through the hoop at the crack of Washington's whip, that this superficial interpretation was regarded as the only explanation of the Frenchman's action.

Actually, General de Gaulle followed a course which was traced out for him by tried economists, including his brilliant young minister of finance, Giscard d'Estaign, who reached the conclusion that China, with its 700 million inhabitants, is an important potential market. From the moment it became obvious that Chiang Kai-shek would never be allowed by the United States to take his chances and overthrow the Communist regime in Peiping, there was no longer any reason why France should not discard the accepted myth that the government on Formosa is the real Government of China.

All European governments which don't yet have relations with Red China share France's point of view and will recognize Peiping after our elections. Economic thinking now takes precedence in Europe over political thinking, even if this annoys Washington. Italy and Germany, and even strongly anti-Communist Spain and Portugal, are expected to have diplomatic relations with either or both Communist groups.

Similarly, there are important negotiations going on between all European countries, the U.S.S.R., and her satellites, to expand substantially their trade. These negotiations have taken a more concrete form since we decided to sell Russia large quantities of wheat and liberalized our trade with the satellites. It is known that representatives of American industrialists are seeking a substantially increased trade with the Red bloc.

Russia is not able to use short-term credits for her planned economic expansion. Very well, it is said, let's give the Russians credit for as long as 25 years. The British have taken the lead in this matter. But all other European countries are not far behind. Danger of communism? Pshaw, say our allies. This is only a shibboleth, a vestige of the cold war which is gradually fading away in fact if not in form. The postwar political and military alliances are breaking down. The need to find outlets for growing industrial production of the West makes it necessary for economic thinking to replace political thinking.

Voice of Democracy—Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD the speech written by Richard Platkin, of Fargo, N. Dak., for the VFW voice-of-democracy contest. Mr. Platkin, an outstanding young American, was selected as the winner in North Dakota this year:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY—CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Richard Plotkin)

We are now going to listen in on a typical interview.

"Sir, what you're against?"

"Well, uh, I'm against communism, juvenile delinquency, car accidents, socialism, high divorce rates, and atheism."

"One more question, what are you for?"

"Hmmm, well, let's see. I'd suppose I'd be for—uh—you know."

"Thank you, sir."

This conversation sums up all too well a line of thinking which we have a tendency toward in contemporary America. Let's be honest. This negativism is nothing more than an easy way out in gaining the sympathies of others and for our own mental processes.

This is where the challenge of citizenship lies. Our biggest challenge is finding something to be for and then supporting it through words and actions. When we realize the assassination of our President came from negativism and the atmosphere of negativism, we should try even harder to be for something.

But what? It is rather foolish to decide to be for something and then look for a something. We don't need to look, however, for we already have it: Democracy.

I will not say you should be for democracy; this would be undemocratic. I go by the idea that democracy shouldn't be practiced in degrees, or only when it meets one's personal objectives.

However, let's not burden ourselves with exacting definitions and get right to the point. One outstanding product of democracy is human accomplishment. This means an excellence of opportunity for all, not the present equality of opportunity for some.

Another important product of democracy is political freedom. This takes the form of freedom of speech, press, assembly, association, the right to vote, and so on. These laws are made for the benefit of all, not the whims of a few, or even a great majority. Democracy should serve to guarantee these freedoms. Unfortunately, though, these freedoms are practiced in degrees.

I explain, to be for these freedoms, is to be for academic freedom, a minimum of local censorship, and the desire to let someone speak, no matter how objectionable his material is to one. Being against the aforementioned freedoms is being against elements of democracy.

Also, we have judicial rights under our democracy, such as: security in our property, right of appeal, trial by jury, but yet there are desires to limit a person's judicial rights. Too often people have been convicted, in effect, without appearing in court. Some wish that the fifth amendment didn't apply to people who harbor certain views. Again, democracy should not be practiced only when we are in the mood.

I have discussed some areas in which we can be for democracy. Democracy, though, creates a dilemma. The ability to use freedom is the ability to misuse freedom. Loose talk can be confused with freedom of speech. We cannot stop people from misusing their freedom, but through education, we can encourage an atmosphere of responsibility. A survey from Princeton University has shown there is a positive correlation between knowledge and support of democracy. Someday, people will not find a danger in freedom of speech and folk singing. Someday, people will not use the labels such as "Bircher," or "Wild-Eyed Leftist" as a form of derision.

We have discussed just areas in which democracy can be completed or preserved. This is only the first step. The next step is using democracy, for it needs much more than moral support.

I have done the first step, as I have shown you what I am for; and to paraphrase the Bible, I am what I am for.

What are you for?

A Youth Employment Act and a National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter addressed to me by Cliff Karchmer, president, Memphis Association of Student Councils, Memphis, Tenn., in support of the legislation establishing a National Service Corps as well as the Youth Employment Act. This young man represents a great number of thinking students. They are interested in the affairs of our country and especially the operation of our Government. I have advised Mr. Karchmer that I shall support vigorously both of these pieces of legislation.

The letter follows:

MARCH 9, 1964.

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Member of Congress, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the member schools of the Memphis Association of Student Councils, I am writing you this letter in reference to two very important pieces of legislation, S. 1 and S. 1321. These bill, a Youth Employment Act and a National Service Corps, respectively, would directly affect the youth of this country, if enacted.

We have thoroughly studied both bills, and it is our opinion that they should be expedited from the House Rules Committee and enacted into law as soon as possible by the House. The student councils are the voice of democracy of the young people of today, and we feel that a large magnitude of concern should be given our opinions.

It is our opinion that S. 1 (Youth Employment Act) would provide gainful employment for many unoccupied youths in the United States today, while conserving our natural resources. We also believe that S. 1321, (National Service Corps) would substantially eliminate illiteracy, poverty, and delinquency; and would provide needed facilities for the retarded, mentally ill, and the helpless aged.

We ask that you give full consideration to voting "yes" for both bills, and that you do your best to see that they receive prompt consideration in the House Rules Committee.

The youth of the Nation are awaiting your decision.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFF KARCHMER,
President.

America's Noble Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Foreign Affairs Committee is resuming hearings for legislative authorization of the foreign aid contributions of this country other than through the United Nations, I think it is apropos to read a letter to the editor of the Daily American as printed in Rome, Italy. It was forwarded me by Mr. Edgar E. Martin a classmate in college, who is experienced in countries outside of the United States although a loyal patriot. He has lived in Mexico, the Argentine, and "the Republic of Texas," as well as being a native Missourian. His comment in forwarding the article is—

I thought you would like to see this letter to the editor that I clipped from the Daily American in Rome, it should be precious for its content and rarity.

I agree with the writer and think it most interesting that it came from Trieste which the American Blue-Devil Division had to guarantee independence and make an international port at the close of the Italian campaign in northern Italy. I commend it to all as reflecting rarely expressed appreciation from impartial world observers concerning not only our humanitarian instincts and largess but our foreign aid giveaway.

The letter follows:

AMERICA'S NOBLE ROLE

DEAR SIR: Violent demonstrations were reported from Athens where the populace raged against the American Embassy (also against the British one) because of the alleged hostile attitude of both nations toward the Greek aspirations on Cyprus.

This reminds me of other similar facts registered in other parts of the world, especially in the Latin republics of South and Central America.

Now everybody seems to forget (even the top authorities in these countries) the role your great and noble country has always played in cases of emergency and also to cure the wounds made during the last war in Europe and Africa. The Marshall plan had enabled Greece and Italy to eliminate the hunger and indigence to the lowest degree. Everyone accepts freely help in money and goods from the United States, but very few show gratitude toward your country.

I remember very well that in every emergency caused by natural elements usually the first help came from America. Substantial and quick assistance was given to the population of Skopje, Yugoslavia, when the earthquake occurred there. The same thing

happened when Morocco was hit by the tremendous earthquake, Americans being the first to rush to the stricken territory, to bring doctors, medicine and food and Red Cross camps.

I could go on mentioning other cases of emergency where the Americans were generally the first to offer help. This was also the case in the disaster of the Lakonia when many passengers of this ill-fated ship were saved on rafts thrown by American pilots.

In vain I searched in the press of the various nations for a sign of gratitude toward the Americans, but this may have escaped my attention. A friend of mine, living in Buenos Aires (Dr. Hochstimm) wrote me lately as follows:

"The case of the Lakonia has been amply discussed in the Argentine press but with the tendency to project to the foreground the part played by the sailors of the Salto Reception de nuestros heroes was the most important feature of the articles in Argentine papers but no mention or praise was manifested for the assistance given by American pilots. You know that Latin Americans are on principle antiyanquis and they profit on every occasion to trample on the only Nation which, at all times and in all emergencies hastens to come to the assistance of all who need it.

I am sure, that the people of the United States will continue to give assistance whenever same is needed by other nations and this for ethical reasons and even ignoring the lack of gratitude of the world. But to my opinion the U.S. Government should allocate, with parsimony, the financial help to those nations who manifestly seem not to appreciate what the Americans are doing. Too many people manifest hate against the Americans but on the other hand are too eager to collect U.S. dollars.

As an Austrian-born Italian citizen I have written to you because I feel that from time to time we Europeans should express our personal thanks for what the United States has done for our welfare.

Sincerely yours,

NICOLO ZAR.

TRIESTE.

A Joint Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of a Gold Medal to Henry J. Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my able colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, in introducing a companion joint resolution authorizing an expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser, one of our great industrialists.

My home city of Portland, Oreg., and neighboring Vancouver, Wash., were two of six locales for the remarkable records performed by the Kaiser Shipyards in building ships and other items for the "Arsenal of Democracy" during World War II. They said it could not be done but Henry Kaiser did it—a ship a day.

The Kaiser imprint is found in many areas of the Pacific Northwest. Responsible, venturesome business enterprise combined with a strong sense of social responsibility are synonymous with the Kaiser enterprises. Mr. Kaiser is to be commended and I hope the Congres sees fit to approve this token of recognition to one of America's great industrialists.

Congressman Bob Dole—"Survival of the Human Spirit Under Adversity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Willard Edwards, one of the most perceptive and highly respected writers on the Washington scene, has written an interesting account of the personal achievement of our colleague the gentleman from Kansas, BOB DOLE, which appeared in the Sunday, March 22, 1964, Chicago Tribune. A 30-year veteran on Capitol Hill, as a member of the Trib's Washington staff, Mr. Edwards has covered every national political convention since 1932, has lectured on communism, managed news and freedom of the press, and is an expert of Marxism in the United States.

The political profile on Congressman BOB DOLE in Sunday's Tribune is a well deserved tribute to an able, hard-working, and unusually effective Member of Congress who overcame adversity because he just wouldn't give up.

The article follows:

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—When Harry Truman went to Hutchinson, Kans., in October 1962, Democrats of western Kansas hailed his arrival, and Republicans awaited his intervention in a hot congressional election with some apprehension.

When the former President left, the roles were reversed. Democrats were speeding his departure, hopeful that he would never return, and Republicans were pleading with him to stay.

"Please stick around for just 1 more day," Truman was begged by Representative ROBERT DOLE, the Republican candidate for Congress. His Democratic opponent, Representative Floyd Breeding, was voicing that old political complaint:

"I can defend myself against enemies, but God protect me from my friends."

TRUMAN IN TRUE FORM

"Give 'em Hell" Harry had been in sparkling form. He emphasized two points which sank deep into the consciousness of the 550,000 inhabitants of the First Congressional District of Kansas.

"A vote for Breeding is a vote for the Kennedy administration program," he said.

There was no happier listener than DOLE, the GOP candidate, who had made this the major theme of his attack upon Breeding. For the remainder of the campaign, he was equipped to remark, "Don't take my word for it, Harry Truman says so."

ELABORATES ON THEME

Truman, who had once characterized farmers who voted Republican as "damn fools," elaborated on this theme in his support of the Democratic candidate. In a speech regretting that farmers through the years had shown a lack of appreciation for Federal paternalism costing billions of dollars, he wound up with this indictment.

"American farmers are the most ungrateful people in the world."

When the campaign had started, DOLE, the Republican, a freshman Congressman, had been considered the underdog in the race with Breeding, the Democrat, a three-term incumbent. In the November election, ingratitude triumphed. DOLE received 102,499 votes to 81,092 for Breeding.

The two Congressmen had been thrown into conflict because Kansas lost a seat in the House as a result of reapportionment based on the 1960 census. In reducing six congressional districts to five, two combined to produce one giant western Kansas district, occupying more than 60 percent of the State.

LARGER THAN NEW YORK

DOLE now is the sole congressional Representative of a 49,668-square-mile area in the geographic center of the United States. It is larger than the State of New York, which sends 41 Representatives to Congress. Its rolling plains, where vast buffalo herds once roamed, produce one-eighth of the Nation's wheat crop. Its 58 counties contain no great cities (Salina, the largest, has a population of 42,000), but western Kansas is witnessing a remarkable industrial growth in recent years, based upon huge underground stores of gas and oil.

BOB DOLE, the spokesman for this vast expanse in the heartland of America, has been graduated, during his less than 4 years in the House, to the top ranks of a young Republican group which is revitalizing the minority party. He is tabbed by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, the GOP leader, as a "comer."

He is 40 years old, of athletic build (6 feet, 1 inch; 182 pounds), a man of smiles and a quick wit who looks as if he had never had a care in the world. He has one unusual habit. As if by chance, when greeting visitors, he has a paper or some thing else in his right hand, so he shakes hands with his left.

HERITAGE FROM ORDEAL

The right arm and hand is a surgeon's product of transplanted bone and muscle. It is DOLE's heritage from a hospital ordeal which lasted 39 months. He was encased in a plaster cast from knees to ears, both arms and both legs paralyzed, his neck vertebrae fractured and his spinal cord damaged. Physicians didn't think he would live, far less walk again.

The miracle of his almost complete physical recovery is only part of a story which is a testimonial to the survival of the human spirit under adversity.

He was a small town boy, born in 1923 in Russell, Kans., then a village of 3,000 of typical Kansas stock, pioneers from Ohio and Indiana, who had come west in the 1880's to wrest a living from the virgin soil. His father operated "a cream and egg station," and he worked, played, went to school, dreamed of becoming a football or basketball star. He also envisioned a career as a country doctor.

WAITS ON TABLES

He was attending the University of Kansas as a premedical student, waiting on tables to help pay his way, earning his freshman numerals in basketball, football, and track, when the war came along to destroy his dreams as it did those of countless others. There was no false heroism about his enlistment ("The draft would have got me").

After preliminary training in the medical corps, he was selected as officer material. In December 1944, he found himself in Italy as a second lieutenant and platoon leader with the 10th Mountain Division. The push across the Po Valley was about to begin.

His first wound on patrol, a grenade sliver in his leg, was "one of those things where they give you Mercurochrome and a Purple Heart," but, a few days later, high explosive shell fragments riddled his body and left him lying for hours on the battlefield.

"It was sort of a long day," he recalled. He was 21 years old at the time.

GIVE UP HOPE

There followed 39 months in hospitals in Italy, Africa, Florida, Kansas, and eventually Percy Jones General Hospital, Battle Creek, Mich. It was there that a pretty young brunet from Concord, N.H., named Phyllis Holden became interested in him. She was a registered occupational therapist on the hospital staff, and when she inquired about DOLE's chances, doctors told her he could not possibly live.

This medical verdict seemed sound when DOLE, wasted down to 122 pounds from an original 194, still paralyzed in all limbs, developed blood clots in his lungs. He became a guinea pig for streptomyecin, then the newest wonder drug, one of four patients in the country receiving the medicine on a trial basis. It worked.

As DOLE fought his way back, from bed to wheelchair to tentative first steps he was assisted in the battle by the girl from Concord.

USES SENSE OF HUMOR

"I was always something of a comedian as a kid, and I developed a sense of humor in that hospital. After a while they were shifting me to wards where morale was low."

But he was still not a whole man. The Army gave him a second Purple Heart, a Bronze Star with cluster for heroic achievement, and "a bedpan promotion" to captain, but it could not provide the specialized surgery needed to give him back his right arm.

"I heard of a Dr. H. Kelikian in Chicago who could perform miracles, and I was looking for a miracle," DOLE said. "I still had ideas of playing football and basketball when I returned to college. I went to see him."

HAS PLACE OF HONOR

A photograph of Dr. Kelikian hangs in a place of honor on DOLE's congressional office wall. The physician, in a series of operations in Wesley Hospital, Chicago, transplanted bone and muscle from the patient's leg to his shoulder and arm, wielded a magical scalpel on hand and fingers. The muscular right-hand handclasp, so important to politicians, still is beyond DOLE's capacity, but that is virtually his only handicap.

In June 1948, 1 month before his discharge from the Army, DOLE married the girl he had met in the hospital. He was not completely recovered ("if I had to stand too long, my legs began to tremble"). But the ceremony was enlivened by a wire from Dr. Kelikian: "Hope that arm I fixed will be used lovingly."

He was 25 years old when he and his bride faced the task of reentering civilian life, completing his education, and choosing a career.

ENTERS LAW SCHOOL

The medical profession was beyond him now. After a year at the University of Arizona, he transferred to Washburn University in Topeka, where he decided to study for a law degree. He could not take notes, but with the aid of a wire recorder in classes he was enabled to transcribe the recordings laboriously, with his left hand, at night. When he eventually was graduated, magna cum laude, in 1952, he had passed his examinations by dictating the answers to his wife, who sat beside him. She also helped him pay his way by working at the Topeka State Hospital.

While still in law school, an interest in politics seized him, and at 26 he was elected to the Kansas Legislature, the youngest member ever sent to that body from Russell County. After graduation from law school, he ran for county attorney and was elected to four successive 2-year terms. The salary was $248 a month, a little less than the courthouse janitor's wages, but DOLE used the post to establish a reputation and a basis for a political career.

He was ready for bigger things in 1960 when Representative Wint Smith, a Republican veteran of 14 years in Congress, decided to retire. Politicians applauded his discretion. Smith had squeaked through to a primary victory in 1958 by 51 votes and had defeated his Democratic opponent in the fall by only 233 votes.

RIVAL HAS PRESTIGE

In the spirited contest for the Republican nomination which followed, DOLE defeated an opponent of prestige in the party organization by 987 votes. He went on to beat a Democratic opponent in November by more than 20,000 votes.

His reelection to a second term in 1962 marked his 10th political victory without defeat in primaries and elections.

His voting record is one of stout conservatism. He is against regimenting the farmer with mandatory programs. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is still smarting from DOLE's exposures in the Billie Sol Estes scandal. And as a representative of the largest wheat producing district in America, DOLE did not hestitate to oppose wheat sales to Russia, although Kansas is obviously interested in the sale of wheat.

QUESTIONS TERMS OF DEAL

"Why were concessions not exacted from the Russians?" he asked. "Why preferential treatment to an enemy and windfalls to giant grain exporters? Why can't we be given the facts? What is there to hide?

"I would rather give our surpluses to a friend than sell them to an enemy. It is hardly consistent or fair to our children and grandchildren to fight communism with one hand and feed it with the other. I cannot and will not hedge on an issue so vital. The gamble is too great—much greater than my political future—for greed will not save the world, the farmer, administration apologists, me, or those seeking the easy way out."

Christ for Washington, Thoughts on the Kennedy Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following excellent article entitled "Christ for Washington, Thoughts on the Kennedy Assassination," by Mrs. George Bennard, widow of the late Reverend George Bennard, author of the hymn, "The Old Rugged Cross."

The article follows:

November 22, 1963. A shot. A nation one in grief, in horror, in calling to God.

Some of this is passing over, and all would desire that it pass over.

But my prayer is that this Nation will not cease to be as one in praying to God. For some certainly this praying has passed over, was not genuine even in the first place. But have any thought to continue in prayer—yea, even continue till the Nation has the new birth of freedom it so sorely needs.

Is it not enough that a nation has stretched out its arms to God. Should a servant of the Lord ignore the challenge that this prayer continue.

All are now asked to turn from hatemongering, and with this, of course, every truehearted Christian will agree. But of what use is repentence if it falls short of a return to God. Is none conscious at such an hour God is asking the Nation to return to him. How self-defeating will a mood of kindness and nicety be if it does no more than invite further Soviet aggression.

Let prayer by all means continue, that this assassination be not a first irrevocable step of descent into a Communist hell.

Our Nation was founded amid prayer.

A hundred years after its founding, the Union was preserved amid prayer.

Another hundred years have passed. Now we face a far greater challenge, whether a nation conceived under God in liberty can endure.

Is there any vision that the prayers rising so freely in the days of November 22 could, if continued, move God's heart and this Nation be spared its descent into hell.

Other nations than ours have risen in these years with ashes in their mouths to face darkness at noonday, not temporarily for the slaying of one man, but permanently because of the enslavement of all.

Does the hideousness of November 22 stir our hearts toward prayer to God against the hideousness continually going on in our midst.

During this season I don't think a person would have been considered sane and rational if he had endeavored to file a suit in court against radio commentators asking for silent prayer over the air or against the holding of church funerals for public officials, or against Presidents calling on the name of God in their inaugural addresses. And yet, even as I write, supposedly rational individuals are solemnly being allowed to file bona fide suits in court to remove the name of God from our coins and from our pledge of allegiance.

We should be praying night and day for a return of Christian sanity and morality in our national life.

We should be praying night and day lest God suffer murder after murder, then massacre after massacre, till a stunned populace is cowed into the state of a human ant heap.

This Nation is drifting toward a point of no return.

Billy Graham and Adlai Stevenson both had a feeling they should have warned the President against going to Dallas.

This is the time to seek the Lord, to carefully heed His warning signs.

In a previous discussion, I referred to mob rule as illustrating what I called the low type of democracy. This is definitely the villain.

On the other hand, there is what might be called the high type of democracy, and this is not only good but imperative for survival.

Certainly Abraham Lincoln was not speaking of an atheistic Marxist rabble when he spoke at Gettysburg of government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

As a deliberate parallel clause, he had prayed that this Nation under God should have a new birth of freedom. Obviously, Marxian "democrats" have no capacity for a birth of freedom under God or any other type of favorable dealing with God.

Those parallel sentences crystallized a prayer. Under the prayer of those sentences Guardian Angels have preserved this Nation till the present. Now a third new birth of freedom under God is needed. And the prayers that will bring it about. It is not ours to look back to a Golden Age.

Our very Founding Fathers could have been closer to the Lord than they were.

Through Lincoln's vision of a republic practicing the Golden Rule we became more of a Christian nation than at the start.

To survive we can only pray now that God will draw this Nation still closer to Him, and that it will be government of the people, for the people, and by the people under God that will not perish from the earth.

A Sporty Conservative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the foundation of our American form of government is an informed citizenry and in these complex and fast changing times it is often difficult for us to keep up with the complex and fast changing faces of political personalities.

In view of this fact, I would like to present the following commentary which appeared in the March 23, 1964, issue of the Trentonian, an admirable newspaper published in our capital city of Trenton. I commend it to all students of political science:

NIXON: CONSERVATIVE IN A SPORT JACKET?

(By J. Willard Hoffman)

The Miami Herald is a great big newspaper, and the other day it held a great big news conference, in which the Herald's publisher and nine (more or less) members of the staff interviewed Richard M. Nixon. The following day the Herald carried five stories on different aspects of the interview, three "head shots" of Mr. Nixon and one "action shot" showing the conference under a full head of steam.

Now by any standards, this is pretty good "play" for a man who flubbed the dub when he had his big chance, who holds that he is not a candidate for anything, and who apparently wrote off the whole Fourth Estate after flubbing the dub again in the California gubernatorial contest.

But the Herald had an explanation for this gaudy display and impressive allocation of expensive newsprint to a New York lawyer. In a page one box that was headed "In-Depth Look at 'New' Nixon," the Herald explained: "Two years ago, Richard Nixon's political career seemed destined for the ash heap. He vowed to quit politics for good. But events since 1962 have changed all this, and the Nixon prospects today are very much alive. Monday he accepted a longstanding invitation to face a panel of Herald newsmen. Their depth reports on Nixon—the man, the politician, and Republican strategist—are featured * * *."

We are always interested in the new Nixon, mostly because we wonder how many times in one life a man can become new. As we recall it, the Nixon who was handed the enviable assignment of running on the GOP ticket with General Eisenhower became a "new" man after hysterically explaining to the country that certain funds given to him really represented something like "charitable" contributions; he became a "new" man again when he was nominated to oppose the late John F. Kennedy and adopted the pose and manner of an elder statesman; he became a "new" man again (or was this the "old" Nixon?) when he went at it with Governor Brown of California; now, according to the Herald, we have another "new" Nixon: "He's relaxed, informal and enjoys politics."

Apparently questing for evidence of the latest "new" Nixon, one Herald writer came up with this:

"Mr. Nixon wore a sport coat when he came to the Herald for a press conference Monday morning.

"He smilingly apologized for it when he noted that the newspapermen were, as he said, 'dressed formal' in regular suits. (That's the Herald for you.)

"This might indicate that he felt awkward in his own informal jacket, but actually it was not a go-to-hell or race-tout sport coat at all. (Oh, good.)

"It was light bluish-gray with barely visible stripes, so conservative that if it had matched his pants it could have passed for a business suit.

"But the point is that he was wearing a sport jacket, and that must be a hint about the 'new' Nixon. The fact it was a conservative jacket and that he felt it was conspicuous must show that there is much of the 'old' Nixon underneath the jacket."

Referring back to a press conference featuring Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon, the writer recalled that the latter "was somber, serious, a good sport and patriot in defeat, but a disillusioned and downhearted man."

"That was not the Nixon in the sport coat Monday.

"But, as with his jacket, he didn't go all the way. He was relaxed—in a conservative way."

There you have him—the "new" Nixon. What bothers us is this: Is he a liberal in a conservative sport jacket, or a conservative in a coat that didn't quite match his pants?

Resolution Adopted by the American Hellenic Council of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the first days of recorded history, the Greek record has been a proud one. In learning, principle, courage, and contribution to the growth of mankind, Greece has been a leader in the entire world, even though a country small in size.

The present conflict on Cyprus is cause for deep concern, not only to the United Nations, but in particular to Greeks in the United States who tomorrow celebrate Greek Independence Day.

In this connection, I commend to the consideration and review of all interested Americans the resolution adopted at the monthly meeting of the American Hellenic Council of New Hampshire held in Portsmouth, N.H. on Sunday, March 22, as certified by Mrs. Christine P. Gaitan, its executive secretary:

Whereas Hellenism, a race, a soul, a spiritual attitude, a courage achieved through shining glories and immense sacrifices—the conquest of these ideals. It conveyed to the world the message that we would call the Greek message—which means: Freedom and human dignity. These values and ideals constitute now the fundamentals of our life. They constitute the sacred trust of every people of every human being putting their faith in them; and

Whereas we Americans who are spiritually and politically devoted to freedom are as much Greeks as they are; and

Whereas we consider that the Cypriot issue constitutes a challenge to the free world and that all the world is waiting to see if the highly proclaimed principles of freedom and justice and majority rule represent for the West a true line of policy or a simple method of political expediency; and

Whereas the issue of Cyprus is the extraordinary veto rights of a 17 percent minority over critical areas of national policy, and, that the people of Cyprus deserve an effective government. And with a minority veto. effective government is impossible, whether it be in the Congress of the United States or on the island of Cyprus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do not forget out stanch Ally of World War I and World War II—Greece. We must act now, and we must accept our duty as the leader of the free world to support the legitimate rights of the majority for effective government.

Stroudsburg Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Dixon is a columnist of considerable reputation and remarkable sense of humor whose writing most of us enjoy every time it appears here in the Washington Post. It was my pleasure during the special election campaign last July in which I was elected to the 88th Congress to be interviewed by Mr. Dixon in the Penn-Stroud Hotel in Stroudsburg, Pa. It was one of the most enjoyable experiences of that campaign and the resulting column Mr. Dixon prepared stands as one of my most treasured mementos of those rugged days of campaigning.

Just this week, Mr. Dixon wrote another column about the 15th Congressional District in Pennsylvania and I think it is one of the most amusing and informative columns of its kind that any of us have seen in recent months. I commend him for it.

As I have said many times to my distinguished colleagues here in the Congress, we of the 15th District in Pennsylvania are extremely proud of the diversification of industry there. We have some of the greatest resort hotels in America in our Pocono Mountains. We manufacture Ronson lighters, the best in the Nation. We have the second largest steel manufacturer in the world, Bethlehem Steel, in our district.

We are the makers of most of the Nation's cement and we are deeply proud of our agricultural products, our educational institutions, and our motor transport industry.

But, until Mr. Dixon put his ear to the ground and came up with his story on Monday, not too many people knew that we were also manufacturers of one of the rarest and most valuable weapons in the world's history—the boomerang.

We are proud, also, of our boomerang factory and I want, today, to insert Mr. Dixon's column in the RECORD, to prove, once more, that the 15th District of Pennsylvania really means what it is saying when we claim that we have "everything."

The editorial follows:

STROUDSBURG BOOMERANG

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Helen Bruch, a prominent matron of Stroudsburg, Pa., telephoned the other day to her son, Charles, who is

associate editor of Public Utilities Fortnightly here in Washington.

Mrs. Bruch mentioned one of her son's former classmates who, ever since schooldays, has manifested a wholesome distaste for gainful employment.

"This will startle you," began Mrs. Bruch. "Your old schoolmate has landed a dilly of a job."

"You can't mean it," gasped Editor Bruch, "Where is he working?"

"At the boomerang factory."

Editor Bruch began to sputter with merriment, but his mother reproved him for such levity.

"There is nothing funny about it," said Mrs. Bruch. "It's a very serious matter."

Mr. Bruch controlled his spasms long enough to ask his mother where the boomerang factory was located. Mrs. Bruch said she didn't exactly know, but that it was somewhere in the surrounding Delaware Water Gap-Pocono Mountain region.

Not fully satisfied with this, Mr. Bruch contacted Representative FRED B. ROONEY, whose 15th district takes in the resort area.

The Democratic Mr. ROONEY, who lives in Bethlehem, said the boomerang factory was in a placid little vale called Cherry Valley, about 3 miles from Stroudsburg, but that was all he knows about it, except that it is possibly smaller than his district's other industry, Bethlehem Steel.

"But the boomerang factory is a going concern," declared Representative ROONEY. "If there ever is a kangaroo explosion in the 15th district we'll be ready to cope with it."

Mr. Bruch, who reads the newspapers, as well as utilities reports, suggested that the boomerang factory make a commercial tieup with Melvin Belli, former chief counsel for Dallas slayer Jack Ruby.

When this simple, clear-cut statement seemed unclear to Representative ROONEY, Mr. Bruch carefully explained:

"Attorney Belli denounced the trial of Ruby as a kangaroo court. He obviously has strong feelings against kangaroo courts and might push the sales of boomerangs to counter them."

When all this was reported to me, I felt there were gaps in the saga of the boomerang factory.

I telephoned Horace G. Heller, who not only is general manager of the Stroudsburg Record but an historian of the Poconos. Mr. Heller had the whole story at his fingertips.

"The boomerang factory," he reported, "is run by Lawrence Boyd, a gentleman of many good works. He feels that a pressing need in this atomic age is for less sophisticated weapons. Consequently, he has taken broad steps to reactivate the boomerang."

Mr. Heller said the boomerang works manufactures 3-ounce boomerangs for children. These are relatively unlethal, unless an oversophisticated kid tips them with curare. But the factory also makes 5-ounce boomerangs for adults, which can be deadly.

"The boomerangs," said Mr. Heller, "are manufactured to scale from boomerangs the factory imported from Australia. These were 7-ounce boomerangs, and our boomerang-maker discovered they were tipped with poison. Moreover, he learned that it was a rare poison that never wears off.

"He toyed with the idea of offering them to Congressman ROONEY, who was then in the midst of a very bitter campaign, but felt this might be too bitter. He disposed of the perpetually poisoned boomerangs in some other manner, ignoring suggestions that he offer them to Senator GOLDWATER for his 16th century campaign."

I called Sir Howard Beale, who is just about to quit here as Ambassador from Australia, and asked if his country was prepared to withstand the boomerang competition from Pennsylvania.

Sir Howard said that Australia would not protest the competition unless the American maker offered rebates on boomerangs.

Excerpts of Stevenson's Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations who is doing such a magnificient job as our representative to this world body, has urged the U.N. to expand its peace-guarding machinery. I commend excerpts of his recent remarks delivered at Princeton University to my colleagues:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY STEVENSON

(UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., March 23.—Following are excerpts from the Dag Hammerskjold memorial lecture prepared by Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative at the United Nations, for delivery tonight at Princeton University.)

You will recall that back in 1947 a certain "Mr. X"—who turned out to be my friend George Kennan—wrote an article for Foreign Affairs in which he introduced the famous label, the "policy of containment." He invented the phrase but he did not invent the doctrine; the United States already was busily, heavily, expensively and dangerously involved in containing the ruthless, heavy-handed outer thrust of Stalin's Russia—wherever he might strike or lean.

This was the main pattern of world events for a number of years and containment was meaningful description of the main purpose of U.S. policy.

I would suggest that we have begun to move beyond the policy of containment; that the central trend of our times is the emergence of what, for lack of a better label, might be called a policy of cease-fire, and peaceful change. I would suggest, further, that we may be approaching something close to a world consensus on such a policy.

POLICY OF LIMITED PEACE

No analogy is ever perfect, but if the policy of containment stands for limited war, then the policy of cease-fire perhaps stands for limited peace. I believe this mutation is occurring simply because the H-bomb has made limited war too dangerous.

Only a few decades ago, once hostilities broke out between the armed forces of two nations, it was assumed with good reason that, since the war was started, the war would proceed until one nation or one side had won and the other had lost—however foolish or futile the whole thing might be.

Since that time there have been some 20 occasions on which the armed forces of two or more nations engaged in more or less organized formal hostilities, which in another day would have been accompanied by declarations of war—wars to be fought until victory was attained by one side or the other.

On at least another 20 occasions there has been minor fighting on disputed frontiers, or armed revolts which usually involved the national interests of an outside state. Any of them would have qualified as a causus belli in another day.

This record of violence without war suggests, then, that we may have slipped almost imperceptibly into an era of peaceful settlement of disputes—or at least an era of cease-fires while disputes are pursued by other than military means.

I would only suggest in passing that perhaps Korea was the end of the road for classical armed aggression against one's next-door neighbor; that perhaps Suez was the end of the road for colonial-type military solutions; and that perhaps Cuba was the end of the road for nuclear confrontation.

The question is, What can be done to make sure that this is in fact an era of peaceful settlement of disputes among nations?

For one thing, we can pursue this consensus on recourse to nonviolent solutions. Most of the world is in agreement right now—though there are a few who would make a small exception for his own dispute with his neighbor. Yet there is reason to hope that the aggressors are extending their doctrine of no-nuclear-war to a broader doctrine of no-conventional-war—on the ground that you cannot be sure there will be no nuclear war unless you are sure there will be no conventional war either.

For another thing, we can get on with the urgent business of expanding and improving the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations.

Cyprus has vividly exposed the frailties of the existing machinery: the Security Council, by an impressive unanimous vote, first saved the situation with a cease-fire resolution providing for a U.N. peacekeeping force but shortly afterward war nearly broke out again before the U.N. could put the resolution into effect.

In short, when time is of the essence, there is a dangerous vacuum during the interval while military forces are being assembled on a hit-or-miss basis.

Time and again, we of the United States have urged the creation of a United Nations international police force, trained specifically for the keeping of the peace.

Perhaps it is too early to contemplate a fixed U.N. international force which would be permanently maintained for use for any and all purposes—for the world's emergencies differ one from another, and there can hardly be one treatment for all of them.

But surely it would make sense for member countries of the United Nations to indicate what forces, equipment, and logistic support they would be willing to train for peacekeeping service, and to supply on a moment's notice. And surely it would make sense for the U.N. itself to add to its military and planning staff so that peacekeeping operations can be set in motion with the utmost speed and effectiveness.

It is true that every United Nations peacekeeping effort is and probably always will be different from any other, and that no simple financing formula can fit them all, but agreement on certain principles and improvements in mechanisms should be possible and useful for the future. The United States will join wholeheartedly in the search for such agreements.

THE ISSUES OF ARREARS

Article 19 of the Charter provides that a member whose arrears amount to as much as its last 2 years' assessments "shall have no vote" in the General Assembly. This article has caught up with the Soviet Union and certain other countries, which means that if at the time the next Assembly meets the Soviet Union has not paid at least some $9 million of its arrears, it will have no vote in the Assembly.

The United States, and I believe all the members want to avoid such a situation—in the only way it can be avoided, namely by a Soviet payment—in whatever form.

It is our earnest hope that the overwhelming sentiment of the members will prevail and that the Soviet Union and others will find the means, in one way or another, to provide funds that will make unnecessary any article 19 confrontation.

The United States and others are exploring the possibility of adjustments to avoid the recurrence of this unhappy situation.

We are exploring possible arrangements whereby the viewpoints of the major powers and contributors to the cost could be assured of more adequate consideration, and also the possibility of more flexible methods of distributing the cost.

The United States is using every effort to reach agreement as to future peacekeeping

arrangements in the hope that agreement as to the future will facilitate solution as to the past and provide a more firm foundation for a peacekeeping structure that has already proved itself so valuable.

I believe there is evidence of new beginnings, of evolution from containment to cease fire, to peaceful change. We see growing up in the interstices of the old power systems a new readiness to replace national violence with international peacekeeping.

The sheer arbitrament of force is no longer possible and less lethal methods of policing, controlling and resolving disputes are emerging. Do we perceive, perhaps dimly, the world groping for, vision of a society based upon human brotherhood, to an order in which men's burdens are lifted, to a peace which is secure in justice and ruled by law?

A Legend Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper article and editorial from the Western Carolina Tribune at Hendersonville, N.C., describe the heroic efforts of a community to save the lives of one of its citizens.

The citizen, Mrs. Cleta Mae Parker, recently lost her battle with the rare malady which once afflicted the great dynasties of Europe—hemophilia.

Rare in men, the disease is even more unusual in women. Yet, for a brief moment in time, a courageous physician, aided technically by interested colleagues and morally by an entire community, seemed on the threshold of a new plasma offering his patient hope for a normal life.

The following account was written by Mr. John P. Sholar, editor and publisher of the Western Carolina Tribune, and let us hope that the medical experience derived from this incident will help lay the groundwork for eventual medical conquest of hemophilia:

DETERMINED PHYSICIAN, MAGIC TURN OF EVENTS, BRING RARE PLASMA—NEW PLASMA FOR LOCAL PATIENT MAY BECOME INSULIN OF HEMOPHILIA

Hopes of a major medical breakthrough in the treatment of hemophilia, or uncontrolled bleeding, has the eyes of the medical world to a mounting degree turned on Hendersonville in the case of a young local housewife.

Suffering from this disease since childhood she is one of a handful of females in the history of recorded medicine who have been diagnosed as having a blood disease virtually limited to males only.

For nearly 3 years her local physician has kept her alive by literally flooding her circulatory system with blood transfusions, as many as 8 a day totaling 218 pints during May, June, and July. This condition is one in which the blood of the victim has either an absence on an insufficiency of the factors (protein products) that cause the blood to clot when in the presence of air. The condition is a very dangerous one in that a hemophyliac may experience a fatal loss of blood from even a small wound, since the flow of blood will not clot and allow the wound to heal.

But the real heartening news, at press time, is that the patient has stopped her almost unstoppable bleeding since receiving in the quantity of 162 teaspoonsful, which actually amounts to 168 pints (21 gallons) of whole blood, within the span of a few short days.

Careful to preclude his remarks with the admonition that these transfusions actually are still in the exploratory stage by bringing together two separately devised systems, one American, the other Swedish, by which the blood factors that retard or prevent blood clotting have been removed, thereby allowing hemophiliacs to stop bleeding, the local physician, who has brought the best techniques and brains the world has developed to Hendersonville for his patient, is hopeful.

NINE VITAL BOTTLES

Nine small bottles containing only 162 teaspoons of a newly developed plasma concentrate combining American and Swedish medical research and accomplishment actually contain, for the one patient, the equivalent of 21 gallons of lifegiving blood and are now by an almost unbelievable series of events and circumstances on hand in Hendersonville, earmarked for one patient. "I don't know what your religion is," stated the physician, "but to me it's clearly the work of the Almighty."

In the nine small vials at Pardee Memorial Hospital are virtually the entire world's supply of a combination of Swedish and newly developed American plasma concentrate.

The local physician, who calls himself a "country doctor," searched the best available material in treating his young patient, who is one among only a handful of female hemophiliacs the medical profession has yet witnessed. He brought in the best specialists he could find, but it remained for a local druggist, working through the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Institute, to turn the key that led to the unbelievable consequences—and even this after both the doctor and his druggist friend had given up hope of learning more about or even getting a small portion of the Swedish plasma which had been getting worldwide acclaim.

THE LETTER THAT LIVED

But the druggist's previous letter to the PMA was not to die forgotten. A call from the chief pathologist of the American Red Cross a month after the letter had been written asking about the possibility of receiving the plasma the Swedes called Bloombach's I–O, known to have provided blood-clotting factors in hemophilia cases, came like the well known bolt from the sky, bringing hope.

MEDICAL FRATERNITY CIRCLES GLOBE

It took a telephone call to Stockholm by the local physician and "through my own southern English and his halting, somewhat broken version" (including internationally known medical terms, of course) to bring the latest, in nine vials, blood plasma concentrate to Hendersonville. The long arm of the medical fraternity indeed circles the globe.

Previously, in a sudden chain of events resulting from world attention even the local physician, the Asheville blood bank, the blood specialists and pathologist at the hospital here, were unaware of, the Red Cross lab advised the local doctor that if he would meet the plane in a few hours, the doctor (specialist) and technician would bring the better part of the Nation's supply of a brand new yet unnamed (called that stuff) plasma to his patient in Hendersonville.

That medical history at this moment may be unfolding and written in Hendersonville by a local country doctor is evidenced by the fact that the patient's bleeding time has returned to normal, and uncontrolled bleeding ceased, thanks to a few precious cubic centimeters of plasma or antihemophilia globulin concentrate, some of which is equal to 40 pints of normal plasma reduced to 18 teaspoonfuls.

The New York pathologist this morning by long distance was only faintly encouraging when told a local newspaper wanted to do the story. He stated that any account must state the exploratory phase now being carried out by a local physician, who has enlisted the entire medical profession of his area in his fight to save a patient, the Asheville blood bank, the local pathologist, a classmate at the State university who is becoming a world authority on blood diseases and especially hemophilia.

If nothing more, this necessarily sketchy account may enlist prayers for a dedicated physician, an attractive young lady with the will to live of three people, the Red Cross blood laboratories, the local druggist who has adopted the case as his project and above all the family of the young housewife who are today full of hope.

A LEGEND IS BORN

Many things we are not. We are not a vibrant city of throbbing industry. We are not a latter-day mecca for the suburban sophisticate any more than we are a major watering spot for the blithely bored fleeing the smothering humidity of southern summers.

A little of this we are perhaps, mostly not.

If our leaders have been lacking in the foresight and fortitude to make us grow with our endowments, we are nonetheless infinitely rich in the legend that only small-town compassion and village brotherhood may engender.

Our most enduring legend, surely, witnessed its beginning a few short years ago when a young woman, barely past her twenties, was striken with a malady as strange as the name—hemophilia, which was born in her.

The world has seen scant few men, virtually no women "bleeders" in the history of the disease. Each day she lived was a new page in medical history. Days, weeks, months and even years passed with her daily condition handed down in the community from her hospital bed, mouth to mouth, relative to relative, friend to friend, stranger to stranger, street to street.

Above the hubbub and babble were two God-granted beings to whom determination and the will to live were a cheerful, early morning greeting, carefully casual even after hope became a brave smile struggling past knowing eyes.

The doctor and his patient, bound together in a oneness of purpose. To the very end defeat and death, a hovering shadow, were kept at arm's length by long hours of vigilance and God-given strength of effort.

BEAUTY AND PEACE

"How peaceful, how beautiful she is," visitors would murmur as they walked down the long hall away from her room, realizing that her determination to conquer the inevitable manifested itself not in tightly drawn lips or hard-set face lines but in a strange loveliness, however fragile, seemingly untouched by day-by-day, hour-by-hour, minute-by-minute suffering so few of us have been called upon to endure.

The rarity of her illness and her physician's day-by-day determination to win the battle drew medical attention the world over, rare plasma, tediously secreted, from Sweden and other faraway laboratories, flying specialists and medical observers to her bedside. That she lived through the long years of suffering is a tribute first to her own indomitable courage and will to live, then to her doctor's inspired efforts which often went above and beyond human resources, and lastly to her own townspeople who rallied to her side.

During 1 short month, 97 blood donors gave blood with naught save the wish to

see her live yet another day. That she lived that day, then another, and another to the very end gave to her surviving beneficiaries both a new heritage in courage and countless pages of medical history and experience to be passed on for the betterment of mankind.

If not in stone, a monument in memory to Cleta Mae Parker was built day by day in the city of honor and heritage, the village of virtue and compassion, and in the hearts of the generations to follow, made yet richer by the days God let her live among us.

These things we are.—JOHN P. SHOLAR.

L.B.J. Likely To Boost TV Press Sessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to my colleagues a recent column by Mr. Barnet Nover of the Washington bureau of the Denver Post in which he comments on President Johnson's first live television press conference.

The article follows:

L.B.J. LIKELY TO BOOST TV PRESS SESSIONS

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—Despite last Saturday's successful experiment, President Johnson is not expected to limit future press conferences to live televised shows.

There is every reason to believe, however, that what happened Saturday will encourage Johnson to use this type of press conference more frequently in the future.

METHOD FAVORED

The live TV press conference was a method favored by the late President John F. Kennedy, who proved himself during his 3 years in office a virtuoso in the art of fielding questions hurled at him by reporters.

But for 3 months President Johnson ignored the clamor for a return to the Kennedy type of press conference and tried various other methods of meeting the press.

Twice he suddenly summoned the White House correspondents into his office for an impromptu press conference, thinly disguised as a coffee break.

Once he had given the reporters 2-hours' notice for a meeting held in the White House movie projection room on a Saturday afternoon. In Texas he held a session with reporters while perched on a couple of bales of hay.

It was not until last Saturday that a Kennedy-type press conference was held by President Johnson. But he did all he could to dampen any comparison between his performance and that of his late predecessor by making his televised press conference as different as possible from that of Kennedy.

SMALLER ROOM

Kennedy, standing, had conducted his press conference from a high rostrum far removed from the nearest reporters. Johnson, seated, was right in the midst of the questioners in a room which holds only half as many as does the auditorium in which Kennedy conferences were held.

In fact, the State Department Auditorium in which all of the Kennedy press conferences were held, had to be filled by visitors in addition to reporters so that it would not appear to be empty.

Kennedy's press conferences were noted for the high humor in which many of the answers were wrapped. Johnson spoke with solemnity. Only rarely did he allow himself the luxury of even a passing smile.

SPOKE RAPIDLY

Kennedy spoke so rapidly that he was often the despair of the stenotypists making the official transcription. Johnson has discovered he is most effective when he speaks slowly, and he did speak slowly at his Saturday press conference.

It cannot be said that Johnson answered all the questions asked of him as fully or effectively or as ideally might be expected. But dealing with some highly touchy subjects, such as the situation in Vietnam, relations with the Republican minority, the Cyprus tragedy, and so on, he broke no eggs. Nor, at any other time (not even when asked about the Bobby Baker affair), did he lose his temper.

All through he showed himself knowledgable, well-briefed.

NOT IDEAL

There is little doubt that the live television press conference is not yet the ideal medium through which President Johnson can best, in his words, explain to the people the reasons for his actions and tell the people something of the problems that confront him.

But having gingerly stuck his toe into the water and found that it was not as cold as he expected, there is every reason to believe that more and more will he take advantage of this way of reaching the people.

One of the Ten Outstanding Men in the Federal Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article in regard to Mr. William J. Driver, who has served as Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs since February 1961. Mr. Driver has been selected by the National Civil Service League as one of the ten outstanding men in the Federal public service.

During the years I have served as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have worked quite closely with Mr. Driver in regard to the administration of laws enacted by the Congress for the benefit of veterans and their survivors. From my personal experience I can say that the selection of Mr. Driver for this award confirms the opinion I have long held as to his superior ability and outstanding achievement.

The article follows:

The selection of William J. Driver, 45, Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, as 1 of the 10 top career men in the Federal Government has been announced by the National Civil Service League.

He will receive the league's 1964 Career Service Award on April 14 at a dinner in Washington, D.C., to recognize and encourage excellence in public service. The award is one of the most highly prized national honors given to public employees by a citizens' organization.

The VA official already holds the VA's two highest awards, the Exceptional Service Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal.

In a letter of congratulations to Mr. Driver, John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, said:

"Your selection for a 1964 Career Civil Service Award reflects two facts. Primarily, of course, the selection stems from the significant contributions that you have made in your 18 years with the Veterans' Administration, most notably your initiating or bringing to fruition a new veterans pension law, Public Law 86-211, which is more equitable to veterans and taxpayers; the work measurement and performance standards program which provides knowledge essential in improving our ability to render service; the large scale application to veterans benefits of automatic data processing and the establishment of a new Department of Data Management to assure achievement of the full potential of advanced electronic management tools.

"Equally important, your selection for this high award is in reality a tribute to the quality and dedication of the employees of the Veterans' Administration. The honor you have won further confirms the conclusion I reached shortly after I became Administrator of Veterans Affairs that in my years of experience in banking and business, and in military affairs, I have never known a group more devoted, diligent and productive than those who serve their country through their work in the Veterans' Administration."

Two other VA officials have won this honor in past years. They were Dr. John B. Barnwell, Medical Research and Education Director for the VA, cited in 1959 for his part in the organization of the VA-Armed Forces cooperative study of the chemotherapy of tuberculosis, and Judson D. DeRamus, manager of VA's Winston-Salem, N.C., regional office, who was chosen for his outstanding record of competence and sustained performance during a long career of Government service.

Mr. Driver came with the Veterans' Administration in February 1946, as a special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Services. He later served as Director of the Records Management Service; Director of the Planning and Field Supervision Service, and special representative to the Assistant Administrator, all in the Contact and Administrative Services.

From May to December 1955 he served as Acting Assistant Deputy Administrator for Veterans' Benefits and in February 1956 became Director of the Compensation and Pension Service responsible for the disbursement of approximately $3.5 billion in benefit payments to more than 3 million veterans or their dependents.

From January 1958, to February 1961, Mr. Driver headed up the VA Department of Veterans' Benefits. He was named Deputy Administrator, second in command of the VA, in February 1961.

Born in Rochester, N.Y., he received his high school education in that city. He underwrote his college education by employment with a Rochester insurance firm, and received a degree in business administration, cum laude, from Niagara University in 1941.

In his early years with the VA, he attended law school at George Washington University at night, receiving an LL.B. degree in 1952. He was admitted to the bar in the District of Columbia that same year.

He served with the Army during World War II from 1942 until 1946. His service in Europe earned him military decorations from Great Britain and France, as well as the United States. He holds the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Order of the British Empire, and the Croix de Guerre.

During the Korean hostilities, he returned to active military duty. This period of service ended in August 1953, after a tour of duty with the Office of the Assistant Chief of

Staff, U.S. Army. Mr. Driver held the rank of lieutenant colonel at that time.

Mr. and Mrs. Driver reside in Falls Church, Va., with their two sons, Joe, 12, and Kellie, 8.

Still Unanswered in the Baker Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Senate Rules Committee proposes to discontinue the Bobby Baker hearings without completing the investigation, it is interesting to see the number of questions enumerated in an article in the U.S. News & World Report of March 30 on this subject.

The article follows:

STILL UNANSWERED IN THE BAKER CASE—

The Bobby Baker case, it seems, will not die.

Efforts have been made to end the Senate's investigation. But new questions keep bobbing up, suggesting new lines of inquiry.

Here are some of the questions that are not settled yet.

The case of Bobby Baker in Washington has raised many questions, all unanswered, that apparently are not to fade away.

Democrats in the U.S. Senate keep saying that it is time to close the investigation. Republicans even more insistently demand that the questions be answered.

Bobby Baker was secretary of the Democratic majority in the Senate until October 7, 1963. He was close to Lyndon Johnson, now President, when Mr. Johnson was U.S. Senator from Texas and Senator majority leader.

Unanswered questions raised by Republicans cover a wide range:

Who told the truth, Walter Jenkins, right-hand man to President Johnson, or an insurance agent concerning alleged pressures brought on the agent to purchase $1,280 worth of advertising over Johnson family-owned TV station in Austin, Tex.? The agent says he sold $100,000 worth of life insurance on Mr. Johnson's life, and Mr. Jenkins then suggested the agent purchase the advertising. Mr. Jenkins says in an affidavit that he knows nothing of the advertising sale. Republicans want to determine who has told the truth.

Did Bobby Baker in 1960 receive $10,000 in $100 bills in an envelope at the Carlton Hotel in Washington—with the promise of $90,000 more—to aid "one of the presidential candidates" on the Democratic side?

Was an accountant's name forged on the tax returns of Mr. Baker, and of a motel in which he had an interest? Were the tax returns of Mr. Baker tampered with by any employee of the Internal Revenue Service?

Where did Bobby Baker get the capital to start on a number of business ventures ranging from motels to vending machines? How did Mr. Baker, with an annual salary of $19,600 a year, induce banks in several States to lend him a total of $1.7 million?

Was it unusual for a national bank in Washington to make a loan to Mr. Baker of $125,000 without security? What, if any, political influence surrounded the granting of a Federal charter to this bank, which included Congressmen among its stockholders?

Was pressure applied to induce the Internal Revenue Service to change a ruling, thereby enabling an insurance company to make a public offering of stock that created fortunes for a number of individuals—including Mr. Baker and some political friends?

Did American taxpayers indirectly support party girls on advertising accounts of defense contractors? And did these girls help to entertain at parties attended by U.S. Senators?

What is the story of the German girl, wife of a West German Army sergeant stationed at the German Embassy, who was mysteriously sent back to Germany after she was described as intimate with the Bobby Baker set and friendly with high officials?

Has an abortion racket been operating under the Capitol dome? Were Senate employees or Senators referred to a "Puerto Rican doctor" in arranging for performance of abortions?

What was the connection of Mr. Baker with efforts of certain gamblers to get concessions in the Caribbean?

Did Mr. Baker know, in the spring of 1960, that a certain Washington contractor was likely to be awarded the job of building Washington's stadium—an award not made until July 1960? And was Mr. Baker given a $4,000 kickback by the insurance agent who wrote the performance bond for the contractor? If so, why?

What was the persuasive power that enabled Mr. Baker to induce rich men to stake him to various profitable investments? Under what circumstances did Mr. Baker obtain $40,000 from the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma? Why would an associate of the oil-rich Murchison family, of Texas, offer Mr. Baker large blocks of stock without any cash investment?

Where is the pressure coming from to call off the Baker hearings? Are Democrats on the committee, as Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, charges, "under compulsion * * * to terminate the proceedings"? And are some of the pressures coming, as he charges, from White House aids?

California-Chile Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, when the foreign aid appropriation bill was before the House 3 months ago, this body wisely resisted an amendment which would have killed the California-Chile program. There were several reasons why the amendment was opposed, not the least of which was genuine belief that its vague wording would repudiate all the help and hope which dedicated State and local officials have given our foreign aid programs over the years.

At that time those of us who fought the amendment properly pointed out that here was a chance to move foreign aid closer to the American people, to give them something to which they could relate in the concept and actual workings of self-help on a people-to-people basis. We argued that the drums have boomed loud and long about State's rights, about big government that had lost touch with the people. We said here was a chance to decentralize, to help bring into being that which many of us advocate. We said here was a golden opportunity to help move foreign aid out of the hands of theorists and give it to practitioners of a free and viable economy, top-caliber people who have done much to help make California the No. 1 State in the Union.

Is it not ironic that today's critics of the California-Chile program are those same persons who were the drumbeaters of yesterday, and who will undoubtedly be marching in tomorrow's antiaid parade?

But I do not rise today to berate foes of the California-Chile program. Rather, in the manner of President Johnson, I ask them to come, let us reason together. Let us examine the program, carefully and objectively under the light of facts. We are united in our desire for a more peaceful and prosperous world and we want the lamp of liberty to burn brightly in all corners of the globe. A legitimate question, and one on which there should properly be various shades of opinion, is "Does the California-Chile program provide such a lamp?"

One man who believes it does is Preston N. Silbaugh, the program's director. His reasons are clearly set forth in a speech which he delivered before the Pan American Society in San Francisco on February 27, and whether one is a friend or foe of the program, I believe the speech is well worth reading.

The speech follows:

I am honored by your kind invitation to this luncheon today, and am grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you some of the elements of the Chile-California program.

This new relationship has lately been the object of considerable public scrutiny. Therefore, I am pleased at the opportunity to try to bring the picture of the program into sharper focus.

Your president, Hugh O'Donnell, expressed some personal concern over this new venture a few weeks back. Since I was standing athwart the charge, I read his remarks with some interest. He appeared a competent man with a broadcast, but I did note that his blade is apparently tempered with a willingness to support worthwhile endeavors in Chile.

I am hopeful that the status report I give you today will reassure him—and all of you—that what we are doing is worthwhile.

If you find from this report that we stand on common ground, then I ask for more than your understanding and encouragement. It is my hope that I will be able to count on the society's help. Your experience, after all, is an accumulation of wisdom gained from long years of inter-American endeavor—and is precisely the kind of support upon which an effective state-to-nation relationship must ultimately depend.

The rationale behind foreign aid needs no jurisdiction before an assemblage of informed men. It is an idea that dates back for a good many years. Benjamin Franklin had a presentment of its utility when he counseled George Washington to bring Baron von Steuben to these shores to organize and train the Continental Army. And we should not forget that just as we are helping with community planning overseas today, our Capital City was laid out by Pierre L'Enfant under an earlier version of a technical assistance program.

Anyone who takes a speculative look at the present state of human affairs in the world's developing areas finds in what he sees a solvent for his most stubborn reservations about the need for advanced countries to help emerging nations establish the base on which to build free and prosperous societies.

In March 1961, in a message to Congress, the late President Kennedy called for a "decade of development" and asserted that

the task of foreign aid was to demonstrate that in the southern half of the globe as in the north, economic growth and political democracy could develop hand in hand. But, he said, "existing foreign aid programs and concepts are largely unsatisfactory and unsuited." He indicated a need to try as many new and varied approaches to the problems of the hemisphere as the ingenuity of man could devise.

The Chile-California relationship is such a new concept in development assistance. It was first proposed in 1961 by two men long experienced in working with underdeveloped countries. They pointed out that many of the individual States, in their own economic development, had encountered problems of striking similarity to those of many developing countries. Also, they noted that the scale of State government is often close to the scale of national government in many developing nations. This led them to suggest that on the government-to-government level, State-to-Nation programs might have more meaning than those forthcoming from the huge bureaucracy of Washington. And with this very important added factor: that such programs would utilize not just government resources, but the entire resources of a State.

I take issue with those who would imply that the Chile-California program is some sort of gimmick to build support for foreign aid in the Congress. Quite the reverse. It is an attempt at a structure which will provide a channel for the great public goodwill toward foreign aid that presently exists. Since the announcement of the program there has been a steady inpouring of mail from the people of this State and elsewhere, asking how they can become active participants. The public response has been tremendous. The theme has been "we wish to help; what can we do?" People seem to feel that at the State level such a program is closer to them. There is a greater tendency to identify with it; a greater outlet for their desires to participate.

Various experts in economic and technical assistance support the thesis that the decentralization of foreign aid is both desirable and feasible. Robert L. Oshins, head of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, is one of the most articulate. Bob Oshins, whom several of you know, published an illuminating article on this subject in the December 1963, issue of the International Development Review. If you missed it, I commend it to your attention.

Oshins argues that the fundamental defect in free world development efforts has been over-reliance on Central Government and, as an alternative, he proposes that participation in AID programs be extended beyond Central Government to as many local governments, voluntary organizations, business firms, and individuals as possible. In other words, Oshins says we should put foreign aid programs on a level where people are affected directly, and where the degree of success achieved will be a matter of personal concern to all involved.

We expect the Chile-California program to have just those characteristics, both in its official technical cooperation aspects, and in the program for private participation which I will describe later.

The program will have other characteristics, too, and I would like to touch on them with you.

We believe that one of the primary criteria for selecting any development project should be its effect in encouraging other investment. A second is that the parts of any program such as this should fit together, without overlap and without gaps. These criteria have not always been kept in mind by AID, the World Bank, and others. All too often, the emphasis has been on "feasibility"—whether the managerial and technical competence was sufficient to carry the project out. Think for a moment what this means. It means that priority among projects has been based on the availability of manpower. The result of this approach is that weaker agenices become weaker and the strong become still stronger.

To her great credit, Chile recognizes the danger inherent in such an approach. She desires that the various segments of her development effort be internally consistent and derive their priority from inherent worth, because she has no desire to waste resources. It is here that the main thrust of the official Chile-California program will take place, in working with the Chileans in their planning efforts to the end that the various parts of Chile's 10-year development plan will be coordinated and that the plan will evolve as a whole rather than piecemeal. This kind of linkage is simply sound business, especially where resources are scarce.

Let me spell out the role of California here just a bit more. I believe technical cooperation programs can be divided into three general categories. The first is assistance in performing some particular operation, perhaps the introduction of a new technique. Second is the teaching or training of individuals to do something. Third is the assistance in creating local institutions which can then perform in a completely viable fashion.

Most of AID's efforts have been in the first and second categories. The California effort will be in all three, but with special concentration on the third, and the measure of its success will be the length of time we take to work ourselves out of a job.

Why cannot AID perform this third function directly rather than through the Chile-California program? Because the State of California is an ongoing operating organization and as such has many able practitioners and great organizational experience. Further, it has been the practice of State government not to limit its efforts to in-house activities but to utilize, by contracting arrangements and other means, the broad range of talents available in the State in other California institutions such as universities, nonprofit organizations, foundations, and private industry. Hence, we presently can provide in many areas a broad range of experience which AID would not be able to tap and mobilize except over a painstakingly long period of time.

Building local institutions or organizations is clearly the most difficult of the three categories. It demands, in addition to technical competence, an ability to deal with people and an ability to adapt known techniques to strange circumstances. It is the area where the foreigner is most likely to make mistakes and encounter difficulty, and where the danger of failure is the greatest. It is also, I think, the most important.

Until recently there seems to have been very little awareness that it is not enough to fund feasible projects, that a great deal more is needed. There must also be assistance in development planning, in the preparation of projects, and in the training of development planners and administrators. And—this is an area where the current machinery of AID contains few resources, but where California has vast experience. This is the reason why the Chile-California partnership makes sense—not because of a mere similarity in topography, geography and climate, but because these physical factors created specific types of problems and because in planning and programing to overcome these problems, the organizations of the State, and the people in them, gained the technical and administrative experience which we are now in a position to share with, and to adapt to, a country like Chile.

I do not wish to bore you with a detailed enumeration of every bit and piece of the official program, but neither do I wish to allow the program's detractors to be able to speak of its vagueness and uncertain objectives. Let me, therefore, take the area of water resources as exemplary and tell you how, in cooperation with and at the request of the Chilean Government, we will proceed.

The physical problems related to the development and improved use of Chile's water resources are in many ways similar to the problems experienced in California. Therefore, most of these problems are subject to the kinds of solutions employed in California.

California's experience also extends beyond the relatively simple physical water problems to the more complex related problems in the social, economic, legal, organizational, and financing fields. It is apparent that effective progress toward the solution of Chile's problems in water resources will result not from attack on any isolated water problem but from a broad frontal attack on at least a cross-cut of the problems in the whole field.

Therefore, the pertinent Chilean Government agencies believe that the most productive type of California assistance here would be a demonstration of the benefits of multipurpose water resource planning where the interrelationship of water resources with other important sectors of the economy can be effectively pointed up through the planning process.

California will provide advisory services in this area to a Chilean planning team in such a practical demonstration. The area selected for this multipurpose development is the Maule River Basin. The resulting plan will involve, in addition to water resources, all other significant sectors of the social and economic structure including agriculture, transportation, marketing, education, public health, and industry, and will undertake to define, justify, and rank in order of priority all projects in the region.

The concerned Chilean agencies are quite enthused about the possibilities of this demonstration, as are we in California. We have been assured the kind of country support which will make this rather colossal organizational job go smoothly.

Substantial and important contributions to this planning effort will be made by many different agencies of the Government of Chile and by other organizations. The problems of coordinating responsibility will be many. California organizational experience will be thoroughly tested. But I think you will agree that for purposes of overall national planning such coordinated multiagency effort will be of great organizational benefit and the most practical of training laboratories.

I do not know how conversant most of you are with the way in which the majority of foreign aid projects are structured, but I trust that you will recognize that this effort of ours is somewhat different in concept. There is no duplication here of anything that has gone before. This sort of thing has not been done before because the organizational resources were not available. We believe we can supply those resources, and so do the pertinent Chilean Government agencies. They want this kind of assistance and they have requested it. We are delighted to undertake the effort.

In addition, California consultants will also be in Chile working with Chilean colleagues in the coordination of sectoral efforts at the national planning level, assisting in the organization necessary for the development of long-term highway plans, assisting Chilean authorities in surveying Chile's educational manpower resources and needs, carrying out a depth study of Chile's marketing problems, and conducting a study of Chile's needs in agricultural extension and education.

This is the first, the initial, phase of our program—but the most important part of the work is the beginning. We expect to have these teams in the field and at work

starting only a little more than 1 month from today.

As you perhaps know, the Chile-California program has already established an office in Sacramento. It is staffed by a deputy director and two secretaries. Within the next month I will go to Chile and set up the headquarters office in Santiago. Helping me will be an administrative assistant and two Chilean secretaries. This constitutes the entire administrative staff.

What I have just described is the official phase of the program, that covered by the contract between California and the U.S. Government. The total cost will be borne by the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Chile, with California supplying only her talent and experience. There will be no financial outlay on the part of the State. Federal money should produce more results this way than under any previous efforts in these areas because our program has a flexibility not possible under the normal Federal programs.

However, there is yet another phase to our program than the official one, and I would take a few minutes more to discuss it with you. The Chile-California program as we envisage it is also intended to demonstrate the advantages of closer person-to-person relationships as an adjunct to the official contacts between two governments. Again, this is considered to be an objective more easily reached through cooperation between a relatively small country such as Chile and an entity such as California whose own scale is more closely geared to that of Chile than to that of the huge subcontinent that constitutes the whole United States.

Our discussions with representatives of the United States and Chilean Governments have led to a mutual agreement to stimulate broad participation by schools, service clubs, churches, businessmen's groups, communities—and above all, by knowledgable informed groups such as this one. This, we believe, will raise the level of effectiveness far above that of a purely technical aid program. This will be the area of the so-called impact project—the project that is quick and immediately visible—the kind of project which excites the imagination of individuals. It is our intention to bring this type of project to the attention of the people of the State or some particular segment thereof through the medium of a private nonprofit trust, the California-Chile fund. This trust, working through an advisory committee broadly representative of all segments of California life, will coordinate the activities of interested groups and channel their efforts into worthwhile and helpful endeavors.

It is not difficult to see how this would work on a school-to-school basis or even on a community-to-community basis. Community cultural exchanges, the assembling of needed school supplies, the distribution of sports equipment to small and remote villages, the thousand and one other projects of like nature which will channel assistance directly to the area of need rather than through central government, will be the business of the California-Chile fund. We hope also to be able, through this vehicle, to tap the vast resources of private industry and to bring the skills and experience of private enterprise to bear directly on the private sector of the Chilean economy.

During my recent visit to Chile I invited two representatives of private enterprise to accompany me. I asked them to determine means of increasing contacts between Chilean and California private enterprise groups—private companies, trade associations, agricultural cooperatives, and others. They were most helpful in identifying areas where exchanges between Chilean and California businessmen and industrialists might prove mutually beneficial. In the field of housing, for instance, improved techniques could do much to increase the volume of low-priced housing availabilities. Likewise, in the area of manufacturing productivity, especially at the small and medium size industry level, an exchange of information on product design and quality control could be of benefit to the Chilean industrialist. There are many potentially fruitful areas for this kind of private cooperation, but it remains to be determined which segments of private industry would most benefit and in what form such cooperation could best be organized. This is where we hope to lean heavily upon the advisory committee, which I mentioned earlier, and upon the counsel and advice of experienced groups such as the Pan American Society.

I previously stated that I believe one of the primary criteria for selecting any development project should be its effect in encouraging other investment, and primarily that means private investment, because all of us are aware that there is no possibility of governmental aid large enough to meet the need for capital accumulation.

I earnestly request your thoughts and recommendations on how to stimulate increased private investment, both Chilean and foreign, in Chilean industry. This is a very difficult problem, but as individuals with an interest in Latin America perhaps you would help us attempt some solution.

You are businessmen, industrialists, financiers, professional men; ann you are also knowledgeable about Latin America. This program needs your experience and your expertise. It is our hope to engage everyone in California who has a contribution to make. I am confident that you have such a contribution and I would be delighted to work with you, to receive your ideas, and to test the ideas of others against the background of your combined experience. * * * For this is your program—and mine—and every Californian's.

Recrimination Deplored, Crash Research Sought in Smoking Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and shocked that a Member of the House is reported to have questioned and impugned the integrity of his fellow Members of this body.

On Thursday, March 19, according to accounts in the daily press, the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., made a statement implying that tobacco State Congressmen and the American Medical Association had made a deal whereby the AMA would oppose the labeling of cigarettes as harmful to health and the Congressmen in return would oppose the pending medicare legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman from New Jersey has been misquoted, for such an implication not only is untrue, it is fantastic, and it is an outrage to this House.

I have been in touch with all developments since the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service on January 11 issued the report "Smoking and Health," warning of health hazards in the smoking of cigarettes.

Immediately upon the release of this report I introduced a resolution in the House calling for a crash program of research into the production, handling, manufacture, and use of tobacco, designed to ascertain and preserve the desirable quality factors and characteristics of tobacco products and to eliminate therefrom factors, properties, or substances which may be detrimental to health.

Simultaneously, I communicated with the heads of major tobacco companies proposing that they join in the research undertaking by contributing the physical facilities for a complete laboratory, to be operated by Government scientists who would render impartial conclusions on the research undertaken in the crash program.

I then learned that the tobacco companies, working through the Tobacco Institute, already had under consideration a grant of $10 million to the American Medical Association, for independent research such as was contemplated in the resolution I had offered in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I cautioned the Tobacco Institute against making this grant to the AMA, warning that some irresponsible people, with axes to grind, would charge that such a research arrangement actually was an attempt to bribe the AMA in its position on smoking and health.

But it was pointed out to me that the AMA already had begun research on smoking and health, and was ready to proceed immediately with a crash program, under a $10 million grant from the tobacco manufacturers.

My advice was not heeded, and now wild accusations have been flourished in the press, on television, and on radio.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must confess it never occurred to me that a Member of this body would broadcast an implication that the Members from tobacco-producing States had entered any kind of deal whereby the AMA would oppose the labeling of cigarettes as a health hazard in return for the support of these Members in AMA's fight against the current proposal for a health insurance plan—medicare—for the aged under social security.

In fact, I had no prior advice that AMA was to testify at all in the Federal Trade Commission hearings on the proposition of placing some kind of warning label or tag on each package of cigarettes. I doubt if any Member of this body from a tobacco-producing State was aware of AMA's position in this matter until an account of its statement appeared in the press.

I hope that the gentleman from New Jersey will see fit to retract or explain to the House the statements the press has attributed to him.

Mr. Speaker, research—fundamental, exhaustive, and impartial research—is the only sound and sensible approach to the problem presented by the report "Smoking and Health." I have pointed out on numerous occasions that 70 million Americans smoke cigarettes, and I have expressed the opinion that many millions will continue to smoke. Moreover, I have pointed out that the Federal and State governments collect annually more than $3 billion in taxes on tobacco

and tobacco products. It is my judgment that the Federal Government has a responsibility to use $5 million to $10 million, of the $2 billion-plus it collects each year on tobacco, to finance a crash research program into the health factors of tobacco.

Our Committee on Agriculture has reported the research resolution. As an indication of our desire to be completely fair and impartial the first witness we called to testify on this resolution was the Surgeon General and he was followed by the Director of the National Cancer Research Institute. Both supported the research embraced in the resolution. Not a single witness appeared in opposition nor did a single member of our 35-member committee vote against the resolution. Research is our answer, and our only answer, to the indictments that have been made against this great American industry.

And now, in conclusion, I will say to the House that it is my hope that this body will promptly pass the research resolution and that the tobacco industry will participate in this research to the extent of building and equipping the laboratory facilities, for the use of impartial scientists under the direction of Federal and State agencies, with the cooperation of the scientists of our colleges.

Mr. Speaker, we have a job to do where the health of our citizens is paramount. Let us have done with recriminations and get on with this job.

Floating Firetraps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the N.M.U. Pilot, published by the National Maritime Union, in an article on January 9, 1964, outlined a serious problem concerning safety measures on foreign passenger ships.

The tragic fire on the Greek liner *Lakonia* last December called attention to the inadequacy of international safety regulations.

I urge my colleagues to read the following article which points out the need for revision of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea of 1948.

The article follows:

[From the N.M.U. Pilot, Jan. 9, 1964]

FLOATING FIRETRAPS

The American public must be alerted to the hazards of booking passage on substandard foreign flag cruise ships that operate from U.S. ports.

Thousands of unsuspecting Americans place their lives in jeopardy every day on cruises aboard foreign flag floating firetraps. "Take a glamorous Caribbean cruise, at far less than you'd expect to pay, aboard the incomparably luxurious SS *LeHarve Monarch* * * * 14 fun-filled days—7 exotic ports—swim, dance, daze in the sun—gourmet food—gracious staff."

So read dozens of cruise advertisements in the travel section of any Sunday newspaper.

Too often, however, included in these glowing inducements to "fun and frolic" at sea is a dread bonus—a ticket in a sweepstakes whose grim payoff could result in unspeakable horror and death.

All too often the ad writer's "incomparably luxurious SS *LeHarve Monarch*" turns out to be a revamped over-age freighter, converted overnight coaster or a wornout passenger liner, painted and patched against her long overdue date at the scrap yard.

She looks fine to the landsman, who didn't know, and now perhaps has noticed for the first time that she doesn't fly the U.S. flag. But if the *LeHarve Monarch* was under U.S. registry she would be ruled unseaworthy by the U.S. Coast Guard.

There is a vast difference in the safety regulations which apply to ships of different countries. It can be a difference of life or death.

The safety regulations of the United States are the most stringent in the world. They set up strict design rules covering bulkheading and compartmentation. Cables and other electrical installations are required to meet high insulation standards. Fire doors, loadlines, sprinkler and detection systems are closely specified. Extensive firefighting equipment is required.

Draperies and furnishings must be of fire-resistant materials. The use of wood is rigidly restricted.

U.S. ship designers have virtually eliminated the use of wood as a construction material. A prime example is the superliner SS *United States*. Her only two fixed wooden installations are the butcher's block in the galley and the grand piano in the lounge.

A traveler who takes passage on a foreign ship, especially one of the many older vessels which are still in service, will find rich, often handsome * * * but highly flammable * * * wood paneling throughout the ship.

Such was the case with the Greek liner *Lakonia* which caught fire last month in the east Atlantic with a loss of 129 lives while on an 11-day Christmas cruise from England to Madeira and the Canary Islands.

The *Lakonia*, built in 1930 as the SS *Johan Van Oldenbarnevelt* for service to the East Indies, had great quantities of solid Dutch woodwork common to ships of that era. When political troubles developed in Dutch Far East colonies, her run was changed to Australia.

She later sailed out of New York and Fort Lauderdale, Fla., carrying groups of students on round-the-world voyages and passengers on cruise runs.

She had six fires in a row in 1950 which proved to be the work of a firebug. Some of the ship's officers were reportedly so apprehensive of a holocaust at sea that they secretly contacted the Coast Guard to insure the holding of shipboard fire drills.

The ship was sold in 1962 to Greek owners who changed her name to *Lakonia* and put her into cruise service out of England. In 1963 the odds caught up with the *Lakonia*. She foundered as her burning hulk was being towed to port. Rescue ships picked up most of her 1,029 passengers and crew—living, injured, and dead.

The U.S. Coast Guard does what is generally acknowledged as a fine job of enforcing the rigid construction and operating standards that make U.S. ships the safest in the world. It is nearly helpless, however, to protect Americans from the hazards of traveling on unseaworthy foreign-flag ships which operate out of U.S. ports.

Each nation has its own safety code and only the nation itself can enforce compliance. Basic sea safety standards on the international level are at the submiminum levels outlined in the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea of 1948.

A more recent, but still wholly inadequate, set of international maritime safety regulations were drafted in 1960, 4 years after the *Andrea Doria-Stockholm* disaster. But even this inadequate safety convention has yet to be ratified by a majority of maritime nations.

Federal law in this country empowers the Coast Guard to inspect foreign vessels serving U.S. ports and even to deny them the right to carry passengers out of this port.

In practice, however, Coast Guard efforts to enforce any vestige of decent safety practice on foreign ships are hamstrung by vast loopholes in the international safety codes and by the U.S. State Department which is sensitive to complaints from foreign shipping interests who protest any attempts at the enforcement of safety regulations.

In many respects, the international safety conventions serve not as a safeguard for the ship passenger and seaman, but as a convenient legal barrier behind which foreign shipowners are enabled to operate vessels with little or no genuine regard for safety of life at sea.

This was graphically demonstrated a few years ago when the Italian-owned Liberian-flag passenger liner SS *Nassau* was sold to Mexican interests and renamed SS *Acapulco*. The ship, a tired old P. & O. steamer built in Britain in 1923, ran out of New York as a cruise ship where her low rates attracted many passengers.

Flying the flag of Liberia, a signatory nation to the International Safety Convention of 1948, her owners operated under what amounted to a legal waiver from U.S. safety inspections.

On her transfer to the Mexican flag, she was immediately declared unseaworthy by the Coast Guard and prohibited from sailing in and out of U.S. ports. Not that she was less seaworthy than when sailing out of New York under the Liberian flag; she became subject to Coast Guard jurisdiction because Mexico was not a signatory nation to the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea.

This was soon remedied by the scratch of a pen. Mexico became a signatory nation and the 40-year-old *Acapulco* was enabled to rejoin the growing fleet of foreign-flag vessels in varying stages of seaworthiness which offer cruise and transoceanic services out of U.S. ports.

There are many famous foreign ocean liners today that could not get Coast Guard clearance as American ships. Fortunately, not many are put to the test of a severe emergency.

There's general agreement that the Italian liner *Andrea Doria* would not have sunk after colliding with the *Stockholm* in 1956 if she had been constructed to U.S. standards of compartmentation. American ships are built to survive the flooding of any two compartments without danger and without causing the ship to list.

Few passengers on the *Liberte*, formerly the German liner *Europa*, which was operated by the French Line for years after World War II, realized they were traveling on a ship that caused marine experts to speculate on "how the ship ever hung together."

The ship, designed to be a smaller, slower vessel, was lengthened during her construction. As a result she twice developed serious cracks. She was also plagued by fires caused by inadequate electrical installations. Nevertheless, she was operated by the French until they could replace her.

When the popular British liner *Mauretania* was finally scrapped she was revealed to be a "floating tinderbox" with shavings and sawdust up to 3 and 4 feet deep between her bulkheads as a result of a succession of conversions made in her wood-paneled quarters during her lifespan.

The cruise operations of so-called "shoestring" or "fly-by-night" shiplines put the unsuspecting passenger in the way of even more serious hazards.

A notorious example was Bernstein Line's *Silver Star*, a former Canadian corvette rebuilt into a passenger ship, which until recently ran out of New York, in the summer, that is. She was not certified for winter service in the Atlantic and therefore shifted operations to Fort Lauderdale in that season.

The *Ariadne*, now advertised as a luxury steamship, running from Miami to the West Indies, was formerly in ferry service between Sweden and England.

Two other foreign-flag ships billed as luxury cruise ships out of Florida are the former coastwise overnight boats to New England, the *Yarmouth* and *Evangeline*. A Greek line now operates the venerable old *Monarch of Bermuda* in cruise service under the name *Arkadia*. The *Monarch* was sold to her new owner after she was nearly destroyed in a shipyard fire.

Perhaps the strangest foreign-flag ship transportation offered to unwary tourists in recent years was the *Arosa Kulm*. Swiss speculators bought the *American Banker*, a vintage freighter built in the First World War and later converted to carry a hundred passengers. They rebuilt her to carry 985 passengers and ran her out of New York.

Shipping men, including Coast Guard inspectors who can't be quoted, are still shaking their heads at the old Mallory Line coastwise freighter *Medina* which was converted into one of the "luxury cruise liners" now running out of Florida.

In this ship the newly installed air-conditioning vents reportedly go through the fire doors for the length of the ship. This means that instead of being barred by the fire doors, a blaze could roar through the entire ship as in a giant flue.

Many fast-buck cruise ships still carry nested life boats, stacking two or three smaller boats inside a single large boat to save deck space. This type of life-saving apparatus has long been outlawed on ships under the registry of responsible maritime nations.

The ship cruise business is booming beyond all expectations as greater segments of the American population get more leisure time and more money to spend. The grim prospect of still more disasters at sea will also grow greater unless the public is alerted to the hazards of traveling on the increasing number of substandard and unsafe foreign-flag ships.

What Are Fads?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Desplaines Valley News, a weekly publication in Argo, Ill., discussing in a most fascinating fashion the forms of present-day expansion.

In view of continued debate on the national scene over the expansion or erosion of our personal liberties, this editorial casts an interesting light.

The editorial follows:

WHAT ARE FADS?

One hears a lot today about fads. Some fads will come along and few people will attempt to follow the pattern, while other fads appear and practically all persons follow it to some degree.

In our society, people are trying to find their place in the scheme of things, at all times searching for their collective place, while as individuals seeking identity or individual place.

Society, after all, is a compatible group relationship. Little leeway is left the nonconformist, for mass psychology is rather a powerful force in human affairs. It builds up from the squealing crowds at the record hops to the roars in the bleachers during baseball or football games, or in watching title boxing matches.

Young people, particularly, are eager to follow fads, to fit in with their group, to conform and to experiment. They will conform to the trivial and bizarre as much as to the stable and constructive.

In order to retain identity with his peers, the teenager must find joys of friendship, the happiness of doing something together plus the feeling that all is right if the collective group all participate in the same behavior.

Stray from the path of conformity and one becomes labeled eccentric or oddball, if not worse. Work together and imitate the team, then you mingle and belong.

Fads, in a sense, are a means of self-expression. They express the desire of the individual to experiment, yet conform to his ideals.

Fad with shortcomings die a natural death. Only those which express the dignity of a person usually remain. Teenage fads are merely ripples in the sea of life. They begin to express rebellion, but are really expressions of cooperation within their group.

In a sense, one can mold this urge to a pattern of good and harmony as unity and harmony is the desire of most people.

While the world has probably never before experienced such bitterness and discord as appears among mankind today, it is becoming obvious that the various groups are really seeking identity—a desire to be like someone else.

Khrushchev and other Russian leaders believe they will bury the Nation with the largest achievements. Yet, what these leaders really seek is to foster the same ideal or concept widespread in our American people in their own citizens.

What they are missing, in other words, is the freedom of expression in their attempts to force mass conformity. When a nation attempts to regiment freedom of expression, it flounders in confusion, for it binds the solution in chains.

For to limit freedom of expression is to limit experimentation. Virtually all progress within our civilization today was the result of fads and experimentation. When the motorcar was invented, it first was a fad. When the airplane was introduced, it was a fad to take a short hop in one of the machines.

When radio and telephones were introduced, they were first fads, then later became essential to modern life. Color television today is a fad, but is already on its way to becoming a necessity.

Television programs were limited to 12 channels until high-frequency waves allowed double the channels. Now, everyone will have a choice to twist the dial to something he individually likes not something that three or four broadcasting systems decide he should watch.

Dictatorship can never hold down for long that freedom of expression. The very challenge of being chained results in attempts to escape.

Someone is always trying to experiment, to transform, to attempt something new. There always remains the desire to become unique in the mass; to contribute a bit toward the total progress.

The fad is the response of genuine community action. Know its attraction, its appeal, and its place in conformity.

Panama Canal Crisis: Zone Residents Shun Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has tried to follow the current crisis on the Isthmus of Panama closely, I have found that the absence of objective reporting in the mass news media of the United States truly appalling.

Thus it was indeed refreshing to read in the March 7, 1964, issue of the Christian Science Monitor a factual and forthright news story by Ralph K. Skinner, special correspondent of the Monitor. As this news story contains important information and provides reliable documentation on the normal working pattern of 13,000 to 16,000 Panamanians who are employed in the Canal Zone and on recent actions and views of certain Panamanian leaders, I quote it as a part of my remarks:

ZONE RESIDENTS SHUN PANAMA

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

BALBOA, C.Z.—An estimated 13,000 to 16,000 Panamanians enter the Canal Zone each day to work. The majority are employed by the Panama Canal Company or a component of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Others may be employed in clubs, unofficial service organizations, or as domestics and gardeners.

These Panamanians enter and leave the Canal Zone without hindrance, because there is no bar whatsoever to traffic in or out of the zone.

Commercial trucks from Panama, buses from Panama, and private cars from Panama are all seen throughout the Canal Zone daily.

But U.S. citizens from the Canal Zone are not entering Panama—especially not in cars with Canal Zone license plates. This broad statement is backed by a careful estimate made by officials here that 95 percent of the Americans living in the Canal Zone have not entered Panama since January 9.

Even Panamanians who live in the Canal Zone do not take their cars into their own country with Canal Zone plates on them.

The relatively few North Americans venturing out of the Canal Zone into Panama is due to a feeling that Panama is not safe for U.S. residents of the Canal Zone.

This feeling persists because the Panamanian people have been filled with anti-U.S. propoganda so strong that acts against Americans are considered patriotic.

EDITORIAL PRINTED

The newspapers and radio stations have not slacked their tempo of propaganda since January 10. There is continuing pressure to convince the Panamanian people that the United States is guilty of aggression, physical and economic, although impartial hemisphere investigators find no evidence of it.

As late as February 19, La Prensa, owned by President Chiari and his brother, printed in an editorial that Panamanians have not much faith in the Organization of American States (OAS) investigating group. The editorial continues, "We should not lose time in taking the case to the United Nations. We cannot forget that the diplomatic power of the United States will use all its means to convince, pressure, or buy the al-

lies it needs to influence the verdict relative to her criminal acts in the Canal Zone."

Former President T. Gabriel Duque attacks the United States consistently in his normally conservative daily, La Estrella. This paper reported that American troops machinegunned defenseless Panamanians on January 9 in a plaza far removed from the Panama City-Canal Zone border which U.S. troops never crossed. This palpable falsehood has never been corrected.

COMMUNIST ROLE STUDIED

Harmodio Arias, Jr., Deputy in the National Assembly and a principal in the control of four major newspapers and a radio chain, has not denied the report published twice in the local press that he told 50 newsmen, "We should lynch the savage Zonians."

The Panama Government has continued to deny that the violence, rioting, burning of cars and property, looting, and killing done by Panamanians during the disturbances starting January 9 were incited by Communists or Castro-type agitators.

On this point, OAS investigators now back in Washington tend to agree, although they state that while Communists may not have incited the crowds that surged through parts of Panama City close to the Canal Zone boundary, they did play a part in their activities.

The mob actions have been termed by Government officials to be the patriotic indignation of a people angry at the United States.

But U.S. observers of the mobs along the Canal Zone boundary saw well-known Cuban-trained and Soviet-trained agitators leading the action.

The Real Man Comes Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the millions of Americans who watched President Johnson being interviewed on television by a team of brilliant reporters no doubt will agree with the comment below that "the performance was flawless because it was the man and not a performance at all."

The comments below were made in T. A. McInerny's authoritative newsletter for Independent Editorial Services, Ltd. I hope we will have more of these "visits" with the American people. Here is the McInerny comment:

WASHINGTON.—There had been sneering and wisecracking about President Johnson's handling of television until the hour-long interview last Sunday night, March 15. In that hour a new personality emerged upon the Nation. From Republican and Democrats alike it was confirmed that this was probably the most human, most honest appearance any President has ever made on the relentless, searching medium of television. The performance was flawless because it was the man and not a performance at all. This is the Johnson that his friends know, his family knows and the Johnson who will probably be known to the world for many years to come. The calm, strong and compassionate man was interviewed by the sharpest performers in the business. Upon them seemed to settle a calm, in the realization that here, a new and great leader was being seen.

Our Meaningful Heritage of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Elbert B. Rose, of Bridgeton, N.J., historian and Lincoln scholar, has been awarded the top essay award again this year by Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge for his essay, "Our Meaningful Heritage of Freedom."

Mr. Rose is a consistent winner of Freedom Foundation Essay Awards. He has entered in the competition 10 times and has received awards 10 times, 2 of which, including this year's, have been the best in their field.

It is a real privilege for me to call his award-winning essay for 1964 to the attention of my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert "Our Meaningful Heritage of Freedom," by Elbert Rose in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OUR MEANINGFUL HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Despite all that has occurred in the past 325 years, the heritage left to us by our forefathers has meaning in the world today.

Liberty, patriotism, courage, industry, and initiative—these are the principles that have made America great. These are the principles that have will continue to sustain us in the years to come.

It does not minimize the problems faced by our forefathers to say that the world in which we find ourselves is in a state of chaos and confusion.

Everywhere the evil forces of communism press against the frontiers of the free world. Crisis follows crisis. What the future may hold for us and for those unborn cannot be foretold.

Of one thing, however, we may be certain. The eternal verities by which men live will not lose their luster. In the critical days ahead the values that are so essentially a part of the American tradition will be those that have always guided man in his long journey from darkness to light.

We have seen in the history of our country how, in generations past, this Nation has repeatedly been brought out of confusion because patriotic heroes stood fast.

They were not ordinary men. They were men who shared with Patrick Henry the noble sentiment, "Give me liberty or give me death." They were men who would have scorned the shareful motto, "Better Red than dead."

They held in their keeping the safety and progress of the Republic. They kept alight the lamp of liberty because they refused to betray their spiritual heritage by abandoning the eternal values embodied in the concepts of truth, justice, mercy, and high regard for the integrity of their fellow men.

I know that I do not need to point out the value of perpetuating our American heritage. I am certain that we agree on the need to inculcate in the younger generation a sound knowledge of American history.

I fear the privilege of living in the United States in an atmosphere of liberty often suffers the same fate as many of the other good things in our lives. They are often taken for granted and treated with indifference.

We must reawaken to the meaning of citizenship in this land of ours. We are put on notice that we owe our country a firmer loyalty, a more active patriotism. This recognition is a stimulant for all of us.

The danger to America lies in certain attitudes that have become too common.

First, there is the attitude of certain sophisticates and pseudointellectuals who ridicule the idea of patriotism and the feeling of reverence for our great charters of freedom.

Second, there is the ignorance of the American tradition on the part of a large body of our countrymen.

Third, there is the apathy toward our national traditions by those who have knowledge of them but think of them as true but trite.

Patriotism must mean more than merely cheering when the flag goes by. It must be active, not passive, deep rooted, not superficial.

As American citizens we must be vigilant and unwavering in defending our form of Government and our way of life.

Civilizations have perished because individuals ceased to have a fighting faith in their cause and in themselves.

Our abundance and power among nations is attributable only to the principles that all men of this land should be forever free and be allowed to pursue happiness in their own manner, with the least possible interference or direction from government.

These principles were set down in the Declaration of Independence and were made legal guarantees in our Federal Constitution. In the composition of the latter document, painstaking care was taken to preserve its meaning and intent. A system of checks and balances was decreed for our Government to forever eliminate the possibility of dictatorial rule by the executive, the judiciary, or the legislative branch.

The most specific language was employed to protect the individual freedoms of all Americans, and the right of redress for wrong, whether by Government, individuals, or private groups, was made amply clear.

It is paradoxical that many of the attacks on our Constitution have been launched in the name of the very freedoms it guaranteed.

It is on these grounds today that the Communists, who have pledged to destroy our form of government, insist in the courts that freedom of speech, assembly and press, which are our heritage, guarantees them the right to go about, quite openly, with their seditious and traitorous programs.

It should be sufficient to say that our constitutional liberties are constantly under attack and the enemy is winning. He is winning because the average American either is apathetic to the patriotism which burned so brightly in our society during the first 150 years of our independence or because he accepts at face value the false promises of those who hold alien philosophies.

When I was a boy, I was taught that just about everyone who fought for American independence was a patriot, and it was implied, at least, that the superpatriots were those who made the extra sacrifice in the cause of freedom, such as Nathan Hale.

Today, this term is being used in application to everyone who believes in our Constitution and an assorted lot of extremists who don't. The inclusion of crackpot elements under the same covering term as is applied to those who are truly patriotic is a studied and calculated attempt to discredit those of us who sincerely believe in our constitutional system.

But there is one certain way to defeat such not-so-subtle attempts to discredit true patriotism. That is through the avenues still left open to us by the existing guarantees of our Constitution—the ballot. Your vote in behalf of patriotic candidates can and should be as powerful as the muskets in the hands of the minutemen.

In addition, it would be well if all Americans were a little prouder of their patriotism, as you are. I think former President Eisen-

hower expressed this belief best when he said recently:

"Too many of us Americans have become so sophisticated that we are inclined to think of any honest emotion, including a public display of patriotism, as corny. It is hard for me to imagine anyone being ashamed of patriotism, yet there it is. And this attitude can scarcely fail to seep down to our children."

General Eisenhower also recommended that American parents spend more time with their children in discussions of the proud and idealistic traditions of our country.

All of us, particularly you and I who are so aware of the dangers America faces, must work toward a rebirth of patriotism if we are to halt the erosion of our constitutional rights and restore the freedoms which our forefathers meant us to have.

Let us explain to our children the importance of historical events. Let's point out the significance of our national holidays. Let's make sure they understand the why of American history.

The history of America is the record of the experiences upon which our institutions are built. If we are to keep and develop these institutions, we must learn the names, dates, places, sacrifices, and splendors that make up the story of human experience in America.

Today America is challenged by history. We can meet that challenge only if we understand that heritage.

The challenge can neither be declined nor ignored. The forfeit is freedom—national and personal alike.

Let's think of the cherished principles that are enunicated in founding documents when we observe the anniversary of our independence. Let us remind ourselves that if our constitutional freedoms are destroyed, then all freedom itself will vanish from the earth. Let us not forget that it was our revolution, our beliefs and courage, which set the pattern followed by other nations throughout the world in winning their own independence.

And let us always keep in mind that what made our forefathers sacrifice their lives for this country was patriotism, but not of the simple type which has been exhibited in a thousand wars and revolutions since the beginning of time. It was the true and dedicated patriotism which is so firmly rooted in human rights, individual liberties and personal freedoms.

We cannot, indeed we shall not desecrate the graves of those great patriots who died that we may be free by supinely abandoning the fruits of their victory.

It is your fight, and mine, and our children's. With firm dedication to the principles of our historic heritage, we will win.

Limitations on Meat Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD the statement I prepared for presentation to the House Rules Committee in support of my request to make germane the provisions of H.R. 10345 to the cotton-wheat bill, H.R. 6196.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in appearing is to ask the committee, when granting the rule on the cotton-wheat bill, H.R. 6196, to make germane the provisions of H.R. 10345 or any of the identical bills introduced on March 11, 1964. All of these bills are similar to the bill offered by Senator MANSFIELD and others in the Senate, placing a limit on beef imports.

These bills, introduced in both the House and the Senate, do not go as far as most of us feel they should go in the limitation of beef imports, but they are a step in the right direction—they are a compromise between what the State Department has given to the importing nations and what the beef producers of this country feel they should be required to live with. As a compromise they have the approval of most livestock organizations.

At the outset, I should point out that while it is absolutely essential that Congress immediately assume jurisdiction over the subject of meat import quotas if American agriculture is to be saved from further ruination (and I shall dwell upon this need later)—there is no other way that this problem can be met, except as an amendment to this cotton and wheat bill.

An amendment similar to this was rejected by the other body on a final vote of 44 to 46. Had two votes been changed in the Senate this provision would be before the House in regular form. Under the circumstances, however, only this committee can remedy this serious error. The Senate subcommittee has been holding hearings on this problem and have heard the testimony of a number of witnesses, but, that body has now gone into continuous session on civil rights and the hearings have been discontinued. Only the Lord and MIKE MANSFIELD know when hearings can be resumed—when legislation which the Senate committee may sponsor may be considered and passed—probably not this session. The result will be that the beef market will continue to be flooded—agricultural income will be further reduced—more farmers will be driven from the land—more land will have to be rented or purchased by the Government and the war on poverty will have lost its first and most important battle.

If, however, this committee makes this amendment germane to the bill under consideration today—the cotton-wheat bill—then this bill, as amended, can go back to the Senate, the amendment can be adopted without delay and this farm legislation can immediately become law. Otherwise there is no chance for passage this year.

NEED

Livestock is the basic industry of a great part of our country. Stockmen are confronted with a kind of competition they cannot hope to meet. They do not ask to have all imports of beef cut off, but they do believe they have the primary claim to the American market.

In 1963 beef imports amounted to 1.8 billion pounds, carcass weight equivalent, on about 4 billion pounds live weight. Translating this into 1,000 pound beef, imports were equal to 4 million head. Not only does this represent 11 percent of all the beef consumed domestically—but it was more beef than was produced and marketed in the States of North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado combined in the year of 1962. These four States are recognized as great beef-producing areas. The American farmer is required to reduce production, in this country, by an area the size of these four States in order to accommodate these beef imports.

Putting it another way—the USDA estimates that nationwide it required the production of 28 acres to produce and market a 1,000-pound beef. Using the figure of 20 acres, however, we find that beef imports alone displaced the production of 80 million acres. We have before us today a bill intended to establish acreage limitations on wheat. The entire wheat allotment in the Nation is only 55 million acres. Suppose some of these acres, frozen into wheat production, could be used for meat production—would the U.S. Treasury have to guarantee price supports and reduce grain acreages—of course not—that acreage could go into beef production and the 270,000 families who were forced from the farm in the past 3 years would still be producing and earning and using the land for the purpose for which God intended—instead of being squeezed out of business through imports.

Let's put it another way—if the 4 million head which came into this country and onto American tables at full market value had been produced in this country, instead of being imported, they would have consumed 20 billion pounds of feed grain in addition to the roughage production of millions of acres, which is a complete waste to the national economy if not harvested by livestock. In terms of corn it would have required 350 million bushels. Certainly this would have made a tremendous difference in the amount of feed grain the Government has been required to purchase and place in storage or give away all over the world under Public Law 480.

Mr. Chairman, 1963 was a year of disaster for the American livestock industry. Prices dropped 25 to 30 percent. Gross cash income from cattle marketings fell more than $350 million last year and helped account for a decline of 3 percent in net farm income in 1963. This figure of loss was partially, at least, responsible for the farm parity ratio droppnig to 76 percent in December of 1963, the lowest since the depression days of the 1930's.

CAUSE

Many today are asking about the cause of this great increase in imports into this country. They are saying why have they jumped from 2.2 million pounds in 1959 and 1.7 million pounds in 1960, and 2.4 million pounds in 1961 to 3.9 million pounds in 1962 and 4.1 million pounds in 1963?

The answer is because of a protectionist attitude displayed by other trading countries of the world who close their own doors to imports while getting free access to ours. Until 1960 and 1961 England and the Common Market countries were a good outlet for free world beef. They raised their tariff rates, either by direct tariff hikes or by some method of import tax. The United States has done none of this with the result that this country has become a "dumping ground" for 60 percent of all beef offered for export by the rest of the world.

Some of the principal importers into this country completely ban any beef imports into their countries. This is true of Australia and New Zealand, the two countries responsible for 70 percent of our imports, and yet not one pound of beef can be exported to either of these countries.

WHY LEGISLATION IS NECESSARY

Acting under authority granted them in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 the State Department has entered into an agreement with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland to reduce beef imports in 1964 by 6 percent under the 1963 level. A reduction of 6 percent of the 11 percent of domestic consumption that was imported means that the 1964 imports would equal 10.4 percent of our domestic consumption.

The agreement, however, exempts such items as canned, cured, and cooked beef, veal and mutton. All exporting nations have to do is to increase their exports of these items and they can more than make up the difference. Actually, we may well see imports increased because of this exemption.

In addition to the loopholes in the agreement itself, the agreement hands to importing nations the 3.7-percent growth factor in the United States.

Beef imports have glutted the American market at the 1962 and 1963 levels. How can this surplus be reduced if we give to importers the growth factor in addition to the surpluses which already have broken our market?

In conclusion—the executive branch has failed the American farmer and stockman. On January 28, Mr. Ronald R. Renne, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture said, "Today the United States is the only major beef market without any quantitative restrictions and with a very nominal fixed import duty." We have become the "dumping ground" of the free world. The agreement with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland will not materially reduce imports. Imports must be reduced to prevent a more serious price bust in beef prices and to prevent agricultural chaos. Agriculture is a basic industry, and our national economy cannot be strong if this basic industry is weak. H.R. 10345, imposing effective quotas on meat imports, will be effective and is absolutely essential to promote an optimistic economic climate in which the meat producers of this Nation can operate.

H.R. 10345 can only be considered and passed if this committee in granting the rule on this legislation makes the provisions of this bill, or similar bills, germane.

Addendum: The March 30 issue of U.S. News & World Report in describing the war on poverty says, among other things, "Under the new plan, the Government would give the farmer up to $1,500 as a gift. This would buy seed, fertilizer and 10 beef cows—and raise his net farm income to $2,000 a year, according to officials." This is fine—but this program will increase domestic beef production. Where will this beef go unless imports are curtailed?

On March 20, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senate majority whip, is quoted by the AP as calling "for curtailment of beef imports and predicted President Johnson will act to offset declining cattle prices." He was quoted as saying "This is the No. 1 economic farm issue in the country right now." If Senator HUMPHREY's statement is true then certainly President Johnson would support this beef import limitation as part of the cotton-wheat bill.

Discrimination—And Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Milburn P. Akers, former editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, in an article of Monday, March 23, discusses "Discrimination and Justice."

The commentary deals to a great extent with the Illinois State FEPC ruling, but obviously it bears a practical application to title VII of the civil rights bill, as well as to the discussion on the floor of the House when that part of the bill was considered.

I insert the article at this point into the RECORD for the attention of the Members:

DISCRIMINATION—AND JUSTICE

(By Milburn P. Akers)

"Discrimination," as the word is ordinarily employed today, is an ugly thing. For the word, in its present-day usage, connotes prejudice—the prejudice of a majority directed against a defenseless minority. It is usually applied to malpractices, real or fancied, in the realms of race or religion.

There is, however, another form of discrimination that has come into being; the discrimination of an organized, articulate minority as directed against a single segment of an unorganized majority. It is a form of discrimination in which government, State, or Nation, too frequently joins with the organized minority at the expense of the unorganized majority.

The recent ruling in the Motorola case by Examiner Robert E. Bryant of the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission is a prime example of organized minority discrimination, aided and abetted by government, aided an unorganized majority—if, in fact, there is such a thing as a majority in this country.

Bryant held that a general ability test used by Motorola in selecting prospective employees was inequitable in that, in his judgment, it discriminated against Negroes. Some Negro applicants, lacking in educational and cultural advantages possessed by some white applicants, were assumed by him to be the object of discrimination. He ordered the company to stop using the test.

The examiner's ruling will probably be reversed by the full commission. Nonetheless, it illustrates a trend. An employer is supposed to conduct his business as a social welfare institution. He is to be required to provide employment for individuals, merely because they belong to a so-called minority group, irrespective of the abilities possessed by them.

Who is being discriminated against? The employer? Yes. But so, too, are applicants, whether white or colored, who possess ability and aptitude.

Society is responsible, in many such cases, for the fact that some applicants lack the cultural and educational background to pass such tests. But is that sufficient reason to require an employer to make up for the failures of society?

Is Motorola responsible for the fact that some applicants, irrespective of race, lack requisite education and aptitude required in specific jobs?

The responsibility for such lacks, whether found in a white or a colored applicant, is not that of industry. Sometimes it is the fault of the applicant himself. Many times society and government are responsible.

Why then should business firms be penalized for the failures of others? Why then should qualified applicants be penalized for the failures of others?

The Motorola case illustrates discrimination; the discrimination engaged in by those who would correct the evils and shortcomings found in our society by discrimination against others.

There has been far too much talk about discrimination. The tyranny of a minority is as bad as the tyranny of a majority.

We need to be more concerned in this country with justice; justice for the minorities and justice for the so-called majority as well. For there is no majority in the United States in the sense the word is ordinarily employed. A majority, even in the political sense, is a temporary grouping of minorities.

The Negro is entitled to justice. Justice demands he have equal opportunity. Justice doesn't require that he have preferential treatment; justice, in fact, should deny preferential treatment to any individual or group. It should also preclude discrimination against any individual or group, including industry.

A society or a government that has failed to provide equal opportunities for its citizens—opportunities which, if availed of, would correct many inequities—shouldn't penalize others for its failures. It should tackle the root cause of those failures.

Today's trend, as illustrated in the Motorola case, is toward the welfare state: an economic and social system which stifles incentive by reducing all to a common denominator. Aptitude and ability, the characteristics which the Motorola test sought to determine in individuals, would be disregarded. The self-sufficient, the able and the creative will be reduced in status to that of the dependent, the ill qualified and the mediocre. For in the idyllic welfare state envisioned by the social planners all must be reduced to a common denominator; none permitted to rise as a consequence of ability, aptitude or motivation.

There has been too much emphasis on discrimination, as the term is employed today, and not enough seeking after equal justice.

Greece and Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, for months the situation in Cyprus has teetered on the edge of catastrophe. Each new day brings the chance of more violence, and the chance that the result will have a serious effect on the solidity of the NATO Alliance. The bloodshed must be stopped. Reason must be maintained. A solution must be found.

My friend and distinguished colleague, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, recently made a forceful and forthright presentation of his views on this serious situation. Mr. KEATING's remarks deserve notice, and I present them here in the hopes that my colleagues and others can give them careful consideration. The remarks were made at the biennial meeting of the Order of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—an organization very much concerned with developments in Cyprus:

KEATING URGES MAJORITY RULE GUARANTEES IN CYPRUS

I am happy and honored to be here with you tonight and I know I speak for all colleagues in expressing gratitude to you for this tribute to Congress. I am particularly pleased also to join with you in honoring the eminent publisher and one of the great figures of our time, one who has done so much to illustrate to all the people of America the cultural glory and achievements of Greece—Henry Luce.

I, like you, look upon Greece as a homeland, not because I was born there but because my culture was. Greece is the mother country of freedom and knowledge—and each of us in the Western World is her son or daughter no matter what our national origin may be—for Greece has taught us—as no other nation has—the dignity of the human character, the truth of learning, the inspiration of art, and the glory of freedom.

The people of America mourn with the people of Greece the passing of King Paul—who was an embodiment of the spirit of the Greek people and the ceaseless striving for peace, honor, and freedom, which are so much a part of Greek heritage. In deepest loyalty to his homeland through its days of adversity, and in sincere dedication and humility, King Paul served his nation. And in a larger measure he served the entire free world.

Our hearts go out in sympathy and support to Queen Frederica and to the new heir to an historic throne, the young King Constantine, who faces a heavy burden of responsibility.

On March 25, Greece will celebrate its day of independence. Americans and free people everywhere will recall and be stirred by the grandeur of the struggle for liberation from 400 years of domination by the Ottoman empire.

Freedom is an inseparable element in the Greek character and as we remember the achievements of Athens in the Golden Age, the ancient culture that is still unsurpassed, we must not overlook the achievements of the Greek people in this century.

Greece has been an ally of the United States in two world wars. At great sacrifice, Greek soldiers and Greek battalions have fought for the freedom of the Western World. In World War II, let us not forget the cry of "OXI," on October 28, 1940, which gave a psychological lift to the entire Western World. Greece defeated Mussolini's forces and earned the admiration of the world. We must not forget that if Hitler had not been forced to send his crack Panzer divisions into Greece, Hitler's offensive elsewhere would have been faster and more formidable. The heroic struggle of the Greek people in the most hopeless days of the Second World War is recognized as a turning point in the struggle for freedom.

In 1947 to 1949, Greek courage and Greek blood turned the tide of Communist aggression in Europe. Greece proudly prevailed and proved to the world that the forces of Communist terror and subversion could not survive against the independence and determination of a free people. It was the first complete military victory against Communist aggression in the world.

Today, once again, the people of Greece, in support and sympathy with their compatriots on the island of Cyprus, are examining the meaning and implication of freedom in a complex world. The Cyprus issue is an old one, yet today, as in generations past, the same questions face the inhabitants of that troubled island. Back in 1940, the British Government put up posters in Cyprus asking the Greeks to "Fight for Greece and liberty." The Greeks of Cyprus responded by the thousands and joined the Brtish Army to fight for Greece and liberty.

They are still fighting in a different guise, perhaps, for that same basic recognition of the principle of self-determination.

Today, the world is witnessing on the island of Cyprus a needless tragedy. Two stanch American allies—Greece and Turkey—are drifting toward war on the island of Cyprus. Greek and Turkish communities are at one another's throats in what could become a bitter, bloody civil war. This communal strife does not help the Cypriots. It does not help Greece. It does not help Turkey. And it does not help the free world. Only the Communists can gain through the tragic breakdown of communications, not only between the Greeks and Turks, but also between the Government of the United States and those most intimately involved in the conflict.

Indeed, Khrushchev has moved to exploit the situation in the Security Council of the United Nations and in letters to the various governments involved, including our own Government.

But at the same time, I cannot recognize, and I believe the Government of the United States must not recognize that a permanent solution to any vital political problem can be found by giving a minority of 17 percent a final veto over critical Government activities including taxation, foreign affairs, defense, and security. One did not have to be a prophet or a soothsayer to predict that a government so constituted could not survive the give and take of political life.

Some of us in the Senate of the United States are today engaged in an effort to prove that in the United States a minority of 18 percent or so of the Senate cannot exercise a negative veto over the pressing issue of human rights. I do not protest the right of individual Senators to express themselves and make their views known, but I do question the right of any minority to prevent the majority from taking action, to block the majority from policy decisions that are necessary for the progress of the Nation.

So I can understand very well what the issue is in Cyprus. It is not a question of Turkish minority rights which are and must be fully protected under the Constitution. The issue is the extraordinary veto rights of a 17-percent minority over critical areas of national policy. The people of Cyprus deserve an effective government. And with a minority veto, effective government is impossible, whether it be in the Senate of the United States or on the island of Cyprus.

So far, the Government of the United States has hesitated to take a stand on this point, the Government of the United States has refused to support the basic issue of majority rule, the United States has failed even to suggest a final solution on the merits for Cyprus. This has unfortunately, in my judgment, contributed to the present crisis. Over the month our Government's offer to send troops or to pay for other nation's troops has left the heart of the problem untouched, and the core of discontent unmoved. The events of these months, and particularly last week, demonstrate that we must act on long-term solutions now to prevent a civil war on Cyprus and war between Greece and Turkey.

Yet our own Government seems somewhat reluctant to give open support to the principle which it endorses everywhere else in the whole world—the principle of majority rule. I will yield to no one in my support and defense for the basic individual and civil rights of a minority.

On Monday, March 9, and Thursday, March 12, 1964, I spoke on the Senate floor regarding an admittedly drastic solution to Cyprus—the transfer with indemnification and international assistance of the Turks currently living on Cyprus to the mainland of Turkey. In my judgment this proposal can no longer be postponed as a long-term possibility, but must be considered and evaluated now. It may be the best answer in the short run as well as in the long run. I was interested to learn that last week the noted columnist Walter Lippmann endorsed this proposal.

Whatever the solution—if we are to help the people of Cyprus move toward freedom and peace, if we are to free them from the eroding influence of Communist subversion, we must not sacrifice principle to expediency. We must act now, and we must accept our duty as the leader of the free world to support the legitimate rights of the majority for effective government.

It is not too late for our Government to recall that for the Greek people, as their history demonstrates, freedom is not negotiable.

The stirring words of Pericles, spoken in the fifth century before Christ, the golden age of Greece, are as meaningful today as when he uttered them, as meaningful to the United States as they are to Greece and to the citizens of every free nation who take pride in their origins and achievements.

For Pericles said this, 'I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country, until you are filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

Ken Barnes, Candidate for Student Association President at American University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the contribution being made by the citizens of northern Virginia to their community and their Nation is well known by all my colleagues. I am proud on this occasion to point out just one more specific example. Mr. Ken Barnes, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kendall M. Barnes, of Alexandria, is now running for student association president at the American University. It is the climax of 3 years of active participation on behalf of the students, and his neighbors, in student activities. I learned of Mr. Barnes' active role in student affairs 1 year ago, when he was in correspondence with me concerning a traffic light for students crossing Massachusetts Avenue to Leonard Center. I was happy to assist him in obtaining the traffic light now at that spot. This type of interest and dedication can only make Mr. Barnes, and those with whom he works, better citizens and better able to serve their State and their Nation.

The article from the American University Eagle of March 10, follows:

BARNES RUNS FOR PRESIDENT; WANTS "NEW LIFE" IN SENATE

Ken Barnes, senior in government, has announced his candidacy for the office of president of the student association.

The basis of Barnes' platform is his belief that American University's student government should take a much more active role in student, as well as university and academic, affairs. He said, "I think student government at the American University needs to be more than a $30-a-year activity fee spent by a once-a-week debating society. It should be stimulator, formulator, and disseminator of student opinion."

Barnes feels that the recently established graduate-level consortium of the five Metropolitan Washington universities sets a precedent for the possibility of greater things for the future. He states, "I think that the student body, working through its student government, should seek the extension of the graduate consortium idea to the undergraduate level." They should also "take every possible step toward the establishment of an interuniversity science center in Metropolitan Washington, and immediately work for a program of cooperative buying of textbooks by Washington area universities for sale to students at discount prices."

The student government, in Barnes' viewpoint, has not realized its full potential. "An example of this potential is the role that student government could and should have played in the recent administration decision withholding from sophomores the privilege of having cars on campus next year. Instead of taking definitive action, it simply bowed to the administration's somewhat arbitrary decision. I said at the time, and I continue to feel, that a more constructive alternative would be to establish grade average prerequisites for sophomores having cars on cam-

pus. Unfortunately, student government has failed to achieve its full potential in the improvement of library, bookstore, and cafeteria facilities. Here, too, alternatives to the status quo need to be provided. This can be accomplished only with extensive student support."

Barnes has participated in two fields of activity at American University. He is a star member of the debating team and program director for WAMU. Last year he also MC'd his own show on the radio station.

Barnes feels that, "Qualifications are more than serving in office. Service doesn't guarantee quality of leadership." He offered two reasons for not having been more active in student government at American University. The first was he wasn't interested due to his appraisal that student government has tended to deal with the least important issues, serving more as a club for its members than a governing body. Because he thinks it can and should be more effective he is running for office this year. The second reason is he has felt that the leadership in the last 3 years, although a product of a "machine-like group," was competent. This year, however, he believes that this group may have picked the wrong person to groom for office.

In closing his statement of candidacy, Barnes said, "Thus far a small number of students, in a tightly organized machine-like group, have dominated the student government on this campus. Their function has been more directed to self-perpetuation than to providing that positive role so necessary for effective student government. It is only by replacing this rule of a minority with a student government sincerely responsive to the entire student body that this positive role can be realized. As a candidate for student association president, I pledge myself to these goals and call upon all students to unite with me in providing student government with the positive role that it should be playing on the American University campus."

Mammoth Cheese From Wisconsin To Be Displayed at New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin is world renowed for the quality and quantity of its fine cheeses and it is fitting and symbolic therefore that the Wisconsin display at the World's Fair in New York will feature the largest single piece of cheese produced anywhere in the world.

The huge 17¼-ton Cheddar cheese was made by Steve's Cheese Co., of Denmark, Wis., in my district.

The production of this unique cheese was described in the following article in the Green Bay Press-Gazette. The cheese, when finally completed, measured 14½ feet long, 6½ feet wide, and 64 inches high, and weighed 34,591 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

WISCONSIN PLANT IS MAKING BIG CHEESE FOR WORLD'S FAIR

(By Ray Pagel)

Along about noon on Thursday, Steve Suidzinski should be able to relax momentarily.

By that time, after a 60-hour around-the-clock operation, the world's biggest Cheddar cheese should be safely encased in its sturdy curing tub.

Suidzinski, owner of Steve's Cheese Co. at Lange's Corners just northwest of Denmark, is producing the cheese for a 2-year stand at the New York World's Fair.

Construction of the mammoth Cheddar block—calculated to weigh 34,561 pounds—began a few minutes after midnight. By 5 o'clock this morning, a 2.7-inch layer of the golden product was spread over the bottom of the tub, with 65.3 inches to go.

MORE THAN 25 BATCHES REQUIRED

More than 25 batches of cheese will be processed in the plant's four stainless steel vats. Only by one, they will be spread and packed into the tub measuring 14½ feet long, 6½ feet wide and 5 feet, 8 inches high.

Suidzinski had little chance to relax Monday. It was hustle and bustle, with a few unexpected but minor hitches, as final preparations were made.

Movie cameramen, with cables, huge floodlights, and cameras, were present to record the event on film for a dairy promotion program.

KEEP OUT OF WAY

"Tomorrow," Steve finally protested, "you'll have to keep out of the way. If the men have to wait just 5 minutes, the cheese will be off grade.

Suidzinski was obviously anxious to preserve his reputation for turning out high-quality cheese no matter the size.

Frank Nemitz, a Denmark contractor, dropped in late Monday afternoon to check on the tub. He had supervised this part of the production, and was satisfied that the 2-inch planks of pine were sufficiently braced and shored to withstand the tremendous pressure.

Suidzinski said the huge cheese will require 375,000 pounds of milk—187½ tons.

FOUR PLANTS COOPERATE

Four neighboring dairy plants, besides Steve's, are supplying the milk. Another is on standby.

Besides Steve's own crew, some 25 other cheesemakers are on the job. They'll work 8-hour shifts or less, depending on the time they can spare from their regular jobs.

Suidzinski has a national reputation for turning out big cheeses, but this is by far his biggest to date. His previous record was a 15,085-pounder made 4 years ago. It was used in a California supermarket for the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture.

At 34,561 pounds, the World's Fair cheese will be more than twice as large.

The Wisconsin Cheese Foundation, an organization engaged in promoting the State's famed dairy product, is exercising general supervision over the production. The State department of agriculture is also actively interested.

EXPERTS ON HAND

H. L. Wilson and Myron W. Hales, Chicago, associated with the Charles Pfizer & Co. arrived Monday to lend any technical assistance required. Wilson is widely known as a cheese judge, while Hales is an expert on chemicals involved in cheesemaking.

Roland C. Behle, managing director of the Wisconsin Cheese Foundation, said it is planned to transport the mammoth Cheddar to New York City in April. Meanwhile, it will be cured at the Steve's Cheese Co. plant by means of a specially constructed refrigeration unit.

According to Behle, the cheese will be on display at the World's Fair until September 15. Then it will be taken on a tour around the country through the fall, winter, and spring before being returned to the fair for a second year.

PLAN TOUR OF COUNTRY

Carting the 17½-ton cheese poses engineering problems seldom encountered in the food industry. The Ford Motor Co. is donating a diesel tractor to provide the power, and Highway Trailer, of Edgerton, is providing the trailer. The refrigeration unit is being donated by Thermo King, of Minneapolis.

At the World's Fair, under recently completed plans, the cheese will be on exhibit next to the Wisconsin Pavilion. The spot is near the New York City building on the Grand Central Parkway, where thousands of fair visitors will pass each day.

Suidzinski said he anticipates that the refrigeration unit will maintain the cheese at its original quality.

"I figure there'll be plenty of good eating from that baby when the fair is over," he declared.

The Borden Co. has agreed to purchase the cheese after the 2-year showing. It is anticipated that the firm will use it for a special promotion, further extending the publicity that the production will receive.

A $35,000 APPROPRIATION

A substantial portion of the financial outlay required will come from the $35,000 appropriation that has been made toward the project by the Wisconsin Legislature. The State department of agriculture and the State conservation department are administering the fund.

Sharing Steve's anxiety that everything should come off as scheduled was Mrs. Suidzinski.

She was at the plant Monday to observe the installation of the cloth liner and bandage in the giant tub. "I sewed them on my sewing machine," she explained.

Further Information From Secretary Dillon on the Run on Silver Dollars and J.F.K. Half Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, during a hearing by the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday morning on the International Development Association bill, I obtained Chairman Patman's permission to ask Secretary of the Treasury Dillon some questions on an unrelated but very timely subject: the run on silver dollars at the Treasury and also the announced plan of the Department to permit individual purchasers at the Treasury's cash room to obtain up to $100 worth of John F. Kennedy half-dollars when they went on sale there this morning.

In view of the fact that the Director of the Mint had previously requested the Nation's commercial banks not to sell the new coin in bulk quantities, and to make it possible for millions of Americans to obtain a few coins apiece rather than have nearly all of them diverted into coin dealers' stocks, I said I thought the Treasury action was a case of asking the banks to follow one policy and turning around and following the opposite policy itself.

The Secretary replied that he was not aware of the limits which had been set for quantity sales of the new half dollars today at the Treasury's Cash Room, but that he would immediately look into it. Subsequently, the Department an-

nounced that no more than $20 worth of the coins would be sold to any one person at the Treasury Cash Room today.

As I told the House this morning, Mr. Speaker, even this limit was far too high. The cashroom's entire stock of 60,000 Kennedy coins disappeared in about 2 hours, with only about 1,500 of the many people standing in line at 8:30 a.m. able to obtain any. Nearly all of those who reached the counter purchased the full limit of 40 coins. If the $100 limitation previously announced had remained in effect, only 300 persons would have gotten any of the coins, assuming they all purchased the maximum number permitted.

So the 1,200 additional individuals who managed to purchase John F. Kennedy half-dollars at the Treasury Cash Room today, the first day they became available, can be glad the matter was brought up in the Banking and Currency Committee hearing yesterday morning and that the original limitation of 200 per person was lowered to 40. However, I wish it had been reduced to no more than 20 coins per person—and even that would have been quite high considering the widespread public interest in this coin and the great first-day demand on the part of average Americans—not just coin hobbyists—for a coin honoring our much-loved, martyred President.

OTHER QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO SECRETARY DILLON

Mr. Speaker, in addition to several questions on the Kennedy half-dollar, I also asked the Secretary three questions relating to the run on silver dollars at the Treasury and the policies followed by the Department in selling them for several days in almost unlimited quantities. My questions were as follows:

In view of the run on silver dollars at the Treasury—not just because of the fact that some scarce coins might turn up, but also because of the widespread belief it might be worthwhile in the near future to melt down the silver dollars for their silver content—has the Treasury given any thought to proposing legislation to reduce the silver content of the silver dollar? If they have only the same silver content as, for instance, two half-dollars—about 92 cents at present prices of silver—couldn't you resume minting them without the danger of their being melted?

I am puzzled as to why the Treasury has been selling silver dollars in almost unlimited quantities—what is it—$50,000 or $80,000 per person? When you do that, are not you just a kind of "filling station"—the dollars go out in large quantities, are picked over, and then returned. Why not just send them out around the country and give everybody a chance at this lottery, but limiting the number sold to any one person?

In view of the continuing coin shortage, which will no doubt continue until the new Philadelphia mint is built, and maybe longer, what thought have you given to fractional paper money—currency in denominations of 50 or 75 cents?

When this line of inquiry threatened to take too much time from our discussion of the IDA bill, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Secretary to submit in writing last night or today his answers to the above three questions and to two others dealing with the Kennedy coin. I received his letter late today, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the debate in the House on the silver situation in connection with the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, I think Secretary Dillon's letter will be of broad general interest to the House at this time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I herewith submit the text of Secretary Dillon's replies to the questions I asked him yesterday in the committee hearing in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over legislation of coins and currency, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1964.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: I am glad to answer the questions concerning silver in your letter of March 23, expanding on my oral answers before the Committee on Banking and Currency on that date.

First, you ask whether the Treasury has given any thought to proposing legislation to reduce the silver content of the silver dollar. The Treasury has considered this along with other possibilities, but has not felt that such a step would offer sufficient advantages to propose it to the Congress. In recent times, the Treasury has needed silver dollars primarily as a unit with which to carry out the obligation of the Government to redeem silver certificates with silver. A dollar with a lower silver content would not satisfy this obligation. Only in a few Western States has any circulation of silver dollars been traditional, and it is not clear that a new and different coin would serve the needs established by tradition. Moreover, a new and different coin would be sought by coin collectors and the number of the new coins minted would have to be great enough to satisfy those needs fully if any of the coins were to remain in circulation. You indicate that you feel that there is a widespread belief that it may be worthwhile in the near future to melt down silver dollars for their silver content. While we do not have any evidence that there is any hoarding of silver dollars for their silver content, since silver bullion can be obtained from the Treasury at its monetary value and the Treasury's stock thus puts a ceiling on the price of silver, the slight decrease in the silver content of the silver dollar that you suggest would not appear to be enough to guarantee no hoarding if there is indeed any tendency in that direction.

Second, you ask why the Treasury has been selling silver dollars in almost unlimited quantities instead of sending them out around the country. Until the option is exercised to redeem silver certificates only with bullion, they must be redeemed with silver dollars. Hence, it has not been possible to put limits on the amount issued by the Treasury, except to the extent that some physical limitations can be imposed in an attempt to regulate the precise timing of redemptions. The Treasury has continued in recent weeks, as always, to provide silver dollars to Federal Reserve banks up to their capacity to handle them for distribution to banks for traditional circulation purposes.

Third, you ask why the Treasury does not sharply limit the quantity to any single individual of Kennedy half dollars first distributed today. Since 26 million of these half dollars are being put into circulation today and they will continue to be minted and distributed as a circulating medium for many years, it is believed that there will be enough to satisfy all demands. I agree with you, however, that the quantity given to any individual on the first day should be sharply limited in order to speed up the servicing of everyone on that day. I am therefore directing that the cashroom give no more than 1 role of 40 coins to any individual.

Fourth, you asked whether, in view of the continuing coin shortage, fractional currency would be advantageous. Each piece of fractional currency would have an extremely short life and its cost would therefore be prohibitive, both in its production and in the security measures with which it would have to be surrounded during its preparation, issuance and retirement. During the Civil War some of the fractional currency then produced did not contain adequate protective features and counterfeiting was a serious problem. History has not demonstrated the desirability of fractional currency.

Fifth, you ask whether it would not be possible to provide that no one person can obtain more than a limited amount of Kennedy half-dollar at one time? While agree with you, as I indicated above, that a limit will be desirable on the first day of issuance in order to speed up the number of persons who can be served, I do not believe that limitations will be necessary thereafter. This coin will be regularly available in large quantities for many years and will serve the needs for a medium of exchange in this denomination. In these circumstances I am hopeful that rationing will not be necessary, and I am sure you will agree that it would not be desirable if not necessary.

I hope that this discussion will be helpful to you and that you will call upon me if you have further questions.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLION.

In Memoriam: Bishop James H. Griffiths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the 30-day period since the passing of Most Rev. James H. Griffiths, auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of New York.

It seems incongruous to speak of a period of time in the life of Bishop Griffiths because his ministry is eternal. His presence on earth and his gifts of high degree are so lasting in effect and evidence that his own death is obscured.

That we are no longer able to call upon his mind, his humor, his magnitude is a loss to all of us who were his contemporaries and his children in God. His country which he served in the military ordinariate can well remember and be gratified for his selfless zeal and fervor.

I commend his memory to my colleagues and fellow Americans with a humble and lasting sense of personal tribute and homage.

My steps in life have been easier because I crossed his path from the beginning to the end of his priestly way.

When he first returned to America after his career of splendid scholarship in Rome he lived in my boyhood parish at St. Augustines.

I was privileged to assist him as an altar boy and I learned baseball, humor, and that two great doctors of the church were Doctor Griffiths and St. Augustine.

His contribution to church and country was joined in World War II and as a serviceman I heard often of his devoted interest. When I returned to the United States following the war I read of his activities in the New York archdiocese and was particularly interested in a sermon he delivered before the delegates to the United Nations.

Shortly afterwards I met him in a New York subway and complimented him on his sermon to these diplomats, one of whom was the Soviet Ambassador. I asked Monsignor Griffiths about his health and he replied:

I haven't felt well since I met Vishinsky.

I was privileged to be in the company of Bishop Griffiths and know his warmth, his devotion to our Nation, and his vast sweep of intellect.

Some of the most enjoyable memories I have were at the commemorations in the Easter rite, in which he was learned and at home among the Cedars of Lebanon.

Most memorable of all, on February 27, 1947, he granted me the great honor of officiating at my marriage at St. Patrick's Cathedral.

I sadly note that on the 17th anniversary of that wedding his requiem was offered in that same cathedral.

During his life he took special joy at the birth of each of our children.

It is my hope that his example will serve to make our family a living tribute to his precious memory.

The account of the life and works of Bishop Griffiths which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet and the eulogy offered at his requiem are submitted for the RECORD:

EULOGY FOR BISHOP GRIFFITHS

(Following is the text of the tribute paid to Auxiliary Bishop James H. Griffiths of New York in St. Patrick's Cathedral (February 24) by Bishop Bryan J. McEntegart of Brooklyn.)

"If there is a splendor in the proclamation of our guilt, there must be more splendor yet in the proclamation of our acquittal; and indeed what once seemed resplendent seems by comparison resplendent no longer, so much does the greater splendor outshine it." (II Corinthians, 3, 9f.)

In his explanation of these words, Monsignor Knox comments: "We are told in the Book of Exodus that Moses' face shone with an unearthly radiance after he had conversed with God on Mount Sinai; for a time, he had to wear a veil because the Israelites could not bear to look on this brightness." And then, applying these words to today's priests, Monsignor Knox continues: "How much more do the faces of Christ's ministers shine with the reflection of His glory, as they grow in likeness to Christ."

What a fitting testimonial to the brilliant life and to the simple goodness of our beloved Bishop James H. Griffiths. His great achievements were but reflections of God's glorious gifts; his unaffected simplicity, the reflection of God's wondrous grace; his priestly living, the dynamic but undemonstrative growing unto the likeness of Christ.

His growth into the likeness of Christ, which this past Monday achieved its fulfillment, was profoundly influenced during his priestly years by one unique event recorded for us in sacred scripture. His priest friends have remarked that the incident in the life of Christ which most fascinated him, the mystery which he penetrated the most deeply, was Christ's transfiguration on Mount Tabor.

It is fittingly, indeed providentially significant that this man, whose life so shone with the brightness of God's gifts, should have been so personally devoted to this manifestation of God's splendor. A close priest friend, for whom Bishop Griffiths searched Rome to find a special pointing of the transfiguration, states that this mystery was at the core of his Christo-centric thinking, that its manifestation of Christ's divinity pervaded his worship of God, that the lessons of Christ's humility and humanity became for him a mandate of priestly living.

He semed to follow eagerly and unceasingly the invitation of St. Leo the Great commenting on the mystery of the transfiguration: "The Gospel narrative which we have just heard with our bodily ears and which has touched the inward hearing of our minds, invites us to seek out the meaning of this great mystery."

How appropriate that Bishop Griffiths' priestly life should begin with his ordination in the Roman Basilica of St. John Lateran, the patronal feast of which is the transfiguration: How meaningful that his priestly life would end with his last mass containing St. Matthew's account of the transfiguration.

It has, therefore, seemed proper to me to consider on this sad occasion of Bishop Griffiths' death the mystery which so filled his living, and to ask ourselves what lessons in the transfiguration can enrich our understanding of his priestly and episcopal life.

Basically, there are three factors in the Gospel narative of the transfiguration: First, Christ was filled with the brilliance of a divine illumination; second, He cautioned His disciples to tell no one; and third, He continued to walk simply among men as one of them.

Like the Lord whom he adored, Bishop Griffiths was endowed by God with splendor in the brilliance of his intellect; like the model whom he imitated, our beloved bishop imaged Christ's humility by a realistic acceptance of God's gifts; like the Saviour whom our friend so loved, he emulated Christ's humanity in the warmth of his human touch, in the genuinity of his affection for all men.

Like the transfigured Christ, Bishop Griffiths' life was marked by a divine outpouring of gifts that filled his splendid mind and illumined his life. This is so evident to all who know him, that its chronicling may seem superfluous; but its omission would deprive some, who are not fully acquainted with the breadth of his interests and the sweep of his achievements.

Archbishop Molloy, our beloved predecessor in the Diocese of Brooklyn, first recognized James Griffiths' talents during college days, and assigned him to the Almo Capranica in Rome. There he studied theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University, receiving the degree of doctor of sacred theology. After ordination in 1927, Father Griffiths was appointed to the Diocesan Tribunal of Brooklyn, where his competent grasp of the law was quickly noted. Later named vice chancellor, he was honored when Pope Pius XI made him a Papal Chamberlain.

During the Second World War, he was assigned to supervise military chaplains and chaplain candidates. And, so efficiently did he fulfill this task, that Cardinal Spellman gave Monsignor Griffiths the responsibility of administering the military ordinariate in 1943. A year later, he was elevated by Pope Pius XII, this time to the position of domestic prelate.

Meanwhile, his great variety of talents was also being expended in other areas of the church's apostolate. Imbued with his own principle that knowledge in itself is of no value, unless it is used for the glory of Christ and his church, he used his encyclopedic knowledge untiringly until the very day of his death. He was one of the founders of the Canon Law Society of America, and its president in the early forties. He closely cooperated in the founding of Fordham University's Annual Conference on Eastern Rites. He was nationally acknowledged as a master in the history and canon law of the eastern rites.

In November of 1949, his holiness, Pope Pius XII, elevated Monsignor Griffiths to the position of auxiliary to the cardinal-archbishop of New York. This very cathedral was the scene of his episcopal consecration only 14 years ago. From that time on, the profundity of his intellect and the breadth of his vision were expended without measure for the good of this great archdiocese and for the needs of the universal church. Civic affairs, no less than ecclesiastical, received the devoted attention of his magnificent talents.

His remarkable proficiency in languages and his comprehensive grasp of international affairs led to his being named Assistant Bishop for United Nations affairs on the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, also chairman of the Bishops' Peace Committee, and secretary of the Bishops' Committee for the Liturgy.

The Holy See recognized in Bishop Griffiths one of this country's outstanding intellects, and appointed him to be the Holy See's observer at the United Nations. When preparations were being made for the ecumenical council, Bishop Griffiths was named as one of the five Americans chosen for the Theological Commission for the Council, a task to which he gave himself unstintingly. At the Vatican council, he was also appointed a member of the Doctrinal Commission for Faith and Morals, and the Mixed Commission on the Sources of Revelation.

A man of lesser stature would pause in pride at the measure of his achievements, but for our beloved Bishop Griffiths, this outpouring of his gifts was simply the expression of his adoration of Christ, loyalty to country, love of church, and compassion for all mankind. He saw Christ vibrantly alive in His mystical body, the church; he saw Christ suffering in the afflicted and the neglected; and he felt compelled to serve his church and assist his fellowman.

The humility of Christ was the second lesson lesson Bishop Griffiths learned from the transfiguration. And how well he learned this lesson.

For there was something greater to this man than his talents, something more astounding than his achievements. Let us then, speak no more of what he did, but rather let us try to understand what he was. Bishop Griffiths' primary claim to greatness lay in the depth of his humility before's God's gifts. He recognized fully that his gifts were not honors for human approval but obligations for a future accounting, that his talents were but tools for transmitting divine truth, that his endowments were gifts for God's cause and not glory for personal conceit. He saw clearly that all he had received from the munificent hand of Almighty God was to be expended for man's supernatural advancement, and not for his own natural aggrandizement. His vision was so broad and his analysis so penetrating that he saw with realistic perspective the smallness of his own (or of any man's) place in the full scope of the divine plan. Understandably then, it was to be expected that he would always seek to imitate the transfigured Christ, who did not want His splendor revealed.

The humanity of Christ is the third and final aspect to the transfiguration scene which so influenced Bishop Griffiths' life.

He was ever inspired by the thought of Christ leaving aside the brilliance of His divine illumination and walking simply as a man among men. His legion of friends, civic and ecclesiastic, can testify that our beloved friend always remained a simple priest and a warm human being. He was indeed a priests' bishop, not only respected but revered; not ony leaned upon, but loved.

May I stop here for a brief moment to recount a few instances of his warm and unaffected human qualities. In justification, we might even use his own words: "This is indeed a moment for remembrance, when lights and shadows and familiar figures flit through the mind."

Despite the many preoccupations of his official duties, he was still attentive to the needs of people. Speak to his parishioners at St. Monica's. They will tell you of his visits, always unannounced, to a hospital to visit a sick working man, or to a home to spend a few moments with the elderly sick.

I cherish the story that, after receiving an honorary degree at a college commencement, he made thet humorously warm and encouraging comment to a student who had graduated with honors: "Congratulations, son, you earned yours; I got mine 'summa cum fraude.' "

Consider the poignant tenderness of his sincere outburst at a priest friend's eulogy: "How can I be expected to speak objectively, with a heart overwhelmed with sorrow, of one who has been an intimate friend for nearly 30 years?"

Recall his unaffectedly stopping in the middle of a conversation when the angelus bell would ring, to greet the mother of God as he would greet an old friend. Or, think of his unabashed wonder when almost 30 bishops and countless priests and dignitaries came to his mother's funeral mass, just a few short weeks ago.

However, his love for people could, when necessary, evoke a scathing denunciation against wrong. Eight years ago, upon hearing that a certain university would admit a Negro only if ordered by the courts, he declaimed: "Do you have to go to court to go to a university when we are all Americans, all Christians, and all followers of Christ? Either we believe in the doctrine of the universality of the human race or we don't. If we do, we must stand by what we believe."

True charity is a total of God, and of neighbor for the sake of God. Bishop Griffiths was a priest immersed in charity.

His unexpected death, which has so deprived his family, his parishioners, the archdiocese, and the church, has shocked and saddened us all. But in this hour, we must not forget that death is in reality the beginning of life, that the stilling of his eloquent voice among us is prelude to the first uttering of his unending adoration in heaven's eternal liturgy.

How clearly St. Leo expresses the same thought: "In this mystery of the transfiguration, God's providence has laid a solid foundation for the hope of the church; so that the whole body of Christ may know what a transformation will be granted to it, and that the members may be assured that they well be sharers in the glory which shone forth in their head."

And Bishop Griffiths, who so revered the mystery of Christ's transfiguration, now knows his own transfiguration, for "from the moment he enters the heavenly city, each one of the elect is transformed into the perfect resemblance of the Son of God. Why shall the fact of seeing God transfigure our souls in this way? Because our souls are like mirrors, and when they contemplate ineffable beauty, they will become, and forever remain, pure images of this beauty."

To his beloved sister, Helen, may we express the sincere sympathy of His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, and myself, and our bishops, priests, religious and people. Be assured of our prayers for your beloved brother, from the two dioceses which he served so well.

May the memory of this great and good man, of this devoted priest and dedicated bishop, sustain us all in this time of sadness. May we be inspired by the realization that now "the truth of the words 'Thou art a priest forever,' have been revealed to his soul in all its depth. His dignity as minister of Christ will be for him an eternal source of incomparable honor, and eternal cause for thanksgiving, for praise, and pure and indescribable joy."

May we all be strengthened by the knowledge of his continued love and prayers for us before God's throne, until that day when we hope we shall all be transfigured, even as he, into the likeness of Christ.

HIGHLIGHTS IN THE LIFE OF BISHOP GRIFFITHS

Of the 41 bishops in history with ties to the Brooklyn Diocese, none could be credited with a wider range of interest, activity, influence and accomplishment than Most Rev. James H. Griffiths, STD, who died Monday.

He was a curate and pastor, a linguist, scholar, teacher, writer and orator; expert on the Eastern Rites, Canon law, and ecclesiastical heraldry; served as chancellor of the Military Ordinariate and Vatican observer at the U.N.; and was one of the leading U.S. participants in the Second Vatican Council.

BORN IN BROOKLYN

Bishop Griffiths was born in Brooklyn July 16, 1903, the son of the late James Henry and Helen O'Neill Griffiths, and was baptized in St. Stephen's parish. A sister, Helen, still lives in Brooklyn. His mother died earlier this year and his father 32 years ago.

The brilliant youth studied at St. Agnes Seminary, which was then located on Union Street, Brooklyn, and at St. Augustine's High School. He was celebrant of a Mass Commemorating the golden jubilee of the latter May 14, 1960.

The bishop-to-be continued his studies at St. John's College. He was its first alumnus to be raised to the episcopate. St. John's awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1941. Three years later he received an honorary doctorate of letters from Manhattan College, and one from Fordham University in 1950.

DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

He attended the Almo Capranica College in Rome, oldest seminary in the world, and made his theological studies at the Pontifical Gregorian University, from which he received the degree of doctor of sacred theology. He was ordained for the Brooklyn Diocese in the Basilica of St. John Lateran, Rome, March 12, 1927, and offered his first Solemn Mass at St. Agnes Church, Hoyt and Sackett Street, Brooklyn.

Father Griffiths served as an assistant in the parishes of St. Joseph, Babylon, the old Our Lady of Mercy, and St. Augustine, both Brooklyn. From 1927 to 1929 he was also New Testament instructor at the Dominican Normal School, Amityville.

In 1929 Bishop Molloy appointed him as secretary of the diocesan tribunal and later as auditor of the ecclesiastical court. In 1931 he became diocesan censor of books. On October 1, 1935, he was designated as vice chancellor of the diocese. He was appointed a papal chamberlain by the late Pope Pius XI in 1938.

He was one of the founders of the Fordham University Conference on Eastern Rites and a member of its board of directors. He was also a founder of the Canon Law Society of America and was president of the organization in 1941–42.

With the entrance of the United States into World War II, Bishop Molloy entrusted to Monsignor Griffiths the supervision of the chaplains and chaplain-candidates in the Diocese of Brooklyn. He helped in the establishment of the National Catholic Community Service in the Diocese of Brooklyn, particularly at the Shore Road Club and at the St. Albans canteen, and was later appointed diocesan director of NCCS–USO activities.

As moderator of the chaplains' aid committee of the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, Monsignor Griffiths organized active groups in several parishes to provide chaplains laboring both in the diocese and throughout the world with vestments, linens, sacred vessels, medals, rosaries, books, and pamphlets.

REPRESENTED VATICAN SERVICE

At the request of the apostolic delegate, Monsignor Griffiths, who was fluent in six languages, handled the work of the Vatican Information Service in the Diocese of Brooklyn, transmitting hundreds of messages each month to and from persons in enemy and enemy-occupied countries. Through the cooperation of the Vatican staff, he supervised the work of tracing dozens of Brooklyn and Long Island men, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, who were wounded or missing in action.

When the Italian and German prisoners of war arrived in this country he acted in the capacity of representative of the Apostolic delegation in providing prayer books, scapulars, rosaries and other articles of devotion for the various prison camps.

On November 3, 1943, Bishop Molloy announced that Monsignor Griffiths had been appointed to the post of chancellor of the Military Ordinariate, or Army and Navy Diocese, in which post he continued general supervision of the work of the Catholic chaplains of the American forces all over the globe.

Pope Pius XII raised Monsignor Griffiths to the rank of domestic prelate with the title right reverend monsignor June 10, 1944.

CONSECRATED IN 1950

On October 15, 1949, he was named Titular Bishop of Gaza and Auxiliary to Cardinal Spellman in his capacity as military vicar. He was consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral January 18, 1950. His eminence was the consecrator and the coconsecrators were Archbishop Thomas E. Molloy, Bishop of Brooklyn, and Bishop William R. Arnold of the Military Ordinariate.

Bishop Griffiths offered his first Solemn Pontifical Mass at St. James Pro-Cathedral, Brooklyn, January 25, 1950. Archbishop Molloy presided; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Casey, president of the Tablet, was archpriest; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John B. Gorman, deacon; and Very Rev. Msgr. Vincent J. Baldwin, subdeacon. (Bishop Griffiths later served as coconsecrator of Msgr. Baldwin as first Auxiliary Bishop of Rockville Centre July 26, 1962, and also of Brooklyn Auxiliary Bishops Joseph P. Denning and Charles R. Mulrooney April 22, 1959.)

In March 1952 Cardinal Spellman appointed him to the board of archdiocesan consultors. In the following year, he was named to the Committee on Moral and Spiritual Resources of the International Information Administration, the Government agency handling oversea information and the Voice of America.

Bishop Griffiths continued with the Military Ordinariate until 1955, when he was appointed pastor of the multilingual St. Monica's parish, Yorkville, home residence of many U.N. and diplomatic officials, where he was able to make great use of his considerable talents.

In 1959 Bishop Griffiths was appointed official observer of the Holy See at the United Nations, and the following year he became the first Vatican observer at a New York session of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. He also

represented the Vatican at U.N. Headquarters at technical assistance and refugee conferences, at which he announced the Holy See's annual contribution to those programs. For many years he served as chairman of the American Bishops' Committee for the Pope's Peace Plan.

AT VATICAN COUNCIL

In July 1960, he was 1 of 5 Americans named to the 57-member theological commission, most important of 10 preparatory commissions of the Second Vatican Council. At the council's first session in the fall of 1962, he was elected to the corresponding doctrinal commission for faith and morals, and was also a member of the mixed commission on the sources of revelation.

Last fall he was named, with bishops from nine English-speaking countries, to the committee which is drawing up plans for a common English text for the mass and sacraments, in those areas which will take advantage of the council's new provisions for use of the vernacular.

Last June Bishop Griffiths gave the eulogy at the solemn pontifical Mass for Pope John XXIII at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He also celebrated a pontifical requiem mass for President Kennedy at the cathedral November 25.

The late bishop, a frequent contributor to the Tablet, was well known as a preacher and speaker at communion breakfasts and other events, at which he criticized, among other things, the slanting of news, court decisions permitting the showing of the movies "The Miracle," "La Ronde," and "M," and racial segregation as practiced by the University of Alabama against Autherine Lucy.

Bishop Griffiths was a Knight Grand Cross of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulcher and held the Star of Solidarity from the Italian Government.

Our Four Merchant Marines—Challenge of the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. One of the most outstanding and knowledgeable persons in the Nation with regard to merchant marine matters is Mr. Frank A. Nemec, executive vice president of the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc. It has been my privilege to know him and to work with him on maritime problems for many years. On March 12, he spoke to the Federal Government Accountants Association of Washington on the subject "Our Four Merchant Marines—Challenge of the Sixties." It was such an excellent address that I believe it should be made available to all Members of Congress. For that reason I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR FOUR MERCHANT MARINES—CHALLENGE OF THE SIXTIES

All too often these days it seems to be popular for Americans to visit the maritime wailing wall moaning that American ships carry only 10 percent of our cargo in the foreign trade and that this low percentage is conclusive evidence that our merchant marine is decaying rapidly and that large amounts of public funds are being wasted.

This 10 percent is an average figure, and like many averages it obscures more than it reveals. It is totally misleading when interpreted as an index of performance for our entire maritime establishment.

The plain facts of the matter are that the United States has four separate and distinct merchant marines, that three are beset by major problems, but that one of them is healthy and vigorous and should be a source of national pride and satisfaction.

Taken together, these four merchant marines of ours have one major thing in common—they use ships to carry cargo and passengers in our oceanborne trade. Aside from this, their mode of operation is different, the primary markets in which they each compete are separate, and their performance, earnings and prospects vary.

To group the performances of these four merchant marines together makes about as much sense as combining the performance of railroads, trucks, pipelines, bargelines, airlines, buses, taxicabs, and other forms of domestic transportation.

Only one of our four merchant marines—the common carrier or liner group—is directly subsidized. This is because the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted as a liner act—designed primarily to establish American-flag companies in our essential general cargo trades—and it has succeeded remarkably well. But—it never was intended to do more. As presently constituted it cannot provide major assistance to any other segment of our merchant marine. In the past, Congress has refused to expand its basic purpose and successive national administrations have not requested legislative change.

It is the height of irresponsibility to criticize the 1936 act for failure to do something which it never was intended to do and for which it has no legislative mandate—particularly when it has succeeded so well in its designed purpose. Let's stop tearing down—and start building up.

If our national maritime policy is to be modified—let's make the changes—deliberately, with full knowledge of specific problems and prospects and after realistic assessment of our national desires, objectives, costs and benefits.

Understanding begets knowledge—and opens the high road of accomplishment. So let us begin with understanding that our oceanborne shipping falls into four major industrial groupings:

Foreign trade:

1. Common carrier or liner operators.
2. Contract and bulk carriers.
3. Tankers.

Domestic trade:

4. Dry cargo and tankers engaged in the domestic trade.

At the present time the United States has about 920 privately owned active ships engaged in oceanborne commerce. In addition, about 300 other vessels are engaged in the Great Lakes. Of this entire fleet of more than 1,200 ships only the subsidized liner companies in the foreign trade and a relatively small group of our domestic tanker owners are building new ships.[1]

But—let us look first at the bright side of the coin.

COMMON CARRIER OR LINER OPERATORS

Today, the United States has one of the largest and most successful liner fleets in the world. A few years hence when the long-range ship replacement program is completed this fleet will be the envy of the world.

American liner companies operate as common carriers for cargo and passengers in the foreign trade, generally serving a fixed range of ports over trade routes found to be essential to the United States. Their present active fleet consists of about 400 cargo liners and 30 passenger and combination vessels. They make sailings with frequency and regularity and normally publish rate tariffs on most commodities valid for stipulated periods of time. They seek and carry most of the thousands of higher rated articles and commodities moving in our foreign trade.

Cargo liners are fast ships, specially designed for the carriage of general cargo and are becoming increasingly specialized to meet the needs of particular trade routes. Because of speed, cargo-handling facilities, passenger accommodations and other construction features, these ships are expensive to build and to operate. Large staffs are required to solicit cargo and to service the ships and cargo. The liner business is extremely competitive and U.S. liners compete with the ships of practically every major maritime power.

Now, let me crow a little and recite some solid achievements:

1. With the solitary exception of the United Kingdom, our present cargo liner fleet is larger than that of any maritime power on earth.

2. Our cargo liner fleet includes more fast ships than any fleet in the world, and even today to privately owned CASL fleet includes five times as many 20-knot cargo liners as the rest of the world combined.

3. In the early 1970's when our building program is completed we will have the newest and most modern fleet of cargo ships flying the flag of any nation.

4. As the result of recent breakthroughs in the field of shipboard mechanization we have a fleet which technically is second to none—indeed, with exception of Japan and a few other foreign nations, we have left the rest of the world at the post.

A retrofit program soon to be initiated will advance shipboard mechanization on ships built during the past several years and will insure that these new ships will remain competitive over their long future lives.

5. American liner operators have been pioneering in the development of better and more efficient cargo-handling techniques. Given the right climate, improvements in this area could be sweeping and rapid. But even at present, the American cargo liner fleet has more and better cargo-handling equipment than any nation in the world.

6. U.S. shipbuilding activity continues at a low ebb and in terms of numbers or tonnage our entire shipbuilding program is not large compared with some of the building and procurement programs of other maritime countries. But the subsidized lines are building new ships at the rate of about 17 a year. And hear this—a recent study prepared by the Committee on American Steamship Lines shows that these 17 ships are about 25 percent of the total world production of cargo liners of reasonable size and speed. For this purpose the study included worldwide orders for ships of this type having capability for sustained sea speeds of 17 knots or more.

Current U.S. production of higher speed liner ships (19 knots or more) is about 75 percent of the entire world production.

7. This American-flag liner fleet in 1962 earned about 36 percent of the cargo revenues in our export trade in addition to carrying practically all military cargo moving by commercial transport.

8. American-flag ship operators earned or conserved foreign exchange amounting to almost $1 billion in 1962, thereby greatly aiding our Nation's crucial balance-of-payments problem. Of this, the liners contributed more than two-thirds, with the subsidized lines alone having net earnings of more than $500 million in the foreign trade.

9. At December 31, 1963, the subsidized operators had contracted for a total of 117 ships costing the companies more than $700 million, leaving 178 vessels to be contracted

---

[1] The subsidized companies are associated in a trade association, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, sometimes called CASL.

for prior to 1975 at a corporate cost of more than $1.2 billion. This total of about $2 billion is the largest private shipbuilding program in the history of the United States.

This record of progress and solid accomplishment is no accident. It has resulted from the determination of the United States to have a liner fleet of modern design and able to carry a substantial portion of our foreign trade. This determination and the wisdom distilled from 25 years of faltering support crystallized into the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Since then, private industry, operating under the long-term operating agreements authorized by that act, has dedicated its capital, earnings, and abilities to this end.

Because of differences in costs (principally wages) between the United States and foreign nations, long-term liner operation in the foreign trade is impossible without Government aid. The 1936 act faced the issue squarely and granted qualified liner companies cost equalization subsidies—the so-called "parity principle." Subsidies are paid to contractors under the act and any citizen can apply and if qualified can be awarded a long-term contract—provided he meets the rigorous financial and operating standards and is willing to undertake shipbuilding and other obligations.

Under the "parity" philosophy of the 1936 act the Government says to the owner: If you will build your ship to American standards, we will pay the construction difference directly to the American shipyard. The Government also says: If you will operate that ship under the American flag regularly, in good times and bad, on a route the Government designates as essential, the Government will pay the difference between your high American ship operating costs and the lower foreign costs. Then you will be in a competitive position, to succeed or fail by your own efforts. The Government does not however absorb any portion of higher American general administrative costs nor any part of cargo handling or other non-vessel expenses. If you earn more than a specified return on the capital necessarily employed in subsidized operations, we will divide the excess 50–50, until the entire subsidy is repaid to the Government. For national defense purposes, it is cheaper for private industry to own and operate a fleet which will be available for military purposes in an emergency than for your Government to build and lay up the vessels in a reserve fleet. The resulting protection, the beneficial effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments, employment of those many thousands of American citizens in building and operating American ships, and the promotion of the American import-export trade in peacetime justify the cost of Government aid.

I don't mean to be a Pollyanna and leave the impression that all is well—

1. Cargo rates are too low. Consequently, industry earnings have been unsatisfactory and capital accretion has been accomplished only at the expense of minimizing dividends to stockholders. Higher rates and increased earnings will be required to fund future replacement costs and attract and retain necessary shipping capital.

2. More commercial cargo is needed—the American shipping public can help—and the Government and CASL are sparing no efforts in this direction.

3. The industry needs a prolonged period of labor peace, and there are signs of progress here.

4. The cost of the program is increasing. Shipboard mechanization offers promise of rationalizing future operating subsidies, but the prospect of rising shipyard subsidy remains unsolved.

5. The freight rate conference system and Government laws and regulations need overhauling.

Despite these and other problems, it is clear that the 1936 act has worked remarkably well—has accomplished its principal objectives—and that the subsidized fleet is a healthy, virile segment of our merchant fleet.

Now let us look at the darker side of our maritime picture.

TRAMP SHIPS OR BULK CARRIERS IN THE FOREIGN TRADE

At the present time the United States has approximately 110 dry-cargo ships participating in the carriage of bulk or other special cargoes under contract terms. These ships are not common carriers and operate on the basis of specifically negotiated contract terms.

They are not directly subsidized and because of high American operating costs they cannot effectively compete in world markets. Their continued operation depends upon indirect subsidies paid by the United States in the form of higher rates on Government-controlled cargo consigned to them under our cargo preference laws.

While tramp or contract carriers do carry parcels of general cargo, their participation is limited since their basic purpose is to carry the large quantities of bulk, homogeneous cargoes which move in world trade on a weight basis. Characteristically, this would include full cargoes of grain, iron ore, bauxite, phosphate rock, and similar commodities, with charter rates varying from day to day, indeed, from hour to hour.

In terms of tonnage—but not in value—the U.S. bulk trade is far larger than the general cargo or liner trade. In 1962, for example, the following weight pattern appears:

Dry cargo exports and imports

[In millions of long tons]

	Year 1962	
	U.S. ocean-borne trade	U.S. percent
Total	171.5	
Liners	47.0	
Irregular or tramp	124.5	6.2

As previously explained, in 1962 U.S. liners obtained about 37 percent of the total liner revenues. Cargo revenue—not weight—is the best indicator of performance in the liner trades. No percentage is shown for liners in terms of weight since to measure performance in the liner trades by weight of cargo is an absurdity. Yet this is normally the manner in which Government statistics are prepared. The purpose of the common carrier is to carry higher rated cargo (such as machinery, silks, manufactured goods and appliances of every variety) and this normally moves by measurement. Comparing or averaging this type of cargo with bulk cargo, such as iron ore, is something that no experienced shipping man does. Yet this is precisely the manner in which most of our shipping statistics are compiled.

Compared by almost any standard with the dry-cargo contract fleet of the world, the American bulk carrier fleet is unimpressive.

The fleet consists almost entirely of war-built ships which were acquired from the Government under the Ship Sales Act or under various other ship procurement programs.

Not a single bulk carrier has been constructed in any American shipyard for the foreign trade since the end of World War II.[2] During this same span of years the bulk carrier fleets of the major maritime powers have grown by leaps and bounds and have vastly increased their size and efficiency. Countries such as Liberia, which provide tax havens, far outstrip the United States in the size and modernness of their bulk fleets. As new bulk carriers are built in foreign yards, there is notable increase in size and speed. For example, orders placed in Japan by foreign owners during the last 9 months of 1963 included six ships of 30,000 deadweight tons or more, with the largest for a Norwegian owner having the prodigious size of 62,300 deadweight tons. To some degree this tendency is beginning to parallel the postwar trend of tanker construction toward supertankers.

There are no superbulk carriers under the American flag and, accordingly, these contract carriers are at increasing cost disadvantages since charter rates are set in the world market.

While construction of bulk carriers in domestic shipyards is permitted by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Government has not appropriated amounts necessary for shipyard subsidies. Applications for such subsidy are now pending, but the fiscal 1965 budget contains no provision to enable construction of such vessels.

As this fleet ages further, the prospects of its continued operation become less and less certain.

The time of crisis will soon be upon us and it is likely that the United States must soon come face to face with basic questions of policy, such as:

1. Is the United States prepared to directly or indirectly subsidize a tramp fleet on a continuing, long-term basis and if so, what form should this subsidy take in order to insure construction of new bulk carriers?

2. Is this form of subsidy desirable in the public interest and are the costs compatible with other national objectives? What effect will it have on the balance of payments?

3. Since foreign importers of bulk cargo generally control the routing of their shipments, how can the United States assure bulk cargo in sufficient volume over the economic life of any new fleet to justify its construction?

4. Is such a fleet necessary for the commerce and defense of the United States, or, as has been suggested in certain quarters, should the United States rely in this respect upon those vessels said to be "under effective U.S. control"? Or should vessels be built abroad for registry under the American flag?

These and many other alternatives and considerations comprise serious questions of public policy which should be faced squarely by the United States after a thorough understanding of the present and potential world markets in which the bulk carrier fleet competes. These contract carriers have problems unique to their industry, and lumping them together with the liner fleet only delays and obscures possible solutions.

Even with the constructive and sympathetic help of the United States the future of contract bulk carriers under the American flag is uncertain and they will face many operating and financial problems in the years ahead.

TANKERS IN THE FOREIGN TRADE

The use of American tankers in our foreign trade has shrunk rapidly since 1946 and at the end of 1963 there were only 35 tankers so engaged.

With low-cost construction and operating costs freely available to foreign owners and with the added inducements of tax shelters in Liberia, Honduras, and elsewhere, the problems of this tanker industry of ours have compounded.

Indeed, for practical purposes it can be said that a foreign trade tanker fleet has ceased to exist for the United States. A number of tankers survive in the foreign trade by carrying dry bulk cargo, such as

[2] Some, however, have been reconstructed through the addition of midbody sections and in other ways. Additionally, certain ships released from the Government reserve fleet have or will be reconditioned.

grains, because under our cargo preference law this type of cargo is more compensatory and available than liquid cargo. Others operate only because of military charters and other special purposes.

Foreign-flag tanker fleets have grown by leaps and bounds, particularly since the Suez crisis, and it seems unlikely that the international oil companies or tanker owners will wish to build tank-ships for operation in our foreign trade even if directly subsidized. New tankers are not being constructed in the United States for the foreign trade.

A number of suggestions have been made as to the manner in which the United States can compel the reconstruction of our tanker fleet involving such compulsions as limiting petroleum import quotas unless 50 percent of the petroleum products are carried in U.S.-flag ships.

This sort of an approach involves not only economic considerations, but also our relationships with other nations of the free world.

Quite plainly, U.S. tankers in the foreign trade are part of a very sick industry beset by pervasive problems, and the United States will have to undertake extensive and radical forms of aid if it desires to perpetrate an American-flag tanker fleet on the high seas. This, too, involves major policy deicsions and it is possible that defense considerations may override normal commercial criteria.

THE DOMESTRIC TRADE

By reason of our cabotage laws, ship employment in the oceanborne domestic trade is restricted to U.S.-flag ships and consists of about 90 cargo vessels and 200-plus tankers.[3]

TANKERS

Most of the tankers are employed in the coastwise trade and are faced with competition from barges and new and improved pipelines. However, the advent of the supertanker into our domestic petroleum trade will insure the perpetuation of a smaller but relatively modern tanker fleet in future years. Shipboard mechanization will confirm this possibility. It is likely, however, that in future years the tanker fleet will show a sharp reduction in the number of ships—if not in carrying capacity.

FREIGHTERS

Typical employment of domestic freighters shows the following pattern during the recent past:

Coastwise	22
Intercoastal	25
Noncontiguous	43
Total freighters	90

The problems and prospects of each are quite different.

On the whole, the domestic shipping industry has declined from about 300 ships in the prewar period.

In the coastwise trade, the successful introduction of the container ship has improved prospects by vastly reducing cargo-handling costs. Yet even here one must assess results soberly. Ships now being used are modified war-built ships with a relatively low capital base. Despite this, the financial return on these operations has been meager. Rebuilding of a new fleet at higher costs or added piggyback competition from the railroad may adversely affect long-term prospects of our coastwise trade.

The intercoastal trade is heavily reliant on the movement of lumber and canned goods from the Pacific coast to the gulf/Atlantic areas. High domestic operating costs and increasing competition from Canadian and other foreign sources are some of the major problems. Prospects for large-scale fleet renewal are dim albeit contrainer-ships are entering the trade.

Our two new States, Alaska and Hawaii, together with Puerto Rico form the principal cornerstones of our noncontiguous trade.

The growth of these key areas is heavily reliant on sea trade and it seems evident that an American-flag service to these areas must be maintained if we are not to chain these three vital bastions to foreign sources of supply. Increasing foreign competition forecasts an extension of the subsidy provisions of the 1936 act to these offshore trades.

Dry cargo companies in the domestic trade have been using ships costing about $1 million (before modification) which eventually will have to be replaced with ships costing 10 times as much—or more.

Here again the United States is confronted with a vital national decision as to the manner in which to proceed.

On balance:

Our domestic dry cargo merchant fleet has shrunk drastically from prewar levels.

Competition from new and improved forms of domestic transport is increasing; i.e., pipelines, bargelines, railroad piggy-backs, trucks and the like.

Operating results are marginal.

Technical innovations have helped—but may not answer underlying economic problems.

Prospects for growth and construction of new ships are not good—except in the tanker trade and other special situations.

CONCLUSIONS

The U.S. liner fleet, the second largest on the high seas, includes many of the most modern cargo liners afloat. In a relatively few years, as more new ships are delivered, this cargo liner fleet will be the envy of the world—in every sense of the word. Even today, it includes more 20-knot ships than the rest of the world combined.

The 1936 act as a liner act has been a resounding success. It has done precisely what it was designed to do.

As a consequence of conserving earnings the subsidized lines are reasonably financed and our liner companies and the ships they operate are invaluable national assets. This segment of our merchant marine is in good shape.

Not so with our other three merchant marines. In each of them we find serious economic problems—and a questionable future. Presently only the domestic tanker industry has the ability to regenerate—but it is likely that this will be a lower level.

Lack of progress in rebuilding our nonliner fleets is no defect of the 1936 act—rather it is a failure on the part of Government to realistically define and implement its objectives in these fields.

The success of the 1936 act and the strength of our common carrier liner fleet provides a secure anchor to windward. So let's temper the lessons of history in the light of present-day realities and develop attainable national objectives for the rest of our maritime establishment.

[3] This excludes 271 vessels employed on the Great Lakes—principally bulk carriers—which also have special and unique problems.

The active privately owned merchant marine of the United States, Dec. 31, 1963

Employment	Number of ships	Tonnage (in thousands)	
		Gross	Deadweight
FOREIGN TRADE			
Common carriers:			
Combination cargo and passenger vessels	30	420	270
Cargo liners, freighters	400	3,400	4,800
Total, common carriers	430	3,820	5,070
Tramps or contract/bulk carriers	112	930	1,200
Tankers	57	850	1,380
Total, foreign trade	599	5,600	7,650
DOMESTIC TRADE			
Passenger vessels	1	30	20
Freighters	90	750	1,080
Tankers	214	3,020	4,850
Total, domestic trade	305	3,800	5,950
Grand total	904	9,400	13,600

NOTE.—Does not include—
(a) 70 inactive private ships;
(b) Government-owned, largely war built, fleet;
(c) Great Lakes fleet, consisting of 271 ships, mostly bulk carriers—
Nor does it include ships said to be "under effective control of the United States."

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, "Employment Report," Dec. 31, 1963, rounded. Employment is typical.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Flammable Fabrics Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I just received from Dr. Edward Press, chairman of the Accident Prevention Committee of the American Public Health Association, on the subject of H.R. 10445, a bill I recently introduced which would include all types of bedding under the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. I was very pleased to learn of Dr. Press' interest in the need for this legislation, and I call to the attention and consideration of my colleagues his letter and the following proposed statement for the American Academy of Pediatrics Accident Prevention Committee:

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 20, 1964.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Minnesota Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: I am very much interested in the bill (H.R. 10445) that you introduced on March 16 for revising the Federal Flammable Fabrics Act.

My committee of the American Public Health Association and a similar committee of the American Academy of Pediatrics on which I also serve have been exploring this field actively for several years. We feel that there is considerable need for a widespread educational campaign to encourage the use of flame resistant treatments on fabrics that are frequently involved in serious or fatal injuries. One beginning step in such an educational campaign in my opinion is an amendment to the Federal Flammable Fabrics Act in general adopting the revised Standards of the National Fire Protection Association rather than the 10-year-old Commercial Standard 191–53 which among other things consider any fabric safe that requires more than 1 second to ignite. If you have not already seen it I believe you will be interested in the enclosed document I prepared as an aftermath of some testimony I gave at a recent meeting of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Interstate Commerce. You will note that there are specific allusions in the statement to fatalities from the ignition of bedding or fabric on furniture. For example in New York City in 1960, 44 fatalities involved flammable bedding fabrics.

I would appreciate your sending me a copy of your bill and any general comments on the subject that you would have.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

EDWARD PRESS, M.D.,
Chairman, Accident Prevention Committee.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS

(Statement for American Academy of Pediatrics Accident Prevention Committee)

Thousands of children suffer serious injuries and hundreds die annually in the United States as the result of burns associated with flammable fabrics used in clothing, curtains, bedding, drapes and other similar materials. The American Academy of Pediatrics has had a longstanding interest in the prevention of burns and in the improvement of their treatment. Several of their committees are involved in this. The accident prevention committee has conducted a joint study with the National Fire Protection Association of the circumstances and fabrics involved in 91 serious or fatal burns that involved clothing. The academy-sponsored American Standards Association Committee on Hazards to Children is also concerned with safety standards for materials and substances involved in childhood accidents.

SIZE AND EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

In 1960, there were a total of 7,645 deaths from fire and explosion recorded in the United States. The exact proportion of these in which wearing apparel or other fabrics such as curtains, drapes, mattresses, etc. were involved was not recorded. An analysis by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. estimates that 13 percent of deaths from such burns among their policyholders were due to the ignition of clothing. They also estimate that an additional similar percentage occurred in connection with fabrics other than clothing, such as bedding, upholstery, curtains, drapes, etc.

A study of accidental fatalities in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County, Ohio, reported a total of 169 deaths there from 1959 to 1962 that resulted from fire and explosion of combustible materials. Of these, 60 or 35 percent were directly attributed to the ignition of clothing and 7 more to the ignition of bedding or fabric on furniture. Eight other cases were felt to be due to "careless smoking" which carries a strong implication of fabric ignition. This would make a total of 75 of the 169 deaths, or 44.4 percent that were associated with flammable fabrics.

Another study conducted through special supplements of death certificates in the State of Colorado over a 4-year period from 1954 to 1958, revealed that of 120 fatalities due to fire and explosion of combustible material, 60 or 50 percent were due to ignition of clothing or other fabrics. Of these, 26 involved the ignition of clothing, 23 the ignition of bed or furniture fabrics while smoking, 11 were due to the ignition of flammable fabrics other than clothing for reasons other than smoking. Another 10 or 8 percent were due to flash fires or localized explosions which probably ignited clothing although the report does not specify this.

A report from the Tennessee Crippled Childrens' Services covering the 3-year period from 1959 to 1961 found that 142 children received medical or related service for burns during this 3-year period and of these, 58, or 40.8 percent, resulted from clothing fires.

In a review of burns among children in Robeson County, N.C., a total of 51 cases were studied and of these, 14 were due to fire or explosion. Thirteen of the fourteen involved clothing fires. The remainder occurred as a result of scalds or contacts with other hot objects.

In an effort to determine the proportion of fire and explosion fatalities that were caused by clothing or other flammable fabrics, the coroners or medical examiners of several major cities were contacted directly by the chairman of the committee on hazards to children. In summary, in Cook County, Chicago, 27 persons died as a result of ignition of their clothing in 1962, 21 were residents of the city and 6 of the suburban areas of the county. In Cuyahoga County with a population of about 1.75 million, there were 23 fatalities in 1962 from the ignition of clothing. In Los Angeles County, for the year ending June 30, 1962, there was a total of 142 deaths resulting from fire. Of these, 48 were associated with clothing and 13 with other flammable nonclothing items such as mattresses, upholstery, etc. In New York City, for 1960, there were a total of 216 deaths as the result of fire or conflagration. Forty-four of these involved flammable bedding fabrics and resulted from smoking in bed. Although the exact amount associated with the ignition of clothing was not specifically determined an estimate of 40 percent was made by one of the officials of the medical examiners office. In Miami and Dade County, Fla., there were 37 deaths from fire and conflagration. Twenty-six of these were adult fire victims where smoking was the point of origin so that the implication of clothing or other fabric being ignited is strong. Five of the 1960 fatalities were recorded as not being associated with smoking but involving the ignition of clothing.

A study by the State fire marshal's office in California for the years 1951 to 1953 inclusive, gave a total of 206 fatalities where the ignition of clothing was a major contributing factor to the fatality. Approximately three times as many occurred in females (152 versus 54) as in males. In addition, as noted in the table below, there is a disproportionately large number of fatalities among the children and the aged. Persons in these age groups are especially vulnerable to accidental ignition of clothing.

California fatalities from clothing ignition, 1951 to 1953, inclusive

Age group	Number of deaths			Percent of deaths	Percent of population
	Male	Female	Total		
0 to 9	5	59	64	31	18
10 to 19	0	12	12	6	12
20 to 74	31	49	80	39	66
75 and over	18	32	50	24	4
Total	54	152	206	100	100

EPIDEMIOLOGY

Reviewing the circumstances involved by an epidemiologic appraisal of the host, the agent and the environment reveals several areas of approach in controlling the source of casualties. Assuming that the agent concerned is fire, the environment, the clothing, upholstery, bedding, drapes, or other portions of the surroundings that catch on fire

and the host, the child or adult burned, the situation can be studied epidemiologically.

Environment: Clothing and other flammable fabrics.

If the fabrics involved were completely flame-resistant, a substantial segment of the fatalities and injuries could be prevented. Pediatricians and many other technical and professional personnel were made tragically aware of the factor of excessive flammability in 1945 when a popular boys costume of cowboy chaps made from a fabric with a high rayon pile surface figured in a series of serious and fatal burns throughout the country. In 1951, a similar high pile rayon fabric used in sweaters that soon became known as "torch" sweaters intensified public awareness of these excessively flammable fabrics and indirectly led to the passage of a Federal Flammable Fabrics Act in 1953. California, where the first similar legislation was passed in 1948 following the episode of cowboy chaps in 1945, led both the other States and the Federal Government in this effort to reduce the hazard of the clothing environment.

The National Fire Protection Association organized their wearing apparel committee in 1951 following the "torch" sweater episode and this committee has developed a series of standards for flammable fabrics, the current revision of which was published in 1962. Although this standard, which unlike the commercial standard CS191–53 includes prohibitions for the excessively flammable costume material such as hula skirts and related items which cannot be tested under the standards of the Federal Flammable Fabrics Act; it still is far from the ultimate answer. A recent joint study of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the National Fire Protection Association showed that a substantial share of the clothes involved have average or normal flammability.

In this study, 91 patients that received serious burns as the result of the ignition of their clothing had each of the various items of clothing involved tested by the U.S. Testing Co. to determine whether of not they were in the "dangerously flammable" category. It was found that 109 of 120 different clothing samples tested failed the portion of CS191–53 that requires the fabric to ignite within 1 second. These 109 all required more than 1 second to ignite. In addition, for plain surface fabrics, a rate of speed specified in CS191–53 requires the flame to travel 5 inches with the fabric at a 45° angle in 3½ seconds or less. In not a single one of the 121 clothing items did the flame travel this rapidly. In spite of this most of these 91 cases were seriously enough burned to require considerable medical care, including several fatalities. It may thus be seen that the standards promulgated by the U.S. Department of Commerce that includes requirements for ignition of not over 1 second and for plain surface fabrics a burning speed of 5 inches in 3½ seconds misses most of the clothing flammable enough to inflict serious or fatal burns.

This is one of the reasons that the National Fire Protection Association has developed somewhat different standards from that used by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce. The NFPA standard does not limit the fabrics to those that will ignite within 1 second but checks their rate of burning after they have been ignited. This more closely simulates the natural conditions of accidental burns.

However, even if the more realistic standards of the NFPA are used instead of those of the U.S. Department of Commerce, there are certain fabrics that could still be dangerous. In general, fibers with a cellulose base such as cotton and rayon (made from wood fiber), burn more readily than synthetics such as nylon, orlon, dacron, etc. Indeed, some of the synthetics such as "Verel" which is a modacrylic fiber are relatively flame resistant naturally. Saran, Vinyon and Dynel also fail to burn easily. Wool is especially flame resistant. Silk, before sizing is added, is also relatively flame resistant. However, some of the processes for stiffening or giving increased body to silk, cotton and other fabrics increase their flammability.

Although many of the synthetic fibers such as nylon, orlon and dacron do not burn rapidly, when they do burn or when they are exposed to heat from adjacent layers of cotton or rayon which have been ignited, they tend to soften and melt forming a relatively hot, sticky, tarlike substance which in its molten stage can cause serious burns.

In addition to the burning characteristics exhibited by the various textile fibers, the manner in which they are woven and worn contribute substantially to their degree of fire hazards. For example, those woven with high nap or pile surfaces have a very large number of edges or points available for ignition. Also because of the abundant air (and oxygen) between them, combustion is extremely easy and rapid. Thus they burn much more readily than fabrics with a plain surface. Some, when ignited, will have the flame almost flash across the surface within a few seconds. Fabrics that are loosely woven but with considerable air space between the fibers, i.e., those with a low weight per unit surface, burn more rapidly than heavy, dense materials, with a low portion of air and a high density per unit surface. Material such as voiles and organdies usually burn very rapidly. Indeed, they burn so rapidly they were prohibited from sale under the original Federal standards, and it was necessary to revise these standards from a minimum of 4 seconds (per 5 inches burning rate) to 3½ seconds, to allow their sale in interstate commerce. In addition to the weaves and type of fiber, the style, design, and method of wearing are factors involved in burn hazards. The fluffy lace petticoats and the wide skirts often worn by little girls, particularly at parties, are much more prone to be ignited than tight-fitting long trousers of the boys. In addition, long baggy sleeves are much more apt to accidentally become ignited by gas range or cigarette than tight-fitting sleeves. The California State fire marshal's office has published a leaflet on this subject which summarizes these factors succinctly.

MODIFICATION OF BURNING CHARACTERISTICS OF FABRICS

Many fabrics can be and have had their burning characteristics modified by artificial means. A variety of flame-retardant processes are available with varying degrees of effectiveness. The optimum process should result in the fabrics which retain air permeability, moisture absorption, tensile strength, sewing qualities, and at the same time resist multiple launderings and dry cleanings. This is not always easy to attain especially at a low cost. Among the current flame-retardant processes discussed at a recent national conference were the Lynrus, F.R.–1 process, the "THPC" (tetrakishydroxymethylphosphonium chloride) and the "APO" (tris I1-aziridinylpholne oxide). By mixing THPC and APO in a 1-to-1 mole ratio, wetting the fabric, squeezing out the excess solution, drying, curing, and washing; an effective flame-retardant fabric results which is resistant to both laundering and dry cleaning.

HOST

In general, children who have not yet reached the stage of growth or maturity in judgment as to be particularly careful about exposing themselves and their clothing to space heaters, gas or electric ranges, matches, candles, etc., are particularly susceptible to accidental ignition of clothing.

The aged, particularly those with disabilities associated with senility, cerebral arteriosclerosis and the associated forgetfulness and carelessness ("second childhood") represent another very vulnerable "host." A third category are adults with adequate judgment and maturity under ordinary circumstances who as a result of excessive liquor consumption or excessive fatigue are likely to have temporary impairment in their behavior and fall asleep smoking either in bed or in upholstered chairs. In addition they may be more careless with cigarettes and other fire hazards than they would ordinarily be. Each of these categories of hosts exhibit particular areas of increased susceptibility or vulnerability to harm from flammable fabrics and the educational and legislative approach to them deserves special emphasis.

AGENT

The item or agent specifically involved in setting fire to the clothing or drapery varies. For children, it is frequently space heaters, gas ranges, matches, and similar sources of fire or heat. For adults, it is more likely to be cigarettes, the use of flammable liquids such as gasoline or flammable cleaning agents, petroleum distillates such as cigarette lighter fluids or lighter fluids for charcoal, etc. These agents, like the special categories of hosts, are also amenable to special or intensive educational efforts to reduce their hazard.

DISCUSSION

It is obvious that burns associated with flammable fabrics, including clothing and nonclothing items (such as blankets, quilts, upholstery, bedding, etc.) figure frequently in serious injuries and fatalities resulting from burns to children (and adults).

A variety of factors are involved and include not only the degree of flammability of fabrics but also the accessibility of matches, combustible liquids, gas ranges, and space heaters and other sources of flame as well as the adequate supervision of children, the disabled, elderly and the intoxicated. Preventive efforts should be intensified in as many areas as possible and with a variety of approaches.

From the standpoint of the host, particularly infants and children, educational activities for parents through pediatricians and through other sources using as many of the media of mass communication as possible; programs aimed at increasing the supervision of children, emphasizing their early indoctrination with obedience and discipline so as to aid in keeping them away from sources of flame and heat all should be intensified. In the sphere of supervision of older persons such as those confined to nursing and convalescent homes and homes for the aged or those with infirmities being cared for at home, a similar type of supervision and effort should be exerted as that afforded to children. For those adults involved in smoking when intoxicated or with the careless use of cigarettes, still a different approach would be indicated.

From the standpoint of efforts to control the agent, increased publicity on the potential hazards of space heaters, on the safety advantages of central heating, on the hazards of fireplaces and of gas ranges and gas space heaters with open flames, should be developed. Also our efforts to keep matches, flammable drycleaning and polishing substances, gasolines, and other flammable agents away from children should be reemphasized and expanded. Leaving children alone in a trailer or in an apartment or house with space heaters with exposed heating elements represents an obvious hazard. Bonfires, burning rubbish, leaves and other sources of open flames, all are serious potential hazards and precautionary measures should be taken in all these instances.

The fabrics involved in most of these fires constitute the major portion of the environment in which artificial modification can play a role in preventing casualties. These modifications should not be limited to the exclusion or prohibition of all flammable fabrics, as most fabrics have some degree

of flammability. However all of the highly flammable fabrics should be barred.

In addition, our efforts to encourage the use of the least flammable materials for the purpose should be redoubled. Modifications in style and design, particularly where more flammable fabrics are involved, to avoid the use of wide billowing skirts and petticoats or wide flowing sleeves for household chores or where open flames, space heaters, or gas ranges are involved; would be highly desirable.

In those instances where for one reason or another it is necessary to use voiles, organdies, rayons, and other types of dangerously flammable fabrics for children or the aged, the use of fabrics from flame resistant fibers should be urged.

Exclusion or prohibition of extremely flammable fabrics not only for clothing but for any other use where there is a fire hazard, could be sought through legislative enactment. Similar statutory prohibitions of even moderately flammable fabrics might be insisted upon in those places where the hazard involves the public en masse, rather than individuals. For example, legislative requirements prohibiting moderately flammable fabrics from being used as drapes in passenger airplanes or in public assembly rooms, conference rooms in hotels, schoolrooms, auditoriums, etc., would be in order.

It is true that the cost of treating various fabrics to make them flame resistant increases the final cost to the consumer but, because of the relative choice of materials available to the consumer and the hazard of dangerously flammable fabrics, it is felt that if there were sufficient demand for this type of treatment just as there has been in the past for other items, the mass production cost would lower the unit cost so that this would not be a major deterrent.

LEGISLATION

The Federal Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953 should be revised to include fabrics that require more than 1 second to ignite and to include costume articles such as hula skirts. Improved standards for classification of the flammability of fabrics have been developed by representatives of a variety of national agencies and published by the National Fire Protection Association. It is felt that Federal and State legislation would be improved by being based on these standards which have been revised in 1962.

Federal legislation applies only to materials that are involved in interstate commerce. Fabrics manufactured and used within the State of origin are exempt from these regulations. It is, therefore, felt that it would be desirable for each of the States to adopt legislation similar in intent and purpose to that of the Federal legislation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the American Academy of Pediatrics formally adopt a policy statement or resolution emphasizing our concern with the prevention of burns in children and suggesting intensification of our efforts for their prevention.

2. Each of the academy chapters should be urged to intensify their activities in the areas of prevention outlined above and such aids as pamphlets, leaflets, brochures, talks, films, and other items currently available (see safety bibliography previously published by the Accident Prevention Committee of the AAP) should be encouraged.

3. Hand in hand with increased educational preventive activities, exploration of the enactment of legislation (or the revision of existing legislation on the subject is indicated) and should be actively pursued. Legislation similar to that existing in California, New York, and New Jersey but based on the current revised standards of the National Fire Protection Association which have been developed in cooperation with the American Academy of Pediatrics should be encouraged.

4. Increased publicity on the availability of the more recent flame retardant processes and efforts to eliminate dangerously flammable fabrics from children's clothing and the furnishings in children's rooms and nurseries, together with suggested modification in style of clothing for children, should be adopted.

Death of Col. G. E. Ijams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, with the death of Col G. E. Ijams on March 22, 1964, Maryland has lost a respected citizen and the veterans of our Nation have lost a great friend.

Colonel Ijams drafted the original soldier insurance plan in 1917 and went on to devote his life to veterans affairs. His efforts won him a citation from General Pershing for "exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service." He also served three terms as national commander in chief of the Military Order of the World War.

I know I speak for all veterans in extending our deepest sympathy to the family of Colonel Ijams. I ask unanimous consent that the obituary contained in the Washington Post of March 24, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COL. G. E. IJAMS, VETERANS AID

A military officer who once distinguished himself by creeping to the front lines in World War I under enemy fire to write $200 million in insurance policies on the lives of U.S. fightingmen, died Sunday after a short illness.

Col. George E. Ijams, 75, whose life was devoted to veterans' affairs, died at Holy Cross Hospital, Silver Spring.

He drafted the original soldier insurance plan used in the field after he was assigned to the American Expeditionary Forces detachment of the War Risk Insurance Bureau in 1917. For his efforts, General Pershing cited him for "exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service."

Colonel Ijams was born in Baltimore. He enlisted in the Maryland Cavalry in 1908 and served two enlistments on the Mexican border. After his discharge, he had an opportunity to be a lieutenant in the Maryland Infantry but declined and reenlisted as a private for more border duty with the Maryland Brigade.

ENLISTED AS PRIVATE

When the United States entered World War I, Colonel Ijams enlisted as a private. Because he had sold insurance, he was asked to handle war risk insurance in the AEF. He declined but later was attached to the war risk insurance detachment on orders of Secretary of War Newton D. Baker.

In 1921, he was sent back to Europe as Assistant Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau to negotiate reciprocal agreements with foreign countries for care of disabled veterans. Later he organized all the regional offices of the Bureau and later became Director.

Under the new VA, he was assistant administrator of medical and domiciliary care, construction and supplies and was given a role in the planning of Federal hospitals.

NAMED TO COMMISSION

In 1945, he was appointed to a commission to study economic conditions created by the Japanese occupation of the Philippines, resulting in establishment of the War Claims Commission in 1946.

After the war Colonel Ijams became director of the National Rehabilitation Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He also served three terms as national commander in chief of the Military Order of the World War. Among his decorations was a Purple Heart, an Officer Order of the Crown of Italy, Officer French Academy, Chevalier Legion of Honor (France) and Order of Lafayette (France).

Colonel Ijams, who lived at 218 Shaw Avenue, Silver Spring, is survived by his wife, Mary Rawlings Addison, of the home address, and three children, George Edwin, Virginia Coleman, and Barbara Whitmore.

Speech of Hon. Millard Caldwell at Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Millard Caldwell, formerly a Member of this body from the State of Florida and later Governor of that State, but who now graces the bench of the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, addressed the Jacksonville Bar Association. This eminent lawyer and jurist made some very pertinent remarks concerning the Supreme Court of the United States.

In order that his timely remarks might receive broader coverage, I submit his speech herewith to be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. Caldwell's speech follows:

World Wars I and II, the nuclear bomb, the airplane, and the radio are little more than grains of sand on the broad beach of world history. None of these phenomena is of fundamental importance—neither has any, in any major sense, deflected the course of mankind. In all of human time we can count three periods of truly vital significance—the first, the era when the first biped crawled out of the mud and stood upright; the second, the advent of Christianity, and, the third, the 20th century showdown between communism and civilization, upon the outcome of which depends, not merely the fate of the United States, nor of Russia, nor of China, but the fate of the future of human free society.

For the second time in history the basic ideology of man, for ages to come, is to be determined by the strength or weakness of a single nation—this time the United States of America. The first such encounter took place on the plains of Marathon, 2,454 years ago, when western Greece turned back the eastern Persians. Had the orientals conquered the West at Marathon, as they had already subjugated the best of the then known world, we would not have assembled here today to discuss the theory of government. But, once again, the West is at war with the East and, once again, the West will decide whether the oriental antigod philosophy shall prevail.

In this time of grave doubt—in a world palsied with indecision—in a world divided between the loose freedoms of democracy and the rigid controls of communism, a new catalyst, a new President of the United States, has been added to the mixture. What he does can and perhaps will make the difference between war and peace with other nations, the difference between our own Nation divided in strife or together in constructive tranquillity.

What the new President believes, whether he possesses the vision, the knowledge and the courage necessary to the task of leading his confused country and a shaky free world, are as yet unknown factors. As a practical matter of politics, we know that, for the immediate future, he must go through the motion of endorsing the policies of his predecessor. Time will tell us what his own convictions are and, if elected to a full term, what direction he will drive. That he is a man of capacity, knowledgeable in government and politically adroit, is without question. I am not at all sure he is part and parcel with the effete establishment which has for some years dominated national affairs. The widely publicized reports of his concern for a balanced budget indicates he may not be but, on the other hand, all the talk about abolishing poverty and socialistic claptraps in general would indicate the contrary.

But it is not my purpose here to second-guess presidential politics nor, in that respect, to do more than hope fate has wisely chosen the man who must now serve as Chief Executive. Neither will any useful purpose be served by a discussion of the legislative branch. Its strengths and its weaknesses are apparent. It has demonstrated its ability to stall some extremely bad legislation and its inability to curb the worst of executive and judicial abuses.

I do, however, want to discuss the third branch of Government, the judiciary—the Supreme Court of the United States in particular. But before I talk about the Supreme Court let me say it's no happy experience to find my long-nurtured convictions in conflict.

As law students we were taught that the accurate construction of the law and the Constitution is to be found in the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. As lawyers we have advised our clients and have conducted our litigation on the basis of the opinions of the Supreme Court.

Also, we have been taught that the whole structure of our Government is founded upon the Constitution of the United States—that without a Constitution and without obedience to that Constitution by the citizens, by the public officials and the judiciary, we endanger our liberties and the permanency of our form of Government.

On the one hand, we have the instinctive urge to speak of the Supreme Court with confidence, but, on the other hand, we note with apprehension the Court's encroachment upon the clear intent of the Constitution and our conviction that such encroachments imperil the future of the Nation and the whole concept of democracy.

I have resolved my conflict with the conclusion that the courts are not sacrosanct—that if they are to be respected they must earn respect. I take the position that the lawyer may with propriety discuss the philosophy of any court and may agree or disagree. Further, that if the lawyer observes transgression by any court upon the constitutional rights of the people, he not only may—he should—express his concern.

The necessity to speak with some frankness imposes an onerous responsibility—because, in utter candor, I must tell you that the Supreme Court of the United States, not subject to election by the people nor to their will, there for life, has tortured the plain language of the Constitution and, to that extent, has destroyed the rule of law and substituted, in its stead, the rule of man.

The integrity of the Federal Constitution represents the difference between a free government elected by the people and government by nine appointed judges. To make it shockingly plain, our Republic has, in a major sense, been converted to a collectivistic sort of principality over which we, as citizens, have lost control. That is harsh language—language which should not be used unless there is sound and provable basis for the apprehension expressed. Let's look at the record and see if what the Court has done and what the Justices of that Court have said, warrant the views I have expressed.

The majority of our Founding Fathers, never having really believed it possible that the Court would set itself up as a maker of policy and a source of new law, did not foresee the awesome possibility of usurpation and did not provide adequate means of correction.

Judicial legislation can be more destructive of our rights than congressional enactments because, while the latter may, at the behest of the voters, be repealed or amended by a new Congress, the former, as pragmatical fact, is subject only to the passing fancy of five judges. The Congress, standing in awe of the judiciary, cannot, unless it be prodded to action by the electorate, be depended upon to assert its authority to proscribe judicial medding with policy.

Since the Federal judiciary is not answerable to the people, as are the legislative and executive departments, the electorate is relatively helpless. The public, when displeased with the Supreme Court, may change Presidents, the appointing power, but a new President can do nothing until, by death or resignation, there is a vacancy.

To illustrate the point, turn your attention to the pending so-called civil rights bill, a blatant but understandable political sophistry. Its purpose, of course, is to lead the sheep to the pen for a shearing.

The bill, as passed by the House and, in all probability, to be passed by the Senate and approved by the President, is in several respects obviously unconstitutional.

Under normal conditions such political haymaking by the left dealers would present no great danger because the country could depend upon a nonpolitical Supreme Court to measure the bill by the yardstick of the Constitution and prevent a miscarriage of justice. But these are not normal conditions. (C.A.)

Washington reminds me of the old days in the Citrus Belt when the fruitpackers thought a little color added on the outside would make a marketable orange out of almost anything that would roll. Our friends in Washington have found that a little color added to legislation insures its constitutionality—the civil rights bill will be no exception.

When the country wakes up and realizes just how it has been duped it can elect a new Congress and a new President but the Supreme Court, absent drastic action by the new Congress, will be left sitting on the uncontested throne.

If they were asked, those who wrote the Constitution would tell you that, if private property rights should be subordinated to social aspirations, the purpose ought to be attained by orderly amendment to the Constiution and not by usurpation. But I suppose they'll not be asked. After all, they were rather simple people who knew more about right and wrong than about how to fool the people.

The authors of the Constitution, not anticipating the very real danger of usurpation by the Supreme Court, in a rather casual effort to forestall abuses, provided that each appointment to the Court be approved by the Senate; that delinquent judges may be impeached and that the Congress have the authority to limit the jurisdiction of the Court. But, as proven in practice, the Senate confirms without serious question, the Congress never impeaches and it never limits the scope of the Court's jurisdiction.

Erstwhile respect for and confidence in the Court has left the public slow to speak but now, after 20 years of experience with an unrestrained third legislative chamber, it is barely possible that indifference is merging into vigilence. It is not beyond the scope of speculation that an alarmed and informed ballot box will demand that the Congress discharge its constitutional duty to restore the Court to its proper sphere of judicial function.

Judicial freewheeling is the proximate result of failure, on the part of the lawyers, to understand the purpose each of the three branches of Government was designed to serve. The man on the street is not disposed to complain when the courts expropriate the power to legislate because, in all probability, he does not know and the lawyers have not told him the legislative function belongs solely to the Congress. The law schools must shoulder much of the responsibility for what has occurred since they trained the Justices who are now in the process of transforming our Republic to a Latin American type centralization. This need not surprise you because, generally, those schools look upon the Constitution as a malleable instrument subject to distortion rather than as the charter under which the Nation is to be governed.

The choice the informed public faces is not particularly complex but the need for making the choice is imperative because, whether this Nation is to be governed by the rule of law, under the Constitution, or the rule of man, unfettered by restraint, constitutes the most vital problem of our time.

An intelligent decision requires, first, that we understand the purpose of and the need for the Constitution and, second, that the Constitution, in itself, represents the difference between a republic and a despotism.

The authors of the Constitution, having been subjected to the whims and fancies of dictators, were determined that this Nation would be self-governed by its citizens who, in turn, were permanently guaranteed certain rights and privileges. They thought that document created a permanent barrier against usurpation—a barrier, the bars of which could be let down only by amendment, approved by the people themselves.

And so it is that our simple choice lies between the form of government as conceived by those who captured our freedoms from Great Britain in the Revolution and another form of government, a centralization, advocated by the left dealers—a choice between a Constitution which requires separation of the three branches of government and recognition of the rights of the States, on the one hand, and, on the other, an emasculated Constitution under which all power is concentrated in the Federal Government.

The differences between the two theories are as wide apart as the poles, as black is from white, as freedom is from slavery, as socialism is from capitalism. Those differences were fairly well delineated by Mr. Justice Goldberg, on the one hand, when recently he argued for the unrestrained wide-open-door policy of the Supreme Court, negating the rights of the States, and by Mr. Justice Harlan, when, in support of judicial

restraint, he said the notion that all deficiencies in our society should find a cure in the courts is a source of serious mischief. Stripped of its diplomatic trappings, the exchange demonstrates the cleavage between the leftwing philosophy of centralization and the time-honored theory of constitutional government.

Although centralization had its strong advocates, a majority of the Founding Fathers, in the light of their firsthand knowledge of despotism, kings, and monarchs, and being convinced that centralization is synonymous with tyranny, required a division of authority between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government and reserved in the States all powers not granted by the States to the Federal Government. There was, however, serious question whether the National Government would in good faith respect that reservation.

Madison, a simple, wordy sort of moderate, thought the language of the proposed Constitution adequate and went so far as to say the States were to be: "No more subject * * * to the general authority than the general authority is subject to them * * *." That means, in plain words, he thought such functions as local law enforcement, local elections, and education were left to the States. He said Federal jurisdiction would extend:

"To certain enumerated objects only and leave to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects."

Alexander Hamilton, the adroit, tricky, declared centralist, having no faith in the common man and with his tongue in his cheek, said:

"The proposed Constitution so far from implying an abolition of State governments makes them constituent parts of the national sovereignty * * * and leaves in their possession certain exclusive and very important portions of sovereign power."

And then he came up with this amazingly false prophecy:

"It will always be far more easy for the State governments to encroach upon the national authorities than for the National Government to encroach upon the State authorities."

Madison, me-tooing Hamilton's sophistry, chimed in with this argument for adoption:

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. * * * the powers reserved to the several States will extend to all objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State."

But Patrick Henry, distrusting a Central Government, believing in the rights of man and the necessary sovereignty of the States, with true and unerring foresight, disagreed. He warned his conferees to:

"Be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty. Instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever."

He told them:

"There will be no checks, no real balances in this Government."

Then he looked ahead to 1964 and said:

"This Government will * * * destroy the State governments and swallow the liberties of the people, without giving previous notice."

George Mason agreed with Patrick Henry and, fearing the loss of all the Revolution had gained, said that a consolidated Government, "is totally subversive to every principle which has hitherto governed us. * * * These two concurrent powers cannot exist long together; the one will destroy the other."

But the warnings were ignored. Mason's prediction has come to pass. Just as Patrick Henry said it would, the National Government is swallowing the liberties of the people. And the Supreme Court, once revered as the guardian of the Constitution, has wielded the knife against its vitals.

When the adoption process reached that provision in the Constitution which created the Supreme Court, the differences and doubts were expressed in harsh language. William Grayson voiced his suspicion in these words:

"This Court has more power than any court under heaven * * * what has it in view, unless to subvert the State governments?"

George Mason agreed when he said:

"When we consider the nature of these courts, we must conclude that their effect and operation will be utterly to destroy the State governments, for they will be the judges of how far their law will operate."

The framers of the Constitution were mildly impressed. They understood the probable weakness of men clothed with great power—they had just won a war induced by ordinary mortals who had assumed the togas of omnipotence. So, in what they conceived to be effectual caution, they gave to the Congress the authority to prescribe limits of jurisdiction for the Supreme Court.

It strikes me as elemental that the keystone of stability in a republic is mutual respect—respect on the part of the people for the republic's institutions and respect on the part of the institutions for the rights and the welfare of the people.

For more than a century the Congress and the Supreme Court maintained profound respect for the people of America, for the rights of the States and for the Constitution. For a century and a half the people entertained profound respect for the Supreme Court. Neither premise is now tenable—the Congress and the Court no longer respect the Constitution, no longer even pay lipservice to the rights of the States and have, in considerable measure, forfeited the confidence of the people.

The Court's seeming contempt for the Constitution, its baldly asserted power to overrule long recognized constitutional principles and to read into the Constitution new and alien ideas, have spawned mistrust—by many of the bench, the bar, and the responsible citizenship of the country.

Let me give you an example of the sort of imperiality which has engendered that mistrust. Mr. Justice Douglas, in the Lincoln Mills case, held the Court was authorized to "fashion a body of Federal law," that "the range of judicial inventiveness will be determined by the nature of the problem." I ask you, since when was that Court authorized to "fashion a body of Federal law" or to indulge "judicial inventiveness"?

That's the sort of irresponsibility which Judge Learned Hand, the most eminent jurist of this era, had in mind, in his lecture at Harvard, of all places, when he waved the danger flag and pointed to what can happen when the Supreme Court arrogates to itself the power to restrict the rights of legislative bodies to legislate, and assumes, for the Court, the legislative function. Judge Hand said the Supreme Court's definition of powers leaves no doubt that it assumes the role of a "third legislative chamber."

He criticized the Court's usurpation of power and said he had never been able to understand on what basis, other than arbitrary usurpation, the Court had adopted the fact it may legislate. Doubting the wisdom of any Judge serving as a "communal mentor," Judge Hand said: "If we do need a third chamber it should appear for what it is, and not as the interpreter of inscrutable principles."

The conference of chief justices of the several States, by formal resolution, urged the Supreme Court, as it determines questions touching the powers reserved to the States, to exercise the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—and to recognize the difference between that which the Constitution may prescribe and that which a majority of the Supreme Court may deem desirable—a strong and deserved rebuke. Of passing interest is the fact that when the resolution was reported to the full conference, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States walked out of the meeting and resigned from the American Bar Association.

That the Supreme Court has consciously set about rewriting the laws is admitted in the language of the Justices themselves. For instance, in the case of *Griffin* v. *Illinois*, one of the Justices said that:

"Candor compels acknowledgment that the decision rendered today is a new ruling. * * * We should not indulge in the fiction that the law now announced has always been the law * * *."

In *Baker* v. *Carr*, two dissenting Justices said of the majority opinion: "The Court today reversed a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago."

That the majority opinion was "[A] massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial powers * * *."

In *Cole* v. *Young*, the dissenting Justices said that by its action the Court intruded itself into presidential policymaking—that the Court's order "has striken down the most effective weapon against subversive activities available to the Government."

In *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, which overruled long-standing precedent affecting State courts, three dissenting Justices agreed they were "bound to say that what has been done is not likely to promote respect either for the Court's adjudicatory process or for the stability of its decisions * * * this Court can increase respect for the Constitution only if it rigidly respects the limitations which the Constitution places upon it * * * our voice becomes only a voice of power, not of reason."

In *Arizona* v. *California*, the majority of the Court became so brazen in stripping the rights from the States that even Mr. Justice Douglas, an avowed centralist and a noted spinner of new law, could not stomach it. He, joining the dissent, said the majority of the Court granted "the Federal bureaucracy a power and command over water rights in the 17 Western States that it never has had, that it always wanted, that it could never persuade Congress to grant, and that this Court up to now has consistently refused to recognize"; that "the present case * * * will, I think, be marked as the baldest attempt by judges of modern times to spin their own philosophy into the fabric of the law * * *."

My time and your patience will not permit any detailed treatment of the cases in which the Supreme Court has risen above the Constitution and usurped the powers reserved to the States. Just by way of reference I call your attention to the Slochower case, where the Supreme Court invaded the State of New York and prevented the separation from the public school system of a man accused of communism; the Brown case, in which the Court reversed some 50-odd Supreme Court decisions to the contrary and, without the citation of a single legal precedent, usurped the State function of managing the public schools; the Schware and Konigsberg cases wherein the Supreme Court deprived State bar examining boards of the right to reject a candidate for fitness and held that it was unconstitutional for a State to find that membership in the Communist Party disqualified the applicant for a license to practice law.

You may well ask, in view of the current judicial usurpations and the flood of judicial legislation, why the Congress has not exercised its prerogative to curb the Court and protect the Constitution? My answer would

have to be that I do not know. Just why the Congress should be intimidated by the Court I cannot guess. Perhaps, because they seek their favors in Washington, the Members feel they must scratch Washington's back. About all they are willing to do is shake their fists in their pockets and turn the other cheek. But, for whatever the reason, when the man goes to Congress he faces the temptation to become a Federalist. (M.J.)

Well, what shall we do about it? We know the Supreme Court has invaded both the other departments of Government and stricken State sovereignty from the Constitution. We know that the Congress has refused to assert its authority to limit that Court's jurisdiction. We know that the law schools are no longer teaching the Constitution as it was written and intended—in fact, just recently, 18 members of the law faculty at Gainesville went on record as approving the spate of judicial legislation which has gushed around and over the left liberals. Shall we, along with the Congress, surrender our rights or should we endeavor to reestablish constitutional government and recapture those rights?

I concede that members of the Supreme Court have the privilege of believing a new and different form of government is better than the one under which the Nation became great. They may be right—it is possible for long years of Federal paternalism have sapped our strength and destroyed our capacity for self-government—it may well be that Black, Douglas, and company are the aspostles of a new day. But, even so, the Supreme Court should play the game by the rules—if the Constitution needs amending, it should be amended in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself.

George Washington anticipated the danger of judicial usurpation when, in his Farewell Address, he said:

"If * * * the distribution * * * of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, my be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Seventy years later, Lincoln, conscious of the danger, warned us in these words:

"If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of the eminent tribunal."

More than a hundred years ago Macaulay, the eminent English historian, after an on-the-ground study of our system of government, foresaw the danger and predicted disaster in these words:

"Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by the barbarians in the twentieth century, as the Roman Empire was in the fifth—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

No, I do not believe that, as we see the Constitution destroyed, we should be guilty of sniveling acquiescence. Nearly every age feels impelled to lead the world on to something better—but this age of ours must regain our losses. Our task, yours and mine, is to reestablish—recapture, if you will—the freedoms which forged a national distinction never before equalled. The way to that end is to persuade the Congress to discharge its responsibility and restore the Supreme Court to its proper place in Government.

Our forebears started from nothing and fought on hope—a hope for liberty and separation from corrupt oppression. They won the war and left to us the heritage of independence. Our prayer is for the strength to defend that heritage from the strange and borrowed ideologies of the rootless left-liberals who, by fortuitous circumstance, are strongly entrenched.

In conclusion, as you observe the encroachments by the Supreme Court and the abject abdication by the Congress, just remember the words attributed to Edmund Burke, spoken nearly 200 years ago:

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

Nickels and Dimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is filled with speeches I made in upholding my Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office and their request to disallow the minting of any new silver dollars at this time because of the severe shortage of coins in other denominations, a shortage which exists throughout the Nation.

I will not repeat that argument today except to say that I am pleased that the House upheld the views of our subcommittee, and that the issue was faced squarely.

At this time, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Greenfield Recorder Gazette on the subject. While the editorial refers to a speech I made on the subject, I feel the editorial is interesting from the standpoint of its contents. It says a great deal about the "automatic" society in which we live. The editorial appeared on February 26, 1964.

The editorial follows:

NICKELS AND DIMES

Life has become a matter of pennies, nickels, and dimes. The dollars take care of themselves.

This is the essence of a mounting national complaint that a shortage of coins is creating economic chaos throughout the country. U.S. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE in a talk this week to the Turners Falls Knights of Columbus pointed out the severity of the crisis.

Greenfield found itself on the monetary map recently when one of its banks offered a dollar for every 98 cents in coins. The move was in the public interest of boosting the supply of available coinage.

The shortage is traceable. Slowly, but persistently, the country has shifted to an age of automatic living closely allied to the slot machine. Not far from virtually every working man and woman, every child in school, every movie patron, and in every bowling alley, every filling station, every bus, plane, and railroad station, and in fact everywhere, there is a vending machine of some sort.

These contraptions gulp down nickels and dimes by the ton. And if they don't get them all the parking meters will. The latter flourish on pennies as well. Even the lofty quarter is getting into the act. One of them will buy five stamps at almost any postoffice.

It would be revolting to think that we soon are to be reduced to automation in its entirety, yet there are few aspects of daily life which do not lean on at least one coin. It may be only a jukebox, a cup of coffee, or a bar of soap. Or it could be a sweepstakes ticket or life insurance policy.

This to all intents and purposes is the copper and silver age. We never see gold any more even though it may stand in back of much of the Nation's wealth. We use silver by the ton and copper in an almost equal quantity. The problem is to keep both flowing through the public's hands freely enough to be available when and where they are needed most.

The alternative may be some sort of substitute which can be purchased with paper money, such as the little chips that one pops into subway turnstiles. But who could be bothered? The mint undoubtedly will have to step up the flow even though it already is straining to keep pace. Society demands that we live by pennies, nickels, and dimes.

An Invocation by Dr. Theodore R. Leen, Pastor of the First Christian Church of Ardmore, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at a recent luncheon meeting in Ardmore, Okla., at which Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and I were present, one of the finest invocations I have ever heard was given.

This invocation was given by Dr. Theodore R. Leen, pastor of the First Christian Church of Ardmore. I believe it so impressed Mr. Webb that it set the theme for his remarks at the luncheon meeting, and he referred to it in an address he made that evening in another city in Oklahoma.

I am sure all Members would welcome the opportunity of reading this splendid and stirring invocation given by Dr. Theodore R. Leen, of Ardmore, Okla.

The invocation follows:

Eternal and gracious God, we are grateful for life in freedom and under Thy divine providence. From the very depth of our being we express our gratitude for the provisions that Thou hast made possible for the wholeness of life. In the presence of adversity and the exacting circumstances of our daily involvement with life, Thou hast made Thy strength available. We are thankful that Thou are not a capricious God, but are a God of steadfast love, motivated by good will toward the highest creation. * * * A God who hast created a universe of dependable law enabling man to be creative and to determine a favorable destiny for himself and his posterity in freedom from one generation to another. Bless to us the food of which we are to partake. May it symbolize to us Thy love and care. Out of our thought and fellowship together may there come warmth and understanding and also new insights worthy of the freedom which has come to us through multiple sacrifice and devotion. We pray that this

freedom may never be destroyed or subverted by totalitarian ascendancy or aggression. Continue Thy guidance to us as a people and may we never lose sight of the dignity and worth of our fellow human beings. May we never cease to be responsible for sustaining the inalienable rights and liberties of our people as a valid basis for our persistent affirmation of the worth of constitutional government in freedom. Amen.

Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Anderson, Ind., Herald entitled "The Human Element in Air Safety":

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN AIR SAFETY

Air safety is still aviation's most important problem, and the protection of the millions who travel by air against the disaster of the midair collison remains the most vital phase of that problem.

The primary responsibility for the prevention of collisions between aircraft, in the air and on the ground, has traditionally belonged to the pilot. But that responsibility in today's overcrowded skies and fabulous speed has shifted from the man in the cockpit to a man on the ground—the air traffic controller, who until recently was aptly described as "the forgotten men of aviation." "Air traffic control operators are not merely supplemental aids to pilots," according to two expert investigators of the control problem, "they have primary control of aircraft." The quote is from the article by Eugene Seagre and Nelson Polsby in Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1961. This startling conclusion of course had reference to the increasing number of high-speed airplanes that have appeared since the war.

The reason for this very significant increase in the controller's responsibilities was clearly stated by Pilot H. F. Hill, Jr., at the hearings of the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Federal Aviation Act. Mr. Hill, a well known airline pilot, told the committee that when the pilot sitting at the controls of a modern, high-speed airline plane first sees another high-speed plane flying toward him on a collision course, it is too late for him to do anything about it. There is not sufficient time for him to take the necessary evasion action to avoid the oncoming plane; before he can complete the prescribed maneuver, the other aircraft will be coming through his windshield. "In consideration of these facts," Mr. Hill concluded, "it is physically impossible for pilots in today's high-speed aircraft to avoid midair collision."

It is the critical task of the controller to see to it that these midair tragedies will not occur. He has a grave responsibility and a task of great difficulty and complexity. The vitally important means used by the controller is the traffic decision in which the controller must separate potentially conflicting aircraft and provide for each a safe course. In formulating this decision and transmitting it to the pilots immediately involved, the controller must act with great rapidly, in seconds and sometimes split seconds. He has no time for the luxury of deliberation. The jets cannot wait.

Hovering over these moments of decision is the haunting awareness that a single mistake in his decision may destroy the lives of a hundred or more passengers.

As the Flight Safety Foundation has pointed out, long exposure to these pressures and tensions will, over a period of time, tend to impair the proficiency of the controller for his critical task. It is also coming to be recognized that the natural forces of aging tend to slow down the mental reactions and ability of the controller to analyze the constantly changing facts of a critical traffic situation and to issue a traffic decision free of error in the seconds that are allowed him.

Reports from Washington indicate that a legislative measure will be before the Congress in the present session to provide earlier retirement for controllers. This will give them the opportunity to retire when they are no longer able, by reason of the effects of aging and the stress of the control work, to make the vital and quick decisions required to safeguard the air traveling public.

It is to be hoped that such a measure will receive the serious consideration of the present Congress. It is solely a measure of safety for the millions who use our navigable air. The United States today leads the world in the safety of its air transportation. Let us plan ahead the sound measures that will assure the continuance of that record.

Sour on Sweet IDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, few actions of this House will be as disappointing as its failure some weeks ago to pass the bill for the extension and expansion of IDA. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which heard the bill, mine was one of the unanimous votes favoring the legislation in committee.

I share with many of my fellow legislators the desire to see an aid program which has as its aim helping others help themselves. I share with many of you the desire to see an aid program multilateral in nature which has the cooperation and financial support of other nations of the free world. On both of these basic counts the International Development Agency scores. Its loans are for basic community facilities. The United States started out as a 43-percent backer on the program and under the new bill would slip to 41-percent support.

Mr. Speaker, I think the editorial which follows should be read in a spirit of sober reflection by all our Members. I would hope that it would weigh in the reconsideration we can give this matter when the Senate bill for IDA reaches this floor.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Feb. 28, 1964]

SOUR ON SWEET IDA

IDA is the name of the World Bank's little sister who came into the world 4 years ago. Since then, IDA has lent half a billion dollars to underdeveloped countries in long-term, "soft" loans. Transportation, water, agricultural and port systems to raise the standard of living have been built with IDA's money.

Because IDA (the International Development Association) is an international organization, dispensing credits without any possibility of a single Government's political interest dominating the transaction, it is widely regarded as the most effective long-term, foreign aid bank anywhere.

The United States agreed to be a 43-percent backer of IDA during its first 5 years. When the question came up of bankrolling the agency for its sixth, seventh, and eighth years, the United States, after long discussions, was put down for $312 million, or 41.6 percent, of a total $750 million added subscription. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan and a dozen other well-off countries were to put up the rest.

The Senate has OK'd this $312 million contribution, but the House rose up Wednesday, in what looked like the wrath of ignorance, to kill the deal. As far as can be learned from the confusing debate. Congressmen objected to the United States having to bear 41.6 percent of the burden. Two points can be made about that: First, 41 percent is a lot cheaper than bearing all the cost, as we do with our own foreign aid; second, the proper way to register objection to the U.S. share is not to kill IDA (which will be the effect of this vote if it is not reconsidered), but to negotiate for a fairer share.

The House has managed once again to put the United States in a disastrous light. Congressmen accustomed to voting billions may not think much of killing a $750 million international agency like IDA, but the failure of this country to support this sister to the World Bank will be widely and deeply resented in the 101 countries which belong to it.

The feeling which is said to have swayed some votes, that this was no time to be adding $312 million to the Federal expenditures, was ill founded, for Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has said that the money won't have to be appropriated out of either this year's or next year's budget. If pressure and persuasion can still be brought usefully to bear on some of the opponents of the IDA contribution to bring them around to a realization that it deserves better, we urge the administration to go to work on them.

A Prayer by the Reverend Thomas Basich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding clergymen in St. Paul is the Reverend Thomas Basich of the Advent Lutheran Church.

He is a spiritual leader whose messages invariably inspire those of us who are privileged to hear him. His words help us better to meet the challenges of the great issues of the day because they so succinctly set out our moral duties and help us to overcome obstacles in the achievement of worthy goals.

Pastor Basich gave a prayer at the fourth Governor's prayer breakfast at the Leamington Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., on March 5, 1964, which I especially commend to my colleagues in the House. Under unanimous consent, I in-

clude his message in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PRAYER

Dear God our Heavenly Father, forgive us for thinking that prayer is a substitute for love, that the sentiment of love is a substitute for justice, that justice suffices without compassion.

Look with favor upon this land—this chosen people—chosen not for privilege but for leadership, not for honor but to carry responsibility, not for dominance but for servanthood.

Give grace to all who have been ordained to speak Thy Holy Word in the world: the rabbi, the priest, the minister. Inspire them to speak the whole truth—the damning truth, the redeeming truth, the guiding truth—so that all the children of man, and especially those who must make the decisions that affect the lives of many, may hear Thy Word in their words. Spur on the men of religion, so that those who have been called to supply moral leadership may not find themselves among the last to follow.

We thank Thee for political freedom under which partisanship is possible. We thank Thee for partisanship in government and in commerce, for we know that in the clash of ideas and wills the truth is safeguarded and inordinate power is checked and refined. But help us to rise above partisanship to partnership, for the sake of the common good.

Bless our business leaders whose enterprise creates the jobs and the wealth by which human needs are met, and without which no social justice is possible. May they see themselves as coworkers with Thee in the development of an unfinished creation. But may they, and we, never forget that the resources with which the earth is endowed were intended by Thee, not for the surfeit of the few, but for the sustenance of all.

Bless our labor leaders who protect from exploitation those who could not speak at all if they did not speak together. But that they may not think their mission is done, remind them that gains now won for many are yet withheld from vast multitudes who daily struggle for existence.

Bless our educators; preserve for them the maximum freedom to investigate, surmise, and speak; but remind them, and us, that man's best thoughts are elementary reflections of Thy divine wisdom, and that man's best science is a stumbling attempt to think Thy thoughts after Thee.

Bless our leaders in government whose burdens are often greater than any man can bear.

Grant to all leaders who exercise power of any sort a solemn awareness of their ultimate accountability to Thee.

Turn the eyes of all of us upon the great unfinished business of this age. And therein help us to comprehend the hunger of the starving, the humiliation of the unemployed, the sadness of the neglected aged, the helplessness of the ill educated, the despair of the prisoner, the terror of the mentally ill, and the bitterness of those discriminated against.

And yet, give us such a due sense of our earthly finitude, and such a keen intimation of eternal life, that we may acknowledge that the meaning fo life is not exhausted in the attainment of a higher standard of living.

And so that this fair earth may not become a smoking ruin, help us to see beyond self-interest, beyond class interest, beyond the national interest, to the common interest of all of mankind. May the vision of one humanity become incarnate in institutions necessary for the preservation of peace and the lifting of the many burdens which everywhere afflict the bodies and the spirits of Thy children.

We intercede for Governor Rolvaag and his family. Grant him wisdom, courage and strength as he faces the problems and challenges of our State. Give him such a warm sense of Thy presence, that he may always know that he serves not only his people, but Thee, and that in his serving he is sustained by power from on high.

In view of all that needs to be done, inspire all of us to live righteous lives of maximum achievement.

Cause us to see that out of the struggle between good and evil. Thou art bringing into being an eternal kingdom; and hearten us by the assurance that all that we may do of value is incorporated forever into the fabric of that kingdom. And thus deliver us from apathy, cynicism, and weariness in well doing.

Help us so to conduct our lives that when the sun sets upon our short day, and the fever of life is over, and our work is done, and we are asked to render the account of our stewardship, we may be worthy to hear Thy words, "Well done, good and faithful servant." Amen.

Fast Action on Twining River Locks Vital: Killian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, the following article which appeared in the March 22, 1964, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

FAST ACTION ON TWINNING RIVER LOCKS VITAL: KILLIAN—BOTTLENECK FOR CAL-SAG SEEN IN DELAY—ASKS MONEY FOR WORK NOW

(By Edward Rohrbach)

The shipping bottleneck being eliminated by a Federal project to widen the Calumet-Sag barge canal will only move downstream unless work is started soon to increase the capacity of locks in the Illinois river, John L. Killian, of John L. Killian & Associates, asserted yesterday.

"Further delay in starting the duplicate locks project in the river will seriously diminish the ability of the Illinois waterway to handle anticipated traffic in a few years," Killian said.

"The full potential of the Cal-Sag project will never be realized until the duplicate locks are built.

ALTERNATE IS CRASH PLAN

"Putting off the project may force the Federal Government to resort later to a highly expensive crash program to take care of the approaching bottleneck at the locks."

Killian is legislative consultant to the Illinois River Carriers' Association, a group which has spearheaded development of the duplicate locks project.

Congress has appropriated $57 million to widen the Cal-Sag. This project, more than half finished now, is to be completed by the spring of 1966. It is estimated that a total expenditure of $85 million will be needed to complete the project.

In 1962, Congress authorized $40 million to start work to enlarge the capacity of the river locks, but no money was appropriated in the final bill.

NEED PLANNING MONEY

Killian said the next step is to get this planning money appropriated at the current session of Congress, though President Johnson did not include the expenditure in his fiscal 1965 budget.

Killian also emphasized the national defense aspects of constructing duplicate locks. In time of war, he said, there would be "considerable advantage" in having an improved shipping route from the Chicago area to the oceans in addition to the St. Lawrence seaway.

The Army Corps of Engineers in Chicago released a plan in 1957 calling for seven new locks adjacent to existing locks on the Illinois waterway, which connects Chicago and the Great Lakes with the Mississippi River.

SIZE OF NEW LOCKS

The new locks would be 1,200 feet long and 110 feet wide, in contrast to existing locks which are 110 feet wide but 600 feet long. Cost of the project has been estimated at $114 million.

Record year for cargoes on the Illinois waterway was in 1962, when nearly 30 million tons of commodities were transported by barge tows. Final tonnages for 1963 have been estimated at 28½ million tons, second highest in the waterway's history.

Bad weather mainly was blamed for the decrease last year but indications are that tonnages have picked up. Tonnages last month were more than double the figure handled at each lock in February, 1963.

The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that the Illinois waterway has a capacity of 55 million tons of barge traffic a year, except for bottlenecks at the locks. Existing locks have capacities ranging from 24 million tons at Lockport and Brandon Road to 30 million at the Starved Rock, Peoria, and La Grange locks.

In 1963, the Lockport lock handled 19½ million tons and Brandon Road slightly more.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 143 years ago today the Greek War of Independence against Ottoman rule began when Archbishop Germanos of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece.

This independence was not won without great sacrifice nor was it easily maintained. During World War II Greece was overrun by Axis Powers, and after the war she was threatened by Communist enslavement. Greece still remains free and independent despite all difficulties, however, because of the indomitable and courageous spirit of the Greek people who so dearly love individual freedom. That love of freedom in ancient Greece was well known and was an inspiration to our own forefathers who won our independence and who used the experiments in democratic government carried on at Athens over 2,000 years ago as a basis for establishment of our own democracy.

I would say that the love of freedom and the courage of the Greek people throughout the centuries can now serve as an inspiration to people throughout the world to rise up and throw off the shackles of slavery imposed by the Communists.

It gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to Greece—our friend and ally for so many years—and to the many Americans of Greek descent who are celebrating this happy occasion.

Woodstock—All America City, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, announcement is being made on March 26 by Look magazine and the National Municipal League of New York that Woodstock, county seat of McHenry County, Ill., and a part of the great 12th Congressional District of Illinois, has been designated an All America City for 1964, one of only 11 selected in the entire Nation.

This signal honor which has come to Woodstock is well deserved. The citizens of Woodstock, the civic, and municipal officers, the merchants, the educators, and spiritual leaders of the community, have nurtured both the initiative of Woodstock's individual citizens and its institutions, producing the energy, spirit, and resourcefulness which have inspired this significant award. The city of Woodstock and a vast surrounding countryside all contribute to form the community of Woodstock which shares the distinction of All America City. Woodstock, Ill., combines beauty, historic traditions, and a warm friendliness which is typical of the best in our American communities. Woodstock's citizens are hardy, industrious, and imbued with a deep respect for God and country.

Woodstock's church edifices, school buildings, manufacturing installations, shopping centers, and parking areas indicate the capacity of the community to meet the needs of its citizens in this modern day.

The annual observance of V–J Day, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, draws thousands of people from this great Midwest area, including those from other States and from all walks of life, to take part in this patriotic celebration.

Good schools—both public and parochial—have been provided by the citizens of Woodstock. The public library was only recently designated a depository for Government publications in order to accommodate the needs of its readers.

The Woodstock Sentinel, a daily newspaper of which William Burfeindt is the editor, supplies the community's news and editorial requirements and spurs the community to progressive and constructive activity. Only last summer, when the late George Sullivan celebrated his 40th anniversary as a newspaperman, including many years with the Woodstock Sentinel, the community of Woodstock joined in with heartfelt respect and commendation for the faithful and tireless service of this journalist and civic leader.

Mr. Speaker, I want particularly to commend the distinguished author John Strohm, a resident of Woodstock, for the nomination of his hometown to receive this high award.

Chairman of the All America City Committee, Dan Andrew, and the vice chairman, Virgil Smith, are also entitled to high praise.

Don Peasley, Woodstock's only public relations specialist, handled the city's publicity in expert fashion.

Ron Hutson, Ralph Stork, and City Manager Everett Howe helped John Strohm, Dan Andrew, and Don Peasley present the Woodstock story to the All American jury. The noted cartoonist, Chester Gould, of Woodstock, and many other citizens shared their talents freely and willingly to help bring this coveted recognition to this city which lies in the heart of Illinois' 12th Congressional District. Woodstock's Mayor Thor Emricson gave his full cooperation to the competition entry—and the jury gave its favorable verdict.

Despite this recognition by Look magazine and the National Municipal League in naming Woodstock as All America City of 1964, this community is not content to rest on its laurels. On the contrary, Woodstock, Ill., accepted this achievement as a starting point for attaining an even better community. The following ambitious eight-goal program describes succinctly what Woodstock seeks for itself and its citizens in the future: First, a safer city; second, more jobs; third, better health; fourth, better education; fifth, more fun; sixth, an expanded culture; seventh, better living; and eighth, better people.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly bring to the U.S. House of Representatives these words of tribute to Woodstock, Ill.—All America City of 1964.

Kalavryta Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL W. RICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, 143 years ago, the Greek people of Kalavryta, suppressed and downtrodden for centuries by their Ottoman overlords, raised the banner of liberty and began their fight for freedom. The rebellion soon spread from the south to all parts of what is now modern Greece, gaining momentum from victory after victory until even Athens fell into their hands. However, initial success did not lead to complete victory; and it was not until 1827, when a joint British-French-Russian fleet succored the hard-pressed Greek nationals, that the fate of an independent Greek nation was definitely decided. By the Convention of London on May 11, 1832, the sovereign state of Greece was created and sanctioned.

The country which emerged, though, was devastated by the numerous battles and pillages. It was to take years of self-denial and economic frugality before Greece could rightfully take its place among the modern nations of the world.

This same building process was to reoccur after World War II. Stripped of its industries, its population starved by the Nazi conquerors, Greece came out of this holocaust with a decimated population, ruined cities, and chaotic politics. Before a reconstruction plan could be initiated by the Government, civil war broke out, a fight to the death between the democratic forces of the national government and the Moscow-directed Communist forces, abetted by the adjoining Soviet satellites. Into this dire situation stepped the United States, to supply arms and military equipment, food and economic support. Through this aid, democracy prevailed and the people once more began their labors to build a nation as their forefathers had done the previous century.

Today, Greece, with its modern army, its rapidly expanding cities, and its far-flung merchant fleet, rightfully resumes its place among the economically developed nations of the world. As a member of NATO, it is an integral part of Western Europe, both in defense and political outlook.

Since the cry of freedom sounded on March 25, 1821, the Greek people have undergone many hardships and troubles. They have overcome all obstacles, though, to preserve the democratic principles handed down to them by their ancestors. It is with pride, therefore, that we in the United States, who live in a nation based on these same great principles, recognize the fervor and spirit of the Greeks and join with them in the celebration of their sacred national holiday, the anniversary of the raising of the banner of liberty at Kalavryta, which brought eventual independence and freedom to their homeland.

Sugar and Our National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SUGAR AND OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

(Address by Irvin A. Hoff, executive director, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, before the Sugar Club, March 23, 1964, Downtown Athletic Club, New York City)

As a past president of the Sugar Club, it is indeed a pleasure to stand before you once again, this time as guest speaker. The Sugar Club is composed of men with much experience from all segments of our great sugar industry. I am grateful and honored that you have come to hear me.

The entire sugar industry has just gone through an extremely difficult period. How-

ever, there appears to be a ray of sunshine breaking through the clouds.

The Agriculture Department has expressed the belief that the period of tight supply and high prices is nearing an end. A recent Department survey showed that producers around the world are enlarging their output to meet increased world demand. The price of sugar today reflects this more optimistic supply situation.

Fluctuating prices are not good for the sugar industry—nor are they good for the consumer.

We enjoyed ample supplies of sugar at stable and reasonable prices for years. We attribute this to the insulation the United States had from the world market.

The 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act, which provided the so-called "global quota and import fee," exposed our market to the world market for the first time in years.

As the world price of sugar started to increase last year, our price was directly affected; whereas under previous legislation it would at worst have been indirectly affected.

If we are to be assured of ample supplies of sugar at stable prices we must restore the insurance we had. We firmly believe that the only way to do this is to:

First, abolish the global quota and import fee concept and thereby provide foreign suppliers with the incentive to meet quotas and maintain reserves.

Second, assign the quota provided Cuba by the 1962 amendments to foreign suppliers on a country-by-country basis, until such time as Cuba returns to the free world.

Third, maintain domestic quotas and "growth" at the expanded levels provided by the 1962 amendments.

Only through such measures can a sugar program operate in the best interest of our country, the consumer, and all segments of the sugar industry.

The Sugar Act worked well for 28 years. It brought order out of chaos. It sought to achieve a balance among the varied interests involved—sugar producers (both domestic and foreign), refiners, sugar consumers, and those dependent on export trade.

This equitable balance of interest led to the fulfillment of the purposes of the program; namely, to protect the sugar industry and the consumer, and to promote the export trade of the United States.

We all recognize the program's contribution to the sugar industry and the consumer. I feel, however, that many of us are not fully aware of the impact the program has on our ports and export industries.

Over 1½ million tons of sugar moved into the port of New York last year. Most of it came from over 20 nations, some as near as the Caribbean, others as far as India. This sugar came in on 150 or more ships. The sugar these ships brought provided employment for some 5,000 refinery workers and thousands of other workers whose livelihood depends on the activity in this port.

Those ships did not leave empty. They took with them the products of American agriculture and industry. These ships link the United States with the sugar-producing nations in our great export trade industry.

The production of 1 out of every 5 acres harvested by the American farmer depends on it. One out of every ten factory jobs depends on it.

Our trade with the sugar-producing nations is formidable. Total U.S. exports to these nations in 1962 were valued at $4.2 billion—up $119.3 million from 1961.

These nations import large quantities of the important American export crops—wheat, rice, tallow, soybeans and soybean oil, barley, cotton, tobacco, grain sorghums, corn, and lard.

Trade is, of course, a two-way street. These nations cannot buy, if they cannot sell. Earning the dollars needed to pay for American products is no simple matter for these nations. They have a limited number of products to offer. They must rely on sugar and a handful of other products to earn most of their dollars.

Unfortunately, some segments of the domestic industry act as though this sugar program was devised for their sole benefit.

The leaders of the beet sugar industry have announced their intentions to demand 750,000 tons of increased quota 2 years before domestic quotas are scheduled to come up for revision. This increase will come at the expense of the foreign suppliers—an integral part of the domestic cane refining industry.

We are convinced that these demands by the beet sugar industry are contrary to the national interest of the United States.

I would like now to discuss, as fairly as I can as a participant, what this move by the beet sugar industry means—both at home and abroad.

To make this part of my discussion more meaningful let's first put things into perspective. Let's look at the sugar beet industry and the place it occupies in our economy.

Sugar beets are produced on less than 1 percent of the Nation's farms—on some 23,000 of the 3,500,000 farms in the United States. Over 50 percent of the farms are located in four States.

Sugar beets account for less than 1 percent of total cash receipts from farming.

An impression has been created by some industry leaders that sugar beets are the salvation to our surplus crop problems. If the beet industry is successful in raiding the quota system for 750,000 additional tons of sugar, this would probably mean an additional 300,000 acres put into beets.

To see how ludicrous this proposition is, compare this acreage to the 45 million acres planted to wheat, 70 million acres to corn, and 14 million acres to cotton.

Eighty percent of all beet production in the United States is centered in eight States, all located in the West and Midwest. Obviously, if the beets were able to achieve their goal, most of the 750,000-ton increase would, of necessity, be absorbed by existing farms and facilities.

Any increase in beet sugar quota means a corresponding decrease in the foreign share. With this in mind, let's look at the effect a transfer of quota from foreign suppliers to mainland sugar producers would have on the economy of the country.

Reduce imports of raw sugar and surely you will reduce exports of our products to these countries.

Some 23,000 farmers in the United States will gain if the beet industry expands, but other more important segments of our farm economy will suffer. As I mentioned earlier, the sugar-producing nations import large quantities of our agricultural products—particularly surplus crops. These nations are virtually an untapped market. We will jeopardize the export markets of other American farmers to favor one small segment of agriculture.

It is argued that greater reliance on domestic sugar production will help our balance of payments. Will it really? In 1962, the United States had a favorable balance of trade of $713 million with the foreign countries that supply us with sugar. Will we continue to have that favorable balance of trade if we reduce their ability to trade for U.S. dollars?

What would be the impact on a port area like New York where one out of every four persons depends on port activity for his livelihood?

The port of New York is the largest center of cane-sugar refining in the world. Five of the Nation's largest refineries are located here.

Sugar ranks second only to petroleum in tonnage among the commodities imported—and it was by far its most important food product. Raw cane suger, imported in 1963, was valued at more than $190 million and generated an estimated $80 million more in business for the New York area.

Any drop of U.S. imports of raw sugar will, most assuredly, be followed by a decrease in exports to the sugar-producing nations. New York and New Jersey, in 1961, exported an estimated $455 million worth of manufactured and farm products to the sugar countries and most of it through the port of New York. These exports provided an estimated 50,000 jobs and $275 million in wages and farm income in the 2 States.

Let's now consider the effect of beet expansion on the consumer.

A transfer of quota from the foreign suppliers to the beet industry would permanently saddle on the American economy additional supplies of sugar supplied by an expensive part of the industry.

An increase in beet sugar production will, of course, increase direct Government payments to beet farmers still further. Last year, beet sugar producers received an estimated $50 million from the Federal Government, which was more than the combined payments to the other four producing segments of the domestic industry. Since the Sugar Act was established, the beet producers have received over $825 million from the Federal Treasury in direct payments. In contrast, the foreign sugar suppliers have paid into the U.S. Treasury over $1.2 billion in import duties.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently stated that for each 250,000 tons of sugar quota transferred to the domestic producers, it would cost the taxpayer nearly $7 million in direct payments and import duty curtailment.

Historically the marketing policy of the beet processors has been to sell at or just below the price of refined cane sugar. To insure the profitability of this policy they have consistently sought to keep the price of raw cane sugar—and hence refined cane sugar—at a relatively high level. To accomplish this objective, they have done all in their power to influence the Secretary of Agriculture, through his consumption estimate, to constrict sugar supplies. It is the supply of foreign raw cane sugar, not the supply of beet sugar, which ultimately determines the prices of both cane- and beet-refined sugar.

And, of course, further beet expansion would be disastrous to the cane refining industry. If the loss of 750,000 tons of sugar were spread evenly among all cane refiners, it would reduce their volume by about 11 percent in a high-volume, low-profit industry presently operating at less than 80 percent of capacity. This would jeopardize a half billion dollar investment in domestic cane refining companies owned by over 200,000 shareholders.

Because of the nature of the sugar market, a cut of 750,000 tons of foreign raw cane sugar could not be spread evenly over all refineries. Its heaviest impact would be felt in the northeastern part of the United States whose refiners rely most heavily on raw sugar imports. Some refineries would be forced out of business.

If the beet industry is successful in obtaining 750,000 tons of additional quota this year, it would mean refinery workers—many of whom are in areas of high unemployment—would lose an average of 24 days work or nearly 3 million man-hours, and more than $9,300,000 in wages.

Expansion of the beet industry would merely transfer opportunities for labor from the East to the Western States. This would be a poor exchange—especially for production workers in the cane refineries who get

an average of $3 per hour and fringe benefits in the neighborhood of 75 cents an hour.

Compare this high compensation with the average hourly wages in the seasonal beet sugar industry of $1.13 for field labor and $2.20 for factory labor in 1961, the latest year for which complete figures are available.

Expansion of the beet industry would also be contrary to the U.S. national interest abroad.

First of all, a reduction of foreign sugar quota, to satisfy the demands of the beet industry, would primarily hurt our Latin American neighbors.

We have made some progress in recent years to help our southern neighbors help themselves through increased trade rather than aid.

Are we to increase AID to countries by decreasing our trade with them?

Both the late President Kennedy and President Johnson have advocated liberal trade policies. Expansion of the beet sugar industry would directly contravene these policies.

Are we now to break our agreement with our Latin American neighbors which we signed at Punta del Este?

The Charter of Punta del Este called on the developed nations to discourage additional production of primary commodities which could be more economically produced by the underdeveloped nations.

In summary, increased beet sugar production in the United States would not be in the national interest.

Beet expanson would:

Cause an imbalance of supply.

Lead to a higher level of sugar prices to the U.S. consumer.

Cost the U.S. taxpayer more by lowering the amount of duty collected and simultaneously increasing the direct Federal payments to beet farmers.

Constrict the ability of the sugar-producing nations to buy U.S. manufactured and agricultural products.

Hurt our favorable balance of trade with these nations.

Injure organized labor, both in the port areas and in cane refineries.

Injure the domestic cane refinery industry.

Violate our foreign trade policies.

It cannot be to the permanent benefit of consumers and our country to expand the high cost and highly subsidized beet industry.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today, Greeks everywhere will commemorate the 143d anniversary of Greek Independence Day and the victorious outcome of the struggle of the Greek people for independence from the Ottoman Empire. It is fitting that we pay tribute to a people whose ideals of democracy, liberty, and the dignity of the individual and supremacy of the law have inspired man throughout the ages. Our Western civilization is based on the culture, philosophy, and basic precepts of government that saw birth during the Golden Age of Greece; and in architecture, literature, and sculpture the creativity of the Greeks has been a source of inspiration to all who love beauty.

In the struggle against communism, the Greeks have allied themselves with other nations that believe in freedom and democracy and have successfully resisted the inimical and aggressive force which today seeks to enslave the world. Certainly a people dedicated to human liberty could not do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to pay tribute to the 1½ million Americans of Greek origin—many of whom are an integral part of the community which comprises the 13th Congressional District of Illinois—who have provided constructive leadership in all aspects of our national life. These are loyal and dedicated citizens who continue to contribute much to the advancement of freedom and justice in our country and whose endeavors in business, government, the arts, education, and other fields of activity have helped make our Nation great.

Creative America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call attention to the recent publication of an outstanding book titled "Creative America," a Ridge Press-Trident Press book which has been published for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Jerry Mason, who serves as president of the press has done an excellent job in editing and coordinating publication of what will be remembered as a most genuine tribute to the diverse cultural accomplishments of this Nation.

Four specific articles by the distinguished Pulitzer Prize winning poet Mark Van Doren; Joseph Wood Kruth, the naturalist and humanist; the fiery, intelligent, essayist and novelist, James Baldwin; and Louis Kronenberger are interspersed with photographs by the Magnum agency. It is a beautiful and important book. Two articles, one from the New York Times of February 5, and one from the February 15 Saturday Review Book Service are appended:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 5, 1964]

BOOKS OF THE TIMES

"Creative America," 128 pages, Ridge Press and Trident Press.

This beautiful book, containing essays and poems by nine noted Americans and dozens of fascinating photographs, was published for the National Cultural Center, recently renamed the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The late President's excitement about developing American interest in the arts, expressed in the first essay, reveals how suitable the new name for the Center is, but this book should not be lost in the shadow of the plans for the Washington institution.

General Eisenhower, a Sunday painter himself, is represented with words of "pride in the concepts of mind and heart that have made our country great." Harry S. Truman, most celebrated of White House pianists, writes that if we value the artist "we must also value that which enabled him to create * * * a community that cherishes freedom of expression.

Besides these Presidential comments, powerful literary voices speak about American creativity—Louis Kronenberger, James Baldwin, Mark Van Doren, and Joseph Wood Krutch—and poems by Robert Frost and John Ciardi exemplify it. Mr. Baldwin's contribution includes a statement that can stand for all the thought and feeling in the book: "Societies never know it, but the war of an artist with his society is a lover's war." Magnum catches the theme of the book in pictures.

—HARRY GILROY.

[From the Saturday Review Book Service]

BOOKS IN BRIEF

"Creative America," Trident Press. This is a book which would have delighted President Kennedy had he lived to see it. It is nothing less than a tribute, in words and pictures, to the creative ferment in America, the importance of which has at long last been recognized. President Kennedy himself contributed an appreciation of the arts, and similar encomiums are printed from former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. The writers are rather more eloquent. "The war of an artist with his society is a lover's war," exclaims James Baldwin. Louis Kronenberger uses a cutting edge when he says that "in a happy-ending nation creativity must show twice the firmness and vigilance it might show elsewhere." Perhaps Mark Van Doren sums it up best when he notes that "nobody ever felt sorry for Shakespeare because he was nothing but a poet." The book carries not only texts by its 10 eminent contributors, but also 125 magnificent photographs, about half of them in color. This handsome book has been produced to further the proposed National Cultural Center for the Performing Arts to be built in Washington, D.C. A good book for a good cause.

A Guardian To Keep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Nashville Banner, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, an editorial on Wednesday, March 11, relative to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover.

We in Tennessee admire and respect Mr. Hoover as a man and as one who has meant much to all of us in making such an excellent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The editorial follows:

A GUARDIAN TO KEEP

The vast majority of Americans will receive a great measure of comfort from the knowledge that President Johnson intends to keep J. Edgar Hoover at the helm of the Federal Bureau of Investigation beyond the normal retirement time.

On January 1, 1965, Mr. Hoover will be 70 years old, the retirement age for those in the FBI service. However, prior to that date, the President is prepared to issue an Executive order waiving mandatory retirement in Mr. Hoover's case.

And this should be considered a special case.

For years, dedicated Communists—homegrown and foreign imports—along with the extreme leftists have been looking forward to "celebrating" the FBI Director's 70th birthday, an occasion which they hoped would remove him from the Federal law enforcement scene permanently.

But Mr. Hoover has no desire to be put out to pasture. He is in superb health, and all indications are that he is fully capable of rendering many more years of valuable service to the Nation.

There probably is no one man in the United States so totally familiar with all of the Communist Party's various machinations. He spelled out this menace in "Masters of Deceit," which since publication has become a textbook on Red-directed conspiracy.

Hardly less than the card-carrying Reds, party dupes and misguided ultraliberals have conducted periodic "get Hoover" campaigns. They once tried to apply pressure on a President to emasculate the FBI and thereby bring about the Director's resignation. In this they failed, too.

Throughout the years, Mr. Hoover and his corps of well-trained special agents have served with equal dedication no matter which political party was in power. He has scrupulously remained aloof from partisan politics. On the Washington scene, veteran observers rate him as the ablest administrator in public service.

As has been proved many times, no one man is indispensable in our form of government, but in Mr. Hoover's case there is no reason to lose the man best fitted for the job when his services are still available.

As President, Mr. Johnson will naturally be required to make many important decisions, with both political and international overtones, but his decision to keep Mr. Hoover in his present post is one which he will never regret, nor will the Nation.

Our Hellenic Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, independence days are usually days of great significance because they afford us the opportunity to recall the past, evaluate the present, and hope for the future. Today, March 25, 1964, we have not only the opportunity but the privilege of recalling more than 5,000 yesteryears of one of the world's oldest countries, Greece.

It is a singular pleasure to be able to say in this Chamber that the Kingdom of Greece, a steadfast ally of the United States of America, is celebrating its 143d independence day anniversary. On March 25, 1821, a revolution started in this small Mediterranean country which eventually, when successful 8 years later, threw off four centuries of Turkish domination.

Many Americans when thinking of Greece recall how the United States helped that country after World War II, militarily, financially, and with technical assistance. Today I should like to recall not what we Americans have given to Greece, but what that magnificent little country has given to us, and perhaps at the same time to suggest that all of our aid, all of our help is in some small manner the beginning of repayment for the legacy Greece—ancient, medieval, and modern—has given us. Whether in marble or music, poetry or politics, dance or democracy, no one has ever challenged the achievements of this country, nor its gifts to the world.

Among all the bequests of our Hellenic heritage, none is cherished so highly by Americans as friendship. The affinity and the respect Americans have for Greece is probably unmatched among non-English speaking nations. It is a great source of pride to Americans today that Greece is a friend of this country, and I might add, not only for military considerations. Even so long ago as 1822, a year after the revolution started in Greece, our own President Monroe said:

> The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. * * * A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

This quotation from Monroe's message to the Congress, the same message in which the Monroe Doctrine appeared, clearly shows that the hearts of the American people were with the Greeks in the fight for independence 143 years ago. It also reminds us that the President's hope for a Greek nation as an equal partner in the world community has come to pass. Today, our friend Greece, an excellent example of a responsible member of the international community, is a hard-working, conscientious member of the United Nations, dedicated to the principle that the world must have peace, and that man must not be a slave to any master. As our friend, Greece has joined hands with us in NATO as the free world's Balkan bastion. As a most responsible member of NATO, Greece has kept her military modern, her economy moving and her government stable, while never removing her eyes from the goal of the Atlantic Alliance—world peace. Our friendship must never waiver.

Another heritage that Americans cherish, second only to friendship, is love of liberty and freedom. As the cradle of democracy with the first representative government in the world, it is an irony of history that the land that gave birth to so many democratic concepts would be dominated for almost 400 years. But these are the kinds of cruelties that history plays on nations, and today we rejoice that our friend has been free again for 143 years. More recently Greece has resisted Marxism, and I think it is important to say that communism was never defeated more convincingly. It is a source of great pride to Americans that we had a part in that defeat. It would be wrong to say that Greece is not a Communist satellite today only because of American help. It is closer to the truth to say that American aid helped the Hellenes do what they themselves wanted to do; namely, live in freedom. That they live as a free nation with a common border with three Communist states attests to their bravery and determination to be free from domination.

Greece has also given the world the beginnings of Western civilization. Thousands of years ago saw the first citizens of the Western World living in a highly sophisticated society. Greece's geographical position has been both her fortune and misfortune, and today, as thousands of years ago in that past civilization we know so well, Greece serves to bridge the gap between Europe and Asia. This position at one end of the Mediterranean permitted ancient Greece to absorb and assimilate portions of other civilizations as Greece became the crossroad of the world. It was the same explanation, location, that permitted the Greek civilization to follow the seas and overland routes to the far corners of the earth to serve as the basis of Western civilization.

When we recall that Greece has contributed so much to Western civilization, we almost simultaneously recall that part of her great heritage to us has been defender of Christianity. This becomes clear when we remember that the original New Testament was written in Greek, that the Old Testament was preserved in Greek, and that St. Paul's greatest sermons were to the Athenians. Today, when we hear a great deal about Christian unity, we should remember that Constantine the Great convened the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea in 325, and from that council came the famous articles of faith known as the Nicene Greed. Indeed, we should remember that the first seven Ecumenical Councils met in Greece.

The world will always be indebted to the Hellenic heritage for its contributions in scholarship. Five hundred years before Christ, Greek scholars, the likes of which the world has never seen, were formulating political and moral philosophies that are the basis of teaching today. Has any nation contributed the equals of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Demosthenes, Pericles, and others? Except in the most modern sense, no people have contributed so much to the sciences—especially medicine, mathematics, astronomy—than have the Greeks. Indeed the Hellenes approaches to these sciences while in their infancy have been the basis of these disciplines for thousands of years.

Greek contributions to beauty and romance and love through the arts is almost unimaginable. So long as man inhabits the earth, ancient, medieval and modern Greek painting, sculpture, drama, literature, language, and architecture will affect the esthetic qualities of man and influence his approach to all other forms of the arts. It is important, I think, to add that these contributions of which I speak are not necessarily confined to ancient Greece. For example, the revolution of 1821, which we celebrate today virtually brought a new era to Greek literature. Since 1821 there has been an abundance of Greek drama of an extraordinarily high quality that is daily praised by the theater community around the world. Greek films have done much to raise moviemaking to a fine communicative art.

Some of the most delicate and breathtaking sculpture in the history of man comes from Greece, and that sculpture continues today to influence that art form. However, we sometimes forget that Greece's modern minor sculpture—woodcarving, furniture, pottery, jewelry, embroidery—is of a remarkably high quality. The 1821 revolution also brought Greek painting and major sculpture back to the world in a profuse manner. The Greek language, one of the most useful and admirable languages ever devised, continues to contribute poetry to the world.

Here in Washington, one the world's most beautiful cities, one is never far from the Hellenistic influence on architecture. Indeed, the magnificent building which houses this Chamber, the Capitol Building, abounds in examples of Greek architecture. The most famous and most popular memorial in this city, the Lincoln Memorial, has a number of authentic examples of Greek architecture.

So it is with pride and pleasure and a sense of humility that I send to our friends the Hellenes our best wishes on their 143d independence anniversary, and a "thank you" for their contributions to our civilization. Our best wishes also extend to the more than 378,000 first and second generation Greeks living in this country, of which 34,000 live in my own State of Massachusetts. Today we salute the Greek nation.

Alabama Jaycees Battle Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama State Junior Chamber of Commerce—truly concerned by the Communist threat to the Americas—has adopted a resolution calling on Jaycees everywhere to "stand together with reconfirmed faith in God to the end that the security, peace, and freedom of the Western Hemisphere shall forever be secured." I commend this resolution to you, and congratulate the Alabama Junior Chamber of Commerce for adopting it.

Text of the resolution follows:

A RESOLUTION BY THE ALABAMA STATE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the American states have under such great patriots as Simon Bolivar, George Washington, and Jose San Martin fought to preserve our basic freedoms and to protect our human rights; and

Whereas the American states by their free and independent governments are not to be considered subjects for colonization by any foreign power; and

Whereas the Communist conspiracy in Cuba has denied the Cuban people their basic freedoms and right to govern themselves under law, has obliterated the Jaycee movement in Cuba and has established a base for future Communist intervention in other Latin American countries; and

Whereas we are steadfast in the belief in the soundness of our democratic principles of self-government under law and in the basic human rights of all peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alabama Junior Chamber of Commerce do hereby encourage all Jaycees of the Western Hemisphere to work in concert through the JCI organization in meeting the Communist challenege, and to stand together with reconfirmed faith in God to the end that the security, peace, and freedom of the Western Hemisphere shall forever be secured; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted by the Alabama Jaycees to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce for adoption at its 1963 national convention.

To be submitted to all international directors of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce to be, in turn, submitted to their State organizations for adoption and active participation.

Bonneville Power Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, activities of the Bonneville Power Administration continue to be of great concern to the people of my district. As you know, I was one of the sponsors of "Power Preference" legislation designed to give the Pacific Northwest first call on Bonneville power in the event that excess power is at some future date made available to regions outside of the current marketing area. As you are also aware, I later introduced an amendment to require the Secretary of the Interior to get authorization from the Congress before proceeding with the construction of any power transmission lines linking the Bonneville Power Administration with other areas of the country.

Because there has been some confusion about the power preference bill and my amendment, I have made both the subject of a special April newsletter to my constituents. I feel this report will be of interest to Members of the Congress as well. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert my newsletter, together with the section entitled "As I See It," in the RECORD:

NORTHWEST POWER PREFERENCE BILL

There's been quite a bit of publicity lately about the Bonneville Power Administration and whether or not they were going to raise electric rates. Statements to the effect that if they did, I was the cause and furthermore, that I represented California and not Washington, were made.

Now, let's just "take a look at the record" as Al Smith used to say.

Bonneville sets the rates, nobody else and the rates have been the same for the past 12 years despite the fact Bonneville Power Administration has been operating in the red to the tune of $10–$15 million annually for the past 5 years. Obviously this sort of operation couldn't go on indefinitely because the Federal Government had to be repaid for loans and so it proposed to raise the rates. Now, due to the efforts of a lot of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, that's been called off.

One of the ways to help solve Bonneville Power Administration's problem is to sell its surplus power to California, but first we needed protection for Washington industry, a guarantee that the Pacific Northwest would have first call on power over California. Legislation was needed and I and others introduced it.

Now there wasn't much interest in this bill—many Congressmen from other parts of the country opposed it—and particularly those from California. They said I was setting up a "Chinese Wall"—"Balkanizing"—"giving preference to Pacific Northwest customers on power which all the taxpayers had paid for."

Then the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall said, "We'll build these transmission lines to California—we're not sure just where they'll go—and we're not sure how much it will cost—somewhere between $150 and $600 million—but don't worry we'll take care of that."

So I put in an amendment to the bill which said in effect, "Before you do, come tell us how much money you want, prove that it's economically feasible and how you expect to repay the costs. In other words, get authorization from Congress."

This amendment passed the Interior Committee by a vote of 23 to 9 including nine Democrats voting for it.

During debate in the House it was freely stated by Members from all over the country that with my amendment they would vote for the bill—without it they would vote against it.

The question as I see it is, Should the executive branch of our Government be given "carte blanche" to spend your tax dollars or should the Congress, as provided in the Constitution, control the purse strings—obviously I believe in the latter course.

Now the Senate could have accepted this bill as it passed the House—but they refused to do so. Had they done so we would now have our regional protection and be selling some of our surplus power to California, thereby helping to eliminate any need for a raise in rates.

Who's representing whom?

Sincerely yours,

Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Every congressional wife in Washington, D.C., and your Congressman, of course, has recently had the opportunity of being a guest at the White House in small groups of 150 people. While our husbands were attending a briefing in the State Dining Room, we wives got to visit rooms on the 2d floor of the White House. We saw the famous Treaty Room; the Queen's Bedroom (where five living queens have slept); the Lincoln Bedroom (which I liked the best); and the private bedroom of President and Mrs. Johnson, which incidentally looked lived in and not quite finished, for some pictures were still leaning against the wall waiting to be hung. In addition, I did "dance with the President" and I will certainly say that he is a nice dancer. However, I think your Congressman is a better dancer, but doesn't quite get the same publicity on his ability. It was a lovely evening, and I really wish all of you could one day have the same opportunity.

One of the best remarks I have heard recently was made by your Congressman. It seems the State Department has decided to crack down on so much illegal parking in the District of Columbia by the diplomats. Unless they now pay for the traffic tickets they receive, they will not be issued new diplomatic plates. JACK's remark was, "Why not take it out of their foreign aid money?"

Panama Canal: Will We Lose It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the January 1964 Panamanian mob attacks on the Canal Zone served to stimulate publication in various periodicals informative articles on interoceanic canal problems.

A recent article by Edwin McDowell, published in the Ferbuary 11, 1964, issue of National Review, follows.

Special attention is invited to its discussion of the difference between the Suez and Panama Canals in respect to their sovereign control and ownership:

WILL WE LOSE THE CANAL?

(By Edwin McDowell)

What Panama wants is clear: it's the canal. What we've got to decide is whether we intend to keep it, and negotiate on that basis, and that alone.

The mob violence and demonstrations in Panama appeared to catch Washington by surprise, although many observers knew just such a situation was inevitable. In effect, tension in varying degrees has existed between Panamanians and the United States for 60 years; during recent months it was widely reported that this tension had approached the threshold of violence. The root of the tension: Despite two major revisions of the original treaty giving the United States the right "in perpetuity" to use, occupy, and control the Panama Canal, the question remains, Which nation— the United States or Panama—is sovereign there?

Panama President Roberto Chiari insists "Panama does not want control over the canal. But we do want a new treaty. We have not received satisfactory economic compensation." Other Chiari demands: Mixed courts in the zone; use of Panamanian postage in the zone; more Panamanian products sold in the zone; dock and port facilities at U.S. expense; Spanish as an official language, along with English; finally, the United States should withhold Panama taxes of Panamanian citizens who work in the zone.

The Republic of Panama was created by the United States; it survives today because of the benefits derived from its treaty with the United States. (Canal Zone payments to Panama in 1962 amounted to $85.2 million, or $18.4 million more than the country's national budget.) Except for the United States, Panama today might still be a diseased swampland, beset by internal revolution and outside invasions.

For hundreds of years the thin strip of land which is Panama had been thought of as a likely place for a waterway connecting the Caribbean Ocean. Balboa, Columbus, Cortez—all dreamed about a waterway which would allow them to travel westward to the great sea. The French also had dreamed of a canal at Panama, and, thanks to the urging of Napoleon III, were eager to undertake the project. A group headed by de Lesseps, the engineer who shortly before had completed the Suez Canal, obtained canal privileges from Colombia. The combination of waste, inefficiency, and political graft, combined with lack of proper tools and frightening losses to tropical diseases, proved too much for them and they sold out to a second French group.

It wasn't until the Spanish-American War in 1898 that the need for a waterway was brought home to the American public. In 1899, President McKinley appointed an Isthmian Canal Commission, which reported in favor of a Nicaragua route.

When the second French group learned of the Isthmian Canal Commission's report, it hired a New York lobbyist and lawyer, William Cromwell, to sell Congress on selecting Panama for a waterway and shortly thereafter, the Commission issued a report advocating the Panama route. The Spooner bill authorized President Roosevelt to acquire rights and property to the French canal company for $40 million, but Colombia refused to ratify the Hay-Harren pact.

Even before the treaty had been submitted to the Colombian Government, a Cromwell-inspired story appeared in the New York World giving details about a forthcoming revolution in Panama, mentioning the exact date it would occur. Cromwell, together with Philippe Bunau-Varilla, French engineer and principal in the second French canal company, chose five employees of the Panama railroad company to incite the revolution.

The man chosen to be President of Panama was Dr. Manuel Amador, a physician employed by the Panamian railroad company. Dr. Amador visited the United States a few months before the scheduled uprising for a conference with Bunau-Varilla. Two months later he returned to Panama armed with a constitution, a proclamation of independence, $100,000 cash for bribes, and an already composed message to be sent back to Bunau-Varilla after the revolution, asking him to become the first Panamian minister to the United States.

When Colombia learned of the scheme, it dispatched a gunboat with 400 to 500 troops to Colon, intending to quell the uprising. But President Roosevelt, invoking an 1846 treaty with Colombia that bound the United States to "protect the right-of-way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama," dispatched a cruiser with marines "to prevent the landing of any armed force with hostile intent."

With U.S. troops blocking the entrance to Panama from the sea, Colombia was helpless. On November 3, 1903, exactly as the New York World had predicted, the new republic declared its independence. Three days later, the United States accorded the new nation diplomatic recognition.

On November 18, the United States signed a treaty with Panama (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty) outlining terms for constructing the canal, and the following year the constitution—which had been written in the United States—went into effect and the country was launched on its independent way. Later, the United States negotiated a treaty with Colombia, agreeing to pay $25 million, in settlement of claims for use of Colombian property. In return, Colombia recognized the title to the canal and railroad, and also recognized Panama as an independent nation.

Under the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, the United States would possess and execute "as if it were the sovereign of the territory" control over the canal to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, and authority." This ambiguous wording (especially the words "if it were") is the focal point of the present conflict.

The United States agreed to give the Panamanian Government $10 million, and promised to pay it $250,000 a year. It should be noted that this was not a rental fee, but a guarantee by the U.S. Government to subsidize the Panamanian Government. Later, under terms of a 1946–49 agreement (Hull-Alfaro Treaty) and a 1955 agreement (Eisenhower-Remon Treaty), the United States increased payments to Panama to $430,000 and then to $1,930,000 a year.

Communist interest in the canal dates back to the early postwar period. In 1946, after Russia charged that American defense bases around the world were visible evidence of aggression, Alger Hiss—at that time head of the State Department's Office of Political Affairs—submitted to the U.N. a list of U.S. "occupied territories." His list included the Panama Canal Zone. Hiss' action was supported by Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Spruille Braden, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, objected to the designation and wrote: "I was infuriated by the stupidity—which I then thought it was—of putting the Panama Canal Zone in the category of occupied territories. But I did not realize its full significance as a play into Russian hands until after Hiss' other activities were exposed."

Zonians were considerably shook up last year when the State Department invited Abdel Hamid Abubakr, Secretary General of the Suez Canal Authority, to visit the canal. And they were even more dismayed when, before a luncheon of engineers and other employees, the United Arab Republic spokesman enthusiastically described the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal in 1956.

SUEZ AND PANAMA: THE DIFFERENCE

Suez and the United Arab Republic have more to do with Panama than might otherwise be thought. Shortly after Nasser seized the Suez Canal in 1956, the United States joined with Russia in demanding that it be internationalized by the U.N. This move delighted the Communists, for they now argue that if Suez should have been internationalized, Panama should also be. But there is this critical distinction to be made: The Suez Canal was built by a private company on territory leased under contract from Egypt, providing revisionary rights to the Egyptian Government. The Panama Canal was built by the U.S. Government in a zone in which the United States was empowered to govern in perpetuity as if it were sovereign.

It is true that in the past the United States has acted unwisely in imposing petty restrictions, which smack of second-class citizenship, on the approximately 10,000 Panamanians who work in the zone.

The United States has removed the irritating and humiliating "gold" and "silver" lines, which required Panamanians to stand in separate queues to collect their pay. But there is more that can be done to improve U.S.-Panamanian relations while simultaneously protecting U.S. sovereignty.

As of now, private enterprise is forbidden in the zone. The Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, both headed by the Governor, provide those goods and services which in the United States are furnished by private business. Commonsense dictates that Panamanian merchants should be encouraged to establish shops and businesses in the Canal Zone. More Panamanian children should be allowed to attend Canal Zone schools. In addition, the United States can and probably should substantially raise the $1.9 million annual payment. It should make the Spanish language compulsory in Canal Zone schools. And Canal Zone tests for positions which do not require mastery of the English language should be printed in Spanish.

None of these concessions, however, is likely to quiet Panamanian demands for more.

It is true that the United States is studying the possibility of building a sea-level canal. Chances are that it will be built in the Darien Province of eastern Panama, where engineers can dig the canal with nuclear explosives in one-half the time of conventional construction at one-seventh the cost of conventional methods. If Congress decides on a new canal, the current controversy over the Panama Canal will become meaningless. A new canal will require a new treaty, and it is unlikely that the United States will agree to a treaty whose

language would ever leave room for doubt or whose terms were opposed to U.S. interests.

Until such time, however, the present canal remains a vital defense lifeline in the type of limited warfare military experts predict for the future. During the October 1962 blockade of Cuba, 26 U.S. warships went through in a 12-hour period, underscoring the passageway's importance not only to the United States but to the entire free world.

In any event, the United States must not even consider abandoning the Panama Canal until such time as a new canal becomes operative—even if the defense of the canal must be guaranteed by force. For the Panama Canal, no less than Berlin or Taiwan, is considered a barometer for measuring U.S. resolution—from measuring our determination to stand fast, or to pursue a policy solely because it is right and just, regardless of who may disagree.

Omaha, Nebr., Newspaper Opposes Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, another of the truly great newspapers of the North has joined the growing parade of newspapers opposed to the unconstitutional Federal power grab hidden in the contents of the so-called civil rights bill.

The Omaha World-Herald, in an editorial on March 16, had this witheringly accurate comment on the bill:

> The whole bill amounts to a vast grant of power to the Federal Government, as friends and foes of the measure agree. * * * For if the Federal strong-arm methods can be justified as a means of righting wrongs to Negroes, why cannot they be justified also to permit the Federal intrusions into other areas?

We know, of course, that they can be amply justified by using the same unconstitutional power, the same false premises and the same kind of invasion into the personal affairs of the individual and the State.

The parade is on and I welcome the illustrious Omaha World-Herald. Perhaps other newspapers will take courage and speak the truth for their readers to see.

The editorial follows:

THE WARMUP

The press services and the commentators chose to skim lightly over the Senate's first week of debate on the civil rights bill. There was much talk of filibuster, especially on the part of television pundits, and a broad hint that no Senator said anything of importance.

Technically, the issue before the Senators was whether to consider the bill immediately or refer to the Judiciary Committee for 10 days. Actually, the discussion was on the merits of the bill.

The debate was earnest, and, for the most part, to the point. New York's Senator JAVITS, guiding the bill on behalf of the Republicans who favor it, spoke of the "dignity and sincerity" with which southerners pressed their cause.

Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, deplored the fact that "some people have the idea we read telephone directories, discuss recipes and follow that kind of procedure" in a debate of this kind. Never in his 18 years in the Senate, said Mr. SPARKMAN, had he ever known a Senator "to indulge in anything of that kind."

The debate ranged over all sections of the bill, but strongly indicated that the main battle will center on three of them. One is the so-called public accommodations section. Another is the sweeping fair-employment provision giving the Federal Government powers over hiring, firing, and promoting. The third, and possibly the most controversial, empowers Federal agencies to cut off funds from States which they decide are practicing racial discrimination.

The whole bill amounts to a vast grant of power to the Federal Government, as friends and foes of the measure agree. And even some of its supporters have reason to be uneasy about what such power may do to the constitutional underpinnings of the American system.

For if Federal strong-arm methods can be justified as a means of righting wrongs to Negroes, why cannot they be justified also to permit Federal intrusions into other areas? Once the Federal bureaucracy intervenes, it has a way of extending its intervention far beyond the boundaries conceived by Congress.

Representative CHELF, Democrat, of Kentucky, a liberal Congressman who supported the House bill and then read it later, said he was horrified to find it will "extend Federal domination over business, industry, and over the individual citizens in a manner never before attempted since the Constitution of the United States was adopted."

John Bailey, Profile of a Political Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an article on the Honorable John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and also Democratic State Chairman of Connecticut. It is an excellent profile of a very able leader and responsible party strategist and administrator, and gives us a keen insight of the man and his thinking.

The article, written by Bill Ryan, was published in the Hartford Times of March 24, 1964. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. We of Connecticut are proud of John Bailey and the leadership he has given to the Democratic Party of our State and of the Nation as a whole.

The article reads as follows:

LONG HOURS, HARD WORK, EASY MANNER: BAILEY EFFECTIVE LEADER IN OLD-FASHIONED WAY

(By Bill Ryan)

John Moran Bailey, the political paradox—the Harvard man wrapped in the cloak of the old-time boss—was leaning back at his desk at National Democratic Headquarters in Washington.

His knees were propped against the desk, and his horn-rimmed glasses were pushed up on his high, sloping forehead. He chewed on an unlit cigar because it was still Lent and he never smokes during Lent. His face wore its perpetually-worried expression, as if each day was election day.

The desk itself was a conglomeration of papers, in not very neat piles. "People," said Bailey, "think we sit around here and make political decisions all day."

He riffled through some of the mail on the desk and then let it lay there in inert heaps. "Mail," said Bailey, "is the bane of your existence."

Is most of the mail from people asking for something? He agreed that it was. "But that's why we're here," he said. "We're a service organization."

The "service organization" Bailey heads, the Democratic National Committee, is a complex operation. It is centered on most of the seventh floor of the modern office building at 1730 K Street in Washington, but recently sprawled out to another building up the street. A total of 117 persons at last count worked for the committee in the 2 buildings. All were salaried except one. That is Bailey. He gets no salary.

No one works harder in Washington in all probability than John Bailey. He puts in a long, grinding day and sometimes it extends far into the night. Any day may be a day when some major political decisions are made but, as Bailey says, he and his staff also have a multitude of other jobs. The job of a national political chairman may have its glamor, but it also has lots of hard, tiring work.

It was Tuesday and Bailey, as usual, arrived at his office about 10. His day, however, had started a few hours earlier.

Before he goes to the office he makes sure he has read two newspapers, the New York Times and the Washington Post.

John Bailey is an inveterate reader of mystery stories, too. The antics of paperback detectives lull him to sleep at night. The published antics of politicians awaken him in the morning.

This particular Tuesday was not an extraordinary day except for two circumstances. The first was that it was the day of the New Hampshire primary. Mostly it was a Republican primary. Bailey smiled. "Naturally we have a curiosity about Republicans," he said. The second was that Harry Truman was in town and he planned to see the former President.

But the day started in the routine of most business offices. It concerned the Democratic convention next August, a giant conclave planned for Atlantic City that will have little built-in drama because President Johnson is assured of renomination, but which takes a great deal of planning nevertheless.

He and Sam Brightman, the head of press relations for the national committee, talked of hotel accommodations at Atlantic City. Brightman is the old pro of the committee. He has been with it since 1946.

Bailey and Brightman and Bailey and most of his other staff members carry on an informal relationship. "What else you got, Sammy Boy?" Bailey asked after they had finished some details on the hotels.

John Bailey has what seems to be a great reluctance to spend money, even if it is not his own and he has a lot of that, too. In his conversations with Brightman he repeatedly checked prices of hotels and motels. He didn't particularly like the prices.

A vice president of the Bell Telephone Co. came in to talk about phone accommodations at Atlantic City. "Can you save us some money?" Bailey asked.

John Bailey went to Catholic University and then to Harvard Law School. He is the national antithesis of the image of the Harvard man, and of the polished, suave politician of today. He neither looks the part, nor speaks the part.

He has a high-pitched voice with the resonance of a file scraping across glass. He is well read and intelligent but can lapse into the language of a longshoreman. He is the fun figure of political caricaturists. He looks like an oldtime political boss, chopping on his cigar.

In some ways the man fits the image of the boss. Political bosses bank on loyalty, alliances, and friendships. Bailey does this. Although he is generally regarded as an unfriendly man by the general public, Bailey has a lot of friends where they count.

He had to attend a luncheon this day, for some communications workers. He arrived late, after the buffet was over, was introduced and then started to make a trip around a huge table so he could meet and shake the hand of each worker there. He knew a lot of them. If he didn't know one personally, he could come up quick with a mutual friend's name. The more modern politician might stand at the head table and take his bow. But not Bailey. He shook everyone's hand.

The image of the tough ogre of politics does not come through from conversations with members of Bailey's staff. Quite the opposite. "Mr. Bailey would never fire anyone," said one secretary. "He hasn't got the heart to do it." Workers don't seem to hold the boss of the office in any particular awe. His private secretary is Mrs. Mary Francis Sweeney, originally from Alabama who has two children in college.

Bailey, as boss of the office, is not given to intercom systems or electronic marvels. "Mary Francis," he yells, and she arrives from an adjoining room.

He seems to despise paperwork in general. Most of what Bailey knows is not on paper. It is safely in his head. He can rattle off registration statistics, election statistics like an IBM machine.

Over the past few years there have been recurrent rumors that John Bailey would be dumped or quit as national chairman. He scoffs at them. "I was picked by Kennedy and Johnson said, 'I want you to stay.'"

Future plans? Retirement? "For God's sake, don't get into that. That's all they need to start it up again. I just want to win this election right now. My term expires at the end of the convention. Then I have to be reelected."

He was sitting at lunch now, in a good restaurant, and had more time to reflect on the life and times of a politician than in the hubbub of his office.

John Bailey is also the Democratic State chairman of Connecticut and he has had a long (since 1946) and active tenure. He has been assailed as a dictator, a manipulator, as the boss by his Republican confreres in politics.

"Those State Republicans, they've run against me a few times. The answer is they always lose. They ought to stop running against me. I'm not on the ballot." Is that his advice to the Connecticut Republicans in this election year? Bailey gave what amounted to a sneer. "I'm not giving them any advice."

The reason for the misfortune of the Republicans in Connecticut, Bailey implies, and conversely the election success of the Democrats, just might be in candidates.

"Why am I the State chairman so long?" He repeated the question. "I had the candidates."

"Three things you need in politics. Good candidates, issues, and organization. We and the organization is last. Maybe 50 years ago, organization would be first but today that isn't true. An organization never stopped a landslide. In 1956, Connecticut went for Eisenhower by 307,000 votes. In 1958, we came back with RIBICOFF and won by 246,000 votes."

The good political organization comes into its own, said the man who is sometimes known as "the kingmaker," in close elections.

"Organization wins the close elections, but you can't stop a landslide. In 1954 it was a close election and we won with an organization. We went out and registered people. Now we've got more registered Democrats than Republicans."

Does the label of "boss" bother him?

"You know it's awful easy to pin a boss label on someone who's running stiffs. But Ribicoff, Bowles, Benton, McMahon, Jack Dempsey, these are highly qualified men. No one's going to boss them. Dempsey runs his own show. RIBICOFF runs his own show. Take a Jack Kennedy or a Lyndon Johnson, no one's going to boss them."

Bailey over the past decade and a half has been the most criticized man in Connecticut politics. Just once in a while would he prefer to be liked instead of disliked? He shrugged his shoulders. "The family gets upset occasionally, but the kids are used to it now." He has two married daughters and teenage twins, a daughter and a son.

"I play position," said Bailey. "You may not like me, but you're going to recognize me. Popular? You can't be. You've got to make decisions. The guy who is popular is the guy running for office. He's the guy who has to be popular."

Bailey on a few occasions has debated on national television with his Republican counterpart, William Miller. It has been conceded that he has come out second best. He evidently bears no great spirit of friendship for Miller. "Miller does all the talking. You can't get a word in edgewise. I have responsibility. I can't be as irresponsible as him."

He was back at his office now. As usual people were waiting. Some were important people. John Reynolds, the Governor of Wisconsin, was one of them. He had problems. Governor Wallace, of Alabama, has filed in the Wisconsin primary. An 80-year-old Negro judge from Atlanta, Ga., stopped in to shake Bailey's hand and converse for a minute. Bailey seemed to enjoy this. "You know he was the first Negro judge in Georgia," he said.

Other people would arrive and depart. "He makes himself too accessible," complained his secretary, Mrs. Sweeney. "He'll see anybody if they're willing to wait. He complains when we're busy, but he's happy."

The day was wearing on. Bailey went over to Blair House to pay his respects to Mr. Truman. Ahead lay a dinner that he didn't want to attend. It was a big service organization.

He went back to his suite at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, put on a tuxedo that he had worried about because he didn't know if it was pressed, and went to the dinner. People from practically every State in the Union had been introduced before they got around to the head table. He finally shook free, went to his suite, changed back to the suit he had previously worn that day.

The Bailey suite at the Sheraton-Park is rather luxurious. It has five rooms, three baths, a balcony. The furniture is French provincial. He and Mrs. Bailey live there during the week, try to be at home to Hartford weekends.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH came on the television set. She said she would be happier if she had more votes. Bailey gave a great laugh. "I'd be happier if I got more votes," he repeated Mrs. SMITH.

He was driven back to his office. There was more work to do. He had to prepare what he was to say on ABC television shortly after 11.

Bailey and a small entourage went from the office to the ABC television studio in Washington. Bailey is obviously chary of television appearances. He had to wait, sitting on a platform with an announcer, for 20 minutes. He didn't appear to enjoy it.

He and the entourage went back to the office. It was approaching midnight and the small group sat around and had a drink.

John Bailey pointed to a huge map on the wall behind his desk. "Look at that," he said. "That's a great big playground."

He started to reminisce about the campaign travels over the great playground.

"Remember Boise, Idaho?" he asked Brightman. Brightman said he did.

"That lady who came up to me after I made the speech. She wanted to tell me how much she enjoyed it. I asked her how far she had come and she'd been on the bus since 4:30 that morning. She lived 600 miles away."

John Bailey, the man who knows that popularity is not part of his job, gave a little chuckle. "I think that woman was the only one who really appreciated me," he said.

The 46th Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussian emigrants who now live in America and other free nations of the world, will observe the 46th anniversary of the securing and proclaiming of national and state independence by the Byelorussian people.

In these days of appeasement, of accommodation, of "deals" and general kow-towing by our Government to the Communists, it is fortunate that an event such as this comes along. It should shock us into recalling just what communism is. It should shock our leaders who are forgetting the evils of communism and acting as if the Soviet Union is a well-trained bear.

Communism is bloodshed. Communism is tyranny. Communism is enslavement. Communism is atheism. Communism is cunning, vicious, and unending in its goal of taking over the world.

Can we in America, where the blessings of freedom are as natural to us as running water, forget that there are millions who live and toil under the yoke of communism against their wills? Can we justify selling wheat to the Red butchers of the Kremlin who keep people of many nationalities under the tyrant's heel?

The Byelorussian Liberation Front makes this appeal: "We earnestly appeal to all governments of the free world, and especially to the Government of America, and we ask you in the future to support us and annihilate the colonial and aggressive policy of Moscow, which has now become a great menace not only for the one Byelorussian people and the other peoples enslaved by Moscow, but also for the whole world including America itself."

The group points out "We consider that the negotiations being carried on

by the American Government in Geneva and Moscow on general disarmament can never achieve useful results for the free world, but only serve for propaganda by Moscow and kill the spirit of hope for liberation in the enslaved peoples."

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, perhaps we should glance backward at the brutal lesson of history. Perhaps we should sit down and coldly evaluate just what communism has done, what it is doing—such as shooting down our unarmed planes in Europe—and what it intends to do—bury us. We should observe the Byelorussian anniversary with renewed dedication to liberate these brave people, and should resolve to halt the senseless aiding and arming of the Soviet Union by unwise officials of our own Government.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—The Civil Rights Bill and What It Means—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, the Chicago Tribune published a series of editorials dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, which passed the House last month and is presently pending in the Senate. The series of editorials discuss in a very forthright manner some of the dangers and pitfalls inherent in this bill. I commend the entire series to the attention of the Members of the Senate and House. The first editorial, entitled, "The Civil Rights Bill and What It Means," is inserted herewith under leave heretofore granted:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL AND WHAT IT MEANS

(The reason for the series)

Last week the administration's civil rights bill swept through the House by a vote of 290 to 130. Such a margin would suggest that the great majority found the bill inoffensive and unobjectionable. Yet Representative LOUIS C. WYMAN, a New Hampshire Republican, said that if the balloting had been conducted in secret it would not have gotten 50 votes.

"This legislation," he said, "makes a mockery of the Constitution. To yield to pressure for an unconstitutional law because of sympathy for social injustice is to say that the end justifies the means. * * * I came here to uphold the Constitution, not to destroy it. There is no power in this Congress to legislate as is here proposed in regard to private lives, private business, and individual activity within and among the several States, having nothing to do with interstate commerce and not constituting State action."

Nor is Representative WYMAN alone in this outlook. Last weekend a number of voices were raised on television and radio programs heard in Chicago. Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, said that the omnibus bill incorporates a minimum of eight and perhaps as many as a dozen areas of legislative subject matter, and that it is hardly understood at all among the people as a whole. Mr. JOHANSEN observed:

"It involves broad extensions of Federal power over State and local communities, over business and labor unions, over private establishments and private citizens, over parents and pupils, and quite probably over the recipients of a host of Federal financial grants. Thereby, this legislation disrupts or threatens to disrupt the delicate balancing of powers within Government and the delicate balancing of rights as between citizens."

Others who were heard on the subject were former Senator Knowland, of California, and William H. Rusher, publisher of the magazine National Review. All stated that the general run of citizens were entirely unacquainted with the provisions of the legislation, and that it represented a vast extension of Federal power and enormous danger of Federal dictation to States and citizens.

Defenders of the legislation argued that 22 of 24 members of the Illinois congressional delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for the bill or were paired in favor of it, and that the remaining two Congressmen did not vote. But the problem of getting reelected was certainly in the minds of most of these men, and the near unanimity of the Illinois vote may represent merely a triumph of expediency.

But because of the gravity of the charges brought against the bill, and because of its sweeping provisions, this proposed law deserves the most thorough analysis before it is acted upon by the Senate. Therefore the Tribune proposes to outline the bill, section by section, and to comment editorially on the purposes and implications of the various provisions.

We hope to present the opposing opinions of experts and scholars in no way associated with this newspaper in exploring this problem. For it should be thoroughly established whether this bill promotes civil rights or Federal power. It should not become law unless it is understood in detail by all of the people capable of comprehending its vague and abstruse language and its highly complicated provisions and how they might be placed in force by the Attorney General and the courts. Finally, it is indispensable to learn whether the legislation, in whole or in part, is constitutional, as the Constitution has been understood until now.

To these purposes, we propose to address ourselves in coming days. We shall print the various proposals of the bill, and we shall offer the best informed analysis within our capacity.

Foreign Aid—A Joint Project in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, as the foreign aid bill comes before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this is an opportune time to point out another of the AID efforts which can be considered a great success in assisting less-developed countries toward the goals of self-sufficiency and independence.

One of the big problems that the AID program faces is to encourage greater private investment and private assistance in foreign countries where our AID dollars are designated. A project which serves as an excellent example of what AID inducement to private investment can accomplish is underway in Israel.

Since its independence 16 years ago, U.S. aid programs to Israel have totaled, up to the end of fiscal year 1963, $959.8 million. These programs have included loans, grants, and Public Law 480 projects for the technical and economic development of the country. A recent innovation though has been inaugurated by the Agency for International Dvelopment whereby this Government Agency, under the provisions of the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, helps private U.S. organizations in their work in less-developed countries. One such agreement has been signed with the American Organization for Rehabilitation through Training—ORT—last May and enabled $100,000 worth of heavy equipment and metal-working tools, all declared as excess to the needs of the U.S. Government, to be sent to Israel. The equipment, obtained from governmental supply depots and holding agencies, was given to the ORT on an "as is" basis. Cost of shipping the machinery to Israel, and installing and maintaining it there was and is the responsibility of the ORT.

This equipment, which includes lathes, milling machines, drill presses, precision grinders, gear cutters, and accessory machine tools, is, at present, being used by approximately 20,000 students in 30 vocational schools operated by the ORT. In the classes supervised by highly trained technicians, the student learns how to operate these various training tools, how to maintain them, and above all, what may be accomplished and produced on them.

Upon completion of the course, the student will take with him to his future position, special industrial skills and apply them for the betterment of his work.

Through such a "success" project, it is easily recognized how Israel has progressed so rapidly in its economic development. In fact, this joint effort of a private organization cooperating closely with the U.S. Government in foreign aid development programs has been considered so successful that future shipments of similar equipment have been scheduled for vocational schools in Iran, Tunisia, and Morocco.

UMWA President Boyle Hails New Contract for Soft Coal Industry, Praises Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of a new agreement for soft coal miners between the UMWA and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, together with the text of remarks made by International President W. A. Boyle, of the United Mine Workers of America made yesterday at a news conference held in the international executive board room at UMWA headquarters. President Boyle's remarks were made following the signing of the new agreement, the text of which follows:

UMWA PRESIDENT BOYLE HAILS NEW CONTRACT FOR SOFT COAL INDUSTRY, PRAISES OPERATORS

Ladies and gentlemen, we have successfully concluded another round of peaceful contract negotiations in the American coal industry between the United Mine Workers of America and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association.

This is an historic agreement. Once again this union, representing the production workers of the bituminous coal industry, and officials acting for a majority of the soft coal operators have demonstrated to the American people—and the people of the world—that free, collective bargaining can and does work.

Once more the responsible managers of our industry have sat in conference with the officers of this union and, on a rational and harmonious basis, peacefully executed a joint agreement that is of benefit to the interests of both parties.

It is to be especially noted that the Government did not participate in our discussion. The Government was not asked to take part. And the Government, wisely, refrained from interference in the normal functioning of the collective bargaining process.

I wish to pay special honor to Mr. Edward G. Fox, the president of the operators' association, and his associates, and to my own associate officers, Vice President R. O. Lewis, and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens, for their parts in the successful conclusion of these meetings.

It is thanks to men of their caliber that we have and will continue to have labor-management cooperation and understanding in the Nation's basic fuels industry. It is to be particularly emphasized that this is the fifth national bituminous coal wage agreement the parties have negotiated in the past 14 years without a major work stoppage.

I would like you to note that, as in the past, the leaders of this union and the managers of this industry have reached an agreement that will benefit not only this industry and its workers but also the American public, the consumers of our coal. Economic stability is the keynote to progress in the free world.

Our great coal industry, more than any other American industry, is now and will continue to be the basic source of strength and power for our magnificent industrial society.

And now I would like to report to you briefly on the terms of our new contract and then open the floor for any questions you may have that we can answer.

This new contract amends the basic 1950 and 1952 national bituminous coal wage agreements. All other agreements are superseded.

NEW AGREEMENT

Following are details of the new wage agreement signed today between the United Mine Workers of America and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association.

The agreement amends the existing 1950 and 1952 National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreements. The agreement is the first negotiated between the UMWA and the BCOA since December 1958. It covers approximately 150,000 production workers employed in the soft coal industry in 25 States of the United States.

Representing the UMWA in the negotiations with BCOA were International President W. A. Boyle, Vice President R. O. Lewis, and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens. Principal spokesman for the soft coal industry in the negotiations was Edward G. Fox, president, Bituminous Coal Operators Association.

In brief the new contract makes the following provisions:

1. A $2-a-day wage increase to be added, across the board, on all existing wages. Basic wages in the soft coal industry are now $24.25 a day.

2. A $25 increase in vacation pay bringing the total vacation pay to $225. Two-week vacations are provided in the agreement.

3. One helper shall be assigned to work with the operator on all continuous coal mining machines.

4. Time and one-half pay for Saturday work as such. Double time pay for Sunday work as such. The coal operator has the right to load coal previously mined and processed on Saturday and Sunday at the premium rates.

5. Holidays, when worked, will be paid at the double time rate. There are seven holidays designated in the new agreement: New Year's Day, April 1 (the annual celebration of the winning of the first 8-hour day in the coal industry in 1898), Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas. When one of these holidays falls on Sunday it shall be observed with a day off on Monday. When one of these holidays falls on Saturday it shall be observed with a day off on Friday. In both cases the premium rates shall be paid if the holidays are worked.

6. No charges shall be made for use of washhouses and washrooms.

7. Minewide seniority will be observed, rather than seniority by classification of work; i.e., the worker with the greatest seniority in the mine will be retained on the job in case of a layoff.

The contract retains the so-called open-end clause without a specific termination date. Under this agreement either party may reopen the agreement upon 60 days' written notice to the other party.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Surveying the Iceberg—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the second of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled "Surveying the Iceberg," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

SURVEYING THE ICEBERG

"A vote here for this bill is a vote against the proper interests and reserved rights of the American people, not a vote for them. Make no mistake about one thing—that we are dealing with an iceberg here. Nine-tenths of public opinion on this legislation has never been shown on the surface. When people realize what an invasion of their private rights is here involved—and they will come to realize it as time goes by should this ever become law—we can rest assured that as surely as there will be an 89th Congress a vote in favor of this bill will come back to haunt those who did so."—Representative LOUIS C. WYMAN, Republican, of New Hampshire.

The civil rights bill which is now before the Senate initially describes itself as a measure "to enforce the constitutional right to vote." The Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 undertook to achieve the same objective. The new section extends the process.

While title I purportedly applies only to "any Federal election," it apparently would affect the election of State or local officials in 46 States which hold State and Federal elections on the same day.

The section then engages itself with the qualifications under State law of "any individual" to vote in Federal elections—not Negro citizens as such, or of women voters as such. In either of these particular circumstances, the 15th and 19th amendments might give sanction.

"Federal election" is defined to embrace not only elections for the House and Senate, but "for the office of President, Vice President, and presidential elector." It is at this point that the new legislation governing voting collides with the Constitution.

Article II of the Constitution states, "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

Therefore, how can Congress say how presidential electors are to be chosen when the Constitution explicitly gives the State legislatures discretion over the method?

Article I of the Constitution quite as explicitly gives each State the power to fix "qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature." Congress showed that it was aware of this fact when, in determining to remove the poll tax as a requisite for voting, it quite properly resorted to a constitutional amendment.

But the House, in approving the new civil rights bill, overcame its scruples in dealing with other voting qualifications under State law. It attempts, by legislative fiat, not by the amendatory process, to say how citizens are to be qualified by the State to vote, although, as stated, the Constitution leaves this to the discretion of the States, with the additional provision that all those qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature are also qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Thus the bill prescribes that literacy tests are to be wholly in writing unless State law authorizes an oral test, and that the applicant is to be given a certified copy of the test, whether written or oral, within 25 days. It further specifies, however, that a presumption exists that anyone who has completed the sixth grade is literate and has enough "comprehension and intelligence to vote in any Federal election."

It is contended that Congress has no constitutional power to legislate in this area at all, and that the bill endeavors to usurp clear powers assigned under the Constitution to the States to fix voting qualifications. The Supreme Court, in a series of decisions ranging from 1884 to 1959, registered its respect for these rights of the States, speaking in one controlling decision of "the exercise by the State of a lawful power vested in it not subject to our supervision."

There are other provisions in title I authorizing the Attorney General to convoke three-judge courts which would "immediately" hear complaints of infringements of the other sections. But if these are, on their face, unconstitutional, the process would be academic.

From Past to Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that a substantial part of Hollywood is in my district and many of the people in the motion picture industry are employed in this business and reside

in my district, I would like to submit an article of unusual interest.

I wish first to speak about the author of ths article, Lawrence J. Quirk, editor of several magazines and nephew of two of our beloved former colleagues, the late William P. Connery, Jr., and Lawrence J. Connery, who successively served capably in the House from Massachusetts between 1923 and 1941.

Many present and former Members of this House will especially remember Billy Connery as an entertainer as well as a legislator. He was widely known for his acting ability and his use of the English language impressively and effectively. Larry Connery also evidenced the family ability to please his audiences, and all this did much in helping to set the course on which Larry Quirk was to travel.

More than that, an uncle on the other side of this young man's family, the late James R. Quirk, founded and was long editor and publisher of Photoplay magazine. With such interest in the great field of entertainment to inspire him, it was not surprising that Lawrence Quirk would find an avenue into it himself.

One of the latest examples of this writer's talent recalls an era in which Congressman Billy Connery was particularly well known for not only his work here in the House but also as a personable actor. Lawrence Quirk, as editor of the magazine TV & Movie Guide, published by Magazine Management, Inc., of which Martin Goodman is publisher, recently wrote what was described as a nostalgic bonus feature, entitled, "The Magic, the Myth, the Mystery of the Fabulous Greta Garbo." In the 40 years since she first began her rise to fame as an actress, the name of Miss Garbo has been known as one of the truly all-time greats of the entertainment world. It is this article by Mr. Quirk, therefore, that I submit herewith to help us bring the past up to the present.

The article follows:

FROM PAST TO PRESENT

Since the 1920's she has been the screen's most enduring legend, all things to all kinds of audiences, a lady of haunting mysteries and fragile illusions. Considered by many the screen's all-time greatest actress, she has been far and away its most discussed.

Her reign over movie audiences, counted by literal time, was only about 17 years, from 1924 to 1941, when her last picture, "Two-Faced Woman," was released. That her fame has outlasted her actual career, that it seems to burgeon with each passing decade, is not the least of the myriad strangeness that have dotted this woman's highly unusual personality and mystique.

From the time that her first major picture, "Gosta Berling" (directed by the man who was her admitted Svengali and created the Garbo legend, Mauritz Stiller), had its premier just 40 years ago, her hold, first on European, then on American audiences, has been nothing short of mesmeric.

What are the ingredients of the strange chemistry, the indefinable essence that have kept this woman's memory and legend alive after 22 years of inactivity?

What is it that keeps TV audiences glued to their sets watching 30-year-old Garbo pictures in reruns? What is it that makes healthy profits for art-house managers who book her old pictures?

The first thing to realize about Garbo is that she is essentially a mystic. The core of her delicate, subtle, ironic art has nothing of the world about it; she seems removed, in time as well as in spirit, from the literalities of this or any era; she is in the world but not of it; but her languor conceals a warm humanity; her smile, as a critic once said, is "like a sunbeam," she seems to contain all the humor and sadness and wry incongruities of the human condition in her best performances.

Her effects in her greatest pictures, "Camille," "Anna Karenina," "As You Desire Me," "Anna Christie," "Queen Christina," "Ninotchka," flowed from a well-spring of enormous natural talent. Hers was not the effectiveness of studio artifice or of polished technique. Her professionalism was always natural, her inimitable gestures and inflections guided by the unerring truthfulness that only a gifted instinctual artist can command.

Relying as she did on inspiration rather than technical resource, she moved with seeming effortlessness through performances opposite some of the most technically accomplished and formidably trained actors of her day: John Barrymore, Lars Hanson, Charles Boyer, Fredric March, Lionel Barrymore, Henry Daniell—and outshone them all with her individual, God-given magic.

Her performances won the highest praise, but she never received an Academy Award, though the New York film critics had voted her the finest actress of 1937 for her "Camille." She won other plaudits for her perfect comedy timing in the anti-Communist spoof, "Ninotchka." The academy finally granted her an honorary Oscar in 1955. Many felt the award had come too late. Garbo greeted it with her usual indifferent silence. The statuette was delivered to her New York apartment by messenger, and was never acknowledged.

Greta Louisa Gustafsson (the name Garbo was one of Stiller's inspirations) was born, the second daughter and youngest child of a laborer, in Stockholm, Sweden, on September 18, 1905. Her childhood and adolescence were dogged by constant poverty. When her father died in 1920, she went to work after only 8 years of schooling. Her celebrated parsimony dates back to those years. She once recalled to friends how she would take her frail and handsome young father, just prior to his death, to a public Stockholm clinic for the poor, where they waited hours for medical attention. She determined then and there that she would never again know the humiliations and tensions of poverty.

Always an aloof, shy girl, she relieved the monotony of her humble jobs (barber's assistant, department store clerk) by living in a world of imaginary romance. She collected photos of actors and actresses, and haunted the stage doors of Stockholm's numerous legitimate theaters. Poverty and drabness, the insensitivities of the people who surrounded her in her workaday life, drove her in time to pursuit of an actress' career.

Luck was with her from the beginning. She went from clerking in Stockholm's largest department store to modeling hats, then to appearing in commercial films commissioned by the department store to hawk its products.

One of the commercial films led to her first movie, a comedy called "Peter the Tramp." After this one film, there were no other offers, and she set her sights for the Royal Dramatic Academy. She won a scholarship there, and was recommended to the famed director Mauritz Stiller while still at the academy. Stiller immediately sensed something quite out of the ordinary in the still-shy, awkward girl with the angular shoulders and large feet of her peasant forebears. "Her body was awkward and big boned, but her face was hauntingly beautiful, with the longest eyelashes ever, and her personality was even then enchanting, once she lost herself in a part," says one who recalls the Garbo of 1923.

Stiller drove her like a martinet. Anxious for success, she hung on his every word, every instruction. The result was critical acclaim in Stiller's "Gosta Berling," and her next picture, G. W. Pabst's "The Joyless Street," released in Germany in early 1925. In July of that year, film producer Louis B. Mayer visited Europe, hunting fresh talent for his new Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer studios. He asked Mauritz Stiller to come to Hollywood to direct films. Stiller refused to go without his protege, Garbo, and Mayer indifferently signed her on.

At MGM she was at first ignored. She struggled painfully to learn English, felt homesick, wished she had never come. Stiller, too, was having his problems in an unfamiliar milieu, and he eventually went home in defeat, dying 3 years later. Garbo was finally put into a picture, "The Torrent," and when it was released in early 1926, she created an immediate stir. The MGM executives at last woke up to what they had.

Her essence in that first picture, and in her subsequent films of the 1926–29 period, consisted of a femme fatale quality carried to the ultimate; a fey sophistication, a grace that far outshone the typical gauche Hollywood heroine's, a pictorial loveliness that the camera flattered uniquely; above all, a kind of compelling hypnotism of personality, an intangible subtlety and spiritual depth.

MGM in 1927 paired her with its biggest male heart-throb, John Gilbert, in "Flesh and the Devil," a box office as well as critical smash, and the legend of the Garbo-Gilbert love affair, off as well as onscreen, began. It was perhaps the most famous romance Hollywood has ever known. It petered out in 1929 because Garbo, "still, sad, cold, a Norse," as Adela Rogers St. Johns, the famous Hollywood writer, has termed her, had made it obvious that she would never marry Gilbert, or anyone else, for that matter. Whereupon Gilbert rushed off to marry actress Ina Claire on the rebound.

Success followed success for Garbo. Each of the 10 silent films she did for MGM during the late twenties made more money than the last (the exotic titles included "Wild Orchid," "The Kiss," "A Woman of Affairs," "The Divine Woman," The Mysterious Lady") and she proved the truth of the old adage that the artist is better at business than the businessmen imagine by making Louis B. Mayer and the MGM brass cough up ever-increasing salary hikes. Her shrewd management of her large salary, made in the days before high taxes, and invested in real estate and solid stocks, has made her one of today's richest women. Yet the forlorn girl who sat with her sick and impoverished young father in the Stockholm public clinic did not forget, and she lived, and continues to live, modestly and circumspectly.

In 1930 she disproved the Cassandras who said she would flop in talkies by revealing a deep, compelling, expressive voice in "Anna Christie," and her career throughout the 1930's brought her a vastly augmented prestige, studded with lush, tragic, highly romatic roles that were ecstatically acclaimed. In 1939 she showed herself likewise on expert comedian in "Ninotchka," but her effort to repeat comedy in "Two-Faced Woman" failed because of a weak script and miscasting.

At this point she permanently retired. She was 36, and, some said, she wanted to be remembered only at the height of her beauty. World War II had cut off MGM's revenues in Europe, and her popularity by that time was stronger abroad than in America. Also the poor reception of her last picture had discouraged her.

For two decades she has resisted all comeback overtures, and her intimates say she will never make another film. She always despised Hollywood publicity hoopla, had the classic introvert's desire for privacy, and

as she has all the money she needs, she sees no necessity for cluttering up her life with any further efforts to be anything but her solitary self.

She has never married. Ralph Waldo Emerson, the philosopher, would have classified her as one of those spirits who flourish best in solitude and who can only function, and indeed survive, when untrammeled by the encroachments of the world. Still remarkably preserved, physically, she lives in New York, in an apartment high over the East River, and can be seen occasionally taking solitary walks. Remote and unapproachable as ever, she seems in latter years to have found more peace and inner tranquillity than she ever knew in the full flush of her active celebrity. Like all true mystics, she has established a subtle barrier between herself and others. Some know the mysticism of self-sacrifice for their fellow man. Garbo's is the mysticism of the inner life, where dreams shape themselves to the soul's desire. She shared with the world some of her dreams, in masterpieces like "Camille," and thus made her contribution to humankind. Now the kingdom of her inner heart is hers to rule and enjoy alone.

Perhaps it is as well that Greta Garbo left the screen at the height of her beauty and creative powers. Artists have canonized her as one of their authentic saints, and saints, like legends, thrive best at a distance. One thing is certain: her talent, her distinctive magic, warranted that canonization.

George Santayana once wrote that "the inspiration of a profound desire, fixed upon some lovely image, is what is called love." This insight could explain as well as any why, for all Greta Garbo's self-absorption and isolation of spirit, she has personified love transcendent to millions.

No Pay, No Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Tallahassee Democrat of Tallahassee, Fla., published an editorial last Monday which I think it would be well for all Members of the Congress to read.

In this excellent article, this paper pointed out that Russia has taken a determined stand not to pay its $52 million assessment for the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations in the Congo and Middle East.

This is another example of the Soviet Union enjoying the privileges of this world body, using it for its own purposes, and then refusing to abide by its decisions whenever and wherever it suits their purpose.

I agree with this paper. Let us accept the Russian threat that it would quit the U.N. if an attempt is made to apply the rule denying votes to financial delinquents. We live by the rules and should be determined to see that Russia does also.

The editorial follows:

NO PAY, NO VOTE

Soviet Russia is taking a flat stand against paying its $52 million United Nations assessment for the Congo and Middle East actions. It implies a threat to quit the U.N. if there is an attempt to apply the rule denying votes to financial delinquents.

The United States is seeking some sort of compromise to keep Russia in the U.N. and happy. It would strike us as better policy in every way for the United States to press vigorously for strict enforcement of the no pay-no vote rule and hope the Russians and all other deadbeat nations would quit or be suspended for nonpayment of dues.

Frankly, we doubt that Russia would really quit or allow itself to be forced out of the U.N., where it gives so little and gets so much. It contributes nothing but dissension, obstruction, and disturbance to the world body. It gets a place at the head table, a team of spies inside the United States, recognition as a respectable member of the world community, and a position from which it can politic for the votes of unstable young nations and throw us into a ward politics competition which we shouldn't have influencing our foreign policy. Russia gets three or more General Assembly votes (depending on how you count the Red satellites) to our one, while we pay nearly half the cost of the entire 100-nation operation, and it won't even pay its disproportionately low assessment.

We might justify compromise with some of the other 72 nations which owe for Congo or Middle East operations, if they acknowledge the debt and make a valid plea of financial hardship. Russia doesn't accept the debt; it defies the U.N. decision and the World Court ruling which says the money is due; and it can hardly plead hardship without discrediting its flamboyant claims of success for communism. The fact is, Russia recognizes law only as it pleases.

This is the method of the outlaw, and it should be treated as such. If Russia and its brand of brigand nations quit or are expelled from the U.N. for refusing to follow the rules, it will be a good thing. The U.N. probably would survive as a more workable, certainly a more respectable, body; or it would be replaced by another international organization which could insist that members join with clean hands and in good faith or try to get along as nations ostracized by decent humanity.

Let's accept Russia's dare to try to make it pay what it owes the U.N.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are perhaps the least known of the scores of non-Russian peoples forcibly held under the Communist regime of the Kremlin. One hears of the Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, the peoples in the Caucasus, and even of those in distant Asiatic regions of the Soviet Union, such as the Kazakhs, Turkemens, the Uzbeks and others, but one seldom hears of the Byelorussians despite the fact that they constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union. Their total number in their homeland, stretching from Poland's eastern borders to the approaches of Moscow, is more than 10 million.

The long and checkered history of the Byelorussians has been just as glorious as that fo their more numerous neighbors, but it is not as well known in the West. From the late Middle Ages down to the beginning of the modern times and later, these sturdy people of rugged peasant stock held their own in their scenic and fertile country. For centuries they had their own independent state and maintained their distinct national status against onrushing Asiatic hordes. They could not, however, withstand the threat of their Slavic brothers, the Russians. In the 16th century the then rising and rapidly expanding Muscovite Russian Empire overran Byelorussia, annexed it to the Russian Empire, and the Byelorussians lived under the Russian czars for more than 300 years.

During their subjection to Russia's czarist regime the Byelorussians managed to retain their national traditions and many of their ethnic traits. Their national feeling was kept alive in the course of these centuries. Finally, after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917 when nearly all non-Russian ethnic groups in Russia sought and secured their national independence, the Byelorussians did likewise. Early in 1918 they were free, and on March 25 of that year they proclaimed their national independence. Then they founded the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, hoping to live and work in freedom. They had hopes of rebuilding their war-ravaged country and of enjoying their well-earned independence. Unfortunately all their aspirations, and hopes, were short lived, their plans wrecked by Soviet Russia. By early 1921 the country was overrun by the Red army, independent Byelorussia was no more, and the country was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then Byelorussia has been part of the Soviet empire, just as it was part of the czarist Russia's Empire before 1917.

For 43 years Byelorussians have been living under totalitarian tyranny. For a brief period during that last war they experienced the tyranny of Nazi dictatorship, when most of their homeland was under Nazi occupation. Barring that unhappy interlude they have been suffering under the unrelenting and stern rule of the Kremlin. However, neither those Byelorussians enduring the horrors of Communist regimes, nor those living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. Nor are they reconciled with the abhorent ideas and brutal practices of communism. Americans of Byelorussian descent thoroughly detest and despise the regime in the land of their ancestors. On the 46th anniversary of their independence day we join them and express the hope that one day these sturdy and stouthearted lovers of freedom will attain their national goal, their independence and liberty.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Consent by Injunction—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the third of the series of editorials pub-

lished by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled "Consent by Injunction," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

CONSENT BY INJUNCTION

"When a man has emerged from slavery, and by the aid of beneficent legislation has shaken off the inseparable concomitants of that state, there must be some stage in the progress of his elevation when he takes the rank of a mere citizen and ceases to be the special favorite of the laws, and when his rights, as a citizen or a man, are to be protected in the ordinary modes by which other men's rights are protected."—Mr. Justice Bradley, for the Supreme Court in the civil rights decision of October 15, 1883.

The second title in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, now before the Senate, is "Injunctive Relief Against Discrimination in Places of Public Accommodation." What the section endeavors to do is to compel private business of almost every sort to serve all comers. An injunction may be issued against a proprietor refusing to do so. If he still refuses to comply, he may be fined or jailed for contempt of court.

Covered specifically by the legislation are "any" inn, hotel, motel, lodginghouse, restaurant, cafeteria, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, movie house, theater, concert hall, sports arena, stadium, place of exhibition or entertainment, gasoline station, retail establishment selling food or refreshments, and any other establishment within a building providing any of these services. An exception is made of lodginghouses with not more than five rooms for rent if the proprietor lives on the premises.

Authors of the bill justify this sweeping regulation under the "commerce clause" of article I of the Constitution and also under the 14th amendment. The first empowers Congress "to regulate commerce among the several States." The second authorizes Congress to enact appropriate legislation prohibiting the States from denying to any person within their jurisdiction the "equal protection of the laws."

How is it argued that serving a hot dog at a hamburger stand can, in the language of the bill, "affect commerce"? The plate, the cutlery, the paper napkin, the hot dog itself, or the mustard applied to it may have moved to the hamburger stand from another State. Q.E.D.

But, accepting even this tortured construction, how does this impose a requirement that the counterman serve a customer? Until now regulation of commerce pertained to carriers moving goods, to the goods themselves, and the conditions under which the goods were manufactured. Only public utilities operating under franchise were burdened by Federal law with a requirement to serve.

We suppose that the answer is that the commerce clause was dragged in as an additional grapple because the administration is aware that in the "public accommodation" section it is reviving a statute passed by Congress in 1875 which, resting solely on the 14th amendment, was struck down as unconstitutional by an unreversed Supreme Court decision of 1883.

As stated, the 14th amendment is again invoked. It applies if discrimination or segregation "is supported by State action" or is carried on "under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation, or * * * of any custom or usage required or enforced by officials of the State" or its political subdivisions.

But what is State action? As the Supreme Court has many times conceded, the 14th amendment does not run against acts of an individual, whether uncharitable, discriminatory, or wrongful. But here the rationale apparently is to stretch the theory of "State action" by contending that a food, beverage, or lodging house license transforms the proprietor of the establishment into an agent of the State. If the State itself does not press the operator to discriminate, what other device is there to invoke if he chooses to turn away a customer?

If the commerce clause can be used to justify purely local regulation, and if the 14th amendment can be invoked against individuals in the control of their property under some attenuated theory of "State action," then we suppose it is no less logical that title II should insert the principle of discrimination in a measure that outlaws the principle. It does so in the exemption of small lodging houses.

A Salute to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, throughout the centuries, the Greek nation has undergone much hardship and turmoil. From the earliest times, even during the Golden Age, civil wars raged among the city states, draining the lifeblood of the Hellenes and ravaging the land. Subsequent invasions and conquests, by the Persians, Romans, Huns, and Turks, continued the pattern of this chaotic existence. Yet in spite of these turbulent epochs, the Greek people have survived, have rebuilt their land and cities, their society and government.

Modern-day Greece has not escaped its past experiences. Perhaps the most brutal period in Greek history occurred when the Nazi Germans invaded and subsequently conquered the Peloponnesus and Aegean Islands, bringing with them complete devastation and starvation. With the retreat of the Nazis, the Greek Government was not given the chance to inaugurate reconstruction programs but was plunged into civil war, this time a struggle between two ideologies. The Communist forces, directed by Moscow and supported by the neighboring Communist satellites, were arrayed against the democratic army of the Greek Government, abetted by American military and economic aid. Three years of intense and bitter warfare left the land a ruined but free democracy.

Today there is again sorrow throughout Greece. The death of their beloved King, Paul I, has caused a loss of leadership which will be difficult to replace. His presence on the front lines, during the civil war in the 1940's, his visits to the homes of his subjects, fishermen and farmers, merchants, and shopkeepers, made him the symbol of the Greek nation, the rallying point for the Greek people.

The perennial Cypriot problem, erupting at this time, threatens to disrupt the calm which prevailed, the prosperity which has placed Greece as an equal among the developed nations of Western Europe, the unity of the NATO members which provides a strong bulwark against Communist encroachment and force of arms.

As in the past, though, during strife and destruction, the Greeks respond to their history. They remember the glories of ancient Greece and the principles of democracy which were cherished so greatly by their ancestors. They remember, too, 1821, when the banner of freedom was first raised at Kalavryta, which ended in the defeat of the Ottoman armies and the independence of the modern Greek state.

We, too, must remember what Greece has given to civilization—sculpture, poetry, science, mathematics, astronomy, and government—those principles and works which we hold so dear. Therefore, as the Greek people renew their strength and faith in the spirit of freedom and democracy by celebrating the 143d anniversary of the events at Kalavryta, when the first successful blow for independence was struck, let us join, too, by wishing them continued success and prosperity and the courage and wisdom to weather their present grief and anxieties.

Mr. Speaker, my home community of Rochester, N.Y., enjoys an enriched culture because of our Greek-American citizens. We are immensely proud of those whose national ties are to Greece.

As I believe many of us are aware, the 25th of March, in addition to being Greek Independence Day, is celebrated by the Greek Orthodox Church as the Feast of the Annunciation. It is, therefore, the feast day for hundreds of my constitutents who are parishioners of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation in Rochester, N.Y.

For this occasion and in response to my request, one of my constituents who is of Greek descent has prepared a report and history of the Greek community in Rochester. He is Nick Nickson, president of the board of trustees of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation. Mr. Nickson is assistant manager of radio station WBBF and is affectionately known as the "Old Professor" by the thousands of loyal listeners to his popular music broadcasts.

I am deeply indebted to Mr. Nickson for writing this interesting and informative commentary which I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues in the House:

THE GREEK COMMUNITY OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.

(By Nick Nickson)

With the usual immigrant beginnings common to most foreign groups, the Greek community established its house of worship in a walkup meeting room on State Street in Rochester almost 50 years ago. Although only a handful of families, their interest in maintaining their heritage and practicing their Greek Orthodox faith brought forth the instant establishment of a Greek Orthodox Church and the invitation to a priest to serve their small group. Since then, the group has progressed and prospered as an integrated part of the American scene.

Moving from its humble beginnings to a small church building then into another with added facilities for Sunday school and small social functions, the group is now in a church building and community center complex with 20 schoolrooms, basketball court, meeting hall, and a sanctuary which seats over 600 people.

The recently completed iconostasis of the church altar and appointments are among

the most beautiful to be found in the entire city of Rochester, if not the entire country.

The choir numbers over 30 young men and women. The buildings, with their simple lines and economy of design, are perhaps indicative of the ancient Greek tradition of natural beauty.

The new generation of Greek-Americans in this community are well represented in the professions—doctors, dentists, lawyers, brokers, businessmen, schoolteachers, college professors, etc.

The Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation, 962 East Avenue, Very Rev. Peter C. Remoundos, pastor, lists close to 800 pledge-paying members and is now in its third 3-year building pledge program which completed its buildings and facilities.

This is certainly a program of growth and progress and indicative of the type of people who have come to our shores from this valiant cradle of democracy, Greece, and certainly a tribute to the men and women of Greek descent and their families in the Rochester community who have integrated the heritage and wisdom of their Hellenic culture, inherited from their parents into our American life today.

Baltic Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following article which appeared in the Norwich Bulletin on March 1. This article documents the efforts of the Baltic Mills to keep up with changing times by the constant modernization of its machinery and its products.

The article follows:

TOP COTTON GOODS PRODUCER: BALTIC MILLS HAS FAITH IN AREA TO THE TUNE OF OVER $1 MILLION

(By Elmer Farnham)

Stand at the western end of the Shetucket River bridge in Baltic and look to the left upstream, noting the gaping hole in the dam, the damaged bulkhead, and other evidences of the disastrous flood of August 1955, surely presenting quite a change from the scene that existed prior to that fateful day in 1955.

Now look to the right. Dominating the view is the granite building of the Baltic Mills Co.; solid, substantial, and showing no sign, scar, or other evidence of any change since the building was erected over half a century ago.

However unchanged it may look from the outside, inside those granite walls there occurred in 1963 the greatest changes in the history of the building, changes that will have more influence on the future of the company than any changes that occurred on the other side of the bridge in 1955.

OVER $1 MILLION SPENT

In 1963, at a cost in excess of $1 million, half of the machinery in that mill was removed and replaced by the most modern and up-to-date machinery ever devised.

What was the reason for this big expenditure?

Just to keep the Baltic Mills in the No. 1 spot as a producer of fine cotton goods, a record that goes a long way back into the years.

For ever since the owner of the first Baltic Mills, the A. & W. Sprague Manufacturing Co., started making fine sheeting and print cloth back in 1858, Baltic Mills has been another name for the best in the cotton goods trade, and the present management of Baltic Mills intends to keep it that way.

Over the years that reputation as the trade's premier fine cotton goods producer has been maintained by constant experimentation and research, by constant adaptation of new machines and new methods and by the maintenance of a force of skilled and efficient workers with a pride in their product.

In line with that policy of always changing to keep up with changing times, the 1963 modernization program has meant not merely new machines, but new machines that can make new products, products for new customers.

MAKING BLENDED FABRICS

For Baltic Mills, long a producer of cotton goods alone has now gone in for blends, that is, mixtures of cotton with synthetic fibers, while still continuing to make those fine cotton goods upon which its reputation has been based for these many years. Still keeping their customers for sheeting and print cloth, the new blends will give them new customers in the street wear, sleep wear, lingerie and sportswear trades.

This addition of blends has meant some 400 new looms, together with other processing machinery, machinery never dreamed of when company was organized back in 1901. As an illustration, one of the new machines can weigh the cotton and synthetic fibers according to a predetermined formula, mix the blend, spray it with a fugitive color to identify it, dry the mixture and package it, ready for the next operation.

Likewise, in accordance with management's program to keep always abreast of changing times, use has been made of the principles of electronics in the installation of an electronic knottier. This most modern piece of textile making equipment automatically ties the warp ends when they run out on the beam even with the machinery running at high speed.

Furthermore it should not be overlooked that when the Baltic Mills management backed its confidence in the future with a $1 million outlay to produce something better, it did so with the realization that machines still need people to run them and that the comfort of the operator is as important as the efficiency of the machine. So to that end a contract was let recently for the installation of a new air-conditioning system that will provide a complete change of air every 7 minutes.

TO KEEP REPUTATION

What is the object of this rejuvenation of the Baltic Mills?

Howard P. Derrickson, executive vice president answered this question quite fully when he said, "We are going to continue to uphold our reputation as a manufacturer of fine cotton goods of unexcelled quality. We have an ideal location in a good town and a good State. We have trained and expert operatives. Our product has a high reputation for strength and quality and by constant research and experimentation we are going to keep up that reputation and at the same time be constantly on the alert to produce something better."

That about sums up the creed of the Baltic Mills Co., relatively a young company as New England cotton mills go, although the name "Baltic Mills" has been synonomous with the best of fine cotton goods for more than a century.

THE FIRST BALTIC MILL

Back in 1855, William Sprague, a former Governor of Rhode Island (1838–40), and U.S. Senator (1842–44), bought some 800 acres of land extending along the Shetucket River from the present village of Baltic to the Scotland station of the Hartford, Providence, & Fishkill Railroad.

With land and flowage rights thus secured, he started in July of 1856 to build the largest cotton mill in the country but his untimely death in October of that year put a halt to construction. That halt, however, was only temporary for the property was acquired by the A. & W. Sprague Manufacturing Co., no novices in the cotton business.

This company, consisting of Byron Sprague, son of William and his two cousins, Amasa and William Sprague, had seven other cotton mills in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Maine, and in addition owned their own commission firm in New York; Hoyt, Sprague & Co.

Continuing the work started by the elder Sprague, they finished the construction of the mill, built a log and earthen dam, 106 double houses, 2 boardinghouses, and a company store with a hall above to be used for social and recreational purposes as well as a place of worship. Later a stone grist mill was built as well as a steam fire engine house with accommodations for men and horses and 31 more 2-family houses were added for a growing labor force.

The mill when completed was of stone, 954 feet long, 62 feet wide, four stories high in front and five in back, and faced the Hartford, Providence & Fishkill Railroad. Power to operate the 76,000 spindles and 1,973 looms was furnished by six water wheels, each 31 feet in diameter. Among the subsidiary buildings was a gashouse which manufactured gas for the illumination of the mill.

The first yard of cloth came off the looms in April of 1858 with production in the early months, all of it print cloth, going to the company's print works in Cranston, R.I., for finishing and printing.

For some 15 years the mills of the Sprague chain were very busy and prosperous with the Baltic mill, the largest of them all and with the lowest overhead leading the field.

In 1867, with the company at the peak of its prosperity, extentions and excursions into other fields put the company into such a position that it could not weather the financial panic of 1873 being forced into bankruptcy in October of that year.

Under a creditors agreement, all properties were placed in the hands of Zachariah Chaffee, of Providence, by a deed of trust and assignment, who continued to operate the several mills.

DAMAGE BY FLOOD

In March of 1876 disaster struck again, this time a freshet which washed away a large part of the dam, 90 feet of the mill, the stone waste house, a lumber storage house, the canal walls, three bridges, the wooden bulkheads, 500 bales of cotton, the gashouse, the stone enginehouse, and all the roads, besides filling the tail race with gravel.

At a hastily summoned meeting of the creditors, Trustee Chaffee was authorized to proceed with repairs and to put the Baltic mill back into operation at the earliest possible moment, even if it meant sacrificing some of the facilities of other mills in the chain.

Although the deliberations of those creditors have not been recorded, it would seem that by their action they realized that "Baltic Mills" meant something in the trade and that the name must be preserved at all costs.

Trustee Chaffee followed the creditors edict to the letter. To the other Sprague mills went calls for help and soon an army of engineers, carpenters, construction workers, maintenance men, and laborers started streaming into the village of Baltic, bringing with them derricks, narrow gage railroad equipment, wagons, and all the other paraphernalia necessary to the rebuilding of the damaged property. Heading this army of

workers was a group of dambuilders from Maine, specialists in the building of stone and log dams.

A temporary railroad brought logs from the company's woodland, another railroad brought stone from the company's quarry and all summer long the army sweated and toiled until by October, a new dam was ready, stone bulkheads had been built, the mill had been repaired, canal walls rebuilt, the tail race cleaned of its gravel and the mill was ready to resume operations.

OTHER MILLS SOLD

News reports of that day indicate that the cost of putting the Baltic mill back into operation ran about $1 million and that this sum was raised by the sale of other Sprague mills, for by 1882, the Baltic mill was the only one left of the former A. & W. Sprague Manufacturing Co., empire. And furthermore this Baltic mill was so loaded down with attachments that it was impossible to give a clear title to any purchaser.

Unable to sell the mill, Trustee Chaffee leased it to Aldrich & Taylor, a cotton brokerage concern with offices in Providence and New York, for an annual rental of $25,000. This concern ran the mill until Friday, October 14, 1887, when disaster again struck, this time a fire. Discovered about 2:45 a.m. the fire raged out of control for some 5 hours and when it was all over, nothing was left standing but the stone walls and nothing was left of the interior but a heap of smoking, smoldering debris.

That was the end of the first Baltic mill.

By 1890 the litigation against the bankrupt Sprague Co. was ended, the attachments removed and Trustee Chaffee was authorized to offer the property for sale. Soon after putting it on the market, Chaffee died and Cornelius S. Sweetland, a Providence banker was appointed by the court as Chaffee's successor. In September of that year, a town meeting voted an abatement of taxes for 5 years if someone would buy the property, put it into running order and operate it.

PONEMAH BUYS PROPERTY

Sweetland continued his efforts to sell the property and in February of 1892 was successful, selling the mill site and water rights plus the company houses to the Ponemah Mills Co. of Taftville.

Under the name of the Baltic Power Co., Ponemah rebuilt part of the old mill using the original stone, filled in the old wheel pits and the canal at the south end of the mill, dug a new tail race, put in three modern turbine waterwheels with a rated cacapity of 1,900 horsepower and two generators and started supplying auxiliary electric current to its Taftville plant and also selling electricity to the Norwich Street Railway which in August of 1892 replaced its horsecars with electric cars.

REBUILDING OLD MILL

But Ponemah didn't stop there. From time to time it added onto the powerhouse which it had built, using the stones from the old mill and building on the same foundation. In 1895 it rebuilt some 220 feet and in 1897 another 175 feet, besides repairing and repainting some 300 houses and other buildings and even went so far as to put in some cotton machinery as an enticement to a purchaser. The additions to the 100-foot powerhouse brought the total length of the structure to some 500 feet, a little over half the length of the original mill.

F. C. SAYLES BUYS PROPERTY

This rehabilitation program bore fruit for in July 1899 a purchaser was attracted to the property. He was Frederick Clark Sayles, of Pawtucket, R.I., who bought all the property, still under the name of the Baltic Power Co. By this time Ponemah was producing its own electrical current so the generators were taken out and cotton machinery installed in the original powerhouse.

In April of 1900 the Norwich banks pooled their resources, granting a loan to the Baltic Power Co. to build a weave shed and install some 1,500 looms plus other cottonmaking machinery.

Just under a year later, Monday, March 26, 1901, to be exact, the first bale of cotton went into the pickers of the Baltic Power Co. and the machinery began to hum, the first such welcome sound to be heard since that disastrous fire of 1887.

BALTIC MILLS CO. FORMED

In July 1901 the Baltic Power Co. was dissolved and the present name, the Baltic Mills Co., took its place. From that time to the present this company has operated the mill which, with the construction by the Baltic Power Co. and the present management, is now approximately the same size as the original mill built back in 1856, with some 7½ acres of floor space.

Not only is it the same size, but what is more important, the same standards of quality that made the Old Baltic Mill the aristocrat among fine cotton goods producers, still exists today.

Constant vigilance in the use of the most modern machinery and the most modern of appliances for heating, lighting, ventilating, and moisture control has enabled the Baltic Mills Co. to maintain the high quality of its products, to maintain a high type of service to its customers, and to survive in an industry that has been the hardest hit by domestic and foreign competition.

PRODUCTS IN WORLD WAR II

The excellence of its tightweave products was well demonstrated during World War II when 95 percent of its output went into the war effort. Its 160,000 yards-per-week output could be found in rafts, uniforms, barrage balloons, parachute flares, submarines, battleships, and bombers, everywhere that a tightweave fabric was necessary in a life or death struggle. Incidentally, the company still makes balloon cloth but this fabric finds it way now into industry.

There are a few changes and events that have occurred in the life of the Baltic Mills Co. that are worthy of note. In 1908 the company built a 25-acre reservoir, laid 3 miles of water mains and a like mileage of sewers, so that all buildings in the village might have running water and sewage disposal. In 1918 a four-story addition was built at the south end of the mill. In 1930 the mill shut down for a short time while repairs were made around the water wheels where leakage was discovered. In 1939 the company auctioned off its houses, thus ringing down the curtain on the era of Baltic as a typical mill town, although it still owns the water company, water rights to Scotland Dam, and 1,000 acres of land along the river. In 1955 a flood washed away part of the dam and the headgates, forcing suspension of operations until a complete changeover to electrical operation could be made, thus ending the use of waterpower which had ruled since 1856.

STILL SAYLES ENTERPRISE

The Baltic Mills Co. is still a Sayles enterprise. The founder, Frederick Clark Sayles, was succeeded as president by his son, F. C. Sayles, with Robert W. Sayles, Sr. next and the present president and chairman of the board is Robert W. Sayles, Jr.

Other officers of the present management include Howard P. Derrickson, executive vice president; George A. West, treasurer; Howard J. Barrowclough, general manager in charge of manufacturing and sales; Howard T. Parsons, secretary, and T. George Orme, an employee of the mill since age 14, superintendent. Directors include Derrickson, Parsons, Mason Merchant of Providence, Charles Collins of Boston, and Percy Kincaid of Wellesley, Mass.

The cotton industry, the oldest in New England and for generations the economic mainstay of eastern Connecticut has had many trials and tribulations, with no area more aware of the continual demise of firms in the industry than the Norwich area.

So it is refreshing to find a firm like the Baltic Mills Co. with enough confidence in its product and enough confidence in its ability to stay in business that it will back its confidence with a million dollars.

Furthermore it is added encouragement to realize that those dollars have been spent to insure the continuity of production of the very best quality goods, for on such goods has the success of the company been built.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Not Quite Everybody's Lawyer—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the fourth of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled, "Not Quite Everybody's Lawyer," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

NOT QUITE EVERYBODY'S LAWYER

"If this bill should become law, there would no longer be constitutional guarantees of the rights of the individual as we have known them through the years. These guarantees would be set aside. In their place would be blanket power for the Federal Government through the Attorney General and the President to control the lives, property, and eventually the thoughts of the people. We could have, for the first time, the basis in law for a police state with all its connotations. In nations where police state powers are in effect, history shows there have been few instances where the people ever regained freedom."—Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida.

If the omnibus civil rights bill becomes law, the Attorney General is going to be a busy little man. He is authorized to institute lawsuits in the name of or in behalf of the United States under four different titles of the act, and he had existing authority to do so under a fifth title.

The possible scale of Federal intervention and of punishment for violation was suggested in one proposed amendment. This would have empowered the President to appoint 500 additional Federal district judges and would have allocated up to $100 million for the erection of appropriate jails, prisons, and compounds for the incarceration of persons found guilty of violating the act.

Lest this proposal be dismissed as a jest, Representative JOHANSEN, of Michigan, has remarked, "One spokesman of extremism enthusiastically announced that a large Federal police force would have to be organized to enforce these laws with a firm hand."

The breadth of power conferred on the Attorney General was discussed at length in the House in considering title III of the act, relating to the desegregation of public facilities—parks, beaches, swimming pools, zoos, etc. There the Attorney General is authorized to go to court not only in matters having

to do with access to public facilities but in any matter involving denial of "equal protection of the laws" under the 14th amendment.

Similar authority was sought in the civil rights act of 1957 and 1960 but was denied by Congress. In testifying on the present bill, now before the Senate, Attorney General Robert Kennedy told the House Judiciary Committee that the proposed grant of power was more than this Attorney General wanted or than any other Attorney General should have.

Mr. Kennedy said that if enforcement on the proposed scale were entrusted to him, "one result would be that State and local authorities would abdicate their law enforcement responsibilities, thereby creating a vacuum in authority which could be filled only by Federal force. This, in turn, if it is to be faced squarely," he said, "would require creation of a national police force."

Nevertheless, the House proceeded to vest him with these undesired powers, providing further that the taxpayers were to be liable for the costs of litigation, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

The sponsors of the bill refused to grant jury trial to defendants under title III, though that right had been guaranteed on a contingent basis under title I and II. Representative GILBERT, of New York, asserted that jury trial was provided under title II, the public accommodations section, because a new right had been created there, whereas jury trial was to be denied under title III because it involved the enforcement of existing constitutional rights.

Chairman CELLER of the Judiciary Committee added that jury trial under the other sections had been given as a matter of grace, not a matter of right. Thus legislation supposedly concerned with the extension of rights and equal protection apparently reduced itself to rights and protection for some, but not for all.

Title III was described in debate as government by injunction and as making the Attorney General the personal lawyer for everybody he chooses to represent, with power to file suits promiscuously, to shop for judges of his choice, and select the forum for trial. A lawyer in private practice who engaged in such conduct would be disbarred for champerty and barratry.

Brendan Behan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the "brilliant and erratic rebel," Brendan Behan died in Dublin on March 20. While Mr. Behan felt himself that, "There is only one bad thing the press can print about you—an obituary notice," I believe his obituary notice in the New York Times pays tribute to this controversial genius in a way even Mr. Behan could not truly object to.

The obituary notice follows:

BRENDAN BEHAN DIES IN DUBLIN—REBELLIOUS IRISH WRITER WAS 41

DUBLIN.—Brendan Behan, the Irish playwright, died this evening at Meath Hospital. He was 41 years old.

The roistering author, whose life was as broad as his plays were brilliant, entered the hospital on March 10 suffering from diabetes, jaundice and kidney and liver complaints—aggravated by his renowned bouts with drink.

He lapsed into a coma 5 days ago and regained consciousness only briefly thereafter. Today, surgeons performed a tracheotomy to ease his breathing and to aid intravenous feeding.

"There was really never any hope for him," the hospital bulletin said.

Mr. Behan died at 8:40 p.m. His wife, Beatrice, and his father, a Dublin housepainter, were at his bedside.

The playwright was given the last rites of the Roman Catholic Church on Monday. He described himself as a Catholic, but a bad one. In his writings he frequently inveighed against the church and its priests.

BRILLIANT AND ERRATIC REBEL

"I don't respect the law," Brendan Behan once wrote. "I have a total irreverence for anything connected with society except that which makes the roads safer, the beer stronger, the food cheaper, and the old men and old women warmer in the winter and happier in the summer."

To this warmth for the human the tousle-haired, craggy-faced writer added in his works a taste for the bizarre and an unfailing ear for the accents of living speech.

His progress through life was an erratic one. It included long spells in jails and hospitals, countless rows with pubkeepers and the police, and a wilderness of empty stout and whisky bottles.

This was his impression of alcohol:

"As regards drink, I can only say that in Dublin, during the depression when I was growing up, drunkenness was not regarded as a social disgrace. To get enough to eat was regarded as an achievement. To get drunk was a victory."

Mr. Behan's rise to notoriety in the United States was sudden and dramatic. He came here late in 1960, preceeded by his reputation, and stepped into the character of ready-made myth—the hard-drinking, talented, and uproarious Irish rebel. On and off the wagon, there were few who did not hear of him.

Although Ireland was his subject, many of his books were banned there. He was fluent in Gaelic and his poetry in that language was fragile and sensitive, contrasting strangely with the broad and bawdy strokes of his plays and prose.

A STRANGE MIXTURE

To those who regarded him with disdain he was a stage Irishman, a strange mixture of the naive and the sophisticated. To those who discounted his public life, he was a writer of immense talent, capable of transferring people live and warm from their natural habitat to the stage or the printed page.

Mr. Behan was born in a north Dublin slum on February 9, 1923. His father, Stephen, was a participant in the Irish troubles of 1916–22. His family was an uncompromisingly rebellious one.

His uncle, Peader Kearney, wrote the "Soldiers Song," the Irish national anthem. One brother, Dominic, is a writer and shares Brendan's taste for what the playwright called "the gargle." Another brother, Brian, is a revolutionary who has been expelled from the Roman Catholic Church and various leftist groups.

Although Mr. Behan had a genius for self-education, some learning was beaten into him by the Irish Christian Brothers, with whom he spent 2 years before being expelled. He then learned a trade—housepainting—an accomplishment he was proud of. At the same time the boy was learning the trade of revolution with the Irish Republican Army, a secret organization devoted to the violent overthrew of British rule in the six northern counties of Ireland.

ARRESTED AT 16

His first real revolutionary assignment took him to England in 1939 (he was 16) to plant explosives. Around this time the IRA was planting time bombs randomly in Britain. The youth was arrested for possessing explosives and was sentenced to 3 years at a corrective Borstal institution. His experiences there were the substance of the book that made him famous, an anecdotal record of experiences observed with a sort of innocent cynicism. The book, "Borstal Boy," was published here in 1958.

Mr. Behan's next educational experience was in an Irish jail, to which he was sentenced for 14 years after political violence on the homefront. He served 4 years and was released in a general amnesty in 1946. Drawing on this experience, he wrote "The Quare Fellow" (1954), the play that introduced him as a dramatist.

The Abbey Theater, now the home of theatrical conservatism, refused to stage "The Quare Fellow" which had its premier in an avant-garde club called the Pike Theater in Dublin. The play is a sort of extended prison obituary for a condemned man who is about to be hanged but is never seen. It had a great success in London in 1956 when it was put on at the Century Theater by the theatrical workshop directed by Joan Littlewood. Without her guiding hand, Mr. Behan's plays would have had a difficult time.

"The Quare Fellow" had its U.S. premiere off Broadway at the Circle in the Square Theater in November 1958. It was well received. Brooks Atkinson, then drama critic of the New York Times, wrote that although "as a craftsman Mr. Behan is no great shakes, he has a robust sense of independence. His comedy-drama is original, boisterous, perceptive." The play was made into a film in 1963.

"HOSTAGE" A GREAT SUCCESS

Mr. Behan's second play, "The Hostage," had even greater success. Originally written in Gaelic, it was first produced in that language in Dublin in 1958. Miss Littlewood took it to London (in English) and, in September 1960, to New York. It ran for 4 months and in December 1961, was successfully revived off Broadway.

"The Hostage," a sort of disordered montage of patriotic, sexual, and musical events, established Mr. Behan in the public mind as a Celtic addition to the working-class, semi-socialist dramatist, such as Shelagh Delaney, associated with Miss Littlewood.

In London several performances of "The Hostage" were interrupted by its author, who mounted the stage and quarreled with the actors, who sometimes told him to shut up.

Afterward, Mr. Behan occasionally heckled his own plays, and later he admitted an acquaintance with the publicity value of his interruptions.

"Richard's Cork Leg," Mr. Behan's third play, which was under option to the Theater Guild, has never been staged.

While wrestling with "Richard's Cork Leg" Mr. Behan found time to write "Brendan Behan's Island," a collection of anecdotes about Ireland, the Irish, and Brendan Behan, showing his abrupt perspective on the world, his strong sense of burlesque, and his extraordinary, if uncontrolled, talents.

At the end of that book he wrote of Ireland something that could well be applied to himself:

"You can take it or leave it, and that's the end of my story and all I am going to tell you and thanks for coming along."

Last month a collection of his works entitled "Hold Your Hour and Have Another," was published here. The 46 pieces in the book—a rollicking tour of Dublin pub life—were written as a weekly series for the Irish Press between 1954 and 1956. Earthy line-

drawings by Mrs. Behan illustrated the work.

A new novel by Mr. Behan, "The Scarperer," is scheduled for publication on June 26.

PRIVATE LIFE WAS PUBLIC

Mr. Behan's private life was extremely public. Some of his drinking bouts were epic, frequently ending in jail or in a hospital. On the television program "Small World" in 1959 he created a sensation before being faded out—ostensibly because of "operational difficulties," actually because of his uninhibited contributions.

In 1961 Mr. Behan was arrested, jailed, hospitalized and fined in Toronto following an all-night spree that ended in his assaulting a policeman and hotel dectective. He had gone there to appear in a jazz revue.

Newspaper reports of Mr. Behan's drinking and quarrelsomeness rarely bothered him. Occasionally, however, he was hurt by them. After an editorial appeared in the New York Daily News in March 1961, he wrote with dignity to the editor:

"Your leader writer says he is bored by my off-and-on-the-bottle antics. He is not more bored than I, by newspaper reports of my personal activities, habits, or failings. Through no fault of mine, the newspapers began reporting these things. They can stop reporting them whenever they wish and stick to more serious matters such as unemployment."

On another occasion, speaking of newspapers, the writer had this to say: "There's only one bad thing the press can print about you—an obituary notice."

In February 1955, Mr. Behan married Beatrice ffrench Salkeld, an artist, the daughter of a painter, Cecil ffrench Salkeld, and granddaughter of a poet, Blanaid Salkeld.

In November 1963, a daughter was born to the couple. The event, Mr. Behan commented, gave him a greater thrill than the publication of his first book. At the christening ceremony at St. Andrew's Roman Catholic Church in Dublin on December 2, the infant was given the names Blanaid Orla Jacqueline Mairead. Blanaid was given in tribute to the poet in the mother's family and Jacqueline in tribute to the wife of President Kennedy.

Mr. Behan write poetry in Gaelic and then translated it himself. His poem on Oscar Wilde was dedicated to the artist Sean O'Sullivan, another epic drinker. It opens:

"After all the strife,
That, alive, he caused,
Ravaged with fear,
In the half-light stretched,
The gay spark's body
Lies dumb in the dark * * *
The Envoi went
Delightful the path of sin
But a holy death's a habit.
Good man yourself there,
Oscar,
Every way you had it."

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Carrot and Stick—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the fifth of a series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled "Carrot and Stick," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

CARROT AND STICK

"I find it genuinely disturbing that this bill should be shrouded in mystery. Who wrote the bill? Just what devil's brew does it contain? How much will it cost? It is well established that the bill appeared out of nowhere and was approved by the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary when its members had no inkling of its contents. That is not a creditable way to legislate. Even today hidden meanings of the bill are being brought to light. No one will attempt to assess a limit to the extent to which this bill actualy goes or to the number of doors for executive decrees it would open, or the costs it will entail. But it is clearly the most dangerous document ever to be advanced to the floor of the House."—Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida.

Title IV of the civil rights bill deals with the desegregation of public education, a process ordered by the Supreme Court 10 years ago. The present legislation endeavors to speed up the operation by offering inducements on the one hand and threatening penalties on the other.

One of the faults of the bill, as well as one of the reasons for the lack of unanimity among citizens in general about what is necessary to fulfill the requirement of the Supreme Court, is the absence of definition in either the decision or the legislation which is now before the Senate. As a matter of law, what is meant by "desegregation"? How is "discrimination" to be interpreted?

The bill makes at least one assumption which we do not believe valid. It also imposes a limitation which is of some value as clarification in stating that "'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." Yet the leaders of Negro civil rights groups have been contending that desegregation requires the assignment and mass reshuffling of pupils precisely to overcome racial imbalance.

In its assumption, which we believe mistaken, the bill contradicts its own finding that desegregation imposes no requirement to overcome racial imbalance. It authorizes the Attorney General to bring civil suits on complaints of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation.

As has been pointed out, the Supreme Court did not tell local school officials what they must do; it told them what they must not do. The court said they must not segregate. The mandate was negative, and under the Court's construction of the 14th amendment the States are under no compulsion to achieve anything in this field. The defendant officials are under orders merely to put an end to State-enforced segregation.

To understand the remainder of title IV, it is necessary to refer to title VI, which threatens the termination of Federal aid in any form to a school or college which countenances discrimination because of race, color, or national origin. Grants for school construction, aid to impacted areas, grants under the national defense education program, school lunch programs, etc., would all be comprehended.

Because many private schools or colleges receive or are eligible for one or another of these handouts, such as private schools aided by the school lunch program, the bill appears to represent an initial move to bring them under Government control.

The threat of withdrawing largess is the stick in the Federal arsenal. The carrot to induce compliance is the offer of a number of enticements, among them training institutes for teachers and other school personnel to enable them to cope with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Stipends, travel allowances, and allowances for dependents are to be paid by the Government.

Inasmuch as the asserted victims of discrimination has always been represented to be just like anybody else, with as much intellectual capacity, respect for discipline, good manners, etc., it would be interesting to learn just what "special educational problems" the administration expects to arise from desegregation.

Captive Nations—Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago today the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. In spite of all the sacrifices, the young Byelorussian State was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was created as an arm of the Moscow Government.

Rousseau and Locke, Jefferson and Lincoln, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev, countless political leaders of the rising new nations of Asia and Africa—all have claimed to speak for and champion the rights of man.

On this day commemorating Byelorussian independence let us consider the meaning of this much-used and often abused term and test the validity of Soviet claims that communism brings to mankind the benefits derived from these rights.

Consider first what the term means.

Perhaps more than any other expression Jefferson's words proclaiming man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness define the basic rights of man. By this expression we and all reasonable and just men in the world mean that man has a right to life, that is, to exist in this world as an individual in the dignity benefiting a creature of God created in His image. We mean that man has a natural right to liberty—liberty to choose the government that directs the collective destiny of his nation; liberty to pursue an economic, social, religious, and cultural life satisfying to his human needs; and liberty to pursue happiness in the broadest and most wholesome meaning of the term.

Let us test this generally accepted definition against the Soviet experience in Byelorussia, as an example of the political subjugation which other captive nations must endure.

Can the Byelorussian people choose their own government and select the political leaders they wish to direct their national destiny? This they cannot do, anymore than the other peoples within the Soviet empire. In 1917, Byelorussians did make a choice, and they voted for national independence; but their na-

tional will was subsequently destroyed by overwhelming Soviet military power.

Do the Byelorussians have the right to pursue an economic, social, religious, and cultural life satisfying to their needs as a nation? Again the answer is an unqualified "No." The Communist system has been imposed upon Byelorussians; theirs is a life of total collectivity, an ordered society structured according to the requirements of Communist doctrine and directed from Moscow. There is no freedom of economic choice; there is no freedom of social choice; there is no freedom of cultural or religious choice.

And what of the pursuit of happiness? How does this fit into the scheme of things in Byelorussia? Let me answer this question with another. How can there be any genuine happiness in a nation forcibly subjugated, tyrannically ruled, and totally suppressed? For this is the condition of life in Byelorussia today, just as it has been ever since the loss of its fleeting independence in 1918.

On this anniversary commemorating Byelorussian independence it is fitting, therefore, that we contemplate the grandeur of those rights of man that we as a nation enjoy; it is also fitting that we reflect upon the condition of those peoples less fortunate than ourselves who live under Communist domination and are denied these rights.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, APRIL 1964

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Painting and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New reproductions: Color postcards: Desiderio, "The Christ Child"; Bellini, "The Flight into Egypt"; de Heem, "Vase of Flowers"; Hobbema, "A View on a High Road"; Monet, "Palazzo da Mula, Venice"; Valazquez, "Pope Innocent X." 5 cents each, postpaid.

Eleven- by fourteen-inch color reproductions: Picasso, "Family of Saltimbanques"; Duccia, "Nativity With the Prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel"; Raphael, "The Niccolini-Cowper Madonna." 25 cents each, postpaid.

Color collotype reproductions: Canaletto, "The Portello and the Brenta Canal at Padua," 22¾ inches by 39⅞ inches, $18; Gentileschi, "The Lute Player," 26 inches by 24¼ inches, $15; Redon, "Wildflowers," 24 inches by 18 inches, $10; postpaid.

Thirteenth Annual Series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: Jakob Rosenberg, professor of fine arts and curator of prints, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, will conclude his series of seven Sunday lectures, entitled "On Quality in Art: Criteria of Excellence in the Past and Present," on April 19.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 30, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 5

Painting of the week: Inness. "The Lackawanna Valley." (Gift of Mrs. Huddleston Rogers.) Gallery 71, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tur of the week: Recent acquisitions of the National Gallery, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3. Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: Thirteenth annual series A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts. "Quality Judgment Today: Master Drawings of the 15th and 16th Centuries." Guest Speaker: Jakob Rosenberg, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Michael Serber, violin; Eugene Helmer, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 6, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 12

Painting of the week: Rembrandt, "The Descent From the Cross" (Widener collection) gallery 45, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Fountains and gardens, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture, 13th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts: "Quality Judgment Today: Master Drawings of the 17th Through the 19th Centuries," guest speaker, Jakob Ronsenberg, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Michael Oelbaum, pianist; east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, APRIL 13, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 19

Painting of the week: Magnasco, "The Baptism of Christ" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 34; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Style in sculpture, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture, 13th annual series A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts: "Quality Judgment Today: Master Prints of the 20th Century," guest speaker, Jakob Rosenberg; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery strings, Richard Bales, conductor; assisted by Mary Washington College chorus, George Luntz, director; East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 20, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 26

Painting of the week: Lancret, "La Camargo Dancing" (Mellon collection) gallery 55; Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Saints and Symbols, rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Style in Art," guest speaker, Lincoln Rothschild, author; lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Anna Koninsky, Mezzo-soprano; Phyllis Alpert, pianist; east garden court 8.

Painting of the week: 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale this week, 15 cents. (If mailed, 25 cents regular price.)

Chicago Tribune Editorial—The Commissars—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the sixth of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled "The Commissars," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

THE COMMISSARS

"When bureaucrats not chosen by the people can warn us to obey the spirit of laws or face penalties; when a Federal judge can sit as the absolute overseer of a local community's affairs; when schoolteachers are muzzled and coerced; when our citizens cease to be free individuals and become merely "ethnic groups" to be manipulated according to some sociological dictum; when our law and our courts become merely the extensions of the sociologists' workshops; when government can invade the hearts and minds of men to search out their subtlest motivations and innermost thoughts; when all of these things come to pass in our land of the free, it is high time we asked ourselves just where we are headed."—Edward F. Cummerford, in the American Bar Association Journal.

The fifth title of the civil rights act now before the Senate set out to make the Federal Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency, but even the most enchanted supporters of this drumhead tribunal lost their enthusiasm because of the ubiquity of its snooping. So, instead of being made permanent, the life of the Commission was extended for 4 years by the House.

The direction that it is to submit a final report on Jauary 31, 1968, suggests that it will expire in that year, but citizens familiar with the hardiness of Federal agencies once they are established will doubt that such good fortune is in store.

The Commission is to function as a national clearinghouse on civil rights information. Any complaint may be funneled to it, and it will look into the matter. It is given the new power to investigate allegations that citizens are "unlawfully being accorded or denied the right to vote, or to have their votes properly counted" in any election of Federal officeholders "as a result of any patterns or practice of fraud or discrimination."

Judging from past experience, such as the election of 1960, the city of Chicago might prove a fertile field for exploration of such practices and patterns, but we do not expect any prompt appearance by the Commission at the doors of the Chicago board of election commissioners.

In its assigned tasks of prying, the commission has the help of State advisory commissions. The behavior of the subordinate commission in Utah contributed in good measure to souring the enthusiasm of the

House for the fishing expeditions of this agency. The Utah commission sent out questionnaires to sororities and fraternities of the colleges of the State, demanding an account of their criteria and practice in selecting members.

When the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, himself a blazing liberal, inquired of the Federal Commission whether it didn't think it was going too far, that august body responded that, while it did not intend to press the inquiry at the moment, it nevertheless possessed a legal base for intruding in such matters and had "ample authority to inquire further into this matter if it chose to do so."

As Congress itself had defined the Commission's jurisdiction, and did not entertain the belief it could poke its nose into the affairs of private social organizations, the House took umbrage at what it deemed "arrogant treatment" of its membership by the Commission. That is why we are, even momentarily, spared a perpetual lease on life for the bureaucratic inquisition.

The Commission also distinguished itself last year by proposing the punitive sanction of cutting off all Federal funds to any State which got in its bad books. While the President originally shied away from this exercise in naked power, the present act adopts this ball-bat approach to the enforced promotion of brotherhood in all enthusiasm.

The Commission is vested in its special field with all the familiar powers and trappings of Federal bureaucracy generally. Congressman TUCK, of Virginia, predicted it would "turn loose on the people of the Nation a swarm of investigators, detectives, hawkshaws, and inspectors with unlimited authority to inaugurate inquiries, to harass the people, to issue subpenas, to bring miscreants before Federal judges and have them enjoined, fined, and imprisoned," and otherwise "to intimidate, bullyrag, and torment an already aggravated citizenry."

And this in a country which charged in the Declaration of Independence that an oppressor had "erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

Urban Renewal a Failure? Look at St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, it has been my boast that I have helped to write every housing bill enacted into law since 1955. I am proud of the housing legislation of this subcommittee under Representative Albert Rains, of Alabama, and of the full committee under Representative Brent Spence, of Kentucky, and, in this Congress, under Representative Wright Patman, of Texas. Our people are better housed and our cities and rural areas are physically much improved as a result of the housing bills we proposed and which the Congress enacted. I might add that the colleges and universities of this country have enjoyed a tremendous expansion of housing accommodations for students, primarily as a result of the college housing loan program—one of the most successful governmental programs ever undertaken to aid education in this country, and achieved without cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat puzzled, therefore, by the attacks being made on current housing programs of the Federal Government, as well as on the new housing programs proposed by President Johnson. One can only gather that the attacks must be based primarily on political factors. Even so, I am happy to note that not all members of the minority party take a dim view of urban renewal or other housing programs, although we may differ on some of the details.

TWO EDITORIALS ON SUCCEEDING DAYS IN ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Whenever there are attacks on any program of Government operating throughout the country, the people themselves can usually look around them and see how that program is operating in their own community. This is certainly true in the case of urban renewal. I note that while a meeting was going on in Rockford, Ill., recently, to attack urban renewal, a newspaper in that community was standing solidly behind a $1 million urban renewal project in that city. So perhaps the point was that urban renewal was a failure elsewhere, rather than in Rockford.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch looked around our city of St. Louis and decided that our projects for urban renewal are also certainly far from being failures.

On 2 successive days, March 11 and March 12, the Post-Dispatch carried editorials on urban renewal from the standpoint of what this program means to our city. Anyone who believes the program has failed would be well advised to read these editorials, and I herewith insert them in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks.

First, I submit the editorial of March 11, "Canutes of Urban Renewal," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, as follows:

CANUTES OF URBAN RENEWAL

A minor offensive against urban renewal appears to have been mounted from Rockford, Ill., where a group of conservative Congressmen met the other day to consider how to roll back the tide of Federal aid. Rockford is a peculiar base for such an attack, for that city is seeking an urban renewal project and—yes—Federal aid.

Two Texas conservatives, Representatives ALGER and DOWDY, are leading the assault. Mr. ALGER condemned urban renewal as a violation of free enterprise and freedom of the individual. Mr. DOWDY recently wrote an article citing incidents of alleged mismanagement in renewal projects as grounds for obliterating the whole program. And Representative CURTIS, of Webster Groves, referred to urban renewal in terms of "failure," "high rise slums," and "calloused disregard for human freedoms." Is Mr. CURTIS, then, opposed to the renewal projects which have remade so much of St. Louis?

This question is particularly relevant in Rockford itself. The Rockford Morning Star, welcoming the conference, said it believed in local responsibility but also stands firmly back of a million-dollar urban renewal project there. Why? Because private capital was not interested "and if private enterprise can't do the job in Washington Park, the only alternative is to give Federal assistance a trial there."

These words state, in effect, the basic principle of the urban renewal program. If private enterprise alone could remove slums and provide adequate housing in all cases, there would be no such program. The program is devised to do what private enterprise has not done. Not every project is totally successful, but St. Louis and other cities have benefited handsomely from Federal assistance in rebuilding. Those who want to roll back the tide ought to remember the elementary lesson of King Canute.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I submit the editorial of the following day, "The Dividends Are in Sight," as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 12, 1964]

THE DIVIDENDS ARE IN SIGHT

A St. Louisan seeking a quick stimulant for his civic pride can find it by driving along Clark Avenue west of Jefferson. Both sides of the street are lined with handsome new establishments of a dozen or so medium-sized industries. Each building is a sort of status symbol, about to be enhanced by landscaping. In Mill Creek, this burgeoning industrial development shows forth—on a scale intimate enough to be readily grasped—the materializing of a new, prospering St. Louis.

It justifies the investment of public and private funds in urban renewal. The 1963 balance sheets of the land clearance authority and the housing authority shows assets of $159,516,441.19. The Plaza Apartments represent a private investment in excess of $20 million with Federal-city contribution of $2,618,000. Mill Creek, which will accommodate about 2,000 families in addition to its other features will represent a private investment of at least $91 million and a public investment of $34 million.

South Broadway's Kosciusko redevelopment, now 80 percent cleared, will cost about $100 million in private and $21,800,000 in public funds. The riverfront memorial, involving about $20 million in Federal-municipal money, inspired the $51 million stadium complex as well as the impressive Mansion House project and, at least indirectly, an accelerating downtown renewal. The impressive housing projects, completed and in process, also the various neighborhood rehabilitation projects, and the flood control work to insure new industrial sites are in the picture.

The object, however, is not to put a dollar sign on this. Financing seems relatively insignificant compared with achievements which are becoming more concrete each day. Completion of all the projects is still a few years away, but it is no longer in doubt. St. Louisans may congratulate themselves on their foresight in voting for the necessary bond issues, and in backing up public investments with far greater private outlays. The dividends are in sight.

Opportunity Knocking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly directed the attention of the House to conditions within the Soviet colonial empire and the fact that the United States should develop an imaginative policy to help the disintegration process of the Communist world.

An editorial in yesterday's Washington Evening Star touches on this subject and although it leaves quite a bit unsaid

and does not emphasize the progressive aspects that should be developed, nevertheless it effectively recognizes the complications in the Communist world.

The captive peoples of communism represent the basic weakness of the Red empire. We should adopt a vigorous policy to encourage and augment the nationalistic forces which work behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that our own freedom and that of other peoples in the free world remains in danger as long as any people are enslaved by communism.

The editorial follows:

OPPORTUNITY KNOCKING

It becomes more obvious every day that the Soviet bloc—which in Stalin's time seemed to be an unshatterable monolith of desperate and totally submissive peoples trapped behind the Iron Curtain—is as full of cracks and fissures as our District of Columbia Stadium.

This, of course, understates the case. For the stadium, an inanimate and still-handsome thing, undoubtedly can be patched up and restored to complete structural health without too much trouble. But the same does not hold true for the monstrosity that Stalin bequeathed to his successors—a grim legacy held together only by the cement of force and terror. That cement, however, now has begun to disintegrate before the world's eyes, and the peoples directly involved are certainly not going to stop the process.

These peoples—the Poles, the Rumanians, the Hungarians, the Czechs and all the rest of the so-called satellites—have ancient cultures and traditions of their own. They are proud; they are not fond of Russia; they are intellectually advanced; and the Kremlin is simply incapable of subjugating them forever. This point has been made very clear by Bernard Gwertzman of the Star in his latest reports from behind the Iron Curtain. His dispatches from Rumania and Hungary, for example, have amounted to particularly good evidence of how Stalin's monolith has been cracking up and how Premier Khrushchev—despite his brutal suppression of the 1956 Hungarian uprising for freedom—can do little or nothing about it.

This is a fact of great potential importance in terms of the cold war and the future shape of the world. Things are in flux. The old Stalinist empire, whether the Kremlin likes it or not, is loosening up, if not falling apart altogether. This does not mean, necessarily, that regimes like those in control of Hungary and Rumania are suddenly going to abandon Moscow and communism, but it strongly indicates that there are some possibilities in that direction.

In the circumstances, the foreign policy of the United States must be flexible—ready at any moment to exploit the situation on behalf of peace and freedom. The cracks in Europe's Red monolith, coupled with the Moscow-Peiping rift, constitute an opportunity knocking very loudly on our door.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—"One-Hundred-Billion-Dollar Blackjack"—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the seventh of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled "$100 Billion Blackjack," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

A $100 BILLION BLACKJACK

"Into our Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, some new and strange concepts are being infused. What is more alarming is that they are being accepted, passively and unquestioningly, by most of our populace. Liberty is being subordinated to equality. A type of absolute egalitarianism, riding roughshod over personal privacy and individual freedom, has become the order of the day. Matters that formerly were well within the realm of choice and decision are now branded as criminal or tortious, with the punitive police power of government standing by. Private business and social dealings must now contend with the Government as an uninvited third party, overseeing and checking what private citizens do and even how and what they think."—Edward F. Cummerford, in the American Bar Association Journal.

" 'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master.' " The whole of the civil rights bill is intended to make it unmistakably clear that Government is absolute boss—if, indeed, "minority groups" which have prodded the administration into this legislation have not made Government subordinate to them.

As with five preceding sections of the bill, title VI, "Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs," is coercive. It provides for the withholding of Federal funds as a means of coercing any particular State to accelerate the process of desegregation.

The language also refers to discrimination, never defined in the bill in terms of law. Cutting the flow of taxpayers' money to a given State, as Castro cut the water line to Guantanamo, is mandatory upon each of the hundreds of Federal agencies handling grants, loans, or contracts if it determines that such action is needed to "effectuate" the sociological objectives of the civil rights act.

An amendment provides that the President must first approve, and that the agency or department taking action must notify appropriate committees of Congress of the grounds for action. Termination of financial assistance from Washington is not to be effective until 30 days after notice is given.

Last April the Federal Commission on Civil Rights recommended to the late President Kennedy that he adopt such methods to punish the State of Mississippi. Mr. Kennedy said it would "probably be unwise" to give the President such power. Yet in his own version of the civil rights bill he had come 'round by June to the belief that the President should have discretionary power to promote race equality.

The bill as it has emerged from the House makes such economic sanctions mandatory. It gives the President the final say in invoking them, but constitutes each Government department or agency prosecutor, judge, and jury in making the determination that a State has offended in some particular.

Considering the multitude of Federal spending programs, ranging from farm subsidies and defense contracts through school lunch programs and aid to dependent children, here is machinery of stunning political power. As Representative TUCK, of Virginia, commented, it puts into the hands of Washington factotums a hundred billion dollar blackjack to club the American people into submission.

If financial sanctions are taken against a State because of the supposed derelictions of a local community or two, everyone would sustain the blow alike—Negroes and whites, integrationists and segregationists. The dew-drops would fall on the just and the unjust; the innocent would be damned with the guilty.

The constitutionality of the scheme may be impeached on the ground that the Constitution provides that "direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective number" and that duties, imposts, and excises "shall be uniform throughout the United States." The title violates thhe whole spirit of uniformity that pervades the Constitution.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in the many words of commemoration on this 46th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. It would be gratifying if Byelorussia itself were celebrating today in freedom also.

Byelorussia was historically a colony of Czarist Russia. Thus the Bolsheviks could put forth one of their ridiculous historical claims to Byelorussian territory without any thought for the much different language, culture, and ethnic composition of the Byelorussian people, or the desires of the people themselves. But the fact that Byelorussia was for many years oppressed by the czars is a poor excuse for the vicious invasion with which the Russians crushed the Byelorussian independence movement in 1918.

It is perfectly apparent that Lenin and his followers were not freedom-loving revolutionaries at all. The revolution they were interested in was only one which would bring them to power over the same empire which the czars had controlled.

If the Communists had been interested in freedom, Byelorussia would have been independent now, rather than a colony in the ever-expanding Russian empire.

I understand that the Russians are going to begin using polite addresses such as "sir" and "madam" again in place of "comrade." Perhaps they might also return to the prerevolutionary title of "czar" for their rulers. The atrocities committed in Russia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and all of East Europe, and unquestioning manipulation of people by the Communist party differ little from conditions of czarist days. The Communists are more subtle and more tightly organized than the Czar's supporters, but the Russian people have yet to experience the real liberation which is offered by western democracy in this 20th century.

When the day comes, as it must, when all the people of East Europe demand the freedom and self-respect due them as human beings, Byelorussia will regain its independence. Then it will be able to put to use all the conviction in democratic ideals which it evidenced in 1918, and still sees existing in the free world. Then Byelorussian Independence Day will truly have new meaning, and our words here will gain increased significance.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Pandora's Box—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the eighth of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled, "Pandora's Box," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

PANDORA'S BOX

"Individuals of any race or creed have but one road to social acceptance and economic abundance. That road is the narrow, rocky trail of personal exertion, perseverance, study, work, savings, and character building. It is a hard road. It is too bad that we cannot pass a law that would make the travel of this road unnecessary for all of us. This road is the only one that leads to self-respect and the respect of others. It leads to good will and understanding. It leads to economic security and abundance. The mere passage of a law will not bring any of these things to any person, or group of persons."—Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama.

Under title VII of the Civil Rights Act, "Equal Employment Opportunity," the Federal Government endeavors to legislate itself into partnership with private business. It assumes the power to dictate hiring, firing, and promotion policies of business, and to cancel business decisions in these areas.

It assumes a similar relationship and powers in reference to labor unions and employment agencies. It will make its own judgments whether a union's apprentice and membership policies are tainted by discrimination.

The policing agency is to be an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with five members, equipped with regional offices and staffs of inspectors and attorneys. Action may be taken by the Commission in the absence of any complaint by an individual. It is sufficient that one member of the five file a charge against a business, employment agency, or union. Any business employing as few as 25 persons will be covered by the 4th year of the Commission's existence.

The Commission's agents are authorized to enter upon business property, have access to business and union records, question employees, and conduct investigations on their own determination of reasonable cause. If persuasion by the Federal inspectors fails, the Commission will seek to enjoin the accused transgressor in a hearing before a judge or master. The businessman (or union) is not allowed jury trial. If the defendant is enjoined, he thereafter must toe the mark or face a fine or imprisonment for contempt.

Although the title addresses itself to equality and discrimination, it defines neither. Its standards are subjective and vague. No employer can be sure that he is not inviting the Commission's displeasure. As one Congressman remarked, you may need a Ph. D. to stay out of the penitentiary.

There must be no discrimination, according to the title, based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The bill generously provides that an Italian restaurateur does not have to hire a Turkish chef to cook spaghetti, that a religious college need not hire an atheistic janitor, and that employers can discriminate against Communists.

No resolution was made of the problem of whether the Harlem Globetrotters are obliged to hire a white forward, or the Birmingham Black Barons a white outfielder. Nor could light be obtained on the question of whether employers and unions would be obliged to institute quota systems to overcome racial imbalance.

The constitutional authority for Congress to control private employment practices in the States when no Federal job or contract is involved proved all but invisible.

The title is predicated on appeals to two constitutional provisions. It applies when a business affects commerce, pitching a new Federal tent on the same tortured ground occupied by the theoretical hamburger stand in the "public accommodations" section, or if the privileges and immunities of citizens are abridged by a State, thus invoking the 14th amendment.

As no State is charged with enforcing conditions of employment in private business which abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens, and as in the Slaughter-House cases the Supreme Court said that the privileges protected were those "which owe their existence to the Federal Government, its national character, its Constitution, or its laws," where is the application? And, short of juvenile laws and legislated conditions of work, it is not apparent where Congress has power to prescribe hiring practices even when goods get into interstate commerce.

The effect of the section is to attempt to legislate discrimination in reverse through preferential hiring.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the 25th of March is a date that is etched strongly and deeply in the hearts of all Greeks everywhere in the world. That date marks their national day of independence. One hundred and forty-three years ago, in 1821, Germanos, the Archbishop of Patras, raised a new national emblem over the monastery of Hagia Lavra. Thus began long years of struggle to establish a new and free Greek nation. In 1830 modern Greece finally took its place in the community of nations.

We must not forget that it was the ancients of this land—Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and Solon to name but a few—that taught the world the concepts of self government, democracy, and a love for freedom. Modern Greece, its citizens and its children around the world stand ever more firmly for these ideals. Over the years they have joined the other free nations of the world to halt aggression and tyranny through the world—from Europe to Korea. Another example of their determination to remain free was their great defeat, after World War II, of the violent and powerful threats to their internal safety, security, and freedom.

We all know that the people of Greek ancestry that have chosen to live in and share our communities with us possess the same love of liberty, the same courage, the same patriotism, and the same determination never to be enslaved that characterized their forebearers. They contribute valuably in all fields of human endeavor in the community and in all the professions. Their presence in our communities is an enriching presence and we are all of us the better for it. We are proud to have them as our friends, neighbors, and coworkers.

I join with all my fellow citizens in saluting all Greek people on their great day of independence.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, the heroic people of Greece rose as one man against the Ottoman Empire under whose oppressive heel they had suffered for more than 400 years.

When Archbishop Germanos of Patras unfurled the flag of Greece over the monastery of Aghia Lavra, 143 years ago today, the courageous Greeks began a bitter struggle for their independence from their despotic oppressors. Fighting against tremendous odds the Greeks were sustained by their uncompromising determination and love of liberty. They won the sympathy and admiration of other nations, including the United States.

A partial victory was gained in 1829 when Turkey recognized Greece as an autonomous principality. It was not until 1832 when their hopes for liberty were realized and Greece became a sovereign kingdom.

The historic bonds of friendship between Greece and the United States found their origin in our mutual dedication to the ancient Greek ideals of liberty, independence, and individual freedom. These ties were further cemented when our sons fought side by side as allies in two great world wars and in Korea.

We have been saddened by the tragic death of King Paul, whom the Greeks and all the world loved and admired for his devotion to his people and their democratic institutions. The compassionate heart of this great leader would desire that his people, although in mourning, celebrate the anniversary of their independence as a tribute to their courageous predecessors and brothers who preserved our civilization and bequeathed democracy to the world.

All Americans and freedom-loving peoples everywhere join in paying tribute to the Greek people, and the more than 1½ million of Americans of Greek origin who have contributed in such large measure to the welfare of our Nation and the world.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Not So Gently Warning—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the ninth of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled, "Not So Gentle Warning," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

NOT SO GENTLE WARNING

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of others but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built" (Abraham Lincoln, March 21, 1864).

The eighth title of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 conveys a threat, thinly veiled, to the Southern States. It is that if they do not bring their election practices into conformity with what the northern majority expects of them, Congress will for the first time since the 14th amendment was ratified in 1868 invoke its punitive provision.

Section 2 of the amendment provides that when the right to vote for Federal and some State officers is denied or abridged, the number of seats in Congress held by the offending States shall be reduced in proportion to the number of citizens disfranchised.

Representative SAMUEL STRATTON, of New York, conceded that this was indeed the purpose of the title, which looks innocent on its face. It empowers the Federal Commission on Civil Rights to direct the Secretary of Commerce to compile registration and voting statistics "in such geographic areas" as the Commission recommends. These are to include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, and a determination of the extent to which they are registered and have voted in primary or general elections to the House since 1960. This census is to be taken in 1970, but may be conducted earlier, if Congress so prescribes.

Describing the civil rights bill as "a giant step forward," Mr. STRATTON volunteered the information that he had introduced a bill requiring the Census Bureau to report such figures and to certify to Congress "a new reapportionment of seats in the House" in conformity with section 2 of the 14th amendment.

Southern Members did not need this notice of intention. They had already detected the purpose and discussed it. Representative TUCK, of Virginia, called title VIII "highly discriminatory," adding, "But, of course, discrimination may be what some people want so long as the discrimination is in their favor."

Representative WILLIAMS, of Mississippi commented, "We know what those areas are—they are the States of the south. This title is aimed at our people." Representative LONG of Louisiana remarked that the Census Bureau was being converted into a civil rights investigator and "I do not believe that anyone is naive enough to miss the implication of this title." He said that it signified a coming "purge."

Representative GROSS, of Iowa, a Republican, spoke sarcastically of the administration limiting its concern to Negro voting in the Southern States. He suggested that Republican voters were discriminated against in the 1960 presidential election in Chicago. "They lost their votes because of the fraudulent ballots that were cast," he said.

Mr. GROSS also suggested that the voting census start with the year 1948, when Lyndon Johnson won the Democratic senatorial primary in Texas by 87 votes. "Let us apply it," he said, "to those who lost their votes in Texas, who should have had their votes counted, instead of a Federal judge finding the ballot boxes stuffed with trash and shredded newspapers."

"Fraudulent elections, involving crooked voting," said the Iowan, "are an even worse discrimination and deprivation of the rights of honest citizens than a denial of the right to vote. I believe every person qualified to vote should have that right regardless of race or color. But this is meaningless if a crooked election is to deprive the honest citizen of the full force and effect of his ballot."

But the prevailing coalition was of no mind to point the accusing finger anywhere but to the States of the Deep South. Should the number of southern seats in the House ultimately be reduced by determination of a bureaucratic commission, we suppose that zealots proclaiming their devotion to brotherhood and racial amity will rejoice. They would like to see the south get some lumps. But the resentments thus aroused would hardly contribute to the furtherance of the Nation's harmony.

First Day of Passover, March 28, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Passover, or Pesach, one of the great feasts traditionally observed in the Jewish faith, is also appropriately commemorated as one of the world festivals of liberty. The first great emancipation recorded in the history of the human race was the liberation of the children of Israel from bondage in Egypt, under the leadership of Moses. This great event, which gives its name to the Book of Exodus in the Bible, has been celebrated through the centuries in the forms set forth in the Bible as commanded by God. It is most appropriate that Christians, at this time, remind themselves that the Easter season takes its other name of Paschal time from the Hebrew word, Pesach, and that the celebration of Easter should include and emphasize the ceremonies that teach the historic and religious meaning of the Passover.

This is, of all occasions, the most appropriate for Americans to sing that noble stanza of "America" that begins—

Our father's God, to Thee, author of liberty.

Though liberty is, at all times and in all places, certainly the gift of God, yet the liberation of the Hebrews from the land of Egypt and from the tyrannical power of Pharaoh was the most dramatic and spectacular demonstration of that fact that has ever been witnessed. It is good for America, and for the world, that this triumph of freedom should be faithfully commemorated, each year, in the Seder that is at once a feast of family affection, an act of worship, and an object lesson in religious history. I am therefore happy to join my Jewish friends, in bodily presence sometimes, in prayerful affection always, as we bless the Lord, "who hath preserved us and sustained us and brought us to this season," and as we praise Him for the glory of the new springtime in which we celebrate His Passover.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Lopsided Law—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the 10th of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled "Lopsided Law," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

LOPSIDED LAW

"This bill has been provoked by lawlessness and, no doubt, will be passed under strong pressure, and will ultimately reap its harvest of hate. The victory of the majority on this bill will be a hollow honor, based upon fear of pressure rather than faith in our people. I predict that the passage of this measure will be only the beginning of an unceasing and insatiable demand for a further destruction of our Constitution." (Representative ALBERT W. WATSON, Democrat, of South Carolina.)

Title IX on the civil rights bill constitutes a license for virtually unlimited civil disorder and makes racial agitators a privileged class before the law. It is designed to stultify the State courts. It strips the Federal district judiciary of the right to judge whether a case belongs in district court or in a State court. It is contrived to afford "civil rights" defendants endless delay, so that no effective action may be taken to uphold law and order. It turns communities over to street mobs.

As the law stands now, a person seeking to assert a civil right can have the case removed to a Federal district court if he believes that he cannot get consideration in a State court. But it is then within the discretion of the Federal judge whether the case belongs before him or should be sent back to the State court. If he decides it should properly be before the State court, he remands it—i.e., returns it.

"An order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed," the law reads, "is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise." That is, the decision lies with the Federal judge, and he cannot be overruled. The only exception relates to certain cases involving Indian lands, and in these the Government, not the Indians, is given the right to appeal a remand order.

Title IX now proposes to extend this authority for review to civil rights cases, so that the hitherto unchallenged power of a Federal judge to keep a case or send it back

to State court is withdrawn. The decision of the judge can be carried to a Federal court of appeals. From there it could be taken to the Supreme Court. By this means, a State court cannot enforce any order against a civil rights defendant and the judicial power will languish indefinitely.

"The obvious purpose of this is simply to bypass and impede the processes of justice in our State courts," said Representative TUCK of Virginia. "It leaves the States and the local law-enforcement authorities of the States absolutely without any police power. It leaves them with nothing but anarchy."

He explained that when a case is removed from a State court and is pending before a Federal court, the State court is deprived of all powers of process and of all power to enter any orders. Other opponents pointed out that the State court cannot maintain the status quo, that while a wrangle over jurisdiction is going on the subpenas outstanding may expire, that there is no way to fix a new return date on the subpenas, and that witnesses whose identity can only be learned during the trial can leave the jurisdiction of the State court.

Representative DOWDY, of Texas, observed that under the existing statute the defendant wishing Federal protection already has two bites at the apple. He can ask to bring his case before a Federal court. If the case is then remanded to the State court, any determination of Federal questions arising there can be taken on review to the Federal Supreme Court.

"You have a special problem which needs a solution," countered Representative LINDSAY, of New York. Opponents were quick to take up the remark. They responded that the special treatment proposed in extraordinary judicial procedure is class legislation.

The predictable effect if the Senate permits this section to stand is that there will be an uncontrollable wave of sit-ins, lie-downs, freedom marches, trespass, and other acts by unruly mobs of nonviolent demonstrators, and that States and communities cannot protect themselves.

Presenting the Credit Policy View Now in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion and comment these days on the impact of the tax cut, interest rate pressures and balance-of-payments problems. The Weekly Bond Buyer for March 23, 1964, contains a feature article entitled "Presenting the Credit Policy View Now in Washington." This article was written by the publication's very able Washington writer and analyst Mr. John Gerrity.

The article follows:

PRESENTING THE CREDIT POLICY VIEW NOW IN WASHINGTON

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON.—To say, as Federal Reserve Gov. James L. Robertson recently did before a Senate committee, that monetary authorities "look no further into the future than 3 weeks" in making policy decisions is to be impeccably correct.

But, if taken literally and without consideration of a host of other facts, these few quoted words, however accurate they may be in themselves, could be illusory and misleading.

This is particularly so, if they tend to create the impression, as they might, that the Nation's money managers are prone to shoot from the hip, a meaning Governor Robertson never intended to convey.

Positioning

As a matter of fact, quite the contrary is true. Today, the chief architects of money and credit policies both in the Treasury and the Federal Reserve may be accurately described as "positioning" themselves for the development of events and situations which will inescapably bring changes in the Nation's monetary policies as they exist at this moment.

This truism should occasion no surprise. Changes in the management of money are as inevitable as is change in all other affairs of men. With the same degree of monotony that characterizes the rotation of the seasons, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa, and Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin have relentlessly sought to hammer home these three basic tenets of policy:

The management of money and credit can and must remain flexible.

Now and at no time in the foreseeable future can the United States live in splendid isolation, so far as the conduct of money and credit policies is concerned.

Since changes in the domestic and international economies, resulting from a wide variety of causes, will most certainly occur, accommodating changes in money policy will also most certainly occur.

On this foundation of basic fundamentals, therefore, here are the views of the Nation's official money managers as to the probable course of direction of future credit policies:

INTEREST RATES

The two dominant determinants of a future rise in rates are the domestic price index and the rate of capital outflows, either short or long-term.

As for the price index, strong pressures are now accumulating sufficient force to elevate wholesale and retail prices within the next 2 or 3 months to a level that could easily be a springboard into a full-blown inflationary cycle.

Tax cut injection

The real bulge in the domestic economy, resulting from the recently enacted $11.5 billion tax cut—and the injection of an additional $800 million a month of purchasing power into the economy—will assert itself no later than mid-June or early July, and very possibly sooner.

Whatever tendency consumers may temporarily have to save their tax benefits will vanish shortly, and most will soon revert to their traditional pattern of spending about 94 cents out of every disposable dollar.

Unprecedented demand

This increased consumer spending, plus a rise in the demand for consumer credit, coupled with a 10 percent increase in capital outlays by business to a total of $43.2 billion will place an unprecedented demand on the capital markets.

Spending by Federal, State, and local governments will be sharply accelerated and the volume of that spending will be increased by midsummer, or toward the approach of the new fiscal year.

Each of these potent forces—increased consumer demand, business spending at an increased rate of $1.5 billion a quarter and substantially larger Government spending—will arrive on the economic scene almost simultaneously, or in other words, with the start of summer.

Price rises ahead

Producers of all sorts of capital and consumer goods have candidly informed the Nation's top money managers that they expect a general price rise; that the price and wage guideposts proclaimed a year ago by the Council of Economic Advisers appear now to be crumbling, and that they have no choice but to join in the general trend toward higher prices.

Some 119 major new labor contracts, led by the pace-setting United Auto Workers, are to be negotiated this year. No matter if the emphasis is on wage increase or fringe benefits, the price of labor will rise throughout the entire industrial complex.

The combined effect of these two major factors—heavier demands for credit from all areas and an upward push on prices—will, in themselves, generate a rise in the price of money as the demand for money increases.

It would be worse than naive to assume in an economic society as complex as is the United States that the management of credit can be left entirely to the free play of market forces.

Applying the brakes

To ward off a runaway inflation, which could begin with seemingly innocent and modest price hikes, the money managers are obligated to apply the brakes before matters get completely out of hand.

In a managed money economy, therefore, the big question as to when the managers will act involves the question of timing.

As one top official of the Federal Reserve explains it, "If you are going to choke off an inflationary cycle, you have to act before it begins. Otherwise, you might just as well lie back and enjoy it."

Consequently, if the assumption that the contributory forces to substantial price rises, and possibly inflation, will be mustered in full array by, say June 15, is correct, and if the money managers are to act in advance of this threat, then this conclusion is valid:

Interest rate push

For domestic reasons alone, interest rates will be pushed upward sometime around the May 15–June 15 period, and sooner, should developing economic factors so dictate.

Timing, of course, will be governed somewhat by the Treasury's financing requirements. Traditionally, the Federal Reserve avoids any major action vis-a-vis interest rates at such a time, so that markets won't be unduly disturbed.

In May, the Treasury has maturing $10.6 billion of debt. Presumably, the refinancing of these maturities will be plotted and announced early in the month.

How the upward push will be accomplished is, to be sure, still uncertain. The Federal Reserve, as it did last July, may announce a rise in the rediscount rate.

Leaning on market?

Or, if it chooses to, the Fed may "lean on the market," forcing the Treasury's 91-day bill rate well above the present bank rate of 3½ percent for a fairly extended period. In such a case, a rise in the rediscount rate would be taken in stride as a matter of certain and undramatic fact.

As for the second determinant of future interest rates, capital outflows, this could very readily manifest itself well before domestic economic factors come into play, requiring an upward shift in rates.

There has been a dramatic change in the international economic complexion in the last year. Just a year ago this spring, the big worry in Western European nations, Japan, Canada, and the United States, was over the possibility of deflation. Today the common worry is inflation.

Fear of deflation dead

As one top money-manager puts it, "With due respects to the shades of Per Jacobsson, time has proven him wrong. The fear of deflation is dead. Today, everywhere, inflation, real or potential, is the big concern."

This is doubtless true in Great Britain, France, West Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, Japan; to a

somewhat lesser degree in Italy, and in the United States. In each of these nations, short-term rates have recently risen, or there is a very real threat they will rise shortly.

In each, as in the recent case of the British bank rate rise, the upward shift has been, or will be, prompted as much by internal economic factors as it was, or will be, by balance-of-payments considerations.

Among the top U.S. monetary experts today there is a shade of difference as to the probable impact of the increase of the British rate from 4 to 5 percent.

Fix on United Kingdom bills

Treasury officials are reasonably certain that so long as the British maintain a fix on their short-term bill rates, the United States will not have to respond with a rise in the bank rate here.

Federal Reserve officials say the Treasury may be right. But they still have some reservations. In short, the Federal Reserve thinks it is a shade too soon to assume as sanguine an air as the Treasury apparently has.

Five to six percent

There is, however, no difference whatever in opinion as to what would happen were the British to kick the bank rate up another point to 6 percent, as they very well may decide to do if the increase from 4 to 5 percent fails to brake the domestic expansion to the desired degree, or if a threatening balance-of-payments situation worsens perceptibly.

"Should the British go to 6 percent, then we would be in trouble," is the common evaluation of the situation. The implication, of course, is that as soon as the British indicate another upward move in advance private considerations, the United States will react accordingly.

It is not at all impossible that should another rise in the British bank rate be deemed necessary, an increase in the U.S. rediscount rate will be announced simultaneously.

Obviously, the onus for a forced rise in U.S. rates because of foreign shifts can't be placed, speculatively, on the British alone. A concerted rise in rates by several nations could have the same effect on U.S. policy, and by no means is this possibility being ignored.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

In some responsible financial quarters, this penetrating question is currently being raised: By its substantial buying and selling of foreign currencies to defend the dollar has not the Federal Reserve so dominated the foreign exchange market that the market itself is no longer capable of reflecting shifts in basic financial and economic factors?

From this question flows another: Granted that the United States was literally forced into the adoption of various "time-buying" devices and expedients to stave off raids on the dollar, are these devices to become a permanent part of the international financial structure, or will they be allowed to expire gracefully after the United States has completely mastered the problem of its own balance-of-payments deficit?

International liquidity

Bedrock to both questions is the problem of international liquidity: Is it sufficient today to satisfy the demands of growing international trade; or do training nations require greater liquidity and, if so, how is it to be provided and when?

This question was the dominant issue of last September's meeting of the world bankers here at the annual International Monetary Fund conference. As was well advertised in advance, various proposals to increase world liquidity were aired.

These ran the gamut of adopting variable exchange rates to expanding the IMF into a sort of international Federal Reserve system, empowered to expand the extension of credit to central banks, which at any given time might be subject to unusual strains and stresses.

The United States made its position patently clear. It was—and is—willing to explore on a conversational basis the topic of world liquidity and to consider any reasonable techniques to amplify it, should such amplification be required. And this it did last year during the meetings of the "Paris Ten."

But until the United States has completely corrected the imbalance in its own foreign accounts, such talks are not to go beyond the point of an exchange of views. Exploratory talks are fine in the proper environment. Top priority rests with the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Position even firmer

Today this position is even firmer, if possible. Messrs. Dillon, Roosa, and Martin are totally gratified—possibly even a trifle amazed at times—with the accomplishments to date in international cooperation and the exchange of confidences among all central bankers.

Before his untimely death, Dr. Jacobson voiced the same sentiments. "Had anyone asked me in 1960" he told a small group of reporters, "that we could reach the point of mutual understanding in 25 years that we have in since 1961, I would have doubted his sanity."

United States, British conferred

One illustration of this exchange of confidences will suffice. Early in December, U.S. monetary officials were informed directly by the British of the impending bank-rate rise.

Talks continued for almost 2 months before the actual event.

With a kind of candor normally found only in a master bedroom, both sides discussed openly the need for such a rise, its probable impact on all nations; whether responsive actions were appropriate at the time, and what protective measures for all concerned could be sensibly adopted.

When the rate increase was actually announced in February it was not more surprising to U.S. officials than would have been the announcement that any given Monday would be followed by a Tuesday.

Talks now

It is correct to assume that the same sort of conversations between the British and U.S. money managers, as well as between those of other nations, are in progress at this moment.

Indeed, it would not unduly strain the imagination to assume that if the British contemplate still another increase in their bank rate soon, U.S. officials know it today and when it will happen.

To the specific question, therefore, of whether the present arrangement of currency swaps, "Roosa bonds" and other newly contrived techniques are to be a permanent part of international finance, the answer is "Yes."

Standard meets tests

As Mr. Roosa pointed out in the October issue of "Foreign Affairs," today's present gold-foreign exchange standard has met all reasonable tests so far. It has survived splendidly. This is as true today as it was last October. This month's swift and smooth extension of $1 billion in credits to Italy demonstrates this vividly.

To Treasury and Federal Reserve officials the expanding "ring of reciprocal arrangements" should go a long way toward meeting whatever increased requirements may develop for world liquidity—and do so within the essential perimeter of consistent gold discipline.

One high Federal Reserve official sums it up neatly: "What has been achieved is truly remarkable. Currency swaps, special issues of Treasury bonds to foreign holders of dollars and all the rest will be with us for years to come. I would say for the next 25 years—and that's about as far ahead as anyone should dare venture in this sort of crystal-balling."

Johnson versus the Fed

Much has been written and said since the President's economic message went to Congress last January 20 about the impending—and almost unavoidable—clash between Mr. Johnson and Chairman Martin over the issue of tight money or easy money.

It is time to lay this shibboleth to rest.

Unless either man goes totally berserk, there is not going to be any clash.

Clearly, Mr. Johnson wants the economy to expand. He is totally sincere in his hope that the massive tax cut will chop down the ranks of the unemployed and put idle plants and equipment back into production.

He wants these things both as a citizen and as a politician, and most assuredly he wants them because he expects to continue as a successful politician.

But he doesn't intend to bankrupt the Nation nor bring it anywhere near the brink of bankruptcy to get them.

Mr. Martin wants precisely the same things as does the President. He is also subject to the same restraints and inhibitions.

Admitted that an intimate knowledge of the intricacies of economics and finance are not now President Johnson's longest suit. But he can and will learn about them. As much and probably more than any other official in Government today, Mr. Martin will serve as his tutor.

The case of Kennedy

The same situation prevailed in the case of President Kennedy. After 2 short years of study and work, he was as conversant with the problems of domestic and international economics as any chief of state in the world. No less is to be expected from President Johnson.

Certainly, there are differences in views between the two men today. But with each meeting they move toward closer understanding. And in one area both are as one. This is the area of patriotism.

Accordingly, if it should develop that Mr. Martin acquired the honest conviction that interest rates must rise, for whatever reason, and that the welfare of the Nation is at stake, the President can be counted on to follow the advices of his top money manager.

He may hope that the benefits of a tax cut won't be siphoned off in part by a tighter or less easy money policy. But he is not going to adhere to a rigid policy of easy money if, by trying to go so, it may imperil the country and other countries that must rely on the United States.

Mr. Martin has a pretty simple definition of the role of a money manager, and it is this:

The objective of monetary management is to regulate the availability of credit in order to prevent speculation, the wastage of assets and price inflation in periods of high levels of business activity.

The counterobjective is to encourage risk-taking, to stimulate the marginal producer and to prevent prices from falling unduly in periods of business decline.

Neither President Johnson nor any other sensible man is likely to find much fault with that.

* * * * *

To put it briefly: Excess productive capacity right now is tighter than it has been at any time since early 1957, except only for possibly the buildup quarter before, and the catchup quarter after, the 1959 steel strike. This is true regardless of whether the excess capacity "yardstick" is in terms of excess plant and equipment capacity or in terms

of excess unemployment. The evidence is this:

First, as far as excess plant and equipment capacity is concerned: According to Government economists—who combine data from the Department of Commerce, the McGraw-Hill Capital Plans Survey, and the Federal Reserve Board's production index—the key fact is simply the following: Namely, the ratio of manufacturing output to manufacturing plant and equipment capacity during this first quarter of 1964 figures out to a level which has not been exceeded since the first quarter of 1957, except only for the steel-buildup second quarter of 1959.

This current high output-to-capacity ratio plateau has prevailed steadily starting with the second quarter of 1963. In the post-1953 period, this high ratio level was achieved initially in the first quarter of 1955 and then moved up by 3 percentage points—thereby eliminating over 25 percent of the remaining theoretical "excess" of capacity—in the second quarter of 1955. From this new level the ratio rose an additional 2 percentage points by the 1955 fourth quarter. But, as noted above, prices already had begun to start jumping by the end of the 1955 second quarter—when the production-to-capacity ratio was only 3 percentage points higher than it is right now.

Further squeeze ahead

Even with plant and equipment capacity scheduled to rise by a net of 5 percent over this coming year—after due account is made of the wearing out and the obsolescence of currently used equipment—the fact is that output probably will rise even more. Conclusion: Net excess capacity in the year ahead is due to be squeezed even further—in the direction of the capacity-tightness situation which helped trigger the 1955–59 inflation.

Second, with reference to "excess" labor supply: The most recently reported seasonally adjusted February unemployment rate for married men—who are the real eager-beavers in the labor force—was at a level of only 3 percent.

Except only for the steel strike aftermath month of February 1960, this current 3 percent unemployment rate for married males is the lowest it has been since August 1957.

In the kickoff month of the 1955–59 inflation, the married men unemployment ratio was markedly lower than now—namely, 2.4 percent. On the other hand, 1955 had started out with this ratio at 3 percent, exactly like February 1964—and had continued at about that level right through April. Indeed, the April 1955 ratio was 3.3 percent—just prior to this ratio's plunge which began in the following month. Incidentally, on two occasions this ratio did get as low as 2 percent; but during most of the inflation months of 1955 and 1956, the ratio hovered around 2.3 percent before it began to rise.

Critical point

Conclusion: The evidence now at hand appears to suggest that the U.S. economy is entering the critical point—the point of decision between, on the one hand, continued price stability which thus far has characterized this current economic expansion—now already nearly the longest peacetime expansion in history—or, on the other hand, a new round of price inflation.

The probability seems strong that the outcome will be a kind of compromise. Chances are that price hikes in the year ahead will be more widespread than in any year since 1959—or even since 1957.

However, it seems quite certain that this price inflation which does seem to lie ahead of us for the coming months will be far less severe than, for example, the really high-speed type inflation of the kind which gripped the U.S. economy during the period stretching from late 1955 through the first half of 1957.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—A Burocrat's Dream—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the 11th of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled, "A Burocrat's Dream," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress.

A BUROCRAT'S DREAM

"The struggle in the past has been against oppression by government and the absolute power of tyrants and kings. It is a strange and shortsighted historical quirk of fate that today the Negro civil rights leaders are advocating the very type of centralized government and authoritarian control over our lives that has caused slavery and oppression in the past. Yes, the past is prolog. Let us not go back to these reactionary times.

"It has always failed when the effort is made to cloak government in a moral armor to combat hunger, insecurity, and deprivation. I fear it will fail in these United States as well. People can reason; government cannot. People can be compassionate; government cannot. If it is alleged that people are intolerant and unfair, let it be understood that there is no intolerance and injustice which can match that of an all-powerful government in the hands of men bent on imposing their will on a free people" (Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio.)

An opponent of the civil rights bill said during the House debate that an ounce of performance is worth a pound of promises, and that the bill consisted of 55 pages of idle promises.

"It will not," said Representative WATSON, of South Carolina, "give one bona fide job to a single member of the minority group; the only jobs it will create will be those on the Commissions established therein and the additional Federal marshals and judges necessary to enforce it." Representative ASHBROOK agreed that the bill "is truly a bureaucrat's dream."

Some more bureaucracy is created in title X of the bill, which establishes a Federal "community relations service" with a chairman and not more than six members to aid communities in resolving racial disputes. As the bill goes, the section is relatively innocuous. It originally appeared in slightly different form as the fourth section of the Kennedy administration bill proposed last June. It was inserted in the present bill on motion of Representative ASHMORE, of South Carolina.

So to the already existing Commission on Civil Rights and the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunities, as well as the newly created Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, another Commission has been added. We shall not be lacking in meddlers and meddling.

Critics of the section (and much of the rest of the bill) asserted that it represented a further step in breaking down the Federal system and the intelligent diffusion of power.

"Here we see," said Representative ASHBROOK, "a concentration which takes power away from State and local government to the Federal level, and at the Federal level it is abdicated by the legislature and concentrated into the executive department."

It was observed that there are already 179 community relations commissions on the local level; yet the Government must also move in. It is the same elsewhere throughout the bill, which represents an invasion of virtually every facet of private and business life.

In their total effect, numerous provisions will add to the already onerous load of paperwork imposed on businessmen, laboring under countless forms and reports and running up costs doing bookkeeping at Federal demand which could otherwise provide for capital expansion and the creation of jobs.

As one Congressman wryly commented, the legislation has created "a haven for lawyers," whose clients will now be wrestling with countless new requirements and forms. Practically every citizen will have an inspector or Commissioner looking over his shoulder.

Should the bill emerge from the Senate as law, it is predictable that it will produce endless confusion, red tape, harassment, and resentment. It was freely prophesied by those opposing the bill that as citizens become familiar with its effects there will be such widespread protest that it will go the way of the 18th amendment.

A View of Modern Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country, there is considerable discussion now going on regarding the outbreak of violence by students in our elementary and high schools. Parents, educators, and administrators have ideas and solutions which would lead to a more effective discipline of those responsible for classroom violence.

Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director for the American Federation of Teachers, has recently written an article entitled "A View of Modern Discipline," which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD today so that his views may be added to the present dialog on this very important subject.

Dr. Reuter's article is based on his study entitled "Discipline During the Age of the New Frontier."

The article follows:

A VIEW OF MODERN DISCIPLINE

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Discipline is one of the most discussed words in modern American life. Teachers, administrators, patrons, and voters are constantly discussing issues within this area. Films, periodicals, and books have discussed the increase in juvenile delinquency. The late beloved U.S. Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, devoted much of his time investigating juvenile delinquency. Dr. W. W. Carpenter of the University of Missouri outlined a dynamic program for alleviating this important issue, which was published under the title of "Drastic Changes for Reducing Juvenile Delinquency."

A part of the real concern for the increasing sensitiveness of teachers and schools to the needs of children and to dissatisfaction with repressive measures which achieve

superficial goals but do nothing to help the child who is at war with himself and with all of his surroundings, is a modern desire to provide a happy and useful life for each citizen. Quite often the teacher will understand the real issues involved and will attempt to relate the child to his environment.

With the passing of time, the population of the world has greatly expanded and this is reflected in additional school populations. Today it is more difficult for children and adults to carry on normal relationships in our world. This is partly explained by the increased tempo of living in the past decade. Great and important changes are constantly taking place. Never before have economic, social, and political factors been so important in their relationship to the youth of the Nation. Since the advent of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, changes have become more common than traditional patterns in many areas of life.

While children have been taught to accept traditional patterns in any age, the world is nearer a revolution today than any prior time. No nation has a plan that is completely desirable for the attainment of necessary goals. Quite often the prevailing educational patterns will produce the kinds of adults that were desirable yesterday, but who will become misfits tomorrow.

In order to keep abreast of the times a method of approach is often advocated that could be the so-called "dictatorial" idea where obedience and conformity without question would be the rule to be followed by the schools. The difficulty with this pattern is that it does not fit the needs and aspirations of children in a democracy. It still might be utilized in the U.S.S.R. or Communist China, but would never be acceptable in 20th century America.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt became President on March 4, 1933, the Nation was geared to a philosophy of doom. The emergency was evident and many considered it the beginning of the end of our civilization. Yet, within a period of a few years, our Nation became the richest and most powerful in the world.

The gross national product expanded almost yearly. World War II and the Korean conflict became a part of the growing industrialization of our Nation, but many postwar problems developed. Some of these will be considered in this study.

American students want and expect freedom. Freedom is a nebulous word that can be very significant, but quite often is depleted of its full significance. Perhaps the desirable approach toward achieving the greatest goal for all American youth is expressed in "A Primer Concerning the Philosophy of Freedom."[1] If this approach were used, the American student would mature in a nation built around six types of freedom. These are: A free mind, a free school, a free economy, a free value system, a free election, and a free economic system.

"Discipline refers fundamentally to the principle that each organism learns in some degree to control itself so as to conform to the forces around it with which it has experiences," according to the "Encyclopedia of Educational Research." This reference further notes: "The forces around the individual require recognition as a means of clarifying the nature of discipline. Forces are always found in interactive relationships; in this case the interaction is between the individual and three principal kinds of environment:

"First, the individual is in constant interaction with nonpersonal objects which make up the physical universe * * * The second kind of environment consists of a culture and its institutions within which the person participates * * * A third kind of environment consists of other persons with whom the individual has interaction * * * The concept of discipline has traditionally and popularly been much more closely identified with the interaction between an individual and his culture and institutions than with the other two, and more closely identified with the interaction between the person and the other persons than with the remaining one."

CAUSES FOR PROBLEMS OF DISCIPLINE IN MODERN SCHOOLS

1. The fears of teachers develop disciplinary problems through insecurity. These fears may be classified as economic, social, legal, physical, and moral.

(a) Economic fear exists at the present time. During the period of time when fortunes are being made in America, teachers find themselves making less than one-half the amount earned by continental truck-drivers. The teachers find themselves in a poorer status in regard to the cost of living than during the great depression. Taxes have increased faster than their annual increments.

While many teachers find current saving to be impossible, they are further frustrated that they are supposed to supply the goals for economic security even though their recommendations for worthy national goals are disregarded.

The Bureau of National Affairs gave the wage increases for 1959. Airlines led 37 industries with a 15.5 cent per hour increase. The low was aircraft and parts, with 5.4 cents per hour. If teaching were added, it would be at the bottom, with 5.2 cents per hour increase.

(b) Social fear exists at the present time. Woodrow Wilson, M. H. Trytten, etc., have dreamed of a dynamic society that would include all Americans. Teachers and books are necessary to achieve these goals. Edward J. Gordon of Yale University has expressed a part of the situation: "The student begins to see that great books are great metaphors of human experience as a way of understanding who he is and where he is going. If this happens, he sees that the good life depends largely upon accepting all others as one's equal in opportunity, that one has no right to sacrifice others to one's own convenience."

Teachers should be fearless, free citizens dedicated to the idea of reducing social fears. The first step in this goal is the development of greater quality in teaching, as this will stimulate more profound educational thought. Paul L. Dressel of Michigan State University has expressed it as follows: "We are forced then into the conclusion that it is the quality of teaching, the nature of the objectives and the nature of educational experiences which determine the liberal education contribution of a course and ultimately of a curriculum."

The second consideration is that the teacher has a major part in the development of the curriculum that is to be the framework of the social reconstruction. Warner Moss of the College of William and Mary has reflected this point: "Only if the professor participates in the construction of the curriculum can he understand the relevance of his work to that of the educational program as a whole. Only if he has engaged in the critical discussion producing the curriculum can he accept responsibility for it and believe in its worth. Only if the curriculum reflects his motivation can he hope to influence the student's motivation."

The third consideration is to insure that long-range goals will be considered as well as short-range ones. Dale E. Hathaway of Michigan State University has summarized this point as follows: "The faculty has both a major responsibility and a contribution to make in the process of long-range planning for institutions of higher education. It should be recognized by both faculty and others that this is a contribution which perhaps can best be made by carefully defining the roles of various groups in the long-range planning process and by limiting the decisions which are required of the different groups."

The fourth consideration will become the social philosophy. Gerard J. Mangone of Syracuse University has expressed this as follows: "Education—for living in the United States or spending some years abroad—is not worth much if it does not contribute to a vibrant social philosophy. Perhaps education for living and working abroad has been best summed up by Dexter Perkins in his exhortation to teachers to fire their students 'with a generous view of life and a wider view of knowledge.' "

(c) Legal fear exists at the present time. Teachers are often victims of legal conditions bestowed on them by society. A part of this is reflected by the fact that the various States respond three different ways as to the liability of teachers and school districts. The common law is relied on in several States to give immunity. The second group of States prescribe limited liability. The third group prescribes full liability to teachers and school districts.

The second type of legal fear comes to teachers who are in States without job security (tenure) laws or who have not qualified in States with these laws. AFT President Carl J. Megel recently called attention to a school district in Texas where teachers signed the following contract: "That either party to this contract, on 15 days' written notice to the other party, may terminate this contract, with or without cause, and said termination shall be final and conclusive."

Harold Benjamin has described the result of legal fears: "Freemen cannot be taught properly by slaves; courageous citizens cannot be well educated by scared hired men." Robert M. Hutchins reflects the results of legal fears: "Hannah Arendt has suggested, we appear to be entering an era in which men will no longer act; they will simply behave."

(d) Physical fear exists at the present time. Fear to self is as deadly as other types of fear. The teacher who is afraid of a part of the public because of what he taught in school, the way he disciplined his students, the organizations he belongs to, the racial and religious background of himself, or because he desires to seek public office, often develops into a case of an actual physical fear. When this becomes the condition, the statement of Dr. J. E. Morgan loses its effectiveness. Dr. Morgan suggested: "It is not possible for society to guarantee to every child a devoted mother and a wise, provident father, but society can guarantee to every child a competent, well-prepared, and adequately paid teacher."

(e) Moral fear exists at the present time. Former U.S. Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst of Arizona, and the historian, Toynbee, give the teacher hope in this important area. Senator Ashurst recently said: "Mankind is inexterminable and there is everywhere a conservation of moral and spiritual energy that preserves the core of every noble resolve and worthy action and molds them into a beneficient achievement aiding the human race in its arduous struggle to conquer all the arts and sciences." On the other hand, Toynbee noted: "The 20th century will be remembered as the first age in history in which people thought it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

The dreams of Ashurst and Toynbee still have not reached reality in many areas. George Meany described such a moral fear by writing to Mrs. Povl Bang-Jensen: "The courage and honor of your husband in his refusal to compromise his high principles

[1] Reuter, George S., Jr., "A Primer Concerning the Philosophy of Freedom." Ann Arbor: Edward Bros., 1953.

will everlastingly provide inspiration to men everywhere who defend the ideals of freedom against the forces of tyranny. Sincere condolences to you and your children." This might have been a letter to a widow of a teacher who died in order to escape moral fear.

2. The fears of students develop disciplinary problems through insecurity.

(a) Hostile homes exist at the present time. Many students come to school from homes that are unfriendly. These students have not been taught the necessity for common goals or the concern for the rights of all people. This type of environment is reflected in homes in all economic brackets.

(b) Divided homes exist at the present time. Arch W. Troelstrup of Stephens College discussed this point in "General Education as a Pattern in Our World."[2] He pointed out that divorce is to a large extent "an American evil," but that "emotional divorce" is even more common in our civilization, hence divided homes vitally affect the majority of students in America today in one way or another.

(c) Homes with working mothers exist at the present time. Poverty is not a crime, but an insufficient income is often the reason for the mother to work for pay outside the home. Either the husband is unable to earn adequate wages for the needs of the family, or he is dead, divorced, or unable to work.

The current national averages of teachers' salaries are too low to permit a husband to completely support a large family.

(d) Homes with major illnesses exist at the present time. Children with poor physical or mental health, or children from homes where parents are physically or mentally ill, usually find it difficult to become a part of a successful learning group.

(e) Homes with children suffering from malnutrition exist at the present time. The evidence of malnutrition among Americans and the faulty food habits as well as equally poor food buying habits make it a must to learn how to meet these problems for better living for less dollars and to provide children with necessary energy to meet the challenges of school.

(f) Homes with unusual children exist at the present time. These homes often develop children who are markedly different from other children in the school. These differences may be reflected in ability, appearances, customs, or income, and they often make these children ill at ease in the classroom. If the tasks are below their ability, or if standards of success seem to them impossible to meet, they may show their resentment by disturbing the whole group. Children must find success and attention somehow. If they cannot do it by pleasing people, they will do it by annoying them.

(g) Homes without proper understanding of growth exist at the present time. As children grow up, it is necessary for them to keep trying out their increasing independence from adult control. Particularly in adolescence they do many unreasonable things to prove to themselves that they are growing up. When parents refuse to understand these factors, complications develop that often affect the climate of the school.

3. The current affairs of our world cause disciplinary problems.

(a) The population growth exists at the present time. Many school districts find themselves unable to maintain adequate educational facilities because of the growth of school populations. Unless the Federal Government is willing and able to help solve this difficulty more completely, the future for education is black in many areas. Classes larger than 25 children breed disciplinary problems.

(b) The unemployment situation exists at the present time. Many students of economics are concerned with the slow economic growth of the Nation. This is a major reason for much of the unemployment at the present time. A troubled family often hinders the stability of children in school.

(c) The metropolitan areas exist at the present time. In 1800, there were 6.1 persons per square mile; in 1900, there were 25.6; now there are 53.2 persons per square mile. There were 4.9 persons in the average family in 1890; in 1953, the number was 3.5; and in 1960, there were 3.6. In 1790, there were 5.1 percent of the population in urban areas; in 1840, it was 10.8 percent; in 1890, it was 35.1 percent; and now there are 63.5 percent. The main issue here is to provide adequate school programs where the children are. Rural children from short-term schools, with inadequate equipment and poorly trained teachers, cannot keep up with their age groups in city schools.

(d) The integration issue exists at the present time. The Southern Education Reporting Service recently noted that "only 6 percent of the South's Negro students attend classes with the white." This issue is badly affecting the discipline of children of all races.

(e) The grouping of children exists at the present time. In "School and at Work"[3] states:

"School systems of the United States are poorly organized to deal effectively with the problems of educating the growing number of children who move from place to place." This issue is often expressed through migrants' children. Overage children pose difficult problems for teachers in social control, as well as in the learning process. Language differences create a barrier which most schools are not equipped to meet.

CONCLUSIONS

In the words of the January 6, 1961, edition of "The Schoolmaster" of London, England, good school discipline will result if the following ideas are carefully considered at all times: "Teachers should also be able to rely on the support of individual governors, managers, divisional executives and local authorities. * * * Discipline can generally be maintained in school provided certain conditions are fulfilled. First, there must be enough teachers. * * * Secondly, schools must have the kind of physical amenities which encourage good behavior and do not make bad discipline difficult to detect. * * * Thirdly, properly organized supervision of school meals by specially appointed nonteaching assistants. * * * Discipline, as with every other aspect of the educational process, is a communal responsibilitity involving the home, the school, the local authorities and the other institutions that influence young people. Given the support of the public as a whole, particularly the parents, teachers can play a vital part in the inculcation of good standards of discipline. Indeed, if the standards of public behavior were as high as those upheld by most schools, there would be less cause for concern than there is at present."

[2] Reuter, George S., Jr., "General Education As a Pattern in Our World." College Heights: Arkansas A. & M. College, 1954.

[3] Reuter, George S., Jr., "In School and at Work." College Heights: Arkansas A. & M. College, 1954.

Chicago Tribune Editorial—The New Slavery—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the 12th of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled, "The New Slavery," and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

THE NEW SLAVERY

"The hour already is late. We may be, even now, in the twilight of our liberty, standing on the very threshold of the type of era envisioned by Orwell. When liberty is taken from some, it tends ultimately to fade for all. When that dreadful day arrives, there no longer will be any need to argue about discrimination for we shall all be joined together in the terrible equality that is slavery. As Justice Sutherland observed a quarter of a century ago:

"'For the saddest epitaph which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time'." (Edward F. Cummerford, in the American Bar Association Journal.)

The civil rights debate in the House concluded on a note of deep irony. While proponents of the legislation talked of the new liberty, opponents talked of the new slavery.

The discussion occurred during consideration of the 11th and final title of the bill. This is a catchall provision. Although Justice Department estimates of the cost of putting the legislation into effect had specified $15.5 million, title XI granted the Attorney General and other enforcers an open-end appropriation. Representative TUCK, of Virginia, called it a blank check, stating that it would authorize the appropriation of unlimited sums and "unlimited sums would be required."

The title also stated that the bill was not to inhibit the Attorney General in the exercise of any power he already possessed, that the legislation was not to preempt the power of the States in the enforcement of any civil rights legislation of their own unless it was inconsistent with the Federal act, and that unconstitutionality of one part of the act would not impair the remainder.

The preemption clause was intended to permit 32 States with public accommodations laws and 26 with fair employment practices acts to proceed under them. Since the Supreme Court in 1956 threw out the conviction of a Communist leader, Steve Nelson, under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, Congress has been concerned lest the Court might establish a general doctrine that Federal law in any instance will supersede State law.

The tender concern for State rights in this instance contributed to the irony of the proceedings, for the civil rights bill as a whole has as its target those States judged to be recalcitrant in carrying out Federal legislation benefiting nonwhites.

Representative HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, directed the most pointed barb at the bill.

He gravely offered an amendment specifying that "nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual to render labor or service without his consent," nor could any court compel such performance.

Mr. SMITH was mindful that the act, as one example, burdens employers with much labor in keeping records of who applied for jobs, who was hired, who wasn't hired, and why. He was also mindful that the 13th amendment prohibits slavery and involuntary servitude. He challenged the "liberals" to vote in favor of the 13th amendment in a bill proclaiming its devotion to liberty. The amendment was rejected on a vote of 163 to 98, but SMITH achieved his purpose of making his adversaries squirm.

It was at this point that Representative ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, proposed creating 500 new Federal judges and erecting $100 million of new prisons. He said he would grant an exception to title VI, which cuts off Federal funds to States charged with discrimination, because the prisons would be needed in the South to house civil rights violators and it was better to be locked up near home where the jailers would be friendly.

The amendment, of course failed, but it adequately expressed a judgment of objectors to the Civil Rights Act that a force bill was in the making which would not extend liberty for all but would sharply contract it for some.

How Long Before Your Trucks Will Be Atomic Powered?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1964 I included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by my constituent, Mr. R. J. Warrington. Since Mr. Warrington's article aroused considerable interest in the possibility of utilizing atomic power for heavy transportation equipment, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a second in a series of articles which he has written on this subject.

The article follows:

HOW LONG BEFORE YOUR TRUCKS WILL BE ATOMIC POWERED?

(By R. J. Warrington)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is to be a more descriptive treatise and essentially, a design parameter for some of the components and accessories required by nuclear powered trucks and tractors. The subject, as treated herein, we hope will assist you in judging the time and desirability of the coming change. The concepts will be reasonably accurate and within acceptable logic. However, fine details and development of mechanisms required to accomplish the end result, we feel, must be left to the forward looking manufacturer who will do the engineering and build the early research models.)

Any established manufacturer of highway tractors and/or trailers or railway locomotives for that matter, desiring to bring out an atomic powered model, can find millions of dollars worth of research already completed and waiting to be used by aggressive industry. Competent reactor physicists and nuclear designers with good heat transfer backgrounds are available, too, since many are in industries where the pay is inadequate for the services performed and the personal preparation required. You may have enough of an organization now, if you added a qualified reactor physicist and a good thermal engineer to work with the good mechanical engineers you no longer need on equipment that will be going obsolete. Your best man should head up the project. There is much to be done before you need your AEC license or finally decide you are ready for the change or added models.

In the case of a sodium cooled fast breeder reactor, the fuel core should have counterflow cooling and shockproof control rods. Surface temperatures of the fuel core should be held to that required for generating 900° to 1,000° F. and 1,150 to 1,450 pounds per square inch of steam.

These are not really hard conditions to which you must adapt your design and it becomes second nature for a designer to stress his structure according to the diminished ratings of the given temperatures and American Society of Mechanical Engineers pressure vessel standards. If you look, you will find. This is also possible with high temperature gas-cooled reactors but we will presently consider our power requirements as that which is necessary to turbine-drive a generator which, at 75 percent of full power, will electrically drive three or maybe four motors each of which are connected to a gear train as follows: One 300-horsepower, 4,160-volt, 1,000/2.5 reduction gears on the afteraxle of the tractor; one 200-horsepower, 4,160-volt, 1,000/2.5 reduction gears on the forward axle of the trailer; and one 100-horsepower, 4,160-volt, 1,000/2.5 with reduction gears on the afteraxle of the trailer. It then becomes obvious that the drivers controls will provide 300-horsepower to traction when needed or, 400-horsepower, or 500-horsepower, or up a hill at 600-horsepower, and this is the means we should use to eliminate highway grade congestion and drive a load over the hill at 45 miles per hour, and down the hill, on ice if necessary, with proper traction resistance or automatic sequence braking on one or two of the trailers axles as we choose. Too often, in northern areas, during the winter, the brakes on the tractor are better than those on the trailer and the driver had no means of preventing a jackknife buckle. So let's get this power under the trailer where it belongs. Wound-rotor motors using primary contactors and secondary resistors, instead of shifting gears are ready for the market in Europe and possibly here, too. The use of high voltage would permit even the railroads to drive long trains, using a motor on each car. It's a tremendous advantage when starting a standing train, a car at a time, just as it is a great advantage to the truck driver when he is hauling over the road trailers loaded with freight up and down hills, wet and dry, rough and smooth, night and day. Since we often find limited traction under the tractor wheels it is better that we put the power where it can bite in and pull, push, or stop—even a two-trailer train.

Speaking for the industry I would say: "We do not want a rechargeable fuel-cell supplying power to the drive-motors as the military branch is considering for propulsion of short haul vehicles." We need a constant source of abundant high-voltage power at low cost to insure reliable performance of transport trucking vehicles.

Neither do we want to delay fruition of our objectives by considering thermoelectric conversion systems such as those in the SNAP (systems for nuclear auxiliary power) programs. The industry needs a compact shortened fuel subassembly in a fast breeder reactor with counterflow sodium collant, and a heat transfer mechanism enclosed in Argon gas and shielded with some uranium and some lead, each to serve their purpose and supply to required integrity.

Scram time of the reactor can be so devised that alternate pumps take over the circulation of sodium from an auxiliary source, and gas cooling mechanisms are available if the control rods do not poison the critical pile fast enough in an emergency shut down. Short fuel subassemblies (not over 20 inches long) help prevent bowing, and induce faster shut downs. The sodium coolant may be kept liquid during the refueling cycle by an inert gas system at the site or fuel station facility. A reservoir for the excess sodium is also needed during the period of the core removal. The alternate core system could handle this, according to the design. More about this problem, later in the article.

At this point I would like to bring out the difference between the operation of a fuel pile (uranium) and say a blasting powder project, or transporting a load of propane or gasoline. There are many ways of causing an explosion in other fuels, but only a combination of proper factors can bring an atomic pile to criticality, and then hold it. Everything must be just right or the pile will go out and not deliver the heat that makes the steam that drives the wheel that turns the dynamo, to give us the needed power. There is no explosion, and control rods are at the ready point, where the simple manual or automatic motion would stop the process of fission while other factors were taking away the heat. The radiation is incidental to the process and is guarded against, at all times, by the integrity of the shielding. In the future, AEC or private enterprise stations, isolated below ground, will be used to process the used fuel, and recover the plutonium and other valuable elements therein. Remotely operated manipulators and mechanical hands are used to accomplish this, in much the same manner that you use tongs to move a log on the fire to keep from burning your hands. The power pile in a reactor may be likened to your grandfathers pot-bellied stove which is burning dry wood, (U^{235}) but stacked all around the stove is green and wet wood, (U^{235}) and because of the proximity (enriching) this wood too will burn when you're ready to feed it, if it is kept close enough for a long enough period (sufficiently enriched) but there is nothing that is apt to take place suddenly like an explosion of liquid fuel or trinitrotoluol, etc.

The pile of uranium fuel with which we started has become more valuable after its use in a fast breeder reactor of the tractor and a trip of 10 to 20,000 miles. The cost of reprocessing must be charged against it but our strategy should be that of having stations scattered over the country, well stocked, out of sight and secure from rifle shots and other forms of sabotage. Remember we save the cost of packing and shipping the ores and oxides by using the trucking industry for this purpose. Enemy saboteurs couldn't possibly do much, if any, damage. Now consider the analogy of 1 pound of uranium being equal in power to 3 million gallons of fuel oil. What does it cost to store that amount of oil? What does it cost to store 1 pound of uranium? Underground. What is the comparative security in time of peace, or war?

Speaking for the Nation as a whole, I would say that our underground storage techniques are very highly developed, but the distribution is bad and the equipment is getting old. Since it is concentrated largely in one area it prevents a training program, with general college participation, from being effective. We need more trained people in this field and the various fuel stations should be manned by highly trained personnel in a manner that colleges would have access to such plants for on-the-job training. Naturally only the lesser responsibilities would go

to the student. Fuel core station management should be considered a career job for highly trained, experienced engineers.

It does seem equitable that part of the present personnel at Hanford and other places, having done such an excellent job over the years, could be released from this routine storage assignment, to concentrate on the space agency problems for which they are so well suited and needed, just to keep their lives chock full of interest.

R. J. WARRINGTON,
Consulting Engineer.

P.S.—Following is a play-by-play running account of the new concept of a driver refueling an atomic-powered tractor. The year, 1968. The driver at some point on the road has switched from his No. 1 fuel core to his No. 2 fuel core because his instruments have indicated that a 3-percent burnup has been reached, or, as in the case of operative malfunctions the No. 1 core was poisoned and shut down. The No. 2 fuel core was made operative by initiating criticality in order to bring the load to dock and then the tractor to the refueling center, probably owned by Phillips or Standard and licensed by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, USAEC or AEC. Upon reaching the refueling station at the appointed time, the driver drove through a large door into a round structure with a closefitting inner enclosure for his vehicle and spotted the tractor over certain plugged openings in the floor and against locating stops for core No. 1. He pulled the control cable from the mobile operation receptacle and plugged it into the fuel station control receptacle, blocked his wheels, closed a valve handwheel, and left the building. A service monitor soon checked the connections and conditions and closed the inner container seals and started the cooling gas within. The No. 1 core is now dormant and the No. 2 core is idle, its integrity secure. The safety releases for the containment vessel holding the No. 1 core are released manually and all personnel leaves the upper building structure. By remote control from the operating cubicle below the floor, the following action takes place. Please read notes Nos. 1 and 2 before going on.

NOTE NO. 1

Reliability factors are such that a truck could be designed to have a single power core and give 2,500–3,000 hours of operation, at which time it must be scheduled into a refueling station.

NOTE NO. 2

The mud pan covering the containment vessel under the truck has been previously removed and a preliminary inspection of the shell of the power units made at the attachment points. Instruments therein tell us about any radiation losses in excess of those permitted by the national health standards and a record of same is made. The means of withdrawing control rods is also disconnected at this point because we want a complete unit to go underground to the laboratories.

This is now in sequence; the required amount of sodium is pumped from the core and stored at 300° F. while the plugs in the floor are being retracted, ready to receive the used-up power unit. Now it is preferable to keep the fuel subassemblies covered with sodium at 250° F. minimum, but there will be a heat rise which will be dissipated as required by circulating cooler gas (argon or equal) through a door operated by outside controls into the hot area.

A supporting plate with positioning dowels next arises from beneath the floor surface (through one of the holes), and three or four screws (1 inch–8 NC) enter the fuel pot skin and secure the pot to the supporting plate, which will eventually transport the pot to a conveyor where it will be cooled and stored in a 16-foot-deep pool of water until the processors are ready to give it their attention in the recovery of the valuable plutonium. All this takes place as soon as the air wrenches remove the high-tensile, high-temperature captive bolts from their mating threads and the support of the fuel core is thus transferred from the upper reactor frame to the service station supporting plate.

The design of this pot and its accessories is a very challenging project in itself, as you can see. It must contain the fuel core, two sodium pumps which operate at temperatures up to 1,100° F., and the ducts to give the unit the highly desirable counterflow cooling. A trap for separating the impurities in sodium should be designed into the pot. All this pot assembly is installed inside permanent shielding on the vehicle and it (the pot) couldn't weigh less than a ton. Or could it? The shielding will probably be a cheaper uranium ore and lead, used in conjunction with each other and alloyed plates to give a predetermined standard of integrity. An inert gas shroud encloses the areas of seals and openings.

Before digressing further, the removal of the used-up fuel core is followed by the installation of the new power core in a new pot with completely overhauled pumps, cleaned-out traps, and cleaned-up control rods, which moves up into place, held by a supporting plate similar to the one that removed the used core. The bolts are tightened into the upper half of the reactor now and the supporting plate is released from the pot and disappears below the floor level after which the plugs close the holes in the floor while a valve opens and the sodium comes up to the proper level; instruments tell us when everything is normal and in the desired state. The control rods are connected manually, the shrouding is made tight. The station attendant then checks off the job and the driver signs on and is ready to drive away when the necessary doors and openings are set and controls taken from station to mobile connectors. The vehicle is still on No. 2 core with No. 1 dormant and in readiness for criticality when needed.

A study of the time spent in gas stations by conventionally powered trucks in travelling 20,000 miles, filling tanks, checking oil and stopping for water etc. would be very interesting. The ultimate goal for nuclear power could be one service stop for each 80,000 miles. Moreover, a distinct advantage to the Nation's security accrues with the placing of many sources and stations wherein atomic fuel is stored and available to the various government agencies at all times.

(PUBLISHERS' NOTE.—Our author, Mr. Warrington, is a stickler for ideas and practices to be proven or disproven. We have been favored with the first printing of his "Atomic Power for Trucks" studies, because he believes we reach the right people with Shipper N Carrier. We are reminded of his work in the engineering oragnization that developed the steam catapult for the aircraft carrier *Forrestal* in the early 1950's. Of over 100 top engineers engaged in this project, his proposal and methods for using steam was bandied about considerably and he was subjected to much kidding from his associates, but after a year of concentrated effort, the steam catapult prototypes were found to be very superior. Mr. Warrington was later placed in the position of checker for the group, which was comprised of so many of the boys who did so much of the kidding.)

Chicago Tribune Editorial—Civil Rights or Civil Wrongs?—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the 13th of the series of editorials published by the Chicago Tribune during the period February 18 through March 2, 1964, dealing with the so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 7152. This editorial is entitled, "Civil Rights or Civil Wrongs?" and I commend it to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress:

CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS?

"Changing times? What do you mean? The only thing that has changed has been the method man has used to destroy what he has built up. To destroy it under the mystical pied piper illusion of civil rights is merely finding a new way of accomplishing what man has been doing since history first recorded his yearning to be free. We have stood as an exception to the trend, in my judgment, for one basic reason: the wise constitutional limitations on actions of government. Now I am not so sure." (Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio.)

The Tribune has given extended attention in its news columns and on its editorial page to the 11 titles of the civil rights bill which is now before the Senate after approval by the House. We did so in the belief that there was not 1 person out of 10,000 who had more than the faintest conception of the contents of the bill or the sweeping implications and probable effects of this legislation.

At the conclusion of our factual presentation and parallel editorial comment, we opened our pages Sunday to two professors of law, one from the University of Chicago, one from the Yale law faculty, presenting opposing opinions on the merits and constitutionality of the bill.

Prof. Philip B. Kurlan spoke for the legislation. Prof. Robert Bork spoke against it.

As the legal battle of the century, this turned out to be something less than the Clay-Liston brawl. It was as if both gladiators developed sore arms and failed to respond to the bell for the 7th round. We shall not, however, hold up their purses on that account.

Mr. Bork proved a cautious constitutionalist. Mr. Kurland was the Clay of the engagement, shouting, "I'm the greatest," and to the Tribune, "Eat your words." He embroidered the occasion by relieving himself of some curdled resentments of long standing against this newspaper. We think we'll survive.

Among Mr. Kurland's other aspersions was that the Tribune, both in its news stories and editorial comment, offered the arguments only of antagonists of the bill. Should he chance to read the debate in the House, together with the majority and minority re-

ports of the judiciary committee, he will discover that the majority coalition offered almost no arguments in support of the constitutionality of the various provisions.

It had the votes and chose to avoid constitutional justification, perhaps for the reason that the bill was unloaded on the Judiciary Committee at the last minute by the Department of Justice and committee debate was limited to 1 minute for both the Democratic majority and the Republican minority, the leaders of which were both committed to the bill, sight unseen.

The constitutional arguments were thus confined to opponents of the bill when debate began. It is noteworthy that the two most effective speeches against the bill were made by northern Republicans—Representative ASHBROOK, of Ohio, and Representative WYMAN, of New Hampshire. The benighted southerners who opposed the bill signified that they at least knew the Constitution and the law. They argued intelligently, if unavailingly, and were gifted with a humor conspicuously absent from the ranks of righteousness.

If we chose, we could throw a little constitutional law back at Mr. Kurland. He ignores the fact that an unreversed Supreme Court decision of 1883 held unconstitutional a "public accommodations" act strikingly similar to that in the present bill, except that it was based solely on the 14th amendment and did not also appeal to the commerce clause. This is the only section of the 1964 bill which Mr. Kurland argued at length.

Mr. Kurland cites law to his purpose. We could cite Supreme Court decisions on the other side, such as the Wilmington Parking Authority case of 1961, the Greenville case of 1963, the Howard Johnson case of 1959, and the "broken package doctrine." But the effort is hardly rewarding. We will concede Mr. Kurland one thing: any constitutional question bearing the sacred tag of "civil rights" is most likely to find Chief Justice Warren and the liberal majority on the wrong side of the facts and the law.

As we have said, the civil rights bill is a vast invasion and usurpation on the part of the Federal Government of the rights of business, individuals, unions, homeowners, and everyone else. It has been declared to be—we believe truthfully—90 percent concerned with the extension of Federal power and 10 percent with any rights which can be so described. It is a distortion of the public interest, requiring that 89.9 percent of the population accommodate itself to the convenience of the remaining 10.1 percent, especially as regards privacy, association, and choice. If these relinquishments were based on sound constitutional command, they might be accepted, if not welcomed, but we do not find it so.

The legislation, further, rewards those who, by promoting lawbreaking and civil clamor, have occasioned much of the domestic vexation of the country. It is a payoff to a Martin Luther King who says that laws not to his satisfaction are to be broken. It is appeasement of an ADAM CLAYTON POWELL who proclaims, "We've got the white man on the run," and advises Negro citizens to "think as a bloc, act as a bloc, and vote as a bloc." When injunctions of morality are invoked, such sentiments are not irrelevant.

Moreover, the provisions of this bill, if they become law, will not prove even a halfway house. Demands will mount until constitutional restrictions become as a broken rubber band. In time, we shall all be under an absolutism that will make the Orwell account of 1984 look like a nursery story. We predict that nonwhites, who were making steady progress through the amelioration of once-hardened attitudes, are going to like the outcome as little as whites.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1964, Byelorussians throughout the world will recall 3 brief years during which their nation tasted liberty, and will rededicate themselves to the distant and cherished goal of lasting independence. For today, Byelorussia is one of the many captive nations that lie within the borders of the Soviet Union, and Byelorussians are one of the many oppressed peoples who long to free themselves from the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

For centuries, the Byelorussians have constituted an ethnically distinct people endowed with their own customs and cultural traditions and with a strong consciousness of their separate national destiny. These traits persisted during three centuries of subjugation to the Russian Czar. During three centuries the longing for national independence never once wavered. In 1918, the chance was seized, and an independent Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed. The totalitarian system which replaced the Czarist dictatorship had by no means discarded imperial ambitions, however. In 1921, the Byelorussian Republic collapsed before the onslaught of the Red Army. Economic exploitation, political purges, and enforced cultural assimilation became brutal everyday realities; national independence entered the realm of dreams and hopes. Those dreams and hopes are still alive; their realization must be the aspiration of all people who know what it is to live in freedom today.

Distinguished Service Award of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] in calling the attention of the Members of the House to a very great honor that was conferred this morning on one of my colleagues from Massachusetts, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

The Distinguished Service Award for 1964 was conferred upon Congressman O'NEILL by the Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council. The entire congressional delegation from our great Commonwealth was represented as our fellow Member received this great honor.

I know of no one who so richly deserved the accolades that were heaped upon him by leaders from the executive branch, the legislative branch of Government, and by distinguished labor leaders.

The resolution citing Congressman O'NEILL that has been placed in the RECORD speaks eloquently of the service that he has given during his 27 years in the public life of our State and Nation. Speaker McCormack; Lawrence O'Brien, special assistant to the President for congressional affairs; Mr. C. J. Haggerty, president of the building and construction trades department, AFL-CIO; Rocco Alberto, president of the Massachusetts State Council; Senator Edward M. Kennedy; and the entire congressional delegation from the House, joined in paying a magnificent tribute to Congressman O'Neill.

Massachusetts can be proud of the outstanding service he has given to his beloved Commonwealth. All of us are proud that he has been singled out for this coveted award.

Congressman Fino Praises Police Captain Dunwoody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, every so often, one man among a group stands out like a beacon. Such a person is New York City's Police Capt. Harold J. Dunwoody who took command of the 47th police precinct in my congressional district 2 months ago.

For several years the homeowners and residents of this section of my district have complained that this precinct, the city's eighth largest in size and the fifth largest in population, was too unwieldly for one command. They demanded that the precinct be broken into two to cope with the series of burglaries, robberies, vandalism, and other acts of violence. The feeling among the constituency was that by splitting the precinct it would increase law-enforcement efficiency.

However, Mr. Speaker, when Police Captain Dunwoody took over, law enforcement in the area increased appreciably. He met with taxpayer and homeowner groups and convinced them that he could do an effective job in the area without disrupting the precinct. With 200 policemen under his command, Captain Dunwoody has improved the situation in this area of the district.

Police Commissioner Murphy, who has an enviable record in law enforcement, is to be commended for his assignment of Captain Dunwoody to the 47th precinct.

On behalf of my constituency, more particularly those in the 47th precinct, I wish to congratulate Captain Dunwoody for the results he has accomplished in a relatively short time.

Appendix

Address by National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on March 24, 1964, Daniel F. Foley, national commander of the American Legion, addressed the department of South Carolina in Columbia, S.C. The occasion was the spring rally.

It was my privilege to hear Commander Foley and I was deeply impressed by his remarks.

The American Legion has throughout the years helped carry the fight for the veterans of this country. In these remarks, Commander Foley points out some of the accomplishments and also sets forth some of the goals of the American Legion. I think that these goals should be gone over carefully by all the Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Foley's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY DANIEL F. FOLEY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, S.C., MARCH 24, 1964 (SPRING RALLY)

What a pleasure it is to be with my good friends of the American Legion of South Carolina, the ladies of your fine auxiliary and your distinguished guests here at this spring rally.

This Department of South Carolina has produced some truly great American Legionnaires who have helped shape the programs and guide the destinies of the Legion, not only here at home, but nationally for so many, many years.

Here we speak of men such as Past National Vice Commander Sam Latimer, who not only served the Legion in this capacity, but who has served long and faithfully as a member of our National Public Relations Commission and was publicly recognized for that service at our 1963 national convention in Miami Beach.

Rev. Feltham James brought great stature to the national chaplaincy of the Legion and his advice and counsel are widely sought and highly respected in the ranks of Legion chaplains and elsewhere throughout our organization. Your national executive committeeman, E. Roy Stone keeps us all in line on the floor of the national executive committee as chairman of our vital resolutions subcommittee.

Here in the department itself, one cannot overlook the fine manner in which Department Commander Tom Peden has discharged the responsibilities of his office with an able assist from Adjutant Page N. Keesee.

While a department's membership achievement is by no means the total measure of how well the department is doing its job—it is always an important barometer.

South Carolina, as of mid-March, ranked 14th among the 58 departments of the Legion in 1964 membership achievement as of that date. You had reached more than 88 percent of your goal for the year. You were in easy reach of your 1963 total as of that same date, and with only some 2,500 to go to reach the goal for this year.

There is no question in my mind that you are going to reach your goal for this year, and as close as you are I believe that South Carolina and several other departments in this same general area of membership achievement could go over the top for 1964 with just a couple of weeks of good solid effort.

Here at approximately the midpoint of my term as national commander, I think it would be appropriate to talk with you briefly about some of the things that have been done, and some of the many things yet to be done.

As you know, we recently concluded our fourth anual midwinter conference in Washington, D.C., with more than 1,200 Legion leaders from across the Nation sharing in a series of inspirational, and, I feel, highly productive conferences which auger well for the future of this American Legion.

Significant among the accomplishments of this session was a pledge by Veterans' Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., that the VA would continue to work with the Legion in our fight to obtain passage of legislation providing for reopening of national service life insurance.

This, as you know, has been a major Legion legislative objective for some time and we were greatly encouraged to learn of the substantial support this measure has in official Washington.

While our legislative program is most comprehensive, two other measures which we again brought to the attention of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs are, to us, of the utmost importance.

We strongly reiterated our support of H.R. 1927 which would improve the death and disability pension program which long has been in need of revision and we renewed our support of H.R. 8009, which has passed the House and is now before the Senate for consideration, and which we hope will be merely the first step by our Government in making adequate provision for the care of the aging and chronically ill veteran who is in need.

Our position in these matters may have been substantially strengthened by the fact that this year we observe the 20th anniversary of the GI bill of rights, the most comprehensive single piece of veterans' legislation ever enacted.

To the critics of veterans' benefits, we were able to point to these significant facts:

(1) More than 10½ million veterans of World War II and the Korean war received all or part of their advanced education under provisions of the GI bill. This program provided the Nation with 480,000 engineers, 402,000 teachers, 165,000 scientists, and 225,000 doctors, dentists, nurses and other skilled technical personnel in allied medical fields.

(2) While the educational provisions of this act were but a small portion of the total package, it is estimated that, on the average, the present annual income of veterans who benefited from the GI bill in this manner is some $2,000 above that of nonveterans in similar categories, and the added tax revenue from ex-GI's whose earning power has been enhanced has paid the cost of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act in full.

As always, and I reiterated this point to the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the American Legion's objective is that: "Responsible veterans' legislation should express the concern of the public in veterans' affairs."

We can point with pride to past accomplishments in every field of endeavor in which we as an organization have been concerned for these past 45 years, yet we know we can never afford to rest on our laurels. To do so would be to place in jeopardy those gains which have been so painstakingly made, and to concede that no new problems exist. This, of course, is not the case. The Legion proposes to move with the times and changing times create new and often more difficult problems than we already have met. One of these, I'm sure, confronts us in the field of rehabilitation, for I suspect that the problem of the aged and aging veteran may, before it is resolved, be one of the most rugged with which the American Legion has ever dealt.

Many of you may recall that upon acceptance of the office of national commander, which our Miami Beach national convention bestowed upon me, I told the assembled delegates that I looked forward to my term of office as a year of rededication to the principles of the American Legion, and a year of rediscovery of the fundamentals of our priceless American heritage.

But, rededication and rediscovery are meaningless terms unless they are backed by strong positive action programs to extend the principles of the American Legion into those areas where they are most needed—and to defend the fundamentals of our heritage against all comers.

As basic as it is to the American Legion, our challenge is not in the field of rehabilitation alone, but the challenge is there and is as real and as demanding in every other area in which the Legion seeks to serve—Americanism, national security, and child welfare.

The American Legion believes it is so essential that this Nation be prepared to speak from a position of strength to those who understand no other language. Certainly, we are in favor of any effort to reduce international tensions—efforts that will be binding upon all parties concerned—but unless and until we see some concrete evidence of good intent on the part of the Communists, we cannot afford to relax our vigil or to permit any weakening of our own structure of national defense and security.

The shooting down of two unarmed American training planes in the Berlin area in the space of some 6 weeks does not look like a well-intentioned effort to live together in peace as peace-loving people would interpret it. The crew of the first plane shot down was killed. Now the three-man crew of the second plane, to the best of our knowledge, is held captive by the Communists. Our State Department has made demands for the safe return of the three Air Force officers, and we of the American Legion believe no stone should be left unturned until these men who risk their lives on the frontiers of freedom are safely returned to us.

Provocative incidents in the Caribbean and Latin American areas stirred up Fidel Castro, the Kremlin's puppet in the Western Hemisphere, such as the fishing boat incidents and the shutting off of water supplies to our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, are not considered peaceful overtures by peace-loving people.

Stepped-up efforts of the Communist Vietcong to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam certainly is no friendly overture. The seriousness with which the United States views this situation is seen in the fact that Defense Secretary McNamara recently conducted a personal survey of conditions in South Vietnam, another of the frontiers of freedom where young Americans daily risk their lives in the battle to stem the tide of communism.

The defense of freedom involves many complex considerations including our rights in Berlin; our assistance to the Government of South Vietnam and the presence of the Castro regime in Cuba. It is the view of the American Legion that our rights in Berlin are nonnegotiable; that the continued presence of our military advisers in South Vietnam is necessary to defend freedom in southeast Asia, and that the early elimination of the Castro regime from Cuba is necessary to protect the security of the Western Hemisphere.

These matters of which I have spoken thus far concern primarily our national security and rehabilitation programs, and we are, of course, just as concerned with the continuing service that must be rendered by our great programs of Americanism and child welfare.

We have pending several matters of vital importance in the field of Americanism, including the subject of prayer in the public schools and the permitting of known Communists to speak on the campuses of our State-supported colleges and universities.

The Legion has strong stands in both instances as we support a constitutional amendment that would permit prayer and Bible reading of a voluntary nature in our schools, and we are unalterably opposed to providing a public forum, cloaked in the aura of respectability accorded to the concept of academic freedom, on the campuses of our tax-supported colleges and universities.

The Legion opposes neither free speech nor academic freedom nor, for that matter, freedom in any form.

It is the view of the American Legion that we are under no legal or moral obligation to provide a public forum to the known Communist for the spreading of an alien ideology, devoid of truth, among impressionable young minds. The concept of free speech does not mean license.

Those who believe that under the concept of "academic freedom" that known Communists should be permitted the forum of our tax-supported colleges, have the grave responsibility to consider the results of this calculated academic risk.

In the years since 1925, when our national child welfare program was formalized, Legionnaires and members of affiliated organizations have contributed more than $185 million of their own funds to the cause of a "square deal for every child."

The work of our child welfare foundation, with a fraction of those expenditures, in the form of grant-in-aid to research projects already underway has done much to enhance medical and scientific knowledge in the field of preventive medicine to the benefit of all American youth.

I know you share with me the conviction that the American Legion has much to offer America, and I'm confident that you share with me the determination that this great land shall always receive the benefit of the very best we have to give.

We believe that continued devotion to the achievement of those objectives to which the American Legion set its heart and hand some 45 years ago is the very best way for us to serve the causes which all of us hold so dear, and to preserve the priceless heritage that is ours because we belong to the land of the free.

Having set our hearts and our minds to the accomplishment of these objectives, there is no force on earth that can deter us, and I believe we shall have the blessings of a higher power if we seek our objectives with the unselfish motivation of service to God and to our fellow man.

Stormy Day in New York City Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read the following article in the Tuesday, March 24, issue of the New York Herald Tribune. Certainly, the matter of violence and lack of discipline in the New York City school system is one to cause grave concern. The Members of the Congress will understand what I mean when they read this article which I insert in the RECORD under leave heretofore granted.

STORMY DAY IN SCHOOLS—TEACHER STONED—THIRD TIME

(By Joseph Michalak)

This time they used tomatoes as well as fists—including those of an allegedly drunken boy—during one of the toughest days on teachers since the current wave of assaults by pupils last month.

Altogether, six teachers—two of them in one Manhattan school—were attacked yesterday. In addition, the board of education reported the stoning of another teacher last Friday—the third such attack against the teacher this month.

The highest 1-day total of attacks on teachers is seven on March 6. Yesterday's outbreak and the Friday attack resulted in the arrests and suspensions of 11 students.

In another incident yesterday, apparently not related to the teacher situation, a 16-year-old Brooklyn student leaped from the fourth-floor ledge of John Jay High School, Seventh Avenue and Fourth Street. But she was caught in a police net waiting below, and suffered only minor bruises and shock.

The girl had danced and paraded on the ledge for more than an hour while resisting the efforts of priests, friends, school officials, and police to coax her down. She was identified as Yvonne Burgess, a sophomore, who lives at 129 St. Mark's Avenue, Brooklyn.

The teacher attacked by stone throwers Friday was Gabriel Neiman, 22, in his second year as a substitute at Public School 30, Brook Avenue and 141st Street, the Bronx. He was struck outside the school by stones thrown by two pupils, both about 13 years old, who were held on charges of felonious assault and suspended from school.

Mr. Neiman, the board said, was previously attacked on March 2 and 6—in each case by a boy who was subsequently suspended. The one on the 6th did not previously mention the hurling of stones.

The victim of the tomato attack yesterday was William M. Phipps, 32, who was appointed a music teacher at Junior High School 120, at Madison Avenue and 120th Street only a month ago. He was attacked at 315 p.m. by four boys, about 14 years old, while on his way to the subway station at 125th Street.

Earlier yesterday the school's assistant principal, Neal Farber, 50, was threatened by a 16-year-old pupil who had been sent to his office for using abusive language in a remedial reading class. Police said the boy had threatened "to get" Mr. Farber. The boy was arrested and, school officials said, will be suspended.

At Benjamin Franklin High School, Pleasant Avenue and 116th Street, Peter D. Golden, 35, an industrial arts teacher, was struck in the jaw by a 16-year-old boy who, police said, had entered the school in an intoxicated condition. The boy, who school officials said was a chronic truant, punched Mr. Golden after the teacher stopped him in the hall. In other incidents yesterday:

Mrs. Gloria S. Schwartz, 26, at PS 177, Monroe and Market Streets, Manhattan, was struck by a girl as she tried to break up an argument between the girl and another female pupil.

Fred Nauman, 34, a general science teacher at Junior High School 271, Hopkinson Avenue and Fulton Street, Brooklyn, was bitten by a boy who objected to Mr. Nauman's asking him about the validity of a late pass to class.

Richard D. Hewitt, 35, a teacher at Lafayette High School, Benson Avenue and Bay 43d Street, Brooklyn, was struck in the face twice by a 17-year-old boy. The first punch was thrown after the teacher had closed a window the boy had opened without permission. The second punch came on the way to the principal's office.

At John Jay High School, the Burgess girl gave virtually the entire Park Slope district fits before jumping into the police net at 4:55 p.m.

Clad in a black raincoat, skirt, and sweater, she opened a window and clambered out on the ledge.

Two fire companies and two police emergency squads came to the scene. When a net was stretched below from the third floor and firemen began to climb down toward her from the fifth floor, she jumped.

The girl landed on her head and right shoulder in the third floor net. She was taken to Long Island College Hospital for treatment and then to Kings County Hospital for observation.

Mrs. Peter H. Bergson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, I was an active participant in the work of supporting the American League for a Free Palestine, an organization of American citizens of all faiths and backgrounds, headed by the former senior Senator from Iowa, Guy M. Gillette. It was our contention that the land of Palestine should be freed and returned to the Hebrew people as a matter of common justice, and in this connection we urged an American foreign policy which would back the militant Palestine underground of those days.

This was not Zionism, but simple common sense Americanism. I remember traveling across the country making speeches and going to meetings, rallies,

pageants, and protest demonstrations. This was the issue which touched us all. It aroused us. I want to report, after the passage of many years, that this freedom fight for Palestine is one of my most vivid and cherished personal memories. My greatest satisfaction came from the association with the people who were involved. The brightest youth, the finest writers and stars of the theater, and the creative talent of America joined with us to help in a small way those who were carrying on the fight.

In all this, two young American girls from Kansas City—Betty and Rose Keane—remain particularly vivid to me. Rose, the older sister, worked in Washington, and across the land, helping to organize and vitalize this great public outcry for freedom. Her younger sister, Betty, not only helped here, but also went abroad to the active scene, to the displaced persons camps, to help organize the exodus, and finally to Israel, where, she married Peter H. Bergson, the brilliant Palestinian leader who was head of the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation.

Mr. President, I recite these sketchy facts because on March 2, Betty Bergson died at the age of 45 in a New York hospital. The few facts I recite in no way tell of my deep sense of loss and my personal sadness. But there is some comfort in knowing that the work of this young American girl endures as an example to the youth of today, to all who may be listless and without a sense of dedication. To those, I commend the life of Betty Bergson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of March 4.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. P. H. BERGSON, WAR REFUGEE AID—LEADER IN EFFORTS FOR JEWS IN EUROPE IS DEAD AT 45

Mrs. Betty Bergson, who as Betty Keane helped to organize efforts for Jewish refugees in World War II and a 1947 blockade running attempt to send Jews into Palestine, died at New York Hospital Monday. Her age was 45.

She was the wife of Peter H. Bergson, investment broker, who was chairman of the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation here during the Palestine mandate. The committee was associated with the Irgun Zvai Leumi underground.

Mrs. Bergson's original name was Betty Caplan. She was born in Kansas City and went to the University of Missouri. In 1939 she came to New York and helped to organize a conference that led to the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe.

She was a staff member of that committee whose cochairmen included Mr. Bergson and Ben Hecht, the author. Later she became a consultant to the War Refugee Board, set up by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and an expert for the U.S. prosecution staff at the Nuremberg war crimes trials.

While in Germany, Mrs. Bergson helped to organize transport to France for 625 Jews, former concentration camp prisoners who had visas for various Latin American countries, on trains supplied by U.S. military authorities.

When they reached Port de Bouc, however, they boarded an 800-ton American yacht, renamed the *Ben Hecht*, which made a run for Palestine in defiance of the British blockade. The ship was caught by the British Navy and impounded in Haifa in March 1947. The refugees were taken to detention in Cyprus but moved to Israel after the State was created.

Three years before the *Ben Hecht's* ill-fated journey, Mr. Bergson had set up the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation with an "embassy" in Washington, vainly seeking Allied recognition as a government-in-exile over opposition of other Zionist groups. After Israel was established in 1948, he was elected a member of the first Knesset (Parliament).

Miss Keane also went to Israel and they were married there in 1950. In 1953 Mr. Bergson resigned from the Knesset, and the couple returned here, making their home since then at 146 Central Park West. Mr. Bergson, whose original name was Hilel Kook, operates H. Kook & Co. at 54 Wall Street.

In addition to her husband, Mrs. Bergson is survived by two daughters, Astra and Rebecca; her mother, Mrs. Fannie Caplan; two sisters, Mrs. Marshall MacDuffie and Mrs. Abraham Brody, and two brothers, Harry Caplan and Maj. Leon Caplan, USAF.

The Shadow of a Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 21, 1964, the Nashville Tennessean published a guest column by my friend, Fred Cloud, of the Methodist Board of Education, in Nashville. I commend the column to my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks include this column, entitled "The Shadow of a Man."

THE SHADOW OF A MAN

(By Fred Cloud)

"An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man," Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote. In February each year, we Americans pause to reflect on the lengthening shadow of George Washington—surveyor, soldier, first President of the United States.

Stories of the cherry tree variety about the young George's truthfulness cause us to smile. And the portraits of Washington on the 1-cent stamp and the $1 bill are so familiar that we cease to see them.

But we need to remind ourselves that such unquestioned integrity should not be taken for granted. It is not too common. It is always something to marvel at, and to be thankful for.

The presence of the lighted Washington Monument piercing the night sky in the city that bears his name is a reminder to every generation of American political leaders, that government in a democracy is a sacred trust. Political power is placed in the hands of elected leaders, not for their personal advantage, but for the common welfare. Graft and corruption are seen in their true light when compared with the selfless service of America's Founding Fathers.

So what? What difference does an 18th-century political leader make to you and me today?

Simply this: ideals such as honesty, integrity, and selfless service do not change with the passing of centuries—whether 2 or 20. In 1964, we need the dream of freedom that sustained George Washington and that accounts for much of America's greatness.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, of the many eulogies to the late President Kennedy, few have been as affecting and have moved me as deeply as the tribute paid by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in New York. This was the eulogy Rabbi Finkelstein delivered 2 days after the tragic hour in which the President met his death.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Rabbi Finkelstein's eulogy as it appeared in the Torch, published by the National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs, winter 1964.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Louis Finkelstein)

The President of the United States of America at best leads a martyr's life. It is a supreme tragedy when he also meets a martyr's death. "How are the mighty fallen in the midst of battle." (II Samuel, 1: 27)

The whole world joins our Nation in its grief and its sense of shock. The head of the leading state of this world, working for a unified country, equality of all citizens, peace for all men, has been cut down in the midst of his labors.

Transcending even this great grief for the calamity that has befallen our Nation and the world, there is the heartrending sadness at the destruction of a human being. For even the loss of the humblest man is, according to the rabbis, like the destruction of a whole world. Who can possibly know what might have been in store for John F. Kennedy in the years to come, both as President and, after he ceased to be President, when he would have become one of the sages of the world, giving his advice to other Presidents, to our Nation, and to mankind at large.

Here was a man with a wife, children, aged parents, brothers and sisters—all of whom are stricken with grief. Rabbi Akiba used to say that when a man meets death through violence, the very image of God is diminished. He meant, of course, that God is present in each of us, and as any human being is cut off, to that extent God may be said—if one may use those words—to have had His image diminished. But he may also have meant something else—that it is only as the image of God is diminished that crimes of violence can possibly occur.

There may be some primitive peoples among whom there is no violence. But generally speaking, primitive man was given to destroying his neighbor, as we are told in the very first chapters of Genesis. As civilization developed, respect for life increased. And one of the great stimuli toward this respect for human life were the influences deriving from the Hebrew prophets.

Each of us is responsible for what happens to our neighbor, and, as we think of what happened in Dallas, perhaps we ought to reflect on our own contribution to this disaster. If a man is unbalanced, perhaps we failed to care for him. If he is uneducated, perhaps we failed to teach him. If he is deprived and neglected, perhaps we have failed to help him. For otherwise how could

it be that America, standing at the very apex of civilization in so many respects, and where religion is flourishing as it never did before, should also be the scene of so much hatred and so much violence?

It is the thought of what each of us has failed to do that comes to us with great solemnity at this moment, and makes us realize the importance of carrying on the work of John F. Kennedy, who was so devoted to the eradication of hatred among men. Is it not ironical that he should have met his death on this trip to Texas, which he made in the very cause of the eradication of violence and hatred?

Our duty now must be to resolve to carry forward the work he so nobly began and to pray for the Divine guidance for President Lyndon B. Johnson, on whom so much depends both for our Nation and the world. For does not the Book of Proverbs tell us that the hearts of kings and princes are in the hands of God? We think of the bereaved widow, the orphaned children, the mourning parents, sisters and brothers, and the mourning Nation and the world with sympathy, with prayer that God may give them all strength to meet the calamity that has befallen them and all of us, and the fortitude needed to carry on the unfinished work which lies before us—to bring about a greater civilization, in which violence will not be.

We must create a greater America, which will rise in its moral and religious standards to the heights which the prophets held out for mankind. We must strive for a nobler age, when men like John F. Kennedy can live out their lives in peace, rendering the service they seek to do, and they are destined to do. As for John F. Kennedy himself, he served his Nation and mankind well—alas, only for a brief time—and now he has his reward with his Father and his God. May his soul be bound up in the bonds of life, with the God whom he loved and whom he served.

Sermon of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John L. Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a sermon of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John L. Storm of the All Hallows Church in La Jolla, Calif., which was given by him on the third Sunday in Lent:

SERMON BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN L. STORM, "THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT"

In one of the best missals for laymen, the St. Andrew's Missal, there is today a subtitle appropriate to the gospel just read. This subtitle is in question form, "Is Satan Still Real?"

The answer tells us how very real he is; yes, and how powerful. Satan is such a challenge today because of what he did not lose when he was banished as an angel from heaven to become a devil in hell. Satan was a spirit; that he remains. He was also a pure spirit, by which quality he knew men's present and past. These he continues to know. Satan was as an angel very real; as a devil he is just as real.

When Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils, is mentioned in today's gospel, it is fitting that Jesus follow up with the theme song of Satan: division, confusion. Christ said, "Every kingdom divided against itself is heading for ruin—each house collapsing on its neighbor * * * he that does not gather with Me, scatters." You notice that the word in this latter quotation is not "gather" it is "Me"—Christ. So that, whatever is not done for and in Christ, can only scatter.

Today's gospel is the loud reply to people who try to compromise sin with virtue, Christ with Satan, Christianity with communism. No matter how you try to paint the coexistence of the two, they are like oil and water. They just don't mix.

How eloquently Jesus expressed this in this very same gospel. "So long as a strong man fully armed is guarding his own palace, his goods are undisturbed; but when a stronger than he comes against him and defeats him, he takes away all the armor he relied on and shares out his spoils." To country after country such a fate has occurred ever since November 16, 1933, when by U.S. recognition of Communist Russia we gave them a place among the nations of the world and thereby armed them for conquest. Communism has proved stronger than any and all opponents and its program of weakening and confusing its enemies has succeeded on every side. Christ's words have been frighteningly accurate: "The enemy takes away all the armor the victim has relied on, and the enemy shares out his spoils."

While we do not hate Communists, we do hate their beliefs and their policies, for their teachings are Satan's own. An awe-struck United States stands along the side of the road today, not because its program is inferior to the Soviets, for the program of a nation originally dedicated to God never takes second place to that of a nation that deletes God. We have lost so much footing for the reason that in the words of Christ * * * we have not gathered with Him, and so we have scattered.

The master of division has been working out on America for a long time. Proof of his amazing accomplishment has been the triumph achieved when our own President was murdered by a Communist, and the confusion within our land came instantly to an all-time high. In fact, it has never subsided, for men of supposed intelligence are still blaming the assassination on every agency except the communistic one that perpetrated it.

In a situation of this type, how can we start to win? I can assure you we will never win through soft talk, compromise, or sellout. We win if we are a nation in Christ; a nation that proclaims His Name; a nation that lives as Christ bade us live, not half good and half bad but all good; a nation which will proudly include God rather than rule that His name grow silent.

Now for those of you who would like to think that communism is a political subject which ought not be discussed from the pulpit. The logical corollary to that is that sin should not be discussed from the pulpit.

Satan is, remember, very real. So is his creed, communism. We wish they were not real, but they are. And so, we take our choice. We scatter with Satan or we gather with Christ.

Proposed Amendment to U.S. Constitution To Permit Voluntary School Prayer and Bible Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was much pleased to read in the March 1964 issue of the American Legion magazine that the American Legion is supporting efforts to have the U.S. Constitution amended for the purpose of overturning recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which attempt to prohibit prayers and Bible reading in our schools. I commend the American Legion for this strong stand against the secularist drive to make America a godless nation. This stand is in keeping with the American Legion's dedication to God and country. It makes me even prouder of my long association with this great and patriotic organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Constitutional Amendment To Permit Voluntary School Prayer and Bible Reading Locked in Committee: Legion Supports Discharge Petition," published in the American Legion magazine, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER AND BIBLE READING LOCKED IN COMMITTEE: LEGION SUPPORTS DISCHARGE PETITION

The American Legion has joined in a movement in Congress for a discharge petition to force out of the House Judiciary Committee a proposed constitutional amendment. * * * The amendment, identified as House Joint Resolution 693, would guarantee voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools and other public places, and forbid judicial or legislative prohibition of references to God on such things as coins, paper money, etc.

The legion is urging its members and all Americans interested in such a constitutional amendment to ask their Representatives in the House to sign discharge petition No. 3 in order to move the resolution out of the Judiciary Committee onto the floor of the House.

A discharge petition, though seldom used, is authorized by the rules of the House to permit a majority to move a bill out of the committee which is disposed not to report it out. * * * The American Legion has supported discharge petitions only a few times in its history. * * * As of February 4, there were 134 Representatives who had signed the petition, and 84 more signatures were needed to provide the required majority of 218 out of 435 Members of the House.

Supreme Court decisions in 1962 and 1963 led directly to the movement to amend the Constitution. A New York case in 1962 stopped New York State from prescribing a prayer to be read in the schools, on the ground that this was a mixing of church and state. Later a New York board of education decision interpreted this to mean that even if all the parents of children in a classroom wished a prayer of which they approved to be read, it could not be. A New York district court denied this interpretation, but its ruling may go to a higher court. A 1963 Supreme Court decision ruled that even if a school would excuse any objectors from participating in school prayer or Bible readings, the school still could not conduct such religious exercises. The Court here went beyond the conflict of church and state and into the field of psychology by basing the decision in part on a belief that it would be humiliating for an objector to excuse himself. It entered the field of voluntary student participation in school religious observances and found against it. These decisions in turn led to a rash of actions and proposals to remove the phrase "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and challenges

to "In God we trust" on coinage and other government issue.

The American Legion and numerous Members of the House have not challenged the decision forbidding compulsory joining in prayer prescribed by a State. But they have taken the position that a Constitution guaranty of voluntary participation in school and oher public religious exercises is now necessary, while any attempt to legislate a prohibition of Government use of the word "God" is an attempt to legislate atheism. Both matters are seen as an interference of the state in religion rather than being guarantees of religious freedom.

Numerous resolutions for a constitutional amendment died in the Judiciary Committee in the last (87th) Congress. In the first session of the present (88th) Congress, 131 joint resolutions for such an amendment were introduced, with indications that either no hearings would be held on them by the Judiciary Committee or that hearings would be held too late to permit any action in this Congress.

Last September 10, Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, in consultation with many colleagues, introduced House Joint Resolution 693 as a sort of master proposal, whose key passage is:

"Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures in any public school or government institution or place, if participation is voluntary. Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental, or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States."

BECKER also introduced discharge petition No. 3 to force House Joint Resolution 693 out of committee. The American Legion, which at its last convention endorsed a constitutional amendment to guarantee voluntary school and other public prayer and Bible reading, threw its backing to the proposals sponsored by Representative BECKER.

If the proposal clears the Congress it will still require approval of three-quarters of the State legislatures before becoming a part of the Constitution.

A Hidden Trap in the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Washington Evening Star of March 16 calls attention to a provision in the recently passed tax bill which may turn out to be a source of great distress to a large number of taxpayers next spring as well as a disturbing influence on the economy. I refer to the immediate reduction to 14 percent of the withholding rate and the impact this will have in reducing refunds of many taxpayers next spring and increasing required tax payments of many others.

My colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee and I called attention to this problem in January and again in the minority views to the Joint Economic Committee annual report earlier this month. Since that time, increasing attention has been paid to the effects of that change in the individual taxpayer and the economy.

Under unanimous consent I insert the Evening Star article containing a question-and-answer discussion of this problem in the RECORD at this point:

UNDERWITHHOLDING TO BRING TAXPAYER WOES NEXT YEAR

Because of changes and delay in enacting the tax cut law, the taxes withheld from paychecks will fall about $800 million short of meeting the actual 1964 tax bills of Americans.

Millions of taxpayers will get smaller refunds than usual a year from now, and a good many—especially in middle and upper income brackets—will owe Uncle Sam more money.

The Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service are being bombarded with questions about why this underwithholding happened, what it means to individual taxpayers and the economy in general, and why steps were not taken to avoid the discrepancy.

Here are some of the questions and the answers given by tax officials and other experts:

Question. Are all taxpayers being underwithheld?

Answer. No, not nearly all. For the great majority of taxpayers, especially at lower income levels, the withholding will cover tax liability. More people will get refunds than will have to pay extra.

Question. Which ones are likely to feel the pinch?

Answer. In general, those with incomes upward of $9,000 to $10,000 a year. The higher the salary, the less likely that withholding will be adequate.

Question. How will underwithholding be felt?

Answer. Many of the 40 million taxpayers who usually get refunds will get smaller ones. Some will get none. Others will end the tax year owing Uncle Sam money. Nearly all those who now have to make additional payments—about 20 million taxpayers—will make larger ones.

Question. How hard will it hit?

Answer. At $15,000 income, a married taxpayer wtih two children and $2,500 of itemized deductions was underwithheld $5 for 1963. For 1964, even though his taxes are lower, he will be about $165 underwithheld.

Question. What about higher incomes?

Answer. At $25,000 income, a couple with two dependents and itemized deuctions totaling $4,000 will be underwithheld by $1,020; they were $780 underwithheld in 1963.

Question. What about single persons? And those who don't itemize but take the standard deduction?

Answer. As always, the underwithholding is more pronounced for those with fewer exemptions or lower deductions for interest, State taxes, medical care and so on.

Question. Is this because the tax cut is smaller than was announced?

Answer. No. But many will find it is not as big as it looks on their paychecks.

Question. Why does it happen?

Answer. The withholding rate is now only 14 percent. The actual tax rate is higher; and since it becomes progressively steeper at higher income levels, the gap widens as income increases.

Question. Wasn't the gap foreseen?

Answer. In the original tax cut plan it was not so large. That called for reducing the old 18 percent withholding rate to 15 percent in the first year and 14 percent in 1965.

Question. Why was it changed to 14 percent from the start?

Answer. Congress didn't move fast enough to get the reduction started at New Year's. For 2 months of 1964, taxes were withheld at the old rate, 18 percent. President Johnson proposed that the rate be dropped to 14 percent for the last 10 months of the year.

Question. Why?

Answer. So that taxpayers, over the full year, would get about the same tax as was originally planned for 1964; and the economy would get the same stimulus in spite of the legislative delay. Congress readily agreed.

ADJUSTED NEXT YEAR

Question. Couldn't the rate have been set at 15 percent, with refunds at the year-end to make up the difference?

Answer. It could have. But then millions of taxpayers would have been overwithheld. They would not have received the full benefit of tax reduction until a year from now. And the spur to business and employment would have been lessened.

Question. Couldn't some fractional rate have been set, to come out closer to even? Or couldn't the lower withholding rate be applied to low-income taxpayers and a higher rate to high-income taxpayers?

Answer. Theoretically either would have been possible, but there are practical difficulties. Employers are used as tax collectors under the withholding system, and many would find it difficult and costly, if not impossible, to administer fractional or multiple withholding rates. And there's another reason.

Question. What's that?

Answer. The wide discrepancy lasts only 1 year. In 1965 the second stage of the tax cut takes effect, and the income tax rates will move down somewhat closer to the withholding rate.

Question. But the withholding remains the same in 1965?

Answer. That's right. The employee's take-home pay will stay just the same as now; the withholding will still be at 14 per cent.

Question. Won't a lot of people be disappointed to find out there isn't any further tax cut coming in 1965?

Answer. Quite possibly. The only added benefit for the average person in 1965 is that he'll get the benefit of tax reduction for 12 months of the year instead of 10.

Question. Was there a political reason to underwithhold in an election year, making the first-year tax cut look bigger than it is?

NO SETBACK SEEN

Answer. Some Republicans have charged that Mr. Johnson wants to heat up the economy to insure reelection. They contend it may be overheated, with a resulting risk of inflation and a recession in 1965. Administration officials deny there is either political motivation or grave inflationary threat. The full benefit of tax reduction will not be felt for 2 or 3 years, they contend, and serious price pressures won't be felt until much more idle machinery and manpower is put to work.

Question. But isn't there danger of a business letdown next year, when people have to write checks for the taxes not withheld?

Answer. The business advance could be slowed up if a lot of people who planned to buy cars or refrigerators are sending extra money to Uncle Sam instead. But Government economists foresee no setback; the upward movement should be strong enough to absorb this relatively minor flow of money to the Treasury.

Question. Some $800 million doesn't sound minor.

Answer. But many if not most of those seriously affected will have cushioned the blow by having their withholdings enlarged throughout the year, or by making quarterly tax payments big enough to offset the underwithholding.

Question. How can I figure out whether I should increase my withholding?

Answer. Compare your paycheck stub now with the one you received before the new rates took effect; a little arithmetic will show your total withholding for this year. Then

use the new 1964 schedule of tax rates, available from IRS offices and at post offices and banks, and make an advance estimate of your actual tax for this year. The difference is the amount you'll have to pay in addition to withholding.

Question. Then what do I do about it?

Answer. You could ask your employer to drop one or more of your exemptions; that is, tell him not to count your wife, or one or more of the children. Each exemption dropped adds over $90 a year to your withholdings.

DROPPED EXEMPTION HELPS

Question. That wouldn't be enough, in many cases.

Answer. True. The other method is simply to ask your employer to increase the withholding by an arbitrary amount. Most companies will do so, if the amount is in multiples of $5 to simplify the bookkeeping—$5, or $10, or $25, and so on.

Question. But if the underwithholding will be smaller in 1965, I might want to change it back again a year from now.

Answer. Yes. Many will prefer, for this year, to make a declaration of estimated tax and then make quarterly payments to cover the underwithholding.

Question. Will I be penalized if I fail to keep my tax payments current and wind up the year making a lump payment to IRS?

Answer. Probably not. The rules demand quarterly payments if the underwitholding exceeds $40. But IRS rarely takes action against a taxpayer who slips up unless he also is violating some other part of the tax law.

Opposition to So-Called Civil Rights Legislation by Chamber of Commerce of Conway, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to receive in my office this week a resolution which has been adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Conway, S.C., voicing its opposition to the so-called civil rights legislation now being debated in the U.S. Senate. I commend the members of the Conway Chamber of Commerce for this strong stand in favor of freedom and against centralization of power in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF CONWAY, S.C.

Whereas our country is based on a free society, which allows free economic competition, free political competition, and free social choice; and

Whereas the civil rights bill, as written, would be detrimental to our country and all of its citizens; and

Whereas we believe that this country including all races, will develop faster under a free society than it will under a controlled society, which the civil rights bill will promote: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conway Chamber of Commerce of Conway, S.C., respectfully voices to the South Carolina delegation and to the Congress as a whole its protest against the civil rights bill as written, as an outrage against all citizens of the United States of America.

———,
President,
Conway Chamber of Commerce.

The Accelerated Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the time will soon be upon us to take up once again legislation to continue and even expand this Nation's excellent accelerated public works program.

This program must survive. Of this there can be no doubt. The reasons are obvious and comprehendable to all.

A recent article in the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO IUD Bulletin presents a lucid and very valid case for accelerated public works.

The article follows:

THE ACCELERATED WORKS PROGRAM

President Johnson has pointed out that more than tax reduction is needed to overcome unemployment. He emphasized in his recent manpower report that at stake in the fight against joblessness is "whether a free democratic society can attain well-being for the less fortunate as well as the more fortunate."

The plight of the less fortunate will remain unchanged while this Nation neglects its public sector needs. Without public programs, there will be no adequate housing for low-income families. Without such programs, rural poverty will remain. Without Federal assistance, the quality of education will deteriorate.

The public and private sectors of the U.S. economy are interdependent and the first is the foundation upon which private enterprise rests. Without public roads, waterworks, sanitation systems and schools, U.S. civilization would founder. To neglect the public sector is to invite trouble.

The major impact of recent tax reduction will be in the private sector. There will be almost no direct benefits for the jobless, although added demand should create new jobs. But, as the President pointed out, the unemployment problem will still remain acute. Certainly, tax reduction cannot be used as an excuse for false economy at the expense of the public sector.

The Democratic majority of the congressional Joint Economic Committee has warned that "tax reduction will not be effective in reducing the present high unemployment if Federal expenditures are sharply reduced." The majority also warned that "an increase in unemployment is too great a price to pay for balancing the budget."

This is the background against which a major public sector program is drawing to a close—the accelerated public works program. This program was created to bring needed public facilities into the Nation's distressed areas. It has been one of the most successful and popular Federal programs.

The AFL–CIO has testified before a Senate subcommittee that termination of the accelerated public works program would be tragic. It would result in the elimination of between 200,000 and 400,000 jobs, mostly in distressed areas. And, as the industrial union department pointed out, "more than jobs is involved."

Some 6,000 accelerated public works projects have been undertaken in 3,000 of the localities hardest hit by unemployment. These projects have meant more and better health and hospital facilities. They have meant clean drinking water, sewage disposal facilities, sidewalks and streets, local public buildings, parks and recreation areas. They have added $1.5 billion to the tangible wealth of the Nation.

The IUD has pointed out that "the extension of the Public Works Acceleration Act should have first priority in the war on poverty" because the facilities created are essential to the eradication of the conditions from which poverty grows. The projects are directed into areas where per capita income is low and which are short of primary investment capital. The tax cut will have least direct impact in these areas.

The accelerated public works program has the full support of hundreds of communities which have demonstrated local initiative and raised matching funds—often at great sacrifice. There are literally thousands of projects ready to go if Federal grants are forthcoming.

Failure of the Congress to renew and extend accelerated public works will mean new joblessness that will counter much of the positive thrust of the tax cut. As the Democratic majority of the Joint Economic Committee warned, high unemployment will persist if programs like accelerated public works are terminated.

At issue is the kind of America we shall have in this new age of plenty. Failure to extend accelerated public works will signal failure of the American conscience. There can be no enduring prosperity upon a foundation of neglect.

Investigation of Robert G. Baker by Committee on Rules and Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, more and more editorials from around the country are calling for the Senate Rules Committee to "finish the job" on the Bobby Baker investigation. I ask unanimous consent to have two editorials on this important subject printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Mar. 13, 1964]

EL FOLDO ON BOBBY BAKER?

Since October, a Senate Rules Subcommittee has been investigating whether or not any Senate employees or officers, or former employees or officers, engaged in outside business which conflicted with their public office. At least, that is what the subcommittee was directed to do by a resolution passed without dissent by the Senate.

From time to time the committee has released transcripts of testimony taken behind closed doors. Other hearings have been public.

So far practically the whole of the inquiry has concerned Bobby Baker, erstwhile secretary to the Democratic majority. Mr. Baker was involved in scads of business operations having nothing to do with his $19,600-a-year job on the taxpayer payroll.

The committee put more than a hundred questions to Mr. Baker. He answered none. His secretary and several other associates also took the fifth amendment when questioned.

Now the committee seems ready to fold, with dozens of questions unanswered. Calling more witnesses, Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN has said, would be "just like playing the same record over and over."

Nobody has nailed as yet, publicly at least, how much Mr. Baker was worth when he got his secretarial job, how much he was worth when he quit last fall rather than answer even the informal questions of Senate leaders, or how much of his worth was accumulated because he was an influential Senate employee.

A witness has sworn that Walter Jenkins, a former Senate employee now on the White House staff, arranged advertising for a radio station owned by President Johnson's family, and that Mr. Jenkins sought a rebate on an insurance policy sold Mr. Johnson while he was Vice President. Mr. Jenkins denied the advertising charge, but never was called before the committee.

Republican Senators are threatening to make an election year issue of the Baker case and all that goes with it. It will be a much bigger and stickier issue if the investigating committee, dominated by Democrats, does an "el foldo" now.

There is only one way to avoid this—and that is to finish the job and get answers to all pertinent questions. The more reluctant the Democrats are, the more the Republicans will make of it—with more telling effect.

ON BAKERISM

A move to shut down what has come to be known as the "Bobby Baker Investigation" backfired yesterday.

The invesigation, of course, was not specifically undertaken to probe the affairs of the former Senate majority secretary. An examination into charges of possible improper conduct by one individual is not an intended function of the Congress or a committee thereof. The Government has investigative and law-enforcement agencies set up to handle that kind of business—and if there is evidence that Mr. Baker may have violated Federal laws, the matter can be explored by the Justice Department. This, it is said, is already happening.

The inquiry of recent weeks by the Senate Rules Committee has been for the purpose of acquiring information to guide the Congress in the making of laws.

And as matters stood this week, the Democratic majority on the committee held the opinion that all the pertinent and desirable information on Mr. Baker that might help in formulating rules to govern the conduct of congressional employees had been adduced—and that the committee should therefore end its hearings.

The Republican members of the committee, in the minority, seemed to feel that more study of Mr. Baker's activities would help point the way to better lawmaking.

That's the way things were Friday, and it appeared that further baring of Bobby's business balloonings had been balked, when Senator HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania Republican, walked into a closed committee session waving an affidavit claiming that an accountant's name was forged on some of Bobby Baker's Federal income tax returns.

Although he read it to the committee, it was ruled that the tax accountant's affidavit was not officially in the committee's record unless the committee voted it in, which it did not do.

Nor did the committee act on a motion by Democrat CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, to end the Baker inquiry, or on a motion by Republican JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, to extend it. The committee may decide which to do when it meets again next Tuesday.

That leaves a curious public a long weekend for wondering.

And one of the things many will be wondering about—and which we hope the Senators will wonder extremely hard about—is whether "the greatest deliberative body in the world" (as its Members like to describe it) can maintain its self-respect and the respect of the Nation if it now attempts to draw the curtain on this unresolved drama.

We would say that it can't.

We would say that evidence of alleged wrongdoing disclosed before the committee should be referred to the FBI and the Internal Revenue Service—as apparently it has been—for further action.

We would also suggest that the Rules Committee, if it is sincerely concerned with developing regulations to prevent Bakerism from flourishing, can let somebody else pursue the mysterious details surrounding the bright young man's rapid acquisition of a couple of million dollars in assets and a truly magnificent array of loosely backed debts.

What the Senators should do, and what they have thus far avoided doing, is to launch an inquiry into the standards of senatorial conduct which have apparently permitted Bakerism to flourish.

Do We Really Need the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1964, I introduced a bill to create a Joint Committee of Congress on American Manpower and National Security. The main purpose of this bill was to promote a thorough and complete investigation of our present methods of procuring, training, and deploying the men and women in our Military Establishment.

This sort of investigation is long overdue. The draft is an invasion of personal liberty—about that there can be no question. But we have learned from the tragic lessons of history that in a world in which ruthless and unprincipled men struggle for world domination, able bodied American men must sacrifice some personal liberty in the interest of the security of all.

In thus sacrificing a portion of the individual liberty of millions of young American men, however, we must never lose sight of one central question: Do we get an honest return in security for the liberties we forgo?

On this count the draft-centered procurement system is sadly deficient. It is a fundamental tenet of human nature that men who are coerced into acting do not act nearly so well as those who act of their own volition. Add to this the fact that the present draft system permits over half of the young men of draft age to avoid any service at all, and it becomes plain that the Congress should be giving serious consideration to military manpower systems which do not use the unsatisfactory draft system as a crutch. Passage of my bill to create a Joint Committee on American Manpower and National Security would be an important step toward giving this vital subject the consideration it rightly deserves but has so long failed to receive.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I should like to insert into the RECORD two articles. The first, which originally appeared in Look magazine on July 30, 1963, is an article by Jack Raymond entitled "Do We Really Need the Draft?" It appears in its present form in the Reader's Digest for March 1964. The second is a column by John McClaughry which appeared in the Granite State Free Press of Lebanon, N.H., on March 5, 1964. Mr. McClaughry's column also runs in several other New England newspapers.

The material follows:

DO WE REALLY NEED THE DRAFT? IS OUR MILITARY TRAINING PROGRAM, AS MANY CLAIM, UNFAIR, WASTEFUL, AND INEFFECTIVE?

(By Jack Raymond, New York Times Washington correspondent and author of "How To Serve and Get Ahead in the Armed Forces")

The U.S. Senate last year took less than 10 minutes to extend until 1967 "the law no one likes." The House of Representatives had previously rushed it through by a vote of 387 to 3.

The act extended so casually, without public debate, is called the "Universal Military Training and Service Act," but the name is misleading. The draft is not universal. It did not meet our military needs during the Korean war or the Berlin and Cuban crises. And there is considerable question whether the training offered most draftees is of value to them or the United States.

CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, commented in offering the bill that "no one likes a draft law." Even in 1940, with Europe and Asia already aflame, President Franklin D. Roosevelt refused to back publicly the first U.S. peacetime draft, the selective service bill, because of the proposal's political danger. The draft was dropped after World War II, but reinstated in 1948, following a bitter nationwide debate. Since then it has been extended regularly with less and less argument. America, once proud that it did not resort to this device of the Old World, has accepted compulsory military service as a matter of course.

This easy acceptance has caused most Americans to overlook the deficiencies of UMT, including this basic inequity: although the law says every man must serve, barely half do. "At any one time, 9,500,000 are on the registration rolls," a member of a selective service board observes. "But about 4,500,000 will never see service of any kind because of low draft calls and the many possibilities for deferment and exemption. This creates a sucker complex in the many who are drafted and they leave for the service in a resentful frame of mind, cynical rather than eager to face a new adventure."

The Armed Forces simply do not need all the men the draft makes available, so every pretext is seized to broaden deferment possibilities. UMT covers men from 18 to 26, and of the 1,110,000 who became 26 years old in 1962, 300,000 (or 27 percent) had been rejected as 4-F. Existing standards of adequacy for military life are based on the assumption that every man in service must

be prepared to cope with every conceivable combat test. Actually, only a relatively small number serve in strenuous combat duty. A high percentage of the officially unfit complain of trick knees and heart murmurs that should bar them only from space travel. A Pentagon official says, "The current physical standards remind me of the early days of World War II. Every draftee had to have eyeteeth that met properly—because this had been necessary in the days when soldiers bit the covers off packaged bullets."

Husbands automatically get deferments. The theory is that they are wage earners and needed to keep a family together. Actually, it costs more to draft a husband: family heads receive greater housing and other allotments. If social considerations prompt deferment or exemption of husbands, what of the argument that the draft discriminates against those who cannot afford to marry? And what of the moral aspects of an act that prompts men to marry hastily?

Students in good standing get deferments. This seems logical. But it means that students who are financially well off (and keep up their marks) have a distinct advantage over those unable to afford college. It has become a grim joke on college campuses, "If your grades go down, you'd better have a girl ready to marry you."

An additional and growing problem is the bewildering number of choices that now confront every U.S. male approaching 18; there are more than 50 possible variations of military service. Each physically fit registrant has a basic 6-year obligation that must be completed in varying combinations of active duty and Ready Reserve training. The draftee serves 2 years of active duty, then joins a Reserve or National Guard unit for at least 2 years in the Ready Reserve. After that, he moves into the so-called Standby Reserve, a roster for mobilization only in the event of war.

Even the Reserve service requirement does not fall equally on all. There are not enough training units for Ready Reservists, so fewer than half of those with drill obligations are required to fulfill them. But those who escape Reserve drilling are irate when they are mobilized anyway—as in the Berlin crisis.

The shortcomings of UMT in military value have been dramatically demonstrated. In what amounted to a national scandal, during the Korean war some 600,000 World War II veterans were summoned back while about 1,600,000 young men of draft age were never called. In the Berlin mobilization, 150,000 reservists were called back to active duty amid a loud national outcry, while the number of extra men drafted amounted to no more than several thousand. And it appeared strange that many more reservists were not called up in the serious confrontation of the Cuban crisis.

Serious questions also arise regarding the value of the training offered under UMT. Draftees for the most part merely "serve time." So do many men who join the regulars only because of the threat of the draft.

If the deficiencies in UMT are recognized in the Pentagon (and many of them are), why has the program been extended for another 4 years? The Pentagon insists that the present Military Establishment could not be maintained on a voluntary basis. Only the stimulus of the draft keeps the Armed Forces at 2,700,000, and spurs enlistment in the Ready Reserve.

The contention that UMT stimulates recruiting in the Ready Reserve is the least impressive of the reasons offered for continuing the draft. Clearly, like the draft-stimulated Regulars, many draft-stimulated reservists also are merely going through the paces.

"I wonder how much the security of the country is being safeguarded by the paunchy reservist who spends 1 evening a week at the Reserve center chewing the fat with the boys, thereby escaping from the dishes at home," Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, asked as he cast his vote to extend the Draft Act.

UMT has critics who would abandon the draft altogether. Many feel that the armed services should be reduced to an elite of well-paid, well-trained volunteers. Rear-area operations, these critics argue, could be turned over to Reserve or civilian organizations—as many National Guard units now man Nike-Hercules antiaircraft sites, and nonmilitary men take part in the Civil Air Patrol. At the space-launching establishments at Cape Kennedy and Vandenberg Air Force Base, civilians fill thousands of jobs, from laborer to key engineer.

Some critics says that the $72 million a year spent on recruiting men, and the many millions more spent on teaching them skills, would be better invested in vocational schools outside the services. Then there would be no time wasted in getting certain types of technicians to meet military requirements. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, points out that the U.S. Navy's Seabees of World War II "did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks of boot training and send them to a bulldozer-operating school. No, they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to experienced bulldozer operators, and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they knew how to operate a bulldozer."

One Army officer insists: "Men would respond to a real call for an elite military service, the way they respond to the Marine Corps. The trouble with military recruiting today is that it flounders in contradictory approaches—one day they say, 'C'mon, there's a crisis in Berlin,' and the next day they say, 'C'mon, we'll teach you interior decorating.'" Another officer says, "We don't ask what the kids can do for their country, but try to sell what the Armed Forces can do for them. And, frankly, there is very little the Armed Forces can do for them, if it is measured only in pay and vacational training."

Assistant Secretary of Defense Norman S. Paul once said that the most important handicap to military recruitment is the concept of the Armed Forces "as an employment facility for the misfit, the mediocre, the man or woman who can't get a livelihood elsewhere." He added, "Without such erroneous notions, we could probably throw away the draft and build the kind of volunteer-professional force we seek."

Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, who has had a hand in military conscription for more than 25 years, still believes firmly in the draft, and would even broaden it. He is convinced that the Nation and its youth would profit if all young men, with virtually no exceptions, were required to train for 6 months. After this training period, they would be available for voluntary recruitment by the active Armed Forces. Those who then elected to serve would do so out of sincere motivation, rather than depend upon a coin toss to help them choose between draft and enlistment.

We thus have those who would eliminate the draft and those who would equalize its burdens. The remarkable thing, in our vociferous age, is that discussion of the draft and mobilization laws, which critically affect the lives and futures of our youth, has been carried on in muted tones. Only recently has the Pentagon undertaken to give UMT the fundamental reassessment it deserves. Certainly we must try to anticipate tomorrow's population growth and changing strategies. Maybe the draft is necessary. But if so, the Government ought to prove it.

[From the Lebanon (N.H.) Granite State Free Press, Mar. 5, 1964]

THE NATION IN FOCUS

(By John McClaughry)

Last year legislation to extend the military draft whizzed through Congress with practically no debate. Now a growing number of Congressmen and Senators are having long second thoughts about the draft—potentially a major issue in an election year.

The arguments against the continuation of the peacetime draft are many and their validity is increasing. The draft must be tolerated as one of the costs of preserving our liberty; but when the draft actually detracts fromm national security, it becomes absolutely intolerable.

A major defect of a draft-centered military manpower procurement system is that it produces men by the threat of force instead of by the promise of opportunity. These men want nothing more than to evade as much responsibility as possible and get out at the first opportunity. It is hard to see how a corps of such featherbedders and ghosts can contribute effectively to national defense.

The Army reenlistment rates provide some indication of the prevalence of this attitude. Of those who enlist, 73 percent leave after their first hitch. Of those who are drafted, 80 percent fail to stay in. No private business could long flourish with such a shocking turnover rate, unless, of course, the taxpayers made up the losses, as they do for the Army.

In addition to the problem of high turnover and the resulting high training expense, the draft system is inequitable. The original idea was that every fit young man would serve his 2-year hitch. But this concept of universality was rejected by Congress in 1951, even though that act bears the title "Universal Military Training and Service Act." Today the booming labor pool in the 18 to 26 brackets provides so many men that the armed services cannot accommodate them. Accordingly, the Selective Service system and the armed services have juggled requirements until today over 50 percent of the young men turning 26 have never served in the Armed Forces at all. It is small wonder that the hapless draftee resents being forced into the Army when over half of his pals escape.

There are basically two alternatives to the present system. One is a truly universal system, where every young man serves his country in the Armed Forces, Peace Corps, civil defense work, or other useful occupation. This removes the problems of inequity and the evasion mentality, but poses great problems of cost and administration. It is hardly a step in the direction of greater personal liberty.

The other alternative is the professional army, similar to that of Canada, Britain, and Australia. In this system a career in the Armed Forces is made attractive by higher pay and more benefits. Men enlist for opportunity, not for coercion.

In the Senate, Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, has introduced a bill to establish a special commission to look into the Universal Military Training and Service (Draft) Act to see if it is fulfilling its original purposes and whether it is being administered fairly. He has been joined in cosponsorship by Republican Senators BEALL, of Maryland; SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; KUCHEL, of California; CASE, of New Jersey; and COOPER, of Kentucky; and Democratic Senators BARTLETT, of Alaska; GRUENING, of Alaska; DOUGLAS, of Illinois; NEUBERGER, of Oregon; and MCGOVERN, of South Dakota. Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL of the Armed Services Committee has solicited the views of the executive branch on the Keating bill.

On the House side, a group of Republicans led by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, has prepared a bill to create a special joint committee of Congress to look into the whole problem of military manpower procurement, training, and utilization. This bill would go far beyond the Keating bill in scope.

It is unlikely that politicians will come out for abolishing the draft until all the facts are in. The creation of either an ad hoc joint committee of Congress or a spe-

cial commission with a broad mandate to unearth these facts will be an important step in this direction.

If such a group finds that a professional Army system can be developed at a reasonable cost, the Congress should act promptly to abolish the unfair and ineffective draft system, basically offensive to a free people.

The Importance of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, for 2½ weeks we have been discussing on the floor of the Senate a motion to consider the civil rights bill. As a cosponsor, I am particularly interested in having the bill becoming law.

I ask unanimous consent that three reports supporting this position be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Tribune, Feb. 29, 1964]

RIGHTS BILL MAY PASS WITH THE HELP OF GOD AND SENATORS CLARK AND SCOTT

The U.S. Senate will be the battleground. Combatants will be northern Democrats and Republicans pitted against southern Democrats and Republicans.

At stake will be a strong civil rights bill which, if passed by the Senate, will strike at the core of discrimination, segregation, and prejudice in this so-called land of the free—so-called because 20 million of its citizens have been, and are being, denied the inalienable rights supposedly guaranteed them by the Constitution for the simple reason that their skin is darker than the skin of 170 million other Americans.

Fortunately for freedom fighters and civil rights advocates, however, two formidable champions have been named by the liberal Democratic and Republican leadership to direct the battle for civil rights legislation on the Senate floor. These champions are Pennsylvanians who hail from Philadelphia: JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., Democrat, and HUGH SCOTT, Republican.

Senators CLARK and SCOTT are famous for taking up the cudgel in defense of underdogs. Their record for sponsoring and supporting liberal legislation has won them the praise of Negroes and other minority groups. That they are prepared by training, know-how, and dedication to take on—and best—the "cream" of the southern crop of Senators sworn to defeat civil rights legislation at any and all costs, there are no doubts.

These two gentlemen may differ on matters pertaining to foreign policy and some domestic policies. But they see eye to eye on the issue of civil rights for Negroes—now. They are as vehemently opposed to the anti-Negro antics of the Governor of Mississippi and the Governor of Alabama as they are opposed to the anti-American actions of Khrushchev and Castro.

Passage of the civil rights bill in the Senate will not be easy. It will be a task almost as difficult as cracking a stone wall with a human fist. For there are many tactics southerners intend to use in their efforts to scuttle the bill. Leading the men from below the Mason-Dixon line, and mapping their strategy will be Senators RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia; JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississipip, and ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana.

Still, with the help of God—and JOE CLARK and HUGH SCOTT—there is excellent reason to believe the forces of good will triumph over the reactionaries bent on keeping Negroes mired in the morass of second-class citizenship.

AN EDITORIAL BY DAVID POTTER OVER WNAE RADIO, WARREN, PA., MARCH 15, 1964

This is David Potter, manager of WNAE, editorially speaking. On one of our broadcasts of world news last week, we carried a recorded statement by Senator HUGH SCOTT. In it, the Republican of Pennsylvania set forth in no uncertain terms his stand on the civil rights bill around which battle lines are forming in the U.S. Senate.

I felt that Senator SCOTT's forthright statement should be repeated. He said:

"A filibuster has just closed in around the Senate. The rules which permit unlimited debate will now be abused by those who seek to defeat civil rights legislation. This is the legislation recommended by the late President Kennedy and I am a principal cosponsor. The opponents of this bill can filibuster for weeks or for months. If the Senate goes into 24-hour session, I have in my office a cot, a coffee pot and some canned goods. I'm going to fight the filibuster and at the end of it I'll be on the Senate floor ready to fight for the civil rights bill—for every provision, for every word. This legislation is right and I know it. And let me make a prediction. We're going to pass it."

Politicians are sometimes accused of placing moral grounds last in their considerations of issues. Such is not Senator SCOTT's priority in this vital matter. He has placed moral grounds first and is working for the passage of the bill, not merely waiting to vote for it if it can ever be brought to a vote in the Senate.

You may recall that early in the year one of these editorials was in the form of an open letter to Representative ALBERT JOHNSON soon after he took his oath of office as U.S. Representative from this district. In that letter, Representative JOHNSON was urged to begin his service by supporting the civil rights bill in the House. His response was: "You can state on your broadcast that I intend to vote for a civil rights bill when one finally comes up for a vote in the Congress."

I believe it's important to emphasize that Representative JOHNSON kept that promise. His vote among the "ayes" helped make both personal and legislative history in the House of Representatives.

It's good to know that our new Congressman and Pennsylvania's veteran Senators are in agreement on this critical issue.

This is David Potter editorially speaking.

FROM A PROGRAM PREPARED BY SENATOR SCOTT AND SENATOR ALLOTT FOR USE BY PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, MARCH 15, 1964

SCOTT. Well, as you know, we're right in the middle of a civil rights filibuster. We don't know how long it will last. But I am a cosponsor of the bill. I favor the House bill and there's much speculation as to how long the filibuster will run and whether we have the votes for cloture. How do you feel about this?

ALLOTT. Well, I listened to the majority whip over one of the radio circuits last Sunday night and he said that he didn't think that cloture would be necessary. Now, I think this is completely unrealistic thinking because I believe that eventually, cloture will be necessary. It is this sort of statement, I think, that gives the constant rise to the rumors which you and I hear around here, or the opinions expressed by Members of the Senate that perhaps some sort of a deal has been made on the civil rights, or a compromise of it.

SCOTT. This is what I suspect, too, because cloture, ladies and gentlemen, means shutting off debate. And if the majority whip, Senator HUMPHREY, says you're not going to have to shut off debate, that means that the southern Democrats will stop talking voluntarily. Take it one step further.. They'll only stop talking voluntarily if something has been offered them to weaken the bill, or presumably something else even more valuable may have been offered to them. But these trial balloons that keep coming up from the Senate majority leadership indicating you may not have to have cloture, it seems to me are strong indications that some kind of a deal is afoot and if the deal fails, then you get cloture. If the deal goes through, at some point the southern Democrats, with a gentleman's agreement or understanding, are just going to stop talking. It's never happened before in the history of the Senate, that I remember, that they have stopped.

ALLOTT. I don't recall it either. And, of course, the real burden in this civil rights debate falls upon those of us who are for civil rights—not for those who are carrying the filibuster because they can divide their team up into two men on the floor for every third day and be on the floor for 6 or 8 hours. They can carry that burden quite easily. On the other hand, any time they call for a quorum, we who are in favor of civil rights have to supply 51 percent of the membership to make the quorum.

SCOTT. Yes; and considering that the Republicans are outnumbered 2 to 1, we have to supply a better percentage of the Members to meet the 51, the quorum, than the Democrats do. And this is a burden for 33 Senators who have to be awake and around most of the time for whatever length of time it takes.

ALLOTT. Well, like you, I would say that when the time comes, I am prepared to sign the petition for a cloture when I think adequate time has been had for a discussion of all of the features of this bill. And I am willing to vote for a cloture. But I believe that unless a deal has been made, this is the only way this debate will be terminated.

Results of 1964 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the results of the final tabulation of my 1964 questionnaire.

The questionnaire, which was sent to all boxholders in the Second Congressional District, covers a wide field of subjects ranging from pending domestic issues to international affairs. I feel sure my colleagues will be interested in the response which generally reflects the sound, conservative thinking of the people of western South Dakota whom it is my privilege to represent in Congress.

The results are as follows:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
GENERAL LEGISLATION		
1. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson asked Congress to enact the following programs, while at the same time stressing his drive for economy. Check those you favor.		
(a) Expand area redevelopment program	25	45
(b) Establish a youth employment program	35	38
(c) Liberalize unemployment compensation program	13	62
(d) Extend minimum wage law coverage	30	45
(e) Broaden the food stamp plan	16	55
(f) Provide funds for construction of more libraries	20	55
(g) Expand public housing	15	60
(h) Provide funds for construction of hospitals and nursing homes	31	37
(i) Provide subsidies for mass transit	5	58
FISCAL		
2. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance during peacetime years?	86	3
3. Should planned domestic programs be postponed until there are sufficient revenues to pay for them?	78	7
4. Do you favor a Federal tax reduction at this time?	39	48
5. If there is a Federal tax reduction, should Government spending be curtailed to accommodate it?	80	4
6. Are you in favor of the proposed increases in salaries for Federal workers?	7	76
INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS		
7. Do you believe that foreign aid spending should be—		
(a) Reduced substantially?	82	3
(b) Increased?	3	69
(c) Expanded in Latin America?	18	53
(d) Approved to countries with Communist government?	3	84
(e) Investigated and overhauled from top to bottom?	85	2
8. Should we continue to support the U.N. even though 26 countries are not paying their share of the cost?	40	42
9. Should the United States grant diplomatic recognition to Red China?	5	90
10. Should the President have authority to extend credit to Communist countries?	3	90
AGRICULTURE		
11. Should the United States limit imports of farm commodities that are already in surplus in this country?	92	6
12. Do you favor a voluntary farm program for wheat and feed grain?	73	13
13. Do you favor a farm program with mandatory controls and quotas?	9	81
14. Do you favor a gradual withdrawal by Government from the farm economy?	85	11
15. Will the interests of the rancher best be protected by quotas and tariff on beef similar to those of most other nations?	67	20
CIVIL RIGHTS		
16. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation to—		
(a) Protect the right to vote?	85	6
(b) Enforce school integration?	35	47
(c) Give permanent status to the Civil Rights Commission?	28	41
(d) Use the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution to enforce access to public accommodations?	35	40
(e) Enact a fair employment practices law?	63	21
MEDICARE		
17. Do you believe that medical care for the aged can best be handled by—		
(a) Present Kerr-Mills Act authorizing a Federal-state cooperative program for the medically indigent?	46	33
(b) Voluntary, private medical plan with no Federal involvement?	56	22
(c) Substantially increasing social security taxes to finance a compulsory program, regardless of need?	9	68

Outstanding Military Editor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the RECORD, pages A1049–A1050, March 3, 1964, a statement concerning Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, who recently retired as the military analyst for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I want to take this opportunity to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on February 2, 1964:

PHILLIPS RETIRING FROM POST-DISPATCH

WASHINGTON.—Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army (retired) retired today as military analyst of the Post-Dispatch after more than 12 years on assignment in Washington and in trouble spots in various places of the globe.

Phillips' analytical articles have been widely read in the Pentagon and by top military men in Western capitals. He is rated as one of the two or three most influential military commentators.

When he was a lieutenant colonel in 1941, Phillips received nationwide attention by his articles in the Infantry Journal pointing out the failure of top-ranking Army officers to comprehend the meaning of new weapons such as the tank. His insistent note of warning was compared at that time with the writing of Gen. Charles de Gaulle a year or two before, when the man who was to become the leader of the Free French denounced the defensive maginot line psychology of France's military command.

It was at this time that the late Joseph Pulitzer, Sr., became interested in Phillips. A Post-Dispatch editorial on April 22, 1941, was headed "Colonel Phillips, Patriot and Soldier." This was when a committee of Congress proposed to investigate him for his writings.

"If there is to be a congressional investigation," the editorial said, "It is not Colonel Phillips who should be haled before the questioners. The Army Command, which has been unconscionably slow to develop mechanization, should do the answering."

The editorial concluded, "We need 1,000 Colonel Phillipses."

By his blunt warnings, Phillips offended the Army hierarchy. He was assigned to intelligence in Puerto Rico and in subsequent years failed to receive either the rank or the commands that admirers felt he deserved. After Pearl Harbor, many of his ideas were adopted in a crash basis.

The elder Pulitzer sought out Phillips on his retirement from the Army and retained him as military analyst for the Post-Dispatch. Among his noteworthy assignments were tours of southeast Asia, both in 1954 and 1959, in which he obtained exclusive interviews with Ngo Dinh Diem on the course of the war in South Vietnam; inspection of the Guantanamo Base in Cuba after the missile crisis of October 1962, and coverage of Operation Big Lift in October of last year.

Phillips has reported on many NATO military conferences and has frequently toured European installations of NATO. He has enjoyed the confidence of leading military commanders abroad.

Phillips was chosen in 1956 as one of two correspondents to report for all afternoon newspapers the first hydrogen bomb explosion at the Bikini Atoll. This was the only hydrogen bomb explosion the press has ever been permitted to witness.

The Post-Dispatch military analyst was awarded the Air Force Association certificate of merit for his writings "in behalf of national defense and air power" in 1956.

He is retiring to complete a book on military strategy for the sixties on which he has been at work for some time. Phillips, 72 years old, lives in nearby Chevy Chase, Md.

Dangers of So-Called Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with another outstanding editorial published in the Charleston Evening Post. This editorial is entitled "The Advantaged Need Not Apply," and was printed in the March 20, 1964, issue.

This excellent editorial by the distinguished editor of the Charleston Evening Post, Mr. Robert M. Hitt, Jr., presents further evidence of the very dangerous nature of the pending so-called civil rights legislation, particularly with regard to its FEPC provisions in title VII.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADVANTAGED NEED NOT APPLY

A recent ruling by the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission is enough to raise the hairs on the neck of even the most rabid friend of the administration's civil rights bill.

Not long ago, Leon Myart, a Negro, walked into the office of the Motorola Co. in Chicago and applied for a job. He was advised that he would have to take the standard aptitude test given all job applicants.

He agreed, took the test, flunked and promptly reported the matter to the nearest FEPC office, alleging that Motorola had discriminated against him because of his race. The FEPC assigned Robert E. Bryant, one of its examiners, to the case and endowed him with the approximate authority, if not the approximate wisdom, of Solomon.

This month, Mr. Bryant handed down his ruling: Motorola would have to hire Leon Myart regardless of how poorly he scored on aptitude. Moreover, said Mr. Bryant, Motorola would have to stop giving that aptitude test. The decree was predicated on the following:

First, the test was unfair to "culturally deprived and disadvantaged groups." Second, the questions failed to take into account "inequalities and differences in environment." And finally, the standards for passing were based on those of "advantaged groups."

It failed to occur to Mr. Bryant that the determination of "inequalities" is the only purpose of such testing. It must be supposed that Mr. Bryant would, in his democratic zeal, strike down any test that sorted job applicants according to their various abilities to perform the required work.

Mr. Bryant did not, it is worth remembering, contend that the Motorola test was loaded in such a way as to discriminate against Negroes. His objection was that the test discriminated against the "culturally deprived and disadvantaged," in a word, the unqualified.

This provides a foretaste of what lies in store for the Nation if Congress passes the pending civil rights bill. Title VII of that alarming proposal would establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, with the power to apply a Federal version of the Illinois FEPC law across the land.

The bill states that it "shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to limit, segregate or (note well) classify his employees in any way which would deprive (note well again) or tend to deprive any individual of employment * * * because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."

It if could be shown in a given case that an aptitude test, though nondiscriminatory on its face, had, in fact, acted to deprive Negroes of employment, could it not then be said that such a test "tended to deprive" Negroes of employment?

We think it could be said, and we submit that, as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow, it would be said.

Midwest Should Have More Research Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate on the NASA authorization much was said about the failure of the administration to recognize the Midwest in research and planning. At that time, I expressed briefly my feeling on this matter.

I attach herewith an editorial from the Champaign-Urbana News Gazette, of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., which was dated Monday, March 23, in which it says: "The Midwestern States have been fed largely with 'crumbs' and 'skimmed milk,'" and "the East and the West are getting the contracts with the 'cream.'"

The placing of the Electronics Center yesterday at Boston demonstrates the influence which Boston has presently in Washington. I believe the Midwest, properly alerted to this, can demonstrate at the polls this fall that it is not only entitled to be recognized in this great field, but that it will be. Mr. Speaker, I herewith attach the editorial in full:

MIDWEST SHOULD HAVE MORE RESEARCH PLANTS

The East and West are getting the contracts and the "cream," the Midwest the "crumbs" and "skimmed milk."

This is the policy the Federal Government appears to be pursuing, and has for some time, in the award of defense contracts and research funds.

The falling behind of the Midwestern States on electronics and other kinds of research, noted recently by science educators as well as by political leaders, is blamed to large extent for Washington policies.

The situation has been exposed to light again by a couple of leaders in the U.S. Senate—HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and HART, of Michigan. They observed, at a joint news conference, that there is an overconcentration of defense and research contract allocations to the key centers of the East, and a paucity of them for the States of the Great Lakes region. The Senators want the President and Capitol Hill to work out and agree on a new policy for distributing Federal Government research contracts. With the Federal Establishment a major factor today in big business spread and growth, the Midwest is losing out on much growth to which it is fully entitled—judged by the taxes Midwesterners pay, the region's adequate facilities and logical locale for such plants, availability of manpower, and other factors.

But the Midwest States have been fed largely with "crumbs" and "skimmed milk."

One of the Senators expressed the need and the opportunities this way:

"The new wealth in the world is brainpower. Give the Middle West a chance to cultivate more of it and we'll show some growth, too."

Without a fair shake from Washington, the luster of our star will gradually diminish.

Ad Hoc for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a group calling itself the "Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution" issued a report stating that as a matter of right every American should be guaranteed an adequate income, whether he works or not.

Significantly, some of the members of this so-called committee are Dr. Gerard Murdal, the Spanish Socialist, and Linus Pauling of Sane Nuclear fame.

In its March 25 issue, Roll Call appropriately editorialized on this economic folly:

AD HOC FOR PRESIDENT

A group called the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution has one hell of a kookie name, but they've come up with the most attractive proposal since the repeal of prohibition.

This group of economists and educators has recommended to President Johnson that every American should be guaranteed an adequate income whether he works or not.

Now whoever thought up this new government-type program is the man I predict will be the next President of the United States. And I further predict that the third-term, fourth-term, and fifth-term tradition will be shattered with ease.

Here is a genius who has shunted aside the elementary governmental giveaways where some pays and others gets. Here's a man that wants us to get, period, and I'm with him.

No more worrying over whether we have enough ads to pay the printer and the taxman. No more social security, withholding worries, and the accountant can be dismissed. We'll burn the bills, collect our Government paycheck for not working, and start using up some of our new-found free time. Florida in winter, Lucerne in summer, Paris in the spring.

Sargent Shriver will be out of a job, for poverty will be a thing of the past. Money will be circulating like it's never circulated before, and so will I.

The only writing I'll do will be two things: Make sure to cast my absentee ballot for the unnamed economist who will be perpetual President; and make out a check for a subscription to Roll Call so I can keep up with the idiot who would rather work than live.

Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I am pleased to include a splendid tribute paid our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, by Hon. John E. Powers, president of the Massachusetts State Senate before 1,000 world delegates that attended the 18th Congress of the Junior Chamber International at the International General Assembly Auditorium in Tel Aviv, Israel, on November 23, 1963.

Massachusetts State President John E. Powers for many years was a close and valued friend of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The tribute follows:

Reverend Father, Mr. President, officers, members, my distinguished friend and colleague, Senator Foster and friends,

A great, unexplainable visitation of an inscrutable providence has visited my country personally and the entire world figuratively.

The sudden death of a young, dedicated public servant and statesman, who held the world's most sensitive position, has been the victim of a mad assassin's bullets. The President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has been slain. The world is shocked.

His projection of devotion to a way of life was his philosophy which was attuned to the times. He not only preached a gospel of equal opportunity but he fostered and faced the issue honestly and squarely. This was his credo. This was his uncompromising belief. A vast majority of Americans believe, too, and will rededicate themselves to its complete accomplishment.

At a time like this the whole world needs strength and understanding. This is what

our President gave his life for. To expect less or to do less would make a mockery of his dedicated beliefs. As great a tragedy his passing is it is not the end. Those aims which he sought must be achieved. And so it is with our system of government. As devoted as was he, as pure and sincere as were his motives and objectives, the world must continue.

Our great and sacred Constitution, which has withstood the assaults of time, has bequeathed to the new President Lyndon Johnson a continuing obligation. He is acquainted with the uncompleted job which lies ahead. He knows the American people and their way of life. He, like our late President, is a man of unquestioned principle, substance and accomplishment. He will complete the unfinished business and continue to make even greater gains.

The world needs now, more than at any other time, understanding and compassion. Our great country needs the world as much as the world needs our country. You, members of the Junior Chamber International are opinion makers, men of ideas and ideals. You are recognized leaders and as such your organizational mandate is to lead. Your part therefore, during the transitional period of shock to tranquility and business as usual is extremely vital. Your pledge and mine that the world must be free and peaceful is our committment. To paraphrase our great late President, "It is not what the world can do for us, but rather what we can do for the world."

One hundred years ago, a martyred President and a great fighter for human rights and dignity pledged that country could not survive half slave and half free.

Today we reaffirm our late President's pledge that a world cannot exist half slave and half free. The impact of his beliefs must be reinforced by all of us in not only words, but deeds.

It is ironic that almost 2,000 years ago another great prophet gave His life for the human dignity of man. We gather at this memorial service in the same general area where this event took place. And so be it 2,000 years, 100 years or yesterday, men believed. This belief has been bequeathed to all of us. To their sacrifices we rededicate ourselves that the world of tomorrow will be better because of them.

Allow me to close with the immortal words of Josiah Gilbert Holland "God gave us men. A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and steady hands."

Atomic Reactor: Heart of City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thought it should be brought to the attention of the membership the effort on the part of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] to keep one of the utilities in his city from building an atomic reactor in the heart of New York City.

In order to stop the building of this reactor, he introduced legislation, which is now pending, giving the municipality the right of veto over the building of an atomic reactor in the city.

A committee of citizens, represented by the Astoria-Long Island City Community Council, called on the gentleman from New York, Representative FARBSTEIN, and requested his assistance in this connection. The result of the introduction of the legislation and other public activities on his part caused the public utility to purchase power elsewhere and so make unnecessary the building of the atomic reactor.

Following is a letter received by the gentleman from New York, Congressman FARBSTEIN, from the Astoria-Long Island City Community Council thanking him for his efforts:

ASTORIA-LONG ISLAND CITY
COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Jackson Heights, N.Y., March 17, 1964.

Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: Now that Consolidated Edison has temporarily abandoned its plans for a nuclear powerplant in the heart of New York City, we can all relax for the time being. We of CANPOP in New York City and the Citizens Committee Against Nuclear Power Plants wish to extend our special thanks to you for being one of the few Congressmen in New York City with the foresight and courage to give extensive interest, time, help, and support in the campaign to make New York a safer place to live in.

However, in the light of the circumstances under which Consolidated Edison withdrew its application, your bill giving local authorities the right of ultimate decision on nuclear plants is still urgently needed. The Atomic Energy Commission, in essence, has not yet committed itself regarding nuclear plants in populated centers. The problem can still arise in New York City or in any other population center for that matter, unless some positive direction, such as your bill, is incorporated into law.

Again, we reiterate our thanks to you as one of the few Congressmen to support the campaign of the people of the city of New York and we wish to assure you of our support and assistance in furthering the passage of your bill.

We are spreading the word amongst our friends and supporters, especially those residing in your congressional district, about the important contributions you have made and are making in this fight.

We wish you the best of luck in your current campaign for reelection.

Respectfully yours,

SIMON TROPP, *Chairman.*

Annual Questionaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the best way I know to keep up with the thinking of the people down home is to circulate a questionnaire from time to time and ask them to respond to questions about some of the issues we face in Congress. While the responsibility of casting votes in Congress must be assumed by the Representative, I have found it helpful to know how my constituents feel about some of the more important issues. In addition, I have found that circulation of a questionnaire stimulates thinking and discussion among constituents. This is all to the good because I believe the more the people think about these issues and discuss them with their neighbors the better informed they will become. I have great confidence in the ability of the people I represent to come up with the right decisions if they become acquainted with all of the facts.

This year I am asking my constituents to respond with a yes or no answer to 10 questions. Since many of these questions are difficult to answer categorically, I am providing space on the questionnaire for those who wish to do so to extend their remarks. As soon as the returns are all in, I shall have them tabulated on an IBM machine and will then publish the results. Following are the questions I am asking this year:

1.(a) Do you approve this country selling wheat to Russia?

(b) If you answered yes, would you favor extending credit to Russia to finance such purchases?

2. Would you approve a constitutional amendment making prayer and Bible reading permissible in the public schools when conducted on a voluntary basis?

3. Do you favor the Civil Rights Act now under consideration by Congress?

4. Do you believe private and parochial schools should be included in any programs of Federal aid to education?

5. Would you approve a Federal income tax credit or deduction for all or part of college expenses?

6. If you answered "yes" to question 5 please answer (a) or (b) following and (c) or (d) following:

(a) would you favor a credit against the tax? or

(b) Would you limit it to a deduction?

(c) Would you limit it (credit or deduction) to a taxpayer who pays college expenses of a dependent? or

(d) Would you extend it (credit or deduction) to a taxpayer who pays college expenses of a student who is not a dependent?

7. The national debt of the United States is now approximately $310 billion. Under existing circumstances, do you favor increasing Federal spending above current levels even if it requires additional borrowing?

8. Do you favor a pay raise for Government employees—including Cabinet officers and executive officials, Federal judges, and Members of Congress?

9. Do you believe our Government should agree to renegotiate the Panama Canal Treaty?

10. On the whole, do you think this country's foreign policy is succeeding?

Pakistan's Flirtation With Peiping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, one of the nations allied with the United States in the Far East, Pakistan, has been conducting itself in disquieting fashion toward the most arrogant and abusive member of the Communist bloc, Red China. I want to call the attention of my colleagues, therefore,

to an excellent article by Mr. D. G. Savarkar, outlining the rationale behind Pakistan's latest overtures to the Communist Chinese, and indicating quite clearly the dangers both for Pakistan and the free world.

Mr. Savarkar, a native of India, is a journalist who has been living in the United States for the past 10 years. Before leaving India, he was the editor of three Bombay daily newspapers. His articles are circulated and read widely throughout the world, particularly among the uncommitted nations. Mr. Savarkar brings to his work a full knowledge of the subject matter and an insight into an area of the world which many of us may otherwise puzzle over. He writes, as well, with a dedication to the principles of democracy and with an antipathy to the new Communist imperialism which seeks to dominate the world.

The article follows:

PAKISTAN'S FLIRTATION WITH PEIPING

(By D. G. Savarkar)

President Ayub Khan of Pakistan, welcoming Mr. Chou en-Lai, the Premier of Communist China, to his country emphasized that "no sinister importance" should be attached to the visit of this friendly neighbor. This theme of diplomatic business as usual was played again by the Pakistani Foreign Minister, Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, who told a news conference that his Chinese guests were only on a "good will visit from a neighboring country to which no significance should be attached."

In reality, the much-heralded visit of the Chinese Communist leaders to Pakistan is one of the strangest spectacles the world of international diplomacy has witnessed in the last 15 years. For no nation in Asia has been more closely tied to the West through military alliances and massive economic and military aid than the country Field Marshal Ayub Khan has ruled for the last 5 years.

PAKISTAN'S COLD WAR INVOLVEMENT

For years, Pakistan had been perhaps the Asian nation most closely involved in the power politics of the cold war. In the middle 1950's, this nation of nearly 100 million people had joined both the Baghdad Pact (now the Central Treaty Organization) and the South East Asia Treaty Organization. President Ayub Khan at that time had little use for the nonalinement policies of the other Asian-African countries. In a visit to Washington in the summer of 1961, he had insisted that Pakistanis were the most loyal and dependable of all of Washington's allies in Asia—"The only people who will stand by you are the people of Pakistan."

Now, all of this has been turned topsy-turvey. Rawalpindi and Peiping have concluded a border treaty with the Communist Chinese government, as well as key agreements for trade relations and air travel between the two countries. During Mr. Chou's visit in February, his host officially voiced support of Peiping's demand for admission to the United Nations.

BACKGROUND OF REALPOLITIK

What is behind this flirtation of America's "most allied ally" in Asia with Peiping—the West's most implacable opponent? The background of this latest move of Pakistan in Realpolitik is a complex one. Ironically, this move by Pakistan to "normalize" its relations with Peiping is motivated by much the same reasons which led it to form close ties with the West in the first place. This is its pathological fear of India and its implacable determination to surpass that country in military strength. It saw its support of Washington's mutual security arrangements in Asia—CENTO and SEATO—as a means of obtaining massive military and economic aid. Today, while it hypocritically betrays all of its formal ties to the West, Pakistan is continuing to receive some half billion dollars a year in the U.S. aid. In this way, Ayub Khan hopes to boost Pakistan's strength to the point where it could impose its will on India by military force.

Even while alining itself with the West, however, Rawalpindi kept open lines of access to the other side. Chou En-lai had been clamorously received in East Pakistan in 1956 when he was awarded an honorary degree in Dacca. A. H. Suhrawardy, then Pakistani Foreign Minister, had been received with great cordiality in Peiping. All during this time, the Pakistani government cynically used its strategic position astride the Himalayas in Asia to extract more and more arms from Washington.

Then, in 1962, with the Chinese assault on India's northern border, U.S. military aid was for the first time extended to India also. Pakistan was enraged. When its demands that the supply of defensive arms to its neighbor be immediately curtailed were rejected by Washington, it decided to "play both sides against the middle" and developed the dramatic strategy of blackmailing the West by its sudden friendship for Peking.

RESPONSES OF INDIA AND UNITED STATES

India's reaction to this warming of its neighbor's relations with China has been restrained. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister Nehru's closest associate in foreign policy affairs, has cautioned Indians against taking an alarmist view. "We have to be watchful and be strong enough to meet any situation." At the same time, Mr. Nehru has reiterated his acceptance of the Colombo proposals, advanced in December 1962, by six nonalined countries, as a basis for the resolution of the Sino-Indian border dispute.

American responses have been more heated. The press has criticized Ayub Khan severely for his attempted blackmail. While some Senators insist on rationalizing away the conduct of their "closest ally" in Asia, others are examining Pakistan's conduct with great realism. Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon has accused Rawalpindi of basic insincerity in its foreign policy. According to him, Pakistan joined SEATO and CENTO for "one purpose only—to get military aid from the United States that would build her forces against her one avowed enemy—India." Disappointed though it is, Washington is continuing its annual $50 to $60 million military aid to Pakistan and hoping for the best.

SELF-DEFEATING FOR PAKISTAN

Although Pakistan as a sovereign nation has the right to follow whatever policies it chooses to, this latest turn toward Communist China not only betrays the interests of its allies, but it is self-defeating from Pakistan's own point of view. The only power in Asia that has shown grave signs of expansionism towards the entire region is Communist China. It has threatened Formosa and South Korea time and again with force. It foments civil strife in South Vietnam. It has brutally suppressed Tibet and launched an unprovoked assault on India. If China were strong enough, it would clearly attempt the domination of all Southeast Asia, and if it were successful, Pakistan would lose its freedom along with its neighbors.

India plays a crucial role in China's plans for domination, for it is the largest and the most stable democracy in the area. If it falls before China's onslaught, the future of democracy in all of Sotheast Asia is doomed. The Americans too should realize that if India falls, Washington's attempt to stem the Communist tide in Vietnam will have no meaning and the entire position of the United States in Asia will be lost. Pakistan's flirtation with Peping even harms those in the Soviet bloc who hope to turn the cold war into a struggle between peaceful competitors.

AFRICA'S MODEL OF MATURITY

The young African nations have provided Pakistan with a good model in their attitude towards China, by granting it diplomatic recognition but avoiding dangerous political entanglement. President Ayub Khan should follow their example and abandon his policy of diplomatic blackmail—motivated solely by his hatred for India—before it damages Pakistan's own interests, as well as those of the West and the other free nations in the East.

Morality Versus Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to all Members of Congress the following article from the Los Angeles Times of March 22, 1964, written by Charles E. Davis, Jr., "Morality Versus Money." There is a close tie between the moral code of the Hollywood, Calif., movie industry and the morality of the country. As we all know, films have a definite influence on the moral standards of the country. Many countries of the world have government censorship over their movie industry in order to maintain a proper moral standard. Only four countries do not have government censorship, the United States, Great Britain, Germany and Japan. I recommend the following article for each Member's reading for each to learn of the voluntary efforts on the part of our domestic movie industry to assert and maintain an appropriate code of ethics in movies for the American people. I hope these efforts will be continued with even greater success in the future so that the American movie can remain the enjoyable and proper media of entertainment it has been in the past.

The article follows:

MORALITY VERSUS MONEY: FILMS HEAL DOLLAR WOUND WITH PROTECTIVE UNDRESSING

(By Charles E. Davis, Jr.)

Seduction used to be something you did not fool around with in Hollywood movies and nudity in pictures was as unexpected as profanity from the parson.

But times have changed.

In some of the movies Hollywood makes today you can see nearly nude women and you can be escorted through sex labyrinths that were taboo a generation ago.

You will hear arguments from some that these are symptoms of a new maturity in Hollywood—a maturity that made it possible for the movie industry to stay afloat financially.

Others insist that Hollywood is pouring out a torrent of filth and corrupting America's youth.

Who decides what can be seen?

The movie industry here censors its own product through the Hollywood Production Code. The United States, Great Britain, Germany, and Japan are the only four

major nations of the world that do not have Government-operated censor boards.

Geoffrey M. Shurlock has been administrator of the Hollywood code since 1947 and he readily admits that the code has been softened over the years.

"The movies merely reflect the general change in public taste," he said. "Newspapers, magazines, and books have changed in their content, too. Actually, movies are copycats. They change after everything else has changed."

WOULDN'T HAVE SURVIVED

"And they had to change," said Shurlock. "The movie industry would not have survived under the old system."

What was the old system? It was something like the automobile maufacturers in Detroit and their dealerships throughout the country. A company owned a studio in Hollywood and a chain of theaters. It produced about 50 movies a year at its studio so it could keep its theaters stocked.

Most of these movies were trite, innocuous things quickly forgotten. But that was the system.

LOST THEATER CHAINS

"The average family would go to the movies 1 night a week," said Shurlock, "regardless of what was showing."

Then the motion picture industry suffered a deadly one-two economic punch.

The Government's trustbusters cracked down on the movie companies. They were required to divorce their theater chains from the studios.

And a new competitor—television—moved into the American home.

Obviously, the public wouldn't pay to see ordinary movies when it could get free entertainment on the TV tube at home.

Today, a Hollywood studio that used to produce a quota of 50 pictures a year will turn out about 12 to 20 films—but they are much better pictures, Shurlock believes.

"TV," says Shurlock, "has taken over what was the stock-in-trade of the old Hollywood B picture. TV now shows the gangster pictures, the routine westerns, the family situation comedies.

"Hollywood hasn't made a gangster picture since "Johnny Cool," and that was a year and a half ago.

"And we won't make pictures like the Judge Hardy series again. How could we when TV gives the public 'Ozzie and Harriet' and similar series at no charge?"

Hollywood has found that it can make good money with the new sophisticated approach. Trade publications cite figures that show they pay big returns at the box office.

And some say this means the industry has found the way again to financial security.

CODE RELAXED

But as Hollywood turned to pictures of greater sophistication with themes that explored alcoholism, narcotics addiction, nymphomania and case histories from Krafft-Ebing, there necessarily had to be greater freedom in the production code.

A scene in "The Carpetbaggers" will show actress Carol Baker partially nude. Shurlock concedes that this scene would not have been permissible 20 years ago.

Shurlock was told that in a recent magazine interview director Otto Preminger stated:

"There is just as much nudity in our films as in Europe. Take Irma La Douce. In the American code, nudity is concentrated on the cleavage. You can only see so much cleavage. So Billy Wilder turned the woman around and gave you a completely naked back."

Shurlock chuckled.

"The New York Times," he replied, "publishes panty ads that show the model naked from the waist up—from the back, of course."

OUTSPOKEN CRITIC

Actress Maureen O'Hara is one of the most outspoken foes of the pictures that show nudity and sexual misbehavior.

"Don't call them adult pictures," she said, her eyes flashing storm signals. "They're not grown up.

"If the public would boycott such movies there would not be the filth you see today on the screen."

But Miss O'Hara admits dolefully that some clubwomen who give lipservice to attacks on smutty movies are the first ones to line up outside the theater showing such a picture.

The red-haired actress said she turned down a script last summer because it contained scenes that dealt with nudity and perversion.

"I thank God I was in a position to turn down the job," she said, "but what about the young actors and actresses who have to take any work they can get to pay the rent and the grocery bills? What can they do?

"Why must everything be so distasteful? In the script I turned down the story could have been magnificently told without the scenes I found objectionable.

"Pictures about wholesome subjects still make money. I was in Walt Disney's 'Parent Trap.' It made a lot of money. It was an honest portrayal of family life."

STILL CAN'T COMPETE

On the other hand, Screenwriter Sydney Boehm, now preparing the screenplay for "Sylvia" at Paramount, believes that while Hollywood has reached the point where it is now making some fine adult pictures, it still cannot compete with foreign-made films in sex freedom.

"I would say that 'Love With a Proper Stranger' is a good example of the fine adult pictures we are making in this country," said Boehm, "but if audiences want pure sex and smut, we can't begin to compete with Europe and Japan.

"Take 'Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow,' the Italian film with Sophia Loren and Marcello Mastroianni. It's a delightful thing but we couldn't make that picture in this country in a million years. It makes fun of pregnancy.

"'Room at the Top' and 'Tom Jones' wouldn't get made in Hollywood either."

Why not?

For one thing, says Boehm, Hollywood moviemakers live in dreadful fear of the Legion of Decency, the censorship arm of the Catholic Church.

Are some of these pictures corrupting our young people?

"I don't know if their minds suffer any more because of these pictures," said Boehm, "than they do from reading about the activities of Bobby Baker and examining the girlie magazines."

IF IT'S CALLED FOR

Speaking from the director's standpoint, King Vidor has a simple solution for sex in movies.

"If the situation calls for it," he says, "I go all our for it."

He recalls with a pale smile how Louis Mayer one day assembled all his producers and directors at Metro and ran off a scene in which John Gilbert kissed the hand of Aileen Pringle and then moved his lips up her arm in a long, burning caress.

"This," Mayer lectured, "is one of the reasons the Hays office was formed."

The scene was from one of Vidor's pictures.

Hollywood's attempts to regulate its product and create a better public image followed an era in which the industry was shaken by several scandals.

Comedian Roscoe (Fatty) Arbuckle, who was making $6,000 a week, was banished from the screen after actress Virginia Rappe died mysteriously during a drunken party in Arbuckle's San Francisco hotel suite.

The careers of two prominent actresses of the day were blighted by the murder in 1922 of Director William Desmond Taylor.

The public condemned its idols then much quicker than it does today.

And when the production code was put into operation in the early 1930's, it was much more puritanical than now.

COULDN'T USE IT

When David Selznick was making "Gone With the Wind," with Clark Gable as Rhett Butler and Vivian Leigh as Scarlett O'Hara, he asked the code administrator's office to approve a scene in which Gable says to Miss Leigh, "Frankly, Scarlett, I don't give a damn."

He was told he couldn't use the word "damn."

Selznick flew to New York to appeal the ruling to the heads of the motion picture companies. They OK'd the line.

"That was 1939," says Shurlock, "and this is 1964."

Shurlock dispelled one myth that has long persisted among even veteran Hollywood movie people and that is that there was ever a code restriction against showing a married couple in bed.

It was the British who objected. But they don't anymore. And movie twin beds are rapidly going out of style.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that we pause a moment to commemorate Byelorussian Independence Day. If we believe in freedom, we should carry its promise to all parts of the world. On their 46th anniversary, Byelorussians are laboring under the same tyranny which communism strives to bring to the whole world. Perhaps our words here will encourage the Byelorussian people to continue their resistance to that tyranny.

Byelorussia was a leader in the wave of revolution that swept Russian imperialism out of most of East Europe in 1918, and the first to bear the full brunt of Bolshevik savagery. Its geographic position alone enabled communism to triumph over freedom. The Byelorussians, could they speak freely today, would tell you that communism is indistinguishable from old Russian imperialism. They suffer just as much.

Byelorussia has every right to liberty and the pursuit of its own path to happiness, which is denied by Russia. The Byelorussian people provide the world with a living refutation of the false promise carried by communism to the great proportion of mankind which now struggles to cast off the lingering chains of imperialism. Our celebration of Byelorussian independence is not sufficient when the Byelorussian people themselves cannot celebrate. Let us hope that every year Byelorussian courage and love of freedom increases, so that soon our fellow men in Byelorussia will be able to rejoin the great and growing family of freemen.

Linda O'Neill Wins Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the speech of Miss Jacqueline Linda O'Neill of my district which won the Voice of Democracy prize for the State of Maryland. The Voice of Democracy contest is conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and each year draws forth from over 250,000 high school students their best ideas on the great Nation in which we live. I believe that Miss O'Neill's talk, entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship" is a noble expression of the responsibilities and adventures awaiting the citizen of tomorrow in a great and free nation such as ours.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Jacqueline Linda O'Neill)

I am an American. This citizenship was my automatic heritage given to me in birthright and I given to it in right of birth. I perhaps like some of you tend to forget that it is indeed the greatest gift that life can offer. We grasp at the privileges of citizenship, we hover in its protection, and we benefit from its blessings of liberty. Do we not owe something for this? Can we forget the duties of God and man, of our consciences and our hearts, of freedom and its products, and most of all of America and the land we love? We must answer the challenge that says it is not enough to have a conscience but that we must be conscious. We must answer the challenge that says it is not enough to have freedom but we must have the free will to give of ourselves to protect it. We must answer the challenge that says it is not enough to endeavor for oneself but we must endeavor for humanity.

When I look down at my hands I see that they are young and smooth for life has been easy upon them. I am not in Saigon, Vietnam, where perhaps they would have been crushed had I raised them to cross the border. I am not in Cuba where my hands would be forced to salute a new liberty-destroying regime. I am not in Russia where my hands would belong to the state. These are my hands, my American hands, to do with as I please, to create or shape as my will dictates. These are my hands that may be folded in prayer, that may be upraised to swear to my country that I will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help me God. These are my hands that may grasp the ring of the merry-go-round of free enterprise and make life what life should be made. My hands give and they take, they ignore and they hold materials by which to learn. These are my hands that must be opened to the world that must give to democracy the use of the hands democracy gave to me. Robert Frost expressed a belief, a belief for life that should be the cry of every dutybound citizen:

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep."

Citizenship then is yet the unfulfilled challenge. We have the power to help ourselves and others yet we live in a self-centered shell all our own. We must strive to protect our citizenship by giving of it to others. Be it futile, be it sacrificial, be it ungratifying, will our hearts, our heritage, and our Americanism let us go free from the task? God help us if we call ourselves Americans and forget "with liberty and justice for all." For all.

Henry David Thoreau, in his "Plea for John Brown" said "in order to die you must first have lived." Are we ready to live, not just exist, but live? Living and giving are this closely related. Our country has lived because of its givers, its John Paul Joneses, Abe Lincolns, and its John F. Kennedys. Their spirits will never die, for these men truly lived. This is our challenge as Americans, as human beings, and as free-thinking citizens of the world.

Ring, ring loud our liberty bell,
That we may hear our call,
Sing, sing out America's song of the flag that would not fall,
Read, read clear our Declaration that scorns at tyranny,
And heed, heed well, those ideas that our eyes must be made to see.
Let everyone give of himself to protect the liberty we owe,
To help to keep our citizenship a burning flame to glow,
In every heart throughout our world and everybody bring,
The freedom God has blessed us with and meant for everything.
And in our hearts remember those citizens now dead,
And let us never, ever forget, the words that we have said,
For all the sights that through His eyes we must learn to face,
Never let us turn our heads in selfish mandisgrace.
And for our goals before us set an inspiring ideal or two,
That what is here where duty lies, we be brave enough to do.
Let us remember that as free-thinking men,
We owe this world an awful lot, we were born American.

Urban Renewal in Cleveland, Another Example of Commercial Redevelopment Taking Priority over Housing Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to call the attention of the House to another example of problems which have been developing in the urban renewal program, this time in Cleveland, Ohio. A good deal has been said about the commercial redevelopment project known as Erieview in that city, but little has been noted of the collapse of another project in the East Woodland area originally designed for housing. After 8 years, the city redevelopment people have now decided to change their plans and use the area for light industry.

This decision has been reached after the demolition of 100 of 126 buildings bought with Federal and city urban renewal funds amounting to roughly $2 million. After chasing industry from the area to make room for housing, and after encouraging 50 homeowners, now in the path of the bulldozer, to rehabilitate their homes, the redevelopment people have changed their minds. An editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 6, 1964, notes that back in 1954 the Federal Housing Administration declined to insure a mortgage in the project on the grounds that the area was not suitable for housing. Since the land has been already nearly cleared, and homes rehabilitated, however, it is obvious that residential housing in this area is not totally out of the question.

According to the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 4, 1964, the city is still buying the few remaining commercial properties and businesses in the area, although they intend to move business back into the area. Why this continued cost which the American taxpayer must continue to share goes on is only one of the question that can be raised. Another might well be, who do the redevelopment officials expect to go back into the area? And, why could no one be found in 8 years to carry out the original housing plan?

According to the newspaper reports, businesses that have remained in the area do not feel that they are being paid the actual costs of relocation, particularly in light of the fact that they have been on the verge of moving since 1957. The Woodland project appears to be a perfect example not only of the increased priority being given to commercial redevelopment at the expense of housing needs, but another case in which the need for full compensation has not been met. I would point out again, the Republican minority bill, H.R. 9771, would give priority to housing needs, provide relocation assistance to businesses as well as families and individuals, and come as close as possible to the goal of full compensation for the damage suffered by tenants and owners alike.

There is one thing that legislation probably cannot do, however, and that is to see that projects once started are carried out promptly, and to see that project goals chosen for a particular city are realistic. The question of 8 years of delay, and the question of changing horses and directions in midstream are the responsibility of the urban renewal authorities, both at the local and at the Federal levels. I would frankly like to know why the city of Cleveland's workable program has continued to be approved, each year, and why additional projects particularly of a commercial redevelopment nature have been sanctioned when it should have been obvious that the city was not completing its obligations on the Woodland project. I cannot help but wonder whether the glamorous Erieview project was started to paper over the cracks in previous urban renewal ventures and turn attention elsewhere.

Earlier this month, I called attention to citizen unrest in a project area in Pittsburgh. Since that time, according to the Pittsburgh Press of March 17, 1964, the White House has reacted and a review of the situation is underway. I would only hope that the Urban Renewal Administration will act on its own to review the Cleveland situation.

The article and editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer follow:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 4, 1964]

RENEWAL LEADERS CONFUSED, SAYS WOODLAND BUSINESSMAN

(By Eugene Segal)

"Those people in urban renewal—I don't think they know what they're doing," said Louis Straus, president of the Pressman Straus Bag Co., 7400 Woodland Avenue SE., in the East Woodland urban renewal area.

Straus was talking about the city's confusing proposal to redevelop East Woodland for use by light industry after forcing industry to move from the area.

East Woodland extends eastward from East 71st Street to the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks and from Platt Avenue SE. southward to the Nickel Plate Road tracks.

Last month it was disclosed that the city was preparing to change the East Woodland plan. Its intentions had been to develop the area for housing. Some 126 buildings had been bought at a cost of around $2 million and 100 of them demolished.

Owners of 50 East Woodland homes were told they would be allowed to remain if they would rehabilitate their properties.

Then, after 8 years, the city decided the area was not suitable for housing, after all, and should be used for light industry. This was confusing to those 50 homeowners, who now were told that their houses would be bought and torn down, even though a number of them had spent substantial sums of money for rehabilitation.

Now the second bit of confusing information comes to light. It turns out that the city has bought virtually all of the buildings occupied by the area's major industries and these companies have moved or are getting ready to move.

After driving industry out of the area, the city now apparently will encourage industry to come back in when the East Woodland plan is changed.

The Pressman Straus Bag Co., which has been on Woodland 30 years, will move next week to a building it bought at 6110 Grant Avenue SE., with the $100,000 it got for the building it presently occupies.

The Empire Varnish Co. bought a paint company at 9808 Meech Avenue SE., built an addition to the plant and will finish moving Thursday. Its old plant is at 2634 East 76th Street. It was paid $275,000 for the plant.

"We believe that on an equitable basis we should have gotten 30 to 40 percent more," said R. L. Hawkins, the company's chairman and chief executive officer. "But starting in 1956 or 1957, the urban renewal department told us definitely we'd have to be out in 6 months. Every year they'd repeat the same story.

"We didn't know what to do. And because they had designated this a renewal area, the neighborhood was rapidly deteriorating. So we decided to take what we could when we could get it. You start dealing with Government and it's like molasses in January."

Hawkins said there is an incalculable loss in every company move from one location to another—a loss that is not compensated by money received for a building—"because the people who should be spending their time promoting the business are fiddling around with moving."

The city is still buying East Woodland industrial plants. Before council, for example, is legislation authorizing the payment of $100,000 to the Suid-Wahl Lumber & Roofing Co., for its property at 7102 Woodland.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 6, 1964]

URBAN RENEWAL FOLLIES

The city's about-face policy on the East Woodland urban renewal area points up the risks of imprudent urban renewal planning.

After forcing industry to move from the area preparatory to creating an urban renewal housing development there, the city reversed itself and decided that the land is best suited to light industry after all.

The decision was reached after 126 buildings had been bought with about $2 million in Federal and city urban renewal funds, and after 100 of the buildings had been demolished. Fifty homeowners who rehabilitated their homes at considerable expense on the promise that they could remain in the area now have been told that their homes will be bought and torn down.

Urban Renewal Commissioner J. B. Williams on February 15 gave as the reason for the switch in plans: "Considering the Woodland Cemetery and the railroad tracks on the boundaries (of the area), and other environment factors, we do not believe the area is desirable for residential purposes."

This should have been apparent as early as January 1954, when the Federal Housing Administration declined to insure a mortgage for construction of housing on the old workhouse site at East 79th Street and Woodland Avenue, later incorporated into the East Woodland urban renewal area. The FHA ruled that the area was not suitable for housing.

If city officials had been more careful in evaluating development possibilities of the area, an incident that casts doubt on the soundness of their planning would have been averted.

The experience provides a bitter lesson, one that should be remembered vividly.

An Action Program for Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an outline for conversion to peacetime economy, as presented by Prof. John E. Ullmann, of Hofstra University, which is located on Long Island.

Legislation has already been introduced in the Congress in line with our efforts to convert from a defense economy to a peacetime economy, and the President has already set up its intergovernmental committee on such problems.

It is my belief that such an outline might be helpful to those who will be concerned with conversion problems, and I am positive that we in this country will be able to meet the challenge.

The outline follows:

AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR CONVERSION

(By John E. Ullman, professor and chairman, Management-Marketing and Business Statistics, Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y.)

The defense industry of Long Island has not thus far taken significant steps to insure an orderly conversion to nondefense programs. It is mainly concerned with getting new business in its traditional lines. While the industry is undoubtedly competent to do this, the prospects of maintaining present levels of business or increasing Long Island's share of the defense business available must be weighed against the following facts:

1. There has already been a substantial decline in the industry and several firms expect this to continue. Five large firms on Long Island that employed 39,000 workers a year ago, had only 30,000 at the beginning of 1964. This is a national trend. Nineteen large firms in the defense business have laid off 67,000 employees within the last 6 months.

2. The defense budget is expected to decline. Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric, writing in Foreign Affairs, spring 1964, predicts a budget no greater than $38.5 billion by 1970 even without a disarmament agreement. This cut is feasible because of the existence of overkill.

The planning process requires initiatives and changes from all levels, from the individual firm to the Federal Government. Many of these are interrelated.

I. THE FIRM

(a) Acceptance of the need for change: Many managers of defense firms still appear to have difficulty in believing that their market is likely to decline. In part, this reluctance is political. Many Americans have come to accept a theory of "protracted conflict" with the Communists and have associated this with a continuous and rapid piling up of weapons by our side. Such a philosophy fails to take into account the present splits in the two blocs, the saturation in weaponry and the importance of political and economical initiatives as distinct from a military emphasis in policy formulation.

Further, of all the groups potentially affected by conversion, the managers are probably the most highly specialized and might find it difficult as individuals to attain the same sort of prominence in nondefense industry. The opinion has also been expressed by some executives in this area, that the defense industry may well have to be treated as an expended war tool to be decommissioned in the same way as an old battleship.

This view, of course, entirely fails to take into account the impact which such a policy would have on the local communities. Accordingly, managements have to be strongly encouraged to plan conversion in three ways: by the collective bargaining process, by community action, and by legislation.

(b) Plant conversion committees: It is proposed that every firm predominately engaged in defense work be required to set up a conversion committee as part of its contract with its employees. Such a committee should at least contain representatives of management and unions and preferably also community leaders and others with competence in the field.

Such a committee is now the only meaningful way of assuring job security, and a labor organization that refuses to recognize this is not doing an adequate job for its members. Such a committee should concern itself with four principal tasks:

(i) The identification of possible new products.

(ii) An inventory of present and previous skills at all levels of employees and of plant capacity.

(iii) It should assure a sufficient supply of research funds and diversion of research talent to put meaning behind the conversion effort.

(iv) Since most of the possible new markets for which the defense firms are suitable, structurally and otherwise require Government action, the committee should formulate and carry through the local, legislative, and other actions to carry out the job. Securing research funds for conversion from the Government might be an immediate task.

It may be a new approach to have decisions on choices of product made as part of the collective bargaining process. However, unions in defense plants have repeatedly extolled the quality of the weapons produced, as part of their efforts to help management get more defense business. This type of activity must now be extended to conversion.

The firms involved may, in fact, be considered as extensions of the Government rather than private enterprise in the usual sense. Under private enterprise a firm decides what to manufacture, how to do it, in what quantities, and at what price. By these criteria, the firms concerned hardly qualify. There should, therefore, be no objection on the part of either labor or management to ask, as it were, for new instructions from governments—Federal, State, and local.

2. LOCAL ACTIVITIES

(a) Better transportation to New York: Long Island is fortunate in having the strong New York economy to fall back on. To make full use of this advantage, we need better transportation to the city. The transportation plans of the Nassau County Planning Commission deserve to be reconsidered thoroughly without the hysteria that has largely vitiated the sound proposals of this bipartisan county authority.

(b) Establishing an airport: Serious consideration should be given to establishing an airport in Nassau County at the site of the present private airport of Republic Aviation Corp. The New York metropolitan area is scheduled to get a further airport before the end of the decade. The sites thus far proposed in northwestern New Jersey and Orange County, N.Y., are too far and too inaccessible from New York. Here on Long Island, we have a local travel market based on a population more than twice the size of Pittsburgh. We have a large reservoir of aircraft workers able to maintain and service aircraft and we have sites already accessible to New York City by rail, in coordination with the plans discussed under (a) above.

(c) Developing the sea: It is proposed that Long Island make much greater use of its location near the ocean by establishing research centers in oceanography—especially with respect to marine ecology. Sea water desalination should form an essential part of this. Although there are now no large shops in Nassau and Suffolk able to handle the heavy platework associated with such projects, the Brooklyn Navy Yard has some ready equipment which would, however, probably require modernization.

(d) Medical electronics: It has been suggested that a federally supported research center in medical electronics be set up in Long Island. This suggestion has a great deal of merit and even in the absence of large institutions for medical research in Nassau and Suffolk, could be integrated with the extensive activities in the field in New York.

(e) Support by the rest of the business community: The support of the business community must be strongly solicited. Department stores, other merchants, shopping centers, banks, especially those with heavy mortgage holdings in the area, and other business groups cannot be indifferent to the fate of a large section of its best paid customers. A general fall in income such as would be the result of a shift into lower paid service industries would have a disastrous effect on retail trade and soon on the service industries themselves and would thus rapidly produce a spiraling local depression.

(f) Inventory of training facilities: Once the necessary decisions on new products have been made and the necessary government initiatives taken, it is likely that a large amount of retraining will be necessary. If this is the case, the community must be ready. An inventory of retraining facilities that could aid those within the defense firms, is thus essential.

3. INITIATIVES AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL

(a) Support of the McGovern bill: The McGovern bill, S. 2274, provides for a Federal Conversion Commission at cabinet level and for the encouragement of State and local conversion efforts. It also requires all contractors to have a bona fide reconversion effort of their own.

(b) Long-range public budgets: It is essential that at all appropriate levels, capital expenditures in public budgets be separated from current ones and that capital outlays be budgeted over a long period. In this way, meaningful long-range plans may be made by the firms themselves.

(c) State conversion, etc: Efforts are now afoot at the State and local level to have extensive conversion efforts underway even before the McGovern bill becomes law. Senator Harrison J. Williams of New Jersey has called for such an effort in his own State and a similar plea has been made by the union leaders of Long Island in their visit to President Johnson. Such efforts are most important because whatever areas are quickest to act will inevitably find their transition much easier than those which delay.

(d) Higher unemployment benefits: Higher unemployment benefits will have to be a necessary accompaniment of a conversion effort. It takes 2 years to convert from one product to another even under favorable conditions. If meaningful conversion plans had been made 3 or 4 years ago, we would not now have this problem. However, such problems were strongly resisted at the time by Government, business, and labor groups. Indeed, many of them have not seen the light even now.

4. GENERAL POLITICAL INITIATIVES

It would be a national disaster if conversion were to be accompanied by the politics of frustration. We may expect that any difficulties will be strongly exploited by the "dispossessed" among the military, business, and labor organizations. Such activities must not lead to belligerence and hysteria in international affairs. We must be particularly on the lookout against unauthorized activities by local military personnel designed to compromise the present relative calm. For example, the American-led raid on a Cambodian village on March 20 led to increased tensions in that sensitive area. We have a right to know how such an action came about and we have a duty to prevent the recurrence of such activities.

We are now facing one of the most crucial challenges in our national history though in some respects it is the noblest one we have ever had. Our ability to deal with the conversion problem will do more to promote world peace than anything else that we could ever undertake. There is no more important national activity today.

Labeling of Foreign Made Motion Pictures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Subcommittee on Finance and Commerce of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the announcement by Chairman STAGGERS, of the subcommittee, that hearings will commence following the Easter recess on legislation requiring the labeling of foreign made motion pictures exhibited in the United States. I feel that this is an important area for the Congress to look into for all of the country, and particularly for my State, California, since the motion picture industry has been one of the major factors for the affluence of the southern California community.

The legislation to stop the showing or advertising of foreign-made films without revealing to the public the names of the countries where they are produced has been supported by the Committee to Promote American Made Motion Pictures of men employed in the Los Angeles studios and by religious and youth groups critical of the low standards of pictures produced outside the country.

The climate for the passage of my legislation or that of Congressman CECIL KING which would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to halt the showing or advertising of foreign films without proper identification has never been better. For the first time we shall present a united front to the lawmakers asking their protection from low-grade pictures made where labor is cheap and taste is low or vulgar.

It is most heartening to find the Tidings, a weekly newspaper published in Los Angeles under the sponsorship of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, bringing to the attention of the faithful the fact that Red propaganda in movies is advancing on another front and that it is a Communist boast that Yugoslavia will soon be the motion picture capital of the world.

Tito is reported to offer free sound stages, free sets, free technicians, free back lot facilities. And American-made motion pictures must compete with this "free" business, under existing law.

Today four current movies are selling the communist line that nuclear war is so terrible the United States should appease, retreat or surrender

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I know the United States has no reason to fear any nation or combination of nations in the world today. I am extremely grateful for the exposé of the subversive situation in the Tidings.

Another factor in the more favorable climate for protection of the Hollywood industry, is the demise of a labor-management committee in the industry which suddenly shifted its position with respect to elimination or reduction of foreign film subsidies.

This means that the men working in the industry in Hollywood will no longer have to fight their associates who seek other means of reducing the foreign threat and that the industry can go forward together in support of legislation which will expose the evil and brand all movies with their country of origin.

Philosophy of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column by Walter

Lippmann which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. Lippmann points to the central problem of foreign aid today—this is the problem of finding ways to transfer capital from the rich nations to the underdeveloped countries of the world. This is not a new problem nor an easy one to solve. The United States faced this same problem 150 years ago. Great amounts of European capital were needed to finance our great agricultural and industrial development. As Mr. Lippmann points out, three-fourths of the money needed to build our railroad system came from Great Britain.

This becomes a long range problem and not one which is entirely based on short-run military and security interests. Rather it is a process of speeding the transition of the underdeveloped countries from reliance on outside aid and capital investment to economic self-support. David Bell, the Administrator of AID, recognized this in his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this week when he pointed out that 17 countries have completed this transition and economic aid has ended. He added that 14 more countries are likely to attain the point where their requirements for capital can be satisfied by regular access to world trade and capital markets.

Foreign aid provides the needed assistance that the underdeveloped countries require to achieve economic self-sufficiency. For this reason it is important that we view foreign aid as a long-term project and base our actions accordingly.

The complete article by Mr. Lippmann follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: FOREIGN AID

(By Walter Lippmann)

As one of the old hands who has been writing about foreign aid since President Roosevelt invented what was called lend lease, I find myself wondering why the whole subject has become so stale. Some kind of vital spark has gone out of the argument. The annual plea for appropriations becomes increasingly a repetition of tired slogans.

Yet, I am satisfied that the reason why foreign aid has become so boring is not at all that it is useless. It is not at all, as Representative PASSMAN and the other bitter-enders say, that it is a way of throwing good money down a rathole. It is not that we can stop giving foreign aid now or for generations to come.

What we must dwell on is that the problem is ceasing to be that of providing emergency relief for friendly countries in time of war and its aftermath. It has become very largely the problem of helping the less developed countries build the foundations of their own well-being. This is a less exciting and a slower effort, and it is asking a lot that each year a Congress, elected from constituencies where public money is very short, should allocate about 3½ percent of the Federal budget to foreign aid.

In a democratic government there has to be some compelling and obvious reason for doing so unnatural an act as giving money away to foreigners. When President Roosevelt pushed through lend-lease in 1940, he was able to do this because public opinion insisted upon it, enough of the people having realized that the measure was necessary to percent the disaster which would have come from the fall of an indispensable and gallant ally. When President Truman asked the Congress to authorize the appropriation of some $17 billion for the Marshall plan, the country knew that if Western Europe could not recover and be reconstructed, we would be left alone, without strong friends and allies in a world convulsed with misery. This was all relatively easy to understand.

The aim of foreign aid has changed radically but the rhetoric employed to persuade a reluctant Congress of its necessity has changed little. We are still assuming, 12 years after the Marshall plan, that the effective way to get the money from Congress is to use the ideas and the solgans of the Marshall plan. As we had put money into Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and the Low Countries to stop the advance of the Soviet Union, so we should now put money into South Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, India, Pakistan, Greece, Turkey, and Latin America. In a fashion the tactic has paid off. Since the collapse of the Nationalists on the Chinese mainland in 1949, there has been no important advance of communism except in Cuba, which seems to have been impelled into the arms of Red Russia because everybody concerned with Cuban policy seems to have made every possible mistake.

What is wearing thin and becoming tiresome is the argument that these funds must be handed out to various governments in order to protect the short-term security of the United States. There is, of course, something in the argument that all great powers have always used funds to promote their influence. Thus, a quite considerable amount of the foreign aid money goes to keep the armies in several of the beneficiary states contented and on our side of the fence. A certain amount goes into subsidizing weak but friendly governments. It is all not very inspiring, especially in view of the public money we do not seem to be able to raise in order to rebuild rat-infested schools in our own slums. But we must realize that this isn't all there is to foreign aid.

The modern problem of foreign aid confronts us because about two-thirds of mankind is poor, has become aware that this is not inevitable, and is determined to overcome its misery and its immemorial servitudes. At the same time, the drop in the death rate, brought about by advances in public health, has caused the poor to increase in number. These are the elements of the great revolutionary movement of our era. It has created a complex confrontation which is triangular in shape as between the various Communist, the various non-Communist, and the various underdeveloped peoples.

The crucial question is how the countries with a backward economy are to find the capital, which includes know-how and organization, to develop. A century and a half ago the United States was an underdeveloped country. Although it started out with great natural resources and an adult population educated abroad, it could not have developed so fast had it not been for huge investments of European capital. By 1913, $4 billion of British money was invested in the United States. Three-quarters of the capital required to build our railways came from Great Britain. I have seen it estimated that if the United States today were to invest abroad as heavily in proportion to national income as did Great Britain in the 19th century, we would make loans in one way or another approaching $30 billion a year.

At the present time, the total flow of capital—of grants, Government loans, and private foreign investments—from the advanced to the backward world is only about $8.5 billion a year. In another few years this will be not nearly enough to do the job, especially in view of the declining prices of the agricultural and mineral products which represent 90 percent of the export earnings of the less developed countries.

Thus, the real problem of foreign aid is not the one that President Johnson and Representative PASSMAN are wrestling with. It is the problem of devising ways by which rich countries can help meet the capital needs of poor countries. In one way or another Congress is bound to support one of the variations of the idea that the richer countries should find a generally accepted way to transfer capital to selected backward countries. This principle is followed rather well in the proposed AID budget: two-thirds of the loan money is to go to six countries to promote their long-term development.

Until a few years ago, the United States had been very nearly the sole supplier of low-cost capital to the non-Communist world. The best way to dilute our responsibility and to share the financial burden is by supporting international institutions, such as the World Bank and its affiliate, the International Development Association, known for short as IDA.

The House recently and without enough consideration cut off our contribution to IDA and it did so in a way which is embarrassing and indeed humiliating to this country. It is also against our real interests, and the refusal will certainly have to be reconsidered.

Ship of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in this week's issue of the Saturday Review an excellent article appeared reminding us of the great and penetrating work of the SS *Hope*.

Project Hope, which derives from the people-to-people program, has for many years been an effort close to my own heart. The vessel is staffed by medical teams who have visited many of the world's needy areas to offer the local populations the blessing of greater well-being.

For many years I have sponsored resolutions expressing the commendation of this House for this worthy venture. It is gratifying that the experiment has been free of political concerns, and has avoided partisan propaganda, and in a sense this factor has assured the ship of its overwhelmingly friendly reception in all the host countries.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the Saturday Review of March 28, 1964, in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIP OF HOPE

On September 20, 1960, the SS *Hope* sailed for her first country of call, Indonesia. In September of 1964, this same SS *Hope* will sail directly from Ecuador to Guinea for her first visit to Africa. In the intervening 4 years the American medical staff abroad the trim white ship will have trained more than 2,750 doctors, nurses, and auxiliary medical personnel in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, and Ecuador. By the end of *Hope*'s stay in Ecuador next fall, some 5,000 major operations will have been performed by her staff in the countries visited. At least half a million people in these countries will have been immunized against polio, diphtheria, tetanus, typhoid fever, whooping cough, and other diseases disastrous to populations that are normally without adequate medical care.

When the *Hope* arrived in Saigon, her staff found local customs of midwifery and witch doctors deterrents to good health; crippling polio among children was also pathetically prevalent. Unarrested and unattended tumors were common throughout southwest Asia. And in South America, harelips, facial malformations, cleft palates, and eye cataracts had a high rate of incidence.

One way of overcoming indigenous, crippling ill health in the countries visited has been to train local medical personnel who would in turn help future generations to enjoy a better physical existence. Volunteer teams of 30 to 35 medical and surgical specialists, working without pay, have been flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of duty of from 2 to 4 months, for the need for surgery has been paramount everywhere. These physicians work with the permanent staff on board the *Hope*, which includes 5 physicians, 36 nurses, and 25 auxiliary medical personnel. The matter of reducing simple hernia alone will keep the medical staff of the SS *Hope* occupied night and day when she reaches Africa.

Because many of the countries visited did not have up-to-date medical books or journals, perhaps the *Hope*'s greatest contribution has been to leave behind thousands of modern volumes on medicine and surgery—6,000 in Indonesia, 2,000 in South Vietnam, and 10,000 more in Peru and Ecuador. Thirty countries have formerly invited the *Hope* to visit them in order to improve their own medical techniques and skills. Practical dietary aids have been fundamental. Every day, the "Iron Cow" on the SS *Hope* turns out hundreds of half-pints of milk which are distributed to local children. This ancillary program helps combat malnutrition and tuberculosis. The rate of milk distribution is an astonishing 3,000 quarts per week.

Nor have the *Hope's* personnel and administration suffered from lack of volunteers. Over 3,000 applications have been received from doctors all around the United States, usually on a voluntary rotating basis. Nurses and paramedical personnel have been equally eager to join what is perhaps the most exciting voluntary medical assistance program in the history of mankind. *Hope* has, incidentally, the formal endorsement of both the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association. While it is a voluntary project with headquarters in Washington, D.C., it does receive some financial assistance from the U.S. Government for the operation of the ship itself.

To have treated 100,000 human beings, immunized half a million more who would otherwise have never known good health, and trained 2,750 doctors, nurses, and medical technicians in fewer than 4 years is an achievement as astonishing as it is heartwarming, communism continues to gain footholds wherever disease and poverty remain; and here is a practical antidote, a program carried on in democratic fashion to the credit of the cause of the free world. In one port of call, Salaverry, Peru, the first weeks of *Hope's* visit were filled with suspicion and downright antagonism. When, 10 months later, the good ship *Hope* pulled reluctantly out of the littered harbor, 40,000 Peruvians lined every foot of shoreline and the water was massed with flowers cast by a grateful and tearful populace, some of whom had walked barefoot for 30 miles to thank their Yankee benefactors.

The American system is, fundamentally, the voluntary system whenever and wherever it will work. Nothing is more sophisticated and nothing more difficult to operate smoothly than this method, which requires a restraint and a political ethic not always found in lands accustomed to authoritarian ways. But when the voluntary system works, it seems to set up a contagion of its own. The SS *Hope* derives from the people-to-people program, and the very facts that the white ship of mercy isn't politically sponsored, isn't wholly tax-supported, isn't part of a propaganda routine have helped make the *Hope* venture successful. Since the voluntary way is precisely that, however, it requires the help of sensible, responsible people; some $5 million is the *Hope's* immediate goal. It will get it, too, for the American people know a good thing when they see one, and the logic and patent success of the *Hope's* first 4 years are overwhelmingly persuasive.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the brave Byelorussian people, who proclaimed their independence 46 years ago, but who have since suffered suppression under the Soviet Union's Communist regime.

On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. But the people of that nation were unable to preserve their independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces. In 1921, the Communists proclaimed that nation as the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic—in the long run, this had the effect of making the government an administrative arm of the Soviet regime.

The popularity of the Communist Party in Byelorussia may be judged from the fact that before World War II, only 0.6 percent of that country's population were members of the party, and after the war, the number rose to no more than 2.1 percent.

Byelorussia is the third largest constituent Soviet republic. Ethnic Byelorussia borders in the north and east on Russia, in the south on the Ukraine, in the west on Poland, and in the northwest on Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In the west, Byelorussians are often taken for Russians, yet they have, since the beginning of their history, developed quite independently of Russia.

The Constitution written by the independent Byelorussian Government formed in 1918 guaranteed freedom of speech and assembly, the right to form labor unions and the right to strike, liberty of conscience, involability of the person and of the home, the right of national minorities to autonomy and equality of all citizens before the law. This is the grand concept of freedom which the Byelorussians hold sacred. Tragically, that nation lost the right to practice these ideals shortly after it attained its independence.

But Byelorussians have not lost faith in these ideals, and have not lost hope that once more, they shall be able to live in freedom. Each year, Americans of Byelorussian descent as well as Byelorussian immigrants in this country celebrate that grand day of independence, and they and their countrymen remind the world that their aspirations for liberty have not diminished. The Byelorussian-American Association, Inc. is very active in bringing this point home.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join my colleagues in tribute to these brave people, and to assure them that we cherish the hope, as they do, that Byelorussia shall regain its freedom, and that that time shall not be long in coming.

Resolution of Dade County Bar Association Regarding Presidential Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith introduce into the RECORD a resolution of the board of directors of the Dade County Bar Association pertaining to the important subject of the performance of the duties of the President in case of the inability of the President:

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF DADE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Resolved, That the Dade County Bar Association recommends that the Constitution of the United States be amended in accordance with the principles set forth in the consensus of the special conference convened by the American Bar Association in Washington, D.C., January 21, 1964, as follows:

1. In the event of the inability of the President, the powers and duties, but not the office, shall devolve upon the Vice President or person next in line of succession for the duration of the inability of the President or until expiration of his term of office;

2. The inability of the President may be established by declaration in writing of the President. In the event that the President does not make known his inability, it may be established by action of the Vice President or person next in line of succession with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by action of such other body as the Congress may by law provide;

3. The ability of the President to resume the powers and duties of his office shall be established by his declaration in writing. In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress may by law provide shall not concur in the declaration of the President, the continuing disability of the President may then be determined by the vote of two-thirds of the elected Members of each House of the Congress;

4. In the event of the death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President or the person next in line of succession shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term; and

5. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice President the President shall nominate a person who, upon approval by a majority of the elected Members of Congress meeting in joint session, shall then become Vice President for the unexpired term; and be it further

Resolved, That the Dade County Bar Association reaffirm in principle the support of the need for interim statutory clarification of the problem after the constitutional proposals have been submitted by Congress for action by the State legislatures, such legislation to provide a remedy while the constitutional proposals are under consideration.

Dated at Miami, Fla., this 5th day of March 1964.

By CHARLES A. KIMBRELL,
President.

Attest:

LYLE D. HOLCOMB, Jr.,
Secretary.

Statement by Joe Carter, Chairman of the Texas Water Commission, Concerning Opposed Amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the long awareness by the State of Texas of its water control problem is well indicated by the passage of the State's initial water pollution control statute in 1917. A further step to correct Texas water control problems was made in 1961 when the Texas Legislature enacted a law creating the Texas Water Pollution Control Board.

This board has now completed its second year of operation and the considerable progress which the State board has achieved, since its enactment, is reflected by the rapid elimination of many of the States' water pollution problems.

On February 6, 1964, Hon. Joe Carter, chairman of the Texas Water Commission and a member of the Texas Water Pollution Control Board, testified before the House Public Works Committee and presented the opposition of the State of Texas to the proposed amendments, as stated in S. 649, to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Speaker, I consider these remarks worthy of the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that this testimony be included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE CARTER, CHAIRMAN, TEXAS WATER COMMISSION, IN OPPOSITION TO S. 649 AND RELATED BILLS

The State of Texas, not being blessed with an abundance of water as some other States, has traditionally held water in high regard and great respect, adhering to the philosophy that water should be maintained in as high a degree of purity as possible. Texas has been and is continuously moving to assume the responsibility of pollution control within its boundaries and cooperating with its neighboring States on border streams. The preponderence of testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the Committee on Government Operations at the Southwest regional hearing December 6–7, 1963, in Austin, Tex., indicated quite strongly that "no additional Federal water pollution control legislation is needed at this time." The Texas Water Pollution Control Board concurs in this, and therefore, submits this statement in opposition to S. 649 and related bills. (A copy of the Texas Water Pollution Control Board's statement to the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power is attached.)

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is opposed to S. 649 because it unquestionably would place a great deal of power and authority in the hands of a new Federal agency which would have far-reaching effects threatening encroachment into a governmental area heretofore reserved to the State and local agencies.

Since the beginning of the current Federal Water Pollution Control Law in 1956, administration of the program has been competently carried out by the U.S. Public Health Service, and Texas has always enjoyed excellent working relationships with that agency. It is difficult to rationalize, therefore, the advantage which might be gained by any such drastic change in administration as authorized in S. 649.

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is seriously concerned about and is opposed to the proposal in S. 649 which would authorize the Federal Government to establish standards of water quality. This is a matter depending entirely upon State and regional circumstances and is, therefore, basically a function of State and regional agencies. Texas is proud of the close cooperation always received from the neighboring States when interstate waters become involved, and such situations have always been handled in a most friendly and effective manner. It is obvious that quality standards which would be applicable to a "water-rich" State would certainly not be applicable to a "water-poor" State. There looms, therefore, the very difficult and time-consuming problem of establishing adequate water quality standards on any given stream, not to mention the gigantic task this implies when imposed on a nationwide basis.

The Texas Water Pollution Control Board is charged by the legislature to issue permits for all waste discharges in the State, and an elaborate surveillance and enforcement program has been developed to back up this permit system. Hence, if this Federal law were passed, it would appear there would be a duplication of effort and a needless expenditure of Federal funds. This does not appear to be consistent with the present economy move of the administration, nor would it be conducive to unification of effort.

Pollution abatement is something that cannot be achieved instantaneously but tremendous inroads have been made during recent years, and the machinery for reaching a solution to this problem is currently operational. Inasmuch as amendments were made to the Federal water pollution control law as recently as 1961, it is believed the present act, as amended, has not been in effect a sufficient length of time to indicate the need for further "patch work." Obviously, changing the basic "ground rules" at such frequent intervals does not contribute to a healthy administrative atmosphere. Drastic administrative revisions as proposed in S. 649 might result in retrogression and possibly confusion in the entire program rather than a desirable acceleration of progress.

It is for these reasons the Texas Water Pollution Control Board recommends that no action be taken on S. 649 and related bills which proposes to amend the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

We Should Support and Urge a "No Money, No Vote" United Nations Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world can no longer afford the luxury of coddling Russia and her satellites who refuse to pay up in the United Nations. Russia's repeated threats to withdraw from the U.N., if the claim for money she owes is pressed, are the shallowest form of dominance through fear. The Soviet Union would lose power and influence overnight were it not for her membership in, and veto power over, the U.N. Here is her best listening post, he best propaganda forum, and her largest stage on which she can strut and play her roles.

Russia assumes the character of protector of the rights of nations, and demands U.N. peacekeeping units, as in Cyprus, and then refuses to pay her share of the cost. The International Court of Justice, in fair and full hearings, ruled the assessments legal and binding. The Court found Russia liable and ruled she must pay or lose her vote in the Assembly and the Councils of the United Nations. There is no real debate here. The Charter of the U.N. specifies penalties for this violation. Those penalties must be applied without fear or favor.

To cringe and retreat each time Nikita Khrushchev prattles, is to operate from a position of indecisive weakness, rather than positive strength. Never in history has a Nation, by its vacillation, halting and timidity, apologized so frequently for its power and authority as has the United States. In the United Nations, however ineffective it may be at times, the United States has the inescapable responsibility to demand fair, impartial and equal treatment of all its members. It is unthinkable that the champions of freedom, honor, and dignity among men and nations will continue to bow to gangsterism and flagrant abuse of the systems of debt and payment. There is a simple policy: "No money, no vote"—let the U.N. enforce it.

Guantanamo and Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was surprised to read in the press of the Nation's Capital of a published proposal to return dependents of the Armed Forces at the Guantanamo Naval Station following the cutoff by Communist Cuba of the station's water supply. This apparently sudden announcement made many Members of the Congress suspicious as to what was behind the proposed move.

The explanation, as published in an Allen-Scott report in the March 7, 1964, issue of Human Events, is a long-range plan of certain elements in the Department of State to "phase out" our naval base at Guantanamo. This station, as all our citizens who have served on ships based at Guantanamo know, is invaluable for regular training exercises of our fleet. Its abandonment to a Soviet Cuba

is unthinkable to any one who is a realist.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would stress, as often pointed out by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], Guantanamo is strategically located on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal. As such it is a part of the Caribbean picture, and what happens to one of these key spots is bound to affect the other. If Guantanamo is abandoned by the United States that will mean the end of U.S. jurisdiction over the Panama Canal.

In order that this clandestine proposal, which is strongly opposed by the agency most directly concerned, the Navy, may be known to the Nation and recorded in the annals of the Congress, I quote the indicated report:

STATE DEPARTMENT PLANS TO PHASE OUT GUANTANAMO

(From the Allen-Scott report)

A long-range, highly controversial State Department plan is behind those suddenly-announced orders to withdraw military dependents from Guantanamo and to reduce the number of Cubans working there.

Aim of this inner State Department plan is the eventual complete "phasing out" of this country's occupancy of the big strategic naval base.

Navy authorities, who are vigorously against both withdrawing military dependents and cutting back Cuban workers, are claiming these moves are important steps in the execution of the State Department's backstage objective.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, spearheaded by the Navy, are strenuously opposed to giving up Guantanamo at any time in the foreseeable future.

The State Department's hush-hush plan actually is not new. It was formulated by the Department's Policy Planning Council not long after dictator Fidel Castro came into power in 1959. But it got nowhere at the White House in the face of adamant Pentagon resistance. At one period in the Kennedy administration, Secretary Rusk sought to pump new life into this scheme, but made no headway when the Navy vehemently dissented.

A major premise of the State Department's plan is that sooner or later Castro will take the Guantanamo issue to the United Nations, and the United States should be ready to give up the base rather than risk a "censure" vote.

It is argued that activities at Guantanamo should gradually be shifted to the Roosevelt Roads base in Puerto Rico. Under a program started by the late President Kennedy last year, this base is being rapidly expanded and modernized at a cost of around $100 million.

While strongly favoring the development of Roosevelt Roads, the Navy flatly opposes evacuating Guantanamo for the following principal reason:

To do so would be a crushing blow to Castro foes in and out of Cuba, and would gravely undermine U.S. prestige throughout Latin America and elsewhere; as long as Cuba remains a Communist puppet state, Guantanamo is militarily vital to the United States; relinquishment of the base would mean its instant falling into the hands of Russia.

Navy authorities contend it's impossible to overestimate Guantanamo's value to the Soviet. It not only would give the Reds a major deepwater submarine base 90 miles from the United States, but would provide them with an invaluable stronghold from which to conduct subversive and other turbulent operations throughout Latin America.

The Right To Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an outstanding article by the notable columnist, George Todt, which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner:

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

(By George Todt)

"The John Birch Society is a good, patriotic society. I don't agree with what its founder said about me but that does not detract from the fact that is membership is comprised of many fine Americans dedicated to the preservation of our libertarian Republic."—GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

When I was a young company-grade officer in the European theater during World War II, my ideal was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. He didn't know me from Adam, but he was my idol and I fairly worshipped him.

Over the years since then, the respect and devotion I felt for my general has never waned. Like millions more of his men, we all still love him. You cannot ask an American to let down his friends.

I am not a member of the John Birch Society and am in complete and total disagreement with the harsh attitude of its founder toward Ike in the past. I have told Robert Welch this much personally to his face.

AN ORGANIZER

But Welch has admirable fighting qualities and is a splendid organizer—he has almost single-handedly raised up a dedicated society in our Nation which is restoring a needed degree of balance to our political system today.

For the John Birch Society, as I see it, is the most effective counterbalance to the liberal Fabian Socialist group in our political spectrum called the Americans for Democratic Action. Who has stood up to the ADA in the past?

More than the numerically weak Communists, the ADA of Walter Reuther is the real opposing force to the John Birch Society today.

RIGHTS DENIED

The intolerant bigots of the left now would deny the Birchers their constitutional rights as American citizens simply because they happen to disagree with their "American Revolution of 1776" philosophy and political outlook. This is a frightening situation for us all.

In the heyday of much-maligned Senator Joseph McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, we were treated to soul-stirring pleas from the o-so-tolerant liberals that we must always secure for our citizens the right to dissent. Did they really mean it?

Loud and long were their tearful outcries against such un-American items as guilt by association and failure to let their side be heard fairly in the press without bias or predjudice—it says here.

That was 10 years ago and look at the same self-serving "liberal" bleeding-hearts today. Their vicious diatribes and hatemongering against the beleagured John Birch Society is undignified, unpatriotic and un-American. How mean can we get?

Actually, a great many intelligent citizens who believe in sportsmanlike fairplay resent the bad, unobjective reporting and propaganda the liberals in mass communications shoot at the public in a gross attempt to sandbag the latter with overwhelming quantity, not quality.

NO HOMEWORK

Most of the leftwing crybabies who rail against the John Birch Society have never visited a chapter meeting or done any basic homework. They don't know the patriotic work which the society is doing. Often they are simply destructive hatchetmen.

Usually they pretend unconvincingly they are overcome at the fact that Welch railed against Eisenhower once upon a time. But Ike himself overlooks the unfortunate incident—and praises the patriotism of the John Birch Society.

I had heard of Ike's generous statement which commenced the top part of the column for a long time. It was made at Los Angeles International Airport. My friend Maurice Stans, Ike's Budget Director, was present. Big surprise, what?

Regarding Girl Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, two outstanding young ladies visited my office a short time ago and made a very interesting presentation as to why the Congress should use girl pages as well as boy pages. They were so enthusiastic and had prepared their case so well that I thought their efforts should be rewarded by letting their idea be known to all Members of the Congress as well as the entire Nation. I therefore asked them to prepare the following statement which under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The two attractive and intelligent young ladies to whom I refer are: Miss Linda S. Katz, 423 Waterway Drive, Falls Church, Va., and Miss Joyce Lynn Peeks, 6508 Glenmore Drive, Falls Church, Va.

The statement follows:

Being a page offers opportunities to learn about the function of the U.S. Government and provides valuable experience for those who are interested in a political career, or who wish to pursue political science and law. Girls are directly denied these advantages because of their sex. Yet, it has been shown that they have as much physical endurance and mental capabilities as boys. Girls mature at a faster rate and show the same initiative, desire, and character. Therefore, they would be able to carry the heavy workload required by their duties at page school.

Girl pages in Congress would inspire a more avid interest in political affairs among women. Since women comprise over 50 percent of the voters, they deserve representation in every facet of the Government.

There would be added convenience for Congresswomen because girls could perform personal errands in the same manner that boys do for Congressmen.

There is a standing proposition to build dormatories for the present pages. It would be more economical to construct both girl's and boy's dormatories at the same time.

Our Government is constantly changing; every part, no matter how seemingly trivial, must be brought up to date. Now is the

time to correct the page problem. Each year, more women are being brought into the political scene, and the need for girl pages is growing.

New Dynamism for the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 16, at the Pan American Union, the Council of the Organization of American States installed the new Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress.

The Committee, called CIAP from its initials in Spanish, has the difficult task of appraising the development performance of the 19 Latin American countries and of recommending the allocation of external financial resources amongst them.

With the installation of the eight members of CIAP, who are now at work, the Alliance gains new impulse, new strength, new talents, new dynamism.

As President Johnson said at the CIAP installation ceremonies, the special significance of CIAP is that from now on the Alliance will be guided by the advice and wisdom of men from the entire hemisphere. No longer does the United States have to bear the burden of making major decisions alone. That does not mean that the United States will take a back seat—it means that the Latin American nations and the United States all have front seats.

Members of Congress should be pleased to know that all the members of CIAP are distinguished men with solid experience in economic development in diverse fields in various parts of the hemisphere.

The chairman, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, of Colombia, is an economist, engineer, and diplomat known in his own country as an indomitable fighter for basic reforms.

Reforms are not always popular, no matter how badly needed, even for those who are supposed to benefit from them. But as finance minister, Dr. Sanz was able to rally the political forces of his country to face harsh facts and take difficult decisions. As a result his country's fiscal position has improved. The external balance of payments is healthier. Heavier taxes are providing additional government income for vitally essential programs.

Significantly, Dr. Sanz is a member of one of Colombia's wealthiest families. He has been a very successful engineer in private life. But he has never hesitated to serve his country. He has been called to high office by every freely elected government of the past 30 years. He has served under presidents of both the Conservative and Liberal Parties. He has traveled extensively in Latin America. And he knows the United States from having served as Colombian Ambassador to Washington on two tours of duty. He speaks fluent English as well as Spanish, Portuguese, and French. It would be difficult to find a Chairman of greater experience and more diverse talents.

Our own Government has a permanent seat in the Committee. Our present representative is Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso, an internationally known expert on economic and social development.

For 20 years, he was the man behind Puerto Rico's famed Operation Bootstrap, the development program that brought Puerto Rico from the depths of poverty to relative prosperity. More recently, as U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, he was the U.S. official chiefly responsible for putting the alliance in motion and laying the foundations for future development.

My pragmatic, imaginative policies, he attracted hundreds of millions of dollars worth of industrial investment to Puerto Rico. Other countries could well emulate his policy of using Government funds as a catalyst to make private investment effective and successful.

The five Central American States also have a permanent seat in SCAP. The Central American representative is Jorge Sol Castellanos, a highly respected authority on international economic problems. Born in El Salvador and educated at Harvard University, he has held numerous high posts in the Government of his country and other Central American Republics.

He has served as Minister of Economy of El Salvador and dean of the School of Economics at the University of El Salvador. He has been Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, Executive Secretary of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, and Assistant Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs of the Organization of American States. He is now adviser to the permanent office of the Treaty of Central American Economic Integration and consultant to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration.

Named to the Committee by Peru and Argentina is Emilio Castañon Pasquel. He has held posts in the Ministries of Justice, Social Welfare, and Treasury, and headed the Superintendency of Foreign Trade. He was chief Peruvian delegate to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in 1962 and 1963, and is now a director of the Central Reserve Bank of Peru.

Named to the Committee by Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela is Luis Escobar Cerda at 37 years of age, the youngest member of CIAP. A native of Santiago, Chile, and a Harvard graduate, he is a well-known professor of economic theory at the University of Chile and a prolific writer on economic subjects in scholarly and popular journals.

Dr. Escobar has been dean of the School of Economics of the University of Chile since 1955 and served as Minister of Economy, Development, and Reconstruction from August 1961 to September 1963. Now the Chilean representative to the International Monetary Fund, he is also a member of the executive board of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning.

Serving for Uruguay, Paraguay, and Bolivia is Gervasio de Posadas, a Uruguayan industrialist, lawyer, educator, and author of books on law, economics, and finance.

He was associate professor of commercial law at the University of Uruguay from 1929 to 1933 and associate professor of political economy until 1952. Since then, he has held the chair of economics. He is the author of books and articles on law, economics, and finance.

De Posadas served as Uruguayan Minister of Industry and Labor from 1939 to 1941 and as Senator from 1941 to 1942. He was president of the National Chamber of Commerce from 1958 to 1962.

Named by Mexico, Panama, and the Dominican Republic is Rodrigo Gómez, an internationally known figure in banking who has been director general of the Bank of Mexico since 1952. He has served two terms as Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, 1946–48, and 1958–60. He has also been a Senator, representing his native State of Nuevo León.

Named by Brazil, Haiti, and Ecuador is Celso Furtado, 43, the noted Brazilian economist who achieved an international reputation as chief architect of the ambitious plan to develop Brazil's poverty-stricken Northeast.

As head of Sudene—Superintendency for the Development of the Northeast—established in December 1959, Furtado directed a program calling for investments totaling $900 million from national and international sources for the rehabilitation and development of industry and agriculture in Brazil's most desperate region. In 1962, President Goulart asked him to serve as minister without portfolio to draw up a national development program for 1963–65. He returned to full-time duty with Sudene early in 1963 after proposing a $1.5 billion program.

Furtado holds the degree of doctor of economics from the University of Paris. He served for many years on the staff of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and with the Economic Development Center, a joint project of ECLA and the Brazilian National Bank for Economic Development. He has also been a director of the bank.

I would hope that Members of Congress will have the opportunity to meet informally from time to time with the members of CIAP for an exchange of views. Their great diversity of experience should be of great value to the members of the House and Senate who are concerned with making U.S. participation in the alliance as effective as possible.

Let us wish them all success in their difficult and important tasks.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the day which gives all people

of Byelorussian ancestry, no matter where they live, a strong glow of pride, because March 25 is National Independence Day for all free and freedom-loving Byelorussians. It marks the day in 1918 when the people marched shoulder to shoulder into the streets to fight against misery and slavery. It marks the day when conviction and bravery became the foundations of an overwhelming wave of revolution. It marks the day when the Byelorussian people cast off their chains.

Since March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people have fought against cruel Bolshevik suppression for their honor and their happiness. In 1919 their armed resistance was overwhelmed by the superior numbers and weapons of the Red army, which once again smothered the exciting spark of freedom with tyranny.

Before 1918, the Communists had never gained many followers in Byelorussia. They were scorned by the people. When the czar fell, Byelorussians made their true feelings felt by declaring their independence. The history of Byelorussia since has been one of trying to achieve that independence which it deserves. So far it has not succeeded against the old Russian imperialism thrust upon it anew by the Communists. But continuous agitation against communism has brought severe persecution to the Byelorussians. Strikes, passive resistance, and apathy have thwarted the Russians at every turn for many years. The Byelorussians resisted with every possible means such favorite Communist schemes as farm communes, nationalized industries, and fake elections. That resistance continued yesterday, it is continuing today, and it will continue tomorrow. If the Communists were to give the people a free choice, the Marxist system would be destroyed overnight.

On March 25, 1964, we can celebrate the 46th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. But celebrating by itself is not enough. We must continue to speak about freedom, and to give the world its best example of democracy in action. Only that way will the Byelorussians be able to keep up their resistance against the great hypocrisy of a better life promised by communism. Only that way will Byelorussia again be free.

Wrong Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newton Kansan which appropriately emphasizes the concern of the public in the Bobby Baker case. It is regrettable that the Democrat majority in the other body has voted to end its investigation without clarifying and broadening the testimony in this matter.

The above-mentioned article follows:

WRONG TACTICS

There has been a lot of talk that the Democrat majority is trying to do a whitewash job in the Bobby Baker case.

Naturally, the Democrats would like to forget the whole thing, and, more than that, they would like the public to forget all about it too.

The Republicans, on the other hand, want everything brought out into the open. They reason that with a national election only a few months away they will profit by any disclosures that might come from the probe.

This is part of what politicians like to call "practical politics." You try to supress anything that will hurt your party, and exploit anything that will hurt your opponents.

Both parties should be above this kind of maneuvering.

Certainly there should be an investigation, and let the chips fall where they may. If the Democrats suffer because of misdeeds by their officeholders, so be it. And if some Republicans find that they are tarred with the same brush, they should also be among the sufferers.

The public is entitled to know what kind of finagling is going on behind the scenes in Government. The public is paying the bill, and the public should know if some of its employees are misusing their power.

The Democrats would be far better off if they would go ahead and root out any evils that might be beneath the surface, than if they try to keep as much as possible secret.

Secrecy breeds rumors and distrust in such cases.

Openness engenders trust.

Let's hear all about the Bobby Baker case. Certainly the Democrats may suffer, but they could suffer even more by pursuing a policy of secrecy.

Beef Imports and Beef Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a rancher's wife living near Alexandria, S. Dak., that I have asked consent to place in the RECORD because it is so well written and so well points up the problem that faces thousands and thousands of ranchers' and farmers' wives across the Nation insofar as beef imports and beef prices are concerned.

The letter follows:

ALEXANDRIA, S. DAK.,
March 20, 1964.

E. Y. BERRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BERRY: My heart aches this snowy morning of March 20 and here is the reason why.

Whether the days be nice or stormy our cattle have to be fed and my husband is out in this inclement weather working his head off so to speak. He is 55 years old and has worked very hard all of his life, also has a big investment in cattle. He lays awake nights wondering if he has worked all his life for nothing and if he will loose everything he has. So discouraging to work so hard and know you are loosing money every day.

We ran out of our own meat just lately so have been buying some in the stores. Something is very wrong; we can only afford hamburger and that isn't cheap. At the price of meat over the counter, city folk think we farmers are getting rich.

Some think the farmer should sacrifice so that our Nation may keep on good terms with other countries where imports and exports are concerned. But is it right to let our own people go down in defeat? Is it selfish to want to take care of our own people and our own Nation first then spread out to help others? I have always believed that missions begin at home.

I am not bitter nor do I blame anyone for the low cattle prices but it is heartbreaking to see the man I love work all his lifetime for naught.

Mr. Berry will you please do all that is in your power to help this situation?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A stockman and farmer's wife,

MRS. ALVIN LOON.

The 1963 Sportsmanship Award to Robert J. Cappadona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in these challenging and troublesome days for the youth of our country I think it pertinent to publicize, as much as we can, information about individuals and events that might tend to inspire some of our young people to greater efforts in the fundamental areas of continued education, competitive sportsmanship, and, indeed, in the great field of life itself.

Each year the Gridiron Club of Boston, Mass. sponsors an annual dinner at which the Nils V. Nelson Award for Sportsmanship is presented. This annual affair was last held in Boston on January 4, 1964, and the award was conferred upon Robert J. Cappadona, of Watertown, Mass.

At this point I would like to include an explanation of the origin and meaning of the award, the citation for the award, and the response of acceptance by the recipient:

THE AWARD

The Nils V. Nelson Award for Sportsmanship is presented annually by the Gridiron Club of Boston on a basis of the following requirements:

"To the player who, by his conduct on or off the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree."

The Nelson Award for Sportsmanship has aroused the interest of leaders in the world of sports throughout the entire Nation. Nominations for the Award have been received from every State in the Union, having been contributed by college coaches, sports writers, radio announcers, and others. This widespread source of information and the enthusiasm expressed by the contributors points to the Nelson Trophy as being firmly established as one of the Nation's outstanding football awards.

We of the Gridiron Club of Boston are confident that the objectives of the Award will ever serve as an inspiration for all that is praiseworthy and good wherever the game of football is played.

THE COMMITTEE.

CITATION FOR THE NILS V. "SWEDE" NELSON—1963 SPORTSMANSHIP AWARD TO ROBERT J. CAPPADONA, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY—AGE 21; HEIGHT, 6 FEET 1 INCH; WEIGHT, 215 POUNDS; POSITION, FULLBACK

The above captions suggest several significant connotations. "Swede" Nelson is a perennial sportsman par excellence. His avocation is to instill and develop essential character in young people. Robert Cappadona, whom we honor in his name, is a 1961 graduate of Watertown High School, Watertown, Mass. Cappadona made an enviable record as a schoolboy athlete at Watertown High School in football, basketball, and baseball. His greatest prowess was on the gridiron being selected on a national basis as a high school all-American in his senior year. In addition, he was an active member of several intraschool organizations and was voted vice president of the student body for 3 successive years. John Carver, member of the Watertown School Board, and chairman of its committee on athletics, stated when questioned, "During Bob Cappadona's high school career he demonstrated not only exceptional football ability but outstanding qualities of personal leadership. He was a constructive influence for what is good and worthwhile in the internal life of the school. He was always quiet and unassuming and utterly without ostentation."

A sophomore in Northeastern's College of Business Administration, Cappadona is employed at Sears, Roebuck & Co. in Boston, on Northeastern's cooperative plan of education in which upperclass students alternate periods of classroom instruction with practical experience on regular paying jobs in business, industry, and the professions. In this educational program Cappadona is determined to make the grade in order to merit the trust and confidence his parents and college have in him.

Northeastern University under Coach Joe Zabilski and his staff enjoyed an undefeated 1963 season (8–0), the first in its 26-year football history. Cappadona had been a key factor in producing the undefeated record. He was the leading offensive back and a solid middle linebacker on defense. After the season finale Northeastern was invited to play in the Eastern Bowl at Allentown, Pa. The decision to accept was left to the squad, of which there were 50 members, since a no-cut system was followed during the season. The first ballot produced a complete negative vote. The squad, noted for its entrenched collective spirit, had learned that Cappadona, due to the NCAA transfer rule (he had attended Notre Dame University as a freshman) was not eligible for postseason competition.

Deeply moved when he heard the results of the vote Cappadona urged reconsideration, pointing out that the Huskies should not pass up a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for him. "Forget me," he told them. "I am just part of the team. You owe it to the university and yourselves to approve. You seniors will never get another chance. I'll help in any way the coaches desire." After the squad voted to accept the bid Cappadona reported for every practice, represented the star back of the East Carolina team in the daily scrimmages, and gave his all even though he knew that he could not play in the intersectional game. In the opinion of observers he showed, if possible, more drive and desire than in the regular season practice sessions. He was the first on the field and usually the last to leave. He aroused himself to an intense pitch to maintain the winning formula of the squad. Coach Joe Zabilski of Northeastern University was thrilled with Cappadona's spirit and efforts. "I have never seen any player who was so dedicated to the game of football and to the interest of his teammates. He is a stalwart guy with a terrific dash of cooperative spirit. I am sure he will continue to give clutch performances in every area of life."

The selection committee is proud to present Robert J. Cappadona as the 1963 winner of the Nelson Sportsmanship Award. The Gridiron Club welcomes him to its Nelson Honor Roll and extends to him a warm gridiron salute.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY ROBERT J. CAPPADONA

Reverend Father, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Toastmaster, head table guests, ladies and gentlemen, for many years I have followed the exploits of Doak Walker while at Southern Methodist University and later of the Detroit Lions, not to mention Jim Swink, of Texas Christian, and J. W. Brodnax, of Louisiana State. As a boy, I idolized such stars; and in later years, I came to both respect and learn from their talents. However, not in my wildest dreams did I ever anticipate my being so closely associated with them.

And it is with added pleasure that my name be linked to theirs under the bond of sportsmanship. For I know that after we all have gained our last yard or made our last tackle that what will have the most lasting effect on our future life will be the give-and-take of scrimmage, which is so closely associated with the give-and-take of life. This played fairly is sportsmanship.

I am a fortunate victim of circumstances. Fortunate to have been on an undefeated team, fortunate to have been on a team that was invited to a bowl game, fortunate to have been on a squad whose motto was: "One for All and All for One," fortunate to have had the opportunity to influence our squad to accept their bowl bid, and lastly thankful that Coach Zabilski allowed me to work with the team in the last 3 weeks of the season. I reacted to the situation as any member of our squad would have. Our team of 50 not only practiced together, but we all traveled to every game, and all played in six out of eight of our regular season games. We were a well-knit unit, and every man was taught to think of the team's best interests first. I merely followed that policy.

I know that sports have played a very important part in Mr. Nelson's life, culminating in his important role in Harvard's 7-to-6 victory over Oregon in the 1919 Rose Bowl game. But what is more important is that he has given to sports much more, I am sure, than it was able to give back in tokens of honors and nationwide acclaim. Sports have played a major role in my life, if not the most important role. For if it were not for football, I would not be in college now. I only hope that I will be able to emulate Mr. Nelson's contributions in some small way. I hope that I will have the opportunity to give back at least as much as I have taken from sports.

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation to my mother and father for always encouraging me to continue on in my studies and in athletics, to Coach Zabilski for influencing me to go to Northeastern, and to Mr. Carfield for nominating me for this wonderful honor. Lastly, I am grateful to Mr. Nelson for two things: First, for the honor of receiving his distinguished award; and second, because I never had to run off tackle against him. If I did, I am sure I would be using his walking stick tonight.

A Hard Look at Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Feb. 13, 1964]

A HARD LOOK AT URBAN RENEWAL

You frequently hear the charge that urban renewal is loaded with graft, that it fosters corruption, that it wastes more than it accomplishes.

How true are these charges?

The Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency decided to investigate. Here are some excerpts from the testimony.

Mr. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee: "First of all, in your investigations, and I hope you will continue them in all the places, have you found any evidences of corruption or crookedness or stealing in this program at either the local or regional level of any type?"

Mr. Louis W. Hunter, Assistant Director, General Accounting Office: "No, we have not, Mr. Chairman."

Mr. RAINS: "Have you not found any places in which they are shortchanging the Federal Government on the money or any type of crookedness of that kind * * * in the urban renewal program?"

Mr Hunter: "No. None of that type."

Mr. RAINS: "In your investigation up to now, Mr. Hunter, has this program been administered in keeping with the law?"

Mr. Hunter: "I think we could not say otherwise."

Mr. RAINS: "There has been a lot of loose talk * * * about urban renewal. The General Accounting Office told us * * * that that they had run across * * * no corruption of any kind * * * Mr. ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, who can be a very sharp-eyed critic, made this statement which I would like to read into the record:

" 'It has been fantastic to me, the amount of money and the amount of different pieces involved. I think there are around 60,000 or 65,000 pieces of property that have been bought (under urban renewal). I have not heard of any public scandal. It is fantastic.' "

That should answer the charge of graft and corruption.

Remarks of Deputy Mayor of the City of New York, Edward F. Cavanough, at Dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of this House, I include herewith the following remarks made by the deputy mayor of the city of New York, Edward F. Cavanough, Jr., on the occasion of the St. Patrick's night dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on Tuesday evening, March 17, 1964:

I deeply appreciate this distinction and high privilege of responding to that now-historic toast, and I know I may ask your indulgence, on this joyful occasion, to sound a note of sorrow—which we here share—for the circumstance giving rise to my presence here instead of another valiant Friendly

Son of 30 years' standing, the mayor of this city, Robert F. Wagner.

With our faith and spiritual understanding, it is not an emotional twist to go from a sigh to a smile in a gathering of the children of Erin, so we now warmly cherish and hail "the day we celebrate."

By inclination and habit, I would have chosen to respond extemporaneously. However, this script of my remarks is an insurance policy for you longsuffering Friendly Sons and our worried committee that my remarks have a timely end.

What a joy to be an Irishman—especially tonight. I cannot claim that distinction of my own efforts. My ancestors gave it to me for my heritage, and tonight I thank them for it and for the honor it affords me here which I proudly and at the same time humbly wear.

My position here at the moment suggests to me the remarks of a newly consecrated bishop who was sitting at a dais with some of his lay friends, when a waiter accidentally spilled some soup on his beautiful new ecclesiastical robes. Quickly rising to his feet he intoned, "I wish one of you, my friends, would make the appropriate remarks."

If it were not for the high privilege of responding to the toast, I would much rather be out there among you in my accustomed place listening to another, because I am deeply sensible of the lofty standards of oratory, rhetoric, and humor which have been established by the many erudite Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and guests of honor who have preceded me. Indeed, I should be filled with trepidation if I did not have such confidence that the words "Friendly Sons" are meaningful.

In general, it's easy to talk about the day we celebrate and about the Irish who made it thus. It's when we get down to particulars that the troubles begin. And trouble and controversy are things which a good Irishman always avoids—unless they happen to be right at hand, which is frequently the case. It isn't that we Irish are quarrelsome or contentious; it's just that we are people of conviction, and at times a little impatient about it.

It has been said, we Irish have no faults, and that we are rather extreme in our virtues. In any event, we are certainly constant in them. We have been celebrating St. Patrick's Day for 1,532 years, and recognizing the emotion and the love that has dedicated us to the day and the ideal over that period, we see constancy at the threshold of its limits.

It's 1,532 years since St. Patrick came across the seas to Ireland to preach the gospel through the length and breadth of the green land, wherever his voice could be heard. The picture we have of him is that of a strong and mighty man—a man of power—armed with the power of faith and gripping the hearts of those assembled on the grassy slopes of Tara. He brought the light into dark places. He converted the pagans to Christianity and at the same time changed a folk into a nation—a nation of poets and priests and playwrights, of singers and dreamers, of statesmen and crusaders, of writers and soldiers, of wanderers and explorers, of settlers and builders.

They came out of that sunswept, seawashed land and spread over the entire world, into every corner of the world—soldiering, teaching, preaching, writing, building, making. As the poet said, "Although you're many miles from where the shamrocks grow, you'll find an Irishman no matter where you go."

Ireland is today the spiritual homeland and motherland of uncountable legions, spread out over the globe. And it is hard to explain to others exactly what the ties are, to those who don't believe in mysteries, in darkness that is also light, in laughter that is made of tears, in beauty, in courage and in righteousness, for their own sake, and for argument for argument's sake, and in leprechauns, too, that can talk politics or agriculture, or love, whatever your inclination is.

That's a part of what makes the Irish race and the Irish nation what it is, and it's that part that's the most difficult to explain.

We indeed know that the Irish have a missionary tradition. It dates way back to our beginnings, but it cannot be overemphasized that those missionaries and those Irish emigrants by their labors have built and have helped to build, have sustained, and have spread Christianity and Western civilization.

There have also been times when the Irish went traveling out of Ireland because they had to, because they were hungry. There was, for instance, the great migration of the 1840's. Mostly they came here, here to the United States and here to New York City. And here in New York City they took root, and gradually they took over. The Irish took over New York and New York took over the Irish. It was love, although not necessarily at first sight.

Tonight the President of the United States is here to honor and grace this occasion. I am not sure of all of the President's earliest antecedents, but we are certain that before the world he leads the Nation in the fight for freedom and that he is a Democrat, and it may be safe to say that is more than half way to being an Irishman.

Seriously, we have less and less time these days to concentrate on being Democrats or Republicans. There are too many problems, at home and abroad, problems for which there is no Democratic answer and no Republican answer, but only an American answer. And to some of the challenges we face, there isn't even an American answer. There is only freedom's answer, an answer all sons of Ireland by their heritage of oppression and suffering, their dedication to social justice, and their gift of faith are particularly qualified to express.

I am thinking of the challenge of godless communism, and of totalitarianism, and slavery. The only answer to that is the collective answer of all free men—the answer of freedom in place of slavery; the answer of food instead of hunger; the answer of God and hope and love instead of fear and hate and brutality.

Our answer must help at home, too—and no further from our front door than our own city. There is much to be done here to achieve equal justice for all—and equal opportunity for all to enjoy the blessings of freedom. There are many among us who lack these, and who lack even the hope to achieve them.

How well we, of all people, know the malignancy of bias and prejudice. Our forebears, indeed, without the assistance of Commissions on Human Rights or enlightened community leadership writhed with the pain of prejudice's whiplash here and abroad. As a result of a spiritual strength, dogged determination, and unceasing optimism the Irish have managed to survive. We therefore, must be the first to understand the problems of those who face the same obstacles.

Recently, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, who is with us tonight, said in a statement that should, in my judgment, be written large over our city, "I pray that the full light of God's truth will shine into the heart of each man, the priceless truth that we are all his children, and brothers, one to another, and that each equally should share the benefit of those rights for which our forebears lived, fought, and died." These are words for us not only to cherish but to live by.

One of the greatest of us, and one of the greatest of all New Yorkers, was Al Smith, who grew up on the sidewalks of New York and got his practical schooling around the Fulton Fish Market. He understood and loved this society and was one of its most beloved members. He understood the disadvantages of poverty and discrimination. He understood the minorities, because he was one of them. He understood and loved New York, because he was a New Yorker. He understood and loved America, because he was an American. He understood and loved the human race, because he was really and truly a member of it in the best sense of the word. That's what we all have to bear in mind: that we are all members of the same society—the society of mankind.

For nearly two centuries the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick have met to toast the memory of the saint and the nation he symbolizes. Who does not realize that this great and historic oragnization rose at the instance of Irish officers who served nobly in the American War for Independence. They brought to the founding of this body the spirit of liberty, democracy, and benevolence. This same tradition and this same dedication motivates the Friendly Sons to this very hour.

It is the annual celebration of this spirit that I ask you to toast with me tonight.

Thank you.

Interesting Days Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress voted to end the bracero program on December 31, 1964. It has been the best solution to a difficult economic and social problem. Heretofore, the problem has been largely handled by the farmers who use braceros and the U.S. Department of Labor. Now the problem encompasses every citizen of the United States and will affect almost every American in one way or another.

I ask that a letter written by Mr. Sam Chinn, one of the most respected and knowledgeable produce growers in the Salinas Valley, to the editor of the Salinas Californian be inserted in the RECORD at this point. It portrays vividly the immense problems which are being created by the termination of the bracero program. I commend it to everyone's attention:

INTERESTING DAYS AHEAD

To the EDITOR:

This letter is not a last-ditch effort to exploit the wonders of the Mexican national bracero program. Much better words and reasons already have been expressed.

I, like many other farmers and farm organizations, have yielded to the wishes of the majority. The bracero program is dead. Before the do-gooders jump up and shout "victory," let us see if they really won.

What used to be strictly an agricultural problem has become everyone's problem.

Experts in research of the farm labor situation already have agreed that 40,000 migrant families from out of State will be needed to replace the braceros. This is in addition to an extensive within-the-State recruitment program.

State government already has pledged millions to be spent in recruitment and housing for these families.

Federal Government has been asked to spend additional millions for some form of

Federal housing for these families. (Remember, farmers at their own expense had provided adequate housing for the braceros.)

Above all, local government will be expected to spend untold millions for schools, welfare, law enforcement, etc., through the years.

Economists agree that, even with this kind of supplemental labor, highly perishable crops will suffer due to the slow mobility of this type of a work force. Due to cuts in acreage of those crops, the public will be paying many more dollars than at present.

All this effect on your economy just because a well proven, wonderful program was cast away for a program that the farmers have no assurance will succeed. Remember, just the presence of these people here is not proof our labor problems are solved.

They must prove out to want to work conscientiously.

They must stay and do stoop labor.

They must be dependable.

Unlike the braceros, there is no law that says these migrants must do stoop labor, or even farm labor. There is nothing to prevent these American citizens from getting a free ride to this land of golden opportunities and, after one day of stoop labor in the hot sun or wind or rain, decides to quit, go to town, and take away someone else's job there.

Conservative estimates are that there will be 8,000 of these families in the Salinas Valley.

I must emphasize that agriculture did not create these problems but that these problems were brought on to agriculture.

The nonfarm people must realize they are able to maintain their high standard of living as a result of the progressiveness and resourcefulness and "plain old sweat" of the farmers of today. They must first try to understand our problems and, with understanding, we will have their support instead of hindrance to any program that is beneficial to agriculture.

We are expected to risk our life earnings on an insecure future already made unbearable by floods, droughts, high taxes, insects, high costs and reduced incomes. Farming is in our blood and we have faced and survived many crises; but this time we are not alone.

Every one of you is a part in this problem. It was bought for you by the "do-gooders." So hang on to your pocketbook and your jobs, there are going to be some very interesting days ahead for you and me.

SAM CHINN.

Let the Far and the Near Unite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who contend that the image of America has been tarnished abroad in recent years would do well to ponder a news story which appeared in the Sydney, Australia, Sun Herald for March 15.

The first elections are being held in the Australian territory of Papua-New Guinea. The island of New Hanover, 160 miles northwest of Rabaul, has a registered voter list of 2,000. When the prospective voters found they could not vote for President Johnson, 1,600 of them refused to vote.

I hate to add to the woes of the opposition, but the news story reads as follows:

PORT MORESBY.—Sixteen hundred natives on New Hanover Island, 160 miles northeast of Rabaul, have refused to vote because they could not vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

An administration spokesman said in Port Moresby the New Hanover islanders had been most disappointed to find Lyndon Johnson's name not in the list of candidates for the territory's first general election.

"When they found they couldn't vote for the U.S. President, 80 percent of the 2,000 voters simply refused to have anything at all to do with the elections," said the spokesman.

The administration is preparing to send patrols to the island's remote villages to explain to the people why the U.S. President wasn't among the candidates.

Senior administration officers in Port Moresby believe the idea of voting for Mr. Johnson was touched off by an American Air Force geodetic survey team which has for months been stationed on the island.

The islanders told polling officials they wanted to vote for Mr. Johnson because he would cut their taxes.

The people of New Hanover have for years been actively pro-American. When the United Nations visiting mission interviewed their leaders 2 years ago they were told Australia should relinquish the territory's administration to the United States.

At that time the U.S. member of the mission, Mr. Delmas Nucker said, "You must realize Australia is your Government, and even if America did take over you would still have to work hard, and there would be no handouts."

Voting in the elections will end on Wednesday and at 6 o'clock that afternoon counting will begin.

A tally room in Port Moresby will be connected by complicated radio link with returning officers in each of the country's 44 electorates.

Trade Policies Queried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a letter printed in the New York Times on March 8, 1964, from Mr. Kenneth B. Outerbridge, Princeton, N.J., contains pertinent comments on administration policy on East-West trade.

Mr. Outerbridge's remarks on that policy, which he labels "a weird exercise in logic" will be of interest to the Congress and to the public. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the letter for inclusion in the RECORD:

TRADE POLICIES QUERIED—ILLOGICAL DIVISION IN OUR DEALING WITH COMMUNISTS CHARGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A strategy of interdependence with the European Communist countries is being promoted by the administration in the hope that it will bring about "evolution within the Communist world toward national independence, peaceful cooperation and open societies."

Increased East-West trade and the extension of credit to finance it are only two examples. Last October President Kennedy announced the wheat deal and the same month the Attorney General ruled that the extension of credit to finance trade was not a loan within the meaning of the Johnson Act.

On February 4 President Johnson notified Congress that he had determined that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to issue guarantees in connection with the sale of U.S. agricultural products to the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. Also Yugoslavia for added goods and services.

However, as your March 3 editorial "Lard for Cuba" points out, the Department of Commerce forbids the export of lard to Cuba. It even stooped to deny a license for the shipment of 25 tons of secondhand clothes and shoes collected for the victims of Hurricane Flora.

We must conclude, therefore, that there are good Communists whom we should feed and succor and bad Communists whom we shouldn't. The U.S.S.R. must be good Communists. They are the prime reason for our $50 billion defense budget, they have just torpedoed the Geneva disarmament conference, and have announced a campaign designed to eradicate religion from Soviet life.

The bad Communists are the Cubans, who are largely supported by Russia and whose plans for subversion of Latin America and elsewhere are no doubt hatched in Moscow. A weird exercise in logic.

K. B. OUTERBRIDGE.

PRINCETON, N.J., *March 3, 1964.*

Editorial Comments on IDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recent House action in defeating the bill providing the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association stirred editorial writers throughout our Nation. As a supporter of the measure, I am extremely pleased to be taking part in new hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency for reconsideration of this important measure by this body. The following editorial comments, gathered from the Detroit Free Press, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, and the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich., are most worthy of the time of each Member:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Mar. 7, 1964]

WILD SHOT AT FOREIGN AID

In its enthusiasm to waylay foreign aid expenditures, the House of Representatives shot the wrong horse.

The House sent back to committee an administration request for a $312 million contribution to the International Development Association (IDA). Recommitting a bill usually means death.

The appropriation was dead-ended because lawmakers are understandably irked with the overall foreign aid program. But IDA is foreign aid with a difference.

IDA is operated by the World Bank to provide long-term development loans at liberal interest rates. It is a useful tool for both

the United Nations and the United States in helping underdeveloped countries.

The United States doesn't pay the entire bill. The $312 million was just our share. Some 16 other nations would contribute $438 million for a combined total of $750 million to operate the IDA for fiscal years 1966–68.

Without the U.S. contribution, it seems probable that other nations also will refuse their shares and the IDA will have to close up shop at the end of next year.

It is unfortunate that some of the accumulated resentment of foreign aid rubbed off on IDA.

These are loans, not grants, for economic, not military, projects. The loans are made only to projects established as economically sound.

Critics say IDA cuts down American control of the funds. But it also gives the United States some influence in the expenditure of funds contributed by other countries. That's the way with cooperative programs and we should do nothing to discourage international cooperation in providing foreign aid.

A minimum of arm twisting might achieve a reversal. Hopefully, the administration will make the effort on what is after all a rather small program. Only 11 vote switches would get the House to change its decision.

The measure already has Senate approval.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 28, 1964]

A SENSELESS VOTE

Even allowing for increasing resentment of foreign aid, the House vote against the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association makes no sense.

The United States initiated the IDA plan in 1960 to encourage European participation in foreign aid. This year the administration proposed a U.S. contribution of $312 million starting in 1966; 16 other countries would contribute $750 million. The Senate approved the idea by 38 to 31. But now the House has voted by 208 to 188 to return the measure to committee.

Possibly some of the House opponents did not like the idea of internationalizing foreing aid, removing it from its close relation with American foreign policy. But apart from the fact that true development aid ought to be divorced from national politics, the advantage of the IDA plan was that it engaged other countries in the effort to help the poorer nations. In the long run it could have reduced the U.S. share of the responsibility. And those who want to reduce foreign aid could have found no better way of doing it than this.

Without further American contributions, the IDA will run out of funds for new commitments this year, and will inevitably die in a few more years. That would be a tragedy for one of the most effective of all foreign aid programs and a tragedy for many nations struggling for a better existence. The Johnson administration should use all its influence to try to get the House to reconsider an ill-considered vote.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 1, 1964]

UNFORTUNATE VOTE ON AID

The House of Representatives has taken an action that could all but wreck one of the most hopeful developments in foreign aid. It has refused by 208 to 188 to approve the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association (IDA).

The Senate previously approved the bill but the House has now sent it back to committee, where, unless Presidential pressure strong enough to revive it is exerted, it will die.

There have long been complaints that foreign aid involved too many gifts instead of loans, that we carried too much of the load without help from our allies, that projects were too often approved without full study, that aid was sometimes politically oriented and that there was not adequate check on how projects were carried out.

Under the IDA program, started in 1960, European allies were brought into the joint aid program. The IDA is known as the soft loan arm of the World Bank, and from the start was very popular.

The bill the House shelved would have given U.S. support to a $750 million program of loans to needy nations. This country would have put up $312 million and 16 other nations the rest.

Apparently the timing in the House was unfortunate. The measure was greeted as another aid bill coming too quickly on the heels of the regular foreign aid measure. However, timing could not be helped because the nations supporting IDA had set a March 1 deadline—and if the United States had not agreed to provide its agreed share by that time the program could die. Representative REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, floor manager of the bill, saw the proposal go down before Republican and southern Democratic votes.

IDA has been a workable and sound phase of the aid program. President Johnson should intervene to reason and get the House to reconsider its abrupt and unfortunate action.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1964]

DEFEAT FOR IDA

In turning down the administration's request for a $312 million contribution to the International Development Association, the House of Representatives has committed a blunder of the first magnitude.

The more rational critics of foreign aid have argued with some cogency that there has been some waste and mismanagement in the dispersion of funds. They have pointed out that economic aid has in some instances been dissipated because of political considerations. They have charged that the United States has shouldered too much of the burden of help for the underdeveloped nations. But in voting against IDA, they are only helping destroy a very real corrective for precisely the features of foreign aid that they do not like.

The fact is that IDA, which is operated by the World Bank to provide long-term development loans on liberal terms, is an answer to many of the more reasonable criticisms of foreign aid. It lends, rather than grants, money to projects only after they are demonstrated to be economically sound; it is a multilateral operation, which assures a minimum of political influence; and it offers the prospect of attracting an increasing amount of funds from the industrialized nations of Europe, which have preferred to conduct their aid programs on a purely unilateral basis.

By denying funds to IDA, the House may cause this constructive and cooperative approach to foreign aid to wither away. The initial outlays to set up IDA are now nearing exhaustion. Unless there is a new injection of money it cannot continue its development activities. Without IDA's supplementary lending, the World Bank will be unable to expand its own operations.

Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of the Treasury Dillon have already expressed the hope that the House will reconsider its hasty and ill-advised rejection of IDA. We join in that hope, and urge the several local New York Republicans who helped massacre IDA—including FINO of the Bronx; BECKER, DEROUNIAN, and WYDLER, of Nassau; and BARRY, of Westchester—to change their stand in recognition of the efficient and economical form of aid that IDA provides.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 2, 1964]

WE NEED IDA

In a fit of something like petulance last week, the House voted to return a very important bill to committee. The measure, which had already passed (although narrowly) in the Senate, would have increased the American contribution to the International Development Association by $312 million over the next 3 years. Since 16 other countries were also to contribute to the fund, and March 1 had been set as the international deadline, the recommittal was quite evidently intended to kill the bill.

But IDA is too necessary an instrument to be treated so cavalierly. The association is an affiliate of the World Bank; its function is to provide soft loans—that is, loans on easier terms than the World Bank itself can offer, and to borrower nations which cannot meet the strict standards of the Bank.

IDA was a creation of the Eisenhower administration, which found in the Association a means of spreading the responsibility for assisting underdeveloped countries and of doing it on a businesslike, if admittedly liberal, basis. IDA's opponents claim that the Association means that the United States loses control over, and credit for, the funds it contributes. These objections may easily be countered by pointing out that IDA permits nations to be helped for severely practical purposes without damaging their self-respect, or entangling the United States in their politics. At the same time it enlists other countries in the projects with hard currency that more than matches our dollars.

The House was extremely shortsighted in turning back the bill. Its Members, and especially the Republican leadership, owe it to the country to see that the bill is brought back and passed. The world needs IDA—and so do we.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1964]

SAVE THE IDA

The House of Representatives should be persuaded to reconsider its tentative rejection of legislation that would permit the United States to join with other advanced countries in supplying the International Development Association with the resources it requires to operate after 1965. Affiliated with the World Bank, the IDA makes loans on generous terms to the poorer nations which find it very difficult to finance their programs for economic development.

A refusal by the House to accept legislation which has been approved by the Senate will have far-reaching consequences. The efforts to place economic assistance on a multilateral basis will be dealt a serious blow and worse still, many of the programs on which the less-developed countries rely to raise living standards may have to be abandoned. The more implacable enemies of foreign aid in the House will not be disturbed by the mischievous results of their handiwork. But there is a large and more responsible majority which will respond to a vigorous appeal on behalf of the IDA.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Mar. 22, 1964]

BETTER FOREIGN AID ANSWER THAN GOP "NO" IS ROUSING IDA "YES"

The accusation most frequently hurled at Republicans in or out of Congress is that they are against many programs as offered by Democratic administrations, and rarely put forward constructive alternatives. But there is one program, foreign aid, that has been the baby of both Democratic and Republican administrations since the end of World War II—and nobody has been greatly pleased with its upbringing.

Now, Republicans may get a second chance this year to squelch that "aginner" reputation and at the same time reverse one of their clumsiest boners when, late in February, they voted down a requested $312 million contribution to the International Development Association.

This was the bill for which Congressman JAMES HARVEY, of Saginaw, spoke at great length on the floor of the House before it suffered an ignominious GOP defeat. To put it briefly and gently, Republican leaders somewhere got their wires crossed—probably because they were so intent on a single-tract determination to reduce administration spending requests that they failed to take a second look at the IDA and the opportunity it offered.

It is timely to review the IDA proposal because President Johnson now has asked Congress for $3.4 billion in foreign aid with a promise that there will be no waste in the operation.

Would that it might be so.

It wasn't true under Truman, or Eisenhower, or Kennedy.

If Johnson does some promised streamlining to achieve prudent and responsible programs, it will develop only because the American people finally have gotten their backs way up. We doubt he can succeed.

Many Republicans are convinced that the oversea assistance program has become so ingrained as a dole operation that it must be terminated to break a bad pattern and break up bureaucracy that has grown and become ingrown over the handout years.

But there are some who, with Congressman HARVEY, recognize fully that the United States cannot withdraw from the world community where poverty and ignorance must be attacked.

And this is the opportunity to break with traditional foreign aid and substitute a refreshing alternative through an expanded International Development Association. This agency has numerous advantages to recommend it:

It is operated by the World Bank and makes long-term loans, not gifts or grants.

Sixteen other nations besides the United States even now are contributing to it. For every dollar we put up, they combine to contribute another $1.40. Considering their resources, that is good. Besides it is a healthy way to join hands in sharing this kind of assistance. It is an encouragement to other nations to share the load.

Further, with 16 other nations participating, they serve as a restraint on our own country's overgenerous instincts—which have contributed to our own $310 billion national debt. Congressman HARVEY testified that, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee handling the measure, he learned why original fund increase proposals were scaled down. Participating countries with intimate knowledge of loan applicants in their various parts of the world are better judges of project needs. Also, these IDA partners are not so quick to spread it around, like it was going out of style.

This latter attribute our Mr. HARVEY credits to the tendency of people to "follow their money." This fact of human nature is said to be largely responsible for the World Bank's great success to date.

This week and after the Easter recess both Houses of Congress will be debating the administration's foreign aid appropriation request. If people could and would communicate their feelings, the chance is here to put our oversea assistance on a much more sound course for the future.

It seems wise that military aid be continued as a separate part of our assistance and under our direction. But all economic aid, which is currently represented as $2.4 billion of the administration bill, could be transferred and transposed at reduced figures to the International Development Association.

The United States needs partnership counseling as well as financial sharing in order to do a more intelligent and prudent job of appraising loan applications. The loans, as distinguished from grants, impose no hardships on recipients in need of such help. They are long term and carry only a minor service charge in lieu of interest. The loan idea is sound, too, because it eradicates the handout aura which has hung over foreign aid, sometimes doing injustice to proud and able peoples who are not charity-seekers.

Rather than flog annually, foreign aid, as a political stepchild with whom a resentful Uncle Sam is stuck, we would urge renewed efforts, on the part of Republicans especially, to acknowledge this Nation's legitimate obligations in the world community, and set about seeing that our Government can play its part in a new atmosphere of willing partnership. IDA is the best idea produced to date as a constructive alternative. It is a chance for Americans of all political shades to be for what they know in their hearts is right and necessary.

Medal of Honor for John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I introduced a bill which would authorize the President to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to our late and lamented leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In support of the bill I also filed with the Committee on Armed Services numerous resolutions which have been adopted by local governmental jurisdictions, labor unions, veterans organizations, and individuals.

Today I am pleased to file with the committee identical resolutions which were recently adopted by Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers of America; the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Idaho, State Executive Committee; the City Council of Pomona, Calif.; Gordon M. Freeman, international president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Joseph A. Beirne, international president of the Communications Workers of America; the City Council of Monrovia, Calif.; the City Council of Chino, Calif.; the Sentinel Publications of Covina, Calif.; the San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune of West Covina, Calif.; W. W. Buck, commander of the Department of California, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America; and our own beloved William "Fishbait" Miller, Doorkeeper of the House.

Mr. Speaker, as I have noted before, the force behind the drive to secure a Congressional Medal of Honor for John Kennedy is the Frank C. Marpe Chapter 44, Disabled American Veterans, located in West Covina. Much of the credit for chapter 44's success to date in securing wide adoption of its Medal of Honor resolution must go to Mr. Victor James Kordell, who resides at 153 Nearglen in Covina.

A trustee of the Frank C. Marpe chapter, and chairman of the Congressional Medal of Honor drive, Vic Kordell devotes his full energy to this project since it is one which is very close to his heart. Like John Kennedy, Vic Kordell is a disabled veteran who served in World War II.

I am speaking in behalf of all members of the Frank C. Marpe chapter, commanded by Joe Gibbs—

Vic said recently—

when I say that we of the Disabled American Veterans suffered a great loss with the untimely death of our Commander in Chief.

Out of respect for all he has done for the veterans of this country, especially the disabled veterans, we would like to show our appreciation in some way, and believe the most fitting tribute would be to stimulate and organize a drive that would result in Congress awarding him the Medal of Honor.

Although the idea originated with the Frank C. Marpe chapter, Vic Kordell correctly stresses that success depends on the interest and support given by other veterans and service groups, by local government and labor unions, and by the press and individual citizens, not only in the southern California area but throughout the United States.

But, in the final analysis, success in securing a Congressional Medal of Honor for John Fitzgerald Kennedy rests with the Congress; and I am hopeful that its judgment will be to pay proper tribute to our late President who, in the words of Victor Kordell, gave his full measure of devotion to his country in the battle for freedom of all men.

Byelorussian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the date of March 25 marks the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. In annually commemorating the events of 1918 we honor the valiant courage and determination of the Byelorussian people who were forced to struggle against Poland, Germany, and Russia in order to preserve their freedom. Such formidable enemies inevitably overwhelmed and divided the new Republic. And today in the minds of too many people, Byelorussia is an unknown or confused concept.

The events as recorded in history are swiftly tragic for that brave nation, but these brief recordings must be appreciated in the light of their full significance. In 1918, the Slavic people of Byelorussia consolidated their culture, their territory, and their people into an independent nation. From the moment of this declaration, the territory of Byelorussia was no longer subject to annexation but could only be gotten by invasion; her culture could not be merely absorbed but had to be oppressed, and her people could not be occupied but had to be enslaved and redistributed. These were the

prices that had to be paid because the Byelorussian people chose to exercise a right that is inherent in all man. These are the sacrifices that called forth in the Byelorussian people the deeds of courage that have made of their nation an exceptional symbol of resistance to the flood of Communist oppression.

It is therefore proper that we join the Byelorussian people in all areas of the world in a rededication to their goals of a free and independent nation.

Outline for Establishment of Western Hemisphere Development Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in anything today that pertains to promoting economic progress and better friendship and understanding among the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

My attention has just been called to a very able statement by Mr. C. N. Shelton of the Peruvian Airlines who has been working for some 30 years in the Latin American countries, which I commend for thoughtful consideration to my colleagues and the country:

OUTLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

The great present need in Latin America is the foundation of a broad private economy that will afford additional employment and provide increased living standards for the great mass of the population. Such an economy is the only guarantee against Communist domination in this area. In one manner or another, these countries will be developed. If the free world cannot provide the means whereby the capitalistic system can accomplish it, the development will be carried on under Communist influence.

Direct aid by the U.S. Government to the Latin countries is not the complete answer. Not only can our governmental economy not afford the billions that would be necessary, but direct government to government aid seldom filters down to the individual in any recognizable form. It can be effective in the field of large public works, but not for the establishment of basic private enterprise. Furthermore, the capitalistic free enterprise system is founded upon the concept of individual initiative as contrasted to the socialistic theory of governmental domination of all economic areas. How can a respect and desire for a private free enterprise system be installed when the active participant in such a plan is the government itself and not the individual? The only ones who can propagate our economic system are those to whom it belongs—the individual investors.

But the need of the Latin economy goes beyond the mere requirement for additional business enterprise. Such enterprises must eventually be owned and controlled by private national interests. With all due respect to the many U.S. companies that have made substantial investments in Latin America, the great majority of these investments are still actually owned and controlled by the parent companies here in the United States. This type of investment, though creating jobs and increasing incomes, is still a form of colonialism—and as such is resented in many areas. It lacks the basic element that must be provided if the capitalistic system is to provide a dam against communistic influence in Latin America—the ownership and control of business entities by private national interests.

But the participation by private U.S. capital in the economic development of Latin America cannot be obtained merely because of patriotic or altruistic desires. For U.S. investors to enter into such a program, they must be assured of a reasonable expectation of profits at a rate greater than they could expect to receive on domestic investments. The following plan seeks to combine the objectives of:

1. The establishment of nationally owned and controlled private ventures, and,

2. A profit incentive for the U.S. investor.

A corporation would be organized in one of the United States for the purpose of investing its capital in other corporations which would be established in any other Western Hemisphere republic under the following plan:

(a) The investment in the foreign corporation would be by way of stock ownership as opposed to mere loans.

(b) The investments would be made in new business, not those that are already operating.

(c) The investment could be made either for all of the stock of the new foreign corporation, or could be made in return for a part of such stock in partnership with other similar U.S. investment corporations, or with nationals of the nation involved.

(d) At the time of the organization of the foreign corporation, the U.S. corporation would enter into a contract whereby all dividends of the foreign corporation (including perhaps a requirement that the foreign corporation would declare as dividends all profits over and above a certain sum) would be used to repay the investment to the U.S. corporation. Upon final repayment of this investment, all title to the stock in the foreign corporation would pass to certain designated nationals of the foreign nation, except that the U.S. corporation would have the right to retain not more than one-third of the stock which it originally received. This stock that would be retained by the U.S. corporation would, in effect, be its payment for financing the foreign corporation. Once the investment had been returned to the U.S. corporation at least two-thirds of the stock in the foreign corporation would be "bona fidely" owned by nationals of the foreign country and the U.S. corporation would retain not more than one-third of such shares.

The following aid would be sought by way of legislation, or otherwise, from the U.S. Government in order to provide the necessary inducement to investors:

(a) The initial investments in foreign corporations would be insured against confiscation either through the present plan of the International Cooperative Administration, or if this cannot be accomplished, through the enlargement of the Administration's insuring powers.

(b) The Federal Internal Revenue Act should be amended to provide the following:

(i) The U.S. corporation would be permitted to recoup its investment and retain up to one-third of the stock in the foreign corporation without the payment of any tax thereon.

(ii) Any dividends received by the U.S. corporation from a foreign corporation after the repayment of its investment would also be tax free, provided that such dividends were reinvested in a similar project within 1 year.

(iii) Taxable dividend income received by the U.S. corporation would be taxed at the rates that are presently applicable to Western Hemisphere trading companies (about 38 percent at the maximum rates instead of the standard 52 percent).

(iv) The U.S. corporation would be permitted to distribute in each year to its stockholders a dividend equal to 2½ percent of the book value of its assets, which dividend would be tax free to the shareholders.

Certain assistance would also be solicited from the foreign governments involved. Preliminary conversations with legislators and other governmental officials in several of the Latin American countries indicates that there would be little difficulty in obtaining the necessary legislation to accomplish the following:

(a) In certain countries amendments would be needed to the laws governing corporations in order to permit the proposed shareholding arrangements.

(b) Tax considerations from the local governments should be obtained whereby certain taxes would be eliminated for a fixed number of years, or perhaps until the original investment had been repaid. The exact nature of such relief would, of course, vary from country to country depending upon the individual taxing policies of each nation. Certain Latin countries already possess in their taxing laws ample provisions in this regard with respect to new industries.

Beef Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, an article in the current issue of the Cooperative Consumer, dated March 14, 1964, regarding the beef supply situation, has just come to my attention.

This article covers all aspects of the current beef supply situation and I believe it will be of considerable interest to all Members who have introduced legislation to restrict beef imports.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today:

CATTLEMEN DOING LOTS OF BEEFING ABOUT BEEF

Who's to blame for low beef prices?

Australians and New Zealanders? American corporations with oversea investments? Hamburger- and hot-dog-living teenagers? The Government? Big feed operators? Old but prolific cows?

Everybody on this list has been blamed publicly by someone trying to fix guilt for the beef price depression that is casting a gloomy shadow across agricultural America.

At the heart of the matter, of course, is oversupply. There is so much beef available in the United States these days that no cattle will bring prices that their owners have grown accustomed to over the last decade or so. Cattle prices have dropped about a fifth since the end of 1962.

The most persistent and emotional blame for beef price troubles has been put on the shoulders of cattlemen in Australia and New Zealand and the Government in the United States.

Record amounts of beef, mostly boneless and in lower grades, are coming to America from Australia and New Zealand. The U.S. Government recently negotiated agreements whereby Australia and New Zealand volun-

teered to cut beef and mutton shipments to the United States slightly this year and to increase shipments by 3.7 percent in each of the next 2 years.

Last year, about 1.9 billion pounds of beef and veal were imported into the United States. This equaled 11 percent of U.S. production. Seven years earlier imports equaled only 1.6 percent of domestic production.

Australia, with 517 million pounds sent to America, was the biggest foreign supplier of beef to U.S. markets.

The United States provided a market for Australian and New Zealand cattlemen when they needed it most. Britain, the traditional market for "down under" beef, recently boosted its barriers to imported meat.

Perhaps, strictly speaking, the Australians and New Zealanders shouldn't be blamed—or credited—with sending beef to the United States.

A former overseas employee of an American packing company estimated that 80 percent of the beef coming to the United States from Australia is owned by American firms before it ever leaves Australian ranches.

And Nebraska Governor Frank Morrison suggested that an investigation be made into the "amount of American capital going into Australia and New Zealand to produce meat for the American market."

Wherever in the production cycle they acquire the foreign beef, American firms make no bones about the fact that they're using it. At Armour & Co.'s annual meeting in February, Board Chairman William Woods Prince was queried about Armour beef imports. An Iowa cattle raiser who owns Armour stock put the question to Prince.

Prince, who said most of Armour imports are manufacturing beef, went on to say, "Armour's duty is to make money for you stockholders. Therefore, Armour has to participate in meat imports if it will make money."

Some 20 to 25 percent of beef consumed in the United States is in processed products. Manufacturing beef, too tough by itself for American tastes, is the principal ingredient in these products.

An Australian government agency has reported that 60 percent of the boneless beef sent to the United States goes straight to American retailers for grinding, with rough cuts and fat trims from domestic carcasses, into hamburger; 5 percent goes to restaurants for stews and similar dishes; and 35 percent goes to packers for frankfurters and other processed meats.

Foreign beef has a fringe appeal for use in hamburger. Generally, it's redder than domestic beef. Because American housewives mistakenly judge hamburger chiefly by its redness, they prefer hamburger with generous amounts of foreign beef.

Herrell DeGraff, president of the American Meat Institute, explained last month in an Omaha, Nebr., speech that domestic production of manufacturing beef has fallen off at the very time demand for it has risen to an alltime high.

He blames the increased demand on the increased number of American youngsters and their hearty appetites for hamburgers and frankfurters.

While the population explosion was building a demand for processed products, it was also building demand for quality beef. There was more profit in quality beef.

Taking advantage of that profitable trend, cattlemen quit culling herds as assiduously as they had in less profitable days. Old cows and bulls that might have been hamburger years earlier were kept to produce calves for that attractive market.

Old cows and bulls are the principal source of domestic manufacturing beef. In the 6 years up to 1963, said DeGraff, domestic manufacturing beef production dropped 40 percent in the United States.

Don't put more than minor blame for low cattle prices on imports, said DeGraff. He recalled that in May, 1963, he warned in another Omaha speech that the "cattle business is heading for trouble."

He based his warning on the fact that in 6 years cow numbers had risen by a third. Not only were herds bigger, there were new herds. The prospering beef industry attracted many a new operator, including some strange to the cattle business. Barron's, the financial journal, has pointed out that newcomers included such diverse interests as comedian Jack Benney, the Hunt Oil Co. and the Mormon Church.

In his 1963 speech, DeGraff warned that bunched marketings would break the market. Before the year was out, the warning came true.

Even in the face of 1963's beef market break, the national cattle inventory has continued to rise. In 1963, there were 104 million beef cattle in U.S. herds; there are an estimated 107 million this year.

DeGraff had some unsettling observations to make about what the increase in the number of giant feed lots has done to the cattle industry. With their big investments, big lot owners must run cattle through their expensive facilities, DeGraff pointed out. Smaller operators can adjust to oversupply by shifting to other operations for a couple of years and riding out bad prices.

The big lots make the industry less flexible, DeGraff observed.

"I have a disturbing feeling that the beef business under this influence is getting to be like the chicken business—pressuring always for volume even though prices take a beating."

DeGraff agrees generally with Department of Agriculture estimates that for every $3.70 per hundredweight decline in cattle prices, 20 cents can be blamed on increased poultry and pork supplies, 50 cents on imports, and $3 on domestic oversupply.

Meat Institute President DeGraff, USDA, and various college economists nowithstanding, cattlemen seem more exercised about beef imports than about the domestic oversupply.

A couple of Ohio Cattle Feeders Association officials have estimated that:

It would have taken 3.2 million domestic animals to produce the beef and veal imported last year.

It would have taken a 4-million-head herd to produce replacements for the cattle slaughtered.

And it would have taken 1.4 million animals to breed replacements for the production herd.

That adds up to 8.6 million cattle. How much of the beef turned out by that hypothetical herd would have been manufacturing beef or willingly sold for manufacturing beef prices wasn't reported by the herd's creators.

Besides fretting about imports' effects, cattlemen have held meetings to protest them. One such meeting was held March 2 in Shenandoah, Iowa.

Cattlemen, bankers, a couple of Governors, and an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture addressed the meeting. The recently negotiated import agreements came in for attack.

The assistant secretary, George Mehrens, explained that the Department of Agriculture has no authority to raise tariffs or restrict imports. It can only negotiate voluntary restrictions—as it did.

Under the new agreements, Australian and New Zealand beef imports will be held this year to 6 percent below last year's imports. It has been estimated that they would have been 11 to 12 percent above last year's without the agreements.

Mehrens said the agreements "bought time" for the United States, apparently until tariff negotiations scheduled for May in Geneva. He implied that the administration intends to press at Geneva for freer world trade for both industrial and agricultural products.

"We don't intend to remain the world's only open market for beef," Mehrens said.

Last year, more than half of the beef in world trade was imported by the United States, which has only a longstanding 3-cent-per-pound tariff on meat.

Increasing the tariff drastically or establishing severe new import restrictions virtually on the eve of the Geneva negotiations would hamper the U.S. bargaining positions, and cause cynical amusement around a world still echoing with American squawks about trade barriers to our poultry products.

Mehrens said that only Congress has authority to change tariffs or restrict imports.

Despite Mehrens' warning about what tariff increases or import restrictions would do to the Geneva Conference, cattlemen closed the Shenandoah meeting by passing a resolution asking "Congress to limit by legislative action imports of beef and veal, fresh, frozen, cooked, and/or canned or cured, to the level in pounds approximately equal in volume to the level of 1960, approximately 775 million pounds or 4.9 percent of domestic production of that year."

Two bills have been introduced in Congress to do just about what the Shenandoah resolution asked. One was narrowly defeated. The other, still in the Senate Finance Committee, has strong bipartisan support.

On the very day of the Shenandoah meeting, the good ship *Sonoma* arrived on America's west coast. The *Mariposa* was already there, sliding between U.S. ports. And less than a week later the *Nottingham* put in at a Florida port before heading up the coast toward the great metropolitan centers.

The refrigerated holds of the three Australian vessels were packed with 7½ million pounds of beef and mutton.

The First Lady Views Space Achievements Firsthand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 24, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson viewed firsthand our accomplishments to date in the space field when she visited the NASA's installation at Huntsville, Ala.

The static firing of a Saturn I engine was witnessed by the First Lady from a blockhouse, and her comments at that time to the effect that if man's mind can do such things with machines, it can do the same thing in human relations, is in my opinion, indicative of the great and sincere interest the First Lady manifests in the welfare of our Nation and the possible peaceful uses of our space program.

The Washington Post for March 25 carried a complete report on Mrs. Johnson's visit and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the article follows:

WANTS ACHIEVEMENT MATCHED IN HUMAN RELATIONS—MRS. L.B.J. IS AWED BY SPACE FEAT

(By Marie Smith)

HUNTSVILLE, ALA., March 24.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson wore a white plastic helmet and held her fingers over her ears here this afternoon as she witnessed a dramatic static test

firing of an eight-engine cluster of the first stage of the Saturn I followed 7 minutes later by a static firing of the F-1 engine which in a cluster of five will be used later this decade to send an Apollo spacecraft to the moon.

There was an almost deafening roar as the eight-cluster engine with a total thrust of 1.5 million pounds belched forth flames like a giant firecracker, and Mrs. Johnson watched from an opening in a bunker 1,400 feet away.

With her were some 60 "kissing cousins" who came to this 17,000-acre Space Flight Center in northern Alabama for a luncheon reunion with the First Lady who spent her childhood summers in Alabama, where her parents were born.

"It was fantastic," she declared after the firing was over and she removed her white plastic helmet labeled in gold letters "Mrs. L.B.J." "It gives you a clear picture of why you need all the heat insulation. I didn't dream it would be that terrific amount of firepower."

She was still talking about the dramatic display when the second test firing went off, a single engine with a 1.5 million pounds of thrust that burned for 60 seconds, filling the landscape in the distance with smoke and flame.

"The awe of what the mind of man can accomplish grows apace when you witness something like this. I've never seen anything comparable," the President's wife said.

The wood and concrete bunker from which Mrs. Johnson watched the test firings cost $200,000. (The test firings had been scheduled as another step in the Apollo program and were not held especially for her.) The bunker was behind bales of hay to reduce the vibration, but still the wood framing of the bunker quivered as the flames erupted.

Mrs. Johnson said watching this impressive accomplishment "gave me hope if the mind of man can do such things with machines, it can do the same in human relations."

The eight-engine cluster of Saturn I, which burns 600 gallons of kerosene a second for 137 seconds, will be used to send an unmanned Apollo spacecraft into earth orbit, and one is presently on the pad at Cape Kennedy for launching later this spring.

With her to explain the firings and the importance of the harnessed reservoir of power were James Webb, Administrator of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration, and Wernher von Braun, Director of the Marshall Space Flight Center.

The entire day was an education in the Nation's space program for the First Lady who has long been interested in it because her husband was author of this Nation's first major space legislation when he was a Member of the Senate.

She stressed the peaceful uses these achievements may mean to he world. She said when she saw the large engine section of the Saturn V, she was reminded that the Roman numeral V—vee—was a symbol of victory during World War II "When in the near future the Saturn V, carries three men to the moon, that will be another V-day, but with an important distinction.

"For the antagonist over whom we will have won a victory will not be a human enemy or hostile ideology. Rather, it is a vast unknown; and our mission is not conquest, but understanding. Our weapons are not arms, but ideas. Our strategy and tactics are intellectual and scientific ingenuity. Our goal: Peaceful cooperation," she said.

She spoke briefly at an assembly of employees in the Center's administration headquarters at which she presented awards to nine employees for outstanding achievement, performance, and inventions. At the ceremony Director von Braun presented to her a model of the Saturn V, which he jokingly said will be known in the future as the Saturn Vee instead of the Saturn Five.

At another ceremony earlier in the day Von Braun had presented to her the white plastic "hard hat" of the type worn by construction workers. He, himself, was wearing a Texas hat which had been presented to him by President Johnson last December when he and Mrs. von Braun were guests of the Johnsons at the L.B.J. Ranch.

He said the President gave him the hat with instructions to put it on the moon by 1970, "I keep it wrapped in cellophane except on ceremonial occasions," he said.

Civil Rights—Justice and Equality for All Our Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the U.S. Senate continues to delay action on the civil rights bill after all these weeks. We passed this important legislation in the House on February 10. I continue to receive a large volume of mail from my constituents thanking me for my vote for the bill and my sponsorship of it, and asking that my efforts continue for final passage. Because of such great interest expressed by residents of my district, I insert in the RECORD at this time my testimony on the civil rights bill on July 17, 1963, and my remarks on the House floor on February 5, 1964:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON JULY 17, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to present to you and members of your distinguished committee my views on H.R. 7152, your omnibus civil rights bill and my own bill, H.R. 7224, containing the President's civil rights proposals. As you know, my bill, H.R. 7224, is identical to your bill, Mr. Chairman. I am here to testify in favor of these proposals and to urge approval by your committee.

You will recall that I was one of the sponsors of legislation to eliminate the poll tax, which passed in the 87th Congress.

You also have before your committee my bill, H.R. 2095, to eliminate unreasonable literacy requirements for voting; and my bill, H.R. 6639, to extend the Civil Rights Commission and to broaden the scope of its duties. These proposals are both incorporated in our omnibus civil rights bill.

Mr. Chairman, 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation assuring freedom and equality to all Americans. One hundred years later, some of our people are still deprived of these rights. Across our Nation we are seeing evidence of impatience of some of our American citizens who are victims of discrimination. And the rest of the world watches while we preach to them about freedom.

The erupting civil rights crisis has injected a sense of urgency into this session of Congress and our adjournment date should not be set until action is taken on this problem. Congressional inertia in this area of our national life would be tragic. As our President has put it so adroitly:

"* * * the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife, causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of responsible and reasonable men to purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquility, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress, and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us."

There should be no partisan politics here; Congress must enact legislation to lay the guidelines for solutions to the various phases of this problem. Failure to do so will weaken the fabric of this Nation at a time when it needs its full strength.

Legislative relief is needed in the areas of voting, education, employment, and public accommodations. It has been in these spheres of activities that the American Negro's struggle for full equality has been a frustrating one.

The struggle is not that of the Negro alone. No American should be denied his basic rights to work, eat, vote, to learn, and to live where he chooses.

Effective action must be taken by Congress to assure justice and equality for all of our citizens.

Legislation cannot change a person's prejudices. If color discrimination were to disappear overnight, the Negro's low economic status would still handicap him. But legislation can work to eliminate conditions that handicap the Negro. And this is where we have a responsibility in the U.S. Congress.

The proposals in our bill, Mr. Chairman, attempt to remove the barriers which some of our citizens have faced the past 100 years—barriers which will stand in the way of enjoyment of full citizenship, to which every American is entitled, and which is guaranteed in his birthright.

There are those who regard the President's proposals as too much, too soon, as too ambitious an undertaking, especially in terms of success. I think not. They offer the Congress a set of solutions that should be acceptable to all men and women of good will. They are not designed because of mere economic, social, or diplomatic considerations. They were designed out of the knowledge that to insure the blessings of liberty to all is the primary prerequisite in a democracy, in a government, of and by, and for the people.

Our basic commitments as a nation and a people, our conscience, our sense of decency and human dignity, demand that we try to eliminate discrimination due to race, color, religion. To eliminate it is (1) not to practice it, and (2) not to tolerate it on the part of others. If we are successful in eliminating discrimination in our great country, other countries will look to us for having given substance to the dream of freedom and equality. If we do not, then we have lost our dignity and leadership both at home and abroad.

* * * * *

Limitation of the exercise of that right to vote according to race serves no other purpose than to put into doubt the rendition of justice to the Negro citizen and the protection of his rights. A government not electorally responsible to one segment of our national citizenry, seriously jeopardizes the very essence of our representative democracy and the political life of the Nation as a whole.

Under the provision of our civil rights bill, Mr. Chariman, voting protection in Federal elections would be strengthened by providing for the apportionment of temporary voting referees, and by speeding up voting suits. For States having the literacy test, a presumption of qualification to vote would be created by "the completion of the sixth grade by any applicant." The constitutionality of such a provision is beyond reproach; Congress has within its purview of constitutional powers the power to regulate the manner of holding Federal elections.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the elimination of unreasonable literacy requirements for voting, I would like to quote from my testimony before your committee in the 87th Congress: "It is a known fact that unreasonable literacy tests have been used unjustly to deny the right to vote. Education is a reliable gage of literacy, but how much education? At what point should the standard be set? My bill establishes the minimum line at the completion of the sixth grade in schools * * * this a reasonable demarcation point, and I believe the most effective device is the one in my bill. It consists of establishing an objective standard by which an individual's literacy may be judged. This eliminates the intrusions of bias or prejudice * * * it requires the determination of fact, rather than a judgment or an interpretation."

Title I under our omnibus civil rights proposal would further require that if a literacy test is used as a qualification for voting in Federal elections, it shall be written and the applicant shall be furnished, upon request, with a certified copy of the test and the answers he has given.

* * * * *

Title II of our bill proscribes discrimination in public establishments such as hotels and motels engaged in furnishing lodging for guests traveling interstate; movie theaters and other public places of entertainment which present forms of amusement which move in interstate commerce traffic; and restaurants and stores that extend food services, facilities, and the like, the substantial portion of which has moved in interstate commerce, for sale or hire to a substantial degree to interstate travelers. Arbitrary practices guided by racist considerations in this area create nothing but unjust hardships and inconveniences for the Negro citizen. He is forced to stay at hotels of inferior quality, and travel great distances to obtain any kind of satisfactory accommodations or food service.

Discrimination in the field of public accommodations should find no quarter of sympathy or tolerance in our National Legislature. As it contributes to an artificial restriction of interstate commerce, it can best be removed by congressional action invoked under the commerce clause. In addition, legislative action can be justified by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment: as these particular vehicles of private enterprise are licensed by the appropriate State authorities to engage in their particular activity, discriminatory practices found therein take on the character of State action and therefore fall within the limits of the 14th amendment.

Critics of the public accommodations section level the charge that legislation of this kind would amount to an unconstitutional hindrance to property rights. The soundness of this argument is tenuous to say the least, for when was the right to property considered to be absolute? President Kennedy answered his critics by saying that: "The argument that such measures constitute an unconstitutional interference with property rights has consistently been rejected by the courts in upholding laws on zoning, collective bargaining, minimum wages, smoke control, and countless other measures designed to make certain that the use of private property is consistent with the public interest * * * indeed, there is an age-old saying that 'property has its duties as well as its rights'; no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large, can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color."

Mr. Chairman, a further provision of the bill—title IV—provides for the establishment of a Community Relations Service, the duties of which would be to work with regional, State, and local biracial committees to alleviate racial tension. The value of such a service cannot be emphasized enough. Lacking the power of subpena, it would advise and assist local officials in improving the communication and cooperation between the races. By so doing, the Service would go a long way in helping to preclude recurrencies of racial crises.

I have already mentioned the Civil Rights Commission; title V will extend and broaden its powers. With regard to title VI, our Federal Government provides financial assistance or backing for many programs and activities administered by local and State governments, and by private enterprises. As a Member of the U.S. Congress, it is my privilege and responsibility to vote on these proposals and I feel the activities and benefits of such programs should be available to eligible recipients without regard to race or color. This should also apply to the employment practices of the organizations involved, public or private.

Title VII authorizes the President to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color, or religion, or national origin, by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistant is provided by the Federal Government.

Unemployment falls with special cruelty on minority groups, and creates an atmosphere of resentment and unrest; the results are delinquency, vandalism, disease, slums, and the high cost of providing public welfare and of combating crime. I support the President's requests for more vocational education and training for our illiterate and unskilled. It is programs such as the manpower development and training program which assist in reducing unemployment.

Racial prejudice and discrimination are fundamentally wrong. Our Judeo-Christian heritage—our sense of how man should treat his brother—our basic commitments as a nation and a people, should make us want to eliminate a practice not compatible with the great ideals to which our democratic society is dedicated.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for letting me appear before your committee. I urge prompt and favorable action by the Judiciary Committee, and pledge my support when the civil rights bill comes to the floor of the House of Representatives.

CIVIL RIGHTS SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. HEALEY, FEBRUARY 5, 1964

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I need not discuss in detail the nine substantive sections which will help assure to all our citizens the equal enjoyment of their rights under the Constitution of the United States. These rights include the right to vote, to hold a job, to have equal access to places of public accommodation, public schools, and other governmental facilities. Surely, no one can begrudge such rights to his fellow citizens on account of their color of skin or religious persuasion. Indeed, the protections the bill affords are so necessary and so reasonable that opponents are having a difficult time attacking the bill on its merits. Instead, they have leveled false and extravagant charges against it, and they give a distorted picture of what the bill actually does. This, of course, is done to arouse such prejudice against it that others may be blinded to its true meaning.

Opponents of the bill say that it sets up racial quotas for job or school atendance. The bill does not do that. It simply requires that children be admitted to public schools without discrimination because of race, and that industries involved in interstate commerce not deny a qualified person the right to work because of his race or religion. And not even all industries are covered—initially only those with 100 or more employees, eventually those with 25 or more.

Under its power to regulate commerce Congress has the authority—and, I submit, the duty—to enact such legislation. The same constitutional basis underlies our right to require nondiscrimination in certain business establishments which are connected with interstate commerce and which hold themselves open to the public at large. Most such places are already under some type of Federal regulation—the Pure Food and Drug Act, for example, the minimum wage law, antitrust laws. The bill has no effect on a private homeowner who wants to rent a room to a "paying guest." In fact, it does not apply to owner-occupied establishments which offer five units or fewer for rent. The bill does not circumscribe private social contacts in any way.

* * * * *

It is clear that State-supported segregation is unconstitutional. This is the mandate of the school segregation cases and the numerous cases involving parks and other governmental facilities. It is high time, therefore, to enable our Negro citizens to enjoy the rights to desegregated educational and recreational facilities without further delay. For that reason titles III and IV authorize the Attorney General to sue for desegregation of these facilities, under certain specific conditions. It is no novelty to allow the Attorney General discretion as to the bringing of an action. The Attorney General has the same authority in antitrust cases and criminal cases, to name but two examples. This is not "unbridled Federal control," as critics are quick to assert.

Nor is it "unbridled Federal control" to require that public funds from the Federal Treasury—funds contributed by all our citizens—be used for the advantage of both races without favoritism.

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, in sum, the provisions of H.R. 7152 are firmly grounded in the Constitution of the United States. They provide for fair and equitable procedures in the courts and before administrative boards. They do not usurp or diminish the rights and duties of State and local governments or of private individuals. They would simply assure that all citizens will have the full enjoyment of the rights now unfortunately denied to many on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Dallas Honors Publisher Carl Estes of Longview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding publishers in the Southwest is Publisher Carl Estes.

I attended SMU in Dallas and think highly of that fine city. I was born in Kaufman County not far from Dallas. The people of Dallas sincerely appreciate the interest of Publisher Estes in their fine city as do many other fine citizens. Their appreciation has been and is being expressed by many letters which have been sent to Publisher Estes.

I include some enclosures at this point in the RECORD, one entitled "Dallas Honors Publisher, City," appeared in the Longview Daily News March 4, 1964. The other appeared in the Longview Daily News Tuesday, November 26, 1963:

[From The Longview (Tex.) Daily, Mar. 4, 1964]

DALLAS HONORS PUBLISHER, CITY

(By Staff Writer)

Dallas expressed its appreciation to Publisher Carl Estes and the people of Longview for their support in a time of crisis through a special personal representative at the chamber of commerce banquet here Tuesday night. This was the highlight of the meeting.

Ed Reynolds, chairman of the board and president of Reynolds-Penland and immediate past president of the retail merchants division of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, came here at the request of Bob Cullum, president, to bespeak the thanks of the chamber and the citizenship for Publisher Estes' editorial, "The Image of Dallas," which appeared in the Longview newspapers several days after the assassination of President Kennedy and was subsequently published in The Dallas Times Herald, and for the support of the people of Longview.

Reynolds, who was described by Cullum as "a wheelhorse in all efforts to build our community and State," read the following message from Cullum:

"You Longview folks are wonderful friends and neighbors.

"Dallas has always known that, and has treasured your friendship through the years. We haven't made a point of telling you how much we value your friendship, because most of us are reluctant about just walking over to our neighbor and telling him, face to face, that we are glad he is what he is. But Dallas has felt that way about Longview for generations—we are glad that you are what you are, and that you are our friends and neighbors.

"The situation is different, however, when your neighbor—through no fault of his own—has a great tragedy occur in his home. That is the time when the heart overcomes reticence.

"That is what happened in the dark hours of last November. A transient fanatic killed the President during his visit to Dallas. It was a terrible thing to have happen anywhere. It was heartbreaking to Dallas that it should have occurred in our own city. It was in those first agonizing hours that Longview spoke out. Carl Estes—with great understanding and conviction—wrote his beautiful editorial in the Longview Daily News. The people of Dallas heard the voices of friends and neighbors—and found strength and reason—and comfort—in them.

"It is a privilege to be with you tonight as a representative of Dallas. It is a privilege to tell you face to face that we think you Longview folks are wonderful friends and neighbors. And it is an understatement to say that Dallas is eternally grateful for the arm you put around our shoulders last November when Mr. Estes spoke out in his editorial.

"Thank you."

Walter Koch, executive vice president and general manager of the Longview chamber, presented Reynolds a scrapbook containing the editorial "and a sampling of the hundreds of letters and telegrams which poured into Longview from all sections of the Nation in recognition of this masterful editorial."

Koch told the huge crowd that "I have been asked to introduce a special event on our program. The tragic events of November 22, 1963, which could have happened anywhere, but did take place in our neighboring city of Dallas, remain in our thoughts.

"The historic events of that date were followed by a period of concentrated attacks upon Dallas by misguided persons and by some who attempted to project a discolored and false image in an effort to destroy the good name of one of the most progressive cities of this Nation.

"Dallas was momentarily stunned by these vicious attacks and did not speak out in its own behalf, but it was not without a champion. Quick to spring to the defense of Dallas, at a time when it was in sore need of friends, was our eminent publisher, Carl Estes. On November 26, a truly inspiring and stirring editorial entitled, "The Image of Dallas," appeared in the Longview Daily News. The masterful words of this editorial gave comfort to those whose hearts were heavy and quickly spread throughout the Nation.

"Which brings us to the purpose of this special event. On the evening of December 3 Mrs. Koch and I were privileged to attend the annual meeting of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce. The long-planned program for the meeting was abandoned at the last moment. In its place three prominent citizens spoke on the responsibilities of Dallas citizenship.

"One of the highlights of the evening was a glowing tribute by Bob Cullum, president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, expressing the sincere gratitude of Dallas to Publisher Carl Estes and the people of Longview for their support in a time of crisis.

"Bob Cullum, president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, was scheduled to be with us tonight, but had to cancel out at the last moment due to an important business engagement. We have just received this telegram from Mr. Cullum:

" 'I had looked forward to being with you personally tonight to tip my hat to one of the truly great forward-looking communities of our State. When an unavoidable conflict developed and I had to cancel my plans, I drafted one of Dallas' fine younger business leaders. Ed Reynolds will represent the Dallas Chamber of Commerce most appropriately. He is immediate past president of our retail merchants division and a wheelhorse in all efforts to build our community and State. He is also part of your own business community. My very best wishes for a great meeting tonight and my personal appreciation to the people of Longview for their friendship and goodwill which mean so much to Dallas.' "

THE IMAGE OF DALLAS

While the spirit of Dallas is bowed in the sackcloth of deep grief over the irresponsible acts of two wild-eyed fanatics, we are witnessing the sorry and un-American spectacle of a widespread campaign of slander and vilification designed to discredit and destroy her recognized influence and strength as a center of faith and patriotism, culture and progress.

Two gunslingers on a shooting spree do not represent nor reflect the true spirit and life of Dallas. Dallas leaders and citizenship alike have firmly condemned the violence. But while the great heart of Dallas has been too deeply moved to speak adequately in its own right, we hear the airwaves literally sizzling and see the pages of the ultraliberal press spread with the outcries of a howling horde of leftwingers, pro-Marxists, Communist admirers, opportunistic political aspirants, unhappy social climbers, sensationalist TV announcers, and not a few highly placed officials who are doing their ugly best to project a horribly discolored and false image of Dallas.

East Texans, and especially we here in Longview, will not sit idle and mum while the red paint bucket brigade puts the big smear on our metropolitan neighbor. When outsiders jump on Dallas and seek to condemn her before the Nation and the world as a sinkhole of crime and outlawry, we east Texans can and do proudly declare: It isn't so.

Because two zealots of questionable background have wantonly spattered blood on the proud image of Dallas, is it fair or reasonable that uninformed outsiders should join their dastardly cause and make the smear national and international in scope? This is justice gone beserk.

Who are these self-righteous and howling critics who would drown Dallas in the blood spilled by two fanatical acts of violence? They appear to be led by Communist Russia with the "me-too" approval of Cuban dictator Castro, and apparently are joined by leftwingers, social climbers, and the misinformed who so easily are deceived. What blind fools some mortals be.

We east Texans flatly refuse to keep quiet and see Dallas crucified by an unholy aggregation of character assassins, disgruntled misfits and social malcontents who display the strong suspicion if not the self-professed admiration of godless foreignisms of questionable color and name.

What has happened in Dallas could have happened almost anywhere. Is a great city to be judged by the action of a mail-order foreign-made rifle said to have been fired by a self-confessed Marxist and admirer of communism? Can decent-minded people fairly judge a city by the blast of a pawnshop type revolver stealthily wielded by a Chicago-born night club and dance hall operator with a strange penchant for dating strip-teasers and a passion for social climbing? God forbid.

East Texas people know the heart and spirit of Dallas. We want to tell the Nation and the world that we regard it as manifestly unfair and cruelly vindictive for persons standing on the idiotic fringe to try to recast the image of Dallas in a mold of common outlawry because of the foul deeds of two discontended misfits who set themselves as prosecutor, jury, judge and executioner of their fellowman.

Dallas is a great city. Dallas is big, dynamic, forceful, cosmopolitan. Dallas also is civic-minded, cultural, patriotic, religious. Dallas has the marks of character and courage, enterprise and leadership, achievement and stability, vision and a steadfast dedication to high purpose.

The great traditions of the free press—established by the Late G. B. Dealey of the Dallas Morning News and the late Edwin Keist and Tom Gooch of the Dallas Times Herald, and so ably and commendably perpetuated today by Ted Dealey and Joe Dealey of the News and by John W. Runyon and James F. Chambers of the Times Herald—provide a rich heritage which both Dallas and east Texas admire and cherish.

Dallas is a major stronghold of private enterprise in Texas and the Southwest—the cherished free system which from the earliest days of the Republic has underwritten and continues to sustain the material strength of our Nation. This system of free enterprise and individual opportunity, so faithfully nurtured and vigorously promoted by Dallas, not only affords the people the highest standard of living the world has ever known but has given multiplied billions of dollars worth of aid and succor to downtrodden peoples and weaker nations the world around.

In a measure almost beyond description, Dallas has contributed to the progress and strengthened the image of Texas as a leader among the States of the Union. The State fair of Texas, although not exclusively a Dallas institution, has been developed and operated by Dallas for Texas as a whole. It has become the greatest exposition of its kind in the Nation. The Cotton Bowl, built and largely financed by Dallas, is nationally recognized as a symbol of Texas and its lead-

ership in outdoor sports and entertainment spectacles.

East Texas, indeed all Texas and her neighboring States, as well, looks to Dallas as the financial center of the Southwest. The enterprising leadership and progressive standards of banking set by such giants as the late Fred Florence and by Nathan Adams, R. L. Thornton, Sr., and others, and so admirably and effectively maintained and extended today by James W. Aston, Robert H. Stewart III, and Ben H. Wooten, R. L. Thornton, Jr., and others, have given Dallas a preeminence that challenges and inspires others all across Texas and the Southwest.

Dallas paces Texas and the great central Southwest region in the field of insurance, with such stalwarts as Dan Williams and Ben Carpenter among many others symbolizing the leadership which has built a large number of strong companies which now make Dallas a major headquarters of this important institutional service.

Symbolizing the pioneering role of industrial development of Dallas and much of Texas was the leadership of the late John W. Carpenter, and the present day leadership of young Ben Carpenter and associates in the ambitious dream and worthwhile canalization of the Trinity River and development of its tremendous potential.

All of us here in East Texas are keenly aware of and impressed by the magnificent role in industrial progress which W. W. Lynch continutes to play in Dallas and throughout Central Texas. The eyes of Texas have long been on the valuable leadership of E. B. Germany, chairman of the Texas Industrial Commission. The hopes and confidence of East Texas and a great section of the Southwest ride with the current leadership of George A. Wilson and associates such as L. D. Webster and others of Dallas-based Lone Star Steel Co.

East Texas looks to Dallas for its religious, educational and cultural inspiration and leadership. For three generations and more, we have often attended and regularly followed the leadership of its fine churches and religious institutions, its colleges and universities, its art centers and libraries, its theaters and symphonies, operas and concerts.

Exemplary courts and honorable and hard-working judges are the hallmark of Dallas.

Dallas has an able, dedicated, and widely recognized mayor in Earle Cabell—a man whom east Texas has long admired and loved. Dallas is noted for its energetic and responsible city government.

A major medical center has been in development in Dallas over the years. Today its many modern hospitals, study and research centers, excellent doctors and trained technical staffs have national and world recognition.

Dallas leadership is a major asset to Texas and the Nation. It is characterized by ability, courage, energy, friendliness, and understanding. We have named only a few but Dallas has thousands of big men who have served with devotion and faithfulness over the years—including such indefatigable workers as B. Hick Majors, Bob Cullum, Earle Wyatt, Julius Schepps, Henry English, Rae Skillern, Erik Jonsson, Stanley Marcus, Willis Tate, and many others.

We here in east Texas are homefolk with the people of Dallas. We have much in common. Call the roll of Dallas leaders and we find prominent among them many who came from our sand hills and piney woods.

Here in Longview especially do we recognize Dallas as our friend and neighbor. We can never forget that it has been Dallas to which we have turned when we needed help, financial and otherwise, in our pursuit of new industrial payrolls to bolster the economy of east Texas. Across the years—in the cotton era, later in the oil era, and in the latter years of our spreading development as an inland industrial center—we have had the assurance that Dallas was at our side.

Dallas has been the friend of east Texas across the years. Our material, cultural, and religious interests are rooted in Dallas. As for many of us east Texans, our friends and kinfolk are there, and some are buried there. Our hearts are there.

In this hour of crisis and distress when the bright image of Dallas is under outside fire, we in east Texas will not turn our backs and run. In the face of a rising chorus of leftwing attacks and condemnation, we will not sit cowed in silence. While some may run for cover before the onslaught of the red smear brigade, we will stand up with Dallas and be counted at her side.

For, you see, we know the great heart and the true spirit of Dallas and have the firm imprint of her proud portrait in our hearts. Whoever would wantonly distort and smear her fair image must learn that when outsiders jump on Dallas they also jump on Texas.

Fair warning is enough. While all honorable Texans condemn and decry deliberate acts of violence, we here and now serve public notice to character assassins of whatever ilk and color that the outraged spirit and righteous indignation of a united Texas must be reckoned with, both now and hereafter.

CARL L. ESTES.

The 175th Anniversary Dinner of the U.S. Customs Service, February 22, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the Federal agencies of which we can all be proud is the U.S. Customs Service which is celebrating its 175th anniversary this year. The Congress called upon the American people to mark this anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities and President Lyndon B. Johnson issued a proclamation designating 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year."

In keeping with this legislation, the Bureau of Customs held an anniversary dinner-dance on Saturday, February 22, 1964, at a Washington hotel where close to 1,000 people assembled to launch the anniversary program for this year. Among those in attendance were a number of distinguished citizens, Members of Congress, jurists, organizations such as the National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., the Air Transport Association of America, the National Customs Service Association, and many others.

It should be noted that the entire cost of this affair was paid for from the proceeds of the sale of tickets to customs employees in Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Detroit, and other cities; and to custom brokers and attorneys from out of town. Customs personel from out of town paid their own way and hotel expenses so that this entire affair was conducted at no expense to Government.

Indeed, the U.S. Treasury has benefited from the customs anniversary.

On the initiative of the Bureau of Customs, the Post Office Department has issued a commemorative postal card with a U.S. customs design for the 4-cent stamp. Assistant Postmaster General Ralph W. Nicholson stated at the banquet that 40 million of these have been printed and have been placed on sale at post offices throughout the country. The demand on the part of the collectors for first-day covers is so brisk that Mr. Nicholson indicated that the print order was increased before the stamp was placed on sale. It is anticipated that the Post Office will realize $1,400,000—less expenses—from the sale of the customs commemorative postal card.

This is typical of our customs service. They always do things with an eye to how the United States can benefit. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, who delivered the principal address at the anniversary banquet, summed up the feelings of most of us when he said:

> Your determination to continue seeking ways to improve your service to the traveling public, and to the international business community, is to be commended. After 175 years, you're not resting on your oars. Your efforts have been instrumental in furthering the administration's policy of encouraging foreign travel to the United States by speeding up customs procedures, by encouraging facelifting of our various ports and, above all, by greeting visitors to our shores with courteous, efficient personnel—our dockside dispensers of good will.
>
> It is a source of real satisfaction to those of us in the Treasury Department to salute Customs employees on their 175th birthday. To Assistant Secretary Reed, to Commissioner Nichols, and to all of you, I say for all of us in the Department—congratulations on a job well done.

One of the keynote speakers at the anniversary banquet was Walter J. Mercer, president of the National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., a man who is widely respected in the trade in which he has been a leading figure for more than 40 years. Mr. Mercer took as his theme the fact that the customs service has fewer personnel today than it had in the time of Calvin Coolidge, despite the fact that there has been a fourfold increase in the volume of customs work performed by the Bureau. Mr. Mercer stated that in his opinion the U.S. customs service, needed strengthening in order to improve our safeguards against narcotic smuggling along our borders and in our Great Lakes ports along the St. Lawrence Seaway. On behalf of the association he represents, Mr. Mercer urged that there be a general increase in customs personnel to expedite the greatly increased volume of international trade between the United States and the rest of the world, all of which comes within the purview of customs.

I think that the American people owe a debt of gratitude to the U.S. customs service and especially to U.S. Commissioner of Customs Philip Nichols, Jr., who has taken the leadership in streamlining and simplifying the customs service since his appointment to this post in 1961. They are doing a yeoman job and everyone of us is better off as a result of this job. However, they must be given the tools if they are to do their jobs with the efficiency, skill, and devotion which

have characterized their performance up until now.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to include excerpts from speeches made at the banquet by Commissioner of Customs Philip Nichols, Jr., Mr. John J. Murphy, national president of the organization, together with the greetings sent by President Lyndon B. Johnson and the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. They follow:

SPEECH BY COMMISSIONER NICHOLS

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, Chief Judge Oliver, ladies and gentlemen, I bid you a warm welcome to the 175th anniversary celebration of the U.S. customs service which we celebrate this evening along with the birthday of George Washington. He by signing a bill into law brought our service into being a century and three-quarters ago.

We are grateful for the presence here this evening of so many distinguished friends. They have come to honor not us but the men and women who, for over 175 years have contributed to the customs service their integrity, their energy, and capability—in fact, their lives, and all that they were.

From every part of the country, and from many foreign ports, there have come messages from those who could not be here in person.

Let me refer to one of many. The other day, an ordinary birthday card was received from an anonymous sender in San Diego, Calif. On it was scrawled simply: "Happy 175th birthday." You may be surprised, Mr. Secretary, to learn from this that our incoming mail does not consist entirely of abusive letters.

The other day I pinned on Alan Pottinger a 50-year service pin, the first such I had ever presented—or even seen. Forty-five-year pins are common, however, in Customs, and a 40-year man is a mere neophyte. It is not surprising that a lady, one of our presidentially appointed collectors, told me she often felt like a petunia in a bed of perennials. At times I feel the same way. However, Customs is like a garden in which each of us can contribute his or her own peculiar fragrance. One talent or two or five are all equally welcome. The tasks of Customs are almost infinitely varied. Because they are so diverse they are never dull. Mr. Pottinger in all those 50 years never has been sure the coming day would not provide something fresh and different from anything he had ever seen before. People stay so long in Customs because they know they are needed, and they are never bored.

We who are here remember the dead but tonight we can enjoy the company of the living. That is what our predecessors of 175 years would have wanted us to do. It is what they did themselves. Besides being deserving public servants, they were good company, too. As the evening goes along, let's hoist an extra one for them. Thank you.

REMARKS OF JOHN J. MURPHY, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CUSTOMS SERVICE ASSOCIATION

I am honored indeed to represent employees of the customs service. This is the first time, as far as I am aware, that a representative of the employees has been able to join with top management at such an affair.

The idea of organizing customs employees into one homogeneous group was conceived during World War I at this time. A small but determined group of Chicago customs employees had conceived the plan of forming their own organization; dedicated to the welfare of all employees of all occupations and pay levels, and directed and guided by the employees themselves.

The response by other employees was extraordinary: branches sprang up all over the country and interest was so strong that the first NCSA convention was held in the city of Chicago in August 1925.

Thus was born the National Customs Service Association, an organization resolute in its purpose to unite the scattered thousands of customs employees into a single organization. An organization led by customs employees and thoroughly familiar with the needs and aspirations of customs personnel. An organization determined to further in every legitimate way their interests and welfare.

When President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988, the order setting up official relations between employee organizations and management, NCSA petitioned for recognition and was accorded countrywide formal recognition as representative of employees in the Bureau of Customs by both the Bureau and the Treasury Department. NCSA is the only organization to receive this recognition.

The employee-management cooperation program will not work without the affirmative willingness to cooperate that President Kennedy urged when he issued the order. Lipservice and going through the motions are a sure way to kill the respect and confidence that must be present. We have never had such incidents in our relations and we are confident that we never shall. It is our view that by working together we can make the Customs Service a model for other agencies.

NCSA is a responsible, reasonable organization. As a matter of policy we refer to top management only those problems that cannot be solved at the local level. We prefer to work cooperatively at all levels but are prepared to fight vigorously for what we believe is right and proper. We have never shirked our responsibility to defend our point of view.

It is a far cry from the bad old days of 1925 to find at this 175th anniversary dinner a representative of an employee organization on the dais standing beside the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. This is certainly as it should be and is in keeping with the spirit of President Kennedy's Executive order that employee organizations and management should be equal partners in carrying out the public business. President Johnson likewise has endorsed this principle and as the days pass many of our dreams of meaningful cooperation will become a reality.

On behalf of the National Customs Service Association, I express my appreciation for the opportunity to address such a distinguished audience. I pledge myself to do all within my power to protect and perpetuate the fine reputation and good name of the Customs Service in which so many of us have invested a lifetime of labor. Thank you.

TEMPORARY WHITE HOUSE,
Palm Springs, Calif.

Hon. PHILIP NICHOLS, Jr.,
Commissioner of Customs,
Washington, D.C.:

Please convey my congratulations to the men and women of the U.S. customs service on this memorable occasion which marks one and three-quarters centuries of service to the American people. The Nation joins me in saluting the Bureau of Customs for its efficiency, for its devotion, for its economy of operation, and for its cooperation with other Government agencies in carrying out the laws of the land. The Bureau has played a historic role in the growth of modern administration and the development of our revenue system.

With best wishes.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Hon. PHILIP NICHOLS, Jr.,
Commissioner of Customs,
Washington, D.C.:

I deeply regret my inability to be present tonight to attend the dinner in honor of the U.S. Customs Service. Throughout the years I have had the highest personal regard for the men and women in the customs service. Their integrity, ability, devotion to duty, and record of achievement down through the years is unsurpassed and has brought honor and glory to the profession of the Government worker. The work of customs is complex and difficult to administer, but the customs people have carried out their tasks with superb skill and unfailing integrity. It is a pleasure for me to salute the customs service. It has the confidence of the people. It will continue to have the confidence of the people whom it has served so well.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

Panama Canal: Key Target of Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the rapidly evolving struggle for conquest of the Caribbean, in which my able and distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has pointed out many times that the Panama Canal is the key target and Guantánamo is the bastion guarding the northern flank of its Atlantic approaches, events have shaped up essentially as predicted by him.

In general the mass news media of our country has not measured up to its responsibilities in truthful and objective service, and our people have been forced to rely on small newspapers and periodicals specialized organizations, such as the Committee on Pan-American Policy of New York, of which Harold Lord Varney is president.

Writing from knowledge gained from long experience with the problems of Latin America, Mr. Varney, in the January-February 1964 issue of Panamerican Headlines presents highly significant fact dealing with the problems of the Caribbean. He explains how the United States was fouled up at Panama and names some of those responsible therefor, about the interaction of Guantánamo and the Panama Canal on each other and why the loss of one would inevitably lead to surrender of the other, how the stand of the U.S. Army in defending the Canal Zone against the Red-led and directed Panamanian assaults served to bring the Red leadership into the open, the identity of the author of an anti-U.S. editorial on the Panama Canal in the New York Times as pro-Castro Herbert Matthews, and the sinister part that Carl Caysen of the White House staff may play in the future as the Panama story unfolds.

Pertinent excerpts from the indicated issue of Panamerican Headlines follow:

WHY WE ARE IN TROUBLE IN PANAMA—WASHINGTON'S CHRONIC INABILITY TO SAY "NO" THE REAL CAUSE OF OUR DANGER IN PANAMA

However we view it, the Panama crisis is a time bomb with our enemies holding the fuse.

Only the naive can believe that the present OAS talkfest is anything more than a delayer. It is also a lifeline for politicians who want to sweep the Panama issue under the bed until after election day.

What is not recognized by most is the monstrous fact that the decision we must make in Panama will be a point of no return for all future U.S. Latin American policy.

A simplified explanation of why we are in trouble in Panama is that official Washington, through two administrations, has shown an ingrained inability to say no. The emphatic utterance of this word by President Johnson would blow away the Panama crisis as quickly as it arose. There is no sign as yet that Mr. Johnson will say it.

It was the inability of President Eisenhower to say no to the rapacious plunderbund of Panama politicians in the late fifties that touched off the whole controversy.

The question of Canal Zone sovereignty has been a piece of political hokum that has been regularly raised by political outs in Panama in each election since the Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936. Since Panama signed a steel-riveted treaty in 1903, giving us sovereignty "in perpetuity" over the zone, for a price which Panama greedily accepted, the present agitators do not have a legal leg to stand on. All that the United States had to do when the issue was first bruited was to declare it "nonnegotiable."

It was Milton Eisenhower who fouled up the whole U.S. sovereignty position. Visiting Panama in 1958, in the company of R. R. Rubottom, he apparently indicated to President de la Guardia that the United States was ready to permit the flying of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone. When, in 1959, a phony Panama mob was unleashed, Washington, in a panic, sent Undersecretary of State Livingston T. Merchant to Panama. Merchant announced that the United States recognized the "titular sovereignty" of Panama over the Canal Zone. The next step in Washington was the official announcement by President Eisenhower on December 2, 1959, that the Panama flag could be flown side by side with the Stars and Stripes in the zone. He enunciated this policy despite the fact that the House had voted 381 to 12 against such a step.

This should have given John F. Kennedy, then the leading candidate for President, a readymade issue against the Republicans. Instead, he muffed it. Surrounded by left liberals who favored going further in appeasement than Eisenhower, he issued a campaign statement advocating further concessions to the Panamanians.

After he became President, Mr. Kennedy found himself straitjacketed in Latin American policy by the unsound views of the Adolf A. Berle coterie which he had placed in authority. In 1962, he entertained President Chiari in Washington. The Washington Post has now revealed that the two Presidents initialed a memo on June 15, 1962, calling for renegotiation of treaty of 1903. This was followed in 1963 by the Kennedy order granting almost unlimited display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone beside the American.

This is the background of the present Panama crisis. The steady erosion of the American sovereignty position has encouraged Panamanians to go after the jackpot. They will get it unless there is a speedy about-face in the Washington attitude.

WE MUST HOLD GUANTANAMO BAY, SAYS VFW HEAD

Never has the case for the United States in Guantanamo Bay been stated more convincingly than in the recent speech of Joseph J. Lombardo, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars before the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington, February 3.

Mr. Lombardo said:

"And what is the next one after Panama? It is Guantanamo Bay.

"The reason that Kremlin and Castro are so insistently demanding we renegotiate the Panama Canal Treaty is obvious. They want to work us into a position where we will establish the precedent for renegotiating our treaty on Guantanamo Bay.

"Anyone who says Guantanamo Bay is not vitally important to our defense of the Western Hemisphere—and the United States in particular—is just plain wrong. Guantanamo Bay, because of the takeover of Cuba by the Kremlin, is even more important than it has ever been before. If we are going to maintain our position in the Caribbean area; if we are going to protect the approaches to the Panama Canal; if we are going to checkmate the growing Russian power in the Caribbean, then we must retain Guantanamo Bay.

"Why? Guantanamo Bay is the largest natural harbor in the world. It is an indispensable training base for our fleet. Also, we must maintain control of Guantanamo in order to protect the strategic Windward Passage—that narrow strip of water between Cuba and Haiti. Through the Windward Passage flows most of the sea traffic from the North Atlantic into the Caribbean and to the canal. If we lose Guantanamo Bay it will only be a matter of time before communism makes its move toward Haiti and the Dominican Republic. And if those go Red then Puerto Rico is outflanked and jeopardized, our control of the Caribbean endangered.

"A key reason the Reds want us out of Guantanamo is so they can have it. You can be sure that the moment the last U.S. ship sailed out of Guantanamo Bay, the first Russian submarine would sail in. If the Kremlin gets Guantanamo Bay as a submarine base, it will only be a matter of time—and a very short time—before the Soviet missile-throwing and torpedo-firing submarines will be routinely cruising the east and gulf coasts of the United States.

Thanks to Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, the leading Communist role in the Canal Zone violence was brought out into the open. The facts are now available. At least 70 known Communists and Castroites took part in the attack. Panama authorities arrested 10 of these, but they were quickly released and the Communist issue was played down by the Chiari government. It now appears that Communist speakers dominated the rally of students at the National Institute in Panama City and started the march on the Balboa High School. Communist leaders who addressed the rally were Floyd Britton, Carlos Nunez, and Virginia Ramirez. "Kill Americans" was urged by Communist exhorters. Other well-known Communists seen or photographed during the course of the attack on the zone were Cesar Carrasquilla, Thelma King, Victor Avila, Andres Galvan Lorenzo, Eligio Salas, and Augusto Arosemena.

The New York Times is up to its old business of confusionism in the Panama crisis. In a situation which calls for a firm united American stand, the Times is for surrender. On January 19 it declared: "A genuinely joint United States-Panama control should be possible, and would probably be the best solution. Some students of the problem are opting for internationalization, preferably under the United Nations. A supranational commission of the Organization of American States is another possibility. What is not possible is a continuation of the present situation without any change at all."

Who wrote these editorials? You have guessed it. It is our old friend, Castro-praising Herbert Matthews. He admitted his authorship of the Times Panama editorials in a recent TV appearance.

The man to watch on Panama is Carl Caysen, deputy special assistant to the President on security affairs. Mr. Caysen has been handling Panama affairs for the White House for some time. He is reputed to be the man who has been encouraging Canal Zone Governor Fleming in the appeasement policy which has so outraged the zonites. A former economics professor at Harvard, Caysen came to Washington early in the Kennedy administration as one of the New Frontiersmen. During the weeks ahead he will be President Johnson's transmission belt to Panama.

Remarks of Hon. William J. Kelly, President, at 115th Annual Banquet of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn, March 17, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, March 17, I had the great pleasure of attending the 115th annual banquet of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn at the Americana Hotel, New York City. I should like to include with these remarks the address of my good friend, the president of the society, Hon. William J. Kelly, on this occasion, as well as the program of the evening:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Connelly, Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests, officers and members of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn and friends.

As president of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn I extend to all here a most cordial greeting and warm welcome to this—the 115th banquet of our society.

I extend my sincere thanks to the man who gave so freely of his time and energy to make this dinner the success that it is, our dinner chairman and my longtime friend, John F. Geoghan.

To George Hunt, our capable and efficient financial secretary, who extended himself to the limit—as he does in everything pertaining to our society, I offer my profound appreciation.

To the vice chairmen, the stewards and all the good people here tonight I am deeply grateful.

Our society was started in January 1850 by a group of Irish Brooklynites to promote Irish culture, literature, good will, and charity and to publicly honor the anniversary of St. Patrick's birth with a dinner. Through the years that tradition has been scrupulously honored and tonight I am proud to take part in its preservation.

In the early days—as today—our society was composed of men prominent in the religious, civic, and business life of our community.

The membership at that time was limited to 50 men of Irish ancestry.

The first election of officers was held on February 11, 1850, at Colgin's Eagle Hotel on Fulton Street and John O'Mahoney was chosen as its first president.

The first dinner of the society was held in a coffeehouse near the Fulton Ferry at a cost of 50 cents a person. At this dinner the object of the society was stated as follows:

To preserve the traditions and history of Ireland;

To stir in the hearts of Irish blood the love for the poetry and literature of Ireland as well as to protect its indigent members.

Down through the years, the society has carried out the aims and purposes of its founders.

For example, in 1881 Charles Parnell, the Irish patriot, appeared before the society to appeal for funds to alleviate the suffering of the Irish people during the potato famine.

Without hesitation the society answered the call.

Later, in 1890, when Parnell himself was on trial for his life as a result of his activity on behalf of the Irish peasantry the society contributed to his defense the sum of $1,200.

On February 3, 1928, at the Hotel Roosevelt, the St. Patrick Society honored William Thomas Cosgrove, the then president of the Executive Council of the Irish Free State.

And now tonight, in this year of 1964, I am pleased to have the honor to continue an old tradition and I invoke the blessing of St. Patrick upon you in the well-known words of the poet, Brian O'Higgins.

"ST. PATRICK'S DAY

"When Ireland's glorious festival is with us once again;
When memories of the golden past are crowding hill and glen;
When saints in Heaven are pleading for the faithful and the true;
May St. Patrick win the blessing and the peace of God for you."

THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE ST. PATRICK SOCIETY OF BROOKLYN

THIS YEAR OUR SOCIETY HONORS THE MEMORY OF JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY, 1844–90

John Boyle O'Reilly was born at Dowth Castle, County Meath, June 28, 1844, the son of William David O'Reilly, mathematician and schoolmaster, and Eliza Boyle O'Reilly. He was educated in his father's Nettleville Institute and at 11 years he was apprenticed to the Drogheda Argus, to take the place of his brother who was ill. He served as a printer and reporter. He became a Fenian, and in 1863 for the purpose of propaganda, he enlisted in the British Army and was stationed in Ireland. In 1866 he was court-martialed and sentenced to death, but his sentence was commuted first to life, than to 20 years' imprisonment. After solitary confinement in Millbank Prison, hard labor at Chatham, and a term at Dartmoor, in 1867 he was transported to West Australia. He escaped in 1869 on an American whaling vessel and reached Philadelphia in November 1869.

O'Reilly went to Boston and was on the staff of the Pilot, the most influential Roman Catholic paper in America. Later he purchased a part interest in it and became its manager and editor in chief. A prolific writer, a fluent speaker, an ardent patriot for both his native and adopted lands and a devout Catholic, he devoted his talents to the fiery defense of the rights of the Jew, the Negro, the American Indian, and to the cause of Irish independence. His death in August 1890 brought together people of all races, great and humble, to mourn the man who had fought for freedom and who had spent himself for justice.

To America, John Boyle O'Reilly came as a hunted stranger, a condemned wanderer from another land. He had much to tell us, for he had learned much. He learned as a soldier, poet, fighter, editor, Irish patriot, British convict, Yankee sailor, and the greatest lesson he taught us was the lesson of brotherhood and tolerance.

The reverence and affection with which he treasured his American citizenship was an example to all who profess their belief in the freedom and liberty which is ours.

OFFICERS

William J. Kelly, president; George H. Hearn, first vice president; Walter E. Cooke, second vice president; Joseph H. Farrell, third vice president; Frank D. Gilligan, fourth vice president; Charles R. McNamee, treasurer; Frank G. Baumann, historian; and Thomas J. Cuite, almoner.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis P. Connelly, chaplain.

Albert J. Byrnes, recording secretary.

George W. Hunt, financial secretray.

Directors: John J. Ryan, chairman; William J. Ahern, Peter Campbell Brown, Albert W. Byrnes, John E. Cone, Vincent D. Cronin, John F. Hayes, Joseph P. Hoey, Walter R. Kuhn, John J. Lynch, Edward J. McDonald, James T. McDonald, Miles F. McDonald, Francis A. McGrath, J. Courtney McGroarty, Albert S. McGrover, Alfred C. B. McNeivn, Joseph F. O'Brien, James E. O'Reilly, John J. Rooney, Joseph T. Sharkey, Edwin V. Smith, John R. Starkey, and D. Gilbert Taylor.

(Toasts of the 150th annual banquet of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn.)

(Invocation.)

("The Star-Spangled Banner.")

(Toast to the President of the United States.)

Speakers: John F. Geoghan, chairman, dinner committee; William J. Kelly, president of the society, toastmaster; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis P. Connelly, P.A., V.F., LL.D., (chaplain of the society, pastor, Our Lady of Refuge Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

(Benediction.)

Rotarian Good Will Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I had the privilege of calling to the attention of the House the visit of a group of French Rotarians and members of their families to Virginia and West Virginia as guests of Rotarians of these States.

These visitors, representing a wide variety of professional and business pursuits, now are in the host communities as household guests of members of constituent clubs of Rotary District 757.

The French Rotarians are affiliated with clubs of Rotary District 164 in France.

I believe it will be of interest to the House to know the names, home communities, and occupations of those who are spending several days in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley enjoying the hospitality arranged by Rotary District Governor, J. K. "Pat" Patterson, of Staunton, Va., and the officials of Rotary clubs in his district:

Visiting Winchester, Va.: Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Levavasseur from Bolbec-Lillebonne—pharmacy—and Dr. and Mrs. Pierre Seyer from Bolbec-Lillebonne—physician.

Visiting Woodstock, Va.: Mr. Yves Leroux from Guingamp—law, and Mr. and Mrs. Guy Moros, and their son, Patrick Maros, from Guingamp—physician.

Visiting Bridgewater Va.: Dr. Marius Berneau from Bolbec-Lillebonne—dental surgeon—and Mr. Rogers Perrotte and his daughter, Miss Jeanine Perrotte, from Dieppe—education.

Visiting Staunton, Va.: Mr. and Mrs. Louis Andrieux, (insurance), Mr. and Mrs. Henry Kerfant—transportation, and Mr. and Mrs. Jean Kerleau—chemical products, all from Guingamp.

Visiting Waynesboro, Va.: Mr. and Mrs. Jean Guay from Brest—real estate, and Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Godard from Bolbec-Lillebonne—agricultural equipment.

Visiting Front Royal, Va.: Mr. and Mrs. Henri Busnel from Dinan—clothing industry—and Dr. and Mrs. Jean Raoux from Dinan—biologist.

Visiting Harrisonburg, Va.: Dr. and Mrs. Jean Germond from Alencon—physician—and Dr. and Mrs. Francois Trebaol from Brest—veterinarian.

Visiting Luray, Va.: Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Bordet, and their daughter, Miss Aleth Bordet, from Alencon—department stores.

Visiting New Market, Va.: Dr. Bernard Gancel from Bolbec-Lillebonne—surgeon, Mr. Louis Bizien from Guingamp—optician—and Mr. and Mrs. Jean Paul Largenton from Guingamp—jewelry, watchmaker.

Visiting Strasburg, Va.: Mr. and Mrs. Andre Doucet—chemist—and Dr. and Mrs. Henri Gazel de la Contrie—physician—all from Bolbec-Lillebonne.

A Tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars Washington Conference was held on Tuesday, March 10, 1964. The affair was the biggest and most successful since its inauguration 16 years ago. Highlight of this conference was the banquet honoring Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces. More than 400 Members of Congress attended as guests of department commanders to honor their colleague Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, senior Member of Congress and dean of the Senate. Senator HAYDEN received the first Annual Congressional Award given by the VFW Commander in Chief Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., host at the dinner.

The Department of Massachusets Veterans of Foreign Wars comprises 239 posts in 18 districts covering 9 counties and has a total standing of approximately 43,000 members. The Massachusetts delegation was well represented and led by State Commander Joseph E. Anderson of Scituate, State Adjutant Allen E. VonDette, and Department Quartermaster William L. McCarthy.

The following past department commanders were in attendance at the conference and banquet: John A. Tyman, of

Brookline; William R. Turnbull, of Jamaica Plain; Edward W. Hartung, of Springfield; Joseph A. Scerra, of Gardner; Emelio F. Marino, of Brighton; James J. Delaney, of Beacon Hill; Paul A. Maliska, of Brockton; Bernard Croteau, of Pittsfield; Thomas Macdonald, of Quincy; Wilfred Guilbault, of Quincy; John Brior, of Quincy; William Macdonald, of Walpole; John F. Dargan, Jr., of Dorchester.

The following projects and programs are to be conducted and sponsored by the Department of Massachusetts VFW for the year 1963–64:

Construction of hospitals programs, blood donor program, crippled children's programs, veterans homes for Christmas program, voice of democracy program in which over 10,000 Massachusetts students participated.

Miss teenager pagent, the lite-a-bike safety program for the youth of the Commonwealth, the community service program in which all of the communities and towns participated, cosponsors of the cystic fibrosis program, veterans legislation on State and Federal levels, widows and orphans national homes program, Governor of the Commonwealth safety program, handicapped persons program sponsored by Mayor John Collins of Boston, service officers program to aid and assist veterans and widows.

I am proud to be a member of this fine organization and at this time, I would like to pay tribute to the name, the record and the glory of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a patriotic body conceived in and dedicated to the spirit of universal freedom and the power of American ideals.

A TRIBUTE TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

There is much that is unusual about our country, not only in terms of wealth and promise, but in terms of a broad, historical perspective. That is to say, in creating this Nation of nations, our forefathers managed to do so in a manner out of keeping with most historical tradition. One of the most remarkable aspects of our national career, in this regard, is the way in which there has been a blending of the civil and the military viewpoint, to the extent that we as a nation can benefit from one without rejecting the other. This blending is not the only requirement for a successful democratic republic; it is, however, one of the requirements, and a vital one.

Since first the struggle for democracy began, centuries ago, many hopeful republican governments have risen to view, only to fail of their purpose and fade into the realm of the forgotten dream. Political causes for these disasters are numerous. And yet, of all causes, two stand out as paramount. These would be, one: That a newly formed republic frequently attempts to protect itself with a strong army, and in time it is taken over by that army, lock, stock, and barrel. Two: That a newly formed republic, seeking to avoid military dictatorship, frequently spurns the need for military might and soon falls prey to an aggressive neighbor state, which in turn divests the republic of its sovereignty.

Indeed we, ourselves, have not been immune to the threat of these very developments in our history. You will recall, following the American Revolution, the way in which certain American Army officers developed a plan for military dictatorship, in which General Washington was to be named as dictator. Under these circumstances, Washington's heroic and historic refusal to go along with the plan was all that saved us from disgrace in the eyes of history. On the other hand, you also will recall the efforts of Thomas Jefferson to go the other way, to such an extent that he practically reduced our Navy to the point of nonexistence. Wars were bad, he reasoned—and navies can start wars. So he cut our Navy down to insignificant size, and built a little gunboat fleet, designed exclusively for defense and not for attack. But when the War of 1812 began, the anti-Navy policy backfired. For most of the glory we won in that war was gained on the high seas, by what few full-size ships we had left in our Navy; while the gunboats, which had no offensive power, turned out to have no defensive power, either, and Admiral Barney had to scuttle the whole lot of them, virtually in one fell swoop.

So it went, throughout the 19th century: One group of Americans fearful of a strong military component, another group fearful of one too weak for national defense. One group holding sway for a time, demanding the creation of a large standing army and/or a big navy; another group, seizing power, periodically, demanding the reduction of military and naval might, in the name of civil authority, unfettered by military influence.

And then, at last, a balance was struck; a balance between the justified fears and possible excesses of both extremes.

The balance in question appeared at the turn of the century—at the close of the Spanish-American War—when for the first time, American veterans began to unite with an eye to something more than their own personal benefit.

What the veterans wanted, and what they began to demand, was not merely financial remuneration; not merely reward for service. Indeed, what they demanded were many things, not in the name of personal gain, rather in the name of the national good. Their campaign in this regard began October 11, 1899, when a charter was granted by the State of Ohio to an organization by the name of the American Veterans of Foreign Service. After a brief period of activity, the founding chapter in Ohio became dormant, but was later revived. Meanwhile, another veterans' organization had begun to flourish in Denver, Colo., under the name of the Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines; and still another, in Altoona, Pa., under the name of the Veterans of Foreign Service. The three organizations merged forces in 1913, to become the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in so doing set the stage for a new development in American political life. Henceforward, there was to be a large body of civilians, with knowledge of military affairs, organized and ready to act in all matters involving the political security of the country. Here, at last, was a force that could serve both sides—civilian and military—with the object of pulling the Nation together, both in times of peace and times of war; a group with full knowledge of civilian needs and purposes, yet fully cognizant of military and naval requirements as well.

Moreover, there was to be about this new veterans' group a special kind of aura, emenating from the eligibility qualifications of the organization itself—a unique qualification requiring actual service in a foreign war, insurrection, or expedition. That is, none but fighting men could join.

The official objects of the VFW, as prescribed by Congress and the VFW constitution, are "fraternal, patriotic, historical, and educational; to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead; and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever"

All these objects, set forth, a half century ago, have been fulfilled, beyond question, by a diligent, intelligent, and forward-looking leadership, concerned not only with self but with the full, unqualified success of the American way of life. Nor has the VFW seen fit to limit its activities to any marked degree. On the contrary, VFW projects roam far afield, into many diverse areas of human endeavor.

Veterans' legislation, of course, receives considerable attention from the masterminds of VFW policy, as does also the distribution of veterans' benefits. Moreover, at Eaton Rapids, Mich., the VFW maintains one of the country's most unusual child welfare projects—the VFW National Home for Orphans of War Veterans.

Another admirable national activity of the VFW is the annual Buddy Poppy sale, established in 1922—the proceeds of which go directly to the organization's welfare program in behalf of disabled veterans and the VFW National Home.

And yet, for all that—for all the beneficial services of an organization concerned for the welfare of the veteran—the fact remains that the outstanding feature of the VFW is its position midway between the world of the civilian and the world of the professional soldier, a position invaluable to the American cause.

For since the foundation of the VFW, the American military and naval forces have plunged into battle time and again, in two World Wars, the Korean controversy and many lesser conflicts, including the Boxer Rebellion, Philippine insurrection, Cuban pacification, the Haitian campaign of 1919–20, the Yangtze River campaigns of 1926–27 and the Nicaraguan campaign of 1933.

In all instances, the VFW has supported the demand for military might, in the knowledge that the time for action was at hand and lack of action could only

serve to stimulate our adversaries. On the other hand, the VFW has also worked, constantly and with equal fervor, to maintain the supremacy of civilian power in American political life.

In both regards—from the military and civil standpoint—the VFW has achieved so notable a record that it stands today the center of national admiration, unqualified and wholly justifiable.

May it live on, the better to achieve its purposes in the days and years ahead, for the benefit of all.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Army Citation of Jack W. Askins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 30, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. The small business adviser of the U.S. Army is a man by the name of Jack Askins. It has been my privilege to know him for many years. He has been very helpful to the small business community in their relations within the Army, and with other segments of the Nation. Mr. Askins recently received a gold and bronze medal from the Secretary of the Army for outstanding service.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of this order be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY SMALL BUSINESS ADVISER RECEIVES GOLD AND BRONZE MEDAL AWARDS SIMULTANEOUSLY

For the past 10 years industry and the Defense Establishment have recognized Jack W. Askins, Small Business Adviser to the Secretary of the Army, for continued outstanding contributions to the businessman who is desirous of doing business with the Government.

On October 3, 1962, the Secretary of the Army, at the Army's seventh annual awards ceremony at the Pentagon, conferred upon Mr. Askins the Army's two highest awards, namely, Decoration for Exception Civilian Service and Meritorious Civilian Service Award. The Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service Award is the Gold Medal Award and the highest award within the Department of the Army. The citation by the Secretary of the Army is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—DECORATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL CIVILIAN SERVICE

"(Jack W. Askins has received official commendation for exceptional performance of duty)

"Citation

"For exceptional service as small business adviser to the Department of the Army, 1957 through 1962. His judgment and unusual ability have contributed immeasurably in the development of an effective program to assist small business concerns in participating in Department of the Army procurement for supplies and services. His understanding of industry problems and his willingness to expand every effort to solve these problems have enhanced the Department of the Army's role in its relationship with the small business community of the Nation, as well as all other elements of industry and commerce engaged in the defense effort. His devotion to duty and his reputation for integrity gain him the respect of those with whom he is associated and reflect great credit upon himself and the Department of the Army.

"CYRUS VANCE,
"Secretary of the Army.

"WASHINGTON, D.C., March 25, 1963."

Dr. Herbert Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the personality portrait by Will Jonathan in the March 7, 1964, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. The subject is Herbert Anderson, Ph. D., director of the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago, and one of my most distinguished constituents:

A MACRO-MICRO MAN: PROF. HERBERT ANDERSON

(By Will Jonathan)

CHICAGO.—The first time the "cat burglar" broke into Prof. Herbert Anderson's home in Hyde Park, near the University of Chicago campus, he took a pocketbook in which the professor's wife, Jean, had put her house key. On the next visit, the cat used the key from the pocketbook to open the front door, and left the house with a suit of the professor's clothes. The third time the cat called he called at night, wearing the jacket of the professor's suit and using the house key so deftly that he reached the hall leading to the professor's bedroom door before being noticed. At that point Mrs. Anderson heard a noise, looked into the hall and saw someone who was obviously not her sleeping husband. She jumped out of bed, ran into the hall, took the burglar by surprise, and chased him down the stairs. As he headed for the front door and freedom, she grabbed the tail of her husband's stolen jacket and pulled. The jacket tightened on its wearer, pinning the cat's arms in the sleeves and throwing him. Mrs. Anderson heaved herself on top of his prostrate body and sat there.

The commotion wakened Professor Anderson, who hurried downstairs and joined his wife on top of the struggling burglar. Richard Lundy, a physics student living with the Andersons at the time, came out of his room and made it three on the cat. The Andersons' daughter Faith telephoned the police while her three siblings—Clifton, Kelley, and Dana—applauded the performance from gallery seats at the top of the stairs.

When the police removed a knife from one of the cat's pockets, Mrs. Anderson said she was scared. And she may have been. Nevertheless, when three young hoodlums in the neighborhood some time later attacked her in an attempt to steal her pocketbook, she fought them off.

Still later, after a bicycle belonging to one of the Anderson children had been appropriated by another youngster known to the family, Professor Anderson and his wife went alone into a slum for a friendly discussion of the incident with the culprit's parents.

If asked, Professor Anderson will confirm these episodes but will not moralize about them. He has chosen to live near the campus of the school with which he is associated, and to participate actively in the great racial harmony experiment being conducted there. He must accept the consequences, the dangers along with the satisfactions. He knows that the crime rate in Hyde Park is still too high, but remembers how much higher it was before the Hyde Park urban renewal project began under University of Chicago leadership. He recognizes that slum conditions everywhere demand a degree of basic research in the social sciences far beyond anything yet tried.

The accelerating urban crisis is more excruciating to him than it is to many men because the professor's position of authority and responsibility at the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies immerses him in the continuing struggle for research funds derived from public tax moneys. The competition between one scientific discipline and another is fierce, and growing fiercer by the day. In his own field of study, atom smashers are necessary to explore the mysteries of the atomic nucleus. Building and maintenance of these enormous instruments costs billions of dollars. But defense of democracy may depend on the knowledge of nature uncovered by these incredibly expensive tools. At what point should spending for democracy's survival stop in order to permit more spending for nourishment of democracy in practice?

Professor Anderson has risked his life in both directions. By continuing to reside where he does, he holds his physical comfort always in some jeopardy. His search for understanding of the atom likewise has been hazardous. For years he has turned back the ravages of beryllium poisoning through treatment with cortisone at Billings Memorial Hospital on the university campus. He makes a joke of the fact that he consumes more cortisone than any other man alive.

Professor Anderson is a genuinely historical figure. Without him, the dawn of the atom age might have occurred at a later time and at a different place on the horizon. He was one of the first Americans to hear the news of the fissioning of uranium (by word of mouth from Niels Bohr, who had heard it from Germany). Enrico Fermi had just arrived at Columbia University in New York City, an exile from Mussolini's fascism in Italy. As an "enemy alien," Fermi had no access to facilities with which he might apply his theoretical knowledge of the German discovery. Although only an unknown graduate student from the Bronx, Anderson did have a facility of precisely the type that would be most useful to Fermi. This was the cyclotron Anderson had built for Columbia physics professor, John Dunning. Anderson suggested to Fermi that Fermi's brain and Anderson's hands together might make a valuable contribution to nuclear science, and Fermi gladly accepted.

Taking an instrument of Anderson's design, and hitching it onto the cyclotron, Fermi not only confirmed the fission achieved by Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassman in Berlin but demonstrated that freed neutrons might enable a chain process of producing nuclear power.

When the time came to build the first atomic furnace, Fermi wanted to make the attempt in New York. A National Academy of Sciences committee headed by Dr. Arthur Compton decided that whosoever built the furnace would do so in Chicago. Being young and eager to see the world, Anderson came to Chicago and encouraged Fermi to come, too. Toward the close of 1942 the trip paid off.

"For me the eventful day began at midnight December 1," Anderson wrote later, "I was the strawboss of the building of the

pile [of interlaced uranium and graphite]. My job was to build the pile layer by layer and see to it that the graphite and uranium were put on in their proper places. * * * On this day our measurement showed that the pile would reach criticality [be ready to work] at the 56th layer. * * * One more layer, the 57th, and the job would be done. I could send the crew home and survey our completed handiwork."

It is curious that this man who did so much to facilitate the exercise of Fermi's genius has never been given material recognition by the Atomic Energy Commission. A payment of $20,000 (what a piddling sum alongside the spectacular present day atomic power investment) has been requested but never awarded.

If Professor Anderson were less modest than he is, it might be easier to appraise the long-term significance of an experiment in which he is now engaged—for the execution of which he recently resigned the directorship of the Fermi Institute. My own layman's guess is that it will speed up atom-smashing research of all kinds and perhaps lay the foundation for more rapid development of simplified nuclear theory.

At the time when Fermi and Anderson worked together, the result of any given experiment always was known by nightfall of the day the experiment took place. Fermi simply didn't go home until he knew the answer. It was therefore easy to plan the next day's experiments on the basis of that day's results.

Since then, however, the nucleus of the atom has become progressively more difficult to understand. Almost a hundred different particles have been identified in it, tentatively grouped in octets. The natures and energies of these fragments make them difficult to trace. To permit them to be trailed accurately, they are shot through chambers filled with bubbles. The tracks left in the bubbles are photographed. Thousands of photographs are taken. Their analysis may occupy a year or more before the result of an experiment can be known. Until that result is known, related experiments must be haphazard.

To speed the process of identifying the nuclear particles, a new detector called a spark chamber has been invented. In this device the passing fragments leave a trail of sparks which can be timed very accurately. This means that only certain fragments may be watched for, while others are ignored. The experiment time is thus reduced. Professor Anderson proposed to reduce it even further by training TV cameras on the spark chamber. The distances of the sparks from the edges of the TV screen are measured electronically, the measurements are read directly into a high-speed computer, and the computer gives the result of the experiment within the hour.

Being dedicated to her husband's happiness, Mrs. Anderson—a former airline hostess who met her handsome spouse at a tea party at Fermi's house in Chicago—undoubtedly knows all about the latest project, which is related to the enormous ZGS instrument at Argonne National Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission. She might be forgiven a request for a TV detector that would watch for stray "cats" around the house.

America and the Two Chinas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 30, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed by an eloquent and logical argument against formulation of a two-Chinas policy, as expressed by Adm. Felix Stump, U.S. Navy, retired, in the March 2, 1964, issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report. The article is entitled "America and the Two Chinas."

I commend this outstanding article to the attention of all Senators. It was written by a great American patriot who has served our Nation with distinction and valor as a leader of our naval forces in time of war and in time of peace. In his retirement years, Admiral Stump has dedicated himself to the task of trying to help preserve freedom. He has made many valuable contributions to the cause of freedom, particularly as a leader of the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa. I am pleased to have the opportunity to serve with him as a member of the board of directors of this great organization.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article by Admiral Stump be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND THE TWO CHINAS

(By Adm. Felix B. Stump)

France's recognition of Communist China has grave consequences for the United States. It unleashes anew powerful forces of accommodation, appeasement, and surrender. It sets in motion an evil series of events which, if allowed to run their normal course, jeopardizes our entire defense structure in the Pacific.

General de Gaulle is no friend of communism. Yet he has taken this unilateral action at a time when the free world is, for all practical purposes, at war with Communist China on five fronts.

First, there is Korea. Here a formal state of war still exists between the United Nations and the combined armies of North Korea and the Communist Chinese Peoples' Volunteers. The uneasy truce along the demilitarized zone is repeatedly broken by uncalled for gunfire which brings death or capture to our young soldiers who are there for one purpose only: to guard the United Nations peace.

Second, there are the offshore island of Quemoy and Matsu. Here innocent families of native fishermen have been subjected, ever since October 1958, to cruel intermittent odd day artillery bombardments.

Third, there is the northern frontier of Nehru's nonalined India. Here specially trained mountain troops conduct wary patrols against further Communist Chinese incursions across India's borders from Mao's forward military bases established on the conquered soil of a once free and peaceful Tibet.

Fourth, there is Laos. Here the Chinese Communists flagrantly violate their solemn pledge, given less than 2 years ago at Geneva, to guarantee the cease-fire and to help maintain Lao neutrality. Daily they provide arms and political guidance to the Communist Pathet Lao forces, encouraging these Red troops to expand their areas of physical control in all parts of the country. At the same time, Chinese Communist soldiers have moved into the northwestern province of Nam Tha and are constructing strategic roads capable of supporting future offensives into northern Thailand and Burma.

And fifth, there is the bitter counterinsurgency struggle in South Vietnam. Here more than 15,000 Americans, side by side with their Vietnamese allies, risk their lives daily against bullets fired from Chinese Communist guns by Communist Chinese-trained Vietcong soldiers. Here too, Peiping was one of the signers of the 1954 Geneva accord which supposedly was to bring peace to war-torn Vietnam after its partition along the 17th parallel.

Nevertheless, France and Communist China have agreed to establish diplomatic relations and to "designate" their ambassadors within 3 months.

The implications of France's action are both immediate and long range. The forces of causality which link world events together in almost predictable sequence will confront the United States with even more difficult political problems as a result of De Gaulle's decision to go it alone.

Specifically, when Paris and Peiping exchange ambassadors: Communist China's prestige will be tremendously enhanced. History will again appear to have confirmed Mao Tse-tung's incessant and effective propaganda that: (1) U.S. power and prestige has declined drastically since the end of World War II; (2) the United States is nothing but a "paper tiger"; and (3) it is inevitable that "the East wind will prevail over the West wind." France's unilateral recognition in the face of longstanding U.S. public opposition will add credence to these Communist themes, giving them an explosive impact on the minds of millions of Asians, particularly the large Chinese minorities in every southeast Asian country.

The countries of southeast Asia, sensing the "handwriting on the wall" will be tempted to shift their foreign policies further toward the left, a tendency which will make them even more vulnerable than they are today to the extension of Communist control over the entire strategic peninsula.

The impact on the war in South Vietnam is likely to be disastrous. The further coordination of Communist Chinese and French political activities in support of neutralism throughout southeast Asia—and particularly their efforts in company with the British and Russians to convene a Cambodian Neutrality Conference in April—will so confuse and undermine public opinion in embattled Vietnam that its army's will to fight could be destroyed.

The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) will become a farce. In 1960, SEATO lost much of its prestige by refusing to take active measures to resist Communist aggression in Laos because of the neutralism of France, Great Britain, and New Zealand, concurred in by the United States. In July 1962, the United States joined the Soviet Union, Communist China and 11 other nations in signing the Geneva "declaration on the neutrality of Laos," thus dealing SEATO a near lethal blow. By excluding Laos (a country SEATO was pledged to defend under the protocol of the Manila Pact) from the protection of SEATO, we acknowledged the impotence of that organization. When France establishes formal diplomatic relations with the enemy this may provide the events leading to the SEATO's coup de grace.

Japan can be expected to follow France's lead. The Ikeda government, already under heavy pressure from Japanese business interests to expand trade with Communist China, will be unable to stand by and watch the French establish for themselves a favored position in the mainland market. The establishment of a Chinese Communist Embassy in Tokyo will open the floodgates for greatly increased subversive activities among Japanese socialist and labor groups which may ultimately result in the loss of Japan as a free world ally.

The impact on Pakistan and Burma will be a tremendous blow to the free world.

The United Nations effectiveness as an organization, already almost impotent, will be further placed in serious jeopardy. France's action could very well result in Communist China's admission into the U.N. this fall. After the annual debate on this question last October, the General Assembly voted

57 to 41 with 12 abstentions against the admission of Communist China. This year, a number of African states may switch their vote in favor of Peiping. For example, the 13 French-oriented countries of the Afro-Malagasy Union may decide to emulate Paris. The fact that Red China's Foreign Minister, Chou En-Lai, spent the last 3 months touring Africa is hardly a coincidence. Undoubtedly one of his most important missions was to line up African support on this very issue. However, even assuming Red China is voted into the General Assembly, under the present charter this does not entitle her to displace the Nationalists from the Security Council. In such circumstances it is difficult to imagine how the United Nations could continue to function with China represented by both a Nationalist and by a Communist in its Assembly and by a Nationalist in its Council. Should Communist China ever gain full membership in the U.N., it is almost certain that she will attempt to destroy the peacekeeping machinery which that body has endeavored to set up in areas of actual or potential conflict throughout the world. And her first target, of course, would be the United Nation's Command in Korea.

Neither the true Nationalist Republic of China nor Red China is likely to agree to the two-China concept. Such could, however, be the key which would unlock the entire chamber of horrors listed above. Yet there are many Americans—particularly those associated with the press and broadcast media—who mistakenly believe our Government should try to make two Chinas a fact instead of just a concept. Furthermore, there is an influential group within policy-making circles in the U.S. Government that considers such an arrangement to be not only pragmatic and desirable, but downright sophisticated. In their view, it has "style"—it opens the way for recognition of Communist China without actually going back on our word to the Nationalist Government. They argue that by adopting this solution we would promote the growing detente (diplomatic language for playing "footsie" with an enemy) between East and West, deepen the split between Moscow and Peiping, and provide our diplomats with greater flexibility in playing off the Communist giants one against the other. In addition, they claim it would stimulate the growth of polycentrism—that is to say, the plurality of independent centers of political authority within the bloc.

The two-China proposal contains the same fallacy as containment, polycentrism, and the various derivatives thereof. That is, they are all designed to provide intellectual excuses to cover the further erosion of the principles on which our country was founded and which made it great. Our whole society is based on the concept of the worth and dignity of the individual. This includes his right to choose the type of society under which he shall live. As we all know, since the end of World War II, communism has deprived millions of people of this fundamental right of self-determination. Moreover, it has locked them behind actual physical barriers such as the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and, more recently, the Berlin Wall.

The American people, while not wishing to change this unfortunate situation by force of arms, are not prepared to acknowledge it as a just or permanent state of affairs. Congress expressed its feelings on this matter when it passed the "Captive Nations Resolution." This specifically provides our moral support to the peoples living under the Communist satellite regimes of Eastern Europe and Asia. It assures them of our continuing support in helping them achieve peaceful liberation. As might be expected, this resolution has become a prime target of the accommodationists who insist that since its language is offensive to Communists it is one of the major obstacles to world peace.

It is important, therefore, for all Americans to realize that the "two Chinas" proposal, temptingly presented as a rational procedure for facing today's realities and for dealing with both the Communist government in Peiping and the Nationalist Government on Taiwan, is neither consistent with our fundamental beliefs nor is it in our country's long-range interest.

It would be the first step toward a fundamental change in our entire foreign policy. It would recognize the postwar status quo as a permanent political fact of life. From the immediate policy point of view, it would legalize the conquest of the Chinese mainland, thereby depriving its 700 million inhabitants of any hope for their future freedom. It would set the stage for our eventual recognition of the Communist regimes in North Korea and North Vietnam. And in the longer run, it would make it extremely difficult to resist pressures both at home and from abroad to recognize East Germany, thus accepting as permanent the current division of Germany and Europe.

In sum, if our Government should ever endorse the two-Chinas policy, it will be an added step against our survival as a free people. Appeasement and vacillation has never paid off. With a firm and steadfast policy against communism at home and abroad, we can still preserve our freedom for future generations.

Well-Deserved Tribute to Angela Bambace and Sam Nocella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, rarely do we find persons who are outstanding in several areas of activity, but last week it was my privilege to be present at an affair honoring two outstanding personalities in the Baltimore area who have won distinction in the labor field and in the field of social services, through their humanitarian interests. They are Miss Angela Bambace and Mr. Sam Nocella.

Miss Bambace has been active in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union since she became a member in 1917 and has risen to the position of vice president and manager upper south department, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. In addition, she has served as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention, is a member of the Italian-American Labor Council, the ADA, the American Civil Liberties Union, and is on the board of directors of the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra.

Mr. Nocella has been active in union activities since 1919 when he joined the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. He has served as manager of the Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania regional joint board, and under his direction a geriatric center for the joint board's retired workers was constructed. He has recently sponsored a program of eye and health examinations for the members of the union. He is now vice president, manager of the Baltimore Regional Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Israel Histadrut campaign, an organization which helps support a network of vocational schools, provides scholarships for underprivileged youth, makes grants for research scientists and maintains cultural and youth centers, among its other activities, Miss Bambace and Mr. Nocella were honored for their work over the years for the improvement of the economic and social conditions of their fellow citizens.

In tribute to them, the proceeds of the testimonial dinner will go toward the establishment of an Angela Bambace and Sam Nocella Histadrut Scholarship Fund, to aid worthy teenagers in Israel to obtain a secondary or vocational education.

A notable group was present at the dinner in their honor, including Mayor Theodore McKeldin; Maryland's Attorney General Thomas Finan; City Councilman Jacob J. Edelman, who served as toastmaster; the Reverend Frederick Helfer; Father Dunn; Rabbi Abraham Shusterman; Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning; Moe Falikman, chairman of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut; Jacob Potofsky, general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Dominic N. Fornaro, president of the Baltimore Council of AFL–CIO Unions; Charles Kreindler; Hyman Blumberg; and Gus Tyler.

The high honor bestowed on Miss Bambace and Mr. Nocella will, I am confident, inspire them to continue their outstanding services to their fellow men for many more years, and inspire those present to follow their good example.

The Expansion of the Economy by Lower Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 30, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How Lower Taxes Expand Economy," written by Sylvia Porter and published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—HOW LOWER TAXES EXPAND ECONOMY

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Those great, big, beautiful figures President Johnson and his economists are throwing around just don't add up. How can an $11.5 billion tax cut come out to an extra $30 billion in spending each year?"

It's a question I suspect many people would like to have answered. So here, in relatively simple terms, is how the President's Council of Economic Advisers reaches the conclusion that $11.5 billion of tax cuts will add up to $30 billion (give or take a couple of billion) in additional spending year after year.

First, here are the key figures. If the tax cuts were in full effect today the after-tax incomes of individuals would be about $9 billion higher than they are and the after-

tax profits of corporations would be about $2.3 billion higher than they are. Now:

1. Based on past dividend payment patterns, it's reasonable to assume that corporations would distribute part of their higher after-tax profits in dividends and that the increase in dividend payments to stockholders would amount to about $1 billion. This would increase after-tax incomes of consumers to approximately $10 billion.

SPENDING TO CLIMB

2. Based on past consumer spending patterns, it's reasonable to assume that individuals would spend about 93 cents of every after-tax $1—suggesting a rise in spending of more than $9 billion.

3. This increase in spending would spur higher production of consumer goods and this higher production would, in the Council's words, mean "extra employment, higher payrolls, higher profits and higher farm and professional and service incomes."

4. In turn, these increases in production, profits, jobs, payrolls would "generate still further increases in spending and incomes."

5. A conservative estimate is that the initial rise of $9 billion in spending plus the extra production plus the still additional consumer spending would swell the economy by $18 billion. A complicated economic theory about the chain effect of spending lies behind this statistic but the simple arithmetic of it can be boiled down to multiplying the initial $9 billion by 2.

6. Then as industrial production climbs toward capacity, as sales mount and as corporations feel the direct impact of lower tax rates and other tax incentives, businessmen will increase spending on new plants and equipment and spend more on inventories. In anticipation of what they foresee for 1964, corporations already are upgrading plans to invest in factories and equipment.

STATE REVENUES AIDED

7. At the same time the Federal tax cuts will, it is estimated, increase State and local government revenues by $2.9 billion—at present tax rates—and this will stimulate more spending by States and localities on schools, roads, urban facilities. Higher consumer incomes are expected to accelerate building of houses.

8. While the President's advisers admit the exact amount of each of the above two increases is hard to figure with precision, their "reasonable" projection is that they'll total $5 to $7 billion.

9. Again, according to the economic theory of the chain effect of spending, these figures must be multiplied by 2—which raises the totals to $10 to $14 billion.

10. And there you have it. An extra $18 billion or so from rising consumer spending; another $10 to $14 billion from rising business investment, State and local government spending and building of houses; a total of $30 billion, give or take a couple of billion, added the economy "not just once, but year in and year out, since this is a permanent, not a one-shot, tax cut."

It will be one of the greatest triumphs of economics in history if it turns out this way.

Florida Gains Lead Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the March 24 issue of the Florida Times-Union carries a very interesting article entitled "Florida Gains Lead Nation," written by the very able Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr. I am glad to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FLORIDA GAINS LEAD NATION

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

"Telling the people every few days that their section is leading the country in business growth is a pleasant job."

When it becomes generally well known what an attractive position William T. Hunt, field agent of the Federal Commerce Department, holds here, he probably will have a lot of opposition for the place. It is an especially attractive political job because the holder doesn't have much to do, so far as things appear on the surface, but hand out good news about what a wonderful record of business progress this region is always making.

There may be, and probably are, however, some extremely aggravating problems, which are created by disgruntled customers who don't always get what they want. But these experiences are not visible on the surface.

Furthermore, the publicity department of Mr. Hunt's section is doing a magnificent job of assembling and writing the news for him and then distributing it for him. We don't know but imagine that part of the job is being done by Hugh Ahern, Associated Press representative at Tallahassee during John Martin's tenure as Governor. Hugh was one of our helpers when we were southern division traffic chief of the AP.

The news about progress in Florida and the South is so generally good that sometimes it becomes almost monotonous. Just one time after another the word is that Florida sets the pace for the entire Nation in first one product or another, or in one phase of business activity or another.

Here, for instance, is a sample from Mr. Hunt's district field office:

"The early 1960's found the southern region of the United States continuing to set a fast pace for the Nation as a whole in rates of increase in many important segments of the country's economy."

Releasing results of its annual survey of activities in 31 divisions of industrial and commercial activities over the past decade or so in the Southern States it was shown that the local region was credited with leading the Nation in the increase of rates of gain in 26 of the 31 divisions.

In his statement that the region topped the Nation in the national average in rate gains, Field Director Hunt cited specifically:

Bank deposits, assets of savings and loan associations, number of telephones in operation, television sets in occupied homes, daily newspaper circulation, number of commercial and industrial firms, nonagricultural employment.

Total and per capita personal income, median family income, cash receipts, and farm marketings.

Total net income per farm, number of beef cattle on farms, commercial production of chickens, value of all forms of construction work, number of motor vehicles registered, and miles of surfaced highways.

Amount of life insurance in force, number of manufacturing establishments in operation, value added by manufacture of goods produced, manufacturing employment, and annual payrolls.

Expenditures for new plant and equipment, production of paper and paperboard, cargo carried by airlines, and value of goods imported from other countries of the world.

The region did not quite measure up to the national average in:

Expansion in population, number of radio sets in occupied homes, value of engineering construction contracts awarded, export trade to other countries, and number of passengers handled by airlines.

In some of the backward fields, however, the South made a good showing, the Commerce Department said. For example, in population gain, the region reflected an increase of 20 percent as compared with the Nation's 23 percent, in radio sets the region's gain was 18 percent and the Nation's 20 percent, the region's export trade rose by 39 percent and the Nation's by 50 percent, and in passenger traffic on airlines, the regional rise was a thumping 368 percent, but did not equal the national average of 430 percent.

The Commerce Department was loud in its praise of the progress made by various Southern States individually, which helped materially to advance the gains of the region as a whole.

One of them was Florida, which not only forged ahead of Southern States in many fields, but equaled or bettered gains made by all States in the Nation.

But Florida was not alone, it was pointed out, in progress shown in the southern area, because either in rates of increase or in volume of business conducted, which were factors in the region's showing, were such States as Texas, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, and other Southern States, many of which showed their heels to the Nation in gain rates.

Meat Price Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 24 issue of the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak., emphasizing the point that imports of meat must be reduced if livestock prices are to be increased.

The editorial is a follows:

FEEDLOT REGULATION ISN'T ANSWER TO MEAT PRICE PROBLEM

Banning meatpackers and food markets from livestock feeding was offered Monday as the way to raise depressed livestock prices by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota.

Asking a special Senate Commerce Committee to consider his bill which would prohibit processor and market participation in livestock feeding, the Senator also supported proposed investigations of the effect of retail chains, vertical integration and contract feeding of livestock.

But the McGovern proposal does not hit at the heart of the current situation. Receipts from livestock and livestock products were down 2 percent in 1963, due primarily to lower livestock prices at the farm. South Dakota's farm income, of which 70 percent comes from livestock receipts, was down 12 percent.

Rather than legislation limiting feedlot operation, Congress should consider legislation to curb imports of feeder cattle and the imports of processed meat. A slight change in these import levels would bring relief to America's livestock industry by removing the extra supply which depresses the market.

The Senate is considering the Hruska amendment which would set 1960 as the base for establishing quotas on these imports and would bring a 510-million pound reduction in the amount now being imported under the new Australia-New Zealand agreements formula.

Imports of processed meat now fill 10 percent of the consumer market in the United States and an influx of feeder cattle from Canada last year increased cattle numbers in American feedlots, bringing a lower price for slaughter cattle.

But the administration is opposing the Hruska amendment and this approach to remedying the current livestock situation. The threat of a presidential veto caused defeat of the amendment when offered during debate on the cotton-wheat bill. Since then, the amendment has been shunted to committee.

Administration thinking seems to be based on the premise that any restriction on meat imports would affect other administration proposals to increase the export market for American food production.

Since the administration opposes meat import restrictions, they should use any power they now hold under existing legislation to stabilize the current market situation.

"What Brotherhood Means to Me"—Miss Ellen Harswick, Winner of the Annual Oratorical Contest Conducted by the Cardoza Lodge of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that a young lady from my district won the annual oratorical contest conducted by the Cardozo Lodge of B'nai B'rith. On February 25, 1964, Miss Ellen Harswick, a senior at Fort Hamilton High School, was awarded first prize after competing with students from 30 schools. She and her teacher-coach, Miss McCabe, are to be congratulated on a wonderful speech, entitled "What Brotherhood Means to Me."

The heartfelt expression by Miss Harswick of a sincere wish that all mankind will live in brotherhood is a desire all fairminded persons share.

I am pleased to insert Miss Harswick's speech in the RECORD and hope that all Members will enjoy reading it as much as I did:

WHAT BROTHERHOOD MEANS TO ME

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Brief were my days among you, and briefer still the words I have spoken. But should my voice fade in your ears and my love vanish in your memory, then I will come again. And with a richer heart will I speak. Yes; I shall return in spirit—and again I will seek brotherhood. If what I have spoken is truth, that truth shall reveal itself in a clearer voice and in words more suited to your times. This is my promise till another day.

Mr. Chairman, honorable judges, friends, seldom in life is it given a man to know the hour of his death, but some men live always in the shadow of death. Some men walk always with the angels. Such a man was Abraham Lincoln. Of him it can be said that his eve was the dawn of true brotherhood in America.

But the shadow of darkness has enshrouded that dawn. Where today is the spirit of Abraham Lincoln? Where is the richer heart? Where is the clearer voice? Where is the man who will bring us another dawn—a brighter sun?

He came into his own and his own received him not.

America turned her back, for she was filled with suspicion and mistrust, jealousy and bad faith, envy and hate. As a result, we, you and I, the citizens of America, cringe in terror before the disaster we have unleashed upon ourselves. Nothing but despair lies ahead of us, and no fine words and no brave slogans seem able to prevent the blowing out of the tiny flame of hope—the eternal flame of hope.

Too late do we plead—go not yet away from us, Mr. President. Only a springtime have you been in our midst, and your youth has given us dreams to dream.

Too late do we beg—let not the years you have spent in our midst become only a memory.

Too late do we pledge—we will impart your spirit of brotherhood to our children—and they will give it to their children, and it shall not perish.

The days of pleading, the days of begging, the days of pledging—are gone. Yesterday is today's memory, but tomorrow is today's dream. And it is that dream—the dream of true brotherhood in America—his dream—that we must bring to fruition. For that dream is not a need, but an ecstasy. That dream is not a black man thirsting after justice, nor is it an empty hand stretched forth. Rather it is a heart enflamed and a soul enchanted. It is eternity gazing at itself in a mirror—but we are eternity and we are that mirror. For we are wedded to one another; it may be to our living—it may be to our death. We cannot escape, we cannot flee one another, however hard we try. For good, for ill, we await ourselves behind every door, down every street, at the end of every passageway. Though we try to remain apart, we cannot.

"Save us" we cry. But who will come to our aid, we who have failed him so terribly? Who will save us if we do not save ourselves?

Though we fly to the moon and beyond, we shall take with us what is in our hearts.

Let us therefore love one another. It is all we have left. It is all he left us, but it is enough.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, my second congressional voting record report of 1964 contains an itemization of all rollcall votes from February 17 through March 12, plus commentary on the tax cut, International Development Association, the FCC and rules relating to frequency of broadcast commercials, the Peace Corps, Equalization Tax Act, and the Federal employees pay bill.

During a portion of the period covered in the report, I was again privileged to be among those legislators representing the Congress as a delegate to the Fourth Annual United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference. The conference, like those held annually since 1961, was designed to develop closer working relationships between the two countries. Delegates diligently sought areas of agreement whereby differences in trade policies can be resolved, and explored ways to strengthen the collective security of the Western Hemisphere.

An important area of discussion was the continuing problem of excessive salinity of Colorado River water which flows into Mexico. This issue is of great concern to our Latin friends who in large measure depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Their concern is certainly understandable since salt water is a killer of soil and further serves to impoverish large areas of Baja California.

According to the International Water Treaty signed in 1944, the objective is to utilize Colorado River water to the greatest advantage. It has been ascertained that salinity is found to result from certain hydraulic operations in the United States, and despite the fact that temporary measures to correct the problem have been more or less satisfactory, U.S. technicians have properly continued to study the situation. The gravity of the problem is such that it was a key area of discussion between Mexican President López Mateos and President Kennedy during the latter's triumphant visit south of the border in 1962. An effective solution to this pressing problem will do much to improve relations between our two countries, and I am hopeful that such a solution will soon be found.

It was largely a result of discussions at last year's interparliamentary conference in Mexico that the Chamizal boundary dispute was settled. Having been a delegate to the 1963 conference the settlement was greatly rewarding to me, not only because it was fair and just, but because it showed our Mexican friends that the "colossus to the north" has a heart and is willing to go to the conference table for equitable solutions to thorny problems.

I was also privileged to join in another effort to strengthen relations between the United States and Mexico when I accompanied President Johnson on his trip to Los Angeles and a summit meeting with President Lopez Mateos. It was indeed appropriate that this executive-level conference was held in the Nation's No. 1 State, a State which has achieved this stature with the help of some 700,000 Americans of Mexican ancestry who live within its borders.

Following the enlightened view held by our beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President Johnson reaffirmed America's pride in its enduring friendship with Mexico when he said:

> In the winning of our independence, in the strengthening of our institutions, in the relentless quest of social justice and human rights, in the pursuit of a better way of life for our people, Mexico and the United States have walked a common road.
>
> For neither Mexico nor the United States leaped into the modern world fullgrown; we are both the products of inspired men who built new liberty out of old oppression. And neither of our revolutions is finished.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my rollcall report:

Roll-call No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
33	Feb. 17		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (145 Members absent; R.B.C. en route to Washington from California).
34	Feb. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kunkel, Republican, of Pennsylvania (86 Members absent).
35	Feb. 18	7381	Nay	83	262	86	To recommit bill modernizing and consolidating laws concerning civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services.
36	Feb. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hoeven, Republican, of Iowa (80 Members absent).
37	Feb. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (99 Members absent).
38	Feb. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (78 Members absent).
39	Feb. 20	9637	Not voting.	336	0	94	On passage of $16,900,000,000 military appropriations bill (1 Member answered "present"; R.B.C. en route from California with President Johnson; would have voted "yea").
40	Feb. 24		Present				Quorum call for Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (103 Members absent).
41	Feb. 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (27 Members absent).
42	Feb. 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (36 Members absent).
*43	Feb. 25	8363	Yea	326	83	23	Agreement to conference report on tax reduction bill.
44	Feb. 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (48 Members absent).
45	Feb. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (34 Members absent).
46	Feb. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Smith, Democrat, of Virginia (52 Members absent).
47	Feb. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Smith, Democrat, of Virginia (53 Members absent).
*48	Feb. 26	9022	Nay	208	188	36	Motion to recommit bill amending International Development Association Act to authorize increased U.S. participation.
49	Feb. 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (67 Members absent).
50	Feb. 27		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (78 Members absent; R.B.C. addressing seminar of university students).
*51	Feb. 27	8316	Nay	317	43	67	On passage of bill preventing the FCC from making rules relating to length or frequency of broadcast commercials.
52	Mar. 3		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois. (51 Members absent).
53	Mar. 3		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota. (63 Members absent).
54	Mar. 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican, of Indiana. (50 Members absent).
55	Mar. 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. O'Konski, Republican, of Wisconsin. (47 Members absent).
*56	Mar. 4	9666	Nay	90	309	32	Motion to recommit bill amending the Peace Corps Act (1 Member answered "present").
57	Mar. 5		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (71 Members absent; R.B.C. attending committee session of United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference).
58	Mar. 5		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Alger, Republican, of Texas (87 Members absent, R.B.C. at Interparliamentary Conference).
*59	Mar. 5	8000	Yea	238	142	51	On passage of Interest Equalization Tax Act (1 Member answered "present").
60	Mar. 9		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Harvey, Republican, of Indiana (151 Members absent; R.B.C. at Interparliamentary Conference).
61	Mar. 10		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Smith, Democrat, of Iowa (67 Members absent; R.B.C. at Interparliamentary Conference).
62	Mar. 10		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (72 Members absent; R.B.C. at Interparliamentary Conference).
63	Mar. 10	8070	Not voting.	339	29	65	On passage of bill establishing a Public Land Law Review Committee (R.B.C. at Interparliamentary Conference; would have voted "yea").
64	Mar. 11		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (34 Members absent).
65	Mar. 11	650	Yea	251	147	34	Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 8986, Federal pay bill.
66	Mar. 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (35 Members absent).
*67	Mar. 12	8986	Yea	184	222	26	On passage of Federal pay bill.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 43: TAX CUT

Of the measures I have strongly supported, nothing affects the American economy more than the tax reduction bill. Signed into law 6 hours after the bill was cleared by Congress, the new act effected the biggest tax cut in the Nation's history and placed in the hands of private consumers and business $11.5 billion with which to buy goods, generate demand, invest capital, and help toward creation of full employment.

Congress took the bold move of cutting taxes after the Johnson administration demonstrated its determination to reduce Federal spending to the most frugal minimum. President Johnson's economy drive meant slashing 7,500 Government jobs and $30 million from Federal appropriations. This move gained for the bill support of southern conservatives and the Republican leadership.

Impressed with the Democratic administration's economy moves, House Republicans who were originally against the bill voted for its final passage. Initially, all but one Republican voted to recommit the bill. On passage of the conference report on the bill, however, 108 Republicans joined 218 Democrats in sending the measure on its way to White House approval.

Representative JOHN BYRNES, GOP spokesman who was against the bill in September, admitted that President Johnson's economy drive made the tax cut acceptable to his Republican colleagues. He avowed faith in the self-imposed restraint of the President in public spending.

REDUCED UNEMPLOYMENT

In my 1963 report on rollcalls 156 and 157, I stated that H.R. 8363 is:

> Designed to stimulate demand and incentives to invest, narrow the gap that now exists between what we produce and what we could produce, and to help reach full employment.
>
> The new act retains the salient features of the same bill.

The tax cut has the immediate effect of increasing income for almost every taxpayer and business in America; those earning the least will benefit the most. Personal income taxes will be cut nearly 20 percent or $9.2 billion a year. Nearly $8 billion of that will be reflected in fatter pay envelopes this year.

Business, especially small business, stands to gain too from lower tax rates. Companies can now pay more of their savings to stockholders and they in turn can increase their investment, which in effect will benefit the economy.

It is hoped that spending of additional dollars in the taxpayer's pocket will create and sustain long-range economic growth. The $25 million released daily to the American consumer is expected to raise the demand for goods. The same is true of the more than $2 billion which businesses will no longer pay in taxes. Much of this money will be used to buy new machinery and finance new construction for the production of demand goods, and most importantly, for the creation of new jobs.

FAITH STRESSED

By its tax cut action, the Congress stressed its faith in the genius of American business to respond to tax incentives and to utilize more fully our growing labor force, our expanding technology, and our increasing quantities of capital in a market economy where these uses will be determined by private decisions of both consumers and investors.

This policy, first enunciated by President Kennedy in January 1963, is now translated into law. It explodes the myth that Democrats are antibusiness and stand for arbitrary Federal manipulation of the free enterprise system. Passage of the tax cut bill will, I hope, do away with this myth once and for all.

ROLLCALL NO. 48: INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Anxious to make an election-year record for "economy," a coalition of Republicans and southern conservatives killed H.R. 9022 through a recommittal motion. This action was extremely regrettable since the bill would have simply continued U.S. support for the International Development Association, a World Bank affiliate.

It should be remembered that IDA was initiated under bipartisan sponsorship during the administration of President Eisenhower, and that the World Bank has an unmatched record of never having had a defaulted loan in 18 years. During debate it was properly stressed that the legislation involved a loan program and not an aid program based on grants, that it is a loan program so designed and it was so initiated. It was also noted that the bill was designed to do something that the United States has sought to achieve for a long time—to bring into the whole area of economic aid and responsibility of world leadership the other strong nations of the world.

The IDA is a decisive step in this direction for through its international mechanism 16 of our wealthier allies, such as Germany, Italy, Japan, Great Britain, and Canada, would contribute substantially toward easing the foreign aid burden which our country has borne for so long.

REDUCED SHARE

Under the bill our contribution to IDA would have been reduced from its present percentage of 43.3 to 41.6. In other words, for every dollar contributed to IDA, our share would have been less than 42 cents. Another point worth noting in evaluating the merits of the bill is that the other participants in IDA had ratified the increase in their share of funds before the House considered H.R. 9022, but they cannot be bound to ratification unless the United States also agrees to participate. With defeat of the bill, our wealthier allies were in effect told that they could duck out on their obligation to aid underdeveloped countries because the United States had done so. In my judgment this is certainly not the direction in which American taxpayers want the worldwide foreign aid movement to drift.

There is no doubt that the need for IDA type assistance is still great. Many of the less developed countries where per capita income has not gone beyond $200 annually are caught in the vicious circle of misery and want. One hundred of these countries contain two billion inhabitants, half of whom go to bed hungry each night. These countries invariably lack capital with which to develop their natural resources, and they are not able to afford loans at normal international interest rates. These are precisely the countries where the international Communist movement is struggling to gain a foothold. I do not think that Americans and other citizens of the free world want to turn their backs on this struggle and sit passively by while underdeveloped areas of this planet are balanced on the brink.

In my judgment, IDA presents our best opportunity to pursue a program of meaning assistance to developing countries, and to share with other affluent peoples the burden of securing economic strength for the starving millions who are haunted daily by the spectre of communism.

A Political Poster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times announces a new White House project that raises serious questions. The project concerns the printing and distribution of posters bearing a picture of the President and a personal appeal for Americans to help win the war in South Vietnam.

This is the most thinly disguised piece of political advertising I have ever seen. Further, it implies that the American public has somehow been lax in doing all it can to secure a victory over communism in southeast Asia.

I want to know what is behind this precampaign project which uses taxpayer money to advertise the President. I want to know how many of these posters are being printed, where they are being distributed, and what heavy bureaucratic hand will arrange their prominent display.

I have no objection to the Government's reminding our citizens that we need to apply our best efforts in support of our forces in South Vietnam. It should be obvious that we entered this conflict to win and to save a strategic area from a Communist takeover.

But, it is shameful when less than 8 months prior to our national elections the administration seeks to exploit a situation in which American men are fighting and dying for political purposes. This is a strong statement, but I feel strongly about it, Mr. Speaker, and I regret and resent the insinuation that our fellow citizens are guilty of causing a slowdown that should give them uneasy sleep.

If the President is truly in need of help in order to cope with the Vietnam situation, let him go before the public and state his case directly. To date, there has been no substantial information on this important foreign policy matter given either to the public or to the Congress. In fact, there is mounting evidence of news suppression concerning South Vietnam.

I cannot recall when the country has been so much in the dark on a matter of grave international importance. How the President can now launch a public appeal in behalf of the South Vietnam conflict when we really know little about that conflict can be credited only to personal ambition.

Mr. Speaker, if such poster projects are allowed to go unchecked, can you imagine the extent to which they could conceivably be carried? Now that our national defense effort in South Vietnam has been chosen as a vehicle to advertise the President, I would not be surprised to see the next batch of military recruiting posters with the traditional pose of Uncle Sam replaced by the present White House occupant. Of course, the caption then should read: "I Want You To Vote for Me."

A Sing on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage that history repeats itself. History is being repeated in a happy and melodious way on Friday, April 3, when the Brown University Glee Club from Providence, R.I., will give a concert at the National Baptist Memorial Church at 16th Street and Columbia Road NW., where the 1922 Brown Glee Club sang 42 years ago at the cornerstone laying ceremony.

On April 22, 1922, the cornerstone was laid by the distinguished Brown alumnus, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State, later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who gave an outstanding address on "Baptists and Religious Liberty." A year earlier, April 23, 1921, the ground had been broken for the memorial by the President of the United States, Warren G. Harding.

Brown University is celebrating this year its bicentennial, having been founded in 1764 in Warren, R.I. Seventh oldest college in America and the third in New England, Brown is sending its glee club to the Nation's Capital on its spring tour as an event of the bicentennial celebration.

As a 1926 Brown graduate and a director of the Brown University Club of Washington, D.C., it is an honor for me to be cohonorary chairman of the April 3 concert with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], trustee of Brown University and recipient of its honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Washington Brown Club President Edward R. Place, 1924, as general chairman of the concert, has arranged for the Brown Glee Club to arrive on Capitol Hill at 1 p.m. on April 3. I am joined by fellow Brown graduates and House colleagues, BILL BATES, of Massachusetts, and JOHN WYDLER, of New York, both "loyal sons of good old Brown," in inviting all the Members of this body and their friends and staff members to hear the glee club sing, under the direction of Prof. Erich Kunzel, in the House Office Building rotunda at 1:45.

At 3 p.m., the 45-man group from Providence will be greeted by Senator PASTORE in the Senate Office Building rotunda, and will present several songs there.

Thomas G. Corcoran, who was graduated from Brown in 1922, the year the Brown Club performed here under the direction of his classmate, Chester S.

Stackpole, is chairman of patrons and patronesses from the Washington Brown and Pembroke College Clubs, for the bicentennial concert.

Mr. Stackpole plans to attend the concert and will be greeted by three of the members of his 1922 glee club, all now employed in Washington: Ed Place, of the Capitol Hill weekly magazine, Washington World; Earle Vincent Johnson, 1924, local Brown Club secretary, who is with General Services Administration, and Theodore L. Sweet, 1922, Brown Club director, and official of Agency for International Development. Mrs. Sweet is in charge of concert promotion for Pembroke, with Pembroke Club president Mrs. Louise Forstall, 1951.

National Baptist Memorial Church will be host to the glee club, concert committee, patrons, and patronesses, at a dinner at 6:30, preceding the concert at 8:15. Dr. Walter Pope Binns, interim minister, who was president of William Jewell College in Liberty, Mo., 1943–62, will make the address of welcome on behalf of the host church, and Senator PASTORE on behalf of the sponsoring Brown Club.

Brown University glee club continues the tradition that Brown is a singing college, and has become recognized for its appearances in the United States and Canada. Its program April 3 will include sacred and secular compositions, and will feature as an added attraction the singing by the Bruinaires, a group of 12 young men who have been delighting audiences from Miami to Montreal for two decades.

Chairman Place, a member of the District of Columbia chapter of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quintet Singing in America, Inc., for 19 years and currently chapter vice president in charge of programs, also will present the singing Capital chorus of around 50 men, under the direction of Dr. Robert Howe Harmon and Joseph B. Yznaga, during the intermission break.

The singing Capital chorus will salute the National Baptist Memorial Church by singing Dr. Harmon's arrangement of the Negro spiritual, "Steal Away," featuring tenor Howard Cranford of the Chapel of the Air television quartet.

Mr. Yznaga will lead the chorus in two songs which they plan to sing at the New York world's fair in early September.

Chairman for the dinner is Richard H. Howland, 1931, head curator, Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Institution.

Minority's Right of Veto Held Main Cyprus Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Minority's Right of Veto Held Main Cyprus Issue," written by the Reverend Father Constantine N. Leftheris, of Pensacola, Fla. I consider it a very fine statement on the problems of troubled Cyprus and of the cause of today's dispute:

MINORITY'S RIGHT OF VETO HELD MAIN CYPRUS ISSUE

I am an American of Greek extraction. My loyalty is with the United States and my prime concern is the national interest, both foreign and domestic, of this my native land. But as an American of Greek ancestry I feel a moral obligation to the ancestral land of my parents that justice prevail.

I know that my fellow Americans are people with a profound sense of justice and good judgment. Given the facts objectively and completely, without the discoloration and antipathy of the American press, they can determine for themselves whether or not the cause of the Greeks of Cyprus is just and in the best tradition of democracies the world over. This does not mean that the atrocities that are being committed in Cyprus by both sides should be condoned. They are, nonetheless, the byproducts of any civil strife in the cause of liberty.

What then is the problem and how did it come about? This question is being asked by many of our fellow Americans and unfortunately many of us cannot answer it despite the detailed information being printed in the newspapers. Simply, the problem is as follows: From time immemorial Cyprus, the third largest island in the Mediterranean has been inhabited by Greeks. Along with the many other islands in the eastern Mediterranean the culture and language of the Cypriots were Greek and Cyprus was part of the ancient Greek world. Following the decline of Greek civilization Cyprus was occupied by many alien forces which included Romans, Arabs, Saracens, and Crusaders from the West. During the middle ages Cyprus became a part of the Greek Byzantine Empire.

Then, following the fall of Constantinople in 1453 to the Turks, the island itself was seized by the Turks in 1517. The Turks remained in control until 1876 when the Congress of Berlin assigned the island over to Britain. During this prolonged period of occupations, despite the inroads of Turks and other alien elements, the culture and language of Cyprus remained unmistakably Greek. Under the control of Britain the Cypriots were repeatedly promised their freedom and one plebiscite after another was held for this purpose. But freedom did not come until 1960 after it was forcefully wrested from the British by a vicious guerrilla war led by Archbishop Makarios and other Greek Cypriot leaders.

At that time, the vast majority of Cypriots, some 500,000 Greeks, wanted union or enosis with Greece, a natural enough step. But a minority of Cypriots, the 100,000 Turks on the island, opposed such a move and demanded an independent Cyprus. To appease Turkey, an ally of Britain and the United States, the demand of the minority was accepted and Cyprus became an independent republic with a Greek president and a Turkish vice president and with the Turkish minority enjoying full veto power over the Greek majority. This was the Zurich agreement of 1960 and this is what President Makarios and the Greek Cypriots want to change, for it constitutes a dictatorship of the minority over the wishes of the majority.

The cause is just. In this respect, no country could be expected to exist and to function under such an illogical setup. It is tantamount to having the 20 million American Negroes, who most assuredly are entitled to the same rights of any American, enjoying veto power over the remaining 170 million Americans, if ever such a situation can even be imagined.

Where is the justice of such a situation? What has happened to the noble principle of self-determination which our country has always espoused and which was incorporated into the United Nations Charter? Why was it never applied to the Cyprus case? Obviously, because of national interests. It is to the interest of the United States and its allies to maintain a common front against the Soviet Union. In supporting outright the cause of the Greeks in Cyprus, the United States would endanger the support of Turkey against Russia. But how good of any ally is Turkey?

In World War I Turkey was an enemy of the United States, allied with Germany and the other central powers. In World War II Turkey was officially neutral but secretly favored the Nazis. Greece, on the other hand, was an active ally of the United States in both wars at great cost and sacrifice to itself. Where then is the juctice of this situation?

I urge you, therefore, to present these facts truthfully and unbiasedly to the American public and let them be the judges of whether or not the cause of the Greek Cypriots is a just one.

Rev. Father CONSTANTINE N. LEFTHERIS.

Softwood Lumber Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there are many Members interested in the subject of softwood lumber standards, I wish to insert in the RECORD for their information a copy of my letter of March 10 to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges and a copy of the Secretary's reply of March 17, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1964.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington. D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have long been interested in the proposed new lumber standards and have been hopeful that this issue would be settled promptly and without further unnecessary delay. Thus it was with considerable interest that I read a press release by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT last week indicating that a settlement of the matter is being postponed perhaps for many months.

Mr. ROOSEVELT speaks of having received various "assurances" from your Department which could be interpreted to mean that you are abdicating your authority in this field to his subcommittee. I think it important to my constituents in the industry that we have a clear understanding of the meaning of these assurances, and will appreciate an answer to the following questions:

1. Does reopening of the list of those to whom the proposed standards change will be sent for comment mean that the same 20 percent of membership restriction which had previously been imposed upon other organizations submitting names of prospective acceptors, will still apply?

2. Is it the intention of the Department of Commerce to resolicit participation by organizations which have previously declined to participate as acceptors? The American Trucking Association representing a large number of trucking firms, indicated in 1963, when first afforded the opportunity to submit a list of prospective acceptors, that it declined to do so on the grounds that it

had no direct interest in the standard. I note from Mr. ROOSEVELT's release that they will now be asked to supply a list.

2. Does the Department of Commerce contemplate any modification of previously determined "weighting" procedures for various categories of acceptors? Mr. ROOSEVELT notes in his press release that "the most careful consideration will be given to the comments in view of the interests making them." Further, what does Mr. ROOSEVELT's statement that "the Department 'is not seeking mere yes or no answers. It desires affirmative suggestions and information concerning the workability, equity, and economic impact of the proposed standard,'" mean? Does it mean that responses not bearing specific suggestions by either proponents or opponents will be evaluated at a lesser weight than those bearing "affirmative suggestion?"

3. Does Mr. ROOSEVELT's report of "assurances" that his subcommittee and the ALSC itself would also be consulted concerning the makeup of the committee indicate that the Secretary of Commerce will seek court sanction of what appears to be a surrender of his powers of appointment under procedures previously approved by the district court? Does the "concrete proposal for reconstitution (of the ALSC) being developed," mean that consideration of assigning prospective ALSC members will be left to the Subcommittee on Distribution of the House Select Committee on Small Business Matters?

4. If additional enclosures, other than the majority and minority positions and the table of equivalent green sizes, are to be included with the mailing of the standards proposal, may I be advised of their nature and purpose?

5. Do Department of Commerce "assurances" to Mr. ROOSEVELT that it will take no action until the subcommittee has had the opportunity of first holding full hearings and then submitting its findings to the Department," imply that the subcommittee judgment will take precedence over Department of Commerce? The Department is obligated to promulgate the standard if it is proved to be acceptable by the vast majority of acceptors polled and is, in the opinion of the Department, in the public interest. Does the Department contemplate that in future standards matters, regardless of the industry involved, the Subcommittee on Distribution will be consulted prior to promulgation of any standard as an approved industry standard? If such procedure is contemplated will the chairman of the Subcommittee on Distribution or his designee serve as a member of all industry committees concerned with industrial standards?

Those of us who are earnestly concerned with improving the standards of quality for softwood lumber, whether it be green or dry, need to know the full extent of agreements reached by Mr. ROOSEVELT with officials of the Department of Commerce so that we can anticipate further delays and gear the industry and the consumer to deal with them.

Sincerely,

FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1964.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOW: Your letter of March 10, 1964, inquired about a recent press release on softwood lumber standards by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT of the Select Committee on Small Business.

In the past several weeks, we have made considerable progress and are now preparing to circulate the proposal widely within the industry and interested public for comment.

The assurances of this Department to Representative ROOSEVELT were just clarifications of the procedures which the Department has been and is following in getting representative industry comment on the proposed standard. The answers to your specific questions follow in sequence:

1. The 20-percent membership restriction on trade organizations is still applicable to any trade organization asking for inclusion on the mailing list. The mailing list is mainly opened to individuals or individual firms which specifically request their names to be placed on the list to receive a copy of the proposal for individual comment. Until the mailing list was closed last fall, individual requests were honered in the same way. The Department of Commerce originally solicited participation by organization, but we do not intend actively to solicit participation by organizations any further. Individual members, however, have an opportunity to receive a proposal for comment. They would have to indicate on the response form the nature of their interest so that their comments would be analyzed properly.

2. Our procedure for weighing the various comments received has not been changed. We have always intended to make a careful analysis of the responses according to geographic location, amount of production, interest in the industry and so on. This will be both by number and by comment for each segment. Much confusion has arisen from the misconception that we were conducting a referendum or vote. We have never taken that position. The assurance to Congressman ROOSEVELT was simply an explanation that our system of analysis of the responses would not be by total number for and against, but would be made according to segment and interest. It is possible, for example, that producers would have different comments and percentage of acceptance than carpenters. The National Bureau of Standards would not attempt to accord one category greater "weight" than another.

3. Last fall we announced that we were reviewing generally the membership and procedures of the existing ALSC to see if changes ought to be recommended to the court having jurisdiction. We have assured Congressman ROOSEVELT that any comments of his subcommittee on what the proper constitution of the committee should be will be taken into account in making our recommendation. This Department has not surrendered any of its authority or responsibility for appointing members of this committee.

4. We are enclosing with the proposal, in addition to majority and minority reports, a brief statement of what the existing standard is and what the differences are between it and the proposed standard. I also plan to add my own letter sending the proposal to the industry and interested public for comment.

5. We have not postponed any action pending full hearings by the subcommittee. As you know, Congressman ROOSEVELT had originally planned to have hearings beginning March 3. After hearing an explanation of our procedures, he concluded that any hearings he has can best take place after the comments from industry and the interested public have been received by this Department and analyzed. We have always intended to make such an analysis public before our final decision in this matter. Any group or committee would thereby have an opportunity to discuss the full implications of the proposal in light of the comments. We have told Congressman ROOSEVELT that if he wishes to have hearings we would be very happy to consider the results in making our decision. We have no procedures for seeking the prior approval of the Subcommittee on Distribution prior to the promulgation of this or any other standard. However, the Congress always has had an interest in what our Department does with respect to standardization. If one of the committees of Congress desires to express its views, we would be happy to study them just as we would consider the views of trade organizations or private groups.

As I have repeatedly emphasized to members of both sides of the lumber standards question, the Department of Commerce intends to see that all segments of the industry and interested public have opportunity to participate in this cooperative, voluntary procedure. We think our procedures will tell us what the extent of the opposition is so that we can determine whether or not substantial support exists. I am sure you know that the commodity standards program cannot operate without wide voluntary acceptance of a proposal within the affected industry. The standards are not mandated. This being so, we have to be considerate of the views of all who wish to express them.

These are our concerns. We believe we are progressing as rapidly as possible consistent with our obligation to get the views of all in this cooperative process.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are among the earliest Slavic peoples known in the West. The recorded history of these stalwart and sturdy inhabitants of the borderland in northeastern Europe, east of Poland and west of Moscow dates from the 10th century. Soon after that they were Christianized and then organized their own diocese and cultural centers around the historic capital city of Smolensk. They had also organized their own state and managed to survive the deluge of Asiatic invasions during the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries. They held their own against all comers and maintained their freedom. Then in the 15th century, when they faced the "barbaric Muscovite hordes," they were gradually submerged in the future Russian Empire. By the 16th century they were all but lost in the then bottomless sea of czarist Russia.

Thenceforth for more than 300 years Byelorussia was no more, its inhabitants suffering under the czarist autocracy. But during all that time these doughty fighters for freedom did not lose heart in their cause and struggled for their independence. All their efforts, however, were not sufficient to attain their goal, for the odds against them were frightfully forbidding. The only real chance they had to realize their dream was in 1918, after the overthrow of Russia's czarist regime by the Bolsheviks in 1917. Very early in 1918, Byelorussian leaders braced themselves, then proclaimed Byelorussia's independence and founded the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25.

That historic day marked a new day for the Byelorussian people and ushered in a new era for them. For the first

time in centuries they became masters of their own destiny, and under most difficult conditions they worked hard to make their war-ravaged country a viable place in which to live and enjoy life in freedom. But in this period of joy and optimism fate seemed unkind and cruel to Byelorussians. From the outset the new state was surrounded by foes whose aim was to rob the Byelorussians of their newly gained freedom; Communist Russia was their deadly foe. The unhappy Byelorussians by themselves could not stave off the mortal threat facing them. After maintaining their precarious independence for about 3 years, they were robbed early in 1921 of their most cherished and priceless possession, their freedom and independence. The Red army overran Byelorussia and then the country became part of the Soviet Union.

From that year on, for 43 years, these 10 million freedom-seeking and peaceful Byelorussians have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their historic homeland. On the 46th anniversary celebration of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their delivery from that tyranny.

Richard A. Ports Killed in Senseless Accident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pay a last tribute to a young man who once served as a member of my staff, Richard A. Ports.

Dick Ports was killed in a senseless automobile accident Tuesday near Tucson, Ariz., at the age of 32. Despite his youth, he had already risen to positions of importance and responsibility in the Republican Party and with the Garrett Corp., of Los Angeles, of which he was a public affairs executive.

Dick Ports had lived in southern California since his release from active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1959. As a concerned citizen, he was active in the Republican Party and a member of the California State Republican Central Committee. He was an officer in State and National Young Republican organizations, and served with distinction on the presidential and gubernatorial campaign staffs of Richard M. Nixon.

Despite his vigorous Republicanism, Dick had the respect and friendship of men in the Democratic Party as well, as Charles Wilson, Augustus Hawkins, Ken Roberts, and others of our colleagues in that party will testify.

No one who knew him doubts that Dick Ports was destined to be one of the Nation's leaders in business and politics. I find it difficult to describe my shock and my grief that one so young and vigorous, so promising and talented, should be taken in this manner.

That talent and vigor were characteristic of Dick from early youth. He was a leader in high school and college activities in Alliance, Ohio. I came to know him as an energetic young reporter for radio station WFAH and later for the Massillon Evening Independent, and I invited him to join my staff in 1954. Later he enlisted in the Marine Corps, successfully completed officer's training, and eventually served as aide to Maj. Gen. A. L. Bowser.

His death is a loss not only to his family and friends but to the Nation as well, for there was no limit to the contribution Dick Ports could have made to his party and his country.

Discrimination Against Negroes in Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a second excellent article by Dr. Max Seham of Minneapolis, Minn., tells another part of the story of discrimination in medical care for Negroes. I am sure my fellow Congressmen will be most interested in this report as follows:

DISCRIMINITION AGAINST NEGROES IN HOSPITALS

(By Dr. Max Seham)

Gunnar Myrdahl in "The American Dilemma" wrote "A genuine and irreconcilable conflict exists between two sets of irreconcilable ideas: on the one hand, the principle of equal rights and fundamental equality of all Americans; and on the other hand race prejudice and discrimination which deny equal opportunity to members of certain racial and ethnic groups."

Although more subtle and less publicized than discrimination in other social and economic areas, this moral war has spread to all areas of medicine, including hospitals.

In the days of slavery, there was no discrimination against Negroes in hospitals for the simple reason that there were no hospitals. Plantation owners protected their slaves against health hazards as carefully as they protected their livestock. The health of the Negro slave was as good as that of his white counterpart, and in some areas the Negro mortality rate was even lower.

After emancipation, health worsened for the Negro. And even as of today, there is a tacit conspiracy of "white" doctors, hospital administrators, politicians to deny Negroes the right to optimum medical and hospital care. Though advances in medicine in the last two decades lengthening the span of life of all Americans, have contributed to the better health status of Negroes, vital statistics show conclusively that the morbidity and mortality rates of the Negro are still significantly higher than those of his social and economic counterpart.

MORTALITY RATES FOR NEGROES

There is, as I shall show later, some glimmer of light in their darkness. Things are beginning to happen. But the darkness has been thick—not only a hundred years ago, but in the immediate past.

Item: In 1960, the life expectancy of the white was 70.6 as compared to 63.6 for nonwhites, a difference of 7 years. Of 100,000 persons at the age of 70, there were 62,000 white people alive, whereas there were only 44,000 nonwhites.

Item: In 1940, the mortality rate for whites of both sexes was 10.4 (per 100,000 population) and 13.8 for nonwhites. Today, it is 9.5 for whites and 10.1 for nonwhites.

Item: In 1960, the death rate for pneumonia and influenza was 24.6 for whites and 55.2 for nonwhites. For tuberculosis, the rate was 4.4 for whites and 15.1 for nonwhites, almost four times as high for nonwhites.

Item: Infant mortality rates reflect the contrast in available medical services. In 1960, the death rate nationally was 18.3 for white babies under 1 year of age and 47.8 for nonwhite babies under 1 year of age. At age 5, of 100,000 sample population, 96,000 white children survived as compared to 94,000 nonwhite children. In Minnesota, in 1960, the infant mortality rate for whites was 21.6 and for nonwhites, 22.6; while in Mississippi, it was 26.6 for white infants and 54.3 for nonwhites.

NEGROES NOT BIOLOGICALLY INFERIOR

This startling discrepancy in infant mortality rates in Minnesota and Mississippi shows what mythical nonsense there is to the claim of recists that the Negroes are biologically inferior. There is no question that if the same care were available to Negroes in Mississippi and other Southern States as in Minnesota and other Northern States, Negro morbidity and mortality rates could be sharply reduced and vast human waste and suffering could be prevented. There is no use to belabor the point: factors responsible for this shocking injustice are poverty, lack of Negro doctors, exclusion of Negroes from first-class "white" hospitals, and the powerful political opposition of Southern Senators and Representatives such as the Rankins and the Russells.

Item: Of the Nation's 4,100 Negro medical doctors, an average of 20 per 100,000 population, about 1,200 practice in Southern and border States—or one M.D. for every 5,000—compared to 1 white M.D. for about every 700 white population.

Item: Today, there are 146.7 M.D.'s per 100,000 whites while only 40 Negro M.D.'s per 100,000 Negroes. In 20 years, the Negro population has increased 46.7 percent while the increase in Negro M.D.'s has been only 14.2 percent.

TRAGEDY OF WHITE-ONLY HOSPITALS

There is no need to describe in detail the many tragedies attributable to discrimination by "white" hospitals against Negroes. Women in labor have been compelled to deliver on cold sidewalks outside of "white hospitals." Victims of accidents have repeatedly been given first aid for skull fractures or other injuries, only to be sent away from "white" hospitals to inadequate Negro hospitals, where death has often followed.

The most publicized of such inhuman treatment was that of the father of Walter White, the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The elder White was run over by a white physician's car on the streets of Atlanta, and taken to a "white" hospital. White was not recognized as a Negro, and he was given the best emergency treatment, but when Walter White, his son, identified him, the father was hustled to a Negro hospital. He died in 24 hours.

It seems incredible that in the year 1964, in the United States of America, such barbaric treatment of Americans exists. But let the record speak for itself:

FEW HOSPITAL BEDS OPEN TO NEGROES

In Atlanta, always a hotbed of discrimination, of 4,500 available hospital beds, only 630 are available to Negroes, although 50 percent of the population is Negro. Because of this situation, in June 1963, suits were brought against the Grady Hospital and the Fulton Medical Society of Atlanta by the

NAACP and a number of Negro doctors. This was settled out of court, and since then, several Negro doctors have been admitted to the society and two have been granted staff privileges.

In Birmingham, Ala., the city where dogs were unleashed against colored children, area hospitals have allocated 1,762 beds to whites and 574 to Negroes, although about 40 percent of the population is colored.

In Baltimore, Md., in 1959, 70 percent of all Negro births were delivered in 7 of the 17 hospitals because only the 7 hospitals offered accommodations to Negroes.

In Augusta, Ga., although Hill-Burton Federal funds were used to build a hospital, this hospital has refused to give pediatric and hospital care to Negroes.

OMAHA STUDY

The Urban League of Omaha, in cooperation with the Nebraska Civil Rights Commission in 1962, made a survey of discrimination in Omaha. The following information was uncovered:

1. There was conspicuous absence of Negroes in most hospitals.

2. Although the administrators of hospitals said that all facilities "are available" to patients without regard to race, 23 Negro doctors revealed that 75 percent of the hospitals consider race when admitting patients, and that patients are admitted to beds on "the basis of race."

3. In the 13 hospitals in the city, there were 7 Negro M.D.'s with privileges on the staffs of 8 hospitals. Of over 1,000 registered nurses employed in the hospitals, only 14 are colored, of 263 practical nurses, 49 are Negro.

U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Because of the persistent and serious charges by many organizations—Negroes and whites—that Negro doctors are denied staff privileges and that patients are refused admittance or are segregated in "white" hospitals, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission launched an investigation in 1960. Three hundred eighty-nine hospitals in 34 States were sent questionnaires, and personal interviews were held in a number of key cities. Replies were received from 130 southern hospitals, 45 from border States, and 214 from Northern and Western States.

One hundred and seventy-five hospitals answered that they have no policy of discrimination. Sixty hospitals admitted to policies of exclusion or segregation. Forty percent of the hospitals that admitted only whites were in Dixie, and of 90 hospitals in Georgia, 83 were built on Hill-Burton funds. Of the 64 southern correspondents, 85 percent reported some type of racial segregation or exclusion. Forty-three percent of the border States admitted such practices. In contrast, only 2 of the 133 hospitals in the North and West reported any type of racial segregation.

As a result of this intensive 3-year study, the Civil Rights Commission concluded that Negroes are denied access to or are segregated in many hospitals and facilities which have received Federal grants via the Hill-Burton plan; and that Negroes do not share equally with white patients in the use of such facilities. What was originally stated as "separate but equal" has in effect become separate and unequal.

SHOULD DENY FEDERAL FUNDS

As a result of this study, the Civil Rights Commission recommended to President Kennedy that further Federal funds be denied to hospitals built under the Hill-Burton program which practiced the so-called "equal but separate" system.

The Southern Conference of Methodists in 1956 polled 2,400 southern hospital administrators on their attitudes toward discrimination. Much progress has been made since then; nevertheless, these data are significant as to the reasons for the undemocratic situations which remain in hospitals, both North and South. Seventeen percent of the administrators were willing to accept desegregation. Sixty-two percent were adamant against desegregation. Ten percent believed the most practicable solutions are to have separate hospitals. Eleven percent were reluctant to express themselves.

SEGREGATION IS AN ANACHRONISM

In answer to those who were sure it was impossible to integrate, Dr. Arnold Bluestone, administrator at Montefiore Hospital of New York, had this to say: "Segregation today is an anachronism. Jim Crowism in hospitals turns the clock back. It jeopardizes the democratic process, and it is a menace to public health." In two decades of integration in his hospital, he states, "There have been no instances of failure. The white residents and interns from Oklahoma sit down for a game of cards with Negroes, and it never occurs to anyone on the staff that any white would object to such a comradeship. Negro and white student nurses walk down the hall hand in hand, and no one seems to worry about such a human relationship." He has never seen any of the dire consequences predicted by racists.

In other hospitals that have integrated, the practice of separating Negro and white patients is breaking down, also. Even where Negroes formerly were excluded, white patients rarely object to sharing facilities with colored.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

The responsibility for this social disease is hard to pin down. The white doctors alone are not to blame. There is no question that the hospital administrators, more in the South than in the North, are guilty. Because of tradition and social pressure, the administrators still cling to psychological and inherited prejudices. In the South, some frankly admit that they do not want Negro patients. They have an inner contempt, and even hatred, for the Negro. In the North, they rationalize complacency and foot-dragging. They may say they are not responsible for antidiscriminatory policies; the board of directors has this responsibility, and if the board does not take corrective steps, they are helpless. Many interviewed administrators said they would like to eliminate the restrictive admission policies, but they do nothing, because important people in their community offer no help in changing conditions.

Over the years, the NMA has repeatedly entreated the AMA to sit down with its representatives and come to reasonable and practical terms. At the 1962 AMA convention, president-elect Dr. Norman Welch promised that he would appoint a committee from the house of delegates to meet with a similar committee of the NMA, and that in November 1963, at Portland, these matters would be adjudicated. The house of delegates considered two proposals at the Portland meeting: a board report on hospital staff privileges, and a resolution concerning membership eligibility in State and county medical societies. The report was approved, but as has happened many times before, the resolutions were not adopted.

AMA SHOULD TAKE A STAND

In response to the failure of the AMA to take positive action, Dr. Kenneth Clements, president of the NMA said, "We must make public our discontent with the silence of the AMA. We want the AMA to address itself to the problem frankly, and not sit back complacently and wait for every incident to be documented exhaustively. We want the AMA to state positively that hospital discrimination makes it impossible to give the best medical care to the patient."

By the end of 1963, the leaders of the NAACP, of the Urban League, and of the NMA agreed that the only way to eliminate discrimination in the area of medicine was by court action and by such demonstrations as the picketing of medical organizations. Accordingly, these organizations have proceeded to accumulate examples of discrimination in hospitals and medical societies, and they have begun recourse to the courts. In addition, they are seeking to eliminate, by legislation, the Hill-Burton "separate but equal" clause.

NAACP HELPS FIGHT HOSPITAL SEGREGATION

The first and most significant battle for integration in hospitals began in 1960, with the showing by the NAACP of flagrant discrimination against Negro doctors and their patients in the hospitals of Greensboro, N.C. The NAACP brought suit which charged the local dental society with depriving Negro dentists of the right to practice in clinics and hospitals. At the same time, six Negro M.D.'s and two Negro patients charged that they were discriminated against by two hospitals, the Moses Cone Memorial Hospital and the Westley Long Community Hospital, both constructed with Hill-Burton aid. The M.D.'s and the dentists sought staff privileges which had been denied to them, and the two Negro patients sought admission to the hospitals and treatment by their personal M.D.'s.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT GIVES AID

They were joined by the Department of Justice, which formally called upon the Federal court in Greensboro to declare the "separate but equal" provision in the Hill-Burton Act to be unconstitutional. The Justice Department pointed out that the two hospitals had received more than $2.8 million in Hill-Burton funds and had violated the 14th amendment by discriminating against the Negroes. The local court decided against the Justice Department. Later, the case was brought before the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, Va. The appeals court, by a vote of 3 to 2, struck down as unconstitutional the "separate but equal" clause. It is expected that the case will be carried to the Supreme Court. If the decision of the appeals court is upheld, it will mean that 104 segregated hospitals in the South will be required by law to open their doors to Negro M.D.'s and Negro patients.

The legal attacks now being pressed against segregation in hospitals built with Federal Hill-Burton money are finally making an inroad upon segregation in a number of other Southern hospitals. Use of the "separate but equal" provision has fallen off sharply, with only one such project approved this year. These changes are occurring not only because of pressure from civil rights groups and the change of heart of some hospital administrators. These changes also come about because authorities realize that it is "bad business", or poor economy, to continue to support duplicate facilities.

In cities where desegregation has occurred, Negro M.D.'s say that the change has brought a marked improvement in Negro medical care. The change has resulted in the elimination of a number of Negro hospitals where facilities and sanitary conditions were medieval.

HISTORY OF HILL-BURTON ACT

The Hill-Burton Act, with its "separate but equal" clause, was fathered by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Congressman Burton of Ohio, in 1946. The Federal funds provided by the act have practically rebuilt the hospital system. The latest progress report on construction of hospitals and diagnostic facilities under this program list a total of almot a million beds. Included in the overall program have been over 700,000 general beds, about 500,000 long-term beds, 5,000 hospital and health centers, 500,000 beds for mental patients, and about 60,000 beds for tuberculosis patients. Between 1948 and 1961, Federal funds accounted for $1.6 billion out of some $5 billion expended. Ironically, in spite of the fact that the Hill-Burton Act has proved to be the Nation's

largest investor in hospitals, the "separate but equal" clause has become a Dr. Jekyll to the whites and a cruel Mr. Hyde to the Negroes. To 20,000,000 citizens, discrimination and segregation followed.

For 17 years, the "separate but equal" clause was discreetly kept in the background. Not until Senator JAVITS and Representative DINGELL took it upon themselves to fight the clause as unconstitutional did Congress take any official notice of the great social injustice that had been perpetrated upon 10 percent of the American population. In the 87th Congress, Senator JAVITS charged that "nothing could be more pernicious than racial discrimination and segregation in the medical field." On the floor of the Senate, he said, "Negro M.D.'s meet obstacles in their practice and advancement every step of the way. Some hospitals still bar Negro patients altogether. Some limit their numbers and segregate them in basements and attics under the 'separate but equal' item." The first bill offered by Senator JAVITS, in September 1962, S. 275, to eliminate the clause, was tabled by the vote of 37 to 33.

In the 88th Congress, Senator JAVITS had the backing of a few Senators and the administration, but he lacked the support of a Democratic leadership, especially the powerful southern Senators. His support appears to be greater outside of Congress than within. Significantly, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, and the Catholic Hospital Association have passed resolutions calling for the elimination of the "separate but equal" clause.

IN SUMMARY

Sufficient facts are on hand to convince the most skeptical that the "separate but equal" provision must be eliminated. The human tragedies which have resulted are indefensible on moral grounds. Congress, hospital administrators, the AMA, and the entire medical profession share responsibility for this social injustice to the Negro. If the Negro were treated as a full citizen, in the decent and democratic way, there would be no need for "white" or "Negro" hospitals.

The 100-year-old struggle for full integration in medicine has received encouraging backing from many sources during the past decade. Religious leaders of all faiths are putting their shoulders to the wheel of integration. Rank-and-file white practitioners no longer take the stand that they are not their "brother's keepers."

To review a few of the more recent successful measures in behalf of integration: (1) The decision of the Appellate Court of Virginia, by a vote of 3 to 2, which declared the "separate but equal" clause unconstitutional; (2) the picketing of the AMA convention in 1963 by both white and colored doctors and dentists; (3) the introduction by Senator JAVITS, Republican, and Congressman DINGELL, Democrat, of bills to eliminate the "separate but equal" clause; (4) the promise of Dr. Welch, the president of the AMA in 1963, to hold joint meetings with officials of the NMA, to settle disputes between Negro doctors and hospitals; (5) the introduction of resolutions demanding that the house of delegates of the AMA take positive action against discriminatory policies in hospitals.

INTEGRATION IN MEDICINE IS ON THE MARCH

At long last, integration in medicine is on the march. Closing ranks, Negro doctors, dentists, nurses, and agencies are grimly determined to secure what is legally and morally their right to first-class professional citizenship. Their impatience today is spiced with anger. To those who admonish them to go slowly, not to rock the boat, they reply, "We are fed up with lipservice and broken promises. You have had over 100 years to deal with our problem, which is your problem, and you have failed. How much longer do you expect us to tolerate this heel of discrimination?"

The house of Hippocrates needs more sociology and less technology. The crying need is for a new leadership to sweep away the barnacles of bigotry and racism. It is ironic that the descendants of those who fought for freedom for themselves deny freedom for others.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 28, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, Mar. 28, 1964)

FALLACIES IN FOREIGN AID MESSAGE

The foreign aid message presented to the House on March 19 is fallacious. It is not supported by the facts of foreign aid as it has developed over the years. On the contrary, foreign aid has become and, as this message indicates, it will continue to be self-contradictory and self-defeating.

An examination of the message shows:

1. The President says: "To those nations which do commit themselves to progress under freedom, help from us and from others can provide the margin of difference between failure and sucess."

The record of foreign aid shows: We give aid to dictatorships and Communists, and punish our freedom-loving friends.

2. The President says: "The proposals contained in this message express our self-interest at the same time that they proclaim our national ideals."

On the contrary: Our outpouring of dollars, our apparent efforts to buy friendship, indicate a godless materialism, rather than our God-fearing spiritual beliefs and our championing of dignity and respect of the individual whose rights come from God.

3. The President says: "We will be laying up a harvest of woe for us and our children if we shrink from the task grappling in the world community with poverty and ignorance."

The fallacious assumption: Communism breeds in poverty. History clearly shows it does not. Communism feeds on ignorance, not poverty.

4. The President says: "They flourish wherever we falter. If we default on our obligations, communism will expand its ambitions."

We have already faltered in our obligations: We have faltered in our obligations to the freedom loving and to our allies, by outright subsidy, trade, aid, and deals with the implacable enemy. In so doing we feed, cultivate, and arm the Communists. Our friends are hard pressed to understand our castigation of their trading with Castro while we trade with the Soviet Union, thereby giving aid to Castro indirectly.

5. The President says: "It is against our national interest to tolerate waste or inefficiency or extravagance in any of these programs. But it is equally repugnant to our national interest to retreat from our obligations and commitments while freedom remains under seige."

A conflicting statement: After admitting that we are against waste and inefficiency, the President seems to make it plain that if these are part of foreign aid obligations, it is all right. The endless examples of waste, corruption, privately padded bank accounts and bad judgment suggest to our world neighbors that we lack judgment, have an inexhaustible source of money, and welcome the opportunity to give it away.

THE PRESENT FOREIGN AID PROGRAM MUST BE STOPPED

We should help only our friends and those who value and practice freedom for their own people. The program should be revised to: 1. Aid recipient countries on projects they need and want; 2. Demand that the major contribution be made by the recipient country; 3. We would provide advice, technical help, and machinery, all on a loan basis with definite proposals for repayment.

This type of foreign aid would allow all nations to keep their self-respect and they would not hate the United States for robbing them of their national pride.

EXPLANATION NEEDED ON HOW AID TO COMMUNISTS HELPS US

The President and the vocal proponents of unrestricted foreign aid owe the American people an explanation of how our gifts to the Communists help the cause of freedom. How is freedom strengthened when we give aid to and help to strengthen governments which do not express the will of their people or who hold their people in slavery? What is the answer to the following actions? Our aid programs are being continued (1) In a country where a dictator has taken control; (2) A military junta has overthrown a friendly government; (3) A president or premier has been assassinated; (4) A newly elected President has been prevented from taking office; (5) A monarch has been dispossessed by a rebel force. Twenty-nine countries receiving U.S. aid between 1948–63 have experienced an illegal change of government. Of these 29 Cuba is the only one not now receiving direct U.S. aid, but is aided indirectly by us through the U.N. and through our deals with the Soviet Union.

ONE FINAL, IMPORTANT QUESTION

Nowhere in the foreign aid message was the big question answered. Specifically, how does a gift of $25 million of wheat to Russia, which can be converted into ethyl alcohol to make weapons of war, benefit the United States? Such a gift makes the earlier scrap iron to Japan look quite innocent by comparison. We must continue to ask ourselves, if treason is giving aid and comfort to the enemy, wherein does aid to Communists differ from treason, and since when was not treason a crime against the Constitution of our Nation?

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Mrs. Peter Bergson-Kook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 31, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to register my deep sense of personal loss and regret over the news of the untimely passing of Mrs. Peter Bergson-Kook, who died in New York on March 2 at the age of 45. Betty Bergson helped to organize the American League for a Free Palestine in the days when Jewish settlers in the Holy Land were fighting for independence and for the establishment of Israel as a free nation. Born in Kansas City, she inspired Americans of all faiths to join with her in the cause she championed, then later went to the displaced persons camps in Europe to help in getting the refugees past the blockade and into Palestine. Her enthusiasm, devotion, and dedication had few equals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the obituaries which appeared on March 4 in the New York Herald Tribune, and in the New York World Telegram.

There being no objection, the obituaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Mar. 4, 1964]

MRS. PETER BERGSON-KOOK: SHE HELPED RESCUE EUROPEAN JEWS

Mrs. Betty Bergson-Kook, 45, wife of Peter H. Bergson-Kook, New York investment broker and former head of the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation, died Monday in New York Hospital after a brief illness.

Born Betty Caplan in Kansas City, Mo., Mrs. Bergson-Kook was educated there and came to New York in 1939 when she joined in drives to rescue European Jews from the Nazi menace. She was an organizer of the Emergency Conference To Save the Jewish Population of Europe, and was active for the next several years in many similar endeavors.

In 1950, in Israel, she was married to Hillel Kook, a native Palestinian, who had used the name Peter H. Bergson for some years in this country while working toward the goal of a Jewish state in the Near East.

When Mr. Kook resigned his seat in the Israel Parliament 3 years later and returned to New York, he amended his name to its present form.

The Bergson-Kooks lived at 146 Central Park West. Surviving, in addition to her husband, are two daughters, Astra, 13, and Rebecca, 5; her mother, Mrs. Fannie Caplan, of Kansas City; a sister, Mrs. Marshall MacDuffie, of New York; and two brothers, Harry Caplan and Leon Caplan, of Kansas City.

[From the New York World Telegram, Mar. 4, 1964]

BETTY BERGSON DIES AT AGE 45; HELPED JEWS TO RUN BLOCKADE

Using trains supplied by the U.S. Army, Mrs. Betty Bergson organized 625 Jews, all former concentration camp prisoners, and brought them to France after World War II. She told the authorities the group was going to various Latin American countries.

But in Port de Bouc, she quickly hustled the refugees on an 800-ton American yacht, renamed the *Ben Hecht*, after the writer, and sailed for Palestine in defiance of the British blockade.

Reaching Haifa in March 1947, the *Ben Hecht* was impounded by the British Navy and the refugees were shipped off to a displaced persons' camp in Cyprus. Later, after the State of Israel was created, they were freed and went to Israel.

ORGANIZED RESCUE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Bergson, 45, died in New York Hospital Monday.

Born in Kansas City, Mo., she attended the University of Missouri. In 1939 she came to New York, changing her name from Betty Caplan to Betty Keane, and helped organize a conference that led to the Emergency Committee To Save the Jewish People of Europe.

She served as a staff member of that committee and later became a consultant to the War Refugee Board set up by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and an expert for the U.S. prosecution staff at the Nuremberg war crimes trials.

Mrs. Bergson was the wife of Peter H. Bergson, an investment broker who was chairman of the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation during the Palestine mandate. The committee was associated with the Irgun Zvai Leumi underground.

SOUGHT U.S. RECOGNITION

The organization set up the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation in 1944 with an "embassy" in Washington. It tried in vain to achieve allied recognition as a government in exile.

Mr. Bergson, who was originally named Hillel Kook, served as a member of the first Israel Parliament in 1948.

Services were to be held today at Congregation Rodeph Sholom, 7 West 83d Street.

Mrs. Bergson is survived by her husband, two daughters, Astra and Rebecca; her mother, two sisters, and two brothers.

Travel: Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the March 1964 issue of the magazine, Birmingham, an official monthly publication of the Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce, carries a factual and descriptive account of the many sights to be seen in the Birmingham, Ala., area by our Nation's travelers. I would like to bring this to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is always nice to have you in Birmingham.

TRAVEL: BIRMINGHAM

Birmingham people are a gay people, friendly and dedicated to the natural beauty of random flowers, picturesque walkways, and niches of surprising loveliness.

Their interests are as varied as the landscape. Sports are a popular pastime, indoors or out of doors. A tour of the city might include a game of golf on one of the seven golf courses in the area. It most surely will include a plunge into one of the numerous privately owned swimming pools, or an afternoon at Holiday Beach lake resort between Birmingham and Bessemer.

The tour might also include a day or two of fishing on one of the many rivers that lace the county, or on Lake Purdy, a thousand-acre body of water located within a 30-minute drive from Birmingham.

Visitors with extended time might choose to visit Emerald Valley resort where cottages are located beside the three fish-stocked lakes, and where hunters may rove the 3,400 acres of wooded mountains.

The more curious may prefer to explore the "depths" of the Birmingham area in Rickwood and Cathedral Caverns.

And the scientifically curious might make arrangements for a visit to Southern Research Institute, one of the South's most successful independent laboratories that has gained fame in the fields of cancer and industrial research.

Southern Research Institute is located on the fringe of the University of Alabama's 15-block medical center. This center is one of the fastest growing in the Nation and is noted for research and practical demonstration with the heart pump, kidney transplants, diseases of the lung, and for its numerous specialized hospitals.

And the Birmingham area abounds in the professional arts. Five little theater groups, ballet companies, a symphony orchestra, the civic opera company, art associations, and a modern museum of art provide year-round entertainment. A 3-week festival of arts every spring pays tribute to all the professional arts and culminates in a 5-day international fair prepared and presented by Birmingham's international population.

Art and antique collectors find Birmingham a haven. French-styled Cobb Lane is a small world of teacups and artistry. Antebellum Arlington House is furnished with Civil War period furnishings. Art and antique shops are located in all parts of the area.

Young visitors to Birmingham always enjoy seeing the Old Mill, an afternoon at Kiddieland and, of course, a visit to the Jimmy Morgan Zoo, one of the most modern and complete anywhere.

Adjacent to the zoo is the new Botanical Garden containing one of the few floral clocks in the world. And periodically, some of Birmingham's private gardens are opened to the public so all flower lovers can share

the color, the arrangement, and the fragrance of one of Birmingham's biggest assets. On the hillsides, in nooks, public walkways, churchyards, and around Birmingham homes, flowers of numerous varieties bloom from March until late in the fall, and flower shows are held nearly every other week.

Pictorially, Birmingham's landscape would not be complete without its statues. Vulcan, mythical god of the forge, is the Nation's second largest statute. He watches over the city from the crest of Red Mountain and looks down upon the Statue of Liberty on top of a life insurance building. Miss Liberty is an exact replica, one-fifth the size, of the original Statue of Liberty. Electra, goddess of light, stands above the power company building; Brother Bryan, one of the area's early religious leaders, kneels in a churchyard on the south side of the city; and Mary Calahan, one of the city's early teachers and writers, holds aloft a torch in Woodrow Wilson Park, heart of the city's civic center.

Birmingham is a picturesque city * * * its sights include far more than glowing steel mills and smokestacks.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

ROLLCALL NO. 51: BROADCAST COMMERCIALS

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8316, which I opposed, prevents the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the length and frequency of radio-TV commercials. It strips the FCC of its vital responsibility to protect the public from the abuses of over-commercialization. It ties the hands of the FCC from establishing standards for which radio-TV stations may be held responsible. This leaves a void in a key area of public policy where no mechanism exists for determining the guidelines by which radio and TV stations may be able to keep faith with their license mandate to "serve the public."

The public service character of the American system of broadcasting has been defined by law. The Federal Communications Act provides:

> There can be no proprietary right in any frequency or channel, that the spectrum is a measurable resource belonging to the entire national public, and that the value to be derived from this concept would be destroyed by uncontrolled private exploitation.

Because the airwaves are a scarce natural resource, Congress by law wisely ruled in 1934 that those who obtain a license must serve the public interest. The public interest in the broadcast field is that the various needs and interests of the listening public be served and not, as Herbert Hoover said in 1922, that these needs be shunted aside by an excessive amount of advertising chatter.

REGULATION NEEDED

Ideally, the industry must promote the public interest by self-regulation. But its own radio-television codes have yet to gain effective acceptance. Competition, on the other hand, cannot be relied upon to regulate because broadcasting time is limited. The law of supply and demand cannot apply here.

Meanwhile, the public continues to be at the mercy of individual broadcasters who have almost uncontrolled power to exploit the airwaves. We have but to flip a switch to know that the airwaves are clogged with excessive advertising. The private code authority of the National Association of Broadcasters has conceded that almost 30 percent of member radio stations violated the current limitation on broadcast advertising. Similarly, an association of State broadcasters reported that almost 80 percent of its member stations exceeded the NAB ceiling on commercial time.

During an hour clocked by the FCC in 1962, a radio station in the Nation's Capital saturated its listeners with 33 minutes of commercials as compared with 27 minutes of entertainment. Another FCC check revealed that about 40 percent of some 134 stations surveyed had exceeded the 18-minute maximum in the course of 1 or more hours of broadcasting.

TRUE INFRINGEMENT

Not only has self-regulation fallen short of the mark, but only about 132 of the radio stations across the country subscribe to the NAB code authority, while one-fourth of our television stations are nonmembers. The extent of overcommercialization has been so great that a leading advertising agency characterized the present increase of commercial time as "a true infringement upon responsible use of the free airways," and warned that "this could lead toward a chaos of commercialization."

The need is clear for establishing criteria which would be meaningful to the public and to the industry. The FCC attempt to impose some measure of regulation on a case-by-case basis in dealing with individual licensees seeking renewal has thus far failed.

The FCC recently entered into consultations with the broadcast industry in search of an effective remedy for the evils of overcommercialization, and speculated upon adopting the industry's own radio-TV codes as Federal regulations. A legitimate wonder is why the spokesmen of organized radio and TV resisted standards which the National Association of Broadcasters had evolved and adopted for the industry. It would seem that the industry has no grounds to reject as improper what it has already accepted as proper.

FCC rulemaking would have done justice to legitimate broadcasters. The FCC's policy against overcommercialization has long been shrouded with uncertainty; no clearcut standards spell out this policy for the benefit of broadcasters. Nothing, I think, could be more unfair to the industry than to leave it without definite rules to govern its voluntary compliance with FCC policy. It is sound administrative practice for FCC to express such policy in clearcut regulations. To keep this vital policy vague and uncertain does not, in my judgment, constitute good Government.

It seems reasonable that when Americans turn on their TV or radio sets, they expect to be entertained or informed No one wants to be bombarded by commercials. The passage of H.R. 8316, however, is an open invitation to abandon the airwaves to more and more commercials and to poor taste. One Congressman summed it up this way:

> I dread the day when the announcer will say, "Now we interrupt this commercial message for a brief program."

ROLLCALL NO. 56: PEACE CORPS

The idealism of John Fitzgerald Kennedy left the American people with the legacy of an effective and working Peace Corps. The overwhelming House and Senate votes to permit enlargement of the Corps from its current 7,000 volunteers to 14,000 represents our determination to keep faith with our late President's highest ideals.

Success of the Peace Corps demonstrates the good that people-to-people foreign aid inspires. Thousands of young American men and women have found in the Corps an opportunity to assume individual responsibility for assisting their foreign neighbors, and volunteers have evoked from their hosts a sense of identity with those ideals which have led our Nation to greatness.

Sitting on the House Foreign Affairs Committee which conducted hearings on H.R. 9666, it was readily apparent to me that most of the caustic critics of the Peace Corps when it was formulated in 1961 have changed their thinking on the program's merits. The skeptics have been convinced by the outstanding record which volunteers have made in all corners of the globe.

MORE VOLUNTEERS

The Peace Corps has been operating in 46 countries and no country has asked that the program be terminated. In fact, most governments want to double and triple the number of Peace Corpsmen they now have. The program for expanding the number of volunteers in 1965 does not contemplate an expansion into additional countries, although there may be some limited activity in this area, but is aimed at increasing the number of volunteers in those countries where the program is already in motion.

Under the able leadership of its director, Sargent Shriver, the Corps has chalked up an outstanding record of administrative excellence and fiscal responsibility. For example, the cost per volunteer has been reduced from $9,000 a year to an estimated $8,560 for 1965. At the end of last fiscal year, the Corps permitted $3.8 million in unobligated funds to lapse. In other words, it did not spend every penny it was allowed out of fear that future appropriations would be cut by a comparable amount. This is fiscal integrity of the highest order and should be properly rewarded.

Perhaps the most eloquent tribute to the Peace Corps is contained in a statement made earlier this year by the Foreign Minister of Thailand:

> We have been struck and inspired by this idea of youth coming to meet with youth, which is in accordance with our belief here in Thailand that peace, good will, and understanding can prevail and remain in this world only if they start from the grassroots. You, ladies and gentlemen of the Peace

Corps, you come from the grassroots. You come to work with the grassroots of our country. That is the basis of future progress in the world so much divided today.

I do not have to wish you success because I know you have already achieved success. Many successes will come to you as things go on. As you come here inspired by your own beliefs and inspired by the great conviction that man can live, must live with man.

It is indeed striking that this important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, of youth mingling, living, working with youth, should come from this mightiest nation on earth, the United States. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great Nation as a wealthy nation, a powerful nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But now many of us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful. This is the secret of your greatness, of your might, which is not imposing or crushing people, but is filled with hope of future good will and understanding. I hope this idea will thrive and all of you, my friends, will continue. I wish Mr. Shriver success, and continued success to all of you.

ROLLCALL NO. 59: INTEREST EQUALIZATION

Against concerted GOP opposition, I joined my Democratic colleagues in a move to curb the outflow of U.S. gold reserves and assure the continued stability of the American dollar. H.R. 8000 imposes a temporary tax until 1965 on the purchase by Americans of certain foreign securities, and is designed to increase the cost to foreigners of obtaining long-term capital in the United States.

This action will slow down foreign borrowing of U.S. capital—U.S. commercial interest rates being substantially below world rates, foreigners borrow funds in the United States whenever possible—and thereby combat the Nation's persistent balance-of-payments deficit. With the exception of 1 year, since 1949 we have had a deficit. During the last 6 years it has resulted in a gold reserves drop of more than $7 billion. In the first half of 1963, the spurt of foreign securities purchased by Americans sharply increased the country's overall deficit in its international financial transactions. At an annual rate of almost $5 billion, this deficit could not have been sustained for long without calling into question the stability of the American dollar.

EASES POSITION

The House-approved measure represents the most significant contribution toward easing our deteriorating balance-of-payments position. Since announcement of its retroactive effect to July 1963, there has been a dramatic improvement in our international financial situation. Our annual deficit rate has dropped from $4.5 billion in the first half of 1963 to $1.6 billion in the second half of 1963. Consequently, gold outflow was reduced to $170 million in 1963 compared to $890 million in 1962. During the next 22 months that the tax will be in effect, it is anticipated that the deficit will be reduced by nearly $1.5 billion. H.R. 8000 is among the key proposals advanced by President Kennedy and later by President Johnson to eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit and to insure the stability of the dollar. Other proposals include fiscal measures to stimulate the economy and attract U.S. and foreign funds, responsible price and wage behavior, export promotion campaign, and reduction in Government spending overseas. It must be noted to the credit of the Democratic administration that despite our critical payments position, none of these measures took the form of direct governmental controls or increase of domestic interest rates. We again have evidence that Democrats reject heavy-handed Government intervention and rely instead on the free enterprise mechanism for curing our gravest economic ills.

ROLLCALL NO. 67: FEDERAL PAY BILL

H.R. 8986 sought two ends: First, to provide a reasonable increase in the grossly inadequate salaries of key Government personnel; and second, to comply with a legal mandate that Federal career employees shall be paid salaries comparable to those in the private sector.

From the day the House agreed to debate the bill, it was the consensus that it had majority support. Perfecting amendments were carried with substantial margins on nonrecorded votes. A motion to recommit the bill was voted down.

However, faced with the prospect of having to record its vote, the House turned tail and rejected the bill, 184 to 222, chiefly because some Members were afraid to add $10,000 to their own salaries in an election year. They feared that their support for the bill might be misconstrued as being out of step with the general clamor for economy in public spending.

President Johnson, himself, found no merit in this argument:

It is a false economy—

He pointed out—

to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented.

The Government is losing numerous top scientists, executives, and professional men simply because its salaries in the upper brackets are so far out of line with those of private business and the professions. Clearly, this is not economy. It is a costly error.

GOOD BILL

Though many Republicans helped defeat the bill, the GOP leadership in Congress was split. Minority Leader HALLECK refused to endorse the measure, but another prominent Republican cosponsored the bill and urged his colleagues to "go home and tell your constituents that this is a good bill for the taxpayers."

After the bill was voted down, it found a new champion in Republican Senator DIRKSEN. He openly declared his intent to insist on congressional and judicial pay raises as soon as the Senate considers a Federal employees pay bill.

The recommended raises for Federal executive, judicial, and legislative personnel were first studied upon the initiative of President Eisenhower. Later, an Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems headed by Clarence Randall recommended pay increases which were subsequently scaled down to modest proportions and incorporated in the present bill. These increases were included in the President's budget. It would not have swelled public spending beyond what is correctly budgeted.

One veteran observer underscored the compelling need for this legislation when he noted:

Congressional pay is demonstrably inadequate for all save Members with private income * * * men holding the life of the United States in their hands are being rewarded on a scale that would be absurd in any private enterprise involving even remotely comparable responsibilities.

WIDE SUPPORT

Thirteen top business leaders from Lucius Clay to Henry Ford strongly urged the passage of this legislation. The bill also was supported by the conservative American Bar Association, the Los Angeles County Bar Association, the National Civil Service League, the various associations of postal employees, and other responsible groups.

Aside from effecting pay raises, H.R. 8986 would have established, on a continuing basis, the comparability principle as a basis for fixing salary adjustments for Federal career employees. Past pay raise legislation has been influenced more by pressures than by any systematic appraisal of the needs of the Government and the proper levels of compensation for its employees. This shotgun approach often produced chaos, dissatisfaction, and distortions in the Federal pay system.

I voted for the pay bill, because I firmly believe that economy in Government can best be achieved by attracting and holding in public service the best minds and skills that our democratic system can develop.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Livestock Price and Profit Outlook—Address by Dr. Herrell DeGraff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 1, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Dr. Herrell DeGraff is president of the American Meat Institute and a resident of Valparaiso, Ind. Formerly a food economist on the faculty of Cornell University, Dr. DeGraff is a man whose long experience has given him insight into the economics of food supplies and prices, and particularly of meats, in America.

In view of the prolonged discussion of the price of cattle and the role of beef imports, I believe the address of Dr. DeGraff before the 16th Annual National Livestock Conference in Omaha on March 5 is helpful and enlightening. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. DeGraff's address may be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVESTOCK PRICE AND PROFIT OUTLOOK

(By Herrell DeGraff)

In spite of some of the circumstances that I feel compelled to discuss this morning, I am pleased to have this opportunity to return to Omaha for another National Livestock Conference. The last time I shared this platform was from my position as food economist at Cornell University where, for many years, I concerned myself with the economics of this Nation's livestock and meat industry. On that earlier occasion I discussed our livestock industries as the balance wheel of American agriculture; as the market for some three-quarters of the total tonnage of harvested crops produced on our farms; as the distinctive factor that sets American agriculture apart from the agriculture of much of the rest of the world; and as the source of the abundant supplies of protein foods that, again, are the distinctive characteristic of the American food economy.

In the years since I was here on one of these programs, I have enjoyed many interesting experiences—including several years when I worked on a part-time basis for the cattle industry as a consultant and analyst for the American National Cattlemen's Association.

Having lived almost 30 years on a university campus, I shifted a little over a year ago to a new career—to working with the American Meat Institute, the national trade association of the meatpacking industry. But it is my own view that my interests in the livestock industry generally have not changed from the time when I worked more directly with cattle producers. There is a meat team in this country, each member of which has its job to do in the process of producing livestock, processing it, and distributing it in a manner that holds and increases the consumers' acceptance of meat. We are living in a time when farmers, ranchers, and feeders—especially of cattle—are having trouble. No other part of the meat team does take, or can take, any satisfaction in this situation. Trouble for any one segment of the meat team has a way of spreading to become trouble for the others. This has always been true, and is not likely to change.

The basic problem before any national livestock conference today is the price break that, in the last year, has hit the cattle industry. We cannot have a livestock conference and ignore this. I came here specifically to talk about the cattle problem, as frankly and forthrightly as I know how. You will have to decide for yourselves whether my comments are pertinent and sensible.

In all the romantic story of America's food—a story that has no parallel in any other time or place in history—there are few if any more romantic pages than the story of beef in our markets in in the years since World War II. Poultry is often referred to as a great success during this same period, but its story is very different from that of beef. Poultry consumption per capita has increased, but the retail price has declined in proportion as the quantity has gone up. As a result, the retail value of the per capita supply of poultry has been almost constant—which means that the poultry industry has literally given to consumers practically the whole increase in per capita supply.

Pork has done much better than poultry, but has met wtih less consumer favor than has beef. The per capita pork supply has been relatively constant in recent years, and retail prices for pork cuts have also held about steady. In consequence the retail value of the per capita pork supply, like the retail value of the per capita poultry supply, has held its own. But it has done so on stable quantities rather than increasing quantities. It is in this same measure, however—the retail value of the per capita supply (made up as it is of both quantity and price)—by which the performance of beef in the consumer market has been most sharply in contrast with either pork or poultry.

I am not sure that anyone knows all the factors that have been important in the successful comparative story of beef. High consumer purchasing power certainly has been one major influence. All studies of consumer preference with which I am familiar indicate that beef is this Nation's preferred meat. And certainly in recent years, more than at any time in the past, American consumers have been able to exercise that preference at the retail meat counter. Another factor in this success story is certainly the improvement in the average quality of the block beef that has come to be widely available to consumers in their supermarkets. This improvement has paralleled the rise of the feeding industry and the tight specifications that have been written by mass retailers for the beef that has gone into their display cases. Under these combined influences the aged steers of the past have all but disappeared. Practically every critter that is feedable has moved into feedlots, including most of what formerly were called two-way cattle. The steers and heifers almost universally go on feed as calves or yearlings, and move on to slaughter in the narrow and young age bracket of some 16 to 24 months.

The comparative uniformity of this beef (compared to the beef supplies of earlier years) and the predominant youthfulness of today's slaughter cattle have resulted in a high average of eating quality to which the consuming public has been remarkably responsive.

These circumstances began to exert their major impact on the cattle market roughly a decade ago. In all earlier cattle cycles it had been true that when beef supplies reached a high level of about 65 pounds, or a little more, the cattle cycle turned around and per capita supplies declined. And when per capita supplies reached a low point of 55 pounds, or a little less, the cycle turned again and supplies began to increase. Beginning a decade ago this picture changed. Beef supply and consumption broke out of the previous range, on the up side. In 1954 consumption rose to the then unprecedented figure of 80 pounds. All through the late fifties it was between 80 and 85 pounds. In 1962, it was just shy of 90 pounds—and last year hit the remarkable figure of 95 pounds.

And at least until this last year, the beef story was not merely one of rising consumption. The prices at which consumers were willing to take the increasing amounts of beef were also inching upward—so that the retail value of the per capita supply rose from about $40 per person per year 10 years ago to about $55 per person in each of the last 2 years.

Thus the beef story has been one of rising demand. Not only was more quantity consumed per person, but it was consumed at slowly rising prices per pound.

Seldom in the history of the cattle business has there been a period of more satisfying and more stable years than those between 1957 and 1962. With a little poetic rounding of figures we can describe those years in about these terms: beef cattle left the ranch at around 28 cents or a little better; corn on the farm was about a dollar a bushel; fed cattle left the feed lot at around 26 cents; fed carcasses wholesaled at 40 to 41 cents; rib roasts retailed at about 79 cents and steak at roughly a dollar. This stability over a 5-year period tended to adjust the whole cattle industry to this kind of a price structure. Perhaps it was too good to be true, and too good to last.

Last May I spoke here in Omaha at a meeting of the Nebraska Bankers' Association. The burden of my remarks at that time was that the cattle business was heading for trouble—and my concern was not with import question but rather that the production potential of our domestic cattle industry was outrunning even the remarkably high level of beef demand by American consumers. Beef cow numbers had then increased to about 30 million head from just over 24 million at the previous low point in 1958. They have since increased to 31.8 million head. This is a one-third increase in 6 years. To be sure it is partly offset by a decline in dairy cows. But only partly, because today even dairy cows are producing steers for the feed lot. Annual beef production per cow in the national herd has been trending sharply up—an increase of 16 percent in beef production per cow per year in just the last 10 years—so that even the increase in cow numbers does not fully measure our increased beef production.

I have begun to wonder when and how ranchers and farmers decide to turn off old cows. Apparently when the price of calves

is good the decision is to keep the cow for the one more calf she might produce. And when cow prices are down, the decision apparently is to keep her because she is not worth much in the market. Maybe the only time she is turned is when calf prices go down and feed prices go up. And I certainly do not mean this statement to be critical because I would probably figure the same way.

It is, nevertheless, true that in recent years we have been very rapidly building up our beef producing potential. Moreover, price behavior since 1959 has indicated that we have been putting into the market about all the beef that consumers would take without risking a decline in cattle prices. This is not to say that 1959 through 1962 was a time of soft prices, but rather than the marketings were about as high as possible without price softness developing. In fact, in the second quarter of 1961 we did have a temporary price break, brought on by bunched marketings in that quarter. But this straightened out and prices again stabilized through practically all of 1962. The heavier marketings of 1963 did bring on the price break, which is the main point of our concern here today.

But even with the large marketings of these recent years we have continued to build up the national cattle inventory. In 1962, inventory numbers increased 3.7 million head, and again by almost as many in 1963. What these figures mean, again in rough terms, is that we were moving into consumption in 1962 and 1963 something like 90 percent of current production, and carrying 10 percent over in inventory. If slaughter rates in these last 2 years had been sufficient to prevent inventory increases, per capita supplies of beef (including imports) would have gone well above 100 pounds. And though beef demand is high and rising, price behavior in the market indicates that consumers are not yet ready to take 100 pounds of beef without a price drop.

Fortunately in recent years we have not had serious dry weather, in more than localized areas. Some cattle have been moved around to equalize feed supplies, but we have been fortunate enough to escape serious drought.

Yet everything in the history of the cattle business tells us that we cannot go on year after year with slaughter rates well below the level of production—and thereby continuing to build up inventory. We know also that record numbers of cattle pose proportionately greater risk to the hazards of dry weather. Always in the past it has been true that several years in which slaughter has been less than current production (leading to inventory increases), have been followed by years in which slaughter rate had to increase enough to check the inventory buildup or turn it downward. That is precisely what happened in the early 1950's—and much as I do not like the conclusion, I am nevertheless fearful that we are about to see the patterns of the mid-1950's all over again.

As I said at the beginning of these comments, my intent here is to speak forthrightly, because I do not think that anything else would be useful in these difficult times in the cattle business. It seems to me that the very success—the fantastic success—of beef in the consumer market in recent years has, of itself, built up much of the trouble that the cattle industry is now facing. This success, of beef, in the form of attractive prices for feeder stock and for fed cattle, has certainly contributed to our inventory buildup. In addition, good prices for cattle and beef in this country have made the American market more attractive than any other in the world—and thus a magnet to the exporting countries. Still further, our demand for fed beef has resulted in just about every feedable critter going into the feedlot, and has contributed also to a low culling rate for cows—all with the result that domestic supplies of lean, manufacturing beef have sharply declined.

In all the hot discussion about beef imports—discussion which I fully understand from the cattlemen's viewpoint—I have heard very little explanation of why the sharply increased quantity of imports has been flowing into this country. The major reason is of course the reduced quantity of domestic supply of manufacturing beef.

Domestic output of manufacturing beef started sharply downward in 1956, at the turning point of the last cattle cycle. And our production of cow and bull beef for manufacturing purposes has dropped off 40 percent in the last 6 years.

In 1955 when our population was 165 million persons, we had a domestic output of 4.5 billion pounds of cow and bull beef. This amounted to 27 pounds per capita. In 1963, with a population of 190 million people we had a domestic production of 2.8 billion pounds of cow and bull meat—or 14 pounds per capita—almost a 50-percent decline on a per capita basis. Even with 1.5 billion pounds of manufacturing-type beef imported last year, we still had an aggregate supply (domestic plus imported) of .5 billion pounds less than the aggregate in 1955—and 15 percent less per person of our population. In all the discussion of the import question I have not seen this figure presented, or an explanation of what would have happened to our supplies of manufactured meat products without the imports that have come to us from other countries. It may be that you do not consider this matter to be important. On the other hand, perhaps it is.

Since 1955 we have had an increase of 10 million teenagers alone. And these youngsters, of course, are the big hamburger and hot dog consumers. As my 10-year-old neighbor girl said last Sunday, "Mommy, I can't take my lunch to school tomorrow. It is hamburger day in the cafeteria." And when my wife gave the little lady a new lunch pail for her birthday, she asked, "Is the mouth of that thermos big enough to take a wiener?"

Since 1955, production of frankfurters in this country has increased—but barely in proportion with the population increase—and the same is true of hamburger and of other processed meat products of which beef is an ingredient. And the only way in which the output of these meat items has kept pace with population growth is through the use of an increased proportion of the rough cuts from our fed beef carcasses. A decade ago one-quarter or less of the weight of fed carcasses was used for grinding or processing, compared to a figure now pushing close to 40 percent of the fed carcass weight. The neck meat, plates, flanks, and shanks are seldom seen these days in the meat case. They go for grinding, along with much of the fat trim, in combination with lean cow beef, of which we are now importing one-third of the quantity that is being used.

In other words if the hot dogs, hamburger, and other processed meats are to be in our markets in anything approaching stable quantities, it can be accomplished during years of low cow slaughter only with imported processing beef. And this situation, in degree, will continue to be true until our domestic production of manufacturing-type beef again turns upward. I still believe, as I did when I wrote the "beef book" for the American National a few years ago, that it is better to keep people eating these products made from beef than it is to surrender this market to alternative foods to which consumers could and would turn.

Figures from a recent report by this country's agricultural attaché in Australia—figures which I believe he obtained from the Australian meat board—indicate that 60 percent of their boneless beef coming into this country goes directly to retailers who grind it for hamburger together with the rough cuts and fat trim from our fed carcasses. Five percent goes directly to restaurants for stews and the like—and 35 percent is used by packers for frankfurters and other processed meats.

The meatpacking industry has a policy of many years' standing of remaining generally neutral in questions of tariff and trade. This is certainly not for lack of interest in such questions, as they may affect our domestic livestock industry. Rather the policy is recognition that trade is a two-way street. We have an enormous amount of tallow and grease—$150 million worth last year—that must be sold abroad. Other exports last year included $80 million worth of hides and $25 million worth of variety meats. There are still other slaughter byproducts for which we need export markets. Finding such outlets is more difficult at some times and less at others. But the trade is important if maximum values are to be returned for the total of livestock products.

It is certainly true that in recent years meat imports have considerably exceeded the value of slaughter-product exports. But this has never yet been true over the whole of a cattle cycle. Perhaps in the present cycle it will be true—but if so, it will be primarily because of the very large increase in the numbers of our teenagers, and even younger kids who have an enormous appetite for hamburgers and hot dogs. Trade is, and still must be, a two-way street—and even the present imports problem cannot be regarded as all white or all black, as all good or as all bad.

The USDA recently presented an analysis of the cattle situation in which it was reported that compared to a year earlier the price of cattle is down about $3.70 per hundredweight. Of this amount, they estimated that about 20 cents was due to increased supplies of poultry and pork, about 50 cents due to the increased volume of imports, and about $3 due to the increased production of domestic beef. While I hold no brief for the precision of these figures, I do think that they are roughly in line with the facts. And if this is true, it indicates that there are matters of concern to the cattle industry that run deeper than the single question of imports. Certainly this statement is not meant to gloss over the import matter, but to try as honestly as I know how to bring it to its proper perspective.

Whether we like it or not some basic economic changes have been occurring in the cattle business that go even beyond the buildup of herds and our rising beef-producing potential that we have already discussed. One of these changes that I do not think can be overlooked is the growth of the cattle feeding industry—and especially the increasing number of commercial feeders with large fixed investments in feed lot facilities. I see a marked parallel between these feeders and the meat packing industry. They get large fixed investments in blue silos, paved feed lots, feed mills, and other facilities—and they simply cannot sit still and look at an empty lot. The farm-feeder historically has been a highly flexible operator. He did not have to have cattle, and he fed in proportion to his own feed supplies and to market prospects as he saw them. The commercial feeder is less flexible. Like the meat packer, his fixed costs go on whether he operates or not—in consequence of which he strives to grind out more and more feed beef to justify his sunk capital investment. I would ask the question, without being able to answer it, as to whether the rise of the feeding industry—and especially of the commercial feeder with his large committed capital—is not pushing toward an ever-rising volume of beef output, and whether this may not be leading toward both (1) a new type of domestic beef industry, and (2) less flexibility in our domestic beef production.

I have a disturbing feeling that the beef business under this influence, is geting to be like the chicken business—pressuring always for volume even though price takes a beating.

Another factor that we must not overlook is the change in the way beef is merchandised, and the kind of beef that today's mass merchandisers demand. Supermarket operators are discriminating buyers, as indeed they must be, if they are to stock the products that please their customers and bring them back to shop week after week. These mass merchandisers do not want, and will not take, overweight or overfat cattle. When market conditions result in decisions to "carry the cattle a little longer," the result is an almost impossible merchandising situation brought about by overfinished and overweight slaughter animals.

It certainly is not my purpose here today to suggest to producer groups what they ought to do about the imports question. But I hope I have been able to emphasize that the cattle industry has problems ahead of it that run both broader and deeper than just the import problem.

I do not like to believe that a period like the mid-1950's is what is ahead of us. But it does seem to me that this risk is so great that every thoughtful cattleman should now be questioning himself as to what he can do to help ease the adjustment pains that the whole industry is facing.

In summary here are some points for your consideration:

1. If you have a cow herd, cull out the old and the barren cows. This may not reduce our calf crops significantly but it certainly should tighten up a ranch operation for the difficult times that may continue.

2. If you are a feeder, do not overfeed the cattle in your lots. Additional gain is costly—ruinously so—heavy weights are discounted, and the extra pounds of carcass do not help the market. Historically there have been few times when light cattle were coming to market that the cattle industry has been in trouble. It's almost always in trouble when the cattle are too heavy.

3. Do not bunch the marketings. We are in a time of high beef volume in the market—a time when bunched-up marketings can only mean further price troubles.

4. Get behind the sound beef promotion efforts of the meat board. Only a few more pounds of consumption by each of us would be a contribution to our supply problem—and though the imports are 10 percent of the supply, the domestic product is 90 percent.

I am enthused by the longer pull outlook for the beef business. Prospective population growth and the continued rising level of consumer income indicates that by 1970 (only 6 years away) we will need in this country some 25 percent more beef production potential than we have at the present time. The tougher part of the outlook is some intermediate years of adjustment—a time when we have temporarily overproduced. These intermediate years will be less difficult if all members of the beef team will keep the component problems in their proper perspective, and work together to get the job done.

Educational Benefits for Peacetime Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a radio address by Mr. James Dull, coordinator for news and public affairs, station WELI, New Haven, Conn. Mr. Dull delivered this address recently on his daily evening program "Point of View," broadcast over that station.

The address deals with the problem of extending the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights to veterans who have served in our Armed Forces since 1955. It is one of the best presentations of the case of these so-called cold war veterans, who have served during peacetime. Mr. Dull informs me that after his broadcast "the mail and telephone response was impressive, the heaviest for any comment I have presented." Which only proves the considerable interest in this matter and the need for extending these benefits to peacetime veterans.

One of the arguments stressed by the author is the impact on the economy of the Nation by these World War II veterans who benefited under the GI bill of rights. There is no doubt that our skilled and trained manpower resources would be much less today were it not for the hundreds of thousands who were able to acquire such skills and training under that act. Extension of these benefits to peacetime veterans would go far in helping to solve the present shortage of skilled manpower in the country.

I am pleased to insert this article into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

POINT OF VIEW

(By Jim Dull, Radio Station WELI, New Haven Conn.)

In less than two decades since the end of World War Two, America has moved into undreamed of accomplishments in space, medicine, research, technology, construction, and the arts.

Where, once, promising students traveled to European schools to complete their education, now European students come to America. Yale, Harvard, MIT, Johns Hopkins, and scores of other outstanding institutions have made the United States the mecca for students seeking the most advanced study.

At least part of this educational explosion was the direct or indirect result of the changes forced upon the universities and colleges by the GI bills of rights at the end of the war. This, in addition, resulted in the introduction into American society of tens of thousands of newly educated men and women who were not only results but causes of the changes which overcame and transformed American society since 1945. The thousands of returning service men and women needed new homes. This was a need that had been building since the late 1920's. Finally the need for new housing in America could be contained no longer, and the GI bill allowed hundreds of thousands who have never owned homes to build or buy with minimal down payments and eas ymortgage payments. Much of America's postwar prosperity resulted in the aftermath of the massive homebuilding by America's veterans.

Then, when the Korean war came, Congress extended the GI bill to the thousands of service people who served between 1950 and 1955. Again, both education and the economy received large scale stimulation at the same time America paid some of its debt to those who spent years of their lives standing guard over the Nation's safety.

But then, following the Korean GI bill, America did what it so often has done before—forgotten its peacetime GI.

Since the expiration of the Korean bill, several million American men and women have served their country, some in extremely hazardous spots, but Congress has not seen any good reason to extend to them the same educational and home loan benefits that accrued to their predecessors.

In peacetime America, with only an occasional crisis or an occasional dead American soldier, a great indifference greets the needs of the young man who happens to have served after 1955. There is no organized group pressing his interest; even the major veterans organizations have been lukewarm to the proposal.

It is argued that since these so-called peacetime GI's serve in the absence of war, they are not entitled to any postservice benefits because they have faced no danger. Nonsense. Ask any of the GI's working in South Vietnam or the families of those killed in South Vietnam, or the families of those killed in the relatively peaceful Canal Zone. Ask any of the GI's who went to Lebanon, or to Little Rock, or who sweated out their recent wait on the Berlin autobahn. Ask any who have stood on alert during the major crises of the cold war, while diplomats argued in the U.N. or exchanged notes, as in the Cuban situation of October 1962, or the Berlin crisis of 1961. Ask any of those reservists called to active duty in the fall of 1961.

The GI who is drafted now or anytime stands just as ready to fight and die as any who went before him, and just as likely to fight as any drafted during World War II. It should be noted that a relatively small percentage of the 11 million service people of World War II actually did the fighting. Many faced only the same dangers that today's GI faces—the potential threat that exists every minute of their service lives, and the heartbreak of being separated from loved ones with the disruption of normal life.

Granted that these are obligations a man owes to his country, but if America owes a debt to one, how can Congress ignore the legitimate obligation to the others?

In addition to the deserved recognition of his sacrifice and the benefits the average peacetime GI would receive, one can certainly not ignore the benefit to the Nation and to the economy from the resultant thousands of well-educated and well-trained men and women that will pour from colleges, universities, and trade schools. This is a time when America needs the greatest number of well-educated and highly skilled citizens it can find to meet the challenges of the future. How can a conscientious nation leave this source of talent untapped? And in a time when the administration seeks to stimulate the economy, the impetus given by the thousands of peacetime GI's buying new homes would have a decided impact.

In short, there is a great national need for a new GI bill for the millions of those Americans who have served us in what can only be called relative peace, at best. There is a need and there is an obligation to show them our appreciation for the sacrifices they have made, whether they have served in a peaceful England or an embattled Vietnam. No matter where they were or what they did, they stood ready.

It is a job for all of us. This commentary will be sent to all of Connecticut's congressional delegation. Veterans' groups, educators, housing and finance leaders should help. Perhaps most effective of all, those millions who thus served our country, now voters all over the land, though we have no organized pressure group, should start making noise, principally by writing our Congressmen.

A large group of young Americans who have served their country is being sloughed off, and the Nation can't afford it. We can only change it by doing something about it. Why don't you?

Arbitrary Age Limits in Civilian Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 1, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a letter written by a young Navy veteran of 20 years' service, which I wish to share with other Senators and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a letter which is highly revealing of the difficulties which beset a man—and he is not the only one—who has given the years of his young manhood to the Armed Forces, when he seeks to enter the civilian labor force even though he is still not yet 40 years of age.

Mr. Max Ford, a resident of Lafayette, Ind., wrote his letter to Mr. Oscar Doob, who is the author of a syndicated column on retirement, as a result of a column by Mr. Doob which was published in the Indianapolis Star. A competent, Navy trained firefighter who has had charge of fire crews and fought fires successfully, he found that despite good physical condition, a job for which he was otherwise qualified was refused to him because an arbitrary age limit of 35 was attached to the position even though, presumably, for those already employed this was not retirement age.

Mr. President, the practice of employers placing arbitrary age limits on positions they are seeking to fill is a form of discrimination which is reprehensible, and all the more so when it prevents a veteran of our Armed Forces from securing employment for which he is fully qualified. We encourage our young men not only to enlist but to serve out a term of years sufficient for them to qualify for retirement pay while still young enough, presumably, to have many active years in civilian employment. Then the civilian employer not only says, "You're too old to start with us as a new employee," but he may even say, as Mr. Ford reported he was told, "We don't hire anyone who is drawing a pension."

I submit, Mr. President, that if this situation is as widespread as I believe it well may be, it is one to which attention and perhaps even legislation should be directed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Ford's letter to Mr. Doob be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. DOOB: After reading your column in the Sunday Star on "Retirement Joys and Jolts," I thought I should write you about my retirement jolts. As for retirement joys, I really don't have any. I happen to be one of those military retirees, age 39.

I retired from the Navy a year and a half ago at the age of 37. At that time I thought it a pretty young age. Since my discharge I have had two different jobs and at the present I am unemployed because the latter job closed down. I cannot collect unemployment because of my retirement pay, which amounts to about $42 a week before taxes. I have a wife and three children to support on this income, plus my wife's income, which amounts to about the same.

When I first returned home from the service I started checking the want ads for work. This was my first retirement jolt. Most every ad limits the age to 35 and under.

Another jolt I received was a few months ago when I went to Purdue University and filled out an application for the newly forming fire department. Age limit there was also 35. However, I did get an interview with the fire chief who was forming the crew. I had to take a written test before the interview and was told I had made a good mark on the test. I was told that they would probably overlook the 3 years I was over the age limit because of the past experience I had with firefighting. Every Navy man is compelled to know firefighting procedures and also equipment, and is sent to school to learn it. I myself have been to schools. I have been in charge of fire crews and have fought fires successfully on numerous occasions. In fact, the Navy spent quite a bit of money on my training. The training that the crew is getting at Purdue is all based on Navy training and was set up by the Navy for Purdue. This same training I have had for 20 years. I was told by the fire chief that I had a good chance of getting on the crew. I was out of work for several weeks while waiting for them to call me, as they said they would. When they didn't call, I called them and was told that I was turned down because of my age. At 38 years young I was too old. I am in better physical condition than most men of my age, although my mental condition isn't going to be much good if I have to put up with retirement jolts like this much longer. I don't expect anything other than what's coming to me as an individual but if this is a sample of what's coming to me because I gave 20 of the best years of my life to Uncle Sam, just as many others are doing now, then I think that something should be done about it. It's quite a jolt to be told that you are too old, especially at my age.

Another instance at Purdue, that wonderful college that I help to flourish with my taxes: One of their employees empowered to hire people made the statement that he wouldn't hire anyone who was already drawing a pension. My taxes also help pay his salary.

A friend of mine retired recently from the Air Force and is experiencing the same difficulty as I, so I know that it isn't just my feelings. He's now thinking about going back into the service. If he's too old now, I hate to think what it would be like later when and if he decides to get out. At least, they don't tell you you're too old in the service.

Why don't they just lower the age to 15 for the boys going into the service so they can retire at 35 if they want to make a career of it? By that time, though, the age limit on employment probably will be 25—so I guess the ex-serviceman cannot win for losing.

Is there really anything being done for people in our status or is it always going to be like this? If so, I think the men in there now with the intention of making the service a career should be told what to expect when their time is up.

I enjoyed your column very much, as it hit the nail on the head. Maybe some responsible people will read your column, too, and I just hope they do some good. Thank you for your time, Mr. Doob, and keep up the good work.

MAX E. FORD.

P.S.—Needless to say, I was in World War II over 3 years and in Korea and if there is a next one, I'll bet I'm not told that I'm too old.

M.E.F.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Salute to Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 2, 1964

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there has recently appeared in the Anderson Daily Mail, of Anderson, S.C., a full page salute to Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral McDonald is one of Georgia's most distinguished sons, and his mother still resides in my hometown of Winder, Ga., where his late father, the Reverend William B. McDonald, served as minister of the First Christian Church for a number of years.

This article, written by Pat Young, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James Young, of Anderson, is an impressive and well deserved tribute to this outstanding American. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN RECOGNITION OF OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE, THE ANDERSON DAILY MAIL HEREWITH INSCRIBES THIS SCROLL OF HONOR TO THIS DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN, ADM. DAVID L. MCDONALD

In May 1963, Adm. David McDonald was named by President John F. Kennedy as Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. With the stroke of a pen the President had nominated a native Georgian for the highest post in the Navy.

Following congressional approval June 28, 1963, Admiral McDonald literally sailed to the Pentagon where new concepts in a dozen areas have lately been replacing some of the greatest established traditions.

A man with strong views of his own, Admiral McDonald, naval aviator, expert in plans and policy at SHAPE, and former commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, in a short period, has shown brilliant leadership.

In this top-ranking post he has many responsibilities broadly viewed as in two groups. In one group, as the ranking naval authority, he is respotnsible for the readiness of 670,000 naval personnel, 870 ships, 7,200 planes, and the rest of the huge naval establishment.

As a naval member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff he shares with the Army and Air Force chiefs and the chairman of that body the responsibility for the planning and performance of the Nation's military forces.

Born at Maysville, Ga., September 12, 1906, his parents are the Rev. William Benjamin and Mary (David) McDonald.

After high school in Maysville and Commerce he entered Riverside Military Academy at Gainesville, Ga., where he was graduated in 1924. He entered the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, where he graduated with a B.S. degree on June 7, 1928.

As a midshipman at the Naval Academy he won the Battalion Commander Medal as outstanding rifleman in the class of 1928. The trophy is awarded for excellence in practical and theoretical ordnance. Another mark of achievement was reached when he received the DAR's sword for excellence in practical and theoretical seamanship, in his senior year.

The Georgian's naval career was the result of the gentle urging of an older friend, "who felt I would enjoy a career of service to my country. I had wanted to be a lawyer, but he convinced me that I should try the Naval Academy first and then, if I still wanted to be a lawyer, I could leave the Navy and go to law school."

Once he had decided to devote his life to the Navy, Admiral McDonald received some advice from a maiden aunt: "If you are bound and determined to stay in the Navy," she told him, "very well. But please keep off the water and stay out of the air." He chose to disregard her advice, and went to sea on the battleships *Mississippi* and *Colorado*, and later became an aviator.

Graduating from Annapolis, Ensign McDonald spent 26 months of sea duty as junior officer. He received his first promotion to lieutenant (junior grade) in June 1931 and was designated a naval aviator in September that year.

In June 1934, after 32 months as a pilot with Fighter Squadron 46 of the carrier U.S.S. *Saratoga*, McDonald was assigned to the aviation unit of the cruiser U.S.S. *Detroit*. In June 1935 he began a 3-year tour of shore duty as a flight instructor at Pensacola. On July 1, 1936, while on the teaching staff of the naval air station, he was advanced to full lieutenant.

From July 1936 to October 1941 he served as a pilot with Patrol Squadron 42, based first at Seattle and later in Alaska and the Aleutian Islands.

At the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Lieutenant McDonald was serving as flag secretary of the aircraft command of the Atlantic Fleet. Advanced to lieutenant commander January 1, 1942, he was reassigned to Jacksonville, Fla. In the following May he was made flight training officer on the staff of the commander of the Naval Air Operational Training Command, and on September 15, 1942, he became full commander.

In April 1944 Commander McDonald joined the carrier *Essex* in the Pacific as air and executive officer. During the battle of Leyte Gulf, McDonald was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V" and was given two letters of commendation with ribbon and star. He is also entitled to wear the ribbon for the Presidential unit citation awarded the *Essex*.

Promoted to captain on March 25, 1945, McDonald was reassigned as operations officer at the Pacific Air Command, and continued in this post until June 1947 when he was called to the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department in Washington.

During the next 3 years he served as Director of Military Requirements, aide to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, and aide to the Under Secretary of the Navy.

In August 1950 he was assigned to the National War College in Washington, where military officers are trained for extremely responsible duties in the higher echelons of military commands. In 1950–51 he was placed in command of the carrier *Mindoro*. In July 1952 McDonald began a 2-year tour of duty as assistant chief of staff for operations on the staff of commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.

In July 1954, he took command of the carrier *Coral Sea*. While skipper, he learned of his selection to flag rank. As he recalls, "It was about 10 minutes before 8, when the exec met me on the quarterdeck, handed me a dispatch and said 'Good morning, Admiral.' That was the first I knew of my selection."

Returning to Washington for a 2-year assignment as director of the air warfare division in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations he was permanently advanced to rear admiral on January 1, 1956.

From November 1957 to October 1960 Rear Admiral McDonald was assigned to Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe, as Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, under Air Force Gen. Lauris Norstad, now the president of Owens-Corning Fiberglas.

A biographical sketch by the New York Times says that McDonald built a "reputation as a master diplomat" during the 3 years in this post. Although soft spoken to the point of reserve, he is described as "one of the toughest across-the-table operators in uniform."

For 9 months beginning in October 1960 McDonald became commander of Carrier Division 6 in the Mediterranean. Then on May 6, 1963, President Kennedy named him to succeed Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., as Chief of Naval Operations.

McDonald became a vice admiral July 28, 1961, and April 1, 1963, following his appointment to succeed Adm. Harold Page Smith he was made a full admiral. His new command gave him authority over U.S. naval forces in Europe, as well as U.S. naval forces in the Eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean. McDonald was 28th in seniority on the list of vice admirals when he received a promotion to full admiral, a fact that was "enough to tip some old Navy hands that something big was in the wind."

This surmise was justified when President Kennedy announced the nomination of David McDonald to be Chief of Naval Operations succeeding Admiral Anderson, who had received a diplomatic assignment to Portugal.

Before taking the office as the new Chief of Naval Operations he made a quick orientation tour of Asia and on his return reported that the Polaris-firing submarines would be operating in the Pacific within a year or earlier.

As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff he was called as a witness before a Senate subcommittee conducting hearings on the recently concluded United States-British-Soviet nuclear test ban treaty. He joined with Army Gen. Earl G. Wheeler and Marine Corps Commandant Gen. David M. Shoup in emphasizing their endorsement of the treaty.

A very likeable and personable man of great character, a correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune observed that like Admiral of the Fleet William F. Halsey, Admiral McDonald "always accentuates the positive," although he has not been known as a hell-for-leather fighter.

He enjoys his evenings at home in the admiral's house, which is at the Naval Observatory in Washington, with his wife, the

former Catherine Thompson, of Rochester, N.Y. They have two children, a daughter, now Mrs. R. L. Spear, of Los Angeles, and a son, Thomas H. McDonald, of Washington, a former bluejacket who spent his last 2 years in uniform as a trumpet teacher at the Navy's School of Music.

Tall and lean at 57, the admiral is 5 feet 11 inches. Weighing in at about 155 pounds he enjoys dancing and modern music. Asked about special food preference he says, "I dislike soup and desserts. Soup is something you eat when you don't expect to get enough for dinner and dessert is something you eat when you didn't."

An avid golf enthusiast, he relaxes on a golf course.

"Whenever possible I like to get out on the course with my wife. In London, we were fortunate enough to live right between two wonderful 18-hole golf courses."

He is a better than average golfer, scoring in the midseventies while stationed at Pearl Harbor after World War II.

A brilliant diplomat, Admiral McDonald see a bright future for the Navy as Chief of Naval Operations.

"The advent of the missile age has put a premium on mobility. In effect, it is the best defense against missile attack, and the Navy has plenty of it," he observes.

He also considers the Navy to be in a very strong position economically.

"With increased emphasis on cost effectiveness the Navy's traditional efficiency will prove itself vitally important. I think we are going to benefit from this emphasis.

"I feel the present concern with the gold flow problem will enhance the Navy's role in national defense," he said.

The Daily Mail salutes our neighboring Georgian and expresses the same confidence in Admiral McDonald as did the President of the United States.

Arms Reduction and Use of Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the prospect of safely cutting 25 percent from our military budget—the possibility advanced recently by the distinguished former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric—is welcome news for a nation and a world which has lived the last 25 years in a state of war and cold war.

With weapons poised and capable of devastating the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere, of leaving a hundred million dead, and contamination of the earth, the water, and the land—weapons which are capable of achieving this end several times over—any serious proposal to further turn down the arms race, consistent with our national security, must be pursued and encouraged.

But as the New York Times has pointed out in a brief but thoughtful editorial of March 30, welcome as this possibility may be there is the disturbing factor that we have "no comprehensive plans for dealing with the economic dislocations that are bound to accompany any rapid cutback in military outlays."

The Times has gone on to suggest that a large part of the funds saved in a defense cutback should be devoted to a new kind of war—the war on poverty. This is not only an excellent suggestion—not only would it contribute effectively to the national welfare and security—but it further emphasizes the need for serious attention and action on the problem of economic conversion.

The article from the New York Times follows:

REDEPLOYING ARMS FUNDS

The possibility that by 1970 our military budget could safely be cut by nearly $13 billion a year has been suggested by Roswell L. Gilpatric, former Deputy Secretary of Defense. His estimate of a 25 percent reduction in present spending, made in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, assumes a continued easing of tensions between the United States and Russia. But it is not predicated on any basic shift in the world situation or on a formal accord for limiting arms.

Mr. Gilpatric's forecast—reflecting as it does an intimate knowledge of our defense costs and capabilities—is a welcome indication that the small cuts already made in our staggering arms program may soon become much more substantial. The only disturbing aspect in this possibility, so earnestly desired over a quarter-century of war and cold war, is that we still have no comprehensive plans for dealing with the economic dislocations that are bound to accompany any rapid cutback in military outlays.

One highly beneficial instrument for cushioning the transition would be a decision now, as a matter of conscious national policy, that a large part of the funds released from defense requirements would be invested in the war to which President Johnson has just committed this country—the war against poverty. The chief limiting element in this assault on human distress and social decay is the modesty of the means allocated to its prosecution. Putting dollars no longer needed for arms into better schools, better health facilities, better housing and other measures for national improvement would be a major contribution to the defense of America.

Knowledge and Understanding Will Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the other day, I had the pleasant task of reading an editorial published in the Weiser (Idaho) American, urging the use of knowledge and understanding as a means of solving our Nation's problems.

At a time when each of our congressional offices is being bombarded with mail from impatient citizens demanding immediate answers to complex problems, an editorial of this nature is most welcome. It also indicates a keen awareness of the paper's publisher, Harry N. Nelson, of what is needed if America is to remain as a leading participant in the world community.

As long as men and nations are of different minds and temperament, we may as well make up our minds that there will be no final solution or an easy, magic shortcut to the settlement of our problems. Our best is to continue to inch forward toward what we feel is a right and just solution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD this editorial printed on Monday, March 23, 1964, in the Weiser-American entitled "Knowledge and Understanding Will Win":

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING WILL WIN

Americans today are subjected to a relentless flow of opinions and information about the state of their Nation and the world during this war with communism.

While there are real reasons for concern as there is in any war, there is also need for faith. There is no call for frantic fits of worry.

Conditions are usually presented by speakers and writers as black or white while in most cases they are grays of various shades.

Western nations that formerly lined up with the United States, but are now going their own way isn't totally black. While these nations aren't upholding freedom to the extent we think they should, it doesn't follow that they are totally against us and the principles of freedom.

The Communist world is splitting up, too, but that isn't all white because their purpose is still to dominate the world, although there is disagreement on how it should be done. Their strength, much more than the free world, lies in complete unity and their progress will be seriously retarded by countries taking different paths.

The answer, of course, is knowledge and understanding followed by firm stands on what, we the people, want our country to do about the many situations.

Search out as many of the unknown factors as possible that exist in every situation. Ask your congressional representatives for information and tell them what you think this country should do about Vietnam, Cuba, Panama, and other trouble spots.

The Communist seminars recently presented here gave many proven facts, which should be considered as the basis for further understanding and definite action.

Giving up to worry can only lead to defeat. Our situation is grayer than it was, but not black, which means that freedom will still win if we have the courage to act for what is right, but that right must be based on knowledge and understanding.

Useful Challenge to Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the hornets nest stirred up by Senator FULBRIGHT's thoughtful challenge to the fixed positions, or sacred cows, of our foreign policy has tended to obscure its real value and importance which is to prod us into rethinking and reevaluating where we are, what we are trying to do, and how well we are doing it.

For what Senator FULBRIGHT has said in essence is that the world of today is substantially different from that which existed at the close of World War II or

the Korean conflict; that we should stop longing for the things we are not prepared to pay for, to examine the illusions we have too long taken for granted.

As the New York Times editorial of March 29 makes clear, there is no need to agree with every detail of his speech. But as the editorial so correctly goes on:

Statesmen can no more fight an old war than can military leaders. In politics as in war, maginot lines are fatal. Senator FULBRIGHT courageously blasted away at some fixed positions in American foreign policy. The United States will be the better for it.

Mr. Speaker, this New York Times editorial helps to place this important address—this important contribution to our national thinking—in proper perspective and I commend it to our colleagues:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S CHALLENGE

Senator FULBRIGHT has stirred things up—always a good thing to do in this contented, affluent Nation. Any speech that could jar the complacent, rigid thinking of much of contemporary American foreign policy deserves commendation for that accomplishment alone.

History may say that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made a great speech to an empty Senate last week. There was no need to agree with every detail of it to recognize that Government officials, diplomats of all countries and political scientists everywhere will be discussing the implications of Mr. FULBRIGHT's address for months. Secretary Rusk already has commended it as "thoughtful and thought provoking."

To be "historic," a speech has to express thinking that is bold, unorthodox and in advance of its time. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Quarantine Speech" of October 5, 1937, was historic in that sense. It is a little too soon to say, but it is very likely that President Kennedy's "Strategy of Peace" speech at the American University on June 10, 1963, will be placed in this great category. Those two addresses had the advantage of concentrating on single, overwhelmingly important topics.

Senator FULBRIGHT's speech was so wide ranging in the subjects, ideas, and countries it discussed that it will take some time to pass a considered judgment on every point. However, the speech made the impact it did because of the simple fact that the Senator struck at our most sensitive points of foreign conflict and at ideas (he called them "cherished myths") that have become like sacred cows in our political religion.

Moreover, the timing of the speech was shrewdly gaged. Recently other addresses by American leaders have also impressed the world, as well as American opinion, for their forthrightness and their freshness, including Ambassador Stevenson's Hammarskjold Memorial Lecture at Princeton a few days ago, HUBERT HUMPHREY's Senate speech in defense of the Kennedy policies in Latin America, and President Johnson's talk to the trade unionists in which he called for "reasoned agreement instead of ready aggression" in American foreign policies.

These speakers all had one thing in common—a recognition of the fact that the world of today is a new, different, dynamic, revolutionary, world. The great power blocs have lost some of their solidity. The factors that gave the United States and the Soviet Union overwhelming predominance in their respective sectors of the cold war are changed. The lines of battle are blurred.

Statesmen can no more fight an old war than can military leaders. In politics as in war, maginot lines are fatal. Senator FULBRIGHT courageously blasted away at some fixed positions in American foreign policy. The United States will be the better for it.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 3, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the SS *Hope* has represented for some time now the eternal spirit of the good Samaritan that has always run deep in the American people. This magnificent hospital ship is staffed by volunteer doctors for 2 months at a time. Its equipment was obtained by public contributions and it is maintained in the same manner. Dr. Charles Stern, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., recently completed a tour of duty on the SS *Hope* at Guayaquil, Ecuador. An account of his experience appeared in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of February 23, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIOUX FALLS DOCTOR RECOUNTS EXPERIENCES ON SS "HOPE"

(By John Beardsley)

Dr. Charles Stern stood on the hotel balcony and watched the large, white ship moving slowly upriver.

Several other doctors were with the Sioux Falls obstetrician, all of them waiting for the same ship. They weren't going anywhere; the ship had come to stay.

Only the day before Dr. Stern and the others had deplaned at Guayaquil, the largest port city in Ecuador. They had come from scattered spots in the United States to this city on the west coast of South America to meet the ship that was just now dropping its anchor in the wide, salt-water river channel that is Guayaquil's access to the sea.

The vessel looked huge alongside the small fishing craft crowding the harbor. Painted on its hull, in large black letters, was the word "Hope."

TWO-MONTH STAY

Later that mid-December day, Dr. Stern boarded the hospital ship SS *Hope* and embarked on a 2-month tour of medical duty on a ship that didn't sail, dispensing medical aid and know-how to a people he had never seen before.

Back home now, Dr. Stern sat in the den of his home in Riverview Heights and recounted many of the impressions and details of his sojourn on the *Hope*.

Perhaps some history is in order first. The *Hope* is a former Navy hospital ship, the U.S.S. *Constellation*, that saw service during the Korean conflict and was then shunted into mothballs.

A few years ago, a Washington, D.C., internist, Dr. William Walsh, formed the People-to-People Health Foundation, a group dedicated to bringing medical help to the poor and needy in the world.

The foundation bought the *Hope* from the Government, used donated money and equipment to outfit it and turn it into a modern, 200-bed floating hospital.

The first year, SS *Hope* was in Vietnam. Last year, the ship stayed in Peru. It will leave Ecuador in September this year, go to Panama for some repairs and new equipment, then head for Africa's Republic of Guinea.

THIRTY AT A TIME

There are about 30 U.S. doctors on the *Hope*, said Dr. Stern. Almost all are physicians with private practice who give 2 months of their time, without pay, to working on the ship.

When one group leaves, another group takes its place. The doctors, of course, receive room and board on the ship, plus travel expenses if they stay the full 2 months.

A permanent staff of technicians, physiotherapists, nurses, and administrative personnel sign up for a year and receive salaries, though not as much as they could make in the States for similar work, said Dr. Stern.

U.S. drug firms donate all the drugs used in the *Hope's* work. And manufacturers donate the equipment. Before the *Hope* put in at Guayaquil, said Dr. Stern, General Electric had installed a complete, new X-ray unit.

The ship, he said, is operated by the Grace Lines, which brought to mind an anecdote:

The ship's purser was a man named William Koolman from Pipestone, Minn. One day during Dr. Stern's tour of duty Koolman received word his father was in Sioux Valley Hospital here. A strange coincidence, perhaps?

FROM TWIN CITIES

On the good-will hospital, the staff worked hard, said Dr. Stern. He and two doctors from the Twin Cities comprised the department of obstetrics and gynecology, and their schedule went something like this:

They had gynecological surgery two times a week.

They conducted classes for Ecuadoran interns and doctors on the ship.

Three times a week, they conducted clinics and made ward rounds at Guayaquil's Maternidad "Enrique C. Sotomayor," a large maternity hospital.

Two times a week, they visited the Luis Vernaza General Hospital in the city.

In addition, the *Hope* set up two clinics of its own—one in Duran, a small town across the river from Guayaquil; the other in the barios (slums) of the port city.

In Duran, Dr. Stern and his coworkers saw prenatal cases twice a week and gynecology cases once a week.

In the barios clinic, they saw all cases.

The SS *Hope*, said Dr. Stern, limits its services to the indigent, and an Ecuadoran Hope Committee, set up before the ship arrived, screened and recommended all patients.

But the definition of "indigent" can vary, quipped Dr. Stern. In Cuenca, a mountain city about the size of Sioux Falls in southeast Ecuador, he said he met persons for whom "the definition of indigent was any person who couldn't go to the United States for medical care."

Despite the work, there was also time to meet people and see some of the country.

"You don't know what hospitality is until you have been down there," Dr. Stern remarked.

One day just before Christmas, Dr. Stern said, the three obstetricians from the ship were guests at a program given for them by doctors at the Maternidad, and the three were given genuine Ecuadoran "panama" hats. He learned then and there that Ecuador is the true home of the popular "panama."

One American doctor told Stern that in the 2 months he was in Ecuador he made more close friends then he ever had in his hometown.

SENSE OF CULTURE

On a trip to Quito, Ecuador's capital and a city that was ancient before the Spaniards arrived, Dr. Stern noticed a remarkable difference from Guayaquil. Quito is in the Andes, 9,000 feet above sea level, but more than the obvious change in atmosphere, said Dr. Stern, there was a distinct sense of culture in the city, a feeling of something old and revered.

When he went to Cuenca, Dr. Stern said the only Americans he saw were Peace Corps members—there were no tourists. Cuenca, he said, is a conservative, native mountain town, and it has a cathedral the residents have been working on for 70 years—and it's not finished.

Dr. Stern naturally gained many impressions from the places he saw, the persons he treated and the people he met.

He is positive that such a program as the SS *Hope* is good for American doctors. And the recognition such service gives to the needs of other people is a major asset.

"These people (in Ecuador and Latin America) for years have felt inferior to us, and they clamor for recognition," he said.

"When you see conditions among the poor in Latin America," he said, "you can understand the reason for Castro, and you can see why there will be more Castros."

WELCOMED OPPORTUNITY

When did Dr. Stern become interested in the Hope program?

"I think one is always interested," he answered, "and one waits for the opportunity."

He said a close friend of his, a plastic surgeon from Miami, worked on the *Hope* when it was in Peru. This friend's comments, spurred him to get on the list for a tour of duty.

And now interested in spreading, said Dr. Stern. An Aberdeen dentist, Dr. Charles Kelly, will be on the next rotation staff of the ship. And a Sioux City doctor, Robert H. McBride, is presently on board.

Although it is good to be home, said Dr. Stern, he will never forget the SS *Hope*, brightly lit at night, its whiteness gleaming against the dark—a lighted symbol of help.

Urban Renewal Helps Win All America City Award for Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this week Minneapolis, Minn., is being given one

of the coveted awards as an All America City. The successful urban renewal programs in Minneapolis played a large part in this award.

Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis, spoke to the Omaha Chamber of Commerce recently about how Minneapolis has made such progress in revitalizing the downtown area and renewing large sections of the city.

Support by the chamber of commerce, labor, the press, government officials, and citizens groups of all kinds has helped make the Minneapolis programs successful. My colleagues may be interested in excertps from the story told at Omaha by Mayor Naftalin, as we consider legislation for extending this vital program:

THE MINNEAPOLIS STORY: PROGRESS IN REDEVELOPMENT

(An address by Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis)

It is a great pleasure for me to accept your invitation to describe the progress we have been making in Minneapolis with our programs of urban renewal, rehabilitation, and redevelopment, programs which are revitalizing our downtown area and renewing vast sections of our city. In the early stages of renewal there were fears that the entire program represented governmental encroachment on private enterprise. Today, however, businessmen in Minneapolis are clearly convinced that redevelopment represents an effective blending of public and private enterprise. In Minneapolis the success of these programs has won fully the support and confidence of our business community and the full backing and cooperation of the labor movement.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORT

Specifically, our Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce is officially and enthusiastically on record for the continuance and enlargement of all the programs, including those that provide low-rent public housing for the elderly and for the low-income families. Our chamber maintains an active department of urban renewal with a full-time staff member. Today the chamber looks upon the redevelopment program as an indispensable dimension in our planning for the future.

THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

Minneapolis, with a population of 484,000, is the core of a metropolitan area of some 1,500,000 persons. Our city is in good condition as compared to other central cities of comparable size. It is a regional, financial, and wholesale trade center. The central business district is compact, well planned, and healthy. Diversified industry contributes to the economic stability of the area. Our chain of seven lakes within the city limits, connected by an excellent park system, is the result of farseeing planning in the early history of the city. The city's lakes and park system have contributed to the development of sound residential areas. Moreover, many of the older neighborhoods are neat and well kept. These neighborhoods are supported by adequate community facilities, public and private.

URBAN BLIGHT

Minneapolis, however, has not been able to escape typical problems of urban blight. Like many cities, the blight starts from poor planning in past years, such as houses placed too close together and mixed land uses resulting from strip commercial zoning. This, in turn, results in gradual delapidation of structures, and changes in land use to the point where clearance and redevelopment is necessary.

To combat these problems, the State of Minnesota was among the early States to adopt comprehensive housing and redevelopment legislation. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority in Minneapolis, which was created immediately after the passage of Municipal Housing and Redevelopment Act of 1947, has two functions: low-rent housing and urban renewal.

HI-LO PROJECT

The first urban renewal action was the Hi-Lo Development in northeast Minneapolis. The program involving the grading of high hills and the filling of low, swampy areas and replatting the area for development. It involves predominately single-family homes. The area had been dormant and was adversely affecting the development of the surrounding area. At a net cost of $27,000, the land was purchased, regraded, platted into lots; sold, and developed as a normal single-family home area of the city. With an investment of $27,000, the city is now obtaining some $31,000 a year in additional tax revenue and the project has had an important effect on the continuing development and improvement of the surrounding area.

GLENWOOD PROJECT

Having had some experience in renewal activity, Minneapolis next undertook to clear and rebuild what is known as the Glenwood area. This area of 180 acres was one of the worst problem areas in the city, and, at the time it was undertaken in 1956, was among the largest redevelopment projects in the country. The Glenwood area, now almost completed, has resulted in some $20 million in construction representing a new community of residential, commercial, and industrial development, including the construction of 470 low-rent housing units, and an 88-unit tower for elderly occupancy. The Glenwood area is now expected to pay taxes to the city 2½ times the taxes before redevelopment. This was accomplished at a net project cost of $8,500,000, of which $2,800,000 was paid by the city of Minneapolis.

GATEWAY CENTER PROJECT

The most exciting and dramatic redevelopment project in our city is the downtown Gateway Center area, a 70-acre development project in the heart of downtown Minneapolis. Before the initiation of the project, the Gateway Center was one of the largest skid row areas in any city of comparable size. The area housed some 3,500 single men in a setting of alcoholism, disease, and crime. Earlier attempts to overcome the impact of the skid-row environment had failed, and only the areawide plan for the area, made possible by urban renewal, was finally able to bring to fruition the efforts of over two generations.

GATEWAY CENTER PLANNING

With urban renewal a possibility, business and civic leadership joined in an all-out effort to make Gateway Center a reality. First, a civic center association was formed. After some study, the association proposed a strip of civic buildings along 4th Street between the central business district and Gateway Center designed to be either a buffer between the two central business districts and the old lower loop, or better yet, a catalyst for Gateway. This plan was supported by city officials and downtown business leaders. When planning of the Gateway Center project was initiated by the authority in 1956, there was active support from the chamber of commerce through its Lower Loop committee and the downtown council through its development committee as well as general support from labor and civic leadership throughout the city. The objective of the redevelopment was to develop the area for single purpose office use and related functions that would support rather than compete with the heart of the downtown area, and so designed to take advantage of future proposals for pedestrian use of the Nicollet Avenue as the main retail street, the preservation of the Gateway Park as an entrance to the downtown area, and potential development of the river front area.

EIGHTEEN MILLION DOLLARS IN PUBLIC BUILDING

A key to the rapid and successful marketing and development of the project was the decision of Minneapolis and the various boards, the State of Minnesota, and the Federal Government to construct a series of public buildings along the 4th Street boundary of the project adjoining the downtown area. Because of this decision, some $18 million of public construction was essentially completed at the time the Gateway Center land was available for marketing. This provided the anchor of private investment in the area. The new public buildings included the new Public Health Center Building, a new city library, a new Federal Courts Building, a new building of Minnesota Division of Employment Security, and a city parking garage.

SIXTY MILLION DOLLARS IN PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION

As a result, a proposal was received and accepted for development of the entire Gateway Center area totaling some $60 million in private construction even before much of the land had been acquired. When complete, a view from the Mississippi River, looking back at the downtown area, will show a development of 1,500 units of tower apartments along the riverfront, joining a new Gateway Park, and a new home office of the Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. Other major developments are a new $10 million Sheraton Hotel, a new office building for Northern States Power Co., a local office of the International Business Machines Co., the development of a special center of restaurants, special shops and consulate offices of Scandinavian governments under the theme of a Scandinavian Center as a focal point of the area, and a Food and Drug Administration building of the Federal Government.

TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY MILLION DOLLARS IN PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION DOWNTOWN

In addition to these improvements, the project has also stimulated new private construction and improvements in the adjacent central business district, estimated at $280 million.' Business leaders attribute this new vitality largely to the Gateway proposals that gave a new confidence in the future of downtown. Most significant are the new First National Bank Building and the $22 million North Star Center. The improvements within the area will provide the city an increase in tax revenue of approximately $1,500,000 per year as compared to a local cost of a little over $4 million and a Federal cost of approximately $12,500,000.

NEIGHBORHOOD RENEWAL

In addition to the redevelopment type of urban renewal project, the city is undertaking an extensive program of neighborhood rehabilitation. A number of neighborhoods contain well-maintained structures and even some new development, but are interspersed with mixed land uses and declining dilapidated buildings which, if allowed to continue, will insure the rapid decline of these areas to the point where future redevelopment will be necessary. The first of these projects, the Harrison renewal project, a 150-acre area west of Glenwood, is entering the development stage this spring. This plan proposes a program of home improvement for some 500 to 600 of the 723 structures in the area, acquisition of some 93 properties, and physical improvements including highway, park improvements, and the development of a new commercial center. Several other large neighborhood renewal plans are under study, including a 750-acre area in the Near North Side, two areas over 300 acres each in Northeast and South Minneapolis called the St. Anthony and Seward areas.

LOW-RENT HOUSING

The city of Minneapolis has also undertaken, simultaneously with urban renewal, an extensive program of low-rent housing to meet the needs of low-income families and families displaced by public action. This housing development has been carefully coordinated with urban renewal to accomplish the renewal of areas of this city as well as to provide for the needs of low-income families.

Some 735 units of low-rent housing were developed in connection with the Glenwood renewal plan. The city has just completed a 1,055-unit program of housing for the elderly on scattered sites, and an additional 750 units are programed. These sites have been selected to remove spots of blight within the neighborhood in which they are located and to influence positively the improvement of surrounding areas. Several high-rise structures are expected to bring about private construction of apartments in these close-in neighborhoods in accordance with the long-range goals of the city. Several of the sites have been chosen in blighted neighborhoods where they are expected to influence the upgrading of the neighborhood.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

One of the first elderly housing developments was a 24-unit 1-story development on vacant land adjoining an existing housing project in North Minneapolis. Three small sites were also selected in Northeast Minneapolis by the neighborhood and in each case removed dilapidated structures and provided for improvement to an area which was otherwise in good condition. As a result of this study, the neighborhood in turn asked for a rehabilitation program for complete renewal of the neighborhood. Sites for these apartments included badly blighted structures, which would otherwise have been subject to redevelopment; again, accomplishing renewal as well as needed housing accommodations for the elderly. The largest single development is the Cedar Hi Apartments, three 10-story towers, housing some 348 units, which are again expected to influence the improvement of a neighborhood being rapidly expanded for the university and institutional use.

COMMUNITY EFFORT AND COOPERATION

There are a number of factors that have made this project possible. First, the many physical and economic advantages of our city which I have previously recited have contributed to the maintenance of our city as a good place to live and work and a determination to maintain and develop these advantages in the face of typical problems of age and blight. We have also been fortunate to have many able and dedicated people inside and outside of city government who have worked continuously and constructively in these activities.

There also exists a spirit of cooperation between leadership in business, civic, labor organizations and the various agencies of city government itself. The Gateway Center project in particular has cemented this kind of working relationship which will help to insure the continuing success in citywide long-range planning and development.

NECESSITY FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION

The necessity for cooperation and joint participation by business and government has been broadly recognized. In this regard, I would like to point out also the necessity not only for local government participation but particularly for Federal financial participation. Basic problems such as urban transportation, housing, urban redevelopment and rehabilitation are problems of major concern that cannot be remedied within the tax resources available to our city.

The use of Federal aids has been recognized as good business in our city, as illustrated by the $12 million Federal investment in our Gateway Center which has been the catalyst for some $80 million of construction within the project and perhaps for several times that amount in the central business district as a whole. The press in our city has done a constructive job of interpreting public programs of housing and urban renewal and has generally given strong support to sound programs of community improvement.

FUTURE EXPANSION OF COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

As we look to the future, we expect continued expansion of community improvement in Minneapolis as a comprehensive program, community-wide in scope. To this end, we are currently undertaking with Federal assistance under the direction of our Planning Commission a $750,000 study to develop such a citywide improvement plan covering not only urban renewal but the whole scope of public improvements. Our Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission in cooperation with the State Highway Department, the Planning Commissions of our Twin Cities and representatives of the seven-county metropolitan area are undertaking a $1,500,000 mass transportation study to provide metropolitan-wide answers to this vital problem.

SEVEN SPECIFIC BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

In summary, our experience in Minneapolis with redevelopment is benefiting our community in at least seven specific ways:

1. It is preserving and revitalizing our downtown. With the Gateway project serving as the impetus, public and private enterprise are investing more than $100 million in the loop area, bringing new vitality to the center of the city and enhancing the attractiveness and convenience of the entire community.

2. Major new properties are being added to the tax rolls and existing properties are enjoying increased values as the result of these programs. At a time when the city so desperately needs an enlarged tax base the redevelopment program has been of major importance by adding so significantly to the overall property values of the community.

3. Along with increased property values has come a dramatic and marked improvement in the tax return to the city. Redeveloped areas that formerly held blighted housing or marginal businesses will return in the form of revenue as much as five times what they did prior to redevelopment.

4. To enhanced property values and increased tax return must be added the additional advantage of reduced cost in government services to the redeveloped areas. Our experience clearly shows that after redevelopment the cost of police and fire protection drops sharply, bringing with it major savings to the taxpayer.

5. The social gains cannot be measured in dollars and cents, but their significance is of even greater importance than the gains to property values and tax returns. The clearance of blight, the rehabilitation of neighborhoods, the planning of needed public improvements such as schools and parks, and the construction of public housing units for the elderly and low-income families are combining to help us attack the problems of poverty and substandard living conditions. These are indispensable dimensions of overall community redevelopment.

6. Obviously, a major gain that results from redevelopment is the immediate spurt to the economy in the form of new jobs and new construction which in turn generates enlarged business opportunities, creating still additional jobs and investment opportunities.

7. Finally, redevelopment has opened for us large new creative opportunities in a total community sense. It has enabled us to discover our city, to identify our strengths and our weaknesses, to maximize the positive values associated with strong neighborhoods and, at the same time, to reach those stubborn problems that breed delinquency, poverty, poor health, and other social deficiencies.

Every American city faces extremely difficult problems for the future. The crush of population, the demand for increased services, the need for improved education (which is closely related to adequate housing and an effective tax base) and the problems of traffic congestion, water and air pollution—these, and other problems, add up to the absolute necessity that every city seek an intelligent approach to its future needs. Our experience in Minneapolis shows conclusively that programs of community redevelopment are indispensable in facing our future.

A New Canal—Dig It or Atom-Blast It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 3, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in the context of the discussion on the need for a new Atlantic-Pacific sea-level canal in Latin America, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to a perceptive article by Mr. William C. Daffron, from the March 9 Washington World.

Mr. Daffron's article concerns the comments of Mr. William H. Bauer, of Port Lavaca, Tex., president of the Bauer Dredging Co., who is convinced that conventional methods could be better employed in digging a new two-ocean waterway, rather than to use nuclear power.

The thrust of the article by Mr. Daffron is that the protagonists of the nuclear construction theory either disregard the debilitating effects of the nuclear test ban treaty on possibilities for peaceful uses of atomic power or fail to acknowledge that anywhere from 5 to 10 years of research might be required to develop a nuclear program sophisticated enough to be economical, safe, and feasible in digging a massive waterway.

Although I do not concur in Mr. Bauer's apparent preference for international control over the canal that will eventually replace the Panama waterway, I do, nevertheless, feel that his views on the possibility of digging a second canal with conventional means merits study by our policymakers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by reporter Daffron be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: THE NEW CANAL—DIG IT OR ATOM-BLAST IT? AEC CONCEDES NUCLEAR METHOD MIGHT REQUIRE A WHOLE DECADE

(By William C. Daffron)

A new Atlantic-Pacific ship canal across Central America can be completed by conventional methods in less time than it will

take the Atomic Energy Commission to develop nuclear canal-excavating techniques.

Thus Engineer William H. Bauer of Port Lavaca, Tex., draws the line on how the proposed second ocean-to-ocean canal in Latin America should be built. Bauer is president of the Bauer Dredging Co.

"A great deal of the engineering work has been completed and when the final site selection has been made, there is no reason why a sea-level waterway cannot be ready for operation within 6 years," he said.

"It can be completed in less time, if the Government wants it to be done that way. This does not mean a higher overall construction cost; it just means bringing in more men," Bauer added.

"Industry has always met the demands of Government eventually, whether it be during a war or in peacetime.

"The present situation in Latin America can change overnight and I am frankly afraid it will worsen before it gets better. There has been talk of a need for a second canal for some time. The crisis in Panama just hastened matters," he said.

Last month, Bauer challenged the statement of Dr. Gerald W. Johnson, director of the AEC's Project Plowshare, after a magazine quoted Dr. Johnson as saying that if nuclear explosives were used in a "string" a smooth-bottomed ditch would result.

Bauer said at the time: "I know enough about Project Plowshare to know Dr. Johnson cannot support his statement with proven performance." Bauer said, "such a blast as he proposes might rip a cut but it would still require conventional dirt movers to cut a template and remove the dirt and rock to a point where it would not slip back into the ditch."

The testimony of Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC Chairman, and Dr. Johnson before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy last month bore out Bauer's challenge and set up a timetable.

Dr. Seaborg estimated it would take about 5 years to do the technical work required, even proceeding at the optimum rate without a treaty and without budget problems.

Dr. Johnson added 2 to 5 more years to this estimate for producing and stockpiling the few hundred nuclear devices needed.

Both AEC officials conceded under committee probing that the AEC's nuclear explosive program was not getting maximum budget support.

They also admitted that AEC was told to postpone one major cratering experiment and to scale down another experiment scheduled for this year.

The administration apparently is uncertain what effect the test ban treaty has on cratering experiments.

Committee Chairman JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, summarized the testimony of the AEC officials:

"Many knowledgeable persons, including some Congressmen, think that a new canal to replace the Panama Canal can be excavated tomorrow using nuclear explosives. This is not so. Moreover, many persons think the nuclear test ban treaty is keeping the United States from immediately digging a new canal with atomic explosives. This, too, is a fallacy.

"The reason nuclear explosives cannot be used for possibly a decade hence is that proper explosives and techniques have not been developed," Senator PASTORE added.

Hearings were held by the Senate Commerce Committee on S. 2497, a bill which calls upon the State Department, and Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission to submit to the committee within 6 months final plans and the selection of a site for a new canal.

So far as the committee is concerned there is every reason to foresee fast action on the measure because 7 of its 17 members jointly sponsored the resolution.

At the time of the riots over the flag incident in Panama, the Army Engineers had under consideration four sites for a new canal. The conversion of the existing Panama Canal to a sea-level waterway was also under discussion.

Within the last 30 days, the possible use of three of the sites became questionable.

The Mexican Legislature went on record as opposing any type of canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, a site favored by Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana. Then Nicaraguan President Renee Schick said he would like to find a way to cancel the remainder of the 99-year treaty the United States obtained in 1914. This pact gives the United States exclusive rights on the San Juan River across Lake Nicaragua and into the Pacific for an alternative canal site.

The continuing deadlock with Panama raises the question as to just how willing the United States would be to enter into a treaty for a second canal within the Republic of Panama, at a site known as the Sasardi-Morti route and located in eastern Panama. It would connect Caldonia Bay with the Pacific through the Gulfo de San Miquel Bay.

Standing as the only possible site not in dispute is the Colombia canal in the Republic of Colombia. This connects Gulfo de Urba with the Pacific.

Bauer agrees with those who say the new canal should be an international property, but he points out that it will be up to the United States to provide the construction money.

"The five Central American Republics, plus Mexico and Panama, could provide the international membership with the United States either as a trustee or a member," he remarked.

Technical know-how, private enterprise and engineering will have to come from the United States, in Bauer's opinion. He said:

"The United States is fortunate in having the world's greatest engineering outfit, the Corps of Engineers. They know their business. They are absolutely incorruptible and they are tough enough to handle the 50-plus contractors a new canal project would require."

Wayne Kinney, of Laramie, Wyo., Honored by Freedom's Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 3, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an American from Laramie, Wyo., Mr. Wayne Kinney, has been honored by the Freedoms Foundation, at Valley Forge, for an essay entitled "What Can I Do for Freedom?"

Mr. Kinney received the George Washington Honor Medal during the 15th annual presentation of awards.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Kinney's award-winning essay printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LARAMIE, WYO.,
October 17, 1963.

WHAT CAN I DO FOR FREEDOM?

If I am citizen A: nothing. I mind my own business, pay my bills, send my children to school. I leave this country unchanged from the way I found it.

If I am citizen B: in time of war, I offer my life for my country's preservation. Otherwise, I am citizen A.

If I am citizen C: not only will I offer my life in wartime, but at all times will I watch for erosion of personal freedoms, local freedoms, and State freedoms, and I will try to vote for the political candidates who will guard against these erosions. Otherwise, I am citizen A.

If I am citizen D: not only will I offer my life in wartime and my careful vote, always, but I will assign myself "watchdog" chores, guarding against erosion of personal, local, and State freedoms, and when I find such erosion, I will write to my Congressmen and my Senators about it. Otherwise, I am citizen A.

If I am citizen E: not only will I offer my life in wartime, my careful vote, always, and letters to my Congressmen and Senators, but I will make a personal stand against the erosion of freedoms that affects me directly, or those close to me, knowing that making this stand could be very expensive in time, money, and reputation, but knowing also that similar personal stands of freedom by thousands of Americans are responsible for the freedoms of scores of millions of Americans. Otherwise, I am citizen A.

If I am citizen F: not only will I offer my life in wartime, my careful vote, always, letters to my Congressmen and Senators and my personal stand for freedom, but I will devote my full time to standing for freedom by running for public office, where I can become effective—by locating the individuals and committees that are the source of the erosion of freedom that is continually going on, and counterattack by my actions and the actions of other politicians like myself, whom I would persuade to act. Otherwise, I am citizen A.

If I am citizen G: not only will I offer my life in wartime, my careful vote, always, letters to my Congressmen and Senators, my personal stand for freedom, but I will write articles and make speeches to the public, when I can, showing them the erosions of freedom I have found and how I was able to trace the attacks to their sources and to make the counterattacks. Otherwise, I am citizen A.

However, I am only citizen H: only partly aware of the erosion of my freedoms, writing only occasionally to my Congressmen and Senators, and applauding but mentally when I read of someone making a personal stand for freedom—and only casually wondering, when and if my turn comes: would I be able to stand up and fight for my freedoms nearly so strongly and nearly so well?

WAYNE KINNEY.

Goldwater Campaign Gets New Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 3, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's many friends in the Senate will be pleased to learn of the fact that his campaign for the Republican presidential nomination is winning new friends and attracting substantial new financial support.

I ask unanimous consent, in this connection, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column recently written

by George Todt, of California, reporting on a most significant campaign dinner held in the Los Angeles Sports Arena.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR GOLDWATER

(By George Todt)

"We are going to run this campaign if we have to run it on bottle tops."—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, "Face the Nation," February 15, 1964.

The hard-riding conservative from the Arizona desert will not have to run his campaign for GOP standard bearer in California on a meager ration of prickly pears and cactus in the foreseeable future.

Thanks to the fantastic efforts of an unsung hero—in this case Henry Salvatori, Goldwater State finance chairman, who masterminded the operation—more than $425,000 was cleared at a recent dinner in the Los Angeles Sports Arena.

More than 4,000 dinner guests showed up and paid $100-per-plate, plus another 10,000 interested persons who anted up $5 apiece to sit in the balconies.

FIGHTING MOOD

The Senator was in a fighting mood after his New Hampshire slowdown and came back with a blazing attack on our meandering foreign policy—if it can be called by that name—which netted 54 ovations.

Apparently the American people want action, not inaction.

It is doubtful if there has ever been such a tremendous dinner for a man who was not President of the United States and had not even captured this own party nomination yet. Goldwater people were proud and happy.

But the real hero of this awesome demonstration was Salvatori, because he came through with raising the green stuff which is the lifeblood of any successful political campaign. Without it, a candidate was.

Not content with this haymaker, Salvatori will make it a one-two punch by repeating the performance next month in San Francisco—which is expected to do at least half as well as here in Los Angeles.

MONEY LACKING

So things are looking up for GOLDWATER in the Golden State. But how is his campaign being backed elsewhere? Are the tycoons putting their money where their mouth is? Or are they falling down on their responsibility?

For answer to this interesting question, let me refer my readers to a recent conversation I had with Denison Kitchel, national campaign director of the Goldwater-for-President forces with headquarters in Washington, D.C.

BARRY's only real problem is enough money," he told me. "Lots of important people urged him to make the run, promised to back him with adequate finances if he would throw his hat into the ring.

"Some of these fair-weather friends have proved long on easy promises and short on making good their pledges to produce required campaign funds. Given an equal break, BARRY can win. But his friends must now back him up."

Suddenly the thought came to me: let's make this a person-to-person crusade by the vitally concerned American people to see that "Mr. Conservative" has his chance.

Why should we leave this important matter up to the tycoons, the "moneybags" as it were? Who needs them, anyway? Let's do the job without these reluctant dragons.

LET'S ALL HELP

Forget the big tycoons and business leaders who presently are dragging their feet. There are at least 10 or 20 million typical, friendly American citizens emotionally attached to BARRY. Let them send their checks for whatever amount they can to his headquarters.

Let's do it today. Send $1, $5, $10, $25, $50, $100, $500, $1,000 or more to the following address: Goldwater-for-President Committee, Post Office Box 1964, Washington, D.C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Americanism Night, American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 18, Dedham, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker on March 19, 1964, the annual "Americanism Night" sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 18 of Dedham, Mass. was held at the legion hall in Dedham. I want to compliment the chairman, Mrs. Pamela St. George, on the complete success of this year's event.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert into the RECORD an article from the March 26, 1964 Dedham Transcript on this commendable affair, as well as essays of the Misses Linda Morrissey and Ann Halladay who were awarded the top prize and runner-up respectively.

The material follows:

LINDA MORRISSEY WINS TOP AMERICANISM PRIZE

Some 300 persons crowded Legion Hall last Thursday evening for Americanism Night and reading of essays on "What My American Heritage Means to Me." It was the largest turnout of distinguished guests, parents, and visitors since the American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 18 began the competition 12 years ago.

Top prize went to Linda Morrissey, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd G. Morrissey of 39 Norwell Road. She won a $100 U.S. bond and her winning essay has been sent to the Heritage Foundation and to Congressman JAMES BURKE for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Other winners were: (2) Ann Halliday, (3) Richard Ellis, (4) Kathleen Carr, (5) Dianne Findlen, (6) Susan Himmell, and (7) David Matheson.

Judges of this contest—and 19 essays were submitted—Representative Harold E. Rosen, Miss Judith Alexander, and Dr. Thomas W. Christopher.

Winners of the fifth-grade contest on "My America," were (1) Marie Laquidra, of Greenlodge School, (2) Linda Tiberi, of Capen, and (3) Michael Butler, of St. Mary's. Judge of this contest was Robert Dumas, director of the Dedham Public Library. There were 24 compositions submitted.

Auxiliary Unit President Frances Lore opened the meeting and then the Americanism Chairman, Pamela St. George, introduced Thomas Yonker, head of the high school social studies department.

He cited Mrs. St. George for the excellent job she did with her committee to make the affair such a success. He explained that every junior in high school has an opportunity to have his or her essay selected. It is given as a general assignment and the best essays are chosen, copied without name or identification, and sent to the judges.

"There is no favoritism," Mr. Yonker stressed. "The teachers select the best papers and send them to me, and I pick out the most representative and have them copied so there is no name on the essay."

Rt. Rev. Edward C. Bailey of St. Mary's gave the opening prayer and Rev. Maxwell Andrews of the Church of Good Shepherd, the closing prayer. Music was by the Youth Orchestra directed by Robert Kelley.

Nine county legion auxiliary units were represented.

Other invited guests were:

Maj. Robert Crowdley, military aide to Gov. Endicott Peabody; Agnes Woodhouse, State Department ALA Americanism chairman; Miss Julia Mullen, past department ALA president; Janet Dupuis, county director, ALA; Thomas Abeley, State department commander, AL; William McLaren, county commander, AL; John Murphy, county junior vice commander; post commander, John Colantuoni.

Francis Powers, Norfolk County public administrator; Charles McGowan, AL post Americanism chairman; Chairman Francis W. O'Brien of the selectmen; John Farrell, chairman, Democratic Town Committee; Town Clerk John T. Carey, Superintendent of Schools Lawrence L. Brown, high school principal, Thomas F. O'Donnell, school committeemen, Thomas O'Connell, Jr., and Walter Flanagan.

Also, Postmaster J. Frank Colbert, deputy sheriff, John Chmielinski, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar George of the VFW, Mrs. Charles Mucciaccio of the Ital-American Auxiliary; Mrs. Edwin Currier, DAR regent, Walter Colby, Boy Scout commissioner; Mrs. Stella Dardinski of the Girl Scouts; Fred Bradbury, Post 18 and his honor guard; Orson Tukey, who aided Mrs. St. George in obtaining prizes; Charles Hunt, scoutmaster of the post Boy Scout troop.

Chairman of the refreshment committee was Florence Ricci, and pouring coffee was Mary L. Schofield.

The Fairbanks family sent a large basket of flowers which later was presented to Mrs. St. George. The spray of roses on the buffet table was sent to Mrs. Ruth Wright, a member of the auxiliary, now at the Dedham Nursing Home.

WHAT MY AMERICAN HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

(By Linda Morrissey)

In our hectic world of today, it is hard to realize that the complexities of 20th-century life were laid long ago on sturdy colonial foundations. The daily dealings of State and Federal administrators with foreign nations and internal corruption seem a far cry from those of our first floundering colonial developments of the 17th and 18th centuries. In the early period of our country's settlement, such large-scale problems as nuclear testing and Communist aggression were unknown; and America, as a free and unified nation, was a gleam in some liberal's eye—a faint gleam which grew to a beacon, searching the anarchical world with its probing light—searching for human liberty under God.

Although our problems (at this early stage) were not large enough to shake the world with their magnitude, they were (in a very true sense) worldwide; for, our revolt against tyranny and oppression was to open the door to free thought and free government throughout the civilized world.

When, in 1620, a small band of Pilgrims arrived in the savage wilderness of New England, the eyes of the world watched to see the spectacle of the day; for, everyone knew such a hard life could not be endured by the members of this party. But, did they think that life in England was any easier to bear? Was a familiar place worth the intolerance and persecution of that time? What good was peace of mind, when the peace was mandatory and free thought was not allowed? The mind of no man—no matter to what strata of intelligence it belongs—can be suppressed for long without reaction.

With much physical suffering, the weight was finally lifted from thought; and the early American began to enjoy his mental liberties. Each thought was savored as a hard-won privilege, and men could not help but feel secure that all posterity would be better for their one bold action.

But, by the simplicities of their desires, Americans moved forward. Soon, the colonists realized that other liberties were necessary for true freedom of thought. These liberties could not be obtained under the heavy hand of the motherland. Thus, came revolt, suffering, and victory. For America, revolution had been the answer. We gained our freedoms—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Again, America moved onward—no longer in colonial self-interest, but in national unity.

However, the years passed; and man, being the inconstant and forgetful creature he is, lost sight of the bloody battlefields of the Revolution, where our long-sought freedoms had been won. In this way, our country left a few of its initial ideals along the path to power—ideals that are still waiting to be claimed.

By the 1820's it became evident that, although our Nation had been founded on principles of freedom for all men, a situation existed within our territorial boundaries which mocked those righteous principles—slavery. Incidents arose concerning this issue, but these were usually passed over and forgotten. But, they could not be forgotten forever.

Although slavery was only one of our country's sectional differences, it did lead us to war—a war with our brothers. The battlefields of Gettysburg and Antietam became worldwide testing grounds for the liberty of free thought. All our golden American ideals were tarnished by long years of national apathy—only the boiling caldron of the Civil War scorched by the fires of internal hatred could scour the Nation clean. But, this too, passed. Our country was left battered and bleeding—surely the American ideals would not be forgotten now.

Again we moved on and prospered. Two wars came—wars to end all wars. Again they moved us from our snug beds and rudely tossed us on another testing ground.

With all the flag waving on holidays and with all the spasmodic displays of national patriotism, America is still a testing ground for the world. To me, America is a legacy of suffering, victory, and freedom. America, from the first Pilgrim to John F. Kennedy, is our heritage.

WHAT MY AMERICAN HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

(By Ann Halladay)

The other night, after studying for a history exam, I wandered into the livingroom, where a blaze in the fireplace arrested my steps. I sprawled lazily in front of it and let its warmth and soothing glow lull me into dreamy relaxation. Pushing my well-

studied history text in front of me, I flipped open the front cover and for some time ruffled the pages of that book, thinking on the meaning of my American heritage—which is all the events in my book compounded, and so many more.

The first chapter was of the early explorers who opened to the world what was to become America. The claims they made would affect this continent for centuries. They themselves were perfect examples of the courage and thirst for unknown reaches that have come to be two outstanding characteristics of the men and women in our history.

The idea of the freedom that is America was realized with the coming of the early colonists. In the main they came as people dissatisfied with life in Europe. They settled along our eastern seaboard, staying mostly with their own kind, and in a rough way lived much as they would have in Europe. But a new feeling had begun to grow within them, for they had had a taste of freedom. Here, to me, is where my American heritage really began, for in my mind America is synonymous with freedom. From this time on our people would be constantly striving toward the goal of being free, a drive which continues to our own time.

The years passed beneath my fingertips as I turned to a chapter entitled "Revolution." Here, surely, was one of the most significant sections of American history. Those times have always appealed to me as the most vibrant, the most romantic in our history. In this movement, the struggle for independence, 13 separate colonies ceased to act only in their own best interests. They united, and we won our independence. The peaceful fire in my own fireplace was transformed, and suddenly the victory bonfires lining Boston Harbor blazed before me. I realized what a task we have today to be worthy of the gift these forefathers gave us, our free Nation. The fight for freedom did not begin or end with the Revolutionary War, however. So long as there are men held unwillingly behind the iron curtain, men in our own country who are denied rights, freedom has not been won. We, as Americans, have not achieved the goal set for us.

One hundred pages, 50 years; 200 pages, 80 years passed. The year was 1861. A log in the fireplace broke and tumbled into the flames, and I was reminded of a broken Union and a blazing war. These were our Nation's most tragic years, but from them came renewed realization that in unity is our strength. Divided we are nothing.

After the War of the Rebellion we were faced with the problem of providing for the freed salves. We dealt in many ways with the Negroes, but the problem of race relations was not solved then, and it is not solved now. The freeing of the Negroes is part of our heritage, but we can't leave it in the past. The problem of trying to equate all men was that of those preceding us; it is ours now, and it will belong to those who follow us.

Still more pages on I paused at a colored picture of a pioneer family, headed West. Their wind-bitten faces reflected fatigue and anxiety, but if they were careworn faces, they were also determined ones and proud. Would we of today have their courage and drive? We have little land left to explore, but we can be pioneers in other fields. We can be and we must be.

The fire was dying now. Where there had been licking flames there were now only glowing coals and a few dead ashes. There was a sudden chill in the room—1933, depression, a dark chapter in our heritage. Our people stood in long breadlines; jobless men were desperate. I gave the embers a poke, and tongues of orange shot up. Fire rekindled; spirit rekindled. We didn't give up. The same spirit and ability which had brought us this far came rushing back. We rose out of depression and surged forward, a strong and resilient nation.

From here on it was forward; by 1947 we were heading for success. We had fought two World Wars and were a recognized world power. Here is where my book ended. I had reviewed a number of events that were my American heritage, but it was not a complete picture. A history book cannot tell of the intangible elements that have made America and Americans. We have had our triumphs, our defeats, and our disgraces; we have exulted in our victories and laughed at our peculiarities.

Living up to a past such as ours and continuing to fight for the ideals for which we stand is a large order to fill. I am proud to have a part in this, however, for to paraphrase the words of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, we as individuals should "ask not what the other man can do to enhance the heritage of those in the future but what we ourselves can do."

St. Patrick's Day Speech by Michael F. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Michael F. Smith, of New Jersey, one of the most charming and persuasive American sons of the Auld Sod.

Ireland never had a better ambassador than our good friend Mike Smith. We in New Jersey are fortunate to have the benefit of his warm smile and his firm hand.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY SPEECH BY MICHAEL F. SMITH, MARCH 17, 1964

No fair man ever begrudged an Irishman's words of praise for the glories of Irish history, the beauty of Irish women, the holiness of Irish saints, the erudition of Irish scholars, or the dear imprisoned sunlight of Irish whisky. What might rightly be construed as boasting if said by an Italian, a German, or an Icelander, must be regarded as a simple declaration of fact if proclaimed by a son of Erin. Indeed, his praise of things Irish would of necessity always remain understatement.

One might single out, for example, the astonishing capacity of the Irish to emerge victorious over the whips and scorns of time; the ignorance of malice of those not so fortunate as to be of Irish ancestry. Within living memory, it was a commonplace to see signs in the city of Boston announcing "Help wanted," with the qualification, "Irish need not apply," appended. Yankee employers, the Lord be good to 'em, were not really discriminating against Hibernians. It was just that their Yankee shrewdness perceived that their own puny efforts to leave a mark on American history would be swallowed up in the driving energy, rare abilities, disarming charm, and fay good luck of Celtic employees.

It is by no means astonishing that this same Boston has given our country the first statesman to promise his electorate the moon—and mean it. But unfortunately his young life was ended by an assassin's bullet.

There's more than a bit of cork in the Irish. They cannot be submerged for long; it was of this breed that the axiom was first coined, "You can't keep a good man down." Let me direct your attention to just one historic proof of that curious destiny by which the Irish, though often repressed, are never depressed; though often regarded with jaundiced eye by the bewildered non-Irish—yet possess a marvelous gift of turning adversity into achievement by employing outrage as a ladder to the stars.

Turn with me for a moment to the year 1848 when the young Irish disorders are rocking the Emerald Isle. Nine lads stand before the bar of English justice (I use the term "justice" here loosely). For their part in the ancient struggle to cast off the yoke of tyranny and free the human spirit from thralldom to the invader, these young men have been tried for treason against Her Majesty, the Queen, found quilty, and are about to be sentenced. Attend while the herald of history trumpets out their names: John Mitchell, Thomas McGee, Richard O'Gorman, Morris Lyene, Charles Duffy, Terrance McManus, Patrick Donhue, Thomas Meagher, and Michael Ireland.

The stern-faced judge, the legal representative of the occupying power, fixes a baleful stare upon the nine brave defendants standing erect before him. "What have you to say in your own defense," he intones, "before I pronounce sentence upon you?" Meagher, upon behalf of all, speaks out in ringing tones:

"My lord, this is our first offense but not our last; if you will be easy with us this once, we promise, on our word as gentlemen, to try and do better next time. And next time—sure, we won't be fools enough to get caught."

Thereupon, the indignant judge sentenced them all to be hanged by the neck until dead, and drawn and quartered in the approved fashion. Protests from all over the world at this barbarous sentence forced the hand of Queen Victoria—she commuted the penalty to deportation for life to far-off, still-primitive Australia. Well might these nine patriots sing out the poet's words:

"O, Ireland, must we leave you
Driven by a tyrant's hand
Must we seek a mother's blessing
In a strange and distant land?"

In 1874, word reached the astounded Queen Victoria that the celebrated Sir Charles Duffy, who had just been elected Prime Minister of Austrialia, was the same Charles Duffy who had been deported some 25 years before. At the Queen's order, the records of the rest of the defendants convicted for treason against the Crown at this same trial were searched out. Here is what was uncovered:

Thomas Meagher, Governor of Montana; Terrance McManus, brigadier general, U.S. Army; Patrick Donahue, brigadier general, U.S. Army; Richard O'Gorman, Governor General of Newfoundland; Morris Lyene, attorney general of Australia, in which office Michael Ireland succeeded him; Thomas D'Arcy McGee, Member of Parliament, Montreal, Minister of Agriculture and president of Council, Dominion of Canada; and John Mitchell; distinguished New York political leader and father of New York Mayor John Purroy Mitchell.

It is sometimes thought that the first Irish American organization in America, known as the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, was founded in New York City, but the fact is that Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love, was (appropriately enough) the site of its birth—the date: March 17, 1771. Although some of us neither look at it nor feel it, we are therefore older than our beloved American Republic. Two honorary members of the

Friendly Sons of St. Patrick were present at that first meeting, and were also signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Filial organizations appeared in subsequent years in Ohio, Minnesota, Washington, Virginia, and other areas. It has always remained a nonsectarian group, not because its members do not except the need for loyalty to their own religious convictions, but because they are keenly aware of the frailties and limitations of the human spirit, along with its noblest aspirations. They are not in any sense a church society, but a God-fearing mand-made society, and we have accepted perforce the sentiments of Thomas Moore, that lyric singer of Irish ballads:

"Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side
In the cause of mankind if our creeds agree?
Shall I give up the friend I have valued and tried,
If he kneel not before the same altar as me?"

Our great seal was adopted in 1772, and it symbolizes, in rare artistic form, the dedication of our strength to the best traditions of Irish-American principles of glorious liberty. Expectedly, for an Irish lover takes no second place to the more flamboyant French and Italians so far as the gentler sex is concerned, a lovely woman adorns the medal; she is supported by a harp—that is, the musical instrument, not the man. St. Patrick, vested in the full regalia of his spiritual office is depicted driving out the snakes.

We've never been content merely to wave the shamrock; brandish the shillelagh and practice the brogue. We are conscious of our duties as friendly but we shall pass over, in typical Celtic humility, our long, unbroken, and generous record of philanthropic labors to needy fellow men, regardless of creed, race, or color. We have even, on occasion, shown largess toward the natives of perfidious Albion.

Of Gen. George Washington it is rightly said that he was first in war and first in peace. He was also one of the first honorary members. The rolls of this organization include many celebrated warriors, and the clank of arms raised in just battle have rung sweetly in the ears of those who went before us. I shall refrain from telling of General Moyland, fierce in combat with his "Moylan's Dragoons" in the U.S. War of Independence. Nor shall I pause to narrate how the Light Horse Troop of Philadelphia, also renowned for its part in the Revolutionary cause, was largely composed of sons of Erin, who perhaps saw the war as affording also an opportunity to strike a blow for a freedom their fathers knew not when Brittania ruled the Irish Sea.

Capt. John Barry, the father of the U.S. Navy, was one of our own. The secretary of the Continental Congress, Charles Thomson, counted it a privilege to be similarly identified. He it was who first prepared the Declaration of Independence for publication from the manuscript of Thomas Jefferson. But the list of eminent soldiers, statesmen, patriotic leaders, grows too long, and I must not weary your patience even in the blessed task of enumerating the matchless achievements of our predecessors.

One is not at liberty to omit, however, mention of the cultural contributions the Irish have made to American life. For example: Victor Herbert, the great composer, founded the glee club of the New York branch of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and its songs reflected that magic blend of joy and gentle melancholy so inseparably woven into the Irish spirit.

In the crucible of privation at Valley Forge; in the surging years of our glorious Republic's infanthood; in the dynamic economic, industrial, social, and cultural expansion of later decades; amid the awesome national and international responsibility that maturity has brought this fair land—our society has left an indelible stamp upon the history and high purposes of these United States. Invisibly but really, our escutcheon blends into the stars and bars of Old Glory. I say to you, gentlemen, that we are proud of our Irish past and its imperishable role in the drama of American history. We cherish the lofty heritage that is ours and aspire to guard it safely against all tarnish.

Unto you, my brothers, and unto all those sons of men who are not so privileged as we to be of Irish ancestry—and their great loss and sorrow it is indeed—in parting I leave all with this Irish wish:

May the road rise to meet you
May the wind be ever at your back
May the good Lord ever keep you in the hollow of His hand
May your heart be as warm as your hearthstone
And when you come to die may the wail of the poor be the only sorrow you'll leave behind.
May God bless you always.

Many Outstanding Newspapers Support Federal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, ever since the House of Representatives voted down the Federal pay raise bill, on March 12, many of the Nation's greatest newspapers have published editorials deploring this adverse action.

Newspapers generally feel that after 9 years, it is high time for Congress to vote itself a pay raise. They also feel that the salaries of higher level civil servants and of Federal Judges should be increased. Above all, they feel very strongly that the postal employees and other Federal workers in the lower echelons should be given a decent raise in pay.

I submit for the attention of my colleagues and for the attention of the American people a representative selection of editorials appearing in widely scattered parts of the country favoring a substantial Federal pay raise:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1964]

INCREASING FEDERAL PAY

A shortsighted and small-minded coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats has voted down a salary-increase bill in the House of Representatives, but this decision should not be permitted to stand. The bill can and should be revived through action initiated either in the House or Senate.

The measure which deserves this second chance would raise by an average of about 5 percent the pay of a million and a half white-collar classified employees and postal workers. It would increase by somewhat more than this the pay of Cabinet members and of other top-level Federal officials, and of all Federal judges. It would lift the salaries of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500. The annual cost of the whole plan would be $545 million. It would be worth it.

It would be worth it because it is good economy to pay salaries high enough to attract topnotch men and women into Federal office and to keep them there in the face of increased competition for their services. One of the most familiar, and discouraging, stories in Washington is the loss by one Federal agency after another of public servants who are doing an excellent job, who like their work and want to go on with it, but who feel compelled to turn elsewhere for a better income.

It is perfectly conceivable that there will be an exodus from Washington of high-quality officials who cannot afford to stay unless a bill of this kind is passed. They should not be asked to make the financial sacrifice they are making—and this comment applies particularly to those in the upper levels of Government.

In the case of Members of Congress, there is a particularly strong argument for higher salaries. This is the desirability of freeing Congressmen from the need or the temptation of supplementing their Federal pay by outside work which may easily involve a conflict of interest with their legislative work. A genuinely hard-working Congressman, ready and equipped to face intelligently and conscientiously each piece of public business as it arises, is worth every bit of $32,500.

No petty political considerations should be allowed to block reconsideration of this bill.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 14, 1964]

SNEAKY, THEN COWARDLY

Representative GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, is the most unpopular man in Congress today. He showed up a majority of his fellow House Members as political cowards.

The leadership of both paties in both Houses has been supporting a pay raise bill that would have given $545 million a year to 1.7 million employees. Tucked away in the measure was a flat $10,000 raise for Members of Congress—bringing their salaries from $22,500 to $32,500, a 44-percent boost.

The bill proposed needed changes in salaries for top administrators, Cabinet members, the judiciary, and other important officials. The Government has a hard time filling many top jobs because the salary scales are not competitive with private enterprise. The pay raise would not have made them competitive, either, but it would have increased compensation enough to attract more qualified men to Government service. The bill also provided desirable adjustments for many other civil servants.

Congressmen deserved some raise, too, for they have not had one in 9 years. Civil servants have had six raises in that period. The argument that some Congressmen are not worth what they get may be valid. But most of them are, and many who lack private means have a hard time meeting expenses. Even with their many fringe and other benefits they find it costly to meet travel expenses, keep up their homes in two communities, and run their offices properly.

However, it was the plan to be sneaky about the pay raise. Most Congressmen wanted to rush the bill through by voice vote or division, which would not record how individual Congressmen voted. Thus a Congressman could vote for the raise and then denounce it to make his constituents believe he had opposed it.

But Representative GROSS managed to get about 100 of his fellows to demand a rollcall vote, which would put everyone on record. And on the rollcall, scores of those who supported the pay raise were afraid to say so—they voted "No" so they would not have to go home and face the charge at election time that they had lined their own pockets.

Thus many deserving civil servants will not get raises unless the bill can be revived, which is unlikely. And many Congressmen are going to have to continue in a financial bind, because they were afraid to stand up and be counted for what they believed.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 15, 1964]

UNFORTUNATE FLIPFLOP

The House voted its fears and not its judgment. The debate on the proposed Government salary adjustments and the preliminary voting on amendments made it unmistakably clear that the bill had the approval of a large majority. The House made a special point of shouting down an amendment to reduce the $10,000 increase which the bill carried for members of the Cabinet, Supreme Court Justices, and Congressmen. But when Representative H. R. GROSS demanded and obtained a rollcall vote, Members ran to cover and voted down the entire bill.

The performance of the House is typical. Most of the Members of Congress who are not independently wealthy and who do not live in safe districts feel the squeeze from biennial campaigns and the cost of maintaining homes in Washington as well as in their own districts. They recognize also the force of the arguments heard from many expert bodies that have studied the problem—that top salaries in all three branches of the Government are far out of line with compensation for similar service and responsibility in industry and the professions. The Government is losing far too many in top scientific, administrative, and professional jobs because the salaries are so far out of line with what they can earn elsewhere.

Logic runs strongly in favor of correcting these inequities. But the House leaders chose a very poor time to press the issue. Much of the opposition arose from the fact that the pay-raise bill came on the heels of the tax reduction at a moment when the administration is laying great emphasis on economy. We do not think there is any inconsistency between the tax cut designed to stimulate the national economy and salary adjustments that should have been made long ago. But the appearance of voting themselves a substantial increase just after reducing the Federal revenue was too much for vote-conscious legislators to face.

Perhaps the best course now would be to pass a separate pay raise for classified and postal employees and leave the other segments of the bill providing for judges, Congressmen, and top executives until after the election. Sooner or later the more controversial issue will have to be faced. This prosperous Nation can afford to pay its key personnel reasonable compensation, and legislators will have to find the courage to support their convictions and then help their constituents to understand it.

[From the Worthington (Minn.) Daily Globe, Mar. 12, 1964]

A $10,000 PAY INCREASE?

If the Members of the Congress have the courage to vote themselves a $10,000 per year pay increase (on Wednesday Congressmen were still trying to duck a rollcall vote on the question), it would be neither an undeserved remuneration nor an outrageous action.

At present Senators and Representatives receive $22,500. The increase would give them $32,500. That is a handsome figure, to be sure. But it is not a thing which is going to make the Members of the U.S. Congress rich.

As Government expenses go—even as private expenses go—this is a "spit in the ocean." Each Representative, for example, has approximately 400,000 constitutents. On a per capita basis, the pay increase would mean that each constituent would pay a total of 7 cents per year to maintain a Representative in Washington. That is hardly a tax burden, and it is a small price to pay for democratic government.

At the same time, the Representative, is still going to have little, if any, extra cash to salt away in a bank.

For one thing, each Representative must maintain two homes. He must be a resident of his congressional district; the Constitution requires that. But, with Congress in almost continuous session, the Representative must also have a home in Washington. He must travel back and forth between Washington and his home regularly. It is incumbent upon him to keep in regular contact with the people he represents. And travel is no small expense.

Considering the cost of the times, the importance of the work the man is doing, comparable executive salaries in industry, and the extraordinary expenses of the position, we will not complain about our 7-cent assessment.

[From the Sunday Patriot-News, Harrisburg, Pa., Mar. 15, 1964]

MEN AND MONEY

The honorable Members were perfectly willing to stand up and be counted in one big group. What they resisted was to pass and be recognized, one by one.

This is what happened Thursday when the House of Representatives arrived at the moment of truth on the bill to raise the pay of some 1.7 million Federal employees, including the Representatives themselves.

First the House passed the bill, on a voice vote. Then that old curmudgeon from Iowa, Republican Representative H. R. GROSS, forced a rollcall, and the bill went down, 222 to 184.

So a bill that had much to commend it failed for two reasons. The Congressmen's embarrassment about voting themselves a raise in an election year triumphed over their cupidity. But earlier, when the bill was drawn up, their cupidity had triumphed over their sense of responsibility.

H.R. 8986 provided for $545 million in annual Federal pay increases. The increases ranged from 2 percent to about 44 percent. Need we mention that it was the Congressmen who were to receive the 44 percent?

But the bill was not, as Mr. GROSS proclaimed, "an unwarranted raid on the U.S. Treasury." The truth is that Federal salaries are much too low and much too inequitable, especially in the upper brackets, compared to salaries paid by private business and even by many States and municipalities. This has been the conclusion of just about every official and unofficial panel that has studied the matter.

We declare that ours is a government of laws, not men. But men make the laws and administer them and judge in accordance with them. When the best men, as is so often the case, feel they cannot afford to go into public service, the country must settle for second best or less.

This is not to say that best men do not often go into public service. But it really makes no sense when Robert S. McNamara, administrator of the multibillion-dollar Defense Establishment—the Nation's largest business—receives the same salary as Pennsylvania's commissioner of mental health—$25,000. Nor when FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover receives $8,000 a year less than the $30,000 received by Chicago's police chief. Nor when the New York secretary of state, whose duties include the issuance of barber's licenses, gets $3,000 more than the $25,000 paid to the U.S. Secretary of State. Nor when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare receives the same $25,000 as the Omaha, Nebr., superintendent of schools. Nor when many of the Nation's top legal minds refuse appointments to the Federal judiciary because they are earning 2, 4, 10 times as much in private life.

It is probably impossible ever to make governmental salaries comparable to those paid by private industry, but it is not impossible—indeed, it is indispensible—to reduce the disparity.

As for Congressmen, their pay, too, is probably insufficient in view of their responsibilities and their expenses. Getting elected costs easily as much as a Congressman's annual $22,500 salary—and usually more.

The difference is that, in the higher echelons of the Federal administration and the Federal judiciary, it is often the job that seeks the man. In Congress, it is almost always the other way around.

We think the course of responsibility in the pay raise bill would have been for the Congressmen to ask for more but not so much more—say, an additional $3,000. If they had, they could have voted on an important measure with a minimum of embarrassment, and they probably would have passed it.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Mar. 15, 1964]

PAY RAISES

Those liberal Democrats who voted against the congressional pay raise because it would be "political suicide" to approve it very probably knew what they were talking about.

The proposal called for a boost from $22,500 a year to $32,500—or almost 45 percent. How would Congressmen explain this to their constituents who haven't had a job, much less a pay raise for month after weary month? In the light of such a boost for themselves, how could they expect the unions to keep their wage demands within the administration's guidelines?

It is not our belief that Congress should forget about any increase. No doubt higher pay is in order for Members of Congress and in the judicial and executive establishments. There should be a relationship, however, between pay increases and merit. And some rule of reason should govern the size of the raises.

Any raises approved in the future, incidentally, should include something for District officials. Proposals for higher pay for them were defeated after the House had tentatively adopted every increase in the Federal pay bill and just before the Members hastily retreated down the Hill in the face of a rollcall vote demanded by Representative GROSS.

Senator DIRKSEN and other seem to think a pay bill can be adopted this year. We hope this is correct—subject only to the reservation that the increases must be reasonable.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, Mar. 16, 1964]

FEDERAL PAY RATES NEED SECOND LOOK

The House of Representatives threw out the baby with the bath water when it nixed pay increases for Federal employees. Pique at having to vote on the record for a provision boosting their own salaries seems to have been a major motivation for the thumbs-down vote.

As House Members realized, fatter plums for Congressmen would be hard to explain away in an election year when most lawmakers are whooping it up for Government economy. When the demand was made for a rollcall vote that would commit legislators in full view of the electorate, they backed off, toppling all provisions of the bill, along with the me-first pay hike.

A pretty good case can be made for the other salary increases which went down the drain. Federal Government chairmans many of the Nation's most important activities, from defense to delivering the mail. To function effectively, it must maintain pay incentives at least moderately competitive with industry.

Now, however, proponents of the measure, smarting from the stinging defeat, are

reluctant to give it another try. They would be wise to reconsider. Shorn of its embarrassing provision for House and Senate pay boosts, the bill might stand up more sturdily the next time around.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Reporter, Mar. 16, 1964]

PAY BILL REFLECTIONS

The critical point in defeat of the congressional pay raise bill came when Representative H. R. GROSS of Iowa got more than one-fifth of the Members of the House to support his demand for a rollcall vote.

This meant that every Congressman saying "yes" would have to be listed on a permanent record as voting a $10,000 pay boost for himself. It meant that the Congressman had to decide not on the merits of the pay proposal but on whether he could be reelected after voting himself the $10,000 jump.

It is unfortunate that the defeat also meant that lower paid Government employees must lose. Our Government wage scales are not especially lavish. Having once delivered mail briefly, we are quite sure that our postmen are entitled to more pay than they get.

It is noteworthy, however, that every salary proposal in the measure sailed through the House of Representatives without a hitch, so long as there was a voice vote which didn't identify the voter. As soon as the vote was recorded, 37 "no" voters were joined by 185 others for a total vote of 222 to 184 against the measure.

We feel more respect for the original 37 opponents than the 185 who joined them later, and more respect for the 184 Representatives who stayed true to their beliefs even though they went no record for all to behold.

For the information of all, Representative ULLMAN, of eastern Oregon, voted for the bill. Representative WALTER NORBLAD of Stayton voted against it. We don't know how he voted previous to the showdown. Representatives EDITH GREEN and ROBERT DUNCAN were absent.

There is scant possibility, the political experts say, that the measure will be revived. It would be an act of maturity if the sections of the bill not dealing with Congress could be recalled and passed. The congressional pay then could be considered alone, on its own merits.

But it probably would be expecting too much of mere mortals to ask our Representatives to pass impartially on their own pay scale, without camouflage all along the line to help the undecided swing over to the positive side.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Mar. 14, 1964]

NO RAISE—JUST JITTERS

The U.S. House of Representatives has done itself little credit with its handling of the Federal pay rise issue.

The House voted down the whole proposition this week; but only as the confused finish of a muddleheaded story.

Its first blunder came when the Congressmen insisted on cutting themselves in on raises proposed for two quite different groups of Federal employees.

In the first of these groups were postal workers and thousands of generally lower paid clerical career people. The second group included top-bracket men in the judiciary, the Cabinet, etc.

Valid arguments could be presented for each of these groups. The upper bracket men are normally of the sort who might double their present income in private industry; the raise was meant as an inducement to attract top-caliber personnel into Government service. In the second group, postal and other lower paid workers not only need extra money to stay somewhere near their equals who work for private firms, but have for years suffered from an imbalance created by too many flat across-the-board percentage increments. This year's bill was designed to put jobs and salaries into a more orderly relationship.

But the Congressmen jumped in with a $10,000-a-year raise for themselves as part of the package. This took brass, and on second thought many Congressmen grew nervous, caught between their wish to be fair to themselves (or their greed) and fear of reprisals from voters who think some Congressmen are overpaid even at the present $22,500 a year.

As the confusion rolled on, the House voted down an effort to separate its own pay boost from the rest. Then, forced to stand and be counted in a rollcall, the Congressmen voted down the whole deal.

This presumably is supposed to win admiration from the taxpayers in the name of self-sacrificing economy. What it really sacrificed is a great number of people working for the National Government—the mailman, the secretary, the scientist—who had big plans for another $450 a year.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Mar. 19, 1964]

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL PAY INCREASES

President Johnson has not given up hope that Congress will pass a pay raise bill at the present session. The House defeated such a bill last week, one that included a $10,000 a year salary increase for Members of Congress—from $22,500 to $32,500. This was a case of election year jitters not an exercise in humility and self-disparagement.

Now the President asks Congress to try again, even if it must exclude a pay raise for itself. We agree with him that "It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre and repel the talented." If the Federal Government is to recruit and hold officials of outstanding competence in top policy positions, it must offer pay comparable to that received in private industry. But the gap between Federal and private pay scales has been growing, rather than lessening, and the President properly considers this a matter of serious concern.

A new bill introduced in the House provides no increase at all for Representatives and Senators but gives substantial pay raises to a wide range of high-level officials, including Cabinet members, deputy and under secretaries, heads of principal services, judges, etc. Other increases are stipulated for civil service and postal workers.

There are difficulties in store for this bill. Many of the new salaries would exceed those paid Members of Congress, a fact not likely to ease the bill's passage. Prolonged in-fighting over the civil rights bill may prove to be another adverse factor.

But the pay increases are plainly needed and President Johnson says that every cent required for them is included in his budget for the next fiscal year. Congress should not hesitate to enact them at the present session.

[From the Worthington (Minn.) Daily Globe, Mar. 16, 1964]

IF WE CAN'T HAVE MORE PAY NO ONE ELSE CAN EITHER

Congressmen decided during the weekend that their proposed $10,000 per year pay increase, justified or not, would be inexpedient to adopt in the spring of an election year. All was going well for the bill and favorable action was predicted until Iowa's Representative, H. R. GROSS, demanded a rollcall vote which would put every Representative on record. At that point supporters of the proposal seemed to vanish into the very desks and walls of the House Chamber and the measure was rejected.

It seemed a valid case could be made for the salary increases. But finally, this becomes a matter of great concern only to the lawmakers themselves. If they are satisfied that income is meeting expenses and that a pay increase cannot be justified then certainly no taxpayer will complain. The Congressmen themselves are the best judges of their own financial needs.

The unfortunate thing about the lawmakers' decision was their dog-in-the-manger attitude—"If we can't have a pay increase then no one else can have one either." The proposal for increasing the Representatives' salaries was tied to an authorization which would have granted pay increases to 1.7 million Federal Government employees. It included, for example, a $37.50 monthly pay hike (on the average) for the Nation's mail carriers and $37.50 each month for Government secretaries. The proposal had the strong endorsement of the House leadership and of the administration.

These pay increase proposals were not something pulled out of a hat. They were arrived at by months of tedious study and examination of pay scales and they represented the first hope for salary adjustments in behalf of the Federal workers in a long period. The evidence that Government salaries across the Nation were lagging far behind cost-of-living increases in recent years and behind salary adjustments in all other areas of the economy stirred an impressive list of endorsements for the proposed pay increases.

Whether there may be too many Government employees and whether there may be persons employed to perform unnecessary jobs is a legitimate concern of economizers and of all citizens. But that is not the question at this juncture.

The question now is whether those persons employed by the Federal Government should receive a salary which is adequate and justified compensation for the work performed and for the needs of the worker in the present economy—a living wage. It is grossly unfair to suggest that because an individual agrees to work at a Government job he should receive a substandard wage.

If any given job is unnecessary then of course it should be eliminated. But if the job is counted essential, if the worker is performing a necessary and useful service, certainly he should be adequately compensated.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican Senate minority leader, announced during the weekend that he proposes to revive the pay bill which the House has now killed. DIRKSEN recognizes the unfair position which the House has taken.

If the Congressmen are convinced their own salaries are adequate, well and good. But 1.7 million other Americans should not have to make a sacrifice for that reason.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 15, 1964]

JOHNSON'S MONEY PROBLEMS AND OTHER THINGS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—One of the persistently awkward things about the people who work for the Government in Washington is that they like to eat and have children and be paid for their hire like other members of the human race.

This has created a problem for every President since General Washington, and Lyndon Johnson is no exception. His appointments so far have been good, but he has lost several brilliant men from the old Kennedy team, including Ted Sorensen, Kenneth Galbraith, Jerome Wiesner, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the Congress has added to the brain drain by refusing to pass the administration's pay-raise bill.

Some of this drift of talent was inevitable and some of it was desirable. There is al-

ways an evacuation in every election year, and President Johnson should and will have his own men if he wins in November. But holding or recruiting talented and experienced men who are tough enough to stand up to Lyndon Johnson 18 hours a day, 7 days in the week has been made all the more difficult by freezing wages even below academic, let alone industrial or commercial levels.

PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

Part of the difficulty is that Congress has refused to raise the pay of one group of public servants unless it can raise them all. It draws no distinction between a secretary who wrestles with letters and an Under Secretary who wrestles with De Gaulle. In short, it has ignored the fact that there are too many drones at the bottom of the Government and too few brains at the top.

Also, the Congress, not unnaturally, feels that if the executives in the Government get more money, Congressmen, who also pay rent and have children, should get more too, and this would bring the across-the-board pay hike to $545 million a year, which is more than some Congressmen think the voters would be in a mood to approve after the Bobby Baker case in an election year.

So long as Congress refuses to distinguish between a postman and a scientist and between the shortage of brains and the surplus of bodies in Washington, the problem is insoluble, but there is a way to reconcile sanity with solvency.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 21, 1964]

A SENATOR'S SALARY

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, followed the lead of a number of his colleagues in making public his personal finances the other day. And in doing so he made a pretty good case for those who say that the $22,500 annual salary Members of Congress get doesn't go very far. In Senator DOUGLAS' case it shrinks to nearly $7,000 before he gets it home.

During 1963, the Senator reports, he had to spend $2,515 of his own money—over and above his annual $307 mileage allowance—to travel back and forth to Illinois. He spent another $2,254 for radio and television tapes to keep in touch with constituents and let them know his thoughts on legislation. Constituents who came to Washington and called on him cost him $1,560 more, mainly for lunches he bought them. Another $1,276 went for advertising, telegrams, various memberships and subscriptions. And he gave $1,731 in contributions to political organizations—which he considers as much of a duty as contributions to churches and charity. Then he paid $3,830 in income taxes on his base salary and $1,687 for an annuity fund contribution.

The Senator could obviously not live in Washington as a Senator must on what was left. But he did pick up $5,000 for lectures, $1,587 in dividends, $1,378 in capital gains, $231 in interest, $2,270 in annuities from the University of Chicago, where he had been a professor; $1,261 in other annuities, $750 for magazine and other writings and $30 in royalties on a book he wrote earlier.

That is pinpoint accounting for a Senator. But it does show how deeply a man without sizable outside means must cut into his congressional salary to pay expenses necessary to his public position—and why, for men like this at any rate, a salary raise is needed. It's a good argument for reviving the pay bill just killed by the House—particularly when added to the convincing argument other civil servants have for pay raises under that bill.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, Mar. 20, 1964]

MORE PAY FOR BETTER U.S. SERVICE

When the House of Representatives defeated a bill to give Members of Congress a $10,000 boost in pay because it was reluctant to risk a rollcall vote in an election year, it also killed proposed pay boosts for 1.7 million employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government. President Johnson now has made a good case for restoration of the latter increases. A bill to that effect but leaving out Members of Congress has been introduced.

The President, in letters to House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Senate President Pro Tempore CARL HAYDEN, wrote that failure to enact the pay bill would impair his efforts to achieve true economy in Government. He added that it would make it "harder than ever to recruit and hold the outstanding people who need for our top policy jobs." He made these pertinent points:

"It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented. They (outstanding people) already earn less—often far less—than they did earn, or could earn, in private jobs. This salary gap has been growing. The proposed bill will not close it, but it will reverse a dangerous trend."

We agree that the Government needs the best people it can get to staff its offices. And we are not disposed to debate President Johnson's contention that congressional membership is most deserving of a pay increase, although we don't like to see legislators vote raises for themselves while in office.

We endorse the President's statement that he needs first-class managers who can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort. And we see reason to accept his assurances that "the dollars paid to attract brains and ability to the Federal service will come back to the American people many times over in more economical and effective government."

What's more, every cent for the proposed increases to Federal employees is already included in the administration's budget which takes effect July 1. Favorable action is indicated.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Mar. 18, 1964]

FEDERAL PAY POINT

If Federal employes generally deserve a pay increase—and Congress seems agreed this is the case—then it should be granted regardless of whether the Representatives and Senators wish to vote higher salaries for themselves. Fair and reasonable pay scales for 2 million Government workers should not be dependent on whether 435 Representatives and 100 Senators believe the political climate is favorable for their own personal objectives.

President Johnson was well justified in raising this point in his letter to Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and other Congressional leaders.

Funds needed for the general Federal pay increase were included in the President's budget for fiscal 1965. Congress stood ready to approve the program, but then tacked on a $10,000-a-year raise for its own Members. House Members got cold feet on this item when it came to a record vote, and the whole pay program was killed, at least temporarily. It may be revived in the Senate.

Members of Congress probably could vote themselves a $5,000 increase without great public reaction. Or they could skip action on their own payrolls entirely. But if they are convinced the Federal Government would operate better by raising the salaries of the ordinary workers and those in administrative positions, then that part of the program should be approved.

Running the Government is a big business operation. Pay of Government employes should be commensurate to that in private business for comparable work.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal]

A WARY CONGRESS SHORTCHANGES FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

In the interests of capably run Government, the House should reconsider the bill granting pay raises to Federal employees. The other day the House turned down this $545 million increase—including a 44-percent increase for House Members—in a rollcall vote that lacked full-hearted assertion or conviction. It was clear that because the Members would be voting themselves a hefty raise by voice vote, they had little heart to face the public for the sake of the rest of the legislation. Thus the fate of such a vast expenditure affecting pay envelopes of some 1.7 million Federal civil service workers and clerks was obviously not decided through any thorough survey of Federal pay scales. Rather, it was the survival instinct of the officeholder that shaped the decision.

Earlier in the debate when no one was required to stand up and be counted, an attempt to put off the raises until the national budget was balanced was turned down easily. So was the suggestion that the whole matter be deferred until a Government study was completed and the lawmakers had time to analyze it. An attempt by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, to strike the congressional pay increase from the measure also was voted down.

But then came the shattering rollcall vote on the entire bill. It was as though House Members suddenly comprehended the wisdom of the administration's economy drive or saw their constituents face to face. More likely, the vote merely accentuated the hazards of an election year, and for many Congressmen, conscious of job security, it was hardly the time to boost the size of their salaries. Certainly after the votes were counted, many Congressmen were rueful, having missed out on a pay hike from the present $22,500 to $32,500.

But it's a regrettable blow to civil service morale that the bill was rejected out of narrow concerns. Such decisionmaking offers precious little satisfaction to the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees who look to Congress to act responsibly with intelligent grasp of the scope of pay raise proposals and to consider the consequences of their decision. These workers are hardly overpaid. Further, there is the continuing need to furbish the civil service with improved salaries; there are few other ways to draw competent recruits. The same imperatives apply to adequate salaries for Federal judgeships, also treated highhandedly by the House.

A solution might be in the new bill submitted by Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, Democrat, of Louisiana; it doesn't include the $10,000 annual increase for Members of Congress, and this sensitive feature could be put off until a nonelection year.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Mar. 16, 1964]

PAY RAISES FOR CONGRESSMEN

To us, it seems a shame that Members of the House of Representatives did not have the courage of their convictions and go through with their proposal to raise the pay

of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500.

Their proposal to do so had been thoroughly aired in committee hearings without raising any public outcry. Their argument sounded logical: To enable the Government to compete with private industry and get capable men for public service, Congress had to raise their salaries.

Why shouldn't the elected representatives of the people, men and women chosen to run the Government of the United States, be paid at a corresponding rate, and more, than the people who work in the various departments under them?

Once a rollcall vote was demanded, however, many Members didn't want to put themselves on record as voting themselves such a large increase in an election year. Their opponents would be sure to make it a campaign issue, and many voters might fall for their demagogery.

But Members of the House have to run for reelection every 2 years anyway. That is why they go along for years without getting an increase as they vote pay raises for other Government employees.

In our opinion, the laborer should be worthy of his hire, and we believe most Americans would prefer to think Members of Congress were worth more than men holding lesser jobs both in government and private industry. And got it.

[From the Morning Advocate, Baton Rouge, La., Mar. 25, 1964]

LOGIC ON THE SUBJECT OF FEDERAL PAY RATES

The Federal pay raise bill was defeated for the reason that most Members of the House of Representatives simply did not have the nerve to vote themselves a substantial pay increase in an election year. So, when Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, demanded a rollcall vote, the pay raise measure, which might have passed on any other kind of vote, went down. With it went the proposed $10,000 a year increase for Representatives, Senators, Federal judges, and Cabinet members, the $450 a year boost for letter carriers and others, and the 3-percent raise for the lowest paid civil service workers.

There were strong arguments against the bill as it came before the House, one being that it was topheavy with large pay raises for those already the best paid, and another being that it was ill timed from the viewpoint of the election and of President Johnson's economy drive. But the fact remains that this time, as in the past, much of what was said and written on the subject was shortsighted and ill considered. A case can be made for better pay for many Government workers.

Governmental pay rates in the lower brackets, especially, are badly out of line, and on the low side, not the high side. The mailmen, among many others, deserve a pay raise. Higher pay for stenographers and clerical workers would be a lifesaver for many governmental agencies, enabling them to find and keep a higher percentage of more competent employees instead of serving, as many of them do, as training schools and way stations for youngsters and other workers interested only in moving to jobs in industry and business after they have acquired a little experience.

The same thing is true of pay for State and many other civil service employees. Salaries are lower than in business and industry for comparable work. Raises are small and infrequent, advancement and recognition sometimes are almost impossible.

As for the salaries of those in the higher echelons, it must be said that if the Government wants to get and keep topnotch people—and surely it is hard to argue that the Government should want any other kind—it is going to have to pay something approximating what these same people would make in business or industry for the same work. The logic of that seems incontrovertible.

[From the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus, Mar. 23, 1964]

SALARY MEASURE

There is new legislation in the House which would furnish pay raises for a million and a half or so Federal employees, all of whom saw their chances for more money go down the drain when the House on March 12 defeated on a rollcall vote the pay increase measure which included higher salaries for Congressmen. The new measure, embodying a number of compromises and carrying no pay hikes for Senators and Representatives, should be enacted in some form.

The reasons are several, as President Johnson outlined in a letter the other day to Speaker MCCORMACK in the House. The Chief Executive argues that the Federal Government must compete in employing competence with industry, business, education, research agencies, foundations, and private professions. These areas of employment attract the best brains and most able individuals because they pay well; Government because it does not meet the salary scales of these other areas find itself increasingly hard pressed to engage and retain competent people.

Contrary to what may be common impression, Federal employment is not increasing as rapidly as private and State and local government employment. During the past decade while the Nation's population arose 17 percent and nongovernment employment ascended by 10 percent, Federal civil employees increased by only 7 percent. In State and local governments the percentage of increase was 65. Granted there are overstaffed bureaucracies in some Federal Government areas and that there could be sizable trimmings without any loss of effectiveness, still the need for the best brains at the top and in the higher levels of Federal functioning is much more pressing today than ever.

In trying to make his program for greater economy work, President Johnson wrote, "I need first-class managers who can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort. It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented." And so it is.

In other words, Congress should come to embrace the principle that comparable pay must be the Federal Government's policy in employment; comparable pay if the necessary competence and ability to operate an increasingly complex Government is to be induced and retained.

And for those individuals who insist that Federal Government is getting too big and too costly, a reminder: There are now 13 Federal employees for every 1,000 Americans and 10 years ago the proportion was 14 for every 1,000. And as the President suggests, if more able people are hired the way is open for still further reduction of the ratio.

Appeasement by Apology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Mar. 25, 1964]

APPEASEMENT BY APOLOGY

Now that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has expressed the U.S. Government's profound regret over a South Vietnamese attack on a Cambodian border village last week, American foreign policy seems launched on a program of retreat by apology.

Foggy Bottom again shows a syndrome of abnormality in its policy structure: No backbone.

Tiny Red Cambodia, to which we contributed more than $150 million in aid before it went lock-stock to Communist China, not only blamed South Vietnam for what was no doubt an accidental attack on a Cambodian village. It blasted the United States because a few Americans were present during the assault, although they took no part.

Cambodia's demand for apologies and reparations immediately should have been ignored. At most a statement should have explained a mapreading error led to the fracas.

To rush with an immediate apology is part of the accommodation policy that plagues State Department thinking. It's getting so any nation, whether a major power or powerless upstart, can extort concessions from Washington just by blustering loudly enough.

Why apologize to Cambodia, when it is furnishing Red Vietcong guerillas with staging areas and passage to South Vietnam in a war for survival of freedom, to which the United States has dedicated 16,000 training troops and more than $500 million of arms and economic assistance?

It would make more sense if we were to warn Cambodia and North Vietnam that, if they did not cease helping the Viet Cong invaders, we would carry attack to the north and bomb Cambodian Red staging grounds.

A corollary instance of State's apology penchant is suggested by conduct in the case of the American flyers most recently shot down in East Germany, where they strayed by accident. Their RB-66 was destroyed by Red gunfire. One of the three flyers was hurt and has been returned to the West.

In demanding return of the other two from Russia, Secretary Rusk warned failure to restore the flyers to America would strain East-West co-operation (to whatever meager extent that exists).

On getting word the other two would be returned, Dean Rusk declared President Johnson has issued orders to make sure our pilots don't wander into Communist air again.

If this is not an apology, it comes thinly close. Report from Bonn is that Soviet pilots have strayed or deliberately flown over Allied territory 95 times in the last several years. Not one was shot down. Yet Mr. Rusk said nothing about Russian violations of Western air space.

We appear almost—not quite—in a position of apologizing for Reds shooting down our own plane and men. Incidentally, the two Air Force officers have not yet been returned by the Soviets.

Our manifest tendency to backtrack and apologize for our actions, even when clearly justified by U.S. right, is making a mockery of American prestige.

No one wants America to hurl its weight around indiscriminately. But power and leadership demand we stand for justice, respect and defense of national interests. We are steadily retreating from such posture.

Wealthy, powerful, a global leader, we need not expect to be loved by the rest of the world. This is a truism of history, whenever a great nation emerges.

But we must be respected, not merely in American interests but for preservation of peace and the free world.

This respect is dwindling fast because of a policy that abides insults and extortion, and by that very posture invites worse.

Mrs. Helen Kocan: Slovak Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, northern Indiana and the Nation lost one of its outstanding civic and religious leaders when Mrs. Helen Kocan, of 1823 LaPorte Avenue, in Whiting, Ind., the supreme president of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of America, passed away at her home Wednesday.

Mrs. Kocan was the recipient in 1963 of the Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice medal and citation from Pope Paul VI in recognition of her Catholic fraternal work. It was presented to her by Bishop Andrew G. Grutka at the National Convention of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union in Milwaukee, Wis. In 1907, Mrs. Kocan organized the Whiting Branch of the Junior Branch of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union with 34 members. The present membership is 1,053. She was elected supreme auditor in 1917, later was named supreme vice president, and elected supreme president in 1933. She organized a new district of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union in 1940 and it is now named for her.

The Villa Sancta Anna Home for the Aged in Cleveland, Ohio, was established under her guidance in 1960. She also organized the St. Ann Guild, an affiliate of the home in 1961. Mrs. Kocan was organizer and president for 30 years of St. Theresa Club in the St. John Parish of Whiting, Ind. She is honorary vice president of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, and an honorary officer of the Slovak League of America.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit excerpts from a tribute written in January 1961 by John C. Sciranka, American Slovak journalist of Passaic, N.J., which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date, setting out a few of the accomplishments of this great American woman of Slovak descent:

On Sunday, January 22, 1961, Mrs. Helen Kocan, supreme president of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, largest Slovak fraternal organization in the world, will observe her Diamond (75th) birthday in the city of Whiting, Lake County, Ind., where she has been a resident for the past half a century.

The membership of this Slovak ladies organization, numbering over 90,000 with assets over $31 million, has in the city of Whiting, Ind., the largest local branch, numbering some 1,400 members.

When Mrs. Kocan took over the reins of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, our country was in history's worst depression. That was 3 months after Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in 1933. With her supreme officers, she guided the organization to its present high standing, enjoying eminent prestige among the American fraternals. Last January 1960 it opened its million and half dollar Villa Sancta Annae Home for the Aged, near Cleveland, Ohio.

At Mrs. Kocan's suggestion a Slovak-American cookbook was published which enjoys its ninth edition and realized from sales over $75,000 for the home of the aged. Scholarships to students are awarded in its junior order.

The organization under her leadership gained the reputation as the most generous American Slovak fraternal, contributing large sums to religious and cultural causes.

It aided the publishing of various books and supported authors. It modernized its official organ the Zenska Jednota (Ladies Union) making it one of the most attractive American Slovak fraternal magazines. Mrs. Kocan is held in high esteem by her supreme officers, 90,000 members and her fellow American Slovaks.

In her duties as supreme president, she often said that she hates to see a thing done by halves and agreed with a teacher who said: "If it be right, do it boldly; if it be wrong, leave it undone."

Mrs. Kocan throughout her 75 years has been mindful of the old teaching that Christianity has lifted woman to a new place in the world.

Realizing the present plight of the women in her native Slovakia, Mrs. Kocan besides her many official duties is doing all she can for the freedom of the people of her native country, now enslaved by the Communists.

Her rise to the highest position among her countrymen in America is the best proof of the great opportunities this country offers.

We conclude our felicitations to this our Mrs. American Slovak Fraternalist with this verse of George Eliot:

And rank for her meant duty, various
Yet equal in its worth, done worthily.
Command was service; humblest service done
By willing and discerning souls was glory.

Happy birthday, Mrs. Kocan.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Opposes Secretary Udall's Modified Pacific Southwest Water Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California bears the heavy responsibility for meeting the water needs of 9 million southern Californians. Population increases every year boost that number of residents by the hundreds of thousands.

The board of directors of that district has carefully analyzed Secretary Udall's modified Pacific Southwest water plan and finds it wanting. Although the needs of Arizona are taken care of in the plan by means of immediate construction of the central Arizona project at Federal expense, the replacement of waters vitally needed to keep southern California alive are left hanging in air. The Secretary only suggests that these needs be met under future legislation of a nature which he concedes could not pass Congress if it were sought for the central Arizona project.

This is a matter of deep concern not only to Californians, but should be to the Nation as well. Southern California, as one of the Nation's most vital geographic areas, and its citizens and businesses who pay such a large share of the Federal tax bill, surely should not, at best be left in limbo, and, at worst, threatened with strangulation, by a plan conceived by a prominent official of the Government like Secretary Udall.

On March 17 the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California expressed their views on the revised Udall plan as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, ON SECRETARY OF INTERIOR UDALL'S MODIFIED PACIFIC SOUTHWEST WATER PLAN, MARCH 17, 1964.

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California opposes Secretary of the Interior Udall's modified Pacific Southwest water plan because it would result in the abandonment of the district's Colorado River aqueduct.

It is unthinkable that any Federal or State administration should advance, as part of a regional water plan, a proposal which would render useless an aqueduct now providing an indispensable source of water for the 9 million people of this district.

The district fully concurs in the principle that the water problems of the arid Southwest can best be solved by the cooperative action of all interests in the area.

Further, it approves of the concept of a regional water development fund dedicated to the complete utilization and conservation of the water resources of all the Pacific Southwest.

It believes that, instead of the proposal by the Secretary for enlarging a section of the California aqueduct, the first Federal moneys spent in California under any regional plan should contribute support to the State water plan and be used for the development of the water resources of this State's north coastal area for California's future growth.

The Pacific Southwest water plan in its present form offers the district at most only feasibility studies for 550,000 acre-feet of northern California water annually as a replacement for part of its present Colorado River supply. This would be replacement of less than half of the 1,212,000 acre-feet per year which the Secretary as heretofore contracted to deliver to this district and upon which the district relied in constructing its aqueduct. The plan offers nothing to make up this shortage or to provide for the greater future needs of the district. To really accomplish what its name implies, the Pacific Southwest water plan should be expanding to require present authorization of projects providing for the future water supply of southern California.

The district endorses the program incorporated in the plan for the conservation and salvage of water along the lower Colorado. However, it urges that this entire program be instituted at once.

The district believes the proposed plan is seriously deficient because of the absence of any consideration of the possibilities of transporting water into the Pacific Southwest from sources other than northern California, such as the Snake River. The district urges that such studies be made.

The plan is critically defective because it fails to recognize and preserve the rights of existing projects in the State of California to priorities to the annual consumptive use of 4.4 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River. To put this another way, California is asking for only the same protection that the State of Arizona by statute in 1961 recognized, under the basic, 100-year-old principle of western water law, for

its own existing projects against the proposed central Arizona project.

In place of protection for California's valid water rights, the plan proposes that the Metropolitan Water District surrender its rights to Colorado River water in reliance upon promises of substitute water. These promises depend upon the actions of future Congresses and the doubtful sufficiency of the regional water development fund, as presently proposed, to accomplish all its objectives.

It is the conviction of the Metropolian Water District that those who desire new works diverting water from the Lower Colorado River should face the hazards of such promises rather than the taxpayers of this district who have built an aqueduct system representing an investment of more than a half-billion dollars.

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California is determined to carry out its obligations to its people to provide them with water and to do all in its power to protect their huge investment in this existing and functioning water supply system.

Are We Too Civilized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Are We Too Civilized" which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, on March 7, 1964:

ARE WE TOO CIVILIZED?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is America approaching that degree of gentleness and irresolution that will render her incapable of surviving in a jungle world?

Have we grown so tolerant of misbehavior among the neutrals, so ready to turn the other cheek to our rampaging enemies, and so intent on peace at any price that we are nudging the world toward a climactic war, a war we may not win?

In short, are we suffering from an overdose of civilization?

A world in which highly civilized men are safe is, of course, devoutly to be wished. It is nice to think that the meek will inherit the earth at this particular time. But the meek haven't been doing so well recently.

The brutal truth is that gutty aggressors can lick the pants off defensive sportsmen. The Marquis of Queensberry rules aren't worth a whoop against the man coming at you with a broken bottle.

It is now being admitted, even in Washington, that America's foreign policy is in "disarray." "Disarray" is a precious bit of Harvardese meaning "a mess." It is in a mess not because the framers of our foreign policy were stupid, but because they suffered from a very persistent illusion.

The illusion was that if we consistently out-do-gooded ourselves the nations of the world would flock to our banner out of gratitude and admiration. This miscalculation may have had its genesis in one of the noblest and wrongest political theorists of all time—Woodrow Wilson.

"There is such a thing," wrote Wilson, "as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right."

Were we wrong in our treatment of Cuba? We delivered her. We were her best customer.

Were we wrong in our treatment of Panama? We delivered her, too. Before we came, the only asset the isthmus had was a 40-mile railroad over which apprehensive passengers hurried through swarms of anopheles mosquitoes.

What evil had we done to Zanzibar? The Americans were booted out, including our diplomatic personnel. And we turned right around and recognized the new regime at the suggestion of that master of tribal psychology, Soapy Williams.

All over the world mobs are descending on American embassies. They used to simply attack the U.S. Information libraries. But now our Ambassadors flee for their lives. Is this part of a pattern? You bet your sweet boots.

The pattern is the systematic humiliation of America. It is humiliation in progressive degrees, from little humiliations to steadily larger ones. The aim is to convince our friends that we are weak and irresolute, the uncommitted that we are a paper tiger, and the people of the Communist countries that worldwide victory for their leaders is inevitable. The campaign has been doing fine.

Why have we behaved so feebly? Because we are so civilized that the possibility of atomic war fills us with horror.

There is another popular piece of Washington gobbledygookery—"escalate." We threw away victory in Korea because we were afraid a bombing above the Yalu would "escalate" into world war III. For the same reason we didn't push a corridor through to Berlin, although the Russians were acting in defiance of all solemn agreements. And in the fall of 1962 we pulled our punch in Cuba and thus junked the Monroe Doctrine.

Has no one in Washington been reading history? Hitler was permitted to remilitarize the Rhineland because the timid British and French feared that if they opposed it matters might "escalate" into World War II. At that time, militarily, Hitler had practically nothing.

Hitler claimed that each new aggressive move would be his last, but he stressed that any opposition would bring total war. So he murdered Dolfuss, took over Austria, grabbed Sudetenland and the Polish corridor. Each time Britain and France fell back, fearing escalation. And when the inevitable breaking point came Hitler was strong and they were weak.

If we don't stand up for our rights pretty soon world war III will be a cinch. Because by perpetually showing weakness we won't end the possibility of incidents. We will simply insure larger and more outrageous incidents until we must choose war or total surrender.

The time has come to say the Panamanian: "Look, Pedro, we have done you much good and no harm. We are here as a result of the most solemn treaties. If you come across that fence we'll return the body."

The time has come to say to Ghana's Nkrumah:

"The fleet will be in tomorrow. The Marines will march down to our Embassy behind the bands. You be there to tell us whether you want the place closed. You've already seen your last gift dollar. And if we lock the Embassy you've seen your last trade dollar."

If we do not start saying these things we will be in total war in 10 years—without any friends.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Daily News Record, trade journal of the men's retail clothing industry, once again points up the widespread support for quality stabilization existing among people who are most directly concerned with the future of the American retail economy.

Those whose economic well-being depends on a strong American retail system recognize quality stabilization as a constructive legislative step toward preserving that system. Opponents of the bill may perhaps confuse some persons who do not know the facts concerning conditions in our retail marketplace and what quality stabilization would do to correct that situation. But propaganda cannot fool those who know best—the businessmen whose livelihoods are threatened by chaos currently existing in the retail marketplace.

Let me quote here from a number of such leaders in the men's clothing industry, as reported in the Daily News Record of February 7, 1964:

Charles F. Hyde, president, Oshkosh B'Gosh, Inc., Oshkosh, Wis.: "The future of the free enterprise system for brand manufacturers such as we depends upon our being able to exercise complete control over our brand merchandising plans and practices in the market area."

Stanley Goldman, president, Eagle Clothes, Inc., New York: "It is imperative for the protection of branded merchandise that favorable action be taken on this bill at the earliest possible moment."

Arthur L. Bowman, Jr., executive vice president, the H. A. Seinsheimer Co., Cincinnati: "The unauthorized use of brand names by disreputable retailers is dangerously on the ascendancy. The consumer is being dishonestly attracted to these stores so for the protection of the fine retailers of the country, brand names must be protected."

WEAPON OF SURVIVAL

Leo A. Haspel, president, Haspel Bros., Inc., New Orleans: "Any bill that Congress can pass to protect owners of brand names would not only be to the best interest of the consumer but would also keep brand names from being used as leaders to entice the consuming public into a store where the number of units with the brand name would be insufficient to supply even the smallest proportion of these consumers attracted by whatever medium of advertising is used."

Lawrence S. Phillips, executive vice president, Phillips-Van Heusen Corp., New York: "The brands and the stability of the brands that independent retailers carry are their main weapon of survival in their violent jungle of competition with the retailing giants and the unscrupulous merchants * * * we assure you of the urgency we attach to passage of the quality stabilization bill."

John D. Gray, president, Hart Schaffner & Marx, Chicago: "The bill is urgently needed to protect consumers against the alarming spread of sharp and deceptive practices by unscrupulous retailers, and to strengthen the position of reputable retailers."

PROTECTS CONSUMER

Harold S. Hirsch, president, White Stag Manufacturing Co., Portland, Oreg.: "Our main interest is to check disastrous price cutting and the deliberate misrepresentation of merchandise to the unsuspecting American public who, of necessity, gets substitute merchandise foisted upon it, which is the bait-and-switch tool of the price cutter * * * we seek a national act which will make it unlawful to misrepresent or bootleg merchandise proclaimed to be the same or similar, but at lower prices."

Elmer L. Ward, president and board chairman, Palm Beach Co., Cincinnati: "We urge Congress to give the worthy manufacturers who think enough of a product to give it a

name and a price that will stand up in a competitive industry the protection that the bill provides."

Michael Daroff, president, Botany Industries, Inc., Philadelphia: "The consumer today is confused and is at the mercy of many sharp operators. The revolution in retailing today tends to destroy recognized standards of value by which the consumer may judge his purchase. The best way to get the consumer out of this quandary is by enactment of the quality stabilization bill."

Arnold M. Raphael, vice president, Kayser-Roth Hosiery Co., Inc., New York: "Passage of this legislation is extremely important in maintaining the existence and the growth of small retailers who today are beset with competition on all sides from giant retailers."

RETAILERS' COMMENT

Typical of comment from men's wear retailers are the following:

Dwight Shirey, president, Patterson Fletcher Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.: "Unscrupulous retailers have been chipping away at out national retail stability. They have used national brand items as footballs. This has been immensely unfair and tremendously disastrous. Our industry needs the legislation."

Joe Brand, Laredo, Tex.: 'There is great pressure on the ethical retailer today who is trying to uphold the standards of our economy. We need the protection this bill will afford us."

Mel Morgan, vice president, Hughes & Hatcher, Pittsburgh: "We are vitally interested in preventing price-cutting on nationally advertised price-fixed merchandise."

Martin I. Zofness, Zofness Bros., Inc., Bartlesville, Okla.: "We support the quality stabilization bill. It would be helpful in preventing price-cutting on brand name goods that is detrimental to the legitimate conduct of business."

Joseph L. Kassell, Kassel Bros., Middletown, N.Y.: "Small businessmen need protection against the unethical practices of the discounters. Lack of such legislation would hasten the demise of the smaller independent legitimate retailers."

William Freeman, I. Strauss & Co., Inc., Indianapolis: "The bill will protect ethical retailers and manufacturers of quality trademarked products which in turn should protect an individual who might otherwise be taken in by a claim of a wide assortment when in reality there would be very little of the advertised item available for him."

Mr. Speaker, here then are the voices of the men who best know the crisis existing in America's retail market. These men support quality stabilization, not as a cure-all to the illness of the market, but as a vitally needed step toward bolstering the Nation's retail economy. These are the true experts regarding this issue, and their verdict is that quality stabilization will serve to protect the interests of America's free enterprise economy and the American consumer.

I also include herewith an article entitled "If You Ask Me," by columnist Earl Lifshey:

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

It wasn't planned that way. And neither knew it was happening. But two very prominent Government officials, addressing two entirely different trade conventions in widely separated cities recently expressed the most realistically forthright and, hopefully potentially significant views about the marketplace that have been heard in a long while at that level. At a time when the widespread official ignorance of the basic fundamentals of the merchandising mechanism is exceeded only by the astonishing distortions and misconceptions being expressed about the merchandising functions, these two statements are particularly refreshing.

Under a Miami Beach dateline, Women's Wear Daily (February 27), reporting an interview with President Johnson's recently named Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Esther Peterson, during a convention of the National Board of the Coat and Suit Industry, states:

"Mrs. Peterson believes fierce price competition in retailing—such as that fostered by discounters—has had the effect of degrading quality of merchandise when manufacturers cut corners to achieve a certain bargain price. The irony is, she is convinced, that 'the poor pay more' when they buy so-called bargains. She explained this by claiming that if a poor person could afford to pay a higher price, she could buy a better quality product which would last much longer than the cheaper item."

A few days later, on February 29 to be exact, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution Problems, the guest speaker at the convention dinner of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association in New Orleans, told that large audience:

"It is my personal conviction that all necessary steps must be taken to preserve the American small business community. The public policy of our Nation recognizes that the importance of small business reaches far beyond the individuals engaged in it. Well over 95 percent of all American business establishments are small businesses.

"This is not to say that you must have special or preferential treatment. People with your ability don't need coddling. What you do need is equality of opportunity to compete. Given that opportunity you are, I know, well able to take care of yourselves.

"I grew up at a time when this country reaffirmed the four great freedoms to which we are dedicated * * *. But it is time we also recognized a fifth freedom—the freedom to compete. That freedom, the freedom to compete, must be established along with the others as one of the great rights to which every citizen is entitled.

"If * * * you can be assured the freedom to compete, you should be able to prosper and grow within the framework of our Nation's free enterprise system. That will be up to you. However, I believe that it is the place of those of us in Government to insure that you have this opportunity. I want to pledge my unqualified support in helping you to retain this fifth freedom—the freedom to compete. It is the key to a stronger, freer, more prosperous America—for all of us."

Well, that's what those two Government officials said. And what makes their statements so significant, it seems to me, is that their views, basically, are identical with those who endorse the principles set forth in the quality stabilization bill.

Its supporters seek no special privilege; they seek only that elementary right of every citizen—that fifth freedom—to compete on a fair and square basis for their share of the consumers' dollar.

They seek the right to compete on a fair and square basis—not one whereby, as is now so often the case, gullible customers are sold well-known items at profitless prices—only to be overcharged on "blind" items by such remarkably efficient retailers so they can get the profit they need to stay in business.

They seek the right to compete for the consumers' favor and funds on the basis of serving the consumer with the highest possible value—not merely on the basis of the lowest possible price. And they seek to stop those retailers who mutilate, if not destroy, the property right a manufacturer has in his trademark by cutting his price and jeopardizing his efforts to serve the public best.

Mrs. Peterson, whose experience in business has, apparently, made her well aware of these important merchandising truths, can serve the consumers of America in no better way in her new post than by helping to establish widespread recognition of the fifth freedom—the freedom to compete * * * fairly.

An Electronic Nurse Takes Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1964, an article in Parade magazine by Fred Warshovsky reported on one of the most dramatic of the benefits that are being obtained from NASA-sponsored space research. This benefit is of particular interest to the residents of the area of Perth Amboy, N.J., in the 15th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

Electronic sensors of the same type as that worn by astronauts for monitoring their physical condition in space flight have been installed in the Perth Amboy General Hospital for surveillance of patients' condition. The tiny equipment is called the Executone-Gulton Physiological Montoring System, and is manufactured by Executone, Inc., Metuchen, N.J.

Our Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight spent many long weekends this winter visiting industrial sites and space centers to observe at firsthand the progress that is being achieved in our space program. It was a source of special pride to me to see the fine work on devices such as these for the protection of the safety of our astronauts. I am now doubly pleased to know that the results of this research will be of benefit to the people of the 15th District of New Jersey.

The article from Parade magazine is as follows:

AN ELECTRONIC NURSE TAKES OVER

(By Fred Warshofsky)

Seriously ill hospital patients are beginning to benefit from the space age. The same type of tiny sensors worn by our astronauts now provide a never-before-possible continuous watch over crucial body reactions that is expected to save lives. A welcome byproduct will be the freeing of overworked nurses from time-consuming aspects of intensive care.

The devices pictured here have just been installed at Perth Amboy, N.J., General Hospital, first in the Nation to have the new physiological monitoring system. Just as they did for the orbiting spacemen, the system's sensors make possible a constant, around-the-clock surveillance of patients' heart rates, respiration and blood pressure.

The patient who is seriously sick often wonders if anyone will notice if he takes a turn for the worse during the night. With the new electronic system in operation, he can take comfort in the assurance that any alarming deviation in his readings will be noted immediately by the nurse on duty.

The sensors are marvels of miniaturization and efficiency. Blood pressure and heart rate are measured through a small, inflatable cuff and a metal ring that are slipped on the patient's index finger. Breathing is registered through a tiny, heat-sensitive bead

mounted on a nose clip. As the patient inhales and exhales, the bead is sensitive to the cooling effect of the airflow.

All of the readings are converted to electrical energy. They are transmitted by wire to a central console at a nurses' station and to portable bedside units, where they appear on dials. If a person's heart rate, breathing, or blood presure should change dramatically, a warning buzzer and red light quickly alert the nurse on duty.

Physical reactions are measured and recorded every 30 seconds, far more frequently than nurses could do it even if there were no national nurse shortage and they had ample time to devote to the task.

One testing ground for the system was the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center in Bethesda, Md. In a special, intensive care ward, many hundreds of patients have recovered from major surgery with this electronic assistance.

The equipment is called the Executone-Gulton Physiological Monitoring System. According to Jess Kaufman of Executone, Inc., it "allows much closer scrutiny than by conventional techniques. A blood pressure reading, for example, is taken every 30 seconds, rather than at 8 or 10 minute intervals." And Perth Amboy Hospital Director Robert Hoyt: "This means a good deal to the comfort of the critically ill and should also save lives."

Doubts Benefiting Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Apr. 1, 1964]

POLITICAL SPLITS COSTLY—DOUBTS BENEFITING ENEMY

The Democratic Party is splitting apart over foreign policy, not only over Cuba but over South Vietnam.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, obviously speaking for the President, has given public assurances that American aid will be forthcoming as long as necessary to defeat the Vietcong Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam.

But Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Democrat-dominated Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, leader of the Democratic majority, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, a leading candidate for his party's vice-presidential nomination, seem to have parted company with Mr. Johnson on crucial aspects of the cold war.

Senator FULBRIGHT has called for recognizing that atheistic communism is in Cuba to stay. Senators MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY are asking hearings on suggestions to neutralize southeast Asia.

Nobody seems very sure just what the neutralization of South Vietnam would mean. North Vietnam has a Communist Government. The Vietcong guerrillas operating in South Vietnam insist they are independent of Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam, and they are being assisted by advisers and equipment from Red China.

There are no suggestions for neutralization coming from North Vietnam.

The Democratic Senators have reopened the wound of indecision. This probably never would have happened had the administration from the beginning never left any doubts as to the course we are pursuing in southeast Asia.

We have backed and filled until the enemy suspects the will is not really there.

Secretary McNamara's assurances of continuing aid until victory are of the moment in the long and agonizing story of our irresoluteness. We believe them; but what is more important, does the enemy believe them?

Korea stands as another lesson of the cost of a lack of firm and realistic policy, and of half-way measures halfheartedly prosecuted.

We are committing the same errors as we did along the 38th parallel in Korea, in arbitrarily drawing a line and promising our enemies we won't step across it unless, of course, the enemy violates some undefined rule of this wearying jungle war.

The atheistic Communists believe they can and will outlast us. American soldiers still help guard the line in a divided Korea. That was a terrible and costly war, and to no end.

So long as the Communists can safely control the nature an extent of these little but bloody wars, easing up when it looks like the giant might become too aroused, and pushing on again when we weaken, we will be kept in the jungles until doomsday.

A search for neutralization does not seem to be the solution. We are going to have to write the answer to one of these engagements. But the answer will not lie with a party leadership so badly split on what to do that assurances of intent are like leaves in a wind.

Panama Confusion: Clearing the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone in January 1964, I have noticed a small but increasing number of objective articles about that well-coordinated demonstration of Red violence. Among the most illuminating is a column in the March 25, 1964, issue of the Washington Evening Star by Max Friedman.

It is especially interesting to note that its author cited Elihu Root, one of the Nation's most eminent jurists, who, first, as Secretary of War, 1899–1904, and later, as Secretary of State, 1905–1909, was among the closest advisers of Presidents William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt when the major points in U.S. Isthmian Canal policy were in the process of formulation.

There is only one point in the column to which serious objection can be made and that is its call "to get on with the negotiations." To this, I object for the following reasons: First, President Johnson's call for restoration of normal diplomatic relations with the United States, which were broken on January 10 by Panama, before there can be any discussions of Panamanian demands; and, second, as regards basic sovereignty and perpetuity provisions in the 1903 treaty, there should be no discussions because surrender or weakening of these rights means the eventual liquidation of U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal.

As regards the statement of Secretary Root quoted by Mr. Friedman, the United States has always met its treaty obligations with regard to the Panama Canal and has always treated Panama with the greatest respect and generosity notwithstanding the clamorous demands of Panamanian radicals. As evidence of this generosity is the fact that Panama has the highest per capita income in Latin America.

The indicated column follows:

CLEARING THE AIR ABOUT PANAMA—BASIC STANDS OF UNITED STATES HELD CORRECT, BUT PRESENTATION OF CASE IS LACKING

(By MAX FREEDMAN)

It might not be a waste of time if President Johnson and Tom Mann looked up Elihu Root's speech in 1906 to the third Pan-American Conference in Rio de Janeiro. He was the first Secretary of State to address such a conference in person. Root said "we deem the independence and equal rights of the smallest and weakest members of the family of nations entitled to as much respect as those of the greatest empire; and we deem the observance of that respect the chief guarantee of the weak against the oppression of the strong."

The Johnson administration can claim with fairness that it has fully respected this principle in its dealings with Panama. It has certainly never thought of oppressing Panama or of bullying it into an arbitrary agreement. Quite the reverse. It has rather meekly endured a succession of broken pledges and evasive statements and blundering taunts by Panama's leaders and spokesmen.

But these facts do not help the United States very much. President Johnson has gained no credit at all for refusing to present his full case against Panama. No one has praised him for his forbearance. He has been accused instead of making a serious mistake in refusing to accept Panama's statement of the case.

President Johnson's real mistake was in believing that the facts counted in such a dispute. Panama could rely instinctively on the sympathy of Latin America, regardless of the facts. Many people in the United States wondered uneasily why Panama's complaints did not receive swifter acceptance in Washington. It seemed churlish and unseemly to them to have the United States set its power against tiny Panama. Friendly ambassadors, with no personal knowledge of the merits of the dispute, have been telling their governments that the United States has been heavyhanded and pedantic.

In reality the White House and the State Department have been neither clumsy nor obstinate. With every measure of good will, they have found it painfully difficult to negotiate, for Panama has taken precedence over an objective study of the facts.

In the first place, the Johnson administration has refused, quite rightly, to surrender an essential interest under pressure. In this case the issue is the 1903 treaty on the Panama Canal. The United States has reviewed that treaty several times with Panama in the past, and it is ready to do so again now. But it is not ready to agree in advance to changes in the treaty as a condition for the restoration of normal diplomatic relations. That is not a formula of wisdom. It is a formula for the manufacture of mischief. Other countries would soon learn the lesson. They would stir up trouble, suspend relations with the United States, and demand an advance commitment before negotiations are resumed.

The second principle has been the refusal of the United States to promise more than it may be able to perform. Nothing would have been easier for the United States, or more popular, than to agree with the clouded formulas that have been produced from time to time to end the controversy. But the Johnson administration decided that amiability is not the highest diplomatic virtue. It decided that popularity should not be gained by this perilous route. For a grievous price would be paid in Latin America if the Panama negotiations began with assumptions which contradicted the purposes and objectives of the United States. Hence the tiresome but necessary insistence of Washington on precise terms for negotiations. The United States does not want Panama or Latin America to believe that matters are already settled when they can in fact only be settled after hard negotiations.

It may be said, with much justification, that there must be something very wrong with the way the United States has presented its case. Only erratic diplomacy can explain why so strong a case has failed to be more persuasive. Certainly it would have been very helpful if America's case had been put with something of Elihu Root's respect for the pride, and even the prejudices, of Latin America. But at a heavy price the United States has at least convinced everyone that a settlement will not be easy. Now the immediate task is to get on with the negotiations.

Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur: What About the Principles To Which He Devoted His Life—Are We Losing Sight of Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I join all America and, indeed, all of the free world in mourning the passing of a truly great man and world leader—General of the Army, Douglas A. MacArthur. His record of service to his country and to the cause of freedom is almost without peer. He gave over 60 years of his life to the cause of protecting our wonderful American way of life and to the cause of furthering our democratic principles throughout the world.

He was the living example of that intangible quality that made America great.

Reflecting upon those qualities which made the general and America the shining examples of freedom and greatness, I cannot refrain from expressing how desperately both America and the entire world need a rebirth of these qualities and principles if the free democratic society he loved and we love is to be preserved for future generations.

With these qualities and principles in mind I submit to my colleagues a recent article from the U.S. News & World Report that suggests perhaps we are losing sight of some of these tools of freedom and of our patriotic sense of duty needed to preserve our way of life:

Back in the days before the phrase "Going to his eternal rest" meant getting a job with the Government, Mark Twain was scheduled to make a talk. Noticing that his lecture was poorly billed, he stepped into a store and said:

"Good evening, friend—any entertainment here tonight to help a stranger while away his evening?"

The storekeeper straightenen up, wiped his hands, and said: "I expect there's going to be a lecture. I've been selling eggs all day."

There have been quite a few changes made since that day. Although the price of eggs may prohibit their use as indoor guided missiles, we have become so well-to-do as a Nation that we have a guilt complex about it.

Conformity is sweeping the country. And, while more and more people want to get seats in the grandstand, fewer and fewer want to sweat it out down on the field. More and more youngsters who come in looking for jobs are asking, "What can you do for me?" rather than, "What can I do for you?"

They want to discuss the extras they're going to get rather than the extras they're going to give. They want to know how cool it is going to be in summer—and how warm in winter. And how safe at all times of the year. And when they go to work, they hasten to hide their light in the security of a committee, where there is safety in numbers.

The progress may be slow and the glory may be small, but the work is steady. Their eyes are on the clock rather than on the calendar. The coffee break is more important than the big break.

More and more girls are more interested in filing their nails than in filing what needs to be filed. The other day I overheard two girls in an elevator; one said to the other, "Heavens, no, don't learn shorthand. If you can't take dictation, you won't have to stay after 5 p.m."

We have always had our share of freeloaders in this country. As Channing Pollock once said, every generation produces its squad of moderns who march with pea shooters against Gibralter. But only in the past quarter century, it seems to me, has noninvolvement become an accepted way of life. When we were poor, we had to sweat it out. We couldn't afford detachment from the life and fate of our country—and one of the great dangers of affluence is that it permits such detachment.

I'm going to mention quite a bit about a six-letter word. Why six letters? Because modern literature has snapped up all the four- and five-letter words as its own. So I am going to start on six-letter words: the word is "square"—s-q-u-a-r-e.

Back in Mark Twain's day, it was one of the finest words in our language, among the top 10 on any lexicographer's hit parade. You gave a man a square deal if you were honest. You gave him a square meal when he was hungry. You stood foresquare for the right, as you saw it, and square against everything else. When you got out of debt, you were square with the world. And that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

Then a lot of strange characters got hold of this honest, wholesome word, bent it all out of shape, and gave it back to our children.

Convicts gave it the first twist. To them a "square" was an inmate who would not conform to the convict code. From the prisons it was flashed across the country on the marijuana circuit of the bopsters and hipsters.

Now, everyone knows what a square is. He is the man who never learned to get away with it. A Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. A guy who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else. A boob who gets so lost in his work that he has to be reminded to go home. A guy who doesn't have to stop at a bar on his way to the train at night because he's all fired up and full of juice already. A character who doesn't have to spend his evenings puttering in a workshop and his weekends scraping the bottom of a boat, because he's putting all that elbow grease and steam into doing a satisfying job on the job he's getting paid to do. A fellow who laughs with his belly instead of his upper lip. A slob who still gets all choked up when the band plays "America the Beautiful."

A square—strictly from Squaresville. His tribe isn't thriving too well in the current climate. He doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, corner cutters, sharpshooters and goof-offs. He doesn't believe in opening all the packages before Christmas. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. He's burdened down with old-fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage, and thrift. He may already be on his way to extinction. He and all the rest of us are living in a country today that is quite different from the one that we were taught to love.

We have come quite a way since Theodore Roosevelt told us, "Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat."

What has happened to us, I think, is that we have changed from an exporting country to an importing country.

I do not mean that we have let the world drain all of our gold away, although that is bad enough. I do not mean any imbalance of trade—threatening as that may be. I mean that we have been importing instead of exporting ideas.

The United States of America was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world had ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility, and freedom. We created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people, and for the people—an idea that is still being bought today. We exported the idea of freedom of worship; the idea of unfettered press; the idea that those who are taxed should be represented.

It is hard to find a basic idea that America has exported since you and I were young. We have, I think, bought in the bazaars of Asia Minor the idea that an honest man is either a fool or a liar.

From our most mortal enemy we have bought the idea of a strong government for weak people.

We have bought abroad the ideas of "Let Jack do it," of "What's in it for me?"—and the gesture of the neatly shrugged shoulder.

The other day I was told by a friend that his young son came home from his progressive school proudly exhibiting a book that he had won for excellence in natural history.

"However did you do that?" the delighted father asked.

"The teacher," answered the son, "asked how many legs an ostrich has and I said, 'Three.' "

"But an ostrich has only two legs," the father protested.

"I know," said the boy. "But I came closest. All the other kids said, 'Four.' "

This may be funny. But it is not funny that today our colleges are loaded with youngsters who are hardly prepared for high school—kids who cannot do simple arithmetic and who cannot spell simple words.

This, too, was an import—the idea that the dull discipline of the three R's was disturbing to little Johnny's ego. We got really scientific and went to work on the poor little kid and his id with the result that today hardly any school that really is a school is without a class in remedial reading. It would save considerable money if the class held in the highest level of our teachers colleges and were called remedial thinking.

Our museums today are exhibiting on their walls paintings by people who never learned to paint. It used to be a sort of joke that you could not tell which was the top and which was the bottom.

Nonbooks are being thrown together and sold by nonwriters who never bothered to learn how to write. Murky poems are being ground out by scraggly poets who sing them to their friends because they are unreadable. Here, for example, is one deathless line: "O man, thee is onion constructed in hot gabardine."

Life magazine describes our beatnik geniuses as "fruit flies, * * * some of the hairiest, scrawniest, and most discontented specimens of all time, who not only refuse to sample the seeping juices of American plenty and American advance but scrape their feeders in discordant scorn of any and all who do."

Some of their output is worse than trash; some of it goes beyond making fun of Mom and Dad and marriage and automatic dishwashers and suburbia.

Always tearing down these days. Never building up. Always knocking. Belittling. Downgrading. A sneer rather than a grin. A mocking laugh rather than a belly laugh. Poking fun at other people rather than at ourselves.

What, by the way, ever happened to laughter? Once we were a laughing nation. We laughed easily and deeply. The corn may have been as high as an elephant's eye—but we laughed, and it was good for us.

We laughed at Lincoln, Mark Twain, Artemus Ward, Mr. Dooley, and Petroleum V. Nasby. Later, we laughed at the gentle humor of such columnists as Don Marquis, F. P. A., and H. I. Phillips. We laughed at Will Rogers because he made us laugh at ourselves. Remember the sly, dry way he spun that rope and those yarns and got off those wonderful quips of his about life in general and politics in particular?

We laughed at Robert Benchley. Remember when a magazine sent him on an assignment to Venice and he wired back, "Streets full of water. Please advise"?

Today I think there is one true comic on the stage, and one real humorist writing a column. I am talking about Bob Hope and Art Buchwald. Others are cynical, sly, and bitter. We laugh when we are told that everyone but squares knows that Mr. A or Mr. B is funny, but we don't know why we are laughing.

We refer to our humor as sick, sick, sick—and it is, is, is. Mother used to get cards on Mother's Day expressing in some way the fact that she was loved and wanted. Now if she is lucky she gets a card that shows "Whistler's Mother" flat on her back and a caption that says, "You're not the only one who's off her rocker." Otherwise, she may get a card that says, "Want to lose 15 ugly pounds? Then cut off your head."

Mort Sahl, to me, represents the cackling of despaid. Even Bob Newhart, clean cut and buttoned down as he is, cannot resist the temptation to give a hotfoot now and then to our national idols.

I claim we need those idols. I am not going to be amused by a skit in which Lincoln's publicity man tells him, "Write it on envelopes, Abe," or, "Why don't you take it easy tonight, Abe, and take in a show?"

Laughter today is stored in Hollywood in cans, just as the gold was once stored at Fort Knox. It is taken out as needed and pasted onto television films. The laugh track tips us off to when things are funny.

I want to laugh when I am amused. I want to decide what I think is funny. This, I suppose, will mark me as a square. It it does, I will be in pretty good company. For this country was discovered, put together, fought for, and saved by squares.

It is easy to prove that Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and almost anyone else you care to include among our national heroes were squares—by simply thinking what each might have said had he not been square:

NATHAN HALE. Me spy on those British? Are you trying to be funny? Do you know what they do with the spies they catch? I'll give you a news flash, chum. They hang them.

PAUL REVERE. What do you mean—me ride through every Middlesex village and town? And in the middle of the night yet. Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?

PATRICK HENRY. Sure, I'm for liberty—first, last, and always. But we've got to be a little realistic. We're a pretty small outfit. If we start pushing the British around, someone is going to get hurt.

GEORGE WASHINGTON. Gentlemen, I am honored. But I do wish you would try someone else. Let's say General Gates. I'm just getting things organized at Mount Vernon. You might say I had already served my time. Against the French, you know.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. What we really need as Ambassador to France is a young man. I'm 70 years old. It's time a new generation took over.

It is perhaps a significant fact that what such men actually did say has been quietly sneaked out of our schoolbooks. This Week magazine made a survey recently of school history books issued before 1920, compared with those issued since. Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," in all of the old texts and in only one of the new texts.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death" in 12 out of 14 earlier texts and in only 2 of 45 recent ones.

But John Paul Jones set the record. He said, "I have not yet begun to fight," in nine of the old books and in none of the new ones.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was President, he appointed a Committee on National Goals to decide where we were all going. Perhaps a first step should be a commission on national heritage to make sure that some of us at least remember where we have been.

Arnold Toynbee, the historian, says that, of 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished not from external conquest but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today, our country still has a choice. I believe it has already begun to make that choice. I believe it is going back to its old beliefs in such things as ideas, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion, and even hard work.

We are great believers in statistics in this country, and, while the things that really count can never be measured even by the most advanced computers, sheer head counting seems to indicate that people are beginning to struggle for better things.

Twenty years ago, half of us belonged to churches. Today, 64 percent of us do. It is perfectly possible that the churches are full and the people are empty—but the statistics are on our side.

Sales of classical records have jumped 78 percent in the last 3 years. Advertising, perhaps, but the statistics are on our side.

Millions of people are visiting museums, millions more than a decade ago.

We spent over a billion dollars on books last year, and people are taking 670 million volumes out of our public libraries each year.

There are 50 percent more symphony orchestras than there were 10 years ago. Expenditures on all cultural activities have increased 70 percent in the past 10 years—to a total of more than $3 billion.

You might point out to me that $3 billion spent for culture, stacked up against $50 billion spent for war, still isn't much. You will have to admit that there is a definite movement—and in the right direction.

Since the turn of the century, the percentage of our population that has graduated from high school is up 10 times. The percentage that has gone to college is up seven times. The percentage in higher education trying to get higher marks is encouragingly greater than it used to be. There are indications that the day when it's smart to be smart is finally at hand.

But the greatest thing that has happened, of course, is that our Nation has a whole new set of heroes—named Glenn and Grissom and Shepard—and Carpenter, Cooper, and Schirra.

The forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are still siting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and dare to be square because the opposite of square is round and being round is much simpler. Responsibilities and problems roll off easily. We can just roll down the path, without any bumps, being careful to stay in the middle because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

Too many of us know the short cuts, and too few know or care where the path leads. Too few of us dare to leave the path because the path is always the easy way, the way most people go. But there is no path to the future, no path to greatness, no path to progress.

How shall we fight for personal independence? How shall we avoid the group poop, the vortex of mediocrity, the great nothing of cynical sophistication?

May I suggest that we all join the S.O.S.? The Society of Squares. It doesn't even exist, but it could. Not a left-wing organization. Not a right-wing organization. Just an organization with wings.

We might have to go underground for a while to avoid being trampled to death by the coast-to-coast rat packs of cynical saboteurs and the canned-wit commandos whose devotion is destruction.

But we would come out.

We might even have a secret handshake consisting mainly of grabbing the other guy's hand as though you meant it and looking him in the eye.

We would be for participation and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for the honest way against the short, for a well-done job and against the goof-off, for education and against the pretense of learning for building and against tearing down, for the boys and girls who excel and against the international bedroom athletes.

We have, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that our problem is not new.

When Benjamin Franklin was told that the war for independence was over, he said, "Say rather the war of revolution. The war for independence has yet to be fought."

And today—181 years later—the war for independence has still to be fought.

A Lesson From History—Wisdom of MacArthur Proved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 28, 1964]

A LESSON FROM HISTORY—WISDOM OF MACARTHUR PROVED

Every issue of a good newspaper offers a lesson in history—but sometimes the lesson never sinks in on certain pupils in time.

Most of these pupils, unfortunately, seem to sit not at kindergarten desks but instead at ones in the State Department. Being somewhat dim at any lesson, they flunk the test of time—and when they do, the Nation flunks a little too.

We are reminded of this historian role of newspapers by seeing a December 31, 1945, issue of the Western Europe edition of the Stars and Stripes.

The top story is headlined, "MacArthur Disputes Plan of Big Three for Jap Council." A Tokyo story revealed that MacArthur had been in "final disagreement" with a Russian-United States-British plan for splitting Japan into zones of occupation like Europe's, although someone in Washington, notably James F. Byrnes' State Department, had reported the general to have had "no objection" to the plan. Ultimately, as you may remember, MacArthur sent a young lieutenant to usher a Russian delegation off Japan as quickly as it landed. It may have been MacArthur's finest hour, even set against all wartime achievements.

Another story is headlined, "Koreans Call Strikes, Stone Americans in Big Three Decision Protest." The protest, of course, was against partition of Korea. Like MacArthur, the Koreans knew trouble was ahead. There was. It was war.

Another headline, dealing with the same Big Three plan, said, "Swedes Liken Meeting to Munich." The Swedes have been canny observers, always, of world affairs. Svenska Dagbladet was quoted: "The Western Powers have made concessions unfortunately reminding us of Munich in 1938. * * * One feels the same uneasiness as existed years ago in Vienna and Prague."

On the back page of the same issue, a story revealed that "the United States would help pour Chinese Nationalist troops into Manchuria. * * * in line with America's broadened Chinese policy." In the opinion of some, our "broadened Chinese policy" really dispersed the strength of Nationalist China over so broad an area that overthrow of the regime by the Chinese Communists was almost a sure thing.

In reading this 1945 newspaper, the lessons now stand out sharp and clear. At the time, however, there were in Washington many intelligent, well-read, eloquent, decent, compassionate (and stupid) people who told us daily (even as they do today) that everything is fine, leave it to us, we know the score, we will create a brave new world, men like MacArthur are just old fashioned and reactionary, we need affirmative thinking, don't worry your heads, leave things like this to the experts.

The big lesson those 1945 headlines tell us all is, "Don't do it. Think for yourself."

Dr. Joseph Delta LaFleur, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding achievement in the field of nuclear energy by a young Louisianian. Dr. Joseph Delta LeFleur, Jr., a senior adviser with the Atomic Energy Commission in Germantown, Md., and a native of Ville Platte, La., was invited to present his paper on "Energy Sources and Energy Conversion" before the conference of representatives of the NATO nations in Cannes, France, on March 16–19, 1964. Dr. LaFleur presented his paper with Dr. Frank K. Pittman, Director, Division of Reactor Development, Atomic Energy Commission, in Cannes.

Dr. Joseph LaFleur received his secondary education in the schools of Ville Platte, La., where his parents, Prof. and Mrs. J. D. LaFleur, Sr., still reside. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and received his Ph. D. in engineering from Catholic University. Dr. LaFleur exemplifies the long tradition of his family in the development of higher education. His mother and father have, over the years, inspired countless young people to further their educations and better equip themselves to uphold their responsibilities in our democracy.

We in Louisiana are justifiably proud of Dr. LeFleur's outstanding accomplishments in the field of atomic energy. As indicated by the invitation to present his technical paper before this important conference, he is recognized internationally as a noteworthy contributor in this vitally important field of scientific research and development.

Racial Demonstrations in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 I publicized the activities of such groups as the NAACP and CORE in their efforts to apply tremendous pressures on Members of Congress in favor of the so-called civil rights bill. Part of this presure is their attempt to purge me as Congressman from the Seventh District of Texas. Another part of their activities is to pressure Members by inciting racial violence in their congressional districts.

In my newsletter of today, I have delved further into this matter, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS—JOHN DOWDY

As Congress recessed for the Easter season, the radical racial groups stepped up their rioting and violence. The NAACP and CORE had been devoting most of their efforts to northern areas, but they have again moved into the South, concentrating their most destructive raids in Florida and Alabama. These demonstrations breed upon one another, and will continue to spread, because the Federal authorities will not permit the local enforcement officers to protect the peace. At the Federal level, it seems there is no courage at all in the face of violence. Just as an example, the police in Jacksonville, Fla., are doing their best to keep the violent mobs in check, but they do not even know how long they will be allowed to do so, because Roy Wilkins, the executive secretary of NAACP, has already asked the U.S. Attorney General to intervene.

That these troubles continue to spread, is, in my opinion, due to agitation of some renegades, who follow the Communist policy of stirring up violence and discord to further their cause. The truth of the matter is that this runs deeper than most people are aware. Secret meetings are being held even in our own district, promoted by a few renegade whites, in which attempts are made to incite the Negro people to law violations and violence, and, of course, as some of the newspapers have revealed, the racial groups in Washington, D.C., on February 25 of this year, sent money for political use to our district, in their effort to purge me as Congressman, because I have resisted their diabolical aims. I have yet to see where any good purpose is served by the violence of evil men.

Ever since the newspapers exposed the law violations in box 18 at Lufkin in the 1962 primary, more and more people are realizing that Duval County is not alone in efforts to steal elections, and closer looks are being taken in many counties. This is particularly true with reference to the free poll taxes, and it is developing that in some cases the same person is obviously registered more than one time. The penalty for violations such as this is more severe than poll tax violations and it is not at all unlikely that criminal cases will be developed. It will be my hope that in such event, the real criminals will receive punishment, and not just the ones who were led into wrongdoing by the evil and intentional criminal.

As the story of the payment of 151 poll taxes, giving residence in a small shack in Lufkin becomes more widespread, I think people will be more careful about illegal voting. That was one of the reasons I offered the "Tombstone amendment" to prevent the voting of dead people. It points up to the Nation how elections are stolen.

I hope you will let me know of any violations that you learn about. This will help assure honest elections, because I will turn the information over to proper authorities, as well as use it as a basis for laws to correct the wrong. With your help, I will continue my efforts toward honest government at all levels. I know that is what you want, and it is part of God's gift to the American people. We must preserve that gift.

National Grange Speaks on Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to salute the National Grange, for the contribution it is making by carrying the truth to the American people—to consumers as well as to farmers—concerning the farm legislation that will come before the House for a vote this week.

Mr. Herschel D. Newson, master of the Grange, particularly has used facts, pure and simple, to demolish the deceitful argument, brought forward by the opposition to this legislation, that to give the farmer a fair price for wheat would mean a "bread tax." Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from Mr. Newsom, dwelling upon this mischief of the opposition. I am placing this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all the Members of

this body may profit from the facts and the truth.

The letter follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1964.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the long and consistent support the Grange has given to a program involving wheat certificates, as a means of getting a reasonable level of income for wheat growers out of the marketplace, rather than from taxpayers through the Commodity Credit Corporation, in the nonrecourse loan, Government storage, and export subsidy, as well as domestic subsidy program, which has become increasingly necessary and increasingly expensive since the close of the Korean war, I feel, as master of the National Grange, that I simply must take cognizance of the attempts of Farm Bureau spokesmen, and the minority leader of your committee, to label our wheat program as a "bread tax."

It is highly significant to me that this sort of mislabeling, or misunderstanding, of our long effort to reduce Government costs, and thereby reduce taxes, in connection with the wheat program—our long and consistent effort to limit effective support to quantities required in our own primary American market, and, at the same time, to provide a lower level of support for secondary markets, coupled, of course, with the export certificate provisions in the pending legislation, to even further reduce Government costs and to eliminate the export subsidy requirements of these past several years—should be so unjustifiably and inaccurately labeled by representatives of either a farm organization or a party leader in the House Committee on Agriculture, that I would like very respectfully to call your attention, as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, to the facts, as we understand them, in this connection.

First of all, let me point out that the total proposed support price in the primary or domestic human food market, including the certificates, which would be required by those placing wheat or wheat products into the domestic human consumption channels, would be $2 per bushel ($1.30 direct loan and purchase support, through the traditional operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for all wheat eligible for that support, plus $0.70 per bushel support for all wheat entering these channels—the certificate simply becoming the means by which the producer receives that additional support in the marketplace). The certificate, therefore, clearly becomes a more effective and much less expensive method of achieving that degree of support, and, at the same time, limiting the volume of wheat eligible for that level of support to the primary market requirements in this 2-year program for 1964–65 wheat crops.

The pending measure, as you well know, does not propose to increase the cost of bread in the domestic human food use channels above that which prevailed in recent years.

It is my earnest hope that we can make those who may have been subjected to this unfounded and unjust attempt to label this wheat certificate program erroneously aware of the fundamental facts in connection with this matter. One year ago, on March 18, 1963, No. 2 Hard Winter wheat sold at Kansas City at $2.28 per bushel; on March 17, 1964, the quotation was $2.14½ per bushel. To the best of my knowledge, this wheat has never sold during the past year for less than $2.05 per bushel. March futures, some few months ago, reached $2.24. I know of no responsible economist who believes that the price of wheat on the market, including the required certificate, will exceed the present price of wheat, to say nothing of reaching the higher prices of last year.

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that in 1963 farmers received $0.031 for all the ingredients in a 1-pound loaf of bread. The wheat accounted for only $0.025 of this total ingredients cost. This is one-tenth of a cent less than in 1962, and two-tenths of a cent less than the 1947–49 average.

The average retail price of a 1-pound loaf of white bread was 21.6 cents in 1963. This was 60 percent higher than the 1947–49 average, over twice the average rise in prices of all foods, and nearly double the rise in the consumer price index, while, at the same time, the price of wheat in the loaf was declining 8 percent.

Simple arithmetic will show that wheat would have to increase in price by about $0.60 per bushel to justify a 1-cent increase in the price of a loaf of bread. So, these irresponsible statements are a sheer attempt to cloud the issue and assure the consumer a continued steady support of his bread grain at a reasonable cost. There is no economic basis whatsoever for the charge that would constitute a "bread tax." It would not increase the price of wheat to the millers, and, therefore, would not increase the price of bread to the consumer.

On the other hand, it reduces the support level for all wheat from about $1.84 per bushel to $1.30 per bushel. Even if all that wheat that is produced this year should go under the support program, which is highly unlikely, the investments in wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation will decline by $594 million. In addition, there should be substantial savings in reduced Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and the cost of storing them.

Additional taxpayer savings will be possible because of the reduced—eventually eliminated—subsidies on that part of the wheat that goes into the export market. This will amount to about $0.60 per bushel on 500 million bushels. In addition to this $300 million saving to the taxpayers, we would clearly enhance the prospect of effective, but fair and reasonable, wheat trading in the world markets, and the eventual expansion of those markets. The export certificates provided for in this legislation will be an investment recoverable from the exporters at the time of export.

The wheat certificates are not a "bread tax." They will not increase the cost of bread to the consumers. On the contrary, they will result in substantial savings to Americans, both as taxpayers and as consumers. Furthermore, if a given taxpayer does not consume wheat, he will not, under the certificate program, be required to pay its cost, as has been true with reference to wheat that has been supported at a somewhat comparable level through the old route of loan and purchase by Commodity Credit Corporation.

The enactment of this cotton wheat legislation will chart a new and reasonable course, under conditions of 1964 and 1965, in American programs for our two major export crops. This legislation merits universal support—not unfounded and inaccurate criticism. Clearly and incontrovertibly, failure to enact the legislation proposed will generate a serious reduction in farm income, as well as a very substantial reduction in employment in our great cotton textile industry.

Surely the Members of the House of Representatives will recognize that the United States of America cannot tolerate the economic deterioration arising from a precipitous decline in the purchasing power of rural America, which would result from the failure to recognize the urgent necessity of providing that agriculture, and rural America, in general, and that, specifically, our great wheat and cotton producing, manufacturing and trading businesses and industries, should become a legitimate part of a growing national economy which will yield a rising level of employment, income, and profits.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM.

What's Wrong, Mr. Freeman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that when Federal employees take a stand in behalf of decent government, and this stand is counter to the position of their appointed political bosses, they are made the objects of punishment.

The latest appears to be the case of Mr. N. Battle Hales, a Department of Agriculture employee, who has testified that there was favoritism in the Billie Sol Estes case, and for having so testified his within-grade promotion is being held up by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

Unless Freeman comes up with a solid explanation for his action in this case, I suggest that the Civil Service Commission take a hand and if the Commission is also hog-tied that it may be necessary for the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to ascertain why a Federal employee must be penalized for trying to do his job properly.

Following is an article in the Des Moines Register bearing directly on this subject:

TESTIFIED ON ESTES, DENIED A PROMOTION—TOLD SENATE GROUP OF FAVORITISM

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is holding up the promotion of N. Battle Hales, an Agriculture Department employee who testified that there was favoritism in the Billie Sol Estes case.

It was learned Wednesday that Hales, a $14,965-a-year employee, has been denied what is usually an automatic ingrade promotion, pending the McClellan investigating subcommittee report on the Estes investigation.

OFFICIALS ANGRY

Hales incurred the wrath of Secretary Freeman, Under Secretary Charles S. Murphy, and other top officials of the Department of Agriculture in 1962, when he went before the McClellan subcommittee and testified that Pecos, Tex., financier Estes had received favored treatment from the Kennedy administration.

Hales was a $14,000-a-year assistant to Emery (Red) Jacobs, a deputy administrator in the Agricultural Stabilization Service, at the time that the Estes case broke in late March 1962.

Hales has received the regular pay boosts provided by Congress, but has received no other promotions.

On March 15, Hales was due to have received an automatic promotion from $14,965 to $15,415 a year that comes with a specific term of service within his civil service grade.

There was first a notification that he would receive the promotion, then a notification

that he would not be given the promotion until the Estes report is completed.

MUNDT COMMENT

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said Wednesday that he is "concerned over these reports that Mr. Hales has not received a promotion that is supposed to be automatic.

"Mr. Hales was a very useful witness before the McClellan subcommittee. He was not under investigation for any questionable actions in connection with the Billie Sol Estes case. Mr. Hales came before the committee to testify as a loyal Government employee."

There was testimony that Jacobs, a political and social friend of Estes, had gone on a shopping spree with Estes at the Neiman-Marcus department store in Dallas. A salesman testified that Jacobs bought more than $1,000 worth of clothes, including three $245 suits, and paid for them with cash after walking into a fitting room with Estes.

Hales testified that he knew that Jacobs had tried to favor Estes on a large cotton allotment that was worth more than $500,000 to Estes.

TRIED TO REPORT

Hales had said he was suspicious of Jacobs and knew Jacobs and Murphy had been friendly to Estes, and tried to see Secretary Freeman on April 16, 1962, to make a report.

Instead of being permitted to see Freeman, Hales was sent to talk to FBI agents, he said, and the Agriculture Department barred him from access to his office records and other records he needed to demonstrate the favoritism.

Freeman's "Shocking" Support of Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, most of the Midwest's leading newspapers take a dim view of the Johnson administration's current farm bill. To some, the wedding of wheat to cotton has only been brought about by a politically loaded shotgun. Others are disturbed by the huge discretionary authority which would be given to a Secretary of Agriculture who has not demonstrated that he understands the need for restraint in the exercise of executive power. A particularly good commentary is the following lead editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of March 29:

FREEMAN'S "SHOCKING" SUPPORT OF FARM BILL

Agriculture Secretary Freeman is making it difficult for anybody to support the administration's wheat-cotton bill. On Wednesday he said Farm Bureau opposition to the measure was shocking. On Thursday he said the milling and baking industries opposed the bill because they would get a 70-cent-per-bushel windfall if it failed. We doubt that.

Wheat will be cheaper if the bill fails, though not by 70 cents. The difference between the present support price and the support price in the bill is 58 cents. But it isn't likely that wheat, particularly Hard Spring wheat, would fall to the $1.30 guarantee on the farm. If the bill does pass, processors would have to pay for the 70-cent-per-bushel certificate and this could raise the price of flour.

A year ago in a referendum, farmers turned down a mandatory wheat control program, drawn up by Freeman's Department, which provided for certificates on part of a farmer's production. After the rejection of that plan, Freeman said he was washing his hands of wheat legislation.

But President Johnson got worried about the farm vote in 1964 and told Freeman to work out a new wheat plan. Freeman and his advisers came up with a slight variation on the rejected program. In the Senate this was tacked onto a cotton bill already passed by the House. Now the bill is back in the House for action.

Senator HUMPHREY and Representative QUIE, of Minnesota, as well as others, offered various wheat bills which would have bolstered prices more effectively than this Freeman bill. Some of the proposals would not have discriminated against upper midwest wheat as does the Freeman plan. Hard spring wheat, raised chiefly in the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Montana, is preferred for many milling purposes to winter wheat, which makes up most of the surplus. Freeman's bill gives the same support to all wheats and requires the same percentage of acreage cuts.

Unless the pending wheat-cotton bill is passed there seems little likelihood of legislation this year. Thus the Tribune has felt that the administration measure is better than nothing and should be passed. But Freeman's angry tactics in support of the bill make us wonder if this isn't just part of his old ambition to control agriculture completely by Government edict.

His bill would give him tremendous power to set support levels and to manipulate prices. At his discretion, he could unload Government wheat at 105 percent of the support rate. The Secretary isn't demonstrating that he is responsible enough for all this authority.

Panama Crisis: International Commissions Uphold United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House in the Appendix of the RECORD on March 29, 1964, on "Panama Crisis: Investigation by International Commisison of Jurists," I quoted a letter from the Department of State giving information on the composition, authority, and scope of inquiry by the indicated Commission on the Isthmus of Panama into Panamanian charges against the United States in connection with Panamanian violence in January 1964.

As Associated Press dispatch in the Washington Evening Star of March 30, 1964, reports that this Commisison, also a factfinding body of the Organization of American States, have completed their inquiries and found the Panamanian charges baseless.

The indicated Associated Press dispatch follows:

CANAL PROBES UPHOLD UNITED STATES

Latin American sources report two international commissions have found no grounds for Panama's charge that the United States committed aggression and violated human rights during the January riots along the Panama Canal Zone border.

Panama also called on the States of "an unprovoked armed attack against its territory and civil population" in a complaint to the Organization of American States. An OAS Commission was set up to investigate the charge.

Panama also called on the International Jurists Commission, with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, to investigate Panama's claim that the United States violated three articles of the human rights code.

Both Commissions have completed their inquiries, the sources added.

A majority of the members of the special OAS factfinding Commission feel that there is no basis for Panama's charge of aggression, the sources said.

The International Jurists Commission has ruled out Panama's charge of U.S. violation of human rights, the sources reported.

This group reportedly will absolve U.S. authorities of serious misconduct but say that U.S. students in the Canal Zone carried out acts of provocations while the U.S. authorities made an excessive display of force.

Detergents—Deadly Hazard to Water Birds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. Robert W. Nero appearing in the Audubon magazine of January-February 1964 entitled, "Detergents—Deadly Hazard to Water Birds":

DETERGENTS—DEADLY HAZARD TO WATER BIRDS: CHEMICALS STIFLE GREBES' OIL GLAND OUTPUT FOR 16 DAYS—18 OF 21 RESCUED BIRDS DIE

(By Robert W. Nero)

(The author, Dr. Robert W. Nero, is associate professor of biology, University of Saskatchewan, Canada. He is a native of Wisconsin and a graduate of the University of Wisconsin.)

Detergents from the modern housewife's kitchen can be as deadly to North American water birds as crude oil pollution.

Last spring my associates and I rescued 20 detergent-soaked horned grebes from the Regina, Saskatchewan, sewage lagoon. Chemicals not only had destroyed the birds' oily waterproofing but it took 16 days before any of the birds resumed their natural oil gland production. Only three of the birds survived.

Complex chemicals may be expected to have a variety of unforeseen effects on wildlife. In June of 1962, the Wilson Ornithological Society expressed concern over "new organic chemical exotics such as detergents."[1] Ornithologists were alarmed over the deleterious effects of detergents on aquatic-plant and animal-food organisms used by birds.

Ordinarily, detergents occur as pollutants in dilute form and their effect on birds is only indirect. However, we now have good evidence of a direct effect hazard; namely, that of wetting of water birds as a result

[1] Annual Report, Conservation Committee, Wilson Ornithological Society, Wilson Bulletin, 74:218.

of encountering waste detergents in concentrated form.

When a water bird loses its waterproofing, it becomes wet. For a grebe, which always takes flight with some effort, the excess weight of wet plumage may be a fatal handicap. Moreover, a wet bird is subject to chilling.

Late in the evening of April 29, 1963, my wife and I discovered a flock of about two dozen horned grebes sitting on floating boards and on the bank of the Regina lagoon. The birds appeared wet, cold, and dirty and were obviously in some difficulty.

The area of the lagoon in which we found the grebes had a thick scum on the water, evidently waste detergent, perhaps concentrated in this area by the wind. We surmised that the grebes had become immersed in detergents during the previous 24 hours. Evidently they had arrived as migrants during the previous night, since they were not there when we checked the area on April 28.

We easily captured two of the exhausted grebes on the bank and found them to be quite wet—an unusual condition for a water bird. We also found three dead grebes, apparently victims of exhaution and exposure.

This was a particularly cold and windy evening, so we decided to rescue as many as possible. We had no doubt the majority would perish overnight. With six friends and flashlights we returned after dark and were able to capture an additional 18 grebes, all wet, cold and clearly exhausted. These were sitting on the bank in grass or weed cover, evidently attempting to avoid the chill wind.

In caring for the birds we found that a recent reading of a delightful new book, "Bird Doctor," by Katharine Tottenham, was most helpful. This British writer on bird care describes the same "wet feather" condition which plagued our grebes. She said detergents will remove fuel oil from a bird but it also removes the natural oil coating which is part of the bird's waterproofing mechanism.

Miss Tottenham also discusses the failure of a bird's oil gland. When this occurs, the bird becames water soaked and "wet feathered." To remain in a waterproof condition, a bird must be in sound health, constantly preening its feathers. This seemingly vain action straightens out the complex arrangement of its plumage and assures proper anointment with oil.

We were interested in seeing how long it would take our grebes to recover their waterproofing. Our first objective was to remove the detergent and dirt from their feathers and make the birds warm. We put the grebes in the bathtub in warm water and were surprised to see how quickly they adjusted to their unfamiliar surroundings. They bathed, preened, scolded, and imbibed, even deliberately swimming over to stand in ecstasy beneath a torrent of hot water from the tap.

After rinsing the birds in plain, warm water we dried them and kept them near a hot-air register so they would dry out. From this time on we kept them in a small indoor pen, putting them in the tub once a day to drink and preen. We fed them raw cod and halibut, and occasionally gave them vitamin A–D capsules. They soon learned to eat chunks of fish a few times daily—and to call when hungry.

For the first few days, water immersion soaked them thoroughly, and they took a long time to dry. It was 4 days before they seemed slightly less wettable, and then mainly on the wings and head. On the seventh day they were still wettable, but definitely less so than previously.

On the 10th day it was apparent that they were quite a lot more buoyant and drier while bathing, but they were still far from normal. By the 15th day two of three surviving grebes (three died between the 2d and 4th day, one on the 12th day) were in good feather condition, though quite thin.

On the 16th day (May 4), the weakest was dead, but we released the remaining two in Wascana Lake. They kicked up their heels and bathed and preened in obvious delight at being out in the sun and open air. One of our six colleagues, Mrs. Dorothy Wade, kept 13 of the other grebes under similar conditions. (Imagine feeding 13 grebes.) Only one survived.

(Evidence of simultaneous migration of both sexes was obtained from our dead grebes. Of 15 which I dissected, 11 were males and 4 were females.)

Our experience suggests that it takes at least 2 weeks for captive grebes to recover any real degree of waterproofing—at least under the conditions described above. Diet, access to sun and water, and exercise also would have effect on the rate of rewaterproofing. Miss Tottenham notes that an oiled guillemot which she washed and cared for had restored only temporary buoyancy after a month.

We checked the sewage lagoons often for other wet-feather cases. On May 7 we found a dead adult Canada goose floating in a mass of debris in a distant corner of the lagoon. It obviously had died in recent weeks, but we have no certain knowledge of the cause of its death.

On May 9, however, we found four newly arrived Western grebes clearly suffering from wet-feather. Three were sitting on the bank, wet and obviously tired. They moved slowly into the water as we approached on foot. They were having difficulty swimming and returned to shore almost immediately.

The fourth grebe was sitting on shore on the other side of the lagoon and we captured it by hand. This bird had a dry head and, when placed in a tub of warm water, had very wet feathers chiefly on the breast and sides. Apparently the detergent had taken effect quickly while the bird was swimming on the surface.

Although we force fed this grebe with fish and vitamin capsules, it died on May 11. One year previously, on May 12, 1962, we had found a dead Western grebe on the lagoon, which we reported in the Spring Migration report of the Saskatchewan Museum of Natural History as follows:

"It was found dead on a small wooded raft which had floated to shore, on which a pile of clay pellets had been heaped into the semblance of a nest mound; a few sticks and grasses laid on top completed this odd structure. An autopsy revealed the bird had starved to death, which is not surprising as the lagoon contains no fish. What could induce the grebe to stay?"

It now seems likely that this was another wet-feather bird unable to leave the lagoon.

There may well have been additional victims there, but we have no other records of it. The lagoon attracts most species of ducks and the common loon—even white pelicans. Presumably the detergent is not always in sufficient quantity or concentration to "degrease" water birds. Possibly most of them are able to fly to clear waters and recover.

An incredible amount of detergent foam blankets Wascana Creek for a considerable distance below the sewage lagoons, so birds may suffer ill effects in the creek as well as in the lagoons. The total biological effect of detergents in our streams may be more deleterious than we can imagine.

There are reports of new chemicals which can be added at sewage treatment plants to alter detergents so that they can be broken down by bacteria (as in the case for ordinary soaps) and thus rendered harmless. But who is going to check on other possible effects of the new chemicals?

GOP Poverty Attack: Focus on Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NEWSLETTER INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE FRELINGHUYSEN—GOP POVERTY ATTACK: FOCUS OF GRASSROOTS

(NOTE.—Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey, is ranking GOP member of the House Education and Labor Committee which is considering the President's antipoverty bill. In the following Newsletter interview, FRELINGHUYSEN discusses Republican antipoverty proposals and the administration's bill before his committee.)

Some press stories have suggested that Republicans oppose Federal antipoverty programs. Is this true?

Of course not. Both the Manpower Development and Training Act and the vocational education legislation are basically Republican programs. Long before President Johnson announced his antipoverty program, Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee advanced many specific proposals to combat technological unemployment which is a basic cause of poverty. The broad Republican approach to the poverty problem is twofold: Promote the general economy by strengthening confidence, then focus your effort on areas where the problems are most stubborn. Basically, you provide motivation to the underprivileged to improve themselves, then you give them the skills they need to do so.

What are some specific Republican proposals? Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee proposed acceleration and extension of vocational and apprenticeship training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act; maximum coordination between vocational programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the apprenticeship program of the Department of Labor, and the vocational training programs of the military services; Government encouragement of long-term private loans to students; tax incentives for persons who finance their own training for a better job and for those who face college expenses, and tax incentives and subsistence or transportation allowances for persons who must look for work in areas far from their homes.

They recommended a review of military service law to iron out obstacles to the smooth transition of young men from school to civilian employment and establishment of a national clearinghouse of job vacancies for the use of the U.S. Employment Service, employers and private employment agencies. The clearinghouse would identify and classify emerging skill requirements and skills becoming obsolete. These proposals are only a few that Republicans set forth in the joint committee report.

Do you think Republicans will support some parts of the Johnson antipoverty program?

I sincerely hope so. The first job will be to scrutinize the program closely. For example, in House Education and Labor Committee hearings last week, Republicans pointed out there is no specific language in the bill preventing Federal aid to religious, recreational, or welfare programs, a plain

violation of the first amendment to the Constitution.

Are there other parts of the program that should be improved?

Yes. The community action program provides elementary and high school aid without standards or guidelines of any kind. Similar proposals have been rejected time and again by Congress as leading to Federal control of education. This is plainly an attempt to sneak school aid through the backdoor of a poverty program. Many in Congress will object to the fact that this program would superimpose a completely integrated system of Federal education and training wholly removed from control of the States. The bill fails to provide the usual incentives for local community cooperation; i.e., matching of Federal funds. Instead, the Federal Government would pay 90 percent of program costs. This will not only discourage local participation, but greatly increase Federal costs, and so limit the amount of good the program could do.

Are any problems presented by the fact that the entire poverty package has been submitted to one congressional committee?

The bill submitted to the House Education and Labor Committee proposes programs over which that committee usually has no jurisdiction. This may well complicate development of sound legislation. For example, how can this committee write farm legislation, legislation to help small business, and legislation having to do with taxes and the Social Security Act? The bill should be split immediately and proposals submitted to the appropriate committees.

Wheat Program Transition Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of members have inquired of as to the authority in H.R. 6196 and existing legislation to enable an orderly transition from the wheat program now in being to the voluntary certificate wheat program embraced in H.R. 6196, the wheat-cotton bill which will come into the House this week for a vote on acceptance of Senate amendments.

I requested Hon. Orville L. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, to clarify the authority to effectuate this transition, and I now have his response assuring me that the Department has ample authority and will do everything possible and practicable to minimize the difficulties and to help assure orderly marketing conditions during the transition period.

With the permission of the House, I am inserting the Secretary's letter in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1964.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to our attention that a question has arisen relating to the transition from the wheat program currently in effect to a voluntary certificate program.

The Food and Agriculture Act, passed in 1962, contains adequate authority to facilitate the transition to the voluntary certificate program. Section 379g (7 U.S.C. 1379g) provides as follows:

"The Secretary is authorized to take such action as he determines to be necessary to facilitate the transition from the program currently in effect to the program provided for in this subtitle. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, such authority shall include, but shall not be limited to, the authority to exempt all or a portion of the wheat or food products made therefrom in the channels of trade on the effective date of the program under this subtitle from the marketing restrictions in subsection (b) of section 379d, or to sell certificates to persons owning such wheat or food products at such prices as the Secretary may determine."

In addition, the Conference Report on the Act of 1962 contained additional explanation and guidelines for handling the transition. The Senate report on H.R. 6196 contains similar language.

Following passage of the act of 1962, the Department of Agriculture worked closely with producers, representatives of all segments of the grain trade, and Members of Congress in developing plans for the operation of the wheat certificate program and the transition to the program.

Since the authority contained in the act remains a part of the law, and the statement on the part of the Congress appears again in the Senate committee report, there is adequate authority to deal with the problems inherent in the transition to a voluntary wheat certificate program.

The Department of Agriculture is currently studying this situation most carefully to determine the specific details relating to the operation of the program. Obviously, the situation is considerably different than would have been the case had the referendum carried last May. New crop wheat will be harvested in about 2 months. Trading in futures contracts on 1964 crop wheat has been going on for some time.

The trade has known since last May that a transition to lower prices would take place and has had approximately 11 months to take this into consideration. The transition in prices has, in part, already occurred and will occur regardless of what happens to H.R. 6196. Therefore, the plans worked out last year for handling the transition under the circumstances that then existed require some changes for handling the transition under the present circumstances. Department representatives have recently met again with trade representatives and are developing plans for dealing with this situation.

While we well recognize, and believe most of the industry recognizes, the difficulties in the current situation, I assure you that the Department has adequate authority, and will do everything possible and practicable to minimize the difficulties and to help assure orderly marketing conditions during the transition period.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Men at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Joe Isakson, which appeared in the Fargo Forum for March 27, 1964.

This thought-provoking commentary by an interested, sincere American should be studied by people from coast to coast.

The article follows:

MEN AT WORK

(By Joe Isakson)

A few days ago I said goodby, reluctantly and painfully, to some hard-earned dollars and sent them on their way to the Internal Revenue Service office in Fargo.

In this business hub of eastern North Dakota, they will be turned over to U.S. tax collectors to serve as payment on my estimated 1963 income.

These cherished dollars, gone but not forgotten, will become part of a mighty stream flowing to Washington to the enormous expenditures of our Republic, both at home and abroad.

They come from the midlands, the hinterlands, the East, the West, the North, and the South.

Soon, I fear, they will lose their personal identity and become a part of a vast parade moving to Washington, where our selected overlords will use them for such missions and services as they deem proper.

Somewhat dejectedly, I realize that not all of these dollars going to Washington are efficiently disbursed.

Easy spenders and wastrels occasionally dip their fingers into the golden stream. Perhaps they are my dollars they are plucking out—a disturbing prospect.

So it is only natural to speculate about the fate of these dollars.

Part of them may go toward President Johnson's salary and the operation of the White House establishment. To this I have no objection.

Nor would I object to my money going for the salaries of Senators YOUNG and BURDICK and Representatives SHORT and ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

To be sure, I don't always agree with them, but their salaries are a legitimate expense of Government.

What would distress me beyond measure, though, is the thought that my dollars would be used to fatten the purses of the dictators of South America or the maharajahs of India.

Or to purchase extra wives for a Congolese dignitary or provide an air-conditioned yacht for the King of Ethiopia.

Over the years, we have put more than $100 billion—your dollars and mine—into a friendship buying movement in the non-Communist world. Yet, sadly, experience is showing that friends do not always stay bought.

I would question the wisdom of pouring billions into new colonies in Africa which have proven they are incapable of self-government.

This is not to say that I oppose aid to our neighbors abroad. To be sure, our dollars have performed miracles in easing hunger, pain and strife of millions born into a less abundant environment than ours. Let us be thankful we have had the means with which to give.

The point is that our dollars must be spent wisely and efficiently, always giving thought to their source.

One can only hope that they aren't engaged in such misadventures.

May the officials in Washington remember that these mass collections include the widow's mite—the money she might have used for a new refrigerator—and the worker's paycheck—the money he might have spent for a better vacation or a new furnace in his home.

Before our dollars become a meaningless tool in their hands, may they ponder the fact

that these anonymous dollars, though quite impersonal in the mass, come out of the sweat, the blood, and the tears of the people of America.

Prosperity or Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, apparently a new twist will evidence itself in the November election. On the one hand we will be told that this is a time of great prosperity and no one should "rock the boat"; but on the other hand we will be told that enormous poverty exists and that a nationwide effort on the part of the Federal Government is called for. Apparently the Johnson administration wishes to have its cake and eat it too. Are we prosperous or poverty stricken? If according to the late President Kennedy 17 million Americans went to bed hungry every night in 1960 and now according to President Johnson 30 million are going to bed hungry at night, is this cause to be elated over the performance of the New Frontier?

I call your attention to the excellent editorial which follows from the Joplin, Mo., Globe of March 19, 1964:

PROSPERITY OR DEPRESSION?

For as long as anyone can remember, politicians at election time have talked about helping the poor, easing taxes, and being frugal in government. Being one of the shrewdest politicians of our times, a graduate of the F.D.R. school, President Johnson now is making political capital of these old cliches.

Viewed realistically, however, there are some aspects of this year's old campaign theme song that it will pay the people to think through, after more than 30 years of bold plundering of their resources in political exploitations.

Are we in a period of "record prosperity" or an era of depression? It's hard to tell from reading the news from Washington. On the one hand, the President tells us the huge tax cut already is stimulating the economy, expanding industrial plants and production to create new jobs, with gross national product certain to shatter all records this year.

But now he proposes a billion-dollar outlay as a starter on a far-ranging "war on poverty" reminiscent of emergency relief measures in the depression thirties when we really didn't have any prosperity. The danger in this is that it easily could wipe out the benefits of the tax cut and plunge the country deeper into inflationary debt.

The emphasis at the outset is to be on helping youths, ages 16 to 21. And it's hard to argue against helping young people to get started. But one wonders how useful and productive it will be to launch them into regimented, subsidized lives indoctrinated with the philosophy of dependency upon welfare statism as a way of life. What will be the reaction of the parents of these youngsters to putting them into Government work camps?

Do you really believe there are such vast numbers of school dropouts and others now tramping the streets, so discouraged and without hope as to justify the drastic action of gathering them under the umbrella of a paternalistic state? Congress bears a real responsibility, regardless of politics, to search out the facts as to this.

Of course, the wholesale regimentation of youth is only the beginning of this gigantic boondoggle. Also proposed are new public works, more food for the needy, more public housing and slum clearance, socialized medicine, subsidized mass transit, higher minimum wages, extended unemployment coverage, more farm and small business aids, et cetera.

The question is how long will a tolerant people permit themselves to be thus bamboozled and marched on down the road to totalitarianism, with their youth placed at the head of the parade?

National League of Senior Citizens Supports Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the National League of Senior Citizens is on record in support of the quality stabilization bill to protect members with limited funds "from the danger of having inferior merchandise foisted upon them."

The resolution states:

This measure would end the disreputable practic of using well-known merchandise as bait or loss leader advertising to lure unsuspecting customers into stores with the full intent of making up the losses on such quality merchandise by selling them cheap and in many cases foreign-made merchandise at high markups.

The resolution points out that passage of the quality stabilization bill will assure "senior citizens everywhere that they will receive quality merchandise from reliable merchants without the danger of having foisted upon them inferior merchandise which, with their limited funds, they can ill afford."

The board of directors of the league was instructed to speak for its 200,000 members strongly endorsing S. 774 and H.R. 3669, otherwise known as the quality stabilization measure and to make known to the Congress of the United States, through this resolution and by all other means at its disposal, that the National League of Senior Citizens urges immediate favorable action on the aforesaid measure.

Some enemies of quality stabilization have inferred that senior citizens do not want the measure. But it becomes daily clearer to us all, that if the true bill is understood, without prejudice, it is realized as a necessity to the consumer just as much as the small businessman.

As the quality stabilization bill moves to the floors of both Houses, I urge that my colleagues will recognize the sickness in our marketplaces today and will support this specific remedy as but one necessity in preserving our free enterprise system.

With unanimous consent I include this resolution of the National League of Senior Citizens in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL (S. 774 AND H.R. 3669)

Whereas this measure would end the disreputable practice of using well-known merchandise as "bait" or "loss leader" advertising to lure unsuspecting customers into stores with the full intent of making up the losses on such quality merchandise by selling them cheap and in many cases foreign-made merchandise at high markups; and

Whereas it is designed to protect established retail merchandisers, the backbone of the Nation's distributive system, from being driven out of business by predators who make no contributions to our communities; and

Whereas its passage will protect American retail employees from being thrown out of work and onto relief rolls through the increasing influx of inferior foreign goods, manufactured with cheap labor; and

Whereas senior citizens everywhere need assurance through passage of this legislation that they will continue to receive quality merchandise from reliable merchants without the danger of having foisted upon them inferior merchandise which, with their limited funds, they can ill afford: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the National League of Senior Citizens, with a membership of 200,000, strongly endorse S. 774 and H.R. 3669, otherwise known as the quality stabilization measure; and be it further

Resolved, That the said board of directors is instructed to make known to the Congress of the United States, through this resolution and by all other means at its disposal, that the Naional League of Senior Citizens urges immediate favorable action on the aforesaid measure; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD be requested to work with the full California delegation for passage of this measure in the interest of senior citizens and all other consumers.

MYRTLE WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Treasurer for the Board of Directors, National League of Senior Citizens.

Differences in Reports of Statistical Agencies of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the Members a press release which incorporates a letter from George Meany, president, AFL–CIO, to Secretary of Labor Wirtz, regarding technical differences in the reports of statistical agencies of the Federal Government.

The press release follows:

DIFFERENCES IN REPORTS OF STATISTICAL AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

AFL–CIO President George Meany has urged Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to eliminate spreading confusion about the impact of automation which, he said, has been created by technical differences in the reports of various statistical agencies of the Federal Government.

In a letter to Wirtz, dated March 17 and made public March 20, Meany proposed a

top-level committee to examine the differences among the agencies in their figures on manufacturing production and productivity. This committee, he said, should be empowered to recommend steps to reduce or eliminate the differences.

"This subject of rising productivity is altogether too important to the Nation—and particularly to American workers—to permit statistical differences among Government technicians to hide the reality," Meany stressed.

"Most key aspects of the overall issue are clear, despite technical differences about the manufacturing sector. Last year, the gross national product rose about $30 billion, but unemployment increased 160,000. National output failed to rise sufficiently in 1963 to generate enough jobs for a growing labor force in an economy whose productivity was rising rapidly. This is beyond dispute * * *."

"As for the manufacturing sector, Government technicians may differ about the precise rate of productive advance. But the facts are irrefutable that employment of production and maintenance workers declined 1.5 million between 1953 and 1963. For the workers who have been displaced and for those threatened by displacement, automation and rapidly rising productivity are very real."

However, Meany said, technical differences in agency reports on manufacturing have been "translated into confusion about the entire economy." He cited in particular a "misleading" headline in the New York Times of March 16, "Job Losses Overestimated in Automation, United States Finds." The story was based on one of the differences between agency findings.

This confusion is needless," the AFL–CIO leader continued. It should be ended. And it can be ended by a careful examination of the differing series of output and productivity figures published by the various Government agencies. * * *

"The American public has a right to the facts and the Government should be able to provide reasonably reliable statistics on output and productivity in manufacturing. A top-level committee such as I propose can eliminate the statistical differences that cause spreading confusion about a subject of great importance to our Nation."

Among the Federal sources of figures relating to production, productivity and employment are the President's Economic Report, prepared by the Council of Economic Advisors, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Departments of Commerce and Labor.

Copies of Meany's letter were sent to Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The text of Meany's letter follows:

Differences in statistics among Government agencies, relating to the recent rate of productivity advance in manufacturing, are presenting the American public with a confusing picture about the pace of rising productivity and the impact of automation. Technical differences about the manufacturing sector have been blown up into implications for the national economy as a whole, such as the misleading front page headline in the New York Times of March 16, "Job Losses Overestimated in Automation, United States Finds."

This subject of rising productivity is altogether too important to the Nation—and particularly to American workers—to permit statistical differences among Government technicians to hide the reality.

Most key aspects of the overall issue are clear, despite technical differences about the manufacturing sector. Last year, the gross national product rose about $30 billion, but unemployment incrased 160,000. National output failed to rise sufficiently in 1963 to generate enough jobs for a growing labor force in an economy whose productivity was rising rapidly. This is beyond dispute.

In addition, the Government's statistics on the pace of rising productivity in the total private economy are also clear. According to the President's Economic Report, output per manhour in the private economy accelerated from an annual rate of 2.2 percent in 1919–47 to a yearly pace of 3.2 percent in the postwar period, 1947–63. Further accelration of the rate of productivity advance is indicated by the Government's report that output per manhour in the private economy rose at a yearly rate of 3.5 percent in 1960–63. These trends are also clear.

This acclerating pace of productivity advance in the private economy as a whole, along with the rapid growth of the labor force, is making is difficult to reduce the high level of unemployment. Public confusion, based on technical differences about the statistics of the manufacturing sector, can only serve to delay the national policy decisions required to achieve and sustain full employment.

As for the manufacturing sector, Government technicians may differ about the precise rate of productivity advance. But the facts are irrefutable that employment of production and maintenance workers declined 1.5 million between 1953 and 1963. For this workers who have been displaced and for those threatened by displacement, automation, and rapily rising productivity are very real.

Actual technical differences relate to the manufacturing sector, alone. But they have been translated into confusion about the entire economy. This confusion is needless. It should be ended. And it can be ended by a careful examination of the differing series of output and productivity figures published by the various Government agencies.

The Government's official monthly figures on manufacturing output are published by the Federal Reserve Board; they imply a very rapid rise of about 4 percent a year in manufacturing productivity in recent years. The Commerce Department publishes at least two different series of figures on manufacturing output, which imply a somewhat lower rate of productivity advance in factories. However, the most recently published figures by the Commerce Department also indicate an acceleration of manufacturing productivity from an annual rate of 2.7 percent in the postwar period, 1947–63, to a yearly pace of 3.7 percent in the most recent years, 1960–63. Yet these differences have been enough to create sensational headlines and confusing reports.

These technical differences must not be permitted to obscure an issue as important as the pace of rising productivity.

I urge you to establish a top-level committee to examine the technical differences among Government agencies on the statistics of manufacturing production and productivity, with authority to make recommendations to those agencies for the purpose of reducing or eliminating such statistical differences.

The American public has a right to the facts and the Government should be able to provide reasonably reliable statistics on output and productivity in manufacturing. A top-level committee such as I propose can eliminate the statistical differences that cause spreading confusion about a subject of great importance to our Nation.

Dr. Olds To War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Glenn A. Olds, president of Springfield College in my home city of Springfield, Mass., has been selected to help organize and operate the proposed "Volunteers for America" phase of President Johnson's antipoverty program, Sargent Shriver, chief of staff of the antipoverty program, has announced. Dr. Olds is not only a master administrator and educator, but he is an innovator, and has breathed new life into Springfield College since becoming its president, in July 1858.

I include with my remarks two articles on Dr. Olds from the Springfield Union on March 26 and March 31, and an editorial carried in the Springfield Union on March 27:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Mar. 26, 1964]

DR. OLDS TO WAR ON POVERTY

Dr. Glenn A. Olds, president of Springfield College, has agreed to help organize and operate the proposed "Volunteers for America" phase of the Johnson administration's antipoverty program, it was announced in Washington Wednesday by Sargent Shriver, the President's chief of staff in the antipoverty campaign.

ONE OF THREE NAMED

Dr. Olds, 43, was one of three men enlisted by Shriver to lead in planning three key programs in the war on poverty. Others are Dr. Vernon Roger Alden, 40, president of Ohio University and former associate dean of the Harvard Business School, and Jack T. Conway, 46, executive director of the AFL–CIO's Industrial Union Department and former Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Dr. Alden will develop plans for the proposed "Job Corps," a group of up to 100,000 draft rejects and school dropouts which will be given job training, education and work experience. Conway will be responsible for making guideline decisions in the "Community Action" program.

Volunteers for America, a Peace Corps-styled organization, will be incorporated into helping wipe out pockets of poverty.

STATUS STILL VAGUE

Shriver said the three men are on loan to his planning group. He said he does not know whether their commitments to their institutions will permit them to head the programs if Congress passes the legislation.

Asked about the chances of the poverty program setting through Congress in this session, Shriver said he has only made a "surface reading" on Capitol Hill but is "rather optimistic."

Naming the three men to head different phases of planning, Shriver said, "is an effort to make plans so we can answer some of the questions Congressmen are asking."

A House Education and Labor subcommittee held the first hearings on the bill last week.

Dr. Olds began his duties as the eighth president of Springfield College July 1, 1958, after serving as director of the Cornell United Religious Work at Cornell University.

In October 1961, Dr. Olds declined an offer of a major administrative position with the Peace Corps in this country and abroad. He also declined a second proposal that he take a year's leave to lend his educational administrative experience to the new international agency. He also decided at that time not to accept a third offer by Peace Corps officials to become a senior consultant on a twice-weekly basis.

Springfield College has been an active participant in the international Peace Corps program, notably in training volunteers for work in South America.

Dr. Olds received a bachelor's degree from Willamette University in Salem, Oreg., and

a bachelor of divinity degree from Garrett Theological Seminary in Evanston, Ill., where he was graduated with highest distinction. He later received a doctorate in philosophy from Yale University.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Mar. 26, 1964]

DR. OLDS TAKES A CHALLENGE

The choice of Dr. Glenn Olds to organize and head the Volunteers of America, one of three key programs in President Johnson's proposed "war on poverty," was not exactly surprising. Over the past 2½ years Dr. Olds had declined three offers of posts with the Peace Corps. He has been close to that program as president of Springfield College, which has done an important training job for the Corps.

It is noteworthy, however, that this time Dr. OOlds agreed to take the post and, hopefully, will be able to put his administrative talent to use in a promising Federal program. The antipoverty measure is currently the subject of congressional hearings, and there is high optimism that it will gain passage this session. The volunteers of America is the phase designed for a domestic Peace Corps type of mission—helping to eliminate poverty where it is concentrated. "Job Corps" and "Community Action" are the names of the other two phases of the program.

Dr. Olds, who came to Springfield College in 1958, has displayed the energy and imagination that makes him an excellent choice for the antipoverty post. He has been credited with revitalizing the curriculum at Springfield College while strengthening the graduate study division and putting new emphasis on the college's international scope. In 6 years Springfield College has gained seven new buildings. Scholarships and annual income have tripled, and the annual budget has doubled. Service programs have been increased, and there have been many other improvements—for students, staff and community. And Springfield College's graduates, incidentally, are among the country's outstanding workers with young people from all environments, including the poor environments where inspiration of young lives is vital to self-improvement.

As to the office of Springfield College, Dr. Olds has said, "It is not the coziest spot in the world and it is certainly one of the loneliest. But, man for man, hour for hour, it is surely the liveliest." The job of wiping out poverty is not so different that it can't use what Dr. Olds has to offer.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Mar. 31, 1964]

IN CHARGE OF VOLUNTEERS—POVERTY WAR ROLE EXCITES DR. OLDS—SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE PRESIDENT HOPES STUDENTS GRADUATING FROM COLLEGE, RETIRED FOLK WILL HELP

Married women whose children have grown and retired persons were mentioned Monday by Dr. Glenn A. Olds, president of Springfied College as "reservoirs" which could provide volunteers for the "War on Poverty" program.

NAMED TO POST

Dr. Olds, who last week was named by Sargent Shriver, President Johnson's chief of staff in the antipoverty campaign, to lead in the planning and operation of the proposed "Volunteers for America" phase of the program, added that he felt many students graduating from college would be willing to "give up a year" to serve in the program and that returning members of the Peace Corps would be a large source of personnel.

During a press conference at the college, Dr. Olds said he is slated to appear next Tuesday before a House education and labor subcommittee to familiarize Congressmen with the phase of the program he is heading. He said that although Congress has yet to enact legislation for the antipoverty program, preliminary planning "commenced immediately" after he agreed to be "on loan" to Shriver's group. He termed Shriver "a human dynamo."

Dr. Olds said the plan is designed "to break the back of the cycle of poverty" and that every phase would be staffed in depth.

ROLE IS EXCITING

"My role is not tidy but from my point of view, it is more exciting," Dr. Olds said. He said the Volunteers for America, a Peace-Corps-style organization, will be incorporated into helping to wipe out pockets of poverty and added he would get "immediate exposure" to those pockets.

The Springfield College president noted he is not unfamiliar with poverty as he worked with Indians in Oregon and other States and also did youth work in Chicago's South Side.

"I have been battling poverty all my life," he said.

Dr. Olds said that while on loan to the antipoverty program, he would be working 3 days a week on the program and 4 days at the college. He said college trustees "felt on the whole that our responsibility to these programs has been constant and if I felt I could do both jobs, I should be given the opportunity to try."

Dr. Olds said the "magnitude of involvement" will be clearer in a few weeks and that his main loss would be "sleep and my family."

"This is descriptive of most of the people I met in Washington," Dr. Olds said, "but there is a deep conviction that this problem of poverty has to be licked * * * studies correlate that if you are born into poverty, you hardly ever get out."

Dr. Olds said the proposed legislation projects 5,000 volunteers in the phase of the program he is organizing and it is possible States and cities may train more volunteers.

Dr. Olds said he hopes to get Stan Musial, recently appointed to head the President's Youth Fitness Council, and other well-known athletes to become "volunteers" even on a part-time basis, to aid in combating youth problems.

"Our athletes are wonderful human beings and have an impact on youth—I believe they will be ueful in this program," he said.

End Runaround Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Globe-Democrat of St. Louis in an editorial April 3 put in proper perspective the issue facing Congress on the second effort to get the authorization bill for the International Development Association adopted.

I commend the full text of this editorial to my colleagues:

END RUNAROUND CONGRESS

On February 26, the House voted 208–189 to kill an administration bill authorizing $312 million as our contribution to a proposed $750 million increase in lending funds for the International Development Association. The Representatives sent the measure back to the Banking and Currency Committee for burial, but it didn't die.

Down Pennsylvania Avenue came the first-string ambulance team to rescue this first important casualty of Mr. Johnson's tenure. The committee held new hearings late in March.

The bill must not be passed by the House; the reasons are numerous and convincing.

Essentially, the scheme is an end run around the tight restrictions on foreign aid written by Congress in recent years and an attempt to increase that aid while not advertising it as such.

The IDA is a subsidiary of the World Bank. It now has $1 billion in lending power and it dispenses these loans for 50 years at no interest charge whatever, with a minuscule carrying fee of three-quarters of 1 percent. We are being asked to help underwrite a near doubling of that lending power. We should not.

While we already contribute 42 percent of the funds, our voting power is limited to 26 percent.

The IDA has power to send our dollars to countries which have seized our property without payment and which have been cut off from foreign aid by Congress.

It can lend to Red and quasi-Red states such as Yugoslavia, Ghana, and British Guiana.

The Association can circumvent the congressional requirement that our dollars be used to promote free enterprise, not socialism. As an example, it is possible that India, denied tax dollars by Congress for its big socialistic steel mill at Bokaro, can get them through the IDA.

Some recipients of IDA loans have been going through the chow line twice; first picking up regular foreign aid from the United States and then IDA dollars.

There is no buy-America requirement that our contributions be spent in the United States. This makes any loans to IDA an even greater threat to the gold crisis and balance-of-payments situation than foreign aid. In addition, we have no guarantee that we will ever get the money back—even in 50 years.

Abuses have appeared. Both Nehru and Chiang Kai-shek have been found making a killing by relending these no-interest funds to their own people at handsome and sometimes usurious rates—up to 12 percent.

If we are going to give out foreign aid, then we ought to have control over where it goes and to whom and for what. If IDA wants more funds let it get those funds somewhere else. We are already carrying too much of the load.

Enactment of S. 792 Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. O. S. Myers, the distinguished President of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, strongly urging enactment of S. 792, to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Area.

Mr. Myers speaks on behalf of 60,000 devoted, dedicated, and enthusiastic conservationists of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, of which he is an outstanding member.

I feel this is the kind of legislation that deserves and requires the early attention of Congress in the interest of all of the people.

The letter follows:

MICHIGAN UNITED CONSERVATION CLUBS,
Lansing, Mich., March 25, 1964.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Area bill, S. 792, is now being considered by the National Parks Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee. Michigan United Conservation Clubs, a nonprofit organization of some 350 affiliated clubs and 60,000 members, considers this a most important bill, along with scores of other responsible organizations and more than a million citizens.

We understand that S. 792 will be compared in the House with a similar bill introduced by Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, a bill which proposes setting up a lakeshore area of considerably smaller acreage. We urge you to give primary consideration to the Senate bill.

S. 792, after years of work and negotiation, is a compromise bill carefully drawn up to consider all interests involved. Its proposed acreage has been scaled down from original proposals of 96,000 and 77,000 acres to 47,600 acres, with 42,300 acres on the mainland in the northwest corner of Michigan and 5,300 acres on South Manitou Island. Included are 33 miles of mainland shoreline and 13 miles of island shoreline, and a 30-mile scenic highway is authorized.

As you are aware, Michigan parks today are overcrowded, and tens of thousands are annually turned away. The proposed acreage of 47,600 acres for the lakeshore area is none too large, and in the very near future, a growing population with increased leisure will use all of that area to the fullest.

In short, Michigan needs the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Area, both recreationally and economically. The area is the apex of a population triangle, with the legs reaching down to the heavy population centers of Detroit and Chicago, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and running up through Lansing, Grand Rapids, and other important centers.

The tourist industry is presently Michigan's third largest industry, and the potential for expansion of tourism in this area is almost unlimited. Over the years, it will provide increasing revenue for growing numbers of persons in that economically limited area.

Further, the presence of such an area will mean an increased funneling of tourists across the Mackinac Bridge into the Upper Peninsula, an economically distressed area which desperately needs greater tourist trade.

We understand the Sleeping Bear Dunes bill has been referred to as "controversial." While this was once true, the amended version passed by the Senate has met virtually every objection, and many of those who once opposed the creation of a lakeshore area now favor it.

Much of the earlier opposition came from those who own property in the area around the inland lakes, who feared that the Government would force them out. Thus, there has been left out of the present bill some 30,000 acres around Little Traverse Lake, Glen Lake, and Platte Lake, where occur the heaviest concentrations of residences and from whence came most of the opposition to the plan.

The number of structures within the boundaries was thus reduced from 1,587 to 288. Those few who still remain have every guarantee that they may continue to enjoy their homesites as long as they wish and, indeed, have additional guarantees that the area will never degenerate to a rundown "neon jungle.".

We feel it is imperative that S. 792 be approved this year. We understand that Congress is considering a number of other seashore and lakeshore areas, that several probably will be approved on something of a "regional" basis, and that the Indiana Dunes is being strongly considered ahead of Sleeping Bear.

We point out that the Indiana Dunes site cannot compare with Sleeping Bear as a region of unparalleled beauty and capacity for offering many different kinds of recreation to millions of people. However, passage of the Indiana Dunes bill this year would kill the possibility of establishing a lakeshore area at Sleeping Bear at the present, and would seriously endanger its chances in the future.

S. 792 as amended is an excellent compromise bill which would give Michigan badly needed recreation area and a tremendous economic asset.

We most strongly urge that you contact the chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee with a request that the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Area bill, S. 792, be given highest priority and consideration.

Thank you,

O. S. MYERS,
President, Michigan United Conservation Clubs.

The 3 Years of Alianza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 36 months ago the charter of the late President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress was signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay.

The Alliance for Progress, hailed as a dream plan to cure Latin America's ills, has become a painful process, but in spite of everything it is pushing ahead. Considering the enormous problems to be met, it is not surprising it has had difficulties. Pulling up underdeveloped economies in which people and attitudes in many instances have to be changed is not a job to be done in 3 years, nor in three decades.

Eight nations have developed comprehensive economic plans. Since August 1961, 10 nations have adopted agrarian reform programs, making a total of 13 with effective land reform plans; four other countries have submitted plans to their legislature.

Most of the countries have taken steps toward attainment of the tax reform goals outlined in the Alliance charter. Eleven countries have increased income tax rates, particularly on large income, and two nations, Guatemala and Uruguay, have imposed an income tax for the first time.

The most visible evidence of the Alliance accomplishments has been provided by projects undertaken to further social progress—in housing, public health, and education.

On March 13, the third anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, the Miami Herald, one of the foremost newspapers in our Nation, carried an article entitled, "The 3 Years of Alianza," and I am particularly pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE CHALLENGE REMAINS: THE 3 YEARS OF ALIANZA

It was 3 years ago today that the late President Kennedy, speaking to a group of diplomats at a White House reception, sent a fresh breeze of hope through Latin America.

Mr. Kennedy announced a 10-point program of mutual assistance under which the social and economic structure of a hemisphere would be uplifted.

The grand design, the most sweeping proposal of its kind ever made, was to be known as the Alliance for Progress.

"If we are successful," said the President, "if our effort is bold enough and determined enough, then the close of this decade will mark the beginning of a new era in the American experience. The living standards of every American family will be on the rise—basic education will be available to all—hunger will be a forgotten experience—the need for massive outside help will have passed—most nations will have entered a period of self-sustaining growth and, although there will be much to do, every American republic will be the master of its own revolution and its own hope and progress."

It was a grandiose dream, eloquently presented, and it was greeted with universal acclaim.

Now that 3 of the 10 milestones have been passed, where does the Alliance stand? The way has been marked by disappointments and frustrations. There have been complaints, criticisms of redtape and lack of cooperation. In some countries enthusiasm has waned, in others there is resistance in high places.

Yet it is a serious mistake to emphasize the negative. The Alliance has some notable successes. In some countries it has surpassed the hope.

There have been tax reform, land reform, improvement in housing and schools in almost every country. Almost 500,000 families have been resettled on their own land. More than 160,000 agricultural loans have been made, 900 hospitals have been built and 700 cities helped to get pure water supplies.

Millions of dollars have been used to develop industry, mining and fisheries.

Administrative changes have brought Latin American leaders to posts of decision. The nations have gained valuable experience in working together. This sense of common interest is more widespread than ever before.

The job has not been done but few expected it to be at this point. If it has not realized its aim, the Alliance at least has demonstrated its potential. It is as much a challenge and an opportunity today as it was on March 13, 1961.

As the diplomats gather in Washington again this weekend to hear another President reaffirm the goals, Mr. Kennedy's 3-year-old words have the same moving application:

"Our unfulfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions."

A Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 6, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, my sister, Mrs. Charles W. Byrnes, sent me the en-

closed poem. It is so expressive that I could not resist having it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for posterity. You know, as do many others, that the great, great majority of Americans still believe in the words, "For God and Country," in the Declaration of Independence, and in the Bill of Rights. They believe, too, that God should be—and must be—revered in the marketplace, in schools, and in our daily lives.

The majority of Americans believe there can be no peace without justice and no justice without God.

The poem follows:

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The traitor's deed is done. The fatal bullet spent.
We can now but deeply mourn our fallen President.
And fall he did as some great oak, with sounds that shook the earth.
For his was greatness seldom known, who now will judge his worth.

O Lord how wrong it seems to take a man so young,
Whose selfless work on earth had only just begun.
Through our grief and mourning please let us understand;
For being merely mortal we see no master plan.
We only knew our hero. We loved our noble Chief.
His width and breadth foreshadowed all. We sit in futile grief.

God rest you mighty champion, to the halls where good men go,
We'll cherish every moment we had you here below.

—AL CARDAMONE

Panama Canal Zone: Key Spot for Control of Round-the-World Strategic Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Red inspired, led, and directed January 9, 1964, mob assaults on the Canal Zone requiring the use of the U.S. Army to protect U.S. citizens, the Canal Zone and Panama Canal from a bath of rape, murder, pillage, and sabotage, the people of our Nation and the Congress have gained a deeper perspective of the long-range strategic aims behind what has been a veritable deluge of communistic revolutionary propaganda for coexistence, disarmament, and peace.

Although many of our citizens have been badly confused by the barrage of words, the real Red aims behind it are clear. They are:

First. The undermining and fatal weakening of NATO, CENTO, and SEATO.

Second. The recognition by the West of the permanent control by the Soviet of European captive nations now behind the Iron Curtain, including the Eastern Zone of Germany.

Third. A nonaggression agreement between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries.

Fourth. The partial withdrawal of U.S. forces from Europe.

Fifth. The permanent separation of Berlin from West Germany.

Sixth. The infiltration, subversion, and overthrow of constitutional government throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Seventh. The creation of a vested interest in the stability of communistic regimes by expanding trade between the Soviet bloc and the West.

Eighth. The establishment of a firm Soviet beachhead in the Near East in the interest of communistic leadership over the entire area.

Ninth. The control of the three great maritime crossroads in the Suez Canal, Malay barrier routes, and the Panama Canal.

The situation in the Caribbean, featured by the securing of revolutionary beachheads in Cuba on the north, and in Venezuela and British Guiana on the south, with control of the Panama Canal as the key objective, stresses the fact that the crisis in Panama is an important part of the overall revolutionary program for gaining control of such strategic water routes.

In this connection, the Red program is far advanced, with Egypt under pro-Red Nasser controlling the Suez Canal and routes across the Malay Barrier dominated or seriously threatened. Were the United States to surrender control of the Panama Canal, the Red domination of round-the-world water routes would be nearing completion. The conquests so far accomplished in these regards could have been accomplished only through the services of a highly trained general staff of transcendant capacity. In fact, their performance establishes them as among the most audacious strategists in history.

Mr. Speaker, it is no mere coincidence that the Panama Canal Zone has been chosen for more turmoil in the future than we have had in the past. Nor should it be forgotten that, when Khrushchev delivered his blistering attack on U.S. presence in the Canal Zone on January 17, 1964, at Kalinin, Premier Castro of Cuba was present.

With the United States preoccupied in several key spots in different parts of the world and our leaders absorbed in the coming presidential campaign, it is only natural that certain foreign countries are seeking their own advantages to the distress of our country.

A perceptive article on the behavior of foreign nations at this time by David Lawrence was published in the February 20, 1964, issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C.

As this article supplements what my distinguished and scholarly colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and others have repeatedly emphasized in addresses in the Congress, I quote it as part of my remarks:

THE BEHAVIOR OF FOREIGN NATIONS—SERIES OF CRISES FOR UNITED STATES EXPECTED AFTER NOVEMBER'S PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

(By David Lawrence)

What's going on beneath the surface today in national as well as international affairs can make the year 1965 perhaps the most critical in this century. During the 8 months before the presidential election, steps will be taken by foreign governments which could involve the United States in a series of crises that may begin to emerge after the presidential election November 3.

What gives most concern at present is the behavior of the foreign governments which have deliberately construed the current election campaign in this country as giving them an opportunity to put into effect policies beneficial to themselves but harmful to the United States.

Unfortunately, presidential elections occur at a fixed time under the American Constitution and cannot be postponed to a more opportune moment, as under the parliamentary system. Foreign governments know that American presidential campaigns are lengthy affairs, and that no President is going to risk his chance for reelection by plunging this country into a military crisis which could demand the drafting of more boys and cause the interruption of the normal lives of many citizens—to say nothing of the impact on the economic situation as a whole.

Confident that the President of the United States is virtually stalemated into a posture of inaction, foreign governments feel free to pursue their disturbing policies without fear of reprisals. This not only is true with respect to Castro in Cuba, but is related to the arrogant behavior of Panama and friction in other parts of Latin America.

So far as southeast Asia is concerned, the position of the United States has deteriorated, and there are hints that American military forces will be withdrawn after November. This will be construed as a humiliating defeat for the American Government. Were it not for the presidential election, it is conceivable that the United States would take a more forthright position not only in southeast Asia but toward her own allies who have created ill feeling in the United States by increasing their trade with Red China as well as with Cuba.

The strategy of the Democratic administration appears to be to do nothing which will aggravate or escalate the international situation. There is a tendency in official quarters to soft-pedal what is going on behind the scenes in different parts of the world. The press is not being given all the facts about Government moves on the international front or even about the happenings inside Latin America, some of which may well be more threatening than outwardly would appear. Policymaking seems to be predicated on the theory that the Nation wants peace at any price and that this is the way to win a presidential election.

Past experience should, however, have taught a lesson. In 1916, President Wilson was reelected on the campaign slogans "Peace and Prosperity" and "He kept us out of war." But within 6 months after the election, the United States entered World War I.

President Roosevelt campaigned for reelection in 1940 with the cry, "I hate war." But a year after the election, the United States was plunged into World War II.

In both instances, the assumption of the enemy was that the United States, for political reasons, would not enter the war. The Kaiser's government was confident of this and went on torpedoing American ships at sea in the belief that the United States would not take military action. Hitler also was sure that this country would not enter World War II in Europe and later persuaded Japan to attack the United States on the supposition that America would become so preoccupied with the conflict in the Pacific Ocean that it would not be able to be of much assistance in fighting the war in Europe.

Throughout these grave periods of history, foreign governments have underestimated the resoluteness of the American people. The Communist policy at the moment is to talk about disarmament and peaceful coexistence, but the Communist drive to take

over Latin America, southeast Asia and Africa continues unabated. The United Nations is powerless to do much about it because Great Britain, France, and the United States are in disagreement.

But usually these periods of apparent appeasements of a blustering enemy come to a sudden end when the enemy overreaches himself and brings on a situation which simply does not permit the "peace at any price" attitude to be continued. This may produce the big crisis after the American presidential election is over. Many Members of Congress believe the President would be far stronger in the world, and even with his own public opinion, if he manifested a resolute policy rather than a passive and acquiescent attitude. Certainly the 8 months before the election appear to be paving the way for crucial decisions in the year 1965.

State and Local Efforts To Reduce Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, while much is heard of the administration's "war on poverty," State and local governments as well as private groups are carrying the burden of the Nation's continuing effort to reduce poverty. An article in the New York Times of March 18 highlighted one such effort—a major assault on poverty by the State of North Carolina developed when the idea of the Federal Government's war on poverty was still a vague concept.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article discussing the North Carolina program in the RECORD:

NORTH CAROLINA PRESSING OWN $14 MILLION WAR ON POVERTY

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The Federal Government's war on poverty was little more than a vague idea when the people of North Carolina decided to act on their own last fall.

Now, with the Federal attack on poverty still just getting underway, North Carolina is quietly moving to break the cycle of poverty in which so many children are trapped.

The State's $14 million assault on poverty—the first such State plan in the Nation—has not gone unnoticed by those who have put together President Johnson's program.

The Federal planners, frequently disorganized and arguing among themselves, have turned from time to time to the men who planned the North Carolina program: Gov. Terry Sanford; Paul N. Ylvisaker of the Ford Foundation, the principal contributor to the State's antipoverty campaign; and others.

Copies of the booklet outlining the North Carolina plan have become dog-eared in recent weeks as Federal planners have sought ideas on how best to combat poverty.

PRESIDENT TOOK NOTICE

Even President Johnson has taken notice that North Carolina is ahead of the Federal Government.

"I want to congratulate you on your initiative in mobilizing for an attack on poverty in North Carolina," the President said in a message to State leaders in January.

Months before poverty became the subject of a Federal campaign, plans for the North Carolina program were underway, with funds supplied by the Ford Foundation, the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, and the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation.

Last September, with the money promised and the plan outlined, Governor Sanford gave the challenge that was echoed 4 months later by the President:

"I have come to believe," the Governor said, "that charity and relief are not the best answers to human suffering, that the schools are not the answer so long as only a third or a half of our students finish school, that the wealth of America is not the answer if many families have 50-some cents a day per person for all expenses."

In North Carolina, the Governor went on, "we want to go into a few communities and say to the leaders of schools, government, welfare, health, charity: 'Look, let's work together, let's see if together in a few neighborhoods near here we can't break the cycle of poverty and give these children a better chance.'"

Fifty-one communities, both urban and rural, put together suggested plans of action.

By mid-April, those administering the program will have chosen 10 of these communities as sites for projects entitled to financial help. The local communities will operate the interracial projects and underwrite part of the cost.

The proposed projects include preschool teaching centers, designed to offset bad home environments; counseling and job training; remedial-education centers; adult-education courses, and services in budgeting and home care for low-income families.

Funds also will be used to establish a learning laboratory, near both the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University at Durham, to study methods of teaching slow learners and problem children and to improve teaching instruction.

The antipoverty planners will also seek to recruit college graduates to work for a year or two in the project communities as part of a sort of domestic Peace Corps.

All of these North Carolina projects—just as the Federal program unveiled today by President Johnson—will focus largely on young people, seeking to help them escape from the poverty in which their families have been trapped for generations.

While generally considered one of the wealthiest and most progressive of Southern States, North Carolina has widespread poverty, particularly among Negroes, who constitute nearly a quarter of the population.

"Definitions of poverty vary," the State antipoverty planners noted in their policy booklet. "But whatever the definition, the record in North Carolina is distressing."

Developing a Sound Domestic Farm Labor Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the major task confronting us in the domestic farm labor field today is a difficult one. It is the task of matching unemployed workers—a figure totaling 496,000 in California alone—with the labor requirements of our Nation's agricultural growers and producers. It is a task which has been tragically ignored to date because of the mass importation of braceros—187,000 in 1963—but one which now demands our attention and action.

In a thoughtful, thought-provoking address delivered recently in California, the very able and distinguished Under Secretary of Labor, John Henning, has made a major contribution to the discussion which the solution of this problem requires. It is not an address which poses all the answers, nor does it pretend to. But its recommendations are sound. Its approach is searching and constructive, and it deserves our close and careful attention.

The address follows:

DEVELOPING A SOUND DOMESTIC FARM LABOR PROGRAM

(Address by Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning, before a Conference on the Development of a Domestic Agricultural Labor Force Cosponsored by the State of California and the U.S. Department of Labor, Sacramento, Calif., Friday, March 13, 1964)

I join Governor Brown in cochairing this conference today with a viewpoint shaped from two different sources. The first involves my background as a native Californian; one fully appreciative of the importance of the agricultural industry to this State, one long familiar with the history and application of Public Law 78 here.

The second involves my present role as Under Secretary of Labor and the Department of Labor's Manpower Administrator, in which capacities I am daily forced to deal with the fact that unemployment in our country has been above the 5-percent rate for some 76 consecutive months.

So I am here with two primary considerations in mind. I am deeply interested personally in seeing California make a successful transition from an admixture of foreign and domestic farm labor to a sound and effective program of domestic farm labor alone. And through such a transition, I also want to see—here and elsewhere—how many unemployed Americans can be put to work.

What is the basic situation which has brought us together today? Essentially, three factors are involved. California's major cities continue to be burdened with high levels of unemployment, no fewer than 22 of them according to the Department of Labor's most recent estimate. Secondly, in a State in which agriculture is such a massive economic factor, the truth that no other industry is advancing technologically at a faster rate is becoming more painfully apparent in human terms with each passing year. And following upon this fact, finally, is the consequent rural exodus to the cities, compounding the already existent urban unemployment problem.

Despite this situation, our State has continued over these past years to depend heavily upon the importation of foreign farm labor. Under Public Law 78, last year, the Nation used some 187,000 braceros. Of this total, fully 111,000 came to California.

I don't think that any of us any longer dispute that one of the results of this contradictory farm employment policy has been the persistent maintenance of substandard living conditions for a significant proportion of California's citizens.

Housing is a case in point. Just 3 weeks ago, Governor Brown placed the following revelations before housing subcommittees of both the House and Senate in Washington.

"More than 80 percent of farmworker families live in dwellings which violate standards of health, safety, and comfort.

"Nearly 75 percent of the dwellings occupied by general fieldworkers are dilapidated or deteriorated.

"Pit privies still serve 33 percent of the dwellings occupied by general fieldworkers.

"Thirty percent of the dwellings have no bathing facilities and 25 percent lack even a kitchen sink with running water."

It is this very kind of poverty that our present national administration believes an intensive Federal-State effort should remove from the land. Certainly, in such an effort, California's present farm employment practices can no longer be countenanced.

Indeed, with the expiration of Public Law 78, they won't be. The primary problem before us now, whatever our self-interests, is that of successfully matching California's unemployed workers with the labor requirements of the growers. At the moment, there are some 496,000 unemployed workers in California.

In this respect, I am pleased with the basic position taken last month before the State board of agriculture by the Council of California Growers. It has adopted a welcome attitude of acceptance of the end of Public Law 78. It envisions no new foreign farm labor program, nor do we envision the use of Public Law 414 as a substitute for Public Law 78. The council of growers has recognized the twin problems of poverty and unemployment associated with agriculture in our State, and has announced its intention to embark upon an intensive worker recruitment program.

In this position, the growers will have the proper cooperation of the U.S. Department of Labor, its Bureau of Employment Security, and the Bureau's Farm Labor Service. In the development and expansion of this position, we stand ready to lend our assistance in accord with the provision of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Following upon its basic statement of policy, the Council of Growers has called for a series of studies designed to chart a course for the future. These would include the following: a determination of the actual number of farmworkers needed in California on a county-by-county, crop-by-crop, month-by-month basis; a projection on the pace of mechanization to determine the length of time these jobs will be available before being replaced by machines; a determination of the number of men and women throughout the State and the Nation who are qualified, willing, and able to perform the temporary farm jobs available; a study of the wages, housing, transportation and other requirements which these workers feel they would need to accept farm employment.

These recommendations should and will be an integral part of the business of this conference.

At the same time, however, I would put forth an allied proposal. There have been, over the course of the past 20 years or so, a series of landmark studies in the field of farm labor through which a great deal of information has been developed on our needs in housing, health services, schools, and other community facilities. The following national studies come to mind: the 1951 report of President Truman's original Commission on Migratory Labor, the 1957 report of consultation of migratory farm labor conducted jointly by the National Council of Churches of Christ and the Federal Government, the 1959 Mexican farm labor program consultants report, the 1959 public hearings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, the Agriculture Department's study of migratory farmworkers in the midcontinent streams.

Non-Federal studies relating specifically to our California situation are also significant. A State senate committee reported, in both 1961 and 1963, on California's Farm Labor Problems. The University of California released in 1963 a study of Seasonal Labor in California Agriculture. The Stanford Research Institute's 1963 projections on farm labor requirements are contained in its California's Economy in 1970. And, of course, recent hearings on housing for domestic migrants by a State senate committee were reported on in January.

So it seems to me that many if not all of the needs have already been identified, and that we ought now to synthesize these studies and then develop an action program, soon, to meet the problems apparent.

At the heart of any such action program would be an agreed commitment to the principle that effective intrastate recruiting is both feasible and practical. Last month was marked by a step which I believe will go a long way toward proving that it is.

The California State Employment Service completed negotiations with a major grower, Carl Joseph Maggio, Inc., to recruit 350 domestic workers. It was agreed that before any interstate methods were pursued, local and in-State sources would first be thoroughly explored. This effort represents a significant start, for the grower has agreed to offer essentially the same working conditions, and transportation benefits contained in an earlier proposal for hiring foreign workers. This fact is particularly pertinent in view of frequent criticisms in the past of provisions of Public Law 78 which guaranteed to foreign workers conditions of employment not offered to Americans. It is most important that the workers to be recruited will be guaranteed a minimum of 150 hours of work each month for an entire year.

Terms and conditions of the Maggio agreement can contribute to the future pattern of farm labor for the entire State. The Maggio approach addresses itself not to the migrant; it addresses itself, rather, to the unemployed as such, wherever they may be in California. Behind this contract is the type of thought, imagination, and attitude which ought to characterize our deliberations here today.

In our neighboring States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington, the use of Mexican nationals has already been all but eliminated. Last year, for example, in these 3 States, only 67 Mexican nationals were used for but 2 weeks' work on the pear crop in Medford, Oreg. This was accomplished through a varied but comprehensive program involving such factors as the development of farm labor camps to house family groups and crews of workers, the installation of day-haul programs in towns and cities near agricultural activities, and the passage of farm labor contractor's laws which prohibited malpractices by unscrupulous crew leaders or farm labor contractors. Affecting these States' successful efforts in interstate recruiting has been the development of a plan for assured earnings for agricultural workers by employers, and the operation of a thoughtful annual worker plan. I think the significant thing for us in their experience has been this emergence of a broadly based, comprehensive program of attracting workers.

What these States have accomplished, California can also accomplish. We are, indeed, now beginning to witness the development of more imaginative State recruitment techniques. We have, for example, already been effective through recent efforts directed toward youth. It is astonishing to note that youth employment in California agriculture rose from 7,500 in 1962 to more than 18,600 last year; an increase of 146 percent. One of a number of techniques—called "Sign-up Saturday"—drew 300 applicants in one local employment office. Involved across the State in last year's direct approach to youths were 2,260 farm employers and 85 public employment offices.

On the east coast, crew meetings held in New Jersey prior to the start of planting season have proved most successful in recruiting a local supply of farm labor. These arrangements resulted in contacts with 204 crew leaders representing 7,000 workers. Emphasis was given to grower cooperation in the use of registered crew leaders. In addition, day-haul points were increased from cities and towns.

We have already made reference to the interstate recruitment activities of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. Two other instances come to mind. The need for foreign farm labor has been completely eliminated in both Iowa and Wisconsin; the former through employers cooperation with the Texas State Employment Service, the latter through agreement with the Mississippi State Employment Service.

It should be understood that interstate recruitment is undertaken by the Department of Labor only when the five following requirements are met:

1. Domestic agricultural workers are not available locally or in the State.

2. Wages offered are not less than the wages prevailing in the area of employment among similarly employed domestic agricultural workers.

3. Housing and facilities are available, hygienic, adequate to the climatic conditions, and "reasonably calculated to accommodate available domestic agricultural workers."

4. Prevailing practices regarding transportation expenses are observed.

5. Other terms and conditions of employment are not less favorable than those prevailing in the area of employment for domestic agricultural workers for similar work.

By and large, there is embodied in these examples the kind of approach which California will require to meet the transition in recruitment policies which will come with the end of Public Law 78. Throughout the State, the primary task is one of informing our own unemployed of approaching opportunities in farm employment.

As the expiration date of Public Law 78 approaches, I think there is one special consideration which we ought to keep in mind. That is the essential, focal point role in such a challenge which accrues to the State employment agency; in our case the California Department of Employment. It should serve as the ultimate coordinating agency for a whole host of both public and private efforts, for it is the one instrument of organization fully equipped to handle the task.

What other matters ought to enter into this conference?

One, of so direct relation to the living and employment conditions of the workers with whom we are concerned, involves the right to collective bargaining. The policy of the State of California is clear in this respect. "It is necessary," the labor code states, "that the individual workman have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment. * * *" Freedom of association is a natural right of man. Historically this has been nowhere more compelling than in the tortured world of our time. This freedom is the inevitable mark of a free society. Conversely, the totalitarian society forbids free associations, whether they be associations of workers, or poets, or Jews, or other freemen who believe a little more or a little less than the government standard permits.

Another factor. Just what might be the effects upon the State of inmigration of out-of-State farmworkers? I think this question ought to be placed in its proper perspective. The problem is hardly new to the Nation's largest State. California faces the fantastic challenge of a thousand new citizens coming into the State every day. A thousand new babies are born that same day. Each year, 250,000 new homes must be built, and 10,000 new classrooms must be added.

In the matter of housing, few consequences of the expiration of Public Law 78 will be of greater significance than the fact

that farm labor in the State will be based on the family unit; not upon the single, male bracero, so readily housed in a barracks-type environment. If there can be automation and technological advance in the fields, it ought to be possible to apply new technique for the housing needs of the human beings who work in those fields.

Secondly, our present facilities for schooling the children of families who follow the crops are even now breeding a new generation of dropouts and generally ill-educated youngsters who bear very little promise either to themselves or to our State or our society. Somehow, some way, the educational process for these children must be expanded and improved. Last year the total of California's agricultural income reached $3.4 billion. Surely, this success would warrant a community investment in the education of the children of those whose labor is essential to the system.

And finally, we require more adequate health facilities for our migrant workers; required both in terms of the welfare of the labor force, and the continuing high standards of our agricultural communities and our agricultural products. Much of the responsibility for providing these facilities falls on those localities which benefit most from this human resource. Through that spirit at work in all the agricultural counties of California—embodied in easily accessible clinical facilities and encouraged by positive support from government—the medical needs of California's field workers can be met.

The last thought I would leave with you, before we turn to our testimony, is my hope that this conference marks the beginning in our intensive joint efforts to improve the life of our farmworkers and to build upon California's position as the greatest agricultural State in the Nation. For to realize these objectives, much more will be needed than today's session. I hope that from our deliberations today there will emerge continuing cooperation—however constituted—directed to the constructive solution of the problem.

National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, legislation of assistance to our veterans has always had my strong support and interest. I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs covering my bill H.R. 2397, and other insurance bills which would be helpful to our veterans:

STATEMENT OF HON. JACOB H. GILBERT, REPRESENTATIVE, 22D DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, you have before you for consideration, my bill H.R. 2397 and other insurance bills which would be of great assistance to our veterans.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has reported that, as the result of a thorough restudy of the veterans' insurance program, the abrupt withdrawal without notice in 1951 of the privilege theretofore granted to millions of World War II veterans to secure postservice insurance may well have caused serious hardship to many of our veterans. We know that many World War II veterans left service while very young, with schooling, marriage, insurance needs, all matters of the future. Many dropped their NSLI in anticipation that they would be able to secure NSLI when they were better established and their needs determined. Regarding veterans who served prior to 1951, I believe that adequate recognition has not been given to our obligation toward those veterans whose insurability has been seriously impaired or lost by reason of their service-connected disabilities. The extension of the right of such veterans to apply for postservice insurance by reason of their service to their country is only their just due, in my opinion.

I am also in favor of legislation to reopen generally the NSLI program for the period of 1 year. I wish to be of all possible assistance to our veterans, and would like to have all World War II and Korean conflict veterans have the opportunity, for a limited period, to secure a policy of NSLI. Our veterans have made great sacrifices for our country; they have earned our best consideration. I am hopeful that your committee will approve this proposed legislation so that the Congress will have the opportunity to make the benefits available to our veterans as soon as possible.

Representative Tupper Tells Why He Voted "Yes" on Salary Increase Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, appearing on Wednesday, March 18, 1964, justly laudatory of the courageous and able Representative of the First District of Maine, the Honorable STANLEY TUPPER.

Representative TUPPER, by his fearlessness, ability, and diligence on behalf of the people of his district and of the United States, is deserving of the fine reputation he enjoys among his colleagues and the people of his district. His efforts on behalf of his constituency and his resoluteness in voting for what he believes to be right have earned him the admiration of his colleagues.

This excellent editorial points out clearly, not only the courage and correctness of the vote of our colleague from Maine, but that the people of this Nation expect Members of Congress to be properly compensated for the high service they perform on behalf of their constituents. It shows that the press will support a courageous Congressman in carrying out what he believes to be the proper service of the public interest on difficult votes.

The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE TUPPER TELLS WHY HE VOTED "YES" ON SALARY INCREASE ISSUE

With the Senate in the toils of the civil rights dispute, the House of Representatives last week turned to the serious matter of raising the pay of Federal employees, and most of them—but not Representative STANLEY TUPPER of the First Maine District, marched up the hill and then marched right down again.

The measure, first approved and then defeated, carried $545 million in salary boosts for postal and other workers, and $10,000 a year raises for Members of Congress (they now receive $22,500), judges and Cabinet members. On a teller (unrecorded) vote the House first gave its approval to the bill. But then Representative GROSS, a stubborn champion of Federal economy mustered enough support to force a rollcall, and many Members of the Chamber chickened out to the extent of reversing themselves. They feared public knowledge that they had voted to increase the salaries of Members of Congress.

Representative CLIFFORD MCINTIRE, of the Second District, voted "no" both times, Representative TUPPER voted "yes," on the teller vote and on the rollcall, and in correcting a report in the Press Herald that he had switched, the Congressman was refreshingly frank in saying why he backed the pay raise.

His salary as a House Member is $22,500, but by the time transportation and other expenses are met, taxable income has diminished to $12,000 or $13,000 a year. Subtracting his income tax, not much is left to live on in high-priced Washington, and still maintain another home in Maine. There is another point in his favor: Representative TUPPER voted for an amendment to the bill that would have barred employment by Congresmen of their wives, husbands, children, and other close relatives, but the clause was yelled down. So nepotism will continue to be part of the way of life at Washington.

We think, with the Maine man, that Members of Congress should have their salaries increased to the extent that they can live decently, avoid the necessity of putting their relatives on the payroll, shun the temptations put in their way by well-heeled lobbyists, and finance at least part of their own campaigns. A House Member, let it be recalled, has to run, for renomination and reelection every other year.

It is not fair to encourage able persons to run for public office, and then send them to Washington and expect them, on an insufficient salary, to represent (in the case of House district) a half million or more people, make vital decisions in the field of national security, to name only one, and demonstrate competence in voting appropriations each year that total a hundred billion dollars. There are a good many attractive aspects to being a Congressman, no one would deny that, but this was not the issue which frightened so many election-conscious Members last Thursday.

Misconceptions About Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Henry C. Wallich, of Yale University, formerly a member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has written a perceptive article on "Misconceptions About Unemployment." The article raises some important questions about unemployment and a number of related problems. It makes the basic point that if we deal with poverty, discrimination, automation, retraining, education, and growth simply from the point of view of reducing unemployment, we shall deal very inadequately with them.

Dr. Wallich believes that one of the most serious misconceptions keeping us

from dealing effectively with the problem of unemployment is the 4 percent full employment target. He also discusses the relationship between poverty and unemployment and shows that, based upon Department of Labor figures, the average family suffering from unemployment is not poor by the standards of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Wallich's important article in the RECORD at this point:

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Henry C. Wallich)

High unemployment is becoming a more pressing issue the longer it remains unresolved. After 3 years of business expansion, the rate is still 5.4 percent. In no year since 1957 has it averaged below 5.5 percent.

The option of closing our eyes to it, even if the Nation were so inclined, probably is not open, because high rates of unemployment are beginning to lead to demands for a shorter workweek. In one way or another, therefore, the problem will be resolved. Americans have an enormous stake in resolving it the right way.

Today it is being attacked in a maze of misconceptions that bodes ill for everybody, including the jobless. Unemployment is not simply a lack of jobs. It is the most visible part of a whole range of other problems—poverty, discrimination, the availability of skills, the problems of education and teenagers, deficient demand and slow growth. But, like icebergs, these underlying issues often are much bigger than the problem of unemployment.

Today it is being proposed that we attack these issues principally in order to cure unemployment. That is a prescription for a botched job. If we deal with poverty, with discrimination, with automation and retraining, with education and with growth simply from the point of view of reducing unemployment, we shall deal very inadequately. We shall fail to resolve the broader problems and may fail even in our immediate objective of creating a firm basis for full employment.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the principal misconceptions about unemployment is that unemployment and poverty are closely related. They are not. There were 9.3 million poor families in the United States in 1962, by the definition of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. These are families whose cash income is less than $3,000 a year.

The Council's data show that among 9.3 million poor families, the head of the family was unemployed in only 6 percent of all cases. In 44 percent of the others, the family head was not in the labor force, while in 49 percent he had a job. Obviously, unemployment is not the principal cause of poverty. Most poor families are poor because of poorly paying jobs, and most of the rest because they cannot or in a few cases perhaps do not want to work. If we accomplish no more than to reduce unemployment, without improving the quality of jobs, little will have been done to reduce poverty.

The average family suffering from unemployment is not poor by the Council of Economic Adviser's standards. The median income of a family suffering from unemployment for 5 weeks or more in 1961 was $4,400, according to a study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics published in the Monthly Labor Review of December 1963, which aroused much attention at the recent symposium on employment sponsored by the American Bankers Association. By 1964 this figure presumably would have risen several hundred dollars.

It contrasts with a median income of $5,700 for all families in 1961. Much of this gap, moreover, is accounted for, not by unemployment, but by the fact that when an unemployed person gets a job, it pays an average of $25 per week less than jobs of year-round workers.

The relatively high median income of families with unemployment conceals cases, of course, of much greater hardship. But for the average family, the data show that the economic impact of unemployment is not as great as one might fear. Many families have more than one breadwinner; unemployment often hits, not the head of the family, but the wife or a youngster whose earnings are lower. With unemployment compensation averaging $35 per week it becomes understandable why the average loss from unemployment is no greater. By the same token, the BLS study cannot fully show the much greater hardship resulting from the much less frequent case of prolonged unemployment particularly of a family with a single breadwinner.

The BLS study even overstates the economic impact of unemployment in general, because it covers only persons unemployed for at least 5 full weeks (counting all spells). About two-fifths of the people who lost their jobs in 1961, and closer to one-half in 1963, were out of work for less than 5 weeks, although some were laid off more than once during the year. All this goes to underline the fact that poverty and unemployment are closely related only in a small number of cases.

The figures show something else, and that is a real political kicker. The total number of persons who in 1961 had some brush with unemployment, short or long, was over 15 million. The number of families so affected might be of the order of 10 to 12 million, since some families may have more than one member out of work. That is of the order of one-fifth of all American households. Counting family members, here are something like 20 million potential critics of the party in power. Perhaps not all of these feel the deep frustration that accompanies long-term joblessness of heads of families. And many may believe that under the opposite party they would fare even worse. But no politician can afford to overlook a group amounting to something like one-fifth of the population of voting age.

Misconceptions also becloud discussions and policies related to voluntary unemployment. Such discussions often take on a highly emotional tone. Both extremes of the spectrum are guilty of exaggeration. On one side there is the view, perhaps no longer frequently uttered in public, that all the unemployed could get jobs if they really wanted to, and that they are lazy and shiftless and thus have only themselves to blame for their misfortunes. On the other side there is a vision of Bob Cratchit out of work, sober, industrious and competent, and altogether a victim of the system. To the allegation that not all unemployment is involuntary those who resent criticism of people in misfortune tend to reply, not in economic, but in moralistic terms, and to express shock at the speaker's callousness rather than rebut his facts.

Voluntary unemployment is indeed a hot issue. Does a man cease to be "unemployed" in the ordinary, involuntary sense of the word if he rejects a job in his line that pays less than his last job? If he rejects a job that would require him to move to another town? Or one that is of a distinctly lower order of skills or status?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics study indicates that workers experiencing unemployment are for the most part quite firmly attached to the labor force. They seek work persistently. They are willing, by and large, to take a little less pay than they had in their best job. Only about one-quarter of them, however, would accept a job in another area away from where they live.

That people can find jobs if they are under great pressure to bring home a paycheck seems to be confirmed by the experience of the "married men" group. These are the workers who have families to support. Their unemployment has consistently been below the average rate. In 1963 it dropped as low as 2.9 percent. Unemployment among teenagers, who have the smallest responsibilities and the greatest reason to shop around and experiment, has been of the order of 15 percent.

This does not mean, as some seem to think, that if all who are out of work looked equally hard, everybody would find a job. Economics tell us, with some qualifying footnotes, that total employment is determined by aggregate demand together with such factors as the level of wages and the way in which skills and job vacancies mesh. While these are not things decided in heaven but generated within the economy itself, a more intensive search for jobs on the part of the unemployed probably would not change them much. The economy sets up a game of musical chairs: the number of jobs is given, but who is to occupy them depends on the skill and luck of the participants.

There is no reason to become indignant, moreover, if people become choosier about jobs. This is, to be sure, something in the nature of voluntary unemployment. But in an economy with rising standards of living, where people can reach beyond the bare necessities of life, they must be expected to reach also for the luxury of a more deliberate choice of jobs. In some cases they may reach for more leisure, as those who are employed certainly are doing.

Instead of blaming some of the unemployed for their greater willingness to remain idle, or, on the contrary, denying that this tendency exists, we should see what can be done to cope with the problem. On one side, there is the possibility of tightening up on the rules governing unemployment compensation, which differ from State to State. Abuses certainly exist, not infrequently with the connivance—and to the benefit of—the employer. The pattern of seasonal layoffs and use of unemployment compensation as a kind of slacktime payroll has frequently been cited.

But much more important is the progress that must be made in curing the basic social ills of which unemployment is but a partial result. Better education, more retraining of employed workers, the continuing battle against discrimination, more rapid growth are all desirable primarily because of the direct benefits they bring. Their indirect result, and a tremendously important one, would be a great reduction in unemployment.

THE 4-PERCENT UNEMPLOYMENT TARGET

One of the most serious of the misconceptions that keeps us from dealing effectively with the problem of unemployment is the 4-percent target which in recent years has acquired a peculiar kind of sanctity. If 5.4 percent unemployment is intolerable, what is so good about 4 percent?

The 4-percent figure has been around for some time. During the Eisenhower years it was regarded as a rough benchmark for "full employment." At lower levels, it was believed, inflationary pressures would become very strong. The 4-percent figure was not advertised, however, because General Eisenhower's economists were reluctant to give that kind of hostage to fortune. The politicians, moreover, rightly feared that so high an unemployment figure, if publicized as acceptable, would lead to criticism from the labor side.

President Kennedy's advisers were less apprehensive. They boldly staked out 4 percent unemployment as "full." By dubbing it an "interim" or provisional goal, they may have succeeded in taking the political curse off it, the well-known durability of all things provisional notwithstanding. The emphasis

which the 4-percent figure in consequence has received has produced a number of undesirable effects.

First, it has minimized, in the minds of many people, the urgency of reducing the existing 5.4 percent unemployment. For obvious reasons, this sentiment does not get a great deal of public expression, but it clearly exists. "What is the difference, so the question goes, between running the economy at 96 percent instead of at 94.6 percent? The gain in the number of people employed is minute. So is the increase in output. Why take chances, if 1.4 percent is all the improvement we can get?"

Of course the difference is not minute. It is over one-quarter of total unemployment. And Dr. Gabriel Hauge, president of the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., reminded the audience at the American Bankers Association Symposium on Employment, that the Good Book stresses the importance of bringing the last one into the fold even though 99 are already in.

Furthermore, the loss in total output is considerably greater than appears. When unemployment falls, output expands and productivity rises. Employers begin to lengthen the workweek and marginal workers return to the labor force. The Council of Economic Advisers calculates that each percent reduction in unemployment means slightly more than a 3-percent gain in GNP. The difference between 5.4 and 4 percent unemployment therefore means a loss of over 4 percent of GNP, or over $24 billion a year.

At the same time, however, calculations based upon what the economy could do at 4 percent unemployment acquire a wholly unreal concreteness thanks to that magic target. They give a precision to the concept of excess capacity which does not stand closer inspection. The capacity of the economy depends not only on labor capacity in general, but also upon skilled labor capacity, as well as on plant capacity. We know much less about the latter two factors, although we have reason to suspect that there is less excess capacity of skilled labor than of labor in general.

Why, moreover, base capacity calculations upon our present working habits? If everybody worked an hour a day more, the economy's capacity would be greatly enhanced. Growing numbers of workers, now 4 million, who brave the complications of moonlighting, support the belief that a good many of us would accept longer hours if they were available.

The magic 4-percent unemployment rate has served to confuse also our fiscal policy. The "full employment surplus" is based upon it; i.e., the budget surplus we would have if we were at 4-percent unemployment instead of being at 5.4 percent and having a deficit. Aside from the uncertainty about what the capacity of the economy really is, there is even greater uncertainty about what Federal revenues would be at the capacity level.

Revenues depend heavily upon the share of profits in the national income, since the corporate rate is so much higher than the average personal rate. The full employment surplus, which underlies calculations as to how and when the budget might be in balance, is less deserving even than the full capacity figure of the aura of precision which today surrounds it.

But the worst of the 4-percent target is that today we are unsure about it in both directions. It may be too modest in the long run, but in the immediate future it may be too ambitious. The Council of Economic Advisers seems to believe that it can be attained now without serious danger of inflation. History does not support that judgment.

A 4-percent unemployment rate was approximately reached, in some years bettered, in 8 postwar years: 1947–48, 1951–53, 1955–57. In all of these years, except 1952–53, prices rose substantially. During the 1952–53 period, when prices were stable, price controls remained in effect while the price level already was settling back after the Korean boom. This evidence, for what it is worth, suggests that prices will begin to rise before we reach 4-percent unemployment.

More precise studies support that impression. Economists have investigated the relation between the rate of unemployment and the rate of prices increases, in England and in the United States. For England, the evidence very clearly shows that prices rise faster the lower the rate of unemployment. For the United States, the case is less clearcut, but the data points broadly in the same direction. There is some hope that, because of the period of price stability we have enjoyed, the habits of labor and management may have changed in the direction of greater stability. But present price movements and statements preliminary to wage negotiations do not confirm that hope.

By concentrating upon the 4 percent target, at a time when labor is proposing high wage increases and the structure of prices is already beginning to buckle, we are running great risks of reviving inflation. At a minimum, we must hold ready the traditional means of keeping inflation in check—the tools of monetary policy. We must give intensive thought also to more novel devices like the guidelines on prices and wages proposed by the President and his economic advisers.

But the solid way, that eventually can lead us to unemployment rates below 4 percent, is to work on the basic problems of which unemployment is but the most visible manifestation. By retraining, area development, better education, and stepping up research and capital equipment spending, we shall not only ease the problem of the 5.4 percent who are out of work, but greatly improve the life of the other 94.6 percent.

Magnificent Demonstration of Ability, Astuteness, Vigor, and Zeal of Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, in the U.S. Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY, is now serving his second year with distinction in the U.S. Senate, thus fulfilling the 6-year term to which his illustrious brother, our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was elected in 1958.

Senator "TED" KENNEDY is rendering the same high quality efficient service and representation to Massachusetts in Congress that his late brother gave for 8 years before his election to the Presidency. He is vigorous, knowledgeable, personable and tireless in pursuing his manifold duties as a Senator, zealously attending committee hearings, sessions of the Senate, meeting with groups from his State coming to Washington with problems, and spending three of every four weekends traveling throughout Massachusetts to keep abreast of area problems and needs. He has also thoroughly grasped national problems as well, as he magnificently demonstrated during an interview on the television "Meet the Press" program on Easter Sunday night, March 29.

Senator "TED" KENNEDY is a national figure in his own right and he is being recognized by the national news media for his ability and astuteness and a Senator who does his homework.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have printed with my remarks in the Appendix an article by Scripps-Howard Newspaper Columnist Bruce Biossat entitled "TED KENNEDY Is Doing His Homework." This article was carried in the Washington Daily News on March 30.

The article follows:

TED KENNEDY IS DOING HIS HOMEWORK

(By Bruce Biossat)

One nippy Sunday morning this month, Senator EDWARD M. (TED) KENNEDY flew out of Minneapolis at 4:45 for Boston.

The way the late President's 32-year-old brother spent that day suggests that he may soon be regarded as a phenomenon in his own right.

Arriving in Boston, he promptly took a smaller plane back to western Massachusettts. There he marched in a St. Patrick's parade in Holyoke and joined in related festivities.

After that, back to Boston again by air. "He gets on a plane like most people get on a bus," says a friend.

The young Senator then went to a late church service. Next he took part in a special meeting on the John F. Kennedy memorial library, on which he labors hard.

In succession for him thereafter came a reception for Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, honored guest at a Gov. Endicott Peabody dinner; the dinner itself, with Senator KENNEDY a featured speaker; a fast run to suburban Everett, where he was master of ceremonies as the Friendly Knights of St. Patrick handed out awards to his late brother's old friends and aides—Lawrence O'Brien, Kenneth O'Donnell, David Powers and Timothy (Ted) Reardon. On hand: 1,000 people.

Still perking, TED KENNEDY returned to Boston to the home of Representative TOBBERT MACDONALD, another old Kennedy friend.

With guests who included many who had worked for TED in his 1962 campaign, this semireception carried on until nearly 2 a.m.

This expenditure of energy was not in any way untypical of this handsome, solidly-built, restless man.

Up for reelection this year, he has never ceased campaigning in Massachusetts. He bounds around the State 3 of every 4 weekends.

Republicans are scouring the woods looking for somebody to oppose him. Vincent Celeste, buried by John Kennedy in the 1958 election, says anybody would be crazy to take on TEDDY.

As his brother never did, the younger KENNEDY moves constantly to keep a firm hand on the Massachusetts Democratic organization. Party leaders there are on the telephone with him in Washington several times a week.

Says one: "He's hovering over everything, all the time. He's involved in appointments, special elections, anything that comes up."

All this, TED KENNEDY manages as a kind of sideline. Wide testimony can be had that he is a very hard working Senator, is learning a great deal, keeps out of the limelight as few imagined would be possible when he came here a year and a half ago.

Though he has spoken out briefly on a couple of subjects of special interest to him

or his State, he has yet to make his true "maiden speech" in the Senate.

Perhaps against their instincts, many Members of the establishment like him for his affability, his diligence, his deference, and humility.

Since 1964 began, TED has taken to the road beyond Massachusetts for the first time to help Democratic Senators and others—many up for election—in their home bailiwicks.

His naturally winning ways draw crowds everywhere. Sympathy for the late President swells interest in him mightily. Inevitably he is forging a stronger bond with Senators who benefit.

A weak GOP rival in Massachusetts would allow TED the chance to stump widely for President Johnson this fall.

If he does that, it ought to be plain enough from this recital that L.B.J. won't be the only beneficiary. Just wait a few elections.

War on Poverty: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I pledge my support of President Johnson's war on poverty in America. I have introduced H.R. 10577, containing the President's recommendations and identical to the administration bill, and I call on my colleagues in the House to approve this program which will be a milestone in our search for a better life for all Americans.

The two major objectives of our proposed legislation to fight poverty are: First, to assure all citizens of decent living standards regardless of economic circumstances and reverses; and second, to enable every individual to build his earning power to full capacity.

Our bill is called the Economic Opportunities Act because it does offer far-reaching opportunities. It will give almost a half million underprivileged young Americans the opportunity to develop skills, to continue their education, and to find useful work. It will give every American community the opportunity to develop a comprehensive plan to fight its own poverty and help these energetic communities to carry out their plans. It will give dedicated Americans an opportunity to enlist as volunteers for America in this fight against poverty. It will give many workers and farmers the opportunity to break through the barriers that bar their escape from the vicious cycle of poverty that binds them. The act will give the entire Nation the opportunity to make a concerted attack on poverty through the setting up of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Job Corps proposed in the act will provide thousands of youths between 16 and 21 with education, vocational training, useful work experience and other activities to prepare them for a productive role in society. The work-study program will provide Federal assistance for part-time jobs for students who must work their way through college. The volunteers for America will recruit and train volunteers in the war against poverty, and will work something like our very successful Peace Corps works in foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the great wealth and prosperity of our country, one-fifth of our citizens are living in poverty. We have 10 million families who are daily struggling to find shelter, feed and clothe their children, and to stave off disease and malnutrition, and somehow manage to get along on less than $60 a week. And almost two-thirds of these families must try to get along on less than $40 a week. These citizens do not know the comfort and happiness of abundance. Their lives are a struggle for the necessities of life. And I think the most disheartening factor of a poverty-stricken family is the hopelessness for the young who grow up without a decent education, in ill health, products of broken homes, and often doomed in a life of poverty and racial injustice.

And who are the poor of our country, Mr. Speaker, and where are they? They are in our big cities and in our farming areas. Our poverty-stricken include widows and other women who are forced to head families, those who are discriminated against because of race, the aged, the young, the uneducated and the poorly educated.

The report on the dimensions of poverty released on March 23, 1964, by the mayor of New York disclosed that 1 out of every 5 New Yorkers lives in "conditions approximating poverty." Sixteen different areas in our city are listed as distress areas in terms of poverty, unemployment, and social problems. The report on the city's present antipoverty programs shows that from the city's annual expense budget, at least $781.2 million go to pay for the effects of poverty and discrimination, and to combat them.

Nearly a million Puerto Ricans live in the United States today, primarily in Metropolitan New York City. Fifty-three percent of New York's Puerto Ricans earned less than $4,000 in 1959, and only 8 percent earned more than $8,000. Three-fourths of them never entered high school. Eight million Negroes—nearly half the total Negro population of the United States—are poor; a third live in the southern cities, one-fourth on southern farms, and the balance in northern cities.

One-third of all poor families in our country are headed by a person over 65. One-half of these 6.8 million heads of families over 65 have incomes of less than $3,000 per year, and half of these support their families on less than $1,000 a year. The majority of our aged receive social security benefits, but in so many instances these benefits are insufficient for their needs, and many of our poorest aged are not covered by social security. Many of the aged are ending in poverty because they began in poverty. Their income throughout their working lives was never sufficient to provide that margin of savings which affords independence and dignity after they retire. Statistics like these point up the need for a program of medical care for our aged. I am one of the sponsors of Medicare and approval by Congress should not be delayed. We should not overlook this while waging a war on poverty. Equally important and necessary in our fight against poverty is a program for more and better housing, and I urge prompt action on the administration's housing and community development bill. A decent home and suitable living environment for every American family, and a program for medical care for our aged citizens, will be milestones in our fight against poverty.

President Johnson has recognized the fact that poverty is a real problem in our country and he proposes a realistic program wherein all possible resources will be mobilized to combat the needless wastes, costs, and ravages of poverty. If we could increase the average production of even 10 million earners among the poor, enough to lift their earnings a modest $1,000 a year, it would mean fresh stimulus to the national economy, and at the same time, a reduction in costs of public welfare assistance and other social services to the poor. Public assistance payments now cost us $4 billion a year, not to mention the costs of fighting crime, delinquency, disease, hunger, and other products of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, we have the wealth, the technical know-how, and the productive capacity in our country today for victory over the poverty suffered by one-fifth of our population. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 will lead us toward this goal. I urge the Congress to take speedy action on this program.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Hon. Al House, of North Carolina, Newly Elected President of the Young Democratic Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain information concerning Hon. Al House, of North Carolina, the newly elected president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

Mr. House is one of our truly outstanding young leaders in North Carolina. His election as national president of the Young Democratic Clubs brought not only great credit to his outstanding work but also great honor to the State of North Carolina.

The material I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD is an editorial published in the Raleigh News and Observer on February 3, 1964, entitled "Into the Mainstream"; a copy of a column written by E. M. Yoder entitled "Las Vegas Jackpot," which was published in the Greensboro Daily News on February 6, 1964; an editorial published in the Winston-Salem Journal entitled "Our Man at Las Vegas," published on February 3, 1964; a newspaper article published in the Raleigh Times of February 13, 1964, entitled, "Democrats, Young and Old, Gather To Honor House for Young Democratic Clubs Prestige"; and a biographical sketch of Mr. House.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, Monday, Feb. 3, 1964]

INTO THE MAINSTREAM

At Las Vegas, Nev., on Saturday, North Carolina won a greater victory than the election of able Al House, of Northampton County, as president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America. His triumph demonstrated the new realistic approach of young men in his State and in the South to the racial problems which have been attended by so much fury in the recent past.

Mr. House's election by the young Democrats of the whole Nation was based upon the determination that the South does not mean to stand separate and apart but is prepared in good will to accept change which is more and more inevitable in the Nation and the world. Furthermore that determination was strengthened and supported by older, hard-headed businessmen in North Carolina who sent word to Las Vegas that they were prepared for the patronage of all regardless of race, color, or creed.

When Mr. House and his supporters entered the race for this top young man's position in the Democratic Party there seemed real question as to whether the national organization would accept any young southerner in view of the irreconcilable position taken by many older politicians in the South. Perhaps the greater wonder now is that the hard core of the House support remained the delegates from Southern States some of which have been represented as being ready to leave the Democratic Party on the racial issue.

Mr. House's election was the result of no desperate gamble in a noted gambling town. Rather it showed that when the chips are down the South is ready to take its hand and play its part in the inevitable movement for human equality in America. Old politicians may be naturally reluctant to accept change. But the young politicians, who will shape the politics of the future, know that change is not only inevitable—it is already here. Their business is so to deal with changing laws and customs as to reduce the plain for all concerned and to see to it that equality for all means a happier, more productive, more prosperous South and Nation for all.

The reluctance of older southern politicians in this matter has not been surprising. It has increasingly, however, shown itself as an item of the romanticism which has not enriched the past and will not shape the future. The new realism, impelled by a new idealism, is clearly the force which will assure the South its proper place in the councils of the country and the human advance of our times.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Feb. 6, 1964]

LAS VEGAS JACKPOT

Forty-nine North Carolina Young Democrats returned rejoicing last weekend from the gaming citadel of the West—Las Vegas, Nev.—their pockets jingling with the tin of a significant political victory.

Al House, 32-year-old lawyer from Roanoke Rapids, had just won the 1964 national presidency of the Young Democratic Clubs of America in a hot fight—a win all the more significant, perhaps, in a national election year.

House, a UNC–UNC law school graduate and law partner of Democratic Chairman Lunsford Crew, offered plenty of qualifications—not only his labors in the party vineyards dating back to undergraduate days at Chapel Hill but youth, vigor, and a splendidly disciplined speaking voice, free from the Yankee viewpoint, of any lush "hush-mamouf" rebel phonetics.

But the House victory is fascinating, not only as a personal sweep but as a sign of the resurgent vitality and skill of North Carolina's young Democratic politicians—and beyond that of the South's reemergence as a power in national party affairs.

One could, perhaps, tick off a list of factors in the atmosphere that made House's win probable—the increasing national prominence of Gov. Terry Sanford as a wise and moderate southern Governor; the generally "progressive" picture North Carolina has managed to project abroad, through thick and thin. Indeed it is no slight of House's energetic year-long campaign to speculate that the abrupt advent of a Southerner to the Presidency in late November helped considerably. Certainly it has thrown the "presidential" faction of the Democratic Party into ferment; and the albatross of segregation and racism has subtly receded where Southern Democrats are concerned.

Al House's opponent at Las Vegas was a 35-year-old Boston labor union official, John O'Malley, a stock representative of the Northern-urban-"liberal" forces who have dominated the Democratic Party outside Congress since 1948. But House captured several crucial Northern delegations—Ohio, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, among them.

Certainly House and his strategists laid their plans well. They knew, for instance, that it would be vital to show House as no racist or footdragger on civil rights. And their foresight was vindicated. The O'Malley forces, in a despairing attempt to thwart the House steamroller, seeded the Young Democratic delegations with leaflets absurdly attempting to link House with Orval Faubus.

This puny tactic backfired. For one thing, House declared himself a strong supporter of the administration's civil rights bill and stuck by his guns in the southern caucuses. "They put the blowtorch up against him and turned it on high," confided one House aid who battled at Las Vegas. "He didn't waver."

In another and equally crucial maneuver House dodged, at considerable risk, the southern YDC caucus in Atlanta last fall. He sent representatives: but there were rumblings of revolt and of tertium quid candidates because he failed to show up in person. House gambled that the Deep South delegates would swallow their pout at Las Vegas. And they did.

Also decisive was the appearance of two Negro members of the North Carolina delegation at the Dunes Hotel, where the Young Democrats deliberated to the music of slot machines. These two delegates were instrumental in persuading the crucial northern and midwestern delegations that House, like President Johnson, is a national Democrat first and a southerner second.

The payoff came when House went handsomely over the top on the first ballot. His lieutenants fought off a last-minute procedural stall.

House's victory is a self-contained victory, perhaps. But it points to any number of possible sea changes in the national democracy. Starting with the civil rights debacle of 1948 and the ensuing Dixiecrat revolt the Southern States have experienced a 15-year-long freezeout in the presidential wing of the Democratic Party. Southern Democrats controlled Congress through the seniority system, but could not fix hands on the network of national Democratic power based on union and minority votes that largely elects Presidents. The closest they could come was in receiving the ritual gift of the vice-presidential nomination to a moderate Senator like Barkley, Sparkman, Kefauver, and Johnson.

Maybe the situation hasn't changed all that much. But the impact of Lyndon Johnson as President is considerable. At least it may convince northern and western Democrats, even the union and minority groups, that the South's monolithic solidarity on civil rights, as dramatized in Congress, is a geographical and philosophical mirage. Given a truly national power base, difference emerge and southerners become as nationally minded as any other Democrats, indeed perhaps a little more so.

At Las Vegas, with House, the Young Democrats tasted victory in a tough national league. This could fire ambitions.

"Who knows?" mused one House backer after the big win at Las Vegas. "If we can have a national YDC president in 1964, maybe we can have a vice-presidential candidate in 1968."

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Feb. 3, 1964]

OUR MAN AT LAS VEGAS

As usual, party bigwigs were on hand at the Young Democrats' meeting at Las Vegas last week—not so much to supervise the doings of the young as to scout the rookie politicians for promising prospects that can be brought up to the majors in a few years.

As we have seen in North Carolina, these organizations of young party members offer ideal training grounds for the politically ambitious. Two of the present candidates for Lieutenant Governor, for instance—John Jordan and Clifton Blue—got their political feet wet as president of the North Carolina Young Democrats. Governor Sanford himself once held the office.

And now that youth is making more and more of a place for itself in the national leadership, the strategists of both parties will be eyeing the rising young hopefuls even more critically.

It is thus not at all likely that the young man from North Carolina, J. Albert House, is being taken lightly in higher Democratic circles right now.

House, of all things, is a southern Democrat who has just been elected to national office on, of all things, a platform of civil rights and against, of all people, an opponent identified with labor.

As George Gobel used to say, you just can't hardly find that happening.

The point, though, is that it has happened. And in the happening hangs a good deal more than that the political star of young Al House is clearly on the rise. Maybe the South in a measure has risen as well.

Certainly, the Young Democrat delegates from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, California, and the Midwest would not have supported the North Carolinian if they had not fully believed that he meant what he said about equal rights. And they would hardly have believed what he said if his State had not produced evidence to back his words.

Maybe North Carolina, more than it knows, has helped to pull the South over the barrier that so long has barred its men from serious consideration for national office. If so, we can take extra pride in the success of Al House at Las Vegas.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) Times, Feb. 13, 1964]

DEMOCRATS, YOUNG AND OLD, GATHER TO HONOR HOUSE FOR YOUNG DEMOCRATS CLUB PRESTIGE

Young Democrats and old came from all over the State to a dinner last night honoring the newly elected national president of the Young Democrats Club, J. Albert House of Roanoke Rapids.

It was intended as a nonpolitical Democratic get-together with Governor Sanford topping the list of speakers. But the rival political factions circulating in the overflow crowd of some 225 persons, the handshaking, the aids handing out buttons to anyone who would have them, all testified to the election year character of the party.

Two of the three major gubernatorial candidates were represented—L. Richardson Preyer of Greensboro by his manager, N. A. (Nat) Townsend, and Dan Moore of Canton by his manager, Joe Branch. Former State Democratic Chairman Bert Bennett, a Preyer supporter now, also was present.

LAKE AIDS ABSENT

Campaign aids for candidate I. Beverly Lake of Raleigh were not there. House has been criticized by some of the more conservative factions in the party for his open championing of racial integration.

Of the three declared candidates for Lieutenant Governor, only Robert W. Scott of Haw River was present, which was something of a suprise. Scott has never been noted as an active Young Democrats Club supporter, as have his opponents, House Speaker H. Clifton Blue of Aberdeen and Wake Senator John Jordan.

Blue was represented, however, by his comanagers, Sam Burrow and Elvin Jackson.

Congressmen HAROLD COOLEY and L. H. FOUNTAIN both were present, as was COOLEY'S opponent for the fourth district seat, R. Mayne Albright, of Raleigh.

Preyer's supporters were present in large number, judging from the prolonged applause that followed reading of a telegram from Preyer, congratulating House and expressing Preyer's regrets at not being able to attend the dinner.

SANFORD SPEAKS

Governor Sanford used his brief talk to call attention to the meaning of House's election in terms of "added evidence that the future belongs to North Carolina."

Other speakers on the program included House, Cooley, and State Democratic Chairman W. Lunsford Crew, who recently suffered a broken leg in an automobile accident, and came to the rostrum on crutches.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

James Albert House, Jr., born Chapel Hill, N.C.; graduate of Scotland Neck (N.C.) High School, University of North Carolina—A.B. in history, University of North Carolina Law School—doctor of laws degree, 1955. Graduate work at Harvard Law School, summer 1961.

Valedictorian and president of student body of Scotland Neck High School.

Academic scholarship, track and cross country teams, men's honor council and student council, class officer, and Phi Beta Kappa at University of North Carolina.

Organizer and president of university Young Democrats Club 1952–53; organizer of other colleges in North Carolina 1953–56, State Young Democrats Club secretary 1953–54, eastern State organizer 1959–60; Young Democrats Club national committeeman, 1961–63; delegate to NATO and Atlantic Conference of Young Political Leaders, Bonn, West Germany, 1963; chairman of resolutions committee, Young Democratic Clubs of America spring 1963.

U.S. Army Counterintelligence Corps. Service in Tokyo, Japan, and Far East 1956–57.

Assistant director and instructor in law, institute of government at University of North Carolina, 1957–58.

Practiced law in Roanoke Rapids, N.C., since December 1958. Member of the North Carolina bar, bar of the United States. District Courts, and admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. Chairman of North Carolina Bar Association, Young Lawyers Division, 1963.

Elected president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America for a 2-year term at the 14th bienniel convention in Las Vegas, Nev., February 1, 1964.

Balance-of-Payments Deficit in 1963 Worse Than Originally Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the latest figures on the balance-of-payments deficit for 1963 indicate that the deficit on "regular" transactions is now calculated at $3.3 billion, or nearly 10 percent larger than the previous estimate of slightly over $3 billion. The deficit is somewhat smaller than 1962 deficit, but larger than the 1961 figure. In order to make more generally known the latest information on the balance-of-payments deficit, I wish to insert an article from the March 25 Wall Street Journal summarizing our balance-of-payments position for 1963 in the RECORD:

U.S. PAYMENTS DEFICIT IMPROVED LESS IN 1963 THAN THOUGHT—SOME AID WAS TEMPORARY

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit didn't improve as much last year as was thought, and some of the improvement was only temporary.

The deficit is currently calculated at $3,301 million for last year, nearly 10 percent larger than the previous estimate of $3,020 million. The 1963 deficit is still narrower than the $3,573 million of 1962 but is newly placed somewhat wider than the $3,043 million deficit of 1961.

A payments deficit results when dollars acquired by foreigners through U.S. spending, lending, and aid exceed the inflow of dollars here from abroad. The administration has been striving to end the persistent U.S. deficit, which gives foreigners mounting claims on the dwindling gold stock.

Not since 1957, when the Suez Canal closing resulted in an export spurt, has the United States shown a surplus ($520 million that year) in its international accounts.

NEW DATA STRETCHED DEFICIT

The revision in the 1963 deficit results from recent information to the Commerce Department showing that foreigners piled up about $100 million more in U.S. bank accounts than had been calculated; also, shipments of military goods to foreigners, which count as exports, were about $150 million less than initially reported.

And the Government agency, in a payments report, noted that part of the improvement recorded last year reflects "developments which have had only temporary significance" as well as some basic economic gains.

Exports of farm products, for instance, were "exceptionally high" due to such "strictly temporary factors" as bad weather and poor crops in Europe, the report said; such conditions probably boosted farm exports by up to $150 million, mostly in the final quarter. Lower import barriers helped coal exports gain nearly $150 million, the report said, but the rise was "accentuated by weather conditions and interruptions in coal production in Europe last spring."

Temporary factors also appear to have pushed up fourth-quarter bank loans and direct investment abroad, which count as outflows. But temporary help came from an unusual inflow of funds from Canadian banks.

Even with the temporary help, however, the revised data put the 1963 fourth-quarter gap at $527 million, or a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $2,108 million. Previously the final quarter deficit had been estimated at $377 million or a $1,508 million annual rate. While advance estimates are even more subject to error than reports soon after a period ends, so far this year no marked change in trend from the fourth quarter appears to be developing, authorities say.

The fourth quarter annual rate in the payments deficit, even afetr being revised upward, is still much less severe than the revised $5,228 million annual rate of last year's April–June quarter. Sharply higher outflows of private U.S. capital then prompted the late President Kennedy to propose and "interest equalization tax" on sales of foreign securities here, intending to discourage foreigners' long-term portfolio borrowing by adding 1 percentage point to

their effective interest costs. Other efforts to trim the dollar outflow by reducing military spending abroad and tying more foreign aid to purchases here also were accelerated. The tax, which would be retroactive to last July 19, has passed the House, but Senate action probably will have to wait until after the civil rights fight.

PRIVATE CAPITAL OUTFLOW DOUBLED

The new figures show that the total net outflow of private capital in the final 1963 quarter rose to about $945 million—about double the total of the previous period, though well short of the total in the April-June quarter. The $945 million consisted of $215 million in long-term portfolio investment such as American citizens' purchases of foreign bonds and stocks, the area that is the target of the proposed tax; $129 million in short-term capital movement, compared with a small net inflow in the previous quarter when interest rates here were raised; and $601 million in direct investment, including acquisitions of foreign companies and construction of oversea factories and oil refineries by U.S. concerns.

The Bobby Baker Case—Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials and newspaper columns relating to the Bobby Baker case.

There being no objection, the editorials and columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Mar. 27, 1964]

BAKER CASE STILL ALIVE

The Bobby Baker case has not been buried just because the Democratic majority on the Senate Rules Committee has managed to close down its investigation after 5 months of evasion and fumbling.

The case is still very much alive and it will stay alive and kicking until all those embarrassing questions which the Democrats on the committee have run away from are answered.

Those questions relate to how an employee of the Senate majority could roll up a fortune of several million dollars on a salary of $19,600 a year; and whether or not the Senate and other Government agencies were used in the process of enrichment.

Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN and his fellow Democrats on the Rules Committee were able, by outvoting the Republican members, to keep 20 witnesses from testifying. Whether those individuals could have furnished the committee with evidence of Baker wrongdoing, or could have opened up some backdoors leading to rather interesting places is, of course, not known.

But, by repressing that testimony, whatever its nature, the Democratic members have aggravated the rumors and suspicions which have circulated around the case from the start.

The Democratic majority will issue a report on its findings and on its recommendations, if any, on legislation intended to cope with conflict of interest in the activities of Senate employees.

The committee minority will be able to submit a report of its own, and it should prove to be a blistering one, more revealing than the majority report, more valuable in suggesting remedies for conflict of interest by Senators as well as by Senate employees.

Senate debate over these coming reports could serve the public interest in focusing renewed attention upon the Baker case and its far-reaching, and unsavory, implications. It could even have such heavy impact that a more extensive inquiry could be authorized.

In any event, the clumsy mishandling of the Baker case by the Democrats controlling the investigation has made it inescapably a prime political issue, from which the Republicans may be expected to glean substantial profit. The charge of whitewash already made by Senator HUGH SCOTT and others is a difficult one for the Democrats to overcome.

The important part of all this has nothing to do with the political consequences but with the shortchanging of the public which the committee has engaged in by its premature termination of the probe. The fire has not been put out by dumping whitewash on it. Public wrath will demand the truth—the whole truth—in the Baker case.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 25, 1964]

BAKER INQUIRY ENDING?

Indications that Democrats on the Senate Rules Committee are preparing to close the Bobby Baker inquiry have brought renewed Republican criticism and further demands for the calling of additional witnesses. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, says the Republicans, outnumbered 6 to 3 on the committee, were "chopped down" in recent voting and may have no recourse except to write a minority report.

How long should the hearings continue? Certainly they should not be terminated so long as there is the likelihood of turning up additional substantive evidence as to how Baker, when a $19,600 a year secretary of the Senate majority, accumulated a fortune he estimated at more than $2 million; particularly if such evidence involves Senators or others in wrongdoing.

But the Democrats have a point when they say the shabby pattern of Baker's wheeling and dealing is plain, and sufficient to provide the basis of a report to the Senate and remedial legislation. It would be a waste of time merely to chew over the facts already brought out, and it seems that new material is running thin. For example, what was alleged a few days ago to be a "forgery" involving a Baker tax return now turns out to have been not a forgery and of no consequence.

The Republicans have very little ammunition to use in the coming campaign against the Johnson administration and would like the hearings to continue indefinitely in the hope of turning something up. On the other hand, the Democrats are charged with "trying to put this skeleton back in the closet" before the elections. No matter what is done it will be impossible to please both sides from a political standpoint.

That leaves the question of whether the public interest has been satisfied. The hearings have been underway since last October, which seems long enough. But if the Democrats terminate them they will automatically take on the responsibility of assuring the public that they have conscientiously fulfilled their assignment. The revelations of how Baker operated have discredited the Senate majority; it will take some doing to restore public confidence.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 26, 1964]

SHAME OF THE SENATE

By a straight party vote, Democrats of the Senate Rules Committee, who never did want a thorough investigation, have slammed the door shut on the Bobby Baker affair, which has no close parallel in congressional history.

After 6 months of headlines, the American people have learned little more about this skulduggery in high places than appeared in the relatively inconclusive hearings.

The fair-haired clerk of the Senate majority, "Lyndon's boy" they called him, ran his $19,000 salary up to something over $2 million—borrowed thousands upon thousands of dollars with or without collateral—bought a townhouse where girl friends did considerable entertaining—engaged in various enterprises with Government officials and Government contractors—and took the fifth, along with various associates.

Well, if that's all we'll ever know about Bobby Baker's doings, the inquiry smells of whitewash. And there has been less talk about his "little book" of late. Could that imply a deal?

Which Senators have so much to hide that they would prefer to bring shame on the Senate itself by having all the Democrats, in effect, collectively take the fifth?

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Mar. 26, 1964]

MEDALS FOR CAUTION, NOT FOR COURAGE

Democrats on the House Rules Committee have refused to call a number of witnesses proposed by the Republican minority in the Bobby Baker inquiry, thus triggering that minority's "whitewash" charges. Among those whom the Democrats rejected was Presidential Aid Walter Jenkins who, one witness indicated, had solicited advertising for the L.B.J. Co.'s television station in Texas as a sort of insurance rebate.

Committee Chairman JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, takes the position that the investigation has already produced enough evidence to illuminate the need for revising Senate rules bearing on conflicts of interest. He thinks further testimony would be repetitive.

But the inquiry has hardly touched the Senators themselves as it revolved around the unsavory financial dealings of the former secretary to the Senate majority. Today the areas which the committee has not investigated loom formidably large and it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Democratic Members have been less interested in doing a thorough job than they have been in skirting potential political embarrassments in a campaign year.

Have the Republican Members no political motives in pressing for new witnesses? Of course they have such motives but in this case, it seems to us, they also have the public interest on their side. That interest is not satisfied by an investigation which throws a protective aura of immunity around Senators or even Presidential aids.

The committee Democrats seem to be saying that it is better to play safe than be sorry. This may win them medals for caution but precious few for statesmanship or courage.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1964]

TOO BAD

The chairman and the majority of the Senate Rules Committee apparently have decided to ring down the curtain on the Bobby Baker investigation. From the first they gave the feeling that they had been pushed into the whole thing only by the insensitive press and they had tried before this to get away from those embarrassing details and up onto the broad plains of principle. Now they have succeeded.

It is too bad. What is lost is not a "carnival," a "circus" or a "partisan field day," to quote a few of the reasons given earlier for letting Bobby off the hook. What is lost is the chance to find out just how involved the Senate majority staff and, for that mat-

ter, assorted Members of the Senate majority itself, were in the complex affairs of the wonder boy from Carolina.

However embarrassing such revelations might have been, they would have been preferable to the not quite diffused cloud that now hangs over the Senate and its staff. The cloud, unfortunately, also hangs over the White House. Nor is it likely to be dissipated while the conflicting testimony involving the President's close assistant, Walter Jenkins, remains unresolved. This is not guilt by association and it is not low partisan politics. It is the commonsense conclusion inevitably drawn from a failure to lay the facts on the table.

Is is, we say, too bad. Assuming there was no serious fire beneath all the murky smoke, it would have been so easy to prove the fact.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 1, 1964]

THE RELUCTANT DRAGONS

When Robert G. Baker pleaded the fifth amendment (plus the first, fourth, and sixth) before the Senate committee looking into his wheeling and dealing, nobody was much surprised. As secretary of the Senate Democratic majority, his path had crossed many lives high in Government, his fortune had been made, and silence was the better part of wisdom.

Now another silence hangs as a pall over the U.S. Senate. It is the attempt of the committee majority to bury the case, quietly and with few mourners. Much remains to be told about Baker's business empire and how it grew. But Democrats have outvoted Republicans on the committee in an effort to close down the investigation; the bipartisan nature of the inquiry has ended.

In effect, this means that it is the Senate itself which is "taking the fifth" on the Baker case. The reluctant dragons on the committee have become timid about investigating one of their own former employees. Thus they have placed themselves on trial, too.

The facts are still not in; many pieces and persons are missing in the Baker financial jigsaw puzzle. What real estate deals were made, what favorable tax rulings were secured, what rebates were received, what gifts were made to and from Baker—for himself and political friends? The basic question remains: To what extent were the U.S. Senate and other Government agencies used illegally for self-enrichment?

The most legitimate of legislative purposes can be served if this investigation is pursued. It can lead not simply to exposure of its central figure but to new regulations governing conflict of interest. The Baker case remains very much alive in the public mind, not matter what the committee says. Its exploration must go on.

U.S. Foreign Policy: Lack of Realism on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating discussion by Constantine Brown, distinguished American reporter living in Rome, Italy, on U.S. policy for Vietnam, was published in the March 28, 1964, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

The indicated article follows:

LACK OF REALISM ON VIETNAM—PEOPLE SEEN WITHOUT WILL TO FIGHT, U.S. OUTCOME LIKE THAT OF FRENCH

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—It is unpleasant for an American reporter abroad to be a Cassandra. But under the present circumstances, because of the manner in which American foreign policy is being conducted, it is difficult to be anything else.

Competent European observers on international affairs with whom a foreign correspondent has inevitable close contacts speak more frankly than diplomats in Washington. Our European friends, being less involved in the many commitments of the United States, see things more objectively than our policymakers seem to at home. They watch with skepticism the travail at Geneva where our delegates discuss with their Russian counterparts that will-o'-the-wisp, disarmament, and forecast that maybe by the end of this century some partial agreements may be reached.

One oldtimer in these perennial disarmament conferences, which started well before the outbreak of World War II, reminded this reporter of a true story. In 1932, Ambassador Hugh Gibson, American delegate to the Geneva disarmament conference, was talking with his Hungarian opposite number. A small child, Gibson's son, came into the room. Gibson, who had a keen sense of humor, a gift diplomats seem to have lost entirely, introduced the child with these words: "This is the probable head of the American delegation for disarmament in 1975."

But what concerns our European friends—and it must be recalled that despite frictions and misunderstandings, we have nothing but well-wishers over here—is the lack of realism in our policies in South Vietnam. We seem to be swayed by emotionalism instead of using our usual practical commonsense.

Defense Secretary McNamara stated in an apparent burst of emotionalism during his last trip to war-torn Vietnam that "We will supply you now and in the future with the economic aid and military equipment that you need to defeat your enemies now and forever."

Actually, European observers and diplomats from Asian countries say the Communists in South Vietnam cannot be defeated except by direct and massive intervention of American forces. Merely sending economic aid and more weapons will not help, since the South Vietnamese themselves are tired of fighting.

Moreover, those called upon to bear the brunt do not know what they are fighting for. The social reforms promised by General Khanh, the new and probably temporary strongman of Saigon, have little if any appeal to the Vietnamese people. They want to be left alone. Under existing circumstances they see no difference between the Saigon force and the Vietcong.

Washington probably has forgotten that the Vietnamese have been at war a quarter of a century. After the defeat of France in Europe in 1940 the French surrendered to the Japanese on orders from Vichy. The peoples of Indochina (Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos) suffered under the Japanese yoke. Tokyo warlords were hard taskmasters. The Vietnamese became second-class citizens in their own country.

Shortly after the defeat and surrender of Japan in 1945, and after some squabbles between the French and Chinese, the new war started. It was initiated by Communist Ho Chi Minh. The French did their best to defeat the guerrillas in the North Vietnam jungles. They were unable to stem the Red offensive after we signed the armistice at Panmunjom which enabled the Chinese Communists to direct their entire attention to Vietnam.

The French were finally crushed, after having lost close to 100,000 men. Their defeat is attributed less to the weakness of some of their military leaders, and certain betrayals from pro-Communist factions within the French Government in Paris, than to the unwillingness of the South Vietnamese to fight in earnest. They either skipped back to their villages at the height of the battle or went over bag and baggage to the "enemy," their own brethren who were fighting under the merciless hand of Ho Chi Minh and his Communist military advisers.

The French did not lack hardware; we saw to it that they got what they needed; they did not always lack military leadership. Men such as Marshal de Lattre de Tassigny were equal to the best Western generals. But what they lacked was the willingness of the Vietnamese to fight for themselves. They did fight in North Vietnam because the choice was clear—either fight or be shot.

This method, however, could not be adopted by France without arousing shouts of indignation of "colonial brutality" from Washington. The Asians, like some Europeans, are always on the side of the winner. And since Ho Chi Minh was the winner, the Vietnamese in the opposite camp obstructed rather than helped the French oppressors.

A Communist movement known as the Vietcong developed in South Vietnam and grew to the present alarming proportions. Our fate in Vietnam will be no different from that of the French. The cold fact is that high-sounding statements by the new Saigon junta and high Washington personnel will have no effect on the disillusioned and tired South Vietnamese.

Curtis Sees $12 Billion Cost of Living Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Republican Congressional Newsletter:

TAX CUT BENEFITS LOST: CURTIS SEES $12 BILLION COST OF LIVING RISE

A leading congressional economist this week forecast a $12 billion increase in the cost of living in 1964 which will "more than wipe out the benefits of the tax cut."

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, ranking Republican on the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, told the newsletter that the worst hit by increased living costs would be poor families—those earning $3,000 or less, according to President Johnson's formula. Each such family could suffer a $90 increase in annual living costs but receive no offsetting tax cut because they pay no Federal income tax. Neither can they hedge against inflation, the Missouri legislator said, because they have no savings to invest in stocks or real estate, which gain in value during inflation.

CURTIS, also a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, charged that President Johnson destroyed all hope of maintaining the price level when he told the United Auto Workers the Government, in effect, would do nothing to hold the price-wage line. CURTIS said this apparently means the Government will not actively oppose the 4.9-percent increase in wages and benefits which the UAW seeks, despite President Johnson's earlier plea to unions to hold their wage demands to 3.2 percent—the annual gain in industrial productivity.

"Evidently," CURTIS said, "the President has abandoned the wage guidepost set by President Kennedy, in order to assure himself of the union vote. And the consumers be damned."

CURTIS noted that prices have been rising steadily during the Kennedy-Johnson administrations at the rate of about 1.5 points annually on the consumer price index. He said the more than $11 billion which the tax cut will pour into the economy, plus a long series of wage increases expected this year, deterioration of the quality of credit, Federal deficits and other factors, could easily double the rate of increase to three points in 1964.

"With disposable consumer income now about $400 billion annually, a three-point price increase would cost the Nation's consumers $12 billion in lost purchasing power," the Congressman said, "which will more than wipe out the benefits of the tax cut."

CURTIS said the green light given auto workers to seek an inflationary wage-benefit increase is especially dangerous this year when 119 major collective bargaining agreements, covering a total of 1.9 million workers, expire. Truckers already have received a 4.5 percent increase this year, two-thirds in wages and the rest in fringe benefits.

The Missouri Republican said the pressure of wage increases could well increase unemployment, thus heightening the poverty problem against which "President Johnson says he is warring."

CURTIS said that before the tax cut and the prospect of a national wave of wage-benefit increases, competition with low-price foreign goods had helped to hold prices down. But he said a new round of wage increases would force employers to lay off workers in order to stay in business against foreign competitors.

"What has happened to the public interest now?" CURTIS asked.

Colorado's Urban Renewal Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in Colorado Municipalities, written by Mr. William L. Slayton, outlining urban renewal activities in the State of Colorado:

On June 30, 1963, 4 Colorado cities were among the more than 700 communities in the country that had urban renewal activity. As is true nationally, the activity in Colorado is not confined to the largest cities alone. Over two-thirds of the cities in the program across the country have a population of under 50,000; about 20 percent have less than 10,000. Federal grants for the less-than-50,000-population group total about $600 million.

As might be expected, Denver, the largest city in Colorado, has more urban renewal activity than any other in the State, with five projects and a community renewal program.

Pueblo, the State's second largest city, also has a community renewal program. Arvada, with a 1960 population of 19,242, and Aurora, with 48,548, also are participating in the Federal program. (In November, Arvada voters chose to discontinue their urban renewal program.)

It is not surprising that Colorado, while experiencing a substantial growth of its cities, would have only a few communities in the program. It is certainly not urbanized to the extent that many other States are. In the 1960 census, only 3 cities in Colorado were in the over 50,000 class: Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo. Only five other cities then had as many as 25,000 people: Aurora, Boulder, Englewood, Fort Collins, and Greeley.

THE PROGRAM IN DENVER

Denver has five urban renewal projects and a community renewal program. A total of more than $5 million in Federal grants is involved.

This is the progress Denver has made to date:

Avondale project: In this area of 101 acres, consisting of 22 blocks, there are 297 structures containing 441 dwelling units. The area is composed of primarily one and two-family houses in relatively poor condition. A number of dilapidated and declining commercial establishments also are in the area.

The renewal program for the area aims at both redevelopment and rehabilitation. There will be multifamily housing on 40 acres, with landscaped, outdoor recreation and play areas for both children and adults, shopping facilities and school expansion. A number of new streets will be built and old ones widened or vacated to provide a more efficient street system. A redeveloper for the residential section has been selected.

Six new seven-story apartment buildings and 23 two-story buildings will be built. This will be known as Colfax Terrace West. There will be 473 dwelling units, costing over $5 million. A $1 million shopping center is about to start, and work on a park and school is underway.

Blake Street project: This is a 45-acre, 9-block area, containing 185 structures. The area is composed of a mixture of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Fifty percent of the area is residential, primarily single-family houses in very poor condition. Environmental factors, mixed land uses and the location of the area make it unsuitable for residential purposes.

The plan contemplates removal of all residential properties. The industrial structures that are sound will be rehabilitated, street improvements will be made, and the land after demolition of the deteriorated structures will be designated for industrial use. The acquisition phase is almost completed.

Whittier School project: This is an area of 109 acres, 28 blocks, containing 547 structures and 970 dwelling units, primarily large, old brick homes. These homes are basically sound but have been neglected and are becoming deteriorated. Many small businesses are scattered through the area.

The project calls for the repair and rehabilitation of the sound structures in need of repair; the purchase and clearance of the buildings beyond saving; street improvements; school construction; and a park extension. Approximately 70 percent of the building will be retained. Already, property owners have spent more than a half million dollars in rehabilitation of their buildings.

Jerome Park industrial project: Another area where mixed uses render it undesirable for residential purposes, this is a 70-acre, 13-block area, with 159 structures, 129 dwelling units, with industrial uses interspersed with residential. Parks, schools, and other facilities are not available, and the residential properties are deteriorated.

Renewal plans call for the removal of all residential structures. The area then will become an industrial one, utilizing the road and rail facilities in the area. Streets will be improved. Property acquisition will begin in 1964.

West Colfax: Another industrial project, it now contains 262 dwelling units and 282 structures on 153 acres. It also has badly mixed residential, commercial, and industrial uses, with old one- and two-family houses which are badly run down and on inadequate lots. The area has further complications—poor topography and drainage.

After clearance the topographical and drainage problems can be corrected so as to make the area suitable for light industrial use. This project still is being planned, and no property acquisition has started.

The projects, according to Denver authorities, include only a small portion of the city that needs renewal. However, it is necessary to schedule this work over many years; as local resources cannot handle all the work to be done except on a long-range basis.

Besides improving the living conditions of those families relocated because of project activity, new industrial activity, an increase of employment possibilities, and increased revenues to the city are bound to result.

OPEN SPACE PROGRAM

In four Colorado areas, local officials have taken advantage of the Federal assistance available to help in the purchase of permanent open space land for recreational and park purposes.

Federal grants under the open space land program, administered by URA, are authorized by the Housing Act of 1961. Purpose of the program is to help prevent urban blight through sound and balanced community growth and development by providing for permanent open land uses in urbanizing areas. Land acquired with Federal financial assistance may not be used for any building purposes but may be developed with non-Federal funds for recreational, conservation, historic, or scenic purposes.

Grants may be made to regional or local public agencies and to States for acquisition of open land important in a comprehensive plan for urban growth. Federal grants are 20 percent of the acquisition cost of the land, but when the applicant has responsibility for providing open space land for an overall metropolitan area, the grant may be increased up to 30 percent.

Two 10-acre sites in Arvada were purchased by the North Jeffco Metropolitan Recreation and Park District with the aid of an $11,720 Federal grant. The new park lands, Marnio Park and Vanderhof Park, are to be developed locally as neighborhood playfields.

Aurora received a Federal grant of $36,382 to aid in the purchase of 42 undeveloped acres in Winsor Heights Subdivision. The land is to be developed with local funds for park and recreation uses, including a public golf course.

Thirty-five undeveloped acres on sites scattered throughout Denver were purchased by the city with the aid of a $50,310 Federal grant. The new park lands are to be developed with local funds for playgrounds, playfields, an outdoor theater, picnicking, day camping, and conservation of land and other natural resources.

A 120-acre park and recreation area near Westminster has been purchased by the Metropolitan Recreation District No. 50 with the aid of a $19,200 Federal grant. The new park and recreation area, together with 80 adjacent acres previously acquired without Federal assistance, will be developed by the district to include public facilities such as a golf course and swimming pool, and several lakes. This Federal grant enabled the district to purchase the last large site available in the area for public recreation uses.

ASSOCIATED PROGRAMS

Besides the benefits in small city urban renewal undertakings, the urban planning assistance program, which was authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and hence called the 701 program, has

given many communities a real boost. Some small cities are using grant funds under this program—and they have to share the total cost of the planning—to develop comprehensive plans.

Small cities are using this planning assistance to carry on planning activities they never had the opportunity or funds to accomplish before. They are undertaking the preparation of base maps and land use maps, population studies, land use surveys, parking and traffic studies, neighborhood analyses, highway and street plans, capital budget planning, zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, and recreation, transportation, and community facilities studies.

Through plans developed under urban planning assistance programs, financed in part with section 701, several Colorado communities have already realized tangible benefits such as development of recreation areas and purchase of new land for uses proposed by their plans, improvement of streets, adoption of zoning and subdivision regulations, development of urban renewal projects, and elimination of substandard housing.

Urban planning assistance program in Colorado, as of June 30, 1963

Type planning area assisted	Federal grants			
	Number	Approved	Disbursed	Localities
Small areas	13	$321,762	$213,423	31
Metropolitan and regional areas [1]	7	369,221	319,743	2
Statewide [2]	2	112,940	28,978	------
Total	22	803,943	562,144	------

[1] Projects in the Denver and Pueblo metropolitan areas.
[2] Grants are to State division of planning.

The People's Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there can be no denying that the American people have a fascination for slogans and catch phrases. We cannot just elect a President anymore; we elect something like a great crusade or a New Frontier. If these phrases contribute anything to the people's interest in their government, I suppose they are fully justified.

But what is the phrase that describes our current administration? A perceptive newspaper editor in Arizona watched President Johnson on television recently, and he took note of the President's reply to a question about such labels as I have been describing. The President said he just wanted to be the "people's President." And right there President Johnson may have, quite unintentionally, coined the phrase that will characterize his administration.

The editor who noted all this was William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Ariz. He commented on the merit of the phrase in an editorial appearing in that newspaper on March 17. I happen to think Mr. Mathews' suggestion is a good one. If this becomes the slogan of the Johnson administration, let it be noted that an editor in Tucson, Ariz., made it so.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, the editorial follows:

THE PEOPLE'S PRESIDENCY—A SLOGAN?

President Johnson handled himself adeptly in his interview, which was prerecorded, on all TV networks on Sunday. Whether or not he intended to, and the continuity of the conversation would indicate that he was not conscious he was creating a name for his administration, he may have uttered a phrase that could become as widely known as the New Deal, the Fair Deal, or the New Frontier.

During part of the interview, he was asked whether he had any label for his administration, and the questioner referred specifically to such labels as mentioned above. Johnson replied that no, he had none; he simply wanted to be the people's President. He referred to this, also, in his discussion of secret service and FBI security measures thrown around him, stating that, to be the people's President, he had to be in contact with the people, and for him to be separated from throngs by 100 yards would prevent such contact.

Johnson said that he was neither a liberal nor a conservative, but a progressive who is prudent.

The political fortunes of his administration seem deceptively easy to predict. They look good now; they could be like dust before the storm at some future date. But the New Frontier just may have been replaced, in political jargon if in no other way, by the slogan, "People's Presidency."

Also, Johnson made a fine statement on public service. Asked of his view of his role as President, he reminded his questioners that he always had considered himself fortunate to be a free man, an American, a public servant, and a Democrat in that order. Certainly, while serving effectively as a Democrat, he showed his capacity to operate nonpartisanly during the Eisenhower administration, when as Senate majority leader he was one of the two strongest Democrats in Washington, the other being Speaker Sam Rayburn, also a strong partisan but a good nonpartisan operator.

If Johnson really is going to establish a people's presidency (as opposed to some sort of a deal or frontier), he will have to be nonpartisan enough to sell himself to independents who hold the true center of the stage in the great drama of American political life. The independent middle will choose the next President, as it has recent Presidents.

Also, Johnson dispelled a recent rumor that the admiral who cut the Guantanamo pipeline did so unauthorizedly and risked punishment. Johnson said plainly that the admiral was sent to Guantanamo to do that very thing.

We Hasten Our Burial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Hollywood Citizen-News recently published an excellent editorial questioning the arguments being offered for removal of economic sanctions against the Soviet-bloc countries.

The Citizen-News states that these proposals ignore the fact that we are in a war for survival, and concludes "Khrushchev means to bury our system if he can; and he can do it faster with our help."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial from the March 21, 1964, issue of Hollywood Citizen-News for inclusion in the RECORD:

WE HASTEN OUR BURIAL

Its hard to understand realistic business leaders favoring an easing of restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. Yet, there is a rising tide of sentiment along this line.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce announces it will ask its members to vote on a resolution calling, in part, for the removal of nonstrategic restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union and its European satellites. A top officer of the National Export Expansion Council says he sees "little purpose" in continuing economic sanctions against Soviet-bloc countries and predicts a change in U.S. policy in the near future.

A popular argument is: "Since the Russians are getting what they want elsewhere, why should we have to hold off? We should have our share of the orders that are now going to Britain and France."

Sentimentally, others argue we can "buy" Soviet goodwill by lifting trade restrictions.

These arguments ignore the fact that we're in a war for survival. The Russian people may be hungry and need food. They certainly could stand a higher standard of living; but it is unrealistic to think we can win the Kremlin over by trade deals. The Communists will not attribute to us any motive higher than capitalist avarice.

The Soviets are doubling the size of their merchant marine every 2 years. They are on a tremendous drive for trade; but their growing merchant marine and increased foreign trade are for one basic purpose: expansion of communism.

As was brought out in Los Angeles this week at a meeting of the Committee for American Steamship Lines, Soviet Russia aims to sink the merchant marines of the free world by undercutting them. She uses foreign trade as an instrument of aggression to plant and strengthen Red units throughout the world.

The old argument that a fat and prosperous Communist is better than a lean and hungry one doesn't hold water, either. In our opinion he is a more deadly foe, because he has more power with which to threaten and to impress.

Khrushchev means to "bury" our system if he can; and he can do it faster with our help.

A.C.

Some Questions About Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Urban League has prepared and is distributing a publication, "Some Questions About Housing," which I think is making a significant contribution toward the general population's understanding of minority group problems in the field of housing. Because I believe the matters contained in this pamphlet are of concern to all Americans, under unanimous consent I insert them into the RECORD, as follows:

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HOUSING

1. What is the housing goal of the Urban League? The National Urban League and its affiliates in more than 65 cities through the United States are working toward achieving full equality in housing opportunities for minority group persons. This means not only increased new housing and the opportunity of living in previously segregated districts but also improvements of those areas which are inhabited primarily by minority group members. Traditionally, the Urban League has been most concerned with the problems of the Negro. But in recent years we have been concerned also with other disadvantaged minority groups, including the low-income citizen.

2. What is the Urban League doing to reach this goal? Many things. The Los Angeles Urban League has a full-time professional staff member working on a housing program which is guided by a housing committee. This committee is composed of volunteers who meet at least once a month and represent not only many phases of the housing industry but also appropriate lay citizens. Generally, the housing program includes research, educational, and service activities. We have a neighborhood improvement program, sponsor workshops, conduct research projects, provide consultation services, and many other activities.

3. What difficulties do Negroes (and some other minority groups) have in getting adequate housing? Multiple difficulties face the minority group person. For one thing, his income is likely to be lower than the national average, due in large part to historical prejudices and lack of educational opportunities. These alone limit him. But there are other barriers. He finds it difficult or impossible to move into certain sections of the city because prejudiced owners won't sell or rent to him, or would like to but "are afraid of what the neighbors would think." Similarly, many apartments or houses up for rental are denied to Negroes. The fact that Negroes are virtually forced to live in specific sections of cities, coupled with the fact that they are a lower than average income group, means that they usually live in the central, older part of the city where land is too expensive to provide large-scale housing developments. Lending institutions are occasionally hesitant to lend to members of minority groups, particularly in segregated, Caucasian districts.

4. Do you think that all neighborhoods should be integrated? Many persons, oriental, Caucasian, and Negro alike, feel that there are advantages to living in a neighborhood where they can get to know persons of differing ethnic backgrounds. They feel it's particularly advantageous for their children, because it lets them learn in a natural way that the world consists of different kinds of people. But the primary concern of the Urban League is to see that every person is free from those artificial barriers which keep some persons from living where they think they can get the best house for their dollars, the best environment for their children, and where they can be reasonably close to work. Naturally, this will mean that Negroes will live in previously segregated districts. But just as there are neighborhoods where no Irish-Americans or Swedish-Americans live, there will, by chance alone, be neighborhoods where no Negroes live. The Urban League, of course, is not concerned about integrating these neighborhoods. The vital thing is that if a Negro, or any other person, wishes to move into an area, he will not be prevented from doing so on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

5. Do Negroes want to live among Caucasians? Negroes don't want to live in an area predominantly because it is a non-Negro neighborhood. They are seeking that housing which they feel best suits their housing needs. It just so happens that the areas that are predominantly non-Negro are often much more desirable in terms of the housing accommodations offered than most of the areas that are predominantly Negro. One of the major reasons for racial tensions and misunderstandings is the lack of day-to-day communications which would bring about racial understanding, and emphasize the fact that people are people, though they may have ethnic differences.

6. How do "mixed" neighborhoods work out? In general, very well. Naturally, there have been cases where minority group persons were received with coldness, or in some cases with active hostility. But in southern California, these cases are increasingly rare. Remember, for each case you hear of active hostility, there are dozens where integration is completely peaceful. There are a number of successfully integrated areas in southern California, and in some, Oriental, Caucasian and Negro persons have formed groups to help keep the area integrated.

7. Some minority group areas are slums. Are "mixed' areas also likely to become slums? Many of the areas where Negroes live were slums before they moved in. That is often the only kind of housing available to them, either because of various restrictions or because that is all they can afford. Because good housing opportunities for Negroes have always been scarce, even the poorest homes are rented or bought for exorbitant sums. Because of housing discrimination, Negroes have been forced to live within the central part of the city where there is a great amount of substandard housing. These conditions are the direct cause of slums. Absentee landlords sometimes contribute to slum conditions by neglecting city health and building codes. However, when minority group persons move into better neighborhoods, they almost always maintain the property in the same manner as their neighbors. A study by the National Association of Realty Boards showed that Negroes take excellent care of their homes if these homes are in good condition when acquired.

8. Will property values drop if Negroes move into a previously all-Caucasian area? Most likely not. A 5-year study made of 10,000 house sales in San Francisco, Oakland, and Philadelphia by Dr. Luigi Laurenti, an economist, showed that when neighborhoods desegregated, in 40 percent of the areas there was no difference in the value of the houses as compared with a highly similar nonintegrated area. In 45 percent of the comparisons, the houses in the integrated neighborhoods were worth 5 to 26 percent more than the comparable nonintegrated areas, and in 15 percent of the cases, houses in the desegreated areas were worth 5 to 9 percent less. Of course, if there is panic selling in a neighborhood, prices will drop, but this price decline is usually temporary.

9. If one member of a minority group moves into an area, does that mean that the area will become all Negro, or all Oriental, etc? Generally not, but there are exceptions. When panic selling occurs, a neighborhood may tend to become racially resegregated. Sometimes an unscrupulous real estate broker will encourage Caucasians to move, scaring them with the argument that if they don't, they will be one of the few remaining non-Negroes, and thus will be living in a house whose value has dropped. Panic selling, because of monetary loss to the seller, creates bitterness toward the Negro buyer, because he is looked upon as the cause of the loss. If the non-Negro sellers remain clam and welcome the new neighbor with the same friendliness that would be shown to a non-Negro neighbor, they would find that their new neighbors are socially and culturally compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. Other factors are involved in neighborhood change. If there is an open housing situation throughout the city, so that minority group persons can move freely into all districts, there is less likelihood that any one area will become a predominantly minority district. If, however, the newly desegregated district is the only decent one available, it will naturally attract minority group persons more quickly. Distance from the predominantly-Negro sections of town (or areas predominantly occupied by other minorities) is another factor; areas adjacent to such districts may, if panic selling occurs, become a part of the minority group district.

10. If I want to live in an integrated area, how can I find one? The Urban League will be glad to help you. If you live in an area that is integrated, you can help insure its remaining so by discouraging panic selling. Public acknowledgement, through letters to editors, neighborhood committees, discussion at PTA's and the like, to the effect that desegregated areas have their advantages, is another way of preventing resegregation.

11. Do you support fair housing legislation? The Urban League stands strongly behind fair housing legislation, feeling that such protection is a fundamental right of all persons. That is, we feel that persons should have a right to purchase property or rent quarters without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

12. Do fair housing laws violate property rights? Do they force integration? The only right affected by the fair housing laws now in effect in California is the right to practice prejudice because of race, religion, or national origin. Otherwise, a property owner has the right of setting as stringent requirements for tenants or buyers, as he wishes; he just is not allowed to have one standard for Caucasians, another for minority group persons. Property rights are by no means absolute; use of perperty is governed—and has been for hundreds of years—by such items as health regulations, zoning laws, grazing rights, building codes, and many others.

13. What are the fair housing acts, and how do they operate? There are three fair housing acts operating in California. The Hawkins Act opposes discrimination on the part of owners whose housing was financed or guaranteed by Government loans—Calvet, FHA, and the like. The Unruh Act opposes discrimination on the part of any business concern, including real estate brokers. Under provision of these acts, a person who believes he has been a victim of unfair discrimination may file a case in court. The third fair housing measure is the Rumford Act, which applies to the following categories of housing: (1) Owner-occupied single family residences receiving Government loans or guarantees; (2) multiple dwellings of three or more units (usually apartments) receiving such Government aid; and (3) all multiple dwellings of five or more units. Complaints filed under provisions of the Rumford Act are handled by the Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC). A commissioner and professional staffman are assigned the case, and they make a thorough and rapid examination of the complaint. Their approach is positive; they use techniques of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. If they find that there is some evidence of unfair discrimination, a private conference is held with the parties concerned. If either party in the dispute is dissatisfied with the recommendations of the FEPC commissioner and staff member, a public hearing may be held before a group of not less than four FEPC commissioners. Ultimately, the case can be taken to court. Most cases are resolved in private conference (employment cases and early Rumford Act experiences have shown), where, if discrimination is found, the owner agrees to rent or sell to the complainant. If no house or apartment is currently available, the complaining party may be given the first chance at renting or buying the next available quarters. If neither a sale nor rental is possible,

a fine of up to $500 may be imposed in some cases. A complaint cannot be filed under provisions of more than one fair housing act. Further information is available by telephoning the FEPC at Madison 0-2610.

14. Will the FEPC be fair? They seem to be. Of the first 30 completed cases handled by the FEPC, only one reached the public hearing stage. Fourteen were satisfactorily resolved in conference, and 16 dismissed because of insufficient evidence, no jurisdiction, or withdrawal of complaints. At latest report, 1 case had gone to public hearing, and 28 were pending. In the case of employment, only 3 of more than 2,000 cases went beyond the public hearing stage, and two-thirds were dismissed because of no evidence or insufficient evidence. The FEPC assumes a person is innocent until proven guilty of unfair discrimination.

15. Will the Urban League provide speakers for housing programs? Yes. Interested persons or groups are invited to telephone the league at Axminster 2-0511 to make arrangements for a speaker. We will find a speaker who is appropriate for your purposes. We will also help set up forums, workshops, and the like.

16. Does the Urban League take part in picketing? The national policy of the Urban League prohibits our participation in picketing, boycotting, sitins, or demonstrations. That doesn't mean we approve or disapprove of other groups doing so; it just isn't the kind of work we do.

Other questions can be answered by writing the Urban League, 3839 South Western Avenue, Los Angeles 90062, or telephoning Axminster 2-0511.

Inflation Fears Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in two columns in the Washington Star of April 4 and April 5, Sylvia Porter, the noted financial writer, has pointed out that for the first time in this decade inflation is a danger that cannot be shrugged off. She points to a general advance in wholesale prices in manufacturing industries, to rising prices of basic materials and commodities, to the free spending mood of the public and to the mounting probability of a big wage increase in the automobile industry. Consumer prices are almost certain to be affected by these developments.

Pointing out that booms carry with them the seeds of their own destruction, Miss Porter then asks what can be done to curb inflation. After ruling out an increase in taxes and dismissing the administration's guidelines as an "iffy" weapon at best, she says that more aggressive action can be taken in issuing warnings against the unwise use of credit in the stock and mortgage markets and observes that a major assist could also come from a ceiling on Federal Government spending while tax collections rise to bring the budget into balance. Finally she points out that the most effective weapon would be a shift in monetary policy to reduce the availability and to raise the cost of credit to borrowers.

Under unanimous consent, Miss Porter's two perceptive columns on the inflationary threat before the country follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 4, 1964]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—BOOM SIGNS BRING INFLATION FEARS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Our 38-month-old business upturn is starting to flash signals of turning into a boom.

The key evidence is in the price trend—in the widely scattered increases being posted in the prices of raw commodities, basic metals, industrial materials and manufactured goods, both durable and nondurable.

The price increases aren't seriously disturbing—yet. They are mostly small, and so they neither arouse much attention nor do they give President Johnson a basis for telling the Nation that the actions "flout the public interest." Inflation is still a threat not a reality.

It well may be that consumer and business spending, accelerated by the great tax cuts of 1964, will be orderly and not add to inflation pressures. It's possible that this year's wage settlements will be within reasonable limits and they'll not boost labor costs to the point where corporations will face the alternatives of either increasing prices on accepting a squeeze on profits.

But let's not kid ourselves. For the first time in this decade of the 1960's, inflation is a danger we must not shrug off.

In his January economic message, Mr. Johnson said, "I shall keep a close watch on price and wage developments, with the aid of an early warning system which is being set up in the appropriate agencies."

Assuming the early warning system is operating, this is what it is showing:

Wholesale prices in manufacturing industries are in a general advance. A sensitive Government index shows that 76 percent of wholesale prices in 23 manufacturing industries are now rising. At the start of last year only 24 percent were rising; as recently as last August only 52 percent were rising. The increases are virtually across the board in durable goods and are taking place in most nondurable goods as well.

Prices of basic materials and commodities are rising at home and abroad, and since many of the materials are essential to the goods we manufacture, the increases naturally put upward pressure on production costs.

The Consumer Price Index is only moderately higher than a year ago, but if the above price increases stick and spread, consumer prices are sure to be affected.

On top of this is tne mounting probability of a big wage increase in the automobile industry which could set a new pattern for the country. What happens in the auto wage negotiations this year will have ramification going far beyond the industry.

On top of this, too, is the free-spending mood of the public. Not in years have consumers indicated so much confidence in the economy's future. Not since the boom of 1955-56 have they shown so much optimism—and they have the incomes and the credit to translate enthusiasm into buying in the marketplace.

Add also the step-up in industry's spending for new plants and equipment, officially projected at 10 percent for 1964. A rise of 10 percent is provocatively close to boom proportions in this type of spending, and the rise would be bigger than the Government estimates.

One reason the current business upturn has lasted 38 months to date is because it had been solid and noninflationary, and if it remains noninflationary it could continue indefinitely.

But if it takes on the extra characteristics of an inflationary boom, it will force counteractions that could lead to the boom's end. Booms carry within themselves the seeds of their own destruction.

The early warning system is signaling now that inflation is only a threat. Our new challenge is to keep it only a threat.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 5, 1964]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—WHAT CAN BE DONE TO CURB INFLATION?

(By Sylvia Porter)

If another wage-price spiral, leading to an inflationary boom, becomes a threat as 1964 rolls on, what could be done to control it?

The possibility of "moderate" inflation reappearing is not to be underestimated. The tax cuts are giving the 38-month-old business advance new strength. Behind the apparent stability of the Government's price indexes, small but scattered increases are being posted—including wholesale prices of both durable and nondurable manufactured goods, prices of raw materials and basic metals. Fairly impressive wage raises are being granted in a number of industries, and the crucial auto wage contract could set a new wage pattern above the "noninflationary" range. A boom atmosphere is appearing, fed by and feeding on rising business and consumer spending.

The fact that industry's investment plans indicate rising emphasis on new plants to expand production capacity—in contrast to investments to modernize old plants—suggests the slack in idle factory capacity is disappearing. The fact that the jobless rate among married men is down to 3 percent suggests that, despite the overall unemployment problem, the slack among relatively skilled workers is disappearing too.

This is a background which could lead to an inflationary boom. What could be done to keep it under control?

The way to answer this question is first to outline briefly what we couldn't and wouldn't do.

Congress wouldn't raise taxes—a traditional way to mop up spending money and curb an upturn. Tax rates are going down.

The administration wouldn't ask for price and wage controls. These didn't work even during the days of global war and they certainly wouldn't work now.

Nor would there be any attempt at other direct controls—such as regulation of installment credit—and with goods in ample supply, there would be no point whatsoever in rationing.

So what?

1. This administration already is actively using the so-called open mouth or jawbone weapon to talk business and labor leaders into restraint. (More elegant terms are "exhortation" and "moral suasion.") It's an "iffy" weapon at best.

2. Authorities also are issuing warnings against unwise use of credit in the stock and mortgage markets and more aggressive actions could be taken in these spheres.

3. A major assist would be a ceiling on Federal Government spending while tax collections rise to bring the budget into balance. Booming business and consumer spending obviously cuts the need for rising Government spending to spur the economy.

4. But the great, most effective weapon would be a shift in monetary policy by the Federal Reserve System to reduce the availability and to raise the cost of credit to borrowers. The reduced availability would make it tougher for all borrowers to get funds to finance projects which would further stimulate the economy. The higher costs of credit—and interest rates are comparatively high right now—would discourage marginal borrowers and eliminate many businessmen and consumers from the loan market. At the same time, higher interest

rates would attract individuals into saving more and spending less and this too would dampen the boom.

The Federal Reserve doesn't want to risk aborting the upturn by stepping heavily on the credit brakes and the administration certainly doesn't relish this. But the central bank will act promptly if price and wage increases move out of the reasonable range.

As Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin has often put it. "We are always in the position of a chaperone who takes away the punch when the party is getting going." Today the chaperone is intently watching the U.S. economy's "party"—and if we don't behave with restraint, our punch (easy credit) will be taken away from us.

Zanzibar II—An African Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ZANZIBAR II—AN AFRICAN CUBA

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

DAR ES SALAAM, TANGANYIKA.—Zanzibar is to Africa as Cuba is to Latin America—a magnificent staging point for revolution. And, as in Cuba, the United States muffed more than one chance to nip a malevolent growth in the bud. Our island policies are rarely brilliant.

Like Cuba, Zanzibar now turns steadily eastward for inspiration. Washington prays that President Karume, a stubborn if not impressively intelligent man, will emulate such nonalined leaders as Tanganyika's Nyerere. But Karume is almost surely Zanzibar's Kerensky.

The real fight will probably come between his pro-Russian and pro-Chinese counselors, and the latter, headed by the acute Afro-Arab halfcaste, Babu, are likely to triumph. Babu, who is in China's pay, could conceivably be handicapped by Arab blood in a fiercely Negro-conscious atmosphere. But he controls the secret police and is playing the Chinese line with all its racist innuendoes.

Zanzibar's revolution commendably seeks to hoist living standards. Nevertheless, Babu says: "After a revolution the public expects one to take extreme measures. It is conditioned to expect the worst. This gives one very great latitude."

That latitude showed promptly in mass murder of Zanzibari Arabs which, strangely, elicited no protests from Cairo. Nasser simply shifted his line and started to back the new regime. Meanwhile, East Africa's leaders are certainly worried.

They hope to create tolerant nonracial societies based on political nonalinement in the cold war and they fear development of a dynamic, racist, Communist center off the coast. Having just seen one Zanzibar coup mirrored by mutinies as far inland as Uganda's Congo border, they have reason for anxiety. The chances of African moderation grow slimmer as Zanzibar slips left.

No grandiose mainland plot from Zanzibar seems imminent yet. Sinophile and Russophile Communists still eye each other suspiciously there; further appetities will come later.

THE BRITISH CHICKEN OUT

January 12, when unrest erupted, Britain had 700 British and trusted Kenya troops ready to fly in, but London chickened out. After subsequent mutinies on the mainland, a British carrier was sent here, the uprisings were quelled and Zanzibar intervention reconsidered. Nobody wanted the archaic Sultan back, but Karume, who admires Nyerere, would surely have accepted such support.

Britain, however, decided on inaction. The United States after feverish consultations, followed suit. The carrier sailed away. All nebulous plans urging intervention have failed so far. We now counsel patient resignation to our East African supporters, wistfully hoping the Negro Karume will euchre the halfcaste Communists out.

Washington seems resigned to follow British Fabian leadership. Since Suez, Britain has developed understandable distaste for intervening except to support existing order; and Zanzibari order now exists. Our own African policy seems obsessed by the notion there are no bad people if their skin is black. This is lunacy and an insult to Africans; surely a Nyerere is preferable to a Nkrumah.

The tide that will someday flow from Zanzibar may ultimately prove more dangerous to U.S. interests than that we imagine threatens us from Cuba. Zanzibar is an admirable base for subversion. Communism already has paid agents in key mainland positions, particularly in Kenya. It has easy access to Tanganyika, a center of African nationalist movements, and can aim at fertile soil from Mozambique to Southern Rhodesia and the Congo.

From Zanzibar, China preaches the anti-white gospel that multiracism is nonsense. This also hits the Russians—which Peiping doesn't mind. Those who do mind are the decent, generous leaders of East Africa who seek to build neutral, nonracial societies, entirely isolated from the cold war. They have been promised our sympathy, aid and support; they have received sympathy and a little aid.

China is on to a good thing in Zanzibar. Racism smolders among Africa's masses and the Chinese know how to fan it. Now that Washington has seemingly dropped all thought of intervening for its friends, Peiping's sole problem is controlling its Zanzibari agents; the old Tammany formula—keep a man honest; an honest man stays bought.

Panama Canal: New Record in February 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on March 9, 1964, under the title, "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics," and in a statement on March 11, on "Panama Canal: Formula for Future Canal Policy," I dealt at length with basic canal questions and proposed a plan of action for our Government for meeting the problems involved.

That the time is now approaching when adequate means must be provided for making the necessary evaluations of various canal proposals now being urged is emphasized by the new records in transits of the Panama Canal. In this connection, an informative article on the traffic for February 1964 by Ralph K. Skinner, experienced special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor now resident on the isthmus follows:

PANAMA CANAL PROSPERS

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

BALBOA, C.Z.—The Panama Canal set a new record in February for total transits in 1 day or 1 week. If March continues at the present rate, another monthly record will result.

This proves that the impasse in United States-Panama relations existing since January 10 has not affected the operations of the Panama Canal.

One day in February, 47 oceangoing ships transited from ocean to ocean, a new record for any single day since the waterway opened on August 15, 1914.

During 1 week, 284 oceangoing ships transited.

Not included in these figures are many coastwise banana boats, fishing craft, and small pleasure boats using the Panama Canal.

IMPROVEMENT SEEN

Capt. M. J. Prince, marine director of the Panama Canal, is very pleased by another statistic. The average time per ship spent in Canal Zone waters for the first 8 months of this fiscal year was 13.7 hours. During fiscal 1962 and 1963 the time was more than 15 hours.

This proves that operating efficiency is improving during a period of growing traffic. Aiding the speedup is an improved system of handling superships in the lock chambers.

More and more superships are using the canal. In the week the record was set, 49 ships were given "clear-cut" handling, which means only single-lane traffic was allowed while they were passing through the 8 miles of Gaillard Cut. Handling of clear-cuts requires expert scheduling to prevent holding up other ships.

The *San Juan Prospector*, the biggest commercial cargo ship ever to transit, sped through the Panama Canal in 10½ hours on January 22. This correspondent was aboard for part of the transit.

The 835-foot supership, usable interchangeably as an ore carrier or a tanker, had a beam of 106 feet, which required perfect handling through the 110-foot-wide lock chambers. Panama Canal personnel take these giant ships in stride but it is a shoehorn operation, viewed from any angle.

REQUIREMENTS SKETCHED

Capable of carrying 69,000 tons of iron ore or oil, the fully loaded *San Juan Prospector* requires a draft of nearly 45 feet. At the maximum draft permitted by the Panama Canal, the ship could carry only 31,000 tons through the waterway—half its normal capacity. Thus the "big ditch" is not up to the *San Juan Prospector's* needs when it is fully loaded.

This was no problem in January, since the ship was in ballast and took the cheaper 72-cent ballast rate per Panama Canal measurement ton instead of the 90 cents per ton laden rate. Even in ballast, this giant special-purpose ship paid tolls over $27,000 for the 10½-hour transit.

In fairness to the Panama Canal, it should be mentioned that many ships such as the *San Juan Prospector* are built to operate between predetermined ports which can accommodate them and are not intended to enter all harbors or use all canals.

Mr. Wilson Strikes Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we are accustomed to dealing with money in

moving van quantities here in the Congress. When a Member of Congress goes to the length of proving the waste of items as small as a rubber eraser, then it can be easily understood by every citizen of this Nation.

This is what was accomplished recently by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Representative EARL WILSON, when he started a personal investigation into the buying policies of the Navy Purchasing Office.

What the gentleman from Indiana, Representative WILSON uncovered at the Navy Purchasing Office is a shocking indictment of the buying policies of some elements of our Defense Establishment. The grains of sand he has documented are but a small part of a mountain of waste.

The Richmond-News Leader editorially complimented the gentleman from Indiana, Representative WILSON, for his fight against waste in an editorial entitled "Mr. WILSON Strikes Again."

I include the editorial at this point and commend it to my colleagues:

MR. WILSON STRIKES AGAIN

After zeroing in on some improper procedures in awarding contracts for Air Force equipment (editorial, Dec. 16), Congressman WILSON of Indiana sets his sights on the Navy. His general target was the Navy Purchasing Office, his specific target Miss Estelle Wolfe, former office services branch head, in charge of providing the NPO with office supplies. These supplies are ordered on a 3-months' basis to serve the needs of the 100 employees of the Office.

Last year the NPO said it needed four new electric staplers. These staplers, if purchased from the Federal Supply Schedule would cost between $22 and $24. Miss Wolfe bought not 4, but 24, staplers from a private jobber, without competitive bids, for $44.75 each. Later it was found that 15 electric staplers were stored unused in the NPO office.

In 1962, Miss Wolfe also bought four new copying machines, at $895 each. The total purchase came to about $5,000, including copypaper and materials. At that time, the NPO had an extreme overstock of copypaper on hand that could be used only in the old machines. An NPO employee happened to catch this blunder, and saved the taxpayers thousands of dollars by taking action to make the company take back the new copying machines.

Mr. WILSON also cited the following items as examples of overstocked supplies: 2,952 erasers; 5,000 boxes of carbon paper, totaling 500,000 sheets; 3,000 staple removers; 3,888 ballpoint pens; 4,668 ballpoint pen refills; $5,000 overstock of copying machine paper; 2,710 boxes of paperclips; a 3 years' supply of stationery; 395 stamp pads; 540 rolls of pressure-sensitive tape; 88 rolls of masking tape; 40 plastic brief cases; 2,358 rolls of cellophane tape—240,000 feet; 70 food-handling aprons; 32 cartons of rubber bands; 23 gross of chalk; 16,000 index cards; 100 dozen pencils; 91 pencil sharpeners; 140 boxes of gummed labels; 131 boxes of index tabs; and 30 pairs of gloves.

Mr. WILSON found it incredible that all these supplies were to be used by 100 people in a period of 3 months. He did a little digging into the reason for this overstocking, with the help of an NPO employee. He found that the items had been purchased from a company named Visual Systems, Inc., headed by Edgerton Smith. Mr. WILSON found further that Miss Wolfe and Mr. Smith are old friends, with business relations dating back to 1957. When Mr. Smith formed his own company in 1960, Miss Wolfe placed a blanket purchase order with him.

Congressman WILSON has placed all his evidence with the Comptroller General, requesting a complete investigation by the General Accounting Office. We hope that the GAO report will contain not only the facts of the case, but an explanation of how such a gross mishandling of taxpayers' funds was allowed in the first place. Such a report could have the desirable effect of training additional guns on wasteful purchasing procedures within the Defense Establishment.

Rev. Joseph B. Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker on last Thursday evening, April 2, 1964, I attended the banquet at the Madison Hotel in Washington, honoring Father Joseph B. Collins, national director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

A great number of church dignitaries and leaders from Washington and other sections of the country were present honoring Father Collins for his long years of outstanding devotion in the cause of religious education in our country.

Father Collins has been an instructor at Catholic University for over 30 years. He has also served as national director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine for a long period of time.

On Thursday evening he was awarded the Cross for Church and Pontiff by Pope Paul VI "For Notable and Distinguished Service" for his outstanding leadership and great accomplishments in the expansion of religious education.

The following is the response made by Father Collins after receiving his award:

RESPONSE BY REV. JOSEPH B. COLLINS

Your excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, after listening to all that has been said, one cannot but feel that some kindly Boswell has been busy gathering glowing details on the life and work of the director of the National Center. I think it was Xenophon who said there is no sound more pleasing than one's own praise. It is all the more true when the words of praise are sprinkled with a great amount of charity or at least with more than a modicum of exaggeration.

I am of course deeply grateful for the award that is presented to us this evening and for the generous and kind citation. But in a true sense they are marks of benevolent and courteous recognition of the work of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the United States, on the part of the holy father and of the sacred congregation of the council, in whose special charge is the CCD throughout the world.

To all of you who have come here this evening to do us honor, my deep and sincere thanks.

We appreciate the presence here of the heads of the various departments of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who after a hard day's work in your offices have left your homes and firesides to be with us. Thanks to the priest members of the staff of the NCWC—our confreres and brother priests—need more be said?

Our thanks too to the administrative officers of the Catholic University for being with us: Father Arand, president of Divinity College, Father McCormick, rector of Theological College, Msgr. Ryan, dean of the school of philosophy, Father Sloyan, head of the department of religious education, Monsignor Skeen and Father Hartman, professor of Scripture, two of the scholars working on the confraternity translation of the Bible. A very grateful welcome to Father James Gillen, able director of the CCD in the archdiocese of Washington. Also, many thanks to our many friends from the city and from outside Washington for coming to help us celebrate this happy occasion.

I am especially happy and grateful for the presence of so many members of the bishops' committee of the CCD. They have been attending meetings all day; they have paid their respects to the apostolic delegate this very evening, and now they grace this occasion as another testimony of their unfailing interest in the confraternity and its national center, which is so close to their hearts.

I am very grateful to Bishop Fitzgerald, my own ordinary of the diocese of Winona, for coming here to honor a priest of his diocese, and to show his interest in the confraternity which has been fruitfully organized in the diocese of Winona for many years.

I have also a letter from Father McDonald, provincial of the Sulpician Fathers, in which he regrets that he could not be present this evening. He is leaving for Paris for a meeting with the superior general. "You have our sincerest congratulations upon the honor," he writes. "It is not only an honor to you but to the Sulpicians. We are very grateful to Bishop Greco for his kindness." You will not mind a tiny word of explanation to some of you who may not know that all Sulpicians are diocesan priests; that they are admitted to the society only after ordination. They are engaged solely in the work of training priests for the diocesan ministry in minor and major seminaries.

I am, however, anxious that the kind words of Monsignor Tanner and Bishop Greco directed to Miss Quinn and myself be shared by the staff of the National Center. All that has been said applies equally to them. We work as a team. But it is in the nature of things that those who really do most of the work receive least of the credit. The daily routine of our office and the numberless tasks that are carried out with promptness and efficiency is due solely to the industry and spirit of charity and dedication of each one of the members of our staff.

This goes for Father Neighbor, our energetic and genial associate director; to Miss Quinn, who happily shares with me the courteous gesture of benevolence signified by the award; to Father Greenspun, of the Paulist Fathers, our well-traveled director of the Apostolate of Good Will and himself an apostle of Christian unity; to Father Alan Smith, Dominican Father, our Scripture scholar and editor of publications; to the two Sisters, Sister Mary Janaan, O.S.F. and Sister Margaret Eugene, O.P., who joined our staff 2 years ago (the first in the history of the CCD), and to each and every one of the devoted and efficient lay workers, whose work, if not their names, is known in every part of the country where the CCD is operating today. They are: Miss Irene Hunt, Miss Suzanne Lamoureux, Miss Marie Knisley, Mrs. Doris Andresen, and Miss Helen T. Quinn, nor must I forget our faithful typist and Howard University student, Mr. Paul Young.

My deep thanks to Monsignor Tanner for acting as master of ceremony for this happy event, and for his overly kind words. He is our benign superior at the NCWC, and his presence with us despite so many calls on his time during these busy days is another evidence of his love for the CCD which goes back to the years when he was closely associated with the confraternity in Milwaukee.

I purposely reserve my final word of thanks to our beloved Bishop Greco. He has made this award possible. Through his thoughtful kindness, and at his request this public testimony to the national center and its staff has been arranged. Bishop Greco has been a member of the bishops' committee since 1950, and its chairman since 1959.

This is an optimum opportunity to state for the record that Bishop Greco has been during these years our counselor, guide, and friend. Besides the many tasks that are his as chief pastor of a busy diocese "with the cares of all the churches" close to his heart, he is a member of a key commission of the Second Vatican Council which necessitates many trips to Rome, he is supreme chaplain of the Knights of Columbus, nevertheless, he takes time to make frequent visits to the national center, he is in practical continuous communication with us, as problems and questions of national import for the CCD arise. On top of this, he has traveled literally thousands of miles, all at his own expense, to attend and speak at diocesan and national meetings of the confraternity in every part of the country. Next week he will be in Seattle for the annual meeting of the diocesan directors, and the following month will see him in Salt Lake City for the annual meeting of the National Lay Committee of the CCD. Hence from even this partial accounting of all that Bishop Greco means to us, how right and just is this expression of our affectionate appreciation and gratitude.

Were I to stop here abruptly in expressing our thanks to all who contribute so faithfully to the work of the national center, I would be guilty of grave injustice. The commendatory citation that Bishop Greco has read declares that "in this great work of the confraternity full honor and praise must be given to their excellencies, the ordinaries of the country, and particularly to the Bishops' Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine."

November 7 of this year will mark the 30th anniversary of the appointment of a committee of bishops for the confraternity by the American bishops assembled for their annual meeting in Washington. This was a historic event not only for the CCD but also for the church in America, for from the Episcopal Committee of the CCD the confraternity as we know it today came into being in this country. Under the direct supervision and guidance of this committee, the CCD has grown to the extent that today it is looked upon as a model for the confraternities that have been and are now being organized in all parts of the world.

The original bishops' committee of the CCD in 1934 comprised only three members: Archbishop Murray of St. Paul, Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati, and Bishop O'Hara then of Great Falls, as chairman. In the following May 1935, the national center of the CCD was formally established at the headquarters of the NCWC in Washington. Its first director was Father Augustine Walsh, Order of St. Benedict, of the faculty of Catholic University, with Miss Miriam Marks as executive secretary, who was to begin her work of self-sacrificing devotion and zeal that ended only with her untimely illness and death in 1961.

Today the bishops' committee numbers 13 members, of whom Bishop Russell of Richmond and Bishop O'Connor of Springfield, Ill., are the latest members, having been appointed by the American hierarchy at their meeting in Rome last year. The bishops of the CCD committee are thus entrusted by the American bishops with the guidance and development of the CCD. In the words of the original petition to the American bishops to establish the committee, its purpose is "to direct and coordinate the work of the national center of the confraternity and to give national scope and authority to the confraternity in the United States." Today the entire country is divided into 12 regions, each with a member of the committee at the head of his particular region to assist the local bishops and diocesan directors in promoting and developing the CCD in that territory. A number of the bishops act as moderators of certain areas of activity, such as the major seminary committee under Bishop O'Connor, the Latin American relations with the CCD is under Archbishop Lucey, and the catechism is in the special interest of Archbishop McGucken. Normally, when the Vatican Council is not in session, the members of the bishops' committee take part in regional and diocesan congresses, and priests' institutes that occur in their particular regions. They are moreover the intimate advisers and collaborators of Bishop Greco, the chairman; they meet with him each year to review the report of the national center and to make suggestions and plans for the farflung operations of the CCD in the years ahead.

This is the first time that we have had the opportunity to express publicly to the bishops of the CCD committee our appreciation for their unfailing interest and their courteous attention to even our least needs for our work, and all done with a wise direction that can come only from their experience and grace of state.

The aim of the bishops' committee and of its national center is to bring the CCD to its full potential. They have no coercive power; their authority is the authority of experience and good will. The CCD is as effective in practical operation as the local ordinaries and pastors make it. Hence, one cannot make a universal statement about the CCD: that it should do this or it is failing in that. One must first know the CCD: its potential—all that it is capable of doing—and then what is the actual situation in every place.

Today the confraternity goes hand in hand with the Catholic schools to provide a full Christian formation to all our Catholic children and youth. The ideal, expressed in the CCD manual for the past 30 years is "every Catholic child in a Catholic school." So also during the present supreme crisis for the Catholic school system, the CCD strives to offer those attending public schools (who have always numbered more than half of our elementary pupils and some 80 percent of our high school students) that religious training which is their just due. The confraternity schools cannot succeed in their allotted task of preparing our future parents and citizens unless they are adequately financed and staffed with dedicated teachers who are fully trained.

In the new era that is opening up for the lay apostolate, the CCD will come into its own not only in this country but all over the world. All signs point to it. Into the waiting, eager hands of the laity, the CCD is a further and final fulfillment of the divine commission given to the Apostles: "Go, teach."

Rockefeller Warns of Inflationary Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, has called attention to the serious inflationary risks inherent in the administration's overall economic strategy. He points to the danger of overheating the economy in 1964 followed by a postelection cooloff in 1965. As a member of the minority of the Joint Economic Committee, which has come to essentially the same conclusions with regard to the economic outlook, I was particularly gratified to note the position taken by the Governor.

The speech also is noteworthy for the 10 points offered by the Governor as a means of accelerating growth and contributing to the Nation's economic strength.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE ANNUAL INSTALLATION DINNER, CONCORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CONCORD, CALIF., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1964

Creative free enterprise is the vital key to the American economy. We must rely upon it for economic growth and for the 20 million new jobs we need in the next 5 years:

1. To meet the problems of 4½ million unemployed.

2. To meet the needs of 2 million men and women who are replaced each year because of automation and advancing technology.

3. To fulfill the hopes and aspirations of young men and women entering the labor market from our schools and colleges in record numbers. For example, 2.6 million young Americans reached their 18th birthday in 1960, but 3.8 million will reach their 18th birthday next year—a 50-percent increase in 5 years.

An estimated 2.1 million new jobs will be needed right here in California.

This means one-third more new jobs must be provided in the next 5 years than in the past 5 years when 1.6 million new jobs were added.

California has led the Nation in the rate of increase in new jobs. Employment here in the past 5 years averaged an increase of 2½ percent yearly, while the Nation averaged 1 percent. However, California will need to increase employment at a rate of more than 3 percent annually to solve its employment problem of the next half decade.

But California's growth is dependent vitally on national growth and this means the National economy must grow at an accelerated rate if California is going to be able to reach its potential.

Frankly, we're not achieving our economic goals despite the promises of the Democratic administration dating from the campaign of 1960; despite massive Federal spending which has reached an alltime high—higher than World War II; and despite 3 years of Federal deficits totaling over $20 billion with another $5 billion in prospect.

We should not be misled by the election year economics of the Johnson administration with its bookkeeping gimmicks and fiscal fantasies.

Here's the kind of gimmick used:

Large amounts of 1965 expenditures are pushed back into the 1964 budget year, painting an inaccurate picture of spending cuts claimed for 1965.

Sales of assets—$2.3 billion of them—are treated as "savings."

After more than 2 years, the administration has finally produced a tax cut—long overdue—to stimulate the economy, but many taxpayers' withholding has been cut below the amount of their tax liability for this election year. Next April 15, they will have the privilege of paying back $1.5 billion of the $8 billion cut which they thought they got this year.

Taken together, the fiscal and monetary policies of the Johnson administration are set for maximum impact around the election this year without regard to potential developments next year.

There is danger that these policies will produce an overheated economy in 1964 followed by a postelection cooloff in 1965.

This November focused program is being undertaken at the very serious risk that inflation will be the outcome, rather than sound growth. Coming at a time when our international balance-of-payments position remains precarious, inflation could have grave consequences not only for our own economy but also for the financial structure of the whole free world. It could, in fact, lead to a downturn in our economy in 1965—which is exactly what we seek to avoid by a tax reduction in 1964.

This Nation must have balanced program to achieve faster growth without inflation. Such a program must be based upon our creative free enterprise system. It must take into account all of the elements which contribute to and produce economic growth, for example:

1. Added encouragement to research and development through more rapid tax writeoffs for this purpose. A good example is New York State's provision of a 1-year writeoff for research and development investment.
2. Scientific information developed from Government-sponsored programs should be communicated to the private sector of the economy to spur growth.
3. Strengthening the capacity of our education system at all levels.
4. Elimination of barriers to equal opportunity.
5. Special incentives for small business.
6. Reoriented farm programs.
7. A coordinated national transportation policy.
8. Maximizing the flow of private enterprise capital into rebuilding urban centers.
9. Better means of bringing jobs and people together through better exchange of information and steps to increase labor mobility.
10. Holding the line on Federal spending, balancing the Federal budget by the fiscal year beginning 1967, and restoring fiscal integrity to the Federal Government.

To meet the Nation's needs at home and abroad, it is essential to have leadership in Washington that understands the free enterprise system, has faith in the free enterprise system, and knows how to encourage the free enterprise system.

The so-called war on poverty will not be won by making America the arsenal of bureaucracy as proposed by President Johnson. It will not be won by fiscal fantasies or budget gimmicks.

Political manipulation of the economy is no substitute for a dynamic free enterprise economy functioning at its true potential under Government policies that look beyond the next election to the interests of the next generation.

Erwin and Taeko Wong Peace Corps Volunteers in British Honduras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to outstanding contributions being made to the Peace Corps program in its aid to underdeveloped areas by two well-known constituents of mine, Mr. and Mrs. Erwin Wong, of Honolulu. The unselfish devotion displayed by this public-spirited couple in improving the life of their fellow men in other parts of the world, at great sacrifice to themselves, is only a small indication of how the citizens of the newest State in the Union are meeting their obligations and responsibilities, not only as Amercan citizens but as citizens of the world.

Those who feel that the image of America has been somewhat tarnished in recent years may take heart in the following article which appeared in the March 1964 issue of the Peace Corps Volunteer:

HAWAII COUPLE WINS THANKS FOR "REVOLUTION IN SCHOOL"

A volunteer couple from Hawaii have been credited by a British Honduras government official with causing "the beginning of a revolution in our primary schools."

Erwin and Taeko Wong, from Honolulu, who have been in the small British colony in Central America since August 1962, were commended for their work in Corozal, in the far north of the country. There they worked for 5 weeks in many village schools of the district, helping both teachers and children with native crafts.

At an arts-and-crafts exhibit held in a Corozal school, Jesus Ken, Corozal south division representative, said, "Native crafts have been dying with the older generation, because the schools have been emphasizing academic subjects. Although there was nothing wrong with this, practical subjects such as handicrafts, woodwork, and home economics have a rightful place in the primary schools' curriculum."

He noted that the exhibits on display were made entirely from materials obtained in the bush, and that the work could be sold for cash. Thanking the Wongs, under whose direction the children started their handwork, Ken said he hoped teachers of the area would push ahead in the field of handicraft. The Wongs' stay in the district was extended by request of the government's education office, which also asked for the exhibition.

The Wongs, who are in the country with 25 other volunteers as members of a teacher training, primary, secondary, and vocational education projects, traveled to Mexico during their Christmas vacation to learn as apprentices the methods of preparing and firing special clays they gathered from various districts of British Honduras. They hope to introduce a pottery industry in remote areas of the country.

From tests made by experts in Mexico, they learned that clay found in the Cayo district, in the west-central portion of the country near Guatemala, is of excellent physical and chemical property. They hope to work this discovery into their arts-and-crafts program.

Before joining the Peace Corps, Wong served as principal of a 40-teacher Honolulu elementary school for 8 years; previously, he had been a teacher since 1930. He holds bachelor's and master's degrees in education from the University of Hawaii, and has done graduate work at Teachers College of Columbia University, the University of Colorado, and the University of Michigan. He has been a board member of the Hawaiian Education Association, and served as president for 2 years of the Lanai Education Association in Honolulu.

His wife, Taeko, was a Honolulu junior high school teacher of French and art before their Peace Corps work, and holds bachelor's and master's degrees from Columbia University in art and education. She has studied in Paris and Brussels, and has worked in Japan as a teacher of English.

Victory Needed in Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union entitled "Victory Needed in Cold War":

VICTORY NEEDED IN COLD WAR: PATIENCE BEGETS PROBLEMS

President Johnson says a nuclear war is impossible and we must seek reasoned agreement instead of ready aggression. He counsels patience.

His remarks followed those of Secretary of State Rusk who almost angrily called critics of our foreign policy quitters who "would quit the struggle by letting down our defenses, by gutting our foreign-aid programs, by leaving the United Nations."

Now comes Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but a maverick as concerns the administration's foreign policy.

In a major speech he has recommended a line of retreat. He asks revision of the Canal Zone Treaty with Panama and recognition of the Communist regime in Cuba.

Will Mr. Rusk also describe Senator FULBRIGHT as a "quitter?" If so, he will hasten the plunge of his own party into the fatal split for which it is headed.

Secretary Rusk contended the "world struggle is going well from our viewpoint." However, Walter Lippmann, columnist, one of the principal defenders of the administration's foreign policy, and a spokesman for the liberals, wrote in a recent article:

"The fact is that on all the continents all sorts of things are happening to which this country is very much opposed. The 'Grand Design in Europe,' the Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere, the containment of Red China, the war in Southeast Asia, Cyprus, Zanzibar, Gabon and whatnot—in none of these places are we prevailing."

He agrees with Mr. Johnson that we no longer are living in the kind of a world in which we can order things our way or resort to some military action.

We agree with that. But, if military threats or actions no longer can be the determining factors of leadership, what is to take the place of force?

No one expects a nuclear war. But does that mean we must now ride the tide, and wait and hope? The Communist world is busy pushing waves of revolution and subversion, and despite the claims of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Rusk, our great designs are going awry all around the world.

There are those among us who want a change of direction and effort and not a further retreat as urged by Senator FULBRIGHT, and it is no answer to gather up all of the alternatives that might have been suggested from various quarters, and make a generalization that everybody opposing the administration's foreign policy is a quitter.

As far as we can see, the situation is the other way around. Republicans opposing the administration's policy want action, not patience, to reverse the tide running against the free world.

Our course must be in the vigor of leadership and in the resolute manner in which we counter the moves of communism.

We don't believe that most people want to abandon foreign aid, or even abruptly

leave the United Nations, but they do believe that such weapons as are at our disposal ought to be used more effectively against our enemies.

It isn't enough just to ask members of our various alliances how to work ourselves out of our difficulties. Somewhere along the line we must act.

These critics of the administration's policy don't want to quit the cold war. They want to win it.

Gitmo Grows More Vital Every Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article which appeared in the Miami News, on Wednesday, February 12, 1964, concerning the vital importance of our naval base at Guantanamo Bay. This article was written by a distinguished retired Marine Corps general, Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, who is known by many of us. He is an authority in his field and I believe the article he has written should be read by every American citizen.

The article follows:

GITMO GROWS MORE VITAL EVERY DAY

(NOTE.—The author, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has served in Guantanamo with the Marines, has been assistant to the Secretary of Defense for legislative affairs under Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and is the author of "History of the Military Staff," a standard text in staff colleges around the world.)

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired)

WASHINGTON.—It was inevitable that Guantanamo would become the focal point of the Communist-generated trouble in the Caribbean. Ever since the Russian takeover of Cuba, the keener U.S. strategists have warned that Guantanamo Bay was a major Red target.

Why? Because our base there is one of the most strategically located in the world.

There has been far too much careless talk to the effect that our base at Guantanamo is outdated and not as important as it once was.

The fact is that it is just as important as ever before. And there are two reasons for its increasing importance: First, the Soviet Union's conquest of Cuba; second, the Russian submarine fleet, by far the world's largest.

From the U.S. standpoint, a Red Cuba makes our hold on Guantanamo imperative. Here are some examples: Guantanamo dominates the Caribbean. Since Castro took over Cuba for the Soviet Union, the Caribbean is no longer "an American lake." Our continued control of Guantanamo is necessary to keep it from becoming a "Russian lake."

Naval strategists point out that when the Communists went after Cuba, they knew what they were doing strategically. Cuba is, in many ways, the strategic heart of the Americas.

It stands directly astride the Atlantic sealanes between North and South America. It is in a position, if unchecked, to control the Atlantic traffic to and from the Panama Canal. And, what is often forgotten, Cuba geographically dominates the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico.

Control of Guantanamo is necessary for U.S. policing and protection of the Windward Passage. This is the 50-mile-wide strip of water between the eastern end of Cuba and Haiti. It is the "watergate" through which funnels much of the shipping between the Atlantic into the Caribbean and to the Panama Canal.

Communist control of the Windward Passage would go far toward sealing, in war, the northern entrances to the Caribbean area against U.S. and free-world shipping.

Red strategists have carefully studied German U-boat tactics in World War II, and know that the Nazi "wolfpacks" sunk a huge allied tonnage in the Windward Passage Narrows.

Red control of the passage would dovetail neatly into employment of Russian submarine forces in war or "high temperature" crisis.

U.S. antisubmarine units, air and surface, based at Guantanamo Bay, virtually on the southern coast of the passage, would break up any monopoly of the passage.

BLOCK TO TAKEOVERS

Also Guantanamo's location helps block Castro's efforts to move into Haiti and the Dominican Republic. A Castro takeover there would outflank our bases in Puerto Rico. Were this to happen, the strategic position of the United States in the Caribbean would be irreparably fragmented.

Continuing Communist subversion in the Caribbean and Latin America increases rather than diminishes the value of Guantanamo Bay by emphasizing its central position. Navy-Marine "ready forces," if based in Guantanamo, would be but a short voyage from Communist-created hotspots.

For instance, the value of Guantanamo Bay as a base in the Caribbean area was well demonstrated when President Eisenhower ordered a naval patrol between Castro's Cuba and the mainland during the Honduran crisis.

Guantanamo was even more conveniently positioned when President Kennedy put 2d Fleet units between Cuba and the Dominican Republic to prevent Castro from moving in during the upheaval following the assassination of Trujillo.

It would be impossible to duplicate Guantanamo as a base for stationing "on-call" Navy-Marine forces for quick movement to the political "brush fires" Castro's agents are lighting throughout the area.

If the United States were forced out of Guantanamo Bay, the loss in terms of our strategic requirements would be tremendous. But, what is often overlooked, the damage to our national security would not be limited to losing what we must have. Rather, the damage would be vastly compounded by Guantanamo's value as a Communist base.

One of the difficulties facing Khrushchev's naval strategists is the lack of submarine bases beyond the territorial waters of the Soviet Union. Without such bases the Russian subs have to spend a large portion of operating time cruising to and from Soviet ports and their assigned patrol areas.

INTO AMERICAN WATERS

Availability of Guantanamo Bay as a Russian submarine base would have the effect, by cutting down traveltime to the Caribbean, of increasing the efficiency of Russian submarine deployment. Mathematically it would mean that the Kremlin could keep far more submarines in American waters.

From the standpoint of U.S. defense, it would make little difference whether the Russian submarines officially flew the hammer and sickle or operated under the fiction of Cuban control. The threat to the America's would be just as great.

Naval strategists say that if the United States were to abandon Guantanamo, when the last U.S. ship sailed out, the first Russian sub would sail in. It would, they add, be but a short time before Russian on Cuban subs (both Russian made with Russian crews) would be routinely patrolling the eastern and gulf coasts of the United States.

In addition to its key location and strategic role, Guantanamo has a day-to-day value in terms of naval efficiency. It is the principal training base for the U.S. Atlantic Fleet. Each year about half the ships in the Atlantic Fleet conduct their training out of Guantanamo Bay. This means that in a 2-year period the entire fleet uses the base for training.

Navy officials are quick to point out that even as a training base Guantanamo Bay would be hard to replace. Off its entrance is deep water, with various temperature levels, providing proper training for antisubmarine forces.

Weather seldom interferes with naval aviation training for carriers based in Guantanamo. Beaches for small-scale marine landings are inside the bay, and larger beaches are within easy cruising distance.

OUR TREATY RIGHTS

As the Communist propaganda guns are brought to bear against our position in Guantanamo Bay, demands for renegotiation of our treaty rights will become more insistent. It will be the same old claim of imperialism and archaic treaties.

But it will be difficult to make the charge of an outdated treaty stick. True, our original rights stemmed from treaties of 1903–4. But with keen foresight those treaties were renegotiated and reaffirmed with Cuba by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1934. Thus we are in Guantanamo Bay through a treaty of the good neighbor era. This should pose a problem for Red propaganda.

But it probably won't bother the Kremlin or Castro. They know how vital Guantanamo Bay is to U.S. security. They also know how much it is needed as a Russian submarine base. They hope to force us out.

Retirement of Distinguished Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, James W. Crowe, one of the Nation's foremost authorities in the field of vocational education, will retire in May as principal of Chicago Vocational High School, which under his administration has won national prestige and acclaim. He was recently named "man of the year" by the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce, as related in the news stories in the Chicago Tribune, Southeast Economist and Daily Calumet that I am extending my remarks to include.

The material follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Jan. 30, 1964]

VOCATIONAL'S PRINCIPAL IS MAN OF YEAR

The South Chicago Chamber of Commerce has named James W. Crowe, principal of Chicago Vocational High School, its "Man of the Year."

Crowe, of 2217 East 69th Street, was selected by a committee of chamber members for his civic activities. The announcement was made by Samuel C. Maragos of 9207 Yates Boulevard, group president.

During his 14 years as principal of the high school, Crowe has been chairman of the chamber of commerce Youth and Industry Week, a program to familiarize high school students with occupations in business and industry.

Before his assignment to the high school, Crowe was supervisor of the school board's bureau of veterans education and training. While supervisor of the city school's drafting department, he wrote a text on drafting now used in the public high schools.

He and his wife, Helen, have a son, Brian, who is a senior at Indiana University. An older son, Mark, is employed in the Navy Department in Washington, D.C.

[From the Chicago Daily Calumet]

HONORS CROWE AS MAN OF THE YEAR

James W. Crowe, 62, of 2217 East 69th, Chicago Vocational principal, has been named "Man of the Year" by the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce.

A committee of chamber members selected Crowe for his civic activities.

Crowe, principal for the past 14 years, has been chairman of the chamber of commerce youth and industry week, a program to familiarize high school students with occupations of business and industry.

Crowe is past president of the South Chicago chamber, having served two terms.

Crowe and his wife, Helen, have a son Brian, a senior at Indiana University. Mark, an older son, is employed in the Navy Department in Washington, D.C.

Crowe was supervisor on the school board's bureau of veterans education and training before his assignment to CVS.

He wrote a text on drafting now used by public high schools while he was supervisor of the city's school's drafting department.

He is a graduate of Lane Technical High School, and Loyola University where he holds two degrees—a bachelor of science in education and a master's degree in education.

Crowe is a member of Local 10, Carpenters' Union, American Federation of Labor.

He taught shop and drafting at Lane for 18 years. He was supervisor of teacher training for the U.S. Navy at CVS 1941–42, and wrote the text for the course "Principles of Trade Teaching."

Crowe was chief of training for War Manpower Commission of Metropolitan Chicago from 1943 to 1945.

Crowe also served as: Educational adviser for Rehabilitation Commission, Department of Illinois American Legion, 1944–54; past treasurer, Illinois Industrial Arts Association; principal, CVS High School since 1950; principal, CVS evening school since 1950; president, Illinois Council of Local Administrators (industrial education); coordinator, Region III, American Industrial Arts Award Competition, 1960–61; member, Education Committee, Association of Commerce and Industry, Chicago.

[From the Southeast Economist]

CHICAGO VOCATIONAL SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IS MAN OF THE YEAR

James W. Crowe, principal of Chicago Vocational High School, was named "Man of the Year" at the annual awards dinner-dance of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce held in the Jovial Club, 9615 South Commercial Avenue.

The coveted honor, awarded to outstanding chamber members, went to Crowe for his longtime civic activities in the community, including his work during the area's annual Youth and Industry Week. The special event is held to help young people select future careers and advise them of the qualifications and opportunities available with the aid of business and industrial leaders.

Crowe, who has been the principal at CVS for the past 14 years, is a past president of the South Chicago Chamber. Before his assignment at CVS, he was superintendent of the bureau of veterans education and training of the Chicago public schools. Previously, he was supervisor of the drafting department of the Chicago schools and author of a drafting textbook still used at vocational schools.

During World War II he served as Chief of Training of the War Manpower Commission of Metropolitan Chicago.

Crowe attended Lane Technical High School and holds both a bachelor and masters degree in education from Loyola University.

He is past president of the Vocational School Administrators Association and past treasurer of the Illinois Industrial Educational Association.

Attorney Samuel Maragos, president of the chamber, said of Crowe: "The choice of the man of the year committee was an excellent one in naming a high caliber of dedicated worker and fine person such as Mr. Crowe."

Committee members included Dr. Alvin Lieberman, 8148 South Kingston Avenue; George Rooney, 2152 East 78th Street, and John Siovic, 9234 South Bennett Avenue.

Corporate Profits and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in his column in the Washington Post on April 6, Harold B. Dorsey points to an undertone of worry about the possible adverse effects on the economy of forthcoming wage negotiations. He notes that a misunderstanding of corporate profits figures might create public support for excessive labor demands that would create inflationary pressures and/or lower profit margins.

Contrary to the commonly held opinion, corporate profits are just beginning to show signs of recovering from the subnormal level that has been stultifying economic growth for the past 6 years. This healthy improvement in corporate profits has neither come out of the hide of consumers or of labor, according to the column.

As Mr. Dorsey points out, a misunderstanding of the corporate profits figures that leads to an excessive increase in labor costs might very well lead to an inflationary boom-and-bust pattern in the economy.

The article follows:

TRUE IMAGE OF EARNINGS TREND NEEDED

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, April 5.—The budget of business news continued favorable last week and the stock averages established another new record. Nevertheless, one can sense the development of an undertone of worry about the possible adverse effects on the economy of wage negotiations.

The concern is not a fear of fair and reasonable wage adjustments. Rather, it centers around the evidence that a misunderstanding of the corporate profits figures might create public support for excessive labor demands that would create inflation pressures and/or lower profit margins.

Inflationary price behavior would restrain a rising volume of consumption—both here and abroad—with an adverse effect on employment. Lower profit margins would reduce the incentive of business to make the capital investments which lead to more and better products for consumers and more and better jobs for employees.

The current issue of the First National City Bank letter points out: "Because newspapers and other accounts play up the news of record profits, whether for individual companies or all corporations, earnings trends are easily misinterpreted and are not considered in relation to the growth of the economy, wage payments, taxes, sales or capital investment. Public opinion polls have consistently shown that people generally have exaggerated notions about how large profits actually are."

It is much more than a coincidence that record corporate earnings are accompanied by new records for employment, payrolls, sales, and practically all of the broad measurements of the economy's welfare. The good earnings should be looked upon as a favorable sign for continuing economic growth. It is unfortunate that they are being looked upon as a target for labor to shoot at.

For example, the UAW's Walter Reuther has stated that the automobile industry could afford to reduce the price of cars by $200, give labor a very large increase in hourly pay, and still record a satisfactory return on its capital investment. If his formula were to be applied to one of the automobile producers, it would seem likely that this company—and the jobs of its 33,000 employees—could not survive.

A second producer would certainly operate in the red under this formula. The other two companies would show such a reduction in their earnings that they could not afford to make the large capital expenditures needed to create more jobs and to maintain the efficiency that is so important in this mass production business.

One of the primary reasons why this column became so optimistic about the outlook for business activity and employment last autumn was the evidence that corporate profit margins were showing signs of recovering from the subnormal level that had been stultifying economic growth for the preceding 6 years. The corporate earning figures are now justifying that anticipation.

The First National City Bank letter gives a picture of the 15-year downward trend in manufacturers' profits as a percentage of sales and capital investment. These measurements were at subnormal levels from 1957 through 1963. The figures of 1962 and 1963 showed a moderate recovery from the lowest level in many years.

There is being created in the mind of the public the erroneous impression that this moderate recovery is exorbitant and that it is coming out of the hides of labor and consumers. This image is simply contrary to the facts. Prices have been unusually stable and the number of people employed and weekly payrolls per worker have risen to new record levels.

An attack on business profits conflicts with the economic program now being espoused by the administration. One of the most important objectives of that program is to encourage American and foreign capital flow into American enterprise by improving the attractiveness of such investments.

Business analysts and investment managers are beginning to appraise more carefully the business prospects for 1965. All of the foregoing observations are an integral part of these calculations. If a misunderstanding of the corporate profit figures is going to encourage excessive increases in labor costs, then we may have an inflationary boom-and-bust pattern. If the higher costs are to come out of profit margins instead of higher prices, then the growth of activity

and employment will turn sluggish again as a result of disappointing business capital expenditures.

The Critique of Democratic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a most candid, disturbing, and thought provoking presentation and anlysis of America's foreign policy during the Johnson and Kennedy administrations was made recently in a speech by Dr. Michael Szaz, Ph. D., assistant professor of history at the Graduate School of St. John's University.

Dr. Szaz's background in international affairs surely qualifies him to make such a comprehensive review. He is the author of countless magazine articles on world affairs, including a book entitled "Germany's Eastern Frontiers." His new work, "The Great Power Conflict Since 1945," will soon be released.

This speech by Dr. Szaz, whom I do not know personally, was delivered at the Wycoff Republican Club in Ridgewood, N.Y., and came to my attention in view of its timeliness and in view of Dr. Szaz's active political life on Long Island. I do not sponsor it in the spirit of partisanship, and I do not subscribe necessarily to all of its premises and conclusions, but since it analyzes the "better Red than dead," appease and accommodate, philosophy of the ultraliberals in a historical setting, it makes interesting reading.

I include this address in the RECORD at this point, and urge my colleagues to give it their attention:

Ever since the fall of 1961, Democratic spokesmen assert that we are winning the cold war by successfully containing Communist aggression and subversion. Considering Communist unity a thing of the past, the Washington thinkers coming from Harvard via the left road to coexistence consider the latter as the epitome of peace and security. No action that could distribute tranquility within the Communist bloc is adovcated, lately we seem to bail out the Soviet Union from her self-made economic crises. If we do so, Messrs, Stevenson and Rostow believe that somehow a worldwide détente may be attained and free world and Communist interests sublimated within the framework of the United Nations.

If wishful thinking could achieve the same result as an impassionate analysis of events, the gentlemen from Harvard and their Democratic superiors would have approached utopia more than any other American administration. Yet their assumptions remain imprecise, often incorrect, mistaking effect for cause and unwilling to face reality. They know that doing so would mean to risk defeat in 1964 because of the indignation an open confession of their policy failures would create in the American public.

Take the assertion that there is no more Communist monolith. Yet, the conflicts dividing Khrushchev from Mao, Hozha from Tito, are consequences of Communist successes and strength. Despite its substantial power, political and ideological content, this conflict would disappear once the adversaries were faced with any real danger from the West. Khrushchev, Pravda, and its Peiping daily equivalent all bear me out on this.

A perusal of the American press, even of the New York Times, will, however, show that the Sino-Soviet conflict became a serious problem to Western unity as well. Not that it had to become one. Unified Western and Japanese policies could have greatly aggravated preexisting Communist difficulties. This could have checked Communist designs, as a house divided against itself cannot stand. The Western powers could have used the conflict for a daring political-economic thrust into Eastern Europe in order to widen the gap between the Russian and local Communist leaders. For, faced with the unpleasant choices in the inter-Communist struggle, they, too, cannot any more completely disregard the nationalist and democratic aspirations of their people.

DISINTEGRATION OF THE WESTERN ALLIANCE

As a result of Democratic policies, the chasm between the allies in the West became abysmal since 1960. After the Paris Summit breakup in May, 1960, there were few major inter-Allied disagreements. Perhaps the British were advocating a little softer policy while the Germans were more adamant about the need of Communist concessionss, but on the whole, Allied unity survived the trying year of 1959. This occurred despite open Communist threats at Berlin and the undermining effects of the Democratic campaign in the press and the Senate on alleged missile gaps and second-rate American military power based either on sheer ignorance or irresponsible political demagoguery. The differences of opinion with President de Gaulle of France did not yet threaten NATO or Franco-American cooperation.

What is the situation today? Administration spokesmen openly regard France as a dangerous competitor in Western Europe and describe her President as a disguised enemy of the free world. France herself is moving into strange directions by Red China's recognition, while maintaining a hard stance toward the U.S.S.R. Could not the Communist argue that their split is adequately matched by the gradual, but seemingly inavoidable, disintegration of NATO? Do not our continental allies discern with outmost concern the scepter of the former Kennedy and the present Johnson administration to pressure them into opposing, not the Communists, but the De Gaulle regime, in order to become worthy of our support?

Many people will, of course, state that President de Gaulle is impossible to get along with, he wants a neutral Europe and our withdrawal from there. It is also charged that he fails to realize France's inability to achieve nuclear parity with the United States and the U.S.S.R. and that he is disloyal to the Western cause of freedom. There might be a kernel of truth in all these accusations. Certainly, the Gaullist concept of an Atlantic Community and France's future is different from ours. De Gaulle does not believe in the permanency of American presence in Europe and does not even desire it. He refuses to regard NATO as a supranational organization despite the contrary view of past and present American administrations.

Yet despite the panegyrics on the grand designs of our late President, it is actually President de Gaulle who has had the broader vision among the Western leaders. His concept is, however, not that of a united world under the auspices of the United Nations. To him the nation state still forms the only possible nucleus of popular allegiance and power and he considers disregarding this fact as weakening our resistance against the Communists. One might disagree with him on the future, but for the present his argument is validated by the nation-state controlled policies of all great powers. If national considerations control policy, then no major power can deny itself nuclear weapons, the ultimate defense. To acquire them thus becomes a matter of national survival, for any great power will insist upon making the ultimate decision about its continuing existence. In the French view, NATO may not deprive any state of its defense decisions, though it does form an integrated alliance united by similar cultural values. The very fact that the United States fails to place all her forces under NATO remains a case in point for the French President.

Some of these differences existed already under the Eisenhower administration without a breakdown of communications between Paris and Washington. For under President Eisenhower American policies were conducted in accordance with American national interests despite the one-world sermons of some second-echelon policymakers.

It had been the "grand design" of the late President that exacerbated the dispute into a major struggle for NATO member allegiances decisively weakening that organization. The design was to transform the Atlantic world into a supranational, American-controlled community. It was launched without adequately explaining to the American people its ultimate ramifications and in the face of open French protest. Preferring to give credit to the intellectual propensities of the White House braintrust, I do not believe that it really aimed at the creation of such a community. The chimera of Atlantic unity was to counteract the attractive concept of a confederated Europe under Franco-German leadership, friendly to the Anglo-Saxon world but independent in world politics, that seemed to please the peoples of Germany and other continental countries.

As slogans can never replace policies, our defense efforts were altered to facilitate the split between France and other NATO members. The Skybolt project, based on a treaty with Britain, was abandoned and in the subsequent Bahamas agreement the Kennedy concept of nuclear integration via submarines was forced upon the Macmillan government. This deprived the British of their only effective asset toward the European Economic Community, i.e., their ability to contribute substantially to the creation of a European deterrent upon their entry into the European Community.

When President de Gaulle reacted violently, he had been immediately denounced as a megalomaniac, a wrecker of NATO. I personally heard a New York broadcast asserting that the other members of EEC had held a secret meeting designating De Gaulle rather than Khrushchev as the major danger to the free world. The propaganda campaign against De Gaulle lasted all summer of 1963 and included President Kennedy's trip to Western Europe.

The campaign achieved unfortunate results. The French President became even more intransigent and replied to our challenge in Western Europe by entering southeast Asia, Africa, and recently also Latin America as a competitor for the allegiances of people. In the meantime, NATO keeps floundering, unable to agree on common nuclear defense problems despite the missile ship project of the former Kennedy administration.

NEUTRALISM AND AMERICAN POLICIES

The emergence of France as a worldwide competitor was not the result of devious planning. Both sides were in part prisoners of their own political dynamics. The chasm now involves policies toward neutrals, allies, and the Communist bloc alike and on the latter problem the future of the Western alliance will depend.

The administration accuses France of wrecking free world unity by recognizing Red China. Yet no matter how distasteful the step must be to any right-thinking American, we, too, are striving for a détente with the Soviet Union. We are shipping or preparing to ship tens of millions of tons of grain in order to ease the shortages incurred by Communist mismanagement in Russia. In August we signed a test ban treaty with the Soviet Union in order to keep France out of the nuclear club. We fail to use our economic leverage for political purposes toward the Communist bloc. We have conveniently forgotten the bloody origins of the Hungarian Kádár regime and continue to call understanding and accommodation with Russian and satellite Communist leaders.

The wheat deal with Russia was advertised by the late President as a one-shot, cash and carry deal in order to improve our balance-of-payments situation, stabilize the wheat price on the domestic and world markets, and help to secure employment to longshoremen by the use of American vessels for the delivery of the grain. All these assertions were proven false in the course of the negotiations. Transportation rates are subsidized by taxpayers' money while we are selling the grain to Russia at world market price, considerably lower than the subsidized price our farmers receive from the Government. Thus no savings to the taxpayer, only an added transportation subsidy. It was described as a dollar and gold transaction and payment would be received within 6 months. We all know, however, what happened in December in Congress where considerable arm twisting was employed by the President to secure a free hand in order to authorize loans up to 18 months by the Export-Import Bank to Russia and guarantees to private sellers in case of Russian default. Thus, no, or only infinitesimal improvement of the gold deficit position of the United States. Recently only a combined pressure of ILA and public opinion forced the administration to ban the vessels trading with Cuba under foreign flag in the deal and assured that the 50-percent provision would be observed.

By all these policies we are violating and abandoning the principles of the Eisenhower, nay even of the Truman administration. We are also bending backward in order to please neutralist nations. The administration seemingly believes that the new neutralist countries, their greedy hands extended in order to extract, by blackmail or supplication, enormous grants from the two adversaries, are in a tenable moral and political position. We no longer consider the defeat of communism as the beacon of peace, rather we hope for the relaxation of totalitarianism in Communist dictatorships while accepting the prospect of a half-free, half-slave world.

Smear tactics have been employed against anyone ranging from Senator Goldwater, former Vice President Nixon to Professor Possony who dare to raise their voices against these disastrous policy trends. Too many columnists, and official and semiofficial spokesmen, denounce them as warmongers as not to suspect an organized effort. Today's liberals are so mesmerized by the shadow of the atomic cloud that they no longer regard their own national values of any relevance. Yet I, for one, cannot believe that freedom and dignity of the individual and Christian and humanistic ideals of life and society have become obsolescent and unworthy of the supreme sacrifice, if need to be. The late President also had to prove in October 1962 that brinkmanship must be used in any major crisis should Communist aggression not prevail.

The righteous anger of the New Frontier is usually directed not at the Communist governments, but at regimes which, either pressured by domestic insurrections, colonial revolts or peculiar historical traditions and political immaturity, repress their urban liberal elements. To the administration philosophers they are enemies of freedom and democracy (some of them truly are, too) while the reportage from Communist capitals has undergone a subtle, but constant, change and not the positive is accentuated in the Communist, and the negative in authoritarian countries.

CONCLUSIONS

To tell the story of our decline in Africa and Latin America since 1960 would fill volumes. The errors were, however, inevitable once the false promise of accommodating communism had been adopted. Of course, New Frontier and Johnson administration public relations men do not call it accommodation. They call it a struggle for peace, in order to avoid nuclear war and to establish a workable world order and a community of nations. These lofty ideals deeply rooted in people's consciousness are used to spread the concept of one worldism. But the reality of political power and ideology is not upset by euphemistic descriptions.

And the reality is that we are in the midst of a death and life struggle against Russian national power augmented by the satellites and by Communist international conspiracy. It helps us little that conflict of interest remains the inexorable law of history and that after the demise of the West a new struggle would ensue between the Russians and Chinese. By that time we would be dead or jailed, our children no longer free, no longer able to pursue studies and enjoy the fruits of their initiative. We would all be, with some exceptions, lower-class cogs in the all-controlling, tyrannical machine of the Communist state.

Far be it from me to accuse the Democratic administrations of consciously helping such a situation to arise. They are composed of honest Americans believing in the basic principles of our constitutional Republic, no matter how misguided on certain ramifications of these principles. The problem lies in their constant refusal to see the international situation in its true light. No matter how noble the intention, it may produce the evil it abhors. The appeasement politicians of the 1930's wanted peace and to avoid the horrors of an air war where innocent city populations would be bombed. They could even point to the latent Communist danger lurking in Hitler's back in case Europe had exhausted itself in a war. Yet they failed, and their failure only produced sweat, tears and millions of people dying on the battlefronts, in bombings and the gas chambers. The horrors of a nuclear war will not be avoided by what is called a mature acceptance of accommodation. This road will only lead to the rise of the atomic cloud over our cities when the ultimate showdown is fought as it could not have been avoided by a constructive foreign policy. Let us hope that the American people will not let the administration inch their way to the point of no return by an ignorance of reality, weakness of resolution and mistaken humanitarianism.

What the United States needs is not only steadfastness in holding our own. We need a new policy of exploiting the enemy's weakness politically, economically, and psychologically. The Republican Party has shown between 1952 and 1960 that, despite occasional setbacks, the United States can regain the initiative and successfully contain and repel Communist expansionism.

We need hope, not resignation. We need impassionate analysis, not utopian concepts. Last but not least we need a sense of mission, the American mission which is to bring the torch of freedom to mankind, not to conquer and rule, but to present them with the Aladdin lamp of truth so that they might also know the blessings of liberty and evils of tyranny. Let us all dedicate ourselves to this cause in the 1964 campaign and we cannot fail to achieve victory.

Boston Needs a Mirror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues and to place in the RECORD an editorial from the April 5 issue of the Danville Register, published in a community that is proud to consider itself typically American and typically southern. The travail brought upon this community from outside in recent months causes it to recognize a sister city in St. Augustine, Fla.

This editorial is particularly timely at the moment, made so by developments of the last few days. In presenting it, I do so in the hope that not only every Member of Congress, but every person in America, may read it and find reason to cogitate.

The editorial is as follows:

WHEN BOSTON NEEDED MRS. PEABODY

When the Irish-Americans march on St. Patrick's Day, just about everybody finds a wee bit of Irish in their ancestry, or at least some sympathy for the Irish patriots who died for the auld sod and some friendship for the Irish politicians at home.

This is true in New York, where there are more Irishmen than in Dublin. It is true in Philadelphia, where there are more Irish Catholics than Quakers. And it is true in Boston, where the Irish have run the Proper Bostonians to the far side of Back Bay. And, to be sure, it is true in Danville, Va., where wearin' o' the green makes Irishmen-for-a-day of most of us.

In Boston, the NAACP got into the high spirits of the day set aside for St. Pat. They gained permission to put a float in the parade and then quickly decorated one consisting of two wooden superstructures on a flatbed truck that supported banners which read:

"From the Fight for Irish Freedom to the Fight for U.S. Equality—NAACP Boston."

There were United States and Irish flags and a large photo of John F. Kennedy. When the parade formed, this was one of the 20 floats moving.

What happened? The New York Herald Tribune reported: "Spectators along the 4-mile parade route hurled stones, beer cans, bottles, eggs, and tomatoes at the float entered by the Boston chapter of the NAACP. In addition to the stoning and the bottle throwing, four teenage boys in the crowd held up a banner—'Nigger Go Home'—as the float passed."

All this happened in the capital of Massachusetts, where Gov. Endicott Peabody presides, and where his mother, a militant integrationist, was not reported taking any part in the effort to create an atmosphere where Negro Americans can join with any other Americans in celebrating a festive day.

Where was Mrs. Peabody on St. Patrick's Day?

The answer is probably that she was busy attending a meeting at which plans were made for the wives of Episcopal bishops to go to quiet old St. Augustine, Fla., which makes Boston seem, by comparison, a boom town of the Yankee traders, and see what publicity coals they could heap on the flameless racial situation there.

Upon her return to Boston this week, Mrs. Peabody said she would continue her fight

for racial equality wherever she was asked to go.

Well, it might not be polite, but may we suggest that Mrs. Peabody concentrate on cleaning up Boston Common before she returns to the ancient park in St. Augustine?

When Boston can provide an example for St. Augustine or anywhere else, then Mrs. Peabody and others in her Florida invasion may have something constructive to point to as an accomplishment. Their visit to the St. Augustine jail and their appearance as expert witnesses in a court jurisdiction case did little but point out that Mrs. Peabody and her friends had fled from more racial prejudice in violent form in Boston than they saw anywhere in the South. They really were needed at home—Boston.

Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the long procession of the years of the 20th century rolls inexorably on. The United States of America emerges from the obscurity of a provincial power and gains a stature unmatched in human history. Its population doubles, and the vigor and ingenuity of its citizens grow hour by hour. Science and industry are in ferment. Brilliant figures light the scene, generating power and plenty and magnanimity. Intricate machines take over labor, both human and animal, and pour forth a stream of wealth for the service of man. Intelligence is cultivated and put to useful work. "There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard." Dominant citizen-kings unfold the mysteries of democracy, and disappear into the mists of the past.

Through all the convulsions of a civilization forging a re-creation of the world, a military star of the first magnitude glows with undimmed splendor. The United States is, by instinct and by deliberate choice, not a military nation. But growth brings conflict, and the United States could not escape the fate of its waxing economic and political power. There have been wars in rapid succession, and in all of them the name of MacArthur stands out with a solar light that cannot be extinguished. A valorous father spread luster on the name. The son added grandeur and glory and nobility.

The record of the days of the long years of the service of Douglas MacArthur to the Nation is written. The details are too familiar to all of us. The record began on the Plains of the Hudson before the dawn of the century. It ended on the deck of the Missouri in a Japanese harbor.

Or did it end there? No, the culmination came when the superb warrior turned into a sagacious statesman. Stern necessity compelled Douglas MacArthur to overwhelm the military ambitions of a Nation deluded by false promises. Nobility of character urged him to rebuild that Nation on a grander scale, with rightness and good will as its foundation stones.

Honors have been heaped upon Douglas MacArthur to the limit of our feeble power to bestow. General of the Army, wearer of the Congressional Distinguished Service Medal, the adulation and hero worship of millions.

We are most thankful that length of years was granted to our general. That gave him time to stamp his personality on the hearts of his compatriots. His name and his deeds will inspire his followers with a zeal and devotion equal to his own. For it is impossible to believe that America can produce only one true patriot and wise leader.

In those who come after him, then, may his career go on. And for their encouragement and guidance, may they diligently con the books in which his record is written, wherein "lies the soul of the whole past time, the articulate voice of the past when the body and material substance of it has altogether vanished like a dream."

Defense Cuts Pay for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IT IS ALL SO UNREALISTIC—DEFENSE CUTS PAY FOR SOCIALISM

The Naval Repair Facility at San Diego is ordered closed to save $1.4 million a year, throwing several thousand skilled workers out of jobs, and then the administration opens an attack on "poverty" with a program of "make-work" for the unskilled and marginal businesses and farming at a cost of more than $900 million a year.

Pardon us if we seem a bit baffled by it all.

President Johnson's "economy" budget has been subjected to some severe examination of late, and its balancing act seems to be based on an optimistic assumption that the gross national product will rise to a $623 billion level this year, or about 6.5 percent over 1963. The only visible reduction in expenses is being made at the cost of the defense program, and these "savings," if that is what they are, will be used to pay for more social welfare projects.

Secretary of Defense McNamara even has suggested that closed military installations, presumably such as the San Diego Naval Repair Facility, be used as training centers for the proposed "work corps" of 100,000 young people.

This does not seem to indicate that installations now are to be closed entirely on a basis of cost of operation, as they apparently are not all to be eliminated, but made available, if wanted, for nationalization of a large section of American youth. These stations will not be operated without cost.

The economy program seems to be an illusion. The Tax Foundation has examined the budget and reports:

"There is little evidence of success in curtailing or eliminating existing programs. Nor does there appear to have been significant accomplishment in establishing priorities among domestic civilian expenditure programs. Proposed new programs would lead to far greater spending in the future than in 1965."

So far the budget has indicated a reduction of only 1,200 personnel of the 2,500,000 on Government rolls. Presumably more than 1,200 will be required to administer the new Office of Economic Opportunity which is being set up to conduct the so-called war on poverty. This Office alone will cost $10 million a year.

The closing of the naval facility and the saving of salaries of its skilled workers will help to meet the expense of this one Office for about a month.

AFL–CIO Board Approves Establishment of Mortgage Investment Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1964, the AFL–CIO Executive Council recommended to the general board the establishment of a mortgage investment trust to help AFL–CIO affiliates and welfare and retirement funds to invest in mortgage loans and thus to stimulate desirable housing construction and to increase employment in the home construction industry. The general board has approved the creation of the trust.

Both the council and the board are to be highly commended for their action, which will undoubtedly stimulate the economy by the production of more housing where it is needed.

The executive council's recommendation follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON MORTGAGE INVESTMENT TRUST, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 24, 1964

The AFL–CIO Executive Council recommends to the AFL–CIO General Board the establishment of a mortgage investment trust to provide a mortgage investment program for all affiliates of the AFL–CIO and any qualified labor-management welfare pension or retirement plan; and an auxiliary housing corporation to provide seed money and to encourage local nonprofit sponsors, for the development of lower income housing.

The mortgage investment trust is to be a common trust permitting the pooling of funds under one trust agreement for the proportionate benefit of each participant.

The mortgage investment trust would thus offer an opportunity for participation in a well-organized mortgage investment program under competent management, obviating the need for separate agreements with trustees by each AFL–CIO affiliate or welfare and retirement fund desiring to invest a portion of its financial resources in mortgage loans.

The participating unions and welfare and retirement funds, as well as organized labor as a whole, would benefit as follows:

(1) The pooling of funds would provide a medium to create socially desirable housing projects and at the same time create additional employment in the construction trades and allied industries that provide material, furnishings, appliances, and other necessities for these new developments.

(2) Through the lending of seed money to local nonprofit housing corporations sponsored by labor or other public interest organizations, housing for moderate income, and

elderly members of participating organizations would be financed with below-market interest rate loans from Government funds, to permit substantially lower rents than now charged in regularly financed housing projects.

(3) A massive attack would be made on America's tremendous unmet housing needs.

(4) A higher interest return would be obtained on investment in Government-insured-and-guaranteed mortgage loans than on investments in Government or other bonds with the highest degree of safety.

The mortgage investment trust, formed by investments from affiliates of the AFL–CIO and qualified labor or labor-management welfare or retirement plans of such amounts as each organization deemed advisable, would be governed by a board of trustees of 10 members selected from the representatives of the participating organizations.

Under the direction of this board, a qualified mortgage investment trust manager would deal with mortgage bankers and other bank officials that would acquire and service mortgages in different parts of the country for the trust.

The auxiliary nonprofit Housing Seed Money Corp. would be organized, with the trustees acting in a dual capacity as corporate directors, to support the initiation of nonprofit rental housing for moderate-income and elderly families. The projects would be owned by local nonprofit organizations sponsored by labor and other public interest organizations, under available Federal aid programs, and would require very modest equity or "seed money" investments.

The trust would confine its investments to federally insured and guaranteed mortgage loans to finance owner-occupied homes and multifamily rental housing projects. This policy would assure an extremely high degree of investment safety and produce a reasonably high interest return on investments.

Thus the mortgage investment trust provides an ideal vehicle for the investing, with the full guarantee of the U.S. Government, of funds that must not be handled in a speculative manner yet should earn the highest possible interest return, putting them to a practical and useful social purpose.

The AFL-CIO executive council therefore recommends to the general board:

(1) That the mortgage investment trust and the auxiliary housing corporation be authorized immediately.

(2) That the president of the AFL–CIO be instructed to name a committee of the executive council to implement this resolution at the earliest practicable date.

(3) That all affiliates of the AFL–CIO and all eligible pensions and retirement plans be encouraged to participate and that the details, policies, and benefits of the mortgage investment trust and the auxiliary housing corporation be widely publicized throughout the trade union movement.

(4) That annual reports on the progress of the mortgage investment trust and the auxiliary housing corporation be made to the AFL–CIO executive council and the AFL–CIO general board.

A Move To Better Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of the House is aware of the tremendous contributions being made by the Honorable EARL WILSON of Indiana, by his untiring efforts to prevent waste in purchases being made by the Department of Defense. I certainly applaud these efforts and commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] in his accomplishments. On June 11, 1963, the Indianapolis Star ran an editorial commending Mr. WILSON's efforts. I am sure that it will be of interest to the Members. I submit this editorial to the RECORD.

A MOVE TO BETTER DEFENSE

Representative EARL WILSON of Indiana has introduced a bill aimed at cutting down abuse of negotiated contracts in the Defense Department and related agencies.

His proposal would set up a joint congressional "watchdog" committee to keep track of contracts awarded without competitive bidding. It would require public disclosure of the reasons for use of negotiation instead of competitive bidding on each such contract. It also would require the keeping of a public log of all contacts with government officers and employees pertaining to negotiated contract awards.

Eighty percent of all defense buying is done on negotiated contracts, Wilson said.

The Congressman also charged that a "system of lunches, good will excursions, wining and dining, and gifts and entertainment" is costing the taxpayers billions every year by influencing the channeling of contracts to favored suppliers at unnecessarily high prices.

Usually we shudder at any proposal for establishment of a new governmental unit, whether of Congress or the administration. But this one ought to pay its way many times over.

Besides the possibility of substantial savings, this proposal could result in more efficient and effective defense buying. It might be one of the pathways—of which many are possible—to better defense at less cost.

We hope it succeeds.

John Crow Selected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, the National Civil Service League will honor 10 Federal Government employees with the presentation of Career Service Awards.

These awards have been given for the past 10 years in recognition of outstanding competence in public service, and winners are chosen from the ranks of Cabinet officers, heads of Federal agencies, and the District of Columbia Commissioners.

One of this year's award recipients will be John O. Crow, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to John for this well-deserved recognition.

During my six terms in Congress, I have come to admire John Crow as a friend, and to greatly respect his ability and dedication as a public servant.

His knowledge of the problems confronting the Indians and his sincere desire to help the Indian people have endeared him to all of us who are also deeply interested in Indian affairs.

John Crow richly deserves this honor for his more than 30 years of sustained dedication to public service. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the text of a Tulsa, Okla., Daily World article announcing Mr. Crow's award and giving an interesting history of his career.

The article follows:

FORMER COMMERCE MAN HONORED FOR HIS SERVICE

COMMERCE.—A former resident of this community who attained recognition first as an athlete and later in a career with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is being honored this month by the National Civil Service League, an organization that recognizes outstanding competence in public service.

Oklahoma Cherokee Indian John O. Crow, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has been named one of 10 Federal employees to receive the Career Service Award. Winners are chosen from the ranks of Cabinet officers, heads of Federal agencies and the District of Columbia Commissioners.

Crow is formerly of Commerce and a 1929 graduate of Commerce High School. He was born near Salem, Mo., but moved with his parents to the little mining town when he was 6 months old.

He graduated from Haskell Institute as a star football player and went on to play pro football with the Boston Redskins (now Washington Redskins).

Crow, an expert in the complex Indian realty field, entered service with the BIA in 1934, as a temporary clerk at the Fort Totten Indiana Agency, North Dakota. Successive assignments took him to the Truxton Canyon Indian Agency at Valentine, Ariz., where in 1942 he was made superintendent of the agency; he also served as superintendent of the Mescalero (Apache) Indian Agency in New Mexico; the Fort Apache Agency, Arizona; and the Unitah-Ouray Agency, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

He went to the central offices of the Bureau in Washington, D.C. in 1956 as Assistant Commissioner for Resources and in 1960 was made chief of the BIA Branch of Realty.

In February, 1961, the late President Kennedy appointed Crow to serve as acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, pending the subsequent appointment of Dr. Philleo Nash, the present Commissioner. After this, Crow was named Deputy Commissioner of BIA, the post he holds today.

He attained recognition in Oklahoma in 1961 as a member of an expert group headed by Cherokee Chief W. W. Keeler, charged with recommending plans for the reorganization of the BIA and development of an improved policies program.

He receives his award for sustained superior service in the Bureau of Indian Affairs throughout a career that began 30 years ago.

Atlantic Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, more people are aware every day of the restless state of world affairs. They are disturbed almost every morning with the

eruption of a new crisis somewhere in the world.

Mr. Theodore Achilles, Vice Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Atlantic Council of the United States, has made an excellent analysis of the world situation in a speech to the Capitol Chapter and Dorcester Chapter of the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Mr. Achilles background and experience in international affairs are impressive. Following work as a newspaperman in California and Japan, he entered the U.S. Foreign Service in 1931 and served at Havana, Rome, Geneva, Washington, London, Brussels, Paris, and Lima.

His experience with international gatherings and conferences extends over a long period of years and a wide variety of occasions—from the ILO Conference in 1941 to heading the U.S. delegation to the Colombo Plan Conference in 1960.

After his retirement from the Foreign Service in 1962, he became Director and Vice Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Atlantic Council of the United States.

Following are a few paragraphs from Mr. Achilles speech:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THEODORE C. ACHILLES AT THE CAPITAL AND DORCHESTER CLUBS OF THE FEDERATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, JANUARY 6, 1964.

Twenty-five years ago, in 1939, World War II burst upon us. Twenty-five years before that, in 1914, World War I broke out. Have we broken out of the cycle, or can we expect a nuclear holocaust before the end of this year?

These two wars were caused primarily, in Toynbee's phrase, by "trying to pour the new wine of industrialization into the old bottles of nationalism." Basically, they had three causes: nationalism, imperialism, and industrialization.

Today, nationalism has lost much of its force. Imperialism in the old sense is finished and the world is digesting industrialization through mass purchasing power and higher standards of living. A fourth favorable factor, which, had it existed in 1914 and 1939, might have prevented both World Wars, is the advance notice that the full power of the United States would be thrown into action immediately against aggression anywhere.

But there are new factors of unstability. One-third of the world's population is under Communist domination. We are witnessing an unparalleled population explosion. Some 60 new nations have been born since 1939. Nuclear power and the means of shooting it anywhere in the world hangs over us.

There is, however, a strong new stabilizing factor in the movement toward wider than national unity, particularly in Europe and the Atlantic community.

In 1939, Clarence Streit propounded the revolutionary idea of a federal union of the free. This idea had four parts:

One was the need for greater unity of free men, greater than national unity. The idea is almost universally accepted.

Second was that this union must begin with the real democracies of Western Europe and North America. This idea is today widely accepted and has been successfully put in practice in Europe and to some extent in the wider Atlantic community.

Third was that it should be a federal union, patterned on the U.S. Constitution. The idea of a wider than national federation still sounds radical to some but is being pioneered in Europe. It has a long and successful history in this country, and is the only peaceful method of extending political authority today. It represents the free decisions of free men to enhance their individual sovereignty. An increasing number of prominent Americans—Hoover, Nixon, Rockefeller, Herter, Senators Kefauver and Fulbright, and Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy—have advocated it in one form or another.

The fourth part was that such a federal union should be established by a constitutional convention. The time for this is not yet ripe, simply because not enough people, including the right people, are yet prepared for the calling of such a convention.

But sooner or later, and, in my opinion, well within the next 25 years, there will be an Atlantic federal union of the free as a nucleus of a future orderly world.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the following poem was written by Vernon B. Hampton, the poet laureate of Staten Island, N.Y., for Gen. Douglas MacArthur's birthday, 1948, and was eloquently acknowledged from Tokyo by the general. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MACARTHUR

(By Vernon B. Hampton)

MacArthur.
Of noble military mien,
Austere,
In etiquette of the tradition,
And master of the craft of war;
A strategist forthright and daring in his plans
And purposes:
The pride of Hudson's Citadel
West Point.

The enemy scarce reckoned with the skill
Of dread MacArthur;
Bataan was but the start,
And not the period,
To the sharp sentence that he wrote,
In this titanic clash.
He wound his way.
By devious twists and turns,
And Island-hopping,
While otherwheres the bulk of fighting force,
Defeated Hitler.
Time never overmastered shrewd MacArthur,
Nor did he wait for Time to play his game.
Distance delayed and hampered, but
Under his skilled hand and cunning,
Armies grew and the impossible attained.
Pacific islands that were lost to us,
Returned again,
Through conquest, loss and death;
The naval might of Uncle Sam,
Marines and sailing men,
And airmen, too,
Were part of the all-conquering pattern there
That led us back through wide Pacific wastes,
Through bloody shores,
Up mountain heights to plant the flag
On Suribachi,
And on to Tokyo.
Grim warfare and grim victory.
A victory of arms and statesmanship:
Years in the field and years in governing
The beaten foe.
The laurel wreath adorns MacArthur's brow,
Deserved and worn with grace.
Pride of the American race.
Pride of us all.

Urban Mass Transportation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, more than 400 new vehicles add to the traffic jam and smog each 24 hours in the city of Los Angeles. This startling fact is emphasized in a communication I have just received from the Los Angeles City Council which meets daily throughout the year in the task of governing a city of nearly 4 million people. In view of the fact that the Senate version (S. 6) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act (H.R. 3881) was passed by the Senate over 1 year ago, and is now with the House version referred to by the councilmanic resolution before the House Rules Committee, I would like to insert this resolution in the RECORD as an expression of my strong support for H.R. 3881. I am sure that most of the Los Angeles County delegation shares my corncern for these measures. In view of the need for this legislation for all of the urban areas of our Nation, I would urge that the chairman and members of the Rules Committee recognize the hope and desire of we Representatives of urban areas to have these measures brought to the floor of the House for consideration and, hopefully, passage. I would commend the reading of this Los Angeles City Council resolution to each Member of this House as a demonstration of the need for this legislation by only 1 of 320 urban communities with a population of over 50,000 suffering with mass transportation problems:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
March 31, 1964.

Hon. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER.

DEAR SIR: I hereby certify that the following resolution was adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles at its meeting of March 31, 1964:

"Whereas the urban mass transportation bill, H.R. 3881, is now pending before the U.S. House of Representatives; and

"Whereas H.R. 3881 would authorize Federal grants to local governments for mass transportation facilities and equipment; and

"Whereas the need for mass rapid transit in the Greater Los Angeles area is well known; and

"Whereas a recent study shows that people coming into the Greater Los Angeles area put 2,500 more vehicles on the road every 6 days; and

"Whereas development of a practical, convenient mass transportation system is a pressing need of this community; and

"Whereas urban areas throughout the United States are experiencing a similar pressing need for development of urban mass transportation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the City Council of the City of Los Angeles hereby urges the enactment of the urban mass transportation bill, H.R. 3881; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to U.S. Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, and to U.S. Congressmen representing the Los Angeles metropolitan area, and that they be respectfully requested to support passage of this bill."

Respectfully yours,

WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.

By M. B. WILSON,
Deputy.

Alaska's Governor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on April 3 Alaska's dedicated and overburdened Governor, William A. Egan, just returned to the State capitol at Juneau after viewing the carnage in Alaskan communities stricken by earthquake and tidal waves, rendered an eloquent and informative message to a joint session of the State house and senate. The message follows:

ALASKA'S GOVERNOR SPEAKS

Mr. President of the Senate, Mr. Speaker of the House, members of the third State legislature, fellow Alaskans, in the history of the United States as a nation, no Governor has had to make a report to a State legislature such as the one I shall deliver today.

In all of our history there never has been a natural disaster to equal the one Alaska suffered almost at this very hour exactly 1 week ago.

Many disasters have caused great loss of life. Many have resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in damage to property.

But, the Alaska earthquake is unparalleled for its impact on a single State's population, homes, businesses, and commerce.

I say this not to emphasize the dramatic—there has been enough drama to last us all a lifetime—but I say it so the scope of the problem that has erupted upon us may be placed in its rightful perspective.

We all know the details. The immediate past is one that we shall never forget. It is the future that must now concern us.

But, at the outset I want to say a few words about a feature of this calamity that has captured imaginations throughout our Nation and around the world.

It has often been said that adversity makes the man. Today Alaska is a land of giant men.

No one would have blamed the tens of thousands of persons who suffered most from expressing momentary panic at the sudden horrors they faced.

But from the first moment until now there has been no panic. There has been no despair.

The story of how Alaskans met this greatest of natural disasters is already a living legend. I hope it is one that is never forgotten by any of us.

Before first light last Saturday morning—before anyone could even begin to guess at the total extent of damage—or death—all communities affected were under control. Reconstruction committees had even been formed.

What is it like to have your world turned upside down—to lose relatives and friends—to lose homes—to watch buildings crumble and familiar landmarks erased from the earth in an instant?

And then to bounce back, pick up the pieces and look to the future? That is what the majority of Alaskans have done since Friday.

The names of ordinary individuals turned heroes is far too long to be recorded here.

They include those in the State civil defense organization who instantly responded and effectively set in motion all necessary emergency functions.

They include those in the city administrations of Anchorage, Valdez, Seward, Kodiak, and elsewhere—village chieftains, radio station announcers and reporters, ham operators, doctors, nurses, firemen, policemen, CAP pilots, utility workmen, national guardsmen—the list is endless.

It includes the officers and men of the Alaskan Command and all its branches who have written new chapters in the annals of civilian-military partnership.

I only wish I could recognize everyone by name who has contributed so much.

The immediate past is one of tragedy. But, it is also one that makes everyone of us in this room today proud to be members of such a community.

In looking at the future we are immediately confronted with some harsh facts.

First, we know that there are still thousands of Alaskans without homes and without jobs, lost as a result of the earthquake and its aftermath of tidal wave and fire.

Second, we know that the property loss will total hundreds of millions of dollars. Losses that take many forms—private homes, places of business, streets and highways; public utilities such as water, sewage, telephone and power systems; fishing vessels and shore-based facilities; public buildings such as schools, the Anchorage International Airport terminal building, Harborview Nursing Home, district highway buildings; and a great number of other areas.

We are working on a factual compilation of total restoration costs that will be completed within a few days.

Following his visit to Alaska, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. McDermott, estimated the loss at a half billion dollars. Our present totals give us no reason to doubt the accuracy of Mr. McDermott's estimate.

This means that the loss will likely be about seven times greater than the total general fund budget the legislature was considering at the time of the disaster. This gives you some idea of the staggering loss in relation to regular State financing.

Third, we know that State revenues will be affected. But, it is simply impossible at this time for anyone to know what that effect will be. It may be 90 days before we may make a reasonable and meaningful estimate based on known conditions.

Fourth, we know that our resource-based industries survived virtually intact, except for certain area segments of the fisheries industry. Petroleum, hard rock minerals, timber and pulp were affected hardly at all. Our fisheries industry suffered a blow, but our analysis indicates it was not as great as originally feared.

Tourism will not decline because of the earthquake. The major tourist agent and operator dealing in the Alaska travel business said just yesterday that he felt this would be our greatest year yet for tourism.

The resource sector of the economy came through almost unscathed.

Finally, we know that despite our heavy losses there is almost unanimous confidence in Alaska's future. There have been many such expressions by some of the most important members of the Nation's financial community.

The Nation's commercial leaders have expressed confidence in many ways—offers have been made to restock lost product inventories at no cost to the Alaska wholesaler. Many having service contracts with Alaksa businesses have advised those businesses that regular payments would not be expected for an indefinite period. In some cases, they will be forgiven entirely.

This is the type of confidence and good will the private business community of America is demonstrating toward Alaska.

And the American people—individually with wires and letters by the thousands—and collectively through the Federal Government—have left no doubt of their concern and their confidence in our future progress.

The immediate tasks were twofold: To care for casualties and provide for the protection of health and property.

And to restore vital community functions—water and power and telephone service—reopening closed transportation links—streets, highways, and ocean transportation.

With this machinery now established, we have devoted our attention to the reconstruction itself.

This has taken many forms:

First, an assessment of total damages. This will be completed before we leave for Washington.

Second, a determination of which channels to funnel assistance through to keep the economy strong, to protect homeowners, businessmen and all other aspects of the private sector of our community life.

And third, a determination of necessary legislation—both on the Federal and State level, including plans for making reconstruction money available.

On Sunday, I plan to go to Washington to meet with President Johnson and the committee he has created to speed the reconstruction effort. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and a longtime friend of Alaska, has been appointed chairman of that committee.

With me will be representatives of the State government, the municipalities involved, key members of the State's financial and business community, and others who will provide valuable assistance in working out a firm program for reconstruction.

Since last Friday, I have spoken a number of times to President Johnson and other high-level members of the Federal Government regarding our situation. There is no question that the President is behind us 1,000 percent and shares our desire to get down to work immediately on a crash program to rebuild Alaska's stricken areas.

This knowledge has been a constant source of strength to all of us who have been coordinating efforts with the Federal Government.

Because Alaska is an integral part of the national life, its loss is a national loss. But, primarily it is ours.

The spirit and will to rebuild here is unquestioned. And I have no doubt that all Alaskans—from Ketchikan to Barrow—share a common desire to contribute every penny we can possibly muster in our own behalf.

As you know, I said Wednesday in Anchorage that I will ask this legislature to enact a proposal authorizing the sale of $50 million in general obligation bonds for reconstruction purposes.

For Alaska, such a program is large—far, far larger than anything we have ever before attempted as a State or Territory. In my view, it represents the full extent of the State's ability to finance its own future in the wake of our common disaster.

Sale of this amount of bonds would, depending upon interest rates received, mean an additional $2.7 to $3 million a year in payments for principal and interest.

We all want to help ourselves financially. And in my view, this proposal is the only realistic means for doing so.

While $50 million is a large sum in relation to anything we have attempted before, it will leave us far short of solving the entire financing problem.

In Washington, therefore, we shall ask the President and his Committee and the Con-

gress to approve the expenditure of large sums of Federal money for Alaska's reconstruction. The amount, of course, to be determined by the final accurate assessment of replacement costs.

We will also ask for a relaxation of many of the procedures that are required under Federal programs in ordinary times but which are simply not adequate to cope with a disaster of this magnitude.

Finally, we will ask for many rearrangements of past relationships established between Alaska and the Federal Government. Because of the earthquake, our relationship with the Federal Government today is one that no other State has had. These new conditions must be recognized.

Some of our requests will be in the area of administrative rulings. Some must be resolved by congressional action. When we return from Washington, we should have definite requests to make for changes in State law to comply with the new situation.

In addition to asking for prompt action on the bonding proposal, I believe two additional actions are immediately necessary.

First is passage of the bond anticipation note bill now before you. This would provide us with a head start on many projects that must be initiated to take the greatest advantage of the coming construction season.

Second is passage of the revenue anticipation note measure that is also before you.

With the flexibility this act would provide, we could retain a maximum amount of State deposits in Alaska banks to keep their reserves strong at this time. Without this authority, there could be need for withdrawal of substantial sums from Alaska banks just when these moneys are most needed to rebuild our State.

Also, I want to say that under the emergency powers granted me before last week's recess, I have assured all those holding bonds for Alaska municipalities, school districts, and other subdivisions that the State will guarantee bond payments. The State will not permit the default of any bond now held.

There is a tremendous amount of work to be done. Passage of the measures I have recommended will be only the beginning. The State budget for the year beginning July 1 also remains to be considered when we have enough information to make realistic estimates on revenue.

It is fortunate that the legislature was in session at this time of crisis and prepared to move swiftly into action. I will need more than ever before your advice and support in the weeks and months ahead.

In closing, I want to say, since we last met, a united and determined people has been welded together from the heat and shock of disaster.

Today, we share a common pride. We share a common goal—healing the scars and wounds and going forward to build a better Alaska than the one we have known.

We are a young State. We are a young people. But we are mature.

Along with so many thousands of others, I shed tears unashamed at what my eyes saw in a land I love. But, from our sorrow has come strength. And, from our strength and unity, a greater tomorrow.

General MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Sixth District of Pennsylvania join their fellow Americans and citizens throughout the free world in mourning the death of one of America's great soldiers, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

General MacArthur's life was dedicated to the service of his country and to the defense of freedom. As a World War I frontline commander, as liberator of the Philippines, as commander of the Allied Powers in Japan and an architect of the free political system of that great and friendly country, and as commander of the United Nations forces in Korea, he was one of America's great heroes.

I know of no more fitting words to serve as his epitaph than those contained in President Johnson's proclamation of April 5:

We will forever be indebted to him for his integrity, his courage, and his brilliant accomplishments as a soldier and citizen; we will never forget that his ultimate goal was peace among men.

My deepest sympathies go to Mrs. MacArthur and their son.

Fair Trade Law Is Ruled Illegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette chronicling how another State fair trade act was held unconstitutional by a State supreme court. The article follows:

HIGH STATE COURT OK'S CUT PRICES IN RETAIL STORES—PENNSYLVANIA FAIR TRADE ACT RULED UNCONSTITUTIONAL—MARK-DOWNS EFFECTIVE TODAY

The Pennsylvania Fair Trade Act, which allows manufacturers of consumer goods to fix minimum retail prices for their products, was struck down yesterday by the State supreme court.

In a divided 5-to-2 decision, the court declared the law violates the Pennsylvania constitution.

In so ruling, the court upheld the right of White Cross Stores, a discount chain with seven stores in Allegheny County, to set its own prices for Squibb drug and pharmaceutical products manufactured by the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.

The effect of the decision will be to free discount stores and other retail outlets from minimum price restrictions which are applied to many consumer items, but especially to drugs and health and beauty aids.

CUTS EFFECTIVE TODAY

In fact, the court's decision had hardly been handed down before the first effect was felt.

Donald Robinson, president of White Cross Stores, said a 25-percent reduction in the price of Squibb products would go into effect today in the 22 White Cross outlets in Pennsylvania.

"This is a tremendous victory for the consumer in Pennsylvania," said Robinson. "It means that the consumer will have the opportunity to buy many former price-fixed items at competitive prices."

The State supreme court, in a majority opinion written by Justice Michael J. Eagen, took aim at a provision of the Fair Trade Act which binds all retailers in the State to any minimum-price contract signed by a manufacturer with a single retailer.

EXCESSIVE POWER RULED

Justice Eagen held this clause gives to any manufacturer the power to regulate prices—a power which constitutionally belongs only to the legislature. Wrote Justice Eagen:

"The producer enjoys the unbridled power to stipulate the price he pleases and at that price the retailer must sell and the buyer must buy. In this respect, the producer is the unrestrained sovereign."

Assumption of such power by private interests, said Justice Eagen, "violates the essential concept of a democratic society and is constitutionally invalid."

Justice Eagen did not venture a judgment on the argument of Olin Mathieson that fair trade legislation protects manufacturers, retailers and consumers from cutthroat competition.

He observed, however, that recent studies have shown that, "rather than being benefited by such laws, the consumer has actually been harmed, and that the whole scheme of fair trade acts is one for private, rather than public gain."

In striking down the Fair Trade Act, the court reversed a prior decision in 1955 when it found the act constitutional. This reversal of an earlier opinion drew opposition from Chief Justice John C. Bell, who urged adherence to judicial precedent.

BELL VIEWS WITH ALARM

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Bell wrote that, while he opposed the Fair Trade Act, he believes the court should leave the changing of it to the legislature. He wrote:

"The frequency and the ofttimes strained reasoning with which supreme courts are now overruling prior well-settled law—with no justifiable reason except that judges think they are improving the public weal—is alarming."

Justice Benjamin R. Jones also dissented, agreeing with Justice Bell that the Fair Trade Act should be left to the legislature.

The fair trade case reached the State supreme court on this occasion as an appeal by White Cross from Allegheny County Common Pleas Court, which last September granted an injunction to Olin Mathieson against White Cross.

The case was argued before the supreme court by Attorneys James P. McArdle, representing White Cross, and Clyde P. Bailey, representing Olin Mathieson.

VINDICATION FOR WEISS

Although the high court's decision reversed Common Pleas Judge Samuel A. Weiss, the decision represented a victory for Judge Weiss, who in granting the injunction said he opposed the Fair Trade Act but was bound to uphold it until the State supreme court set it aside.

Judge Weiss recalled yesterday that when the act was passed in 1935, he himself was majority whip in the State house of representatives and State supreme court Justice Herbert B. Cohen was majority leader.

"It was an emergency measure," Judge Weiss said. "We never thought it would withstand a constitutional test, but we felt it was needed during the time of the depression."

At that time, said Judge Weiss, the act was urged primarily by small retail druggists who were hit by plunging prices. By 1941 similar acts had been passed by 45 States. The reaction against fair trade legislation began in 1949 and Pennsylvania is the 24th State whose supreme court has invalidated the legislation.

I also insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the New York World-

Telegram and Sun of Monday, March 30, 1964, pointing out how much in the public interest was this determination of unconstitutionality of the outrageous price-fixing statute of Pennsylvania, its "so-called fair trade law."

It is outrageous indeed that while States are striking down price-fixing legislation so destructive to the interests of business and consumers alike, and so detrimental to the free competitive economy we enjoy in this Nation, that we should see legislation like the so-called quality stabilization bill, which is nothing more or less than price fixing, receiving so much attention from the Congress.

FAIR TRADE BOUNCED AGAIN

In spite of everything, the price-fixing lobby keeps pushing Congress to pass the so-called quality stabilization bill, thusly named after efforts to enact the measure under other names failed.

The latest development on this front was in Pennsylvania.

The supreme court in that State has just declared unconstitutional a fair trade law passed in 1935. A drug manufacturer tried to compel a retailer to charge his customers the prices fixed by the manufacturer. The retailer fought back, and the court decided in his favor—or, more aptly, in favor of his customers.

Either by repeal or court action, some 20 States now have abandoned fair trade laws. Fair trade was the original alias of price-fixing by law. Quality stabilization is the newest disguise.

The Pennsylvania court's decision, however, is not likely to deter the price fixers. It will stimulate them, since the more they lose in the States the harder they push Congress to enact a national price-fixing law.

This bill is opposed by President Johnson, by the Justice Department, by the Federal Trade Commission, and by anyone else friendly to the principle of competition. It is exactly contrary to the book of laws now vigorously enforced by the Government against trusts and monopolies and price fixers. But the push is still on—so let buyers beware.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the great captains has died but has left a memory in history that will long be remembered, revered, and studied by students of not only military history but of the chronicles of all time.

General MacArthur was an inspiration not only to those who knew him but to those whom he led and served and to those who knew and studied his accomplishments.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was a soldier's soldier. His early life left no doubt of the illustrious future he would enjoy. He is the proof of the greatness of America because our system must produce General MacArthurs in order to maintain our leadership of the world. We must build leaders and to this end General MacArthur devoted an ever increasing amount of time in his last years. He was dedicated to West Point and to the military leadership that our free society demands.

He wrote a prayer, which might be called a father's prayer, during the trying battle for the Philippines in 1942. It is not only a message to his son but it is a message to all sons of America. I quote it here as one of the great contributions of one of the great captains:

Build me a son, O Lord, who will be strong enough to know when he is weak, and brave enough to face himself when he is afraid; one who will be proud and unbending in honest defeat, and humble and gentle in victory.

Build me a son whose wishes will not take the place of deeds; a son who will know Thee—and that to know himself is the foundation stone of knowledge.

Lead him, I pray, not in the path of ease and comfort, but under the stress and spur of difficulties and challenge. Here let him learn to stand up in the storm; here let him learn compassion for those who fail.

Build me a son whose heart will be clear, whose goal will be high, a son who will master himself before he seeks to master other men, one who will reach into the future, yet never forget the past.

And after all these things are his, add, I pray, enough of a sense of humor, so that he may always be serious, yet never take himself too seriously. Give him humility, so that he may always remember the simplicity or true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, and the meekness of true strength.

Then I, his father, will dare to whisper, "I have not lived in vain."

Why Better Libraries Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday will mark a weeklong observance of National Library Week. This year's theme is "Reading Is the Key to New Worlds."

The National Library Week program is a voluntary citizens' movement dedicated to the long-range goal of encouraging lifetime reading habits, increasing people's use of libraries, and expanding and improving the total reading and library resources of the Nation.

Each April, nationally and in some 5,000 communities throughout the several States, Library Week is both the climax and the starting point of many year-round activities that spur Americans to read more and to accept the responsibility for making reading opportunities more available to others.

Notable in my congressional district will be the presentation of a $1,000 Book of the Month Club Award for 1964 to the Nez Perce County Library at Lewiston, Idaho. The awards are given in memory of Dorothy Canfield Fisher and is open to libraries in towns of 25,000 or less, in every State of the Union. It was established in 1959 to encourage interest in and support of small-community libraries.

The statistics on public libraries on the national level is shocking. Eighteen million Americans do not have ready access to a public library and for another 110 million it is not sufficient or adequate. The median age of public library buildings in this country is 52 years; 85 percent built before 1920.

At our colleges and universities, the situation is equally alarming. More than 75 percent of our 4-year colleges and more than 90 percent of our 2-year institutions fail to meet minimum recommended standards for academic libraries.

In Idaho, the libraries are also generally inadequate to meet the present and future needs of their readers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in today's RECORD a statement prepared by the Idaho National Library Week Committee of which Mr. Richard J. Beck, of the University of Idaho, is chairman, entitled "Why Better Libraries Are Needed," the statement follows:

WHY BETTER LIBRARIES ARE NEEDED

The exploding population, the expanding body of knowledge, changes in educational methods, increased leisure time, job and skill obsolescence, and retraining for new jobs—these are just a few of the social, educational, and economic developments which have increased our need for better libraries at all levels.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Your public library should be an information and cultural center for education, utility, enjoyment, and inspiration, enabling every member of a community to have access to a wide range of books and other library materials on any subject.

Idaho ranks 50th of the 50 States in the percentage of people served by a public library. Of the State's 667,191 people, 41 percent or 275,853 live in areas where there is no public library. The remaining 59 percent do have access to a public library, but none of these existing libraries is completely adequate in bookstock, staff, building, and services. In 1962–63, only 18 of the 90 public libraries reported an income of more than $10,000.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Each school, whether elementary, junior high or senior high, should have a central library of printed and audiovisual materials to meet the needs of the school curriculum. The scope of knowledge has become too vast to be covered by classroom instruction alone, and the school library must provide additional information for each student. Teacher, librarian, and parent should cooperate in developing the child's reading ability, by supplying not only adequate materials but guidance and encouragement in their use, and a room conducive to quiet study.

With a few notable exceptions, Idaho school libraries are far below minimum levels.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

In the college, even more than in the high school, the library is the center of the instructional program. Both professor and student need current materials, plus the significant publications of the past. The student is expected to read widely, and compare the writing of authorities in each field of study. The college book collection must be supplemented by periodicals, pamphlets, Government documents and audiovisual materials.

Idaho's college age children are expected to increase from 8,722 in 1962 to 14,000 in

1975, and a 50-percent increase in the number of those attending college within Idaho is expected. Idaho has four junior colleges and five 4-year colleges, but less than half of them have libraries, meeting minimum standards of bookstock and budget.

SPECIAL LIBRARIES

Corporations, banks, trade associations, churches, and governmental agencies also maintain libraries.

In Idaho, the Mountain Home Air Force Base Library supplies materials for the technical reference, educational and recreational needs of its personnel. The National Reactor Testing Station Technical Library at Idaho Falls has materials on nuclear science and engineering. The library at the Veterans' Administration Center in Boise serves patients through a library collection designed for its therapeutic value, maintains a medical library for doctors on its staff, and extends its services to the adjacent communities.

STATE LIBRARIES

The Supreme Court Law Library and the Idaho Historical Society Library are part of State government serving special functions. The Idaho State Library has a more general function—serving all members of State government, including the legislature when it is in session, and working closely with local public libraries throughout the State. Advice and assistance, as well as book loans, are freely given to all public libraries insofar as the State library's resources permit. Materials not available within Idaho are borrowed from other libraries outside the State when borrowers request this service. The State library also strives to establish new libraries and to strengthen the total library services of Idaho. The State spends less than 11 cents per person annually to finance the Idaho State Library.

CONCLUSION

Idaho's libraries are generally inadequate to meet the present and future needs of their users. Financial support for public, State, school, and academic libraries is insufficient. More books and new or expanded buildings are needed. Additional professional libraries are needed in libraries of all types. Accredited college courses leading to a professional degree in librarianship are not available in Idaho—thus young people interested in librarianship as a career must leave the State for training and seldom return to Idaho to work.

One Idahoan sums it up this way: "The general attitude of public apathy toward librarians and library needs in Idaho is shameful. The entire citizenry needs to be alerted to our State's needs and present low status. Surely State pride should inspire us all to do everything in our power to educate and legislate toward something as vital and absolutely necessary as better library service at every level."

Senator Frank Church Explains Foreign Policymaking Problems at Moscow, Idaho, Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in these times when foreign affairs are of such great importance to our country, my State of Idaho is proud to have its senior Senator, FRANK CHURCH, filling an important part in the foreign policymaking process as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Unlike any other age in the history of organized man, has there been a relationship between countries and cultures as we witness today.

For now, through improved communication methods, one nation's action takes on a swift reaction throughout the globe and within minutes entire national policies drastically change.

In such a convulsive period, our foreign policy must continue to be that of conviction and firmness, but also flexible enough to meet these changing times. Without flexibility, disaster would follow.

Two weeks ago, Senator CHURCH had an opportunity to speak in my congressional district to members of the Chamber of Commerce of Moscow, Idaho, relative to America's role in foreign affairs. In answering questions from that group, he explained the difficulties and frustrations that are so much a part of today's foreign policymaking.

Next morning, in an editorial in the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Bill Johnston made some interesting observations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD this fine editorial published on Thursday, March 26, 1964, entitled:

THE ILLUSION OF FINAL SOLUTIONS

The universal illusion of simple, permanent solutions and the natural human yearning for fixed and final positions always have frustrated the architects and managers of American foreign policy.

"What is our foreign policy?" the political campaigner or the baffled ordinary citizen may demand. What shall the Government answer? Secretary of State Dean Rusk reminded recently that the United States is dealing continually with 120 other foreign policies in the world. But no simple answer can really communicate to the governed the government's complex and elusive problems in dealing with a world in transition—a world in which change is the only constant.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, an exceptionally lucid and thoughtful member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, seemed to be grappling with this frustrating problem yesterday in answering questions at a Moscow Chamber of Commerce meeting. The questions were solid. The answers were illuminating. Yet, there was an inevitable reluctance to fully accept the fundamental, crucial fact that today's best answers may be worthless tomorrow.

One example may illustrate in part:

What might the United States do, CHURCH was asked, to counteract the favorable impressions created by French President Charles de Gaulle during his recent visits in Latin America?

"I think," CHURCH replied, "that we Americans tend to be a little pathological in our thinking about De Gaulle. He is so independent and so inclined to oppose some of our own policies that we react more strongly to certain actions he might take than we would to the same actions by some other Western leader."

CHURCH went on to cite an interesting and significant chapter in diplomatic history.

The late President John F. Kennedy, he said, was concerned about the cultural, economic, and political isolation of Latin America from Western Europe. Mr. Kennedy believed it was an unhealthy situation for the United States to be virtually the only great power in the Western Alliance to maintain close ties with Latin American countries.

As long as the United States has a dominant, almost exclusive, role in Latin America, the developing nations in the Western Hemisphere will tend to demand more aid and attention than this country can supply, blame their frustrations and failures upon the United States, and nurse from generation to generation the resentments against the "colossus of the north."

If other nations in the Western Alliance would establish stronger ties with Latin America, Mr. Kennedy believed, the contest for "influence" there would not be confined to the United States on one side and the Communist bloc nations on the other. America's allies in Europe could help share the burden (and the blame) for development of Latin America.

So Mr. Kennedy suggested to De Gaulle and other Western European nations, CHURCH said, that they reestablish stronger ties with other countries in this hemisphere. De Gaulle accepted the invitation, and his recent preliminary visit to the Caribbean area was a first step toward that objective. "In the long run," CHURCH said, "I believe this approach may best serve the interests of the United States."

But is De Gaulle, a frequent opponent of U.S. foreign policy in many parts of the world, a trustworthy ally for such a mission?

"In October 1962 during the Cuban confrontation," CHURCH said, "it appeared that nuclear war between the United States and Russia was likely—even imminent. I well recall that the first European leader to step forward and announce that he supported President Kennedy and would be on our side in any showdown was De Gaulle. I think that was significant evidence, when the chips were down, that he means what he says in declaring he will stand with us in a showdown."

Many Americans obviously do not share these views. Doubtless some other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee do not. Nor can there be any proof, until years later, whether such views represented the best judgment that the U.S. Government could make from the best facts available. Even in the perspective of the future these judgments cannot be confirmed or repudiated in any fixed and final fashion. The world does not permit fixed and final judgments. The only constant is change.

"In the 20th century," CHURCH said, "the United States has taken over the role in world affairs which Great Britain exercised in the 19th century as the greatest power on earth. We are the richest nation in the world by far. We are the most powerful nation by far. We are now both the leading power and the leading creditor in the world. We know that nobody loves his banker."

So the United States must expect, he said, that this country will be blamed, abused and even vilified in other parts of the world. Political leaders of small, frustrated nations will find it convenient to blame their failures upon intervention or lack of intervention by the United States. "No President, no party and no administration is going to escape this. We must be mature enough to understand the reasons for these resentments by other nations. We must be firm and persevering enough to fulfill our obligations as the presiding nation of the world. The king has to be very generous."

And the king—even though he never wanted to be king—must especially be wise enough to recognize that patience, tolerance and acceptance of the inevitability of change are essential ingredients of world leadership.

Dogmatism and rigid adherence to formulas that used to be sufficient for a simpler world are worthless to a world leader in a time of ferment in every corner of the globe. Foreign policy must change by the hour in the Department of State, because events change by the hour. Foreign policy must change more rapidly than it often does in the understanding of American citizens.—B.J.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, another Fifth District Massachusetts community has responded to my call for information of historical interest to visitors both from abroad and from our own country. North Reading, Mass., which dates from 1651, has prepared some material describing its landmarks.

These Massachusetts towns are compiling a wealth of attractions that will no doubt prompt many travelers to visit an area rich in tradition and vital in its progress for the future.

The information follows:

NORTH READING LANDMARKS

In 1651 the general court set off a certain parcel of land north of the Ipswich River as part of Old Redding, now known as North Reading, called the Two-mile Grant. It was known as the north precinct until 1853 when it was incorporated as a separate town.

Two hundred and fifty years ago North Reading had two main roads which went as they are today; the old Ten Rod Way, now Park Street, went east and west; the Sixteen Rod Way, now Haverhill Street, went north and south.

At the corner of these two roads stands the Common. This common land was parish land until 1858 when the town purchased it from the parish. On September 2, 1718, the old town of Redding voted to give the North Parish all the common land west of the land that was already given by Sgt. George Flint for the accommodation of a minister, except for a three-pole highway through the parish land, now Haverhill Street.

"On October 4, 1827, the parish of the north precinct did vote to build a third new meeting house"—the building on the common. A committee at that time reported that a new meeting house could be built for $3,000, which would give 64 floor pews, and that "subscriptions for 30 pews" had already been obtained. The building was finished in 1829 at a cost of $4,198.14; and pews had been sold to the amount of $3,472.08.

The outward appearance of the church presently known as the building on the common is like the original structure, except that 7 feet have been added to the studding, and the single long windows have been divided. Architectuarily the building of 1829 was finer. Inside was the vestibule which has not been materially changed. Two doors opened into the auditorium of the church. A stairway at either end led to the singing gallery.

There were two broad aisles, the pews between them facing the pulpit.

In the summers of 1857, 1858, and 1859, Dr. George F. Root, author of many Civil War songs, conducted a "Normal Musical Institute" in the parish church.

On July 13, 1931, the building on the common was deeded to the town of North Reading. Since that time the town has rented the building to various organizations as a meeting place.

Looking north on Bow Street, from Central Square in front of the Flint Memorial Hall to the Union Congregational Church, visitors to North Reading could well imagine themselves transplanted to early days in the town.

The Weeks Memorial Library, commanding a striking view of the square and the common, was the original old Damon Tavern, built in 1812, and was a popular stopping-off place for stagecoach drivers on the road between Boston and Haverhill, as well as on the route from Salem to Lowell. The old tavern has had an interesting history, having been the first post office in North Reading and the early telephone office.

A ballroom unique in Massachusetts, boasts authentic Rufus Porter murals and is comparable to the old dance hall at the Wayside Inn in Sudbury. This is being restored under the supervision of the North Reading Historical and Antiquarian Society, who also have a small room in the library which is used as a museum for their own antiques. One of their most prized possessions is an old organ formerly used by George F. Root, Civil War songwriter, who spent his early days in North Reading. Root is famous for the songs "Battle Cry of Freedom," "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp, the Boys Are Marching," and "Just Before the Battle, Mother," as well as hymns, choral pieces, and others.

The youth room, on the lower floor of the library, has a most interesting old fireplace with huge rendering pots and brick ovens. The town was fortunate in securing the library property through the provisions of the will of the late William Weeks.

The Flint Memorial Hall on Central Square, built in 1875, housed the library until 1958. Harriet N. Flint, one of North Reading's most generous benefactors, gave to the town this fine old Victorian structure and also the funds to establish the Flint library collection. The Flint hall at present contains town offices and quarters for the police department.

North of the library are several buildings which are dwellings dating back to the early days. The first house next to the Damon Tavern and reportedly built in conjunction with it, is a charming old place. The old Putnam homestead, next above, was the residence of the first minister to the North parish, Rev. Daniel Putnam, who built the place in 1720. It has beautiful paneled rooms, huge old fireplaces, and is one of the oldest houses in North Reading.

The second minister, Rev. Eliab Stone, who preached from 1761 to 1822 (for a period of 61 years) built himself a Georgian home in 1812. This can be seen diagonally across from the common, located on Peabody Street between the Batchelder school and the Union Congregational Church. It is a very beautiful place and is kept in excellent condition by its owner. For many years it was the Congregational parsonage.

North Reading residents are proud of their town, and although recently many modern homes have been erected, we are doing everything possible to preserve the traditional atmosphere of the early days.

Now, therefore, we the board of selectmen of the town of North Reading, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim North Reading's endorsement of See America Year, 1964, and welcome visitors to North Reading.

WILLIAM E. DOTEN,
Chairman.
DONALD K. ROBERTS,
MALCOLM MACRAE.
GERALD J. MCCORTLEY,
PHILIP H. PEDTON.

A Bill To Protect Employees Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, and particularly the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, to H.R. 10540, which I introduced shortly before the Easter recess—more specifically, on March 23, 1964.

This bill would amend section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from levy property necessary to satisfy the taxpayer's liabilities to his employees for wages and fringe benefits.

The need for such legislation has been apparent for some time; however, the specific incident which in effect became the straw that broke the camel's back occurred in my own congressional district in Seattle, Wash. It involved the Stewart Hotel in that city in connection with a withholding tax delinquency to the Internal Revenue Service.

On November 7, representatives of the Internal Revenue Service abruptly and without prior notice impounded the hotel's finances, including its bank account. Shortly before the November 7 date, the hotel had paid its culinary and other employees. Many of these checks had not been presented to the hotel's bank before the account was impounded, and consequently were refused payment and the employees themselves were required to make them good. The end result represented a loss of from 2 to 4 weeks' wages, together with—in many instances—earned vacations and many other fringe benefits.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question of the legal right of the Internal Revenue Service to take this sort of action when delinquencies occur. However, the dispute in each instance is between management and the Government, and the employees should not be required to pay the penalty. Frequently, what is legally right is morally wrong, and certainly this is a case in point. Furthermore, and historically, labor liens have always had a priority over any other litigation, and the same rule should apply in cases such as this. H.R. 10540 would specifically spell this out, clarifying the law and preventing any further injustices of this nature. Consequently, I urge that the Committee on Ways and Means schedule this legislation for earliest possible consideration.

The First Lady Receives Degree From Texas Women's University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following the First Lady's visit to Huntsville, Ala., she proceeded on her tour to Texas where the Texas Women's University conferred upon her a doctor of laws degree. This is an award which Mrs. Johnson richly deserved and the Houston Post in an editorial Friday, April 3 very pointedly discussed this matter.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the aforementioned editorial:

MRS. JOHNSON HONORED

The honor paid Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson by Texas Women's University in awarding her a doctor of laws degree was no mere courtesy extended her by reason of the position she holds as the Nation's First Lady. It was one that she had earned and richly deserved in her own right.

Although she has worked closely through the years with her husband, the President of the United States, admirably fulfilling her responsibilities as a loyal wife and mother, and at the same time doing what she could to assist him in his career, she has simultaneously distinguished herself as a businesswoman, as a citizen, and as an individual possessed of great talent and ability as well as personal charm.

Texas has every reason to be proud of Mrs. Johnson as one of the State's outstanding citizens no less than as the wife of the President, and it was proper that the university should honor her as a Texan of notable accomplishments and one who has blazed a path that others may follow.

Her achievements in the world of business and public service command respect and admiration quite apart from the fact that she is a woman, but they are all the more impressive because she has not allowed her career to interfere in any way with her other obligations.

No feminist in the old-fashioned sense of the word, she has demonstrated again that for women of intellect and ability, marriage and motherhood need not be an obstacle to full realization of one's potential as a person. She has shown that women, when given the opportunity, can meet the challenges and responsibilities of public life and service on equal terms with men and acquit themselves with distinction.

During the short time that he has been in the White House, President Johnson has shown great respect for the abilities of women in the area of public service by appointing an unusually large number of them to positions of great importance and trust. Mrs. Johnson, in accepting the degree, said that there have been 93 of these top appointments since January.

This policy on the part of the President of searching out and naming to high office women of ability is in itself a tribute to Mrs. Johnson and an indication of the great respect that he has for her abilities as a person. It can be said without exaggeration that Mrs. Johnson is to a large extent responsible for the great progress toward recognition that women of the Nation currently are making.

As she said in her degree-acceptance speech: "This is a good time to be a woman, because there are so many opportunities, so many roads to take."

And she, by her own accomplishments, has helped immeasurably to make those opportunities available and to open the roads from which the barriers to members of her sex have been removed.

How Insects Resist Insecticides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by Mr. David B. Peakall entitled "How Insects Resist Insecticides," which appeared in the January–February 1964 issue of the Audubon magazine. This article points out the reason why wisdom and care of the most extreme sort is needed in the conduct of these insecticide spraying programs.

The article follows:

HOW INSECTS RESIST INSECTICIDES—HEAVY DOSES, HIGH LETHAL RATES KILL ALL BUT THE TOUGHEST, WHICH BREED RESISTANT OFFSPRING

(NOTE.—The author, Dr. David B. Peakall, is an assistant professor in the department of pharmacology at the Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, N.Y. He is currently working on the effects of drugs on the production of web proteins in the spider.)

(By David B. Peakall)

Within 7 years after the corn rootworm in Nebraska had been sprayed with aldrin and heptachlor, its descendants had developed stubborn resistance to the same amount of insecticide. The sprayers had to use 100 times as much aldrin in this area of central Nebraska as in the eastern part of the State where aldrin had not been used previously.

One can readily realize the impact on wildlife if these toxic chemicals are going to be used in such massive doses. The figure of 100 times the normal dose given by H. J. Ball and G. T. Weekman in the Journal of Economic Entomology, 1962, 55:439, is not an extreme case. Cases of several thousand times the normal dose have been cited.

Doses which may not be fatal to all of the insects (sublethal doses) are actually more effective than massive applications seeking 100 percent effectiveness. There is much experimental evidence, covering a wide range of species, to prove that an insect cannot acquire resistance to an insecticide if successive generations are subjected to sublethal doses.

In one experiment, fruit flies were given sublethal doses of DDT for 50 generations without showing any increase in resistance to the insecticide. For effectiveness, a moderate dose with a number of survivors is preferable to a massive lethal dose in which few survive, perpetuating their resistance in succeeding generations.

Insect resistance does not occur due to mutations caused by insecticides. Mutations are sudden, permanent changes that occur due to changes in the genetic material. Once a mutation has taken place (be it the color of the eye, structure of some body fluid, etc.) the change becomes a permanent part of the animal and is inherited according to the normal laws of inheritance.

Mutations, from the standpoint of the animal, are random. Evolution has occurred by natural selection of those mutations which were favorable to the animal, not by directed mutation. Generally, insecticides do not have any effect on the normal mutation rate at all. Thus an insect under pressure from an insecticide is not able to mutate to acquire resistance.

Resistance arises not from adaptations caused by exposure to insecticides but from mechanisms that are already in existence. This may seem rather strange, but the explanation is not difficult to understand.

In any population the susceptibility to a poison varies considerably from individual to individual. Although most are killed by a given dose, some individuals are killed by half of this dose and some are not killed by twice the dose that is fatal to most of their fellows.

A small fraction of insects has tremendous resistance to insecticides. This phenomenon of increased resistance to insecticides occurs only when a large proportion of the population is killed in a given area, so that selection favors any genetic characteristics which enable the surviving insect to tolerate larger doses. This property of resistance is, therefore, inherited and has been shown to obey the usual laws of inheritance.

A laboratory experiment will demonstrate this. A large population of flies is given a dose of DDT that kills 98 percent of the flies. The survivors are allowed to breed and in a few days the population has reached the level of the beginning of the experiment.

The same dose is given; again most of the flies die although it is now a somewhat smaller percentage; again the flies are allowed to breed and so on. Before long this dose of DDT will be killing only half of the flies.

In the wild, conditions are somewhat different. In the first case there is interbreeding with populations not affected by the insecticide and secondly the insecticide is never given in a uniform dose throughout the population. These factors will slow down the pace of insecticide resistance as compared to the laboratory experiment.

But, despite these factors, high insect resistance is found in the wild. In a report on the housefly in New Jersey, Dr. Elton J. Hansens, writing in the Journal of Economic Entomology, 1960, 53: 313 illustrated this. After studies in the wild under normal conditions, he concluded, "the outlook for fly control without recourse to sanitation and mechanical measures is not very bright. Chlorinated hydrocarbons (DDT, aldrin, etc.) are of virtually no value. Organophosphorus materials (parathion, malathion, etc.) are decreasing in usefulness and even space sprays are less effective than previously. Diazinon is still giving the best results in many locations and kills many flies even where resistance is present. It remains a question as to whether or not it will fail completely."

The usual answer to insect resistance has been larger doses and newer, and often more poisonous, chemicals. At the symposium on insect resistance, held by the Entomological Society of America, regret was expressed that despite all the expenditure on chemicals, virtually no basic research on resistance in agriculturally important pests has been made.

The futility of increasing doses has already been mentioned but it should also be stated that changes in the insecticide used also has little value. Often the mechanism by which the insect is able to detoxify insecticide No. 1 also works on insecticide No. 2. Even if it does not, the insects soon build up resistance to this second insecticide although the rate of onset of resistance varies considerably from insecticide to insecticide.

An example of this problem was presented by Dr. H. G. Johnston, head of research and development of the National Cotton Council of America. He described the rising costs of the increasing amounts and increasing variety of chemicals used to attempt to control the boll weevil and other cotton pests. He concluded that while pest control is essential the present situation demands a total reevaluation of the entire cotton pest control program.

It is difficult to evaluate this overall rise in insect resistance because the increase in resistance may be slight or may be massive. It may apply to a large or minute fraction of the population of the species.

The rise in resistance has been most carefully studied in the anopholene or malaria-carrying mosquitoes. Anyone interested in the details should read the World Health Organization Technical Reports 162 (1959), 205 (1960), and 243 (1961).

Our graph (p. 34) shows the increase in the number of mosquito species in which insecticide resistance has been found. The period 1950–57 represents resistance to DDT; the sharp rise thereafter is due to resistance to dieldrin. Resistance occurs more readily to dieldrin than to DDT. Some species are resistant to both insecticides but a few species have not developed resistance despite heavy pressure.

The widening geographic range of resistance is shown in the other graph. In this the number of countries in which dieldrin resistance in mosquitoes is found is plotted against time. This resistance now covers areas inhabited by some 25 million persons.

However, something of the other side of the malaria story should be told. Some 1,300 million people live in areas which are or were affected by malaria. The present program, which could not have been carried out without insecticides, has eliminated malaria from areas inhabited by 280 million people. Work is being carried out in areas containing 700 million people, and preliminary studies on areas inhabited by 138 million.

The total number of insect species in which resistance has been found is rising so rapidly that reviews are out of date by the time of publication. By 1961 the total number of resistant species was at least 150. In the bulk of these, resistance had been found since 1956.

Besides the malaria-carrying mosquitoes, some 30 other species of public health importance have acquired resistance. The resistance of the housefly to chlorinated hydrocarbons occurs in virtually every country of the world. DDT resistance of body lice has been found in parts of Africa, Asia, America, and Europe.

On the agricultural side, resistance has been reported in 16 species of insects which attack vegetables, including the cabbage worm, cabbage looper, and potato wireworm. Twelve species that attack cotton have acquired resistance, although the bulk of the damage to this crop is cause by a single species, the boll weevil.

In the case of this insect, resistance to chlorinated hydrocarbon has been found in 7 out of 11 cotton-growing States. At present, phosphorus insecticides are reasonably effective, but in view of the sudden onset of massive resistance of the boll weevil to DDT and dieldrin in 1956 and 1957 the situation is being closely watched.

One may ask why higher animals, including birds, do not acquire resistance. The answer is that they may, in time. Resistance is dependent on breeding rate so that longer periods of time are required for resistance to occur.

Flies can breed back to their normal population in a few days, so that a loss of 90 percent of the population is not a serious matter. A similar loss of bluebirds might take years to make up and in the case of still slower breeding species, such as eagles, it might result in extermination.

Thus, because of the mechanism by which insects acquire resistance, insecticides are, in the long run, least effective against those species we wish to destroy and most "effective" against those creatures we wish to keep.

Having considered these limitations of insecticides, let me say that I realize the importance of chemical treatment of crops. It is part of our farming methods and obviously no farmer is going to stand aside and watch a pest eat his crops. At the moment other means, such as biological controls, are just not effective enough to deal with the problem. An understanding of the problem of insect resistance can help promote the wise use of insecticides and will give maximum benefit to the farmer and do minimum damage to the general wildlife of an area.

The most effective amount of insecticide is a dosage that will kill 80 to 90 percent of the insect population. This will reduce to a great degree the loss of crops due to the pest insect. Attempts to improve on this percentage will be short lived; insect resistance will soon occur and control by means of this insecticide will soon become impossible.

Insect resistance rarely becomes a serious problem if the attacked population can freely interbreed with unsprayed insects. Thus, no attempt should be made to spray areas where the pest species is not actively harming the crops. It may sound like a good idea but the reverse is the case.

The pest species will breed back anyway, and it is much better to crossbreed with insects that have not been subjected to the insecticide than for them to interbreed with each other. Interbreeding develops resistance to a much greater extent.

For the long-term benefit of the agriculturalist, the following should be avoided: First, frequent spraying of any area. Second, spraying where insect damage is low.

The fact that extensive spraying programs often harm agricultural interests as well as others should be emphasized by conservationists again and again.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, another era of the fighting MacArthurs ended Sunday with the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In less than 5 months, our Nation is again plunged into deep mourning over the death of an outstanding citizen.

Born at an Army post on the American frontier on January 26, 1880, MacArthur followed in the footsteps of his forefathers who, as early as the 14th century, were noted warriors then serving under Robert the Bruce for the independence of Scotland.

His destiny was guided by a deep sense of devotion to duty, honor, and country. The importance he placed on these words is related in an address he made at the U.S. Military Academy 2 years ago.

Those three hallowed words—

He said—

reverently dictate what you want to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn.

Fifty-two of his eighty-four years were dedicated to the profession of arms and the art of war. His military career carried him through three major wars, and his ability won high praise from leaders throughout the world. The British Chiefs of Staff sent the following message to MacArthur shortly after the successful landing of troops at Inchon, Korea:

We believe that the brilliant conception and masterly execution of the Inchon counterstrike which you planned and launched whilst holding the enemy at bay will rank among the finest strategic achievements in military history.

He was very much aware of changing times and changing situations.

The old methods and solutions no longer suffice—

He told the American Legion gathered in Los Angeles in 1955—

We must have new thoughts, new ideas, new concepts, just as did our venerated forefathers when they faced a new world.

In an address at the U.S. Military Academy before the 1962 graduating class, he continued this theme:

You now face a new world, a world of change. The thrust into outer space of the satellite spheres and missiles marks a beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a more abrupt or staggering evolution.

We deal now not with things of this world alone, but with the illimitable distances and yet unfathomed mysteries of the universe. We speak in strange terms of harnessing the cosmic energy, or making winds and tides work for us * * * of the primary target in war, no longer limited to the armed forces of an enemy, but, instead, to include his civil population; of ultimate conflicts between a united human race and the sinister forces of some other planetary galaxy, such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting of all times.

General MacArthur is no longer amongst our ranks. As if writing his epitaph, he also told the graduating cadets at West Point:

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tints. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of thing that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen then, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and re-echoes: duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river, my last conscious thoughts will be of the corps, and the corps, and the corps. I bid you farewell.

With bowed heads, our Nation bids Gen. Douglas MacArthur a very sad farewell.

Congressman John D. Dingell Asks Conservationists, "Why Do You Fight Among Yourselves?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], is the author of a very fine article in the April–May edition of the magazine, National Wildlife. A great conservationist himself, the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, points up the unhappy results when conservationists, faced with united opposition from the outside, are unable to agree among themselves on matters of basic importance to the cause of conservation. The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman DINGELL, has made a searching analysis and I am happy to submit his article for the record:

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN D. DINGELL ASKS, "WHY DO YOU FIGHT AMONG YOURSELVES?"

"THE LION AND THE THREE BULLS

"(Aesop's Fables)

"Three bulls were grazing in a meadow, and were watched by a lion, who longed to capture and devour them, but who felt that he was no match for the three so long as

they kept together. So he began by false whispers and malicious hints to foment jealousies and distrust among them. This stratagem succeeded so well that ere long the bulls grew cold and unfriendly, and finally avoided each other and fed each one by himself apart. No sooner did the lion see this than he fell upon them one by one and killed them in turn.

"Moral: The quarrels of friends are the opportunities of foes."

Conservationists who fight among themselves may win battles—but they will lose the war.

This is my considered judgment as an interested citizen and a Member of the Congress who constantly deals with conservation legislation. Your opponents like nothing better than to see conservationists bloody each others' noses.

Why do you fight among yourselves? Why do you waste your strength on internal struggles?

Let's face it. People who belong to conservation groups—and you are one of them—are far outnumbered by the million who couldn't care less. In spite of these odds, you can be heard, and you can get things done. But if you aren't all on the same side of major issues, and aren't well-enough organized to drive your point home, you don't stand a chance. Railroad spikes aren't driven with tack hammers.

And by you, I mean you both as an individual and as a member of your organization.

Members of the Congress usually know what people think. We hear constantly from folks back home about every subject under the sun. Sometimes, general opinion jells and things happen. However, when opinions are badly splintered, nothing happens—nothing good, at least.

A good example of a bad job by well-meaning conservationists is the duck story. The great flights of ducks and geese which thrilled us in spring and fall are dwindling. The situation has been critical now for several years. Why? The wetlands needed by these magnicent birds were—and are—going. And where have the conservationists been? Birdwatchers have been fighting hunters. Hunters have been fighting each other—and game commissions about bag limits and lengths of open seasons.

Hunters, birders, game biologists, sporting goods manufacturers, outdoor writers—all rallied to "save the ducks." But, while they argued among themselves on what to save them for, the battle was lost—lost to the real villains: Federal subsidies, agricultural drainage experts, real estate developers, water polluters, and so forth.

By the time conservationists began working together to preserve some of that disappearing habitat, it was too late. Poor flights made poor hunting. Poor hunting resulted in poor duck stamp sales. Funds for habitat preservation, earmarked from duck stamp sales income, didn't materialize. Congress authorized a loan of $105 million against future stamp sales, but has actually appropriated only $17 million of it. And the draining, filling, and pollution still goes on and on.

There is too much to be done for conservationists who believe in preservation and wise use of our natural resources to bicker among themselves. Our Pacific salmon are dwindling, our wilderness disappearing. Everything from trout streams to redwoods are being sacrificed to road builders. Litter and billboards clutter our highways and byways. Water pollution is reaching new, and dangerous, levels. There are a dozen major issues, and a hundred small (but no less important) ones before us.

To lick them, we must quit pulling at cross purposes. Soil conservationists want to reclaim prairie wetlands; duck hunters want to save them. Tree lovers spray poisons to protect their trees * * * and in so doing kill birds. Congress is not above reproach; we authorize expenditures for conservation, but sometimes fail to appropriate the money.

We'll lose our outdoor heritage for sure, unless that interested minority learn to pull together—and in the right direction.

It works. Perhaps the first good example of group conservation action overcoming legislative inertia was the American Buffalo Society's successful fight to save the vanishing bison. It established the refuges and herds that saved the species from extinction. Other historic successes include the Audubon Society's work to save the egrets and eagles. Several State groups have won their fights to create nonpolitical conservation agencies.

Conservation groups have united to purchase lands to protect the Key deer, prairie chickens, waterfowl and other endangered wildlife. They have bought lands for parks, forests and unique ecological areas. Women's organizations, health associations, and civic groups have been invited to join in supporting bond issues to clean up polluted waters.

Coordination is the key. Your own National Wildlife Federation makes outstanding efforts, sponsoring national conferences and other forums.

The antilitter campaign is a fine example of successful coordination between conservationists, civic groups, and the packaging industry.

Should not this approach be equally successful in wilderness preservation? In water pollution control? In providing waterfowl habitat?

One of the most intriguing case histories of conservation frustration is the attempt to establish a national wilderness preservation program. For at least 7 years now, this proposal has undergone a series of refinements. Since these bills apply only to lands already owned by the Federal Government, in some classification of wilderness, cost was not a factor. Yet, not until conservation and resource groups got together did the wilderness bill move.

It was passed by the Senate in the 87th and 88th Congresses. But continued opposition from some commercial interests, using highly skilled professionals, has thus far kept the House from voting on it. Are conservationists still united? Your opponents are

No Government official likes to be "pressured." But coordinated public opinion can help stop mining on a wildlife sanctuary, the construction of roads through wilderness, or dams on a stream. Organization is the key.

Many conservation battles are fought in the legislative halls, and nowhere is the united front more important.

If you have a pet project, get a responsible organization to draft a proposal, backed up with facts. Get a sponsor in your State legislature or in Congress who is interested enough to see it through. When the bill has been introduced and referred to a committee, let your legislator know that you want action.

I know that conservationists essentially are individualists. They resist organization and discipline. They argue among themselves about everything from bass lures to methods of controlling the use of pesticides. But when the chips are down, it's time to put aside minor differences and unite on the major issues—or nothing will get done.

The late President Kennedy observed: "United there is little we cannot do; divided, there is little we can do." Let this be your guiding principle.

(A former park ranger, Mr. DINGELL (Michigan) is one of the House of Representatives outstanding conservationists.)

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution urging that the United States, through its delegation at the United Nations, take forthright steps in securing a world condemnation of anti-Semitism.

This resolution specifies that this universal ban must be in treaty form, and that all signatory states must pledge themselves to eradicate anti-Semitism within their territories and establish mutual enforcement measures.

I believe such an achievement will contribute much toward our goal of ending the overt and covert manifestations of anti-Semitism which still fester in the world.

I should like to congratulate the distinguished participants of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which met earlier this week here in Washington. This meeting has served us all in drawing attention to the flagrant abuses prevailing in the Soviet Union.

The able and distinguished Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, spoke to the gathering only yesterday, and his timely comments on the situation are crucially relevant.

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech of Senator JAVITS, given at the Hotel Willard in Washington on April 6, be inserted at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

SILENT DIPLOMACY WILL NOT SAVE SOVIET JEWS

(By Senator JACOB JAVITS)

Events over the Passover holiday demonstrate the relentless character of the Soviet Union's campaign of repression against the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R. But they also show that the regime in the U.S.S.R. is not impervious to the protests of the world on this issue. Both are vitally important conclusions.

That anti-Jewish repression continues was shown when on the eve of the Passover holiday the Kremlin went out of its way to prevent Jews from obtaining matzoth in time by impounding 2,000, 10-pound packages of matzoth paid for and sent with full import clearances prepaid by Americans in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles to relatives and friends in the Soviet Union.

In response to representations by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow made at my request, the Soviets explained that packages from individuals to individuals were delivered and only those sent by organizations were returned; it was also claimed that matzoth were available in the U.S.S.R. to all who wanted them. But this explanation was contradicted by reports in the Soviet press itself before the beginning of the Passover festival on March 27 on the nondelivery of the parcels and the advice of Moscow's chief rabbi allowing Jews to use peas and beans in place of matzoth.

It is hard to believe that in this decade, a major world power like the Soviet Union with its nuclear capability and space exploration achievements would stoop to this kind of

petty but cruel and repressive official harrassment of a helpless minority. Against such calculated disrespect for elementary human rights as well as for world opinion, there must be general and universal protest.

The fact that the Soviet regime listens was shown when the Soviet official news agency Tass reported a partial recantation of the scandalous and libelous anti-Semitic book published in Kiev under the title "Judaism Without Embellishment." The Kremlin's leaders should be made aware that a great wave of indignation from all parts of the world is rising up over the Soviet Union's continued campaign of anti-Jewish repression.

All of us must here resolve that we will not remain silent or permit the world to remain silent while the scope and intensity of Soviet actions against the Jewish minority grows and becomes more deliberate.

In the name of humanity not only our voices but the voices of free men and women everywhere as well must be raised above the Iron Curtain in protest.

This conference must demand that the Soviet Union halt these oppressive acts forthwith and restore to Jews the elementary human rights to practice their religion, to be free of discrimination and to rejoin their families in other lands.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is very sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism. The Communists pride themselves on the law which makes anti-Semitism a criminal offense. Indeed, they tried to deny its existence when the poet Yevtushenko published his famous poem "Babi Yar" as a protest against Russian anti-Semitism. But when 89 out of 163 sentenced to death by Soviet courts between July 1961 and October 1963 for alleged economic crimes—almost 60 percent—are publicly reported to be Jews and their names are held up for ridicule and contempt in the official Soviet press; when the Soviet regime closes down synagogues and Jewish cemeteries, crushes every vestige of Jewish culture and deports Jews to Kazakhstan while simultaneously telling the outside world that Jews enjoy religious freedom; and when there is distributed an officially published edition of 12,000 copies of the blatantly anti-Semitic book by Trofim Kichko, entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment," under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences—then it is time to rip off the false mask from the Soviet claim that there is no "Jewish question" under communism and to expose the hypocrisy behind official denials of anti-Jewish actions. The Kremlin would like us to believe that anti-Jewish repressive acts are cold war lies spread by capitalists and imperialists, but the facts give this explanation the lie.

I have asked the Soviet authorities to explain why there is such a sharp difference between the way Jews are described in Soviet publications for external distribution and the way they are vilified and made objects of suspicion in books and periodicals distributed inside the U.S.S.R. The crude racist hatemongering of the Kichko book has brought forth protests even from Communists themselves in France, Italy, and the United States who have condemned its Hitlerite propaganda and called for its suppression.

In the Soviet press for the first time, the Jewish nationality of the accused in the show trials is openly flaunted. This was not done even under Stalin with his "Doctors' Plot" when Jews were identified only through euphemisms like cosmopolitans, and the shock and significance of this departure from Communist ideological practice has not been lost on Jews. Add to all this the fact that propaganda against Israel has been stepped up, and you can readily appreciate the mounting fears of Jews the world over for the safety of our coreligionists in the U.S.S.R.

Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders from time to time have tried to insist that Soviet treatment of religious minorities is an internal matter and that protests constitute interference in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs. Over a century ago, the U.S. Government provided an answer to this kind of rebuttal, and formulated a policy that remains valid to this day.

Since 1840, the United States, while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state, nevertheless has protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments and justified these protests in the name of our moral duty toward humanity. The United States has done so alone and also in concert with other nations. Our country has never been silent in the face of persecution.

We have lodged these protests and registered our disapproval in a variety of ways, among them, through direct communication to the governments concerned, by recalling the U.S. diplomatic representative for consultation, by direct references in the President's annual message to the Congress, by the termination of a commercial treaty, and by the use of indirect acts such as joining in multilateral acts of disapproval as a means of protest.

The list of such protests on behalf of Jews is long and honorable. In 1840 the United States condemned the persecution of Jews in Damascus.

In 1870 we urged the Ottoman government to halt the killing of Jews in Rumania.

In 1877 the United States granted protection to Russian Jews settled in or near Jerusalem, and emphasized that "the sympathy of the United States for all oppressed peoples in foreign countries has been freely manifested in all cases where it could be done in accordance with the spirit of international courtesy and diplomatic usage."

In the next two decades the United States protested no fewer than nine times against the Czarist Russian Government's repressive acts and persecution of Jews. These protests, backed by the American people and by resolutions of the Congress culminated in 1911 when President Taft terminated the treaty of commerce with Russia which had been in effect since 1832. President Taft took this action over the advice of the State Department which warned that abrogation of the treaty would have serious effects on the Nation's commercial relations with the Russian Empire in addition to larger political considerations.

The United States has protested action gainst Jews by Rumania, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Italy, and Poland. The record of U.S. protests to the Nazi government should still be fresh in our minds. Secretary Cordell Hull recorded in his memoirs that "I found myself calling in the German Ambassador time after time to protest against violations of the rights of our citizens, against persecution of the Jews, and against mistreatment of Americans by Nazi bullies."

No policy is more firmly fixed in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs than this moral imperative to come to the aid of oppressed peoples. American public opinion must be roused to the danger that this Soviet campaign presents not only to Jews—though they are the first victims—but to all religious minorities in the U.S.S.R. Moscow has every reason to be concerned over the bad name that its anti-Jewish policy is creating for it in the world, and our protest must be intensified in every way possible. Only then will we be able to convince the Kremlin that the price it must pay for its anti-Jewish policy is too high and too costly in terms of its international image.

This is no time for counsels of caution and fear—or of silence—on the part of American Jewry. Each great wave of indignation will serve to ultimately alleviate, and will help prevent aggravation of the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Each protest by individuals, by organizations, and by the free nations of the world will serve to make the Kremlin realize how sterile and harmful is its anti-Jewish policy.

Private Power Gets Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again we are seeing an example of the Machiavellian activities of the private power combines. Consistent with their position of nearly one-half a century, an important element of the so-called investor-owned utilities, better known as the IOU's, the Idaho Power Co. is doing everything it can to stir up uninformed opposition to the extension of the Bonneville Power Administration into southwestern Idaho and southeastern Oregon.

The IOU's are very fond of pointing to themselves as great examples of free enterprise. Walter Wells, of the Oregon State group, writing in the Oregon Grange Bulletin of April 6, makes an excellent statement which points out the real position of private power companies in comparison to true free enterprise. Mr. Well's article is included at this point:

PRIVATE POWER GETS SUBSIDY—COMPETITION LACK, HIGH RATES PROTECT MONOPOLIES IN STATE

(By Walter Wells)

Private power companies spend millions of dollars of the ratepayers' money advertising in local papers and national magazines to convince the reading public that they have a free enterprise, business managed, taxpaying operation.

Actually they have the special privilege of an exclusive franchise and monopoly granted by the city and State and have no competition at all in most areas they serve.

This, in effect, is a very valuable subsidy they enjoy, because the State law allows them to set rates high enough to earn 5 percent on their investment and almost all money they have ever put into the system is still on their books for ratemaking, even the money spent for lines and equipment now obsolete and no longer in use.

DEBTS STAY ON BOOKS

Private power companies almost never reduce their indebtedness and their electric consumers will always be paying rates based on this high value, yet they will never have any measure of control and will always have to buy from an exclusive monopoly.

Is this free enterprise? No.

Public power systems require and have the best business management, because they have lower rates, and out of their income they pay interest on their investments, pay Bonneville or some other source for their electric energy.

They hire their employees from the same unions as does the private power company and pay the same wages.

Each year they pay on their bonded indebtedness, and as the debt is paid off, lower rates for electricity will follow since public power systems are in business not to make a profit but to serve their electric users at the lowest possible rates.

PEOPLE OWN PUBLIC UTILITY DEPARTMENTS

Public power co-ops and public utility departments are owned by the members and supervised by a manager and a board of directors elected by the people. In this way the people have full control over their systems. Public utility departments pay taxes the same as private power companies do.

Some co-ops, because of the State law under which they work, do pay less taxes, yet the saving in rates paid by the consumers many times over offset this difference. Anyway, taxes paid by private or public power systems is money taken from the rate payers' pockets and is not new money brought into the area.

All public power systems should advertise more to let the public know the great benefit derived where the people own the systems serving themselves.

The following is reprinted from the Northwest Public Power bulletin.

PEOPLE SERVING THEMSELVES

People create public and cooperative electric systems to provide themselves with the best possible electric service at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound business principles.

Whether the outward form of the utility be that of a cooperative, public utility departments, city, crown corporation, or irrigation district, the function of serving themselves with electricity remains the universal objective of the consumer-owners. These electric systems truly are by, of, and for the people.

Inscribed above the doorway of each consumer-owned utility office might be the central, vital, and unifying motto, "People Serving Themselves."

The common ideal recently has been defined in terms of five functions or purposes of the consumer system:

1. Provide the privileges of ownership.
2. Provide the benefits of nonprofit operation.
3. Provide adequate, dependable, low-cost power.
4. Provide advice on effective use of electricity.
5. Provide information concerning the consumer-owned electric system and its operation.

FIVE-STAR SERVICE PROGRAM

REA Administrator Norman Clapp calls this a five-star member service program for consideration by each REA borrower system, but it applies equally well to every utility owned by the people.

He urges attention to all five points in the interest of organizational strength because support can be retained only by constant attention to what consumer owners need and want from their own, locally controlled electric organization.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON expressed a similar need in his keynote address to the 23d Annual Convention of the Northwest Public Power Association, when he urged utility leaders to return to the soil, to the grassroots, to maintain the common touch, and revitalize public understanding about consumer-owned electric systems.

Call it public relations, or community service, these two great leaders plead for eyeball to eyeball contact.

SHOULD BE KNOWN, UNDERSTOOD

Low electric rates, good wages, and all the community services need to be known and understood by the people.

The test of leadership lies in remaining close to the people, seeking and fulfilling the aspirations of the people. Dedicated leaders are precious assets of the Pacific Northwest community.

As a flourishing tribute to such pioneering, public understanding, and leadership, the region's public and cooperative electric systems now serve 3,900,000 people, own and operate $2.5 billion of electric facilities, provide some of the lowest cost power in the world, and help to raise the well-being and standard of living in their communities—and, since 1950, have reduced electric rates $30 million.

The sound, steady growth of these systems epitomizes "People Serving Themselves."

A New Chapel for McNeil Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice, especially its Bureau of Prisons, is to be highly commended for its recognition of the role that religion plays in the rehabilitation of inmates of penal institutions. I have had occasion to visit the U.S. Penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash., and have witnessed the excellent work done there in connection with its religious worship and self-improvement programs. Currently, a chapel is being constructed at the institution. The project is being hailed statewide in Washington State. Many organizations worked in behalf of the chapel, and they are entitled to great credit. However, the Justice Department is entitled to a large share of that credit for its fine cooperation and attitude in the matter. Had it not been for the Department's recognition of the need and worthwhileness of the chapel, it might not have been built.

I include the following article:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Mar. 29, 1964]

A NEW CHAPEL FOR MCNEIL ISLAND

(By Chapin D. Foster, chairman, McNeil Island Penitentiary Chapel Association)

To those inclined to think of a new chapel being built at the U.S. penitentiary on McNeil Island as "just another building" and possibly not too necessary, read the statement of Erle Stanley Gardner, noted detective story author, and others on the place of a chapel in a prison program.

"I have known many inmates and many prisons," writes Gardner. "I have never known of anything which had the constructive value of a good chapel conducted by sincere men. These prison chaplains help men to find themselves and, in many more instances than the public realizes, bring about a truly substantial rehabilitation."

Gardner knows prisons in general, including McNeil, as he was the principal speaker at the annual Self-Improvement Group meeting there 2 years ago.

This article brings together opinions of men inside and outside the McNeil prison, men who are in a position to know what they are talking about. One said:

"A chapel should be provided that will command the respect of the prisoners, where in a quiet hour each can set free his trapped thoughts to soar to new heights as he prepares himself for eventual freedom."

These words came from Kenyon J. Scudder, author of "Prisoners Are People," after a visit to McNeil Island where a new chapel is more than 50 percent completed.

A similar thought was expressed by James V. Bennett, director of the Bureau of Prisons, who has written:

"Religion is indispensable in the correction and reclamation of the individual."

The story behind the new McNeil Chapel is one of persons who have taken seriously the problem of men living behind bars who must prepare themselves for eventual freedom, who must reclaim themselves as individuals.

An important organization at the McNeil penitentiary is the Self Improvement Group, organized by prisoners 7 years ago to help them prepare themselves for return to civilian life. In the intervening years, more than 3,000 business and professional men in the Puget Sound area have met with this group and discussed problems they will face on return to civilian life. Discussion subjects are selected by a group committee.

While the importance of vocational rehabilitation has been recognized—and excellent work is being done on the island in this field—many of the visitors saw another need. Moral rehabilitation also is important and it was felt that chaplains should have as adequate facilities as are found in other departments.

The McNeil Island Penitentiary Association was organized with U.S. District Judge George H. Boldt as honorary chairman. The group included an executive committee of 21, a steering committee of 6, and 57 sponsors. While most of these men are from Washington, a number of other States are represented.

Cooperation was accorded the project by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON and Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON. Men who had attended group meetings were asked to give reasons for believing a chapel was needed, and these letters were forwarded to Washington, D.C. These men had visited the prison, had talked with prisoners and their statements impressed members of the Senate Appropriations Committee with their sincerity and conviction.

The result was an appropriation of $100,000. The chapel will be completed this year, with prisoners doing much of the work.

Senator MAGNUSON has written something important to those who feel that moral rehabilitation should place much higher on the rehabilitation program: He wrote: "As you know, McNeil Island literally 'broke the ice' as far as obtaining new chapels for other Federal institutions. Strange that with accent in recent years on other rehabilitation steps, room for separate worship should have lagged so badly."

Congressman TOLLEFSON began the movement in Congress by getting the item included in the Department of Justice budget. He wrote: "I share your view that moral rehabilitation is just as important as vocational rehabilitation if not more so."

Director Bennett says: "The key to a man's ultimate success as husband, father, and employee will be measured by the extent to which he changes his attitude toward social and moral responsibilities. The chapel will provide a place where men come face to face with the great truths of life and gain spiritual nourishment and regeneration."

Much closer to the prison is Warden Paul J. Madigan. He observed that for inmates showing no interest in religious services there are hundreds who deeply feel the need to partake of a spiritual way of life.

"I am sure the chapel will add a certain dignity and beauty to our institution," he wrote. "Its presence will announce that we make a sincere effort to carry out our duties, according to the demands of God and free society."

From a different angle came a statement from a man forced frequently to send men to "the island"—Judge Boldt. He said: "Any community is enriched by inspirational places of religious services and penal institutions are no exception. No other method of rehabilitation is more effective. It would be difficult to select an improvement at McNeil that would match in importance a beautiful place of worship."

Not many architects have an opportunity to design a prison chapel. Moritz Kundig of Spokane won the chapel competition. He said the new chapel would have character and stature and prove a useful tool in the hands of chaplains. Certainly no more impressive site could have been selected.

The writer has visited McNeil Island 15 to 20 times in the past 7 years, meeting with the Self Improvement Groups and Yokefellow Club. I am convinced that moral rehabilitation ranks first in that phase of prison life, that there is no single building more needed in a prison that an inspiring chapel, and that a chapel is actually self-liquidating.

From 20 years as Catholic chaplain at McNeil, a group sponsor, Rev. Francis J. Prange, S.J., is in a position to speak with authority. He said that, to many, rehabilitation means conditioning a man so he will be afraid to commit another crime, to others any type of rehabilitation is a waste of money, but he takes a very different view.

"Prisons are loaded with men of means, skills, education, and high social status, but who have none of the factors of so-called successful living," he wrote. "They need a spiritual awakening, a realization that man is a special creation of God with a destiny no society can give, change or take away. Needed is a chapel wherein alone contact is made with God, the most important relationship of a prison inmate with the world around him."

From Bob, a prisoner, came a word from the "inside." He said: "Response to the chapel has been something different. Support has been unanimous, which is something hard to come by in prison."

Another opinion was offered by a prisoner, Lex, who thinks every penal institution should have a place of worship, along with places of entertainment and physical contests.

Jack, another prisoner, calls the chapel an "armory of moral and spiritual rearmament," a place where men can arm themselves with weapons needful in working toward new lives.

"A chapel is the soul of the institution from which spiritual rehabilitation proceeds," wrote Rabbi Richard Rosenthal, Jewish chaplain. He said that wherever men have lived, they have erected houses of worship. He sees a special need for a place of worship in a prison. He wondered why the public has been so slow in recognizing this need.

Another man from the mainland and a frequent improvement-group guest is Waldo Carlson, manager of the Auburn Chamber of Commerce.

"From my contacts, I gather that many men out there never have given attention to spiritual aspects of life," he wrote. "In prison they find that guidance of a Greater Being is needed. The chapel will be the most potent factor in rehabilitation a prison can provide."

Another man to whom the new chapel means much is the new Protestant chaplain, the Reverend John H. Mates.

"The building of a chapel is the best investment on McNeil because there is no way to measure its positive effect," Chaplain Mates wrote. "Few people realize the staggering amount that goes to support prison 'repeaters'."

Another active visitor from the mainland is Rev. Robert G. Weinman of the Luther Memorial Church in Tacoma. He said the chapel will provide a place where men needing light can find it.

Chuck is an alumnus of the prison who feels a chapel is much more than just another prison building. He said that if just one man a year changes his thinking because of the chapel, it will be worth while.

No. 26462 lives in a 10-man cell, which isn't the best place to live, and where it is anything but easy to follow religious inclinations.

"Some years from now," he wrote, "26462 will be on his knees again in the quiet just before Mass. With him will be his wife, a good woman, and a little wide-eyed boy. Back at McNeil, the dope-pusher, check artist, or automobile thief will have returned to their cells. No. 26462 will not have the things these men will talk about but he will have peace in a community."

"Whether we like it or not, our prisoners will return some day to the community from which they came," the author, Scudder, wrote. "And a chapel will help them return as better citizens. There is a definite place for voluntary religious worship in every prison, conducted by trained chaplains, skilled in family counseling and available to every man."

Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, with the death of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur the United States has suffered a great loss—a loss that is deeply felt by every Member of this Congress and our Government. The Akron Beacon Journal of April 6 carried an editorial that I believe expressed our views better than any words of mine might do.

That fine editorial follows:

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

He came from the long, gray line.

With him it was always: Duty, honor, country.

In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, Gen. Douglas MacArthur was a symbol of the enduring fortitude, the fierce pride, the invincible determination of the American fightingman.

He stood in the front rank of the great captains who, so often in our history, have held the Nation's destiny in their hands.

His was the profession of arms. He lived by the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory.

General MacArthur who died at 84 was possibly the most decorated soldier in American history, a hero of St. Mihiel, Bataan, Corregidor, New Guinea, Manila, Tokyo, and Inchon.

He held the Nation's highest decoration for valor, the Medal of Honor, as well as all the other American medals and many foreign ones. But he never wore any.

His dress was almost ostentatiously simple. In the twilight of his 52-year military career, he still wore that old, battered campaign hat with the gold braid, a khaki shirt open at the collar and used a cane as he walked, swinging it in time with his long strides.

MacArthur was a warrior but not a warmonger. "The soldier above all other people," he once said, "prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war. Always in our ears ring the omnious words of Plato, that wisest of all philosophers: 'Only the dead have seen the end of war.' "

General MacArthur was, plainly, an aristocrat. He had a flair for the dramatic and a trace of arrogance which, simply, were characteristics of a man who believed himself superior and saw no reason to hide it.

He believed it was for others to debate the controversial issues which divide men's minds. Yet in his lifetime he became a tower of controversy.

"The thing that has kept MacArthur always in the limelight of controversy," wrote Edwin A. Lahey at the close of World War II, "is perhaps best seen as a combination of military skill and personal vanity. He steps arrogantly to the plate, but he never strikes out, and this is always an irritation to critics."

The greatest of these controversies was the clash of wills between MacArthur and President Truman over American policy in the Korean war. The general rarely made any public reference to his firing by Truman. But a man privy to MacArthur's feelings said he was deeply hurt by it and felt that it case a stigma over his military record which will never be erased. "He will go to his grave with a deep sense of bitterness."

Still, there was a ring of vindication for the aging soldier in 1962 when Congress, 11 years after the firing, passed a resolution tendering him the thanks of the Nation for his distinguished military service.

Few men have touched more history in their lives than MacArthur. His brilliant military career spanned two World Wars and the development of modern warfare from the airplane to the hydrogen bomb.

During World War I in France, MacArthur personally led his men in some of the most severe fighting. When he returned home in 1919, he was a dashing figure, a military hero with a ramrod posture that in later years was to become one of his trademarks.

In World War II, from the dark days of the retreat from the Philippines to the Japanese surrender aboard the USS *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, MacArthur executed the bold strategy that swept the Japanese invader from the South Pacific.

His formula was simple—go where the Jap is and kill him. In his own words, he employed "massive strokes against only main strategic objectives."

With the surrender of Japan, MacArthur became Supreme Allied Commander for the Japanese occupation. His achievements were enormous. He gave the Japanese people the mechanics of democratic government and the tools with which to keep democracy going.

MacArthur was a master of the eloquent phrase. Only Winston Churchill in our time ranks as his equal. He was fond of themes of leadership or the state of the world, and the words rolled out sonorously in ciceronian rhythms, each clause marching by in highly polished cadence.

When he talked of the soldiers who fought with him, it sounded like this: "My estimate of the American man at arms was formed on the battlefields many years ago, and has never changed. I regard him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless.

"His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast."

Not long ago, General MacArthur returned to West Point where he had graduated at the head of his class in 1903. He was then 82, an old soldier fading away, and he had come to bid the corps of cadets farewell:

"The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were.

"Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday.

"I listened then, but with a thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

"In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield.

"But in the evening of my memory, I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and reechoes: Duty, honor, country."

Now he is gone.

We are left with his heritage, and we can only marvel at it, for we shall not see his likes again.

Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, Philippine National Hero and Famous Freedom Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the greatest fighters for the cause of freedom and independence recently died. I refer to that great national hero and former President of the Philippines, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo. Until February 9 of this year when he died he was probably the world's oldest living authentic independence fighter, and the greatest living hero of his country.

Emilio Aguinaldo lived from March 22, 1869 until February 9, 1964. Early in life he gained a reputation for ability, leadership, and personal magnetism, and led the Filipinos in their first rebellion against Spanish rule in 1896. His youth and early manhood had been influenced by the first great independence leader of his people—Dr. Jose Rizal, medical doctor, scientist, poet, essayist, novelist, and spiritual and moral leader of his enslaved brothers under Spanish rule. It has been said that Jose Rizal was the "pen," and Emilio Aguinaldo the "sword," which united the Malayan people in the Philippines to their ultimate fight to victory in gaining their national independence. When the United States refused him immediate recognition as President of the newly proclaimed republic, he went to war again, this time against the Americans. When finally captured, he took an oath of allegiance to the United States, believing that this was the quickest way to attain independence for his country. He was right in this surmise and through our help obtained complete national independence for his country. He was the type of freedom fighter that the Communist world never celebrated nor could call its own, for he relished not that particular brand of freedom.

Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo's love of country and freedom culminated in the overthrow of Spanish sovereignty and sounded the death knell of colonialism not only in the Philippines, but in other parts of the world as well. Shortly before his death, he ceded his home to the national government. The Philippine Legislature, in appreciation of Aguinaldo's contribution to its national sovereignty and independence changed its national holiday to June 12, the date on which he had proclaimed from a balcony in his home in Kawit, Cavite, his declaration of independence from Spain. This balcony is known today as "Independence Balcony."

When he died on February 9 of this year, freedom-loving people everywhere mourned his passing. His contribution to liberty, independence, and the principles of human dignity now belong to the ages. To many, he symbolized the storied noble knight on the white charger, who rode—not once, but twice—in response to his people's pleas for freedom and liberation from injustices.

It is fitting and proper that the Post Office Department issue a special commemorative postage stamp to honor this great Philippine patriot, and I ask my colleagues to join in support of such Government action. At a time when so much of the world is still under the shackles of slavery, colonial rule, or communism, it is invigorating to see a country which has been independent approximately only a half century, be so progressive, fertile, and capable of self-rule under democratic principles. Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo contributed a major share to the Philippines of today.

Judge W. T. McDonald Dedicates Confederate Memorial at Millican, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Robert Millican, one of Stephen F. Austin's original 300 colonists coming to Texas from South Carolina had a son Elliott from whose name the town of Millican derived their title. This small town is steeped in historical interest as it was an important shipping point for Texas and the Confederacy during the War Between the States.

On October 20, 1963, the Texas Civil War Commission and the Texas State Historical Survey Committee erected a historical memorial which was dedicated by Judge W. T. McDonald.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Judge McDonald's address which very aptly traces the history of this town and its founder:

SPEECH OF W. T. MCDONALD AT MILLICAN, TEX., OCTOBER 20, 1963

Certainly, it is fitting and proper that the citizens of Texas pay tribute to the veterans of the War Between the States on this hallowed ground this afternoon. I commend the Texas Civil War Commission and the Texas State Historical Survey Committee for the selection of Millican as the site of one of 29 historical memorials.

Millican is rich in history and properly has an important part in the history of Texas and of the Confederacy. The town derived its name from Elliott M. Millican, whose father was Robert Millican. Robert Millican was one of S. F. Austin's original 300 colonists, coming to Texas from South Carolina. Elliott M. Millican was given title to 2 sitios of land by the Mexican Government on March 26, 1831. A sitio (c tiO) is identical to a league, and it comprises 4,428.40 acres; so Mr. Millican was a large landowner, having 8,857 acres in these two sitios. Elliott M. Millican took an active and influential part in the development of first the Republic of Texas, then the State of Texas, and this particular area of the State. He served as a constable in Washington County, Tex., in 1839 (this county was formerly a part of Washington County); then, in 1841 he was sheriff of Navasota County. Brazos County was created in 1841, but it was not organized until 1843; the name was changed to Brazos County from Navasota County in 1842. Mr. Millican was the sheriff of Brazos County in 1843. In addition, he served as a Member of Congress from Brazos County in the 9th Congress of the Republic of Texas, and he later served as State Representative in the first, second, and third Texas Legislatures and as a member of the Senate of Texas in the fifth Texas Legislature.

We must look in retrospect at the history of Texas and review it so that we might properly appreciate the part that Texas played in the struggle that ensued 16 years after Texas' admission to the Union. General Houston and the people of Texas wanted a lasting peace with Mexico. Texas was quietly negotiating with England and France on the one hand and the United States on the other. Texas was a cotton growing, slave state or country at that time, and England needed our cotton supply for its mills. The anti-slavery North opposed the admission of Texas to the Union. The cotton-growing Southern States who had slavery clamored for our admission.

Texas early alined itself with the Confederacy. You will no doubt recall that the secessionist convention was held at Columbia, S.C., on December 20, 1860, and then by February 4, 1861, secession was declared in six States: South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida and on February 4, 1861, at Montgomery, Ala., a convention was held establishing a provisional constitution for the Confederate States of America. Texas actually held its secessionist convention January 28, 1861, but it was not ratified by the people until February 23, 1861; so Texas became the seventh State to secede from the Union. The movement for secession halted for a time until Fort Sumter was fired upon on April 12, 1861, and the war was on. Within less than 2 months thereafter these seven secessionist States were followed by Arkansas, Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

While not much of the war was fought on Texas soil, Texas contributed much to the Confederacy east of the Mississippi. One of the most notable of these Texas organizations was Hood's Texas Brigade and Terry's Texas Rangers. We did have the capture and recapture of Galveston, which was the largest city in Texas and the principal port of the State. Galveston was captured on October 4, 1862 while the Texas coast was blockaded but on January 1, 1863, it was recaptured by Confederate forces and remained in the hands of the Confederates until the end of the war.

Texas' first railroad had been built in 1853 from Harrisburg to the Brazos River, extending 20 miles by 1855. The second railroad became known as the Houston and Texas Central, the H. & T.C. The first permanent telegraph line had been completed between Galveston and Houston in 1860; so Millican no doubt had a telegraph line during the war. It was this second railroad that made Millican an important part of Texas. By 1860 this line had reached Millican. The outbreak of war made it impossible to extend the line further north; so Millican was the northern terminus of the H. & T.C. Millican was the largest town and city north of Houston and Galveston. Only Jefferson, far to the northeast, exceeded it in population. Millican was a flourishing town. Wagons and traders came here from 100 miles away on each side of the Brazos.

It was here that Sanger Brothers had their first store. It was logical and natural that loyal Texans flocked to the colors. It was here that Camp Speight stood. The camp was actually a mustering in and training center. It was named for a prominent citizen of Waco, Tex., Col. Joseph W. Speight. The troops from Waco marched down and ferried down the Brazos River to Camp Speight to join in the Confederate Forces, Company K, Speight's Regiment. It was here at Camp Speight that Richard Coke mustered in and became captain. From Millican they went by train to Houston and Galveston and thence by boat to New Orleans and up the Mississippi to join the trans-Mississippi campaign or else marched overland to Tyler and thence to Arkansas. (I desire to give credit to Henderson Shuffler, director of the Texana program of the University of Texas, and formerly director of publicity for Texas A. & M. for his assistance in supplying me with some data on Camp Speight.)

Colonel Speight later became General Speight and later led a regiment in Walker's Greyhounds. Baylor University is now situated upon land owned by the Speight family and Baylor faces upon Speight Street.

After the war the railroad moved north in 1866, and then in 1867 yellow fever struck Millican; so the population was thinned by migration and disease. The first Episcopal mission in Brazos County was organized here in August of 1866. Mr. George D. Haswell, the father of the late Tyler Haswell, was the only known Episcopalian. On December 10, 1867, the parish of St. Andrew was organized in Bryan. The county seat of Brazos County moved from Booneville to Bryan with the coming of the railroad.

It is hard for the successful majority of a people once divided into angry and warring parts, to do justice to the leaders and soldiers of the defeated minority and yet the southern side of the War Between the States is as much a part of the history of our United States, as is the northern side of it. Just as the eternal truth that "It is better to have loved and lost than not to have loved at all," so it may be said: "It is better to have fought and lost than not to have fought at all."

Long may this marker that we place here today endure as a memorial to our great predecessors, the true sons of the South. We can neither add to nor subtract from their fame, but this can be, and will be, a witness of the opinion of true men, that it is not success, nor failure, which measures the worth of men, but that brave endeavor, honest purpose persevered in them. Forgetfulness of self are the essentials which fill the measure of God's demand, and constitute the standard for true men's judgments. May such ever be our rule of final judgment of one another in this great Republic of ours, consecrated to one flag, one Government, one Constitution, and one civilization; now and forever.

Insuring the Elderly: Rising Costs, Political Woes Plague Health Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent hearings on the King-Anderson bill, I raised a number of questions with the Health Insurance Association of America as to the record of the private insurance companies in meeting the insurance needs of our older citizens. Most of the answers were either evasive or inadequate. My colleagues will be interested in an article from the Wall Street Journal of Monday, April 6, which is an excellent analysis of the problem I raised in committee. The article points out the basic inaccuracies of the statistics used by the private insurance firms to prove their effectiveness. I think it clearly shows that the private insurance companies have not, will not, and cannot meet the hospital insurance needs of our older citizens.

The article follows:

INSURING THE ELDERLY: PRIVATE HEALTH POLICIES FACE STEEP COST RISE, SCRUTINY OF CONGRESS—SOME RATES GO UP—INDUSTRY PARES ESTIMATE OF PEOPLE IN NEW GUARANTEED PLANS—MEDICARE FIGHT BEGINS AGAIN

(By Roger A. Simpson)

Health insurers are suffering some embarrassing financial and statistical pains with new medical care plans for the aged.

The industry, until recently, had pointed proudly to the fiscal soundness and widespread acceptance of a guaranteed type of health insurance issued to anyone age 65 or older who applied. But now they say such insurance is becoming increasingly unprofitable, and some companies have boosted rates sharply. At the same time, the insurance industry is paring previously publicized totals of those covered by the plans.

All this is causing discomfort among insurers at a time when they're trying to expand coverage of the aged. The companies are anxious to prove they can adequately protect those age 65 and over, and thus head off President Johnson's drive to enact "medicare," a plan for financing hospital bills of the aged through social security. The House Ways and Means Committee this week will take up the medicare bill and alternative proposals. Even if the administration's bill is stalled or defeated in Congress this year, it seems certain to be an election issue that will further throw a spotlight on the insurance industry.

Meanwhile, insurers worry over the impact of Senate hearings, slated late this month, that will probe how well commercial insurers are meeting the needs of the elderly. A subcommittee headed by Senator MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, will look into charges that the industry is overstating by 1 million its claim to cover more than 10 million of those over 65, or roughly 60 percent of the aged population.

GROWTH OF COVERAGE

For years, insurers have been quite selective about issuing health policies to elderly persons, mainly because frequent ailments of those over 65 make them a risky group. In the past decade, though, the industry asserts it has expanded coverage of the aged from 30 percent to the present 60 percent. Such figures, of course, include people with any kind of insurance, even minimum policies.

In the past 5 years or so, guaranteed insurance has become available to the elderly. Such insurance is issued to anyone who applies, without physical examination or other qualifications. Three large insurers, Continental Casualty Co. in Chicago, Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co., and Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. of San Francisco, have led the way with such guaranteed insurance. Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans began using mass enrollments to offer such insurance in 1962. And since 1961, a large number of insurance firms have been banding together in State pools to sell the guaranteed plans. The pools are operating in Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, Texas, and California and are forming in several other States.

Sellers of the guaranteed insurance for those 65 or older rely on heavily advertised mass enrollments during brief annual periods to make sure they get a good cross-section of risks signed up. While companies like Continental and Mutual of Omaha aim to make a profit from the insurance, the State pools generally hope merely to break even. Their purpose is avowedly political—to undercut the arguments of those who say only the Government can meet the health insurance needs of the elderly. The State pool plans try to cut administrative costs to the bone and rely on indirect subsidies, such as donated executive time, to keep premiums down.

JUGGLING FIGURES

The guaranteed plans for the elderly are involved in some recent figure-juggling. A year ago, top industry officials claimed that such policies covered more than 2 million persons, or about 20 percent of all health insurance for those 65 and over. But now, officials say, the figure is only about 1,525,000, up around 200,00 from a year ago. One big insurer explains that Senator MCNAMARA's attack on industry statistics caused the company to recheck its figures and it "may indeed have made an error." An official explains that previous estimates of those covered greatly underestimated the number who own more than one policy.

Estimates of profitability also turned out to be a bit rosy. In mid-1963, Continental Casualty said it was making a small profit on its guaranteed mass-enrollment policies. But Lee Farmer, vice president, says audits early this year showed the company lost money on the insurance last year. As a result, it boosted the combined monthly premium on its package of three policies to $25.50 from $21.

Other companies are making similar increases. Fireman's Fund last August lifted the monthly cost of its "Plus $10,000" plan, which covers major hospital expenses, to $15.75 from $11. Connecticut 65, the first State pool plan, last year raised rates 9 percent. Mutual of Omaha, which with Continental Casualty issues about 80 percent of all such guaranteed insurance, plans no rate increases, according to a spokesman. But he adds the company is taking a hard look at its operating figures in light of other companies' rate boosts.

The rate increases reflect generally rising medical and hospital costs, as well as the high claim rate by the elderly. The daily cost of hospital stays has climbed more than 7 percent a year in the past decade. Last year it averaged $39.33, about double the level in 1953, says the American Hospital Association. And people over 65 use three times as much hospital care as do younger people, Government officials assert.

Policies covering these costs vary widely, and there is no good way to compare them. But a person generally can buy two types of coverage—a basic hospital and doctor bill policy paying some portion of room and board for a fairly brief period, and a policy, usually called "major medical," that pays the high costs of long illnesses.

Typical are the policies that Western 65, a State pool, has begun selling in its initial mass enrollment in California. A basic policy that pays up to $20 a day for 31 days and up to $200 for extra hospital charges costs $11 a month. A major medical policy paying up to $5,000 a year, after a $500 deductible share is paid by the policyholder, and up to $10,000 during a lifetime, costs $14 a month. A third plan that combines hospital expense and major medical coverage costs $23 monthly.

The major medical policy has been a large factor in rising rates because policyholder claims have exceeded company calculations. Also, people sometimes buy two or more

policies from different companies and make duplicate claims for the same expenses.

Firemen's Fund had to raise premiums on its major medical, or "plus $10,000" policy, because "our incurred losses on that policy alone were 160 percent of premium income," says Kenneth T. King, vice president. About 70 percent of the 50,000 elderly persons insured by Firemen's Fund through mass enrollments have the policy. The company's loss margin was substantially less on its total mass enrollment policies.

Connecticut 65, while increasing its rates last year, also curtailed one benefit under its major medical policy. Previously, the plan paid $18 a day indefinitely for registered nursing care in the home. It now limits this benefit for its 26,500 policyholders to an annual amount ranging up to $1,000.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY

For a small number of the aged, major medical policies are "an investment rather than insurance," say some officials. State laws or the high cost of enforcement have allowed people to buy several policies and make claims under all of them. Such duplicated claims usually are made under major medical policies. An elderly Fireman's Fund policyholder spent 40 days in a California hospital, using a private room and other extras that ran his bill up to $70 a day. He put in claims under three separate policies, paid his bill and wound up with a $4,000 profit. Fireman's Fund says there are no provisions in its policy that would allow it to prosecute the policyholder to recover its money.

Such cost problems, and the higher premiums that result, can only complicate the insurance industry's political problem. The House Ways and Means Committee begins this week closed door consideration of the King-Anderson bill, which embodies the President's medicare plan. The committee has refused to okay a bill for the past 3 years. If it now does clear the bill for House action, it is likely to make substantial changes, probably curtailing some of the benefits and altering the financing details.

The committee also has before it a number of other health care proposals, including a plan to liberalize the Kerr-Mills Act. This act provides matching Federal funds for State welfare medical programs, designed to assist people age 65 and older who need special help in meeting the costs of medical care.

While the House committee ponders medicare, Senator McNamara's committee hearings are expected to scrutinize the State pools, the validity of industry statistics and various proposals to aid the commercial insurers in providing coverage, possibly as a supplement to a social security hosptal care program. The committee's liberal majority is expected to be looking for ammunition for administration forces in the King-Anderson bill debate.

MEDICARE PROS AND CONS

The King-Anderson bill would provide a choice of hospital benefits, ranging from 45 days at full cost to 180 days with a small amount paid by the patient. It also would pay benefits for nursing home care, home health care and outpatient diagnostic service. It would be financed by an increase in the social security tax rate of one-fourth of 1 percent for both workers and employers and an increase in the annual earnings subject to tax to $5,200 from the present $4,800.

Proponents of medicare claim that a large number of the elderly can't afford to pay about $200 a year on the average for private insurance coverage. They contend that the high cost of old-age illnesses should be paid off over a productive lifetime rather than in a few large payments during old age. And they say millions of the elderly have little or no private health insurance at all now.

Insurance companies and other opponents of medicare point out that the administration plan would cover those who can afford to pay their own bills, as well as those who can't. And they note it wouldn't cover most doctor bills, as do some health insurance policies. They assert that most of the elderly now have insurance or the means to pay their own costs of illness and that the proportion of the aged who are insured is growing fast.

Scouting's High Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, no group has done more for the building of a responsible and informed citizenry than the Boy Scouts of America. Currently including 4 million Scouts and 1½ million adult leaders, BSA performs an important and vital service. The March 1964 issue of the Elks magazine contains a fine tribute to scouting and under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SCOUTING'S HIGH STANDARDS

Last month the Boy Scouts of America began its 55th year of service to the Nation with an enrollment of more than 4 million boys in 137,000 Cub packs, Scout troops, and Explorer posts. This is a far cry from the 61,000 boys enrolled in the movement in 1910, when it was launched.

The growth of the Scout movement, its great success over more than a half century of tremendous change, is a tribute to the soundness of the idea and the ideals with which Scouting began in 1910. For, while Scouting has changed much, adapting to changed needs and new challenges, the same principles and ideals guide the organization today.

These principles and ideals establish standards of moral conduct to which every boy is expected to measure up and measure himself against. They also call for the mental and physical development of the boy to the level of his capacity.

To the everlasting credit of Scouting, let it be pointed out that it does these things without attempting to press any lad in a mold of conformity. On the contrary, Scouting accomplishes its good work by stimulating and stressing individual thinking, individual development, initiative, self-reliance, and self-discipline within a framework of moral standards and values, the proven worth of which is mankind's great heritage.

However sound a program, it would accomplish nothing without devoted people to make it effective. Behind today's 4 million Boy Scouts, or, more properly, leading them, are nearly a million and a half men and women. These are the den mothers, the scoutmasters, the councilmen, and all of the other busy people who somehow find the time and the energy to devote themselves to the rewarding task of turning American boys into American men of good character with strong bodies and a high sense of civic responsibility.

There is yet another important ingredient in scouting's success. It is the fact that Scouting is deeply rooted in the community through the sponsorship by local groups of every Scout pack, troop, and post. These local charter sponsors total some 90,000, and they include fraternal organizations, churches, service clubs, veterans' posts, volunteer fire departments, and many others.

Ranking high among them is the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, whose lodges are the sponsors of nearly 1,000 Boy Scout units, a ratio of nearly 50 percent in relation to the number of lodges. This is more than triple the number of Scout units sponsored by Elks lodges 15 years ago.

The Order of Elks has given such strong support to scouting because Elkdom believes in Scouting's standards and values and because scouting has demonstrated its ability to inculcate them in young minds and hearts to the great good of community, State, and Nation. We hope that that support not only will be continued but will vastly increase as more and more of our lodges grasp the opportunity to help develop American youth through the sponsorship of Boy Scout units.

The Wine Bubble Tax—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request of my constituent, Mr. J. James Kaufman, of the Almaden Vineyards, Calif., I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first in a two part series of letters written by Mr. Richard Calvert, Sr., to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon.

Mr. Calvert's letters reveal some interesting facts concerning the so-called wine bubble tax and I am sure they will be of interest to my colleagues:

CALVERT TO SECRETARY DILLON, ON "THE WINE BUBBLE TAX"—PART I

(By Richard Calvert, Sr.)

DEAR MR. DILLON: You may recall my several letters addressed to you and Director Dwight E. Avis, of our Alcoholic and Tobacco Tax Division, on the subject of this continuing exorbitant and unrealistic excise tax on all sparkling wines, in which, Mr. Charles Fournier, distinguished president of Gold Seal Vineyards, in Hammondsport, N.Y., also participated. This was during July and August of 1962.

Since then, and in view of the changing favorable atmosphere for further tax relief created largely by congressional passage of the administration income tax reduction bill, there has been a greater concentrated effort by both American and foreign producers of sparkling wines to once more bring the matter of needed tax relief on all sparkling wines to the attention of Congress. Needless to tell you, all of these sparkling wine producers fully realize the practical aspects of getting any suitable legislation passed for this purpose may well continue to be as remote in the future as they have been in the past, without first obtaining the endorsement necessary from the Treasury Department where all tax legislation originates.

They are cognizant of the fact that a favorable Treasury Department report has been in the past almost a must before the Ways and Means Committee would favorably consider reporting out a bill urging a suitable tax reduction. Up until now, your Department has steadily failed to submit such a report in any way favorable to this tax reduction or its slightest modification, which our wine industry has since more familiarly and jocularly referred to as the taxing of mere wine bubbles. For this, my dear Mr. Secretary, is, in essence, what the present incomprehensible Federal excise tax of $3.40 per

gallon amounts to as a tax having nothing whatever to do with the actual alcoholic content of the wine itself, and being essentially a tax on the mere bubbles appearing in that same wine, just as they appear in soda water, ginger ale, or beer, which carry no similar tax.

As you no doubt know, the tax on all table wine below 14 percent alcohol is only 17 cents per gallon. However, the moment even the slightest number of bubbles appear in this wine through natural fermentation, the tax jumps automatically to $3.40 per gallon, or, to make these figures more understandable for the average layman, a case of still white wine (that is to say without bubbles) pays a Federal tax of 41 cents, but when the same wine is converted into sparkling wine, the tax catapults to $8.16 a case.

UNREALISTIC APPROACH

It is the purpose of this letter to bring these facts and figures to your attention in a final effort in the past several years to try to convince you of the utterly unrealistic approach the Treasury Department has adopted to date on this most unrealistic tax and to respectfully importune you to try to see your way in cooperating with our fast-growing American wine industry by favorably reporting out a bill which will eventually correct this gross injustice in the taxing of the mere bubbles in wine.

It may be that our American wine industry, as a whole, is partly to blame for this continuing impasse in accomplishing this needed wine-bubbles tax relief, and for failing to date to present with greater clarity the elementary logic and reasonableness of our appeal to yourself and Congress. It may be necessary, before we attempt to convince you, that we are ourselves convinced by emphasizing very strongly the fact that this sparkling wine excise tax is the only one of its type in existence. The idea is to make clear for all time that there is actually no difference between table wine and sparkling wine and that all sparkling wine (whether or not we call it champagne) is just another table wine.

The excise tax on sparkling wine is so high as to be equal to at least 33 percent of the retail price, and, in many instances, up to 50 percent. Following upon the Treasury lead on this unjust taxing of all sparkling wine, the several States apply additional taxes, which, of course, tend to compound this flagrant tax injustice. To highlight the Treasury's utter inconsistency on the continued taxing of these mere bubbles in wine, I should further like to call to your attention that, as matters now stand there are three distinct classifications on the taxing of all sparkling wine.

We shall start with the first classification, which exempts all wine with minimum 5-pound pressure of carbon dioxide from any tax whatever. The second classification calls for a tax rate of $2.40 per gallon on all artificially carbonated wine having a pressure above this 5-pound tax-exempt limitation. The third and final classification imposes an even stiffer tax of $3.40 on all naturally fermented champagne, regardless of how low or high its effervescence, which, in a sense, penalizes our champagne industry for putting out a superior product over a mere artificially carbonated wine.

WHY STOP THERE

The utter inconsistency on all these graduations and methods of effervescence in sparkling wine is the fact that it places our Treasury Department squarely on record admitting a minimum effervescence (anywhere below 5 lbs. of carbon dioxide) as permissible and tax free. But the question is why stop here? Why the fantastic ludicrousness of having to literally count the number and size of each and every slightest bubble produced in a bottle of wine in order to arrive at a reasonable tax ruling? Bubbles are bubbles, whether they are large or small, and should make little difference in a bottle of wine.

Actually what possible difference should it make to the whole principle of taxation in our alcoholic beverage industry—logically based on the degree of alcohol and not the degree of bubbles in any beverage—how the bubbles in wine are developed and through what process, whether by natural fermentation in the bottle or tank, or through artificial fermentation, as long as the alcoholic content on that same wine remains the same?

When this rule of logic and law in all wine and liquor legislation is reversed, and each and every bubble appearing in a bottle of wine has to be literally counted before arriving at a suitable tax rate, it may well be time for an aroused citizenry to think about starting a wine bubbles tax rebellion. It will simply mean that our tax laws governing wine may no longer be designed to control or regulate the flow of legal wine as originally intended, but rather to hamstring and inhibit our fast growing American wine industry to the point of diminishing returns on its invested capital and the ultimate tax confiscation of the fruits of its combined labor.

More significantly, the continuation of this unjust wine bubbles tax is a heavy blow struck at the very heart of our lagging agricultural economy, of which all grapegrowing and winemaking is an integral part, or should be, as it is in fact in every other wine producing country in the world, with the single exception of our own country.

FARMER IS HURT

I need hardly mention to you the growing economic plight of our American farmer, which may still pose a serious threat to the future of this present administration, of which you happen to be one of our most admired and capable Treasury Secretaries. In a recent article by Michael G. Gartner in the Wall Street Journal, with heading "Rural Slowdown," and subheadings "Farmers Begin To Cut Spending as They Face Big Drop in 1964 Income—$700 Million Earnings Decline Seen on Farm Prices Sag—An Election Year Headache," the first paragraph reads as follows: "While their city cousins confidently look ahead to another year of prosperity, the Nation's farmers are worrying about a recession. They are already cutting back hard on their spending in a trend which could become the Johnson administration's first major economic headache."

It should be quite obvious to you, my dear Mr. Secretary, as well as all Members of Congress, that while continuing to stress the political significance of providing ways and means for improving the general lot of our American farmer, in this instance of continuing at the same time in perpetuating a most unrealistic taxing of the mere bubbles in wine, which, to repeat, happens to be a grape product, whose greater growth and consumption vitally affects our overall agricultural economy, you are unjustly penalizing this same impoverished American farmer by making it more and more (and not less) difficult for him to make a decent living.

For this wine bubbles tax jeopardizes the livelihood of thousands of farmers through discriminatory legislation. Without it, farmers could develop bigger and more profitable grape crops for considerable greater winemaking and consumption of wine in this country, which is still negligible compared to the consumption in all other wine-producing countries.

The tax means an arbitrary levy of something like $540 per ton of grapes for which the grower receives only $50 to $100 per ton. It is the same as taxing meat processors $1,250 to $2,500 on each steer the farmer sells to them for only $250. It is the same as taxing a mink fur 20 times more than any other kind of fur. Need I continue further, my dear Mr. Secretary, to pose the utter inconsistency of so discriminatory a taxing policy to the considerable detriment of our failing free enterprise system of government in this country?

If this discriminatory and confiscatory taxing theory behind the present exorbitant tax on the mere bubbles in wine means the Government has the right to spiral its tax structure upward in accordance with the ultimate higher sales price the consumer may have to pay for any article he preferes to buy, it is obvious you should not stop with the taxing of the bubbles in champagne alone, making the drinking of champagne a luxury. Champagne is a luxury only because of this tax, nowhere else tolerable in any country in the world.

You should go all the way, my dear Mr. Secretary and similarly tax all the other many considered luxuries of life. One of these may well be the ownership of a fine Cadillac, which most of us may prefer to drive in the place of a mere humble Chevrolet. In that case would it not be as consistant to impose a super sales tax—which is what the champagne tax really amounts to—on all purchases of Cadillac cars many times over and above the normal tax on a lower-priced Chevrolet? If the champagne tax makes any sense at all, surely a similar tax on the purchase of all Cadillac cars should make even greater sense.

I shall endeavor to sum up my final arguments for either the total repeal or realistic reduction of this most unrealistic tax in the second part of this open letter, which I trust you will read with due consideration.

I am, my dear Mr. Secretary, with deepest esteem and respect,

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD CALVERT, Sr.,
Wine Editor, Beverage Retailer Weekly.

A Great Captain Passes

SPEECH
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the last and most difficult battle, Douglas MacArthur demonstrated the courage that marked his entire career. With the knowledge that this last battle could not ultimately be won, he nevertheless fought gamely, and once again, the American people fought with him.

His career spanned the international confrontations of the 20th century, a century marked by two major world wars and the terrible 37-month long Korean crises. In every instance—from his brilliant undergraduate days at West Point to the highest pinnacles of military strategy—Douglas MacArthur remained first and last a soldier; a very brave and valiant soldier.

Despite his famous saying that "old soldiers never die" the inevitable has happened. With Shakespeare, we may now say that "the valiant never taste death but once."

His last days, as well as his entire life, amounted to a case study in courage. I will miss him greatly, and the country has lost one of its truly great heroes. My deepest sympathies and those of the entire world go out to his wife and son on this day, and we can say with cer-

tainty that Douglas MacArthur now belongs to the ages.

Many great things have been said about the late general here on the floor of the House, where many friends of the general have extolled his memory.

On Monday, April 6th, the New York Herald Tribune editorial described the career of General MacArthur titled "A Great Captain Passes." I am pleased to make this article a part of the permanent RECORD. The editorial follows:

A GREAT CAPTAIN PASSES

The stresses of a long life, the agonies of its last gallant days have ended for General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. His great feats in battle belong to history; the memory of his services, his electric personality belong to the American people.

General MacArthur's whole career was invested with authentic drama, heightened by his own panache, an aura that was as tangible as the white plume of Henry of Navarre.

The general came by his military bearing naturally. He was a soldier by career and by inheritance—a product of West Point's strongest traditions and the son of that Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur whose military experience extended from the Civil War to the Philippines insurrection. Douglas MacArthur held high command in three great wars, as well as the highest peacetime offices in the Armies of the United States and the Philippines Commonwealth.

Had General MacArthur possessed less than authentic genius, his commanding manner might not have served him well with the American people, who generally prefer their generals to have the outward simplicity of a Stonewall Jackson, a Grant, or an Omar Bradley. The strategic brilliance of Douglas MacArthur was too real to be obscured by such considerations, as the massive and virtually unprecedented welcome he received on his return from Korea demonstrated.

Yet the pride and affection in which Americans held the soldier had their limits. Though the General's views on domestic and international politics received a full and respected hearing, they did not markedly affect the Nation's course.

General MacArthur's broad ideas on global strategy in World War II and after will doubtless long be debated. Many controversies survive those stormy days. But the superb mastery of the complex technology of warfare he displayed is undeniable.

In the long defense of Bataan and Corregidor—foredoomed but presenting a striking contrast to the swift collapse of so many other Pacific bastions before the Japanese tide—General MacArthur was a symbol of dogged resistance. His promise to return was a kind of individual pledge of a national resolve.

But neither symbol nor resolve of themselves could have accomplished the tremendous feat of taking fleets and armies some 2,500 air-line miles through the tangled archipelagoes that lay between the advanced Allied bases at Port Moresby and Manila.

The Pacific war was fought on many fronts, from the foggy Aleutians to hot, pestilential Guadalcanal. No one effort can be given sole credit for the final result. But General MacArthur's drive, against carefully selected links in the Japanese chain, was an operation for the textbooks, a model of coordination, deception and boldness.

As Lord Alanbrooke, who has termed MacArthur the greatest general and the best strategist that the war produced," pointed out, the General not only left masses of Japs to decay" behind the points he chose to hit, but picked for those points the ones "best suited for the efficient use of the three services." MacArthur waged triphibious war at its most deadly.

This is the more striking when it is remembered that the general had received his initial training at a time when armies moved on the feet of men, horses and mules, when cavalry still carried sabers and were expected to use them in a charge, when magazine rifles, smokeless powder, machine guns and quick-firing artillery were all relatively new in war. His first experience in combat was in the mired simplicities of World War I, during which he rose to brigade and, at the war's end, divisional command.

That his triumphs in the Pacific war should lead to General MacArthur's central role in accepting the surrender of Japan on the deck of the battleship *Missouri* was natural. That this in turn led to a masterpiece of imaginative administration in the rebuilding of Japan under the general's supreme command may be ironical. But the sturdy foundations that General MacArthur laid for America's principal Far Eastern alliance testify to the fact that if he was primarily a military man, he was both broad-gaged and farsighted.

The Communist attack upon the Republic of Korea thrust General MacArthur into his third war in his 70th year. It included the great stroke at Inchon—worthy to be considered his most striking single maneuver—and the anticlimax of his recall by President Truman.

Though it shadowed his last years, the recall was not in any sense a judgment upon his career. That judgment is far better expressed by divisional command in 1918, Chief of Staff under President Hoover, Field Marshal of the Philippines Commonwealth, General of the Army in the world's greatest war, Supreme Commander in Japan, Commander in Chief of the United Nations in Korea and many decorations, including the highest, the Medal of Honor.

Repeated heavy responsibilities, brilliantly discharged, show the confidence the Republic reposed in its great captain and the reasons for its gratitude to him.

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Incorporate or Charter the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the five concurrent resolutions adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the State of Rhode Island; the State of New Jersey; the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and the State of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

I wish to congratulate these Americans of Italian ancestry, whose organization consists entirely of honorably discharged American War Veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. During World War II nearly 845,000 men of Italian descent served in the armed services of the United States and distinguished themselves in every battle, in every theater, in every campaign, earning every decoration this country can bestow.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include these five resolutions compiled by John F. Nave, past national commander and chairman, National Legislative Coordination Committee, Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., Syracuse, N.Y. It is my hope that other States will adopt similar resolutions in the very near future.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth."

House of Representatives, adopted, March 30, 1962.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 3, 1962.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, 1963

Resolution memorializing Congress respectfully requesting the enactment of appropriate Federal legislation to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterarns of the United States, Inc., as a national organization.

Resolved, That the Members of Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to enact such legislation to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Incorporated, as a national organization.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable action taken by Congress upon this special matter.

[From the State of New Jersey]

S. CON. RES. 15

(Introduced Mar. 11, 1963, by Senator Ridolfi)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Incorporated.

"2. The secretary of the senate is hereby directed to cause properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to be forwarded to the presiding officers of each branch of the Congress and to each of the

Senators and the Members of the Congress from this State."

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of resolution adopted by both houses of the New Jersey Legislature.

HENRY H. PATTERSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by senate on April 22, 1963.
Adopted by assembly, May 20, 1963.
Governor's signature not required.

[From the General Assembly of Pennsylvania]

H. RES. 20

(Introduced by Messrs. Scarcelli, Cianfrani, Butera, and Odorisio, Feb. 6, 1963)

"Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

Agreed to (adopted) July 8, 1963.
Adopted by house on May 15, 1963.
Agreed to by senate July 8, 1963.
Governor's signature not required.

[From the Assembly of the State of New York]

RES. 29

(By Mr. Savarese, Mar. 23, 1964)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur); That the clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the Presiding Officer and Clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each member thereof from the State of New York."

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 23, 1964.
Concurred in, without amendment.
By order of the senate.

HEBERT J. ABRAMS,
Secretary.

Adopted by both houses of the New York State Legislature on March 23, 1964. Governor's signature not required.

Miss Kate Adele Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech which is to be delivered at the District 14, Texas Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs seminar at Beaumont, Tex., by Dr. Kate Adele Hill, of College Station, Tex.

It has been both my privilege and pleasure to know Miss Kate Adele Hill for a number of years. Last August she retired after having served 38 years with the Texas Agriculture Extension Service. She first entered the service as a home demonstration agent in 1925 in Cameron County, Tex. Miss Hill holds three degrees from Texas Women's University, a B.S. in home economics, an A.B. in sociology, and a Ph. D. in general home economics which was conferred on her in June of 1957. She also holds a M.S. degree from Texas Technological College in agricultural economics and sociology and has attended the Universities of Texas and Missouri.

The speech follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY KATE ADELE HILL AT DISTRICT 14, TEXAS FEDERATION OF B. & P.W. CLUBS SEMINAR AT BEAUMONT, APRIL 19

Madam District Director of District 14, Madam Chairman, B. & P.W. members and others assembled here for this seminar.

I appreciate the invitation to speak to you on the subject assigned to me, and the opportunity to visit Beaumont again. In June of 1939, here in Beaumont, I concluded my term of office as State president and handed the gavel over to my successor, our Judge Sarah Hughes. That year (1938–39) will always be one of the high spots in my career and it meant much to me, both personally and officially—so it is a pleasure to come back to Beaumont again. To return to the subject assigned.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE TO WOMEN OF TODAY—1964

As has been my customer for many years, I consulted a dictionary, Webster's New World, to be exact, to refresh my mind on the two key words in the subject as given to me; namely, "Challenge and Change."

Challenge as a noun: 1. A demand for identification, as a sentry gave the challenge; 2. a demand calling with question, as a challenge to an assertion; 3. a call to a fight or contest, etc.; 4. a demand claims upon. As a transitive verb: 1. To make a challenge to; 2. to make objection to; question; 3. to call a fight, contest; 4. to call for; demand, as this idea challenges our attention (page 91). I challenge you to study, consider, and revise your ideas and practices to meet the age of change—and now what is change—as a transitive verb?

1. To put or take a thing in place of something else, substitute.

2. To exchange; as they changed places.

3. To make different, alter; as an intransitive verb; 1. To alter, vary, as the scene changes; 2. to leave one train or a bus and board another; 3, to put on other clothes; 4. to make an exchange. As a noun, change is defined as: 1. A substitution alteration, or variation; 2. variety; 3. another set of clothes; 4. to do or say a thing in many ways (p. 92).

Underlying each definition of either word, as a verb or as a noun, the foundation idea is adjustment to something different. From external causes national, international, statewide, local, and personal, in one's profession and in one's family, change is constant, and it is not a new circumstance or experience. The rate of change has increased, and the extent of change touches all of us; when do we need to learn to cope with this changing world? First, we need to know that change, per se, is not always beneficial, but rather we must learn to protect, reapply, and retain home of the eternal verities which are the foundation of our home, State, and Nation.

Therefore, we must be analytical, and questioning, before we accept every change without considering its effects in the long run. Instead of being an immediate conformist, why not be an analytical student, and observer before we follow every change promoter out into the far horizon of the unknown. Get information before acting or adopting a change. This process is not always possible, I know, as change can be sudden.

One phrase that has been greatly prattled in the past two decades has been "How to win friends and influence people," and one tenet of that doctrine has been "How to make people think like you do." How much better it would be if that sentence was, "How to make people think." Know the source of your information. Is the agency which is seeking a donation of money from you registered with your chamber of commerce? Is the request which came in your mailbox often, seeking a contribution to help some cause you never heard of, a trustworthy, reliable organization or is the money going to support something not what it appears to be. Do you know that your Congressman can and will supply you with a list of organizations not approved by the Attorney General by which you can check such requests? If we are going to adjust to constant and rapid change, then we must study our candidates, their standards, and their records. We must be informed voters, with sensible and valid standards of judgment. Perhaps one of the most universal effects of change, which has been going on all of our lives, is our use, planning, and organization of our own time.

How much time, our own, and that of our audience, which may be a club, a class, or our next door neighbor, do we waste telling some one how much we have to do? Why not save that time and energy to put in on the task at hand? As women, we do a great deal of unnecessary talk; which could be turned into energy used to adjust to the change. What about developing some change within ourselves which could be useful to us in accepting this age of change?

1. We could be more accurate in our statements, avoiding the use of such terms as, "I imagine she will do so and so." If it is not an established fact, don't quote it as being so. Avoid saying "somebody said so and so."

2. Stop talking about how much we have to do, and get at doing it.

3. Listen when the other person is talking.

4. Don't interrupt a person who is talking to you before that person can finish a sentence.

5. Don't start a sentence and then wander all over a whole section of land in conversation before you get back, if you do, to your original statement.

6. Study your job, both at home and at your place of business, classroom, or office, and the time allotted to each phase of such jobs.

Here is a bulletin on management of our time as homemakers. Women who are employed in addition to being homemakers have a combined job. Here let me point out that whether married or single the processes of homemaking are involved in time allotment. Whether the prefix is Miss or Mrs. almost every woman has the responsibility of providing and/or managing the time needed for food, shelter, and clothing for herself and for those persons for whom she is responsible. Time is the element most affected by this age of rapid change. I have here 50 copies of this bulletin. If this number is not sufficient, you may obtain this publication at the office of your county home demonstration agent, or you may write to the Texas agricultural extension service at A. & M. University, College Station, Tex. Another publication which I studied in preparation for this talk is published by the Hogg Foundation of the University of Texas, based on a study made for the Texas Federa-

tion of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, by Dr. Bernice Milburn Moore, Mrs. Burt Kruger Smith and Glenn V. Ramsey. This bulletin is entitled "Women View Their Working World."

On page 5, this information is given: One of three married women is employed. Two out of three have children under 18, and one out of four has a preschool youngster.

On page 9, the subject of split-level education is discussed—describing how the woman who did not go to college, or who married before she finished college finds herself needing study for economic reasons after her children are grown. Here is the why of one phase of continuing education, such as we are doing in these seminars.

Another manual for your guidance in meeting the challenge of change is the special issue for the 1963–64 program of the National Business Women magazine of March 1963. The information on the changing role of women is well organized in this issue, especially on pages 14, 15, 16, and 17 where personal development and civic participation are set forth in a fundamental presentation of each program area. Study these pages, and figure out how to use the ideas and themes found there, as a person, and as a citizen who faces responsibility.

One point not often recognized or emphasized, I would call to your attention, which is that single women have homes, and responsibilities, often responsible for the aging family members' care and seldom credited with what they are asked to do for family members, young or old; namely, because usually they do not talk about their responsibilities—nor parade them. So change, and time planning affects us all, regardless of civil, State, state of development, occupation, financial status, or home responsibilities. I call your attention to page 31 in the publication "Women View Their Working World," which is a thought-provoking paragraph revealing some very unfair attitudes of the employed married women toward the single woman.

In summary, I repeat:

Be analytical, be accurate, listen, be careful what you repeat as a fact, be thoughtful and do your own thinking, be studious, be cooperative without being a conformist or a status seeker, be interested in all ages of persons, be aware of and use all available reliable resources of information, be the best individual possible as a family member, as an employee, or an employer, and as a citizen.

With the present emphasis of the President's planned appointment of 50 women to key jobs in Government, we must all be challenged to do a superb job, asking no favors because we happen to be women, but delivering results of high quality whatever our challenge may be, changing procedure, and philosophy when it is sensible to do so; holding on to our priceless heritage as Texans and Americans. Women are finding places in all kinds of employment because of competency. The President's recent action is recognition of women's ability. This recognition has been earned, not given. Shortages in many fields exist; namely, teachers and nurses as two examples. The status of women will grow and endure. To help us to do this, I leave with you this salutation of the dawn, from the Sanskrit. This beautiful challenge was read to me first by my Virginia-born grandmother when I was a little girl growing up on a west Texas ranch. This is what I mean by holding on to the eternal verities, because these words are just as applicable today, as they were the day they were written.

"Listen to the Salutation of the Dawn;
Look to this day.
For it is Life, the very Life of Life
In its brief course lie all the varieties and realities of your existence;
The bliss of growth
The story of action
The splendor of Beauty
For yesterday is but a dream and tomorrow only a vision.
But Today well lived makes every yesterday a dream of happiness.
And every tomorrow a vision of hope
Look well, therefore, to this day; such is the Salutation of the Dawn."

—FROM THE SANSKRIT
(The ancient literary language of India).

REFERENCES CONSULTED

1. Webster's New World Dictionary, 1959 edition.
2. "Women View Their Working World," based on a study in mental health for the Texas Federation of B. & P.W. Clubs, published by Hogg Foundation of Glenn V. Ramsey, Burt Kruger Smith, and Bernice Milburn Moore, pages 3, 9, and 31.
3. "Manage Your Time and Energy," page 342. Texas Agricultural Extension Service, A. & M. University, College Station, Tex.
4. National Business Woman, March 1963.
5. National Business Woman, November 1963.

Dr. Jose Rizal, Philippine National Hero and Champion of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest champions of freedom in the world was, in my estimation, that outstanding patriot and Philippine national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal, who gave his life for his country. Rizal was one of those universal men of the 19th century who excelled in everything he did. He was apart from being a brilliant medical doctor and ophthalmologist, a novelist, a poet, an essayist, a historian, a philosopher, an artist, a sculptor, an anthropologist and ethnologist, a linguist, a fencer, world traveler, and a humanist, whose life and works and deeds, crowded into the short span of 35 years, were consecrated to the liberty and independence of his country and people. He was executed at the age of 35 years by order of the Spanish Government, under whose rule the Philippines was governed at the time of his death, December 30, 1896. He was born in the little town of Calamba, Laguna, 55 kilometers from Manila on June 19, 1861.

My own State of Hawaii paid tribute to this enormously talented man and great patriot by joining in the centennial celebration of the birth of Jose Rizal on June 19, 1961. I ask your support, and the Members of this Congress, in approving a special commemorative stamp to be issued by the Government in the "champion of liberty" series. His contributions to his country, and to humanity, can best be epitomized by the expression "The pen is mightier than the sword." His pen was ever pitted against injustice and race prejudice, and the soundness of his principles, expressed openly at great personal danger to himself, are today incorporated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations. He was a Malayan and proved that people of all colors and races could do what the white man had done in science, arts, and letters. His precocity showed at an early age. He learned his three R's from his mother when but 3 years old and at the age of 8 wrote his first poem. Before he was 15 years old he had written many inspiring poems, some of which were later set to music. One of his most vivid and best known poems is one he wrote just before his execution, called "Ultimo Adios"—Last Farewell. At the age of 18 he won prizes in literature and poetry. During a period in his exile in Dapitan from August 1892 to May 1893, he wrote to Father Pastells:

> I do not aspire to fame or glory; I do not aim at rivaling others whose conditions, intelligence, and circumstances are different from mine. My supreme desire is to do what I can for my country; to do whatever is necessary. I have received a little learning, and this, I believe, I should teach to my countrymen. Others more fortunate than I may scale the heights of glory.

Surely this great man lived and believed in the philosophy expressed by our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, when he urged Americans "Ask not what your country can do for you: ask what you can do for your country."

His writings when living in Spain, and later in other countries, made him a marked man for the firing squad. He discussed his views on race equality and denounced the practice of denying the Filipinos their rightful share of the products of their toil, under the Spanish regime, which was causing them to lose incentive to labor. In this connection, he said:

> Man is not a brute * * * he is not a machine; his object is not merely to produce * * * man's object is not to satisfy the passions of another man; the object is to seek happiness for himself and his kind by following the road of progress and perfection.

An essay he wrote called "Filipinas Dentro de Cien Anos"—The Philippines A Century Hence—strongly urged such reforms as freedom of speech and of the press, representation in the Spanish Cortes, establishment of the merit system in the civil service, and a halt to the abuses of the civil and military authorities in the ruling Spanish Government. He intimated at that time that if needed reforms were not forthcoming the Spanish Government might be overthrown and his country would seek help from the United States. In another essay which he addressed to a group of women in his country who were planning to open a school for women and children he exhorted them to teach their children to be fearless and brave and not to join in blind worship or blind obedience to foreign masters. In another novel, "El Filibusterismo," published in Belgium in 1891, he calls upon youth to consecrate their lives and their energies to the welfare of their native land and to be pure and spotless so that they would be worthy sacrifices for so worthy a cause as the freedom and happiness of their native land.

Despite the fact his medical practice was becoming lucrative, he chose to continue—at great financial and personal sacrifice to himself—his unceasing fight for justice and freedom and liberation of his country from Spanish rule. He openly organized an association called La Liga Filipina on July 3, 1892, a few days after his second return from Europe. Its aims were to concretize the formation of the national community, to encourage education, commerce, and agriculture, to render mutual protection from want and necessity, and to provide "defense against all violence and injustice." Four days later he was arrested and exiled to Dapitan on the Island of Mindanao, where he remained 4 years. While there, however, this indefatigable patriot established a hospital, a school, a water system, and helped the poor fishermen improve their methods of catching fish and farmers to improve techniques in farming.

In essence, Jose Rizal taught that people cannot live a moral life if they are compelled to live under circumstances and institutions or governments which brutalize, corrupt, and degrade. He felt it was useless to expect political morality where social arrangements and customs make corruption profitable and respectable. It was futile, he said, to demand diligence and industry when no one can be assured of the fruits of his labor. It is ridiculous to expect spiritual upliftment where religion serves to burden, rather then liberate, the human soul. The true measure of the peoples' capabilities is the performance by them in a condition of national independence, when failure or success is proof of their abilities. Rizal felt that freedom is not just physical but moral as well, and moral liberty requires not only that a man must respect the dignity of another, but that the other must first possess dignity.

The National Cultural Shrine of the Philippines will be a permanent repository for Rizal's works and other Filipino culture, so that it may be worthy of him—Rizal—"who gave his people dignity and honor that they may have their rightful place among the free nations of the world."

Dr. Jose Rizal achieved his greatness by personal example in following seven basic tenets of living. I feel it is appropriate today to summarize them: First, a man must live with a purpose in life—the purpose of doing good for others, of deriving one's own happiness by bringing happiness to others. Dr. Jose Rizal not only lived for the welfare of others, but died for his fellow man; second, a man must educate himself to the fullest extent of his abilities; third, a man must seek the truth and live by it. Rizal truly followed Christ's teaching "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free." In his untiring pursuit of further education, he studied 22 languages because he wanted to read what the greatest minds in all languages had to offer. While known as the "best opthalmologist in all Asia" he was actually appreciated more as a scientist in Germany, France, and England for his other contributions in the arts and sciences; fourth, he felt that a man must have a religion and be guided by it. He told Father Pastells, his confidant at one time, "To doubt the existence of God would be to doubt my own conscience, and, therefore, to doubt everything. And then why should one live?" Fifth, a man must make the best possible use of his time, Rizal felt, because time was the essence of life. To this end he developed methodical habits so as to conserve precious minutes for worthwhile endeavors; sixth, a man must lead a clean moral life, he stated, and Rizal was renowned as a stickler for truth and integrity. One time he wrote to a publisher, "Take care not to insert exaggeration nor lies, nor low, nor unworthy language. We can win our cause by speaking the truth, because right and justice are on our side"; seventh, one must have the courage to live by his own convictions, was another of Rizal's basic principles, and although it ultimately meant his death, he abided by this without any compromise until his execution. On that fateful day of December 30, 1896, Dr. Jose Rizal walked with perfect calm to the firing line—the only heroic and gallant figure amongst all present at the sordid scene.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the Governor of Hawaii declared June 17 to 25, 1961, "Rizal Weeks," in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of this great martyr, and in recognition of humanity's acceptance of this Philippine patriot not only for his talents, his valor, the affection, and esteem of his countrymen, his work to bring about material and moral betterment of his race or his country, but for the unflinching example he personally set for himself to serve all of the underprivileged, downtrodden, and unenlightened and enslaved peoples of the world. Yes, the life of Dr. Jose Rizal carries a message to the whole world. We can help to spread this message by putting his picture on one of our commemorative postage stamps.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Increased Sales and Community Development Means Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Mr. Wm. T. Nordeen, general manager of Northern Lights, Inc., of Sandpoint, Idaho, addressed the members of the Northwest Public Power Association at their convention held in Spokane, Wash. on April 1, 2, and 3, 1964.

The service area of Northern Lights, the first cooperative to receive an REA loan west of the Mississippi River, is a land of lakes, rivers, forests, and river valleys.

His remarks are most pertinent and under leave to extend my remarks, the text of Mr. Nordeen's address follows:

INCREASED SALES AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MEANS SUCCESS

(By Wm. T. Nordeen)

Fellow members of the electrical utility industry, I would also like to welcome you to the Inland Empire. We hope you have had an enjoyable stay and we want you to come back and see more of our beautiful area including northeastern Washington, northern Idaho, and western Montana. Gus Norwood has asked me to tell you a little bit about the area and some of the things we are doing at Northern Lights.

Northern Lights, with headquarters in Sandpoint, Idaho, which is located on beautiful Lake Pend Oreille, is a tristate, customer owned, REA financed cooperative serving residents of Idaho, Washington, Montana, and British Columbia. We received the first REA loan of any cooperative located west of the Mississippi River.

The service area of Northern Lights is a land of lakes, rivers, forests, and river valleys. Hunting and fishing are unexcelled in this area commonly called "the Emerald Empire." You can bag elk, deer, grouse, pheasants, ducks, geese, or rabbits. This is the home of the large-mouth bass, the Blueback or Silver, the Cutthroat, Rainbow, Brook, and Brown trout. You are allowed 50 bluebacks a day. Crappie, perch, and blue gills are everywhere. Kamloops trout from Lake Pend Oreille are caught up to 37 pounds and Makinaw Trout in Priest Lake run over 50 pounds. Our agricultural pursuits include cattle, dairy farming, and hay and grain. Our companion agricultural pursuit is tree farming. We mainly have as an economic base: (1) lumber, (2) farming, and (3) tourism.

In recent years our economic base has not been adequate to furnish jobs to our young people. They have had to go to other areas to seek employment. Many people in our service area are giving thought to improvement in our economic and social life. Greatest opportunities appear in agriculture, in lumber products, and in tourism. Mining could develop over the years.

Northern Lights furnishes the main energy base in our service area. Of course, in the cities investor owned utilities such as Pacific Power & Light, Montana Power, and the Washington Water Power Co., along with the city of Bonners Ferry, furnish the energy base. Northern Lights serves the areas that the others formerly did not wish to serve. We have brought the energy base to the rural areas over the last 28 years. The percent of rural customers who now receive electricity has increased from 5 percent to over 99 percent.

In addition to selling electricity at a reasonable rate with only three consumers per mile of line in a heavily wooded area, with expensive rights-of-way to maintain, Northern Lights has felt an obligation to its members to take part in improving the economic base of the area. We belong to seven chambers of commerce. Our employees participate in civic and social activities as do all utility employees.

The Rural Electrification Administration in recent years has set up a Rural Areas Development Section. This department has been very helpful to us and to our communities in their efforts to improve economic conditions. A few of the activities of Northern Lights in rural area development include: (1) construction of a line to serve the Schweitzer Basin Ski Development which is located only a few miles from Sandpoint, Idaho; (2) construction of 21 miles of powerline to the beautiful Yaak Valley in western Montana; (3) last year we were able to help a large sawmill in western Montana get needed working capital. I would like to discuss these items in a little more detail.

The Schweitzer Basin ski development is an outstanding example of community cooperation. Lumber and timber products have generally been the leading industry in our service area. The lumber industry has been in poor health for years and as you know, employment is often seasonal. Due to our short tourist season, employment in service trades is low in the winter. Our area receives little of the Canadian tourist dollar any more due to their governmental policies.

Several years ago, Bonner County, along with other north Idaho counties, was designated a redevelopment area eligible for ARA loans. A countywide development committee was established of which Northern Lights was a member. An overall economic development program for the county was completed and approved. This program analyzed factors basic to economic growth and economic potentials along with a program for action for creating new employment opportunities. After a well-known ski area consultant found that the Schweitzer area was superior to others in the Northwest, the task force committee went ahead with the job of financing the project. This was done through a $320,000 Area Redevelopment Administration loan, a $75,000 Small Business Administration loan, and through local investors including Northern Lights and our employees. Also the road was built by local contractors in return for stock in the project. The total investment now is about $550,000.

Facilities at Schweitzer include a mile-long Riblet double-chair lift, a rope tow, a 1,300-foot T-bar, a 9-mile easy-grade access road, a three-story 30- by 140-foot day lodge, and a 500-car parking lot. Schweitzer has been a success from the start. Daily crowds of 2,500 to 3,500 are common on weekends. The large volume of crisp snow, the beautiful setting and the unlimited area for expansion make Schweitzer a real hit among Northwest skiers. Forty-three are employed at the basin. The project has already bettered the economic life of the area and it has just started to develop.

Schweitzer is only a few miles from the town of Sandpoint which is served electrically by the Pacific Power & Light Co. Early last fall we were asked to supply power to Schweitzer and within 60 days we had built a three-phase, 13,000-volt, 6-mile line up to Schweitzer through pretty rugged terrain at a cost of $86,000 including tree clearing. Our powerload is 220 kilowatts at the electrically heated lodge and 200 horsepower for the three tows. We are looking ahead to illuminating the slopes for night skiing this year. Power bills now run about $7,000 a year. We expect the powerloads to triple this year since a 54-unit apartment house, an 18-unit dormitory, plus two more chair lifts are planned. On March 1, 1964, Schweitzer was officially dedicated by William L. Batt, Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration; Gov. Robert E. Smylie; Representative Compton White and Spokane Mayor Neal R. Fossen assisted by Miss Sandpoint, Miss Spokane, and Miss Idaho. In Sandpoint our merchants have two periods of increased sales: Christmas and summertime. With Schweitzer Basin retail sales pick up in the winter also. Therefore, Schweitzer Basin has added the third Christmas along Main Street.

Another project that is keeping us busy is extension of power up the Yaak Valley. About 1½ years ago we received an inquiry from a prospective power customer up the Yaak Valley in northwestern Montana. We made an investigation and found that this beautiful, 47-mile-long valley had some 70 families, a U.S. Forest Service ranger station, and a large sawmill, all hungry for electric power. The nearest source of highley from this source of power at Troy, Mont., would mean a tremendous investment. Also, since the valley is heavily forested, the clearing of a 40-foot right-ofway would be very expensive (over $2,000 per mile in clearing costs).

It became increasingly clear that power service could be provided if we could use the existing telephone right-of-way of the General Telephone Co. and if the Bonneville Power Administration would construct a substation on their 115,000-volt transmission line which crosses the lower end of the valley.

A conference was arranged with the General Telephone Co. and they agreed to share their right-of-way if Northern Lights would provide a crossarm on each pole of the new powerline for telephone use. With the cooperation of the U.S. Forest Service, this arrangement was carried out.

After a feasibility study, Mr. Charles Luce, of Bonneville Power Administration, agreed to provide the new Yaak substation at the point where their 115,000-volt line crossed the Yaak Valley Road near U.S. Highway No. 2.

The next step was to secure transfer of the rights-of-way and to arrange for construction funds from the Rural Electrification Administration. Engineering was started in the spring of last year followed by tree-clearing crews. The construction program for 1963 included 21 miles of line to serve 30 families, the Leighty Sawmill, and the Sylvanite Ranger Station.

This coming of power to the Yaak was celebrated at a dedication sponsored by the Troy, Mont., Business and Professional Men's Club on October 10. Over 140 persons from

all over the Northwest attended the luncheon and the substation dedication. Russell Holt, Bonneville Power Assistant Administrator, closed the switch at the Yaak substation and power flowed up the beautiful Yaak Valley. Publicity on the project included a page in Time magazine, three pages in the NRECA magazine, two front page stories in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, a feature story in the Spokesman Review magazine section and a feature story in the New York Times and many eastern newspapers. The proprietor of the local saloon called the Dirty Shame, Jr., is receiving letters from prospective settlers from all over the United States. At the present time a 16-millimeter color movie is being made featuring the Yaak Valley.

This year we will soon start construction of more miles of line to serve more Yaak consumers. The extension of an energy base into the region will stimulate lumber and mineral production as well as tourism. The lights going on in the Yaak Valley will light the way to a better way of life for all residents.

Another item that has created a lot of interest is a section V loan we made to the Durable Wood Products, of Trout Creek, Mont., to finance a chipper and a debarker. This was a $60,000 recourse loan for a term of 5 years. Unless we had made the loan, the Small Business Administration would not have granted a pending loan to Durable. This loan was good business for us, for Durable Wood Products and for the community. It meant saving a payroll of 75 men and preserving income for 200 of our consumers who sell logs to the mill. It has meant also a $24,000 a year power load for us. The chipper and debarker installation has been extremely successful. Even though we have been criticized by certain investor-owned utilities, this was undoubtedly a very sound and businesslike loan.

Since an electrical utility brings the all-important energy base to an area and to its customers, we actually have a basic interest in the communities we serve not only in their electrical usage but in all phases of the economic life of the area.

In bringing this energy base to our consumers we have an obligation to provide the best possible electric service at the lowest cost possible consistent with sound business principles. The success of our business is dependent upon good management and in order to insure results we must have good sound fiscal policies and we must sell. I would like to emphasize this, we must sell and sell and sell. Why all this emphasis on sales? Shouldn't we sit in our offices and wait for the customer to come to us? Some utilities may do this but they won't be successful and they won't be accomplishing the purpose for which they were established.

Our business is a fixed-cost business; that is, a large amount of our cost of doing business is in fixed investment and effective use of this investment is a necessity. Many costs of serving a customer are present regardless of the kilowatt consumption of this customer. As kilowatt-hour consumption per consumer increases, the basic cost of providing each kilowatt-hour decreases. Many costs that we have that are semivariable can be spread over more kilowatt hours, thereby bringing down costs per unit.

We have noted that a few of our electrical utilities now have no planned sales or power-use program. If you are in this category, now is the time to start selling and help your customers get the fullest use from electricity. One extra bonus that we get from a large user of electricity is good will. I have noticed over the years that a large user of electricity is normally very friendly to the serving utility. All businesses today are interested in creating a friendly "image." There is no better way to improve public relations than to have large users of electricity on your lines.

We are often regarded as a natural monopoly. We still have competition, however. We are constantly competing with natural gas, bottled gas, oil, coal, and wood. One large item of competition overlooked many times is competition for the consumer's dollar. If our customer is to use electricity, he must spend money for adequate wiring, for appliances, and for power. How much of this money is going for these items compared to other possible uses for his money? We must make our service attractive and desirable in the eyes of the consumer. We must create desire for our customers to use this wonderful product we sell.

The fuller use of electricity by our customers and our prospective customers and methods to increase this usage in a method profitable to both the utility and the user, is a matter that concerns not only management but our policymakers as well. My opinion has always been that a sales program must be an all-inclusive thing. It must be dovetailed with the policies of the utility and when policies are established, their effect on power usage and sales must be measured. Customer service policies and rates have an important effect on the sales of a utility. Some utilities have penalty rates for electric heat which is a good thing for the oil and gas companies. Employee or personnel policies also affect sales. I have always felt that all employees must have knowledge of the concept of expansion through increased sales to be effective representatives of our utility, and we must stimulate them. It is not easy to instill sales enthusiasm in all employees, but we should never give us trying.

Quite often a utility will have great success with one type of sales program. I am convinced that a program that is a world beater in one utility may fall flat in another. A certain sales organization may be very effective in one area and this same organization would not be successful in another area. A few items that must be considered in any power use program are: (1) What is the nature of the customers, are they in a rural or urban area or a combination of both? (2) What is the size of the family group? What is the average age of parents? (3) What is the average income of the family and what are family occupations? (4) What is the availability of electrical contractors and appliance dealers, and how active are they in creating new business? (5) What percent of homes are new and/or modern? (6) What publicity mediums are available, such as radio, TV, and newspapers, and what is their coverage over the utility service area? (7) What credit is available in the area? and (8) What is the capacity of the distribution system and what rebuilding is necessary? These are a few of many items that must be considered in developing a power use program.

Northern Lights has adopted a vigorous power use program during the past several years. We make it easy for our consumers to use electricity. Are you doing the same? It is readily apparent that if our utility is to keep rates at their present level, we must encourage more electrical usage among present and prospective members.

Northern Lights operates in an area mainly dependent on the lumber business. Economic conditions have been very depressed in the past few years. Farming in our area is confined mainly to dairy herds and some cattle ranches. Farms generally are not large and yearly we find fewer farm families living in our service area. Also, the average farm family is small and the owners are generally middle aged or older. Most of the young people raised on farms have left our area to seek employment in urban centers.

For 3 years, each year we have conducted a special promotional program. In addition to these special programs, we have certain regular programs including (1) sale of quick-recover, 52-gallon water heaters at cost; (2) gift of 200-ampere switchboxes if a consumer adds two major appliances and/or electric heat; (3) an active section V loan program financing appliances and installation of electrical equipment including electric heat. Our programs the last 3 years have been: (1) an employee bonus plan where each employee received a bonus of $10 for each major appliance sold and $2 a kilowatt for electric heat installed; (2) a bonus of $100 worth of free electricity to all consumers who added at least 10 kilowatts of permanent electric heat; and (3) a program which gives 1 year free mercury vapor yard lighting for those consumers who add at least 10 kilowatts of electric heat.

We have two new electrically heated schools in Idaho and Montana. One of the main reasons we got these loads was our extremely attractive rate.

Recently we had conferences with U.S. Forest Service officials from our area and from their Missoula area headquarters. As a result of these meetings, we are now connecting two new ranger headquarters that will be all electric including heat. Without electric heat the load would be about 40 kilowatts, but with electric heat the connected load will be about 400 kilowatts.

I have often been asked, "Do these power-use programs help a utility economically?" I believe they do. In 1960 we had no revenue increase over 1959; however, in 1961, our revenue increase was $16,000; in 1962 the increase was $52,000; and in 1963 $47,000. Our annual net margin in 3 years has tripled.

Our excuse for existence is the service we render to our customers. If we are to succeed we must constantly do a better job for our consumers. This means increased sales effort. Lets all adopt the policy of making it easy for our consumers to use more and more electricity.

Thank you.

Part-Time Brain Hunt in Princeton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the Republican Party is attractive to the professors of our country. As a case in point some professors of political science are working with us on the minority staffing problem in Congress and making a significant contribution.

It is with this thought in mind that I include the following story from the New York Times, February 20, 1964, in the RECORD:

THE PART-TIME BRAIN HUNT IN PRINCETON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—Every President since Franklin Roosevelt has complained that he could not find and keep enough talent to work for the Federal Government, and President Johnson is now going through the same routine.

His answer to the problem has been to appoint a distinguished historian, Dr. Eric F. Goldman, of Princeton, to serve as a part-time consultant to assure a flow of fresh minds and ideas to Washington, and Dr. Goldman is now calling for ideas.

One idea that might be considered is that this whole project is too serious and important to be handled on a part-time basis. Dr. Goldman will go on teaching and writing

and running a television program, and serve the President on the side. This is as good as illustration as any of what's wrong with the whole program of recruiting talent for the public service.

The Foreign Service and the Civil Service do some recruiting, and the armed services put some recruiting jingles on the radio, but every large corporation and ever major professional football and baseball organization in America scouts the available talent more carefully than the Federal Government.

A TALENT ROSTER?

One result, for example, is that President Johnson has just assigned Sargent Shriver to command the war on poverty in the United States in addition to running the Peace Corps overseas, which is even sillier than expecting Dr. Goldman to mobilize the brains of the country in his spare time.

This is an immense job. It involves, for example, a serious review of the antiquated conflict-of-interest laws, which are a major barrier to the recruitment of talented men and women. It involves reviewing with the universities their rules which force faculty members to chose between serving the country and losing their job security or tenure after a certain length of time.

Beyond this, it probably means compiling a national roster of talented men and women who have special qualities of character and mind and certain language or administrative skills that might be made available to the public service.

The Federal Government is now able, for example, to run millions of selective service cards through a computer and find out in a few minutes where there is a young American who can take apart a jet engine or speak Swahili. But it has no comparable way of knowing who has the special talents necessary to serve the civilian departments of the Government at home and overseas.

One result of this is that a great many talented men and women in America are never even considered for the public service, partly because they are too modest to come forward on their own, and partly because they would not know how to apply if they wanted to.

Top jobs are now filled primarily because somebody in the Government, knowing of a vacancy, suggests somebody else he knows or has heard about. Or the national committees of the two parties, always on the hunt for jobs, suggest the names of some devoted and defeated candidate, who may or may not be competent.

Dr. Goldman's operation can help enlarge the list of talented potential public servants. It can help mobilize ideas in the intellectual community of the Nation, and, as Robert Sherwood and Archibald MacLeish did for Roosevelt, improve the quality of presidential speeches, but this is not likely to touch the larger pool of talent in business, labor, and agriculture, whose abilities might prove highly useful to the Government service.

THE STATE PROBLEM

This larger job probably cannot be done without cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. Each Governor, with the cooperation of the mayors, the lawyers, the editors, and the teachers of his State, could put together a roster of talented men and women in his own State, complete with a record of experience and skills, and this in turn could be a starting point in the effort to improve the quality of public service in the States as well as in the Nation.

The bar association now helps the President in screening appointments to the Federal judiciary. Mr. Johnson has recently been searching for ways of getting similar help in finding talented appointees for the regulatory agencies. At the same time, he is looking for 50 talented women to take top jobs in Washington, but all this is more than one busy professor can help tackle at Princeton in his spare time.

Air Captain's Letters Say Vietnamese War Is Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters from my district, relative to a story that appeared in the Indianapolis News on March 28, 1964. This story relates to letters received by the family of Capt. Edwin G. Shank, Jr., of Winamac, Ind., and the experiences that he has had as a member of the U.S. forces in South Vietnam. Captain Shank was killed on a strafing run, it was announced by the Air Force about 2 weeks ago. He left a widow and four children, the youngest being only 6 weeks old, whom the captain had never seen. I am sure that the contents of these letters will be of great interest to the Congress. I am likewise sure that some will be shocked by the information that they relate. With permission, I would like to submit this article from the Indianapolis News for printing in the RECORD:

KILLED IN ACTION: AIR CAPTAIN'S LETTERS SAY VIETNAMESE WAR IS UNFAIR

WINAMAC.—The letters were from an Air Force captain stationed in South Vietnam: A University of Notre Dame graduate who previously had piloted C-124 cargo planes for Military Air Transport Service.

"I'm over here to do the best job possible for my country," said the letter dated January 20 from Capt. Edwin G. Shank, Jr. "Yet, my country will do nothing for me, or for any of my buddies or even for itself.

"I have never been so lonely, unhappy, disappointed or frustrated in my whole life," said the letter to his wife, Connie, describing the "unfair" war being fought with Communist guerrillas.

The Air Force announced Tuesday that Shank, who was shipped to Vietnam last September, and a Vietnamese student were killed while on a strafing run.

Shank was the father of 4 children—the youngest, a 6-week-old daughter whom he had never seen.

His father, E. G. Shank, cashier of First Union Bank & Trust Co. here, has disclosed the contents of some of his son's letters.

"I can say these things now," said the elder Shank, "because I can't hurt him * * * he stated in many a letter that we were losing the war already."

The younger Shank, 28, a 1959 architectural engineering graduate of Notre Dame, had flown more than 80 missions in single-engine T-28 trainers since being assigned to the small airfield in the Mekong Delta.

Technically, American pilots are "instructors," and the Vietnamese riding in the back of the two-seat World War II vintage planes are the pilots.

"I'll bet that anyone you talk to does not know that American pilots fight the war," one letter said.

It went on:

"We—me and my buddies—do everything. The Vietnamese [students] that we have on board are airmen basics. They know less about flying than Bart (Shank's 5-year-old son). The only reason that they are on board is in case we crash, there is one American (adviser) and one Vietnamese (student).

"They're stupid, ignorant, sacrificial lambs. They are a menace to have on board."

The Air Force notification of death read: "After his third pass on the target his plane was seen to crash. There was evidence of hostile fire in the crash area."

Said the elder Shank: "He stated before that ground fire was being controlled by radar * * * the boys didn't have much of a chance."

And in another letter home: "Bernie (another flier) was going in on his seventh strafing pass and never came out of it. Don't know what happened, whether he got shot or his controls shot out. That was two airplanes in 2 days. Kinda shook us up.

"Not only that, the B-26's have been grounded since Monday, because the wings came off. After the last (T-28) crash, the whole U.S. Air Force is down to six airplanes. Six airplanes. Might as well be none."

And later: "Rumor now is that the B-26's will fly again, only with greater restrictions. If I lose another friend because of that old airplane, I'm going to start writing letters to CHARLEY HALLECK. Poor B-26 jocks are really shook. That airplane is a killer."

The elder Shank: "He had 3 Air Medals, 1 for every 25 missions, but he'd trade the whole bag of tricks to come home and see his family. He said he'd come in so dog tired * * * many a day they had four missions.

"What is true for this boy is true for the remainder of the boys in the squadron."

The letter: "I love America. My country is the best, but it is soft and has not guts to do anything about it at all. What gets me the most is that they won't tell you people what we do over here."

Questionnaire, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed the tabulation of my fourth annual poll of public opinion on some of the major issues confronting the Nation, the Congress, and the administration and I am happy to report that I have received a record number of returns. This demonstrates anew that the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, which I have the honor to represent, are continuing their gratifying manifestation of responsible interest and knowledge in Government affairs.

During the 4 years I have conducted this survey through the medium of a questionnaire—not printed at Government expense—distributed to residents of my district who are on my regular mailing list there has been clear evidence of increasing interest and a growth in the numbers participating.

In 1961 I mailed 7,305 questionnaires and received a return of 1,375 or 18.5 percent. In 1962 I mailed 10,000 and received a return of 1,795 or 18 percent, and in 1963 I mailed 12,000 and received 2,110 or 18 percent returns.

The 1964 questionnaire was mailed to approximately 13,000 people and I have received 2,505 returns or approximately 19.2 percent. In every respect, the current returns are the highest recorded in the 4 years the survey has been conducted. Each year I have been gratified with the response, not only in the number of cards returned but also in the hundreds of letters and messages which

have come to me with critical or laudatory comments and in many cases with detailed expressions of opinion on specific legislative matters.

This is not intended to be a scientific sampling of opinion, for the questionnaires are distributed to persons on my regular mailing list which is comprised of people with whom I have had previous correspondence, and they are also distributed to those who request them after newspaper, radio, and television announcements of their availability. I am indeed grateful to these media, also, for the interest they have shown.

While I do not look upon these returns as an official mandate to be followed by me in my voting in the Congress, they are helpful guides in their indication of public opinion trends. However, I shall continue to exercise my own judgment and to vote on the issues as I see them and their influence on the people of my district and of the Nation.

Each year that this study has been conducted through my office we have learned by experience that certain improvements are in order and can be effected in the format and procedure. As long as I am in Congress I shall continue to go each year to the voters of the district for an expression of their views on national problems, and each year I shall revise the program as necessary for the purposes of obtaining the greatest possible cross-section of opinion.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the complete tabulation of the 17 sections and the several subsections covered in my 1964 questionnaire showing the total scores both in figures and in percentages:

Results of questionnaire, March 1964, JOHN S. MONAGAN, *5th District, Connecticut*

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Do you favor—						
1. A program of medical care for the aged?	1,897	76.1	239	9.1	369	14.8
(a) Under social security exclusively?	827	33.1	655	26.2	1,015	40.7
(b) Under social security with private insurance?	689	27.6	840	33.6	824	38.8
(c) Under Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) program?	616	24.7	594	23.8	1,287	51.5
2. Change in wage-hour laws to spread employment by increasing overtime payments?	893	35.7	1,325	53.1	279	11.2
3. Appropriation of additional funds for accelerated public works program for labor surplus areas?	1,506	60.3	717	28.7	274	11.0
4. Amendment of immigration and nationality laws to revise national quota system?	1,426	57.1	671	26.9	400	16.0
5. Federal aid to education?	1,540	61.7	572	22.9	385	15.4
(a) For parochial school construction?	876	35.1	1,178	47.2	443	17.7
(b) For public elementary school construction?	1,663	66.6	448	17.5	386	15.9
(c) For public school teachers' salaries?	1,153	46.2	1,130	45.2	214	8.6
6. Civil rights legislation—						
(a) To bar discriminatory practices in establishing voting rights?	2,143	85.8	275	11.0	79	3.2
(b) To prohibit discrimination in specified places of public accommodations?	1,709	68.4	516	20.7	272	10.9
(c) To desegregate public facilities, other than schools?	1,671	66.9	510	20.4	316	12.7
(d) To desegregate schools?	1,709	68.4	493	19.7	295	11.9
(e) Establishment of a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission?	1,460	58.5	591	23.6	446	17.9
7. A constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools?	2,016	80.7	365	14.6	116	4.7
8. Federal controls on use of cigarettes?	513	20.5	1,767	70.8	217	8.7
(a) Restrictions on tobacco advertising?	1,423	57.0	827	33.1	247	9.9
9. Funds for foreign aid program—						
(a) Military (in present amount)?	911	36.5	624	25.0	962	38.5
1. More?	325	13.0	722	28.9	1,450	58.1
2. Less?	1,088	43.6	424	17.0	985	39.4
(b) Economic (in present amount)?	781	31.3	461	18.5	1,255	50.2
1. More?	507	20.3	780	31.2	1,210	48.5
2. Less?	977	39.1	422	16.9	1,088	44.0
10. Additional $1,200 income tax exemption for persons paying expenses of college students?	1,876	75.1	486	19.5	135	5.4
11. Positive action to correct water pollution conditions—						
(a) With additional Federal funds and assistance?	1,426	57.1	471	18.9	600	24.0
(b) Through local-State-Federal police action?	1,523	61.0	241	9.6	733	29.4
12. Expansion of Federal programs for housing for the elderly?	1,705	68.3	617	24.7	175	7.0
13. U.S. sale of surplus food to all nations?	1,665	66.7	516	20.7	316	12.6
(a) On strictly cash basis?	1,354	54.2	423	16.9	720	28.9
(b) With credit through Export-Import Bank?	746	29.9	805	32.2	946	37.9
14. A change in our Presidential succession law?	1,492	59.8	655	26.2	350	14.0
15. Additional Federal funds for expanded space program for manned moon travel?	793	31.7	1,410	56.5	294	11.8
16. A Domestic Service Corps?	1,513	60.6	725	29.0	259	10.4
17. A Youth Conservation Corps?	1,806	72.3	406	16.3	285	11.4

A Tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL W. RICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the great soldier who fired his first shot in battle 61 years ago and served with distinction as a fighting general in three wars, has lost his final battle to death.

The death of the five-star general, senior ranking officer in the U.S. Army, removed from the American scene a public figure who had written himself brilliantly into the history of his time not only as a soldier but a statesman.

As United Nations commander in the occupation of Japan, he became the first foreigner to govern that country.

The impact of his personality alone has made him an outstanding world figure since he came dramatically out of retirement and into field command in the Philippines when the Japanese started World War II.

In World War II, as commander of the Southwest Pacific Theater of Operations, General MacArthur often was under fire as he landed along with his troops on invasion beaches. The planning and execution of his campaign that led allied forces from Australia back through jungled islands and through the Philippines has been called masterly by military critics.

The audacity and calculated chance taking of some of his maneuvers caught the enemy completely off balance. In the Korean war, in which he was United Nations commander, he conceived and carried out the Inchon amphibious landing in 1950 despite opposition from his field commander and initially from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The operation recaptured Seoul, the capital city, and sparked the routing of the North Korean Communist army.

His words "I shall return," and "I have returned," will long be remembered by all Americans and all free people in the world. But most of all we will remember the words he spoke to the joint session of Congress from one of the most popular barracks ballads "which proclaimed most proudly, that old soldiers never die, they just fade away. And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away."

The memory of Gen. Douglas MacArthur will never fade away in the hearts of free people of this world.

To his widow, his son, his family, we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, from the plains of the U.S. Military Academy to the decks of the battleship *Missouri*, through two World Wars, and Korea, up the beaches of Corregidor and across the Peninsula of Bataan there stands a trail blazed by an American patriot—a man who served his country and labored in her name.

Many in New Mexico have a very special knowledge of that man, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for during World War II there served on Bataan two battalions of the New Mexico National Guard. It was to men such as those that he triumphantly returned in 1944. For the accomplishment of that remarkable feat alone, we shall be forever in the general's debt.

Little more than a week ago, the tired warrior opened his eyes after major surgery; and, while having barely regained consciousness, he whispered, "I will do my best." As 20 years ago he kept his promise of, "I shall return," we may feel secure in the knowledge that he did no less than "his best" throughout his years.

May we who have benefited from his courage, determination and dedication always walk in his footsteps doing nothing less than our best.

Americans have had good reason to take pride in their country. But now, we have been given new reason for pride in this Nation by the thoughts, words, and deeds of this General of the Army, for we are able to hold dear the same land to which he dedicated his life.

Each of us, as citizens of America and as citizens of the world, can honorably toil in the service of his ideals, and while emulating his devotion to peace, may we withstand with equal fortitude the gales of war should those ill winds ever again surround us.

In the annals of history, there still live many men who no longer walk among us. Yet, death and the passage of time have illuminated their deeds and elevated the memory of their lives as a source of mankind's hope. Like those men, Douglas MacArthur is a man whose memory will serve as a wellspring of hope. But, unlike them, it was during life and not in death that he became a legend. In repose, he can serve only to make us realize the great depth of our loss, for already we realize that we have sustained a loss.

May we learn from his passing of our great need to bring from the generations of today and tomorrow men, who like him, will live with dignity and integrity. May we recognize that what many have thought beyond human ability is surely not so, for by his death, Douglas MacArthur has again manifested his greatest quality, his humanity.

To a Son in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, by coincidence on the same day that I received notice of the coming observance of Armed Forces Day, I received the usual weekly edition of the Harvard Herald, published in the 12th Illinois District.

The editor and publisher, Lowell A. Nye, is a longtime friend who is worthy of the best traditions of the hometown editor and community leader. An American in the noblest sense of citizenship, he has never hesitated when it comes time to take a stand in the support of the national interest. But, not only is he an American and an editor, a community leader, and a sounding board; he is a father, a husband, and a human being whose heart murmurs—even as ours. His open letter to "A Son in Korea" is well worth reading:

TO A SON IN KOREA

DEAR SON: This is being written on Good Friday. After watching your mother shed some more of those silent tears this morning while she was reading out loud a little "Prayer for a Young Soldier," I thought it was a good time to send a few serious lines to you.

I would guess that several million Americans do not know, or have forgotten, what is involved in keeping the peace. Before you went over there, I was one of them. Korea? It was just another place where our boys went overseas. But now at Eastertime, with your mother's voice breaking and me following her out to the kitchen to stop the tears. I am going to sound off. I have had enough of this be-brave-be-silent routine.

It is actually got to the point where we must have "peace at any price." And since it has reached that point, a few mother's tears or a dad who could use a willing and eager son in his business are not to be considered. Americans can do anything else to make work easier. Union workmen have more time on their hands to loaf. Farmers can get a dairy barn cleaned by pushing a button. But no one gives a tinker's damn about ending the war and bringing the boys home. So it seems.

Peace at any price.

A national foreign policy of turning the other cheek.

Continue the draft, extend it, extend it. And if boys do voluntarily join the Armed Forces, it is a minimum stint of 3 years or the 6-month deal plus the national guard for 6 years or else the compulsory draft for 2 years.

All this time the boy does not have a chance to earn a buck. We know you do not make enough to send money home. But none of that is what makes a mother cry.

How much longer does it go on? What about your two younger brothers, now in high school? Are they destined for the same rat race, with no variations on the basic theme?

Our national leaders will say: "What are you squawking about? We have kept the peace, have we not? Your sons are not being killed in a shooting war, are they? What more do you want?"

We want military service cut to a year or 18 months. That is enough time to expose any young man to the good things about serving his country in uniform. That is what we want. We have had enough of a mother's tears. Thirty-six months is just too confounded long.

There now. I have sounded off. And I am not a bit sorry.

DAD.

This Is a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article titled "This Is a Farmer," which appeared recently in the St. John News, St. John, Kans., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

All Americans admire and respect the American farmer. He is indeed a rugged individualist, the epitome of the Jeffersonian ideal, the essence of a strong democratic society. That he is willing to persevere in spite of the vagaries of government officialdom, is evidence of his strength and symptomatic of his love of liberty and aversion to the growing forces of government regimentation. His achievements certainly have glorified our country as the greatest agricultural nation in the world.

The article follows:

[From the St. John (Kans.) News, Mar. 12, 1964]

THIS IS A FARMER

Farmers are found in fields plowing, seeding down, returning from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting, if—

Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them, meals wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

When you car stalls along the way, a farmer is a considerate, courteous, inexpensive road service.

When a farmer's wife suggests he buy a new suit, he can quote from memory every expense involved in operating the farm last year, plus the added expense he is certain will crop up this year. Or else he assumes the role of the indignant shopper, impressing upon everyone within earshot the pounds of pork he must produce in order to pay for a suit at today's prices.

A farmer is a paradox—he is an "overalled" executive in his home and his office, a purchasing agent in an old straw hat, a personnel director with grease under his fingernails, a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, animals, and antibiotics, a production expert faced with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze. He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, Saturday nights in town, his shirt collar unbuttoned, and above all, a good soaking rain in July.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, helping with the housework, or grasshoppers.

Nobody is so far from the telephone or so close to God. Nobody else gets so much satisfaction out of modern plumbing, good weather, and homemade ice cream.

Nobody else can remove possessions from his pockets, and on washday still have overlooked five "steeples," one cotter key, a rusty spike, three grains of corn, the stub end of a lead pencil, a square tape, a $4.98 pocket watch, and a cupful of chaff in each trouser cuff.

A farmer has faith and is fatalistic—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage, but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food and fiber, and furnishes self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities.

He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature.

And when he comes in at noon having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words, "The market's up."—author unknown.

In Memoriam to Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, like an old soldier who never dies, Gen. Douglas MacArthur faded away Sunday leaving behind a great legacy for those who loved

and cherished him. His passing, though anticipated for some time, brings deep bereavement to our countrymen everywhere for he has long been the symbol of a great father to all of us, as he fought for our country and protected our homesteads and our American ideals.

The legend that Gen. Douglas MacArthur created for our Nation and our people is almost unparalleled in the records of American military history. He became a living embodiment of the West Point Academy code which he himself so eloquently expressed many times during his long distinguished career: That of duty, honor, and country.

To many young boys, as well as those who grew up alongside of him during the war period, General MacArthur was the hero who could never die. He also became the idol and beloved hero of other countries and peoples around the world.

General MacArthur exhibited both courage and physical strength during his military service that made people everywhere admire and respect him, yet he also had a deep-seated devotion to spiritual values. During the desperate early days of the war in the Pacific, General MacArthur wrote a credo, which his family joined in to repeat during early morning devotions. It is a simple legacy from a father to a son, and I would like to submit it here in memoriam to his fine aspirations:

Build me a son, O Lord, who will be strong enough to know when he is weak, and brave enough to face himself when he is afraid; one who will be proud and unbending in honest defeat, and humble and gentle in victory.

Build me a son whose wishes will not take the place of deeds; a son who will know Thee—and that to know himself is the foundation stone of knowledge.

Lead him, I pray, not in the path of ease and comfort, but under the stress and spur of difficulties and challenge. Here let him learn to stand up in the storm; here let him learn compassion for those who fail.

Build me a son whose heart will be clear, whose goal will be high, a son who will master himself before he seeks to master other men, one who will reach into the future, yet never forget the past.

And after all these things are his, add, I pray, enough of a sense of humor, so that he may always be serious, yet never take himself too seriously. Give him humility, so that he may always remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, and the meekness of true strength.

Then I, his father, will dare to whisper, I have not lived in vain.

Nondiscriminatory Tax Treatment as Between Corporation Employees and Self-Employed Professionals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution which passed the New York State Legislature:

[From the State of New York]

S. CON. RES. 98

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending section 7701(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals

Whereas the Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Men—Tax Status and Tax Benefits of the New York State Legislature was created in April 1963 by concurrent resolution of the New York State Senate and Assembly (in assembly April 4, 1963; in senate April 5, 1963) for the purpose of investigating and studying all phases of affording equitable tax status and tax benefits to professional men licensed to practice their professions pursuant to the laws of the State of New York; and

Whereas the said joint legislative committee has conducted its investigation and study of the question and rendered its report, dated December 14, 1963, to the 1964 session of the New York State Legislature, in which, among other things, it recommended that the tax benefits and savings afforded corporation employees should not be denied to self-employed professionals and further recommended that the New York State Senate and Assembly by appropriate joint resolution memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals; and

Whereas the said joint legislative committee reported that under the then existing Kintner regulations (Code Reg. sec. 301, 7701–1 and 2, adopted Nov. 15, 1960; CCH 1963 Fed. Tax Rep. vol. 6, par. 5942), equality of tax status could be afforded professionals by enactment of legislation at the State level which would authorize professional practice in association or corporation form, but that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had announced that impending amendments to the Kintner regulations as they then existed would soon be made; and

Whereas proposed amendments to the then existing Kintner regulations were published by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the Federal Register on December 17, 1963, which would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for professionals conducting their professions in association or corporation form to qualify for the tax savings presently afforded employees of corporations; and

Whereas on December 19, 1963, a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States (S. 2403) by Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law and providing that professional associations and corporations shall by definition be granted the status of corporations within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, section 7701(a); and

Whereas it is deemed desirable to create a tax status for self-employed professionals relatively equal to the favorable treatment afforded corporation employees, in order to eliminate the existing tax discrimination against professionals in New York State, which has resulted in a trend on the part of many professionals to enter corporate employment rather than private practice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact into law S. 2403, known as the Talmadge bill, amending section 7701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law, or, in lieu thereof, to enact other similar legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code to grant to self-employed professionals the tax benefits and savings afforded corporation employees; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congress of the United States by forwarding one copy thereof to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate and one copy to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and one copy to each Member of the Congress from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate March 20, 1964. Concurred in, without amendment, by order of the Senate.

ALBERT J. ABRAMS,
Secretary.

A Warning From General Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Times of March 11, 1964.

EISENHOWER WARNS LAG IN JOBS AND SCHOOLS CAN ENDANGER UNITED STATES

(By Murray Illson)

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned yesterday that the Nation was courting disaster by failing to provide adequate education and job opportunities for all citizens.

His warning was coupled with an announcement that he had accepted the chairmanship of a 53-member national advisory council for Tuskegee Institute, which provides professional and vocational training primarily for Negroes.

General Eisenhower's statement was read for him by Gen. Lucius D. Clay in a news conference at the Overseas Press Club. He explained that General Eisenhower was in California.

"A major threat to our social and economic stability seethes beneath the headlines of the day," General Eisenhower warned.

"It is embodied in our collective failure to provide adequately for the education, skills, and motivation, as well as the opportunity, for every one of our citizens to be gainfully employed and lead a full life in self-respect."

Changes in the Nation's social and economic structure are seriously affecting job opportunities for youth, he said.

"On the one hand, technological advances are producing countless new opportunities," he observed. "On the other, automation, coupled with the need for greater operating efficiency, is rapidly making obsolete many traditional forms of labor.

"We are told that within a few years more than half of our population will be 25 years of age or younger, and that within the next decade more than 25 million young people will be seeking their first jobs. Of these, more than 7.5 million will lack a high school education. To ignore their problem is to court national disaster."

After having praised Tuskegee's role in educating and training Negro youth, General Eisenhower went on:

"The fulfillment of our national commitment to leadership in both moral and economic affairs depends substantially on the quality of educational opportunity we offer to our young people.

"We must understand this and we must extend educational opportunity fairly and at high-quality levels, for if we fail, then all of America may soon become enveloped in debilitating disadvantage."

General Clay, now a senior partner in the investment banking house of Lehman Bros., said the advisory council would help to plan a 10-year, $40 million development program for the 83-year-old Alabama school.

He said he was sure the campaign "will receive wide support from the American people."

At the news conference were Basil O'Connor, chairman of the Tuskegee board of trustees; Bayard F. Pope, chairman of the institute's development committee, and Dr. Luther H. Foster, president of the institute.

Dr. Foster made public Tuskegee's 50th annual report, titled "Race Relations in the South—1963." He said the "overall situation" was "favorable," with "considerable more pluses than minuses."

Tribute to Dan Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Dan Parker is retiring. The name Dan Parker is known throughout the world among sports conscious people. His name has been closely associated with sports and athletics in every area and in every echelon and his has been the final word on fairness and integrity.

Dan Parker through his writings and through his personal associations with key figures in athletics has contributed immeasurably to the development of American youth through sports and I am proud of the association I have enjoyed with him and also of the fact that he started his climb to success in the world of sports journalism in Waterbury, Conn., which is his hometown and mine.

As Dan Parker enters retirement I know that I am joined by all my colleagues in wishing him happiness, health and new success in the more leisurely writing assignments which I am confident he will undertake with the same zest that characterized his long and successful career as a sports editor and columnist, first with the Waterbury Republican and later for so many years with the New York Mirror. Without a question Dan Parker is one of the great masters of English prose writing today and I hope that he will turn his great skill to more serious artistic pursuits in the days to come.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I should like to include here a brief editorial on Dan's retirement which appeared in the March 28, 1964, edition of the Waterbury Republican, the newspaper for which Dan Parker wrote one of his first columns:

DAN PARKER—A SPORTSWRITER'S SPORTSWRITER

The announcement that Dan Parker, sports editor and columnist, is retiring, is surprising. For anyone who has ever met Dan Parker would have a hard time believing that so forceful and prolific a man could "retire" from his much-loved profession.

And happily we note that Dan plans to continue writing for newspapers and magazines. Most sports fans know that Dan Parker was born in Waterbury and worked for these newspapers before he joined the now-defunct New York Mirror. He has always maintained close contacts with his old friends and associates, and is one of the most respected writers in journalism.

Dan Parker is considered one of the top sportswriters in the United States, and we have always taken pride in the fact that he is a Waterbury native and an alumnus of these newspapers. We hope he enjoys his "retirement" and that his fans can continue to enjoy his freelance copy.

The Hall of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the material abundance which is characteristic of life in the United States is a result of our free enterprise system. Indeed, its rich supply of goods has overflowed around the world—working to alleviate hardship and hunger.

If we acknowledge as the source of our plenty the free enterprise system coupled with the maximum freedom our people enjoy, then we are obligated to do all in our power to preserve that system.

Wishing to preserve our system, we must first understand it. Unfortunately, while the majority of Americans do not question the value derived from our system of free enterprise, a great many do not understand its principles.

A rare educational opportunity for junior executives and supervisors is being presented at the Hall of Free Enterprise at the New York World's Fair 1964–65. Here a course in Enterprise Economics will be given by Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y. The first class begins May 4.

Enterprise Economics is designed to explain and demonstrate the principles which guide the free enterprise system. Enterprise Economics concerns itself with the production of goods and services in a competitive environment in which the customer is supreme. It reveals those principles in support of sound businesss practices that result in healthy profits, high employment, innovations and an ever-higher standard of living. Enterprise Economics insists that prices of consumer goods must be a decision of the marketplace, not of government. Enterprise Economics teaches that a free economy is a prerequisite to all other freedoms.

In explaining the objectives of the course, Dr. James F. Bender, director, Graduate Business Studies, Adelphi University, said:

Personnel and training directors, supervisors and junior executives from business and industry who complete the course can return to their companies and plant communities better equipped to deal with economic problems. They will be equipped to help foster a better labor-management relationship to the interests of the increased productivity upon which our future depends. This is a major objective of our workshop.

The workshop will meet for 2 hours of classroom work and 1 hour of field work, 5 days a week for 2 weeks. Those applying as matriculated students may earn as many as three graduate credits.

Enterprise Economics will be given in six languages; its cost is $120 with an additional $15 registration fee. Living accommodations can be arranged through the university.

Applications, being processed at this time, are available upon request by writing to: Dr. James F. Bender, director, Graduate Business Studies, Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y. Special consideration will be given to individuals applying for admission during May, September and October, and for those applying in groups from selected industries or associations.

The Hall of Free Enterprise is sponsored by the American Economic Foundation with the support and cooperation of more than 90 international, national, regional and local organizations. Among the national organizations participating are: National Small Business Association, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, American Institute of Executives, National Interfraternity Conference and the Southern States Industrial Council.

The Hall of Free Enterprise is being financed by the voluntary, tax deductible contributions of individuals and corporations.

Tribute to General MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, we have become only too familiar in recent months with the sense of loss that is felt when a great man and a great national figure dies. Men who possess the rare quality that is called leadership hold a special place in the affections of their countrymen. Their departure occasions therefore a very deep, a very genuine, and a very unique kind of grief.

Everyone is familiar with the history of General MacArthur's life, and now we are sorrowfully familiar with the circumstances of his calmly courageous death. He died as he lived, a hero to the end.

In this stalwart and romantic figure, the great hopes, dreams, and ideals of the United States came to life and found fruition. In his full life of superlative leadership, of patriotic service, and of dedicated achievement, General MacArthur gained a deep and penetrating wisdom which found utterance in his public statements.

Rather than attempting the impossible task of reviewing the major triumphs of a life so full of achievement, it may perhaps be appropriate to repeat some of the words of Douglas MacArthur, words that his fellow Americans may remember in the years to come when his presence and counsel will not be here to guide and sustain us.

He stated his dedication to the cause of his country and of freedom thus:

I shall raise my voice as loud and as often as I believe it to be in the interest of the American people. I shall dedicate all of my energies to restoring to American life those immutable principles and ideals which your forefathers and mine handed down to us in sacred trust. I shall assist in the regaining of that moral base for both public and private life which will restore the people's faith in the integrity of public institutions and the private faith of every man in the integrity of his neighbor. I shall set my course to the end that no man need fear to speak the truth. I could not do less, for the opportunities for service my country has given me and the honors it has conferred upon me have imposed an obligation which is not discharged by the termination of public service. I am animated by the sole desire to help restore, preserve, and advance those great American principles and ideals of which we have been beneficiaries ourselves and are now trustees for future generations.

Following the surrender of the Japanese on the battleship *Missouri* he said:

Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start, workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.

This is the manner in which he described our crisis and prayed for the future of his country:

There are those who seek to convert us to a form of socialistic endeavor leading directly to the path of Communist slavery. As a counterbalance to those forces is the deep spiritual urge in the hearts of our people—a spiritual urge capable of arousing and directing a decisive and impelling public opinion. This, indeed, is the great safeguard and resource of America. So long as it exists we are secure, for it holds us to the path of reason. It is an infallible reminder that our greatest hope and faith rests upon two mighty symbols—the cross and the flag; the one based upon those immutable teachings which provide the spiritual strength to persevere along the course which is just and right—the other based upon the invincible will that human freedom shall not perish from the earth. These are the mighty bulwarks against the advance of those atheistic predatory forces which seek to destroy the spirituality of the human mind and to enslave the human body. Let us pray for the spiritual strength and innate wisdom to keep this Nation to the course of freedom charted by our fathers; to preserve it as the mighty instrument on earth to bring universal order out of existing chaos; to restore liberty where liberty has perished; and to reestablish human dignity where dignity has been suppressed.

In one of his last speeches, his farewell to the Cadet Corps at the Military Academy when he was presented the Sylvanus Thayer Award for service to the Nation, he spoke these moving words:

The long, gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from under their white crosses, thundering those magic words: duty, honor, country. * * * The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished, tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday.

I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory always I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and reechoes: duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river, my last conscious thoughts will be of the Corps, and the Corps, and the Corps.

I bid you farewell.

The Urgent Need for an Increase in the Beet Sugar Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10674 providing for an increase in the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966.

The sugarbeet growers and processors have issued a joint statement pointing out the need for this increase and this statement is being distributed by the Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association of Michigan.

I desire to present this statement for the consideration of my colleagues and particularly for the members of the House Committee on Agriculture to which this legislation has been referred.

The statement follows:

WHY A BEET SUGAR QUOTA INCREASE OF 750,000 TONS IS NECESSARY

(Joint statement of U.S. Sugarbeet Growers and Processors distributed by the Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Saginaw, Mich.)

1. PRESENT BEET SUGAR QUOTA IS GROSSLY INADEQUATE

The basic beet sugar quota (sec. 202(a)(1) of the Sugar Act) should be increased by 750,000 tons—from the present 2,650,000 tons to 3,400,000. The higher levels of production requested by the Government for 1963, 1964, and 1965 make an increase of this amount necessary. This increase is in the interest of U.S. sugar consumers, and is vital to American farmers who need sugarbeets as a cash crop and as an alternate or replacement for crops now in surplus production. Also it is important to the welfare of factory and field labor in the 25 States in which the beet sugar industry is now located.

2. WHY BEET SUGAR PRODUCTION IS ABOVE EXISTING QUOTA

To encourage "growth and expansion of the beet sugar industry" in new areas (sec. 302(b)(3)), the Congress in 1962 provided for erection of six new beet sugar processing plants in the 1963–66 period. And early in 1963, when the critical foreign sugar supply situation became alarming, the executive branch of Government turned to the domestic beet sugar industry as the quickest dependable source of greater production in the period ahead, and announced that there would be no acreage restrictions on sugarbeet planting in 1964 and 1965 as well as in 1963. The industry responded with immediate and substantial increases in production far above existing quota levels.

3. DRASTIC ACREAGE CUTS INEVITABLE UNLESS BEET SUGAR QUOTA INCREASED

Unless the basic beet sugar quota is increased, established sugarbeet growers will be faced with a 40-percent cut in acreage. Moreover, authorization of additional new beet sugar factories would be out of the question. It would be grossly unfair thus to penalize present growers who have contributed so importantly to the national sugar supply and to prohibit sugarbeet production in new areas where the crop is so urgently needed.

4. BEET SUGAR INDUSTRY SAVED MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR CONSUMERS IN 1963

Consumers are benefiting materially from the beet sugar industry's response to the congressional intent and Executive requests. The industry produced a half million tons more sugar this year than last, thus conprocess of producing a quarter million tons more sugar this year than last—thus contributing substantially to relieving the supply problem. Moreover, the beet sugar industry has significantly recognized its obligations to consumers under the Sugar Act. In 1963 beet sugar sold from $1 to $3 a hundred pounds less than cane sugar in the same markets. Both the volume and price of beet sugar helped keep U.S. prices of imported raw cane sugar lower than many other countries had to pay for the same sugar.

By saving millions of dollars for U.S. consumers in 1963, the beet sugar industry was continuing its tradition of serving consumers: beet sugar never sells for more than cane sugar, and usually sells for less. It is significant that in the one section of the country where only cane sugar is normally available—the Northeast States—the basis price for sugar has been the highest in the United States for many years.

Recognition of the importance of domestic sugar production for American consumers was given by President Johnson on January 31, 1964, when he urged Congress to authorize unlimited 1964 marketing of domestically produced sugar.

5. INCREASE IN BEET SUGAR QUOTA WOULD COME FROM UNALLOCATED GLOBAL QUOTA

The 750,000-ton increase in the basic beet sugar quota could be made without disturbing any of the present individual country quotas. The increase would come from the so-called global quota. Under changed world sugar supply-demand conditions it would appear undesirable to continue a system wherein a large quantity of U.S. supplies is not specifically allocated.

6. OTHER DOMESTIC PRODUCER QUOTAS NOT AFFECTED BY INCREASED BEET QUOTA

The transfer of 750,000 tons from the global quota to the beet area quota would not adversely affect the quotas of the other domestic producing areas—mainland cane, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

7. SUGAR ACT BENEFITS TO CANE SUGAR REFINERS

Cane sugar refiners had their position materially improved by 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act. These added 450,000 tons to the cane refiners' volume by prohibiting future importation of that amount of foreign refined sugar authorized by the previous law. This brought total volume of cane refiners to nearly 7 million tons, and left only 75,000 tons of foreign sugar which may be imported as refined sugar. The slight increase in the beet quota in 1962 was offset, in the cane refiners' favor, by the transfer of Hawaiian and Puerto Rican deficits from domestic areas to foreign countries, which were required to ship the sugar in raw form.

It should be noted that 100,000 tons of protected beet sugar expansion have already been awarded to cane sugar refiners and that cane refiners' interests have applied for another 100,000 tons of the reserve. Thus cane sugar refiners are prime recipients of the benefits of the beet sugar expansion authorized by Congress.

8. WORLD SUGAR SITUATION CONTINUES TO BE UNCERTAIN

Many changes have taken place in the sugar world since Congress wrote the 2,650,000-ton basic beet sugar quota into the law in 1962. No longer is there a world surplus. World reserve stocks of sugar, large in mid-1962, are now almost nonexistent. Even if talked-of increases in foreign production are eventually realized, it will take time and a vastly improved investment climate.

Nearly a third of world sugar production is under Communist control. Instability and political turmoil plague many of the other sugar-producing nations of the world. Therefore, in this uncertain atmosphere, it is in the public interest to rely on the domestic beet sugar industry for an additional 7½ to 8 percent of our total sugar supplies—which a 750,000-ton increase in the basic beet sugar quota, to 3,400,000 tons, would achieve. Even after adding 750,000 tons to the beet area quota, foreign countries would still be guaranteed a third of the total U.S. market of about 10 million tons.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today we pay our last respects to a great soldier and a distinguished American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Freemen mourn his passing throughout the world. General MacArthur's military genius, his spirit of patriotism, and leadership will long be remembered.

General MacArthur devoted his life to the service of his country. He was an inspiration to all those who served with him in three wars. He had written himself brilliantly into the history of his time not only as a soldier but as a statesman. As United Nations commander in the occupation of Japan, he became the first foreigner to govern that country. He earned the respect and gratitude of the Japanese people for the fair and impartial manner in which he guided their rehabilitation following World War II.

Today we salute this great American and bid him a final farewell. I know I speak for the citizens of my district in conveying heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. MacArthur and her son. We pray that God will bless and comfort them in their bereavement.

Following is an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which further exemplifies the great loss which Americans have felt because of the passing of General MacArthur:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

"On a field where courage was the rule his courage was the dominant feature." From a World War I citation to Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Americans, it has long been noted, are not a military people. When a military man is venerated by the American public surely he is a great man. Douglas MacArthur was such a man. The death of the five-star general, senior ranking officer in the United States, removes from the Nation one of the most memorable persons and one of the most capable military leaders of this century.

His brilliant career spanned three wars. But probably he will be best remembered as the determined warrior of the Pacific war against Japan. His angular profile, open collar, crushed service hat and corncob pipe, his prophecy that "I shall return," when he left embattled Corregidor in December 1941, and his return, wading ashore, 3 years later are a dramatic part of that war.

Douglas MacArthur was anything but an "armchair" general. He combined the dynamic flare of a frontline soldier, of the George Patton type, with the military genius for tactics of a Robert E. Lee. He was audacious and outspoken. These were qualities that inspired unswerving loyalty from his men and the consternation of President Truman who relieved him of his U.N. command in Korea when the General became outspoken in carrying the war across the Yalu River. To MacArthur there was no substitute for victory.

MacArthur was a statesman and peacemaker as well. To him fell the task of supervising defeated Japan. And his influence and direction pervaded. The postwar Japanese constitution, loudly criticized as the "MacArthur Constitution," served as an effective charter for the rehabilitation of Japan under democratic principles. Today the country he helped defeat and then rebuild stands as a showcase of democracy and prosperity in Asia.

The old soldier rankled many. He had the tenacity of a tank. But it was this trait that made men proud to follow him. Americans have lost a brilliant military man, a diligent statesman, and a devout patriot."

Mr. John E. Allen, Political Scientist, Urges Support for House Resolution 43 To Correct Imbalance on Committee Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of John E. Allen, a political scientist, regarding House Resolution 43, which I have introduced:

STATEMENT OF JOHN E. ALLEN, POLITICAL SCIENTIST, REGARDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 43, INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENGEL, OF IOWA

It seems to me that House Resolution 43, introduced by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, is one of the most needed and progressive pieces of legislation now before the American Congress. I wholeheartedly recommend its early enactment, which would facilitate the legislative process in the House of Representatives, specifically enabling the current political minority more closely to cooperate, on a more equitable basis, with the majority leadership. The measure, authorizing additional professional staff and clerical personnel, would serve to expedite congressional committee business in the national interest. Passage of the bill would, in addition, represent a practical step in the right direction toward the overall plan to reorganize operations of the U.S. Congress on a more effective and efficient basis. Enactment of House Resolution 43 into law is definitely overdue.

Demands upon congressional committee members have multiplied many times in recent decades, particularily during the past 20 years. In the main, this is the principal reason equal or nearly equal staff and clerical assistance should be provided the minority as well as the majority. Committee operations can be strengthened by all members receiving correct, precise, and meaningful data on the legislative proposals at hand. The committee workloads have increased tremendously, and there has likewise been a concomitant increase in complexity of the legislation. To keep abreast of these changes, House Resolution 43 should be passed now.

Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, emphasized the significant role of congressional committees in the legislative process in his book, "Congressional Government." He appeared insistent that, to him, committees were the "real national legislature." Another of our popular Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, had a good deal to say to Congress, and on July 4, 1861, in a fragment he said that, "The people will save their Government, if the Government itself will allow them." So it seems imperative that the American people, Congress, and the administration, "take the important step now," to see that House Resolution 43 is passed in the earliest practicable time.

Ungrateful or Forgetful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by David Lawrence from the current issue of the U.S. News & World Report entitled "Ungrateful or Forgetful?" At this time, when a revision of our thinking toward our relationship with other nations is being advocated, Mr. Lawrence points up some of our past experiences and our past contributions as a Nation of high principle and firm determination among the world family of

nations. This Nation was founded on high moral principles of the preservation of individual freedom and condemnation of oppression and, as such, has become the most powerful Nation in the world and also the most successful in providing to its people the highest degree of opportunity and individual freedom.

I believe this editorial provides appropriate food for thought for not only Members of Congress but all of the American people, as to whether or not we are going to maintain the position of respect among nations which we have so long enjoyed. I commend this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House.

UNGRATEFUL OR FORGETFUL?

(By David Lawrence)

Twice in the last half century, the American people have been dragged into war in Europe.

Twice we have triumphed on the military side, only to lose our battle for international morality.

Both wars were waged against acts of aggression committed by dictatorships thousands of miles away from our shores. Yet American youths were sent overseas under the banner of a great idealism, and they saved our allies from defeat.

We helped Russia twice. We helped Great Britain twice. We helped France twice.

We annexed no territory. We acquired no new resources. We piled up war debts of $245 billion. We buried our dead but not our ideals.

We in America are still bearing the main burden of the military defense of the free world. Yet, notwithstanding the lessons of the past, we see a return by some of our allies to the same paths of appeasement that preceded both World Wars.

Also, despite the record of our unselfish efforts, we are confronted today with the same old materialism—the quest for trade—that brushes away ideals under the euphemistic cover of flexibility and realism.

No better example of this mood could be cited than the warm reception given recently in Europe to misguided suggestions coming from some of our own would-be spokesmen who have been advocating flexibility, if not surrender, in foreign policy. In fact, the United States is boldly urged to accept temporary reverses as permanent changes and to disregard Communist aggressions in the cold war and come to terms, at last, with the realities.

But what, then, becomes of moral principle? What shall we say to the families of those American soldiers, sailors, and airmen who lie in the cemeteries of Europe? Shall we argue that money is everything and that morality no longer means anything? Shall we give up all that we have stood for?

Morality in international affairs means adherence to honesty of purpose. It means an unflinching championship of individual freedom, as opposed to the tyranny of the state. It means a refusal to compromise with autocratic governments or dictatorships that continue to imperial the peace of the world.

We should not remain indifferent when a brutal dictator takes over in Cuba, executes hundreds of innocent citizens, and makes a deal with the Soviet Government to erect missile bases to threaten us.

Why, then, is our economic boycott of Communist Cuba being frustrated, as voices of despair in our midst and abroad openly espouse commercial expediency as the paramount guideline of international conduct?

What becomes of moral principle when our respected ally, France, through its leader, General De Gaulle—who certainly knows from personal experience the sacrifices America has made for his country—decides to recognize the Government of Red China? Has De Gaulle forgotten it was Red China, aided and abetted by the Soviet Government, which attacked the United Nations forces in Korea in 1950 and brought about a 3-year war in which America again bore the brunt of the fighting and paid the bill?

What becomes of moral principle when we see aggression by a Communist regime rewarded with a formal bestowal of diplomatic recognition?

It may be contended that diplomatic recognition is mere routine, but this is the hogwash of diplomatic parlance. The fact is that now—before all the world—France has, in effect, expressed her contempt for moral principle by ignoring the evil deeds of the Peiping government. And for what reason? To obtain for France a commercial foothold in Asia?

The history of the world teaches us that when moral principle is abandoned—as governments wobble and appease—the gains on the material side are short lived. For ultimately the world is plunged into a war in which not only human lives are lost but all the so-called trade is forfeited.

It is time indeed for an emphasis not on mythical new realities, but on the same old realities that have in the past darkened the progress of mankind.

Dangerous dictatorships, we must remind ourselves, cannot long survive if the free world remains united. Moral support must therefore be given constantly to the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe. By holding aloft the torch of individual freedom, we can keep alive in the breasts of the Soviet people, too, the hope of emancipation from bondage. For we need only to recall that it was the concerted will of the Russian people which broke down the dictatorship of the czar and caused his own army to join the revolution.

Disunity among our allies can only give aid and comfort to the unmoral regimes of Moscow and Peiping.

Unity, on the other hand, and a revival of moral principle among our allies can, by bloodless war, save human life and trade and preserve as well the heritage and ideals of mankind.

The Belief of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE DIGNITY OF MAN—THE BELIEF OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, dead at 84, already is accorded rank as one of history's greatest military leaders. Strangely, he was a man dedicated not to war but to preserving the dignity of man.

General MacArthur regarded war in his time as inevitable. Consequently, he believed, it was an instrument that should be wielded efficiently to bring a swift end to the suffering it creates. This was exemplified by his address to Congress after his recall from Korea because he disagreed with the Truman administration's decision that Communist bases in Manchuria should not be bombed:

"I know war as few other men now living know it and nothing to me is more revolting. * * * But once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision."

As supreme Allied occupation commander in Japan for 5 years 7 months and 15 days, he exercised his virtual dictatorship with such firm benevolence that his former enemies eventually revered him. No one was more shocked or saddened than Emperor Hirohito when General MacArthur was ordered to return home.

The emperor, apart from his appreciation of General MacArthur's magnificent contributions to Japan's recovery, had a very personal reason for allegiance to the American military leader. Hirohito's name was on the list of accused war criminals drawn up at the end of World War II. His name was stricken when General MacArthur protested violently to Washington.

"His [the Emperor's] trial and execution would have necessitated an additional million troops successfully to carry out the occupation of Japan," the general said.

In 1942, accepting an award as outstanding father of the year, General MacArthur expressed a wish that indicated the strength of his moral fiber:

"My hope is that my son, when I am gone, will remember me not from the battle but in the home repeating with him our simple daily prayer, 'Our Father who art in heaven.' "

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and the Nation in paying tribute to a great man.

Douglas MacArthur was one of those star-crossed individuals who not only had the great fortune of living in this Nation at a time when great history was in the making, but who also took a major role in the shaping of that history. He was one of our rare soldier-statesmen.

As a soldier he led this Nation to overwhelming victory in the Pacific. Then after the conflict had passed and the guns of war had fallen silent, he lifted the vanquished from the ashes of defeat, and almost single handedly built them into the great democracy they are today.

This is but one of the many examples that could be used to illustrate his ability.

From his first campaign in the Philippines to his last battle in Korea, he served this Nation with every fiber of his body and every thought of his brilliant mind.

His military genius and administrative brilliance will long continue to set the example for the young men in this Nation who will graduate from our military academies in the years to come.

I was privileged to hear his farewell address to the Congress in which he used that now famous phrase:

Old soldiers never die, they just fade away.

Now, after his passing, I cannot help thinking that no statement he made could be more mistaken.

For as long as history continues to record the deeds of men, the memory of Douglas MacArthur will never "fade

away" from the minds of the American people.

We can never repay you, Douglas MacArthur, for all you have done for your country. I hope it will suffice to say, "Thank you and God keep you."

J.F.K.: The Eternal Flame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, somehow the sublimeness of every great man born into a generation rubs off onto even the lowliest of creatures. Wherever he walks he sheds light and evidences of truth, which many of us have long discarded as hopeless aims to strive for. Yet somehow he still reaches us, some more consciously than others. Yet the truth of his greatness cannot be denied.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is still dearly remembered and vestiges of the way he has deeply touched even souls and hearts of those who have not even seen him in person, but have heard his voice or watched him on television, remain with us. One such person who was very much distraught over the passing of this great man and President is Mrs. Anne Herman, of Jersey City, N.J. Her sentiments are so beautifully expressed in a poem she wrote that I would like to insert it in the RECORD for all to read:

THE ETERNAL FLAME: A MEMORIAL POEM TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By A. Herman)

This bright young man,
Whose shining vigor helped to light,
The darkest corner of the world.
No more to shine.
This star from out the firmament,
This gift from God to all the poor, the humble, the downtrodden.
No more the hand reaching out across the world,
No more the heartening voice bringing hope and courage to all,
Rich and poor, powerful and commonplace alike.

This dastardly act performed by one mad man,
Did in but one moment, remove from us our gift from God.
Extinguished in one flash a bright light,
And left the world heavy of heart.
Each one of us alone, and yet united in these dark and troubled hours.

Physically he is gone, this man we loved, leader of his peoples.
Light to all the world.
But from his hand we snatched a spark,
And from this spark the light of his soul will become a beacon.
And the sound of his voice will have become a clarion,
Echoing and pointing out to all the world,
The dignity of man, with freedom and equality to all its peoples.

Thank You God for Your gift,
However briefly we have had him,
Still he will live forever.

Growth of Fort Monmouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the growth of Fort Monmouth, Monmouth County, N.J., stands out as an American example of development under the intelligent leadership on the part of the Signal Corps. Much has been accomplished there over the years in the field of research and those of us who have watched this growth are enthusiastically proud of the outstanding work done there. Among other things the discovery and advancement of radar which played such a revolutionary part in the field of communications was developed at Fort Monmouth. This Army post is now entering into a new phase of accomplishment in the electronic field.

Fort Monmouth has a military personnel of 7,500 which is augmented by 7,600 civilian employees. Much must be done to promote efficiency and under the able command of Maj. Gen. F. W. Moorman its reorganization to meet these demands of electronic advancement is well underway. Recently General Moorman issued orders implementing a sound and businesslike organization to project this U.S. Electronics Command as a team which will contribute in no small measure to the defense of our Nation. Under his able leadership it is the aim to bring about worthy achievement and to enhance the outstanding reputation which Fort Monmouth has for progressive results. I am pleased to append to these brief remarks, articles appearing in the local press about these efforts which I hope my colleagues will read with the realization that devoted and unselfish effort is being made there for the benefit of our country.

The articles follow:

[From the Red Bank (N.J.) Register, Apr. 2, 1964]

ELECTRONICS COMMAND IS REBUILT

FORT MONMOUTH.—The U.S. Army Electronics Command is being "restructured under a plan directed toward achieving efficiency in providing the Army electronics material, equipment, and systems, it was announced today by Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman, commanding general.

Commandwide operations—which will continue without interruption—begin under the realined organization May 1, General Moorman stated.

The "restructuring" encompasses regrouping activities in terms of function and physical location. A number of the realined elements will move their sites in the reallocation of buildings within the main post and other areas of Fort Monmouth. The movement of personnel between activities here and in Philadelphia will be minimal, he said.

General Moorman said that under the "restructuring," the activities of the subcommands of the Electronics Command will be regrouped into an integrated commandwide directorate-type organization.

The new directorates are the U.S. Army Electronics Research and Development Laboratories, Procurement and Production, Material Readiness, and Personnel and Training. Also being established is the Electronics Support Command. The reorganization of the laboratories March 23 was consistent with the overall "restructuring," he added.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, Apr. 2, 1964]

ELECTRONICS COMMAND ANNOUNCES CHANGES DESIGNED TO CUT REDTAPE

FORT MONMOUTH.—Changes designed to cut redtape in operations of the Army Electronics Command, effective May 1, were announced today by Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman, commanding officer.

An Army spokesman said the changes had been planned since creation of the command in 1962, and have no connection with the current investigation into the relation between contractors and civilian employees working for the command, nor with the conviction in Federal court of two civilian employees and a manufacturer's representative on bribery-conspiracy charges.

The changes will be made through use of directorate-type organizations to be known as the Electronics Research and Development Laboratories; Procurement and Production; Materiel Readiness, and Personnel and Training.

CONSOLIDATION PLANNED

To eliminate "staff layering," the staffs of command headquarters and of major subordinate agencies will be consolidated in the new directorate. Two deputy commanders, both brigadier generals, will also be appointed to provide "balance of command."

The general emphasized that no program will be discontinued or curtailed because of the changes. A relatively small number of transfers between geographic points in the command is contemplated, he said, but no jobs will be eliminated.

General Moorman said procurement and production activities will be changed from the Electronics Materiel Agency in Philadelphia to a new directorate of Procurement and Production to be located in the Coles area, Lincroft, Middletown Township, now the site of the Electronics Materiel Support Agency.

HEXAGON STILL CENTER

Research and development programs will continue to be centered in the Hexagon here, but will now furnish program guidance to research facilities at White Sands, N.Mex., and Fort Huachuca, Ariz. The Evans area, Wall Township, and smaller sites in Monmouth County remain integral parts of the operation.

The Materiel Readiness Directorate, which manages the worldwide inventory of electronics items, will absorb some functions of the Electronics Materiel Agency, now located at Coles. It will have headquarters in Philadelphia.

The new personnel and training directorate will combine command staff functions in those fields with similar activities spread through subordinate elements and will have its headquarters at Russel Hall, here.

The Electronics Support Command will also be in charge of housekeeping duties at Fort Monmouth.

NO JOB CUTS SEEN

General Moorman said the changes will not cause cutbacks in employment or in activities at any of the Monmouth County installations of the command.

The changes are designed, he said, to:

Obtain the most efficient and economical use of resources.

Assure close management of electronic commodities.

Assure better balance between planning and programing and direction of operations.

Strengthen material acquisition operations.

Establish closer ties between functional groupings of the command and its parent, the Army Material Command.

The general said higher employee productivity is expected through better use of staff personnel, a reduction of command echelons, consolidation of common support functions, and functional as well as physical regrouping of staff and operating units.

[From the Long Branch Daily Record, Apr. 2, 1964]

MOORMAN ANNOUNCES EXTENSIVE RESHUFFLING FOR ARMY ELECTRONICS COMMAND

FORT MONMOUTH.—The Army Electronics Command is being restructured under a plan directed toward achieving maximum efficiency in providing the Army with electronics materiel, equipment, and systems, it was announced today by Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman, commanding general.

Commandwide operations—which will continue without interruption—begin under the relined organization May 1, General Moorman said.

The restructuring encompasses regrouping activities in terms of both function and physical location. A number of the realined elements will move their sites in the reallocation of buildings within the main post and other areas of Fort Monmouth. The movement of personnel between activities here and in Philadelphia will be minimal.

General Moorman said that under the restructuring, the activities of the subcommands of the Electronics Command will be regrouped into an integrated commandwide directorate-type organization.

The new directorates are Army Electronics Research and Development Laboratories, Procurement and Production, Material Readiness, and Personnel and Training. Also being established is the Electronics Support Command. The reorganization of the laboratories on March 23 was consistent with the overall restructuring.

General Moorman said that along with restructuring operating and supporting activities, the Commodity Management Offices also will be regrouped and strengthened. These offices function as E-Command headquarters staff elements. They are responsible for the life-cycle management—from concept through disposal—of designated items or systems.

A main distinction here is that the operating elements are primarily responsible for carrying out their respective missions—research and development, procurement and production, and materiel readiness—whereas the "intensive" management the Commodity Office gives the specific items extends across all of these areas.

As one of the principal features embodied in the dictorate form of electronics commodity management, the staff elements of E-Command headquarters and the supporting staffs of the major subordinate agencies are being combined within the integrated operating activities. This will eliminate what military and industrial planners term "staff layering."

To achieve a better balance of command viewed as essential to the new structure, General Moorman announced that two deputy commanders, both brigadier generals, will be appointed. One will be responsible for plans and programs, the other for operations.

The reorganization, General Moorman said, reflects the emphasis the administration, the Department of Defense, and the Department of the Army place on continuing improvements in governmental efficiency.

He stated that summarized objectives are:

1. To obtain the most efficient and economical use of available resources.

2. To assure strongly integrated management of electronics commodities throughout their life cycle.

3. To assure a better balance between planning and programing, and the direction of operations.

4. To strengthen the material acquisition cycle.

5. To establish a closer correlation between the functional groupings of the Army Electronics Command and its parent Army Materiel Command.

General Moorman said that among the benefits expected from the reorganization is "greater mission effectiveness through intensified management of electronics items and systems from their concept to their disposal."

He said higher employee productivity and quicker reaction time are expected through the better use of staff personnel, the reduction in command echelons, the functional and physical regrouping of staff, and operating elements and the consolidation of common support functions.

In turn, these benefits within the command should make possible greater responsiveness to the needs of Army materiel users, and a substantial reduction in the time required to translate new concepts into end items for field operations, General Moorman continued.

In commenting on events that have predicted the restructuring, General Moorman pointed out that the Army Electronics Command is one of seven subcommands under the Army Materiel Command, which was created in 1962 during reorganization of the Army's technical services.

The extensive studies since made have been directed toward revising the organizational structure of the subcommands in the manner that best equips them for carrying out their respective activities within the cohesive framework of the parent AMC. The plan announced by General Moorman was adopted as the one best suited to achieve the best possible use of available resources for management of electronics commodities.

No program will be discontinued or curtailed because of the restructuring, General Moorman said.

He emphasized that no separation of employees is planned, although the relatively small number of position transfers between geographic points is projected.

Although the effects of the consolidation will extend throughout the command's headquarters and its subordinate command, regrouping will have the most effect on three major activities.

Besides the laboratories, these are the Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency, in Fort Monmouth's Coles area, Lincroft, and the Army Electronics Materiel Agency, centered in Philadelphia.

The other subordinate activities are Headquarters, Fort Monmouth; the Army Avionics Field Office, St. Louis; the Army Intelligence Materiel Development Agency, Fort Holabird, Md.; the Army Electronics Research and Development Activities at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., and White Sands, N. Mex.; the Army Electronics Logistics Research Office, Philadelphia; the Army Electronics Command Inspector General Field Office, Philadelphia; and the Army Electronics Regional Labor Office, Philadelphia.

In the organizational changes in research and development, the Army Electronics R. & D. Activities at White Sands and Fort Huachuca will now receive program guidance from the laboratories.

The Hexagon Building continues as the headquarters and principal center of R. & D. operations. The sizable Evans area, near Belmar, and other smaller sites in Monmouth County remain integral parts.

The new center of activity of procurement and production operations—whose duties include letting contracts to industry for quantity outputs of equipment—is being refocused from the Electronics Materiel Agency, in Philadelphia, to the new Procurement and Production Directorate, which will occupy the Coles area at Lincroft, presently the site of the Electronics Materiel Support Agency.

The Production and Specifications Engineering Department of the Electronics Materiel Support Agency will become a part of the new P. & P. Directorate. Procurement contracting functions now carried on in Philadelphia will remain there, but under the direction of the Coles-based directorate. Besides Fort Monmouth, the directorate will continue the procurement operations at Washington, D.C., and Fort Meade, Md.

Although subordinate materiel readiness functions will be carried out at other points, Philadelphia becomes the center of activity as well as the headquarters of this directorate, which is responsible for the third and final phase of life-cycle equipment management. This includes such operations as managing the worldwide inventory of Army electronic items, determining requirements, controlling distribution, and allocating maintenance activities.

As an integral part of the operation, a materiel readiness field office, designated a national maintenance point, remains at Fort Monmouth. This office had been a part of the Army Electronics Materiel Agency in Philadelphia, remains there as part of the new directorate. Other elements of the directorate to remain at their present sites include the Plant Inventory Control Office, of Washington; the Intelligence Materiel Development Agency, of Fort Holabird; the Army Avionics Field Office, of St. Louis; and the meteorological teams, of Fort Monmouth.

The new equipment introductory team, formerly under the direction of the laboratories, will become part of the Materiel Readiness Directorate. However, team members, who travel widely to teach troops in the field how to operate and maintain new equipment, will continue to be based at Fort Monmouth.

The other two activities, personnel and training and the Electronics Support Command, will have headquarters here in Russel Hall.

The new Personnel and Training Directorate will combine the present Electronics Command headquarters staff functions in those areas and the activities that have been spread among the subordinate elements.

At Fort Monmouth, the commanding officer of the Electronics Support Command will be in charge of administration of the post and direct installations and services. Jurisdiction will encompass such functions as common supplies, local communications, transportation, Provost Marshall, special services, and post exchanges. A field division will be maintained in Philadelphia.

Among the new activities being established as a command facility are a Computation Center, under the staff supervision of the Management Science and Data Systems Office, and a Financial Management Center, under the Comptroller and Director of Programs. The computation center and the financial management center will have Philadelphia divisions.

As part of the reorganization plan, General Moorman recently appointed special assistants to the commanding general for technical relations and congressional affairs, and established a Quality Management Office.

He also appointed an Army coordinator for the AIMS program, which is a triservice undertaking to establish an automatic aircraft identification system for military use that would be compatible with the air traffic controls the Federal Aviation Agency employs to automatically identify civil aircraft.

In announcing further details on personnel actions, General Moorman said a number of job spaces are being eliminated under the consolidation. However, the small number of persons thus affected will be given an opportunity to move into undermanned areas, he said.

Among transfer of positions in the regrouped elements, there are less than 50 scheduled to be moved from Philadelphia to Fort Monmouth, and also fewer than 50 such moves planned for the opposite direction. A command spokesman said that since it is expected that some of these employees can exchange similar jobs, the figure may be even lower.

The top-level command group of the Army Electronics Command will move from Russel Hall, on the main post, to the Hexagon Building, which is about 3 miles way in the Eatontown area, by October 1. All other physical moves are to be completed by December 31 of this year.

Headquarters elements of the command will move into Building 2525, near the Hexagon. The National Maintenance Point of Materiel Readiness will occupy buildings in the main post's 700 area, and the Computation Center will move into Vail Hall, also on the main post.

All of the regrouped activities in Philadelphia will be located in the present building at 225 South 18th Street.

Representative Frank Thompson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very informative pamphlet entitled "Footlight," which included a very interesting progress report on the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. It gave a short sketch of one of my first "tutors" when I arrived on Capitol Hill, the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON. Representative THOMPSON is a Board member and one of the sponsors of the original National Cultural Center Act. I would like to bring this sketch to the attention of my colleagues:

THE CENTER'S FOUNDERS

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat of New Jersey: As Board member and one of the sponsors of the original National Cultural Center Act, Representative FRANK THOMPSON has maintained a steady interest in the Center's affairs ever since. A supporter of the bill extending the 1958 act, Mr. THOMPSON further testified on behalf of the proposal to dedicate the Center as the official memorial to President Kennedy in the Nation's Capital. He strongly endorsed the measure from the floor of the House prior to the passage of the bill on January 8.

Elected to the 84th Congress in 1954, Mr. THOMPSON had previously been a member of the New Jersey Legislature. In the House of Representatives he has served on the Committee on Education and Labor and the House Administration Committee. He has been one of the leading advocates of and has sponsored improvements in the so-called impacted areas education legislation, and has played an important part in the passage of legislation dealing with labor-management relations. He currently serves as chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education.

His reputation as a leading congressional supporter of the arts is well known. He has been a sponsor of three major acts in the field of international cultural exchange, has fought for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, and for legislation to raise the architectural standards of Federal buildings.

Referring to the recent John F. Kennedy Center Act, Mr. THOMPSON said, "We cannot now fully assess President Kennedy's place in history; but I do submit that those who were warmed by his wit, captivated by his grace, and enlightened by his spirit are entitled to see to it that these qualities of the man are not denied future generations. I know of no better way to accomplish this than the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts."

Bishop W. Angie Smith Called Methodism's Greatest Evangelist Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week in Oklahoma more than 800 Methodists including 14 bishops gathered in Oklahoma City to pay tribute to Bishop W. Angie Smith, head of the Oklahoma-New Mexico Methodist Conference, upon his retirement from the Methodist General Board of Evangelism after 12 years as its president.

Among bishops who joined in honoring Bishop Smith were Paul Garber, Virginia; Edgar Love, Maryland; Charles Brashares, Illinois; Fred Corson, Pennsylvania; William and Paul Martin, both of Texas; Aubrey Walton, Louisiana; Kenneth Copeland, Nebraska; Eugene Slater, Kansas; Paul Galloway, Texas; Marvin Franklin, Mississippi; Kenneth Pope, Arkansas, and Lloyd Wicke, New York.

An article in the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, Okla., for Thursday, April 2, tells of this April 1 meeting:

BISHOP W. ANGIE SMITH CALLED METHODISM'S GREATEST EVANGELIST LEADER

Oklahoma Methodists—more than 800 strong—paid tribute Wednesday night to Methodism's "greatest evangelist leader" since colonial days, Bishop W. Agnie Smith, head of the Oklahoma-New Mexico Methodist Conference.

Scores of Methodist leaders from around the country joined the more than 800 clergy and laymen in honoring Bishop Smith on his retirement from the Methodist general board of evangelism after 12 years as its president. The dinner in the Skirvin Tower Hotel was one of the highlights of the board's 3 day meeting in Oklahoma City.

Verbal bouquets were also handed Mrs. Smith, who has followed her husband on dozens of trips around the world as a member of numerous boards and bodies within the Methodist Church during his 20 years as a bishop.

Mrs. Smith's "gracious personality and wonderful devotion to her husband" was cited as "an outstanding example" to ministers' wives by Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, Philadelphia, president of the World Methodist Council.

In his headline speech Bishop Corson quoted another speaker, Dr. Harry Denman, Nashville, general secretary of the board, as saying "the last 40 years belonged to Marxism."

During this time more than a billion people came under the rigid anti-Christian control of communism.

"But the next 40 years must belong to Christ," Bishop Corson said. "The greatest service Bishop Smith has given the church in the past 20 years is his preparation for the crusade of the next 40 years."

He called the bishop "the architect of a new evangelism," and praised the gains the Oklahoma-New Mexico area has made during the last 20 years.

Corson said Smith has encouraged experimentation with new forms of evangelism, and was among the first to realize evangelism could not be left to the professionals.

He said that every Methodist must be a winner of souls and led the shift to personal and visitation evangelism.

Earlier in the day the board of evangelism voted to established a department of family evangelism to promote evangelistic efforts by Christian families to families not related to the church.

The board further honored Bishop and Mrs. Smith by naming a $900,000 addition to its headquarters building in Nashville, Tenn., for the couple.

Bishop Corson expressed his regret that "an arbitrary rule rather than qualifications for office are depriving us of his (Smith's) services." His reference was to a decision of the last general conference that board members can only be on a general board for a 12-year period.

Bishop Corson also credited Bishop Smith with creating "God's good neighbor" policy as the church's consultant to Mexico and South America for 12 years.

"Evangelism can establish fellowship and brotherhood where commerce and diplomacy have failed," he said.

"Bishop Smith recognizes that evangelism is an everlasting and continuing challenge as long as one knee is unbended. The world can never be saved en masse."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the many Americans who is profoundly sad because of the passing of one of the greatest soldiers, one of the greatest statesmen, and one of the greatest men in all respects, General MacArthur.

In January 1946, it was my privilege, along with several other Members of the House of Representatives, to visit with General MacArthur at his headquarters in Tokyo, Japan. His great Pacific victory had just been won; however, he was modest to the last degree.

It was clear to all of us he was working night and day to try to assist a group of people who had vigorously fought America, the Japanese. We are all aware of his unusual success in bringing order out of chaos in Japan.

When the proper evaluations of all great leaders in the history of America are made, we all are aware General MacArthur will stand with and by the very highest.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1964, President Johnson issued a proclamation marking Tuesday, April 14, as Pan-American Day, and the week beginning April 12 and ending April 18 as Pan-American Week.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to our friends and neighbors in this hemisphere. There is much that we have in common as we join hands against the enemies of poverty, injustice, and ignorance and look for new ways to improve the condition of our people. The interest of America in the development of our pan-American neighbors stems from the early beginning of our country through the famous Monroe Doctrine and stretches through the current efforts under the Alliance for Progress program. The principle announced at the Punta del Este Conference in 1961 takes into account the important fact that freedom cannot exist in any country unless there is adequate education, political stability, and economic growth. The Pan American Union has created the kind of partnership necessary to create a spirit of social advancement in all of the republics in the hemisphere.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I join President Johnson in urging "all citizens of the United States and all interested organizations to join their Government in helping to make both Pan-American Day and Pan-American Week occasions for the recognition to the ideals of the inter-American system, and to the principles and objectives of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Charter of Punta del Este."

The text of the President's proclamation follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 2, 1964.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY AND PAN-AMERICAN WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas April 14, 1964, marks the 74th anniversary of the establishment by the American Republics of the inter-American system which is now known as the Organization of American States; and

Whereas relations between the United States and the other American Republics are of utmost concern to this Nation since we believe that mutual problems of the various republics must be resolved in a spirit of friendship and understanding; and

Whereas the United States is firmly and traditionally committed to the concept that every American nation has the right and duty to govern itself, free from outside dictation or coercion from any quarter, and that every citizen of the Americas has the right to speak his views, worship God in his own way, and participate in the political life of his nation; and

Whereas mutual efforts to increase the solidarity and well-being of the people of the Americas over the years have evolved into an Alliance for Progress; and

Whereas the United States, in its traditional spirit of cooperation and amity, has pledged the energies of this Nation to the achievement of the common goals expressed in the Charter of Punta del Este by engaging in a relentless war upon poverty, social injustice, and tyranny:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, April 14, 1964, as Pan-American Day and the week beginning April 12 and ending April 18 as Pan-American Week; and I call upon the Governors of the 50 States of the Union, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and appropriate officials of all other areas under the United States flag to issue similar proclamations.

Mindful of the vast tasks that still lie before us if the material progress and the social advancement of the Americas are to match the spiritual and cultural achievements of the Republic of this hemisphere, I urge all citizens of the United States and all interested organizations to join their Government in helping to make both Pan-American Day and Pan-American Week occasions for the recognition of past achievements, and for this Nation's rededication to the ideals of the inter-American system, and to the principles and objectives of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Charter of Punta del Este. For on the maintenance of these ideals and the achievement of these objectives depends the future of freedom, human dignity, and national independence in this hemisphere.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 2d day of March in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Another AMA Bogeyman Bites the Dust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in light of the current doctors' strike in Belgium and the American Medical Association's continuous propaganda war against what it calls socialized medicine, I would like to call attention to the following column by Reporter John Herling which appeared in the Washington Daily News April 7, 1964. I would especially recommend it to those who are under the impression that the King-Anderson bill to provide hospital care for the aged is a radical proposal which would be detrimental to the medical profession and the American public.

WRONG DIAGNOSIS

(By John Herling)

The doctors of Saskatchewan are no longer running a high fever. They are living happy, normal, even affluent lives. They are pleased but shamefaced.

You will recall how back in 1962 the doctors of Saskatchewan—a large group of them—called a strike against the medical insurance plan which the Canadian Province had installed. The personal target of attack was T. C. Douglas, then the Prime Minister of the Province, the innovator of the medical plan. He was charged with trying to enslave the populace as well as the doctors in the chains of socialized medicine. What actually was being introduced was a health and medical care scheme, somewhat less in scope than Britain's national health insurance system.

The doctors' strike attracted spectacular attention because it was the first of its kind in the Western Hemisphere and because it coincided with the Kennedy administration's attempt to pass a law establishing medical care for the aging under the social security system. This was bitterly opposed then—as it is now—by the American Medical Association. Using the apparent coincidence of the doctors' strike in Saskatchewan, the AMA immediately exploited it for all it was worth. The AMA never before had been known to have supported a strike of any kind. Pointing at Saskatchewan as a horrible example, it now sought to steam up U.S. public opinion by declaring that the Kennedy-sponsored legislation sent the United States down the "road to medical serfdom." In order to keep the pot boiling, AMA societies, California and Texas among others, contributed money to the Saskatchewan doctors' strike fund, and put all its public relations facilities to work to embitter public opinion on both sides of the international boundary. Meantime, the late Senator Robert Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, with the help of his aide-de-camp, Bobby Baker, then Senate majority Secretary, was whipping together a narrow majority to defeat the medical care bill for the aging.

Many doctors—not all—were decrying the Saskatchewan plan on the grounds that it would deprive doctors of their rights and incomes under free medicine, and so on. Such were their fears, real or fancied.

What has actually happened? Here is the present picture as recently described by Mr. Douglas. The cost of medical care is less than had been announced. After 18 months of operation, the cost of medical care comes to $22.05 for each person instead of the estimated cost of $23.40 per person per year. In addition, many more people are receiving medical care than before. Since the start of the plan, the number of doctors in the Province increased from 881 to 939. Thus the panic exodus of doctors not only was stemmed, but there has been an influx of new medical talent. The number of medical specialists has risen from 221 to 235. Also the average income of doctors in Saskatchewan rose by $1,800 to $20,000 a year, making them the highest paid group in the hard-working Province.

The fears and arguments raised by the opponents of the plan that people would become hypochondriacs and abuse the medical health system have failed to materialize. Instead, in the upcoming election campaign, the Conservative Party now uses the argument that it could administer the socialized medical plan more efficiently than the new Democratic Party which introduced the plan. This is the same pattern as has evolved in Britain. There is no move to repeal the system—against which the doctors of Saskatchewan struck in horror 2 short years ago.

Forecast for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the smoke created by the propaganda grinding out

of the Treasury Department has been successful in camouflaging and confusing a very serious situation: the depletion of Treasury silver stocks, and consequently, the possible melting down of our silver coins.

The world has always known and governments have always striven for a coin of intrinsic value and the recent run for silver dollars on the U.S. Treasury indicates the value that the American people place on our coinage.

Already, within our own time, we have witnessed a similar path cleared for gold when in 1934, the United States abolished its gold coins and replaced it with paper money.

An astute observer of our monetary malady, Mr. M. E. Fry, editor of the Mining and Natural Resources Record, wrote an excellent article on the problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert his editorial published on Thursday, April 2, 1964, at Denver, Colo. Entitled "Hindsight and Previews," the article follows:

HINDSIGHT AND PREVIEWS

In 1934 the United States abolished its gold coins and arbitrarily ordered every resident of this country to surrender his gold coins and receive in payment paper money. After the American people had dutifully obeyed this illegal edict and the United States had collected most of its good coins then in circulation in this country, it raised the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce. By this action it gave the residents of foreign countries who owned American gold coins a profit of $14.33 an ounce on the gold coins which they held. At the same time, it deprived (maybe "cheated" would be a better word) the citizens of this country of this same profit.

When the United States abolished its gold coins, it also abolished and demanded the surrender of all paper dollar bills commonly called "gold backs" because they were redeemable in gold. This action left as the only real money in this country the silver dimes, quarters, half dollars and dollars, and the silver certificates secured by silver dollars.

Lest it be said we had another type of money called Federal Reserve notes we should explain that these Federal Reserve notes are not redeemable in gold or silver coins and cannot be considered as true money especially when compared with silver certificates which are redeemable in silver. True, there is a polite fiction that Federal Reesrve notes are secured by a 25-percent gold reserve, but no American may hold this gold or demand it in redemption of Federal Reserve notes. That privilege is reserved for foreigners. We should remember also that the short-term liabilities of this country held by foreigners, most of which are payable in gold, now exceed by some $10 billion all the gold owned by this country. So, in fact, we have no 25-percent gold reserve behind the Federal Reserve notes.

Now Congress has abolished the silver certificates. They are being called in, and in their place the American people are being given Federal Reserve notes and, again, this Government is depriving its people of a valuable form of money just as it did in 1934 because Federal Reserve notes are not redeemable in any coin, while the silver certificates state on their face that there is on deposit in the Treasury of the United States silver dollars of the same denomination as the silver certificates and payable to the bearer on demand.

Like a growing number of American people we are wondering just when the U.S. Government will cease preferring the welfare and interests of foreigners to the welfare and interests of its own citizens. The only real money existing in this country now are the dimes, quarters and half-dollars and the silver dollars which are still in circulation. As stated in our last issue, it is now proposed that the United States cease coining all silver coins and stop the use of silver as money because silver must be reserved "for more urgent industrial needs."

We truly expect that this Nation will terminate the use and coinage of silver money—then what? We cannot have shinplasters (those little slips of paper in 5-, 10-, 15- and 25-cent denominations) which were used around 1865 because the people of this country then, as now, did not have much faith in the then paper money and the greenbacks and started hoarding silver coins. Neither plastic coins nor shinplasters can be used in parking meters, pay telephones, coin laundries, and the like, so we predict that soon we will have coins of tin and iron and some other cheap and abundant metals.

We also believe the final step in the devaluation and repudiation of our dollar will be the reduction and final termination of the now purely theoretical 25-percent gold reserve behind Federal Reserve notes. In fact, a committee of Congress has already recommended this procedure.

Doubtless the moneychangers in the U.S. Treasury are now confident that the American people have been so brainwashed that the U.S. Treasury can abolish the 25-percent gold reserve at one stroke without any gradual reduction of this reserve or the further conditioning of the American people. It has been argued that since the American people cannot own gold they should abolish the 25-percent gold reserve so as to make all of our gold available to pay the demands of residents of foreign nations. Wouldn't it be grand if some day our Federal officials would once, just once, put the welfare of the American people above that of foreigners, but apparently no one in the U.S. Treasury cares whether the U.S. citizens have any confidence in the dollar. Possibly we do not deserve such consideration. We have complacently watched the value of the American dollar decline from 100 cents in 1939 to 45.0 cents today. We have not only tolerated this situation but we have actually supported and participated in it. Ironically and despite this drop in the purchasing power of the dollar, we still hear Treasury officials prattling about how the dollar must not be devalued, meaning of course that Uncle Sam should not raise the price of gold to a point where the gold miners could afford to reopen the mines and help provide a new gold reserve for our money.

Authorizing Construction for the Military Departments and Reserve Components

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the purport of my amendment is to reduce by $3,323,000 the appropriation for Fort Sheridan. This will preclude the transfer of the 5th Army Headquarters to Fort Sheridan.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some misunderstanding in regard to this transfer. It has been presented as an economy measure, when as a matter of fact it is the wild and reckless spending of a sum that ultimately will total in excess of $10 million. It is conservatively estimated the cost to complete the work may run to $13 million.

Something of this, I think, was in the mind of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] at the hearings. Mr. BRAY was of the opinion that the transfer might be a good one on the surface, but he said to General Shuler, "Will you not have trouble in providing living quarters?" Well, the general thought there might be trouble providing living quarters. That was an item apparently he had overlooked. Then Mr. BRAY, the distinguished Republican from Indiana, said, "Yes. And Great Lakes is having a lot of trouble."

General Shuler, by the way, is the only member of the U.S. Army who even recommended the removal of the 5th Army Headquarters from Hyde Park to Fort Sheridan. As far as I am informed he is today the only officer who thinks the removal wise and in the best interest of economy and efficiency. There have been a number of studies made by the Army, studies that were in depth and were participated in by groups of experienced and competent officers, and the report invariably was that the removal to Fort Sheridan would be an expensive move that could only increase the cost of operation and reduce efficiency.

It is to be kept in mind that the 5th Army headquarters services 13 States. The transportation cost in time and money is not inconsiderable of the many officers who come to report to 5th Army headquarters. The fact that Hyde Park, the present location of the headquarters, is only 15 minutes from the loop and railroad stations is a factor that probably has been taken into consideration by previous study groups.

The removal from Hyde Park to Fort Sheridan is exclusively the notion of General Shuler, who did not take into account the fact that there were no available living quarters at Fort Sheridan for the additional Army personnel and no living quarters of any sort for the 2,000 civilian personnel either at Fort Sheridan or within convenient traveling distance.

The good general figured that $3.3 million would build adequate office facilities to accommodate the 5th Army headquarters, and even here he used figures of 2 years ago. So even if the $3.3 million were set aside and spent, there would be still a shortage of perhaps $500,000 to $700,000 to complete the construction. This is because construction costs are higher. Then there would be office space, but no living quarters for the service personnel—absolutely none, mind you.

The 5th Army Headquarters employs 2,000 civilians. They are all workers with special skills. They cannot easily be replaced and at Fort Sheridan there is neither available housing for the present civilian workers nor an adequate and competent labor replacement pool. All of this eventually would lead to the expend-

iture of several million dollars more to provide housing quarters for the civilians.

I have talked with a number of persons of wide experience and knowledge in the field and all are agreed that the final cost of preparing Fort Sheridan to receive the 5th Army Headquarters would reach at least $10 million and probably would go as high as $13 million. Whether it is wise to put $10 to $13 million into new military construction that is not needed now and at a time when we are hopefully looking forward to reductions in military personnel should be a matter of grave concern.

A vote for my amendment is the greatest economy vote that any Member of this body can cast. We will save at least $10 million to the taxpayers. There is not any question about it. We are starting by immediately saving over $3 million, and if you project it for the next 4, 5, or 6 years, it can easily run up to $13 million.

I would be very happy to answer any questions that any one of my colleagues might have to ask. I wonder if my friend from Illinois might wish to say something.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. There is no question in your mind that this would involve an expenditure of $3.3 million in Illinois. This would be new construction in Illinois for Illinois people who work generally at 5th Army Headquarters whether it is in Chicago or whether it is in my district at Fort Sheridan, Ill. Our Governor was down here, was he not, and said that he wanted the Illinois delegation to support new construction in Illinois?

Here we have a problem and yet the gentleman is taking the floor against new construction in Illinois. That is quite inconsistent with what our Governor wants and what I thought the Illinois delegation was going to support—Republicans and Democrats. I have a hard time reconciling myself to that position.

Surely I think we ought to have a new base. So far as I am concerned you can have it in Chicago or anywhere you want it, in northeastern Illinois, or wherever it would serve a great metropolitan area. But I think what we have to do is to serve the 5th Army which in turn serves 16 States in the midwestern part of the Nation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear my good friend's definition of economy. I have always been a little bit suspicious of some of these definitions.

The gentleman believes in spending a lot of money, just so that you spend it in Illinois. I do not subscribe to that. I do not think we should spend one nickel or one dollar in any State of the Union if we do not have to spend it. I take my stand with President Johnson for real economy. I hope that my friend from Illinois will join in that economy campaign. If we do not have to spend it, then let us save it. If that is the only reason the gentleman is against my amendment, then I think my amendment should carry overwhelmingly.

Indomitable Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, a Pecos, Tex., student, Miss Kay Smith, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Smith, of Pecos, has won the State essay contest sponsored by the Texas Employment Commission. I would like to congratulate Kay and her teacher, Mrs. Irene Turk, on the quality of this essay. Its message is of the indomitable spirit which has contributed the energy which has built our Nation.

The essay follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Miss Kay Smith)

A big smile greeted me as I stepped into the small, unimposing Wallace Boot Shop. Wallace Connally took time from his work to answer my questions. When did it begin? He had suffered polio at the age of 5. How was he educated? He had owned a big shepherd dog who pulled his wagon from the farm to school in Balmorhea; later he had ridden his pony to school. He learned his trade by working for bootmakers as a youth. Wallace Connally walks on his hands because he cannot use his legs. He is but one of the many handicapped citizens of Pecos who are proving that ability is what counts.

Just what is ability? It is, I feel, more than simply a person's inherent talents. Ability is taking those talents and making a life with them. A physical handicap does not mean disability. We are all handicapped in some way—physically, mentally, or temperamentally. Wallace's handicap shows more than most, but it does not hold him back. He takes care of himself; his work is of the finest quality. Mr. C. C. Blakely, a local cattle buyer, described Wallace's careful process. First he measures the foot in all possible places. Next he makes a wooden form, planing and building it to fit the foot. Then he stretches the leather over it for several days and finally puts the boot together with wooden pegs. The finished product is so skillfully perfected that it does not even cause sore feet the first wearing.

"Wallace," said Mr. Blakely, "is quite a man. He never lets a child go barefoot nor a stray dog go hungry." The first thing I noticed about him was not his handicap, but his warm smile and genuine interest in people. He has the determination to succeed. He drives his own car, enjoys knowing people, and supports himself and his mother. In addition to his shop he raises Chihuahua dogs. In his younger days he raised cattle for sale and even rode in bronc shows. Wallace's fierce determination comes through; he attributes much of his success to the fact that a number of people were willing to give him a chance. But he is only one example of the truth that ability counts.

Marian Russell, an attractive young artist, is confined to her wheelchair. Most of her life she has been the victim of muscular dystrophy. She started painting on her own, and later taking some correspondence courses. In addition to working on a third course now, she has several pupils of her own. She is a member of the Pecos Art Shop, a club organized for the advancement of art in the Pecos area as well as a means of sharing techniques.

During our interview Miss Russell talked about some of the psychological problems a handicapped person must fight. He must plan out all the details of his day before he goes out. This leads him to thinking of himself too much, another handicap he must overcome.

Marian's favorite subjects are people, but she also enjoys doing still life. She feels better painting the things she knows, rather than the landscapes she has less chance to study. She enjoys working at the West of the Pecos Museum, a community project. Her medium is usually oils with occasional charcoal drawings. Marian enjoys her art and is a master at it.

A third example of the able handicapped in my community is Russell Smith, farmer, farm implement dealer, and engineer. At the age of 16 Russell lost his right hand in a feed chopper on his farm home near Kaufman, Tex. He had to learn to write all over again using his left hand. After staying out of school a year, he completed high school in Dallas and went on to the University of Texas. He graduated third in his class with degrees in civil and mechanical engineering. He worked for the Dallas Power & Light Co. and the Texas Highway Department as an engineer. During the war he was employed by the Federal Government in the Priority Section of the War Production Board and later as the Dallas district manager of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Today he owns a 320-acre cotton farm in addition to the Minneapolis-Moline Implement and Peerless Pump dealerships for the Pecos area, his home for 16 years.

Mr. Smith has invented a dual tractor hitch, whereby a farmer can use two regular farm tractors as one large tractor for deep plowing and other heavy work. Since most farmers needing this type of equipment already have the regular farm tractors, the $1,100 hitch can save them most of the cost of the $18,000 to $20,000 crawler tractor. The hitch has been designed for several types of tractors and sold in Texas, Florida, Utah, and Montana.

Being around Mr. Smith a person never thinks of him as handicapped. The lack of a hand does not keep him from his intricate manual work on machinery or his engineering drawings. He is an expert at repairing anything around the home from cars to broken jewelry to leaky bathtubs. He is not only a great help to his daughter with her trig and physics homework but also her inspiration to be a physicist or engineer. How do I know? He's my dad.

As I stated earlier, each of us has some kind of handicap, be it physical, mental, or temperamental. Wallace Connally, Marian Russell, and Russell Smith have physical handicaps. These three undaunted Americans have conquered their physical handicaps in a lucrative manner. Disability does not hold them back; they make their abilities to provide for themselves, their abilities to find happiness in life, their abilities to be undaunted Americans really count. Their determination and courage gives them a head start on those of us with fewer burdens.

These individuals have found happiness in overcoming their handicaps by exercising their own wills and by proving that ability counts.

Resolution on Civil Rights Presented by the District of Columbia Republican Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this

point a resolution presented by the District of Columbia Republican Committee which shows their active interest in civil rights.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE

Whereas the Republican Party had its origin in contention for human rights and the dignity and worth of the individual; and

Whereas the 1960 civil rights platform of the District of Columbia Republican Committee declared that "We shall not compromise on these fundamental rights of American citizens as guaranteed by our Constitution"; and

Whereas the leadership of the two national political parties has agreed that action on the civil rights bill now under consideration before the Congress should receive nonpartisan support; and

Whereas Republicans in Congress historically have consistently outvoted the Democrats in proportion to their strength on civil rights issues since 1933, and Republican Congressman WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH of Ohio, in cooperation with other Republican Members of Congress, has produced Republican majorities on vital amendments to the 1964 civil rights legislation under consideration in Congress, we urge the Republican Party to help insure passage of said bill at an early time; and

Whereas such support, will, as it should, remove the question of civil rights from the area of partisan political debate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Republican Committee does fully endorse and support the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, now pending before the Congress, with any modification which shall give increased assurance of the recognition of the dignity of the human personality;

That the District of Columbia Republican Committee does recommend and urge all Republican Members of the Congress to give their full endorsement and support of H.R. 7152.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Republican Members of the Congress.

February 12, 1964.

FRED L. DIXON, *Secretary*.

The Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1963 the Honorable Abe Stark, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, formed the Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity to promote equality of opportunity in housing, employment, and education for Brooklyn's minority groups. The committee has done excellent preliminary work under the leadership of Rabbi Benjamin Kreitman of the Brooklyn Jewish Center and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the committee's March 11, 1964, statement and interim report.

The enlightened leadership of the Borrough President's Committee is to be highly commended.

The statement and report follow:

STATEMENT OF BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S CITIZENS ACTION COMMITTEE FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, BOROUGH HALL, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

A 31-member Brooklyn civil rights committee, consisting of outstanding community leaders, issued today an interim report of its activities and recommendations to promote equality of opportunity in housing, employment, and education for the borough's minority groups.

The committee, known as the Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity, was formed in the summer of 1963 at the invitation of Abe Stark, the Brooklyn Borough president, and is composed of religious leaders, business executives, bankers, educators, spokesmen of civil rights groups, and representatives of social service agencies.

In major details of its report the communitywide committee:

1. Called for the enactment of new legislation at both the National and State levels to spur the construction especially of needed new middle-income housing and to modify existing lending procedures for the financing of dwelling renovation and rehabilitation in minority areas.

2. Revealed that, for the past few months, a close liaison has existed betwen the JOB (Job Opportunities in Brooklyn) organization of Brooklyn and the committee itself to find additional jobs for members of minority groups and that its efforts have been hailed by a prominent civil rights leader, the Reverend William A. Jones, Jr., as "an important contribution toward the realization of the goal of equal opportunity."

3. Voted unqualified endorsement of President Lyndon B. Johnson's declaration of "unconditional war on poverty" wherever it exists in the Nation and pledged its support in response to his appeal for cooperation at the local level.

Pointing out that the President's crusade was directed at inadequate schools, dropouts, poor health, unemployment and other ills which cause delinquency, slums, crime, disease, and broken families, the report declared that "these are among the selfsame aims and objectives for which the Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity has been formed."

"It is a program," the report stated, "which can be of inestimable benefit to our own community."

The committee's report was promptly commended by Borough President Stark.

"This committee has earned and deserves the gratitude and highest respect of the whole Borough of Brooklyn for its praiseworthy activities," he said. "Its interim report commends itself to all people of good will."

The borough president expressed particular thanks to Rabbi Benjamin Z. Kreitman, the committee's chairman, "for his leadership and for the inspiring manner in which he has dedicated himself to the all-important cause which this committee represents in the life of the community."

Before submitting its recommendations for housing legislation, the committee's report reviewed the problems relating to technical and vocational training in such categories as the training of the chronically unemployed worker toward a new vocation; the training of new workers coming into the labor market and training toward promotions for individuals already employed.

The report disclosed that, with the cooperation of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, a survey of personnel requirements of 17 major business and industrial enterprises had been conducted. This survey produced the finding that there is no centralized listing of available jobs.

"In the area of job training," the report stated, "facilities for job training are widely scattered and information about them is not generally known. Very often a person who might benefit from such training is not aware of its availability."

The committee's report noted that since the beginning of the working arrangement between the JOB, organization of Brooklyn, a group of ministers primarily of the Bedford-Stuyvesant section, and the committee itself, a procedure has been developed whereby jobs identified by the borough president's committee are referred to the JOB placement center at Bethany Baptist Church at Decatur Street and Sumner Avenue. At this center trained personnel from the New York State Employment Service conduct interviews and refer qualified applicants to existing vacancies.

In a letter of thanks to Rabbi Kreitman, Rev. William A. Jones, Jr., coordinator of JOB, pointed out that this working relationship has resulted in "the establishment of a most wholesome, cooperative, outgoing procedure on matters of employment opportunity in Brooklyn."

Reverend Jones's letter further stated: "We fee that your committee has made an important contribution toward the realization of the goal of equal opportunity we are all striving to achieve and we look forward to the continuation and expansion of this most productive relationship."

In additional details the report reviewed the committee's efforts in matters relating to education, youth and recreation, and housing and community conservation.

These sections of its report discussed conferences on the part of subcommittees with Dr. Calvin Gross, the superintendent of schools of the board of education, with officials of the State department of education, the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with representatives of Brooklyn banking institutions.

The report stated that the meeting with the representatives of commercial banks was held "for the purpose of stimulating their interest in the financing of new industry in Brooklyn."

In prefacing its recommendations for new housing legislation and the modification of lending procedures for home renovation financing, the committee stated:

"Among the most critical of all the problems plaguing a number of our older and underprivileged areas is that of financing home renovations.

"On several different occasions the committee's attention has been drawn to reports that owners of dwellings in areas such as those mentioned above have encountered problems in their efforts to obtain funds needed to renovate and improve their homes.

"At the meeting with the bankers heretofore mentioned, the subcommittee chairman emphasized the vital role of dwelling renovation financing especially in these areas. He pointed out that, if normal banking channels do not meet these needs, property owners are then driven to other sources for the necessary funds.

"Such sources, because of premium charges and higher rates of interest, are considerably more expensive than banks. The added expense of such financing, he pointed out, results often in putting the cost of necessary repairs and renovations beyond the reach of those who need them most."

The committee urged administrative changes in Federal Housing Administration procedure as well as broadening amendments of the National Housing Act of 1961. The report asked the FHA to "intensify" its efforts to publicize provisions of the law which authorize low-cost loans to homeowners who are otherwise unable to afford repairs.

A proposed amendment to section 220–H of the National Housing Act would permit guaranteed loans to be made to qualified borrowers whose homes are outside of designated urban renewal areas. The same section and

section 203–K would be amended to provide that, as renovation work proceeds, the advances made by lending institutions would be guaranteed after inspection of the FHA or certification by the lender that the work is completed at each stage.

The report stated this would enable the applicant for an improvement loan to secure immediate financing with insured payments being made either to the applicant or the contractor during the course of the improvement.

"The advantages to be gained by the homeowner and the contractor under the provisions of the National Housing Act," the report said, "are made impractical due to the necessity of paying premium rates for the temporary loan to complete construction before being able to make use of section 203 (K) of this act."

In other recommendations the committee:

Urged approval by the State legislature of the New York City housing program submitted by Mayor Wagner for increased government aids for more new housing in both the low-income and middle-income categories and for broader authority to prevent further deterioration of older housing.

Called upon all Brooklyn voters to rally in support of a constitutional referendum to be submitted at the polls in November which would broaden the existing housing and urban renewal article of the State constitution.

The committee, in urging strong support for the referendum, said the effect would be to clarify and liberalize the State legislature's authority to provide "housing and rehabilitation for the benefit of all persons and families of low income whose housing needs cannot be met by the unaided operations of private enterprise." The report emphasized that revision of the existing amendment would also enable the legislature to provide for rehabilitation of substandard dwellings, incuding the making of loans to the owners of multiple dwellings for rehabilitation and improvement without any limitation cannot be effected by the unaided operait is determined by law that such rehabilitation cannot be effected by the unaided operations of private enterprise.

As the interim report of the Citizens Action Committee of Brooklyn was made public, Borough President Abe Stark issued a statement praising the committee's membership and expressing full support of its report.

His statement follows:

"This committee has earned and deserves the gratitude and highest respect of the whole Borough of Brooklyn for its praiseworthy activities.

"Ias interim report commends itself to all people of good will.

"It is truly a citizens report in the sense that it reflects the thinking and activities of dedicated, public-spirited individuals from all walks of life.

"In their persevering efforts to help solve one of the most perplexing problems of our times, they have cooperated most willingly and generously in the committee's work. I know it is a fact—and I believe it should be mentioned publicly—that individual members of this committee have sacrificed their own interests to provide such cooperation. They have taken time from their own pressing business affairs and from their personal obligations in order to attend meetings that had to be called at an early and not always convenient hour of the day.

"These and other reasons justify the statement that, in agreeing to serve on this committee, its members have answered a summons above and beyond the call of duty.

"In my own name and in behalf of the Borough of Brooklyn, my congrautlations are extended to all the men and women of the committee. I want especially to thank Rabbi Benjamin Z. Kreitman, the chairman, for his leadership and for the inspiring manner in which he has dedicated himself to the all-important cause which this committee represents in the life of the community.

"The committee's interim report has my complete support. As evidence of all that has been done to date it demonstrates that the committee's efforts have been productive of good results. Useful lines of communication have been established and are in operation today where they have not existed heretofore.

"Having worked with the committee at almost every step, I want to say it has proved itself to be equal to the challenge which caused it to be brought into being. I am particularly proud that it has lived up to one of Brooklyn's finest traditions, namely, that when critical problems have arisen in the past, our citizens have always been ready and willing to come forward for the purpose of meeting them. Where the public welfare is concerned—where human dignity and human rights are the issue—Brooklyn has never been a community to stand aloof or to allow itself to be frozen in icy indifference. It is the reaffirmation of this spirit—the willingness of our people to accept responsibility—which leads and compels me to express my faith and confidence that this committee is on the road to real success."

BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S CITIZENS ACTION COMMITTEE FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN, CITY OF NEW YORK—INTERIM REPORT

On August 7, 1963, Borough President Abe Stark invited a number of Brooklyn's community leaders to meet with him at Borough Hall to consider the formation of a committee to undertake action on problems of civil rights, employment, education, better housing, and community services for our deprived neighborhoods.

Condemning existing inequities, Borough President Stark said at that time:

"All of us want equality of opportunity and demand that we be treated as equals. Second-class citizenship for any Brooklynite is wholly unacceptable."

In committing himself to the goal of equality of opportunity, he declared:

"This is the task to which I propose to dedicate the Borough President's office: Namely, to the leadership in this most important of civic struggles. This is the task for which I ask your help."

This meeting was attended by representatives from Brooklyn's banks, business concerns, major stores, social service agencies, civic, educational, and religious leaders. Unanimously, they voted to constitute themselves a permanent action committee to help resolve problems in the minority communities.

The committee adopted the name, Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity, with emphasis on the word "action" to show an intent to get results in the effort to secure equal opportunity for all our citizens. The committee voted to concern itself only with Brooklyn.

Shortly after the initial meeting, Rabbi Benjamin Z. Kreitman, spiritual leader of the Brooklyn Jewish Center, was designated chairman of the committee. Subsequently, in order to pursue the stated goals more effectively, the committee organized itself into the following subcommittees:

(a) Subcommittee on Fair Employment Opportunities, Dr. Aaron Brown, chairman. Dr. Brown is a member of the New York City Board of Education.

(b) Subcommittee on Education, Robert M. Burke, chairman. Mr. Burke is vice president, New York Telephone Co.

(c) Subcommittee on Housing and Community Conservation, Rev. William Cullen, chairman. Father Cullen is pastor of St. Peter Claver Roman Catholic Church.

(d) Subcommittee on Youth and Recreation, Mr. Russell N. Service, chairman. Mr. Service is director of the Bedford YMCA.

The complete membership list of the Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity is attached.

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

This subcommittee seeks to deal with the problems of technical and vocational education in three basic categories:

1. Training of the chronically unemployed worker toward a new vocation.

2. Training of new workers coming into the labor market.

3. Training toward promotion for persons already employed.

To evaluate the relative effectiveness of existing training facilities and the possible need for augmentation, it became necessary to find out what jobs are available in the Brooklyn employment market and what the minimum requirements are for getting them. To accomplish this, a survey was made, with the cooperation of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, of the personnel requirements of the major employers in this borough. This survey embraced 17 major business and industrial enterprises with about 20,000 employees and produced the following information:

Educational requirement for factory, maintenance, and craft jobs

1. The majority of the firms surveyed (56 percent) require only that applicants for these positions be able to read, write, and speak English. They must be able to count and to understand simple written or spoken instructions.

2. Seventeen percent require a high school education for some jobs of this kind because it will be needed if the employee is to work himself up in line of promotion.

3. The remainder (27 percent) of the firms have a flat requirement that all applicants for factory, craft, and maintenance jobs have a high school education because it is needed to understand and profit from on-the-job training.

Educational requirements for office and clerical jobs

Persons with less than 4 years of high school are considered for office and clerical jobs in 71 percent of the firms surveyed. Nearly all of these jobs involve more arithmetic, more spelling and grammar, more ability to understand written and spoken instructions than is given a person in grade school. At the same time, a high school diploma is not required of every office or clerical applicant. In some cases, the job itself requires skills such as typing, shorthand or commercial arithmetic which are only learned in 3 if not 4 years of high school.

In addition, the subcommittee report on this subject made the following observation:

"One general comment from a number of personnel executives interviewed bears repeating. It was to the effect that there are many job opportunities in business and industry which offer pleasant working conditions, good pay and benefits and excellent opportunity for advancement. However, there just aren't enough people available willing to expend the effort to learn the next job in the line of promotion and to do their assigned job well. There were more opportunities than people available."

It was discovered that there is no centralized listing of those jobs which are available. There are nearly 8,000 manufacturers in Brooklyn and approximately 5,000 of these, employing 19 or fewer workers, do not forecast what their personnel needs will be in the next 3 to 6 months. Nevertheless, an examination of a representative sampling of these firms would provide the data from which certain overall predictions could be made and would be most valuable.

This survey of the personnel needs of Brooklyn employers is an ongoing effort. A plan to secure private funds necessary to make the broad survey needed is now under consideration.

In the area of job training, facilities for job training are widely scattered and information about them is not generally known. Very often, a person who might benefit from such training is not aware of its availability. The subcommittee hopes to find a more effective method of disseminating information about training facilities.

A meeting was arranged with the members of a subcommittee from JOB (Job Opportunities in Brooklyn, a group of Negro ministers primarily from Bedford-Stuyvesant). This meeting was held December 9, 1963, at the office of the borough president.

This initial contact has resulted in the development of a procedure whereby jobs identified by the borough president's committee are referred to the JOB placement center at Bethany Baptist Church at Decatur Street and Sumner Avenue. There, trained personnel from the New York State Employment Service conduct interviews and refer qualified applicants to existing vacancies.

In a letter to Rabbi Kreitman, thanking the committee for its efforts, Rev. William A. Jones, Jr., coordinator of JOB, wrote:

"One significant outcome of this meeting and the subsequent conferences with Deputy Borough President John F. Hayes, Mr. Robert M. Burke, Mr. Howard Swain, Mr. Wilbur Levin, Mr. George Brooks, and many others has been the establishment of a most wholesome, cooperative, outgoing procedure on matters of employment opportunity in Brooklyn.

"We feel that your committee has made an important contribution toward the realization of the goal of equal opportunity we are all striving to achieve and we look forward to the continuation and expansion of this most productive relationship."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The aims of this subcommittee are twofold:

1. To make available to workers in the minority communities new employment opportunities.

2. To enhance the chances of such workers for promotion or upgrading.

On December 11, 1963, in the office of Borough President Stark, a meeting was held between members of the subcommittee and Dr. Calvin Gross, superintendent of schools of the city of New York. This meeting had two purposes:

1. To express formally the support of the borough president's committee for an application by the Bedford Branch of the YMCA for funds for a vocational training program at the "Y" on a pilot basis.

2. To seek to clarify and resolve the jurisdictional problems between State and city officials which had delayed decision on the application since it had been formally filed almost a full year ago.

As a result of this meeting, and subsequent conversations between Dr. Gross and Dr. Joseph R. Strobel, assistant commissioner for vocational education of the New York State Department of Education, it was agreed that the final decision on the application would be made solely by the State officials. This resolution of the administrative difficulties will result in expediting final decision on the application.

Another matter discussed during the meeting with Dr. Gross was the problem of closer correlation between the courses given in the New York City vocational and technical high schools and the actual needs of the employers of the borough. From this discussion, it is hoped, will come a closer look at, and reassessment of, the training curriculums in these high schools.

Mr. Frank Coyle, District Director of the U.S. Department of Labor office for New York and New Jersey, met with this subcommittee and outlined for them the full range of training facilities and programs available through the Manpower Development and Training Act and related legislation.

Following up on this meeting and acting on the information given by Mr. Coyle, a member of the subcommittee went to Washington and discussed with officials of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare the procedures to be followed in order to secure funds for possible vocational training programs in Brooklyn.

Members of this subcommittee also participated in a meeting with the bankers of this borough which took place in Borough President Stark's office on October 7, 1963. The subcommittee has contacted commercial bankers for the purpose of stimulating their interest in the financing of new industry in Brooklyn and will continue doing so.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND RECREATION

The major areas of concern of this subcommittee are:

1. Racial tensions affecting the youth.
2. Recreation culture.
3. Problems of law enforcement.
4. Human relations and family life.

On December 4, this subcommittee sponsored a meeting of representatives of various social and governmental agencies which are concerned with youth in this borough. Proposals were made for programs to provide opportunity for all citizens to learn more about the history and cultural contributions to America and the cultural heritage of minority groups. The purpose of such a program would be: (1) To offset the inferiority feelings of minority youth; (2) to develop among others understanding and respect for minority cultures.

Also under study is a plan for the establishment of a neighborhood commons program. Designed to create and foster interest in the physical aspects of the community, this is a plan whereby the youth of the area are encouraged to develop and improve city owned or leased vacant lots for small parks or recreational purposes. A pilot project in this direction is now being organized.

This subcommittee has also decided to conduct this spring, with the cooperation and participation of youth-serving agencies in the borough, a major, borough-wide conference of representative youth in Brooklyn. The conference topic will be "Youth and Discrimination—What Can We Do?"

In addition to leaders from the borough's high school student population, participants in this conference will include teenagers at all levels, including dropouts, gang leaders, etc. The conference will use the workshop method. Individual panel discussions will attempt to develop clearly defined action programs tending toward the realization of the goals heretofore outlined as the aims of this subcommittee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY RENEWAL

Among the most critical of all the problems plaguing a number of our older and underprivileged areas is that of financing home renovations.

Certainly, the proper maintenance of structurally sound dwellings is vital to the proper maintenance and stability of the community itself. Each such dwelling is primarily a center of family life. Because it stands also as a bulwark against the inroads of neighborhood blight and deterioration, it is, therefore, a distinctive community asset.

On several different occasions the committee's attention has been drawn to reports that owners of dwellings in areas such as those mentioned above have encountered problems in their efforts to obtain funds needed to renovate and improve their homes.

At the meeting with the bankers heretofore mentioned, the subcommittee chairman emphasized the vital role of dwelling renovation financing especially in these areas. He pointed out that if normal banking channels do not meet these needs property owners are then driven to other sources for the necessary funds.

Such sources, because of premium charges and higher rates of interest, are considerably more expensive than banks. The added expense of such financing, it was pointed out, results often in putting the cost of necessary repairs and renovations beyond the reach of those who most need them. The subcommittee urged the participation of the bankers in a joint program, consistent with sound banking practices, which would make such funds available to property owners in underprivileged areas at reasonable rates of interest.

The committee is grateful to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Renewal as well as to other individual members who have directed its attention to the specific problems involved in the matter of home renovation financing.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION

In the comparatively limited period of time which has elapsed since the committee's formation, meetings of the plenary committee and the executive committee have been held each month. As a rule subcommittee meetings have been held several times a month.

In addressing itself to some of the more pressing community problems, the committee devoted much time to factfinding and research. This became an indispensable part of the committee's work toward establishing needed foundations for future efforts to find solutions for a number of such problems.

Parenthetically, it seems scarcely necessary to point out that problems which have hardened and widened in scope over a period of years are not easily susceptible to solution. This, of course, emphasizes all the more the prevailing necessity for persistent efforts to evolve workable solutions.

In the matter of recommendations for new legislation the committee considers itself fortunate that it has been able to call for and receive helpful advice from three of its own members who are also members of the State legislature: The Honorable Stanley Steingut, the Honorable Bertram L. Baker and the Honorable Thomas R. Jones.

Indeed, various additional members of the legislature representing Brooklyn districts and members of our city's own legislative body, the city council, have expressed interest in the committee's work.

The committee desires likewise to acknowledge that it has received assurances of the complete readiness of members of the Kings County congressional delegation at Washington to cooperate in its efforts to the fullest possible extent.

In its efforts to secure authoritative data the committee consulted and received the cooperation of Hon. Fred J. Martin, the New York State director of the Federal Housing Administration.

The committee wishes to acknowledge also helpful advice provided by the Honorable Abraham D. Beame, comptroller of the city of New York, as well as by representatives of several city agencies notably the housing and redevelopment board.

At this time, therefore, the committee deems it to be its special duty to express its concern over the continuing and unresolved problems involved in the matter of home renovation financing.

Having considered this matter on several occasions and realizing its importance, the committee submits a number of recommendations for administrative as well as legislative action and urges their adoption.

Before outlining these, however, the committee wishes to record the fact that soon after its formation and at its specific request, a letter was forwarded to seven mem-

bers of the Kings County congressional delegation by Borough President Stark.

In this communication the borough president took occasion to point out that the overall rate of employment in the city of New York and in the Borough of Brooklyn is quite high. He stated, however, that there are a number of depressed areas where the rate of unemployment is much worse than the national average. His letter stated that these are areas in which a significant portion of our Negro and Puerto Rican population needs broader job opportunity, better training and educational facilities.

Mr. Stark asked for efforts to have smaller population units used as a basis for determining depressed areas in need of Federal aid. The advantages to be gained locally by such action, he pointed out, would also benefit the Nation as a whole.

This, therefore, became the committee's first direct step in the matter of requesting legislation at the national level. Each member of the delegation in replying to the borough president's letter pledged cooperation toward securing such legislation.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AND FHA

Reference has been made previously to the committee's factfinding and research activities. For example, an intensive study was made of the operation of the National Housing Act and the activities of the Federal Housing Administration. This study was concerned primarily with provisions under which it is empowered to make loans or to guarantee loans by private lending institutions to owners of homes in communities to which this committee has directed its attention.

Within the scope of this program, the number of home improvement loans made in all of Kings County over the period of 1934–62 have aggregated more than 415,500 in the total amount of $387,057,000. Many of these loans have been used to improve single-family homes. The number of such home improvement loans in Kings County in 1962 was 11,541 in a total amount of $21,159,983.

These and additional details were provided in the committee's study.

Based on this study and on further information which has been obtained, the committee recommends the following:

(a) That the FHA intensify its efforts to publicize the title I provisions of the National Housing Act which permit low-cost loans to homeowners otherwise unable to afford repairs. These provisions encourage banks and other lending institutions to grant inexpensive loans on the personal credit of the borrower for the purpose of upgrading residential and commercial properties.

(b) Section 220(H) of the National Housing Act of 1961 be amended to permit guaranteed loans to qualified borrowers without the necessity of designating the area in which his home is located for "urban renewal."

This section be further amended to permit the advances by the lending institution as construction proceeds, to be guaranteed after inspection by FHA or certification by the lender that the work is completed at each stage.

(c) Section 203(K) of the National Housing Act of 1961 to be amended to permit lending institutions to have guaranteed partial advances on improvement loans insured by the FHA. This would enable the applicant for an improvement loan to secure immediate financing with insured payments being made either to the applicant or the contractor during the course of the improvements.

Under present regulations, there is an undue burden and expense on both the homeowner and the contractor who must seek expensive temporary financing during the course of the renovation or rehabilitation.

The advantages to be gained by the homeowner and the contractor under the provisions of the National Housing Act are made impractical due to the necessity of paying premium rates for the temporary loan to complete construction before being able to make use of section 203(K) of this act.

THE 1964 REFERENDUM ON PROPOSED REVISION OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION

In conclusion, the committee notes that the State legislature has approved and that there is to be submitted to the voters of the State at the coming election in November a proposed modification of article XVIII of the New York State constitution.

This article was first adopted by the State constitutional convention of 1938 and was ratified by the vote of the people in November 1938. It is known as the housing and urban renewal article of the State constitution.

It provides in general that the legislature may provide in such manner, by such means and upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, for low-rent housing for persons of low income as defined by law, or for the clearance, replanning, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of substandard and insanitary areas, or for both such purposes, and for recreational and other facilities incidental or appurtenant thereto. Since its adoption in 1938 this article has been amended on a number of occasions.

In 1962 and again in 1963, under constitutional requirements, the legislature approved a series of proposed modifications of article XVIII for submission to the people at the election of November 3, 1964. These proposed modifications are set forth in several sections and are designed to permit greater flexibility in the conduct and financing of the State's housing and urban renewal programs and to conform the language of article XVIII to modern concepts and present needs in these vital fields.

The committee notes with particular interest that the proposed amendments, if finally approved by the people, would include the following important and essential provisions:

(a) Clarify the legislature's authority to provide housing and rehabilitation for the benefit of all persons and families of low income whose housing needs cannot be met by the unaided operations of private enterprise;

(b) Recognize the rapid advancement of urban renewal from the limited concept of "slum clearance" and "reconstruction" to the many programs and projects presently authorized by Federal and State law; and

(c) Authorize the legislature to provide for rehabilitation of substandard dwellings where it has been determined by law that such rehabilitation cannot be accomplished by the unaided operations of private enterprise, including the making of loans to the owners of multiple dwellings for the rehabilitation and improvement thereof without any limitation as to the income of the occupants thereof.

Several other provisions are to be noted. These would:

Authorize the exclusion of "urban renewal notes" retired within 10 years after their original issue, from the 2-percent housing and urban renewal debt limitation of municipalities;

Authorize the legislature to confer jurisdiction of the State comptroller to compute the amount of self-liquidating municipal indebtedness permitted to be excluded from the 2-percent housing and urban renewal debt limitation pursuant to the present provisions of section 4 of article XVIII.

Conform provisions of article XVIII to those already contained in article VIII (the local finance article of the constitution), wherein municipal debt limitations are based on a percentage of average "full" valuation of taxable real estate rather than on average "assessed" value.

It has been observed that existing article XVIII presents problems of age, concept, and detail. It has been stated that changes which have occurred in the past 25 years in public thinking, housing economics, and governmental land use control have been truly revolutionary.

The public housing program which started in the depression years with a reemployment and slum clearance emphasis now finds itself part of comprehensive land use planning intended to prevent the development or spread of slums to conserve and rehabilitate neighborhoods, and to rebuild our cities through comprehensive and coordinated efforts under the label of "urban renewal."

A memorandum of the State Division of Housing and Community Renewal has, for example, offered the following observations:

"A major focus of State housing policy over the past 7 years has been the problem of middle income housing. Article XVIII refers to 'low rent' and 'low income.' These terms which have taken on a certain definable quality over the years, suggest possible obstacles to the State's middle income housing programs. It is true that the legislature is authorized to define the terms 'low rent' and 'low income' but it has never actually done so, except for establishing arbitrary ratios of income to rental. It has apparently deemed the phrase 'as defined by law' to be sufficient authorization for such middle income housing programs as the limited profit housing companies law and the New York State Housing Finance Agency Act.

"Nevertheless, the potentially restrictive effect of the words 'low rent' and 'low income' remains apparent. It has been the subject of considerable litigation, with the courts, fortunately, holding that the terms need not be confined to the 'lowest possible rents' nor to 'persons of the lowest income,' but may include all those persons and families whose housing needs cannot be met by the unaided operations of private enterprise. In order to avoid future doubt, litigation and controversy over this question, it is deemed advisable to amend article XVIII so as to clarify the authority of the legislature to provide housing for persons and families whose housing needs cannot be met by the unaided operations of private enterprise."

Another important observation contained in the meorandum of the State division of housing and community renewal is the following:

"Neither the present direct municipal loan program to owners of existing multiple dwellings (art. 8, of the private housing finance law) nor the activities of the Mortgage Facilities Corp. (art. 7 of the private housing finance law), have proven themselves to be a solution to the ever increasing problem of financing the rehabilitation of substandard multiple dwellings which are not yet so deteriorated as to warrant demolition.

"The direct municipal loan program is hampered by the present constitutional limitation that such loans must be 'for occupancy by persons of low income.' No municipality has yet availed itself of the power to make such loans, although the authority to do so has been in the law since 1939. A bill that would have removed the income limitation from the law (Senate Intro. 3109, Print 4551, 1961) was vetoed on constitutional grounds.

"The Mortgage Facilities Corp., created in 1956 to make rehabilitation loans in blighted or deteriorating urban areas, has not been able to make any significant progress toward rehabilitating the many thousands of dwellings that are worth saving.

"Since the rehabilitation of substandard multiple dwellings continues to be a pressing need in our urban areas, and since such rehabilitation has not been and cannot be accomplished by the unaided operations of private enterprise, or even by the operations of municipal government within the limi-

tations presently prescribed in article XVIII, it is apparent that those limitations must be removed.

"Moreover, there should be constitutional authorization for the State, perhaps acting through a corporate governmental agency similar to the State housing finance agency, to undertake the rehabilitation financing of individual substandard dwellings.

"It has been demonstrated that a successful rehabilitation loan program must have some form of State or municipal assistance, whether in the form of low-interest financing or partial tax abatement, or both. This amendment, if approved and implemented by legislation, will provide a ready source of financing rehabilitation improvements without unrealistically limiting the tenancy in such rehabilitated dwellings to persons of low income. Proper utilization of such a program by municipalities and by the State in conjunction with already existing powers to compel owners of substandard dwellings to make necessary improvements, may prove to be the long-sought answer to the serious problem of rehabilitating partially deteriorated areas."

When the proposed revision of article XVIII of the constitution was submitted to the 1963 legislature both the senate and the assembly voted overwhelming bipartisan approval. In the senate the vote was 56 to 1 and in the assembly it was 78 to 46. Massive support for the approval of the proposed new amendments was provided by the New York City members of the legislature.

In view of the serious need for much more middle-income housing than is now being provided and the further need for a workable rehabilitation loan program, the committee calls upon all voters of Brooklyn to rally in support of the revision of article XVIII when it is submitted to them in the referendum of November 3.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The foregoing matters, both Federal and State, serve to remind us that much additional legislation of importance to the Borough of Brooklyn is pending in the Congress at Washington and in the legislature at Albany.

For example, one of the measures before the legislature provides for a referendum on a $165 million housing bond issue and for grants to place low-income families in middle-income housing.

The New York City administration's own program for needed housing legislation has also been submitted. In his message requesting prompt and favorable action on this program, Mayor Wagner has stated:

"Our necessity is for legislation to meet two separate but intimately related needs: (a) increase Government aids for more new housing in the low-income and middle-income categories, and (b) expanded authority to rescue from slum conditions our older housing and to prevent more slippage of this older housing into slum status."

The committee urges enactment of the city administration's program.

The attention of the entire Nation has been focused on President Lyndon B. Johnson's dramatic declaration of war on poverty in America. In his memorable state of the Union message to the Congress on January 8, 1964, the President stated:

"This administration today here and now declares unconditional war on poverty in America. I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort.

"It will not be a short or easy struggle—no single weapon or strategy will suffice—but we shall not rest until that war is won. The richest nation on earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it; $1,000 invested in salvaging an unemployable youth today can return $40,000 or more in his lifetime. Poverty is a national problem, requiring improved national organization and support. But this attack, to be effective, must also be organized at the State and local levels and must be supported and directed by State and local efforts."

The President stated that the weapons in this attack on poverty will be "better schools and better health, and better homes, and better training, and better job opportunities to help more Americans—especially young Americans—escape from squalor and misery and unemployment rolls where other citizens help to carry them."

The President has told us that concerted community action, with new Federal assistance, "can break the dismal and vicious cycle found in too many of our rural and urban areas: The cycle of poverty: inadequate schools, dropouts, poor health, unemployment—creating delinquency, slums, crimes, disease, and broken families—thereby breeding more poverty."

These are among the selfsame aims and objectives for which the Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity has been formed.

In this spirit the committee unreservedly and wholeheartedly endorses the President's program and pledges its fullest support in response to his appeal for cooperation at the local level. It is a program which can be of inestimable benefit to our own community.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The Borough President's Citizens Action Committee for Equal Opportunity believes, and seeks to reaffirm, that Brooklyn is a community of good will. The committee is not an official arm of the government, but rather a "citizens committee" exercising independence and autonomy.

The committee recognizes that there already exist many worthy organizations which are actively pursuing the same or related goals as those it has marked out for itself. It does not seek to displace or supplant any of them. Rather, it hopes to supplement and strengthen their action and, because of its boroughwide nature, believes it can be of service by coordinating some of the activities of the many responsible groups now functioning.

The committee feels that some progress has been made toward the achievement of its stated goals. However, it must be recognized that the problems to which it is addressing itself are among the most complex which face our Nation today * * * that—unfortunately—it may be a long time before they can be completely resolved.

It is also true that many of the contributions made in this area do not readily lend themselves to objective measurement. The very act of identifying specific problems and the marking out of avenues of approach—as was done in the survey of the needs of Brooklyn employers—constitute an attack which, while not immediately productive, is nevertheless vital to any hope of ultimate success.

In addition to its attempts at specific problem-solving, the committee counts among its contributions the fact that it has created a forum for free and uninhibited discussion. Here, because of the broad diversity of its membership—i.e., major civil rights groups, commerce and industry, civic and religious leaders—a true exchange of opinion among people of good will can and does take place.

The committee invites communications from the citizens of our borough on matters involving discrimination. They can be addressed in writing to the committee at borough hall where they will be received by George D. Brooks, coordinator and given prompt attention.

The committee hopes ultimately to involve all the communities of the borough in this effort toward equal opportunity and, by establishing intercommunication between them to point the way to mutual solutions of our problems. Toward these ends, the committee invites the help and support of all people of good will.

BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

Mr. Bernard Alderman, deputy fire commissioner.

Hon. Bertram Baker, assemblyman, sixth assembly district.

Mrs. Carmen Barrow, Puerto Rican Community Organization.

Mrs. Ruth Best, secretary, State labor department.

Lt. William Bracey, 71st Precinct, Brooklyn North.

Mr. Arthur Bramwell, sixth assembly district, Republican Organization.

Dr. Aaron Brown, board of education.

Mr. Isaiah Brunson, chairman, Brooklyn CORE.

Mr. Warren Bunn, president, Brooklyn branch, NAACP.

Mr. Robert M. Burke, vice president, New York Telephone Co.

Rev. William J. Cullen, St. Peter Claver's rectory.

Mr. Charles M. Freeman, branch manager, International Business Machines.

Mrs. Ruth Goring, supervisor, Brooklyn Visiting Nurses Association.

Hon. Thomas R. Jones, assemblyman, 17th assembly district.

Mr. Ascher Katz, president, Brooklyn division, American Jewish Congress.

Rabbi Benjamin Kreitman, Brooklyn Jewish Center.

Mr. John J. Lynch, Kings County Trust Co.

Rev. Richard Martin, St. Philips Church.

Mr. Robert Morse, counsel to the Board of Education of the City of New York.

Mr. Grover Moscowitz, executive vice president, Downtown Brooklyn Association.

Dr. Robert Palmer, Central Brooklyn Coordinating Council.

Mr. Johny Parham, director, Urban League.

Mr. Andrew Boscoe, president, Equitable Savings & Loan Association.

Rabbi Eugene J. Sack, Congregation Beth Elohim.

Mr. Russell Service, director, Bedford YMCA.

Hon. Stanley Steingut, chairman, Kings County Democratic Organization.

Mr. Howard Swain, executive vice president, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

Rev. Gardner Taylor, Concord Baptist Church of Christ.

Dr. Francisco Trilla, chairman of Puerto Rican Hispanic Leadership Forum.

Mrs. Celia Vice, president, Puerto Rican Woman's Political Association, nonpartisan.

Mr. Max Weiner, vice president, Equitable Savings & Loan Association.

Tribute Paid to Educator, Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, a deserving and appropriate tribute is being paid to a resident of my congressional district who has devoted almost his entire life to the welfare of the people I have the privilege to represent.

He is Mr. Robert Allen of Lathrop, Calif., in whose honor a new park on the San Joaquin River will be named.

Mr. Allen was an educator until his retirement in 1946. Since then he has de-

voted his time to civic activities and the promotion of programs for the benefit of sportsmen.

One of Mr. Allen's historic achievements was the organization of the first Junior Traffic Patrol unit in the United States while serving as principal of Jefferson Elementary School in Stockton, Calif., in 1917—6 years before the next unit was organized in San Francisco. The program, as you know, has spread across the United States and each year thousands of patrol youngsters come to Washington to participate in ceremonies and a parade to emphasize the importance of the work they are performing in making our streets and highways safer for our children.

The park which is being created near Mr. Allen's home is being partly financed by Federal funds under the accelerated public works program.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the April 1, 1964, issue of the Manteca Bulletin—a statewide prize-winning newspaper published in my home community—concerning the honor which is being paid to Mr. Allen.

The article follows:

BOAT RAMP TO BE NAMED FOR BOB ALLEN

San Joaquin County's new public boat launching facilities nearing completion on a 9-acre site at the end of Dos Reis Road in the Lathrop area will be called Robert Allen Park, members of the county board of supervisors decided this last week.

Allen is a well-known Lathrop resident who for many years worked as an official of the Lathrop District Chamber of Commerce and has been active all his life in fishing and wildlife activities.

While principal of Jefferson Elementary School in Stockton in 1917 he founded the first junior traffic patrol unit in the United States.

Allen moved to Stockton from Kansas in 1885 and began teaching in 1908. In Stockton he taught in Jackson and Hazelton schools before assuming the principalship of the city's Jefferson School where he was principal 28 years until his retirement in 1946. He since has devoted his time to woodworking, hunting, fishing, gardening and his civic activities.

He was instrumental in State acquisition and development of a park which is being named in his honor at the suggestion of the Lathrop Chamber.

Lathrop Chamber officials in proposing the name to Fifth District Supervisor Frank Hoyt stated, "We would appreciate very much any efforts you could extend in our behalf in giving the park at the end of Dos Reis Road, the name "Robert Allen Park." We feel that Mr. Allen has done much for the community of Lathrop during the many years he has served as a member of the chamber and other organizations in this community. In recognition of his help and services we would like to honor him in this manner by naming this park, "Robert Allen Park."

The State purchased the site and has spent a total of $44,000 for land and improvements on the San Joaquin River site. The launching facilities is the State's first State-financed development of its kind built for the county government and will include a boat ramp, parking areas, possibly a loading float and restroom facilities.

World Law and Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, one of the facets of the future development of the resources of the ocean that has altogether too little attention is the need for progress in a legal environment for such development. It is elementary, one would presume, that the basic requisite for venture capital would be the protection of proprietary interests which might emerge from such venture. In the broad inquiries relative to weather, wave studies, currents, temperatures, and other elementary basic information about the oceans of the world, all nations and people have a common concern and the extracted data does not impinge directly upon the marketable goods and services of the industrial and commercial world. However, one has only to turn to our recurring problems in the international fishing grounds of the world to see an example of the need for effective legal structure to ascertain property rights and to protect them.

When we hear the expositions which project the promise of mineral resources and food supply from the oceans, we must think concurrently that orderly development can only occur where there is a uniformily definitive procedure to establish rights which will justify the commitment of public and private funds of separate nations and their citizens. Concurrently there must be the establishment of a recognized and respected enforcement structure of judicial administration to assure such rights protection. Let us put it in the particular. Supposing some enterprising group of Americans with or without Government support discovered an ocean floor in the international waters between Hawaii and Tahiti surprisingly rich in nodule deposits of potassium, nickle, and cobalt. Assume that they had in hand plans for equipment to mine and process such findings at a very promising financial gain. How would they describe the boundaries of their potential claim? With whom would they file it? To whom could they appeal if others from a variety of nations should "jump their claim?" Before the investment in equipment, materials, and labor required in the extraction would be feasible, answers to these and other questions would have to be forthcoming.

Supposing some nation or a group of its citizens discovered a spawning grounds of a new specie of fish surprisingly palatable to most tastes. Assume that they developed scientific and practical information on how to improve this specie of fish, reduce its competitors, increase greatly its numbers so as to project a substantial harvest after such development. What special rights if any would be created? Could a gigantic fish farm be created within describable boundaries? What would happen if the fish ranged beyond set limits. Could the species be described in a manner to provide a "brand" for the sea?

Even in the broader aspects of oceanography there may be legal problems. If certain relationship between ocean currents, clouds, and winds exist, and our science at this point strongly suggests such relationship is inescapable, then suppose some nation or a group of its citizens determine that by inducing artificial changes in surface temperatures by some pumping method, new influences in cloud formation and wind directions could be induced causing new rain patterns in areas they desire to change from arid to a more humid climate. Now what are the legal rights, if any, to see that some other nation or some other groups do not engage in activities which seriously interfere with the new situation? More importantly what liability, if any, incurs if side effects from this new phenomenon are adverse in other areas or to other interests?

Mr. Speaker, what I am attempting here to demonstrate is that any realistic move into the great promise that lies in exploring and exploiting the potentials of the Oceans of the World must be accomplished by effort toward the anticipation of legal problems international in nature. These will require formulation of legal rules, laws, procedures, administration; courts and decisions such as maintain order in the affairs of men in every nation where investment of human resources is encouraged and where the blessings of industry and commerce are justly distributed.

The United States should be exerting leadership in all the organizations to which she is a member for developing the constructive inquiry into this field. Some of our great law schools should be urged to devote some of their talent and energy to exposing problem areas and suggesting possible alternative solutions that can be urged in world forums. In this work there should be an early and meaningful wedding of disciplines so that communication is constant between the legal minds, the scientific minds, and the governmental minds to the end that whatever leadership we exert its quality will be apparent to all who share our concern and knowledge.

J.F.K.: Upon Arrival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the period since November 22, 1964, many beautiful and inspiring words have been written in memory of our late President,

John F. Kennedy. One of the most moving of the poems written was by Mrs. Pat Baxter, of Great Bend, Kans. I commend her words to my colleagues:

J.F.K.: UPON ARRIVAL

A group stood at the gateway
And smiled their welcome, warm,
As a tall young man approached them
With an angel on each arm.

The young man neared the entrance;
He looked among the crowd
And recognized his brother Joe.
They embraced and wept aloud.

Then some celestial being
Placed within his arms a child;
And he stood transfixed in glory
As on its face he smiled.

The others there stepped forward;
And he took their hand and spoke.
From history's past, the great arrived
In resplendent robe and cloak.

He takes his place of honor;
With us the pain remains
Indelibly inscribed on all.
Our loss is heaven's gain.

Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh Report of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, over the last several months there has been considerable publicity given to the urban renewal program. In some instances not all of this publicity has been favorable. As a matter of fact, we have heard some comments lately on the adverse effect of urban renewal on employment.

I do not know the source of this information, but I do know one community—that of my hometown, Pittsburgh—where just the opposite is the truth, and I have a strong feeling that the situation in Pittsburgh is really indicative of the true situation in locality after locality.

In its January 1964 "Report of Progress," the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh has some interesting comments on the positive effects of urban renewal on employment opportunities. The report states:

On the basis of funds already spent and projected for expenditure in the 15 projects now in the Pittsburgh renewal program, assuming a 20-year life span for that program in total, the direct urban renewal payroll in Pittsburgh averages out to about $17 million per year, or the equivalent of about 2,500 jobs. This does not include additional payrolls indirectly resulting from manufacture and delivery of materials and supplies for local renewal projects.

The following extract entitled "Effect on Employment Opportunities" is taken from the Pittsburgh Redevelopment Authority "Report of Progress":

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Urban renewal's key objective is to eliminate blight. In so doing, it also eliminates uneconomic use of valuable city land. By expanding the usefulness of city land, urban renewal invites new business investment in the community, and provides new opportunities for growth in education, health care, culture, recreation, housing, and other urban enterprise.

By providing sufficient land to such enterprise in a dense city area with an acute shortage of buildable sites, urban renewal provides difficult-to-obtain space for development of job and career opportunities.

Over the past 14 years, Pittsburgh's urban renewal program has worked in that manner for industrial plants, business firms and institutions, enabling them to expand facilities and thus protect jobs as well as create new ones.

One example is the redevelopment project which permitted the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. to build $80 million worth of new open hearth furnaces at its South Side plant. On completion in 1951, this expansion directly resulted in about 225 new jobs. More importantly, without the opportunity to expand at the South Side location, Jones & Laughlin may have been forced to curtail operations there, in favor of another location, and thousands of manufacturing jobs would have been lost to the city.

Another example is Gateway Center, a 23-acre area in which some 20,000 persons will be employed by mid-1964, compared with fewer than 4,000 prior to 1949. Many of the 20,000 jobs are new jobs which resulted from expansion of office headquarters. Most are jobs which previously existed elsewhere in Pittsburgh but might have been transferred to another city if Gateway Center had not come about.

Ultimately concentrated in the Chateau Street West industrial district will be several thousand jobs which otherwise might have been taken out of the city by concerns seeking locations in which to build expanded modern facilities.

Aside from creating space for employment, the urban renewal program is stimulating new employment in the service fields—jobs for specialized workers necessary to service new buildings, hotels, parking garages, and other uses in renewal areas. This type of increasing employment helps to offset employment losses in manufacturing and other fields.

About 1,900 persons—hotel workers, parking attendants, maintenance workers, janitors, gardeners, elevator operators, restaurant workers, etc.—are needed to service Gateway Center. Activities at and around the Civic Arena, including parking lots, account for some 200 full-time and part-time jobs. Chatham Motor Hotel, soon to be built, expects to employ some 1,100 persons. Allegheny Center will require an unestimated number of persons to service parking areas, new stores and residences, considerably more than were employed in a service capacity prior to clearance of the old business core.

Such are the employment opportunities which follow urban renewal. In addition, the urban renewal process itself contributes directly to wages, salaries and fees for those employed in the engineering, real estate, demolition, architectural, planning, construction, and other action phases of renewal programing.

On the basis of funds already spent and projected for expenditure in the 15 projects now in the Pittsburgh renewal program, assuming a 20-year life span for that program in total, the direct urban renewal payroll in Pittsburgh averages out to about $17 million per year, or the equivalent of about 2,500 jobs. This does not include additional payrolls indirectly resulting from manufacture and delivery of materials and supplies for local renewal projects.

Look Who's Subverted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, continued complications within the Communist colonial empire are, of course, being reported to us and analyzed. We can clearly see the complications which world communism faces in attempting to suppress nationalistic aspirations of various captive nations.

The Chicago Daily News had a practical and timely editorial in its Tuesday, April 7, edition, analyzing Premier Khrushchev's latest contribution to the Communist international debate. It is well for us to ponder the wisdom of subsidizing communism at a time when its world empire shows signs of internal disruption.

The editorial follows:

LOOK WHO'S SUBVERTED

The speaker was pretty mad. His arms waved and his voice rose in pitch. His enemies in another country, he said, were trying "to incite the people against me."

The situation he described is older than the current word for it—subversion. And in recent years the techniques of subversion have been refined to an art by Communists operating all over the world. The high priesthood of the art has its headquarters in Moscow.

But who was this crying "foul" because the neighbors were making propaganda against him? None other than Nikita Khrushchev, the boss of all the Russians. The Red Chinese, his onetime bosom buddies, are blasting at him with both barrels, telling anyone who will listen that Khrushchev has strayed from the true faith and become soft on capitalism. Their most recent attack included a direct appeal to the Soviet Communist Party to throw Khrushchev out.

There is more to this, of course, than a classic case of chickens coming home to roost. The rift in the Communist ranks is deep and wide, and Khrushchev's trip to Hungary illustrates the seriousness with which he regards the problem. He is campaigning as hard as he can to retain the support of the European satellites in the showdown still to come.

The outburst in a speech at Miskolc, Hungary, indicates that the campaign at home will be a tough one, too. Further evidence lies in the ouster from the party of the old-line Bolsheviks, Molotov, Malenkov, and Kaganovich. Apparently it is no longer sufficient to keep them on the sidelines; they must be relegated to the limbo of the nonparty masses, deprived of any voice whatever in the policy discussions of the country they once helped Stalin rule.

Khrushchev's campaign is built on the theme of prosperity. His brand of communism, he has been saying over and over, brings peace and higher living standards (despite such temporary setbacks as the wheat crop failure), whereas following the Chinese dogma would mean war and hardship.

The theme has a familiar ring, especially in the United States in an election year. There have been other familiar notes in the recent Russian pattern of development, and the Chinese charge that Khrushchev

has been borrowing capitalist techniques has at least a slight basis in truth.

We foresee no abrupt Russian conversion to capitalism or anything like it. But the change that is occurring because of Russia's movement up the economic ladder is fascinating to watch. And when Russia's leader begins complaining that the envious neighbors are trying to do him in because his country is prosperous, we can almost say welcome to the club.

A Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, pending before the Judiciary Committee are numerous resolutions for constitutional amendments relating to nondenominational prayer in public schools. It is well for us to review some of the developments that have stemmed from the Supreme Court ruling against prayer in public schools.

The Suburban Life of La Grange, Ill., in an editorial Thursday, March 26, discussed a development in one of Cook County's suburban high schools that merits our thoughtful review.

The editorial follows:

A CHALLENGE?

Ramifications which have arisen from the Supreme Court's ruling against prayer in the public schools, based on the church-state separation provisions of the Constitution, appear to have gone far beyond what was intended.

A case in point is the cancellation of an Easter program at Riverside-Brookfield High School. It was to be presented by the Hi-Y group, an organization of students affiliated with the Young Men's Christian Association.

Last year's presentation was toned down in its religious aspects. This year the students felt that if the program could not have a religious theme they would not care to stage it. So the traditional program expired.

This is no criticism of the high school or its officials. Similar programs have been canceled elsewhere.

Obviously a fear has arisen throughout the country regarding religious programs and displays in schools and public buildings and on public grounds, a fear that the law will be abridged and that personal liberties will be violated.

But the Supreme Court decision was based on a specific: prayer in the classrooms. There was nothing said, nor contested, regarding dramas or exhibits with religious themes.

There is only one way to tell the Christmas, Easter, or Passover stories. Prior to the High Court's ruling such programs were, in the main, welcomed and enjoyed. It's a different situation now.

It's hard to see where liberties are being jeopardized in religious presentations with optional attendance in schools or public buildings.

Such presentations, be they Christian, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, or what have you, in themselves can be instructive without being propaganda.

The Supreme Court itself may be surprised by the ways in which its decree has been interpreted.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some heroes are accidents of history. Through a quirk of circumstance not of their own doing, they happen to be in the right place at the right time and do the right thing.

But there is another brand of hero, the sort of hero typified by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur whose death we mourn today.

Time after time and on occasion after occasion, General MacArthur deliberately placed himself in the path of history and dared it to run him down.

I don't think General MacArthur ever played it safe in his life.

He never compromised principle for expediency.

He lived the life he wanted to live, and he lived it to the fullest.

His dedication to his Nation will be remembered as long as there is a United States.

Words came easily to General MacArthur, because he believed fervently in what he said, and he lived what he believed.

His speech before the Corps of Cadets at West Point on May 12, 1962, deserves to be remembered forever. It was delivered without notes, from the heart.

In speaking of the motto of the U.S. Military Academy, "Duty, Honor, Country," he said:

Unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase.

But these are some of the things they build. They build your basic character. They mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the Nation's defense. They make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid.

They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success; not to substitute words for action; not to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm, but to have compassion on those who fail; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh, yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future, yet never neglect the past; to be serious, yet never take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness; the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength.

What more can I say, what more can anyone say about this man who was born to heroism, lived life nobly and died with dignity and honor.

If each of us in this Chamber today could have done one of his deeds, each of us would be a hero.

We will never forget General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, either here in the United States, in the Phillipines or in Japan.

He was a magnificent soldier, a magnanimous victor and a matchless man.

Let us hope and pray with all our hearts that the good Lord will give us more men like him in the future.

The Civil Rights Bill: What It Would and Would Not Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, recently two articles by the very responsible and highly respected columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, have come to my attention. I believe these articles go a long way toward explaining exactly what the civil rights bill now before Congress would and would not do if enacted. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I include these articles in the RECORD for the interest of those who may have missed them:

OBJECTIVES OUTLINED: RIGHTS BILL'S CONTENTS CLARIFIED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Very few of the Senate opponents of the civil rights bill openly attack its objectives. They argue against it on two other grounds—that Congress is trying to do by law what can be done only by education and that the bill goes much too far in giving the Federal Government power to interfere in State affairs.

These arguments may be advanced quite sincerely, but it is evident from the debate thus far that they rest on a misstatement or misunderstanding of what the civil rights bill contains.

To assess the validity of these arguments it is important to know what the bill does not attempt to do as well as what it does.

According to the mail which many Senators are receiving, public opinion is particularly stirred by provisions which people believe are in the bill but which either were never there or were removed by the House.

Here are the facts:

Question. Does the bill interfere with the right of a homeowner to sell or lease his house?

Answer. It does not deal with housing at all. It doesn't touch the subject. There is no change in existing Federal regulations.

Question. Doesn't the bill try to create greater balance in public school integration? Doesn't it do this by permitting the Federal Government to finance or to compel the compulsory transport of schoolchildren out of their own neighborhood to where schools are racially imbalanced?

Answer. No. Not only is there no such provision in the bill, but the House of Representatives wrote in a clause specifically stating that nothing in the law should give the Federal Government the power to do any such thing.

Question. Does the bill propose to dictate the membership policies of private organizations, clubs, and fraternities?

Answer. They are exempted.

Question. Does the bill tell restaurants and other public accommodation owners what customers they must serve?

Answer. Hotels, theaters, restaurants, etc., affecting interstate commerce must treat all customers alike—no discrimination because of race. They can refuse to serve any customer, say, who is improperly dressed or is unruly but not because of his color. Small

roominghouses where the owner lives are exempted.

Question. Does the bill give the Federal Government power to assume control of the curriculum content in the public schools and to hire and fire teachers?

Answer. It deals only with official discrimination in the assignment of pupils to public schools. If a pupil is assigned to a school only on the basis of race, it only then gives the Department of Justice the right to bring suit to stop it. Even then the decision is made by the courts, not by the executive branch of the Government. The bill has nothing to do with the curriculum used in the schools or with hiring or firing teachers.

Question. Doesn't the pending civil rights bill take from the States their long-held right to establish qualifications for voters and invest this power in the Federal Government?

Answer. This is another misapprehension. The bill recognizes that qualifications of voters under the Constitution are fixed by the respective States. All the bill does is to strengthen the hand of the Federal Government in seeing that the qualifications for voting are administered without discrimination, that they are administered equally for all citizens. This is a constitutional requirement—"equal protection of the law," and then only in voting for Federal office.

Probably the greatest misunderstanding about the civil rights bill is that it proposes to legislate racial equality, that the proposed law rests, as one Senator said, on the false premise of "the absolute equality among men."

This is not true. The bill does not try to legislate racial equality. It seeks to strengthen equality of opportunity for all citizens regardless of race. The principle underlying the bill is not equality of race or absolute equality among men, but equality in citizenship—equal right to vote, to job opportunities, to attend the public schools for which all pay, and equal access to public places.

THE REAL ISSUE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The balance of political forces in the Senate favors ultimate passage of the civil rights bill.

The consensus in Washington is that this balance will continue secure on three conditions:

If public opinion can be kept focused on the moral duty to promote not racial equality, but equality of citizenship.

If the Democratic-Republican coalition, which brought the legislation safely through the House, is carefully nurtured by both sides.

If the civil rights pressure groups do not alienate needed Republican Senators by giving lipservice to Republican support and simultaneously making it clear that these Republicans can expect no backing in the elections.

The real issue: The clearest statement of what is not the real issue has come from Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia. He said in the Senate a few days ago:

"There may be a key to the achievement of absolute equality among men, but we do not hold it. It does not lie in anything Congress or any other legislative body will do—not now, not ever."

He's right, but it has nothing to do with the civil rights bill.

There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States that says that the rights of citizens and equal protection under the law rest upon "equality among men."

There is nothing in the unanimous Supreme Court decision suggesting that desegregation of the public schools rests upon "equality among men."

There is nothing in the pending civil rights bill that proposes to legislate the unlegislatable—equality among men.

The issue is not racial equality; the issue is equality of citizenship, equal right to the ballot, equality of opportunity and individual dignity.

Let the goal of equality among men be competitive. One measure of that equality, or lack of it, will be how well these precious rights are used and made secure for all.

The party coalition—the work and the votes of Democrats and Republicans together—were essential to carry the civil rights bill well on the road to enactment. The leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson was indispensable. The votes of Republican Congressmen were indispensable. An enactable bill would never have emerged from the House Judiciary Committee were it not for the rescue work of the Republican minority. On the final vote in the House the strong civil rights package won the support of three-fifths of the Democrats and four-fifths of the Republicans.

The maintenance of this coalition is crucial in the Senate.

Dangers to the coalition: On this point the National Committees for an Effective Congress, a stout arm of the civil rights cause, issues a timely warning in its latest report.

"It is especially important," it says, "that the national Negro leadership recognize and find some way to cope with the purely political distrust in which they are held by some Republicans. Too often they are regarded as shills for the Democratic Party.

"Republicans complain that the typical civil rights organizational attitude is that 'if there's a bad Democrat, we'll oppose him in the primary—and if there is a bad Republican, we'll oppose him in the general election.' "

The civil rights pressure groups imperil this vital Democratic-Republican coalition by giving their support only to their Democratic allies.

United Space Efforts Bring Man Closer to the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to personally witness the successful shot at Cape Kennedy on Wednesday, April 8, 1964, which marked the first actual test in our Gemini program. Gemini is a bridge between the Mercury program which was completed May 16, 1963, with the 22 orbital flight of Astronaut Gordon L. Cooper and the Apollo Manned Lunar Landing mission scheduled in this decade.

The Gemini capsule, built by the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. is a two-man spacecraft capable of earth orbital flight of as long as 2 weeks. Also, it will be used in the development of space rendezvous and docking techniques. Yesterday's flight designated Gemini-Titan I—GT-I—is a test of the Titan II launch vehicle system, as well as Gemini spacecraft structural integrity and spacecraft launch vehicle compatability. The spacecraft was equipped with instrumentation, communication, electrical and coolant systems. This spacecraft will remain in orbit a number of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant step forward in our space program, and I congratulate those who have been directly concerned with this particular phase.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today we, as Members of the Congress of the United States, on behalf of the Nation we serve and represent, have sought to pay our final respects to truly one of the greatest figures this country has been fortunate enough to have known, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. The long shadow of this most singular statesman and warrior casts its spell deep into our past and over some of this Nation's most heroic and finest hours. In honoring him the Nation honors itself, for the immortality of MacArthur, disclosed in his words and deeds, cloaks both him and the countrymen he served and led. The storied life of General MacArthur transcends and numbs the sting of death. We feel less a sense of loss than a sense of gratitude for a life fulfilled, for the greatness which we have known and from which we have so benefited. I know that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan would not wish to have their thoughts and feeling of deep appreciation and respect left unspoken on this occasion and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert as part of the RECORD of this day two expressions of that sentiment as they appear in editorials in the Monday, April 6, editions of the State Journal, of Lansing, and the Flint Journal, of Flint, Mich. The editorials follow:

[From the State Journal, Apr. 6, 1964]

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S MEMORY WILL LIVE ON

Americans are united in mourning the passing of one of their most illustrious and devoted countrymen—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The grand old soldier and patriot has joined the honored ranks of the Nation's heroic dead—ranks that include both the departed military leaders and those they had led into battle in defense of freedom.

What the rigors of a score of military campaigns, the enemy shells on a dozen battlefields and the demands of three wars failed to do, the ever-moving hand of time has accomplished.

General MacArthur's death is mourned not only by Americans but by millions of people in other lands who still are free because of the military victories which he helped so much to win.

The hero of the war in the Pacific had already completed 38 years of distinguished service in the Army before his name became a source of inspiration to his countrymen after the Japanese invasion of the Philippines.

Graduated from West Point with highest academic honors in 1903, he took part, as a captain, in the Veracruz expedition of 1914. In World War I, although a brigadier general, he saw personal action in the bloody St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives, among others, and was wounded twice.

By the time the war clouds were gathering again in the 1930's, he had served as superintendent of West Point and commander of the Army's Philippines Department and had reached the top of the military ladder as Chief of Staff.

Then came World War II, and as if he had not lived and done enough to fill the lives of a number of men, MacArthur's contribution to history was far from ended with the signing of the peace. It is to MacArthur, who as occupation commander virtually wrote the postwar Japanese constitution himself, that the Japanese owe their present democracy and the spectular release of their native energies from the bondage of totalitarianism.

Brilliant and wise administrator that he was, however, MacArthur was foremost a warrior, and a victory as startling as any in American military history was to be his with the landing at Inchon during the Korean war. His subsequent removal by President Truman served only to increase his stature in the eyes of many Americans.

At last came the long-delayed triumphant return to his homeland, the parades and accolades, all capped by his moving speech before Congress. His retirement from public life was but the beginning of a new career as a corporation board chairman.

One of the greatest soldier-patriots in all of America's history is dead at 84.

Old soldiers, like all other mortals, die. But the memory of the great general with the gold-braid insignia on his cap, his corncob pipe and his battle cry of "I shall return" will never fade from the minds and hearts of his countrymen.

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Apr. 6, 1964]

IN OUR OPINION: ONE OF NATION'S NOBLEST PUBLIC SERVANTS "FADES AWAY"

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has answered his final rollcall.

A grateful nation has lost one of the most colorful and noblest public servants in its history, and the entire free world a military leader and champion who fought and won every major battle with which he was confronted.

Undisputedly one of the most brilliant war leaders of all time, General MacArthur came to be better known after his retirement as a master of phraseology. As such, he came to be looked upon by many of the present generation as profoundly Victorian. Contemporaries often charged him with being melodramatic and theatrical. This he may have been. But the true fact of his greatness was that he firmly believed in the fundamental truths he expressed with such eloquence.

His deep sincerity combined with his extensive knowledge and remarkable military skill made him truly a patriot. Much of what has been called the MacArthur presence—and there actually was such a thing—was experienced only in personal contact with this inspirational leader. But for millions of others, he spoke words which will be long remembered.

His famous "Soldier's Farewell" speech, delivered May 12, 1962, to the cadets at West Point, included these words:

"His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty he gave—all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast. But when I think of his patience under adversity, of his courage under fire, and of his modesty in victory, I am filled with an emotion of admiration I cannot put into words.

"He belongs to history as furnishing one of the greatest examples of successful patriotism; he belong to posterity as the instructor of future generations in the principles of liberty and freedom; he belongs to the present, to us, by his virtues and by his achievements.

"In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his statue in the hearts of his people. From one end of the world to the other he has drained deep the chalice of courage."

He was speaking of the American fighting man. But his tribute also aptly applies to one who led and inspired those American fighting men to victory in three major wars—Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

He led a full life, one of dedicated service to his country. And now this "old soldier" has won his final victory. He has returned.

Physical Fitness Leaders Are Honored Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a highly successful first annual Physical Fitness Leadership Awards program was held here in Washington.

Under the sponsorship of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Standard Packaging Corp., 12 outstanding men were honored for their contributions to the Nation's physical fitness posture.

Of these 12 physical fitness leaders, 3 were singled out for distinguished service and were presented $1,000 cash prizes each.

Alph Stanphill, a close personal friend and a neighbor in my hometown of Muskogee, Okla., was selected as one of the three for special recognition and was presented his award by Stan Musial, the former baseball great and presently consultant to the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

My sincere congratulations are extended to Alph Stanphill for this richly deserved recognition.

Alph was the guiding light, the genial and hard-working director and coordinator of the pilot physical fitness program at Muskogee. His enthusiastic leadership made the Muskogee project the national model for the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

We in Oklahoma have long admired Alph Stanphill for making Muskogee the "physical fitness capital of the Nation." We are proud that his efforts as one of America's foremost fitness educators were recognized today.

I also congratulate the other special awards winners—Prof. Bill Bowerman of Eugene, Oreg., and Mr. Frank Manley of Flint, Mich.

The junior chamber of commerce and Standard Packaging Corp. also deserve a special vote of gratitude for sponsoring the physical fitness leadership awards. Through this Jaycee-Stan-Pak program, an important boost has been given to strengthening our Nation's physical and moral fitness.

Environmental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous growth of our population and the increasing complications which accompany population growth make it absolutely imperative that we learn more about the factors which are affecting our health.

Daily our cities and communities are becoming more congested, forcing people to live under less desirable health circumstances. The water that we drink requires more and more purification to make it potable. The air, contaminated by exhaust and insecticides sprayed on crops as well as in homes, sooner than most of us anticipate will need purification before we can be sure it is not damaging to the health—in some areas, this is already necessary.

In short, our work is cut out for us; but we are wasting time. For several years now the Congress has had before it a request by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for funds for planning the construction of a new Federal installation to be known as the Environmental Health Center. And for several years Congress has turned its thumbs down on this project. Again for the 1965 fiscal budget, the President has asked for these funds and HEW has specified that it wants the new facility located in the Washington area. I sincerely hope that Congress this year will recognize the urgency of the matter and appropriate the funds for starting the Environmental Health Center.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the following address delivered by Surgeon General Terry on April 1, 1964, in Cincinnati, Ohio, vividly pointing out the very serious need for an Environmental Health Center, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH—THE TIME IS NOW

(By Luther L. Terry, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered at dedication of new wing of Kettering Laboratory, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 1, 1964)

George Bernard Shaw once said, "Science is always wrong. It never solves a problem without creating 10 more."

I don't know whether Shaw actually believed that himself. I am sure that all of us here today would have to dispute his premise from a purely empirical view. The first scientist, the man who first picked up a stone that fitted his hand and created a tool, had begun to solve the fundamental problem of man's continued existence on the planet. Since that first application of scientific method, man has, through science, improved his lot immeasurably, and none of us would care to exchange today's problems for those that man faced a few thousand years ago.

By our presence here today, however, to dedicate this fine new laboratory devoted to research in environmental health, we acknowledge that man's progress—his science, if you will—has created some very real problems. They are not, perhaps, in Shaw's ratio

of 10 to 1. But they are many and complex, and they demand solutions now.

The problems of environmental health are urgent, first of all, because they bear upon the most fundamental of all questions—the question which faced the first scientist thousands of years ago—the ability of man to survive in the environment in which he finds himself. Today, his environment is a synthetic one which he himself has largely created.

The last few years have ushered in a new era in man's struggle to adjust to the biocommunity of which he is the dominant member. Urbanization, industrialization, and scientific research have brought us face to face with a scientific truth which was known, intuitively perhaps, even to the ancients. Over 2,000 years ago, Lucretius, the Epicurian philosopher, said, "Nature resolves everything into its component elements, but annihilates nothing." Ovid put it this way: "All things change, nothing perishes."

This is the scientific truth which the community of men must accept today in approaching the problems of air and water pollution and in devising protection against radiation. It manifests itself, too, in the mysterious biochemical reactions which take place within the human body as we handle and use some of the thousands of new products and processes which are the mark of modern industrial life.

But scientific truth is, after all, the tie that looses, even as it binds, the scientist. If we apply ourselves to the task, we can surely look with some degree of optimism upon the ability of man to bring under control the environmental hazards which his science has created. The need to move ahead rapidly is clear when we recognize what tremendous issues are at stake. For all his science, man is subject to the same inexorable laws of nature that govern all living things. While other animals have become extinct through centuries of environmental change, man has survived and flourished. We cannot, however, postulate for him, or for any species, an unlimited capacity for accommodation.

The urgency of our task is heightened by the fact that the problems are multiplying so rapidly. Twenty-one years ago, no one in Los Angeles had ever complained of smog; and control measures were not instituted there until 1947. A dozen years ago, San Francisco was paying little attention to air pollution; today the San Francisco area has an active control agency. In 1953, New York City had its first detected smog "episode", to which some 200 deaths are attributed. Washington, D.C., probably the least industrialized U.S. city of its size, had its first recorded instance of Los Angeles-type smog in June 1960; there have been several more. One is reminded of the two little boys who were comparing their hands. "Mine's dirtier than yours," the first one said proudly. "Well," said the second, "you're a year older."

The population of the United States is increasing at an unprecedented rate. We now number more than 190 million, and our population is expected to increase to about 235 million by 1975. Urban areas are absorbing the increase. We expect that, by 1970, three out of four people will be living on only 10 percent of the land area of the United States. Thus, an increasing portion of the waste products discharged to the atmosphere will be released into relatively small segments of the air mass.

There is now nearly six times as much pollution in our rivers, streams, and lakes as 60 years ago. and the amount is still increasing. An expanding population increases the demand for a fresh water supply and, at the same time, increases the volume of waste. The crowding of people into urban centers intensifies the problems of waste disposal. Application of commercial fertilizers, and use of a vast array of new herbicides and insecticides, contribute to pollution. Increased production of goods increases the amount of common organic and inorganic industrial wastes. New technologies produce new wastes that defy current ability to treat or control them and, in some instances, even to detect their presence in water. Substances which are harmless in themselves react chemically with others to produce noxious odors and tastes.

Every year, more than 500 new chemicals and chemical compounds are introduced into industry, along with countless operational innovations. Except with the most toxic materials, there is necessarily a time-lag between the introduction of a new material or process and the recognition of deleterious effects. The lag is apt to be greater still where the effects are subtle, nonspecific deteriorations of general health and efficiency. The effect of occupational exposure is sometimes slow and undramatic, and may easily be mistaken for the "normal" processes of deterioration which accompany aging, for example.

In contrast to the infectious diseases, we have little exact knowledge of what takes place within the human body when it inhales, ingests, or comes into physical contact with toxic substances in small quantities over a long period of time. In our research facilities here in Cincinnati, the Public Health Service is devoting considerable time and effort to basic scientific research into these mysterious biochemical responses.

Possible genetic effects on long-term exposure to potentially harmful substances can only be guessed at. Scientific protection against radiation is at the beginning stage of development. The effects of such physical forces as heat, cold, and noise are little known, and the psychic effects of automation and regimentation in our modern industrial life are just beginning to be recognized.

It is in the industrial situation that the human organism is first exposed to the materials which reach the general population as drugs, food additives, synthetics, fuels, and a thousand other products. It is the worker, too, who first handles the materials which ultimately find their way into the air or water as industrial wastes. There is ample evidence to suggest that many of the chronic diseases—cancer, respiratory ailments, allergies, heart disease, and others—as well as the frankly "occupational diseases" may have a direct relationship to the victim's occupation. Moreover, those peculiarly 20th century maladies related to psychological stress are first encountered in the work situation. In a very real sense, the field of occupational health is in the frontline of man's struggle to control his new environment.

In 1924, when Dr. Kehoe began his studies of leaded gasoline here at the University of Cincinnati, occupational and industrial medicine was just out of its infancy. The term "environmental health" had probably not even been coined. Dr. Kehoe's early studies, and the foundation of the Kettering Laboratory which soon followed, were truly a pioneer effort in occupational health. But they were something more. They represented something uniquely and admirably American—an enlightened and humane interest on the part of industry in protecting its workers and the public.

The fact that the work of the Kettering Laboratory, until very recent years, was sponsored and supported exclusively by the industrial community makes this research plant a monument not only to Dr. Kehoe's vision and scientific acumen, but also to the responsible enlightenment of American industry. That the laboratory has been free to conduct its investigations and publish its results in a spirit of scientific independence and objectivity makes this collaboration between science and business especially noteworthy.

We need more of this collaboration in our national effort to solve environmental health problems. Certainly the Federal Government has an important role to play—in stimulating the efforts of all groups, in seeking ways to utilize all the resources of States, communities, universities, and industry. But industry itself is the primary laboratory for environmental health research. I hope that the pattern of industrial and scientific collaboration which has been set here at the University of Cincinnati will continue to spread.

I offer my congratulations to the university, to Dr. Kehoe and his staff, to the city of Cincinnati, and to the leaders of business and industry, who have supported the research done here. Together they have made an incomparable contribution to the health of the Nation.

Speaking for the Public Health Service, I must call attention to the remarkable brotherhood of science which has bound together the Kettering Laboratory and the public health research organizations located here. In recent years the laboratory has performed vital research projects for the Public Health Service, as well as other Government agencies, which have complemented our own studies and given us the benefit of the special competencies developed here.

In addition, the cooperation which Dr. Kehoe and his entire staff have given to the Public Health Service has invigorated and inspired our own scientists. Dr. Kehoe's unquestioned eminence as a scientist has added prestige and luster to the field of environmental research, and he has given of his time and talents unstintingly to serve as a consultant and adviser to the Public Health Service in the field which he knows so well.

Here in Cincinnati, our laboratories and Kettering have shared scientific knowledge, have collaborated in the training of urgently needed specialists, and have at all times worked together toward the common goal. I think I should mention specifically the immeasurable assistance given by your Dr. Frank Princi to the Occupational Health Facility in setting up current studies of the thermal environment in industry. Dr. Princi's passing was a tragic loss, not only to the laboratory to which he had contributed so much, but also to his friends and scientific colleagues throughout the Nation.

As you know, the Public Health Service has for several years urged the establishment of a new focal point for research, training, and control efforts in environmental health. Ample evidence is on hand of the need for a comprehensive and integrated approach to this complex problem. Let me illustrate with one recent dramatic example.

You are acquainted, of course, with the mysterious and frightening puzzle posed by the death of millions of fish in the Mississippi River Basin over the last 4 years. Now our scientists, working here at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center and elsewhere, have identified the culprit responsible—infinitesimal traces of chemical pesticides draining from farmlands throughout the watershed. Except perhaps that the known is always less frightening than the unknown, there is little comfort in the solution to the mystery. It serves, however, to point up the enormity of our problems.

Furthermore, it illustrates the interdependence and interrelationship of all facets of environmental health, as well as the intimacy of its association with every aspect of natural resource management. The fish-kill problem has obvious implications for land management, agricultural practices, and wildlife protection. Since it affects an important food source and the livelihood of commercial fishermen, it has great potential social and economic significance as well.

The need for a unified attack upon such problems is a compelling consideration both in our recommendation for the creation of an Environmental Health Center and in our

choice of a location. We believe that the Center should be located in the Washington, D.C., area.

The Center, as we see it, will serve as the headquarters for an expanded national effort in environmental health. As such, it will have important coordinating responsibilities, both within the Public Health Service and with other Federal agencies and with professional and voluntary organizations as well.

As you undoubtedly know, the Service now operates a number of field installations and laboratories devoted to various facets of the environmental health problem. Our principal laboratory facility, of course, is here in Cincinnati. In addition, however, there are radiological health laboratories in four States, which serve different regions of the country. We administer 14 comprehensive, enforcement, or special project water laboratories in as many States scattered throughout the country. Shellfish sanitation research centers are in operation along the New England coast, the Pacific Northwest, and the gulf coast. We have three occupational health laboratories—here in Cincinnati, in West Virginia, and in Utah. And the Arctic Health Research Center in Anchorage conducts environmental and other studies related to cold climates. Several additional water pollution control and shellfish laboratories have been authorized and are now being planned.

In addition, we coordinate the National Air Sampling Network which now includes 260 individual air sampling stations, located in urban and rural areas in every State, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

It has been estimated that we have formal or informal relationships in the environmental health field with some three dozen different Federal agencies or their components, most of which are located in the Washington, D.C., area. Proximity of the proposed Center to these agencies will facilitate frequent interchange of resources and skills, and will tend to minimize costly overlapping or duplication of efforts.

I should point out, too, that many relationships are informal, involving contacts among professional workers in related scientific disciplines or among offices having similar functions. It is difficult to measure the total effect of these interrelationships, but undoubtedly they play a fundamental role in the development and progress of Government research and control operations. The same type of relationship exists with a number of professional organizations and societies which have their headquarters or principal offices in Washington.

Coordination, national direction of a national program, relationships with other groups and agencies—all these factors necessitate the location of the Environmental Health Center in the Washington, D.C., area.

When the new facility becomes a reality, some changes in emphasis will necessarily take place in our research activities in Cincinnati. But changes in emphasis will not mean curtailment of activity. On the contrary, I look forward to continued productive, significant, and expanded work in the Taft Center. Environmental research, like biomedical research in general, will need many sources of specialized skills and responsibilities. Certainly the Taft Center shall continue to play an important role in the Nation's health picture.

We in the Public Health Service, therefore, look forward to a continuation of that close working relationship between our laboratories and the Kettering Laboratory which has strengthened and reinforced both. I am gratified that the Public Health Service, through its grant program, has been able to play a part in the construction of this new wing. I know that with its new and expanded facilities, Kettering's future contributions to environmental health research will be greater than ever.

You of the Kettering Laboratory who are devoting your lives to this research know how fundamental your work is to man's continued progress. In man's struggle to master his environment, nature has provided both the adversary and the weapons, and to this extent the struggle may be regarded as that part of his aspiration which is materialistic. His material purpose, however, has never been far removed from his philosophic, artistic, and spiritual strivings.

All are inspired by the longing of the human spirit to be free and ennoble itself so that man may live in harmony with the very forces of creation with which he is seemingly at war. We are in danger, on the one hand, of creating an incredible disharmony in nature which will ultimately degrade and enslave us. Or we can create an environment which can enrich our lives, our society, and our individual well-being. It is for our generation to decide. We must make that critical decision now.

New CAB Transatlantic Mail Policy: All Wet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest and pride the growth and achievements of the U.S.-flag airlines. However, recently I have noted with concern the controversy involving the Post Office and Defense Departments' disagreement with the Civil Aeronautics Board over the award of transatlantic mail contracts. It appears that the CAB is revising the standards by which these contracts are awarded and showing extreme favoritism to the all-cargo carriers, specifically Seaboard World Airlines, all with little regard for the combination passenger-cargo carriers.

We can only speculate as to why our pioneering combination carriers are being discriminated against—as evidenced by recent CAB proposals favoring the all-cargo airlines. Hopefully the Civil Aeronautics Board can provide a reasonable explanation as to why mail contracts should be awarded on a preferential rather than quality of service basis.

Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, has written a factual and stirring account of this situation as it now exists, and under unanimous consent, I include his article of Thursday, March 26, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEW CAB TRANSATLANTIC MAIL POLICY: ALL WET

The CAB is pressuring the Post Office and the Defense Department to award transatlantic mail contracts on a preferential instead of service basis.

What in effect CAB Chairman Alan Boyd is proposing is a handout for an all-cargo carrier at the expense of the two combination—passenger and cargo—lines.

The two airlines which the CAB proposes to penalize for being successful are Pan American and TWA. The all-cargo carrier which the Federal agency wishes to benefit is Seaboard World Airlines.

The CAB tells the Post Office Department it is in the national interest for Seaboard to be given a larger share of the transatlantic airmail it is currently receiving. The CAB cites the stated Federal policy of encouraging the use of modern aircraft for military purposes.

Nothing is said about the primary concern of the Post Office under the law—the quality of service.

The CAB offers the Post Office Department a new yardstick to measure transatlantic service and thus revise its allocations of mail. The CAB proposes mail contracts to be divided according to the number of all-cargo flights of the three airlines involved, but ignoring the more frequent combination passenger-cargo flights, which have substantial cargo capacity.

CAB'S YARDSTICK FAULTY

The CAB further fails to differentiate between pure jets and turboprop craft, nor does it consider tonnage capacity of the different plane types. Only number of flights is the CAB "yardstick."

This is ridiculous, but nevertheless it is the proposal of the CAB.

Seaboard is operating 10 all-cargo transatlantic flights, Pan American 6 and TWA 6, so the latter two each have 27 percent of the all-cargo flights and Seaboard 46 percent. But Seaboard is operating CL-44 turboprop craft, as compared to the more modern and faster pure jets of Pan Am and TWA, which have 25 to 33 percent greater capacity.

WOULD MERGE ALL APO'S

Much of Seaboard's capacity is reserved by contract for foreign airlines. Taking this into consideration, it can be shown that the 6 all-cargo flights of either Pan Am or TWA provide as much effective capacity as Seaboard's 10, but the CAB wants the Post Office Department to assign 67 percent more military ordinary mail to Seaboard than to either of the regular carriers.

Even more amazing is Mr. Boyd's forgetfulness as to the 116 round-trip combination flights operated by Pan Am and TWA every week across the Atlantic with the modern, pure jet equipment. The combination flights provide cargo capacity several times that of Seaboard's all-cargo flights.

In manipulating the mail contracts, Mr. Boyd has another suggestion for the Post Office Department. This is to lump all APO's in Europe into one area, which Boyd explains:

Thus, if the three U.S.-flag carriers serving Europe with all-cargo service provided a monthly total of 100 flights to and from Europe in modern cargo configured aircraft, the objective would be to divide the total military ordinary mail destined to all the APO's in the European land mass in relation to the contribution of each carrier to the total number of flights."

BLOW TO ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Thus, Mr. Boyd would give Seaboard a pro rata share of all military mail to all of Europe, although the cargo line only serves five European cities plus connecting service to three German points. It operates 10 flights a week, in contrast to Pan Am's jet service to more than 20 European cities, with all-cargo service to 7, plus flag stops. Pan Am has 79 eastbound transatlantic flights a week.

As one critic puts it:

The program would "strike at the very heart of our system of free and competitive enterprise and would mark a sharp departure from traditions of allocation of business on a basis of quality service."

The "New" Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News:

THE "NEW" FOREIGN AID

This country's "new" foreign aid program has a number of things to commend it, and for these things President Johnson should be thanked. But it seems the program still is made up of too much of what has made it bad for too long a time.

For one thing, the program's scope is smaller, and that alone is a simple but important improvement.

The President's message to Congress asks appropriations of $3.4 billion for the coming fiscal year starting July 1, of which $1 billion is military and the remainder economic. The total compares with an initial request of $4.9 billion for the present fiscal period, which was reduced later by Congress.

The program also looks to ending or tapering off assistance in certain areas. Additionally, the message cites several specific steps designed to increase efficiency in administration of aid—most assuredly a worthy goal.

The importance of trimming foreign aid, belated though it is, is very great—both in terms of the Nation's international payments deficit and its domestic Federal deficit. Beyond that, the excessive size of previous programs has directly encouraged waste, mismanagement and mistakes; ironically, it has made aid a less effective tool of foreign policy than would have been possible with a more modest and discriminating approach.

Still another potentially useful change of emphasis is an attempt to apply the knowledge of private enterprise in the United States to the encouragement of private enterprise in underdeveloped countries. This change also is inexcusably late. It is somewhat staggering to think it has taken officialdom more than 15 years to figure out that private enterprise has a role—an extremely important one—to play in economic development.

The bulk of the program, unfortunately, remains on the same old unworkable terms. We use the term "unworkable" advisedly. Anyone traveling in the underdeveloped world, whether the dusty plains of Rajasthan in India or the bleak plateaus of the Altiplano in Bolivia, can see that the lot of the masses is as miserable as ever. Certainly any isolated improvements are not remotely commensurate with the expenditure of some $100 billion.

There are various reasons for the untoward results. One is quite simple; when the U.S. Government hands money to another government it is handing it to a political clique and frequently to a single despot. Much of it is bound to be used to entrench the power of the group or the man, not to mention providing a lavish scale of living for them; little gets to the people.

What such a state does spend on its society is usually in the form of public works, all too often without economic justification. The crying need of backward lands is for an incentive economy; mostly they have been given monuments to the glory of the local leader.

That propensity is actually defended as smart politics by some aid officials. And it's true that in a cold and Machiavellian world, facing implacable foes, the United States need not be above trying to buy the political support of another nation. But the way the United States has gone about it, indiscriminately and unrealistically, has not been effective. Witness Sukarno, Nkrumah, Sihanouk, to mention a few. Attacking U.S. Embassies has become something of a favorite sport in some aid-receiving nations.

Additionally, the program continues to rest, ostensibly at least, on a false philosophy. Whether anyone in Washington believes it or not, it is a disservice to the Nation and the world to go on mouthing it. The President put it this way: Our task is to grapple in the world community with poverty and ignorance; from that obligation "there can be no escape in logic or in honor."

To such a proposition one can only reply, well yes and again no. Charity has always ranked high among American ideals. Charity, however, cannot be defined as supporting dictators in luxury, at inadmissible expense to the U.S. taxpayers, and without reaching the poverty and ignorance. To imply that this course represents a moral duty is to stretch both logic and honor.

The President was closer to the mark when he said: "The most important ingredient in the development of a nation is neither the amount nor the nature of foreign assistance. It is the will and commitment of the government and people directly involved." For all its promised improvements, the U.S. aid effort still awaits a program geared to moving governments and peoples toward economic and political liberty.

Don't Buy My Product

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, within recent months a great deal of controversy has arisen as a result of certain inquiries and studies which have been made by various groups in connection with alleged relationships between smoking and certain diseases. The public has been exposed to much misleading speculation as to the Government's responsibility and the role which the tobacco industry should play in clearing up the problems.

Recently, there apeared in the Richmond News Leader, of Richmond, Va., a very fine editorial entitled, "Don't Buy My Product." This editorial sets forth in very cogent language the problems confronting the tobacco industry in the face of widespread Government attacks. Some of the agencies of the Government are, in my opinion, exceeding the authority under which they were established. This editorial makes this point very clear, and I commend the editor on his splendid presentation.

I include the editorial herewith and commend this to the reading of the Members of the House:

DON'T BUY MY PRODUCT

Some profound questions of constitutional freedoms are deeply involved in the effort of the Federal Trade Commission to impose regulations upon the advertising of the tobacco industry. If the FTC succeeds in this unprecedented effort, we shall have traveled a long way down the road that leads to Federal regimentation of our lives.

Acting under its own construction of its own law, the FTC proposes to compel the cigarette manufacturers to carry an affirmative warning, both on labels and in all advertising, that cigarette smoking is a hazard to health. We believe the first and fifth amendments of the U.S. Constitution prohibit the FTC from doing any such thing.

It is useful to know what these hearings are not. Over the years, we have become accustomed to the FTC's "cease and desist" proceedings. In such cases, a complaint is made that some seller of goods is engaged in false and misleading advertising in interstate commerce.

Most of these cease-and-desist proceedings have dealt with advertising of food, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices, because these are specifically covered in the FTC act itself. Thus, the courts have upheld the FTC in prohibiting a manufacturer of oleomargarine from boasting of his "dairy" product. The makers of Charles of the Ritz cosmetics were forbidden to advertise a "rejuvenescence cream" that would restore the "petal-like quality and texture of youth." The makers of such patent medicines as "Aspirub" and "Glantex" have been enjoined against their more extravagant claims. In recent years, three or four producers of hair tonic, said to cure baldness, have been put under FTC decree.

Other cease-and-desist proceedings have stemmed from the FTC's own regulations, as distinguished from the statutory law. The FTC has taken the view that under its broad powers "to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act," it may proceed against misleading advertising in any field. The courts have upheld this power. Thus, Zenith Radio Corp. 20 years ago was forbidden to say that a short-wave set would bring in foreign broadcasts "every night." An importer of rugs was denied the privilege of calling himself a rug "mill." In 1940, the General Motors Corp. was enjoined from advertising a "6 percent plan" of auto credit, on the grounds that the true interest rate in these contracts was 11½ percent. A maker of simulated wooden trays was required to label them as paper.

Most of the body of FTC law, or so we are advised, has arisen from these cease-and-desist proceedings. But the FTC's pending prosecution of the tobacco industry is not a cease-and-desist proceeding at all. It is a plunge into the wild blue yonder of sumptuary decrees, arbitrarily arrived at. What sort of due process of law is this?

In a cease-and-desist proceeding, a defendant is entitled to all the protections of our jurisprudence. He may summon witnesses, cross-examine the Commission's witnesses, and build up a record for judicial review. If the tobacco hearing were being conducted by the traditional rules of an evidentiary proceeding, the tobacco companies might be able to expose the flimsiness of the statistical evidence on which the recent Surgeon General's report was based. The statistics are shot through with fallacies and inconsistencies. There is not one single report of a laboratory experiment, as disinguished from raw statistics, to support the Surgeon General's overblown charges. A skilled lawyer could reduce the statistical findings to nothingness in fairly short order.

But no such opportunity is provided by the current hearings. The FTC is to function as judge, jury, and prosecutor. No witnesses may be called, no testimony taken, no exhibits filed, no assumption challenged. On its own naked fiat, the FTC simply proposes to impose these serious requirements upon one of the largest and oldest industries.

And notice, too, the affirmative thrust of the proposed regulations on cigarette adver-

tising. It is not that something purportedly false is to be enjoined; it is rather that something purportedly true is to be required. The manufacturers are not to be told what they must not say, but rather what they must say. Even under the cease-and-desist procedure, the courts have been very leery of giving the FTC any such authority. In one case in 1950, the FTC attempted to make the manufacturer of a certain blood tonic carry a statement in all his advertising that "the condition of lassitude is caused less frequently by simple iron deficiency anemia than by other causes, and in such cases this preparation will not be effective in relieving or correcting it." The Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed the FTC order, with a remark that the FTC has no power "generally to do whatever is considered by it to be good and beneficial."

This newspaper takes no exception to the purpose of the original FTC act. Willfully false, fraudulent, and misleading advertising ought to be prohibited. We would agree with the Federal circuit court which held that "there is no constitutional right to disseminate false or misleading advertisements." A reasonable construction of the commerce clause gives the Congress power to act in this field.

But it is a great leap from the prevention of fraud to a requirement that national manufacturers, in their advertising, carry whatever "warnings" or "statements" the FTC may require. The power here asserted is a power to control a free market by administrative decree. It is a power that strikes at the first principles of free speech and free press.

Perhaps cigarettes are dangerous in some cases. We know that ideas are dangerous in many cases. The governmental power to declare "truth" as to cigarettes, and to demand warnings of the dangers of tobacco, implies a power to declare "truth" as to ideas and to restrict their dissemination also. Fantastic? It might seem so. But that is the direction in which this power grab could lead us, unless it is stopped in its tracks here and now.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur—A Tribute to a Warrior Who Knew Only the Winning Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today, as America's splendid soldier rests in the rotunda of the Capitol I am moved to pay tribute to his memory. The title he most revered was "soldier." As a former infantryman I well understand his recognition that the term "American soldier" is the highest honor to which any American may aspire. His code of duty, honor, and devotion to country should guide every young American. The most expressive words he spoke were these:

There is no substitute for victory.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has secured the greatest victory in the life of leadership which gained us victory after victory after victory. His final victory is over death itself. His memory is imperishable. It must serve to remind us that this Nation under God must never retreat from its responsibility to guard the freedom of every individual no matter how great the cost or the sacrifice.

The Nuclear Revolution at Seat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of nuclear propulsion, particularly as applied to naval vessels. The day is not too distant, I am sure, when most of our vessels will be propelled by nuclear power. Therefore, whenever I read a thought-provoking article in support of nuclear naval forces, I feel it should be disseminated as widely as possible to help inform the Congress and the public on one of the most vital topics of the second half of the 20th century.

That is why I consider it a privilege to include in this RECORD the following article on "The Nuclear Revolution at Sea" from a recent issue of the Ammunition Locker, published by the Navy League of the United States, which is known as the civilian arm of the Navy:

THE NUCLEAR REVOLUTION OF THE SEA

Tomorrow is the today of the future. Nowhere is this being demonstrated with greater effect than in the revolution now underway on the world's oceans. And it would appear that because we are so close to this nuclear-power revolution we find it as difficult to understand as did our ancestors of more than a century ago when the revolution from sail power to steam was taking place.

The nuclear powered *Nautilus* first put to sea in January 1955. Then came the *Long Beach* in September 1961. Subsequently, the *Enterprise* was commissioned in November 1961, and the *Bainbridge* in October 1962. Only now, however, are we coming fully to understand the vast advantages not only of nuclear powered submarines, but also of nuclear powered surface ships. In 1963, for example, a nuclear powered frigate cruised 50,00 miles without requiring any real shipyard work. This was possible because of the reliability that is characteristic of a nuclear powered ship. Nuclear carriers, a missile cruiser and destroyer screens with nuclear propulsion could operate, for example, in a vast sea space such as the Indian Ocean (with 16 sovereign states on its rim) and do the work with far more seakeeping capability than conventionally powered task forces. Perhaps even more important is that the brush fire conflicts of our time call for rapid reenforcement if they are to be kept from escalation. A nuclear powered fleet can react in half the time of the conventionally powered one and "on the spot" forces can be reenforced twice as fast.

Thus far the surface ships of the world's navies have operated under the inhibiting factor of refueling and have, therefore, been unable to undertake sustained high-speed operations. The U.S. Navy through developments in refueling and other techniques was able to solve this problem to a far greater degree than any existing navy. But even the U.S. Navy could not overcome all of the problems involved in planning operations with refueling requirements in mind. Today, nuclear power for surface ships represents a quantum jump in technology. This can give the United States—if we will but move forward and exploit our know-how—a significant advantage for peacekeeping opertions from the sea.

At first glance, considerations of economy appear to show that nuclear powered surface ships are more expensive than conventionally powered craft. This is primarily because there is still a lag between strategy and technology. The application of nuclear power to the submersible ship so that the underwater craft has become a true "submarine" has been reflected in our current strategy. This is evidenced by the deployment of the Polaris weapons system. But strategy and the interrelated politicoeconomic factors have not yet caught up with technology with reference to surface ships and their role either in suppressing brush fires in world trouble spots or in deterring general war.

Additionally, it is necessary to take a closer look at the cost-effectiveness picture and ask whether the higher cost of nuclear powered surface ships is meaningful. That is, is it based on short-term or long-term prospects? It cannot be denied that costs will come down with more general applications of nuclear power. Recognizing this fact, the Navy now follows a policy of not laying down future submarines with conventional power. The cost of nuclear powered destroyer leaders is about $30 million more than conventionally powered ships. Today, carriers cost approximately $100 million more. But it needs to be noted that this includes the cost of the fuel for several years. Further, nuclear powered ships can carry more ammunition and the need for tankers and other logistic support ships is reduced. Thus, there are some important savings, as well as priceless experience, training, and further development.

In deterring general war or in maintaining the local peace with seapower, cost is a factor which cannot be ignored. But in this particular case, cost would appear to be marginal, and promises to be eliminated through improved design and increased unit production. This has always been the American industrial-technological answer to higher initial cost. And even though cost must always be weighed carefully, it does not stand alone. Quite obviously sails are cheaper than steampower. A prime consideration is the marked military readiness of a fleet that functions with full effectiveness as it moves forward continuously, at top speed if necessary, on nuclear power. Such ships can strike faster, strike farther, hit harder, keep the sea indefinitely. In short, they have a vast strategic reach. These operational facts were powerfully suggested by the events of the 1962 Cuban crisis.

As of the end of 1963, 70 percent of the ships of the active fleet were ships designed for World War II. Any sober analysis of the present state of the world would seem to indicate that the global commitments of the United States will not permit any important reduction in the number of ships in the Navy. We are therefore faced with the problem of replacing large numbers of outdated ships at a time when fast and effective responsiveness to world trouble spots is the key to peace. If the United States is to continue to have a meaningful defense posture, the Navy must play its part on our all-service team as a quickly available arm of our foreign policy. We cannot afford to deter a program which offers decided technological and strategic advantages. In this connection, it is well to recall that a significant move of a single ship of our 7th Fleet has, on occasion, eased critical situations in the Far East. The only proven way to check the threat of aggression is to be able to respond in a timely and effective way as each such threat becomes apparent, not after it has grown into a full-blown crisis.

Speaking with prophetic vision on board the U.S.S. *Kitty Hawk* on June 6, 1963, President Kennedy said: "Events of October 1962 indicated, as they had all through history, that control of the sea means security. Control of the seas can mean peace. Control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security and those ocuntries which stretch thousands of miles away that look to you on this ship and the sister ships of the U.S. Navy."

Nuclear power is a national asset essential in exercising the control of the seas in the interest of world peace. Currently, the United States leads the world in the know-how of nuclear propulsion. We must, however, press our marked strategic advantages since we dare not adopt the complacent attitude that we can continue to keep a present, temporary advantage. One need only recall that once upon a time we thought we could be somewhat relaxed as regards our temporary advantage in nuclear weapons.

We have the technological momentum. We have the nuclear know-how. We have the national resources. Will we have the vision to go forward with a program of progress through nuclear propulsion which will best enable us to help keep the peace with seapower?

Calvert to Secretary Dillon, On "The Wine Bubble Tax"—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1964, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first part of a two part letter written to Secretary Dillon by Mr. Richard Calvert, Sr.

The second part of Mr. Calvert's letter dealing with the "Wine Bubble Tax" follows and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CALVERT TO SECRETARY DILLON, ON "THE WINE BUBBLE TAX"—PART II

(By Richard Calvert, Sr.)

DEAR MR. DILLON: I shall proceed in this second part of my open letter to sum up my case against the continuation of this senseless excise tax on the mere bubbles in wines. Did you know, Mr. Secretary, that in every other wine-producing country in the world most wine—better known as Vin Ordinaire—is consumed while it is quite young in age—from 6 months to a year old—and that a good portion of this same wine generally developes a slight natural sparkle, as is the case in the well-known "cracking" wines of Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, and Italy? These wines, as a rule, are light in alcoholic content—as low as 9 percent in alcohol—and are fresh tasting and fruity and otherwise delicious with or without meals.

UNREALISTIC

Were these same wines to be taxed, as in this country, the utterly unrealistic rate of $3.40 per gallon or $8.16 per case of fifths merely because of their natural effervescence, it would spell the ruination of the wine industry in these respective countries. What I am trying to convey to you is the fact that tax-wise there is absolutely no distinction whatever made in all these other wine-producing countries of the world between a regularly still wine and a wine which sparkles. As long as these wines come under the same classification as table wines and are all within a designated limit of alcoholic content—generally below 14 percent by volume—the tax remains the same.

The only exception to this rule seems to have been West Germany where a similar high tax on all sparkling wines—there called sekt instead of champagne—was in effect the Second World War to defray some of the heavy German war debts incurred. But this tax was reduced drastically in 1952 from the then prevailing 3 marks per bottle (or 75 cents in our money) to 1 mark per bottle (or 25 cents in our money), with the result that the consumption of all sparkling wines in the Bonn government skyrocketed to an alltime high.

This phenomenal increase in consumption of all sparkling wines in our own country and react as well in vastly increased revenues as it has reacted in increased revenues in the Bonn government.

I am aware your Department has questioned to date the possibility of this increased revenue accruing to our Government as a result of a realistic tax reduction on sparkling wines, and I can only attribute this defeatest mentality on this important tax issue to the fact that our wine industry may have failed to properly present to your Department the statistical history of the experience of West Germany in a similar tax reduction. However, the amazing fact remains that the soaring rise in all sparkling wine consumption in West Germany since 1950 has skyrocketed from 6 million bottles to 86.8 million bottles consumed in 1962, and this is truly a fantastic record as a result of a direct tax reduction. I am reliably informed that when the 1963 figures are available, an even greater increase is expected in the sales and consumption of all German sparkling wines.

HOW IT HELPED

The wine-bubbles tax reduction came into effect in West Germany in November 1952. Now let us note the statistical picture as a direct result of a reduced tax covering the decade from 1950 to 1959, which is as follows:

Consumption of sparkling wine in West Germany by years:

Year:	*Thousands of bottles*
1950	6,473
1951	7,328
1952	9,693
1953	15,386
1954	18,948
1955	24,829
1956	32,440
1957	37,944
1958	42,578
1959	51,405

These figures—and we are told figures don't lie—reveal the amazing fact that, during this decade from 1950 to 1959, based on total sales of all alcoholic beverages consumed in West Germany, the consumption of all sparkling wines soared 858 percent in comparison to the much more modest increased consumption of all spirits (or schnapps as the Germans call them) of only 180 percent, beer 278 percent and still wine a negligible 129 percent. It shows the overwhelming acceptance by the West Germans of all kinds of sparkling wines, even above their preference for beer. And frankly, my dear Mr. Secretary, I cannot find any fault with this trend, since wine is a grape product and its greater consumption is not only beneficial to the health and happiness of the German people but is also a definite aid to the overall German agricultural economy, as it should be in our own country's agricultural economy.

It is mainly due to this precedence set by the West German Government's experience in achieving a considerably greater revenue by drastically reducing the sparkling wine tax, that I must respectfully differ with the still prevailing Treasury Department's reasoning on this important tax issue. In a letter dated July 30, 1962, by Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL of New York to Charles Fournier, president of Gold Seal Vineyards Co., he quotes the opposition of your Department to the proposed champagne tax cut as follows:

"The Department acknowledges that 'there undoubtedly would be some increase in the sales of sparkling wines if the tax were reduced substantially and the retail price were reduced to reflect the tax reduction. We find it difficult, however, to believe that even a substantial price reduction would within a short time result in the growth of sales to anywhere near the level necessary to prevent a substantial revenue loss from a tax reduction of the magnitude which proponents have in mind. Taxable withdrawals would have to increase 240 percent to produce the same amount of revenue as is now being collected if the tax were reduced from $3.40 to $1 per gallon. Sparkling wines require special production work and handling which necessitates their being priced (exclusive of tax) at a higher level than ordinary wines. Thus, irrespective of the tax situation, sparkling wines undoubtedly would continue to be priced and sold as a luxury wine relative to still wines.'"

I must say I am far more impressed with the logic and reasoning on this same tax issue as expressed by such enterprising American producers of champagne as Greyton H. Taylor, executive vice president of the Taylor Wine Co., Hammondsport, N.Y. In a letter from Mr. Taylor addressed to me some time ago, he says as follows:

UNFAIR TO CONSUMER

"Many thousands of people in the trade to whom your publication is directed, I am sure, are aware of the greatest single factor that keeps champagne in the luxury class (meaning the champagne tax) and a relic of the glamorous days of Diamond Jim Brady. The philosophy of our American way of free enterprise is to strive to make the so-called better things of life more and more available to a greater number of our population, but for some reason, champagne has been a step-child in this forward progressive movement."

And what Mr. Taylor has to say, of course, is the absolute truth, and all of us should agree with him. For the present tax on champagne is nothing else but a super luxury tax on a light table wine (of no more or less alcoholic content than any other table wine) simply because it contains some bubbles in it. It is also—and this is of far greater significance to all of us who have been fighting this tax—a levy actually based on the fantastic theory that all champagne, or sparkling wine, whether a great vintage or lesser known brands has to be a luxury and must be taxed higher because it costs higher.

I don't feel that your department alone is to blame for this confused thinking, which also exists in part among our own American wine industry, although utterly nonexistent in all other wine producing countries in the world where the fundamental belief is that wine is a necessity of life and a definite aid to digestion when partaken with your meals. It is certainly far from being regarded as a luxury, whether it has bubbles in it or not, and for the very obvious reason that some of the very youngest and cheapest selling wines in all these other wine-producing countries can be literally overflowing with effervescence, while some of the highest priced and truly fine wines, such as a prized Bordeaux or equally exclusive Riesling or select Chianti (which may have not the slightest effervescence in it) will cost many times more. You can buy all the cheaper effervescent wine you wish from one end of Italy to the other and pay no more than 25 cents a full quart in our money, believe it or not.

ARTICLE OF FOOD

In order to proceed with any objective approval of a realistic reduction of the present champagne tax, it is evident that your Department has first of all to accept the basic principle that all table wine (in which classification fall all champagne and other sparkling wine) be regarded as an article of food for people who, for centuries since the dawn of civilization, going back to Biblical days and the days of ancient Greece and Rome, have been accustomed to drinking wine with their meal as an aid to digestion just as we drink beer or coffee or tea.

Wine is today so regarded in France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, in all the countries of the Soviet Union and in South America where the lowliest among their people can afford to enjoy a bottle of taxless sparkling wine. As one who must know his Old as well as New Testament, I am sure, my dear Mr. Secretary, that you do know wine was so regarded long before Christ's time among the Hebrews, who could afford to buy all the wine they needed for their daily use at the local temple at reasonable prices and without strangling taxes. This wine was consumed regularly with their daily meal and especially during the holiday season with their traditional roast lamb and was generally diluted 1 part water to 3 parts wine.

Today when the present administration is launching an all-out fight to eradicate poverty in this country, does it make any sense at all, Mr. Secretary, to levy a tax on the mere bubbles in wine which has historically been the poor man's drink and thus make of this same wine a luxury to be enjoyed exclusively for only the more affluent in our society who can afford to pay the price?

With its splendid achievement in final passage of the Revenue Act of 1964, as the long-needed income tax relief to stimulate the economy, this administration could cover itself with even greater glory in the eventual betterment of our lagging agricultural economy as well by offering a measure of needed tax relief to all producers of sparkling wine, which, let us not forget, is essentially a grape product upon whose greater growth and development a large segment of our farm population depends for a living. Without this crippling wine-bubbles tax, our wine industry could expand beyond its fondest hopes and expectations and our total table wine consumption could actually double and triple itself in a very short time. It may not necessarily reach the fantastic expansion of French wine production, which amounts to something like 1,300 million gallons annually, giving steady employment to millions of workers needed among the over 1,800,000 French winegrowers. But as the saying goes, we should, without this strangling tax be on our way and, who knows bubbles or no bubbles, some day we may wake up to find we have grown into a real wine consuming country along with rest of the great wine producing countries of the world.

As one, who for many years before you became one of our best admired Secretaries of the Treasury, was equally as well admired among our select financial fraternity of Wall Street, I would like to close this letter urging your realistic reconsideration for a reasonable reduction of the present unrealistic champagne tax by quoting from Joseph E. Granville's E. F. Hutton & Co. Daily Market Letter of December 28, 1961. Wrote Mr. Granville at the time:

"The day when taxless champagne becomes a reality may not be near but if we are to believe Richard Calvert, Sr., writing in the Beverage Retailer Weekly, the day may be nearer than most people think. He points to the curious fact that the Federal tax on still wines—wines without bubbles—is only 17 cents a gallon but that the minute the slightest amount of bubbles appear the tax automatically jumps to $3.40 a gallon. Actually, he points out, Government revenues are not threatened by tax reduction but are actually enhanced. In West Germany the champagne tax was reduced from three marks to one mark per bottle and the consumption then reached a phenomenal alltime high of 856 percent above the rate of gain in the consumption of other alcoholic beverages, he says. The added revenue to the Bonn government underscores the fact that increased consumption follows tax reduction and in the end the government revenues rose still higher than they would have with an unchanged tax."

May I respectfully request you, Mr. Secretary, your frank reaction to this letter and especially if I may have failed to clarify any point in doubt existing in your own mind why our present tax on champagne and all other sparkling wine should not be realistically reduced for what I feel is the best interest of the overall European economy as well as our own American economy. For the fact still remains that the main beneficiaries along with our own American producers of sparkling wine will be the European producers, whose product is similarly taxed the moment it reaches our shores and is sold in this country, whereas such a tax is nonexistent in their own country.

Prayer and Bible Reading in Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of our most basic and elemental freedoms is the right to seek divine guidance and to study the greatest of all books, the Bible. The right of our children to voluntarily offer prayer and to read the Bible must be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this House a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution which would permit voluntary prayer, Bible reading, and Bible study in our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve in both Houses of one of the greatest legislative bodies in the world, the South Carolina Legislature. I was very pleased to learn that the house and senate in South Carolina adopted a resolution endorsing an amendment to the Constitution which would permit voluntary participation in daily prayer and the reading of Scripture in our public schools. This concurrent resolution was authored by one of our most distinguished State senators, the Honorable John C. West.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the United States.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROPOSE AN AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION MAKING LAWFUL THE VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN DAILY PRAYER AND THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Whereas the general assembly has noted with great concern the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court declaring the offering of prayer to Almighty God in the public schools unconstitutional; and

Whereas it is not believed that this decision represents the will of the people of America; and

Whereas at least this body holds that the matter should be submitted to the electorate of the entire United States in order that by the exercise of the free ballot the will of the people may be determined as to whether or not daily prayer and the reading of the Scriptures should be allowed in the public schools of the country; and

Whereas the general assembly further believes that the great majority of the people will vote in favor of paying this simple homage to Almighty God, which will result in inserting into the U.S. Constitution a mandate making it lawful to voluntarily participate in daily prayer and the reading of the Scriptures in the public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the U S. Constitution, which shall be amendment XXIV, as follows: "Amendment XXIV—Notwithstanding any statute of the Congress or of any State of the United States or of any decision of any court to the contrary, it shall be lawful to voluntarily participate in daily prayer and the reading of Scriptures in the public schools throughout the United States", be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina, and to each Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress from South Carolina.

State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S.C., April 4, 1964.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Freedom To Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, many of the programs which fix prices and place Government controls on farm products have proved to be failures in helping the farmers solve their basic problems and have added extra taxes to the housewife's breadbasket.

Farmers have been aware of this for some time and now city dwellers and suburbanites are beginning to wake up to the fact that they, too, have a vital interest in farm legislation. Evidence of the farmer's desire to get out from under the Department of Agriculture's control system and of mounting public opinion that the farmer is capable of managing his own business is found in a statement by a spokesman for the American Farm Bureau Federation. The statement was included in an editorial appearing in the September 19, 1963, edition of the Hagerstown (Md.) Morning Herald. I submit this editorial, "Freedom To Farm," for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FREEDOM TO FARM

A spokesman for the American Farm Bureau Federation, this country's principal agricultural organization, says that public opinion about farmers and ranchers received the biggest boost of the past 20 years with the defeat of the administration's wheat certificate scheme, in the referendum of last May.

In his words: "Wheat growers * * * voiced a clear indication in favor of a change in the direction of national farm policy. This turn away from Government intervention and aid, which many people thought had general acceptance as a part of our national way of life, brought renewed confidence in farmers and ranchers by most of the remainder of the taxpaying public.

Failure and false hopes of Government price-fixing programs during the past 30 years caused farmers to turn thumbs down on the wheat certificate plan and instead mark their ballots for freedom to farm, and they demonstrated a new and stronger confidence in the market price system."

It is a matter of record that this market price system has worked in the crops which have been free of controls, while Government price fixing, accompanied as it must be by all manner of bureaucratic controls, has been one of the most costly and chaotic fiascos in recorded history. Meat is a primary example of the market price system. Producers, and everyone else connected with the meat industry, have opposed Government intervention. That has been true in bad times as well as good. The meat people want to take their own chances and rule their own destinies. All in all, that praiseworthy policy has produced fine dividends, not only in dollars and cents, but in the more important coin of freedom. And the public has been given the world's most abundant meat supply at fair prices.

Someday, perhaps, this will be true of all agriculture. May that day come soon.

Dedication of New Headquarters, Baltimore Regional Joint Board, ACWA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, unions in general, and the clothing workers in particular, have come a long way in the past half century. This year the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America observes its golden anniversary. The organization has been active in Baltimore since its beginning.

Baltimore was for many years one of the outstanding clothing manufacturing centers in the country and employed many thousands of workers. Conditions in some of the plants when the union was organized there were such, that the description of "sweatshops" was a very accurate one. In my opinion, no other group of workers has made such advances as has the clothing workers, and these, despite strong opposition and hard struggles, even against other organized groups. Therefore, the celebration of its golden anniversary this year is an especially noteworthy occasion.

On April 4, new headquarters of the Baltimore regional joint board, which represents 30 locals in six States, with a membership of more than 14,000, was dedicated. This represents a worthy monument to the struggles of the group over the years and its determination to continue to work for the benefit of its members.

Not only will the new building provide adequate office space for its activities and space for union meetings, but it will also contain the Hyman Blumberg retired members center, with facilities for recreational, social, and educational activities. This is dedicated in honor of Hyman Blumberg, executive vice president of the national organization. In addition, it will provide a geriatrics center where extensive medical and optical examinations will be available to the members, under the board's health plan. To my knowledge, no other industry enjoys such a program as provided here.

To the former union members who labored so hard for this cause, and the former manager of the joint board, Ulisse DeDominicis, much credit for the progress made by this organization is due also to the untiring effort, the foresight and the leadership of Sam Nocella, manager of the Baltimore regional joint board, and vice president of the national organization.

After the dedication ceremonies, a banquet was held in the spacious banquet hall, at which representatives of labor and Federal, State, and city officials were present. Among these were Angela Bambace, August Bellanca, Mr. and Mrs. Reuben Block, Mr. and Mrs. Hyman Blumberg, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Brazier, Murray Finley, Mr. and Mrs. Charles J. Garrahan, Bessie Hillman, David Monas, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Nocella, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Rosenblum, and Mr. and Mrs. Peter J. Swoboda, representing the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Also Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore; Thomas D'Alesandro III, president of the Baltimore City Council; Louis Goldstein, State comptroller; Joseph Tydings, former member of the State legislature; and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Samuel Friedel and Carlton Sickles, with Mrs. Sickles.

While the new building represents the culmination of many years of tireless labor, it also represents the beginning of a dynamic new program to provide for the future welfare of the union's members. It was indeed a privilege to be able to join in paying tribute to the board at this milestone of its activities.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following fine editorial on General of the Army Douglas MacArthur appeared in the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y.

The editorial expresses my feelings and those of so many of our friends all over the world, that I want to share it with others through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

The greatest soldier of his era has died, but he will never fade away, as he once forecast in addressing the U.S. Congress. Instead, he has gone to share the plotting tables and briefing rooms of military giants like Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Napoleon, Washington, Lee, and Mannerheim.

The success of these men was extraordinary, but even more notable in most cases because of their ability to achieve it despite limited resources.

Deprived of the volume of men and materiel which went to Europe during World War II, MacArthur evolved a strategy of bypassing Japanese strong-points and hitting the enemy where he didn't expect it. This was a strategy which paid off for him consistently, even as other forces were sustaining heavy losses through direct attacks. His losses were consistently light, his gains substantial.

An expert in a good position to evaluate the skills of World War II commanders, Field Marshal Lord Alanbrooke, wartime chief of the British Imperial General Staff, evaluated General MacArthur in his book in these words: "MacArthur was the greatest general and best strategist that the war produced. He certainly outshone Marshall, Eisenhower, and all other American and British generals including Montgomery."

His career continued after World War II when he was handed at the last moment the responsibility for easting the Communists out of South Korea. His landing at Inchon was a classic, carried out in the face of disapproving frowns from associates in the Navy and in Washington. At that time the envious doubtless longed for his failure. Its success left them astounded and bewitched, even as it left the Reds only frantic flight to get out of the land they had almost captured.

This page carried an editorial on May 15, 1962, when Douglas MacArthur had just been honored by his beloved West Point with the Sylvanus Thayer Award. We would like to carry this tribute again:

From Flanders Fields where he won division command in World War I to the beaches of Inchon where he demonstrated again in the Korean war those elements of surprise and tactical skill which stamped him as a military genius, Douglas MacArthur has shown again and again why he is a great American.

Yet the Sylvanus Thayer award he received goes beyond military distinction. The award has been presented to others, some of whom were not soldiers at all. Neither Ernest O. Lawrence, the nuclear physicist nor John Foster Dulles, the international lawyer, could so qualify, yet the Military Academy graduates had to defer the MacArthur award until after the honor had been presented to them along with Henry Cabot Lodge and former President Eisenhower. All were worthy, but so was MacArthur.

On Saturday the Academy recognized the man who stands so high in American history, the soldier-diplomat who earned the love and loyalty of the Philippine nation, the respect and affection of the Japanese he had defeated in the far Pacific and the respect and hatred of the Communists he was able to curb during occupation duty in Japan and overcome in Korea.

There have been some who have tried to deride this magnificent leader. Their snide comments are refuted by the man's decorations, as well as his achievements. The Congressional Medal of Honor and the Military Order of the Purple Heart augment the multiple presentations of the Distinguished Service Cross and Distinguished Service Medal among other awards.

The phrases "island-hopping" and "letting them die on the vine" described aptly General MacArthur's technique during his triumphant sweep northward to Japan to conclude World War II. This meant striking where he was not expected and leaving the Japanese strong points to wither in isolation. It also meant saving American lives, as soldiers were spared the costly frontal attacks which never proved cheap in the face of Japanese defenses.

Many thousands of American veterans live today because of this military strategy. So, incidentally, do many Japanese.

In Japan as occupation commander, General MacArthur did not tolerate the obstructionist maneuvers of the Communists. The Reds, thanks to a belated entry into the Pacific war as the Japanese were quitting, sought to interpose the same harassment by veto and the same controls in Japan they worked so effectively in Berlin. MacArthur was a rock upon which they split while lesser representatives of this Nation backed and filled.

The Sylvanus Thayer Award recognizes chiefly the winner's service in the light of the West Point motto "Duty, honor, country."

If one goes beyond direct service to the Nation and considers the indirect service he performed to the U.S. Military Academy itself, it would appear that he should go down in the traditions of that institution as important a figure as Sylvanus Thayer, himself.

Like the latter, General MacArthur helped rebuild USMA after a trying period. Instead of a curriculum and program shredded by carelessness and political manipulations, such as Thayer found, the autobiography of Col. Red Blaik tells how MacArthur found West Point's program in bad shape after it had been ripped asunder to meet the Nation's needs in World War I.

MacArthur restored West Point to its old standards while he was Superintendent from 1919 to 1922. Some day we may see him elevated to a place beside Thayer for this.

Now the old soldier has gone. Of few can it be better said that history will have to write the final chapter—the Korean war and the diplomatic maneuvers that denied him final victory.

But history will write it—in Laos, South Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and all the other places where the pattern of Korea has been followed.

Admiral Smedberg Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the Navy's outstanding leaders has retired from active duty after 42 years of service.

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg, former Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis and more recently Chief of Naval Personnel and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, leaves behind him an extraordinary career full of distinguished accomplishments. To mention only a few of his commendations, he has received the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, three Gold Stars, and—at his retirement ceremony—he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

While the Navy has lost one of its most valuable assets, we can anticipate that Admiral Smedberg's accomplishments in retirement will be as significant as they were during active service. On behalf of the rest of his friends and admirers in Annapolis, I wish him the best of luck in the years to come.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask the following editorial from the Evening Capital—Annapolis—of April 2, 1964, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

ONE OF THE NAVY'S TOP OFFICERS RECEIVES DSM

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg, III—one of the great leaders of the modern U.S. Navy—yesterday took his final salute as an active-duty line officer.

The former Naval Academy superintendent was extolled and commended by high naval officers and civilian officials at a change of command ceremony yesterday at the Washington Navy Yard.

He also was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal which was presented by Under Secretary of the Navy Paul B. Fay on behalf of President Lydon B. Johnson.

Admiral Smedberg later shook hands with more than 2,000 friends who passed down the receiving line at post-ceremony reception in the Commissioned Officers' Mess.

Yesterday's ceremony meant retirement for Admiral Smedberg, who has reached the mandatory age limit of 62. He was succeeded in the posts of Chief of Naval Personnel and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations by Vice Adm. Benedict J. Semmes, Jr., an exceedingly capable and worthy naval officer.

Admiral Smedberg, was superintendent of the Naval Academy from 1956–58. He also graduated from the Academy in the class of 1926 and from 1948–51 headed the Academy's Department of Electrical Engineering.

While serving as Academy superintendent the admiral made it a point to personally meet and chat with every midshipman. Always an ardent Navy sports fan, he has motored over from Washington in recent years at every opportunity to boost the Academy men on to victory.

His tours of duty here plus his personal magnitude and charm have earned him a host of friends in Annapolis.

On hand to wish Admiral Smedberg well was the Academy's popular ex-superintendent, Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, who would have gained a promotion and succeeded Admiral Smedberg had he not been stricken with a heart attack last January. Admiral Kirkpatrick now looks hale and hearty and it was good to see him so well on the way to recovery.

Speakers yesterday recalled the brilliant record made by Admiral Smedberg in World War II.

A warship and destroyer squadron commander, his medals gained in that conflict include the Legion of Merit, Gold Stars in lieu of the second, third and fourth Legions of Merit, the Silver Star Medal, the Bronze Star Medal and a Letter of Commendation with ribbon.

Admiral Smedberg can take great pride in looking back on 42 full years of dedicated service to his country.

We join with his many other friends and admirers in wishing him a life of contentment and happiness in the many years that lie ahead. We are glad that he will remain "in harness" as the head of the important Navy Relief Society. This duty will keep Admiral Smedberg and his wife in the Washington area, following a vacation at their winter home in Florida.

An Architectural Advance in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, ABC television, and other influential media focused attention on an exhibit titled "Churches and Temples: Postwar Architecture," which opened in New York City prior to nationwide tour.

This exhibit was sponsored and developed by the New York chapter of American Institute of Architects, an organization representing the borough of Manhattan; Sullivan, Orange, Putnam, and Rockland Counties; the southern half of Ulster and Dutchess Counties; and Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone.

I think this exhibit, as well as other activities of this chapter, are worth reviewing as examples of public-spirited behavior. The organizations representing the professional and nonprofessional men and women in this country have a responsibility that goes beyond protecting the interests of their individual groups. It is through the organization that the efforts of its members can be welded into programs and activities which benefit the public—first, by improving the standards of the profession; second, by encouraging good work among members and related persons, groups, and agencies; and third, by enlightening the public.

The overall program of the New York chapter of American Institue of Architects is a vivid illustration of what an organization can accomplish in this regard.

For example, the exhibit on religious structures, created through the expenditure of considerable time, effort, and money, will make an important contribution as a result of its 2-year tour under the guidance of the American Federation of Arts. It is an exhibit of significance because we are in the midst of intense activity in planning religious buildings in communities throughout the Nation. In the next decade we will build thousands of churches and synagogues costing billions of dollars. This imposes a heavy responsibility on church-goers, and not only a financial one. For in most faiths the congregation members help decide what the building will look like—and the building should be one which best expresses their philosophy of worship, their social needs, and the spirit of their community.

This is no small task. One of the prime responsibilities of the congregation will be in its association with the architect engaged to design the church. A great deal can come from this relationship if committee and architect understand each other's role and if the committee is aware of how religious architecture has evolved and why. The exhibit prepared by the chapter seeks to answer, in part, these questions. The

board of selection, which chose the 21 churches and temples comprising the exhibit from more than 160 submissions from this country and abroad, says:

Perhaps the significance to be perceived in this collection is the unremitting search for appropriate form by architects of religious buildings. In this age we can no longer repeat styles, but must find concepts for houses of worship that are meaningful for congregations of today and tomorrow. The architects whose work is represented in this exhibit feel that they have done this, or at least have indicated paths to be followed for the religious architecture of the future.

This is but one of a number of public service activities in which the AIA's New York chapter has engaged. Some of its more significant and recent efforts also deserve attention.

Through the chapter and its women's auxiliary well over $10,000 is awarded each year in the form of scholarships and fellowships. Among these is the Arnold W. Brunner Scholarship, calling for study in a field which will contribute to the advancement of the architectural profession. Grants have been made for a study of urban living, new means of communication which will facilitate architectural design, and many others. This past year the scholarship was given for a study of Government control of architecture in European countries. In making the award, Geoffry N. Lawford, president of the chapter, said:

With the intensive growth of our cities and our citizens' increasing concern with better architecture and improved city planning, the role of legislative controls is of vital interest.

The chapter recently completed a 3-year study of the hospital operating area. Out of this research program, which was made possible through a grant to the chapter by the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities of the U.S. Public Health Service, evolved a new concept in planning hospital surgical facilities. The new design approach calls for the development, within the hospital, of a nearly self-contained surgical center capable of caring for patients from admission to completion of their postoperative recovery period. While patients would continue to use the hospital's standard nursing units for convalescence, many minor cases would never even require assignment to a hospital room.

Specifically designed to give hospitals better control over wound infection, by limiting the patient's and staff's exposure to contamination, the "surgical center" is expected to provide additional benefits. Among these are faster handling of urgent cases, increased efficiency, improvement in the patient's emotional environment, better use of personnel, and increased surgical service capacity. The U.S. Public Health Service has awarded research funds to develop the first surgical center at Montefiore Hospital in the Bronx. The research study was conducted under the auspices of the AIA chapter's hospital and health committee. It was assisted by an advisory board composed of persons distinguished in their work in preventive medicine, surgery, administration, and other pertinent areas.

During the year the hospital and health committee conducts a program to broaden the architect's knowledge of the latest hospital problems and procedures. Through hospital tours, meetings, and speakers, it also contributes to an exchange of ideas between hospital representatives and architects. It is currently developing a seminar on hospital planning to prevent sepsis.

Our schools comprise another area of prime importance. Making a contribution here is the chapter's school committee. Last year it jointly sponsored with the Board of Education of the City of New York a 2-day seminar on the unique problems of planning schools in a big city. Leading educators and architects in the fields of research, administration, and design participated. The aim of the seminar was to find ways of improving educational and architectural standards for urban schools.

Each year the house consulting committee of the chapter holds a design competition to stimulate an appreciation of attractive and efficient house design and to arouse the public to the importance of good architectural design in daily living.

An urban design committee keeps constantly abreast of what is happening in the city with regard to zoning, parks, and other matters which affect the planning and development of New York. As a result, the chapter has given its support to a proposal for a new civic center, a park at Breezy Point, promoted the idea of converting Ellis Island to a memorial park which would be in keeping with its historical associations, and was very active in fighting for passage of a modern zoning code for the city.

The chapter joined with the American Management Association in developing a national conference on design. Prior to that it sponsored the first conference on aesthetic responsibility.

It would take far too long to detail the many other public spirited activities of this organization and its committees. Therefore, I have limited myself to some of the more significant efforts.

The New York chapter of American Institute of Architects, representing more than 1,400 members, many of them known throughout this country and the world for their work, can serve as a model and inspiration to other organizations on city, State, and National levels. Its members and its officers are to be congratulated for public spirited efforts as this chapter enters its 97th year of service to its profession, its members, and the general public.

New Pay Bill for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] has introduced a new Federal pay bill (H.R. 10700) for our consideration.

This new bill represents a constructive and intelligent compromise over the bill which this body did not see fit to approve last month. It reduces the proposed pay increase for Members of the Congress and for Federal judges from $10,000 to $7,500 and it delays the effective date for these two categories until January 1, 1965. It maintains the same provisions for postal and Federal workers that were in the original bill, with an effective date of July 1, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the original Federal pay bill and I shall support this one.

I know the disappointment and discouragement which filled the hearts of postal workers in my district when this body disapproved of the original pay bill. These people need a pay raise. They need it badly. The Congress had promised them this pay raise when it had passed the pay reform bill of 1962. Postal workers and Federal workers felt, quite rightly, that Congress owed them a debt of honor and that this debt had been repudiated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity of redeeming our honor by passing a bill that deserves the enthusiastic support of every Member of this House. The bill follows the recommendations which the late President Kennedy made to the Congress a year ago this month. It also follows the recommendations which President Johnson has made to the Congress. It is a fine bill; a constructive bill and a deserving bill.

I intend to do everything in my power to help achieve its passage.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, I shall leave the eulogies of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to those Members of the Congress who had greater personal contact with that great patriot. I simply wish to express the deep feeling of loss felt by the people of the 10th District of Ohio by the passing of General MacArthur. I know that I speak for all of them in expressing our condolences to the late general of the Army's family. Certainly they should know that we share their great sorrow.

I first heard the words of Douglas MacArthur when I attended the Republican National Convention of 1952. I shall always remember the keynote address that he gave there. His inspiration carried us on to victory at the polls in November of that year.

I would quote two paragraphs from that speech. The words are nonpartisan. In the future, it would be well if we kept ourselves constantly reminded of the following words of General of the Army MacArthur as they were given by him at

that Republican National Convention of 1952:

Spiritually and physically we possess the resource, properly conserved and realistically applied, to lead toward a world freed from the exhausting wars which have so plagued the past. This is a practical purpose, not visionary. For the destructiveness of modern war has now in the atomic age become too frightful to contemplate by even a potential victor.

This, then, must be the direction of our foreign policy. We must, upon restoration of our military strength and spiritual balance recklessly dissipated in our headlong retreat from victory, chart from that strength a true and unequivocal course to peace and tranquility—a peace and tranquility which will be real, not fictitious; deep-rooted, not superficial. Our ideal must be eventually the abolition of war. Such is the longing hope of all the masses of mankind of whatever race or tribe. Indeed, so well is this understood that even the despot in order to assure a following cloaks the threat or application of force with the hypothetical pretense that his purpose is to secure the peace.

We should all heed well the words of this great American. We should continue to develop all of our resources that we may remain strong enough to maintain the peace.

I would suggest that a committee be formed to create a suitable memorial to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. To be in keeping with his character, it should be one that can be used to some practical purpose.

A Doleful TV Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, once more we come to the baffling confusion that seems inevitable in Government by commission, which shows up again in this very calm and factual article by Vermont Royster, that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 7.

It seems that in this matter of licenses for TV and radio, the FCC is damned if it does and damned if it does not:

THINKING THINGS OVER: A DOLEFUL TV TALE

(By Vermont Royster)

Sometimes we just cannot help feeling sorry for the gentlemen who make up the Federal Communications Commission.

If there ever was a political hot seat, they are on it, what with their power to give or take away television licenses, those little pieces of paper which have become permits to coin money. And now a concatenation of circumstances involving the fortunes of Lyndon Johnson makes it almost certain they will get burned whether they sit still, squirm, or try to get off.

Briefly, the tangled plot of this television soap opera runs like this:

Back in 1943, when Lyndon Johnson was a young Congressman fresh out of the Navy, his wife bought a small radio station in Austin, Tex., for $17,500. At the time it did not seem much of a deal since station KTBC had a limited license and lost money.

What followed, though, was a Horatio Alger success story. Mrs. Johnson quickly won an unlimited license from the FCC and a network affiliation with CBS, turning red ink into black. Later there came a television license, the acquisition of other stations, affiliation with the two other networks, and FCC permission to boost transmitting power.

Meanwhile, other aspirants for stations in the Austin area got discouraged about the necessary FCC clearance for any competing stations. So some 20 years later the L.B.J. Co., as it was called until recently, found itself with exclusive broadcasting rights in this rich central Texas area and with a balance sheet measured in millions.

No breath of scandal marred this success story. Lyndon Johnson, on the record, owned no part of his wife's prosperous business, and neither as Congressman nor as Senator did he ever say a word on her behalf to the FCC, even when he was chairman of the Senate committee handling FCC business.

But in every television tale, as in the Alger stories, a little rain must fall. Just as another challenger appeared on the Austin TV scene—this time a company that "pipes in" TV shows from out of town—Lyndon Johnson wound up in the White House.

It's doubtful if this complication bothers Mr. Johnson, or Lady Bird either. But it puts the FCC in an excruciating position.

The other company presently has a license to pipe in to Austin some TV shows but it is prohibited from offering its customers (who receive programs by cable into their homes) any of the network programs the Johnson station might offer but doesn't until at least 15 days after the Johnson station has passed up the opportunity. This restriction, which protects the Johnson station, is what is now at issue.

If the Commissioners don't lift the restriction, they'll be burned for allegedly protecting the Johnson "monopoly." If they do, there'll be hot howls from previous would-be entrants who were denied access to the Austin market and also scorching accusations that the gentlemen of the Commission are reversing established policies just to avoid the charges of favoritism.

So they're dammed if they do and dammed if they don't which is certainly the stuff of which dramatic plots are made.

Even so, our sympathy for their plight is dampened somewhat by that feeling we often get watching TV playlets—you know, the feeling that if the characters in the tale had acted a little more sensibly they wouldn't be in such a fix.

The only excuse for putting TV stations under a licensing system anyway is a technical one. That is, in the VHF wave spectrum, which is currently the main one for commercial broadcasts, there is room for only so many stations.

Except for this technical problem there is no more reason for a Government rationing agency for TV than for a Federal bureau to decide how many shoe stores, barber shops, newspapers, or movie houses should be allowed in a given town.

But as so often happens, somewhere along the line policies that had some sense in them turned ridiculous. Today if you apply for a TV license in Middletown, U.S.A., the Commission isn't content with just deciding if there is air room for you to operate without jamming another station. The Commission also tries to decide if there's room enough for competition. And at this point, the whole thing becomes utter nonsense.

Back in 1948 the FCC suspended granting any new TV channel allocations, technical considerations or no technical considerations, while it launched a "study" of what was the "right" number of stations per capita and where they should be located. Subsequently it evolved some guidelines, which we don't profess to understand and which no Commissioner can logically expain, that would limit the number of stations on population ratios and all that sort of thing.

Here the Commission doesn't pretend that it is doing anything but acting "to protect local television stations from competition." In other words, the fellow who's already there has got it made—at least for as long as the Commissioners are happy with him.

No wonder TV stations sell for fabulous sums. It's not the physical plant but the Government license that's worth a mint. No wonder that present owners are satisfied with the policy. No wonder, either, that they live in trepidation of displeasing the Commission, for what the Commission gives the Commission can take away. These licenses to coin money, remember, are renewable.

And no wonder the Commissioners get perplexed trying to decide who gets rich and who doesn't. Solomon would be confused.

The Johnson case, therefore, isn't unique. True, delivering TV shows to people's homes in Austin by rented cable wouldn't interfere with the KTBC-TV signal: it would only interfere with the station's exclusive rights to a captive audience. But in shielding KTBC-TV from the winds of competition the Commissioners aren't singling out the Johnson company for favortism or, for that matter, picking on just Austin audiences in depriving them of a wider choice of TV shows. Under FCC policies, it happens all over.

That the Commissioners, nice gentlemen all, should now find themselves tangled in the toils of presidential politics is just hapless fortune, and we'll watch with sympathy as they try to untangle it. Still, it's just like all those TV plots—take away the foolishness and there'd be no doleful tale to tell.

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, the NASA authorization bill before Congress represents this Nation's investment in the conquest of space. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives, I support the high priority given this program.

Outside of defense spending, this Federal space program represents our largest single expenditure—over $5 billion.

The responsibility for this programs is awesome. The Space Agency is expanding at an enormous rate. Yet, I am convinced that the men doing the job are sincere, dedicated, and competent. They have obtained excellent overall results of which all Americans can be proud.

In paying this general compliment, I must express some reservations and specific criticisms.

First, I have joined with my colleagues on the Committee in separate views on

the authorization bill. By far the most important, as it affects the security of our Nation, is a reassessment and definition of our national space objectives. Consider the impact around the world of a sudden announcement by Russia that she had established a military space platform manned by Russian cosmonauts which was continuously flying over the United States. Not only would our prestige suffer a severe blow but the balance of power in the world would be affected. Demands for a reappraisal of our space objectives would be instantaneous. The fact of our space probes and moon-shot program would not be reassuring. The Nation would demand action. I believe there is a distinct possibility that just such a series of events may occur. That is why we should set up a top priority review of our space objectives at once. The primary emphasis should be on national security, and that means military control of inner space. I am not convinced that our space program is properly oriented.

I fully support the Apollo program. However, our fixation on a self-imposed deadline is unrealistic and unnecessary. The program should proceed in the most efficient and economical way. It should not be forced nor pushed.

Last year, in committee discussions, I stated my belief that NASA should feel free to make requests for supplemental appropriations. I compliment them on taking such action. I am convinced such requests are justified in an agency where most of the funds are expended for research and development. The funds requested this year were authorized by our committee last year. I have informed the Appropriations Committee of my conviction that these funds should be made available.

I directed many inquiries during our hearings this year to the unique relationship between NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. I am not convinced that there is justification either in past performance nor future benefits to be derived for its continuance. I believe NASA should instigate an immediate review toward this end.

I also believe NASA should prepare in the coming year some definitive projections of its post-Apollo operations. Although we have had a great national "debate" on going to the Moon, the fact is we are already spending great sums of money on a trip to Mars. It would be unwise to first make the downpayment on this trip and then decide later whether we want to take it. We should make the decision first. I will, therefore, expect NASA next year to be prepared to discuss the projected post-Apollo space program. Its plans and cost should be made known to the general public and particularly our business, scientific, and educational communities. It is time for another great national debate.

Finally, I must review the proposed Electronics Research Center in Boston. No other proposal has done so much harm to NASA or our space program. It is a blot on NASA's good name. Aside from the political implications in the decision, the agency has refused to let me examine its files concerning the proposed center. Denying such files to a Member of Congress and of the committee, where no national security is involved, is unfair and suspect.

Consider the unusual history of this proposal in Congress. It was completely eliminated by the Senate subcommittee last year. A new vote was had and a reversal obtained. It then was authorized by Congress which simultaneously announced that its "need" was not established. A report to establish its need was then submitted, but no hearings were allowed to be held on it. A subcommittee in the House, after hearing testimony this year, decided the expenditure of construction funds was not justified. The full committee reversed the subcommittee.

On this record, I am forced to agree with Philip H. Abelson, director of the Geophysical Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution of Washington who says that "the concentration of such effort into one facility is not the best procedure," and Warren Weaver, vice president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, who described the "proposal to create an Electronics Research Center of some 2,100 persons to conduct research for planetary trips as an unsound and wholly undesirable one."

It is not too late to reconsider this matter and get the facts. If forced through in its present form time will show this project and not Ranger to be the most costly setback to NASA in 1964.

Inside Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information bulletins by my colleague from Indiana's Ninth Congressional District, Hon. EARL WILSON:

INSIDE WASHINGTON, BY CONGRESSMAN EARL WILSON, FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 30, 1964

America today is at a crossroads, facing a decision that has been in the making for 32 years. Americans must soon select between a rocky road that leads to a greater United States of the future or the deceptively smooth highway that leads straight to State socialism and a complete loss of cherished freedoms.

This is the real issue of 1964 which must be faced by the American voter. Sending Representatives to Washington who will simply continue to promote the mistakes of the past 32 years will be a vote for a continued plunge into State socialism. Returning to Washington men who will continue to work for our country's freedoms and future well-being will be the same as casting one's lot on the side of constitutional government and for the principles of Americanism which made our Republic great.

There is no middle course. Our 32-year drift into socialism must be stopped now if any vestige of our freedom is to remain. Socialism has been spurred on and sold to the people under the guises of depression, national emergencies and under actual emergency conditions of wartime. Thus has our Nation veered from its past of government by republic and been diverted down the road to socialism one time after another.

Socialism's handmaiden and No. 1 beneficiary—a rampant and insatiable bureaucracy—has flourished throughout the past 32 years. Today it is the No. 1 threat mustered against our freedom.

The results of our 32-year experiment with modified socialism are all too apparent today. We are now poised on the brink of the abyss of full-scale state socialism. It is appalling that so many of our leaders are ready to jump without so much as a glance at the consequences.

When this rush toward socialism is criticized, the pat answers of the leftwingers are disguised in high-sounding phrases and labels. Americans are fed political placeboes that disguise the bitter truth of socialism as experienced by nations in the past. For example, Americans are told over and over again that they have the highest income in the world. They are not told that they also have the world's highest tax bill and the most pernicious tax structure the world has ever seen. Neither are they told that their country owes more money than all the other nations in the world combined. Nor are they encouraged to look at true facts which prove the near bankruptcy of their currency and monetary system.

While Americans are told daily that they have the highest standard of living in the world, they are told in the same breath that massive Federal spending is needed to fight an urgent situation of widespread poverty. This is the same poverty we were assured had been all but eradicated as long ago as 1936.

Americans are encouraged to weaken their own financial foundations—some of them already eroded by excessive debt obligations and excessive taxes. Their leaders tell them to spend their money—as with the tax cut—rather than save it in the frugal American tradition. Meanwhile, these same leaders continue to roll out new spending plans that cannot help but wipe out the benefits of any tax cut and demand twice as much money in future taxes as is now being handed to the taxpayer.

Paradoxically, while we urge freedom on the rest of the world, our own Government's direction is toward eroding away and stealing this same freedom from the people.

Americans have allowed all this to happen. The qualities of freedom and individual enterprise have been replaced by a love of comfort and an attitude of unconcern as one freedom after another is stealthily removed. Thus have we reached the final crossroads. After 32 years of socialism in the United States, today there is no turning back. We must choose the final road down which we will travel.

The freedom road is lined with pitfalls and formidable obstacles. Self-denial, self-help and refusal of tantalizing Federal handouts, ignoring the pleas of well-meaning but gullible dogooders are just a few of the stumbling blocks. But at the end of this rough road lies freedom, world respect, a strong and free economy, a solvent nation and a better world for our unborn grandchildren.

The socialism road is wide, broad, landscaped, paved. Everything is provided. There are no detours, no rough road—until the end is reached. At the end of this road is a completely regimented economy; an all-powerful bureaucracy that will control and restrict every move; governmental policies which will thwart the aspirations of those who would progress on their own initiative—a government of state socialism that will make a mockery of our American heritage.

Taking the freedom road will not be easy. Americans must lay aside their comforts of the moment for greater goals of the future.

Self-denial at home and abroad, an insistence that nationalism replace internationalism in our foreign policy, demand for the acceptance of balanced budgets, a determination to retire our national debt and the curtailment of the makework and relief programs that have deeply rooted themselves into the vitals of our society are things that must be sought and fought for along the freedom road.

Which way will you turn this year?

INSIDE WASHINGTON BY CONGRESSMAN EARL WILSON, FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 6, 1964

WHAT THE NEW FRONTIER MEANS TO YOU

In the 3 years since the words "new frontier" became a part of our everyday language, Americans have been told countless times that defeat is really victory, that loss of freedom is, indeed, an expansion of these same freedoms, and that setbacks on the homefront are in reality progress.

It is a fair commentary to state that the "big lie" has come to be used as widely by the administration in power as was the "big stick" used by President Theodore Roosevelt.

What the New Frontier has really meant to the everyday citizen of our Republic is a far cry from its high-sounding claims.

IN THE BREAD BASKET

Are you a housewife? You know how much less your grocery dollar buys these days. Foodstuff prices are at the highest point in our Nation's history. While farm prices have slipped alarmingly, retail prices have tilted upward sharply ever since January, 1961, and are going up monthly.

The added dollars you spend for other necessities such as clothing, light and heat also take more of a bite from your purchasing power. This is due to the extravagant spending policies of the administration in Washington today.

It is a fact that our Nation has plunged deeper into debt by $21 billion in the last 3 years. Your dollar today is worth 44.9 cents in purchasing power, and its worth goes down daily. As purchasing power declines, the inevitable result is inflation. That is what you have been fighting for the past three years.

It is a fact that President Eisenhower slowed this upward spiral to a standstill. But the floodgates were opened again 3 years ago and you are now feeling the pinch more each day.

It is a fact that while talking about economy, President Johnson is spending $2 million more each day than did President Kennedy and $50 million more each day than President Eisenhower.

ARE YOU A BUSINESSMAN?

The New Frontier has made a great show of being probusiness, but it's been simply that—a show. Tax policies, import-export policies are all geared against the business community and titled in favor of the advent of a socialistic economy.

It is a fact that bankruptcies in fiscal 1962—the last evaulated year—totaled 147,780—the worst figure since 1933 and 5,000 more than in fiscal 1961.

It is a fact that business failures under the New Frontier now total 64 of every 10,000 businesses—the worst rate since the last pre-World War II year of 1939. Over 15,000 businesses failed last year and over 17,000 the year before. Yet, while these businesses were being driven to the wall, merchants were forced to raise wages, extend vacation periods, pay benefits they couldn't afford. Thus is the New Frontier's true attitude toward business exposed.

ARE YOU A FARMER?

On January 23, 1961, cattle brought $28.75 per 100 pounds on the Chicago market. In late February 1964, this price was down to below $22 per 100 pounds and dropping steadily. At the same time the farmer is paying more for what he must have. Soybean meal, used for cattle feed, sold for $51.50 a ton in 1961. Today it is $72.50 a ton—a 40-percent increase. Thus, the farmer pays more for what he buys but gets less at the marketplace.

Is it any wonder that farm failures are setting new records every day? Is it any wonder that the parity ratio is at its lowest point since 1939 and that farmers nationwide are being forced off the farm in record numbers?

Much was made recently of agreements by which Australia and New Zealand agreed not to send unlimited beef into the United States. But contained in this same agreement was a provision which gives these same nations an automatic increase in the beef, veal, and mutton markets of the future. The result—by 1966 Australia and New Zealand will be shipping 7.4 percent more meat into the United States than they are today.

There are 38 countries which flood our markets with meat—but nearly all of these same nations have restrictions which keep U.S. meat off their shelves.

FACTORY WORKER?

In January 1964, imports of women's and children's footwear jumped 65 percent over the same figure for 1963—while prices per pair went down. It is costing less to make shoes in Italy than a year ago, while U.S. costs soar. Any wonder foreign markets are eating into the shoe trade?

A total of 8.8 million pairs of shoes were imported into the United States in January—equal to 14 percent of our total domestic shoe production. This represents a 2-percent gain over the same period a year ago.

As shoe industry jobs disappear, the reasons are obvious. Foreign manufacturers, able to produce cheaply and take advantage of our weak import-export restrictions, make inroads at your expense.

YOU ARE AFFECTED

These are the bitter fruits of 3 years of the New Frontier. Regardless of your line of work or your calling in life examples can be used to show the same conclusion. In every trade and at every level of our society your dollar buys less, your freedom shrinks and your Nation's position in the world becomes shakier every day the policies of the New Frontier continue unchecked.

These facts are not pretty, but they demand telling. The only way to reverse this course is to change the thinking from top to bottom in Washington. It is up to the people to speak because, in the final analysis, it is their Government to do with as they choose.

The Politics of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 7 brings out some interesting points on the effect of different political philosophies on our foreign policy.

It seems that the very radical cleavage in the majority party is working to the disadvantage of our foreign policy, and certainly to the confusion and bewilderment of our European friends and allies.

The editorial follows:

THE POLITICS OF FOREIGN POLICY

In the 10 days or so since Senator FULBRIGHT made his famous speech on foreign policy myths, he has been attacked by men of almost every shade of political opinion. Yet it seems to us the politics of the matter lies not so much in this new "great debate" as it does simply in the record.

One central thesis of the FULBRIGHT address is that the world, very much including the Communist world, is rapidly changing; among other things, this means the United States will be unwise to regard all Communist regimes as identical and posing an identical threat. To Senator GOLDWATER and some others of both parties such talk is "appeasement."

Actually, though, the American people have been seeking, without perhaps always realizing it, a middle ground between appeasement and undue belligerence almost since the end of World War II. When they saw the full menace the Red Army held for Europe, they supported the defensive alliance of NATO. Many had deep misgivings about the Korean war, but they fought it anyway, at least to a standstill. As a general rule they have favored resistance to Communist aggression.

At the same time they have mostly welcomed efforts to improve relations with the Soviets, because if we literally and finally cannot get along with them at all, then the world is likely to blow up. Today probably many people agree with FULBRIGHT and other scholars that Moscow and Peiping are two quite different kettles of Communist fish, with Russia representing at this time less of a threat than Red China; accordingly the United States explores the possibility of settlements with the Soviets.

The peculiarly bedeviling part of it all is just that it is so easy to go too far in either direction, dangerous provocation or dangerous appeasement. The impression that GOLDWATER tends to give of favoring the former makes some uneasy; FULBRIGHT and sometimes the Democratic administration are accused of the latter.

In any event, our foreign policy is the result of the people's instinctive or reasoned groping for that hard-to-find middle ground. That is why the policy itself—which can be only vaguely generalized as firmness coupled with willingness to seek peaceful accords—has remained basically unchanged throughout Republican and Democratic administrations.

What has changed, and what can be politically important, is the carrying out of the policy. On this score the Republicans have a better case than the Democrats, if they are capable of making it.

President Eisenhower made some notable gains for firmness plus peace. They include ending the Korean war without surrender, the Austrian Treaty, resisting without rancor Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatums. No new territory was lost to Soviet aggression in that period.

The falling off since then has been considerable: The continuing existence of a full-blown Communist state in Latin America, the incredible Bay of Pigs affair, the failure to follow through after the Cuban missile crisis. To this day the United States has neither eliminated communism from Cuba nor evicted the Soviet men and arms nor contained Castro's indirect aggressions elsewhere in Latin America.

Nor is that all. Zanzibar may be the Cuba of Africa. Relations with European allies have deteriorated. Laos seems likely to fall to communism under a U.S.-condoned coalition. And though the United States was involved in Vietnam under Eisenhower, the involvement has grown much deeper and presently appears to many observers to be all but hopeless.

Now we do not presume to know why, on this record, the Democrats are more inept at

the conduct of foreign policy than the Republicans, except perhaps that their ranks contain more people pulling in different directions. For them the middle ground seems particularly hard to find and hold. But while the Democrats are vulnerable, it is hard to see how a Republican candidate can effectively exploit that vulnerability without also giving thought to the evident desire of most Americans to avoid both war and appeasement.

Whatever happens, foreign policy is providing an interesting opportunity and challenge for the Republicans—not only in their own political interest but in the Nation's.

Addresses Delivered at the 16th National Banquet of the Order of Ahepa Honoring the 88th Congress of the United States, March 16, 1964, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, every 2 years, the Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, the leading organization in this country of Americans of Greek descent, sponsors a banquet honoring the Congress of the United States.

This year the Ahepa banquet honoring Members of the House of Representatives and Senate of the 88th Congress was held in Washington, D.C. on March 16.

Among the speakers addressing the 16th National Ahepa Banquet were Ahepa Supreme President John G. Plumides; Mrs. Josie Chase, grand vice president, Daughters of Penelope; Pierre Calogeras, Chargés d'Affaires, Royal Embassy of Greece; His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America; Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana; Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York; and Mr. Henry R. Luce, editor and publisher of Life magazine.

Mr. Luce received on this occasion the Order of Ahepa 1964 Socratic Award for his contributions and services, through a series of articles in Life magazine, to the dissemination of Helenic culture, and Hellenic ideals to the peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the addresses delivered at the 16th National Ahepa Banquet:

THE 16TH NATIONAL BANQUET OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA HONORING THE 88TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1964, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Ahepa Supreme President John G. Plumides)

It is a unique opportunity and an unusual one in which the supreme president of our organization assumes the role of toastmaster. It is no easy task to preside at a podium where so many illustrious Americans must listen to your humble servant. The Order of Ahepa, as you know, is an organization composed primarily of Americans of Hellenic descent. The Ahepa has a history of 42 years of service to the United States of America, the greatest democracy ever conceived in the mortal mind of man. And it is our fervent hope that as long as the organization exists, so long as there is blood in the veins of any American of Hellenic extraction, that the Order of Ahepa will continue to render service to this great democracy of ours.

This banquet which the Order of Ahepa sponsors every 2 years, is given in honor of the greatest legislative body in the world—the Congress of the United States of America. These Members of Congress who serve as our legislators, who enact and promulgate the laws of our land, sometimes are the forgotten soldiers of American history. But we, in the Order of Ahepa, can never forget the debt of gratitude that we owe to you, the Members of Congress, for serving the American Nation in a most gracious, in a most determined, in a most American form of government.

We are cognizant, my good friends of the Congress, of the times and conditions that we must face as a nation; and we have full confidence, trust, and faith in your actions to safeguard this democracy for this and future generations of Americans.

FUNERAL OF KING PAUL

Only 4 days ago, I had the distinct privilege of attending the funeral of the late King Paul of Greece in Athens as a designated member of the official American delegation, selected by the President of the United States, that great American, Lyndon B. Johnson. King Paul of Greece was a dedicated friend of the United States, a man who labored long under democratic principles, and who knew no other ally than the United States of America. He knew no protector other than the United States of America.

The Order of Ahepa feels deeply gratified that the President of the United States selected our organization's supreme president to be a member of the official American delegation to King Paul's funeral. Only in America could an opportunity of this kind present itself to one who is the son of immigrants from Greece, as I am. Those of us born of parents who chose America as their new home have tried, as loyal Americans, to prove our worth as citizens of this great country that we lovingly call the United States of America.

On that solemn occasion in Athens, where religious and political leaders gathered for the funeral of King Paul, all nations of the world were represented, and among those taking part in the funeral possession was your humble servant. This could only happen in America.

This is America, and I am grateful to this, the greatest democracy, and to you, the Members of Congress, who represent our people in this hour of peril throughout the world.

REMARKS OF GRAND VICE PRESIDENT JOSIE CHASE, DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE, SENIOR WOMEN'S AUXILIARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

On behalf of the Daughters of Penelope and our Junior Order of the Maids of Athena, we are honored this evening in the privilege of extending to these dedicated men and women of Congress our most sincere appreciation for their steadfast service and endless contributions to the preservation of the American way of life. And we express our gratitude to Mr. Henry R. Luce, editor in chief of Life magazine, for having made it possible that people in every walk of life could, through his famous series of articles, "The Miracle of Greece," get a glimpse of the ancient, Hellenic way of life, through which was set the basic pattern of culture and government for our present Western civilization.

In the turmoil and unrest which exists around us in this space age of today, we pray that a divine providence may grant good health and the necessary foresight to these men and women into whose hands we have, through our vote, placed the power with which they may shape the destiny of our beloved America, and we pledge to our Nation, our every effort in defense of the Constitution and the American way of life, which we hope and pray is God's way.

REMARKS OF CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRS PIERRE CALOGERAS, ROYAL EMBASSY OF GREECE, AND ACTING AMBASSADOR OF GREECE TO THE UNITED STATES

Ambassador Matsas of Greece was unable to be with us here tonight. His sad duty was to accompany to Athens the First Lady of America and former President Truman to represent this great Republic of yours at the funeral of my lamented sovereign, King Paul of the Hellenes. The Ambassador has asked me to tell you how much he regrets missing the opportunity to be with you tonight, and to speak to you.

The great sorrow which we all feel in Greece and in this country because of the death of King Paul of Greece has been somehow alleviated by the part the biggest and noblest ally of Greece took in our mourning. Nobody could more ably represent the United States of America than your First Lady and former President Truman. You all know that without the genius of this great statesman, Greece's survival as a free and democratic nation would have been immensely difficult. My dear friends, I would like to thank you in my own name, and on behalf of my wife, for the most kind welcome which we have received here tonight.

Let me tell you how deeply I appreciated the pleasure of meeting here tonight the distinguished members of your organization and the eminent guests. It is my privilege to convey to you and to the Order of Ahepa the warmest greetings of the Royal Hellenic Government, as well as the feelings of respect and fraternal affection of the Greek people. These feelings were enhanced by your participation in our national mourning as we buried our beloved king. His memory will live forever in the hearts of the Greek people. He was dedicated to the cause of freedom and peace. He delighted in helping the poor and the underprivileged. He fought bravely with his troops against the enemy. He was a courageous man. You will join me, I'm sure, in expressing here our best wishes to King Constantine. His burden is heavy, but the dynasty's motto is "My strength lies in the love of my people." I am not speaking to you tonight only as the Chargé d'Affairs of Greece, and the representative of the Royal Government. I am the representative of all friends that Ahepa counts among the Greek people. It is their friendly greeting that I bring you.

REMARKS OF HIS EMINENCE, ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

America, as a pioneering and leading democratic nation, and Americanism as a culture, ideology and political philosophy, is what we have come to honor this evening in your presence. Deeply appreciative of your continued and most dedicated efforts, not only to uphold but also to protect the fundamentals of a democratic way of life. Our Nation, the United States of America, in carrying on the legacy of its Founding Fathers, and in honoring its worldwide responsibilities, finds itself beset with political situations such as no other nation has ever faced. And because our Nation professes to believe, and furthermore preaches justice, freedom, and peace, it is expected not simply to concern itself when and where these principles are safe, but also to champion the struggle regardless of the risks and dangers.

We, the descendants of those who instituted democracy as a way of life, and fought for the dignity of man, and his rights, and his relations with the state and the rest of

the world, know full well the nature, the expensive nature, and the agony of your unacclaimed struggle for the justice, order, and well-being of your constituency and of our Nation. The Order of Ahepa is responding to an imperative demand of the Greek-American conscience in this country to register and record both our understanding and respect for your noble and determined efforts to establish justice, peace, and freedom throughout the world. Our national prestige, gentlemen, as you certainly know, can best be served by abiding by the God-ordained aims and objectives of our democracy.

Our loyalty and determined dedication to these aims and objectives will not simply gain new friends for us, but the confidence of the world as well. Gentlemen, you have my sincere admiration and, together with it, my fervent prayers that God Almighty, the God of our Founding Fathers of this Nation, may gird you with new power so that you may overcome prejudice and bias, as well as mistrust and hostility. Democracy will be the future form of government for all the people if we succeed in maintaining it unaltered, true, and genuine, as it was given to us. God bless you and our Nation forever.

INTRODUCTION OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS BY AHEPA SUPREME PRESIDENT JOHN G. PLUMIDES

This past week has given me the opportunity as an American citizen to visit the country of my parents. This visit was made possible by the graciousness of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. On this mission of our Government, in addition to myself and His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, was a young man whose ancestors also called Greece their home. This young man, truly a scholar and a gentleman, trained and learned in government, with a desire and ambition only obtainable from this greatest country of our times, has served with distinction in the House of Representatives of these United States. He hails from the great State of Indiana. He is now concluding his third term as a Member of the House of Representatives. He is an active member of the Order of Ahepa, and has been very helpful in the promotion and dissemination of the American ideals throughout the Hellenic community of America. At this time, I introduce to you the only Member of Congress of Hellenic descent, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, U.S. Representative from Indiana.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS OF INDIANA

I am honored to have been invited to speak this evening to my brother Ahephans at this biennial banquet honoring Members of Congress.

At the outset of my remarks I want to extend my warmest congratulations to Henry R. Luce, on being the first recipient of the Oreder of Ahepa Socratic Award for the magnificent series of articles on ancient Greece published in Life, the magazine of which he is editor and publisher.

I want also to take this opportunity to salute our dedicated and hardworking Supreme President of the Order of Ahepa, Brother John G. Plumides, and to congratulate him on the splendid leadership he is giving to our organization.

As you know, four of us at this table, His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos; Mike Manatos, Special Assistant to President Johnson; Supreme President Plumides; and I have just returned from Greece where we, as members of the official U.S. delegation appointed by President Johnson, attended the funeral of King Paul of the Hellenes.

Though our journey to Greece was a sad one, it was nonetheless an experience memorable in several ways.

FUNERAL OF KING PAUL

First, standing in the cathedral, we saw many of the chiefs of state and kings and queens and princes of Western Europe who had come to honor the late King.

And we joined with the members of other delegations in marching in the 2-hour long procession from the cathedral down Hermes Street through the heart of the city of Athens.

It was, however, an especially proud moment for all of us as Americans to be able to go to Greece on the first official mission of the gracious and lovely wife of our President, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

And I know I speak for the rest of my colleagues in the American delegation as well when I say that we shall long remember having gone to Greece on the first trip to that country of the man who, more than any other American, has come to be a symbol of the friendship of the people of Greece and the people of the United States, President Harry S. Truman.

I am pleased to report to you that both these outstanding figures in our national life were warmly received by the hundreds of thousands of Greek people who lined the streets of Athens to do honor to their late King and to pay homage to their new monarch, King Constantine.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND MRS. JOHNSON

In view of some of the press reports you may have read, you may be surprised to learn that both President Truman and Mrs. Johnson and indeed every member of our delegation were greeted with such friendship in Athens.

I make this observation because I realize as do you that the present crisis over the Cyprus issue has caused some demonstrations in Athens that were critical of the United States.

I can only say to you, however, from my own personal observations last week that I am convinced such demonstrations in no way reflect the overwhelming sentiments of the people of Greece, who continue to look with respect and affection to our own country, as we do to theirs.

CYPRUS

I have alluded to the question of Cyprus. Both because I have just returned from Greece and am the only Member of Congress of Greek descent, I think it appropriate that I address myself to the Cyprus issue for a few moments.

It is a matter about which all of us in this room are deeply concerned. I know we must all feel greatly encouraged that the latest news from that island indicates that, in keeping with the unanimous resolution of the United Nations Security Council a few days ago, the first troops of the U.N. Peace Force have arrived and that more are on the way.

I say we must all be encouraged for clearly it would be catastrophic if the political disputes respecting an island of some 600,000 people were to be the cause of all-out war between Greece and Turkey.

1. Such a war would have the most appalling effects in terms of lost lives of the nations directly concerned, Greece and Turkey and Cyprus.

2. It would mean the destruction of the southern flank of NATO, for both Greece and Turkey, we must not forget, are our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

3. Such a war would, in addition, be a major triumph of Soviet foreign policy and a victory achieved at almost no cost to the Communists.

DANGER OF WAR

4. A Greek-Turkish War, moreover, would always mean the possibility of involving the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, in direct military conflict, thereby posing the unthinkable danger of a Third World War.

5. Finally, the territorial independence and the national sovereignty of Cyprus, which all of us here tonight strongly support, would, if full-scale hostilities were to erupt in the eastern end of the Mediterranean, become almost meaningless words.

For all these reasons, then, we must view the Cyprus issue with more than passing concern and, if I may say so, we must view it not only as men and women of Greek descent, justifiably proud of our Hellenic heritage but we must view it as Americans, proud of our own Nation and citizenship and soberly aware of the immense responsibilities which history has thrust upon the United States in a troubled world.

I may here interject that the role of a great and powerful nation like ours in a dispute in which two allies are involved is never a happy one for it will inevitably bring criticism from both sides that the keeper of the peace is favoring the other. Without here presuming to judge the validity of such criticism, I think we all know that the United States has in fact been criticized by both Greeks and Turks on precisely these grounds.

TRUMAN DOCTRINE

In 1947, the United States, through the Truman doctrine, announced to the world and to the Soviet bloc in particular our resolute determination to support the people of Greece in their valiant struggle against communism.

Standing last week in Athens in front of the splendid statue of President Truman, given to Greece by our Order of Ahepa and marked by both the American and Greek flags waving at half-mast, I read once more, engraved there, those words of President Truman of exactly 17 years ago this month:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

"I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid, which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes.

"Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the West as well as to the East.

"We must take immediate and resolute action."

Just as the United States made a commitment to the support of freedom against Communist challenge then, so must we reiterate that commitment today in the crisis over Cyprus, for make no mistake, the Soviets have already begun to fish in the troubled waters surrounding that island.

Russian offers of economic aid in recent days, the negotiation of a Soviet air agreement with Cyprus, and the recent visits of Cypriot officials to Moscow are hard evidence of this continuing danger.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SALUTE TO ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS

None of us question for a moment the deep commitment of Archbishop Makarios and the Government of Cyprus to maintain the freedom and independence of Cyprus.

I remember well, for I was there, President Kennedy's salute to President Makarios at the White House on June 5, 1962:

"We want to express our very warm welcome to our distinguished visitor who comes from a most ancient country, representing a most ancient people, and also a young country. We salute him particularly because of the long and difficult fight he conducted for his country's independence, involving the most sensitive interests, involving his own persistent, courageous and far-seeing view of his country's future. * * * Your country occupies a most significant, strategic position in the world today. Your own efforts

to maintain the independence and viability of your country are well known here, and you come to the United States with the warmest wishes of all of our people who admire a courageous fighter for freedom."

I draw your attention to President Kennedy's reference to President Makarios' "efforts to maintain the independence and viability" of Cyprus for the pattern of Communist take-over in the postwar world must surely provide an object lesson to all nations intent upon maintaining their freedom. Just as we Americans are deeply concerned about what happened in the Caribbean, we must be alert to such dangers in the Mediterranean.

PEACEFUL SOLUTION

These then are some of the major considerations we must have in mind as we reflect on this issue.

Surely we can all agree that we must encourage with every means a peaceful, nonviolent resolution of this dispute.

For we Americans are committed to the conviction that peaceful change is the way to bring change. The success of the Reverend Martin Luther King, for example, in pressing for nonviolent means to solve our own own major domestic problem must by now have made that fact abundantly clear. The Senate of the United States is today acting on this matter and, at last reports at least, is doing so in a nonviolent manner.

I spoke of change for I believe there must ultimately be some change in the London-Zurich Agreements of 1960 which are part of the Constitution of Cyprus.

We know now that much of this treaty has proved to be unworkable and indeed has helped cause some of the present conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

While we can all agree, that, as in our own country, there must always be protection of minority rights, we must also surely agree, again as in our own country, that in a democracy the majority, again respecting the situation of the minority, must ultimately be able to work its will or democracy will become meaningless.

PEACEFUL CHANGE

Just as our own U.S. Constitution recognizes the necessity for change—peaceful change—so too I believe we must recognize that change in the Constitution of Cyprus has become essential if that constitution is to be workable.

Because of our commitment to peaceful settlement of international disputes, we must continue our support of the United Nations Peace Force on Cyprus and of the work of a mediator there.

As you know, the United States has already made a commitment of $2 million to the U.N. Peace Force.

For although we might prefer to stand aloof from this dispute, the stakes are far too high in terms of our own national interest and security and in terms of the peril this crisis presents to the free world for us to do so.

CYPRIOT COOPERATION

Let us hope that all the parties concerned will cooperate fully with the U.N. Peace Force and the mediator and will, difficult though it may be at times, act with sober restraint and profound awareness of the potential dangers of failure to cooperate. I was delighted to read in today's paper the airport statement by the Interior Minister of Cyprus, Polycarpos Georgadjis, on the arrival in Nicosia of the Canadian members of the Peace Force: "The contribution of the U.N. force to efforts of the Cyprus Government to restore law and order will be immense."

Greece has a new, young and able monarch in King Constantine and I am confident that we in the United States are anxious to help him in his responsibility and to help Prime Minister Papandreon and the Government of Greece in their efforts to continue the economic and social progress of the country.

Certainly as prospects increase for the peaceful resolution of the Cyprus issue, Greece can again turn its attention, with renewed energy and commitment, to the internal development of the country.

Just as 17 years ago the people of the United States joined hands with the people of Greece in the defense of freedom against communism so too the American people stand ready today to work closely with Greece in meeting the challenges of the present hour.

UNITED STATES-GREEK TIES

As a Member of Congress and as an American of Greek origin, I am deeply gratified to see Greece develop as a modern, democratic nation fully capable of handling its own affairs.

The special ties which have linked the peoples of Greece and America for over a century and a half are still there and are perhaps of even greater significance today.

If the democracy which our two lands have come to symbolize is to endure and if the cause of human freedom to which both our peoples are committed is to prevail, it is in the interest of both the United States and of Greece that we maintain a constant vigilance over this special relationship within the alliance.

May I say in closing that no organization in American life has a greater responsibility for the maintenance of this relationship than has ours—The Order of Ahepa.

I am confident that both as Ahepans and as Americans we will meet that responsibility.

PRESENTATION OF THE AHEPA SOCRATIC AWARD TO MR. HENRY R. LUCE, EDITOR IN CHIEF, LIFE AND TIME MAGAZINES

Supreme President John G. Plumides, we will now proceed to the second portion of our program in honoring that distinguished friend of the Order of Ahepa, that distingu'shed friend of Greece, who so heroically portrayed for all Americans "The Miracle of Greece" in Life magazine. This man is known to all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or religion. His periodicals go into every home, and the message that he delivers is read by all. His influence through his periodicals have influence on the thinking of all citizens of this country.

We, of the Order of Ahepa, as small as we might be in number, were cognizant of the service that this man gave to our people by publishing the series of articles on the land of our parents. This series of articles, as I indicated previously, portrayed a pictorial and cultural series depicting "The Miracle of Greece."

We, the members of the Order of Ahepa, representing what we believe to be the opinion of all Americans of Hellenic extraction, have taken it upon ourselves to honor this great American by inviting him to be present tonight to meet us, to know us, to feel our pulse and our hearts, so that we can present to him a small token of our appreciation for his humanitarian efforts.

Through this series of articles, all Americans of every station in life were able to study the works of our ancestors. This is truly a product of great imagination, and the imagination of this man knows no bounds. His love for things that are Greek goes back to his youth when he won an award for his ability to read and speak the Greek language.

His love for the Greek people, his portrayal of this remarkable series of articles, and his dedication to the greatest Republic on earth, the United States of America, has caused the Order of Ahepa to present to him this bust, symbolic of the Ahepa Socratic Award. The award itself is a bronze bust of the Greek philosopher Socrates, done two-thirds lifesize and mounted on a marble base. American sculptor Felix W. de Weldon, creator of the Iwo Jima Marine Corps Memorial and many other monuments and statues throughout the world, including the Ahepa Truman Statue in Athens, did this bust of Socrates for this award. The likeness of Socrates is based on the bust of Socrates which is in Pentelikon marble, now resting in the Louvre Museum in Paris, and which was done during his lifetime in ancient Athens.

The Scroll, accompanying the Socratic Award, reads as follows:

"The Order of Ahepa 1964 Socratic Award, presented to Henry R. Luce, editor in chief, Life magazine, for contributions and services in the dissemination of Hellenic culture and Hellenic ideals to the peoples of the world through the pages of Life magazine. The series of articles entitled "The Miracle of Greece" which appeared in Life magazine in 1963, notably recounted in words and pictures the achievement of a handful of people called Greeks who aroused the human race to a new ambition and sense of purpose. The contributions of ancient Greece to all of us, to our world of today, is an achievement so great that it touches almost every phase of our lives. Hellenic culture and ideals have not only encompassed practically all facets of life in today's modern world, but brought forth one great thought, so novel and profound that a whole new age dawned in its light. As stated in "The Miracle of Greece" this great thought was that man's nature, even in its mortality, is the glory of creation and that man has a noble purpose to live at the highest possible pitch of human performance, physically, morally, and intellectually. One of the major objects and purposes of the Order of Ahepa is the dissemination of Hellenic culture and ideals through education and practice. It is with grateful appreciation, therefore, that the fraternity does herewith present to Mr. Henry R. Luce the Ahepa Socratic Award for 1964, represented by this scroll and the award itself, a bronze bust of the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates.

"Done in the city of Washington, D.C., this 16th day of March 1964.

"JOHN G. PLUMIDES,
Supreme President."

REMARKS OF MRS. HENRY R. LUCE

It has been a wonderful experience for me to be here this evening, not simply because I am the very happy recipient of a great award (the Ahepa Socratic Award)—no award has ever made me happier—but simply to have this experience of being with the Greeks. There is a saying that we are all Greeks. All those who have been touched a little bit by the process of civilization are all Greeks. There is a great vitality and a great love of liberty among the Greeks, as evidenced by the feelings that have been expressed here tonight.

In the 20th century we have a little bit of the feeling of what it must have been like in the time of Pericles. I thank you, therefore, for the great privilege of this personal experience.

I can quite simply say that I have never received any honor which has appealed so much not only to my vanity and pride, but to my heart. This series on Greece, "The Miracle of Greece," was, in fact, a work of love. It was the work of many hands, and I hope that you will permit me a minute to mention just a few of them. The editor of Life is Edward K. Thompson. He is here tonight, and he was my senior colleague in this work. Also working on this series were John Thorn, special projects editor; Ed Kern, our distinguished art director, and three of our great photographers who put their hearts into this job—Milet, Dick de Kessel, and Jim Burton. For all of us it was a wonderful labor of love.

A GREAT AND NOBLE THEME

The greatest thrill for an editor is to be seized with a great and noble theme, and to be able to develop this theme in such a manner that millions of people will be able to en-

joy it and learn from it. There was, as your President has so generously remarked, a complete response from the wide American public to this series, and this was the greatest satisfaction that can come to us who work in the journalistic, editorial field. To have this labor of love give such satisfaction in response and results, and then to be crowned with the Ahepa Socratic Award, leaves me almost speechless with gratitude for the whole great experience.

In these United States of America for the past 200 years, the American people have been faithful to one dominant purpose, namely, to the establishment of a form of government. That purpose has now been fulfilled. This was very movingly alluded to last night on President Johnson's television interview, when he said: "I am so proud of this country, of the form of government which we have, of the free enterprise system and of the opportunity which has been given to me and to millions of others."

In recent years, there is something more to be seen in this land. This is the challenge to create an American civilization based on the idea of Greece—the expansion of knowledge, music, culture, universities. We will meet that broader challenge which involves the shaping of a civilization. We will succeed in creating the first modern, technological, prosperous, humane and reverent civilization—2,500 years after Pericles.

Pursue excellence rather than mediocrity—that is what the Greek community is saying to us today. This message from the Greek community all over this country has a greater relevance today than ever before. We are all Greeks, because we are all touched with civilization. Let us all, as Americans in this 20th century, emulate the Greeks and build the first modern, technological, prosperous, humane and reverent civilization.

Rowland Evans Presents False Picture of Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of our colleagues read the syndicated article on Birmingham which appeared in the daily papers several days ago. The article was grossly false in commenting on Birmingham's economic picture.

I submit herewith an editorial from Monday's Birmingham News which presents the true facts regarding Birmingham's healthy and progressive economic growth. I urge all Members to read this editorial.

ROWLAND EVANS ON BIRMINGHAM

Once again Birmingham has been measured by a 1-day vistor, this time Rowland Evans, who with Robert Novak writes a syndicated column. The News subscribes to this column. It printed the article on Birmingham Friday, believing Birmingham citizens deserved to see what nationally syndicated writers were saying about their city.

But the Evans column with a lick and a miss unfairly dealt with the economy and the general picture of Birmingham, the more so as the comparison to which we are accustomed was made, with Atlanta.

Mr. Evans left the distinct impression we were suffering economically, going nowhere. This is grossly unjust and simply is not true. He wrote that Birmingham's unemployment situation was unchanging, that the smarter migrating Negroes bypassed Birmingham, etc.

All we know is what the economic figures show. These are impressive, as we believe all objective persons would agree.

From 1960 to 1963, Birmingham retail sales increased more than $75 million or 10.2 percent. Buying income was up $26 million or 2.2 percent. Bank debits were up almost $208 million or 24.3 percent. Total bank deposits were up $112,311,682 or 18 percent. Bank savings deposits were up $91½ million or 65.6 percent. Savings and loan deposits were up $81 million or 46.8 percent. Demand deposits were up $95½ million or 22.8 percent.

Despite implication by Mr. Evans, population growth remained good at 4.9, though it is true that this increase is considerably less than percentages of previous periods. Here indeed is a problem which we must recognize.

Other statistics show the improvement in citizens' conditions—motorcar registrations up around 11 percent, electricity use up 2.4 percent under home metering, up 28.6 percent in commercial sales of kilowatt-hours. There was a $10.7 percent increase in that period in telephone installations.

Household average income in Birmingham in 1963 was $6,361. While it is true that Atlanta's was $7,840, Louisville's at $7,178, Dallas' at $7,989, Birmingham was exactly the same as Memphis, better than bustling Tampa-St. Petersburg, less than $200 behind Miami. Percentage of growth in such income from 1950 to 1963 showed Birmingham at 66.2 percent, Atlanta 62.9, and other Southern cities generally some 10 to 20 points behind Birmingham.

In weekly manufacturing earnings, Birmingham was $113.97, compared with Atlanta's $91.76, Philadelphia's $102.66, Dallas' $86.94, Miami's $79.79, etc. Obviously, we are doing very well with what we have. Our shortcomings, which are not at all as great as so often described by such reporters, are readily detectable. We know where are the areas for improvement.

Moreover, these and other statistics improve by each quarter, generally, revealing steady growth, if not always as spectacular as we would like.

Birmingham properly resents the imbalanced picture. We can face up to accurate, judicious evaluations. But the habit of seeing only the negative is not only discomforting, it is downright boring.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Heart of Gold Award Presented to Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg by the Variety Club of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Variety Clubs International is a philanthropic organization composed of men and women in the world of show business who minister to the needs of their communities through leadership in worthy causes—particularly concerning themselves with the welfare of children.

Since its founding in 1929, this organization has grown until it is now comprised of some 36 tents located in the United States, Mexico, France, and Great Britain, with a membership totaling well over 10,000. During this period the clubs have donated more than $85 million to worthy causes.

During its 28 years of purposeful existence the Variety Club of Washington, Tent No. 11, has contributed approximately $1 million to fund-raising campaigns and charity drives in the metropolitan area. Bolstered by illustrious members such as President Lyndon B. Johnson, our late President John F. Kennedy, and former Chief Executives Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, Tent No. 11 has carried forward such notable projects as the Children's Hospital Variety Club Research Center; Shut-in-Screenings; the Glaucoma Clinic at the Washington Hospital Center; support of the Metroplitan Police Boys Club, and many others. It is interesting to note that Prince Philip is an active member of the London, England, tent.

Each year, Variety Clubs International sponsors a Humanitarian Award which is awarded to a person achieving worldwide recognition because of humanitarian endeavors, with emphasis placed on charitable activities associated with children. Numbered among recent recipients have been such personages as Dr. Albert Schweitzer, Sir Winston Churchill and Dr. Jonas E. Salk.

Additionally, the Variety Club of Washington, Tent No. 11, annual selects leading show business personalities whose efforts in charitable fields have been outstanding. Voted Personality of the Year 1963 was Sammy Davis, Jr. Previously named have been such prominent stars as Steve Lawrence and Edie Gorme, Maurice Chevalier, Bobby Darin, Andy Williams, Jack Paar, Kitty Kallen, Pat Boone, Steve Allen, Eddie Fisher, Jane Froman, Perry Como, Arthur Godfrey, Joe E. Brown, and Al Jolson.

Mr. President, on Monday, February 10, 1964, it was my privilege to be present at the Variety Club Heart of Gold Award Luncheon at the Statler-Hilton Hotel. Long referred to as "the heart of show business" the club in 1961 established the annual Heart of Gold Award, which is presented to a deserving citizen who, through the Welfare Committee, is chosen for his unselfish contributions to civic and charitable endeavors.

Presiding at this memorable event was Albert W. Lewitt, capable chairman of the Awards Committee for the Heart of Gold Luncheon. The invocation was given by Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, one of the associate ten chaplains, and rabbi of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, following which Mr. Lewitt discussed the history of Variety Clubs International. Honored guests included:

Mr. Lewitt; William Brizendine, international representative of Variety Clubs International; Father Hartke, associate chaplain of tent No. 11; the Honorable Tyler Abell, Assistant Postmaster General of the United States; the Honorable Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission; the Honorable John R. Duncan, Commissioner of the District of Columbia; the Honorable Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to the President; the Honorable John J. Sirica, judge of the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia; dean of the diplomatic corps, His Excellency Guillermo Sevilla-Secasa, the Ambassador of Nicaragua; the Honorable E. Barrett Prettyman, senior judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; the Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Justice Brennan of the U.S. Supreme Court; Mr. Justice Clark of the U.S. Supreme Court; Mr. Justice White of the U.S. Supreme Court; international columnist Drew Pearson; Joseph M. Zamoiski, chief barker of tent No. 11; Edward Fontaine, former chief barker, tent No. 11; Dr. Charles W. Lowry, associate chaplain of tent No. 11; Dr. James M. Nabrit, president of Howard University; the Honorable Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; His Excellency Berhanou Dinke, the Ambassador of Ethiopia; the Honorable James Skelly Wright, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia; the Honorable James Randall Durfee, judge of the U.S. Court of Claims; the Honorable Charles Fahy, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; Rabbi Norman Gernstenfeld, associate chaplain of tent No. 11; the Honorable George Thomas Washington, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals; the Honorable David L. Bazelon, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; Mr. Justice Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court; Mr. Justice Stewart of the U.S. Supreme Court; and the guest of honor, Mr. Justice Goldberg of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Former Heart of Gold Award winners Daniel Bell—1961—and Milton S. Kronheim—1962—were introduced, along with the 1963 designate, Drew Pearson.

It was Mr. Pearson's pleasant responsibility to present the Variety Club's Heart of Gold Award to the 1964 recipient, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In making the presentation, the noted news analyst commented on Justice Goldberg's outstanding military service during World War II, and praised his achievements in the legal profession and later as Secretary of Labor. Mr. Pearson also emphasized the close personal friendship which existed between the Associate Justice and the late President Kennedy. In concluding his remarks he said:

> One of the greatest things the late President did was to leave us, in a position of judicial influence, a man with great understanding of the law, great understanding of human nature and a man with a heart of gold.

Mr. President, it is fitting that we commend the membership of Variety Clubs International for their energetic support of public-spirited programs. We are likewise grateful to members of Tent No. 11 for selecting to receive the Heart of Gold Award Arthur J. Goldberg. These citizens have been instrumental in building an organization which can be truly known as "the heart of show business."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from remarks by Albert W. Lewitt and Drew Pearson at the Variety Club of Washington, Tent No. 11, Heart of Gold Award luncheon, February 10, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ALBERT W. LEWITT, CHAIRMAN, AWARDS COMMITTEE, HEART OF GOLD LUNCHEON, FEBRUARY 10, 1964

I would like to welcome you to the Heart of Gold luncheon, one of two affairs that the Variety Club Tent No. 11, of Washington, holds every year for the purpose of giving an award to the individual whom Variety Club feels has made an outstanding contribution to the needy and underprivileged. The other function is the personality award dinner, held in November, at which time the Variety Club gives an award to the individual in show business who, in their opinion, has made an outstanding contribution to the needs of the less fortunte. Our last personality award dinner, at which time Sammy Davis, Jr., was to be the recipient of the award, was canceled because of the assassination of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Variety Club, which is called "the heart of show business," owes its beginning to a lonely infant abandoned in a Pittsburgh, Pa., movie theater on Christmas Eve, 1929. Pinned to the baby's diaper was a note from her distraught mother. It said there were eight other children at home and with her husband unemployed she could no longer take care of her child. Having heard much of the goodness of show people she hoped and prayed that they would care for the baby. A group of local show people including John Harris, producer of Ice Capades, adopted the baby, and named her Catherine Variety Sheridan. She grew up under Variety sponsorship with her real identity known only by two people.

Since the first Variety Club was organized in 1929, there have been 36 tents organized in cities throughout the world. The Variety Club has over 10,000 members including people from all walks of life, and has as some of its members our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, ex-Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman, as well as the late President John F. Kennedy. Prince Philip is an active member in England's Variety Club.

Variety clubs throughout the world, since being organized, have contributed over $85 million to various charitable organizations and Tent No. 11 here in Washington has contributed nearly $1 million to local charities which includes a $200,000 contribution to Children's Hospital for a research center. This is but one of the many contributions that Variety Club has made and continues to make in providing relief for the indigent, sick, and needy.

REMARKS BY DREW PEARSON AT THE HEART OF GOLD LUNCHEON, FEBRUARY 10, 1964

One of the great things about this country is that a man can come from nowhere and attain the highest office in the land. No one knew when Arthur Goldberg was born to a poor immigrant family, in an obscure part of Chicago, approximately half a century ago, that he would serve in the Cabinet of the United States and be elevated to the highest office in the land. No one dreamed of this when he carried shoeboxes as a messenger on the streetcars of Chicago to eke out his family's livelihood—there being no child labor act at that time.

No one realized this when Arthur was a brilliant student at the University of Chicago Law School, except perhaps his wife. Arthur used to say when he was a law student that some day he was going to be a Justice of the Supreme Court and his wife who knew him well had faith in him. She knew that some day he would achieve his ambition.

During the war others began to know Arthur but few knew of his great contribution to the war because it was strictly secret. He was a member of the OSS. I did not know of it until the end of the war when I met the head of the European Transport Workers, a Belgian, who told me in some detail how Arthur was organized an amazing intelligence network behind Nazi lines. He used Czech conductors, Swiss railroad men, bargemen from the River Rhine, to locate concentrations of Nazi railroad cars and barges which laid up during the daytime in order to travel at night. This was how American bombers received their orders, while in flight as to which targets they should bomb, as a result of Arthur Goldberg's amazing intelligence system, organized through European trade unions.

Gen. "Will Bill" Donovan, head of the OSS, paid tribute to the fact that Arthur's contribution was one of the greatest single factors in hastening the end of the war.

After the war Arthur became the Nation's leading labor attorney and delivered one of the most brilliant arguments against the use of the Taft-Hartley Act in the steel strike. Later as Secretary of Labor he invoked the Taft-Hartley Act in the maritime strike. Labor did not blame him for this. Because labor knew that Arthur was a friend. They trusted him and knew he was putting the welfare of the public first. He was one Secretary of Labor who could appeal over the heads of the union leaders to the men because they knew and trusted him.

There was a time when my friend Arthur did me a great disservice. He stole my secretary. But I, whom am not always a tolerant man, have forgiven him.

Arthur and the late President were very close. There was a deep bond of understanding between them and a sense of humor. President Kennedy used to tell a story how Arthur when climbing in the Swiss Alps got lost. The Red Cross went out in a helicopter to search for him and the loudspeaker boomed out over the Swiss Alps "Arthur Goldberg, this is the Red Cross, Arthur Goldberg, this is the Red Cross."

There was no reply at first and finally a small voice came from below: "This is Goldberg, I gave through the office this year."

In September 1962 after Felix Frankfurter retired, President Kennedy called in his Secretary of Labor and in a sad voice offered him the vacancy on the Supreme Court.

"It's like cuting off my arm to lose you," he said.

The man who told his wife that his greatest ambition was to make the Supreme Court replied, "I will be glad to stay on in the Labor Department, there will be other vacancies in the Court."

But the President, with perhaps tragic premonition said "I am not so sure. You will be here long after I am gone."

One of the greatest things the late President did was to leave us, in a position of judicial influence, a man with great understanding of the law, great understanding of human nature and a man with a heart of gold.

MacArthur: Epic of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the career of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is an epic of history; his passing a great, national and world loss that has brought profound sadness to people everywhere.

This great military leader, probably the greatest of our times, was superbly equipped for the critical tasks committed to him during his long, faithful, outstanding service as high-ranking officer of the American Army.

Of brilliant, mental capacities and preeminent intellectual attainments, leader of his class, and inspiring leader all his life, one can speak of him only in superlative terms.

"Duty, honor, country," the motto of his beloved West Point, found in him from early days until his last breath an adherent of undeviating loyalty.

Courage of most exalted form permeated every cell of his body.

Belief in God, and firm, unyielding faith in his Maker, his country and his own power to fulfill his noblest destiny marked his thought and action as he measured up so conspicuously to a succession of desperate challenges on sea, land, and in the air, in war and peace, in the military, in government, and diplomacy that profoundly influenced for the good the security of the country and the free world and the well-being of the human race.

By common consensus, Douglas MacArthur was one of the greatest military leaders of history. Yet, he was not always a prophet in the eyes of his own Government.

The sad part of his career is that his discerning judgments and counsel which were shared abundantly by the Joint Chiefs and other military experts in the Nation were not accepted. If they had been followed, the whole course of history in the Far East and many other world areas would have been changed for the better.

For who among us in our official life was better qualified by virtue of long interest, study, and experience in Asian affairs, by virtue of his deep understanding of conditions and people in that part of the world, to counsel and act in the furtherance of a sound, constructive, safe American Asian policy, predicated on conclusive victory and the primary interests of our country and the free world, than this great American soldier, diplomat, and Government administrator.

To reinforce the doctrine that "there is no substitute for victory," and the truism that American boys should never have to fight a deadly enemy with their hands tied behind their backs, would have been a glorious exploit for this Nation which the great MacArthur could and would have used, always mindful of the men of his command, to win a decisive victory over world communism, to stabilize the peace of the Far East, and contain the Marxist conspiracy in that part of the world.

The great man who, with our Joint Chiefs, so strongly sponsored and exemplified the cause of victory has now gone to his eternal reward.

Let us hail and salute the great MacArthur epic of history.

Let us dwell upon his unsullied, stainless patriotism, love of God and country, his bitter sacrifices for his cause and his faith, his glorious career which makes him stand out in history as a great military strategist and resourceful, intrepid leader of arms and men.

Let us honor his memory as he honored our country.

In our profound gratitude let us always exalt and hold dear to us the precious truths by which he lived and served.

Long will the people of this Nation remain grateful to this great American leader. And long will our Nation, the free world, and all striving to be free be inspired by his faith, his courage, and his unselfish, noble service to the sacred cause of security and liberty.

To gracious, devoted Mrs. MacArthur, her fine son, and family, I tender my heartfelt sympathy for their irreparable loss. May the good Lord comfort and sustain them in their deep sorrow, and give their dear loved one, our immortal General of the Army Douglas Mac-

Arthur, eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

Hold high the gleaming banner of his faith. Keep in our hearts the glory of his deeds and the high purpose of his supreme dedication.

From the Commonwealth of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a memorandum opinion handed down by Judge Henry Meigs, of the Franklin Circuit Court, on March 16, affirming the Public Service Commission's issuance of a certificate to Big Rivers Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. to construct a generating plant and transmission facilities.

The opinion is as follows:

KENTUCKY UTILITIES CO. ET AL., PLAINTIFF, *v.* PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ET AL., DEFENDANTS—FRANKLIN CIRCUIT COURT, CIVIL ACTION NO. 64043—MEMORANDUM OPINION

Many complex factors enter into a determination of public convenience and necessity such as to warrant construction and operation of electrical generation and transmission facilities. Certain general principles and guides are postulated by the legislature, but consideration of the facts, engineering, cost, and other technical data offered in support of an application is for the Public Service Commission and its technical staff. Review by the courts of a Commission order may be had only upon the evidence heard by the PSC, and the scope thereof is limited to a determination of whether or not the order is reasonable or lawful. Parties seeking to set aside such order must sustain the burden of showing clearly and convincingly that it is unreasonable or unlawful.

By its opinion and order the Commission made findings with respect to adequacy of existing service, duplication, costs, impact of the proposed facilities on the protesting utilities and the sufficiency of consumer market. From such findings and upon all the evidence the Commission concluded that public convenience and necessity required the granting of authority sought.

Although the Commission appears to have made a studied attempt to conform its findings to the order in the east Kentucky case, and the opinion of the court of appeals therein (252 S.W. 2d 885), there is some basis for the contention of protestants, that the facts upon which the ultimate conclusions were grounded are not specifically detailed. It cannot be said, however, that these considerations, as a matter of law, do not constitute a lawful or reasonable basis for the Commission's order, for the Commission's findings are substantially the same as those approved in *K.U.* v. *P.S.C.*, 252 S.W. 2d 885 (east Kentucky case). Moreover, since the record abounds with substantial evidence supportive of the Commission's opinion we are not presented with a case in which "an agency has failed to disclose clearly the grounds upon which its decision is based" (*L. & N. R.R. Co.* v. *Ky. R.R. Comm.*, 314 S.W. 2d 940).

It is significent that the following statement in brief of applicants at page 45 ("After the presentation of K.U.'s and L.G. & H.'s case admitting the definite need for generating facilities, the question now is not whether it is needed, but rather who should be permitted to install it.") is annotated by counsel for K.U. "This is Big River's only argument." Together with the evidence, these statements impel the conclusion that this is the heart of the case, and bring it squarely within the ruling of the east Kentucky case where, as here, the expansion plan of K.U., based on anticipated load, is clear admission of the inadequacy of existing facilities. In addition to finding that Big Rivers application met this test of "inadequacy of existing service" the Commission found, upon substantial evidence, an inadequacy of existing service due "to indifference, poor management or disregard to the rights of consumers, persisting over such a period of time as to establish an inability or unwillingness to render adequate service."

Although the evidence may—and obviously does—give rise to honest difference of opinion as to the ultimate conclusions drawn therefrom, no part of the Commission's order and opinion is shown to be unreasonable or unlawful.

In accordance with the foregoing counsel for defendants may tender a judgment herein sustaining the order of the Public Service Commission, subject to objections as to form.

This 16th day of March 1964.

———,
Judge, Franklin Circuit Court.

A Letter of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a copy of a representative letter I have received expressing grave concern over the plight of Jews living in the Soviet Union. The letter speaks for itself. Continuing reports from the Soviet Union are indeed profoundly disturbing. I believe the time is at hand when the Government should take official recognition of this question and express our concern in strong terms to the Soviet Union and in the United Nations. To quote from the letter, we "cannot in good conscience remain silent."

The letter follows:

A LETTER OF CONSCIENCE

Profoundly disturbed by authoritative reports of discriminatory and repressive treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union, and affirming the universal moral principles of justice and brotherhood, I hereby join with other Americans in expressing grave concern.

We appeal to Soviet authorities:

1. To extend to Jews in the Soviet Union the full measure of equality to which they are entitled under the Soviet constitution.

2. To eradicate every vestige of anti-Semitism and to institute a vigorous campaign against all anti-Semitic manifestations.

3. To permit the creation of central religious institutions to serve Soviet Jewry, and to allow unrestricted worship and religious instruction for young and old.

4. To allow formal religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad and to permit official exchange visits and religious pilgrimages to the Holy Land.

5. To reopen Jewish cultural institutions and permit the full expression of Jewish cultural life in Yiddish and Hebrew.

6. To grant permission on a humanitarian basis to those Jews who have been separated from their loved ones by the Nazi holocaust to rejoin their families in other lands.

7. To cease making Jews the scapegoat in the governmental campaign against economic crimes in the Soviet Union.

The essential dignity and equality of all men is an elementary religious and moral principle. So long as this principle is violated I cannot in good conscience remain silent. I therefore solemnly subscribe to this urgent appeal.

DAVID MAY,
MARY H. MAY,
Husband and Wife.

Oklahoma's Professional Rodeo Season Begins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days, one of the most colorful, challenging, and popular professional sports in Oklahoma begins its 1964 season.

I am speaking of the professional rodeo season which begins with the Ardmore, Okla., rodeo championships on April 15, and concludes with the State Fair Rodeo at Oklahoma City, October 1.

Between those dates, 24 communities in Oklahoma will be hosts to the world's greatest professional cowboys who will compete in grueling events ranging from bronc and bull riding to steer wrestling and calf roping.

My personal invitation is extended today to each Member of this body and to the citizens you represent in Congress to attend one of these fine Oklahoma professional rodeos.

Americana unfolds at these spectacles reminiscent of the old West from the opening grand entry when cowboys and cowgirls of all ages parade their finest horses under saddle, flags, and pennants with bands blaring, until the final event when thoroughbred Oklahoma quarter horses compete in the traditional cutting horse contests.

In the second congressional district which I represent, comprising the 16 counties of northeastern Oklahoma, 5 communities have already announced dates for outstanding professional rodeos this year.

The first is the Miami, Okla., rodeo, May 21–23, to be followed by rodeos at Wagoner, June 4–6; Claremore, June 24–27; Lenapah, July 1–4; and finally Vinita's famed Will Rogers Memorial Rodeo, August 19–23. Rodeos are also a feature attraction of the State Fair held at Muskogee each fall.

I heartily recommend that one of Oklahoma's rodeos be considered as a part

of everyone's vacation plans this year. These professional rodeos are truly family entertainment. The smallest child cannot help but be thrilled by the daring action and daredevil feats of the cowboys. Every adult appreciates the professional precision of these great competitors.

You cannot beat a rodeo for action-packed thrills and excitement and colorful pageantry. It is one professional sport that cannot be fixed—for no one has ever figured a way to make a deal with a wild Brahma bull, or a hard-bucking cow pony.

We in Oklahoma are proud of our rodeos and of our many rodeo champions. The Second Congressional District boasts six professional rodeo champions headed by world champion all-around cowboys, Jim Shoulders, of Henryetta, and Buck Rutherford, of Lenapah. Our other world champions include Shoat Webster, of Lenapah, Willard and Benny Combs, of Checotah, and talented newcomber, Barry Burk, of wagoner.

More than 270,000 spectators thrilled to the 24 rodeos in Oklahoma last year. This is more than the total number of persons who saw Oklahoma Sooner football games in Norman last fall.

So I urge that for a scenic and fun-filled vacation this year, you should visit Oklahoma. You can enjoy one of our State's fine professional rodeos and afterward you can participate in water sports, fishing and other fun at one of Oklahoma's many beautiful and conveniently located lake resorts, which have helped to establish Oklahoma as the recreational heartland of the Southwest.

I also recommend for your reading pleasure an article by State Senator Clem McSpadden on Oklahoma's professional rodeos which appeared in the current issue of Oklahoma Today. Clem has become nationally famous as a rodeo commentator and he has appeared many times on network television. He is a foremost authority on the rodeo in America.

Clem McSpadden's article follows:

RODEO

(By Clem McSpadden)

Rugged individualism is a much admired American trait. Every so often we hear someone lament that rugged individualism no longer exists, but there is at least one stronghold in which it still flourishes. When you see a professional cowboy compete in a rodeo sanctioned by the Rodeo Cowboy's Association you are seeing individualism in its purest form.

As a member of the Rodeo Cowboy's Association he is entitled to compete in any professional rodeo in the United States and Canada. He pays a cash entry fee for the right to compete, and is not subsidized in any way. He has no team doctor, or trainer to cure his aches, bruises, or broken bones. As Jim Shoulders once said, "I just wire myself up and keep going."

The bucking horse he draws doesn't know if he is a rookie or a seasoned pro. Nor does he know the color of the cowboy's skin or his religious affiliation. In a timed event, the stop watch runs the same for each contestant. A professional cowboy is his own boss. He belongs to a vanishing breed. He stands on his own feet and knows that when the chute gate flies open, he is on his own; just man versus beast.

Oklahoma cowboys have led the way on the national level since the Rodeo Cowboy's Association point award system was first started in 1945. They have won 41 world's championships. Jim Shoulders leads the way with a total of 16 titles and an unprecedented 5 all-around championships. The dean of Oklahoma cowboys, Everett Shaw, is next in line with 6 steer roping titles, the most any man has ever won. He has been among the top money winners in this event for 14 of the past 18 years.

Shoat Webster has 4 steer roping titles to his credit. He and the late Bob Crosby are the only men ever to win the all-around title at the Pendleton Roundup for 3 consecutive years. Clark McEntire and Todd Whatley have each won 3 world's championships.

Freckles Brown, perhaps the most popular of all champions, astounded the rodeo world in 1962 by winning the bull riding title at the tender age of 40. After cinching the title Freckles wound up second best with a Brahma Bull at a Portland rodeo and broke his neck. In traction for a month, then a full length cast for 3 more months, he is back in the thick of things now, pulling the loose rope on the hump backs.

Tom Nesmith, all-around champion in 1962, is the first timed-event man since 1941 to turn the trick. The Combs brothers, Willard and Benny, are the only brothers in the history of rodeo who have both won steer wrestling titles. Ike Rude, steer roping winner of 10 years ago, was 64 years old when he was crowned, the oldest cowboy ever to win a world's championship.

Iron man Buck Rutherford, almost killed in a car wreck several years ago, refused to quit. Against the advice of medical specialists, he came on to join Shoulders and Whatley as a world champion all-around cowboy.

The backbone of any sport is the seasoned veteran, like rodeo's Bob Wegner. Three times he has been runnerup for bull riding honors, but had the misfortune to peak just when Jim Shoulders was riding his best. The Federson brothers, Don and Bill, both topflight contenders in steer wrestling and bronc riding, have been elected by fellow contestants to serve on the Radio Corporation of America's board of directors. Pat Scudder, who at one time or another has competed in and won every major event, now serves as television coordinator for the Radio Corporation of America. Tater Decker and Duane Hennigh are versatile hands. The most talented newcomer in many years is Barry Burk. As a teenager he was the American Junior Rodeo Association all-around champ five times. In 1963, in his rookie professional year, he was among the top 15 steer wrestlers and qualified for the national finals.

In 1963 there were 24 professional rodeos in Oklahoma plus the national finals steer roping at Pawhuska. The sponsors of these rodeos put up more than $76,500 prize money, which the contestants' entry fees swell to a total of more than $165,000. More than 270,000 fans attended these rodeos, a total greater than the number of fans who saw big red football at Owen Stadium.

Lenapah, in Nowata County, has its population multiplied 15 times for each of the four performances of their Fourth of July Rodeo. Hinton produces the oldest continuous professional rodeo in Oklahoma. One of our most colorful rodeos is the annual State prison rodeo at McAlester, where the prisoners compete in the riding events. Professional cowboys compete in the timed events at the prison rodeo and you, as a spectator, are locked behind the prison walls while you watch the performance.

In 1934, while visiting in Vinita, Will Rogers promised, "You have a rodeo next year and I'll be back." Vinita held the rodeo the next year—but Will wasn't there; during the intervening year he had been killed in the plane crash at Point Barrow, Alaska. It is for this reason that Vinita's annual rodeo is named the Will Rogers Memorial Rodeo.

Oklahoma's largest city holds two rodeos each year; the Jaycee International in June and the State Fair Rodeo in September. Tulsa's Johnny Lee Wills Stampede is a big and exciting rodeo. But regardless whether the site is a town of 200 or a metropolitan center of half a million, the action is great.

Taking H.R. 6196 From the Speakers Table and Agreeing to Senate Amendments

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the Senate the managers of the bill interpreted the term "raw cotton" as it is used in section 101 with respect to inventory payments as applying equally to all inventories of spinnable raw cotton including those grades known as cotton comber noils and card strips. I have been asked whether that interpretation is correct inasmuch as the language in this regard is the same as that contained in the bill when it passed the House. There is no question about the correctness of that interpretation and this section relative to inventory payments applies to cotton comber noils and card strips in the same manner as any other raw cotton.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should also like to set the RECORD straight as to the general payments to be made under this legislation to enable American mills to buy American cotton at the same price that American cotton is made available to foreign mills.

There have been charges made that this measure is a mill subsidy.

This is not a mill subsidy.

After inventory adjustments are taken care of the mills receive nothing except the right to buy cotton in the same way and at the same prices for which cotton is sold for export. This will be accomplished through payment-in-kind certificates which will be issued to persons engaged in the marketing of cotton.

This will protect producer prices, permit U.S. mills to buy cotton at the prices at which it is sold for export, and keep cotton moving in the normal channels of trade.

I repeat, this program is not a mill subsidy. It merely puts American mills in the same position as buyers for export.

Mr. Speaker, the Durham (N.C.) Sun on April 1 published an editorial entitled "Mill Subsidy." I shall read this editorial into the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

COTTON SUBSIDY

Says Representative PUAL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, the Nation's five textile mills will receive a total of $57.2 million a year in subsidies if the House accepts the cotton-wheat bill.

We are weary of saying it but the truth of the matter is that the subsidy is not to the mills but to the farmers. The Government by its fixed prices jacks up the price to the mills above that charged foreign buyers and would only, if the cotton-wheat bill passes, be taking off the overload for domestic mills.

The support price is paid to the farmers. The mills merely get back their money and are placed approximately on an even footing with foreign competitors.

Another thing. Cotton textiles are still highly competitive. Cotton must, too, meet the challenges of other fibers. Hence, the textile mills will not pocket all of the money, even if it is money just being paid back to them.

Some reflection is certain in pricing and the American consumer may expect price benefits as some of the artificial cost props under American-made cotton textiles are removed.

National Library Week, April 12 to 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that April 12 to the 18 is National Library Week, and in celebration of this highly important event, I received from Ann E. Bauer—librarian of the Lewiston Public Library in Maine—a striking book jacket that dramatizes very effectively the important message that National Library Week conveys.

Inscribed on this jacket are these words: "Reading Is the Key to New Worlds." How true are these words, for the pages of a book perform somewhat in the manner of pathways that lead us into new and fascinating places.

This comment brings to mind the old adage that says: "Reading maketh a full man," for these words have a highly appropriate application to the world in which we live today. It is immediately evident that the written word can play a very vital function in keeping the individual adequately informed on this highly complex age of which he is a part, thereby equipping him to harvest its benefits and adjust to its adversities.

I want to join with the legion of those who are actively celebrating National Library Week, and in doing so I cite for the convenience of my colleagues the following extracts from the book jacket that was provided me:

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

PURPOSE

The National Library Week program is a voluntary citizens' movement dedicated to the long-range goal of encouraging lifetime reading habits, increasing people's use of libraries, and expanding and improving the total reading and library resources of the Nation.

Simultaneous explosions in population, knowledge and technology create relentless new pressures for reading materials and for their maximum use and availability. Those who sponsor and participate in the program firmly believe that reading and libraries are truly means toward the full pursuit of life, liberty and happiness and are essential to the development of an informed, creative citizenry capable of making the many harsh choices and complex decisions that confront our society each day.

SPONSORSHIP

National Library Week is sponsored by the National Book Committee, Inc., in cooperation with the American Library Association. More than 60 national organizations of all kinds participate actively in the program.

SCOPE

Each April, nationally and in some 5,000 communities throughout the several States, Library Week is both the climax and the starting point of many year-round activities that spur Americans to read more and to accept the responsibility for making reading opportunities more available to others.

The week enlists wide support because it presents reading as a desirable activity appealing to the various motives that impel people of all age groups to read—for enjoyment, for inspiration, for knowledge.

The tremendous public response to the program from its inception in 1958 gives clear evidence of widespread belief in its objectives and of a general concern for the quality of intellectual life in the community and in the Nation. Thousands of librarians, publishers, magazine and newspaper editors, authors, broadcasters and civic, education, business, religious and professional leaders have devoted their time, skills and money to the success of the program.

Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, and Hoover have led scores of other high officials in reminding Americans that the freedom to read and the free access to adequate reading materials are both the privilege and the responsibility of a free, democratic society.

New Honors for Littleton High School Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, once again the Third Massachusetts Congressional District has been signally honored by the Washington Cherry Blossom Festival by the designation of one of its high school bands for participation in the 1964 festival.

Not long ago the outstanding Fitchburg High School band gained this high recognition and I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House that another high school band from my district has been chosen for this great honor.

This year the 84-member Littleton High School Band, led by eight majorettes and a four-man color guard, is representing Massachusetts at the Cherry Blossom festivities and I take this opportunity to commend this talented musical organization for being selected for this great distinction and to congratulate the band members for the new honors they have brought to their State, their community, and their school.

As the official Massachusetts band, the Littleton musical group is participating in many of the Cherry Blossom activities during their stay in Washington from April 10 to 12, including the Cherry Blossom Festival Parade of Princesses on Saturday.

While members of the Littleton band have little free time during their stay in the Capital, it has been possible for me to arrange a special guided tour of the White House for the group on Friday morning. In addition through the excellent cooperation of officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the group will be given a guided tour of FBI headquarters early Friday afternoon.

Littleton and Massachusetts should be proud of this wonderful musical group which has already won acclaim throughout central Massachusetts. Among the 50 or more bands from across the country selected for participation in the festival this year, Littleton with its 5,800 population is one of the smallest communities in the Nation to be so honored by the festival.

Wearing navy blue military-style uniforms, festooned with gold braiding, the Littleton unit makes a smart and handsome appearance wherever it appears. For the festival parade, the group will lead the open car bearing the Massachusetts cherry blossom princess, Miss Joan Rooks, the daugter of Col. and Mrs. William A. Rooks.

Last December immediately after the invitation to the festival, the townspeople of Littleton joined wholeheartedly in a communitywide fund-raising effort for the some $10,000 in funds required for the trip to Washington. Old-fashioned New England bean suppers, the sale of car bumper strips and chocolate bars, raffles on braided rugs, and a variety of social affairs have helped to raise these funds.

The band's eight majorettes are wearing special new uniforms specially made for the Washington trip by a group of Littleton mothers. In addition, the American Legion Post of Littleton has contributed flags and chrome-plated rifles for the color guard.

The Littleton band is under the able direction of School Music Director John Walker, who has a staff of three to assist him. Musical instruction is started in the fourth grade at Littleton and this early training insures a good selection of capable students for the band by the time the youngsters reach high school.

The Littleton High School Band brings new laurels to the town of Littleton through its participation in the Cherry Blossom Festival of 1964. I take pride in hailing and saluting this superb musical organization for its past achievements and extend best wishes for its continued success in the years to come.

Let Public Law 480 Help Build Democracy—People's College, Haldwani, India, an Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, democratic ideals and practices are engaged in a supreme confrontation with totalitarian trends in many of the newly independent and developing countries of Asia and Africa. The same is true in varying degrees of many countries of Latin America.

On February 16, 1964, Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered an address before the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, N.J., entitled "Education for Citizenship in the Modern World," in which he quoted President John F. Kennedy's statement, "Without an interest in the responsibilities of citizenship, nothing can be done." A meaningful education in citizenship becomes all the more important in the developing countries, where because of illiterate centuries under colonialism, feudalism, or in a tribal state, the uneducated millions cannot differentiate between a Kennedy and a Stalin and between a democrat and a dictator.

We are spending billions of dollars helping most of these underdeveloped countries to help themselves to build up their own ways of life as political, social and economic democracies. Fully agreeing with Secretary Rusk's remarks that citizenship is a necessity in the modern world, I think that it is high time that our foreign aid programs give priority to helping to set up schools for democratic training and behavior. This can be done through training programs for illiterate or barely literate adult and youth leaders from the urban areas, villages, or local governments, and from the trades and businesses.

Every rural or urban leader so trained with periodic follow-up correspondence or refresher courses could prove to be the intellectual lighthouse for the cause of democracy and freedom within his own city or rural area.

About a hundred years ago, N. F. S. Grundvigt and Christian Kold laid the foundations of such a movement in Scandinavia by starting folk high schools in Denmark. Modern Scandinavian democracies owe much to these "people's colleges," and even today many of the Scandinavian leaders are the products of these colleges. The UNESCO has strongly recommended the opening of such colleges or folk schools in the developing countries, but little has been done in this field, outside of the Scandinavian countries, Germany, and England.

In India, a people's college has been established with the aid of a small seed money grant from Sweden, at Haldwani, District of Naini Tal, Uttar Pradesh, India, mainly through the leadership and efforts of the able congressional fellow who has been assigned to my office, Mr. Narayan Datt Tiwari of Naini Tal and Lucknow, India.

I feel that such people's colleges or folk high schools could and should be opened in many of the developing countries using our uncommitted Public Law 480 funds. Such colleges or schools would be particularly effective in rural areas, where they could function as small scale land grant colleges not only to teach young farmers citizenship and fundamental education, but also improved agricultural production techniques.

It is my opinion that such schools would also be very useful, in our own United States in our war on poverty. We should give such a program serious consideration.

I offer for the attention of my colleagues in Congress and for a wide consideration throughout the United States extracts from "People's College, Haldwani—Naini Tal—India"—1961—and "A Year of Work at People's College, Haldwani—Naini Tal—India"—1963—both published by the Planning, Research, and Action Institute, Planning Department, Uttar Pradesh, India:

PEOPLE'S COLLEGE, HALDWANI (NAINI TAL), INDIA—PEOPLE'S COLLEGES IN SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES

The voluntary schools for adults in Scandinavian countries are called folk schools or people's high schools. The aim of the folk high schools has been, and is still, to become an educational institution for all sections of the population, for rich and poor, for town and country, for industrial worker and farmers. But the great majority of students of folk high schools come from the countryside and particularly from the farming classes. The students from the country come from the homes of farmers, artisans, tradesmen, teachers and priests and preachers. The high schools do not prepare pupils for a life of academic study only but their object is also to enable pupils to return to their daily work with a deeper understanding of human life and its problems.

WORKING OF PEOPLE'S COLLEGES

All the student in folk high schools, with the exception of those whose homes are in the neighborhood, live at the schools. The winter term for young men continues for 5 months—from November 1 to April 1, the summer term for young women, 3 months—from May 1 to August 1. The schools are entirely free in their curriculum which the teacher, living as they do in a circle of friendly intimacy, have little difficulty in agreeing upon.

The State supports the high schools in two ways: it gives a direct subsidy to each school (from 5,000 to 14,000 kroners), graded in proportion as the salaries of the teachers, building expenses, etc. It also gives a number of scholarships to help pupils who would otherwise be unable to pay for board and tuition. These scholarships are appointed by the local government without regard to the particular high school the pupil may elect to attend.

Two to four pupils usually share a room bringing their own bed clothes. They eat at a common table, and the fare is plain but plentiful. All the students participate in the whole of the instructions given, which with intervening periods for rest and recreation, occupies the whole day. As a rule, three lectures daily are given to the whole school. This study in common, which some times includes discussions on the lecture-subjects, constitutes the principal work of the schoolday. Before and after each lecture the pupils sing together songs which have, as far as possible, a bearing upon the lecture.

The high school people maintain that it is not their aim to make all young people in Denmark either schoolteachers or bookworms, but to help them find happiness in their daily work, and give them a spiritual understanding of active human life. The pupils are intended to return to their farm, craft, or trade from which they come, to do their work with an undaunted spirit and a brighter intelligence as a result of their attendance at folk high schools.

DEVELOPMENT OF PEOPLE'S COLLEGES IN SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES

A century ago, a group of great-hearted patriots in Denmark moved their fellow countrymen by their teaching and by their example. The man whose personality imprinted itself first on a small body of disciples and ultimately upon the peasantry of Denmark, was N. F. S. Grundtvig, a pastor, poet, historian, and educational reformer. The pioneering efforts of Arnold of Rugby had proved very effective in making England realize Denmark's message in social reform. Grundtvig's visits to England and to the British Museum deepened his belief in liberty and in the power of wise, inspiring education to enhance the manliness of the people. "It is my highest wish as a citizen," he wrote, "that soon there may be opened a Danish high school accessible to young people all over the land where they may become better acquainted with themselves in particular, and where they will receive guidance in all civic duties and relationship, getting to know their country's real needs. Their love of their country shall be nourished by the mother tongue, their nation's history, and by Danish song. Such schools will be a well of healing for our people."

The people's colleges founded by Grundtvig and his disciples, chief among them being Christian Kold, gave the essence of a liberal education to farmers' sons and daughters and ultimately transformed the peasantry. The new leaders of the peasantry, the organizers of the new and effective cooperation, were for the most part high school men. There was a sharp fall in the food grain prices in Denmark, hence attention was shifted from agriculture to dairying on cooperative lines. The cooperative dairies rose like magic. Butter and bacon saved Danish agriculture. Behind the new and swift reorganization of one of the most conservative and individualistic of industries were brains, leadership, and unselfish public spirit. The people's high schools inspired their pupils with energy and idealized labor and trained young men for mutual trust, help, and cooperation. The schools awakened in the students a yearning for knowledge and a desire for work.

One of the most valuable programs stressed by the folk high schools is the Danish agricultural cooperatives. A Danish farm is now connected with a network of cooperative organizations. The numerous threads by which a modern agricultural undertaking is linked economically with the world around are almost all spun by a cooperative organization. A farmer buys his goods at a cooperative store; he borrows money from a cooperative credit association, he obtains his seed from a cooperative seed supply, his fertilizers from the cooperative shops, his electricity from an electrical company established on a cooperative basis; and when he wants to sell his produce, he sends his milk to the cooperative dairy and his pigs and eggs to the cooperative stores. He places his savings in the cooperative savings bank. From different cooperative breeding associations he is able to get information about the best breeding stocks. He gains his knowledge regarding the amount of milk each cow should yield from the control union and he has at his service the best and most up-to-date theories of agriculture, brought to him

through the consultants appointed by the agricultural unions.

There are, at present, several technical folk high schools in Denmark. These folk high schools are the strongest medium of social education and their contribution in strengthening democracy and in bringing general prosperity and happiness in Denmark is exemplary.

A YEAR OF WORK AT PEOPLE'S COLLEGE, HALDWANI, NAINI TAL

INTRODUCTION

Notable success achieved in Scandinavian countries through the medium of people's colleges drew the attention of other countries facing similar problems in the sphere of adult education. Close upon the initiation of the community development program in India followed the great need of adult education in the country. Feelings began to be voiced from all quarters that the success in community development program would be possible only through an effective program of adult education and, apart from economic and material development, the level of living of the people would be raised only in proportion to their desire for knowing more and more about their life and living. Soon after it began to be increasingly realized that the 5-year plans of India should be the people's plans. With this end in view, the scheme of democratic decentralization was visualized. This further necessitated the need for educating adult masses and representatives of people so as to enable them to understand their rights and duties in a growing democracy. Thus the need for a network of such institutions became inevitable. The task was a big challenge and People's College, Haldwani, came into being as an answer to it.

The college was founded on February 18, 1961 and its opening ceremony was performed by Dr. Ram Das, director, Planning Research and Action Institute, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow. A little financial aid received from the Government of Sweden as a token of Indo-Swedish friendship enabled the college to get going. With the consent of the State government the college was put under the guidance and control of the Planning Research and Action Institute. It has a project advisory committee whose prominent members are Mr. Bertil Mathsson, a representative of the Swedish Embassy in India, and Sri N. D. Tewari, who actually initiated the idea of the college after his return from the Scandinavian countries in the year 1959–60. (Denmark-trained H. K. Sharma is the principal of this school.)

OBJECTIVES OF THE COLLEGE

The objectives of the People's College, Haldwani, are as under:

1. To impart social education to the members of the block development committees, teachers and other people representing various trades and vocations who, after their attendance at the college, are supposed to spread the new ideas and skills among the masses around them so as to improve the level of country life continuously.

2. To inspire the students of the college for healthy community living and to unite them together for common national purpose.

3. To enlighten the students of the college through talks, discussions, through living words and through audiovisual aids and practical work for improving their general knowledge and stimulating them for further development of their latent qualities.

4. To grow among people a love for themselves, for their neighbors and for spiritual values.

5. To enable people to realize the value of education throughout life, full-time employment and healthy recreation.

6. To prepare an army of voluntary leaders who by virtue of their personal examples, will convey to the masses the great message of cooperation, self-sacrifice, diligence, and honesty.

7. To work out, a pattern of adult education for India suiting her genius.

Thus it may be seen that the aim and purpose of the college is to give the trainees general and civic training in which special emphasis is to be laid on such instructions as will awaken independent thought and action and make the pupils acquainted with their locality, district, country and outside and also the historical development and present conditions and problems of their land along with its human and material resources. It should also, as far as possible, give such instructions in practical subjects as may further pupil's capacity for his trade or profession.

TRAINING COURSES

People's College mainly aims at experimenting at adult education and also at working out a suitable pattern for it, hence a good many training camps were organized for imparting general education and enlightenment to the trainees. The main base of the program was the occupational field for persons of different trades drawn in batches from different vocations. Although much could not be expected in the sphere of occupational skill and efficiency, yet the aim was to stimulate desire among the trainees to improve their professional skills and knowledge and be desirous to better their best in life.

In the case of girls and boys primary importance had to be given in the shape of physical and cultural activities, hobbies and a spirit of enterprise. This was done in consultation with the girls and boys themselves and the consultation was found to be essential.

A brief description of the training courses is given below:

1. Training of the Members of the Block Development Committees: In all the States of India democratic decentralization is to be effected, hence the training of Pradhans, Up-Pradhans, Pramukhs (village council presidents, vice presidents, and block presidents) and other voluntary workers is very much needed at the village and block level. For making the community development program a people's program, it is genuinely felt that more powers, of course, in suitable measures should be passed on to the people who are going to be charged with increasing responsibilities. Very aptly, this item was included in the program of People's College, Haldwani, with the concurrence of the State government.

SYLLABUS OF TRAINING

In all training courses, participation in the following program was essential:

1. Morning prayers, national flag hoisting, and get-fit program.

2. Light Shramdan (voluntary labor) work in the shape of community service.

3. Lectures and discussions on aims and objects of People's College, Haldwani, Indian Constitution, basic village institutions, democratic decentralization, 5-year plans, formulation of plans at different levels, family planning, rights and duties of citizens, and general knowledge relating to tenancy act, taxation, rules of economics, rules of the road, railways and post office, national flag, national anthem, national festivals, and everyday affairs. Each lesson was prefaced by a song, having a bearing on the topic for discussion. Besides the above, talks were held on the role of Gram Panchayats (village councils) and their welfare and production samities. Agriculture, animal husbandry, cooperatives, and cottage industries were discussed in detail. Specific problems received from the trainees were discussed and solution suggested keeping in view the local conditions. Talks and discussions were supplemented by laying out demonstrations and by resorting to audiovisual aids.

2. Barbers' training camp: This was a 4-day camp and was held from May 13, 1961 to May 16, 1961. In all 64 barbers received training. Sri S. R. Gaur, the famous hair stylist of New Delhi was specially invited to guide the trainees in improving the art of hairdressing. Apart from being a good hair stylist, Sri Gaur was highly skilled in presenting his viewpoint and it would not be too much to say that the success of barbers' training camp was mainly due to him. He chiefly dwelt on the functions of barbers in society, their level of living and lack of education and vocational training to the members of barbers' profession. He specifically stressed on the barbers for a decent layout of their salons, proper decoration, cleanliness, use of disinfectants and organization for the trainees.

Besides the above, talks on general knowledge and enlightenment were given to the trainees. There was a great enthusiasm among the trainees and this continued even after the camp was over. As a result of the sustained interest the trained barbers decided to form a consumers' cooperative. Shares have been collected, applications submitted and the registration of the society is underway. The barbers often come to the college, hold their own meetings and discuss their problems with the college staff. This is just a beginning although it is first of its kind in the country for improving the lot of persons in this trade. One of their important demands at present resting with the state government is the setting up of a training center for the barbers. The demand is very reasonable. Barbers have to deal with the skin and bones of human beings and any investment incurred for educating this group stands fully justified.

3. Washermen's camp: Barbers' training camp had its own radiation insofar as it touched men of other trades. Washerman were the first to react to it. They assembled and demanded a training camp for them. Consequently a 5-day camp was organized from March 1, 1962, to March 5, 1962. In all, 74 washermen attended the camp. Sri Jhaman Lal, a leader of the community and an expert in the profession, was specially invited to help in running the camp. Demonstrations of scientific washing were held and those advanced in the profession considerably contributed to demonstrate the art of washing successfully. Besides practical training, lectures were given for general enlightenment. It was emphatically stressed on the trainees that their services to society were very valuable and by improving their trade, they could become very valuable assets. An interesting feature of the discussion came to interpret a few age-long sayings that used to decry washermen's profession.

After the camp was over a washermen's association (Rajak-Sabha, Haldwani), was formed. The association consists of 11 members and is charged with the followup program.

4. Youth training camp: A youth club known as People's College Youth Club was formed in the college premises in April 1961. The members of this club are mostly urban youth. The youth club is essentially patterned on the PRAI rural youth organization. So far physical, cultural, and recreational activities have been included. Side by side, there is provision for group discussions also in which members of the group freely participate and add to their general knowledge. It is hoped after some time suitable economic projects also will be made available.

The youth club at People's College, Haldwani, has a strength of 60 members. One of the major needs of the members was the provision for a healthy recreation. All the club members desired it and pressed for it. Musical gymnastics patterned on Danish sys-

tem were found to be most appropriate. Music in itself is very attractive to the youth and educational gymnastics seek to develop the best possible coordination between the brain and brawn and are what our youth need most today. Such gymnastics, when set to music, proved to be a source of greater attraction to the youth. Throughout the whole year, members of the youth club—students and nonstudents both—took part in musical exercises. Some of them exhibited qualities of functional leadership and by now they have been trained to command the exercises set on orchestra. Each evening after the exercises are over, they sit in a group for discussions on topics of their interest.

A spirit of enterprise has been fostered among the club youth. They are fond of travels. In February 1962, a party of 50 members of the club went to New Delhi to see the World Industrial Exhibition and bore 50 percent of the expenses themselves.

Close upon the formation of the Youth Club, young children in the age group of 6 to 11 demanded their own club which came into being in the name of Bal Mangal Dal. This provides a very good opportunity to the members of this unit to play and sing together. They play with small balls and light pieces of apparatus. Their songs are mostly action songs. They recite stories and poems and take part in dialogs.

Youth Club and Bal Mangal Dal are the most valuable assets of the college. The members are helpful, sympathetic, and disciplined. They are prepared to serve the college in all circumstances. They are the best publicity agents and render considerable assistance in organizing displays and demonstrations. It is hoped as the members mature, they will turn out to be the greatest human force the college can count on.

(5) Hobby camps: One of the chief functions of Youth Club at the Peoples' College is to cater to hobby interests of the youth. Consequently, on the demand of interested members of the club a 4-day photography training camp was organized from January 26, 1962, to January 29, 1962. In all, 50 members received training. The chief instructor was Sri Babu Singh, junior associate photography, PRAI. Another hobby camp was organized from July 1, 1961, to July 4, 1961, to train interested youth in beekeeping and poultry farming. Sri K. R. Kohli apiarist, beekeeping, Haldwani and the veterinary assistant of Haldwani Block were of great help in organizing these camps. The club members who have received training are continuing their hobby interest with greater zeal.

(6) Girls' camp: A 10-day camp from June 15, 1961, to June 24, 1961, was organized for the junior and senior girls, numbering 136. The trainees were brought to the college premises under the leadership of Srimati Sobhawati Mittal, a well-known social worker. The girls were trained in physical and recreational activities, environmental sanitation, sewing, knitting, and homemaking. They were also guided in the formation of Yuwati Mangal Dal which they effectively did afterward. A good impact of the training is visible in the girls forsaking their shyness and in coming forward to participate in functions. The girls are anxious how to receive further training which is being planned in the shape of Youth Leaders' Camp.

(7) Lok Karya Kshetriya (public works project for a group of villages) Workers Camp: A good many Lok Karya Kshetras have been in operation under the auspices of the Bharat Sewak Samaj, India. (India social service societies). The main function of these Kshetras is to involve people and voluntary organizations for the execution of the community development programs. The Cooperation Division of the Planning Commission, India, felt convinced of the utility of Lok Karya Kshetras and consequently decided to run Lok Karya Kshetras under the guidance of the State governments. The State of Uttar Pradesh in the first instance was allotted five Kshetras with one Sahyogi and five Up-Sahayogis and some working expenses sanctioned for each.

The initial training of the Sanchalaks, Sahayogis and Up-Sahayogis (directors, helpers and assistant helpers) was found to be very essential even though they were recruited on the basis of good record of social work and experience. The task of training was assigned to the People's College, Haldwani and a 15-day camp from November 13, 1961 to November 27, 1961, was organized. The Sanchalaks, however, joined the camp only for 3 days and had a short orientation. Key point lessons were prepared covering the entire curriculum and copies of the lessons were placed in the hands of trainers and the trainees. This was, indeed, a very successful camp insofar as the trainees, for the first time, formed a clear picture of what they were going to do in their areas. Toward the end of the training program, the trainees prepared an annual plan of work for their Kshetras.

On the basis of the good work put in during the said camp, the state government has allotted one Lok Karya Kshetra with all its resources to the People's College.

WORKSHOP

In order to give a practical bias to the training program for different types of trainees, it was found advisable to set up a few workshops in the college premises where the trainees will learn and acquire skill in the manufacture of articles. To fulfill this aim, a scheme of Jan Udyog for manufacturing the P.R.A.I.-type latrines was started. The project was started with an initial amount of Rs1,000 and at the end of the financial year it yielded a profit of Rs2,093. In addition to the monetary gain it offered an opportunity to all the trainees, especially the members of the block development committees, to acquaint themselves with the working, installation, and utility of the latrines. It is intended to enlarge the scope of workshops for a full and richer program of training.

OBSERVATIONS

1. The college with its new ideas and novel approach has had all sorts of reaction from the people. Even fairly educated people have been putting queer questions about its working. Hence it is no wonder if this institution in its initial stages was looked at from strange angles of vision. During its short existence for a year it has been able to dispel all sorts of dubious feelings and interpretations, and at least those who have stayed in the college for some time are fully convinced of what the college stands for. A few opinions will amply prove the above observations.

"For the first time in the history of India, People's College, Haldwani, has thought of barbers' training program. It would be really a great day if men from different trades will receive training and education for improving themselves and their vocations."—S. R. Gaur, hair stylist, New Delhi.

"Adarsh Jan Vidyapeeth, Haldwani (Hindi name of People's College, Haldwani), has been making a correct approach to the problems of adult education in the country."—Bachi Singh, Pradhan, Village Sunkhia (district Naini Tal).

"People's College, Haldwani, is the real answer to the most of the problems of youth today."—Shamim Ahmad and Navin Chandra Tewari, Youth Club, Haldwani.

* * * * *

4. A year's work at the People's College, Haldwani, provides us with a workable pattern of fundamental adult education to begin with. For us, in India, adult education does not only mean adult literacy but also enthusing the nonliterate or semiliterate adults to self-enlightenment for shouldering the responsibilities of citizenship under a democratic constitution. The practice of delivering lectures, however wisely this may be done, does not sometimes appeal to the average adult. Here we can work upon the motto of the Scandinavian folk high schools—"Enlightenment through enlivenment." The adult masses consist of different occupational or vocational groups, following generally the same vocation or occupation. Each occupational or vocational group consists of hundreds and thousands of adults with varying degrees of occupational efficiency from region to region, city to city, city to town, town to village, and even from village to village. In our people's colleges, we can have short-term classes for each vocational or occupational group coming from a certain area or city, wherein enlightened experts drawn from their own occupation can hold seminars dealing with various problems confronting their occupation. Also lecturers and audio-visual aids could tell them of modern trends of development in their occupational sphere within the country and the world over. In between such discussions could be interspersed carefully prepared or tape-recorded songs or lectures on civics, elementary economics, Indian history and constitution. Community or occupational folksongs could also be sung and developed. Training imparted to barbers and washermen, among others by the most successful among the barbers and washermen of the country; i.e., Sri S. R. Gaur, hair stylist, New Delhi, and Sri Jhanumanlal, laundryowner, Delhi, at the People's College, Haldwani, confirms our belief that such a large-scale adult training program, with a careful follow-up, would go a long way to lay the proper foundations for fundamental adult education in the country. Within 3 to 5 years, all occupational groups within a city or district could be galvanized through simultaneous and concurrent courses, and the Peoples College would be a web of social educational activities to which all the occupational groups would flock for enlightenment. Even farmers from various sectors of agricultural production; e.g., cane growers, potato growers, tomato growers, vegetable growers, milk producers, etc., could come for training and benefit a lot.

5. All sorts of physical exercises are at present being practised by the youth and adult alike in the country. In very few cases the performance is motivated by a genuine desire from within. Those vested with the responsibility of the physical well-being of the youth have to face a good many difficulties in bringing youth together for performing those exercises. People's College, Haldwani, made an experiment by introducing musical gymnastics among the members of the Haldwani Youth Club. The system of these musical exercises was first evolved in Denmark, and Neils Bukh, principal of the Folk High School, Ollerup, was its greatest exponent.

The exercises are educationally sound, being based on the principles of anatomy and physiology. According to Neils Bukh these exercises develop among youth the brain of Shakespeare, the agility of a monkey and the strength of a bull. A year's performance of People's College, Haldwani, enables us to infer that the musical gymnastics are highly attractive to the youth and apart from their fitness and recreational values, these have a rare virtue of forging emotional integration among the participants.

These exercises have great potential and should be extended among youth of other areas also in Uttar Pradesh.

Governor Brown's Pledge on Redwoods Not Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, most of the great, sky-piercing redwood trees in the world are located in my district on the north coast of California. Their ageless grandeur absolutely must be preserved.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the generalities of the situation. But, as in the case of most generalities, many more factors become involved when attention is focused to the specifics.

Mr. Jack Craemer, the editor of the San Rafael Independent-Journal, has succinctly pointed out a realistic appraisal of the situation. I commend his fine editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

GOVERNOR BROWN'S PLEDGE ON REDWOODS NOT REALISTIC

(By Jack Craemer)

Governor Brown's pious pledge that "not a single redwood (tree) will be destroyed to build a freeway" sounds great.

It appeals to those who, not familiar with the facts, think that because the Governor says it, it will be observed.

It sounds great to those whose mental picture of redwood trees is limited to the rather rare giant trees whose age is counted in milleniums (ignoring the abundance of scrawny second-rate redwoods that make up much of the vast north coastal areas of redwood forest).

The fact of the matter is that most redwood trees in our north coastal stands are not in public ownership. Most miles of Redwood Highway, even in the redwood forest areas, are routed through private lands, mostly owned by lumbering concerns over which the State exercises no powers of prohibition on cutting.

This means that the loggers could strip an area through which a freeway is destined to pass. When the State ultimately buys the land for freeway development, Governor Brown's declaration can be observed. There will be no redwoods left which would have to be cut down to build the freeway. It would pass through kind of a devastated area.

A more realistic approach would be to acquire so-called scenic corridors along freeway routes, so that they pass through preserved remnants of forests, instead of barren, logged-off wastelands.

There have been instances of redwood grove rejection by the Save-the-Redwood League and the State division of beaches and parks. That is, although the trees appeared beautiful, they were believed unsound and not likely to endure. Although they were in jeopardy of being logged off (alongside the Redwood Highway where the after-appearance would be the most distasteful), both the league and the State were cold to suggestions that they be acquired for preservation as State park land.

Would Governor Brown apply his "not a single redwood" edict to freeway construction through rejected groves?

It would be better, obviously, to preserve a scenic corridor even through rejected redwood trees along a freeway in such an area, than to surrender the trees to loggers.

A pattern for the ultimate development of the Redwood Highway has already been established and deserves to be followed: freeways bypass the heart of the groves of millennial giants, leaving the old Redwood Highway as a scenic "Avenue of the Giants."

Even through areas of second-rate stands, the freeway should get there first (before the loggers devastate the area) and a scenic corridor of the smaller, less-impressive redwoods can be preserved to beautify the freeway route, too. This, obviously, would involve taking out some trees to make way for the road.

San Francisco Senator McAteer's resolution on redwoods is more realistic than the Governor's comments.

The senator's resolution asks the State department of parks and recreation, in effect, to get off the dime with their planning for north coast redwood parks.

Only those redwood trees in public ownership can be preserved. The State park authorities need to complete their studies on which areas deserve to be saved for posterity.

It is neither feasible nor desirable to save every single tree. Present-day, tree-farm forest practices, under State and Federal supervision, provide for the reproduction of areas not preserved in public ownership. This procedure is both necessary and desirable for those areas not suited for State park acquisition, development, and use.

These areas ought to be designated, so freeway development can move ahead without plowing through privately owned areas (where the Governor's edict cannot be enforced) but which should, nevertheless, in the future be preserved as public parks.

Senator McAteer's resolution deserves support so that highway improvement can move ahead in an orderly fashion—with guidelines based on reason instead of emotion.

Civil Rights Acts, 1866 and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, exactly 98 years ago today, on April 9, 1866, the 39th Congress enacted the first major civil rights act for the protection of Negro citizens of the United States. The act, which is reproduced below, emphatically declared Negroes to be citizens of the United States under the principle of jus soli and specified that they were to enjoy the same personal and property rights and suffer the same punishments, pains, and penalties as were applicable to white citizens. Neither prior slavery or involuntary servitude, except as just punishment for a proper criminal conviction, would serve to bring about impairment of those rights and obligations.

Exactly 98 years from that date, the 88th Congress is engaged in efforts to secure and protect some of the very same rights covered in the act of April 9, 1866. This Chamber has discharged its duty with unparalleled determination and conviction, as far as H.R. 7152 is concerned. It remains for our sister Chamber to do likewise, as I am confident it will, in spite of unjustified opposition.

By comparison with the act of 1866, the present legislation is mild. Absent are the criminal sanctions. Gone are the provisions for on-the-spot judicial attendance for arrest and trial. Forgotten are the provisions referring to slavery and previous condition of servitude. Omitted is the specific grant of executive power to employ the land and naval forces to prevent violations. The present legislation is written in the context of 1964, not 1866. And, there is no anticipation of a presidential veto or the necessity of overriding executive disapproval. The age is different and so, too, the act.

Yet, the deprivation of the rights of Negro citizens cries out as it did in 1866 for immediate corrective measures by Federal legislation. The message of those times went unheeded in the long view, even though the Supreme Court, three times by 1869, refused to declare unconstitutional this and other aspects of the Congress' reconstruction plan.

The task remains to be done, perhaps because it has been left to mere men who do not always live up to their commitments to the Constitution in the most positive fashion. Be that as it may, the text of the act of 1866 should serve to remind one and all that the fight for equality will not subside until all Americans enjoy the same opportunities under the law of the Constitution.

I include the text of the act of 1866 in my remarks, as follows:

CHAP. XXXI.—AN ACT TO PROTECT ALL PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES IN THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS, AND FURNISH THE MEANS OF THEIR VINDICATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States; and such citizens, of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, and penalties, and to none other, any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That any person who, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, shall subject, or cause to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State or Territory to the deprivation of any right secured or protected by this act, or to different punishment, pains, or penalties on account of such person having at any time been held in a condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, or by reason of his color or race, than is prescribed for the punishment of white persons, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction, shall be punished by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That the district courts of the United States, within their respective districts, shall have, exclusively of the courts of the several States, cognizance of all crimes and offences committed against the provisions of this act, and also, concurrently with the circuit courts of the United States, of all causes, civil and criminal, affecting persons who are denied

or cannot enforce in the courts or judicial tribunals of the State or locality where they may be any of the rights secured to them by the first section of this act; and if any suit or prosecution, civil or criminal, has been or shall be commenced in any State court, against any such person, for any cause whatsoever, or against any officer, civil or military, or other person, for any arrest or imprisonment, trespasses, or wrongs done or committed by virtue or under color or authority derived from this act or the act establishing a Bureau for the relief of Freedmen and Refugees, and all acts amendatory thereof, or for refusing to do any act upon the ground that it would be inconsistent with this act, such defendant shall have the right to remove such cause for trial to the proper district or circuit court in the manner prescribed by the "Act relating to habeas corpus and regulating judicial proceedings in certain cases," approved March three, eighteen hundred and sixty-three, and all acts amendatory thereof. The jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters hereby conferred on the district and circuit courts of the United States shall be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, so far as such laws are suitable to carry the same into effect; but in all cases where such laws are not adapted to the object, or are deficient in the provisions necessary to furnish suitable remedies and punish offences against law, the common law, as modified and changed by the constitution and statutes of the State wherein the court having jurisdiction of the cause, civil or criminal, is held, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be extended to and govern said courts in the trial and disposition of such cause, and, if of a criminal nature, in the infliction of punishment on the party found guilty.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted,* That the district attorneys, marshals, and deputy marshals of the United States, the commissioners appointed by the circuit and territorial courts of the United States, with powers of arresting, imprisoning, or bailing offenders against the laws of the United States, the officers and agents of the Freedmen's Bureau, and every other officer who may be specially empowered by the President of the United States, shall be, and they are hereby, specially authorized and required, at the expense of the United States, to institute proceedings against all and every person who shall violate the provisions this act, and cause him or them to be arrested and imprisoned, or bailed, as the case may be, for trial before such court of the United States or territorial court as by this act has cognizance of the offence. And with a view to affording reasonable protection to all persons in their constitutional rights of equality before the law, without distinction of race or color, or previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, and to the prompt discharge of the duties of this act, it shall be the duty of the circuit courts of the United States and the superior courts of the Territories of the United States, from time to time, to increase the number of commissioners, so as to afford a speedy and convenient means for the arrest and examination of persons charged with a violation of this act; and such commissioners are hereby authorized and required to exercise and discharge all the powers and duties conferred on them by this act, and the same duties with regard to offences created by this act, as they are authorized by law to exercise with regard to other offences against the laws of the United States.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted,* That it shall be the duty of all marshals and deputy marshals to obey and execute all warrants and precepts issued under the provisions of this act, when to them directed; and should any marshal or deputy marshal refuse to receive such warrant or other process when tendered, or to use all proper means diligently to execute the same, he shall, on conviction thereof, be fined in the sum of one thousands dollars, to the use of the person upon whom the accused is alleged to have committed the offence. And the better to enable the said commissioners to execute their duties faithfully and efficiently, in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the requirements of this act, they are hereby authorized and empowered, within their counties respectively, to appoint, in writing, under their hands, any one or more suitable persons, from time to time, to execute all such warrants and other process as may be issued by them in the lawful performance of their respective duties; and the persons so appointed to execute any warrant process as aforesaid shall have authority to summon and call to their aid the bystanders or posse comitatus of the proper county, or such portion of the land or naval forces of the United States, or of the militia, as may be necessary to the performance of the duty with which they are charged, and to insure a faithful observance of the clause of the Constitution which prohibits slavery, in conformity with the provision of this act; and said warrants shall run and be executed by said officers anywhere in the State or Territory within which they are issued.

SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted,* That any person who shall knowingly and wilfully obstruct, hinder, or prevent any officer, or other person charged with the execution of any warrant or process issued under the provisions of this act, or any person or persons lawfully assisting him or them, from arresting any person for whose apprehension such warrant or process may have been issued, or shall rescue or attempt to rescue such person from the custody of the officer, other person or persons, or those lawfully assisting as aforesaid, when so arrested pursuant to the authority herein given and declared, or shall aid, abet, or assist any person so arrested as aforesaid, directly or indirectly, to escape from the custody of the officer or other person legally authorized as aforesaid, or shall harbor or conceal any person for whose arrest a warrant or process shall have been issued as aforesaid, so as to prevent his discovery and arrest after notice or knowledge of the fact that a warrant has been issued for the apprehension of such person, shall, for either of said offences, be subject to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, and imprisonment not exceeding six months, by indictment and conviction before the district court of the United States for the district in which said offence may have been committed, or before the proper court of criminal jurisdiction, if committed within any one of the organized Territories of the United States.

SEC. 7. *And be it further enacted,* That the district attorneys, the marshals, their deputies, and the clerks of the said district and territorial courts shall be paid for their services the like fees as may be allowed to them for similar services in other cases; and in all cases where the proceedings are before a commissioner, he shall be entitled to a fee of ten dollars in full for his services in each case, inclusive of all services incident to such arrest and examination. The person or persons authorized to execute the process to be issued by such commissioners for the arrest of offenders against the provisions of this act shall be entitled to a fee of five dollars for each person he or they may arrest and take before any such commissioner as aforesaid, with such other fees as may be deemed reasonable by such commissioner for such other additional services as may be necessarily performed by him or them, such as attending at the examination, keeping the prisoner in custody, and providing him with food and lodging during his detention, and until the final determination of such commissioner, and in general for performing such other duties as may be required in the premises; such fees to be made up in conformity with the fees usually charged by the officers of the courts of justice within the proper district or county, as near as may be practicable, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States on the certificate of the judge of the district within which the arrest is made, and to be recoverable from the defendant as part of the judgment in case of conviction.

SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted,* That whenever the President of the United States shall have reason to believe that offences have been or are likely to be committed against the provisions of this act within any judicial district, it shall be lawful for him, in his discretion, to direct the judge, marshal, and district attorney of such district to attend at such place within the district, and for such time as he may designate, for the purpose of the more speedy arrest and trial of persons charged with a violation of this act; and it shall be the duty of every judge or other officer, when any such requisition shall be received by him, to attend at the place and for the time therein designated.

SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted,* That it shall be lawful for the President of the United States, or such person as he may empower for that purpose, to employ such part of the land or naval forces of the United States, or of the militia, as shall be necessary to prevent the violation and enforce the due execution of this act.

SEC. 10. *And be it further enacted,* That upon all questions of law arising in any cause under the provisions of this act a final appeal may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SCHUYLER COLFAX,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
LA FAYETTE S. FOSTER,
President of the Senate, pro tempore.

The Handicapped and the Gifted Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me before the Council for Exceptional Children, Chicago, Ill., on April 2, 1964:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, RHODE ISLAND, BEFORE THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 2, 1964

I welcome this opportunity to speak before you who are dedicated to work among the handicapped and the gifted. The Nation owes you a debt of gratitude for devoting your intelligence, energy, time, and drive to serving our children who have difficulty making adjustments in their homes and in their schools. The test of our democracy is not how many cars we have, or how many refrigerators we sell, but the reach and range of the opportunities we extend to all young Americans. In this test of democracy you truly and admirably serve.

In our country we have learned that the vitality of our industry and our Government, of our domestic and our foreign affairs, always finds its taproots in the education of our citizens. We have seen at home and abroad that nations of high literacy generally obtain their social and economic goals

by reasoned evolution, while in lands where revolution is needed for change the people very often are poorly educated.

Our present and future strength clearly rests on the education of all, the best education our society can provide—to the slow-learning child as well as the fast-learning child, to the hearing child and the deaf, to the seeing child and the blind, to the emotionally stable child and the emotionally unstable, to the child who can easily communicate and the child who has not developed the skills of communication.

Failure in our country today to educate all our children to their full capacity is a guarantee of trouble tomorrow. In World War II we saw indelible proof of the havoc created by neglect of adequate universal education. Seeking healthy, educated men for the fortress of freedom, we found vast numbers who were educationally retarded. The military was then forced to establish emergency schools in camps throughout the country. More than 380,000 soldiers admitted into the Army were functionally illiterate and had to be taught to read.

Today the same pattern prevails among those rejected by Selective Service. Today the physically, mentally, and educationally handicapped, including the school dropouts, are found in formidable numbers among the unemployed and on the public assistance rolls. This is the unhappy harvest of our neglect.

I have long recognized and, happily, many of my fellow Congressmen, recognize that the health and educational strength of our citizens form the keystone in the arch of our progress and our greatness. We may spend billions on reaching the moon and succeed, but can be justify our failure to reach millions of our handicapped children here on earth? I say it is high time to replace neglect with the significant advance in the education of our handicapped and gifted children.

Education in this country has been, and rightly so, the role of the local community. But local districts often lack the means of providing adequate education for all the children of the community. As a result, State governments support local schools partially or in large measure. When local and State governments are unable to educate some segment of the population, the Federal Government may temporarily assume responsibility.

Among our handicapped and gifted children, educational progress has been slow. The cost of educating a handicapped child, I am told, is from two to four times as great as the cost of educating the average child. When States began to subsidize local school systems for the organization of classes for handicapped children, they found that they were short of classrooms, short of professional specialists, short of teachers to instruct these classes.

The Office of Education estimates that today we have approximately 50,000 to 60,000 special teachers for handicapped children in the United States, but that we need 200,000 such teachers if we are to give adequate educational opportunity to all handicapped children. The reports we receive in Congress consistently tell us that classes are being organized faster than colleges are training specialized teachers to man them.

We in Congress have recognized that this is an emergency situation requiring Federal assistance, that progress is slow and that much remains to be done. But we have made some promising beginnings.

Federal aid to handicapped children is not new. Congress has appropriated funds for the Public Health Service for many years. In 1946, the National Institutes of Health were organized to conduct research and to train research workers in health and mental health, with special emphasis on the handicapped. The health of the handicapped has received substantial Federal support.

Now I will admit that it has been traditionally easier to pass legislation for health than for education. One reason, of course, is that education is considered a State and local function, and attempts to improve education through Federal assistance often meet with resistance. In recent years, however, this resistance has been slowly giving way.

Probably most of you know of the cooperative research program of the U.S. Office of Education, a long-range and most hopeful effort. In 1957, $1 million was appropriated for this educational program. Initially, two-thirds of that appropriation was earmarked for work in mental retardation. Since then approximately $8 million has been awarded for projects to improve the education of the mentally retarded, the physically handicapped, and the gifted.

In 1959, a training program directed toward mental retardation was created through Public Law 85-926, with the appropriation of $1 million a year to train teachers of these handicapped youth. The U.S. Office of Education reports that by the end of 1964, 835 fellowships will have been granted to 560 individuals under this law.

In 1961, another Federal program for educating the handicapped was launched. This was provided for my Public Law 87-276 which appropriated $1½ million to train teachers of the deaf. At that time, we in Congress were informed that the shortage of teachers of the deaf was severe and increasing at an alaming rate, and that Federal intervention to increase their ranks was a necessity. In the 2-year period from 1962 to 1964, 942 scholarships were awarded to students preparing to become teachers of the deaf.

The cooperative research program and the teacher-training programs for the mentally retarded and the deaf were a modest but important beginning. Much effort was expended by associations, citizens groups, and Congressmen to enact these laws. The dynamic impetus for further advances came through the efforts of President Kennedy. In his messages on health and education, he led the way to greater undertakings.

Congress responded dramatically to this leadership last year with the most significant educational legislation in the whole history of the Office of Education, now nearly 100 years old, and with landmark measures to aid the handicapped.

Among the major legislation passed in 1963 pertaining specifically to the handicapped are Public Law 88-156, entitled "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963," and Public Law 88-164, entitled "Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963."

The first of these measures, maternal and child health, was signed by President Kennedy on October 24, 1963. It was formulated to prevent and combat mental retardation in these specific ways:

It provides funds to assist the States in planning comprehensive State and community action programs for the mentally retarded.

It provides project grants for maternal and infant care.

It increases maternal and child health services.

It increases services for crippled children.

It provides grants for research to improve maternal and child health services.

The second law, entitled "Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963," was signed by President Kennedy on October 31, 1963. It appropriates approximately $329 million over a 5-year period for these purposes:

It provides for the construction of research centers and facilities relating to mental retardation.

It provides for construction and establishment of community mental health centers.

It provides for training of teachers of handicapped children.

It provides for research and demonstration in the education of handicapped children.

In the training of teachers, the law is broader and more comprehensive than previous legislation. It provides for training in all areas of the handicapped and at all levels of preparation—from teacher training to the training of college instructors, research personnel, and the administrators and supervisors of teachers of the handicapped.

In addition to the training of personnel, the new legislation also provides a broader base for research and demonstration in the education of handicapped children. Under the cooperative research program, grants are made only to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies for research and demonstration. The new law extends these grant provisions to public and private school systems, and to nonprofit public and private agencies dealing with handicapped children.

I have spoken of Federal programs now in effect to serve our handicapped and retarded children. Now let me turn to a no less important need—the improved education of America's gifted children.

Congress did not include the gifted child in its 1963 legislation. This does not mean that the Congress lacks interest in gifted children, but that we have not yet determined the role of the Federal Government in promoting higher quality education for gifted children.

Here the Congress and the educational community still have their homework to do—to arrive at specific proposals defining the role of the Federal Government. Should we at the Federal level provide funds for developing materials and curriculums for the gifted? Should we support training grants for the preparation of teachers? What kinds of professionals are needed and for what kinds of programs? Should we start with the preparation of teachers of gifted children as we have with the preparation of teachers of the deaf? Or should we begin by supporting programs for leaders and supervisors of teachers?

I am aware that fine work is now being done in various parts of the country, particularly in the higher socioeconomic areas, in identifying gifted children and adapting programs for them. I am also aware that a far larger proportion of gifted children enter college today from these higher economic areas than from our lower economic levels. These gifted children of the well-to-do are more easily detected from their IQ scores and school grades than children who potentially may be gifted but, because of poor home and neighborhood environments and poor motivation for learning, fail to score high on conventional tests. What can we do to detect these potentially gifted, to strengthen their opportunities for learning, to salvage these rare and overlooked children who could otherwise contribute so greatly to our national well-being?

I would be interested in receiving proposals to assist the Nation in identifying the full range and number of our gifted children and proposals to act upon this knowledge—both among the advantaged and the disadvantaged of our society. These children are truly a vital human resource. To waste their potential—to neglect this latent wellspring of strength—is to perform a shameful disservice to these children and to the future of us all.

Tonight, in reviewing with you some of the Federal legislative programs for the ex-

ceptional child, I would add that the role of Congress is a limited one. We can pass legislation for the handicapped and, hopefully, soon for the gifted. We can appropriate funds. We can encourage the development of programs across the country. But the big and fundamental task begins and ends with you—with the creative wisdom and talent you bring to bear in your own schools and your own communities.

We in Washington canot organize these programs for you. We cannot carry forward the needed research and development. We cannot develop teaching procedures for handicapped or gifted children. But we can make it possible for you to do a better job and this we assuredly should do. Specifically, through legislation, we can hope to stimulate these major results:

First, to increase the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government with State educational agencies, with local school systems, with institutions of higher learning.

Second, to encourage the development and strengthening of special education in our colleges and universities.

Third, to make possible the selection of the most qualified individuals for these special fellowships and traineeships.

Fourth, and last, to increase not only the quantity but also the quality of instruction for these handicapped and gifted children who deserve the best that we can provide.

Now, in conclusion, I wish to pay tribute to you for your dedicated work, to my fellow Congressmen for their legislative vision, to President Johnson for his strong and continuing interest in the education and health of the handicapped, and, finally, to the memory of the late President Kennedy for the legacy of ideas and programs which he has left to us to carry forward. It is befitting at this time to quote from the January issue of your own journal, Exceptional Children:

"The least any of us can do in the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is unselfishly to double our efforts to prevent handicapping conditions in children and to educate and rehabilitate all the handicapped children in our society. This is one substantive measure which we can take so that the eternal flame which now burns in Arlington Cemetery may illuminate the lives and spirits of handicapped children throughout the land."

Tombstone Editor Cast Long Shadow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in February, a light plane crashed into a storm-shrouded mountain in southern Arizona, bring death to Clayton A. Smith and two companions.

Mr. Smith was editor and publisher of the Tombstone Epitaph. He was a man of great talent, energy, and high ideals. Entranced with the rich history of old Tombstone, he devoted much of his life to preserving and spreading word of its colorful past. Largely because of his efforts people throughout the country and even in some other parts of the world are familiar with much of Tombstone's romantic history.

As a dedicated newspaperman, Mr. Smith worked for the betterment of his profession as well as his community. He faithfully served the Arizona Newspapers Association which recently saluted him for "his untiring efforts" to the profession and for his "wide and continuing interest in all phases of community betterment, and in activities designed to encourage and assist the young men and women of Arizona."

Clayton Smith died in the midst of his greatest service. But his accomplishments, particularly his work for Tombstone, have won for him a place in history. This is well stated in the following editorial by Hal D. Stewart in the San Diego Union:

TOMBSTONE EDITOR CAST LONG SHADOW

A man died in the crash of a small plane in southern Arizona the other day, and because of what he did to help preserve the history of the great Southwest his death should not go unnoticed.

He was Clayton A. Smith, editor and publisher of the Tombstone, Ariz., Epitaph.

I first met Clayton Smith in the early 1940's when he acquired the Epitaph. At the time I was a young lieutenant stationed at Fort Huachuca, about 25 miles from Tombstone.

Smith bought the Epitaph because he was fascinated with the history of the Southwest—and some of that greatest history was made in Tombstone when it was a thriving silver mining town in the 1870's and early 1880's.

Clayton Smith enjoyed walking the streets and byways of Tombstone where once trod the legendary figures of Marshal Wyatt Earp, Doc Holliday, the Doc's girl friend, Big Nose Kate, the villainous Curly Bill, the Clanton gang and the others that will forever give the town a place in America's history of the frontier.

It wasn't long after Smith arrived in Tombstone that he took leadership in seeing that many of the historical spots were preserved. He helped establish an annual event during which many of the famous episodes of the old Tombstone where recreated. One was the famous gunfight between the Earp brothers and the Clanton gang at the O.K. Corral. The annual event brought spectators from all over the country.

Smith also worked to restore Tombstone's famous cemetery, Boot Hill. The epitaph on one of the tombstones has always stuck in my memory:

"Here lies Lester Moore
Shot four times
with a forty-four
No less
No Moore."

When he had the time Clayton Smith would stop at the old Crystal Palace Saloon and put his foot on the bar rail as many of the gunfighters and silver miners had done 80 years before.

And he was interested in preserving the Bird Cage Theater, where some of the best known entertainers of the 1870's and 1880's had appeared. The old theater is crumbling away and this always worried Smith. It was a part of the town's history and he hated to see it go.

A few years ago Smith became the technical adviser on a television show called "Tombstone." It was another effort of his to bring recognition to the old town and preserve its heritage.

Tombstone will now be a smaller place without Clayton Smith. But he cast a long shadow while he was there, and he, too, has become a part of its history.

A Tribute to Dr. H. Claude Hudson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a brief biographical sketch of one of the most distinguished and influential citizens of the city of Los Angeles, Dr. H. Claude Hudson. No history of the civil rights movement in California would be complete without mention of his name.

During his 10-year service as the president of the Los Angeles branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People his leadership provided an impetus that made itself felt throughout the Nation. His unwavering devotion to the cause of human freedom continues today as an inspiring example to all of us in the forefront of the battle for the constitutional rights of our citizens. I am proud to join with the community in paying tribute to Dr. Hudson.

The biographical sketch of H. Claude Hudson is the story of a Louisiana sharecropper's son's rise to the presidency of a $44 million savings and loan association, a successful dental practice, and a position of leadership in the civil rights struggle.

He was born in Marksville, La., and was educated in the schools of Louisiana and Texas. He attended Wiley University in Marshall, Tex., prior to entering the Howard University School of Dentistry in Washington, D.C. He graduated from Howard University in 1913 with the degree of D.D.S., and was engaged in the practice of dentistry from 1913 to 1923 in Shreveport, La. Dr. Hudson then moved his family and practice to Los Angeles and is still engaged in the practice of dentistry in Los Angeles.

He is the father of six children, the oldest of whom gave his life in the service of his country during the World War II Normandy invasion.

Dr. Hudson was elected to the presidency of the Shreveport, La., branch of the NAACP in 1921 and served until his departure for Los Angeles. Less than a year after arriving in Los Angeles, he was elected to the presidency of the Los Angeles branch of the NAACP and served 10 consecutive years. During his term of office, he developed the Los Angeles branch into the largest and most effective in the Nation. Since 1934, Dr. Hudson has served the local branch as either vice president or as a member of the executive board.

In 1950, he was elected to the national board of directors of the NAACP, has served continuously since that date, and is presently a member of the executive committee of the national board of directors.

In 1927, Dr. Hudson enrolled in the Loyola University School of Law and

was awarded the LL.B. degree in 1931. His interest in the study of law was to better enable him to carry on the work of the NAACP during his tenure as president.

He is the president of Broadway Federal Savings & Loan Association of Los Angeles, an institution with assets in excess of $44 million. When Dr. Hudson assumed the presidency of the association in 1949, the association had assets of less than $3 million.

In 1962, at Charter Day exercises, Dr. Hudson received the Distinguished Alumnus Award from his alma mater, Howard University, Washington, D.C. In 1963, he was given a distinguished citizens award from the county conference on community relations.

Dr. Hudson is a trustee of the Wesley Methodist Church and is a member of and active in many social, professional, and human relations organizations.

A Tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the gray skies and misting rain we have witnessed in Washington give sad expression to the sorrow we all feel as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the most vivid public servants of our age, lies in honored state under the dome of this Nation's Capitol.

It is a tribute reserved for the great of this country, and the greatness of Douglas MacArthur, a dedicated patriot of freedom, a brilliant military strategist, and a commander of our forces in three wars, was recognized long ago.

During the black hours of World War II, the rugged face, the tarnished hat, the determined look of self-assurance gave hope and confidence to a frightened world. His courage and strong sense of duty, honor and country gave inspiration and valor to the men he led in sacrificing service to this country and the cause of freedom. His own sense of duty is characterized by his uncompromising statement:

> The man who will not defend his freedom does not deserve to be free.

MacArthur was a serious and eloquent man. His high sense of purpose and indomitable moral courage clung to him throughout a lifetime. After the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, when the Filipinos were left alone under cruel enemy occupation, it was to him a moral duty to return.

As Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo reminded us:

> For him to say "I shall return" was to wave the flag of hope, of determination, of undying faith. The guerrillas in the swamps and in the mountains would continue fighting because MacArthur they were sure was coming back. The personal pronoun "I" was MacArthur. His word was his bond.

And MacArthur did return. With moral courage, and a genius for strategy, he led victorious troops across the Pacific into Japan.

Perhaps his great success as a military leader came from his genuine respect for the men he was called to lead. Of the American man of arms he said:

> My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless * * *. In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his stature in the hearts of his people.

This respect that MacArthur held for the average foot soldier has been returned twofold, not only from those who served under him, but from the hearts of people throughout the world who esteem the example he set before us. We may not be able to express it in the same eloquent manner, but our feelings are as deep and as genuine.

General MacArthur was born to military life. The son of Arthur MacArthur, a lieutenant general and one of the outstanding figures of our Civil War, he learned well his lessons in patriotism and love of country. In 1899 he entered his beloved U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and the years spent there were among his dearest memories of a full lifetime.

Four years later he graduated as first in his class. From that point on, the fact that he was outstanding among men was seldom questioned. He became the youngest brigadier in the American Expeditionary Forces of the First World War. He was then made Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, again the youngest in history, and was retained for an unheard of second term under the directions of President Roosevelt.

Then came Pearl Harbor and the devastation of World War II. He was entrusted as supreme commander in the Pacific and brought exceptional leadership to the fight for freedom. He became, as President Johnson said, "one of the authentic American heroes of this century."

At the outbreak of the Korean conflict the free world turned to him as their supreme allied commander. His decision, made against great opposition, concerning the Inchon landing in Korea in 1950, proved to be a brilliant victory. Some historians have expressed the opinion that it may be among the greatest examples of military strategy in history. But MacArthur's dictum, that "There is no substitute for victory," brought him squarely in conflict with the leader of our country. After years of noble service to this Nation he was retired from active military life.

The words he spoke in that memorable and touching farewell speech to Congress point up the great moral courage of the man. He held a strong conviction and, in the face of what he considered to be disgrace—held on to it. It is not for us to judge who was right—future generations will do that for us—but those closing lines expressed the dedication and the courage of an exceptional man, a man whose passing deeply grieves the world. Those lines were:

> Now I close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goodby.

Land Reform in the Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Prairie Farmer magazine of April 4 carries a timely, objective, and helpful comment on the war on poverty as it applies to American agriculture.

The text of the editorial points up the hazards of this aspect of the poverty proposal:

THE NEW CRUSADE: WAR ON POVERTY

We are now embarked on a crusade—a war on poverty. Someone has said that nothing is so irresistible as an idea whose time has come. The war on poverty is such an idea. Most of us want an end to the ignorance, stagnation, futility, and lowered self-esteem that goes with poverty.

But poverty is relative. People who today have running water, gas, electricity, telephone, television, automobile, and bathroom are being classed as poverty stricken. Yet we can remember when neither we nor our neighbors had any of these but never considered ourselves underprivileged.

We suspect that the poverty war has November political overtones. Critics ask if there are enough statistics to make clear what the problem is. For example, retired people with $100,000 in the bank and $3,000 income are classed with the poor who need help. The Labor Department says there are 6 million unemployed. But another authority says there are only 1 million hard-core unemployed, because the bulk of the unemployed are teenage dropouts, married women, and the sick and crippled who are unemployable.

At the reecnt Pure Milk Association meeting in Chicago we listened to two dairymen say that there is nothing tougher in the dairy business today than trying to get good, dependable help. Demand is also strong in business and industry for skilled workers.

Much as we sympathize with the problem of the unemployed and much as we commend the administration for deciding to do something about poverty, we hope they will not rush into this thing blindly. We would like to cite an example of one proposal we feel sure is heading for trouble.

In a speech before the National Farmers Union convention in St. Paul recently, Sargent Shriver, director of the poverty war, proposed that the Government put up the money to buy large tracts of farmland. This land would then, he said, be divided into small farms. Cash grants would be made to the poor families taking over these small tracts.

Size wasn't mentioned. But let's say poor families would be moved onto 40- or 80-acre tracts. It is doubtful that such land would be available in the fertile, high-priced prairies of the lower Midwest. About all that might be available would be in remote

areas like northern Wisconsin and the upper peninsula of Michigan.

This seems to be a harebrained idea lifted from land-reform programs proposed for backward countries. How would poor families with little or no capital handle such acreage? With a job in town, they could cut food costs. Without a town job—and we wonder where such jobs would be found in remote areas—they would starve. It would be uneconomic to invest in machinery for such a small acreage, and even if it weren't, where would they get the money to finance it? Then there are real estate taxes to pay. Schools and roads would be costly, so land taxes would be high.

Questioned about the futility of such a program, Shriver said: "If a poor family is only earning $1,500 and we can raise it by this program to $3,000 we will have accomplished a great deal." True enough, but we still would have little more than a rural slum or a form of rationed poverty.

The problem of poverty in country or city should be attacked with the tools of education and the incentives of opportunity. Shriver said, "Soon we will eliminate poverty completely from this land." If all men were thrifty and industrious, we would agree, but all men aren't.

So let's be sure we know where we are going before we start out on tangents like this. A thorough study by hardheaded, knowledgeable people would be a good place to start. Enough mistakes have been made in agricultural planning without adding another.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Texas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation mourns General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, we find ourselves united once more in shared sadness and reflection.

The lives of us all have been lifted by the force of this man's character.

We who live in Texas are glad that our State contributed to the formation of his life, as his life later contributed to ours.

As a boy in his teens, Douglas MacArthur spent in the State of Texas what he called in his memoirs, "the happiest days of my life." Later he served in Texas as a young officer in the Army of the United States.

General MacArthur recounts in his life story that his first memories are of a tour of duty his father Gen. Arthur MacArthur, served on the Rio Grande River at Fort Seldon near El Paso.

At 13, Douglas MacArthur was enrolled at the newly established West Texas Military Academy in San Antonio. There he achieved high scholastic standing and honors. He was quarterback of the football team and a tennis champion.

Writing of his years at the West Texas Military Academy near Fort Sam Houston, General MacArthur said:

It was here that a transformation began in my development. There came a desire to know, a seeking for the reasons why, a zest to learn the facts. Gradually an overwhelming thirst for knowledge seized me.

That the late General MacArthur regarded Texas with the same esteem with which the State of Texas and its people regard this great national hero is reflected in his words:

It was a wrench to leave San Antonio. My few years there were without a doubt the happiest of my life. Texas will always be a second home to me.

In Texas the past is important. The soldier whose body lies in state here today will be remembered.

The War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the crisis we face in southeast Asia continues to be one of the most serious problems confronting the free world. The chief of the Washington Bureau for the Gannett News Service, Paul Martin, has written an outstanding summary of the events that have led to the situation we face in that beleaguered area. We often overlook or forget the nature of events and decisions that lead to difficult situations. This is regretable because we should learn from them. Mr. Martin has performed an outstanding service by recalling for all of us the major events and decisions that have led to the present crisis in Vietnam.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, April 6.—Of all the foreign problems confronting the United States around the world, the most baffling to the administration is the Communist guerrilla war in southeast Asia.

This is the longest continuing war of modern times. It has been going on intermittently for more than 20 years, or since the Japanese occupation in World War II of the former French colonies in Indochina, now known as Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.

Casualty reports show that 205 American soldiers have been killed in combat or service accidents in South Vietnam since the United States embarked on a stepped-up military assistance program in 1961.

Gen. Paul D. Harkins, Chief of the U.S. Military Mission, said 10,000 South Vietnamese were killed in combat during 1962. No later figures are available.

A dispatch from Saigon last November placed the strength of U.S. personnel in the country at 16,500 military and 3,500 civilians.

Military and economic assistance figures supplied to Congress show the continuing jungle warfare has cost American taxpayers $5 billion in the last 10 years.

The current foreign aid program to South Vietnam is running at a level of $500 million a year.

Between 1946 and 1954, when the United States supported France in a 7½-year losing war against the Communists in North Vietnam, the cost was more than $3 billion.

The National Assembly in Paris was informed that the United States was paying 78 percent of the bill for the anti-Communist war in Indochina, or around $1.5 billion a year.

The French claimed at the time of 1954 partition of Vietnam that they had suffered 253,000 casualties, including 92,000 killed, 114,000 wounded, and 28,000 prisoners. Communist losses were estimated at more than 200,000 dead.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have made four factfinding journeys to Saigon in the last 2 years in an effort to find a solution.

Henry Cabot Lodge, former U.N. Ambassador and 1960 Republican nominee for Vice President, was appointed by the late President Kennedy as U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam on June 27, 1963, in overall charge of the diplomatic, economic, and military effort.

During his tenure, there have been two changes of government in Saigon.

Ngo Dinh Diem was ousted as President in a military uprising November 1–2, 1963, in which 34 soldiers or civilians were killed and 236 wounded. Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were assassinated. Madame Nhu, on tour in America at the time, accused the United States of inciting and supporting the revolt, which placed a military junta in charge.

The military junta was overthrown in a bloodless coup last January 30 led by Gen. Nguyen Khanh who became the new Premier. Khanh charged on March 1 that French agents plotted to assassinate him, overthrow his regime, and join with Communists in imposing a "neutralist" settlement on Vietnam.

Communists took advantage of the confusion to increase their attacks on government-controlled strategic hamlets and communications in South Vietnam. They launched a new campaign of terrorism against Americans stationed in Saigon.

U.S. officials say that if South Vietnam were all that mattered, we could pull out. The country doesn't mean that much to us in trade or raw materials. Its principal exports are rice and rubber. Both are surplus in the United States, but would be of considerable value to the economy of Red China.

The country has a population of some 14 million, compared to 16 million in Communist North Vietnam. About 85 percent of the South Vietnamese are engaged in farming, and 70 percent of them are illiterate. They have a per capita income of around $94 a year, and a gross national product of $1.4 billion. The country is a food surplus area with a strategic location in southeast Asia.

Government officials claim that what is really at stake here is the prestige and power position of the United States throughout the entire Pacific.

If the Communists took over South Vietnam, they would turn the same tactics on Thailand, Malaysia and perhaps the Philippines. Next would come Burma, India and Japan. Alliance with the United States would become of dubious value in the Orient.

The essential problem is how to preserve the freedom and independence of the region, without becoming involved in a conventional war against the masses of Red China, or a general nuclear conflict over the rice paddies and steaming jungles of southeast Asia.

The following sequence of events illuminates the nature of the long and frustrating struggle:

YEARS 1941–46

During Gen. Douglas MacArthur's fight for the Pacific in World War II, the United States gave military aid to Ho Chi Minh, a Moscow-trained Communist and veteran Soviet agent, who led a native uprising against Japanese occupation forces in Vietnam.

When the French tried to regain their position in Indochina after the war, Ho seized power, proclaimed a "people's republic," and fired on Hanoi December 19, 1946, starting a civil war.

The United States provided military and economic assistance to French Union Forces for 7½ years. After the Communist conquest of the China mainland in 1949, Ho's followers were supplied from Red China.

IN 1954

The French were on the verge of collapse by 1954.

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in a supposedly "off-the-record" speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, said the United States would have to send troops to Vietnam, if there was no other way to prevent its fall to the Communists.

With the Korean war fresh in mind, Nixon's remarks raised a storm of protest in Congress and the press. Senator John F. Kennedy demanded that administration say whether "we are about to enter the jungle and do battle with the tiger." He urged "independence at once" for Indochina.

Former President Eisenhower told newsmen he was bitterly opposed to involving the United States in a hot war in Indochina. He claimed it would be a "terrible tragedy." Former Defense Secretary C. E. Wilson predicted a military victory was both possible and probable.

France, Britain, and the Soviet Union negotiated truce agreements at Geneva on July 21, supposedly ending the war by dividing Vietnam into a Communist North and a free South at the 17th parallel.

The United States refused to become a party to these agreements. Former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles warned that a Communist victory would lead to Red domination of all of southeast Asia, posing a grave threat to security of the entire Pacific.

Eisenhower said "the agreement contains features we do not like," but avoided calling it "appeasement." Adlai Stevenson termed it "A victory for communism," in which the United States "defaulted and France salvaged what she could."

Ho Chi Minh promised over Peiping radio to "liberate" the rest of Vietnam. He said the Communists would use the cease-fire to "adjust the military zones as the first step toward our final goal."

The State Department said in a 1961 documentary:

"Even as they were negotiating the Geneva accords * * * the Communists were making plans to take over all of Vietnam. Trained and well-disciplined party members were picked to remain in the south * * * arms and ammunition were cached in hundreds of carefully selected spots throughout South Vietnam."

YEARS 1955–60

Ngo Dinh Diem, a Roman Catholic and anti-Communist Nationalist, replaced the playboy emperor, Bao Dai, as leader of South Vietnam. Diem was hailed as a miracle man in pulling the country together.

The State Department said:

"When the republic of Vietnam was born in 1955, its economy was a shambles. Years of foreign occupation, wartime bombing, bitter fighting with the French, and internal battles with dissident elements had left confusion in their wake.

"The years 1956 to 1960 produced something of an economic miracle in South Vietnam. * * * Prewar levels of production were achieved and passed * * * South Vietnam was outstripping the North in the same fashion that West Germany has exceeded achievements of the 'Socialist' East. The leaders in Hanoi could not accept that prospect."

In 1959 the Communists launched a campaign of terror against the people of South Vietnam, using torture and assassination.

"They killed hundreds of village chiefs and other local officials * * * schoolteachers, even wives and children, have been among the victims," the State Department reported. "It is a program that relies on every available technique for spreading disorder in a peaceful society."

IN 1961

One month after the U.S. presidential election in 1960, the Soviets began supplying arms and ammunition to Communist forces in Laos by airlift out of Hanoi. By March 1961 Communists in battalion formations had launched a major offensive with heavy artillery, machineguns, mortars, and armored cars.

Former President Kennedy in a dramatic TV appearance on March 23 warned the Soviet Union that the United States "will not tolerate the loss of Laos to the Communists." He called for a neutral and independent country as pledged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman negotiated new agreements at Geneva supposedly guaranteeing the neutrality of Laos under a coalition government.

The Communists, however, continued to make gains. A State Department official said "The most important route for Communist reinforcements and supplies coming into South Vietnam is through Laos."

An international control commission including India, Canada, and Poland has never been allowed to function behind Communist lines in southeast Asia, any more than a similar neutral nations commission in Korea.

U.S. involvement in the war has grown steadily since late 1961 when advisory, support, and training units were sent to South Vietnam along with large amounts of military equipment. American troops began ferrying South Vietnamese units in airplanes and helicopters, giving them logistics and communications support, and guiding them in combat.

The "strategic hamlet" program was launched to fortify villages against hit-run attacks by Communist guerrillas.

IN 1962

Former President Kennedy told newsmen March 14 there were no U.S. combat troops in Vietnam. He said that if a constitutional decision were required on sending in American armed forces, "I would go to Congress."

Communist forces increased from 12,000 in 1961 to more than 20,000 men in 1962. McNamara said after a trip to Saigon that U.S. aid had enabled the Diem government to "take the offensive." General Taylor announced in Manila "the Vietnamese are on the road to victory."

Diem told his national assembly October 9 that South Vietnam, with 200,000 troops in the field, had "reversed" the advantages won by Communists in 1961. American correspondents, however, claimed the war was being lost, or would take years to win.

Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi promised to "outlast" American aid by keeping up guerrilla warfare for 10 years if necessary.

IN 1963

When a Bhuddist religious controversy broke out in 1963, Kennedy appointed Lodge as his new envoy to Saigon, and hinted the United States might like a change in the Government of South Vietnam.

The Diem regime was overthrown in a military coup on November 1–2 when artillery and planes supplied by the United States for anti-Communist warfare attacked the presidential palace.

Meanwhile, President de Gaulle, of France, recognized Red China, and proposed that both North and South Vietnam be transformed into a unified, "neutral" state with French aid if the Vietnamese were prepared to throw off "foreign influence" wielded by the United States and Communist nations.

American officials reacted with anger and amazement. President Kennedy rejected the proposal, pledged the United States would not withdraw from South Vietnam until the Communist menace had been crushed. "After carrying this load for 18 years," he said, "we are glad to get a little counsel, but we would like a little more assistance."

Returning from another inspection trip, McNamara and Taylor issued a White House statement saying "in their judgment, the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965." McNamara thought 1,000 American troops could be withdrawn by the end of 1964.

President Johnson assumed office on November 22. He met immediately afterward with Ambassador Lodge, pledged his administration would carry out U.S. policies toward Vietnam established by the Kennedy administration.

IN 1964

McNamara told Congress January 27 that the Communists had made "considerable progress" since the coup that overthrew the Diem regime. He reported the "new Government has more support than its predecessor." The new Government, or military junta, was overthrown in another coup on January 30.

President Johnson rejected the De Gaulle plan for neutrality as being against "the interests of freedom." He warned in a speech at Los Angeles February 21 that the suppliers and directors of Communists in South Vietnam were playing "a deeply dangerous game."

The State Department later sought to dispel reports that the administration was considering carrying the war to North Vietnam with the same guerrilla tactics the Communists are using in the south.

McNamara and Taylor returned from another trip to Saigon, lauded Premier Khanh for his "leadership and military ability," and pledged U.S. support for South Vietnam for "as long as it takes" to defeat the Communists.

The White House said that Khanh had produced "a sound central plan for prosecution of the war." Following a National Security Council meeting March 17, President Johnson announced the U.S. Government would send increased economic and military assistance to support the war plan of the new Premier.

That is where the situation stands today.

Eulogy of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Members in expressing my sorrow over the death of General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur. As one of the millions of American servicemen who served under General MacArthur during the Pacific campaigns of World War II, I have personal recollection of some of his greatest triumphs.

Certainly, in the proper judgment of military observers, General MacArthur has earned a place in history as one of our greatest military geniuses. His World War II strategy was almost flawless in its development and was especially noteworthy for the fact that his plan produced effective recovery of territory from the Japanese with a minimum loss of American lives.

We are all mindful of the frustrations to which General MacArthur was subject during his command of the forces in the Korean war. He was one of the first victims of foreign policy decisions which

prevented clear-cut victory in the war against communism. The American people still remember his logical and dramatic emphasis on the fact that the purpose of war is victory.

Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur served our country in his military capacity for over 50 years, and his service was one of dedication, honor, courage, and, above all, triumphant accomplishments of American military forces.

A nation joins us in paying tribute to this great soldier. This Saturday when he is laid to his final rest, bugles will sound over his grave, and his soul will take its place at the head of a long line of heroes who have served our country so well.

Navy Creating Institute of Oceanography Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it was a real pleasure to learn recently that the U.S. Navy is creating an Institute of Naval Oceanology. Although it appears to be much less than the commitment this country should be making to the study of inner space, it is a step toward the type of oceanography program I had been advocating for some time.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a short article by Mr. John G. Norris, from the Los Angeles Times, which discusses the new Naval Institute of Oceanology in more detail:

NAVY CREATING INSTITUTE OF OCEANOGRAPHY STUDY

(By John G. Norris)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy is creating a Naval Institute of Oceanology here to speed the scientific and military development of inner space.

The Institute will coordinate research, development, and applications work in oceanography, which many believe should be pushed with the same vigor as the national space program.

There has been criticism in Congress and the scientific community about the fragmentation of effort in oceanography, and some have urged the establishment of an independent agency similar to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

RUSSIA PROGRAM

They declare that Russia has a larger oceanography program underway than the United States and cite the words of Soviet scientist G. V. Petrovich: "The nation which first learns to understand the seas will control them, and the nation which controls the seas will control the world."

The exploration and exploitation of the oceans could be of immense importance militarily—and perhaps even more as a source of food, water, minerals, and chemicals for the world's exploding population.

Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, the Navy oceanographer, disclosed the decision to set up the Naval Institute of Oceanology. Full details of the reorganization have not been worked out, but it clearly falls far short of being a "NASA for inner space."

The Government's oceanographic program, expanded greatly in recent years, is split between the Navy, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, Coast Guard, Geological Survey, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Public Health Service, Atomic Energy Commission, Smithsonian Institution and National Science Foundation.

An interagency committee on oceanography, operating under the White House office of science and technology, coordinates the program. Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development James H. Wakelin is chairman of the interagency committee.

COMBINATION PLAN

Wakelin, said Knoll in an interview, has directed that the Navy's oceanographic effort be pulled together in the new naval institute. For the present, it will informally combine the major portion of Knoll's oceanographic office with those activities of the office of naval research concerned with oceanography.

"We visualize the Naval Institute of Oceanology becoming the focal point of oceanographic effort for the Navy, other Government departments, scientific circles, and industry," said Knoll.

Whether such coordination of effort will satisfy those who want more centralized direction remains to be seen. But Navy officials feel that coordination rather than merger of activities is the best way to make progress.

U.S. Army School in Canal Zone Is Pro-Reds' Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Daily News was written by Clayton Willis who was recently in Panama. He describes the operations of the little-known School of the Americas there and I think Members would be interested in reading it:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 12, 1964]

U.S. ARMY SCHOOL IN CANAL ZONE IS PRO-REDS' TARGET

(By Clayton Willis)

FORT GULICK, C.Z.—The Panama Canal controversy has given the South American Reds, Fidelistas, Panamanian leftists, and Yankee haters in general an opportunity to make a propaganda target of a little publicized project called the School of the Americas.

After the recent riots, denunciations of the school appeared in Panama's newspapers.

The School of the Americas is operated in the Canal Zone. Uncle Sam has put a lot of money and brains into it. In a very real sense, it is a keystone in the military security of South American nations against armed subversion and revolution.

TEACH GUERRILLA WAR

Big role of the "school" is to teach Latin American military men techniques to fight successfully insurgency and guerrilla war. How well it does this can be judged by the fact that Fidel Castro is very unhappy about the existence of the school, and its site.

The Cuban leader and his Panamanian henchmen would like to see the present canal treaty torn up and a new one negotiated which would reduce the U.S. control of the zone area, because, among other considerations, squeezing the United States out would squeeze out the school.

By and large, the School of the Americas and its activities are popular with Panamanians. For one thing, it pleases them that the school's instructors all must speak Spanish to teach the 31-odd courses.

FOUNDED IN 1949

The school occupies a sprawling piece of tropical, sunbathed land sandwiched in between lakes, canals and heavy jungle which, like the rest of the zone, is leased from the Republic of Panama.

It was founded in 1949. At first, it trained U.S. Army technicians but by 1963, emphasis had switched and 1,397 students who graduated were Latin Americans, while only 41 were from the U.S. Army.

Overall total up to December 31, 1963, is 14,903 Latin American students and more than 8,000 U.S. graduates. The Latin American graduate group includes 291 pre-Castro Cubans.

Says the U.S. commandant, Col. H. J. Muller, Jr., "Latin Americans from all countries come here. They exchange ideas. While their countries themselves might not always be on the best of terms with each other, their delegates here in the school mix well."

Intelligence value of the school is great, since it is an ideal chance for our people to meet and watch in action top military men from Latin America and can keep in touch with them as they move up through various commands in their own countries.

EXTENSIVE COURSES

Courses themselves vary from 2-week counterinsurgency courses to 40-week command, staff, and cadet courses, all aimed at establishing internal security and nation-building practices necessary to stamp out Communist-led and Communist-fed insurrections, including counterinsurgency operations, military intelligence, police work, command and staff training, infantry and jungle operations as well as paramilitary, political, sociological and psychological defense.

Here are the number of graduates, by countries:

Nicaragua, 2,729; Ecuador, 1,564; Costa Rica, 1,554; Panama, 1,347; Colombia, 1,321; Venezuela, 1,015; and several hundred from various other areas.

The Air Force Academy's First Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register on the "Air Force Academy's First Decade":

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY'S FIRST DECADE

Ten years ago on 1 April 1954 President Eisenhower signed the legislation authorizing establishment of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

In that short time, this newest of service academies was set up and has graduated five classes. Even before its first class was graduated in 1959, USAFA won academic accreditation as an institution of higher learning by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

It lists among its other acocmplishments:

Seven Rhodes scholarships have been awarded members of its five graduating classes, placing it among the top four colleges and universities in percentage of graduates so honored.

Academic success has been remarkable as shown by the scores achieved by cadets on the graduate record examination in comparison with those of graduating students at 231 representative colleges and universities throughout the country. The class of 1962 ranked first in the social science area among the 231 schools, and the classes of 1959, 1960, and 1961 were second.

The USAF Academy was the first undergraduate school in the Nation to establish a Department of Astronautics.

The Engineering Council for Professional Development authorized the Air Force Academy to award engineering degrees, making it the first service academy to receive this accreditation.

Of the Academy's all-military faculty 21.6 percent have doctorates and the remainder master's degrees.

Military training motivation was revealed in 1962 when 85 of the cadets gave up their leave to enroll in paratroop training at Fort Benning, Ga. No cadets were eliminated and 1 cadet was first in a class of 700.

Cadets at the Air Force Academy complete a 4-year program of academics, military training, and physical training totaling 186½ semester credit hours, whereas engineering schools require 140 to 145 hours and the average liberal arts college 120 to 130 hours. Furthermore, half of the cadets enter courses in an enrichment program, as a result of which 25 percent of the graduates have earned majors in one or more areas.

For some years, USAF Academy leaders have sought authority—it would require legislation—to confer master's degrees. There has been some opposition. Certainly, in view of USAFA's outstanding record, the proposal should be thoroughly explored before a final decision is made.

Credit for the Academy's remarkable achievements in such a short span of years goes to many. It goes, for example, to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay and his predecessors as Chief of Staff, who have insisted that top priority be given to the assignment of instructor and administrative personnel for the Academy. It must go, too, to the fine caliber of officers who have served as Superintendents of the Academy: Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon, 1954–56; Lt. Gen. James E. Briggs, 1956–59; Lt. Gen. William S. Stone, 1959–62, and Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, the present Superintendent.

The services and the Nation have reason to be proud of this addition to the national academies at its 10th anniversary.

A Tribute to the Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year Future Homemakers of America Week is observed from April 5 through April 11, and it is with pleasure that I pay tribute to this fine organization which prepares our young women to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

The membership of more than one-half million is drawn from those junior and senior high school students who are studying home economics in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the United States. The national organization is composed of chartered State associations which are made up of local chapters. Kentucky was the first State to charter the Future Homemakers of America. Cosponsors are the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the American Home Economics Association.

I am proud of the local chapters, in the Second District of Kentucky. They conduct programs that give the homemaking student training and experience in home management, child care, family relations, and community service. Through their participation in civic projects, they demonstrate their sense of good citizenship and become highly valuable members of the community. Assisting and guiding their endeavors are the home economics teachers who devote the extra hours that have made this a vital organization.

To attain the Future Homemakers of America goal of helping individuals improve personal, family, and community living, the national projects for the period 1962–65 are: First, you and your values; second, focus on family friendship; third, marriage calls for preparation; fourth, stay in school; fifth, action for citizenship. An example of a project in action is the stay-in-school project. Using slogans such as "Diplomas Open Doors—Stay in School," "Dropouts Are Leftouts—Stay in School," and "If You Don't Learn, You Won't Earn—Stay in School," they encourage their school friends to graduate. They assist potential dropouts by tutoring in problem subjects, advising on workable study habits, and sponsoring financial assistance when needed. The limitless possibilities of each of these projects reveals the scope and depth of this organization which so ably develops mature, skilled, responsible young women.

The complex nature of our modern society has, of course, a direct effect on the American housewife. The mastering of household skills, rearing of children, and the continual developing of herself as a creative, intelligent member of society are challenges for which she must be prepared. And, today, over 12 million women are assuming the dual responsibilities of homemaker and jobholder. The Future Homemakers of America recognizes the multiplicity of roles expected of women today and helps prepare them for their responsibilities to themselves, their families, and their communities.

The invaluable quality of a homemaker is her ability to bring love, harmony, and a knowledge of God to the family unit. Without the family's working together as a whole, each member respecting the distinctiveness of the other, the child would never appreciate the value of cooperation and of respect for the rights of others. It is in the home that the child is exposed to, and adopts, a reverence for God, and a deep understanding of America's goals and purposes. The complex role of homemaker is vital to our strength as a free and Christian Nation. Again, I salute the Future Homemakers of America for their past achievements and wish them continued success in all of their future endeavors.

Promoting the Arts at the Local Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the early days of the Republic the performing arts have received the support of the American people, but unfortunately this has been limited in great measure to only the largest cities, such as New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. Even in Washington, with the exception of the fine National Symphony Orchestra, the performing arts are relatively recent arrivals.

Fortunately, all this is changing. Today, in many medium size cities across the country efforts are underway, or already in operation, to bring the arts to all the people.

One such program which has met with an enthusiastic reception is the Academy Royale Theater at Palm Beach, established by Mr. Frank J. Hale. A nonprofit educational institution for the purpose of developing a center for the performing arts, with particular emphasis on ballet, the theater has been founded almost singlehanded and with great energy and enthusiasm by Mr. Hale. A successful industrialist, and former performer himself, he has given of his time, energies, and resources to guide the community effort needed to make the theater a success.

The theater, in addition to bringing to Florida internationally known artists will further scientific and educational research in the field of the theater and the ballet.

Perhaps the best illustration of the value of this enterprise, and its success, can be seen from the following letter, received by Mr. Hale from the music director of a well-known theater on Long Island:

> We heard increasingly enthusiastic reports about the Academy Royale Theater * * *. We took those with the usual grain of salt growing out of every present local patriotism. Attending the opener of your 1963–64 season afforded me to form a personal opinion of the whole project * * *. Your theater is a jewel, an oasis in the desert * * *. You are carrying the flag of the decentralization of the arts without which our country will never achieve the cultural level of the great nations of the world.

The people of Palm Beach are to be commended for their interest in, and their support of, the Academy Royale Theater. The community is indeed fortunate to have the valuable talents of Mr. Frank Hale to lead the theater from idea to fulfillment. It is sincerely hoped that other areas will follow the example of towns like Palm Beach, and encourage greater participation in the performing arts.

Cotton-Wheat Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the elimination of two-price cotton is not only of great merit but is overwhelmingly approved by the American people.

The textile industry has been for years beset by a series of adverse legal and economic developments, of which two-price cotton is one, responsible for serious dislocations. The adoption of this bill will lift at least one heavy, competitive burden from this gravely afflicted industry and its earnest, industrious, hard-working employees.

How such an unfair concession to foreign industry, so discriminatory against our own industry, so injurious to its workers, so disastrous to its interests, so totally unsound either as a foreign aid or trade measure, on the whole so objectionable from every standpoint, is like many other things that have been done by this Government in the fields of foreign aid and foreign trade wholly impossible to understand on any rational basis.

Two-price cotton should have been repealed long ago. So let us repeal it now once and for all, and never allow a similar tactic to bedevil and besmirch our foreign aid, trade or agricultural programs.

Regarding the wheat provisions of this bill, I am not exactly cheering them. I have long been at variance with many of our farm programs.

However, many erroneous statements have been made concerning the wheat provisions of this bill. I am assured, however, from responsible committee members, Government officials and experts in the field that this bill will not involve a bread tax nor will it cause an increase in bread prices.

It would be a distortion of economic realities to contend that the bill, of itself, will cause any increase in the so-called staff of life upon which our consumers and people depend.

Moreover, we have our overall agriculture surpluses to consider. These surpluses are very costly to the Government and to the economy and the people. They are unjustified, highly detrimental and must be resolved at the earliest possible time, although the efforts to date of several political administrations have not borne much fruit.

I have struggled hard to try to find adequate solutions here, but the hard core of the farm problems have tenaciously resisted any practical solution.

It has been my view that every administration should be entitled to try its own plan, if it seemed at all feasible. Accordingly, I have felt that these plans had to be judged on their own merits and when they were clearly unjustified or a bad second edition of previously enacted laws that had failed to accomplish the results claimed for them, they should be rejected.

Admittedly, the wheat provisions of this bill must definitely be placed in the category of legislation which represents another try to find solutions.

It is on this basis that I can find support for the entire bill, and I hope that what is being done here today will work out satisfactorily. After all, some effort must be made to establish a practical, workable, sensible, economical farm program. We can no longer delay coming to grips with these extremely complex, difficult and costly farm programs. I hope this bill will provide part of the answer to these problems.

Address by E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Before the National Association of Broadcasters, Chicago, April 7, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, April 7, 1964, the Honorable E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, made a most interesting and thought-provoking speech to the National Association of Broadcasters at their annual convention held at the Conrad-Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., which I wish to call to the attention of the Congress. I, therefore, ask that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY E. WILLIAM HENRY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 7, 1964

Governor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am doubly honored on this occasion. It is not only a privilege to address this distinguished association, but a high honor indeed to speak to the same group that heard Governor Collins yesterday and who will tomorrow listen to Dr. Billy Graham. Collins to Henry to Graham—if that combination doesn't give you religion, I suppose nothing will.

Several months ago I was chatting with a well-known syndicated columnist. We agreed that sometimes criticism—of a political candidate or any prominent figure—proves to be a blessing in disguise. This columnist confided to me that some years ago a Congressman, up for reelection, had come to him and pleaded to be criticized in one or two articles which would be carried in the Congressman's local newspaper. "He figured," said the columnist, "that if I criticized him, he would surely be reelected."

The other side of that coin we all know—praise from one source can result in condemnation from another. So, when LeRoy Collins faced your board of directors last January, I remained tactfully silent. Now, as I speak to you for the first time as chairman I feel obligated to say to you—as my first order of business—that in Roy Collins you have one of the most able and conscientious men that it has been my privilege to know. A lawyer by profession, a great State's chief executive by popular demand, and a first-class human being by every sound standard, he is a wonderfully effective advocate for your cause. You are fortunate indeed to have him and I am proud to share this platform with him today and to call him my good friend.

One of the three luncheon gatherings at your annual convention is traditionally set aside for the Chairman of the FCC to speak his piece. Without changing that format, I'd like to put the spotlight briefly on my fellow Commissioners seated here at the head table.

These Commissioners are collectively bipartisan but individually independent. Their differening philosophies reflect their diverse backgrounds. Overall, they represent an amalgam of experience and ability which this industry and the public have seldom if ever had at their service.

You all know Commissioner Lee Loevinger, our newest acquisition. He is the highly competent ex-member of the Minnesota Supreme Court and ex-Assistant Attorney General of the United States, whose abilities compensate for his retiring, shy, soft-spoken manner. He assures me that he is not really against multiple ownership, but his wife also confides that each of their children is allowed but one toy.

Ken Cox is the only man in the history of the Commission to be "dropped in" from Chief of the Broadcast Bureau to Commissioner, and you broadcasters are fortunate to have a man on the Commission who knows as much about your industry as he does. He is our expert on television allocations, and the only Commissioner who thinks as much, if not more, of local live programing than I do.

Fred Ford has served the Commission with distinction in many capacities, ranging from general attorney through Chief of the Broadcast Bureau's Hearing Division to Chairman. He is the only member, who, at the drop of a hat, can deliver a well-rounded speech on every major section of the Communications Act. He is a man of high principles—but whose golf score is not as low as he claims.

Next in line up the ladder comes Robert (Ultrahigh Frequency) Lee, the only Irish Catholic Republican Commissioner from Chicago on any Federal agency. As you know, his wit is as unique as his background. As a 10-year veteran of Commission battles and a former FBI agent, he is the FCC's candidate for broadcasting's big brother.

Bob Bartley was once one of you—before he decided to go straight. A former professional broadcaster, he remains an unprofessional Texan, a dedicated public servant, and our Defense Commissioner who needs no defending. All commissions should have one Bob Bartley.

Rosel Hyde—who has been affectionately dubbed "the old grey fox"—completes the picture. He is a Mormon with only one wife, who doesn't have to smoke or drink to have fun, a career public servant, and a high-class individual in every sense of the word. As senior member of the Commissions, he votes just before I do—but not always the same way.

The members of this distinguished group occasionally fail to recognize the brilliance of their chairman's proposals, but I am delighted to take this occasion to express publicly my appreciation, and I'm sure yours as well, for the manner in which they discharge the high public trust reposed in them.

Having talked about the Commission as individuals, let's discuss them for a moment as a voting body. What has our record been since we saw you in Chicago last year?

The regulation of advertising time standards, better known as overcommercialization, has been in the forefront of late. You all know what happened, but let me suggest to you again that there may be more in our notice terminating the proceeding than readily meets the eye.

I would have preferred a rule. A Commission majority, however, preferred to continue the case-by-case approach, and in a democratic society compromise is a way of life. The Commission still has not indicated the number of commercials or the percentage of time devoted to advertising that will cause some application, some time, to be honored with a designation for hearing. But it has made a start by letting you know that renewal applications from stations showing the highest levels of commercial activity will be given a thorough going over. Having looked closely at a few of these applications, we have found it necessary to write to some licensees about the nature of their commercial policies, how they mesh such policies with public need, and the reasons for their departures in practice from the policies they profess to follow.

In this way we are moving toward the development of sound regulatory standards in this field. The process may be painful to some, more painful, I think, than a rule would have been, but it is healthy and necessary.

I would also remind you, when and if the Commission decides to look reality in the face and put overcommercializers to the test of a hearing, you may want a specific rule then as much as you shun it now. You might even then recognize that legislation to prevent rulemaking in this field is not a protective barricade, but a sandbag in disguise.

In this same vein, we have instituted an inquiry into loud commercials. In my mind there is no question but that action should be taken by the Commission, and that a solution can be found I am also pleased to note that your code board, under the able direction of Howard Bell, has the problem under study.

Recorded commercials are louder than program content—ninety-nine and fourty-four one-hundreths percent of the time. You may slice them lengthwise or crosswise, color a discussion of them with technical terms, and put meters in front of them that register different things at different times, but most radio and television commercials are simply too loud. You do not have to live in an apartment building and be aware of your neighbor's television set only during the commercials in order to recognize the problem. It is noticeable in your living room and mine.

A man from Florida recently wrote me an interesting letter on this subject. He said:

"DEAR CHAIRMAN HENRY: Television has had its share of criticism, but I want you to know that I get a great deal out of it. I was inspired by President Kennedy's appeal to this country for physical fitness, and I think the television stations are doing their bit.

"On the particular stations I listen to the commercials are so loud that I must get up about 8 times every 15 minutes to go to my set—4 times to turn the commercials down, and 4 times to turn the program up. I am in great physical shape because of it, and I want to compliment the television industry for its cooperation."

We know that television commercials are intentionally made loud for two reasons: first, to make an impression on the average viewer; and second, to hold the attention of Aunt Nellie who heads for the kitchen to stir the soup at every program interruption. We also know that loudness is primarily a matter of excess compression and that the elimination of such compression, though not the complete answer, will go a long way toward solving the problem. It remains for the Commission to require the elimination of excess compression in a manner consistent with sound regulatory and administrative practices. This is all that remains.

Here is a perfect opportunity for the broadcasters to be of help—to be positive rather than negative, to be progressive rather than reactionary. You won't lose a single customer and your sponsors can still make their pitch without the change of one single word. A few of you have been helpful; more should do likewise.

As William B. Lewis, chairman of the board of Kenyon and Eckhardt, has told you, "sooner or later the pitchman will pass in radio and TV as he has passed on the midway. The faster you boot him out the easier your public relations will be, and the happier your image."

Also during the past year the Commission renewed the licenses of the Pacifica Foundation radio stations which had been on deferred status for over 3 years. Complaints originally came to the Commission from several sources and varied from disgust over allegedly obscene programing to charges of the possible affiliation of key personnel with the Communist Party.

Now, when a regulatory agency is called upon to handle allegedly obscene Communists, it indeed has a hot potato on its hands. The Pacifica potato was admittedly handled gingerly for too many months, but I am proud that the Commission showed its calluses while I was its chairman. It issued a forceful, broad-gaged opinion clearing Pacifica of the charges levied against it. In my judgment, this action will stand as a bulwark against the enemies of free broadcasting and free speech.

At every public meeting of broadcasters I have attended, a speaker has only to declare himself in favor of "freedom" to be rewarded by an automatic burst of applause. But oratory is easy; firm action is difficult. Surely, if ever there was a time when the freedom of broadcasting was at stake, this was it. Who took the action in this case?

Which State association sent delegations to Congress charging that the FCC had deferred the Pacifica licenses for an unwarranted period and was operating outside its jurisdiction? Which of you wrote me a letter urging the Commission to dismiss these charges and to reaffirm the Commission's time-honored adherence to the principles of free broadcasting? Where were your libertarian lawyers and their amicus briefs—your industry statesmen with their ringing speeches? Did the sound and fury reach no ears but ours?

If broadcasters or their advocates felt involved in this issue, there is no evidence in our records to indicate those feelings. Apparently, not one commercial broadcaster felt obliged to make his views known to the Federal Communications Commission. As it has done time and again the FCC itself stanchly upheld and protected broadcasting's right of free speech and expression for the people of this Nation.

Your contrasting reactions to these two struggles—overcommercialization and Pacifica Foundation—cast a disturbing light on the basic motivations of an industry licensed to do business in the public interest. And you might similarly gain insight into the reasons why, for all your magnificent services to the public, your critics remain vocal. When you display more interest in defending your freedom to suffocate the public with commercials than in upholding your freedom to provide provocative variety—when you cry "censorship" and call for faith in the Founding Fathers' wisdom only to protect your balance sheet—when you remain silent in the face of a threat which could shake the first amendment's proud oak to its very roots—you tarnish the ideals enshrined in the Constitution and invite an attitude of suspicion. You join the forces of crass complacency—in an industry and at a time in the history of this Nation when complacency of any sort is both misplaced and dangerous.

There is no such complacency, I assure you, in the halls of the FCC.

For this is still an age in which we need all the excellence and all the greatness we can muster. Government cannot create excellence by fiat—businessmen cannot create it simply by spending money. But we can work together to produce the conditions under which excellence and greatness can grow. We can at least try to make our actions in the service of freedom match the high-flown words we use to praise her.

I could talk for quite a while on other subjects that have cropped up during the last year—our efforts to enforce the rules now on the books against those few who refuse to abide by them, multiple ownership, responsibilities under the fairness doctrine, our new program of collecting fees for the filing of license applications, the proposed new program forms for television and radio, increased activity in our inquiry into the control of networks over the sources of program supply—to name but a few. But I would rather devote my remaining time to a subject that concerns me perhaps as much as all the foregoing put together. It is a matter which lies shrouded in the mists of the future. Its exact shape is imperceptible, but its growth is of vital interest to everyone in this room. It approaches on cat feet, but with the appetite of a ravenous tiger. It has been given a number of names, but they all mean the same thing. I refer, as you may have guessed, to pay television.

Pay television is an enigma. No one knows the answers to the questions it poses. But since "the beginning of wisdom is an admission of ignorance," let us examine the subject—not as experts—but as neophytes in search of the best method of realizing the vast potentialities of the television medium.

You all know that the Commission has authorized a program of experimentation with subscription television, that one experiment is being conducted in Hartford, Conn., and that another has been approved for Denver, Colo. Several years ago there was a considerable hassle over the question of whether there should be any experiments at all with pay television and, if so, what the scope of the experiments should be. That controversy was settled when the experiments were limited to prevent competitive damage to our advertiser-supported television system as a whole. Indeed, some proponents of pay television claim that the restrictions are so stringent that they prevent any significant test of what pay TV can accomplish. In any event, our experimentation with pay television via broadcasting stations is proceeding cautiously and under carefully controlled conditions.

But life in a free society is never that simple. As Thomas Jefferson said, "The boisterous sea of liberty is never without a wave." The technology of modern communications does not stand still, and neither do the imaginative entrepreneurs who look for ways to serve new and unmet public needs. The communications industry, of which broadcasting is a part, is the most dynamic in the Nation. A broadcasting transmitter was once the marvel of the age. But now communications satellites soar overhead. Lasers and masers are workaday concepts. And the wire—thrust from the center of public attention by the glamour of radio communications—prepares for a comeback in a new form.

Transmission of communications by wire and microwave is becoming increasingly less expensive. Low-cost cable may soon be available. Experiments with the transmission of television signals over a pair of telephone wires are underway. It may soon be economically feasible to transmit television signals by microwave between metropolitan areas and to distribute a multiplicity of these signals to every home in every metropolitan area by wire. "Talk-back," or two-way communication between one's living room and the transmitting studio, may soon be commonplace. Your wives may one day respond

to the electronic huckster by pressing a button on the television set to order the home demonstration of a new refrigerator. An electronic scanner mechanism attached to your television set may perform a variety of supplemental jobs—such as reading your gas meter, providing continuous stock market quotations, and sounding a remote alarm in case of fire. And for all of that, you will watch now and pay later on easy credit terms.

Now, are these merely intriguing daydreams, far removed from present reality? Let's take a close look at present developments.

A $25 million wired closed circuit television system is underway in California. As I understand it, entrepreneurs in charge have as a financial base, a contract allowing the broadcast of local major league baseball games on a closed circuit. Los Angeles will broadcast the Los Angeles home games; San Francisco will broadcast the games played in Candlestick Park. Other programs—first-run movies, off-Broadway shows, instructional courses for credit, BBC productions, operas, etc.—are also planned. Due to the high density of homes in both areas, family dwellings may be wired for a relatively low price per unit. No licenses are now required from the Commission because no transmission of radio energy is yet involved.

However, let us assume that these separate systems in Los Angeles and San Francisco prosper. The inevitable next step is for the system's owners to apply to the Commission for a microwave license to connect the Los Angeles audience with the programs originated in San Francisco, and vice versa. So it is only a matter of time before we shall be called upon to render decisions vital to the California project.

Let me now shift your attention to the east coast (and it takes longer for this shift than it does for a microwave signal to go from Los Angeles to New York). The heavyweight fight between Sonny Liston and Cassius Clay was viewed by an estimated 475,000 people on closed circuit television. Gross receipts from television rights are estimated to be $2,375,000. That, without more, is pay television. It is different from the usual concept of pay television only in that it was not available on the same television receivers that carry free television.

But that's not the whole story. The Liston-Clay fight was available on an estimated additional 200,000 home television receivers. Unlikely, you say? Not at all. These television homes were subscribers to the 88 community antenna television systems which were themselves subscribers to the closed circuit fight. Therefore, the inevitable conclusion is that, in addition to the Commission's authorized experiments in Hartford and Denver, one brand of pay television is already here—via the community antenna system.

At the present time approximately 1,200,000 homes are wired to receive television on a paid subscription basis through CATV systems. Community antenna homes are increasing at a rate of about 15,000 per month. Community antenna systems not only provide service to those communities which are without local broadcast stations, but may now bring additional signals from large metropolitan areas to communities with more than one local station. Signals from Los Angeles are being carried to places as far away as Yuma, Ariz. Signals from New York City now reach Laconia, N.H., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa. and further expansions are planned.

Thus, as the Commission and the Congress labor in Washington on many pressing matters, the world is being wired for sight and sound. Technical know-how is being acquired, and vested interests of king-sized proportions are building up. And as importantly, the concept of paying for television has become an accepted fact in over a million homes.

Let me say to you as strongly as I can that it is not enough to meet these developments with clogans such as "free enterprise must prevail" or "free TV must be preserved." We will not help ourselves or or country by attempting to make a blind choice between oversimplified formulas. Nor is it enough to make speeches decrying the outworn dogmas of the past and advocating original thought. We need the commodity itself. And in the fast-paced modern world, where there is so little time for thought of any kind, original thought is a scarce commodity indeed.

So let us analyze the fundamental issues now.

The basic problem is the competitive effect of wired television upon our present advertiser-supported system. Does community antenna television limit or block the growth of television broadcast stations in outlying communities? Will it stunt or thwart the growth of UHF stations, upon which our hopes for greater diversity within the television industry so largely rest? Would pay television provide the additional program choices which its supporters claim and which we all desire; or would it gradually erode and eventually destroy the free television system?

To approach these questions intelligently, we must first examine the merits of our present system. What is it we are afraid of losing?

First of all, the programs of our present television system are free to the viewer. Of course, free television is supported by advertising, and advertising adds to the cost of the products we purchase. But free television's programs are not withheld from the viewer who lacks the ability to pay.

Today we hear much on the subject of the inability to pay—otherwise known as poverty. Twenty percent of the families in the United States earn less than $3,000 per year. But it is a striking fact that only 8 percent of the homes in the United States are without a television set, and some of these homes are in Palm Beach. So poverty itself is rarely, if ever, a barrier to the powerful beam of entertainment and intelligence called television. For milions of Americans with low incomes, the glow of the television set is one of life's few lights. That glow may often be dull, with programs to match, but who can say that its extinguishment is a matter of no concern?

Additionally, the signals of television transmitters in our present system travel to areas which are economically beyond the reach of cable. The rancher in the isolation of Wyoming's mountains—the Indians on Arizona's outlying reservations—the inhabitants of farmhouses all over the country—all are entitled to share in the benefits of the national television system. We cannot abandon them merely to provide a variety of services to people in the core of our urbanized society.

Finally, our present system is built upon the principle of local station ownership and local program origination. Local news, local public affairs and other local programs may be only a fraction of the total programing produced by our system. But it is that fraction which justifies the vast frequencies now allocated for TV services. It is a growing fraction which we cannot give up.

But, wired television also has its merits. Community antenna and pay television systems are not the inventions of money-mad moguls. They are primarily a response to expressed public needs.

Community antenna television started, and still has its heartland, in areas which lack adequate off-the-air television service. In modern America, people are not content to go without television, to rely upon inadequate signals or upon only one decent signal. If they cannot obtain the benefits of our present system any other way, they are more than willing to pay for them. And the men who bring those benefits to them perform a real public service.

I must say, in all frankness, that I think the growth of community antenna television reflects an inherent weakness in our advertiser-supported system—a failure to make its basic program services available to the entire country, including outlying communities too small to support more than one station, or any station. The CATV systems moved in to make good that failure.

The same thought applies to the newer trends in both community antenna and pay television. The men who seek to bring the programs of New York and Los Angeles stations to smaller communities via microwave relays and community antenna systems—the men behind the California pay television venture—are betting that the American viewer wants something more from his television set than the present system makes available. They think the viewer wants and will pay for more variety and more choice—and they see no reason why he should wait longer to get the variety and the choice we have thus far failed to provide.

On balance, what conclusions should we draw? First, the time to grapple with the problems raised by wired television is now. There is always a lag between the thinking of the scientists and engineers who create new technology, the businessmen who apply it, and the Government officials who try to decide whether the public interest requires control. We must shorten that lag as much as possible. Legislation is clearly required on some points, and action by the Commission or the industry on others. Congress, the Commission and the industry must make critical decisions about wired television before events make them for them.

Second, community antenna television provides a useful, though limited, service which is not provided by free television. We should seek ways to integrate it fully into our national television system. We should not shrink from hard choices when community antenna television threatens to thwart basic purposes of the Communications Act. It must not be permitted, for example, to hamper the development of UHF. But we must make a strenuous effort to find measures which will allow both kinds of television to survive—to keep open for the public all of the choices which a free economy makes available.

Third, pay television—though closely related to community antenna television—raises problems of a different order. Here we are dealing, not with an established industry, but with one that is struggling to be born. Moreover, here we deal, not with a system aimed primarily at distributing more widely the programs produced by advertiser-supported television, but with a wholly new source of programs for the television audience.

Fourth, the problems of pay television over wire are the same as the problems of pay television over the air. It makes no sense to have tightly controlled pay television experiments using broadcast frequencies while giving carte blanche to the development of pay TV over wires. It may well be that the California venture could provide an appropriate testing ground for the development of wire systems. But it should be a real test subject to Govenment control and regulation. Wire pay TV should not be permitted to grow like Topsy.

For pay television in any form must have a public interest justification. It cannot be so justified unless it brings to the public a greater variety of choice through specialized, high-quality programing. It must be a supplemental service, not a substitute service. And in my opinion, if pay TV is to come into our homes, it should not be allowed to bring the sponsor's commercials with it. If viewers must pay for additional programing, they must not pay twice.

Finally, the time has come for the television industry to heed the advice of Macaulay to "Reform if you would conserve." You cannot get protection without providing a service worth protecting. You cannot beat something with nothing.

Your claim to protection against competition from community antenna systems and from pay TV rests largely upon the fact that you provide local service. If that claim is to be persuasive, your service to local needs and interests must be real and substantial. It cannot be limited to one or two regularly scheduled news programs and a very occasional local "special." Riding the network and relying upon the projection of old movies may be as easy a life as riding the rails, but in the long run it may be just as dangerous.

Moreover, the search for maximum profits in the short run does not represent maximum wisdom in the long run. With every dollar that drops into your till from the sale of advertising, you are creating a greater public willingness to pay for programs without commercials. There is such a thing as pushing the long-suffering public too far, and those who do so may find the eggs that are laid far from golden.

But above all, wired television systems challenge you to bring more variety and more choice into the present system. In addition to emphasizing program diversity in order to give the public more choice on present outlets, the Commission has sought in every way to encourage the development of additional outlets on UHF channels. Your long-range interests and the interests of free television generally are dependent upon the success of UHF television.

If free enterprise cannot come to television via UHF channels, it will do so by means of wires and microwave relays. The result may not be all that you—or I—would hope. But in the long run the choice is inexorable.

For modern technology and the modern marketplace afford us no easy resting place. In today's communications industry we are propelled around the bend and into the future not to the steady chug-chug of a Mississippi riverboat, but to the piercing whine of an Atlas Agena rocket. How we will navigate depends both on the natural forces within the industry and our response to them. Can we create conditions under which the constructive forces of the marketplace will flourish and the destructive forces be controlled? That, I suggest, is the challenge that confronts us today.

Foreign Aid—Operation Niños

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, many of the social problems in Latin America are staggering. For instance, it is the rule, rather than the exception, that the majority of the population of Latin America live in substandard dwellings that are overcrowded and without sanitary facilities. Often whole families live in one room, sharing it with their chickens, piglets, and working tools. If the family is fortunate, they have a meager plot of ground to cultivate which would be considered untillable by American standards. Their shanties are bordered within a few feet by the same type of dwelling, often consisting of a simple thatched roof and walls of pressed tin cans, palm leaves or cardboard. Picture a hillside of these "houses"—either in a remote village or a plush resort city—and it is a typical Latin American scene often described as "local color" by the American tourist.

Picture also a flock of half naked children who consider one of these dwellings their home by night, for they only can sleep there. Regardless of the weather, their daylight hours are spent on a hillside playground of rock and dirt. When evening comes the children take over the shelter, sleeping on pallets of flat, woven straw while the adults gossip over kerosene lamps on the ground outside, the smell of charcoal and cooking oils filling the dank night air. This is the life of the Latin peasant and their niños.

If youngsters are raised in squalor, with inadequate food and without education, they cannot develop strong bodies and clear minds necessary for a full life. Instead they will face a hostile world of frustration and disappointment. As the leaders and workers of tomorrow, children should, and do, receive special attention in our aid program.

Two American assistance programs, involving both private and public cooperation, offer hope for a better life to the children of Chile. One is an Alliance for Progress housing program—a self-help program where the new owner does most of the construction work, the Alliance furnishes the tools and equipment, and the Chilean Government offers technical assistance to the new owner-builder. The other is Operation Niños, a food-for-peace program, in which our surplus food helps to feed 10 million hungry Latin American children.

Well illustrating the effective assistance these two programs are giving to underprivileged Latin American children, is the story of 6-year-old Alicia Vilche, a dark-eyed, black-haired Chilean moppet who was living in a shanty town one room shack with dirt floor, void of windows, heat, electricity or water.

Two years ago, Alicia moved with her family into a 4,000-unit housing development called San Gregorio on the outskirts of Santiago, which was sponsored by the Chilean Government and the Alliance for Progress. In line with the self-help emphasis of the program, Alicia's father, a construction worker, built his own three-room home with tools, equipment, and building materials furnished by AID through an Alliance for Progress loan of $713,000 to the Chilean Government. Payments on the $680 house are geared to the $18 per month salary of Senior Vilche.

Last year Alicia began school in nearby San Salvador community center which is operated by the Church World Service, a private American voluntary relief organization. Here Alicia first came in contact with Operation Niños. Every morning Alicia and her 3- and 4-year-old sisters receive a hot breakfast at the community center which their mother, again in the vein of self-help, assists in preparing as a volunteer member of the community center's mothers club. Because the Vilche's income is so small, each member of the family also receives a monthly supplement of 5 pounds of food-for-peace flour, corn, and powdered milk.

Good housing and food has left an amazing effect on Alicia. Much more attentive in class, she has a new spirit and enthusiasm. Gone are the haunting memories of poverty, sickness, and malnourishment which retarded her earlier development. Now, thanks to American loans and food distributions, Alicia and other children like her have hope for a bright future in which they can contribute their part toward building a modern nation.

It's Time for United Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I encountered an article entitled, "It's Time for United Statesmanship," which I am sure is worthy of publication in the RECORD and should have the wide circulation enjoyed by the RECORD.

The article follows:

IT'S TIME FOR UNITED STATESMANSHIP

(By a puzzled and worried American citizen)

There are some things happening around the world that scare the living daylights out of me and I hope you share this concern.

I read in the papers recently that the Soviet Union is setting up a satellite observation station in Cuba.

This followed on the heels of a report from Cuban exiles, whose underground frequently has been more accurate than our CIA, that at a base 30 miles west of Havana and 5 miles from the northern coast of Cuba, three missiles 70 feet tall are aimed at the United States, manned by Soviet troops; and that nine other missiles are stored underground at the base.

These reports, in turn, followed Castro's impudent action in turning off the fresh water supply at Guantanamo and our weak-kneed and fainthearted "retaliation" which is costing American taxpayers untold millions to haul water from Fort Lauderdale and to distill it from the sea. Here, obviously, we muffed a real chance to show some signs of strength.

These events, in turn, followed the murder by the Communists of three American flyers over East Germany.

You don't have to have access to the secret information of the State Department, the CIA or the White House, or to be an expert of foreign affairs to conclude that as of now this country has no positive program regarding Cuba and the elimination of communism in this hemisphere, and that it is suffering from what can be described only as a deterioration of the backbone and a softening of the muscles. I can't and don't believe that this is the will of the American people.

On July 24, 1963, our Embassy in Havana was confiscated. Representative YOUNGER, of California, dug into this and found that only once before in our history has this been done. That was when the Japanese moved into Vietnam and temporarily took over our Embassy in Saigon. The Germans, the Ital-

ians and the Japs did not bother our Embassies during World War II. Even the Chinese have not made a move toward our Embassy.

In the opinion of many Congressmen this action by Castro was tantamount to an attack on Miami or Washington. What did our administration do about it? As far as I know, it did nothing and said nothing except, "Tut. Tut. Well. Well."

Back to Cuba in a moment, but in the meantime let's look at how the United States is being regarded today around the world.

Henry J. Taylor, in an article copyrighted by United Features Syndicate and appearing in leading newspapers, had this to say:

"Are we falling for Soviet gradualism?" he asks. Here's part of what he says:

"A Castro-trained Zanzibar pigmy can put a gun at the back of our American consul and walk him to the docks. Do our ships move to protect him? Oh, no, he's just booted off to East Africa like a bag of burlap.

"Three American airmen can be shot down in East Germany, and so what?

"Soviet stooges can bomb the U.S. Embassy on Cyprus, surrounded by the great U.S. 7th Fleet, and photograph our Ambassador struggling in the debris and dust. The front-page pictures were a sellout in Nicosia while the population watched the Americans flee.

"Two-penny Ghanaian tyrant Kwame Nkrumah makes Red hay with anti-American insults, and threatened, helpless U.S. teachers are given 24 hours to get out of the country.

"Congolese make a mockery of our official representation, burning our flags and tearing American passports into pieces.

"Panamanian whatnots, led by more than 70 Castro-trained goons, can ambush and kill our soldiers in the Balboa High School and bomb our Embassy to boot. Our dead are quietly returned to America.

"For the past 2 years, some place in the world, American embassies, consulates or agencies have been attacked, burned or looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity. And every time even a little bobtailed tyrant kicks us in the teeth, to say nothing of Khrushchev or Mao, Washington hastens to say he didn't mean it.

"Castro can cut off a U.S. naval base's water. We talk tough on Monday and decide on Tuesday that he doesn't mean too much trouble, after all. Meanwhile, Soviet troops can remain 90 miles off our shores 15 months after the President of the United States told the world that they must leave.

"In all this we are supposed to find a foreign policy? We are to believe a policy exists? This is not a policy; it is a catastrophe.

"The result? It is not easy for a country to chop the world's leading nation down to size. But the U.S.S.R. is doing a first-class job of it.

"What we are seeing is the Soviet technique of gradualism. Accustom people to retreating and you cannot only push them out of firm positions (like Cuba) but they'll even begin to believe that ducking into doorways is really much better than walking down the street.

"This means the aggressor is getting what he wants by having it given to him. Throughout all history that has always been the road finally to war (or surrender), never peace.

"Our momentum down this disastrous road must be broken. Never in history have enemies won so much by so little. Never have our incredible losses in strategic positions and world authority mounted so rapidly and on all sides.

"If we do not retaliate against the calculated humiliations we're suffering all over the globe, our days as the world's No. 1 power are numbered. The Soviet and its stooges cry 'Frog' and we jump. This must stop, or God help the United States."

There are several ugly questions hanging in the air that need answers, and these answers do not appear to be forthcoming from this administration. Here are a few of them:

1. THE INTELLIGENCE GAP

Many Members of Congress feel there is a potentially highly dangerous intelligence gap. That we have known since February 9, 1963—low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuba by Navy and Air Force pilots have been suspended on direct orders by the White House, despite protests by both services that these flights are necessary if we are to know what is really going on in Cuba; and that high-level U-2 reconnaissance flights, now under the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency, have been kept to a minimum, with none passing directly over Cuba.

True or false?

2. THOSE "FISHING BOATS"

I am told that Russia is using a fleet of highspeed so-called "fishing boats" to export Fidel Castro's Communist revolution to other Latin American countries. I understand that there are now around 200 of them:

That these oceangoing vessels which have the deceptive configuration of trawlers and which can sail rings around the World War II naval vessels of neighboring Caribbean nations, are transporting arms and guerrillas.

That those "fishing boats" have a carrying capacity of 150 to 250 passengers, or 300 to 550 gross tons of fish or arms, that their speed ranges up to 30 knots. As far as fish are concerned, the well-founded suspicion is that most of them have yet to wet a net and that they are built strictly for dirty work at the Latin American crossroads.

True or false?

3. THOSE CAVES AND TUNNELS

You hear a lot about the caves in Cuba.

Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1963 stated that there are indeed countless thousands of caves in Cuba and that many of them are large enough for storing military weapons, including missiles. Furthermore, he stated that aerial reconnaissance indicated roads recently built to known cave locations.

On April 1, 1963, Representative CLEVELAND inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a piece from the Saturday Evening Post on this subject, pointing out the highly significant fact that it was possible for some caves fronting on the ocean to contain submarine pens, and there has been additional information since to indicate that this is so.

Is it any wonder that Castro doesn't want on-site inspections?

According to Free Cuba News, the newsletter of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, the Soviets have secreted guided missiles in the Russian-made tunnels in La-Gobernadora hills, near Cuba's principal naval base of Mariel. Electrical systems are also said to be installed at the nearby base of Meseta de Anafe and are connected with the guided-missile stations at LaGobernadora.

True or false?

4. THE STENNIS REPORT

In May 1963 the Stennis senatorial investigation committee, including both Republicans and Democrats, issued a hard-hitting, unanimous report stressing the gravity of the situation. The committee gathered its information from top people in the administration.

The Stennis group was particularly concerned over repeated published reports from exiles and refugees that Soviet missiles are concealed in Cuban caves.

These reports are all the more alarming in view of the administration's admission that, lacking onsite inspection, no one can say for sure that all the Russian missiles have been removed.

Consequently, Republicans have called on the President to resume discussions leading to the onsite inspections demanded in October 1962, and waived a few days later.

What has happened to the recommendations in the Stennis report?

5. THE PORT OF BANES

With very little effort, Russian submarine bases can be established in Cuban ports. Already there are widely published reports that a Soviet naval base is under construction at the Port of Banes. This, of course, could neutralize the American base at Guantanamo. The administration is silent when the question of Banes is raised.

6. THE ISLE OF PINES

We know beyond any doubt that there is a tremendous Soviet buildup on the Isle of Pines.

We know that this is the transshipment point for arms drops to Latin America and that the Russians have asked that the Isle of Pines be turned over for use exclusively by the Russians for such arms buildup and as an available depot for arms drops to other Latin American countries.

7. TRAINING IN TERRORISM

Early in 1963 the Nation's intelligence chief, J. A. McCone, Director of the CIA, reported to a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House that 1,000 to 1,500 trainees from every Latin American country, save one, went to Cuba to receive training in guerrilla warfare, sabotage, and terrorism.

There are ample grounds for believing that Cuba is the campus for an even greater number of such trainees today.

Today reports of a shocking new policy by our State Department are gaining circulation.

The Hall Syndicate, Inc., reveals that behind the recently announced orders to withdraw military dependents from Guantanamo there is an inner, long-range State Department plan to "phase out" this country's occupancy of the big, strategic naval base.

This report says: "A major premise of the State Department's plan is that sooner or later Castro will take the Guantanamo issue to the United Nations, and the United States should be ready to give up the base rather than risk a censure vote."

I think that the American people are entitled to some straight nonpolitical answers now to the questions I have raised, and others.

How about it, Mr. President?

What about the intelligence gap?

What about those fishing boats?

What about those caves and tunnels?

What about those 70-foot missiles west of Havana?

What about the Isle of Pines?

Is a Soviet naval base with submarine pens under construction at the Cuban port of Banes, or isn't it?

What is your attitude about the Monroe Doctrine?

What about the Stennis report?

How much is it costing American taxpayers to provide fresh water to Guantanamo?

If it is such a good idea to convert sea water at the base, why didn't we start preparing to do it years ago when trouble with Castro started instead of waiting until now?

How many Russian troops and technicians, or whatever you call them, still remain in Cuba, and what functions are they performing? Are they actually running things in Cuba or aren't they?

What are our long-range plans regarding Guantanamo? Is there any truth to the rumors of the "phasing out" policy of our State Department?

Certainly these are not things somebody dreamed up to embarrass you politically. There has been too much sober, well-in-

formed discussion of them in Congress to justify such a notion.

Yes, Mr. President, what about Cuba and what are we going to do about it? The American people are entitled to know.

Congressmen are getting a lot of mail these days from puzzled voters who can't understand why we are supporting a Communist coalition on Laos, yet we fight the Communists in Vietnam with more than 15,000 Americans stationed there, continue to lose a lot of American lives, and spend around $1.5 million a day and do practically nothing about the Communist threat at our doorstep.

This Cuban situation obviously is a nasty thorn in the side of this administration—as it should be.

The do-nothing, wait-and-see policy, if you can call this a policy, seems to be rooted in the philosophy that any positive action would risk a nuclear war; that anyone who brings up the subject is a warmonger, playing politics, or is some kind of a nut or something. Administration spokesmen then promptly attempt to sweep it under the rug.

This is obviously a matter of grave national concern and should not be a partisan issue, but it is becoming abundantly clear that today we can look only to Republican leadership to restore what ex-President Eisenhower has aptly called "United Statesmanship," to erase the tragic and threatening mess in Cuba, which is obviously our first essential step in building new respect for ourselves, not only throughout Latin America, but throughout the world.

Obviously the only thing that is going to get action is a truly aroused electorate.

It seems pretty clear by now that, in spite of all it costs them, the Russians have a good thing going for themselves in Cuba as part of their historic, long-range strategy of world domination and what Henry J. Taylor calls gradualism. It is an advanced intelligence base which can be used for electronic surveillance of our military and space activities in the southeast United States and the entire Caribbean area, and which is an ideal submarine base.

Even Harry Truman is critical of our foreign policy.

In an article copyrighted by the North American Newspaper Alliance appearing Sunday, March 1, he said:

"It is all too obvious that the position of the United States in the affairs of the world is not what it should be.

"Our leadership has been steadily losing its effectiveness. Our hopes for a world committed to peace, freedom and security for all seem to have faded in the resumed struggle for power and trade.

"It serves no useful purpose to protest or to ignore this unpleasant state. But we had better face up to it."

This isn't quite what you hear from the White House which claims we are loved throughout the world.

How much of this soft soap, I wonder, are the American people willing to take?

What can be done about it with minimum risk of war?

Let's not be trapped by the familiar administration argument and psychosis that to do something constructive we have to invade Cuba and risk a nuclear war.

Representative FOREMAN, of Texas, says: "I think the American people are correct in saying that they are tired of this business of being concerned with how popular we are instead of how right we are."

Obviously, if we are right, our popularity will take care of itself.

What are some of the right things we can do in a positive program?

Here are some of the most elemental things that best informed Members of Congress have demanded:

1. Step up our surveillance at least to the point where it was prior to the blockade of October 1962.

2. Abide by Public Law 87-872 and put some teeth into trade restrictions which will prevent the free world from feeding the Cuban economy and relieving Russia in the process. Many practical measures have been proposed toward that end.

3. Restate and enforce the Monroe Doctrine which is based on the principle that a foreign government shall not colonize in the Western Hemisphere.

4. Recognize a Cuban Government in exile and take the initiative in helping to form one.

5. Revise the present punitive policy against Cuban patriots in exile, who through their independent activities, can at least buoy up the hopes of their helpless freedom-loving friends and relatives in Cuba.

6. In collaboration with the Organization of American States (a) forbid all travel between Cuba and the Latin American States and (b) stop all trade between Cuba and the Latin American States.

We should have learned by now that this Organization of American States welcomes the leadership of this country.

Have we forgotten how quickly they rallied behind us when we initiated and followed through on the naval blockade of 1962?

The Latins respect strength. Most of the Latin countries are genuinely with us. They are simply waiting for us to act—and we don't.

The time for action obviously is now. Every month, every week, the situation worsens.

More Cubans are constantly being indoctrinated in Moscow to hate us.

Every week more subversives are trained and planted in South America.

Every day more military equipment is accumulated in Cuba and more men are trained to use it.

The patriotic rebels in Cuba, who a year or two ago were raising havoc with the sugar harvest, are constantly growing less effective in their power to resist under the increasing surveillance of an increasingly powerful police state.

The Cuban economy grows stronger—rather than weaker, as we are often led to believe. And we are permitting this to happen.

Many Congressmen are of the view that with a policy of firmness on our part, the necessary results can be accomplished without a shot being fired, but that if it involves limited war it is a risk we must take, that the sooner we take it the better, and that this represents the will and true spirit of the American people.

It seems obvious that until this Red cancer is removed, and as long as we remain soft with this condition staring us in the face, our foreign policy in all other parts of the world, from Saigon to Havana and at all stops in between, is properly suspect and, in fact, a living lie.

The time has clearly come to stop drifting and dreaming, speechifying, pacifying, and alibiing about Cuba and about communism in this hemisphere.

It is equally obvious that we cannot look to this administration to do anything about it.

That's why I believe we must look to ex-President Eisenhower's "United Statesmanship" which is rapidly becoming the philosophy of the Republican Party.

That's why more and more people, as they watch the behavior of this administration in its incredibly soft attitude on Cuba, in its expedient and wobbly, jerry-built policy throughout the world and in its obviously political domestic policy of something-for-everybody-at-less-cost are deciding that it's time to be a Republican-American for a change.

They feel it is time to shore up America, that it is time to stand up in the eyes of the world, and that it's time for guts—not buts. Yellow simply doesn't go with red, white, and blue, and the American people are not yellow. These puzzled and worried Americans, I am sure, want to close the ever-widening leadership gap and to vote America back on the track. That's mainly why they are going to vote Republican.

They feel that this is the best thing they can do for their country, which right now needs a lot done for it. It is later than you think.

Air Force Electronic Systems Division Best Served at Hanscom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the decision of Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert to retain the vitally important Electronic Systems Division at Laurence G. Hanscom Field in Massachusetts is one that the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress wholeheartedly approves and applauds.

While it has been known for the past few days that the decision on Hanscom would be a favorable one, Secretary Zuckert today in a lengthy memorandum made known the reasons which prompted him to reject the request for transfer of some or all of the Hanscom functions to Griffiss Air Force Base in New York. I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks correspondence dealing with Hanscom.

While I am sympathetic with the Rome, N.Y., area over its concern about the relocation of certain Griffiss functions, I am most disturbed over the efforts of some of my colleagues from New York to raid Hanscom and I see little justification for efforts of this kind at a time when all defense installations are under review for possible closing by the Department of Defense.

For those of us in Massachusetts who have been aware of the ESD contributions to the defense effort for some time past, largely generated by the huge scientific-research complex Boston is fortunate enough to have, the decision on Hanscom was the only one possible under the circumstances.

However, very many people became alarmed when what can only be described as a power grab began some weeks ago by some members of the New York delegation. Letters of protest descended upon Massachusetts Congressmen in growing numbers, but there was little in the way of positive assurances for these good people until the Air Force had completed its survey of the functions at Hanscom.

This Air Force decision was expedited in great measure, in my opinion, through recent actions of our Committee on Armed Services when the Subcommittee on Real Estate, of which I was chairman a few years ago, now ably directed by our distinguished colleague, the courteous and capable gentleman from Mississippi, my valued and esteemed friend [Mr. WINSTEAD], was called upon to give routine clearance to a land acquisition project affecting Hanscom.

The project called for the acquisition of some 40 acres of land near Hanscom for the 200-unit housing project, authorized and funded by the Congress last year. Early this year the Air Force released $3½ million in funds so that the work, already long delayed, could get underway.

The Air Force presentation to justify the project had just begun when questions were raised about the necessity for such housing at a time when the Air Force was surveying Hanscom.

The House met at 11 a.m. that day and the subcommittee adjourned without taking any action on the Hanscom project.

In view of the need for early approval of the land acquisition project for Hanscom, Chairman VINSON of our committee wrote Secretary Zuckert on March 16, reciting the facts and urging an early decision on the over-all Hanscom survey so that some disposition of the subordinate land acquisition problem could be made.

That subcommittee decision was also made today, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to report that the subcommittee endorsed Secretary Zuckert's decision on Hanscom by a vote of five to two in favor of the acquisition of needed land for Hanscom housing.

If it had not been for Chairman Vinson and our committee, I feel sure it is quite possible that Hanscom would still be the subject of conjecture and uncertainty.

Let me make it clear that Chairman Vinson took no sides on this issue. He simply let it be known that it would be desirable to have an early Hanscom decision, one way or the other.

The members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress from the outset vigorously protested the New York raid on the Hanscom functions. While it is difficult to see how the Air Force could have come to any other conclusion on Hanscom, especially in view of the huge investment the Federal Government already has made in the Hanscom facilities, totaling over $70 million and the obvious invaluable character of the unmatched scientific and research and development advantages of this base, the delegation worked most energetically as a unit to retain Hanscom at full strength.

There is a lesson for all of us in the Hanscom situation, Mr. Speaker. There is every indication that more and more of the outmoded or surplus defense activities will be curtailed or phased out partially or completely in the months and years ahead. When that time comes, congressional efforts should not be geared to raids on other parts of the country with requests for time-consuming and expensive surveys, as has been done here. Rather, it would seem to me that action be directed toward the retention of the facilities in question and the best possible case made with the officials concerned and our colleagues here in the Congress.

In that way, sectional differences would be eliminated and a more sympathetic and greater awareness of the problems of other areas might well result when these matters come up for discussion in the House. Moreover, interested groups should exercise good judgment in not jumping the gun on rumors and speculative reports and conclusions.

Pertinent correspondence on Hanscom follows:

MARCH 24, 1964.

Hon. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.:

Have been greatly concerned about your survey possibly designed to remove Electronics System Division from Hanscom to Griffiss. Believe such a move would be extremely ill advised, costly, wasteful, inefficient, and harmful to national defense. Strongly urge your rejection incredible proposal New York Senators and early activation before our Real Estate Committee your own prior proposal commencement housing project at Hanscom. Will be most grateful your consideration and favorable action in this matter. Thanks and regards.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is to acknowledge your telegram of March 24 concerning a proposal to transfer the Electronic Systems Division from Hanscom Field to Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y.

This proposal was placed before the Air Force on an official basis by several members of the New York State congressional delegation. They also approached the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA) with a view to determining whether NASA could use any facilities vacated by ESD.

We are conducting a study of this proposal and have established contact with NASA officials. This study is necessarily complex because of the wide range of ESD activities. We expect that a final answer will be available next month. At that time we will promptly inform you.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. LOCKHART,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Deputy, Director, Legislative Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 9, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Repersentatives.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is in response to your recent letter, signed jointly with other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, in which you recommended the retention of the Electronic Systems Division (ESD) at Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass. Several members of the New York State congressional delegation had suggested that ESD be moved to Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. Their suggestion was predicated on the projected availability of resources at Griffiss resulting from the phase out of the Rome Air Materiel Area (ROAMA) and the need of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for facilities and capabilities to establish their proposed Electronic Research Center in the Boston area.

We have made a detailed, objective analysis of this proposal, considering the impact on manpower, facilities, and dollars. The results are described in the attached outline.

Our conclusion, after these evaluations, is that the retention of ESD at Hanscom would best serve the Government's interest.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

CONCLUSIONS RESULTING FROM ANALYSIS OF PROPOSAL TO RELOCATE THE ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION (ESD) FROM LAURENCE G. HANSCOM FIELD, MASS., TO GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Several members of the New York State congressional delegation have proposed that the Electronic Systems Division (ESD), now located at Laurence G. Hanscom Field (near Boston, Mass.), be moved to Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. It was postulated that ESD could use resources at Griffiss made available by the phaseout of ROAMA. This, in turn, would make available to NASA the facilities and capabilities of ESD for the proposed NASA electronics center in the Boston area.

The first step in our analysis was to consider the resources and missions of the major Air Force activities involved in the proposal.

(a) At Griffiss Air Force Base, the following situation prevails:

1. The Rome Air Materiel Area (ROAMA) is being phased out. This will make available nine warehouse-type buildings, of which about 315,000 square feet have been modified for administrative purpose. The more modern of these facilities are under consideration for use by other Air Force activities scheduled to remain at Griffiss.

2. The Rome Air Development Center (RADC) executes the systems command exploratory and advanced development programs in electromagnetics. It also provides technical support to ESD in the design, engineering, and development of subsystem components and equipment. Some 40 percent of RADC work is done for ESD. Less than 10 percent of the total ESD work is accomplished by RADC.

(b) Located on or near Hanscom Field, Mass., are the Lincoln Laboratory, the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratory, (AFCRL), the Systems Development Corportation (SDC), the Electronics Systems Division, and the MITRE Corporation. The effect of the proposed move of ESD on these activities is as follows:

1. Lincoln Laboratory and AFCRL accomplish basic research functions. While their colocation with ESD is not essential, the nearby availability of their considerable human talents does substantially assist in the accomplishment of the ESD mission.

2. SDC is a service activity of ESD. Again, although colocation with ESD is not absolutely essential, it is desirable.

3. ESD is primarily responsible for managing the acquisition of electronic information and communications systems from initial concept to their installation as a part of the Air Force inventory. There is a continuing shortage of Air Force personnel sufficiently trained to perform the in-house engineering and technical support required in the acquisition of modern Air Force weapons and support equipment. As a result, "not-for-profit" corporations have been established to provide systems engineering and integration for Air Force programs. In the case of electronic systems, MITRE performs this vital function. Thus, it is an essential part of the overall ESD operation and any separation of these two activities would bring about unacceptable increases in costs, and slippages in urgent national command and control programs.

4. MITRE is presently located 4 miles from Hanscom in facilities which cost over $9 million. The mortgage on their buildings (owed by MITRE) has a present unpaid balance of some $5.1 million.

(c) The following information concerning the proposed NASA Electronic Research Center was developed:

1. NASA has budgeted approximately $56 million for the Center (exclusive of land costs). They have estimated that approximately 40 percent of this is for building construction, with the remaining 60 percent to be spent for equipment acquisition and installation. This is subject to refinement after the final site selection.

2. On the basis of moving ESD, and its integral component MITRE, to Griffiss, the Civil Engineer, Hanscom Field, after study-

ing the NASA report to Congress (Electronic Research Center, Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated January 31, 1964), has estimated the cost of meeting the NASA facility need using the ESD and MITRE buildings. His construction and alteration estimate is $5.5 million. This arrangement would involve a 4-mile split operation of the NASA Center. This is not in accord with present NASA planning. Further, this estimate does not include the cost of paying off the mortgage on the MITRE facilities (present value $5.1 million).

(d) Other factors which entered the evaluation were:

1. The cost of movements, and preparation of facilities, at Griffiss for ESD and MITRE was estimated to be $20.5 million.

2. It was also recognized that there would be major losses in ESD and MITRE civilian personnel should these organizations be moved to Griffiss. This led to a survey of personnel occupational skills within ROAMA to determine if the ROAMA phase out would assist in filling the anticipated ESD and MITRE vacancies. This study revealed that there are significant differences in the occupational skill requirements of ESD and MITRE in research and development areas, while the ROAMA needs are generally for individuals skilled in logistics and supply management.

The conclusions of the evaluation covered the areas of costs and mission performance.

(a) The Air Force and NASA costs are summarized in the following table:

[In millions of dollars]

Alternative	ESD	NASA construction	NASA instrumentation	Approximate total cost
NASA Electronic Research Center in Boston area (not using ESD or MITRE facilities)	0	[1] 22.4	[1] 33.6	[2] 56.0
Move ESD and MITRE to Griffiss	20.5	[3] 5.5	33.6	[3] 59.6

[1] 40 percent of $56,000,000 is $22,400,000; 60 percent of $56,000,000 is $33,600,000.
[2] Does not include land.
[3] Excludes present $5,100,000 mortgage on MITRE facilities.

(b) In the mission performance area, the following conclusions were developed:

1. Movement of ESD alone to Griffiss would result in unacceptable mission degradation.

2. Movement of ESD and MITRE to Griffiss would bring about one-time costs in excess of the NASA construction and equipment estimates ($59.6 million versus $56 million). Additionally, other long-term costs, difficult to quantify, would be incurred by the Air Force. These involve losses of technically qualified personnel, the breaking up of the closely interrelated complex of research and development organizations in the Hanscom area, and the limited employment potential for ESD/MITRE skills in Rome. In essence, the scientific, technical and academic environment of the Boston area is of significant assistance to the ESD/MITRE operation.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Congressman Harding Supports "This Nation Under God"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of other Americans in my alarm at the efforts of certain of our citizens to deemphasize the role that God has played in the foundation and preservation of our great Nation.

I have a deep and lasting faith in the existence and the loving kindness of our Creator. I believe that the future destiny of America is assured and our freedom will always endure as long as we are a God-fearing Nation. However, by the same token, I am convinced that if this Nation ever forgets or denies God that the American way of life as we know it today will become a thing of the past.

I do not share the alarm that many people do over the decisions of the Supreme Court on State-prescribed prayers in public schools. Combined with my personal faith in God, I also have a dedication to the principle of the separation of church and state. If a State prayer is to be said daily in a public school, should it be a praper prescribed by the Catholic Church, one of the Protestant Churches, the Mormon Church, or a Jewish synagogue? It is evident that it is most difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at a prayer that a State can compel to be said in public schools and at the same time maintain the principle of the separation of church and state.

Therefore, Mrs. Harding and I have done everything possible to make prayer an important part of our family life, to teach our children to pray and to acknowledge the generosity of our Heavenly Father before each meal and to thank God for the bounties of life at least daily in family prayer.

I believe that the faith in our Heavenly Father that I learned in the home of my parents is the outstanding principle of my life in giving me the direction, ideals, goals, and aspirations that have made my life both challenging and satisfying. Is it any wonder that I want to see my children imbued with this same legacy?

I am one of the millions of Americans who believe that the Constitution of the United States was divinely inspired. At a time during the Constitutional Convention when it became evident that the framers of the Constitution could not agree Benjamin Franklin delivered the following historic exhortation:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes and ayes, is methinks a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution now no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states all round Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances.

In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarcely able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered.

All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war and conquest.

I therefore beg leave to move—that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.

The above motion of Benjamin Franklin was adopted and our Constitution was thereafter drafted.

I believe that it is most appropriate that the coins that we carry in our pockets as legal tender in this great Nation bear the inscription "In God We Trust" as a constant reminder that this Nation in its origin was guided by our Creator and our present and our future if to be meaningful must have the same divine guidance.

I fully subscribe to the words of the Pledge of Allegiance in its present form in which we not only pledge allegiance to our great Nation but at the same time recognize the role that God played in the creation of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I feel prompted to make these remarks because of the following article appearing in the Washington Post of April 7 in which Mrs. Murray, a resident of Baltimore, Md., and a professed atheist, announced a campaign to delete the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag:

"UNDER GOD" ATTACKED BY PRAYER FOE

BALTIMORE, April 7.—Madalyn Murray, who won her Supreme Court fight to outlaw required prayers in public schools, now wants to get rid of the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Murray will appear before the Baltimore Board of Education Thursday to demand that the reference be deleted from the pledge to the flag.

Her two sons, Garth, 8, and William, 17, attend Baltimore schools.

"We find this to be offensive to our individual liberties and to our freedom of conscience, since we are atheists," Mrs. Murray wrote to the school board Monday.

Mrs. Murray contends the words "under God" make the Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional.

"We will proceed with whatsoever legal action is necessary to stop the practice," she said.

Mrs. Murray said she wants her sons to participate in the pledge, but not with the reference to God.

I pledge all the resources of my command to oppose this most brazen attempt to deny God. If it were not for God, we would not be here today either as human beings or as Americans.

The great difference between our life and life in a communistic society is that in this Nation nearly everyone recognizes the existence of God and worships God according to the dictates of his individual conscience, whereas, the Communists deny God, ridicule Him, and prohibit members of their society from worshiping a supreme being. That is the great reason why I am convinced that our Democratic way of life will eventually triumph over atheistic communism.

However, today as I was still upset by the newspaper account of Mrs. Murray's action, I read in the letters-to-the-editor section of the Idaho Daily Statesman, the following letter from an Idaho teenager, Peggy Peterson:

TEENAGER VIEWS PATRIOTIC LACK

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

I would like to thank Mrs. D. W. Crossley of Boise for her article entitled "Patriotism Flows in Boise Residence" in last Sunday's March 29, Statesman, and I say amen to her words.

As a teenager, I am sometimes troubled by the seeming lack of patriotism and lack of interest in the workings of our government by others of my generation. The thought is even more troublesome when I stop to realize that my generation will, in a few short years, be at the head of the government.

I am proud to be a citizen of the United States of America. My citizenship is truly

one of my greatest possessions, but as Miss Kathy Fong pointed out in her winning speech, I need to do more than just be born in the United States to be called a true citizen. I should prepare myself to be able to vote intelligently when the time comes and possibly even do my part by trying to give others the feeling of deep love of this wonderful country by entering into the teaching profession or by possibly doing my part by preparing myself to serve as a public official.

I personally embrace the principles of the Democratic Party, but that is really immaterial when it comes to feeling a great pride in my country. The important thing isn't for someone to be a Republican or a Democrat, but rather to be "something." I would actually rather see a very active Republican than a passive Democrat because even though the Republican may have a viewpoint differing from my own, at least they have an apparent interest in the government and are trying to do what they feel to be right.

I, too, am distressed by such things as taking the Bible out of the schools or by talk of taking the words "In God We Trust" off our coins. Have we as Americans filled our heads with such a feeling of self-sufficiency to think that we would have what we now have without God's help and guidance? Can we as Americans look out upon our beautiful mountains and valleys, lakes and streams, sunrises and sunsets, and allow ourselves for even a moment to forget that it is all the work of the Master Painter—our God? If we can then we no longer deserve to be called Americans.

I am grateful for the views expressed in Peggy's letter. I pray that we will always have a great majority of Americans that will have the sincerity and faith expressed by this Boise High School junior. As long as we have enough Peggy Petersons in our society we can even tolerate a few Madalyn Murrays. Even then, our goal should be to change the atheistic views of Madalyn Murray to the beautiful realization and appreciation of God as expressed by Peggy Peterson.

Socialist and Communist Propagandizing Through Musical Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an interesting and informative editorial broadcast by Mr. Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager of station WOKE in Charleston, S.C. The editorial is concerned with the propagandizing of the public with the Socialist and Communist lines through musical records which are made available to broadcast stations over the country. Mr. Weaver cites one particular record and its origin to establish the point of his editorial commentary.

I ask unanimous consent that the broadcast editorial of March 24, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL—APRIL 6, 1964, BY HARRY C. WEAVER, PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER WEAVER BROADCASTING CORP. (WOKE), CHARLESTON, S.C.

It is always interesting to observe the various reactions to music on radio stations of the 1960's. Many people, who prefer one type of music, will call a radio station that is playing another variety and will request their kind of music although they aren't even listening to the station called. It has been our experience that fan clubs are the most guilty, in some cases as paid agents or promoters of some terrible-sounding artist who had no business in getting in front of a recording mike in the first place. When a person has been in the radio profession long enough, he soon becomes acclimated to the twists and the quirks of a promoter who has no interest in a particular radio station outside of how it can help to sell the recordings or personnel appearances of his client, for free, while he draws an agent's commission.

There is another type of promoter in the field of music who has another goal besides personal financial returns. This kind of a person delights in selling smut * * * in promotion suggestive or off-color lyrics * * * in appealing to youthful passions * * * with the net results of wild, drunken beach parties as held at coastal States' beaches and one which we officials of the South Carolina State Broadcasters Association were subjected to last April at Myrtle Beach.

Then there is another type of music promoter who has still another goal to reach, the mingling of the colored and white races through the means of rot-gut, wild-screaming rock 'n' roll music which has polluted the American scene and has contributed to interracial mixing, street marches and demonstrations. This kind of agent or promoter is an easy mark for the Communists who never overlook any avenue of communication with the American public to sell the party line. This thinking has been scoffed at by many Americans. Members of the U.S. Congress and even our State legislature have made it their business to ridicule such a method to reach the minds of our youthful Americans, the future leaders of our great Republic.

To those people, who might jeer at such a possibility, we invite them to read the brief article "Out of Tune" on page 221 of the March 24 issue of the National Review. As the management of our radio station auditions every 45 record that comes into the studios, many, many disgusting selections referred to as "music" never gets further than the front office. One of these, entitled "Little Boxes," had lyrics which smacked of a socialistic order for young Americans of today. This recording has been played on network radio and some of the other Charleston stations may have exposed it on their air. But, there's more to the story than a record label, a title or the artist. This particular song was written by a Communist as revealed in the National Review article.

Its author, Mrs. Malvina Reynolds, a folksinger wrote the lyrics in about 12 minutes while riding in an automobile and adapted the lyrics to a borrowed tune. When interviewed on network radio she said, "The voice of the times speaks through people like me." As the National Review pointed out, the Time magazine's issue of February 28 came very close to isolating the secret ingredient in the "Little Boxes" success formula when the Times said of Mrs. Reynolds "And of course she is a liberal and a 'ban-the-bomber.' "

National Review pointed out that Mrs. Malvina Reynolds was identified as a Communist in sworn testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities as early as 1950, and before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee last year. That she was a registered Communist voter back in 1936 and 1942 * * * that she was a writer for the Communist "People's World," which is listed in the U.S. House committee's December 1, 1961's listing of subversive organizations and publications.

Mrs. Reynolds' father was a charter member of the party. Her mother was a party financial supporter, her sister has been identified as a Communist Party organizer, her brother-in-law has a long record of associations with Communist-supported causes. Her uncle was a distributor of the Communist "Western Worker," which was the predecessor of People's World. Mrs. Reynold' cousin is a member of the Communist-front National Lawyers Guild who married the sister of the chairman of the Los Angeles Communist Party. Such a nice family—just another group of those members or followers of an international conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of the American form of government and our way of life.

We are grateful to the National Review and its issue of March 24 for calling the recording "Little Boxes" to the attention of the American people and hope that all sales of this record, written by a known Communist, will cease at once. In that Mrs. Malvina Reynolds was also identified by a committee of the State of California as a Communist, it will be very interesting to see what information the former FBI counterspy, Mr. Karl Prussion, might have on the matter when he appears in Charleston at the Memminger Auditorium at 8 o'clock on the night of the 16th of this month under the auspices of Charleston Post 10 of the American Legion.

James K. Polk's Successful Presidency Expanded the Growth and Greatness of America—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, one of our strongest and most successful Presidents was James Knox Polk, of Tennessee, who history for a time has underrated as one of our most successful Chief Executives. Now, some 120 years later, President Polk and his successful presidency is receiving much deserved recognition.

The qualities which made this Tennessean a great national leader, and the achievements which made his administration a notable contribution to the development and expansion of our country, are effectively related in a two-part article which was published in the Sunday magazine of the Nashville Tennessean on March 22 and March 29.

This article is the work of Louise Davis, a perceptive student of American history and a writer of distinction. In her account of our 11th President, 1845–49, she has produced an authentic and colorful reconstruction of a significant and dramatic period of the American past. This is a stirring story that is of particular interest to Members of Congress and historians.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include these articles in the Appendix of the RECORD. They will be reprinted in two installments. Part I follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Mar. 22, 1964]

JAMES KNOX POLK: THE PRESIDENT WE HAVE FORGOTTEN

(By Louise Davis)

Odd, they said, the way Sam Polk's boy, Jim, perked up after that horrible ordeal in Kentucky.

Surgery was new then, and nobody would undergo it except as a last resort. But sickly James Knox Polk, 17 years old and doubled up in pain much of the time, had ridden horseback the 230 miles from his father's Maury County farm to Danville, Ky., to see the famous surgeon, Dr. Ephraim McDowell.

That was in 1812, and there was no anesthetic then. They strapped the thin, undersized boy to a wooden table, gave him brandy, made the incision and removed the gallstone.

It was like a new life to Jim when he recovered from surgery and, months later, headed home on horseback.

He would make that life count, the Presbyterian-born boy resolved. He would make up for his small size and weak body by doing something really impressive.

But not even then did he dream of the White House. And 22 years later, when he become the youngest President until that time, he had no illusions about his greatness. His diary makes that clear.

He was so hounded by bickering and vicious opposition through years as Speaker of the House in Washington, as Governor of Tennessee, as President of the United States that, when his term was up, he wanted nothing so much as to come home to Nashville and forget about it.

At is turned out, he died 3 months after he got home and practically everybody did forget about him for more than a century.

But now the Polk boom is on again.

In this presidential year, 120 years after Polk was elected, he has come into his own.

Some scholars call him the "most successful" of all Presidents—if you judge by what he accomplished in office. Some call him the "most neglected."

Polk ranks among the 10 top Presidents in every list drawn up by historians in the last 10 years.

Only five—Lincoln, Washington, F. D. Roosevelt, Wilson, and Jefferson—were ranked "great" in a poll of 75 distinguished historians in 1954.

But the six men in the next group, the "near great," included two Tennesseans: Andrew Jackson at the top of the list and James K. Polk close behind.

Among his claims to fame: He, more than any other man, was responsible for pushing our Nation's borders to the Pacific Ocean. And he was one of the earliest champions of the "little man."

But at the time Jim Polk returned from the operation in Kentucky, he had no idea what he wanted to do.

He had been too ill to attend school regularly, and it was apparent to his father and grandfather, Ezekiel Polk, that he would never be strong enough to manage the vast land holdings they had amassed since they arrived from North Carolina 6 years before.

Sam Polk got the boy a job in a store in Columbia, with a view to setting him up in a mercantile business.

Jim Polk hated it.

He wanted to learn some profession, and his father sent him to the little academy at Zion Church in the nearby Frierson community.

That was in 1813, when Jim Polk was 18. He outstripped everybody else in school, and the next year his father sent him to a more advanced school in Murfreesboro.

His "fine gray eyes" were glued to books so constantly that his health suffered, but in 2 years he was graduated as "much the most promising young man in the school."

That was in 1815, and the 20-year-old youth was determined to enter the University of North Carolina. He passed the examinations in Latin, Greek, and English, and was admitted to the sophomore class.

There he found himself.

He never doubted what he wanted to do—and that was to go into politics—after he discovered his oratorical ability in university debating societies. He was not dramatic or particularly appealing. His voice was nothing special. But he dug hard for the facts and lined them up in invincible order. When he faced an audience, he was confident, self-assured.

Jim Polk finished the university at the top of his class in May 1818, but he had studied so hard he was in a state of collapse, too ill to travel. Not until the following October could he make the trip home to Columbia.

His father and mother, with their nine other children, had moved into town, in a fine brick home on the best street in Columbia. But Jim didn't tarry there long. He went to Nashville to study with Felix Grundy, leading lawyer and political power in the State.

Entirely by chance, he got his foot in politics. On a hot summer day in 1819, he heard Grundy advise another young lawyer, Francis B. Fogg, to apply for the job as clerk of the legislature.

Fogg said he didn't want the job. Polk asked Fogg if he would use his influence to help him get the job. Fogg did.

The same year that Polk was admitted to the bar in Columbia (he told his family they must call him James from then on), he began his precise work as clerk of the legislature meeting in Murfreesboro, then the capital.

He earned his $6 a day by his "careful, businesslike habits." There was no question about his being reelected without opposition for the next session and two special sessions.

Between sessions, Polk built a strong law practice in Columbia. But his driving interest was in the maneuvers in the legislature, in every shrewd move.

"Everything here is done by management," one new member observed. "Intrigue and bargaining are at the bottom of everything."

Polk was watching the slow turn in national politics too—away from the bankers whom poor men were blaming for the financial crisis of 1819, and toward the political revolution that would sweep Andrew Jackson into the White House 9 years later.

In 1822, when Polk was about to marry and thought it time he run for the State legislature, he was already turning against his own family background of wealth and vast land holdings to fight for the little man's rights.

His opponent was an experienced and popular member of the legislature. Polk rode up and down the creeks of Maury County to explain his views. When the legislature met in Murfreesboro in 1823, he took his place in his first elected office. (A fellow legislator: David Crockett.)

Banking laws were the big issue, and party lines were being chiseled out by the stand a man took. Polk, then as later, was for getting banks out of the hands of the Government.

He fought the stifling tax laws and the evils of land speculation and caught the eye of the State's leaders, including his lifelong hero, Andrew Jackson.

Polk made a point of never allying himself too closely with anyone. But he saw things as Jackson saw them, and when there was talk of Jackson's running for the Presidency, Polk offered his full support.

Polk was urged to run for Congress, and he took on four strong opponents. He "lived on his horse" for 6 months of intensive campaigning, and won easily.

He had married Sarah Childress, daughter of a wealthy Murfreesboro merchant and landowner, on New Year's Day, 1824, and Sarah, who loved beautiful clothes, sprightly conversation, and the excitement of politics, was eager to join the heady Washington crowd.

But she stayed home in Columbia, in their cottage across the street from Polk's parents during his first session, and Polk lived in a boardinghouse with other Tennessee Congressmen in Washington.

The next session, Sarah went along, and they drove their own carriage and took two servants. On the way, at Nashville, they picked up Sam Houston, who was also in Congress then.

In Washington, David Crockett, the raw-boned bear killer, was again a fellow legislator. Tennessee, in fact, was producing an amazing surge of frontier vigor on the national scene.

Polk became President Jackson's right-hand man in Congress. He refused to have anything to do with the gossip when one of Jackson's Cabinet members, John H. Eaton, married a Washington tavernkeeper's daughter, Peggy O'Neale. Other Cabinet members and congressional wives snubbed the lively Peggy, and brought on a split in the Government. But when Sarah Polk joined in the snubbing, her husband left her at home in Columbia one session to think matters over.

Polk was in Congress in 1832 when his old friend Sam Houston breezed into Washington, fresh out of drunken exile among the Indians. Houston caned a Congressman who had made false statements about him, and the Congressman had Houston "tried" before the House.

Polk was among the Tennessee Congressmen who rallied to Houston's aid and gathered in his hotel room the night before the verdict to drink to a happy outcome.

Throughout his 14 years in Congress—4 of them as Speaker—Polk pressed his fight for low taxes, no tariff, and cheap land. He worked doggedly to cut down the inequities that New Englanders had set up to make their part of the country richer and the South poorer.

Sometimes when the ailing Polk came home to campaign between terms, he found himself a hero, worn out by the massive wining and dining. Sometimes he found the opposition so firmly entrenched that he had to fight for every vote and take to his bed at the end of the campaign.

When Polk became Speaker of the House in 1835, a bitter clique was lined up against him. They regularly announced in Washington hotels how they would harass him the next day as he presided, and crowds were invited to come watch the show.

President Jackson warned Polk that his life was in danger. The opposition was trying to provoke him into a duel.

But Polk refused to be baited. Cool, courteous, a skilled parliamentarian who steered the House through dizzying traps set for him, Speaker Polk won the respect of his stubbornest opposition.

New Englanders, "shaking with wrath" over proposed changes in tariff laws, decided to get even with Southern States by making an issue of slavery. Throughout a 3-month fight in 1836, the New Englanders sought to drive a wedge between northerner and southerner, between liberal southerner and conservative southerner, and Polk tried to hold a scrupulously fair line as he presided over the wild debates.

President Jackson left office after two terms. Polk was as valuable to President Van Buren as he had been to Jackson, and

Van Buren, as President, later visited the Polks in Columbia.

Sarah and Speaker Polk entertained royalty in their fashionable Washington home and splurged on a fine new coach that had venetian blinds at the windows and champagne-colored upholstery. And Polk became serious contender for the Vice Presidency in 1836.

But a financial crash had almost wrecked Jackson's party in Tennessee, and Polk was called home to run for Governor and help build up the party.

His victory in Tennessee against tremendous obstacles was a matter of national significance, and political leaders began to look on him as a man who could do the impossible.

But national leaders of the Whigs, the opposition party, concentrated their efforts on undermining Polk's administration as Governor, and he lost his next two races for the Governorship.

"Lean Jimmy" Jones, the east Tennessean who opposed Polk both times, could amble across the platform with a snicker and stroke a coonskin cap just so, and have the backwoods voters roaring with laughter, before he opened his mouth. His jibes at the deadly earnest Polk were killing, and "Lean Jimmy" won both races handidly.

Polk's family troubles had dogged him almost as incessantly as his political enemies and his stomach ache. His father had died soon after Polk went to Congress, and Polk, with no children of his own, had tried to help his widowed mother guide the younger brothers and sisters.

One brother had died an alcoholic, and two others died the same year. His four sisters were married, but one of them was so obstreperous that she kept the family in a turmoil. The Polks were often embroiled in litigation over division of their vast estates.

Polk had taken special interest in the education of his two youngest brothers at the University of North Carolina. One of them, Polk's favorite, died of tuberculosis soon after graduation. The only remaining brother exchanged shots with another man during a quarrel, killed him, and served a term in jail.

When Polk lost two tries for the Governorship, his gleeful opponents said it was all over for him. There was just so much a sick man could stand.

But it wasn't all over. Not by a long shot.

Tribute to Project Prayer and Tribute to Clarence Manion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite the attention of Senators to two recent columns written by one of the best and soundest writers in America, Mr. George Todt, of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. Mr. Todt is a great patriot and a stanch friend of freedom. He has won numerous awards for his writings, particularly by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

In one of these columns, Mr. Todt pays tribute to Project Prayer, an organization which is seeking to launch a campaign to overturn the Supreme Court decisions against prayers and Bible reading in our schools. In the other, Mr. Todt gives appropriate recognition to another great American patriot, Dean Clarence Manion, who produces the Manion Forum Broadcast and was formerly dean of the Notre Dame School of Law.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these columns, dated April 7 and April 6, 1964, respectively, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RALLY FOR PRAYER

(By George Todt)

"I want you to know how deeply I feel on this issue of trying to make America an atheist nation. It is my conviction that the Socialist-Communist conspiracy is pushing this program forward. There is a need for vigorous, organized opposition."—Mormon Apostle Ezra Taft Benson, letter, February 28, 1964.

A tremendous, star-studded rally in behalf of "Project Prayer" will be held in the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles this coming Saturday, commencing at 8 p.m., and it merits our support. Admission is free.

The event had originally been billed for showing at the Sports Arena last February 23, but necessary financial backing was mysteriously withdrawn at the 11th hour. So the rally was temporarily postponed.

But now the funds have been advanced and the contracts let—which I have seen—so there will be a "really big show" 4 days hence.

Some of Hollywood's biggest names will be on hand to entertain.

BEAUTY PLUS

National cochairman of "Project Prayer" and official rally hostess will be lovely Rhonda Fleming, whose beauty is exceeded only by her devotion to spiritual qualities and American patriotism.

California chairman and rally host will be Peter J. Pitchess, sheriff of Los Angeles County and former FBI agent.

This quiet, self-effacing gentleman is not only one of the greatest law enforcement officers in the Nation today—but solid as the Rock of Gibraltar in his steadfast, inspirational faith in our Creator, almighty God.

Some outstanding Hollywood stars will moderate and steer the flow of thinking for this documentary program. Among them are scheduled: Johnnie Grant, Lloyd Nolan, Robert Taylor, Robert Stack, Leon Ames, Gene Raymond, and Gloria Swanson.

WHERE TO CALL

Those desiring additional information may call the Project Prayer office, 1717 North Vine Street, Los Angeles 28; telephone HO 6-4766. Director is a wounded naval World War II veteran, Sam Cavnar. Inquiries are welcomed.

Over three-fourths of the required 218 Congressmen needed to sign necessary discharge petition No. 3 on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C., have already done so. This would take the Becker prayer amendment out of the Judiciary Committee freezeup, where it has lain idly in a contrived state of suspended animation for many months.

Its chairman, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, is a man who knows how to scream to high heaven if a civil rights bill gets hung up in this manner during the committee proceedings by his southern opposition. But he has done exactly the same thing to the stalled adherents of Project Prayer and the Becker prayer amendment.

WHOSE RIGHTS?

As is so often the case throughout history—and human nature—many bleats of self-righteousness merely depend upon whose ox is getting gored. Actually, what is intolerance anyway?

I wonder if anyone has ever had the temerity to point out to CELLER that just as many millions of American citizens—perhaps even more—are as interested in their unalienable religious rights as others are in so-called civil rights?

If the gentleman from New York expects generous treatment from others with regard to the controversial issue he is so interested in himself—he should be generous likewise to those who like the Becker prayer amendment.

Let's be motivated by a spirit of consideration and fair play here.

A LOVER OF FREEDOM

(By George Todt)

"Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."—Matthew 6: 34.

One of the most dedicated and hardest hitting American patriots I have ever met is Dean Clarence Manion, formerly of Notre Dame University, who now practices law in South Bend, Ind.

He is a marvelous speaker, full of fight, and will be on hand tomorrow for another in a long series of annual lectures at the Freedom Club of Los Angeles starting at 7:30 p.m.

The address will be in the sanctuary of the First Congregational Church, 555 South Hoover Street, Los Angeles (Dunkirk 5-1351). Those desiring seats should arrive early to insure them.

Dean Manion was one of the first guests I had on my Hollywood NBC television editorial show 10 years ago. We have been good friends ever since.

WHO IS HE?

Who is Dean Manion, anyway? Actually, his is one of the keenest legal minds in the Nation and is recognized as an international authority on constitutional law. This libertarian has an unquenchable love of freedom.

From 1941 to 1952 he was dean of the college of law at the University of Notre Dame in South Bend. He is now a member of the eminent law firm of Doran, Manion, Boynton & Kamm there.

His remarkable courage, wisdom, vision and moral strength has helped produce some fine brochures and well-qualified works on Americanism. The one I liked best of all was his book, "The Key to Peace."

LEGION SUPPORT

The American Legion must have felt much the same way about this little gem that I did—because the Legion adopted it for distribution to high schools throughout the Nation in its Americanization program.

As a result of his exemplary writings, Dean Manion was awarded four George Washington Honor Medals from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

He is in much demand on the lecture platform, being particularly well known for his radio "Manion Forum of the Air." He permits citizens who think as conservatives to come aboard—quite remarkable nowadays.

It was George Washington who once exclaimed: "Government, like fire, is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

CONTROL THE KEY

Dean Manion has amplified Washington's remark thusly:

"Government is exactly like fire, useful, necessary, but at the same time the most dangerous instrumentality on earth. Unless you keep government as you keep fire—under control, checked and balanced, separated, divided, tied down—government will destroy you."

Like most sensible public-spirited citizens today, we all believe in the right amount of limited self-government by the legal rep-

resentatives of the American people. But we want nothing smacking of alien Marxist dictatorship.

Totalitarianism from any direction is reprehensible to right-thinking patriotic Americans of both major political parties in our libertarian Republic.

We want no storm troopers, commissars or weird, far-out "intellectuals" who handsomely describe themselves as an "elite" to guide our destiny in the future. Let's stand on our own feet. Why not?

The Menominee Indians Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Green Bay Press-Gazette carried a very worthwhile and informative editorial concerning the situation in Menominee County, Wis.

Three years ago this month, Federal supervision was terminated over the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin. This termination took effect by the publication in the Federal Register of Secretary of the Interior Udall's Termination Order in April 1961. The House Appropriations Committee recently directed the Department of the Interior to make a complete and thorough study of the status of the Menominee termination. There are grave problems facing the Menominee Indian people in Wisconsin, and I would suggest that the Johnson administration begin its first offensive attack in the war on poverty in Menominee County, Wis. Thus far, I have been unable to interest the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or any other Federal agency in the problems of these people. The editorial which appeared in the Green Bay Press-Gazette Sunday supports the position I have been taking.

The editorial follows:

THE MENOMINEES NEED HELP

It is good news, although long delayed, that the Menominee Indian Commission has recognized the serious situation in Menominee County and is preparing to do what it can about it.

Assemblyman Theodore Abrahamson, of Tigerton, who represents Shawano and Menominee Counties in the legislature, told the commission that the timetable for the reappraisal of petitions affecting the Menominees should be advanced. The law authorizes a review in 1965. Abrahamson pointed out that the present economic difficulties of the county cannot wait that long. The commission appeared to accept Abrahamson's estimate of the situation. There can be no doubt about the grave need for assistance but there must be serious doubt that this burden should ever have been unloaded onto the State by the Federal Government.

If the Federal Government is looking for an opportunity to fight poverty it should give serious thought to Menominee County. The Menominees were and should still be the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is doubtful whether the State of Wisconsin can ever make a success of this special county.

Quite obviously the intention of the Federal termination act was to put the Menominee people on the same basis as the other people in Wisconsin. To do that they must have complete freedom but they have never been granted any such status. When the Federal Government withdrew, the State government stepped in and the result has been a special county with special laws and with continuing restrictions upon the Menominees' activities.

Because of an awareness of the unfortunate results of previous granting of freedom to Indian tribes the government of Wisconsin was not willing to permit the Menominees full freedom. It was feared that the valuable timber property would be disbursed to clever dealers ready to take advantage of the lack of business ability among the Menominees. The State viewed the former reservation as a beauty spot to be preserved. The result has been a virtual continuation of the reservation with the responsibility for its maintenance transferred from the Federal Government to the State government.

It is hard to disagree with the position the State government has taken. Few people believe that the Menominee Tribe suddenly granted full freedom and responsibility for their own affairs would be able to maintain their position as landowners and timber operators. But if they cannot be trusted to manage their own affairs they should then by all rules continue to be the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Ralph Donahue, a Madison engineer, who is familiar with the Menominee situation with the Government, appeared to have the most practical suggestion at the recent meeting of the State Menominee Indian Commission. Donahue said that the National Government in its war on poverty program, should reestablish a Federal hospital, take over the cost of the public school system, build a sanitary system, undertake vocational education of Menominee youth, rebuild streets and other community facilities, take over liability for medical and hospital care, and underwrite the value of the Menominee hold.

The Federal Government through its program to end poverty has the means to aid people in distress areas. The program in general calls for getting people off the relief rolls by teaching them new skills which will enable them to find jobs and maintain themselves. This is exactly what the Menominee people need. They need skills that will enable them to take jobs or advance to better jobs in their own lumbering industry or elsewhere. It is quite obvious now that such a job training program should have been undertaken by the Federal Government long before the termination act was adopted. The unfortunate experience of the Menominees since termination indicates clearly that the Federal Government will still need to go back and pick up this neglected training program. Further it will need to do a great many other things for the Menominees until the effects of the training program and the employment program begin to have some effect.

Food Stamps and the Cotton-Wheat Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, we have just experienced the annual cliches bearing on a solution of the agricultural programs.

Once again, surpluses are to be reduced, the farmers' income increased and, by way of legerdemain, consumer prices also reduced. Of course, storage charges on the huge surpluses are still piling up and proponents of the bill would be remiss indeed were they not to again promise taxpayer relief in that direction.

Our enormous appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in the meantime has been increasing by leaps and bounds, and the estimated cost of the present cotton program, $753 million a year plus $100 million for the wheat proposal, surely adds no fuel to the President's economy drive. Consistency in that direction would indicate a Presidential veto of these measures and bears out my own opposition to both.

Incidentally, a constituent writes me in connection with the food stamp plan:

If we are to have another form of currency, why not pay off the top echelons of Government, who are seeking big increases, in food stamps.

Reds To Form Youth Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I see, according to the article in the Aurora Beacon-News, that the Communist Party in the United States is planning to hold a convention in Chicago to establish a National Marxist Youth Organization. The authority for this is no less than the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as we get along into consideration of President Johnson's war-on-poverty proposals, particularly with respect to the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, Job Corps, or what-have-you, that if these programs come into being, the administrators be particularly on the alert for infiltration by these young Reds, who will be bent on sowing the seeds of communism in just such organizations.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD.

REDS TO FORM YOUTH PARTY

WASHINGTON.—The Communist Party in the United States hopes to hold a founding convention in June, probably in Chicago, to establish a national Marxist-oriented youth organization.

This was disclosed today by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"Plans for the group were discussed at high-level party conferences in Chicago in October and December 1963," Hoover said in an interview. "The party is presently setting up organizing committees in various parts of the country to plan and create interest in a founding convention."

Hoover said the party youth organization is viewed by Reds as a "climax" to its intensive work in the youth field during the last several years.

"Party leaders have spoken at many college campuses," Hoover said. "They have talked to students personally, spread literature, tried to present the party as a legitimate political party. In radio and television broadcasts they have tried to present a false image of communism as a 'forward-looking' American program designed to improve the welfare of our people and promote 'world peace.' "

Hoover said the proposed youth group is viewed by Communists as "a new weapon of assault against the United States." He said it will be a front organization that tries to hide its formal links with the Communist Party organization behind "the trappings of a Marxist-oriented" group.

Plea for a Law To Control and Regulate Corporations Building Runaway Plants in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution that was proposed and adopted by the New York State Legislative Committee on Political Education of the United Steelworkers of America at its meeting in February 1964, at Albany, N.Y.

This resolution, which follows, calls upon Congress to enact legislation for the control and regulation of corporations building runaway plants in foreign countries, and has been approved by many locals of the United Steelworkers of America in my area:

RESOLUTION CALLING ON CONGRESS TO ENACT A LAW TO CONTROL AND REGULATE CORPORATIONS BUILDING RUNAWAY PLANTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Whereas the strength of our economy has long depended on the initiative, competence, and skill of its work force. Since ours is an interdependent society, our country can be only as strong as those Americans working on the lowest paid jobs;

Whereas unemployment is steadily becoming worse, due to many factors. Since 1956, there are 200,000 fewer men in the steel industry and the auto industry has abolished another 168,000 jobs;

Whereas the Department of Labor sets its own estimate of 4,000 jobs being eliminated every week but admits, that nobody really knows, yet competent industrialists state that a more correct figure would be 40,000 men per week being disemployed;

Whereas many industries including the steel industry have built and are building modern new plants in many foreign countries, on money and profits accrued in our great country;

Whereas it is possible and even probable, that companies plan to produce in foreign countries for export to the United States. In a matter of several years, these foreign plants could be gnawing at our very existence;

Therefore in view of the record profits that almost all huge corporations are earning, with less manpower, and worse yet, allowing productive plants to remain idle in America: Be it

Resolved, That some form of legislation be enacted to protect our own vital productive capacities, and also to prove to big business that democracy cannot afford to sacrifice even a small group in its population, to serve the avarice and greed of many huge corporations; and be it further

Resolved, That corporations who are using foreign countries to further their own selfish interests should be made responsive to the general public interest of the United States, and we urge the enactment of a law prohibiting these irresponsible huge corporations from taking advantage of present loopholes in the tax laws, by applying tax reductions to their foreign operations in runaway plants.

Lesson of Wisconsin Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by David Lawrence, entitled "Lesson of Wisconsin Primary."

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is time to reflect in a sober fashion on just what would happen to the citizens of this Republic if the so-called civil rights bill as it passed the House were to be enacted into law. As Mr. Lawrence states so well, American people resent intrusion into their private lives and their freedom to choose their associates.

The editorial follows:

LESSON OF WISCONSIN PRIMARY—SEGMENT OF PEOPLE RESENT INTRUSIONS INTO PRIVATE LIVES, FREEDOM OF CHOICE

[By David Lawrence]

Maybe what has just happened in the Wisconsin primary will give Congress pause. It may teach a lesson often forgotten—that a substantial segment of the American people resent intrusion into their private lives and their freedom to choose their associates, black or white or brown or yellow, on the basis of their own judgment and their own likes or dislikes.

For if resentment already evidenced across the Northern States—not merely in the South—is beginning to be expressed in the form of votes at the polls, then a crisis of major proportions may come again to America.

The last crisis of this kind—governmental coercion in an attempt to achieve prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors—ended in a debacle. It was largely the fault of the prohibitionists, who could not see that their methods were wrong.

Today, the cause of civil rights, which in many respects is a just cause, is headed for another debacle, largely because its proponents have chosen the wrong methods to win public support.

It is easy enough to say that in Wisconsin mostly Republicans give a symbolic vote for the arguments of Governor Wallace of Alabama. But there were unquestionably Democrats who felt the same way. The expectation at first had been that the Alabama Governor would get only 5 percent of the vote. He finally received 25 percent of all votes cast. Indeed, in the Democratic primary itself he got 34 percent.

The significant development is that, in a State as far from the south as Wisconsin—known for its progressive thinking—an election was actually conducted in which civil rights was an issue, and 25 percent of the voters registered their protest against it.

On the same day, moreover, that the Wisconsin primary was being held, a tragedy occurred in Cleveland, Ohio, where an impassioned minister was killed as he dramatically threw himself behind a bulldozer. In that city, the mayor has been trying to halt the violent demonstration in a school-segregation crisis. The trespassers on public school property were trying to get the city to abandon the construction of certain schools. This extreme method of demonstration touched off sporadic violence and at least 15 persons were injured and 26 arrested on charges of disorderly conduct or resisting arrest.

The responsibility for these tragic happenings rests on some of the leaders in the civil rights movement particularly on those leaders who misconstrued demonstrations like the famous "March on Washington" as seeming to give the stamp of approval to demonstrations of all kinds.

Today, many of the northern cities, including New York and Chicago, are conscientiously striving to handle the difficult problem of racial integration. But they find themselves not occupied merely with what the Constitution and the law require—namely, that there shall be no racial discrimination in citizenship rights. They are instead being stampeded to correct racial imbalance by methods which introduce a counter-discrimination—as, for instance, against those white citizens whose children are being prevented from going to their own neighborhood schools. This is one of the demands of civil rights leaders in their boycotts and other demonstrations.

Also, the newspapers in Cleveland report that a local rifle club is being formed to protect the civil rights demonstrators. There are said to be about 16 such rifle clubs in the country, and their avowed object is to intervene wherever "police guarantees" are deemed inadequate.

How can public sentiment express itself against encroachments on private rights? The citizens of Wisconsin found a way, and so did the voters in Kansas City, Mo., this week when they voted on a city ordinance which dealt with "public accommodations." The ordinance was designed to enlarge the number of places in which discrimination would be prohibited, and went beyond the provisions of the pending bill in Congress. The measure was under vigorous attack by tavern owners, and the vote was about 50–50, as the ordinance won by a narrow margin.

All this adds up to civic resentment, the first signs of which are beginning to appear in different sections of the country. The pending "civil rights" bill is only a first step in the crusade. The real crisis will come when the Federal Government tries to enforce the provisions of the proposed law not only in "public accommodations" but in the handling of employment in various kinds of businesses. Demands that racial quotas become paramount guidelines of employment can only provoke deep-seated antagonisms if the Government agencies set up their own methods of determining efficiency and qualifications for a job in private business in America.

Results of California's Sixth District Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the results of my annual poll of San Francisco's Sixth Congressional District have just been tabu'ated.

Questionnaires were mailed to every household containing a registered voter. Perhaps my colleagues will be interested in the results:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. TAX CUT AND NATIONAL DEBT			
While the exact form of the tax bill expected to be approved by the Senate is uncertain at this writing, it appears likely that the final vote will come on a measure which will reduce Federal revenues and lower corporate and personal income taxes by more than $11,000,000,000. The measure would also eliminate the 4-percent tax credit on dividend income, render nondeductible items such as State and local auto and gas taxes, and adjust other miscellaneous rates. The national debt on June 30, 1964, is estimated at approximately $312,000,000,000 and an unbalanced budget is projected. In view of all factors, do you favor the tax bill?	56	39	5
B. CIVIL RIGHTS			
Do you favor the following features of the civil rights bill now before Congress authorizing the U.S. Attorney General to—			
1. Initiate civil proceedings concerning the possible violation of voting rights?	80	14	6
2. Initiate action to compel the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, and facilities of any place of public accommodations such as hotels, restaurants, movies, and sports arenas without discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin?	67	27	6
3. Enforce equal opportunities for employment without discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin?	70	23	7
C. EAST-WEST TRADE			
Recent developments such as the partial-test-ban treaty have heightened interest in increased trade between the United States and its allies on the one hand and the Soviet Union and Communist bloc nations on the other. Do you favor—			
1. Permitting maximum trade between East and West?	32	46	22
2. Trade limited to nonstrategic goods; e.g., recent U.S. wheat sale?	57	24	19
3. Restricting East-West trade to a minimum?	37	33	30
D. PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS			
In view of the 1963 Supreme Court prayer decision interpreting the 1st amendment to the U.S. Constitution, do you favor the proposed constitutional amendment allowing the offering of prayers or reading from the Bible on a voluntary basis in public schools?	66	31	3
E. IMMIGRATION			
Do you favor a bill to change immigration requirements so that foreign-born individuals would be admitted to the United States on the basis of personal skills or relationships to U.S. citizens rather than by quotas allocated according to national origin?	59	35	6
F. PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION			
Do you favor a line of Presidential succession—			
1. According to present law whereby the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate follow the Vice President?	26	42	32
2. According to the law in effect from 1886 to 1947 whereby the Secretary of State and other Cabinet members followed the Vice President?	34	34	32
3. So that the Vice President, if he succeeded to the Presidency, could then nominate his own Vice President, subject to approval by Congress?	36	36	28
4. To provide for the election of a First and Second Vice President?	33	39	28

Urban Renewal Program in Fresno, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal urban renewal program is much in the news these days, and more and more will this be true as time for debate on the Housing Act of 1964 approaches.

In my hometown of Fresno, the urban renewal program gives every indication of being an outstanding success. Time and again it has been said that the successful renewal program is the one that has the backing of all facets of community life—the local citizen groups, the business groups, such as the local chamber of commerce, and the news media. Fresno today is proof of this.

There are four urban renewal projects in Fresno now under contract, involving the redevelopment and renewal of some 290 acres of land. The Federal Government, through the URA, has allocated or reserved over $20 million for these projects, two of which are in the development phase and two in planning. The Federal contribution will be matched many times over by the local investment in the four areas.

An $8 million complex has already been completed in one of the project areas, with more to come in the same area, including a mall, a new Federal building, a county courthouse, and a convention center.

Fresnans are particularly proud of their downtown renewal project, and in this connection, I would like to call attention to the following articles from the Fresno Bee of March 7 and March 10, 1964:

[From the Fresno Bee, Mar. 7, 1964]

WEBB OPENING POINTS TO BIG FRESNO FUTURE

(By H. L. Sisson)

A Fresno native and his home city drew several rounds of praise and applause today as the new 22-story Del Webb Towne House and Fresno Center was opened.

In ribbon-cutting ceremonies at the Tulare Street entrance to the sunken plaza a glowing picture of Fresno's future was painted by Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson, Federal Commissioner of Urban Renewal William L. Slayton, Mayor Wallace Henderson, and Edgardo Contini, a senior partner in Victor Gruen & Associates, the firm designing the Fulton Street Mall.

Webb, a native Fresnan and corporate owner of many major developments, was assisted in the ribbon cutting by Anderson and Mayor Henderson.

THIRTY-UNIT PARADE

The ceremonies followed a parade with 30 units through the downtown area to the front of the building.

While Webb and his $8 million project were in the spotlight, the impact upon the total community and its future were not overlooked.

Webb emphasized during a press conference that the corporation's selection of Fresno for the venture was based upon extensive research which indicated a healthy future. He noted that the facility already has bookings for activities through 1966.

"Fresno has a need," he said.

Later he said the corporation will also keep its eye on Fresno for future project opportunities.

"If there is an opportunity we will be here building it," Webb said.

POINTS TO GROWTH

Anderson pointed to statewide growth and urban renewal programs in "anticipation of our growth from our current population of 17½ million to 30 million persons" by 1980. He cited Fresno's interest in development and urban renewal as a statewide example.

Contini termed Fresno's interest in growth such as Webb's project and urban renewal as unique.

"Fresno has always viewed urban renewal as a catalytic function and has had the real spirit from the start. It has expanded its program with the support of government and business, all based upon * * * the problem of revitalizing the central area. What is more important, it is not just a paper plan. It works."

FUTURE IMPACT

Mayor Henderson covered the future impact of the Webb project with 225 employees, new conventions coming in, and the corporation offices here. He also cited the future impact of the Fulton Street Mall and the Fresno convention center.

"I would estimate that $200 million in new money will be spent in Fresno in the next 5 years," Henderson said.

The mayor also briefly reviewed the various urban renewal projects under way and emphasized that future projects are being considered.

"But right now," he said, "we have our hands full."

In a speech to members of the Fresno County and City Chamber of Commerce at noon today, Slayton called Fresno "an excellent model of renewal."

Fresno, he said, "indeed has put its money where its mouth is" in implementing the Fresno plan to revitalize the downtown district.

PLUNGED INTO ACTION

"Planning has been plunged into the action field," Slayton said. "We now have a vehicle, urban renewal, to carry out the plans that heretofore were but hopes and dreams. And since the action vehicle is at hand, we have to put up or shut up.

"We can no longer just talk in pious terms of the city and what we want it to be. We must dec..e specifically what is to be done this year, and next year, and the year after, to make sure our cities are rebuilt as we want them to be.

"There is an old saying, and a true one; money talks, in short, we have to put our money where our mouth is.

"When I was apprised the other day of the generous financial contributions that Fresno businessmen had made through your Downtown Association and mall assessment district, I realized that Fresno, indeed, has put its money where its mouth is."

Slayton urged Fresno to continue pressing its downtown redevelopment program.

GOOD DESIGN

"You have a good design here in the Fresno plan. Make sure that you follow it, that you do not allow yourselves to be detoured by the siren songs of quick profit or ephemeral savings.

"What you are building here in the central business district is going to last a long, long time. Let us make sure that our children and our children's children will be able to enjoy the fruits of our investment in dollars, energy, ingenuity and effort."

Slayton called the Fresno plan "exciting" and "one of the most ambitious, imaginative plans for central business district development that I have yet seen," and a tribute to business leaders, government and citizens who have supported it.

In a press conference this morning, Slayton said Fresno's mall treatment of the downtown district "is a first" in urban renewal nationally.

He predicted the project, which will go into construction March 30, "will encourage other cities to do the same thing."

Master of ceremonies for the ribbon cutting was Chamber of Commerce President Richard Worrel. Also on the speakers' platform were Fresno Assemblyman George N. Zenovich, Sloan P. McCormick, chairman of the board of supervisors, Mrs. Webb, and the owners of the property on which the new Webb building complex is located, Milo E. Rowell, Paul R. Bartlett, and Mrs. Elizabeth Farrar.

The building will be open to the public for tours tomorrow from noon to 9 p.m.

[From the Fresno Bee, Mar. 10, 1964]

ROAD BACK LIES OPEN FOR DOWNTOWN FRESNO

Fresno's downtown plan is no longer a paper plan and the voices of the cynics are getting fainter.

The physical evidence abounds. Even the complacent pigeons are fluttering uneasily in the architectural furbelows and gingerbread at 1920–22 Mariposa Street. The other examples along Mariposa of the uniquely ugly building style sometimes called carpenters' Gothic are being loaded into trucks by the wrecker's clamshell and 1920–22 is waiting its turn.

Work on the Fulton Street pedestrian mall will start in about 3 weeks.

Soon to come—a new Federal building, county courthouse, and convention center. And the 22-story Del Webb Center, the first high-rise building to be built here in 38 years, opens as a symbol of the millions of dollars of private investment which has been and will be generated by the downtown plan and its underpinning, the central business district redevelopment project.

All this began as an act of faith by the city, the Federal Government and the downtown association that the city's declining central core could be resuscitated.

The catalyst was urban renewal—the willingness of the public agencies to put an estimated $31 million into redevelopment (almost $13 million will come back from the sale of improved land).

The private sector has responded and will continue to respond and this is not an act of faith but a cool, conservative estimate of Fresno's future needs.

In the words of William L. Slayton, the Federal Commissioner of Urban Renewal, Fresno has "put its money where its mouth is" and has produced "one of the most ambitions, imaginative plans for central business district development that I have yet seen."

The upward spiral, then, would seem to be irreversible. But Slayton had something else to say which bears reemphasis. In the heady atmosphere which is enveloping the downtown project the city should make sure it does not bend the plan out of shape in response to what Slayton called "the siren songs of quick profit or ephemeral savings."

It is perhaps no exaggeration to say this is a once in a century opportunity. The planners and the architects must continue to play as important a role as the investors and the economic analysts.

Idaho Statesman Newspaper Opposes John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, since 1961, I have been opposing the extremism of the John Birch Society in Idaho. My congressional mail has revealed a great amount of John Birch Society activity and an increasing number of converts.

However, my attempts to warn Idahoans of this extremist group had been ridiculed by the editorial and political writers of Idaho's largest paper until Wednesday, April 1.

As late as March 9, the Idaho Evening Statesman carried the following reprinted editorial insinuating that my great concern about the Birch Society must be for California or some other State as Idaho did not have any John Birch activity.

GOODING LEADER

[From the Boise (Idaho) Evening Statesman, Mar. 9, 1964]

Congressman RALPH HARDING, Democrat, of Idaho, is hitting the headlines regularly with his attacks on members of the John Birch Society.

In places where there are John Birch Society members they are chiefly notable for the extreme political philosophies of their members. For this reason there are not many of them. Their activities where they do exist are limited to telegrams, telephone calls, presence of pickets at State capitols, news releases.

In California, for instance, the members of the society are very vocal and have had influence in certain elections. In this one State, at least, the John Birch Society conducts well organized campaigns to influence the legislature, with letters, telegrams, pickets, meetings, news accounts, speakers.

In contrast here in Idaho we have never seen a newspaper story of a meeting, heard a local speaker on radio or television, been invited to a meeting, etc.

It is a fact that the great majority of Americans are moderate in political philosophies, either Democrat or Republican. Of these a large segment votes independently of political party, choosing to aline behind a candidate, particularly in the presidential elections.

Have you ever met a member of the John Birch Society? Have you ever been contacted to join the John Birch Society?

Congressman RALPH HARDING's great concern must be for California or some other State—not Idaho.

The paper chose to ignore the fact that Robert Welch, Tom Anderson, Reed Benson, John Rousselot, and Billy James Hargis have headlined a list of Birch speakers into that section of Idaho in which the Idaho Statesman is circulated. I am informed that the so-called Reverends McIntyre and Schwartz are next on the extremists' circuit into Idaho.

In addition, we have been subjected to the rantings and ravings of Dean Manion and Dan Smoot via radio and newsletter.

I was, therefore, relieved when on Wednesday, April 1, in a reversal of the complacency of their earlier reprinted editorial, the Idaho Statesman finally came out in opposition to the John Birch Society with the following editorial which I consider outstanding and helpful, even though months late.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 1, 1964]

THE EXTREMISTS SPEAK

Nothing should give the Communists more happy thoughts these days than to be headlined as the chief promoters of the civil rights bill, now before the Senate.

A spokesman for the John Birch Society in Boise Monday night declared that the "rights" bill is a "Red tool" and that the act heads the Communists' agenda to promote "this strife."

Americans might answer to this alarmist organization that the U.S. Senate is perfectly capable of debating the controversial issues of the Civil Rights Act without being alarmed that each paragraph or subsection points to the rise of communism. If anything in the past 2 years has given a lift to the extreme leftwing in American politics it probably has been the John Birchers. If any organization is bent upon creating civil strife, suspicion in the minds of citizens, turmoil in the legislative halls, the John Birchers could be the major promoters—but they have minimized their influence by preoccupation with extremism. From them, the Communists should take lessons.

The Civil Rights Act may be good or may be bad. But that is what the taxpayers pay their legislators in Washington, D.C. to figure out. Whether the minority is going to rule the majority by passage of the Civil Rights Act is not foreseen. But that the public is expected to renounce the act because it is alleged as a tool of the Reds is a ridiculous request of the John Birchers.

The rights bill concerns mainly the desires of a group of Negro leaders. Even though the bill is passed there is no certainty that all will be well. Court tests are in the offing. Public acceptance of some of the bill's proposals is doubtful. There can be strife.

But, nevertheless, this is a Republic and Congress is charged with the issuance of laws through a representative legislative process. And whether we like civil rights, Congress, the Supreme Court or not, the American public is not going to cower before the idiotic assumptions of the Birch society.

The avowed purpose of any group to fight communism within the United States is laudable, but only when the fight waged is honest and judiciously waged. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is the responsible, trained agency in this country to so wage the fight—not the John Birch Society, which sees a Communist under "every bed" of political activity in our realm, which splits religious groups, which divideds good citizens—those who agree with Birchism and those who do not, with the later tabbed as "pinko" or "Red."

Idahoans have a past of being fiercely independent and honest in their political thinking. The pioneers who built this State in the last century spoke bluntly and candidly. But can state historians look into the past annals and find a group of solid, respected citizens so captivated by such an organization as the John Birch group?

The founder of the John Birch Society gained prominence when he accused former

President Eisenhower of being a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy" and "the chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior boss within the Communist Party."

The late President Kennedy declared that the society was totally alien to both the Democratic and Republican parties and noted that Mr. Eisenhower had been as vigorous in his denunciations of the John Birch Society as was he, Mr. Kennedy.

Vice President Richard Nixon said neither party could afford candidates who sought the support of such organizations as the Birch Society.

"The United States needs good, strong anti-Communists," Nixon said, "but those who accept or seek support from the John Birch Society are not serving America."

This is a free country in which all may speak or preach. Let that freedom remain without being subverted by the extremists, whether in the Communist ranks or on the rolls of the Birchers.

As evidence of the error of the Statesman's complacent attitude suggested in their reprinted editorial of March 9 that Idaho does not have any John Birch activity, one only needs to read the readers' reaction to their editorial of April 1. Following are letters contained in the "Letters to the Editor" section of the Sunday Statesman of April 5:

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

ARTICLE DECLARED EXTREMELY UNFAIR

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

With all due respect to the press, I feel a few comments would be in order concerning your editorial of April 1, 1964, concerning the John Birch Society.

I have followed this group with great interest over the last 2 years. My aunt is a very hard worker in this organization in California and she has sent a great deal of reading material to me during that time, some of which I have agreed with and some of which I have not.

Anyone who would deny that the Communists are involved in the Negro situation in this country would be a fool. It would seem to me that the Communists would be fools not to get into the civil rights battle. They have always supported any legislation in this country that would provide more Federal control, and I imagine they always will as long as they are allowed to get by with it. They would be fools if they didn't. And fools they are not. I have in my possession a copy of "The People's World" which is the west coast Communist newspaper and it goes into detail about the civil rights bill. They have told us in this that they are involved in it and when they themselves tell us this, we can hardly deny it.

I think your article was extremely unfair. I have lived in Idaho most of my life and have read the Statesman over the years, and have not always agreed with them but never have I found them to be unfair until now. The article was very much exaggerated and really when people call the Birchers "hatemongers" it might be wise to clean out their own closets a bit. The liberals and the Communists and the Socialists have attacked our society with more hate than the JBS could come up with in a 100 years. This article in my opinion was extreme and very slanted and really stretching way out. One can make anything look bad if one is a clever writer and can work hard enough at it.

I am not so concerned about the actual Communists in this country as I am about our liberals that have been brainwashed into carrying out the Communist Party line. These people are honest Americans in most cases, I am sure, but as our Saviour said: "God forgive them for they know not what they do." If everyone would read a book, of which there are many, about the Communist menace in this country I am sure they would realize that the liberals are carrying out the wishes of the Communists and they don't even know it. "God forgive them for they know not what they do."

JEANNE DOUGLAS.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

EDITORIAL BRINGS READER COMPLAINT

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

Until Wednesday's Statesman arrived I have had little complaint about the Statesman, but that morning's editorial, "The Extremists Speak," should be retitled "The Extremist Speaks."

The news articles of Tuesday stated that the statements of the Birch speaker were supported by frequent documentation. Would it not have been more responsible editorial writing to have attacked the document sources as being false, illogical, or unworthy than use statements such as "alarmist organization," "ridiculous request," "idiotic assumptions," "subverted by extremists," and several longer ones?

The editorial used quotes also, but quoted the opinions of the people that the Birchers have challenged to prove that the Birchers were guilty or poor judgment. This is similar to proving that the Statesman in a bad newspaper by quoting the people that dislike the firm.

Since the editorial was written on April 1, maybe the typesetter forgot to add the last line which said, "April Fool."

I for one hope that the Statesman will continue to live up to the qualities in the word "Statesman" as it has in the past.

DON E. HAASCH.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

EDITORIAL DOESN'T QUITE MAKE SENSE

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

Your editorial on "The Extremists Speak" (April 1) didn't make sense after hearing the well-documented talk on the civil rights bill by the Honorable Mr. John Rousselot.

Talks which I have heard by refugees from enslaved countries, as well as talks given by ex-FBI agents on the same subject, corroborate what Mr. Rousselot said about the civil right's bill's being used as a tool by the Communist conspiracy to divide and conquer us. You referred to the FBI yourself as an authority, and Mr. Rousselot quoted J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, in the documentation which he gave.

In J. Edgar Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit," there is a whole chapter written on communism and minorities. Here is a quote from page 250 by a Negro who had gone to Russia to attend the Lenin School: "I found that Negroes were special objects of political exploitation. The sacrifices and dirty work planned for the American Negro Communists as spearheads for communizing the United States made it obvious that we were considered only as pawns in a game where others would get the prize."

It has always been the traditional right of a free people to question the acts of those whom they elect to office, for just being elected to office doesn't insure that the mantle of righteousness is going to fall upon the occupant. I hope that what you said in your editorial does not mean that you want that right taken away.

Contrary to what you said in your editorial about the members of the John Birch Society looking under beds for Communists, they are looking for them in places they have said they would infiltrate—the Government, civic organizations, minority groups, etc.

MARY JANE ROOT.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

FORTHRIGHTNESS SEEN IN EDITORIAL

As one who has frequently criticized the Statesman editorial page, I want to congratulate and applaud the forthright editorial in your Wednesday, April 1, 1964, morning edition. This editorial, entitled "The Extremists Speak," which denounced the John Birch Society, certainly deserves the praise of all of your readers.

Your stand against the emotionalism and fanaticism of the Birch Society should be the signal for all those who agree that such an approach to the problems confronting the United States is destructive of our responsible political party system to join you in publicly denouncing the society.

BYRON J. JOHNSON.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

VOICE OF REASON SHOULD BE CLEAR

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

We can't tell you how good it was to read the courageous and welcome editorial in Wednesday morning's paper on the John Birch Society. We have been appalled in recent months to see the increasing effect of the radicalism of this movement in the community. Nothing could be more timely than that the Statesman should be the clear voice of reason in labeling this movement for what it is.

Thank you again.

L. L. AND ALICE DIETER.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

OLD-FASHIONED PATRIOTISM LIKED

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

I read that the John Birch Society has sent another messenger to Boise—and wonders of wonders—he tells us that the Communists are going to give our minorities their civil liberties. The society has explained another issue and made another decision for us. It now appears that if one is to be anti-Communist he should do "all within his power" to defeat the civil rights bill. This puts me in a quandary because I want every American to have his constitutional rights. Does this make me a Communist or comsymp?

In fairness to Mr. Rousselot, I will say that there are portions of the present bill that may exceed the definition of a civil right. If this is true, Congress or the courts will surely correct them. The society evidently fears that our legislative and judicial processes are either unworkable or Communist controlled. Does this indicate that they advocate another form of government?

It is difficult to legislate morality (to subjugate a religious or racial group is immoral in my opinion) but America has waited too long in seeing that all her citizens obtain their civil rights.

The John Birch Society seems to have brought forth a new breed of "super-patriots." I submit that old-fashioned American patriotism is quite sufficient. We must retain the right of freedom of thought and speech. We must defend this right one for another. We must gain for all our citizenry their precious inalienable rights. These and the rest of our heritage can be obtained and protected through basic democratic means.

"Super-patriotism" and thought control can lead only to another extreme. Let us discard labels and fearmongering and combat communism (and other obscene ideologies) not with extremism but with Americanism.

C. W. MARY, Jr.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

LOGIC OF BIRCHERS DRAWS CRITICISM

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

Thank you for your editorial, "The Extremists Speak," on April 1. You have done a real service in pointing out the idiotic assumptions of the John Birch Society which "sees a Communist under every bed." Their logic on the civil rights bill seems to be: "We don't like this bill. Since we are the only true Americans, the bill must be anti-American; the Communists are anti-American, so they must be behind the civil rights bill."

Last year when Robert Welch spoke in Boise, he blamed the Communists (or gave them credit) for the election of Roosevelt in 1940 and the defeat of Taft at the Republican convention in 1952. Now his society believes the Communists were able to dupe the House of Representatives (which has passed the civil rights bill) and the large number of Senators who favor the bill.

Apparently the Birchers have no faith in democracy; they believe that the democratic process has failed in the aforementioned Republican convention, the last several national elections, and in the majority of the congressional elections.

They believe that the Communists are strong enough (with a few thousand party members) to sway the opinions of college presidents, ministers and church leaders, political parties, the voting public: In fact, everyone but the Birchers themselves.

Thank God the American people have more faith in democracy, and give less credence to the power of the Communists, than this unhappy society does. I dare to believe that not only Negro Americans, but a majority of white citizens, will rejoice when this bill to remove some of the racial barriers to democracy is passed.

PAUL V. LARUE.

BOISE.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Apr. 5, 1964]

MEN ENTANGLED BY THEIR TONGUES

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

A resounding three cheers to the editorial in last Wednesday's a.m. edition regarding the John Birch Society. It's true that birds are entangled by their feet and men by their tongues, for the Birch bunch have proved it.

NELLIE DAWSON, *Weiser.*

Even though the majority of Idahoans who wrote the editor on this subject supported the Statesman in its editorial against the Birchers, one only has to read the opposition letters to realize that it is not just California that has a problem with the hysteria and the extremism of the John Birch Society.

I am, however, gratified that in spite of the John Birch Society's letterwriting instructions we had a 5-to-3 margin in letters opposing the John Birch Society and what it stands for.

The Presidential Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, countless items have been written about the death of President Kennedy, but one of the most meaningful I have read is a poem by Dr. Bernard G. Jackson, of Round Rock, Tex. Under permission granted, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENTIAL PASSING

(By Bernard G. Jackson, D.D.S.)

We mourn the Presidential passing!
From aching hearts keep asking
Why did he have to go?
Must crime and evil ever triumph so?

The reeling nation staggers;
Its heart-beat briefly laggers!
The brilliant future dimming
By senseless, hateful killing!

The ship of state is steadied,
For coming conflict readied—
To lead the nation to the right,
The Charter points us to The Light!

Engrave on every heart as well,
What every little coin can tell:
To every citizen a must—
The only hope: "In God We Trust."

Lament the Presidential passing!
Resolve to keep on asking
God's help: Our strategy
For Triumph out of tragedy.

James K. Polk: The President Who Extended Our Borders to the Pacific—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the driving force that made James Knox Polk, of Tennessee, a great American President was "the conviction that he had to serve the little man and to pave the way for the growth of the Nation."

This insight into the sources of his strength is given in the second and concluding part of Louise Davis' article on "The President We Have Forgotten," which is being reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

Miss Davis points out that earlier estimates of Polk as a proslavery President were far from the historical facts.

His drive to stretch the Nation to the Pacific had nothing to do with extending slave territory—

She writes:

It was a determined drive to get America's hands firmly on Pacific ports, particularly San Francisco.

The text of the concluding installment of this article on President Polk's administration follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Mar. 29, 1964]

THE DARK HORSE MAKES HIS PLAY

(By Louise Davis)

The fan that Sarah Polk fluttered against her blue velvet gown at the inaugural ball had miniature portraits of all 11 Presidents on it—the newest, her husband, James K. Polk.

It was Polk's special gift to his wife to commemorate the day she became First Lady of the Land—one of his few lapses into sentimentality. She carried it to the inauguration ceremonies in the drenching rain that March 4, 1845.

They rushed from the wet procession to the White House for the formal dinner the 49-year-old President and his wife were giving that night.

That was the beginning.

Four years later, when the California gold rush sent ships and wagons racing west, some Americans remembered it was President Polk who had acquired that land—from Mexico to Canada, from the Rockies to the Pacific—for the United States.

One of their toasts ran: "To George Washington, who did more than any other man to establish our country; to James K. Polk, who did more than any other man to enlarge it."

But in the century between the gold rush and the atomic bomb, Polk's memory was almost blotted off the history books.

The long sleep of Polk's fame came largely because northern historians mistakenly imagined that the southern President's motives in expanding the Nation was to extend slavery.

But when the passions of the Civil War had cooled and historians investigated Polk's diary and correspondence, they were astounded at the size of his accomplishments. Polk had in fact devoted much of his energy to averting a civil war.

Every survey of the Nation's Presidents in the last 10 years has placed him among the 10 greatest. Some historians place him at the top, as "the most successful," if Presidents are judged by what they accomplished.

Actually Polk would never have had a chance at the Presidency if it had not been for the touchy problem of slavery that was muddying political campaigns 20 years before the Civil War.

Martin Van Buren, who had already served one term in the White House, was practically sure of nomination as President, and Polk had hopes of being Vice President.

But the big question of the day was whether the United States should admit Texas to the Union, and Van Buren, a New Yorker, opposed that. The Texas question was being confused with the slavery question. Northern politicians were arguing that letting Texas into the Union would mean another slave State.

Andrew Jackson, old and frail and less than a year from his grave, summoned Polk from his Columbia home to the Hermitage. He told Polk to make his views known on Texas and win the election for the Democrats. The Nation was in a mood to grow.

And Polk, even though he had been out of office for 3 years (defeated in two tries for the governorship after one term), was still a power in national politics. His Columbia home, just down the street from where his parents' home still stands, was bustling with correspondence between him and party leaders in Washington.

Even President Tyler, of the opposition party, offered him the job of Secretary of the Navy during those years of retirement, but Polk turned it down. He was biding his time for the Vice-Presidency.

So, in May 1844, while the slow-talking, meticulously dressed Polk devised the strategy from his Columbia home, his friends, Cave Johnson, of Clarksville, and Gideon Pillow, of Columbia, went to the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore to work for his nomination for the Vice-Presidency—and just possibly for the Presidency.

The convention turned into a mad, four-way contest, with Van Buren leading. It was not until the third day of balloting that Polk's name was proposed for the Presidency, and Van Buren withdrew in his favor—throwing the powerful New York delegation to the pro-Texas candidate from Tennessee.

On the second balloting after his name was introduced, Polk got the unanimous vote of the convention. All of a sudden the Nation had its first "dark horse" candidate, and the opposition delighted in chanting, "Who is James K. Polk?"

To balance the ticket, easterner George M. Dallas, a Pennsylvanian whom Sarah Polk later described as "an elegant man, tall, exceedingly handsome, and gentle in manner," was nominated as Vice President.

Thus the campaign slogan, "Polk, Dallas, and Texas!" streamed across campaign banners, and thus the Texas city of Dallas later got its name.

His race for the Presidency was against the famed Kentucky statesman Henry Clay. Polk lost Tennessee by 113 votes, but won the election. His victory hinged on the New York vote.

Word of victory reached him at his Columbia home by fast mail (a Nashville livery stable owner rode all night to get the message there) a day before papers got the news. Polk strolled down his hometown streets and took sly pleasure in the people who offered condolences for his "defeat."

President Polk was neither imposing in appearance nor endearing in manner. But he did know how to get things done, and he announced that he would get it done in one term.

He did—sometimes ruthlessly, sometimes slyly, but always with the conviction that he had to serve the little man and to pave the way for the growth of this Nation.

But the slight man with the firey eyes shook the country with his new concept of the Presidency.

"I intend to be myself President of the United States," the tight-lipped Polk wrote from his Columbia home 10 weeks before his inauguration.

Absolutely incorruptible himself, a demon for work (he took only 6 weeks' vacation during his 4 years as President, and averaged 10 to 12 hours' work a day), he shattered himself in the effort.

"No President who performs his duty faithfully and conscientiously can have any leisure," he wrote shortly before he left the White House. "If he entrusts the details and smaller matters to subordinates, constant errors will occur."

Polk made a point of being in Washington 2 weeks before his inauguration.

Methodically he listed the goals he would shoot at in his 4 years. Methodically, during those 4 years, he checked each goal off the list after he had coaxed, browbeaten, outmaneuvered overwhelming opposition in Congress.

Polk's goals were to annex Texas, acquire California, settle the dispute with England over Oregon and maintain American rights there, lower the tariff so it would be just to farmers and manufacturers alike, and thereby put an end to the division between the agricultural South and the industrial North, put an end to financial chaos and bank controversy by creating a sub-Treasury, or, as he called it, a constitutional Treasury.

For years, historians shrugged off these tremendous accomplishments by imagining that the going was easy then—that Polk was simply in tune with a Congress and a Nation that happened to want to move in the same direction he did.

Actually, he was at loggerheads with his Congress, his Cabinet, his generals, leading members of his own party as well as the opposition party most of the time.

When his four-volume diary—a meticulous record of his White House years—was published in 1910, historians understood for the first time the battles by which Polk steered the Presidency into new power and responsibility.

They saw that the earlier estimates of Polk as a proslavery President were far from the facts. His drive to stretch the Nation to the Pacific had nothing to do with extending slave territory. It was a determined drive to get America's hands firmly on Pacific ports, particularly San Francisco.

He held Cabinet meetings every week, encouraged each man to express his views, but was seldom swayed from his own. He had Congressmen in to confer with him practically every night. When they balked at his bills, claiming they were carrying out the will of their constituents, Polk reminded them that he had constituents too—the whole country.

Cartoonists labeled him "King James," and his own Vice President despaired over the "cunning that so completely dominated Polk's actions that even his most devoted friends could not refrain from complaining to each other, with bitter grief and shame, of his crooked politics."

One Whig Congressman roared out on the floor of the House that "the whole Government is now virtually in the hands of the President" and a man had either to "stand on the platform with the Executive, or be pushed into the sea."

Polk was the first President since Washington to become in fact and deed Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Cornered into fighting Mexico to win the land settlement he had hoped to gain by negotiation, he had to battle his generals as well as the enemy.

But with all that, he was a master diplomat. When he decided to play his hand behind the scenes in the dickering with England over division of the Oregon territory (which then stretched all the way to Alaska and had been jointly governed by our country and England), congressional leaders were furious at his silence.

But his tactics wore down all opposition. and they drew the northern boundary of the United States where he wanted it. At the same time, he thought England and France had designs on California, and he wanted to buy it from a reluctant Mexico.

When Mexico finally met his terms, it was for half the amount he had originally planned to offer them: $15 million.

Throught sheer will and dogged cunning, he had rounded out our share of the continent in monumental proportions. He had added to our country not only what is now Texas, California, and Oregon, but also Arizona, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Polk boiled at the tariff laws that made the "rich richer and the poor poorer," and the legislation dearest to his heart was the bill lowering the tariff. A cold, unsentimental man, he never nursed grudges or cultivated hates. If he found a good man for a job, he appointed him. no matter how bitterly that man had attacked him on former issues.

He was scrupulously careful never to accept a gift of value from anyone while he was in office. When someone sent him a fine horse, he returned it. When someone else sent him wine, he paid for it.

He and Mrs. Polk considered it beneath the dignity of the White House to have dances there, and they cut out that practice.

Sarah Polk worried over her husband's poor health, tried to get him out of the White House for a carriage ride occasionally, spared him every possible annoyance, read the newspapers first to mark the stories he would want to read.

"The White House was the abode of pleasure while I was there," she recalled in her 42 years of widowhood, lived out in Nashville, in the white-columned house that Polk bought, practically in the shadow of Tennessee's new capitol.

The house had once belonged to Felix Grundy, the canny old lawyer who had first taught Polk law, and the President, barely holding on to his health through his last year in office, must have had some sentiment about the place.

He wrote to his mother of his tremendous yearning for Tennessee and the years of rest he looked forward to, and Sarah busied herself with selecting drapery and upholstery material for the new home in Nashville.

Polk battled Congress to his last hour in office, and as he and Sarah stepped on the steamer the next day, bound for Tennessee, he was, at 53, a broken man.

His illness was so acute that he had to cancel appearances before crowds waiting to honor him on the journey home, and his arrival in Nashville was delayed several days because of his suffering at the boat's motion.

He could hardly make it through the welcoming ceremonies at the courthouse square where Gov. Neill Brown made the chief speech.

It was spring, 1849, and he and Sarah were eager to start work on the garden of their new home (where the Downtowner Motel is now, at Seventh and Union). Sarah was in a dither over the furniture, and Polk insisted on arranging his own books on the library shelves.

That exertion apparently was too much, and it was thought that he fell victim to the cholera epidemic that was infiltrating Nashville at that moment. In spite of all medical aid available, he died 12 days later, on June 15, 1849, just 3 months after he left the White House.

Polk had commissioned William Strickland, architect of Tennessee's capitol, to design his tomb, and it stood on the grounds of the Polk home until after Mrs. Polk died in 1891.

In 1893, the vault and monument, with Mrs. Polk buried beside her husband, were moved to the "back side" of Capitol Hill where it is seldom noticed by anyone any more, and not even the men who mow the steep hillside pause to read the tributes inscribed there to the man who "planted the laws of the American Union on the shores of the Pacific."

Farm Surpluses

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, since corn, wheat, and cotton comprise more than three-quarters of our agricultural surpluses, it can be readily seen how important it is to concentrate governmental attack on the reduction of these surpluses of these major crops.

In large part, that was the purpose of the recent cotton-wheat bill. Tied in with efforts to reduce surpluses and to prevent additional surpluses, is the move by the House to help the waning textile industry, and to slacken the present, rather disquieting movement of farm and commodity price levels.

Time and again, I have pointed out the need of our Nation for general, national prosperity, as distinguished from spotty prosperity in some places and economic trouble spots, and unemployment and chronic poverty in other places.

I think we must take something more than a provincial view of the question of national prosperity. The Congress must recognize the need for looking at the national picture as a whole and for trying to reduce overemphasis on sectional interests and questions.

In this representative government, it is our job, of course, to represent our own constituents. That is why we have been

sent to Washington, and most of us here feel we must discharge that vital duty unceasingly and unquestioningly.

But we certainly must also recognize the interdependence of separate parts of our great American free enterprise economy, a productive machine of untold wonders and fabulous potentiality, capable, if properly harnessed and wisely developed, of not only unbelievable levels of prosperity, but rapidly advancing elimination of poverty and want in every part of the country.

There are some who say that we should not be unduly concerned about those who are without jobs, who are poor, who are unable to take care of themselves, but this is an antiquated doctrine, thank God, that has little place in the present-day thinking of an overwhelming number of Americans.

It is a painful anachronism in this country of greatest wealth and incredible productivity, where many people are able to live amidst a surfeit of economic goods and a lavish abundance that would have been believed impossible not too many years ago, that we should have many people, and especially children, in this country who do not get enough to eat, let alone proper clothes and shelter and ordinarily decent living conditions.

As human beings selected to represent all the people, and who are supposed to be endowed with special qualifications to grapple with and solve the great problems of government, we would be grossly remiss in performing our duty, if we were not to seek and to find some suitable, early solutions for social problems of this magnitude and of such great import to the relationship of our moral standards and the functions of our free way of life. We must not rest upon these standards. We must see to it that they are observed in the stream of government in order to retain and develop the strength and vitality across the total spectrum to measure up to the fiercely competitive problems we face in this age.

For these reasons, it is of special importance that we should try to reconcile the differences and shortcomings, where they exist, in the relationships between agriculture and industry, and other parts of our economy.

Obviously, the well-being of the textile industry and other industries, South and North, East and West, wherever they exist, and also of our great productive agricultural system and their relations to each other, must be of deep concern to us. The national prosperity and strength depend upon this coordination.

If the recent farm bill contributes, as I think it will, to a better relationship, to stable production and marketing in agriculture, reduction in farm surpluses, and some help for the beleaguered textile industry and its workers, it will serve a good purpose for the well-being of the entire Nation, as well as that of agriculture and industry.

Reduction of present subsidies is expected to cut surpluses and reduce the cost to the Government of maintaining better cotton and wheat programs.

If this measure can bring about some of the remedial action that is claimed for it by those experts best in a position to know, we may well expect better results for this bill than have been derived from some of its predecessors.

Duty, Honor, Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation mourns the loss of one of the greatest military generals of our time, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Nashville Banner and the Nashville Tennessean, honoring Gen. Douglas MacArthur be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Apr. 6, 1964]

"DUTY, HONOR, COUNTRY:" GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

"For more than a half century of active military service, in both World Wars and the Korean conflict as well, General MacArthur's name has been the symbol of courage, of patriotism, and of inspired generalship. Together these earn him a foremost place in the hearts of our people and in the annals of our military endeavors."

Such was the tribute of one great soldier to another—the Presidential message voiced by Dwight D. Eisenhower on the occasion of Douglas MacArthur's 80th birthday, 4 years ago. It expressed the heartfelt sentiment of his country, and bespeaks today the national sense of loss occasioned by his death.

To none have come more gruelling command assignments than were his in the wars he fought in the Pacific. The brilliance of his leadership in snatching victory out of defeat—in an island-hopping campaign that was crushing the enemy even before the atom bombs were dropped—was equaled only by his statesmanship in bringing governmental order out of chaos in postwar Japan. For that achievement, too, shoring up security in that part of Asia that was his responsibility, the free world is in his debt.

He fought America's fight against every mortal enemy; his the lifelong dedication to its security and survival. He kept the faith. He did not initiate the storms that swirled about him when lesser men sounded retreat. Though he bowed to the authority that overruled victory tactics and removed him from command—a decision of folly, for which the free world still is paying—conscience and conviction spoke in his inspired words of warning, that "once war is forced upon us—there is no substitute for victory."

General MacArthur is dead, and the Nation mourns.

It shared the anxious vigil at his bedside; its prayers with him through three operations—undergone in the same magnificent courage that marked him as a soldier. It will remember him as a man, who put his country first, whose creed was honor and duty in its half; and as the greatest military genius in its history.

Of all inspired messages Douglas MacArthur ever spoke, none could have moved more deeply the patriot heart than the closing paragraphs of the one he gave at his last public appearance at West Point:

"The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll—But in the evening of my memory—always there echoes and reechoes: duty, honor, country."

He measured with full devotion to the crises that were his responsibility to help resolve with judgment and skill. And on none did he default. Never once was there timidity and indecision on his part as a brake on the precepts of enlightened action in the pattern of valor.

He believed in America—in its readiness of response wherever the course of a discerned duty led. And America believed in him.

To no American commanding officer has come the affront that subsequently became his, shared and resented by his Nation, when he was "fired" by then-President Harry S. Truman, for believing and advocating that the Korean war should be won. MacArthur's estimate of strategy and policy was that of enlightened generalship, possessed of know-how and of concern for the fate of the free world if communism were allowed to win such a victory in Asia.

As noted above, he believed there was (and is) no substitute for victory, once a battle is joined. His recall, paradoxically, enlarged his place in America's heart, and on its honor holl of military giants.

He was the Army's youngest brigadier general in World War I, the youngest man ever named superintendent of West Point, and the youngest ever assigned as Chief of Staff. But he fought his greatest battle as commander of the Pacific theater in World War II, when he was over 60—recalled from retirement for that. His pledge, "I shall return," uttered at the island fortress of Corregidor before its falling to the invading Japanese, because the rallying battle cry in that vast area of conflict during the darkest days of that war.

The Nation's respect for Douglas MacArthur—in war or peace—was bounded by no sectional or partisan lines. Born a southerner, the South loved him. His wife, the former Jean Faircloth, is a Tennessean, from Murfreesboro.

As is true of the greatest military figures, he hated war. His labors were for a world of peace—with justice and honor and freedom to undergird international society for the very survival of civilization.

Long after detractors have been forgotten, America will remember him. It was these who "faded away." His place in history is secure; his name still a symbol of courage, of patriotism, and inspired generalship.

He honored the uniform he wore; and the five stars designating him General of the Army.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Apr. 6, 1964]

HISTORY WILL MARK HIM AS GREAT "OLD SOLDIER"

After a gallant, stubborn fight to live, the "old soldier" is dead. Time has done what three wars could not. And General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is mourned not only by the country to which he gave so much, but by millions the world over.

His was the indomitable will for victory—even to the last against sickness—but General MacArthur proved that in war, once victory is attained, his will was no less strong in cultivating the fruits of peace.

The strong image that the name MacArthur evokes is one of a stern-faced, austere hero of the Pacific, vowing to the people of the Philippines that, "I shall return." The image is incomplete, both in terms of personality and career. The latter went back to the battle of Vera Cruz which was only a start in a monumental military record.

When the United States entered World War I, the then Major MacArthur conceived the idea of and named the famous Rainbow Division and was largely responsible for its organization and training. In that war he was wounded twice, decorated 13 times, and cited 7 times for extreme bravery under fire. He returned a brigadier general—the youngest division commander in the U.S. Army.

He was later superintendent of West Point, where he modernized the Academy's military training and broadened the curriculum to include a full collegiate education.

General MacArthur served on the court-martial of Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, a prime exponent of air power. He was, however, sympathetic to General Mitchell's ideas, and in fact, put them into practice when he became a chief of the general staff.

His was an important contribution to this Nation's peacetime Army and its training as war clouds hovered over Europe. And World War II again found this fighting man back in the thick of things, but forced by vastly superior enemy forces to relinquish his positions in the Philippines.

Corregidor and Bataan were names that brought gloom, but it was General MacArthur's rallying cry of "I shall return," which brought hope not only to Filipinos but Americans. He did return, and went on until victory was achieved in the Pacific.

But history was not yet finished with General MacArthur, or he with history. For he was to take on the most herculean task of all, the occupation of Japan. It is to this man, who virtually wrote the postwar Japanese constitution, that the Japanese owe their present democracy and the strides they have made free of the bondage of totalitarianism.

General MacArthur might have closed a brilliant career on the spectacular note of a wise and brilliant administrator of Japanese occupation. But he was a warrior still, and he wrote another chapter in the MacArthur legend with his startling victory with the landing at Inchon during the Korean war.

Korea was to prove a bitter ending for General MacArthur's military career. The world had changed, and in the new realities of the nuclear age, there was friction between the "old soldier" and his commander in chief, President Truman. He was removed from command and came home in the midst of a national controversy to the parades and accolades of a country grateful for his long and outstanding service.

His name was mentioned for presidential nomination, but he began instead a new career as a corporation board chairman.

Opinion about General MacArthur as a personality and as a public figure removed from his command has been divided. But his ability as a strategist, his military skills, his patriotism, and his integrity have never been questioned. From the Meuse-Argonne to Inchon, he left the marks of legend.

Now General MacArthur is dead; the iron commander is no more. Yet, he will live on in the annals of history as one who possessed greatness. And to paraphrase slightly his moving speech before Congress, great old soldiers never die.

Our River Problems and Control of Our Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, GILLIS W. LONG from Louisiana, delivered a thoughtful and challenging address at the meeting of the Red River Valley Association last week at Shreveport, La.

His address showed careful research and a thorough understanding of our river problems and the importance of intelligent control and maintenance of our water resources, dating back to his early boyhood.

I have always had the greatest respect for the ability of GILLIS. As chairman of the committee appointed by the Speaker to investigate campaign contributions and expenditures, it was my privilege to name him on three occasions as chief counsel for the committee. Before that I had never known him, but he had served in the same capacity when my friend and colleague, the Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, served as the chairman of this important committee. He is an excellent lawyer and performed his duties for the committee in such a way as to merit the praise of both Democrats and Republicans on the committee, as well as high praise from the membership of the House as a whole.

Because I appeared later on this same program in Shreveport, I had the pleasure, and I say with great sincerity, the privilege of hearing GILLIS deliver his address in a most forceful way.

That other of my colleagues may have the benefit of his speech, I extend my remarks and include it:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE GILLIS W. LONG BEFORE THE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION, SHREVEPORT, LA., MARCH 31, 1964

Mr. Chairman, members of the Red River Valley Association, and ladies and gentlemen, you know, all of us that are here have something in common—a bond of concern and commitment; commitment to the job of bringing the people of the Red River Valley into the mainstream of progress through the oldest route known to man: Inland navigation.

Looking back over history, man's progress has paralleled his use of waterways.

I remember when I was a boy growing up near Tanehill in Winn Parish a country schoolteacher tried to get me interested in the great civilization that once flourished along the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It was pretty much of a wasted effort. Besides all the normal problems of trying to cram education into a boy's head, this teacher had to overcome the fact the the biggest body of water in my life was Dugdemona Bayou—and there wasn't much there except a few undernourished fish, some snakes and the black water from the papermill at Hodge.

A little later on, when I moved to Pineville, the Red River looked big and impressive, and I remember wondering why it didn't have steamboats and barges and the things I had read about or imagined. I still wonder.

In our own day we see the river's edge of American civilization along the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Missouri, the Mississippi, the Arkansas, the St. Lawrence, and still others now in the making. Pretty soon you'll be able to count the Trinity, the Ouachita and others with far less to offer than the Red River. Why? Well, I don't guess anyone has all the answers, but I'm going to venture a few guesses here today, and I hope I step on a few toes in the process.

Before I do, though, I'd like to take a little sentimental journey, with your permission, to the past of our venerable, muddy, undependable friend, the Red.

This river is tied up more closely than most people realize with the main course of American history. From the time LaSalle first pushed into the area around Natchitoches in 1687, looking for the mouth of the Mississippi, to the great era of the steamboat, its history has been as colorful as its name.

Everyone here knows of the great fight between Captain Shreve and the infamous raft. When he died in 1851, 13 miles of the river channel he had fought to open was closed again. The history of her navigation didn't end then, however. Sternwheelers were later to reach their great moment in history along this river.

The stories told by steamboat buffs are as numerous as the big hulking sternwheelers—like the story of how the *Morning Star* burned and sank; how her owners shoved her engines into the *Belle of Shreveport*, which was to meet an unhappy fate; and how finally the same engines wound up in the *Ranger*.

When the War Between the States came, the river was jammed with boats supplying the Confederacy. Most of the beef that fed the hungry South came through the Red River.

The conflict itself came to Red River in a way which was to be sorely regretted by the Union Army, and after the fighting ended the river entered its golden age of navigation.

The wharves were piled high with cotton, pelts and hides, and total victory was finally won over the raft.

But the victory of channelizing the Red came too late to be of much importance. The railroads had arrived—and Shreveport was on its way to becoming a rail center.

In what has turned out to be a monumental lack of foresight, the river began to feel neglect * * *. The steamboats began to leave Red River and in a few years their melancholy whistles were heard no more.

That was Red River. I am here to tell you today that we can restore the glory and excitement and prosperity that once was Red River. I don't mean in terms of an antebellum cotton and steamboat economy; I mean a combination agricultural-Industrial-manufacturing complex like none other in the South. And the first step, the urgent need of today is to make this river navigable again. This valley can not develop without navigation—it's that simple.

Of course the real irony is that I'm saying this to people who already know it and know it well. Sort of like a preacher talking to the same flock of believers every Sunday * * * you don't need to be converted * * * you just need a little revival once in a while.

Since it was organized in 1925, the Red River Valley Association has made common cause with the people of this valley, the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Congress in trying to make the Red River the servant of the valley and not its master. This group is a living, breathing example of what the people of four neighboring States, in cooperation with the local and Federal Governments are able to do when they join together in a common cause.

But until the spirit of this group becomes a real part of the imagination and the daily life of each citizen in every community, we might as well quit talking.

Until the Red River becomes a people's project, our work will be slow and our achievements limited.

Those are harsh words, gentlemen, but they need to be spoken. Until we can break what Franklin Delano Roosevelt called the "ice of indifference" we are going to be frozen and immobile.

As I said, I'm telling this to the wrong people * * * it's the ones who are noticeable by the absence that I'm really talking to, not you.

The Red River Valley Association can be proud, very proud, of what it has done, and is doing. Recently this was brought home to me during some correspondence I had with Col. Frank Milner, chief of the Technical Liaison Office of the Corps of Engineers in

Washington. In a letter to me, Colonel Milner said "* * * the Red River Valley Association is one of the more able and energetic groups of its kind in the country and * * * deserves to be given full support and encouragement."

That esteem also goes to the Halls of Congress, where your association has been a great factor in getting this project as far along as it is.

But you cannot rest on your laurels—the democratic process doesn't allow local initiative to relax its efforts.

Back in 1959 when the late Senator Robert S. Kerr was going around the country holding hearings with his select committee on national water resources, he came to Alexandria. One of the witnesses at that hearing on water problems was Roy Mathias. Roy told the committee that he thought a certain piece of legislation would be a wise move on the part of the Federal Government.

Senator KERR told him, in a manner very familiar to most of you, "I'll tell you this * * * the Federal Government is not going to take that move * * * it's going to have to be moved." To which Roy Mathias replied, "Maybe we can help move them."

In many cases you have moved them. You've been pushing hard for countless projects to move this valley forward. Right now you're working to get this comprehensive study completed. I hope that your efforts, and the efforts of your friends in Congress and the Corps of Engineers will result in an interim report this year and help us get started right away on a bank stabilization and navigation program.

You know what bank stabilization means * * * you've seen 250,000 acres of fine fertile soil wash down the river in the last 25 years. And as for navigation, you fully realize that if the Red's shifting and shoaling current can be brought under control the valley can grow and develop like our other major rivers.

With that in mind, I'd like to take a few minutes to talk to you about what we've been missing * * * and what we can expect to get if this dream of Red River navigation is brought to reality.

Here in Shreveport our per capita income has gone up over $1,000 in the last 20 years. This and other optimistic information sometimes leads us into a false sense of security.

There are more than 1,000 vacant homes in Bossier City and Shreveport alone—the best way to fill them is with workers—and workers need jobs.

Right now there's enough pulpwood available in our part of the State at low cost to supply several new papermills. But they won't be built because we can't provide them with the low-cost year-round barge transportation they need.

Bossier, Shreveport, Alexandria, Pineville, and many other towns and cities owe their very existence to the Red River's past glories. It's true they didn't wither and die on the vine when navigation passed away. But they haven't grown fast enough.

I don't want to labor the point, but I want to make it clear for even the most doubting Thomas:

There is great and urgent need for water transportation in the Red River Valley, and without it we will not prosper.

Fly over the Ohio, the Missouri; the facts are there for anyone to see. You don't even have to go that far—travel the banks of what was a few years ago the undeveloped wasteland between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. Today they call that stretch of the Mississippi "the billion dollar strip." This area is renowned for its "strip," too, but I doubt that you can base an economy on it.

Let's look around the best of the country: Since the end of World War II, 2,500 new industrial plants have invested about $18 billion in new facilities in the Ohio River Valley.

If the Arkansas River Valley which is now developing its potential matches the Tennessee Valley it ought to bring in $20 billion in personal income to that region within 20 years.

The space industry is on the brink of bringing to the South and Southwest an industry with as powerful an impact on our economy as the automobile had on Detroit. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration will spend better than half-billion dollars in the southern Mississippi and New Orleans area in the next several years. And they went to that area largely because there was water to transport the giant Saturn boosters to their launch pads at Cape Kennedy.

Are we going to be left out of this great undertaking for lack of interest on the part of our people?

I hate to keep talking about what others are doing, but I think sometimes comparisons help to get our imaginations in gear.

Take the State of Alabama, for instance, where the State voted $10 million in bonds to provide terminals to serve the Chattahoochee River, 6 years before the project was finished. Their foresight has paid off: The project is being completed now, and its development has already started.

The city of Columbia, Ala., has launched large capital improvement programs to meet the needs of the expected boom. Their mayor has a watchword which could as easily apply to Shreveport, or Alexandria or any other city in the Red River Valley. He said "to achieve big things, you have to expect big things."

The people of the Ouachita River Basin are doing that. As you know, they've had a 6½-foot navigable channel for sometime. In 1960 after years of testimony and letters and studies and passing reports back and forth between Vicksburg and Washington, they got Congress to authorize a 9-foot channel. Construction has now started on that $80 million project.

This was no pipedream. Between 1951 and 1959, the potential of that area for industrial development was shown through the spending of $80 million—the entire cost of the 9-foot project—annually on new or expanded manufacturing and processing plants.

Montsanto Chemical, Commercial Solvents, International Paper, the Murphy Co., the Crossett Co., and others went there, and they have prospered. Waterborne cargo increased 262 percent between 1954 and 1961 * * * and with a 9-foot channel the prospects are even brighter.

I could go on for an hour talking about the success stories of other river basins. But that is not our purpose here. However, I think it behooves us to look around at our neighbors, not in envy, but in admiration, and feel spurred on in our own search for the riches that are held out by navigation.

Louisiana is a maritime State * * * with 7,500 miles of navigable waterways, and three deep water ports. Yet the fact that only 2,500 miles of our streams are regularly maintained, and others are not yet either improved or developed should be a matter of great concern to our people.

The prospect of a booming Red River is not some idea from never-never land. It has been done and is being done on other rivers and streams nearby.

This State has hundreds of millions of its own dollars to fight and prevent floods. Can we afford not to protect this investment?

Since 1908, citizens groups in north Louisiana have promoted river transportation and river improvement. They formed this Red River Valley Association and have supported it through the years.

Now others are joining in the work and there are encouraging signs for the future.

Shreveport and Alexandria both now sport legally constituted port commissions. There are other groups formed or forming to help the Red River Valley Association in what has many times been a lonely fight.

The next move is up to Congress. These many willing hands cannot really begin to function until the Congress gives its stamp of approval to the project we are all interested in here today.

But even a favorable report to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers will not do the trick. You remember the Corps several years ago recommended a waterway proposal for the Red River—but somewhere through the years since the Overton-Red River Waterway Authorization of 1946 the chain of cooperation and contribution broke down.

One failure does not justify another.

The Chinese pholisopher, Mencius, said, "A journey of a 1,000 miles begins with a single step."

Our journey up and down our hoped-for Red River waterway will only be 205 miles, but it too must begin with those first few steps.

Some of the steps are up to you; some are up to the Congress which always waits to hear from you; and some are up to the Corps Engineers whose mills do seem sometimes to 'grind exceedingly slow."

Whatever philosopher you prefer—the Chinese, Mencius, or Oklahoma's Bob Kerr—it is up to you to take the first step and it is up to you to see to it that whoever needs to be moved, is moved.

House Chaplain's Eulogy to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, during the services 2 days ago for the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the Chaplain of the House, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, delivered a eulogy that stirred every person present.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to make Reverend Braskamp's words available to all Members:

EULOGY TO THE LATE GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR BY DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In the life of each of us there are times when all our feelings seem to impose silence; times when we walk slowly and speak softly. Rufus Jones, professor of philosophy at Haverford College, would always salute his audience with this salutation: "Let us have a moment of hush."

In the adventure of life we encounter great personalities, strange events, and experiences which make an indelible impression upon our minds and hearts.

In going up and down the courts of memory we find ourselves calling to mind two personalities who, in our generation, have stood like giants among their contemporaries. They were both unique in many ways and endowed with manifold gifts. What a matchless and marvelous command they had of the English language.

We recall that memorable day when Sir Winston Churchill stood and spoke in the Senate Chamber during the dark days of the World War; days when our hearts were filled with fear and foreboding. Then with what calm and courageous faith and assurance he quoted these words of the old psalmest, "He

shall not be afraid of evil tidings, his heart is fixed; trusting in the Lord."

Today as we go up and down the courts of memory we find ourselves thinking of our own noble and beloved Gen. Douglas MacArthur whose departure men and nations everywhere are mourning.

How our hearts were thrilled when he addressed the joint session of the Congress. He was never a prophet of doom and defeat, but of courage and hope. He closed that memorable message with these words in a clear and clarion voice. "An old soldier, who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goodby."

General MacArthur quietly and peacefully went from among us last Sunday afternoon. His sun went down, while it was yet day, only to rise again with radiant splendor in that land whose language is music. We have not said "farewell" but only "goodnight," assured that on some blessed morning we shall dwell with him in hallowed union, forever with the Lord.

We like to think that Saint Paul's words to Timothy were also General MacArthur's valedictory words before his soul was released from the body. "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith; henceforth, there is laid up in me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous judge will give unto me and unto all who love His appearing."

The good Lord has opened unto him the gateway to the larger life and received him unto His nearer presence and bestowed upon him this priceless benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou unto the joy of the Lord."

So be my passing:

"My task accomplished and the long day done,
My wages taken and in my heart,
Some late lark singing,
Let me be gathered to the quiet West
The sundown, splendid and serene."

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, words can little express the sorrow that has befallen Americans because of the passing of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. There is a feeling of shared sadness among the peoples of a most grateful nation.

His life, his ideals and love for his country, his devotion and dedication to duty exemplify him as one of our greatest American soldier-patriots.

We are all aware of the fact that his raw courage, brilliance, sheer genius, and mastery of military science and tactics have sustained us during time of great national peril. His contribution to humanity is immeasurable.

Indeed, the world, and our Nation in particular, are so much better because he had lived.

As the following editorial of April 7 from the Rockford Morning Star so appropriately states:

His greatness will not fade—the sands of time will not erase his greatness.

The article follows:

HIS GREATNESS WILL NOT FADE

Friends and former enemies in all parts of the world are paying sincere tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur as a grateful Nation mourns his death. His courage and ability helped to protect America from powerful aggressors and to sustain freedom in the world.

General MacArthur's long, brilliant, and courageous service to his country inspired millions of Americans and won him the respect of peoples and leaders throughout the world. His gallantry in three wars is linked to such names as the Marne, Meuse-Argonne, St. Mihiel, Sedan; Bataan, Corregidor, New Guinea, Leyte, Lingayen Gulf, Luzon; Pusan, Inchon, Yalu River.

General MacArthur was a great soldier and patriot and an eloquent spokesman for the American way of life. A country such as ours, he often said, is worth fighting for and dying for. His belief that the United States should not settle for less than victory in war caused him to be relieved of his command in Korea. American casualties along the shaky truce line there continue to prove the wisdom of his conviction.

In a memorable address to the graduating class at the U.S. Military Academy in June 1962, General MacArthur said:

"Yours is the profession of arms, the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory, that if you lose the nation will be destroyed, that the very obsession of your public service must be duty, honor, country."

To Douglas MacArthur, the words "Duty, Honor, Country" (the motto of West Point), held deep meaning. Their meaning governed his every action as a soldier and as a citizen.

Throughout the Nation this week, Americans will have in mind General MacArthur's parting words in an address to Congress upon his return from Korea 13 years ago: "Old soldiers never die, they just fade away." The record of General MacArthur's devoted service to his country and to the cause of freedom is written indelibly in history.

The sands of time will not erase his greatness. His long life was devoted to ideals the American people cherish.

The Civil Servant: Who Is He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Morton A. Reichek, of the Advance's Washington bureau, wrote a series of articles which appeared in the Staten Island Advance of March 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, 1964, covering the field of civil service and particularly the civil servant. He discusses in detail the Jeffersonian death wish for Government employees.

In this age of the big bomb and big business, big Government is almost a necessity. These articles explode many myths concerning civil service and the Federal system, and I wish to commend the Staten Island Advance for their fair, timely, enlightening, and informative series.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first two articles:

THE CIVIL SERVANT: WHO IS HE? GOVERNMENT WORKER LOW MAN ON U.S. TOTEM POLE—PART 1

(By Morton A. Reichek)

WASHINGTON.—When the Vanguard rocket blew up on its Florida launch-pad in 1957 during the first U.S. attempt to orbit an earth satellite, a joke began going the rounds that the rocket should be named "Civil Servant" because it wouldn't work and you couldn't fire it.

The gag reflected an old American custom: malignment of the Federal Government worker.

The typical civil service employee, according to the general stereotype, belongs to an army of clerks doing work of dubious importance.

In its most extreme form, the popular image is of a clock-watching incompetent who is outproduced by his counterpart in private industry, a boondoggler protected against firing by civil service regulations, a drone obsessed by concern over the security of his job, a grubby bureaucrat wrapped in yards of red tape who hasn't the gumption to look for work outside Government.

A few weeks ago, in his zeal to push through the tax cut bill, President Johnson may have unwittingly magnified this image.

In what has been widely interpreted as an effort to woo congressional conservatives, the President ordered a freeze on Government jobs to hold down the Federal budget.

Then, in a highly publicized pronouncement, the President poured some salt in the civil servants' wounds. He said he "is unconvinced that we are getting the maximum possible output per employee." He inferred that only 9 out of 10 Government workers put in "a full day's work for a day's pay." Infuriated leaders of Government employee organizations quickly called the President's statement "an unwarranted slur."

Ever since, administration spokesmen have been scrambling to soften the psychological effect of the Presidential remarks. "Government employees shouldn't feel defensive," says one high-level official. "What the President said was a challenge and a compliment, not a slur. It was like telling a baseball player who hits only .270 that he has the potential to hit .330."

This may be the case. But the negative sterotype of the Government worker has become so ingrained—even among civil service employees themselves—that there's no doubt that the morale of Federal employees across the Nation has suffered.

The adverse public image of the Federal civil service worker seriously disturbs administration leaders. It undermines the best efforts of the most dedicated of Uncle Sam's employees and reduces the caliber of people on whom Government recruiters can hope to draw.

A recent survey by the Brookings Institution, to be published shortly, shows how deep rooted the negative civil service image is. A representative sample of some 4,000 people was asked its views on Federal Government workers.

The consensus was that civil service employees lack ambition, are overly motivated by considerations of job security, and that their work is monotonous and routine. The person of above-average income and education said it would be downgrading for him to enter the civil service.

Commenting on the unfavorable sterotype of the Government worker, John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, complains: "People carry their Jeffersonianism too far. They carry a 'death wish' for Government."

But President Johnson has pointed up some crucial questions which ought to be asked and which have never been adequately answered.

How efficient are Federal Government workers compared to persons who do com-

parable work in private industry? Does the American taxpayer get his money's worth for the $13.8 billion paid annually to 2.5 million Federal employees? In short, is the Government worker's adverse public image justified?

THE CIVIL SERVANT: WHO IS HE? SYSTEM OFTEN WASTES TALENT AND MONEY—PART 2

(By Morton A. Reichek)

WASHINGTON.—At the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a young professional quit his job out of boredom—there wasn't enough work to keep him busy. A couple of months later, his supervisor hired two men to replace him.

Six months ago, the chief of a foreign aid mission in southeast Asia was returned to Washington. The Agency of International Development has yet to give him a new job. Officials are unwilling—or unable—to fire the man. So he sits around twiddling his thumbs.

At the Pentagon, the public relations staffs of the four military services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense have grown so large that reporters who regularly cover the Pentagon are now outnumbered by the military public relations men.

Until recently, dozens of high-salaried executives in at least three Government agencies worked for years on plans to convert factories which make civilian goods to production of arms in case of war.

But the industrial mobilization plans were based on theories rejected by most military strategists. Machine tools were being stockpiled to produce obsolete weapons which would never be bought again.

The program was based on the prenuclear experience of World War II and showed little if any recognition of subsequent technological changes in the nature of warfare. Eventually, the plans were scrapped. But not until considerable money and effort had been wasted.

This is the sort of empire building and administrative boondoggling which has led to the traditional malignment of the Federal bureaucracy.

But is managerial incompetency necessarily more prevalent in Government than in private industry, and are civil service personnel by nature less capable than people who work elsewhere?

The most reasonable answer seems to be this: Government workers are no better and no worse. Any large organization, whether a Government bureau or a major corporation, is inherently wasteful. Its efficiency depends on the skill of top management. But there are some obvious elements in the nature of the system which frequently inhibit efficiency and magnify bungling in Government.

First off, the Government operates in a fishbowl. Managerial blunders, which in private industry are rarely exposed to public view, receive considerably greater publicity when they occur in Government.

Compared to private industry, Government officials normally have less freedom of action. They are restrained by tightly prescribed rules and regulations on procedure, employment, and other operational policies. The restraints are aimed to keep Government clean—to prevent corruption and to minimize political favoritism.

But the results can be restrictive. Red tape piles up. The bureaucratic machinery moves slowly. Incompetent workers are hard to fire. Almost boastfully, the Civil Service Commission reports that 14,000 were discharged last year for cause. The discharge procedures are so involved, however, that many supervisors are discouraged from acting.

Finally, there are political pressures which often complicate the efficient operation of government. The Defense Department wants to close bases it doesn't need, but is forced to keep them going in the face of local political opposition.

Congress authorizes pork-barrel projects of marginal utility which have to be administered. Changes in administration or political and economic crises cause unanticipated revamping of policy—all of which makes efficient management more difficult.

Nevertheless, government workers get good marks from some authoritative observers.

"The quality of the work force in government is probably a cut above that in private business," says Wilfred J. McNeil, president of the Grace Lines, who was an assistant secretary of defense under the Eisenhower administration.

J. Edward Day, Postmaster General in the Kennedy administration, a onetime senior officer of the Prudential Insurance Co. and now a Washington lawyer, says: "I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I was while serving in the Federal Government."

Small Business Committee Hearings on Small Business Investment Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 and 18, the House Small Business Committee held full committee hearings on the implementation of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, at which time it received testimony from officials of the Small Business Administration and representatives of small business investment companies of various sizes and types from different areas of the United States. The committee also received testimony concerning the views of stockholders and small businessmen who apply for loans.

As a whole, the testimony developed at these hearings indicates that the small business investment program is progressing favorably and there are great hopes that it will fill the purposes for which the program was initiated by Congress.

Among the witnesses who appeared before the committee was Mr. Eugene P. Foley, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Mr. Foley pointed out in this statement that the 706 active small business investment companies had invested an amount approaching the half-billion-dollar mark, in some 10,000 small firms.

In discussing the development company loan program he pointed out that since the program was launched, 366 local development company loans have been made, totaling about $50 million, and accounting for about 22,000 jobs. In all, Mr. Foley gave a very optimistic statement concerning the implementation of the Small Business Investment Act.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I feel that Mr. Foley's statement will be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Foley's entire statement in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Foley's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF EUGENE P. FOLEY, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, MARCH 18, 1964

Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to appear before you today. Since being appointed Administrator of the Small Business Administration last August, I have devoted more of my time to the activities of the Investment Division than to any other of the agency's programs. The Investment Division has responsibility for administering the small business investment company and local and State development company programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

My prepared statement, for the most part, is confined to a general review of the state of the SBIC and development company programs and comments on some areas of special interest to your study. Richard E. Kelley, who joined us last month to serve as Deputy Administrator for Investment is with me today and he will discuss specific areas of the SBIC program relating to its impact on small business. While Mr. Kelley is new to the agency, he is not new to the SBIC program. As a consultant, adviser, editor and publisher, he has been active in this program since its inception. In fact, I asked him to join the agency because of his unique qualifications. I know you will see when he testifies why he is regarded as a leading authority on the SBIC program.

The SBIC industry is healthier and on a sounder footing today than at any time in the past. The large, publicly-held SBICs have weathered adverse market conditions for the past 2 years, but today they are generating new confidence and optimism. SBIC shares have edged upward during each of the past 3 months. The smaller SBICs, with several years operating experience behind them, today have a realistic picture of how to operate within their size limits. Many of these privately held companies have expressed their confidence in their own operations and the future of the industry by putting additional private capital into the program during the past year.

While the health and profitability of the SBIC industry is important to us at SBA, we, of course, always view SBIC's as a vehicle to assist small business. To date, the 706 active small business investment companies have invested an amount approaching the half-billion dollar mark in some 10,000 small firms. It is difficult to analyze at this early date the impact of SBIC's on these small firms, but in light of the high risk which typifies SBIC financing, it appears that most of the small businesses which obtained SBIC financing were unable to obtain capital from other, more conventional sources. Knowing what we do about the goals of SBIC managements and the way SBIC's evaluate potential investments, we can be certain that most of these 10,000 firms—whether they are engaged in manufacturing, retailing, construction, sales or services—used SBIC funds to expand their operations. If these SBIC portfolio companies meet their goals they will be strengthening competitive forces, creating new jobs and profits and further stimulating the economy. The SBIC program is giving thousands of independent businessmen an opportunity for growth and survival which they otherwise would not have had.

When I joined SBA last August, several major problems appeared to be impeding the SBIC industry. First, the industry was questioning whether the Federal Government was in fact wholeheartedly behind this program. Second, the market for publicly held SBIC stocks was badly depressed and had been for more than a year. Also, many

SBIC's, especially the smaller ones, were suffering from inevitable growing pains. Related to all of these problems were the confusion and duplication created by the joint regulation of the industry by several Government agencies.

A number of developments in the past 6 months restored industry confidence in the continuing support of the Federal Government.

During my first few months at SBA I visited SBIC officials in every part of the country and spoke with representatives of several hundred licensees.

Negotiations which had been underway with the Treasury Department for many months were stepped up and Treasury officials soon agreed to promulgate certain regulations and rulings and to support legislation which would provide the type of tax benefits which the Congress intended for SBIC's when the program was first authorized. Most important among these tax benefits are a 10-percent loss reserve which will benefit all SBIC's and a personal holding company exemption which will aid many small SBICs.

The Securities and Exchange Commission published a proposed ruling which encouraged the publicly held companies.

The President expressed his confidence in and support for the SBIC program in a letter which was read at the industry's annual meeting in New York.

The House and Senate gave an overwhelming endorsement to the program with the passage of new amendments to the Small Business Investment Act.

An Industry-Government Liaison Committee was established to review proposed regulations affecting SBIC's. Serving on this committee with a cross section of SBIC executives will be high-ranking officials from SBA, SEC, Treasury, and IRS.

The combination of these developments and other specific actions we have taken at SBA reassured industry members that the Federal Government is fully behind the SBIC program. I would like to add that I became fully convinced of this overall Government support very soon after I started exploring the matter. In my conversations with officials at other agencies, in Congress and at the White House, I found virtually unanimous support for this program. We have been heartened by the sincere interest in this industry which prevailed wherever we have turned in Washington.

The state of the market for publicly held companies is of vital concern to this program, and the SBIC industry suffered a severe shock when the over-the-counter market collapsed back in May 1962. The stocks of publicly held SBIC's—there are 49 of them—were depressed to the point where most were selling at close to half their book value. Fully invested, publicly held companies were unable to return to the market for more capital. Small SBIC's were forced to postpone plans for public offerings. The new issues market was dead and this hurt SBIC's because their portfolio companies were unable to achieve public offerings. Unrealized profits in publicly held portfolio companies vanished.

The fall off of SBIC shares actually preceded the May 1962 market drop and the SBIC industry has been fighting its way back ever since. The shares of publicly-held SBIC's still are selling at sharp discounts and while it may be early for growth-minded licensees to offer new stock issues, and thereby bring large amounts of private capital into the program, there have been some encouraging signs in the past few months. The over-the-counter market has picked up and some SBIC portfolio company shares have performed well. For the first time in nearly 2 years several investment advisers and analysts are recommending the purchase of SBIC shares. Of course, in the final analysis, the SBIC stocks will reflect the performance of the SBIC's themselves, and that is the way it should be. But there is a time lag, especially during the industry's early years. In this industry, losses usually show up long before profits. So, many licensees have written down several of their investments without having taken any significant profits. There is another complicating factor which works against the SBIC's. It is an accounting problem which may be of interest to you.

SBIC's are required by SEC to write down their problem investments. But SEC does not usually permit an SBIC to place an increased value on portfolio items which have increased in value—unless the portfolio company is publicly traded, in which case the SBIC can value its investment at the market price.

This is an understandable position for SEC to take, but it means that SBIC stockholders receive financial statements which reflect the problem investments but not the good ones, except perhaps in a footnote.

A number of SBIC officers have told me about attractive items in their portfolios which they are unable to reflect accurately in their annual reports. I am aware that this is not an easy problem to resolve. Evaluating high-risk portfolios is a very difficult job. Banks are reluctant to make such evaluations when SBIC's come to them for loans. Even SBIC's have difficulty doing it when they sit down and discuss mergers. However, we have this problem under study and plan to discuss it with SEC officials shortly.

Many of the problems which SBIC's have faced have been due to growing pains. Inevitable though these problems may be in a new industry, I wanted to make certain when I came into SBA that we were doing everything feasible to facilitate the operations of SBIC's. We started by cutting red tape wherever it could be done without hurting our administration of the program. We streamlined the handling of applications for loans and were able to reduce by one-third the time it takes to approve or reject such applications. We reviewed our reporting requirements and were able to make modest reductions in the amount of paper an SBIC is required to file with us. Our entire set of regulations have been placed under review and, with the passage of new SBIC legislation, major revisions and clarifications will be made shortly. Several key personnel changes were made to strengthen our internal operations.

Some of the regulatory problems facing SBIC's fall outside the jurisdiction of our agency. This committee has received testimony from the industry about the problem of dual regulation. All publicly held SBIC's are registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940. When an SBIC makes an investment it usually becomes an "affiliate" of its portfolio company and most future financial transactions between the SBIC and the portfolio company require SEC clearance. SEC, of course, is acting in accordance with its responsibilities under the 1940 act.

SEC has not been unaware of industry's views on the problem of dual regulation. The Commission has a rule pending which should help matters considerably. We at SBA are cooperating with SEC in every way possible to facilitate a satisfactory solution to the problem.

Similarly, we have continuing discussions with officials at the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service in an effort to help resolve some of the differences between officials in those agencies and the SBIC industry. As I indicated earlier, officials at all of these other Government agencies have given every indication that they are sympathetic with the industry's problems and will do what they can to help resolve them.

The industry's main differences with the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service have been under discussion and, as I indicated earlier, a number of these points are being resolved. Treasury already has granted SBIC's administratively a 10-percent loss reserve on loans, and the Department has indicated it will support legislation which will extend this reserve to debt securities. So, most of the investments made by SBIC's will be covered by loss reserves. The 10-percent figure will be reexamined after 5 years in light of the actual loss experience of SBIC's, and it will be adjusted accordingly, if necessary.

Treasury has also agreed to support legislation which would provide a meaningful exemption for SBIC's from personal holding company penalty taxes, and the Department has agreed to go along with changes in the International Revenue Code which will enable SBIC's to take ordinary loss treatment on all investments, rather than just on straight loans. This latter change might be described as a technical one which will bring the code in line with earlier amendments to the Small Business Investment Act.

SBIC's also were seeking automatic regulated investment company treatment by IRS so they could pass through their income to stockholders without having to pay corporate taxes. But this raised some major policy questions at Treasury and the matter is still under study.

It is not likely to be resolved soon. SBIC's also wanted the right to make equity investments in subchapter S corporations without endangering the tax advantages those corporations enjoy, but Treasury is opposed to this.

Another change sought by the SBIC's—exemption from accumulated earnings taxes—was granted through Treasury regulations.

Let me turn now to the local and State development company programs. Sections 501 and 502 of the Small Business Investment Act were designed to assist small businesses in obtaining capital for plant, land, and equipment, and at the same time to foster such assistance through the initiative of both the local community and the State. Embodied in these programs is the principle that all citizens have a stake in economic growth and each community bears the major responsibility for the well-being and growth of its own economy in general, and its hometown industries in particular.

Since these programs were launched, 366 local development company loans have been made totaling about $50 million and accounting for about 22,000 jobs. The job figure is based on estimates reported to us by the small concerns.

Who have we reached in this progrem?

Half our loans went to communities in distressed or redevelopment areas. Half went to communities with more normal economies. About 80 percent of the loans were made to communities with populations of less than 15,000; 293 of the 366 loans went to small manufacturers covering a broad range of industries.

The impact of the local development company program varies in each community. But virtually all of these loans create jobs and that, as you know, is just the starting point. It is like throwing a stone into a still pool of water. Sometimes the ripples continue long after the stone is resting at the bottom of the pool. I could give you numerous examples of the job we're doing, but I would like to read you just one brief letter we received March 3, 1964, from the Levy County, Fla., Chamber of Commerce regarding a $126,000 loan made to the Bronson Develop- Corp. to save a small orange crate manufacturer who was threatened when the citrus crop failed for 2 successive years.

This is the heart of the letter, and I quote:

"Through the financial assistance of (the Bronson Development Corp. and the Small Business Administration), Brice Crate, Inc.,

is making beverage cases on a limited basis, and will be in full production within the next 10 days. With additional labor that is now being required by Brice Crate, there is not a vacant house or apartment in the town of Bronson, thus some of the labor finds it necessary to reside in nearby communities in Levy County. This is the first time in the history of Bronson that there are no apartments or houses for rent.

"The chamber of commerce is deeply indebted to the Bronson Development Corp. and SBA for this tremendous boost in our economy and that of Levy County. Since this loan has been closed there is now in progress in Bronson the building of a motel and restaurant, which the community has been in dire need of. We in the chamber of commerce feel that the additional economy caused by your financial assistance is the main reason for this and other additions to come in the town of Bronson and Levy County.

"GUS EFFEREN,
"Executive Secretary."

Letters such as this one make us fully aware of the tremendous potential of this program and the need for making it known to every community in the Nation. We embarked on a new plan in February which aims at developing cooperative programs with Federal, State, and local organizations—both public and private—which are concerned with economic development. These are groups which already are working directly with communities—chambers of commerce, State departments of commerce, banks, utilities, and others. I am confident that this program, which is headed by Thomas Francis who we recruited from the Department of Commerce last December to direct our development company activities, will succeed in making our local development company program widely known throughout the country.

We have had less activity with our State development company program, primarily because State development companies generally can borrow sufficient funds from member banks at a reasonable interest rate. Should this source of funds dry up, then more activity can be expected in this loan program.

Thank you again for the privilege of testifying before your committee. We welcome your study and look forward to the committee's findings and recommendations.

Cause and Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEL CLAWSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, two editorials which appeared in recent issues of the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, call attention to parallel pernicious trends in the private and public sectors of our economy, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues in the House. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial entitled "Cause and Effect" from the March 30 issue and "The Betrayal of Trust" from the March 23 issue of the Deseret News:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Mar. 30, 1964]

CAUSE AND EFFECT

If anyone wonders why Federal spending gets out of hand, a former economist for the U.S. Bureau of the Budget may have the answer. It's simply that Congress doesn't have enough control over the budget.

Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum, now senior economist at the Stanford Research Institute, has made a study showing that for fiscal 1964 only 58 percent of Federal spending requests were subject to effective congressional review through the appropriations process. The remaining 42 percent consisted primarily of permanent indefinite appropriations, continuing construction projects, and other items "relatively fixed and uncontrollable."

With Congress lacking effective control over almost half the budget, the Federal Government has become somewhat like an automobile on which the brakes work only about half the time.

As a result, big government has gathered so much momentum that the Federal establishment now employs 1 of every 13 workers, owns 1 of every 3 acres of land, owns 421,260 buildings with 2.5 billion square feet of floor space, and has lent or given more than $100 billion to other nations.

This makes the U.S. Government the world's biggest spender, lender, employer, property owner, tenant—and the world's biggest debtor, owing more money than all other countries combined.

The conclusion is inescapable: Without giving Congress the means of exercising more complete control over spending, the Federal bureaucracy seems bound to keep getting more bloated, more costly, and exercise more restrictions on individual prerogatives.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Mar. 23, 1964]

HONESTY SUFFERS—THE BETRAYAL OF TRUST

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American standard of living cannot continue to go up if the American standard of honesty continues to go down.

In 1945 there were 11,051 personal bankruptcy petitions filed in America. Last year there were 157,000. That we should have 15 times as many debt welshers in a time of unprecedented prosperity than we had 19 years ago points to trouble ahead.

For much of the genius of American commerce has been based on the employment of trust. Without trust we would have no bank checks, no time payments, no installment loans, no credit cards. We have been able to put a car in every garage and a refrigerator in every kitchen simply because we have been safe in assuming that only a negligible number of Americans will duck their debts. Now the question is: Is the number still negligible?

The bankruptcy laws were designed to release from a life of hopeless struggle those who, through great bad luck, had found themselves beneath a debt burden far larger than any present or hoped-for earning power.

These laws were well conceived. Imposing a life of slavery upon a man who had had a financial disaster was too stiff a penalty. There had to be a way out, a chance to start again. But bankruptcy was to be a life preserver, not a way of life. And a way of life it is becoming.

Many lawyers now pass the word that for a small fee they can release a man from his obligations. The word gets around the shop or office. Here's Bill who filled his house with fine furniture and then claimed it all as household chattels exempt from replevin in a bankruptcy action. Pete wonders why he and the wife should scrape and scimp so hard to meet their payments. Shouldn't he take the easy way out?

The fact is, however, that if enough Peters are seduced into bankruptcy by the example of Bill, the way out may prove to be anything but easy. For the whole credit structure on which American selling is now based will begin to totter.

Part of the blame goes to American business. The pressure for volume, for unloading more goods than your competitor does, is great and growing.

The bad credit risk stands as a tax against all good credit risks. In an effort to overcome losses, sellers have hiked the interest rate on credit purchases. Some of these are beginning to collide with State usury laws.

The Saturday Evening Post recently pointed out that the Nebraska Supreme Court has ruled that all interest and carrying charges above 9 percent of the purchase price are usury and that buyers who protest may be excused not only from all future payments but may keep the goods as well.

A smalltown Oklahoma banker recently remarked:

"People are confused over what wealth is. A man used to consider himself 'worth $50,000,' for example, if his homestead, his investments, and his business could be liquidated for $50,000. But recently people have gotten the idea that their wealth amounts to everything they own plus all the credit they can command."

Today, out of every $5 after taxes the average American citizen owes $1 for purchases already made. That's 20 percent. In 1954 the figure was 15 percent and in 1946 6 percent. Now the 20 percent would not be alarming if it were evenly distributed. But a lot of people in the lower income brackets are in far deeper. And with any business setback repossessions would snowball which would kill new retail sales which would slow manufacturing which would add to unemployment and distress.

Thus, the deeper people go into debt the more pressure there is for Government antirecession measures. But there is no magic here. Antirecession measures are nothing but a process of pumping new Federal borrowings into the economic bloodstream. But these transfusions won't come from Heaven. They will represent new mortgages against the future earnings of the people.

Ah, well. Cake eating and cake having. High spending and high borrowing. Taxshirking and debt ducking.

What happened to the French Empire under the Louis? It went "thataway."

On Our Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 10, 1964:

ON OUR BACK

The wheat-cotton bill just passed by Congress is a makeshift contrived in a series of horse trades inspired by election-year politics.

The wheat part is a modified version of the price-support, acreage-control plan which the farmers voted down last year in a rather obvious invitation to Government meddlers to go away and let them alone. Since provisions of this bill, at least in theory, are voluntary, instead of compulsory, the farmers don't get any vote this time.

The cotton section seeks to remedy the ills caused by two subsidies by adding a third. The Government presently supports cotton at artificially high prices, then pays an export subsidy to move cotton on the world market. This makes U.S. cotton mills pay more than their foreign competitors, an

obvious injustice. So now domestic cotton buyers also will get a subsidy. This circle may be closed when the Government starts offering a handout to anyone who buys a shirt or a bed sheet.

By their vote last year, the wheat farmers exhibited the courage to take their chances in a free market. But wheat-State legislators were frightened of reaction at the polls should prices abruptly skid. Hence this bill.

Probably wheat and certainly cotton could be grown on our large, mechanized farms and sold profitably at world prices, if the laws would permit. Government meddling is a wholly futile effort to hold back the revolution in agricultural methods. It has cost the taxpayers billions without helping anyone, including the farmer.

Count Leo Tolstoy said it, a long time ago: "I sit on a man's back, choking him and making him carry me, and yet I assure myself and others that I am very sorry for him and wish to ease his lot by all possible means—except by getting off his back."

Legislative Program of AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the entire Congress a most important legislative program as outlined by Mr. Edmund M. Gulewicz, the 19th national commander of the AMVETS.

Mr. Gulewicz, speaking for Amvets throughout the United States, spoke before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives on April 9 regarding the legislative aims of that veteran organization.

I am especially proud to include his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because he is one of my constituents and a very prominent leader in civic, veteran, and business affairs in the Detroit area.

His remarks are as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDMUND M. GULEWICZ, AMVETS NATIONAL COMMANDER

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, this opportunity to present the views of AMVETS to this distinguished committee is sincerely appreciated by myself, the national staff of AMVETS, and the group of national and departmental officers who are with me here today. In addition, may I present our immediate past national commander, Don Spagnolo, who is known to this commtitee and who is now serving as AMVETS national executive director.

I am delighted at this time to thank the chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE; the members of the committee; and the staff of the committee for their unfailing courtesy and cooperation with AMVETS. It is certainly our desire to create a stronger bond of understanding between this committee and AMVETS where each will seek the best legislation based on human experience and modern technology.

We cannot overemphasize the importance and the value we place upon the efforts and accomplishments of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in providing balance, objectivity, and long-range responsibility in coordinating legislative efforts of all major nationally chartered service organizations.

We wish to emphasize that the basic legislative policy of AMVETS is a continuing interest and concern with the legitimate and changing needs of the veterans of World War II and Korea, and their dependents. It never has and never will be the policy of this organization to seek narrow, selfish, or irresponsible special interest legislation which is not in the best interests of the entire country and all segments of its population.

However, we realize that in this area, as in all human affairs, to accomplish the proper and progressive legitimate ends of this policy in behalf of our membership and veterans generally, the continuing dedicated interest and effort of men fully informed of the ever-changing needs of our veterans and their dependents is absolutely necessary. We in AMVETS are attempting to provide the training and continuity among our responsible officials at the National, State, and post level to this objective

The relationship of veterans' legislation to other economic and social legislation generally must be borne in mind and properly related thereto.

The vigilance required to protect veterans' benefits already secured is repeatedly demonstrated by such scurrilous articles as have been printed almost continuously, such as the Saturday Evening Post article by Edwin P. Neilan, and the almost annual vilification of the Reader's Digest antiveteran groups.

We have always contended that the human costs are just as much a part of the expense of waging a war as is the cost of building warships, airplanes, tanks, guns, rockets, and firearms.

The human cost of war represents the tragedies of battlefields, training camps, disabilities, blasted careers, and hopes, losses of sight, hearing, arms, legs, and mental health, as well as other requirements in earning a living.

It is equally the duty of the responsible officials of every level of our organization to oppose vigorously legislation that would be detrimental or hostile to the interests of veterans and their dependents, particularly in the framework of a rapidly changing economic, industrial, and social era. Among the most immediate are the problems of retraining and rehabilitation posed by the tremendous acceleration of automation and its concomitant problem of physical relocation of people to new geographical locations of job opportunities is something previously undreamed of in the normal progress of our industrial growth up to the present, at least in the acute fashion that now confronts us.

While this affects not only veterans in the age groupings of the veterans of World War II and Korea, we believe our responsibility under our national charter and its objectives requires us to be properly informed and positively participating in finding solutions.

At this juncture of our presentation, may I bring to your attention the following digest of resolutions in synopsis form that were adopted at the AMVETS 19th National Convention in Detroit, Mich., August 22–25, 1963, which we feel are of particular significance to this committee and may be helpful to the committee staff:

1. Supports legislation to establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate.

2. Urges the passage of legislation that would reopen national service life insurance for a 1-year period to all veterans and excluding from the good health requirements service-connected disabilities.

3. Urges Congress to enact legislation which would increase the Federal grant to State veterans' homes to one-half of the annual operating costs of such homes, and to authorize 50-percent Federal matching funds on the renovation and rehabilitation of existing facilities in State veterans' homes.

4. Supports legislation that would amend section 415 of title 38, United States Code, to the end that medical and dental payments be excluded from annual income of parents in determinations of entitlement to dependency and indemnity compensation to the extent that they are not borne by the Federal or State Governments, or reimbursed by union health insurance policy or by reason of a cause of action by or against another party.

5. Reaffirms our position that the Veterans' Administration be the one agency to administer the veterans' programs in the United States.

6. Opposes H.R. 9627 and any similar legislation which would grant hospital and domiciliary care to any person who served in the active service of the armed forces of any government allied with the United States in World War I and World War II by reason that we believe that it would tend to destroy the present system of veterans' benefits programs.

7. Urges the adjustment of the entire sliding scales of Public Law 86–211 in order that pensioners under the old law would benefit by electing under Public Law 86–211.

8. Favors more aggressive support and increased reemphasis to secure favorable congressional consideration of necessary legislation to achieve judicial review of veterans' claims.

9. Seeks legislation to revise Public Law 86–211 to exclude all of the earned income from employment of the wife of the veteran in computing his statutory income limitations for pension.

10. Recommends that the social security laws be amended to provide continuous payment for dependency of children who are attening school until age 21, such as provided under the present Veterans' Administration laws and regulations.

11. Recommends that service-connected paraplegic peacetime veterans be provided with an automobile or other conveyance.

12. Recommends that Public Law 86–211 be amended to the end that where a veteran has minor children, the $1,200 of the wife's income presently excluded in computing his eligibility for pension be increased by $600 for each additional child.

13. Recommends the income of the veteran, in computing his entitlement in pension under Public Law 86–211, be reduced by any just debts, expenses for last illness and burial costs of the veteran's wife.

14. Urges enactment of special legislation to provide medical and nursing care for all chronically ill eligible veterans.

15. Reaffirms our position urging an addition to the Veterans' Administration rating schedule for disabilities providing for at least a 10-percent rating where a hearing loss exists in the high frequencies only.

16. Urges the Committee of Veterans' Affairs to act favorably on either H.R. 2867 or H.R. 3098 bills, which would change the marriage date requirement for Civil War widows from June 27, 1905, to date of enactment of either bill.

17. Bestows AMVETS highest accolade of praise and commendations upon the Veterans' Administration Administrator, the Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr.

18. Supports the principle of war orphans benefits for children of totally and permanently disabled service-connected war veterans.

For the sake of brevity, I will confine my comments to five bills and proposals of particular importance.

AMVETS were one of the first to recognize and support the proposed Domestic Peace Corps, and we are happy to see this being implemented by President Johnson as part of his program for the war against poverty. We intend to support this at every level of our organization.

S. 5, the Cold War Readjustment and Assistance Act, has been the subject of pre-

vious testimony by Mr. Spagnolo, and we wish to reaffirm most emphatically, our support of this measure. The educational programs previously adopted have proved their worth and have made great contributions to the welfare of our country. The increased income of the beneficiary has largely paid for these benefits through increased individual income tax. Other intangible benefits realized are beyond measure.

Since our national convention a bill, S. 2534, introduced by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the distinguished Senator from Texas, recommends itself on practical and humanitarian grounds to the most serious study and consideration of all interested in the welfare of the ill and economically underprivileged veteran who is suffering because of rapidly changing social and economic conditions. This measure has my support because I believe that from a practical point of view it is less expensive and certainly more humane to assist the veteran in the maintenance of his health through such a program administered on an outpatient basis by the Veterans' Administration than through recurrent periods of hospital bed occupancy for repeated retrogressions which succeed only in restoring him to a level of health which he cannot maintain, through lack of medication and medical care, under the circumstances of his daily life.

The intent of this bill would affect a group of veterans already on the pension rolls who have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration their need and entitlement to pension. We would again emphasize our view that the Veterans' Administration is and should be the exclusive agency to administer veterans' benefits.

The development and timely action by this committee with respect to H.R. 8009 to most effectively meet a changed condition resulting from a realinement of domiciliary care facilities again evidences the concern and the speed of action characteristic of this committee.

The highest praise is well deserved by you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee and staff, for your prompt action. We of AMVETS believe that this is a well-justified measure and provides an effective solution to a serious problem.

We of AMVETS are especially concerned with the proposed limited reopening of the national service life insurance program. In our opinion, one of the major factors in this measure is that the primary beneficiaries of this proposal would be the dependents of the veteran rather than the veteran himself.

We deem this measure particularly necessary because of the very high percentage of World War II and Korean veterans who, through improper counseling or misunderstanding, coupled with their financial inability during their post-service-readjustment period, allowed their policies to lapse.

This measure, strengthening as it does the financial security and stability of the lower income group, is particularly timely and conducive to the aims of the President's war-on-poverty program.

It increases the chances for a more sound economic adjustment by the widows and children and parents of these veterans at a time when the breadwinner veteran is taken from them. It may be the means of saving the family home, permitting the completion of children's educations, and preventing additions to the rolls of the local, State, and Federal welfare systems.

In considering the costs of this program, since it is to be nonparticipating, the administrative costs are to be absorbed within the premium rate structure. It is our understanding that administration of the additional insurance can be absorbed without additional requirements for personnel or equipment. In addition, the required cost of physical examinations would be assumed by the veterans and not by the Federal Government.

In short, we believe the local communities will be the greatest beneficiaries of this added financial security for their citizens.

We understand the demands made upon the time of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee by the volume of detailed work referred to it, and so, Mr. Chairman, we want to thank you again for this opportunity and privilege of appearing before you.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, America has lost one of its great captains in the passing of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

His service in 20 campaigns and on a hundred battlefields represents—in the highest sense—his dedication to the creed of the long gray line: "Duty, honor, country."

As Supreme Commander of the occupation of Japan, MacArthur's leadership wrote an inspiring chapter in American-Japanese relations; creatively and sensitively encouraging Japan down the road of social and economic reform—and firmly toward democracy. Above all, he laid the foundations for a Japan committed to the principles of the United Nations; dedicated to peace; and determined to play an important role as a leader of the free world.

He was to say of his service in Japan:

If the historian of the future should deem my service worthy of some slight reference, it would be my hope that he mention me not as a commander engaged in campaigns and battles, even though victorious to American arms, but rather as that one whose sacred duty it became, once the guns were silenced, to carry to the land of our vanquished foe the solace and hope and faith of Christian morals.

Could I have but a line of a century hence crediting a contribution to the advance of peace, I would yield every honor which has been accorded by war.

Of the United Nations he said:

It represents perhaps the noblest effort man has yet made to evolve a universal code based upon the highest of moral precepts. It became the keystone to an arch of universal hope.

In time of war his rallying cry on leaving Corregidor on February 22, 1942, "I shall return," was a covenant with the Filipino people and an earnest of the determination of the United States to pursue the war in the Pacific with all our resources and to a successful conclusion.

MacArthur's brilliant strike at Inchon on September 12, 1950, will stand as a master stroke of amphibious operations in the hostilities against North Korea.

His admonition to military commanders at that time and to the corps of cadets on May 12, 1962, "that in war there is no substitute for victory," will be remembered by all those who serve our country in "the profession of arms."

May our generation of men and officers in the armed services remember even more his additional stricture that moving day at West Point:

This does not mean that you are warmongers. On the contrary, the soldier above all other people prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war.

We have lost a soldier great in war and enlightened in peace. MacArthur now belongs to history.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all Members of this House in extending my deepest sympathy to Mrs. MacArthur, Arthur MacArthur, and members of the family.

Birch Society's Intemperance Challenges American Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, just about a year ago, in commenting upon the speech on "fright mail" made by the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, I made the statement:

Happily, the John Birch Society and its imitators do not seem to have made much of an impression upon the citizens of New Jersey.

It would appear from the following articles that my assessment may have been a bit premature. The news story by Henry J. Smith, Jr., appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on April 2 last. The editorial, which speaks for itself, appeared in the April 7 edition of the Burlington County Times, a daily newspaper published in Willingboro, N.J.:

BIRCH LEADERS ARE "IDENTIFIED" IN WILLINGBORO—TWO RESIDENTS ADMIT BELONGING TO RIGHTIST GROUP

(By Henry J. Smith, Jr.)

WILLINGBORO, April 2.—A member of Assemblyman Robert H. Berglund's campaign committee of last fall was named as the Willingboro leader of the John Birch Society last night.

Mrs. Kathleen Roderique, legislative secretary to Berglund, an avowed political conservative admitted the truth of the statement but said the campaign aid kept his membership in the ultraright group a secret during the election drive.

Berglund, one of the five organizers of Burlington County Conservatives, Inc.—of which Mrs. Roderique is president—was one of two Republicans elected last November to their first terms in the State assembly.

The issue of John Birch Society activity in Willingboro was raised at a meeting of the Willingboro Democratic Club by Brant Coopersmith, regional director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, a guest speaker.

Mrs. Roderique was in the audience at the meeting which was open to the public.

Coopersmith said that two local men have leading roles in the John Birch Society. He said one is George Barnett, of Bradford Lane and the other is David R. Matteson, of Midfield Lane. Both are past presidents of Burlington County Conservatives, Inc.

Coopersmith mentioned that Barnett had been active in Berglund's campaign. He said that Matteson is staff coordinator for the Birch Society in Delaware and Maryland.

Mrs. Roderique said that Barnett was financial chairman for Berglund during his general election campaign last fall.

She said he did not tell Berglund or any members of the county conservatives group that he had joined the Birch Society. She said his reason for secrecy was he was afraid that public knowledge of his activities with the society would harm Berglund's chances.

Reached at home, Matteson said he has taken the job of coordinator for the Birch group in the Maryland-Delaware area and is going to move. He did not say where he will live but said he is moving closer to his activities with the Birch Society.

Barnett confirmed today he joined the John Birch Society in August and said he would have told Coopersmith this had Coopersmith called him.

Mrs. Roderique said she is not a member of the Birchers and would not join the society.

Berglund has issued frequent and strenuous denials that he belongs to the John Birch Society.

Coopersmith, also a local resident, said of Berglund:

"He may not have known what he was involved with. If he knows Barnett and Matteson belong to an association that says things about Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and still associates with them then we can raise some questions about him."

BIRCH SOCIETY'S INTEMPERANCE CHALLENGES AMERCAN FREEDOMS

What's wrong with the John Birch Society?

What's wrong with communism, fascism, and the Ku Klux Klan?

What's wrong with every surreptitious, clandestine and anonymous group of political radicals who can see no other way of life except a reflection of their own distorted image?

Just about everything.

Sure, the Birch Society is a patriotic organization. But it is a super-patriotic group which will suffer no viewpoint except its own extremism. Its leaders are self-ordained experts on what's best for the United States, and woebetide those who disagree.

Presidents of the United States, a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and other proven men of service in the fields of government, science, and the military have felt the sting of vile character assassination when their actions failed to meet the narrow standards of the militant Birchers.

A group supposedly dedicated to the Constitution and the American way, Birch organizers have violated basic precepts of our free society by intemperance, slander and guilt by association techniques.

Millions of Americans are deeply committed to the preservation of our constitutional freedoms. They are well aware of the Communist menace. They are also aware of the potential destruction to basic American freedom poised by the cancerous growth of irresponsible and visceral reactionaries.

The threat of world communism must be met resolutely wherever and whenever it is found; indeed, a free citizenry must take the initiative at every conceivable opportunity. But too often Birchers have used this as an excuse to wage their battles in the gutters and cesspools of human behavior.

The development of the John Birch Society has been a disservice rather than a service to conservatism in the United States today.

Its extremism rivals the very threat it purports to fight. There is room, indeed a continuing need, for constructive and responsible criticism of all elected and appointed officials to every branch of the American Government. But there is no place for character assassination and distortion of facts.

Lies, half-truths and innuendo cannot be fought with more of the same but with truth. One rotten philosophy cannot be beaten with another. An idea or ideal must be fought with a better idea, a higher ideal.

The stigma attached to the John Birch Society is well-deserved. It is unfortunate that thousands of freedom-loving Americans have no better outlet for their aroused political conscience.

This is a large land. It can use more patriotism, more concern for constitutional processes. It can use the weight of mass effort on the legitimate right as well as the liberal left.

But the John Birch Society, far from fulfilling these needs, provides only more hate, more suspicion and more un-American activity.

Emphasis-Analysis, Monday, March 16, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it was my opportunity to hear the NBC news program Emphasis-Analysis by Chet Huntley on Monday, March 16, wherein he commented on the hour-long, televised program of Conversation with President Johnson.

I thought Mr. Huntley's comments such a fine tribute to our President that I wanted to bring them to the attention of the entire membership of the House of Representatives.

I, therefore, include them at this point in the RECORD.

EMPHASIS-ANALYSIS, MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1964

This is Chet Huntley, NBC News, with Emphasis-Analysis, concerning President Johnson. I'll be back with some development of this topic in a moment.

* * * * *

This is Chet Huntley, Emphasis-Analysis.

We in electronic journalism have our frequent and persistent detractors. There are some who boast that they do not have a television set in their homes. Others insist that electronic journalism is superficial and weak.

Last night's program in which the three networks carried a conversation with President Johnson gives the lie to those who discount the medium. The Nation had a good, long, intensive, and highly rewarding look at the President last night. Some of the questions were penetrating and incisive. The answers, for the most part, were framed in an aura of candor.

This is a complex man who now occupies the White House. It is universally agreed that Lyndon Johnson is the supreme political man. He knows how and when to work on the weaknesses of the opposition; he knows how and when to deploy his own strengths; he knows how to confuse the political opposition with whatever weaknesses there may be in his own proposition. In his years in the Congress, Lyndon Johnson could be as tough and unyielding as he could be gentle and mild. There was a fierce and unyielding pride, at times a kind of haughtiness about the Lyndon Johnson who was the majority leader. Frequently he did not respond in kind to gentle criticism or good-natured ribbing.

But the man the Nation saw on television Sunday was not that Lyndon Johnson at all. Here was a humble man, a self-effacing man, a man with soft and gentle answers to the questions.

As one watched the President last night or as one read the transcript this morning, you got the impression that the confidence of this President has soared in these 120 days. This is not the same man, at all, who spoke to the Congress shortly after taking office. It was also evident in last night's interview that this man in the White House likes his job.

There has long been a quality about Lyndon Johnson which tended to baffle and confuse all who came close to him. I recall that this quality was there in the interview I had with him in the 1960 political campaign * * * that quality of quiet eloquence. His experience, his background, and his very physical appearance tend to suggest that here is a man whose answers to questions are going to pop, snap, and crackle; but they don't. His answers are great clouds of gentleness, humility, and compassion. There have been, and there are those, who are convinced that this demeanor is one which the President has learned to turn on and off like an electric switch. But we may question whether any switch for personality can work that well and that consistently.

It may be in order, therefore, to guess that here is a man who loves the power and authority that goes with his office, a man who knows how to use it; but all of that tempered with a man who remembers his humble origin and who has not forgotten the ways and attitudes of his humble countrymen. And politically, last night, President Johnson has to be given an A plus.

Mechanization of Ports Aids Steamship Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared for the Journal of Commerce by Mr. John Thurman, vice president of the Pacific American Steamship Association, relating to the mechanization of seaports.

I would like to commend the article to the attention of my colleagues. It is reprinted herewith:

MECHANIZATION OF PORTS AIDS STEAMSHIP INDUSTRY

(By John Thurman)

In a recent speech before the Propeller Club in Washington, D.C., Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., stated that in order for the steamship industry to keep up with the times and promote world trade modern operating methods and automated vessels would have to be developed and put to use. This has long been recognized by the industry with the knowledge that similar advances must also be made at dockside in the loading and discharging of cargo by longshoremen.

On the west coast it was determined as far back as 1957 that something should be done to update the longshore industry. At that time the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union realized modernization would eventually have to come to the waterfront.

The union concluded that new methods and machines would someday be introduced, no matter how great the effort by the membership to resist change. Employers had

the right by contract to make changes and to arbitrate changes; therefore the best the union could hope to do was to retain, as long as possible through delaying action, the old rules governing size of gangs, methods of cargo handling and related contract guarantees.

NEW CARGO HANDLING IDEAS

New ideas for cargo handling, revolutionary ship design, large-scale use of containers and bulk movement of cargo, the introduction of strapped loads, and numerous other devices would obviously sooner or later bypass the existing work rules.

In the mind of the union there were also officially announced programs of legislation which would make illegal many of the guarantees and safeguards afforded by the existing contract. Were this to come about it would leave the workers with little protection or bargaining power.

At the same time, the steamship industry was confronted with a series of difficult operational problems. Postwar construction costs skyrocketed the investment in ships. The price of fuel, wharfage fees and wages for seafaring personnel all moved up with the times. The only way to offset these rising costs was to speed cargo handling and ship turnaround. When a ship is in port it loses money; it only makes money when it is on the high seas.

INCREASED EARNINGS

Speedier loading and discharge not only improves the ship's turnaround, but in the long run also increases the number of trips the vessel can make each year. The savings in capital investment and the increase in earnings resulting from the introduction of new machinery and new methods of cargo handling could well be decisive in determining the profitability of the industry.

The sum total of developments added up to one conclusion. The time had come to review and reexamine labor relations in the light of mechanization and modernization for west coast longshoring.

Following long periods of discussion an agreement was finally reached in October 1960, that went into effect January 1, 1961, to run until July 1, 1966, and not subject to review. The union received a substantial degree of security for its members, provided for in no other union contract, and the ship owners otbained freedom for productivity improvements.

OBSOLETE RULES REVOKED

The union was thereby guaranteed a share in the benefits of mechanization. As a return for the benefit and the guarantee that men would not be laid off, but would gain from the introduction of modern practices, obsolete work rules were removed. Past practices of cargo handling were discarded and new and better ways to stow and discharge cargo can be introduced as developed.

It should be noted that the mechanization and modernization agreement covering all Pacific coast ports was reached by direct collective bargaining between the PMA and the ILWU, without Government or other third-party participation. The M. & M. provision is a part of a basic agreement applied and interpreted by regular labor relations machinery.

It is integrated with other aspects of the overall west coast longshore contract, such as joint registration of longshoremen, control of the size of the work force, rotary dispatch of longshore gangs and men through jointly operated hiring halls, central records—keeping of earnings and hours and a range of contractural provisions from wages, hours and conditions of work, to benefits such as vacations, pensions, medical care, life insurance, dental care for member's children.

In addition, the longshoremen retain their contract protection regarding health and safety on the job, joined by new provisions prohibiting individual speedup or onerous work demands.

A trust fund was established into which ships owners contribute $5 million annually for the life of the contract. The fund is for the exclusive use of the men in the union and under their own terminology it is considered to be " a share of the machine." A portion of the fund covers early retirement and death benefits, and another portion establishes a wage guarantee.

At the same time the ship owners can put in any new machine or operating method, provided only that they can establish through grievance machinery that the method is safe and that there is no purposeful speedup of individual effort. In addition, the union is guaranteed that any new equipment used by employers will be operated by union members, trained if necessary by the employers.

ECONOMIC EXPANSION NOTED

The agreement for mechanization and modernization has resulted in an orderly, economic expansion on the west coast waterfront. This pioneering effort in the field of labor relations is working and working well on the west coast today.

Recently, to fill job openings nearly 2,000 men were added to the longshoremen and they were selected from more than 20,000 applicants. At the same time ships are being loaded and discharged with possibly the most advanced methods of any ports in the world. Time in port is no longer excessively lost. Speedy turnaround is resulting in an economic advantage to the ship operator while at the same time, use of modern machinery is not bringing about unemployment.

It has been acknowledged that the west coast waterfront agreement is revolutionary in nature and while it may not fit into other industries, or perhaps other facets of the maritime industry, it is a step in the right direction and a long step in advancing U.S. foreign trade.

A New Evaluation of Manufacturing Capacity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of most important assertations made by administration spokesmen in defense of their highly expansionary economic policies is that inflation will not result because of the existence of widespread excess plant and equipment in the economy. It is said that as the economy expands excess capacity is available to supply the new demand without inflationary pressures resulting.

Over the past year considerable evidence provided by private surveys and studies has come to light indicating that much of the so-called excess capacity is actually obsolete or inefficient. In the light of this evidence, doubt has been growing about the ability of the economy to supply the burgeoning demand that may arise from the administration's economic policies without new inflationary pressures arising.

An article from the March 1964 issue of the Survey of Current Business, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, points out some highly significant evidence on this point. According to the article, nearly one-third of manufacturing companies, with just under 50 percent of the total capital assets in manufacturing, indicated that their facilities at the end of 1963 were inadequate to meet their needs in 1964; 60 percent of the firms with 44 percent of the assets considered their facilities about adequate. In other words, less than 10 percent of the firms—with 7 percent of assets—felt that existing capacity exceeded their needs.

There are a number of qualifications that should be consdiered in evaluating these new statistics, and the yare spelled out in the article. The point remains, however, that this new evidence should alert us to the strong possibility of a new wave of inflation that might very well arise from a strong upsurge in economic activity.

Under unanimous consent I wish to insert an excerpt from the Survey of Current Business discussing the new data on manufacturing capacity at this point in the RECORD:

AN EVALUATION OF CURRENT CAPACITY

Each manufacturing company in the current survey was asked: "Taking into account your company's current and prospective sales for 1964 how would you characterize your December 31, 1963, plant and equipment facilities: More plant and equipment needed; about adequate; existing plant and equipment exceeds needs?" In all questions concerning industrial capacity, there are very difficult definitional problems—including those on product mix, number of hours or shifts, and cost relationships associated with the use of facilities of varying ages and efficiencies—which make measurement of capacity and of capacity utilization extremely difficult. It was hoped that the present inquiry, which required only a qualitative answer, would elicit a larger response, although it does not, of course, permit a quantitative estimate of how much yearend 1963 capacity exceeded or fell short of requirements in 1964.

The survey results are shown in table 3 in terms of the distribution of firms by number and by gross capital assets. It is probable that the most fruitful results of the question may come from comparisons over time as later surveys are completed. Without an attempt at a detailed interpretation at this time, some interesting highlights emerge. Almost one-third of the companies, accounting for just under 50 percent of the total capital assets in manufacturing, indicated that their facilities at the end of 1963 were inadequate to meet their needs in 1964; 60 percent of the firms with 44 percent of the assets considered their facilities about adequate. Thus less than 10 percent of the firms (with 7 percent of assets) felt that existing capacity exceeded their needs.

TABLE 3.—*Manufacturers' evaluation of their capacity, Dec. 31, 1963*

[Percent distributions] [1]

	Number of firms				Gross capital assets			
	Total	More plant and equipment needed	About adequate	Existing plant and equipment exceeds needs	Total	More plant and equipment needed	About adequate	Existing plant and equipment exceeds needs
All manufacturing	100	32	59	9	100	49	44	7
Durable goods	100	32	59	9	100	52	34	14
Primary metals	100	36	54	10	100	54	22	24
Electrical machinery	100	33	55	12	100	43	11	46
Machinery excluding electrical	100	32	60	8	100	20	76	4
Transportation equipment	100	30	64	6	100	62	35	3
Stone, clay, and glass	100	33	50	17	100	54	24	22
Nondurable goods	100	32	60	8	100	46	53	1
Food and beverage	100	28	59	13	100	40	54	6
Textile	100	24	67	10	100	43	55	2
Paper	100	49	45	6	100	62	33	5
Chemical	100	37	59	4	100	63	37	(2)
Petroleum and coal	100	38	57	5	100	38	62	(2)

[1] According to respondent companies' characterizations of their plant and equipment facilities on Dec. 31, 1963, taking into account their current and prospective sales for 1964.
[2] Less than 0.5.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics and Securities and Exchange Commission.

Manufacturing companies evaluating their present facilities as inadequate for 1964 prospective sales were on the average the larger firms in terms of capital assets. Firms reporting their existing plant and equipment as about adequate, on the other hand, were the smaller firms on balance. The results for durable and nondurable goods producers were similar to those for all manufacturing firms. (See table 4.)

TABLE 4.—*Carryover of plant and equipment projects, manufacturing and public utilities* [1]

[Billions of dollars]

	End of period				
	Dec. 1962	1963			
		Mar.	June	Sept.	Dec.
Manufacturing	7.21	8.61	9.00	9.18	9.08
Durable goods	3.99	4.84	5.15	5.25	5.05
Primary metals	1.66	1.97	2.08	2.27	2.23
Electrical machinery	.33	.37	.36	.33	.32
Machinery excluding electrical	.25	.56	.48	.40	.31
Transportation equipment	.87	1.10	1.40	1.37	1.36
Stone, clay, and glass	.31	.32	.30	.32	.29
Nondurable goods	3.23	3.78	3.85	3.94	4.03
Food and beverage	.34	.42	.41	.36	.41
Textile	.17	.16	.15	.14	.20
Paper	.36	.52	.56	.61	.59
Chemical	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.11	1.03
Petroleum and coal	1.02	1.32	1.40	1.41	1.50
Public utilities	5.07	6.13	6.40	5.58	5.46

[1] Carryover refers to expenditures yet to be incurred on projects already underway.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics and Securities and Exchange Commission.

A tabulation was made breaking down actual capital expenditures in 1963 and anticipated expenditures in 1964, according to the response to the adequacy-of-capacity question. It was found that among both durable and nondurable goods companies, those reporting their 1963 capacity as inadequate plan the largest relative increases in spending from 1963 to 1964.

In considering these new statistics, it should be stressed that the fact that large numbers of companies with substantial capital assets report inadequate capacity does not necessarily mean that the amount of inadequacy is large. Also a company may find its capacity inadequate for only one of its products; or the inadequacy reported may apply to only one stage of the production processes; or capacity may be inadequate in some geographical area but not in others. Finally, it should be clear that the firms which report a need for more capacity for 1964 operations may now have available excess capacity that will be drawn into production as demand rises to the expected levels.

Corporations in Politics: How Far Can They Go Under the Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, an enlightening discussion of the requirements of the law regarding political activities by corporations and labor unions appeared in the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

Inasmuch as this article appears to clarify the various court decisions interpreting the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Taft Hartley Act, the Public Utilities Holding Company Act, and other statutes dealing with corporate and labor union political contributions, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

CORPORATIONS IN POLITICS: HOW FAR CAN THEY GO UNDER THE LAW?

(By William B. Barton, general counsel of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

Businessmen frequently ask: Would there be anything illegal about my company buying some $25 tickets to a fundraising dinner for Congressman X? If the company can't do it, would it be illegal for my company's staff people to do so and place the item on their expense accounts? When the Congressman comes to our city, would it be all right to put him up at the Clover Athletic Club at company expense? When Congressman X runs for reelection, would we be safe in letting some of our staff take time off with pay to work for his reelection? Our president is to give a television address. Would it be all right if he spoke out for the reelection of the Congressman? What would be the consequences if a news commentator we sponsor were to slant the news so as to influence the Congressman's reelection? These and dozens of other questions about political activity are the sort businessmen frequently wonder about.

The completely safe way would be to avoid doing the things of the sort suggested by these questions. This answer, however, does not satisfy the businessman. He quite properly insists that there must be some few things that he and his company can do without risking a brush with the law.

The law allows the businessman as an individual to act politically like any other individual. If the businessman as an individual wants to endorse a candidate, give a political speech, run for office, or give money to a political party, committee or candidate, he is restricted only by some limitations in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act [1] and State laws that apply to all individuals. He should be aware of these limitations, but they will not be mentioned here. Rather, this discussion considers the limitations placed by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act on the political conduct of corporations as such.

LABOR UNIONS INVOLVED IN MOST OF THE CASES

To answer the question there is too little help from court decisions. Most decisions have arisen because of political activity of labor organizations, section 313 of the act declaring it unlawful for corporations or labor unions to make "* * * a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election * * * at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in conection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section." [2]

This statute, which dates back to 1907, was amended in 1947 to include labor unions, after the Smith-Connally Act had temporarily recognized the problem during World War II.[3] An indictment was obtained under it in 1948 against the CIO. This case, *United States* v. *Congress of Industrial Organizations*, 335 U.S. 106 (1948), has been cited more than any other to show what labor organizations and corporations can do politically under Federal law.

The case arose because soon after the 1947 amendment there was a special election for a Congressman in Maryland and Philip Murray, as president of the CIO, wrote an editorial for one candidate and against the other. The editorial was inserted in the CIO News, a thousand extra copies of which were printed and circulated at CIO expense. The indictment was for expenditures in connection with publishing and circulating the editorial. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held the statute unconstitutional as violating the first amendment and dismissed the case (77 F. Supp. 355).

The United States appealed to the Supreme Court, which avoided deciding the question of constitutionality, but held that the indictment did not charge acts within

Footnotes at end of speech.

the scope of the statute. Reviewing the history of the 1947 amendment, the opinion regarded the use of union funds to publish and distribute the regular union publication to those accustomed to receiving it as not being prohibited by the act. Four concurring justices would have held the statute unconstitutional. Whether the Court would have found a violation had the evidence clearly shown union funds to have been used to circulate the paper to members of the public generally was left undecided.

SMALL UNION PUBLISHES IN OUTSIDE NEWSPAPER

After that case a local union and its president were indicted under the act for expending union funds for a newspaper advertisement and a radio broadcast advocating defeat of certain persons in connection with conventions to select presidential and vice-presidential electors and candidates for Congress. The district court, denying the defendants' motion for dismissal of the indictment as unconstitutional, concluded that Congress acted within its constitutional powers in adopting the statute to safeguard the elective system, first amendment rights not being absolute (79 F. Supp. 516).

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed in an opinion by Augustus N. Hand and directed a dismissal (*United States* v. *Painters Local Union No. 481*, 172 F. 2d 854 (1949)). The court said it seemed impossible to differentiate the scope of the decision in CIO from the case before it. Since the small union involved did not own a newspaper, the reasoning was that the use of the public press and radio was a natural way of communicating with its members. The court observed that in each case it seemed unreasonable to suppose that the members objected; in the case before it the expenditures had been approved by membership vote.

In 1951 in *United States* v. *Construction and General Laborers Local Union No. 264*, 101 F. Supp. 869 (W. D. Mo.), a local union was indicted for having spent the local's funds in connection with the general election of November 2, 1948, in support of a congressional candidate. The court, hearing the case without a jury, found the evidence insufficient to sustain charges that certain alleged small expenditures had been made for the campaign. Other charges had to do with the payment made to three different individuals for service allegedly rendered on behalf of the candidate. Finding no violation, the court said:

"If that is to be the construction placed upon this statute, then any political activity of any person on the payroll of a labor organization, from its president to its janitor, would render that union and its principal officers liable, if such persons devoted any appreciable time in support of, or in opposition to any candidate for President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative in Congress. The same would be true of any corporation which permitted one of its employees while on its payroll to spend a few hours hauling voters to a place of registering, to vote, or to engage in any other type of political activity."

The court further observed that if a narrow construction were adopted, then it would be necessary to consider constitutionality. Citing the CIO case as a precedent, the court ordered a dismissal.

UAW EXPENDS FUNDS FOR TV BROADCAST

After the 1954 congressional elections the UAW was indicted as having violated the act by paying a certain sum from its general treasury fund as costs of sponsoring television broadcasts allegedly urging the election of certain candidates for Representatives in Congress and for Senator. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, on the precedents of the earlier cases, granted a motion to dismiss the indictment (138 F. Supp. 53).

The Supreme Court reversed the dismissal in *United States* v. *United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Workers*, 352 U.S. 567 (1957). The opinion, by Justice Frankfurter, found a congressional intention to proscribe commercial broadcasts. It viewed the broadcast as unlike the communication in CIO, which "was neither directed nor delivered to the public at large. The organization merely distributed its house organ to its own people." A trial, said the Court, might bring matters to the surface and cause constitutional questions to disappear. Three Justices dissented and would have sustained the dismissal under the authority of the first amendment.

After a subsequent trial in the district court, a jury found the defendant not guilty. There was no appeal. One of the points the instructions asked the jury to consider was whether the broadcasting was intended to and did influence the general public.

A more recent case is *United States* v. *Anchorage Central Labor Council*, 193 F. Supp. 504 (D. Alaska 1961). The council, an association of labor unions, was indicted for spending union funds to sponsor four television broadcasts in connection with the 1958 national elections. The court acquitted the defendant, observing that most of the funds used were voluntarily contributed and that the council, not the unions, actually made the expenditures anyway. The court noted also that the broadcasts, although they doubtless reached the public, were the most inexpensive way for the unions to communicate with the members.

The experience of corporations under the act has been limited to the trial courts. In 1916 a large number of brewing companies in Pennsylvania and New York pleaded guilty to an indictment which charged them with making contributions towards the election of certain candidates. In 1948–50, 23 actions were filed in the Eastern District of Michigan charging incorporated automobile dealers with contributing to a political committee in the 1946 Federal election. On trial, there were 2 not guilty verdicts, but in the other 21 cases there were pleas of nolo contendere. The court treated these as tantamount to pleas of guilty.[4]

These cases against corporations are in contrast to a 1960 trial court decision which dismissed through statutory construction a case in which a labor union was prosecuted for spending funds to elect candidates for Federal office.[5]

WHAT DO THESE CASES MEAN FOR CORPORATIONS?

What, then, do the cases show about the legal status of a corporation's political contributions or expenditures?

They do not show that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act as applied to such contributions or expenditures is a dead letter. Some spokesmen for both business and labor have expressed this conclusion, but it is without substantial foundation, and it is dangerous.

The cases definitely support the proposition that a labor organization can bear the expense of using a regular publication sent to its members to advise them why it is in their interest to help elect or defeat specified candidates for Federal office. It appears to be a sound assumption that the courts would accord a corporation a similar latitude to communicate with its stockholders through its house organ.

When the 1947 amendment was before the Senate for consideration as part of the Taft-Hartley Act, Senator Taft said on the Senate floor that a labor organization which uses its house organ politically should charge a subscription fee.[6] His remarks not only show Congressional intent but are sound, because union members have paid dues to maintain collective bargaining activities, not to support political causes. A corporation, on the other hand, derives its money from business operations and maintains its house organ from business income as a business expense. Realistically, Senator Taft's observation about charging a subscription fee seems less applicable to the corporation house organ. A corporation could find itself in trouble, however, if it circulated political views in a house organ gratis to members of the general public beyond its stockholders.[7]

Whether a radio or television broadcast can lawfully be paid for by a corporation or a union to convey a political view to members presents a further problem. The Supreme Court reversed the lower court's dismissal of an alleged expenditure for broadcasting in the UAW case. The Court observed that the broadcast under consideration was unlike the communication in the CIO case, because the latter "was neither directed nor delivered to the public at large." In sending the case back to the trial court, the court asked as one question: "Did the broadcast reach the public at large or only those affiliated with appellee?" Although an acquittal followed in the trial court, had there been a conviction with evidence that the broadcast did, in fact, reach the public at large, who can be sure the Supreme Court would not have sustained it?

Obviously, a corporation, like a labor organization or association, faces the same problem if it enunciates partisan political views at a meeting to which it invites members of the public who are not stockholders or members.

All corporations and labor unions should carefully avoid direct contributions to candidates. Similarly dangerous is the payment of employees while they do political work for a specified candidate or party and the direct or indirect payment of automobile expenses, printing, bill posting, or other items that might be assumed as part of a political campaign.

BUSINESSMEN WONDER ABOUT THE UNIONS

But why is it, asks the businessman, that the labor union can carry on vast political activity but the corporation cannot? Part of the answer is that the AFL–CIO has set up the Committee on Political Education. Other labor organizations have created similar political groups. Supporting funds from the labor organizations (and hence derived presumably from members' dues) are supposed to be used by COPE or its counterparts only for educational purposes. Voluntary contributions are supposed to be the source of funds used for political purposes.

As long as none but the voluntary contributions are used for political purposes, the activity is legal, but if union funds are used, there is a violation. A spokesman from the office of a former Attorney General said: "It's a fine line, but if it's crossed the law is violated." Only a court of law could decide with any finality that there is a violation.

Holding companies have a special problem because of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, which makes it a felony for a registered holding company or any subsidiary of such a company to make political contributions.[8] Tax laws present other problems, as do State laws on corporate political spending.

A complete answer to the question of what a company can do requires a check of the laws in each State where it does business. In keeping with the temper of our times, States generally have restricted political activity of corporations more diligently than labor unions.

As for the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the corporation can play safe in its partisan political activity only if it limits its appeals,

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

whether written or oral, so as to avoid the general public and communicate rather to its stockholders. On principle it seems a corporation should be allowed to appeal also to its employees, along with its stockholders, although there is no decision which settles this point. Donations and expenditures for partisan political causes or purposes should be carefully avoided—not only the direct kind in money or items of value, but also indirect ones through the use of staff time at corporate expense.

Perhaps one day Congress or the courts will spell out added rights for corporations' political activity. But those who find them in the law to date seem to be stretching its interpretations to conform to wishful thinking rather than what the decisions are.

---

[1] 2 U.S.C. 241 et seq.

[2] This section is now codified as 18 U.S.C. sec. 610.

[3] Labor organizations were included temporarily in the section by the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943 sec. 9, 57 Stat. 167 (1943), 150 U.S.C. App. sec. 1509. This provision was made permanent by the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 sec. 304, 61 Stat. (1947).

[4] Nation's Business, June 1960, p. 60.

[5] *United States* v. *Warehouse Workers' Union*, 47 L.R.R.M. 2005 (E.D. Mo. 1960).

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6437 (1947).

[7] Regarding the 1st amendment and the use for political purposes of union members' dues, see *International Association of Machinists* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 740 (1961) and *Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks* v. *Allen*, 373 U.S. 113 (1963).

[8] 15 U.S.C. sec. 791(h) and 79z—3.

Prayer Ban Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, when we see the Supreme Court of the United States striking down prayer in our schools it might do us some good to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln which my dear friend, Miss Estella Marshall, 18 Washington Place, Leominster, Mass., a fine God-fearing American woman, has brought to my attention. They are:

We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven, we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity, we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown.

But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these things were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own.

Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

It may be said by way of comment that we have been a God-worshipping country, yet we have recognized the constitutional right of every person to embrace and practice his own beliefs, faith, or creed. We have given atheists, agnostics, disbelievers, and free thinkers of every type and kind the right to hold to their views.

America was built, defended, and preserved by men and women who believed in God. To be sure, there were some who did not so believe, but they were in the vast minority and represented only a fraction of the population of this country at any time. Such people are in a vast minority today. We recognize their right to their beliefs.

Now the question is: Are we to become a totally godless country by official decree of our Supreme Court, insofar as our public schools are concerned?

Are we to become officially godless like Russia, China, and all their Red satellites? Shall godlessness be made the official creed of America? That is the question we must answer.

Do we want to have "In God We Trust" removed from our currency, the word "God" removed from our legal oaths and our national anthem? Do we want to have prayer banished from our public gatherings, chaplains removed from our armed services—the name and worship of God completely driven out of our official American life?

If we do this, my dear friends, we will be turning our backs on our own heritage. We will be casting the spiritual truths which made this Nation great before the money changers in the temple, tossing them into the flesh pots of Mammon.

If we allow this prayer band and trend toward official godlessness to continue in our country, we will rue the day, because we shall become a vast wasteland of materialism, dessicated and sterile of any real spiritual impulse—a place where the things of the spirit cannot live in the public lives of our people, and in the official life of our Nation, which has been built and has risen to greatness by virtue of reliance in God and devotion to the freedom of man.

Let us wake up America or we will find our spiritual strength sapped and our fair land dominated by crass materialists and the sworn enemies of all organized religion. That day could well mark the end of our freedom and our greatness.

Economists See Peril to Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee have pointed out in their minority views on the President's 1964 Economic Report, as well as during hearings on the report, that the administration's expansionary economic policies could lead to a boom this year followed by a bust. Overheating the economy in 1964 might very well cause inflation and other excesses that could trigger a serious recession in 1965 or 1966. A panel of economists meeting at an annual conference at the University of Chicago has warned of the same dangers as a result of the Johnson administration's economic strategy. An article in the New York Times of April 4, reports on the conference, and under unanimous consent I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

ECONOMISTS SEE PERIL TO BOOM

A panel of economists cautioned yesterday that if the 1964 boom went too fast there would be a correction in 1965. The occasion was the annual conference of economists at the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business.

Norman Robertson of the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, said he foresaw little or no help next year from the second stage of this year's tax cut. He added that 1964 "will be a vintage year, but it may leave us with a hangover."

Herbert Johnson, of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., Chicago, forecast that plant and equipment spending by business would level off in the first half of 1965, after reaching a peak annual rate of $46.5 billion in the fourth quarter of this year. He included housing and other kinds of private investment in the downtrend early in 1965.

Ezra Solomon, of Stanford University, defined the outlook this way: If the gross national product reaches the Government's forecast of $620 billion this year, the expansion "should continue well into 1965." However, he said, if the gross product reaches $630 billion, which would indicate an annual rate of $650 billion in the final quarter, "there would develop significant imbalances and the chance would be high of a downward correction in early 1965."

Fair Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 28 and the Pittsburgh Press of March 29 and March 31, 1964.

These excellent editorials set forth the victory of the consumers which occurred in the finding that a Pennsylvania Fair Trade Act was unconstitutional. Also pointed out are some rather excellent reasons why this action was in the public interest.

It is remarkable indeed that when foreign nations around the world are retreating from price fixing and such other anticompetitive devices as the fair trade legislation, and when our several States are repealing by legislative action and by judicial findings of unconstitutionality of State fair trade laws, that the Congress should have pending the so-called quality stabilization bill so destructive of the free competitive enterprise system and so damaging to the consumers' interest.

The articles follow:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Mar. 28, 1964]

VICTORY FOR COMPETITION

Pennsylvania's 1935 Fair Trade Act, intended as a temporary palliative for depression

era price cutting, has been after 30 years thrown out by the State supreme court. In a decision, which the justices hinted last year they were prepared to make, the high court invalidated the act as an unconstitutional delegation of regulatory power to private parties.

The fair trade law permitted manufacturers to set minimum prices on their brand name products and to require all retailers to charge no less than the set price, as long as one dealer in the State had signed a price agreement with the manufacturer. But some nonsigning retailers didn't like this price-fixing arrangement to which they had not agreed and proceeded to sell so-called fair-trade items at rates below the fixed prices. It was one of these dealers, White Cross Stores, Inc., which in the current case appealed and won a reversal of a price-maintenance injunction granted here last fall to a manufacturer, Olin Mathieson Corp.

Although the process has taken a long time, the Pennsylvania decision is in line with a national trend away from the noncompetitive commercial devices of the depression years. At one time nearly all of the States had fair-trade laws; only 13 have them now. Since 1952 more than 20 such laws have been thrown out altogether or in part by State courts. The trend is in keeping with the American concept that business should be enterprising and competitive.

At the national level, where there is still a movement to imbed price fixing in our retail system by congressional sanction, the Pennsylvania ruling should be one more signal that competitive pricing is the preferred way.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Mar. 29, 1964]

HELP FOR CONSUMERS

The American way of life has won another victory in Pennsylvania. The State supreme court, in a 5-to-2 decision, ruled that the Pennsylvania Fair Trade Act of 1935 is unconstitutional.

This act says, in effect, that a manufacturer may set a price on a product and the power of the State may be used to compel the retailer to sell at that price.

Only 13 other States have such regulations. In the remaining States the law of supply and demand sets prices. Experience has shown that prices to consumers are considerably lower in such States.

Actually, the law has been widely ignored in recent years, particularly since discount houses have become so numerous. For that reason alone a high court decision on the matter is welcome. A law that is ignored weakens all law.

More important is the principle involved. The majority opinion of the court held, as this newspaper and many others have long contended, that the power of the State should not be used to fix prices in normal commercial transactions.

This opinion, written by Justice Michael J. Eagen, said the State may delegate such power "* * * to responsible governmental agencies, such as public service or utility commissions. However, it may not be delegated to private persons.

"The vesting of discriminatory regulatory power over prices, rates or wages in private persons violates the essential concept of a democratic society and is constitutionally invalid," read the opinion.

The dissent in this case was technical. Justice Benjamin Jones, who wrote the dissenting opinion, said he and Chief Justice John C. Bell feel that this is an economic question which should be settled by the State legislature, not the courts.

If the decision stands—the plaintiff, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., producers of Squibb products, has not yet said whether it will be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court—the drug and appliance businesses, particularly, will be in for a period of readjustment.

When that is over, the vast majority of Pennsylvanians should be better off. Certainly the consumers will be, and many small retailers should be. They have tended to favor the fixed prices to protect them from competition by big discount houses. Even with price fixing, however, the big houses could undersell them with house brands.

If a free market doesn't prove to be best for most, then Americans have been wrong all these years about the way to do business and achieve prosperity.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Mar. 31, 1964]

PRICE FIXERS WON'T QUIT

In spite of everything, the price-fixing lobby keeps pushing Congress to pass the so-called quality stabilization bill, thusly named after efforts to enact the measure under other names failed.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has just declared unconstitutional a fair trade law passed in 1935.

Either by repeal or court action, some 20 States now have abandoned fair trade laws. Fair trade was the original alias of price fixing by law. Quality stabilization is the newest disguise.

The Pennsylvania court's decision, however, is not likely to deter the price fixers. It will stimulate them, since the more they lose in the States the harder they push Congress to enact a national price-fixing law.

This bill is opposed by President Johnson, by the Justice Department, by the Federal Trade Commission, and by anyone else friendly to the principle of competition. It is exactly contrary to the book of laws now vigorously enforced by the Government against trusts and monopolies and price fixers.

But the push is still on—so let buyers beware.

Retired Civil Service Employees—Need for Annuities Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10751, to increase the annuities of certain retired civil service employees. My bill provides that each annuity payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund having a commencing date prior to January 1, 1963, shall be increased 5 percent effective on the first day of the second month following enactment of this act. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER is sponsoring a similar bill in the U.S. Senate.

Inflation is the greatest enemy of the retired employees of the Federal Government and their dependents and survivors who are trying to live on meager retirement annuities. Congress made an effort 2 years ago to bridge part of the gap between annuity dollars and the cost of living, but the 5-percent adjustment effective January 1, 1963, was only half enough to make ends meet.

The two outstanding changes in the Civil Service Retirement Act were made in 1948 and in 1956. The revisions in 1948 increased the annuity formula for persons who would retire in the future and also at the same time granted 25 percent increases in the annuities of most of those previously retired. On the other hand, the further revisions in the formula approved in 1956 for those who would retire in the future made no provision whatsoever for persons previously retired. It was not until 2 years later, in 1958, that a 10 percent increase was approved for persons retired before the effective date of 1956 revisions.

In the meantime, salaries were rapidly climbing in both Government and private industry, and inflation was squeezing the purchasing power of annuity dollars. In 1962, when the Congress took up the bill to increase annuities, it adopted the base year of 1958, in determining that cost of living had then risen at least 5 percent, which overlooked a number of essential facts. The increase in 1958 was not a general adjustment of annuities, but only a belated correction of an adjustment neglected for 2 years. The real gap in cost-of-living deficiency started in 1956 and not in 1958.

I believe that an analysis of cost-of-living figures from July 1956 through December 1962 will disclose that there was an increase during that period of approximately 10 percent. One-half of this gap was covered by the increase which became effective in 1963. My bill introduced 2 days ago will provide a further adjustment to cover the rest of the gap.

Mr. Speaker, in the past I have supported and sponsored legislation in behalf of our retired civil service employees which I felt was just and warranted. I have introduced H.R. 10751 because I believe it is just, warranted, and needed, and I urge approval by the Congress. It is my sincere hope that the House and Senate committees will hold hearings on this proposal in the near future.

A Poke at Poverty Hokum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Phillip W. Porter, executive editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, never pulls his punches in the popular and widely read column he writes for Cleveland's famed morning paper.

Following is an example of the plain talk and straight thinking which have made Phil Porter one of the Nation's most thought-provoking newspapermen:

A POKE AT POVERTY HOKUM

(By Philip W. Porter)

The political astuteness of President Johnson is nowhere better illustrated than by his proposal described as the "antipoverty program" or the "war on poverty." It has more than a faint odor of hokum about it, but its implications are that anyone bold enough to question or peer deeply into it

must be in favor of poverty—and that's politically and socially disastrous.

The present level of extravagance in the American uppercrust, affluence in the middle class, and considerable comfort even in the lower pay brackets is so widely taken for granted these days that a campaigner against poverty has to hunt around for groups and areas to help. (The poverty is mostly statistical for average incomes today are around the $7,500 to $10,000 level.)

Unions today are pitching for sabbatical years, and their members are even now taking a few weeks off in Europe or Mexico. Working stiffs take long weekends fishing, hauling their boats along on trailers. They are deeply conscious of taxes and read the stock tables.

But there are increasingly large numbers of Negro dropouts from high school and teenage unemployment. And small farmers who can't seem to get ahead. And inhabitants of "Appalachia," the mountains where coal mining has gone to pot. These are areas with average incomes of $3,000 a year or under. They've got to be saved from themselves by the Federal Government. Hence, the "war on poverty," a colorful phrase much favored by newspapers, TV, and radio.

There's really no war on anything. The Johnson proposal is an attempt to sop up some unemployed teens by giving them jobs in conservation camps, to lend some money to the hardscrapple farmers, to produce some loan help for college students—and, just as important, add some new bureaucrats to the payroll.

The objective is good, particularly the movement of dropouts from the street corner to the forest. But the only way to solve the Appalachia problem is to transplant whole families and villages to places where there are jobs—but they won't leave. And lending money to marginal farmers is fruitless; the quicker they give up small uneconomical "family" units, and try to earn money elsewhere, the better off they'll be.

Some individuals will be helped, no doubt. The politicians have something new to promise. But eradicating all poverty is about as unlikely an attainment as entering the Kingdom of Heaven, which our grandmothers talked so much about.

The objective, though vague and built of goober feathers, is good. But will it work on those of low mentality who are not educable, or those who lack desire to improve themselves? And in reverse, is it really needed by the determined individual, the man already moonlighting to go to law school, or waiting table to pay for college?

Has the Horatio Alger, Jr., concept, the bootblack who became a tycoon, vanished completely? Andrew Carnegie built a fortune from little. So did Henry Ford. Lyndon Johnson himself started from scratch. Gov. Jim Rhodes had to drop out of college and worked in a greasyspoon restaurant. Abraham Lincoln, learning to read and write by an oil lamp, was a resident of the Appalachia of his day.

But today the Federal Government has got to get into the act. And anyone who asks questions or objects is automatically a stinker.

Lake Erie Sesquicentennial

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this measure because Perry's victory on Lake Erie was a significant and inspiring event in our early history and it seems to me there is no wiser use of our money, within reasonable amounts, as is the case here, than that expended in the observance of historic anniversaries that make the past part of the present and give to living generations something of a personal touch with the national heroes whose deeds have set the pattern of our dreams and aspirations as a people.

This modest amount of money will clear the debt remaining of the observance of the 150th anniversary of Perry's victory. I trust that the celebration of this 150th anniversary will linger in the memory of those who witnessed it, at least some of them, as long as the memory of the 100th anniversary has remained with me.

Chicago observed the 100th anniversary on a grand scale, temporary stands having been erected in Grant Park on the lakefront to seat a mammoth crowd. I had the honor and the thrill of attending with a direct lineal descendant of Admiral Perry, Chesley Perry, who in the Spanish-American War had carried on in the spirit of his famous ancester and who, with his wife, had been prominently active in the good works of United Spanish War Veterans and its auxiliary.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our revered leader, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, saddens us all. For over a half century, he played a heroic role in the life of our Nation as his words and deeds have been woven into the enduring fabric of our country's greatness. So sincere has been our admiration, so genuine our affection, so deep our gratitude that he has become our symbol of dedicated service. His masterful power of expression employed infrequently, but always effectively, spelled our eternal goals of national aspiration. His actions have been marked with judgment and courage. He moved through a lifetime of outstanding service to this Nation with a dignity and purpose that inspired and strengthened.

Such a noble spirit will live on. The cadets at West Point will forever cherish him. The Army will forever claim him as its own. The people of our Nation will forever enshrine him in hallowed memory. Those of us who have seen and heard him will never forget his commanding presence. The impact of this great American will continue as we remember those ideals for which he lived, for which he fought, and for which he would have gladly died. We honor his memory best by renewed devotion to our country and the preservation of our heritage as a free people.

We thank God for men like Gen. Douglas MacArthur. We are richer for his noble gift of self. We share the grief of his loved ones and sense their pride.

A grateful nation salutes a gallant soldier and courageous patriot. Now, he, too, belongs to the ages.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very timely and interesting interview given by His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, to Mr. Jan Walewski, Vice Chairman of the Council of the Republic of Poland—a parliamentary body in exile.

I think all Members of the House and, indeed, all Americans would be well advised to read and consider the views and warnings of this distinguished Polish leader.

President Zaleski voices the distrust that grips the world today with regard to international relations because of the faliure of the Communist governments, particularly Soviet Russia, to observe its international commitments.

The President also alludes to the disillusionment that has come to the captive nations and nations struggling for their freedom as the result of the surrender or forfeiture or compromise of the principles for which so many boys of all free nations offered their lives and their most bitter sacrifices.

To be sure there is a note of bitterness creeping in every now and then to the President's views, and this is entirely understandable. After all, as I have said so many times on the floor of the House, the violation and betrayal of Poland is one of the great crimes of history.

It is no excuse to say that it was dictated by the necessities of history. As a matter of fact, the opposite is true. At the time, the free world was developing tremendous military strength and it was evident that the Axis Powers could not survive in the war against the free world.

The plain fact of the matter is that a few nations sat around a table and joined together in carving up Poland and turning it over to Soviet domination.

That our great free Nation that had its birth in struggle, revolution, and battle against tyranny participated in this sellout of a faithful ally makes the situation all the worse, since by our policy and action we virtually abandoned even the pretense of principle and joined in a sordid delivery of a great, free, spiritually minded people to suit the expediency of the moment.

Under these circumstances, we should well understand the reason for bitter-

ness on the part of those who were delivered. In fact, it is amazing that they have been so restrained, and it is to their great credit that they remained with our side at all.

This country has great obligations to the Polish cause, and to the Polish people, and we should and must stand with them to try to secure their release from tyranny and secure freedom.

A great injustice has been committed in which we took part. The question now is, What should we do to rectify it?

Shall we go to war over Poland and the other captive nations? No one has suggested this course, though in another generation we might have gone to war for far less. But in the last analysis, none of us would want to take the responsibility of plunging the world into a destructive nuclear war.

The other choice is to try by our example, sympathies, support and help, when it is needed, and our use of all the very strong diplomatic means we have available to try to secure the liberation of Poland and other oppressed nations by diplomatic arrangements and agreements and by actual support of their objectives and efforts.

Admittedly, this may be a long drawn out task, but we certainly must never abandon the gallant Polish people and leave them to permanent tyranny and loss of hope behind the Iron Curtain.

We are pledged and we remain pledged to help them to get back their independence and their free government and to the extent President Zaleski's views strengthen that resolve in the minds of our countrymen and others in the free world they will be most welcome and we hope most effective.

Mr. Zaleski's interview follows:

[From the London Rzeczpospolita Polska (Republic of Poland), March 1964]

SPECIAL INTERVIEW WITH H. E. AUGUST ZALESKI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Question. Mr. President, to what do you ascribe the present climate of international life imbued as it is with uncertainty, fear, and a specific helplessness?

Answer. There are several causes. But it seems to me that the most important is the virtually complete lack of confidence in the world today. There is this mutual lack not only between the two groups embracing the greatest powers, that is to say, the Communist countries and the democratic ones. It also exists among the member states of each group and even between countries linked with one another by alliances.

In effect, it can be stated without fear of exaggeration that in world politics today nobody trusts anybody else. It can probably be stated that lack of confidence is a constant feature in world relations but I think this distrust has never before been so great as now. Too many falsehoods and injustices have emerged since the Second World War broke out for these facts not to have exerted a significant influence upon human nature.

It now transpires that, barely a few hours after the Anglo-Polish alliance of August 25, 1939, was signed, Poland's new ally approached the German Government with the offer of an accord as a result of which the Polish Government would be forced to cede Danzig to Germany and agree to a plebiscite in Pomerania if Hitler would conclude an alliance with Great Britain.

How often during the war did we hear fine declarations of fighting for freedom and justice. Yet, what happened after the war to the lofty principles of the Atlantic Charter? It turned out that, already at Teheran, Stalin was promised he could do as he pleased with Poland; there was only one condition—that this was not to be announced before the elections in the United States * * * I may mention that the minutes of the Teheran proceedings were officially published by the U.S. Department of State.

Question. Do you think that the United Nations Organization, seriously sick as it is for well-known reasons, can help to bring about a healthier international climate?

Answer. I have some doubts on that point. It must be realized that the United Nations Organization (for that matter, as with the League of Nations) has so far primarily served as an easier method of reaching an understanding on international affairs.

Before these institutions arose, talks between governments were conducted by diplomatists on the strength of coded telegrams or by diplomatic couriers over the whole world. In the League of Nations, as now in the United Nations Organization, exchanges are effected orally in direct manner within the boundaries of a single city. This makes things much easier. But the execution of the second major task of such an organization, the authoritative settlement of affairs by an international authority, is only in its beginnings. We see how great are the difficulties encountered when settling the affairs of the Congo or of Cyprus. Actually, it must be stated that only matters upon which the Super Powers are in agreement can so far be settled through the United Nations Organization. And, unfortunately, such matters are few and far between.

Question. What do you think of the present discord within the Atlantic Alliance and, according to you, what should be done to cope with it?

Answer. These clashes are caused above all by the universal lack of confidence I mentioned just now. If it comes to that, there is similar friction among the Communist countries and it is evoked by the same cause. Over there, too, nobody trusts anybody.

The countries of the Communist bloc are beginning to realize that actually, Russia is the only colonial power left in the world today. True, she strives to persuade the nations subjected by her that the present emancipation of former colonial areas is only passage to another system which she calls neocolonialism. Nevertheless, it can well be doubted that the countries still subjected by Russia do not perceive the evident truth that only Russia possesses a great colonial empire—not only in Asia but also in Europe.

Question. The United States opposes the granting of long-term credits to the Soviet Union whilst Great Britain is most in favor of them. Do these conflicting doctrines imply the moot point: which Communist is more dangerous—a hungry one, or one who has eaten his fill?

Answer. At the heart of this question we find the great misunderstanding current in Great Britain and the United States with regard to Russia. As from Germany's attack upon Russia, Great Britain and the United States built up a theory that Russia would save them from defeat though in point of fact the contrary occurred: they saved Russia from defeat. Just as at the outset of the First World War there was implicit belief that the Russian steamroller would crush German power, so now was this role again ascribed to Russia, blind to the fact that, if not for deliveries of food and ammunition from the United States and Britain, Communist Russia would have suffered the same fate as Czarist Russia. This serious error in evaluating reality bears down heavily upon the Western democracies to this day. It led and is still leading the West to make countless concessions to Soviet imperialism. The supplies now sent to make up Russia's food shortage can have only one certain result. The shortage of food in Russia was caused by two things: the faulty Communist system but also and chiefly by the fact that Russian production was geared for the most part to building up her military potential. Making up Russia's food shortage will enable her to continue the production of armaments to be used primarily against those who are providing the food she lacks.

Question. Mr. President, according to you, which are the real causes of the profound impasse at the Geneva Disarmament Conference?

Answer. The Russian objective just mentioned by me is likewise the reason for the failures of the disarmament negotiations. Russia does not want to disarm; indeed she cannot do this because it would entail the risk of losing her colonial empire, maintained by force—as became evident in Hungary—and which she intends to extend in the same way as far as possible, even to embrace the whole world.

Question. Mr. President, what is your opinion regarding French recognition of Communist China and what do you think of the French concept of "neutralizing" southeast Asia and Southern Vietnam in particular?

Answer. The question should rather be directed to the French Government. I can only venture surmises. It seems to me that Western policy in Asia has encountered so many setbacks since the Korean war that France has come to the conclusion that a fresh method should be tried out.

Question. Now, with regard to Cyprus, Mr. President; can you define the essential and actual elements of the Cyprus issue? Is it possible that Cyprus may become a European Cuba?

Answer. The Cyprus issue is very involved. I believe that this latest outbreak of fighting on the island primarily stems from the sincerely-felt aspiration of the Greek Cypriots for union with Greece—an aspiration which is undoubtedly shared by many circles in Greece. But the method of fighting—attacks on the Turkish minority—certainly evokes the impression that it may be exploited by those who expect to profit by evoking disturbances in that part of the Mediterranean, and these can only be the Communists.

Unfortunately the endeavors undertaken up till now by the United Nations do not seem to be effective. True, the Security Council has passed a resolution giving special powers to the Secretary-General, but we must remember that some members of the Council have abstained from voting while others have made reservations.

The task of the mediator who is to be appointed by the Secretary-General will be very difficult. All this can result in a lengthy crisis, the end of which is difficult to foresee.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the NATO countries will find a way of coordinating their policies so as not to allow the creation of that which you call "a European Cuba."

Question. Mr. President, do you consider the present preelectoral situation in the United States and Great Britain offers justifiable hopes that the issue of restoring real freedom, independence and sovereignty to the issue of restoring real freedom, independence and sovereignty to Poland and the other countries of east-central Europe, subjected by Russia will be taken up in earnest?

Answer. I must admit, I have small hopes that this issue will be raised as matters stand at present. It seems to me that the climate of elections is hardly suitable for this purpose. After all, the pledges of candidates during election campaigns should not necessarily be taken literally. Bismarck used to say that one should not believe people in three cases: when they narrate their hunting exploits, when they strive to gain the affections of the other sex, and when they stand for election. On the other hand, I am

sure the time will come when this issue will ultimately be raised. I am profoundly convinced there can be no lasting peace in the world as long as international relations are based on power, not on justice.

I am under no illusion that such a far-reaching change will come soon; but mankind must sooner or later choose one or other of the two methods of settling international matters, that of justice or of force. Inasmuch as nuclear weapons make war equivalent to the destruction of mankind, humanity must acquire the conviction that relations between nations must be based on justice. It must be supposed that this change will be a prolonged and gradual process. It is to be hoped that it will begin in Europe, the continent which still occupies a key position in world politics as the cradle of modern civilization.

Question. How do you appraise the several enunciations of General de Gaulle on the subject of Yalta and the suggestion he recently made in a letter to Khrushchev—namely, that it would be sound policy for the latter to follow the example of France who has granted independence to all her former colonies?

Answer. General de Gaulle is the only contemporary statesman whose utterances are in sympathy with the aim of the Polish Nation and of the other peoples behind the Iron Curtain to regain independence. I am convinced that all Poles, except a mere handful of Communists, are sincerely grateful to him for this.

Statement of William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, on S. 774

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement made by the Honorable William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust matters at the Department of Justice in opposition to S. 774, before a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee on January 23, 1964.

This excellent statement well points out the evils of the so-called quality stabilization bill and gives an abundance of good reasons why that iniquitous measure should be summarily defeated.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JR., ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, ANTITRUST DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ON S. 774, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, JANUARY 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to present the views of the Department of Justice concerning S. 774, a bill designated as a "Quality Stabilization Act." The Department of Justice strongly opposes this legislation. It is not in the public interest. It is inconsistent with a free economy. It means higher prices for consumers.

The title of this legislation is grossly misleading. The bill has nothing to do with quality. It is instead designed to legalize resale price fixing on a nationwide basis. The bill would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to permit the owner of a brand, name or trade mark to establish and control resale prices on goods identified by his mark. Thus, manufacturers would be permitted to dictate the prices at which distributors and retailers must resell merchandise that they and not the manufacturer own. This is not the American way.

By legislative fiat the bill would utterly destroy intrabrand price competition among distributors and retailers selling branded products. The result of such legislation would be the charging of higher prices to the consuming public. The bill might more aptly be named "The Consumer High Price Act." In our view, it is bad legislation.

S. 774 IS INCONSISTENT WITH A FREE ECONOMY

S. 774 strikes at the heart of our free enterprise system by restricting freedom of contract, limiting the right to transfer private property, restraining individual business initiative, and subverting the principles of free competition.

Free and open competition is basic to our capitalistic system. Since the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890 every administration has supported this principle which is so much a part of the warp and woof of our democracy. For example, President Hoover in his memoirs contrasted our free economic system with the cartelized systems of Europe. He said that "By maintaining competition, our industries were forced into channels of constantly improving methods and plants and constantly lowering prices with the increased consumption of goods, whereas trade restraints in Europe tended to stagnate improvements in favor of price and distribution controls." [1]

President Kennedy said: [2]

"The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decisionmaker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed. It thus is a vital underpinning of our democratic system."

Only last Monday President Johnson in his economic message to the Congress reiterated his deep belief in the necessity for competition and issued a mandate to his administration "that antitrust policy must remain keenly alert to illegal price fixing and other practices that impair competition; [and] that we must resist new steps to legalize price fixing where competition should prevail."

There is no mistaking that S. 774 "would legalize price fixing where competition should prevail" and is therefore antithetical to the economic program of this administration.[3] Like all resale price maintenance schemes it is also antithetical to long established antitrust principles.

Put simply, S. 774 legalizes price fixing by and for unregulated private interests.

Fifty-three years ago, in the Dr. Miles medical case [4] the Supreme Court outlawed resale price maintenance. Relying on common law principles against restraints on alienation, the Court found that resale price maintenance contracts were designed "to prevent competition among those who trade in [the contract commodities]," and held that when a manufacturer has "sold its products at prices satisfactory to itself, the public is entitled to whatever advantage may be derived from competition in the subsequent traffic." This doctrine is as much in the public interest today as it was in 1911.

Not only does S. 774 legalize vertical price fixing, it also promotes horizontal price fixing at all levels by drastically restricting the number of persons who may decide at what prices articles shall be sold.

In the last 20 years, the Department of Justice has prosecuted case after case where State "fair trade" laws have been used to cloak illegal price fixing. These cases variously involved agreements among competing manufacturers,[5] among competing wholesalers,[6] among competing retailers,[7] and among manufacturers competing with others at different levels of distribution.[8] Under "quality stabilization," with its nationwide scope, such agreements would tend to be even more prevalent and detection even more difficult. Beyond this, parallel pricing by manufacturers would be facilitated.

Approximately one-half of the 150 or so pending Government-instituted antitrust cases directly involve price fixing. To one degree or another all of these practices would either be legalized, facilitated, or encouraged by the so-called quality stabilization bill.

Recent examples of how legalized fair trade tends to be used for illegal price fixing may be cited. Only last month the Department of Justice brought suit against one of the country's major cosmetic manufactures, that sells upward of $65 million annually, charging that it had conspired to fix retail prices in nonfair trade States thereby forcing consumers to pay higher prices for cosmetics. The Government's suit seeks to enjoin the manufacturer from pressuring retailers into adopting fair trade prices.[9]

A month earlier the Department of Justice instituted two antitrust suits against a New York druggists' organization which had fixed prices on more than $70 million worth of drugs a year in a two-county area, in order to keep prices at high and noncompetitive levels.[10] Using the State fair trade law as a basis for its activities, this druggists' association, the complaint alleged, policed drugstores to check adherence to manufacturers' fair trade prices; coerced druggists to maintain fair trade prices and informed manufacturers of any deviations; harassed druggists who reduced prices; and engaged in other concerted activities to insure that price reductions on fair trade items were not available to the public. Similar reprehensible tactics charged against a druggists' association in Hawaii were just recently halted.[11]

These are not isolated instances. Similar practices have long been used by fair trade backers to maintain high prices.[12] S. 774 would encourage the use of such strong-arm behavior against any manufacturer refusing to quality stabilize his prices and any retailer daring to give consumers a break by selling below fixed fair trade or quality stabilization prices.

Were the Federal Government now to seek for itself price-fixing power of the type authorized by this bill, all elements of our society would be outraged by such an encroachment upon economic freedom. But is it not even less in the public interest for private business concerns lacking public accountability to have this power over the prices and incomes of others?

S. 774 MEANS HIGHER PRICES

There is absolutely nothing in the bill assuring that consumers will receive better quality, larger quantities, or improved services from either manufacturers or retailers in return for the higher prices they will have to pay. On the contrary under this legislation it is inevitable that consumers would be denied access to products at prices reflecting competition at all levels of distribution. As the Consumer Advisory Council commissioned by President Kennedy to protect consumer interests, concluded after its study of S. 774:

"So-called 'quality stabilization' (fair trade) bills are inimical to the interests of consumers. They violate the third right of the consumer as stated in the President's consumer message, the 'right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

variety of products and services at competitive prices.'"

That enactment of S. 774 would mean higher prices is clearly evidenced by manufacturer efforts to enforce "fair trade" prices. Repeatedly, in thousands of cases, the enforcement actions have stemmed from retailer sales below "fair trade" prices. In other words, retailers were willing, even desirous, of selling at lower prices but brand owners have brought lawsuits to force the retailers to increase their prices. Comparisons of the actual prices charged by the retailers in certain of these cases vis-a-vis the "fair trade" prices as set out in the court papers and decisions, are shown in table I. These comparisons amply demonstrate the spuriousness of the claim that "quality stabilization" will not raise prices.

On the contrary, the data reveal that on a wide range of everyday consumer products, from Alka-Seltzer to Zerex, large manufacturers have sought to compel retailers, most of whom are relatively small businesses, to deprive consumers of savings ranging up to 40 percent. Savings in a majority of the cases involved were in excess of 15 percent.

A recent study of prices in the liquor industry in New York shows the same effect of "fair trade" pricing. Table II reflects the savings obtainable by purchasers in the District of Columbia, a non "fair trade" jurisdiction, as compared to New York which has a mandatory resale price maintenance law. Minimum savings were 14 percent and the average was 26 percent.

But the results of these and other impartial surveys reveal only what is obvious: resale price maintenance means high prices, and slowed economic progress. England has had the experience of nationwide resale price maintenance. What is the assessment there of its merits? Edward Heath, Minister for Trade and Industry of the British Government, announced just the other day that his Government will seek abolition of resale price maintenance in England. Pointing to the need to prevent inflation from marring the United Kingdom's industrial growth, Mr. Heath emphasized that resale price maintenance is "incompatible" with the objective of "keeping down costs and prices." [13]

The latest study in the United States of resale price maintenance further emphasizes its detrimental effects. The Moreland Commission appointed by the New York Legislature to investigate the operation of New York's mandatory liquor resale price maintenance statute reported only 2 days ago that the State pricing law "injures the New York consumer in at last three important ways:

"1. It causes New Yorkers to pay about $1 a fifth more for liquor than consumers in areas of the country which do not have mandatory resale price maintenance.

"2. It eliminates competition and deprives the New York consumer of the benefits of free market efficiency.

"3. It places price-fixing power in the exclusive hands of the distillers, the group having the largest self-interest to serve, an extraordinary power which the State should be reluctant to grant any private group, even a disinterested one." [14]

The Commission recommended repeal of provisions of New York law "which provide for [State] enforcement of minimum consumer resale prices fixed by distillers." [15]

There are relatively few branded products which would not be subject to private price fixing under S. 774. The bill would encompass all goods "identified by a distinguishing brand, name, or trademark, either on the label, container, or dispenser thereof." Little of what the consumer purchases does not fall within this category.[16] Such commodities as canned goods, clothing, drugs, appliances, automobiles, books, furniture, farm equipment, hardware, or building materials, even meat and potatoes, could arguably be price fixed at the discretion of the brand owner, merely by imparting knowledge of the owner's currently established prices to his customers—the retailers. We estimate that sales in excess of $200 billion annually are susceptible to the coverage of S. 774. Beyond this, not only retail trade sales would be covered by S. 774, but also products which may be used in further production or as parts of other products. Consumer services which include the furnishing of a product (for example, plumbing, automotive, and farm machinery repairs) would be similarly affected. In sum, prices on tens of thousands of items could be artificially fixed with a cumulative impact through each level of distribution.

IS S. 774 REALLY OF BENEFIT TO SMALL BUSINESS?

It is alleged that this legislation is needed to protect small businesses against the economic advantages enjoyed by big businesses. But such benefits as retailers may derive from the bill will be conferred principally upon large retailers—the department stores, chain stores and mail-order houses. They have sufficient volume to sell private brands at low prices while their smaller competitors would be forced to sell comparable but "Quality stabilized" products at higher prices.

It must be noted that S. 774 provides no right which a small business man can invoke. On the contrary, all the rights and privileges created by this bill are granted exclusively to brand owners—generally the largest national manufacturers and distributors. It is they who would dictate resellers' profit margins. It is they who would have the option of restraining or ending price competition at distributive levels. Moreover, since the cost of promoting brand names and of enforcing "fair trade" has been shown to be substantial,[17] it follows that only large manufacturers or distributors ordinarily have the resources needed to take advantage of "fair trade." Their sizable costs in administering "fair trade" programs would either be passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices or to small retailers in the form of lower profit margins.

Additional special benefits would be given the large manufacturer engaged in dual distribution. S. 774 would overturn the McKesson & Robbins decision [18] and permit a manufacturer to fix the wholesale and retail resale prices of those to whom he supplies goods, while the manufacturer could sell in direct competition with such distributors.[19]

A particularly vicious effect of S. 774 is that it would virtually exclude the emergence of new small businesses. These new entrants frequently break into a market by offering substantial price concessions. There are many examples of this in the last decade's retail revolution. Many firms now established as suburban department stores trace their origin to low overhead volume merchandising operations established after World War II. "Quality stabilization" would have blocked these newer distribution ventures by barring their right to sell at reduced or discount prices.[20]

By holding up the mirage of a riskless economy replete with high profits "quality stabilization" does a disservice to small business and the public. The cessation of American production of Studebaker automobiles has been attributed by a leading business publication to the fact that Studebaker dealers "were content to sell a couple of dozen cars a year. They had a reputation for refusing to 'deal,' for holding out for the full list price so they could ring up a profit of $500 or more per car. In contrast an aggressive Ford or Chevrolet dealer often is satisfied with $75 to $125 profit per car expecting to boost his overall earnings through increased volume." [21]

CONCLUSION

In closing, I should point out that S. 774 raises substantial constitutional problems as is shown both by the multitude of State supreme court decisions which have struck down similar State laws as an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power [22] and also by the U.S. Supreme Court's action on December 9, 1963, in noting probable jurisdiction in *Hudson Distributors, Inc.* v. *The Upjohn Co.* (No. 489, 1963 term), and *Hudson Distributors, Inc.* v. *Eli Lilly & Co.* (No. 490, 1963 term), cases in which Federal constitutional due process questions are raised.[23]

The essence of "quality stabilization" is to substitute a system of high profits and restricted output for the proven American way of low cost, mass-produced goods for all. Since S. 774 would do violence to time-tested legal, economic, and social policies, it follows that its ultimate effect would be to devitalize our free enterprise system and democratic society. Accordingly, the Department of Justice respectfully urges rejection of S. 774.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The Memoirs of Herbert Hoover, vol. 3, 1952, p. 420.

[2] Address, White House Conference of Business Editors and Publishers, Sept. 26, 1962, quoted in 9 N.Y. Law Forum 1–2.

[3] "[T]he administration * * * will resist proposals—such as the revival of resale price maintenance now before Congress in the so-called quality stabilization bill—that would inhibit price competition and reduce the competitive vitality of our marketing system." Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers transmitted to the Congress with the Economic Report of the President, 1964, pp. 117–118.

[4] *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *John D. Park & Sons Co.*, 220 U.S. 373 (1911).

[5] E.g., *United States* v. *Maryland State Licensed Beverage Assn. Inc., et al.* (Cr. 23212, 1955; Civ. 9122, 1956; D. Md.)

[6] E.g., *United States* v. *National Wholesale Druggists Assn.* (Cr. 618–C, D. N.J. 1942).

[7] E.g., *United States* v. *Utah Pharmaceutical Assn.* (Civ. C, 30–61, D. Utah 1961).

[8] E.g., *United States* v. *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.* (Civ. 76–50, S.D. N.Y. 1952).

[9] *United States* v. *Max Factor & Co.* (Civil No. 14757–1, W.D. Mo.).

[10] *United States* v. *Nassau-Suffolk Pharmaceutical Society, Inc.* (Civ. 63–C 1207, E.D. N.Y.), and (Civ. 63–C, 1206, E.D. N.Y.).

[11] *United States* v. *Hawaii Retail Druggists Assn.* (Civ. 2064, D. Hawaii, 1962). Final judgment, Nov. 19, 1963.

[12] Report of the Federal Trade Commission on Resale Price Maintenance (1945), pp. 166–250.

[13] The Wall Street Journal, Jan. 16, 1964, p. 4. This judgment comports with the similar conclusion of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation that:

The rate of progress of productivity is generally retarded and in some respects may be totally arrested by resale price maintenance. Gammelgaard, Resale Price Maintenance, OEEC, 1958, p. 113.

[14] Report and Recommendations No. 3, Jan. 21, 1964, p. 30. On the basis of studies made for the Commission by economic experts it was concluded that mandatory resale price maintenance is costing New Yorkers $150 million per year. Id. at 8.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] Large producers of bulk commodities are striving to have S. 774 made applicable to their products. Large oil companies have already appeared before the subcommittee urging that the bill be amended to permit their products, which include gasoline and fuel oil, to come within its coverage.

[17] The General Electric Co. in enforcing its "fair trade" program spent "* * * many millions of dollars in administrative, legal and other costs." U.S. Senate hearings before the Committee on Interstate and For-

eign Commerce on S. 3850, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 99.

[18] 351 U.S. 305 (1956).

[19] Such a situation is found in a wide number of diverse industries: Flat glass—Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.; gasoline—Humble Oil & Refining Co., Standard Oil Co. of California; clothing—Botany Industries; shoes—Brown Shoe Co.; paints—Sherwin-Williams Co., Glidden Co.; steel products—United States Steel Corp., were among examples cited in recent hearings on dual distribution held before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

[20] Blocking the entrance or growth of new or smaller enterprises is an acknowledged objective of some "quality stabilization" supporters. An official of the Atlantic Refining Co. recently told a petroleum trade association meeting that "quality stabilization" is the "route to price stability." Citing frequent gasoline price fluctuations, the official remarked, "Essentially they add up to branded or unbranded marketers attempting to achieve a bigger share of the market through cutting the price." The Oil Daily, Friday, Sept. 23, 1963, p. 1.

[21] Business Week, Dec. 14, 1963, p. 28. For comments on the overall consequences on the Nation's economy of "quality stabilization" see "Summary Analysis of the Probable Effects of the Proposed Quality Stabilization Act on Prices, Incomes, Employment and Production" prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers at the request of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, Joint Committee Print, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963.

[22] See cases collected at 2 CCH Trade Reg. Rep. par. 6021. See also *A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States*, 295 U.S. 495 (1935).

[23] Apparently therefore, *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram Distillers Corp.*, 299 U.S. 183 (1936), did not lay to rest all constitutional due process objections to legalized private price fixing. See the statement in *Meade, Johnson & Co.* v. *Breggar*, 1963 CCH Trade Gas. par. 70,721 (Penn. S.C., Mar. 28, 1963):

"The very idea that a commercial entity may hold in one fettering price-fixing grasp all businessmen engaged in vending a certain product, just as a herdsman holds lassoed cattle on the plains, offends against the most elementary concept of a free and independent society."

TABLE I.—*Price comparisons in actions brought under "fair trade" laws to require higher retail selling prices as reported in CCH trade regulation reporter service,*[1] *1954 through 1963, inclusive*

Case	Product and identification	"Fair trade" price	Selling price	Percent saving over "fair trade" price
Hoffman-La Roche, Inc. v. *Schwegmann Bros. Giant Supermarkets* (Louisiana 1954 Trade cases," par. 67779).	Gantrisin tablets, 0.5 gm. (100's)	$4.00	$3.58	10.5
	Asterol powder, 5 percent (1½ ounces)	1.35	1.05	22.2
	Asterol ointment, 5 percent (1 ounce)	1.20	1.04	13.3
	Sedulon syrup (4 ounces)	1.00	.94	6.0
Union Carbide and Carbon Corp. v. *White River Distributors, Inc.* ("Arkansas 1955 Trade Cases," par. 67953).	Prestone antifreeze (1 gallon can)	3.75	2.97	20.8
Seagram Distillers Corp. v. *New Cut Rate Liquors, Inc.* ("Illinois 1955 Trade Cases," par. 68004).	Seagrams VO (½)	5.98	4.89	18.2
	Seagram 7 Crown (½)	4.30	3.49	18.8
Bulova Watch Co., Inc. v. *Anderson* ("Wisconsin 1955 Trade Cases," par. 68036)	Bulova commutor watch	71.50	55.00	23.1
Sunbeam v. *J. Eis & Sons* ("New York 1956 Trade Cases," par. 68393)	Sunbeam AP-10 percolator	29.95	24.00	19.9
	Sunbeam coffemaster	37.50	30.00	20.0
	Sunbeam T-20 toaster	27.50	20.00	27.3
Sunbeam Corp. v. *Rosenblum* ("New York 1956 Trade Cases," par. 68436)	Sunbeam shaver	29.50	19.06	35.4
	Sunbeam handmixer	21.95	16.50	24.8
	Sunbeam fry pan	23.00	16.95	26.3
	Sunbeam Coffeemaster	37.50	26.95	28.1
	Sunbeam handmixer	21.95	17.00	22.6
Casco Products Corp. v. *Hess Bros., Inc.* ("Pennsylvania 1956 Trade Cases," par. 68466)	Casco steam iron	15.95	10.00	37.3
Miles Laboratories, Inc. v. *Skaggs Drug Center* ("New Mexico 1956 Trade Cases," par. 68471)	Alka-Seltzer tablets (25's)	.54	.37	31.5
Atlantic Refining Co. v. *Sobocinski* ("Pennsylvania 1956 Trade Cases," par. 68583)	One-A-Day multiple vitamin tablets (60's)	1.96	1.39	29.1
	Gasoline (gallon)	.279	.260	6.8
	do	.309	.290	6.1
Seagram Distiller Corp. v. *Mills Cut Rate Liquor Mart, Inc.* ("Maryland 1957 Trade Cases," par. 68692).	Seagrams Ancient Bottle gin (5th)	4.03	3.77	6.5
Ampex Corp. v. *Goody Audio Center, Inc.* ("New York 1957 Trade Cases," par. 68710)	Series 600 magnetic tape recorder	545.00	381.50	30.0
Casco Products Corp. v. *Hess Bros., Inc.* ("Pennsylvania 1957 Trade Cases," par. 68738)	Casco steam iron	15.95	10.30	35.4
Parker Pen Co. v. *Charles Appliances, Inc.* ("New York 1957 Trade Cases," par. 68767)	Parker 51 pen	16.50	9.90	40.0
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. v. *Benjamin Fan, Inc.* ("Ohio 1958 Trade Cases," par. 68920)	Prestone antifreeze (1-gallon can)	2.95	2.49	15.6
Quality Oil Company, Inc. v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.* ("Kansas 1958 Trade Cases," par. 68970).	Zerex (1 gallon can)	3.25	2.25	30.8
General Electric Co. v. *Weldman d/b/a Belmont Supply Co.* ("Pennsylvania 1958 Trade Cases," par. 69044).	GE iron, F-60	15.95	12.75	20.1
	GE iron, F-43	12.95	10.25	20.8
Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. v. *Lindemann Pharmacy, Inc.* ("New York 1958 Trade Cases," par. 69202).	Squibb product [2]	1.00	.89	11.0
	do [2]	.69	.59	14.5
Gulf Oil Corp. v. *Mays* ("Pennsylvania 1959 Trade Cases," par. 69495)	Good Gulf (gallon)	.279	.269	3.6
	Gulf Super No-Nox (gallon)	.309	.299	3.2
	Gulf Crest (gallon)	.339	.329	3.0
Upjohn Co. v. *Save-Mor Drugs, Bethesda, Inc.* ("Maryland 1960 Trade Cases" par. 69827)	Delta-Cortef tablets, 5 milligrams (30's)	8.48	7.95	6.2
	Neo-Delta-Cortef ointment 0.5 percent (5 gram tube).	1.47	1.40	4.8
American Oil Co. v. *Stanley Stroh* ("Pennsylvania 1960 Trade Cases" par. 69838)	Reserpoid tablets, 0.25 milligrams (50's)	[3] 3.19	2.95	7.5
	Gasoline (gallon)	.279	.269	3.6
	do	.329	.309	6.1
Standard Drug Co., Inc. v. *General Electric Co.* ("Virginia 1960 Trade Cases" par 69858)	PH-5 flashbulbs (each)	.14	.12	14.3
	PH-5 flashbulbs (12's)	1.59	1.39	12.6
Skaggs Drug Center, Inc. v. *Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.* ("Montana 1961 Trade Cases" par. 69930).	Prestone antifreeze (1-gallon can)	3.25	2.49	23.4
Johnson & Johnson v. *Lindemann Pharmacy, Inc.* ("New York 1961 Trade Cases," par. 70026).	J. & J. baby powder (economy size)	.73	.59	19.2
Parke, Davis & Co. v. *Green Willow, Inc.* ("New York 1962 Trade Cases," par. 70234)	Abdec vitamin drops (50 cubic centimeters)	3.51	2.91	17.1
	Myadec vitamin caps (100's)	9.67	5.75	40.5
Parke, Davis & Co. v. *Amalgamated Health & Drug Plan, Inc.* ("New York 1962 Trade Cases," par. 70250).	Myadec vitamin caps (100's)	9.67	5.75	40.5
	Abdec vitamin drops (50 cubic centimeters)	3.51	2.65	24.5
Parke, Davis & Co. v. *Jarvis Drug Co., Inc.* ("New York 1962 Trade Cases," par. 70318)	Myadec vitamin caps (100's)	9.67	6.00	38.0
	Abdec vitamin drops (50 cubic centimeters)	3.51	2.89	17.7
Bulova Watch v. *Family Fair* ("Connecticut 1962 Trade Cases" par. 70344)	Abdec vitamin drops (50 cubic centimeters)	3.51	2.91	17.1
	Bulova watch	39.75	27.87	29.9
	do	59.50	39.97	32.8
Upjohn Co. v. *Cost Less Drug* (Pennsylvania 1963 Trade Cases" par. 70831)	Unicap caps (100's)	3.11	2.63	15.4
Mead Johnson v. *Quakertown Sales* ("Pennsylvania 1963 Trade Cases" par. 70877)	Poly-vi-Sol drops (30 cubic centimeters)	2.39	2.23	6.7
	Tri-vi-Sol drops (30 cubic centimeters)	2.33	2.16	3.1
	Poly-vi-Sol Chewables tablets (100's)	4.55	4.19	7.9
	do	4.55	4.09	10.1

[1] This table comprises all cases reported in which the "fair trade" and actual selling price is given.

[2] Item not further identified.

[3] Prorated on basis of actual number of tablets involved in sale.

TABLE II.—*Retail prices in "fair trade" New York State and free trade District of Columbia for the Nation's leading 20 brands of distilled spirits, August and September 1963*

Brand	Retail prices per 5th		Percent saving by Washington, D.C., purchasers	Brand	Retail prices per 5th		Percent saving by Washington, D.C., purchasers
	Washington, D.C.	New York State			Washington, D.C.	New York State	
Seagram's 7 Crown	$3.49	$4.84	27.9	Corby's Reserve	$2.99	$4.34	31.1
Seagram's V.O.	4.99	6.50	23.2	Fleischmann's Preferred	3.18	4.40	27.7
Canadian Club	4.99	6.40	22.0	Ten High	[2] 3.18	[2] 4.35	26.9
Old Crow	3.39	5.30	36.0	Old Taylor	4.29	5.80	26.0
Imperial	3.18	4.35	26.9	Cutty Sark	5.59	6.96	19.7
Jim Beam	3.49	4.95	29.	Four Roses	3.69	5.04	26.8
Calvert Reserve	3.49	[1] 4.84	27.9	Kessler	(3)	(3)	
Schenley Reserve	3.49	4.84	27.9	J & B	5.95	6.94	14.3
Early Times	3.79	5.30	28.5	Old Sunnybrook	3.29	(3)	
Ancient Age	3.59	5.80	38.1	Kentucky Gentleman	[4] 3.19–3.39	4.64	26.9

[1] Calvert Extra.
[2] Revised.
[3] Not marketed.
[4] Based on the higher of the Washington, D.C., prices.

NOTE.—New York State and the District of Columbia have similar excise taxes—$1.50 per wine gallon; New York State, however, imposed an additional $0.15 per 5th use fee in 1963, which is not included in the New York State prices.

Source: New York State Moreland Commission on the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law, "Resale Price Maintenance in the Liquor Industry," study paper No. 5, Oct. 28, 1963, p. 36.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Civil Rights—Federal Regimentation of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 11, 1964

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few days ago, I had occasion to discuss my opposition to the civil rights bill with Hon. John C. Satterfield, former president of the American Bar Association, as to its effect on farmers and farmer organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Mr. Satterfield on this subject, dated April 9, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SATTERFIELD, SHELL, WILLIAMS & BUFORD, ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Jackson, Miss., April 9, 1964.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: As requested, I have examined the civil rights bill for the purpose of determining its effect upon farmers and farm organizations.

I will, first, present my conclusions and then state the reasons for them.

In my opinion, if this bill is enacted, it will have the following effect:

1. FEDERAL REGIMENTATION OF FARMERS

Section 601 amends every act creating or appropriating funds for "any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance," and subjects to Federal control in relation to "discrimination" on the ground of "race, color, or national origin," every person who participates in or receives the benefits thereof. In excess of 100 programs are amended.

Section 602 says, in part: "Each Federal department or agency * * * shall take action to effectuate the provisions of section 601."

Consequently, if this bill becomes law, following the November election, we may expect regulations issued by "each Federal department or agency" which deals with farmers and farm organizations. These include banks for cooperatives, Federal land banks, Federal production credit associations, the Agricultural Stabilization Credit Corporation, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service, and other agencies.

These regulations will seek to inhibit "discrimination" in the administration of each applicable program. But that is not all. In my opinion they will, also (under penalty of cancellation, termination, foreclosure, blacklisting, and withholding), dictate to the "participating" farmer or to farmers receiving "the benefits" of applicable programs.

Specific agricultural pursuits which will be affected include: The contractor and his employees who build the farmer's home, dust his cotton, dig his ditches, or clear his land. They will include the "use," "occupancy," or "sale or other disposition" of the farm. They will include the tenants upon the farm, i.e., the "rental" or "leasing" thereof. They will include the "employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation and selection for training" of all of his farm employees.

This control will be exercised as to "discrimination" on the ground of "race, color, or national origin," all of which terms, not being defined by the law, will be defined by the agency or department exerting control.

This control will include action of two sorts: (1) Action upon complaints brought by individuals, and (2) action brought without individual complaints but after visits by Federal inspectors.

The penalties and sanctions will include: Cancellation of contracts, foreclosure of loans, withdrawal of supports, blacklisting from participation in Federal programs, and "any other means authorized by law."

The above opinion is based upon the factors hereinafter set forth.

2. METHOD OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Under section 602 all Federal departments and agencies administering programs receiving Federal financial assistance "by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty," are required to (1) make rules and regulations which will define "discrimination" and such terms as "race, color, or national origin," (2) fix the procedures and penalties which may include "termination of or refusal to grant or to continue assistance under such program or activity to any recipient," and (3) "other means authorized by law."

Under section 601, Executive orders will be issued governing all other "programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance." (Senators KEATING and CASE made this clear on March 14 on pages 5074 and 5075 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.) The regulations or orders will require nondiscrimination clauses in contracts and penalties including cancellation of contracts, withdrawal of supports, foreclosure of loans, blacklisting, and similar sanctions.

3. EXTENT OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Title VI requires nondiscrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin. The important question is whether the authority of enforcing this title will extend to the departments and agencies only when they are engaged in the actual distribution and expenditure of Federal funds, or if the authority it grants will be utilized to control the subsequent actions of the "persons" who are the actual recipients of the funds.

The answer, it appears, is to be found in the precedent set by Executive Order No. 11063. This order demonstrates the kind of controls which may be expected, if title VI of the civil rights bill becomes law.

Executive Order No. 11063 was issued to prevent discrimination because of "race, color, creed, or national origin" in the administration of programs involving housing owned or operated by the Federal Government, or provided by loans made or insured by the Federal Government. This was its ostensible purpose.

But it did not stop there.

It was drafted so as to extend Federal control to homeowners, realtors, building and loan associations, contractors, and banks in "the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of residential property and related facilities (including land to be developed for residential use) or in the use or occupancy." An extraordinary extension of control.

Thus, as the Executive order now stands, when a person buys a home and makes use of a FHA or GI loan to finance the purchase, Federal control extends not simply to the agency administering the program. It goes far beyond that. It dictates to: (1) The realtor who develops the land; (2) the contractor who builds the house; (3) the bank which makes the loan; (4) the realtor who sells the house; and (5) to the owner in the "use and occupancy thereof." It applies in the rental of the home, in its leasing and in its "sale or other disposition."

Thus Executive Order No. 11063 grew. Originally proposed to apply to the administration (only) of programs involving housing owned or operated by the Federal Government, or provided by loans made or insured by the Government, from that beginning, today, it includes vast powers.

A second precedent may be cited. It is embodied in Executive Order No. 10925. This order was proposed to inhibit discrimination in the administration of programs involving Government contracts.

But it did not stop with its original design, either.

As it stands, today, it extends Federal control to the contractor and his employees in their employment, promotion, demotion, transfer, layoff, termination, to their rates of pay and selection for training. It extends to the subcontractor and his employees in like manner; to the materialmen and their employees in like manner; and to the labor unions which deal with all such contractors.

To enforce its provisions, the Federal Government holds over all their heads the eternal threat of contract cancellation, termination, blacklisting, and withholding.

Thus Executive orders grow.

The question comes again: How far will the executive branch use its powers to extend its authority to enforce title VI if the civil rights bill becomes law.

There is no answer short of total control.

4. OUTLINE OF OTHER CONTROLS

In a brief opinion it is impossible to describe the extent of Federal control authorized by this package of 10 bills thrown together as 10 titles and proposed under the cloak of civil rights. Within the coverage of this bill (with minor exceptions) Federal control will extend to—

Schools and teachers as to (titles IV, VI, and VII): (1) Handling of pupils, (2) employment, discharge, promotion, and compensation of faculties, and (3) occupancy of dormitories and use of facilities.

Employees and labor union members as to (titles VI and VII): (1) Seniority in employment, (2) seniority in apprenticeship programs, (3) racial balance of job classifications, (4) preferential treatment of minorities, and (5) membership in unions.

Businesses and banks as to (titles VI and VII): (1) Hiring, firing, promotion, and compensation of employees, (2) racial balance of office staffs and job classifications, and (3) approval and foreclosure of loans by banks.

Hotels, motels, and restaurants as to (title II): (1) Rental of rooms, (2) service of customers, and (3) hiring firing, and promotion of employees.

Hospitals as to (titles II, VI, and VII): (1) Medical and nursing staffs, (2) technical, clerical, and other employees, (3) patients' beds and operating rooms, and (4) facilities and accommodations.

States and municipalities as to: (1) State FEPC acts (title VII), (2) handling of public facilities (title III), (3) supervision of private facilities (title II), (4) judges and law enforcement officers (title II), and (5) handling of elections (title I).

If you wish a more detailed opinion upon the terms of the bill, I will be glad to furnish it to you.

Yours very truly,

JOHN C. SATTERFIELD.

Reclamation and Mike Kirwan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1964, our distinguished Governor of California, Pat Brown, was the guest speaker at a dinner honoring our distinguished colleague, Congressman MIKE KIRWAN.

In my judgment, Governor Brown made an excellent speech on that occasion and I am particularly pleased by his recognition of the great service that our beloved MIKE KIRWAN has rendered to the cause of reclamation. The speech of Governor Brown reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, ANNUAL MAHONING COUNTY DEMOCRATIC DINNER HONORING CONGRESSMAN MIKE KIRWAN, IDORA PARK BALLROOM, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, APRIL 9, 1964

The Mahoning Valley is a long way from the Sacramento Valley but it's a trip I was glad to make. This dinner has a great tradition and it's an honor to share in that tradition.

Youngstown and Sacramento have much in common. They are about the same size. They are both river towns. They are both seats of government, proud of their symphonies and colleges.

And they both owe a great deal to MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN.

Earl Warren once said when he was Governor of California that the two men who have done the most for Western America are Theodore Roosevelt and MIKE KIRWAN. And he said in balance MIKE KIRWAN has done the more. Roosevelt put through the Reclamation Act of 1902. But MIKE KIRWAN made the act work.

We have a pioneer tradition in the West and we like to stand on our own two feet. But I can tell you that MIKE KIRWAN has made the footing more solid for all of us.

The great reclamation projects that have passed through his dedicated hands have made deserts bloom and prosper. The great forests he has saved will make generations of children skip and laugh. And this has been a labor of love for MIKE. As he once said on the floor of the House: "This is the greatest country on earth, better than all the rest rolled into one, with its mountains, its streams, its climate, its soil, its minerals, everything the work of God."

One of these days there will be a Kirwan National Park somewhere in the West—and I hope it will be in California. It will have to be a special park. It will have to be a park that helps people enjoy life a little more. If it doesn't, it won't really represent this great man's work.

Now, those are things I have wanted to say publicly about MIKE KIRWAN to the people of the 19th Ohio District for a long time. It's a trip I was glad to make.

Of course, I do have one criticism of Congressman KIRWAN.

We have a dropout problem in California, as every State has. Last year, I budgeted $346,000 for a pilot program to find out how we could make youngsters want to stay in school, want to learn. And if they ever find out about MIKE—six honorary college degrees and a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution and never a day beyond the third grade—that whole $346,000 will go out the window.

At the same time, I can't complain about MIKE's arithmetic. And neither can the Congressmen he has helped swing the tough campaigns during the 16 years that he has chaired the congressional campaign committee.

MIKE has steered that committee through 1,991 elections. In 1952, when all the political odds said the House should have gone Republican by a landslide, MIKE held the GOP to a 12-vote margin. And he got it back in 1954 and held it for the Democrats in 1956 against the biggest plurality ever registered by a presidential candidate.

That, my friends, is a great record.

Now it is election year once again and as usual the Republicans have an epidemic of hat-in-ring disease.

Out in California last week, Senator GOLDWATER and Governor Rockefeller were churning up dust along the campaign trail. They say they went west because California has a primary election in June, but you'll find a better reason if you look at a map. California is as far away from New Hampshire as they can get.

Mr. Nixon is staying out of it. He is sticking to the humdrum routine of the typical American lawyer—press conferences, magazine articles, convention speeches, and trips around the world.

And Henry Cabot Lodge is in Saigon, reading the polls and picking another primary campaign to stay out of.

And where are the Democrats while all this is going on?

They are working. The Senate Democrats, for example, are in Washington this very night, getting ready to strike the sharpest blow for freedom this country has seen since the Reconstruction.

They are getting ready to send to the President a civil rights bill that will help us keep a promise we made to the American Negro 100 years ago.

And when that bill is law, we Democrats will start to churn up some dust of our own.

We will match the Republican promises with performance.

We will balance their words with our deeds.

And when November comes, we will put President Johnson back in the White House with a fresh mandate to carry on the job President Kennedy began so brilliantly.

We will send STEVE YOUNG back to the Senate. We will send MIKE KIRWAN back to the House. All across the land we will assemble majorities in both houses to back up the President on foreign aid and medicare, poverty and aid to education and the other programs this country needs, and needs now.

Woodrow Wilson said in 1913 the Republicans hadn't had a new idea in 50 years. It has now been 101 years. And you can be sure if they stumble onto a new idea this year, BARRY GOLDWATER will take it out and drown it.

And the American people know it.

They know you can't look to the future if your head is buried in the sands of time.

They know you can't serve the general interest by catering to the special interest.

They know which party works to open doors for people and which works to close them.

All they have to do is look at the record—look at the vigor and imagination that the Democratic administration has brought to Washington.

Three years ago, the cause of freedom was on the defensive all around the world.

Premier Khrushchev was openly insulting President Eisenhower in Paris.

The Soviets were reaching for a beachhead in Africa.

Castro had taken over Cuba.

Moscow was trying to blackmail the West into giving up West Berlin.

Here at home, we had a recession. Unemployment was over 7 percent, the highest in 20 years.

And you remember that here in Youngstown the mills were running at less than half capacity while Mr. Nixon was going from city to city telling us we never had it so good.

All of this changed—and changed dramatically—in 1961.

This country started to move again under the calm and courageous leadership of President Kennedy and then of President Johnson. And we are going to keep it moving—with the help of men like MIKE KIRWAN—and with the support of dedicated Democrats like you.

Let's look at what happened when the Democrats took over:

The Soviets backed out of the Congo.

Khrushchev backed down on Berlin.

The Russians dismantled their missiles and pulled out of Cuba in the face of the most courageous act of leadership in two decades.

We shored up our defenses all along the line.

Thus armed, we negotiated and the negotiations produced a test ban treaty and the cause of peace began to prosper. And we are at peace tonight because we have men in Washington with the courage to fight when fighting is needed, courage to negotiate when negotiation is called for.

At home, the longest peacetime expansion of business in our history began and it is still underway.

The gross national product rose 16 percent. The deficit in the balance of trade went down.

And to keep the economy moving, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson began a bold campaign to cut taxes to pump new money into the economy.

Last month, America's working men and women began to enjoy what amounts to a $10 billion increase in takehome pay.

And that tax cut—as the Democrats said it would—already is beginning to pay off. Here in Youngstown, for example, the decision of Republic Steel to invest between $3 and $4 million in expansion is a direct result of the cut in taxes.

During the past 3 years, the Democratic administration has poured funds into regions where recovery was slow under the Area Redevelopment Act, the expanded public works program.

We extended unemployment insurance payments. We changed the law so that a father who is out of work doesn't have to desert his family to let his children qualify for Government aid.

I tell you, my friends, no administration in history has done so much for so many people in so short a time.

Peace, prosperity and progress was a Republican slogan in 1960. But it took President Kennedy and President Johnson to make that slogan come true. In 1964 we have peace; we have prosperity; and we are making progress. Progress for everyone, not the favored few. Progress for every single American, young and old, sick and disabled, black and white.

And what do the Republicans say to this?

Senator GOLDWATER says we should sell off the TVA and sell out the United Nations; put social security on a voluntary footing and send the Marines into Cuba.

And you know how much that program will help people here in Youngstown or in Cleveland or anywhere else in this land of ours.

I speak to you tonight as the Governor of California, the most populous of the 50 States. We number 18 million people now and in 20 years we will have 30 million.

The challenges of growth like that are tremendous. We deal today with every problem that other States must face in the next 20 years—technology and automation; mobility, civil rights, the aging, urban sag and suburban sprawl, unemployment, education, taxes and the stalling tactics of special interests.

Now there are two ways to deal with growth like that. One is to sit tight, retrench, cut services and insist that nothing can be done. That will solve growth problems. It will stop the growth. And it will stop the prosperity that goes with it, too.

The other way is to meet the challenge head on, and that is what we are doing in California.

In California, every child who can make the grade can go from kindergarten to graduate school without paying one cent of tuition. To meet this high standard, we must double the capacity of our public university and colleges before 1970. It will mean a big investment, but Californians are glad to invest in their youth and their future.

The bonds we issue today to build new campuses will be paid in future years by the graduates of those schools out of the higher income their education will help them earn.

I understand you will be building a technical school as part of your fine university here under a similar bonding plan. I am glad that Ohio's State leaders know a good idea when they see one.

California needs water to grow. When I took office, I won a fight for approval of a project that will bring flood control to the northern part of our State and water to the arid southern half in a manmade river 500 miles long. The project will cost more than $2 billion. And the people of California have voted to pledge their credit for bonds to cover $1,750 million of that amount.

There are other examples of California's willingness to make sound investments for growth, but these will serve to make my point.

People in California are no different from people anywhere. Given a challenge and a good, sound plan for meeting it and they are equal to the task.

I understand that MIKE KIRWAN has been trying to get Ohio's leaders to rally behind a manmade river of your own for years. MIKE has made the case. This great industrial area, this American Ruhr, needs a link between Lake Erie and the Ohio and the rest of the Nation needs it as well. But no man can fight through a project like this alone. It takes cooperation from all leaders, from all Members of Congress. And I hope the people of Ohio will let their Congressmen know this fall that they are behind MIKE KIRWAN on this one and that they want action on the canal.

Let me add one more thing—the people of California, the Governor and the congressional delegation stand ready to help you get Federal help to build that canal—and that's a promise.

Much has been done in the past 3 years, but much remains to be done.

Under the determined leadership of President Johnson, we are just beginning to deal with the poverty that exists side by side with plenty in this richest of all nations.

One-fifth of our people are ill-housed, ill-clothed, undernourished, and deprived of a minimal standard of health and decency.

Poverty cuts across many lines—the aged, minorities, the disabled, the illiterates, the sick, farmworkers, and the unskilled for whom no jobs exist.

The burden of poverty is heaviest on the poor, but it costs all of society in the tolls of crime, mental illness, welfare payments and bad health.

President Johnson is determined that the poor must not always be with us. He has declared unconditional war on poverty and we Democrats will not rest until that war is won.

Will you join us in that fight?

The civil rights bill is a great beginning, but we must follow it with action. We Democrats will not rest as long as one American can be turned away from a job or a room because of the color of his skin.

Will you help us win on civil rights?

One of the great shames of America is that medical care is least available to those who need it most. We cannot rest until every elderly American is covered by a program that will guarantee them a decent standard of health.

Will you help us win on civil rights?

Those are government programs in the tradition of Jefferson and Jackson; Wilson and Roosevelt; Kennedy and Johnson—programs of a government that leads, not follows—of government that shares the concern of every citizen for his rights, his dignity and his needs.

The challenges never stop and neither can a liberal force like the Democratic Party.

We cannot rest until we prove that a country which can create machines to fill jobs can also create jobs to fulfill men.

We cannot rest until we show that a country which can build a force like the Peace Corps can tear down a force like bigotry.

From our missile centers, we are learning to explore space. From our hope for mankind, we are learning to explore new paths to peace.

This is the meaning of a Democratic victory in November. Those are the goals for which we work.

Thomas Knapman Davey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Tom Davey, architect and engineer, died the other day. He had the reputation of being an orator of superior finesse supporting his presentation with clear, logical, and convincing thinking. Personally he was cordial, friendly, and kindly. He loved his fellow man and enjoyed being among them.

His main arena of activity was in the serviceman atmosphere of the American Legion of Illinois. He was most sought after as an after dinner speaker at Legion affairs. He would spill over with a brand of dry humor that sent his audience into fits of gleeful guffaws that tickled into humorous response the most downfaced skeptic. His clever use of puns would nettle his most violent adversary in debate at conventions. He was shrewd in using a meticulous approach to his subject, reflecting an intimate knowledge of the matter under discussion. His mental superiority over an adversary became self-evident, matched only by his earnestness and honesty of purpose.

Tom Davey contributed much to the solution of problems confronting the servicemen through the years. He was ever ready to contend for lost causes. He fought to protect the voicings of the minority, upon Legion mandates presented to the convention. His reasoning was basically sound and generally prevailed. He asked for little for himself and during a turbulent career received naught in the way of official posts of advancement. Yet in his inner soul, in spite of these reverses, exuded a luminous light of cleanliness and healthful patriotism gleaming with sincerity.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a great American and solid patriot died the other day—and in his own selfless way left a great heritage for lesser men to light their way—even without hope of reward. In the minds and hearts of his many friends, Tom will live on in their fond memory as a true advocate of the principles of the good samaritan, that in good deeds one enjoys the feeling of relief of a better life. We will miss Tom and his honest face, his cryptic phrases and sardonic grin while charming victory over a vanquished foe. The members of Federal Post will sense a void in his absence at the annual installation of our officers—and I personally have lost a valiant opponent and warm friend.

His darling wife, Helen, continues her services at Hines Hospital as a volunteer and carries on in the best tradition of the auxiliary, tending the sick veterans. To her we extend our heartfelt condolences. God is good and Tom in his goodness will be blessed in God's will.

THOMAS KNAPMAN DAVEY

Thomas Knapman Davey, born January 15, 1896, died February 29, 1964. Thomas Knapman Davey was born in Cornall, England, on January 15, 1896. Learned the trade of a granite cutter and as such worked in London, England, and in many quarries and large cities in the United States, having come here in about 1903. On about the 15th of July 1917, he enlisted in the 132d Infantry, Company K, 33d Division. He was honorably discharged as a sergeant on May 31, 1919. Received the Silver Star Decoration, French Decoration for service in the Meuse-Argonne, 1918, Purple Heart, Citation from his 33d Division for Gallantry in Action. A splendid performance of duty at Albert, France, on August 19, 1918. Also received Accolade signed by President Woodrow Wilson stating he served with honor in the World War and was wounded in action. Has a certificate signed by Abel Davis, colonel, stating he was an instructor in the post schools of the 33d Division for 8 weeks and that his work was satisfactory. He was one of the founders of the American Legion in the State of Illinois. The first commander of Forge Post and the second commander of the 5th district of the American Legion. He was a candidate for Representative in Congress, State at large, in the primary election, April 8, 1930. He was commissioned as colonel by the Governor of the State of Oklahoma on December 29, 1931. There were three such commissions given out that time, Bill Rogers and Mary Pickford the other two. On December 29, 1920, he was married to Miss Helen Irene Byrd. He was connected with Graham-An-

derson-White Architects and worked on many of the skyscrapers in Chicago for about 25 years. He was with the Palmer House as construction engineer for 25 years.

Karen Spence, Idaho's 1964 "Ability Counts" First Prize Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 and May 1, of this year, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped will hold their annual meeting here in Washington, D.C. One of the persons who will be attending this gathering will be a constituent of mine, Miss Karen Spence of Caldwell, Idaho, who is Idaho's first prize winner of the 1964 "Ability Counts" contest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to insert in today's RECORD the text of this fine essay entitled, "How Handicapped Workers in My Community Are Proving That Ability Counts."

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Karen Spence, Caldwell High School)

Living with a physical handicap is not easy; yet many people use such a handicap to prove that stumbling blocks can be turned to stepping stones. In every community across our Nation reside people who were born physically handicapped or who have become incapacitated during life. Only a few hundred years ago such citizens were considered as people of whom to be ashamed. Carefully tucked away where they could not be seen, such handicapped people had little chance to lead a happy, productive life. Fortunately, this situation has changed a great deal in recent years. We have learned that a physical handicap in no way limits the usefulness of an individual to his world.

My community harbors many examples of this change. There are a number of physically disabled people in my area eager to prove that ability counts, and there are just as many citizens eager to listen and learn from them. Through this cooperation the whole community has found that a person, physically handicapped, has a wealth of talents to offer his area. Such knowledge helps us to appreciate these disabled people for the abilities they possess, not pity them for what they lack.

What is this ability of which I speak? When we consider the word "ability" we first think of the attribute, talent. Hearing the beautiful music played by young flutists, one can be sure that their polio-stricken teacher has made her talent count. A new book enthusiast attending an autograph party is very likely to meet a young couple, both with crippling disabilities. The husband, a writer, and his wife, a poet, have disregarded their handicaps to give expression to a fulfilling talent.

It is true that talent is one of the most important facets of ability. However, I believe that the physically handicapped in my area are proving many other attributes are equally as important as talent. Perhaps we could even say these characteristics are forms of talent and are thus included in ability.

Perseverance is an essential quality in all modern living. When one has a physical defect, this perseverance becomes doubly important. I have had the opportunity to become friends with a young man who was long considered to be a mental incompetent. Through his persevering desire to prove his ability, coupled with his great initiative, this young person, after 21 years, was not only released from a State school for the mentally retarded, but also learned to read and later to type with one finger. Now he has an expanding newsstand business. In spare moments this remarkable businessman has written three books. Certainly this young man has not allowed a diseased body to prohibit his leading a very productive life.

Very often the handicapped are an influence on the community simply by the happiness they feel and express to others. Being around someone who enjoys living, and shows it, is always a pleasure. This pleasure becomes a lesson in living when the person is afflicted with the crippling Paget's disease. The lovely aunt of a close friend combines a wonderful personality and great poise to teach many of her young friends the meaning of true charm. If she were completely able-bodied, her influence could not be greater.

The religious faith of the handicapped people of my community has also been a tremendous influence on others. Entering many homes in my town, one may hear a lovely tenor voice from a recording of religious songs. This voice belongs to a man whose hands and arms have been burned pitiably. Now the hands which once played the organ so beautifully are nearly useless. Did he let this sudden handicap defeat him? No, he did not. Because his religious faith means so much to him, the man decided to overcome his disability and is now disseminating a wonderful influence on this area through his vocal music.

Another extremely important attribute is love for one's family. In a nearby town lives a woman with multiple sclerosis. Confined completely to her wheelchair, this courageous lady has worked out methods of housework so that she has been able to continue caring for her family. This love that conquers all is an example for all her able-bodied friends.

To have fun is important to everyone. When it involves the physically handicapped, fun means much more than just a good time. Putting aside bitterness and self-pity, many of the physically unfortunate people of my community have organized the Indoor Sports Club. This organization offers a chance for the handicapped to show their initiative, have fellowship together, and join in healthful recreation. The most important attribute of this club, and others like it, is that it shows the community that attitude and ability, not physical disabilities, are really important.

Truly, physically disabled people are radiating a tremendous influence on the life and nature of my community. Daily they prove by their actions and attitudes that it is man's will to live a worthwhile life that really counts. We, the privileged able-bodied, need to prove that we accept these standards for our own lives.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Pending Urban Mass Transportation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE PENDING URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACTS: A QUESTION-AND-ANSWER ANALYSIS OF THE NEED FOR THIS FEDERAL LEGISLATION

In the near future, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963—one of the major legislative proposals of the current session of Congress—is expected to be called up for a vote by the House of Representatives.

The Senate already has acted favorably upon the Urban Mass Transportation Act, and it has been the subject of thorough committee hearings in the House of Representatives.

Originally proposed by the late President Kennedy and his administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Act is being strongly supported by President Johnson. Appeals for its enactment have been made twice to Congress by President Johnson—once in his state of the Union message and the other time in his message on housing and community development.

"Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and this Congress," said President Johnson.

"Efficient transportation systems are essential to our urban communities," President Johnson explained. "The proper mixture of good highways and mass transit facilities should be developed to permit safe, efficient movement of people and goods in our metropolitan centers.

"I urge early enactment of the mass transit program (H.R. 3881) as basic to the development of our Nation's cities," President Johnson asserted.

The Institute for Rapid Transit, using the question-answer technique, herewith presents the views of knowledgeable leaders in the transit industry on the need and justification of the Urban Mass Transportation Act:

Question. What is the need for this legislation?

Answer. After many years of concentration on improving highways and other facilities for the private automobile, it has become obvious that the automobile alone cannot possibly supply all of the urban transportation requirements. The cost alone of providing enough urban highways to provide the total transportation requirements would be fantastic and prohibitive. Furthermore, it would be a grossly uneconomic use of land to provide for not only the required highways but also the parking facilities required by these highway constructions. This continuing need for mass transportation facilities is especially apparent in the peak hours of travel to and from the central business districts and other increasingly congested sections of the metropolitan areas. It is the belief of the transit industry that improved transit facilities could attract substantial numbers of patrons and thereby relieve congestion on highways and streets.

Question. Isn't it possible to private industry to provide the mass transportation needs without any Federal or other governmental assistance?

Answer. Experienced operators, planners, and other students of the transit industry are in general agreement that it is no longer attractive to private industry to make substantial capital improvements which are required for the long overdue modernization and expansion of such facilities. There is not sufficient revenue coming through the fare box to provide either the basis for low-interest bonds or the capital to finance these improvements. To attempt to finance these capital improvements through the fare box would raise fares so high that not only would transit riding be reduced, but a financial hardship would be imposed on those persons who must depend solely on transit services.

Question. Aren't privately owned urban transportation properties profitable?

Answer. There are certain privately owned transit companies which are profitable operations, but the trend for many years has been for the privately owned transit companies to withdraw in favor of public transit authorities or similar governmental agencies. The fact of the matter is that since World War II, many privately owned transit companies have failed, resulting in either public operations or abandonment of transit services in the community involved.

The last 25 years have seen a shift from private to governmental operations in such cities as Boston, Chicago, New York, Miami, Memphis, Cleveland, and Los Angeles. In the last year or two, the privately owned transit properties have disappeared in St. Louis, Dallas, and Pittsburgh. This problem is not only restricted to the large and medium-size cities, but includes numerous smaller cities as well. For example, privately owned properties in recent years have given way to public operations in such cities as Long Beach, Sacramento, and Bakersfield, Calif.; Savannah and Rome, Ga.; Michigan City, Ind.; Tacoma, Wash.; San Antonio, Tex.; Newcastle, Pa.; Janesville, Wis.; Jonesboro, Ark.; Greeley, Colo.; Staunton, Va., and Jamestown and Ithaca, N.Y.

Question. Would not this act be the death knell to private transit operators?

Answer. This act plays no favorites between the publicly owned and the privately owned transit operations. Under the provisions of this act, all Federal grants or loans would be made to State or local governmental bodies. In no case would assistance be rendered directly to an operating transit organization, whether publicly or privately owned. The sponsoring State or local governmental agency would make the necessary improvements in transit facilities. These improved facilities in turn would be operated by the existing transit operator, whether it is privately or publicly owned. In fact, this act might very well help to continue certain private operations which are having great difficulty in continuing on their own.

Question. Do proponents of this bill feel that improved transit can handle all of the transportation requirements of a modern city?

Answer. On the contrary, just as most Americans do, proponents of this bill recognize and enjoy the advantages of the private automobile and look to improvements in highways where required.

Transit experts also recognize the fact that no one form of urban transportation can handle all of the transportation requirements in large cities and metropolitan areas. In other words, the proponents of the Urban Mass Transportation Act are recommending a balanced approach to the urban transportation problem—an approach embracing the private automobile, the bus, the commuter railroad, and rapid transit, as required for a given urban community.

Question. Has the Federal Government recognized this need for a balanced transportation approach?

Answer. The answer to this question is found in section 9 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 approved October 23, 1962, amended chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, by the addition of a new section 134, which reads as follows:

"It is declared to be in the national interest to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems, embracing various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the States and local communities efficiently and effectively. To accomplish this objective, the Secretary (Commerce) shall cooperate with the States, as authorized in this title, in the development of long-range highway plans and programs which are properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation and which are formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of urban areas of more than 50,000 population. After July 1, 1965, the Secretary (Commerce) shall not approve under section 105 of this title any program for projects in any urban area of more than 50,000 population unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by States and local communities in conformance with the objectives stated in this section."

Question. Would this proposed transit legislation be harmful to existing highway legislation?

Answer. By no means would this be a threat to highway legislation. For instance, Mr. Rex Whitton, Administrator of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee, agreed that the Urban Mass Transportation Act would in no way impede the progress of the vast highway construction pragram.

On the subject of balanced transportation planning Mr. Whitton also told a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee:

"On the other side of the coin, financial aid from Federal or State sources has not been available in substantial amount for mass transportation improvements, and there has been no solid organizational apparatus developed through which such aid could be quickly applied. As a result, implementation of public transit aspects even of well-balanced plans has lagged behind the highway program in urban areas."

Question. Why have mass transportation improvements lagged behind highway improvements?

Answer. Mass transportation improvements have lagged far behind urban highway improvements primarily for two reasons. First of all, since World War II, emphasis was placed on highways and the private automobile with the thought that such improvements would take care of all the urban transportation requirements. Secondly—and probably more important—substantial financial assistance was available from the Federal Government for automotive facilities. Not only are 90 percent matching Federal funds available for urban highway improvements under the $41 billion interstate and defense highway program of 1956, but funds also have been available for many years for urban areas under the Federal assistance programs for urban, primary, and seconday highways. Similar Federal assistance up to now has not been forthcoming for mass transportation improvements.

Question. Would not section 134 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 mentioned in an earlier answer take care of the mass transportation requirements in our metropolitan areas?

Answer. No, it would not. Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act requires that highways to be eligible for Federal assistance after July 1, 1965, must be part of an areawide transportation plan that includes all forms of transportation as required. In other words, the Highway Act itself now recognizes the need for transit by insisting on balanced transportation planning, but unfortunately it provides financing for the highway phases but not for the mass transit phases of any plan. Passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act would at least in part answer this need.

Question. What type of transit improvements does the industry believe are needed under the Urban Mass Transportation Act?

Answer. The type of improvements would be determined by the physical layout, the size and population density of the city and surrounding metropolitan areas. Such requirements would be determined locally to fit the needs of the individual cities and areas.

The objective of the act, as expressed by Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, is "to provide the people in the community a choice so that if they want to have mass transit they can have it." Dr. Weaver has explained further that if a community decides to depend solely upon the automobile, it can make this choice. But he also has pointed out, in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, that a community should "not be forced to use the automobile because of the lack of a decent mass transit system."

Question. Is the Institute for Rapid Transit supporting the Urban Mass Transportation Act solely for the purpose of expanding rapid transit facilities?

Answer. No, the Institute for Rapid Transit wholeheartedly supports the balanced approach to urban transportation. This includes not only the coordination of public and private transportation, but also the proper coordination of the various forms of mass transportation, such as rapid transit, commuter railroads, and buses.

The Institute for Rapid Transit is an operators' association whose board of directors is made up of the general managers of the larger transit operations throughout the country. While the transit operations represented have plans for expansion or implementation of rapid transit facilities, it should be recognized that these organizations also are the operators of the larger transit bus systems throughout the country. These operators are not trying to favor one form over the other, but are trying to utilize each—rapid transit and the bus—to its fullest effectiveness.

Question. Why can't surface transit vehicles operating over streets and highways provide all of the transit requirements?

Answer. To make transit more attractive, scheduled speeds must be increased and regularity of service must be assured. This is difficult if not impossible to attain with surface transit vehicles competing with automotive traffic in congested areas. These objectives in such areas can only be attained through the provision of transit service on a grade-separated, private right-of-way.

Long experience with rapid transit on its grade-separated, private right-of-way has shown that scheduled speeds of two to four times that of surface transit vehicles are easily attainable. Existing rapid transit lines, free from the interference of street traffic and the elements, have demonstrated the highest possible degree of regularity of service.

Question. Is not the need for rapid transit restricted to only the largest metropolitan areas?

Answer. Obviously, the need for rapid transit grows with the size and the density of population in the areas involved. However, we believe that the ability of rapid transit to handle large masses of people provides an economical method of supplying the high capacity required for the peak hour movements in and out of congested areas. We believe that the demonstrated ability of the Cleveland "rapid" to perform this function and the plans for such systems in such cities as Atlanta, South Jersey, and Washington, D.C., are indicative of the desirability of rapid transit in the important medium size metropolitan areas.

Question. Isn't the Urban Mass Transportation Act really a big city bill?

Answer. No; the transit industry definitely does not look upon this act as a big city bill. It is true that the problem of transportation might be more complex in the large metropolitan areas, but it probably is actually more serious in the smaller cities. Obviously, the automobile is relatively more effective in the smaller cities than the larger. This has resulted in great difficulties in the continuance of transit service in such areas. On the other hand, in any urban area, there always will be substantial numbers of people who will not have access to an automobile and who are handicapped unless some form of public transportation is provided. These people dependent upon public transit include families who do not own automobiles, members of large families having only one automobile, and those who are unable to drive, such as the handicapped, the young people, and the old.

There are also those who are able to drive, but prefer public transportation over driving in congested areas or who do not want to incur the cost of parking in downtown areas. Federal assistance is vitally needed to assure transit service for these groups of people in the small as well as the large cities.

Question. Could not financial assistance to transmit be provided by State and local governments without the Federal Government's help?

Answer. Actually, many metropolitan areas are providing assistance to transit operations in various manners. Unfortunately, however, because of the great demand on the local and State tax dollar brought about by our expanding urban populations, it is impossible to finance adequately the mass transportation improvements that are needed solely at the local level. Consequently, an imbalance has developed in urban transportation facilities because local levels of government have had Federal assistance available for the highway requirements. If Federal funds can be justified for highways in urban areas, it would seem logical that similar assistance be provided for mass transit.

Question. Isn't it true that Federal highway assistance represents a nationwide program, while transit assistance would be solely local in nature?

Answer. It is true, of course, that the Federal Government's Interstate Highway System includes rural as well as urban areas. But it also is true that much of the cost of the Federal Interstate Highway system is being incurred in the urban or metropolitan areas.

While only approximately 5,000 miles, or 13 percent of the total of 41,000 miles of highways in the new Federal interstate system are being built in urban areas, the proportional cost of the construction of this system in urban areas is equal to 45 percent of the total cost of the interstate highway program.

Question. Would the Urban Mass Transportation Act be a giveaway program by the Federal Government?

Answer. By no means. First, it should be understood that the public assistance would be only for capital improvements, not for the operations of transit. It also is important to realize that local governmental bodies and/or States would be required to provide a substantial contribution of their own before being able to qualify for Federal assistance for mass transit improvements. The Federal Government would provide up to two-thirds of the cost of the mass transportation facilities and equipment that could not be financed from estimated revenues. To retain responsibility at the local level, the remaining one-third of the cost of such improvements must be provided by local governmental agencies, but this local agency must be a body other than the transit operator.

In addition to the Institute for Rapid Transit, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 is being actively supported by many organizations. Among these are: American Institute of Architects; American Institute of Planners; American Municipal Association; American Transit Association; Association of American Railroads; National Association of Home Builders; National Housing Conference; Railway Progress Institute; United States Conference of Mayors.

Other organizations supporting the Urban Mass Transportation Act also include many local chambers of commerce throughout the Nation.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 3881: THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

1. It would authorize a long-range program of financial assistance to States and local governmental bodies in providing, through both public and private transportation organizations, the mass transportation facilities necessary for the orderly growth and development of urban communities. It would replace a temporary program of loans and demonstration grants voted by Congress in the Housing Act of 1961.

2. Federal grants would be provided for up to two-thirds of the cost of mass transportation facilities and equipment that could not be financed from estimated revenues. This portion of the cost—that which cannot be financed from revenues—is designated the "net project cost." Local and/or State funds would be required for the remaining one-third of the net project cost. In all instances, the local contribution would have to come from a governmental agency or body other than the transit operator itself. Repayments of the local grant could be made later from any surplus revenues, but there also would have to be proportional repayments of the Federal grant if there were surplus funds.

3. Federal loans would be authorized only where the total project cost could be financed by this method with reasonable assurance of repayment. Such loans also would be made by the Government only when the funds could not be obtained in the private market on reasonable terms. Also, Federal loans

could not be used to supplement grant funds.

4. H.R. 3881, as presently drafted, authorizes $500 million for appropriation spread over 3 years. Actual budget outlays in the next fiscal year are estimated at only $10 million.

5. Both grants and loans would be subject to strict planning requirements. A major requirement would be the preparation of a program for a unified or coordinated urban transportation system. Such a transportation plan in turn would be an integral part of a comprehensive development plan for the urban area.

6. For an initial 3-year period, Federal loans and grants on an emergency basis would be authorized on the basis of less provision of a 50-percent Federal grant, rather than a two-thirds grant. The remaining one-sixth Federal grant in such instances would become available if full planning requirements were met within 3 years from the date of the grant agreement.

7. A research, development, and demonstration program would be authorized for all phases of urban mass transportation to replace the present demonstration grant program authorized under the 1961 act. H.R. 3881 would add $30 million from the $500 million grant authority to the present $25 million demonstration grant authority.

8. An adequate relocation program for families displaced by urban mass transportation projects would be required. Federal grants would be authorized for relocation payments to individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit corporations on the same basis as in the Federal Government's urban renewal program.

Retirement of William Patrick Flynn, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Indiana National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, there are still some great rags-to-riches stories, exemplifying the very heart of the American dream, abounding in our land today.

Few are more compelling than the story of William Patrick Flynn who, at the age of 65, has retired as chairman and chief executive officer of Indiana National Bank at Indianapolis, Ind. I hasten to add that retirement for Mr. Flynn means that he will now remain a member of the board and will be chairman of the bank's executive committee.

William P. Flynn was born on the west side of Indianapolis. His father was a farmer and later supervisor of the Indianapolis Street Railway Co. In 1915, when he was 16, young Flynn took a job as office boy for a life insurance company. But he quit that job to take advantage of his first great opportunity. He accepted an offer of a 50 percent salary increase to become a bank messenger. His decision meant that his weekly pay would increase from $4 a week to $6 a week.

From messenger boy, he was promoted first to clerk, then to bookkeeper, then to receiving teller. His rapid rise was noticed, and in 1918—when only 19 years old—Mr. Flynn became one of the youngest men appointed to the responsible position of assistant national bank examiner with the Seventh Federal Reserve District in Chicago.

In 1922 he became bank examiner for the Indianapolis Clearing House Association. He returned to the Indiana National Bank in 1930 as vice president in charge of the credit department. In 1940 he was elected to the board of directors, became executive vice president in 1944, president in 1952, and board chairman in 1957.

He is now a director of the insurance company where he started as an office boy, as well as the retiring chief officer of the bank where he started as a messenger boy.

In addition, Mr. Flynn serves as a director of a number of business, civic, and religious organizations. He is a director of the English Foundation, the United Fund of Greater Indianapolis, the Indianapolis Civic Progress Association, the Indianapolis Hospital Development Association, the Indianapolis-Marion County Building Authority, the Indianapolis Chapter of the American Red Cross, the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra, and many others.

In 1961, Mr. Flynn was named a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope John XXIII for his leadership in fundraising campaigns for the archdiocese.

Mr. President, I submit that the example of personal, civic, and religious advancement set by William P. Flynn is one that commends itself to the youth of our Nation. He is to be congratulated for a life filled with service to his fellow man.

Reaction to May Craig's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, of interest in Washington should be the reaction outside Washington to recent remarks by correspondent May Craig. The following, written by Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., appeared in the Long Beach Independent newspaper:

MAY CRAIG HAS HER SAY

Millions of Americans have watched May Craig and listened to her Maine accent as she asks questions on "Meet the Press." Now she is stating some of her own views in a U.S. News report. She is greatly disturbed over the lowering of our morality in dealing with domestic and world affairs. She says: "Unless there is a change, deep down, in the American people—a genuine crusade against self-indulgence, immorality, public and private—then we will witness the decline and fall of the American Republic."

As examples Mrs. Craig gives, "death on the highways—a pack a day, cheating from top to bottom in our society, reckless debt, breakup of the family, and a faltering foreign policy." Why, she asks, should we think we can take that path and change history? Around the world they can take our money with one hand and slap us in the face with the other. We talk of our "leadership" but we are apparently incapable of giving leadership.

She goes on to remind us that Red China is close to being admitted to the United Nations. That is at a time when our men are dying in jungles—killed by Red Chinese weapons and their trained guerrilla fighters. We are opposed to Communists, but seem to think Khrushchev is not so bad as we sell him our subsidized wheat and thus save him from a breakdown of the system we say we oppose.

Mrs. Craig apparently is a conservative, and therefore suspect to many who object to these observations. But they are vital reminders of the faltering policies we have been following. She refers to the Cuban Bay of Pigs debacle where we failed to support the 1961 force of Cubans we had trained to overthrow Castro. It made us appear weak in the eyes of most of the world. The result is, today Cuba is the base for Communist attacks on Latin America, and a nuclear menace to our own Nation.

The Bobby Baker scandal is apparently to be glossed over to avoid embarrassment to the President and Senators during this election year. Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton are drawing great crowds to view them in "Cleopatra." Frank Sinatra continues to be a favorite entertainer, even though he was kicked out of his Nevada enterprises because of his association with hoodlums.

Mrs. Craig says: "The United Nations itself should be forced into financial honesty by the United States refusing to keep on paying the bills while many nations get a free ride while outvoting us. The idea of letting in a small nation of fewer than a half million people—utterly inexperienced in governing itself—within a few days of its establishment, is an example. We might at least insist on a period of probation."

She concludes her article with: "Nobody respects a fumbler—a weak man, a wobbler in policy or deeds. First, every one of us has to clean out weakness and selfishness and immorality of all types. Then chosen leaders with strength and principle will lead us to where we can have self-respect and respect of others. Would we elect such a man if he campaigned on such a platform?"

It is quite an analysis of present-day problems. It should cause each of us to ask, How do I measure up? It will give added interest to the appearance of May Craig in her next "Meet the Press" panel. It reminds us of Bernard Baruch's remark that the American people had lost their capacity for indigation.—L.A.C.

Robert C. Weaver on Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, probably no person in the country is better qualified to speak out as an expert on the problems of urban renewal than Robert C. Weaver, the distinguished administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. Weaver has again demonstrated his comprehensive perception in a discussion which was published in the Nation and also in the Sunday, April 5, issue of the Washington Post under the title, "Urban Renewal Is Dispossessing Its Critics."

Because of the importance of housing and community development and the matters of legislation connected with it, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Weaver be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL IS DISPOSSESSING ITS CRITICS

(By Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency)

Urban renewal is no longer a theory. It is a fact of growing impact and significance in reshaping the environment of our urban centers for the needs of our expanding population.

The fact is evident in more than 700 towns and cities with more than double that number of renewal projects under way or completed. It is evident in the public response and reaction to what is being done and how it is being done, and an increasing demand in local communities for more of it.

It is also evident in the hard-core opposition to the very purpose and concept of urban renewal emanating from groups and spokesmen who were against it in the first place and who are even more vehement in their attacks now that it is well on its way to accomplishing its mission.

Those who are spearheading these intemperate attacks upon urban renewal have timed their activities well, because it is now or never. Their arguments abound in quotations out of context, citations of inaccurate or outdated figures and reiteration of criticisms which are either no longer valid or have been dulled by the changes in the program.

Meanwhile, the promises of the program are rapidly becoming realities. Already, in Washington's Southwest, redevelopment is shaping into an esthetic, economic and social success. A recent issue of Engineering News-Record described in glowing terms Boston's urban renewal program, which through slow in getting into execution is now moving vigorously ahead. Mill Creek, in St. Louis, another slow starter, is a success, providing housing at a variety of rental and cost levels and attracting a continuous volume of industrial and commercial redevelopment.

San Francisco, through urban renewal, has demonstrated how low-income, moderate-income and high-income housing can be provided in the core area of the central city. Similar multi-income residential redevelopments are underway in New York City, White Plains in Westchester County and Brookline, Mass. Equally important, urban renewal has restored hope for older cities and worn-out neighborhoods, providing local leaders and governments with tools for revitalizing their communities.

Those who are against change are, of course, against urban renewal. For better or worse, change in our urban world is not preventable. Slums and blight are the consequences of change for the worse—of doing nothing to control the direction of change. Urban renewal is an instrument that hundreds of communities are successfully using to bring about change for the better.

Urban renewal is now under attack primarily for accomplishing much of what it set out to do—and not for its failures.

Diehard opponents of urban renewal like to picture it as a bureaucratic monster, armed with a bulldozer, that ruthlessly uproots people and lays waste vital areas of the city to no good purpose. Their bill of indictment includes shoving poor people and small businesses out of their homes and established locations, making the hard life of nonwhites harder, leaving valuable areas to stagnate while planners plan, doling out benefits that the Federal Government can't afford to local governments which don't need them.

Some of these charges are not true. Others are worse: they are half-truths, giving the uninformed the semblance of the whole truth.

Urban renewal uproots people. True. It uproots them primarily from slums where they have been condemned to live for lack of better housing opportunities.

Urban renewal is clearing slums on a large scale—as it was intended to do. In 700 projects now in advanced stages, more than a quarter of a million substandard housing units have been, or in the near future will be, eliminated.

But urban renewal does more. It is the only major operation involving displacement of people that assumes both legal and moral responsibility for what happens to them. By law, urban renewal provides decent housing for displaced slum dwellers and financial assistance to help them and displaced businesses to move. The record shows that more than three-quarters of those displaced have been rehoused in good standard housing, and this record has been improving in recent years.

In its treatment of people, urban renewal is humane. Yet the impression persists, with help from the opponents, that people are shoved out and forgotten. This was never completely true and it is definitely false now.

Large numbers are being displaced every year in our cities from other causes. Urban renewal often gets blamed for all of them. It is estimated that more people are displaced by activities such as highways, code enforcement, public buildings, etc., than by urban renewal. This still leaves out of account the additional families displaced by apartments, office buildings and other private construction.

Urban renewal falls most heavily on nonwhite families which have the greatest difficulty finding homes. True. Because of their low incomes, a disproportionate number of those in the slum and blighted areas where urban renewal operates are nonwhites.

But urban renewal affords them an opportunity to move into areas not previously open to them. Furthermore, urban renewal is providing more new or rehabilitated housing for nonwhites in desirable locations in the renewed areas themselves.

As of June 30, 1963, there were about 48,000 dwelling units completed in urban renewal areas. Of these, more than 30 percent were occupied by nonwhites. More than 90 percent of the housing in redeveloped areas has been privately financed, and in many cities, in all regions, urban renewal is providing new, privately financed shelter available to minorities in prime locations.

Moreover, urban renewal is providing much more housing in renewal areas for the moderate- and low-income groups than before, and making it available without racial or religious bars. Urban renewal has thus become a potent force in breaking down the ghetto.

Under the new moderate-income housing program, provided for in the Housing Act of 1961, the FHA by mid-1963 had allocated more than 9,000 dwelling units in 44 urban renewal projects. As of June 30, 1963, slightly more than 4,000 units of federally assisted low-rent housing were occupied in urban renewal areas and an additional 16,000 units were under construction or in planning.

The bulldozer is no longer the symbol of urban renewal. Urban renewal has demonstrated that rehabilitation can be as effective in restoring and saving good neighborhoods and structures as in tearing them down.

In numerous cities, urban renewal has been a rescue operation for historic buildings that had been left to decay among the weeds of urban blight. Philadelphia provides an exciting example of this. Of even broader significance, however, is the greater emphasis now being placed on rehabilitating areas instead of clearing them.

More than 100,000 dwelling units in urban renewal projects underway are scheduled for rehabilitation. Although the process takes longer and is more complicated than building new residences, nearly half of this rehabilitation is completed or being carried out.

Urban renewal, it is said, takes too long. How long is too long? With experience, the process has been speeded up, but even so, it must be measured in years. Renewing a vital area in the community requires considered, complex planning, both for the area and for its effect on the future of the community. Human and property rights must be protected and preserved.

Even so, as of June 30, 1963, on about 85 percent of the land ready for reuse redevelopers were either designated or engaged in rebuilding. About three-fourths of the land disposed of, excluding streets and alleys, had been purchased by private investors.

Urban renewal permits cities to tear down some sound structures. True, an older office building or warehouse occupying part of a site needed for well-planned housing, commercial, or public redevelopment is not an asset to the area or the community merely because its walls are sound. Cities cannot wait to redevelop blighted areas until all the structures fall of their own weight. Their elimination, subject to prescribed limits and controls, is often essential to carry out the plan for the area's renewal.

Urban renewal is not perfect. It is a dynamic program that will continue to evolve and develop. The Housing Act of 1961 brought significant changes to make urban renewal more effective, particularly in providing critically needed moderate-income housing and in supporting greater use of rehabilitation to conserve our assets and diminishing the need for displacement of people and businesses.

In the pending housing and community development bill of 1964, President Johnson has proposed further improvements. They would simplify and speed up the urban renewal process. They recognize that rehousing and relocating people and small businesses is not the full answer; they must be helped to adjust to their new environment.

Thus, the bill would provide special financial aid for the lower income displaced families in their new housing and would assist small businesses to meet the costs of getting started elsewhere or recompense those who, by choice or necessity, do not stay in business.

It would strengthen rehabilitation, particularly to enable elderly homeowners in renewal areas to improve their homes. It would make possible more low-income housing in these areas and elsewhere and extend to displaced single persons many of the aids now available to families.

The proposed bill also recognizes that there is an inescapable connection between what we are trying to do to restore our central cities and what we do to influence the development of the outlying suburbs of metropolitan areas. It proposes measures for sound, forward planning and development of outlying areas to avoid the waste and heavy cost of renewing and redeveloping them soon.

Urban renewal is not and should not be above criticism. But the attacks of critics who originally opposed it and now want to kill it are aimed largely at imaginary evils that never existed or are exaggerated criticisms of earlier difficulties that have been and are being met. They are half-truths that focus on the tearing down aspects of urban renewal and ignore its rebuilding and restoration functions.

Urban renewal is generating private investment many times the amount of public

funds expended. For 479 projects involving about $1.25 billion in Federal grants, estimated private investment will be about $7.5 billion and another $2 billion will come in public redevelopment expenditures.

Urban renewal is turning deficit tax areas into paying areas that will contribute to the economic and social needs of the whole community. For about 400 projects where redevelopment has been started or completed, estimated assessed value will be more than five times as great.

Urban renewal has acquired hundreds of millions of dollars of real estate without a major scandal.

It is also strengthening the economic base of our cities by helping to revitalize business and downtown areas and providing more jobs through business expansion. After all, the best answer for the low-income housing problem is, ultimately, higher incomes.

Contrary to the impression of some urban renewal remains primarily a program to improve homes and living conditions. Less than 25 percent of the funds, as of last June 30, have gone to predominantly nonresidential projects, and even in these, 26 percent of the acreage will be redeveloped for residential uses and 13 percent for public and institutional use.

Urban renewal has also made large areas available for educational and medical centers and for recreational and cultural use. It has played a major part in the development and expansion of many of our modern colleges, hospitals, public centers, and other institutions.

Urban renewal is essentially a democratic program, responsive to the public will. It must be initiated by the elected local governing body. It must be executed by local authority under State-enacted laws.

In order to qualify for urban renewal assistance, a locality must have a broad-scale program to combat blight and improve the community, including an advisory committee representing key citizen interests. Under Federal law, a public hearing must be held before land can be taken for urban renewal.

Urban renewal is one of the most publicly discussed operations in the community, from start to finish. It often is an issue in municipal elections—and in the great majority of cases voters want something done about their slums, their congestion, and their community's growth and welfare.

It is hard to see how so complex an undertaking could be made more responsive to the public's will or more democratic. But the die-hard opponents do not seem to want it that way. They would like to make every step and stage subject to the veto of any individual or small opposition bloc. This would only thwart the will of the community. It would destroy the democratic process.

Similarly, some would "reform" urban renewal by killing it. For example, proposals to substitute Federal loans for Federal grants simply ignore the shrinking tax bases of our cities and their growing public responsibilities. Without Federal grants, the program would die in all those localities that need it the most.

It is the responsibility of those who know to see that the public is fully informed.

The Clifford Davis Bridge

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and pleasure to join the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and my colleagues in introducing this resolution to name this great bridge at Memphis, the Clifford Davis Bridge.

Mr. Speaker, this bridge over the Mississippi at Memphis is now under construction and will be one of the most important connecting links in our Interstate Highway System—connecting the wonderful city of Memphis, and the great State of Arkansas. It is fitting and highly appropriate that this bridge be named after Judge CLIFF DAVIS. The name of Judge DAVIS is synonymous with the progress, the culture, and yes, the patriotism on that great beautiful southern city, Memphis.

I have benefited personally by his wise counsel as chairman of our subcommittee. In my 16 years in the Congress, I have never know a more able tactician in handling the passage of vital and necessary legislation—legislation essential to the prosperity, growth, and development of our entire Nation—our rivers, highways, and natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known in this Congress a more able, more dedicated public servant. Judge DAVIS adheres to the oldtime principles of integrity. His word is his bond. Many times I have heard our beloved and revered chairman of the Rules Committee, Judge HOWARD SMITH, say with great price that DAVIS is a man of his word; that his promise is as sound as gold; that when he gives you his word, you can depend on it.

Mr. Speaker, Judge DAVIS has earned and deserves this high honor. Judge DAVIS ranks in that immortal company of illustrous Tennesseans, Andrew Jackson, Speaker Joe Burns, Cordell Hull, and Gen. Nathan B. Forrest.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to make many addresses throughout the country and upon one occasion I was delayed in Memphis for several hours waiting for the plane. While there I found that Judge DAVIS was most beloved by his constituents in every walk of life. A bus boy in a cafe replied instantly, "Of course I know my Congressman. He is Judge CLIFF DAVIS." A taxidriver astonishingly said, "Have you not ever heard of the Judge Cliff Davis blues? This song was written in honor to Judge DAVIS before he went to Congress." I could not find anyone who did not know him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this resolution pass unanimously and this bridge be named CLIFFORD DAVIS in honor of one of the greatest men that I have ever known, a great American and a man this House points to with pride.

The Book of Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the Florida Supreme Court in the school prayer cases it said that the Florida court should render a decision in keeping with previous decisions in prayer cases of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Florida court yielded to the U.S. Supreme Court with respect to school prayers but said no opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court had covered Christmas and Easter celebrations in public schools. So, those two phases of the Florida case are now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court and argument on them will probably be heard in the next month or 6 weeks.

In its last decision outlawing prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools, the Supreme Court indicated that it would not outlaw the study of the Bible in public schools as comparative literature. Consequently, when a 15-year-old girl from Jacksonville, Fla., named Miss Prue Snead, wrote me on March 6, that she was in the sophomore English class at Andrew Jackson High School in Jacksonville and said that her class was working on a project with books and added "Will you kindly give me the name of a book which you have read that has made a lasting impression on you or that you feel is just too good for a teenager to miss?" I replied promptly, recommending the Book of Job of the King James version of the Bible.

Job was an Arab chief of the city of Uz. No one knows just when the Book of Job was written or how many contributed to it. Evidently, it was one of the first books of the Bible and presented the fundamental struggle of the human race to get a clearer conception of life after death. The book poses the eternal problem of constant conflict between good and evil and of the ultimate reward that comes to those who supplement their good works with their faith. And when Job asked the vital question which is embraced in the Christian religion: "If a man dies, will he live again?" he had walked a little way along the road which led to the first Easter and indicated that he saw as in a glass darkly the face of Him, who, centuries later, being God from all eternity died as man at a point of time within human history. That type of faith laid the foundation for the wonderful description of faith given by St. Paul in the 11th chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews. As for its usefulness as comparative literature, the British essayist, Thomas Carlyle in "Heroes and Hero-Worship," has this to say of the Book of Job:

> They had many prophets, these Arabs; teachers each to his tribe, each according to the light he had. But indeed, have we not from of old the noblest of proofs, still palpable to every one of us, of what devoutness and noblemindedness had dwelt in these rustic, thoughtful peoples? Biblical critics seem agreed that our own Book of Job was written in that region of the world. I call that, apart from all theories about it, one of the grandest things ever written with pen. One feels, indeed, as if it were not Hebrew; such a noble universality, different from noble patriotism or sectarianism, reigns in it. A noble book; all men's book. It is our first, oldest statement of the never-ending problem—man's destiny, and God's ways with him here in this earth. And all in such free flowing outlines; grand in its sincerity, in its simplicity; in its epic melody, and

repose of reconcilement. There is the seeing eye, the mildly understanding heart. So true everywhere; true eyesight and vision for all things; material things no less than spiritual; the horse—"hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?"—he "laughs at the shaking of the spear.". Such living likenesses were never since drawn. Sublime sorrow, sublime reconciliation; oldest choral melody as of the heart of mankind; so soft and great; as the summer midnight, as the world with its seas and stars. There is nothing written, I think, in the Bible or out of it, of equal literary merit.

Today, I was pleased and highly gratified to get an interesting letter from Miss Linda Wiggins, another teenage member of the Andrew Jackson High School, Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. President, I wish to commend that letter to all who may think that the study of the Bible is no longer an essential part of the education of every boy and girl in our country and to ask permission that it may be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
April 9, 1964.

Hon. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: In this letter I want to give you my kindest regards for recommending a book to my sophomore English class at Andrew Jackson High School. Due to the many kind people who answered our letters our project is a great success. Our librarian has never seen such a mass of eager readers.

After reading the Book of Job in the Bible I think I know why you recommended this book to my class. Job's uprightness, Job's acknowledgment of God's might, Job's trials and complaints when he denounced his friends, Job's appeal for pity, Job's wisdom in praising God's greatness are the lessons to be found in this great book. It also shows Job's weaknesses which we all possess, but I never will forget Job's patience. One example of Job's patience is the fact that he was long suffering but the never lost faith. I hope I understand the value of this great story as you see it and understand it. I appreciate your recommending this book to me as I probably wouldn't have read it.

On behalf of my teacher, Miss Mary Harrell, my classmates, and myself, I wish to thank you wholeheartedly for the time and effort spent in answering our letters.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA WIGGINS.

Crime and the Undercover War Against Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: "Crime," published in Time magazine of March 27, 1964, and "Undercover War Against Narcotics," which appeared in the magazine, Parade, on March 22, 1964:

[From Time magazine, Mar. 27, 1964]

CRIME—THE SELDOM SEEN

Every year, $350 million worth of illegal narcotics get smuggled into the United States. Most of the stuff comes from Turkey, Communist China, and Thailand, moves through processing plants in France, then is passed by racketeers to dope pushers on street corners, in barrooms, and pool halls. Last year the Bureau of Customs seized nearly 1,500 ounces of heroin, 48,000 ounces of marijuana at U.S. ports and borders. That is a big haul, but not nearly big enough. The smuggling trade is still profitable enough to satisfy the needs of the Nation's 48,000 narcotic addicts, 23,000 of whom live in New York City alone.

Controlling the torrent of narcotics traffic into the United States is the job of a seldom-seen band of 295 agents bossed by Bureau of Narcotics Commissioner Henry Luke Giordano, 49, a tough veteran of 22 years with the Bureau and an ingenious undercover operative. Last week a House appropriations subcommittee released testimony from Giordano, who described some of the triumphs and perils of his adventurous colleagues. Items:

In 1962, a U.S. agent in France, posing as a gangland dope racketeer, arranged a buy from an international narcotics ring. French police closed in just as a batch of heroin was delivered to the agent. The deliveryman shot his way free, but he and the gang's ringleaders were arrested later.

In late 1962, agents got wind of a pair of brothers who were peddling heroin in New York—one taking orders in his East Harlem clothing and toy store, the other delivering the "junk" in his taxicab. An undercover agent made a buy of 102 grams of heroin for $2,000. Later, both brothers were arrested, and 442 grains of heroin were found in the taxicab.

In 1963, agents boarded an express truck delivering baggage to a building in Hoboken, N.J. When two men later left the building with the bags, the agents arrested them, recovered 687 kilograms of marihuana and 202 grams of heroin. Baggage checks taken from one of the captives led to caches of narcotics at railroad stations in Poughkeepsie and Albany, N.Y., and Philadelphia.

In April 1963, a narcotics agent in Turkey wormed his way into the confidence of a band of international traffickers headed by the former mayor of a Turkish city. The agent arranged to buy 18 kilograms of morphine base. The exmayor made the delivery—accompanied by 20 Turks armed to the teeth. When the agent and Turkish police got the drop on the crooks, they tried to shoot their way out. After a furious gun battle, six men, including the exmayor, were arrested. Said Giordano: "Very few cases in Turkey end up in other than gunfire."

Last October in Chicago, two agents in separate cars spotted a well-known narcotics racketeer named Nolan Mack taking a heroin delivery from a second man. Recognizing the agents, Mack leaped into his car and fled. The agents barreled after him. In a dizzying chase, Mack rammed one of the pursuing cars, sent it careening into a lamp pole. The second agent finally cornered Mack. But as the agent scrambled from his car, Mack opened fire. The first bullet creased the agent's temple; the second slammed into a car window, spraying glass into the agent's face. The report concludes with characteristic understatement: "When the agent was able to return the fire, two of his shots hit Mack, causing his death."

UNDERCOVER WAR AGAINST NARCOTICS

(By Jack Anderson)

Several weeks ago, Federal narcotics agents descended on an astounding prey, Salvador Pardo-Bolland, Mexican Ambassador to Bolivia. They charged he and two cohorts had been smuggling heroin into the United States for the Mafia. More than $52 million in narcotics was seized.

The arrests, in New York and Montreal, culminated a lengthy investigation by United States, Canadian, and French police. Agents had tailed the Ambassador for months and watched the worldwide operation unfold.

This was only one of the dangerous incidents in which the 280 unsung agents of the Narcotics Bureau are plunged every day. Shortly before that, after a 100-mile-per-hour chase through Chicago, Agent Gayle Ruhl hooked up in a blazing gun battle with Nolan Mack, a syndicate gunman, and shot him dead. And acrsos the United States and around the world, these men continually risk their lives in a never-ending war against one of the most relentless conspiracies and greatest evils.

The Narcotics Bureau fights most of its campaigns from the inside, behind the enemy lines. It was the first law-enforcement body to infiltrate the underworld's most closely guarded citadel, the Mafia, known to its members as La Cosa Nostra, or Our Thing. The Bureau moved into the Mafia 20 years ago in a long battle against organized dope-smuggling.

How successful it has been is evident from the decrease in the narcotics trade. Significantly, although only 2 out of every 100 Government agents are N-men, they are responsible for 15 of every 100 convictions.

ALL IN THE LINE OF DUTY

As undervover men, narcotics agents learn to look like gangsters, talk like gangsters, think like gangsters. Sometimes they also die like gangsters—shot, knifed or strangled in some dark alley. They work across the world, for the traffic in illicit drugs knows no frontiers. The shadowy figures they trail may lead them into any city. And always death walks with them.

Last year alone, N-men engaged in seven running gun battles with drug smugglers: three in this country, four in Turkey. Agents have been run down by automobiles. One was thrown through a window. Some have died under torture. They face addicts who are wildly unpredictable, racketeers who will stop at nothing to defend their huge revenues. Often the men against them are equipped with speedboats, planes, radios—and, above all, cold cash to buy silence, to hire killers, to appear respectable.

Inside Cosa Nostra, one small slip can mean an N-man's death. For those who have taken the Mafia blood oath are the world's most sinister cutthroats. Their mood can switch in a moment, and they can kill without warning. Agent Wilson Shee, for example, had an appointment with an informer who had been furnishing him information for several months. Suddenly the squealer whipped out a gun and shot Shee to death, then killed himself.

Another agent, about to handcuff an addict in a top-floor room of a Harlem tenement, was suddenly grabbed and dragged through the window. The agent managed to clutch the railing of the fire escape and hang there as the addict plunged to his doom.

On a New York street, a gangster fired five times at an agent who was trying to arrest him. Two of the bullets slashed through the agent's raincoat. Before the N-man could return the fire, a woman strolled between them, wheeling a baby carriage. The agent holstered his gun, sprinted across the street and collared the man with his bare hands.

THEY NAB "MR. BIG"

Narcotics officers have been responsible for the arrest and conviction of the Mafia's most notorious ringleaders. Prize of the bag: Vito Genovese, who, even in prison, is still regarded as Mr. Big of the Cosa Nostra. Others put behind bars include such delegates to the infamous Apalachin crime conference as chunky, snarling Carmine Galente, who has

a reputation in the underworld as a sadist; big, booming, 240-pound "Big John" Ormento, who had a weakness for flashy clothes, which he has unhappily exchanged for prison garb; and barrel-chested Vincent Mauro, a surly customer who is described in Narcotics Bureau files as a merciless and "vicious killer."

Not long ago, an agent called on Mauro in prison and tried to pump him for information. The mobster spurned a warning that he would be wise to cooperate. "You're the one who has to worry, not me," he snarled at the agent. From underworld tipsters, the Narcotics Bureau later learned that Maurio's threat was no mere bluff. According to the Bureau, the Mafia lords in prison, alarmed over the demoralization of their mobs, had marked five agents for murder. Such a dramatic gesture was needed, they agreed, to show their defiance of the Government and to impress rank-and-file mobsters.

Mafia leaders on the outside feared the scheme was too dangerous. "You kill five Federal agents, and they won't be above framing all of us," was the reaction of one racket boss, as quoted by an informer. Genovese reportedly decided it would be enough to bump off one key agent. The last word was that the murder "contract" had been issued, but all five agents alerted by informers are on their guard.

Parade can also reveal that it was George Gaffney, then chief of the New York Narcotics office and now Deputy Narcotics Commissioner, who persuaded squealer Joe Valachi to violate the code of omertà (secrecy or death) and take the witness stand against his colleagues in crime.

Valachi was no stranger to the N-men. He had directed a smuggling ring which brought heroin into this country in false trunk bottoms. Agents moved in on him in 1955, but his conviction was reversed by the court of appeals. In 1959, however, they got enough evidence to send him away for 15 years. Another conviction in 1961 added 20 years.

But his book wasn't closed. Undercover men learned that the Cosa Nostra regarded Valachi as a weak link who couldn't stand confinement and might crack any time. They decided to eliminate him. Valachi heard the same whispers and tried desperately to contact Gaffney with an offer to talk. Soon Genovese, who shared a cell with Valachi, made the whispers formal. Valachi reported that he received the ceremonial Mafia "kiss of death" from Genovese, who, he said, handed out a "contract" to another Mafia inmate, the emaciated, cold-blooded Joe DiPalermo, to silence Valachi forever.

MURDER BY MISTAKE

From then on, Valachi lived in terror. It was in terror that he grabbed an iron pipe and killed convict John Saupp, whom he mistook for DiPalermo. It was only after this murder by mistake that Valachi, through his defense attorney, was able to contact Gaffney, and thus became the most important informer yet on the Mafia.

Success stories like the Valachi case make headlines, but similar successes—the result of relentless sleuthing and unsung heroism—are legion in the files of the Narcotics Bureau. And they are no accident. For N-men are picked not only for their razor-sharp wits and ice-cold nerve but also for their ability to mix in the underworld without suspicion. All the top narcotics officials have been undercover men. Only 10 years ago, Narcotics Commissioner Henry Giordano was posing as a racketeer to gain the confidence of the sinister Mallock brothers, John and George, who were smuggling dope into Canada and the United States.

Working with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Giordano wormed his way into the Mallock mob. He played his part so convincingly that on one occasion the brothers told him they trusted him implicitly. His work led to their arrest, but they skipped bond and fled to Mexico. In 1953, George Mallock was rash enough to sneak back into New York to visit a favorite barmaid, was promptly nabbed, hustled back to Canada and sentenced to 21 years. John Mallock was tracked down in Mexico, pursued in a wild car chase, died when his car crashed into a truck.

In recent years, the Narcotics Bureau has branched out. N-men are at work all through the Mediterranean, the Middle East and southeast Asia, where the pipelines start. Most of the time they pose as American gangsters, having patiently built up their background against checking.

The recent arrest of the Mexican Ambassador had just such worldwide ramifications. It began with the arrest of Guatemala's former Ambassador to Belgium, Mauricio Rosal, who was picked up with 250 pounds of heroin. On trips between Brussels and Guatemala City, Rosal arrived in New York with 180 pounds of luggage, departed with only 100. But because of diplomatic immunity, he couldn't be searched.

FROM THE EMBASSY TO THE PEN

Then Rosal made a slip. On one trip, instead of continuing to Guatemala City, he decided to return to Brussels. He was no longer technically in transit, thus lost his diplomatic immunity. He was quickly and quietly searched. His luggage was loaded with heroin, largest haul ever made in the United States. Rosal confessed he had received $40,000 in courier fees. He is now in the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta.

Narcotics agents, living as they do in the shadow of sudden death, can ill afford to make a slip. But they admit ruefully that they pull their share of boners. One told Parade how he finally won the confidence of a smuggler who agreed to sell him dope at a lonely rendezvous. The smuggler showed up without the goods, explained nervously that his car was known to the police and he might have been jumped. If the agent, whom he knew as an out-of-town racketeer, would trade cars, he would go and get the drugs.

For all the N-man knew, the smuggler was wise to him and had arranged a trap. But rather than blow the case, he handed over the keys of his car. Then he followed the smuggler and waited for him to go into an apartment. When the smuggler emerged with a parcel, the N-man made his arrest. It wasn't until they reached police headquarters and he got his keys back that he noticed a metal tag on the keyring inscribed: "Property of the Narcotics Bureau." If the smuggler had caught a glimpse of that tag, the agent might never have lived to tell the anecdote.

Northeastern University Launches New Cooperative Education Program for Negro Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Northeastern University in Boston, Mass., has launched a unique, new program to expand the opportunities for Negro youth to obtain advanced education and on-the-job training. The university has received a $150,000 grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education for this pilot program.

Under the program, Northeastern will seek Negro students at the high school level who show aptitude for college-level training but who for a variety of reasons would not be intending to go on to college. The program is not directed at Negro youth who would normally be planning for a college education. This cooperative study-work program is directed toward increasing the number of available and qualified Negroes for employment in business and professional careers. This effort by one of our leading educational institutions and the Greater Boston business and professional community is a direct attack on the problem of assisting youth from underprivileged areas to obtain the skills necessary for jobs and opportunities in today's world.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the March 1964 issue of industry, published by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, which describes the Northeastern University program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PILOT PROGRAM TO EXPAND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES FOR NEGRO STUDENTS INITIATED BY NORTHEASTERN—THE NORTHEASTERN PROGRAM WILL ENCOURAGE 75 NEGRO YOUTHS TO CHOOSE PROFESSIONS WHICH TOO FEW NEGROES ENTER TODAY

A new, pioneering program designed to expand business and professional career opportunities for Negro young people through college study under the cooperative plan of education has been launched by Northeastern University.

Dr. Asa S. Knowles, president of Northeastern, said a pilot program to increase the number of Negro youths who are available and qualified for employment in positions requiring education beyond the high school level will be conducted under a $150,000 grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

FIRST GROUP IN FALL

A total of 75 Metropolitan Boston Negro students who otherwise might not go to college will be enrolled during the next 3 years in the cooperative curricular offered by Northeastern's full-time undergraduate colleges.

The first of the three 25-member groups of Negroes will be enrolled as freshmen this fall. An additional 25 Negro students will enter the freshman class at the outset of the 1965 and 1966 academic years.

Several steps have been initiated by the university to make sure that Negro students selected to participate are properly prepared to undertake a college education.

These include: a plan to utilize undergraduate cooperative students in Northeastern's College of Education as teacher aids in public schools to help enhance the language and reading skills of potential enrollees; and, launching of an intensive precollege summer study program for enrollees who may find themselves inadequately prepared in certain subject areas important to success in higher education.

Scholarship aid under the pilot program will be given to students according to individual financial need, not only in their freshman year, but throughout their entire 5 years at Northeastern.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Northeastern officials became acutely aware of the urgent need to increase the number of Negro youths who are available

and qualified for employment in positions requiring education beyond the high school level through the university's wide contacts in business and industry.

Leaders of the Greater Boston business and industrial community have informed Northeastern that numerous job opportunities are available for Negroes in positions requiring a college degree, but few, if any, qualified applicants can be found.

Northeastern's plan to increase the number of Negro youths enrolled in its cooperative educational program through use of the $150,000 grant from the Fund for Advancement of Education is an effort to develop qualified Negro applicants for these positions.

"The most pressing need of the Negro today is for more and better jobs," Northeastern's President Knowles pointed out. "The rate of joblessness is twice as high among Negroes as it is among whites. The average Negro earns approximately 40 percent less than his white counterpart.

"Sensing a lack of opportunities for employment as junior executives in administrative, managerial, technical, and sales positions, as well as in certain positions requiring advanced education, relatively few Negroes in the past have even tried to prepare themselves to become part of the white-collar work force of the Nation.

"We are convinced, Doctor Knowles continued, "that the cooperative plan of education, with its alternating periods of study and on-the-job experience, offers a particularly meaningful solution to the problems faced by young Negroes as well as by employers seeking to hire Negroes."

A UNIQUE PROGRAM

The Northeastern president said the university's program for Negro youth is unique in that it requires the university to seek out Negro boys and girls who are capable of doing good college work but who would not otherwise go to college. It is not designed for Negro youth who would come to college if the program did not exist.

Moreover, Dr. Knowles said, the program is designed to encourage Negro youths to enter professions for which too few Negroes usually prepare. These include engineering, science, business, education, pharmacy, nursing, and medical technology.

Because of Northeastern's cooperative program of alternating work-study periods, students are guaranteed a job assignment in industry or business related to the field in which they are studying. This aspect of the program removes the fear of many Negro youths that they will be unable to obtain employment in their chosen field even though they possess the necessary educational qualifications.

Northeastern, with more than 50 years of experience in placing and supervising students on cooperative work assignments, has working relationships with 1,277 employers who now employ the school's cooperative students.

The cooperative work assignments begin with the sophomore year. During these work periods, students are under the close supervision of faculty coordinators. In addition to visiting the student on the job periodically and talking to his superiors, the coordinators receive written reports from both the student and the employer at the end of each cooperative work period. Throughout the four upperclass years, the faculty coordinator provides valuable instruction in such matters as proper job attitudes, manners, dress, and personal conduct.

TWENTY FIRMS INTERESTED

The cooperative work assignments for Negro students in the program will be selected only after careful consideration as to their relevance to the students' field of study and the prospects of permanent employment after graduation for the student in that type of work.

Approximately 20 companies in the Greater Boston area have already indicated to the university that they will employ Negro students on cooperative work assignments, and several companies have discussed with the university the type of job sequences that they would develop for the Negro students.

Northeastern is convinced that the cooperative plan of education offers a particularly meaningful solution to the problems faced by young Negroes as well as by employers seeking to hire Negroes. Not only do cooperative work periods offer Negro students the opportunity to gain experience related to their field of study, but more importantly, work periods offer on-the-job experience, under actual work conditions, that for many of them will lead to permanent jobs with the same employer after graduation.

During their cooperative work periods they will have the opportunity to try various assignments and to test their vocational objectives in the fire of firsthand experience. Faculty coordinators will instruct them in such matters as proper job attitudes. Their earnings will contribute substantially toward the cost of their college education. But most important, cooperative jobs will make it possible for them to have a respectable job beginning in their sophomore year and thus overcome the fear of not being able to find employment as a college graduate.

COOP BENEFITS

At Northeastern, experience has demonstrated that nearly 50 percent of all students employed as cooperative trainees are offered good jobs with their cooperative employers at graduation. In some companies, as many as 80 percent remain with their cooperative employers, and it is not uncommon for employers to pay a salary as much as 20 percent higher than is paid to conventional college graduates. This premium recognizes the 2 years of experience the cooperative trainee has gained in his field of specialization as a result of cooperative employment.

Because the work experience provides the employers with an opportunity to observe the effectiveness of their trainees in the work situation, it is hoped that, if Negroes are carefully placed, employers will quickly realize that they are equally competent and as reliable as employees of different racial origins.

EARLY IDENTIFICATION

Recognizing the need to identify promising Negro students before they reach their senior year in high school in order to give them the encouragement and assistance necessary, if they are to become potential college applicants, the university will work with appropriate student personnel and community agencies to discover and encourage promising applicants for the proposed program at the 9th and 10th grade level.

To achieve this goal, Northeastern recently added to its staff an admissions counselor whose primary responsibility will be to seek out promising Negro youngsters for the program. He will be assisted by another admissions counselor on a part-time basis. Both have been thoroughly trained in the field of student personnel and in working with community agencies.

To locate promising applicants for the proposed program, the counselors will work with high school guidance counselors and teachers, social agencies, neighborhood groups, and churches. They will be aided by the Assistant to the President for Community Relations who has established many useful contacts with the Negro community and with interested community agencies, because of the university's close proximity to the Roxbury area where many of Boston's Negroes make their homes. The admissions counselors will also draw upon the resources of the university's occupational information service.

THOROUGH SCREENING

Once promising Negro applicants have been identified, the admissions counselors will make thorough studies of each student's educational background, including the need for special preparation, as well as of each student's home situation. Special visits to the homes of the prospective applicants will be made whenever necessary. Through means such as these, the university seeks to insure that each Negro enrolled in the program will have the best possible chance of completing it satisfactorily.

In selecting the 75 students who will study under the program, Northeastern will make use of all standard testing devices and will draw upon the judgment and experience of its admissions office, which maintains contact with 780 secondary schools. In addition, the university will utilize the resources of its testing and counseling center, which provides information, testing, and counseling concerning educational objectives, vocational objectives, and special aptitudes.

Aware that some who may be desirable candidates for admission to the program may be deficient in certain subject matter areas and/or in reading ability at the time of application, Northeastern will admit these students upon condition that they attend a preliminary summer program at the university prior to matriculation, with the expectation that they will be prepared to do college level work upon completion of the summer program.

OPEN TO ALL

The preliminary summer program will be designated for any student, regardless of race, who plans to enroll at the university the following fall and who needs additional instruction to prepare him for college level work. The program will draw upon superior high school teachers from the greater Boston area and will make use of the latest teaching techniques, including programed instruction. In addition the program will utilize Northeastern's own resources including the testing and counseling center, the occupational information service, and the center for reading improvement which is staffed by highly trained specialists with extensive experience in reading improvement and in the development of vocabulary and study skills.

This summer seminar will also consider sociological and psychological factors affecting the attitudes of children from underpriviliged communities.

LACK OF RESOURCES

The university recognizes that not only do many young Negroes not have the resources to meet tuition costs, but that often they cannot even buy the basic necessities of life and frequently live under crowded conditions and in environments not conducive for college study.

For these reasons, the university must have funds to provide full scholarships for the freshman year, as well as allowances for tuition, books and supplies, room and board, and clothing when needed.

During the upperclass years, the university must have funds to pay tuition and cover other costs of attending college with he expectation that the earnings during the cooperative work periods will cover all or nearly all of the students' living expenses. Students attending the summer preparatory program prior to entering the university will also require scholarship assistance.

Northeastern estimates that it will be necessary to provide some financial assistance for every Negro student enrolled in the program.

Most of the selected students will probably need funds to help meet the tuition costs of the preliminary summer program and of the freshman and four upperclass years. In addition, it is anticipated that Northeastern

should be prepared to assist a number of the students in meeting their living costs, in purchasing books and supplies, and even in providing personal needs such as clothing.

NEGROES FACE BARRIERS

Educators are just beginning to appreciate the barriers which discourage Negro ambition. One example is that books written for suburban youngsters may have little meaning for Negroes. Another example is that of a Negro student who lost his courage as college graduation approached because he lacked funds to purchase an appropriate suit to wear at the ceremony. Some of these obstructions can be overcome by increasing the funds for scholarships and living expenses. Others may require careful preparation of special and lengthy programs.

As this program is carried out, additional obstacles to Negro ambition may be uncovered. These discoveries may justify increases in the financial scope of the program, or they may point to major modifications in order to achieve the defined objectives.

A special adaptation of the Northeastern cooperative plan offers a promising means of encouraging children from disadvantaged areas to make the most of their abilities. Accordingly, the university has arranged to carry on a pilot project in 1964–65 and 1965–66 to explore the possibilities for using undergraduate cooperative students in the College of Education as teacher aids in public high schools located near the university in areas largely populated by Negroes. These co-ops who are preparing for careers in teaching, will be selected from the fourth and fifth year classes on the basis of their interest in helping disadvantaged pupils and their demonstrated ability to serve effectively in the cultivation of language and reading skills.

There is much evidence that language development is crucial to effective school adjustment. For children reared in underprivileged areas the acquisition of reading skills is often particularly difficult. They usually come from homes which place little value upon education and are virtually surrounded by negative influences which discourage the growth of competent command of language skills.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

These "teacher interns," who will be paid for their services from the overall grant for the program, will be given intensive training in basic concepts of reading and language instruction and specific training in the use of materials to be employed in the participating schools.

The following year (1965–66) it is proposed to add two more pairs of juniors to the program and continue the four co-ops who began in 1964–65. More than one school could be served in the second year of the program if this should be desirable.

TRAINING THE INTERNS

This program will be designed to test whether the use of co-ops is a fruitful approach to the problem of developing language skills among pupils from disadvantaged areas.

The four co-ops who are to begin the project in 1964–65 will be selected from the fourth year (junior) class in the college of education and will have had at least 1 year's work in the field of reading. During the summer of 1964 they will be given an intensive course of training in basic concepts of reading.

Now the largest university in the free world operated on the cooperative basis. Northeastern is confident that its pioneering efforts in applying the cooperative plan to Negro education will attract nationwide attention as well as widespread imitation, not only by the 60 other cooperative colleges and universities in the United States, but also by those in other countries.

Courtesy at the Capitol or the Lack Thereof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the powers that be around here I have asked unanimous consent for the printing of the following observations on their work by Ridder Newspaper Columnist Bill Sumner:

TOURISTS PLAN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INVASION—CAPITAL READY WITH INSULTS

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—It seems to be time for the annual report on tourism in Washington, D.C. During Easter Week—a cold, snowy week, incidentally—the tide started that will jam the Capital until next September.

It is a question whether it is the fat women in shorts who invade our sacred legislative halls, ghost ridden by the now silent spirits of bygone greats, or the treatment and reception given the typical tourist here that is the most irritating. But I lean to the latter viewpoint.

Official, municipal Washington sets forth formidable roadblocks enough in the form of unfathomable traffic and parking regulations, regulations which may well have been written by 400 captive monkeys typing at random for 10 years. But it is at the Capitol that our various politically appointed servants, such as elevator operators, doorkeepers, and other such anointed beings become larger than life and with arrogance to match.

The story going the rounds here a week or so ago (and promptly denied) held that Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, had taken a punch at an elevator operator in one of the Senate office buildings. The immediate thought, never confirmed, was that the operator had been as cheeky with the Senator, perhaps not knowing him, as is the usual form with a tourist.

In any case, such servants do grow sullen and uppity with the common herds. And the good women who serve as Capitol guides, who most surely have been auditioned for their jobs in a boiler works going at full clamor, grow louder, brassier and more monotonous of voice.

All things considered, the tourist, camera slung from a shoulder, kids in tow, suffering from an ailment known as museum feet, does not get the happy-hearted welcome he might expect from a city whose existence he pays for.

He gets the full welcome, his pockets stuffed with visitors' brochures, by the employees of his Congressmen and Senators and, if it is not a crowded day, from the great men themselves. But on the lower levels of life at the Capitol there is inexcusable rudeness and clearly expressed boredom, conduct that on a hot, muggy day here, when tempers are on edge, must surely rate at least a bust in the snoot.

Well, perhaps METCALF did and perhaps he didn't, and perhaps this was the reason. But if he did and it was, the citizens of America should send in dimes somewhere to buy him a nice silver platter.

One of the most futile efforts in tourism here—to look for a moment at the negative side of things—is the importation of restless, rambunctious busloads of school kids from all parts of the Nation for tours of the Capital. These must be costly ventures, but they are without merit from the standpoint of educating the young. A 15-minute view of Congress in action is baffling and frustrating. They have museums at home. The Lincoln Memorial is surrounded by snarled traffic and exhaust fumes when they go to see it. The time at Mount Vernon is spent buying shoddy souvenirs offered by the concessionaire.

This, of course, is treason. The town has a booster organization which regards such an influx as contributing heavily to the life's blood of the community and so promotes it. If there were no school kids, it is reasoned, there would be little market for hats with plumes (with the legend, "Washington, D.C." splashed in silver paint across the front), nor would there be a market for novelty ashtrays which spread out from the base of a small Washington Monument, or dinner plates on which the profile of the President has been painted. Or for whips, pea shooters, horns or banners, and pillows stamped in three colors showing the Capitol.

Well, you can't just pull a plug from such a solid wall of the economy. Not without helping the economy back home at any rate.

Urban Renewal in Grand Rapids, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Urban Renewal Administration has assisted many cities in meeting the problems of urban decay and in revitalizing these communities.

An excellent article on how urban renewal has worked in the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., appeared in the 1963 edition of the Michigan Yearbook. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL IN GRAND RAPIDS

(By Donald W. O'Keefe)

In his book, "The Future of Our Cities," the late Robert Futterman, an astute young man who amassed a vast fortune in real estate before he was thirty years old, said, "Many people tend to regard urban renewal as some new god from the machine of government, riding in at the end of the story on a bolt of lightning, his wonders to work. Dazzled by this concept, many believe urban redevelopment under urban renewal to be relatively easy."

The realities of urban renewal, as Mr. Futterman well knew and went on to explain, are quite the contrary. Nonetheless, many people and communities, having entered into an urban renewal program with visions of the "quick and easy," become quickly disenchanted with the whole idea when faced with the time-consuming and tough realities.

It cannot honestly be said that the Grand Rapids urban renewal program has been completely devoid of disenchantment; but, by and large, municipal officials and populace, although impatient, have held on firmly to the "long look" and realized that the ravages of 50, 60, and 70, or more, years cannot be undone in a few months. Years of planning and dedicated, hard, thankless work are an inherent part of the price of urban renewal, but they pay off in handsome dividends.

One must keep ever in mind another profound observation by Mr. Futterman: "It is

an error to believe that money can be saved by not building needed facilities. The choice is merely between the cost of building and the cost of failure to build. The failure to plan and build costs much more than the expense of intelligent renewal."

Here in Michigan's "second city," urban renewal has been coordinated and correlated to the Michigan State Highway Department's expressway program and to a carefully planned program of expansion of central business district parking, with results benefiting not only Grand Rapids itself, but extending to Kent County and the State.

Grand Rapids' pilot project, the Grand River Industrial Park, is taking a 44-acre area of mixed residential-commercial-industrial use, isolated from its schools and neighborhood shopping facilities by the north-south expressway, and rebuilding it into a modern, light-industrial park, from whence traffic flows in all directions, to Muskegon, Kalamazoo, Detroit, and Chicago, unhampered by intersecting roads or stoplights. More than 275 obsolete houses and commercial buildings have been razed and more than 250 families have been relocated into decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings to make way for the modern industrial buildings now rising, or already in use, in the renewal area.

The park has afforded an ideal location for Old Kent Bank & Trust Co.'s new million-dollar electronic data processing center that will serve correspondent banks throughout western Michigan. It is also the home for new distribution facilities for Graybar Electric, Westinghouse Electric, Toledo Scales, Copper & Brass Sales, Inc., Sunbeam Electric, L. G. Cook Distributing, and many other local firms.

The two central core projects encompass 40 acres of central business district area, characterized by 70- and 80-year-old, obsolete retail stores, vintage public buildings, flophouses, pigeon roosts, small bars, and an element of general defeatism. This forlorn, but unable-to-be-forgotten area, which added nothing to the prestige of Michigan's second city, will become an area symbolic of confidence and dynamic faith in the future, widened by a combination of public and private redevelopment. It will contain a new civic center from which will rise a hall of justice, a police administration building, a modern city hall and a county building commensurate with the status of Kent County in the State of Michigan. From the private redevelopment sites will rise several modern, nonmercantile buildings long needed in Grand Rapids. The new construction, in addition to its intangible esthetic value, will have a tangible monetary value many times the total cost of acquisition for both projects.

Behind all this lies several years of intensive planning. What is happening now is the tangible result of the planning and the implementation of the first part of a phased program for the conservation of Grand Rapids' and Kent County's downtown.

A short-range development plan adopted in 1960 provided for a 15-year program to revitalize the central business district. Among the proposals were a comprehensive parking program, a major street program for the central area, and the development of a joint city-county administrative center.

Included in the first 5-year program were the provisions of off-street parking facilities, the initiation of the central core urban renewal projects in the lower Monroe Avenue area, and the start of the civic center complex. All of these programs were to be coordinated with the expressway program to assure a total effort at revitalization. As we near the end of the second year of the first 5-year phase, we find two new parking structures have been completed; the urban renewal projects on course, full speed ahead with the majority of the property under city ownership and the steel ball and bulldozer of the demolition experts hard at work clearing the acquired areas for the oncoming new construction.

During this third year, emphasis will be placed on completion of the land acquisition phase and the beginning of construction of the civic center. In 1962, Giffels & Rossetti, Inc., the city's architectural design consultants, prepared a detailed architectural development plan for the entire civic center, including a police administration building, a hall of justice (courts building), a city building and a county building. All of these buildings were designed so that together they form a complex of public buildings, but each retains its identity as an individual unit. Grand Rapids' architects, Roger Allen & Associates, are currently preparing detailed construction drawings for the first two units—police administration and the hall of justice.

The year 1963 will also see the first announcements of new construction by private enterprise in the nonpublic areas of the projects. Land for these private developments will be sold under open competitive conditions, but preliminary promotion, to avoid a daisy-growing hiatus between demolition and reconstruction, has guaranteed that at least one highly acceptable proposal will be received for each disposition site offered. The reuse plan for the private development areas permits office buildings, motor-hotels, and special-purpose buildings of a nonretail nature which will complement the civic center. Construction of the modern public and private buildings will occupy the final years of the first phase. They will rise, like a fine new crop, from the ground that has been thoughtfully and carefully prepared for them within the target dates established in the original report.

The year 1963 will see many dynamic and dramatically progressive strides made toward the final completion of the short-range plan.

Meanwhile, preliminary planning is being undertaken to enable the continuation of the program for the later phases, including detailed proposals for a cultural center, a continuation of the parking program, and completion of the internal street extension system.

Experience in Grand Rapids has shown that urban renewal is neither totally painful nor totally painless; nor is it a general panacea. It is simply a useful "kit of tools" making possible a partnership among local government, State government, Federal Government, private enterprise, and citizens, in mounting an offensive against slums and the causes of urban blight where the magnitude of the task is so great that no one of the groups could successfully cope with it alone. Urban renewal, like every other good set of tools, needs competent workmen. It is not self-motivating or effortless. The hammer does not swing itself. And long-sleeping muscles complain at their awakening.

Over 2,400 years ago, Confucius saw the basic need and truth behind intelligent, well-used urban renewal when he observed: "* * * the value of thy property dependeth upon thy neighbor."

Brig. Gen. Thomas Dodson Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of Brig. Gen. Thomas Dodson Stamps.

General Stamps was a professor of military engineering at the U.S. Military Academy during the years I attended, and later became dean of its Academic Board. He was an inspiration to all of the cadets whom he trained and guided during their formative years at the Military Academy, and mixed a fine sense of humor with real leadership and still maintained the military virtues of discipline and attention to duty.

General Stamps was devoted to his profession, devoted to his country, and devoted to his family. I wish to express my deep regrets to Mrs. Stamps and her two daughters.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article from the New York Times of April 13, 1964:

GENERAL STAMPS DIES—A WEST POINT AID—RETIRED PROFESSOR AND DEAN OF ACADEMIC BOARD WAS 70

WASHINGTON, April 12.—Brig. Gen. Thomas Dodson Stamps, retired professor of the U.S. Military Academy and in 1956–57 dean of its academic board, died today in the Walter Reed Medical Center. He was 70 years old and lived in Bethesda, Md.

General Stamps was head of the Department of Military Art and Engineering at the Academy from 1938 to 1956. He developed texts and atlases for the study of recent wars and during World War II initiated a series of paperbacks to bring the latest developments of the war to the cadets.

He was a short, wiry man, generally reserved but of a cheerful disposition, and he was an energetic and popular teacher.

While at West Point he was active in many post and cadet affairs and served for many years on the athletic board.

From his retirement from the Army in 1957 until last August, General Stamps directed military studies at the University of Maryland.

He was born in Kingsbury, Tex., and was graduated from the University of Texas in 1912 and the U.S. Military Academy in 1917. Four years later he received a civil engineering degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

General Stamps was commissioned a captain in the Army in 1917 and served in World War I in France and Germany with the 107th Engineers, 32d Infantry Division. He took part in the Aisne-Marne, Oise-Aisne, and Meuse-Argonne campaigns.

After the war and before his appointment to the Academy, he served as construction engineer for the Mississippi River Illinois Waterway, the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo, and the U.S. consulate in Yokohama and for 4 years was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

His decorations included the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster and the French Legion of Honor.

General Stamps was a member of the Society of American Military Engineers, the Association of the United States Army, the American Military Institute, and the Army and Navy Club of Washington.

Surviving are his widow, the former Lois Baker; two daughters, Mrs. Charles D. Daniel, of Arlington, Va., and Mrs. John A. Poulson, of Falls Church, Va.; three sisters, Mrs. Alvin J. Wirtz, of Rochester, Minn., Mrs. Walter B. King, of Waco, Tex., and Mrs. Joseph D. Mosheim, of Chickamauga, Ga., and six grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held in St. David's Episcopal Church here Wednesday at 2 p.m. Burial will be at West Point on Thursday at 2:30 p.m.

Hoosier With a Brooklyn Accent: Review of Book, "My Indiana," Written by Irving Leibowitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, among the adopted sons of Indiana is the distinguished managing editor and columnist of the Indianapolis Times, Irving Leibowitz. A native of New York, Mr. Leibowitz has become an enthusiastic resident of Indiana, so much so that he has produced a book about Hoosier politics and personalities entitled "My Indiana." This new book has been reviewed by a member of the Scripps-Howard organization and good friend of mine, a member of the Capitol press corps who reports on Indiana affairs from Washington, Ted Knap.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the book review by Mr. Knap be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOK REVIEW: "MY INDIANA," BY IRVING LEIBOWITZ

(By Ted Knap)

He is Booth Tarkington with a Brooklyn accent.

"I came here from the sidewalks of New York City. Where do I come off writing a book about Indiana?" That's what Irving Leibowitz asks himself in the introduction to his book, "My Indiana."

Then he answers himself: "I have 'chutzpah.' It is almost impossible to translate 'chutzpah' from Yiddish to English. It means more than gall, more than brass. For example, if a boy murdered his mother and father and then threw himself on the mercy of the court because he was an orphan, it could be said he had 'chutzpah.' "

Leibowitz's "chutzpah" is reinforced by the fact that, after 15 years as political writer and columnist for the Indianapolis Times, he loves Indiana.

"For a boy who was one of the faceless millions on the sidewalks of New York City, living in Indiana has made me somebody. I'm a Hoosier. I belong * * * I never had it so good."

Anyone who ever lived in the Midwest—or in any town small enough to make it worthwhile to look at people as you walk downtown—will understand that the author's Indiana is, oh, so much like the reader's Ohio, or Harrisburg, or Selma.

Leibowitz's "My Indiana" is mainly about Hoosier politics and personalities. It also touches on the State's cities, creeks, colleges, sports, and writers, and dwells a great deal on two dwindling powers—the American Legion and Ku Klux Klan.

It gives the reader inside dope on the rise of the Klan, its corruption of two Republican Governors and the trial of Grand Dragon D. C. Stephenson for the sex murder of a statehouse secretary.

It gives an insight into the importance of the Legion as a social force in the small towns and a political powerhouse in the State capital. The Legion elected three Governors, and is keeping one from speaking at the State's World War Memorial.

It catches some of the flavor of Gasoline Alley at the 500-mile race.

The wisecracks are the best part of Leibowitz's book.

He describes Indianapolis as a city that's "lousy with civic-improvement associations. A standing joke is that when you see two people talking in the street they are in the midst of electing a president and vice president of an uplift or down-with society."

To show how rough the Legion plays politics, Leibowitz quotes an Indiana Governor: "In the Legion, you'd be stabbed in the back—and then they'd have you arrested for carrying a concealed weapon."

When Gov. George Craig hired a Chicago publicist to sweeten the image of his administration, Leibowitz quoted a backwoods politician: "It's just like an outhouse. You can whitewash it and plant honeysuckle all around, but it still stinks."

Leibowitz also quotes Hoosier Kin Hubbard: "Now an' then an innocent man is sent t' th' legislature."

And Leibowitz recalls that "Dwight D. Eisenhower had an easier time establishing a beachhead on Normandy than he did in Indiana politics."

That's because the Republican Party in Indiana is to the right of BARRY GOLDWATER. That's also why Leibowitz, in choosing one man as the symbol of Indiana, discarded lovable old former Gov. Henry Schricker and instead named screaming, reactionary former Senator William Jenner.

If that choice is unfair to Indiana, Leibowitz makes up for it by claiming that Abe Lincoln was one of the three Presidents from Indiana.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from one of the country's largest metropolitan areas, and having previously served on the Committee on Banking and Currency, I think I have some understanding of the many problems involved and the efforts being made in trying to meet the goal of a decent, safe, and sanitary home for all our people through the federally assisted housing programs.

It is for this reason that I have been watching with more than a passing interest the controversy now developing over the Federal urban renewal program. In my opinion, this program is doing the job intended. It is clearing slums, and doing so on a large scale. I understand that in over 700 projects now well underway, more than 250,000 substandard housing units have been, or are being, eliminated; and the bulk of the people who lived in these slums are, or soon will be, living in decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

What interests me particularly in this growing controversy is the sharp and seemingly rather bitter philosophical conflict now splitting the U.S. Chamber of Commerce from its local chambers in so many communities. The consistent and inflexible opposition by the U.S. chamber to this Federal program is well known, but what may not be so well known is that, according to a poll recently conducted by the U.S. conference of mayors, this position is not shared by many of the local chambers; in fact, it seems to be shared by only a small handful.

Perhaps, nowhere is this dichotomy between the U.S. chamber and so many of the local chambers more in evidence than it was recently in Chicago. At almost the same time, the president of the U.S. chamber was castigating the urban renewal program, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, the local chamber, was issuing a statement strongly supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a news item from the Chicago Tribune of April 4 captioned "City and U.S. Chamber of Commerce's War Over Renewal," at this point in the RECORD, together with the text of the statement issued by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Apr. 4, 1964]

CITY AND U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S WAR OVER RENEWAL—TALK SETS OFF CLASH ON FEDERAL AID

(By Robert Wiedrich)

The Chicago and U.S. Chamber of Commerce clashed yesterday over the issue of Federal urban renewal programs.

The national chamber opposed Federal handouts for urban renewal and the local chapter favored them when municipalities lacked enough financial means. The disagreement evoked comment even from Mayor Daley.

What sparked the clash was a talk delivered before the executive club in the Palmer House. The speaker was Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. chamber.

CRITICIZES FEDERAL AID

Neilan criticized urban renewal plans by the Government, as well as all forms of Federal giveaways.

He charged that old time political hacks who used to benefit from local graft had given way to a new gang in city hall that derives its power from Federal subsidies. He charged that national political figures maintained their position by trading Federal grants for votes.

Text of Neilan's speech had been made available in advance. Shortly before he spoke, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry issued a statement which said its directors opposed the national chamber's position on urban renewal and public housing grants from Washington.

CHAMBER'S STAND TOLD

The statement said the local chamber agreed with the long-range ideal of restoring responsibility for urban renewal to the States and municipalities. It said, however, that this would have to wait until local governments were given the financial means to shoulder such responsibility.

The Chicago association said that "extended Federal taxes have so invaded local taxing sources that Federal grants must continue until taxing powers are realined."

A member of the audience asked Neilan about the Chicago group's statement disagreeing with his. Neilan replied:

"We can't brainwash members of chambers of commerce locally."

CALLS CHICAGOANS SELFISH

He said he did not think the Chicago group had done much to dispute the facts offered by the national chamber. He accused the Chicagoans of taking a "selfish attitude."

"They think they can get tax funds from Delaware, Maine, and everywhere to help them out," Neilan said.

In answer to another inquiry about attempts to get the Federal Government to

take over the Chicago Skyway, Neilan remarked:

"This was built to benefit Chicago traffic. Now they want to bail the investors out by using my tax dollars to do it."

SEES THREAT TO RESIDENTS

In his criticism of urban renewal grants, Neilan told the executives club:

"The new gang is as likely as not to send a squad of urban renewal bulldozers around to tear down your house. They consider that a bigger favor because they're beautifying your neighborhood.

"It's too bad you can't stay around and see the results, but you can go find yourself another rundown neighborhood to crowd into at a higher rent, thereby enriching both the old and the new slum owners."

DALEY CALLS IT ESSENTIAL

Daley bristled when informed of Neilan's comment.

"It is significant to point out that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has opposed urban renewal from its inception," he said. "This is nothing new for them. They're thinking is still in the Victorian or McKinley Age.

How do you rebuild cities without Federal aid? Without it, there could be no Lake Meadows or University of Illinois.

In my opinion, Mr. Neilan should realize that slum and blight isn't good, even for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce."

FOR RELEASE OF THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

The board of directors of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry today opposed the Chamber of Commerce of the United States' stand against Federal participation in urban renewal and public housing programs.

While agreeing to the long-range ideal of restoring the responsibility for urban renewal to States and local communities, the association said that such action must wait until local governments are given the financial means to carry out current redevelopment programs without disruption.

The association pointed out that extend Federal taxes have so invaded local taxing sources that Federal grants must continue until taxing powers are realined.

The association, the largest metropolitan chamber of commerce in the United States, said it has a dual responsibility to promote the Chicago area's commercial and industrial growth, and to help create a better community for all who live and work in the area. Urban renewal affects both objectives.

Neighborhood deterioration is the greatest challenge to American cities today, the association said. Both business and the community in general suffer from unchecked urban blight because it:

Stifles commercial and industrial vitality.

Depresses confidence required for continued capital investment, thus impeding the flow of private funds and expansion of free enterprise.

Demoralizes civic pride and creates breeding grounds for crime and juvenile delinquency.

Increases the cost of municipal services.

Reduces assessed property valuations and the local tax base, thus diminishing local government's financial resources.

On the other hand, the association said, urban renewal expenditures stimulate private enterprise and investment, which in turn help fight poverty and increase employment.

Urban renewal has justified itself economically, the association said. In Chicago, for example, tax yields from recent projects have more than doubled. Chicago's redevelopment program already has increased assessed valuation by over $100 million broadening the tax base while improving living conditions and spurring economic growth.

The association cited the Hyde Park-Kenwood conservation program as an example of how such projects stimulate private investment. The program, which cost $36,700,000 in Federal and local public funds, will result in an investment of nearly $200 million by private property owners and institutions.

If Federal funds had not been available for the project and there were no alternative methods of generating the "seed money" necessary to attract private investment, a striking Chicago success story never could have been told, the association said.

The association's five-point position on urban renewal favors:

Continuation of present Federal sharing of local urban renewal costs at this time.

Federal grants only where they will be part of a comprehensive urban renewal plan and of an overall city plan.

Plans which encourage private enterprise to invest in redevelopment of cleared lands.

Plans which stimulate the entire community to upgrade living standards through private development and private financing.

Continued Federal provisions for low-rent housing for families displaced by public works projects, code enforcements, and other public actions.

Where is the Roosevelt Memorial?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly wonderful time of the year to be in Washington. The singular beauty of the city is enhanced by trees and flowers but most wonderful of all to me is the flood of the people from all over the Nation who come here to visit the seat of National Government.

They come here by the hundreds to see their Representatives at work in the Capitol. They come here to see the great art museums, the majestic memorials and monuments and invariably to ask, "Where is the monument to President Roosevelt?"

To answer this question is most embarrassing. For all Members of Congress know that the memorial to President Franklin D. Roosevelt is still on paper. Disagreements among the various committees involved, arguments over location, contrary views of what is appropriate and what is not appropriate have resulted in a situation which has produced no national memorial to the man who brought this country back from the brink of revolution.

Thirty-two years ago this month, farmers in the Midwest were threatening to hang the officers of the court involved in foreclosure sales. Masked men were seizing milk trucks and dumping milk in the roadway. One-quarter of Southern States devoted to the cotton economy were reported sold in one day under the auctioneer's hammer. Irate Nebraska farmers threatened to tear down the new State capitol building unless help was forthcoming from the legislature.

Homes were being foreclosed at the rate of a thousand a day, unemployed workers in Detroit raided grocery stores filling their baskets and leaving without paying. In St. Louis, hungry men demanding food at city hall were shot by police in an effort to control the mob. In Chicago, 55 persons were charged with tearing down a brick building and carrying it away. People lived in packing boxes on the river front, they slept in empty street cars. Heart disease complicated by malnutrition was the entry in hospital registers when people, dying from starvation, were brought in to spend their last hours under a roof.

From Pennsylvania to Wyoming, jobless miners bootlegged coal. In cities, jobless veterans sold apples and shoestrings for paltry pennies. Fields of unpicked cotton extended from New Mexico to the Carolinas because the sale price of cotton would not pay for the picking. There were vineyards and orchards with fruit unpicked in the country and starvation in the streets of the cities.

Ten thousand striking miners in southern Illinois organized a coal caravan—the cars in the demonstration stretched for 48 miles. Communist-led demonstrations were at every hand.

In this chaotic and fearful situation, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his inaugural address, had stated:

> First of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, unreasoning, unjustified terror.
>
> We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply. Primarily, it is because the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods have failed through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence and have abdicated. The moneychangers had fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths.

Then came the national bank holiday and on March 9, 1933, within 5 days of his taking office, the special session of Congress convened to pass, sight unseen, the emergency banking bill which extended Federal help to reopen the banks.

Sixty million people gathered around their radios the next Sunday night to hear the first of the fireside chats.

Small wonder that the children and the grandchildren of those people ask when they come here, "Where is the Roosevelt memorial?"

And from the inaugural date on March 4, 1933, for the next 100 days, this House and Members of Congress stood by the President and remade the figure of Government in our time.

Franklin D. Roosevelt re-created the modern Presidency, according to William Leuchtenberg:

> He took an office which has lost much of its prestige and power in the previous 12 years and gave it an importance that went well beyond what even Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson had done. Clinton Rossiter has written: "Only Washington who made the office and Jackson, who made it, did more than Roosevelt to raise it to its present condition of strength, dignity, and independence."

His most important formal contribution in the opinion of many historians was the creation of the Executive Office of the President on September 8, 1939, Executive Order No. 8248 set up the Executive Office with six assistants with

a "passion for anonymity." It did more than that, it placed in the hands of the President as drivers at the reins of government. This authority has been increased and enlarged today but it all dates from the Executive order.

Small wonder students of government from around the world look for a memorial to this man who saved representative and democratic government.

Franklin Roosevelt perfected the art of the newspaper news conference and the fireside chat over the radio. His press conferences were rough and tumble, his fireside chats as cozy as a chat with grandfather. And the White House mail multiplied 50 times.

The financial center of the Nation shifted from Wall Street to Washington under the New Deal; John Dillinger, a nortorious bank robber was shot to death in Chicago after he had escaped from a number of jails and led a spectacular career in crime through a dozen States, impotent to stop him.

Reform in the 1930's was economic reform and much of the force and power of the New Deal came from organized labor and brought fruit in the Committee for Industrial Organization.

Here, under sponsorship of Government organizers, set up a whole new concept to organized labor, a movement that was to have much to do with the sweep and the power of organization for the next 30 years.

Nor were the arts neglected as many a post office built in those troubled times can attest.

Art projects, theatrical projects, dance projects, the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps were adjuncts of the more widespread WPA, which kept many a family together, and the PWA which built badly needed buildings and gave jobs to thousands in permanent construction.

Alphabetical agencies gave fodder to the cartoonists, the comedians, and the hardheaded. And they saved the lives of thousands, gave new hope to the entire country, and laid the groundwork for today's flexible Government the most powerful in the world.

Spring in Washington is a glorious time, a time to welcome the thousands of visitors who come here for a pilgrimage to this magnificant complex. But it brings a most embarrassing question from the lips of hundreds: "Where is the Roosevelt Memorial?"

It is difficult to believe that the memorial to the man who brought us back from the brink of revolution exists today only on paper.

Panama Canal: Prime Red Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who has studied the brilliant address in the House on March 9, 1964, by our esteemed and most distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], on the "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics," I am tremendously impressed by his deep insight into the strategic significance of what has occurred at Panama in relation to program of the world revolutionary movement for universal conquest.

In this connection, I must say to this body that I have read on many occasions published statements by various journalists, and even by high officials of the Armed Services, that the Panama Canal is no longer important in a military sense. That, Mr. Speaker, is a misleading, absurd, and most dangerous doctrine, well calculated to produce paralysis by our Government in meeting the threat that now faces our country at Panama and must be so recognized. High officials of our Government who voice it not only reflect discredit on themselves as being extremely naive or misinformed but, even worse, they invite the suspicion of subversion by advocacy of a policy and program that aids, abets the revolutionary power that has threatened to bury us.

As so ably pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the Panama Canal is the prime objective for the Communistic revolutionary conquest of the Western Hemisphere. In this light, the actions of our officials, legislative and executive, who temporize in meeting the issues over the treaty-based sovereignty of the Panama Canal or who belittle its military importance by absurd assertions are doing a tremendous disservice to their country.

The February 1964 issue of the American Security Reporter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars shows that this national veteran's organization is keenly aware of the significance of the Panama Canal in communistic revolutionary strategy for gaining control of vital transportation routes. I quote it as part of my remarks and commend it for careful reading by all Members of the Congress, the staffs of cognizant legislative, appropriations, and investigating committees, and by officials in the highest echelons of the executive branch concerned with Isthmian Canal policy matters.

Among the many vital points discussed in the indicated statement, I would especially emphasize that which stresses that fact that if the Panama Canal were not a great factor in the Communist revolutionary program for world conquest, why is it that Khrushchev and Castro are doing everything within their power to wrest control of the canal from the United States? The simple truth is that if we lose the Panama Canal we lose the struggle for freedom.

The statement follows:

PANAMA: ANOTHER RED TARGET

Chalk up another score for the Kremlin for the Panama crisis. Castro and Khrushchev must have taken time off from their secret talks in Moscow to toast each other on the success of their Caribbean policy.

And it's pretty hard to say that they aren't having some real success. Success in what? The answer is obvious: success in undermining our position in Panama, endangering our full authority over the Canal Zone, in short, placing a dagger at the jugular vein—the lifeline—of our commerce and strategic integrity.

Once again, we are already hearing the familiar old tune—that the Panama Canal really isn't as important as it used to be. And so, they say, we don't have to have full, unquestioned, control of the zone as we have had in the past. And what does that mean? Simply that we should make concessions, reduce the area under our control, and impair our authority.

And this means we would, in fact, be following a policy of appeasement. And if we look ahead a few steps we can begin to see where such a policy would take us. Where? Right down the road to strategic disaster in the Caribbean and Central America. Khrushchev and Castro have the scenario all written. And we are well beyond the first act.

Here are a few reasons why the seriousness of the Panama crisis cannot be overexaggerated:

We will be fooling no one but ourselves if we ever proceed on the assumption that the canal isn't vital to our national security. Of course, we now have a few ships—the new aircraft carriers—that can't squeeze through the locks. They are, however, usually assigned to either the Pacific or Atlantic areas on a longtime basis. But, the rest of the Navy can make the switch from east to west coast, from the Atlantic to Pacific. And between our ports of those of Latin America.

Anyone who is under the impression that the canal isn't of critical importance to U.S. national security has overlooked or forgotten its role in the Cuban missile crisis, Then, in late 1962, Marines from the west coast, in combat loaded amphibious transports, were sailed to the Caribbean through the Panama Canal. This was no academic maneuver. It was a genuine crisis, a potential war situation. And, as the record so clearly shows, the Panama Canal was of indispensible strategic value. No more persuasive a test could be devised as to the modern requirement for the Panama Canal within the framework of our national defense.

Also, it is well to remember that during World War II and later, during the Korean crisis, the canal was the logistic lifeline for moving our military power, our men and equipment, from our east coast to the combat areas of the Pacific and Asia.

Through the same Panama Canal go, today, the ships with war material to help beat back the Red aggression in South Vietnam. And there is more trouble looming close ahead in Asia as communism is stepping up its subversion and outright penetration.

Twelve thousand ships a year use the canal. In so doing they cut off 8,000 miles which they would have to otherwise travel in order to go from the Atlantic to the Pacific around South America. In time and shipping requirements, both naval and commercial, the canal is a vital factor in our struggle for survival. No wonder Krushchev and Castro want us out of the Canal Zone. No wonder they want us to be crippled with the logistic burden that would be imposed on us by loss of full and complete control of the canal.

Viewed in its broad perspective, it would be hard, indeed, to find a single, concentrated area so vital to the well-being and actual survival of the United States as is the Panama Canal.

So, it's easy to understand why it is the prime target of Communist aggression in the Western Hemisphere. The mobs that shot and killed U.S. soldiers defending our Panama lifeline demonstrated how far communism has pushed its spearheads into the vitals of our defensive zone.

And it should have been expected. Why? Because the Kremlin captured Cuba. Because Cuba is the base for pushing the Red

subversion of the Americas. The dead U.S. soldiers in the Canal Zone are silent, but persuasive—very persuasive—proof that whoever believed we can live with Red Cuba couldn't have been more wrong.

The Communist arson, terror, murder, and subversion, directed by the Kremlin and shipped via Cuba has been hitting Venezuela without mercy. Now it has moved to Panama.

The noose—and it's a Red one—is tightening on us.

Does anyone really doubt Communist leadership in the sorry spectacle of the Panama riots? If anyone has any doubts on this score, he should reread the statements of Army Secretary Cyrus R. Vance. Secretary Vance was sent to Panama by President Johnson at the outbreak of the trouble. On his return the Secretary reported that 10 Cuban trained Communists had been arrested. One of them, he added, was a sniper.

Nor is this Communist agitation in Panama something new. Just about a year ago the Director of the Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, testified before a congressional committee that 12 tons of Communist propaganda were being confiscated a month in Panama.

There may be some in our country who don't think the Panama Canal is of critical importance to us. But that's not what Castro and Khrushchev think. And that brings up the interesting but not surprising matter of Khrushchev's reaction to our Panama troubles. The Kremlin boss has been waving the olive branch and talking peace for some time now. He's having agricultural trouble and some short crops at home. And we're helping him out by selling him subsidized wheat. No one can say that the United States hasn't helped him out of trouble he made for himself by placing more importance on weapons than on food production.

How did Khrushchev show his appreciation? He didn't. Instead, he did what real Communists always do—take full advantage of our trouble. As soon as the Red mob leaders in Panama began doing their work, Khrushchev's worldwide propaganda went into high gear, accusing the United States of mass murder, of imperialism, and everything else they usually say bad about us.

All of which indicates that Khrushchev must be appreciative, at least in one way, for our wheat—he won't have to take his anti-U.S. agitators off the firingline and put them to work growing wheat for home consumption.

The Communists know how to use trouble to cause more trouble. They're going to keep it up in Panama. And it's not just for the Panama crisis that Red propaganda is demanding that the United States renegotiate our legal and binding treaty there.

This Communist effort to force the United States into an across-the-board renegotiation of the canal treaty isn't just to weaken us in Panama, as bad as that would be.

What they want is to work us into renegotiating on the canal. This would give Castro the precedent for demanding we renegotiate the similar treaty for our base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. This is a key target of the Reds—get us out of Guantanamo and get the Russian submarine fleet in.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 11, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

FREEDOM ASSAULTED

Using unprecedented naked power and disregard for reasonable procedure in passing important legislation, the Democratic leadership of the House this week rammed through two bills which may well prove to be decisive steps in putting an end to the freedom of the people of the United States. In passing the food stamp plan and the cotton-wheat bill the fundamental philosophies of the two parties were never brought into clearer focus. The real coalition in Congress, Northern and Southern Democrats, were almost unanimous in trampling on the parliamentary rights of the minority and in adopting the two measures.

THE LEGISLATION

1. The food stamp plan (H.R. 10222) to provide stamps to welfare recipients for the purchase of food: It is declared to be "an essential instrument in the war on poverty." The report on the bill states: "H.R. 10222 improves, expands, and makes permanent the food stamp program that now is operating successfully on a pilot and experimental basis in 43 areas in 22 States, covering some 380,000 persons."

In opposing the bill, the minority members of the Agriculture Committee said: "The establishment of a nationwide food stamp plan is not needed; it would be extremely expensive and inefficient; it would destroy the rights and usurp the responsibilities of local and State governments; it would aggravate the problems of commodities now held in surplus stocks by the Government; it would add hundreds of new employees in the Department of Agriculture; it would give the Secretary of Agriculture new broad and sweeping powers; it would be adverse to the needy people it is designed to help; and it would be of little benefit to U.S. farmers.

In the power move in which the House engaged, the food stamp plan was brought to the floor ahead of the cotton-wheat bill in a reported arrangement between city members who wanted the stamp plan and rural members who wanted the cotton-wheat program, thus assuring passage of both.

2. The cotton-wheat bill (H.R. 6196): The cotton bill was passed by the House with two very important amendments (the McIntire and Jones amendments) to protect States rights and lessen Federal control. The wheat bill was never considered by the House. In fact, it had not even been accepted by the Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee prior to the passage of the bill by the Senate and its return to the House. The entire wheat bill was added as a Senate amendment to the cotton bill after the Senate had stricken both the McIntire and Jones amendments from the latter.

Under these circumstances the House was asked to approve a 71-word resolution to send to the President without any amendment, with only 1 hour of debate, the entire cotton-wheat program.

Both bills were rammed through the House by keeping the Members in session until 12:30 midnight and by using a House-approved recess to honor the memory of General MacArthur as a device for an additional questionable recess to give some legality to highly irregular House procedure. Never in the history of Congress has there been a greater display of ruthless power, which resulted in an incident which to my knowledge is without precedent, the booing of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE

To detail all the parliamentary maneuvering and to discuss at length all the provisions of the legislation would take pages. The most I can do in the space of a newsletter is to alert the people as to what was done and the question of principle involved in the legislation.

1. The wheat bill is the same program turned down by the farmers in a nationwide vote last year. It established a two-price system in wheat; it is going to be more costly to the taxpayers both in supporting the subsidies and in higher prices for food; it increases the potential for greater wheat surpluses; it open further the floodgates for socialism. Approval of this legislation implies approval for greatly expanded minimum wage laws, medicare, wholly owned Federal housing, and complete Federal direction of urban renewal, together with all the other big government, big spending Federal projects, and welfare programs.

2. The cotton bill adds an additional subsidy to the two already in effect, giving cotton a triple subsidy; it gives unhealthy power to Federal-oriented cooperatives at the expense of private cotton merchandisers; places unusual control of cotton in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is claimed it will correct the market. Actually, it adds an additional subsidy to correct a problem created by a previous subsidy. It was sold to the cotton people as a temporary 2-year program. Those who bought this forget that we have been operating on temporary agriculture subsidy programs for over 30 years.

After months of study of the cotton legislation and in protest against being asked to approve a wheat program which had never been before the House, I opposed the bill. I am convinced, as are many members of the Agriculture Committee, including some from cotton States, that passage of this bill will, in the end, tremendously damage the entire industry and may even mean the end of privately owned cotton trading enterprises.

THE POLITICAL ASPECT

Many of the cotton people of Dallas do not agree with me at this time. I received a number of letters and personal telephone calls indicating political reprisal if I voted against the bill. Under such circumstances I have only one course—to follow reason and my conscience and vote according to my own judgment, knowing all the facts and the probable effect of the legislation. Political expediency cannot be the deciding factor in voting on such vital legislation if a Representative is to remain true to his convictions. I believe my vote was in the best interest of the cotton industry and am prepared to debate the issue with any leaders of the industry, presenting all the facts as I know them to be.

In the passage of these two bills and the manner in which it was done, freedom in America was seriously assaulted this week. Who knows what new blows are being planned to weaken the private enterprise system and the remaining freedoms of the American people?

APRIL 11, 1964.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

L.B.J. Has Put New Life in Latin Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News:

L.B.J. HAS PUT NEW LIFE IN LATIN POLICY

(By Virginia Prewett)

For the first time since the black April 17, 3 years ago when the Cuban Exile Brigade was abandoned on the Bay of Pigs' bloody beaches, the new world's lovers of liberty and workers for progress have cause for lifting hearts.

The Brazilian people in one tremendous sweep have brushed their Communist-lining Goulart power clique into the discard. Panama has dropped its impossible demand that the United States abrogate the 1903 Canal Treaty before talking over mutual problems.

And our Government in the 3 short months since President Johnson made diplomat Thomas Mann his Latin American coordinator, has restored dignity and a reassuring degree of consistency to the actions of the United States in its Latin American relations.

COULD NOT

The new world could not prosper while the United States, which cannot escape leadership, alternately blustered and tiptoed in Latin America, often reversing in a short time positions assumed with a show of strength.

Nor could it prosper while Brazilian leadership, with a rare talent for destruction, led the South American giant every day closer to civil war and chaos.

Too many people have known for too long that Brazilians were organizing to overthrow President Goulart for U.S. policy to be credited. But the firm stand taken by President Johnson and Ambassador Mann in every crisis that has arisen, plus their determination to judge each situation on its merits and not by some predetermined rule of thumb, undoubtedly encouraged some faint-hearted top army officers to joint the anti-Goulart sweep.

DESERVE CREDIT

President Johnson and Assistant Secretary of State Mann deserve credit for standing firm not only against external pressures but also against strong internal pressures.

Ever since Fidel Castro revealed himself in Cuba, a very small but powerful sector of the U.S. press, plus fragments of the far-left wing of the Democratic Party, have indirectly—and directly—campaigned for U.S. policies that would encourage "Jacobin" revolutions in Latin America. These are revolutions of fire and blood and of class warfare.

Advocates of this solution for Latin America's problems have made it as hard for President Johnson and Ambassador Mann as they possible could.

STRONG PRESSURE

In the Panama crisis, the pressure was strong for the United States to adopt an attitude of "mea culpa" and capitulate to the irrational demand that we abrogate a vital treaty without knowing what would take its place.

Both President Johnson and Mr. Mann have stood firm, even when attempts were made to drive a wedge between the two men.

No major problem in Latin America has been solved and many must be met. But at last the hemisphere can begin to feel that Washington is no longer a policy quicksand.

International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the IDA bill was defeated on February 26, the Committee on Banking and Currency has been receiving a heavy volume of mail urging passage of this proposal to increase the U.S. participation in this international program for the benefit of underdeveloped countries. The program has the great advantage of obtaining $1.40 in contributions from other wealthy nations for every $1 that we put in.

Many people have sent us newspaper editorials from all over the country urging reconsideration of this proposal and its enactment into law. One such communication received yesterday is from Mr. Philip Young, president of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce:

Hon WRIGHT PATMAN,

Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

In testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives on March 17, 1960, the U.S. council recorded its support for legislation establishing the International Development Association. This action was taken after extensive consideration of the problems surrounding the establishment of new governmental lending machinery that could compete with existing private financial institutions.

Although world economic and political conditions have obviously changed considerably since 1960, the value of the IDA has not become any less significant—in fact, its successful operation is evidence of the need for continual support.

The IDA appears to offer one of the more promising methods by which the burden of foreign assistance can be shifted somewhat from the United States to other nations. The ultimate effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position should be favorable.

It also should be pointed out that the guiding principles of the IDA lending policies are closely in line with what we consider to be sound business procedure and, therefore, influence favorably the climate for private investment in the developing countries.

With the above considerations in mind, the members of the U.S. council once again wish to indicate their support for the International Development Association. The members of the council strongly recommend that appropriate action be taken by the members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency to resubmit the IDA appropriation bill.

PHILIP YOUNG,

President, U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Food Stamp Act of 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I support the food stamp bill because I think that it will benefit not only the low-income consumer but also the farmers and the general economy of the Nation, as well. It is incongruous that in a country which enjoys the agricultural abundance that ours does people should be subsisting on substandard diets. This bill will put our agricultural surpluses to their best possible use in helping to bolster the inadequate diets of hungry people.

The food stamp program is not an innovation in this country. We had similar national programs in the thirties and forties and the pilot program conducted since 1961 has proven the feasibility of this type of approach in fulfilling a desperate need among low-income families.

A food stamp program is eminently superior to direct distribution of surplus commodities, in my opinion. The pilot program has demonstrated this to be true. People are allowed to increase their consumption in meats, fruits, and vegetables and enjoy a more nutritionally adequate diet under a food stamp program. Retail food stores are able to increase their sales and at the same time relieve the Government of the expense of distributing the food.

The farmers also will benefit from this program. The pilot program brought about a 24-percent increase in the use of grains, directly and indirectly among the families participating. On a per capita basis, these families increased their direct consumption of grains and grain products from 4.8 to 5.2 pounds per week. Even more important was the increase in the indirect use of grains through consumption of meat, poultry, and dairy products. Here the increase went from 39.1 pounds to 48.4 pounds per person per week under the pilot program.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that there is no sauce in the world like hunger. This may be true, and perhaps there are some of us who should taste this sauce more often. But a steady diet of it is good for no one.

We are unique among all of the nations in the history of the world, in that we are plagued with the problem of being able to grow too much food for our people rather than too little. And yet a full one-fifth of our people are not able to obtain sufficient of the proper foods to eat decently. I cast my vote for the food stamp bill in order to erase this shameful anomaly from our Nation's picture.

A Noble War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in support of President Johnson's war on poverty, the Catholic Week edition of April 10, 1964, carried a very worthwhile and informative editorial on this important

legislation. This newspaper is the official newspaper of the Mobile, Ala., diocese and is published in Birmingham, Ala.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

A NOBLE WAR

President Johnson's war on poverty deserves the interest and consideration of every American citizen. For while a majority of the people enjoys its share of relative prosperity, an estimated one-fifth forms the "Other America," one far from the affluent image of the United States held by most foreigners and Americans themselves.

More people are working than at any other time in history, but chronic unemployment remains unchanged. While our colleges and universities are crowded with eager students, hundreds of thousands remain illiterate, never get past rudimentary education, or join the growing army of dropouts. Though the are of medicine improves daily, and while insurance programs arise to meet medical expenses, many cannot afford the pittance often required before service in clinics is administered.

The President has submitted a billion-dollar program to stamp out what he calls the plagues of our contemporary society—ignorance, disease, poverty, and unemployment.

The program calls for cooperation between public and private agencies. It seeks the support of State and local communities in the effort which will be financed largely—up to 90 percent—by Federal funds.

Some of the proposals are:

The establishment of a Job Corps for boys between 16 and 21 who would work on conservation projects, or who would receive vocational training and basic education.

The establishment of work-training programs for boys and girls in the same age bracket.

The establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps, which would hope to tap the same enthusiasm which has made its international counterpart so successful.

Health and education programs on the community level would be highly encouraged and financially helped.

The President's program has already run into much opposition. Critics complain of the cost. Fears are voiced that personal initiative will be dulled, and that Federal control will interfere with personal life. The program is considered by many as carrying us further down the road to socialism.

Although criticisms of specific legislation are healthy, they sometimes fail by oversimplification or dependence on half-truths.

The cost will be great. But, if over half the Nation's budget is earmarked for warfare, why not apply only a fraction of it to the welfare of the Nation's people, our greatest resource? Helping those who are ill housed, without work, education, or medical care is in keeping with American ideals, besides being the prerequisite for any program of preparedness.

Worry over loss of personal initiative is often naive, as if the only difference between the Oakies and the Rockefellers is willpower. Often the needy are all easily dumped into the handy, but unfortunate, category of the "undeserving poor." Hard facts can then be readily ignored. But living in economically depressed areas (such as Apalachia), lacking skills in the age of automation, not being able to finish school—these are circumstances which cannot be wished away.

The problem of Federal control would not exists if State and local machinery could, or would, assure proper housing, job training, medical assistance, and education to the truly indigent.

Cries of "socialism," however sincere, must not distract us from clear responsibility to fellow human beings. And Pope Paul takes it for granted that, as Christians, "We'll love all social classes, but especially those most in need of help, of assistance, of advancement. We will love children and we will love the old, the poor, and the sick."

History teaches that lasting peace is impossible for a nation tolerating social injustice and forgetting the poor. Each man must share the hunger and want of others everywhere. A person's freedom from hunger and want is neither a true nor secure freedom, until all men are free from hunger and want.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, I called to the attention of this body the fact that current planning for military hospital construction is proposing a drastic reduction in the spaces available for medical care to military retirees and their dependents. For example, current planning for the replacement for Letterman Hospital in San Francisco proposes a reduction of exactly 300 operating beds. A similar situation exists at other hospitals. Current policy, when implemented, will bring about a reduction of 2,937 beds from the constructed bed capacity of 9 existing military hospitals.

Today, I call attention to the fact that on March 24 of this year, according to the Associated Press, the United States gave to Communist Poland a $6.1 million grant to complete the building of a children's hospital in the city of Krakow in Poland. This will bring to a total of $10.4 million the U.S. contribution to that particular hospital, and will provide for a total of 300 beds therein.

It would appear that, in practical effect, we are deducting 300 beds from those available for our own military retirees in the San Francisco district alone, and transferring them to the city of Krakow, in Communist Poland.

It is an old adage that "charity begins at home." However, medical care for our own military retirees, who have preserved this Nation and made possible our ability to continue to distribute largesse around the world, is not charity at all, but the discarge of both a legal and a moral obligation. It would be bad enough if we were distributing charity abroad while denying it at home, but the situation is worse than that. We are distributing money as charity abroad, to nations which are our avowed enemies, which we still owe as an obligation to the longtime defenders of our own land.

The inconsistency as well as the injustice of the situation becomes even more apparent when we face the fact that these distributions of largesse gain us, not friends, but the ever-increasing bitterness and jealousy of the recipients. No better evidence of this fact is needed than what President Sukarno, of Indonesia, said publicly, in the presence of our Ambassador, on March 25 of this year, "I say go to hell with your aid."

It is high time that we restrained our spendthrift, giveaway policies, in favor of more consideration for our own people.

Wheat, Cotton, and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the arm-twisting tactics of the administration reached new heights, and the House was forced into passage of the wheat-cotton bill. This attack upon the public and our free enterprise system is hailed as a New Frontier victory, but in reality is a cruel blow to the public.

Today's Chicago Tribune contains a clear, concise and thought-provoking editorial on this subject which I place into the RECORD at this point:

WHEAT, COTTON, AND POLITICS

President Johnson, presumably with a straight face, said the passage by the House of the administration's farm bill "represented good judgment and economic progress" which will benefit farmers, workers, and taxpayers. It hardly does that. It does, however, represent the weak-kneed propensity of many Democrats in Congress, including House Democrats from Chicago, to submit to White House pressure, a fact that bodes ill for the taxpayers when more free spending administration measures come up for consideration.

The farm bill was an outright vote-buying scheme to win election year favor for the administration in the wheat-growing areas of the Midwest and the cotton-producing sections of the South. Accurate estimates of the cost are hard to come by, but $2 billion a year would be a conservative estimate of the assortment of subsidies the legislation offers wheat and cotton farmers, exporters, and textile mills. The administration relied on widespread ignorance and apathy toward farm legislation among urban voters, who will now have to pay the bill, to put it over.

The kind of "good judgment" that was displayed was illustrated in the vote trading that went on between the farm bill and the bill to establish a permanent food stamp program. The administration induced urban Congressmen who favored the food stamp plan to support the farm measure in return for rural support for food stamps. Having approved legislation to provide cheap food for poor people, the House then proceeded to approve a farm bill which the milling and baking industries and the American Farm Bureau Federation maintain will increase prices of wheat foods.

Even so, the farm bill passed by a narrow vote of 211 to 203. A switch of only five votes could have defeated it. President Johnson is credited by Washington political observers with having shored up the courage of 15 to 20 wavering Democrats in personal phone calls from the White House. Only 10 Republicans, representing mainly cotton textile centers, defected to vote for the bill.

Although they have lost in Congress, opponents who believe the legislation will hamstring the farm economy and heavily burden

consumers and taxpayers would appear to have grounds for challenging it in the courts. During the debate Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri Republican, questioned the constitutionality of the legislation.

He pointed out that the wheat section of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to collect as much as a half billion dollars annually from flour millers and wheat exporters under price support provisions. This authorization, said Representative CURTIS, was added in the Senate and makes the bill a revenue measure of substantial proportions. Article I, section 7, of the Constitution states that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House.

Representative CURTIS contends, moreover, that these provisions authorize what in effect are processing and exporting taxes, which are also unconstitutional. Beyond that, said Mr. CURTIS, the legislation gives the Secretary of Agriculture the direct power of taxation, "which this Congress has refused to give even the President of the United States."

These questions deserve to be cleared up. Taxpayers and consumers who have to foot the bill for subsidies designed to enhance the administration's chances at the polls next November at least are entitled to know if it's legal.

Wheat Argument Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Drew Pearson provides another chapter in the continuing wrangle over whether the United States should continue to fill Khrushchev's wheat-shortage hole. The Johnson administration wants to back away from the requirement that 50 percent of any shipments be in U.S. vessels. American unions object.

Here is Mr. Pearson's inside report on the latest argument, as printed in the April 12 Washington Post:

THE WHEAT ARGUMENT: CABINET MEMBERS, UNION LEADERS DISCUSS SALES TO SOVIET UNION

(By Drew Pearson)

Three Cabinet members attended a closed-door meeting with leaders of the Longshoremen's and the Seamen's Unions recently to try to solve the question of shipping wheat to Russia in foreign-flag vessels.

The issue involved a sharp conflict between American farmers and American labor as there is a probability that the Russians will buy more wheat next year if shipment at a low freight tariff is accomplished this year.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman told labor leaders that Russia was probably in the market for about $200 million worth of wheat next year, if the present contracts are fulfilled. This would mean a big lift to American farmers. However, if the unions force 50 percent of American wheat to be shipped in American vessels at a higher cost, further grain sales to Moscow are probably off.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk strongly supported Freeman.

Present at the closed-door session, in addition to Freeman and Rusk, were Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, and Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds. Representing labor were AFL–CIO President George Meany; Joe Curran, president of the National Maritime Union; Teddy Gleason, boss of the International Longshoremen; and Paul Hall, boss of the Seafarers International Union.

"You are putting us on a tough spot," Freeman said. "If we continue to enforce the 50 percent restriction, we will sell no more grain to Soviet Russian on anybody's ships. We have played out our hand."

"To put it another way, we will be forced out of the East European grain markets," added Rusk.

"Do you mean to say that you will sell in those markets, without the 50-percent guarantee to protect the jobs of American seamen?" asked Meany.

"Yes, I do," replied Freeman. "There won't be any protection for anyone if we are squeezed out of the market. We have to make up our minds pretty soon. I am looking at this in the national interest. I understand the problems of the maritime industry, but I also must think about our grain surplus."

"That's where you and I differ, Mr. Secretary," snapped Meany.

Joe Curran backed him up. "The real villains in this controversy," he said, "are the grain profiteers, the big private exporters who are not thinking of the national interest. They want to use cheap maritime labor on foreign flagships to transport the grain."

Curran pointed out that some Liberian and Panamanian vessels were owned by American interests, but were registered under a "flag of convenience," giving them arbitrary powers to fix wages below the American scale. He charged that the State Department had always countenanced this practice.

"Well, I'll have to deny that," bristled Rusk. "The State Department does not approve profiteering of any kind."

He added that his Department was trying to move grain to Soviet Russia and its satellites to fulfill a contract and was being seriously hampered by the 50-percent restriction.

"Unless we remove the restriction, we sell no more grain to Soviet countries. It's as simple as that," said Rusk.

"If you do away with the restriction, you are throwing the grain shipments up for grabs to the most unscrupulous operators," argued Gleason, head of the International Longshoremen. "What's to stop Russia from trying to use its own ships to carry our grain? My union doesn't make foreign policy, but if that happens let me tell you that our men will never touch a hammer-and-sickle ship."

Hall, the Seafarers boss, Curran, and Gleason brought out that they agreed to load and operate grain shipments to Russia only because Assistant Secretary of Labor Reynolds had assured them the 50 percent restriction would be maintained. Reynolds nodded his head in agreement.

One point developed was that for every bushel shipped, a subsidy of 7½ cents goes to the grain dealers from the U.S. Government.

There was also some acrimony over the claim of the big grain dealers that they could not get vessels over 32,000 tons into Russian harbors. Yet when Under Secretary of Commerce Martin went to Russia, they told him they could take any size ship.

Union leaders had proposed that the SS *Manhattan*, which has a displacement of 100,000 tons and doesn't require any larger crew than smaller ships, was available to carry wheat. But Continental Grain, Inc., gave the argument, later shown to be erroneous, that the Russians would not take the *Manhattan*.

Myer Feldman, economic aide to President Johnson, recommended that in view of the divergent positions, a grievance committee be established as soon as possible. This was done.

Just before the meeting broke up, Gleason remarked to Freeman: "We'll see you on the picket line, Mr. Secretary."

"I've been there before," replied Freeman.

"And he has too," said Meany.

King-Anderson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in an advertisement that appeared in the March 5 issue of the Courier, the Wayne County Medical Society criticized the proposal which I have sponsored together with many other Congressmen for hospital insurance for the aged under social security. The medical society calls the proposal bad medicine. This proposal, known as the King-Anderson bill, is, of course, not bad medicine. Nor is it good medicine. It is not any kind of medicine. The bill would simply provide an improved way for people to pay certain health costs in old age. People would contribute while they are working and are best off toward hospital insurance in old age when their incomes are reduced.

What reasons are given by the medical society for opposing the King-Anderson bill? The first reason is that the bill would only cover older people hospitalization costs and related health costs and would not pay doctor bills. That is true but it is also true that the King-Anderson bill offers older people better coverage than is carried by the majority of the aged who have health insurance. I have my suspicion that doctors would not be more favorable to the proposal if it provided broader coverage. In any event, with their hospital insurance paid for through social security, the money older people now spend on generally inadequate coverage could be used to buy private insurance against doctors fees and other kinds of health insurance. Thus, they could have far broader protection than any but a very few older people now can afford.

The medical society's second criticism of the King-Anderson bill is that the few well-to-do aged would benefit along with the other aged. But why should they not? People qualify for social security because they have contributed toward the program, not beacuse they have proved they meet a means test. That is the big difference that makes social security acceptable and public welfare programs demeaning to most Americans.

Also, the very wealthy aged would get relatively little out of the King-Anderson bill that they are not already getting through medical deductions on their income tax. Such deductions can produce tax savings amounting to more than three-fourths of their medical expenditures.

The medical society says that the King-Anderson bill would lead to the complete socialization of the medical profession. But the King-Anderson bill has

nothing to do with socialized medicine. And enactment of the bill would in no way change the fact that there is no support for the socialization of medicine in the United States. Most Congressmen are not doctors but they also are not as foolish as the medical society seems to think when it says it is inevitable Congress will adopt socialized medicine later if it improves social security now.

It was only a few years ago that organized medicine fought a losing battle against adding disability benefits to social security because it considered disability benefits in the European tradition and public relief to be the American way. Congress overrode the AMA objections then and very few people believe the AMA was right. I am sure that after social security hospital insurance is adopted just as few will believe the AMA was right in opposing this bill.

Even the medical society assumes the adoption of the proposal will gain its supporters votes. Even the doctors then seem to be agreeing that the people will like it. What better endorsement can the proposal have?

The Civil Servant: Who Is He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a series of articles by Morton A. Reichek, which appeared in the Staten Island Advance, March 25, 26, and 27, 1964:

THE CIVIL SERVANT: WHO IS HE?—OVERORGANIZATION CALLED WEAKEST LINK IN GOVERNMENT—PART 3

(By Morton A. Reichek)

WASHINGTON.—R.M. is a management analyst in the Federal aviation agency who has held executive positions in private industry. He has some penetrating observations about civil service.

"The weakest link in Government is overorganization in the middle ranks," he says. "There is a fetish about assistants. Every division chief has an assistant division chief. His boss, a bureau director, will have an assistant director and even a special assistant. His subordinate, a branch chief, will have an assistant branch chief.

"The assistants have authority but no responsibility. Each represents an extra channel through which all paper must flow. The assistant is the one man in ten to whom President Johnson alluded who is not productive."

Overorganization in middle management does not exist to the same extent in private industry, R.M. claims. "In business, you're always running against previous figures on labor costs, production, net sales, or profits. If you're not improving, you're under pressure to do so. One way is to cull the stuffing out of middle management. By and large, the same kind of pressure isn't here in Government."

But R.M. argues that the devotion to duty and the individual productivity of the average Government worker is generally on a par with that in industry.

A lawyer in a large regulatory agency, H.W. also defends the individual civil service worker, but criticizes the system:

"The Government fosters mediocrity. A good man can get lost. The tendency is to promote solely on the basis of seniority. In private business, a good man is identified early and can be moved up faster.

"In Government, it's hard to get rid of an inefficient person. You can eliminate his job. But if he has seniority rights, he can 'bump' someone else in a similar job who may be much better but has less seniority."

A longtime Government economist who quit to join a large Washington consulting firm, L.T. agrees that the Government "lacks a ready mechanism for weeding out the inefficient."

Often, he recalls, "it was the hack who was more adept at bureaucratic infighting and procedure than on doing his job who was able to hang on."

R.H. is an engineer for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who formerly worked for several aircraft manufacturers. He deplores tendencies to generalize that industry people are superior to Government workers, or vice versa. "On both sides," he says, "my experience is that you have some people who goof-off and some who break their backs.

"In NASA, I've seen groups organized for special assignments who have to sit around doing nothing when the job ends. But in private industry, working as a test engineer, we used to sit on our hands for hours waiting for mechanics to install an engine before we could touch it. This was because there were strict jurisdictional rules over who could do what. Doing similar work in Government, I've never been faced with this kind of waste."

Says E.G., a budget officer for the Navy Department with experience in private industry: "In any large organization, Government or business, you can't control what everyone is doing. You have to delegate authority. In the process, someone is going to take advantage. You can't completely keep track of everyone."

M.G. was an engineer for the Navy and NASA before joining a private firm. "You'll find the same ratio of competent to incompetent in both Government and industry. The 10 percent Mr. President talks about reflects the norm in the population. One guy in ten is always being carried by the others."

A.B. is a scientist in the Army who monitors defense research contracts. "From what I've seen," he says, "there are as many or more 'drones' in industry who live on cost-plus Government contracts than there are on the civil service payroll."

An attorney for the National Labor Relations Board, B.A., who was formerly on the staff of a major trade association: "Generally there is no more boondoggling and makework in Government than in industry. It's probably harder to fire the less productive person in Government. But even in industry, there's a tendency to paternalism which protects the deadwood, assuming the man has built up long tenure in his job."

O.E., an economist in the Defense Department, says, "Sure there's make-work in the military. For purposes of national security, you have to keep men in uniform ready to fight or to provide a cadre in case of an emergency. So you make work to maintain him in uniform.

"Then you put on civilians as part of the supporting establishment. But you can't apply normal standards to this kind of operation."

S.R., a top-level administrator in the State Department: "It's difficult to get rid of the inefficient. We have built-in checks to prevent arbitrary or political discharges. This inhibits getting rid of people not fitted for their jobs. Which is more important, the individual or the job? In our system, it's the individual."

THE CIVIL SERVANT: WHO IS HE?—LACK OF PROFIT DRIVE MAKES EFFICIENCY COMPARISONS DIFFICULT—PART 4

(By Morton A. Reichek)

WASHINGTON.—The charge is frequently made that the capabilities of individual Government workers and of Federal agencies as a whole are inherently inferior to private business because the profit-and-loss incentive for greater efficiency is missing in Government.

Thomas D. Morris, an Assistant Secretary of Defense who was for many years a private management consultant, sees some merit in this argument.

Says Morris: "Compared to top Government career managers, industry executives are more prone to be self-starters and to take greater risks. This is the custom in private enterprise. Man-to-man competition determines those who succeed to top responsibilities.

"Furthermore, the profit and loss environment—in which compensation is based directly on what the individual contributes to company profits—is a powerful day-to-day stimulus."

Morris sees offsetting factors, however, which favor the civil servant. "As a generalization," he says, "top-level career civil servants have more education and greater breadth of interests than their counterparts in private industry. The industry men are apt to focus their interests within a particular industry or profession."

Morris also claims that the Government official "generally tends to be more flexible and responsive to changes in leadership. He has learned to adjust to new programs and policies brought about by changing administrations."

The question of who is more efficient or productive—the Government man or the person in industry—can never be answered with any precision. The working conditions of the two sides differ so much that direct comparisons are not very meaningful.

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, recently made an off-the-cuff observation that the Social Security Administration can administer an insurance account at a substantially lower cost than a private insurance company.

But officials in the agency's Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance are embarrassed by the claim. They say it's unfair to compare their costs with a private firm's. Under the social security system, for example, employers are compelled to keep records for the Government which a commercial life insurance company would have to maintain on its own.

The Bureau of the Budget, which is pushing programs to measure productivity of Government agencies and individual Government worker output, cites two cases where private management consulting firms recently made comparative studies.

The consultants examined the Bureau of the Mint's manufacturing activities and the now-defunct Government-operated steamship line which operated from the Canal Zone to New York. The consultants concluded that the two government programs were more efficient than comparable private operations.

On the other hand, a recent audit of Navy shipyards and private yards by an accounting firm hired by the Pentagon showed that the private companies were considerably less costly.

In neither case can it be said that the conclusions reflect on the capabilities of individual workers involved.

The Budget Bureau's productivity measurement program is designed to give Government managers a tool, comparable to industry's profit-and-loss statement, to gage efficiency and to project budgets. In brief, the program determines the ratio of inputs of labor, money, and other resources to an agency's output.

Pilot studies have been conducted in five Government agencies. In the Treasury Department's Disbursement Division, which writes the Government's checks, and in the Veterans' Administration's Insurance Service, it was decided that measurements of productivity are feasible. Both agencies are essentially engaged in mass clerical operations.

But since most Government agencies do not produce a tangible item that has an easily measurable cost, it's unlikely that productivity measurement can be extended very widely in Government.

So far, the Budget Bureau's studies have shown that the rate of increase in Government productivity—in areas where this can be measured—is pretty much in line with the average 2- to 3-percent annual productivity rise attained in private industry.

The Bureau is also encouraging measurements of work output by individual employees engaged in routine, production-line types of activity. The purpose is to develop norms of performance—say, of a postal clerk—then to compare an individual's actual performance to the norm. No attempt has been made to relate the results to workers in private industry because of the difficulties in across-the-board comparisons.

THE CIVIL SERVANT: WHO IS HE?—AUTOMATION CUTS COSTS, HALTS INCREASE IN WORK FORCE—PART 5

(By Morton A. Reichek)

WASHINGTON.—A Veterans' Administration Insurance Service employee processes 2,000 policies a year, 4 times as many as 12 years ago, slashing handling costs per policy from $9.03 to $3.88.

At the Treasury Department's Disbursement Division, similar accomplishments have been made. The agency now issues roughly 200,000 checks and bonds annually per employee. Back in 1935, the average annual employee output was only 30,000.

Comparable hikes in output for mass clerical operations have been recorded by several other Government agencies.

These sharp increases in Federal productivity have resulted from Washington's pioneering use of automation in data processing and other managerial improvements.

The productivity advances have permitted the Federal Government to hold its overall rate of employment fairly stable during the past decade. This has been achieved in the face of an expanding population, a growing economy, and of what one official describes as "an increasing desire by people for more Government services."

There are now about 2.5 million civilian employees on Uncle Sam's payroll—about the level of employment in 1953.

Of this number, about 86 percent have job protection rights of the competitive civil service system. Most of the others work for such agencies as the FBI, CIA, AEC, TVA, and the Foreign Service which have similar merit systems, career benefits, and job protection rights. Only some 2,000 do not have these benefits and rights—Presidential appointees, top-level policymakers, and ones with special jobs "involving close personal relations" with these officials.

During the past decade, there have been some sharp ups and downs in Government job totals. Employment rose in 1961 and early 1962 because of the space program's expansion and military buildups in the Berlin and Cuban crises. But Government jobs now number 3,500 less than a year ago.

Despite President Johnson's highly touted talk of economy in Government, total civil service employment will not be reduced. The outlook is for a stable level of Government jobs over the next 18 months, assuming no crises in the domestic economy or in international affairs. A rise of about 1 percent, or 25,000, may even occur.

This is the overall picture. But the Defense Department plans to lay off about 70,000 civilian workers in the next 3½ years as nonessential bases across the country are shut down or scaled back.

Civil service, however, remains in the labor market. This year, for example, at least 250,000 persons will be hired just to take care of regular employee turnover.

While Federal employment may inch up in the near future, the goal is to trim the number of Government workers in relation to the total population. Ten years ago there were 146 Federal employees to every 10,000 people. In 1962 this ratio fell to 133 per 10,000 people.

Says B. B. Bray, Jr., staff director of a House subcommittee which has been investigating manpower utilization in the civil service:

"The cardinal problem in Government has been the lack of a hard-nosed, objective method of determining how many people you need to do a specific Government job. Too often in the past, this has been determined on the basis of historic precedent."

President Johnson's new policy is designed to correct this defect. By clamping tougher controls on Federal employment, the President wants to inject a greater sense of urgency in the drive to improve Government efficiency.

The goal is to revise such an appraisal of the Government worker as was recently made by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. A onetime vice president of Marshall Field & Co., Hodges has been in Washington for 3 years.

"I have in all candor and kindness," he said, "found two things that bother me in Government service. A small minority of us Government workers, us bureaucrats, if you please, are inclined to continue doing things that are unnecessary or outmoded or that plainly duplicate what others are doing. The second thing is the inclination of some of us to do a poor, inefficient job, and hide behind the liberal policies of the civil service to protect us."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Fishing for Fun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, one of the finest men that I have been privileged to know in my public life is former President Herbert Hoover, who recently celebrated his 94th birthday. When he was President of the United States, I was chairman of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries. In that capacity, to promote interest in Virginia in all phases of wildlife conservation, I helped to organize a large number of Izaak Walton League chapters. In recognition of the splendid contribution to the cause of better fishing being rendered by the then Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Herbert Hoover, the Virginia chapters of the Izaak Walton League had me present to President Hoover on their behalf a very fine bamboo fly-casting rod. A few years ago, I asked President Hoover if he still had that rod and he said that he did; that he had often used it, and that he treasured it very highly.

One of the finest speeches that any Government official has ever made concerning the Federal fisheries policies was made by President Hoover at an annual meeting of the Izaak Walton League in Chicago on April 12, 1924. That speech is too long to be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but since this is the 40th anniversary of when it was made, and a season of the year when the minds of all trout fishermen are thinking of dogwood blossoms—Virginia's State flower—oak leaves the size of squirrel's ears, and trout in limpid pools, eager to rise to a properly presented fan-wing Royal Coachman, I deem it to be both pertinent and proper to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts of Mr. Hoover's Chicago speech of 40 years ago.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One dominant thing lays upon my memory from a long ago reading of Izaak Walton. That is its placid flow of a calm and peaceful spirit; of good will toward men and fishes.

A fisherman must be of contemplative mind for it is often a long time between bites. These interregnums emanate patience, reserve, and calm reflection—for no one can catch fish in excitement, in anger or in malice. He is by nature possessed of faith, hope, and even optimism or he would not fish; for we are always going to have better luck in a few minutes or tomorrow. All of which creates a spirit of affection for fellow fishermen and high esteem for fish. These are the essential qualities of good fishermen. This should also be the attitude of good governments toward fish.

In the city of Washington, where I have temporary abode, this spirit does not always exist in matters of fish—and also other questions that you know of. You may have noticed lately a lack of harmony and friendly feeling amongst some of our residents. According to the public press, they even exchange mean and unpleasant remarks of one another on various subjects; for there are too few fishermen in public life. And there are vital national problems in fish.

There are large governmental problems affecting our game fishing. Obviously, these are matters in which State control is dominant. The contribution of the Federal Government is through assistance by scientific investigation, through rescue work and through the Government hatcheries. The depletion of our game fish is going on with heartbreaking acceleration in these past few years. The extension of the Federal and State activities in propagation is most urgent.

The automobile with its easy transit to all fishing centers and the growing spread of fishing as a stimulus to outdoor life makes it necessary that we should study the whole field of Government activities and inaugurate new policies. If we do not we shall see our greatest national instructor of the calm and contemplative mind fail right in the middle of a most hectic civilization. It can not become too long between bites or patience will not endure.

In these times of decreasing fish we are catching many fish which are still infants in arms, despite any State regulation to the contrary. Thus we are destroying our breeding animals. Hatcheries cannot propagate all the fish or even a small proportion. I wish to make a proposition to your league. Among your members are many fishing clubs who hold considerable preserves. Within these preserves it is possible that young fish could be protected until they have reached maturity and could be made a source of spawn in the surrounding streams. It is possible that cooperation could be set up with the Department by which the private fishing clubs could contribute something financially and by administration the Department could contribute much in the supply of young fish and scientific investigation, under which the clubs could take care of the matter from then on, maintaining the stock not only of their own streams but systematically spreading it into the neighboring streams, for every true fisherman must have an affection for his neighbors and especially for the barefoot boy where we all started our fishing careers. I would be glad if your league could set up a committee to study this subject.

I need not extol to you the joys of outdoor life, its values in relaxation, its contribution to real and successful work. All these things have been covered by your stimulating convention. The spiritual uplift of the goodwill, cheerfulness, and optimism that accompanies every fishing expedition is the peculiar spirit that our people need in these troublous times of suspicion and doubt. They ought all be sent fishing periodically, and if they are to be sent fishing we must build up the opportunities for them to fish. Life is not comprised entirely of making a living or arguing about the future or defaming the past.

Nor is this association formed solely for the extension of your own pleasure and gratification. You, as the men interested in fishing, have also a responsibility in the protection of our great food supply. It is through such organized support as yours that the policies which I have recounted to you of the Department of Commerce can be carried through to success.

Ralph Yarborough Day in El Paso County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, each of us knows full well the tremendous responsibilities and burdens which a senior U.S. Senator must carry. This is particularly true, of course, of Senators who represent States of large populations.

With these almost overwhelming responsibilities personal attention to local problems requires an almost superhuman effort and a fierce devotion to each individual citizen and his personal life.

This effort and devotion manifested by the senior Senator from Texas, our good friend and distinguished colleague, RALPH YARBOROUGH, has been paid well-deserved tribute by the citizens of El Paso, Tex., and it seems entirely appropriate to mark this honor.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution approved by the County Commissioners Court of El Paso County designating April 10, 1964, as "Ralph Yarborough Day" in El Paso County, follows:

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
County of El Paso:

Know all men by these presents, That—

Whereas the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, senior Senator from the State of Texas to the Congress of the United States, is a former resident of El Paso County; and is, therefore, well known to many of the residents of this county, and is familiar with many of the problems confronting the local government of this county; and

Whereas Senator YARBOROUGH has never failed to take an especial interest in matters affecting this county, and has on many occasions assisted El Paso County by furthering and sponsoring Federal Government projects for El Paso County, and has participated in many ground breakings and dedications, honoring this country with his presence, including the dedication of the El Paso City-County Building, the New Sun Bowl Stadium, and the John F. Kennedy Manor, among others; and

Whereas Senator YARBOROUGH has now introduced and is attempting to have the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch designated a national park, and is further assisting this

county with vital legislation relating to the Chamizal settlement; and

Whereas Senator YARBOROUGH will be in El Paso County on the 10th day of April 1964, and the El Paso County Commissioners' court is desirous of acknowledging his many contributions to this county, the State of Texas, and the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the El Paso County Commissioners' court, That the 10th day of April 1964 be, and it is hereby officially designated "Ralph Yarborough Day" in El Paso County, Tex.

Adopted in open court at El Paso, Tex., this 6th day of April A.D. 1964.

GLENN E. WOODARD,
County Judge.

Will We Have a Choice for All Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the Washington Post for April 11, 1964, there is published an article written by Bernard Nossiter, in which he discusses the difficulties which the American negotiators are having in trying to preserve the billion dollar-plus sales which our farmers enjoy in the Common Market countries.

Mr. Nossiter indicates in his column that the Common Market countries do not want to discuss and negotiate agreements on trade tariffs for farm products until 1966 at the earliest. Mr. Nossiter states that as a result the negotiators may have to strive for agreement to lower trade barriers on industrial goods alone, or permit the bargaining to break down in a stalemate.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the American farmer will not be sold down the river by our negotiators. Let America stand firm for once and if the agreements cannot be reached for all segments of our economy then let us have a postponement of negotiations until our overall economy can be discussed. For once, let us have at the bargaining table an understanding that our negotiators will stand for all Americans and will not make a choice of representing only the chosen few to the disadvantage of American agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mr. Nossiter, and I commend it to all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN FARM POWER MAY DASH U.S. AIMS

(By Bernard Nossiter)

PARIS, April 10.—Europe's politically potent farmers are likely to drive their American cousins from a large share of their billion-dollar-plus sales in the Common Market.

As a result, American negotiators in the Kennedy round of tariff bargaining may be faced with a very tough choice: to strive for an agreement to lower trade barriers on industrial goods alone or to let the bargaining break down in a stalemate.

These conclusions can be drawn from an interview given today by Edgar Pisani, the French Minister of Agriculture.

Pisani said that it was politically unrealistic to look for agreement on farm trade in the Kennedy round until 1966 at the earliest. Even then, he indicated, a deal is uncertain.

Whether there will be any farm agreement, he said cryptically, "is a matter of political will."

UNITED STATES MAY SUFFER

If the United States can't make a deal with the Common Market on farm imports, American produce exports are sure to suffer. This is because of two reasons: the Market is building strong, protective tariff walls around its farm output; and it is aiming at propping agricultural prices at levels that are almost certain to encourage increased production.

All this is of interest to more than just American farmers, whose political strength must be reckoned with anyway. U.S. officials have repeatedly said they will make no bargain to lower tariffs on manufactured goods unless they can also do something for agriculture.

Pisani talked quite candidly of the political obstacles blocking any early agreement on farm trade. He noted the United States and Britain will hold elections next fall and Germany and France in 1965. Under these circumstances, he indicated, no government will want to expose its farmers to new conditions so no farm deal is conceivable before 1966.

FARMER IS POWERFUL

American politicians are keenly alive to the strength of farm votes. But in Europe, Pisani observed, farmers are often even more important politically. In several continental countries, he said, the farmers hold the balance of political power. This is because urban voters are fairly evenly divided between Centrist and Socialist Parties or they vote along generally predictable lines. So governments here are under special stress to be kind to their farmers at the expense of foreigners.

For example experts outside the Government observe President de Gaulle has no hesitation about going to a distant country like Mexico and expecting triumphant greeting. But last month he postponed a trip he had planned to Picardy. The French press says he was fearful he would receive an ugly welcome from farmers to whom he had denied a raise in milk prices and given only a small increase in beef prices.

De Gaulle generally regards farm problems according to his aids as the concern of "grocers" or "quartermasters."

OUTLOOK CHANGES

But he's running for reelection next year. So when farm organizations here pressed the general for an interview, he didn't turn them down cold. Next week, he is due to make a television address to France that will deal, among other things, with farm problems. Pisani, in fact, left me to consult De Gaulle on his speech.

All this helps explain why American farmers and Kennedy round negotiators should expect a tough time in making a farm deal.

The United States has been urging the Common Market to guarantee American framers a share of Europe's rising food consumption. Pisani repeated the market position that no such guarantee is negotiable.

For its part, the Common Market has proposed bargaining over the amount of price support given farm products.

Christian Herter, the President's special trade negotiator, has said this approach is unacceptable.

For all these reasons, observers here are doubtful that anything more than a token deal will be worked out for farm products in the Kennedy round. If this view is correct, the administration will have to decide whether to back down from its insistence on a meaningful farm deal or to turn away from any bargain with the Common Market.

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, along with the continuing high level of unemployment there have been untold numbers of actual and potential jobs going begging for lack of skilled manpower. Additional evidence to support this contention has come from an article which appeared in the Washington Post of March 29. The article, headlined "Manpower Shortages Dot Some Industries," clearly shows the need for increased training of our labor force both as a cure of the unemployment problem and as a means of speeding economic growth:

MANPOWER SHORTAGES DOT SOME INDUSTRIES

(By David Fouquet)

While millions of people in this country are unemployed some occupations and industries are experiencing acute labor shortages.

These jobs are scattered over broad skill and economic levels, ranging from tailors to teachers and doctors, but many observers feel that by upgrading the skill of the labor force to fill the vacancies enough new openings would be created at the lower echelons to ease unemployment.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson last year said, "Many fields offer opportunities which are lying fallow because trained personnel is not avaiable to take advantage of them."

Representative TOM CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, has said "there are as many jobs available as there are persons without jobs," and that the solution "is to create skills to fill the jobs. By filling jobs that now need to be filled we actually would create new jobs."

Recently a Labor Department aid called on industry and labor to begin a program to overcome the "definite scarcity of skilled maintenance mechanics."

Although no statistics are available on the actual number of vacancies, a survey of various occupations and industries shows they exist.

A recent Government study showed the possibility of a substantial gap between the demand for new scientists and engineers and the number of trained persons available up to 1970.

The figures showed there would be about 1 million openings for scientists and engineers by 1970 but that there would be only 765,000 newly trained men and women to fill this need—a shortage of about a quarter of a million.

It is also estimated that by 1975 there will be a need for 3,600 more doctors a year.

Other health fields also are demanding personnel. Over one-fifth of the jobs budgeted in non-Federal U.S. hospitals were unfilled despite a 40-percent increase in nurses since 1955, the American Nurses Association reported.

A special manpower study group recently undertook the task of finding how the air-

line industry is going to fill at least 100,000 vacancies by 1970. Federal Aviation Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby said the airlines would need about 32 percent more people by then.

Pilots are in especially short supply. Because of the retirement of pilots trained during World War I and Korea. If there is continued deemphasis in manned military aircraft, the shortage may even grow wider.

United Airlines was recently looking for 350 pilots, and said 200 may be needed by the end of the year. Eastern has been hiring for months and says it will need about 630 new pilots between now and mid-1965. Pan Am also hired back 200 furloughed pilots recently.

The decline of foreign chefs coming to this country has created a shortage in the supply of chefs and cooks. A rise in wages on the Continent and the greater prestige chefs have always enjoyed there has cut the number coming to this country from 100 to 150 a year before World War II to 25 to 30 now, officials of the American Culinary Association say.

The average age of the current crop also points to an impending crisis. The average age is now 64, up from 55 in 1955. Some hotel chains and Government projects are training chefs to meet this lag.

Another profession which is watching its ranks diminish because of the retirement of its members and the lack of training for new blood is the centuries-old trade of the tailor.

A national tailoring consultant recently said that "there is an acute shortage of tailors in the United States and Canada," and added that the situation was acute and getting worse rapidly in smaller cities.

The growth of paperwork and mechanization in this country has also boosted the number of professional and technical workers 112 percent since 1947, of sales workers 28 percent, and of clerical workers 40 percent and the need for more is held to be growing constantly.

General Eisenhower's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1964, an article by Walter Lippmann appeared in the Washington Post.

It is entitled "General Eisenhower's Views," and its contents follow:

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S VIEWS

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has just published in the Saturday Evening Post a long statement of his present beliefs about the state of the Union. They can fairly be described as Goldwater minus the howlers about the graduated income tax, social security, TVA and the like. That is to say, General Eisenhower's position is that of the conservative right not of the radical far right.

His basic thesis is that there has been for 30 years under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier "a steady obvious drift of our Nation toward a centralization of power in the Federal Government." We have "an overbearing Federal bureaucracy that seems unchecked in both size and power." The net result of the "easy money and inflationary policies" of this Federal bureaucracy is that "the dollar you saved and earned 24 years ago is now worth just 45 cents."

This is a strange interpretation of the history of the past 25 years, and one thing we may be certain of is that General Eisenhower will never be hailed as a reliable historian. He was the Supreme Commander in Europe during the Second World War, he was the Supreme Commander of NATO in the cold war, and he was twice the President of the United States. Yet, incredible as it is, he has interpreted what has happened since 1940 without even mentioning the fact that the country has grown by 50 million people, that during these 25 years the country has fought the Second World War, the Korean war and the cold war.

How is it possible to talk about the rise in prices which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar by rather more than half without mentioning the wars and the preparation for war? As a matter of fact, half of the rise in prices occurred during and immediately after the Second World War; another 15 percent of the rise occurred during the Korean war. From 1953 to 1963 the rise in prices has been a little over 1 percent a year. The rise was just about the same under President Eisenhower as it was under President Kennedy.

If General Eisenhower is blind to the economic consequences of the wars in which he has played such a distinguished part, he exaggerates grossly the part played by the civilian sector in the growth of the Federal bureaucracy.

There has not been, as General Eisenhower says, an unchecked growth of the Federal bureaucracy. While State and local government employment has doubled between 1947 and 1963, nondefense employment in Federal Government was the same percentage (1.9) of the total civilian labor force in 1963 as it was in 1948. In fact, Federal civilian employment has not grown so fast as the population. There are now approximately 13 U.S. workers per thousand of population. Of these, five are employed in defense, three by the Post Office, one by the Veterans' Administration, and four by all the rest of the Federal Government.

Nor is it true that there has been a "consolidation of power and revenue in the Federal Government." While the share of State and local government in the national product has doubled since 1948—from 5 to 10 percent—Federal revenue as a percentage of the national product has increased only slightly—from 12 to 14 percent—and has not risen for 5 years. And if we take debt as a measure of activity from 1947 to 1963, we see that State and local debt increased 382 percent; private debt increased 279 percent; Federal debt increased 26 percent.

Thus, General Eisenhower has not painted a true picture of the state of the Union. It is not possible to paint a true picture of the state of the Union since 1940 by ignoring the three wars, by ignoring the growth of the population by as many people as live in Great Britain, by ignoring the preponderance of Federal employment (71 percent) in the indispensable functions of defense, the postal service and veterans' care, by ignoring the relatively greater growth of State and local activity, and by professing to believe that all the troubles and dangers of our age are due to the handful of civilian welfare measures.

It is just this refusal to recognize the facts of American life which accounts for the condition of the Republican Party today. General Eisenhower meant to speak for the moderate, prudent, and, in the correct meaning of the word, the conservative mass of our people. But what he says is so greatly out of touch with the realities—with what has happened, with what is happening, with what the people need to have happen in the future—that it lacks all credibility.

Winning Essay on the Life of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh County Republican Committee in the district that I have the honor to represent sponsors two essay contests on the "Life and Times of Abraham Lincoln," as part of the Lincoln Day celebrations, one being for senior high school students and the other for junior high school students of Lehigh County.

The winning selections are made by a board of distinguished educators from several hundred essays submitted. I am very proud of the fine students who are in this contest and the essays they submit. This year the contest for the senior high school students was won by Paul Hopstock, a 10th grade student at Emmaus High School, Emmaus, Pa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this winning essay, which is as follows:

THE WAR YEARS

(By Paul Hofstock)

But in your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You have no conflict, without yourselves being the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it." So ended Abraham Lincoln's first inaugural address. But this address was just the beginning of the most important period of Lincoln's illustrious career. During the years of the Civil War, Lincoln had to face some of the most pressing problems in the history of the United States. He took the great task of leading this country in the time of its greatest disunity.

What did the people see in Lincoln that made him the choice for the 16th President of the United States? His witty humor captured the attention of many people. To others it was his simple, sincere way of talking that aroused their enthusiasm. Here was a man who lived on a social level equal to many of the people he was to govern. He did not live in a great mansion. He worked for a living splitting rails. The people believed this man would lead well.

But by no means was Lincoln the choice of all of the people of the United States. The strongest feeling against Lincoln came from the South. The southerners considered the election of Lincoln a death blow to their right to continue holding slaves. The North already had control of both Houses in Congress, and the election of Lincoln seemed to put them in a position where they would have to follow the lead of the North. The Republicans had declared against the extension of slavery, and Lincoln agreed with that idea. Because of this stand, the southern people thought that their constitutional rights were being taken from them.

Lincoln won the election. One reason was that the Democratic Party was divided in its views, and it nominated two candidates. Because more than two candidates were running, more people voted against Lincoln than for him.

During Lincoln's campaign many of the Southern States said that they would withdraw from the Union if Lincoln were elected

President; South Carolina was the first State to make good its promise. By March 4, 1861, six other States had seceded.

Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor was Lincoln's first real test as the President. Lincoln met the problem forcefully by calling out the militia, blockading southern ports, and expanding the Army beyond the limit set by law. He also suspended the privilege of habeas corpus and spent money not appropriated by Congress. He justified these actions by making a brilliant speech. The following idea of his speech has never been answered by anyone:

"Are all the laws but one to go unexecuted, and the Government itself go to pieces lest that one be violated?"

During the early part of the war Lincoln's idea of the purpose of the war to unite the Union again. Lincoln expressed this aim in his letter to Horace Greely, editor of the New York Tribune on August 22, 1862, in which he said:

"My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or destroy slavery."

But by the late summer of 1862, he saw it was time to change his policy toward slavery. Without asking for advice from his Cabinet, he decided to issue a proclamation of emancipation. To be sure the circumstances would be favorable, he waited until the North had a victory. The proclamation made foreigners have different ideas about the war. They now considered it a battle between right and wrong, not merely a squabble between countrymen.

The Battle of Gettysburg gave Lincoln the chance to make his now famous Gettysburg Address, one of the greatest statements of democratic faith. It is the best known of the many speeches which Lincoln made.

By 1864 the Union forces seemed to be gaining strength, and the war seemed to be near its end. But the war went on, and Lincoln seemed to be losing followers for the coming election. The trend of the war changed, and the people swung back to Lincoln. By election time he received all but 21 of the 233 electoral votes.

In his second inaugural address, Lincoln foresaw that the end of the war was close at hand. Already he was planning for the Reconstruction period at that time. In his second inaugural address, one of the most beautiful of his speeches, he called not for vengeance but for charity, and not for malice but for unity. This plea showed that he was no ordinary man—he was something special. He did what was best for his country—something which few men have had the foresight to do. But this was Abraham Lincoln.

The 4 years in office had their effects on Lincoln. He looked pale and tired, and he even admitted to friends that he was very weary.

When Gen. Robert E. Lee surrendered on April 9, 1865, Lincoln had given Grant generous terms to offer to Lee and his men. Many believed that Lincoln was doing too much for the South. Louisiana's request for admission into the Union gave Lincoln a chance to answer his critics. He said:

"Will it be wiser to take it as it is and help improve it, or to reject and disperse it?"

A few days after this speech John Wilkes Booth assasinated Lincoln, and the life of one of the greatest citizens came to a close.

During Lincoln's administration many new things came to pass. The Government issued the first Federal paper money, completed the transcontinental telegraph, and established free mail delivery. The first military draft in the country occurred, and the first battle between ironclad ships also took place. The two States of Nevada and West Virginia joined the Union during Lincoln's time as President.

What can be said about Lincoln's Presidency? So many things that it would be impossible to write them down in any book. His kindness, gentleness, and understanding could never be put into words. These attributes are something that have to be seen or felt to really know what these kindnesses meant to the people around him. For what other reason would crowds of people have lined the railroad tracks just to see the train carrying Lincoln's body on its way to Springfield. At Springfield he was to be buried, his wife later joining him.

Lincoln may be considered as one of the world's truly greatest men. Under his leadership, Lincoln brought together a nation which was having its greatest split in history. Lincoln was also one of the true believers that democracy is the best form of all government. The war instilled this belief even more firmly in him. His speeches moved many people and many people quote them. Although he was President of the United States, he never lost touch with the common people.

But probably the greatest things that can be said about Lincoln are to quote his nicknames, "Honest Abe" and "Father Abraham."

L.B.J. Arrogance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a good insight into the "hands off" arrogance attending the Bobby Baker case and the general press agent deceit here in Washington is indicated in an article on page 23 of the April 10, 1964, issue of Time magazine. Blazing along at 85 miles per hour, President Johnson nonchantly ran a motorist off of a Texas road, according to this firsthand report. Who cares? Laws are for people not for the President. Bobby Baker, it would seem.

The article concluded:

Later, White House Press Secretary George Reedy—in a statement almost as foolhardy as the President's driving—tried to deny that Johnson had exceeded Texas' 20-mile-per-hour speed limit.

This is somewhat of an extension of the December 1962 statement of Arthur Sylvester that the Government has an "inherent right to lie" to protect itself from nuclear holocaust. Maybe Mr. Reedy and the President's apologists now believe that it is their inherent right to lie whenever it is necessary to put the President in a favorable light.

Like so many other things here, it indicates a pure arrogance of the American public. There is an election in November, remember? I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENCY—"MR. PRESIDENT, YOU'RE FUN"

A cream-colored Lincoln Continental driven by the President of the United States flashed up a long Texas hill, swung into the left lane to pass two cars poking along under 85 miles per hour, and thundered on over the crest of the hill—squarely into the path of an oncoming car. The President charged on, his paper cup of Pearl beer within easy sipping distance. The other motorist veered off the paved surface to safety on the road's shoulder. Groaned a passenger in the President's car when the ride was over: "That's the closest JOHN MCCORMACK has come to the White House yet."

It was like that during much of the Easter weekend at Lyndon Johnson's ranch outside Johnson City. The President may exude slow-spoken, sobersided sincerity during his public appearances in Washington. But let him get a whiff of a spring-fresh Texas range dotted with cattle and Angora goats, and suddenly he comes on like a cross between a teen-age Grand Prix driver and a back-to-nature Thoreau in cowboy boots.

"WHOOEEE—WHOOEEE"

One afternoon, the President gazed dreamily around his spread and sighed contentedly to reporters assembled: "The cows are fat. The grass is green. The river's full, and the fish are flopping." To prove it, he hopped into his Continental to play tour guide, invited in four reporters, including Hearst's pretty blond Marianne Means and two other newswomen.

More reporters and photographers scrambled into five other Johnson-owned vehicles, and the whole caravan jounced at high speeds across a pasture, zigzagging around dung mounds and clusters of fat white-faced cattle.[1]

At one point, Johnson pulled up near a small gathering of cattle, pushed a button under the dashboard—and a cow horn bawled from beneath the gleaming hood. Heifers galloped toward the car while photographers clicked away and the President look pleased. As he drove, Johnson talked about his cattle, once plunged into what one startled newswoman called "a very graphic description of the sex life of a bull."

Later, Johnson came across a sow with half a dozen tiny piglets. He stopped and told photographers he would pose for pictures with a pig "if you can catch one." They started chasing the little pigs, and just as Country Boy Johnson had known all along, the angry sow charged the frightened photographers. While the city slickers fell all over themselves eluding the sow, Johnson guffawed exhuberantly, honked his cow horn repeatedly and roared, "Whooeee. Whooeee." Finally a pig was run to ground, and the President dutifully posed. During the tour, Reporter Means, her baby-blue eyes fastened on Johnson, cooed: "Mr. President, you're fun."

THAT SKY

Through all the fun, the President sipped beer from his paper cup. Eventually, he ran dry, refilled once from Marianne's supply, emptied his cup again and took off at speeds up to 90 miles per hour to get more. Reporters in the cars behind could scarcely keep up, and all kept a wary eye on their speedometers. In the President's car, someone gasped

---

[1] Other U.S. Presidents were high-velocity types too. Ulysses S. Grant was fined for driving a horse-drawn carriage down M Street at an "unreasonable" rate of speed. Woodrow Wilson's driver scared the daylights out of newsmen by "reckless driving and excessive speed." In 1919, two reporters died in crashes while trying desperately to keep up with Wilson's car. In 1921, State cops clocked Warren G. Harding's car at 38 miles per hour as it zipped through Hyattsville, Md. The speed limit was 15 miles per hour, but no arrest was made. After he left office, Harry Truman was stopped for cutting in front of a patrol car on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. And Dwight Eisenhower used to be in such a hurry to get from Washington to his Gettysburg farm that reporters insisted they sometimes hit 100 miles per hour on narrow Maryland highways trying to keep up. In 1957, vigilant State cops ordered part of the Presidential motorcade to pull over, told trailing reporters they would have to obey the 55-mile per hour limit, but allowed Ike's car to whip along up to 70 miles per hour.

at how fast Johnson was driving. Quickly, Lyndon took one hand from the wheel, removed his 5-gallon hat and flopped it on the dashboard to cover the speedometer. Later, White House Press Secretary George Reedy—in a statement almost as foolhardy as the President's driving—tried to deny that Johnson had exceeded Texas' 70-mile-per-hour speed limit.

At sunset, after 2 hours of hair raising sightseeing, Johnson sped to a lonely granite knob that overlooks miles of ranchland. Suddenly meditative, he gazed at the stunning panorama before him. "Look at that sky," he said. "Why would anyone want to leave here and go back and fight."

Farmers Lose Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial, which appeared in the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News of last Friday, entitled "Farmers Lose Again," so well expresses my views and those of the people of my district I am inserting it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Not only did the farmers lose with the passage of the cotton-wheat bill. The entire country lost. I will repeat here what I wrote in my newsletter of April 2 to all the newspapers of my district with respect to the strongarming through the Congress, particularly the House, this unwanted legislation:

The arbitrary gag procedure they are following is an affront to the farmers, an insult to the House of Representatives and makes a travesty of the whole legislative process.

The editorial follows:

FARMERS LOSE AGAIN

About all that passage of the wheat-cotton subsidy bill has proved is that President Johnson can be a ruthless—and effective—politician when the chips are down.

Even so, the measure squeaked through the House by an eight-vote margin.

So the wishes of the Nation's wheat farmers, decisively expressed less than a year ago, have been circumvented. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has his way at last. He has argued that the new measure differs from his 1963 proposal, that it is voluntary. Sure it is—if you're in, you're taken care of; if you're out, you're out of luck.

Government now will be able to fix prices, manipulate supplies, handle stocks and dispose of surpluses. The wheat raiser will be dependent upon Government payments.

It has been said that present low livestock prices can be traced, in great measure, to Government determination to punish noncooperators in the feed grain programs of 1961 and 1962. With enactment of the wheat legislation, wheat will become competitive with corn and probably influence lower corn prices. This again could invite overproduction of all livestock.

If this happens, lay the blame where it belongs—at the door of the welfare staters, the ivory tower theorists, the whole kit and kaboodle of free enterprise enemies who have made such a mish-mash of the farm program for 30-odd years. The emphasis is on "odd."

Is Corruption in Government Inevitable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared for the Transmitter entitled "Is Corruption in Government Inevitable?"

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues. It is reprinted herewith:

IS CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT INEVITABLE?

It has been said that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." In the areas of politics and government we seem always to hear of corruption at all levels of government. Payoffs for zoning changes, "quickie profit" deals, gifts for favors, legislators performing dual roles of public representation of constituents and private representation of clients, and voting frauds are in our news headlines frequently. Reactions to these exposés range from "throw the rascals out" and "you can't fight city hall" to serious thoughts as to how to improve our system so that opportunities for corruption do not exist, or are, at least, not as plentiful. A previous article on these pages suggested that to expect real and lasting change to originate with political action was like hoping for a change in one's appearance to originate in one's mirror. Political action can be but a reflection of underlying ideas and real change then can only stem from a change in the basic beliefs of a society. Too often we "throw the rascals out" of a local, State or National government only to find that we have put other rascals in. Let's examine a basic, the sources of government power, to see if corruption is inevitable.

SOURCES OF GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY

The authority of government comes either from the people or from some source other than the people. This statement seems simple enough but let's examine some historical situations to understand its implications. Generally speaking, the ancient concept was that the authority of government came from a source beyond the people governed. Most often the source was heredity; the king ruled because he was the son of the previous king. Sometimes the source was conquest; the right to govern from the might to make it so. Often the ruler cited "the gods" as his source of his authority to compel people to obey him. But whatever the claimed source for the authority, it was almost never the people themselves. Their function was to obey, even worship, the government.

The modern concept is just the opposite—at least in theory. That is, government derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed." No person has any right by birth to rule over others and neither the institution nor the officials of government should ever be worshiped.

Certainly that is the traditional concept of the source of government authority in the United States. It was proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence, confirmed by the known philosophies of the founders of our Nation and is clearly written into our Constitution. Individual persons have natural and inherent rights and the purpose of government is to protect those rights. In fact, it was a government exceeding this proper function and depriving persons of their natural rights that led to the people rebelling and establishing our Government.

While the documents of other nations have phrased this idea differently, the modern concept of the source of governmental authority is still clearly identified as the people. Even Mr. Khrushchev makes his decisions in the name of the Russian people, and he claims that his authority comes from the people.

This brings us to one of the oldest of all philosophical questions: Does the individual have any rights other than those granted by government? If so, what are they and where do these fundamental rights come from?

INHERENT RIGHTS AT BIRTH

The contention is that each person does have individual and inherent rights at birth. It is true that this cannot be proved in a laboratory sense. But no human aspirations, ideas, or activities can be proved in that manner, for the laboratory requirement of "holding other things equal" can never apply to human beings in real life. Principles of human relationships can only be found by observing how human beings act universally, how they always have acted in real situations. Men always based their actions on the supposition that they have rights that inhere in themselves as self-controlling human beings. In fact, they cannot avoid doing so. For example, men always instinctively resist the persons who try to deprive them of life. And when they think about the issue after the danger is over, they invariably devise laws and institutions to protect their lives. Thus, since all men have always acted in this fashion, we are faced with a truth of universal human action that identifies a proper relationship among men—that is, a man has an inherent right to protect his life against anyone who attempts to deprive him of it.

Since this inherent and individual right to life comes with each person when he is born, the source of the right is above and beyond any governmental institution that men may correctly or incorrectly establish and support.

LIBERTY AND PROPERTY

In addition to a right to life, man also has an inherent right to liberty. And always men attempt to preserve their freedom of action. When they give it up it is always due to a superior force or to a lack of knowledge that their liberty is being lost. The fact that some persons may at a given time prefer the combination of bondage and security to the combination of freedom and responsibility proves only that men have different scales of values but does not deny the existence of the right to liberty.

In one way or another, men through the ages have instinctively attempted to preserve their property. If man has an inherent right to life, he has an inherent right to sustain it by the product of his effort. It is not possible that any person would ever have collected or created anything at all unless he had an inherent concept of ownership. This concept of a right to his own property came with the first man who ever used reason, and the source of his individual right to his legitimately acquired property is the same source that supplied him with life and the ability to reason. That source is obviously not government. Individual and inherent rights to life, liberty, and property do exist and always have existed. They exist because man is self-controlling and is thus responsible for maintaining his life, his liberty, and his property. If man had not generally followed this natural principle, he would have disappeared from this earth long ago.

LAWS FOLLOW RIGHTS

These three basic rights of all individuals did not come into existence because men es-

tablished governments—just the contrary. As the political economist, Frederic Bastiat, phrased it, "It was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed that caused men to make laws in the first place." In reality, the justification for having a government at all is to prevent any person from infringing upon the inherent and equal rights of any other person.

Do you know of any action now being performed by government that would be illegitimate and immoral for you to do as an individual? If so, here is a disturbing question: what is the source of the government's authority to perform that action? For if no individual possesses the right in the first place, it is self-evident that no individual can delegate it to government. Nor can two or more individuals legitimately do in common what is forbidden to them as individuals. Thus, if the government is doing anything that logic and morality forbid to all individuals, then the government's authority to perform that act is obviously derived from a source above and beyond the people.

Let us test this idea on specific functions now performed by government in the United States. For example, our Government has the responsibility for protecting equally the lives of all citizens. Is that a legitimate function of government? Well, does each person have a right to protect his own life? We know that each does. Therefore, if a person wishes, he can delegate that right to his government. Since each of us has the right individually, obviously we also have it collectively. Thus, we individually delegate to a common police force (government) the authority to protect us from domestic murderers and foreign invaders. That function of government is clearly legitimate.

Let's take another example. Do you as an individual have a legitimate right to use force or threat of force to compel me to sell my goods and services at whatever price you decree? You do not. Thus, you cannot logically or morally delegate to any agency (government) the authority to do what you do not have the right to do yourself. Nor does the fact that two or more persons do it together change the logic or morality of the act in any way. The fact is that our Government does enforce maximum prices and minimum wages. Where does it get the authority for those actions? Obviously not from the people who have no such right in the first place. Thus, the authority must come from a source above and beyond the people—a reversion to the ancient concept of government.

The same line of reasoning applies to liberty and property. Since each of us has these rights, we also have the right collectively to delegate to Government the authority to defend them for us and to charge us for the cost of doing it. There is nothing mystical about this process; we do it because we can thereby get better protection for less money.

At this point you may say to yourself, "But the majority of the people voted for it, and that is the source of the authority. Isn't that the democratic way?"

SOME USES FOR THE VOTING PROCESS

The answer is clear. As a mechanical process for selecting the President or a mayor, the democratic procedure is just fine. But as a process for distinguishing right actions from wrong actions, it is totally invalid. When you get right down to it, the blind acceptance of the compulsory rule of the majority is closely akin to the age-old idea that the strong have a right to rule the weak—might makes right. In this case the "might" is not a conquering army but a 51-percent voting majority of the people.

Even if a majority of the people vote for slavery—slavery is still wrong. Voting has nothing to do with this issue one way or another; slavery is wrong because no person has a legitimate or moral right as an individual to enslave another person. Even a 98-percent vote in favor of enslaving the other 2 percent cannot justify the action. If anything, the fact that the majority freely votes for an immoral and illegitimate action makes it all the worse. We could and would fight any tyrant who attempted to impose viewpoints upon us. But democratic majorities cannot be opposed in that fashion; they can only be pleaded with. And maybe these words are a plea. Let us not destroy the process of rational thought, or use our hard-won franchise as a sort of a plaything, and vote for mere whims. Let us rather use our vote to prevent any individual or a group from ever telling peaceful persons what they must and must not do. Any other use of the franchise will ultimately destroy it as a means for the practice of freedom.

As another example, consider religious problems. If a majority vote really could determine right and wrong, we could easily solve all religious problems now before us by having a national election to determine which particular religion we should all be compelled to follow. Most certainly you would consider the democratic process to be an improper method for determining that issue. Moral issues can never be settled by a show of hands.

LEGALITY VERSUS MORALITY

In the United States today the vote of the majority determines what is legal and illegal, and no change in that process is advocated here. But that legalities determine moralities is not accepted. As a minor example of the confusion that exists between legalities and moralities, take the issue of drinking intoxicating liquors. The "prohibition" amendment to our Constitution did not make the drinking of whisky immoral; it merely made it illegal. Nor did the repeal of that amendment make the drinking of whisky moral; it merely made it legal again. The use of alcohol is a moral and medical and economic question, and thus its rightness or wrongness can never be determined by a vote of the majority.

But the confusion is so great today that we need only to make a thing legal to give it moral standing among the vast majority of the people. Are you in that majority? If you are in doubt try this test: how do you distinguish a right action by government from a wrong action by government? Can you, without using the concept of majority vote, write out an answer that satisfies you? If you can, include yourself in the increasing minority who are seeking a basis for collective government action that is more permanent and fundamental than the passing whims and passions of imperfect people.

The solution that was propounded by the founders of our country still seems the best—that all rights begin and end with the individual; that every person has an inherent right to his life, liberty, and property; that he may exercise his rights fully, so long as he does not violate the equal rights of others; that we may delegate the defense of these rights to our government; that any action that is illegitimate for persons is automatically illegitimate for government; and that we should never regard government as any more sacred than any other useful organization that provides us with specialized services we want at prices we are willing to pay.

Liberty Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a column appeared in the Washington Daily News, Monday, April 13, 1964, written by Mr. George Clifford and Mr. Tom Kelly. I have never met nor talked to either of these reporters. The column implies that I am supporting an organization called the "Liberty Lobby" that has been extremely critical of the Republican leadership supplied by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Congressman CHARLES HALLECK. This impression is totally inaccurate and misleading.

I was invited to participate in a school of politics panel, to be held Saturday morning, May 2, 1964. This panel is sponosred by the Government Educational Foundation. The invitation was first extended to my staff by phone and later by letter, dated April 4, 1964. One paragraph in the letter is indicative of what I considered the objective of the panel to be:

> Would you please tell the students the most effective way to contact a Congressman, both by letter and personally. Some of the mistakes that people make in trying to influence Congress would be extremely informative, as well as particularly effective means and methods with which you may be familiar.

At no time in the invitation was the Liberty Lobby mentioned. In fact, the panel to which I was invited is sponsored by the Government Educational Foundation and it takes place Saturday morning. The meeting sponsored by the Liberty Lobby is another gathering and it takes place Saturday evening. However, lest there be any confusion about my position, I am today writing the Government Educational Foundation advising them that I do not intend to appear on the panel.

Any statement or any implication that my acceptance of this seemingly routine invitation was an endorsement of the Liberty Lobby or an endorsement of their criticism of the Republican leadership is unfounded, unwarranted, and untrue.

L.B.J. Deceives American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable when the President of the United States should embark on a course of deceiving the American people about their sworn enemy. On Sunday, April 12, 1964, the front page of the Washington Post contained a two-column headline which proclaimed "Johnson Welcomes K. as Peace Apostle." What an affront it is that the chief spokesman for our Nation should refer to the butcher of Budapest, the man who put missiles in Cuba, the man refuses to pay his U.N. assessments, the man who is today running a network of subversion throughout the world, as a peace apostle. This is sheer deceit and I do not believe it will fool the American people. More than any statement to date, it clearly shows the ineptness of

Lyndon B. Johnson to be President of the United States.

In his press conference, the following colloquy is reported:

Question. Mr. President, Mr. Khrushchev had some complimentary things to say about you and Mr. Rusk during his tour of Hungary. I wonder how you feel in response, sir?

Answer. I am glad to see that Mr. Khrushchev is playing the role of peace and seeking to preserve peace in the world. That certainly is the desire of this country. When he talks in peaceful terms, he will always have our ear.

Is the President really so naive as to believe that Mr. K. is an emissary of peace? If he is, are we safe as a nation and a people? Or is he so arrogant as to believe that the poor, common people are not smart enough to see through the obvious deception of his effort to paint Nikita Khrushchev in any other color than red, blood red? Does the President believe that any American would honestly believe that the Kremlin gangsters are relenting in their ruthless drive to enslave the world? What must the people of the Iron Curtain countries think when they see our Chief Executive bow and scrape before their oppressor? How can you explain Mr. K.'s role as an apostle of peace to the people of Poland, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and the thousands who are in concentration camps?

Has Mr. K. ever publicly retracted his threat of burying us? Little has changed, despite Mr. Johnson's rose-colored glass approach, since Premier Khrushchev told the world the simple facts of life at Warsaw, Poland, in April 1955. He said:

We must realize that we cannot coexist eternally, for a long time. One of us must go to his grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They [Americans and westerners] do not want to go to their grave. So what can be done? We must push them to their grave?

Does the President not know that the Communists are still an internal threat to this country? Consider the record of Soviet spying during the past year alone. It is not necessary to recite the long list of espionage and treason cases. Just look at a few of them:

July 1: The State Department ordered Gennadi G. Sevastyanov, a Soviet Embassy cultural attaché in Washington to leave the United States for attempting to recruit a Russian-born employee of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency as a Russian spy.

July 2: The Federal Bureau of Investigation arrested four persons and charged them with conspiring to spy for the Soviet Union. Ivan D. Egorov, a personnel officer at the United Nations, and his wife, Aleksandra, were arrested in New York and later sent back to the Soviet Union in return for two Americans held by the Russians. Also arrested were a Washington couple using the names of Robert and Joy Ann Baltch.

July 19: A Federal court jury in New York convicted Navy Yeoman Nelson C. Drummond of conspiracy to commit espionage for the Soviet Union. He received life imprisonment.

October 10: The Defense Department disclosed that Sfc. Jack E. Dunlap, a former clerk-messenger for the National Security Agency, had sold secrets to the Soviet Union over a 2-year period before committing suicide last July.

October 29: The FBI arrested an American electronics engineer and a chauffeur for a Russian trading agency on spy conspiracy charges. Two Soviet diplomats were arrested and then released because they had diplomatic immunity. A third Soviet diplomat was named in charges filed by the FBI but he was not apprehended.

I repeat my question. If Mr. Johnson believes Mr. K. is an apostle of peace, are the American people safe?

Imports of Kentucky Blue Grass Seed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the serious and imminent problem of agricultural imports has now been compounded by another threatened industry; namely, the producers of Kentucky blue grass cleaned seed.

South Dakota is the largest producer of Kentucky blue grass seed of any State in the Union. The industry adds over $4 million each year to the State's economy and produced over 17 million pounds of seed in 1960.

But this industry faces serious future problems if immediate action is not taken to curb the foreign competition which is flooding the domestic market. The estimates from the Department of Agriculture concerning imported Kentucky blue grass seed show that the tonnage has increased over 12 times the 1957 level of import. In 1960 only 4 million pounds of seed were imported, but in 2 short years, the total had tripled to a figure of 12 million pounds in 1962. Although the 1963 figures are not yet established, over 12 million pounds had been cleared for import by late February, and the total influx is expected to soar to a record high of 15 million pounds for 1963.

The primary foreign producers of the imported seed are the European countries. Much of the seed is inferior in that 75 percent of it has a Poa Anna weed content. This weed has been declared noxious in some States.

Like the other suffering industries in our economy which are facing great losses at the hands of increasing foreign products which annually flood the market, the blue grass seed producers do not ask for total elimination of seed imports, but do urge that realistic quotas be promptly established.

The foreign seed is certainly not imported for reasons of domestic need. The 25 million pounds of seed produced right here in the United States is an ample supply for annual use in this country.

The producers of Kentucky blue grass seed are now making their pleas for realism in our import policy and entire trading philosophy. We have witnessed the devastating effects of imported beef, veal, lamb, wool, mutton, dairy products, fruits, and other commodities upon the domestic market. Without immediate action we may add another casualty to the long list of private enterprises which are being ruined at the hands of foreign importers and free traders.

Republican Spokesman's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the April 14, 1964, Washington Post, Walter Lippmann comments very fairly and succinctly about the recently published beliefs of General Eisenhower and his personal Republican philosophy.

I concur in the conclusions expressed by Mr. Lippmann below and hope that those people who profess total adherence to political organization and the statements of their spokesmen will analyze the operations of the Federal Government and draw the conclusion that the necessity for change in the world today to meet the kinetic forces require some governmental spending and actions and an analysis of all economic factors must be done in a fair and nonpolitical light.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Walter Lippmann's column of April 14, 1964:

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S VIEWS

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has just published in the Saturday Evening Post a long statement of his present beliefs about the state of the Union. They can fairly be described as Goldwater minus the howlers about the graduated income tax, social security, TVA, and the like. That is to say, General Eisenhower's position is that of the conservative right not of the radical far right.

His basic thesis is that there has been for 30 years under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier "a steady obvious drift of our Nation toward a centralization of power in the Federal Government." We have, "an overbearing Federal bureaucracy that seems unchecked in both size and power." The net result of the "easy money and inflationary policies" of this Federal bureaucracy is that "the dollar you saved and earned 24 years ago is now worth just 45 cents."

This is a strange interpretation of the history of the past 25 years, and one thing we may be certain of is that General Eisenhower will never be hailed as a reliable historian. He was the supreme commander in Europe during the Second World War, he was the supreme commander of NATO in the cold war, and he was twice the President of the United States. Yet, incredible as it is, he has interpreted what has happened since 1940 without even mentioning the fact that the country has grown by 50 million people, that during these 25 years the country has fought the Second World War, the Korean war, and the cold war.

How is it possible to talk about the rise in prices which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar by rather more than half without mentioning the wars and the preparation for war? As a matter of fact, half of the rise in prices occurred during and immediately after the Second World War; another 15 percent of the rise occurred during the Korean war. From 1953 to 1963 the rise in prices has been a little over 1 percent a year. The rise was just about the same under President Eisenhower as it was under President Kennedy.

If General Eisenhower is blind to the economic consequences of the wars in which he has played such a distinguished part, he exaggerates grossly the part played by the civilian sector in the growth of the Federal bureaucracy.

There has not been, as General Eisenhower says, an unchecked growth of the Federal bureaucracy. While State and local government employment has doubled between 1947 and 1963, nondefense employment in Federal Government was the same percentage (1.9) of the total civilian labor force in 1963 as it was in 1948. In fact, Federal civilian employment has not grown so fast as the population. There are now approximately 13 U.S. workers per thousand of population. Of these, five are employed in defense, three by the Post Office, one by the Veterans' Administration, and four by all the rest of the Federal Government.

Nor is it true that there has been a "consolidation of power and revenue in the Federal Government." While the share of State and local government in the national product has doubled since 1948—from 5 to 10 percent—Federal revenue as a percentage of the national product has increased only slightly—from 12 to 14 percent—and has not risen for 5 years. And if we take debt as a measure of activity from 1947 to 1963, we see that State and local debt increased 382 percent; private debt increased 279 percent; Federal debt increased 26 percent.

Thus, General Eisenhower has not painted a true picture of the state of the Union. It is not possible to paint a true picture of the state of the Union since 1940 by ignoring three wars, by ignoring the growth of the population by as many people as live in Great Britain, by ignoring the preponderance of Federal employment (71 percent) in the indispensable functions of defense, the postal service and veterans care, by ignoring the relatively greater growth of State and local activity, and by professing to believe that all the troubles and dangers of our age are due to the handful of civilan welfare measures.

It is just this refusal to recognize the facts of American life which accounts for the condition of the Republican Party today. General Eisenhower meant to speak for the moderate, prudent, and, in the correct meaning of the word, the conservative mass of our people. But what he says is so greatly out of touch with the realities—with what has happened, with what is happening, with what the people need to have happen in future—that it lacks all credibility.

The Kind of Citizen I Hope To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an essay by Miss Gay Brummitt, 16 years of age, from my hometown of Bowling Green, Ky.

Miss Brummitt will receive the Lucille M. Wright Citizenship Award at the Girls Club of America annual conference in New York City this week, having won the Girls Club national citizenship contest over 60,000 girls in the Nation on the basis of this winning essay and her activities in her local club.

The essay is as follows:

THE KIND OF CITIZEN I HOPE TO BE

The kind of citizen I hope to be is a good, honest citizen. But as a good citizen I will have to be educated and informed on the events of my community, State, and Nation. Our late President in his Nashville, Tenn., address said, "Only an educated and informed people will be free people * * * the ignorance of one voter in a democracy impairs the security of all."

The definition for the word "citizen" is a person who by birth or choice is a member of a State or Nation. I feel that if you do not take an active part in running your country you cannot call yourself a good citizen. We have many privileges in America but they are not any greater than our obligations. A good citizen will meet these obligations with the best of his ability. There is a great need for community workers. The community worker will find it a blessing to help the people of his community and work for a better place to live in peace.

It is my responsibility to the future generation to work and pray to keep America's image of freedom, democracy, and Christianity alive. I will have to be faithful to my country and be willing to defend it at any time. Also, I will have to understand and obey the Constitution of the United States. Above all, I must love God and keep His commandments. This is the kind of citizen I hope to be.

GAY BRUMMITT,

BOWLING GREEN, KY.

A Shortsighted Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in his column in Newsweek magazine of March 23, Henry Hazlitt discusses the proposed interest equalization tax, which has passed the House and is now before the Senate Finance Committee. Pointing out that the cause of our persistent balance-of-payments deficit has been our Government's own policies, Hazlitt observes that the interest equalization proposal is a shortsighted measure. The administration, rather than facing up to the results of its own policies, has chosen to blame foreign investment for the continuing balance-of-payments deficit and to penalize American citizens for buying foreign securities. This attack on foreign investment is in spite of the fact that income from foreign investment is a major plus in our balance of payments. The United States is the financial center of the world, but the administration seems willing to give up this national asset through the interest equalization tax proposal.

Henry Hazlitt's column discussing this issue follows:

SHORTSIGHTED TAX

(By Henry Hazlitt)

On March 5, the House passed by 238 to 142 the administration's bill imposing a tax on the purchase of foreign stocks and bonds by Americans. It was a sad day for freedom of international investment. From the standpoint of the longrun national interest, it would be hard to imagine a more shortsighted measure.

The bill was passed ostensibly as a cure for the "deficit"—the net outflow of our dollars and gold—in our international balance of payments. Since the end of 1957, this deficit has been running at an average rate in excess of $3 billion a year, and has reached a total of more than $18 billion.

The cause of it has been our Government's own policies. For 30 years, with minor intermissions, we have been following a policy of inflation. The cost of living has more than doubled. Since the end of 1939 the supply of dollars has been more than quadrupled. Since the end of 1957 our active money supply has been increased 14 percent. When we count time deposits, our money supply since the end of 1957 has been increased nearly 40 percent. During this period our Government has granted more than $24 billion, or $4 billion a year, in foreign aid. We have run a cumulative deficit in the last 6 fiscal years of nearly $38 billion, or some $6.5 billion a year.

BLAMING SOMEONE ELSE

On top of all this our monetary authorities have deliberately been holding down both short-term and long-term interest rates. This has been done "to encourage employment and economic growth," but its effect is to discourage foreigners from investing here and to encourage Americans to invest abroad.

But under no condition will the administration admit that the deficit in our balance of payments is the result of its own policies. It is determined to blame something or someone else. So it has decided to blame foreign investment and to penalize Americans for buying foreign securities.

Its decision to pick on the purchase of foreign securities as the scapegoat is purely arbitrary. If foreign lending and investment must be the villain, why not tax or forbid short-term bank loans abroad, or direct investments in new plants? Out of scores of major items in the international balance sheet that cause a net outflow of funds the most obvious is foreign aid, which has been running at some $4 billion a year compared with the total annual payments deficit of only $3 billion. The next most likely candidates are "luxury" imports of all sorts, from French perfumes to German cars. Or foreign pleasure travel by Americans.

ONLY TEMPORARY?

Instead, the administration has pounced on the least plausible item. In the 5 years 1958 to 1962 the aggregate net outflow of $16.6 billion for new foreign investment was offset by $15.4 billion of income from previous investment. Even Secretary Dillon concedes: "In the long run the outflow of American capital to foreign countries is more than balanced by the inflow of income earned by that capital." At best, then, the tax is shortsighted. When we give away foreign aid we get no money back. In the long run reducing foreign investments must mean a corresponding reduction in our exports.

We have succeeded only in the last 30 years in making the United States the financial center of the world. Why kick this national asset away?

The proposed tax is being officially urged "only as a temporary measure to meet our problem pending more fundamental solutions." But no fundamental solutions are being considered. Such solutions would be

to balance our budget, to halt our inflation, and to permit our interest rates to go to levels that would halt or even reverse the pressure for lending or investment abroad. Instead the administration is cutting taxes, planning continued huge deficits, and insisting that money be kept cheap.

The proposed tax, therefore, will not cure anything. If the situation grows worse, the administration will look for other scapegoats—for example, foreign travel—to blame, tax, and control. And if foreigners suspect this intention, the foreign investment tax will have exactly the opposite of its desired effect.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to find words for the expression of adequate tributes to a man of the stature of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. One of the fine tributes to his memory appeared in the Catholic Standard on April 10, which I submit here for insertion in the RECORD:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

The outpouring of tributes to Gen. Douglas MacArthur are more than accolades to a successful and magnanimous soldier. In a sense, they are tributes to the American ideals which the general epitomized. His conduct of the administration of conquered territories, even more than his military valor and skill, gave a noble expression of the ideals which this country cherishes.

The touching tributes from Japan are not only of concern to the bereaved family of the general and his close friends. They are deeply appreciated and will long be cherished by the grateful country that the general served. All humanity will be benefited as long as it remembers the example of the general's policy of wisdom and benevolence by which he turned an implacable foe into a warm and devoted friend. That policy excluded from the outset any motive of vengeance which sullied the first program for the governing of Germany and it resolutely barred the Red machinations to proliferate misery and chaos. His assessment and protection of the Emperor's status saved Japan and us from a dreadful contest for governmental power.

The cordial relations that we now enjoy with the Philippines stem largely from the same wisdom and magnanimity of the general. His father, before him, had charted the same course. Both had appreciated the potential contribution and destiny of this Christian land, poised like a mission post, in the Far East.

Above all, the general was a proud and vocal exponent of the American ideal. His pride in the national heritage was inspiring. He had an exalted concept of the American mission to the world and never fell prey to the error of national self-abasement which afflicts those who do not appreciate that mission. He was, at times, flamboyant and he never claimed that he was not is withal a great American hero and we, with those whom he helped, should be grateful that he was prone to the errors which afflict all mortality. He lived in our day. May God grant his soul eternal rest and may the good Lord keep fresh in our memories the ideals that he cherished.

The Navy's First Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the U.S. Navy, assigned to submarine duty, it is a distinct honor and a privilege for me to mark the occasion of the 64th anniversary of the Navy's first submarine. Had it not been for the tenacity of the inventor and builder of the Navy's first truly submersible boat, John P. Holland, a self-taught Irish immigrant, the history of our country might well have been written in different ink.

It was on April 18, 1900, that the U.S. Navy took possession of its first submarine, the *Holland*. This little craft was 53 feet long, and could make 7 knots on the surface and 5 submerged. It could travel a maximum range under water of 40 knots without coming up.

John Holland was 30 years old when he came to this country in 1872, joining his mother and two brothers in Boston. He got a job teaching in a parochial school in Paterson, N.J. After 7 years of full-time teaching and part-time tinkering, he quit teaching to devote all of his time to the design and construction of a workable submarine. He had already built an unsuccessful pedal operated 15-foot craft and had many failures and disappointments before building the *Holland*.

But Holland had mechanical genius and persistence in abundance—the two essential qualities of the really creative inventor. It was not the endless number of technical problems that inevitably occur that hampered Holland for these were a stimulant and a challenge. What often frustrated him was old-fashioned thinking and bureaucratic redtape.

In these early years the attitude of the Navy can be described as curious, but highly skeptical. But there were enough convinced people to persuade Congress to appropriate $150,000 in 1888 and invite bids from the several submarine designers of the day. A Holland design was chosen in the following year but the whole project was shelved until 1893 when Congress appropriated $200,000 for a new competition. Holland won again and this time the work went forward, with the inventor forming the John P. Holland Submarine Boat Co.

Work began in 1890 on the *Plunger*, with an 85-foot hull, which was to have been the first American submarine. But the construction was closely supervised by Navy engineers. During part of the time Holland was ill and a number of changes were made without his approval. Progress was slow because each new step had to be approved through channels. The result was a submarine that could not meet the requirements originally set. Holland knew the *Plunger* would fail and set about building a submarine of his own, at the company's expense. The *Holland* was launched on St. Patrick's Day, 1898. After 2 years of frustrating efforts to interest the Government, the boat was purchased in 1900 for $150,000. It had cost the Holland Co. $236,615 to build.

Even though it had passed what were considered by some to be impossible requirements the Navy was still not convinced. There were a few officers who felt strongly that the Navy should begin building submarines. They expressed their opinions before Congress, contradiciting their superiors. Ironically the top brass in England and Germany also scoffed at the submarine. Within a few years both nations were locked in a deadly sea battle of attrition with the traditional British maritime supremacy threatened by German U-boats.

After the *Holland* was acquired Congress appropriated money for seven more submarines of an improved design even though the Navy Department was indifferent. This next design became the first submarine to be accepted by the British and Russian Governments. The Holland Co. trained their first crews, as it did the first U.S. Navy crew.

Thus, the acceptance of the submarine by the United States, and the genius of this dedicated inventor had a worldwide impact. The United States originally looked upon the submarine as a short-range craft suited mainly for a defensive role close to our shores. Within a few years it was to become one of the most potent strategic weapons ever used in war, and its unrestricted use against American shipping brought this country into a World War.

No one ever again doubted the value of submarines and the U.S. Navy submarine service played a great role in World War II. Let us hope that the most modern and destructive undersea craft of all, the Polaris nuclear-powered submarines, will by their presence contribute to the security of the free world and make reckless aggression a thing of the past.

Impact of Federal Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, we often hear expressed in this body great concern over foreign competition. Our domestic manufacturers' need for protection from foreign competition has been stated so often that the applicable terms are almost clichés in our legislative language.

Our Federal Government's buying policy is not adding to a solution of this important problem.

I know of a number of important contracts that have been awarded to foreign manufacturers when our domestic manufacturers were perfectly capable, and in fact anxious, to provide the goods. It is

clearly time for us to take a long, hard look at our buy-American policies.

One of the finest industrial minds in America, Mr. Donald A. Holden, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., Newport News, Va., recently discussed one aspect of the foreign competition problem in an address before the Conference of Bank Correspondents of the First and Merchants National Bank in Richmond, Va. His remarks, which he entitled "Impact of Foreign Competition on Heavy Industry," would be most interesting, I believe, to many of my colleagues, and I would like to insert Mr. Holden's address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The address follows:

IMPACT OF FOREIGN COMPETITION ON HEAVY INDUSTRY

(By D. A. Holden)

We speak of foreign competition but what we really mean is the usurping of a growing segment of our domestic market by our friends across the seas.

Manufacturers of capital goods in this country are, to varying degrees, up against a losing battle when it comes to foreign competition, particularly in items that have a high labor content. In a number of important equipments and in certain basic materials produced by heavy industry, European and Japanese manufacturers have outstripped demand in their own domestic and local markets and are selling in the United States at prices below our costs, in spite of tariffs and transportation costs. To a large extent, these manufacturers are using plants built with U.S.-aid funds. Many lines of endeavor now have excess productive capacity insofar as world demand is concerned—shipbuilding is in this situation—many items of machinery such as hydraulic turbines and large electrical equipment, other prime movers, large cranes, certain transportation equipment and some steel products are similarly troubled.

It is only natural that I should talk some about the shipbuilding industry and it also serves the purpose of this topic well. We have practices and problems that are common to both shipbuilding and heavy manufacturing. Consider a comparison of 1962 hourly earnings in shipbuilding including legally required fringe benefits (negotiated fringe benefits are, of course, in addition to these figures):

United States	$3.01
Sweden	1.69
France	1.25
Norway	1.09
West Germany	1.08
Denmark	1.08
Netherlands	1.00
Great Britain	.96
Italy	.84
Japan	.73

Labor rates in shipbuilding in the United States are reasonable representative of rates in heavy industry and are from 2 to 3 times rates in Europe and 4½ to 6 times rates in Japan, depending on how fringes are allocated

Increase in rates—call it escalation or inflation—currently is about 3 percent per year in the United States and anywhere from 4 to 9 percent per year abroad. Even if we were to freeze wages in this country, it would be years before foreign labor rates would catch up with ours.

Oddly enough, and for a variety of reasons, material, and to some extent equipment, costs in these countries are not widely different from our own costs, but the labor differential alone is sufficient to make it impossible for U.S. firms to compete in the world market for ships and certain other items that have a high labor content. Japanese ships are sold for prices a little more than one-half of U.S. prices.

The comparative competitive situation is further complicated by practices in many foreign countries because of the introduction of subsidy in one form or another in the pricing of ships for export and, to a varying extent, heavy machinery—either for reasons of bringing in foreign exchange or of providing employment in State-controlled industries, or both.

For example, the Japanese had a practice recently, and it may still obtain, whereby a shipyard was permitted to buy a given amount of sugar in the world market and sell it at home at the local pegged price, thereby turning a substantial profit. In return for this the shipbuilder agreed to sell a certain number of ships in the world market at prices below his cost—thus providing foreign exchange for the country and work for people at home.

Other countries have made direct and indirect subsidy of shipbuilding for export to varying degrees. About the only one that has not done so thus far is Great Britain.

We have also seen in recent years where very liberal credit terms have been guaranteed by foreign governments for ships and other items for export.

These practices are expected to continue in one form or another in many areas due to overcapacity in world shipyards and much of the world's heavy industry. This overcapacity is due to rapid plant expansion since the war, a large part of which was financed by our foreign aid programs which provided the means and ofttimes the machinery for building new and modern plants. Methods and machines abroad are as up to date as ours, and in some cases more advanced than ours.

Let me emphasize that American industry has not been standing still by way of improvements in plant and methods. Purely from the domestic competitive aspect of shipbuilding, millions have been put into plant and costs have been reduced. From statistics based on one large class of product—cargo ships—costs, by rates and indexes, have risen at least 8 percent in the last 6 years, yet selling prices have declined about 18 percent in actual dollars. In other words, there has been a net real reduction referred to base of about 25 percent. It appears that margins may have suffered heavily, but it is definitely apparent that a large part of the reduction has been in more efficient production. Also part of the cost reduction is due to lesser costs of installed major components; i.e., heavy machinery—this equipment having gone through the same price squeeze as ship construction—i.e., improvement in manufacturing efficiency being reflected in lower prices in spite of rising labor costs.

Yet the fact remains that our labor costs are so much higher than our foreign competitors that they can undersell us in the world market for ships at prices one-half to three-fourths of our prices. They, too, have improved the efficiency of their operations.

You may wonder why we are still in business. We exist because of national policy and national expediency. Our Navy from the point of view of national security in the development of fighting ships cannot afford to have its designs known to others outside the country—also they must retain control of shipbuilding and ship repair capabilities. Our merchant fleet exists and operates under laws that have been national policy. Since the early times of our country, all coastal and intercoastal trade must be by American-flag vessels; and since 1936 a segment of our foreign commerce must be carried on American-flag ships on what have been determined as essential trade routes. This is for purposes of national self-sufficiency and defense practice as well as protection against being at the mercy of others for transportation of vital commodities. Many of these merchant ships operate under Federal subsidy both as to building cost and operation cost. However, unlike many subsidy programs, better than half of the Federal funds expended find their way back into the Treasury.

To digress for a moment with respect to the American shipbuilding industry, assuming that you have some interest and curiosity concerning it: In the private industry sector there are some 15 yards capable of building moderate- to large-size vessels plus about 70 small yards where the business is essentially ship repair. Total employment in this industry is about 115,000 and the industry as a whole has the capability with existing facilities to do several times the business it now enjoys. The industry itself has a bad name for being cyclical but it is not about to collapse in spite of the rise and fall of some companies in it. Lest some of you, who may be stockholders or otherwise interested in the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., may feel from the foregoing that our prospects are gloomy, let me point out that our position in the industry is unique. We have not, for many and varied reasons, fluctuated widely in workload, nor in our corporate performance—we consistently reinvest in plant—$67 million in the last 17 years (all out of cash flow)—our current enrollment is 19,000 employees or about 17 percent of the entire private sector of the industry. We have a backlog of about $375 million (largest in the industry).

To return to our theme of some of the facets of foreign competition:

I believe it is rather generally agreed that wages in basic industry in this country have advanced more rapidly than the productivity of labor in spite of all that has been done in investment in plant and equipment and methods to improve efficiency. In many basic products and equipment, while the labor hour content of the product is less than it was a few years ago, the labor dollar content is more; also depreciation costs have risen sharply as a related item. In the last 15 years, looking at some of the major indexes, cost of living has risen nearly 40 percent and output of productive workers, happily enough, and due to improved plants, has increased by over 55 percent, but hourly earnings of these works has increased over 100 percent, i.e., twice what they were in 1947.

Although we have had a rather fantastic growth in U.S. industrial production and increase in gross national product, it has come about with a narrowing of the gap between relative prices of U.S. equipment and prices of foreign-made equipment delivered in the United States—in fact the gap has closed and even reversed in the case of some products.

Looking at the steel industry briefly: From 1940 to 1958 labor costs, i.e., rates plus fringes, rose at an average rate of 8 percent per year (compounded) and total costs per man-hour rose at about the same rate. Productivity increased, through management methods and plant improvement, at a rate of about 2 percent per year, compounded. Recognition of this inflationary trend and other considerations in 1958 and 1959 led to a slowing of the trend from 1959 to 1962, with man-hour costs rising at about 3½ percent per year with productivity still advancing at the rate of 2 percent. In the last 2 years it appears that man-hour costs have been held somewhat closer, equal to about 2 percent per year which is the same percentage increase as is experienced for productivity.

I cite the foregoing information from the steel industry not only because it is available from many studies that have been made, but it is also quite typical of what has been happening to U.S. industry since World War

II. Heavy manufacturing has, by and large, followed steel in the wage pattern and to some extent in the fringe benefit pattern.

Steel, in the past few years, has experienced appreciable inroads from foreign competition. Last year over 5½ million tons of steel were imported, which is 7 percent of U.S. consumption. (Incidentally, the United States exported 2 million tons last year, down from 5 million tons 6 years ago.) The most noteworthy imports were inexpensive and commonly used items made of common steel rather than in the specialty alloys. Wire nails, barbed wire, reinforcing bars for concrete can be, and are being, delivered in our Midwest at prices that are tending to undercut domestic producers. About 40 percent of consumption of these items comes from abroad today. Some sheet and strip products are finding their way in and a few specialty items also—notably polished stainless steel sheet from Japan. Heavier products are not quite competitive yet—of interest to us in shipbuilding, however, is the fact that steel plate from West Germany can be delivered to east coast ports, including transportation and 10.5 percent duty, at a price about 5 percent above domestic list prices. Today Japan will quote only for long-term delivery due to heavy demand at home—their prices are, however, not quite competitive with our own. This close margin has existed for several years and there have been times when U.S. shipyards have purchased foreign steel due to shortages in supply in the domestic market when pipelines and similar construction were using large quantities of steel plate.

The aforementioned increase in steel imports and decrease in exports not only mean less work in our own mills and fewer jobs, but it also means less taxes to Federal, State, and local governments to the extent of $33 for every ton. This should be a matter of concern to our Federal authorities.

One of the oddities of competing with our friends across the seas has been brought to public attention by the steel industry. Equalization of tariffs is only part of their difficulty in selling abroad. The United States charges only the specified import duties—foreign countries, to varying degrees charge several times this amount through adding to import duties such items as transmission, turnover, sales and stamp taxes. Thus the true export selling costs for U.S. producers is much higher in proportion. In addition to this, there have been many instances of "dumping" in the world market by foreign steel producers.

Turning now to an example of foreign competition making heavy inroads on a domestic activity, let us look at the hydraulic turbine industry. While it is a small segment of the economy, it is a specialized product involving a fairly high percentage of labor in design and construction. This is another industry that we at Newport News know something about as we have been in this business since 1920.

An hydraulic turbine is a prime mover that produces power by means of falling water. When coupled to a generator, the resulting power produced is electricity. Such turbines are large custom-built machines weighing many tons which require engineering, laboratory facilities, and large machine tools. These machines are highly developed with respect to design, having been improved and refined over many years, thus leaving little opportunity for U.S. ingenuity to make radical cost-saving innovations that might improve the competitive position.

By far the largest buyer of hydraulic turbines is the Federal Government, through the agencies of Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, and TVA. The total business in hydraulic turbines is not large, averaging about $27 million a year; but it is vital to our economy and security as has been proved in past emergencies. The industry is supplied by four manufacturers in the United States, three capable of building the largest and one that builds small- to medium-sized units. The electric generators that go with these turbines are similar specialty items and have experienced the same competitive situation. The world capacity to produce both turbines and generators is at least twice, if not more than twice, would demand.

While there have been a few cases in recent years where American turbines and generators have been exported to foreign countries, in each instance it has been so only because the plant in question was being built with U.S. aid funds which required purchase of American machinery.

Our Government agencies for domestic application have purchased their turbines under the Buy American Act, but this act has been supplemented or modified by Executive Order No. 10582. You probably are not familiar with this Executive order but, believe me, we who struggle with foreign competition every day are familiar with it. By application of this order, our Government agencies buy foreign if the low bid, including tariff, is as much as 6 percent below the low American bid.

The frustrating aspect of the Government's buying policy is that numerous committees and agencies have studied the problem and their conclusions have been:

1. The industry's trained personnel, large machine tools and facilities are essential to defense.
2. The country wants the industry retained.
3. The industry's problem is serious.
4. The Government will maintain a continuous watch over the situation.

The Government's degree of concern has been hard to find. In 1962 the Federal Government awarded four hydraulic turbine contracts to foreigners and one domestic. We lost a job for the Bureau of Reclamation in 1963 by being only 13 percent above a low Japanese bid. Unfortunately, such a policy has spilled over into certain municipal governments and public authorities that buy such equipment and they are buying foreign in many instances. There have been many instances where Japanese bids have been as low as 60 percent of American manufacturers' bids. European prices, including the 15 percent import duty, have been 10 to 15 percent below American prices on many occasions. It rather looks to us as though the foreign companies can charge what the traffic will bear and bid just under the American effort. Incidentally, the tariff on electrical machinery is 12½ percent.

We have constantly sought relief in Washington to check this disappearance of our market on the basis of:

1. National security.
2. Outflow of gold.
3. Effect on our general economy.

We are now also seeking some means of being placed on a more nearly equal basis with our foreign competitors. By such I mean some equalization factor to compensate for our having to abide by such laws as the Walsh-Healey Act, minimum wage law and others. Our foreign competitors are exempted from compliance with such law and regulation.

The effect on our economy when an individual or a private company buys a piece of equipment abroad is quite different from the occasion when the Federal Government makes a similar purchase. In each case there is an addition to the net amount of gold that will flow out of the country but there the similarity ends. The individual buys his equipment for less money, his capital structure and therefore fixed charges are less and, other things being equal, he makes a greater profit (of course he has to give half of this increment to the Government in taxes).

On the other hand, the U.S. Treasury is affected by both the outgo of funds for purchases and the influx of funds from taxes accruing from the transactions and operations of our economic system.

Assume our Government buys a machine at $1 million. Let us make reasonable assumptions as to manufacturing profit and income taxes on individuals' wages and trace the cycle back through subcontractor furnished material of second and third tier, etc., to the source; i.e., all materials or finished products are essentially all labor. Taxes taken by Treasury probably amount to 25 to 35 percent of the million—say 30 percent or $300,000 as a reasonable estimate of direct return so that the machine actually cost the Government $700,000. And if this reasoning is pursued further with respect to the $700,000 put in circulation, there will be additonal tax return to the Treasury—assume what you want, the return tends to approach the offsetting of the cost; certainly it reduces the net cost to less than the foreign price. Call this fallacious (sophomoric) economics if you wish—there is something to it; pick your own percentage—at least the money stays in this country.

Compare this with buying the machinery abroad for, say, $600,000. The Government saves money on the purchase but—the money joins the gold outflow account—and none goes into circulation here.

This is pretty elementary arithmetic but it's hard to see where it cost our Federal Government much, if any more, to purchase this machine at home—and there would be the added advantage of keeping the money at home.

We must all keep in mind that the reduction in volume of business in any industry or the elimination for our economy of that industry is simply a reduction in gross national product. Even in and expanding economy we cannot afford to have any deletions, except for the things that no one uses any more. It is absolutely false to argue that there is no effect on the economy because people who lose jobs due to an industry's decline, as a result of foreign purchasing, will find jobs elsewhere and that companies will find other products to make. The true fact is that the jobs have been removed from our economy completely and our total activity and gross national product are less by that amount.

We should buy the foreign things that we lack—basic metals that we do not have and Scotch whisky and French perfume and the like. As citizens, however, we should insist on a Federal policy of buy American. As members of the business community we should if at all possible take the larger view of the interplay of all factors in our economic structure, realizing that the good of the whole is, in the long run, the best for the individual.

Top Party Politicians Join in Tribute to Howard Hannah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Mr. J. Howard Hannah, of Springfield, Mo., lost his life in a tragic automobile accident in Florida. Howard had earned the title of Missouri's Mr. Democrat. A lawyer by profession, he had served for the past 22 years as general chairman of the traditional Democrat Jackson Day dinner in Springfield. Although of the

opposite political faith, our relations always were cordial and friendly, and his broad smile was a trademark to all who knew him. Our heartfelt sympathy is extended to his lovely lady and survivors. The following excerpt from the April 11, 1964, Springfield Daily News indicates how devoted he was to the cause he championed, and the respect in which he was held by those who knew him best:

TOP PARTY POLITICIANS JOIN IN TRIBUTES TO HOWARD HANNAH

"We have lost a great Democrat * * * a great American * * * a great friend."

These were typical statements from Democrats great and small yesterday, from Washington, St. Louis, Kansas City, Jefferson City, and Springfield, as word spread of the death of James Howard Hannah in an auto accident.

Springfieldians close to him were shocked, top party politicians stunned. He had left here after his most triumphant Jackson Day Dinner, for his annual vacation in Florida. The accident that killed Missouri's "Mr. Democrat" happened there.

County Democratic Chairman Arch M. Skelton, attending a regional meeting of Boy Scout leaders in Omaha, Nebr., said last night he heard of the death about 11:30 a.m. Friday.

"The news of the tragic death of Howard Hannah and injuries received by his lovely wife was received with sadness," Skelton said.

"Howard was general chairman of Jackson Day for the past 22 years, and he was loved not only by Democratic leaders throughout the Midwest, but also by a vast number of devoted friends in the Springfield area.

"He worked unceasingly and with great dedication to the Democratic Party, for his church, and for the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. I have been very close to Howard these past few years in connection with my chairmanship of the Democratic committee, and there was never a time when I asked him to do a job for the party that he didn't immediately accept and proceed to accomplish.

"I will sadly miss this close personal friend. I am relieved to hear that his lovely wife, Margaret, was only slightly injured."

"The greatness of Howard Hannah was the service that he rendered for other people," said State Attorney General Thomas F. Eagleton last night. "He sought little for himself but desired to do only what he could for his legion of friends."

Eagleton's was only one of scores of voices raised in praise of Hannah. Earlier Senator STUART SYMINGTON, in Kansas City when he heard of the death, declared:

"In the tragic death of Howard Hannah, Missouri has lost a great American and a fine citizen, and I have lost a close and valued friend. To his gracious wife, Mrs. Symington and I extend deepest sympathy in her tragic loss."

Greene County's T. E. (Ted) Von Willer, county recorder and longtime friend of Hannah, said: "We have lost a great Democrat. Howard has been a good friend of mine ever since I've been involved in politics in Greene County."

Declared Tom Greenwade, a baseball scout, "My associations with Howard Hannah have been more than pleasant. I feel that the community has lost an outstanding citizen, not only from the political standpoint, although he was of course a staunch Democrat, but also as a man.

"It is hard to express your feelings at such a shock as this."

Judge William R. Collinson, one of Greene County's most popular Democratic officeholders, declared: "I have known Howard for 30 years and in the last 10 years he has become the best known Democrat in the State of Missouri.

"His whole hobby and work has revolved around the Democratic Party and he will be badly missed by both the people in the State and at national level. He was a tireless and effective worker, especially in connection with the Jackson Day banquet, which he ran singlehandedly, and which had grown to be the biggest thing of its kind.

"He will be hard to replace."

The Bobby Baker Case Should Not Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Lawrence Collins, Sr., printed in the Long Beach Independent on April 9, indicates what I gage to be a fairly accurate summation of the way very many Americans regard the Bobby Baker case:

DARK STAIN ON THE WHITEWASH

The Bobby Baker case ought to be called the case of the U.S. Senate. This is the view or Columnist Roscoe Drummond—and probably of most of the American people. Drummond goes on to say: "The abrupt—and kindly—termination of the Baker investigation may take the heat off somebody—but it is going to take the heat off the Senate itself."

The Reporter magazine gives much the same impression: It tells how the Senate Rules Committee carefully refrained from calling any Senators as witnesses although there was clear evidence that some had made large profits from association with Baker—who was the secretary of the Democratic Senate organization. It is estimated that during his 9 years as secretary of his $19,000-a-year salary, he built up a fortune of millions of dollars, all from projects that involved the influence he exerted in his job.

Drummond say, "Of course, Bobby Baker has few defenders—and fewer friends on Capitol Hill today. His onetime close associates—Senators and former Senators—can now hardly remember his name though not long ago they were always saying—ask Bobby—call Bobby—tell Bobby. He was the clearinghouse for the Democratic Senators on voting and influence."

Apparently Baker is to go free of prosecution or further questioning. The Senators do not want any more testimony in this election year. Some of them cannot afford to have the facts of their association made public to their constituents as they stand for reelection. So the whitewash is to be as complete as it can be when the press and public still are asking questions.

It is considered in bad taste to remind the public that, during most of the 9 years of his fabulous maneuvering, Baker was under the leadership of the majority leader of the Senate—Senator Lyndon Johnson. It has been charged that Baker was a part of negotiations to sell advertising on the Johnson-owned television station in Austin, Tex. Another negotiator named was Johnson's longtime aid, Walter Jenkins. But the Senate committee refused to call Jenkins as a witness.

During these years, Senator Johnson must have known about some of Baker's improper financial transactions. If he did not, he displayed a lack of insight and authority that does not speak well for his executive ability. It, therefore, is reasonable to assume he considered such activities as proper—and just a part of the political game. The President has refused to discuss the case since it has become of national prominence.

It is a dark stain on the Senate and the whitewash it is permitting. It leaves the impression that too many Members of the Senate have profited from such influence peddling to have their actions brought out into the open. It is a sordid example of why the people lose confidence in the integrity of their officials. When Baker took the fifth amendment so he would not incriminate himself, it probably was a great relief to those who had worked so closely with him.

Charles A. Buckley, Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives: His Record for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of the House a short review of the many accomplishments of our distinguished colleague, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY. Few men in our time have contributed so much to the welfare and growth of our Nation through the legislative process. Mr. BUCKLEY is the able Representative of New York's 23d District, Bronx County. He is in his thirtieth year as a Member of Congress and for 12 years he has been chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY is a modest and unassuming Member of the Congress. During his long tenure of service he has consistently avoided the limelight. All who know him recognize him as a stalwart, honest individual. We also know him as a leader in advancing the Nation's welfare. I rise to cite his record of accomplishments and to commend him on behalf of his colleagues and the American people for the job he has done and is doing for this country.

The committee must also deal with flood control, a crucial instrument in the protection of American lives and property. Clear thinking and good planning under Mr. BUCKLEY's leadership today means life and property saved from flood tomorrow.

Flood control also means electric power. The huge dams authorized by the Committee on Public Works are sources of hydroelectric power, as vital to the individual consumer as to the businessman. The power generated by the flood-control projects helps move the wheels of industry in nearly every part of our Nation.

Important byproducts of the manmade lakes created by these dams are new water recreation areas used by millions of Americans, where they may enjoy swimming, boating, and water skiing. Within the land area immediately adjacent to these dams have arisen fine campsites and other land recreation areas. This is just one more benefit of the flood-control program, and records indicate that each year more Americans are taking full ad-

vantage of these facilities in all parts of our country.

Probably the most striking product of Mr. BUCKLEY's work is the vast network of new highways that cross our Nation, linking major cities and providing the avenues over which our defense apparatus can move in times of national emergency. Along these highways moves the American trucking industry, carrying the goods of our country from one section to another and providing thousands of jobs for those within the industry and for those whose livelihood depends upon it.

Mr. BUCKLEY's work, particularly in committee, has affected and benefited all American citizens.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works covers an impressive array of vital Government activities, including the improvement of the Nation's rivers and harbors; flood-control projects which protect life and property, generate electric power, and provide recreation areas; the vast multibillion-dollar Federal highway program; the construction of public buildings; the operation of the mighty Tennessee Valley Authority; and the creation of permanent new public beaches and prevention of beach erosion.

The committee is responsible for the improvement of our Nation's lakes, streams, rivers, and ports. All waterborne navigation, whether commercial or recreational, benefits from the rivers and harbors legislation from the Committee on Public Works. The vast job of keeping the channels of our rivers clean, the constant dredging operations, the protection of our navigable streams and waters, are all helped along by enabling legislation from Mr. BUCKLEY's committee.

It can be truly said that the waterborne commerce of our Nation travels not only on our streams, lakes, and rivers, but also through the Public Works Committee. The widespread effect of this legislation becomes strikingly clear when one considers the impact of improvements of rivers and harbors on our waterborne commerce and on the sizable portion of our country's goods carried by it. Rivers and harbors legislation is of vital importance to the economic well-being of the United States.

This new Interstate Highway System provides means by which the American citizen may travel freely to all portions of the country not only in his business pursuits but in seeking relaxation for himself and his family.

The entire Federal-aid highway program has come into being as a direct result of the Committee on Public Works and Mr. BUCKLEY's leadership. In 1956 the committee authorized the greatest single public works program in the history of the world—the 41,000 miles of Interstate System which will, when completed, link all our major cities. This program and the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems have poured into our economy billions of dollars and provided an untold number of jobs for men in all sections of the country. As a direct result of this highway program, the automobile industry and its companion industries, such as steel, concrete, asphalt, and rubber, have received a fantastic boost in their economic development.

The scope and magnitude of this road program is breathtaking and its overall effect on our national way of life has been tremendous. It has not only changed and stimulated our economy but has made us indeed "a Nation on wheels."

As one travels over these fine highways one can be thankful for the foresight and ability of CHARLES BUCKLEY, who fought so vigorously to see that this program came into being.

The program most readily associated with the Committee on Public Works is the construction of public buildings. For 30 years prior to 1959, as a result of the great depression, World War II, and the Korean war, the Federal public building program was at a standstill. Realizing the crying need for action in this field, Mr. BUCKLEY's committee authorized the Public Buildings Act of 1959. The great impact of this legislation on the public building program is known to us all. As the Federal Government grew the need for space grew with it. This program is providing that space. It not only provides for more efficient operation of the Federal Government but has been another shot in the arm to the economy in areas where these buildings are constructed.

In addition to the many responsibilities already cited, the committee must watch and improve the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA, well-known in the thirties, has continued to bring prosperity to the Tennessee Valley and was essential in bringing necessary services to one of our great space centers, the Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala.

To understand the scope of Mr. BUCKLEY's interests and responsibilities, one need but look at the great span between a project such as TVA and the committee's work in developing a program to prevent beach erosion and create thousands of permanent new beaches along the Nation's seaboard.

It can be truly said that CHARLES BUCKLEY has not been provincial in his approach to public works projects. He has applied his energies and directed the work of the committee toward the full-scale development of the natural resources of the entire Nation. Though his interests have spanned the country, the people of the State of New York, those now living and generations to come, owe him a deep debt of gratitude for over 200 public works projects that his committee has authorized for the Empire State. Its waterways, highways, parks and beaches have all benefited through Mr. BUCKLEY's leadership. The vast St. Lawrence Seaway project, the Niagara Power project in the west and north sections of New York, the Hudson River improvements, the improvements in our lakes, the new highways, and the new beaches approved by his committee bear strong testament to Mr. BUCKLEY's deep interest in permanent public improvements.

In New York, one can cite Jones Beach, Coney Island, and the Rockaways, the new Federal building in lower Manhattan, and new highways moving traffic efficiently through the five counties of New York City, all permanent improvements.

The great port of the city of New York has continued to develop throughout the years with the help of Mr. BUCKLEY's interest in providing legislation to deepen its channels and keep it properly maintained at all times.

Let us move to Mr. BUCKLEY's home county, the Bronx. Its over 1½ million residents have their own postal operation to properly facilitate postal service within the county. The designation of the Bronx as a separate postal unit was, in large part, due to Mr. BUCKLEY's efforts.

With a keen awareness of his county's needs, Congressman BUCKLEY has worked diligently to gain authorization for a new Federal building there. Within a very short time this building will rise in Bronx County and housed therein will be all the Federal agencies now scattered throughout the area. This will provide more efficient Federal service for all citizens of the Bronx.

The new roads moving in and out of the Bronx, such as the Major Deegan Expressway and the New England Thruway, are in existence because Mr. BUCKLEY understands the highway problems of his home district, and acted to see that these needs were recognized in Congress.

The New York World's Fair of 1964–65 opens its doors on April 22. After the fair is over, a permanent park will be located on that site for the use of the citizens of New York. The roadways that lead into the fair, and which will provide for transportation to this park, are a direct result of Public Works Committee action.

Out of the murky mess that was Flushing Bay there will emerge a beautiful marina to house 2,000 boats. This marina is a permanent addition to the city's recreational facilities. This is but another product of Mr. BUCKLEY's zealous efforts on behalf of the city of New York.

What I have cited is a brief resumé of CHARLES A. BUCKLEY's contribution to his county, his State, and his city. His foresight and determination to have these many public works projects approved represent an invaluable contribution to the present and future well-being of our Nation. Americans in all walks of life owe a large debt to Congressman BUCKLEY for his untiring efforts in this most important field. Those who are with us today and those who follow tomorrow will reap the great benefits of his work. I am sure that he will continue to fight as he has in the past for these projects which benefit all Americans. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY is a representative of the people in the true sense of the word and we here in the Congress are privileged to know him.

An Impressive Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution condemning the

persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religious and cultural background. It is a similar resolution to one introduced in the Senate by the Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Senate Resolution 204, which was also cosponsored by 63 of his fellow Senators.

I was shocked to hear what the Soviet leaders are doing to the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, as was reported at the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry in Washington last week. It is an insidious attack on both the cultural and religious background that is being perpetrated, and I have no doubt that without the rest of the world raising its voice in protest the program could extend itself to a program of Jews in the Soviet Union. It was both fitting and proper for the formation and the emergence of this conference in our Nation's Capital and much good, I hope, will come from the 18-point resolution of the meeting which called for the elimination of discrimination against Soviet Jews and restoration of their full cultural and religious rights.

I am also in accord with the decision of the conference to call for a National Day of Prayer to be observed in every American synagogue as part of a national protest against this calculated assault by which the destruction of the Jewish community within the Soviet Union is being pursued. It has been an impressive start, but I do hope that the fight will be continued to a successful culmination where all such persecutions and attempts at destruction will be not only diminished but completely wiped out.

In furtherance of this thought I insert at this point a very fine editorial from the Jewish News of Newark, N.J., in its issue of April 10, 1964:

AN IMPRESSIVE START

Neither by accident nor by coincidence, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry which met this week heard repeated references to the dark years of the 1930's. The points made were shockingly clear: During the period of Hitler's intensification of anti-Jewish measures all too much of the civilized world was virtually paralyzed—for a variety of reasons—and therefore did and said relatively little to protest and combat the anti-Semitic barbarism of the Nazis. Today we dare not and will not remain similarly neutralized in the face of very clear evidence that for the Jews of the Soviet Union the spirit of Stalin remains virulently alive and continues to dictate official policy for their treatment.

The parallel drawn between Hitlerism in the 1930's and the persisting Stalinist malevolence toward Jewry is inescapable. For example, even the Communist parties of countries outside of the Soviet Union have condemned the book, "Judaism Without Embellishment," published by the Ukrainian Academy of Science, and have pointed out that its caricatures of Jews are reminiscent of the material published by Julius Streicher in Der Stuermer.

We are not comforted or reassured by the Kremlin's response thus far to the voluminous protests from abroad over this clear incitement to programs by an "academy of science" under the direct control of the Soviet Government. According to Pravda, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party this week criticized the book on grounds that its text and illustrations are inept and in error. This criticism, however, was phrased with notable mildness, and also found fault with the book because it was an inadequate explanation of "the reactionary essence of Judaism." The logical sequence would appear to be a Kremlin demand for more sophistication in the writing and illustrating of such anti-Semitic works.

In projecting plans intended to reverse the steadily declining position of Russian Jews, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry has already achieved the unprecedented cooperation of 24 major national organizations. It has made a singularly impressive start in unifying and directing the efforts of all of us who recognize that only by concerted, intelligently planned action will we be able to make an appreciable contribution toward alleviation of the plight—and threat of greater hardships—faced by some 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union.

Roseville, Calif., the All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce to the House of Representatievs that my hometown of Roseville, Calif., has been named an All America City. Roseville was one of three western cities to win this coveted title and as one who has lived all his life in this beautiful community, I know of no other which deserves the distinction more.

The city of Roseville is a chartered city which has been progressive in the distribution of low-cost public power and development of an advanced municipal water system. It has taken the leadership in providing fine, modern hospitals, outstanding fire protection, and a model sewage treatment plant. Its school system is excellent and it has a splendid cadre of city employees to whom much of the credit for this award must go.

Mr. Speaker, I have a personal interest in this since I served this wonderful city as a member of its school board of trustees and as its mayor for several years before becoming her representative in the California State Senate and now in the House of Representatives.

Many commendable comments have been made about the city of Roseville in connection with the award and I shall have these printed at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

I am happy to extend my heartiest congratulations to the mayor and citizens of Roseville as you receive the All America Cities Award.

I commend you on your many past achievements and wish your city continued prosperity and progress in the years to come. Your community has helped to set high standards of citizen participation and civil improvement which raise the quality of your Nation's life.

STATEMENT OF GOV. EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN

It is a pleasure to join in this tribute to one of the finest and most progressive cities in northern California. A beautiful city, Roseville very appropriately was chosen by Look magazine as one of the 22 finalist cities in its All America City awards competition.

I want the people and the officials of Roseville to know that I share their pride in this honor and extend to all of them my best wishes for continued success and prosperity.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

It is with great pride that I learn of the selection of Roseville to receive the All America City Award.

As a lifelong resident of Roseville, who has had the privilege of serving my hometown as a member of the city board of education, city council, and mayor, I am certainly pleased that our progressive city has been awarded this honor.

Every citizen, faction of local government, including the many faithful municipal employees, businessmen, and civic organizations are to be commended and congratulated.

We are indebted to the early foresight of our "city fathers" who, with the cooperation of the people, were greatly responsible for the factors that brought this honor to our city, among the most significant being:

1. The early acquisition of our electrical distribution system for municipal operation and later, the acquisition of the private water supply system also for municipal ownership and operation which provided the city of Roseville with the financial means with which to move forward. While mayor, I had the opportunity to sign the first contract which called for the delivery of low-cost Federal power for redistribution through the municipal system. This has further benefited the financial condition of our city.

2. The use of the Revenue Sewer Bond Act of 1941, in perfecting the city sanitary facilities.

3. The passage of the initial bond issue of $250,000 for the start of the Roseville District Hospital, and the acquisition of the site which was donated by Mrs. Adamson. This project has been expanded under the Hill-Burton Act funding, whereby the Federal Government and the State contribute matching funds to the city. This has enabled Roseville to perfect a medical facility and health team which is unequaled for a city of comparable size throughout the United States.

Mayor Mahan, members of the city council, and all the fine municipal employees who contributed so greatly to the growth and progress of our city can be proud of the recognition which the city of Roseville is receiving.

Dr. Gordon Harris, chairman, and the members of the city's citizen congress, are to be highly commended and congratulated for the untiring efforts they have put forth toward winning this award and bringing recognition to our growing community.

STATE SENATOR PAUL J. LUNARDI

Having the distinction of being born and reared in Roseville, I am especially proud of the achievement of its citizenry in having been the only city in California to be awarded the 1963 All America City Award sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

As a native son, I have watched the progress of this community and participated in the planning of many civic improvements during my tenure on the city council. I offer special congratulations to the civic leaders in meeting all the challenges accompanying the prolific growth in population. It is commendable that in meeting these demands of public service the city of Roseville drew national attention.

It is, indeed, a pleasure to join many others in paying this tribute to our wonderful city.

ROSEVILLE MAYOR ROBERT P. MAHAN

I'm very happy to hear that we have been selected as one of the 11 All American Cities.

I know that Roseville has a lot to offer and this will show others what we do have. The city council and staff will go on doing all that's possible to see that Roseville continues to grow and prosper in an all-American manner.

A Fast Buck on Kennedy Half

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Alexander M. Jones, chief editorial writer of the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., has been a frequent and articulate critic of the distribution methods of the Kennedy half dollar. I share his concern and interest and I know others also do.

On April 13, 1964, an editorial entitled "A Fast Buck on Kennedy Half" pointed out in the Daily Home News that "central New Jersey banks seem to have done a creditable job in distributing Kennedy half dollars on a one-to-a-customer basis," but that distribution "is not so good elsewhere."

I hope that by including this Home News editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, more Representatives and U.S. Senators will help in supporting and achieving a more equitable distribution of the Kennedy half dollar.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Apr. 13, 1964]

A FAST BUCK ON KENNEDY HALF

As we said recently, central New Jersey banks seem to have done a creditable job in distributing Kennedy half dollars on a one-to-a-customer basis. Some influential people seem to have been able to obtain a roll of 20 of the coins, and some businesses and industries seem to have obtained small quantities, but for the most part the picture is good.

It's not so good elsewhere. At the coin show at the Pines on April 5, the dealers participating were selling Kennedy halves at various premiums. One fellow offered $10 rolls for sale at $25. An area dealer is selling the coins at 95 cents apiece. He says he was offered a bag (2,000 coins) by another dealer. A pupil in an area high school is selling the halves at $2.50 apiece to his classmates.

The coin publications relate that each Senator received 100 Kennedy halves. The Illinois Toll Highway Commission had 18,000, but distributed them in change. President Johnson sent one Kennedy coin to each Member of Congress. The Treasury, having asked bankers to distribute 1 to a customer, sold the coins 40 to a customer. Reporters noted the customers selling to people in the neighborhood, one tourist paying $5 for a single coin.

A coin weekly of almost 150,000 circulation last week had many dealer advertisements on Kennedy halves. In Charlotte, a dealer wanted $13 for a roll of 20 and guaranteed delivery. In Georgia, a dealer offered a free Kennedy half with each $16 purchase. Louisiana and New York, dealers offered single coins at $1. In San Francisco, a dealer offered a $1,000 bag (2,000 halves) for $1,500. And so it went.

Perhaps the most curious advertisement was from far-off Liechtenstein where a big operator offered to all the world Kennedy halves at $2 apiece and $22 for a $10 roll.

A writer in the coin publication said that on the day after initial release of the Kennedy half, dealers were offering lots of up to 20 rolls.

How much worse the situation will get, we do not know. What we do know is that the money grubbers and the fast-buck guys are making a real killing which could have been avoided had responsible agencies in Washington, all of them alerted by us, taken the proper precautions. They included the White House, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Attorney General, among others. The Treasury itself participated directly in making the current situation possible, by selling coins 40 to a customer. Sentimentality and love for President Kennedy would scarcely seem to prompt the purchase of 40 Kennedy halves by individuals.

There's still time to cut off the supply of Kennedy halves to the profiteers, but Middlesex County's Representative EDWARD J. PATTEN will need more help in Congress than he is now getting.

Jackie Robinson Attacks President on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the pioneers in better race relations in America has been Jackie Robinson, whose courage and integrity many of us have admired both in the fields of baseball and business. He is also known for his interest in Government and political life.

Jackie Robinson has written a new book entitled "Baseball Has Done It," in which Negro players speak out, in interviews with Jackie Robinson, about their personal experiences; with integration in baseball means to them and how it is helping in the battle against bigotry.

Jackie Robinson also has some thoughtful observations on civil rights, and I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 29, "Jackie Robinson Attacks President on Civil Rights."

JACKIE ROBINSON ATTACKS PRESIDENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Fred C. Shapiro)

Jackie Robinson lashed out bitterly last night at President Johnson and the administration's efforts to win full civil rights for Negroes.

"You and I know that it takes more than a big job, big talk, and big gestures to wipe out the bad taste, the poison of a 3-year record of adamant opposition to the cause of civil rights," Mr. Robinson said in a prepared speech at the Hotel Biltmore. He was there last night to receive the annual War Memorial Award for outstanding civic service presented by the New York City Young Republican Club.

Attacking Mr. Johnson's civil rights speech at Miami Beach Thursday, Mr. Robinson continued: "You and I are aware that the same statesman who calls for congressional allegiance to civil rights from the White House is the same politician who only last year voted to make it necessary for two-thirds of the Senate to curb the filibuster.

"It's a matter of record that when the newly sworn President arrived in Washington a few hours after the atrocious assassination—and when he was met at the airport by a distinguished group of legislators and officeholders—the first thing the President of the United States did was to ask: 'Where's Dick?'

"We know he didn't mean Dick Nixon. He meant Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia, his old and trusted friend and accomplice in the art of thwarting human liberty.

"Where is DICK? I want to know where is DICK—and the other segregationists who, only a few months ago, were in full cry after the late, revered John Kennedy, hooting at his heels and lambasting him for his stand on civil rights.

"DICK and the rest of them are awfully quiet now. They seem to be 'going along' with the President despite the fact that he is saying the same things Mr. Kennedy said. Could it be that DICK and the rest of the segregation gang are no longer worried?

"Could it be that they have been assured that a civil rights bill administered by one of their own would be a fraud and a farce which still enables the South to maintain its recalcitrant refusal to give the Negro his place in the sun.

"I say that in spite of his enchantment with Lyndon Johnson's words, and his appointments of talented Negroes to high places, the Negro in America (expresses) a basic distrust of a man who has to do so much now to change an image which he has created for 30 years."

Mr. Robinson, a recently appointed campaign aid of Governor Rockefeller warned that "the loyalty of the minorities will not be handed us on a silver platter. We must prove to these people that we want their allegiance and are willing to give them sincerity in return.

And though the dinner was billed as nonpartisan, among Republicans at least, Mr. Robinson could not resist the urge to plug his man, Governor Rockefeller, and knock other leading Republican candidates, or potential candidates.

"I hope that the Republican Party will not commit the suicidal error of listening to the counsel of a BARRY GOLDWATER, who probably doesn't know any better, or a Richard Nixon, who should know better, and who both say we should stick our heads further in the sand and maybe the Negro problem will go away." Mr. Robinson supported Vice President Nixon in the 1960 presidential campaign.

"We found the assassin of the President within a few hours," Mr. Robinson said. "We have yet to find the bombers of a church in Birmingham who murdered children. We have yet to solve, in fact, some 50 bombings of Negro churches, the homes of Negro civil rights leaders in that same city."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, who presented the medal to Mr. Robinson, also dealt with the filibuster in his prepared speech, questioning whether "this group of Deep Dixie Democrats is going to be allowed to stymie the will of an overwhelming majority of the Senate. * * * We can't vacillate and bow to obstructionists in dealing with the problems before the Congress with any more success than in dealing with the problems before the world."

"The Congress," he concluded, "is saturated with special privileges but grievously lacking in equal opportunity. That may sound a harsh thing to say about the legislative body of the leading nation of the free world, but it's true. I speak these words not out of disrespect but out of reverence for our institutions and out of a conviction that we have a solemn obligation to preserve these institutions from decay and obsolescence."

Observation on the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as one who has enthusiastically supported the Peace Corps since its inception and shall continue to do so, I have been impressed by communications and articles throwing favorable light on the Corps and its work.

However, I recently received a letter from a high school teacher and coach from Portland High School, Portland, Maine, which may indicate there is room for improvement in this program in certain areas of the world.

Mr. Gerald M. Davis, a former member of the Peace Corps assigned to Sierra Leone from June 1962 to April 1963, has written me the following letter setting forth his personal experiences and views. This young man is highly intelligent, very popular, respected in his community and certainly his observations deserve attention.

I hope that Members who wish to continue to improve this valuable instrument for peace will take the time to read Mr. Davis' letter.

APRIL 4, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TUPPER: This letter is to actualize hopefully my observations on the Peace Corps. I was a member of the Sierra Leone Project II from June 1962, through April 1963.

The late President Kennedy once said that the only sure reward in life is a good conscience. Believing the supposition to be true, I offer the following opinions on the Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps is a new organization without any inner discipline. This was very evident at the New Paltz, N.Y., Training Center and again in Sierra Leone. Each Peace Corps volunteer makes his own rules and regulations in dealing with individuals and groups in other countries.

My assignment was to teach and coach at Bo Government School in Sierra Leone. It is my firm belief that no volunteer should be assigned to this school.

I was involved in four riots precipitated by the predominantly Moslem students of Bo Government School. The essence of the agitation was religious hatred of the African Christian schools. The immediate cause of the most violent riot was the athletic contest between a Moslem and a Roman Catholic school. The spark that started the violence was a fellow Peace Corps volunteer judging a foot race between a Moslem and a Christian African. It was a very close contest. The Peace Corps volunteer awarded the race to the Christian . The Moslems immediately began rioting. This turbulent riot was vicious and violent. Catholic nuns were stoned. African Christian schoolgirls were beaten. Hundreds of students and adult Sierra Leonians took part. Two important facts should be kept in mind. The majority of Africans involved in the riot firmly believed the white-skinned Peace Corps volunteer had, with malice and forethought, awarded the contest to the Christian Sierra Leonian. Volunteers are continually put in similar situations fraught with religious and racial consequences.

Secondly, how are volunteers to act in riots? Are they to watch passively or police actively such disturbances? The first riot occured in October of 1962 and the last in February of 1963. It was duly reported by the Freetown newspaper to which the Peace Corps administration had access. They ignored the whole situation.

I have in my possession a letter Mr. Sargent Shriver wrote to Senator MUSKIE concerning my experience in the Bo Government School riots. Mr. Shriver relates that I acted courageously in the best interest of my country when I encountered an unforeseen emergency. I appreciate the compliment. However, the violence to which I refer was not a sudden occurrence. This was a situation that had been festering for months. Proper investigation by Peace Corps administrators of the social, economic, and political realities of Sierra Leone was never undertaken. I am reliably informed that recently a fifth disturbance materialized and Americans were stoned out of the school grounds. Peace Corps policy seems to be to have no policy.

I am categorically opposed to the actions of Walter Carrington, the Peace Corps representative in Freetown. My greatest complaint abount Walter Carrington is that he does nothing. He lives in the capital city of Sierra Leone. He makes no effort to help the volunteer in his everyday existence. Most volunteers live in the underdeveloped part of the country. Mr. Carrington makes occasional ostentatious tours through the jungle areas. He never visited my classroom or athletic field. He never visited any Sierra Leonian schoolroom to my knowledge.

The majority of volunteers are teaching in Sierra Leone. I believe this to be an error in judgment. The English took 50 years in the Protectorate to build up the educational system of Sierra Leone. Independence arrived 2 years ago. Much of the productive work the British arduously built up has been badly damaged. Two schools have been burned down by African students. The vicissitudes of Sierra Leonian independence have had a depressing effect on their school system. Mr. W. G. Jones, the Sierra Leonian educational secretary, admitted in a written statement that there was a general lack of discipline in Sierra Leone schools. I believe white-skinned Christian American teachers disciplining African students of the Moslem faith can only lead to anti-American feelings. Mr. Sargent Shriver does not agree. He has stated the following opinion in writing. "Let me simply state that experience in Africa does not lend belief to Mr. Davis' statement that Africans are tired of being disciplined by white-skinned people." I believe sincerely that Mr. Shriver's opinions are basically unsound. Africans resent to the depths of their being disciplinary measures by any and all white-skinned people.

The administration of the educational system in Sierra Leone is chaotic. Instead of operating one good school in Sierra Leone, the Peace Corps is trying to have volunteers in every school in the country. Justice and good will have not materialized. There might have been a possibility of success if one entire school had been operated by Americans. It is very difficult to work for Sierra Leonians. Tribalism complicates effective and well-run schools.

I would feel guilty of negligence if I did not mention the poverty, disease, and hunger of the majority of Sierra Leonians. People in Sierra Leone very often go hungry. It is extremely difficult to learn academic knowledge on an empty belly. The infant mortality rate in Sierra Leone is one of the highest in the world. Malaria is very prevalent. We are wrongly emphasizing education when health and welfare should be our chief concern.

Sincerely,

GERALD M. DAVIS.

Freedom of Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern of April 3, 1964, entitled "Freedom of the Press."

It has been my position ever since the House considered the so-called civil rights bill, which I voted against, that the legislation if enacted into law would affect freedom of the press and freedom of speech as well, as the editorial points out so vividly.

FREEDOM OF PRESS

That the civil rights bill now before the U.S. Senate would affect the lives of everyone is sometimes lost sight of. Some think of it only as granting long-awaited rights to people of the Negro race. Many are not yet aware it would take rights away from some and limit rights that have been granted in the Constitution.

It cannot be said that the act goes this far and no farther. The language written into the bill is not of that sort. It has open-end provisions that give it whatever depth and intensity one desires to read into it. In the language of the bill, "the President is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate to prevent" and "each Federal department and agency * * * shall take action to effectuate." This vests almost unlimited authority in the President and his appointees to do whatever they desire.

The bill is, in a literal sense, revolutionary. It is destructive of the very essence of life as it has been lived in this country since the adoption of the Constitution. Any number of examples can be cited to demonstrate the effects of this legislation on people, the meaning of lost liberty, the power in the bill to completely dominate the lives of even the least of us.

For instance, in regard to the press: Race, as the first criterion of employment for newspapers, periodicals, radio, and television, applies under this bill, as well as for other elements of commerce. If a job applicant can write and there is an opening and if he is of the race called for to balance the makeup of staff, that person must be employed in preference to someone of another race. The bill grants the power to make it mandatory that the staff of a newspaper be thoroughly integrated, racially and religiously, else the owners are in violation of Federal law.

Destruction of the right of free choice, serious as it is, is not the most fearsome feature of this bill as it applies to the press. Title II, section 203, says: "No person shall * * * incite or aid or abet any person to do any of the foregoing"; i.e., deny or attempt to deny any person any right or privilege described in the title. If this becomes law it means that no editor could with impunity editorialize in opposition to its provisions. (Even an editorial such as this one.)

If a citizen takes a position in direct opposition to some provision of this title and a newspaper writes an editorial in support of that position, indeed, urges others to take similar stands, is that newspaper inciting, or aiding, or abetting? It would seem so, according to section 203.

The fact of the matter is this: If a person were to stand in a public square or before a civic club and advocate that segregation is best for either race and urge that it be maintained—and his stand is editorially supported by a newspaper—both would be in violation of Federal law and both would be subject to fine and imprisonment, if they continued to exercise freedom of speech and of the press. Under such a circumstance, what becomes of the right of free speech? Or freedom of the press?

Save the Small Retailer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article contained in the Washington World, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, has performed a singular service to the cause of America's independent retail economy.

The March 23, 1964, issue of that publication contains the gentleman from Wisconsin's [Mr. O'KONSKI] argument in behalf of the quality stabilization bill. A great deal has been said and written about this important economic legislation in recent months, but the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has succeeded in cutting through the fog of opposition propaganda regarding quality stabilization to get to the real substance of the issue.

I recommend the gentleman from Wisconsin's [Mr. O'KONSKI] article to those interested in a fair and penetrating discussion of quality stabilization and what its enactment will mean to our retail economy:

A CONGRESSMAN SPEAKS: CHAINS' PRICE CUTTING KILLS INDEPENDENT RETAIL STORES

(By Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin)

Is competition doomed in America's independent retail marketplace?

Yes, said an expert witness before a recent congressional group studying current economic conditions among independent retail operators. According to this spokesman for one of the newly emerging retail giants, "fewer than 50 mass-merchandise operations" will control the country's retail system by 1974.

The steady economic attrition of independent retailers and small businessmen is a cause of concern of all segments of the national economy, and especially for the American consumer. Retail shutdowns mean fewer sales outlets for the country's manufacturers and fewer buying outlets for the housewife.

What are the factors behind this decline of the independent retail operator?

The reasons are many and complex, but high on the list, according to the retailers themselves, is the growth of cutthroat merchandising techniques that are destroying ethical operators, not to mention public confidence in the standard of the marketplace.

The increased use of "switchbait" and "loss-leader" lures for the unsuspecting buying public hurts consumer interests as well as legitimate retail competitors. Those most familiar with the working of the retail market say that sooner or later something must be done to curb these sharp practices—or the small retailer will face extinction.

The quality stabilization bills—S. 774 and H.R. 3669—are aimed at bolstering the competitive position of the independent retailer in his fight for economic survival. The bill is not claimed to be a panacea for the current ills of the retail market, but it does represent a most constructive effort toward bolstering the independent retailer in his fight for economic survival.

What is quality stabilization and how can it help the retail economy and the consumer?

Much has been said and written about this controversial legislation, yet seldom has any economic issue been so widely misunderstood as this bill.

In recent months, a massive propaganda barrage against quality stabilization has been launched by its opponents, including giant discount houses which have a splendid interest in maintaining present chaotic conditions in the marketplace.

Yet seldom has any legislation, economic or otherwise, received as widespread bipartisan support as quality stabilization. Eleven Senators and twenty-four Representatives—including the writer—are sponsoring the bill.

These sponsors range from Democratic leaders like Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, assistant majority leader; and Representative HALE BOGGS, House majority whip; to Republicans like Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, assistant minority leader, and Senator THRUSTON MORTON.

Moreover, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has endorsed the bill, terming it "essential to the survival of hundreds and thousands of small, independent businessmen."

Quality stabilization would provide manufacturers of brand-name products the same rights concerning the resale of their merchandise as are now exercised by chainstores selling their own private-label goods.

The consensus of retail experts is that use of such brand-names as a consumer "come-on" is standard procedure for monopoly operators seeking to crush their smaller competition. Thus, by curbing the use of brand-names to lure custombers (who are then high pressured into buying poor quality, non-brand merchandise), quality stabilization would strengthen the independent retailer's competitive hand in his fight for economic survival.

Is this bill helpful or damaging to the free enterprise concept of the American marketplace?

Those of us who support quality stabilization do so in the belief that something must be done—and done quickly—to keep the free enterprise concept alive in our Nation's retail system. And if quality stabilization is not the complete answer, it is the best answer anyone has yet devised to meet the current problems facing independent retailers.

Critics of the bill have been guilty of misrepresenting what quality stabilization means and how it would affect free, independent market competition. Despite their claims, the fact is that the bill would not limit, but rather would encourage competition. After all, no one can seriously claim that the collapse of small business and the takeover of our retail market by monopoly giants would be in the interests of free enterprise. And despite all criticism, the record shows that no one has yet stepped forward with any other plan designed to check this trend toward retail monopoly.

Moreover, as Senator KUCHEL has pointed out, the bill is "permissive."

No manufacturer would be compelled to come in under its provisions, nor would any distributor or retailer be required to sell any product.

What is the consumer's stake in this fight?

Clearly the American consumer would suffer if the retail economy fell into the hands of a limited few operators. Moreover, the spreading cancer of high-pressure, low-quality retail operations can come to make caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—the motto of a new era of "jungle" retailing in which the consumer is a helpless victim.

Only by preserving healthy and fair competition—and by maintaining the quality standards of brand-name products—can consumer interests be fully protected in the marketplace.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

Evaluating the quality stabilization bill, Representative O'KONSKI believes:

Its aims and its effect will be to advance the cause of free enterprise on Main Street, U.S.A.

Action must be taken to curb predatory evils now rampant in the marketplace.

Retail shutdowns mean fewer sales outlets for manufacturers, fewer buying outlets for the housewife.

Increased use of "switch-bait" and "loss-leader" lures hurts consumer interests.

Vice Admiral Ricketts Addresses Journalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our country is most fortunate to have within its Military Establishment men whose vision extends beyond the purely military consideration of our national affairs. One of those men is Adm. Claude Ricketts, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy. I have been impressed with Admiral Ricketts' grasp of the role of the military in national affairs for several years.

As a former fleet commander during some critical days in the Caribbean, he has been understanding of the application of naval power in support of U.S. policy. He is the Nation's foremost military authority on the new multilateral force concept. He combines those rare qualities of brilliance and humility, and is an inspirational leader with a broad understanding of the relationship between the military and other elements of our society.

Last Saturday Admiral Ricketts spoke to the regional meeting of Sigma Delta Chi in Oklahoma City on the subject of projecting the U.S. image. His speech on this subject is most enlightening, and I feel it should be given wide readership. No one can question the responsibility which every American shares in this matter, nor can anyone question the great contribution to good will for America which our Armed Forces have made all over the world.

In this endeavor, the U.S. Navy has been particularly effective, and under the leadership of officers like Admiral Ricketts that effectiveness is sure to continue. The speech follows:

PROJECTING THE U.S. IMAGE

(By Adm. Claude Ricketts)

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to make a confession at the beginning that prior to the

receipt of your very kind invitation to talk to you tonight, I knew virtually nothing about Sigma Delta Chi, its objectives, its organization, its procedures. So, I did a little research and found, not surprisingly, some very interesting and encouraging information.

For example, I found that your 1964 national theme is "Our Quest for Truth Is a Vote for Freedom." Certainly, a very timely and commendable theme.

I am impressed by your society's motto, "He Serves Best Who Serves the Truth," and your watchword, "Talent, Truth, Energy."

I studied carefully also the purposes of Sigma Delta Chi and was delighted to find that they are to associate journalists of talent, truth, and energy into an intimately organized unit; to assist members in acquiring the noblest principles of journalism; and to advance the standards of the press by fostering a higher ethical code.

These are certainly worthy objectives.

To these purposes there was added in 1960 an additional one which especially caught my eye, and that is, to raise the prestige of the journalist in the community.

If you are successful in accomplishing this, we of the military would be most interested in taking some lessons from you.

After hearing a brief review of my career and realizing that for the past 40 years my profession has been that of a Navy man, you probably would expect me to talk solely on military matters or even more specifically, on naval matters.

Perhaps I would be on sounder ground by doing just that, but I am going to take a chance and broaden the base of my discussion beyond strictly military matters, and cover a related field in which we of the military and, indeed, all Americans have a mutual responsibility; that is, forming and projecting the image of the United States, not only among our own citizens, but to other countries—friendly, neutral, and unfriendly.

So, I propose to lay before you some of my thoughts, as a military man, on this subject of national importance.

If any of my remarks should be interpreted as indicating some areas of possible improvement in our mutual effort to support your motto and your watchword, I hope they will be interpreted as constructive—because that is the spirit in which they are made.

The word "image" suggests different interpretations. One of the best definitions was written recently by one of your members, Mr. Blackstock, in an editorial in the Oklahoma Publisher. He said, "Image is supposed to mean the total reflection or general public reaction to a product, an organization, or an individual. It is the sum total effectiveness which has been achieved by that person, group, or product.

"The first requirement," he continued, "is to have a good product, a responsible company, or an authentic individual."

Transposing Mr. Blackstock's thesis to a national U.S. image, we have this first requirement; i.e., a good product—in fact, a superior product.

This doesn't mean it is perfect; nor that it remains static, requiring neither change nor progress. In fact, it is virtually impossible to maintain a status quo in any field of endeavor, nor is it usually desirable to do so. One either moves forward or slips backward, particularly relative to others, because our competitors in the international arena likewise move—either forward or backward.

So my theme tonight is based upon the conviction that our national product is fundamentally sound and good today. The challenges lie in keeping this product current in an inevitably changing world; and in the proper projection of the resulting national image to the world.

Why is it important that the proper image of the United States be formed in the minds of her own citizens and be properly projected abroad? In my mind the answer is basically this:

By virtue of a combination of circumstances—some old, some new—we have grown from a fringe of Colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to the strongest Nation in the world, and to the position of leader of the free world today.

Some examples of these circumstances are: The principles upon which our country was founded; the energy with which the founders and their successors went about their tasks; the variety and quantity of our material resources; our building of a sound economic base; and our discreet use of tremendous military power.

Our actions have generated a unique kind of faith in us on the part of other countries. Some of this faith stems from the fact that we have used our strength and our power, not for conquering others, but as a sponsor for freedom in other lands as well as our own.

May I cite one example of what I mean here?

For a fleeting moment in history the United States had a complete monopoly in nuclear weapons. We did not exploit this monopoly by using these weapons against avowed aggessors, even though we knew it would not be long before they had the same weapon. This is perhaps the most noble restraint exercised in the history of man, but it was in keeping with our principles.

This restraint is a part of our image.

On the other hand, we have more than once came to the economic and military aid of friends far from our shores where some could not see U.S. interests directly involved.

These actions are a part of our image.

The leadership required of the United States in today's world is not something which will sustain its momentum automatically. It is not a sort of perpetual motion. It is under challenge. It has been for some years. This challenge will not fade away.

Therefore, we face the necessity for the projection of our image—an accurate image—not only to our longtime friends, but to newly independent countries, and also to those who question our motives.

Influencing the mind of man is one of the objectives of war. If we can reduce sufficiently the will of an enemy to continue the war, then the war ends. Influencing the minds of adversaries in peace to the proper extent may very well prevent war. Influencing the minds of allies keeps them as allies. Influencing the minds of neutrals and uncommitted may draw them to us.

It is my thesis that projecting the U.S. image is a mutual responsibility of all of us. It applies to Americans in virtually all professions, and to a greater extent than we often realize—the journalist, the tourist, the industrialist, the civilian public servant, the military, and millions of others.

Of course, you in the journalistic profession spend more of your time directly in image making and image assessment than most of us; but, we are all involved.

How does a nation project its true image? I have listed four primary means:

First, by example.

Second, by the material products of our hands.

Third, by the oral word.

And fourth, by the printed word.

Most Americans are involved in one or more of these means of imagemaking. Therefore, our individual proficiency in one or more of these talents will have its commensurate influence on our neighbors—near and distant.

The projection of a national image certainly is not as simple nor as measurable as the selling of merchandise.

In our position as the leader of the free world, military strength is an essential ingredient. Balanced military forces are required to meet a variety of military threats and contingencies. But unbeatable military strength is not the total answer. Military power is basically a shield behind which we exercise the full potential of our economic, spiritual, and cultural resources.

The conflict of today transcends weapons of war. It permeates every phase of human endeavor—man's work, his religion, his dignity, his sense of values. It is both physical and spiritual.

Thus we see why it is so important that we project our image by example.

It is in this field that we of the military exert a great effort. We also realize our increasing responsibility in this area. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are spread throughout many parts of the world—many times our families are with us. We come into contact with large numbers of the citizens of other lands. Our fleets carry thousands of officers and bluejackets. Frequently, we visit ports where other U.S. military men do not go and, in fact, where few other American citizens go. There are some parts of the world where U.S. sailormen carry the major responsibility for projecting the United States image by example.

The ships that carry sailors to those ports are little bits of U.S. territory equipped with some of man's most advanced weapons and equipment. They exhibit the capabilities of the American mind, the American workman, American industry. In other words, here are moving particles of the United States transported to a distant port—a piece of U.S. sovereign territory upon which the citizens of that port can tread. It is something they can appraise from that country about which they have read so much but have never seen. These U.S. sailors represent more than just our Navy. They represent the parents who raised them, the schools which trained them, the communities which molded them. They represent a composite America.

With very few exceptions, the officers and men of the military services discharge this responsibility in a commendable manner. It is greatly distressing when even one fails to meet this responsibility and reflects a wrong image.

One wrong example can very quickly counterbalance hundreds of good examples. porgancoun

But the good examples far exceed the few exceptions. Such examples as those servicemen who used their bare hands to dig survivors from the rubble of the Agadir earthquake, have left an indelible impression with the populace.

Deserving of special mention are the Navy's Seebees. Small Seabee teams are presently digging fresh water wells on the Mekong Delta of South Vietnam, building roads, bridges, dams, hospitals and industrial buildings. They are teaching construction and mechanical trades; creating the image of the American ideal. The Seabees are clearing away the damaged structures of Kodiak, Alaska. We recently received a message in Washington that the admiration for the outstanding performance of the 152 Seabees now working in Kodiak is greater than those on the scene can express.

There are, of course, many other programs that have helped in the projection of our image abroad. Foreign assistance programs, the Marshall plan, the Agency for International Development, American private industry and organizations play a major role.

Let's shift now to consideration of the spoken and written word. One of the marvels of modern technology has been the development of improved communications. Radio, the telephone, television, the movies, the jet plane, have compressed time and space to the point where communications can be virtually instantaneous. Travel is so rapid that personal contacts betwen people in any part of the world can be made in a matter of only a few hours.

These facts have tremendous implications. In the first place, they provide a means by which our own people can be kept up to date on world happenings almost hourly. For example, how long was it between the time that President Kennedy was shot and the time when virtually every citizen of the United States knew about it? Or when the entire world knew about it? It was only a matter of a few minutes.

Think of the millions of people who see and hear the President of the United States in his press conferences or his discussions of such critical matters as establishing the quarantine of Cuba. What I am driving at here is that the citizens of our country have the facilities for keeping themselves up to date on world affairs; up to date on international relations, modern scientific developments and domestic affairs; up to date on the opinions and beliefs of their elected officials and of the candidates for high offices; up to date on the views of columnists and others who use the news media for the distribution of opinions and information.

To paraphrase that wonderful song from the stage play "Oklahoma," "Things are up to date in America."

With such an improved base of knowledge, our people are in a position to act with greater discretion, with greater judgment, with great confidence, and with greater effectiveness; but effective civic responsibility and action require accurate information.

Our citizens are so heavily involved in their own professions that they do not have the time to take each news report or editorial comment, analyze it and research it and determine its accuracy.

Busy people have no alternative but to accept a great deal of what they read and hear as factual and as a basis for their own actions. This puts upon all of us who transmit information to our fellowman the very special and great responsibility of insuring its accuracy.

Some other nations whose motives are not as idealistic as ours, use these same media of communication for ulterior purposes, including the spread of their own undemocratic philosophy among other countries. These are the facts of life. They represent an arena of intense competition, an arena in which results will be only as effective as the quality of our input.

I need not dwell on the importance of words, and freedom of words to this audience. You gentlemen are steeped in the tradition and all that it means. You are skilled in the use of words, both spoken and written. You know their meaningful impact upon others. Our neighbors oversea sense in us a deep drive for the freedom to use words. The Bill of Rights expresses many freedoms—including the freedom to speak freely and to write freely. The people of enslaved lands yearn for these basic rights.

But every such right carries with it a commensurate responsibility. These are the unwritten laws of accountability, self-discipline, and restraint. Every citizen is expected to use that right so as not unfairly to injure others. This wise restriction is the basis of our libel laws. Freedom of speech and of the press is invaluable to the U.S. image abroad. By drawing together men of letters, your fraternity is making its own distinct contribution to the American image.

A few weeks ago, I made an extensive trip to the Far East, visiting many countries. Several of them are looking not only to us but to our adversaries for help and for guidance. Their actions in the future will be governed to a great extent by what they see and hear from the proponents of these respective philosophies—what they see and hear of us through many media of communications. They are going to compare the products of each before they choose—the outputs of our respective factories; they are going to compare our ships, our planes, our tanks, our guns, our electrical appliances, in fact, all of the material products which they receive from us. They are going to compare the actions of our respective citizens, our officers, our soldiers, our tourists, our industrialists.

There is no doubt whatever in my mind that when the best of the United States is put in the window with the best from our competitors, we will be the winner; and the prize is worthy of our best. It is our choice as to whether we put the proper material before others; whether it be the printed word, the spoken word, the personal example, or the product of our factories.

I am a firm believer in freedom of speech; and a firm believer in the responsibility that goes with the exercise of that right. There is no question that the proper use of free speech stimulates the minds of people to a greater activity and achievement than when speech and press are not free.

One of the greatest assets that we of the United States have is the right to choose and dissent. This right to choose stimulates a greater spectrum of actions in the United States than in any other country in the world.

When we stop to think that we have the right to choose what we say; the right to choose our profession, how we spend our money; what part of the country in which we live; what we study in school; what our religion will be; what our political party will be—we recognize these as tremendous rights. We should never take them for granted, for as we look back over history, we realize that these rights can be eroded.

One of the surest ways to invite erosion is the abuse of the rights that we have.

It is well to keep under constant evaluation the results of the U.S. image that we project—a frequent turning of our eyes inward for a self-analysis.

How did the poet, Robert Burns, express it?

"Would some power the giftie gie us to see ourselves as others see us; t' would from many a blunder free us, and foolish notion."

For example, what image do our adversaries have of our military power? How do they evaluate our will to use it? Isn't it probable that the image thus formed has been the major deterrent to major war in recent years?

Isn't it likely that a similar evaluation by our allies has the major bonding element of our alliances?

What effect on our world image resulted from our positive actions in Korea, Lebanon, the offshore islands, and the Cuban quarantine of October 1962? Are there any lessons that we can learn here so we can apply them in other areas of tension—such as South Vietnam?

Some of these places are a long way from home and there are many who question our interest in them. To them, I would point out that the frontiers of our influence are no longer restricted to our sovereign territory or to our allies—or to our close neighbors. In fact, the sphere of our influence is just that—spherical in scope.

It encompasses the spherical globe of our earth, with no frontiers delineated by a line on a world chart. Just as our Minuteman missiles have intercontinental range, and just as our Polaris submarines can be positioned so that their missiles can reach any point on the globe, so our national image is worldwide.

In the play, "Hamlet," Shakespeare said, "all the world is a stage." In these days of modern means of travel and communications, we can say that "all the world is a mirror." Our actions, our words, written and spoken, the products of our handiwork are reflected throughout the world—and thus our image is formed in the minds of others.

I am not advocating the reflection of an image of what others want to see, necessarily, but rather a true image of which we ourselves can be proud. If it is not so, then it is within our power to change that image by refinement of our own actions. By thus using our own criteria, our image is one that elicits respect—rather than popularity—and there is a vast difference.

Profits in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the emphasis on the absolute level of corporate profits in the economy obscures attempts at more meaningful analysis of the level of profits. What is important is corporate profits compared to stockholders' equity and as a percentage of sales. Corporate profits as the share of gross national product is also an important and meaningful measure of profit.

The fact is that profits have declined in the postwar period in relative terms. The relationship between profits and sales, for example, shows that in the 5 years beginning in 1950, corporate profits averaged 3.6 percent of sales. In the next 5 years the profit margin was down to 3.1 percent and thus far during the 1960's, the margin has averaged only 2.6 percent. Profits as a return on investment show similar results. Also profits amounted to 8 percent of gross national product in 1950, 5.8 percent in 1955, 5.1 percent in 1959 and 4.7 percent in 1963.

In an important speech before the 12th Annual Management Conference of the University of Chicago on March 5, Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co., discussed the profits picture. One of his conclusions was that since 1950 profits have really gone down rather than up. When 1963 profits are converted to 1950 dollars, they shrink from $27 billion to $20.5 billion—10 percent below the actual profits of American corporations in 1950. In a long list of economic indicators outlined by Mr. Ford, corporate profits, which increased 20 percent since 1950, is the only item that has gone up less than the 33 percent increase in prices during the same period.

The decline in profits has been accompanied by a sharp decline in business investment. The chain of events is clear: lower profits; less investment; slower economic growth; fewer jobs; and less income for all.

Under unanimous consent I place a copy of Mr. Ford's speech, "How High Is Up?" in the RECORD at this point:

HOW HIGH IS UP?

(An address by Henry Ford II, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co., delivered at the 12th Annual Management Conference of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., March 5, 1964)

As everyone knows who has ever raised children, the simplest questions are sometimes the hardest to answer. How high, for example, is up?

This evening, I ask you to consider with me a question that is just as simple to ask

and just as hard to answer. My question is this: How high are profits?

The news, these days, is full of answers, and all of them seem to run in the same direction.

Profits at record high, say the headlines.

Profits up 52 percent, say the President's economic advisers.

Profits are staggering, says Walter Reuther.

The profit squeeze is over, says Time magazine.

These are all, in their fashion, answers to my question. Let us consider them.

It is, of course, true that the total dollar volume of profits was higher last year than ever before. Corporate after-tax earnings for 1963 are estimated at $27 billion—11 percent above the previous high. But a lot of other economic records were also set last year. Gross national product, personal income, labor force, employment, taxes, industrial output—all were higher than ever before. There is, therefore, no special significance about the fact that profits, too, were higher. Indeed, it would be startling if they were not.

Nor should it be considered remarkable that profits were up 52 percent, in view of the fact that the measurement was taken from the bottom of the previous recession to the highest point so far reached after 3 years of strong recovery. Profits were up even more—over 60 percent—in less than half this time during the preceding recovery period.

The fact that Walter Reuther is staggered isn't very significant either. Mr. Reuther is always staggered by profits in the automobile industry, especially in a negotiation year—even, as I remember, in 1958, when many of us in the industry were staggered by our lack of profits.

The conclusion that the profit squeeze is over would seem to mean that profits are now high enough or back to normal. But if this is the meaning, then we have to ask, how high is enough, and what is normal? Since these questions are even harder to answer than mine, I propose that we put them aside for the moment and go back to the relatively simple question: How high are profits?

One answer, as I said a moment ago, is that profits last year amounted to $27 billion. Now, the trouble with $27 billion is that it has too many zeros. Nobody has a reliable, instinctive feel for the size of anything that's measured by an 11-digit number.

Perhaps we can begin to get a feel for the size of profits by comparing them with some other things. For example, total corporate sales last year were in the neighborhood of a trillion dollars. A little arithmetic tells us that corporate profits were, therefore, about 2.7 cents per dollar of sales. In other words, corporations, on the average, incurred expenses of 97.3 cents to earn 2.7 cents.

There are various other economic measures that we might compare with corporate profits. Corporate profits represent about 4½ cents for each dollar of gross national product, about 6 cents for each dollar of personal income, and about 13 cents for each dollar of compensation to corporate employees.

Corporate profits are about equal to the increase in employee compensation that occurs every 18 months in our rapidly growing economy. Corporate profits are also about the same size as total tax collections for social security and unemployment insurance. Corporate after-tax profits are less than half as big as the total amount of taxes collected from or through corporations.

At this point, we have two sets of answers to the question, how big are profits. The first set suggests that profits are very, very big. The second set suggests that profits aren't really so big after all. Taken together, they suggest that the answer depends entirely on what you compare profits with. As a matter of fact, "how high are profits" is about as useful a question as "how high is up." To get some useful answers, you really have to change the question.

One question we might ask, instead, is this: Are corporate profits bigger or smaller than they used to be, relative to other things they might reasonably be compared with? In other words, are profits growing as fast as other factors in the economy?

Here we begin to get some answers that make sense, for the fact is that most of the possible answers point in the same direction. Almost everything is growing faster than profits, and profits, therefore, are smaller relative to almost everything else than they used to be.

Let us see, first, how fast profits are growing. After tax profits, $27 billion in 1963, were $23½ billion in 1956, nearly $23 billion in 1950, and more than $20 billion as long ago as 1948.

Since 1950, profits have grown by $4.4 billion, or less than 20 percent. Meanwhile, here is what has happened to other factors in the economy:

Gross national product, up 106 percent.

Employee compensation, up 120 percent.

Weekly wages in manufacturing, up 70 percent.

Business investment in new plant and equipment, up 90 percent.

Per capita disposable personal income, up 56 percent.

Government spending—Federal, State, and local—up 179 percent.

Prices, up 33 percent.

Let me repeat that last figure. Since 1950, prices have gone up 33 percent. This, of course, means that a substantial part of the dollar increases in the other categories is the result of inflation rather than of any real gain. This is true of each of these categories, but I call your special attention to the fact that corporate profit is the only item on the list that has gone up less than prices.

This, in turn, leads us to the startling conclusion that since 1950 profits have really gone down, rather than up. When 1963's recordbreaking profits are converted to 1950 dollars, they shrink from $27 billion to $20.5 billion, 10 percent below the actual profits of American corporations in 1950.

In short, when we measure our national economic performance in constant dollars, we find that 1963 was not the year of highest profits for American corporations. That record belongs to 1950; 1963 was not even the second best year; 1948 takes second, with 1963 in third place, a nose ahead of 1955 and 1956.

In relative terms, of course, profits have suffered a sharp decline. Consider, for example, the relationship between profit and sales. In the 5 years beginning in 1950, corporate profits averaged 3.6 percent of sales. During the next 5 years, from 1955 through 1959, the profit margin was down to 3.1 percent—a 14-percent decline. So far during the 1960's, the margin has averaged only 2.6 percent—a further decline of 16 percent.

When we consider profits as return on investment, we get similar results. In the 5 years from 1955 through 1959, the profits of manufacturing corporations averaged 11.4 percent of stockholder equity. So far during the 1960's, the return has averaged only 9.4 percent—a decline of 18 percent.

How high are profits? By any relative measure, profits are now at about the same level as they were during the 1954 recession. Today, after 3 full years of rising prosperity for the rest of the economy, profits have finally climbed back up until they are as high as they were at their lowest point in the decade after the end of World War II.

If it is true that profits were at a recordbreaking rate in 1963, then the record was a new low—not a new high. In the postwar era, profits have never been so low at a high point in the business cycle as they are today. The trend is plain. Corporate profits amounted to 8 percent of gross national product in 1950, 5.8 percent in 1955, 5.1 percent in 1959 and 4.7 percent in 1963.

At this point, I think we can best continue our inquiry into the size of profits by once again changing our question. Even though profits are steadily shrinking, there are many people who seem to feel that profits are as high as, or even higher than, they ought to be. How high should profits be? How do we know?

It seems to me that there are two approaches to this problem. One is the modern-day version of the Robin Hood approach, which assumes that the way to make people better off is to spread the existing store of wealth. Applied to the corporation, the Robin Hood approach leads to the conclusion that corporations can always afford to keep less of their income and give other people more.

Since most corporations make far more money than most individuals, this conclusion has a great deal of superficial plausibility about it. It also has a strong emotional appeal, as the popularity of the Robin Hood legend over the centuries testifies.

The trouble with this approach is that it can't possibly do very much for many people very long. Even if you ignore all the side effects that would result from redistributing present profits, they just aren't big enough to go very far. Corporate profits are only about the same size as 1 year's increase in gross national product. In other words, each year, the growth of our economy provides as much new wealth for the American people as the total amount of corporate profits.

This, in turn, suggests that the American people have much more to gain from the continuing growth of the economy than they could possibly gain by dividing up the profits of corporations.

It also suggests a second approach to the problem of deciding how high profits should be. This approach begins by inquiring into the relationship between profits and growth. What happens to the growth of our economy when the rate of profit goes down, as it has in recent years, and what would happen if we could do something to bring profits back up again?

The relationship between business, profit and economic growth is basically very simple. Profit determines investment, and investment is essential to growth. Thus, a steep and continuing decline in profit is likely to mean a serious drop in investment, and therefore, slower growth for the economy. In these circumstances, higher profit would mean higher investment and faster growth.

The decline in profits during the postwar period has in fact been accompanied by a sharp decline in business investment. Business expenditures for new plant and equipment averaged 7.9 percent of gross national product from 1947 through 1957, but only 6.8 percent after 1957. Last year, business investment amounted to only 6.7 percent of gross national product—well below the lowest level of the earlier postwar years.

This is no petty change. It represents a decline of 14 percent in the share of gross national product going into business investment. To put it differently, if business investment last year had been at the 1947 through 1957 level, instead of at its actual level, $7 billion more would have been spent on new plant and equipment.

Seven billion additional dollars in plant and equipment expenditures would have made a great deal of difference in the performance of our economy. Among other things, it would have meant a great many more jobs.

It is no accident that business profits, business investment, and unemployment are the three economic indicators that have remained at recession levels throughout the

current economic upswing. It takes a lot of business investment to provide one job in today's economy. Indeed, it takes more and more investment for each job. In 1953, American manufacturers had less than $10,000 invested in plant and equipment for each production worker. By 1960, that investment had increased to more than $18,000 per worker.

To get more jobs for our rapidly growing labor force, we need more business investment, and the only way to get more investment is to reverse the steady decline in business profits.

The facts are clear. The logic is plain. The need is urgent. We cannot afford to let the facts be obscured, the logic be confused or the need be frustrated by misunderstanding of the positive role of profit in a dynamic economy.

One common misconception is that an increase in cash flow—profits plus depreciation—does as much to stimulate investment as an increase in profit alone. This is simply not the way things work. The decision to invest or not to invest in a company is not based on that company's success in recovering the cost of its past capital outlays. The determining factor is the company's prospects for future profit.

Does this mean that past profit has no influence on present investment? On the contrary. Past profit experience serves as a basis for predicting future earnings. When the general level of profit goes down steadily, as it has in the postwar period, businessmen have the best of reasons for being increasingly conservative in their estimates of the profitability of new investments. The more conservative their estimates, the lower their investments will be, regardless of their cash-flow position.

An even more basic fallacy is the idea that the growth of our economy can be speeded by expanding consumer purchasing power, regardless of the level of profits and investment. The grain of truth behind this argument is the fact that our economy has been operating below its potential in recent years. When this is the case, then it may be possible to achieve fuller use of existing capacity to produce simply by stimulating consumer demand.

But, fuller use of existing capacity is not economic growth and it is not enough to satisfy the economic aspirations of the American people. To provide more and more new jobs for our constantly expanding labor force, we need to expand our capacity to produce as well as our capacity to consume. Moreover, in addition to more jobs, we need better, more productive jobs, jobs that will continue to provide the American people with a rising standard of living and a wider variety of new and better products.

All of this takes business investment, investment in research and development, investment in new plants, new equipment, new processes, new products. Innovation is both expensive and risky. As often as not, the investment is lost.

Of all the corporations that reported to the Internal Revenue Service during the fiscal year 1962, 40 percent had operated at a loss—and their losses amounted to a total of $6.4 billion. Ours is a profit-and-loss economic system, not a profit system, and the chance to make a profit is what induces people to run the risk of loss. No one with ordinary common sense will risk money on a new idea unless he has good reason to hope for a substantial profit—a profit commensurate with the risk—if the idea passes the acid test of the marketplace.

The lower the expectation of profit if an investment is successful, the more new products and processes will be stifled in the board room before they are ever tested in the marketplace. And, conversely, a higher general level of profit on investment will lead to more innovation and more economic growth, more and better products for consumers, more nad better jobs for employees.

My remarks so far can be summarized in two very simple statements. First, profits have been getting steadily lower. Second, the American people would be better off if profits were higher than they are.

The idea that profit is good is difficult for many people to accept. The idea that higher profits are even better is still harder to accept. What the critics of profit see on the surface is that business aims, not at helping people, but at making profits through people. Their instincts tell them that one man's profit is another man's loss, and so they conclude that profit means exploitation. But experience is a better guide than instinct, and experience tells us that in a competitive economy businesses profit most from those ventures that best serve the general economic welfare.

The target of private business is private profit. The proper target of an economic system is the material well-being of all the people. The great virtue of a free and competitive economy is that it places these two targets in line with each other, so that hiting one means hitting both.

At this point in our national economic history, the target business aims at is becoming steadily smaller and more elusive. Profit is shrinking, and so are the general benefits that profit brings.

Fortunately, there is reason to hope for some improvement in the profitability of business enterprise. The reduction of Federal income taxes is an important step in the right direction.

By cutting taxes across the board, for corporations as well as for individuals in all tax brackets, the new tax law serves to increase profit and investment as well as to stimulate consumer demand.

Its effects on business investment are already being felt. According to the latest surveys, business plans for new investment in 1964 are up substantially from last year and from earlier predictions. It is now expected that business investment this year will be more than $3 billion higher than last year—a 9-percent increase.

As encouraging as the present outlook may be, the tax cut is not a panacea. It does not guarantee that profit will rise or that investment will continue to rise. Its benefits could be lost if rising business costs lead either to inflation or to further pressure on profits or to both. Conversely, the benefits of tax reduction can be greatly enhanced if business costs can be reduced.

The responsibility for controlling the rise in business costs is broadly shared. It rests, in part, with business management; in part with Government, State and local as well as Federal; in part with employes and their unions; in part with the American people.

Management has the primary responsibility for controlling costs by seeking more efficient ways of making and marketing products. But many of the costs of doing business lie wholly or partially beyond the control of management.

Among them, of course, is the rapidly rising burden of State and local taxes. To the extent that savings in Federal taxes are merely diverted into State and local government treasuries, the benefits of Federal tax reduction will be lost.

The Federal Government has recognized that high tax rates can limit the growth of tax revenues by slowing the growth of the tax base. The Federal Government has also recognized that the best hope of increasing tax collections in the long run is to limit Government spending now and to set taxes at a level that will encourage the growth of the economy. These are conclusions that are just as relevant to the serious fiscal problems of our States and cities as they are to the fiscal problems of our national Government.

In a broader sense, they are also relevant to the problems of collective bargaining. Recent statements by union leaders suggest that they are planning a determined drive to limit output per worker, to resist management efforts to find more efficient ways of working and to gain the biggest wage and fringe benefits increases in many years. Wage costs would also be raised substantially by the administration's bill to require double-time for overtime work in selected industries.

The benefits of Federal tax reduction can be destroyed just as surely in this manner as by a general increase in State and local taxation. Whether business costs are raised by taxes, by collective bargaining, by new labor legislation or by other developments, the effects will be the same—lower profits, less investment, slower economic growth, fewer jobs and less income for everyone. On the other hand, whatever serves to reduce costs and restore profit margins will lead to more investment, more growth, more jobs, and more income for everyone, including union members.

In the last analysis, much of the responsibility for controlling the rise in business costs belongs to the American people—just as the benefits of lower costs and higher profit belong to them. The taxing power of governments and the bargaining power of unions both are based on law, and law is determined, however imperfectly, by the opinions of the people.

The enactment of the new tax law is a hopeful sign that the economic function of profit is gaining broader understanding among the American people and their representatives. It also presents an opportunity to promote still broader understanding by demonstrating the benefits that higher profit can bring. Those of us who are in business management face the challenge of proving—not in words, but in deeds—that profit is good and more profit is better.

This means, first of all, that we must protect and enhance the profits of our businesses by renewing our determination to reduce the costs we can control. Each of us must make his own shop as efficient as it can possibly be—and then go on to make it still more efficient.

But reducing costs, important as it is, is not the most important part of the challenge we face. Our larger responsibility as businessmen is to act in the spirit of the entrepreneur. The entrepreneur is the man who dares, the man who faces the future with boldness and vision, the man who is ever on the lookout for new markets and new ways to serve old markets.

He is the man who never passes by a fair chance to make money by risking money. He is the man who justifies profit by making it the engine of economic growth and progress. His is the spirit we need to prove that profit is good, not only for business, but for our Nation and all its people.

Investigation of Robert G. Baker by Committee on Rules and Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have prepared a summary of the Baker investigation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with an editorial from the

Washington Evening Star for March 26 to appear at the end thereof.

There being no objection, the summary and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOBBY BAKER INVESTIGATION

It appears that the investigation of the "Bobby Baker Affair" is over. The counsel for the committee is said to be drafting a report for the committee, which consists of six Democrats and three Republicans. The Republican members have not yet been called into consultations on the report, and it is probable that they will file a minority report in view of the refusal of the majority members to call certain witnesses requested by them. These included Walter Jenkins, a White House aid and former administrative assistant to the President when he was majority leader of the Senate. (Last month the White House announced that Mr. Jenkins, who owned some stock in the LBJ television station in Austin, had resigned as manager of the LBJ Co. interests.)

Mr. Baker served as secretary to the Senate majority for a number of years until his resignation under fire last October. He was regarded as a protege of Majority Leader Johnson who, on August 30, 1957, said of him: "I consider him one of my most trusted, most loyal, and most competent friends." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 16722.) He refused to give testimony before the committee, claiming his privilege under the fifth amendment.

The question of whether any of Mr. Baker's alleged improprieties involved the majority leader, now the President, will probably never be answered. The nearest the committee came to this delicate subject was when a Maryland insurance man, one Don Reynolds, testified under oath that he had been obliged to purchase $3,000 in advertising time on the LBJ station by Mr. Jenkins, following Reynolds' sale of a $100,000 policy on Senator Johnson's life. (Letters and checks in the committee's file substantiate payment of at least $1,208 for such advertising.) The committee received a sworn statement from Mr. Jenkins that he knew of no such arrangement, but the majority on the committee refused to call Mr. Jenkins before the committee to answer questions.

Mr. Reynolds also testified that, at Mr. Baker's instance, he bought an expensive hi-fit set and had it installed in Senator Johnson's home. Asked about this by reporters, President Johnson said that he understood that was a "gift" from Mr. Baker.

The monopoly position of the LBJ station in Austin has provoked considerable comment, particularly in view of its rapid growth into a very profitable enterprise. Since his succession to the Presidency, President Johnson has transferred the family stock to a trust in an effort to avoid any conflict of interest. However, dividends from the stock and any appreciation in the value of the stock will accrue to the family's benefit.

The question of whether any of Mr. Baker's alleged improprieties involved any Members of the Senate will also probably never be answered. The nearest the committee came to this equally delicate subject was the revelation that Mr. Baker participated in a highly profitable Florida real estate venture with one Member of the Senate. Asked by reporters about this, the Senator stated that he thought it would "help" Mr. Baker, who was trying to raise a family. (While serving in his $20,000 a year position as secretary to the majority, Mr. Baker submitted a financial statement with an application for a loan showing his "net worth" in excess of $2 million.)

Mr. Baker is reported to have handled campaign funds for some of the Democratic Senators in their campaigns for reelection.

It appears that Mr. Baker's outside activities included, among others, a highly profitable purchase of stock in a Milwaukee insurance firm 17 days before it was registered for sale by the Securities and Exchange Commission; assisting a Nevada gambler in obtaining gambling concessions in the Caribbean; a partnership in a motel in North Carolina with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges; a townhouse in Southwest Washington; stock in a vending machine corporation with machines located in plants of Government contractors; commissions from the Haitian-American Meat & Provision Co. on each pound of beef exported from Haiti to the United States (4.5 million pounds was exported by this firm to the United States and Puerto Rico from June 1, 1961, through last September); efforts (unsuccessful) to get the Federal Housing Administration to reverse itself and approve a housing project in Puerto Rico; and the million-dollar Carousel Motel on Maryland's Eastern Shore.

SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

On October 10 of last year, the Senate adopted a resolution authorizing and directing the Senate Rules Committee to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, for the purpose of ascertaining (1) whether any such interests or activities have involved conflicts of interest or other impropriety, and (2) whether additional laws, rules, or regulations are necessary or desirable for the purpose of prohibiting or restricting any such interests or activities.

The committee got off to a very bad start when the chairman of the committee announced to the press that we are not investigating Senators. Subsequently, under a bipartisan threat of amendment of the resolution on the Senate floor, it was agreed that no such limitation of the scope of the committee's investigation was ever intended. However, the attitude toward avoiding possible embarrassment of Senators had been expressed, and it is significant that no testimony was taken which might have unfavorably reflected upon any present Member of the Senate, aside from the aforementioned transaction involving the Florida real estate deal.

My personal views on this matter were expressed on several occasions:

On February 3: "I have said publicly that I thought this investigation should be pressed completely and without regard to partisan considerations, letting the chips fall where they may; that the integrity of the U.S. Senate, and, indeed, very possibly certain offices within the executive branch of our Federal Government is involved * * * [regarding Mr. Reynolds' sworn testimony and the statement filed by Mr. Jenkins]. In view of what appears to be a conflict in testimony, I trust that the committee will call all of the parties before it to have it out—once and for all, and, may I add, to let the chips fall where they may. The public has a right to know the whole truth about this transaction—not just half of the truth. And I presume the committee will also want to have Mr. Baker shed some light on the situation too"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1709.

On March 16: "I recall one witness in particular. Mr. Reynolds made some allegations, and those allegations have been completely denied by someone [Mr. Jenkins] who has not yet been called before the committee. It would seem that the least the committee might do is to get the witnesses together and find out who is committing perjury and who is not. That apparently will not be done"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5195.

On March 18: [Referring to possible contempt proceedings against Mr. Baker for refusing to answer questions of the Committee] "However, it would seem to me that if there was any reasonable possibility that contempt proceedings could be successfully conducted, if there ever was going to be a time for the Senate to get moving on something like this, this is the time. If they cannot be made to stick when the integrity of the Senate is involved, as it is in this case, it seems to me we may as well forget about any contempt proceeding at any time."

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION

The lead editorial of the Washington Evening Star for March 26 is printed in full below. It expresses my sentiments on this matter. The cloud over the White House will be a campaign issue this fall, I think.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1964]

TOO BAD

The chairman and the majority of the Senate Rules Committee apparently have decided to ring down the curtain on the Bobby Baker investigation. From the first they gave the feeling that they had been pushed into the whole thing only by the insensitive press and they had tried before this to get away from those embarrassing details and up onto the broad plains of principle. Now they have succeeded.

It is too bad. What is lost is not a "carnival," a "circus" or a "partisan field day," to quote a few of the reasons given earlier for letting Bobby off the hook. What is lost is the chance to find out just how involved the Senate majority staff and, for that matter, assorted Members of the Senate majority itself, were in the complex affairs of the wonder boy from Carolina.

However embarrassing such revelations might have been, they would have been preferable to the not quite diffused cloud that now hangs over the Senate and its staff. The cloud, unfortunately, also hangs over the White House. Nor is it likely to be dissipated while the conflicting testimony involving the President's close assistant, Walter Jenkins, remains unresolved. This is not guilt-by-association and it is not low partisan politics. It is the commonsense conclusion inevitably drawn from a failure to lay the facts on the table.

It is, we say, too bad. Assuming there was no serious fire beneath all the murky smoke, it would have been so easy to prove the fact.

An Understanding of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column from the March 27, 1964, bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center.

My good friend, Rabbi Harry Halpern, has thrown into focus the essence of religious belief, which is ethical-conduct. His remarks follow:

FROM WHERE I STAND

There is one subject on which there is continuous debate, which leads to emotional outbursts, about which everyone seems to be informed and on which almost everyone has an opinion and which has been argued and discussed down through the ages. That subject is religion, which defies accurate definition and which is used in many different ways.

Most of us are agreed, I think, that any religion worthy of its name no matter what it may involve ritually or theologically, should impose a certain pattern of conduct upon its adherents. Any religion which makes no ethical demands upon those who profess it, cannot command the respect of any thinking person.

Two items in the news make me realize how little people understand of religion and that it is possible to justify unethical conduct in the name of religion.

A determined effort is being made by many Americans to bypass the Supreme Court decision banning prayers and Bible readings in public schools. It is proposed to amend the Constitution so that children may be able to start the school day with a prayer. Thus, it is assumed, that youngsters will be imbued with the spirit of religion and we will not raise a godless generation. How naively it is assumed that a brief formula recited in the morning will spell the difference between religion and atheism.

Meanwhile far away from here, in India, seven Moslems were killed in an outbreak of religious violence. The murders are an outgrowth of tensions which arose some months ago when a reputed hair of Mohammed was stolen from a mosque, allegedly by Hindus. Whether the hair was in reality from the head or the beard of Mohammed is a debatable question, but evidently it is more valuable than human life. Is it because a prophet's hair is sacred while a human life is not? How is it possible to commit murder in the name of religion?

And if we are depressed and we deplore the stabbing of Moslems in India, should we not take a look at our own actions? True, we may not murder but we do become bitter and hostile over religious differences. We denounce and deride others, we persecute them because they have committed some ritual offense. In the majority of instances, we must admit that hatred and antagonism are religiously more serious than the violation involved. The rabbis of old said that the temple in Jerusalem was destroyed because there was baseless hatred among the inhabitants of the land.

The mouthing of a prayer does not constitute religion nor is murder over a sacred hair an expression of piety.

Trial of All Crimes Shall Be by Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg, S.C., Herald of April 12, 1964, printed a very eloquent argument against the recent Supreme Court decision which would deny trial by jury even in cases in criminal contempt. This editorial clearly points out the constitutional provision which specifically requires that all criminal cases, except in impeachment cases, shall be tried by a jury.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this excellent editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Apr. 12, 1964]

TRIAL OF ALL CRIMES SHALL BE BY JURY

Those who scoff at fears that the American Constitution is being trampled during these troubled times need to search the document in relation to current applications.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the former Governor and former Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi can be imprisoned without a jury trial.

"The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury."

So says the U.S. Constitution in article III, section 2. Words could not be any more certain in meaning.

But not to the Supreme Court. The prevailing justices claim that criminal contempt, with which the two are charged, is an exception to this clause.

Yet, these men are charged with a crime and the Constitution admits no exception.

Ross Barnett and Paul Johnson (now Governor) are accused of criminal contempt of court for refusing to enroll a Negro at the University of Mississippi.

It matters not what one thinks of Ross Barnett and the tragic events at the university. A great many southerners feel that he performed a terrible disservice in the whole episode.

Faithful adherance to the Constitution is the question.

At the time Barnett was charged, another serious breach occurred.

The Constitution says, in the same section as above: "In all cases * * * in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction."

Quite clear, isn't it?

A Federal court in New Orleans called a hearing on the contempt citation against Barnett. The State of Mississippi was a party, Barnett being personally involved only as its chief executive.

Legal authorities for the State sought to present that constitutional question to the court. They were not even allowed to appear.

The Federal court in New Orleans had no constitutional right even to hear the case against Barnett, much less to convict him. It did both.

The gravest danger to constitutional principle comes when people are persuaded that some of its provisions are hampering justice and fairness. It is so very easy then to sweep aside the guarantees that have been so jealously guarded for nearly 200 years.

On Homemaking and the Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the great youth organizations in our Nation today is the Future Homemakers of America. This fine organization is an outgrowth of the teaching of home economics in our high schools and colleges across the Nation. This fine group encourages and instills the pride of a good home in these fine young ladies.

A most fitting tribute was paid last week by one of our finest weekly newspapers, the Havana Herald, to this organization. Jack Dudley, the publisher, is one of Florida's most respected newspapermen and I would like to have the editorial which appeared in that paper reprinted here:

ON HOMEMAKING AND THE FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

We are glad that modern education thinking has included in its program a continuing emphasis on the importance of home economics in our high schools and colleges.

Homemaking is an honorable profession and an important one and it is gratifying to know that today our high school girls are receiving training in the arts of keeping house and home managing.

Many of our teenage girls are members of the Future Homemakers of America, an extracurricular organization aimed at encouraging and popularizing this course for our future wives and mothers. Members come from the home economics classes.

As this is FHA Week it seems timely that we review some of the activities of this group to see just what we can expect of our future homemakers.

With the motto, "Toward New Horizons," ever in mind, FHA girls aspire to obtain knowledge, not only in the housekeeping arts, but also to intelligently take their place in community life. They are trained to speak before public groups. Members can plan and carry out a social function from a small luncheon to a large banquet. Their minds are open to everchanging economy and they can cope with problems of the old and new with rapid adjustment.

FHA members are aware of their future duties as citizens. They understand the process of our political system and themselves hold conventions to elect officers on a local, State, and National level.

Not forgetting the basis of commendable homemaking, FHA members also have projects of sewing, cooking, home decorating, and nutrition as well as knowledge of proper social graces and attractive appearances.

Young ladies who are members of the FHA can also handle finances, a most important aspect of home life at any level. They can write a news story, keep accurate accounts and records, and find time to help with community charity and health fund drives. They can take care of small children as well as behave in the proper manner at a teenage dance. Members can offer a spiritual devotional in the home and at school.

True, all girls in this school organization are not proficient in all of these phases of homemaking, but many are quite skilled in a number of these fields. All of them have had the opportunity to obtain some knowledge of what is expected of a future homemaker and should be better able to establish and direct a fine, dependable family unit, in the world of tomorrow.

We honor the FHA organization this week, for these aims.

Fair Trade Bill Labeled "Harmful to Economy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL REC-

ORD an article appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., Thursday, November 7, 1963, entitled "Fair Trade Bill Labeled Harmful to Economy," pointing out how destructive the so-called quality stabilization bill would be to the interests of consumers, business, and the economy as a whole.

FAIR TRADE BILL LABELED HARMFUL TO ECONOMY

(By Richard Harwood)

WASHINGTON, November 6.—The President's Council of Economic Advisers warned Congress Wednesday that a national fair trade law would damage the American economy.

In a report to the Joint Economic Committee, Council Chairman Walter Heller said the legislation would hit consumers in two ways. It would force up retail prices, he said, and would put an end to the seasonal sales ordinarily conducted by stores to clear out excess stocks of such things as summer clothing and Christmas merchandise.

Heller also predicted that a fair trade law would hurt the small businessmen who are promoting it.

By eliminating price competition, said Heller, Congress would force retailers to increase their advertising budgets to buy "fancier store decorations," to provide additional services to customers, and to engage in "other forms of nonprice competition."

"This would force up the costs of retailing," he said, "and retailers would not in the end have been protected from competitive pressures (from big stores). * * * Although a small number of individual retailers might be better off, for retailers as a whole, the 'protection' afforded by price maintenance would be illusory. Retailers would not gain, but their customers would lose."

Heller said low-income shoppers would be hardest hit by a national fair trade law. Fixed prices would "reduce the real incomes of consumers and erode the value of their savings."

Under present competitive conditions, he said, "consumers can now choose to patronize relatively high-priced shops that provide substantial services with their goods, or they may choose stores that sell at lower prices but without the auxiliary services." But with prices fixed, Heller said, these choices would either be eliminated or seriously reduced.

The joint committee requested Heller's statement in connection with its consideration of the "quality stabilization" (fair trade) bill now pending in Congress.

The bill has strong support in both House and Senate although the White House has opposed its passage.

Former President Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues who participated in the special tribute to former President Herbert Hoover on March 24, 1964, entitled "Get Well, Mr. President," would enjoy seeing the response I received from Mr. Hoover after I sent him a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day. I am, therefore, submitting a copy of his letter herewith:

WALDORF-ASTORIA TOWERS,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: I have your most kind letter, with its enclosure.

Never have I received a greater get-well incentive than yours and your comrades in the Congress. I do not feel I deserve such a tribute, but if anything will get me feeling completely well again, you and your colleagues have made a major push in that direction.

I send you my gratitude and my warm good wishes.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Time and Mass Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, of all of the legislation currently pending before the Congress the most important to my congressional district, and to every metropolitan area in America, is the mass transit bill. Accordingly, at this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial of Monday, April 6, 1964, which appeared in the Boston Herald, a Republican newspaper:

TIME AND MASS TRANSIT

Sometimes you can solve a problem by simply ignoring it. More often, however, putting off a solution makes a problem worse.

A lot of people seem to think that the problem of urban transportation will solve itself. In fact, the urban transportation problem is getting worse every day, and the difficulty of solving it is being compounded by public inaction.

When the mass transit bill was being debated in the Senate a year ago, Senator SPARKMAN warned: "The longer we delay in recognizing that this is a real crisis, the costlier it will be. Many communities have abandoned transit rights-of-way that could have been saved if Congress had acted sooner."

He was right. Mass transit is only a part of the urban transportation picture. But it is a vital part. President Kennedy and President Johnson have both recognized that without strong rapid transit systems our big cities cannot meet their transportation needs. Automobile commutation has long since reached the point of diminishing returns. The automobile is slowly defeating itself. Rail and bus transportation have become a must.

Yet the country has been strangely slow to see the need. It has let existing transit companies go to the wall financially. It has let precious rights-of-way be abandoned and built over. It has hoped that time would turn something up. And time all along has been working against it.

President Johnson is now trying to break through this inertia. He is trying to revive the House version of the Administration's Mass Transit bill, which would provide $500 million in matching grants-in-aid to cities building or rebuilding mass transit facilities. It is important that he succeed.

Every urban community and every Congressman representing an urban community should back this bill. Time is running out. The need for rapid transit expansion is overwhelming, and Federal aid is absolutely essential if the expansion is to take place.

The key to successful action in the House is support by urban Republicans. The Speaker has said he will move the bill as soon as he has commitments from the 40 GOP members needed to assure its passage. Massachusetts, an urban State with peculiarly pressing transportation problems, should have no absentees on this rollcall.

The time to be counted is now.

Poverty in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I was most encouraged by the clear analysis of President Johnson's proposals for a war on poverty which appeared recently in the editorial column of the Daily Utah Chronicle, the student newspaper of the University of Utah, edited by Joan Trevithick, of Salt Lake City.

I liked the forthright way in which the editorial attacked the myth that people are poor simply "because they are lazy and do not want to work," and then proceeded to tick off and discuss with understanding some of the causes of poverty—including racial discrimination, technology, slums, and lack of educational opportunities.

The editorial pulls no punches about the size of the job or the difficulties ahead in conducting the war on poverty, but holds that the war can be won, and concludes persuasively "Let us commence that war."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Utah Daily Chronicle be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY IN AMERICA: PENNILESS POPULATION

It must certainly seem ironic to the average, prosperous, middle-class American that one of the current issues of the day centers around economic depression and poverty. It is far too easy in this day of general economic progress, growth and prosperity to neglect the fact that there exists a class of Americans that does not share in this well being. Yet there is no denying that poverty is one of the pressing problems in this country.

The frightening thing about this situation is that it has become a chronic state; it is not a transitional phase or a passing thing. It is chronic to the point of becoming structural: 20 percent of our population is now living in a state of second-class citizenship with incomes below what most of us would consider necessary for subsistence.

The structural nature of poverty has created a lower class that has little hope or opportunity for betterment. And what is even worse is the fact that initiative and enterprise is stifled by the near impossibility of overcoming the obstacles of ignorance and lack of education.

There are any number of causes that contribute to the existence and growth of poverty and just as many misconceptions as to why they exist. The notion that these peo-

ple are poor because they are lazy and don't want to work for their own improvement, though true in some cases, cannot be generalized as the only cause. Racial discrimination is certainly a causative factor both in the South and the North. Technological shifts, such as the problems of coal mining in West Virginia, or cutbacks in key industries must also be considered. Countless other factors could be mentioned that would add to the conclusion that many Americans suffer from gross misconceptions and oversimplifications.

It is difficult to believe that this country would allow such a situation to persist for long. Our traditional notions of equality of opportunity are certainly on the firing line as long as we allow this structural poverty to continue. This is particularly true when we consider the self perpetuating nature of this problem and its effect on a large sector of our youth.

Children brought up in slums surrounded by depression never learn to expect anything else in life. Their educational opportunities are generally below average and the social stigmas attached to poverty are only too obvious. How can it be argued that young people brought up in this environment will somehow be able to break out of it on their own and become useful citizens? Not to say that it can't be done; just that, without help, the barriers are almost impossible to overcome.

Johnson's proposals to attack this problem are a step in the right direction if only to call the Nation's attention to the fact that a problem exists. But platitudinous declarations of war and statements such as, "I guess we're all against poverty," will never be enough. A bold Federal program pledged to take direct action and to aid States in their efforts will be necessary before any significant progress can be made in this area.

A number of Johnson's proposals deserve close consideration. It is especially in the areas of retraining that his attack on poverty has merit. Funds to aid families in moving from economically depressed areas to places of greater employment opportunity would help those workers that have been displaced by technological shifts and automation.

The Federal retraining program can also help to shift workers into industries where demand is greater. But the limitations to these programs must be analyzed realistically; they can only go so far. A coal miner cannot be retrained to be an engineer. Nonetheless, these projects do have possibilities.

It is on the educational front that the greatest assault must be made. Ignorance and poverty are always dual problems; not until we put our youth out of the depths of ignorance will there be any hope of keeping them out of the depths of poverty. Only through education will a real opportunity be provided; any lasting solution to the specter of poverty will depend on our attack on ignorance. To Johnson's war on poverty we would add this attack on ignorance. Only by striking at this double problem can the war be successfully waged. But let us commence that war.

Jefferson Randolph Kean: Doctor, Soldier, Virginia Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your notice on Thomas Jefferson's birthday, the work of Gen. J. R. Kean, M.D., U.S. Army, great-great grandson of the third President. General Kean once laid his own Army Medical Corps career on the line in support of Dr. Gorgas, sanitary engineering hero of the Panama Canal epic. This courageous act is but a highlight of a long, quietly efficient service which further enhances the Jefferson family tradition. I call to your attention the article published in Military Medicine:

DOCTOR—SOLDIER—VIRGINIA GENTLEMAN

(By Brig. Gen. Leon A. Fox, U.S. Army, retired)

(NOTE.—Leon Alexander Fox, born November 2, 1890, Birmingham, Ala. University of Cincinnati, doctor of medicine 1912; Johns Hopkins, doctor of public health 1935; also M.S. chemistry and Ph. D. biology and philosophy, American University. After internship spent almost entire active professional life in Medical Corps, U.S. Army. Mexican border service 1916; American Expeditionary Force, France 1917–19; Chief of Laboratory Service, Army General Hospitals; Director, Department of Administration, Medical Field Service School; Chief Surgeon U.S. Army Forces in China 1937 until evacuation of American forces 1938. Early in World War II Director of the U.S. Army Engineer Health Service, involving the organization and direction of medical service for labor forces of hundreds of thousands constructing camps and airfields all over the world. Appointed Director of the U.S. Typhus Commission 1943 (Presidential appointment). Later at own request relieved as director and appointed field director to continue work in the field. Appointed brigadier general 1943. Retired, physical disability 1946. Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, numerous service medals, battle stars and many foreign decorations all received as an active field officer.)

In Lynchburg, Va., in the strenuous days of 1860, on the eve of the Civil War, Jefferson Randolph Kean was born. The world had a right to expect much from one carrying the names of three of Virginia's great families. A great-great-grandson of Thomas Jefferson is heritage of which any man could be proud for when it comes to breeding, Thomas Jefferson is the "man of war" of American statemen. If his immortal soul has any awareness of happenings on this planet, he must be proud of the way Jefferson Randolph Kean ran life's race.

A true thoroughbred horse will carry his burden (weight) through the course and at the head of the stretch with the finish a quarter mile away; when the real test begins, the quitters start to "bear in," "bear out," "cough it up," or just plain "stop." The real horse (or real man) takes hold of the bit and says "Come on, I have just started to run." Jefferson Randolph Kean carried his burden straight and true. Thomas Jefferson, his grandsire, had founded the University of Virginia. Naturally, young Kean after adequate preparation entered the university and in 1883 graduated with his doctorate in medicine. A year later we find him in the Medical Corps of our Army where he served nearly 40 years.

We shall not take time to review General Kean's entire military career from the time he entered the service until he was made a general officer in World War I. We can truthfully say he came up the hard way. His early service when stationed at western frontier posts included Indian fighting such as the Sioux campaign of 1890–91. He was in Cuba in the Spanish War as Gen. Fitzhugh Lee's chief surgeon. Later, when the more active military phase of the campaign was over, Gen. Leonard Wood appointed him director of the department of charities. He was thus associated with the Walter Reed yellow fever board.

In 1902 he was ordered to Washington, D.C., for duty in the Surgeon General's office. He was assigned as executive officer to Surgeon General O'Reilly. Then for a period of over 20 years he was a tower of strength to O'Reilly and succeeeding Surgeons General of the Army, who only permitted him to leave the Capital long enough to comply with the Manchu law. The following quotation from Ashburn's "History of the Medical Department" mentions but a few of Kean's many great accomplishments. Discussing O'Reilly's staff, Ashburn states: "First of them, and executive officer in the organization, Jefferson R. Kean, one of the farseeing and long-planning men of the corps, to whose foresight and plans, more than to those of any other man, we are indebted for the Medical Reserve Corps, the close liaison with the Red Cross, and the Red Cross hospital units of the World War, and who was prominent in all the developments of the corps, during the administration of Surgeons General O'Reilly and Torney."

General Kean was one of the first officers of our corps in France in World War I. When General Pershing appointed General Ireland chief surgeon of the U.S. Expeditionary Force, Ireland's choice for a deputy was naturally Kean. They had worked together for years. During his entire 40 years' service, outstanding, superior performance was routine for Jefferson Randolph Kean, an almost perfect Army medical officer. The knowing will not question the first part of my title, "Doctor—Soldier * * *." And the story I shall relate reveals he was truly a Virginia gentleman.

I am now going to review an incident of which few remaining alive have knowledge. This incident tested his loyalty and character and established him as outstanding even for the proud State of Virginia. The incident concerns Colonel Gorgas, his many trials and continued harassment when serving as health officer during the construction of the Panama Canal. Major Gorgas' excellent work in Cuba was under the watchful eye of Gen. Leonard Wood. Wood, though a line officer, was a doctor, holding an M.D. from Harvard University. At Harvard, Wood knew Theodore Roosevelt with whom later he served in Cuba. When Roosevelt became President, naturally Leonard Wood became his military adviser. Gen. Leonard Wood, whose medical training enabled him to appreciate Gorgas' ability, recommended that Major Gorgas be promoted to the grade of colonel and appointed the chief health officer for the construction of the Panama Canal.

All know of the wonderful work in field sanitation accomplished by Gorgas at Panama. Few know of the difficulties and harassment the engineers in charge of construction showered on the kindly, patient, long-suffering but persistent and determined man. His great work in field sanitation, even when burdened by vexatious difficulties and obstructions, earned him certainty of appointment as the Surgeon General. The incident I intend to relate occurred at the time when Colonel Gorgas was beset with man-made difficulties and obstructions.

During Theodore Roosevelt's administration, the President was confronted with the problem created by the differences that existed between Colonel Gorgas and the engineers in charge at the Panama Canal. When a request reached Roosevelt that Colonel Gorgas be replaced, of course the President consulted Gen. Leonard Wood who had originally recommended Gorgas. It is reported that the reason given for requesting the relief of Colonel Gorgas was that his numerous regulations were petty and unreasonable and would indefinitely delay the completion of the canal. Lucky for Gorgas, lucky for the Medical Department of the Army and especially fortunate for the people of the United States of America, General Wood was a

medical man, thoroughly familiar with Gorgas' ability. It is reported that General Wood's comment was that he did not know when the engineers at Panama could complete the canal even with the help of the measures Colonel Gorgas recommended but he was certain they would never complete the canal if they ignored the recommendations of Gorgas. He called the President's attention to the fact that one of the reasons the French failed at Panama—even though DeLesseps, the engineer that built the Suez Canal, was in charge—was because the French neglected sanitary measures. Thank God, the President reacted with typical Rooseveltian decision. He appointed Colonel Gorgas a member of the Panama Canal Commission.

With Colonel Gorgas a member of the Commission, naturally his status improved; however, he still labored under great difficulties in a hostile environment, and his troubles with the engineers were not at an end. When William Howard Taft succeeded Roosevelt as President, Goethals again requested the relief of Gorgas. Now Jefferson Randolph Kean enters the picture. I have the story directly from Generals Ireland and Reynolds, both former Surgeon Generals of the Army. General Ireland—at that time Maj. Merritte W. Ireland the personnel officer in the Surgeon General's office—was certainly in position to report accurately the following incident. Major Kean in his official visits to the White House had become an acquaintance, possibly a friend, of President Taft. When Taft received the request for the relief of Gorgas from duty with the Panama Canal Commission, the President requested that Major Kean call at his office.

President Taft reviewed the request of Goethals for the relief of Gorgas and directed Major Kean to consult with the personnel officer in the Surgeon General's office then return to the White House the next day with an appropriate recommendation for the best qualified officer to relieve Colonel Gorgas. Major Kean hurriedly returned to the Surgeon General's office; and when he arrived was so disturbed and angry he was almost incoherent. Naturally, neither Ireland nor Kean knew anyone qualified to relieve Gorgas. Kean had worked with Gorgas in Cuba and was thoroughly familiar with his high character and great ability. They knew very well there was not a man in America, in or out of the service, so well qualified to act as health officer at Panama. They decided they would not recommend anyone to replace him. Major Kean was the executive in the Surgeon General's office. He did not shirk his duty. Kean assumed responsibility for handling the entire matter.

The next day Jefferson Randolph Kean put on his "best bib and tucker" (pencil striped trousers and afternoon jacket) and carrying his cane proceeded to the While House. Lo and behold, when he entered the President's office, he was greeted by President Taft as follows: "Major, I have decided I do not need your recommendation. I have made inquiries myself. I have found out that you are the best man in the Medical Corps to succeed Gorgas. You were in Cuba with Gorgas, you had the same experience and you are generally considered a tactful officer." Major Kean was flabbergasted. He had worked with Gorgas and he knew better than anyone in the corps Gorgas' special aptitude for the work at Panama. He knew how well the sanitary measures were proceeding. He knew the wonderful results that had been obtained and he knew that anyone who continued the sanitary measures would be recognized as the great sanitarian who made possible the construction of the canal. He also knew the completion of the canal was now just a question of time. Kean, the executive officer in the Surgeon General's office, knew these facts; however, Jefferson Randolph Kean was not a Brutus to knife a coworker and reap unearned rewards.

Jefferson Randolph Kean reacted as a thoroughbred: "Mr. President, I beg you will not consider me for this duty. I know there is no man in the corps who could have accomplished the things Gorgas has done at Panama. I assure you I love the Army Medical Corps. It is my life but I will resign from the Army if I am ordered to replace Gorgas. Gorgas is a hero to the American medical profession. If I had any part in the replacement of Colonel Gorgas, I could never forgive myself." Then like Rabbi Nathan confronting David, after the murder of Uriah and the affair with Bath-sheba, with the famous "Thou art the man"—Kean faced the President with: "Mr. President, I trust you realize the medical profession will never forget and never forgive if you relieve Gorgas." Then a final plea to leave no doubt about his own position: "Mr. President, I pray you will not force me to leave the Army."

Taft was a man of judicial temperament and not to be hurried. He requested Kean to return the next day. Major Kean returned to the Surgeon General's office thinking he had so displeased the President he would have to leave the service. He informed the Surgeon General and the personnel officer, Major Ireland they should be considering someone as his successor. To the everlasting credit of President Taft, when Kean presented himself at the White House the next day he was greeted with: "Major Kean, you know Gorgas better than anyone in Washington. On your word, I have decided it is best to leave him at Panama."

Jefferson Randolph Kean, one of the truly great officers of our corps, was not to be the sanitary hero of Panama. The price of fame was too high—loss of self-respect. Therefore, the world does not know him. He is not mentioned in any of the encyclopedias. The Britannica lists but two Keans, both actors, stage actors, play actors. Jefferson Randolph Kean, a real actor in the American play "Our National Welfare," is entirely unknown save to a few "eldtimers" in our corps who know his greatness. To us he is a real hero. His remains rest at Monticello with the Jefferson family.

Thomas Jefferson was a cultured gentleman with a classical education, a lawyer, a philosopher, a scientist, an honest statesman of parts, a horseman of renown—even in Virginia where gambling and horseracing were a part of the life of the cultured class. Jefferson had few, if any, bad habits; though he loved the races and a good thoroughbred horse, he did not gamble. Thomas Jefferson must be proud of his grandson Jefferson Randolph Kean. Kean was a Virginia gentleman, a thoroughbred.

Addendum: In this story the heroes are Gorgas and Kean. There are no villains. Certainly, General Goethals and his assistants, the engineers at Panama, are not the villains. At the time few doctors in America or elsewhere realized the great importance of the insect transmission of disease. In America Theobold Smith's work with tick fever and the investigations of the Reed group working with yellow fever had revealed the basic fundamental facts of insect transmission of disease. Ross, working in India applying the lessons of Theobold Smith, solved the malaria problem.

This basic research could not be assimilated overnight. Remember Gorgas' work at Panama was the first great example of applied field sanitation. He had been successful in Cuba with the campaign against yellow fever. At Panama, the pest hole of disease, Gorgas faced almost every problem. Why, even today not 10 percent of the medical profession realize the importance of preventive medicine. Few were enlightened 60 years ago. The early workers in the field of preventive medicine were real crusaders, and scientific crusaders are seldom popular during their lives.

The men digging the Panama Canal were the guinea pigs that proved the value of field sanitation. The lessons of field sanitation were learned at Panama. The engineers had to be shown. They were shown. I know from personal experience they were good students. Today the Engineer Corps of the U.S. Army can teach many in the medical profession the lessons Gorgas taught so well at Panama.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, slowly but surely the light of public understanding is helping to dispel the fog of misinformation generated by opponents of the quality stabilization bill.

A growing appreciation of the economic ills of the Nation's retail marketplace is leading more people to a study of quality stabilization and its aims. In fact, many persons who have previously been misled regarding this vital legislation are now taking a second look at the terms of the quality stabilization bill.

I have opposed the so-called fair trade legislation each time it has been considered by the Congress. Quality stabilization is 100-percent optional to the manufacturer, retailer, and consumer. It is not price fixing as "sharpers" in the retail trade would have the public believe. If enacted into law, it will save the legitimate retailer and the quality manufacturer from destruction by mass distributors of foreign made junk merchandise now being unloaded on the American public.

Recently, a letter concerning quality stabilization came to my office from a couple in Hammond, Ind., Mr. and Mrs. Donald Mahns. The following letter reflects growing grassroots response when the consumer knows the true facts about quality stabilization legislation.

HAMMOND, IND.,
March 14, 1964

Subject: Quality Stabilization Act.
Hon. R. J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. MR. MADDEN: I was enlightened by your reply to my letter on the Quality Stabilization Act. The information on this act, as I had know it, was not fully explained. My information was by circular, from a discount house and as the literature you sent states, discount houses would naturally be in opposition. However, I have too often been the victim of discount house bilking.

I also agree with the other points included in this act. I have therefore reconsidered and find this act an important one and the people would derive many benefits. I do encourage you to vote for this act.

May I also thank you for your time in replying to my letter, as I am sure many people are not aware of the advantages of this act. I am also going to pass the material on to others, as I feel they will also then want to vote for this.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. DONALD MAHNS.

The Quality Stabilization Bill Makes Strange Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., a gentleman whose political philosophy is somewhat to the right of a certain Republican candidate for President.

While it is difficult to publicly aline myself with this particular gentleman, I must do so with regard to H.R. 3669, the quality stabilization bill.

The column appeared in the March 22, 1964, edition of the New York Journal-American and follows:

ON THE RIGHT: PROS AND CONS OF PRICE-FIXING

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A first-class row is going to break out in the immediate future, when the House Rules Committee reports out the so-called quality stabilization bill (H.R. 3669) which is, with elaborate qualifications, a fair trade law binding retailers to maintain the prices set by manufacturers for their products.

The bill is enormously interesting, among other reasons because there is a curious division of ideological sentiment toward it. It looks like something the manufacturers brought in; but the principal pressures for it are by the retailers.

Its principal backers in the Senate is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY; yet HUMPHREY'S boss and idol, the late President Kennedy, swore he'd veto it if ever it got to the White House.

The AFL-CIO is adamantly opposed to it; yet many of the Congressmen it owns lock, stock and barrel have come out in favor of it. The eloquent Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Dallas, among the half dozen most conservative Congressmen in the House, has uttered a mightly oath against it because it would "abolish capitalism as we know it"; and the eloquent Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, among the half dozen most conservative Senators, has vigorously endorsed the bill.

What goes on here?

Let us look at it, first philosophically. Can I sell you, for resale to others, an article with my trademark on it, and specify the conditions of resale? I should think the case for the affirmative is overwhelming. If the article bears my trademark, my reputation is at stake when it reaches the consumer, and I should be permitted to guard my reputation.

If a discount chain chooses to sell my $50 high quality vacuum cleaner for $10, as bait merchandise to lure you into his store, that may be very good business for him, but very bad for me in terms of the public psychology about my products' true value. Should I have no recourse?

Opposed is, I think, the rather slender argument that once the retailer acquires merchandise, it is his to dispose of as he sees fit. But doesn't this confuse retailer with consumer, the true ultimate owner?

The bill, moreover, makes a useful distinction when it says that if the retailer strips all identifying marks of the manufacturer off the product, and refrains from using the manufacturer's name in the sale of it, then indeed the retailer may do as he sees fit; otherwise not.

Economically, the manufacturer is greatly at the mercy of the retailers, who are free to play around with the price of his product.

Justice Louise Brandeis pointed out years ago that price cutting "has been the most potent weapon of monopoly—a means of killing the small rival to which the great trusts have resorted most frequently." And the discount houses have recently boasted that they will control 80 percent of the Nation's retail business by 1970.

Projecting current economic trends, aren't the discount houses the principal monopoly threat of the future? If so, isn't it wise that corrective legislation should gravitate toward nascent monopolies? Again, the bill makes a useful distinction, by refusing to cover the sale of the products of monopoly producers.

To whose disadvantage, then, is the bill? The roaring answer is: the consumer's. It is said that the moment the bill passes, and the discount houses fold up, the consumer will be stuck with higher prices.

But if the consumer is asked to pay higher prices, he will, by the laws of economics, buy fewer products. Why should the manufacturer be satisfied with fewer sales? His price, per product, was the same before the bill, as it would be after the bill; and only the manufacturer in question has the right to enforce the provisions of the bill.

If the manufacturer chooses to let a discount house sell his goods at a discount, he would continue to be free to do so. So why should he not, rather than run a loss? Because other retailers would conspire to boycott him if he did? But there are already laws against conspiracies in restraint of trade. Moreover, many discount houses peddle primarily their own brands of merchandise. They would be unaffected by the bill and would keep pressure on the manufacturers to keep the retail prices competitive.

The philosophical and economic argument put me on the side of Senator HUMPHREY. Perhaps he will reconsider his sponsorship of the bill?

An Editorial on States Rights by Gerald Cosgrove, WNDU-TV, April 1, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of a most thoughtful editorial comment given by Gerald Cosgrove, of South Bend, Ind., on station WNDU-TV, located at the University of Notre Dame, on April 1, 1964.

Mr. Cosgrove, formerly editorial writer with the South Bend Tribune, makes some extremely perceptive comments on the Supreme Court and States rights.

His comments follow:

GERRY COSGROVE COMMENTS, WNDU-TV, WEDNESDAY APRIL 1, 1964

Because of a series of decisions in the last 10 years on civil rights and legislative reapportionment the U.S. Supreme Court is the target for some criticism.

The Court members are accused of exceeding their constitutional power, of indulging in emotionalism, of dabbling in sociology instead of concentrating on constitutional law.

In the process, the critics charge, the highest Court has been nullifying private property rights and States rights.

It must be left for legal authorities to locate the dividing line between constitutional law and emotionalism and sociology.

But legal training is not necessary to realize that some advocates of States rights must blame themselves, to some extent, for what's going on now.

States rights are vitally important in our constitutional system, designed to avert unreasonable, dangerous concentration of government power.

To be constructive, these rights must be exercised wisely and fairly.

Instead, in some States, States rights became synonymous with procrastination, evasion and direct obstruction to perpetuate injustice.

For about a century, States rights were used for discrimination against, and suppression of, a racial minority..

And, for decades, entrenched minorities in Indiana and some other States deprived majorities of the State legislative representation guaranteed them by the State constitutions.

The elements that misused States rights can't be blamed if, as charged, the U.S. Supreme Court is exceeding its power.

But they did weaken the States rights system by using it as a shield for intolerable conditions, and practically forcing the highest Court to intervene.

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, a powerful and brilliant spotlight has been focused on one of our Nation's most deadly enemies, poverty. The entire world is watching to see what action we take to correct the situation and what we do to bring the millions in this, the richest nation on earth, out of the morass of suffering and despair in which they are now entrapped. The crusade against poverty is one in which every right-thinking American will wish to take part. I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Education and Labor which is in charge of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, in which I urge that prompt action be taken on this vitally important bill.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am grateful for this opportunity to urge your favorable action on the bill under consideration, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The war on poverty can and must be won. The battle flags have now been unfurled and we must move forward speedily and resolutely toward victory and the goals set forth by the President in his program. Hope has finally been held out to the 35 million persons who live in dire poverty in our Nation; 11 million children who go to bed hungry every night have been told that they will soon have enough to eat. In our great State of New York there are 600,236 destitute families. It is beyond belief that any person, knowing of the hopelessness and despair of our Nation's 9.3 million poor families, could dash the hopes of the poverty stricken and oppose this bill. To show my strong support, I introduced a bill identical with the administration's bill, and it is my

earnest desire to do all I can to secure passage of it without delay, so that the various programs provided by the bill can be implemented and the important work go forward.

Your committee has been given more than ample testimony which proves that poverty, on an alarming scale, exists throughout our country; we also know that concentrations of poverty are found in certain groups, especially among the undereducated, the nonwhite, the elderly, those in broken homes, and in rural farm families. We like to think that in ours, the richest Nation in the world, every man, woman and child enjoys the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The shocking truth is that one-fifth of our population is, in reality, barred from the pursuit of happiness by poverty; millions of persons are denied even meager comforts, and the opportunities enjoyed by the more fortunate are beyond their reach and their children's reach.

For far too long a time those who have, have found it easy to ignore the sad plight of the have-nots. We must face up to the problem honestly and with compassion in our hearts for our suffering fellow citizens; we must admit the truth, that people are not poor because they want to be poor but because they have been caught in a web of adverse circumstances beyond their control. They must have our help; they are powerless to help themselves. This Congress has been presented with a rare opportunity to break the vicious cycle of poverty which, in many cases, continues through generations. Poor housing, insufficient nourishing food, inadequate education, lack of job opportunities, all lead to the years of despair and hopelessness endured by millions, and forecast a similar lot for their children.

Our enemy, poverty, presently undermining all parts of our Nation, is a vicious one. Fortunately, we have powerful weapons at our disposal; knowledge possessed by our governmental agencies, the initiative of local communities, and the determination of dedicated Americans who wish to help their fellow man. It is estimated that victory, in economic terms will add $14 billion a year to the national output by creating new industry, higher production, increased earnings, and better income for all. Even as cold statistics cannot measure the terrible despair suffered by the poor, so there is no yardstick by which we can measure the full extent of the benefits which will accrue by implementation of this bill, the dawn of hope, the chance for education, training and employment, for realization of ambitions and plans for their children, now beyond the reach of so many.

It is well to emphasize that the programs do not represent handouts but a realistic undertaking which will give people a chance to become self-supporting; to take their rightful place in our society, to be able to walk through life with dignity and not be objects of charity. This bill would strike at the very roots of poverty.

It is altogether right that the accent of President Johnson's program to eliminate poverty is on youth, for this offers the most direct method of breaking the cycle of poverty and halting the transmission of defeatism from one generation to another. The Department of Labor estimates that there are 350,000 idle young men, 14 to 24 years of age, who face virtual lifetime unemployment unless rehabilitation programs are enacted to reach them. These young men are no longer seeking work because there is no opportunity for them in their areas.

The Job Corps will help 100,000 young men whose background, health, and education make them least fit for useful work. The work-training program will provide work and training for 200,000 American men and women between the ages of 16 and 21. The work-study program will provide Federal funds for part-time jobs for 140,000 young Americans who do not go to college because they cannot afford it. What better investment can we make than to help the youth of our Nation; our future depends upon our young people and it behooves us to help them toward realization of their full potential in education and work so they may take their rightful places in their communities and be qualified to discharge responsibilities of leadership and citizenship.

The programs giving each community the opportunity to develop its own comprehensive plan to fight its own poverty, the recruiting and training of dedicated Americans who enlist as volunteers for America in the war against poverty, the creation of special programs to combat poverty in rural areas, the establishment of an Office of Economic Opportunity which will coordinate the national effort, are all of vital importance. This will be a cooperative undertaking by all levels of our Government, Federal, State, and local; we aim to strike at the causes of poverty, for it would be futile to attack only the consequences.

I am in complete agreement with the President's statement that it is not a matter of whether we can or should support this program. We must. Now that the challenge has been so forcibly put to us, with our shame and disregard of the poor called to the attention of the entire world and the eyes of all nations upon us, we must, indeed, do our duty. I feel certain that your committee will approve this bill without delay. I look forward to the privilege of voting for the bill, which is reasonable and feasible in all respects. I trust that the Congress will pass the bill in the very near future so that the vitally important work can be started and the long, uphill fight against our enemy, poverty, begun.

Birthplace of U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1964, I introduced a concurrent resolution proposing the recognition of the village of Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., as the birthplace of the U.S. Navy.

This resolution was intended to provide proper recognition of the important part this community contributed in constructing 12 of the 15 ships that took part in the Battle of Valcour during the War of 1776. New York State has always been proud of Whitehall's place in history and its yeoman efforts in helping to shape the early destiny of our great country.

The reasons why Whitehall is being recognized as the birthplace of our Navy are outlined in the following resolution, which has recently been adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Washington, N.Y. Enactment of the resolution by the Congress would provide deserved national recognition; and it is my hope that the resolution I have introduced will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION 51

Title: Recognizing Whitehall as birthplace of U.S. Navy.

Whereas it is generally conceded that Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., formerly Skenesborough, can well be considered the birthplace of the U.S. Navy, as 12 of the 15 ships that took part in the Battle af Valcour in October 1776 were built in its harbor; and

Whereas this fleet was constructed after the Declaration of Independence and engaged in the first naval battle after the Colonies asserted their unity and independence; and

Whereas the Battle of Valcour, though dimmed by the glamour surrounding the Battle of Saratoga, nevertheless played a very important part in shaping the destinies of the Colonies by forestalling early invasion of the Colonies from the north; and

Whereas Whitehall's place in history had not heretofore been given the recognition it justly deserves for the contribution made by it in shaping the early destiny of our beloved country; and

Whereas a resolution to this effect has been offered by Congressman CARLETON J. KING, of Saratoga Springs, N.Y., to the Congress of the United States, asking that the village of Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., be recognized as being the birthplace of the U.S. Navy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Washington go on record as recognizing the village of Whitehall as being the birthplace of the U.S. Navy; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Honorable CARLTON J. KING, Congressman from the 30th District; Hon. JOHN MCCORMICK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS and Hon. KENNETH KEATING, U.S. Senators from the State of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Washington, ss:

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Washington have compared the foregoing copy of resolution with the original resolution now on file in the office and which was passed by the board of supervisors of said county on the 13th day of March 1964; a majority of all the members elected to the board voting in favor thereof; and that the same is a correct and true transcript of such original resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the board of supervisors, this 19th day of March 1964.

EDMOND A. MCMORRIS,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Pan American Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in many cities across the American continents, people will celebrate this week because it is Pan American Week. From April 12 to April 18 a great range of activities, including conferences, parades, speeches, and fiestas, will be held in commemoration of many years of peaceful cooperation among the nations of the Americas.

The ideal of a united, progressive hemisphere originated early in American

history with the efforts of one of the greatest Americans, Simon Bolivar. While the plans of his conference of Panama in 1826 were not immediately carried out, they nevertheless expressed the hopes of millions of people and provided the goals toward which they constantly strove.

In 1890 Washington, D.C., became the center of the pan-American movement when the first Inter-American Conference was held here. That Conference established the International Union of the American Republics, which became the Organization of American States in 1948 at the Bogotá Conference, the final fruition of Simon Bolivar's aspirations. In 1910 the House of the Americas, surely one of the most beautiful buildings in Washington, was dedicated. Now the House of the Americas is headquarters for a dynamic organization, vitally concerned with the economic development of the Western Hemisphere, the defense of the American people against aggression and subversion, and a multitude of other activities effecting the lives of millions of people.

The Organization of American States has taken the lead among all international organizations of the world in human rights, but adopting the declaration of the rights and duties of man, through peaceful settlement of disputes, and in the cooperative application of reason to the social and economic problems of our time.

Pan American Week each year honors all of these significant accomplishments. In our recognition here we lend our approval also to the history and development of friendly relations between the nations of North and South America. We should especially remember Tuesday, April 14. It is designated as Pan American Day and is the apex of the hope and determination for a better tomorrow for all American people.

Tribute to an Outstanding Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, outside of Government, there is no more important servant of the people than the news media. American newspapers have been part of the backbone of our daily way of life, and the weekly newspaper is closer to the people than any other.

It is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of this body the 25th anniversary of the Franklin Square Bulletin, a weekly newspaper published in my congressional district.

It should be noted that the Bulletin has continued publication throughout the period characterized by the greatest growth of any county in the United States. To me, this seems silent tribute to the Bulletin for the service it renders the community.

This is particularly true when one realizes that unprecedented population growth generally sees existing institutions go by the boards. In the newspaper field in suburban areas, we all too often see the community-oriented weekly paper go out of existence as the large nearby daily gets the bulk of the advertising dollar and the majority of the readers.

In such competition, it is only the weekly paper which realizes its unique ability to cover the events in its area better than any other media that perseveres.

The Bulletin stands today, too, as tribute to the strong belief in his country, county, and community that imbued its late founder John J. O'Neill. He was a man of vast vision, whose record of community contributions extends even farther than the founding of the Franklin Square Bulletin. He was one of the pioneers in the concept of developing vocational programs alongside academic programs at the high school level. A monument to him, too, is Sewanhaka High School, regarded today as one of the Nation's outstanding example of a "comprehensive school." Mr. O'Neill, in the late 1920's, fought for this concept in higher education along before it was in vogue, before we discussed dropouts, unskilled graduates, and vocational training.

Mr. O'Neill, too, has several living monuments: his son, James, who helped his dad start the paper and is now one of the top reporters on Newsday, one of America's leading daily newspapers; his daughter, Margaret, who carries on in her father's tradition as the editor of the Bulletin; his son, John, a leading executive with one of America's outstanding companies; a daughter, Anne, who pursues a career as a legal secretary; and last, but by no means least, his wife, Margaret, who continues to bring culture to the weekly audience via her book reviews.

Today, Mr. O'Neill's paper survives as an indispensable part of the life of Franklin Square. It still publishes according to Mr. O'Neill's dictum:

No one in Franklin Square will ever be embarrassed in the columns of the Bulletin. Sordid news has no place in my paper. This is a community. In a community a man has a right to his good name. I will leave to others, who care less about Franklin Square, to report the embarrassments of the people who live here.

I believe that dictum, Mr. Speaker, can serve as the highest ideal of a community newspaper anywhere. It is therefore proudly that I compliment the Franklin Square Bulletin and its staff on achieving its silver anniversary.

U.S. Aid Bright Spot in Aid Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, too often only the instances of the failures of our foreign aid make the headlines of our daily press. Unheralded go the many successes which our military and economic assistance programs have had around the world.

It was, therefore, heartening to read a recent article from Laos citing our U.S. aid program as the one bright spot in an otherwise clouded situation. The article was written by Delia and Ferdinand Kuhn, distinguished foreign correspondents, as a part of a series on southeast Asia which appeared in the Washington Star.

In their March 29 column, the Kuhns found our U.S. aid program in Laos had "verve and style and seems to know where it is going." This conclusion paralleled my own observations made last October when the congressional study mission, of which I was chairman, visited Laos.

We found that our impact aid programs, which included road construction, rural development, education, village dispensaries and teacher training, were assisting measurably the neutralist Government of Laos. These projects should go far to demonstrate that the non-Communist section of Laos is substantially better off than the Pathet Lao areas, and that cooperation with the free world can be most beneficial.

I am pleased that the Kuhns' independent observations coincide with those of our study mission, and that this encouraging story of our U.S. foreign aid has received wide dissemination. At this point I request permission to insert the Kuhns' article in the RECORD for the benefit of those who may have missed it in the Star, and commend the attention of my colleagues to it.

The article follows:

FAR EAST REPORT: U.S. AID BRIGHT SPOT IN LAOTIAN SITUATION

(By Delia and Ferdinand Kuhn)

VIENTIANE, LAOS.—Sometimes Americans at home must steel themselves for the shock of hearing good news from a far-off trouble spot. In this beleaguered country, the posture of American aid is now upright and proud.

The contrast between the morale of the aid staff here in Laos and that of the mother agency in Washington is as startling as the contrast between the Winged Victory and the Laocoon. This is not to suggest that the Laos branch is an armless or a headless figure, but rather than it has verve and style and seems to know where it is going.

Having watched a good many aid programs in Asia, often with dismay, we can suggest two or three reasons for the quality of this one. Under the leadership of a new Ambassador, Leonard Unger, and a new aid director, Charles A. Mann, a fresh start was made about 18 months ago.

Everyone from the Ambassador down is conscious of the stigmas attached to the old program, the exposures of almost unbelievable mistakes. Nobody is going to let even the smallest grain of dirt settle on the new program if he can help it. Every project is kept out in the light and scrubbed daily.

CLOSE CHECK ON GOODS

As one of the new safeguards, four American customs inspectors are stationed here to check every item that enters the country under the American-financed commodity program. Every refugee from the Pathet Lao guerrillas who gets an American blanket, for example, must sign a receipt, even if he cannot write. In the files of the aid mission here are stacks of thumbprinted receipts, ready for the General Accounting Office to inspect and ponder.

A second source of pride and high morale here can be traced to the nature of the

challenge in Laos. After the American military advisers departed in October 1962, under the terms of the Geneva agreement, the aid mission and the U.S. Information Service had the field to themselves. Today about 80 technicians, more than half the aid mission's technical staff, live and work outside the capital. Of these about 30 are young men and women of International Voluntary Services, a private agency under contract.

To say that the fieldworkers lead precarious lives is to understate. Guerrillas, bandits, and thieves rove the countryside. On the roads you may be ambushed; in the air you may be hit by bullets or flak.

The aid mission maintains its own plane and helicopter service, and its own radiotelephone system. Everyone based outside Vietiane must call headquarters daily, or, if atmospheric conditions prevent, must report through another contact in the field. If nobody hears from him, a plane flies off to check his whereabouts. So far the safety record has been good.

MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

So also has the record of accomplishment. The main effort outside the capital has been in rural development. As part of it, American skills and materials are helping Laotians to build roads and bridges, waterworks and schools. One American remarks that the Pathet Lao have not interfered much with the building of roads, probably because they expect to use them some day.

Pathet Lao tolerance does not, however, stretch to the refugee relief work. Of the multitudes who have fled the Communist-led guerrillas in the past few years, no fewer than 170,000 have received some kind of help under this program. Many organizations from many countries cooperate with the Laos Ministry of Social Welfare to feed, clothe and resettle them. The American aid mission shoulders the largest part of the burden.

Of all the Americans scattered around this country, perhaps the two who lead the most isolated and exposed lives are a middle-aged farmer from North Fort Wayne, Ind., and a young graduate in community development at Berkeley, Calif. "Pop" Buell and Tom Ward work with refugees of the renowned Meo mountain tribe in the Province of Sam Neua on the North Vietnam border.

FIGHT WITH OLD MUSKETS

The Meo account for about half the refugees in Laos. They not only flee the Pathet Lao; they fight them with old hunting muskets. Sam Neua is a Pathet Lao stronghold. So when American-donated rice and blankets and seeds are air-dropped to the Meo in that Province, Communist propaganda screams that American bandits are putting the Meo "in fighting condition."

The Pathet Lao would dearly like to capture the two American aid officials in the mountains of northern Laos. More than once Mr. Buell has been roused in the middle of the night and warned that Communists were near. Each time the Meo led him to safety in another village.

As a show window of Asian neutralism, Laos may be what one European here called "a mess, a tolerable mess." But as a showwindow of American aid at its best, Laos is worth a respectful look.

God Taken to Court Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Tallahassee Democrat in Tallahassee, Fla., last Sunday printed a most perceptive editorial which I would like to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It points out the continuing campaign to have all reference to God stricken from our national conscience and I present it here for the information of the Congress.

GOD TAKEN TO COURT AGAIN

The phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance, "One nation under God," offends Mrs. Madalyn Murray. She says it violates individual liberties and freedom of conscience of her two school-age sons. She is the same woman whose objection to school prayer on the ground that it violated the conscience of these same two boys produced the Supreme Court decision that banned school prayers and Bible reading in the public schools of the Nation.

Justice Potter Stewart's lone dissenting opinion has proved to be prophetic only too soon. He asked what was to stop the court from removing from the pledge to the flag the phrase "One nation under God." Mrs. Murray has instituted suit that will determine whether the High Court will go that far—and we're afraid that not many Americans have much confidence that it will restrain itself.

It is past time for our Congress to prepare and submit to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment overthrowing the Supreme Court ruling and clarifying in unmistakable language that freedom of religion doesn't mean rejection of religion, and that separation of church and state does not make the state antagonistic to God.

Stick With Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hasten to enclose an excellent, thoughtful and significant letter, written to the editor of the Cheraw Chronicle, Cheraw, S.C., which appeared in the edition of Thursday, April 2, 1964, in which one of my constituents pointed out what so many of us have long known: That the Democratic Party is the best party for the people of my district. I share his opinion and the letter is as follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—STICK WITH DEMOCRATS

CHERAW, S.C., *March 29, 1964.*

To the CHERAW CHRONICLE:

The South Carolina Republicans sure are in an awful rush to select their candidates. They selected them in convention, you know, not in a general primary, where the people would have a chance to elect them. This is typical of the GOP which is less interested in democracy and popular representation than in tight control of party machinery by a few at the top. They'll never win any elections that way.

Those people in Chesterfield County who are now registered Republicans, and more especially, those so-called Democrats who register one way and vote another in our party primary, ought to study history a little bit. They would soon discover that the Republican Party has never been a friend of the South, whether from 1865 to 1876, during the period of Reconstruction, or after 1876, when big business captured the party and began to legislate not for the good of the people but for its own economic benefit.

History teaches that the South, and the average, middle-class wage earner and farmer, is far better off under the Democratic Party, which understands the needs of the "little man" and puts his interests at heart. That's why it was the Republicans who brought on the great depression and then stood still for nearly 4 long years, while the poor became poorer and the rich bought up everything at depressed prices, and the Democrats who, under the late great F.D.R. and a Democratic Congress, started the country back on the long road to recovery.

Many of the local Republicans couldn't afford to be Republicans when the GOP had charge of things. They had to wait until Democratic administrations enabled them to make enough money to let them vote Republican.

At the national level, who do the Republicans have who can measure up to President Johnson? Certainly not Rockefeller. Not Goldwater, who, ever since his heel healed, has kept his foot in his mouth.

In this relatively poor county, we need all the Federal help we can get. And we are getting it under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations: ARA, STEP, and many other economic programs, designed to help us help ourselves. It was the same back during New Deal days, too. It was the Democrats who gave us the welfare program for the need, social security, and unemployment insurance. I don't see anybody who votes Republican and gets a Government check turning that check back to the Government, uncashed.

The farmer, the worker, the small businessman; the producer, the consumer, the elderly, the retired; the young breadwinner who wants a job; all these people in our society have a stake in a Democratic administration, and we hope and believe Mr. Johnson, and a Democratic Congress will be returned to power—with South Carolina's help—next November so we can all enjoy a better deal.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. GRAHAM.

Anniversary of the Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the observance of the submarine birthday. This is the 64th anniversary of the Navy's acceptance of its first submarine, the U.S.S. *Holland*. It was on April 11, 1900, when the U.S. Navy purchased its first undersea craft from the Inventor John Philip Holland, who had built several submarines. That first submarine was 53 feet long and cost $150,000. Today, our nuclear-powered submarines are nearly 10 times as long and cost about $30 million each, exclusive of the powerplant.

I have the privilege of representing the Second Congressional District of Connecticut, which includes the city of Groton, sometimes described as "the submarine capital of the world." It is at Groton that the Electric Boat Co., one of the largest submarine builders in the world, is located. We in Connecticut are extremely proud of this company's great

record of achievement and of our contributions to the defense of our Nation.

At the launching on April 4 of the submarine U.S.S. *Greenling*, built by Electric Boat at Groton, Rear Adm. Roy S. Benson, Assistant Vice Chief of Naval Operations, paid this tribute to the company and all those who work there:

> There is not the slightest question in my mind but that no submarine building yard turns out better submarines than does Electric Boat. Your record is magnificent.

Today, on the occasion of the anniversary we are observing, we are paying a well-deserved tribute to the men in the U.S. Navy's Submarine Service, we are stressing their role in our national defense, and we are recognizing the significance of the service in times of war and peace.

During World War I, submarines were used primarily for defensive purposes, such as coastal patrol, attacks on German U-boats to keep shipping lanes open, et cetera. Although the First World War demonstrated the strategic effectiveness of the submarine, the United States did not start a major submarine building program until 1933 when the Roosevelt administration came into power. By December 1941—at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—we had 111 submarines in commission and 73 under construction. We had 51 active boats in the Pacific, against 83 submarines in the Japanese fleet.

The first attack by an American submarine against a Japanese ship was by the *Swordfish* in the South China Sea on December 9—2 days after Pearl Harbor. While it was never verified the *Swordfish* hit its target, our first real success came 5 days later when the same *Swordfish* sank an enemy ship. In fact, this was the first time in history that an American submarine torpedoed a ship.

During the first year of the war in the Pacific our small but growing fleet of submarines carried out many special missions, such as reconnaissance, evacuation of civilians, running supplies, and transporting commando raiders.

Only eight of our boats were on full-time antishipping duty; consequently, we had only limited success in sinking enemy ships. In that first year our boats sank 600,000 tons of enemy shipping—which is a considerable amount—but the total Japanese merchant fleet was estimated at over 6 million tons. As our submarine fleet grew larger, Japanese shipping losses also grew larger and reached a critical stage. Our submarines turned their attention also on Japanese warships, particularly destroyers, a chief enemy of submarines.

It is a fact that more enemy destroyers were sunk by our submarines than by any other means. In all, we know that American submarines destroyed two-thirds of the enemy merchant fleet and one-third of his navy. Let me say at this point, in tribute to the gallant men in our submarine service during World War II, that theirs was an extremely hazardous service with a death rate of about one out of every five men. This is the kind of bravery and heroism for which our Nation is eternally grateful—and in this spirit of appreciation I salute them.

In World War II we used the submarine in much the same manner as it was used by the Germans in World War I; namely, to cripple the enemy's lifelines on the seas. Since the end of World War II the role of the submarine has changed. Great developments have taken place in submarine technology. There has also been a change in the potential threat in the development of a large Soviet submarine fleet. This has resulted in an effort to make the submarine an important aspect of antisubmarine warfare.

The change or reorientation of our submarine mission began in 1949, when we first realized that the Soviet Union is vastly increasing its submarine fleet and that it constitutes a potential threat to our naval power and sea communications around the world.

That change has been going forward since then. Every attack submarine in our Navy today has antisubmarine warfare as a primary mission. These are mainly nuclear-powered ships; they are fast; they are maneuverable; and they have new advanced underwater sensing devices.

There is another role performed by the submarine—a role unheard of even in 1949, less than 15 years ago. I refer to the role of the submarine as a sea-based strategic missile system. The latest in submarine technology, combined with the most advanced missile development, produced the Polaris-firing nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarine. We now have 12 such submarines in commission, and 23 under construction or authorized for construction—a total of 35 of these submarines. May I add that these figures were given me by the Navy Department and they are not classified. Thus you can see that we are gradually building up the most formidable offensive second strike deterrent weapons in existence.

And there is another change to be noted here—a change that is no less important. I refer to the life and the role of the submariner today which has also changed greatly. Although there is the same informality among the officers and men, the same esprit de corps as in the past, living conditions have improved and the technical demands on the crew are much higher. Being constantly submerged for 60 days is the standard patrol of the Polaris submarines. The old submarines designed in the 1920's and used in World War II could stay submerged under the most favorable conditions for 24 hours. They were noisy, poorly ventilated, cramped for space, and always in need of repair. On modern submarines space is still at a premium, but much more attention has been given to comfort and surroundings, and the air is purer.

Even though it is peacetime and underwater patrols are much longer than before, we have more men who volunteer for submarine service than we can accept. The training is much more rigorous today. The enlisted man on the ballistic missile submarine requires about 6 months duty both ashore and at sea before he can attain qualification status. The officer requires a whole year. Engineering personnel get an additional 13 months of schooling. These men are highly trained technicians in a perpetual training process to master their jobs and the ever-changing equipment.

Mr. Speaker, there must be something very admirable about a service which can arouse so much interest and devotion, so much loyalty and heroism, both in time of war and in time of peace, as the submarine service. The men who have been in it, and those who followed them, deserve recognition for the sacrifices and the patriotism they have demonstrated. Theirs is not the patriotism of merely marching behind a band or lighting fireworks one day in the year. It is much more than that. It is the very defense of the flag and the Nation of which they are a part; it is the spirit of the people who unselfishly devoted themselves to the cause of freedom. Their patriotism is the love for their country, the respect for its traditions, the honor of its people, the future of its destiny. Their patriotism was expressed in standing firm for the common good, for the peace and well-being of all. Their patriotism was to stand tall and unafraid against all enemies, ready to sacrifice their lives, if need be.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this observance, I believe it is fitting and proper to recall another occasion—a very sad one, indeed—where men of the submarine service made a supreme sacrifice. Just about a year ago, on April 10, 1963, we were all stunned by the tragedy of the submarine U.S.S. *Thresher* which went down in the Atlantic with a loss of 129 men. Many of those men were from my district in Connecticut. These gallant men are today a part of the long list of American heroes who have sacrificed their lives for the security and defense of our country.

On the first anniversary of this tragic event, we honor their memory and we recall their bravery. We express our deepest sympathy to their loved ones, to the bereaved wives, children and parents, in whose hearts they will live forever. We also voice our deepest gratitude to these men for their courageous deeds and patriotic devotion to their country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an editorial on the subject, published in the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, on April 10, 1964. It reads as follows:

THEY ARE NOT FORGOTTEN

A year ago today the Nation and the world were shocked and saddened by a major submarine disaster for on April 10, 1963, the dark icy waters of the Atlantic Ocean claimed the nuclear attack submarine *Thresher* with 129 men aboard.

The *Thresher*, attached to Group 2 at the Groton Submarine Base but operating out of Portsmouth, N.H., was lost 220 miles east of Cape Cod while conducting a series of deep dives. The 8,400-foot depth of the ocean in the area made it impossible to either rescue the 96 enlisted men, 16 officers, and 17 civilian observers who were aboard what was described as the fatest and deepest diving submarine in the world or conduct salvage operations.

A dark cloak of mystery hung over the sinking until the bathyscaph *Trieste* was moved into the disaster area in June. This deep-diving craft failed to locate the hull of

the *Thresher*, but during a series of dives debris positively identified with the ill-fated submarine was located on the ocean floor and brought to the surface.

These men, a number of whom lived among us in eastern Connecticut, will never be forgotten. They were dedicated to the service of their country and gave their lives in the performance of their duty, displaying the devotion and courage that is typical of America. In the words of Vice Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, commander submarine force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, who wrote the forward to a *Thresher* memorial book forwarded to the immediate next of kin of officers and crewmen who lost their lives in the sinking of *Thresher*, "They are remembered not as men who were, but as men who are; men, who because of dedication to their profession of the undersea, have given us greater knowledge of its mysteries, and opened broader paths for its exploration and use."

On the first anniversary of this great sea tragedy we honor these submariners who made the supreme sacrifice, for they and men like them have and will continue to play a major role in keeping our Nation strong, both in war and in peace.

The Churches and the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee will begin hearings next week on the controversial "prayers in schools" proposals to amend the Constitution.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. adopted on June 7, 1963, the following pronouncement on this matter. It is an erudite and intelligent defense of the doctrine of the separation of church and state.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

THE CHURCHES AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Adopted by the general board, June 7, 1963)

As Christians we acknowledge God as the ground and source and confirmer of truth, whose Spirit is ever ready to respond to men's and children's search for understanding by correcting their fumbling misapprehensions and leading them into larger and fuller truth. Teaching and learning at their highest are pursued within this recognition. As Americans we are firmly committed to the right of freedom of conscience and freedom of religion; that is, the freedom of each citizen in the determination of his religious allegiance, and the freedom of religious groups and institutions in the exercise and declaration of their beliefs.

The American tradition with respect to the relations of government and religion, often described as "separation of church and state" does not mean that the state is hostile toward, or indifferent to, religion. On the contrary, governments—National, State and local—have prevailingly acknowledged the importance as well as the autonomy of religion and have given expression to this principle in many ways.

In present-day American society, with its diversity of religious conviction and affiliations, the place of religion in public education must be worked out within this recognition of the prevailing positive attitude of the American people as a whole toward religion and safeguarding of religious liberty.

As Christians we believe that every individual has a right to an education aimed at the full development of his capacities as a human being created by God, his character as well as his intellect. We are impelled by the love of neighbor to seek maximum educational opportunities for each individual in order that he may prepare himself for responsible participation in the common life.

CONCERN FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

We reaffirm our support of the system of public education[1] in the United States of America. It provides a context in which all individuals may share in an education which contributes to the full development of their capacities. It serves as a major cohesive force in our pluralistic society. We also recognize that significant value derives from the fact that this system is financed by public funds, is responsive to the community as a whole, and is open to all without distinctions as to race, creed, national origin, or economic status.

DEFINITION OF ROLES

Religious ideas, beliefs, values, and the contributions of churches are an integral part of our cultural heritage as a people. The public schools have an obligation to help individuals develop an intelligent understanding and appreciation of the role of religion in the life of the people of this Nation. Teaching for religious commitment is the responsibility of the home and the community of faith (such as the church or synagogue) rather than the public schools.

We support the right of religious groups to establish and maintain schools at their own expense provided they meet prescribed educational standards.

We support also the right of parents to decide whether their children shall attend public or nonpublic schools. The parent who chooses to send his children to a nonpublic school is not excused from the responsibility of the citizen to support and seek to improve the public schools.

Neither the church nor the state should use the public school to compel acceptance of any creed or conformity to any specific religious practice.

It is an essential task of the churches to provide adequate religious instruction through every means at their disposal. These include both those activities which individual churches provide within their own walls and also various joint ventures of churches involving cooperation with the public schools. Christian nurture and the development and practice of Christian worship are inescapable obligations of the congregation and the family. We warn the churches against the all too human tendency to look to the state and its agencies for support in fulfilling the churches' mission. Such a tendency endangers both true religion and civil liberties. At the same time, we call the churches to renewed worship, study, work, and sacrifice to fulfill their mission as God's people in the world.

PLACE OF RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

No person is truly educated for life in the modern world who is not aware of the vital part played by religion in the shaping of our history and culture, and of its contemporary expressions. Information about religion is an essential part of many school subjects such as social studies, literature, and the arts. The contributions of religious leaders, movements, and ideas should be treated objectively and broadly in any presentation of these subjects. Public school administrators and textbook producers are to be commended for the progress made to date in including objective information about religion in various subject matter fields. Teachers should be trained to deal with the history, practices, and characteristics of the various religious groups with competence and respect for diverse religious convictions. Their greatest influence will be through the life and attitudes they reflect in the classroom. They should be free as persons to express their own convictions in answer to direct questions from pupils when appropriate to the subject matter under study.

The full treatment of some regular school subjects requires the use of the Bible as a source book. In such studies—including those related to character development—the use of the Bible has a valid educational purpose. But neither true religion nor good education is dependent upon the devotional use of the Bible in the public school program.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Regents' Prayer case has ruled that "in this country it is no part of the business of Government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the Government." We recognize the wisdom as well as the authority of this ruling. But whether prayers may be offered at special occasions in the public schools may well be left to the judgment of the board responsible for the program of the public schools in the local community.

While both our tradition and the present temper of our Nation reflect a preponderant belief in God as our source and our destiny, nevertheless attempts to establish a "common core" of religious beliefs to be taught in public schools have usually proven unrealistic and unwise. Major faith groups have not agreed on a formulation of religious beliefs common to all. Even if they had done so, such a body of religious doctrine would tend to become a substitute for the more demanding commitments of historic faiths.

Some religious holidays have become so much a part of American culture that the public school can scarcely ignore them. Any recognition of such holidays in the public schools should contribute to better community understanding and should in no way divert the attention of pupils and the community from the celebration of these holidays in synagogues and churches.

We express the conviction that the first amendment to our Constitution in its present wording has provided the framework within which responsible citizens and our courts have been able to afford maximum protection for the religious liberty of all our citizens.

CHURCH SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

American public education should have the full and conscientious support of Christians and Christian churches. Therefore, we urge our constituency to continue efforts to strengthen and improve the American system of public education through positive steps such as the following:

1. Providing intelligent appraisal and responsible criticism of programs of public education;

2. Keeping informed about the needs of the public schools and studying issues related to public education as a basis for intelligent action as citizens;

3. Supporting able candidates for boards of education and being willing to serve as members of such boards;

4. Working at local, State, and national levels for improved legislative and financial support of public schools;

5. Emphasizing to prospective and present teachers the profession of public school teaching as a vocation that is worthy of the best service a Christian can give;

6. Exploring cooperative arrangements of the churches and schools whereby the church's teaching of religion may be improved.

---

[1] In this document the terms "public education" and "public schools" are taken to mean the system of public elementary and secondary education in the United States.

In American education, there is a substantial interrelation between primary, secondary and higher education.

It needs to be stressed that, in a substantial majority of publicly maintained institutions of higher education, provision is offered for the voluntary election of courses in religion on a parity with all other subjects of the curriculum, and not infrequently for publicly supported chaplains and other services of religion.

The question should be explored whether these arrangements through which religious instruction and services are provided within State institutions of higher education without infringement of law or offense to individual conscience may not offer suggestion for more adequate provision within the public schools of opportunities for the study of religion where desired, fully within the constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience and of religious expression.

NOTE.—The Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America has indicated that it disclaims and dissociates itself from this pronouncement—65 for, 1 against, 1 abstention.

Pulse of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Times Record of Troy, N.Y., on November 15, 1963, entitled "Legislating Prices," pointing out clearly the evils of the iniquitous quality stabilization bill:

PULSE OF THE PEOPLE

LEGISLATING PRICES

EDITOR, THE RECORD:

According to reports from Washington, more and more heat is being generated in the battle to induce Congress to pass this year the so-called quality stabilization bill which is nothing more nor less than a legalization of price fixing of all trademarked articles sold in interstate commerce. In the House of Representatives, this bill is identified as H.R. 3669.

In the Senate, the bill is identified as S. 774.

Although the bill contains a statement that it may be cited as the Quality Stabilization Act, there is nothing in its terms to stabilize quality of merchandise or which could affect the quality of merchandise in any way. The sole and entire purpose of the bill is to prevent any person retailing brand-named merchandise from selling it at less than the prices set by the manufacturer or distributor.

This means, in effect, that if you have been purchasing a particular brand of cigarettes, groceries, drug preparations, etc., at one store cheaper than at another store, the manufacturer can force you to pay the higher price when you buy. This could increase prices of many of our purchases from 10 to 20 percent.

Paul R. Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, estimated that passage of the bill would cost American consumers about $8 billion a year. Experts claim that passage of the bill would raise the average price level by as much as 20 percent, thus causing a big boost in the cost of living for workers and other consumers and hardships for millions of elderly people who are trying to keep body and soul together on inadequate incomes.

Similar price fixing laws have been repudiated in 26 States. Now an effort is being made to establish them throughout the Nation.

The House bill has been reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is now awaiting a vote on the House floor. Hearings are now underway on the Senate bill before the Senate Committee on Commerce, and it is expected to be reported out within a short time.

These bills have been consistently opposed by the Department of Justice and consumer organizations.

Time is short if these vicious bills are to be defeated.

Citizens opposed should write to their Congressmen and Senators without delay and register their opposition.

E.S.W.

WYNANTSKILL.

What Has Happened to America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Manion Forum of South Bend, Ind., has published an interview with the Honorable Charles Edison on the subject of "What Has Happened to America?" This interview was broadcast over the Manion Forum network on April 5, 1964.

I have been very much impressed by the comments of this distinguished former Governor of New Jersey and former Secretary of the Navy and feel that these comments should be made available to all Members of this body. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this interview by Dean Clarence Manion with the Honorable Charles Edison be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO AMERICA?

(Interview with Hon. Charles Edison)

Dean MANION. Those who chronicle the exciting record of the past century will find some great names carved into the highway of American history. No one of these is more enduring, more exciting, or more widely known for its great and ever-growing contribution to the progress, prosperity, and pleasure of our times than the name Edison.

The late Thomas A. Edison is universally acclaimed as the greatest technical genius who ever lived. The value of his inventive contributions to humanity is far beyond the possibility of measurement. But the most valuable of all of these is the precious lesson in the eternal value of personal liberty that we learn from the life and work of the great inventor, who was perhaps the most imaginative and accomplished free enterpriser who ever lived.

The whole world has reason to rejoice that Thomas Edison was able to live his most extraordinary life in a free country. No person in America has done more to project, teach, and exemplify this liberty lesson than Charles Edison, the distinguished son of the great inventor, who is my guest at this microphone now.

A lesser man would have gone into permanent eclipse behind the great reputation of his incomparable father, but Charles Edison has made his own great contribution to American history as a scientist, a businessman, as Secretary of the U.S. Navy, and as the Governor of his native State of New Jersey. Beyond that, he has fought for freedom continuously throughout all of his days in private and public life.

Governor Edison, as you well know, your visit with this audience fulfills a hope that I have cherished for a long time. Welcome to the Manion Forum.

Governor EDISON. Thank you, Dean Manion. I would like to speak about America—about how it was and how it is. America—our country—the culmination of the dreams of the Founding Fathers and the centuries-old aspirations of men throughout the world for liberty.

"Liberty"—a word and an ideal from which archaic in these days, sort of old-fashioned and fondly remembered, but belonging to an old frontier, somewhere back in the pleasant, dead days when the United States was a power to be reckoned with.

"Liberty"—a word and an ideal from which men pledged to each other their lives their fortunes, and their sacred honor; for which farmers, and merchants, and artisans, and ironmongers, and cobblers, and writers, and preachers—all of them together—withstood the bitter winter of Valley Forge to carve out a new nation and a new idea.

The spark set by these men ignited a fire which swept the world and still, even in these days of cynical hypocrisy, has the power to inflame men to action—in Hungary, in China, in East Berlin and—yes—even in Cuba.

What did this word mean? What caused men to leave their shops and their farms prepared to give their lives fighting against what must have seemed tremendous odds—against the mightiest colonial power of the day—against the might of England? Certainly, at that time, England must have seemed at least as powerful as Russia does today. Yet, the thirst for freedom banished fear.

These were men and women, as you and I—with basically the same problems of bringing up children, of paying the bills, of trying to live their lives peacefully and well. What was it, then, that moved them so and brought forth every resource of courage and strength known to man? The word "liberty?" Yes. And the meaning behind the word.

"Liberty" meant the right to control one's own destiny and, above all, the God-given right of each individual man to pursue his life as he saw fit, without interference or control except as he was responsible to his neighbors and his community. This, above all, was the essence of the word and the dream—the rights of the individual above any right which may be seized from him by government, whether it be from a foreign shore or from within his own country.

And so, the Nation was founded—given strength by its individual citizens and given form by the Constitution drafted by the Founding Fathers.

The Nation flourished. Through the years, it became the new promised land to peoples from every section of the earth. And, for the most part, the promises were fulfilled. From every nation and every area they came, the immigrants, the new Americans, giving of their talents and the sweat of their brows to build America into a proud and free and fearless nation.

AMERICA'S STRENGTH CAME FROM LIBERTY

From the famine stricken farms of Ireland, from the peasant villages of Italy, from the snow-swept hills of Sweden, from the coal mines of Wales, from the ghettos of Russia—from the tyranny that was Europe they came. Yes, many came involuntarily—from

the jungles of Africa and from the Villages of China, and they, too, eventually found freedom and added their strength to America.

The American people marched on and settled the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The true frontier moved forward. Our strength came from liberty and from the guaranteed right of each American to control his own destiny. The treasure of our country was brought forth from the earth and from the mountains to make the Nation rich, and to give our people more of the good things of life than any other people on earth in any era of recorded history.

And as we grew, we learned that liberty could not be held exclusively. With technological advances, the fate of other people's freedom became intertwined with our own. And our young men once again laid down their lives, in Cuba and the Philippines in the war with Spain, in World War I and World War II, in Korea, and today, in Vietnam—for liberty. For liberty and—the way things are going—perhaps for nothing.

This was our country and these were the American people—nurtured in the spirit of individual liberty and in their obligations to the Nation through patriotic understanding of what America meant. Through those years, our Nation produced heroes and villains—strong men and weak men. But all in all, we produced a great and proud people.

Unhappily, I speak in the past tense. What has happened?

The spirit of the old frontier has been whittled away and eroded in the past 30 years until the American people now find themselves in the nevernever land of the New Frontier. The eternal values of the Nation have been labeled "old fashioned" and not fit to survive along this New Frontier. The strength of the American people has been sapped.

From a people who proudly held honor as among the basic tenets of individual and national life, we have become a people where, more and more, honesty and honor are looked on as being old fashioned. A country where self-reliance, pride, hard work, and thrift are being replaced by ideas of dependency on government, pleasure before duty, higher pay for less work, and the right to government handouts.

And the honor of the Nation, what has happened to that? An administration which permits a policy of news distortion or blackout of truth in apprising the American people of the state of affairs and excuses this by citing national security. A Nation which has propagandized peoples throughout the world living in Communist slavery on the principles of liberation and on America's courageous dedication to freedom—this same Nation cowers in fear when they are called upon to help the struggle for freedom carried out in other nations of the world.

A bit of our Nation's honor was lost along with the Hungarian revolution. Still more of our Nation's honor has been lost in the waters of the Caribbean along with the brave men who seek to liberate their Cuban island from slavery.

And what has happened to individual liberty—to the right of the American citizen to pursue his life and his destiny as he sees fit and within the limits of his capabilities? No longer can an Amercan farmer grow what he wants. No longer can an American workingman be employed where he wants. No longer can an American businessman produce what he wants or employ whom he wants.

No longer can an American exercise his full talents and his initiative in order to profit himself and his family. More and more, everything is controlled or else it is just not worth it to see the fruits of his labor be taxed away into the enormous Federal bureaucracy. The American citizen is today controlled by a bureaucrat Frankenstein which he created himself. More and more individualism is lost to the State. More and more the State does all—feeds, houses, clothes, cares for the aged, cares for the youth, cares for the lower income group, the middle income group—takes care of everyone and everything. Thus, the empty philosophy of socialism is replacing the rich and free traditions of America.

SOCIALISM SLOWLY STRANGLING INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS

There is a community of men today in the United States who live under this system. All their human needs are taken care of. They are fed reasonably well, they are housed in decent and air-conditioned quarters. When they are ill, there is medical care available. They are given work training and taught various trades and skills and they have job security. Their recreation is assured. There are books and study programs available. They have no problems other than that of living. This is the perfect example of socialism.

The place I speak of is in Leavenworth, Kans. And this Leavenworth system—under different names and different slogans—is slowly being imposed on the American people. If this system is ever finally implemented throughout the United States, it will be truly escape-proof.

We have already lost much of our individual liberty. Our people's initiative is being destroyed. The eternal values which have made us great have been relegated to the scrap hap. The New Frontier offers us culture and entertainment and security and welfare—and emptiness.

The courage of our people—proved again and again from Valley Forge, through Gettysburg, through the trenches in France, through the islands of the Pacific, through the mud of Korea—has been squandered in fear and appeasement of tyranny and in international cowardice.

Our leaders rush forward to embrace our enemies—knowing that each time this is done freedom is lost in some place in the world. They seem unable to face up to the fact that the enemy is our enemy and meet it squarely.

The world has seen many dark times. One period of history was even called the Dark Ages. But even in those times, men carried on. In those years, there were monks who went from town to town, from country to country. Under their robes, they carried with them the manuscripts, the learning of the centuries gone before. They were hunted from place to place, and yet they carried with them the light of knowledge and the light of truth. Without them, all would have been lost.

Perhaps that is the function of Americans today—to keep on fighting and to carry with them the eternal truths laid down by our Founding Fathers. These truths are eternal and they will survive.

I have lived a good many years. No one knows all the answers, but I do know this: In the time that is left me, I will continue fighting for America—for what it really is and what it really means. And so must we all—no matter what the obstacles and no matter how discouraged we may become. To give up would indeed be a sin against the memory of all those heroes of the past who have given us a nation.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Gov. Charles Edison.

For the sake of our country, our hope and prayer is that your effective fight for America may be continued for many fruitful years to come.

Naturalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, at a naturilization proceeding held before the Honorable Howard T. Hogan, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, in the County of Nassau, Dr. R. Gordon Hoxie, president of C. W. Post College of Long Island University, made an address entitled "Three Great Challenges." I believe this address to be of such high quality that its inspiration should be spread beyond those new citizens in attendance that day and become a part of the RECORD of this Congress.

The address follows:

THREE GREAT CHALLENGES

Mr. Justice Hogan, new citizens of the United States of America, distinguished guests and friends, this day means a great deal to many persons, myself among them. To participate with you, who from distant lands have now received your citizenship in this your new home stirs the deepest sense of love of patria.

Some of you caught your first glimpse of America coming up New York Harbor past the Statute of Liberty. In 1886 this gift to the United States was made by France from where, we are happy to note, we have new citizens this morning. You have all viewed this proud lady with her torch of freedom. Perhaps you have not read, however, these stirring words of Emma Lazarus, inscribed on her base: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

Some of you have suffered this sense of confinement followed by this release of freedom. All of you I am certain this beautiful morning must have felt with me this expression from the Sanskrit:

"Look to this Day!
For it is Life, the very Life of Life
In its brief course lie all the Varieties
and Realities of your Existence!
The Bliss of Growth,
The Glory of Action,
The Splendor of Beauty.
For Yesterday is but a Dream,
And To-morrow is only a vision;
But To-day well-lived makes every
Yesterday a Dream of Happiness,
And every To-morow a Vision of Hope.
Look well therefore to this Day!
Such is the Salutation of the Dawn!

And this day's dawn I am sure you will always remember. May you be moved by this expression from "The Student Prayer-book:" "God of each day, we bring to thee this day. We are thankful for its newness, its clean untouched freshness, and for our chance to write upon its smooth, concise page. Stir our hearts and open our minds to its unique and varied possibilities, that we may use it to thy glory and that of all men everywhere."

Many of you came here today on this culminating step toward citizenship made your decision and had it accomplished at considerable self-sacrifice. You recognize the significance both of the opportunity and the responsibility of citizenship. You preceive freedom and responsibility as the two-sided

shield ever reinforcing one another if the heritage of the rights and privileges of mankind is to be preserved and strengthened.

It is my conviction that you new citizens can give a fresh approach to many of the problems facing this your new Nation.

This morning I am going to pose three challenges. Two in the domestic sphere and one in the international. They are all interrelated, and I am going to place them in their historical context which I am sure is familiar to you. The United States can achieve much through your approach to these problems as we can indeed by your very presence here today. For we who are here receiving you as fellow citizens, today is a time of rededication. It is a time for reenunciation of our own belief in the right, privileges, and responsibilities cherished and fought for by our Founding Fathers and set down in the U.S. Constitution and the constitution of the State of New York.

Perhaps even more than a body of law we cherish a body of spirit, a body of spirit such as was set forth in the still ringing terms of the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

You all remember these phrases. And then the Declaration continues: "That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Here we see government as an instrument of man, rather than, as in totalitarian states, man as an instrument or a tool of the government.

Similarly, the preamble to the U.S. Constitution declares, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This oldest written Constitution still in use, so relatively brief and relatively free of substantive amendments, clearly sets forth the doctrine of limited government and the purpose of government to serve the citizenry rather than make the citizenry a slave of government's will.

May we remind ourselves also that the goals of government here set forth are both to promote the general welfare of the group and to protect the individual's rights, those of his children, his children's children, and their posterity. The men who wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, and 55 others, gathered in the Second Continental Congress in 1776, knew full well of that which they were doing, defying the authority of the most powerful nation on earth. "And for the support of this Declaration," they concluded, "with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

A little more than 11 years later as George Washington and 38 others affixed their signatures to the Constitution they emphasized that they did so "by the unanimous consent of the States present." The authorities set forth in the Constitution had been delegated by the States, with all others retained by the people in the several States. Here again the doctrine of limited government had been enunciated.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution might well be termed milestones, markers along the path of freedom. Relating the Constitution by time "in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven, and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth," the Constitutional Fathers sensed this stream of freedom with its historic markers.

Most of you here today came out of what we term western civilization. Some few of you came out of eastern civilization. What we in the West forget in our recognition of our Greco, Roman, Hebraic, Christian cultures is that they comprised a mingling of East and West. Civilization had its beginnings not in the West, but in the Near and in the Middle East, in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. We forget that there have been historic milestones of freedom East and West.

As a nation primarily founded by Englishmen we understandably trace this freedom path through the English Magna Carta, Petition of Right, and Bill of Rights, to our own Declaration, Constitution, and its Bill of Rights. Yet philosophically our Founding Fathers were as much influenced by such French philosophers as Montesquieu, Diderot, and Voltaire, as by the English Locke and Hobbes. What I am suggesting is that all mankind has contributed to that which is a humane aspiration, the sense of dignity of the individual and of the rights and responsibilities of the group. We are all inheritors of a precious heritage. Even when a people was reduced to slavery, as was the case of the ancient Hebrews, there was an abiding expression of man's fundamental dignity. The Jewish people believed in a holy and just God Who directed judgment to "run down as water and righteousness as a mighty stream" and in the coming Messiah who would lead them out of captivity.

To many, Jesus Christ became that Messiah.

Aside from the Hebrews, in the ancient world the most complete attempts to establish democratic rule were in Greece and Rome. The very word "demokratia" comes from the Greek term "demos" (the people) plus "kratein" (to rule), thus: rule by the people. Democracy does not, alas, necessarily connote or guarantee individual freedom. In Athens such reformers as Solon, Clisthenes, and Pericles demonstrated that in a small city a government could derive its power from the individual. However, even in Athens this concept of individual freedom was limited, for the free men were greatly outnumbered by the slaves. Moreover, even at its height in the fourth century B.C., Greek democracy and political philosophy as expounded by Aristotle and Plato still subordinated the individual to the state.

The Roman state approached political democracy under the Republic, but even then when power was popularly exercised there was no concept of individual rights or civil liberty.

Indeed, it remained for our constitutional fathers in these United States to set down for a nation a written durable constitution protecting the individual in his rights and civil liberties; protecting him from the tyranny of the group as well as providing for the general welfare. The genius of this was the federated republic. That is, a representative government with the division of powers between the states and the federal whole and a separation of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

As was so well expressed in the "Federalist Papers," a remarkable series of political essays, which if you have not I would invite your reading, written by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay in 1787–88 in defense of the Constitution:

"It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers but to guard one part of the society against the injustices of the other part."

This is one of the greatest challenges faced by the American people today, "to guard one part of the society against the injustices of the other part." The equal opportunity concept of the Declaration of Independence and the citizenship rights set forth in the Federal Constitution and interpreted in the Federal courts and the State courts provide the avenue toward more perfect freedom for persons of all races, color, and religious creeds.

Not all of the answers are found at the Federal level. Often overlooked is the work that has been accomplished in our States. For example, here in New York State the Commission on Discrimination has long done a remarkable job.

Finally, in our hearts and minds, our attitudes, lies much of the answer.

The second great challenge is in the protection of the rights of the individual. The history of our living Constitution has witnessed a constant change from the balance envisioned by the Founding Fathers. The States have steadily lost ground to the Federal authorities and the reserve rights of the individual have diminished as we have become increasingly dependent upon the Federal Government in our daily lives. The constant advancement of the Federal commerce powers, of the taxing authority, of the general welfare concept, have moved us from the path of individualism and sent us down the path of statism.

These tendencies must be arrested if we are to keep faith with the principles of the Nation's founders and the trust of the freedom milestones we have here indicated.

The third great challenge is founded in the international sphere. You who have now become citizens will understand and appreciate far beyond that of many of us what I here mean in the international sphere. You have become citizens at a critical juncture in human history. The very survival of this heritage of which we speak is at stake in this severe testing period between democracy and communism. There is involved both man's relationship with the State and with his fellow man. There is further involved the temptations of seeking a halfway house of compromise. Some of you come from lands that tragically learned the lesson there is no compromise, no neutral position, with communism. To do so is to relinquish our fundamental beliefs.

Sadly, I must report to you who have just become citizens that it has been brought acutely home to us that our own citizenry, those born with the privileges of American citizenship, are not always adequately informed as to the nature of the conflict, the implications and issues, and the means of their resolution. On the one hand there is lack of understanding of the principles essential for the preservation of freedom. On the other there is a groping of well-meaning individuals seemingly unable to translate their individual concern into united action through the democratic process. What we do know is that we are engaged in a protracted and severe struggle, testing our social, moral, and spiritual fiber as well as our political and economic institutions. What we further know is that ours is a republic, a representative form of government, in which the citizens determine within broad limits the trend, scope, and nature of the policies our Government will take during this testing period. This individual participation on our side—so lacking in the totalitarian camp—can be either a tremendous asset or a dangerous liability. The key to it all is citizenship education. The vox populi, the people's voice, will be heard either on the basis of ignorance and prejudice or on the basis of knowledge and understanding. That is why this citizenship course which you have undertaken is so tremendously important. I exhort each of you to continue it as a personal course throughout your lives, broadening your horizons, your knowledge, your understanding, taking your places as alert, intelligent citizens of this beloved land.

Commencing this Sunday here in the United States we observe Brotherhood Week. What could be more fitting today than extending the hand of brotherhood today? Today millions of people throughout the world, as you here today can attest, yearn for a sense of neighborliness, for a strengthening of basic institutions. And herein lies our great opportunity: to make our own institutions an ever more inspiring model for other peoples, and to extend the helping hand in strengthening theirs.

As the late Dr. James Rowland Angel of Yale University expressed it: "There is no ethical development more important than the sharpening and enrichment of this conception of neighborly obligation."

Here is your opportunity through yourselves, your friends, and your relatives, here and throughout the world in extending this sense of brotherhood. Not just depending upon government to do so.

In a final lecture delivered shortly before his death one of my mentors, the distinguished historian, Carl Lotus Becker, set forth an abiding truth:

"When all is said what is needed for the solution of the difficult national and international problems that confront us and therefore for the preservation of our institutions and of the liberties they were created to serve, is more intelligence, more integrity, and a heightened sense of responsibility.

"This is only to say that the preservation of our freedom depends less upon the precise nature of our constitutions and laws than it does upon the character of the people. In the last analysis everything depends upon the possession by the people of that virtue (virtue in the ancient Roman sense of the word), which Montesquieu declared to be the fundamental principle, the indispensable guarantee of the republican form of government."

To build and inculcate that character, that intelligence, that virtue, in this your new land now today becomes your lifelong duty, your heritage, and your trust.

God speed you on your course and us with you.

General Eisenhower's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I hope the many people who read the article on the state of the Nation by General Eisenhower in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post will also read today's column by Walter Lippmann. Only then will they have a balanced picture.

For example, General Eisenhower sees both the inflation that caused the drop in the value of the dollar and the increased size of the Federal Government in the last 25 years as almost exclusively the result of the policies of Democratic administrations. Mr. Lippmann wryly points out that three world wars and an increase of 50 million people might have had something to do with it.

Mr. Lippmann characterizes the Eisenhower article as typical of the Republican refusal to recognize the facts of life in America in the 1960's. This is an excellent statement of Republican myopia at both the national and local levels in many parts of the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the Lippmann column as it appeared today in the Washington Post of April 14 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S VIEWS

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has just published in the Saturday Evening Post a long statement of his present beliefs about the state of the Union. They can fairly be described as GOLDWATER minus the howlers about the graduated income taxes, social security, TVA, and the like. That is to say, General Eisenhower's position is that of the conservative right not of the radical far right.

His basic thesis is that there has been for 30 years under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier "a steady obvious drift of our Nation toward a centralization of power in the Federal Government." We have "an overbearing Federal bureaucracy that seems unchecked in both size and power." The net result of the "easy money and inflationary policies" of this Federal bureaucracy is that "the dollar you saved and earned 24 years ago is now worth just 45 cents."

This is a strange interpretation of the history of the past 25 years, and one thing we may be certain of is that General Eisenhower will never be hailed as a reliable historian. He was the Supreme Commander in Europe during the Second World War, he was the Supreme Commander of NATO in the cold war, and he was twice the President of the United States. Yet, incredible as it is, he has interpreted what has happened since 1940 without even mentioning the fact that the country has grown by 50 million people, that during these 25 years the country has fought the Second World War, the Korean war, and the cold war.

How is it possible to talk about the rise in prices which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar by rather more than half without mentioning the wars and the preparation for war? As a matter of fact, half of the rise in prices occurred during and immediately after the Second World War; another 15 percent of the rise occurred during the Korean war. From 1953 to 1963 the rise in prices has been a little over 1 percent a year. The rise was just about the same under President Eisenhower as it was under President Kennedy.

If General Eisenhower is blind to the economic consequences of the wars in which he has played such a distinguished part, he exaggerates grossly the part played by the civilian sector in the growth of the Federal bureaucracy.

There has not been, as General Eisenhower says, an unchecked growth of the Federal bureaucracy. While State and local government employment has doubled between 1947 and 1963, nondefense employment in Federal Government was the same percentage (1.9) of the total civilian labor force in 1963 as it was in 1948. In fact, Federal civilian employment has not grown so fast as the population. There are now approximately 13 U.S. workers per thousand of population. Of these, 5 are employed in defense, 3 by the Post Office, 1 by the Veterans Administration, and 4 by all the rest of the Federal Government.

Nor is it true that there has been a "consolidation of power and revenue in the Federal Government." While the share of State and local government in the national product has doubled since 1948—from 5 to 10 percent—Federal revenue as a percentage of the national product has increased only slightly—from 12 to 14 percent—and has not risen for 5 years. And if we take debt as a measure of activity from 1947 to 1963, we see that State and local debt increased 382 percent; private debt increased 279 percent; Federal debt increased 26 percent.

Thus, General Eisenhower has not painted a true picture of the state of the Union. It is not possible to paint a true picture of the state of the Union since 1940 by ignoring the three wars, by ignoring the growth of the population by as many people as live in Great Britain, by ignoring the preponderance of Federal employment (71 percent) in the indispensable functions of defense, the postal service and veterans' care, by ignoring the relatively greater growth of State and local activity, and by professing to believe that all the troubles and dangers of our age are due to the handful of civilian welfare measures.

It is just this refusal to recognize the facts of American life which accounts for the condition of the Republican Party today. General Eisenhower meant to speak for the moderate, prudent, and, in the correct meaning of the word, the conservative mass of our people. But what he says is so greatly out of touch with the realities—with what has happened, with what is happening, with what the people need to have happen in the future—that it lacks all credibility.

Cause for Civil Rights Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville (S.C.) News of Monday, April 13, 1964, contained a very thought-provoking editorial entitled "Cause for Civil Rights Fighters." This editorial discusses the recent Supreme Court decision in the Barnett-Johnson criminal contempt case, which denied these defendants a trial by jury. It also points out that many similar occurrences could be expected if the pending so-called civil rights measure were enacted.

This serves to point out more vividly the need for general legislation to clarify the obvious intent of the sixth amendment. S. 2722, which I introduced on April 9 and which would guarantee a trial by jury to the accused in any prosecution for criminal contempt in the courts of the United States, should be acted on without delay.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, "Cause for Civil Rights Fighters," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAUSE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHTERS

We are surprised, rhetorically speaking, that none of the militant champions of civil rights in Congress have risen to sound an alarm and denounce in words that would ring across the land a gross abrogation of a fundamental right of American citizenship.

It occurred in the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court denying Gov. Paul Johnson of Mississippi and his predecessor, Ross Barnett, a jury trial on the criminal charges brought against them by the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals sitting in New Orleans.

It was by a significant margin of only one, a 5-to-4 decision which is rare or nonexistent in any case related to Negro rights, that the 9 justices issued a decree which flies in the face of the Bill of Rights.

Equally significant is the fact that Chief Justice Earl Warren, the architect of the original school integration decision, was in the minority favoring the trial the two Mississippi officials had asked.

There are many differences, of course, between the charges against Barnett and Johnson and ordinary criminal charges. No two cases are alike. And the whole set of proceedings growing out of alleged efforts by Barnett and Johnson to prevent integration of the University of Mississippi in the ill-famed Meredith case has been most unusual.

But the basic principle of trial by jury is there, as four of the nine justices agreed, and that right should not be altered by circumstances. They met all of the requirements. They did not waive their right to a trial by a jury, which any citizen has a right to do.

Negro demonstrators charged with the misdemeanor of violating local laws pertaining to breach of the peace and similar offenses have received trial by jury upon demand.

Any person accused of even so minor an offense as overparking can demand a trial by a jury in City Recorders Court and if he doesn't get it he has perfect grounds for an appeal to a higher court.

Article 6 of the amendments to the U.S. Constitution, No. 6 of the 10 items of the Bill of Rights says:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

Notice that the amendment says "all criminal prosecutions."

Well, Barnett and Johnson are being subjected to a criminal prosecution. The charge against them is criminal contempt of court in that they allegedly failed to obey a court injunction to refrain from interfering with the integration of the university. It is no misdemeanor, but a high crime, of which they stand accused.

As the majority of the Supreme Court said, the power of a Federal court to impose "summary punishment" for the crime of contempt of court is well established. It is, but the establishment has been more by custom and precedent than by law.

The distinction is that such charges are generally regarded as "civil" rather than "criminal". Mississippi's Governor and his predecessor now face a "criminal prosecution" which Senator STROM THURMOND and other lawyers feel comes within the meaning of the sixth amendment, a solemn guarantee by the Bill of Rights, and entitles them to a jury trial.

The excuse advanced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, in his debate with THURMOND over the civil rights bill, that American citizens already have been deprived of the right of trial by jury in many Federal matters during the last 30 years doesn't make violation of the right proper. It should make Senator HUMPHREY, if he is sincere about his advocacy of civil rights, rise up in righteous wrath.

But, as Senator THURMOND said, we haven't seen anything yet, if the civil rights bill passes. For there are criminally punitive provisions in every section of the proposed law and in no instance is the right of trial by jury mentioned.

In fact, in most instances the accused violators of "rights" conferred by the proposed bill would not even be tried by a court, but by politically appointed bureaucrats.

And the power of summary punishment is the threat by which the authors of the bill and the administration which is sponsoring it hope to gain abject compliance on the part of citizens who are either willing to abdicate their right to appeal to a court or can't afford the expense of doing so.

It was unusual for the Fifth Circuit Court to retain jurisdiction in the case, instead of serving its role of an interpreting court on appeal and sending the matter back to the district court, which is the Federal court of enforcement and punishment.

It was unusual for that court to bring the criminal charge and attempt to prosecute it and judge it, rather than sending it to the district court for disposition within the limits and instructions of its basic decisions.

Its denial of a jury trial, and the upholding of that decision by the Supreme Court is more than unusual. It is a sinister outrage.

If a court can do that to the elected chief executive of a State, heaven knows what may happen in the future to an ordinary citizen, white or Negro.

Where now are the militant spokesmen and fighters for "civil rights?" Or do only members of minorities have civil rights?

Extremists Are Danger to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include at this point in the RECORD an article written by the Reverend Paul Hardin, Jr., resident bishop of Columbia, S.C., which appeared in the Methodist Advocate. Reverend Hardin is a native of my district, a church leader of the highest erudition and accomplishment, the first bishop of South Carolina. I believe his reasoning is just cause for thought to all of us and an approach to many of the confusions which exist today among all Americans who are subjected to hearing the charges and countercharges of various groups. This article also appeared in the Cheraw (S.C.) Chronicle of Thursday, April 2, 1964, and is as follows:

EXTREMISTS ARE DANGER TO FREEDOM

(By Bishop Paul Hardin, Jr.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was written by the Reverend Paul Hardin, Jr., resident bishop of the Columbia area and first appeared in the Methodist Advocate. Bishop Hardin is the son of the former Miss Harriet Wannamaker, of Cheraw, and is a nephew of Messrs. Henry, Herbert, and Caston Wannamaker of this community. Bishop Hardin's review of J. Edgar Hoover's recent book, "A study of Communism," is a valuable contribution to the discussion of political extremism in America today.)

As we think of the crucifixion of our Lord, it is appropriate that we should give serious thought to an enemy which would happily crucify His church.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is regarded as the greatest authority on communism in the United States. In his excellent book, "Masters of Deceit," he writes, "Communism is the major menace of our time. Today it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization." In his equally outstanding and more recent volume, "A Study of Communism," used widely in high schools and colleges, Mr. Hoover says, "The danger which world communism presents to the free nations has not abated, if anything, it has increased."

Relating the danger of communism to religion in our Nation, Mr. Hoover has on different occasions warned our church people of the efforts of Communists to "infiltrate American religious groups." In his article, "Communism: The Bitter Enemy of Religion," Mr. Hoover continues, "The Communists would like to extirpate religion. * * * You, as ministers, have a challenge to make your pulpits sound the trumpet cry of free men." Elsewhere he has declared that one Communist or pro-Communist in any religious organization is one too many.

I am in full agreement with every one of these statements by Mr. Hoover. This is no time in our country's history to take a soft approach toward communism or to appease Communists in any way whatsoever or to give them any kind of support, direct or indirect. We must oppose this menace to our religion and country without qualification.

Is the National Council of Churches a Communist-front organization? Has it been cited by the Attorney General? To what extent have Communists infiltrated our churches?

These are questions I directed to FBI Assistant Director William C. Sullivan in a recent conversation.

Mr. Sullivan replied that the National Council of Churches has not been designated as subversive by the Attorney General.

Mr. Sullivan said that churches and religious organizations have for many years been targets for Communist invasion and will continue to be so. He went on to say that these invasion efforts have been thwarted by the FBI's internal security programs, by investigations, arrests and prosecution of Communist Party officials; by calm, rational, intelligent public opposition; and by constructive social action on the part of business, labor, government, and the churches.

It seems to me that one of the best things about the FBI is its sensible, factual, informed, balanced view. It is against not only law violators but also extremists of all kinds whose carelessness with facts and whose ill-considered actions can be harmful to our Nation.

As early as April 1, 1961, Mr. Hoover wrote in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin: "There exists today in our land a vital rift which the Communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label of Communist is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority. Those whose lives are not led according to what one segment of society might decree to be the norm are too frequently challenged as Reds. * * * Attributing every adversity to communism is not only irrational, but also contributes to hysteria and fosters groundless fears."

Mr. Hoover states: "Communism feeds on social ferment. On both the local and national levels, the Comunist Party, U.S.A., is continually exploiting social, economic, and political grievances for its own tactical purposes. For this reason the 'Party Line' will frequently coincide with the views of many nonconformists on specific issues. We must not, therefore, indiscriminately label as communists those whose opinions on a particular question may, on occasion, parallel the official party position.

"We must also guard against the tendency to characterize as Communists those who merely disagree with us or who advocate unorthodox or unpopular beliefs. * * * When anyone is erroneously branded a Communist, it not only constitutes an injustice to the individual, but also helps communism by diffusing the strength of anticommunist forces.

"The person who would bomb a school, desecrate a house of worship, or spread the doctrine of hate toward his fellow man con-

stitutes a real threat to our American way of life. He lives in a vacuum of moral degeneracy. His crimes are so outrageous it is unthinkable that anyone except the extreme 'lunatic fringe' could rationalize or condone them.

"Invariably, these hatemongers attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism, but their real objectives is to destroy the very American ideals which they claim to uphold. They preach 'mobocracy'—disrespect for the law, for our Constitution, and disregard for the welfare of others."

Continues Mr. Hoover: "I place the 'fiery cross' of the vicious Ku Klux Klan in the same category as the 'swastika' of the Nazis and the godless 'hammer and sickle' of atheistic communism. All ignore the rights of everyone to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"All right-thinking citizens know that there is no place in America for vigilantes, rabble rousers, the 'lunatic fringe' and those who make a profit—political or material—out of merchandizing prejudice.

"No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in our society. Intimidation and mob action are not the American way—nor are they God's way—of accomplishing any objective which is truly worthwhile."

In another speech entitled "Faith in Freedom" and given as recently as December 4, 1963, Mr. Hoover declares:

"Communism feeds upon ignorance, prejudice and sickness of the mind and soul. It probes relentlessly for weaknesses in America's moral armor.

"That is why the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the 'lunatic fringe' and other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellowman.

"These venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right, are carriers of a highly infectious disease. They clutter the streets—and the mails—with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to acts of hate, terror and intimidation. They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children, and destroyed churches and other temples of worship. They are a national disgrace."

To sum it up, churches and religious organizations and all other worthy endeavors continue to be the targets of Communists. We ministers must be always alert to his and oppose them relentlessly.

We should never have a merely negative approach. Ministers and laymen alike need to proceed from the conviction that it is not enough to be against something. We must also be for something. And what we are for is the living reality of Jesus Christ and all the personal and social values which emanate from His being.

Jesus said, "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly." He was interested in the well-being and fulfillment of all life and every life. And so the church must be. We must not be frightened away from successfully carrying out the Christian mission and purpose either by Communists or by extremists of any other kind. If, in this long struggle in these trying days we remain true to our Christian heritage, we will merit the praise given American clergymen by Mr. Hoover when he said in his article, "Red Goals and Christian Ideals":

"The Christian pulpit is today one of America's most formidable barriers against communism. The spiritual dedication of thousands of clergymen, in large and small churches across the Nation, is a powerful antidote to the danger. America owes a great debt of gratitude to the stalwart example of our religious leaders."

Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley—Partners in Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Carl B. Jensen, chairman of the board of directors of Dravo Corp. of Pittsburgh, Pa., is one of the most knowledgeable men in America on the subject of inland waterways, I commend to my colleagues his speech to the trustees of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association on February 27, 1964.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the OVIA and guests, I'm pleased to be able to participate in this meeting sponsored by the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. Today I am to talk to you about a subject that is close to my heart and, I suspect, to yours—the economic development of Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley. It's a big and complicated subject which can only be covered in broad brush fashion in this brief discussion. It is also a subject on which I'm somewhat biased.

My company has a big stake in both Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley, and we believe strongly in their combined future. Our activities are tied closely to the special characteristics of this rich industrial area. As most of you know, we build and operate towboats and barges. We supply processes and equipment for steel mills, power plants, chemical plants, and other industries. We construct navigation and flood control dams.

My personal attachment to the Ohio goes back more than 40 years to one of my first jobs at Dravo, where as a construction engineer I was involved in building one of the old lowlift wicket-type navigation dams near Vanceburg, Ky. One reason I remember it so well is that I spent my honeymoon on that job. The dam has since been replaced by a bigger and more modern structure. It is my good fortune to still have the same wife.

In choosing a title for my remarks, I have described Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley as partners. This implies that each contributes to the benefit of the other—a happy situation which has existed since pre-Revolutionary War days. Pittsburgh was the first town to develop west of the Allegheny Mountains. It was the gateway to the West. It was here that adventurers looking for new lands to settle stopped to buy their supplies before starting the dangerous, tedious journey downriver by canoe, flatboat, or keelboat. Pittsburgh flourished on their business, and they in turn depended on the commodities and services Pittsburgh had to offer. The unifying thread between this city and the new settlements to the west was the river. It served as the only highway through the wilderness, and it led not only to the west but to the Mississippi River and south to the Gulf of Mexico. Pittsburgh's first important industry was boatbuilding. But it's doubtful that the Ohio meant any more to the settlers who rode those boats than it does to the millions who today live and work along its banks.

For the Ohio River—all 981 miles of it—still carries prodigious quantities of Pittsburgh products to other cities in the west and south and brings other products back. And it gives not only this industrial community but all Ohio Valley communities a common outlet to markets to the south, west and north.

It was a happy aftermath of the ice age that sent the Ohio and its tributaries flowing toward the Gulf of Mexico. We are told that streams in this area flowed north toward the polar wastes before the glaciers melted and dropped their heavy moraines of gravel and sand. Further back—millions of years prior to the ice age—this valley of ours was inundated by a great inland sea that deposited salt and lime and covered great forests with silt, which in due course formed our unmatched coal deposits. This underground natural wealth, together with the availability of economical water transportation, formed the basis for the valley's industrial growth. Eighty percent of the Nation's coal is mined in the six States through which the Ohio flows. Because coal is near the rivers, it can be moved by water. Economical water transport means low-cost coal, which means low-cost electric power, which in turn means thriving manufacturing plants. These factors, added to salt deposits—like those at Natrona north of here—brought chemical plants to the riverbanks. And the limestone quarries are close at hand for the steelmakers. Since 1950 alone, more than $18 billion has been spent on industrial expansion in the Ohio Valley.

These mills and plants use water transportation. The Ohio and its tributaries carry more tonnage per mile than any other river in the United States, except the lower Mississippi with its deep-sea freighters, and most of that tonnage in one form or another originates or terminates somewhere on the Ohio.

The river provides something besides transportation. It supplies industrial plants with the tremendous quantities of water needed for various manufacturing processes. These, of course, vary from industry to industry. It takes only 10 gallons of water to refine a gallon of gasoline and 300 gallons to produce a barrel of beer. But to produce a single ton of steel, our Pittsburgh mills must draw 65,000 gallons of water from the river. Jones & Laughlin's Aliquippa plant alone uses more water than is handled by the waterworks system for the entire city of Pittsburgh.

Only a small part of this water, of course, is actually consumed. Except for that which is evaporated during its passage through the industrial plant, most of it is returned to the river. But it usually goes back at a higher temperature, and it is not uncommon for a steel mill to ask the Army Corps of Engineers who build and operate the dams to release additional water from the flood control reservoirs because water in the river, through use and reuse, has become overheated. A U.S. Senate committee report on national water resources says that water in the Ohio River between Pittsburgh and Cairo, Ill., is used four times over in periods of low flow.

Any mention of flood control and navigation dams and reservoirs brings up the question of expending public funds for improvements to the waterways. Some well-intentioned people seem to believe that this is done exclusively for the benefit of the bargeline operators. As most of you know, there was a time on the rivers when the channel depth fluctuated drastically from one period of the year to another. This certainly made river navigation a rather spotty proposition. It also meant that there would be times when riverside industrial plants would run short of process water. Between 1885 and 1929, by congressional authorization, the Army Corps of Engineers built a system of 51 navigation locks and dams that assured the Ohio River a year-round dependable 9-foot channel. When the last dam was completed, traffic on the Ohio totaled somewhere around 2 billion ton-miles (a ton-mile being 1 ton moved 1 mile). By

1961, 32 years later, traffic on the Ohio had exceeded 18 billion ton-miles a year, and the Corps of Engineers was at work replacing the old locks and dams with larger, more efficient structures that could better handle the demand.

Did this benefit only the bargelines? Not on your life. Between 1939 and 1961, the amount of electric power generated by plants in the Ohio Valley increased almost 1,000 percent, compared with an increase of slightly more than 500 percent for the whole country. To take a more recent development, aluminum reduction capacity in the Ohio Valley increased about 500,000 tons between 1957 and 1962. During the same period the rest of the United States added only 400,000 tons of new capacity. Of course, the new locks and dams improved water transportation, but they also made it possible for industry to expand. And the assured flow of water helped not only industry but the hundreds of growing communities that take their water supply from the rivers. As the riverside plants flourished, they meant new business for railroads and trucking lines. They meant more jobs for labor and lower prices for consumers everywhere.

Part of the steady flow of water resulted, of course, from utilization of the storage capacity of the flood control projects. But is that all these dams and reservoirs have accomplished? On March 18, 1936, the river level at Pittsburgh was 46 feet, 21 feet above flood stage, and 30 feet above normal pool. It was a disaster for this city and for town after town farther down the Ohio. More than one businessman wondered seriously whether he could afford to stay on the river, where another flood would bankrupt him. As a result of that catastrophe, Congress appropriated funds for the Corps of Engineers to build a system of reservoirs in the Allegheny and Monongahela River Basins. You are familiar with their predominantly Indian names—Tygart, Loyalhanna, Youghiogheny, Conemaugh, Mahoning, Tionesta, Crooked Creek, and East Branch. It's estimated that had those eight reservoirs been in operation in 1936, they would have cut 10 feet off that St. Patrick's Day flood crest. Or take a later example: the flood of October 1954 brought on by Hurricane Hazel. That flood crested at Pittsburgh's Point at 32 feet, 7 feet above flood stage. Had there been no reservoirs, it would have reached 41 feet and would have caused an estimated $140 million damage in the Pittsburgh district alone, to say nothing of Cincinnati and Louisville. The entire cost of building and operating the reservoirs through June 1955 was just $118 million. They more than paid for themselves in one flood. Kinzua Dam, now under construction above Warren, Pa.—the last major link in the flood control chain—will provide substantial additional protection against a potential flood threat to Pittsburgh and downriver cities.

The flood control and navigation dams have provided another benefit to residents of the Ohio Valley. That is their recreational value. Every summer—starting early in the spring and continuing well into the fall—literally millions of people use the reservoirs and rivers for swimming, boating, fishing, and water skiing. Most of them would not have a chance to vacation in the Bahamas or even on the Jersey shore. But here they can enjoy life in or on the water just a few miles from home. Does this benefit the bargeline operators? As a matter of fact, quite the opposite. For a rich, full description of what it means to the barge-lines, talk to any outspoken towboat pilot who has spent a weekend behind a 500- to 1,000-foot tow trying to avoid running down frolicsome pleasure boat operators and water skiers.

What the river brings to one community along its banks, it brings to every community. Without the river there could be no Pittsburgh and no Ohio Valley industrial centers as we now know them. The river is a unifying element that brings the entire valley closer together. Some of you here today, I am sure, represent companies with two or more plants located at various points along the Ohio and its tributaries. To paraphrase an old saying, "When Pittsburgh catches cold, Cincinnati sneezes." And it's a sneeze whose economic repercussions are felt throughout the United States and in many a foreign country.

In the smaller cities—like Parkersburg, Marietta, Paducah, Ashland—the river dominates the life of the people. These are river towns, and they are proud of it. To a somewhat lesser degree, this is true in Huntington, Cincinnati, Louisville or Evansville. But Pittsburgh breaks the mold. I find it perplexing that, in spite of their history and the debt they owe the rivers, Pittsburghers don't seem to realize that they live in a river city. Most Pittsburghers regard these broad streams only as an obstacle to cross on the way to work.

I know that this does not apply to many of you Pittsburghers here. Your businesses, to a considerable degree, are closely linked to the rivers. But what about all those other people? Their attitude really wouldn't be too serious, were it not for the lack of perspective it fosters. Pittsburghers seem generally sympathetic to the problems of the railroads; and since this is a great rail center—and heaven knows the railroads have plenty of problems—this attitude is good. But how many care what happens to the rivers? Maybe this indifference stems from a lack of understanding of the importance of low-cost transportation.

Such a lack of understanding hasn't always existed in the Pittsburgh area. Back in 1790, 25 percent of the liquor stills in the United States were located in the upper Ohio Valley. The reason was simple: it was good country for growing rye. Farmers found that a horse could carry only 4 bushels of rye grain to Philadelphia—then the main trade outlet—but the same horse could carry the equivalent of 24 bushels over the Allegheny Mountains if the grain were first turned into whisky. Inevitably, somebody decided to tax the whisky, and that brought on the Whisky Rebellion. I don't particularly condone rebellions, but the farmers' reasoning points up one very significant conclusion that is just as true today: Transportation costs are an extremely important factor in any business.

We in Pittsburgh—as well as every resident of the Ohio Valley—enjoy tremendous advantages because of the rivers. I wonder how many Pittsburghers realize that steel mills here can buy coal for industrial coke at about 15 percent less than the cost to mills in the Chicago district. And that the Pittsburgh mills need this advantage because the Chicago mills enjoy a comparable edge in the transportation cost of iron ore. I wonder if they realize that without the benefits of low-cost water transportation, finished steel products could no longer be shipped to many areas at prices competitive with those of mills in Texas or the Chicago area. Or take electric power. Because their coal is delivered economically by water, electric generating plants in the Ohio Valley can buy their fuel for about $4.50 a ton, compared with a national average for utility coal of $6.37 per ton, according to one power system executive. Every user of electricity benefits in lower prices. Or what about aluminum? In view of the current competitive market situation, any increase in transportation costs for the large producers in the Ohio Valley would mean either that they would be forced out of business or that the whole price structure of aluminum would rise—to the detriment of the consumer.

It is obvious, I think, that an important goal for all industry must be to keep transportation costs as low as possible, whether the means be barge lines, railroads, trucks, or airlines. At the same time, each of these forms of transport deserves a chance to make a profit, for the orderly conduct of modern business operations would be impossible without the tremendous contributions of all of them. I might point out that last year railroads performed 43 percent of the Nation's intercity ton-miles of transportation, trucking lines handled 23 percent, oil pipelines 17 percent, and the inland waterways only 10 percent. There are still a lot of places you can't go with a barge; the Great Plains are murder on hull bottoms.

In our intensely competitive society, it's quite understandable that a transportation business, like any other business, can run into financial problems. Yet we cannot afford to help one segment of that society to the detriment of another. Admittedly large sums of money have been spent to improve the rivers. But the rivers were here first, and even in their natural state they provided the early settlers with many advantages. Arbitrarily limiting those advantages—whether to help the railroads, the truckers, the airlines, the buggy whip manufacturers, or the rutabaga growers—is simply cutting off our nose to spite our face.

Fundamentally, I believe in competition. I was brought up along the old Erie Canal—"Clinton's ditch"—in New York State, and as a small boy I used to watch the mules plodding along the towpath, pulling the tiny canal boats. Only a short distance away train after train of 100 cars each roared past on the four-track main line, water level route of the New York Central. I don't have to tell you what happened in that competitive situation; the mules and the canals lost out, as they deserved to.

Long before that, shortly after the Civil War, the railroads began threatening the existence of the river packet boats. The trains were faster, they ran in all kinds of weather, and they ran all year long. The packets had to tie up at night, and at times during the year they didn't have enough water under their hulls to operate at all. Besides, they periodically blew up. By the turn of the century, the packet boats were in full retreat, and by the late 1920's they were gone for good. As much as they had contributed to this country's growth, they deserved to go. Oh, they might have been able to compete if somebody had been able to get a law passed prohibiting trains from traveling at more than 10 miles an hour, but nobody thought of that. It was too silly.

Let's come a little closer to home. Twenty years ago Pittsburgh was headed straight downhill. When the great architect Frank Lloyd Wright was asked what he would do to solve the problem, he said, "Abandon it." To the everlasting credit of a group of outstanding Pittsburgh civic, business, and political leaders, that idea never got far. Nor did anyone suggest building a wall around Cincinnati, or Cleveland, or Chicago to improve Pittsburgh's competitive position. They moved in, studied the situation, decided what was wrong, and set out to rectify it. Some of the measures were drastic. Some haven't fully paid off even now, and much is yet to be done. But Pittsburgh came up fighting. Now it is a city that takes its rightful place in doing progressive things.

One example was the drive to clean up the rivers and make the water safe for drinking and swimming. The master plan for sewage treatment and disposal was pushed until every community in Allegheny County had either joined or taken care of its sewage problem locally. At the same time, industry was spending huge sums of money to solve its waste disposal problems. The result was cleaner rivers, not just in the Pittsburgh area but up and down the Ohio Basin, as community after community followed that

example and launched a fight against pollution. Now 95 percent of the towns along the river have effective sewage and waste treatment facilities.

What Pittsburgh and other Ohio Valley cities have done could not have been accomplished without an atmosphere of business prosperity—a prosperity traceable directly to their location on the rivers. But prosperity is not an automatic consequence of geographical location. Some of the once busy towns of the Monongahela Valley are having difficulties. They look to Pittsburgh for help. With the cooperation of everyone concerned, that help can be delivered. An economically healthy Ohio Valley affects the lives of those living hundreds of miles from it, but to spread that economic health requires constant effort, constant probing at the causes of those ills, and a firm determination to make the most of those natural resources with which we have been blessed. As much now as ever before, our economic health in Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley depends on our best use of the river system from which we have benefited for so many years. I have no doubt that our future history, for good or bad, will depend largely on how well we maintain and employ this great gift of nature.

Milwaukee's International Institute: Haven for the Foreign-Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, there are few American communities which can claim to be the "melting pot" of various nationalities that Milwaukee is. This Wisconsin city was founded and grew strong on successive waves of immigrants from all over the world, but particularly from Central and Eastern Europe.

Even today Milwaukee has an unusually large number of individuals considered to be of foreign stock, that is, those who themselves are immigrants or whose parents were immigrants. The problem of assimilation into our American culture and language is still a problem for hundreds of Milwaukee citizens.

Assisting in this vital task for decades has been the International Institute of Milwaukee. It has performed a valuable service in aiding Milwaukeeans to understand, and to be understood in their new environment.

In addition to this time-honored service, the International Institute serves as clearing house for hospitality and assistance to foreign visitors, including exchange students, tourists and the many seamen who visit Milwaukee's international port.

For years the Institute has been operating out of a large double house. While spacious, these quarters have become substandard and inadequate to the current needs of the organization. For that reason, the International Institute has embarked on a $225,000 fundraising drive to allow it to tear down its present facility and replace it with a new, modern structure.

It is my sincere belief that the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin will respond generously to this campaign, in order to permit the International Institute to expand and improve its valuable services to the people of our community and those who visit us.

Because I believe Milwaukee's International Institute to be a truly unique organization, I am inserting in the Record an excellent article on it which appeared in Let's See magazine in April 1964.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE—TODAY AND TOMORROW

International crises are not necessarily global; some of the most interesting ones are quite minute. There was one in Milwaukee not long ago, for instance, which we might call the Psomaki affair, and it was really quite exciting even though nothing was heard of it either in Washington or Istanbul.

It involved a literally minute personality, a little Greek girl who had just turned 4. She stepped off a plane at Mitchell Field into the arms of a Milwaukee couple who had adopted her. It was a moment of great joy which lasted until, comfortably settled in a home, they came to the first breaking of bread. That's just an expression; the new parents actually offered her eggs. The little girl shook her head, looked up, and in an inquiring tone uttered a word they couldn't understand. They tried cereal. Again, the appealing look and the word. A little quiver of uneasiness ran through the joyous atmosphere. They tried milk. They tried baby foods. They tried almost everything. Everything ran into the averted head and that word—and joy ran into panic? Where does one turn in a crisis like this?

This couple turned to the phone and rang up the International Institute. They got Albert M. Davis, the Institute's executive director, and posed the crisis of the unintelligible word. Davis riffled mentally through the Institute's pertinent resources: 13 staff members (backgrounds Slovak, German, Irish, Cuban, Guatemalan, Cypriot, Serbian, Polish, Swedish, Negro, Czech—and Greek) with language capabilities in German, Spanish, Slovak, Russian, Turkish, Serbian, Croatian, Polish, Czech—and Greek. The obvious choice was the Institute's administrative secretary, Mrs. Tula Kostopoulos, and Davis dispatched her to the scene.

A moment's conversation between Mrs. Kostopoulos and the little girl disclosed that a quite literal breaking of bread was in order.

The word was "psomaki," a Greek diminutive for "bread," and food, in this little girl's experience, was a little bread and nothing else. It is comforting to reflect on Davis' follow-up report that within 4 weeks she was "fighting in English as well as any other kid in the block."

Crisis is not the normal tenor of life in the institute's old (circa 1901) double house at 2624 West Highland Boulevard—except for a chronic space crisis which, assuming the succesful completion of the present fund drive for $225,000, will be resolved in 1965 by the erection of a new two-story headquarters with facilities adequate for the institute's many and diverse activities. Hopefully, the new building will eliminate a problem which has dogged the institute for all of its 41 years so consistently that a description of its first quarters in 1923 (a five-room cottage at 183 N. Seventh Street) might well apply to the present on certain occasions. Mrs. Irma Estes, a staff member in the days when the institute began as a part of the YWCA (1923–35), recalls that "we had 40 or 50 young people trying to dance in a 9- by 12-foot parlor and someone trying at the same time to teach English in a cubbyhole of a kitchen where the washing from the party the night before was still drying."

Although the Highland Boulevard structure is larger than those first quarters (it's a carpenter's wedding of the old Charles Knoernschild home and the adjacent onetime home of Judge Richard Hennessey), it is still disturbingly easy for a folk-singing group to drown out a language class in the next room, and it is still distractingly difficult to fit the institute's activities into its nooks and crannies because the activities—and the institute's mission—have grown and broadened as the community has grown and broadened.

To many Milwaukeeans, the words "International Institute" probably flick up one or both of these associations: "Holiday Folk Fair" and/or "melting pot." Both are accurate and well-deserved associations, but they do not touch upon significant new functions which the institute has been performing increasingly in recent years.

Among them is its role as the official clearinghouse for hospitality and assistance to all foreign visitors—students, tourists, the 10,000-odd seamen who call here each season on foreign ships, and delegations of businessmen who come here to shop Milwaukee products. Since the city selected the institute for this job 8 or 9 years ago (at the request of the State Department), a wide variety of foreign delegations has taken home a rosy recollection of Milwaukee gemuetlichkeit—a dozen Turkish army officers, 8 students of police methods, a dozen French trade unionists, 125 French agriculturalists and 30 from Germany interested in Milwaukee industrial products, 18 Swiss businessmen with 3 languages amongst them, and on and on. The institute fielded them all with picnics at Carl Schurz Park, downtown dinners, visits to Milwaukee homes—and the proof of the pudding seems to lie in the fact that some of them have started coming back.

The institute started in the classic melting pot tradition; it was a vehicle for assimilation, helping newcomers from the world outside to assimilate themselves to the Milwaukeeans who were their new neighbors. It still serves this purpose with the Hungarians, the Cubans, the Indonesian Dutch and others who now play the roles once enacted by the Irish, the Italians, and the Poles.

But the institute of 1964 also serves an interesting new purpose which is the exact counterpart of its traditional objective: it is still a vehicle for assimilation, but it is a vehicle to help Milwaukeeans assimilate themselves to the world outside—to understand, and to be understood.

Not every foreign-born arrival in Milwaukee these days intends to be melted down into an American. Far from it. Now that the United States (and there's Milwaukee, right in the middle of it) has become a Goliath with whom every living soul on the face of the earth must reckon, thousands of our foreign visitors come here only to find out what makes us tick. What Milwaukeeans do and say become tiny tesserae—some as tiny as the Psomaki Affair—in the mosaics of American life and manners which they carry back to Asia, Africa, the Soviet Union, and perhops some day to Venus.

Some of these doings and sayings are being transmitted through the activities of the International Institute, and in the process Milwaukeeans are collecting some tesserae of their own—little bits and pieces garnered over the dinner table from a visiting Ghanian, or at a dance for Indian students—which may clarify an otherwise unintelligible picture of the strange ways adopted by some of the far-off beneficiaries of American munificence.

The Institute is a red feather agency, depending primarily upon United Fund support, supplemented by proceeds of the holiday folk fair, dues from 1,104 members, service fees, and contributions. Its work falls into three broad divisions of which the

folk fair, of course, is one. The others are casework, covering assistance to individuals and families, and group work, coordinating and assisting the programs of 54 organizations affiliated with the Institute. The old house rang with the footsteps or telephone bells of callers more than 5,300 times during 1963, concerned about interpreters, hospitality for visitors from abroad, the loan of flags, information for the Institute newsletter (12,335 copies last year), requests for ethnic group representatives or international students to appear in club programs, and the like. Exactly 880 translations, involving 17 languages, were made for clients and individuals in the community (with 240 producing a small fee).

Volunteers are an essential arm of the 13 staff members in spreading the Institute's work to a communitywide scope. The biggest group encompasses the 3,500 members of the 35 ethnic organizations who help each year to make the folk fair a colorful and glittering statement of Milwaukee's kaleidoscopic cultural mix. Next largest corps of volunteers includes the members of more than 500 Milwaukee families registered with the Institute's Hospitality Council—families prepared to entertain foreign visitors and students and make them feel at home in Milwaukee. In other volunteer roles, senior Girl Scouts babysit for children of parents attending the Institute's informal English conversation circles (preparatory to entering formal English classes), American Red Cross volunteer drivers deliver golden agers of German descent to Institute headquarters for a half day of kuchen and klatsch every first and third Tuesday, and such groups as the colonial dames and the business and professional women's club are on standby to whip up refreshments for Institute affairs. Individuals, too, turn a hand, like the little Filipino woman who folds newsletters every month, and the young fellow from Dutch Indonesia who returns quid for quo—he logs on regular hours of clerical work as a "thank you" for the help the Institute gave him. (When Indonesia became independent in 1949, Holland was unable to absorb all the families who chose to keep Dutch citizenship. Many of them were admitted to the United States by act of Congress in 1960, and 40 families settled here—with Institute help.)

Group work is often a traffic problem, but the I.I. managed to fit 85 groups into its headquarters for 782 meetings during 1963 (sometimes by distributing guests at a single function among several rooms, which does cramp the party spirit somewhat). Group activities include nationality dinners, featuring homeland specialties of the host group; a monthly open house where all groups can mingle and get acquainted; and the individual functions of such affiliates as the International Students Club, El Club Espanol de Milwaukee, Le Cercle Francais, and so on through the nationality spectrum.

The casework department rounded out 963 with 883 active cases on hand (409 new ones added to 474 carried over from the year before), and 267 of the 500 members of the hospitality council had entertained a total of 220 visitors from 34 countries. The indicated surplus of Milwaukee hospitality will probably be taken up as visitors increase under the stimulus of the newly inaugurated "Americans at Home" program of the U.S. Travel Service. This Commerce Department division is establishing offices around the world to assist foreign visitors planning an American tour, and to encourage them to see how we live. Milwaukee is 1 of 20 American cities which will extend the hospitality of an American home to them.

" * * * the hospitality of an American home."

The door opened on South Newton Avenue, and there stood the Nigerian editor, resplendent in a flowing cape of brightly printed cotton. An air of awesome formality might have prevailed except for a practical bit of hospitality council advice: "Don't tuck your children in bed and make it a company dinner; visitors want a glimpse of everyday life." Small William was on hand, irrepressibly fascinated by that great cape, and he scooted under his parents' guard with the demand: "Wuddaya wear underneath?" The editor obligingly peeled (disclosing a pajamalike cotton garment) and explained that the divestment was tantamount to an American businessman's removal of his suit jacket. So the host peeled, too, and "we had a marvelous time."

"* * * The casework department rounded out 1963 with 883 active cases on hand."

A Milwaukee department store called the institute, asking what to do about a young Iranian who had turned up with a Persian rug for sale—a desperate effort to keep going with his education in Wisconsin. Foreign students at first came here with government sponsorship and no financial problems, but growing numbers of them are now trying to swing it on their own. Lower tuition at colleges out in the State draws them out of the metropolitan area—but the part-time jobs which are the only legal jobs they may hold are not available and they gravitate to Milwaukee. Institute caseworkers were busier with problems like this during 1963 than with the classic problems of the immigrant and the new citizen.

"* * * managed to fit 85 groups into headquarters for 782 meetings."

It was Independence Day, but the entree was carried goat instead of hotdogs, and the air vibrated with calypso drums, not fifes. It was Jamaican Independence Day, and 150 Jamaicans had the institute jumping at a celebration arranged by the West Indian Cricket Club and the Exquisite Brothers Social Club. * * * And now the entree was roast chicken with atzame pilafi and tiropita (a cheese turnover), with giaourtini and restina for dessert. This, some of the guests thought, was reminiscent of the Greek cuisine at the old Minerva, which stood on 5th Street before it became more important to have a parking lot there. Well it might seem reminiscent, for it was prepared by the daughter of the Minerva's chef, and for one evening, at least, Milwaukee revived a little of the culinary heritage he had brought from the eastern Mediterranean.

You can get both a practical and a philosophical evaluation of the institute from a man like Circuit Judge Robert Hansen, who with Circuit Judge Christ T. Seraphim is assisting Chairman Richard Cudahy and Honorary Chairman Michael Cudahy in the institute's campaign for building funds. Judge Hansen finds it quite practical, in the conduct of family court, to call upon institute interpreters and caseworkers ("we actually use institute personnel in preference to our own court agencies in cases where language difficulties and Old World customs are involved"). But there is a broader philosophy behind the work and support Judge Hansen has given to the institute through the years. He puts it this way:

"Whenever you want class warfare, you divide the people into two groups, put up the barricades, and wait for the shooting to start. Milwaukee and cities like it have hot only tried to be hospitable to newcomers, but have tried also to keep alive the cultural heritages of all the people. This is an insurance policy against the development of the notion that there is one majority and one minority. There is really no majority as such in America; we are a collection of majorities from all parts of the world, and this is a much richer notion then the one majority-one minority idea, just as a symphony is much richer than a duet."

Labels and Contents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Virginia Methodist Advocate of March 26 there was published an excellent article on the so-called civil rights bill entitled "Labels and Contents." This article was written by Dr. George S. Reamey, the editor of the Virginia Methodist Advocate, and I think that all Senators would do well to ponder the warnings which Dr. Reamey has sounded with regard to this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article entitled "Labels and Contents" printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABELS AND CONTENTS

Picture for yourself a situation something like this: When the housewife in your home makes her periodic visits to the neighborhood grocery store, let us suppose that she is unwise enough to select her purchases entirely by the attractive labels on the cans or boxes she sees. Her concern is only incidentally with the quality of merchandise inside, so enticed is she with the labels.

Let us suppose further that only in rare instances do these containers hold what she thinks she is buying. If she thinks she is getting a can of coffee, she goes home, opens the container and finds tea, not coffee, on the inside. She buys a can with a most attractive label reading "tomatoes" and showing a picture of several specimens thereon, but when she opens the can at home, behold the contents are string beans or succotash.

Unless such a housewife is in serious need of medical attention herself, it will not be long before she finds other ways of selecting her purchases.

The above picture is so extreme that, of course, it is ridiculous; yet, it does portray without much exaggeration what is constantly going on in the religious, political and social realms. Just find a popular label for some real or fancied "cause," place behind that label almost any kind of contents you desire, and there will be multitudes of uncritical folks who will eagerly "buy" the label and pay scant heed to what lies behind it. If the label is acceptable the whole product must be good. That seems to be their motto.

Specifically, what we have in mind at the moment is the so-called civil rights bill now before the U.S. Senate. Because of the label on this bill, there seem to be multitudes of persons who stand eager and ready to give this bill all-out support, and to urge others to do likewise. But one wonders whether they have read the bill? Do they know just what this proposal actually contains?

On the one hand, the bill has merit. It recognizes that there are minority groups—including Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans on this side of the Rio Grande—who do not receive certain rights to which they are and should be entitled. Voting rights are a case in point. Better educational opportunities are another.

But, there are other provisions in this bill that make one wonder whether he is in America or in Moscow or Havana? If this bill is passed in its present form—that is,

without substantial amendment—the United States will be perilously near a dictatorship. Such absolute powers will be given to the Attorney General in Washington that any difference that may exist between personal freedom and totalitarianism in this country will be purely coincidental. Well, let's see the record; but, before we do, let this point be made perfectly clear: What we are about to say has no direct bearing on civil rights, as such. We are talking about procedures of coercion and arbitrary power which will reduce citizens of the United States—of whatever race or religion—to a state of near tyranny. We ask, is this the best way that supposedly sensible men can find to achieve social changes which they hold to be desirable?

Title II of the civil rights bill now before the U.S. Senate is the public accommodations section. It applies to operators of inns, hotels, motels, rooming houses which have more than five rooms to rent; also to restaurants, cafeterias, lunch rooms, lunch counters, soda fountains; also picture houses, theaters, concert halls, sports arenas, and the like, although the bill specifically excludes what are called bona fide private clubs, including the swank country clubs of the wealthy and pretentious.

This section 203 reads in part: "No person shall (a) withhold, deny, or attempt to withhold or deny, or deprive or attempt to deprive, any person (the use of privately owned public accommodations); or (b) intimidate, threaten, coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten or coerce any person with the purpose of interfering with any right or privilege (at these places of public accommodation); or (c) punish or attempt to punish any person for exercising or attempting to exercise any right or privilege."

Then there is this statement: (section 204): "(a) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 203, a civil action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, may be instituted (1) by the person aggrieved, or, (2) by the Attorney General."

Thus, as Charles McWilliams says in his series of articles in a Richmond newspaper, "anyone who pickets a hotel, restaurant, or theater for serving Negroes, or of whom there are reasonable grounds to believe that he is about to picket such a place may find himself enjoined, and thereafter subject to imprisonment for contempt * * * without trial by jury or right of appeal."

The civil rights bill (which the Advocate editor has read with care) makes it clear that the person who brings a charge against a taxpaying private property owner, accusing him of having violated some portion of this bill, does not himself have to sign his complaint. This means the taxpayer can be hailed into court, without knowing the identity of his accuser; can be tried before a Federal judge selected by the Attorney General (and favorable to the latter's views); can be sentenced to prison without trial by jury, and can make no appeal to a higher court to review the case. And this, Advocate readers, is not Moscow or Peiping or Havana; it is Washington, U.S.A.

Furthermore, as U.S. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia said 2 weeks ago in Washington, D.C., Federal funds going to the States for highway construction, social security, and child welfare could be cut off by the complaint of one individual under the proposed civil rights bill.

We have never heard of a surgeon who claimed that, in order to remove a patient's appendix, it was necessary first to cut out his heart and throw it away. Yet, these politically minded legislators in Washington are trying to do just this to the American people. Let it be said with emphasis and gratitude that Virginia's 10 Representatives in the House all voted against this iniquitous bill, and our two Senators are now fighting it. Strength to them.

This bill does not need to be scuttled, but it would seem that Negro leaders as well as whites would realize the folly of attempting to promote justice by first taking away vast areas of human liberty which do not need to be removed in order to promote racial justice, or justice of any other variety.

As the House has already passed this legislation, despite the opposition of Virginia's courageous Representatives, the battle is now in the Senate. Letters of encouragement to our two Senators will help, and the prayers of all rightminded people are needed in this crisis.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Hope for the Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an excellent article written by Selig Greenberg in the Providence (R.I.) Journal of April 3, 1964. The article deals with the work that Dr. Robert B. Kugel, professor of medical science at Brown University and chief medical consultant at Ladd School is doing in the field of mental retardation:

HOPE FOR THE RETARDED

(By Selig Greenberg)

Is mental retardation always irreversible?

The heartening news that it is not and that it can often be modified comes from Dr. Robert B. Kugel, an authority in the field of mental retardation, who is now a professor of medical science at Brown University and also is serving as chief medical consultant at the Ladd School in Exeter.

Dr. Kugel emphasized in an interview recently that the effects of severe brain damage in the newborn cannot be remedied by anything now known to medical science. But there is reason to believe, he said, that considerable improvement can be obtained through proper remedial measures in cases of mild brain abnormality where the retardation is aggravated by adverse environmental factors.

FIVE-YEAR STUDY

In a 5-year study he headed at the State University of Iowa before coming to Rhode Island last September, Dr. Kugel and his associates demonstrated this by securing an average increase of 23 IQ points in a group of retarded children who were 3 or 4 years old when they joined the project.

The IQ of one little girl jumped from 81 to 115.

When the youngster was tested at the age of 3, her intelligence was classified as borderline, being only 6 points above the upper limit for feeblemindedness. Three years later, after she had received medical treatment for conditions not directly associated with her retardation and her diet and other home conditions were improved, her IQ had been raised to the level of college material.

Aside from strictly organic causes, Dr. Kugel feels, "certain adverse psychological and social factors may play an important role in preventing a child's optimal development."

When children born with some brain damage also are deprived of love and attention and of the right kind of food and medical care, he said, their mental retardation becomes worse than it would ordinarily be.

Experts estimate that perhaps as many as 20 percent of all retarded individuals fall in the category of so-called cultural-familial mental retardation caused by a combination of organic and environmental factors.

Dr. Kugel and other researchers are proceeding on the assumption that if the brain damage is not to extensive its effects can be minimized in young children by correcting some of the deficiencies in their lives and enriching their environment.

IT'S WHAT YOU DO

"It's what you do with the retarded child that's important," he declared. "If you don't do anything, the child won't even develop to its optimal capacity. Any retarded child can be helped some. But there is a time when you can do the most. This tends to be as early as possible."

Dr. Kugel holds it is a mistake not to start doing anything educationally for problem children until they are 5 or 6 years old, as is now generally the practice. He believes the process should start much earlier.

Another area in which he is intensely interested is how the resort to lifetime institutional care for the mentally retarded can be reduced. If this were done, the patient turnover in such institutions could be stepped up and more effective rehabilitative treatment given to those who can benefit from it.

This is one of the tasks which Dr. Kugel has set for himself in his work at the Ladd School, where he is spending about half of his time.

He is convinced that "institutional care can be detrimental, particularly at an early age." The tendency, he said, is now all too often to commit retarded youngsters to an institution "for social rather than medical or educational reasons because the parents, the school of the police throw up their hands."

"If parents," he said, "received the necessary guidance and support from physicians, educators, psychologists and social workers, they wouldn't have to resort so much to institutional care. If there were facilities in the community for the care of retarded children and for aid to their parents, institutions would be used only for some specific medical or educational problems and they could become more treatment oriented rather than primarily custodial in nature."

VARIED CAREER

Although he is only 40, Dr. Kugel has already had a varied career of research and teaching.

A native of Chicago, he is a graduate of the University of Michigan and its medical school, and received his pediatric training in Michigan and at Yale. After 3 years of service in the Air Force, he became assistant professor of pediatrics at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine and director of the division of school health in the Baltimore city health department. He joined the faculty of the University of Iowa in 1956 and was an associate professor of pediatrics and director of the child development clinic until coming here.

At Brown he is now mostly devoting his time to research and to curricular planning for the medical education program which got underway last September.

Under a Federal grant, he is also engaged in a research project at Providence Lying-In Hospital to compare two blood testing techniques for the early detection of phenylketonuria, which is a malfunction in the way the body utilizes proteins. If the disorder is not corrected at an early age, it leads to mental retardation in about 95 percent of the cases.

TOXIC EFFECT

All protein—which is provided by meat, dairy products and many vegetables—contains 10 amino acids without which a human being cannot live. One of them is phenylalanine. Children suffering from phenylketonuria cannot metabolize this amino acid which backs up in the blood and has a toxic effect upon the brain.

"The treatment," Dr. Kugel said, "is to construct an artificial diet with very little phenylalanine in it. The earlier the treatment is started the better. The latest time it can probably be effective is between the age of 6 and 12 months. We don't know yet whether the treatment has to be continued beyond the fifth birthday."

Phenylketonuria is a rare disease, with an incidence of only one in about 8,000 births. But the important thing is that it can be treated if detected early enough. Finding the most effective method of detection is vital because infants with phenylketonuria do not show any of the common symptoms of mental retardation.

At Ladd School Dr. Kugel is treating some patients and directing the establishment of an up-to-date record system for the classification of the patient population, in order to identify those who can benefit most from rehabilitative measures.

"We are studying the best means of stepping up the patient turnover," he said. "This would include more intensive preadmission evaluation and expansion of the staff of medical consultants. We're also looking forward to moving out eventually some of the chronic patients through the establishment of half-way houses in the community."

TEST CONDUCTED

In a study he conducted several years ago in Iowa, Dr. Kugel found that mongoloid children raised at home were far more advanced in walking, talking and other phases of development than those raised in an institution from the time of their first birthday or before.

"Almost all of the children kept at home walked by the age of 5," he reported, "But about 40 percent of those placed in an institution were still unable to walk when they were 6 years old. While 60 percent of the youngsters kept at home were able to use brief sentences by the age of 8, only 10 percent to those who were institutionalized could do so at the same age.

"There is a growing body of evidence that children, regardless of diagnosis, develop much more slowly when reared from a very early age in an institution. Institutional placement may never be in order for some of these youngsters. But even those who must ultimately be put in an institution are easier to care for and seem to profit more from the institutional training if they remain in their own homes at least until the age of 5."

Dr. Kugel feels strongly that a retarded child's development may be impaired physically, intellectually, and socially when it is deprived of maternal care and other features of home life and that institutionalization should be regarded only as a last resort.

"There also is increasing recognition of the fact," he said, "that some mental retardation may not have a purely organic basis but may be related to psychological causes."

All of the boys and girls whose IQ readings were raised in the 5-year Iowa study came from poor families where at least one of the parents and one of the other children were also mentally subnormal.

INTENSIVE CARE

As part of the study, the children were given intensive medical and psychological examinations. They received the required medical and dental treatment and were furnished with glasses if they needed them. A special nursery school was set up for them and home economists and social workers were sent into their homes to teach mothers how to budget better and to improve the diet.

The finding that the most striking improvement could be obtained in the youngest group demonstrates, Dr. Kugel believes, that "one may be able to modify some of the deleterious effects of poor environment as far as the ultimate intellectual functioning of these children is concerned and that they need not be condemned to lifelong mental subnormality."

"Great strides have been made in the past few years in our understanding of many causes of mental retardation," he said. "There have been important scientific discoveries and there is much more public awareness of the problem. We are learning better methods of care, medical treatment and vocational rehabilitation.

"There is room for optimism that significant help can be given many of the retarded. Some authorities believe that as many as 90 percent of the mildly retarded placed in special classes will ultimately be able to take their place in society as reasonably competent individuals."

"Leadership Justifies Confidence"—Speech by Representative Robert W. Hemphill of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate an outstanding speech made by Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina, at the occasion of the dedication exercises of the new Jefferson Post Office on March 29. The subject of Mr. HEMPHILL's talk was "Leadership Justifies Confidence," and he defends our great democratic system of government and our way of life in his usual forceful manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Representative HEMPHILL's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERSHIP JUSTIFIES CONFIDENCE

(By Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL)

Senator Leppard, Mayor Miller, Postmaster Thomas, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for having me here today. While I am sure I cannot feel as much pride in this new evidence of Jefferson's progress as you who live here must feel, I delight to share your happiness and your justifiable delight in this new facility. It is a token of the steady and sure pattern of progress symbolic of the town of Jefferson, and its people, today and tomorrow.

As most of you know, our national debt is around $300 billion. You doubtlessly know also that the gold reserves are at the lowest in many, many years; on the international front, or fronts, as it were, we are besieged, bedamned, and at times seemingly bewildered. Domestically we face high unemployment, despite our civilization and progress, and I suppose there are all sorts of other signs, problems, and troubles which make happiness for the prophets of gloom in our country today. I thank Heaven that I am not one of those.

In international affairs we have failed to evaluate the progress we have made. We have maintained the salutary effect of our Peace Corps on our country-to-country and people-to-people relations. We have maintained, here at home, the strong stand taken by President Kennedy in the Cuban missile incident. Until his unfortunate death, the prophets of gloom here at home endeavored to overshadow or hide the impact and the image that Mr. Kennedy, as President of the United States, made all over the world.

On November 22, there emerged from out of the tragedies of the hour, a sure and experienced statesman, who gave the world its greatest and most modern lesson of confidence in the continuity of our way of life and our system of government that this century has witnessed. In his first 100 days, the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, has used his great talent and his great American traits to reassure the free world and to strengthen our world leadership. In this great effort he has exhibited the acknowledged and great American characteristics of hard work, comprehension, coordination, humility, leadership, and many other happy factors that good fortune has bestowed upon him, and through him, on the American people. Even the prophet of gloom will have to admit that his direction of the ship of state has been sure, significant, and salutary.

But some may say, look how much we are in debt. Is our money sound? What about the fact that we have debts to finance it? What blind ray, or rays, of hope does our horizon of the future offer? What consequence has such contemplation on the occasion of the dedication of a small post office in a small but growing town, in a small Southern State?

This post office is a part of the wealth of our Nation and the wealth of our people. Because of the way we keep our books in our Government we fail to list as assets of our people, of our Republic, the millions of acres of land, the timber, the minerals and stored water, that we as a people own in the name of our Government. Were we to cash in on these assets and sell them we could discharge the national debt without having to sell such things as the thousands of post offices, Federal buildings, docks and other terminal facilities, airplanes, automobiles, ships and other hardware which could be adapted to civilian use with minor changes. We fail to count the fact that our gross national product is $600 billion a year or more and if we are willing to make the sacrifice and go for broke by a major tax contribution, in 1 year we could take our earnings and wipe out the national debt. We fail to count our blessings, and far too often we accept the installation of a post office or other governmental facility as something very ordinary, or even something apart from the people.

President Johnson has declared war on poverty, on unemployment, on lack of education. Every American citizen now has the call to arms, to participate, to share in this typically American effort. I do not know what my part is, I hope I have a part—I shall certainly seek it out. I urge you to do likewise—you do have a part in this program.

Would you look to the right of you, or look to the left? Do you believe there are any finer people on earth? Of course not. Do you believe these people, and their descendants can continue, and improve, the standards of living that have made us the envy of the world? Of course they can. We will meet the problems of the present and the future, and we will solve them.

Just as this post office will be a part of you, and I believe your happiness, in its use and its services, so it will be a part of your American way of life. This is your building, your Government, and your public facility, and I am sure it will be a blessing to your community. It is a symbol of what a free people can do for themselves with their collective efforts and determinations. It is the part of your Federal Government that is the nearest to your home.

I have no gloom about the future of this great country and its people. I am sure we are going to have problems, I hope we are not going to continue to have debt, but we will from time to time. I am sure we are going to have some unemployment, but, as in Jefferson, we know what the Area Redevelopment Administration and the accelerated public works programs are able to do in communities with the municipal facilities such as the town of Jefferson.

Your great Government today, as large as it is, and some may criticize it for being too large, is alert to the needs of its citizens. Some say it is doing too much and others say it is trying too much and not doing enough. I believe that it is right and proper to have a new post office at Jefferson and a modern water system.

I believe such things are in the best interest of you as a people and part, an important part, individually and collectively of a great nation. I would not dare to predict what tomorrow may bring, but I have faith in the future because I have faith in citizens like you who, all over the land, continue in the determination for freedom, and gather at such occasions as post office dedications to participate in the happy salute to progress of the people, for the people, and by the people.

That is why we are here today and we want all to know that this, our postal facility, is another signboard to our progress and our freedom.

Winning Essay on the Life of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Lehigh County Republican Committee in the district that I have the honor to represent, has pursued a very fine program of sponsoring two essay contests on the life and times of Abraham Lincoln as part of the annual Lincoln Day celebration. One of the contests is for senior high school students and the other is for junior high school students of Lehigh County.

The winning selections are chosen by a group of distinguished educators from a large number of essays submitted. I am very proud of the outstanding students who enter these contests and the essays they submit. This year the winner of the contest for the junior high school students was John Ashcraft, an eighth-grade student at Emmaus High School, Emmaus, Pa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include this winning essay, which is as follows:

LINCOLN: HIS ROAD TO THE WHITE HOUSE IN 1860

(By John Ashcraft)

Abraham Lincoln, unlike most presidential hopefuls, did not think of himself for the Nation's top job. Perhaps he wondered, who would vote for this man from Illinois, who was really only known to the people out West.

After his last famous debate with Stephen Douglas, Abraham Lincoln had a national reputation. He was invited to speak in every part of the country, except in the South. Lincoln did not understand, at the time, that these demands were proof that he was one of the great men of the Nation. One of his statements at this time was: "I have been a great man such a mighty little time that I am not used to it yet." His friends knew what is meant, though.

Soon Lincoln was invited to give a speech at a church in Brooklyn. For the speech the man from Illinois would get $200. It was also an excellent chance to see his son, Robert. He arrived in New York on February 25, 1860, with one small satchel in his hand. From the boat Lincoln walked to the Astor House, where he got a room. The tall westerner then went to see Henry Bowen, editor of the independent. There he was informed that the speech would be given in the Great Hall in the new Cooper Union building in Manhattan, instead of Henry Beecher's church in Brooklyn. Bowen was not sure how Lincoln would do. Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, printed some nice things about him. When Abe read the paper he said the location would have to be changed. The next day he heard Henry Beecher at his church. Afterward he worked very hard perfecting his oration. On the day of the speech (February 27, 1860) Lincoln had his picture taken, for the first time, in Mathew Brady's studio. Later he remarked, "Brady and the Cooper Institute made me President." The Saturday Evening Post predicted, about the Cooper Union speech, that he would make "a powerful assault upon the policy and principles of the proslavery party, and an able vindication of the Republican creed." That night 1,500 people attended, "the pick and flower of New York." Among them were George Palmer Putman, David Dudley Field, the beloved poet, William Cullen Bryant, and Horace Greeley. His theme dealt with slavery and he got off to a bad start. But, he became better as he progressed and in conclusion he said, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it." There was a burst of applause and loud cheers.

Abraham Lincoln's speech was a success. Reaction in the newspapers to the speech was excellent. In next morning's New York Tribune Horace Greely stated, "The vast assemblage frequently rang with cheers and shouts of applause. * * * No man ever before made such an impression on his first appeal to a New York audience."

When he returned to Illinois, people began talking about Abraham Lincoln for President. A few of his friends talked to him concerning the matter. He didn't see the use of himself running for President with men like Senator William H. Seward, of New York; Governor Chase, of Ohio; and others.

The State convention was held in Decatur, Ill., May 1860. Lincoln was carried to the platform amidst cheering and yelling. He was preceded by a banner, "Abraham Lincoln, the Rail Candidate for President in 1860." After making a speech a resolution was passed making Abraham Lincoln the choice of all Illinois Republicans for President. The delegates were told to "use all honorable means to secure his nomination."

William Seward was expected to be the Republican nominee; two-thirds of the delegates expected to vote for him. However, there were elements of weakness in his candidacy. In a Senate debate he made statements that in the public mind, associated him with the extreme abolitionists. Republican leaders were convinced Seward's nomination would scare away voters, otherwise friendly, in Indiana and Illinois. Firm opposition, plus the purely personal hostility of Horace Greely (the New York Tribune was widely read by Republicans) led to delay and caution.

The Republican National Convention met in Chicago on May 16, 1860. They assembled in a wooden building called the Wigwam, especially erected for the convention. At first there were many favorite sons. After some voting it was clear that if Seward was not nominated Lincoln surely would be. He (Lincoln) could carry Illinois; he had done so 2 years before, and Indiana would probably vote for him. Pennsylvania, pledged to Simon Cameron, did not like Seward. There was great excitement. The first time around Seward got 137½ votes (40½ too few) and Lincoln received 102. On the second ballot Seward came up with 185½, Lincoln 181. The third ballot gave Abraham Lincoln a majority, and after a painful delay, New York made it unanimous. Senator Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was nominated for the vice presidency.

Lincoln was in Springfield, Ill., standing in the doorway of a newspaper office when a boy ran up with a telegram telling of his nomination. After reading the telegram he said to his friends, "As there is a little woman down on Eighth Street who will be glad to hear the news, you must excuse me until I inform her." Because of the problem of many visitors he was given a room in the State capitol.

The Democratic Convention was held in Charleston, S.C., on April 23, 1860. The Democrats became hopelessly divided. Stephen Douglas was ahead of all opponents, but he did not have the required two-thirds. He had offended the South in his debates with Abraham Lincoln. Soon the convention split into two angry groups. In the end two Democratic candidates were presented. Douglas was the choice of the northern half and Vice President John C. Breckenridge represented the southern portion.

A third party was the Constitutional Union Party. It mainly appealed to the neutral voters. Their candidate was John Bell of Tennessee.

When it came time to campaign Lincoln stayed in Springfield while Douglas and the others campaigned actively. Abraham Lincoln felt it undignified to campaign actively. But his fellow Republicans more than made up for Lincoln's inactivity. The campaign grew hot and tense. "Wide Awake" clubs were formed in northern cities. The men marched in torchlight parades. They wore capes and glazed oilcloth caps, Lincoln, the "rail-splitter candidate," was best known as "Honest Old Abe." Like all candidates Abraham Lincoln had many bad things said about him and was the butt of many jokes.

The election was held on November 6, 1860, and was the first national victory for the Republican Party. These were the results of the electoral college: Lincoln—180 (all from the North); Breckenridge—72 (all from the South); Bell—39; and Douglas—15. These were the results of the popular vote: Lincoln—1,864,613; Douglas—940,652; Bell—266,307; and Breckenridge—262,279.

On December 20, 1860, South Carolina seceded from the Union. Before the President-elect took office six others followed suit. They formed a confederacy and elected Jefferson Davis as their president. Later Governor Rhatt, of South Carolina, stated, "The election of Lincoln was not the cause of secession. Disunion has been a cherished project for the last 30 years." On February 11, 1861, Abraham Lincoln left Springfield, Ill., for Washington, D.C. On March 4, 1861, Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President of the United States of America, took office.

Abraham Lincoln never forgot he was a minority President, nor that his nomination came from a convention two-thirds for other men. I wonder what our Nation would be like today if one of the "other men" had been nominated.

"Plutonium: The Ornery Element"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, delivered at a meeting on the commercial fabrication of plutonium fuel, at Richland, Wash., on April 3, 1964. His speech is entitled "Plutonium: The Ornery Element."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLUTONIUM: THE ORNERY ELEMENT

(By Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission)

Today Hanford is a very different place from my first memories of it. I recall coming out here before the plant was little more than an idea in the minds of a few people and looking out over one of the flattest, most lonesome looking expanses of territory I had ever seen. Today its name is almost synonymous with the name of extraordinary element we have come here to discuss: plutonium. I am very happy to be here for this meeting devoted to studying the commercial fabrication of plutonium fuel.

The story of plutonium is one of the most dramatic in the history of science. For many reasons this unusual element holds a unique position among the chemical elements. It is a synthetic element, the first realization of the alchemist's dream of large-scale transmutation. It was the first synthetic element to be seen by man. One of its isotopes has special nuclear properties which give it overwhelming importance in human affairs. No other fundamental scientific discovery exploded in man's face as this one did: the announcement to the world of the existence of plutonium was in the form of a bomb dropped over Nagasaki.

No other element has made so dramatic an escalation in its quantitative growth. It was first identified at Berkeley late in 1940 and early in 1941 through experiments involving tracer amounts, picograms or less. Two years later, during work at the Metallurgical Laboratory in Chicago, the microgram stage was reached with the first weighable quantity of plutonium. There followed the experiments with milligram and gram quantities necessary to perfect the chemical processes employed here at Hanford for the separation of plutonium and the metallurgical processes at Los Alamos for the fabrication of the nuclear weapon. Less than 3 short years after the first weighable quantity was obtained, kilogram amounts of the new manmade element were being produced at Hanford and delivered to the Los Alamos

Laboratory. Today in this meeting on the commercial fabrication of plutonium into fuel elements for power reactors, we are talking about megagrams—or, in the vernacular, tons—of plutonium. The scaling up from discovery to the present status then is by a factor of more than 10^{18}—an increase of more than a billion billion times.

It is only natural that an element so unusual, and in some respects so difficult and unpleasant as plutonium, should have its critics. My good friend, and basically a great admirer of plutonium, Dr. Robert E. Wilson, until recently a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, has in fact, said some rather harsh things about this element which I helped to usher into the world. "If there ever was an element which deserved a name associated with hell," he says, "it is plutonium. This is not only because of its use in atomic bombs—which certainly would amply qualify it—but also because of its fiendishly toxic properties even in small amounts." He goes on to mention other troublesome characteristics including the wide variation in the value of its more important isotopes, ranging from $450,000 per pound for Pu^{238} to a few dollars a pound for Pu^{240}.

I have carefully considered this bill of particulars issued against plutonium and find that I cannot quarrel with the accuracy of the charges contained in it. In fact I can go even further in elaborating plutonium's claim to being at the same time an ornery element and an element so unusual as to approach the unbelievable. Under some conditions plutonium metal can be nearly as hard and brittle as glass, under others as soft and plastic as lead. It will burn and crumble quickly to powder when heated in air, or slowly disintegrate when kept at room temperature. As a matter of fact, pure plutonium metal undergoes no less than five phase transitions between room temperature and its melting point. The metal thus possesses six allotropic modifications.

Plutonium is very remarkable in the characteristics exhibited in its several phases. Except for one part of the temperature range of the alpha phase, there is not one of the phases for which both the coefficient of thermal expansion and the coefficient of electrical resistivity have the conventional sign. Strange indeed is the fact that in two of its phases, delta and delta prime, plutonium actually contracts as it is being heated. Recently we have found to our surprise that the pure metal in its alpha, or brittle, phase can under certain conditions be rolled to a very thin foil about one-thousandth of a centimeter in thickness.

Its chemical properties are no less unusual. Plutonium has four oxidation states that can exist together in aqueous acidic solution in equilibrium with each other at appreciable concentrations. This situation is unique among all of the chemical elements. And, of course, plutonium found its way into a totally unexpected and unpredicted position in the periodic table of the elements.

The atoms of Pu^{239} change continuously to those of a completely different element but transform themselves so slowly that thousands of years would pass before as much as 10 percent of the substance would be changed—yet rapidly enough that the heat generated by the reactions would cause the material to feel warm to your hand. In fact because of this self-heating property, new experimental techniques for dilametric and thermodynamic studies had to be devised in the case of plutonium. Finally, in sketching the personality of plutonium, I must say that Dr. Wilson's indictment of its poisonous quality was almost an understatement. A particle the size of an ordinary speck of dust, about 0.6 microgram, constitutes the "maximum permissible body burden" of plutonium, the amount that can be accumulated in an adult person without eventually causing significant body damage.

Those unacquainted with or field might wonder how it is possible for anyone to rise to the defense of an element so unobliging in its characteristics. It may be because I am so well acquainted with plutonium's early childhood that I am inclined to view it as one might consider a "bad" child—difficult and even exasperating in its conduct at times but replete with fascinating possibilities. In the case of plutonium, these possibilities have a vital significance for the future of nuclear technology. There is also the significant place plutonium occupies in my own life and no doubt in the lives of many of you listening to me here today. I remember our wartime quests for plutonium in amounts large enough to be effective for military use as an epic of feats rivaling the legendary adventures of Paul Bunyan. Both in the exciting laboratory episodes and in the subsequent construction of the mammoth plants here at Hanford, it is a tale of prodigious contrasts, the disparities between working out processes using barely weighable quantities of the new element and projecting these microscopic amounts into the gargantuan scale of production reactors and chemical processing plants.

I left my early photographs at home, but I would like to share some reminiscences with you concerning events in the history of the manmade elements, and more especially the element plutonium which provides the occasion for our meeting. Afterwards I may want to say a few things also about my feeling for the future of plutonium.

I was one of those young chemists profoundly stirred by the experiments performed by Fermi, Segre, and their co-workers when they began their bombardments of uranium with neutrons and found at first, as you may recall, several beta emitters as products of these neutron reactions. I recall that this was the first time that I began to read the scientific literature. It was in August of 1934 that I had moved from the University of California at Los Angeles, where I had completed my undergraduate work, to the University of California at Berkeley where I began my graduate study. During that fall of 1934, when we began to get these papers from Rome in an Italian journal, I remember how we all tried to decipher them in order to understand the exciting experiments Fermi and his group had done. The excitement was spreading in many places. Several groups were interested in these beta radioactive isotopes produced through the irradiation of uranium with neutrons. Hahn and Meitner and later Hahn, Meitner and Strassman in Germany studied the beta emitters for a number of years on the assumption that they were transuranium isotopes.

In my own case I remember that I chose transuranium elements as my topic for the seminar that G. N. Lewis had each of us graduate students give once a year. I gave an hour-long talk on these elements and described their chemical properties in detail. Like everyone else I went along a hundred percent with the interpretation that these beta radioactivities were transuranium isotopes and considered myself, even at that time, a minor expert on the so-called transuranium elements.

There is no need to tell you how wrong we were, and I will not retell even the more significant episodes of the very involved and complex detective story in which a number of eminent sleuths were engaged over a number of years. Suffice it to say that the true transuranium elements were at last unveiled and their false forerunners exposed as the fission products they were. The irony of all this was that the people intent on studying the fission process then found the transuranium elements. You can see from this how plutonium, belonging to this unpredictable transuranium crowd, would be likely to start off on its left foot.

The early work on plutonium, even the first Berkeley experiments, was carried on under a self-imposed cover of secrecy, in view of the potential military application of element 94. Throughout 1941, element 94 was referred to by the code name of "copper," which was satisfactory until it was necessary to introduce the element copper into some of the experiments. This posed the problem of distinguishing between the two. For awhile then, plutonium was referred to as "copper" and the real copper as "honest-to-god copper." But as this grew more and more cumbersome and difficult, we were at last forced to give the new element a name of its own.

Since McMillan had already christened the first of the manmade elements neptunium after the planet Neptune, we followed the pattern he established by naming the next element plutonium—Pluto being the second and last known planet of our solar system beyond Uranus. I remember how Kennedy, Wahl, and I debated whether the name should be "plutium" or "plutonium" and chose the latter because it sounded better. There was also the matter of a symbol and again propriety was overruled. We chose "Pu" for the reason you would suppose—rather than the more proper "Pl." Experience with the ornery element has proved our choice of "Pu" to be most descriptive.

Many of you know at firsthand the trials and tribulations connected with getting from microgram amounts of plutonium to milligrams and grams and at last to kilograms. Ultramicrochemistry came into its own in those hectic days. Even so, there were moments of comic relief as when we were forced by the crowds of sightseers wanting an early look at the new element to color some of the more plentiful aluminum hydroxide with green ink in order to devote our entire small supply of plutonium to the required, more urgent experiments. We preserved our integrity with the careful statement that "This represents a sample of plutonium hydroxide."

In one instance plutonium cooperated in a puzzling way, Stanley Thompson and I were investigating the possibility of using some tetrapositive phosphate compound analogous to plutonium phosphate as a carrier. The fact that bismuth phosphate with its tripositive bismuth, noncorrosive and with good handling properties, turned out to be an excellent carrier for tetrapositive plutonium was an unexpected windfall in our urgent efforts to develop completely reliable chemical separation processes for use here at Hanford.

Because of this puzzling behavior, there were many with persistent doubts that the bismuth phosphate process could be made to work at the Hanford plant levels of plutonium concentration. This unusual behavior on the part of plutonium made necessary the crucial test of the process at the Metallurgical Laboratory on the ultramicrochemical scale using cyclotron-produced plutonium. Then, atfer the Clinton extraction plant gave us larger amounts of plutonium with which to work, a complete mechanical test of the Hanford process was carried out on the semiworks scale. Still there were skeptics who thought the process would never work at Hanford plant concentrations, some backing their convictions with bets, and a number held onto these convictions until the day that the first successful production run was completed.

I would like to emphasize the fact that the scale-up from the ultramicrochemical experiments to the final Hanford plant amounts to a factor of 1 billion, surely the

greatest scale-up factor ever attempted. In spite of these difficulties the chemical separations process at Hanford was successful from the beginning, and its performance exceeded all expectations. High yields and decontamination factors were achieved in the very beginning and continued to improve with time.

It is hardly necessary to remind this group that we proceeded with the utmost respect for the formidable dangers involved in separating out the ornery element. The chemical plants were massive structures ingeniously engineered to fit the grave problems inherent in handling the extremely high levels of radioactivity. It is self-evident that no one saw the plutonium as it entered the plant. It is also true that no one saw it until just before it finally emerged as a relatively pure compound. In the meantime, it had passed through a maze of extraction vessels via thousands of feet of piping with only instruments and an occasional sampling to chart its progress. Probably no process on a grand scale in chemical engineering history received such painful care in its development and engineering designs as that operating in the Hanford plutonium plant, certainly not in such a brief period of time.

Despite the cussedness of plutonium, we were able to carry out this enormous effort for the most part without getting too far out of line, bureaucratically speaking. An exception I recall had to do with our concern for finding a long-range alternate to the bismuth phosphate process, one that would recover the uranium for reuse. In developing the Redox process we conveniently ignored great official resistance from the Manhattan district and carried on a large-scale bootleg research effort during much of 1945. Both the bismuth phosphate and the Redox processes, as you know, were used here at Hanford.

Certainly plutonium is no less cantankerous today than it was when we were battling and overcoming the many difficulties connected with its production during World War II. We still recognize and deal with these difficulties in our modern technology, but we have learned a great deal more about the element's potentialities as a useful servant of man.

Indeed I would be willing to predict that plutonium—ornery and unusual as it is—will turn out to be one of the most useful elements at our command. The really important role of plutonium 239 in peaceful applications lies in the fact that it is a fissionable isotope that can be produced from uranium 238, an isotope that is not readily fissionable. In any analysis of the world's energy resources, it is evident that gas, oil, and coal are not inexhaustible, but rather that the supplies of these fuels are eventually limited. Studies to date indicate that the energy locked in uranium is at least a thousandfold more than that in our usable reserve of fossil fuels. This total nuclear energy resource is calculated, however, on the basis of utilization of not only the 0.7 percent of uranium 235 present, but also on the basis of the inherent energy in the 99.3 percent of uranium 238 that can be converted into fissionable plutonium 239. Thus the immense importance of the breeder reactor, capable of producing more fuel than it consumes, comes into sharp focus for us when we look at the future of a scientific and technological society inescapably dependent on the large-scale consumption of energy. Plutonium will of necessity play a principal role in the drama of our future technological growth.

Plutonium will also be called upon to play another role in the near future as exemplified by the PRTR—the plutonium recycle test reactor—here at Hanford. The recycle of plutonium produced in water reactors or in other, advanced converter, reactors can provide a significant improvement in fuel utilization.

It should not be surprising then that the Commission carries on a vigorous and intensive effort to develop plutonium technology and breeder and recycle reactors. We fully appreciate the extremely complex problems posed by these development efforts and recognize that though many technical advances have been made over a period of years, much remains to be done.

Here in particular, when we start talking about its use in reactors, plutonium shows its ornery property. One of the greatest barriers to developing breeder reactor technology is plutonium's combination of high radioactivity, amounting to about 140 million alpha-disintegrations per minute per milligram, and its physiological property of depositing in the bones and remaining there. Even today, chemical investigations of plutonium are frequently carried out on a scale of a milligram or less by choice, rather than from any limitation of supply. These deadly properties of plutonium mean that very elaborate systems of remote control must be used in every phase of its handling, such as are so much in evidence here at Hanford. It is a special tribute to the workers at Hanford that in their unremitting carefulness no one has ever been hurt. I am sure that the difficulties which plutonium's radioactivity poses for its widespread use in nuclear power will similarly be overcome as a result of the ever-increasing sophistication of automation.

The development of plutonium reactor technology, of course, involves many difficulties in addition to the matter of handling plutonium safely. These reactors must be run at high temperature to allow for extraction of the energy usefully and efficiently, with many attendant problems as to construction materials, corrosion, and so forth. I need not emphasize for this group the difficulties to be overcome in the development of plutonium fuel elements.

We are, therefore, pleased to see not only such meetings as we are holding here today on plutonium fuel fabrication but we also are encouraged that a number of significant projects are making good progress in the important breeder reactor phase of the AEC program. The Fast Reactor Test Facility (FARET), a fast breeder, sodium-cooled, 50-thermal-megawatt reactor authorized by Congress in 1963, will be used to investigate physics, core stability, safety, and other nuclear operating characteristics of many different fast-breeder reactor designs. Construction of the FARET is scheduled to begin this year.

The Commission is also participating in the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor (SEFOR) project which will forward research and development through construction of an experimental breeder reactor fueled with a mixture of plutonium and uranium oxides. In addition to AEC's two experimental breeder reactors, EBR-1 and EBR-2, and the Enrico Fermi Plant, there are the four conceptual design studies now underway. These studies, initiated by Allis-Chalmers, Combustion Engineering, General Electric, and Westinghouse Electric, are on the nuclear portion of a hypothetical 1-million-electrical-kilowatt, fast-breeder-reactor, central station powerplant. Each of these studies will spell out design characteristics and principal features of a plutonium-fueled, liquid-sodium-cooled, fast-breeder reactor having a minimum breeding ratio of 1 to 1.2. I am especially pleased to observe that early in May of 1963, during the conduct of physics tests with the EBR-1, a breeder reactro, electric power was for the first time in the United States produced with a plutonium core.

I cannot close without at least mentioning one other aspect of this endlessly fascinating element. Most of us at some time or other have read of the phoenix, that mythical bird of the Egyptians which when consumed by fire arises again from its own ashes. Plutonium promises to provide us with a phoenixlike fuel. This fuel, being developed here at Hanford and containing certain combinations of the plutonium isotopes 239, 240, and 241 is expected to make possible extraordinarily long-lived reactor cores. As plutonium 239 is burned up in the reactor, the fertile plutonium 240 isotope yields enough fissionable plutonium 241 to maintain the reactivity of the fuel.

The prospect that plutonium and its compounds spread before us in looking toward the future of nuclear power production is interesting and most encouraging to those of us who nursed it through its early production stages. It is no exaggeration, I believe, to say that plutonium is destined to play a central and an indispensable role in the increasingly significant drama of nuclear power as this new source of power begins to fill more and more of the world's energy requirements. When an element shows the kind of versatility that plutonium does, I believe we can afford to put up with quite a bit of orneriness.

Results of Missouri Seventh District Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, following are the results of the Missouri Seventh District opinion poll. A total of 13,850 persons responded, about a 10 percent return. I believe the poll represents an acurate reflection of the opinions of the seventh district since an effort was made to send the questionnaire to all residents of the district, regardless of party affiliation.

Although the last question on the poll, I suppose it is only natural that question No. 15 dealing with presidential preference, would attract the most attention and publicity. In listing all potential candidates, I assumed it to be a foregone conclusion that the incumbent President would receive his party's nomination and therefore President Johnson was the only Democrat listed, although a blank space was left for write-in votes by those not satisfied with the choices offered.

At the time the poll was prepared back in late January, Henry Cabot Lodge was not considered a serious candidate and he was not included among the choices though he did receive 394 write-in votes.

It should come as no surprise that President Johnson, as the only Democrat choice on the poll, would draw more votes than any single Republican since the Republican vote was divided among seven potential candidates. On the other hand, of those responding to this question, 31 percent indicated a preference for the incumbent President, while 69 percent indicated a preference for someone else.

In regard to the other questions, I believe the answers clearly indicate that the residents of the Seventh District of Missouri have views which differ from the present administration on most issues.

The greatest disenchantment with present policies seem to be in the field of foreign affairs. Almost 90 percent believe that the United States should take whatever steps are required to prevent the use of Cuba as a base for Communist subversion in Latin America. Contrast this with the statement of the Senate Foreign Affairs chairman that we should accept Castro as a permanent fixture in the Western Hemisphere. In southwest Missouri at least, there is a decided difference of opinion with the Senator from our sister State as to which is myth and which is reality.

Of those responding, 61.6 percent said the United States should not bow to a U.N. decision if it conflicts with our own national self-interest. I believe this shift in attitude toward the U.N. reflects an uneasiness about the balance of voting power now held by a large group of unstable African nations intent on playing the East against the West for their own gain.

Eighty percent indicated a belief that the foreign aid program should be substantially reduced. Each year a new "image" is placed on our foreign aid program, but more and more people are beginning to suspect that a new cover does not change the book. I believe they are right.

On domestic issues, although 66 percent favored some form of civil rights legislation, there was a substantial difference of opinion over separate sections of the bill now before the Senate. Fifty-six percent do not favor the creation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission and another 14.4 percent are undecided, leaving only 30.6 percent favoring this particular title of the civil rights bill.

The opinion poll follows:

RESULTS OF THE MISSOURI SEVENTH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

Congressman DURWARD HALL today announced the results of the Missouri Seventh District opinion poll. A total of 13,850 persons responded to the poll. Although some replies still are being received, Representative HALL said they are not expected to make any appreciable difference in the results. He expressed personal appreciation to all who had participated directly in this survey in the interest of good representative government. HALL also thanked all who as a result of legislation and/or the poll, wrote personal letters.

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you believe the present law of Presidential succession should be changed?	44.7	43.8	11.5
2. Do you believe a constitutional amendment should be adopted which would restore the status that existed between religions and the schools prior to the Supreme Court Decision on prayer?	73.5	16.8	9.7
3. Do you believe that civil rights legislation which may be adopted should include specific language:			
a. Prohibiting segregation in public accommodations?	44.0	40.8	15.2
b. Guaranteeing all Americans the right to vote?	83.9	10.5	5.6
c. Creating a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission with authority to require employers to hire persons which the Federal Commission determines have been denied jobs because of race?	30.6	56.0	13.4
4. Do you favor passage of some form of civil rights legislation?	66.3	20.7	13.0
5. Do you favor creation of a Domestic Peace Corps financed by Federal tax funds?	18.0	64.8	17.2
6. In the event that tax reduction legislation is adopted, do you believe that the Congress should attempt to make cutbacks in individual appropriation bills if necessary to avoid a large planned Federal deficit?	78.6	10.5	10.9
7. Which of the following do you favor as a means of meeting the medical care needs of persons over 65 years of age:			
a. Emphasis on individual responsibility channels, (personal and family resources, insurance; and private, church or community, voluntary help)?	44.5	17.0	38.5
b. Expansion and improvements in the existing Kerr-Mills law of Missouri wherein assistance for payment of hospital and doctor bills to persons over age 65 is limited to those in need, and financed out of matching Federal-State funds?	56.5	18.7	24.8
c. An increase in employee and employer social security taxes, to provide compulsory Government financed hospital care for all persons over age 65, regardless of need?	18.9	53.7	27.4
8. Do you favor legislation:			
a. Authorizing compulsory Government arbitration to avert national strikes when collective bargaining cannot produce an agreement?	68.5	15.0	16.5
b. Making labor unions subject to similar antitrust laws now applicable to business?	77.4	9.2	13.4
c. Repealing the Taft-Hartley law section that permits States to enact right-to-work laws?	20.0	58.2	21.8
9. Do you believe solution of present problems in agriculture requires a trend toward—			
a. More Government control on a compulsory basis?	5.6	63.4	31.0
b. Less Government control on a voluntary basis?	82.6	3.8	13.6
10. Should we make new concessions in our Panama Canal Treaty?	10.9	73.1	16.0
11. Should the United States take whatever steps are required to prevent the use of Cuba as a base for communist subversion throughout Latin America?	89.2	4.1	6.7
12. In the event a United Nation's decision conflicts with our own national self-interest, should we bow to the United Nations decision?	18.7	61.6	19.7
13. Which of the following statements should be the guidelines for our foreign aid program:			
	Percent		
a. It should be continued at approximately the present level	12.1		
b. It should be substantially increased	2.6		
c. It should be substantially reduced	80.0		
d. Undecided	5.3		
e. The military assistance funds should be removed and included in the defense budget	44.1	11.1	44.8
14. Which statements of principle do you believe more nearly describe the proper role of Federal Government:			
	Percent		
a. "That government is best which governs least"	26.1		
b. "The government should do for the people only those things which the people cannot best do for themselves"	50.7		
c. "The government should redistribute the wealth through the tax system"	8.8		
d. "The government should increase its direct activity in welfare programs"	14.3		
15. Whom do you believe would make the best President of the United States in 1964-68:			
	Number		
a. President Lyndon Johnson	3,444		
b. Senator Barry Goldwater	3,006		
c. Governor Nelson Rockefeller	453		
d. Governor George Romney	572		
e. Governor William Scranton	473		
f. Richard Nixon	3,058		
g. Senator Margaret Chase Smith	116		
h. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge	394		
i. Miscellaneous write-ins	310		
j. Opinion withheld	2,014		

McCormack May Get His Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Art Buchwald:

MCCORMACK MAY GET HIS CHANCE

President Johnson's driving has become of some concern to the free world. Reporters down at the L.B.J. Ranch for the Easter weekend said the President drove his Lincoln Continental at speeds up to 85 or 90 miles an hour, passed other cars on the hills, and frightened many members of the official entourage.

The President's press secretary, George Reedy, was surprised at the reports and said he had never known the President to exceed the Texas speed limits. The President himself, at a press conference, denied driving too fast and could not recall ever going over 70.

But the American people had one more thing to worry about when they read the stories. We do not know if they were true or not as we were not there, but two White House correspondents who were following the President's car insist the stories were correct.

"I distinctly remember," one of them said, "as the speedometer climbed to 80, turning to someone in the car and saying, 'I do not care what you say, I think Speaker MCCORMACK would make a good President.'"

"I heard him," the other correspondent replied, "and I said, 'You may be right. After all, the job makes the man. There has been much too much criticism of the Speaker.'"

"Then our speedometer hit 85 and I said, 'If nothing else, people will take pity on us if McCormack is President. Everyone will feel sorry for us.' "

The speedometer rose to 90 miles an hour. The second correspondent said "McCormack has very good connections in Congress. He could get the pending legislation through."

"And as far as foreign affairs are concerned, Dean Rusk would certainly stay on."

"I am sure the entire Cabinet would stay."

"It would be foolish for McCormack to form a new Cabinet so near elections."

The President's car neared the crest of a hill and the President pulled out to pass a car. Just then a car came over the hill from the other direction.

"Are you going to stay here or go back to Washington for the swearing-in ceremony?" the correspondent asked his friend.

"I do not know. I guess I will have to call the office."

The other driver saw the Continental coming at him and veered off to the shoulder of the road. President Johnson managed to get through.

The first correspondent said, "I think the Democratic race will be wide open in Atlantic City. Who do you think the candidates will be?"

The President put his hat over the speedometer.

"I think the thing I will miss the most is the dances at the White House."

"Does McCormack dance?"

"I do not know, I had better check that."

"I will miss the Saturday afternoon press conferences."

"Maybe McCormack will hold them on Saturday afternoons also. Let us call him and ask him when we get back to the ranch."

Panama: Former U.S. Airman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress who have followed relations between the United States and Panama have long ago noticed a wide divergence between the views expressed by our journalists who visit the isthmus a few hours and write up their hastily gleaned impressions and those contained in letters of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen who have been stationed in the zone and know Isthmian problems from personal observations over a period of time.

I include in my remarks a letter written by a former airman, stationed for 2 years at Albrook Field in the Canal Zone and published in the January 1964 issue of Kernels, published at Golden, Colo.

This letter is provocative, but I am sure will be of interest to those who have been concerned over the crisis in Panama.

The letter follows:

PANAMA

Only the very naive were surprised to see the recent developments in Panama. It was only a matter of time before the Reds in Panama were going out in the open, create an incident, and demand the canal be turned over to Panama.

The Reds in Panama were then aide in their demands by the well meaning and woolly minded liberals in this country. For some reason, there are those in this country who don't believe we, as a Nation, have a right to anything which is desired by the Reds, even though the properties desired by the Reds are covered by treaties and agreements.

While in the employ of my rich uncle I was stationed at Albrook Field in the Canal Zone on occasion. In the 2 years, I traveled in and out of the zone I never heard anyone seriously propose that the United States didn't have complete sovereignty over the zone. Then under Eisenhower and his brother Milton we were told that we only had titular rights. Under the guise of this hogwash we agreed to fly a Panamanian flag on American soil.

Now the liberals will tell you that we never acquired title to the land in the zone. Well, if we didn't, somebody back in 1903 violated the law. On June 28, 1902, the Spooner Act was passed by the U.S. Congress which authorized the United States to "obtain from Colombia a strip of land for maintenance, proctection, and operation of a canal." It was impossible to obtain the land from Colombia by treaty. A group of people in Panama revolted and we negotiated the canal treaty with the Government of Panama. The Spooner Act was the basic enabling legislation.

The land for the canal was acquired for $10 million cash and $250,000 per year. For this Panama agreed to give the United States perpetual sovereignty "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority."

In 1921 we gave Colombia $25 million to compensate her for the loss of Panama. Because the U.S.S. *Nashville* arrived off Panama the day before Panama revolted the Colombians decided not to send troops to put down the revolt in Panama.

Although we paid Panama for her sovereign rights over the zone our present liberals say we stole the zone at gunpoint. Did we? We have paid over $50 million for 647.84 square miles of land from Colombia and Panama. This amounts to $80,000 per square mile to date. If you include the $40 million we paid to the French company for their canal rights in the isthmus, the total cost to date is $150,000 per square mile.

When you consider that in 1867 we paid Russia $7,200,000 for her sovereign rights to Alaska which amounted to about $12 per square mile it appears that we are being short changed by the Panamanians. Since the United States does not have complete jurisdiction over the Canal Zone for $50 million, do we have it in Alaska for $7,200,000? I suppose it is only a matter of time until the Russian flag will have to be flown in Alaska.

Last year the total revenue received from the canal was $103 million with a net profit of $2.3 million. There are 14,000 civilian employees connected with the canal plus the defense costs. In a time when economy in Government is of paramount importance we might be money ahead to give the canal to Panama. The so-called net profit from the canal is usually spent for capital improvements.

The Panamanians being friendly to us would accord the United States the privilege of letting our Navy pass through the canal without paying tolls as we have for her navy since 1914. This arrangement would allow us to keep our defense posture and save money. Can you top that?

There are only two courses of action open to the United States, we make countries live up to their agreements or we announce to the world that if they don't like agreements that we have made in good faith forget them.

To the fuzzy minds who keep telling us we have to be ashamed of our "gunboat" diplomacy, I suggest they reread their history books. The same Americans who negotiated with Panama for a strip of land also signed an agreement granting independence to the Philippines. I do not and will not accept the idea that our former Government was not acting in good faith in both cases.

Because the Reds want the canal it will be given to them. Just as we dismantled our bases in Italy and Turkey last year when the Reds asked. Just as we have allowed the establishment of a Red base in Cuba.

Old Tio Sam is again being thanked by a Latin neighbor, for sending the Peace Corps, adding $60 million per year to the Panamanian economy, and $75,700,000 in foreign aid. Don't confuse that foreign aid figure with the canal revenues because this $75 million is over and above.

Great Future for Vocational-Tech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives passed the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Included were funds to implement and effectuate training programs to attack such problems as unemployment and school dropouts. Specifically, the House of Representatives evidenced support for such programs as the manpower development and training program, the higher education facilities construction measure and increased vocational education emphasis.

In the final result, however, the success or failure of these programs will rest with the local people and the effort made at the local level. In this connection I take pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues the excellent work being accomplished at the local level in Colorado. A new Vocational-Technical Center is being constructed, designed to prepare those young people who do not attend college to meet the problems of employment and training in our highly complex industrial society. Mr. Basil F. Allen and other Boulder leaders led the fight for Vocational-Tech and they deserve the commendation of all.

I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record Jim Corriell's fine editorial that appeared in the Boulder Camera on Friday, April 3, and describes Boulder's efforts in providing local leadership to meet one of the most important problems of today:

GREAT FUTURE FOR VOCATIONAL-TECH

It was a bold step to take. But it will fill an urgent need. And its possibilities for the future are unlimited.

The new Vocational-Technical Center will be a reality by the opening of school next fall. After countless hours of study by citizens and school officials, Boulder Valley School District took a pioneering step in setting up Vocational-Tech.

It will fill a gap in secondary education that has been a troubling problem for a long time. Secondary education had been geared essentially to college careers. But many students had neither the desire nor the apti-

tudes for college. Their talents fitted them best for vocational and technical training, but educational opportunities for this group were inadequate.

Basil F. Allen, who has been head of vocational training in the school system, worked hard to fill the gap. He had many obstacles to overcome in alerting the public to the need. Appropriately, he will be director of the new center.

Registrations are coming in already for the five courses that will be offered when the center opens. The courses have been wisely chosen—auto body and fender repair, automotive mechanics, basic electronics, machine shop, and welding, and metal farbrication.

These are basically useful courses, and the demand for trained workers in the five fields is healthy. As the center develops, more courses will be added.

The school system points out that "the courses will be as rigorous as regular courses, and students have been warned not to consider them snap courses. They will have to be rigorous, because they are designed to prepare young people for various kinds of jobs after they leave high school."

The benefits will be threefold: Opportunities will be broadened for students. Industry and trades will get better trained vocational and technical personnel. The colleges and universities will be spared part of the influx of students who have been misdirected toward college careers.

We believe the new center has a great future.

Item Concerning a Colleague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, one always is pleased to read kind remarks about a friend and such are contained in the following article printed in the Arizona Republic concerning our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]:

HOSMER: ATOMIC-AGE CONGRESSMAN

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, can be characterized the Nation's first atomic-age Congressman, for the atom brought the studious lawyer from Long Beach to his seat in the House.

HOSMER was a lieutenant commander in the Navy, waiting in the Philippines for the start of the invasion of the Japanese homeland when the first bomb exploded at Hiroshima.

The implication was immediately apparent to HOSMER. This was the power that would shape the future, and he wanted to have a hand in dealing with it.

Back home, he took a job at Los Alamos as a government lawyer. The experience was disappointing, but it made HOSMER decide to go to Washington.

Long Beach isn't necessarily the best place for Republicans to launch new political careers. HOSMER took a whipping in 1950, but came back in the Eisenhower year of 1952 and won.

As he does with everything he undertakes, the 48-year-old HOSMER has closely studied his constituency. He has continued winning reelection with growing majorities, though Long Beach is generally considered to favor the Democrats about 60 to 40.

HOSMER had to wait until a vacancy occurred on the Atomic Energy Commission. He was assigned to the Interior Committee, where he also retains membership.

As it turned out, atomic energy and the power and water problems of the Interior Committee dovetail perfectly; and the future will draw them ever closer together.

HOSMER's district in the midst of a megalopolis is far removed from the agricultural problems preoccupying lawmakers from other water-shy areas.

"There's only one farmer in my district, a man with a 10-foot window box," HOSMER says with a twinkle in his eye.

So he regards the central Arizona project legislation, upon which he one day will be called to pass, as "just another extension of the battle of the river."

Such projects won't cure shortages, it will just bring more of them, he fears.

And behind the whole issue of reclamation-type projects, HOSMER sees the ever-present matter of electrical energy.

"Whatever is behind it," HOSMER wrote recently in a minority report on a Bonneville Power Administration bill, "under a succession of Interior Secretaries, the Bureau of Reclamation has moved deeper into the generation, transmission, and marketing of electric power."

HOSMER fears there may be a determined effort of careerists within the Interior Department to extend the Federal control over electric energy ever and ever further.

Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who HOSMER finds is "busy running around the country," could do the Nation a service by "flushing out and laying on the table the true nature of the Federal power program," the Congressman declares.

While HOSMER is dedicated to opposing Fabian socialism, he is cognizant that private, local public, and Federal resources are going to be needed to fill the Nation's power needs in years to come.

And tied to these is the question of water for the thirsty Southwest. HOSMER is constantly aware that his teeming district would be empty desert, save for the water brought to it.

He believes, as do most men working with the problem day after day, that harnessing the atom to desalt the sea is the eventual answer.

But much must be done. An economical plant, HOSMER estimates, would cost $500 million, too big an undertaking without Federal help.

Once, HOSMER asked an atomic scientist at Oak Ridge, Tenn., about the problem of refuse from desalinization plants. The man had never considered what would be done with it. The incident disturbed HOSMER because it symbolized the tendency of persons working with great problems to leave things unfinished.

HOSMER's desire for knowledge on legislative problems is almost obsessive. His conclusion in his minority report on the Bonneville power bill epitomized this: "Defeat * * * is urged because more must be known to consider it wisely," he wrote. "This will place the appropriate committees of Congress on notice to do the investigation work they have neglected."

Tall, handsomely dark complexioned and, at times severely serious, HOSMER is one of the most respected young Members of Congress. In private conversation, he is warm and candid.

A native of the Los Angeles area, HOSMER is the son of a mechanic whose curiosity made him a successful inventor.

Chester C. Hosmer worked in the oilfields for Standard Oil Co. He devised a replaceable cuting edge for power shovel scoops that is universally used today.

"I'll bet most of the construction work in Arizona today was done with his invention," HOSMER says with satisfaction.

Young HOSMER got his bachelor's degree at the University of California in Berkeley, then went to the University of Michigan for a year of law school. He returned home to receive his law degree at the University of Southern California, where he was editor of the law review. He then got in a year at the U.S. Naval Academy before World War II sent him to sea.

HOSMER married the former Marian Caroline Swanson in 1946. They have two children.

The Congressman does his own legislative research, preparing his notes on a yellow legal-size pad, then typing the first draft himself. He's a good typist, too. Uses the touch system.

National War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in a special message to Congress, President Johnson recommended legislative action against poverty, calling for total victory in a national war on poverty.

The message was accompanied by a 46-page omnibus bill, H.R. 10440, written by various White House aids. It contains a wide variety of new spending measures, increased spending for some laws now on the books, a revival of other programs out of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first administration which subsequently died, together with provisions for an antipoverty czar here in Washington with very broad powers.

H.R. 10440 can be likened to a large bundle of sticks, some of which may be strong and of good quality, others of which may be weak and unreliable. Anyone who wants to examine these sticks one by one, rather than buy the total package like a pig in a poke is going to risk accusations of being for poverty.

Nevertheless, it is my intention to run such risk and for a very good reason: It is well known that several key members of the Johnson administration—even Cabinet secretaries—are violently opposed to some of the sticks in the bundle known as H.R. 10440. They grouse about them bitterly in private, even though they cannot do so in public without being fired.

I consider myself just as much against poverty as President Johnson. I think it should be eliminated wherever it may exist and such effective measures as will do so are well within the national interest and well worth the effort and expense involved. However, I refuse to be a party to running in endless, useless—but politically attractive—circles of expenditures in the name of eliminating poverty but which have no prospect whatever of doing so. I am not willing to be a party to measures which subsidize poverty in the name of eliminating it. Nor am I about to approve blindly any scheme which will unnecessarily concentrate power in the hands of Washington bureaucrats—which I regard as a contributing cause of poverty.

In short, like most Americans, I will regard with favor any reasonable stick in

the bundle which does, in fact, have effective promise for eliminating the blight of poverty. But also, like most Americans, I look with disfavor on any of those which have failed in the past or show no promise for the future. This is because squandering Federal money uselessly is not a sure cure for poverty, it is a sure way to make it universal.

Poverty: One Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the Zelienople News Record of Zelienople, Pa., in my congressional district carried a special supplement this week on poverty in Butler County. Mr. Joseph Zelnik, editor of the News Record, has written an editorial "Poverty: One Solution," which I feel has much merit. I am sure my fellow Congressmen will be most interested in this editorial which follows:

POVERTY: ONE SOLUTION

This issue contains a special supplement on poverty in Butler County on pages 7 and 8.

Over 16 percent of families in the county have less than $3,000 a year income and are thus defined as "poor."

About 1,200 county residents receive public assistance.

Some 2,617 families with a total of 9,321 persons get surplus food to supplement their diets.

Key factor in being poor is unemployment.

There are 2,400 persons in the county who want work but cannot find it.

Some 750 are under the age of 22. Over 550 of these are unskilled and have little education.

Another 600 are 22 to 34 years old; 375, 35 to 44; 500, 45 to 65.

If we can solve the unemployment problem, we can go a long way toward solving the poverty problem.

In our opinion, one solution to the unemployment problem lies in the 14,000-acre proposed Moraine State Park.

This multimillion-dollar park will require more than 5 years to complete. Land acquisition has been OK'd by voter approval of project 70. Many thousands of man-hours will be needed.

President Lyndon Johnson's program to fight poverty includes an employment program to put the jobless to work on useful projects such as conservation programs and public construction jobs.

Why cannot the Federal and State Governments get together so that much of the work needed at Moraine Park could be done by the county's unemployed?

The park includes numerous projects which require various types of skills:

A park office and superintendent's residence, relocation of Route 422, a dam, clearing of a 3,200-acre area for Lake Arthur, clearing, landscaping, and reseeding of camping and picnic areas, some sort of water purification system, a sewage treatment plant, food concession buildings, cabins, swimming beaches, boating and docking facilities, pavilions, construction of a winter sports area, numerous facilities such as cabins and dining halls for organized group camping areas, many access trails, etc.

There is no doubt that the county's unemployed could make a major contribution to many of these projects.

None of the jobs performed by the presently unemployed would displace regular workers.

Thus Moraine State Park would be doubly beneficial—its construction would be aiding the county as much as its completion will.

This suggestion only scratches the surface of potential.

The same facilities being built by the unemployed could be used during evenings and weekends by the proposed Domestic Peace Corps and instructors from the manpower development and training program to give further education to those who need it.

Thus our unemployed could receive a blend of training, basic education, and work experience.

The program would be a unique combination of Federal, State, local, and private efforts.

We think the idea has merit. If county, State and Federal officials agree, now is the time to act.

Children Will Be What You Teach Them To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "It's the Age-Old War Right Here in La Mesa," from the La Mesa Scout of February 20, 1964:

IT'S THE AGE-OLD WAR RIGHT HERE IN LA MESA

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

When we allow the fear of God to be displaced with fear of civil court * * * have we then allowed the first commandment to be broken * * * in front of our children?

These days in La Mesa, the trees of legal gobbledygook are too big, twisted, and grotesque for some folks to be able to see the forest.

It is not the teaching about religion of which we here speak, but the actual denial of God's existence to the children.

Often in the course of the human race, we wander about, seeking a formula for the future that will remedy the ills of the present.

But, when we make a formula which immediately causes ills in our present hour, does that not call for further thought, further action?

Underlying the entire prayers-in-school battle is an undying note of human hope in the hearts of some * * * "Let us crush this day the invading atheists."

It is shocking, isn't it, to see how little value so many of our neighbors place upon the principles, judgments, and traditions of our forebears?

The logic we have heard for the eradication of God from schools truly sounds like logic. At the same time, it turns the stomach.

It is logic in the vein of the University of Berlin professor, lecturing in New York, who logicized that Hitler could be relied on not to allow persecution of Jews because * * * "Herr Hitler doesn't drink, doesn't smoke and leads an exact moral life."

Our new La Mesa logic seems to read: "Go ye, therefore, into all the classrooms * * * teach not, speak not, know not of God * * * for the court may not smile upon such acts by thee."

When fear of God is smothered by fear of what some other human might do * * * it is a sad, sad day.

There is much confusion about this precept of dividing church and state. In America, school is not so much "state," or should not be, as it is an extension of home. Parents should be in charge of those who do the teaching. In the old days, not so long back, parents would have fired on the spot a teacher who did not encourage their children daily to know and to feel the bondage of ideas in which they had been born and bred.

There are those among us who would contaminate all American children with the barrenness of atheism. Sinners like to teach others.

There are others who are liable to lose the battle through apathy. They have not yet shown enough guts to fight.

There are a few who are saying: "They shall not sweep God from La Mesa, any more than they shall sweep back the ocean with brooms."

We know of one teacher who just quit her job. She could not take the atheistic orders any more. She wasn't getting far with the Lord's Prayer, anyway, she told us. "Very few of the children know it any more," she said.

There is good in our past, our traditions, the foundations of our country. Cicero wrote: "Who knows only his own generation remains always a child."

It is the age-old war of the believers and the nonbelievers, going on right here in La Mesa.

The believers are not fighting hard enough as yet.

If they do not preserve traditions, the other side will win, and it won't be too many years when youngsters by the thousands reach their teens and know not the meaning of the name "God."

They will see it written upon our country's coins, very probably believe the letters stand for "Garrulous old devil," spend them for dope * * * a knife * * * or a gun * * * and break another commandment.

For children will be what you teach them to be.

LEONARD SIME.

The Businessman's Stake in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech made by Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

These remarks were made in Dallas on March 19, before the National Industrial Conference Board. There were some 700 business executives from throughout the Southwest in attendance, and I am informed that these informative remarks were exceptionally well received:

THE BUSINESSMAN'S STAKE IN FOREIGN AID

(By Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development)

Mr. Chairman, members of the NICB, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me

to speak this noon here in Dallas under the auspices of the National Industrial Conference Board. I am always very pleased when I have a chance to speak to American businessmen about the U.S. foreign assistance programs, because no one has a larger stake than you as businessmen in the success of our foreign aid programs.

This is true in the direct and narrow sense that foreign aid today is paying for about $2 billion worth of U.S. exports of goods and services—machinery, equipment, raw materials, engineering consulting services, and many other items.

Some of the figures are quite impressive. In calendar year 1962, the last year for which there are complete figures, for example, we sent abroad under the foreign aid program about $123 million worth of U.S.-produced iron and steel products—which was about 21 percent of all the exports of iron and steel from the United States that year, $48 million worth of fertilizer, about one-third of all U.S. fertilizer exports and locomotives valued at $40 million, over one-third of all U.S. locomotive exports.

In the case of these and dozens of other products, foreign aid is a substantial source of financing for U.S. exports, and by the same token is a substantial source of production, employment and profits for many American firms. For January and February of this year, Texas stood first among the States in the volume of AID-financed procurement.

These exports have significance not only in the short run sense. In many cases American products sent abroad under the foreign aid program achieve market acceptance which will insure future orders after foreign aid has been ended. An official of the Indian Government, for example, told me some months ago that the Indian railways had wanted to buy British equipment with the proceeds of an American foreign aid loan. Informed that American foreign aid could be used only to purchase items in the United States, the Indian railway officials had at first protested strongly. The policy was a firm one, however, and they had to buy American railway equipment. This happened 3 or 4 years ago. Today, according to this Indian Government official, the Indian railway authorities display a marked preference for American equipment, and U.S. foreign aid has probably opened up a significant future market for American products.

I think these evidences of the relationship between the foreign aid program and U.S. exports would be impressive to any American businessman. We should not, however, misread their significance. The promotion of U.S. exports is not the primary reason for U.S. foreign aid. Nor is it the fundamental reason why U.S. businessmen have a tremendous stake in the success of the U.S. foreign aid program.

We have a foreign aid program today—and have had one since the end of World War II—in order to influence what happens in the world in directions that are compatible with U.S. interests. The foreign aid program is a major action arm of U.S. foreign policy. It is in the interest of the United States to do what we can to support the development of freedom and democracy in the world. This is essential to the security of the United States in the broad sense that only in a world of free and independent nations can our own free institutions survive and flourish and this is most significantly true with respect to free private enterprise.

The U.S. interest in strengthening free countries takes us—and has taken us over the years—into many different kinds of situations. I have just returned from 5 days in Vietnam with Secretary McNamara and General Taylor. As everyone knows, this situation is the most difficult in which we are now engaged. The United States has been engaged there for 10 years, ever since the French debacle in Dien Bien Phu, assisting the free government of South Vietnam in its efforts to establish security, peace, and progress in that country.

In the middle 1950's the effort was primarily to establish a new government for South Vietnam which could take care of the large number of refugees from North Vietnam. In those years the Communists in North Vietnam expected momentarily that the Government of South Vietnam would collapse and the area would fall into their hands. Thanks to U.S. aid and the efforts of the South Vietnamese people, this did not happen.

Beginning in the late 1950's, however, a new and deadlier attack was launched with organized guerrilla units well led, well trained, and well supplied, conducting a continuous campaign of terror in large parts of the countryside of South Vietnam. Moving largely at night and seeking to establish cells of sympathizers in every village, thousands of Vietcong with strong support and direction from North Vietnam are fighting a stealthy and bitter war of attrition in an attempt to wipe out freedom in South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese effort to clear and hold larger and larger areas of the countryside which are free of guerrilla activity is necessarily a long, slow battle.

This battle has been complicated in recent months by the overthrow of the Diem regime and the attempt to find a strong and effective leadership for the South Vietnamese Government.

There is no reason, however, to despair, or to give up the struggle. The conclusion of Secretary McNamara and General Taylor was that the battle against the Vietcong can be won. The plans that General Khanh has for doing so are sound. The means for "clearing and holding" village after village, for moving gradually out from areas that are secure to those that are less secure, establishing ever widening zones in which the villagers are secure against Vietcong terror and in which schools and health centers and agricultural progress are established—these ideas offer an effective strategy for victory over the Vietcong.

We know that guerrilla wars cannot be won rapidly. The experience in Malaya and the Philippines, where similar wars were won only after many years of unrelenting effort is proof of this.

We know that guerrilla wars cannot be won at all unless the people of the country want to win them. This is perhaps the most impressive element of the situation in Vietnam. Not only the Vietnamese Army, but the local security forces established in each area—I have seen some that were no more than a group of village boys given a few days of training and minimum equipment—have defended themselves valiantly against the Vietcong in hundreds of engagements over the last 2 or 3 years. In the process, thousands of Vietnamese patriots have given their lives for the freedom of their country. This continues to be the situation today.

The lesson is plain. The free men and women of South Vietnam do not want to succumb to Communist control. They are fighting hard for their freedom. It would not only be the rankest cowardice, but a step opposed to our own deepest national interest, for us to run out on them at this time. The military and economic assistance we are providing in Vietnam is a vital element in our own security expenditures.

Vietnam is one type situation in which the United States is engaged. There are dozens of others. Many of you here in Texas are especially interested in the effort we are making in Latin America under the Alliance for Progress. In Latin America, and in other parts of the world, the United States is trying to help establish progressive economies which can increasingly meet the needs of their growing populations. The people of underdeveloped countries of the world are determined to have more education for their children, healthier lives for their families, and a growing standard of living. We want to help them achieve those objectives through free institutions. No one has a larger stake in our success than do U.S. businessmen, and no one has responded more generously with their time and resources than U.S. businessmen. Future markets and future investment opportunities depend on growing economies abroad and direct opportunities for private enterprise.

We have learned a good deal in the last 15 years about how to help countries achieve economic progress. One of the lessons we have learned is the importance of seeking to expand opportunities for private initiative and private enterprise. We believe the lessons of economic progress in the United States, which rested so heavily on local responsibility and private action, are applicable to the problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We seek to encourage the application of similar ideas in the countries where the aid program is operating.

To promote medium and small size private business and overcome the lack of credit which often cripples such enterprises in lesser developed countries, U.S. foreign aid has as of June 30, 1963, provided over $1 billion to 85 development banking institutions in 46 countries for industry, housing and agriculture. Many of these banks were established on the initiative of the World Bank and with the participation of U.S. private capital. Not all have been equally successful but both their performance and their potential is illustrated by the Central American Bank for Economic Integration. This bank, seeking to develop projects which will have a regional impact on all of Central America, has in a little over 18 months loaned over $4 million to private enterprises in the fields of metal working, food processing and chemicals and pharmaceuticals. This is assistance to the private sector of developing countries in action.

Another illustration of our help to the private sector is the aid we have given to the establishment of savings and loan associations. In Chile, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Peru, and Venezuela, countries which 3 years ago had no savings and loan associations worthy of the name, associations established with the help of our aid program, had grown to 100,000 members as of December with total savings of $35 million and over 14,000 homes financed to date.

The know-how needed to establish these savings and loan associations was obtained from the leaders of the U.S. savings and loan industry recruited by AID to serve as consultants and experts in these Latin American countries. This is typical of the way in which we seek to draw on the most competent men and women in the United States to help the underdeveloped countries meet their problems and typical of the response that we have received from those who have been called on.

In addition to working in every way we can think to support and strengthen private enterprise in the less developed countries, the foreign aid program also strongly supports U.S. private investment in those countries. Over the last several years we have expanded very greatly the nature and extent of the support we are providing for U.S. private investment in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

For example, 2 years ago a new device was established under which AID will share up to one-half the cost to American firms of making investment surveys. Where the survey results in an investment, the firm pays the full amount of the survey. If the survey does not result in an investment by the surveying firm, AID pays up to one-half

the cost and the survey results are turned over to the Government. Sixty-five surveys of this kind were initiated during 1963, and some of them have already resulted in investment decisions.

In addition AID is now in the process of cataloging for the first time in any systematic fashion investment opportunities throughout the lesser developed world. Within the next month we hope to make available information on over 1,800 investment opportunities, over one-third in Latin America, gleaned from past Government surveys and from the files of many U.S. businesses which have generously made information available to AID.

Most of you know, I am sure, that for some years AID has operated a program of guaranteeing U.S. private investments against the so-called political risks—expropriation, incovertibility of currency and damage from war or insurrection. We have steadily expanded the number of countries in which such guarantees are available and the list at present numbers 58 countries. Over a billion dollars of such guarantees are now outstanding and during the October-December quarter of 1963 the rate issuance reached an alltime high of $260 million for the quarter.

Many of you are also aware of the so-called Cooley loans, which are local currency funds available in many underdeveloped countries for lending to U.S. business firms. Some 49 loans of this type were made last year totaling approximately $56 million. These loans are frequently of great value to American business firms, and represent one of the very constructive uses of the local currency funds derived from the sales proceeds of our surplus agricultural commodities made available under Public Law 480 which is before the Congress again this year.

In his foreign aid message to the Congress today, the President is recommending to the Congress a significant new incentive for U.S. private investment in underdeveloped countries. This is an investment tax credit of 30 percent which would be available to certain kinds of U.S. investment in less developed countries. Under the President's instructions, we are also seeking to establish a new privately organized Executive Service Corps, under which American businessmen would work in advisory or operating jobs in businesses in less-developed countries, to install improved management practices in those firms.

I have cited only a few of the many ways in which the U.S. foreign aid program seeks to stimulate U.S. private investment in less-developed countries and to stimulate the growth and development of the private sectors in those countries. I could go on at great length about other related matters, for example, the means by which we are seeking, in the circumstances of each country we aid, to help establish sound fiscal budgetary and monetary policies which in turn would be conducive to economic growth.

I trust I have said enough, however, to demonstrate that there could be no greater fallacy than to think that the U.S. foreign aid program is limited to a program of loans to foreign governments. Instead it is a wide-ranging and far-reaching program, seeking to deal in a great variety of ways with the real circumstances in less developed countries. We seek to influence public policies and private actions in dozens of countries around the world in the direction of progress and freedom. And despite the crises which monopolize the daily headlines, I think that there is much to be hopeful about.

I would like to make one more point. It is not an apology. We are trying to run AID on businesslike terms and I think that we are succeeding more and more. But we are in a high risk business and we are going to make mistakes. As Fred Foy of Koppers once said to me: "If you don't make any mistakes, it means you are not doing your job." We are taking vigorous steps to insure that our money is well spent and we have a lot of help in that regard. In addition to our own AID auditors and inspectors, an independent inspector general, the General Accounting Office, and various congressional committees are constantly checking our activities. With this sort of help we are increasingly able to say that our money is going not only where we intend it to go, but where it should go.

Let me end as I began with the comment, that no one has a larger stake than does U.S. business in the success of our foreign aid program. Foreign aid is not a charitable enterprise. It is a hard-headed practical effort to support the growth of free and democratic institutions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. As President Johnson has said: "There are no easy victories in this campaign" but our vital interests "require us to stay in the battle." Our security and the future prospects for both our own freedom and for the free enterprise system depend upon the outcome.

Melvin J. Maas

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened, as I am sure all of those who knew him were, by the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Melvin J. Maas, who served as a Representative from the State of Minnesota until 1945.

I will leave to those who knew him during his service in the House to pay tribute to him for that type of dedicated public service, but the fact that he received the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, and the Legion of Merit based on his service in the Marine Corps in World War II, is sufficient indication of the type of service which he rendered the country in the military.

Mel Maas served with distinction in any position which he occupied. He made an especially fine contribution as National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

He never really retired from public life and some of the finest contributions which he made were during the period which he served as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, a position he held at the time of his death. It was here, and in personal contact, that Mel made his greatest contribution. He literally saved the lives of some of his despairing colleagues by inspiring them and by giving them a reason to live. In his later years, as most of you know, he was blind, but this was a physical weakness which did not affect his great spirit in any degree.

The Congress is a better place because of our late colleague's service here. The world is a better place because he lived, and certainly the thousands of handicapped individuals to whom he dedicated his later years, can attest to that fact, as those of us can who had the honor of knowing of some of his activities.

Pan American Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, this is Pan American Week marking the 74th anniversary of the establishment by the American Republics of the inter-American system which is known as the Organization of American States.

The President, in proclaiming this special week, rededicated the Nation "to the ideals of the inter-American system, and to the principles and objectives of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Charter of Punta del Este. For on the maintenance of these ideals and the achievement of these objectives depends the future of freedom, human dignity, and national independence in this hemisphere."

Mr. Speaker, the United States signed the Charter of Punta del Este in August of 1961. Already there are forces at work in this country which would contravene our solemn pledge to help our neighbors in Latin America to help themselves.

I am speaking specifically of that portion of the Charter of Punta del Este which called on the developed countries to "avoid increasing the unecomonic production of goods which can be obtained under better conditions in the less developed countries of the continent, in which the production of these goods is an important source of employment."

Last week, some of my colleagues sent a letter to President Johnson asking the administration to support an increase in domestic sugar production of at least a million tons. This million tons of sugar would be taken away from the sugar-producing countries of the world, primarily those in Latin America.

Sugar is the third most important dollar earner for these countries. Surely, if we reduce imports of their basic commodities, we will seriously restrict their ability to buy our agricultural and manufactured exports. In 1962, these nations imported some $4.2 billion of American goods.

We had a favorable balance of trade of $713.6 million with these countries. If we reduce imports of sugar, will we continue to have that favorable balance of trade?

I call on the President, the administration, and my colleagues in the House of Representatives to resist this attempt by highly subsidized, high-cost beet sugar industry to contravene the objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este—a move that certainly would jeopardize our own Nation's economic health.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Foreign Agriculture, April 6, 1964:

PAN AMERICAN DAY MARKS ANOTHER ANNIVERSARY IN OUR HISTORIC TRADE WITH LATIN AMERICA

Next week, on April 14, the Pan American Union, now a part of the Organization of American States, will observe its 74th anniversary.

From the start, this nonpolitical association concentrated on trade, its charter listing its purpose "to promote good relations among the American Republics through trade relationships and exchange of information pertaining to commerce." Yet this is only another milestone in the historic trade between the Americas that began back in the 17th century when the American Colonies were shipping cargoes of flour, codfish, and beef to the Spanish Territories in the Caribbean in return for their sugar, molasses, and fruit.

Today this mutual exchange of products represents the largest hemispheric trade in the world, and much of it is agricultural. The United States takes over three-fourths of Latin America's coffee and bananas, 40 percent of its cocoa beans, and a large part of the sugar (excluding Cuba's) that it sells on world markets.

These and other Latin American products, valued at $4 billion, accounted for nearly one-fourth of total U.S. imports in 1963. But this trade is not a one-way street. It provides the basis for U.S. exports of industrial and manufactured goods as well as a wide range of agricultural commodities to Latin American markets each year.

DECADE OF PROGRESS

Trade relationships between the Americas were greatly strengthened by the favorable economic growth which occurred during the decade following World War II. In the United States this growth spurred demand for agricultural and mineral products under terms of trade which were very favorable to the Latin American nations, and, in turn, this increased trade contributed to significant rises in the per capita gross national product of the Latin American Republics.

This decade of progress created in Latin America a growing market for U.S. farm products. Urban development, rapid population growth, and improved incomes in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, and the Central American countries, upped the demand for our grains, fats and oils, fruits, vegetables, meat, and dairy products. As a result, the value of U.S. agricultural exports to the Latin American republics rose from an average of $46 million for the prewar period, 1935–39, to $448 million for the 1950–54 period.

After the mid-1950's, as expected production around the world increased competition and weakened world market prices for most Latin American exports, the demand for U.S. agricultural imports slowed down. Depressed world prices contributed to reduced foreign exchange earnings, inationary pressures, and a general tapering off in economic growth. Trade restrictions and other measures adopted to conserve scarce foreign exchange and capital resources generally favored those products needed to maintain industrial development.

In consequence, the nature of our trade with Latin America changed. Today approximately one-third of our food shipments to the area fall under the food-for-peace program, which is based on Public Law 480 enacted in 1954. Oriented to the economic objectives of developing nations, this law permits them to purchase their needed foodstuffs in their own currency. The law is also geared to long-range expansion of agricultural trade. Its effectiveness is evidenced from the fact that last year U.S. agricultural exports to Latin America (excluding Cuba, once our leading Latin American market) were valued at $485 million compared to the 1950–54 average of $331 million.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The future of our trade with Latin America is closely related to the area's economic progress. These countries continue to face serious problems of stabilization and economic adjustment. They are unable to expand their agriculture to meet rapidly increasing consumption and export needs. Their weakened foreign exchange position continues to affect productive investment, and inflation still persists.

To overcome some of these difficulties two free trade areas have been organized in Latin America: The Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), which associates Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay; and the Central American Free Trade Association (CAFTA), linking Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. The goal of these two associations, as with all common market groupings, is to foster trade among the member countries and promote economic growth.

Even more important as positive factors are the food-for-peace program and the Alliance for Progress. By obtaining agricultural commodities under food for peace, the Latin American countries can more fully satisfy their food needs and, at the same time, apply their scarce foreign exchange earnings to economic development. The Alliance for Progress, in which the United States is the principal partner, is also expected to stimulate economic growth, improve levels of income, and further the demand for food and fiber.

Crime and Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the administration of criminal justice in America is hardly a highwater mark in the progress of civilization. For a country which takes pride in its ability to find new solutions for old problems, we have long since been surpassed in our treatment of crime—the most ancient foe of free society.

No one is more acutely aware of this than our Nation's chief jailer, Federal Bureau of Prisons Director James V. Bennett. Free to live outside jail walls, he has chosen to work within them. His experience and judgment are a unique source of insight for all of us who make the laws which send men to jail and determine the conditions under which they will live there.

The April issue of Harpers magazine carries an article by Mr. Bennett, entitled "A Cool Look at the Crime Crisis." It should dispel any comfortable notions Americans may have about the justice of our criminal laws or the adequacy of our penal system. Anyone who has ever had the fleeting thought: "There, but for the grace of God, go I," should take the few minutes required to read it.

The article follows:

A COOL LOOK AT THE CRIME CRISIS

(By James V. Bennett)

(The Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons points out that many widely believed "facts" about crime simply aren't true. A leading proponent of enlightened penology and criminal law in this country, Mr. Bennett was chairman of the United Nations Conference on Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders held in London in 1960)

The main corridor of the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta is paved with Georgia marble of a hardness rare among the substances of this planet. Yet on both sides of this corridor clearly discernible paths have been worn by the feet of thousands of men shuffling three times daily from the enormous cellhouses to the dining room, and back again.

It is staggering to contemplate the mass frustration, the restlessness, the human defeat—and the challenge—represented in those paths. If you stand between the lines of marching prisoners and search their faces, as I have frequently done, they look like men you would meet anywhere. Few of them are smiling, for few are happy. Here and there is the bowed figure of a defeated old man; now and then, a head held proudly high.

The men in Atlanta are much like those in any other large penitentiary. Among them undoubtedly are many hillbilly bootleggers, very similar to one I saw starting his fourth prison term not long ago. He was wearing a Silver Star emblem in his lapel buttonhole. He lived in a shotgun cabin on five burned-out acres in southern Alabama with his wife and seven "head" of kids. "What could he do?" asked the deputy marshal who brought him to prison. "Not being able to get relief, was he to leave the family, let the kids starve—or go to making whisky?"

In another Federal prison, there is a young girl who was sent there for pasting a canceled stamp on a letter she mailed to get a free cosmetic sample. She is feebleminded, impoverished, and a Negro in a southern State that has achieved worldwide notoriety for its treatment of her race.

In prison too is the youngster who "borrowed" a car to escape from a family situation he found intolerable. The statistics classify stealing a car as a serious crime, even though most cars are stolen for only a few hours' use and not for monetary gain. There will be more cars stolen as each year adds more school dropouts and more homes wrecked by alcohol or divorce. Does this mean that serious crime is increasing ominously?

The average newspaper reader's answer to this question is likely to be based on highly suspect fare. He reads the crime statistics but he has no way of evaluating them in relation to population, economic conditions, changing laws, and social attitudes. Nor can he judge the relative harmfulness of the many offenses which are recorded. Dramatizing the statistics are the press reports of spectacular crimes, exploits of big time criminals, and sensational trials. To complete the frightening picture, TV provides crime and courtroom dramas which reflect little of the truth about real crimes and criminals.

As a prison director I have a different perspective. For one thing, I think in terms of individuals rather than statistics. I know, of course, that on any given day there are about 220,000 men and women in our State and Federal prisons and another 100,000 in local and county jails. Taking the turnover rate into account, we see that approximately a million people spend some time behind bars during the course of a year. But most of them are not the murderers, rapists, and kidnapers pictured by the average citizen.

More than three-fourths of the men and women who are locked up in local jails are drunks, vagrants, mentally ill or defective, or social misfits of other kinds. Of those sentenced to State and Federal penitentiaries, more than two-thirds have been convicted of nonviolent crimes such as forgery, auto

theft, housebreaking, and larceny. Less than 10 percent have been found guilty of homicide, rape, or kidnaping.

BEHIND THE STATISTICS

What else do the statistics tell us? We discover that only a handful of the people who go to prison are women, some 8,000 altogether. Is this because women are less criminally inclined than men? Probably not. They stay out of jail in part because everyone—including cops, judges, and juries—tends to be more lenient with female than with male offenders. And from time immemorial women have not been reluctant to share a man's money and possessions however nefariously obtained. Professional prostitutes outnumber the men who are in prison.

Some of America's top check forgers, blackmailers, and embezzlers are women. I think, for instance, of the woman—now in the Federal penitentiary in Alderson, W. Va.—who inspired such confidence in a rubber-stamp board of directors that she was able to steal and spend more than $2 million over a period of 30 years. Another woman manager of a savings and loan association hoodwinked the auditors and her superiors so effectively that shortages mounted to more than $400,000 before she was discovered. I know of no male embezzler who has been as adroit, although there are enough inside bank jobs every year to keep the bank examiners from being smug.

Certainly all too many men and women succeed in outwitting the law, at least for a while. But there is reason to believe that progress is being made in controlling crime if we study the data in depth. For example, in the past 30-odd years, the homicide rate has been cut nearly in half, dropping from 8.9 per 100,000 of our civilian population in 1930 to 5.1 in 1962. The actual number of homicides declined for a time from the 10,500 that were recorded in 1980, and later rose again. In 1962 the total reached only 9,500 although the population had increased 50 percent since 1930. We may conclude that the life of the ordinary citizen is a good deal safer than it used to be—despite the contrary impression created by headlines.

It is enlightening also to ponder the figures on bank robbery, a crime always much advertised in the Nation's press. In 1962 banks lost about $1,800,000 in 461 holdups. This was a 27 percent increase over 1961. But in the depression year of 1932, 609 banks were held up for losses aggregating $3,400,000. Yet today there are 5,300 more banks than existed in 1932. The individual bank, it would seem, is far less likely to be robbed now than in John Dillinger's time. In fact, the American Bankers Association, in a paper issued in September 1963, said that in view of the growth in banking "it cannot be realistically contended that bank crime has grown to unmanageable proportions."

We have no statistics comparing previous generations with our own. But historians tell us that past ages have been incontestably more lawless. They tell us also that the wholesale application of every cruelty conceivable to the human mind proved futile in reducing crime. The men who ran prisons in medieval and Elizabethan times experimented intensively in the art of administering inhumanity to man—but few experiments in all human history failed so completely.

Among the most disturbing of current statistics are the records of juvenile delinquency—a half-million youngsters are handled by our juvenile courts each year. Certainly, we must take every possible step to redirect them. But we should also use the perspective of time to reassure ourselves that the modern generation is not as black as it is painted. Less than a century ago, as Herbert Asbury pointed out in "The Gangs of New York," the city swarmed with youngsters who stole, murdered, rioted, and engaged in every form of debauchery. Offsetting today's juvenile delinquency statistics, other figures show that 35 percent of college-age young people are going to college today in contrast to less than 5 percent before World War I. The fact is that our young people are doing more to prepare themselves for lives of responsibility than any previous generation.

In evaluating the crime statistics we also ought to ponder the fact that the general prison population of the counrty is declining. Last year in 27 prison systems the absolute number of inmates declined; in 32 systems the ratio of prisoners to the general population fell. Across the Nation there are now 118.3 persons in prison per 100,000 people; the ratio ranges from 258.3 in the District of Columbia and 179.6 in Maryland to 26.3 in New Hampshire and 37.2 in North Dakota. When the Federal Government started publishing prison statistics in 1939 the national rate of imprisonment was 137.6; this figure has not since been matched; it fell to 101.2 during World War II.

RACKETEERS AND TEENAGERS

The men and women now in our prisons are individuals with hearts, lungs, and emotions like anyone else. To say this is to invite reproach for "coddling" criminals, a charge frequently made in legislatures and newspaper editorials.

There is a bitter irony in this accusation, for, in fact, the criminal in America is dealt with harshly indeed. Our criminal laws are the most severe in the world, and our legislative bodies are still at work making them more severe. Except possibly for "enemies of the state" in countries where people are sent to prison for political reasons, the American criminal on the average serves several times as long a sentence in prison as his counterpart anywhere else in the world.

The injustices that result from our highly punitive criminal laws are compounded by the fact that the sentence of the court is not subject to review in most American jurisdictions. Among civilized nations the United States[1] is alone in denying to the convicted any avenue of appeal even for sentences of Draconian severity. Only in America do we find, occasionally, sentences of 199 years and 100 years, and regularly sentences of 30, 40, and 50 years. In England in the course of a year no more than 150 men are likely to be given sentences of 5 years or more. In the United States the number is about 15,000.

The successful defense lawyer knows how to maneuver his case and his client so that they come before an "understanding" judge. But the average defendant is at the mercy of the widely disparate sentences given by different courts in different parts of the country and even by different judges in the same court. A person convicted of homicide in Texas will probably serve about 5½ years, but in Illinois 16½. For all types of felonies the convicted offender serves about 1 year in Vermont, but in nearby Rhode Island he averages nearly 4.

President Kennedy, whose compassion exceeded that of most men, took an unusual interest in the problems of "equal justice under law" and used his powers of Executive clemency to redress judicial savagery. In one case, he cut the life sentence of a teenage epileptic addict convicted of a narcotics charge (his sentence can be compared with that of Vito Genovese, the alleged kingpin of the American narcotics racket, who got only 15 years). He also reduced the 15-year sentence given a young, minor bank embezzler who arrived in prison at the same time as another young bank embezzler from another court in the same district—with a 6-month sentence for an identical offense.

To their great credit the Federal judges now meet several times a year in seminars and institutes to find ways of minimizing such inequities. But the problem remains.

SHADOWY MINDS

To deplore injustice is not to suggest that we should, in any way, relax our efforts to enforce the law and reduce crime. The dilemma is how best to do it.

The problem is heightened by the fact that a sizable proportion of crimes are committed by psychopaths and mentally sick people. I recall, for example, a bank robber who was known as the Black Phantom. He was an ex-cop who financed affairs with some 40-odd women by holding up banks. After he was caught and committed to a Federal prison for observation, we found that he also had a rich fantasy life. He liked to don a black cloak and hat and spring out of the darkness of alleyways upon befuddled drunks. His mind was as shadowy as the alleys he prowled and he needed psychiatric treatment. Psychiatrists, to be sure, do not have an answer for the problem of crime but they do contribute illuminating insights into the behavior of criminals. Yet there are only 50 professional psychiatrists among the 232 major Federal and State prisons and reformatories. At other levels, trained personnel are also scarce, and except in a handful of prison systems, salaries are too low to attract competent people. Buildings too are generally rundown, obsolete, and jammed with prisoners. One of the best prison systems is the research-conscious organization created in California by Gov. Earl Warren, now Chief Justice of the United States. One of the worst is in Mississippi, where the lash is still in generous use.

The State prison in Trenton, N.J., was opened in 1798 and many of its buildings date back as far as 1836. It is a disgrace to American penalogy. But here and there, where new prisons are being built, the old bastille concept has been discarded. We are no longer building massive walled facilities housing as many as 4,000 or 5,000 prisoners. Instead, the trend is toward open or medium-security prisons for 400, 500, or 600 inmates. Outstanding examples are the "Prison Without Walls" at Seagoville, Tex., and the fine State institution at Fox Lake, Wis., where the inmates carry their own keys.[2]

Do most ex-convicts eventually return to prison? Are they as unredeemable as those who push for harsher penalties say they are? Certainly the ex-convict who wants to go straight can expect to have a rough time. When he leaves the walls he doesn't have money enough to last more than a few days. Many firms will not give him a job, at least if they know about his record. Sometimes even his family doesn't want anything to do with him. And in some cities the police will pick him up on any pretext, to put him into the day's "lineup" or merely to harass him so much that he'll move on to another town.

But the typical ex-prisoner persists in his efforts to surmount these difficulties. A 5-year study of Federal prisoners, done by the University of Illinois under a Ford Foundation grant, indicated that 9 out of 10 prisoners intend to take up an honest way of life when they get out. Some fail in their good intentions, but the same study proved that two-thirds are successful in staying out of trouble.[3]

---

[1] In Massachusetts, Connecticut, and a few other States, review of sentence is possible under certain circumstances. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA of Nebraska has introduced a bill—S. 823—providing for appellate review of all sentences imposed by Federal courts.

[2] For other examples, see "Without Bars," by Giles Playfair, on p. 171.

[3] See "After the Stretch," by Morris Rudensky, on p. 180.

Our prison systems will not succeed in permanently "reforming" larger numbers of their graduates until communities are ready to play a much larger part in the rehabilitation process. And I wish that this problem would attract more serious attention and public discussion than, for example, the perennial emotional debate about capital punishment.

The issue here is between people who are certain that only the electric chair, the gas chamber, and the gallows protect us from an overwhelming horde of criminals, and others who consider these grim devices the stamp of a brutal and primitive society.

Both sides are unduly hysterical. The capital-punishment issue in all probability will not be resolved by legislation. Rather, the death sentence will be used with increasing caution as people come to realize that the ultimate penalty can be justified for relatively few offenders. Already the number of executions has fallen from 199 in 1935 to 57 in 1962. In many States which still retain capital punishment, no one has been put to death for decades. As our civilization advances, the use of the penalty will continue to decline.

But it should remain on the books. Shrink as we might from putting a human being to death, there are some crimes for which there seems to be no other fitting penalty: acts of high treason, for example; blowing up a loaded passenger plane in flight; kidnaping and killing a child. If Lee Harvey Oswald had lived to be convicted, what other penalty could possibly have been appropriate for such a heinous crime?

Today, it is chiefly the indigent, the friendless, the Negro, and the mentally ill who are doomed to death. Or the young. Only this year Georgia raised to 16 the lower age limitation for execution. It was formerly 10. There should be an automatic psychiatric examination for everyone accused of a capital crime and an automatic appeal for everyone convicted of one.

MURDER OVER THE COUNTER

The people arguing about capital punishment could put their time to better use by jointly pressing for such safeguards.

They would do well, also, to ask why we send so many people to prison and yet make it so easy for them to commit crimes? Why, for example, don't we have more effective controls on the firearms traffic? In the United States today almost anyone can obtain a gun almost anywhere. All he needs is the money and not much of that. Here and there, a few laws and ordinances have been enacted to control gun transactions, but they are ineffective in the absence of uniform regulation throughout the country.

There are now an estimated 50 million handguns, rifles, and shotguns in the hands of private individuals. Two million more are made and sold in this country every year, and an additional half million are imported from other countries—with virtually no control of any kind, as demonstrated by the ease with which Oswald got his scope rifle. We have robbers in our penitentiaries who bought their guns over the counter on their way down the street to stick up a liquor store. The last man to be executed by the Federal Government had a history of criminality and mental illness, but no one asked him any questions when he bought a gun at a sporting goods store. The questions didn't start until he used the gun to kill a doctor who was a complete stranger.

The assassination of President Kennedy was a dramatic and tragic result of the uncontrolled gun traffic. But 5,000 other victimes are kill each year with guns in the hands of people who should not be permitted to have them.

The assassination also dramatized the hostilities in the breasts of many persons. The pressures of our high-voltage society are too intense for many people to bear, and the consequence is too often a mental illness characterized by hostility toward one's fellow man. Oswald was one example, but every law-enforcement officer knows of other individuals equally ruthless. We need facilities for the treatment of the hostile, mentally ill persons who become involved in crime. But an even greater problem is the ratpack of hostile and mentally ill individuals who spew forth hatred and venom to foul the atmosphere of an otherwise tolerant democracy. They foster and actively incite disrespect for the law, and we shall not achieve a more orderly society until we learn how to deal with them.

Currently, there is a trend to attack the crime problem by bringing the Federal Government more actively into the picture. My friends from abroad are amazed at the multiplicity of offenses over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction, at last count numbering more than 2,000 felonies. They want to know how local law enforcement is helped by having the Federal Government assume jurisdiction over crimes that also lie within the purview of State authorities. The fact is that when the Federal Government enters a field, the local and State authorities tend to abdicate. At the very least, misunderstandings and jealousies result which hobble law enforcement. The overlapping of criminal laws sends into Federal prisons the physically handicapped, the alcoholic, and the other social misfits who are really the responsibility of local and State authorities.

THE GOAL IS NOT UTOPIA

Jurisdictional overlapping must be eliminated if agencies of different types and Federal and State agencies are to work effectively together. At present the multiplication of law-enforcement and treatment agencies has made a morass out of the entire effort to combat crime. Competing agencies spar for jurisdiction over the sensational case or the one that has political implications. More than one prosecutor has reached high office on the basis of publicity afforded by some sensational case. But the overall goal of crime prevention is not served in the process. This is a task for quiet, firm, persistent cooperative effort.

The fruit of such effort can be considerable. But it will not be a utopia free of crime. Human beings are infinitely varied, and some of their behavior is bound to be considered criminal by at least a portion of society. The challenge we must meet is to reduce the basic causes of crime, improve law-enforcement methods, and use more effectively the techniques that have been developed for changing human behavior. The existence of crime and criminals should spur us on to experimentation, infuse new life into our efforts to rid the country of social injustices, and make us all a little more tolerant of each other's imperfect conduct.

Capitol Pages Should Not Be Judged by Bobby Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress it was a genuine pleasure for me to help a young man from my congressional district to serve as a Republican page. He conducted himself as a gentleman and a fine American citizen and reflected great credit upon his parents, upon me as his sponsor, and upon the House of Representatives. I shall always be proud that I had the privilege of appointing Douglas Bosco, of Sunnyvale, Calif., as a page in the House of Representatives.

There is much unfounded criticism and overgeneralization of the Capitol Hill page system. I, therefore, thought a recent article written for the Sunnyvale Standard for April 1 by Doug Bosco, giving the truth about the page system from one with firsthand experience, should be brought to the attention of the entire membership.

The article follows:

PAGE BOY SYSTEM UNFAIRLY BLAMED

(By Douglas Bosco)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Drawing on his recent experience as a congressional page, Sunnyvale teenager, Douglas Bosco, offers the follow analysis of the controversy surrounding the "pagedom" system.)

Shortly before the Civil War, Daniel Webster and Henry Clay recommended to the Senate of the United States that a young man of 9 be appointed to serve the Senate and House as a messenger boy. Although older messengers had been used by Congress since its origin in 1789, the Senators felt a need for smaller, more agile young men to do the job, and so, upon the urging of Webster, the Senate appointed its first page.

As the country grew and Congress expanded, the Senate and House of Representatives could no longer operate with just one messenger, and since the time of Webster and Clay 77 boys have been added to the staff.

These young men come from all parts of the country, and range in age from 14 to 18. Appointed only by Members of Congress and Supreme Court Justices, these boys serve Congress in many capacities. Some carry messages, others answer phones, guard the Chamber doors, file bills, or perform many other tasks which greatly help Congress in its daily operation.

These young men have earned for themselves an excellent reputation throughout the years. Their experience in working closely with Congress has aided them in achieving personal success in many fields, and some have later returned to represent their districts and States in the U.S. Capitol.

This outstanding record, however, has suddenly been damaged, in the eyes of many Americans, and in Congress, by the actions of one former page—and the results have put the whole system on the chopping block. Unfortunately, the most famous page of all is not the one who served in Congress or in many other notable professions, but rather Robert G. Baker.

For some strange reason, various Members of Congress began to investigate the page system and the daily life of the average page—including where he lives, what he does in his spare time, and how he spends his money. Although the system has worked exceptionally well for over a hundred years, and was functioning properly at the time, Congress and the newspapers suddenly found that pages lead a very "unwholesome" life, and radical changes had to be made.

It made a good story, anyway, and another thing—it diverted people's attention from the Baker case. Although no one has directly connected the two problems, a loose connection between Bobby Baker and pagedom formed in many minds.

What Congress and the press are doing, however, is exaggerating the problems which do exist and imagining some which never did. The result is that much has been said,

little has been done, and a clear-cut definition of the actual problem has yet to be made.

It must be realized that some problems will always exist with boys who are away from home at a relatively young age. An adjustment must be made to a somewhat independent, difficult, and rigorous, new life—and the boys have to learn to take care of themselves.

Most of the newly appointed young men have been able to adjust very well to this new life, and most are responsible civil servants who reflect favorably on Congress and their individual sponsors.

The few boys who cause the real troubles are almost always those who never should have been appointed in the first place. Unfortunately, some Members of Congress send boys to Washington because their fathers are campaign contributors, or influential men in the community, and not because the boy himself is qualified and could handle the difficult job of being a page.

Some Congressmen rotate their page appointments monthly, to cover more bases back home. These 1-month boys don't have nearly enough time to learn their job, but instead use the opportunity for a 30-day paid vacation. Among the other boys they are known as "30-day wonders." These pages, along with the rich men's sons who suddenly found that they couldn't have all the comforts of home, cause the real problem.

Although the idea of a special page dormitory has been discussed in Congress, as well as some disciplinary suggestions, no steps have been taken to encourage or require the appointment of well-qualified boys. Therefore, until Congress is more careful and selective with its page appointments, the problem will still exist—and many worthy young men will be denied the opportunity of being a page.

As for Bobby Baker, he can hardly be used as an example, although some Members of Congress have brought up his name in connection with the alleged "page scandal."

During last month's committee interrogation of Baker, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, went so far as to ask Baker himself how he thought the page system should be changed. Baker abandoned his fifth amendment policy of the afternoon, and said that he would send PELL a letter explaining his views on the subject.

Perhaps it will come as a surprise to the Senate Rules Committee, which is now deciding the future of pages in Congress, that Bobby Baker learned what he did long after he graduated from Capitol Page School. For in the school yearbook, which requests that each graduate submit a quotation to accompany his picture, Bobby Baker, class of 1945, chose for himself:

"His best companions, innocence and health.

And his best riches, ignorance of wealth."

Franklin Square Post Office Cited for Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in August 1962, in order to create a continuing awareness of good housekeeping practices by all employees of the postal service and to improve the postal image to the general public, the Post Office Department instituted an award entitled "Citation for Excellence." This award is authorized for presentation to those facilities demonstrating superior accomplishments.

Recently, after a survey of housekeeping practices at more than 1,500 post offices, the post office at Franklin Square, Nassau County, N.Y., which is in the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing, was adjudged to be superior and eligible for the citation.

My congratulations to Postmaster Anthony B. Nicastri and all the employees of his post office in Franklin Square who contributed to the award.

The wording of the award follows:

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S CITATION FOR EXCELLENCE

To the community of Franklin Square and its postal employees for maintaining the building and grounds of the Franklin Square Post Office in such a manner as to provide a clean, attractive, and pleasant place in which the public may conduct its postal business.

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

I am proud that this post office is located in my congressional district.

Quality Stabilization Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the 1963 Annual Meeting of Western Association of Attorneys General held October 6–9 in the Hotel Westward Ho, of Phoenix, Ariz. in opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill.

The resolution speaks for itself and points out very clearly the tremendous danger of the free competitive economy and to our society generally inherent in the iniquitous so-called quality stabilization bill, S. 774 and H.R. 3669.

The resolution follows:

PROPOSED QUALITY STABILIZATION ACT, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation styled S. 774 and H.R. 3669, bearing the title "Quality Stabilization Act." Although so titled, it is in fact another price maintenance bill of the type which had had the so-called fair trade label for many years.

Whereas S. 774 and H.R. 3669 would authorize the owner of a brand name or trademark to establish the resale prices of goods bearing his identifying mark. The Western Association of Attorneys General, at the 1963 annual meeting, opposes enactment of this legislation or similar legislation which, it is submitted, would result in the following undesirable consequences:

1. Establish price fixing by private individuals as a substitute for free and open competition, the keystone of the American economy;

2. Undermine existing antitrust laws and the free competition system which the antitrust laws are designed to protect;

3. Weaken statutes and principles governing public competitive bidding;

4. Raise prices paid by consumers and thereby encourage inflation;

5. Foster a climate favorable to price-fixing agreements among competitors;

6. Increase disrespect for the law because the public and business will attempt to evade what is against their economic interests; and

7. Add the heavy cost of enforcing private price-fixing agreements to the cost borne by the consumer.

The Western Association of Attorneys General as an organization and each of its members pledge resistance to the enactment of S. 774 and H.R. 3669. This organization requests its chairman to take immediate steps to make known to Congress its opposition to such legislation, despite the fact that the proposed legislation provides exemption for sales to or by Federal, State, or municipal governments or their political subdivisions or agencies. This exemption clause, in the opinion of the Western Association of Attorneys General, based on previous experience with similar legislation, fails to provide the protection sought for public agencies because it does not permit adequate enforcement or penalties for violation thereof.

"Quality Stabilization Acts" proposed to the last Congress and to the current Congress are opposed by the U.S. Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the U.S. Department of Commerce, Council of State Governments, the American Bar Association, the National Association of State Purchasing Officials, and many other public and nonpublic bodies and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of Attorneys General opposes enactment of S. 774 and H.R. 3669 and directs the secretariat to send copies of this resolution to members of the Rules Committee, the House of Representatives, the Senate Commerce Committee, the Attorney General of the United States, and to all Governors and State attorneys generals.

Eventually, So Why Not Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the April 11 South Bend Tribune concerning the current railroad dispute.

The editorial follows:

EVENTUALLY, SO WHY NOT NOW?

The showdown that would have resulted in a nationwide railroad strike has been postponed again to give the unions and operators more time to discuss the issues.

The delay is welcome. It raises the possibilities of a settlement without a strike and all it would entail in terms of inconvenience to the public and adverse affects on the economy, especially if it dragged on for weeks like the last nationwide steel strike.

But the 15-day grace period is short, indeed, in view of the length of the period that the unions and the railroads have been arguing over rules changes (since 1959 in some instances) without notable progress toward agreement.

So the best that can be said of the postponement is that it leaves the door open to a settlement without the disruptive influences of a strike; it does little to encourage op-

timism that it will bring forth an agreement.

It is an unfortunate circumstance for the country.

Two of the issues that nearly boiled over into a strike last year are not involved this time.

But some other rules changes which presidential boards and commissions and even the courts have held the railroads are entitled to make are bitterly opposed by the unions which see job losses for some and pay cuts for others. The unions say they would strike if the railroads attempt to impose new rules. No one seriously doubts that they would.

The strike that might have gripped the Nation yesterday was averted when the operators yielded again to administration pressure to delay putting new rules into effect.

It will require an uncommon amount of business-labor statesmanship to resolve the issues without a strike, without government intervention and without lingering bitterness to bedevil railroad labor-management relations for years to come.

But, as Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz said the other day: "The public interest demands that the dispute be settled, that it be settled immediately, and that it be settled by agreement."

Both unions and operators should recognize the basic truth of Mr. Wirtz's statement in their own interests. There will be an agreement one way or another eventually. So why not now and why not get it at the free bargaining table?

Foreign Aid: U.S. Labor Programs in Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there are many aspects to a well-rounded aid program in any country. Take, for example, Turkey, a valuable and strategically located ally which links Europe with Asia. Most of this country of 30,000 square miles is a high, semiarid plateau surrounded by mountains. Its population which was estimated at 29.4 million in 1962 has a per capita income of $210. Although agriculture still predominates, the mining of its rich mineral deposits and the rising industrial sector are contributing more and more to the development of a modern Turkish state.

Just as important as the economic aid we are giving Turkey to achieve this advancement is our assistance to their labor ministry and private labor unions through AID development grants. If Turkey and other countries like it are to become vigorous, modern states, they must not only encourage technical advancement but also foster a corresponding change in attitudes and institutions. This change must not only permeate the upper classes, but necessarily pervade the working classes which, more than any other group, could be attracted to communism.

Thus, our Turkish labor aid program does not only cover inplant training projects, which provide Turkish enterprises with skilled workers and manpower projects with the Turkish Ministry of Labor, which encourage the study of manpower needs, but it also includes the training of labor officials, at the national, regional, and local level. Under agreements reached with Turkey's Organization for Economic Cooperation that began in fiscal year 1961 and are scheduled to end in fiscal year 1968, the Turkish Confederation of Labor, which represents 162 local unions whose combined membership exceeds 400,000, has responsibility for the education and training projects. Working with them are two full-time American advisers who have so far obtained promising results.

In the spirit of joint participation, the scope of this program encompasses the entire labor relations field. This year approximately 900 Turkish trade union leaders, from shop stewards to top level union leaders will study areas vital to them. Subjects include collective bargaining, agriculture production, industrial relations, and such complicated courses as labor economics and statistics and labor law administration.

Although most training takes place in Turkey, some trade unionists, under the participant training program, are visiting the United States to study our labor problems and the techniques of American unions. One such recent visitor, Mr. Oktay Poyraz, director of public relations and publications for the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions, said after spending 4 months here with different American unions that "AID does a tremendous job with its exchange program, especially with labor and in the trade union field."

It is certainly heartening to hear such praise of and appreciation for our aid program. However, the success of this project is possibly best illustrated by the expression of interest from the business sector. Following the Turkish law of July 1963 calling for collective bargaining and free trade unionism, business has shown a desire for management training as well.

An Economist in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the April issue of Challenge magazine our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, CLARENCE D. LONG, former professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University, has written a wise and perceptive article describing his personal transition from the campus to Capitol Hill. I commend it strongly to all Members of the House.

In the course of his article, the gentleman from Maryland, Professor LONG, discusses the problem of structural unemployment and repeats a long-held conviction that the current unemployment problem is largely due, not to inadequate demand, but to the substandard quality of the supply.

He says that the modern problem of structural unemployment is largely the result of the social minimum wage which applies mainly to the worker of humble qualifications, and which has priced him more or less permanently out of the labor market.

The gentleman from Maryland, Professor LONG, says that the solution to the structural unemployment problem does not lie in any of the questionable remedies that have been suggested such as double pay for overtime, a third layer of subsidy to cotton mills, higher tariffs on steel imports, increases in the minimum wage, supports and controls for wheat, retaining obsolete military bases, and accelerating public works projects. Such programs, he says, are "doubtful economics" and only impede adjustments as well as lead to other economic problems.

Under unanimous consent, this important article follows:

CAMPUS TO CAPITOL HILL—AN ECONOMIST IN THE HOUSE

(By CLARENCE D. LONG)

(While economists often criticize politicians for either ignoring or no understanding the complexities of economic issues, one wonders how different economic legislation would be if Congress were composed of professional economists. CLARENCE D. LONG was professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University until his election (as a Democrat) to Congress from the Second Maryland District in 1962. While his views on the major economic issues have changed little, he finds that by being a "service Congressman"—helping his constituents with personal problems—he has greater freedom in voting on national issues which most voters are not really interested in. After a little over 1 year on Capitol Hill, Representative LONG concludes that "in politics, pure economics must be heavily laced with pragmatism.")

A little over a year ago—after more than two decades as an economist—I took office as Representative from the Second Congressional District of Maryland. During my freshman year, the usual questions were put to me by my academic friends: "What theories have you been able to put into practice?" "Have your ideas changed since you went to Congress?" "How has your year in Congress affected your thinking on such closely related problems as unemployment, economic growth, and inflation?"

My initial reaction was gratification that anybody imagined I had had the time to think. In a year in which my Committee on Armed Services met 74 times and my subcommittee 16 times; in which I inspected our bases in Guantanamo Bay, Puerto Rico, Europe, and many parts of the United States; participated in voting on the floor; spoke in favor of fallout shelters and on the need to improve the quality of human resources in order to reduce unemployment and raise incomes; introduced a dozen bills; sent out 200,000 copies of my newsletter; spoke to, or attended, 650 meetings; lectured to 2,500 students visiting the Capitol; kept 900 appointments in my offices; received 10,000 letters and signed 20,000—in such a year, did I really have time for reflection? Sixteen hours a day putting out fires leaves little time for the theory of combustion.

Nevertheless—in the midst of pressure to get a military burial for a combat veteran to eliminate an official reprimand from the record of an employee who had his arm chewed off in a hamburger grinder, or to get information for a businessman on wheth-

er he can legally reproduce the President's seal for business use—I welcome the opportunity to reflect on what my first year in the national legislature has done to the ideas I had formed in teaching and writing on economic questions.

Those familiar with the problems of unemployment, stagnation, and inflation are aware that opinion on their causes and cures divides into two broad schools of thought—the effective demand school and the structural school.

The effective demand school holds that the cause of unsold goods, idle labor, and unused plant capacity is insufficient spending by consumers, business, and government. Lack of spending may be due to not enough income, too much income going to oversavers, insufficient inducement to invest, and taxation which chokes off incentive. With the approval of this school, the Kennedy-Johnson administrations moved to cut the personal income tax, without an equivalent cut in government outlays, thereby leaving more spendable income to households and businesses. The corporate income tax was also cut in order to increase incentive. These tax cuts, it is held, will reduce unemployment and stimulate economic growth. They will not cause inflation, it is alleged, because the resources called into production will counter increases in demand with increases in supply.

The structural school holds that unemployment is due largely to deficiencies, not in demand, but in the quality of the labor supply. Joblessness is thus concentrated among the young, the old, the unskilled, the Negro, and manual laborer, the worker with a one-use skill, and, above all, the poorly educated or illiterate. This structure of unemployment is by now familiar and well documented. The question arises as to why structural unemployment is a new problem. Haven't there always been workers with these characteristics? Indeed, millions of unskilled, unlettered immigrants were absorbed by the American economy during the last half century before World War I, apparently without creating chronic unemployment. What is new in the current labor market which creates the modern problem of structural unemployment?

This new thing, I have argued, is the social minimum wage which applies mainly to the worker of humble qualifications and which has priced him more or less permanently out of the market. The last 20 years have seen the development of a formidable system of social minimums—statutory minimums, union minimums, unemployment insurance benefits, welfare, generous allowances given by middle-class families to teenage children, and high-wage policies of firms and governments.

Under social and political pressures, these minimums are geared to the average of wages and living standards, and rise with them—indeed, outpace them—with the result that they keep the services of the marginal workers overpriced and unemployed even during periods of high aggregate demand for labor. Further increases in aggregate demand may result in the employment of the overpriced and substandard worker, but only at the expense of still higher prices—and only temporarily, until a new upthrust in the social minimum wage again prices them out of the market.

Since the problem of structural unemployment is thus caused by two factors, the lagging productivity and the overpricing of poor quality labor, the remedy is also twofold: First, raise the productivity of poor quality labor by providing a massive program of education and training, and by eliminating discriminatory job barriers to enable workers to qualify for new opportunities. Second, stop boosting the social minimum which continually prices low-productivity labor out of the market.

This was my diagnosis of the problem before my election. How have this diagnosis and my views concerning sound policy been affected by my service in Congress?

Congressional experience has strengthened my view that the current unemployment problem is largely due, not to inadequate demand, but to the substandard quality of the supply. It has done this in a modest way through my own experience in hiring a full-time staff of eight. The number interviewed and the necessity of replacing several of those originally hired has reinforced my view that a substantial number of the unabsorbed labor force are of borderline employability. The employers I have talked to do not find this discovery surprising. Even a union leader told me, "Perhaps I shouldn't say this, but our problem nowadays is not so much with the employers as with the workers."

When I sought to employ a Negro secretary, I notified my numerous friends in the Negro communities in Baltimore and Washington (there are few Negroes in my own district) that I wanted a mature, well-educated woman who could type and handle casework. The salary—like all Federal salaries for secretaries—is much higher than that paid by private industry. I expected to be deluged with jobseekers. In actual fact, I received few applications. The employment offices of Howard University and Morgan State College informed me that good secretaries are scarce; any on file would probably be hired by the colleges themselves. I now have three Negro secretaries—more, I believe, than any other white Congressman, and all are quite satisfactory; but I do not have the impression that there are large numbers of well-educated and competent colored girls who cannot get jobs.

The chief insight my year has provided, however, has come from close contact with the unemployed who seek my help. On Saturdays I "ride the circuit"—each week meeting constituents in a different post office in my giant district. Usually the entire post office lobby is full of people waiting to see me. A random call of the roll includes:

A Negro boy, who barely graduated from high school, has been turned down for entrance in a junior college and has just fathered an illegitimate child. He seeks my aid in enlisting in the Army after he received a score of 3 percent on an exam in which the minimum passing grade is 31 percent.

A jobseeker who came to see me in the morning reeking with alcohol and who returned later in the day barely able to speak.

A father who asked me to get his 27-year-old married son's undesirable discharge from the Marines changed to honorable so the son could get a job. Unfortunately, the son's chances were impaired by his having since served 3 years for statutory rape.

A man in his forties—trying to support a family of five on a take-home pay of $218 a month, barely able to feed his family, his wife is mentally ill, the only clothing his children had were "what they were stealing," his teeth badly in need of care—said he "could do anything," but could not name a skill, and stated that, with his family responsibilities, he could not afford to enter the manpower retraining program.

A man unemployed since having been discharged from a steel plant 5 years earlier (with the union's consent) for assaulting his foreman, now taking psychiatric treatment and at the same time participating in the manpower retraining program.

A 45-year-old woman who had resigned several years ago as a bench hand in a large electronics firm just as she was about to be fired for absenteeism, got a job with another firm as a result of my intercession, but is dissatisfied and wants to change her job again.

This experience has impressed upon me that the unemployment problem—even in my relatively high income district—is a stubborn one. Nearly all the unemployed who come to me for jobs have one or more of the following characteristics: incomplete education (often nearing illiteracy), alcoholism, mental disturbance, prison or bad military conduct records, poor health or physical handicaps.

The older people and the Negroes who come to me are nearly always unemployed because of these handicaps and not primarily because of age or color—although, no doubt, these are complicating factors. I have gotten jobs for many, but of the ones I have been unable to place, I can think of none who does not fall into one or more of the categories of poor motivation, poor education and training, or emotional instability.

If I am correct in my assessment that the unemployment problem is primarily structural, what are the remedies? One of my lessons as an economist in Congress is that the political pressures are too often strongest for those remedies which involve questionable economics: greater subsidies to shipyards than the already high 55 percent; tariffs on imports of steel; a 35-hour workweek with double pay for overtime in order to discourage it; a third layer of subsidy to cotton mills; supports and controls for wheat; increases in the minimum wage; retaining obsolete military bases; accelerating and proliferating public works projects of dubious need.

Such programs are doubtful economics because they involve the production of things not needed or things available cheaper and better elsewhere; measures to prevent people from working, under the pretense of protecting them; or measures to provide jobs for the wrong people at the wrong places at the wrong times.

Such programs impede adjustments that are ultimately needed, impair flexibility, inflate costs and prices, place a burden of lower real incomes upon the general taxpayer, and shift the burden of idleness to workers in other areas or trades perhaps unprotected by unions or unable to perceive how they are being injured.

It is difficult to resist such proposals. For one thing, the arguments in support of them are often persuasive to Congressmen untrained in economics. More important, the businessmen and workers who come to your office to urge them are alive and present, are sincerely hurting, and are demanding immediate relief. The measures asked for promise to give this immediate relief in the workers' and firms' localities, and in their occupations and products. Proposals, however sound, that firms shift to new products and that middle-aged workers with families enroll for instruction in a new trade, take kids out of school, kiss families goodby and move to new localities—all these sound hollow even to one who prides himself, as I do, on being a free market economist.

Given this conflict of loyalties between good economics on the one hand, and suffering, voting, humans on the other, each Congressman must make his separate peace. The vote he casts will not please everybody, not even himself. Most politicians—including this one—hold firmly to the philosophy that, to be effective, they must stay in office. After all, the difference between a Congressman and the many high-class citizens who somehow never get to Congress, lies in the ability to get elected. Getting elected is a difficult art; those who deprecate it are invited to give it a whirl. Unfortunately, politicians are rarely frank in setting forth the essence of the art. All action in social, economic, and political affairs is a compromise of conflicting principles. When a politician tells an audience he never compro-

mises, he is either kidding the audience or kidding himself.

In my brief tenure I have followed one broad course in trying to vote good economics and at the same time to stay alive in the political jungle. I have become a "service Congressman," ever ready to stimulate local projects and to help with personal problems.

My activities in behalf of local projects have included organizing a mass meeting in support of a bridge across Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties; calling a defense procurement conference; setting up a business desk which has won contracts for radiosondes, rabbits for medical research, paper butter dishes and post office design; inviting and answering inquiries on how to get on bidders' lists and find new markets for products; mailing thousands of books and pamphlets to firms in my district on how to sell to various Government agencies; arranging meetings between Baltimore area industrialists and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in an endeavor to attract a $50 million electronics center to my area; waging a long fight against New York to win a $2.5 million nuclear research reactor for the Aberdeen Proving Ground; taking a keen interest in cleaning up dirty water and air in industrial areas of my district, and bringing in the Public Health Service to study this pollution for the purposes of law enforcement.

In addition to these civil programs, I have done much for individuals in need of help. A family denied social security benefits wrote to me: "An injustice has been done, but we do not know how to cope with the Government—it is too large." My appeal brought them $4,400 in back benefits. I persuaded the Internal Revenue Service to stop dunning an aged and indigent woman for back taxes. I got the State Department to allow a South African girl stranded in Canada to join her finance in America, and a young Austrian to visit her sister here. My latest triumph was to get a 17-year-old girl out from behind the Iron Curtain to join her family, who had not seen her since she was a baby.

All these efforts have won me a reputation as a hard-working Congressman, who helps people. As a result, my strongest potential opponents have backed away from running against me. I have discovered—or think I have—that most voters are not greatly interested in national legislation. They have problems and needs of their own, and if you help them with these, they allow you great freedom in voting on national legislation. Put it another way, a solid base of popularity with the ordinary voter gives a Congressman sanctuary from pressure groups who want things inimical to the national interest. As a consequence, I can vote solidly for civil rights in a basically Southern State with a white constituency drawn increasingly from the deep South.

Perhaps the least satisfactory aspect of being an economist in Congress is that it is seldom possible to cast a vote which does justice to all the many and subtle considerations that surround any major issue. For example, the tax cut and its effect on unemployment and economic growth are, to me, complicated and manysided questions.

I have grave doubts as to the need for, or the efficacy of, such a cut at a time when important indicators show that we are far from recession conditions. And all the arguments regarding our deficient aggregate demand have still not changed my mind. I voted for the cut because I had to make a choice. I was doubtful that a cut was justified; on the other hand, I was not absolutely certain that it would not help, and I was willing to take a chance on it.

I voted for the tax cut also for party reasons. As a Democrat, I am naturally convinced that my party is closer to the right answers in most matters and that it is important that the opposition not be allowed to hand us a black eye on an important issue. Thus the tax cut became a party, as well as an economic, issue.

There is also the matter of time and energy. Hundreds—nay, thousands—of economic bills come before Congress. While I can analyze and understand any one, or a small number, of such bills, to master all aspects of all such legislation is impossible, in view of the heavy demands to serve my district, receive visitors, speak to and visit in my district, read and answer thousands of letters and phone calls.

I am sometimes bemused by the fact that my vote normally does not differ from that of many of my colleagues who never had a principles of economics course. Unquestionably, economics training is needed in Congress; more Congressmen ought to have it. But isn't there a limit to what an economist can do in Congress when the public, which, after all, makes the rules of practical politics, nether knows nor cares much about this intricate subject?

Thus, although my thinking on the causes of unemployment, stagnation, and inflation has not been significantly modified by my year in Congress, I have concluded that in politics, pure economics must be heavily laced with pragmatism, and that Congress is no place for a textbook economist.

Compassion Versus More Jobs: That "Great Heart" of Walter Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the consistent national lobbies in the cause of socialism and related misguided economic theories is President Walter Reuther of the United Automobile Workers.

Mr. Reuther's views are analyzed in a very interesting fashion by Columnist John M. Johnston, retired editor of the Chicago Daily News, writing in the Monday, April 13, edition of that paper.

The article follows:

COMPASSION VERSUS MORE JOBS: THAT "GREAT HEART" OF WALTER REUTHER

(By John M. Johnston)

There are fashions in the vocabulary of statesmanship, and highly admired at the moment is the quality of compassion. So it was natural that a news account of the union demands to be served on the auto industry should find them indicating the "compassion" of Walter P. Reuther.

Out of his tender heart, Reuther will not only strive "to civilize and humanize" the offices and factories, and "for a fuller measure of the equity due workers and their families." He will also fight to boost the pensions of retired workers.

It might be wondered why Reuther does not demand all the equity due workers, but the answer is that his compassion can hardly extend to conceding that in any one contract the industry has done full justice. There must be room for future improvement.

Reuther is also unpersuaded by President Johnson's plea that wage increases be held within the "guidelines" of the general rise in industrial productivity. Reuther thinks the higher figure achieved by the auto industry itself should guide his demands.

This raises the question of how Reuther's "compassion" differs from the avarice of other union leaders who are frankly out to get all they can for their members and let the devil take the hindmost. Reuther is an eloquent speaker on the terrible economic loss inflicted by unemployment, but his policies are directly contrary to those which would create jobs.

He demands for the industry workers the fruits of rising productivity resulting from imporved technology and capital investment. The cheaper processes never get reflected in lower prices for autos, although it is obvious that jobs would be created by wider purchase of new cars.

One of Reuther's anecdotes concerns his first sight of a new plant in which engine blocks were produced automatically in a fraction of the time formerly required. Reuther says he was asked whether he was concerned over his inability to collect union dues from the machines. He replied that what bothered him was "how autos were going to be sold to those machines."

His argument sounds plausible until it is realized that cheaper production through automation could make it possible to sell autos to many who could not otherwise afford them—unless the undisplaced autoworkers obtained all the savings in production cost achieved by the new machines.

Reuther is also an eloquent advocate of minimum wage laws, which are simply another way of saying that any man who is not worth $50 a week to an employer shall not be employed at all. He may get a dignified check from the welfare office, but he will get no job.

So the results of Reuther "compassion" get confined rather strictly to the United Auto Workers and his role of "labor statesman" becomes a lever to multiply the power he applies. A 1964 wage pattern exceeding or even absorbing the full improvement in productivity is counter to the goal of increased employment.

Testimony to the truth of this economic principle comes from a source highly esteemed in liberal circles as the authority for the merit of deficit Government spending as a means of creating jobs and prosperity, the late economist John Maynard Keynes. In a 1932 essay on the subject, Keynes wrote:

"Unemployment, I must repeat, exists because employers have been deprived of profit."

Minnesota Editors Point Out Livestock Industry Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, my mail, and the editorial comment of Minnesota editors, makes it perfectly clear that the livestock industry continues to be in deep trouble, with no sign of any real action to save the livestock producers from disaster. I hope that bills which I and many of my colleagues have introduced, to put quotas on imports, will get action in spite of the opposition of the administration. Two editorials from last week's newspapers in the Second District of Minnesota point up the problem, and

I include them at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Waseca Herald]

FARMERS UNITED

Farmers are united in their opposition to excessive importation of beef by the United States. That they have a cause for complaint becomes clear when a comparsion is made of the import figures for a 2-year period. In 1960, 1,123,750 head of cattle were imported. By 1963 the number had increased to 2,475,716—more than doubled.

Last year 11 percent of the beef consumption in the United States came from foreign cattlemen. This brought a storm of protest and a renegotiation of the situation, the result of which brought little if any comfort to American producers.

While the prices paid the farmer have declined, the farmer protests that the prices to the consumer have not reflected the difference. This has prompted an investigation of the price situation as it relates to the packer, the retailer and the distributor.

Such an investigation is justified but it is difficult to see where this will do much to solve the problem. If it should result in lower retail prices the consumption would increase and that would cut into the surplus. Will it make as much difference as some hope?

The problem must be solved partly by the cattlemen themselves and partly by the legislators. The legislators can reduce the meat imports if they will. The cattlemen have been guilty of raising more beef year after year and they have compounded their own problem.

Agricultural products have been used as a pawn in our international relations. We say to Australia and New Zealand that they may send us beef, although we have it in surplus, in order that we can ship them in the products of our factories.

Suppose the shoe were on the other foot and our diplomats would permit the importation of manufactured goods to the United States in exchange for our right to send the country more of our farm products. What would labor and management say about that?

[From the Rock County Star-Herald]

IT'S ALL RIGHT TO OFFEND THE AMERICAN FARMER

One of the shrewdest operators in the livestock business in Rock County said to us a few weeks ago "when I saw the Government dumping that cheap grain on the market I said oh, oh, this is no place for me and I started pinching in."

That's when the trouble started in the beef price situation when Secretary of Agriculture Freeman started dumping grain on the market at a rate five times the previous year's sales in 1961.

Freeman is a poor forecaster as an economic prophet. He is also a poor administrator. It has been said that he didn't even know what was going on and wasn't aware that the recent voluntary beef import agreement permits Ireland to increase its shipments of beef to the United States.

The proposed beef-buying program by the Government shows the shortsighted, inadequate, thinking of the Department in confronting the situation. It is like handing out aspirin to kill the pain when drastic surgery is needed. It will only compound the agony of the situation.

There are 70 bills in the congressional hopper to cut the import quotas of beef from abroad but none of them will be called up. The administration is going to block every attempt on every bill.

In the meantime the condition of the livestock industry worsens daily.

We are being "sold" the idea by Washington that we must take the big, long view on world trade.

It's hard to take a magnanimous view when one is losing his financial shirt.

It is hard to estimate the total losses suffered by the livestock industry.

Reliable figures show that the Nebraska cattlemen have lost, in the past 15 months, between $60 million and $75 million * * * and "that ain't hay" * * * that's cold, hard cash.

What Freeman seems to be saying loud and clear is simply this—we mustn't offend foreign countries but it's all right to offend the American farmer.

It's time for the livestock men of Minnesota to raise pluperfect cain with their two Senators who have talked out of both sides of their mouths on this situation.

Bible Reading and Prayers in Schools: A Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement by the Executive Council of the Lutheran Church in America.

This statement is taken from the minutes of the sixth meeting of the executive council which took place June 28–29, 1963, and contains the resolve of the Lutheran Church to rededicate itself to, in the late President Kennedy's words: "make religion — and prayer — more meaningful in homes and churches."

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA RESPECTING THE 1962 DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE PUBLIC SCHOOL LORD'S PRAYER AND BIBLE READING ISSUES

(Minutes of the sixth meeting of the executive council of the Luthern Church in America, June 28–29, 1963, p. 611)

We do not believe that much has been lost in terms of the specific points covered by the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school prayer and Bible reading cases. If the "Lord's Prayer" were to be recited in schoolrooms only for the sake of the moral and ethical atmosphere it creates, it would be worth nothing to the practicing Christian. The "Lord's Prayer" is the supreme act of adoration and petition or it is debased. Reading the Bible in the public schools without comment, too, has been of dubious value as either an educational or religious experience. The more we attempt as Christians or Americans to insist on common denominator religious exercise or instruction in the public schools, the greater risk we run of diluting our faith and contributing to a vague religiosity which identifies religion with patriotism and becomes a national folk religion.

At the same time, in candor, these decisions must be seen as a watershed. They open an era in which Christianity is kept separate from the state in a way that was foreign and would have been repugnant to the minds of our ancestors at the time when the Constitution was written and ever since. They signalize the fact that the United States of America, like many other nations, is past the place where underlying Christian culture and beliefs are assumed in its life.

This event intensifies the task of the church. It heightens the need of the church for strength to stand alone, lofty and unshaken, in American society. It calls for greater depth of conviction in all Christian men and women.

A Cool Look at the Crime Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James V. Bennett, longtime Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and one of our country's outstanding penologists, has taken a frank and refreshing look at crime and imprisonment in the United States. In a special supplement of Harper's magazine this month, Mr. Bennett makes some telling blows against many of the myths abounding today. He draws on statistics and his vast experience to support his conclusions. Do most ex-convicts eventually return to prison? Is juvenile crime as rampant as it has been pictured? Do we coddle our criminals? Mr. Bennett considers these questions, and attempts to picture the situation in a proper perspective. I am inserting his article in the RECORD, with the knowledge that many of us would be very interested to see what Mr. Bennett has to say:

A COOL LOOK AT THE CRIME CRISIS

(By James V. Bennett)

(NOTE.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons points out that many widely believed facts about crime simply aren't true. A leading proponent of enlightened penology and criminal law in this country, Mr. Bennett was chairman of the United Nations Conference on Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders held in London in 1960.)

The main corridor of the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta is paved with Georgia marble of a hardness rare among the substances of this planet. Yet on both sides of this corridor clearly discernible paths have been worn by the feet of thousands of men shuffling three times daily from the enormous cell houses to the dining room, and back again.

It is staggering to contemplate the mass frustration, the restlessness, the human defeat—and the challenge—represented in those paths. If you stand between the lines of marching prisoners and search their faces, as I have frequently done, they look like men you would meet anywhere. Few of them are smiling, for few are happy. Here and there is the bowed figure of a defeated old man; now and then, a head held proudly high.

The men in Atlanta are much like those in any other large penitentiary. Among them undoubtedly are many hillbilly bootleggers, very similar to one I saw starting his fourth prison term not long ago. He was wearing a Silver Star emblem in his lapel buttonhole. He lived in a shotgun cabin on five burned-out acres in southern Alabama with his wife and seven "head" of kids. "What could he do?" asked the deputy marshal who brought him to prison. "Not

being able to get relief, was he to leave the family, let the kids starve—or go to making whiskey?"

In another Federal prison, there is a young girl who was sent there for pasting a canceled stamp on a letter she mailed to get a free cosmetic samples. She is feebleminded, impoverished, and a Negro in a Southern State that has achieved worldwide notoriety for its treatment of her race.

In prison too is the youngster who "borrowed" a car to escape from a family situation he found intolerable. The statistics classify stealing a car as a "serious" crime, even though most cars are stolen for only a few hours' use and not for monetary gain. There will be more cars stolen as each year adds more school dropouts and more homes wrecked by alcohol or divorce. Does this mean that "serious" crime is increasing ominously?

The average newspaper reader's answer to this question is likely to be based on highly suspect fare. He reads the crime statistics but he has no way of evaluating them in relation to population, economic conditions, changing laws and social attitudes. Nor can he judge the relative harmfulness of the many offenses which are recorded. Dramatizing the statistics are the press reports of spectacular crimes, exploits of big-time criminals, and sensational trials. To complete the frightening picture TV provides crime and courtroom dramas which reflect little of the truth about real crimes and criminals.

As a prison director I have a different perspective. For one thing, I think in terms of individuals rather than statistics. I know, of course, that on any given day there are about 220,000 men and women in our State and Federal prisons and another 100,000 in local and county jails. Taking the turnover rate into account, we see that approximately a million people spend some time behind bars during the course of a year. But most of them are not the murderers, rapists, and kidnapers pictured by the average citizen.

More than three-fourths of the men and women who are locked up in local jails are drunks, vagrants, mentally ill or defective, or social misfits of other kinds. Of those sentenced to State and Federal penitentiaries, more than two-thirds have been convicted of nonviolent crimes such as forgery, auto theft, housebreaking, and larceny. Less than 10 percent have been found guilty of homicide, rape, or kidnaping.

BEHIND THE STATISTICS

What else do the statistics tell us? We discover that only a handful of the people who go to prison are women, some 8,000 altogether. Is this because women are less criminally inclined than men? Probably not. They stay out of jail in part because everyone—including cops, judges, and juries—tends to be more lenient with female than with male offenders. And from time immemorial women have not been reluctant to share a man's money and possessions however nefariously obtained. Professional prostitutes outnumber the men who are in prison.

Some of America's top check forgers, blackmailers, and embezzlers are women. I think, for instance, of the woman—now in the Federal penitentiary in Alderson, W. Va.—who inspired such confidence in a rubber-stamp board of directors that she was able to steal and spend more than $2 million over a period of 30 years. Another woman manager of a savings-and-loan association hoodwinked the auditors and her superiors so effectively that shortages mounted to more than $400,000 before she was discovered. I know of no male embezzler who has been as adroit, although there are enough inside bank jobs every year to keep the bank examiners from being smug.

Certainly all too many men and women succeed in outwitting the law, at least for a while. But there is reason to believe that progress is being made in controlling crime if we study the data in depth. For example, in the past 30-odd years, the homicide rate has been cut nearly in half, dropping from 8.9 per 100,000 of our civilian population in 1930 to 5.1 in 1962. The actual number of homicides declined for a time from the 10,500 that were recorded in 1930, and later rose again. In 1962 the total reached only 9,500 although the population had increased 50 percent since 1930. We may conclude that the life of the ordinary citizen is a good deal safer than it used to be—despite the contrary impression created by headlines.

It is enlightening also to ponder the figures on bank robbery, a crime always much advertised in the Nation's press. In 1962 banks lost about $1,800,000 in 461 holdups. This was a 27-percent increase over 1961. But in the depression year of 1932, 609 banks were held up for losses aggregating $3,400,000. Yet today there are 5,300 more banks than existed in 1932. The individual bank, it would seem, is far less likely to be robbed now than in John Dillinger's time. In fact, the American Bankers Association, in a paper issued in September 1963, said that in view of the growth in banking "it cannot be realistically contended that bank crime has grown to unmanageable proportions."

We have no statistics comparing previous generations with our own. But historians tell us that past ages have been incontestably more lawless. They tell us also that the wholesale application of every cruelty conceivable to the human mind proved futile in reducing crime. The men who ran prisons in medieval and Elizabethan times experimented intensively in the art of administering inhumanity to man—but few experiments in all human history failed so completely.

Among the most disturbing of current statistics are the records of juvenile delinquency—a half-million youngsters are handled by our juvenile courts each year. Certainly, we must take every possible step to redirect them. But we should also use the perspective of time to reassure ourselves that the modern generation is not as black as it is painted. Less than a century ago, as Herbert Asbury pointed out in "The Gangs of New York," the city swarmed with youngsters who stole, murdered, rioted, and engaged in every form of debauchery. Offsetting today's juvenile delinquency statistics, other figures show that 35 percent of college-age young people are going to college today in contrast to less than 5 percent before World War I. The fact is that our young people are doing more to prepare themselves for lives of responsibility than any previous generation.

In evaluating the crime statistics we also ought to ponder the fact that the general prison population of the country is declining. Last year in 27 prison systems the absolute number of inmates declined; in 32 systems the ratio of prisoners to the general population fell. Across the Nation there are now 118.3 persons in prison per 100,000 people; the ratio ranges from 258.3 in the District of Columbia and 179.6 in Maryland to 26.3 in New Hampshire and 37.2 in North Dakota. When the Federal Government started publishing prison statistics in 1939 the national rate of imprisonment was 137.6; this figure has not since been matched; it fell to 101.2 during World War II.

RACKETEERS AND TEENAGERS

The men and women now in our prisons are individuals with hearts, lungs, and emotions like anyone else. To say this is to invite reproach for "coddling" criminals, a charge frequently made in legislatures and newspaper editorials.

There is a bitter irony in this accusation, for, in fact, the criminal in America is dealt with harshly indeed. Our criminal laws are the most severe in the world, and our legislative bodies are still at work making them more severe. Except possibly for "enemies of the state" in countries where people are sent to prison for political reasons, the American criminal on the average serves several times as long a sentence in prison as his counterpart anywhere else in the world.

The injustices that result from our highly punitive criminal laws are compounded by the fact that the sentence of the court is not subject to review in most American jurisdictions. Among civilized nations the United States[1] is alone in denying to the convicted any avenue of appeal even for sentences of Draconian severity. Only in America do we find, occasionally, sentences of 199 years and 100 years, and regularly sentences of 30, 40, and 50 years. In England in the course of a year no more than 150 men are likely to be given sentences of 5 years or more. In the United States the number is about 15,000.

The successful defense lawyer knows how to maneuver his case and his client so that they come before an "understanding" judge. But the average defendant is at the mercy of the widely disparate sentences given by different courts in different parts of the country and even by different judges in the same court. A person convicted of homicide in Texas will probably serve about 5½ years, but in Illinois 16½. For all types of felonies the convicted offender serves about 1 year in Vermont, but in nearby Rhode Island he averages nearly 4.

President Kennedy, whose compassion exceeded that of most men, took an unusual interest in the problems of "equal justice under law" and used his powers of executive clemency to redress judicial savagery. In one case, he cut the life sentence of a teenage epileptic addict convicted of a narcotics charge (his sentence can be compared with that of Vito Genovese, the alleged kingpin of the American narcotics racket, who got only 15 years). He also reduced the 15-year sentence given a young, minor bank embezzler who arrived in prison at the same time as another young bank embezzler from another court in the same district—with a 6-month sentence for an identical offense.

To their great credit the Federal judges now meet several times a year in seminars and institutes to find ways of minimizing such inequities. But the problem remains.

SHADOWY MINDS

To deplore injustice is not to suggest that we should, in any way, relax our efforts to enforce the law and reduce crime. The dilemma is how best to do it.

The problem is heightened by the fact that a sizable proportion of crimes are committed by psychopaths and mentally sick people. I recall, for example, a bank robber who was known as the Black Phantom. He was an ex-cop who financed affairs with some 40-odd women by holding up banks. After he was caught and committeed to a Federal prison for observation, we found that he also had a rich fantasy life. He liked to don a black cloak and hat and spring out of the darkness of alleyways upon befuddled drunks. His mind was as shadowy as the alleys he prowled and he needed psychiatric treatment. Psychiatrists, to be sure, do not have an answer for the problem of crime but they do contribute illuminating insights into the behavior of criminals. Yet there are only 50 professional psychiatrists among the 232 major Federal and State prisons and reformatories. At other levels, trained personnel are also scarce, and except in a handful of prison systems, salaries are too low

[1] In Massachusetts, Connecticut, and a few other States, review of sentence is possible under certain circumstances. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, has introduced a bill—S. 823—providing for appellate review of all sentences imposed by Federal courts.

to attract competent people. Buildings too are generally rundown, obsolete, and jammed with prisoners. One of the best prison systems is the research-conscious organization created in California by Gov. Earl Warren, now Chief Justice of the United States. One of the worst is in Mississippi, where the lash is still in generous use.

The State prison in Trenton, N.J., was opened in 1798 and many of its buildings date back as far as 1836. It is a disgrace to American penology. But here and there, where new prisons are being built, the old bastille concept has been discarded. We are no longer building massive walled facilities housing as many as four or five thousand prisoners. Instead, the trend is toward open or medium-security prisons for 400, 500, or 600 inmates. Outstanding examples, are the "Prison Without Walls" at Seagoville, Tex., and the fine State institution at Fox Lake, Wis., where the inmates carry their own keys.[2]

Do most ex-convicts eventually return to prison? Are they as unredeemable as those who push for harsher penalties say they are? Certainly the ex-convict who wants to go straight can expect to have a rough time. When he leaves the walls he doesn't have money enough to last more than a few days. Many firms will not give him a job, at least if they know about his record. Sometimes even his family doesn't want anything to do with him. And in some cities the police will pick him up on any pretext, to put him into the day's "lineup" or merely to harass him so much that he'll move on to another town.

But the typical ex-prisoner persists in his efforts to surmount these difficulties. A 5-year study of Federal prisoners, done by the University of Illinois under a Ford Foundation grant, indicated that 9 out of 10 prisoners intend to take up an honest way of life when they get out. Some fail in their good intentions, but the same study proved that two-thirds are successful in staying out of trouble.[3]

Our prison systems will not succeed in permanently "reforming" larger numbers of their graduates until communities are ready to play a much larger part in the rehabilitation process. And I wish that this problem would attract more serious attention and public discussion than, for example, the perennial emotional debate about capital punishment.

The issue here is between people who are certain that only the electric chair, the gas chamber, and the gallows protect us from an overwhelming horde of criminals, and others who consider these grim devices the stamp of a brutal and primitive society.

Both sides are unduly hysterical. The capital punishment issue in all probability will not be resolved by legislation. Rather, the death sentence will be used with increasing caution as people come to realize that the ultimate penalty can be justified for relatively few offenders. Already the number of executions has fallen from 199 in 1935 to 57 in 1962. In many States which still retain capital punishment, no one has been put to death for decades. As our civilization advances, the use of the penalty will continue to decline.

But it should remain on the books. Shrink as we might from putting a human being to death, there are some crimes for which there seems to be no other fitting penalty; acts of high treason, for example; blowing up a loaded passenger plane in flight; kidnaping and killing a child. If Lee Harvey Oswald had lived to be convicted, what other penalty could possibly have been appropriate for such a heinous crime?

[2] For other examples, see "Without Bars," by Giles Playfair, on p. 171.

[3] See "After the Stretch," by Morris Rudensky, on p. 180.

Today, it is chiefly the indigent, the friendless, the Negro, and the mentally ill who are doomed to death. Or the young. Only this year Georgia raised to 16 the lower age limitation for execution. It was formerly 10. There should be an automatic psychiatric examination for everyone accused of a capital crime and an automatic appeal for everyone convicted of one.

MURDER OVER THE COUNTER

The people arguing about capital punishment could put their time to better use by jointly pressing for such safeguards.

They would do well, also, to ask why we send so many people to prison and yet make it so easy for them to commit crimes? Why, for example, don't we have more effective controls on the firearms traffic? In the United States today almost anyone can obtain a gun almost anywhere. All he needs is the money and not much of that. Here and there, a few laws and ordinances have been enacted to control gun transactions, but they are ineffective in the absence of uniform regulation throughout the country.

There are now an estimated 50 million handguns, rifles, and shotguns in the hands of private individuals. Two million more are made and sold in this country every year, and an additional half million are imported from other countries—with virtually no control of any kind, as demonstrated by the ease with which Oswald got his scope rifle. We have robbers in our penitentiaries who bought their guns over the counter on their way down the street to stick up a liquor store. The last man to be executed by the Federal Government had a history of criminality and mental illness, but no one asked him any questions when he bought a gun at a sporting-goods store. The questions didn't start until he used the gun to kill a doctor who was a complete stranger.

The assassination of President Kennedy was a dramatic and tragic result of the uncontrolled gun traffic. But 5,000 other victims are killed each year with guns in the hands of people who should not be permitted to have them.

The assassination also dramatized the hostilities in the breasts of many persons. The pressure of our high-voltage society are too intense for many people to bear, and the consequence is too often a mental illness characterized by hostility toward one's fellow man. Oswald was one example, but every law-enforcement officer knows of other individuals equally ruthless. We need facilities for the treatment of the hostile, mentally ill persons who become involved in crime. But an even greater problem is the ratpack of hostile and mentally ill individuals who spew forth hatred and venom to foul the atmosphere of an otherwise tolerant democracy. They foster and actively incite disrespect for the law, and we shall not achieve a more orderly society until we learn how to deal with them.

Currently, there is a trend to attack the crime problem by bringing the Federal Government more actively into the picture. My friends from abroad are amazed at the multiplicity of offenses over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction, at last count numbering more than 2,000 felonies. They want to know how local law enforcement is helped by having the Federal Government assume jurisdiction over crimes that also lie within the purview of State authorities. The fact is that when the Federal Government enters a field, the local and State authorities tend to abdicate. At the very least, misunderstandings and jealousies result which hobble law enforcement. The overlapping of criminal laws sends into Federal prisons the physically handicapped, the alcoholic, and the other social misfits who are really the responsibility of local and State authorities.

THE GOAL IS NOT UTOPIA

Jurisdictional overlapping must be eliminated if agencies of different types and Federal and State agencies are to work effectively together. At present the multiplication of law-enforcement and treatment agencies has made a morass out of the entire effort to combat crime. Competing agencies spar for jurisdiction over the sensational case of the one that has political implications. More than one prosecutor has reached high office on the basis of publicity afforded by some sensational case. But the overall goal of crime prevention is not served in the process. This is a task for quiet, firm, persistent cooperative effort.

The fruit of such effort can be considerable. But it will not be a utopia free of crime. Human beings are infinitely varied, and some of their behavior is bound to be considered criminal by at least a portion of society. The challenge we must meet is to reduce the basic causes of crime, improve law-enforcement methods, and use more effectively the techniques that have been developed for changing human behavior. The existence of crime and criminals should spur us on to experimentation, infuse new life into our efforts to rid the country of social injustices, and make us all a little more tolerant of each other's imperfect conduct.

Most of U.S. Rights Bill Is Already Indiana Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an excellent article by John V. Wilson, Washington correspondent of the Indianapolis Times, published in that newspaper on March 29, 1964, concerning the civil rights act of the State of Indiana as compared with the civil rights bill passed by the U.S. House of Representatives and now under consideration by the U.S. Senate.

The text of Mr. Wilson's article follows:

MOST OF U.S. RIGHTS BILL ALREADY IS INDIANA LAW

(By John V. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Hoosier opponents of the civil rights bill may not realize it, but they're already living under similar and possibly stronger State laws.

This curious twist mystifies Indiana Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, who are being besieged by letterwriters protesting the bill before the Senate.

Just this month, HARTKE's mail has turned from 2 to 1 for the bill to 6 to 1 against. BAYH's mail is running 4 to 1 against.

One explanation, of course, is that aginers are usually more vocal. But the Indiana mail also shows that the campaign of the Southern-financed Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms against the bill is bearing fruit.

"A lot of these people have been misinformed," observes BAYH. "Others are not well informed about the bill."

BAYH, who cosponsored one of Indiana's civil rights laws in the 1962 legislature, emphasizes that the Federal bill "would have little or no effect on Indiana."

"Our equal accommodations law has really stricter provisions than the bill," he points out.

In 1961, the legislature enacted fair employment practices and equal accommodations laws. Two years later, the laws were strengthened by the Indiana Civil Rights Act.

Thus, despite the uproar over the Federal bill, Indiana laws already forbid racial segregation in public schools and discrimination in voting, employment, labor unions, and places of public accommodation.

Here's how the Federal civil rights bill compares with existing Indiana laws:

VOTING RIGHTS

Bill: Prohibits registrars from using different standards for whites and Negroes and allows the Attorney General to bring voting suits before special three-judge panels.

Indiana: Laws have long assured Negro voting rights; witness last year's upsurge in Negro registration.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Bill: Outlaws discrimination by refusal of service in hotels, motels, restaurants, service stations, theaters, sports arenas and rooming houses of more than five rooms and in which the proprietor does not live.

Indiana: Forbids discrimination and segregation in every place of public accommodation. Provides fines of $25 to $100 and jail sentences up to 30 days. Also provides for civil suits and judgments of $25 to $100. Empowers State Civil Rights Commission to issue cease and desist orders.

DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

Bill: Forbids denial of access to any public facility of the State or its subdivision. Allows the Attorney General to join a person seeking to have his rights enforced.

Indiana: Guarantees access of all persons to public facilities of the State and its subdivisions. Enforcement power vested in State Civil Rights Commission.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Bill: Extends Commission's life another four years. Commission is empowered to investigate complaints, conduct hearings, subpena witnesses and make reports.

Indiana: Five-member Commission is empowered to investigate complaints, conduct hearings, subpena witnesses and records, issue cease and desist orders against dicriminatory practices and have them enforced by county courts.

FEDERAL AID CUTOFF

Bill: Forbids racial discrimination in Federally assisted programs and allows Federal agencies to refuse funds to States and communities, except for federally insured programs such as FHA and VA.

Indiana: Executive order issued by Governor Welsh bans racial discrimination by all businesses licensed by the State.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Bill: Allows Attorney General to bring suits to enforce desegregation, but there is no requirement for mixing of white and Negro pupils by transfer to other school districts.

Indiana: School segregation was outlawed in 1947.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Bill: Bans discrimination by employers and labor unions. Would be put into effect over a 4-year period, covering businesses and unions with 25 or more employees or members. Creates a commission with power to bring suits to enforce compliance if persuasion fails.

Indiana: Bans discrimination by employers of six or more employees and labor unions. Civil Rights Commission empowered to issue cease-and-desist orders if persuasion fails. Bans discrimination by firms doing business with the State or local governmental units.

Despite the similarity of the civil rights bill and Indiana law, the Hoosier Senators are the targets of such letters as these:

"The only conclusion I and my wife can come to is that this bill is Communist inspired," a Fort Wayne man wrote HARTKE.

"I feel so strongly about this that I make you this promise—if the bill does pass, I shall vote for your opponent, even though that opponent is only a pair of rubber boots. I feel it is better to have a rubber boot in office than a rubberstamp," an Indianapolis man, who said he had been a Democrat for 32 years, wrote BAYH.

On the other hand, HARTKE and BAYH do get some letters supporting their stand for the bill.

"I am writing this to you to help you bolster your strongly expressed position in favor of this bill," a Bloomington woman wrote BAYH.

"Stand by your guns and keep firing," an Indianapolis woman wrote HARTKE.

FCC Chairman Henry on "Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article appearing in the Washington Post, Columnist Lawrence Laurent has called attention to the courageous address delivered by FCC Chairman William Henry at the April 7 meeting of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Chairman Henry's address is particularly significant, for he speaks directly to the discrepancy in the NAB's position of opposing limitations on commercial advertising, as an invasion of broadcasting freedom, while ignoring the far more basic challenge to freedom involved in the Pacifica case.

I commend Mr. Laurent's column and a careful reading of Chairman Henry's remarks to our colleagues' attention:

FCC CHAIRMAN TURNS TALK OF "FREEDOM" BACK ON NAB

(By Lawrence Laurent)

CHICAGO.—Ever since E. William Henry came to the Federal Communications Commission in 1962 and particularly since he became chairman last June, broadcasters have regarded him as an attractive but ineffecutal bureaucrat.

Henry made his first appearance before the National Association of Broadcasters yesterday and his 33-minute speech provided the first major shock of this 42d annual convention. The 3,000 broadcasters gathered at the Conrad Hilton discovered that the lean, handsome 35-year-old lawyer from Memphis, Tenn., is a toughminded regulator who has learned about broadcasting with an amazing swiftness.

Sitting on the dais, without a change in expression during Henry's performance, was the FCC Chairman's No. 1 antagonist, Representative WALTER ROGERS, Democrat, of Texas. ROGERS has been the No. 1 hero of this convention, for broadcasters have been generous in their gratitude for ROGERS' having killed an FCC proposal to set limits on commercial advertising.

Henry warned broadcasters that the FCC rule may be dead but the policy against overcommercialization is still very much alive. The FCC is looking at commercial policies every time a station's 3-year license comes up for renewal. Henry said:

"In this way we are moving toward the development of sound regulatory standards in this field. The process may be painful to some—more painful, I think, than a rule would have been—but it is healthy and necessary."

With that stern admonition, Henry turned with polite scorn to the attitude shown by the broadcast industry over the Pacifica Broadcasting Co. Pacifica operates listener-supported (no commercials) stations in Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif., and in New York City. Complaints about the station's programing and charges that Pacifica employed Communist sympathizers caused a 3-year FCC investigation. Last winter, the FCC renewed the Pacifica's licenses and issued a sweeping free-speech ruling.

Henry said:

"At every public meeting of broadcasters I have attended, a speaker has only to declare himself in favor of "freedom" to be rewarded with an automatic burst of applause. But oratory is easy: Firm action is difficult. Surely, if there was ever a time when the freedom of broadcasting was at stake, this was it."

Henry reminded broadcasters that they took absolutely no action in the Pacifica case.

The silence was heavy as Henry concluded that while broadcasting "libertarian lawyers" had ignored the Pacifica case, the FCC, itself, stood up for broadcasting's freedoms. Henry added:

"Your contrasting reaction to these two struggles * * * overcommercialization and Pacifica Foundation * * * cast a disturbing light on the basic motivations of an industry licensed to do business in the public interest.

"When you display more interest in defending your freedom to suffocate the public with commercials than in upholding your freedom to provide provocative variety * * * when you cry 'censorship' and call for faith in the Founding Fathers' wisdom only to protect your balance sheet * * * when you remain silent in the face of a threat which could shake the first amendment's proud oak to its very roots—you tarnish the ideals enshrined in the Constitution and invite an attitude of suspicion."

Henry also warned that the FCC will take action against overly loud commercials and that legislation is needed to regulate pay-as-you-see TV.

With the silence that thundered during parts of Henry's speech came a certain amount of respect. Ten times he was interrupted with applause and at the finish the broadcasters stood up and applauded. It was the only ovation at this convention that came close to matching the one given to Congressman ROGERS.

Young Chairman Henry has arrived.

The Late Major General Melvin J. Maas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was with great and sincere sorrow that I learned of the passing of Melvin J. Maas.

It was my privilege to know General Maas as a fellow marine, and it is my contacts with him in the corps that I value most highly. When I came to Congress, he served as a special inspiration,

for despite severe handicaps, he was determined and successful in leading a useful and full life. His example will never be forgotten by all of us who knew him.

I want to express my deep feeling of loss and my deepest respect for a very fine and great man. Mrs. Roosevelt joins me in extending sympathy to his family.

Fair Trade and Higher Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of November 19, 1963, entitled "Fair Trade and Higher Prices" simply pointing out that the enactment of the so-called quality stabilization bill would result in higher prices to consumers and definite hurt to the interests of all consumers, but especially those in the lower income brackets.

It is striking to note that no editorial opinion anywhere in the country has endorsed the quality stabilization bill or has supported the idea of fair trade and high fixed prices which would injure the consumers, the economy, and the retailers generally.

The article follows:

FAIR TRADE AND HIGHER PRICES

Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has often received criticism in these columns for his questionable theories. It is a pleasure, therefore, to be able to agree with him on at least one important issue.

Dr. Heller's opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill is based on sound principles.

In a statement to Congress, he has pointed out the dangers of this old "fair trade" bill, now masquerading under a new name, which high-powered lobbies are trying to force through this session of Congress. It would allow manufacturers to set minimum prices at which their goods could be sold by retailers.

As Dr. Heller said, and a conclusion never successfully disputed, this legislation would lead to higher prices for consumers.

In summary as to price effects, he said:

1. Uniform resale prices (to consumers) would tend initially to be set higher than the present average of prices charged.

2. Temporary reductions in prices by retailers would be eliminated.

3. Rising costs and reduced efficiency in retailing would put pressure on manufacturers to raise their resale prices further.

And for the retailers who want this bill enacted, Dr. Heller advanced some logical conclusions which should give pause for thought and diminish their enthusiasm considerably.

With price competition at retail for these fixed-price goods eliminated, he pointed out, other forms of retail competition would be intensified. Fancier store decorations, additional services and other forms of nonprice competition would be used to compete for sales. This would force up the costs of retailing.

Small retailers, he said, might in fact be disadvantaged in the end of passage of this bill because fixed prices on fair-traded merchandise in many instances would not compare favorably with the private brands and other non-fair-traded items handled by big stores, mail-order houses and chains. Private brands would increase and get a larger share of the market.

As Dr. Heller's statement made clear, there's so much wrong with this latest attempt to legalize retail price fixing, the whole project should be pitched into the wastebasket. It certainly wouldn't help consumers. Nor would it be good, either, for retailers as a whole.

Meet the Alibrandis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous growth of electronics and related industries in eastern Massachusetts is providing opportunities for countless talented young men and women to advance themselves in their professions while making outstanding contributions to our Nation's scientific efforts. One such young executive is Joseph F. Alibrandi, of Lexington, Mass. Joe currently heads the Sparrow air-to-air missile program of the Raytheon Co. An able engineer and executive, a devoted family man and a dedicated worker for his community, Joe is a fine example of the professional talent available in Massachusetts. An excellent profile of the Alibrandis appeared in the Wall Street Journal yesterday under the byline of Cal Brumley. Under unanimous consent I wish to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEET THE ALIBRANDIS—YOUNG EXECUTIVE'S PAY CLIMBS FAST BUT WAY OF LIFE STAYS MODEST—CHIEF OF A RAYTHEON MISSILE PROGRAM KEEPS HIS $27,000 HOUSE, DRIVES 1958 CHEVY—MIDDLE MANAGEMENT HAZARDS

(By Cal Brumley)

BEDFORD, MASS.—Joseph F. Alibrandi is a prosperous young executive who hasn't got around to living like one.

At 37, he heads Raytheon Co.'s production of the Sparrow air-to-air missile for Air Force and Navy fighters. He oversees 7,000 employees at the program's headquarters here in the Boston suburb of Bedford and at plants in Lowell, Mass., and Bristol, Tenn. His annual salary, which was $3,900 when he joined the electronics and aerospace company as a junior engineer in 1952, is now more than $30,000.

But Joe Alibrandi's spending hasn't kept pace with his ascending career. With his wife, Lambertha, and their two small children, he lives in a $27,000 three-bedroom ranch house in Lexington, another Boston suburb. The Alibrandis own one car, a 1958 Chevrolet. Joe, a trim 6-footer whose dark hair is beginning to show flecks of gray, often wears the same suit three days running; until recently he owned only one pair of shoes. One of the few visible signs of his rising affluence is a 30-foot cabin cruiser purchased second hand for $5,200.

In part, Joe's conservative spending may reflect the habits formed when he was growing up in a third-floor tenament apartment in a poor section of south Boston. But the go-slow policy on spending may also stem from his awareness that there are hazards as well as rewards for a man who emerges from the ranks of junior executives into a role in middle management.

Such a man is no longer lost in the crowd, and with more riding on his performance he is apt to be judged by stricter standards. Blunders are hard to conceal for long; usually a glance at an operation's profit-and-loss statement is enough to tell whether the executive in charge is doing his job.

Raytheon has been troubled by shrinking profit margins in recent years and, more lately, by declining orders from its major customer, the military. The result has been frequent management changes. Since 1958, the company has had two presidents and three executive vice presidents. Nine of the thirty-one officers listed in the 1962 annual report do not appear in the recently issued 1963 report. Many lower level executives have left along with the presidents and vice presidents. One of the few permanent fixtures in Raytheon's top management, in fact, has been its chief executive officer, Charles Francis Adams, who now holds the title of president himself.

ADJUSTING TO CHANGE

Joe Alibrandi says he doesn't spend much time brooding about the heavy executive turnover. "There is always some apprehension when there are changes, but a person has to learn to adjust," he observes. A fellow executive says Joe's "optimism and confidence are high enough so that he doesn't waste time worrying."

Joe's boyhood supplied him with ample motivation to achieve business and financial success. His parents, who now live next door in Lexington in a house he had built for them before his marriage in 1957, are Italian immigrants. His father was formerly a laundry worker and his mother a dressmaker.

At the age of 11, Joe began contributing to the family income by working at a movie theater, sweeping up after school, and delivering handbills on Saturday morning for 50 cents a week. By the time he was 13 he was working in a dress factory after school and on Saturdays.

High school was followed by a stretch as an enlisted man in the Army Signal Corps. Upon discharge, he enrolled at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge under the GI bill to study mechanical and industrial engineering.

After his graduation from MIT, Joe picked Raytheon from several job offers, mainly because his father was in ill health and he wanted to work near home. Right at the start he asked to be assigned to the missile program he now heads. "It sounded exciting," he explains.

STARTING UP THE LADDER

Joe's first assignment was to help study sites for a proposed factory to produce the Sparrow missile, which Raytheon had developed. When a site was chosen near Lowell he put his college training to use by working on the production layout of the plant. His talent quickly became evident, and after a few months he started up the ladder, becoming supervisor of quality control for the Sparrow. In 1955 he moved up to staff assistant to the manager of the Lowell plant. In 1959 he was promoted to assistant plant manager at Lowell.

Two years later he took charge of the Sparrow program, his present assignment. The operation he is responsible for last year accounted for over $100 million of Raytheon's total volume of $489 million.

Joe Alibrandi doesn't try to conceal his pleasure over the way things have gone. Promotions have come more rapidly than he thought possible when he joined Raytheon. One reason, he suggests, is his good fortune in landing a spot with a new program at the beginning of his career. "I had opportunities and I was given responsibilities that I

could never have hoped for so early in an older operation," says Joe.

But his associates say that more than luck has been involved in Joe's rise. One former superior calls him "very brilliant." Martin Schilling, a German rocket scientist who came to the United States after World War II and is now vice president and general manager of Raytheon's Missile Systems Division, declares: "I could draw up a list of the requirements for the prototype of an ideal manager, and Mr. Alibrandi would meet nearly all of them." Mr. Schilling, whose division embraces the Sparrow program, is Joe's immediate superior.

Joe is given credit for setting up detailed procedures that enable semiskilled workers to turn out high-precision instruments like walnut-size gyroscopes for the Sparrow guidance system and missile valves with microscopic tolerances. Mr. Schilling says that since Joe has headed Sparrow production "the unit cost has dropped 50 percent although model improvements have pushed upward on costs."

"POLITELY AGGRESSIVE"

Despite his powerful drive to get to the top, Joe appears to have advanced without stepping on a lot of toes along the way. He is, in the words of one associate, "politely aggressive." "I've never heard him tear anyone down to build himself up." This quality enables him to command the loyalty of people he works with. Says a subordinate: "Joe's the type people want to join with rather than shoot down."

A typical Alibrandi working day begins with a coffeeless breakfast of fruit juice and french toast; sometimes the menu is varied by substituting a milkshake for the french toast. Hopping into a company-owned Chevrolet, he drives to his Bedford office, located in a hangar at Hanscom Field, a civilian airfield around which are clustered many defense-related industrial and research facilities.

He is at his desk by 8 a.m. His office is spacious but utilitarian. The desk is big, modern and generally uncluttered. A model of the slim, finned Sparrow missile sits on it atop a wooden pedestal, and there is a tan telephone studded with push buttons. Joe can swivel around to another tan phone—on a long, low cabinet under a window behind him. On the blond wood paneling of the office walls hangs a picture of the late President Kennedy; Joe, a Democrat, was an ardent supporter of Mr. Kennedy.

A BRISK PACE

Joe makes a point of not taking work home but until he leaves the office at 6 p.m. he sets a brisk pace. Lunch is usually limited to a sandwich at his desk. He figures he spends about half his office time meeting with subordinates, "discussing problems and solutions and planning future projects." Every Monday morning he holds a staff meeting attended by close to a dozen people. He meets frequently with Mr. Schilling, whose office is in Bedford, and at least once a week he confers with Thomas L. Phillips, Raytheon's current executive vice president, at Mr. Phillips' office at the company's headquarters in Lexington.

Besides day-to-day production matters, a major concern in all these discussions is planning for the day when the Government has enough Sparrows on hand and orders for the weapon end. Joe, who is convinced that a powerful military force will be needed for a long time to insure peace and who appears to have no qualms about tying his livelihood to the defense field, sees the Sparrow "phasing out" in about 5 years. By then he hopes to have another missile ready to sell the Pentagon.

"We're working on several, most of which are classified, but one is an air-to-ground missile for which we have a formal proposal in to the Government now," says Joe.

Joe usually spends several hours a week with visiting customers, which means military men. "You have to keep them satisfied on costs and performance or you are out of business," he says. "And it's competitive. If the Defense Department doesn't think you are doing a good job it may invite some other company to make your product, since the Government in effect owns production rights."

There are piles of reports to read on policy, and production matters to be gone over. Joe reads them with a red pencil in his hand. "I mark things I want to know more about, and if it seems urgent I get on the phone right then," he says.

A POSSIBLE PROBLEM

Mr. Schilling suggests that Joe's habit of grabbing a phone to talk directly with a man well down the line about a problem might cause him trouble someday if he moves up to a still higher level job with broader responsibilities. He would then have to learn to delegate more authority, in Mr. Schilling's opinion.

"It could be difficult for his No. 2 man to work for him because he takes shortcuts and reaches down into the organization to find a solution for a problem and in this sense may be considered a little autocratic," says Mr. Schilling. "He is a good organization man, but he doesn't believe in all the channels."

Joe concedes he often bypasses a lieutenant in favor of a sergeant. "If I'm wondering why floor-cleaning costs in the Powell plant were up last month, I'll probably call the head of janitor services rather than the plant manager," he says. "But then I always call the manager to tell him I've talked to one of his men." On the other hand, he insists that lower echelon people clear through their superiors before seeking a conference with him. "I want all to know I trust my various managers," he explains.

Joe's job entails considerable traveling. He averages four or five trips a month, always flying coach class in conformance with company policy. Many trips are 1-day visits to the Pentagon in Washington. Other regular ports of call are the company's plant at Bristol, a Navy missile testing facility at Oxnard, Calif., and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, an Air Force research and development center at Dayton, Ohio. Last fall Joe went to London, and this spring he will visit London and Paris; Raytheon hopes to sell the Sparrow to foreign governments if Washington approves.

TALKING TO PILOTS

He tries to visit every Sparrow-equipped Air Force and Navy squadron in the United States at least once a year, talking with the squadron commanders and pilots "to see if they have any problems with the bird." During the Cuban missile crisis in October of 1962 he headed a group of Raytheon missile experts who hurried to Sparrow squadrons in Florida to be on hand in case any problems arose with the weapons.

For his services, Joe receives a number of fringe benefits, in addition to the $30,000-plus salary and the use of a car. Raytheon pays part of the cost of a $120,000 life insurance policy and all the cost of medical insurance. If Joe stays with Raytheon, he will eventually benefit from a pension plan. On two occasions Joe has been granted stock options, but declines in the price of Raytheon stock have made it unprofitable for him to exercise them.

Joe now tries to save or invest 25 percent of his take-home pay. He is active in the stock market. "I'm looking for growth when I invest," he says. "I stay away from the widow stocks. I've taken a few flyers, and I have some highly speculative stocks, but I feel I can afford them because I'm young."

The young executive figures his net worth is now about $100,000. This includes his savings and investments, plus his equity in his own home and the one he built for his parents.

The Alibrandis' basic monthly expenses make a relatively small dent in Joe's pay. Housing expenses total $216 a month (Joe's brother lives with the senior Alibrandis and now meets the mortgage payments and other costs on their house). Lambertha, a former Raytheon secretary who goes by the nickname Tunny, says she spends $160 to $170 a month on food.

WORKING FOR THE UNITED FUND

The Alibrandis are generous givers. They usually contribute about $750 to the United Fund. An equal amount is divided among the MIT alumni fund, an organization devoted to aiding retarded children, an orphanage in Italy and their local Catholic church. Joe, like most executives, is called upon to work on charitable projects; over the fireplace in the family's recreation room is a plaque commending Joe for his service as campaign chairman of the Greater Lowell United Fund in 1962.

Executives generally can't avoid some mixing of business and social life, and Joe is no exception. When military men he deals with are in town, for example, they frequently are house guests of the Alibrandis. For the most part, however, Joe tries to forget about business after hours. A gregarious man, he has a large body of non-business friends, and the Alibrandis either entertain at home or visit friends two or three evenings a week. When they go out, Joe's parents come over from next door to baby sit for 4-year-old Paul and 1-year-old Ann Marie.

The younger Alibrandis' house, which Joe designed and did a lot of the work on, is set on a wooded 4½-acre plot. Lambertha, a slender, 27-year-old blonde, cuts the grass, using a mower she can ride; Joe has convinced her the jouncing will keep her slim. The most heavily trafficked rooms in the house are the sunny kitchen-dinette, which Joe made extra big "because that's where Tunny spends most of her time," and the recreation room.

This basement room hints at Joe's restless energy. There is a ping-pong table and a dart board. On one wall hangs a 6-foot 9½-inch sailfish that Joe caught during an off-hour on a visit to military units in Florida. He also hikes, bowls, and plays a rugged game of water polo once a week with college friends at the MIT pool.

When the weather turns warm, Joe and Lambertha spend almost every weekend aboard the boat, either fishing or cruising. The current model, which costs about $1,000 a year to operate, is Joe's fifth boat; the first was a 13-foot outboard runabout. A favorite cruise is from the berth in a boat basin on the Charles River to Cape Cod.

"It's quite a thrill to leave Boston for some place on Cape Cod, plot your course, be out of sight of land for a couple of hours and then suddenly arrive at your destination," says Joe.

Voter Registration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, though the right to vote is one of the most cherished and hard-won privileges of American citizenship, it often is the case that citizens do not use it. In recent months, an extensive voter reg-

istration campaign has been underway in Fulton County, in the Fifth District of Georgia.

Under the leadership of local officials such as Chief Registrar Leon Hay and many interested citizen groups, an impressive gain of over 75,000 new voters is expected.

Acting under a law passed in a recent session of the Georgia Legislature, Registrar Hay has taken the voters' books out of the courthouse and into the neighborhoods, even during the evening hours, to give citizens an opportunity to register.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend the staff of the Fulton County registrar's office, and other civil groups including the Ben Hill Junior Chamber of Commerce, for this important and successful service.

Hats Off to the Mayor, the City Council, and the Citizenry of Waltham, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, April 12, 1964, there was celebrated in the great metropolis of Waltham, Mass., a classic example of what is too rarely exhibited today, of our traditional New England and American community resourcefulness, community reliance, and community pride.

Initiated and chartered by the irrepressible and distinguished mayor of Waltham, the Honorable Austin D. Rhodes, with the cooperation of the city council, civic leaders, all the civic organizations and the loyal citizenry, Waltham, last Sunday, formally dedicated a $2.5 million municipal service center which will forever stand as a high tribute to community response and responsibility and which provides an inspiring example for all other American cities and towns to follow.

I have been requested to include the brief address I was privileged to deliver on this most eventful occasion and I wish to include also a most pertinent editorial which appeared in the April 7 issue of the Waltham (Mass.) News Tribune. They follow:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE AT THE DEDICATION OF MUNICIPAL SERVICE CENTER BUILDINGS, WALTHAM, MASS., APRIL 12, 1964.

Mayor Rhodes, members of the city council, distinguished invited guests, dear friends, it is a high honor for me to take part in these exercises today celebrating with you the completion of this beautiful modern public service center.

As a longtime observer of Waltham activities I am not at all surprised by this additional evidence of the aptitude and initiative of your leaders and your citizens.

Through the years that I have been privileged to be your U.S. Representative I have experienced repeated demonstrations of your inspiring community spirit, community interest, and community cooperation.

Very early in my National Representative career, I was, you might say, "made" aware of the extraordinary unity, combined resourcefulness and persuasive impact, that exists among your civic directors and your people.

I vividly remember this solid impact upon those occasions when you were particularly concerned with the reorganization of the watch company, the construction of the South Side post office and the urgent need of the facilities of a new boys' club.

Of course, I heard from Austin Rhodes almost, it seemed, before I had completed the recitation of my congressional oath in Washington. I had the feeling he must have been waiting for me and for any one else who could help his city. Even then, as he was approaching the conclusion of his private business career, I marked Austin Rhodes as a "young heart" who was going to go places and do a great many more things in the field of public service. I earnestly wish that all my judgments were as easy to make as that one.

In the truest sense the dedication of any public facility is basically the recognition of the prudent planning of devoted city fathers, the responsive understanding of alert civic leaders, and the cooperative zeal of a local citizenry.

As practically an adopted son of Waltham, I am very pleased to join in this eminently deserved recognition of and salute to the "youngest" mayor in the country, Austin Rhodes, the distinguished members of the city council, the News-Tribune people, the wise advisers of your citizens' committee, the chamber of commerce, the Rotary Club, every civic organization that took part and last, but most of all, the sacrificing citizens of Waltham without whom this center would not have been possible.

Beyond our local recognition and salute to you I consider it my further obligation, as an official of this country's Government, to emphasize, however briefly, the larger meaning of our gathering here today.

In the noblest sense this public service center generates a consciousness of community self-reliance and self-resourcefulness of national significance. Your achievement here is a timely and symbolic reminder that the grain of traditional American greatness is still rooted in the American community. It needs only the vision of local leaders and the sacrifice of local citizens to flourish into fruitfulness, as we see around us here today.

In an age of unprecedented doubt, temptation and confusion this center represents a revival of individual responsibility, community conscience, cooperative sacrifice, and common pride through which this Nation was begun and by which, please God, it will forever survive, against all enemies, even the weakness of ourselves.

It is for this patriotic contribution to your country that I especially congratulate you and for which, in my opinion, you deserve national recognition as an all-American city.

Yes, it is for this patriotic contribution that I am, today, even more proud and privileged, than ever before, to represent the people of Waltham, Mass., in the U.S. Congress.

[From the News-Tribune, Apr. 7, 1964]

PROGRESS, 1964 STYLE

Every now and then it is important to pause and reflect upon what is right with Waltham. Too often the attention of a lot of us is focused on the negatives—such liabilities as traffic congestion, parking, school problems—because the desire for improvement makes it essential that the eyes are kept on the future.

There is a great deal that is right with Waltham.

This month civic pride is lifted another notch with the opening of a facility that is comparable to the finest in all of New England. Waltham's $2.5 million municipal service center is to be put on public display for 3 days, then pressed into action for the concentrated operation of three vital departments.

Waltham's antiquated Blue Lantern Inn at 25 Lexington Street will be going out of existence, leaving memories that trail back into another century. A half mile or so away on the same street is the fine new police headquarters, spacious and finely appointed. It is flanked by a bright new fire station. Centerpiece is the Public Works unit, which for the first time pulls together the scattered divisions of the department.

It is significantly appropriate that industry should join with the city fathers in celebrating the service center's dedication, for Waltham is blessed with a solid economic base principally due to extensive commercial investment. The older, established firms which made Waltham the Precision City have ben joined by a galaxy of new companies whose coming to Waltham represents the expenditures of millions of dollars in job-producing plants.

For those who want to be impressed at the diversity and scope of Waltham manufacturing enterprises, the Rotary-sponsored industrial exhibition will be most revealing. Its theme is "Decade of Progress" and the exhibits are certain to demonstrate that Waltham is well out front in the industrial parade.

A lot of bows can be taken. The municipal service center represents the top accomplishment in the four terms of Mayor Austin D. Rhodes, who got strong support from the city council and considerable help from the citizens' advisory committee. Rotary, the chamber of commerce, and other civic organizations all have pulled together in the exhibition project.

So, Waltham citizens, puff out your chests and bust off a few buttons. You've got plenty of the right things to boast about.

Antidumping Bill and Its Implications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

A bill similar to this one was introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress by 50 Members of the House, including 10 members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I introduced the bill at that time, and am pleased and privileged to introduce it now.

To my mind, this bill poses one of our greatest domestic needs; that is, to have some form of relief for our afflicted industries and their faithful workers from the incessant, ever-increasing flood of cheap foreign imports that are flooding our American markets and causing untold disruption, unemployment and hardship to many industries, many workers and many communities, and sapping the vitality of our economic system.

This measure broadens the antidumping amendment which was previously introduced to meet certain determinations of the Treasury Department and the Tariff Commission, clearly indicating that changes in the 1963 amendment were necessary if we are to accomplish our objective of securing relief against dumping in a truly significant way, and without having to face the blank wall of

frustration that currently ascends from the Federal bureaucracies responsible for administering the act.

We are concerned, of course, about making sure that proper, sufficient guidelines for the future consideration and action of the Department of the Treasury and the U.S. Tariff Commission be included in this bill, because it is of utmost importance to spell out with clarity and positiveness the congressional intent and the aims and ends which this important legislation contemplates.

I believe that the revised measure is a much improved one. It derives from much consultation with the industries, workers, and Government agencies concerned with the Antidumping Act. While laying out more definite guidelines, so to speak, the bill does not depart from the basic philosophy of the Antidumping Act and, certainly, it does not go as far as I should like to see remedial legislation concerning imports go in applying proper safeguards to the Trade Expansion Act.

I feel very strongly that there can be no real relief from the present most inequitable, harmful, and injurious effects of the Trade Expansion Act until Congress adopts adequate safeguards to regulate the growing deluge of cheap goods entering the country from abroad. This must be done, in my opinion, if we are to save our industrial structure from increasingly serious harm and damage from foreign, cutthroat competition.

Until this is done, I fear, there will be no real relief from these conditions. While this measure moves in the right direction, it covers only a limited area where dumping exists.

There are very great difficulties in first, uncovering and then checking the dumping that is now evidently being practiced by some foreign nations. Dumping is hard to prove. It requires sometimes long research, the collection of evidence, it takes a great deal of time when speedy action to shut out destructive imports is imperative.

Then, second, there are the political undertones that are emphatic, in the obvious statement that without strong support from the executive department, it is almost impossible to get favorable action on legislation of this kind.

There is not much point in Members of Congress introducing bills, however important and vital these bills may be, when departmental reports on them are held up, and consideration of them is shunted aside, and they are otherwise delayed, and put off, so as to give the impression that Nero is fiddling while Rome is burning.

I think that the affected industries themselves must act; their workers and labor organizations must act; public opinion must be aroused and mobilized to conduct a militant campaign to change our trade bills.

If for any reason it is not possible to prevail upon the agencies now vested under the trade bill with authority to act internationally and domestically to cut down injurious imports, it strikes me that Congress would be well advised to move to recapture its own constitutional powers over imports and make sure on its own account, as it always did prior to the adoption of the trade laws, that ruinous destructive foreign competition is stopped.

As I pointed out, this does not mean any renunciation of enlightened, forward looking trade policies adapated to the times in which we live. As Americans, we favor trade, we want trade, and we are willing to enter into all reasonable negotiations with other nations to get mutually profitable trade.

We are an open country and an open economy, and the last thing we want to do is to shut ourselves off from the rest of the world in any respect. The American people want maximum communion intellectually, commercially, socially, and cooperatively, especially in those areas having to deal with disarmament, control of nuclear energy, peace, and human betterment with other nations of good will.

These are all goals toward which we of this great Nation are working day by day, resolved, as we are, to strive for peace with full enthusiasm and determination to gain the ends that we seek of a world organized to maintain peaceful relations of brotherhood, good will, and justice.

But, frankly, the presence of dumping, cutthroat competition and other harmful, injurious practices are unquestionably impairing the development of the kind of climate we need in the world today to promote the broader goals of brotherhood and mutual cooperation we so earnestly seek and strive for.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should do our best to try to pass a bill like the antidumping bill, and also pass other pending legislation designed to bring about better and fairer conditions in our commercial and trade intercourse with other nations, that will prevent harmful, destructive imports into this country.

I hope that the committee will take early action to conduct hearings on this bill and report it to the House, so that it may be considered and acted upon by all Members.

It is a good bill. While it does not go far enough, it is needed now—not later, and the sooner the better, because so far as our import situation is concerned, we may well say it is now a quarter to 12.

New York Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, Calls for Immediate Senate Passage of Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for all those who are concerned with the achievement of equality in America to let their voices be heard. It is vitally important that civic organizations, trade unions, religious institutions and private citizens support the civil rights bill and make their support felt in Washington.

I am delighted to report that the New York Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, sponsored a civil rights rally on April 8, 1964, which adopted a resolution calling for "immediate Senate passage of the civil rights bill without weakening amendments" and urging "all trade unionists to write, and visit their Senators calling for their strong support of the bill." The resolution also urges the formation of "neighborhood rallies for passage of the civil rights bill." I want to commend the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council under the chairmanship of Louis Simon for its leadership in this struggle.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION: THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, MANHATTAN CENTER, APRIL 8, 1964

"The AFL–CIO is for civil rights—without reservation and without delay." This statement by AFL–CIO President George Meany sums up the position of millions of trade unionists. The AFL–CIO has wholeheartedly endorsed the civil rights bill and if organized labor has any criticism, it is that the bill does not go far enough.

Congress and the American people cannot stand idly by and watch the daily denial of rights to Negroes and other minorities: the denial of the right to enjoy service in hotels, restaurants, and theaters; to register and to vote; to education and training; to employment and promotion. It is to right these wrongs that the civil rights bill has been proposed.

Today, we are stirred by a civil rights revolution in which those who have been discriminated against, are demanding freedom and equality. We believe that the labor movement and the civil rights movement have a common goal and a common interest. Neither can be successful without the support of the other.

However, an unholy alliance exists between rightwing, antilabor groups and the racists and segregationists. Scratch a labor-baiter and you will find a race-hater. The presidential primary in Wisconsin only confirmed what we have long known. To defeat civil rights or any progressive legislation, the bigots and the Birchite of either political party will join forces and hate peddlers will find a willing audience in the North and the South.

The Senate debate on the civil rights bill begins its second month. We remind the Senators of President Johnson's state of the Union message. "Let this session of Congress be known as the session which did more for civil rights than the last 100 sessions combined. Today Americans of all races stand side-by-side in Berlin and Vietnam. They died side-by-side in Korea. Surely they can work and eat and travel side-by-side in their own country."

How can the United States claim to lead the free world when in a southern county with 1,900 white persons over the age of 21, there were 2,250 registered voters and none of the 5,122 Negroes of voting age were registered? How can the United States boast of free speech when civil rights leaders are murdered?

The time for legislation outlawing discrimination in voting, in public accommodations, in employment, in education, and in federally assisted programs is long overdue: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New York City AFL–CIO call for immediate Senate passage of the civil rights bill without weakening amendments.

We urge all trade unionists to write, and visit their Senators calling for their strong support of the bill, and we further urge our members to initiate neighborhood rallies for passage of the civil rights bill.

We call upon all our affiliates to press for passage of the bill and to initiate with their employers labor-management committees to demonstrate widespread support for this needed legislation including support of the fair employment practices section.

We recognize that passage of the civil rights bill does not mean total victory in the struggle against discrimination. But if the bill is effectively enforced many abuses will be reduced. We pledge therefore to be vigilant in order to insure enforcement.

Finally, we recognize that this effort is part of the battle against poverty and for full employment and we pledge our complete support to President Johnson in that struggle.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, quality stabilization has come under attack in two reports, one official and one academic. The official report was a "Summary Analysis" published by the Council of Economic Advisers at the request of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. The academic attack came in the form of a so-called "fact" sheet originally distributed by half-a-dozen New York area economics professors.

In his columns published in Home Furnishings Daily, February 10 and 11, Earl Lifshey, a leading proponent of quality stabilization, analyzes these two reports in detail and presents what I believe are effective replies to their criticism of this much-needed legislation. With unanimous consent, I ask permission to insert Mr. Lifshey's columns of those dates into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
President, University of Oregon,
Eugene, Oreg.

GOOD MORNING MR. FLEMMING: I have read with much interest a copy of the letter dated December 20, 1963, together with a so-called "fact" sheet, I understand you circulated to many important people throughout the country seeking their support in opposing the quality stabilization bill now before Congress.

As one who has long participated in and been an observer of the Nation's merchandising mechanism in the consumer marketplace I am firmly convinced of the desirability of the basic principles which the quality stabilization bill represents. I have often gone on record here to that effect.

I am well aware, of course, that many others like yourself hold an opposite viewpoint; happily we have that great privilege in this country and I respect your right to disagree. But isn't it important, in the interests of trying to arrive at the correct conclusion in a highly controversial topic such as this, that the arguments be confined to facts and not fictions? I say that because there are a number of statements in your memorandum which, as you can readily ascertain by checking, are inconsistent with the facts concerning this proposed legislation.

In your item No. 2 you state that "It (the quality stabilization bill) would cause a price rise on all brand products, including food, household furnishings, conservatively estimated as between 20 percent and 27 percent, with the outlook that further price rises would ensue." Since, as the record shows, fair traded merchandise has never accounted for more than about 7 percent to 12 percent of all merchandise sold, what possible justification is there for making such an exaggerated charge? By what law of logic can anyone assume that the passage of this law will suddenly cause a major switch in the longestablished historical pattern of merchandising practices?

In your item No. 6, you claim, "The Government itself, the largest consumer, would be adversely affected on the Federal, State, and local levels, through the forced abrogation of the system of competitive bidding." That statement is as astonishing as those made in Washington recently at Senate subcommittee hearings on this bill by Albert Kornblum, Assistant General Counsel of the Navy, and A. J. Racusin, deputy for procurement management in the Air Force, both of whom testified that the bill would greatly increase defense supply expenditures. Yet the bill clearly and precisely, in section 16, spells out the exemption of all Government agencies from the provisions of this bill; that includes, as stated in section 16(E)—"Sales to or by the Federal, State, or municipal governments or their political subdivisions or agencies." One wonders, Mr. Flemming, how explicit language can be—or what good it does to even try if its meaning is so arbitrarily and incomprehensibly reversed?

You say that "experience has shown that there are more failures of small businessmen in States with price-fixing than in those States which do not have it." No doubt you are referring to the testimony of the former Assistant Attorney General, Lee Loevinger, at a Senate committee hearing on this bill in 1962, at which he introduced the findings of a survey his Department made on this subject. Like the technique of "repeating the big lie" often enough so that it will eventually be believed, this spurious charge continues to be repeated by uniformed persons.

But it fails to stand up under careful examination. In a series of three columns here (October 2, 3, 4, 1962), I revealed the fallacy of his claims by showing that: "1. His figures not only include retail business failures but also 'all distribution failures.' (It was not just small businessmen as you state.) 2. He includes businesses in which fair trade prices play little or no part. And 3. He makes absolutely no allowance for the fact that almost without exception fair traded merchandise generally for only a very small percentage of the total retail volume." My charges have never been refuted.

You state that "Alleged abuses in the form of predatory 'bait' advertising can be corrected by application of existing laws." Perhaps you know of laws and methods of which the sponsors of this legislation are unaware for correcting this merchandising malpractice; if so it would be good to have you provide that information.

Those who believe in the principles advanced by this bill do not want an end to competition; however, they do want the opportunity to compete under the law of fair play before the law of the jungle has eliminated most of the competitors. Or is that expecting too much?

Cordially,

EARL LIFSHEY.

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Feb. 11, 1964]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

Like many others I got quite a laugh when I read, in the special "Summary Analysis" of the "Probable Effects of the Proposed Quality Stabilization Act on Prices, Incomes, Employment, and Production," prepared last fall by the Council of Economic Advisers at the request of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, the following paragraph on page 3:

"Rising costs and reduced efficiency in retailing would put pressure on manufacturers to raise their resale prices further. The main limitation on the extent of these upward price movements would arise from an accelerated development of private brands, sold under the labels of large department and chain stores and mail-order houses. Rising prices for the price-maintained items would surely encourage the use of private brands. Needless to say, this development would not be to the benefit of either the retailers or the manufacturers of the price-maintained items (except to the extent that the same manufacturers also produce the private brands)."

After that report appeared I wrote and wired to Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council, in the hope of learning more about his conclusions regarding private-brand merchandising and how he arrived at them. But since he hasn't replied to any of my inquiries, I have no idea how he did so. Maybe it's top secret—classified information and he can't talk; one never can tell.

But it's very obviously no secret to anyone at all familiar with the marketplace that retailers in general and large department and chain stores and mail-order houses in particular have not only been getting deeper and deeper into their own private brands for the past 2 or 3 years, but that they have been doing it without the slightest thought of the quality stabilization bill. The interest of retailers in and their development of private brands has been at an alltime peak for quite some time.

Sears, Roebuck, for example, points to the fact that 90 percent of its business is done on own-brand merchandise; Ward's has announced a goal of 90 percent on private brands, and almost every other chain or group has been similarly engaged. Just how much more, one wonders, can retailers be "encouraged," as Mr. Heller puts it?

There was a time, long before World War II, when retailers went in for private brands primarily so that they could have something to promote at a special low price during a sale. In those days, no self-respecting buyer would think of murdering the markup on regular national-brand merchandise.

But now—and this is the main point which Mr. Heller seems to have completely missed—the No. 1 reason for private brands is not, as his report claims, to put a "limitation on the extent of * * * upward price movements" (which presumably would be caused by the quality stabilization bill) but to provide the profit which has become so extremely elusive on the deeply price cut national-brand products.

The readers of this newspaper need hardly be reminded of the many, many stories that have appeared in its columns during the last year or two bearing out that statement. Nor is this by any means the only place where such reports have appeared. Just a year ago, J. Gordon Dakins, the executive vice president of the National Retail Merchants Association, wrote in that organization's publication:

"Private brands are on the increase. Most large retail operations already have well-established private brands some of which rank with the best national brands * * * in acceptance * * * In private brands some see opportunities to build on their own prestige, to realize higher profit margins * * * among other benefits."

Well, as I said earlier, Mr. Heller isn't talking. Meanwhile, the facts speak quite eloquently for themselves.

Appendix

I Quit Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the same issue of Reader's Digest and on the same subject. It is "I Quit Smoking or Cooper's Last Stand." Anyone who has ever been a smoker will appreciate the personal side of this interesting article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Courtney Ryley Cooper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I QUIT SMOKING OR COOPER'S LAST STAND

(By Courtney Ryley Cooper)

The scene is deeply etched. It was a lazy Florida afternoon; on my studio floor snored my terriers, the four Marx Brothers. All in an instant I whisked away a lighted cigarette and said aloud, "No; I've stopped smoking." Here was the culmination of many years' resolutions, each too weak to stand by itself, but all forming a basis for "Cooper's Last Stand." Now I must either lick the foe or admit to being a weakling and a sucker.

Suddenly I was terrified—a sniveling sacrifice on the altar of resolution. It was the kind of afternoon for a fellow to lean back from his typewriter, forget his work for a moment and light a cig—

But I had sworn off.

My smoking had gotten a bit thick. For more than 40 years I had sucked up nicotine like a filling-station sponge. Even at night I awakened many times and grabbed for a cigarette. And now I stood quivering with the knowledge of what I was in for. I didn't even have any help; my wife was out shopping. I was alone—

Alone. I laughed. No need to tell anyone what I had done. No need for braggadocio, or alibis in case I couldn't stick it out. If I failed, there would be no shame. Nobody could kid me into weakening, because nobody knew.

Suddenly everything was swell. Deliberately I put some cigarettes in my pocket; that afternoon I fingered them a hundred times. At last I laid them aside. I had lived for 8 hours without smoking. Why shouldn't I be able to live 8 hours more? I refused to touch my cigarette box when I went to bed. Some way I managed to sleep, only to awaken with a horror hanging over me—of something terrible I'd done—

Then I heard the clock strike 4. I'd been asleep for 6 straight hours, something unheard of for years. My terror passed; now I really laughed. Snapping on the light, I opened the box and streamed cigarettes through my fingers, exulting over them. "I've got you licked," I gloated. "If I can stay away from you this long, I can stay away forever."

Here the story chops short. On that day when the big excitement happened I was 20 pounds underweight. I had no taste for food. I had smoker's throat, a bronchial cough, smoker's nerves, sinus trouble. The fingers of both hands were stained a deep walnut. I was ashamed to open my mouth because of the thick incrustations on my teeth, to say nothing of the brown fur on my tongue. I was a one-man furnace.

A single month brought about a great change. My smoker's pulse, which often had pounded along at 120, dropped back to a pleasant 72. I could really taste and enjoy food for the first time in 10 years. The smoker's throat, cough, and sinus inflammation were gone. Today if I don't sleep 8 hours at a stretch, I complain about it. The only scar remaining is the wish that I'd done all this 25 years ago.

I had attempted it often enough, but without the proper philosophy. Usually I told everyone that I was going to try to stop smoking. Or I began the tapering off technique, and all that self-delusion bilge. In a few days I was smoking like a fire engine again. How anyone afflicted with acute nervous nicotinitis can cut down on his intake is sometihng I've never learned. On the contrary, everybody who has studied the problem of smoking avers that there is only one way to decrease the intake—and that is to stop altogether. J. C. Furnas, in an exhaustive canvass of smokers, found that either you'll cut smoking off short and take it on the chin or you won't cut it out at all.

From 45 of my acquaintances who have sworn off, I have discovered some rather surprising things. Those who experienced the least difficulty in quitting were those who did least talking about it. As one friend put it:

"If you're going to build bridges back to smoking even before you quit, then quitting is just a pretense. You're going to lay off for a while, go through hell and high water, start smoking a little on the sly, then get back hard as ever, meanwhile lying your head off about how you really found out it was better for you to cut down gradually."

There exists no doubt about the benefits to be derived from cutting out tobacco. Of my friends who have stopped nibbling at nicotine, all but two or three are feeling far more fit. Headaches have vanished, sinus troubles decreased. In some instances, sight has been enhanced; others mention a keener sense of smell, even of hearing. With many, there has been a lessening of indigestion and biliousness, and a greater resistance against colds or flu. Smoker's throat and cough have disappeared. While some have gained weight, most have not gained in size. Since I stopped smoking, I have gained 20 pounds, and can drool easily at the thought of oysters, a sirloin steak, baked potato, and ice cream. Yet I still wear the same size clothes.

This is probably due to an increased desire for activity. A person feels better, and goes in for more exercise. The type of flesh which one puts on by abstinence from smoking seems entirely different from the inner-tube variety which attaches itself to the midriff as a result of indolence.

There is a common belief that a drink isn't much good without a smoke to accompany it. Therefore, one big hurdle is the social hazard when everyone is standing around with cocktails in hand. You think you're not going to be able to take that. But it can be done. Merely say what you've always said when you haven't felt like smoking: "No, thanks." The offering of cigarettes is merely a mechanical social gesture. It is amazing how few persons notice that you aren't in the huffing-and-puffing class. One rule need be observed here: Always carry matches. Oddly enough, the more cigarettes you light for others the fewer times you will be asked to smoke.

Heavy smokers become accustomed to irritation of the throat and some sort of taste in the mouth, and my friends agree that this is the big thing to beat in staying away from tobacco. In times of stress I sucked on a menthol coughdrop or a mint. Others have used hard candies. But stay away from soft candies; you'll eat the whole box before you realize it.

The person who stops smoking must inure himself to the knowledge that every old association will bring a recurring desire. Once this is understood, however, it is just another apple in the bag. The desire can be squelched by a compensatory amount of reasoning which makes the craving ridiculous. This phase grows weaker the more you laugh about what a nuisance smoking used to be. Soon the thought of smoking seldom enters your mind.

One association will not bother you: the smell of cigarette smoke. Indeed it has the opposite effect; the longer one stays away from tobacco, the more obnoxious it becomes. The exhalation from another's cigarette stinks like a dead cat, and revives no memories except unhappy ones of headache, hacking coughs, a half-dead feeling, and hours in which one sits cussing himself for being able to do nothing but suck on a tube of tobacco.

Always remember this: No one ever died or went crazy from lack of tobacco. The worst that can happen to you is annoyance, for which you are repaid by better wind and pulse, and a mouth which doesn't taste like glue.

To stop smoking is a real job, but it is not as sacrificial as one likes to pretend. I wish I could assume gigantic stature and stand, Napoleonlike, with a hand in my vest while I relate terrible experiences. But I can only say that, like any other abrupt change, quitting smoking is serious, but not crucial. One must employ every possible element of one's sense of humor, whip up all the pride that ever existed—and use commonsense. After all, why fuss and worry about something that enables you to wake up rested in the morning, restores your mental clarity, and adds years to your life?

An overwhelming desire for a cigarette is possibly sweeping over you right now. But why should a puny piece of paper with some tobacco inside it be allowed to push you around?

An Unhappy Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES.* Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop has had the courage to reveal

through his syndicated column a generally known fact which other writers have shunned. It is known in official quarters in Washington that Rev. Martin Luther King has among his close associates and advisers, persons who have Communist leanings. Naturally, the Communists will seek to take advantage of any movement by which their cause can be furthered and racial unrest is a prime target for their activities. Alsop's column entitled "An Unhappy Secret," appeared on April 15. I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

AN UNHAPPY SECRET

(By Joseph Alsop)

An unhappy secret is worrying official Washington. The secret is that despite the American Communist Party's feebleness and disarray, its agents are beginning to infiltrate certain sectors of the Negro civil rights movement.

The infiltration is spotty, as yet. But it is a very serious matter, nonetheless, that the charges of Communist influence, which have been hurled for so long by anti-civil-rights racists, should now be acquiring some color of truth.

The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by the Reverend Martin Luther King; the Students' Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, more usually called "Snick"; and the Congress on Racial Equality, more usually called CORE, are all affected in greater or less degree.

These, it should be noted, are all relatively new-fledged outfits. The older, more experienced organizations of Negro civil rights fighters, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League, are quite untouched.

Both the Urban League and the NAACP learned their lesson the hard way in the late 1930's and early 1940's—the period which was also the high water mark of Communist infiltration in the labor movement. Like the CIO, both these civil rights organizations expelled the Communist infiltrators, after a hard struggle but with total success.

Very recently, the NAACP staged a repeat performance with Robert Williams, who had been active in the North Carolina branch. This is the man who went to Cuba after his comeuppance from the NAACP, there to become a Castro propagandist.

Of the infiltrated organizations, CORE has the least serious problem. A few Communists are reported in some of the local branches, but none are known to be in CORE at the national level.

In the case of Snick, the name, Students' Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, is in itself deceptive; for the Snick leader, John Lewis, though not a Communist, quite frankly believes in quasi-insurrectionary tactics. Thus no great difference has been made in Snick's tactics, because known Communists have also begun to play a certain role in Snick.

The subject of the real headshaking is the Reverend Martin Luther King. His influence is very great. His original dedication to nonviolence can hardly be doubted. Yet he has accepted and is almost certainly still accepting Communist collaboration and even Communist advice.

In 1962–63, the issue of the Communists' role in the King organization was raised because of Hunter Pitts O'Dell, commonly called Jack O'Dell. This man, a known Communist, held posts in the Southern Christian Leadership Council, first in the South and then in the New York office, until the late spring of 1963. King finally dropped him when he was warned by U.S. Government officials that O'Dell was the genuine Communist article.

Official warnings have again been given to King about another, even more important associate, who is known to be a key figure in the covert apparatus of the Communist Party. After the warnings, King broke off his open connections with this man, but a secondhand connections nonetheless continues. Without much doubt, this is simply a mark of the Reverend King's political innocence, but it is disturbing all the same. The King organization and King himself are clearly the prime Communist targets.

Such, then, are the facts. What ought to be made of the facts is the almost precise opposite of the kind of thing the anti-civil-rights racists will say about them. For despite these facts, the Negro civil rights movement is most emphatically not "run by Communists" or "inspired by Communists."

Instead, the newer and more inexperienced Negro civil rights organizations have at length proved vulnerable to Communist infiltration. But they have been vulnerable because the grievance for which they seek redress is so shocking, and therefore so emotionally obsessive.

Every man must bear the responsibility for his own acts. Yet in this case, a heavy burden of responsibility, a vast share of the guilt, must also be charged to the white majority, which has created the grievance by injustice to the Negro minority.

The facts cited indeed constitute a strong argument for the earliest possible passage of a strong civil rights bill, and for other measures, too, that are needed to redress the Negro grievance. These facts are further proof that time is rapidly running out. Justice must be swiftly done; or gross injustice, complacently persisted in, will breed an incurable cancer in the bottom of American society.

Comments on Governor Scranton's Press Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on April 9, 1964, Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, Sr., president of the Scott Paper Co., commented on the press conference held by Gov. William W. Scranton.

Since I share the regard for Governor Scranton alluded to by Mr. McCabe, and since I am desirous of associating myself with Mr. McCabe's views, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of Mr. McCabe's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Only a man of extraordinary purpose and courage could make the statement which Governor Scranton made today in refusing the overtures of his many friends that he become an active candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

I am confident that his supporters will admire him more than ever for his candor and his desire to complete his term of office as Governor with honor and distinction. In view of the fact that he did not definitely close the door to a draft, he will undoubtedly go to the convention as Pennsylvania's favorite-son candidate.

He has the qualities of leadership and statesmanship that the Republican Party needs at this critical juncture in the campaign. Never before has Pennsylvania had in the Governor's chair a man who could more successfully inspire and unify the divergent elements of his party. This was exemplified by his outstanding record with the legislature in solving knotty problems which his predecessors had swept under the rug.

Governor Scranton has proved his ability as a campaigner and has the winning personality, persuasiveness, and persistence required of a national leader. His friends firmly believe that Governor Scranton has presidential stature and that he is conveying to the Nation a new youthful image and qualities of integrity and dedication that are needed at this time.

He may have to accept a draft in spite of himself.

THOMAS B. MCCABE.

APRIL 9, 1964.

Will Lenin's Prediction Come True?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Lenin has predicted that the "fat capitalists" will drop into the lap of communism like a plucked apple. Recent speeches from well-known individuals are worrying the American people. Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer's article in the Long Island Press of April 10 tells us why:

OPPOSITE VIEWS ON CUBA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

All unexpected here is nothing less than a national debate on foregin policy sparked, not by Republicans but by the very liberals who under Kennedy managed—or mismanaged—our international affairs.

For the liberals are not only attempting to hold the "can win" policy of Senator GOLDWATER up to ridicule but, through their unfailing mouthpiece, Senator FULBRIGHT, to make it clear that when they talk of "greater elasticity" in our policy they mean not more but less, backbone.

Look magazine republishes what the editors obviously believe to be the "primitive views" of Senator GOLDWATER. And liberals all over the country have popularized a speech which Senator FULBRIGHT made on the Senate floor to precisely four other Senators.

So the debate is on. And it is hot. Take Cuba. Senator GOLDWATER: "We should aid anyone who wants to go in there and let Castro have it—overtly or covertly * * *. If we told the Cubans that they had to get rid of Soviet arms and equipment, I am convinced, and I am backed up by every military man I have ever spoken to, that Russia not only couldn't but wouldn't, come to the support of Cuba."

Senator FULBRIGHT: "We must abandon the myth that Cuban communism is a transitory menace that is going to collapse or disappear * * *. The Castro regime is not likely to be overthrown by any policies which we are now pursuing or can reasonably udertake * * *. The continued existence of the Castro regime, though inimical to our interests and policies is not an insuperable obstacle to the attainment of our objectives."

Obviously, part of the difference between the two may be glandular. But it goes beyond that. The liberal establishment believes unshakably two things about Cuba: first, that the Castro revolution, however badly it turned out, was justified by the miserable economic conditions of that country; and second, that Castro has such widespread support from the "masses" that even if we helped eliminate him, we should then face guerrilla warfare by his followers for perhaps a decade.

GOLDWATER Republicans deny both. Where is the truth?

Now obviously, the former economic condition of Cuba is a matter of fact, not of theory. And it just happens that Cuban refugees in Madrid have put out a little booklet: "Revolution in Cuba—the Objective Truth of the Cuban Case," which Cuban experts tell me is exact. And it shows that far from being exceptionally exploited, the Cubans, including the much pitied agricultural workers, had the third highest living standard in Latin America. Batista was a political tyrant, not an economic oppressor.

Whether today's Cubans would welcome liberation from Castro or rally to his defense must remain somewhat a matter of opinion. All we can lay a finger on is the amount of opposition to the Castro regime over the last 3 years and the difficulty Castro has had in dealing with it. And here again the facts are eloquent.

The weight of evidence is on the side of Senator GOLDWATER. As of today most Cubans would apparently welcome liberation by fellow countrymen backed by the United States. If Senator FULBRIGHT still denies this, the burden of proof is on him.

Nation Mourns Death of Melvin J. Maas—Soldier-Statesman Headed President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped for a Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we are saddened at the passing of Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, a respected public servant and the cherished friend of many who today serve in this body. As a soldier, statesman, and crusader for the handicapped, he won the admiration and esteem of those who seek justice and progress under the democratic system.

It was my privilege to work closely with Mel Maas when we served together in the House of Representatives. More recently, we were associated in the worthwhile efforts of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, a group which he headed for 10 years prior to his death. Under his able leadership the Committee intensified its educational and promotional efforts in behalf of the physically handicapped, and expanded its functions to include the mentally restored and mentally retarded.

General Maas also established an outstanding record of military service during three wars, and served with Adm. William Halsey and Gen. Douglas MacArthur in World War II. It was during the fighting on Okinawa that an enemy bomb damaged his optic nerve.

Returning to civilian life after the close of the war General Maas assumed responsibilities with several large business concerns until the outbreak of the Korean conflict. He was recalled to active duty, and served briefly as a member of the Reserve Forces policy board. Since 1949, he has been active in efforts to build a better way of life for handicapped citizens.

It is appropriate that we remember the achievements and sacrifices of Melvin J. Maas as he served his country and his fellow man in war and peace. We pray God's blessing on this worthy American, and on his loving family in this hour of grief. Thousands of citizens are comforted in the knowledge that Melvin J. Maas brought lasting benefit to the world in which we live.

Mr. President, I request that the Washington Post article of April 14, 1964, on the death of Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MAAS, THREE-WAR VETERAN

(By Kenneth M. Boyd)

Retired Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMC, veteran of three wars, former U.S. Congressman from Minnesota and Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, died yesterday at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The death of the 65-year-old general was attributed to a combination of heart disease, arteriosclerosis and diabetes. It was the 10th anniversary of his appointment to the Committee chairmanship.

General Maas, blinded since 1951 from injuries suffered during World War II, traveled hundreds of thousands of miles since his appointment to the Committee chairmanship in an effort to obtain equal opportunity for the handicapped.

He curtailed his extensive traveling a year ago, however, because of ailing health, but continued to direct his affairs by tape recorder from his home, 4714 Essex Street, Chevy Chase.

JOINED MARINES IN 1917

A graduate of the College of St. Thomas, in St. Paul, Minn., General Maas interrupted his education to enter the Marine Corps in April 1917, to serve as a private with Marine Aviation in the Azores throughout the war.

He accepted a Marine Reserve commission in 1926 before his election to Congress that year at the age of 27.

In 1933, General Maas received the Carnegie Silver Medal for heroism for persuading a mentally deranged spectator in the House galleries to yield a pistol he was waving menacingly at Congressmen.

A Republican and an opponent of most New Deal domestic policies, General Maas served in Congress until 1945 with the exception of 2 years when he went into private business.

He was joint author of legislation setting up a promotion system for the Navy and sponsoring author of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 which, until passage of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, governed the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves.

SERVED WITH HALSEY

The general returned to active duty in the summer of 1941 to serve at sea and on the staff of Adm. William Halsey and in 1942 with Adm. Frank J. Fletcher in the Solomons campaign.

He then served as a Marine observer in Australia and New Guinea with the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and in 1945 assumed command of the Awase Airbase on Okinawa, where an enemy bomb explosion injured his optic nerve.

General Maas returned to civilian life to become assistant to the chairman of the board of the Sperry Corp. He later became a director of the U.S. Life Insurance Co., and of Mutual of Omaha.

With the exception of a brief return to active duty in the Korean war, when he served as a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board in the Pentagon, General Maas has been with the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped since its formation in 1949.

He leaves his wife, Katherine; a son, Melvin; three daughters, Patricia, a Marine major; Mrs. Anthony C. Martino, of Richmond, and Mrs. Leo Catteron, of Annapolis.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in submitting for the RECORD this article from the Washington Post, explanatory of the career of the late Melvin J. Maas, I wish to state that not only was he a major general of the Armed Forces during an illustrious career, but he also was one of my cherished friends, with whom I had the privilege of serving—together with other Senators present today on the floor of the Senate—in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He was stricken blind rather late in life. His energies were used in the public good. He became chairman of the President's Committee on Employment for the Handicapped.

Now he is gone. I have written, through dictation—for I cannot actually read what I have dictated—a letter to his widow. I ask unanimous consent that this communication be printed in the RECORD, together with my remarks, in tribute to this great American, who gave so much of himself, his talents, and his compassion to mankind.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,
April 14, 1964.

Mrs. MELVIN J. MAAS,
Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR MRS. MAAS: Permit me to extend deepest sympathy on the passing of your beloved husband my cherished friend, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas. The Randolphs share your sense of loss in this difficult time.

It was my privilege to serve with Mel when we were Members of the House of Representatives, and I have worked closely with him in his post as chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. He proved himself a responsible and purposeful leader and one who was ever motivated by the desire to serve his fellow man. As a courageous military commander and as a statesman of vision and integrity, Melvin J. Maas exemplified the strength of character and devotion to duty which are the integral components of American citizenship.

We are confident that you and your children will be comforted in the knowledge that the world is a finer place because of the wisdom and sacrifice of this gifted man.

With warmest personal wishes, I am,

Very truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

CAB Stirs Airline War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting two articles for the RECORD which I hope will help Members to understand proposals by the Civil Aeronautics Board to shift business to nonscheduled airlines at the expense of regularly scheduled carriers.

The first is by Leslie Gould of the New York Journal-American, the second by Jack Steele of Scripps-Howard newspapers.

I think most Members will agree that there is a situation here which requires a basic policy decision from the Congress and which ought not to be handled solo by a Federal agency.

The articles follow:

COMPLETION CURBED: CAB STIRS AIRLINE WAR

(By Jack Steele)

The Civil Aeronautics Board has unleashed a bitter war among U.S. airlines by a series of moves curbing competition.

Most of the Board's actions are designed to shift more passenger and cargo business to supplemental (nonscheduled) and all-cargo airlines at the expense of the regularly scheduled carriers.

This means the CAB has taken on the industry giants in a battle which may continue for years and end up in Congress or the courts.

HOWLS

Some CAB decisions and proposed rules also may bring howls from passengers and shippers, some of whom will be restricted in their choice of airlines for charter flights or for the fastest cargo service.

Under one proposed rule, for example, anybody arranging a charter flight could engage a regular airline only if a smaller nonsked refused to handle it.

The CAB's moves raise fundamental questions of how far a regulatory agency can or should go in limiting competition—which the Government, under the antitrust laws, is supposed to promote.

The Board's actions have been taken without any direct authority from Congress.

Some congressional makers of aviation policy, among them Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, have in the past pushed legislation to boost the all-cargo and nonsked lines but failed to get it enacted. Now the CAB apparently is achieving this by executive action.

SPLIT

Most CAB decisions have been by 3-to-2 votes, with two Republican members, former Senator Chan Gurney and Whitney Gilliland, dissenting.

Some of the embattled airlines recently have taken newspaper ads and briefed reporters to press their views.

The CAB decisions and policy rulings have these objectives:

To shift more cargo business from scheduled airlines, which carry passengers and freight on the same flights and so are known as combination carriers, to four small all-cargo lines. They are Slick, Flying Tigers, Riddle, and Seaboard World Airways. Seaboard flies only overseas.

To shift most charter flights from the scheduled lines to smaller nonskeds which were limited to charter service by Congress 2 years ago. The CAB claims this law intended to make the nonskeds "charter specialists." The regular lines deny this.

To shift more oversea airmail, military and commercial, to Seaboard, the only all-cargo line, certificated for this service. The CAB prevailed on reluctant Post Office and Defense Department officials to give Seaboard a third of their business.

One of the key CAB decisions came last month.

The Board gave two supplemental airlines, Capitol and Saturn, the right to fly charter groups to Europe in the peak summer-tourist season. A third nonsked was included but went bankrupt before the order was issued.

This decision also lifted many restrictions on charter flights. It will permit more than one group to use the same flight and let travel agents assist in forming charter groups, thus cutting into Pan American and TWA business.

The Board, in another new proposal, would limit regular and all-cargo airlines to devoting only 2 percent of total passenger miles to charter flights, instead of the present 10 percent.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 29, 1964]

CAB CHARTER PLAN PUNISHES CERTIFIED LINES

(By Leslie Gould)

The CAB (Civil Aeronautics Board) is going all out in its efforts to bail out the supplemental and all-cargo airlines at the expense of the certificated carriers.

The most scandalous proposal is to give the supplemental and all-cargo lines first refusal on off-route freight and passenger charters of the certified combination (passenger and cargo) carriers.

At the same time, the supplemental and the all-cargo lines would be allowed to fly charters on the routes of the certificated carriers without any such clearance.

This is nothing more than a handout, which, instead of coming from Government, will come from the pocketbooks of the shareowners in the major certificated carriers—like Pan American, TWA, Northwest, United, American, Eastern, and so on.

When the CAB opened the doors to the supplemental and all-cargo lines, it adopted a policy of barring them from subsidy. Now, the CAB having erred originally, is attempting a backdoor subsidy for these carriers, few of which are making money.

The charter raid is in addition to the CAB's efforts to swing to the all-cargo lines a larger percentage of the transatlantic military mail. This also would be at the expense of the two transatlantic certificated carriers—Pan American and TWA. A preceding column exposed this.

CAB PROPOSES 8-PERCENT CUT

Under present rules the combination carriers off-route charters are limited to 10 percent of their base on-route revenue plane miles. The CAB now proposes to reduce this to 2 percent, with a further limitation that only a third of the 2 percent can be flown in any 3 consecutive months.

While off-route charters have only been running a little better than 2 percent for a 12-month period, the CAB waves aside the fact that this volume rises and falls according to the season. So, under the proposed plan, the combination carriers would be greatly restricted in the period of peak business—such as the summer months on the Atlantic runs.

The big change, which would all but bar the combination carriers from off-route charters, is the proposal to grant first refusal rights to the all-cargo and supplemental carriers. However, the supplemental and all-cargo lines would not be required to grant first refusal to the combination lines for charters on their routes.

TWO SETS OF RULES

In other words, the door would be open to virtually unrestricted competition on the combination carriers' own routes, but the combination lines would be restricted on their off-route charters, in that they would have to give first refusal to the supplemental and all-cargo companies.

This tosses into the ashcan the original premise whereby these other carriers were set up. They were created to supplement—not to supplant—the services of the older and established combination carriers.

United Air Lines, in its brief filed with the CAB, states:

"The purpose of both of the proposed regulations * * * is to try to transfer traffic of the combination carries to the supplemental and all-cargo.

"The proposed new volume limitation on off-route charter mileage, together with the proposed first refusal rights, are designed to channel the combination carriers' off route passenger charter business to the supplementals and their off-route cargo charter traffic to the all-cargo carriers.

"PROPOSALS CALLED ILLEGAL

"Similarly, the proposed policy statement is designed to divert substantial volumes of the combination carriers' cargo traffic carried on scheduled flights to the socalled all-cargo carriers."

TWA which holds the Board's proposals are illegal, makes this point:

"When Congress enacted the off-route charter provisions of the act, it made the conduct of such operations subject to Board regulation for one basic reason—a congressional desire to protect regular route services from being undermined by off-route operations."

Pan American also, in branding the proposals as illegal, shows how ridiculous and unfair they are, saying:

"An entirely new provision of the regulations would require a carrier such as Pan American to obtain the consent of any supplemental carrier who had filed a notice with it before performing any off-route passenger charter, or to obtain specific authority from the Board."

It is time Congress took another look at the CAB, and at the same time check other creatures of its legislation as to usurping of powers never intended by the lawmakers.

Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for some time there has been increasing evidence of growing anti-Semitism within the Soviet Union. All over the world, freemen concerned about this ominous campaign have spoken out against the measures which deny Soviet Jews their religious and cultural rights, and allow political, social, and economic measures against Jews.

In connection with this protest, the Seattle Council of Rabbis has been active in arousing the conscience of the public. The Governor of our State proclaimed a Sabbath of protest, which was widely observed last month. As a continuing part of this effort, I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation of the Governor

be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

In flagrant violation of human rights, the Soviet Government has subjected its Jewish citizens to discrimination and persecution. The Jew in the Soviet Union suffers unique religious, cultural, economic, and social discrimination.

We protest the attempt to strangle Russian Jewry by prohibitions intended to leave the Jew ignorant of Hebrew, bereft of rabbis and lay leadership, deprived of Bibles, prayerbooks, and religious objects, lacking in journals and publications of Jewish content. We protest the press campaign which condemns Jews and Judaism as subversive. We protest the discrimination in employment and education which imposes economic penalties on a man because of his religion. We protest the unjust and severe punishments inflicted on Jews for so-called economic crimes. We protest the use of the Jew as a scapegoat, the deliberate encouragement of popular anti-Semitism, the systematic attempt to reduce the Jew to a second-class citizen, the refusal to grant him the enjoyment of his cultural and spiritual heritage. We protest the inhumanity of a government which claims to guarantee its citizens equal rights.

Now, therefore, I, Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington, do hereby designate 29th of Adar 5724 (March 14, 1964) to be a "Sabbath of Protest" in the State of Washington. On that day, Jews will gather in their synagogs to protest on behalf of a historic Jewish community, to call on their fellow Americans to join in opposing this policy of evil, and to speak out lest silence encourage inhumanity.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor.

Private Enterprise in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, many times in recent years I have pointed out the vital role that U.S. private business investment must play if our country's plans for Latin American economic development are to succeed.

The unsettled economic and political climate of many Latin American nations has in the past deterred many U.S. investors from exploring business possibilities in this area. Nevertheless, a number of pioneer U.S. companies have not only established operations in Latin America, but through the success of their efforts have contributed greatly to hemispheric progress and unity.

One company that has acted as an economic pioneer in the Latin American consumer area is Sears, Roebuck & Co., operating retail outlets in nine countries of Central and South America. Although much has been written concerning the contribution of Sears' operations in Latin America, I was especially impressed by one article brought to my attention by Mr. William O. Kelleher, director-resident of Sears, Roebuck S.A.

With unanimous consent I therefore insert the article entitled "American Retailers—Brazilian Style," extracted from the publication Brazilian Business, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AMERICAN RETAILERS—BRAZILIAN STYLE

Every retail store in the free world has one main overriding purpose—to get its merchandise in the hands of the buying public. To do this, it must boost the attractiveness of the products offered for sale.

But, to be attractive, a product must have many things. Among these, it must be practical, stylish, efficient, and priced well within the purchasing power of the consumer.

And any store worth its salt must be able to stand behind the quality of its goods; that is, in spite of varying wholesaler or manufacturer standards, a product which reaches the hands of the buying public represents mainly the organization from which it was purchased. Quantities of future sales depend on the ultimate satisfaction the customer received after his last cash outlay.

More than 13 good years have passed since cruzeiro-waving customers flooded into the first store opened by Sears, Roebuck S.A. in Brazil. From that day forward, the corporation has maintained a high popularity quotient in all areas. It has kept a rigid standard of attractively priced, quality merchandise, created thousands of jobs, placed millions of cruzeiros' worth of factory orders, and still has won a fair profit—much of which it has been constantly reinvesting in Brazil through further expansion.

One of the main keys to Sears' merchandising success in Brazil is what it calls product development. In this country, it works in four important ways:

1. Production of a completely new item, not previously seen on the local market. A dramatic example of this type of product is Sears' homefreezer—almost unknown here pre-Sears—and which is expected to create a demand for frozen foods in Brazil, and possibly a new industry.

2. Production of a new type of item, of which there are other kinds already on the market. In this category is Sears' introduction of the Brazilian-made Kenmore washing machine. An exact copy of the Kenmore automatic in the United States, it washes by agitation and dries by centrifugal spinning.

3. Improvement of an item already on the market. Babies' shoes have always been for sale here, but it was Sears who first demanded that those in their stores should be made without nails.

4. Invisible quality improvements. Such an invisible improvement occurred after Sears' discovery that in an otherwise excellent electrical appliance made here, the switch always gave way after a few hundred movements. Result: the manufacturer, grateful for the information, installed a stronger switch.

There are several keys to Sears' success in buying methods, unlocking the doors to low-cost, high-quality merchandise. The more than 100 buyers are in the habit of going to the manufacturing sources—not waiting for the sources to come to them. This helps to cut down on extra distribution costs.

The company, when it agrees with a manufacturer on the specifications of its merchandise, gives high-volume, long-term orders, which allows the source to efficiently plan his future production. To maintain this larger order policy, Sears tends to buy from fewer sources, and it allows these suppliers to work on certain merchandise "out of season," thus helping factories to avoid slack periods.

Because Sears prepares its own advertising, it asks its sources not to include advertising percentages in its bills; and because Sears pays its bills on time, sources do not include in their prices any reserve for bad debts or late payments. Many other similar savings are effected.

In spite of many regional difficulties, Sears buyers follow these and other principles—adapting them where necessary—in order to help the corporation maintain its selling policy: to sell better merchandise at prices the same as those of the competition for lower quality items, or, failing that, to sell the same merchandise at lower prices than competitors.

When the first Brazilian Sears store opened in São Paulo in 1949, a relatively small percentage of the merchandise offered was made in Brazil. Today, that figure is more than 98 percent, and the types of products being offered in the company's nine stores are constantly increasing.

"We regularly examine our U.S. Sears' catalog and merchandise lists with the greatest care," says Director-President Kelleher, "to see which styles, which items, and which features we can give to our Brazilian-made merchandise. We feel that this is one of the ways we can best justify our existence here. And all this is within the framework of the phrase that is compulsory in every advertisement: 'Your Satisfaction Guaranteed or Your Money Back.' "

Among the many satisfactions of storekeeping, merchandise development is one of the more fascinating, Kelleher points out. Brazilian buyers for Sears have developed such "firsts" here as built-in collar stays in men's shirts, a new-type paint roller, several items of playground equipment, an expandable dress form, cushioned soled men's shoes, travel diapers, and many others. Sears has also brought tools and dies from the United States of America to be used in Brazilian production. A case in point was the set of huge dies for a pressure cooker which has since become one of the most popular in the country.

Sears has contributed to the popularization of many consumer goods previously only available to higher income brackets here. These include such items as metal kitchen cabinets, innerspring mattresses, sofa beds (helped along by the decreasing size of new apartments), and certain power tools.

Although the innerspring mattress was barely available here before Sears, the store did much to develop it into a line—each item of which presented different numbers of springs, covers, and other features. A similar line was developed in juvenile furniture. Sears also was the first to bring to Brazil "thread-count" sheets which now enable customers to compare price with specific quality. Other textiles such as curtain materials and towels were adapted copies of similar products sold by Sears in North America.

Splendid furniture has been made in Brazil for many years. But it was Sears, Roebuck's massive orders that allowed manufacturers to produce in cost-cutting quantity—and with the same high quality.

In order to bring to Brazil the maximum benefit of techniques developed over its 76 years of existence in the United States, Sears once organized a suppliers "caravan" to the home office in Chicago. A planeful of men and women representing many local merchandise sources conferred in the Windy City with Sears' top supervisors and buyers. Then they fanned out to factories of Sears sources throughout the Nation where they investigated many manufacturing techniques. These suppliers returned to Brazil with new ideas and thousands of samples of merchandise that they could produce in this country.

Mass retailing demands mass advertising, too. And from Sears' first opening in eight full pages of advertising 13 years ago has grown the ability of consumers to shop by newspapers. Other stores jumped on the ad-

vertising wave, and newspapers, of course, have grown in size, power, and independence.

When Sears first opened its doors, several persons feared that through its efficient methods of buying, promotion, service and selling, it would have such an impact as to drive other stores out of business. Impact it had, but other retailers after casting a careful eye on what Sears was doing, began to follow its techniques. They began to grow and develop beyond what they might have attained had they not had a new competitor. Some have said that Sears has acted as a standard against which other retailers could measure themselves. Today, each new large store set up by competing organizations tends to employ many variations of principles brought to Brazil by Sears.

One of these methods is the open counter display. When Sears began to display its merchandise in open counters instead of closed glass showcases, many persons made dire predictions of mass shoplifting. But Sears' experience in the United States had shown them that merchandise in open displays sold better than in closed cases. Shoplifting, as it turned out, was no more prevalent in Brazil than in stores in the United States.

Other stores then began to follow the open-counter trend, and the furniture manufacturer who had made the displays for Sears soon found he had orders rolling in from other stores as well. Other Sears' innovations such as air conditioning, fast cash-register service, and piped-in music were also copied in varying degrees.

Some of Sears' methods adopted elsewhere were a direct result of competitive stores' hiring of Sears-trained personnel. One of these was the unit-control system of counting and ordering merchandise. These stores followed up on these methods by creating their own training programs based on those of Sears and other U.S. retailers.

Customer service was another innovation in which Sears led the field. The store's insistence on a "We Service What We Sell" policy set a new standard in the maintenance of spare parts and a corps of trained repairmen for household appliances and other mechanical merchandise.

The "one-stop shopping" concept was another idea that Sears successfully formed in the minds of the public. Even though there were stores in existence with relatively wide assortments of merchandise, it still was somewhat of an initial shock to Latin Americans that the same store would sell diapers and lathes, white shirts and tires, and hot dogs and refrigerators all under the same roof.

A less-accentuated trend, but one bound to increase, was begun by Sears when they began locating their stores away from city centers. With the increase in cars and traffic in Brazil, the difficulty of downtown shopping is becoming more acute and suburban shopping is consequently not only more convenient, but almost necessary.

Sears' policy of promoting personnel from within has also been reflected in other firms. The store's promotion policy has seen the quickly increasing replacement of North American employees with Brazilian nationals. Seven of Sears' nine stores are managed by men born in this country. (And the other two have an important stake in Brazil by marriage.) Of 66 North American employees who opened the Sears stores in Brazil, only 8 remain.

Sears took another pioneering step in Brazil when it systematically organized its contributions to worthy causes. A fixed percentage of its sales was established as the pattern within which donations would be made. Most of this help has been given to education, some of these through a series of 5-year plans of student scholarships and aid to university libraries. Institutions which have benefited from this Sears' program include the University of Brazil, the Catholic University of São Paulo, the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, the University of São Paulo, and Mackenzie University.

HELP FOR CHARITIES

Sears' efforts in corporate citizenship have not been limited to education, however. Active help has been given to such organizations as Rio's Museum of Modern Art, the Association of Help to Crippled Children in São Paulo, the Young Men's Christian Association, and many local charities, in more than 250 donations a year.

Community relations projects in general rank high up on Sears' program list. Last December, there was the promotion of an employee contest for a "Sears' Citizen of the Diamond Jubilee Year," a companywide effort to recognize employees who had done the most for their communities. An annual project is the "Festival of National Progress"—a twofold program which ties in a show of the latest Brazilian merchandise development with a sales promotion.

Internal public relations programs directed to employees are many. There are such divergent elements as the publication of an employee house organ called Noti-Sears, a subsidized group life-insurance program, morale surveys, illness allowances, aid to employee clubs and sports teams, sending selected personnel for U.S. training, such drives as blood donation and fire prevention, "know your country" and "know democracy" programs, religious projects such as a Paschal Mass in all units, and efforts promoting inter-American understanding.

Said Kelleher in a recent interview: "It is not easy to summarize the divergent results of thousands of dedicated men and women over a span of more than a dozen years.

"All we can say is that we hope—we sincerely believe—that we have played a part in the development of this great country."

Dr. Leonard F. Herzog II Wins Free Enterprise Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday in New York City at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, the Free Enterprise Awards Association presented citations to 10 men who have proved that the American dream of rising to the height of a profession is still a reality, no matter how diverse the circumstances, or how formidable the task.

One of the recipients of these awards is a Pennsylvanian, Dr. Leonard F. Herzog II, founder and president of Nuclide Corp., a Pennsylvania-based firm.

Dr. Herzog, with the help of his associates, built Nuclide from a one-room laboratory to three buildings. The 125 scientists and technicians presently employed at Nuclide develop standard and custom built mass spectrometers, spectrographs, and other technical apparatus for the analysis of isotopes, gases, liquids, and solids. The firm's products can be used for such diverse purposes as lunar exploration and heart research. Known worldwide for its technological excellence, Nuclide recently received the President's "E" Award for its growing exports and its ability to compete successfully in this highly sophisticated market.

A sergeant in World War II, Dr. Herzog worked his way through undergraduate and graduate schools as a gasmeter reader and a reporter. He earned a bachelor's degree at the California Institute of Technology, an engineering degree at Oregon State and a Ph. D. at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Herzog, a recognized authority on cosmochemistry and instrumental analysis, is a part-time professor at Pennsylvania State College.

Dr. Herzog is a good example of the type of man that leads industry in Pennsylvania: he is purposeful, dynamic, efficient, and resourceful. To the commendations already given to him and his firm, I would like to add my own.

A Master of Phrase and of Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has left us, but his memory shall live forever. His dedication to high principle, his genius for leadership, and his allegiance to the cause of freedom dramatically served the American ideal. He once stated:

My work is my life. To live is to function.

This energy, this purpose, combined with his inner conviction has moved history another step forward and all Kansans mourn his passing.

A fitting editorial tribute recently appeared in the Salina (Kans.) Journal. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD:

A MASTER OF PHRASE AND OF STRATEGY

"An old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty."

Such was General MacArthur's own obituary, spoken to the Congress.

For a man who was master of the phrase as well as the master of tactics, for a man who made his own history and cast his own heroic and dramatic role therein, these words suffice.

But it should be noted that his light was a blazing sun of ambition, whatever its source might have been.

And because MacArthur's light and the Nation's light coincided, because both the United States and its foremost general have enjoyed a sense of great mission and great ambition, we pay tribute today to an old soldier who was never that, to one who could never "just fade away."

You should be sentimental about General MacArthur because he encouraged sentiment, manufactured it, lived by it. Sentiment was part of his weaponry. He deployed it precisely upon a vast stage and at the right moment, delivered with Jovian mastery. The miracle was he had the logistical power to augment sentiment with the Nation's thunderbolts. With ships and men and guns, he did return.

Here was a great Shakespearian drama that you and I saw, in the flesh. It was be-

yond reality, above the muck and confusion of war, but it was so.

Toward the end, he spoke against war as a form of global suicide and against a strong central government, although it is only such a government that can mount a successful military force. But this was after his ambition had overreached itself and he had seen himself above the natural authority; and he had been frustrated.

During the long, loyal portion of his soldier's duty, however, he was a general such as a nation needs, a highly specialized instrument, forged to one purpose, authoritarian, far from democracy, yet essential to democracy in time of danger. Like all such men in such roles, General MacArthur was a paradox and a source of controversy.

Love him or hate him, we could not have done without him. Whatever its source, his was a greatness we needed and it came at times when we needed it most.

America, the Beautiful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Frontier magazine published in California has in its April issue a book review, "Smutting Up America," which is a comprehensive review of "God's Own Junkyard," by Peter Blake.

This is more than a review, it is an excellent commentary on the sad state of what was once America the beautiful. Mr. Blake makes a plea for better taste in suburbia and city planning. I was pleased to see reference to the efforts of my husband, Senator Neuberger, to control the proliferation of billboards along our interstate highways. In addition to carrying an important message, the book is forcefully illustrated with pictures of the atrocities which our civilization has allowed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the book review entitled "Smutting Up America."

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMUTTING UP AMERICA

(By John W. Caughey)

Peter Blake is a sad and angry young man. To be precise, he is not so much sad as hurt, and not just angry but furious. Fury hot or cold is the venom in which the best tracts are written. In "God's Own Junkyard," he pours it out on all the louts who have been defacing America the beautiful.

His book is one to be read first with the thumb. It has more pictures than text. A few, perhaps 1 in 10, show pristine beauties, a Virginia hayfield, a Nevada desert scene, or the shore at Nantucket. A very few show tasteful, manmade improvements. The rest pick up the footprints of the marauders and review the atrocities and obscenities they have performed. This pictorial trail runs all up and down America from the flatlands to the mountains and from the sea to shining sea. Blake's gallery of horrors will make almost any viewer cringe. And where did he find these scenes of devastation and blight? The answer is easy. Mr. Blake has been peeking out my windows—and yours.

Along with the pictures, or rather as a warmup to them, he offers acid comments. He pillories the litterbugs, showing a few choice pictures of their droppings. A step up, he comments in word and picture on the unsightliness of collected rubbish. He features a few junkyard pictures, others of city dumps, tangles of wreckage, and acres of scrapped autos. An archeologist could have told him that primitive peoples also had their kitchen maidens and refuse dumps. In an age of cans and beer bottles, paper and plastics, and planned obsolescence in all our appliances, our extrusions of waste are enormous. Possibly it is just as well that we make some effort to collect and concentrate it, though not always out of sight.

From litterbugs Blake moves on to purposeful defacers, beginning with the billboard industry. A fair man, he lets the billboard moguls present their side of the argument. According to one company president, "billboards are the art gallery of the public." By promoting sales they are crucial to the economy. They implement the first amendment guarantee of freedom of speech and of the press. They serve society with free plugs for the Red Cross, the Community Chest, and safe driving. (This last, Blake asserts, is an irony. By their distraction of drivers—and that is their prime purpose—billboards are a measurable cause of accidents.) The billboard industry also serves by judiciously allotting space to particular candidates for office. That is a service for sure, but not necessarily to the public.

HIGHWAY BILLBOARDS

In 1958, by proposing a small bonus to States that would ban billboards along the $40 billion Eisenhower highways, the late Senator Richard Neuberger touched off what Blake calls the great billboard debate. Billboards, Neuberger discovered, are too much of a sacred cow to be dehorned without a battle royal. Pictorially, Blake pays his respects to this "art gallery of the public" and its lesser imitators, the ragtag of little signs, posters, and store fronts. He also salutes the persons unknown who one day flattened all the billboards between Santa Fe and Los Alamitos.

Moving in to town, the gauntlet along any highway congests with a welter of competing gas stations, motels, hamburger stands, and tourist traps. It is enough to make one regret the invention of neon lights, aluminum foil, rotators and blinkers, and the alphabet.

Blake finds no more delight in suburbia. His approach, in the late Senator Kerr's phrase, is that of "assthetics." The tract developer is guilty of two crimes. He chooses a cheap, uninspired design, and then he repeats it endlessly. Typically he begins with scorching the earth of all trees and other irregularities, allows a minimum of open space, and plants thick his assembly line houses. This monotony breeds others. Suburbia becomes too residential, too uniform in age bracket, income level, and school needs.

The modern answer to suburban sprawl is the high-rise apartment. Blake writes many of them off as junk. Working vertically, architects and builders apparently can be just as unimaginative as when they are working horizontally. In the office skyscraper most architects prove as feckless. Blake is convinced that some of them could do better. As editor of Architectual Forum, he is to be believed on this point.

Some of the blame he transfers to the laziness of bureaucracy. Government financing is more readily had for designs already approved, which means that cookycutter or repetitive work tends to drive out originality. In New York, furthermore, the assessor and the tax court acted to penalize good design in the Seagram Building, while rewarding monstrosities such as the Pan Am Building. Fie on bureaucrats. But private enterprise, whether moneylenders, managers, or stockholders, can be just as elephantine in discarding good architecture and favoring mediocrity or worse.

Next in line of fire are those timorous souls, the city planners. Like the military they time and again are caught planning the last war rather than the one to come. Continually they are up against the obstacle of the fait accompli. Their zoning rules always have to fight a rearguard action against the variances. A bold plan is sure to be expensive, and if the politicians do not sabotage it, the taxpayers association and the electorate probably will.

INADEQUATE PLANNING

Meanwhile, almost every city in the land, particularly every growing city, has to fight against the pricks of woefully inadequate or shortsighted planning. How now green belts? How can a city break out of its straitjacket?

Pamphleteer Blake scorns the standard response, with or without urban renewal, which is to create a "city of ghettoes." Besides the ghettoes of race there are the ones of function, an industry ghetto, an offices ghetto, a government ghetto, a shopping ghetto, an apartment ghetto, a medical center ghetto, one or more for poor housing, and one for high-cost prestige housing. The "city of ghettoes" is fantastically inconvenient. Among other flaws it enormously complicates the problem of transportation.

That brings us back to billboardia and the mad geniuses who bulldoze their way through the best scenery and such city planning as there is to carry the freeways on their imperious course. A bridge can be beautiful. The sweeps and curves of a freeway can gratify the senses. The ruling consideration, nevertheless, is utilitarian, and some of the most glaring scars and gashes on the face of the land are those administered by this new race of landscapers.

Blake twits the litterbug and tilts at the billboarder, the subdivider, the tract builder, the entrepreneur of high rise, the saturator of mid-Manhattan, the architectural profession in general, the bureaucrat, the profit-minded banker and businessman large and small, and the paving trustee. Despite their number, these malefactors are not the full rollcall. You and I, according to Blake, as part of the electorate, are accessories before and after the crime. In his book we are junkies too.

There is a larger sense in which he is right. Much of this smutting up of America is direct outgrowth of the population explosion. Man sometimes improves on the natural appearance. In many more instances, or so the pictures seem to show, his touch is befouling. Blake's plea for better taste is as urgent as it is timely.

Will America Always Mean the Same?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago Cecile Maravilla came to our shores from the Philippines.

She is presently serving as a secretary at the Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa. We need more Ceciles today and fewer of those who would destroy the customs and traditions that have made a comparatively young nation the greatest on earth.

Read and reflect on her conception of America:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

I met my first American when I was a little girl in the Philippines. There was a war on then and we children saw a large number of tall American soldiers who often passed out chocolate candies. America to me, meant tall soldiers and candies.

Time passed and through association, education, and I hope, maturity, I came to see America in its truer light; America the creed, the symbol, and the goal. Yes, America means:

Freedom to say what you think, practice your beliefs, and to exercise your rights as an individual.

Opportunity to pursue a career of your choice and to advance to the limits of your capability, rather than having someone dictate what you should do and how far you can advance.

Dignity of labor and pride in a job.

Sharing the things you have, helping the peoples of the world to learn self-reliance, pride, and giving hope to those in the clutches of terrorism.

After living in the States for slightly more than 2 years, I find that I too, succumb, at times, to complacency and complaints. Yes, I too, must take stock of myself—for I have not only the food the world hungers for, but I have America.

The Pitfalls of a One-World Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there appears in the April 6 edition of the New York Times an interesting article about a proposal for one big world trade organization. This plan, backed by the Russians, is loaded with many pitfalls, as the item points out.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIANS FAVOR ONE TRADE BODY—IDEA OF WORLD GROUP DRAWS SOME SUPPORT AT GENEVA U.N. CONFERENCE—WEST CITES PROBLEMS—DEVELOPING NATIONS SEEK TO BROADEN GATT RULES TO COVER EVERYONE

(By Richard E. Mooney)

PARIS, April 5.—One of the most commonly appealing ideas that is being discussed at the United Nations' Trade Conference in Geneva is the establishment of one big all-embracing world trade organization.

The idea of an organization that includes everyone is appealing on the surface. It suggests equal, nondiscriminatory treatment by and for all nations in their trade with each other.

Behind the idea there are two forces—the Communists and the underdeveloped countries. The Communist countries, except for special cases, are not in and are not particularly welcome in, the existing General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The underdeveloped nations are in, or can get in, but believe that the Western industrial powers have it stacked against countries that are less powerful.

NEW GROUP PROPOSED

The Soviet Union has proposed the creation of an entirely new organization. India, with some support from other underdeveloped countries, has proposed broadening GATT to cover everyone.

There are 62 "contracting parties," which means "full members," in GATT now, and 11 other countries associated in one way or another. Ther has been a sharp increase in less developed country membership in the last few years.

These new members need, and are getting, some exemptions from the agreement's general rules of trade liberalism and nondiscrimination, in order to protect their new industries.

Some of GATT's founding fathers are not happy about this dilution of the general rules, and would be even less enthusiastic about Communist participation.

CZECH MEMBERSHIP

Actually Czechoslovakia is a full member already, and Poland and Yugoslavia have special status. The Czech membership dates from pre-Communist days and is not really active now. But Poland, which is the biggest of all Communist traders with the West, is actively negotiating now to find a way to fit in and participate. One-third of Poland's foreign trade is with non-Communist countries.

The technical problem in fitting a Communist country into the agreement is that their economic system is basically different. There is just one importer in a Communist country—the government. There is no need for tariffs. The government imports what is needed to supplement the country's own production, and no more.

Communists maintain that they can make trade deals with the rest of the world just as well as a market country can. Instead of lowering its nonexistent tariffs to let more foreign goods in, a Communist country can commit itself to buy a specified larger amount of foreign goods.

But there is a flaw in this, too—discrimination. In the absence of special laws or regulations that close out particular lines of goods, a market-economy country is composed of many importers making their many choices. In a Communist country, however, with just one importer, there is discrimination in the very act of buying.

RED COUNTERPROPOSAL

One Communist counterproposal is that they fulfill their commitments to buy more abroad by buying from countries to which they have increased export sales.

But even this does not satisfy the Western view that trade should be totally nondiscriminatory, with no master decision-makers picking and choosing.

Another question, of course, is prices. The Communist pricing system is not the Western way.

The Poles maintain that they sell for export at whatever the current world market prices are, and that it would be foolish to sell for less. But the West is ever suspicious that the Communists may break a market at any time, by dumping goods at cutrate prices.

Thus, the debate goes on, on technical grounds. This is not just a case of technicalities, though. It is perhaps essentially a nontechnical political matter.

Western countries are just not really interested in trying to do commercial business with the Communists on an equal footing—not wanting to invite the commercial or political competition, or not trusting the Communists to stick to the rules.

There will be much talk about this during the remaining 10 weeks of the United Nations Conference. One of the five subcommittees is working exclusively on the organization question.

In view of the entrenched resistance, the Conference itself may be as close as the Communists will get to participating in a worldwide organization. This could mean that the Conference itself, in recurring meetings in future years, will evolve into the organization that so much of the world wants.

Enterprise and Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, quite naturally, is concerned with how our money is spent; both at home and abroad.

Recent months have found a considerable majority of Congress expressing concern with the AID program. Even the greatest champions of foreign aid among our colleagues are reconciled to the fact that the popularity of foreign aid is going down the hill rapidly. It appears almost certain that the foreign aid requests for fiscal year 1965 will be substantially reduced.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I was tremendously impressed to read an article in the Wall Street Journal of April 14 concerning the excellent progress Pan American World Airways has made in establishing a worldwide international hotel organization.

Like its parent company, Intercontinental Hotels Corp. has no domestic facilities. It is, as is Pan American, purely international. As the Wall Street Journal says, IHC "has found that it can be good business to help other countries of the world develop economically."

Intercontinental Hotels Corp., Mr. Speaker, as an operating entity, is less than 20 years old, yet by the end of 1966, when it will achieve its 20th birthday, IHC expects to be operating 33 hotels in 26 countries and 6 continents.

Mr. Speaker, this Wall Street Journal article is most refreshing. Under unanimous consent, the article follows:

ENTERPRISE AND DIPLOMACY—PAN-AM AIRWAYS HOTEL UNIT HELPS ITSELF BY AIDING NATIONS

(By Ruth Sheldon Knowles)

A privately owned U.S. enterprise has found that it can be good business to help other countries of the world develop economically.

Intercontinental Hotels Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of Pan American World Airways, is making its international hotel business into an informal instrument of U.S. foreign policy by an imaginative approach that benefits government and private interest wherever it goes. It does this by specializing in building or managing hotels in areas where the establishment of a first-class hotel will itself create tourist and commercial business.

That IHC's approach is unusual is attested by this statement from a prospectus with which it and several partners made a public offering of stock for five hotels in Pakistan: "A related benefit not to be measured financially is the mutual understanding of people of different races and nationalities promoted by intensified traveling from abroad."

But the fact is that IHC also has scored some striking successes financially. For one

thing, most of its hotels are heavily patronized almost as soon as they open, and some establishments, only a few years old, already are expanding. Beyond this, the existence of the hotels has greatly stimulated air travel to areas served by Pan Am.

At the same time, IHC has been pioneering some novel investment techniques, bringing together United States and foreign capital, both public and private, to finance most of its hotels. IHC itself shares in the ownership of each hotel it operates, always as a minority stockholder. This, too, varies the familiar pattern; Hilton Hotels International, IHC's chief rival in the foreign field, does not own any of the hotels it manages. Hilton also contributes to economic development in the countries where it goes, and a close look at IHC shows what impact such American operations can have.

IHC's growth has been so spectacular that by the end of 1966 it expects to be operating 33 hotels in 26 countries and 6 continents.

If IHC has been successful in spurring economic development where it puts up hotels, the result is by no means accidental. IHC was born of an effort to help alleviate a critical economic and political problem in the Western Hemisphere toward the end of World War II.

At that time the U.S. Government was considerably concerned over the need of South American countries for dollars to strengthen their economies and increase needed imports. But businessmen and tourists alike were avoiding South America because of the lack of firstclass hotels.

Since Pan Am was the largest air carrier for South America, President Roosevelt, in one of his last acts before his death approached Juan Trippe, the airline's president, with the idea that Pan Am undertake to build hotels in South America and upgrade existing ones.

SHIFT IN EUROPE, ASIA

IHC's early efforts went into renovating and building hotels in Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, Uruguay, Mexico, El Salvador, Curacao, Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico. In recent years, however, it has concentrated in Europe, Asia and lately has ventured into Africa. IHC hotels are in operation or planned in such places as Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, Liberia, the Ivory Coast and even the fabled island of Bali.

To be sure, political and economic instability may sometimes adversely affect IHC earnings. The IHC hotel in Havana, the Nacional, was expropriated when Castro came to power, and Venezuela's political troubles have reduced the business of IHC's Tamanaco in Caracas.

But this part of the risk does not bother IHC executives unduly. They look upon their projects as providing self-made long-range insurance. "We are a catalyst for economic growth and trade," declares John Gates, IHC's chairman. "This will contribute to greater political stability."

The IHC prospectus for the Pakistani hotels asserts, for example, that Pakistan is entering the most important phase of its economic development and that its lack of hotel accommodations of international standards is handicapping the efforts of government and private investments. So with the aim of bringing businessmen and tourists to the country, five hotels will be built, the first in Karachi opening next month.

The 1,116 rooms which the Pakistan hotels will provide are expected to bring an increase of 40,000 foreign guests a year. Figuring that each will spend an average of $200, this will increase Pakistan's annual foreign exchange by $8 million. Moreover, the totels will have a stimulating effect on the economy by increasing employment and by leading to the expansion and establishment of businesses and service industries. Economic studies show that one unit of tourist expenditure adds three units to the national income.

The financing of three of the Pakistani hotels, costing $21,237,700 altogether, illustrates the new foreign investment patterns being established by IHC and the diverse partners this type of venture assembles.

Dollar loans of $8,892,300 were obtained from the U.S. Export-Import Bank, rupee loans of $2,966,000 were secured from the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Government of Pakistan took $2,848,400 of 4 percent rupee debentures. IHC took a minority stock position—23 percent in this case—with the balance of the $6,531,000 equity being provided by the Pakistan Government, the Pakistan Airlines, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, local businessmen, and the public.

In establishing its equity position, IHC borrowed Pakistan rupees from AID funds which have accumulated from the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural products to Pakistan.

In Ireland, where in 1963 IHC opened a 314-room hotel in Dublin and two 96-room hotels in Limerick and Cork, the financing brought together a similarly strange assortment of partners.

The Irish Government made an outright grant of $490,000 and it guaranteed the first mortgage of $4,015,000 taken by the Ulster Bank. The bank also took a $700,000 second mortgage. The shareholders providing the balance of the money were IHC; Irish Airlines; the Gresham Hotel Co. of Ireland, which had operated Dublin's leading hotel; Guinness, Ireland's noted brewing company; and a group of European investors, including Baron Rothschild and Countess Bismarck.

The Dublin Intercontinental is the largest, most modern building in this perfect example of an 18th century European city, but it is not an anachronism. It is contemporary in design but it also is Irish throughout. IHC decorators and designers worked with Irish mills and manufacturers to produce the textiles, furniture, china, silver, and glassware for all three hotels.

At first many Irish were inclined to scoff at the new hotels and what they could do, but they now have become important business and social centers, the tourist trade is increasing and the government has been able tc launch an intensive industrial development drive.

IMPACT IN FRANKFURT

No less an impact has been made by the $10 million Hotel Frankfurt Intercontinental, which opened in the German Main River city in June 1963. Frankfurt is not interested in industrialization; it has a labor shortage. But as the banking center of Germany and with Europe's third largest airport in traffic volume, it was interested in promoting itself as a center for international commercial and scientific conventions to stimulate overall German trade.

But the shortage of first-class hotels was a preventive. So IHC was brought in to put up a 20-story, 504-room hotel, the largest in Germany. The State of Hesse considered the hotel so important to the growth of Frankfurt that it guaranteed the second mortgage loan.

Owners of other Frankfurt hotels initially were exceedingly hostile to the new hotel because they thought it would detract from their business. However, when the Intercontinental opened every hotel in Frankfurt was filled to overflowing. The reason: The Intercontinental had made it possible for the World Petroleum Congress, with 8,000 delegates, to hold its meeting in Frankfurt.

Foreigners always have been inclined to look on American hotels as being dedicated to plumbing, efficiency and size to the exclusion of graciousness, art and culture. IHC decorators and architects take great delight in confounding this image.

In Frankfurt, a center of theater, art and music, the theme of the Intercontinental's main restaurant and bar centers on the international theater, with paintings, tapestries and puppet scenes from great plays and operas. Even the coffee shop is decorated with original Picasso ceramic plates. Also, the architects took advantage of the hotel's spectacular panoramic view to design a glass-enclosed supper club and bar which has become a favorite of Frankfurters.

But it is in the Middle East, at Beirut, Lebanon, that IHC has put up perhaps its most magnificent hotel.

Beirut is the traditional gateway to the Orient, the banking center of the Mideast and a tourist's paradise. If offers breathtaking scenery, year-round bathing in the Mediterranean, the most spectacular Roman ruins extant, Crusaders' fortresses and easy access to all the historical places of the Holy Lands. The city is a miniature Paris with a lavish casino and night life.

When IHC opened the $9.5 million, 315-room Hotel Phoenicia at the end of 1961, it increased Beirut's first-class hotel room capacity by 38 percent and give the city its first convention facilities.

The Hotel Phoenicia is a work of art in itself. It is one of the outstanding examples of Architect Edward F. Stone's talent. It states in contemporary mood the essence of Oriental beauty with its lacy balconies, white marble columns, spacious rooms, and courtyard swimming pool overlooking the sea.

In working in the less developed lands of Africa and the Orient, IHC frequently encounters unique challenges and unusual experiences. In Indonesia, for example, IHC's director of training, Leo de Franco, had to start with help who had never worn shoes, much less seen the inside of a hotel, used knives or forks, or had any exposure to Western customs, food or drink. It takes 1,600 employees to service the Intercontinental's 420-room Hotel Indonesia in Djakarta, possibly a record for hotel employees per room.

EXORCISING EVIL SPIRITS

In Bangkok, Thailand, IHC ran into difficulties of another sort. When the $5 million, 224-room hotel IHC is putting up there did not progress in the beginning as rapidly as it should, the Thai Government concluded it was because of the activity of evil spirits.

The royal astrologer advised the Government the most propitious day on which ceremonies should be carried out to exorcise the spirits. Thus, last December a corps of Buddhist priests thoroughly decontaminated the hotel acreage. This undoubtedly was the most unusual preconstruction cost any hotel ever has had to bear.

IHC is particularly interested in what it can contribute to and gain by the development of the new African countries. So far it is operating a 230-room hotel in Liberia, and an expectedly lavish 17-story hotel in Abidjan which expresses the desire of the Republic of Ivory Coast to become Africa's Riviera.

The Ivory Coast government wanted a showplace and it got it. There are 50 acres of park, a yacht basin, a garden patio accommodating 3,000 guests, a ballroom, conference rooms, three nightclubs, a supper club and an Olympic-sized swimming pool. The hotel's capacity already is being increased from 220 to 500 rooms.

However, this hotel is not typical of what IHC is planning and negotiating in other African lands.

"There is no real tourist travel to Africa yet," Mr. Gates says. "The need of the African countries is for hotels that will provide simple basic requirements for businessmen and diplomats so that they will stay there long enough to do the job in each country that needs to be done."

From the evidence at hand from other parts of the world, it is practically a foregone conclusion that IHC will bring many

benefits to Africa—demonstrating in actual practice how private enterprise can help others while it helps itself.

The Senator and Castroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the very good editorial appearing in the April 10 issue of Life magazine and would call my colleagues' particular attention to the damaging report mentioned of the OAS relative to Castro's aggression against Venezuela. I had occasion to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that entire report on March 9, pages 4548 through 4562. The editorial reads as follows:

THE SENATOR AND CASTROISM

Senator FULBRIGHT's big speech urging a new approach to foreign policy has achieved its stated objective of starting arguments. The Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee accuses the Democratic administration of basing its diplomacy on "cherished myths rather than objective facts" and even on "excessive moralism" (shades of John Foster Dulles). The Devil, says FULBRIGHT, no longer resides in Moscow; the cold war has so changed that we had better drop our old good-guys-bad-guys illusions and even start thinking "unthinkable thoughts." Just what he means by that—i.e., just what policies he would change—is the proper subject for debate.

From the growing impact of FULBRIGHT's speech, there is evidently a widespread hunger for some fresh thinking to match the recent changes in the world situation (Life, Mar. 13). The Senator accurately described these changes: the political sterility of nuclear war, the Communist split, the steady "depolarization" of power. And, in doing this, he helped stimulate the reappraisals that U.S. policy is always in need of. But when he got down to making specific proposals in at least one major policy area, FULBRIGHT proved wrong in substance and worse in timing.

That area is Cuba. He wants us to learn to coexist with Castro and treat him as a "minor demagog" instead of "a Napoleonic menace." We should abandon our political and economic boycott of Cuba since our allies won't let us make it work. FULBRIGHT is not against the boycott, just defeatist about it. Short of a full blockade which "could explode into nuclear war," he says, an effective boycott "is simply not within our power."

As Secretary Rusk remarked 2 days later, our Cuban boycott is not that much of a failure; our problem is not how to drop it but how to make it tougher. FULBRIGHT acknowledged that "Cuban communism does pose a grave threat to other Latin American countries" but added that "this threat can be dealt with through the prompt and vigorous use of the established procedures of the inter-American system." Alas, the Senator's speech threw a large spanner into that very machinery.

The Organization of American States recently issued a clear indictment of Castro for aggression against Venezuela. Its investigators found 3 tons of Cuban arms in Venezuela, plus money, propaganda and Cuba-trained terrorists with a plan to seize Caracas and kill or exile the president. The overwhelming evidence has been well circulated in Latin America and the OAS foreign ministers have been trying to decide what to do about it. Most Caribbean countries are for applying all the sanctions of the Rio Treaty short of force, which would complete the isolation of Cuba by her neighbors. To muster the necessary two-thirds vote, the OAS needs what its former Council Chairman Facio (of Costa Rica) calls "a very strong leadership from the United States." Awaiting that leadership, the Latin foreign ministers got instead the Fulbright coexistence speech, which they insist on thinking (wrongly) was a trial balloon for the State Department. "There go the votes we had lined up," said Facio, in dismay.

Even if the OAS does not vote sanctions against Castro, the United States could offer more intensive joint surveillance of Castro's subversion and gunrunning, as urged by Senator KEATING. The U.S. Navy could do a lot more than it has been doing to help the other Caribbean nations patrol their shores.

Castro is neither as harmless nor as well established as FULBRIGHT thinks. His creaky economy is now 80-percent dependent on Soviet bloc aid and trade. The mystique of Fidelismo has long since lost its appeal to most Latin Americans; but he is still actively trying to foment alien revolutions in a hemisphere that used to be protected by the Monroe Doctrine.

FULBRIGHT, among other shrewd generalizations, spoke of the State Department's "malady of chronic and excessive caution." In the case of Cuba, he himself has made the malady worse. There can be no coexistence with Castro until his regime is made "compatible with this hemisphere," as Rusk mildly puts it. Neither the United States nor the OAS has done all it can to effect that.

He's Right This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post Times of November 18, 1963, again setting forth the evils of the quality stabilization bill and clearly pointing out reasons why that inquitous anticonsumer legislation should be throttled by the Congress.

The article follows:

HE'S RIGHT THIS TIME

We rarely see eye to eye with Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

But from this corner a hearty "amen" to his argument opposing the so-called quality stabilization bill. This is the old fair trade bill, now traveling under a new label. It would allow manufacturers to establish minimum prices at which their goods could be sold by retailers.

As Dr. Heller said in a summary as to price effects:

Uniform resale prices (to consumers) would tend initially to be set higher than the present average of prices charged.

Temporary reductions in prices by retailers would be eliminated.

Rising costs and reduced efficiency in retailing would put pressure on manufacturers to raise their resale prices further.

And for the retailers who want this bill enacted, Dr. Heller advanced some logical conclusions which should diminish their enthusiasm considerably.

With price competition at retail for these fixed-priced goods eliminated, he pointed out, other forms of retail competition would be intensified. Accelerated advertising expenses, fancier store decorations, additional services and other forms of nonprice competition would be used to compete for sales. This would force up the costs of retailing.

Small retailers, he said, might in fact be disadvantaged in the end by passage of this bill because fixed prices on fair-traded merchandise in many instances would not compare favorably with the private brands and other non-fair-traded items handled by big stores, mail-order houses and chains. Private brands would increase and get a larger share of the market.

From Educator to Hub: Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Boston Traveler brought into focus one of the most touching people-to-people experiences in recent years. Too often this type of humanitarian work is never brought to the attention of the public, and I feel this article of February 5, 1964, should be included in the RECORD to commend the persons involved:

FROM ECUADOR TO HUB: THANKS

(By Charles N. Eischen)

A grateful Latin American country extended its personal thanks yesterday for the generosity shown a tiny Ecuadoran girl orphaned in a Boston hotel fire last March.

"It is generosity and kindness of this type that overshadows the tragedy of death," Ambassador Jose Correa said to his guests from Boston.

He recalled the flash fire that swept through the Sherry-Biltmore in Boston last March snuffing out the lives of an Ecuadoran couple who had brought their physically handicapped daughter there for medical help.

They were Fabian and Maria Jijong, of Quito, Ecuador. As the fire took their lives, their helpless daughter, Maria Elena, 5, lay quietly in the Massachusetts General Hospital.

When the story of her plight reached the people of Boston, a ham radio operator named James Jacobs, of Boston, sent his radio call to Ecuador for help in locating relatives.

Another Bostonian, George Swartz, also went to work.

With the help of Sheriff Howard W. Fitzpatrick and Alfred Johnson, vice president of the New England Merchants National Bank of Boston, a fund was established to take care of the orphaned child.

It was their heartfelt help, Ambassador Correa said, that spelled survival for the child.

"The people of Ecuador will be everlastingly thankful for your consideration and thoughtfulness of this child," he told Swartz, Johnson, and Fitzpatrick.

The Boston visitors declined any personal credit, extending it instead to the 1,000 or more donors to the Maria Jijong Fund which has grown to $11,689.29.

"The people of our area are always ready and willing to help others in need," said Swartz. "We will be happiest when we can see this child walk again and we have been told she can walk again."

With the money collected, the trustees hope to return the youngster to the Massachusetts hospital this year for hip surgery. Beside their personal interest in the orphaned child, the trustees of the fund were hopeful that their consideration may have a favorable effect on the need for better people-to-people relations between countries.

Another example of this grassroots humanitarianism was shown a few weeks ago when George Swartz offered to provide funds for a young sailor's return to Boston to be fitted with a prosthetic device to replace the right hand he lost in an accident. We certainly need more generosity of this type, and it certainly is good for our public relations and our image in Latin America.

"Equal Time" Suspension in Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I noted a recent editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune commenting on the so-called equal time bill, House Joint Resolution 247, which has passed both Houses of the Congress and has not been scheduled for conference committee action. It would seem to be in the public interest that this proposal be given final congressional approval before this session of the Congress adjourns. Whether the President wishes to commit himself to engage in any televised debates is not the point at issue at all—the question is whether the Congress should make it possible for the American public to benefit from joint appearances of the candidates of the two major parties. This purpose would be achieved by the passage of House Joint Resolution 247.

Quoting from the editorial:

If a go-ahead signal from the White House is needed for passage, by all means let us have it.

Under unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

L.B.J. AND THE EQUAL TIME PROVISION

A bill which would suspend the "equal time" provision of the Communications Act of 1934 is stalled in Congress and some Republicans are placing the responsibility for this on the President. Mr. Johnson, they say, would prefer not to debate his Republican opponent in the forthcoming campaign as the late Mr. Kennedy debated Richard Nixon. If the "equal time" provision is not suspended, no radio and television debate will be held; therefore the President's friends in Congress are stalling the needed legislation.

So the Republican charges run. There is, of course, no proof that they are true, yet it is perhaps, significant that Mr. Johnson, who, urged "even more" than the four scheduled Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960, has seemed reluctant to commit himself to any such arrangement in 1964.

We hope these charges are without foundation. So long as radio and television stations must provide equal time to all political candidates, even the most obscure, the debates which shed such a revealing light on the two major party nominees 4 years ago will not have their counterpart this year.

It is possible that Mr. Johnson feels that he would be more effective in some other type of campaigning, yet there is his responsibility to the electorate to be considered. The bill now buried in conference would certainly make for a better informed public.

The differences between the House bill and the Senate bill are not significant. If a go-head signal from the White House is needed for passage, by all means let us have it.

Israel's 16th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago today the ancient Jewish Commonwealth was reconstituted in Palestine as the state of Israel. For over 2,000 years the children of Israel wandered over the face of the earth, persecuted, harassed, and homeless. But it was not until the height of persecution was reached with the merciless slaughter of 6 million Jewish men, women, and children that the conscience of man was stirred.

After the full horror of Auschwitz, Dachau, and Bergen-Belsen became known, the community of nations—in partial restitution to the pitifully small surviving remnant—overwhelmingly voted for the establishment of a Jewish state in part of Palestine. On May 14, 1948, the State of Israel came into existence.

The purpose of the new state was openly proclaimed in its declaration of independence: "The State of Israel will be open for Jewish immigration and for the ingathering of the exiles." And by the hundreds of thousands the displaced persons flocked to their new homeland. The 700,000 Jews in Palestine soon grew to 1 million and then to 2 million persons. Immigrants from 5 continents and 100 countries were absorbed and molded into citizens of Israel.

We in the United States did much to accomplish this modern-day miracle. President Truman recognized the new state 10 short minutes after it was declared and every succeeding administration has clearly enunciated our friendship and support.

Our Government since 1951 has given or lent Israel nearly $1 billion in foreign aid. The American people have contributed generously of their efforts and finances.

Israel's accomplishments are thus a source of pride to us as well as to the Israelis.

Their strides toward economic self-sufficiency, their reconquest of the swamps and desert, and above all, the assistance they have given to the newer nations of Africa and Asia are achievements many older states would do well to emulate.

But one task remains incomplete, one goal unattained. Peace in the Middle East lies as much in our hands as it does in the hands of the countries of the region. If we speak out forceably and refuse to condone aggression, whether by threats or boycotts or blockades, if we assure Israel's strength, if we insist that the resources of the Middle East be constructively utilized for economic development; then Jerusalem, the City of Peace, will finally know peace.

Israel Celebrating 16th Anniversary Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we join Israel in celebrating the 16th anniversary of her independence on April 17. Since Israel was established, in May 1948, with a Jewish population of 650,000, more than a million newcomers have found a home there. Her story is a history of humanity and freedom from tyranny and persecution.

From the beginning her doors have been open to any Jew in need of a home. In doing this, Israel has become a symbol to the world in cherishing and honoring people, in showing respect for the individual to be free in his own home, in providing safety from oppression and hostility, and in showing man can work in union with others to overcome prejudices and provide a better life.

Since the day the independent State of Israel was established it has been a full member of the United Nations. She has one of the few governments which have maintained political stability since 1948. Changes have been brought about by the ballot box—not by violence.

After attaining a higher standard of living and overcoming economic problems at home, Israel has sent teachers and scholars throughout the entire world. Her technical assistance program is now reaching 87 states and territories on four continents.

Israel's technical cooperation program is unique because it emphasizes training. Students who come to Israel pass on what they have learned to others. When they leave, they start their own courses to meet immediate needs. The students study about cooperation in agriculture, in industry, and commerce; about hotel management, child welfare, communication, home economics, youth and community leadership, crime prevention, journalism, physical education, metalworking, carpentry, automobile mechanics, and public administration.

From Israel, other new governments gain confidence that they, too, can build a rapidly growing economy, produce a wide variety of crops and products, train its population to be workers, farmers, and good citizens—combining many cultures and traditions and accomplishing this miracle with voluntary cooperation, free from dictatorial coercion.

The most important lesson Israel teaches many new nations, as well as many old nations, is the art of cooperation. This little nation has remained independent, despite being surrounded by threats to destroy her. Israel proves that a nation can advance and overcome hostilities by the cooperation of self-respecting free men.

I salute Israel and her people on her day of independence.

"Wallace in Wisconsin," an Editorial in the South Bend Tribune, April 9, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of April 9, 1964, entitled, "Wallace in Wisconsin."

I agree with the editorial and I salute this newspaper on it.

The editorial follows:

WALLACE IN WISCONSIN

Can a quarter of a million Wisconsinites be wrong?

Quite obviously they can. They proved it by voting for Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace in the Wisconsin presidential primary.

In Wisconsin, Governor Wallace campaigned on a platform of opposition to the civil rights bill which now is getting the filibuster treatment from the Alabama Governor's spiritual cronies in the U.S. Senate.

It's to bad Mr. Wallace wasn't honest enough to campaign in Wisconsin on the same slogan he uses back home: "Segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever." That way, the people of Wisconsin would have known what it was they really were voting for.

As it was, the Alabaman played on fears and misunderstandings. The fears center on the new grants of Federal power contained in the civil rights bill. We happen to believe these fears are groundless and that the power will be properly placed, but we can understand the existence of the fears.

The misunderstanding center on Negro demonstrations on behalf of their rights. There has been a good deal of white reaction to such demonstrations, partly, no doubt, among whites who haven't yet comprehended the desperation that has been spurring the Negro drive for full equality. There have, moreover, been excesses among the demonstrations, although it would require a great many more excesses to put them in the same league with the excesses perpetrated against Negroes in this country. Yet some demonstrations have undeniably backfired and done more harm than good to the Negro cause.

But the chilling, disheartened fact remains that Governor Wallace got a heavy vote in Wisconsin. Not even the Kansas City vote favoring an ordinance curbing discrimination in public accommodations can offset that.

Governor Wallace is fired up. He promises to campaign in Indiana before the May 5 primary election, in which his name is on the Democratic presidential ballot.

We fervently hope that Hoosiers will have more sense than a quarter of a million Wisconsonites did.

The Economic Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the "Business Roundup" section of the April issue of Fortune magazine, a survey of the economic outlook entitled "The Fed's Dilemma," sheds considerable light on the boom that is developing and the "increasing cross-winds" that will determine the trend of business in the coming year.

As the article points out—

This is hardly the best of all possible economic worlds that Washington has been painting (any more than the pre-tax-cut economy, which it so long deprecated, was the worst).

Many economists, according to Fortune, are beginning to have "second thoughts" about the road recently taken.

Among the economy's problems is the fact that "for the first time in 5 years, spring breezes are carrying a nostalgic if faintly sulfurous whiff of inflation." Inflation talk, says Fortune, stems from rising capital outlays, inventory plans of manufacturers, a high level of consumer optimism, an anticipated sharp rise in housing, and an anticipated 8 percent increase in the Federal Reserve Board's Index of Production during the current year. The labor market is also expected to tighten and with that development all sorts of cost pressures will mount.

Fortune says that an important and complex set of forces are beginning to get into motion that initially tend to keep a boom going, even as they tend to undermine it eventually. The dilemma for the Federal Reserve Board in the current situation is to apply the credit breaks neither so soon as to cause a recession nor so late as to be ineffective in curbing an inflationary boom followed by a serious correction.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the April issue of Fortune in the RECORD at this point:

THE FED'S DILEMMA

(Business roundup: A monthly report on the economic outlook; a whiff of inflation; forecasts move up; home builders' plans—a Fortune survey; money, the deficit, and the Fed.)

For the first time in 5 years spring breezes are carrying a nostalgic if faintly sulfurous whiff of inflation. Businessmen and economists are beginning to murmur about it, bulls have started to talk it up again in Wall Street, and even Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has found a new subject for speeches, of course explaining why it shouldn't happen. Prices have gone up about a half percent more in the past year than in any of four before, and they are universally expected to rise more in the next than in the last. None of this is critical so far, but prices have begun to enter into calculations of the business future, including those of the Federal Reserve, and this is news.

Inflation talk stems from the fact that opinions about the economy are beginning to catch up with its realities. In the past 6 months business economists on average have increased their estimates of the 1964 GNP from around $610 billion for 1964 (with a tax cut) to $620 billion or more today—i.e. by fully as much as the whole effect of the tax cut, which they estimate at around $10 billion for 1964. Many estimates are approaching Roundup's forecast that the GNP this year will near $630 billion. The rising optimism of the past month is based on a series of midwinter surveys, taken before tax reduction was counted certain:

Capital outlays will be up 10 percent, according to the recent SEC-Commerce survey of business plans, and final spending usually outstrips initial estimates.

Inventory plans of manufacturers call for additions of $1 billion this quarter (a $4 billion annual rate), the highest reported since business stockpiled steel as a hedge against a strike.

Builders surveyed by Fortune look for a 12-percent rise in housing this year over last, and starts have registered half that gain already.

Consumer optimism begain the year at the highest point since 1956, according to the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, and retail sales set new highs through winter.

Most forecasters' models expect tax-cut stimulus only in the future. So far, the Federal stimulus to business has been less than expected: defense outlays have been running well below the levels called for in the fiscal 1964 budget. In the budget for 1965, however, they are scheduled to run $1 billion higher than now.

In coming months there will be another upward run in the FRB index (see chart). From the February high of nearly 128, the index should top 137 by yearend, up nearly 8 percent from last yearend, which was up 6 percent from late 1962.

This will mean a faster uptrend in nonfarm jobs, which rose sharply in February, up 1,600,000 (3 percent) above a year ago. Overtime work is already high (and part-time work low) and "moonlighting" increased rapidly in 1963. Unemployment has fallen to the lowest rate in several years, 5.4 percent of the labor force, even though rising job opportunities have been attracting many workers into the labor force, after a subnormal growth in 1959–62. As the labor force rises on trend in coming months, and jobs open up more rapidly, the percentage of idle should start to fall off sharply.

In a tightening labor market, all sorts of cost pressures will mount. As output surges, productivity will continue to make large gains for a while. But gradually it will be slowed by the need to train new workers, and to staff new plants, as well as by "wildcat" stoppages and labor turnover (help-wanted ads are now the highest in 4 years). Competition for labor is already firming factory wages. Apart from overtime costs, they rose about 3 percent in 1962 and 1963 (including most fringe benefits), and perhaps 3.3 percent in the past 12 months. This is about on a par with the 3.2 percent "guideline" offered by the Council of Economic Advisers. And this has happened without any large negotiated increases.

THE WAGES OF CARS

Walter Reuther last month announced that the UAW will seek a minimum 4.9 percent annual increase in its negotiations with Detroit. Present contracts run out August 31. In its 1961 negotiations the UAW won an average rise of about 3.5 percent (to which the cost-of-living adjustment has added 1 percent annually). The labor movement that Mr. Reuther one day may head will expect him to do better than that when Detroit is booming. The new settlement may include provisions that obscure cost calculations (e.g., improved working conditions, penalty overtime, etc.). Other union settlements, if not up to the UAW's, will similarly tend to rise.

Labor costs are traditionally a delayed factor in the business cycle. They can press hard on prices belatedly, even after the first fever of demand subsides. As time and demand go on, price changes unfortunately take a sticky form—i.e., the restructuring of price lines. Cars and homes, for example, got steadily bigger and more luxurious in 1955–57, narrowing demand for years to come. Markets thereafter were widened again by a reversal of the price trend, in a climate of cost reduction, the shift to compact cars, low-cost apartments, and industrialized houses, small appliances, discount apparel, low-premium gasoline, light steels, etc. This laid the base for the present boom, but the first signs of change have begun to appear. Last year consumers started to buy larger cars, and Detroit incorporated some of the changes in 1964 models. The access of tax-cut funds will foster more trading up—in cars, high-style apparel, color TV; for a while, so may the increments to purchasing power from higher wages.

Thus an important and complex set of forces are beginning to get into motion that initially tend to keep a boom going, even as they tend to undermine it eventually. This poses a harsh dilemma for the Federal Reserve in a situation where no one can be certain how far ahead the present boom will carry. If it is destined to peter out in 1965, and the Fed meanwhile steps hard on the credit brakes, this will sharpen the letdown, as Roundup pointed out last month, because credit action itself takes time to become effective. But if the Fed does not brake credit, and prices should speed up, and the boom should feed on itself for a couple of years, the conceivable consequences could be quite serious both to the economy's future and to the competitive position of the United States in the world. Even though this may be the less likely possibility, it will seem the greater danger to the Fed. Its decisions will thus be hard to make, for to avoid possible inflation it may need to risk recession. And with the budget turning sharply to deficit now and to temporary surplus next spring, the Fed may have to shift ground more than once in the period ahead.

The character of the business outlook for the next year has now taken shape. A 3-year-old expansion, internally generating increased strength, has been given added stimulus in 1964 and promised budgetary restraint in 1965. The consequence is a boom, developing increasing crosswinds. How strongly each blows—how much and how soon consumers spend, costs rise, output grows, capacity expands, and credit firms—will determine the trend of business a year hence; and no one can foretell all this now. So this is hardly the best of all possible economic worlds that Washington has been painting (any more than the pre-tax-cut economy, which it so long deprecated, was the worst). Some officials, indeed, as well as a good many private economists, are now having second thoughts about the road recently taken. They begin to see that overstimulus is more likely than not to lead on to overrestraint. Growing recognition of this whole dilemma is the first good harbinger of spring, not just for 1964, but for 1965.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of quality stabilization are going out to prove that this legislation will be detrimental to our economy, especially the consumers, and now it appears that they are somehow tying it up to increased defense costs.

Mr. Harry B. Henshel made the following statements in support of this bill which I believe answers the charges on the defense angle:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL TO SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE BY BULOVA WATCH CO.

I wish to comment on the relationship of S. 774, the quality stabilization bill, to the cost of Department of Defense (DOD) procurement. As a citizen active in industry, I am always heartened by congressional attention to defense costs.

I believe anyone must place value in procurement ahead of price because second best weapons and second best operating supplies are too costly to be afforded. The area of defense surely is one sector of the economy in which quality should be the predominant consideration.

Examination of the quality stabilization bill leads me to suggest to you that it is not necessary for Congress or the DOD to be concerned by any fears that this measure would raise the cost of Defense procurement. Defense purchasing may face various causes of excess cost, but a Quality Stabilization Act cannot be classed as one of them.

And, based on my experience in industry and my deep convictions regarding free competitive enterprise, it is my opinion that costs to the private consumer will not be raised by this measure.

With respect to Defense procurement, the fact is that normal methods followed by industry in seeking Government business, plus the safeguards built by law and otherwise into Defense purchasing procedures, automatically negate any possibility that the Quality Stabilization Act will increase the cost of Department of Defense purchases.

Defense buying, like industrial purchasing, usually is conducted directly between the buyer (DOD) and the source (the manufacturer). The prices paid by DOD result from competitive bidding procedures or from negotiation between buyer and seller.

The quality stabilization bill deals with the protection of the manufacturer's trademark in the resale of such trademarked product. It has nothing to do with the prices a manufacturer will charge to the DOD (or a DOD contractor or subcontractor) for products it will use.

The subcontract zone is generally regarded in industry as one of considerable price pressure with the prime contractor devoting himself to securing every proper assistance for a low bid on the end product. Components and material are obtained usually on the basis of specifications rather than trademarks or brand names.

Now as to the relatively small amount of procurement done in the field—that is, where purchases may be made by DOD, or its contractors and subcontractors, not from the ordinary source (the manufacturer) but from wholesalers or retailers of the manufacturer's trademarked product—there is a specific provision in the quality stabilization bill that exempts any purchase of such trademarked product by any unit of the Federal, State, or local governments.

Undoubtedly, DOD is aware that only last year the U.S. Supreme Court held that the U.S. Government in its purchases must be free to secure the lowest possible price in its procurement even though a State prescribed by statute minimum price regulations applying to the commodity. (*Paul v. United States*, 371 U.S. 245, 1963.)

In light of the specific exemption in the quality stablization bill regarding Government's purchases, there can be no doubt that the courts would broadly construe such exemption to insure that the DOD in its purchases will be free to secure the lowest possible price.

Of course, I respect honest disagreement, but it is indeed shocking to read the testimony of the DOD. Undoubtedly, DOD was aware of the prior decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court which, under analogs but less stringent statutes, state conclusions opposite to the hypothetical picture DOD painted in its testimony.

In testimony before Congress it would seem to be the minimum duty of a Government agency or department to give objective and complete information, just as the congressional committee itself makes an objective study of the proposed legislation before it.

In reading the testimony not only of the DOD but also of other governmental agencies and economists on the quality stabilization bill, I am amazed at the lack of practical insight reflected by their testimony regarding our free enterprise system.

The Bulova Watch Co. is more sensitive to the marketplace than any theorist or Government agency. It is the goodwill of our trademark that is involved. It is our sales dollar that is involved. It is our distribution structure that is involved. It is the fickle American consumer that we must serve.

Any notion that our marketing or pricing policies can be arbitrary is ridiculous. There are literally hundreds of other manufacturers anxious for us to make mistakes so that they can move in and take our business. That is the way it should be. That is our dynamic free, enterprise system at work. And the quality stabilization bill is a symbol of that system at its best because it puts the risk on us to deliver more than any of our competitors—to give the consumer the greatest value for the dollars he spends, or else that consumer's business goes to another product.

Unless the Quality Stabilization Act helps us do that, it will not be used by Bulova or any other manufacturer in our industry.

It is our opinion that the Quality Stabilization Act will serve admirably the public interest. It is 100-percent consistent with—and in support of—our free enterprise system.—HARRY G. HENSHEL.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time that I received Mr. Henshel's statement I ran across an article entitled "Watches and Tariffs," by Paul F. Mickey, of the American Watch Manufacturers Association.

The article follows:

WATCHES AND TARIFFS

(By Paul F. Mickey)

Charles P. Taft has been writing letters for a dozen years against the American watch industry and in support of the efforts of the Swiss watch cartel to lower U.S. watch tariffs. The letter published March 22 shows that his respect for facts has not increased with the passage of time.

The public record at the Tariff Commission shows the following facts, not one of which was mentioned by Mr. Taft. The U.S. jeweled lever watch industry now has only 15 percent of our own market. The Swiss cartel now supplies 83 percent of all imports. In 1954 the U.S. Tariff Commission found

the U.S. industry had already been seriously injured by imports. Since that 1954 finding, the U.S. industry has been reduced to three companies—Bulova, Elgin, and Hamilton; U.S. production has declined 40 percent and employment of watchworkers has decreased 48 percent. The American industry pays over 2½ times the Swiss rate.

This is the condition of the industry that Mr. Taft said is "stronger" than in 1954. These are the facts which have led the Tariff Commission in each annual review of the watch industry escape-clause action to find no cause for removal of the relief which President Eisenhower granted in 1954. They indicated a need for additional help, certainly not a tariff reduction.

But the most significant fact—which Mr. Taft also did not mention—is the finding of the U.S. district court in New York, in 1962, in an antitrust suit brought by the Department of Justice, that the Swiss watch industry is an international cartel. On the basis of an 8,000-page record, Judge Cashin concluded that, as early as 1931, the defendants "entered into a combination and conspiracy to eliminate competition in the U.S. manufacture, import, export, and sale of watches, watch parts, and watchmaking machinery."

These practices, needless to say, are completely repugnant to the stated purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and are specifically condemned in section 252 of that act, which makes a finding of their existence the statutory basis for withholding or withdrawing tariff concessions from the nation tolerating such practices.

It is outright misrepresentation for Mr. Taft to say that spokesmen for the companies "admitted last week that the companies would survive a reduction in the tariff." These spokesmen—the chairmen of the boards of directors of Bulova, Elgin, and Hamilton—said the companies could survive—profitably—by becoming 100-percent importers, but that U.S. jeweled watch production would not survive. And, as one of them, Gen. Omar Bradley, pointed out, this would leave the United States and the Western Hemisphere without a jeweled watch industry at a time when Russia has expanded her industry from a production of 635,000 movements in 1938 to 26,500,000 in 1962.

The small U.S. industry, which produced only 1,400,000 movements in 1963, has made timing devices for practically every missile and spacecraft launched by the United States. It may make sense to Mr. Taft to destroy this capability in order to provide a monopoly for a foreign cartel, but that would not be in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that if the opponents of quality stabilization are seriously interested in the defense of this Nation they would first of all support quality stabilization as a bulwark in our defense posture, since this legislation, in my opinion, will guarantee that our domestic watch industry will be able to survive in the dog-eat-dog international attack upon the American watch market.

Mr. Mickey's article is thought provoking and in a sense a warning to the American Congress that if we keep following the advice of international profiteers and foreign agents, we may find ourselves completely dependent for all of the needs of our economy, including defense needs, upon the type of craftsmanship that is found only in the watchmakers guild.

I once said that this was the age of doubletalk-doublecross and alibi, and I am more convinced than ever that this is true. I warned the Congress that free trade carried to its ultimate would destroy American job economy. The recent act establishing a subsidy for the cotton textile industry to meet the foreign competition is only a beginning. Unless we start to protect our own market by legislation such as quality stabilization we will find ourselves compelled to subsidize what is left of the watch industry in order that we may have the necessary men and equipment, not alone for defense, but in the case of war, to produce the fine instruments demanded by modern warfare.

I believe every Member of Congress should read the statement by Mr. Henshel and the article by Mr. Mickey.

Whom We Shall Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, being a firm believer in the liberalization of our immigration policy and especially the removal of the national origins quota system, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of April 16, 1964, struck me as particularly appropriate. I take pleasure in submitting it for the RECORD:

WHOM WE SHALL WELCOME

Immigration has been a wellspring of America's growth to greatness. The men and women who streamed from the Old World to the New in search of freedom and opportunity brought with them invigorating skills and energy—and brought with them, even more significantly, an enriching diversity and a passion for individual dignity that have immeasurably ennobled American life.

It is time to take stock of this country's immigration policy. For the gates once welcomingly open to newcomers have been pushed even more nearly closed in recent decades. The American Immigration and Citizenship Conference which meets here today has chosen an auspicious and, indeed, a decisive hour. The moment is ripe for doing away with a meanly discriminatory basis of admitting immigrants—the national origin quota system—which belies and dishonors the ancient American respect for human equality.

The national origins quota system operates to restrict immigration by fixing quotas on the basis of the national origins of the American population of 1920. It discriminates against those who would come here from central and eastern Europe or from the Orient and it holds down the stream of immigration by assigning quotas to nations that do not use them. "Under the current law," Abba Schwartz, the State Department's Administrator of Security and Consular Affairs, said in a recent speech, "157,000 quota visas are authorized annually. But they are never fully utilized because of the manner of the allocation. Thousands upon thousands of persons, otherwise qualified for admission, await their turn on the quota lists."

President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress last July, called for abolition of the national origins quota system. President Johnson, in his state of the Union message of January 8, put the problem as simply and succinctly as possible: "We must also lift by legislation the bars of discrimination against those who seek entry into our country, particularly those with much needed skills and those joining their families. In establishing preferences, a nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: What can you do for our country? But we should not be asking: In what country were you born?"

The all-day conference on immigration and citizenship will terminate this evening in a dinner to which Members of Congress who have introduced legislation that would abolish the national origin quota system have been invited as guests of honor. We hope they will go back to Congress with refreshed determination to bring that healthy change about. Once the civil rights bill is enacted into law, immigration policy should be high on the congressional agenda. Discrimination on grounds of race and origin is an un-American at the country's gates as it is inside them.

Act Now To Check Cheap Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress must, as an inescapable duty, review the alarming, critical conditions that have been developing in the country as a consequence of the increased step-up of cheap imports.

The textile industry is bearing the principal brunt of these imports and many of its units have already gone out of business, with more to follow.

The shoe industry is also suffering from foreign competition and there are many other industries that have similar problems.

I think it is urgent and imperative that this Congress should conduct a study and very careful inquiry into the causes and extent of the steadily increasing volume of foreign imports into the United States, and take action necessary to prevent this great injury to the national productive system and the loss of jobs of millions of Americans and the prosperity of many going business concerns now facing destruction.

I think Congress must act at once to try to stop the growth of the very heavy increase of these destructive imports. It is imperative that we should do this right now, rather than wait until the situation becomes so bad that it will be irremediable.

I think the Congress must do this without disrupting or discouraging legitimate, honest, mutually profitable trade with nations of good will who desire to trade with us on a give-and-take basis and open their markets on some reasonable basis to American products, which is not the case today. Present trade is all too often a one-way street for our country, with other nations reaping rich benefits and this country suffering grave losses.

I feel that if something is not done real soon, many more industries will be forced to close their doors and many

more hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens will be out of work.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Morning Sentinel, Waterville, Maine, entitled "Save Our Woolen Industry," which is extremely critical of conditions that exist and the need for doing something to correct them.

Let us get going here—amend the trade bill to make it fair to American industry, and stop now the destructive, growing flood of cheap imports that is causing untold damage and harm to our industrial and economic system, putting many people out of work, and threatening to prostrate and weaken much more of our business structure.

The article follows:

SAVE OUR WOOLEN INDUSTRY

If the rate of increase of imports of wool textiles is permitted to continue at its present rate there will be no U.S. woolen textile industry left by 1968—4 years from now.

An alarmist statement? Perhaps, but the author is one who ought to know of what he speaks, for he is William Sullivan, president of the Northern Textile Association.

And if it is true it spells some serious difficulties for the Waterville area, for the State of Maine, and for all of New England.

A large part of the textile industry that was once a New England giant has gone elsewhere, and consequently you might not believe that there are presently 3,000 textile and apparel plants in the six New England States employing nearly 200,000 workers.

That is 13 percent of the manufacturing employment in the region with an annual payroll of $725 million.

So, if present trade policies are such that this industry is considered expendable we should be aware of the economic catastrophe this policy can bring to New England.

And don't think that the electronics industry—once considered New England's great white hope—is going to expand to offset this loss, if it comes.

Donald White, science-industry reporter for the Boston Globe, reported last week that in Massachusetts alone nearly 7,000 workers in the electrical machinery industry are claiming unemployment benefits.

Is there an answer to the textile problem or must we sit idly by and watch jobs and payrolls go down the drain?

Mr. Sullivan says there is an answer. It doesn't require any congressional legislation, either. The President has the authority in his hands now.

Tariffs, as a means of controlling imports, have broken down in the textile industry, according to Sullivan, because of the great variance of production costs.

Thus, the answer is in a quota program which would, through international agreements, hold imports at a given level under a program established in 1961 by President Kennedy.

We believe in international trade, but don't think that New England industry like Wyandotte and Cascade in our own area and New England workers like those employed in textiles here should carry an unfair share of the load.

Mr. Sullivan provides the information that the unfavorable balance of trade in textiles in 1963 amounted to $600 million compared with a favorable balance of a billion dollars 15 years ago. Thus, it would seem that we have already done our share.

This is an election year and while it may not be idealistic for New England to exert every bit of pressure it can to cause Washington to move with speed and with firmness to negotiate control agreements covering wool products, enough is at stake to make it justifiable.

The Great Question Before the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, there is too much misunderstanding about the civil rights bill that passed the House of Representatives. If more people would read the legislation instead of the inaccurate interpretations of it this would be a great contribution to sober thought.

Of all the editorials that have appeared on the subject of the civil rights bill, the piece, I think, that was the most accurate and reasonable comment was the Saturday Evening Post's editorial in the April 18 issue of that magazine.

In the interest of giving this editorial wide congressional notice, I am inserting it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE GREAT QUESTION BEFORE THE SENATE

Before the Senate embarked upon its great filibuster, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, said on Meet the Press that passage of the civil rights bill would be "looked upon as the greatest achievement in the field of human rights since the Emancipation Proclamation." That may have sounded like hyperbole, but it is actually not an exaggeration. The current filibuster may be the last great legislative battle of the civil rights struggle.

The bill before the Senate now is the most comprehensive civil rights measure to come before that body. Its major provisions would go a long way toward eliminating what Senator HUMPHREY calls the citizenship gap in the United States. The bill would implement Negro voting rights, eliminate discrimination in public accommodations, authorize the Attorney General under certain circumstances to bring suit to desegregate public schools, terminate Federal assistance to State and local programs involving discrimination, and authorize the establishment of a Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission.

In recent weeks southern Senators have belabored the bill as a mortal threat to States' rights and constitutional liberties. For all the oratory, however, two simple facts stand out. First, if the States are to maintain a responsible role in our system, they must behave responsibly themselves. Some 32 States have enacted public-accommodations laws, but Southern States have simply failed to discharge their responsibilities to Negro citizens.

Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio, put the problem of State versus Federal action in the civil rights field succinctly and eloquently when the House debated the civil rights bill. "I believe in the effective separation of powers and a workable Federal system whereby State authority is not needlessly usurped by a centralized government," Mr. MCCULLOCH said. "But I also believe that an obligation rests with the National Government to see that the citizens of every State are treated equally without regard to their race or color. Where, then, individuals or governmental authorities fail to shoulder their obligations, and only stress their rights, it is the duty of the Congress under constitutional authority, to correct that wrong. To do otherwise would be to forgo our responsibility as national legislators and as human beings who honor the principles of liberty and justice."

The second basic fact of the civil rights "debate" is that for all the crocodile tears that have been shed over "constitutional rights," the current bill only attempts to insure to certain American citizens rights and opportunities that others have long enjoyed. How a decent, humane society can do less, and how people who call themselves Christians can settle for less, cannot be answered by any amount of filibustering.

Before the filibuster, both sides—southern conservatives and civil rights advocates—pledged that there would be no compromise. President Johnson to his great credit, has repeatedly promised that his administration will not weaken the bill. We do not say the bill is perfect. There may be changes, but there should be no compromise on its basic objectives. The bill is not a radical measure. The House passed it by a vote of 290 to 130 after an exemplary debate. The bill, in essence, is an affirmation of elementary principles of fairness and decency, a test of whether our society in its 188th year can conform to its original promise.

Many Against Fair-Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Denver Post of November 17, 1963, again pointing out the evils of the so-called quality stabilization bill which would fix prices, gouge consumers, and deny the small businessman the privilege of setting his price at the level most advantageous to himself.

The editorial follows:

IS "FAIR TRADE" FAIR?—TWO U.S. BILLS WOULD LEGALIZE PRICE FIXING

(NOTE.—This is the first article of a five-part series on an attempt now being made in Congress to curtail price competition in the American merchandising system, at both the retail and wholesale levels, on brand-named goods.)

(By Leverett Chapin)

Like the cat with nine lives, "fair trade" is back. Instead of being dead by the hands of numerous courts across the country, "fair trade" is purring around the halls of Congress where it has acquired a lot of friends and admirers.

"Fair trade," in case you have forgotten, is a system of price fixing designed to eliminate price competition on trademarked goods between retail stores.

Many, but not all, store owners, wholesalers, and manufacturers see it as the ideal solution for the worst of their problems—problems created by bargain selling, price cutting, the rise of chain stores and discount houses.

Consumers generally view it as a scheme to legalize price gouging and conspiracies in restraint of trade to produce higher profits.

Battles over "fair trade" have raged across the country for 30 years.

At one time 45 States, including Colorado, had "fair trade" laws on their statute books. None of them worked as well as the sponsors had hoped, and in recent years many State supreme courts, including the Supreme Court of Colorado, have ruled that, under the traditional system of competition in business, merchants cannot be restrained from cutting prices if they wish to do so.

Today less than half the States retain a semblance of the "fair trade" price-fixing system.

However, at this darkest hour for champions of "fair trade," a new and amazingly powerful push to impose price fixing in one swift stroke on the entire country—this time by Federal law rather than State enactments—has developed in Washington.

Two bills, S. 774 and H.R. 3669, are being promoted by a lobby supported by 70 trade associations in the drug, electric appliance, sporting goods, clothing, jewelry, furniture, bedding, and many other lines of business.

The House bill has been approved with only one dissenting vote by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and is expected to clear the House Rules Committee soon.

The Senate bill is still in committee.

The rising popularity of the bill is the more surprising in that it is opposed by nearly everyone outside of trade: The Department of Justice which enforces antitrust laws, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Defense Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and many other consumer groups, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, etc.

Both the Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union, which seldom agree on major issues, are opposed.

Because the term "fair trade" has become tarnished over the years, through efforts made in the name of "fair trade" to raise prices to consumers, the new bills are called "quality stabilization" proposals.

Most supporters readily admit the disguise is thin and that the objective, as in the past, is to eliminate price competition at the wholesale and retail levels on trademarked items which are commonly sold by all dealers in a particular line of business.

Because it would be imposed on the entire country by Federal law, this new effort, if it worked as its sponsors hope, if it survived court tests, would revolutionize long-established trade practices.

An amendment put on the bill in the House Commerce Committee would permit a State, through later action by its own legislature, to exempt itself from price fixing but congressional sponsors of "fair trade" hope to eliminate that loophole before a final vote is taken.

Here is how price fixing would work as contemplated in these two bills:

A manufacturer of widgets, which might be razor blades, shoes, or any other trademarked goods which were in competition with other goods of a similar kind, would be authorized to fix the price at which widgets could be sold by any wholesaler or retailer anyplace in the United States.

In this respect the proposal would go beyond the "fair trade" laws in many States which authorize retail price fixing only.

If a wholesaler or retailer cut below the fixed price, to stimulate sales, because he considered the profit margin built into the fixed price was too high, or for any other reason, the manufacturer could sue him in Federal court for damages, court costs and attorneys' fees.

MANUFACTURER COULD GET INJUNCTION

In addition the manufacturer could get a court injunction to restrain the wholesaler or retailer from violating fixed prices in the future.

The proposed bills contemplate that all retailers in any trade area, the boundaries of which could be set by the manufacturer, would sell widgets at exactly the same price, regardless of whether the retailer ran an efficient low-cost operation or an inefficient, high-cost operation.

They contemplate that "bargain days," "sales days," and similar business-promoting efforts would disappear from the American scene as far as trademarked goods are concerned.

The bills list only two possible defenses for a retailer or wholesaler against a suit brought by a manufacturer: (1) the defendant might escape penalties if he could show that the manufacturer had not brought suits against other dealers who had cut the price of widgets; (2) he might escape if he could show that the manufacturer had charged him more for widgets than another dealer had been charged.

This provision seemingly would end the quantity discount system under which business has always operated. The manufacturer would have to charge the same price to every buyer, whether he bought one widget or a carload.

Next: What would happen to prices under "quality stabilization"?

The Right Course for Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration has said that it would be "self-defeating" for monetary policy to blunt the economic stimulus expected to arise from the tax cut. It has said that money should be kept easy unless inflation becomes a clear and present danger or the balance of payments shows a sharp deterioration.

This position is becoming the subject of increasingly lively debate. Dr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist of the Bankers Trust Co., says that if the Federal Reserve heeds this advice the economy may be in for an unstable boom that could eventually produce a bust. According to Dr. Reierson, the administration's position would amount to muzzling the Federal Reserve guns until trouble breaks out. By then, the use of monetary policy might come too late.

Dr. Reierson's own prescription is for a gradual tightening of credit as the expansion proceeds. In the minority views to the 1964 Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee, the Republican members also urged the administration to adopt a greater willingness to make timely and aggressive use of monetary policy in order to prevent an overheating of the economy followed by a serious recession.

Under unanimous consent, I place an article written by Murray J. Rossant from the New York Times of April 13 discussing Dr. Reierson's views in the RECORD at this point:

MONETARY ARMAMENTS: REIERSON OF BANKERS TRUST CO. ENTERS DEBATE OVER CHOICE OF FISCAL WEAPONS

(By M. J. Rossant)

A new and critical voice has joined the debate over what is the most suitable course for monetary policy to pursue during the present stage of economic expansion.

In a speech last week, Dr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist for New York's Bankers Trust Co., attacked the administration for suggesting that the Federal Reserve should maintain relatively easy credit conditions and low interest rates unless inflation becomes a clear and present danger, or the balance of payments shows a sharp deterioration.

He states that if the Reserve needs this advice, the economy may be in for an unstable boom. This would have to be countered by a money squeeze, characterized by extremely tight credit conditions and high interest rates, which could produce a bust.

Dr. Reierson's own prescription is for a gradual tightening of credit. He does not see any immediate need for a rise in the discount rate, which influences all other interest rates, but he argues that the only way to avoid abrupt and violent moves on the monetary front is by moderate anticipatory action.

The Federal Reserve has not taken sides, although it has been tightening credit very gradually. But Dr. Reierson is implying that the administration's strictures have led the money managers to pull their punches.

More is involved in this debate than the question of what may be the appropriate monetary policy to follow at this particular point in time. Rather, it concerns the nature of monetary policy and how it should be employed.

As an economic weapon, monetary policy was in mothballs prior to the 1950's. Then it was wheeled out to become the principal economic stabilizer. It had a bigger job than it could handle during the Eisenhower era, but in the last few years it has been used with considerable effectiveness.

Now, Dr. Reierson insists that its continued effectiveness depends on a show of force by the monetary managers. He charges that the Johnson administration's position would amount to muzzling the Federal Reserve's guns until trouble breaks out.

It does appear that President Johnson and his Council of Economic Advisers want to avoid any credit tightening as long as excess plant capacity and idle manpower are in evidence. They belong to what Senator PAUL DOUGLAS once described as the "don't fire until you see the whites of the eyes of inflation" school.

In the President's economic report, the Reserve is called upon to employ its monetary weapons to reinforce fiscal policy in promoting expansion unless required to act as "defensive shock troops." According to Dr. Reierson, this concept of monetary policy is most likely to insure that it will be used to fight the wrong war at the wrong time.

Most authorities agree with Dr. Reierson in envisioning an entirely different approach, taking the view that monetary policy is the most pliable and versatile of economic weapons. Unlike the tax cut, which is a clumsy, one-shot affair, the monetary managers have an arsenal of instruments that can be adjusted to cope with changing conditions.

Allan Sproul, former President of New York's Federal Reserve Bank, urged making frequent use of monetary policy on the economic front because "it can probe and withdraw, apply pressure and relax pressure in varying degrees, test the substance of an economic movement or a structure of interest rates, without final commitment."

FLEXIBILITY NOTED

The same point was stressed by the Commission on Money and Credit, which stated that "the monetary authorities should make full use of the fact that monetary measures can be varied continually in either direction and reversed quickly at their discretion."

Even if monetary policy is the most sensitive and flexible weapon available, it does not always work according to plan. There is usually a time lag before either loosening or tightening takes effect. In addition, the Federal Reserve has been known to make mistakes.

Thus, as Federal Reserve Governor George W. Mitchell has admitted, it may seem "that monetary policy has taken us to sea in a pretty unmanageable boat" because it is difficult to "gage the effects of our monetary actions on the real economy, both in terms of timing and magnitude of impact."

The Council of Economic Advisers itself has lambasted the monetary policies pursued by the Federal Reserve during the Eisenhower administration, charging that its restrictive measures in 1957 and again in 1959 were a major element in the subsequent downturns. It has praised the Reserve's role in contributing to domestic expansion since 1961 while defending the international status of the dollar.

But Dr. Reierson argues that a continuation of expansionary policies is no longer needed. He fears that it will mean a resumption of the unstable conditions criticized by the Council of Economic Advisers. If the Reserve's hands are tied now, he predicts that it would mean "renewed inflation, economic instability, and a weakening of the dollar."

The Reserve Board itself prefers to let its actions speak louder than any words. It is doubtful that it will relegate itself to a purely defensive "shock troop" role. But neither is it likely to take the offensive.

Instead, it is probable that it will probe and reconnoiter toward a tighter policy. It is in an unenviable position, for whatever moves it makes will add fuel to the debate.

Urban Renewal, Senior Citizen Housing, Human Relations Program Win All America City Award for Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1964, Minneapolis became one of the 11 cities to win the All America City Award.

This award, sponsored jointly by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, was presented to Minneapolis largely on the basis of its urban renewal program, senior citizens housing, and the human relations program of the chamber of commerce.

The Gateway Center, the largest urban redevelopment project in the Nation, has shown how centrally controlled development can transform a decaying central urban area into a modern, vibrant, and attractive commercial center.

In the speech in which he presented the citation, Vernon C. Myers, editor of Look magazine, pointed out how Minneapolis is an example of what cities can and should do in order to be not only centers in which to work and do business, but attractive, enjoyable places in which to live as well. Excerpts from Mr. Myers' address follow:

ADDRESS BY VERNON C. MYERS, PUBLISHER, LOOK MAGAZINE, ON MINNEAPOLIS ALL-AMERICA CITY AWARD AT PICK NICOLLET HOTEL, APRIL 8, 1964

Mayor Naftalin, Mr. Martens, Mr. Harris, honored guests and citizens, today it is official. Minneapolis joins the distinguished family of all America cities for 1963. In point of time, you are the first city this year to have an official award presentation ceremony. Originally, another city had set its presentation date for April 4, 4 days ago. The week before Easter, we received a jubilant letter from the president of its chamber of commerce telling us that the Governor and 2 Senators would be at its 2-day celebration, and that the Army and Air Force were going to augment the parade with 3 bands and 400 marching troops. That celebration has had to be postponed, but I wish to announce that we are ready to join it whenever it takes place. Seward, Alaska, is more than ever an All America City.

I think you can readily understand my feeling of pleasure at being here on this particularly happy occasion—for you and for us. Minneapolis is a city I have often visited, and have always enjoyed visiting, whether on business or pleasure.

Most of you are probably aware of the brotherly feeling Look has for Minneapolis because of the close relationship between the two men who respectively head up our magazine and your newspapers. Mike Cowles has asked me to bring you his greetings and congratulations. He regrets that he cannot be here personally.

But however close we feel to Minneapolis, you could not have made the winning team if you hadn't deserved it. I was on the All America Cities jury, it is true, but the jury had 12 members, and I had only 1 vote.

Minneapolis is the birthplace of the All America Cities Awards. The program had its origin here in 1949, at the National Conference on Government—and for the first 3 years the awards were cosponsored by the National Municipal League and the Minneapolis Tribune. As the program grew in scope and reputation, however, the Tribune suggested that a national publication would be a more fitting sponsor. Thus, in 1952, Look joined the league in the sponsorship of the All America Cities.

It is not easy to win the honor you are receiving today. The award is conferred in open competition with the Nation's cities for major civic improvements initiated and carried through by private citizens, with or without the cooperation of the city government.

From the beginning the odds are heavily against you. There are, in the United States, about 20,000 communities which could make an entry of some kind into the contest. Each year, about 230 of these communities ask for entry blanks * * * but more than half drop out when they see the searching questions they must answer.

Of the cities that stay in the running, only the 22 best are chosen for the finals. Minneapolis, as you know, was one of these. And of the 22, only 11 can become All America Cities. Minneapolis made it again. This would not have been possible unless you had given an outstanding accounting of yourselves as citizens who are resourceful, farsighted and determined.

Minneapolis is not by any yardstick an ordinary city. For one thing, you are the largest city this year to hold the All America City title. You may not realize that it is harder for a big city to win an award than a small one. There seems to be a law of diminishing returns—the larger the city, the smaller the citizen action in proportion to the population and resources.

Renewal of aging and deteriorating downtown areas is one of the key jobs facing the Nation's older communities. Last year, the jury considered central city rejuvenation so important that 8 of the 11 cities won their awards largely on the basis of this activity. This year—while one or two other cities were cited in part for renewal of the downtown area—the activities in Minneapolis were considered outstanding. Your award comes to you largely for the dream, the plan and the accomplishment that have led to a new heart for your city.

The balance of your citation has to do with the heart in another sense. You also win for your efforts to give minority groups better opportunities through the work of the chamber of commerce human relations committee, and for the concern and respect shown for your older citizens in providing them with comfortable and cheerful apartments within their means.

As you were lucky enough to find out in time, a city with a rundown heart can become a city with a rundown personality. Every city needs an attractive center, not only for conducting business, but as a place that draws all people of the city—for shopping by day, and for dining out, movies, theater, concerts and other amusements and cultural offerings in the evening.

Offhand, one would think that the phenomenal growth of our cities during this century would present a rosy outlook. Unfortunately, this has not been so. Our downtown areas have been drying up. As one distinguished architect, Victor Gruen, put it—our cities are in danger of becoming like doughnuts, with all the dough in the suburbs and a hole in the center. He points out that the average citizen avoids going downtown because he can't get into it * * * he can't get out of it * * * he can't get around in it * * * and he can't find a place to park.

And I might add that not only do people avoid going downtown, but new industry and new business avoid coming to a town with a "hole in the center," and those that are there tend to look about for more enticing pastures. It is not merely the pressing growth of population that drives a city's most substantial citizens and retail businesses to the suburbs—it is the depressing view of shabbiness and decay at the city's heart.

Sounds pretty grim, doesn't it? The picture is a fair likeness of what could have happened to Minneapolis. Your city is too fine in other ways for you to have permitted it to go bad at the core.

Actually, Minneapolis wears a double crown as winner of an All America City title. Many of you may remember that you were also an All America City of 1962. This is not a common happening. In the 15 years since the awards were established, only 10 cities are multiple winners out of the 152 that have received awards. And only two besides Minneapolis have received both of their awards within the past 12 years.

Winning the All America City competition is justly a cause for jubilation and a stimulus to civic pride. But we have found that it is more. Rightly used, it can be an advantage in the wider contest every modern city hopes to win, and that is the competition for new business, new industry, and new people.

Many of you may wonder why Look should concern itself. Why should a national magazine go to such trouble year after year to encourage local communities to improve themselves? You say that a magazine's function is to print stories and articles—and the All America Cities article is only one out of the hundreds of stories Look publishes each year.

I have already mentioned Look's desire to discharge its responsibilities as a good citizen.

But there is another side to the picture. We like the All America Cities program. For Look's greatest concern is in people—what they do, what they feel, what they believe, what they want. It's a never-ending story, which we try to tell with warmth, understanding and wonder. We believe in people * * * but our interest goes beyond a mere belief. We also know what people can accomplish.

We know that fellow citizens, working together in their community for a common end,

can achieve tremendous results. We have seen it happen time and time again. And we are seeing it happen right here in Minneapolis.

To all the citizens of Minneapolis, as well as to the individuals and organizations from which the leadership has come, I extend the congratulations and good wishes of Look magazine. I understand that you have already received congratulations from many other quarters—including a message from the President of the United States—but I can assure you that none is more sincere than ours.

We say at Look—"Success is a journey, not a destination." The All America City Award is not an end, but a beginning. Just keep on traveling.

Mayor Naftalin and Mr. Martens, it is with great pleasure that the National Municipal League and Look magazine present to you as the elected representatives of all the citizens of Minneapolis this recognition of their outstanding achievement through citizen action * * * the All America City Award.

Tribute to Clarence Cannon on 85th Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10723) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we in the House, who know him so intimately and admire him so much, have a thousand reasons for eulogizing CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, on having achieved his 85th year. The massive weight of his services for his State and his country, in the great decisions made in this Chamber and by its committees, is a matter of record and has not gone unnoticed, both nationally and internationally. Yet the degree of his fame hardly matches the monumental importance of his contribution for the good of our country and the free world.

The point, however, I am most eager to emphasize in the career of Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of the Ninth District of Missouri, is that the mere accumulation of years is no measuring device for determining an individual's capacity for major service. Far from being a handicap, the seniority that CLARENCE CANNON has attained is the very arch stone of his influence among us, because he is the living proof, demonstrated daily and hourly in this House and its deliberations, of just how relative age can be. By common acceptance and by what is sometimes called the conventional wisdom, CLARENCE CANNON, at 85, ought to be ripe for retirement. It may be, indeed, that CLARENCE CANNON is the exception, perhaps the remarkable and singular exception; but, exception or not, it would be foolhardy and wasteful to the point of legislative tragedy, for the people of his District, the Members of this House, or for Representative CANNON himself, to be persuaded that he should leave this deliberative body and go into retirement.

I have been in this Chamber long enough, indeed the whole of a political lifetime, to recognize at once among my colleagues the symptoms of failing powers and diminishing vigor. Thousands of legislators have come more or less intimately into my observation over the run of the years, whole generations of them. And so, however great my personal admiration, respect, and affection for CLARENCE CANNON may be, I would not offer this very special emphasis on the strength and effectiveness of his counsel with the committees on which he serves today, did not the fact make so powerful an impression.

For here, to put it bluntly, is seniority without senility.

It is, incidentally, a phenomenon I have witnessed again and again in this House in the course of the years.

What might very likely be a handicap with other legislators of advanced years is an asset with Representative CANNON, for every month and every year of his experience adds to the depth and soundness, the force and analysis of his judgments. Mr. Chairman, I have been in this Chamber some 36 years, and I testify as I would under oath, that it is my most thoughtful conviction that the most useful years of CLARENCE CANNON'S service to his State and to his country in this Chamber occurred after he reached his 70th birthday. And yet the record of his life before that is one to excite the wonder and the applause of the most ambitious leaders of our time.

The wisdom that CLARENCE CANNON has demonstrated through the years and the restraint—especially in fiduciary matters—has been bulwarked by experience as it grew with the years. Had it been otherwise, his influence with the Members of this Chamber and with the committees on which his leadership and direction was so outstanding, would have declined as his gifts declined. Instead he never ceased to grow, to broaden, to understand more and more fully, the endless complexity of the problems that came under his ken and under his decision. Today, as, humbly, I evaluate his meaning to the Congress, to the country, and to the world, I am positive, beyond all question of a doubt, that CLARENCE CANNON stands at the very apex of his talents and his great force as a legislator and a leader of legislators. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that in this man from Missouri the Nation has, for years to come, one of its greatest human assets.

National Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a successful and determined offensive against ignorance, prejudice, and illiteracy is being waged by the libraries, librarians, and all of those dedicated to this great cause. Poverty is associated with a lack of learning and low income.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the United States is paying homage this week to all of those throughout the Nation who make our library program one of the very best in the world. These devoted men and women at the local level are making a great contribution to our national culture. Our country is moving forward to its destiny as a nation of enlightenment, education, and understanding, largely because our libraries are leading in the campaign for learning and knowledge.

I salute our libraries and their devoted personnel during this National Library Week and wish for them every continued success. I am particularly proud, Mr. Speaker, of the superb achievements and devotion to duty and success of the men and women in my own State of South Carolina who have been associated in improving this great work.

Lowell Thomas, Jr.'s, Story of Alaska Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 5, carried a most graphic description of the holocaust which raised such havoc in our neighboring State to the north, Alaska. Since this article was written by a professional, Lowell Thomas, Jr., who happens to live in Alaska and who happened to be in Alaska at the time of the tragedy, I think its contents should have as wide distribution as possible.

One of the great contributions to the immediate information that Alaska was undergoing an earthquake, Mr. Speaker, came from many thousands of "ham" radio operators, based in Alaska and in other places all over the world. Normal communications broke down almost immediately after the quake struck and I am informed the "ham" operators stayed on duty endlessly.

The vigor and courage of our neighbors to the north is being perfectly exemplified in the current disaster. I have heard of no one packing what may be left of his belongings and returning to the less hazardous surroundings of the mainland proper. I do know, however, that Lowell Thomas, Jr., and his courageous wife, Mary Taylor Pryor Thomas, daughter of Sam Pryor, vice president of Pan American Airways, are staying on in Alaska, although their home in Anchorage was a total wreck. I am also informed that it is quite possible that Mr. Thomas will become a Republican candidate for the Alaska State Legislature.

The New York Herald Tribune article by Mr. Thomas follows:

THE WEEK THAT SEEMED LIKE A YEAR—LOWELL THOMAS JR.'S STORY OF ALASKA TERROR

(By Lowell Thomas, Jr.)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—Just over a week ago the great earthquake struck Alaska. But it is a week that seems like a year. I am sitting in the shattered remains of our once-beautiful, split-level home on Chilligan Drive which commanded one of Anchorage's most spectacular views, sweeping 180 degrees from Mount Spur, a still-active volcano on the left to the Chugach Mountains on the right, with mighty Mount McKinley right in the middle.

Our home was just back of the bluff that dropped in a series of steps to Cook Inlet, a few hundred feet below. That was before the earthquake. Now the twisted, broken remnants of our home are scattered along the base of the new bluff line in half a dozen pieces and just barely above high tide.

I am sitting on what is left of the stairs to the bedroom which somehow held together, although it is tipped up at a sharp angle. My study, directly below, was crushed into the sand. Where the front door and the hall were is a jumble of broken boards, masonry, and pipes. Thirty yards away is the squashed living room and kitchen. Farther along are the tilted remains of the garage.

Another pile of debris marks the family room, and farthest away is the greenhouse with only a few broken panes. It is intact—one of the oddities of this disaster. Farther off are the ruins of neighbors' homes beyond twisted trees. This looks like a World War II battleground, with one exception. The ground has been broken up into a crazy jumble of huge blocks.

HOURS OF TERROR

As I sit here I can still feel the terror my wife, Tay, and our two children experienced a week ago. It is a miracle they escaped. I wasn't here, having flown to Fairbanks that afternoon to give a speech at a Republican district convention. Chances are that had I been home, one or all of us would have been killed, because at the first trembling I probably would have tried to reassure Tay by telling her it was just another mild shake, such as we felt before.

Had she not immediately rushed out the door with the children, the collapsing house would have claimed them. As it was, they barely cleared door before a terrific shock flung them to the ground and the house began to pull apart.

Then the snow-covered ground began to heave and break up. Everything started to fall toward the inlet. Trees snapped, huge blocks of frozen earth tumbled down, deep cracks opened, then closed again. How Tay, Anne, 8, and David, 6, kept from being crushed or swallowed up can only be credited to the grace of God. Others were not so fortunate. It is a terrible story, but it is Tay's story.

My part in this devastating earthquake, so far, has been to pick up the pieces of our home, which also doubled as my office, and to resettle the family. In Fairbanks it was several hours before word of disaster began to trickle in. All normal communications with Anchorage had been knocked out.

I was fortunate to hitch a ride that night on an emergency civil defense flight, landing at Elmendorf Air Force Base after midnight. While waiting for transportation into Anchorage, I learned for the first time that my part of town had slipped into the inlet. No one knew the fate of those living there and I feared the worst.

The next 3 hours that night were the grimmest I can remember, not knowing whether Tay, Anne, and David were alive. It was one of our neighbors, Bud Schultz, manager of Chugach Electric, who told me the good news that I still had a family. This was at civil defense headquarters. Bud had actually seen them climbing the bluff to the remains of our street, but he didn't know where they had found shelter. He, too, had lost his house but saved his family.

A new day was dawning by the time I located Tay and the children. They were still in a mild state of shock and Tay's feet were painfully frostbitten. They had run from the house lightly dressed and in their stocking feet. How fortunate they didn't pause for their boots.

I was so happy that my family had escaped that Tay's report of our house being demolished didn't matter. One can find a new home, but, of course, there is no way to replace a family of loved ones. However, our dog and two cats were still missing, so I lost no time in going back to our street.

It was now about 7 o'clock in the morning and civil defense men were guarding the edge of the new cliff. Far down in the devastated area was the wreckage of our place. They warned me about the still collapsing cliff and instability down below, but I told them my dog was still down there. Over I went, slithering and crawling through sand, clay, snow, and ice. Bud Schultz' German shepherd appeared, barring my way—the loyal watchdog. I had to hit him several times with a rope to keep from being bitten and to get on to my place.

As I picked my way along, I called for Boaz, our 9-year-old German shepherd. No answer. Getting closer I heard low mournful howling. Old Boaz was pouring his heart out as though the world had ended. When he heard me calling he began to bark excitedly. Well, it took a rope swing finally to hoist Boaz up the cliff.

Back down I went, this time taking a close look at the wreckage. I couldn't believe the total destruction I saw and still can't a week later. All that day I gathered possessions that were strewn over the ground, aware that my neighbors were doing the same. When we spoke to each other it was to express our sorrow at the loss of two children in the house right next to mine. They had been seen falling into a crevasse which closed over them.

HEROIC EFFORTS

That evening Eskimo Scouts of the Alaska National Guard came quietly through the spruces along the new bluff, taking guard positions throughout the devastated area. They were unsmiling, and quiet, which is unusual for these wonderful, happy people. Obviously they were saddened and awed by what they saw. Their purpose was to guard against looting and I was very glad to see them. One of the scouts said he came from Gambell on St. Lawrence Island, in Bering Strait near Russia, and he recognized me from a film I had made a few years ago.

Another important find that first day was the children's kitten, Sylvester. He was hiding under David's bed, a terrified kitty. The other cat didn't turn up until the next day, buried but unscathed beneath blankets and clothing in what had been the laundry. That cat used up about five of her nine lives surviving that.

During the days since the quake, truly heroic efforts have been made by the people of Anchorage to care for the hundreds of homeless families and to salvage as much property as possible. In our case, the Spenard Rotary Club organized rescue squads of 10 men each to help the owners of lost homes retrieve clothing and possessions. Bulldozers cut trails into the devastated area, all manned with voluntary help. All available cranes and hoists were brought in. Collapsed roofs were lifted so we could get at what was left inside.

Another miracle, for us, was the recovery of our ranch wagon, partially crushed by the garage roof and suspended by its bumpers over a pit where the floor had dropped away.

I was certain the car would never run again, although it looked in pretty good shape. The question was how to get it out and up over the cliff. A bulldozer operator, in true Alaskan fashion, said he'd like to give it a try. So, with a cable he pulled off the garage roof, then bulldozed a hole into the back of the garage, and hauled out the car, towing it up a trail that he had already made. A few hours later, Tay drove it away, never minding the bashed top, dented chrome and missing rear window.

The Air Force donated four-wheel-drive trucks to haul possessions retrieved by rescue crews. The Army sent soldiers from nearby Fort Richardson to help policemen patrol the devastated area and prevent the unwary from entering hazardous sections.

Everywhere the spirit of Alaskans was, "Let's pick up the pieces and start building anew." There has been little or no despair shown by a youthful people who are used to making new starts. There has been much thankfulness that the loss of life was not far greater.

DETERMINED PEOPLE

As for our future here in Alaska, we have more than enough spirit and energy to get on with it. Our determination to conquer and develop this last great American frontier is stronger than ever. We all feel that nothing can stop us now, provided our sister States will lend a financial hand in restoring our shattered cities and homes. A quick estimate of our losses from this disaster totals between $500 and $750 million. That kind of money does not exist up here. Clearly, this is a case for Federal assistance.

Although I have been picking up the pieces of my demolished home and office all week, there are still valuables buried in the sand. But it is time now to call a halt and to look ahead. As I scribble these impressions of the week that seems a year, Tay and the children already are moving into a new house in an undamaged section of Anchorage.

For the children, school will probably reopen next week. For me, much work lies ahead in helping friends and neighbors rebuild Anchorage and then continue the development of "Alaska, America's Brightest Star," the title of a film I made a few years ago for the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce and the Alaska Banker's Association.

It was great to be an Alaskan before the quake of '64, but it is even greater to be an Alaskan now.

UAW Promotes Retraining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the United Auto Workers Union is to be congratulated for taking the lead in promoting retraining courses for their members who are prospective victims of technological unemployment. The union-sponsored training program is an outstanding example of union-State-Federal cooperation under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Under unanimous consent I place an article from Business Week of April 11, discussing this program in the RECORD at this point:

LEARNING NEW JOBS BEFORE OLD ONES FADE

United Auto Workers, in cooperation with State and Federal agencies, is retraining

workers who face technological layoff for white-collar occupations with a labor shortage.

The earnest young man at work at the drawing board (picture) is a prospective victim of technological unemployment—a Detroit autoworker whose assembly line specialty is on its way out. But neither he nor his union is waiting passively for disaster to overtake him. He is studying mechanical drafting—a skill for which there are plenty of job openings—at a school run by the United Auto Workers.

Retraining officials believe the school is the Nation's first union-sponsored training center for white-collar skills.

COMBINED EFFORT

The UAW program could serve as a textbook example of union-Federal-State cooperation. The Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESC) certified the existence of labor shortages in mechanical drafting, graphic illustrating and clay modeling. This enabled UAW to receive $16,231 under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act, to teach these skills, it remodeled an old union hall into classrooms at its own expense.

The U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training keeps a paternal eye on the program. MESC picks students from among both union and nonunion applicants.

Students attend 3-hour classes 2 nights a week for 40 weeks. There are 25 in each class—men and women, Negro and white, and ages range from 18 to 50-odd years. All took aptitude tests before being admitted in January. They must maintain passing grades to stay in class. A handful who found the going too rough have been replaced by others.

Those who remain make eager pupils. Instructor Don Kramer gets to his 6:30 clay modeling class a half hour early—but finds students ahead of him every time. "By 6 o'clock some fellows are already at work," he says.

Most students are intent on bettering themselves, worried about the possibility that their new skill will be wiped out by automation, Kramer says. He's happy to assure them that clay modeling is not a job for machines. It takes initiative, imagination, and creativity and has a "no limit" future in industry, he believes.

Kramer is a clay modeler at Chrysler engineering.

The Center's staff consists of an administrator and seven instructors, all UAW members who work at regular jobs during the day. Each is a specialist in his subject, and most have teaching experience. They are paid from Manpower Development and Training Act funds at a rate a bit above their normal hourly pay.

MOVING UP

Three kinds of workers are eligible for the program: those already unemployed, especially if technological change is the reason, those whose jobs are threatened by technology, and those capable of learning skills that have manpower shortages. Like other retraining programs under Manpower Development and Training Act, it aims to supply workers for occupations that have shortages; to reduce unemployment; and to provide more job opportunities for unskilled and semiskilled workers, who may be able to move into jobs vacated by retrainees who move up.

There are plans for a second cycle of classes—perhaps in the same specialties, perhaps in others, depending on the labor market.

COAL STRIKES EBBING BUT LOCALS SIMMER

A strike by dissident coal miners in six States appeared to be breaking up early this week—but dissatisfaction was still running high against a new contract and United Mine Workers President W. A. "Tony" Boyle.

UMW recently negotiated soft coal contracts calling for a $2 a day in wage increases over 2 years plus more vacation pay and seniority and other job-security gains (BW, Mar. 28, 1964, p. 121). A number of large locals protested that the union should not have compromised tougher security demands in return for more pay. At their peak, wildcat walkouts involved more than 10,000 miners.

The national leadership moved in quickly to defend the terms as "a splendid contract," with new and important job props. However, the explanations appeared less important than coal market considerations in bringing the wildcats to an end in many coalfields; locals feared jobs would be lost if strikes continued.

Within the UMW, the contract revolt has this added significance: Boyle faces his first election to the presidency this fall, and the dissident moves reflect possible opposition gathering against him.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Quality Stabilization Act Brand-Name Standards Have Little Effect on Discount House Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 17, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, it has been revealed that the Nation's giant discount houses have raised a huge war chest to fight the quality stabilization bill. Now, an article in Discount Store News of February 24, 1964, raises a serious question as to the underlying reasons behind the big discounters' opposition to this legislation.

The article states that a survey of discount superchains indicates that the ratio of price-maintained merchandise to overall merchandise in these stores ranged from only one-tenth of a percent to a high of 2 percent. In other words, price-maintained merchandise represents only a small fraction of the entire inventory held by most discount houses, according to their own figures.

We might, therefore, reasonably ask the question as to why the discount houses are so vehemently opposed to quality stabilization. Clearly, the establishment of quality stabilization standards for brand-name products will have hardly any effect at all on the overall operations of the discount giants.

To quote one discount store operator:

Under today's concept of discounting, we see no advantage to price-maintained merchandise. As discount stores continue to upgrade merchandise, you'll find more and more price-maintained products.

This being the case, why then are the discount houses so actively fighting a bill aimed at protecting the interests of small, independent retail merchants whose livelihoods depend on maintenance of brand-name quality standards?

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to in my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE-FIXED ITEMS DO ONE-TENTH TO 2 PERCENT OF TITANS' BIZ—TOP CHAINS: YOU MUST CARRY SOME PRICE-FIXED PRODUCTS IF YOU WANT A COMPLETE DEPARTMENT

NEW YORK.—Price-maintained products have a small but apparently secure spot in the discount industry.

Dilution of the discount image, fear of driving shoppers back to neighborhood stores, and inadequate volume are the principal reasons why nearly all of discounting's superchains overwhelmingly keep price-maintained products to a minimum.

Nine of ten superchains interviewed by Discount Store News reported only fractional involvement with fixed-price merchandise and said they didn't plan to get in any deeper. Estimates of their ratios of price-maintained merchandise to overall merchandise ranged from a low of one-tenth of 1 percent to a high of 2 percent.

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

"You can't be both a discounter and a maintained-price retailer," Discount Store News was told by Murray Bellenson, Korvette secretary and division merchandise manager. "You must go one way or the other. If your shoppers can buy in their neighborhood stores the same products you carry at the same prices, they'll have no reason to come to you. They'll buy in the neighborhood."

Aaron Goldberg, King's vice president and general merchandise manager agreed. "You can prostitute yourself by going too far with price-maintained merchandise. It sells and you like the markup, and then you hate to give up and lose that markup. But if you go too far you lose your discount image. And when you lose that why should the customer come to you when she can buy the same product at the same price from a conventional retailer who also gives her more service?"

Lone rebuttal—and a sharp one—came from Gamble-Skogmo. Ted Berland, discount division group manager, told Discount Store News: "We have no objections to carrying price-maintained merchandise so long as there is a demand for it. We'll increase our price-maintained merchandise as demand increases. We consider ourselves mass merchandisers, and we have no fear of competing with anyone on such products. We believe that we can outmerchandise our competitors.

"Under today's concept of discounting, we see no disadvantages to price-maintained merchandise. I believe there's a trend today to more price-maintained merchandise. As discount stores continue to upgrade merchandise, you'll find more and more price-maintained products."

ALL ALONE

Discount Store News found no supporters for Mr. Berland's views. "We don't believe it's in keeping with the discount concept," emphasized Harold Gottfried, Atlantic Thrift Centers vice president and secretary.

Walter Mayer, Shoppers Fair vice president and general merchandise manager, put it this way: "In principle, we shouldn't go into price-maintained merchandise and don't want to. If you do go into it, it must be at a minimum. You should be a discounter with 99 percent of your merchandise so as not to dilute your discount image."

Gamble-Skogmo's Berland refuted the dilution argument, told us: "We have the answer for that in our private label lines." As an example, he used a name brand fair-traded refrigerator. "We go along with that fair trade price, but that makes our private label refrigerators even more appealing because of the price difference. Our private label merchandise becomes that much stronger. We're not concerned, either, about selling against the acceptance of the brand name. That's just a matter of salesmanship and merchandising."

Here are other major topics of maintained pricing discussed:

1. Consumer demand is the principal reason most discounters have any truck with price-maintained merchandise. "What we carry are items that customers want, particularly in drugs and housewares," noted Frank Beckerman, head of Interstate's Topps division. "You must have Pyrex, for example. However, there really isn't much that you really have to have."

DEMAND PERFORMANCE

"I can't think of any particular item we carry except Corningware," emphasized Korvette's Bellenson. "It's a demand item and there's nothing else like it. With other price-maintained merchandise, you can always get something similar that has better value."

K-Mart told us, "We carry only five items, and we carry them only because of the demand." King's Goldberg agreed. "Some things you just have to have. Pyrex is a good example. If you don't have Pyrex you don't have a complete housewares department."

2. Inadequate volume. "We wouldn't be concerned about diluting our discount image if price-maintained merchandise sold," we were told by Irving Strum, Clark's vice president and secretary. "The few items that we do carry happen to be items that are accepted and sell. Fruit-of-the-Loom sells well and we get full markup, but that is about the only price-maintained merchandise on which we get any real volume. There are so few price-maintained products on which we can get good action."

LINE OF LEASED RESISTANCE

3. Lessee problems. "Price-maintained merchandise represents a special problem for discount stores with leased departments," noted Leonard Goldstein, GEM operational supervisor. "We try to carry as little as possible. The drug department may want to carry Revlon, the shoe lessee Buster Brown, the housewives department something else. Everybody wants to carry some price-maintained merchandise, and if you let them you'll soon have price-maintained merchandise all over the store."

SMALL CARAT

GEM holds its price-maintained merchandise to "a small fraction of 1 percent," he said, adding: "The only time we have price-maintained merchandise is when we have an injunction to hold the price. We cut prices as long as we can, until they get an injunction. When they do, we hold the price, but we put up signs that advise our customers that they can get more value with the comparable GEM products, and we tell them that we are being forced to sell the brand product at the maintained price."

SECRET SERVICE

He also declared, concerning one price-maintained housewares line: "We keep that in the back room and don't bring it out unless customers ask for it."

4. Product availability. There's general agreement that there's little difficulty today in obtaining price-maintained merchandise. Dissident viewpoint came from Shoppers Fair's Mayer: "There is difficulty in getting such merchandise if you want to go big in it. There are still some major brands that just won't sell to discounters, even with assurance that prices will be maintained." However, Topps' Beckerman expressed the

majority opinion: "There's no problem getting price-maintained merchandise if you want it."

ALL-STAR TEAM

5. Prime price-maintained merchandise. Corningware, Pyrex, Rubbermaid, Fruit-of-the-Loom, and BVD generally are carried by most major discounters. Or, as Hyman S. Glass, J. M. Fields, senior vice president and general manager, expressed it: "Everybody has about the same group of products and it's spread around the departments." Other mentions: Scott's lawn products, Hartz Mountain products, Max Factor, Coty—carried by K-Mart. King's in addition to Fruit-of-the-Loom, BVD, and Pyrex, carries Hanes in some stores.

Here are general comments by superchain executives:

Atlantic Thrift Centers' Gottfried: "I don't know that we carry any price-maintained merchandise. We may not be 100 percent without it, but we're certainly 98 percent. It's alien to the discount theory."

Gamble-Skogmo's Berland: "There's demand—and lack of it—in certain product and geographic areas." He has found that one fair-traded housewares line, for example, is very strong in the Kansas City area and another is not. Yet, "you might find the exact reversal in Missoula, Mont." Asked about policy of maintaining prices in non-fair-trade States, Berland replied: "We're in 24 States. As an example of our policy, we carry the Motorola line which is price maintained. We have no objection to the Motorola program and we maintain the price in each State we're in, even though some of those States do not have fair trade provisions."

FRACTION OF THE ACTION

GEM's Goldstein: "The price-maintained merchandise we carry is negligible, a small fraction of 1 percent. We want to maintain our policy of having our customers save money on everything they buy at GEM. We've always been a trade-up organization. We've always upgraded, and we have never found it was necessary to carry price-maintained merchandise."

Fields' Glass: "We carry some price-maintained merchandise but not much, and we don't plan to increase."

Topp's Beckerman: "We do not carry much price-maintained merchandise—actually less than 1 percent of our total merchandise—and we don't plan to increase. We don't believe it belongs in a discount operation. I believe the trend is to fewer and fewer price-maintained products in discounting."

DROP IN THE BUCKET

King's Goldberg: "We carry very little, a minimum, certainly less than 2 percent of our total. I don't see how we could drop the lines we do have, but we would be reluctant to add more. We do not have a selling service, and the ideal situation for us is to have national brands at cut prices. We do have some private brands, but we haven't got people on the floor to discuss the advantages of our brand over a national brand. We'd sooner have, say, Cannon sheets at discount prices than sheets under our own brand."

Clark's Strum: "We carry very few price-maintained items. It's really fractional with us, and I don't foresee an increase. I don't see the need for price maintenance, and I believe the trend is away from it. If I sell an item for 5 cents more than you do and you see that I'm selling, you'll soon add the 5 cents to your price. That's real price maintenance, based on practice. Prices hit their own level, and we all maintain them."

ARM'S LENGTH

Korvette's Bellenson: "We don't have too much to do with fair trade items. If anything, we're decreasing. We stay away from it. Physically, you don't have the space to carry everything, and we concentrate on merchandise on which our customers can save money."

K-Mart: "Our involvement probably amounts to no more than one tenth of 1 percent, and our interest is decreasing. We carry only five items, because of demand. We don't see much future for price-maintained merchandise in discounting."

Israel's 16th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the State of Israel celebrates its 16th anniversary. Men of good will the world over pay tribute to this courageous country in recognition of her remarkable progress during her years of statehood. At this time I would like to extend to the people of Israel my congratulations and best wishes and I hope this fearless little state will continue to prosper and grow with each passing year.

On the occasion of her last anniversary I denoted Israel's achievements in the field of foreign technical assistance, and spoke of her aid programs which have placed at the disposal of the emerging nations much of the technical knowledge and expertise she has gained over the years while arduously building her own economic and social order. Today I would like to commend the bold and progressive efforts Israel has made in the development of a comprehensive plan to best utilize her meager water resources. Such systematic utilization of available water is an indispensable condition for the future strength of Israel, because without it she cannot hope to maintain a balanced economy or provide for a growing population.

Recently, the central project in Israel's overall water development, the Jordan-Negev pipeline, has come under heavy criticism from the Arab States of the Near and Middle East. Last January representatives from the Arab League States met in Cairo to discuss the implications of impending completion of the project. In view of the fact that the Arab States may opt for a forceful policy to prevent the Israel plan from going into operation, it is incumbent upon all of us to understand the realities of the situation and what it will mean not only to Israel but to all who are concerned with the precarious peace now existing in the Middle East.

If Israel is to be able to open up new areas within her present borders for the settlement of a growing population and for the expansion of agricultural production, she must turn to the large tracts of undeveloped arable land which lie in the northern reaches of the Negev Desert. This area is mostly flat tableland, eminently suitable for mechanized cultivation and convenient for pipelaying, roadbuilding and similar operations. However, because of the scanty and erratic rainfall in the Negev, only large-scale irrigation will permit settlement and cultivation, and Israel must transport the required amount of water from the north where it is unused and available. The diversion of a portion of the Jordan's waters to the Negev, in addition to other diversion projects, will provide enough water for large-scale reclamation and settlement in the Negev.

Israel's plan to divert a portion of the Jordan River grew out of a proposed unified plan drawn up by experts from both Israel and the Arab States who share the Jordan and its sources. After 3 years of research, planning and negotiation, the late Eric Johnston, who had been sent to the Near East by President Eisenhower to direct the search for an acceptable plan, reached an understanding on a unified water plan with the experts representing, on the one hand, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon, and on the other Israel. The plan comprised such basic factors as the equitable allocation of the waters of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers among the respective riparians and the siting of storage and diversion installations. The Johnston plan, as it was called, was rejected by the political leaders of the Arab States, and for obvious reasons. Although it would benefit the Arab States, it would also serve to strengthen the economy and growth of their mortal enemy, Israel. Support for such a plan was, and still is, an untenable position for an Arab politician, many of whom have risen to power on their demogogic opposition to Israel and its existence.

The rejection of a cooperative approach by the Arab States left the leaders of Israel with no alternative but to assume the technical soundness of the Johnston plan and to implement it on a national rather than on the proposed regional level. Under the Johnston plan 40 percent of the water of the Jordan River system was allocated to Israel, and the Jordan-Negev project will draw less than the proposed limit. It should also be noted that Israel is carrying out her own national water project in accordance with the agreed technical aspects of the Johnston plan and in a manner which would enable it to be integrated into a coordinated regional plan whenever, and if ever, that becomes possible. Moreover, the Arab States are assured of their legitimate share of the water simply because they are situated upstream from Israel.

The Jordan-Negev complex consists of a conduit 65 miles long, with intermediate reservoirs and pumping stations. The point of intake from Lake Kinneret—the Sea of Galilee—which is the main reservoir of the project, is at Eshed Kinrot, located on the northwest corner of the lake. The water will be pumped from the lake, which is 630 feet below sea level, to the level of the conduit, 120 feet above sea level. From the point of intake to the operational reservoir at Beit Natufa in lower Galilee, a distance of more than 20 miles, the water will flow in a canal. After that, it will pass through concrete-lined tunnels in the Galilee and Menashe hills for 5 miles and then for 48 miles through the central

section of the pipeline, mostly along the coast, to the headworks of the Yarkon-Negev project, east of Tel Aviv. From there the water will be carried farther south in the two existing Yarkon-Negev pipelines. In addition to the agricultural and industrial benefits anticipated as a result of this project, the pipeline will interconnect and supplement other water projects met on its way from north to south. It will become the coordinating and integrating instrument for all the endeavors which Israel has initiated in the field of water resource utilization.

At the present time, Arab spokesmen are reviving the threat to divert the two of the Jordan's three sources which rise beyond the borders of Israel. Such a costly venture, when coupled with the diversion of the Yarmuk River being undertaken by Jordan, can only be regarded by the Israelis as an unwarranted and unprovoked attack against the security and well being of their country.

King Hussein, of Jordan, recently restored to the good graces of the Arab nationalist leadership, has been in Washington all this week in an attempt to persuade President Johnson that Israel's water projects are a danger to the uneasy peace in the Middle East. We who support the eminently equitable Johnston plan remind King Hussein and all for whom he is speaking, that it is those who would thwart Israel's legitimate right to the use of the Jordanian waters and not Israel, who endanger the delicate balance of power. They would also do well to recall the failure of previous attempts to make Israel conform to their way of thinking.

Statement by Senator Moss of His Income and Financial Holdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 17, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the past few years, several Members of the Senate have voluntarily made public a statement of income and financial holdings. I now ask unanimous consent that such a statement on my part be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MOSS

Like Caesar's wife, a U.S. Senator should be above suspicion. I have, therefore, filed with the Senate a statement of my financial income and holdings and of my business connections.

I receive an annual salary of $22,500 from the U.S. Senate. I earn $788.66 annually in reserve training pay from the U.S. Air Force.

Since coming to the Senate, I have earned approximately $1,000 as honorariums for speeches.

I receive no income from the practice of law or from any business. Upon my election to the Senate, I withdrew from the law practice entirely and since then have received no income of any kind—present or future—from the law practice. My name remains on the door of my old law firm, but I have had no connection with or knowledge of the firm's business since 1958. I resigned from the boards of two corporations and sold my stock when elected to the Senate. I now have no connection with or income from any business corporation, partnership, or proprietorship.

My wife and I own an equity of about $4,000 in the home in which we live in Maryland. I also own an unimproved lot in Holladay, Utah, having a value of less than $500.

Besides our household and personal effects, we own a 1959 Rambler American and a 1960 Comet. We own U.S. savings bonds of face value of $1,250, a savings account of $3,244.53, and maintain a fluctuating checking account between $900 and $3,300.

We have two sons in college at the University of Utah; one son in junior high school in Maryland; and our daughter is married.

I think that the contents of this financial disclosure indicate why I felt no compelling reason to make it sooner. I believe, however, that all public officeholders, and those who seek public office, should make full disclosure of their income, financial assets, business relationships, and every other matter which might be a basis for conflict of interest. I know of no conflict of interest on my part.

Commemorating Pan American Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my esteemed colleague and friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], in his commemoration of Pan American Day. It is fitting, indeed, to call to mind once again our historic bonds of friendship and goodwill with the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Further, it is an appropriate occasion to reaffirm our dedication to the principles of mutual security and common action for peace and prosperity which have found expression in the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress.

The links between North America and South America are not merely geographic ones. The people of the Western Hemisphere, the New World, are linked by a common vision of a better life for our children and our children's children.

By working together, we can achieve those aims. Pan American Day reminds us of this interdependence, a dynamic force for cooperation and progress in a crisis-ridden world.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that the stirring invocation we have heard this morning was delivered by the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, a distinguished fellow son of Wisconsin. Known as the "Padre of the Americas," Father Thorning is a professor of Latin American history at Marymount College.

I am certain that his many friends and relatives in Milwaukee, particularly his two sisters, Mrs. Paul Reilly, of Shorewood, Wis., and Mrs. C. R. Reilly, of Wauwatosa, Wis., are proud of his efforts at strengthening the bonds of friendship among the sister nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Let me extend my sincerest wish and prayer that Father Thorning continues for many years in his ministry to his fellow men.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 17, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, of the 24 Members of the House and the 11 Senators who are sponsoring the quality stabilization bill, none is more sincere and hard working in his efforts to enact this vital legislation than the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senate's assistant minority leader.

In a recent article published in the trade journal, Wallpaper and Wallcoverings, my colleague analyzed the terms and scope of the quality stabilization bill and offered his reasons for supporting this legislation. This article should be read and studied by everyone who seeks a solution to the current problems facing the Nation's retailers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY STABILIZATION: NEW BILL MAY RELIEVE DECORATING PRODUCTS DEALER OF COMPETITION WOES

(By Senator THOMAS KUCHEL)

(Growing numbers of decorating products dealers across the country have expressed fear that they will be hard hit by unscrupulous merchandising tactics at the hands of discounters. Some dealers feel that their operations are relatively unaffected by discount competition, however, the appearance of many brand-name decorating products on discounter's shelves has given rise to a great deal of apprehension in many quarters of the paint and wallpaper field. Will loss-leader selling, bait advertising and the use of well-known product names by price cutters force many independent paint and wallpaper dealers out of business? The answer is an emphatic "Yes," many industrymen and retailers assert. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a California Republican, feels that the best interests of manufacturers and retailers of paint and wallpaper would best be served by the quality stabilization bill now before a subcommittee of the House Interstate Commerce Committee. Here, in an exclusive article for Wallpaper and Wallcoverings, Senator KUCHEL explains the provision of the measure and tells why he strongly supports it.)

Let me state very plainly: I am firmly committed to a vigorous, competitive free enterprise system.

Today, small business—an essential part of our American free enterprise system—is being pushed toward economic extinction. There is more than a casual relationship between this skyrocketing rate of retail business failures, and unfair, deceptive practices prevailing in the distribution of trademark, brand, and name products. If small business in America should be ploughed under, a bruising blow would be dealt our system of

free competitive enterprise. Regrettably, there is very real trend in this direction.

It will probably come as a surprise when I say that each day of the year in America some 1,200 retail establishments and other small businesses close their doors forever because of the distributional malady that has invaded our economic bloodstream. It is a sad commentary on this land of abundant opportunity when the marketplace is so disorganized that 438,000—nearly one-half million—businesses fail each year.

With these failures are the concomitant increases in unemployment, new additions to the welfare rolls, and many other human and economic disruptions.

Is it any wonder that we have 6 million unemployed in a nation that is looked upon as the most prosperous in the world? How can we as a nation hope to employ gainfully that static 6 percent of our work force which is unable to find jobs if we do not act to prevent these 1,200 daily business failures?

THREAT OF MASS MERCHANDISERS

The mass merchandisers say that by 1970 they will take over lock, stock, and barrel 80 percent of the retail business of the country.

An acknowledged expert even predicts that by 1966 about 50 giant retail organizations will control 50 percent of the Nation's total retail volume in practically all major merchandise classifications.

One of these huge discount chains lays it right on the line as to its practices. Its president has stated bluntly:

"We plan to own and operate our own traffic appliance departments. It will be simply a loss-leader operation. We are going to take a percentage of the store items that will identify value and use them as giveaways to build an image."

Thus, this gentleman confirms the use of two ingredients in the merchandising formula. The first is the low price, oftentimes, a loss-leader baiting price, used in part to give the false impression that all of the store's prices, for all of its multitude of products, are also bargains. The second ingredient is the use of a reputable brand name as the bait.

KILLING COMPETITION

The pricing policies of the discount house may present deceptive attractiveness to the public, but the long-range result is almost certain to be a reduction in competition—and greater monopolistic concentration in distribution at severely higher costs to consumers. This clearly is not in the public interest.

Nor is it in the public interest that the market place in the last few years has degenerated to that resembling an Oriental bazaar. The consumer has been the victim of comeons; he has been baited, he has been switched, he has been gouged.

Commercial predators—and those who would fully merit the phrase and admonition common in my profession of the law, "caveat emptor"—are probably ancient in origin. What should concern us today is that the breed is growing in its pestilence, and in its effect on the more responsible members of our business community.

It is time for a legislative insecticide to be applied to this parasite of the free enterprise system, if the American system is to survive over one which believes solely in the fast buck.

Independent retailing in all fields—and this includes wallpaper and wallcoverings—is being relentlessly liquidated as a result of this unscrupulous price cutting. There may be, and probably are, other reasons for the decline of independent retailing. But the inability of the small storekeeper to sell—at a fair profit—the famous brand-name products which are his bread and butter, must come at, or near, the top of these reasons.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Four centuries ago, Shakespeare asked: "What's in a name?" Two centuries later, Thomas Campbell answered that there is "magic in a name." But it was for 20th century America to prove that Campbell was right, that in the world of commerce, the good will and quality which the name on a product represents have become an essential element of our distribution and marketing system.

The manufacturer has a great stake in protecting the good will and quality which the trademark, brand or name on his product implies. To permit this good will to be undermined by offering a product below actual production cost to build traffic for a store is not only wrong from the standpoint of ethical retailing, but destroys confidence in our entire pricing system. It is wrong morally and economically.

The predator hopes that these bait prices, rigged at profitless levels on recognized items of merchandise, will create the impression that such "bargains" abound in his store on all commodities. Simple economics tells us that this cannot be so, or even the price juggler soon would be among America's one-half million annual business casualties.

Continuance of the independent retailer is essential to the American distribution system. Many small manufacturers in the wallpaper and wallcovering industry, and in other industries, as well as distributors of drugs, gasoline, groceries, sportswear, toys, automobile parts and many others who have written me have a real stake in the economic growth of their community. They—and you—provide enormous strength to America.

As one writer told me: "The predator does not go down to the store at 3 a.m. to fill the prescription, or grant credit for groceries, or gasoline, or hardware items until the man can get another job. The local small businessman, an active and highly regarded member of the community does."

NATIONAL LAW NEEDED

As a young State assemblyman in California over a quarter of a century ago, I vigorously advocated legislation to protect the legitimate retailer from the price slashers. I take the same position today on a national level. Federal law is urgently needed if we are to get at predatory pricing. I was delighted to join with my counterpart in the Senate on the other side of the aisle, Assistant Majority Leader HUBERT HUMPHREY, in leading a bipartisan coalition of Senators who are particularly interested in a solution to this growing problem by coauthoring S. 774, the quality stabilization measure. Twenty-three Representatives and 11 Senators have sponsored this much needed legislation.

They, along with other Members of Congress, have seen first hand what is happening to businesses in their own States, in their own districts, and in their own communities. They know that this blight must be halted before the malady grows beyond cure.

The quality stabilization legislation is permissive, not mandatory. It does not require the owner of a trademark, brand, or name to set a uniform retail price unless he desires to do so to protect his product and his goodwill.

Only then could he use the provisions of the bill only if his product was in free and open competition. This legislation does not require a set price on comparable articles sold by competitive manufacturers. It would not prevent the retailers from making a greater profit on volume sales because of a manufacturer's discount for quantity purchases. It would permit goods to be sold at any price after the trademark, or brand, or name is removed.

NONDISCRIMINATORY

The manufacturer, at his discretion, would be able to stop resellers from misrepresenting his product and from using it as "bait merchandise" by selling it at other than an established price or within a price range—by court action, if necessary.

The bill does not discriminate against discount houses. It says to the discount house, just as it says to the corner druggist, the small hardware store, and to all retailers, don't misuse someone else's property—and a trademark is property which the manufacturer does not relinquish even when he sells his merchandise to a reseller.

Under the quality stabilization measure, the discounter has four honorable choices:

1. He, along with all other merchants using a name brand under the proposed act, must respect pricing requirements of the manufacturer.

2. He may remove the manufacturer's trademark, brand, or name and sell a product at any price he desires.

3. He may refuse to handle the product.

4. He may stock private brands.

The giant stores opposing S. 774 obviously have the financial strength to develop their own private brands. In many cases they are already doing so. They already have. Thus, large merchandisers would be creating business on the strength of their own reputation.

NO PROTECTION FOR INEFFICIENCY

This legislation does not protect the inefficient producer or reseller from elimination if he fails to provide consumers with quality merchandise and the kind of high-type service they have come to expect. It would prevent those with large accumulations of capital, and little interest in service, from using unfair practices to increase the rate of the small retailer's demise.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recognized the long overdue need for this legislation when it reported favorably on H.R. 3669, a companion bill to S. 774. Only 1 Representative on the 33-man committee filed a minority report opposing the measure.

In this long hard fight to make for a more vibrant and stronger economy in the marketplace, the opponents of quality stabilization have not been asleep. They have raised a tremendous slush fund to bring every pressure to bear on Congress to defeat this most necessary legislation.

They are using every type of false and misleading propaganda to make consumers—the very people who have the most to gain from this measure—believe that it would increase prices to them. Nothing could be further from the truth, since it would force the mass merchandisers to use their own unbranded merchandise for loss leader selling—meaning lower prices to consumers.

YOUR DUTY TO YOURSELF

Moreover, many editors have been misled by this propaganda and, as a result, have been berating Congress in behalf of the opposition. Newspaper editors across the country would cry to high heaven if a law should be passed decreeing that news dealers must be allowed to sell newspapers at any price they desired—to use them as loss leaders, if they cared to, to sell magazines and other merchandise. But these editors forget that their one protection in maintaining the quality of their papers is the fact that they are permitted to fix their resale price.

As an elected representative of the people, I can assure you that the thoughtful letter detailing the effect of legislation on one's life and one's business is meaningful.

You, as citizens and businessmen, have a duty to perform, as does Congress and the President.

Congressmen not only welcome letters from their constituents, they read them care-

fully and are influenced by what they say. Remember, we are human. If we receive a preponderance of letters in favor or in opposition to a given measure, naturally we are going to be influenced by them.

I know that members of the wallpaper and wall covering industry believe that passage of the quality stabilization measure would go far toward remedying many of the insidious diseases which now infect the American marketplace.

So, if you want the Congress and the President to stand up and be counted on this matter, your immediate duty to yourself, to your employees, and to your customers is to write your Senators and Representatives—now—and let them know where you stand on quality stabilization.

National Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, this week, April 12–18, we salute National Library Week. Having recently enacted legislation vital to expanded library service, we are keenly aware of the major and fundamental role libraries play in a free society. To the National Library Week slogan "Reading Is the Key to New Worlds" we might add, "Libraries Are the Key To Realizing American Objectives." Functioning as storehouses of knowledge, as disseminators of information, and as educational and cultural institutions, the libraries of this country have served goals basic to the American system since the time of its founding.

Social, educational, and economic developments have daily increased the responsibilities of our libraries. Population expansion, increased leisure time, training for new skills, and a body of knowledge that both accumulates and becomes obsolete at a staggering rate demonstrate that the library must be a dynamic and growing institution able to meet diverse and changing needs. School and college libraries should be at the center of the instructional program with current materials and methods to meet the demands of a modern curriculum. All special and State libraries have a greater job in maintaining up-to-date and complete records and collections. The public library, must develop, improve, and extend the wealth of its resources so that it might truly serve all the American people.

In describing the modern public library of today, Francis St. John, former director of the Brooklyn Public Library said:

It covers all segments and ages of our society. Its resources and services reach the citizen seeking information, the student, the technologist, the scientist, the businessman, government officials, housewives, children, and you might say the total community. It is the information center for the total community and the main source of continuing education for the adult population.

In large urban areas the library has the important opportunity to serve diverse segments of our population such as businessmen, the adult learners, the potential delinquent, gifted children, and retired persons. The library can also be a significant weapon in the war against poverty in opening new worlds to culturally deprived youths and adults.

The free and ready access to knowledge is a right and privilege. Exercise of this privilege is increasingly crucial to individual well-being and the success of our system. A great lady of the world of books, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, once said:

And there is no shaping modern human personalities to the necessary minimum of intelligence and civilized standards without a continuous, widespread use of books of decent quality.

Libraries are a wellspring of opportunity serving our Nation's objectives. In saluting National Library Week it is fitting to stress the need for continued promotion, support, and use of the Nation's library resources and services this week and each week throughout the year.

Israel's 16th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take note of the anniversary which is being celebrated this week of the birthday of Israel. One of the major historical actions of our time was the United Nations resolution which established this state and took firm steps to provide for a solution in that torn area of the Middle East.

We must recognize that the resolution did not heal all wounds. The suspicions and the fears which existed, the deep concern among displaced peoples for their share of the future, have not disappeared. Hostility and a desire for reversal of these decisions have caused some moments which the world can only regret.

But through it all, the people of Israel have worked hard and independently for the growth of their state. At this, the world has cause to marvel, for the sacrifice of the comfort and convenience that has gone into the construction and strengthening of a new home on the shores of the Mediterranean has been remarkable.

It is proper that we pause to extend our congratulations on this 16th anniversary to our good friend in the Middle East and hope that in the forthcoming years we will see the disappearance of hostility in the area to let all peoples of good will work for better development of the once fruitful shores of this sea and the welfare of all.

Junior Achievement and "Operation Industry"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in recent years, it has been my privilege to call the attention of our colleagues in the Congress to the remarkable work which is being accomplished by Junior Achievement, the nonprofit organization which, through the active cooperation of leading business establishments in an area, provides invaluable opportunities to young men and women of high school age to participate in the actual ownership, management and operation of their own junior business activity.

As I have remarked before, there is no finer nor more successful Junior Achievement program that I know of than Junior Achievement of Union County, N.J., blessed as it is with excellent leadership, enthusiastic young people, and a wealth of nationally known business firms whose enlightened managements recognize the benefits of participation in Junior Achievement, benefits to youth, to the community and to business.

This year, Mr. Speaker, Junior Achievement of Union County developed another youth incentive and awards project, known as Operation Industry, which ranks high in the series of imaginative and stimulating projects Junior Achievements has sponsored. And this week, the winning Junior Achievers from Union County are visiting the Caterpillar Tractor Co. in Peoria, Ill., and Chicago, a trip they have earned by their skill, their hard work, their intense interest and the all-round high caliber they displayed in the operation of their Junior Achievement companies.

As an example of how an outstanding Junior Achievement program is organized and functions, Mr. Speaker, I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, information on this year's "Operation Industry" prepared for the JA adult advisers in Union County by the program's executive vice president, J. Kenneth Roden.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY, INC.,

Elizabeth, N.J., January 2, 1964.

To: Junior Achievement advisers.

From: J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.

Subject: Operation Industry.

There is a definite need for we who are associated with Junior Achievement to inspire our young people to rededicate themselves to the principles of free enterprise and to effectively teach and demonstrate that our American free enterprise system is not just a system for carrying on business, but much more: The best system for promoting human progress while preserving individual freedom—a system which has led the world in accomplishments and in setting high living standards.

A nationwide survey of high school students has confirmed the need for dynamic, positive programs to create better understanding of how business operates, its problems, its invaluable contributions to the American way of life.

Operation Industry will be a three-pronged youth incentive, youth educational, and public relations project. It has been planned and developed by the board of directors of Junior Achievement of Union County to meet our present-day challenge. Its objectives are as follows:

1. To provide Junior Achievers and advisers with a positive educational and incentive program designed to stimulate full understanding of the principles, benefits, and rewards of the American free enterprise system.

Operation Industry will demonstrate that every individual—whether employee, manager, or community leader—must ever be aware that the vigor of the American free enterprise system depends upon a heritage that attaches prime importance to liberty, equality of opportunity, individual rights and dignity. It will emphasize educational requirements and the responsibility of the individual to adequately prepare himself to carry his share of the load, and to discharge his responsibilities to the best of his ability.

2. To give Junior Achievers actively engaged in owning and operating their own junior companies an opportunity to feel the pulsebeat of American industry and to learn firsthand the economic facts of life in business.

Emphasis will be on the need for profits, and the effect of business profits upon the everyday lives of young people, their families, and the community.

Operation Industry will demonstrate that each individual's contribution, if properly utilized, will result in a profit to himself, to his employer, to the community, and to the Nation. I will further demonstrate that corporate profits are the lifeblood of business which assure continued growth, prosperity, and stability of the economy, all of which are more valuable and desirable than personal security through handout or a welfare State. It will show how corporate profits become job producers.

3. To have successful businessmen, experienced in the various stages of education and business advancement, convince the Junior Achievers of the dollars and cents value of a high school diploma and to demonstrate clearly the increased income and opportunities available to young people who obtain higher education or seek technical or specialized training.

The project will demonstrate how profitable and advantageous continued education can be and how short-range thinking with emphasis on short-term income opportunities and the desire for maximum job security and benefits, without personal contribution, productivity, and responsible leadership, fail to develop the full potential of the individual.

4. To maintain the high standards of performance, productivity, and prestige of the Junior Achievement program.

Special emphasis will be placed on stimulating superior performance at all levels of Junior Achievement activity, development of personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, good attendance, punctuality and accuracy. Improved production techniques to reduce operating costs will be encouraged. Aggressive, continuing safety programs will be required. Sales incentive programs will be sponsored.

5. To demonstrate to Junior Achievers, parents, educators, and the community at large the degree of interest which local businessmen have in young people.

This program will demonstrate to the community that local business and industrial organizations are good neighbors, willing to help prepare young people to accept responsibilities of business management and professional and community leadership.

6. To give recognition to business and industrial sponsors and supporters of Junior Achievement for their unselfish efforts on behalf of young people.

There will be widespread publicity about Operation Industry and opportunities for good employee and community relations will be initiated by Junior Achievement on behalf of its sponsors and other participants.

PROGRAM

It is planned to have New Jersey's Gov-Richard Hughes and mayors of local communities proclaim Thursday, April 16, 1964, as Operation Industry Day.

On Operation Industry Day members of Junior Achievement companies which have met the performance standards established by the Junior Achievement organization will be guests of top executives at the offices and plants of the sponsoring industries.

The day's program will begin with arrival of the Junior Achievers at the executive offices at regular starting time and will continue through a normal working day. Each Junior Achiever will spend the day side by side with an executive or member of the management or supervisory staff of comparable title and authority to that of the Junior Achiever. He will observe normal daily activities. The officers of the junior company will spend the day with their counterparts in the host company—president with president or chief executive officer, treasurer with treasurer, production manager with production manager, etc.

The specific program for the day's activities will be developed by the Junior Achievement advisers and executives of the host company in accordance with the outline provided by Junior Achievement. The day's activities should include verbal and visual presentations and tours of plant and offices to demonstate the following:

1. The organizational structure of the host company; how jobs are created; education and training required for various types of jobs; capital investment per employee.

2. Earnings potential in industry; the dollars and cents value of a high school diploma, higher education, technical training or specialization.

3. Modern production methods; automation; training methods and costs.

4. Marketing programs; sales activities; effect of foreign competition.

5. Importance of financial controls; data processing; legal restrictions; government controls; taxes and other influences on executive decisions and profits.

6. Executive operating responsibility, authority and accountability; the scope of decisionmaking. Attendance at a staff meeting will be scheduled if possible.

7. Importance of research and development.

8. Public relations; employee relations; other corporate activities.

The Junior Achievers should be provided with descriptive literature and possibly samples of products to assist them in making reports to high school classes, assemblies, civic organizations.

AWARD TRIP AND OPERATION INDUSTRY DAY

In early April outstanding Junior Achievers will be selected for an award trip to Caterpillar Tractor Co. in Peoria, Ill., and to Chicago, scheduled for April 15, 16, and 17.

Provided that the Junior Achievement company and its individual Junior Achiever members have met the standards set forth in the "Performance Standards for Operation Industry" memorandum, each Junior Achievement company will be represented on the 3-day trip.

At the same time the award winning Junior Achievers will be participating in Operation Industry at Caterpillar Tractor Co., other Junior Achievers in the Union County-Carteret area will be participating in a similar Operation Industry activity in sponsoring and cooperating business, industrial and financial organizations in New Jersey. Operation Industry Day in Union County and Carteret will be Thursday, April 16, 1964.

NOMINATION AND SELECTION OF ACHIEVERS FOR THE AWARD TRIP

Each Junior Achievement company which qualifies by meeting the performance standards for Operation Industry will have the privilege of nominating two members, one boy and one girl, for participation in the Operation Industry award trip. Consideration should be given only to outstanding Junior Achievers.

Consideration will be given to leadership, personal initiative, appearance and grooming, poise, ability to get along with young people and adults, originality of product, production and sales techniques and their successful application, attendance, punctuality, adherence to safety regulations, accuracy, knowledge of Junior Achievement company operations, knowledge of sponsoring company's activities, knowledge and understanding of the values, workings and benefits to the individual of the American free enterprise system, and future educational and employment plans of the Junior Achiever and degree to which these plans are being implemented.

The degree of personal participation in bringing the Junior Achievement company into full participation in Operation Industry should be an important factor in the selection. Bear in mind that the Junior Achievers who visit Caterpillar Tractor Co. will be representatives of our industrial and educational community and will be guests of important businessmen and civic leaders of Peoria.

A nomination form will be provided by Junior Achievement with instructions for completion and the due date.

All nominees will be interviewed by a panel of Junior Achievement officials and directors, members of the chamber of commerce, and other business and community leaders at a time and place to be specified by Junior Achievement.

Selections of Junior Achievers who will participate will be announced at least 10 days in advance, when instructions will be issued for obtaining written permission from parent or guardian, and other pretrip details.

NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FREE ENTERPRISE AWARD

To encourage and inspire our young people and their advisers to develop their capabilities to the highest possible degree, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce will present its Free Enterprise Award to the sponsor of the outstanding Junior Achievement company.

The winning company will be selected by the chamber of commerce awards committee. The award will be presented to the president or top officer of the sponsoring company at the annual dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The board of directors of Junior Achievement of Union County has delegated responsibility for the planning and execution of Operation Industry to Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president. He will be responsible for liaison with Junior Achievement in Peoria and other participating organizations.

The board of directors has named a committee to advise and assist Mr. Roden, who will also serve on the committee. Members of the incentive program committee are: James D. Abeles, president, Purolator Products Inc.; William M. Bristol, III, president, Bristol-Myers products division; A. C. Brown, Jr., vice president, Air Reduction Sales Co.; Edward R. N. Douglass, president, New Jersey chapter, Public Relations Society of America; Harry P. Frank, publisher, the Daily Journal; Dr. John Lawler, plant manager,

General Aniline & Film Corp.; Hon Richard R. O'Connor, O'Connor, Morss & O'Connor, general counsel for Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.; and J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.

PRIORITIES TO REALIZE FULL POTENTIAL OF OPERATION INDUSTRY

Our Junior Achievement companies are off to a very good start this year with practical, top quality products which are selling well. Attendance has continued at a very good rate. Operation Industry is designed to help you maintain this momentum of production and sales, and the enthusiastic participation of every Junior Achiever and adviser. It will help your JA company meet and maintain our performance standards.

Officials of Caterpillar Tractor Co. are enthusiastically programing Operation Industry Day at Caterpillar's headquarters plant. Mr. William Blackie, president of Caterpillar, will participate and address our Junior Achievers at a dinner to be given in their honor and attended by Caterpillar executives and advisers and achievers from the Peoria Junior Achievement organization.

Start now to prepare for your Operation Industry Day.

Review this bulletin carefully and announce Operation Industry to your JA company members.

Tell your top management executives about Operation Industry and review this bulletin with them in detail. Make sure they realize the potential for good employee and community relations through participation in this youth incentive and awards project.

Plan your Operation Industry Day activities to accomplish the objectives outlined in the program section of this bulletin.

Review your proposed program with me as soon as possible.

Remember, a successful Operation Industry program can help you earn the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce Free Enterprise award for your company.

Representative Thomas J. O'Brien, of Chicago—A Tribute on His Death in His 85th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Representative Thomas J. O'Brien, of Chicago, was typical in the very best sense of the grand politicos of the old school, and his death, although not unexpected, seems to me something very much like the passing of an era. For me Representative O'Brien, gone from us in his 85th year, embodied the finest qualities of leadership in the politics of the recent decades and the Middle West. I know it is the custom to refer to men of decision and forthrightness in politics as "bosses," once they achieve authority and great influence. But Tom O'Brien, as I observed him,, could never be called the boss in the dictatorial, the peremptory, the arbitrary, the domineering sense. Rather, he was known to most of us in this House as an extremely astute master of his profession who ruled by right of leadership and by the virtue of his service to his district, his State, and his country. Tom O'Brien was not listened to merely because of the weight of his authority and the force of his personal will, but because also of his lucid and direct and unwavering judgments. Of course, he knew how to make decisions, but he knew also how to respect the opinions and the decisions of others. As a great craftsman in the field of parliamentary maneuver he knew how wisely to accept compromise when compromise suggested the best solution for the good of the common welfare. Thus, he was the type of legislative leader who got things done and arrived at his goals with the least possible friction and without riding roughshod over those who disagreed with him. It is symptomatic of the man that when he spoke his voice was soft and persuasive and his manner gentle and cooperative. The respect he enjoyed from the Illinois congessional delegation was so great that he was its undisputed leader here in the Congress, and of course its dean, but it was a respect shared by many other Members of the House from all over the country. What has been said here since the announcement of his death Wednesday, April 14, after a long illness in the Bethesda Naval Hospital, is ample testimony of the high regard in which he was held by us all.

When I say that he was the embodiment of the most admired qualities in the makeup of the American politician, I mean that he provided the service to his constituents and the loyalty to them, to his party, to his country, that earned him undying loyalty and devotion in return. The reason that his following in Illinois never abandoned him was that he never abandoned them, and as he fought valiantly for them, so they fought valiantly for him. The best proof is, of course, that death was knocking at his door at the very moment that his dedicated political following, in the Chicago area, were casting ballots to make sure he would be a candidate and then a Member again in this House for his 15th term. It is symptomatic, too, that in this House, as our comments during these days so eloquently prove, he enjoyed a deep, an abiding, a powerful range of friendships. Only a strict personal and political integrity, and a long record of keeping one's promises and acting on principle, can bring that about.

The Illinois delegation enjoys a high quality of leadership among its members but even among them Tom O'Brien was unique. It is my most devout prayer that the current and the forthcoming generations of Americans will send to this Chamber to represent them, men as dedicated and as competent in the handling of the affairs of their time, as Tom O'Brien was in the handling of the affairs of his. Politics in our country will never know a higher level of character than that provided by Tom O'Brien.

The 16th Birthday of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my colleague from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] has taken time to extend birthday greetings to Israel. In 16 short years this small but dynamic nation has made a lasting impact upon the events of this generation. I have had the honor to visit this country. I was inspired by what I saw in the way of determination, achievement and moral courage. The great talent and skill of the Israel people will furnish leadership oriented to Western ideals for generations to come in a most important area of the world.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Out of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 18, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Lexington Gazette, recently consolidated with the Rockbridge County News under the name of the News-Gazette, is one of the oldest newspapers of continuous circulation in Virginia and indeed in the South. Each week it publishes interesting items in its columns from the files of previous years. In its issue of April 15, the News-Gazette published from the columns of the Lexington Gazette, of April 18, 1889, an account of how a Republican President from Ohio named Benjamin Harrison offered an appointment as Postmaster at Lexington, Va., to the widow of the immortal Confederate leader, "Stonewall" Jackson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three brief news items from the Lexington Gazette of April 18, 1889, which were printed in the News-Gazette of April 15, 1964, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF THE PAST: 75 YEARS AGO, APRIL 18, 1889

Our postmaster, Mr. John A. R. Varner, has had a mailbox placed on the lamp post at the Effinger Corner, where parties can drop their mail, and it will be taken to the office in time for the next mail departure.

A Confederate veteran says he has seen 10,000 snowballs in the air at once. It was at Guinea's Station near Fredericksburg, in the winter of 1863. The snow was a foot deep, and the snow-balling commenced between Company A, 2d Georgia, who opened on the Cherokee Brown Rifles, and it did not end until the whole of Lee's army had taken a hand at it.

It is understood that in response to the letter of Mrs. T. J. Jackson, declining the Lexington (Va.) postmastership, President Harrison has written the great "Stonewall's" widow a very pleasant letter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Quality Stabilization Vitally Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, despite special interest attacks on the quality stabilization bill, the fact remains that those who know the American independent retail economy best—our Nation's independent retailers themselves—are strongly supporting this legislation.

Recently Mr. J. H. Fultz, of Moses Lake, Wash., whose knowledge of conditions in the retail market comes from a lifetime of firsthand experience, made a comprehensive analysis of current trends in our retail economy. His conclusion that quality stabilization is vitally needed to stem the tide of retail monopoly and to save the small retailer deserves the serious consideration of every Member of Congress.

I ask, under unanimous consent, that this excellent argument on behalf of our free enterprise retail system be included at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MOSES LAKE, WASH.,
February 25, 1964.

GENTLEMEN: I have been in the retail business all my life—for over 40 years. I trust that you will agree that after this long on the frontline I must have learned something; perhaps, something that the policymakers of our country profit from listening to.

Although I have a bachelor of science degree, much of what I have come to know has been the hard way. I have learned through facing the everyday problems that have confronted the businessman during these changing 40 years; during, before, and after the depression of 1929; during, before, and after the fair-trade laws.

For some reason, beyond my understanding, many of the established traditions in business since Lincoln's and Washington's times, long before any of the present policy makers were born, have come under attack. These established practices have served well and usefully over the years; and, suddenly, we find them condemned. Condemned, not by the businessmen, but by "economic theorists" who are creating havoc.

The custom of printing the selling price on many patented items and of listing this suggested price along with the cost price in price sheets and catalogs has been done since long before you and I were born. It builds confidence in the customers' minds that the local merchant is not overcharging; in fact, it prevents overcharging as the correct price is clearly printed on the article. It also facilitates the handling of the item in stock as it can be checked in by the "greenest" clerk with assurance that it is price correctly when it reaches the shelf. Thus, this procedure lowers the cost of doing business. It stops confusion and puts order into selling.

The basic price, at retail, to the consumer is established on every article in commerce at the time of its manufacture. The first thing a manufacturer must figure when launching a competitive article on the market is the price at which it will have to sell to the consumer, at retail, in view of similar items, for similar items for similar use already on the market. Then, he hopes he can manufacture and promote it and still offer it to the wholesaler and retailer at a price margin that will interest them in handling the item. Obviously, every effort is made to be competitively priced.

Why, then, do we kid ourselves that the retailer—or anybody, except the manufacturer—sets the price to the consumer? Why not legalize this fact by passage of the quality stabilization law?

The retailers and wholesalers of this country are averaging less than 5 percent profit. So, obviously, they could not change that basic price—much.

Franchise distribution is about the only thing that is keeping half the small businesses in business today. Now, apparently, franchise distribution has become a sin. I trust you will pardon me if I state that I am of the opinion that there are a lot of men messing around with this problem that haven't the slightest idea of the magnitude or effects on this country that their misdirected activities will bring.

Over one-half of all retail and service institutions in this country are small businesses that are hard pressed to make a profit. It won't take much messing around with this to put them out of business. How do you expect a man to operate without retail price lists? Does it make sense to first obliterate all guides and then see how long it will take him—and how much expense it will take him—to reestablish them? Or, do you expect him just to guess? I cannot think of a business that operates without price lists.

I am afraid there is far too much tendency to appraise the business profit picture by taking the activities of a few dozen publicly financed giant corporations, forgetting that half the business of this country is done by the small business operator. The combined effects of this on the economy is very great and is often overlooked. It is here that you will find the reason why all measures so far attempted to cure the unemployment of the country have failed.

Lack of sufficient profit percentage by the majority of small business operators in this country is producing the unemployment and is preventing expansion of small business in job-producing ventures.

I cannot say too strongly how much I am alarmed at some of this opposition to what is needed in the business world to bring about job producing investments and to produce a healthy business community so absolutely necessary to a healthy America and full employment and prosperity. I am appalled at the destruction of fair-trade laws with the blessings of many in this administration and the opposition of many to the proposed quality stabilization bill, now in Congress awaiting passage. This opposition, to me, seems to indicate that many men in high places and in a position to form our legislation are dangerously unaware of the needs of the small businessman and the consequent effects that this undermining of business will have upon the welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country.

If this country is to remain the America as we have always known it, where any man no matter how humble his beginning, can have a reasonable chance through intelligence and hard work to become successful through operation of his own small business; if our future generations are to have any choice except to work for a giant corporation, controlled by giant labor unions, then we must take steps now to preserve the small business operators' chances to survive, to make a legitimate profit and to expand into job producing ventures. We must quit throwing obtacles in his path to make a profit. We offer some reasonable Queensbury rules to protect him from ruthless, predatory, unscrupulous, destructive, under-the-counter, and underhanded practices. We need the quality stabilization law, now proposed.

Legitimate profit is the foundation stone of our economy. It is the lubricant our economy runs on. Let us not pull out the foundation stone or see the lubricant so thinned down that it can no longer perform its function.

Somewhere in this country during the last few years, there has emerged the unfortunate view that "profit" is a nasty word. This viewpoint can and will paralyze our economy in this country if not corrected; if not washed from the minds of our Congressmen and economic advisers who shape our national policies.

The viewpoint that profit is a nasty word is made to order to destroy the Western capitalistic system of economy. Once this system is discredited, what other system is there to look to? If the Communists have not been behind this selling job that "profit is a nasty word," if they have not created this idea in the minds of many of our people, then someone else has surely done their job for them. Nothing could destroy our capitalistic form of economy more quickly.

I feel that we have lost sight of a basic fact that jobs are created from profit; 900 out of every 1,000 jobs in this country.

A few Queensbury rules will no more destroy competition in business than those rules destroyed competition in boxing. It will force efficiency by eliminating unfair, destructive, parasitic practices. We need a few "house rules" and "stake limits" in this no-limit poker game we call business before the biggest pocketbooks pick up all the chips. The biggest pocketbook will always win in a "no-limit" poker game and efficiency at the game won't necessarily have anything to do with it.

Why legislate that I cannot burn out my competitor or murder him, but withhold restrictions on my removing him by another means I can devise by opposing all attempts to regulate destructive practices in business? There are numerous other unjust and unfair methods to destroy him besides murder and arson, a multitude of unfair practices unregulated today.

Is there anything basically wrong with a few rules of fair play in business? Are unrestricted, destructive, parasitic price wars beneficial to our economy?

For evil to win—it is only necessary that good men remain silent.

The quality stabilization law is not a price gouging law; but, rather it is a stop-loss law, designed to make businesses win or lose through efficiency, fairplay, honesty, and sound policies. It is needed badly in safeguarding the economy of this country.

Over the last 10 years average percentage net profits in business in this country have declined from just over 7 percent to just over 3 percent. (Dun & Bradstreet figures.)

It is significant that unemployment has risen by almost the reverse percentage—from 3 to 7 percent in that same 10 years.

Since jobs are made from profit, is this too surprising? Isn't the solution to unemployment obvious?

All attempts to cure the unemployment problem will fail until profits are high enough to warrant investment of private risk capital in job producing business ventures by the small businessman, who produces perhaps 50 percent of all the jobs in America.

I refer to profit—not extortion. Business competition will take care of extortion so long as there isn't monopoly.

Monopoly is created when business is allowed to destroy its competition because of lack of "Queensbury rules" to prevent it; such as, the quality stabilization law now proposed.

Twenty years ago 400 large corporations produced 50 percent of the retail sales in America. Today, 200 large corporations produce 50 percent of the retail sales in America. And tomorrow? It has been estimated that within 10 years 100 large corporations will produce 50 percent of the retail sales in America.

Did I hear anyone say that a monopoly is not developing in America?

There is certainly nothing wrong with any merchant selling any item formerly foreign to his type of operation. There is nothing wrong with the one-stop concept of retailing; but, when the other guy's line is put in, to deliberately sell it at a loss, as a traffic builder, then this is another thing.

How many other guys can be hurt before bankruptcy and lost jobs occur? How long before the economy of the whole community is effected adversely as these lowering profits soon mushroom throughout the whole community and result in a sick economy where more jobs are lost and business confidence wanes and investment in job producing ventures ceases.

The quality stabilization law is bady needed to clean up this mess. Can such tactics be anything but destructive? Do you think they should have the blessing of our Government?

The public loves price wars. They love the bankruptcy bargains these price wars bring on. They shed narry a tear for the businessman who has lost his shirt nor for his employees who have lost their jobs.

But, this jubilation is the offspring of ignorance. Ignorance of the fact that with every bankruptcy their own job security is lessened just that much. Ignorance of the fact that with every decline in business prosperity in their community their own chance of a wage increase is lessened just that much and their chance of even having a job is lessened. Ignorance of the fact that their property values have also dropped in a "sick" community. Ignorance of the fact that the chances of their children getting jobs when they enter the labor market is also lessened.

This is the kind of prosperity that unrestricted price wars bring. What is efficient about selling a large percentage of your stock below your cost of doing it? Why should it be allowed—unless one is definitely discontinuing it?

Any purchase made by a consumer which results in a loss to the seller is only undermining that purchaser's welfare in the long run by jeopardizing profits. It is jeopardizing jobs—his job. He is, in effect, "digging his own economic grave" with every such bargain purchase.

Jobs are made from profits—your job and mine; we must not forget it.

There is plenty of precedent for protection of profits. The producers have their tariffs. The farmers have their parity prices. Labor has its collective bargaining and minimum wage laws are labor's fair trade laws on labor's selling price. All are necessary to a degree, at least, and I am not criticizing them.

What I do protest is the consistent refusal to offer any protection to the retailers, one of the largest economic divisions of our economy.

Dogs fighting in the street are offered more protection than our businessmen on that same street. Common decent people will protest at a vicious dogfight and stop it; but will the same people stop a destructive fight between two local merchants? They will not, because they do not understand or even see much of what is going on. They do not realize such tactics undermine their own welfare.

It is up to our Congressmen, who should be able to see the significance of it, to step in and offer some reasonable protection to break up these destructive practices in business that are undermining a large segment of our national economy, destroying profits and jobs.

It is up to good men of intelligence to get behind the quality stabilization law, so well designed to do the job. It would be a tragedy if this opportunity is lost because good men remained silent or did not understand the issues.

Any sale by the retailer to the consumer at a loss is self-defeating, and will ultimately do the consumer more harm than good, by undermining his job and economic welfare of the community. Loss leader selling is destructive and has no sound place in our economy and should be regulated by law because it undermines the economy.

Profit is the lubricant that keeps our economic machine running. We need the quality stabilization law to keep the selfish and ignorant from wrecking the machine to gain a temporary advantage at the expense of the economy.

Respectfully,

J. H. FULTZ.

"Foreign Aid and the American Image"—Address by Dr. B. H. Jarman, President, Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech entitled "Foreign Aid and the American Image," delivered by Dr. B. H. Jarman, president of Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky., before Kentucky representatives of the Circle K—Kiwanis—Club at the Jenny Wiley State Park. The speech received an enthusiastic response from the audience and throughout Kentucky.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following Dr. Jarman's speech, an article entitled "President at College Is Named," written by Gerald Griffin, and published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 30, 1964. The article relates to the appointment of Burnice H. Jarman as president of Pikeville College, one of the outstanding educational institutions of the State of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID AND THE AMERICAN IMAGE

(By B. H. Jarman, A.M., Ed. D., Litt. D., President, Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky.)

Mass media, coupled with a growing interest in psychological knowledge, have made us Americans very conscious of our image both at home and abroad. Each organized group, business, and manufactured product makes every effort to create a favorable image to the public, the electorate, the consumer, and the man in the street. Vested interests spend more money on mass media to create a favorable image than on lobbying to secure favored legislation.

In the current cold war waged to win men's minds and loyalties for the free world, the concept of image is as potent a weapon as ideology, guns, and bread. What is the image abroad of the American and the United States? Can our image be improved? If so, how?

My 2 years with the Agency for International Development of the U.S. Department of State took me into 16 countries and covered some 30,000 miles while circumnavigating the globe. I reached five conclusions concerning our foreign relations and aid:

1. Dollar diplomacy has failed. Friends, either individuals or countries, cannot be bought. Santa Claus (Uncle Sam) is regarded as a mean old man of wealth, who can and should give more. Instead of gratitude for our economic and technical aid there is found more often dislike and even contempt for the United States.

2. You cannot help people who do not wish to be helped or who are unwilling to help themselves. Why waste American personnel and materiel on foreign peoples who are both unwilling to work or to fight for survival?

3. Regardless of the source, private or public, it takes risk capital to produce new wealth. We, too often, have supplied both the dollars and taken the risks that have gone into new factories and industries. While professing to teach emerging peoples American competition and free enterprise, we have in practice taught them socialism. In Korea, alone, the landscape is dotted by abandoned factories built with American capital. These visible failures are eternal monuments to American stupidity and lack of business acumen.

4. The Communists can build roads, schools, factories, and dams cheaper than we can because they use slave labor. Americans have only one unique commodity to sell the world—freedom and human dignity. These concepts, however, must be earned and learned. Freedom is never a gift, but is a conquest.

5. Americans must differentiate clearly between foreign aid designed to help foreign countries and the aid given to foreign countries in order to keep our domestic economy from slumping. Much of the ingratitude of peoples receiving foreign aid is owing to their belief that the aid given helps the Americans more than it does them.

There is now, in my opinion, no single American image abroad. There is rather a blurred image of three pictures. Sooner or later, however, one of these images will emerge clearly as the American image.

One blurred image depicts us Americans as being timid, confused, and just plain stupid. We have no consistent policy, we throw our dollars away with reckless abandon, and we do not know what is happening. In Korea, for example, where we have invested some $6 billion and 30,000 American lives, there is little to show for the investment. In spite of the presence of the Eighth Army, the American Embassy, the Agency for International Development (USOM), the U.S.

Information Service, and our private business people and missionaries, both the student revolution that overthrew the Rhee government in 1960 and the military coup d'etat that overthrew the second republic found us Americans completely surprised. From Panama to Tokyo we do not know what is going on.

Although World War II ended in 1945, many nations have yet to choose between the free world and Iron Curtain nations. How long do we give them to make up their minds? Their indecision pays off handsomely. By working both sides of the street they receive both Soviet and American aid. Between two-thirds and three-fourths of our aid dollars have gone to the so-called neutral countries.

The American image of free elections, representative government, and human dignity is blurred by our relations with the world's most notorious dictators—Chiang, Tito, and Franco.

The American image of integrity, courage, and will to fight for the things we believe in is blurred by our being blackmailed by the Pakistani and Indians, and the Spaniards and Yugoslavians. Who remembers the words of Pinckney raised against the Barbary Pirates, "We have millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute"?

The second American image abroad is created by our mass communications—press, radio, and motion pictures. Hollywood productions picture us Americans as hoods, sadists, gangsters, criminals, and sex perverts. The printed word and radio dwell on our failures in human relations, particularly those with minority groups. The press has just about convinced us at home that as a people we are no good and that as a nation we have had our day. How tragic that in our time of crises our press cannot remain both free and responsible.

The third American image is created by the many fine Americans who represent us abroad—personnel in our diplomatic and Armed Forces, and our nongovernmental citizens who may be tourists, missionaries, or business people. For the most part they represent us for what we primarily are—God fearing, law abiding, hard working, and peace loving.

American leadership, if not American survival, is at stake. Let us create an American image based on fundamental principles. I suggest the following principles be considered:

1. Let us be more concerned with gaining the world's respect than in expecting others to love us. No great nation has ever been, or will ever be, loved. Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain, Germany, Japan, and England were never loved. Respect must be earned through policies and programs that are equitably and efficiently administered. Respect comes through good communications, refusal to compromise our principles, and courage to act.

2. Let us cease our wishful thinking that a counterrevolution will destroy the U.S.S.R. or that China and Russia will demolish one another, or that the puppet states will revolt successfully against the Kremlin. The cold war will be with us a long time, perhaps for generations.

3. Let us cease trying to remake the world into replicas of the United States. In spite of Magna Carta in 1215 and Jamestown in 1607, we Americans still have grave differences as to what democracy is and how it should be expressed. It takes time for a people newly emerged to learn new concepts, develop leaders, and to establish sound governments. What is good for the United States is not necessarily good for the Congo, Venezuela, or Korea. Are we going to destroy any nation that disagrees with us politically and economically? American arrogance must be replaced with realism.

4. Let us set up a list of priorities that the United States can accomplish, done in terms of our physical and human resources and insist that the United Nations do the rest. A suggested list of priorities might begin with the United States and possessions, followed by the Western Hemisphere, and the NATO nations. Although we would not like to pull out of Asia and Africa, we cannot hope to do the entire job alone. The U.N. must take up the slack.

5. Let us not economically "kill the goose that laid the golden egg" as was done in the ancient fairy tale. Our dwindling gold reserves, the mounting national debt, rising inflation, increased military costs, and orgies of spending for space can destroy us as effectively as triumphant invading enemy troops.

6. Let us insist on a free, but responsible, press. We need to put our best foot forward. We do not need to launder our soiled linen abroad. In spite of our failures in human relations, minority peoples living in the United States are infinitely better treated politically, economically, and socially than in any other country. Why not stress the positive? Why not stress our victories over ignorance, poverty, and intolerance?

7. Let us exchange diplomatic expediency for respected diplomatic principles. Expediency lost Cuba to the free world. Does the Monroe Doctrine still exist?

8. Let us stop being blackmailed by the "neutral" nations. Pakistan and India must decide which side they are on. No one can justify aid to such Iron Curtain nations as Poland and Yugoslavia. No one can justify continuing aid to economically sound countries such as France, West Germany, and England.

9. Let us frankly recognize the need for enlightened self-interest in giving foreign aid. Any good business venture should benefit all parties. Hard-nosed diplomacy, as with hard-nosed football, wins victories.

10. Let us insist that only those Americans, governmental and nongovernmental, represent us abroad who can create the kind of American image we want pictured to the rest of the world. Democracy cannot be sold by salesmen who do not understand it, love it, and live it.

Finally, my tour with AID taught me three important things about our divided world today. First, the differences between peoples are much less than their likenesses. Asians and Africans want the same things that we westerners want—hope for a better tomorrow for our children; a world characterized by law and justice; a world without the threat of war; a world devoid of hunger and unemployment; and a world where all men enjoy human dignity.

Second, of the three greatest causes of war—communism, overpopulation, and the impatience of people living in the newly emerging countries to get both freedom and material goods—communism places a poor third. One human being in every two lives in China, India, and Burma. Nuclear war is a lesser fear to them than hunger. New emerged people do not wish to wait, work, or earn what it took westerners centuries to achieve.

Third, the altruism of youth may upset the time schedules of both East and West. I saw with my own eyes the brave college youth of Korea face with bare hands the armed police. Many of them died, but they caused the downfall of an inept and corrupt government.

Youth everywhere are restless. They seek a life that matters. They are not bound to past traditions. The country's image, East or West, that succeeds in capturing youth's imagination and loyalty is the nation that will control the world of tomorrow.

A genuine and lasting American image must be based on fact and not fancy. Let us exchange our vices for our virtues—play for work, expediency for principles, cynicism for idealism, and personal greed for brotherhood. Such an exchange adds up to a smart bargain. The American image can and must be changed.

PRESIDENT AT COLLEGE IS NAMED: PIKEVILLE GETS PROFESSOR IN WASHINGTON

(By Gerald Griffin)

LEXINGTON, KY., January 30.—Dr. Burnice H. Jarman, professor of education at George Washington University, Washington, has been named president of Pikeville College.

The announcement was made Wednesday by the Reverend James W. Angell, chairman of the college's board of trustees and pastor of Second Presbyterian Church here.

The college at Pikeville is a Presbyterian-related institution.

Dr. Jarman has been on the George Washington faculty since 1939. He succeeds Dr. A. A. Page, now of Mount Sterling, who resigned effective December 31 after more than 21 years as president.

IN ADMINISTRATION POSTS

Besides teaching courses in the history and philosophy of education, Dr. Jarman has held several administrative posts at the university. He served as registrar, secretary of the faculties, assistant to the president, and dean of the summer sessions.

From February 1960, until February 1962, he served as chief adviser on higher education to the Ministry of Education, Government of Korea, under sponsorship of the U.S. Department of State and Seoul National University.

Ewha University, world's largest women's university, conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of letters.

Before going to George Washington, Dr. Jarman was on the faculty of St. Alban's School in Washington. From 1941 until 1945 he was director of instruction for the Arlington County, Va. schools.

SERVED AS CONSULTANT

Dr. Jarman has served with the U.S. Office of Education and has been a consultant to many Federal agencies, including the National Security Agency, the Air Force, and the Naval and Army Dental Schools. He is an honorary member of the faculty of the Command Management School, Fort Belvoir, Va.

He received a bachelor of science degree from Westchester, Pa. State College, and holds master of arts and doctor of education degrees from George Washington. He is a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, National leadership fraternity; Phi Delta Kappa, education professional organization, and Pi Gamma Mu, national social-science society.

Dr. Jarman is married and the father of two children.

Panama Flag in Canal Zone: Violation of International Usage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the recent discourteous raising in the Canal Zone of the Panama flag at full mast on request of President Chiari of Panama at the time the U.S. flag was at half mast in respect to the late General MacArthur, was shocking even to residents of the Canal Zone.

In view of the specific provisions of the flag code governing display of the flag, which all high school students and

patriots understand, many wish to know the identity of the person or persons responsible for permitting this insult to the U.S. flag.

A letter from a Canal Zone resident follows:

BALBOA, CANAL ZONE,
April 7, 1964.

Representative FLOOD: The U.S. flag flew at half staff today in reverent and solemn tribute to the memory of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. Beside the flag of the United States at full staff flew the flag of the Republic of Panama. Both banners were flown from dual flagstaffs at Shaler Triangel in the Canal Zone.

According to the 9 p.m. newscast from SCN, the Panamanian flag will again tomorrow continue to fly at full staff above our "Stars and Stripes" in direct violation of the Flag Code, title 36, section 175–G, which clearly states: "International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace."

This unpalatable fact should come as no great surprise, though possibly with some slight measure of shock, to complacent Americans who have permitted the erosion of American rights and freedoms here in the Canal Zone without lifting a pen to demand their immediate and uncompromised return. Will these same Americans awaken to what is taking place about them only when they are staring into the loaded rifles of an alien Red firing squad?

It is a travesty of justice that a country as small as Panama can be permitted to insult, in the eyes of the world, not only the flag of our Nation, but also the sacred memory of one of its greatest and most beloved patriots, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a man whose entire life was dedicated to defending his country's flag and the priceless principles of dignity, freedom, and justice which it represented.

Will this sleeping giant that is the American press continue to slumber while the person or persons responsible for this act of infamy remain unnamed and unchallenged in their relentless destruction of our basic American freedoms?

Think for a moment while there is still time. What heritage will you leave your children?

NANCY ZERR.

Israel's Heritage

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel are celebrating the 16th anniversary of the establishment of their country as a sovereign state. In reality, though, Israel is not a new country; the modern nation has been built on the old, on the kingdom of David and Solomon and the other Jewish leaders, who made the land of Israel a name to respect. There has elapsed two millenniums between the two nations of Israel, yet the similarities which exist between them are indeed numerous.

The main reason why so much of the old kingdom has emerged as a part of the new state is because of the religious fervor of the Jewish people. Through centuries of persecution, of enforced exile, of mass deportations and genocide, the Jews have banded together to preserve their ancient customs, laws, rites, and beliefs. Clinging tenaciously to their culture, they survived to the 20th century to plant their mores and government in the homeland of their ancestors.

Israel's flag, which flies proudly from merchant ships sailing to all parts of the globe, has embossed in its center the star of David, the six-pointed star, symbolically linked with David and Solomon, a good example of Israel's past in its present. There is the Menorah, the candelabrum, used for centuries by the Jewish race. It is symbolically displayed on Jewish publications and public buildings, denoting the religious background of Israel.

One finds, too, in Israel, the Hebrew language being spoken. Preserved mainly by religious scholars and for religious rites, Hebrew, once considered a dead language, has been revived as the official language of the country. With the 80-some nationalities which comprise the population of Israel, it was necessary to find a common tongue, one which everyone could understand. Although thousands of immigrants come to Israel each year, bringing with them their own language, the Government has established special schools to teach these new settlers their mother tongue, Hebrew.

Throughout the present-day Israel are the place names with which a Bible reader is familiar. Sodom, once remembered for its notoriety, is now famous as an industrial center for potash and phosphates. Beersheba, a place remembered for the seven wells dug by Abraham, is now a modern city of 44,000. It is the gateway to the south, and as such, will spur the development of the Negev, Israel's desert tract.

There is, of course, Jerusalem, the capital of modern Israel as it was the seat of the former kings. Although divided as a result of the Israel-Arab conflict, some of the old has been incorporated into the new. David's Tomb on Mount Zion overlooks the modern sprawling city, with its hospitals, government buildings, and well-planned thoroughfares.

It is the heritage then of the Jewish people to which we pay tribute today. Its impact has enabled the modern Israel to become the progressive nation that it is. This splendid heritage will continue to influence the Israeli people as they attain even greater recognition and prominence in the world community.

Great Qualities of F.D.R. Reflected by President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, our memories of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt have been made more vivid this year by the words and deeds of one of the greatest of his faithful followers, President Lyndon B. Johnson. Many Members of Congress have long been impressed by the strong ties between F.D.R. and L.B.J., and by their likeness in certain notable respects—particularly in their common human quality and their remarkable political talent.

The distinguished Washington political writer, William S. White, comments perceptively on this significant resemblance between these two great Democratic Presidents, in a column that appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on the 19th anniversary of Mr. Roosevelt's death. His article is of particular interest to Members of this body, and under unanimous consent I reprint it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 12, 1964]

THE TRAITS OF F.D.R. COME TO LIFE AGAIN

(By William S. White)

It was 19 years ago, on April 12, 1945, that Franklin D. Roosevelt died on the eve of a great Allied victory in World War II and just at the dawn of the atomic age.

The anniversary has, this year, a special significance, a strange effect of merging the present with the past. For the feet of the present President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, were first put on the high, swaying ladder to national power by Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was he who got Johnson to run, in 1938, for his first elective office—a seat in the House of Representatives from Texas.

And no occupant of the White House in these last two decades has been more basically like Franklin Roosevelt of Groton School, Harvard College and Hyde Park, N.Y., than Lyndon Johnson of the public schools of San Marcos (Tex.) State Teachers College and Johnson City, Tex.

STARTLED RECOGNITION

History, fate, and circumstances have now put the pupil and protege where the master sat so long. And those whose memories go back far are sometimes caught up in startled recognition that some action, some gesture now seen in the White House is a curiously faithful echo on some action, some gesture seen there half a generation ago.

There are even marked physical and personality resemblances—the broad, heavy shoulders characteristic of both men; the gusty humor and, occasionally, the powerful anger, the intuitive, highly personal approach to the art of politics with little recourse to the advisers, the charts and all the other aids of the more mechanical politics practiced by others in the White House.

There are differences, of course, but these are mostly superficial. Johnson's modified Texas drawl is a far tone away from Roosevelt's modified broad "a"—about as far as it is from Hyde Park to Johnson City. Johnson's political techniques in dealing with Congress are usually conciliatory, whereas Roosevelt's were urgently demanding. But even so and even here, Johnson himself can be most demanding at times, as he has just shown Congress in his farm and antipoverty legislation.

PRINCIPAL DIFFERENCES

But the principal differences between Roosevelt and Johnson as men are more of shadow than of substance. And such differences as do appear spring largely only from differing circumstances; the 1960's are not the 1930's or 1940's.

For what truly identifies Roosevelt and Johnson is a common human quality wholly surmounting the fact that they never looked at every issue in the same way or with the

same eyes. This is a shared quality of high and natural political savvy, a thing that can never be made but can only be inborn.

Agree or totally disagree with Roosevelt, he had all the same a gift, a talent, for politics, for an indescribably acute blend of presidential power with presidential persuasion, that is rarely seen in public life.

THE SAME TALENT

Agree or totally disagree with Johnson, he has that same gift or talent. This does not mean he is always "right"; it only means that, right or wrong, he has a superlative instinct for his profession. Nothing in the world could have prevented him from becoming a performing politician, just as nothing in the world, not even crippling polio, could keep Roosevelt from becoming a performing politician.

Mr. Johnson's predecessor, the late President Kennedy, was never in the Roosevelt mold—and never for a moment wanted to be. Indeed, he was both amused and annoyed at followers who tried to make comparisons that did not, in fact, exist. Kennedy was simply not Roosevelt's kind of politician.

The old New Dealers know this, and this is why one sees them gathering around Johnson. They may think him sometimes wrong in his policies, and in individual cases they may even think Kennedy more nearly spoke their language in terms of issues and all that. They gather around Johnson not in the conviction that he is necessarily "right," but because in him they see the old master painter of politics revisiting the White House.

How Handicapped Workers in My Community Are Proving That Ability Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD a paper by Mr. Donald J. La Voy, of Reno, Nev., which won first place in the nationwide 1964 ability counts contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. The competition was between juniors and seniors from public, parochial, and private schools in 49 States and territories.

The paper follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Donald Joseph La Voy, Reno High School, Reno, Nev.)

The sovereign seal of the State of Nevada is designed to represent the outstanding industries of the State. The plow, the sheaf of wheat, and the sickle are symbols of the agricultural resources of Nevada. Because Nevada's mineral wealth is among the most extensive in the Nation, the quartz mill, the mine tunnel, the miner, the carload of ore, and the team-drawn ore cars are appropriate symbols of the State's mining industry. In 1964, as Nevadans celebrate their State's centennial year, they may well pause to contemplate the golden fruit of the wealth of Nevada.

The utilization of great resources has required a distinguished labor force. In demanding times, the labor force of the State has proved her most precious asset. Working shoulder to shoulder, the handicapped have added both strength and dignity to that force; they have proved that ability counts. A spirit of good will and cooperation presently characterizes the relationship between employers and the agencies aiding handicapped citizens. Gov. Grant Sawyer, Nevada's progressive young leader, has said, "This cooperative effort has up to now enabled Nevada to do an adequate job in meeting its responsibilities in this challenging field. Nine hundred and ninety-six handicapped persons were accepted by Nevada employers in 1962. An increase of 62 percent over 1961. This was the largest number of partially disabled workers ever placed in a single year. In 1963 more than 750 placements had been effected by August 31. Statistically speaking Nevada has for several years placed a higher percentage of handicapped workers than most other States and for several months during 1962, we led all other States in providing jobs for handicapped veterans."

The statistics cited by Governor Sawyer demonstrate the impressive results of rehabilitation that can be measured in dollars and in the added strength the handicapped give to the labor force. Handicapped workers are productive: they often surpass the production records of other employees. They are careful: the safety records of the handicapped are as good as those of other employees. They are regular and reliable workers: their job attendance records equal those of other workers doing the same type of work. Most important, they are capable: many handicaps, physical or mental, do not interfere with the work in which the disabled person uses his best abilities. The records of thousands of physically and mentally handicapped persons in wartime and peacetime have proved that "It is not what a man has lost, but what he has left that is important."

In my community admirable, useful, and productive citizens who were once handicapped are proving that ability counts. Among the most distinguished employees of the State are several physically handicapped individuals. The administration of State business requires that an employee be mentally capable, but very few of these jobs require that an individual possess physical perfection. Mr. Donal O'Callaghan, director of the State of Nevada Department of Health and Welfare, devotes mind and energy to myriad problems. Much interested in the problems of youth, he at one time served as Clark County's juvenile probation officer. He is not in any way hampered in the pursuit of his duties by the loss of a leg. Mrs. Bruce Barnum, a double amputee, is chairman of the Capitol Area Committee of the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. A full-time public school teacher, Mrs. Barnum works closely with the Nevada Division of Rehabilitation in directing handicapped young people to the proper agency through which they may receive aid. She devotes her spare time to securing additional rehabilitation services for the young.

Blind since birth, Mr. John Ruiz, an excellent administrator and an acknowledged scholar, heads the Bureau of Services to the Blind. Mr. Ruiz participates in panel discussions designed to inform the public of the needs of the handicapped individual. He frequently cites the data incorporated in a comprehensive study made in 1956 proving that the efficiency of blind workers is at least as good as that of their sighted competitors. According to the study, absence, safety, and tardiness records favored the blind.

A victim of severe, crippling polio, Mr. Maynard Yasmer completed high school and college in a wheelchair. As a counselor for the State of Nevada Division of Rehabilitation, he has rendered distinguished service to his community. For his remarkable contribution to the work of rehabilitation, he was recently awarded a trip to Denmark, where he will study the rehabilitation programs of the country.

Mr. Pat Peeples must be counted as one of the State's outstanding ranchers. Although he lost one foot in an accident with his hay baler, he has not curtailed even his physical activity. He loves to play baseball, and he is the pitcher on the local team. It is said that only a mighty fast man can equal his performance in running the bases.

During the year just ended 119 disabled Americans were restored to activity, employment, dignity. Their contribution to the labor force of the community is indisputably great. For the handicapped individual, aside from the opportunity of increased income, the satisfactions inherent in productivity are also great. In utilizing the potential of all individuals, the community extends to them the equality of opportunity so basic to our American democracy and so esteemed by American citizens. Given the opportunity to prove their worth, the handicapped acquire their rightful status in our society. The community thus furthers and secures our democracy by demonstrating the inherent dignity of the individual as a basic tenet of that democracy. Our late beloved President Kennedy eloquently asserted this fact when he said, "Utilization of physically handicapped persons in productive employment is sound and necessary, both for the contribution handicapped citizens can make to our national productivity and for the sense of independence and well-being which they can derive from doing a job."

District of Columbia Uses Blackmail To Encourage Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a shoddy episode in the race-mixing drive came to light last week when Supt. Carl F. Hansen of the District of Columbia school system, let it be known that the promotion of white schoolteachers will hinge, in the future, on whether or not they have "voluntarily" applied for transfer into Negro schools.

"Schools must have biracial staffs," he said, "in order to develop bridges between the teachers," whatever that means. He also stated that mixing with Negro teachers would "broaden the professional background" of the white teachers and the volunteers would be given "additional consideration" when they request promotion.

This sick episode is just one more illustration of the lengths to which the Government will go to force, threaten, and blackmail people into race mixing when, obviously, they do not want to do it.

Mr. Hansen's tawdry little memo is now only a shoddy piece of blackmail. If the civil rights bill becomes law, I predict we will see the blackmail replaced by an open order backed by a threat of dismissal if it is not obeyed.

For the benefit of anyone who did not see this story in the Post last week, I insert it here in the RECORD:

EMPHASIZED EFFORT TO INTEGRATE FACULTIES ORDERED BY HANSEN FOR WASHINGTON SCHOOLS: AFTER NEGRO LEADERSHIP CONSULTATIONS

(By Gerald Grant)

Sup. Carl F. Hansen has ordered renewed efforts to integrate all school faculties and cut down on imbalances in assignment of temporary teachers.

After a meeting with District school officials this week Hansen produced a memorandum, saying:

"Those in charge of personnel assignments will make a maximum effort to set up biracial faculties in each school unit."

One high school, two junior highs, and several elementary schools now have all Negro teaching staffs, while two other elementary schools have all white faculties.

Hansen said yesterday he hoped that by this time next year all schools staffs would be biracial, because it develops "bridges" between teachers.

He said the personnel department had been working on this problem since the schools were integrated in 1954 and that the policy was not new.

However, he added that "consultations with Negro leadership groups, including CORE," last month indicated a "need to be more definitive in our approach to these problems."

Noting that almost 75 percent of all the city's teachers are Negro, Hansen said he was "not talking about numbers" because an equal distribution of white and Negro teachers was a mathematical impossibility.

Hansen's memo also encouraged teachers to request transfers to "schools of different ethnic or socioeconomic characteristics * * * to broaden their professional backgrounds."

"Teachers who did so would be given additional consideration when they request promotion" he said. "We've always tried to pick the people with the most experience and widest possible background."

Hansen said the new policy on temporary teachers was not a reflection of the quality of teaching among temporaries, but an effort to stabilize school staffs.

Because of the higher turnover among the temporaries, a more proportionate balance between temporary and permanent teachers was needed in some schools.

In the future, he explained, new teachers with advanced standing will be assigned to schools with the highest proportion of temporaries. Transfers of advanced teachers will be suspended to schools where more than 70 percent of the teachers have advanced standing.

Pulling Illinois Out of the Mud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am enclosing an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of April 15, 1964, that mentions the 50th anniversary of a motorcade in the administration of Gov. Edward F. Dunne and in which I, as Dunne's lieutenant governor, participated.

Governor Dunne was the father of good roads in Illinois. It is a far cry from the roads of half a century ago, deep in loose gravel in dry weather and almost impassable in mud in rainy weather, and the network of paved thoroughfares of today. Too much credit cannot be given Governor Dunne and his administration for arousing public interest and support. I am humbly thankful that it was given unto me to help Governor Dunne pull Illinois out of the mud.

The editorial follows:

THEY TOOK US OUT OF THE MUD

In Europe the people in various areas stage pageants and conduct ceremonies in memory of important events that changed the history of their communities and that dates back sometimes hundreds of years. The people put on ancient costumes and go through procedures their ancestors engaged in generations ago.

Americans with their much shorter history and diverse cultural backgrounds generally do not go in for such folkloric performances, but today in Illinois a similar kind of celebration will take place. The pageant, in the form of a cavalcade—more specifically, a motorcade—will move from Chicago to Dixon, a distance of 108 miles. Instead of old costumes, ancient autos will be used, a typically American touch.

One of the cars will be a 1914 Dodge touring car and this will be in keeping with the general symbolism of the affair. For it marks the 50th anniversary of a similar tour that took place in 1914 and which was led by the late Edward F. Dunne, Governor of Illinois, and the late Charles M. Hayes, president of the Chicago Motor Club. The first tour was made to arouse interest in "pulling Illinois out of the mud" by building modern concrete highways, called in those days, "hard roads." The golden anniversary celebration today is dedicated to saving more lives on the extensive network of hard roads that have been built since Illinois began to pull itself out of the mud 50 years ago.

It was in the year 1914 that State aid became available for new roads and planning for a modern highway system really began. In those days it cost $16,000 to build a mile of 18-foot concrete roadway. Today a limited access highway costs about $10 million per mile in urban areas and $1 million a mile in rural districts.

The Illinois hard road system did not suddenly come into being in 1914. As always with new ventures, there were men of foresight who saw the need for modern roads to match the growth of the then young auto industry. An early poineer for better roads was William G. Edens, who at the turn of the century, was assistant superintendent of rural mail delivery for the Post Office Department. He spent 7 years campaigning for good country roads to make the job of rural mail carriers easier. When a group of business and civil leaders formed the Illinois Highway Improvement Association in 1912, they drafted Edens to lead the movement.

Edens and the other road pioneers of his time such as Hays and Governor Dunne did pull Illinois out of the mud. The Cook County Highway Department was established in 1914. Men clad in goggles and linen dusters rode around in their gas buggies campaigning for hard roads.

So the motorcade today, with its folkloric ceremonial, is a salute to men who helped change transportation in our State. That it all happened only 50 years ago, within the memory of many persons still able to participate in the celebration is a commentary on how fast America moves. Edens himself lived to the age of 93 and when he died in 1957 he had seen the giant superhighways of this modern day, one of which is named after him.

Health Care Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, considerable confu.'on exists in the minds of many people in this Nation today because of a flood of propaganda with respect to hospital care bill presently before the Congress. A Trojan horse has appeared upon the scene in the plan of some insurance companies to forestall the development of health care under social security.

Some of these plans may have some merit—others are mere extensions of fraud which are being used to persuade the aged and the feeble that insurance can do the job better than social security. The Trojan horse, you will remember, was a giant wooden horse with soldiers concealed inside. When the horse was brought within the walls of the ancient city, the soldiers under cover of darkness leaped out, killed the garrison and captured the city, which had previously held out against the invader.

The Trojan horse of insurance seeks to do the same thing for the legislation proposing health care for the aged. Persons considering the purchase of this type of insurance can quickly determine the value of the "new type" insurance by asking the following questions:

First. Is a physical examination necessary to receive the benefits under the so-called new plan? No physical examination is necessary under the social security health plan.

Second. What is the monthly cost per individual covered?

Third. How does the monthly cost under the insurance plan compare with 25 cents a month, the cost of a health plan under social security.

which the individual insurance under the

Fourth. What are the terms under "new plan" can be canceled?

Fifth. How does this compare with the health plan under social security which is noncancellable under any circumstances.

These five questions provide the answer to the value of the widely heralded insurance plan now being presented to the public as something new.

While the new insurance plans may present a stumbling block with respect to the social security health plan, it is interesting to note, if my mail is any guide, that more sentiment for the social security plan is developing among the doctors of the Nation. If statements sent me are correct, some doctors at least believe that social security will take care of some of the patients they now treat, without hope of remuneration. It is my information that each year every doctor takes care of some charity patients. The health plan under social security would reduce the number of patients who are wholly without funds or health protec-

tion of any kind—the persons who must be dependent upon charity. It is further my information that frequent physical checkups by a physician would prevent many critical illnesses, and would reduce the number of times when a physician must tell the patient or the patient's family: "I'm sorry, but it's too late to do much in this case."

Today many people do not go to a doctor until they are carried into a hospital on a stretcher. This is the real tragedy of medicine today, when the patient is brought in on a stretcher, it means the case is critical—the patient is no longer able to continue his daily routine and, all too often, it is too late.

There is another change in the attitude of thoughtful medical men, I am advised. They no longer believe as they once did that hospital care under social security is "socialized medicine." Anything "socialized" is repugnant to most Americans. "Socialized medicine" is among the worst. But today, under hospital care with social security, the patient may choose his physician, may continue with the physician who has served him for years, and in whom he has confidence. Also, he may go into the convalescent home or hospital of his choice. He is free to select one close to his home—or convenient for his family and friends to visit. He will not be an institutionalized person. He will have control over doctor and hospital. Under these terms, the charge of "socialized medicine" is slowly fading from the scene. To be sure, is it not gone, but it is fading in importance—simply because it is not true.

President Johnson has declared war on poverty. The Nation applauds his action in taking the lead to alleviate the pain of poverty by a more equitable distribution of the world's goods. No part of the war on poverty can be more important than the prevention of poverty, the protection of the funds accumulated by the little family as it grows and develops. Working wives in many homes today add to the resources, but the resources of the average family are blasted and withered in a long sick spell. It has been estimated that the average cost of 1 day in the hospital in California exceeds $44. Forty-four dollars and more for 1 day or 24 hours' stay. How long can the resources of the average family stand this sort of a drain? How long can the average person's savings estimated at the average to be something less than $15,000 stand this kind of strain? And this figure of $15,000 includes the cost of the home, the stocks and bonds, the family automobile; in fact, all of the assets of an average family.

Under social security at an estimated cost of $1 a month, and estimating the average working life of a person to be 35 years, the average contributor will put in $420. This is about what 10 days in the hospital would cost—and this is a lifetime contribution if handled under the proposed health care plan under social security.

I feel we are winning the battle on this important legislation. However, it behooves the head of every family who is raising his own family to see that everything possible is done to provide this health service for the aged and infirm today so that the substance of son or daughter can be devoted to the welfare and education of the family of tomorrow. It is this group that should have the greatest interest in health care under social security.

Panama Canal: Traffic Reaches Two New Peaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a former chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Panama Canal that conducted the 1949–50 investigation of the operation of the Panama Canal, I read with much interest an article on canal traffic in the March 20, 1964, issue of the Panama Canal Spillway, an official periodical of the Panama Canal Company.

The sustained growth of transit traffic therein indicated emphasizes the importance of the overall canal question, which my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] outlined so brilliantly in addresses to this body on March 9 and 11, and in which he urged the creation of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission to undertake the necessary studies with respect to the formulation of a policy concerning increased canal facilities.

The article follows:

CANAL TRAFFIC REACHES TWO NEW PEAKS; DAILY, WEEKLY TRANSIT RECORDS FALL

Panama Canal traffic hit another peak during the week of March 8 to 14 when a total of 284 oceangoing ships passed through the canal, bringing the daily transit average to 40.4 ships, the highest in the history of the waterway. The previous record week fell the third week in January this year when there were 256 oceangoing ships in a 7-day period.

Last week, the busiest in the history of the canal, included a recordmaking traffic day, during which the number of oceangoing vessels handled in a 24-hour period rose to 47 ships, the all-time daily record.

Ships using the canal during the record week included the *San Juan Pioneer*, one of the biggest vessels to use the Panama Canal and 48 other ships which were given clear-cut transit handling. Of these 22 required transit during the daylight hours.

The daily average of ship traffic during the first 15 days of the month of March rose to 36.3 ships as compared to the former record of 35.3 ships established in the 29-day month of February 1964.

The heavy traffic arriving at the Panama Canal during recent weeks follows a fairly well established pattern set over the years. The pattern indicates that a traffic surge can be expected at the Panama Canal during the months of January, March, and May. These months have always been peak traffic months in canal records. The record set during the month of February, however, did not follow previous trends.

The year of 1964 started off with a traffic jam of 1,055 vessels of more than 300 Panama Canal net tons transiting the canal during the 3-day period. This was a record for the number of oceangoing ships to use the canal in 1 month. This total exceeded the previous record set in March 1963 by 25 ships. The traffic in January also included a record-breaking super tanker-ore carrier, the 835-foot *San Juan Prospector*, sister ship of the *San Juan Pioneer*. This giant came southbound in ballast on January 22.

February brought a total of 1,024 oceangoing ships and a record daily average of 35.3 ships. It brought kudos also for the employees who handled the traffic and brought the average time spent by all ships in canal waters down to 13.7 hours during the first 8 months of the fiscal year 1964. The average time for all ships in canal waters from one entrance to the other in 1962 and 1963 was more than 15 hours.

With traffic at a record peak both from the standpoint of the number of and size of ships, there were few delays and only one bona fide holdover. Some overtime was authorized for the locks crews at Gatun in order to handle the peak traffic. Work is in progress on the Atlantic locks for the installation of 60-cycle power in the locomotive tracks to be used by the Panama Canal's new towing locomotives. Twelve of the new mules already are in use on the east lane of Gatun.

President Johnson's Negotiating Skill Is a National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, James Reston has written an interesting and factual article concerning President Johnson's skills and talents as a champion in negotiating and reasoning together, a vital resource needed at this time for our country.

I believe this article should be widely read, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

(By James Reston)

One of the vital natural resources of this country these days is the tireless negotiating skill of President Lyndon Johnson.

Without it, the House of Representatives would certainly not have passed the farm bill or the food stamp bill last week, and without it, every railroad train in this country would be at a standstill now.

He was on the phone 'till well after midnight Wednesday, pleading and arguing with wavering Members of the House about the farm legislation. The ox was in the ditch, he said; he needed their help. He used every technique in the books. He appealed to their patriotism, to their self-interest, to the political needs of his own party, to his personal need for their friendship and support, and in the end he prevailed.

Thursday he was back at it with the leaders of the railroad companies and the unions. Some of his advisers told him it was the end of the road; there would be a national strike at midnight; he would only lose face by intervening. He intervened anyway.

He got them together in the Cabinet Room of the White House. He told them labor and management had pledged him their support "on that tragic day in November." He

needed that support right now, he said. He was the only President they had, whether they liked it or not.

They told him they had been trying to settle this thing for 4 years and that they had lost faith in each other. He turned to Roy E. Davidson, head of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. "Have you lost faith in me?" he asked. Davidson said, "No." The President asked J. E. (Doc) Wolfe, the chief negotiator for the railroads, the same question and got the same answer, but still they protested.

They said the White House had been involved in this dispute for years and it had done no good. President Johnson said all he asked was the same chance they had given President Kennedy. "Let me have 20 days," he requested.

Then he called Walter Heller, Chairman of the Board of Economic Advisers. He wanted within an hour a memorandum on the effect of a national rail strike. At 8 they were still deadlocked. He read them the Heller memorandum and told them a story.

Once he said, when he was a young Congressman he lost his temper in a similar dispute in Texas and told everybody to go to hell. Later, a friend said to him: "You can always tell people to go to hell but they don't have to go." The President addressed himself again to Davidson and Wolfe. He asked them to look at one another and say in his presence that they couldn't possibly agree and wouldn't give him a chance. Were they going to tell the President of the United States to go to hell or weren't they? They didn't.

In the end, they gave him 15 days to try. "If the old atmosphere is poisoned, we'll create a new atmosphere," he said. Later that night, he telephoned Dr. George W. Taylor, a distinguished labor mediator at the University of Pennsylvania, whose wife was in a hospital. The President talked to him personally. "I'm not asking you," he said, "I'm telling you to be in my office at 9 in the morning." And so he was. Johnson met with him for over an hour.

Maybe all this won't work, but this Capital hasn't seen the like of the Johnson technique In many a year. It is an elemental force. It is directed in such a way that it cannot be ignored. It is highly personal and it is aimed directly at the personal honor of the men in dispute. It can be opposed only by equal force and only with great personal embarrassment, but it cannot be evaded.

This city is still muttering negatively about Johnson's style, but the complaints are really about appearance. If style in Government is not merely the art of pleasing but the technique of getting things done and making stubborn men put the general interest above their special interests, then President Johnson has plenty of it. It is not the style of Tunney but the style of Dempsey; it is as obvious and as effectively as a swift punch in the nose.

There is another point. This is not merely the brutal use of Presidential power. The emotional content of the Johnson appeal, the total absence of ideology, the passionate insistence on the general welfare, the willingness to talk endlessly through the night if necessary, the vivid earthly American language and optimistic faith that problems can be solved, all this is highly effective under Johnson.

He has that rare gift in a small room of antagonists, not only of telling men how he thinks they should feel, but of making them feel it, of forcing them to face the larger problems, as if they were sitting his chair.

In a vast continental Federal union, with inevitable conflicts between regions, parties, classes, and institutions, this is a personal force of immense value to the Nation.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD in the Labor Beacon has contributed greatly to clarifying the quality stabilization issue for readers of that publication. There is increasing evidence that organized labor, like other important segments of the American public, is now realizing the real economic need for quality stabilization legislation. This is taking place despite opposition propaganda efforts to generate public misunderstanding regarding the aims and scope of quality stabilization. The organized propaganda against this bill fails to mention that the provisions are 100 percent optional. No manufacturer, retailer, or consumer need to come under the bill. The "fast buck," big merchandisers can still sell "shiploads" of cheap labor, foreign-made junk to the gullible customer. But the consumer will be protected with the assurance that they can buy a quality product if they choose.

With unanimous consent, I therefore ask that Representative HOLIFIELD's excellent summation of the quality stabilization issue, appearing in the April 9, 1964, issue of the Beacon, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SEE SUPPORT FOR QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL IN CONGRESS

(By Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Member of Congress from California)

Labor is the greatest consumer of goods it produces and should lead in the demand for orderly marketing of quality brand name goods as essential to a stable economy. Therefore, labor should be leading the fight for enactment of the quality stabilization bill, a bill currently sponsored by many of labor's strongest supporters, including Senator HUMPHREY, Representative RAY MADDEN, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Representative JOHN DENT, and many others, including the writer. It is bipartisan legislation.

The quality stabilization bill has this strong support in Congress because it will strengthen independent retailing, it will help consumers have a true standard of value combining both quality and a fair price, it will discourage monopoly, it will promote competition, and it will help the national economy.

Many of the sponsors of this bill are themselves small businessmen who have personally experienced the unfair competition that threatens the small businessman's existence. This small businessman, just as the man of labor, should have the right to earn a profit from his endeavors. The small businessman should have a fair profit on his investment and for his long hours of work.

I say that a principle of equity is involved which is identical to the basic principle involved in securing a fair wage for the wage earner. If we do not permit by legislative approval the extension of reasonable and fair protection to the independent retailer, as we have to the wage earner, we are neither just nor consistent.

Now I've heard the theorists get up and expound that the quality stabilization bill is no good because it will raise prices to the consumer. This is hogwash. The Nation's small independent retailers who so desperately plead for the enactment of this bill do not want it as a means to gouge their neighbors and lifelong friends who helped them build their business.

In the first place, the quality stabilization bill is specific on this point. The law cannot be used unless (par. 8 of the bill): "Goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the owner of such brand name, or trademark, and are in free and open competition therewith."

The idea that because you have a right, to sell an item made in monopoly industry gives the manufacturer or the retailer a chance to gouge the market is completely erroneous. It may be justified by theories, but in the practical application of it, this is just simply a factor that doesn't obtain.

Yes; this bill is a modification of pure competition. When we talk about competition being the life of trade and competition being necessary in the marketplace we do not necessarily mean the ruthless type of competition which cannibalizes itself and destroys itself by its excesses and abuses. We are talking about competition under orderly rules of society to protect all of the component factors of society to an equitable extent.

This is what the quality stabilization bill will do. It will bring about equity in one area where equity does not now obtain. It will not force any manufacturer to use it; it will not give any manufacturer a chance to use it in a monopoly item area. It will not create an obligation on the part of any consumer to buy that item. He can obtain various similar items and buy them if he does not want the stabilized item. It is an orderly adjustment of what I consider to be an inequitable condition in our pattern of production and distribution which threatens to eliminate that final link of independent retailing.

Now, if independent retailing is worthy of a place in the market, if it is something that we want to preserve to give opportunity to the little man to start into business and grow big, it has a justifiable position in the marketplace. I say that it has such a position, and millions of small retailers throughout the country would certainly also say that it is justified. They are putting in 10, 15, 16 hours a day. They are putting in their life savings into little drugstores, into little retail hardware and clothing and jewelry stores. They are struggling against many odds in the competitive area.

Can't we give them a little bit of the protection that we give to every other facet in the chain of production and distribution by enactment of the quality stabilization bill?

Panama Canal Zone: That Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on April 7, 1964, I supplied data on the total cost to the United States acquiring the Canal Zone that now totals $144,568,571, and described it as our "most costly territorial extension."

It was, therefore, with considerable interest that I read in the Washington

Post of the same date, a humorous letter on the same subject by Robert Hull, which emphasizes the stupidity of current demands for retrocession of the Canal Zone to Panama.

The letter follows:

THAT TREATY

After reading the March 20 editorial I can come to only one conclusion.

The only right and just thing to do is turn the Panama Canal over to the Republic of Colombia, see that Panama is returned to its rightful place as a part of Colombia, using force if necessary (remember we fought a war to forceably restrain several States from leaving our Union) and of course don't forget the $10 million in gold (with interest since 1903) which should rightfully go to Colombia.

While we are bleeding all over for Panama let us do a little bleeding for Mexico. Seems as if I remember in our history books that our present States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California were once a part of Mexico; the dirty gringos moved in, seized the land from the rightful owners and when Mexico attempted to stop them, the United States then moved in. Mexico was in turn defeated and her rape was completed by the United States seizing that part of their country which now makes up the abovementioned States.

Also, let's bleed a little for France. After all, we caught France on the downgrade and obtained Louisiana for practically a song, or should I say a sou. Let's return Louisiana to France, throw in a lot of sous and that would really make General de Gaulle happy. How about Mr. Khrushchev? We could also make him happy by returning Alaska back to Russia and throw in a lot of kopecks for all the money we have taken out of Alaska.

Come on, let's be consistent. If we are going to bleed for Panama, let us bleed for Mexico, France, Russia, and try to obtain justice for these countries. Oh, I know the answer is "It happened too long ago and we can't do anything about it now." What difference does the century make? A steal is a steal whether it was consummated in the 20th, the 19th, 18th, or 17th century.

ROBERT HULL.

SUITLAND, MD.

Congressman John Hyde Sweet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, with permission I would like to introduce into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this short editorial tribute to a warm friend, Editor J. Hyde Sweet, of the Nebraska City (Nebr.) News-Press who recently passed from our midst at the grand old age of 84.

Mr. Sweet was perhaps one of the best known writers in the Midwest. His comments on the passing scene, always vivid and discerning, were usually delivered with a leavening of humor that made them extremely readable.

In addition he had the privilege of representing the Nebraska First Congressional District after the death of Congressman George H. Heinke in 1940. Unfortunately, political life did not appeal to Mr. Sweet so he returned to his newspaper duties after serving his people for a short 9 months. I always regretted that he did so because I think it deprived the United States of the services of a man of knowledgeable discernment, yet one who possessed the wit and humor to understand the vagaries of human nature.

To sum up, many of us will sincerely miss former Congressman Sweet's facile wit and pen. But we feel privileged to acknowledge that he was of our time and he contributed so much to a richer understanding of life's purpose.

The editorial follows:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Apr. 7, 1964]

John Hyde Sweet was a great newspaperman. Born to an era of personal journalism, he became a personal journalist of top rank. He expressed his opinions with very few inhibitions. He took his stand on the issues of the day in his State and in his home community. He was a man of conviction and courage.

When Hyde Sweet died the other day in Arizona, he was 84 years old, and he was still editor and publisher of the Nebraska City News-Press. And he was an active editor. Almost up to the day of his death, he wrote his daily column as well as the paper's editorials. Recuperating from a cataract operation a few months ago, he kept his column going day by day. And when he left for his annual winter stay in Arizona, he prepared enough columns in advance to take care of the time he would be on the road.

The News-Press was widely known as "Sweet's paper," and his column sparkled with anecdotes and good humor that made it one of the finest in the country. A working newspaperman, he had little time or inclination for social pursuits, but a great many persons beyond his home community came to know him well through the attraction of his pen. He left a shining stamp on his hometown and his State, and a great many persons throughout the Midlands will feel that in the passing of Hyde Sweet they have lost a wise friend.

Facts on Foreign Aid, Mortgaged Gold—Is Devaluation Coming?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you well know I have for the past 20 years raised my voice and exerted all the power at my command in reducing unnecessary, wasteful Federal spending for every purpose, to the end that as the top Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, I prevailed on the other 19 Republican members of that committee to assist me in organizing a Republican budget-cutting task force early in the last session, composed of all the Republican members of that committee.

Under the chairmanship of that task force, Congressman FRANK BOW, of Ohio, we were successful, with the help of enough conservative Democrats, to reduce the President's budget for fiscal year 1964 over $6,300 million. Our budget-cutting task force is still operating during this session.

How much is $6,300 million? To make that figure more comprehensive, it represents a saving of a little over $130 for each American family on an average. I am sure every American family who knows these facts appreciate it, for had we not done so, it is very doubtful that Congress would have passed the Federal income tax reduction bill, which is now law.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, you also know that I have, ever since the shooting war stopped in Korea, voted against foreign aid, mainly for the reasons so convincingly explained in the following statement, which should convince every American, including every Member of Congress, that the time is far past due when the more than $100 billion foreign giveaway should have been stopped. The statement follows:

FACTS ON FOREIGN AID: MORTGAGED GOLD—IS DEVALUATION COMING?

Because of foreign aid spending, has the dollar become inconvertible? A deficit in our balance of international payments occurs if the flow of dollars into foreign lands exceeds foreign spending in the United States. Since foreign aid began, each year except in 1957 because of foreign purchases for the Suez crisis, the United States has experienced a foreign-payments deficit. Principally because of U.S. foreign aid and spending by and for our oversea forces, foreigners now hold $26 billion in short-term credits. These dollar credits supposedly are redeemable in gold, but the U.S. Treasury has not this much gold. The U.S. gold reserve now stands at $15.461 billion; our own demands on our own gold reserve are:

[In billions]

Legal gold reserve against banking and circulation liabilities	$12.7986
Borrowings from the IMF, repayable in gold	.925
Foreign currency borrowings by Federal Reserve, net	.145
Foreign currency borrowings by Treasury	.760
Total U.S. gold requirements	14.6286
$15.461 minus $14.6286 equals net free gold of	.8324

Accordingly, the United States has only $0.8324 billion—$832.4 million—free gold to meet potential claims of $26 billion. So far this year foreigners have drawn only $50 million from our gold reserve. This leads to the conclusion that the dollar, long inconvertible at home by Presidential decree, has become inconvertible de facto abroad. It leads to the conclusion that foreign central banks are being told not to try to convert their paper dollar holdings. This appears to be the meaning of the top secret monetary conference now being held in Washington as reported in the New York Times of April 13.

In all but 6 of the last 34 years U.S. Government spending has exceeded its income. During this time, by purchase—largely with aid dollars—foreigners have been able to reduce our gold stock from $24.5 billion to $15.461 billion. As a result of our unprecedented foreign aid spending—and the resultant flight of gold—an early devaluation of the dollar appears likely.

This impending devaluation can be prevented. The American people must demand of their Congress and President deep cuts in foreign spending. This would insure favorable balance of payments and tend to alleviate planned deficits in the Federal budget. If deficit spending continues to be the order of the day, economic chaos will follow.

President Johnson and the Congress Take Significant Actions in Aid of American Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress, many actions have been taken in aid of American small business and other actions are underway in the Congress and President Johnson's administration. I refer specifically to the provisions of the tax cut bill which favor small business, the amendments to the Small Business Investment Act program recently passed by Congress and signed into law by President Johnson; programs to expand the Small Business Administration's loan program, including an enlarged small business development corporations program; recommendations by the President to eliminate pockets of poverty and to expand the Farmers Home Administration, among other significant actions.

The House Small Business Committee has recently made significant recommendations with respect to small business participation in foreign trade, and copies of a documented report on this subject are now available to Members of Congress and others interested.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that my recent newsletter, "Capitol Comments," summarizing some of the significant actions of benefit to American small business, be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

BETTER TIMES AHEAD FOR AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

Congress and President Johnson are placing increasing emphasis on the role of small business in broadscale efforts that are being made to strengthen our national economy and keep our country growing.

Measures designed to stimulate small business activity and enlarge the small business community form an important part of the new programs for Appalachian regional development and elimination of "pockets of poverty" throughout the country.

These two separate but closely related developmental undertakings call for an expanded Small Business Administration loan program, an enlarged Small Business Development Corporation program, and a broader Area Redevelopment Administration program. In addition, the Farmers Home Administration program would be expanded to create new opportunities for the small farmers in our vital agricultural industry.

STEPS TOWARD A STRONGER ECONOMIC BASE FOR THE UNITED STATES

With these programs and other actions by Congress, long strides are being taken in improving the outlook for the American small business sector of our economy. There are 4½ million small businesses in America, containing 95 percent of our business population—the very bedrock and seedbed of our American free enterprise system.

A major step to heighten prosperity came earlier this year with the passage of the $11.5 billion tax cut bill, aiding small business and all segments of our economy. Your Representative was present at the White House when the President, in signing the bill, spoke of the great and timely stimulation this act is giving to our economy. He remarked that small business fares best in the tax relief that is provided for business. This large saving and the substantial cut in individual tax rates, plus the benefit from tax credit that was provided by Congress for new investments in plant and machinery, plus the more liberal depreciation schedules, add up to a vast improvement in the financial position for American small business concerns.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, your Representative is actively and constantly aware that American small business is engaged in a stern competition to survive and to prosper. Many things still need to be accomplished before independent small business is assured of equal opportunity in the growing competition with giant corporations. But substantial progress is being made in many areas. Congress and the President are showing a determination to continue and broaden this effort.

Two important gains made earlier in this session of Congress were the final approval of amendments which improve and strengthen the Small Business Investment Act and broaden the Small Business Administration disaster loan programs—acts recently signed into law by President Johnson.

MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

A great new opportunity for American small business exists in the field of foreign trade, under the Trade Expansion Act which Congress passed in 1962. Our Small Business Committee has just issued a report, based on extensive hearings, that sheds light on existing opportunities in expanded export trade.

The late President Kennedy, who followed these hearings closely, wrote a letter last November 19 to me as the committee chairman, expressing his hope that many more of our country's 300,000 manufacturers would turn to the inviting export field, and emphasizing his interest in our committee's work in behalf of expanded American foreign trade.

"The information brought together for the first time in these hearings should act both as a guide and spur to small businessmen considering ventures into foreign markets and to Government officials responsible for assisting them," the late President wrote.

Copies of the committee's report, which summarizes the testimony at the hearings and contains recommendations for further improvements in our foreign trade program, are available to interested persons upon request to the House Small Business Committee.

War on Poverty No Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a well-considered article written by Roscoe Drummond appearing in the Boston Globe of April 17, 1964.

As Roscoe Drummond pointedly said:

The critics of President Johnson's antipoverty program are making a great mistake picking at its fringes.

The argument that this must not be the business of the Federal Government is a profitless and outdated argument.

The article by Mr. Drummond follows:

SHRIVER PLAN ON RIGHT TRACK: WAR ON POVERTY NO HANDOUT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The critics of President Johnson's antipoverty program are making a great mistake picking at its fringes.

The argument that this must not be the business of the Federal Government is a profitless and outdated argument.

Any democratic society must be concerned at every level of government with the problem of continued high unemployment in the face of continued high prosperity.

Any democratic society must be concerned at every level of government with the fact that, despite a consistently rising standard of living for many Americans, despite a higher average wage for most Americans, despite a mounting gross national product of more than $600 billion annually, some 35 million persons in this country can afford neither adequate food nor adequate shelter nor adequate clothing nor adequate schooling.

I submit that at no level of government—local, State, and Federal—dare we neglect this pervasive problem of widespread poverty in the midst of widespread affluence.

I think we can't.

Therefore, the central questions to be asked—and answered—are:

Do the proposed actions go to the heart of the problem, to its causes, not merely to its symptoms?

And even if the measures are well conceived, can poverty be substantially done away with?

They are, as pointed out by Raymond J. Saulnier, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and no pie-in-the-sky economist: "lack of skills," "inadequate education," "unsuitable or inadequate work experience," and "discrimination."

These are the root causes and the Shriver program is aimed concretely at these causes as a practical and necessary way to reduce poverty.

These are the things which most often make people poor and keep them that way—often from generation to generation.

This Nation cannot accept continued poverty for 9,300,000 families with a median income of $1,800 a year.

This kind of poverty is not due to the failure of our economic system.

It is due to the failure of our society to provide the education, the job training and retraining, the encouragement and the environment needed to help the poor become productive and the productive become more prosperous.

This is why a panel of practical, experienced business leaders helped to shape and then gave its unanimous endorsement to the program which Shriver proposed to the White House.

The war-on-poverty program which its chief of staff, Sargent Shriver, has put together for the President and unfolded to Congress reflects realistic, workable, and, indeed, conservative economic principles.

Shriver is not talking about reducing poverty by spreading the wealth of others.

He is not talking about increasing handouts in order to decrease distress.

He is not talking primarily about how to help the poor, but primarily about how to help the poor help themselves.

What are the causes of increased unemployment and continued poverty in the face of increased and long-sustained prosperity?

Recently the Gallup Poll reported that 83 percent of the respondents said no when asked, "do you think poverty will ever be done away with in this country?"

I suspect they asked the wrong question. The realistic goal is not abolishing poverty.

Some people may not have the will to lift themselves out of poverty even when given a better opportunity.

Some may not have the mental capacity to improve themselves even when the chance is put well within their reach.

But the kind of poverty and unemployment we have experienced in the past 15 years ought to be seen as an anachronism not to be accepted.

This war on poverty is headed in the right direction.

Tax Exemption for Cerebral Palsy Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that I am today introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $600 for taxpayers who have cerebral palsy.

Recently on a visit to the Cerebral Palsy Center in Seattle, Wash., located in my congressional district I was made keenly aware of the contributions being made to help those of our citizens who are making a better life for themselves even though they are physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, my bill provides that these persons whose earning power is limited because of this handicap and whose needs include special living expenses will receive an additional $600 exemption to equalize their opportunity to be self-supporting.

Today, in the congressional district I am honored to serve and in King County, Wash., some 150 cerebral palsied are able to test their individual capacity to make a living. These handicapped persons are finding companionship in spite of an affliction that usually means misery through loneliness.

This is made possible because of a sheltered workshop operated by the United Cerebral Palsy Association of King County and financed, in part, by the efforts of the handicapped employees at the center from their limited earnings.

Development of a sheltered workshop came naturally, the byproduct of a step taken a generation earlier when a group of concerned parents established a school for cerebral palsied children. As these young people grew older, so grew the realization that a work-and-therapy center also was needed for adults.

So the parents—after affiliating with United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc.—formed a workshop program in 1952 and brought into being a center that produces a source of self-sustaining revenue. Income from the jobs—many from various industrial plants in the area—covers wages for employees and helps make it possible for the natural expansion of the center's busy workshop.

The variety of jobs gives the center an opportunity to provide work tailored to specific physical capabilities of each individual handicapped person. The center has strengthened one belief: that work, regardless how seemingly menial, is a morale building tonic and, consequently, cultivates its own theraputic benefits.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is directed toward covering all persons whose earning power has been decreased by cerebral palsy and my discussion of what is being done in my congressional district is ample proof that these handicapped persons can become productive and useful citizens if given the opportunity.

Therefore, it is my firm conviction that these people should be given this tax consideration just the same as the handicapped who receive a $600 exemption because they are over the age of 65 and who are blind. With a special exemption these people can become more self-supporting while playing an important role in the life of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this legislation.

Worse Than Profumo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a significant editorial concerning the Bobby Baker case which appeared in the April 17 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

WORSE THAN PROFUMO

No matter how frantically the administration's troubleshooters try to nail the Baker case shut, the hant inside the packing case continues to emit piercing reminders of its existence.

Don B. Reynolds, Bobby Baker's insurance pal whose testimony has been acutely embarrassing to President Johnson and members of his staff, seems ready and eager to keep on talking. He said on television that pressure to end the Senate Rules Committee hearing has come not only from the White House, but also from a good many Senators, including Republicans, who are just as reluctant as the White House to hear any more about Mr. Baker's influence peddling apparatus, especially the part Mr. Reynolds says was played by ladies of leisure.

Mr. Reynolds seems undeterred by the administration's devious and vicious campaign to discredit him by supplying accommodating columnists with derogatory material from the confidential records of his past service with the Air Force and the State Department.

Mr. Reynolds' personal qualifications for sainthood are not the issue here. He has made serious charges which the committee is duty bound to follow up before it closes shop, as it is now eagerly preparing to do. He is willing to tell more. His charges have been strenuously denied but never disproved, and they fit in with a pattern of influence peddling and profiteering which has been confirmed from many sources other than Reynolds.

Somebody has been lying to Congress just as Mr. Profumo lied to Parliament. And the implications of the Baker case are considerably more serious than those stemming from Mr. Profumo's indiscretions, which, except for the Government's brief attempt to cover up for him, proved to have no bearing on the performance of his duties or on the conduct of Government.

Not so with the Baker case. Nearly every strand, as the tangle is unraveled, leads to a new example of official impropriety or worse. Dozens of questions remain unanswered regarding the abuse of office by Mr. Baker or by other officials apparently indebted to him in one way or another. Other questions have been officially avoided, such as what part Members of Congress and of the Government played in the mysterious goings-on at the house on N Street.

As long as these questions are evaded, we may assume that—as in the State Department's Otepka case—the answers are more embarrassing than the questions. Senator Jordan and the Democratic members of the Rules Committee are helping to suppress a Johnson administration scandal much worse than the Profumo affair.

The Infallible Mr. McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps Secretary of Defense McNamara and his spokesman, Arthur Sylvester, think they can sweep the TFX fighter plane contract under a convenient rug in the Pentagon but we predict it will take a newer and larger broom than they have yet used to do the job.

There are at least a few Members of the House and Senate who remain completely unconvinced that the best interests of this Nation were served when McNamara rode roughshod over a substantial number of the Government's top experts in this field and awarded the huge TFX contract to General Dynamics which, incidentally, operates in Texas.

The Washington Star has consistently questioned the manner in which the contract was awarded and the following editorial, in its April 19, 1964, edition, is again to the point:

When Pentagon insiders talk about "overkill" they are not referring to the nuclear stockpile. What they have in mind is Secretary of Defense McNamara's enthusiasm for proving that he is at least 100 percent right 110 percent of the time. However close the question, once Mr. McNamara decides which way to lean he banishes all of the counter arguments and tries to get the world to banish them, too.

Take the TFX decision for instance. It might be 60-40 for the General Dynamics plane, but probably it was closer. When Mr. McNamara made the decision, however, it was suddenly General Dynamics 100 percent, Boeing a great big raspberry.

If the entire free world is not now convinced of this, it soon will be. For Arthur Sylvester, Mr. McNamara's official spokesman, has launched a massive public relations program to prove that the TFX, of Mr. McNamara's choice, is a faultless airplane.

The services, Mr. Sylvester has ordered, will describe the still-unbuilt plane in such a manner as to make clear that it will do everything the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps want. Savings accrued from the McNamara choice will be emphasized. People who still think there may be another side to these issues—the side brought out by

service dissenters during the Senate investigation of the TFX contract—might just as well forget it.

Service people are obedient, as they should be, so the past dissent doubtless will subside. This will please Mr. McNamara. It will not please people who want to know more about their country's military problems.

Neighborly Spirit in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the rare neighborliness of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Ballard, of Pleasant Plains, Ill., was reported in the March 8 issue of Lookout, a publication of the Disciples of Christ Church. Appearing first in the January 15 issue of the Illinois State Register, it was written by George Derwig and tells a heart-warming story especially appropriate in this period of racial stress.

The article follows:

I WAS A STRANGER AND YE TOOK ME IN

(By George Derwig)[1]

Broadway may long remember Monty Woolley in "The Man Who Came to Dinner," for the humorous complications that resulted from a casual invitation.

But these were nothing compared to the results of a casual invitation issued to a few snowbound travelers Sunday night by Edward Ballard, whose farm lies on the north side of Illinois 125, in Pleasant Plains, near Springfield.

A motorist, stalled in heavy drifts, made his way to the Ballard farmhouse to borrow a shovel about 5:30 p.m. Sunday. Looking out at the highway, Mr. Ballard suggested, "If there's any other folk out there, tell them to come on in."

It wasn't too long before two couples were at the door, and Mr. Ballard's wife, Shirley, started whipping up a batch of waffles.

Suddenly Ballard was in the kitchen. "Better wait with what you're doing until we know how many guests we have," he said. "More are coming."

More was right. Sixty-three people, including eight or nine children, soon were huddling in four downstairs rooms. "We even had a cat and a dog and two sailors," said Ballard.

In short order, the waffles disappeared as did another final batch. No more eggs. Not much more milk or cream. The Ballards haven't raised chickens for 10 years and haven't milked a cow for 6. But there was plenty of cheese and crackers—and a supply of chipped beef. So there was creamed chipped beef on toast.

Mothers with little children had had the foresight to carry a supply of milk, so the youngsters were well taken care of. Soon stomachs were full, eyelids were drooping and idle chatter and banter gradually gave way to sleep.

The howling winds made use of the unheated upstairs impractical. Everyone huddled together in the living room and dining room, utilizing chairs, couches and the floor as sleeping space. Any place was better than the cars in which all had been waiting for at least an hour up to 6:30 p.m. for snowplows to clear the drifted highway, and in which some had been stalled earlier in Salisbury for 5 hours.

One of the latter was Mrs. Ruby Sarff, a widow who was returning to her home in Springfield with her granddaughter, Sandra Sidener, 8.

She was intensely grateful to the Ballards for their hospitality. "They were wonderful people. I can't give them enough praise. They were simply precious," she said today. But in her relief at her "life being saved," she experienced a slight annoyance. Perhaps she was too excited, but she couldn't sleep.

And, in clear line of vision, was a fellow underneath the baby grand piano, "snoring away, and enjoying a nap for all he was worth."

Mrs. Sarff had to admit she was a bit perturbed. "But the Ballards made up for that. They stayed up with us and kept us company."

The fellow who crawled under the piano to sleep said he did so because it was the only safe place to be. Ballard said once the group got set for the night, nobody could move.

Some of the folk were somewhat perturbed when they found themselves stranded, but the Ballards' hospitality soon took the edge off their nervousness. The two sailors, who had been worried about being AWOL because they couldn't catch their train to Great Lakes Naval Training Center, soon were so relaxed they were ready to stay on the farm. One was Donald Chartier whose parents, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Chartier of Matanza Beach, were driving him and his buddy from Alabama to the depot in Springfield.

Another couple, also bothered at first, provided the group with the "best lesson of all in human relations" according to the Ballards and others in the company. This was a Negro man and his wife, about 50 years old, from Rock Island en route to Springfield because of a death in the family. "They hesitated to come in at first," said Ballard, "but finally they did and were soon getting along famously with the rest." Mrs. Sarff praised this couple highly and described the man and his wife as most agreeable company. "He was up early in the morning and shoveling snow like a trooper," she said.

Snow shoveling was accompanied by an appetite. What to eat? Would the meat from the freezer thaw in time to provide breakfast?

Suddenly someone remembered eight dozen eggs in one of the 23 stalled cars, stretching in a mile-long line west of the farmhouse. It wasn't too long before these were in frying pans "and we fared real well for breakfast," Ballard said today.

Some of the men made their way a half mile to the Stone Seed Co. where they were able to call for snowplows and notify worried relatives. Proprietor Rolland G. Stone sent back a big supply of food with the men, which also accounts for Ballard's satisfaction with breakfast.

By 10 a.m. Monday the snowplows had broken through the drifts and the last of the folks who stayed for breakfast were again on their way, including one man for whose life the travelers had feared the night before.

This man had collapsed in a snowbank as he left his car for the Ballard farmhouse, and had to be carried in by some of the other men. He was put to bed, and by morning was among those who enjoyed a real farm breakfast.

How do the Ballards feel today about their adventure? "It was not too much of an ordeal," Ballard said. "I thought for a while the water supply would run out, but it didn't. So we made out just fine.

"There really isn't too much to say about it. I don't see how you could refuse anyone lodging on a night like that."

Mrs. Ballard laughed today and said, "Well, I wouldn't have been ready for that much company again the next night, but I'd be willing to start all over again tonight if the weather got bad."

And the Ballards could do just that. They came to town Tuesday noon with a load of cattle and went back with a big supply of groceries—just in case.

Apparently Mrs. Ballard is waiting for another storm and another batch of company. "It was sort of exciting," she said with a chuckle.

They're keeping a weather eye on the low-hanging clouds and the snow driven from the fields northward onto the highway. It could happen again.

[1] Reprinted from the Illinois State Register, Jan. 15, 1964, with special permission.

Committee OK's Pay Raises up to 30 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Finance Committee of the California State Senate recently approved two bills which would grant salary increases to California State employees ranging as high as 30 percent.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sacramento Bee of April 3, 1964, which explains the proposed increases for various State officials, including the judiciary, and which points up once again the disparity in Federal salaries of many executives who have far greater responsibilities than their higher salaried colleagues in the progressive State service of California:

COMMITTEE OK'S PAY RAISES UP TO 30 PERCENT: MORE FOR JUDGES, OFFICIALS

(By Robert J. Markson)

California's judges and top State government chiefs will have their bankrolls fattened considerably if the State senate finance committee has its way.

The committee, after a hearing in the capitol yesterday, recommended approval of two bills, senate bill 50, Miller, and senate bill 53, McAteer, which would grant annual salary increases ranging as high as 30 percent.

Meanwhile, the committee delayed for 1 week action on senate bill 11, Short, which would have allowed the State personnel board, if it saw fit, to boost incomes of about 30,000 State employees in the lower pay classes.

Senator Alan Short, of San Joaquin County, was unable to muster sufficient votes for his measure. The bill would have removed a legislative restriction which disallows pay boosts to workers whose income was not at least 5 percent behind that comparable in private and other governmental business.

Short said the bill would not mean that pay increases for these workers would be mandatory but it would allow the board to set boosts if a salary survey justified them.

Senator George Miller, of Contra Costa County, committee chairman, warned passage of the bill would be taken to mean the 5-percent raise would be mandatory.

Senator Stephen P. Teale, of Calaveras County, echoed this statement but also observed the legislature has been so concerned with the "$18,000 to $20,000 a year State officials" that the "small people" often are overlooked.

In addition to granting pay boosts to judges, senate bill 50 would require that there would be no further increase until 1968 and then the amount would be equal to the per-

centage increase in the per capita personal income in California based on a Federal Department of Commerce survey.

The pay increases for judges under the Miller bill would be:

Chief justice of the supreme court, $29,400 to $34,000; associate justices of the supreme court, $27,300 to $32,000; appellate court justices, $25,200 to $30,000; superior judges in counties of over 100,000 population, $21,000 to $25,000; superior judges in counties of under 100,000, $18,900 to $25,000; municipal judges in counties of over 250,000, $18,900 to $23,000; municipal judges in counties of under 250,000, $16,800 to $23,000.

State attorney general, $27,300 to $32,000; administrative director of the courts, $25,200 to $30,000; clerk of supreme court, $18,191 to $22,000; reporter of decisions, $17,365 to $19,500; clerks of the first and second district courts, $13,680 to $18,000; clerks of the third and fourth district courts, $13,680 to $16,500; clerks of the fifth district court, $13,332 to $16,500.

In addition, the bill would increase the amount of contribution by the State to the judges retirement fund from 4 to 8 percent to avoid a deficit. The situation is nearing the point where benefits will exceed contributions.

Under the measure for increasing the pay of most top State officials, senate bill 53 by Senator Eugene McAteer, of San Francisco, the pay of Gov. Edmund G. Brown would remain at $44,100 and that of State Finance Director Hale Champion at $30,319.

Other salaries would be changed in this manner:

Agency administrators, $25,000 to $27,500; director of mental hygiene, $24,806 to $26,000; director of public health, $21,499 to $26,000; president of the public utilities commission, $20,948 to $25,500; controller, $22,050 to $25,000; superintendent of public instruction, $22,050 to $25,000; Lieutenant Governor, $22,050 to $25,000; public utilities commissioners, $20,948 to $25,000; director of social welfare, $19,101 to $24,500; director of employment, $20,948 to $24,500; director of public works, $22,050 to $24,500; director of water resources, $22,044 to $24,500;

Legislative counsel, $22,050 to $25,000; executive secretary to the Governor, $19,845 to $24,500; director of industrial relations, $19,101 to $23,500; director of agriculture, $19,680 to $23,500; director of corrections, $20,948 to $23,500; director of youth authority, $20,948 to $23,500; director of motor vehicles, $20,948 to $23,500; treasurer, $21,500 to $23,500; secretary of state, $21,500 to $23,500; director of general services, $21,500 to $23,500; real estate commissioner, $17,365 to $22,500; savings and loan commissioner, $17,365 to $22,500; commissioner of corporations, $17,365 to $22,500.

Director of conservation, $18,522 to $22,500; director of parks and recreation, $18,522 to $22,500; director of fish and game, $18,522 to $22,500; director of the department of alcoholic beverage control, $19,101 to $22,500; commissioner of the State highway patrol, $19,101 to $22,500; superintendent of banks; $19,101 to $22,500; insurance commissioner, $19,680 to $22,500; director of rehabilitation, $19,101 to $22,500; director of professional and vocational standards, $17,365 to $21,500; director of veterans affairs, $17,365 to $21,500; director of the California Disaster Office, $18,522 to $21,500; executive officer of the franchise tax board, $19,680 to $21,500; State architect, $20,000 to $21,000; chairman of the industrial accident commission, $17,365 to $21,000.

Chairman of the board of equalization, $18,522 to $21,000; chairman of the adult authority, $19,101 to $21,000; chairman of the water rights board, $19,101 to $21,000; chairman, unemployment insurance appeals board, $19,680 to $21,000; member, industrial accident commission, $17,365 to $20,500; member, board of equalization, $18,522 to $20,500; member, adult authority, $19,101 to $20,500; member, youth authority, $19,101 to $20,500; member, water rights board, $19,101 to $20,500; member, unemployment insurance appeals board, $19,680 to $20,500; deputy director of employment, $19,680 to $20,500; deputy director, department of justice, $19,101 to $20,500; commissioner, economic development agency, $19,101 to $20,000.

Other secretaries to the Governor from up to $17,365 to up to $20,000; State printer, $18,000 to $19,500; fire marshal, $17,365 to $18,000; consumer counsel, $17,365 to $18,000; chief, division of labor law enforcement, $15,918 to $17,000; chief, division of industrial safety, $15,160 to $17,000; chief, division of housing, $13,892 to $15,500; chief, division of industrial welfare, $13,802 to $15,500; director of aeronautics, $15,225 to $15,500; State librarian, $13,892 to $15,500; chairman, alcoholic beverage control appeals board, $13,892 to $14,500; secretary, horse racing board, $13,892 to $14,000.

Member alcoholic beverage control appeals board, $13,892 to $14,000; member, personnel board, $7,178 to $8,000; chairman, board of barber examiners, $6,946 to $8,000; member, board of barber examiners, $6,946 to $7,500; secretary, San Francisco Pilot Commission, $5,832 to $7,500; executive secretary, shorthand reporters' board, $2,509 to $3,700; commissioner, San Francisco Port Authority, $1,200 to $1,500; commissioner and secretary-surveyor, Humboldt Bay Harbor, $1,621 to $1,800; commissioner, Harbor Commission for Humboldt Bay, $463 to $500.

Excessive Control of Predators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the April 8, 1964, edition of the New York Times, decrying the excessive use of predator control employed by the U.S. Government and calling for a sharp curtailment of Government activity in this field in order to protect America's valuable wild animals.

The editorial follows:

EXCESSIVE CONTROL OF PREDATORS

Secretary of the Interior Udall's advisory committee on wildlife management has sounded a long-needed warning about the excesses and errors of the Government's branch of Predator and Rodent Control. Among the errors cited by the committee is the dangerous aerial broadcasting of grain treated with sodium fluoroacetate, a deadly poison known in the trade as compound 1080. This practice was held responsible for the death last year of two birds from the tiny flock of California condors that is the last survivor of its kind on earth. Many other valuable animals, including rare grizzly bears and mountain lions, have been killed inadvertently.

Wolves and other wild beasts are no longer the threat to domestic herds and flocks they once may have been. Indeed, the true wolf is almost gone in the United States outside of Alaska. The coyote still harasses sheepmen in some places, but this is a problem that could be handled effectively and at far less cost by concentration of efforts in local areas. Secretary Udall's committee pointed out that control operations now extend into areas where there are no sheep or other valid justification.

Congress must share the blame for the outsize growth of the predator control agency, which now employs more than 600 trappers and poisoners in the western States. For the most part, Congress has closed its eyes while its appropriation committees annually doled out larger funds at the request of the wool growers' association and as a result of indirect lobbying by the predator control agents themselves. Certainly the problem does not require the present army of Government hunters. Here is a fine chance for some of that governmental economy the President has been talking about.

UNESCO in the U.N. Setting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, my friend and constituent, the Honorable Ellis Arnall of Newnan, Ga., a former Governor of the State of Georgia, and a former Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, is a member of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. He is serving as Chairman of an ad hoc committee of the National Commission.

On March 31, 1964, Mr. Arnall as Chairman of the ad hoc committee submitted recommendations which were to be considered by the U.S. National Commission. On April 1, 1964, the Commission voted unanimously to accept those recommendations. The primary recommendation was for the U.S. Commission to ask UNESCO to make a study "as to the desirability of encouraging or discouraging the creation and recognition of additional new and small nations and the impact and relation of such encouragement or discouragement to the attainment and maintenance of world peace."

Every member nation of the United Nations no matter what its size or population has one vote in that body. It has grown from 30 nations in 1946 to 113 nations as of December 1963. Chairman Arnall pointed out that these less-developed nations now constitute a majority, and their vote is controlling in the international organizations and UNESCO. His key question was: Should voting strength in the international organizations be based on some formula other than "one nation—one vote?"

Within the framework of the United Nations this concept is novel. It certainly deserves consideration.

The ad hoc committee of which Mr. Arnall is chairman consists of the following: Mrs. Barry Bingham of Louisville, Ky.; Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C. (formerly, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress); Mr. Lawrence M. C. Smith, of Philadelphia; Dr. Walter H. C. Laves, chairman, Department of Government, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., and Dr.

James A. Perkins, president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Mr. Arnall is presently serving a 3-year term as a member at large of the Commission. However, he is no stranger to its work. As president of the Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, he served on the Commission from January 1949 until early 1951. He was advisory member to the U.S. delegation to the UNESCO Conference in 1949.

I recommend the reading of his splendid report. It is with pleasure that I make it an extension of my remarks.

The report follows:

UNESCO IN THE U.N. SETTING

(Report by Ellis Arnall, Chairman, ad hoc committee, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, March 31, 1964)

The U.S. National Commission since its creation by Congress in 1946 has centered its efforts on helping UNESCO establish international programs of continuing usefulness in the fields of education, science, and the arts and humanities. As these programs grew in importance, parallel to the increasing importance of the work of the United Nations and the other specialized agencies, it became increasingly evident that UNESCO's development needed to be viewed more closely in its relationships to the entire United Nations family of organizations.

Early in 1964, the Chairman of the National Commission, Dr. Harvie Branscomb, named a small ad hoc committee to survey this complex of relationships and to identify problems to which the Commission should give attention.

In its examination of the situation of UNESCO within the United Nations framework, the committee recognized certain major developments of significant import.

Two of these were:

1. In a jet travel and satellite communications world, there is an ever increasing creation and recognition of national entities in the family of nations and the international organizations. That this trend will have an impact upon the objectives of attaining and maintaining a peaceful world is certain.

2. In an era of increased emphasis on personal service and personal sacrifice as well as on increased financial support, the United States has not furnished an adequate number of citizens for services with UNESCO and other international agencies while successfully affording financial contributions to the welfare and advancement of the international organizations. This will have an impact upon the over-all influence, leadership and service of the United States in UNESCO and the other international organizations.

The creation of the United Nations system with its family of functional organizations was to provide an institutional framework for organized international cooperation in solving mutual problems and meeting the needs of a world then recovering from the devastations of war. The United Nations was conceived as a security organization, concerned primarily with political and regulatory functions. The specialized agencies were a manifestation of the increasing complexity of the economic, social, technical, and cultural interrelations of the peoples of the modern world.

The number of specialized agencies, created by intergovernmental agreements and having wide international responsibility, has steadily increased; at present there are 12, including UNESCO. But perhaps a 13th should be added: the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Each of them deals with a particular sector of economic, social, cultural, or technical activity. Each of them possesses the capacity to act in pursuit of the purposes set forth in their constitutions, purposes as specialized, and yet at the same time as universal, as the needs themselves.

Since 1950, the United Nations system has undergone a profound change. It has embarked upon a new kind of activity, generally called operational activity. Focused initially upon the conventional concept of economic development which was gradually replaced by a more comprehensive concept of balanced economic and social development, this remarkable expansion of economic and social cooperation within the framework of the United Nations has not followed any preconceived plan. It has been a reflection of many things. The most important being the admission of a great many newly emerging countries to the international community.

UNESCO was established to contribute to world peace and security by promotion of cultural and intellectual cooperation among 30 of its original, predominantly European, member states. Although its precise purpose has been debated since the organization's earliest days, the traditional European view of UNESCO as a clearinghouse for information and center for intellectual cooperation was dominant during the organization's first years of existence. It assumed that UNESCO is a political institution and that as part of a world political system its main purpose is to contribute directly to peace and security.

Today, however, UNESCO is called upon to supplement its efforts to promote intellectual cooperation by the day-to-day operation of technicial assistance projects in more than 90 member nations. Jointly with other agencies within the U.N. system, it is now engaged in an intense struggle against age-old enemies of progress and development—poverty, disease, illiteracy. During the course of these 18 years UNESCO seems to have accepted the philosophy which decrees that men must attain to a measure of well-being before the arts of peace can prosper in their lands.

The nature and magnitude of this shift in relative emphasis—from the promotion of intellectual cooperation to technical assistance operation—is dramatically illustrated by the fact that there is in 1953–54 expenditures of UNESCO's Departments of Education and Natural Sciences, devoted to the promotion of intellectual cooperation, amounted to $3.5 million as against $6.2 million for technical assistance programs, in 1963–64 the balance that exists as between these two functions and the relative growth of each is pictured as: $8.8 million against $38.2 million; or 150 percent proportionate increase for the traditional activity and 510 percent increase for new operational activity during the past 10 years.

There seems to be a general agreement that this change in UNESCO's program and the remarkable expansion of its operational activity are the direct result of the change and growth in UNESCO's membership which has grown from 30 nations in December 1946 to 113 nations in December 1963. The bulk of these new members are the less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. These less-developed nations now constitute a majority and their vote is controlling in the international organizations and UNESCO.

Thus, the emergence of many new nations has increased UNESCO's obligation to serve. These new nations are not merely interested in intellectual cooperation; they demand from UNESCO and other specialized agencies direct and practical services to alleviate their ills of poverty, ill health, and illiteracy and this requires men and money.

With the death of colonialism, large areas and many people found themselves "free' and since the age of jet travel and satellite communications had not yet reached many areas and many peoples of the world, of necessity, nations were organized on almost a local basis.

And what is a nation? According to Webster a nation is: "A people as an organized body politic; an aggregation of people of common origin and language; a race, a tribe." The word "Nation" comes from the Latin "nascor" which means "to be born."

And what is a state? According to Webster a state is: "A political community organized under a distinct government recognized by the people as supreme; a commonwealth; a nation."

Is UNESCO, by virtue of its scientific, cultural, and educational composition and by reason of the outstanding international scholars composing its membership, especially fitted to survey and study the chauvenistic and nationalistic trends—trends which are developing throughout the world and which give rise to an ever-increasing number of small, new, and developing nations?

Is it time to bring consideration of these trends into the open for full, free, and frank discussion and analysis?

Are too many or too few national entities recognized as sovereign nations in the world today? Should there be a population minimum? Should there be an economic or self-Should there be a geographical area minimum? Should there be an economic or self dependence qualification? Should political philosophy determine the recognition of national entities into the international organizations? Should the right of national self-determination be insured and, if so, how or under what conditions? Should lanugage and culture form the basis of affinity? Should affinity be predicated on mutuality of economic interest? Or on education?

Should every province, department, state, county, land district, tribe, clan, and family achieve national status? Should the international organizations strive to effect the creation of more and more national entities by encouragement, or should additional small, new, and underdeveloped areas and peoples be discouraged from seeking independent national status? Should ethnic or religious groups constitute nations unto themselves? Should national existence require polyglot populations? What are the lessons of history in this regard? Should reversion to the old idea of the Greek "city states" be encouraged?

Should voting strength in the international organizations be based on some formula other than "one nation—one vote"?

While on the one hand we witness the surge toward the creation of smaller, newer, and underdeveloped nations, on the other hand we see international movements toward consolidation and area units of nations designed to bring about ultimately one political entity and one nation.

The European Economic Community would be the indicative of this potential development. There is an appreciable current of thought that national boundaries and tariff walls should be broken down. Many nations no longer stamp passports but access between many nations is free and easy. Jet travel and satellite communications have in truth succeeded cart travel and messenger communications. The world is shrinking. Time and distance are being overcome.

In our own Nation we are conversant with a strong feeling that there are too many counties and geographical units of government and that county and city governments should be consolidated. The editor of one of our largest magazines recently requested me to write a piece to the effect that the States of the Union are antiquated, obsolete, and useless governmental appendages. While I declined to do the article, the fact that I was asked to do it is indicative of the feeling that numerous governments and the expense of small units of government are being seriously questioned.

And basically we must keep in mind that the entire purpose of the U.N. and the international organizations which function under it was to insure and maintain peace through-

out the world. How do these trends—the creation of many more new, small nations and the trend to consolidate and unify the older, more established nations—affect the potentiality of achieving and maintaining peace in the world?

These are provocative questions and require difficult answers and solutions. Forthright findings and conclusions, general and specific, might eventuate from a study of these problems by UNESCO.

It is not enough to merely deal with situations which exist in the world today but, logically, efforts should be made to establish an international viewpoint as to the encouragement or discouragement of additional new and smaller nations. When once they are created and come upon the world stage, they are accepted and dealt with as sovereign entities of the people whose nations they are.

CONCLUSIONS

From its study, your committee concludes that:

1. The American people should acquire a greater degree of understanding of the newly developed capacity of United Nations organizations to contribute significantly to world peace.

2. The problems connected with the recent growth of the U.N. system require continuing examination for the purpose of constructing solutions compatible with the traditions and interests of the United States and many other nations committed to peaceful conduct of world affairs.

3. On the problem of the creation and recognition of an ever-increasing number of new and small nations and their impact upon the furtherance of world peace, a UNESCO study should be undertaken.

4. On the particular problem of recruitment of Americans for service with UNESCO and the other international organizations, intensive effort across a wide spectrum of activity is urgently needed.

It is true that many Americans have served UNESCO well and have experienced great personal satisfaction in doing so. Nevertheless, in order that the United States can discharge effectively its responsibility for making available highly qualified personnel, this committee believes that considerable action is still needed to increase the flow of Americans toward UNESCO.

In the report, "Staffing International Organizations," appear a variety of recommendations pertinent to all international organizations of which the United States is a member. Your committee endorses those proposals and recommends them for National Commission endorsement as the first of a set of recommendations set forth below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the National Commission by formal resolution (a) again strongly enorse the Advisory Committee Report, issued in April 1963, (b) urge the Department to carry out the recommendations contained therein on a priority basis, including the provision of adequate staff and travel resources, and (c) request the Department to assign at least two officers to the task of recruiting candidates for UNESCO positions.

2. That the National Commission intensify its total effort to improve the UNESCO "image" in the United States. Recruitment will be facilitated as the Commission makes progress in this general effort.

3. That the National Commission direct special attention to developing a closer relationship with American academic institutions, which constitute a primary source of personnel for service in the educational, scientific, and cultural fields of interest to UNESCO.

4. That the National Commission encourage its associated national organizations to lend all feasible support to improvement of the recruitment situation through their publications, annual conferences, and other appropriate programs.

5. That the National Commission urge the Department of State to assign to its Permanent Delegation to UNESCO a qualified officer whose principal duty will be personnel matters.

6. That the National Commission urge the Department of State and other appropriate Government agencies to make greater use of existing statutory authority (Public Law 85-795) under which Federal employees may serve with UNESCO for a period of years, while retaining reemployment rights and other benefits connected with U.S. Government service. An important adjunct of this practice is a willingness of Federal agencies to provide suitable positions for such personnel on their return from UNESCO.

7. That National Commission members assume a personal obligation to promote wide recognition of the fact that a period of service with UNESCO can contribute to the career development of the individual, to the advantage of both the individual and his employer.

8. That National Commission members capitalize on their positions of influence to encourage appropriate educational institutions, foundations, State and local governments, research bodies, labor organizations and industries to establish policy releasing able employees for UNESCO service on a leave without pay basis that will assure reemployment, count such service for retirement purposes, and continue other fringe benefits where they exist, such as health insurance or the accumulation of sick leave.

9. That the National Commission's Executive Committee arrange to review the forthcoming study on administrative procedures in UNESCO for the purpose of identifying any ways in which the Commission might further assist in improving the recruitment situation.

10. That the National Commission give serious consideration to the possibility of developing a nongovernmental mechanism which might serve in special cases to augment the income of Americans serving in UNESCO, in ways which would not conflict with UNESCO personnel regulations.

11. That Commission members who visit UNESCO Headquarters undertake to discuss employment opportunities with appropriate UNESCO officials for the purpose of identifying on the one hand the career advantages to Americans through service with UNESCO and on the other hand the skills Americans can bring to particular UNESCO programs.

12. That the National Commission arrange to review the staffing situation in UNESCO annually until it is satisfied that our national responsibility in this regard is being fulfilled.

13. That the U.S. National Commission submit appropriate recommendations to the next formal meeting of UNESCO in Paris in the fall of 1964 to the effect that a study be made by UNESCO as to the desirability of encouraging or discouraging the creation and recognition of additional new and small nations and the impact and relation of such encouragement or discouragement to the attainment and maintenance of world peace.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Arthur Hoppe was a visitor to Washington and wrote three columns which I am sure will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They were published in the San Francisco Chronicle on April 5, 7, and 9 of this year. Also included is a column published in the Chronicle on April 17 which refers to our former colleague, now Mayor Shelley of San Francisco.

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 5, 1964]

THE WHITE HOUSE ISN'T BRILLIANT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Well, so much for President Johnson's vaunted economizing around the White House. A lot of talk, that's what it is. For I strolled by there the other evening and it turns out he leaves the porch light on. All night.

No, there's no question about it. There's the White House, dimly perceivable through the trees, a vague, hulking, dark blob, a sight to stir the hearts of us taxpayers. Not a chink of light escapes to mar the gloom. (Except for a faint, fluttering glow from a basement window, which I assume is merely some disobedient menial trying to read in bed with a candle.)

But there, hanging over the front entrance for all the world to see, is the porch light. Shining away as though electricity grew on trees.

Now it might be all right if Mr. Johnson had left the porch light on by accident. He could get up in the morning and switch it off with only that little twinge of guilt you feel when you discover you've accidentally forgotten the darned thing. But I have it on the excellent authority of an unimpeachable insomniac that the porch light burns all night. Every night.

So this is no oversight, fellow taxpayers. It is cool, calculated extravagance. And what I want to know is, how can Mr. Johnson possibly justify it?

We all know when leaving the porch light on is justified. It's perfectly proper, for instance, if you are expecting callers. Will Mr. Johnson contend, I wonder, that he is merely expecting callers? At 4 o'clock in the morning? I doubt it.

And it is also reasonable to leave the porch light on if you are waiting up for some member of the family. Perhaps he will say that Miss Linda Bird or Miss Luci was out on a date. Or Mrs. Johnson was at the PTA and he * * * All night? Every night? I trust we need explore this explanation no further.

No; there is clearly only one plausible motive behind Mr. Johnson's appalling profligacy: misguided patriotism. He obviously feels he must leave the porch light on as a symbol—as a symbol to the thousands of tourists who pass by each night and somewhere in that darkness their national shrine still stands. Somewhere.

A worthy motive. But fraught with danger for Mr. Johnson's whole economy program. If we can leave the porch light on at the White House, people will ask, Why can't we go on lighting up the Washington Monument, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, and the Statue of Liberty at nights? And there goes another possible economy.

Worse, people will start talking about how the White House used to look—like a fairy wedding cake, gleaming in the dark. And they may even demand Mr. Johnson turn the outdoor floodlights back on. Well, you can imagine the pretty penny that would cost.

No, if he wishes to prove his sincerity, he must turn out that porch light. No halfway measures. Let's make our national shrine a perfect black blob, a shining example of pennypinching to us all.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 7, 1964]

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ALL GOOD CATERERS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Ah, there's nothing that brings a lump to your throat like seeing a forgotten has-been, game to the last, stage a smashing comeback. I mean, of course, Perle Mesta.

You remember Mrs. Mesta. For three decades she reigned as the "Hostess With the Mostest." Mainly because she happened to be an ardent admirer of Mr. Roosevelt in the 1930's, Mr. Truman in the 1940's and Mr. Eisenhower in the 1950's. Unfortunately, she decided in 1960 to become an ardent admirer of Mr. Nixon. And consequently for the past 3 years the only way she could get in the White House was on the 50-cent tour.

But now all is changed. For it turns out Mrs. Mesta has always been an ardent admirer of Mr. Lyndon Johnson. He's been high on her guest lists for years. So naturally she's the No. 1 hostess again. And I say it's a tribute to her grit, her determination, and her caterer.

For, as you know, all Washington parties are catered. But the system is obviously somewhat different than elsewhere. In the event you are considering becoming a Washington hostess, allow me to describe how I think it works.

Scene: A penthouse in Chevy Chase. Mrs. Erstwile McDoo, the bride of a freshman oil lobbyist, is conferring with Dr. Elmo Trott, Ph. D., director of Trott's Complete Party Service.

Mrs. McDoo. I'm so glad you came, Doctor. It's my first Washington party and I'm terribly nervous. Now, to start things off I was thinking of having——

Dr. TROTT. Senator HUMPHREY; He's a must. I would avoid Robert Kennedy. Too risky. Our latest opinion samplings and White House leaks clearly indicate it would be advisable to support the Senator for the Vice-Presidency at this time. But not too firmly.

Mrs. McDoo. The Vice-Presidency? No, I meant——

Dr. TROTT. Ah, yes, the future Secretary of State. Very astute, Mrs. McDoo. You do have the makings of a good hostess. Frankly, we are still predicting Senator FULBRIGHT, but we urge caution. That is, seat him on your left, at least two places down.

Mrs. McDoo. Yes, but——

Dr. TROTT. Exactly. You will need a few conservatives to strike a balance. We will check our exhaustive precinct lists and select a half dozen who show the most promise in the coming elections. And, of course, you will want the five businessmen, four labor leaders, and three Negroes. There now, that should do it.

Mrs. McDoo. But, Doctor, what I wanted to know is what hors d'oeuvres to have.

Dr. TROTT (yawning). Oh, I suppose the traditional: Boiled Kleenex on fried waxed paper.

Mrs. McDoo. Oh, I couldn't serve that to my friends.

Dr. TROTT (shocked). Friends? You don't mean you wish to ask some personal friends?

Mrs. McDoo (timidly). Just a few. Please?

Dr. TROTT (with dignity). I am afraid I must withdraw my services. We cannot afford to be associated with any losers. And you, Mrs. McDoo, will never become a successful Washington hostess. Not if you insist on inviting friends to a party.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 9, 1964]

THE GAYEST TRIBE IN WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I wouldn't want you to think for a moment that my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands," is to be merely a grisly compilation of macabre rites. No, there will also be a chapter on the gayest of the many indigenous tribes—the State Department.

These unspoiled natives dwell in isolated happiness in an area known as "Foggy Bottom." There, gifted by bounteous appropriations, they have evolved an idyllic culture, similar in many respects to that of the Tutuamotu Archipelago where breadfruit grows on trees.

The natives in Foggy Bottom can be distinguished from members of the other local tribes by their uniforms—a vertically striped shirt, a diagonally striped tie and handmade shoes. Each also invariably carries the tribal staff: a stick some 3 feet long wrapped in tightly furled black cloth. Its use is not immediately clear.

While the other tribes rush to and fro battling each other, the Foggy Bottomers blissfully while away their days in paper passing, the object being to see which native can get his desk clear first. Although this simple, primitive game serves no useful purpose, the natives vie joyously at it and those who excel are selected as the tribal leaders.

All that mars this otherwise utopian environment is the attitude of the other tribes, which is distinctly hostile. The Solons and the Pentagoners, in particular, despise the Foggy Bottomers, referring to them as "fuzzy thinkers" and whispering that many have "softoncommunism," which, from the evidence, appears to be a dread endemic social disease.

As a consequence of being shunned, the Foggy Bottomers have turned inward on themselves, creating a secretive, inbred society, marked by acute xenophobia.

They stamp the papers they harmlessly pass among each other with cryptic symbols, warning outsiders that to gaze on them entails a horrible punishment. They communicate among themselves in mystic phrases, such as "counterproductive implementization." And when startled by a direct question of any kind, they immediately engage in fingertip tapping.

This curious gesture consists of the native's placing his elbows on his desk and tapping the fingertips of both hands together directly in front of his lips. As it is accompanied by complete silence, the ritual is believed to be some form of prayer—obviously a prayer that both question and questioner will somehow vanish.

Despite this ingrained fear and mistrust of strangers, the Foggy Bottomers are at heart a simple, peace-loving folk. And I feel we should treat them as gently as possible in hopes that some day they may emerge hesitantly from their protective shell. And make contact with the outside world.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that they're awfully happy just the way they are.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronical, Apr. 17, 1964]

MOTHERHOOD GETS YOU IN TROUBLE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Politics have sure changed. Our mayor, Mr. Shelley, comes out foursquare for motherhood, a growing city and generations yet unborn. And what happens? The roof falls in.

I'm speaking, of course, of Mr. Shelley's lopping $10,000 out of the budget for birth control—a clear stand for more motherhood. And yet people are outraged. They note that Mr. Shelley is a Catholic. And his more vocal critics are going all over town accusing him, right out in public, of having religious convictions.

Naturally, Mr. Shelley has hotly denied this. And I'm on his side. Let's be fair. His decision, I'm convinced, was purely political.

It seems obvious. The $10,000 would have been spent to teach poor people how to practice birth control. And the more poor people learn birth control, the fewer poor people will be born. And as the poor generally vote Democratic, the fewer Democrats there will be. Yet Mr. Shelley's critics expect him to appropriate $10,000 to reduce his own party's strength? Nonsense.

But I say Mr. Shelley should put aside these purely partisan considerations and restore the $10,000 to the budget. For, frankly, I think we've got enough poor people as it is. Like every good American I love poor people. I really do. It's just that I love rich people more.

And the whole trouble with birth control as it's now practiced in this country is that it's primarily practiced by the rich. It isn't only that the rich have more leisure time to practice, it's that they have the education to master the instructions and the money to purchase the equipment. Indeed, with the energy they devote to practicing, it's a wonder we've got any rich people left at all.

And it's no wonder we've got so many poor people. Here are the rich, studying and spending and practicing in a supreme effort to wipe themselves out. And there are the poor, bumbling along, unskilled, amateurish, accident-prone. Obviously, the day is fast approaching when we'll be nothing but a nation of poor people.

So I'm forming the National Committee To Make Birth Control a Poor People's Sport. Unarguably, they deserve an equal opportunity to wipe themselves out. And with encouragement, I'm sure they'll find practicing birth control as enjoyable, say, as bowling or frog spearing.

At the same time, the committee hopes to encourage rich people to take up some other leisure skill. A return to croquet, perhaps, or lawn tennis. With luck we'll reverse the whole trend and have nothing but a nation of rich people. Which proves that birth control can solve our economic problems if practiced by the right sort.

So from a political standpoint, Mr. Shelley's dead right. But from an economic standpoint, he's dead wrong. And it's a good thing he didn't louse everything up by acting out of religious convictions. But, after all, who really expects our political leaders to have any of those these days?

What Should the Transport Industry Do To Help Initiate Their Early Use of Atomic Power on the Road?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have inserted articles into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, written by my constituent, Mr. Ronn Warrington, a consulting engineer. Mr. Warrington is a strong advocate of an atomic-powered transport system.

I am sure that this third article which has been published by Shipper 'N Carrier, will be of interest to my colleagues:

WHAT SHOULD THE TRANSPORT TRUCKING INDUSTRY DO TO HELP INITIATE THEIR EARLY USE OF ATOMIC POWER ON THE ROAD?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—R. J. Warrington, a consulting engineer, now dividing his time between California and Michigan, says: "I see a need for certain cooperative action between the manufacturers of, and large users of, tractors and trailers, to the end that a more reliable and readily available fuel supply

would be effected, and we then should have some control over the source, particularly in times of national stress. 'Control' is a normal bonded warehouse operation. Also needed is the development of a noiseless, gasless, and ample source of power with a terrific improvement in tractor performance on the highway. See the last paragraph in the following article for the form of organization needed to promote such a project." In our two previous articles by the author, Ronn Warrington, in regard to atomic transport forecasts, we have been made acutely aware of the probability that fuel may not always be available to our multibillion-dollar equipment investment as it is used to conduct the business of hauling the raw materials of the country to where they are needed and the finished goods, partially or completely processed, to where they are used. Can you conceive some of the problems which may be initiated into your area if, overnight, a series of incendiary bullets were to blow up the gas and oil tanks in that given region or even on a national scale? Would you be willing to go on fuel rationing? How would a repetition be prevented in case the tanks could be rebuilt and refilled? Nor can we think of any good reason for continuing with the present-day concept of reciprocating motors if better power can be made available. We understand that with the advent of sealed high-voltage motors (2,000 to 4,160 volts) and series-power designs in the axles of both the tractors and trailers, a 29- to 48-ton load should run up a 7-percent grade about as fast as on the level. Our transport industry would like to eliminate the need for cars passing trucks on hills, be it up or down grade; both in the interest of reducing accidents and shortening the time on the road for the rigs and the drivers.)

Possibly the initial use of nuclear-powered land vehicles should be on a modern transcontinental transport highway. This might be a roadway for rubber wheels, or a railway for steel wheels having the necessary resiliency designed into the track bed or possibly the rolling stock. Its route must be fairly straight and well isolated from cities, since we don't have store-door service in mind for this equipment. The tread gage (center distance of wheels) should be not less than 10¼ feet wide and gages up to 11¾ feet wide should be considered as required for safety and capacity. Permitted loads could be up to 70 tons per trailer and the new highways ballasted accordingly. A tractor and semi could haul one or two trailers on a transport highway properly designed and constructed. We are more in need of this type of transcontinental highway than we are in need of a new isthmus canal in Central America. Nuclear power can be made to pull this rig. Magnetic and disc brakes with fail-safe features are ready and waiting. Why then are we still holding to the same track gages we used at the time of President Lincoln? The Conestoga wagon was safer than our 5-ton dump trucks in making a turn on a grade. During the last 100 years our equipment has worn out many times but we always replace with and for, obsolete highways and/or railways.

We are now asking the States for 8½-foot-wide bodies for 1965. Are we hopeful this will give us some relief? This is too little and too late, but as long as we are restricted to this dimension in piggyback service on the railroads, it doesn't make much difference what we think or say. Our railroad gages are just outdated for modern use and have a tremendously bad effect on the design of "equipment which should benefit the trucking and transport industries."

Now then: let's consider the benefits to be derived by our country if a two-lane, super heavyweight, all-weather, all transport highway from Texas (on the gulf) to California (probably Wilmington harbor area) were to be built. It would be designed and ballasted for say a 10¾-foot gage tread, 10- by 24-inch wheels and 14.00 rubber, double axles and double wheels. We wouldn't need more than one wide lane in each direction on this projected transportway because the stops are limited and the speeds are fairly uniform. The project might indeed be interesting to the military services in the event they chose to move some heavy equipment across the continent and wouldn't risk the Panama water route. Our space program needs this transportway now. Whether it be rail or road, we need this Texas to California route—now. Its use would be restricted to heavy rigs with approved power units and would later be extended to Georgia in the East and Washington State in the North with facilities for the Bay of San Francisco. The handwriting is on the wall for all to see, but the industry must initiate the action to bring about the required research and design of nuclear-powered tractors and the new concept of axle-powered trailers with adequate volume and weight capacities, including mechanical loading and unloading devices which do not now seem profitable in the limited size equipment conforming to the law-strangled standards which must be met on the basis of our present day roadbeds. Let's get this transportway built soon. Write your Senator. Write your Congressman.

The second major discourse in this article relates primarily to the processing and storage of nuclear fuels. Over 99 percent of the fuel in a fast breeder reactor will probably be U^{238}, an unfissionable atom. We want to convert this to U^{235} or Plutonium Pu^{239} (they are about equal in values) by using it in our long-distance tractors, as fuel, hauling heavy loads, on the transportway. After the necessary 3 percent burnup the fuel core should be taken from the truck powerplant and stored or processed as required by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, "AEC." Because of the high value of the product and the integrity of the bonded warehouseman, I think the principle herewith submitted merits serious consideration by Government and privately interested corporations. Remember this: When you store 1 pound of uranium you have the makings of 3 million kilowatt-hours of electric power. When you store 1 pound of coal you have 1¼ kilowatt-hours. Thus considered, we should have an auditable stock of peacetime holdings of nuclear fuels, well distributed and readily available by acceptable methods into authorized carriers.

Moreover, in the processing of 233, 234, 235, 238 or 239 by the electric power companies or others who have reactors in operation, there is an AEC requirement for special shields and containers which confine the radiation and heat in the spent fuel and various nuclear components which are being transferred to a remote plant for processing. This is usually a considerable distance but is necessary to recover the richer fuels which are now more valuable than when criticality started the fuel pile with the lower cost uranium. Now it goes without saying, that our transport trucking industry is now, has been, and always will be the prime mover for the many fuel cores and other components which have to travel at times a thousand miles or more. As far as I know, we haven't had a single radiation injury on any truckline, and won't have one, with average attention to details. There are many new methods of shielding being tried for shipping containers but in the final analysis the best method can best be designed into the tractor chassis and the matter of direct loading of new and spent fuel cores can always be done underground in a sealed building with proper integrity and security. This should save a lot of money which now goes for boxing these fuel cores with walls, floor and ceiling of lead, good heavy lead, 11 inches thick, and artifically cooled for some periods. Then too, the box occupies load space and weight, whereas if it were properly applied to the power unit in the tractor, it would provide the fuel required to make the trip as well as haul a payload too. So at present, we use oil and gas and load space very unprofitably. How can we make any money and reduce taxes if we don't get into peaceful nuclear power? An additional safety factor to be considered is that the fuel unit handled by the tractor's power unit (instead of in its cargo as at present) will never be exposed until it reposes in its underground, underwater, berth for reprocessing and return to service.

We need the plutonium and other fuels, if we design powerplants to use this clean element. It is manmade and not found anywhere, naturally. The stations for the processing thereof could be spaced from coast to coast, near enough to colleges so that training and orientation for the future fuel station personnel could be effected. We are withholding too much information on the atomic developments from the related scientist, for our own good. All of this activity takes place at a safe level below ground, and would be well distributed throughout the country if fast breeder reactors were to be put to good use in nuclear-powered tractors. Remember, this type of reactor produces a product which is more valuable after its use as fuel, than the original cost of the fuel. Except for processing expenses it would appear that there is a profit on the fuel investment. This is hardly true, however, our industry needs and should have the means of converting the fuel, inasmuch as the shielding can be done more safely in the chasis design that in a separate container which must be loaded, transported, unloaded and handled like freight. A tractor, 11 feet wide, with 10 tires, over 4 feet in diameter and size 14.00 offers a sizable base upon which to design your shield for radiation and cooling. An illustration of a proposed prototype will appear in a future issue. The driver is a specialist in the care and handling of his powerplant and when the fuel core is changed at any given station, the exchange is handled in the safest way possible.

In closing this article I would like to outline briefly, the type of organization which lends itself to the task of perpetuating the interests of the truck manufacturers, the trailer manufacturers, operators and owners of extensive terminal and bonded warehouse facilities, and the many transportation companies in all areas. There is no doubt that in the future there are many potential benefits to be derived from this new field by those who organize efficiently.

Nuclear-Powered Transportation Associates, Inc., is a title that aptly describes the functions and objectives as much as a title can. The organization could be nonprofit operated like the APDA of Detroit, Mich. (Atomic Power Development Association), who did so much of the preliminary work on the Enrico Fermi reactor, a fast breeder, located at Monroe, Mich. More about the work that is ahead of us in a future article, including some outline illustrations of proposed prototypes.

R. J. WARRINGTON.

P.S.—For those who have their doubts about the growth of this nuclear science, I can't resist telling this story of my dad. The year is 1896 and he is in high school and interested in becoming an electrical engineer. After many talks with the school counselor of the times, he decided on steam engineering because it was safer. As explained to him by the many sages of the day: electricity was too dangerous to ever become practical, and besides, it was killing so many birds the authorities would soon make the light companies take the wires down and that will be the end of electricity. Note; after a few years of this, the wires were moved farther apart on the crossarms, so

birds could not touch two wires in roosting thereon. Our problems in nuclear-powered transportation will not be that simple.

The Khrushchev-Johnson Announcements Regarding Reductions in Production of Fissionable Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, before anyone starts dancing in the streets over Mr. Khrushchev's announcement today, they should understand what he said—because he said very little.

He announced construction was being stopped on two plutonium reactors that are not built yet. How many more are building on which he did not stop construction? How many more are being kept on the line pouring plutonium out for Soviet nuclear warheads? By contrast the United States is actually shutting down four large plutonium reactors, admittedly cutting our production by 20 percent. According to Khrushchev's own words, the Soviet Union is reducing its plutonium production by zero percent. No one knows whether or not or by how much it is actually increasing it.

Next, as to production of U^{235}, enriched uranium, another essential material for nuclear weapons. Khrushchev spoke only vaguely in terms of a promised "substantial" reduction to be accomplished "over the next several years." What does he mean by the "next several years?" When does it start? When does it end? What is a "substantial" reduction in his vocabulary?

Speaking today in New York City, President Johnson called the reduction boost from 25 to 40 percent in U.S. production of enriched uranium a "substantial" one; that is, the 15-percent additional cutback from 25 to 40 percent. Is 15 percent, then, what is meant by a "substantial" reduction? If so, Mr. Khrushchev's "substantial" 15-percent reduction is what the United States is getting for Mr. Johnson's "whopping" 40-percent reduction. But even this is not a fair comparison because most people forget that in February 1961 almost one of the late President Kennedy's first acts was to order a 17½-percent cut in enriched uranium production. The total of both Kennedy and Johnson cuts is a staggering 50 percent.

This entire course of events has been a "one rabbit for one horse" deal in which the United States has traded 50 percent of its uranium production for a measely 15 percent of the Soviet's, and by which we have surrendered 20 percent of our plutonium production for no Soviet reduction at all.

This is unilateral disarmament in action. It proves we do not even have to go to a negotiating table to lose our shirts. We can do it by speeches and press releases.

An Economist in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, CLARENCE LONG, is also a noted professor of economics who taught at Johns Hopkins University before being elected to the 88th Congress.

In an article appearing in the April issue of Challenge, a magazine of economic affairs, Dr. LONG has posed the challenging questions of how different might economic legislation be if the Congress were composed of professional economists? How much does an economist's position change after more than a year in the House of Representatives?

I am sure that our colleagues will share my interest in this article and sympathize with Professor LONG who has now joined the ranks of those who must make hard day-to-day decisions not always rooted in the textbook models of the classroom.

The article follows:

AN ECONOMIST IN THE HOUSE

(By Clarence D. Long)

A little over a year ago—after more than two decades as an economist—I took office as Representative from the Second Congressional District of Maryland. During my freshman year, the usual questions were put to me by my academic friends: "What theories have you been able to put into practice?" "Have your ideas changed since you went to Congress?" "How has your year in Congress affected your thinking on such closely related problems as unemployment, economic growth and inflation?"

My initial reaction was gratification that anybody imagined I had had the time to think. In a year in which my Committee on Armed Services met 74 times and my subcommittee 16 times; in which I inspected our bases in Guantanamo Bay, Puerto Rico, Europe, and many parts of the United States; participated in voting on the floor; spoke in favor of fallout shelters and on the need to improve the quality of human resources in order to reduce unemployment and raise incomes; introduced a dozen bills; sent out 200,000 copies of my newsletter; spoke to, or attended, 650 meetings; lectured to 2,500 students visiting the Capitol; kept 900 appointments in my offices; received 10,000 letters and signed 20,000—in such a year, did I really have time for reflection? Sixteen hours a day putting out fires leaves little time for the theory of combustion.

Nevertheless—in the midst of pressure to get a military burial for a combat veteran, to eliminate an official reprimand from the record of an employee who had his arm chewed off in a hamburger grinder, or to get information for a businessman on whether he can legally reproduce the President's seal for business use—I welcome the opportunity to reflect on what my first year in the national legislature has done to the ideas I had formed in teaching and writing on economic questions.

Those familiar with the problems of unemployment, stagnation, and inflation are aware that opinion on their causes and cures divides into two broad schools of thought—the effective demand school and the structural school.

The effective demand school holds that the cause of unsold goods, idle labor, and unused plant capacity is insufficient spending by consumers, business, and government. Lack of spending may be due to not enough income, too much income going to oversavers, insufficient inducement to invest, and taxation which chokes off incentive. With the approval of this school, the Kennedy-Johnson administrations moved to cut the personal income tax, without an equivalent cut in Government outlays, thereby leaving more spendable income to households and businesses. The corporate income tax was also cut in order to increase incentive. These tax cuts, it is held, will reduce unemployment and stimulate economic growth. They will not cause inflation, it is alleged, because the resources called into production will counter increases in demand with increases in supply.

The structural school holds that unemployment is due largely to deficiencies, not in demand, but in the quality of the labor supply. Joblessness is thus concentrated among the young, the old, the unskilled, the Negro, and manual laborer, the worker with a one-use skill, and, above all, the poorly educated or illiterate. This structure of unemployment is by now familiar and well documented. The question arises as to why structural unemployment is a new problem. Haven't there always been workers with these characteristics? Indeed, millions of unskilled, unlettered immigrants were absorbed by the American economy during the last half century before World War I, apparently without creating chronic unemployment. What is new in the current labor market which creates the modern problem of structural unemployment?

This new thing, I have argued, is the social minimum wage which applies mainly to the worker of humble qualifications and which has priced him more or less permanently out of the market. The last 20 years have seen the development of a formidable system of social minimums—statutory minimums, union minimums, unemployment insurance benefits, welfare, generous allowances given by middle-class families to teenage children, and high-wage policies of firms and governments.

Under social and political pressures, these minimums are geared to the average of wages and living standards, and rise with them—indeed, outpace them—with the result that they keep the services of the marginal workers overpriced and unemployed even during periods of high aggregate demand for labor. Further increases in aggregate demand may result in the employment of the overpriced and substandard worker, but only at the expense of still higher prices—and only temporarily, until a new upthrust in the social minimum wage again prices them out of the market.

Since the problem of structural unemployment is thus caused by two factors, the lagging productivity and the overpricing of poor quality labor, the remedy is also twofold: First, raise the productivity of poor quality labor by providing a massive program of education and training, and by eliminating discriminatory job barriers to enable workers to qualify for new opportunities. Second, stop boosting the social minimum which continually prices low-productivity labor out of the market.

This was my diagnosis of the problem before my election. How have this diagnosis and my views concerning sound policy been affected by my service in Congress?

Congressional experience has strengthened my view that the current unemployment problem is largely due, not to inadequate demand, but to the substandard quality of the supply. It has done this in a modest way through my own experience in hiring a full-time staff of eight. The number interviewed and the necessity of replacing several of those originally hired has

reinforced my view that a substantial number of the unabsorbed labor force are of borderline employability. The employers I have talked to do not find this discovery surprising. Even a union leader told me, "Perhaps I shouldn't say this, but our problem nowadays is not so much with the employers as with the workers."

When I sought to employ a Negro secretary, I notified my numerous friends in the Negro communities in Baltimore and Washington (there are few Negroes in my own district) that I wanted a mature, well-educated woman who could type and handle case work. The salary—like all Federal salaries for secretaries—is much higher than that paid by private industry. I expected to be deluged with jobseekers. In actual fact, I received few applications. The employment offices of Howard University and Morgan State College informed me that good secretaries are scarce; any on file would probably be hired by the colleges themselves. I now have three Negro secretaries—more, I believe, than any other white Congressman, and all are quite satisfactory; but I do not have the impression that there are large numbers of well-educated and competent colored girls who cannot get jobs.

The chief insight my year has provided, however, has come from close contact with the unemployed who seek my help. On Saturdays I "ride the circuit"—each week meeting constituents in a different post office in my giant district. Usually the entire post office lobby is full of people waiting to see me. A random call of the roll includes:

A Negro boy, who barely graduated from high school, has been turned down for entrance in a junior college and has just fathered an illegitimate child. He seeks my aid in enlisting in the Army after he received a score of 3 percent on an exam in which the minimum passing grade is 31 percent.

A jobseeker who came to see me in the morning reeking with alcohol and who returned later in the day barely able to speak.

A father who asked me to get his 27-year-old married son's undesirable discharge from the Marines changed to honorable so the son could get a job. Unfortunately, the son's chances were impaired by his having since served 3 years for statutory rape.

A man in his forties—trying to support a family of five on a take-home pay of $218 a month, barely able to feed his family, his wife is mentally ill, the only clothing his children had were "what they were stealing," his teeth badly in need of care—said he "could do anything," but could not name a skill, and stated that, with his family responsibilities, he could not afford to enter the manpower retraining program.

A man unemployed since having been discharged from a steel plant 5 years earlier (with the union's consent) for assaulting his foreman, now taking psychiatric treatment and at the same time participating in the manpower retraining program.

A 45-year-old woman who had resigned several years ago as a bench hand in a large electronics firm just as she was about to be fired for absenteeism, got a job with another firm as a result of my intercession, but is dissatisfied and wants to change her job again.

This experience has impressed upon me that the unemployment problem—even in my relatively high-income district—is a stubborn one. Nearly all the unemployed who come to me for jobs have one or more of the following characteristics: incomplete education (often nearing illiteracy), alcoholism, mental disturbance, prison or bad military conduct records, poor health or physical handicaps.

The older people and the Negroes who come to me are nearly always unemployed because of these handicaps and not primarily because of age or color—although, no doubt, these are complicating factors. I have gotten jobs for many, but of the ones I have been unable to place, I can think of none who does not fall into one or more of the categories of poor motivation, poor education and training, or emotional instability.

If I am correct in my assessment that the unemployment problem is primarily structural, what are the remedies? One of my lessons as an economist in Congress is that the political pressures are too often strongest for those remedies which involve questionable economics: greater subsidies to shipyards than the already high 55 percent; tariffs on imports of steel; a 35-hour workweek with double pay for overtime in order to discourage it; a third layer of subsidy to cotton mills; supports and controls for wheat; increases in the minimum wage; retaining obsolete military bases; accelerating and proliferating public works projects of dubious need.

Such programs are doubtful economics because they involve the production of things not needed or things available cheaper and better elsewhere; measures to prevent people from working, under the pretense of protecting them; or measures to provide jobs for the wrong people at the wrong places at the wrong times.

Such programs impede adjustments that are ultimately needed, impair flexibility, inflate costs and prices, place a burden of lower real incomes upon the general taxpayer, and shift the burden of idleness to workers in other areas or trades perhaps unprotected by unions or unable to perceive how they are being injured.

It is difficult to resist such proposals. For one thing, the arguments in support of them are often persuasive to Congressmen untrained in economics. More important, the businessmen and workers who come to your office to urge them are alive and present, are sincerely hurting, and are demanding immediate relief. The measures asked for promise to give this immediate relief in the workers' and firms' localities, and in their occupations and products. Proposals, however sound, that firms shift to new products and that middle-aged workers with families enroll for instruction in a new trade, take kids out of school, kiss families goodbye and move to new localities—all these sound hollow even to one who prides himself, as I do, on being a free market economist.

Given this conflict of loyalties between good economics on the one hand, and suffering, voting, humans on the other, each Congressman must make his separate peace. The vote he casts will not please everybody, not even himself. Most politicians—including this one—hold firmly to the philosophy that, to be effective, they must stay in office. After all, the difference between a Congressman and the many high-class citizens who somehow never get to Congress, lies in the ability to get elected. Getting elected is a difficult art; those who deprecate it are invited to give it a whirl. Unfortunately, politicians are rarely frank in setting forth the essence of the art. All action in social, economic, and political affairs is a compromise of conflicting principles. When a politician tells an audience he never compromises, he is either kidding the audience or kidding himself.

In my brief tenure I have followed one broad course in trying to vote good economics and at the same time to stay alive in the political jungle. I have become a "service Congressman," ever ready to stimulate local projects and to help with personal problems.

My activities in behalf of local projects have included organizing a mass meeting in support of a bridge across Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties; calling a defense procurement conference; setting up a business desk which has won contracts for radiosondes, rabbits for medical research, paper butter dishes and post office design; inviting and answering inquiries on how to get on bidders' lists and find new markets for products; mailing thousands of books and pamphlets to firms in my district on how to sell to various Government agencies; arranging meetings between Baltimore area industrialists and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in an endeavor to attract a $50 million electronics center to my area; waging a long fight against New York to win a $2.5 million nuclear research reactor for the Aberdeen Proving Ground; taking a keen interest in cleaning up dirty water and air in industrial areas of my district, and bringing in the Public Health Service to study this pollution for the purposes of law enforcement.

In addition to these civil programs, I have done much for individuals in need of help. A family denied social security benefits wrote to me: "An injustice has been done, but we do not know how to cope with the Government—it is too large." My appeal brought them $4,400 in back benefits. I persuaded the Internal Revenue Service to stop dunning an aged and indigent woman for back taxes. I got the State Department to allow a South African girl stranded in Canada to join her fiance in America, and a young Austrian to visit her sister here. My latest triumph was to get a 17-year-old girl out from behind the Iron Curtain to join her family, who had not seen her since she was a baby.

All these efforts have won me a reputation as a hardworking Congressman, who helps people. As a result, my strongest potential opponents have backed away from running against me. I have discovered—or think I have—that most voters are not greatly interested in national legislation. They have problems and needs of their own, and if you help them with these, they allow you great freedom in voting on national legislation. Put it another way, a solid base of popularity with the ordinary voter gives a Congressman sanctuary from pressure groups who want things inimical to the national interest. As a consequence, I can vote solidly for civil rights in a basically southern State with a white constituency drawn increasingly from the Deep South.

Perhaps the least satisfactory aspect of being an economist in Congress is that it is seldom possible to cast a vote which does justice to all the many and subtle considerations that surround any major issue. For example, the tax cut and its effect on unemployment and economic growth are, to me, complicated and many-sided questions. I have grave doubts as to the need for, or the efficacy of, such a cut at a time when important indicators show that we are far from recession conditions. And all the arguments regarding our deficient aggregate demand have still not changed my mind. I voted for the cut because I had to make a choice. I was doubtful that a cut was justified; on the other hand, I was not absolutely certain that it would not help, and I was willing to take a chance on it.

I voted for the tax cut also for party reasons. As a Democrat, I am naturally convinced that my party is closer to the right answers in most matters and that it is important that the opposition not be allowed to hand us a black eye on an important issue. Thus the tax cut became a party, as well as an economic, issue.

There is also the matter of time and energy. Hundreds—nay, thousands—of economic bills came before Congress. While I can analyze and understand any one, or a small number, of such bills, to master all aspects of all such legislation is impossible, in view of the heavy demands to serve my district, receive visitors, speak to and visit in my district, read and answer thousands of letters and phone calls.

I am sometimes bemused by the fact that my vote normally does not differ from that of many of my colleagues who never had a principles of economics course. Unquestionably, economics training is needed in Congress; more Congressmen ought to have it. But isn't there a limit to what an economist can do in Congress when the public which, after all, makes the rules of practical politics, neither knows nor cares much about this intricate subject?

Thus, although my thinking on the causes of unemployment, stagnation and inflation has not been significantly modified by my year in Congress, I have concluded that in politics, pure economics must be heavily laced with pragmatism, and that Congress is no place for a textbook economist.

Cheap Imports Hurt Shoe Industry and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the continued imports of shoes is disconcerting and bewildering. It bears no good portent for our shoe industry.

It probably will continue to increase with ever graver implications.

Of course it should be stopped and stopped now.

How to do it. It is obvious it will not be done effectively by so-called informal agreements, or by hearings before the Tariff Commission which are usually abortive and seldom productive of real relief, as the law now stands.

Before any real relief can come to the shoe industry, impacted, as it is, by steadily mounting, cheaply produced imports, the basic law will have to be changed. That is clear and obvious.

It is idle to talk about "peril points" and "escape clauses" that are never enforced and seldom invoked and flagrantly ignored.

It is all too trusting and but a pious hope, to expect that officials who, in principle, approve the steady, growing flow of imports into this country could be relied upon to check them.

I think it is time for American industry to realize where the remedy lies, if indeed any remedy can be applied in the light of all the current apathy and opposition.

There are many in the Congress willing to help to save our American industrial structure from the devastating effects of low-standard, foreign competition, but until the industries and employees affected make it unmistakably clear to their Representatives in Congress that they are prepared to wage a strong, determined, organized campaign to revise these stultifying laws it is all too much to expect this situation will improve. The fact is it will continue to get much worse.

While changes in Government statistical methods make it difficult to get comparative figures, the foreign trade committee for the shoe manufacturing industry has ascertained that total foreign imports of footwear for 1963 were over 91 million pairs, valued at $108 million and equal to 13 percent of domestic production of leather and rubber-canvas types of footwear.

This situation needs to be corrected and fast. Can we mobilize the leadership and support from American industry and labor to accomplish this desperately needed task?

Statement of American-Israel Public Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week King Hussein, the young King of Jordan, met with the President and other officials in Washington. During his visit King Hussein attacked the democracy of Israel and its supporters in the United States and United States policy in the Middle East. Jordan, a country which has benefited from our foreign aid program, should be willing to live at peace with its neighbor, another recipient of our aid. In light of the King's statements the U.S. Government should reevaluate its policy toward Jordan. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the following statement which was issued by the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee on April 16, 1964.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN OF ROCHESTER, N.Y., CHAIRMAN, AND I. L. KENEN OF WASHINGTON, D.C., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

For many years, American Jews have been strongly supporting American aid to Jordan and other Arab States because they believed that it was right to help raise living standards in the Near East, because they hoped that it might help to promote peace and because they believed that it was in the best interests of the United States.

This work has been carried on since 1954 under the auspices of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, an action committee which consists of Zionists and non-Zionists.

During this period Jordan has received more than $450 million in economic and military aid from the American people, in addition to about $150 million, which has come from the American taxpayers, through UNRWA, to care for the Arab refugees in Jordan. This is one of the highest, if not the highest, per capita economic aid programs in the world.

We deplore that King Hussein has abused the hospitality of the United States, while here as a guest of the President, to malign the Zionist movement, to insult the great majority of the American Jewish community who strongly support Israel, to misrepresent the facts about Israel, and to distort the objectives of U.S. policy.

The facts are that Israel accepted the U.N. partition resolution in 1947; the Arabs went to war against it. Israel wants peace; the Arabs have rejected it and continue until this day to refuse negotiations with Israel, despite the mandate of the U.N. Charter. The truth is that Israel has sought cooperation in water development. Israel accepted the Eric Johnston regional water development plan. The Arabs rejected it, even though it assured them of all the water they needed.

It comes with poor grace for King Hussein to attack the United States for supporting Israel's water development when he has received large-scale economic aid from the United States to finance his own. Both water developments are highly constructive and completely consistent with the original Johnston plan.

Furthermore, the American people will not take kindly to King Hussein's veiled threats to go to the Soviet Union if he does not receive all the economic and military assistance that he seeks.

King Hussein apparently has learned the Nasser technique of trying to play both sides. Indeed, he seems to be speaking here with two voices—one as the head of his Government and one as the voice of the myth-makers of Cairo, who will go to all lengths to rewrite history, to smear Zionism and to destroy the hopes for peace and cooperation in the Near East.

In view of the belligerent attitude adopted at the recent Cairo conference, we have a right to inquire as to the purposes for which Hussein seeks additional aid. Is it to enable him to make a contribution to the Arab joint military command which is preparing a new attack against Israel? Is it to enable him to join in the fantastic spite project to deprive Israel of her rightful water supply? These questions need to be answered.

In the light of these questions our committee will undertake a full review of the U.S. aid program in the Near East at its national policy conference, which will be held in Washington May 3 and 4.

Minneapolis Survey Results: For Medicare, 67 percent; for Civil Rights, 75 Percent; for United Nations, 86 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the response to a questionnaire I sent to my constituents in Minneapolis and want to share the results of this informal mail survey with the other Members of the House.

The questionnaire covered nine topics: Civil rights, the tax cut and economic growth, foreign aid, Federal aid to education, care for the elderly, the United Nations, unemployment insurance, Cuba, and civil defense, although the last question could not be tabulated because of an error in printing. The questionnaire was part of a newsletter and went to every home in the city of Minneapolis.

UNITED NATIONS STRONGLY SUPPORTED

The most consistently stated opinion—held by those of all political views—was strong support of the United Nations. Eighty-six percent of those answering said that the U.N. has been doing a good

job. The choice checked by this large majority stated:

The United Nations has been doing a good job. Although it has limited power, it has helped keep peace in the Middle East and the Congo without involving American troops. Its specialized agencies have helped many new nations. We must keep building the U.N. and encourage more nations to bring their problems to it.

MINNEAPOLIS RESIDENTS FAVOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Strong support was also stated for Federal civil rights legislation, though many added comments that they wished laws did not have to be passed because all persons are equal and naturally deserve equal rights. Seventy-five percent of those answering the question said that "Congress should make laws to curb discrimination." These included 85 percent of the Democratic-farmer-labor voters. 74 percent of the independents, and 54 percent of the Republicans. Thirteen percent of those answering thought State legislatures should make the civil rights laws.

Minnesota has had a tradition favoring civil rights. I think this reflects the strong position our churches have taken on this issue. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders have worked together for many years.

I am proud to report to my constituents that I worked and voted for the civil rights bill and am proud that it is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minneapolis who is now floor leader for the bill in the U.S. Senate.

MEDICARE WIDELY ENDORSED

In reply to a question on medical care for the elderly, 67 percent were in favor of hospital care under social security. This was supported by 92 percent of the Democratic-farmer-labor, 80 percent of the independent, and 22 percent of the Republican voters.

Minneapolis has many senior citizens and a high standard of medical care. But this care is costly and the fear of large hospital bills wiping out savings reserves or taking big bites from small pension checks is very real. This subject drew more comments than any other single subject.

TAX CUT SUPPORTED

Almost as many added notes favoring greater economy and efficiency in government. Virtually everyone favored the tax cut. Forty-eight percent were in favor without qualification, because "Though we may have a deficit in our Federal budget, we will eventually get more tax money as the economy grows." Almost all others replying favored a tax cut only with reduced Federal expenditures in the same amount.

FOREIGN AID GETS A MAJORITY VOTE

More than half of those replying like strong foreign aid programs. Three in ten, however, said they think it time to cut back sharply, that foreign aid has been a failure. About 1 in 10 wrote comments on the programs—usually that although foreign aid is good it may not have been wisely planned and administered.

MINNESOTANS CONCERNED ABOUT EDUCATION

Federal aid to education is needed on a broad scale, about 48 percent of the respondents think. Thirty-one believe that "limited Federal aid is justified"; and 18 percent want no Federal aid.

Minnesota has a strong tradition of public education. It has an excellent university, an expanding system of State colleges, and superior private colleges.

I was interested that many, many people commented on the problems of education. They were concerned about dropouts and the necessity for young people to have training in order to find jobs.

I am proud that I am a Member of the 88th Congress, which has adopted the strongest series of education bills in history. I believe, like many others, that the local school districts and States have carried far more than their share of the burden of education. It is time our Federal Government began bearing its share of the responsibility.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—FEDERAL STANDARDS

In January 1964, unemployment in the Minneapolis metropolitan area stood at close to 31,000. In considering unemployment insurance standards, 53 percent of those answering the question would like Federal standards, and 39 percent favor State standards. Others stated no opinion.

CUBA

Although they dislike the existence of a Communist regime in Cuba, 47 percent of those who replied feel the real Communist threat is in the U.S.S.R. and China. Another 22 percent think that reestablishing better relations with Cuba might be worthwhile. Twenty-six percent want stronger action against Cuba.

CITIZENS LIKE QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. Speaker, I further report that many of our citizens indicate that; they like the idea of questionnaires. They are concerned with telling their Congressman what they think. Many asked specific questions about bills before Congress.

Written comments generally indicated an alert, well-informed public. I found the views expressed very useful and important.

In short, the survey; was a stimulating and informative project. I trust my colleagues in the House will think these results interesting and significant.

Israel's 16th Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the State of Israel on the 16th anniversary of her independence. Of all the nations which have gained their independence in recent years, Israel stands as a model of what freemen can do to shape their future.

There is no question that this small nation has achieved remarkable success since the State of Israel was established. The people have forged a modern democratic society from what was once a virtual wasteland. This young nation now boasts modern cities, full employment, and a unified people. She has developed industry, built schools, hospitals, and scientific institutions. It has been a great struggle which required great sacrifice on the part of the people and they are deserving of our highest commendation, for their accomplishments.

It is also important to note that Israel has not concentrated all her energies within her own borders, but has extended a helping hand to other developing nations. Israeli technicians and advisers are working in about 50 other countries to give them the benefit of her experience and practices which have been tested and proved fruitful.

But Israel has not only helped other countries to develop; she has also opened her doors wide to people of other races and religions. As a result her population has tripled since she became an independent nation. These immigrants have been trained in new skills so that they can become self-supporting and self-respecting citizens. Israel has proven to the world that members of the Catholic faith, Greek orthodox, Russian orthodox, Armenian, Ethiopian, Maronite, Coptic, the Anglican Church, the Lutheran Church, Baptists, and other Protestant groups can live together in peace and harmony, helping one another. From the progress that has already been made, Israel's ultimate goals of full civic integration and equality of citizenship seem assured.

Today, modern Israel is the best friend the United States has in the Middle East and we must not overlook its importance in this strategic area. It is an outpost of the free world and gives evidence for all to see that democracy and freedom can flourish and grow amid hostile surroundings. But we cannot forget that Israel faces the constant threat of war from the Arab countries and is harassed by boycotts, blockades, by hate propaganda, and a dangerous arms buildup.

This 16th anniversary seems an appropriate time for the United States to renew its commitment to do everything within our power to maintain peace in Israel and to make our position unmistakably clear to any aggressor. For only if peace is maintained can Israel continue to grow and prosper as a democratic nation.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to the people of Israel on this anniversary for a job well done, and very best wishes for continued success in their endeavors.

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been made aware of a short essay written by one of my con-

stitutents, Peter Mikuliak, on the subject of our American heritage. Mr. Mikuliak attempts to appraise exactly what has made America what it is, and just what virtues are necessary to produce an even greater civilization. This essay was awarded the Good Citizenship prize by the Broward County Council of the Parent-Teacher's Association.

I include this article, showing our young citizen's interest in our American heritage, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The article follows:

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Peter Mikuliak, Junior College of Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.)

In a consideration of the concept of the American heritage, the fundamental problem is how to assess the several factors involved in its outward appearance, to use these as a guide to the essentials, and to maintain a proper perspective of the relationship of the parts to the whole in order to chart a suitable course of action.

The areas of social action, political involvement, economic responsibility and military duty are all necessary and important factors of the American heritage. Yet one must not be misled by superficialities. A fifth factor must be introduced which encompasses the four mentioned above, molding them into a unified whole. This fifth factor, this essence of the American heritage, rooted in the basic value system of our civilization, lies in the ideological realm.

An appraisal of the value system of contemporary American civilization must contain three separate points: (1) the traditional American heritage; (2) the current situation and the relationship of what "is" to what "ought to be"; and (3) action to be taken by the individual. Our Greek and Anglo-Saxon heritage has given us a concept of government based upon written law, not despotic rule, with its blessing and curse contained in the basic unit; the individual. But while our current situation may indicate a trend toward standardization—of thought, achievement, and morality, virtuous citizenship demands and requires within the scope of its value system: disinterested, unselfish individualism; creative nonconformity; transcendent faith and the existence of both absolute and relative values. These principles, combined with the special factor of militancy, will not only uphold the American way of life, but will also produce a greater civilization.

An Analysis of the Republican Housing Proposals

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in order to assist my colleagues in their deliberations on the future course of the Federal urban renewal and housing programs, I am including at this time an analysis of H.R. 9771, and companion measures, introduced by Republican Members on the House Special Housing Subcommittee, January 28, 1964.

The analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD REHABILITATION ACT OF 1964 BY SENATOR TOWER

TITLE I. LOW-RENT HOUSING IN PRIVATE ACCOMMODATIONS

Sections 101–102: Provide annual contributions to provide direct assistant to supplement rents paid by low-income families. Units would be existing housing leased by local authority but operated and managed by private owners. Rent assistance is provided for 30,000 units.

TITLE II. COMPENSATION OF CONDEMNEES

Sections 201–202, declaration of policy: Enunciates declaration of policy of just compensation with the aim of compensating owners of land and their tenants as fully as possible for losses suffered by reason of federally assisted condemnation under any housing or urban renewal statute.

Section 203, assurance of compensation: Extends assistance to tenant by assuring him of supplementary payment over and above compensation to owner.

Section 204, compensation: Establishes formula for compensation of tenant equal to actual value of interest or to the net diminution in actual value of the interest taken or damaged. Actual value will be determined by replacement cost of interest. Owners and tenants will be allowed reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in securing such compensation.

Section 205, payments before eviction: When condemning authority has knowledge that property is to be taken or damaged, authority must make advance payment of 90 percent of estimated amount of compensation not later than 15 days after notice of taking parcel or adjoining parcel.

Section 206, actual value: Defines actual value of fee property as the greatest amount a prospective purchaser would have offered for the interest had it been offered for sale on the date of taking.

Actual value of a tenant's interest in a leasehold is the greatest amount that would be offered to purchase the tenant's interest by a prospective assignee willing to assume the obligations of the lease.

Section 207, replacement cost: Defines replacement cost to include moving expenses, costs of advertising and special promotions incidental to reopening a business, and attorney's fees, commissions, and other costs incidental to acquiring new property.

Section 208, taking and damage defined: Defines "damage" as the consequences of the exercise of eminent domain or zoning resulting in a net diminution of the actual value of the parcel, and if the parcel is adjacent to a parcel taken in the course of a redevelopment program.

Sections 209–210: Technical provisions.

Section 211, application: Makes title effective only for contract executed after enactment, and for public housing and urban renewal for which there has been submitted a plan after enactment.

TITLE III. URBAN RENEWAL

Section 301(a) prohibits assistance for demolition and removal of buildings if objectives of renewal could be achieved by rehabilitation.

(b) Rehabilitation loans: Provides rehabilitation loan program to owners and tenants in an urban renewal area; residences or businesses, owner or tenant must establish that they are unable to obtain rehabilitation financing from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms. Terms: 15 years or three-fourths of remaining economic life, whichever is less; 3-percent interest; up to cost of rehabilitation or $10,000 in case of residential property, or $50,000 in case of business property, whichever is less.

The section establishes $100 million revolving fund with additional $100 million to be made available after July 1, 1964, and July 1, 1965, a total of $300 million.

Section 302, relocation of displacees from urban renewal areas: Requires relocation program for busines concerns, in addition to individuals, displaced by urban renewal. Provides for strict enforcement of relocation program, without regard to race, etc., of displacees, with suspension of further advances or payments as penalty for noncompliance.

Provides that relocation payments be made at time condemnation proceedings are commenced.

Section 303, local responsibilities under urban renewal program:

(a) Adds as an elements of a workable program: "a statement of anticipated zoning changes in the community which would serve to assist displaced business concerns in making arrangements for their relocation."

(b) Requires administration in evaluating workable program to determine "that the locality has adequately identified the goals to be achieved with respect to each element of the workable program and has committed itself to the improvements (with respect to each such element) that will be made during the ensuing year."

(c) Provides for suspension of financial assistance if annual review of workable program finds that locality has not fulfilled its commitments.

(d) Authorizes HHFA assistance to communities in developing self-help programs for community improvements including rehabilitation projects which require no financial assistance as well as self-liquidating redevelopment projects.

(e) As a condition for approval or renewal of a workable program, requires community to initiate and carry out a study of the property assessment system to determine (1) effect of workable program and urban renewal project on property values; and (2) extent to which real estate taxation can be used as incentive to improve properties and a means of financing local urban renewal activities.

(f) Requires community referendum and majority approval before a local public agency can enter into any contract for loan or capital grants.

(g) Declares congressional policy that localities desiring to undertake urban renewal should be encouraged to obtain necessary financing from State and local sources, public and private. Also, gives priority to applicants of urban renewal assistance which permits increases in tax revenues resulting from redevelopment to be pledged for the payment of principal and interest charges on obligations issued for financing project, or which is otherwise found to have taken all possible steps to obtain State or local financing.

Section 304, nonresidential renewal: Terminates grants for nonresidential and nonpublic renewal; substitutes 10-year loans at going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent, up to two-thirds of net project cost. Loans will bear no interest for any period prior to the date on which the land involved is sold or otherwise disposed of by the local public agency for redevelopment.

Section 305(a) requires, insofar as practicable, competitive bidding on real estate acquired for a project.

(b) Preference to local developers.

Section 306, local grants-in-aid: Requires that grant-in-aid credit for streets within urban renewal area consider the ratio that traffic to and from the area bears to the total traffic with no credit being allowed for any portion of a street outside of the area.

(b) Denies grant-in-aid credit to any public body which has received any grant or sub-

sidy from the Federal Government with respect to any demolition, removal, improvement or facility, to the extent of such subsidy or grant, with the exception of Federal contributions to the District of Columbia.

Section 307, definition of local public agency: Redefines local public agency to incide "any public body exercising all of its functions relating to a project as agent for a local government or State."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 401, local approval of low-rent housing sites: Requires local governing body approval of sites for public housing before entering into any contract, including a preliminary loan contract.

Section 402, expenses in connection with private organizations: Prohibits use of any Federal funds for urban renewal or public housing to be used for (1) dues or fees in connection with membership in a private housing or urban renewal or related organization; (2) travel or subsistence in connection with attendance at meetings or conferences of such organizations except where individual is a scheduled speaker or has formal official duties at such meetings or conferences.

Section 403, FNMA purchase of conventional loans: Authorizes FNMA to purchase conventional mortgages of a quality generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors.

East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there is currently a great deal of speculation about the possibilities of the Communists becoming less aggressive as they become more prosperous. Some newspaper commentators have even gone so far as to predict that in the years ahead the United States will find its own interests served by actively assisting Soviet and Communist bloc economic growth and industrialization. This attitude has tended to support the thesis that the United States should welcome economic competition with the Communists, because economic competition is peaceful and therefore unlike political and military competition.

When we welcome affluent Communist nations, we encourage them and enhance their ability to wage subversion and psychological warfare against the free world. When we trade with the Communists as they find themselves in severe economic straits, we help to bail out our avowed enemies. We should keep firmly in mind Khrushchev's own definition of "competition" given just 10 months ago as we allegedly entered the period of detente":

Comrades, when we speak of victory in economic competition, the point in question is not only cement or metal, but policy as well—the power of our ideas, the power of Marxist-Leninist theory, the superiority of the Socialist system over the capitalist system.

The capitalists know the cruel laws of competition: if one form outstrips another, the stronger one swallows the weaker one. The competition of the two systems in the economic field strikes even greater fear into the hearts of the imperialists: they see that the rapid growth of socialism is increasingly shaking the foundations of capitalism, bringing nearer the end of this system, which is doomed by history. (Speech at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, June 21, 1963.)

But regardless of whatever position an individual Congressman or Senator may take on the position of East-West trade, practically everybody is in agreement that the present state of affairs is entirely inadequate and chaotic. What is needed is a clearly articulated policy on the part of the United States on the one hand, and a unified effort to implement and coordinate allied policies on the other. That this need is urgent is underscored in a report released yesterday by the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University, "East-West Trade: Its Strategic Implications," which stresses that "the longer the delay in securing allied unity in trading policies, the more difficult the problem will become. Failure to act, it has been demonstrated, will result in a worsening of the problem and consequent disarray in the alliance."

This report, written by two specialists in international politics, Samuel F. Clabaugh and Richard V. Allen, not only analyzes the strategic implications of trading with the Communist nations, but also presents a complete picture of the action Congress has taken on the subject during the years 1959–63.

The Director of the Center for Strategic Studies, Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, points out in his introduction to the report that it is designed to assist Congressmen and public policymakers. If the Congress is to fulfill its obligation of actively formulating and shaping the attitudes of this country toward the issue of trade with the Communist bloc, it must stay informed. Studies such as this are of real assistance in that task, and I therefore commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The Abuse of the Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the growing restlessness and agitation among many civil rights leaders and groups for more aggressive action and immediate results is understandable when we consider the long years of discrimination and personal indignities; the years of second-class citizenship.

These years of denial and frustration are now compounded by the filibuster going on in the Senate with the result, as the distinguished elder statesman of American political commentators has pointed out, that the "internal peace of the Nation is threatened and the fearful possibility of race riots cannot be ignored."

Surely, as Mr. Lippmann emphasizes:

It is the paramount duty of civilized Americans to make order prevail in the racial conflict by establishing the supremacy of law.

But if this is to be done, and, as Mr. Lippmann has so correctly stated it, "the preservation of order through the due process of law is the course we must take," can such a filibuster be justified?

Mr. Speaker, this is a thoughtful, pointed commentary on the critical social issue of our time and I urge that it be read and digested by all who are interested in the welfare of our country:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 15, 1964]

THE ABUSE OF THE FILIBUSTER

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is indeed reason to worry about what may be developing in the relations between whites and Negroes. There are strong indications that there is an undercurrent of white resentment about the access of Negroes to housing and jobs in the North. This feeling came to the surface in the vote for Governor Wallace in the Wisconsin primary. There are parallel indications of desperation and extremism among the Negroes, as in the proposal to stall the traffic at the World's Fair and to increase the New York water shortage by turning on the faucets to waste water.

These are manifestations of irreconcilability: by the whites of a refusal to redress the grievances of Negroes by legislation and by the Negroes of a desperation that is politically suicidal. The whites who voted for Governor Wallace were opposed to legal remedies for the grievances of the Negroes. The Brooklyn Negroes who are organizing the traffic jam are willing to affront the whole population because they have lost all faith that anything will be done for them by reason and good will.

It is clear that the internal peace of the Nation is threatened, and that the fearful possibility of race riots cannot be ignored. What then, in all seriousness, is the right course? Is it, as not only Governor Wallace but even Senator RUSSELL is advocating, to close the door against laws designed to redress the grievances? Is this the wise course—leaving aside the question of whether it is the course of justice and compassion? To close the door, saying that the Negro protest is the work of agitators and Communists, is to say that there can be no legal redress, that the two races must rub against each other without any legal criterion of right and wrong, of what is permissible and what is not. To advocate closing the door is to be for anarchy.

Surely it is the paramount duty of civilized Americans to make order prevail in the racial conflict by establishing the supremacy of law. It is true that harmony cannot be established by laws alone. But it is irrelevant. Peace can be made to prevail by faith in the guarantees of the Constitution and of the laws made under the Constitution.

If the preservation of order through the due processes of law is the course we must take, then we have to consider the filibuster in the Senate. This is an effort to prevent the Federal Government from reducing the racial conflict by the legal redress of certain of the more conspicuous grievances of the Negro. Can such a filibuster be justified? No more, it seems to me, than would a filibuster in time of war. For the legal government must always have the sovereign power to secure the peace of the Nation. If it hasn't that power, it isn't a government.

The filibuster is properly a device for delaying and preventing a passionate majority

from overriding a defenseless minority. It cannot be justified morally as a device for preventing a majority from attempting to redress grievances which have been outlawed under the Constitution for nearly a 100 years. Such a filibuster is not obedience to the Constitution and the laws. It is nullification.

What the country must have is a beginning in the lawful redress of the ancient grievances of Negroes. The essential thing is to make a serious beginning even if the legislation is not perfect, even if—as is certain—it will need a lot of perfecting as it is tried out in practice. A filibuster which delays legislation for months to come, or even stops it entirely, will not only promote disorders, will not only subvert faith in the supremacy of law, but will most surely lead eventually to the destruction of the filibuster altogether.

That would be a pity. Our American liberties would lose one of their greatest safeguards if a temporary 51 percent majority could prevail immeditaely and at any time. But if the filibuster is abused, as it will be if Congress is denied the right to legislate on civil rights, there will build up an irresistible demand for the abolition of all filibusters.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 18, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT: ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM AND POLITICS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The question: Is the antipoverty program a sincere effort to help those in need or is it a political gimmick to get votes in an election year?

To help the poor is a Christian duty. Concern for our fellowman is one of the strong foundations of our Judeao-Christian heritage. It is a part of the makeup of every truly religious person. Few indeed would turn their backs on the ill, the maimed, or the unfortunate. Why then, the controversy about the administration's so-called war on poverty? Because the Government is trying to legislate moral duty: it means to make charity compulsory; it sets by decree what poverty is and who are the poor.

In addition to the bills already introduced in Congress to carry out the antipoverty program, there was a discussion this week between several Members of the House and Sargent Shriver, head of the President's Poverty Committee. Sargent Shriver's discussion made several things clear to me:

1. Those who want to do good through Government edict have no trust in the people.

(a) They do not trust the people to be able to take care of themselves, nor to solve their individual problems.

(b) They do not trust the goodness of the people to voluntarily help those in need.

2. The Government has decided on what poverty is by setting an arbitrary figure of $3,000 annual income as the breaking point between poverty and plenty. Mr. Shriver admitted this figure could have been set higher or lower.

3. The program does not differentiate between the poor in worldly goods and the poor in spirit.

As a result of the spread of the welfare-state philosophy in this century, and the increase of Federal programs to do everything for the people, there has been an increase in the poor in spirit. There are those who will always be poor, no matter what their level of income, because of lack of spirit which keeps them perpetually disinherited. These people need a reawakening in spirit, a challenge to meet the diversities of life headon, a new faith in themselves which will cause them to look up instead of down. This is a moral struggle in which each of us must engage through his own efforts and no amount of Federal help will put spirit into the heart of a man who has no other goal than to exist.

There are those who do need material help. There are those who are unemployed through no fault of their own; there are those who are too ill to work, and we will not turn our backs on their need. But the billions-of-dollars proposals of the administration is not the answer. Guaranteeing an annual wage, stamps for all the necessities of life, cradle to the grave security even when there is no effort to earn it, merely accentuates the problem.

A POSITIVE SOLUTION

A strong and healthy and free economy is the best possible solution to ending poverty.

1. Only private initiative and investment will create jobs. The Federal Government has no money, cannot create wealth through legislation, and can only spread the poverty, not eliminate it.

2. Private initiative will create jobs if the full force of capitalism is unloosed. The billions spent on the waste, inefficiency and corruption connected with bureaucracy, should be left in the hands of the people through less Federal spending and lower taxes, so that they may build the new factories to produce the products for which there is such a great demand in a prosperous and free nation.

3. There are sufficient programs now in operation through private initiative, State and local governments, and even at the Federal level to care for those who, through no fault of their own, suffer real poverty. For the able-bodied, a free American economy can provide all the jobs necessary at wages that will enable every man to live at whatever level he can earn through his own efforts, hustle and sweat, knowhow, and willingness to raise his own standards.

4. All Federal programs should be reevaluated and many eliminated.

PRESIDENT'S FIVE MUST BILLS

The President has listed the 5 bills which he says must be passed by this Congress:

1. Civil rights: The present bill is a dangerous excursion into the freedoms of all the people. We cannot guarantee privileges for minority groups by taking away the rights of all.

2. Food stamp: I discussed this last week. It is further increasing the Federal control over the supplying of necessities.

3. Government pay increases: Increases in Federal salaries must be earned and this can be done by exercising discipline in spending. No further Federal pay increases are justified until the budget is balanced and we live within our national income.

4. Medicare: Federal intervention in the field of medicine will lower medical standards, will take away the free relationship between doctor and patient, and will greatly increase the cost of medical care to the detriment of those the program is supposed to help.

5. Antipoverty: The wide range of human endeavor called for in this program will put the Federal Government into every facet of the lives of the people and freedom will be traded for security.

While the President maneuvers to out-New Deal the New Deal the world situation deteriorates at our expense and to the benefit of communism. Cuba still threatens, Americans are dying in Vietnam, all of Asia is slipping behind the Iron Curtain.

SPEND MORE BUT MAKE IT LOOK LESS

The House approved H.R. 10809, appropriations for the Departments of Labor and HEW.

The same old story, pass a bill below the budget estimate but increase spending over last year.

APRIL 18, 1964.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

The Fulbright Phenomenon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal's Vermont Royster in his column "Thinking Things Over" has written a most stimulating article on what he calls the "Fulbright Phenomenon."

Mr. Royster has pointed out that "Senator FULBRIGHT's contribution may be no more than that of the little boy who suggested that the Emperor wore no clothes. But that's enough for consternation."

One does not have to agree with everything said or inferred by either Senator FULBRIGHT or Mr. Royster to realize that this kind of open speculation may ultimately raise questions which, "If people started noticing, there might be a lot of policies left naked before the world."

The article follows:

THINKING THINGS OVER: FULBRIGHT PHENOMENON

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—Senator FULBRIGHT has lately been saying some interesting things about American foreign policy. But no less interesting to a visitor here is the hubbub he has raised just by saying them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT's simple thesis, as all who read now know, is that the real world around us is quite different from the world U.S. foreign policymakers have thought—or pretended—they were looking at. This difference between perception and reality, he says, accounts for the floundering of American policy in such diverse places as Europe, Latin America and the Far East.

Of course the Senator's own view of reality, as there set forth, has struck some people as distorted in a different way. He's been verbally assaulted by Secretary of State Rusk and Senator GOLDWATER at the same time and almost for the same things, which is a pretty neat trick for anybody around this town.

Still, the thing that strikes a visitor most forcibly is that the excitement is less over the controversial part of the Senator's ideas than over the mere fact that anybody of such stature—the Senator is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—would dare say things aren't what they seem.

It's a sort of compulsive fascination; like King Charles' head, Mr. FULBRIGHT continues to turn up in nearly every conversation. Invariably the speaker begins by explaining to his guest where the Senator is fuzzy on some point or other and why he need not be taken too seriously. Whereupon the visitor is then treated to a long discussion of everything Senator FULBRIGHT said.

So, plainly, the Fulbright phenomenon is something to notice and to spur a visitor to

some reflections of his own about all the hubbub.

The first thing to notice is that much of what the Senator said borders on the obvious. For example, he said that the Communist bloc is not a monolith free of internal stresses, either between its two great powers—Russia and Red China—or within the Soviet satellite structure.

He also said that in reality there are not two Chinas but only one, and it is ruled by Communists. In the same vein he stated it as a fact that the economic boycott against Castro is not proving a workable policy for bringing his downfall; moreover, that while the existence of the Castro regime is "inimical to our interests" it is not "an insuperable obstacle" to the attainment of our objectives in Latin America.

On Latin America in general he said that the historical odds are against the prospect of great social changes without an upheaval and that the present odds are against our being able to manage "the outbreak of general social revolution" in the area.

Besides this, he delivered some general aphorisms on the nature of changing power relationships in the real world. "Hostility can give way in an astonishingly short time to close friendship. * * * The reverse can occur with equal speed."

In all this, surely, there is nothing much new either to the denizens of the State Department or the citizens of Seattle. What creates the flap is the fact that these things, once openly said, explode with implications not easy to grab hold of.

An illustration: Once admitted that the Communist world is not monolithic, then the verbal battle between Peiping and Moscow can't be wholly dismissed as a sort of meaningless marital squabble. Once admitted that nations switch from hostility to alliances and vice versa (Japan once a foe, now an ally), then the possibility of another switch in our relations with the Soviet Union is at least implied.

This explains why Senator FULBRIGHT has been represented as "soft on Moscow" to the scorn of Senator GOLDWATER. Similarly he's represented as suggesting recognition of Red China—although he specifically denied it—because that is a seeming implication of admitting that the Communists do in fact control China; or as suggesting that we forget about Castro. That's what brought Secretary Rusk down on him.

What it doesn't explain is why, despite the disagreements, Washington is so fascinated by Mr. FULBRIGHT'S "unthinkable thoughts." The explanation for that, we suspect, is that a good many people around the country, and quite a few right here in Washington, were already thinking that many American policies didn't fit the real world.

If others have made less of the obvious split between Moscow and Peking, it's not from myopia but uneasiness. So long as you can treat all Communist nations as a monolithic foe, you can have a settled policy. If the Communists are falling out among themselves, then you have to grope through a new set of uncertainties. How deep is the cleavage? Do we risk being gulled again if we believe it? Is there opportunity to be exploited? If so, how?

Similarly, everybody knows the Taiwan Government isn't the actual Government of mainland China and isn't likely to be. Yet how can the United States turn loose of its present policy of recognizing Taiwan as "the" Government of China without plunging into more terrible problems?

So a part of the Fulbright phenomenon is simply that he has said out loud what others would rather not, although incidentally he's as fuzzy on the new questions as anybody. If you look for a policy in his speeches, you look in vain.

But you can't help feeling that the fascination is touched also with a little fright, which is the kind that most holds people spellbound. For that kind of questioning can be catching.

What if people start comparing the reality of the U.N. with its mythology? The reality of Latin America with the Alliance for Progress? The Europe of De Gaulle with the assumptions that it is still the Europe of 10 years ago?

Senator FULBRIGHT'S contribution may be no more than that of the little boy who suggested the Emperor wore no clothes. But that's enough for consternation. If people started noticing, there might be a lot of policies left naked before the world.

Action Memorandum No. 4 of the Massachusetts Citizens for Public Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my friend and constituent, Rev. Robert G. Howes, a learned, dedicated, religious leader in my district, and under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD action memorandum No. 4 of the Massachusetts Citizens for Public Prayer, Box 1776, Rutland, Mass.

This memorandum, which is very ably drawn, is designed to promote and bring about action by the Congress and then by the legislatures of the several States on a constitutional amendment to put prayer and Bible reading back into the public classroom and remove the threat to other traditional public reverences of the Divine Master.

It should be noted that this memorandum is prepared with very great ability. It not only very ably presents the case for those who seek to nullify the recent Supreme Court prayer decisions, but it also suggests certain language for a constitutional amendment that would protect the right to pray to God on a voluntary basis in the schools, or elsewhere, and to prevent other proposed infringements upon belief in God and the practice of public reverence.

Father Howes makes out the strongest, irrefutable case for a constitutional amendment. The objective is, as he notes, not intended to repudiate or eliminate the Supreme Court. It merely means that an overwhelming number of the American people do not agree with the prayer decisions of the Court and believes that an amendment should be adopted clarifying the right of the American people to exercise their historic right to pray and acknowledge the living God in and out of the schools, and to preserve the place which belief in God and worship have always had in the American Government and in American life.

There is no suggestion in the plan to deny anyone in this country the right to his own views on religious matters. Prayers would be insured on a permissive, not on a mandatory, basis, and those desiring to be exempt from participating or listening would be accorded their full rights in this regard.

America was founded by people who believed in God and human freedom and these beliefs and the right to practice them are as vital to American democracy now as they were when the exercise of them was first established by the sturdy, indomitable, God-fearing Founding Fathers.

The proposed amendment is not intended to attack anyone's right to believe as he chooses. Atheists, agnostics, and other people, who do not accept the idea of God or a Supreme Being, under our laws can hold fast to their own views. But it permits believers in God and a Supreme Being, who constitute such an overwhelming majority of the American people, to hold to their own views, and to exercise their beliefs and declare their faith in public, as they do in private, without depriving other people of their beliefs. In this democracy, minority rights must always be considered and scrupulously protected, but the majority of the people must rule in accordance with democratic principles. No minority should be allowed to dominate this Government and force its views or will upon the majority of the people. And this is particularly true when the personal spiritual beliefs and moral precepts of an overwhelming majority of the American people are in question. Americans must never be forbidden to pray in public.

I commend Father Howes for his fine piece and outstading work for this great cause which is the cause of our country and will continue my efforts to speed the day when the prayer decision is canceled by constitutional means and little American schoolchildren and the people are free to pray in school and in public according to their right as free Americans.

The resolution follows:

ACTION MEMORANDUM NO. 4 OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC PRAYER, RUTLAND, MASS.

Now that hearings have been scheduled on prayer amendment proposals, three things are important:

(i) Proponents of amendment must speak out at the committee hearings with frequency and with a clear understanding of the various facets of the case for amendment.

(ii) When an amendment proposal reaches the Congress, presumably with committee approval, another heavy round of mail must indicate to all Congressmen the will of the people (a) that action be taken on this proposal, and (b) that action be taken with as much dispatch as is consistent with the weighty nature of the subject.

(iii) Once released by the Congress, action must be initiated and sustained in every State to the end that the amendment proposal be ratified as quickly as possible. Human nature being what it is, there is a distinct probability that time, in this fight, could work against us.

In order to meet each of these needs, the following question-and-answer memorandum has been prepared. It may be used in any manner consistent with our purpose, as an entirely nonsectarian, nonpartisan group; namely, the passage of a peoples' amendment for public prayer. On this purpose, again here, we ask the blessing of Almighty God.

1. Are you opposed to the Supreme Court of the United States?

We are not opposed to the Supreme Court either as an institution or as individuals. Nor do we have any commitment to any other amendment proposal now pending in any State relative to the future situation of

the Supreme Court. We say, quite simply, that we believe the Supreme Court was seriously wrong in its two prayer decisions.

2. Why do you want to change the Constitution? Isn't it dangerous to tamper with it?

We are firmly convinced that the Constitution, as written, fully accords with our position in the matter of public reverence and requires no change. However, since the Court, in its two prayer decisions, has twisted the Constitution from its real meaning, there is no alternative but to spell out now in detail what we are certain the first amendment has always hitherto meant. It is not a question of changing anything. It is a question of restoring something which has been taken away.

3. What, briefly, is the substance of your objections to the two Supreme Court prayer decisions?

We object on two major grounds. First, that the Court has misapplied a valid constitutional principle. Second, that in the process an important factor in the public education of our young people has been eliminated, and a shadow of doubt has been cast over all other instances of public reverence.

4. Is prayer in public schools, and Bible reading, really important enough for a constitutional amendment?

We concede that many of those who, with us, support a constitutional amendment do so mainly on the ground that the two "prayer decisions" could in time wipe out other instances of public reverence and are not seri- so mainly on the ground that the two "prayer in the public schools. We do not argue with them. We believe ourselves, however, that that brotherhood of prayer which opened the school day in so many of our States for so long is important, that it does contribute to the reverent character of education, and that it provides a highly significant basis for that type of adult brotherhood as between men and women of differing faiths for which this Nation has of late been so distinguished. Nor does the fact that there have been occasions when the morning prayer and Bible reading have been accomplished with something less than due dignity alter in any way the essential wisdom of encouraging Jewish, Protestant and Roman Catholic children to stand side by side as they begin each day their study of the life sicences and recite a common prayer to a common God. Nor can the presence of "religion" as a footnote in history or art class in any way suffice for the reverence which is part of prayer.

5. The Supreme Court said its decisions were narrow, that they did not affect other practices. Do you accept this dictum?

Respectfully, we do not. Once a precedent has been wheeled into place at law, it can be used again and again in a steady process of widening and advancing. The Supreme Court, despite its sonorous majority paragraphs, has posited an equation in the two "prayer decisions" the fall out from which blights, as we have before indicated, every other instance of public reverence (e.g. chaplains, "under God", prayer at legislative sessions, etc.). That equation says:

"Any Act of nondenominational public reverence in a public facility or under public auspices equal an 'establishment' of religion under the terms of the first amendment."

We believe no other reading of the two decisions is possible. And once this equation has been placed, the only ultimate consequence, as Dean Harry Van Dusen, of Union Theological Seminary, has expressed it, is: "prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances." In any case it is already evident from suits introduced in various States that the enemies of religion in America intend to use the "prayer decisions" as precedent for further attacks on public reverence.

6. What about the rights of the minority?

We might reply "What about the rights of the majority?" The prayer and Bible reading which distinguished our public classroom in so many States for so long and which our amendment would restore was voluntary. We concur fully that students who dissent must be permitted to be silent or to absent themselves from the prayer exercise. But this does not mean that we must subvert the will of the majority by refusing to it the right to pray. It is true, as Dean Griswold expressed it in his magnificent address at the Utah Law School, that such silence and/or withdrawl will separate the dissenters from other students—but the separation does exist in any case, and there is an even more compelling obligation on dissenters to respect the rights and privileges of the great majority of students than there is on the majority to abrogate its own rights totally simply to accommodate that dissent.

7. We read little about the prayer amendment fight. Who is conducting it?

The most wonderful thing about this fight so far is that, while there are some real prominent Americans in it, by and large the push is coming from little people. Grassroots strength started early and has grown rapidly. It was, literally, tons of mail from the home districts which finally moved the Congress to act. Even though, for some strange reason, many of the news media neglected to give adequate coverage to the fight as it developed, word passed from mouth to mouth, from organization to organization, from relative to relative. In fact this was something of a repeat of the Revolution. Then, too, there was no news coverage. But patriots everywhere corresponded back and forth. This is what has happened here. This is why we call our amendment a peoples amendment for public prayer. Seldom in history have the American people risen in such masses and without VIP direction to demand something as emphatically as they now demand this amendment.

8. What action is now called for?

Every American who feels as we do must make his voice heard in these hearings. Telegrams, letters, personal appearances where possible—it is imperative that the noise we make now demonstrate our numbers because, surely, the few who oppose us will be speaking as loud and long as they can. By and large, our support should go to "an amendment" rather than this particular amendment. We have confidence in the majority of the Congress. Herewith, a copy of the amendment we favor, but in the course of hearings it may be modified somewhat. What is important is that an amendment which satisfies our dual purpose (namely, to put prayer and Bible reading back in the public classroom and to remove the threat from other instances of public reverence) be carried in this session and reported out to the States for action in their respective legislatures.

9. Supposing no amendment is placed before the States in this session?

Then every Congressman running for election this fall, plus all the presidential candidates, must be again and again placed on record in favor of immediate action when the new Congress convenes to place an acceptable prayer amendment before the States.

10. Suppose an amendment is placed before the States in this session?

Then, if possible, immediate action should be sought in every State legislature. Where action is not possible prior to election in the State, every candidate for State legislature must be again and again placed on record in favor of immediate action in favor of amendment when the State legislature convenes.

11. Is there need for other action?

Our cause here is the cause of the Lord. We fight for the right of religion first of all in the classrooms of this reverent democracy. But we must use every available human tactic commensurate with the dignity of our purpose. This means prayer demonstrations, peaceful reminders to our leaders of our will to quick action on amendment, petition and repeated assurances from those who seek our support at the polls this fall that they will vote for amendment or otherwise favor amendment if elected.

12. How will the Prayer amendment read?

There are many wordings possible. Indeed, once these hearings and the congressional vote are over, it is quite possible that an entirely different—but equally satisfactory—text than this will be forthcoming. There is no doubt of the need for extreme caution in spelling out the Prayer amendment. But we are confident that the Congress, reflecting the overwhelming will be the American people, will accord in the end with our position. Here, at this time, is how we would prefer to see a prayer amendment worded:

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or biblical scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"SEC. 4. The enumeration of anything herein shall not be construed as intending that this article or the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States proscribes as such any other practice, proceeding, legislation, right, privilege, or immunity which may relate to God, a Supreme Being, or religion.

"SEC. 5. (Provides for ratification by States within 7 years.)"

13. Shall we debate the issue of amendment?

By the time the amendment hits the States debate will long since have occurred on it. There is absolutely no point in our providing a forum to our opposition. Nor in wasting our time, at this late stage, in any quibble over matters long since authoritatively considered in the hearings and elsewhere. One thing we must beware of and that is being tricked into a legalistic hassle. Even if the Court was completely right in its technical language of the first amendment—something we concede here only for the sake of argument, even then our position is justified. For then the first amendment would be saying, verbally, what the vast majority of ourselves and our ancestors have felt it did not say. What is then necessary is to revise the wording of that amendment so that it says exactly what we the people want it to say. * * * No, now is the time for positive action for amendment. We must beware of the temptation to dissipate our energies in a local debate which can at best prove futile.

Agency Defense of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, very soon the House will be called upon to vote for additional grant funds to continue the

urban renewal program. Frankly, I have been disturbed about the propaganda campaign that has been mounted against the urban renewal program. In a program of such magnitude, obviously there have been differences of opinion, but I believe the extensive hearings conducted by our Housing Subcommittee have proved the program has been doing a very effective job of helping our cities to rebuild and revitalize themselves.

One article which has been receiving widespread attention in the press, appeared in the March issue of the Reader's Digest and was entitled "The Mounting Scandal in Urban Renewal." I am pleased to insert a point-by-point rebuttal prepared by Mr. William L. Slayton, the Urban Renewal Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Slayton's detailed and restrained criticisms and rebuttals of the points raised in the Reader's Digest article make, it seems to me, a convincing case for the urban renewal program and an effective antidote to the arguments and allegations contained in the article.

The rebuttal follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1964.

Mr. DEWITT WALLACE,
Editor, Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: I have read the article, "The Mounting Scandal in Urban Renewal," in your March issue and would like to point out some misleading and incorrect statements in it. Unfortunately, the article was not checked with this agency before publication, and thus this is the only opportunity I have had to correct these inaccuracies.

We have prepared a list of the principal allegations in the article together with a factual reply to each. Copy is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM L. SLAYTON,
Urban Renewal Commissioner.

Allegation: "Many big projects have been carried out competently, but in a shockingly large number costs have skyrocketed. Charges of graft, favoritism, waste, arbitrary use of power have risen to a roar."

URA reply: The General Accounting Office and the Chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, Representative ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, who have policed, audited, and reviewed urban renewal operations in detail virtually since the program started in 1949, do not agree.

Representative THOMAS made the following statement at the conclusion of the hearings for the fiscal 1963 budget:

"It has been fantastic to me, the amount of money and the amount of different pieces of property involved. I think there are around 60,000 or 65,000 pieces of property that have been bought. I have not heard of any public scandal. It is fantastic."

On November 20, 1963, during an exhaustive hearing on urban renewal conducted by the House Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Housing, Chairman ALBERT RAINS asked the following of Louis W. Hunter, assistant director of the GAO:

Mr. RAINS. "In all your investigations have you found any evidence of corruption or crookedness or stealing in this program at either the local or regional level of any type?"

Mr. HUNTER. "No, we have not, Mr. Chairman."

At the conclusion of Mr. Hunter's testimony, Mr. RAINS again asked: "In your investigation up to now, Mr. Hunter, in a program of this kind, which is a vast program, I want to ask this question: By and large has this program been administered in keeping with the law?"

Mr. HUNTER. "From the work we have done I think we could not say otherwise."

Allegation: "The U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, having swallowed up $4 billion already, is asking Congress this year for authority to spend $3 billion more for urban renewal.

URA reply: The $3 billion figure is wrong. The request is for $1.4 billion for the next 2 years.

This would provide approximately the same rate of approvals as the level of the past 3 years.

Allegation: The Digest article is critical of an urban renewal project called Erieview in Cleveland, Ohio. The gist of its complaint is that the Urban Renewal Administration approved the demolition of a number of sound commercial buildings in this downtown project area. The article alleges that city building inspectors had previously certified as sound most of the buildings which Cleveland officials later reclassified as substandard in order to make the project eligible for an urban renewal grant of $33 million. It charges further that a party of Government employees from Urban Renewal's regional office in Chicago briefly toured the Erieview site, did not look inside the buildings, and endorsed the city's reclassification.

URA reply: The statement that "most of the 118 buildings in the Erieview area had been judged sound by Cleveland housing inspectors" is untrue.

The Erieview project involves an area in downtown Cleveland which the city decided was blighted and obsolete. Accordingly, the city drew up a plan for redevelopment of the area which required the demolition of a number of buildings that were plainly substandard. Still others had to be removed in order to carry out the plan: most of them were obsolete and exerted a blighting influence on the surrounding area; some constituted hazards to health and safety; some had to be taken to widen streets and relieve traffic congestion; and some had to be taken down to provide enough land to attract sound, new development.

The General Accounting Office, while critical of the determination made to demolish some of the structures in the Erieview project, agrees that the demolition of structurally standard buildings is justified in renewing an area. This was stated by Bernard Sacks, supervisory accountant of the GAO Civil Accounting and Auditing Division, to the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in the course of hearings involving Erieview. Mr. Sacks said: "We have never in any of our reports suggested that standard buildings should never be torn down * * * We recognize that in many instances, because of the location of buildings, or because of their relationship to the proposed reuse of the land, it may be necessary to tear down structurally standard buildings."

The bond issue to raise funds to pay the city's share of urban renewal project cost was approved 2 to 1 in a referendum. And, after a series of public hearings attended by more than 500 persons and lasting for 12 hours, the Erieview plan was adopted by a unanimous vote of Cleveland's 33-member city council.

The project was also challenged in the courts, but unsuccessfully. The court of common pleas of Cuyahoga County said: "The engineers of the past did a good job of planning for a little city then of small consequence. But is a large part of the downtown area of the great metropolis of Cleveland to lie moribund in the cocoon which was woven for it when a village more than a century ago?"

And the Ohio Court of Appeals said: "The extensive evidence here shows that the legislative body of the city had before it a great mass of factual data upon which it makes its legislative judgement that the area in question is, in fact, a blighted area, deteriorated and deteriorating, and, as a consequence, detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare. Thus, we conclude from all the documentary evidence above described and all other evidence contained in the record, that the findings of the trial court must be sustained."

As to the visit of employees from the regional office to Cleveland to inspect the buildings: the facts are, officials of the regional office made three trips to Cleveland in connection with the project during which, among other things, they made sample inspections inside the buildings.

Allegation (Columbia Plaza): The gist of the complaint in the Digest article is that a firm of contractors had bought more than half of a 9-acre tract for private redevelopment when the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia decided to redevelop the area with the aid of Federal funds. The article says that the Redevelopment Land Agency selected another group of developers even though the original firm by then owned 90 percent of the area. The article also charges that the "deal brazenly ignored the law's requirements as to what kind of property can be taken over by urban renewal," and that a "backstage" operation was involved.

URA reply: The fact is that the firm of contractors referred to in the Digest article had tried for more than 11 years to acquire all of the land in the area needed for redevelopment. A stalemate had been reached and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia concluded that renewal assistance was necessary. It adopted an urban renewal plan for the area and received a Federal urban renewal grant reservation of $958,276. The contractors, who had been unable to acquire all of the needed land, were given an opportunity to redevelop the area. They did not choose to do so, so another redeveloper was chosen and the contractors referred to in the article became minority stockholders in the selected firm of redevelopers.

All of this was done in the full light of citywide publicity. The redevelopment plan was approved after two public hearings. At both hearings the project reecived substantial support from a broad range of citizens.

Allegation (point 1): "The program is prodigal in its spending of taxpayers' money." The Digest article is critical of the operation of the program under which the Federal Government pays two-thirds of the net cost of a project and the locality pays the remaining third in cash or grants-in-aid (such as streets, schools, or other public improvements in or serving a project area).

The article also charges that cities rarely pay their share of local costs for urban renewal in cash.

URA reply: The Federal urban renewal statute specified the two-thirds Federal one-third local sharing of the cost of urban renewal. In enacting this formula Congress confirmed the findings of many congressional committee investigations—that slums were a national problem and that the afflicted communities should not, and could not be expected to bear the entire cost of eliminating them. Furthermore, the law provides that cities may pay their share of renewal costs with either cash or noncash grants-in-aid.

Noncash grants-in-aid may cover public facilities, such as schools, streets, utilities, parks, and similar improvements that are essential to sound urban renewal and are a necessary part of the cost of the project. Therefore, the law properly provides that communities should be given credit for the

cost of providing necessary public facilities serving project areas.

This is not so. Cities have paid or have obligated themselves to pay more than $319 million of their share in cash—the total amounting to more than 35 percent of the total local share of net costs.

This includes virtually all projects that reached the execution stage as of June 30, 1963.

Allegation (point 2): "The program operates like Robin Hood in reverse. It approves the taking of property by police power from ordinary citizens and selling it by advance arrangement to other, often wealthy, private citizens at prices frequently as low as 30 percent of acquisition cost.

"For example: In Washington, D.C., the city's redevelopment agency paid the D.C. Transit System, of which O. Roy Chalk is president, $1,266,605 for some property, then later leased it back to his Chalk House West, Inc., for 99 years at a bargain rental of $43-221 a year."

URA reply: Urban renewal land is acquired in the same way that land is acquired by highway, military, school, and other public agencies—through purchase or eminent domain. Land is purchased at fair market value, on the basis of two separate, independent appraisals. In most cases land is acquired by negotiation, rather than condemnation. If property owners think the offered price is too low, the case may be settled in court.

Cleared land is always sold to redevelopers at fair value for its new uses. The selling price must be competitive with land elsewhere in the community. The cost of the acquired land is almost always higher than its selling price because the acquired land usually contains buildings and other facilities that must be cleared before new construction can begin.

This results in a deficit that is met partly by the Federal Government, partly by the locality. This is the "subsidy." It is the cost of eliminating slum and blight. Not a penny of this money goes to the redeveloper.

The cleared land Mr. Chalk leased was only a portion of the land and improvements originally acquired from his company, D.C. Transit. Furthermore, Mr. Chalk was awarded this portion in open competition as to design, and without knowledge of his identity as a bidder until after the award was made by a disinterested panel. The Digest article failed to mention that the property acquired from D.C. Transit included improvements—a major carbarn and a storage yard—that had to be paid for. The property that was leased consisted of cleared land and was limited in its development by the renewal plan.

The values for both acquisition and disposition were determined on the basis of appraisals by outside professional appraisers.

The Digest article also failed to mention that in order to obtain the best possible residential development the Redevelopment Land Agency announced in advance the fair value of the land and held a public competition based on the quality of the redevelopment proposals. Eighteen separate proposals were received. They were identified only by number (not by name) and turned over to a panel of distinguished architects.

This panel, by a vote of 4 to 1, selected the entry submitted by Mr. Chalk. Only after it had submitted its report did the panel learn the identity of the sponsor and the architect who had prepared the plan.

Although the annual rental that will be paid for this parcel is $43,221, based on fair, independent appraisals, the imputed capital value that will be deposited to the project's account for this parcel is $720,335. The difference between that amount and the acquisition cost represents the cost of acquiring and clearing the existing buildings, as well as the restrictions on the new use of the land.

In addition, the Digest article does not mention that the annual D.C. tax on the land and improvements before renewal was $6,891, while after renewal it will be about $98,000.

Allegation (point 3): The Digest article charges that the urban renewal program "forces poor but independent homeowners into subsidized public housing."

The article charges that urban renewal "in practice seems to displace, most often, poor Negroes."

It charges that in Alexandria, Va., the Durant Civic Association "is struggling desperately to prevent destruction of a neighborhood of neat, clean, older houses, owned and well kept by thrifty Negroes whose families have lived there for as long as 100 years." It implies that A. Melvin Miller, an FHA attorney, is leading the fight against the urban renewal project.

URA reply: This accusation is untrue. Most of the 157,000 families relocated to date were living in substandard housing, much of it unfit for human habitation, before urban renewal. Each family must be provided with an opportunity to rent or buy standard housing within its means. Approximately 80 percent of these families have been relocated into decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Only about 6 percent are known to have relocated, despite offers of assistance from the city, into substandard housing. The remainder are families which could not be traced or moved out of the city. No one is forced into public housing or any other kind of housing. About 22 percent of the 157,000 families moved to public housing.

About two-thirds of all of the families removed by urban renewal are Negroes since, because of low incomes and discrimination, they constitute a disproportionate number of those who live in slum and blighted areas. A great majority of them now live in better houses than they had before.

Under date of March 4, 1964, Mr. Miller sent a letter to Reader's Digest denying that the Durant Civic Association and he have been opposed to the project. He said the quotation attributed to him was taken out of context and its true meaning distorted. Mr. Miller added that the statement attributed to him in the Digest article was in opposition to particular sites which were being recommended for public housing. They were not part of the urban renewal project.

Allegation (point 4): "Urban renewal ruins thousands of small business enterprises, many of which could survive and even flourish under programs to rehabilitate rather than raze their areas." A study by Brown University is cited as showing that 40 percent of the shops in urban renewal areas in Providence, R.I., had to go out of business.

URA reply: The majority of businessmen displaced by urban renewal benefit from the move. They are aided by (1) fair value, subject to court determination, for business property acquired in renewal areas; (2) Federal payments up to $25,000 for moving costs; (3) low-interest loans from the Small Business Administration for re-establishing in new locations.

The Digest article ignores the part of the Brown University study that states that the reasons for the failure of some of the relocated businesses to reopen were many and varied. Some small businessmen were going to close their shops anyway because they could not earn even a poor living in a slum area; others had better job offers.

The Brown study also states that nearly 60 percent of the businesses that relocated successfully had the same or higher income after moving. More than half (54 percent) moved into a newer building than they had been occupying, 62 percent said their new quarters were in better condition, and nearly 65 percent reported larger space.

Reports to the Federal Government and other studies of business relocation have consistently shown a substantially lower percentage of businesses failing to relocate successfully than the Brown University study. The 187 cities with active relocation programs as of September 1963 showed a loss rate of about 29.5 percent. A study by the University of Connecticut of 21 urban renewal projects in 14 cities reported an even lower loss rate of 25.6 percent.

Allegation (point 5): "The program encourages land-grabbing and hasty starts on ill-conceived projects, often followed by long periods of stagnation. About 20 percent of all projects are abandoned.

"Boston, for instance, now has 19 urban renewal projects involving $227,960,000."

The article quotes the State auditor of Massachusetts as saying that the principal result of the Boston Redevelopment Authority's operations has been the establishment of many parking lots on valuable land, which have been rented to private operators "at a fraction of their value." Also, that land owned by the authority is not subject to real estate taxes, and that the delay in construction has cost the city thousands of dollars in taxes.

The article states that during the period of the audit (late 1957 to early 1963) "approximately $1,675,000 was paid to various contractors for maintenance and major repairs to property scheduled for demolition." It added that the auditor was unable to find a single case in which the work was done under contract resulting from competitive bidding.

URA reply: Actually, the program is designed to prevent "hasty starts on ill-conceived projects." Detailed surveys are required before a project can be undertaken.

The record on "abandonments" shows that "ill-conceived projects" are not undertaken. They are "abandoned" as soon as planning surveys show they are not feasible.

The projects described as "abandoned" are those where surveys resulted in a determination that the project should not be undertaken. No project has been abandoned after land acquisition began.

By mid-1963, for those projects that had been approved for execution, 21,970 acres of land had been acquired, redevelopers had been selected for nearly 58 percent of the land acquired, and another 15 percent was ready for sale. Of the land for which redevelopers had been selected, 84 percent had redevelopment under contract, underway, or completed.

The Digest figures are inaccurate. The 19 urban renewal projects in Boston involve a total of $120,710,664 in Federal capital grants.

Some of the cleared land has been used for parking—but the chief result has been a reduction—not an increase—in the number of parking spaces in the three areas where land has been cleared. The Boston Redevelopment Authority has a policy of allowing parking lot operators to continue in business until the land is actually needed for redevelopment. They are being charged either the same rental they were paying before the authority bought the land, or, if they had owned the land, a fair rental based on two independent appraisals of the property.

The delays encountered in the early days of the program have been eliminated. Nearly $7.4 million in construction has been completed in Boston's New York Streets project; more than $11.5 million has been completed in the West End project and another $11 mil-

lion has been started; and $47 million in new construction has been started in Government Center.

During an even longer period (July 1955 to February 1963) repairs on these projects totaled less than $487,000. The remaining expenditures consisted of wages for janitors, watchmen, etc. ($457,081.88); fuel, light, power, and steam ($529,982.57); insurance ($224,797.75); and water and sewerage charges ($72,252.84).

These costs were paid from rents collected during the period. It is necessary to maintain these buildings in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition during the period when people and businesses are being relocated.

As for the bids, more than 99 percent of the repair and maintenance work orders involved less than $500. Most of them were emergency jobs. For these reasons, bid taking would have been impractical.

Allegation (point 6): "Urban renewal programs often enrich slum owners. A slum landlord can split single apartments in two and then, because of crowding aggravated by demolitions elsewhere, charge huge rents. Finally he sells out to urban renewal, and since slums pay high returns per square foot of space, he receives a handsome price. He takes his bonanza, pays a 25-percent capital gains tax, buys another slum, and waits for urban renewal to buy him out again—ad nauseam."

URA reply: These same enriched slum owners are referred to elsewhere in the Digest article as poor but independent home owners. Actually, genuine slum lords are among the most vigorous opponents of urban renewal, since it deprives them of their lucrative operations. Under urban renewal they receive only fair value for their properties. The handsome price can be no more than fair value, and this price is frequently determined by a jury.

In some 700 projects more than a quarter of a million substandard housing units have been or soon will be eliminated. In addition, the workable programs for community improvement require housing and other codes as well as more effective code enforcement. Since 1955 (when the workable program began) to July 1963 the number of communities with housing codes jumped from 56 to 736.

Allegation (point 7): "Once a program is started, no one is free from condemnation on whim. If but one small structure in a block of five buildings can be declared substandard, all houses or business in that block can be condemned for urban renewal."

URA reply: The Urban Renewal Administration's requirements on this point are quite specific and are not subject to whim. Local renewal agencies must provide evidence that acquisition of properties is necessary to accomplish the renewal of the area.

Allegation (point 8): The Digest article attributes to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce a statement that the Administration asked 2,400 city mayors to use their influence for passage of legislation to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

URA reply: The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, national organizations representing mayors and other public officials, advocated the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs for years before President Kennedy recommended such a Department. It was not necessary to influence them, as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce charges—they were calling for it. Furthermore most local chambers of commerce are active suporters of urban renewal in the localities where the program operates despite the opposition to this program by the national body.

Salute to the Federal Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at noon today, the Federal Union, Inc., and the Advisory Council of the International Movement for Atlantic Union, held a luncheon meeting in the New Senate Office Building at which it was my pleasure to preside.

The event commemorated two dates significant in the history of the movement for Federal Union. First, today we celebrate the 175th anniversary of the day on which George Washington left his plantation home in Virginia to ride to New York City for his inauguration as the first President of these United States.

It is, of course, just one more historical event in this history-filled 175th anniversary year of the establishment of our present form of government under the Constitution.

When one considers that our Nation—though relatively young—has the oldest written, working constitution in the world, it becomes clear what a marvelous triumph of man's reason we commemorate this year.

The second date is one notable because of its significance in the Federal Union movement, founded by our Mr. Clarence Streit. Fired by a vision of a Federal Union of North Atlantic States, Mr. Streit began a campaign to make this idea a reality, a campaign to which he has devoted his life.

To him, this date recalls the first stirrings of interest for his ideas of Federal Union among the people of the Midwest, a region which had a long history of isolationist feeling.

The ultimate measure of his success can be seen today. We know that the isolationism which once dominated the Nation's midlands has all but vanished, melted like snow before the frictions of our modern times and the fervor of men like Clarence Streit.

More than any one event, it was the founding of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that brought our Nation closest to a true federal union with the democracies of Western Europe. Today, however, with signs of a thaw in the cold war, the structure of NATO has begun to show signs of stress. There is grave danger that, instead of pressing forward to the goal of union, NATO will be scrapped.

Recently we have heard warnings about this eventuality from no less a world statesman than Konrad Adenauer. He has warned that Soviet tactics in the next few years would be directed at breaking up the North Atlantic alliance after 1969, the year when the treaty comes up for renewal.

He urged that the NATO countries overcome their differences and make urgently needed changes in the NATO treaty by 1967. If this is to be accomplished, we must of course begin now to work and plan for those changes.

Any revision of this treaty should be aimed at promoting a closer union of the Atlantic States. The job will be difficult, for there is sure to be objections from France, but we must—as President Johnson is fond of saying—"reason together" for the good of all.

The group of Congressmen and other distinguished guests at the luncheon were privileged to hear three speakers who are exceptionally knowledgable in matters of federal union. Hon. George V. Allen, former Director of the U.S. Information Agency, former Ambassador to Yugoslavia and now executive director of the American Tobacco Institute, spoke on the meaning of the federal union in our Nation's history. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] spoke on the change in attitude toward federal union with Europe which has occurred since 1939. The final speaker of the day was Mr. Streit himself, who discussed the meaning of America's "revolution" of 1789 and its meaning for the concept of Atlantica.

At this point I should like to include the remarks of Mr. Allen, Representative Findley, and Mr. Streit, and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF GEORGE V. ALLEN, FORMER DIRECTOR OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

As we commemorate this anniversary, the sharp contrast in communications between 1789 and the present is worth recalling. Then, 9 days elapsed between the counting of the electoral ballots in New York and the notification of Washington in Mount Vernon that he had been chosen President. In contrast, a false rumor on Monday that Khrushchev had died was flashed to radio and TV stations around the globe, and before a correction could be obtained 20 minutes later, the rumor had already been broadcast to villagers from Timbuktu to Tierra del Fuego.

Albert Beveridge, in his life of John Marshall, gives a delightful description of the state of transportation 175 years ago. When Washington left Mount Vernon on April 16, 1789, to travel by carriage to assume the duties of President, "his carriage stuck in the mud, and only after it had been pried up with poles and pulled out with ropes could the Father of his Country proceed on his journey; and this, too, over the principal highway of Maryland."

Beveridge adds that the driver of a lumbering coach of that day would shout to his passengers: "Lean to the right," and all the jostled and bethumped travellers crowded to that side of the clumsy vehicle. "Left," roared the coachman a little later, and his fares threw themselves to the opposite side. The ruts and gullies, now on one side and now on the other, of the highway were so deep that only by acting as a shift ballast could the voyagers maintain the stage's center of gravity and keep it from an upset.

"Richard Henry Lee objected to the Constitution," says Beveridge, "because, among other things, 'many citizens will be more than 300 miles from the seat of this (National) Government and as many assessors

and collectors of Federal taxes will be above 300 miles from the seat of the Federal Government as will be less.' "

Advances in the physical sciences, including communications technology have been constant since 1789, but progress in political science has been uneven and uncertain. The cities of Washington and San Juan and Anchorage and Honolulu are close neighbors today, not only in time but also in political structure, thanks to federation. On the other hand, the distance between the United States and France today, politically and psychologically, is greater than it was in 1789.

The Federal constitution of the United States takes only seven pages, with the amendments, in the World Almanac, yet it contains the framework within which the original States, now grown to be 50, have thrived for nearly two centuries. The document has shown its capacity for adaptation, and the same basic principles embodied therein could serve as the basis for the government of other communities of peoples having a similar background and common goals.

The nations of the North Atlantic form a common community, geographically and culturally. The peoples of Europe and America are joint heirs of the political and ethical concepts of the Judeo-Hellenic tradition. Yet two world wars have started among this very group of peoples during the present century. World Wars I and II have been called, with reason, civil wars. One of our purposes today must be to assure, at the least, that a third civil war does not break out within this same community. Another purpose is to build a solid enough structure to avoid, discourage, and if necessary, repel any aggression from the outside.

Fifteen free nations can be held together today on the same basic principles that 13 sovereign States were merged into one federation in 1789—by providing machinery through which differences can be thrashed out, adjudicated, or compromised, and by which, if necessary, aggression from without or defection from within, can be repelled.

George Washington began a journey into the unknown in 1789. The new Constitution seemed a medley of accommodations and adjustments which pleased no one entirely, and the result was bitterly distrusted by a large part of our population. There were no precedents for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches to follow. This Federal system was a new political concept. Washington's uneasiness, as he traveled north, must have matched his physical discomfort.

Yet, a mere 50 years later, Dr. Tocqueville was able to hail this same document as a great political discovery, and a half century later, Lord Acton saw it as "an astonishing and unexampled success." Gladstone referred to it as the greatest document ever stricken off at one time by the pen and purpose of man.

I submit that the limits of this powerful concept have not been reached. As we look backward to 1789, we can also look forward—not 175 years ahead but to the immediate future. The atomic age is pressing upon us. We must hasten, or we shall lose the heritage we celebrate today.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE PAUL FINDLEY, REPUBLICAN, OF ILLINOIS

My colleagues of the Congress, and my colleagues, one and all, in the family of freedom, the year 1964 is a year for reflection and forethought. It is the 175th anniversary of the American Republic. It is the 50th anniversary of the outbreak of World War I, and the 25th anniversary of the outbreak of World War II.

It is also the 25th anniversary of an undertaking as creative and as hopeful as the American Republic itself, as breathtaking in its potential for good as the World Wars were awful in their power to destroy. Seven months before World War II began, the book "Union Now" was published. Written by Clarence K. Streit, one of our speakers today, it proposed a federal union of the democracies of the North Atlantic. A few months later a membership association now known as Federal Union, Inc. was established to promote the idea set forth in the book.

The "now" of "Union Now" is yet to be, but in the 25 years since the proposal first appeared in print, remarkable progress can be noted.

In 1939 the doctrine of absolute nationalism ruled world thought and action just as completely as the dogma of communism rules Russia today. The League of Nations had few believers. In the United States isolationism had sunk to neutralism.

The "Union Now" proposal—to use the magic of the U.S. constitutional system to link the free peoples of the North Atlantic—was regarded in many quarters as visionary, unrealistic, utopian, or downright dangerous. Eyebrows went up all the way when it was apparent that traditionally isolationist United States was to lead—not just participate—in the federal union.

A 1939 review of Mr. Streits' book wrote that the author must mean "now" in the geological sense.

Today attitudes have changed immensely. The advance toward Atlantic union has been so great the only serious questions left are how and when—in time to prevent another disaster, or too late.

Neutralism is now gone from the United States and so is isolationism. The U.S. took the lead in forming NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with a North Atlantic Treaty Council and a North Atlantic commander. The term "Atlantic Community" has become commonplace, and so has the fundamental interdependence of this community. A group of Republicans in the House is devoting its attention to the problems of strengthening NATO.

The federal union proposed in "Union Now" is a respectable proposal, given serious consideration in many high places.

Each of the four leading prospects for the Republican presidential nomination—Goldwater, Nixon, Rockefeller, and Lodge—has spoken plainly either in behalf of this very proposal or for structural changes to make NATO more effective and durable.

In a foreign policy statement in Life magazine, January 17, Senator GOLDWATER made the key to his own policy the "structural" strengthening of the Atlantic community. "We must rethink the purpose of the alliance, and the degree to which we are willing to concede to NATO certain prerogatives which we now reserve to ourselves."

In April 1963, Richard Nixon, who missed the White House by a few votes, urged "expanding NATO to a political confederation." He called it the only solution for NATO.

Just last month Governor Rockefeller spoke up for a "union of the free." In 1962 he said, "The Federal idea, which our Founding Fathers applied in their historic act of political creation in the 18th century, can be applied in this 20th century in the larger context of the world of free nations—if we will but match our forefathers in courage and vision."

Ambassador Lodge, until his appointment to South Vietnam, was director general of the Atlantic Institute. Last year he spoke up for a "union of free nations."

On July 4, 1962, President Kennedy called for a "declaration of interdependence in the Atlantic community."

On July 10, 1963, former Prime Minister Anthony Eden came out for an "Atlantic Federation" on the initial Telstar broadcast and asked General Eisenhower if he agreed that "the only future really deserving of our efforts and our idealism is some sort of Atlantic Union."

General Eisenhower replied, "Well Anthony, you have stated the final objective beautifully and eloquently."

This is a year to give pause to any grandfather or grandmother, any father or mother, and any son or daughter. It should help open their minds and hearts to the idea of constituting a new great union of the free, not in the future, not eventually, but now while the living can enjoy its immense advantages.

Federal union is the only answer to the life-and-death problem of securing freedom peacefully that has proved practical through seven generations—as attested by this 175th birthday of the Federal Constitution.

The times demand an imaginative yet thoroughly tested program. They demand bold, swift, comprehensive action capable of moving the hearts of men. Atlantic federal union offers that kind of program. It has the further advantage of being deeply identified with the basic principles and patrotism of the American people, of springing from the purest sources of American life, of pioneering and carrying forward heroically the living American dream.

For that reason, I propose that President Johnson assemble a blue-ribbon panel of citizens and invite the leaders of other NATO nations to do the same. Then let these best minds of the free world sit down together, just as our forefathers met in Philadelphia in 1787. Let them fashion and propose for ratification a new standard to which the wise and the honest can repair.

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN REVOLUTION OF 1789—AND ITS MEANING FOR ATLANTICA NOW

(By Clarence Streit)

Much as the names London and Paris, in news dispatches are taken to mean Britain and France, the name of our Capital often means to the world our Government and people. This was true even before this city and this Government existed or we formed one people. They all resulted from the Federal Union whose advent we commemorate today—and George Washington's leadership was decisive in this achievement. But even before this vast creation, his virutes had made his name renowned through the civilized world, a symbol of the free principles the 13 States had declared in 1776, the most potent yeast that freedom then possessed with which to transform a world far more sodden with oppression than is ours today.

Today, the name Washington stands for the world's strongest power. But does this name now have the revolutionary fermenting force for our ideals it had when its power came from moral virtues, rather than from missiles and money?

In his Farewell Address, Washington asked: "Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a people with its virtue?" To assure to Washington now the power for freedom and union it had when that name stood also for a living man, must we not have the virtue to remember the great creators and creative acts that gave us our present material power?

It was on March 4, 1789, that our Federal Union began "the career it has so grandly run" to quote the great English historian of freedom, Lord Acton. The slowness with which it began to function reflects the apathy and hostility it still had to overcome. New York City was then the Capital, and it hailed with cannon and bells the dawn of March 4. But though that date had been officially set nearly 6 months pervious as the day for the Federal Government to begin work, it could not start to function, for only 8 Senators and 14 Representatives had arrived. Neither House had a quorum.

Only 11 States had then ratified the Constitution, and though these included New York, its State government remained so hostile to the new Federal Union that the presidential electors, who had cast their votes for President in February, included no New Yorkers, and no Senators from New York

appeared in the Senate until mid-July. The number of Representatives the Constitution gave the 11 States totalled 59—but it took nearly a month before the 14 reached, on April 1, the 30 needed for a quorum and the House could do business. The Senate was then indeed a club; there were only 22 Senators—but it took more than a month, it was April 6th, before the 8 grew to 12 and the Senate had a quorum. Only on that day could the two Houses meet jointly and count the electoral ballots and announce the unanimous election of George Washington as President.

This dragging of feet explains why George Washington did not leave Mount Vernon for his inauguration until April 16—6 weeks after the day set for the Federal Government to begin. Ironically, the Father of our Country is our only President who never got to serve his full 4-year term even while living. He was shortchanged by those 6 weeks. His first term ended not 4 years after April 30, when he was inaugurated, but 4 years after March 4, 1789—for that day remained, and still remains, the birthday of our Federal Union.

This birthday was marked every 4 years thereafter by the inauguration of the President and a new Congress on March 4, until 1933 when the 20th Amendment advanced the date to January. Since then this birthday has been increasingly forgotten. Even this 175th anniversary passed with no official celebration of March 4. Nothing marked that day this year except half a dozen speeches on the Floor of the House (three of them by Members present here today, Congressmen ZABLOCKI, FINDLEY and SCHMENGEL) and by a luncheon which our organizations held in New York.

If any day deserves to be celebrated by us every year, it is March 4, for it marks an even more revolutionary event, in some major respects, than the Fourth of July. This "forgotten revolution" drastically changed the United States from an association or alliance of sovereign State governments, as it was under the Articles of Confederation, into a Federal state composed, primarily, of sovereign citizens rather than States. And it was much more than that: It was one of the greatest breakthroughs in world political history, as eminent foreign scholars have testified.

We now think of the Constitution as a means for governing domestic rather than foreign affairs. But to the people of each of the 13 States it came as a bold 'experiment" (to quote Washington) in foreign policy—a new way to govern their own State's relations with the other 12, and the rest of the world—a way so new as to be unheard of. It was far worse than that to Patrick Henry, who nearly killed it aborning. Convinced it would destroy the liberty of Virginians, he almost persuaded them not to ratify it. He told them this Constitution was "extremely pernicious * * * and dangerous," "oppressive," "absurd," "the most fatal plan that could possibly be conceived to enslave a free people," and "a solution as radical as that which separated us from Great Britain."

Radical it was indeed. It completely reversed the system on which the United States Congress under the Articles of Confederation was based. Both systems applied the Roman maxim of "divide and rule"—but in opposite ways: The Confederation applied it to divide the American people (or rather, to keep them divided) into New Yorkers, Pennsylvanians, Virginians and so on, let their State governments rule not only their purely State affairs but their own common affairs with the people of the other States.

The Constitution allowed the American people to rule the United States as well as their own State governments; it did this by uniting the people while keeping all their governments divided—the State governments independent of one another, the Federal Government independent of them all, and its legislative, executive and judicial branches separated from each other, and its Senate from its House.

Under the Confederation the relations of the 13 States were set up basically the same as those of the 15 Atlantic allies now. Each had its own armed force, trade barriers, currency, citizenship, and foreign policy—when Massachusetts closed its ports to British ships, rival Connecticut opened its harbors to them. Common affairs were handled, as in the NATO Council, through a one-House body (Congress) composed of Delegates named, instructed and paid by their State governments. Each State had one vote—and a veto over any change in the Confederation—and the Congress (again like the NATO Council)—had no power to enforce its resolutions, or make delinquent States furnish their military or financial quotas. The U.S. President was as powerless then as the NATO President is now.

It was the Federal Constitution that gave the United States what we now take for granted—its common market, common currency, common citizenship, common standing armed force. It was Federal Union that gave us our common government, one representing the people directly rather than their State governments—a common government with voting power proportioned to population, and no State having a veto, with power to govern the fields transferred to it by operating directly on the citizens through a strong Executive.

The Constitution reversed no less revolutionarily the purpose of the previous, so-called United States. The confederal aim was to maintain the "sovereignty, freedom, and independence" of each of the States that made it. The Federal purpose was, and is, to preserve the sovereignty of the citizens who made the Constitution—"We the people of the United States, in order to * * * preserve the blessings of liberty to ourselves * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution."

This transformation from Confederation to Federal Union was so pround as to constitute a "Second American Revolution" much more extraordinary than the preceding one we all remember, the one which set up those 13 "free and independent States."

The 13 Colonies were not the first to break away from the mother country and become independent. Nor were they the first to set up democracies and unite them in a confederacy. This had been done by the ancient Greek city states. But the 13 were the first to solve the problem that had always baffled mankind and had led to the destruction of democracy ever since the ancient Greek failed to solve it: How to unite democracies effectively, democratically, enduringly? How to balance equitably big and little states? How to save liberty from its hereditary twin foes—tyranny and anarchy, too much government and too little?

As Lord Acton said of the 13 some 70 years later: "They had solved with astonishing and unexampled success two problems which had hiterto baffled the capacity of the most enlightened nations; they had contrived a system of federal government which prodigiously increased the national power and yet respected local liberties and authorities; and they had founded it on the principle of equality, without surrendering the securities for property and freedom."

They achieved this historic breakthrough, as Tocqueville pointed out, by "this Constitution which * * * rests, in fact, on a theory that is entirely new, and which stands as a great discovery in modern political science."

"Revolution" connotes something relatively great in scope done in relatively little time by relatively new ways. By all these three acid tests, the Second American Revolution outranks the first one.

In scope: It was not only greater in comparison with past human achievement, but in comparison with even the latest comparable efforts. The European union movement has gained great, and deserved credit for its achievements, yet the European Common Market is only one item among those which the Constitution wrapped up in its Federal package.

As for speed: It took Europe 9 years from the first proposals in 1948 to reach the stage of signing in 1957 the Treaty of Rome—under which the Common Market of the Six Nations would be completed by 1970—another 13 years (President de Gaulle permitting) or 22 years in all. Now turn back the clock to the sundial era. The State of New York has the honor of having been the first government to propose formally (thanks to Alexander Hamilton) that a Federal Convention be called to "revise and amend" the Article of Confederation. That was on July 20, 1782. Five years later the Convention met, drafted, and signed the Federal Constitution—all in 1787.

After long and strenuous debate in a number of the States it was ratified by enough of them for the Federal Government to be inaugurated less than 2 years later—7 years from start to completion. This in the sundial, oxcart age, when it took 24 days to carry the Declaration of Independence from Philadelphia to South Carolina by the fastest means available.

Yet the peoples of the 13 States did far more than begin a common market in those 7 years; they set up at the same time a common currency, defense force, foreign policy, citizenship, government. All this was done as a step in the dark, a bold experiment undertaken despite the warning of Patrick Henry against a solution which that fiery revolutionist called "as radical" as the separation from Great Britain. By way of comparison, that first American Revolution took 8 years—from the Declaration of Independence to the ratification of the peace treaty in 1783—or 18 years if one starts with the Stamp Act in 1765.

Let us turn to our third acid test. That first American Revolution was achieved in the age-old way—by violence, bloodshed, war—8 years of war. The second American revolution was achieved in a new way—peacefully—not merely without war but without any bloodshed or violence, to my knowledge, except one minor riot in Albany, N.Y. It happened on the fourth of July 1788, while the New York State Convention, elected by the people to approve or reject the Constitution was meeting in Poughkeepsie—only halfway through its heated 6 weeks debate on the subject. Only 1 man was killed and 18 injured in that Albany riot.

In our time most Americans profess to attach high importance to peaceful solution of this very problem. And well they should, since they had to suffer the bloodshed of two world wars and be faced by another atomic one before they would enter even the Atlantic alliance. One might expect such a generation to consider as revolutionary indeed the fact that their forebears made the giant breakthrough from alliance to federation without war and with practically no violence or bloodshed. Yet this revolution is the forgotten revolution—forgotten even by our generation. So much do we still seek peace by rating the victories of violence as more memorable, more heroic, more revolutionary than the triumphs of reason.

Some will say—indeed, many here and in Europe have said to me through 25 years—that it was relatively easy for the people of the 13 States to do all they did in so little time with so little violence, and therefore it wasn't so great a thing after all. They mean that they assume it was easy, compared to the problems they see facing the step from alliance to union in the Atlantic community now.

It seems to me that those who faced the situation in America then were in a much better position to judge its difficulties than we are now—especially the great majority of us who are so incredibly ignorant of the conditions in which this second revolution was achieved. Patrick Henry was by no means the only one who found that this breakthrough was as "radical" as the one we remember so well.

To Alexander Hamilton it was more than a revolution, it was a miracle. We have time to hear only three other witnesses, two Americans and one European. We call to the stand first George Washington.

Only 3 months before the Federal Convention met, he wrote General Knox on February 3, 1787, "I believe that the political machine will yet be much tumbled and tossed, and possibly wrecked altogether, before such a system * * * will be adopted. The darling sovereignties of the States individually * * * would give their weight of opposition." Still more gloomily General Washington wrote a month later, March 10, to the Foreign Secretary of Congress that the latter's opinion that "attempts to alter or amend it—the Articles of Confederation—will be like the proppings of a house that is ready to fall, and which no shoars can support (as many seem to think) may also be true. But is the public mind matured for such an important change as the one you have suggested? What would be the consequences of a premature attempt? * * * A thirst for power, and for the bantling, I had like to have said monster, for sovereignty, which have taken such fast hold of the States individually will * * * form a strong phalanx against it. It is more than probable that we shall exhibit the last melancholy proof, that mankind are not competent to their own Government."

How often I have been told that the public is not ripe for even an Atlantic Federal Convention, that it would be too dangerous to risk failure. The difference between these modern nay-sayers and Washington is that he nonetheless agreed to stake his prestige by serving as a delegate. When, after a 3-day horseback ride from Mount Vernon, he arrived at Independence Hall on May 14, the day set for the Convention to open, he found the only other delegation present was the one from Philadelphia.

With such proof of public apathy or hostility, his modern successors in office would, I fear, have saddled their plane and jetted home. The Father of our Federal Union merits that title because he stayed, cooling his heels for 11 days until a quorum of seven delegations allowed the Convention to open May 25.

During those 11 days that tried the souls of the Founding Fathers, "practical" delegates urged that the Convention—if it ever could open—limit its efforts to some halfway measures which the people might approve. But George Washington, deeply as he shared the prevailing pessimism, intervened with one of the most decisive speeches in human history. Certainly it was the shortest of important speeches. Here is the whole of it:

"It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

Result: The practical men gave in, and the Convention began with so revolutionary a spirit that it ignored its instructions—which limited it to merely amending the Articles of Confederation—and set out to draft a whole new government on lines which the delegates themselves believed would work—and they left the result to the people, and to the hand of God. Six weeks later the Convention had come to complete deadlock, after such wrangling that Washington on July 10, wrote to Hamilton (who had been called back to New York): "I almost despair of seeing a favorable issue to the proceedings of your Convention, and to therefore repent having had any agency in the business." But he ended his letter by saying characteristically: "The crisis is equally important and alarming, and no opposition under such circumstances should discourage exertion until the signature is fixed."

When the Constitution was finally signed on September 17, Benjamin Franklin—my second witness—gave the testimony you have on your program on the dangers and difficulties the signers had thus overcome. Speaking of the finished Constitution, he said:

"I think it will astonish our enemies, who are waiting with confidence to hear that our councils are confounded like those of the Builders of Babel; and that our States are on the point of separation, only to meet hereafter for the purpose of cutting one another's throats."

Such was the danger of wars among the 13 States then, in the considered judgment of so realistic a man as Poor Richard, so experienced a statesman as Franklin, then 81.

Today, there is no danger of any war among the 15 NATO allies—but so timid are the successors of Washington and Franklin now that they cease all effort when President de Gaulle vetoes some elements in the administration's Atlantic "partnership" plan. The mounting Atlantic disunion, which results from their own lack of vision and courage, is to them not urgent incentive to redouble efforts to unite the Atlantic community but justification for ceasing them and seeking accord with Moscow instead of with Paris, our oldest ally.

Europeans are now among the first to assume that the change from alliance to Federal Union among the 13 States was far too simple to be compared to the difficulties of making such a change now. But when the U.S. Constitution was signed, Europeans were, indeed, "astonished." Small wonder, for Europeans found the difficulties facing Union then so impossible to surmount that my third witness—Josiah Tucker, dean of Gloucester—wrote in 1781:

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever; a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains."

Massachusetts ratified the Constitution after prolonged debate by a majority of only 19. Despite Washington's endorsement, Virginia, after listening to Patrick Henry denounce the Constitution for 3 weeks—and raise fears of civil war—ratified it by only 89 to 79. Despite the Federalist papers—written to win a majority for the Constitutuion in the election of delegates to the New York Convention—the people elected a two-thirds majority of them opposed to ratification. Hamilton had to argue through 6 weeks before, by one of the greatest forensic feats in history, he finally persuaded them, by 30 to 27, to ratify the Constitution.

What are the lessons in our forgotten American Revolution of 1789 for the people of the 15 nation-states of Atlantica today? I see many, but I shall touch on only three or four, depending on the time I have left.

The first lesson is that we Americans, Atlanticans and all the non-Communist world have far more to gain now from studying our forgotten revolution than our remembered one. The principles of free government in our first revolution's Declaration of Independence began toppling autocrats in Western Europe in May 1789, when they helped lead to the meeting of the States General in France. In the 175 years since the French Revolution began spreading these principles in Europe, a number of nations there have grown into stable democracies. Their growth in freedom, combined with the force of the example of the Thirteen Colonies in breaking away from the British Empire, has led, particularly in the last decade, to the transformation of their colonies in Asia and Africa into independent nation-states—usually without the wars that marked the much earlier breakup of Spain's American Empire. Only the Russian, Red Chinese, and Portuguese Empires now remain to be broken up by the principles of the first American revolution.

The transformation of the Western European empires into scores of small independent nations has come at a time when mass production and mass destruction, together with the rise of Communist dictatorship, have made even the strongest democracies unite in the Atlantic alliance. The challenge of "unite or perish" which the 13 States faced after independence, and solved at the dawn of the steam-electric age by their forgotten revolution, faces the strongest Atlantic democracies far more imperatively now, at the dawn of the jet-atomic age. Its solution is no less vital to the inexperienced new nations—but they have no possibility whatever of solving it effectively by regional federations if the Atlantic democracies fail to meet this challenge—fail to provide the world with a pilot plant on international democratic federal union. If they fail to do this promptly, the undeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America are doomed, I believe. to go the way of Cuba, Zanzibar, and North Vietnam. If we do rise to the challenge, then I am confident that the remainder of this century will see our forgotten revolution spread federation of the free through the world as the remembered revolution spread independent nationalism through the first half of our century. Which will it be?

I come to the second lesson of the forgotten revolution. It is this: It is much more prudent and practical to build the Atlantic pilot plant on the broad lines of the Federal Union which has already stood the test of 175 years, than along the lines which the administration is now following.

Atlantic union has progressed so far in the past 25 years that is no longer a question of whether Atlantica should be effectively united, but only of how. There are two major answers to this question. One is the administration's Atlantic partnership plan; the other is the plan we uphold, for an Atlantic Federal Union in which all the NATO nations would be member states.

Both plans depend on Federal principles, but the partnership one would apply them only in Western Europe. It seeks to solve the problem of balancing the American colossus with the European nations by federating the latter in a European union, so that it would thus become equally colossal. The two giants would then be united by a bar called "partnership" which has never been defined, but which would obviously be much weaker than federation.

This plan was originally called "Operation Dumbbell" by its State Department authors. They were thinking in terms of the gymnasium—two equal spheres connected by a bar—but with all respect to them I believe that the slang sense of "dumbbell" more accurately describes this operation.

I have time to mention only two of the reasons why I think this plan is unsound and unworkable. One is that the Dumbbell

balance is essentially the old European balance of power between sovereign nations, which has never worked to prevent war and depression. Two sovereign democracies are bound to differ on how to advance peace and freedom just as two political parties do. But there is no way on earth to get sovereign powers to agree short of war, and since neither wants war, the result is stalemate. For more than a year now the United States has been deadlocked with a much smaller power—France. And in other ways, with another smaller power—Britain. How much worse the stalemate would be, were it between two equally powerful sovereign unions, European and American. To stake life and liberty on the hope that the reverse will then be true, that equality in national power will make for agreement and prevent dangerous deadlocks, is to fly in the face of all experience, to the height of folly.

Operation Dumbbell is also unsound because it would bridge the Atlantic by building only the approach on either side on tested Federal principles—and then connecting the main span, between the two towers, by the fragile principle of partnership. There it depends on the old European balance of power—equivalent to stretching a tight rope between the two towers of the Atlantic suspension bridge and relying on diplomats to balance their way across—across the ocean.

Our plan would build the longest span of this great bridge by the strongest, not the weakest principles—by Federal principles all the way across, and not just at the two approaches. Put in Federal, instead of engineering terms, our plan would solve the problem of balance between the American colossus and the small European nations by the time-tested Federal balance between the House and the Senate. It safeguards the people of the larger States by their voting power in the House and those of the smaller States equally by their voting power in the Senate. Though no law can be passed without the approval of both Houses, and deadlock is theoretically possible, there has been, in practice, no serious danger of stalemate—and none whatever in times of grave danger from abroad. For, over and above both the House and the Senate, stand the sovereign citizens of the Union, on whom all the Members of both Houses depend for office.

It is the partnership plan which President de Gaulle has blocked. His motives may have been the wrong ones, but personally I am very grateful to him for having halted Operation Dumbbell, and thus given people an opportunity of seeing the folly of this project and turning to the sound alternative before it is too late. The United States drifted into Operation Dumbbell without its implications and basic principles ever having been subjected, so far as I know, to close scrutiny by those in power or by most others.

President de Gaulle, by my reading of his various statements, has always left the door open to our Atlantic federal plan. I wish I had time to point out how it meets many of his main objections to the partnership plan. Suffice it to say now that, until the U.S. Government proposes Atlantic federal union along the lines we propose, and he rejects it, I for one shall continue to believe that the obstacle lies much more in Washington than in Paris. I have been told on good authority both in Washington and Paris that the U.S. Government has never even sounded him out on Atlantic federal union.

The third lesson to be drawn from our forgotten revolution is that the sound way to solve the problem of Atlantic unification is to tackle it as a whole—again by the method that has now worked for 175 years—and not piecemeal, by the little tested method that is now being followed officially. This method, called by its supporters the functional approach, has set up among the six nations in Europe first the Coal and Steel Authority, then Euratom and later the Common Market. The plan is to add next a common currency, then a common defense force, and finally a common government.

The fact is that these economic, monetary, military and political elements in the problem are closely interrelated, much as are the digestive, circulatory, muscular and nervous systems of our bodies. To tackle them separately seems to be simpler, but the successes are illusory—as I had ample opportunity to observe when covering for the New York Times such efforts at the League of Nations in the period between world wars. Whatever progress one makes in one function is jeopardized by failure to advance proportionately in some other function. In a recent example, the Nassau agreement on weapons triggered President de Gaulle into blocking the development of the Common Market.

The Founding Fathers of our Federal Union had the revolutionary wisdom to create through the Constitution a body politic complete with all these interrelated organs or functions. Because of our reluctance to study afresh our forgotten revolution it seems to many that it is much harder for us to do this now in Atlantica. Be that as it may, why not first try at least the method that worked and see what we can do ?

Full-fledged union will take years, of course, to achieve. This does not mean, however, that we must leave the attainment of this goal to the mercy of time, and meanwhile concentrate on meeting this and that crisis with this and that "practical" gimmick. To build one's dream house takes time, too—but jerry-building will never turn the dream into reality. The goal cannot be gained without a definite decision to build the house, followed by selection of architects to prepare the plans and builders to turn the blueprints into building. To put these decisions off indefinitely because the final goal takes much longer than the first step is the opposite of practical.

This is true of Atlantic Union, too; the basic decisions take relatively little time, there is no sense in deferring them further, and every reason to take them now. What does this mean, concretely? It means a decision by the President to invite the NATO allies to send delegates to meet with U.S. delegates in another Federal Constitutional Convention, patterned broadly on the one in 1787, to take—subject to ratification by their peoples—the following positive, creative actions:

1. Declare that the goal is the transformation of the NATO alliance into, eventually, a full-fledged Federal Union, that is, one with a common citizenship, foreign policy, defense force, and free movement of money, goods and men through its territory—which would guarantee the continued independence of each Member Nation as regards its purely national affairs, and could admit other nations that so desired, when it agreed that this would advance its purpose.

2. Draft a Federal Constitution to speed attainment of this goal by:

(A) Listing the Bill of Rights, or individual liberties, and the other peaceful purposes which this Union of the Free would be made to advance.

(B) Establishing a democratic government with a Federal Senate and House, and an Executive and Judiciary to pursue these aims;

(C) Assigning to this Government the task of working out, as a whole, the transition to complete Union in the various interrelated fields to be given it, and fixing a definite time-table for the attainment of each—a common currency to be achieved in ------ years, a common market in ------ years, a common defense force in ------ years, and free movement of citizens throughout the Union in ------ years.

Certainly there would be conflicting views in such a convention, and many compromises would have to be made. But the Convention would be spared the difficulty of working out the details of transition which the drafters of the Rome Treaty incorporated in that columinous document which set up the Common Market. All such questions would be left to the New Union Government to answer. This Convention, like the one in Philadelphia, could concentrate on the basic political problem—and turn out as short a document as the U.S. Constitution.

If the French Government refused to participate, or, participating, refused to sign or ratify the resulting constitution, the other nations could still federate. How long could even General de Gaulle keep France out of a union that included the United States, Canada, Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, the German Federal Republic, Italy—to mention no more? There is so much support for Atlantic union already among the French, including the Gaullist leaders, that one could confidently expect France to enter such a federation soon, if it were not among the founders, as I am confident it would be.

The fourth and concluding lesson we can draw from the forgotten Federal Revolution is the most important: It is to meet the challenge of our day with the revolutionary vision and courage. This means abandoning three delusions we now cherish. One delusion is that we can succeed in meeting our oceanic challenge with halfway measures that even such statesmen as Washington, Franklin, Hamilton could not succeed with among 13 English-speaking States in "easier" conditions.

Our second delusion is that we do not need even to attempt to federate Atlantica with the revolutionary scope and speed with which they achieved their great breakthrough. We talk of the explosion of population, of new nations, of technological and scientific advance that is shrinking the world at revolutionary speed—and we nurse the delusion that we don't need to advance with revolutionary speed and on a revolutionary scale in the political field, in constituting effective free international government in such a world.

Our third delusion is that we can meet our challenge without demanding of our leaders the revolutionary character, heroic courage, the Founding Fathers farsighted vision and sublime faith in the sovereign citizen which Washington, Franklin, Hamilton and a galaxy of Founding Fathers provided 175 years ago.

Let us be done with these delusions. Let us be done with them now. We are not so feeble that we cannot do what our fathers did and what we expect our children to do. We, too—each of us here, and all our friends and fellow citizens—we, too, can do far better than we have yet begun to do. We, too, can raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. We, too, can have Washington's faith that if we will but raise that standard, the hand of God will turn the event our way.

We of Federal Union, Inc., and of the International Movement for Atlantic Union have that faith. We have already raised anew Washington's standard of Federal Union of the free. We invite you cordially to help us carry it forward to another "astonishing" triumph of human reason, and of the human spirit.

Supreme Court Prayer Decisions

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 22 the House Judiciary Committee will begin hearings on legislation concerning prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. To aid in the debate concerning this important matter, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a compilation of comments by religious spokesmen upholding the Supreme Court prayer decisions and opposing efforts to amend the U.S. Constitution to negate those decisions.

The comments follow:

COMMENTS OF RELIGIOUS SPOKESMEN UPHOLDING SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND OPPOSING EFFORTS TO AMEND THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

"Don't tamper: In our view, it would be less confusing and safer to leave the country's basic declaration about religion untouched * * *. The two clauses about religion, one forbidding the establishment of an official American religion and the other guaranteeing inviolability of religious freedom, admirably express traditional American convictions. There will always be some disagreement over the precise meaning of these ideas, but if we must rely on amendments to apply these ideas to particular situations, the amendments could become endless, and the Bill of Rights would become a confusing patchwork of words."—Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph.

"Campaigns * * * to change the Constitution are deplorable."—Catholic World.

"Christians—Catholics and Protestants—would properly be disturbed if their children in public schools were expected to be present for the saying of a Mohammedan or Buddhist prayer. Catholics and other citizens have objected to the public school system being used as an auxiliary of Protestantism. The present decision of the U.S. Supreme Court makes the point more clear: Tax-supported public educational systems are not to be used to promote a specific denominational religion.

"The decision is not against God; it is not against the Bible; it is not against prayer. From what we have read, it simply states that the reading of a denominational Bible and the saying of a denominational prayer—the Our Father—is contrary to the first amendment.

"We think that if those who have become upset by the decision turned their attention to the furthering of religious instruction of the young—by word and example—much good would be accomplished."—Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy, Milwaukee Catholic Herald Citizen, June 22, 1963.

"Any explanation of the Bible reading and prayer cases must take account of the fact that here the Government was deeply and directly involved in religious practices that operated with an indirect compulsive force on all public school children.

"The Court has clearly made an important contribution to the cause of religious freedom. Its interpretation of the separation principle has not stemmed from any hostility to religion or to the churches. On the contrary, its interpretations have been premised on the assumption that due regard for the necessity of freeing religion from the compulsion of government and of freeing government from the domination of religious forces, serves the best interests of both religion and government."—Commission on Church and State Relations, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America, 1963.

"It is an essential task of the churches to provide adequate religious instruction through every means at their disposal * * *. We warn the churches against the all too human tendency to look to the state and its agencies for support in fulfilling the churches' mission. Such a tendency endangers both true religion and and civil liberties. At the same time, we call the churches to renewed worship, study, work, and sacrifice to fulfill their mission as God's people in the world.

* * * * *

"The full treatment of some regular school subjects requires the use of the Bible as a source book. In such studies—including those related to character development—the use of the Bible has a valid educational purpose. But neither true religion nor good education is dependent upon the devotional use of the Bible in the public school program.

"The Supreme Court of the United States in the Regents' Prayer case has ruled that 'in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the government.' We recognize the wisdom as well as the authority of this ruling."—The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S. of A., June 7, 1963.

"The guarantees of the first amendment were hard won and are precious. The proposed [amendment] calls for a fundamental change in our basic charter of liberties which were regarded by our Founding Fathers as unalienable. The proposal to tamper with the freedom of religion clause of the first amendment sets a dangerous precedent.

* * * * *

"Leaders of various religious bodies, both in the State and in the Nation, have announced support of recent Supreme Court decisions as being good for religion and beneficial to the Nation even though these decisions bar religious exercises in public schools. We believe it is important for our legislators to give serious weight to such moral guidelines."

The Reverend Arthur C. Barnhart, Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Relations, Diocese of Pennsylvania, Episcopal Church; Wilbur W. Bloom, Executive Secretary, Pennsylvania Baptist Convention; Jules Cohen, Executive Director, Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia; Chad P. Combs, Church and Society Chairman, Synod of Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; Brant Coopersmith, Regional Director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Donald M. Hall, Field Director of Christian Education, United Presbyterian Synod of Pennsylvania; Theodore R. Mann, President, Pennsylvania Region, American Jewish Congress; Harry L. Moore, Director of Christian Education, Pennsylvania Baptist Convention, Valley Forge, Pa.; Jesse D. Reber, General Secretary, Pennsylvania Council of Churches, Harrisburg, Pa.; the Reverend George H. Easter, Chaplain and Instructor in Christian Ethics, Philadelphia Divinity School (Episcopal); the Reverend Norman J. Faranelli, Rector, St. Martin's Episcopal Church, Oak Lane; Dr. Murray Friedman, Pennsylvania Area Director, American Jewish Committee; Rabbi Harold Goldfarb, Executive Director, Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia; Rabbi Theodore H. Gordon, Main Line Reform Temple Beth Elohim; Miss Margaret E. Kuhn, Office of Church and Society, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; Howard Maxwell, Office of Church and Society, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; Rev. Edward A. Powers, General Secretary, Division of Christian Education, United Church of Christ; Protestant and Jewish religious leaders, Philadelphia Inquirer, March 13, 1964.

"In view of the recent Supreme Court decision on school prayer and Bible reading, we, a group of educators, lawyers, editors and religious leaders, have felt it our duty to meet and to discuss the implications of this decision. We represent diverse religious commitments and reflect varied reactions to the Court's ruling.

* * * * *

"Despite our differences, we concur on the following points:

"1. We treasure the guarantees in the first amendment of the Constitution and appreciate the role of the Supreme Court in protecting religious liberty. The Court has clarified the relation of the public school to religion. We are obliged to respect and heed this decision.

"2. The decision does not endorse irreligion or atheism in America. The Court emphatically states its belief that the place of religion in American society is an exalted one. The policy of 'wholesome neutrality,' which the Court asserts, 'neither advances nor inhibits religion.' We see no need to amend the Constitution or change the role of the Supreme Court.

"3. Although devotional exercises are forbidden, the Court clearly allows for the objective study of religion and particularly of the Bible in the public school. Citizens should encourage public school authorities to explore the possibilities suggested by this decision to include within the public school curriculum an understanding of the role of religion in society, culture and history. They should assure school officials the necessary freedom to perform this task in a responsible professional manner.

"4. We advocate that in a pluralistic society religious and civic groups use the instrumentality of dialogue to resolve conflict. However, we affirm the right of individuals or groups, without being subjected to abuse or penalty, to appeal to the courts to secure and protect civil rights.

"5. The decision challenges parents and religious leaders to shape and strengthen spiritual commitment by reliance on voluntary means, and to resist the temptation to rely on governmental institutions to create religious conviction."

Dean Edward W. Barrett, Columbia University Graduate, School of Journalism; Dr. William Brickman, Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania; Dan Callahan, Associate Editor, Commonweal; Dr. C. Emanuel Carlson, Executive Director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; Father James Deneen, Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Evansville, Ind.; Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, Editor, Reconstructionist; Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, Staff Consultant, Religious Freedom and Public Affairs Project, NCCJ; Rabbi Robert Gordis, Jewish Theological Seminary; Dr. Kyle Haselden, Managing Editor, Christian Century; Dr. Carl F. H. Henry, Editor, Christianity Today; Dr. David Hunter, Director, Department of Christian Education, Protestant Episcopal Church; Dr. Wilber G. Katz, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin; Father William J. Kenealy, S.J., Law Professor, Loyola University, Chicago; Dr. Dumont F. Kenny, President, Queensborough Community College of the City University of New York, who served as the meeting's chairman; Rabbi Norman Lamm, Professor,

Yeshiva University; Dr. Joseph Manch, Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo, N.Y.; Senator Eugene McCarthy, Minnesota; Dr. Claud Nelson, Staff Consultant on Interreligious Relations, NCCJ; Thomas J. O'Toole, Former Director, Church-State Institute, Villanova University; Dr. Theodore Powell, Connecticut State Department of Education; Father John Reedy, C.S.C. Editor, Ave Maria; Father John B. Sheerin, C.S.P., Editor, Catholic World; Prof. Roger Shinn, Union Theological Seminary; New York; Rev. John M. Swomley, Jr., St. Paul School of Theology (Methodist), Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. Norman Temme, Acting Public Relations Director, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod; Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland; Dr. Thomas J. Van Loon, Nashville, Tenn.

"The United Synagogue of America earnestly prays that no legislation will be enacted by the Congress which will in any way compel or threaten to compel the children of America to worship in Government agencies or under the aegis of temporal authority. The religious training of American children should be permitted to flourish in church, synagogue, and home, where it belongs. Religion cannot become, however remotely, an arm of Government."—Mr. GEORGE MAISLEN, president of the United Synagogue of America, July 1962.

"We are skeptical * * * of the advisability of attempting to modify the wording of the religion clauses of the first amendment, even for purposes of clarification. For one thing, it would speedily appear, we fear, that those who want a clarification are deeply divided among themselves. It may be true that a majority of the American people are willing to add something to the religion clauses in order to bring out their true meaning. But does everyone want to add the same thing? We doubt it.

"A weightier reason for questioning the wisdom of this move is that, if it should succeed, it would only shake the faith of the American people in the firmness of the constitutional guarantee of our most basic civil liberty, freedom of religion. From a purely formal point of view, of course, everything in the first amendment is as much subject to amendment by the people as any other part of the Constitution. But for all practical purposes, the first amendment's religion clauses ought to be regarded as unamendable.

"Our country contains more than 250 different religious faiths, as well as a host of people of no definite religion. It is imperative that all of us should be able to feel a serene confidence that, however much we may quarrel and dispute, no successful attempt will ever be made to change the fundamental terms on which we live together in the secure enjoyment of religious freedom."—America (a Jesuit weekly), May 25, 1963.

"I do not see how the U.S. Supreme Court could honestly have ruled otherwise than it did when it outlawed Bible readings and recitations of the Lord's Prayer as devotional religious exercises sponsored by the authorities in the Nation's State-operated public schools.

"Not for one moment can I agree with those who are calling for a constitutional amendment to make these practices legal. I am strongly opposed to the setting of any precedent of tampering with the first amendment to the Constitution.

"The amendment as it stands is adequate, and has proved a priceless protection for freedom of conscience and religion.

"Apart from the legal question, the primary right and responsibility in the education of children belongs to the parents. American law says so. So does the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And the popes—including John XXIII—have repeatedly enunciated the principle.

"If by our energy and ingenuity and community cooperation we can wipe out polio, we can correct religious illiteracy. But we won't accomplish much until we stop leaning on the public schools, and address ourselves to our religious duty."—JOSEPH BREIG, The Pittsburgh Catholic, August 15, 1963.

"It is now clear that public authorities are required to show neutrality toward all groups of believers and nonbelievers. In public schools, members of religious minorities are not required to choose between participating in religious practices against their conscience and submitting to the handicap of expressing their dissent by conspicuous withdrawal.

"We may be thankful that the Constitution does not permit the Government to define and give preference to some general version of Christianity or of Judeo-Christian religion."—The Rt. Rev. ARTHUR LICHTENBERGER, Presiding Bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

"Prayer is cheapened when it is used as a device to quiet unruly children, and the Bible loses its true meaning when it is looked upon as a moral handbook for minors. Both are meaningful only as sincere expressions of faith.

"The Court's decision underscores our firm belief that religious instruction is the sacred responsibility of the family and the churches. It is both mistaken and dangerous to assume the spiritual needs of our youth are met by formal recitation of prayers or the casual learning of words taken from the Holy Writ.

"We reiterate that religious instruction is not the responsibility of a public institution * * *. Now that the Court has spoken, responsible Americans will abide by its decisions in good grace. They will not speak out of disrespect for the judicial system of the Nation or encourage proposals subversive to the Bill of Rights.

"Responsible Americans * * * cannot praise the Court or remain silent when they approve of a decision and then turn around and attack its integrity when they dislike a ruling."—The Reverend SILAS G. KESSLER and the Reverend EUGENE CARSON BLAKE, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States.

"Since pagan influences increasingly shape American institutions, it is noteworthy that the Supreme Court set its prohibition of compulsory devotional exercises in the context not of irreligion but of the Nation's religious heritage. The Court banned legislated Bible reading and prayer in public schools and its logic likewise would ban legislated irreligion. Neither majority nor minority should use machinery of government to implement religious beliefs or nonbeliefs.

"The decision multiplies the responsibility of American parents and churchmen to promote spiritual decision not through machinery of the state but through voluntary agencies."—Christianity Today, July 5, 1963.

"As representatives of the Christian faith, we accept the decision of the Court in full recognition of the historic spiritual values the decision seeks to preserve.

"The decision makes it mandatory for us to seek ways of relating religion and education in the life of the child that shall not be by statutory decree. Unless Bible reading and prayer are performed in an atmosphere of religious devotion and worship, often not possible in the public school, the very act may be profane and secularized to the detriment of the public.

"In the long run, this decision of the Court is more likely to conserve and protect the spiritual values that lie at the heart of our democracy, and of the Christian faith, than a contrary decision."—Bishop JOHN WESLEY LORD, bishop of the Methodist Church (Washington area).

"Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have interrupted or modified traditional devotional practices in many public schools and caused considerable concern in many quarters * * *. We concur in the implication of these decisions that the state has no right to establish or authorize devotional practices in our public schools. Since we have lived in considerable harmony under the first amendment of the Federal Constitution for many years, during which time free religion flourished in America we see no reason for proposing amendments to either the Federal or * * * State Constitutions to nullify the decisions of the Supreme Court."—New York State Council of Churches, statement of legislative principles, 1964.

"Prayer amendment, No: It seems to us that it is a panic reaction to suggest that only a constitutional amendment can solve what is certainly a serious problem for our society.

"The issue is whether the publicly financed, publicly administered, obligatory educational system should, under our system of freedom of worship, conduct acts of religious devotion and indoctrinate students in a set of religious values.

"And the related issue is: How shall this society effectively provide a religious dimension to the education of its children?

"This last question weighs heavily on the consciences of parents and religious leaders. But it does not demand that we amend the Constitution in such a way that authority over religious education will be granted to some government official or agency.

"And that's what would have to be done if the amendment were to be carried out as a reality.

"Authority over religious education should not be conveyed by majority vote."—Ave Maria (a Catholic weekly), December 21, 1963.

"When the Court ruled against the New York Regents' prayer and against religious devotions in the public schools of Pennsylvania and Maryland * * * many mature persons seemed to think the Highest Court had driven God out of the country, as if that were possible * * * and some 50 bills were introduced to amend the first amendment in such a manner as to undo the Court's decision.

"The Standard submits that the people of the United States are fortunate to have a government which provides for checks and balances. At this particular time, when so many in government want to pay the bills for the churches and so many in the churches want the government to pay them, we should be thankful that the judicial department has 'prevented the Government from underwriting any religious sect.'

"The National Constitution provides for separation of church and state, and perhaps most of the men and women in Government really believe in the principle, but those who obtain and retain their office by the vote of the people know the votaries are divided often tempted to sidestep the constitutional provision in order to please the people 'back home.' * * * There must always be one division of government free from any and all political pressure. If American people are smart, they will see to it that the judicial department shall always remain free.

"For the last 40 years, the legislative and executive branches of the National Government have sometimes sought new means for permitting something, even though it might be unconstitutional. We are fortunate that the third branch is devoted to preventing that which the Constitution forbids."—The Baptist Standard, February 26, 1964.

"We oppose any attempt to override the Court's salutary interpretation and to alter the intent of the Founders of our country to

keep church and state separate. If the state engages in religious practices, religion in the United States will suffer; and if religion suffers, so will the Nation. We need government and we need religion, each working in its own sphere, each acting for the good of all."—Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice and the Unitarian Universalist Association, July 26 and August 2, 1962.

"Whether the Supreme Court declares these particular mandatory religious practices in public schools to be constitutional or unconstitutional, there are some significant characteristics of our Presbyterian heritage that must not be forgotten or ignored. One is that the instruction of children in the beliefs and practices of the Christian faith is the responsibility and privilege of the church and the family; these things are not properly to be provided by the state or by any of the agencies of the state, including the public schools. Another is that the greatest perils confronting the church when it confuses its faith with the surrounding culture—even a benign and benevolent culture—and substitutes civil legislation for its own internal disciplines in order to replace its own evident responsibilities and tasks. Finally, it is the greatest betrayal of our heritage and of our profession of faith in Jesus Christ as Lord, to treat the worship of God, and prayer in particular, or the public reading of the Scriptures, as convenient devices to enforce order in assemblies, or as ceremonial supports for either a narrow band of patriotism or an expedient social morality."—WILLIAM A. MORRISON, general secretary, board of Christian education; EUGENE CARSON BLAKE, stated clerk, general assembly; Monday Morning (a magazine for Presbyterian ministers), May 20, 1963.

"Don't rush the prayer amendment. It is so easy to think that one is voting for prayer and the Bible. It comes as a shock that this is not the issue. The issue is that agencies of government cannot avoid favoring one denomination and hurting another by the practical decisions that have to be made by government authority on what version of the Bible shall be imposed and what prayer. The churches know this and that is why they are against the Becker amendment.

"Prayers and Bible reading are more meaningful within the home and church than in the public schools. The late President Kennedy pointed out quite accurately that the U.S. Supreme Court ruling 'would be a welcome reminder to every American family that we can pray a good deal more at home and attend our churches with a good deal more fidelity.' "—Christian Science Monitor, March 30, 1964.

"The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs reaffirms its conviction that laws and regulations prescribing prayers or devotional exercises do not contribute to a free exercise of religion and should not be encouraged.

"The Baptist Joint Committee also expresses a deep concern lest such laws and regulations become the means for confusing the moral values of American society for a devotion to religious insights. While the committee is enthusiastic about much in the American heritage as a national way of life, the equation of religious ideas and practices with our national culture will erode rather than strengthen the American heritage.

"The committee recognizes that some political leaders may make appeals for the establishment of religious acts through legalized means to arouse public sentiment. This we regard to be in bad taste as a violation of the principles of separation of church and state.

"Legislative representatives and political leaders should be made aware of our Baptist support for a clear distinction between the roles of the churches and those of State agencies."—Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, March 10, 1964.

"The religious liberty declaration," Cardinal Ritter said, "is necessary for progress toward Christian unity and the unity of mankind." The reason:

" 'Without such a declaration there can be no mutual discussion, and the door would be closed to any real dialogue with those outside the church.'

"In other words, the first requisite for a dialogue with other Christians, with Jews, with Mohammedans, with mankind generally, is full recognition that each person must be free to obey conscience.

"A corollary of this is that the church must strive to express religious truth with such clarity and charity that it will appeal to the free intellects of free human beings.

"Those are among the purposes for which Pope John XXIII summoned the Ecumenical Council.

"This principle of respect for conscience is also in perfect accord with Pope John's encyclical, Pacem in Terris, in which he emphasized that 'by the natural law every human being has the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions.'

"It would seem impossible to square with such principles a school prayer amendment to the Constitution which would legalize religious exercises which are initiated, sponsored or directed by pubic school authorities."—Catholic Universe Bulletin (Cleveland, Ohio), January 3, 1964.

"We believe that a person is not adequately educated for life unless he has a real appreciation of religious ideas, values, institutions, and practices. But because of the religious pluralism which prevails in our society today, religious education cannot be a function of the public schools. However, this does not mean that the role which religion, as empirical fact, plays in the culture and in human history cannot be taught in the public schools. Therefore, while supporting the Supreme Court decision of June 17, 1963, we urge positive cooperation toward this end among clergymen, educators, administrators, and other leaders of the community."—Bishops F. Gerald Ensley, A. Raymond Grant, John Wesley Lord, and Kenneth W. Copeland (officers of the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church).

"We do not believe that much has been lost in terms of the specific points covered by the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school prayer and Bible reading cases. If the Lord's Prayer were to be recited in schoolrooms only for the sake of the moral and ethical atmosphere it creates, it would be worth nothing to the practicing Christian. The Lord's Prayer is the supreme act of adoration and petition or it is debased. Reading the Bible in the public schools without comment, too, has been of dubious value as either an educational or religious experience. The more we attempt as Christians or Americans to insist on common denominator religious exercise or instruction in the public schools, the greater risk we run of diluting our faith and contributing to a vague religiosity which identifies religion with patriotism and becomes a national folk religion."—Statement of the Executive Council, Lutheran Church in America, June 28–29, 1963.

"Committing religious suicide—Several religious and political forces in the United States appear determined to destroy the Nation's constitutional guarantee of religious freedom * * *. The numerous efforts to circumvent the U.S. Supreme Court's decisions on Bible reading and prayer in the public schools are variously motivated. Some of the efforts rise from a sincere but misguided notion that the Supreme Court's rulings have jeopardized religion in the United States. Some of the attacks on the Court's decisions can be charitably explained only as products of ignorance * * *. Jews, Unitarians, secularists, Roman Catholics and others whose children have been unwillingly subjected to religious services and instruction in public schools may have to excuse [this] ignorance, but they do not have to stand idly by while that kind of ignorance destroys their freedom from religions imposed, supported and coerced by the state. Some of the efforts to amend the first amendment are entirely motivated by political considerations. Whipping the Supreme Court, even when it faithfully interprets the Constitution, is a popular pastime, and a political candidate who runs on a platform that 'defends God' expects from Providence a reciprocal courtesy * * *. Frenetic attacks on the Bill of Rights imperil the very soul of the Nation and jeopardize every man's right to worship and obey God in freedom. God does not need our defense, but we need to defend ourselves against religion-intoxicated fanatics, sincere but bungling religionists and opportunistic politicians who offer us their kind of religion and their brand of God in exchange for God-given religious freedom."—The Christian Century, April 1, 1964.

The Late Ben Hecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Ben Hecht at the age of 70 our country has lost a journalist, a dramatist, an all-around writer, and philosopher, we are not apt to see again. I have lost a friend of many years ago, although in recent years our paths have not crossed.

Change has come to the fourth estate as it has elsewhere.

Hecht was born in 1894 and came to Chicago in 1910, getting a job at the ripe age of 16 on the old Chicago Journal, published and edited by John Eastman. Young Richard J. Finnegan at the time was rapidly becoming Eastman's strong right arm at the commencement of one of Chicago's outstanding journalistic careers.

When Ben moved over to the Chicago Daily News he was 20. Meanwhile Carl Sandburg had come down from Milwaukee, where he had been secretary to the mayor, and about this time was city editor of the Day Book, Ned Cochrane's adless newspaper.

It was not until 1928 that Ben Hecht and Charles MacArthur produced "The Front Page," which in a way immortalized Walter Howie, although of course not by name.

It was 1902 or 1903, as I remember, that Walter, a green country kid, had come from Iowa to join up as a cub reporter under City Editor Mose Koenisberg at the Hearst madhouse on Madison Street in Chicago. We called it the madhouse with a degree of real affection and much truth since our entire editorial staff operated with din and noise on one floor, with on partition, save those of a small enclosure at the right front, the throne room of Foster Coates, the big boss under William Randolph Hurst and whom I still hold as one of the all-time greats of the fourth estate. At the time I was sporting editor and Hugh Fullerton and Ring Lardner covered baseball. In 1907 I became Sunday editor, a job I always enjoyed.

If Ben Hecht later made what must be near a world record in word production, Hugh Fullerton certainly set the pace in that earlier decade. He could write brilliantly on any subject and his typewriter pounded on and on at lightening speed with never a moment's halt.

On one occasion a fire destroyed the copy for an overdue edition of the Sears Roebuck catalog. All that was salvaged was some 4,000 or 5,000 photographs of goods and wares to be offered for sale in the catalog. Hugh undertook to supply the text for the photographs on his Sunday off, making up the description of the wares as his typewriter rattled on. It turned out to be the most successful catalog, in sales result, that Sears Roebuck had put out up to that time. And Hugh did the job in 6 hours flat.

Walter Howie remained in that atmosphere of the Hearst madhouse for several years, then moved over to the Inter Ocean as city editor, eventually taking over the city desk of the Tribune, and in the end winding up again in the old Hearst fold. I had been one of his first friends in Chicago and our friendship continued during the years.

As far as I know, I am the last survivor of the fourth estate of Chicago during the first decade of the 20th century that marked the advent of William Randolph Hearst, the Chicago American in the afternoon, and the Chicago Examiner in the morning. It was an exciting, an adventurous and a challenging decade and it was the period of birth of newspapers with a million circulation.

Ben Hecht, who joined up at 16 and henceforth carried on in the approved spirit of a passed era, giving to the world in "The Front Page" the genuine Walter Howie profile, was the last of the breed. The world is the poorer for his passing.

Let's Try Separate U.S. Pay Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is generally understood that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may report out a bill which will have the same provisions for postal pay and classified Federal employees pay as the bill defeated in March. One of the principal differences will be a $7,500 a year increase in congressional pay instead of $10,000, and to be effective January 1, 1965, instead of upon final approval of the bill.

From the viewpoint of some of us who opposed the bill that was defeated, this new proposal may be some better in that it provides for only a 33⅓ percent increase rather than a 44 percent increase for Members of Congress, and is some better in that its effective date is January 1, 1965, but it still seeks to tie together issues which should be considered separately. It seems to me the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by their determination to serve up again a package including executive, judicial, and legislative salaries, want to make it plain to everyone that as far as they are concerned there is just no other way this matter can be handled. Their proposed action would seem to indicate the committee believes that Members of Congress will never vote themselves a pay raise unless they feel compelled to approve in the same bill an increase for those in the classified and postal service as well as the Federal judiciary. If the committee continues to insist that all these must be considered together, there may very well be a repetition of the previous defeat of the bill.

A congressional pay increase should not be made to appear to be bait or come-on held out as a sort of bonus to enlist support for other issues wrapped together in the same package. Actually, none of this sort of thing should be needed because the Federal employees pay increase can stand on its own merit.

Members of Congress should not have to bear the burden of the charge that they are trying to slip their own pay raise through while public attention is focused upon the otherwise popular provisions for the increase of postal and classified Federal employees. There should be a separate bill on congressional pay and let each Member consider the reasonableness of its provisions and vote it up or down on a rollcall vote.

The largest newspaper in my congressional district, the Kansas City Star, recently published on its editorial page, the editorial included below. The Star has not found it convenient to agree with many of the positions I have taken in the past upon issues before the Congress but, as I read the suggestions of this editorial, they could not be in more complete agreement with the thoughts I expressed during the debate on the pay bill in March, which were included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For this reason, it is a privilege to ask consent that the following editorial be included as extraneous matter in connection with my own remarks above and for the benefit of my colleagues as an expression of thought which, to me, makes sense and which, if followed, could result in a reasonable increase in pay for our postal people and others in the Federal service that might not happen if our Post Office and Civil Service Committee persists in its stubborness.

The editorial of Tuesday, April 14, 1964, follows:

LET'S TRY SEPARATE U.S. PAY BILLS

Persistence is a commendable quality, and you have to credit the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee with persistence. There are those who would call the quality, in this instance, stubborness. We won't quarrel with that judgment, for it does seem that the Representatives didn't learn very much from the defeat last March of the Federal pay bill. The committee plans to try again, in hearings starting this week. But there is a difference: the congressional pay increase would be $7,500 a year instead of $10,000. A strategy with more chance for success, we believe, would be to divide the bill into three parts—executive, legislative and judicial.

We have favored the pay increase bill and we were not impressed by the argument that Congress ought not to raise its own pay. No one else can. Moreover, it seems to us that the quality of the Nation's legislative body is not likely to be upgraded until salaries are more competitive with the pay levels of other governmental bodies and of private business. This does not mean that we regard every present Member of Congress as worth his pay. But we would hope that with an improved salary schedule, Congress would be a little less cut rate.

But beyond the congressional issue are the related issues of pay for executive and judicial department people. Particularly in the case of the Federal judges, we regard the present schedule as too low. Many State court judges receive better pay than do their Federal counterparts. The load on the judiciary—Federal and State alike—has increased tremendously since the last increase for U.S. judges in 1955.

In the executive department, it is worth noting that in Los Angeles alone, eight municipal jobs offer more pay than do Cabinet posts. If a pay raise for top executives is justified—and we believe it is—you have to consider the thousands in the classified and postal services.

But the big furor in the House, as we recall it, was over the pay of the lawmakers. It became an emotional issue and little attention was paid to the merits of the bill. It might be different this time, if the House would, one by one and in good order, consider separate bills for the three branches of Government. No one could then say that Congress was trying to sneak its own pay raise through while the public was looking the other way. It would be a frank approach that just might be successful.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association Does a Good Service in Working Constantly for Rule of a Government of Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I believe that one of the best ways to preserve individual liberties in this great land of ours is to foster respect for the law. We talk much about a government of laws and not of men, and sometimes the expression becomes identified more by its usage than by its true meaning.

The Federal Bar Association was founded 44 years ago to join attorneys who have a connection with the Federal Government, be it legislative, executive, or judicial, together in a professional atmosphere to foster the principles that lead to a government by law instead of by men. Among the objects of this association are the following:

To advance the science of jurisprudence.

To promote the administration of justice.

To uphold a high standard for the Federal judiciary, attorneys representing the Government of the United States, and attorneys appearing before courts, departments, and agencies of the United States.

To encourage cordial and friendly relations among members of the legal profession.

To promote the welfare of attorneys employed by the Government of the United States.

It was my pleasure to assist in the formation of the chapter of this association here on Capitol Hill, and I am proud to be a member of it. Some of the fine work of this chapter in recent months is summarized in a recent article in Roll Call, a newspaper of Capitol Hill, dated March 25, 1964. This work pertains to legislative efficiency and legal thoroughness and should be of interest to all Senators and to the legal profession in general. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL BAR CHAPTER ACTIVE, INFLUENTIAL

A few days ago, while others inched their way homeward in a darkened Washington's slushbound rush hour, some 150 men and women gathered quietly in a high-ceilinged House chamber to commence a 2-hour skull session on a seemingly tedious and obtuse theme—"A B C's of the Immigration and Naturalization Law."

Typewriters down the street at the HEW building, and at FAA and Commerce, had been covered long ago. Foggy Bottom types were already on their second Gibson, and in other quarters the evening newspapers had provoked talk of stereo sets and cantaloups, of influence that could be bought, and of Capitol Hill secretaries whose qualifications were more apparent after 5.

But afterhours activities for our group on the Hill meant taking notes and asking questions of a Deputy Assistant Commissioner of Immigration. They seemed fascinated, nonetheless, as they had been in weeks before, when the meetings concerned such lighthearted matters as "How To Use the United States Code," or "A Layman's Briefing on the Tax Reform and Reduction Bill."

This, unfortunately, is a side of Congress and its staff that goes unheralded by the wire services and the TV cameras. But editors tell us that readers of the "Everytown Exhorter" wouldn't be interested, anyway, in the hundreds of similar seminars, briefings, and "working luncheons" that are a well-attended, though extracurricular, part of the life of many conscientious staff aids on Capitol Hill.

The organization that has contributed, perhaps, the most to this unpublicized aspect of staff life is the Capitol Hill chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

Bursting forth in recent months with a refreshing enthusiasm, an impressive list of guest speakers, and a unique series of services for Hill lawyers, the chapter has become one of the most active and useful professional societies in Washington.

Composed of more than 300 members, including Senators, Representatives, committee counsel and congressional and Library of Congress staff, the organization has grown since its birth 5 years ago from a relatively obscure subdivision of the District of Columbia Bar Association to a widely respected and fullfledged chapter.

Its success can be traced to the active support of such men in Congress as the late Senator Estes Kefauver, a lawyer and loyal patron of the club in its earliest days, and Representative TORBERT H. MACDONALD, of Massachusetts, who served as the chapter's first president.

The surge of activity in recent months and the development of services designed, increasingly, to promote the legislative effectiveness of its members, is attributable on many counts to the organization drive and ability of MACDONALD's administrative assistant, Erwin G. Krasnow, the retiring chapter president.

A member of Phi Beta Kappa and a graduate of Harvard Law School, Krasnow believes the chapter has an important mission beyond that fraternal common ground it provides for Hill lawyers, or the occasional social function it performs, such as a year-end party or dance.

"The bar association on Capitol Hill promotes high standards of its members, all of whom work in some way in the area of legislative law," Krasnow said.

"It is remarkable to note the paucity of orientation and educational services—tools for a professional staff—available within Congress. This is the largest and certainly the most important parliamentary body in the world; an institution handling well over 10,000 bills a session as well as plowing through a $97-billion-plus Presidential budget.

"The bar association on Capitol Hill plays a key role, I feel, in supplying congressional staffs with an opportunity to gain insight into the legislative process, develop proficiency in their administrative duties and, generally, be more aware of the scope of national problems."

Krasnow said he feels much more needs to be done.

"We are just scratching the surface in establishing basic orientation and educational services for staffers. Clearly, the multiplicity of organizations on the Hill should be providing more services in this essential area."

Krasnow speculated that in time Congress itself may devise and even finance ways of developing a more well-rounded and better informed staff personnel.

The Hill Bar Association is a unique and in its own way a very exclusive society. Membership is limited to lawyers who work for the U.S. Congress.

Services of the organization are not exclusive, however, and have been purposely designed to cover the broadest possible base. Every congressional staffer is welcome, Krasnow said, to attend the luncheon meetings and evening skull sessions and to participate in other activities of the organization.

To stimulate the greatest possible interest, the chapter's speakers have been drawn from the top levels of Government and their subjects have been timely and sometimes controversial.

Jack Anderson, for example, one of the club's non-Government guests last year, lashed out in his fiery revival-tent style on the sins of Congress. Washington correspondent for Parade and a longtime associate of Columnist Drew Pearson, Anderson attacked conflicts of interest in Congress and challenged chapter members to use their position as insiders to help stamp out and expose abuses.

Some of the speakers have included Representatives John Lindsey, of New York, who approached conflicts of interest from a legislative point of view; Senator John Sparkman, of Alabama, on Supreme Court prayer decisions; Representative John Moss, of California, on congressional access to information; Representative Moore, Jr., of West Virginia, on aid to indigent criminal defendants in criminal courts, and National Columnist Roscoe Drummond, who discussed an intriguing question—"Does Congress Have a Future?"

One of the most popular programs featured former Presidential Assistant Ted Sorenson, who spoke on decisionmaking in the White House prior to the assassination of President Kennedy.

F.D.R.'s crusty trustbuster, Thurman Arnold, was a recent speaker. He expounded for nearly an hour on the economic and historical folklore of capitalism in the United States.

A special series of educational programs has been planned by Vincent Doyle (American Law Division), chairman of the chapter's legislative drafting committee and the chapter's new president. The purpose is to develop greater proficiency in legislative draftsmanship.

Charles Zinn, House law revision counsel and a member of chapter, was keynote speaker in Doyle's series and addressed staffers on the United States Code and how to use it.

Cyril Brickfield, former Judiciary Committee counsel and now chief benefits director

of the Veterans' Administration, addresses the group in February.

Don Greeley (RIVERS of Alaska) is chairman of the chapter's congressional orientation committee, which sponsors programs rich with practical information for staff members. The series last year included lectures on the tax bill, immigration laws, the operation of the Office of Legislative Counsel, the Legislative Reference Service, and the work of the many committees and joint committees of Congress.

Floyd Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian of the Senate, briefed members on his field, and Louis Doyle, General Counsel for the Post Office Department, spoke on a very important matter—"To Frank or Not To Frank, That is the Question."

Dave Glick, counsel for the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, is chairman of the program committee, which has the job of sponsoring the chapter's monthly luncheons in the caucus room. These are open to all staff personnel and Members of Congress and for a modest fee the chapter provides a buffet lunch along with a consistently interesting speaking program.

Some of the chapter's other services and active committees are:

The general counsels' series, a speaking series featuring the top legal aids in the Federal Government. Frank Hammill, counsel for the Science and Astronautics Committee is in charge of this special series.

Legal and legislative services committee, which, under the direction of Ed McCue III (joint committee on defense production) is compiling a legal manual designed to supplement the congressional secretary's handbook. It will feature a comprehensive listing of legal services available to the Congress and serve as a primer for researchers working on legislative history.

Professional affairs committee is headed by Justinus Gould (small business committee) and is studying the matter of salaries of committee staff during the interim period between the opening of a new Congress and final action on appropriating resolutions.

Professional ethics committee is preparing a compilation of statutes, codes of ethics, etc., on conflicts of interest relating to congressional staff members Dale MacIver (Fraser, of New Mexico), and Milton Eisenberg (Senator Keating, of New York), are cochairmen of this committee, which is also considering the feasibility of giving advisory opinions on such matters to staff members who wish clarification on a situation that might involve conflict of interest.

The chapter also sponsored a law day hearing last year by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. "Law in a Totalitarian Society" was the topic and witnesses included a former member of the Hungarian Parliament, an expert on Nazi Germany and a former professor of philosophy of law at Cuba's Oriente University.

Chapter President Krasnow just turned his gavel over to Vincent Doyle when he left the Hill to join the Washington law firm of Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz, and Masters.

"The chapter needs and wants the support of Congress and congressional staff," Krasnow concluded, "but the benefits of an active bar association on Capitol Hill can be mutually shared. There needs to be a continual advancement of professionalism among the staff.

"Today's Federal legislator, unlike his 18th or 19th century counterparts, has a full-time, year-round task. Much of his scope and breadth is only possible with the help of a highly professional administrative and legislative staff needed to meet the challenge of the expanded scope and breadth of today's Congress."

A Farewell Tribute to General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to offer for the RECORD the farewell tribute to General MacArthur which was given by the famed radio commentator, Bob Considine, on April 6, 1964.

This is the most fitting tribute to Douglas MacArthur that I have read or heard. It is a beautifully worded tribute and I commend it to all the Members of the Congress:

Mr. CONSIDINE. Hello, everybody. There is no place to start nor any place to finish in bidding farewell to Douglas MacArthur. I think his face should be carved on Mount Rushmore but whether or not it is, it will always be carved in the hearts of Americans. He was unique, timeless, his career spanned the inventory of weapons from the bow and arrow to the atomic bomb. As a child on his father's western outpost, he was nearly killed by an Indian's arrow. As Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in the Pacific he gave the order that cleared the path for the dropping of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I suppose that of all the world figures I've interviewed or reported on in my years of newspapering, MacArthur stands out as a most vital, most arresting, most compelling personality. He had a way of making "hello" sound like a phrase from the Gettysburg Address. When he'd tell a story, recall a moment in his incredible past, he'd marshal his facts and figures in military style, and march them past those who listened as if it were a sparkling parade. The air today sounds and resounds with his quotes, passages from his farewell speech to the joint session of the Congress and from his last speech to the West Point cadets.

They may have seemed strained to you—perhaps contrived, written in purple ink—but that was the man himself. MacArthur spoke that way, felt that way, lived that way. So many memories of him pass through my mind. Oh, a day in Tokyo in the summer of 1950. I had gone to the embassy where he lived filled with the shock of seeing our forces being rolled up like a rug in Korea, but he didn't want to talk about that calamity. When Mrs. MacArthur rushed to greet him with a kiss he put his arm around her trim waist, lifted her off the rug and held her out like a doll while he shook hands with me. Hours later when he was showing me to the door I finally was able to ask that big question about our losing the Korean war. MacArthur said "I'll have my headquarters in North Korea within a month." His immortal Inchon invasion planning had been completed that very day. I think of MacArthur riding a white horse down Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington on a hot day in the summer of 1932 leading a little band of soldiers commissioned to throw the bonus marchers out of the Capitol. Somebody heaved a rock at him and it narrowly missed his head. MacArthur didn't even turn around but went about the sad and ugly task to which his Commander in Chief had assigned him. In a day on the plains at West Point when he rode slowly past the cadet corps standing in a ceremonial jeep while the band played the haunting old airs of World War I—"Long, Long Trail a Winding," "Tipperary," "K-K-Katy," and "My Buddy." MacArthur will live with George Washington, Lincoln, Lee, Roosevelt—like those immortals he was a man for his time—irreplaceable, irrepressible. He was on call for a half a century and was never found wanting when called. Douglas MacArthur was motivated by a spirit more apparent in him than in almost any other American—the spirit of patriotism. He lived for and offered his life to his country. He leaves us all a little more understanding of what it means to be an American and what we owe for that precious privilege. God bless him. I want to thank my sponsor, Mutual of Omaha, for affording me this extra time to say auf wiedersehen to a great man. So long.

Life in A.D. 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., has printed in its April 4, 1964, edition a very entertaining—but unfortunately—realistic appraisal of the future of this country if we continue to move further and further down the road to communism and conformity. The article was written by Dr. D. O. Rhame, of Clinton, S.C., a very distinguished and respected member of the medical profession of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE IN A.D. 2000: A NIGHTMARE

A traveler is returning to our shores after many years. The time is the year 6 million—which would have been A.D. 2000—only that system has been changed because it referred to the birth of Christ. He is landing in Harbor 216, formerly New York. The voyage has been delayed, despite automation, nuclear devices, and computers, due to the insistence of the unions on a built-in slowdown mechanism—the fact that the crew consisted of all captains, since no one must feel inferior; and the new 10-hour workweek.

To his surprise, he finds the name of the country is now Equasia; the governing body is the Supreme Equalizer—formerly the Supreme Court. Congress has been disbanded as unconstitutional and sent home. All corporations have been declared illegal due to the profit motive, and all business is run by the Government from the Capital City of Warrenton. There are now no churches, and all religion has been banned. It is rumored that some churches still exist, working underground, of course.

There is plenty of paper money, but it will not buy much, for the peoples' factories do not turn out much of the good things—only bare necessities. Silver and gold have long since been nonexistent, having all been sent to other nations to help them pay their debt to us. Private property as such has disappeared, and each person is allowed to rent a small home and a tract of land from the Government—which now guarantees everyone security and equality. The public debt has been canceled—since it could never be

paid anyway. Likewise, all private debts have been nol prossed—giving every citizen an equal start in the financial potato race.

The Army and Navy have been disbanded, because no country now covets what we haven't got. All colleges and universities have been converted to public schools because higher learning is unnecessary and creates complexes for those who cannot qualify for it, education being superfluous for eating and drinking and working the 10-hour week.

All books referring to patriotism, thrift, individuality, and religion have been destroyed. The Bible and the flag have disappeared, and all reading matter is edited in Warrenton. Likewise the newspapers, radio, and TV networks are controlled by the Central Government. All business and industry has dispensed with hiring and firing, employees being selected and apportioned by the Government on a basis of sex-race formula which varies day by day with the birth rate.

All sports have come to a halt, due to the new law which requires that there be no winner. This is insured by mathematically equalizing all teams. Father, mother, home, honest day's work have all become forbidden words. All our enemy nations have become wealthy due to our generosity to them, and our allies have found their positions unprofitable. Initiative, ambition, and incentive have all disappeared, and our 200 million people who were, of course, born unequal, are in a mad race to become exactly like everyone else in the great conformity race.

As for politics, there is now one party which, of course, takes its platform from the Government. The Presidency is now only a figurehead, the chair being occupied by the member of the Supreme Equalizer who is on vacation. His job is to entertain and divert foreign figureheads who are also on vacation. Foreign travel has about faded out due to the wall of our borders which keeps our itchy-footed natives from escaping.

Communication and travel in the country are practically nonexistent, for no one wants to see or talk with another who is just like himself in looks and ideas. Crime has been on the upgrade since the jury system has been outlawed. Judge, jury and police chief are now combined in one man appointed by the Supreme Equalizer—which represents quite a saving in salaries. Birth is likewise controlled by a permit from Warrenton, based on a sliding quota system, many poor couples having to stand in line up to 6 months to get their cards punched. As a matter of fact, it doesn't matter much, as the women are looking more like men and vice versa. One interesting sidelight might be mentioned here. The Government is offering large bonuses for twins, triplets, etc., on the theory that less will have to be spent on getting them to think and look alike.

This could go on and on. The returning traveler is too busy filling out ration cards so he has made very little progress. There are now at least 11 courthouses in each county, the need being brought on by the fact the practically all citizens are under indictment for civil rights infractions. Jails have gone out of existence, since all sentences are now fines of a certain percentage of what a person owns; however, each culprit has the comfort of knowing the fine is limited to 94 percent. Fortunately, any discontented citizen can obtain clemency if he doesn't like the law or uses the fifth amendment.

The Constitution is now the Reconstitution—as a result of repeated renovating and remodeling, so that it now guarantees everything to everybody. Any resemblance to the former glorious document now is purely coincidental.

It is now estimated that 50 percent of the people work for the Government, while the remaining 50 percent belong to the Relief Corps. In spite of all efforts to erase classes—a new aristocracy has evolved—consisting of those who can get the most out of the Government while putting in the least.

Tobacco, alcohol, and firearms have been outlawed, with the result that the death rate is much higher—due to the fact that people are now happily killing themselves and each other, there being little else to do after the short work hours.

Taxes have been decreased year by year until finally they just disappeared, there being no one making enough to qualify. The 50 States are now numbered subdivisions, kept as such mainly for administrative and judicial functions. People have numbers for names now, it being considered unequal for one to have the name of Squilch while his neighbor flaunts the name of Fauntleroy.

Our Capital City now has two outstanding attractions: The giant four-way directional mechanized corridors for the sole use of minority marchers who are shuttled in at Government expense, applauded, wined and dined, and then relocated to the State with the highest priority quota. There is also the famous Tomb of the Unknown Last Freeman.

One other small item should be noted as, of course, you want to hear about Russia. Well, having gotten all of our gold and silver, Russia is now a capitalist country—and laughing at the neat trick she has played on us.

It hasn't happened—it won't happen if we remember our history and our heritage and our Bible.

D. O. RHAME, M.D.

CLINTON.

The Many Faces of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by a constituent of mine, Mr. Sydney Houston, of Dade City, Fla., in which he very aptly describes the many faces of peace. I thought this letter was so well done that I wanted to share it with the membership and commend it to them for their consideration:

Hon. A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr.

DEAR SIR: According to the Associated Press, President Johnson has said "Mr. Khrushchev is playing the role of peace and seeking to preserve peace in the world. That certainly is the desire of this country. When he talks in peaceful terms, he will always have our ear."

Comrat Khrushchev is certainly playing a role and if we listen to him with credence, he will eventually have our throat.

We all desire peace, but we must discriminate as to the kind of peace we seek.

Peace has many faces.

There is the bloodstained peace of the slaughterhouse when the day's killing is done.

There is the dreary peace of the prison cell in the long still hours of the night.

There is the helpless peace of exhaustion, when the weary body falls defenseless into unconsciousness.

There is the sated peace of the bird of prey, after the kill and the gorging.

There is the uneasy peace of the truce between rival gangsters.

There is the hopeless peace following the abortive revolt crushed under the iron heel of despotism.

There is the transitory and expensive peace purchased by the appeaser, blindly oblivious to the fact that a few Munichs later there will be no more peace.

There is the illusory peace seen in the evanescent mirage of one worldism.

There is the peace of the grave in which Khrushchev has promised to bury us.

In those aspects of peace there is no safety, profit, or honor.

A good peace can be won only by an honest facing of facts and an unflinching and courageous decisiveness.

Beware of the chuckleheads, marplots, and subversives who preach step-by-step retreat and installment plan surrender. Though they speak with the tongue of men and angels, heed them not.

Such a peace would be Dead Sea fruit that would starve body, mind, and soul. Our stunted and anemic children would find themselves bound in the galling chains of a hideous totalitarian slavery, with no prospect of release in the foreseeable future.

Man would have to start his upward climb to freedom, from the slough of collectivist slavery, all over again under handicaps more insuperable than before since tyranny armed with modern technology would be more efficient than in the past.

Sincerely,

SYDNEY HOUSTON.

The Civil Rights Bill—Letter From Remmie L. Arnold, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a friend and constituent, Hon. Remmie L. Arnold, Sr., who requests that his letter be treated as a petition to the Senate under the provisions of the first amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMMIE ARNOLD PEN CO., INC.,
Petersburg, Va., April 16, 1964.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you regarding the civil rights bill H.R. 7152, to tell you how I feel.

I want to go on record of absolutely and without reservation, opposed to the un-American bill in its entirety, and under my constitutional right to petition the Congress to have this letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

What irks me about those so-called do-good ministers and a lot of so-called religious creatures, is why did it take the school segregation law of the Supreme Court of 1954 to wake them up to their religious duties, that they were not treating the colored man quite right?

Why did they wait all these many years for a Court decision to change their hearts and minds? Before this 1954 school Court decision, no one even heard of a minister advocating that the Negro should be given such rights as are set forth in the so-called civil rights bill now before the Senate.

Why don't these civil rights ministers and civil rights religious advocates insist on a section of the bill reading as follows:

"No church, Sunday school, religious college, or religious organization of any kind, can deny the admittance of anyone regardless of race, creed, or color."

Since they feel it is their business to try to run the state—why cannot the state run the churches?

I think they are making a big mistake, they may gain a few colored brethren, but they will certainly divide their congregation and lose more members than they will gain.

I don't believe many of them are sincere, they are supposed to preach the Gospel from that sacred book—the Bible—and if the Bible has scriptures that relate to the treatment we should accord those with black skin, why have they not quoted this before the 1954 Court decision, and why are they not quoting it now?

I have the greatest respect for our churches, religion, and most clergymen, but I believe many so-called religious leaders, rabble rousers, freedom riders, paraders, religious fanatics, are not only hurting the Negro's chances, but the religious institution as well.

I recommend that they confine their efforts to the saving of the soul, and not the saving of the body.

Senator, continue to fight, but don't shoot so long as there is a spark of life left in our courageous southern Senators.

Keep quoting the words from the mouth of that famous statesman Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty, or give me death."

Most sincerely,

REMMIE L. ARNOLD, Sr.

The Massachusetts Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is fortunate in having a number of distinguished literary quarterlies and so-called little magazines devoted to poetry, short story, and the critical essay.

Publications such as the Kenyon Review, the Prairie Schooner, the Sewanee Review have consistently maintained high quality throughout the years. And there are many others of similar distinction throughout the land.

Until the publication of the Massachusetts Review, which is published independently with the support and cooperation of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts, it did not seem possible that one single magazine could, in a sense, make us forget about all of the others.

And yet it is true that the Massachusetts Review, beginning in 1959 and to the present day, has established such an outstanding record that it is difficult to imagine a finer publication of its kind in the Nation, proving anew that excellence will always have a place in our national life.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, are occasioned by the most recent Massachusetts Review, which is dedicated to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and which includes by way of high tribute, a selection of previously unpublished items of W. B. Yeats, J. M. Synge, Sean O'Casey, Thomas Kinsella, and G. B. Shaw, to name a few.

It also included an address the late President gave at Amherst titled "On Poetry and National Power," a most moving statement. It was after this address that I saw the late President for the last time, and talked with him at some length of his legislative program in Congress, and the future possibilities of that program.

I have a feeling that he would be proud of this particular dedication to him.

In concluding, it would be almost impossible to sum up the many qualities of the Massachusetts Review.

It is being read and discussed in all parts of the United States, and throughout the world.

Past contributors have included the late Poets E. E. Cummings, Robert Frost, and William Carlos Williams, and also W. H. Auden, Richard Wilbur, and others; Artists Leonard Baskin, Rico Lebrun and on and on—the writers, the printing, and the layout have been superb from the beginning.

Distinguished Editors Jules Chametzky, and John Hicks deserve a great deal of credit for continuing to produce what Ben Shahn has called "one of the outstanding magazines in the country." This great artist has also said:

I find it the best reading that comes into my home.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this and in the other body some facts regarding this distinguished publication. Additional information may be obtained by writing to the Editors, Memorial Hall, the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass. It is my impression that the Massachusetts Review deserves the widest possible reading.

Latin America's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an excellent guest editorial which was broadcast over Station WBT in Charlotte, N.C., on March 16, 1964. The editorial comments were prepared by a young Puerto Rican, Jorge Sanchez del Valle, who is currently study at Mercersburg Academy in Mercersburg, Pa. I am confident that the Members of the Senate will be impressed with this young man's analysis of our Latin American problems. I ask unanimous consent that this broadcast editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA'S PROBLEMS

We asked permission to use the following editorial by Jorge Sanchez del Valle, a Puerto Rican student at Mercersburg Academy in Mercersburg, Pa., written for his school paper. He writes:

"The object of the Alliance for Progress and the Peace Corps, it is said, is to end illiteracy, pacify political factions, reduce the burden of overpopulation, and modernize the antiquated agronomy of the trouble spots of Latin America.

"These ideas have their merits; geography, disunity, fanaticism, and corruption do create dreadful problems for Latin America, but there exists another cause, which, unfortunately, has been greatly disregarded. This forgotten factor is * * * the social cause."

Jorge goes on, "The social factor's main weapon is the typical latinos themselves. The vanity and selfishness which frequently exemplify the latinos have led to the rise of intolerance and irresponsibility toward the need for moral codes, for a balance between social classes, and for better means of agriculture. They desire only those rights which will afford them pleasant, although meager, lives. Unfortunately, the latinos have remained indifferent to the aesthetic pleasures of life, which do so much to raise men from the mud of the earth. Because of such social vices, it is difficult to comprehend how the latinos will put to good use the privileges and scientific advancements brought to them by the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress. It is incredible that all latinos, either rich or poor, educated or illiterate, have, to greater or lesser degrees, almost all of these vices. The exceptions are few. It is also incredible that the above are not simply the vices of the latinos; the above define the latinos.

"Because of their social vices, the latinos will have tremendous problems when they try to rule themselves. Latin governments will collapse, for they are as corrupt, as incongruous, and as disorganized as the men who compose the governing bodies.

"The latinos must educate themselves. They must learn about the enormous difference between communism and democracy; they must become acquainted with the rules of democratic governments; they must study agronomy, economics, and sociology. But before latinos do all these things, they must discover what they represent; they must understand the causes for the antagonistic feelings which arise at their presence. They must understand what they are."

Jorge concludes, "The Latin Americans are continually receiving aid from friendly nations, which desire the answers to the problems of Latin Americans. These nations are making efforts to reduce the problems of political disunity, fanaticism, and geography. But all these efforts will be wasted unless the latinos help out by conquering one thing, themselves."

This was a guest editorial by Jorge Sanchez del Valle, a Puerto Rican student at Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa.

Truly a Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the course of a lifetime, one meets many outstanding people, and there are a very few who leave a real imprint upon everyone having had an opportunity to know them.

Such a person was J. C. Ruppenthal, of Russell, Kans., who died at the age of

95 on Friday, March 27. Judge Ruppenthal was known by all of us in our hometown of Russell, Kans., for his tireless dedication, not only to the legal profession, but in nearly every other phase of our community life.

The editor of the Russell Daily News, Russell T. Townsley, has written an excellent editorial which was included along with other fine editorial remarks of Whitley Austin, editor of the Salina Journal. The editorial comments clearly tell the story of one of the great leaders of a passing generation. One whom I, and all who knew him, respected for his honesty, integrity, tireless devotion and dedication to his family, his profession, church, and community. The editorial comments follow:

JUDGE RUPPENTHAL DESERVED THE TITLE

In another day, perhaps more often than now, the town lawyer was the town leader in things intellectual and spiritual. He enjoyed the education, he commanded the income, he was stirred by curiosity, and by profession he was both a warrior and a counselor.

One of the lawyers who enjoyed such a position in this region was Judge Ruppenthal of Russell. I feel unfortunate that I knew him only in his declining years; indeed, the generation that truly knew him is gone.

But Russ Townsley who knew him slightly longer and more intimately has written an obituary editorial for the Russell News about the judge that catches and puts on paper both the man and the spirit. It follows:

"There are those purists who claim the title 'judge' is one legally bestowed and serves only during the time one holds the position. It goes, they say, with office—not with the man.

"Judge J. C. Ruppenthal, who died at the age of 95 Friday, was an exception. He was every inch a judge, before, between and after his several terms on the bench.

"The old gentleman, and that's what he was when we first met him some 17 years ago, was brighteyed, sharp, meticulously accurate to detail and as fair and impartial as one could hope. At that time, he had lived a full life, seen his family grow and prosper, found a special interest in history and genealogy. His spry step, quickly peering eyes and dry sense of humor set him apart.

"He was, I believe, a Democrat. But I was never sure because he spoke of men's attitudes, morals and integrity—instead of party labels and easier-to-assess traits.

"His was the only photographic memory I have seen at work and what a blessing it was that it was he who had the gift. For the unusual skill was accompanied with an intensely sharp interest in people. This man saw pioneer days in Kansas; taught in a one-room school with little more education than some of his students; became a lawyer; was county attorney and rode the circuit. He developed the skill to study, learn and appreciate not only material facts around him, but the wonders of nature and foibles of man. His education was far more liberal than the most progressive student today can hope to find.

"In his lifetime, he saw the arrival of the first motorcar, read the first news reports of the Wright brothers, noted the importance of discoveries of DeForest, saw the arrival of wonders such as the electric icebox (had his first one in 1932), gas for home heating, paved highways, television, and thousands of other miracles which were undreamed in his childhood on a Russell County ranch.

"He taught law, helped found and guide the city library, was a leader in his profession and its associations. He served his Nation, his State and city. And, equally important, he served his family well.

"The judge is gone and we doubt if there is another today so well equipped by instinct and natural ability to make such a transition in stride. He deserved the title he loved so well."

Look Magazine Pays Tribute to a Wisconsin Honeymoon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from an article published in the current issue of Look magazine, which pay tribute to the beauties of Wisconsin and the attractiveness of the State as a honeymoon spot be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF AN ARTICLE FROM LOOK MAGAZINE PAYING TRIBUTE TO WISCONSIN

Brent and Bonnie Brafford of Atlanta, both 22, spent their honeymoon days on a trip that took them as far north as they had time to go. They knew the Yankee Northeastern seaboard, but the American midland was new territory for them. So they set out on a freewheeling voyage of exploration. "Anything with an adventure attached to it is what we want to do," said Brent. They came to, saw and were conquered by Andrew Jackson's white-columned Hermitage near Nashville, Mark Twain's rambling Mississippi River, Abraham Lincoln's plain Springfield house, and Frank Lloyd Wright's stone citadel, Taliesen, in Wisconsin. They then rolled on north to Wisconsin's Lac du Flambeau area. There, they immersed themselves in the wide-openness of the voyageur country with its lakes and woods and fields that Bonnie said "stretch out so far—like an ocean." On the long way home, they swung over to the eastern side of Lake Michigan, drove down the lake shore and cut cross-country to Cincinnati, the Kentucky Bluegrass, Knoxville—wandering here, there, everywhere. This was what Brent wanted: "I like the feeling of knowing you can go anywhere you want behind the wheel of a car, with some money in your pocket. Bonnie's the same way."

* * * * *

In the cool lake region of northern Wisconsin, where they spent 5 days loafing, horseback riding, water-skiing and boat racing, they "find a three-tree birch group and wrap ourselves happily around it" for a honeymoon portrait.

Like thousands before them, they rubberneck at Wisconsin Dells, where a racing river runs deep through a narrow gorge in the sandstone: "We strolled on boarded pathways winding through rocks tall with trees. Peaceful and romantic. We loved this."

* * * * *

Notes from a Wisconsin forest: "Coley is the name of the horse I rode that day. Brent and I loved the quiet woods and narrow paths. Airy ferns stood all around us, and sunlight filtered through the pines tall above. A place to think, ride slowly and wind through the green."

At circus home in Baraboo, Wis., they ate buttered popcorn and watched baby elephants dance to pipe-organ music. As Southerners, they were most struck in Wisconsin by the "really red tomatoes, honey-colored does, huge black bears that forage at night, the cold, cold water, lots and lots of trees and the romantic sun hanging low over treetops for lovers to see a little more of before it's gone for the day—and then the nights so still under the silver moon."

Are We Going To Deny Rights to Some Workers in Our Zeal To Protect Others?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following column from the Washington Evening Star written by David Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence points out the "Threat of Slavery in Rights Bill." We should make sure we are not taking away the rights of all Americans in our zeal to protect some rights of the minority.

THREAT OF SLAVERY IN RIGHTS BILL—LAW PROFESSOR DETECTS DANGER TO WHITES IN CERTAIN JOBS UNDER NEW PROPOSALS

(By David Lawrence)

Strange as it may seem, "involuntary servitude"—as slavery is defined in the 13th amendment of the Constitution—may again be an issue in America, though this time it could mostly concern white persons.

Such is the conclusion reached by Alfred Avins, formerly special deputy attorney general of the State of New York and a well-known professor of constitutional law, who has just presented his argument in a comprehensive article in the Law Quarterly of Cornell Univeristy.

If the pending "civil rights" bill is adopted, serious questions will be raised in the courts as to whether persons working in barbershops or beauty parlors, or even in restaurants may be forced out of their jobs against their will because they do not choose to serve certain kinds of customers.

Supporters of the "civil rights" legislation contend that only those barbershops or beauty parlors which are part of a hotel or motel establishment will be affected. Thus, a barbershop in a hotel would be required to serve Negroes, but a barbershop across the street could lawfully refuse to do so. But if there are no jobs available across the street or elsewhere, the worker could argue that he was being deprived of an employment opportunity because of his beliefs. Mr. Alvin writes:

"Although there are a number of cases which have held antidiscrimination legislation constitutional under the 14th amendment, no decision has dealt with this matter under the far more specific provisions of the 13th amendment. Yet the 13th amendment would seem to apply far more directly to antidiscrimination legislation in the rendition of personal services.

"Making and serving someone else a hamburger is not work for the Government, for one's family, or for a party one has injured. Nor is cutting another's hair, carrying his luggage, shining his shoes, or performing other personal services for him. The 13th amendment gives every person the right to

refrain from working for any other person. It protects barbers, hotel clerks, shoeshine men, sales clerks, waiters, and waitresses, just as much as it protects cottonpickers, field hands or farm laborers.

"The 13th amendment guarantees the right to refrain from work, from all work, from some work, or from work for some people. To coerce personal service is to impose involuntary servitude."

Mr. Avins discusses also a case in a State court dealing with a barber who declined to serve a Negro, and says:

"An arguement may be made that the barber, for example, is free to cease barbering at any time. Hence, it may be contended, that as long as he voluntarily continues to be a barber, he is not subjected to involuntary servitude if he is forced to serve all who apply."

Mr. Avins declares, however, that "such an argument overlooks the right to work," and he quotes the Supreme Court of the United States as saying that the "liberty" mentioned in the 14th amendment includes the right to "work * * * to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling; to pursue any livelihood or avocation * * * (and) the right to follow any of the common occupations of life is an inalienable right." Mr. Avins adds:

"Even leaving aside the 14th amendment right to work, antidiscrimination laws which provide in effect that a person must serve another on pain of leaving his chosen occupation is involuntary servitude since the alternative to the servitude is punishment."

The Supreme Court has several times pointed out, according to Mr. Avins' article, that exclusion from one's occupation is punishment and has declared that to disqualify a man from the pursuit of a lawful job "may also, and often has been, imposed as punishment." The Law Quarterly article continues:

"Where a barber or waiter is permanently barred from earning a living in his occupation unless he serves all who apply, the reality of the situation is that he is being punished for refusing service. The exclusion from his calling is a particularly severe sort of punishment. To force him to serve on pain of such exclusion constitutes involuntary servitude.

"Even, however, were the alternative to serving everyone without discrimination of going out of business or leaving one's occupation not deemed, strictly speaking, punishment, nevertheless, this alternate constitutes such a degree of coercion as to make the service involuntary."

Current Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, during the last few months several actions have been taken by the Congress which were of the utmost importance to not only the people of my district, but of the Nation. Under unanimous consent, I include my recent newsletter—"Your Congressman PETE ABELE Reports to You"—summarizing my statements in regards to these significant actions in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, PETE ABELE, REPORTS TO YOU

(By Hon. HOMER E. ABELE)

Several important bills have been acted on by Congress since my last newsletter to you. Although you may have read or heard some of the comments on these issues from the newspapers and radio commentators, as your Congressman, I feel that I have an obligation to state my views on these matters.

PAY RAISE BILL

For several months the administration has been pushing the plan for a pay increase for all Federal employees, department heads, Federal judges, and Congressmen.

When the pay raise bill was discussed in the House of Representatives several arguments were presented in favor of it. I am aware of the obligation of the Government to adequately compensate its employees, and there are no doubt cases in which increased pay can be justified. However, the arguments in opposition to this measure were more persuasive, and it was defeated by a vote of 222 to 184 in the House. If this bill had been passed it would have increased the salary of every Congressman by $10,000. I voted against the increase in salary because I believe that Congressmen should be willing to make a sacrifice in the interest of financial solvency for the Nation and the taxpayers have a right to expect this of their Congressmen. Since the end of World War II, 1945 to 1964, the national debt has increased from $258 billion to $311 billion. To pay off the national debt it would require a contribution of approximately $1,600 from every man, woman, and child in the United States. The national debt continues to rise and the end does not seem to be in sight. Presently, it is costing the taxpayers $11 billion just to pay the interest on the debt. In view of these circumstances, I did not think it was wise at this time to vote in favor of the pay raise bill which would have added an additional annual burden of $500 million to the overburdened taxpayers.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

One of the most controversial issues considered by the House this session was the civil rights bill. As you may recall, this measure was approved by the House on February 8, 1964. Presently, it is being considered by the Senate. The big question is how long the southern Senators will filibuster in an effort to block its enactment into law.

The major sections of this bill provide protection for the voting rights of minorities, prohibits discrimination in the use of public facilities and bans discrimination in employment on the basis of race or color by unions or management.

Insofar as Ohio is concerned there is little new in the Federal civil rights bill. Ohio has had for many years laws protecting the rights of minority groups. However, it should be kept in mind that there are many areas in the United States in which the educational, political, and economic rights of our citizens are not protected. After considering all the issues involved, I voted for the bill because I could not, in good conscience, oppose a bill which is aimed at protecting the constitutional rights of minority groups. It does not sound very convincing for us to talk about justice and equality for people of foreign countries and yet refuse to show concern about the welfare of some of our own citizens.

FLOOD CONTROL

Since the recent flooding of the Hocking River and its tributaries, I have had discussions with several persons in the areas affected about the status of the plans of the Army Corps of Engineers for dealing with these floods. From personal observation I am aware of the great amount of damage done to private homes, farmlands, schools, Ohio University, roads and highways, and of the hardships caused to many individuals, families, and business concerns. I have kept in close contact with the Washington office of the Army Engineers and the District office in Huntington in an effort to speed up the completion of the study of the Hocking River Valley. I have been assured that flood control plans will be ready for presentation to Congress by June of this year. Upon the completion of these plans, Congress will appropriate the necessary funds to build a series of dams and levies to control these frequent floods. In the meantime, I want to assure you that I will do all I can to get this project started.

TAX REDUCTION

Last year when the proposal to reduce taxes came before the House of Representatives the Republicans took the position that they would vote to reduce taxes if the administration would agree to hold Federal spending down to $98 billion. The logic of this position was that it would be unwise to increase spending and at the same time reduce the income of the Government. Since the Democrats would not agree to a provision to hold down Federal spending, I voted against the bill. Shortly, after taking office, President Johnson sent to Congress a budget of slightly less than $98 billion. In view of the promise of the President to hold down spending, I voted to reduce taxes when the conference report of the tax bill was presented to the House. I have no doubt in my mind but that individuals and business concerns deserve a tax reduction, but unless the administration is willing to make a greater effort to eliminate some of the unnecessary expenditures it will be exceedingly difficult to reduce taxes.

WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES

Here are some more examples of the way in which your tax dollars are spent. As long as the Government continues to underwrite these programs, we cannot expect to arrive at a balanced budget.

1. Frog spotting patterns, $14,700.
2. Eye and brain development in the mosquito, $119,000.
3. Tagalog Social Organization, $35,000.
4. Family functions in contemporary China, $54,700.

VISITING WASHINGTON?

With the arrival of spring and the tourist season many groups and individuals will be visiting places of interest in Washington and the surrounding area. If you will contact me by telephone or letter, I shall be glad to do whatever I can to make your visit an interesting and pleasant occasion.

Very sincerely yours,

HOMER E. ABELE.

A Gracious Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I was privileged to witness the award of the 1964 Peter Canisius Medal to Rosalind Russell.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very fine article about Miss Russell which appeared in the Canisian monthly magazine:

A GRACIOUS LADY

When it was announced that Rosalind Russell, a woman, a Hollywood movie star, "Auntie Mame," was to receive the 1964 Peter Canisius Medal, 14,000 living eyebrows of our alumni went up in mild surprise.

The citation read at the breakfast was a condensed version of "This Is Your Life." It relived her life from childhood days in Waterbury, Conn.; her career as an actress on the stage and screen; her flair for writing

as an author; and her role as mother and wife for 23 years to Frederick Brisson.

Her entire life has been spent serving the needs of the unfortunate and the afflicted.

She has been involved in over 90 charitable and civic endeavors. To mention a few: She is one of the founders and member of the board of the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Institute and the national women's chairman of the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation. She is a driving force in the annual Catholic charities appeal in New York City. She is an active member of the Family Theater and Family Rosary Crusade. She is a member of the Los Angeles Orphanage Guild. She is on the advisory board of the Catholic Actors Guild of America.

Miss Russell is a sponsor of the National Foundation for Neuromuscular Diseases, Inc. She is on the administrator's board of the St. John's Hospital Guild, and active in the Tracy Clinic for the Deaf, Birmingham Veterans Hospital of Los Angeles and Mount Sinai Hospital for handicapped children. She is a committee member for the American Foundation of the Blind. She was national campaign cochairman of the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

She gave unstintingly of her time as a volunteer to help find a cause and cure for leukemia, and helped create the Dean Martin Blood Disease Research Center at the City of Hope. She is a member of the board of directors of the Jewish Home for the Aged. She has played an active part in the Red Cross, Heart Fund, cancer crusade, multiple sclerosis, and community chest campaigns.

After hearing the citation read, Miss Russell said upon presentation of the medal "after listening to the litany of my virtues, for a moment there, I thought I was dead."

Miss Russell's response stressed the qualities which are necessary to make a star, not only on the movie screen but to make anybody anything in life. They are: (1) Have faith in God as your Saviour and as a friend because in most things that are important you are alone; (2) good health and the safeguarding of it; (3) willingness to work, to do the extra things, because with this you can project yourself; (4) good manners, not just please and thank you but a thorough and constant consideration for others; (5) and finally, talent which actually is the least important.

"This is what goes to make up a star in life, and believe me, I haven't made that yet. I may be a star in the theatrical world but I certainly am not in life. I'm still working on this."

After listening to the citation and hearing Miss Russell's response, it is very evident why Rosalind Russell was the unanimous choice of the 45-member alumni executive board to be the 1964 recipient of the Peter Canisius Medal.

Toastmaster for the breakfast was Supreme Court Justice Matthew J. Jasen, 1937. John P. Propis, 1942, was general chairman. Robert E. Stedler, 1939, alumni prexy, welcomed the members of the class of 1964 into the alumni association. The response was given by Michael J. Ryan, 1964, senior class president.

A total of 803 people attended the affair. Sixteen hundred and six eyebrows are still raised in awe at the charm and graciousness of this outstanding American woman.

Curve Ball by the CAB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be an authority on aviation matters, but I do recognize an injustice when I see one. A recent editorial carried in the Washington Daily News entitled "Curve Ball by the CAB" immediately caught my eye; and if the material contained in the editorial is factual, and I must assume it to be because of the excellent reputation of the editorial page of the News, I join in the swarm of protest that is buzzing over the head of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with success, provided it is honestly and diligently earned. All airlines, the long-established ones in particular, have not always been successful. Only in the past couple of years have they begun to see daylight. The year 1963 was an extremely profitable one for most of our large trunkline and international carriers with the exception of Eastern which went through an agonizing strike problem and managerial change. It is now anticipated by the rest of the industry that Eastern will soon regain its proper economic position with other long-established airlines.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to be the policy of the CAB to penalize success. It seems to be the attitude of the CAB that if you are successful you are illegal. This is not the concept of the American ideal; no Government agency should have the power to penalize private enterprise or a regulated public utility simply because it is able to return dividends to stockholders and to keep enough profit in reserve to pour back into new plants and new equipment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following Washington Daily News editorial, "Curve Ball by the CAB" in the RECORD.

CURVE BALL BY THE CAB

The Civil Aeronautics Board, according to the Government Organization Manual, is charged with "maintaining competition" in the airline industry. Recent actions indicate the present CAB majority is doing just the opposite.

It has issued a series of policy rulings, reported by Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Jack Steele, which would:

Force groups seeking charter flights to deal with small, nonscheduled airlines rather than the larger, better-equipped commercial carriers.

Shift cargo business from the major passenger lines, which usually have extra space for freight, to four small concerns dealing only in cargo.

Require the Post Office and Defense Departments to give more of their overseas airmail business to a single all-cargo line at the expense of regular American overseas carriers.

The CAB might argue that these tentative decisions are aimed at keeping the non-sked companies in business, and therefore at preserving competition.

But their net effect, it seems to us, is clear: The agency is going to tell customers which airline they have to do business with. That is curbing competition, not helping it.

As one example, a club wishing to charter a flight from Washington to New York for the World's Fair now can choose the best offer from all air carriers serving the area. Under the proposed changes, it would have to offer the business first to one of the non-skeds, and could use a well-known line only if the non-sked turned the charter flight down.

Friends of the small lines tried to achieve similar changes through law a few years ago. Congress said no. Now they apparently have prevailed on the CAB to do by executive fiat what they could not get by the legislative process.

Luckily for the country, most of the CAB rulings in this regard are not final—and thus are open to challenge. Both Congress and the Johnson administration should take a good look at them before it is too late.

Military Commissaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Comptroller General fired a blast at military commissaries, charging they are costing the taxpayers about $150 million annually. This is an example of the kind of so-called economic analysis, rampant since the civilian whiz-kid types stormed the Pentagon's walls, captured control of its E-ring and installed a decisionmaking system which ignores people and morale as a factor of a nation's military strength.

They are out to cut military spending and get things cheap. Things are all, people are nothing according to their way of thinking. Barricaded behind account books and computers, they are immune to the historical truth that the spirit of America's men in uniform and their families has been just as essential an ingredient to our victories on the battlefields as equipment. In fact it was that spirit which held the line during the first 2 years of World War II until our factories could turn out the things needed for them to go on the offensive and start winning the war.

There are over 2½ million people wearing U.S. uniforms. Thus the $150 million cost of the commissaries amounts to about $60 per serviceman. Yet that $60 investment gives him something which encourages him to stay in the service and make it a career. Every man that is given this stimulus to reenlist means the Government is saved $7,000 to equip and put through basic training a replacement. Only a one-tenth of 1 percent boost in reenlistment rates need be gained by the maintenance of the commissaries in order to wipe out the entire $150 million gain the Comptroller claims would be made by closing them.

Does the fact mean nothing that for decades and decades the services have maintained these commissaries for the very reason that they do, in fact, make service life more attractive, encourage reenlistments, and thus save countless millions to the services?

Surely, giving the serviceman's wife the small status symbol her commissary card implies—this wife who lives next door to a civilian housewife whose husband's paycheck is far greater than her's—is much more than a one-tenth of 1 percent factor in reenlistment rates.

It is time to stop throwing the account books at our military personnel and get down to the job of restoring service morale which lately has been so unmercifully kicked around.

Cooperation To Preserve Our Historic Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, at the site of the Passaic Falls in Paterson, I was privileged to participate in a most impressive ceremony dedicating a park overlooking this magnificent gift of nature. As described in the following article from the Paterson Evening News, four flags were hoisted. These flags were accepted by members of the Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Rangers. Among these youngsters were representatives of each of our major religions, and they were of varying national origin and different colors. They were all unified, however, as good Americans.

Just as the ceremonies themselves were the result of cooperation and unity, the following article from the Paterson Evening News of March 30, 1964, indicates how very much cooperation between industry and labor contributed to the success of the project.

My distinguished predecessor in Congress, Gordon Canfield, and the esteemed publisher of the Paterson Evening News, Harry B. Haines, deserve much credit and honor for their public spirit in sparking the entire project.

The article follows:

LABOR AND INDUSTRY BACK CIVIC PROJECT AT FALLS

The historic heritage of the Passaic Falls will be made more meaningful to this and future generations by the public-spirited interest of two Teamsters union locals, and the cooperation it has sparked among other civic and industry groups.

On April 18, when the city dedicates the new Passaic Falls overlook, the scene will be dominated by the colors of the American and four other flags that will be flown from a 45-foot-tall flagpole, the gift of locals No. 999 of Paterson and No. 945 of Passaic, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Officers of both unions: James Perrotti, president, and Lawrence De Angelis, secretary-treasurer of local No. 999; Michael A. Ardis, president and Daniel Tortorello, secretary-treasurer, local No. 945 met with Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson News to announce their plans to make this contribution to the city for the Falls Park. Also present were: Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., who accepted the gift for the city; former Congressman Gordon Canfield, chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the falls restoration; Ernest G. Branca, executive assistant, Passaic Division of Public Service Electric & Gas Co. and William Gates, president of Gates Ladder Co., 625 21st Avenue.

Thanking each member of the group personally, Mr. Haines said the occasion represented "something I have long visualized, the cooperation of labor, management, and the businessmen of this city on programs of this nature aimed at dramatizing and making more meaningful the history of this great city."

"The event," he said, "marks only the prelude to what will be happening on the 18th (falls overlook dedication date) when the falls will be restored to its rightful place as a shrine marking this spot as the birthplace of the first industrial city of the new world."

"I thank you for what you are doing," he continued, "for you are doing this, not for me, not for yourself but the city of Paterson and its future generations."

He noted that the statue of Alexander Hamilton is to be moved from its present location at the post office plaza to the falls overlook, and said he hoped "it will be in place for the dedication ceremonies."

THE INSPIRATION

De Angelis, speaking for the two unions, said they had been aware of Mr. Haines' efforts to stimulate the Federal Government's interest in the local scenic site, toward having the area eventually developed into a national shrine.

It was here that Alexander Hamilton stood and saw in the roaring waters of the Passaic Falls "enough water power to turn all the wheels of industry in America." He envisioned a great industrial city rising on its shores freeing the New World from its dependence on the industrial production of the Old. Hamilton implemented that dream by setting up the Society for Useful Manufactures (SUM) with a contract so foolproof that it stood unbroken for some 200 years, in spite of the efforts of some of the country's greatest legal minds.

As representatives of a powerful labor organization, the leaders of both the Paterson and Passaic Teamster unions saw it as their civic responsibility to share in any movement aimed at giving recognition to the city's industrial and historic heritage, De Angelis told Mr. Haines. A survey of the site revealed to them that although the plaza has been beautified and improved to provide a scenic overlook, it lacked a flagpole big enough to appropriately display the colors.

They put the idea up to their respective memberships and found mutual agreement that a flagpole would be a suitable gift.

GATES VOLUNTEERS

De Angelis said they then contacted William Gates, president of a company which has been a part of the Paterson business community for more than 100 years; himself a descendant of Civil War stock.

He said that Gates had become so enthused that he had agreed to supply the pole at cost. He also is contributing a monument to be erected at its base, on which a plaque will be placed to designate the donors and the story behind their gift.

The 45-foot tubular aluminum flagpole will be equipped with a 14-foot crossbar, capable of accommodating four flags in addition to the single American flag. The pole will be topped by a 24-inch gold-plated replica of the American Eagle, which will serve as a weathervane. The base on which the eagle rests will carry the insignia of the Society for Useful Manufactures (SUM).

FOUR FLAGS TO FLY

For the dedication ceremonies the flags of the U.S. Coast Guard (established by Hamilton) the State of New Jersey, city of Paterson, and the State's tercentenary flag will be displayed, as well as the national flag. Other flags will be flown from time to time appropriate to the events being observed.

The legend to be inscribed on the base of the monument will read:

"This flagstaff is our salute to the memory of Alexander Hamilton whose vision and energy made Paterson the first industrial city in America, and to his creation of the Society for Useful Manufactures which made this very ground the cradle of American industry. To this gallant statesman and the working men and women who helped forge this great Nation out of the wilderness, we are ever grateful.

"Gift to the people * * * James Perrotti, president; Lawrence De Angelis, secretary-treasurer, officers, and members, local 999, International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Michael A. Ardis, president—Daniel Tortorello, secretary-treasurer, officers, and members, local 945, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

A further step toward promoting the Passaic Falls as a major national tourist attraction will be accomplished through the cooperation of Public Service Corporation.

PRESERVE LAMPPOSTS

Recently it was brought to the attention of Mr. Haines that the more than 60-year-old ornamental iron lampposts at the now unused Lackawanna Plaza were about to be removed by Public Service Corporation.

With the thought that they would add much to the beauty and general use of the falls overlook, Mr. Haines contacted Mr. Branca to see how they might be acquired. He learned that these supposedly obsolete lighting fixtures are in wide demand by communities seeking to beautify their streets with the charm of a bygone day.

However, when Mr. Branca learned of the civic gesture being contemplated by the union bodies, he pledged to use his influence with the parent corporation to have the poles made available locally at a cost to make their acquisition feasible. Mr. Branca's suggestion met with instant enthusiasm and the Public Service Corp. promptly agreed to donate the lamp posts for this purpose. Public Service even went further. It agreed to send its own lighting engineers from the Newark headquarters to supervise the layout and advise on the installation. The lamp posts will not be in place by next month's dedication but will be installed before the summer tourist season gets actively underway.

MAYOR COMMENDS THEM

Mayor Graves, who joined the group in Mr. Haines' office, highly commended the union leaders for their public spirited gesture.

He paid tribute, too, to Mr. Haines, for his leadership in the restoration of the falls and said "this is typical of his lifetime civic service. There is hardly a civic program, a memorial, a historic or patriotic project that does not bear his stamp of leadership," he stated.

He also acknowledged the cooperation of Public Service Corp. and said: "It is right that industry and the men whose brawn and brains keep the wheels of industry turning are sharing in this interprise. For without this kind of teamwork, the great industrial might of America that Alexander Hamilton envisioned in the mists rising above the Passaic Falls could never have taken shape."

Mr. Haines, too, had words of appreciation and commendation for the labor leaders, and for the contributions being made by Branca, Public Service, and Gates.

"They are helping to preserve the precious heritage of the past and to make meaningful for today the message of yesterday."

Compensation for Jobless: No Give-Away Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the membership to a letter written by Mr. Harry L. Tyson, metropolitan area manager, Florida State Employment Service, in which he points out that compensation for the jobless is no giveaway program:

COMPENSATION FOR JOBLESS: NO GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

In reading your editorial concerning President Johnson's programs in attacking the unemployment and poverty problems of the Nation, I would like to concur with your conclusions that it should not be a giveaway program but one based on sound planning for the future and not for just the present election year.

I also feel that Dade County could offer some guideposts that would probably be very helpful to any program designed to assist the unemployed, and your statements on the subject sum up the problems that exist.

But perhaps you were misled when you quoted a statement concerning unemployment compensation made by an anonymous official who said "We cannot get them off unemployment compensation long enough to take the course even when the Government pays for it."

I feel that statements such as this, regardless of who makes them, should be checked for their accuracy. It has been our experience that those persons collecting unemployment compensation are not the ones who need the training. In order to collect unemployment compensation a person must have some previous work experience and consequently he would have an occupation of some kind. Also, experience indicates that these people mostly are between jobs and they do not remain on the unemployment rolls for a long duration. Another fact is that most of the past and present trainees have never drawn unemployment compensation and if they had it has long since run out. He is not the person we are aiming at specificially, but the one who needs the training is the person with no skills and little education.

HARRY L. TYSON,
Metropolitan Area Manager,
Florida State Employment Service.

Text of President's Address to the Associated Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the text of President Lyndon B. Johnson's address to newspaper executives and their guests on April 20, 1964, to open the annual celebration of Publishers' Week in New York City. The President, speaking at a luncheon meeting of the Associated Press in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, took the occasion to announce that the United States and the Soviet Union would both make substantial reductions in the production of uranium and plutonium for nuclear weapons. By any standards this was one of the President's finest speeches and certainly was one of the greatest speeches of this year. The text in its entirety follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1964]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The world has changed many times since General Washington counseled his new and weak country to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations." Great empires have risen and dissolved. Great heroes have made their entrances and left the stage. And America has slowly, often reluctantly, grown to be a great power and a leading member of world society.

We seek today, as we did in Washington's time, to protect the life of our Nation, preserve the liberty of our citizens, and pursue the happiness of our people. This is the touchstone of our world policy.

Thus we seek to add no territory to our dominion, no satellites to our orbit, no slavish followers to our policies. The most impressive witness to this restraint is that for a century our own frontiers have stood quiet and unarmed.

But we have also learned in this century, at painful and bloody cost, that our own freedom depends on the freedom of others—that our own protection requires that we help protect others—that we draw increased strength from the strength of others.

Thus to allies we are the most dependable and enduring of friends, for our own safety depends upon the strength of that friendship. To enemies we are the most steadfast and determined of foes, for we know that surrender anywhere threatens defeat everywhere.

GENERATION OF UNITY

For a generation—without regard to party or region or class—our country has been united in a basic foreign policy that grows from this inescapable teaching.

The principles of this foreign policy have been shaped in battle, tested in danger, sustained in achievement. They have endured under four Presidents of the United States because they reflect the realities of our world and the aims of our country.

Particular actions must change as events change conditions. We must be alert to shifting realities, to emerging opportunities and fresh dangers. But we must not mistake day-to-day changes for fundamental movements in the course of history. It often requires greater courage and resolution to maintain a policy which time has tested than to change it in the face of the moment's pressures.

Our foreign policy rests on tested principles.

First, since Korea we have labored to build a military strength of unmatched might. We have succeeded. If the threat of war has lessened, it is largely because our opponents realize attack would bring destruction. This effort has been costly. But the costs of weakness are far greater than the costs of strength, and the payment far more painful. That is why, in the last 3 years, your Government has strengthened the whole range of America's defenses—increasing defense spending by $17 billion.

Second, we have resisted Communist efforts to extend their dominion and expand their power. We have taken the risks and used the power which this principle demanded. We have avoided purposeless provocation and needless adventure.

PROVE DETERMINATION

The Berlin airlift, the Korean war, the defense of Formosa, the Cuba crisis, the struggle in Vietnam, prove our determination to resist aggression and our ability to adapt particular response to particular challenge.

Third, we have worked for the revival of strength among our allies: initially, to oppose Communist encroachment on war-weakened nations; in the long run, because our own future rests on the vitality and unity of the Western society to which we belong.

Fourth, we have encouraged the independence and progress of developing countries—both old friends and new nations. We are safer and more comfortable in a world where all people can govern themselves in their own way, and all nations have the inner strength to resist external domination.

Fifth, we have pursued every hope of a lasting peace. From the Baruch plan to the Test Ban Treaty we have sought and welcomed agreements which decrease danger without decreasing security. In that pursuit, for 20 years we have been the leading power in support of the United Nations. In that pursuit, this year as in every year, we will work to reach agreement on measures to reduce armament and lessen the chance of war.

Today we apply these same principles to a world much changed since 1945. Europe seeks a new role for strength rather than protection for weakness. The unity of communism is being eroded by the insistent forces of nationalism and diverging interest. A whole new group of societies is painfully struggling toward the modern world.

PRINCIPLES ADEQUATE

Our basic principles are adequate to this shifting world. But foreign policy is more than a set of general principles. It is the changing application of those principles to specific dangers and opportunities. It involves knowledge of strengths and awareness of limitations in each new situation. The presence of offensive missiles in Cuba was a fact. The presence of fallout in the atmosphere has been a fact. The presence of guerrillas in Vietnam is a fact. Such facts cannot be dealt with simply by historical judgments or general precepts. They require concrete acts of courage, wisdom, and restraint.

These qualities of endurance and innovation, continuity and change are at work in at least six major areas of continuing concern.

First, is our relationship with the Soviet Union—the center of our concern for peace.

The Communists, using force and intrigue, seek to bring about a Communist-dominated world. Our convictions, our interests, our life as a nation, demand that we resolutely oppose that effort. This activity and this alone, is the cause of the cold war between us.

For the United States has nothing to fear from peaceful competition. We welcome it and we will win it. It is our system which flourishes and grows stronger in a world free from the threat of war. And in such a competition all people, everywhere, will gain.

Today there are new pressures, new realities, which make it permissible to hope that the pursuit of peace is in the interests of the Soviet Union as it is in ours.

And our own restraint may be convincing the Soviet leaders of the reality that we seek neither war, nor the destruction of the Soviet Union.

Thus, I am hopeful that we can take important steps toward the day when in the words of the Book of Micah, "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

We must remember that peace will not come suddenly. It will not emerge dramatically from a single agreement or a single meeting. It will be advanced by concrete and the gradual growth of common interests, by increased awareness of shifting dangers and alinements, by the development of trust in a good faith securely based on a reasoned view of the world.

POSITION IS CLEAR

Our own position is clear. We will discuss any problem, listen to any proposal, pursue any agreement, take any action which might lessen the chance of war without sacrificing the interests of our allies or our own ability to defend the alliance against attack.

I am taking two actions which reflect both our desire to reduce tensions, and our unwillingness to risk weakness.

I have ordered a further substantial reduction in our production of enriched uranium, to be carried out over a 4-year period. When added to previous reductions, this will mean an overall decrease in the production of plutonium by 20 percent and of enriched uranium by 40 percent. By bringing production in line with need, we reduce tension while maintaining all necessary power. In

reaching these decisions I have been in close consultation with Prime Minister Douglas-Home.

I am happy to say that Chairman Khrushchev has now indicated to me that he intends to make a move in this same direction.

At the same time, I have reaffirmed all the safeguards against weakening our nuclear strength which we adopted at the time of the test ban treaty.

The second area of continuing effort is the development of Atlantic partnership with a stronger and more unified Europe.

Having begun this policy when peril was great we will not abandon it as success moves closer.

We worked for a stronger and more prosperous Europe, and Europe is strong and prosperous beyond expectation.

We have supported a close partnership with a more unified Europe. In the past 15 years more peaceful steps have been taken in this direction than at any time in history.

The pursuit of this goal, like the pursuit of any large and worthy cause, will not be easy or untroubled. But the realities of the modern world teach that increased greatness and prosperity demand increasing unity and partnership.

OLD BARRIERS ERODE

The underlying forces of European life are eroding old barriers and dissolving old suspicions. Common institutions are expanding common interest. National boundaries continue to fade under the impact of travel and commerce and communication. A new generation is coming of age, unscarred by old hostilities or old ambitions, thinking of themselves as Europeans, their values shaped by a common Western culture.

These forces and the steadfast effort of all who share common goals, will shape the future. And unity based on hope will ultimately prove stronger than unity based on fear.

We realize that sharing the burden of leadership requires us to share the responsibilities of power. As a step in this direction we support the establishment of a multilateral nuclear force composed of those nations which wish to participate. We also welcome agreed new mechanisms for political consultation on mutual interests throughout the world—with whatever changes in organization are necessary to make such consultation rapid and effective.

The experiences of two World Wars have taught us that the fundamental security interests of the United States and the interests of Europe are the same. What we learned in time of war, we will not forget in time of peace.

For more than a decade we have sought to enlarge the independence and ease the rigors of the people of Eastern Europe. We have used the tools of peaceful exchange—in goods, in persons and in ideas—to open up communication with these restless nations. We have used limited direct assistance where the needs of our security have allowed us to follow the demands of our compassion. In that spirit within the last month I have exercised the power granted me by the Congress, and reaffirmed the right of open trade with Poland and Yugoslavia.

In the third area of continuing concern—Latin America—we have renewed our commitment to the Alliance for Progress, sought peaceful settlement of disputes among the American nations, and supported the OAS effort to isolate Communist-controlled Cuba.

IS CENTRAL TASK

The Alliance for Progress is the central task of this hemisphere. That task is going ahead. But that Alliance means more than economic assistance or investment. It requires us to encourage and support those democratic political forces which seek essential change with the framework of constitutional government. It means preference for rapid evolution as the only real alternative to violent revolution. To struggle to stand still in Latin America is to "throw the sand against the wind."

We must, of course, be on guard against Communist subversion. But anti-communism alone will not suffice to insure our liberty or fulfill our dreams. That will take leadership dedicated to economic progress without uneconomic privilege—to social change which enhances social justice—to political reform which widens human freedom.

The resumption of relations with Panama proves once again the unmatched ability of our inter-American system to resolve disputes among good neighbors. At the outset of that dispute we stated our willingness to seek a solution to all problems without conditions to any kind. We never departed from that willingness. On that basis the dispute was settled.

We now move toward solution with the generosity of friends who realize, as Woodrow Wilson said, "You cannot be friends on any other terms than upon the terms of equality."

The use of Cuba as a base for subversion and terror is an obstacle to our hopes for the hemisphere. Our first task must be, as it has been, to isolate Cuba from the inter-American system, frustrate its efforts to destroy free governments, and expose for all to see the ugliness of communism. That policy is working. The problems of this hemisphere would be far more serious if Castro fought the councils of the OAS; disrupting debate and blocking decision—if he had open channels of trade and communication along which subversion and terror could flow—if his economy had been a successful model rather than a dismal warning. The effectiveness of our policy is more than a matter of trade statistics. It has increased awareness of difference and danger, revealed the brutal nature of the Cuban regime, lessened opportunities for subversion, reduced the number of Castro's followers, and drained the resources of our adversaries.

We will continue this policy with every peaceful means at our command.

A fourth area of continuity and change is the battle for freedom in the Far East.

WILL NOT WEAKEN

In the last 20 years, in two wars, millions of Americans have fought to prevent the armed conquest of free Asia. Having invested so heavily in the past, we will not weaken in the present.

The first American diplomatic mission to the Far East was instructed to inform all countries that we never make conquests, or ask any nation to let us establish ourselves in their countries.

That was our policy in 1832. That is our policy today. Our conquering forces left Asia after World War II with less territory under our flag than before. But if we have desired no conquest for ourselves, we have steadfastly opposed it for others. The independence of Asian nations is a link in our own freedom.

In Korea we proved the futility of direct aggression. In Vietnam the Communists now try the more insidious, but equally dangerous, methods of subversion, terror, and guerrilla warfare. They conduct a campaign organized, directed, supplied, and supported from Hanoi.

Armed Communist attack on Vietnam is a reality. The fighting spirit of South Vietnam is a reality. The request of a friend for our help is a reality. The statement of the SEATO allies that Communist defeat is "essential" is a reality. To fail to respond to these realities would reflect on our honor as a Nation, undermine worldwide confidence in our courage, and convince every nation in south Asia that it must bow to Communist terms to survive.

The situation in Vietnam is difficult. But there is an old American saying that "when the going gets tough, the tough get going." Let no one doubt that we are in this battle as long as South Vietnam wants our support and needs our assistance to protect its freedom.

I have already ordered measures to help step up the fighting capacity of South Vietnamese forces, to help improve the welfare and morale of the civilian population, and to keep our forces at whatever level continued independence requires.

No negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force. Once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible. The door is always open to any settlement which assures the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom to seek help for its protection.

In Laos we continue to support the Geneva agreements which offer the best hope for peace and independence for that strife-torn land. At my instruction Assistant Secretary William Bundy has already arrived in Laos for a first-hand examination of the developments of the last 48 hours.

ACT ON REALITIES

As for China itself, so long as the Communist Chinese pursue conflict and preach violence, there can be no easing of relationships. There are some who prophesy that these policies will change. But we must base our acts on present realities, not future hopes. It is not we who must reexamine our view of China, it is the Chinese Communists who must reexamine their view of the world. Nor can anyone doubt our unalterable commitment to the defense and liberty of Free China. Meanwhile, we say to our historic friends, the talented and courageous Chinese people on the mainland, that, just as we opposed aggression against them, we must oppose aggression by their rulers—and for the same reasons.

Fifth is our concern with the new nations of Africa and Asia. We welcome their emergence; for their goals flow from hopes like our own. We began the revolt from colonial rule which is now reshaping continents and creating new nations. Our mastery of technology has helped men to learn that poverty is not inevitable, that disease and hunger are not laws of nature. Having helped create hopes, we must help satisfy them, or witness a rising discontent which may ultimately menace our own welfare.

What we desire for the developing nations is that we desire for ourselves—economic progress which will permit them to shape their own institutions, and the independence which will allow them to take a dignified place in the world community.

Let there be no mistake about our intention to win the war against poverty at home, and to help fight it around the world. This battle will not be easy or swift. It takes time to educate young minds, and shape the structure of a modern economy. But the world must not be divided into rich nations and poor nations, white nations and colored nations. In such division are the seeds of terrible discord and danger in decades to come.

A WALL OF GLASS

For the wall between rich and poor is a wall of glass through which all can see.

We recognize the need for more stable prices for raw materials, and broader opportunity for trade. We are ready to help meet these claims, as we have already done, for example, with the negotiation of the international coffee agreement, and as we will do in the Kennedy round.

We will continue with the direct economic assistance which has been a vital part of our policy for 20 years.

Last year the Congress reduced foreign aid from a requested $4.5 billion to a total of $3.4 billion. This year I ordered that our request be cut to the absolute minimum consistent with our commitments and our security. That was done.

Every dollar cut from that request will directly diminish the security of the United

States. If in spite of this clear need and this clear warning, substantial cuts are made again this year—in either military or economic funds—it will be my solemn duty as President to submit supplemental requests for additional amounts until the necessary funds are appropriated.

In these areas, and in other areas of concern we remain faithful to tested principle and deep conviction while shaping our actions to shifting danger and fresh opportunity.

This year is an election year in the United States. In this year let neither friend nor enemy abroad mistake growing discussion for growing dissension, conflict over programs for conflict over principle, political division for political paralysis.

Let those at home who share in the great democratic struggle remember that the world is their audience, that attack on old policies requires responsible presentation of new choices; that in the protection of our security, partisan politics must yield to national need.

I recognize that those who seek to discuss great public issues must be informed on those issues. Therefore, I have instructed the Departments of State and Defense, and the Central Intelligence Agency to be ready to provide major candidates for the Office of President with all possible information helpful to their discussion of American policy. I hope candidates will accept this offer in the spirit in which it is made—the encouragement of the responsible discussion which is the touchstone of the democratic process.

FOREVER BOUND UP

In the past 20 years we have gradually become aware that America is forever bound up in the affairs of the world; that our own future is linked to the future of all. In great capitals and in tiny villages, in the councils of great powers and in the rooms of unknown planners, events are being set in motion which will continually call upon our attention and our resources.

Prophecy is always unsure. But if anything is certain it is that this Nation can never again retreat from world responsibility. We will be involved in the world for the rest of our history. We must accustom ourselves to working for liberty in the community of nations as we have pursued it in our community of States.

The struggle is not merely long. It is unending. For it is part of man's ancient effort to master the passions of his mind, the demands of his spirit, and the cruelties of nature. We have entered a new arena. The door has closed behind us. And the old stage has passed into history.

Dangers will replace dangers; challenges will take the place of challenges, new hopes will come as old hopes fade. There is no turning from a course which will require wisdom and endurance so long as the name of America still sounds on this earth.

Harold Russell Appointed Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the appointment last Saturday by President Johnson of Harold Russell to the important position of Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, succeeding our late colleague, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, is an excellent one.

I congratulate President Johnson in appointing Harold Russell. The President could not have made a better appointment. Harold Russell will give outstanding leadership in carrying out his duties.

For his appointment will bring hope and confidence to millions of handicapped persons in America.

In April, 1962, President Kennedy appointed Harold Russell, past national commander of the AMVETS, former vice president of the World Veterans Fund, Inc., and Chairman of the Disabled Veterans Committee of the President's Committee, to be a Vice Chairman of the President's Committee.

Millions remember the 48-year-old double arm amputee, who is a resident of Weyland, Mass., for his Academy Award winning performance in the movie "Best Years of Our Lives."

But to countless others the name of Harold Russell has symbolized the unquenchable spirit of those handicapped as the result of combat injuries, accidents, or disease who have waged an uphill fight to rehabilitate themselves, enter gainful employment and become useful and tax-paying members of their community.

Moreover, the Vice Chairman has traveled throughout the world, working with the World Veterans Federation, and inspiring men and nations to greater efforts for world peace and for rehabilitation of victims of war and persecution.

In addition, he has worked with the Treasury Department to spur the sale of savings bonds, the American Red Cross, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and with the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. Currently he is a member of the Board of Directors of CARE and on its Executive Committee and a member of the International Committee for Economic Growth.

In 1920, Russell moved to Boston with his family at the age of 6, following the death of his father. He attended public schools in Boston and Cambridge, graduating in 1933. After graduation he went to work for a grocery chain and rose to the position of store manager.

In February 1942 he entered the Army and volunteered for service with the paratroops. He qualified as a paratrooper instructor—attaining the rank of sergeant—and specialized in demolition and explosives. He made more than 50 jumps until an explosion cost him his hands.

This altered his career but Harold Russell was determined not to let the accident get him down. He has received many awards, including the honor of being chosen by the junior chamber of commerce as 1 of the 10 Outstanding Young Men of the Year in 1950.

In my remarks, I include an address delivered by Mr. Russell at a regional meeting held at Rochester, Minn., on April 13–14, 1964:

REMARKS OF HAROLD RUSSELL, VICE CHAIRMAN, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Today I am going to tell you three stories, make two points, ask one question, and sit down.

The stories are true, although I am not revealing any names. They are not particularly unusual stories; I am sure you know of similar ones right here in this city.

They are stories of courage—"Profiles of Courage," you might call them.

The first is of an epileptic, a brilliant lawyer. Yes, he has occasional seizures. But they are not as bad as they were before his doctors found the right combination of drugs; and they usually occur before noon; and he has learned to detect the warning signs and lie down beforehand.

After graduating from law school with high honors, he got a job with a law firm. He pulled no punches; he told his boss he was an epileptic. The boss hesitated at first, but high honors students don't come along every day—so the young epileptic was hired.

A year passed. Everything was going along just fine, but then it happened—a seizure on the job. The next day the boss called him in, and looked down at the ground while talking to him. "Look, you know how it is * * *" and a jumble of more words, all adding up to the fact that the law firm no longer could use the services of this bright young man. He was fired.

Well, you don't keep a good man down. And so he started his own law practice, at first using the living room of his house as an office. From the beginning, every one of his clients knew he was an epileptic, but they also knew he was a brilliant lawyer, and retained him anyway. He built his practice around his disability—no morning appointments, an associate to handle court cases whenever there's even a remote chance of a seizure, an occasional time out for a rest.

The young lawyer isn't getting rich, but he is making a living, and he's doing it entirely on his own—no favors asked.

And so ends story number one. Now for story number two.

This one has to do with an attractive woman now in her middle thirties, who spent the best years of her life—from age 20 to age 30—in a mental hospital—10 whole years out of touch with the world. But modern therapies and modern drugs worked wonders on her and—the miracle of miracles—came the day of her discharge.

The hospital's rehabilitation worker found her a job as a typist, and everything seemed just fine. She was fast, she was accurate, she caught on quickly, she got along well with the other girls in the office. But there was a cloud in the sky. Her supervisor did not like her. Her supervisor, it turned out later, did not like anyone who had ever been in a mental institution.

Life grew more and more miserable for this young lady just out of the mental hospital, but she wouldn't quit her job. Finally, due to some fancy footwork by the supervisor, she was let out.

How did the young lady react to her long, bitter ordeal? Like a princess. No glimmer of a relapse, of a step backward.

She did what any girl of courage would do. She went out and found another job. That was 3 years ago. She is still there; she has had three raises in salary, with a fourth coming soon. And to top it all, she got married, and in a few more months will go on what they call a maternity leave of absence.

With that, we go on to story No. 3.

The scene is an occupational training center for the mentally retarded. The time is a Monday night. The cast of characters includes retarded men and women who left the center for jobs in the community and who have been coming back every Monday night for informal get-togethers—to talk

about their work, their little victories, their disappointments, anything on their minds.

This one Monday night, a girl in her early twenties has the floor. She has a problem, she tells the group; one she doesn't know how to handle. Can they help her? Can they advise her? It seems that she works in a soft drink bottling plant, operating a simple machine that puts caps on ginger ale bottles. This is the first job of her life. This is more than a job; this is her life.

But the young men who work with her have been teasing her, and throwing bottle caps at her. What should she do? How should she cope with this?

The suggestions come thick and fast: "Throw bottle caps back at them." "Tell your boss." "No, don't tell your boss." "Quit your job." "Don't pay any attention."

She takes it all in, and then there is silence while she mulls it over in her mind. Finally she speaks, slowly:

"I know why they throw bottle caps at me. They don't like me. They want me to quit." She raises her voice. "But I'll show them. I'm not going to quit. I'm not going to quit."

Do you want the postscript to this story of courage? She did not quit. She's still there, this girl with retarded intellect but not retarded courage.

So there you have three profiles of courage of the handicapped. Before we sit back complacently and tell one another, "Isn't it wonderful what the handicapped can do?" I think we had better take a close look at that key word, "courage." What is courage?

Our dictionary tells us that courage is "that quality of mind which enables one to meet difficulties with firmness," or "that human quality which keeps one going in the face of opposition."

Courage, you see, implies jutting out your chin and standing up against something fearlessly, regardless of the odds stacked against you. Let me underline that word "against."

And what, my friends, have these three handicapped people, and all the other brave handicapped we know, been standing up against, in their respective profiles of courage?

This may come as a shock to you, but when you think about it, they have been standing up against you. And against me. And against our society which, in this enlightened age of science and education still bangs the door shut against full acceptance of the physically and mentally handicapped.

That epileptic lawyer, what brand of courage was his? It was the courage not to lose heart when he heard the burning words of his boss, "You're fired." Isn't it tough enough to have to fight epilepsy itself without having to fight rejection because you happen to be afflicted?

And what about the mentally restored office worker? Wherein lies her courage? It, too, was the courage not to flinch when faced with massive rebuff. And the mentally retarded girl in the bottling plant? The courage not to give in to the jibes of heartless coworkers.

I contend that the handicapped show courage enough in surmounting the difficulties of their disabilities. Let's not force them through additional ordeals of courage to stand up against a society which won't let them through the front door.

We need not only to rehabilitate the handicapped; we need to rehabilitate society.

This may sound like a task for supermen—the moving of mountains, the deflecting of the flow of rivers. But when you examine it closely, it is a task of man-sized proportions. It is no larger than man himself.

It is the task of eradicating the stereotypes that infest our minds, stereotypes that fuzz our thinking, stereotypes that conveniently toss labels upon our fellow men because it's the easy thing to do.

It is the task of directing the spotlight of truth so that we can look beneath the epilepsy to the man himself; beneath the mental illness to the woman herself; beneath the retardation to the young girl herself.

It is the task of convincing ourselves and our fellow creatures not that all men are created equal, but all men are created different * * * and vive la difference.

It is the task of seeing the man for what he is, rather than seeing him for what he is not; of concentrating on his strengths, his individual strengths, rather than on certain weaknesses we so conveniently attribute to entire disability groupings.

It is the task of recognizing that indeed, every man is an island, an island of individuality. It is respect for that individuality.

Now let's pause to see what ground we have covered. I promised you three stories, two points and one question. I have delivered the three stories; and I have just completed the two points—one being that our society could stand a bit of rehabilitation in its consideration of the handicapped, and the other being that this consideration will come about when we finally reach the stage of respecting the individuality of man. What remains is the one question—and what a question.

The question I ask is this: Well, what are we going to do about it? Yes, you and I. What are we going to do about it?

There is much we can do, very much. But in order to do anything, we need facts; we need organization; and we need time. Let me explain.

The facts, first. The only way to combat society's slanderous stereotypes about the handicapped is with facts, facts, facts. It's not enough to sing "It ain't necessarily so." We must explain why. "The truth shall set ye free," they say; and the truth can free our minds of misconceptions about the handicapped.

There is plenty of truth around; it is up to us to spread it far and wide. There is the truth of a vast Department of Labor study showing that the physically handicapped have better safety records and better production records than the able-bodied. And there is the truth of a Veterans' Administration study showing that the mentally restored actually have more stable job records than others, and can adapt to almost every type of job on the face of this land. And there are other nuggets of truth, if only we search for them and tell the world about them.

When we come across areas where facts are few and far between, it is our responsibility to stand up and say so. Why, for example, is there no conclusive study of the work records of the mentally retarded? Why have not more individual companies gone through personnel records to compare the capabilities of their handicapped and nonhandicapped employees? I could add a host of "for examples," but you get the idea.

Where there are facts, we must spread them; where there aren't facts, we must get them.

Another of our needs is for organization. I refer to the organization of Governors' committees as well as mayors' committees on employment of the handicapped—the Nation's sturdy instruments for spreading facts, for developing proper public attitudes toward our handicapped citizens.

Organization of these committees, I submit, must be flexible enough and strong enough to keep up with the dizzy pace of change of these years of the sixties.

A committee that galvanizes into action once a year to put on a frenetic observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week can hardly be said to be flexible and strong.

And neither can a committee with arteries so hard it cannot adapt to current needs * * * needs, for example, of the mentally restored and mentally retarded; or of action for more effective second injury legislation; or of encouraging business to use physical exams as tools, for proper placement rather than as screening devices against the handicapped; or of mobilizing the willing resources of local women's groups in the cause of the handicapped; or of promoting the establishment of sheltered workshops where needed; or of stepping up lagging awards programs; or of pushing for more dynamic use of the mass media of communications; or of a host of other emerging needs.

I am not a statistician and I never hope to be one, but I do get a thrill out of going over the reports sent in by Governors' committees, and sensing the surge that is taking place toward better organization, toward flexibility and strength. And so time is running in our favor; and each passing month brings a step upward.

All of which takes us to our third pressing need, which is time itself, old father time with his hourglass.

We are engaged in one of the most complex enterprises on the face of the earth—the enterprise of reaching human minds, of eradicating stereotypes, of changing people's attitudes toward the handicapped. Deep-seated attitudes do not change overnight, or overyear, for that matter. The change takes place slowly, almost imperceptibly. Only we must keep hammering away, hammering away with all our hearts and all our minds—even if at times we get the hollow feeling we are talking to a brick wall.

The change is occurring, and if you have your doubts, think back to the days just after World War II, when the physically handicapped—war veterans included, mind you—were turned down for job after job after job; and when no one even gave a second thought to the mentally ill and mentally retarded. "Keep 'em out of sight" was the common attitude, if anybody even bothered to think about them at all.

So we have come a long way and we are going a long way, you and I. Tramp, tramp, tramp, we are marching steadily down the road toward equality for all, the handicapped included.

Tramp, tramp, tramp, we look to the right and left, and the scenery hardly changes. But it is changing, my friends, and the sun is climbing higher in the sky.

And if we keep our spirits high, and our organizations flexible, and our arsenel of facts fresh and meaningful, we shall continue to head toward the city of hope, and the sum shall grow brighter and more triumphant.

And the day will come—as sure as I am standing here, the day will come, even though you or I may not be around to see it—when our handicapped brothers and sisters will not have to stand up against society, in order to attain rights that should be theirs by birth; when their profiles of courage will not have to be against the bullheadness of unthinking people; when they will be looked upon as men and women rather than as handicapped faceless creatures; when each human being on earth will be recognized and respected for what it really is, some loving mother's son or daughter and a child of God.

May the day come soon, for so many have waited for so long.

Results of a Poll of Citizens of the First District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years it has been my custom, early in the session, to send questionnaires to the citizens of the First Arkansas District seeking their views on national problems and matters of current interest.

The tabulation of the latest poll has been completed and it is my wish to share with other Members the information contained in it. I would like to point out that the response to this effort was highly gratifying and the poll gives an excellent cross-section of opinion in eastern Arkansas. Farmers, bankers, wage earners, housewives, and people in all walks of life favored me with their replies to these questions and—in a great number of cases—added to the response by writing detailed letters as to why they favored or did not favor certain questions raised. Nor was the tabulation confined to merely the questionnaires mailed from my office. Arkansas newspapers printed copies of the questionnaire which many people clipped, answered, and mailed to me. Area radio stations publicized the questions and cooperated in the effort. The interest in their Government and in the problems that face our Nation by Arkansas citizens has resulted in a definitive and a significant expression of opinion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the results of the poll taken in the First Arkansas District:

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Cotton subsidy legislation which would permit our mills to buy cotton at a competitive price with synthetics and remove the inequities caused by foreign mills being able to buy our cotton at a much lower price?	76	14	10
2. Increasing the price support on soybeans at this time?	21	70	9
3. The food stamp program which would take the place of the present system of distributing surplus commodities?	42	41	17
4. Increased authorizations and appropriations for ARA?	9	43	48
5. The recent decision of the Supreme Court that held that congressional districts should be as nearly equal in population "as practicable"?	51	36	13
6. Prayer and the reading of the Bible in the public schools?	90	6	4
7. Developing a new manned bomber to be made available when the present planes become antiquated or worn out (Secretary McNamara opposes this plan)?	73	12	15
8. Civil defense shelters even though the cost would run into billions of dollars?	15	74	11
9. The quality stabilization bill (by Harris of Arkansas) (this bill has been called fair trade legislation)?	37	34	29
10. The efforts our country is making to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control?	55	31	14
11. Economic sanctions being taken against nations who carry on trade with Cuba?	72	20	8
12. Continuing strong U.S. financial support of the U.N.?	45	45	10
13. The manner in which Congress performs its work?	49	23	28
14. The job being done by President Lyndon B. Johnson?	51	32	17
15. President Johnson for a new 4-year term?	45	33	22
If answer is "No," who is your choice?			
Percent			
Barry Goldwater 52			
Henry Cabot Lodge 9			
Richard Nixon 8			
John McClellan 7			
Richard Russell 5			
Governor Wallace 4			
Harry Byrd 3			
Nelson Rockefeller 2			

NOTE.—Receiving the remaining 10 percent were Governor Clements, Governor Scranton, Henry M. "Scoop" Jackson, Wilbur Mills, Governor Faubus, J. William Fulbright, Hubert Humphrey, David Lawrence, Martin Luther King, Adlai Stevenson, John Stennis, Strom Thurmond, and E. C. Gathings.

Mail in Support of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before, during, and after the debate on civil rights legislation in the House of Representatives, I have had various communications from my constituents both for and against this legislation. I am pleased to note, however, that 84 percent of the letters and telegrams have been in support of the civil rights bill as it passed the House.

Recently I received a letter which is an open letter to the Congress with respect to civil rights. I feel obligated to bring it to the attention of my colleagues by asking that it appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

To Members of Our U.S. Congress:

It is absolutely imperative that the civil rights bill be passed now and without delay.

There are many issues which must be voted upon and amended in one way or another but the civil rights bill must and should be passed now as it stands—without further changes—without further stalling.

In the name of "the land of the free" you must not engage in a reckless and damaging filibuster. This excessive talk delaying necessary legislation is a threat and a blot on this Nation's character.

We cannot talk of party issues now, but we must push this legislation into the "law of the land."

In the memory of our fallen President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, let us march forward and lead the land we love.

President Kennedy fought bravely for peace at home and abroad. He stood boldly against the Communists and said we would not back down, if necessary face nuclear war for the freedom and well-being of all freedom loving nations everywhere.

At home he, President Kennedy, faced the Negro problem head on. It was his conclusion that we must unite as a nation, not by racial discrimination groups, and give each and every individual regardless of race—freedom of speech, good housing, a good job, voting rights, a decent education, and a civilized place in our society today—tomorrow and always.

I ask that this legislation be passed above all else. I ask this in the name of thousands of Americans everywhere.

This is not a wish from a Democrat, Republican, conservative, or a liberal, but an urgent appeal from an American—first, last, and always.

An American.

Respectfully yours,

LLOYD W. HILL, Jr.,
First Congressional District.

DAVENPORT, IOWA.

Dean Andrew V. Clements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, word has reached us of the passing of a great figure in the field of legal education. Andrew V. Clements, dean of the Albany Law School of Union University, was a truly outstanding American of this generation. His service to mankind has been unstinting and replete in every way since his graduation from that law school in the class of 1919. Dean Clements is mourned by legions of friends in all walks of life and in every corner of the world, three of whom are presently serving in the House.

I am confident that his full and diverse life as husband, father, dean, writer, scholar, advocate, arbitrator, and friend fully prepared him for the call. His customary zeal and integrity will, I trust, be a source of strength for his wife and family who survive him and I hope they will accept my profound sympathy.

As many colleagues have come to know him through his legal writing and still others remember his plea for retention of "reading" as a preparation for bar examinations, I would be remiss were I not to include the biographical sketch which the New York Times wrote of Dean Clements' life. It is as follows:

ANDREW V. CLEMENTS IS DEAD—DEAN OF ALBANY LAW SCHOOL, 65

ALBANY, April 14.—Andrew V. Clements, dean of Albany Law School, died yesterday at Albany Medical Center Hospital. He was 65 years old.

Since 1957, he had been a member of the State mediation board, assisting in labor disputes. He was appointed first by Gov. W. Averell Harriman and reappointed by Gov-

ernor Rockefeller. From 1948 to the present was a member of the regional loyalty board for New York and New Jersey. He was chairman of the panel from 1951 to 1953.

Mr. Clements was appointed to the State's grievance appeals board in 1955. The group was set up to settle disputes involving State employees.

Mr. Clements, an authority on criminal law and legal ethics, was the editor of Manual of Changes for Trial Justices, issued in 1951, and Criminal Law and Procedure, published the following year.

A native of Chatham, Ontario, he attended high school in Rochester, graduated from Union University in 1919 with an LL.D. and in 1919 from the Albany Law School.

He joined the staff of the school in 1921, serving first as registrar. He was a member of the teaching faculty until he was named acting dean in 1945. He was named dean 2 years later.

Survivors include his widow, Mrs. Dorothy Sevill Clements; a son, Bruce, of Rochester; a daughter, Mrs. Douglas Campbell of Wilmington, Del., and nine grandchildren.

SUPPORTED READING

In 1954, when the Joint Conference on Legal Education suggested to the State court of appeals that reading be eliminated as a preparation for bar examinations, Mr. Clements registered a mild protest.

"Reading" is a longstanding tradition under which some would-be lawyers qualified for admission to the bar by serving rather than by going to law school.

Mr. Clements said that the move would destroy "the Lincoln tradition." He added that very few persons in recent years had taken advantage of the "office study" provision of the law.

Taps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation paid formal tribute to a great American leader, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and his passing has brought sadness to people everywhere.

I offer for the attention of my colleagues, a poem composed by Mrs. Jessie M. Williams, of Chicago, Ill., which expresses very vividly the courage of an exceptional man:

A five star general
  Through struggle and strife
Lost only one battle
  The battle for life.

He shall not return
  He just faded away
A gallant hero
  Who led to the fray.

Once more he heeds the call
  To a last command
Closed his eyes in peaceful sleep
  As god took him by the hand.

The five-star general's fond farewell
  A last salute he gave
His spirit ever marches on
  Far beyond the grave.

Flags flying at half-mast
  Taps softly playing
For old soldiers never die
  But only fade away.

The Campaign Against Poverty

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the campaign against poverty in our country has occupied the attention of the country for the past several weeks. Recently the gentleman from Missouri, Representative RICHARD BOLLING, delivered some clear and compelling thoughts on the matter in a speech he made in his home district of Kansas City, Mo. Under unanimous consent, I include his speech, which I commend for reading and analysis, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN RICHARD BOLLING AT GARRISON COMMUNITY CENTER

We live in the richest country history has ever known. We produce more food, more television sets, refrigerators, and automobiles than any other country in the world. Our Nation is laced with an incomparable highway system. We have opened the earth to bring forth minerals and raw materials for our mills and factories. Our forests stand tall and our rivers run deep.

If we turn to the world, proud of this America we have built, then we must also stand in shame in the knowledge that one family in every five in this Nation of plenty lives in dark poverty.

What is poverty? Anyone who is poor knows what poverty is. It is an empty breadbox; it is the "no help wanted" sign on the factory gate; it is the cardboard stuffed into your shoe to keep your foot off the ground; it is the questions in the eyes of your children; it is the bitter memory of yesterday and the despair for tomorrow.

There has always been poverty and there have always been the poor. It has been said that "God must love the poor because he made so many of them." In the past, God's love and a painless death was all the poor could hope for. If you were born poor—you stayed poor. This was a fact of life and for centuries nobody thought to ask why.

Today, we are asking why and, as we ask, some answers are revealed to us.

We know now that poverty is not a natural state. That if we have rich we need not have poor. If we have abundance, we need not have poverty. To have the well fed, we need not have the hungry. To discover these plain facts was the work of centuries. This knowledge has led to understanding.

Through the ages, the very rich have mistrusted the medium rich and they in turn looked down upon the middle classes. And they were all united in their war upon the poor.

Now we have called off the war against the poor and have declared an all-out war against poverty.

Let us take a look at the enemy—poverty. Poverty is that state in which a family does not have enough money to provide the basic necessities of life: adequate food, clothing, and shelter. It has been established that the minimum income needed to secure these things is $3,000 a year. This is, let me repeat, the absolute minimum.

One out of every five families in the United States has an income below that required for bare existence. Of these, nearly half have incomes of less than $2,000.

If that does not shock you, then imagine, if you will, trying to raise six children on a total income of $38 a week. More than 1 million children presently are being raised in such homes.

Now, just in case you feel that these figures represent the agricultural South or depressed areas of the industrial North or places and people far away, let me try to bring them a little closer to home.

In 1959, the last year for which figures are available, 1 family in every 10 in Kansas City had an income of less than $2,000 a year. This is about twice as good as the national average, but it is a figure that must be erased.

Now that we have declared war on poverty what weapons do we use? What ammunition? What battle plan?

The first weapons in this war were wheeled out a generation ago, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office. He found one-third of a nation ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed, and he set out to do something about it.

His big guns rolled out of Congress under the label of "Social Legislation." There was the WPA and the PWA to put men to work. There was the CCC to take our youth off the streets; the Wagner Act to compel employers to bargain fairly, social security which held the promise of dignity in old age; unemployment compensation to take way the shame of the breadline, and a battalion of others.

At last we were on our way toward doing something about poverty.

Succeeding administrations continued to build dams against the floods of poverty. It was not always easy and very often the attempts failed but at least we knew where we were going.

Under President Kennedy, the Congress created a Manpower Development and Training Act to provide new skills for those that were not equipped to enter or stay in the labor market. And, the Area Redevelopment Act was passed to provide new life to communities whose mines had been worked out or whose industries had disappeared.

All of these things have helped in the battles against poverty. But they have been only battles. Now, we have declared total war.

President Johnson has asked Congress to create a law to be known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Such a law would provide education and job training for our young men in centers away from home. It would create massive retraining programs for young men and women and would allow them to earn while they learn. It would supply assistance to whole communities trying to "get rolling" again. It would work to bring prosperity back to the small farmer and his rural neighbors. It would make available loans to businesses which agree to hire the unemployed. It would aid small businessmen. It will, in short, strike at the heart of the poverty cancer that is eating away at the healthy body of America.

Legislation has already been proposed that would complement and support the President's request for an Opportunity Act. For example, the minimum wage law should be extended to millions who are not now covered and the minimum wage itself should be raised substantially. We desperately need aid to education at the elementary and high school level. There is pending a bill to provide double pay for overtime which we hope will discourage employers from scheduling overtime and cause them to put more people to work.

And, finally, there is a bill to provide medical care for the aged. The bill is a must. To be poor is a tragedy. To be poor and old is a living death.

You can see from this outline that we do, finally, have an idea of where we are going. There are many who do not want us to get there. But there are others from whom we must—one-fifth of a Nation.

For them, I turn to the 9th Psalm, 18th verse:

"For the needy shall not always be forgotten, nor the expectation of the poor perish forever."

Poverty Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now that poverty has become fashionable and the administration is encouraging more people to be a part of it, it is only natural that we will soon have Government forms to fill out. No bureaucratic program is a success until we have proper forms and thousands of additional employees are put on the Federal payroll to handle the paperwork. This week I received a sample form that may be useful to the department which is bound to be set up to handle poverty. I thought you would be interested in seeing it, so I am including it as a part of these remarks:

GOVERNMENT POVERTY APPLICATION

DEAR CITIZEN: This form is being provided for your use if you have reason to feel you can qualify for a Government poverty grant. May we ask that you carefully study the important questions on this sheet and answer them to the best of your ability. If it can be determined that you qualify as a "povert," then a Government representative will call on you to determine how much money you need.

1. Do you eat as well as some of your neighbors? ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Do you know of other people who have more than you? ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Do you need more money to spend? ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Do you find it difficult to pay your monthly bills? ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
5. Do you know of any reason why you should not be able to qualify for a poverty grant? ..... Yes ☐ No ☐

Please sign or place your "X" in the space below.

Name: .....

In order to assist you with the above questions and to help you qualify for a poverty grant, we submit the following suggestions: the answer to question No. 1 should be "No"; the answer to question No. 2 should be "Yes"; the answer to question No. 3 should be "Yes"; the answer to question No. 4 should be "Yes"; the answer to question No. 5 should be "No."

SPECIAL BONUS OFFER

Do you know of three friends whom you think can qualify for a poverty grant? If so, please send their names and when these people qualify, we will send you another $1,000 poverty bonus.

Mr. Speaker, finally, not to be forgotten is the statement earlier this year by President Johnson:

We are going to try to take all the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the haves and give it to the have-nots that need it so much.

The Plight of the Independent Oil Producer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article about the plight of the independent oil producer—a backbone of the Kansas economy—recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal for Wednesday, April 8, 1964.

By unanimous consent, I include the Wall Street Journal material at this point, as a matter of substantial interest to all my colleagues here in the Congress:

PETROLEUM PINCH: MORE SMALL OIL FIRMS SELL OUT AS COMPETITION MOUNTS, PROFITS SUFFER—DRILLING COST RISE, CRUDE SAG SQUEEZE INDEPENDENTS—BIG CONCERNS ARE EAGER TO BUY—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STEPS IN

(By James C. Tanner)

In recent days M. H. Robineau, president of Frontier Refining Co., in Denver, has quietly passed the word in the oil industry that his concern, with an annual volume of $44 million, is up for sale. The reason, according to Mr. Robineau: "I've been in this business 40 years but I've got to be realistic. It's getting murderous for the independent refiner."

In deciding to sell out, Frontier is joining a growing list of independent oil companies who are giving up the struggle. With crude oil prices sagging, production costs climbing, and major companies intensifying their fight for customers, the squeeze on many smaller oil companies has become too much to withstand. "Many independents are operating in the red—those making a profit, like ourselves, are an exception," notes Mr. Robineau. In the past 3 years, oil company mergers have run at a $1 billion annual clip (based on selling prices) and many industry officials look for the figure to go even higher this year.

In most cases the independents are having little trouble finding buyers. For some of the same reasons that the independents feel compelled to quit the business, fully integrated major oil companies are ready to take them aboard. Rising real estate and construction costs, for example, often make a merger or purchase of a smaller company a less expensive way for a big firm to establish a strong regional marketing setup than to go out and build their own chain of stations.

EXPLORATION COSTS SOAR

The same holds true of finding crude oil. Exploration costs have soared to such an extent that major firms often regard acquisition of independents as a cheaper way to get oil than by hunting for it themselves. The steep rise in drilling costs points up what firms face in oil exploration. Last year, according to the trade publication Petroleum Engineer, the average deep oil well cost $695,984 to drill, a 6-percent increase from 1962 and 27 percent above the $550,000 average of 1953. Yet, only one in nine expensive wildcat wells ever strikes oil.

Mergers are increasing in many industries, of course, largely reflecting company efforts to diversify. But the trend seems more pronounced in the oil industry and can generally be traced to a different reason: a cost-price squeeze.

"Since 1957 the prices which the company can obtain from its domestic oil have declined approximately 6.5 percent while operating costs have increased approximately 20 percent," says Lawrence S. Reed, president of Houston-based Texas Gulf Producing Co. The company's stockholders this month will vote on a proposal to sell its assets to Sinclair Oil Corp. Directors of Texas Gulf, big independent with interests in Libyan and Peruvian operations and with large U.S. reserves of oil and natural gas, decided to recommend sale of the company for $250 million rather than continue the "increasingly costly and discouraging" search for oil and gas.

"For many, it's become more profitable to sell than to continue in business," comments Minor S. Jameson, Jr., executive vice president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. Though the cost-price squeeze, low production allowables by States and declining rates of return are the immediate factors bringing the sellouts, Mr. Jameson says the independent oilman's woes are more basic. The growing worldwide surplus of petroleum, a slackening in the rate of growth in U.S. oil consumption, an upheaval in gasoline marketing policies and the "increasing intrusion" of the Federal Government into the economic affairs of the industry are at the root of the oil merger trend, he declares.

A DROP IN MEMBERSHIP

As an indication of the extent of such consolidations, the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association reports the number of oilmen in the State has dropped to 6,200 from 6,600 in the past 5 years. "Even more significant is the growing number of operators who have pulled in their horns on drilling and exploration but are not yet on the dropout list," adds an association official.

The merger trend hasn't escaped the attention of Government officials. The Justice Department, in fact, currently is trying to break up one combination—the $385 million sale of assets of Honolulu Oil Co. to Pan American Petroleum Corp. and Tidewater Oil Co.

Now in Federal court in San Francisco, the case is being watched closely by much of the industry because of pretrial remarks made by Government attorneys. "What we * * * propose to show," said the attorneys in a brief, "is that the acquisition is part of a trend which, if not stopped, threatens an undue restriction in the number of independent producers and independent refiners by concentrating ownership of domestic production in the hands of 20 or so large integrated oil companies."

Oilmen don't dispute the trend though they dispute Justice Department conclusions that it may be unduly restrictive on the independents. Sellouts will continue to climb, says one oil company executive, adding: "The only limiting factors are the Justice Department—and the supply."

OLD BREAKUPS PLAYS A PART

Ironically, much of the motivation for today's consolidations on the marketing side dates back to the Government-enforced dissolution of the old Standard Oil combine a half century ago. It left some powerful oil companies with only regional markets—a pattern they are trying to break. And, many have found, a quick, painless way to market their brands coast-to-coast is by acquisition.

Standard Oil Co. of California chose this way to break into five Southeastern States formerly outside its marketing area, with the 1961 acquisition for $170 million of Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky.

Now, Humble Oil & Refining Co., chief domestic subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), is following the same route by proposing to buy the west coast refining and marketing facilities of Tidewater Oil for $329 million. Humble, 3 years ago, began an effort to push into the Far West by building its own stations. It so far has 800 in this region—250 of them in California. With the acquisition of the Tidewater facilities, Humble would pick up 3,900 additional stations, bringing its U.S. total to about 34,000.

"It's hard to justify any big advertising program in an area unless you've got at least 5 percent of the market," says one oil industry executive, putting his finger on the major problem of trying to enter a market

by building up from scratch. With the purchase of the Tidewater facilities, "Humble will become a big factor on the west coast in one fell swoop," notes a competitor. "It would have taken years to do it any other way."

WANT MORE CRUDE

In today's fiercely competitive atmosphere, oil companies want not only to have their own outlets for their refinery production but also to be self-sufficient in crude oil supplies. Many integrated oil companies are deficit refiners; that is, they process more crude oil than they are able to produce and have to buy much of the crude from independent producers.

E. L. Steiniger, chairman of Sinclair Oil says that purchase of Texas Gulf Producing's vast oil reserves will help "to enable the company to compete on more equal terms with competitors now more favorably situated." Following the Texas Gulf acquisition, Sinclair will be able to produce about half of its refinery requirements compared with about 43 percent now, says Mr. Steiniger.

Just getting 100 percent of their crude oil needs now is not enough for many companies, one oil executive contends. "Most would like to have double the reserves they need now, as a floor for future growth," he says. "That's why everybody has been trying to make a deal with Superior Oil Co."

Superior is one of the few independent domestic producers large enough to go abroad in the search for oil. But for some time it has been unable to find markets for all its foreign petroleum and in late January plans were announced to sell its Venezuela subsidiary to Texaco, Inc., which has extensive refinery facilities, for about $125 million.

Much of the glow of foreign crude is beginning to rub off as market competition worsens and governments abroad get more fickle about such matters as oil royalties. This has played a role in intensifying interest in obtaining more U.S. crude as insurance in case oversea supplies are cut off.

Not all the sell-outs, of course, can be blamed on a sag in profits by independents. Many independent companies do well despite industry problems—often because they have themselves pursued an active policy in acquiring smaller firms. But the fierce bidding for properties often pushes the price high enough to make a sell-out more attractive than continuing in business. Shell Oil Co., which has been wanting to expand in the southeast, last month bought the refining and marketing properties of El Paso Natural Gas Products Co., a subsidiary of El Paso Natural Gas Co., for $37 million, though El Paso by no means was a poverty case. Its 1963 net income, according to W. S. Noel, president, varied little from the $3,563,283 earned in 1962. "We thought it was a good sale for us to make," he says.

OILMEN REJECT SHUTDOWN

OKLAHOMA CITY.—Independent oil producers from Kansas proposed that wells in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas be closed to protest a decline in crude oil prices. But independents from Oklahoma and Texas yesterday declined to go along with the suggestion.

The Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association called a meeting of independents from the three States after several major buyers of Kansas crude recently reduced the top price by 5 cents a barrel to $3. Crude prices in most of Oklahoma were cut by the same amount last year.

George Bruce, president of the Kansas group, told Texas and Oklahoma producers that he would "almost gamble that a 10-day shutdown would restore the price." But representatives of Texas and Oklahoma producer associations said they didn't believe their State laws would permit a well shutdown. Bruce Street, president of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, added that he "doubted it would be in the best interest of the producers to do this."

L. S. Youngblood, president of the Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, blamed rising oil imports for the price erosion, and representatives of the three groups agreed to push for a Federal study of oil imports and their influence on domestic crude prices. The groups also voted to ask Interior Secretary Udall to review off-shore leasing of oil development rights and to consider bringing off-shore oil production under market demand proration systems practiced by some States.

About 120,000 barrels of Kansas' 305,000 barrels daily crude production and two-thirds of Oklahoma's 545,000 barrels daily production are currently under the $3 posting.

Crude Reserves in United States Slip Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association recently released their annual estimate of the Nation's proved reserves of oil and gas. I should like to call attention to the fact that although natural gas reserves increased in 1963, the increase was the third lowest of the postwar period. Furthermore, even though reserves of natural gas increased, production increased even faster and thus reserves fell in relation to production. In 1954, when the Federal Power Commission was given jurisdiction over natural gas producers, reserves were 22.7 times annual production. After 10 years of regulation, proved reserves are only 18 times annual production. Though the policies of the Federal Power Commission have encouraged a high level of consumption, it is evident they have failed to give producers the incentives needed to meet these growing requirements. Unless action is taken to restore incentives to producers, the time will inevitably come when reserves will be inadequate to meet demand. Low gas prices will be of no value to the consumer, Mr. Speaker, if gas is unavailable at these prices.

I should also like to point out that gross additions to crude oil reserves in 1963 were the lowest of any year of the postwar period and that crude oil reserves fell to a 5-year low in 1963. This unfortunate fact also stems, in part, from the depressing effects of the Federal Power Commission's regulation of natural gas. The oil and gas components of the petroleum industry are inseparable and an injury to one harms the other.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of the Nation's petroleum reserve situation entitled "Crude Reserves in United States Slip Again" appeared in the March 30, 1964, issue of the Oil and Gas Journal. I am pleased to insert this article for the information of my colleagues:

CRUDE RESERVES IN UNITED STATES SLIP AGAIN

Last year's decline of 1.3 percent pushes oil reserves to lowest level in 5 years. But gas reserves grow 1.4 percent and gas liquids rise 5 percent, joint study shows.

Last year brought the slimmest returns on U.S. crude-oil finding efforts since World War II.

Record production coupled with a poor discovery performance sent crude reserves into their fourth decline in 7 years. Even a good gain in natural-gas liquids was not enough to prevent the second straight decrease in total liquid hydrocarbon reserves and only the third in the postwar period.

Natural-gas liquids and natural gas both pushed ahead to new peaks of proved reserves. Both also reported new production highs in the joint study by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association.

API and AGA presented this summary audit of the Nation's underground petroleum banks as of January 1, 1964:

Crude oil: Reserves down 419 million barrels, or 1.3 percent, to 30.970 billion barrels, a 5-year low, after production of 2.593 billion barrels.

Natural-gas liquids: Reserves up 362 million barrels, or 5 percent, to 7.674 million, after production of 516 million barrels.

Total liquid hydrocarbons: Reserves down 56.8 million barrels, or 1.4 percent, to 38.644 billion barrels, after production of 3.109 billion barrels.

Natural gas: Reserves up 3.872 trillion cubic feet, or 1.4 percent to 276 trillion cubic feet, after production of 14.762 trillion cubic feet.

In a supplemental report, the Canadian Petroleum Association and Canadian Gas Association listed new highs in all categories:

Canadian reserves: Crude up 9 percent to 4.9 billion barrels, natural-gas liquids up 7.5 percent to 748 million barrels, total liquid hydrocarbons up 8.8 percent to 5.629 billion barrels, and natural gas up 4.4 percent to 37 trillion cubic feet.

The figures reported are "proved" reserves, described by API and AGA as "the known and established underground working inventory available for recovery under prevailing conditions." They do not include "oil that may become available by fluid injection or other methods from fields in which such operations have not yet been applied."

Crude oil: Gross additions to crude reserves of 2.174 billion barrels in the United States was the poorest showing in the postwar years.

As usual, revisions of previous estimates and extension to known fields accounted for the bulk of the additions, but reserves from these sources were relatively small. The 1.824 billion barrels of extensions and revisions was the second lowest of the past two decades: only last year's 1.8 billion was lower.

Discoveries of new fields and pools added only 350 million barrels, down from last year's 381 million.

Only seven States gained in crude reserves. The only appreciable increases were made by Montana and Utah. Each added about 22 million barrels.

Louisiana, by all odds the hottest oil hunting ground, added net reserves of about 2 million barrels. Even so, this State contributed 142 million of the 350-million-barrel national total of oil found in new fields.

Heavy losses were registered by the important older oil States—Oklahoma, 100 million barrels; Texas, 75 million; New Mexico, 53 million; California, 49 million; Illinois, 44

million; and Wyoming, 43 million. The life index of reserves once more slipped below 12 years.

Natural-gas liquids: Offsetting their crude-oil results, both Texas and Louisiana had banner years in natural-gas liquids.

Texas gained 213 million barrels and Louisiana 143 million barrels to totals of 4 billion and 1.8 billion barrels, respectively. Together they account for more than 75 percent of the U.S. reserves of natural-gas liquids.

New Mexico had the only other sizable gain, 41 million barrels, lifting its reserves to 558 million barrels.

Texas and Louisiana thus were able to add appreciably to their total liquid-hydrocarbon reserves. Texas advanced by 138 million to 18.6 billion barrels and Louisiana 145 million to 6.9 billion barrels.

The gross additions to natural-gas liquids reserves of 878 million barrels were the largest on record for the United States.

Natural gas: The increase in reserves of natural gas was well below the previous year's 6 trillion cubic feet and the third lowest of the postwar period.

The industry has made gross additions of 302 trillion cubic feet since the reserves study was begun in 1946 by AGA, for an average of about 18 trillion cubic feet-year. Gross additions last year were 18.4 trillion cubic feet.

But because of record production, the life index of reserves declined from just under 20 to less than 19 years. This continued a general trend to natural gas production increasing faster than the reserves.

What success gas explorers had was concentrated. More than 40 percent of all gross additions—some 8 trillion cubic feet—were recorded in Louisiana, and this single State supplied almost all of the gain in reserves.

New Mexico, with a gain of 925 billion cubic feet, and Oklahoma, with 880 billion, were the only other States to show substantial increases.

Texas led the list of 10 States where reserves declined, Texas production of 6.1 trillion cubic feet exceeded its gross additions to reserves by more than 1 trillion cubic feet.

AGA compiled last year's reserves on a new pressure base, substituting 14.73 pounds per square inch absolute 60° F. for the old base of 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute also at 60° F.

Canada: The meager discovery record for crude oil in 1962 did not bode well for last year's revisions and extensions, but Canada turned in one of its best increases anyway.

The western provinces added about 401 million barrels to reserves, due in large part to new secondary recovery projects. Only 28 million barrels of the 657 million barrels of gross additions came from new discoveries.

Once again, Alberta provided the great bulk of the new liquids reserves—334 million barrels of crude and all of the natural gas liquids net gain of 52 million barrels. British Columbia and Saskatchewan had declines in natural gas reserves. Alberta recorded no additions to natural gas liquids reserves from new fields or pools.

Crude oil reserves

[In thousands of barrels]

	Proved reserves Jan. 1, 1963	Extensions and revisions	New discoveries [1]	Production in 1963	Proved reserves Jan. 1, 1964	Changes in 1963
Alabama	37,501	16,488		8,920	45,069	7,568
Arkansas	246,795	959	3,805	26,268	225,291	−21,504
California [2]	3,648,434	239,617	11,705	300,021	3,599,735	−48,699
Colorado	388,330	16,661	1,575	38,191	368,375	−19,955
Illinois	460,160	28,013	2,518	74,079	416,612	−43,548
Indiana	61,010	14,326	302	12,206	63,432	2,422
Kansas	862,410	78,104	9,651	108,816	841,349	−21,061
Kentucky	108,626	8,563	210	16,943	100,456	−8,170
Louisiana [2]	5,086,622	308,335	142,299	448,651	5,088,605	1,983
Michigan	74,996	9,266	363	16,082	68,543	−6,453
Mississippi	388,383	49,383	4,360	57,217	384,909	−3,474
Montana	248,860	49,593	3,666	30,866	271,253	22,393
Nebraska	93,824	7,669	3,000	20,910	83,583	−10,241
New Mexico	1,064,590	32,487	18,111	104,459	1,010,729	−53,861
New York	23,106	−3,000		1,671	18,435	−4,671
North Dakota	403,467	9,913	750	24,972	389,158	−14,309
Ohio	77,321	11,662	4,870	6,039	87,814	10,493
Oklahoma	1,728,268	89,765	4,602	194,497	1,628,138	−100,130
Pennsylvania	96,748			5,014	91,734	−5,014
Texas [2]	14,648,325	715,224	124,838	915,262	14,573,125	−75,200
Utah	197,722	55,020	215	33,381	219,576	21,854
West Virginia	56,172	4,387		3,256	57,303	1,131
Wyoming	1,297,023	79,386	11,894	133,997	1,254,306	−42,717
Miscellaneous [3]	90,530	2,398	1,157	11,625	82,460	−8,070
Total, United States	31,389,223	1,824,219	349,891	2,593,343	30,969,990	−419,233

[1] Only a limited area is assigned to each new discovery.
[2] Includes offshore reserves.
[3] Includes Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Missouri, Nevada, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Natural gas reserves

[In millions of cubic feet]

	Proved reserves Jan. 1, 1963 [1]	Extension and revisions [1]	New discoveries [1]	Change in underground storage [2]	Net production [3]	Proved reserves Jan. 1, 1964 [1]	Changes in 1963
Alaska	1,634,321	60,432	500		4,529	1,690,724	56,403
Arkansas	1,643,669	111,486	109,106	11,030	82,647	1,792,644	148,975
California [4]	9,121,385	225,650	106,105	26,795	614,209	8,865,726	−255,659
Colorado	2,204,777	−260,472	23,782	2,923	94,953	1,876,057	−328,720
Illinois	158,213	−6,431	249	23,942	7,378	168,595	10,382
Indiana	49,638	3,875	199	10,077	3,609	60,180	10,542
Kansas	18,567,174	124,893	85,356	1,257	784,445	17,994,235	−572,939
Kentucky	1,108,942	34,576	10,409	−332	68,359	1,085,236	−23,706
Louisiana [4]	71,544,088	6,245,918	1,790,102	591	4,215,707	75,364,992	3,820,904
Michigan	647,039	10,352	2,115	96,315	33,009	722,812	75,773
Mississippi	2,735,845	−104,986	50,330	100	199,662	2,481,627	−254,218
Montana	600,171	10,509	1,874	13,222	27,645	598,131	−2,040
Nebraska	100,194	1,893	666	10,343	13,044	100,042	−152
New Mexico	14,112,734	1,562,784	51,322	−14,370	714,648	15,037,822	925,088
New York	131,196	2,253	1,361	988	3,513	132,285	1,089
North Dakota	962,709	188,687	1,491		33,312	1,119,575	156,866
Ohio	727,912	32,394	17,790	8,591	38,500	748,187	20,275
Oklahoma	18,259,036	1,620,670	382,325	4,921	1,128,132	19,138,820	879,784
Pennsylvania	1,175,083	74,930	16,255	40,570	92,340	1,214,498	39,415
Texas [4]	118,854,773	2,286,825	2,796,001	2,174	6,130,397	117,809,376	−1,045,397
Utah	1,786,366	99,739	20,136	248	68,687	1,638,324	−148,042
Virginia	33,045	330			2,072	31,303	−1,742
West Virginia	2,025,999	425,900	43,053	2,119	185,907	2,311,164	285,165
Wyoming	3,931,224	242,806	27,417	−955	211,946	3,988,546	57,322
Miscellaneous [5]	163,325	7,439		13,184	3,616	180,332	17,007
Total	272,278,858	12,802,974	5,577,934	253,733	14,762,266	276,151,233	3,872,375

[1] Excludes gas loss due to natural-gas liquids recovery.
[2] The net difference between gas stored in and gas withdrawn from underground storage reservoirs, inclusive of adjustments and native gas transferred from other reserve categories.
[3] Net production equals gross withdrawals less gas injected into producing reservoirs. Changes in underground storage and gas loss due to natural-gas liquids recovery are excluded. 4th quarter production estimated in some instances.
[4] Includes offshore reserves.
[5] Includes Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Maryland, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Natural gas liquid reserves

[In thousands of barrels]

	Proved reserves Jan. 1, 1963	Extensions and revisions	New discoveries [1]	Production in 1963	Proved reserves Jan. 1, 1964	Changes in 1963
Arkansas	19,744	1,495	77	2,621	18,695	−1,049
California [2]	299,685	15,728	150	25,493	290,070	−9,615
Colorado	21,361	4,055	153	3,579	21,990	629
Illinois	4,976	−590	25	667	3,744	−1,232
Indiana	93	20	1	19	95	2
Kansas	179,096	−3,183	1,047	7,719	169,241	−9,855
Kentucky	50,666	2,303	1,151	3,115	51,005	339
Louisiana [2]	1,697,809	168,492	97,393	122,871	1,840,823	143,014
Michigan	5,424	910	38	1,046	5,326	−98
Mississippi	36,015	−487	607	2,987	33,148	−2,867
Montana	10,488	29		539	9,978	−510
Nebraska	3,793	−741		277	2,775	−1,018
New Mexico	517,209	71,449	1,404	31,829	558,233	41,024
North Dakota	78,775	5,700		2,458	82,017	3,242
Ohio						
Oklahoma	347,003	1,194	5,768	25,772	328,193	−18,810
Pennsylvania	1,506			69	1,437	−69
Texas [3]	3,829,381	416,434	64,026	267,483	4,042,358	212,977
Utah	48,788	238		2,435	46,591	−2,197
West Virginia	58,859	11,996	5,998	8,074	68,779	9,920
Wyoming	100,835	5,152	99	6,606	99,480	−1,355
Miscellaneous [3]	11	−11				−11
Total, United States	7,311,517	700,183	177,937	515,659	7,673,978	362,461

[1] Only a limited area is assigned to each new discovery.
[2] Includes offshore reserves.
[3] Includes Alabama and Florida.

Canadian reserves: Crude oil, natural gas liquids, and natural gas

	Proved reserves, Jan. 1, 1963	Extensions and revisions	New discoveries [1]	Production in 1963	Proved reserves, Jan. 1, 1964	Changes in 1963
Crude oil (thousands of barrels):						
Northwest Territories	50,412	18		631	49,799	−613
British Columbia	136,577	11,849	453	12,452	136,427	−150
Alberta	3,807,009	483,215	16,184	165,561	4,140,847	333,838
Saskatchewan	462,372	122,370	11,540	72,825	523,457	61,085
Manitoba	14,928	12,667		3,798	23,797	8,869
Eastern Canada	9,404	−1,087	68	1,220	7,165	−2,239
Total	4,480,702	629,032	28,245	256,487	4,881,492	400,790
Natural-gas liquids (thousands of barrels):						
British Columbia	35,779	−1,329	112	1,074	33,488	−2,291
Alberta	648,031	83,143		25,107	706,067	58,036
Saskatchewan	11,540	−2,171		1,179	8,190	−3,350
Total	695,350	79,643	112	27,360	747,745	52,395
Total, liquid hydrocarbons	5,176,052	708,675	28,357	283,847	5,629,327	453,185
Natural gas (millions of cubic feet; total in Canada)	35,436,892	1,201,342	1,301,332	1,005,149	[2] 36,960,023	1,523,131

[1] Only a limited area is assigned to each new discovery.
[2] Equals total of cols. 1, 2, and 3 minus 5 and plus 25,606,000,000 cubic feet net change in underground storage.

A Blueprint From Shriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the man singled out to lead the drive in the war against poverty in the United States is Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps. This week Mr. Shriver sat down with a group of Hearst newsmen, and talked frankly about what the "war on poverty" could mean in the down-to-heart human terms.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this interview:

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 5, 1964]

A BLUEPRINT FROM SHRIVER

Here are the questions asked of Sargent Shriver by the Hearst panel and his answers:

Question. President Johnson has called for "total victory" in the war on poverty; realistically now, is this a war that can be won?

Answer. Before I took on this job, that was one of the first things I tried to decide. You don't go into war, ordinarily, if you don't think there's a chance of winning. This war can be won.

Let's say we had all been sitting around a table in Baltimore in 1893 when the medical school was founded at Johns Hopkins, and the great doctors said that in 50 years there wouldn't be anybody dying in the United States of diphtheria or polio or scarlet fever or typhoid fever. Most Americans, if tested on a Gallup poll, would have said those doctors were crazy, those diseases had been around since the beginning of mankind. But today those diseases exist no longer for most Americans.

That's the sense in which I think we can win the war on poverty. We can get rid of grossly substandard housing, grossly substandard education, grossly substandard health, and grossly susbtandard income in this country in the foreseeable future.

We've got the national income and productivity to do it. We've got the educational techniques—audio-visual techniques, teaching by television, machine teaching. We've got mobility of population—people can move to where the work is. And we now know enough about economics so that it is possible, through organizations like the Federal Reserve System, to do what's required in that area.

Question. Just who is it we're talking about when we refer to the poor, or the poverty stricken?

Answer. The statistic that I happen to find most compelling is that 9.6 million American families, with an average of four persons per family, had a median income of $1,800 a year. Now, I believe nearly all of us would agree that $1,800 a year would stamp a family—or an individual—as pretty poor in terms of the American standard of living. And 20 percent of all Americans are in that group.

Question. Why have the poor suddenly been "discovered"?

Answer. After World War II most of us were interested in getting settled down, moving to suburbia, getting our own houses, getting the big automobile with shiny chrome. There seemed to be limitless opportunities for everybody, and nearly everybody was getting ahead. In fact, poverty even by the definitions we're using now decreased substantially from 1945 until 1960.

Now nearly everybody has gotten to a certain level of living and suddenly we turn around and see a whole bunch of people who never were in this movement up the economic ladder, never getting a fancy new car or television; they had missed the development of the affluent society.

Question. How many of this group would you describe as chronically poor, perhaps through choice, or lack of iniative?

Answer. I couldn't give a figure. I personally believe that it is a relatively small proportion of the total. I think that a lot of people who are described as slothful or shiftless or worthless frequently are that way because of the environment they grew up in.

Question. Are we beginning to encounter a second generation of poor?

Answer. Yes. Forty-five percent of all the people rejected by selective service had parents who never graduated from grade school. It is part of the cycle of poverty. Now they'll have children who won't get out of grade school unless somehow we open up the wall of poverty and allow some people to escape.

One of the things that's so bad about severe poverty is the hopelessness of it * * * the fact that there doesn't seem to be any way out of it. There's no light dimly visible

at the end of the tunnel—just a black wall—it's like a type of a prison and the phrase is generally used, "you're imprisoned in poverty." What we're trying to do is open up ways out of this prison, and I want to emphasize we're not just trying to reach down in there and take people out willy-nilly—or without them making any contribution to the effort themselves * * * but what we are doing, you might say, is building an escape hatch.

Question. Is it true that there are today more hopelessly poor people than there were before because of technological changes?

Answer. I think that's true. People who are now stuck in poverty are stuck deeper, or it's harder for them to get out than for their forefathers. Until, let's say, 1850, there was plenty of room for manual laborers—in fact, there was much more need for that sort of work than people to do it. But now it's the other way around.

Question. Now exactly how are the poor going to be helped under this program? Can you give us some examples?

Answer. Take an unemployed, untrained 18-year-old Puerto Rican boy in New York. He can volunteer to join the Job Corps. If he is accepted, he can go off to either a conservation center or to an education study center. He can get job training—he can learn about work habits, discipline, how you fill out application forms, how you behave for the boss, what it means to work a full day, the desirability for punctuality. He can get physical exercise and training. If his health is bad, if he needs glasses or something like that, he can get help at the camp. If his English is very poor, he would be given basic education in English. The same for arithmetic and other basic subjects.

At the end of a year or two—depending upon his acquisition of knowledge—he will be ready to be a good employee for nearly any kind of a concern. Perhaps he would be a good apprentice in the building trades.

Question. What will the youngsters be paid in these camps?

Answer. They would get a base of $50 a month which would accrue to them as it does in the Peace Corps. They can't draw it. But they could allot $25 of that to a dependent if they wished. And if they did we would match it with another $25. So the trainee could be in the position of sending home $600 a year—to a family whose total income last year might be only $1,800. In addition to that, he would get his housing, clothing, food, and some spending money.

Question. Will there be a screening process to find out whether this boy ought to go to college?

Answer. Yes, we would guide or counsel him into collegiate work if he was qualified.

Now, here's an alternative for the Puerto Rican boy. He doesn't want to leave Spanish Harlem. He can get a grant for part-time work under the work training program, to be run by the Department of Labor. He can get a job, let's say, with the sanitation department or any other nonprofit, public enterprise of value. He can learn good job habits, can begin to become a part of the community, and actually become productive.

While he's on that job he can be counseled in two ways—to go back to school, if he has the qualifications; or, to become a permanent worker with a certain type of skill.

There's a third thing he can do. If a community action program has started in his part of town, he can get a job in a playground operation connected with that or as assistant counselor—maybe he's good working with delinquent kids, or as a junior assistant around the hospital—and maybe in this way he'd find out there was some work he could do connected with a hospital.

Question. These job opportunities would be created?

Answer. Oh, yes, they would be created * * * the Department of Labor would have the responsibility of doing that, and the Department thinks that in the first year we will be able to reach 200,000 boys and girls between 16 and 21 under the work training program. The pay would be determined on the basis of the boy's skill, the wage rate in the locality, and the quality of work he's doing.

Question. Is this underwritten by the city?

Answer. The financing would be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent local, just like the Federal highway program. That's for the boy.

Question. There would be an assumption here that he is not replacing anyone——

Answer. Yes, that's explicit.

Now this is something that could be done for this boy. In other words, work with him right where he is, or take him out of one environment and help him in another in hopes we will spring him out of the poverty cycle he's in.

Question. Now what about a 35-year-old man laid off in Detroit by automation?

Answer. Under this program he could get job training too. A job coud be found for him where he would not replace a regular worker but could learn a new skill or a new trade, upgrading himself. Let's say he's a sheet metalworker, and maybe he's got the skill to become something in the electronics business. He could be brought in as an apprentice and given work, partly paid for by the Federal Government, and he could begin to train himself into a new type of job.

In Chicago about 3,000 men over the last year and a half have been given job training of this type and as a result have become permanent employees and their whole families have gone off public welfare. They've got jobs as taxicab drivers, in department stores, in freight handling.

Question. Let's take a 55-year-old farmer in North Carolina, gross annual income of $2,000 and kids running around in rags—what can be done for him?

Answer. Under the provisions of this bill the Farm Home Administration (FHA) would have the authority to give grants and loans to that man, assuming a plan could be worked out between them showing that if the grant and loan were made and the fellow handled the farm in such and such a way, let's say in a year or two he would have an income of $3,500 instead of $2,000. The grants and loans could go for a new tractor, incubators, seed, fertilizers. The FHA man would keep coming back once a month to make sure that from the point of view of management (which is usually the thing that is missing) the farmer is actually learning how to manage the farm.

Question. How about the plan to create family-size farms?

Answer. We're asking authorization to be able to create, at the local level, corporations which can go out and buy land when it comes on the open market * * * let's say 2,500 acres comes on the open market and it could be divided into several farms. This corporation would acquire that land, sell it to several tenant farmers who are now scratching out a poverty existence, put them onto that land, help in the supervision of the farming as they develop it, and those people then would become self-sustaining farmers.

Question. Is there any connection between this and the Peace Corps?

Answer. What the Peace Corps has been doing abroad is in some respects similar to what needs to be done at home. Overseas we're trying to give people the idea they can do things to help themselves—to get out of the conditions they've been in. We're trying to do the same thing here. And in this program, I should emphasize, a big component will be volunteer work. We call it here "Volunteers for America" * * * in the sense these would be volunteers to do things for the United States right here at home.

Question. It is expected you will head the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) if Congress passes the bill. Does that pretty much imply that you would have to leave your job as Director of the Peace Corps—or take a leave of absence for it?

Answer. Well, of course, that's a decision the President has to make because both these positions—assuming that the OEO is authorized by Congress—are Presidential appointments. And frankly I don't know what he will decide. He may decide I ought to stay with the Peace Corps and some other person ought to come in to run OEO, or vice versa.

Question. This is an election year and your name gets mentioned as a possible vice-presidential nominee. Do you think your political future could be affected by the course the poverty program takes?

Answer. Well, right from the beginning I was worried that this would come to be regarded as just an election year gimmick or a political deal, and one of the things I strenuously sought to avoid and I think successfully avoided is any implication that what we're doing is just politics. So much so that one of the things I've said to all the businessmen—and the labor people, too—is that we're trying to establish a program which any administration, Democratic or Republican, any President, would want to continue because it is a constructive approach to a national problem; namely, the problem of poor people. That's the way the whole program is conceived and it's the only way in which we presented it.

Therefore, I think this is a legitimate program no matter what the year, election year or any other year. There isn't a thing in this program that wouldn't have been in it last year, or shouldn't be in it next year so far as we have been able rationally to determine. There's no politics in this program as it's established now, not a nickel's worth of politics.

Dick Daley, the mayor of Chicago, always said that "good government is good politics." You can say that's a platitude, but I believe this is a sound, constructive program and therefore good government. * * * It is also open therefore good politics. But it's not undertaken because of political consideration; it's undertaken because we have a national problem, a practical problem which would command the attention of Nelson Rockefeller or Barry Goldwater or Bill Scranton if they were President, and a program which originally commanded the attention of President Kennedy.

Question. Do you think this is an extension of President Kennedy's intent in this area?

Answer. I don't think there's any question about it. He got the wheels going at the beginning to interest the executive branch about doing something about the poverty problem in the United States.

Question. Let me ask you this. If you, as expected, are appointed director of the OEO and you get going in June or July, wouldn't this likely take you out of the political arena this year—you couldn't suddenly be pulled off this program if it's as important as it appears to be.

Answer. Well, that might be true.

Question. This could take you out of politics?

Answer. Yes, it could. Again I think that depends a great deal on how it develops; first of all, whether the Congress enacts it and, when they enact it, how it develops and then who the President decides to have manage it.

Question. What kind of a timetable do you see for the program?

Answer. We're hoping to have this out of the House committee sometime around the

first part of May, and that means it would then move over to the Rules Committee. I hope if it does get to the Rules Committee, let's say the first couple weeks of May, it would get out of the Rules Committee in a couple of weeks. That means we could look forward optimistically perhaps to the bill being on the floor and passed by the House sometime in May—maybe the first of June. Say it gets over to the Senate the first 2 weeks of June. * * * What happens then depends on what happens to the civil rights legislation.

Question. You are geared up to get in action right away?

Answer. That's right. What we're doing is getting ready to go when and if Congress fires the starting gun.

Address by Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of an address delivered by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at a dinner sponsored by the National Association of Retail Druggists in honor of Senator HUMPHREY on April 8.

This address very skillfully delineates the importance of the free enterprise system to the drug industry and the detrimental effect the so-called quality stabilization bill would have on this industry by fixing prices, thereby eliminating competition, encouraging the prices of drugs to rise and further denying the benefits of drugs to the many Americans who cannot afford them.

A portion of the address follows:

PORTION OF ADDRESS BY HON. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE

Finally, Government is concerned with the cost of drugs—the economic aspects of this remarkable industry and its relationship to the needs and resources of the consumers.

This is much more than an academic interest because drugs fall in that special category of products which are recognized today as necessities of life. They occupy an increasingly large and important place in the total spectrum of vital health services.

Drugs purchased by consumers alone—that is to say, drugs bought in your drugstores and dispensed by your pharmacists—today account for nearly one-fifth of the Nation's private medical bill, or some $4 billion.

Our public drug bill last year—that is, prescription drugs needed by welfare recipients and paid for by public funds—came close to $83 million, almost 10 percent of the cost of public medical assistance for the year and almost equal to the cost of physicians' services in these programs. Fifty million dollars of that $83 million went for drugs in the old-age assistance program—to the aged who are both sick and poor.

Most Americans realize that the costs involved in discovering and producing new drugs are sometimes extremely high. When a new drug is the product of years of painstaking research and testing, this cost is likely, initially, to be reflected in relatively high prices. Few people would protest this fact, for, in our free enterprise system, industry is expected to look for a reasonable return on its investment.

Most Americans—and I include myself—are firm believers in the free enterprise system. We understand the need for reasonable profits, and we will pay a fair price. But one of the cardinal principles of the free enterprise system is that fair prices are not fixed prices. They are open to competition.

As President Johnson has stated, "Freedom of choice for consumers from our storehouse of goods, at the lowest possible prices, is the very cornerstone of American consumer policy."

We do not believe that the corner druggist needs Federal price-fixing legislation in order to stay in business. We are convinced that his business will be better off and certainly the country will be better served without legislative price controls.

Instead of seeking to impose needless and stultifying controls on the marketing of drugs and other consumer goods through the so-called Quality Stabilization Act, let us seek to reduce prices and broaden the market so that every American may share in the profits of freedom.

Price controls may appear, in the short run, to be the most attractive solution to the problems of small businessmen struggling to survive in an intensely competitive environment. But in the long run, they serve only to undermine the very foundations of our system.

There are other ways to cut costs, to stimulate business, and to increase profits—ways that are completely compatible with the American free-enterprise system.

May I suggest that your consumer market is far from saturated—you could sell a much larger volume of drugs if prices were within every individual's reach. It is a hard fact of life that many millions of Americans are denied the benefits of modern drugs today simply because they cannot afford them.

As citizens and as members of the pharmacy profession, you share with Government its vast responsibility for the well-being of our people.

A large part of that responsibility, as you have seen, is dictated by the need to cope with the changes that are transforming our world and our way of life—changes that men, themselves, have set in motion by their never-ending quest for the good life in the good society.

"Change always disturbs," John F. Kennedy once said. Yet he knew and we know that change is the heart and soul of progress and that its disturbances need not divert us from our goal, which President Johnson has described as "a nation that is free from want and a world that is free from hate—a world of peace and justice; and freedom and abundance, for our time and for all time to come."

Authorship of "Christ in Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, I inserted a very inspiring article entitled "Christ in Washington," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Inadvertently authorship was credited to Mrs. George Bennard. Actually, the author was Mr. Samuel Wolfe, of 421 W. Padre, Santa Barbara, Calif., as it attested to, by the following letter:

APRIL 7, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Am happy to grant a request of Mr. Samuel Wolfe, 421 West Padre Street, Santa Barbara, Calif., to let you know I am not the author of "Christ in Washington," which you kindly read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—abridged—but only suggested the submission after having read it carefully, though it would be an honor to have written such an inspiring, and timely warning in this period of fear and lack of faith in our God.

Thanking you for your interest, and praying you may have ever the "wisdom from above." I am,

Very Sincerely,

(MRS. GEORGE) HANNAH BENNARD.

Dateline Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article showing the affection and high prestige the people of Massachusetts have for our great Speaker, the gentlemen from Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Congressmen THOMAS P. O'NEILL, and JAMES A. BURKE, appeared in newspapers throughout the Nation.

This article was written by Mr. Frank Daley, an expert newspaper columnist, who is recognized as one of the best informed men on the national scene.

Of course, the result of the poll taken in Massachusetts is no surprise to the Members of the U.S. Congress. The gentlemen from Massachusetts, Speaker MCCORMACK, Congressman O'NEILL, and Congressman BURKE are amongst the hardest working Members of the House. The Speaker occupies the second most important position in the Government, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman O'NEILL, is a member of the powerful Rules Committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BURKE, is now one of the leading members of the most important committees in Congress, the House Committee on Ways and Means. These three men rate with the best.

The article follows:

DATELINE WASHINGTON

(By Frank Daley)

WASHINGTON.—Members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce were much embarrassed when U.S. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, pointed out that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce president "crusades against Federal aid programs, as he silently accepts farm subsidies."

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN made the charge that Edwin P. Neilan, also president of the Bank of Delaware, made two speeches in Indianapolis crusading against Federal appropriations and subsidies in which he said "The citizens were ruining their way of life."

The Texas lawmaker added, "but I am certain he did not tell them that he himself was receiving bounteous largess from Uncle Sam's Agriculture Department."

In a House speech, Representative PATMAN said: "Mr. Neilan's 207-acre farm at Bear, Del., has collected $2,158 in Government payments since 1959." Representative PATMAN noted: "I am not against farm subsidies, but I am against men like Mr. Neilan, who silently accept farm subsidies while at the same time they scream from one end of the country to the other about the horrors of Federal subsidies."

L.B.J. RIDES HIGH IN SPECIAL POLLS

The 109-year-old rural publication, Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, completed a poll of farmers throughout Iowa and discovered that, if elections were held now, Iowa farmers and their wives would vote overwhelmingly for President Johnson against all potential GOP nominees.

Results of a similar Wallace poll, 2 months before the 1960 election, showed 49 percent of the State's farmers preferred Richard Nixon. The poll was accurate, as the State voted more heavily Republican than did the rest of the Nation.

The Iowa poll stunned the GOP national command but, when results of a recently conducted GOP poll in congressional districts in the Bay State were compiled, the GOP command speedily arrived at the conclusion that funds would be "wasted" in Massachusetts in efforts to unseat Democratic Congressmen.

Polls conducted in districts of Congressmen BURKE, O'NEILL, and MCCORMACK convinced the GOP command that it would be a waste of time to enter Republican candidates against the above-mentioned Democratic Congressmen. As one top GOP leader noted, "It would not only be wasted efforts, but it appears as though we would suffer humiliation by the small GOP vote against BURKE, O'NEILL, and MCCORMACK."

To add to the discomfort of the GOP national policymakers, three daily newspapers in generally Republican South Dakota conducted a statewide poll this month and found that Republican voters themselves would pick Mr. Johnson over all potential GOP nominees. Mr. Johnson, it was shown, would get 64 percent over all other GOP nominees.

The Touch of the Master's Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 12, 1964, it was my pleasure and good fortune to hear a forthright and meaningful sermon by the Reverend Jack F. Coffey, pastor of Downtown Baptist Church, Alexandria, Va. The subject of the message was "The Touch of the Master's Hand." It was presented skillfully and with dedication.

The membership of Downtown under Mr. Coffey's able ministry has grown exceedingly since his assumption of the pastorate in February 1962. I am proud to be a watchcare member of the Downtown Baptist Church and especially to have Jack Coffey as my pastor "away from home."

A native of North Carolina, the Reverend Mr. Coffey received his BD degree from Wake Forest College. He had 1 year of theological training at Duke Divinity School, Duke University, and completed his work toward the BD degree at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Prior to assuming his present pastorate, he served as pastor of the Island Creek Baptist Church, Henderson, N.C., and associate minister of the Petworth-Montgomery Hills Baptist Church, Washington, D.C. Mr. Coffey is married to the former Sara Elizabeth Buie of Winston-Salem, N.C. They have two children Sara Catherine and Jack Jr.

I share the philosophy expressed in this great message. I requested permission to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as this sermon is of universal interest. It is indeed a pleasure to insert his inspiring and thought-provoking remarks:

THE TOUCH OF THE MASTER'S HAND

(A sermon by the Reverend Jack F. Coffey, April 12, 1964, Downtown Baptist Church, Alexandria, Va.)

Text: Matthew 8: 3.

There are distinctive things that Jesus did in his earthly life which affected the lives of men. Among them, two things are prominent. He looked, and from that look came the recognition that one had been seen as he had never been seen before. I can sympathize with Simon Peter after his thrice denial of the Lord when we are told that Jesus, as He was being led away captive, looked upon Peter. That look must have pierced his heart leading him to the sure affirmation that he could never deny his Lord again.

Not only did Jesus look upon the lives of men, but He also touched them; and, in that touch, a dramatic change was wrought.

The touch of the Master's hand. Evidences of the touch are manifold. From the Scriptures we glean instances of the restoring touch of the Master's hand. In the eighth and ninth chapters of Matthew there are recorded a number of times where health was restored at the touch of the Master's hand. Jesus had delivered His "Sermon on the Mount"; and, as He walked away, a leper followed and called, "Lord, if you will, you can make me clean." Jesus put forth His hand and touched him, and immediately the man's leprosy was healed.

Later Jesus entered into the home of Simon Peter and found his mother-in-law seriously sick with a fever. Jesus touched her hand; and, with His touch, the fever left. She arose to serve Jesus as her guest.

Still later, two blind men pursued Christ and cried, "Have mercy on us." As they came before His presence, He asked them of their belief. At their affirmative response, He touched their eyes and they could see.

The crowning act in the touch of the Master's hand was not the restoring touch that brought back health, but it was the restoring touch that brought back life.

Jairus was a ruler of the synagogue. He had an only daughter of 12 who was seriously ill, and he came to Jesus requesting that He come to heal her. On the way to Jairus' house, they were met by one of his servants who declared the girl to be dead. However, Jesus proceeded confidently; and, arriving at the house, He removed the mourners. With but a few present, He took the girl by the hand and said, "Maid, arise." And she stood, having been restored to life.

Yet again, the restoring touch of the Master's hand is witnessed as Jesus was once preparing to enter the city of Nain. At the gate of the city, He encountered a funeral procession. He learned that the corpse was the only son of a widow highly respected by the citizens as evidenced by their concern in her loss. Jesus joined them in their concern, and with compassion stepped forward to touch the bier. With His touch, the procession halted and the people present witnessed the young man's restoration of life.

All of these were instances of physical healing. Of far greater importance are the spiritual transformations wrought by the spiritual touch of Jesus. Of these, many of us could testify.

For instance, there is the guiding touch of the Master's hand. This is the touch that Peter Marshall calls "The Tap on the Shoulder." In his book, "Mr. Jones, Meet the Master," he presents a sermon in which he refers to the number of times during a difficult life that God had given guidance in a most definite way. It was as though the Master had a hand upon young Marshall's shoulder to show the direction in which steps were to be taken. At a youthful age, responsibilities seemingly beyond his capacity to handle, were forced upon him; but, under the guidance of the Master's touch, Peter Marshall was led to walk in a sure way. It is true that he could often walk but a step at a time, but he seemed to sense that these progressive steps would lead him to the appointed end—setting him aside for Christian service.

God gives us this guidance, too. We must but yield ourselves to His touch. We need to be sensitive to that tap on the shoulder. God is prepared to direct men in all walks of life. This direction is not limited to those of us who might be termed "professionals" in following God's will and way. This is a blessing unto which all men can avail themselves.

In my college days, I can recall having an impression that I might serve God best as a Christian businessman. I, thus, considered seriously the profession of pharmacy as my possible vocation. However, in due time, there came the sure touch of the Master's hand which said in no uncertain terms, "This is the way; walk ye in it." I knew that God was leading me into a full-time church-related vocation.

This is not to say that God leads men into a church-related vocation only. God's guidance in vocational choices, as in all decisions, is available to all who will be responsive to it. A sense of certainty can come to all who commit themselves to the call of God. Your vocation may be business, professional, or political; but you should have an assurance that God has led or will lead you to it and through it.

There is not only the guiding touch that gives one a sense of direction, there is the restraining touch that may serve as a warning against taking the wrong way.

I recall a story I once read of two young men who had been walking idly along a street. They were looking into the windows of the shops as they strolled. They passed in front of one; and, gazing rather aimlessly into the window, their conversation continued. One who was wearing a diamond ring had slipped it from his finger and appeared about to scratch his initials on the glass. Noticing what was apparently about to take place, the companion put out his hand to deter him and cried, "Don't write there. You can't rub it out." Of course, the diamond would have readily cut an unerasable mark on the glass, had it not been for the restraining touch of a friend.

God's restraining touch is often upon our lives. We start to do something we ought not to do; and immediately our consciences are pricked, and we are kept from making the mistake. Of course, one may always refrain from yielding to the restraining impulse. The more often he does, the less sensitive he becomes to the feeling that this is something which he should not do. The conscience is crippled until it tends to be completely deadened. The reverse is yet true. As one is responsive to the inward inclination that a thing is wrong, the more sensitive the soul is to good and evil, right and wrong; and the more one can depend upon the guidance of so called conscience.

One lives in tune with the Word, and it often says, "Don't walk there, you can't wipe out the tracks; don't say that, you can't eat your words; don't do that sin, the scar can never fully heal."

Thank God for the restraining touch of the Master's hand. However, there is another touch far more rewarding than any of the others. That is the transforming touch—the touch that changes life.

We have all witnessed the change Christ has made in the lives of men. I recall well the transforming touch that fell upon the life of one man I know. Though from a prominent family, he had met many reverses in life. Alcohol had become a controlling factor of his very existence. Bit by bit, the addiction led to his loss of family, friends, and job. Finally, he found himself in a rescue mission. There he found himself indeed; but he found Christ also, and in His touch this man's life was changed.

Many are the instances where a life has been changed when that life came to know the saving touch of Christ. Myra Brooks Welch has said it meaningfully in her "Touch of the Master's Hand."

"'Twas battered and scarred, and the auctioneer,
Thought it scarcely worth his while,
To waste much time on the old violin,
But held it up with a smile:
'What am I bidden, good folks,' he cried,
'Who'll start the bidding for me'
'A dollar, a dollar'; then, 'Two.' Only two?
Two dollars, and who'll make it three?
Three dollars, once; three dollars, twice;
Going for three—But no.
From the room, far back, a gray-haired man,
Came forward and picked up the bow;
Then, wiping the dust from the old violin,
And tightening the loose strings,
He played a melody pure and sweet,
As a caroling angel sings.

"The music ceased, and the auctioneer,
With a voice that was quiet and low,
Said, 'What am I bid for the old violin?'
And he held it up with the bow.
'A thousand dollars, and who'll make it two?
Two thousand. And who'll make it three?
Three thousand, once, three thousand, twice,
And going, and gone' said he.
The people cheered, but some of them cried,
'We do not quite understand
What changed its worth.' Swift came the reply:
'The touch of a master's hand.'

"And many a man with life out of tune,
And battered and scarred with sin,
Is auctioned cheap to the thoughtless crowd,
Much like the old violin.
A 'mess of pottage,' a glass of wine;
A game—and he travels on.
He is 'going' once, and 'going' twice,
He's 'going' and almost 'gone.'
But the Master comes, and the foolish crowd,
Never can quite understand,
The worth of a soul and the change that's wrought,
By the touch of the Master's hand."

A Need for More Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an extremely interesting and thoughtful article which appeared in the January 1964 edition of the Voice of Seven-Seventy, the official publication of the Retail Clerks Union, Local 770, in Los Angeles.

This outstanding article was written by Mr. Joseph T. DeSilva, secretary-treasurer of Local 770, and executive editor of the Voice of Seven-Seventy.

Mr. DeSilva is attempting to analyze some aspects of the increasingly difficult problems caused by our rapidly changing economy, and particularly the problems caused by automation.

From his vantage point as a progressive and imaginative leader of one of the most dynamic labor organizations in southern California, Mr. DeSilva has pinpointed these problems and has proposed some provocative solutions, especially to what is termed "job moonlighting."

No doubt, many will not entirely agree with everything Mr. DeSilva has to say. But one of the most important things, in my opinion, is to get an intelligent dialog going on these problems. So that, in the traditional American way, we can arrive at a solution to our difficulties and move forward toward a growing economy of full employment and equal opportunity for all our citizens.

The article follows:

KILL MOONLIGHTING: A NEED FOR MORE JOBS

(By Joseph T. DeSilva)

Talking about a solution to unemployment is like talking about the weather * * * everyone talks about it, but no one does anything about it.

At least it seems that way because those who are in positions of responsibility and who are morally charged with a solution to our domestic economic problems acknowledge the fact that there are unemployed and speak of programs to alleviate unemployment, still no one has been able to do anything much about it.

But all Americans will have to face the problem of unemployment sooner or later since competent experts predict that within a few years all the production we need will be furnished by less than 25 percent of the Nation's manpower.

HUMAN SLAG HEAP

Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz says that a human slag heap of unemployed and unskilled is being created in this country.

And how does the heap grow?

Start with the youth of our Nation. Every year great numbers of young people become available as a labor force. But no new jobs are being created for these millions, so those who cannot seek higher education because they lack the scholastic qualifications or the economic means automatically fall into the unskilled pit.

Another group of able-bodied workers are being added daily to the rolls of the unemployed because of automation—men and women who, 5 years ago, were needed in our industrial and commercial development. Now they have become discards because many of them cannot be reeducated to operate the machines which run the machines.

GREATER PROBLEM

Just a few years ago, we were concerned about the machine replacing man. Today a greater problem faces us. Technological equipment has advanced so rapidly that machines are now operating other machines and man's physical power is needed in lesser and lesser amounts.

Caught in the grinding wheels of progress is still another class of human beings—a tragic group which is considered obsolete because of age. Industry no longer wants a 35-year-old woman or a 45-year-old man so they are cast aside like old dogs—too old to be taught new tricks and too young to obtain social security.

Not so many years ago, men and women in this age group could look forward to many years of productive work. Now their ambition is being smothered by the more educated young or by machines.

Finally comes that great mass of people for whom everyone feels sorry, but for whom few do anything * * * mom and dad. Among them are those who were once part of the workforce, contributed to social security, and who now are able to eke out a modest, but respectable, existence through social security monthly benefits.

But far too many others must depend upon outside sources for survival, and no matter what label its hiding under, it still amounts to charity whether the help comes from the family, or from a State or local assistance program.

HOW WE RELATE

We would all do well to take a moment to determine where we fit or how we relate to these four groups.

After a close examination of the various members of our society, one can quickly recognize that every member in the first three groups is capable of working and becoming part of our country's labor force. And it takes no mathematical genius to conclude that the present workweek is longer than it should be in order to provide work for everyone.

This is a problem that no politician wants to face, but about which they all like to talk.

We will not attempt to provide statistics, but we will suggest a workable formula.

One could arrive at a theoretical workweek in this way: From the Department of Commerce, obtain the number of hours required to produce our gross national product. Divide these hours by the number of man-hours available through the Department of Labor which should equal the total workforce. To this last, be sure to add the millions of unemployed.

LITTLE VISION

Perhaps this equation is too simple, and we readily recognize that it would take a major depression—or a revolution of ballots instead of bullets (neither of which we advocate)—to catapult someone with a little vision and a lot of courage into action.

As the first step toward the distribution of work, we suggest that a closer look at the present work force would reveal that many are holding more than one job—moonlighting, if you please.

The next logical step would be to eliminate one of the two jobs. This would make available millions of hours for some of our unemployed, but no one seems willing or courageous enough to face this problem.

There is a simple way to cure moonlighting, but it is so simple that no one has thought of the remedy.

FERRET OUT

By law, employers must report their employees' total annual earnings on W-2 forms. Under the present method, only total earnings are set forth. With a slight revision in the W-2 form, the exact dates during which the individual was paid could also be included. Then even a grade school student could readily determine who is holding more than one job because it would be simple to ferret out the moonlighters if the W-2 forms showed that an individual worker for more than one employer during the same period.

To discourage the employment of moonlighters, a high tax—one close to the 90-percent bracket—should be imposed on the second job. The tax would apply to employers and moonlighters alike. This, of course, would not be a popular idea with moonlighters or with employers, but it would

certainly be a ray of hope for the millions of unemployed. It might even provide a temporary escape from the burden of national unemployment for the politicians.

NOTHING UNFAIR

Most certainly there is nothing unfair about paying moonlighter taxes. On the contrary, more taxes must come from somewhere to clothe and feed the growing rolls of unemployed and charitable wards in our society.

It is evident that the "human slag heap" continues to grow, so we must point out to those in positions of responsibility that we are not sounding a false alarm.

It is not at all inconceivable that the undercurrent created by the underprivileged and victims of discrimination soon may become a force so great that it will be impossible to stop. If that happens, drastic changes in our way of life and in our economic system will take place.

At the rate we are presently proceeding—with more machines and a smaller work force—we must distribute the work and thereby reduce the number of unemployed who may justifiably raise their voices in the not too distant future.

Our industrial and business leaders constantly complain about high taxes, but continue to do everything to contribute to the causes which increase taxes.

FIGHTS GOVERNMENT

Private enterprise fights Government economic controls, yet it refuses to recognize that the hiring of moonlighters is only contributing to a recession and more millions of unemployed.

As national political campaigns begin to pick up steam, we will hear much about individualism, less Government interference, and a return to the day when individual initiative spells financial success.

The late President Kennedy, shortly before his tragic death, attacked the powerful chairmen of certain key committees representing big business.

"They talk loudly of deficits and socialism," he said. They are campaigning on a platform of so-called individual initiative. But they do not have a single job-creating program of their own—and they oppose the efforts that we are making.

"The forces of freedom are still in the majority around the world because the United States has been willing to bear the burden," the late President observed. "But we can maintain these forces only if we provide for a growing and buoyant and progressive economy here."

SHOW CONCERN

So today we can no longer look upon ourselves as a class of fortunate, secure, privileged individuals. We must show genuine concern for those around us who failed to make the grade.

Labor Secretary Wirtz states it this way: "We cannot tolerate the development of a separate nation of the poor, the unskilled, the jobless, living within another nation of the well off, the trained and the employed."

Let us stop debating and promising. The time has come to act.

As a first step, let's kill moonlighting.

Rural Electrification Program Meets Changing Needs of Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, over 7,500 rural electrification leaders met in Dallas, Tex., March 9–12 for the 22d annual convention of the National Rural Electric Co-op Association. They were representing nearly 1,000 rural electric systems in 46 States.

In a stirring keynote address, Clyde Ellis, general manager of NRECA, pointed out that the rural electrification program is a growing, dynamic one which has proven its ability to adapt to our changing times. He noted that the rural electric cooperatives now own about 54 percent of the electric distribution lines in the United States and serve a tenth of our country's people. Consumer-members of rural electric co-ops are using power faster than the national average, doubling its use about every 7 years.

In discussing the present challenges and new dimensions in rural electrification, Mr. Ellis outlined an excellent 22-point action program to enable the rural electric systems to continue to meet the changing needs of their members and rural America. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include portions of Mr. Ellis' speech in the RECORD:

NEW DIMENSIONS IN RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

(Address of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1964 annual meeting, Dallas, Tex.)

Twice before we have met in this room at times of great challenge to our program. It was here, in 1958, that you resolved to "Stand your Ground"—and you did. And here, in 1961, you resolved to "Take a Giant Step" in several areas to move the program forward—and you did.

I wish with all my heart that I could stand before you today in Dallas and congratulate you, and all of us, upon a total job well done. I would like to say we have fought a good fight and our program is now secure. I would like to say our major problems have been solved.

But we all know something else must be said this morning. We all know that somehow rural electrification is a different program than it was in 1958, or 1961, or even the early part of 1963. We know there are vast new dimensions to both our problems and our opportunities. We know, too, that any group caught up in the throes of rapid change either adjusts to the new dimensions or dies—like the dinosaurs and the old farmers' mutual telephone systems.

We know we're just on the verge of breaking through to a dazzling future for our program. But we know also that at this moment our program is in a period of maximum peril. Because our opponents are suddenly aware that we might after all live and succeed, they have launched a last-ditch, all-out effort to either kill our program or alter it to death.

They have good reason to believe it can be done with money, power and political pressure. They have a great abundance of all three, and they have committed their total resources to your demise.

I have a word for them: We are not in Dallas for the funeral of the rural electrification program.

We are here for a massive rebirth of the fighting spirit that has always characterized this program and its leaders.

We are here to study the dimensions of our challenge, and to make whatever adjustments we must to save the greatest program for social and economic good this country has ever known.

We shall win if we make the same total commitment to victory that the power companies have made to our defeat. We can never match their dollars, but they can never match our people, if our people, as owners, can be aroused and mobilized.

Specifically, I shall outline this morning a 22-point action program which represents our best judgment as to what we—all of us—must do now to save rural electrification and help it grow as needed. Some of these suggestions have come from you. I am sure you will develop still others during this meeting.

Here are the action programs I think we can and must carry out to keep our heads above water in this critical area of public affairs:

Point 1. The most important thing we must do is to intensify our efforts to achieve territorial integrity, by agreement with the other power suppliers if possible, or through State legislation, or Federal legislation. End the power companies' grab for the cream of our territory and you will end that war against us.

Since the bitter results of the campaign against us are most apparent in public affairs, including Congress, let's look at that area. Congress is the place where we can be hurt the most the quickest. We are particularly vulnerable there because we have the burden of moving new loan funds and other measures through Congress each year.

I think all of you realize that we were hurt badly last year. This was the result of a new dimension in power company lobbying: a sharply intensified campaign led personally by top officials of their industry, combined with the active support of much of the big business community.

This campaign had a terrific impact. When the smoke cleared, a principal power company spokesman was quoted as saying they got 80 percent of what they wanted from Congress, and he made it clear they'd be back this year for the other 20 percent. They are already back, and they just might succeed in finishing the job.

Last year they concentrated on the generation and transmission program. They asked that no funds at all be approved for generation and transmission loans unless severe restrictions, which would have virtually the same effect, were placed on the program. They got language in the Appropriations Committee's reports which all but makes it impossible for the Administrator to approve a generation and transmission loan on merit and his own judgment under the law.

Now the Administrator has to check around the whole country to be sure all the interested power companies are satisfied, that all the interested politicians are satisfied, and that key officials in the administration are satisfied. The only interested people who don't have to be satisfied are the rural electric people who need the loan.

As a result of this committee language, everybody is looking over the Administrator's shoulder; everybody is second-guessing him.

This situation is a grave new dimension in the rural electrification program. This is what I meant at the regionals last fall when I said there would be no more REA as we had known it in the past.

In these changing circumstances, I think we're fortunate to have a strong Administrator. He isn't afraid to make decisions which may be unpopular with our opponents, and sometimes they make a lot of noise.

We wouldn't have that noise if he were a do-nothing Administrator. When he makes a loan the power companies oppose, they scream to the press and to the Congress and perhaps to the administration.

For my part, I'm glad Norman Clapp is a fighting Administrator who has the courage to be controversial when controversy is inevitable.

Point 2. Included among the measures we desperately need to get passed this year—and I shall mention others later—are these interrelated matters: (a) adequate REA loan fund provisions without paralyzing restric-

tions; (b) new starts, for a change, on multipurpose river and tidal development projects.

I just hope we don't get so pinned down fighting defensive battles that we can't give time and attention to these constructive needs.

Point 3. We must multiply by several times our efforts at the scene of the battle itself—in Washington. We just have to have more manpower in the legislative area to cover Capitol Hill, and more people backing them up at the office. We simply are not staffed to even hold our own, and certainly not to win.

Point 4. We have got to have more backup support from the statewides and from your local systems. Some of the statewide managers do a terrific job, but many are understaffed to do their own jobs and at the same time help with the national program. When we're in the thick of these fights, we must be able to call your statewide manager and many of you into Washington, sometimes for long periods. We must do much more of it than we have in the past.

Point 5. Every rural electric system in America must jump into this fight with a legislative effort of its own. In my opinion, you've got to develop close contacts with your State and National legislators to win. And you've got to discuss the issues with them. I want to make this proposal: Let us resolve here and now that every rural electric system in the country this year will invite its Congressman to speak at its annual meeting and discuss the issues, and/or to meet with its board of directors and discuss the issues. And let's invite every U.S. Senator to address a statewide meeting.

Point 6. Let's move immediately to develop and organize whatever allies we can on the State and local levels. The Electric Consumers Information Committee has been a great success in Washington, bringing together rural electrics and other cooperative, labor, farm, and public power groups to work for the sole objective of an abundance of power at low cost. There is no reason that I can see that you can't organize a loose association of some kind with the groups in your own area who should be sympathetic to us.

Point 7. All of us have got to become more active in politics—in both parties. We need Republicans' support and we need Democrats' support. There are plenty of good men in both parties who would support our program if you would help get them elected. I urge you to work actively in the primaries of your own party and in the general election—this year. This is a dimension of business life which our opponents understand well, and, because they do and we don't, they beat us to death.

The whole field of public opinion and our image in it is another area in which there are vitally important new dimensions that require positive action by all of us now.

Public opinion cannot be separated from legislation. We're being openly attacked in Congress now because some Congressmen think public opinion is swinging away from this program—and it is. You know it, and I know it.

The millions upon millions of dollars the power companies have spent on advertising and propaganda to distort the facts and buy public opinion are having an effect.

Point 8. We must have and we will have a strong public relations program at NRECA, if you provide the resources to do it. There are more correspondents, reporters, and editors in Washington than any other place in the world—the men who really make public opinion. We need to have the same continual contact with them that we need to have with the Congress.

But you've also got to get busy at home in public relations. I cringe every time I see one of those canned power company editorials in a newspaper from a rural electric area. You have got to challenge them locally, we think, as a part of your total mobilization.

Point 9. Hire someone or designate someone on your system to do the public relations job. Get someone who's a professional or can learn to be a professional. He must be a communications expert, just as technically qualified as an accountant or an engineer. Public relations is hard, specialized work—it isn't backslapping at a church supper.

Point 10. Let's set up a regular schedule of advertising in every newspaper circulated in the co-op area, and on every radio and television station.

Point 11. I urge every stem to do its share in the national "Tell the Nation the Truth" advertising. Help tell the people in every home, including those you serve, the truth about yourself in dignified national magazine advertising.

We come now to one of the most formidable of the new dimensions of danger to our program, and one that to me is the most frustrating and infuriating of all—the power grabbing, empire building of the Federal Power Commission.

FPC is determined to bring the rural electrics under its jurisdiction—it is doing it—even though the co-ops are already regulated by their member-owners; their financing and accounting are already regulated by REA, regulated by State commissions, audited by GAO and closely supervised by committees of Congress. It sometimes seems that every public agency that can at all wants in on the act of providing "friendly" regulation over the electric co-ops—often with the help of our opposition, no doubt—which reminds me of the old saw: "God help us from our friends."

FPC regulation of cooperatives would clearly conflict with the powers assigned by Congress to the REA Administrator and would constitute an unconscionable duplication of effort, unnecessary interference, and a colossal waste of tax dollars.

There is no sound basis for anyone thinking rural electrics are, or should be, controlled by FPC. The Federal Power Act of 1935 and the Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 were both part of one bill. They were passed by Congress together to avoid a recurrence of the Hobson-Insull power company financing fiasco which bankrupted millions of people. Both laws were remedial legislation designed to reach investor-owned companies. All types of consumer-owned systems then known were expressly exempted. And, had the electric co-ops been in existence they too would have been exempted, I am sure.

Rural electrics are owned and controlled by their own consumers. There is no conflict of interest between owner and consumer. The consumers set their own policies, including rate policy, except as regulated by REA, some State commissions and every other public agency that horns in on the act.

I think those consumers and the men they elect to their boards of directors are better able to regulate their own affairs than some commission in Washington.

In addition to direct jurisdiction over electric cooperatives, FPC seems determined to prevent them from negotiating the lowest cost wholesale power contracts with the power companies. It has suspended our wholesale contracts in some States and is investigating them in others. FPC's theory is that if the wholesale power we buy from a company has ever crossed a State line then it is under FPC control all the way to the consumer, no matter how many times it is sold within a State. And, FPC says that if the wholesale rate we negotiate is lower than that of someone else, it is illegal until proved otherwise. I think we can assume, and FPC must assume, that when a rate offer is made, the power company has determined that the rate is economically feasible from its standpoint and should be allowed to stand. If the rate discriminates against another wholesale customer, the rate to that customer should be lowered—instead of raising ours. I don't think the FPC is in business to raise power rates for anyone.

Point 12. A bill to specifically exempt the electric co-ops from FPC jurisdiction must be passed this year, and I know you are going to give this a top priority.

Point 13. There must also be enacted into law this year—and I know you will give this a top priority—a bill to exempt our wholesale power contracts from FPC interference.

Point 14. I think we must give our people in the Northwest at least moral support in their legal battle to stop FPC's giveaway of the Mountain Sheep Dam site on the Snake River.

Point 15. I recommend that every rural electric cooperative set up a resolutions committee composed of its consumer-members. The best way to secure the support of the membership is to be sure the members participate fully in the system's affairs. Explain the issues to this committee, and let them draft resolutions for the full membership to consider at the annual meeting. The more grassroots participation we can have in the making of policy in this program, the better.

Point 16. We must have strong Minuteman programs, youth programs and women's programs in every system. We stand ready to help you with ideas and materials.

Point 17. I urge you to do everything else, as rapidly as you can, to achieve the kind of operating system that you want to tell people about. An honest image, after all, is simply a reflection of something which exists, good or bad. People must want to belong to the cooperative or power district because it's to their advantage to belong. This means achieving the efficiency and warmth which only dynamic management can provide.

Point 18. I think we must identify strongly with the current movement to protect and advance the consumer interest. This is an area which will receive increasing emphasis in the days ahead. President Johnson has named a special assistant to give the consumer a strong voice in the White House—you'll hear her, Mrs. Esther Peterson, on the program Thursday morning.

Point 19. I urge every rural electric system, every official and employee and member to enlist immediately, with organizational strength and individual talent, in the war on poverty.

Through your rural areas development activities, you have long been leaders in the effort to eliminate the poverty of opportunity in your communities. This must be the key to this effort. We are not talking about massive relief and welfare programs,

we are talking about providing opportunity, jobs, payrolls. Most people want to work, if they can find a place to work.

Point 20. Therefore, I urge your support of the concept of a Rural Cooperatives Administration in the Department of Agriculture with a mandate to go out and help develop cooperatives where needed—the type job REA did in the thirties and forties. This new Cooperatives Administration should have REA-type loan authority, because the greatest need is for capital.

A Rural Cooperatives Administration should also help organize the kind of cooperative-type organizations which in turn would also promote profit-type local industry and community services as well as operational co-ops.

Point 21. One of the most urgent of the new dimensions which you have already said we must explore completely is the study of sources of possible supplemental financing that we discussed at the regional meetings. This thorough study, in depth, would be made by some outside, well-known financial institution, probably a Wall Street investment banking firm. But a great deal of work in support of it would have to be done also by both REA and NRECA.

Point 22. Power supply is just as important to us as financing, and we must continue to press for our concept of national power pooling. Power pooling is here, and is becoming more important every day.

National power pooling exists in every major nation but our own. Tremendous savings can be effected by connecting all generation of an area of a nation, or of adjoining nations, with all generation and all distribution systems sharing in the benefits. This can be done without disturbing any present ownership and control pattern. Indeed, it is being done right now by and among the power companies, TVA, and the other Federal wholesale power marketing agencies, but not much yet by the electric co-ops and power districts. We're either going to be in or out of the pools, and we can't afford to be out. We are mostly out now.

Most important of all, we must protect, in the Congress and elsewhere, our right and ability to pool with all types of power suppliers, including the Federal projects.

Surely it is clear from these 22 points that there can be but one answer to all this: that we must arise as one and do what must be done.

In the darkest days of the American Revolution, Thomas Paine wrote these lines that electrified the poor, discouraged colonists standing against a powerful tyrant nation:

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the services of his country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

Let our enemy realize from this point on that we who stood our ground before at Dallas and took a giant step have not returned as "summer soldiers" or "sunshine patriots," but to do whatever is necessary to conquer these new dimensions and assure the rural electrification victory, for our own country and as an example for the world.

Five Blind Schoolchildren Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress a story that was sent out last evening over the Associated Press Wire Service and written by Mr. Ernest G. Warren, an outstanding newspaperman, who took time from his busy schedule to help make a day more enjoyable for five youngsters from Braintree, Mass. The story is as follows:

FIVE BLIND SCHOOLCHILDREN VISIT WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Five blind schoolchildren from South Braintree, Mass., "saw" the Capital today.

They visited the grave of President John F. Kennedy, where a guard gave them a mental picture of the Arlington scene.

At the Tomb of the Unknowns they sensed majesty by listening to the measured tread and clicking heels of the sentries.

At the Capitol they were greeted by Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and their Representative JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, in the Speaker's formal office.

Here they were handed a bronze plaque of the late President, seeing his profile through fingertips and reading his words—"Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

BURKE then took them into the House Chamber, vacant after the day's session, placed them in congressional chairs and described the setting and functions of the House.

Each had a turn sitting in the high Speaker's chair, while BURKE envisioned for them a House in session.

Then it was ice cream and cake, with BURKE as host, in the House Members' dining room, kept open until they could get there.

En route to Statuary Hall they felt the shoe buckles and knee breeches of Thomas Jefferson's statue.

In the famous Hall they stopped and touched the brass marker where John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts, the Nation's sixth President and later House Member, was stricken.

From there they were conducted through the rotunda to the Senate side of the Capitol, rode on the tiny subway train to the Senate Office Building, and called on Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

KENNEDY, after welcomings and introductions, described the furnishings of his office—all the products of Massachusetts industry—and told them to "feel at home."

Before the group left MCCORMACK's office he personally called the White House and asked the possibility that Mrs. Johnson might see them before their trip ends on Wednesday. This was arranged.

Tomorrow the five children, their teacher at Liberty School, Mrs. Wilberta Woods Pittman, and two adult chaperones will visit the FBI headquarters and other points of interest in the capital.

The trip was made possible by Mrs. Pittman's collection of some 300,000 trading stamps which she redeemed for round trip plane passage, hotel, and other expenses. With her are Mrs. John Hyland, mother of one of the children, and Mrs. Clarence Sargent.

The children, who seemed to see and comprehend all of the places they visited, are Judith Dixon, 11; Christopher Devin, 14; Joan Hyland, 13; Ralph Antonetti, 13; and Brenda Bruce.

Are They Really Trying To Solve the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for over 30 years the New Deal-Fair Deal and New Frontier have been trying to solve the economic problems of agriculture. Now the Better Deal continues the confusion. But are the social planners really trying to help the farmers? Is it not sort of natural to suppose that there may be another motive in the insistence that we keep trying to solve the problem by attempting to use methods which have failed again and again? Do you suppose that the wheeler-dealers of the past 30 years have been fooling the farmers all along and that they never did intend to get agriculture back to a free market?

A look at the record would make it appear that many of those charged with our farm programs have either been awfully stupid or they have some other motive in mind than the good of American farmers. The following article, "Uncle Sam Plows a Funny Furrow," by Paul Harvey in Human Events, issue of April 25, would make us suspicious that the real goal is control of agriculture:

UNCLE SAM PLOWS A FUNNY FURROW

(By Paul Harvey)

There is a surplus of peanuts. Our peanut growers are growing more peanuts than ever before. So peanuts should be cheaper at your store. They're not. They're higher.

You say, "Nuts."

You're right.

The ancient law of supply and demand says when you have more peanuts they cost less in the marketplace, but that law has been amended by Government subsidy. Last year the Government increased its price support for peanuts an additional $3.60 a ton. Total became $224 a ton.

So growers did what you'd expect them to do. They planted more peanuts. They planted so many more that the Government now has had to buy about 25 percent of the total crop, about 500 million pounds.

This Government buying—in competition with yours—pushes the price higher instead of lower. To some this might not make sense.

Fish prices in the United States are so high most of the world's fishermen want to sell theirs to us. But this depresses the prices which U.S. fishermen receive for theirs.

So our Government is now studying a plan to buy up $50 million worth of fish. This will further raise prices. So more of the world's fishermen will want to sell theirs here. That will drive prices down again. Until our Government has to buy more again. Until we all get hooked on our own bait.

Soybean farmers have farmed efficiently. They have not overplanted. Carryover from 1 year to the next rarely exceeds 60 million bushels. Sometimes it's only 5 million. So there is no great glut on the soybean market. They bring prices 40 cents higher than the Government guarantees.

In fact, the soybean market is so good soybean farmers are going to have to plant more acres of soybeans. Soybean farmers are beginning to plant idle acres to soybeans. Land which the Government has paid them to keep idle. Guess what?

Along comes Secretary of Agriculture Freeman insisting on higher price supports for soybean growers. They are already selling their beans at 40 cents more than the Government support price, but Freeman wants to raise that support price. They can't figure it out either.

Last year, wheat farmers courageously voted "no" to Federal regimentation. They began holding down their own plantings, reestablishing some semblance of a free and orderly market for wheat. But Congress now has rammed through—to "benefit the wheat farmers"—the very kind of snooper vision which they overwhelmingly rejected.

The American farmer has no enemies.

If only somebody would protect him from his friends.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the April 1964 edition of the International Potter, which gives an excellent analysis of the quality stabilization bill.

This article well points out the truly detrimental effects enactment of this resale price maintenance legislation would have on the consumer and the retail merchant, and describes the reasons why labor, business, and consumer groups must work to defeat the bill.

The article follows:

SHOPPERS BECOMING WORRIED—QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL IS RECURRENT FAIR TRADE LAW IN A DISGUISE

Your Congress has been giving serious consideration to the passage of a national fair trade law. If this bill becomes law, competition will disappear in countless thousands of instances and the prices you pay for commodities will go up and up and up.

The bill, which is being given extensive hearings in Congress, is called a quality stabilization bill. Actually, it is nothing in the world but a "fair trade bill."

The proper technical term for the proposed legislation is "resale price maintenance." The law would permit manufacturers to set the legal prices at which wholesalers and retailers could resell brand-name or trademarked products. Once the brand-name owner had decided the price at which the product should sell, no retailer could legally sell it at a lower price. Prices would be "maintained" by outlawing price competition on the product among its wholesalers and retailers.

"Fair trade" is nothing new in this country, although no Federal law has yet succeeded of enactment. During the 1930's, as many as 45 States passed resale price maintenance legislation. In recent years, however, these laws have come under increasing attack, both from the U.S. Supreme Court and the supreme courts of many States. Some have been repealed by legislatures. At the present there are only 21 States with fully effective fair trade statutes and an additional 20 with weakened or defective statutes.

Legislation of this type invariably tends to keep high the prices of branded items to consumers. Surveys by the Department of Justice, for example, have shown that prices in fair trade areas are anywhere from 19 to 27 percent higher than in free trade areas. Estimates of the possible cost to consumers of a resale price maintenance law range from $1 to $14 billion a year.

The bill has been widely promoted as a last ditch effort to rescue "small business" from predatory price cuts on the part of the larger retailing enterprises such as chainstores, discount houses, department stores, and mail-order establishments.

Critics of the bill point out, however, that resale price maintenance would not succeed in its intended aim of preventing small business failures. Evidence supplied by the Department of Justice, for example, showed that for each of the years 1947 through 1962, the rate of business failures was lowest in the States without fair trade laws and highest in the States with fair trade laws.

The Council of Economic Advisers has forecast that enactment of a Federal price maintenance law will lead to successive rounds of price increases on branded products, followed by shrinking profit margins for small business, so in the end small business would be no better off than it would be without the legislation. This result occurs because, when price competition is shut off, retailers tend to compete in other ways which involve higher costs, such as adding to store conveniences, expanding services, providing credit, offering free delivery, and the like. Also, additional distributors are attracted into the field, tempted by the temporarily high margins offered on branded merchandise. The presence of additional sellers tends to reduce the volume of sales per store, and thus the profit available to individual establishments. As the Council put it, "Retailers would not gain, but their customers would lose."

A second boomerang for small business under such legislation is that the larger distributors would step up marketing of their own so-called house brands which generally sell at conspicuously lower prices than the name brands owned by manufacturers. Often a house brand is exactly the same product and even made by the same manufacturer as a name brand product.

For manufacturers in industries where relatively little price competition exists, the game of follow the leader on price increases becomes easier if prices on particular products of individual companies can be made to stick at the retail level. Even prescription drugs would become subject to resale price maintenance, despite the documented price abuses that have been shown to exist currently in the drug manufacturing industry.

At its 1963 convention, the AFL–CIO called on Congress to reject all proposals for Federal resale price maintenance legislation by whatever label offered, including the presently pending quality stabilization bill. Should this anticonsumer legislation nonetheless be passed, we urge its prompt veto by the President."

President Johnson, in his consumer message, pledged his opposition to legislation which limits price competition, whether under the label of quality stabilization or any other name.

The odds-makers in the Nation's Capital do not give the quality stabilization bill much of a chance. However, anything can happen, and it is important that organized labor keep a close watch on such legislation. It is always possible for special interests to successfully promote such legislation in order to benefit themselves at the expense of the people. Organized labor, through its legislative representatives, has continued to oppose this bill, which would operate against the best interests of the working man and his family.

This is only one more instance of the many, many manners in which organized labor, day in and day out, works quietly in behalf of its members.

The Cyprus Time Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the unity of the free world is threatened by a wide variety of dangerous problems.

To mention but one, Cyprus, we see a situation that should be solved promptly by a united West to save untold suffering, loss of life, blood, and property. As it is, the peril and suffering continue to spread.

One interesting and hopeful solution was presented as a public service in paid newspaper space by the International Latex Corp. in the New York Times of March 3, 1964, in an article written by Mr. Eliahu Ben-Horin with an explanatory introduction by Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder of this corporation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and hope that my colleagues will take the opportunity to read the following views:

THE CYPRUS TIME BOMB

(By Mr. Eliahu Ben-Horin)

(Many a man has died of blood poisoning that started with a scratch. Let us hope that this will not be the fate of NATO lacerated as it is by Cyprus. Yet the danger is real and the United Nations appears to have no solution that can be deemed to be permanent in character. NATO, already weakened by Western disunity, will therefore continue to exist under mounting threat until an enduring solution for Cyprus is found and promptly implemented.

(Indeed, the situation is so grave that Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, who is certainly no alarmist, writing from the Paris office of the New York Times expressed this ominous note:

("The world has become so used to hearing about trouble in Cyprus that it isn't aware how desperate the current crisis is. Every day it gets worse despite U.N. pacifying efforts.

("Neither Athens nor Ankara wants things to slip over the brink but they are on the verge of doing so. Neither can control its own advocates on the island and Archbishop Makarios is no longer master of a situation he misguidedly helped create. Extremists are in the saddle.

("Time is running out; we are near the brink of disaster. NATO has found itself unable to dam the threatened tide despite all efforts by Secretary General Stikker.

("Both sides—the 80 percent Greek majority and the 20 percent Turkish minority—

are preparing for a showdown and both sides are interested in gaining the support of their co-nationalists, the mainland Greeks and mainland Turks. The extremists are not seeking to avoid war: they prefer it."

(It is in this context that we present the following article which details a constructive plan for solving the explosive Cyprus problem. Written by Mr. Eliahu Ben-Horin, historian and authority on Mediterranean affairs, it merits urgent consideration by free world governments and NATO.—A. N. SPANEL, Chairman, International Latex Corp.)

No one, howsoever optimistic, can possibly believe that the present deliberations on Cyprus can produce either lasting peace on that island or a definitive solution for the highly complicated problems that confront it. Even if a neutral "police force" is agreed upon, it will be just one more fragile palliative, a costly palliative both politically and financially. An international garrison of 10,000 men will reportedly cost $50 million for a 3-month stay. And when the 3 months are over?

The political "expenditure," moreover, will run much higher. The Cypriot crisis has already provided Moscow with an open door for intervention in the Eastern Mediterranean and for playing the part of "the defender of the oppressed" against alleged imperialistic designs of the West. Two members of the NATO Alliance, Turkey and Greece, are at each other's throats. It is clearly a situation where temporizing can bring little or no improvement and is likely to further aggravate a spreading crisis.

Only a permanent solution can insure the future of Cyprus and remove the danger of intercommunal strife and terror on the island, and quench the sparking of a possible war between Greece and Turkey which may spread into a much larger conflagration.

There are those who have suggested the separation of the two incompatible Cypriot communities—the Greek majority and Turkish minority—by partitioning the island; but it is extremely doubtful whether partition would work in this case—and not alone because of the determined opposition of the Greek-Cypriot majority which actually controls the Government. For if the island is cut in two, the chances of the Republic of Cyprus ever developing into a viable state would greatly diminish. Moreover, the Turkish-Cypriot community is not concentrated geographically but spread all over the island. Partition of Cyprus would therefore entail considerable internal migration and settlement. Let us therefore consider another solution:

(a) The establishment of an international commission to appraise the full value of all real estate, goods, business enterprises and established professional practices such as medical, dental, legal, etc., that are now owned by Turkish Cypriots; permitting the Government of Cyprus to buy all these properties for their appraised cash values.

(b) The prompt resettlement of the 100,000 Turkish minority people in Turkey.

To be sure this is a radical step, but no less a constructive one. It offers not merely a temporary expedient but a lasting solution. Indeed, a much greater and deeper conflict between Greece and Turkey was once before successfully resolved in this very fashion. After World War I, over 2 million Greeks and Turks were transferred and resettled in an exchange of populations. It has had a most beneficial effect on the relations between the two countries and peoples. Fortunately, to achieve similar results in the case of Cyprus 100,000 people would be moved, not 2 million.

At the moment, passions run high on both sides, creating a hostile atmosphere for appeals to reason; but emotionalism cannot be permitted to govern explosive political situations. When the problem of Cyprus is considered soberly on its merits, we believe the following conclusions will be clear:

(1) Turkey is interested, no less than Greece and the Western democracies, in peace and stabilization in the eastern Mediterranean; (2) with Cyprus now an independent nation, Turkey would have no valid reasons—political, economic or strategic—to oppose a Greek-populated Cyprus; (3) Turkey has more than enough room to absorb the 100,000 Turkish Cypriots; (4) the latter would find a new life among their own people and better economic, cultural and moral conditions, with more security, than they now enjoy in Cyprus; (5) the sizable financial investment in their resettlement—which would have to come from international sources—will bolster Turkey's economy.

Cyprus would be the gainer from this solution as would the NATO partners, Greece and Turkey—as would the free world at peace.

It is time for a bold attempt to defuse the Cyprus time bomb charged with so much that is sinister.

Milwaukee's Plymouth Hill Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following recent article in the Practical Builder on developer Alan R. Crawford of the Horizon Renewal Corp., and his award winning design for the Plymouth Hill homes in Milwaukee:

DESIGN PLAYS MAJOR ROLE IN URBAN RENEWAL SUCCESS

Today the sales success of Milwaukee's Plymouth Hill homes is relatively certain. Two months after opening over 30 sales have been chalked up for the first 40 units, with evidence of growing interest.

"Award winning design didn't guarantee our success on Plymouth Hill," according to Alan R. Crawford of Horizon Renewal Corp., "but, it did help us get our proposal accepted by a typically skeptical collection of city officials. We knew the design was outstanding, but there was no way to predict its sales success until we started writing sales contracts."

Delay, redtape, and risk are three monsters every developer of an urban renewal project learns to live with. If he doesn't accept them from the day he makes an initial investment with his own time and capital, he'll be frustrated until he signs his first firm contract.

Developers Crawford and Sidney Friedman learned to accept that frustration. With $44,000 of their own capital invested before their bid was accepted, they had no other choice. The amazing thing is that they were able to maintain their equilibrium through those 2½ years before the first sales.

Horizon started work on the long, long trail to completion as soon as the city made its first announcement of a renewal area.

During the next months, a complete professional market-research job was done, a renewal expert, Leonard Styche, was hired as vice president for the project, preliminary plans were prepared, and invaluable groundwork was laid with city agencies, local politicians, and citizens groups. Finally, an expensive brochure (about $9 per copy) was prepared and the project was entered in (and won) a national architectural design competition.

When the city of Milwaukee announced that bidding documents were available, over 100 builders and developers requested the forms. Deadline for bids allowed for about 2 months of double time effort for Horizon. Crawford or Styche spoke before every possible citizen's group which would have an interest in the project, giving the name "Horizon" an image of a new way of life. (In one 4-week period, four different speeches were printed by the Milwaukee Journal.)

By the time the actual public commission hearing on bids was held, Horizon's groundwork had been laid.

The result: every point in Horizon's defense to sour grapes tossed by several competitors was made not by them, but by the impartial citizens' groups with which they had worked so closely. Their bid was accepted at the next council meeting. (Though the city had set $278,000 as minimum for a bid, Horizon intentionally came in with a bid of $312,000, primarily in anticipation of competitive bids.)

The period between August 1962, when the bid was accepted, and July 1963, when construction got underway, was the most frustrating.

Crawford blames this on the natural problems created by multiplicity of Federal and municipal agencies, each having the right of critique and change. "Each change requiring backstepping and reapproval with agencies which had already accepted our plans," says Crawford. "It meant unnecessary months of delay and laborious effort before common accord could be reached between these different interests, and we could obtain all the necessary approvals."

Construction finally got underway just in time for Crawford and Friedman to be hit with last year's lumber industry strike. "The timing was far from favorable," says Friedman, who was in charge of construction. "Because of the bad timing, we ended up by paying a 25-percent premium on plywood and 10 percent on lumber in order even to guarantee completion of the first unit. Also we hit public works contractors at their busiest time, ending up with development costs that ran 50 percent higher than anticipated."

These and other delays had the expected results: Price-per-unit cost was increased and the developers' profit potential almost cut in half.

Prices for the units, originally pegged at from $12,000 to $12,500, increased to $13,000, $13,650 and $13,750. And, instead of an allowable 10 percent net profit, Horizon says it will be lucky to net 5 percent total profit including all salaries and overhead even of ithe entire project is completed.

"Though these prices still represent a real bargain in low-cost housing in Milwaukee," says Crawford, "we feel that a number of the demands were unnecessary. They are unfortunately inevitable in any project like this, though, when you have as many controlling agencies, all concerned that the project be successful and safe. But ways must be found to grant greater protection to the developer who can tie up considerable capital with no guarantee of success."

CAN YOU PREDICT SUCCESS?

"There's really no way," says Crawford. "We took the gamble and we knew it. We'll start construction on the additional 144 units only when we are guaranteed advance sales. When we have 40 firm contracts in our hands and 40 advance sales—enough for the next unit—we'll build it.

"It's up to our sales department now—and prospective buyers."

Crawford feels that the entire project will be completed. "Our sales record is satisfactory considering our seasonal timing, and our ratio of current qualifications seems to be excellent with over one-half of our depositors qualifying without any credit problem." FHA approvals have also been heart-

ening: 10 approvals on the first 12 submissions.

FINANCING

As a 221(d)(2) project, buyers receive up to 40 years financing at 5¼ percent interest plus one-half percent for FHA insurance. Displacees may obtain 221 certificates enabling them to purchase for only $200 down while others are required to pay $400 to $450 down.

For construction financing, Horizon received FHA approval on 40 operative builder construction loans for the first court. These provided for a payout of 85 percent of the full loan available to the buyer.

CONSTRUCTION

"We could have provided the same amount of square footage for less money had we accepted an ordinary pedestrian design," says Crawford. "We decided early in the game, though, that if our project was to make the necessary impression on the city officials, and, later, have a unique appeal to buyers, we had to give them more than standard lines."

Any builder studying the photos and plans can spot how Horizon could have saved money and probably lowered the sales prices. But at what expense? Sales seem to be proving that even in low-cost housing, buyers are showing their appreciation for good site planning and architectural treatment. There's nothing comparable available today in Milwaukee for the same price, and many hundreds of families are paying higher rents for for apartments that are virtually slums. (Monthly payments average $104 to $111.)

Party walls are 8-inch concrete block and the remainder of the construction is frame with milled plywood used on exteriors. Face brick is used only on the entry levels facing the courtyards.

SALES PROGRAM

Though the developers had hoped for integration in this development, it looked hopeless considering the location. Therefore, they hired a well-known and highly respected Negro real estate broker as sales manager and he, in turn, works primarily with a Negro sales force.

"Our name, Plymouth Hill, wasn't chosen by accident, and we intentionally relate it with a new way of life in our advertisements and promotions," says Crawford, "both the Negro press and the Milwaukee Journal have been used for advertising, but in a project with as much prepublicity as this one had, newspaper advertising is pretty much 'frosting on the cake' compared with intracommunity word-of-mouth publicity.

"Leaders of every Negro organization, church, neighborhood association were contacted long before completion and were invited to our opening. Local church leaders have expressed their conviction that homeownership is good for the community and they have taken more than a passing interest in the value we provided for the dollar."

MAINTENANCE OF COMMON AREAS

A homeowners association will be organized to administer maintenance of the common park and walkway areas with a fee of $3 already included in the monthly payment breakdown. Supervision will be vested in a nonprofit corporation governed eventually by a resident board of directors. Initially, however, the board will consist of the executive director of the Milwaukee Urban League, Developer Crawford, and his legal counsel.

Wide housekeeping and esthetic control powers have been established in order to guarantee upkeep of court areas and lawns, and individual units. Even repainting will have to be approved by the board in order that a harmonious appearance may be maintained. The developers are putting up $11,000 as a starting maintenance fund.

One final word from Crawford: "City officials must accept the fact that the renewal developer deserves a fair profit if he is asked to risk his own capital. They must support him with more than lip service—and at a time when he needs it, rather than at the final festivities—if they want to see successful renewal and rehabilitation of their cities."

Southern Voters Now Have a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for many years in the one-party system of our Southern States, a man could be elected and reelected if he was right on segregation. This is no longer true as voters in the South are more and more alert to the many issues facing the Nation, the growing threat of big Federal Government and the cost to the individual of big Federal spending. What is more, the southern voter now has a choice as the Republican party marches on in the South offering good candidates for practically all elective offices.

My colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable BOB WILSON, has pointed out that the growing Republican Party in the South is getting the cream of the crop in voter support and in candidates. The Republican Party in the South is attracting the young, eager citizen who is concerned with the preservation of constitutional government and the freedom of the individual. It is the strength of the Republican Party in the South which encourages many of us to believe that there is a turning point shortly ahead in the long road to Federal Government control or statism which we have been following through the days of the New Deal to its reincarnation under the misnomer of the "Better Deal."

The well-known columnist, Holmes Alexander, describes the trend in the South in the following article, "Is the Filibuster Enough" from the April 18 issue of Human Events:

IS THE FILIBUSTER ENOUGH?

(By Holmes Alexander)

In Washington the southern stalwarts of the Senate are dutifully filibustering the civil rights bill, cheered on by their constituencies and by most of their influential newspapers, expectant that the last-ditch defense of what appears to be a lost cause will insure reelection—but a time has come to wonder about that.

Not for a moment should it be imagined that the decent, thoughtful, property-owning, community-supporting people of the South regard the civil rights bill as anything but the spearhead of another invasion by the juggernaut of Federalia. But the point that will set a traveler in the Deep South to wondering is whether mere opposition to civil rights is any longer a passport to reelection by Democrats from Dixie.

So while integration is not a dead issue, a whole lot of other issues are alive and kicking in southern politics. And although no southern Senator would be forgiven for failing to resist civil rights, it's more doubtful than I've ever observed on many trips whether southerners in Congress can count upon full absolution of other failings simply by opposing this one particular bill.

Repeatedly I was asked, "Why didn't our men vote against mass transport aid? Against the planned deficit in the tax bill? Against the nuclear test ban treaty? Against the wheat deal? Against all the welfarism in the Kennedy-Johnson package, which brings about an erosion of local sovereignty and personal liberty?"

What makes these queries the more significant is that southern voters are no longer in the fix of having nowhere to go. There is hardly a ballot in town and county which does not offer a Republican candidate for some most parochial office. There are two factors which inevitably recommend these GOP aspirants to the electorates. One is that they unalterably oppose just about everything with which the national Democratic party has been identified for three decades, principally loose fiscal morality, philandering with trampish ideas that are anti-Constitutional, political bosshood in the big cities—and above all—consorting with communism in war and peace.

The other factor helpful to Republican officeseekers is that they are nearly always, and by careful design, the most attractive and most respected young men and women in the community. In these areas, so long one-party, there is rarely such a thing as a Republican party hack, or a courthouse crook, with which the opposition party seems to abound.

Republicans in the South, despite what is said on the outside, do not seek the "lily-white" vote. They know it to be a fact that 95 percent of the increasing Negro registration goes Democratic, but the GOP regrets this—being practical politicians—and tries for support, among Negro educators, businessmen, and individualists.

It is against this changing background of southern political awareness that a reporter may wonder how much longer southern Democrats can play fast and loose on almost every subject—save one—which concerns the deepest convictions of their constituents.

Space Agency Office for the Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues from the Midwest and I have long been concerned with the policy of the Government's scientific agencies in placing the predominant portion of their contracts and research activities in the East, West, and South of the Nation.

A distinguished colleague of ours, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH, has proposed that NASA establish a Midwestern Operations Office to provide the same technical and procurement assistance to midwestern firms as is provided to companies in the East and West by similar offices in Boston and Los Angeles. I support my colleague's proposal, and I insert here an editorial on the subject broadcast by radio station WOWO of Fort Wayne, Ind.:

A NASA OFFICE FOR THE MIDWEST, TOO

(By C. W. Vandagrift, general manager, WOW, Fort Wayne, Ind.)

During the WOW "Focal Point" discussions in December, Indiana Congressman J. ED-

WARD ROUSH, objected to a National Aeronautics and Space Administration policy of "putting all their eggs in one basket." Congressman ROUSH was protesting against what he termed the unfair geographic distribution of NASA contracts in favor of the East and West coasts of the United States at the expense of the Midwest.

Congressman ROUSH recently followed up on this complaint by protesting against the operation of two Government offices in the Boston and Los Angeles areas which are supposedly serving as coordinating agencies between NASA and potential space contractors in those areas. The offices are to offer technical assistance to industries and universities in these areas and to help in the preparation of proposals for NASA business. ROUSH wants a NASA liaison agency for the Midwest too.

Congressman ROUSH was particularly disturbed to find during an unannounced inspection tour of the Boston office that the office was engaged in making inventories of research and production capabilities of institutions in the area. In other words, the agency was compiling and maintaining information on facilities available in the Boston area to provide a handy reference file for NASA in the placing of new orders. ROUSH contends that if the Government is going to offer this kind of service to Boston and Los Angeles, then why not to the Midwest and other areas of the country whose taxpayers are also paying for the half-million-dollar a year cost for operation of these offices.

We agree with Congressman ROUSH that if it is in the best interests of NASA to operate liaison offices to aid potential contractors in securing NASA business, then every area of the United States should qualify for this aid.

We commend Congressman ROUSH for his efforts to locate a NASA office in the Midwest, an area that has long received the short end of space and defense business. We hope that all Tri-State area Congressmen and citizens will support these efforts to add a badly needed dimension to the industrial development picture of this area.

George Jessel: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1964, the Van Nuys Lodge 1779 of B'nai B'rith honored George Jessel as its Man of the Year.

George Jessel is one of the leading figures in the entertainment industry in America. He has won fame as an actor, producer, and songwriter.

In recent years he has devoted much of his time and energy to the cause of the State of Israel. Through his efforts, millions of dollars have been raised to support this new nation in its struggle to maintain its freedom and independence.

George Jessel richly deserves the award given him. At the testimonial dinner given in his honor, Mr. Ben L. O'Brien, who was the 1960 Van Nuys B'nai B'rith honoree, made a moving tribute to Mr. Jessel. His speech is one of the most beautiful I have read. I commend it to the Members of the House:

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE JESSEL

For more than 5,000 years, the sons and daughters of Israel have recognized that there is but one God—

"That it is He that hath made us and not we ourselves."

That we must love God with all our heart and with all our mind and with all our being.

That if we truly love God, we must love our neighbors as we love ourselves.

The sons and daughters of Israel have carried this love of God, and this love of their fellow man, across the centuries, to every corner of the world, and to all the peoples of the world.

Their love of God, and love of all mankind, has eternally made the children of Israel the enemies of tyranny, the enemies of oppression, the enemies of injustice, the enemies of ignorance, and the enemies of fear, whenever they have appeared in the world's history.

Every tyrant who has lived has tried to deny God, and has tried to set people against people, and neighbors against neighbors.

Yet one by one, each tyrant has been like a candle, which threw out a feeble light for a short time, guttered in the wind, and flickered out, leaving a stench in the darkness.

But the great burning light which shone on the world when Moses stood on the mountain and saw God face to face, and spoke to God, illuminates all the dark places, all the hidden places. That light will burn forever, until all mankind acknowledges that there is but one God who made us all; and that only those who love their neighbors as themselves, truly love God.

I shall always treasure the honor I received in 1960 from the Van Nuys B'nai B'rith Lodge. I am deeply honored to have been invited to be with you on this beautiful occasion here this evening. I am grateful for the opportunity to pay tribute to George Jessel, who has been proclaimed Man of the Year by the Van Nuys B'nai B'rith Lodge. Mr. Jessel has been properly called by the Honorable Ben Gurion, beloved first Prime Minister of the State of Israel, "the greatest living American Jew."

His philanthropy, his unstinted giving of his talents, his energy and himself to the poor, the needy and the oppressed unquestionably have earned him this title. But the man devoted to the cause of democracy with every fiber of his being, the man with an intuitive sensitivity to fundamental religious truth—the man with the loving heart filled with compassion for all mankind—which is the real George Jessel, beneath the brightly colored tinsel of the jester's cap and gown, has richly earned designation as a Good and Faithful Servant of the Lord.

Every Citizen Holds Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the text of an excellent article by our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy to the Citizenship Committee of the National Education Association of January 1964:

EVERY CITIZEN HOLDS OFFICE[1]

(By John Fitzgerald Kennedy)

Disdain for the political profession in our schools and communities did not matter quite as much in the days when active participation in the political affairs of the Nation was limited to a select few.

But today, the implications of national policy necessarily make politicians of all of us. Today, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, "holds office"; every one of us is in a position of responsibility; and, in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of political leadership, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

The American political education with which I am concerned is that of each and every American citizen. His opinions, his votes, and his efforts define the limits of our policy, provide its guideposts, and authorize its implementation.

In Lincoln's words, that man on the street, the average citizen, the educated voter, "makes statutes possible or impossible to execute." His attitude toward taxation and selective service, foreign aid and alliances, the United Nations, imports, immigration, even his attitude toward members of minority groups in his own country—all of these have an impact upon foreign policy far beyond his knowledge. Without his indispensable support and loyalty, no American foreign policy in times such as these can possibly succeed.

There are, of course, dangers in this increased participation of the public in the policymaking process. Public opinion in a democracy has on many occasions, in this Nation and others, been too slow, too selfish, too shortsighted, too provincial, too rigid, or too impractical. But in these times, in facing these issues which deeply touch the lives and fortunes of every citizen, in making these hard decisions which require overwhelming public support, we as a nation cannot—we dare not—exclude the people or ignore their opinions, whether right or wrong. Instead, in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them—but to inform their discertion (by education)."

"To inform their discretion (by education)"—that is the task of every teacher in every city and village in America: to educate all, or nearly all, Americans to serve as politicians in making public policy. But what kind of education is necessary to prepare young Americans for a more active and enlightened role in the political affairs of their Nation? Permit me to offer a few suggestions.

First, I would emphasize that we need not an overconcentration upon civic and political affairs, but the development of a broad range of talents. We do not need men like Lord John Russell, of whom Queen Victoria once said that he would be a better man if he knew a third subject—but he was interested in nothing but the Constitution of 1688 and himself.

We need instead men with the education of Thomas Jefferson, described by a contemporary as "a gentleman of 32, who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a

[1] This article, the lead article of a 14-page feature, "The Teaching and Practice of Politics," printed in the NEA Journal of October 1961, was adapted by special permission of President John F. Kennedy from a speech he delivered, while a U.S. Senator in 1957, before a convention of the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City.

horse, dance a minuet, and play the violin."

We need men like Daniel Webster, who could throw thunderbolts at Hayne on the Senate floor and then stroll a few steps down the corridor and dominate the Supreme Court as the foremost lawyer of his time; men like John Quincy Adams, who, after being summarily dismissed from the Senate for a notable display of independence, could become Boylston professor of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard and then become a great Secretary of State.

Secondly, I would emphasize that we need scholarship fitted for practical action, for something more than merely discussing political issues and deploring their solutions with learned phrases. We need intellectual achievements fitted for more than the delights of abstract discourse.

It is not enough that our schools merely be great centers of learning, without concerning themselves with the uses to which that learning is put in the years that follow graduation. Indeed, care must be taken to see that it is not left behind upon graduation.

Third, I would emphasize the importance, in teaching students about public affairs, of avoiding the confusion of political idealism with political fantasy or rigidity. We need idealism in our public life—we need young men and women who will stand for the right regardless of their personal ambitions or welfare.

But let us not permit them to carry that idealism to the point of fantasy—to the point where any compromise or concession is regarded as immoral. For politics and legislation are not matters for inflexible principles or unattainable ideals. Rather, the democratic way of life and the federal system of government require compromise between the desires of each individual and group and those around them.

Fourth, I would emphasize the importance, in teaching students about public affairs, of avoiding the confusion of national patriotism with national mythology. Instillation of a sense of patriotism, of national pride, of awareness and gratitude for the liberties and opportunities that are ours as Americans—these are precepts which, of course, it is hoped every student shall grasp.

But at the same time let us recognize the necessity of clearing away these false axioms and myths which, however comforting to our sense of security or appealing to our sense of patriotism, impair a realistic view of our Nation's role in the world. I refer to those myths, among others, that are based upon the untouchability of national sovereignty; the existence of inherently good, bad, or backward nations; or the emphasis of governmental economy over national security.

Many Americans persist in the myth that a democratic way of life, inasmuch as it is the best way, will inevitably be the victor in any struggle with an alien power; that the United States can never lose a war. Many still hold to the belief that our allies owe homage and gratitude to the United States and to all of its views at all times.

There are those who oppose assistance to our cooperation with our allies, those who reject bargaining or diplomatic pressure as a method of dealing with international disputes. Education for citizenship, for increased participation in American political life, must dispel these myths.

Fifth and finally, I would emphasize that this kind of education requires quality as well as quantity. I realize that education cannot fulfill its responsibilities when nearly a million boys and girls are deprived by the classroom shortage of full-time schooling, when millions more are held back in unwieldy classes of 40 or more, and when the Nation is short 135,000 qualified teachers.

But more and better classrooms are not enough. Even an increase in the number of teachers is not enough. Better trained, better paid teachers, using better techniques and textbooks, are necessary if we are to improve still further the education of our citizens for the responsibilities of citizenship.

Of one thing we can be sure—the graduates of our schools and of our universities will be expected to play an increasingly important role in American political affairs. The effort and expenditure by which society has made their education possible have not been undertaken merely to give them an economic advantage in the life struggle. They are expected to offer leadership and guidance for all.

"Don't teach my boy poetry," an English mother once wrote the provost of Harrow. "Don't teach my boy poetry; he is going to stand for Parliament." Well, perhaps she was right—but if more politicians knew poetry, and more poets knew politics, I am convinced the world would be a little better place in which to live.

Hugo, Okla., Honors Majority Leader Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 17, our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, was honored by his constituents in Choctaw County, with Carl Albert Appreciation Day.

The day long celebration took place in the city of Hugo, where Oklahomans from throughout the State gathered to pay tribute to the Third District Congressman and his wife, Mary.

Gaily decorated with flags and welcome signs, Hugo honored our able majority leader with a luncheon, a public reception during the afternoon, and a dinner and special program in the junior high school auditorium Friday night.

Along with our colleagues, the Honorable TOM STEED and the Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM, I had the pleasure of attending the dinner and witnessing one of the most outstanding programs of its kind ever presented in Oklahoma. Congressman ALBERT's first-grade teacher, his former high school debating partner, former neighbors who assisted him in his first campaign for public office and his brothers and sister were among the surprise guests who joined in presenting the Oklahoma version of "This is Your Life, CARL ALBERT."

Hermon Baggett, Joe Anderson and Jack Stamper were members of the program committee which presented the unusual surprise for our colleague, and Stamper did a fine job of directing the event.

Jake Pullen of Hugo delivered a stirring tribute to Carl and Mary Albert as they entered the auditorium, and Hugo's fine school orchestra provided the music.

The pride which all Oklahomans share in the achievements of Congressman ALBERT is best summarized by the front page editorial of the Hugo Daily News for Friday, April 17, and the text of the News editorial follows:

WELCOME TO OUR COUNTY, CONGRESSMAN ALBERT

A football coach can lose a game to an arch rival and winning the rest of them may not restore him to the good graces of alumni and fans.

A pro baseball team can win its league but lose the world series and its public image sometimes changes from hero to bum.

Similarly, a public servant—a politician, if you will—may serve his constituents with honor, dignity and distinction, but one vote contrary to the views of a group of citizens can create a clamor for the political guillotine.

This is oftentimes the unhappy role of the public servant.

Our distinguished Congressman, CARL ALBERT, has never publicly complained of the ups and downs of trying to be a good Representative. That he is subjected to them, however, is a certainty. No man can be all things to all people.

But there is one vitally important thing that we like about CARL ALBERT. His balance sheet is clean. His assets are tremendous. His influence in the Congress and in the White House is enormous. His stature on the national scene presents the image of a man highly respected by leaders of both political parties.

As majority leader of the House of Representatives, he has achieved a plateau achieved by few men in the history of this Nation. Those who know him best and who have followed his career closely are of the opinion CARL ALBERT has not yet reached the peak in his public life.

CARL ALBERT is a humble man. Here we have our Congressman, a man called on urgent matters two or more times daily by the President of the United States, willing to leave the busy Washington scene to shake hands with his friends in Choctaw County.

It is an honor to have you with us, Mr. ALBERT. We hope the activities of the day are most enjoyable for you and Mrs. Albert. Our prayers are that you and our other national leaders will pilot our country along the paths of peace, that our world image will merit the respect of free nations everywhere and that our Nation's shadow will cause the tyrant to retreat from designs to enslave God's people.

The Federal Government: A True Portrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the charge so casually yet so frequently made—the charge that for the last 30 years, under Democratic administrations, the country has moved steadily toward a "centralization of power in the Federal Government" and an "overbearing Federal bureaucracy"—has been effectively challenged and repudiated by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann's article should be "must" reading for anyone interested in considering this problem fairly and I include it for our colleagues' attention:

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S VIEWS

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has just published in the Saturday Evening Post a long statement of his present beliefs about the state of the Union. They can fairly be described as GOLDWATER minus the howlers about the graduated income tax, social security, TVA, and the like. That is to say, General Eisenhower's position is that of the conservative right not of the radical far right.

His basic thesis is that there has been for 30 years under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier "a steady obvious drift of our Nation toward a centralization of power in the Federal Government." We have "an overbearing Federal bureaucracy that seems unchecked in both size and power." The net result of the "easy money and inflationary policies" of this Federal bureaucracy is that "the dollar you saved and earned 24 years ago is now worth just 45 cents."

This is a strange interpretation of the history of the past 25 years, and one thing we may be certain of is that General Eisenhower will never be hailed as a reliable historian. He was the Supreme Commander in Europe during the Second World War, he was the Supreme Commander of NATO in the cold war, and he was twice the President of the United States. Yet, incredible as it is, he has interpreted what has happened since 1940 without even mentioning the fact that the country has grown by 50 million people, that during these 25 years the country has fought the Second World War, the Korean war, and the cold war.

How is it possible to talk about the rise in prices which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar by rather more than half without mentioning the wars and the preparation for war? As a matter of fact, half of the rise in prices occurred during and immediately after the Second World War; another 15 percent of the rise occurred during the Korean war. From 1953 to 1963 the rise in prices has been a little over 1 percent a year. The rise was just about the same under President Eisenhower as it was under President Kennedy.

If General Eisenhower is blind to the economic consequences of the wars in which he has played such a distinguished part, he exaggerates grossly the part played by the civilian sector in the growth of the Federal bureaucracy.

There has not been, as General Eisenhower says, an unchecked growth of the Federal bureaucracy. While State and local government employment has doubled between 1947 and 1963, nondefense employment in Federal Government was the same percentage (1.9) of the total civilian labor force in 1963 as it was in 1948. In fact, Federal civilian employment has not grown so fast as the population. There are now approximately 13 U.S. workers per thousand of population. Of these, five are employed in Defense, three by the Post Office, one by the Veterans' Administration, and four by all the rest of the Federal Government.

Nor is it true that there has been a "consolidation of power and revenue in the Federal Government." While the share of State and local government in the national product has doubled since 1948—from 5 to 10 percent—Federal Revenue as a percentage of the national product has increased only slightly—from 12 to 14 percent—and has not risen for 5 years. And if we take debt as a measure of activity from 1947 to 1963, we see that State and local debt increased 382 percent; private debt increased 279 percent; Federal debt increased 26 percent.

Thus, General Eisenhower has not painted a true picture of the state of the Union. It is not possible to paint a true picture of the state of the Union since 1940 by ignoring the three wars, by ignoring the growth of the population by as many people as live in Great Britain, by ignoring the preponderance of Federal employment (71 percent) in the indispensable functions of defense, the postal service and veterans' care, by ignoring the relatively greater growth of State and local activity, and by professing to believe that all the troubles and dangers of our age are due to the handful of civilian welfare measures.

It is just this refusal to recognize the facts of American life which accounts for the condition of the Republican Party today. General Eisenhower meant to speak for the moderate, prudent, and, in the correct meaning of the word, the conservative mass of our people. But what he says is so greatly out of touch with the realities—with what has happened, with what is happening, with what the people need to have happen in the future—that it lacks all credibility.

Tax Laws Impede Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the recently enacted Revenue Act of 1964 contained a provision—section 213—allowing a tax deduction for certain moving expenses incurred by old and new employees who are not reimbursed for these expenses by their employers. Although this provision does not go nearly far enough, it is in my judgment partial recognition by Congress that the labor force is becoming increasingly mobile. In order to match job vacancies with job demands we must remove the impediments to labor mobility that are contained in the Revenue Code. As the code is presently written and administered it discourages mobility by being too rigid in its definition of what expenses are deductible and by an excessively narrow definition of what kinds of reimbursement constitute nontaxable income. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Malabre discusses the problem of reimbursements in a sober way and he points out the interrelatedness of the tax law and the problem of unemployment.

I also want to call attention to my bill, H.R. 2076, which would permit a taxpayer to deduct as trade or business expenses the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode. We must realize that our present-day economy necessitates high geographical mobility on the part of the workers and we should not let archaic laws designed to meet outdated situations stand in the way of modern needs.

UNFAIR TAX BURDEN?—FIRMS PROTEST LEVIES ON REIMBURSEMENTS IN EMPLOYEE MOVES

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

In its eagerness to eliminate so-called loopholes, does the Federal Government occasionally place an unfair tax burden on some citizens?

The question is raised at this time because of a growing dispute between an angry group of corporations and the Internal Revenue Service. At issue: Should transferred employees be taxed on reimbursements they receive for certain moving expenses?

Until recently, the IRS generally did not challenge such reimbursements as taxable income. Now, however, the Service is claiming many such payments do constitute income to personnel being moved, and as such are taxable.

The principal types of payments which the IRS is beginning to tax are reimbursements companies pay transferred employees for losses on sales of houses and for expenses incurred in the early days at a new post of duty. These typically include hotel bills, house hunting trips, meals in restaurants, laundry service and journeys back to the former location to visit and pick up the family.

The ultimate effect of the IRS drive, in large measure, will hinge on future court decisions in cases where companies decide to fight the Service's rulings on specific transfers. Many such cases already are in litigation and many more seem bound to develop.

A typical case involves William B., a research scientist for a large food processing company. Mr. B's employer recently ordered him on short notice to transfer from a company plant in the Los Angeles area to one near New York.

A $4,070 REIMBURSEMENT

To enable Mr. B to transfer quickly, without losing money, the firm paid him $4,070 to cover various expenses resulting from the move. Of the total, Mr. B spent $704 to drive his family across the country and $1,250 to have a mover ship his household goods. This much of the $4,070 reimbursement, amounting to $1,954, was ruled a legitimate business payment to cover the move and therefore wasn't held taxable income to Mr. B. But the remaining $2,116 did indeed constitute income, the IRS is claiming, on which taxes of some $500 are due.

Mr. B has detailed exactly how he spent this $2,116 of "income." A reimbursement to make up the loss he sustained selling his California home hurriedly, on company orders, accounted for $1,254. Hotel bills and other expenses totaled $817; this was spent during the 8 weeks when Mr. B. first arrived in New York, before he could find a new home, move his household goods and have his family join him. The final $45 was spent for a cleaning of the California home as a courtesy to the new occupant.

"It is absolutely ridiculous and unfair," fumes an official in the personnel department of Mr. B's company. "The only reimbursements the IRS doesn't view as taxable income, apparently, are those for the bare picking up of a family and moving it to the new post of duty. The IRS seems to think all other payments to afford employees basic decencies and prevent their losing a great deal of money in company-ordered moves amount to income."

Mr. B's case will be taken to court, the official says. This action "may cost us about $50,000 in legal fees," he adds, but "it is well worth it; we have literally hundreds of similar transfer situations, and if we let the IRS get away with this case you can be sure it will try to collect taxes on all our other transfers, too."

THE NEW TAX LAW

Why is the IRS "cracking down," as corporate tax men put it; on moving reimbursements?

Part of the answer is found in the Revenue Act of 1964, the widely acclaimed tax cut measure that President Johnson recently signed into law. Section 213 of the act carefully defines what constitutes a legitimate moving expense in a transfer: "Only the reasonable expenses of moving household goods and personal effects from the former residence to the new residence, and of traveling, including meals and lodging, from the former residence to the new place of residence."

In other words, such expenses as those run up by Mr. B during his first 8 weeks in New York, or the loss he took when ordered to sell his California home quickly, apparently don't qualify. Only the mover's bill and the cross-country car ride are legitimate transfer costs, so the law seems to state.

Before passage of the new act, Government policy regarding transfer expenses constituted what many tax experts term a gray area. The law books contained no clear definition of moving expenses, they recall. Occasionally the IRS would challenge expenses run up in a particular transfer. Usually, the company concerned would dispute the ruling. The case would end up in court, where the decision would sometimes favor the transferee and sometimes the Government. In the great majority of corporate transfers, however, IRS agents simply ignored all such reimbursements.

The definition of moving expenses in the new law, executives say, is being interpreted by the IRS as a signal to crack down on transfer reimbursements. Corporate lawyers, on the other hand, contend the language of the new act still leaves plenty of room for argument.

An IRS spokesman denies any specific orders have gone out from Washington for an "organized crackdown" on moving expenses. But in the next breath he notes that "the 1964 act at last clarifies what are legitimate moving expenses" and concedes the volume of tax disputes involving corporate transfers "well may be rising."

To corporate charges that the IRS is putting an unfair tax burden on transferees, officials in both the Service and its policysetting parent, the Treasury Department, cite the revenue act and assert they're merely trying to carry out the law of the land.

Treasury officials had a considerable hand in formulating this law of the land, the evidence indicates.

The restrictive definition of moving expenses contained in the new law derives largely from arguments by Treasury officials before congressional committees. Though these proceedings have not been made public, apparently the Treasury men, led by Assistant Secretary Stanley S. Surrey, persuaded the legislators to throw out considerably more liberal interpretations of transfer expenses originally contained in the tax bill. Under these, all of Mr. B's reimbursement income, for example, would have been clearly nontaxable.

What sort of reasoning is behind the Treasury's argument against a more liberal tax policy on transfers?

An assistant to Mr. Surrey discloses the tenor of the Treasury's argument in the Congressional hearings. "We pointed out that the line had to be drawn on moving expenses somewhere for revenue reasons," he says. If the act had allowed as legitimate moving costs the sort of expenses on which Mr. B is being assessed, the Government's "revenue loss" would amounted to $227 million, the Treasury man estimates.

Also, he continues, "we wanted to eliminate many of the abuses that have been going on." While no company will admit as much publicly, there's no question that moving expenses sometimes have been used to abuse tax regulations. A typical dodge works like this: A company-hired appraiser puts an excessive value on a transferee's home, amounting, say, to $5,000 more than the employe originally paid for the house. The company pays the employee the appraisal figure and takes the house off his hands. Under the law, a $5,000 capital gain on the sale of a home is tax free if it is reinvested in a new home within 12 months.

The corporate reaction to the Treasury's reasoning is best described as one of muffled outrage.

One executive, noting the Treasury's concern over abuses, charges, "Surrey's trying to burn down the barn to kill a few rats." An official of Mr. B's company asserts, "It's politically muderous to raise tax rates, so the Treasury is trying to tap every conceivable other source for revenue."

OTHER CRACKDOWNS FEARED

It is this concern that prompts executives to insist on anonymity, even though they're boiling made at the new IRS policy on transfers. They fear the service may decide to launch similar forays against other so-called loopholes. Typically, a major aircraft manufacturer, already embroiled in litigation over transfers, fears the IRS may now attempt to collect tax money from hundreds of its engineers who are on expense-paid university assignments, taking courses that will enhance their value to the company.

"We're convinced the Treasury's policy on transfers is outrageous, but we dare not say anything publicly because that might prompt the Government to hit us somewhere else, too," says a spokesman for the firm.

Defending its reasoning, the Treasury raises some additional points. "In most transfers, a promotion is involved," Mr. Surrey's aid contends. "Why shouldn't some of the reimbursements received be taxed as income? The move is benefiting the employee."

The Treasury official also stresses that the new act eases at least one important moving regulation. It places newly hired employees on the same tax footing as transferees. Previously, new employees received no tax privileges at all on their moving expenses. Says the Treasury man: "We felt the more liberal treatment for new hires would increase mobility in the labor force, and therefore help combat unemployment.

Corporate personnel men dispute the Treasury on whether most transfers represent promotions. The personnel director of a large chemical company, for example, estimates that "in at least half our transfers, no promotion is involved; in many instances, in fact, the employee would much rather not relocate." And even if a promotion is involved, the personnel man continues, "the taxes the IRS would collect on the promoted man's moving reimbursements could very well wipe out a large portion of his raise."

An official of a large utility angrily predicts, "If the IRS crackdown is successful the only young employees who'll be moving around will be those with private sources of income, or the gamblers—men willing to take a loss on a transfer on the chance the move will eventually pay off."

The IRS drive already is prompting what amounts to corporate subterfuge.

To cite one example, personnel directors increasingly are postponing the official "transfer" of an employee until the man is firmly ensconced with wife and family at his new duty post; during his first expensive weeks there, normally spent in a hotel, the transferee is merely on "temporary assignment," records are being made to show. According to tax regulations, reimbursements for hotel bills and other expenses incurred on temporary assignments don't constitute taxable income. Whether such an artifice would permit transferees to escape taxes on what really are new-post-of-duty reimbursements remains to be seen.

Another planned device: Many companies intend to reimburse transferred personnel not only for moving costs, but also for whatever taxes may be due on the reimbursement. This would increase company transfer expenses by more than one-fifth. But, as one executive says, "We must continue to encourage people to take transfers, and a reimbursement for taxes would seem the only fair arrangement." A "reimbursement" for taxes could be made as a "wage bonus."

It is worth noting that the higher corporate transfer expenditures resulting from such wage bonuses would tend to reduce the Treasury's tax take. This is because corporations may deduct such bonuses from their taxable income. "The Treasury people are too optimistic when they talk about saving $227 million by their crackdown," says one tax expert. "They won't even get half that."

Such devices well may mitigate whatever financial burden the new IRS drive places on transferred employees. But they would appear to offer scant comfort to those who bitterly contend the Government's tax position on transfers, indeed, is unjust.

Former Space Chief in Happy Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished former director of the NASA Manned Flight Program, Dr. D. Brainerd Holmes has joined the Raytheon Corp. in Lexington, Mass., one of our top defense contractors. As a senior vice president of the firm he is taking an active interest in attaining a greater balance between commercial and governmental business, and displays a realistic concern over the inevitable shifts and reductions in Federal spending which must be faced by industry in the years ahead. Donald White, science-industry reporter for the Boston Globe, recently interviewed Dr. Holmes. Under unanimous consent I place Mr. White's article which appeared in the April 16 issue in the RECORD:

RAYTHEON'S PLEASED, TOO: FORMER SPACE CHIEF IN HAPPY COMPROMISE

(NOTE.—This is the first in-depth interview with Brainerd Holmes to be published since he gave up direction of the Nation's multimillion manned space program to join Raytheon.)

(By Donald White)

He does not look like the kind of man who, for nearly 2 years, headed the Nation's manned space flight program.

He does not look like the kind of man for whom some of the biggest space-oriented corporations in the Nation were clamoring.

Which just goes to prove—once more—that appearances are deceptive.

You have only to talk to D. (for Dyer) Brainerd Holmes for about 30 seconds before doing a mental doubletake. He's the man all right. Which of course is one reason why Raytheon feels so pleased with itself these days.

For Holmes, who until last October held the post of Director of Manned Space Flight for NASA, chose Raytheon. Why?

Speaking with a frankness that sometimes makes Raytheon's public relations men wince, Holmes first tells why he left the NASA post in which he was responsible for disbursement of millions of dollars.

"I am not a wealthy man, unfortunately. You take a tremendous financial licking serving an agency like NASA. With Project Mercury over and Gemini far away it seemed time to make a break."

One thing Holmes did get with NASA "because of my job and not necessarily to my personal credit" was a lot of free publicity. He had many offers from industry, among them his alma mater, RCA, and from

universities who wanted him as dean of their engineering schools.

Money was a consideration, but not the major one. "Every bit as important was to be able to say I helped to accomplish this thing or that, or in creating it.

"This ruled out most of the conservative ventures where volume is so large that no one man in my sort of position could influence the company."

Holmes also considered the "faster dollar" there might be in buying and selling. "But it would have been difficult looking back 10 years from now to find something I had created."

Consequently, the field of choice was narrowed and Raytheon turned out to be "a happy compromise."

How is it working out?

"This is where I intend to retire," Holmes says.

One other thing may have influenced his choice—sailing. He'll talk about it at the drop of a hat and can't wait to sample New England's coastal waters in his 46-foot Concordia yawl.

Holmes is a senior vice president at Raytheon and one of the four horsemen of top management. The others are Charles F. Adams, president; Tom Phillips, executive vice president, and George Ingram, senior vice president.

Until February Holmes managed the company's Space and Information System Division. Now he is moving into the whole company structure. In his new position he will concentrate more on the Government side of business (80 percent of the total).

"I'd like to see a nicer balance—say between 30 and 40 percent commercial business," he says.

Of Raytheon's future he declares, "I am very optimistic. I would not be here if I were not. Few firms have so much in-depth potential. And to a large extent it is untapped."

Has the switch from the Nation's moon-mission spotlight to private industry been hard?

"It's an adjustment alright. My associations with the people of NASA were very close. I still see them often. It was tremendously stimulating because of its scope and general purpose."

Now that he is sitting on the sidelines, does the man-to-the-moon-by-1970 project still appear realistic?

"The timetable now is tougher than it was, but still possible," he maintains.

Though he says there were few cases of industrial sloppiness during Project Mercury he feels quality and reliability will have to be imporved despite costs.

"That is why some of Defense Secretary McNamara's attempts at better contracting procedures are valid." Holmes is all for a return to the fixed-price system, says the cost-plus system was born of the urgencies of war, has no place nowadays and is generally bad for industry.

"A push toward incentive contracting is highly desirable," he says.

George Junior Republic Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unique organizations in the United States is the George Junior Republic. It is a nongovernmental organization that fills a gap which government has never been able to bridge. The George Junior Republic is a nonprofit organization, supported by a group of dedicated people in New York, whose purpose is to rehabilitate the lives of troubled, adolescent boys and girls. The Junior Republic bases its operation on a unique system of education and training through individual effort and complete self-government. Its young "citizens" run the municipality in the fullest sense, assuming responsibility for their own classroom and vocational programs, holding their own elections, running their own courts, while at the same time teachers and psychologists help them unscramble complex problems of adjustment and growth.

Founded in 1895, housed in 24 buildings, on 900 acres in the Finger Lakes region of central New York State, with a staff of over 100 employees, serving 185 boys and girls from 13 to 21, the Junior Republic performs miracles by taking a youngster who, when he comes to the community seems hopelessly antisocial and destined for a life of drift and despair, crime and narcotics, and launches him forth anew in the world as a purposeful, thoughtful, responsible, young American.

These days we hear much about poverty and adolescent problems. The George Junior Republic is one of many non-governmental, citizen-supported organizations that is really doing something about it. The organization deserves much more financial support than it is getting and I would hope that one day government can assist because the demands upon the organization far exceed its financial capacity. The supporters of the George Junior Republic have been extremely generous, but there is a limit to private philantrophy.

Last week I had the pleasure of speaking before the annual meeting of the George Junior Republic Association in New York City. The meeting was pleased to hear very significant and important talks by Donald S. Stralem, chairman of the board of directors of the association, and by George Ross, president of the Citizens Government of George Junior Republic. Both of these talks deserve the widest possible reading and it is with that thought in mind that, with the consent of the House, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS BY DONALD S. STRALEM, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, GEORGE JUNIOR REPUBLIC ASSOCIATION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 16, 1964

Congressman LINDSAY, Mr. Citizen President, fellow directors, and friends of the George Junior Republic I greet you all and thank you for being with us today. Mark Twain once called the annual meeting "a traditional occasion for a solemn statement compounded of equal parts of self-satisfaction and saliva." I'm afraid my remarks may not refute that illustrious observation. However, in expressing sufficient pride in what our organization has achieved in the past 12 months, I will try to add the right dash of modesty and self-challenge, and relate them to what still needs—urgently—to be done.

There have been few periods in the Republic's long, living archive when it was so fully active with ideas, plans, and accomplishments. In an overtense world buffeted by change, this is at it should be. It is hard to argue the fact that the urgency of the Republic's work with youth could not be greater than it is today. Nor is there any question that differences between the generations could be any greater. The teenager is being exposed to society's vastly new problems. The sources of his difficulties and tenisons are entirely different from those of a generation ago, and these differences produce differences of outlook as well. Twenty-six million young people in the United States will be coming of age, in the next 10 years, projecting their ideas and goals into the mainstream of American life. It will be 40 percent more than the number who became adults in the fifties. What will be the net effect on our society of this flood of new adults? Will we, as a nation, benefit by their idealism and skills, or will they serve to diminish the country's moral conscience and productivity. I do not think we can predict the secrets of the coming years with any accuracy, but certainly we can never cease to ask ourselves whether our leaders and educators and youth workers are molding, as astutely as possible, the attitudes and talents of this generation.

If the average American were asked to search his civic conscience for the most serious problem in our contemporary society, it is safe to say that adolescent unrest and indifference would be high on the list. It has assumed major and deeply disturbing proportions in recent years. I don't use the more common word delinquency because it is an unprecise term and can mean many things, frequently obscuring the real issues. We must be mindful always that the myriad ways of rebelling are externalization of emotional, social, and moral conflict in our mobile culture. It is difficult to gage the degree to which this social breakdown—for such it is—has grown, but it is amply clear that an alarming national situation exists which calls for bold and constructive action, at both the public and voluntary levels.

According to Premier Khrushchev, our country may be enjoying "the last years of its greatness." Although there is inherent superiority of our way of life, both in its philosophic principles and in its economic and political results, it s not enough to rest on past achievements. How well America will be able to continue meeting any challenge will depend in part on how effective we are in projecting the study principles of the past into meeting the needs of the future. Human dignity, economic freedom, individual responsibility, these are the characteristics that have distinguished our democracy in the past. These are the characteristics that we must call on to guide us through the disappearing present and the greatness of the future. In America, where the obligation of governing is vested in the people, the education of youth forms the very foundation upon which the Nation's democratic principles rest. The success achieved in educating the rising generation for the broad responsibilities of living will in large measure determine our ability as a people to deal effectively with the issues of our time. The obligation of educational institutions remains to assist young people in realizing their full potential as human beings, to live responsibly, and thus to do their part to create a better nation and a better world.

This, my friends, is how the George Junior Republic perceives of its responsibility and how it is fulfilling its primary purposes. Thus it assumes a uniquely significant and influential role in the American scheme of education. America's greatest virtues were crafted in the past, and the George Junior Republic continues to operate on the premise that the best hopes of education and character building can be found in democracy's early ways.

The philosophy of education at the Republic rests upon certain enduring principles. Let me restate them:

First, that education should be concerned with the total boy or girl;

That it should encourage thought and experimentation, insight and independence—rather than the mere accumulation of facts;

That education, especially for troubled youngsters, should help our youth understand that their growth is influenced by their environment and by the significant people in their life;

That education should be individualized to develop the separate identity, the unique potentialities of each young person; and

That the teenager, insofar as possible, should manage his own affairs, earn his own way, direct his own future, and find a place among fellow citizens in the spirit of an adult democratic community.

Any profile of the Republic's work and yearly progress should begin, of course, with these youngsters themselves, and with some true assessment of our benefit to them, not just theoretically but in individual, life-weighted terms. After fire destroyed two cottages in 1962, our student population was dropped from 155 to 123. Today, I'm glad to say, we have rebuilt one and completed two new and beautiful residential dwellings, which has enabled us to increase the student body to 165 boys and girls, with the prospect of 185 within a month or two. We have many of our board members to thank for making this kind of dynamic physical recovery possible. It is significant, I believe, to point out here that in the last 15 years, in keeping with the many demands made upon us, the Republic has increased its expenditures for plant and program development by approximately 3,000 percent.

But it is individuals we are concerned with always. Their achievements recede only too fast when one is challenged by the growing needs of an onrushing tomorrow. Let me cite some interesting current figures which plainly indicate just what is happening to some of the boys and girls who are now finishing their residence at the Republic* * * boys and girls, who, incidentally, came to us with complex and crippling problems. In June, we will graduate 28 youngsters, about one-sixth of our student population. Of those who will leave at that time:

Ten boys will go on to finish their education, six of them in college, four in high school.

Three boys will enter military service before going to college.

Eight boys will join the service and go into employment afterward.

Six girls will enroll in junior college.

One girl will go into employment immediately.

I think it is enormously gratifying that this graduating class will go down in the record book as further evidence that teenagers, no matter how confused or alienated, can be led to useful outlooks and responsible citizenship. Indeed, our results today with the Republic's children stand out in the long stretch of its history of service. We are proud of the fact that nowhere else in the field of educational therapy has the combination of character building with training for democracy found a more practical or successful expression.

We have been hearing a lot lately about school dropouts. Right now the condition is no doubt one of our society's most serious—and expensive—ills. The Republic's staff, in its many experiences with placement agencies all over the country, has come to recognize that a very large element of the youngsters who are labeled "dropouts" might more fittingly be classified as school "pushouts." For "pushouts" better describe the disturbing number of youngsters in our population, who in the turmoil of adolescence, in yearning for self-challenge, experimentation and real responsibility, become underachievers and classroom nonconformists—high in inherent capabilities but low in the motivation to learn from formal classroom experience. They usually have behavioral problems which multiply as they are pushed along through grammar school into high school, until the teachers and people in authority become exhausted by their disruptive influence and their disinterest. A great many of our schools are not in any position to understand or deal with them, so inevitably the climate of learning is preserved for the youngster who wants to learn, and the frustrated slow-learners are somehow induced to leave, expelled, or pushed out. The obvious tragedy is that so many of these so-called school dropouts, these rejects, have their origin in the vested, conventional American educational scheme. That they are competent—often highly intelligent—children who simply are not challenged and excited to learn is most distressing.

The George Junior Republic knows that the well-entrenched rules of American education cannot be overhauled without much more research and the most skillful of planning. The study and diffusion of proven ideas, such as we have, must, of course, be our continuing effort. Such efforts cost money. We are still stretching limited voluntary funds beyond ever-present capital and operational needs. We hope soon to secure funds for assessing in depth and experimenting with every part of our concept of growth through responsibility. Then we shall be able to spread with documented evidence the tried and proven methods of the Republic to more of the Nation. Our board of directors knows it would be derelict in its mission to society at large if it failed to push forward this aim with increased vigor.

You private citizens who are here today, who also share the conviction that this organization does contribute importantly to young lives and to the Nation, you also have an opportunity to help us make the George Junior Republic even worthier of regard. Beyond its daily activities in education and treatment, the Republic must enlarge its basic resources and assets for the bigger job. Important as these objectives are, they cannot be carried on in a physical plant which does not lend strength to their fulfillment.

We lack only some of the physical facilities to be a model social laboratory, in a field that crucially needs it. In terms of physical plant, we have seen an impressive amount of expansion and improvement within the last few years. Bright new classroom facilities in a magnificent academic building are now enriching the Republic's capabilities. A second school unit, as striking as the first, devoted to a scientific curriculum and incorporating a community library, a center of intellectual exploration, is almost ready. Only a shortage of available capital funds prevents its final completion.

Some of our biggest and most pressing physical needs still confront us. What are these essential needs? With our enrollment growing, our failing dining facilities are simply no longer serviceable. Double shifts are necessary to feed today's population. We must build a new community dining room. Neither can our young citizens make do any longer with the Republic's inadequate gymnasium and outmoded physical education facilities. These two new buildings are most essential right now to the maintenance of our program. In the language of banking, they are a "gilt-edge investment" in the future productivity of our services to youth. To build these two new units, we need over $500,000—an impressive amount yet small when compared with the enduring contribution it can make.

Under the pressures of inflation, with greater demands for service, with unmet capital and operating needs, nearly all privately operated schools—up and down the educational structure from the specialized agency like ours to the great universities—all face some form of economic decision. It is no secret that the scramble for available private contributions is fierce. Still, secondary education is the master key to opening up the possible resolutions of other social problems. The George Junior Republic has always been in the thick of this fundraising competition, and these days we have to row even harder to stay where we are. The world of business and foundation philanthropy gives away money because it has a moral as well as a self-serving responsibility to improve educational institutions at all levels for the benefit of society as a whole. The logical starting point for the George Junior Republic's more intensive fundraising efforts is and must be within the ranks of its board and friends. We can never rest on our oars, for our obligation to the agency we have chosen to serve was never greater nor more obvious. All of us should be unafraid to ask—in fact, proud to ask—people for some of their substance or for some of their interest and energy. I think that we all know that the theory, made popular on Broadway, that you can succeed in business without really trying, is here, off Broadway, really the bunk.

Friends, we here are actually the backbone of the George Junior Republic. We are entrusted with the best hopes and the worst fears of youth. We cannot be involved in a more meaningful work. I sincerely hope that all of you will continue to give this vital organization your abiding interest and loyal support. Help it to continue dealing affirmatively with its mandate to build and grow. Give the George Junior Republic the means of putting before more and more troubled young people and the Nation a true image of what, living and working together, they can make of this free life. Thank you.

REMARKS BY GEORGE ROSS, PRESIDENT OF THE CITIZENS GOVERNMENT, GEORGE JUNIOR REPUBLIC

Mr. Stralem, Dr. Forbes, members of the board of directors and friends of the George Junior Republic; it is a privilege for me to be present here this afternoon representing my fellow citizens. I bring you their best wishes and warmest greetings. Because you are all familiar with the Republic, I don't feel it is necessary to talk to you today about the actual structure of the Junior Republic or the philosophy which it follows. Instead, I would like to speak to you about the effectiveness of the program and the end product which it produces. I feel the best way to do this is by interjecting a personal note and sharing with you how I feel the Republic has prepared me for my later life.

One of the first lessons that I, as a new citizen learned, is that everyone at the Republic is on an equal basis. No matter what his or her background—whether it be a home of wealth or poverty—no matter what the race or creed or whether there has been past behavioral problems, equal opportunities are offered to all. From my very first days at Freeville, I was made to realize that whatever success or failure I might have would be completely dependent on the use I made of the opportunities that were available to me. I cannot say that I immediately put these opportunities to good use. My learning experience was actually a three-stage process.

The first stage was the discovering of how to live at, and accept the Republic itself, because I was not too happy with my being there. This actually took longer than you may think. The second stage was the setting up of goals for myself at the Republic in school, in the cottage, in the government, even in the work area. One of the

most important elements in this stage, having established the goals, was learning how to achieve them. This was the first important lesson which I think will be carried over to my later life. I came to realize that establishing goals was only half as important as learning how to reach them. Prior to my coming to the Republic I did little or nothing in school. I was completely disinterested. During this second stage of my life at the Republic my interest in the student government stimulated in me a desire to become a lawyer. To reach this goal I knew that an education was indispensable. It was then that I started to apply myself in school.

This was the beginning of the third stage—the formulating of goals for my later life, a law career, which then necessitated college and law school. Since this is my senior year in high school, I have made application for college and have been accepted. Two years ago this would have been the farthest thing from my mind. I was ready to quit high school with no thought of college.

I feel certain that in many other phases of my life at the Republic there has been this steady growth in my relationships with people, in my financial responsibility, work habits, and in many other ways that I won't realize until years after I have left the Republic.

The goal of the Republic is to prepare us to be successful adults. Success however is a difficult word to define. It has different meanings for many people. I feel that my Republic experience has taught me that success will be found in my being happy and content in whatever I do. That wherever I might be or whatever line of employment I might follow, success will come only with real work—and at times self-sacrifice. Happiness and contentment will come from my knowing that I have done my best. This to me will be success. It is for this reason that I feel that I am prepared for this kind of successful life more than the average teenager who has not had the opportuity of Republic training.

To all of you who made this possible for me, I wish to express my personal gratitude. For all the hundreds of other citizens, past and future, I say thank you. And for all who may be helped by us, the graduates of the George Junior Republic, again I say thank you.

Wisconsin Electric Co-op Delegates Speak Out Against Federal Power Commission Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the biggest registration in the history of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative was recorded at its 28th annual meeting, held March 30, 31, and April 1 in Madison, Wis. Some 550 persons representing rural electric systems in the 13 States served by WEC picked up badges for the 1964 convention of this association of rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives.

During the 3-day meeting, delegates passed a series of resolutions that express their thinking on a number of issues before the Congress and the Nation. The first of those resolutions was in support of passage of the legislation I have introduced to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from attempting to extend jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives. As you know from my previous comments on this subject, I am opposed to the current tendency of the FPC to "empire-build" at the expense of our rural electric systems.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have that resolution and a number of the others passed by the WEC delegates printed in the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, MARCH 30, 31, AND APRIL 1, 1964, 28TH ANNUAL MEETING

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Whereas the Federal Power Commission is now engaged in a process of hearing and investigation for the purpose of determining whether it properly may exercise its regulatory jurisdiction over electric cooperatives; and

Whereas neither the Federal Power Act nor the Rural Electrification Act grant or imply any such authority for this Commission, and the Congress of the United States on several occasions has been decisive in indicating it never intended this allocation of jurisdiction; and

Whereas this form of regulatory jurisdiction as a protection to the rights of consumers is superfluous and without meaning when applied to any membership organization which is owned and controlled by the members it serves; and

Whereas electric cooperatives already are involved with another Federal agency, the Rural Electrification Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we firmly oppose the assumption of such unwarranted authority over the affairs of electric cooperatives by the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to repeat its traditional opposition to this Commission's quest for jurisdiction in this field by passing favorably on legislation already introduced in each House, which clearly spells out this prohibition; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to act as promptly as it can, within the limits of prudent study and democratic process, in order that the electric cooperatives of this country may be spared the costly burden of continuing hearings, investigations, and court actions.

REA LOAN INTEREST RATE

Whereas the organized pressure which has been applied to the Congress in recent years in an effort to bring about an increase in the REA loan interest rate is mounting in intensity; and

Whereas this effort is based on the unsubstantiated claim that the Nation's electric and telephone cooperatives today are financially capable of assuming interest costs substantially higher than those presently attached to REA loans; and

Whereas the economic stability of electric and telephone cooperatives depends on providing a balancing factor to offset the obvious low level of revenues in the sparsely populated areas they serve, and the REA loan interest rate has been established to serve as such a factor; and

Whereas the electric and telephone cooperatives of the Nation, through their national association, are themselves initiating a comprehensive study to determine whether their general financial condition now warrants any substantial change in this interest rate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States delay any legislative action intended to exert an effect on REA loan terms, in order that the study currently in progress may develop the facts of the situation and provide a clear perspective of whatever balancing factors may still be required in order to preserve the stability of electric and telephone cooperatives.

ELIMINATING HATE

Whereas in his first address to Congress after assuming the duties of the Presidency, Lyndon B. Johnson declared fervently that there must be an end to the "teaching and preaching of hate" if the ugly violence of assassination is ever to be erased from the American scene; and

Whereas this call for tolerance and genuine respect for the rights of all others has been repeated publicly in all sectors of the Nation by noted statesmen, educators, and religious leaders; and

Whereas it is our opinion that the persistent characterization in widely circulated periodicals, public speeches, and motion picture films of electric and telephone cooperatives as "socialistic," "taxpayer subsidized," and "threats to private enterprise" are calculated to create a public hatred for these cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of all who have recognized the desperate need to abolish hatred, and urge that they renew their call for tolerance and respect and specifically relate it to the fact that electric and telephone cooperatives, too, are entitled to freedom from character assassination.

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

Whereas President Johnson has revealed that a major goal of his administration will be to erase the "pockets of poverty" which have become chronic blots on the Nation's economy; and

Whereas it has long been the contention and official position of cooperative rural electrification that the most significant and lasting way to stabilize the economy of any area either at home or abroad, is to teach people practical methods of helping themselves; and

Whereas history reveals no more certain means of doing this, and at the same time preserving the dignity of people who are self-sufficient, than through the practice of the cooperative way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government encourage every practical use of the cooperative form in its campaign to eliminate poverty; and be it further

Resolved, That new stress be placed on this self-help method in the programs projected by both the Area Redevelopment Administration and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's rural areas development activity; and be it further

Resolved, That the electric and telephone cooperatives of Wisconsin be urged to assume the role of aggressive leadership that will secure for the areas they serve the fullest possible advantages of both of these proven Federal development programs.

REA LOAN ACCOUNT

Whereas establishment of an REA Loan Account would be consistent with capital budgeting and sound business practice; and

Whereas the existence of such an account would help to emphasize to the public that the REA program is one of fully repayable, interest-bearing loans, not grants; and

Whereas the total new loan fund request for 1965 for the electric and telephone loans program is $428 million, a figure that would be reduced to $81 million if the REA Loan Account were to be authorized and the principal and interest payments for fiscal 1964 and 1965 were placed in the account; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture is requesting that the Rural Electrification Act be amended to establish an REA Loan Account in order to properly reflect the Nation of this program and to comply with sound business principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the proposal of the Secretary and respectfully suggest that the Congress of the United States enact the amendment he suggests.

ADMINISTRATOR NORMAN CLAPP

Whereas our fellow cooperators in rural electrification and telephony have adopted resolutions in their local, State, regional, and national meetings expressing their unreserved administration and respect for Norman M. Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas we of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative are particularly proud as we observe in the Administrator's excellent record the complete justification of the confidence in his abilities and sense of dedication which we expressed at the time of his appointment to this position in 1961; and

Whereas we believe it is proper and appropriate that we express our continued confidence openly and publicly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we proclaim our full satisfaction with the administration of REA under the direction of Norman M. Clapp, and that we repeat our acknowledgment of his personal contributions to the orderly progress of this program by means of his devotion to the interests of rural America and the unquestioned high plane of integrity he has insisted upon in administering the affairs of this Federal agency.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Whereas the American Farm Bureau Federation and some of its affiliates have shown concern about the organization and operation of electric cooperatives; and

Whereas we feel deeply the fundamental need for understanding and reasonable unity of purpose between the various organizations created to serve the interests of America's rural population; and

Whereas we are committed to preserve, as economically and efficiently as the low-revenue nature of our operation permits, the organizations which supply electricity without profit to the members who own and control them, among which are many Farm Bureau members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we invite American Farm Bureau Federation officers, members and all others who may be interested or concerned to learn the full story of our electric and telephone cooperatives and their successful efforts to provide modern electric and telephone service without profit to our rural areas.

COMMEND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Whereas we are keenly aware of the excellent record in support of this program established by President Lyndon B. Johnson during his service in both Houses of Congress; and

Whereas we value fully the expressions of continued support which he has offered publicly since taking office as the Nation's Chief Executive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demonstrate in this way our sincere appreciation for the leadership so often exerted in our behalf in the past by President Johnson, and solicit his continued enlistment in the ranks of those who do not hesitate to endorse the record of selfless service fashioned by those involved in this national program of cooperative rural electrification and telephony.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas it is essential to the economic security of electric cooperatives, and to their continuing efforts to reduce their costs in order to provide more economical electricity to their member consumers, that they remain fortified with the right to generate their own supplies of electricity when other sources cannot or will not provide adequate amounts at reasonable terms; and

Whereas this right is without meaning unless it is implemented with the necessary REA loan funds that will make it possible for low-income electric cooperatives to establish their own generation and transmission facilities, and to add new capacity from time to time as the demand increases in the areas they serve; and

Whereas the inadequacy of such loan funds, or the unwarranted delay in processing and approving applications for their use, will serve to place electric cooperatives under the economic domination of the profit power companies, which in many areas are the only alternate source of supply; and

Whereas these companies, individually and through their associations, repeatedly have demonstrated their intention to eliminate the cooperative method of electricity distribution whenever and wherever they can: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to approve within the total of the REA appropriations adequate loan funds for the construction of generation and transmission facilities when these are needed by REA borrowers to insure a low-cost supply of energy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to reject new attempts to seriously hamper this program by restricting the authority of the REA Administrator to approve such loans, prudently but without time-consuming procedures that serve no important purpose other than to subject applicants to costly delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress move positively in this same direction by eliminating the cumbersome limitations on the Administrator's authority in this respect which were imposed by the language of reports originating in committees of both the House and the Senate.

ENCOURAGEMENT TO YOUTH

Whereas this program of cooperative rural electrification has been in existence in this State for more than a quarter of a century, and many of those who helped so energetically to establish it and maintain it are no longer physically able to spend themselves indefinitely in order to preserve it; and

Whereas a new generation is moving into the active ownership and control of electric cooperatives and still another generation within a very few years will have the most numerous representation within our membership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we devote our interested attention and concern to the matter of encouraging a lasting dedication to the principles of cooperation among these potential future owners of our systems, and an awareness of the importance of the Rural Electrification Administration in making possible our home-owned electric service; and be it further

Resolved, That we encourage progress in this direction by providing special programs for youth during all annual WEC meetings and during the annual meetings of our local electric cooperatives.

REA APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the National Telephone Cooperative Association have demonstrated repeatedly in the past that their painstaking surveys of loan fund requirements of their members are impressively accurate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress is urged to appropriate REA loan funds in accordance with the amounts these studies show to be necessary for fiscal year 1965, and REA administrative funds as requested in the President's budget; and, be it further

Resolved, That in appropriating these funds the Congress and its committees refrain from the imposition of burdensome restrictions which may well limit the REA Administrator in the performance of his duties to the extent that such funds can not be utilized with full effect in the rural electrification program.

EFFECTIVE MEMBERSHIP AND CITIZENSHIP FOR WOMEN

Whereas we recognize a need for concerned and informed citizenship to protect our rural electric systems; and

Whereas the women have expressed a desire to accept their share of the responsibility by more active participation in support of our rural electric system; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our appreciation to the Wisconsin Electric cooperative for their recognition on this year's program of the potential role of women in support of our program; and, be it further

Resolved, That we commend NRECA for the appointment of a coordinator of women's activities and recommend cooperation with her efforts on all levels; and, be it further

Resolved, That we urge rural electric systems to encourage participation of women in the work of education of members and community in the philosophy and principles of electric cooperatives and in public affairs which supports our program.

WHOLESALE FOR RETAIL RATES

Whereas the establishment of separate rate classifications applicable to the sale of energy at wholesale for resale to rural electric cooperatives has been firmly established by a long standing custom and precedent based upon sound cost of service accounting principles, as well as by sound social and economic considerations and has been expressly approved by many State regulatory commissions and courts; and

Whereas the preservation of such separate rate classifications for sale of energy at wholesale for resale to rural electric cooperatives is essential to the sound development of rural electrification and is productive of benefits directly and indirectly not only to the ultimate patrons of such rural electric cooperatives but to the whole economy influenced by a healthy development of rural electrification; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Public Service Commission in its decision of January 10, 1964, in Docket 2-U-5624, held that the separate rate classification for wholesale for resale rates applied by Wisconsin Power & Light Co., to rural electric cooperatives, though lower than the wholesale rates applied by said company to its other wholesale for resale customer, is not discriminatory or unlawful, because justified by differences in cost of service to the two types of wholesale customers involved; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission staff in recent proceedings has called into question the application of separate and lower wholesale for resale rate classifications to rural electric cooperatives than are applied to other wholesale for resale customers threatening thereby a very serious economic blow to rural electric cooperatives and the future healthy development of their program and the reduction in cost of energy to ultimate rural electric patrons; and

Whereas a recent initial decision by a Federal Power Commission examiner in a case involving the wholesale supplier of Oconto Electric Cooperative, in which case said cooperative was not a party, holds that higher wholesale rates applied by said supplier to other wholesale customers are discriminatory and unlawful because not applied to Oconto Electric Cooperative and two other rural electric cooperatives in Michigan and in effect tells said supplier that such higher rates if applied to Oconto and said two other rural electric cooperatives would be lawful and reasonable at an increased cost to Oconto Electric Cooperative of nearly 23 percent and in excess of $43,000 per year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all members of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative join in their support of Oconto Electric Cooperative and other rural electric cooperatives in fighting this threat

of the Federal Power Commission and to establish firmly before the Federal Power Commission the recognition given by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission and by many other State commissions and courts that separate and lower wholesale for resale rate classifications to rural electric cooperatives are justified by sound cost of service principles as well as by sound economic and social considerations essential to the future welfare of rural electrification.

The Sino-Russian Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the increasing exacerbation of the dispute between the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties has prompted many people to take the euphoric view that the split will aid U.S. interests in the long run. Others have urged us not to take the rift seriously and treated the disputed as a Communist ploy to put us off guard.

A realistic approach to the problem appeared in a fine editorial in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune on April 16. The editorial points out that the dispute has deep historical roots and wisely cautions us to remain alert for possible shifts in policy. Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

THE SINO-RUSSIAN CONFLICT

Americans watch the controversy between Russia and Red China with doubt and hope.

The hope is that the controversy will cause a split between the Communist giants that will weaken the Communist cause throughout the world. The doubt is about the reality of the controversy.

Do the Russians and Chinese really mean the nasty things they say about each other or is the display of bad feeling a carefully staged act to lull the West into the belief that communism is so deeply divided that Communist union for attack on the West is impossible?

The answer probably is that the Russians and Chinese do mean what they say. Thus the display is not an act. The probability that it is sincere, however, does not mean that the West can rely for security against communism on deep and lasting ideological division between Russia and China.

Indeed, the ideological difference probably is only incidental to the basic difference.

The historic fact is that Russia and China are natural enemies.

Russia, although geographically huge, is traditionally expansionist primarily because it instinctively seeks ocean ports. As long ago as the 17th century the czars pushed Russia's frontiers eastward through Siberia into conflict with the Chinece Empire. In the 19th century the Russians took advantage of the weakness of Manchu Emperors to impose treaties under which China had to yield vast Far East territories to Moscow. At the Yalta Conference, Stalin agreed to enter the war against Japan only if he got substantial territorial concessions from Chiang Kai-shek. Under American pressure, China granted the concessions.

Stalin did not support Mao's Communist war on Chiang Kai-shek, did not recognize his regime until the day after the new govment was proclaimed. Then, because he was dealing with fellow Communists, he had to give up Russian penetration of Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang. Under a mutual assistance treaty with Red China, Moscow was careful not to help build great strength for Peiping.

Great strength for Red China would mean Chinese effort to regain territories lost to Russia by treaties imposed on the weak Manchu Emperors—territories extending from Vladivostok northward along the Pacific for about a thousand miles and almost as far inland as the Amur River, incorporating Russia's Far East industrial centers of Komsomolsk and Khabarosvsk.

In this national rivalry for territory the ideological conflict appears as both a cover of the real controversy and as a means of strengthening the parties to it. Both Russia and China are evangelists for their different interpretations of Communist philosophy. Each is trying to win Communist states to its side to gain the power and prestige that accompanies leadership. Each actually is trying to strengthen itself for direct conflict between them.

Victory for China in this seemingly ideological conflict could push Russia into alliance with the West. But a chance to deal the West a destructive blow could temporarily unite Russia and China with the bonds of common Communist purpose. This is a possibility the West must be continually alert to. A power struggle between philosophical kin, like a family spat, can always be put off while the quarrelers dispose of a nuisance both recognize.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Prescription for Hospitals: Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a series of five articles outlining today's hospital problems appeared in the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., from March 29, 1964, to April 2, 1964.

The articles were written by Ralph Soda, who did an excellent job in reporting and analyzing one of our Nation's serious problems.

The Daily Home News and Mr. Soda should be commended for this outstanding series, which has received praise from many individuals and groups. The series was well written, informative and comprehensive and called: "Prescription for Hospitals: Dollars."

In the hope that this five-part series will make Members of Congress more aware of the problems facing hospitals today and perhaps increase our interest in helping to find a solution, the articles will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in five instances. The first is called: "Hospitals: Hour of Crisis."

PRESCRIPTION FOR HOSPITALS: DOLLARS—HOSPITALS: HOUR OF CRISIS—PART 1

(By Ralph Soda)

Don't look now, but your hospital is sick.

The strain of carrying the indigent patient load without receiving adequate reimbursement for so many years has taken its toll.

The financial lifeblood of the hospital is draining away. It needs a new dollar transfusion. But there are no donors.

PUBLIC CLAMOR RISES

Public resentment to the hospital has risen in proportion to the spiraling rise in hospital costs, the increase in hospitalization insurance rates, and the staggering need for more improvements, better equipment, more beds.

In short, the patient is critical and in hospital jargon * * * "going bad."

But the public for its own sake cannot ignore the situation for long. This year one out of every eight patients in the Twin County Area will go to a hospital. Then the hospitals' problem becomes his problem.

What caused the sickness? Is the public criticism of hospital costs justified? Are hospital costs too high?

THE OTHER SIDE

Discussing the last two questions, an official of the New Jersey State Hospital Association says, "No." He was emphatic.

"Why doesn't someone have the guts to come straight out and write that hospital costs aren't too high?" he asked when interviewed in connection with this series.

Biased? No. Our hospital man is sincere in his belief that hospital costs aren't too high and he has some convincing facts to prove it.

But equally sincere is another man with a few grim facts of his own that support the opposite view.

For years, JO and his wife labored long, hard hours at their small neighborhood grocery in South Amboy. To say that they prospered would be an exaggeration, but by dint of industry and thrift they managed to scrape together a sizable enough nest egg in preparation for that day when they could "take it easy."

When the day came, they sold their little business, bought a small home in Edison and settled down to a comfortable, if not luxurious, retirement. And then it happened. JO's wife fell ill with a rare kidney ailment that was not immediately diagnosed.

By the time the illness was identified, expensive specialists' fees had gnawed deeply into the couple's savings. Then followed a long, and even more expensive stay in the hospital where the needed intensive care and special drugs spiraled costs to an average of $80 a day. * * * and JO had no hospitalization insurance.

A TRAGIC ENDING

In the end, his wife died. Their modest fortune was wiped out. JO—now 68 and in poor health himself—went back to work.

Ask him today about hospital costs and he'll give you an opinion far different from that voiced by the hospital spokesman quoted above.

Who then is right? Actually, both are. Our hospital man can show you down to the last penny—the last decimal point—that hospital costs are justified. But, at the same time, he'll admit quite frankly that in the case of JO's wife and similar self-paying patients, the hospital bill was, in all probability, too high.

A MATTER OF ECONOMICS

In other words, JO's hospital bill was more than what it actually cost the hospital to care for his wife. A shocking admission? Perhaps. But to understand it requires a knowledge of basic hospital economics.

There are three kinds of hospitals:

Voluntary hospitals, nonprofit organizations run by a governing board of community leaders who serve without pay, such as Middlesex General Hospital, Perth Amboy General Hospital, Princeton Hospital, St. Peter's General Hospital, Somerset Hospital, Middlesex Rehabilitation Hospital and South Amboy Memorial Hospital in this area.

Government hospitals operated by Federal, State, or county governments and of which Roosevelt Hospital and the Veterans' Hospital in Lyons are examples in this area.

Proprietary hospitals, run by an individual, partnership, or corporation and operated for a profit.

PATIENTS FOOT THE BILL

The hospital receives some money from grants, donations, and fund drives but most of the income comes from the patient. Ideally, the donations are reserved to finance capital improvement expansion, the purchase of new equipment and research. The money paid by the patient is supposed to cover the actual costs of operation. But it doesn't always happen that way.

Patients come in three varieties, too:

The Blue Cross, or other insurance patients, with prepaid hospitalization insurance.

The self-paying patient, like JO's wife, who pays out of private funds.

And the indigent patient, who has no insurance and no money of his own with which to pay hospital costs.

WELFARE FALLS SHORT

Here's the rub. Although some form of welfare or governmental assistance is available to the hospital to reimburse it for the costs of caring for the indigent, this assistance in the Twin-County area doesn't even pay half the actual cost to the hospital.

Blue Cross pays the cost of the patient's treatment but it does not pay the hospital's charge, which is the actual cost of caring for the patient plus a small amount to cover losses.

For example, assume that in the same room with JO's wife was a woman with Blue Cross and in the bed next to her was a medically indigent woman. Assume all required the same care treatment and the hospital charge as $40 a day for each.

But Blue Cross would only pay $37 a day for its patient, and the donations for indigent care to the hospital amounted to only $20 a day. The hospital is left holding the bag to the tune of $23 a day and you can't go on losing that kind of money and stay in business.

The result is that the hospital hikes the bill of the self-paying patient to make up some of the deficit and uses needed development or expansion funds to pay the rest.

So JO paid extra because somebody else didn't pay at all, or, at best, didn't pay enough. This fact is even harder to accept when you realize the unlucky self-paying patient also helped pay the taxes that financed part of the indigent's bill.

BLUE CROSS SEEKS RATE INCREASE

Not even the patient with prepaid hospitalization can afford to be complacent. Right now a lively debate is raging over an application by the New Jersey Blue Cross for an average 32.6-percent increase in rates. There are many who claim the rates are already too high. But Blue Cross counters that it needs the increase to keep solvent in the face of increasing hospital costs and hospital usage.

Here is an example of how hospital costs have risen in this State. In 1958 the average New Jersey Blue Cross hospital cost was $27.44 a day. Last year it was $36.27 a day and in its current application for an increase Blue Cross estimates it will go to about $40.75 a day in 2 years.

Although the Blue Cross average last year was $36.27 a day, the average daily charge by hospitals in this area was $40 a day. For instance, at St. Peter's General Hospital the figure was $36.86 a day; at Middlesex General Hospital, $39.71; and at Princeton Hospital, $41.90.

CHARGES DUE TO SKYROCKET

All are expected to climb over the $41 a day mark this year. And, in the words of the carnival barker, "Brother, you ain't seen nothin' yet."

A survey of 98 hospitals in the New York Metropolitan area indicates that by 1967 the average cost per patient will be about $55.35.

This is the predicament both the hospital and the public find themselves in today. As Sister Dorothy Reece, administrator of St. Peter's General Hospital, expressed it in her annual address to the board of directors, "Will hospital care become a luxury in the next 10 years?"

PRESCRIPTION FOR HOSPITALS: DOLLARS—THE HOSPITAL'S STAFF OF LIFE AND MODERN EQUIPMENT PUSH MEDICAL COSTS EVER UPWARD—PART 2

(By Ralph Soda)

Hospitals are like barbershops.

Until such time as someone invents a machine you can stick your head into, press a button and get a haircut, it will continue to require the services of one barber to trim one head of hair at a time.

And until such time as someone invents a machine to take your temperature, rub your back, do your laundry, cook your meals, adjust the light, smile good morning, and say good night, it will continue to require the services of two and a fraction employees to care for every patient in the hospital.

The analogy is Jack Owen's, executive secretary and vice president of the New Jersey Hospital Association. And it's a good one.

For automation has been no more successful in reducing the number of employees in the hospital than it has been in ousting Joe the barber from his tonsorial parlor.

NEED MORE PEOPLE

On the contrary, it has had the opposite effect. A new improvement in medicine, a new piece of equipment, usually means the employment of a new, trained technician to operate it.

And it is this ironic fact of hospital life that hospital men find most frustratingly difficult to get across to the public.

"They always compare us with hotels, or industry," one hospital official lamented, and it's not a valid comparison at all. They see the similarities but ignore the basic differences."

The differences are these:

Two-thirds of every hospital dollar—two-thirds of every dollar you pay for hospital bills—goes for salaries and wages. Industry, according to a Middlesex General Hospital bulletin, spends approximately one-third of every dollar for wages.

A hospital must be staffed, ready for an emergency, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. To do this requires the services of approximately 2.5 employees for every patient. Many of these people, such as the dietitian, pharmacist, pathologist, lab technicians, housekeeping staff, and administrative personnel, are never seen by the patient. But they're there.

Hotels, the service industry with which hospitals are most often compared, require one employee for every four guests. So next time you hear that worn lament—"I could have gotten a suite at the Waldorf for what I paid the hospital"—take it with a grain of salt. If a hotel had to maintain the same ratio of employees to guests as the hospital does employees to patients, chances are you'd be spending your vacations at home.

PERSONNEL TURNOVER

But the big problem with hospital personnel is the high turnover. For years hospital wages were notoriously low, resulting in a large and frequent turnover of personnel.

Gradually hospitals have been trying to raise wages to a point where they are more competitive with salaries paid employees in other industries.

Some progress has been made but a large gap still exists. For instance, the annual starting salary of a registered nurse in this area is several hundred dollars less than the beginning teacher's salary. And the nurse works weekends, at nights and 11 months a year. The teacher works about 9 months a year, Monday through Friday.

In the annual report of Princeton Hospital last month, the hospital's administrator, John W. Kauffman, had this to say about the turnover problem:

"Our overall personnel turnover percentage," he said, "dropped 10 points to 55.5 percent with full-time personnel turnover at 41.5 percent."

Kauffman described this as a "significant improvement" in personnel stability. And he wasn't kidding. For hospitals this is rockbound stability, compared to what they've known.

COSTS WILL CONTINUE TO RISE

So until somebody invents a machine to replace people in hospitals, costs will continue to rise, at least until salaries are truly competitive.

In the words of Owen: "If machines could save a human life, if equipment could practice medicine, the cost of hospitals would be reduced by 60 percent."

Which brings up another irony of hospital life. Actually, someone has invented a machine of sorts to substitute for the costly hospital employee.

It's a bed, a mechanical bed.

Press a button and you're raised to a sitting position. Press another and a hidden table rolls up obligingly in front of you. A twist of a dial will expose a gleaming, private sink of which you can wash your hands, or draw a glass of water.

A little more complicated adjustment and, lo, there's that old, familiar hospital acquaintance, the bedpan, still recognizable despite a few fancy, jet-age, sanitary embellishments.

They show this multitalented robot at hospital conventions with a beautiful model as a demonstrator. They extoll its virtues, emphasizing the savings in wages which would accrue to the hospital equipped with such beds. Everyone agrees that they are wonderfully practical contraptions.

But the darn things won't sell. Why? "The patients don't like them," says Robert S. Hoyt, director of Perth Amboy General Hospital, "particularly the women."

So there you have it. One place automation could save money in a hospital and it's no go.

But elsewhere in the hospital, machines more than hold their own. These are the miracle machines, the revelutionary new lifesaving devices of which the heart-lung is an example.

This famous unit, which pumps and purifies blood during heart surgery costs $12,000 and this does not include the salaries of the trained technicians needed to operate it.

STANDS IDLE FOR DAYS

It might stand idle for days without being needed. But when it is, it could save a life. And so the hospital must have a heart-lung machine.

There are dozens of similar miracle machines, machines that start stopped hearts, take over for the kidney and deliver X-ray pictures in minutes.

Each one requires its own highly trained technicians—some as many as 18—and each technician demands a salary commensurate with his skills.

People rarely give this expensive equipment a thought until they, or a loved one, need them. And then woe to the hospital that can't supply the right miracle machine at the right time.

Even the much maligned hospital bill doesn't truly reflect this expense. For example, one area hospital recently set up an operating room for a gallbladder operation. On each piece of equipment needed for the operation a sign was hung designating the price of that piece of equipment. The total—$25,000.

And this did not include the salaries of the half dozen or so skilled professionals needed to operate the equipment and perform the operation.

And there's the recurring expense of improvements to the physical plant that hospitals must contend with, a fact the patient seldom takes into consideration when trying to figure out why his bill is so high.

But hospitals are constantly under pressure to expand—to get the patient out of the hallway and into a room—and this is expensive.

Just to paint a room costs a hospital more than it does industry. The law requires that only a specbial fire resistant paint be used.

THE HIDDEN CHARGES

These are just a few of many, many things that put hospitals in an expensive class by themselves and are the hidden charges in your hospital bill. Of course some things can be done cheaper; it all depends on what you want.

As Paige L'Hommedieu, president of the Middlesex General Hospital Board of Trustees, expressed it: "You can have the best 1920 hospital around, if that is what you want. But this is 1964."

There is little doubt that people want their hospital to be the best 1964 hospital around. But it is doubtful that hospitals will ever attain that goal, as long as they continue to lose about a million dollars yearly in medically indigent care as they have been doing in Middlesex County.

PRESCRIPTION FOR HOSPITALS: DOLLARS—SICKNESS A LUXURY SOME CAN'T AFFORD—PART 3

(By Ralph Soda)

Jimmy was the sweetest kid you ever saw. But he was doomed to misfortune from the beginning.

Shortly before he was born, his father deserted and Jimmy's mother, emotionally shattered by the abandonment, was left to make her timid way alone in a world turned cold with hopelessness.

When the time for Jimmy's birth arrived, she was admitted to an area hospital. She had no money. She was what is known as a medical indigent—someone who can't afford to be sick.

When Jimmy was born it was found his liver would not function properly. His body couldn't retain nourishment from food and it soon became apparent that he was dying of malnutrition. His already stricken mother, unable to bear the strain of this latest misfortune, turned her back on the friendless reality of life as she knew it and was committed to a mental institution.

BACK IN HOSPITAL

But Jimmy, coddled by the nurses, the pet of pediatrists lingered on in the hospital for over 6 months. His condition improved and he was finally discharged in the custody of an aunt. But it wasn't long after that, that he developed a hip deformity and was back in the hospital for another lengthy stay.

Needless to say, the hospital was never reimbursed for the costly and intensive care given Jimmy and his mother. And there are thousands of Jimmies passing through hospitals in the twin-county area each year. It is the No. 1 problem facing hospitals—the big crisis.

Last year, such cases resulted in a loss of over $801,870 to the five volunteer hospitals in Middlesex County alone. Next year it is expected to jump to $900,000 and the year after that to $1 million.

That's $1 million worth of capital improvements, new equipment, research, administrative and medical education money that these hospitals will have to lop off their budgets and forget about.

That is a $1 million deficit that you—the public—may have to make up indirectly by increased hospital charges, larger fund drive donations to meet higher goals and, maybe, by having to put up with second-rate care because the hospital is financially unable to provide the first-rate care it would like to provide. Unless, of course, somebody does something.

Hospitals have been pleading for years for somebody to do something. And now the Middlesex County Board of Freeholders has joined in the chorus. Up to now the only

major aid available to the hospitals for the care of needy patients under the age of 65 has come from the freeholders. But when the hospitals went back at budget time this year to beg for an increase, one official let it be known that the freeholders were * * * "at the end of our rope."

HALF FOR WELFARE

Half of the board's $17 million budget goes for care to needy persons in one form or another. For medically indigents the county appropriated $850,000 in aid for 1963—$100,000 more than the previous year but still only half of what it is estimated the hospitals will need.

The freeholders say they can't afford these lavish grants much longer and it is plain that hospitals are in no condition to absorb such costs for any great length of time either. A classic example is the Chester Hospital in Chester, Pa.

Backed against the wall by increasing indigent patient care losses, the Chester Hospital was finally forced to bolt the doors of its emergency room and clinic, through which most of the medically indigent patients enter a hospital. The result was chaos. But at least it aroused public officials to the need for more help for hospitals. Now the State of Pennsylvania has a program of increased indigent aid for hospitals. But it was too late for the Chester Hospital. It has since been merged with another hospital.

NO STATE PROGRAM

In New Jersey there is no program of State aid to hospitals for indigent care. But Connecticut has a plan for full reimbursement of costs to the hospital. Minnesota has been paying full costs since 1955 and Idaho began to do the same in 1958. New York also has an aid program. And in Maryland a plan is in effect in which the State pays 80 percent of the hospital indigent costs and the counties 20 percent.

If such a plan had been in effect in New Jersey last year, the Middlesex County freeholders' appropriation for hospital aid would have been considerably lower and the hospitals would have received full reimbursement. There would be no crisis today.

But there is one hopeful sign. The freeholders see the need for some sort of State plan and are contemplating the initiation of such a program through the New Jersey Association of Boards of Chosen Freeholders. But so far, nothing yet has been done.

Also needed is a central clearing house of credit information for hospitals, preferably operated through a governmental agency such as the welfare department.

Hospitals now maintain their own credit departments to screen patients in an effort to determine which ones are truly medically indigent. But these credit departments do not have the legal right to check such things as a person's bank account, and consequently are ineffective. The welfare agencies, however, do have a legal right to this information.

Last year a young couple came to an area hospital where they planned to have a baby. They told the hospital admitting office that they had no insurance and intended to pay cash for the hospital's services. The hospital kept its end of the bargain and the baby was born. All the hospital ever got out of the couple was a token deposit. The major part of the bill today remains unpaid.

Subsequent investigation revealed that this same couple had had two other children in two other hospitals in the area. Neither were ever paid. Had there been a credit clearing house in operation, the last two hospitals victimized by that couple would have been forewarned that they were dealing with poor financial risks.

Hospitals are continually plagued with such people, known to the business world as deadbeats. Some go so far as to give false names and addresses when applying for treatment in outpatient clinics, receive their treatment and tell the hospitals to send them the bill.

There is not much a hospital can do about these deliquent bills. It can and usually does make a patient agree in writing to allow the hospital to garnishee his wages, if he fails to pay his bill. But this is seldom enforced. Nor do hospitals have the right of repossession available to business.

HOSPITAL IS STUCK

The car dealer can repossess that new car and the department store can take back the television set. But the hospital is stuck.

J. Harold Johnston of Highland Park, an official of the New Jersey Hospital Association, has a speech on this subject. He calls it: "You can't put the appendix back."

When the hospital has exhausted all efforts to collect on the delinquent bill, it's turned over to a collection agency. And for that service the hospital must pay 40 cents out of every dollar the agency is successful in collecting.

It's an expensive way to get something that belongs to you but then a half of loaf is better than none. And hospitals have been living for years with financial malnutrition. But they can no longer survive on half of the indigent care loaf.

"Just reimburse us for what we spend on the medically indigent," said one official, "and we'll be more than satisfied."

Paige L'Hommedieu agrees. "Reimburse us 100 percent of our costs for the indigent. Give us what hospitals in some other States get and we'll be able to help control rising costs and improve our services at the same time."

If there is such a thing as a wonder cure for the financial malady hospitals suffer with today, it is what the hospitals in New Jersey want and what the hospitals in Connecticut, Minnesota, Idaho, and elsewhere have * * * 100 percent reimbursement of what it costs the hospital to care for the medically indigent.

PRESCRIPTION FOR HOSPITALS: DOLLARS IN HOSPITALIZATION PLANS NOT ALL THE SAME—PART 4

(By Ralph Soda)

Whenver people discuss hospital costs, that familiar gripe "Why doesn't my hospitalization insurance cover my hospital cost?" is bound to be heard.

The growth of prepaid hospitalization insurance is directly related to the high cost of medical care. More and more people are enrolling in hospitalization plans out of a genuine concern over rising hospital costs. And, ironically, the general confusion concerning prepaid hospitalization seems to rise in proportion to its increasing popularity.

There are two main types of hospitalization insurance—Blue Cross and commercial.

New Jersey Blue Cross, a nonprofit organization, does reimburse the hospital for all its expenses in caring for the Blue Cross patient, depending on the amount of services the subscriber buys in his contract.

Commercial plans, offered by private firms in the business to make a profit, set a limit on what they will pay clients for hospital services they purchase in their insurance plan. And these limited payments very rarely cover the full cost of the hospital's charge to the patient for these services.

So the patient with commercial insurance makes up the difference out of his own pocket.

The Blue Cross patient, on the other hand, pays the hospital nothing out of his own pocket except the cost of such personal extras as telephone and television, which Blue Cross does not pay and which are not an essential part of hospital expenses.

This is because Blue Cross has an arrangement with the hospital in which Blue Cross agrees to reimburse the hospital 100 percent costs to care for the Blue Cross patient.

In return, the hospital allows Blue Cross to audit the hospital costs to insure they are justified.

CHEAPER PREMIUM

Since the commercial firms, on the other hand, do not pay 100 percent of the hospital costs for all its clients, they can sell their insurance cheaper than Blue Cross.

The result is, where once there were more people with Blue Cross insurance than with commercial hospitalization, today the opposite is true.

CAN BOOMERANG

This craving of the public for cheaper hospitalization has sometimes worked to its disadvantage. Most commercial firms are reputable, reliable businesses that offer fair and sound plans. But there are a few exceptions, which the public would do well to be cautious of.

One such firm offered a policy with a very attractive premium and fairly good coverage. But down low—in the fine print—was a footnote that the policy was only applicable to diseases and ailments common to both sexes.

A man with prostate trouble, who is not given to the reading of fine print in tedious looking documents and whose wife is expecting a baby, could find himself out of luck with such a policy.

Fortunately, such extremes are the exception and it is generally conceded that prepaid hospitalization insurance, particularly Blue Cross, has been a boon to the hospital.

POOR RISKS

Hospital officials still remember that terrible time before Blue Cross when you could not even get a vacuum cleaner salesman into a hospital to demonstrate his wonder machine. Salesmen felt hospitals were as poor financial risks as the patients they served.

Today you can't keep salesmen away. They're eager to sell hospitals because they know money is now available. And it is available primarily because of Blue Cross.

The hospitals are the first to admit it. Yet they feel that Blue Cross could do a lot more. Specifically, hospitals want Blue Cross to pay a small amount in excess of costs, for use as a development fund.

Hospitals say they need such a fund to purchase new equipment, cover losses, and for research, improvements, and better facilities.

NO AGREEMENT

But Blue Cross won't buy it. "Why should we pay out our subscribers' money for a hospital development fund when we have no say in the direction or extent of that development?" remarked one Blue Cross official.

Hospitals and Blue Cross also find themselves at loggerheads when it comes to the auditing of hospital costs by the Blue Cross. The hospitals claim Blue Cross auditors are too prejudiced in favor of Blue Cross.

And Blue Cross counters that hospital auditors are too prejudiced in favor of the hospitals and against the public as represented by the Blue Cross patient.

In Maryland, they have solved this trouble by the appointment of an impartial council to audit costs for Blue Cross and the hospital. This 10-member council has civic leaders and representatives of business, industry, labor and the medical and legal professions. They are appointed by the Governor.

WANTED HERE

Many people would like to see a similar council in New Jersey. But until then, Blue Cross remains the only organized body which mounts a vigilance on hospital costs. And for this reason alone, even its competitors—the commercial insurance company—is happy to see Blue Cross still around.

But this is only a vigilance, it is not a control. Hospitals are here to provide medical care. The decision of how much medical care they provide rests solely with the hospital physicians. In this they reign supreme. Neither the administrator nor the trustees can in conscience counteract them. The doctors are the professionals and the professionals should know.

Therefore, the success of the administrator in controlling the costs in his hospital depends largely upon the demands and requirements of his attending physicians.

The New Jersey Blue Cross Rate Study Committee in its final report dated 1960 described this as similar to national defense.

MILITARY VIEW

"The professional soldiers are arguing for unlimited expenditures for defense, while the President attempts to establish a balanced budget and insists they live within appropriations.

"There is, however," the report says, "no comparable brake on hospital expenditures for medical care."

But there are many suggestions about what should be done to apply the "brake."

The New Jersey Hospital Association feels the brake should come in the form of organized planning to improve hospital utilization and prevent duplication of hospital facilities and expenses in a community.

Princeton University Prof. Herman M. Somers, who has made a study of the subject, feels the major businesses and industries—the largest buyers of hospitalization insurance, through group plans for their employees—should take some action, if only to hold down the expenses of their investments in hospitalization.

STATE CONTROL

Middlesex County Freeholder George J. Otlowski would like to see hospitals regulated like public utilities by the PUC.

And there's socialized medicine, the spectre that is always around to haunt the medical profession.

The study committee sees Government intervention a distinct possibility if Blue Cross and Blue Shield rates should continue to rise to the point where they price themselves out of the budget of the average citizen.

And it sees the medical profession—the doctors who most directly affect rising costs by deciding what facilities a hospital should have—as the only logical brake to rising hospital costs short of socialized medicine.

In its final report, the committee stated flatly that if it wishes to stop socialized medicine from becoming an accomplished fact in this country, the medical profession must "accept the responsibility of devising controls on the monopoly it exercises in the areas of hospital utilization and hospital medical care."

OTHERS NEEDED

These are just a few of the controls some feel are needed to hold down rising hospital costs.

That there is need for some control, almost everyone agrees. But the enigma remains: What form should the control take?

The Blue Cross Rate Study Committee suggests it is an enigma the legislature as well as the medical profession would do well to ponder.

And even a cursory observer of the financial plight of hospitals and the rising cost of medical care would have to agree.

PRESCRIPTION FOR HOSPITALS: DOLLARS—RISING HOSPITAL COSTS AFFECTING ALL, SICK OR NOT—PART 5

(By Ralph Soda)

You don't have to be sick to feel the pinch of rising hospital costs.

You can feel it in the increasing hospitalization insurance premiums you're paying. And you can feel it in the contributions you are being urged to make to annual hospital appeals and new hospital building fund drives.

Currently in the Middlesex-Somerset-Monmouth County area alone, there are drives for construction of three hospitals—the 200-bed John F. Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Edison, the 100-bed Raritan Valley Hospital in Green Brook, and the 100-bed Bayshore Community Hospital in Holmdel.

And the regular fundraising compaigns of existing hospitals continue to total many millions of dollars.

You may have wondered just how long this could go on without somebody calling some kind of a halt. Well, you weren't alone.

SCREENING GROUP FORMED

The question of just how much more the public can be expected to bear has been of continuing concern to hospital people themselves over the years, and it resulted last week in the formation of the Health Facilities Planning Council of New Jersey, Inc.

Don't let the name fool you. The council is a saving agency, not a spending one. It's the first statewide organization ever formed for screening hospital building plans, and its formation is the brightest beacon to appear on the financially fogbound New Jersey hospital horizon in years.

Specifically, the council will evaluate existing hospital facilities throughout the State and screen plans for the construction of new facilities and the establishment of new services.

KNOWS OF PRESSURE

"The council," says J. Harold Johnston, its executive director and the man who launched it for the New Jersey Hospital Association with the aid of a $50,000 grant from the U.S. Public Health Service, "recognizes the fact that wherever hospital beds or facilities are provided there is pressure to use them whether or not similar facilities may be available just down the street."

"We want to insure," he said, "that there are adequate services to meet the public health care needs in every locality. But we also want to make absolutely certain that there is not one unnecessary or duplicative hospital bed or cancer laboratory, for example, in that locality."

In other words, the council will discourage construction of new hospitals, expansion of existing ones, or provision of new services that are not needed. And any observer of the hospital scene in New Jersey will have to agree it's about time.

When a hospital service is duplicated unnecessarily, the public usually loses. For instance, if all the hospitals in a particular area compete to see who can provide the most elaborate cancer laboratory, the need in the area for equally extensive facilities to treat another major disease may go begging.

And every time an unnecessary hospital or an unnecessary expansion of a hospital is built, the cost of medical care in that area is apt to go up. It's a matter of hospital economics. It costs a hospital an estimated $10,000 to $12,000 a year to maintain one hospital bed, occupied or empty.

The more empty beds a hospital has, the more money it loses. Therefore, if a new hospital draws patients away from an existing hospital to the point where the older hospital loses money, the latter must increase charges to cover the deficit.

A PRIMARY DUTY

Determining the need for new hospitals will be one of the most important functions of the council. There are no set rules for making such a determination. The U.S. Public Health Service formula for Hill-Burton aid is 1.5 beds per 1,000 local population, provided this does not exceed the recommended statewide ratio of 4.5 beds per 1,000 population. But just because the population of an area justifies construction of a hospital under this formula, there may not be enough physicians, nurses, or other professional personnel available to adequately staff that new hospital and the existing ones.

Nor does it follow that just because a hospital is crowded, just because some beds may have to be moved into a hall for lack of rooms, that a new hospital is needed. Maybe it would be more economical for everyone if an addition were built on the existing hospital. At least that's the opinion of Johnston.

PLUS OTHER ANGLES

"There are many, many factors—from the staff requirements down even to the traffic pattern in the area—that must be considered before even the need for a new hospital can be accurately determined, let alone the community's ability to support it," he said.

As it is, there are already stringent regulations governing construction of hospitals in New Jersey. For one thing, you must substantiate the need for a hospital if you hope to qualify for the Hill-Burton program, the Federal assistance plan for hospital construction and modernization.

And before the State department of institutions and agencies will grant a license you must agree to follow rigid construction standards, to provide adequate care and facilities and to maintain an emergency room and clinic for treatment of all persons, regardless of their ability to pay.

HOSPITAL PEOPLE, TOO

Still, just the fact that the Health Facilities Planning Council was conceived would indicate a feeling among hospital officials themselves that stricter control of hospital construction is needed. It is no secret that some even hope the council's findings can lead to new laws providing these controls.

It must be pointed out, however, that the formation of the council is not to be misconstrued as meaning the proposed hospitals in Edison, Green Brook, and Holmdel are not needed. On the contrary, it is generally conceded that because of its continuing growth and organization of the Rutgers Medical School this area can support these institutions. But it is also conceded they could cause problems for existing hospitals, if only because of the need for more professional personnel.

BLAME IS WIDE

There is little doubt that hospitals contributed in part to their own malady. There is a suspicion they may have been too lax in admitting insured patients for treatment that could have been received in the doctor's office. And there is reason to believe they haven't been as adept in their financial housekeeping as they could have been.

But at worst these things only weakened the condition. There is no doubt that the virus which has struck the hospital low in New Jersey is the unreimbursed expense of caring for the medically indigent.

And the job of getting the patient back on his feet will probably require, besides effort from the patient, a legislative helping hand, an understanding public, and a cooperative medical profession. According to those who should know, the prescribed treatment should include:

First, 100 percent reimbursement of the cost of caring for the needy patient, similar to programs in other States.

A central clearinghouse of credit information, operated by an agency such as the welfare department, with full investigative powers to enable hospitals to separate the truly indigent from the pretenders.

An impartial council to audit hospital costs for Blue Cross similar to that in effect in Maryland.

Payment by Blue Cross into a hospital development fund.

Action by the hospital physicians to hold down costs, by discouraging unnecessary use of hospital facilities, and by controlling their own demands for increased services.

And finally, willingness on the part of the hospitals for self-discipline in expenditures and to cooperate with the new planning council to avoid duplication of services.

Spending of Tax Dollars—National Morality—Cabin Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a ranching family at Moose in Wyoming's scenic Teton Mountain area has for several months distributed an open letter type publication titled "Cabin Comments." I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the 20th issue of their letter, dated April 1.

In their publication, the Bettys give voice to many of the questions which are troubling Americans throughout the Nation, questions regarding the spending of tax dollars, and the deteriorating state of the national morality.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the April 1 issue of Cabin Comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CABIN COMMENTS

(By the Bettys)

APRIL 1, 1964.

We are proud to live in the United States and know that no other country in the world could hold the advantages and charms for us which this country does. There is no one in the world with whom we would change places. We realize full well that there are many in downtrodden, Communist-ridden, starving countries who would only too gladly change places with us. It takes money to support a country, and if it is our tax money and the tax money of others which helps to make this Nation good and great and strong, we think that no money anywhere could be spent more wisely. We would willingly give even more than is required of us if by so doing we could be assured that the United States would continue on the path which has made it the most civilized, the most humane, the most honest, the wisest of all nations.

But many doubts have been nagging us lately, and we are begininng to wonder if our tax money and the tax money of others really is contributing to this country's good. Could all the millions and millions of dollars which pour into the U.S. Treasury each year from the American public, we wonder, be contributing instead to the detriment of this country?

We have done no research on taxes and how tax money is spent. We are writing here only of things which we have witnessed with our own eyes, have read in reliable papers and magazines, or have heard. We realize that anything we may say in protest to the ways our tax money is being spent will make no effect whatsoever. Sometimes, however, making such a protest clears one's own conscience. Paying taxes, we know, is inevitable; wasteful use of much of taxpayers' money apparently is inevitable, too. But before April 15 we want to state that we are becoming alarmed and at times saddened by what we know. We are not resigned. We know we must bow before the inevitable, but we shall not do so submissively.

A person would be considered not only wildly extravagant but childishly simple if he bought a car worth several thousand dollars unless he first examined that car carefully and compared it with others as to appearance, durability, performance. Who would dream of buying a fur coat or a piece of jewelry worth the same amount without first inspecting that cost or that jewelry? But millions of Americans turn over comparable amounts of money or more each year to their Government and never question its use or its expenditure. They do not demand to see honest, good results come from their money. They simply hand the money over, forget it, and if they are prudent start saving for next year's handout. In the hands of scrupulously honest, conscientious Government officials this complete trust might be understandable, but in the hands of anything less, such trust is preposterous and unthinkable. And yet, all of us do it every year.

As long ago as November 1962, we were staggered to read the cost of maintaining the President in the White House. Over $2 million to protect the President and his house, 250 police force members, an office staff of nearly 300, and transporting the President with Boeing 707 jets, propeller-driven Executive transports, helicopters, a fleet of White House limousines, elaborate and expensive watercraft—at a cost in all to taxpayers of $10 million annually.

Last summer the President and his staff of over 100 people flew into this valley, on, what was called, a mission of conservation of natural resources here. For days before the President arrived, planes of all kinds flew in and out. It was reported that before the arrival of the executive plane, the President's fire engine was flown in at terrific expense so that in case his plane should catch fire, the flames could be quickly extinguished. A large hotel here was kept open beyond the season's closing date to accommodate the Presidential party. Someone even telephoned from Washington to see what time it was here in the valley as it was apparently too difficult for him to figure out the time differences across the country. We saw the great silver Presidential plane arrive at 6 o'clock one evening. Shortly after we saw three helicopters taking part of the Presidential party to the hotel. The next morning at 9, exactly on preannounced schedule, the helicopters flew back, and shortly thereafter the great plane rose into the air and left the valley. What could have been accomplished in that short time in regard to conservation, people in the valley wondered. But a few suspicions were confirmed when later papers and news magazines frankly stated that the trip, although called one for conservation purposes, actually was entirely political. We wondered what the cost of this elaborate but short trip had been and who had paid for it. It was without question the American taxpayers. If a tour is political in nature and intended primarily to win votes in coming elections, perhaps the party which would benefit by such a tour should pay for it. Perhaps it would be more honest if the President himself called such a trip political instead of having news magazines and papers make the announcement for him. But such evasion, even such subtleties in handling the truth, have grown common, and, what is discouraging, are accepted by the American public as natural and defensible.

We were disturbed to read recently of the incredible waste of the Air Force. Hundreds of thousands of dollars of furniture was bought when the furniture already in use was perfectly adequate. And this simply because there were some unspent funds in the Air Force treasury. Computer systems leased when new ones could have been bought and maintained for about half the cost of the leasing. Fifty million dollars, plus the interest cost, wasted annually in maintaining in stock such things as nuts and bolts when such things could be purchased almost anywhere when and as needed. Would Air Force officials who order such items or who are responsible for such expenditures of money be so ready to do so if the money came from their own pockets? Is not one doubly careful when handling the money of others? Does one not guard the interests of others with even greater caution than his own? And these are the things which sadden us—members of the U.S. Government and armed services who have become so willing to waste and fling about extravagantly money which the American public has worked hard to earn.

Everyone is familiar with offers to Republican Senators and their wives of as many as five trips abroad, all expenses paid, if when the Senators return they cast their influence in passing White House programs which are being met with opposition in Congress. This is not only a misuse of taxpayers' money but a deliberate attempt to bribe Congressmen to vote the way the Whie House wants them to vote. Not only do we dislike seeing our money being spent to send Congressmen on expensive and needless trips, but we dislike even more seeing our money spent for dishonest, corrupt purposes.

At the beginning of last month came the news of two employees of the Interior Department who said that they had been given no work to do since August. Their combined salaries totaled nearly $20,000 a year. One is gratified somewhat to know that there are two members of the Government who do not wish to see taxpayers' money misspent, even on their own salaries, but one wonders also why they waited nearly 7 months to make their state of idleness and waste known.

And then there were the radio and published news reports of how the President, in order to cut expenses, went around turning off lights in the White House. Psychologically this was a master stroke. There probably are few families in the country, the members of which have not been cautioned at one time or another by the head of the family or the breadwinner of the family "to turn off lights; save expense." Naturally when these millions of families read the report of how the President of the United States himself was trying to be careful about electrical expenses, they smiled with satisfaction that he, too, was in their class and wanted to help save their money. Later reports came through, however, that just as soon as the President left some of the White House rooms in darkness, one of his staff went around quietly and turned all the lights back on again. The expense of keeping a 100-watt bulb burning for 10 hours in Washington is less than 2 cents. Also taxpayers read not long ago that certain Government officials were being denied their use of tax-financed limousines and chauffeurs. These officials are permitted to have cars, but hereafter they must drive them themselves. All of this may sound impressive at first, but compared to the billions being spent, the turning off of a few electric lights, the denial of a few limousines and chauffeurs, important as any conserving of expense may be, is not too important and cannot make much difference in the public's tax returns next year. We wonder sometimes if these announcements of petty savings are not intended only as a sop to the taxpayers to try to prove to them that much is being done to save them money.

We cannot take too much stock in these intended sops, however, when we read in the March issue of one of the country's most respected magazines of the incredible waste in defense spending. Since 1954, for

instance, five billion dollars was spent on weapons which were proved either impractical or unnecessary. Work done in Navy yards has been proved by a Navy survey, the survey ordered for the purpose of trying to disprove what another accounting firm had discovered, that construction costs in Navy yards were 15 to 31 percent higher than construction done by private firms, repairs 10 percent higher, modernization 8 percent.

We are not impressed by the President's turning off lights in the White House when we read of elaborate entertaining by the Pentagon of Congressmen who are in positions to grant favors. Elegant breakfasts, gourmet dinners, fancy cocktail parties, transportation by liveried chauffeurs in limousines. Everyone in government seems to want to cash in on the lavish spending, the posh living, the wild extravagances at the taxpayers' expense. It recalls in a terrifying way another era in another country when the people were taxed beyond endurance to satisfy the extravagances and licentiousness of another government, and the cry flung to the oppressed citizens was "Let 'em eat cake." It brings sorrow and disillusion to think that there are high officials in this Government who not only will tolerate but themselves are willing to snatch all they can get to spend upon their selfish desires and wishes. The money is not theirs to spend in such fashion and was never intended to be spent in that way by anyone.

Nor are we impressed with the recent tax cut. We cannot rejoice about tax cuts of any kind until there is concrete evidence on the part of the Government that expenses and big expenses at that are being cut back first. If an individual finds that his expenses exceed his income, the only sensible answer to the problem is not in increasing expenses and cutting down income but in cutting expenses and increasing income. As Eisenhower said—never in the history of the world has an individual, an institution, or a nation spent itself into prosperity.

A year or so ago we were summoned by the Department of Internal Revenue to appear at a stated time, a stated place, in regard to our income tax returns of the year before. We entered a room filled with countless desks at each of which sat a man whose job it was to interrogate persons about their taxes. There were dozens of others like us who were called up one at a time, asked to be seated, and then the questioning began. We do not know what the attitude of the other interrogators was, but the man we drew had the attitude that we were naturally dishonest of course, hoped to cheat the Government, and were doing all we could to circumvent the law. He was insulting in his questions, even more insulting in the manner in which he asked them. For example, he questioned our expenditure of money for books necessary to our work. He said, "Why is it any more im, ortant for you to have these books than for the man on the street?" It so happened that we were teachers, needed books for which the school could not pay, had bought the books at our own expense in order that our classes could profit by them. We thought that at least we could deduct the cost of such books from our income tax, as indeed we could. But to be questioned in such a derisive, patronizing manner about this deduction as well as all others was insupportable. Finally we said in high resentment, "We are honest people. We have no idea of trying to cheat the Government. We have made deductions which it is stated in your own form we are entitled to make. If we have made a mistake, we shall be most happy to correct it. But we object strenuously to being treated in this manner." A shabbily dressed little lady who happened to be passing our desk at this moment, overhead what we had said, stopped a moment, and said in indignation. "That's how I feel, too. I'm a hard-working office clerk. I want the Government to have all from me it is supposed to have. But they've treated me here like a criminal who is trying to get by with something. I don't like it either."

The following year we decided to consult the Government's free service in making out our tax returns. We appeared at their offices at 7:30 or 8 in the morning, and already the line of people reached far down the long corridor. There were three desks at which were seated three youthful public servants who were there to help us with our problems and questions. Standing the entire time, we waited a full 2 hours until our turn came. When we approached the desk, no chair was offered. We continued to stand. We asked several questions and to each were given the answer with a casual shrug, "I don't know. I'd have to look that up." Finally we became discouraged and realized that the people put there to answer our questions knew even less about them than we did. We left, having received no help whatsoever, merely a brushoff, apparently for having been a nuisance and for not having known the answers to our questions in the first place.

Again—it was the attitude more than anything else which saddened and even frightened us. Is the Government of this tremendous, powerful country so eager to squeeze every penny from its people that it will permit its agents to humiliate, to frustrate, to accuse? Will it, when sincere people go for honest help so they will be certain to make no errors on their tax returns, permit them to be met with indifference, ignorance, and a patronizing attitude from those hired to help them? It made us regret we had ever sought such help.

We were very pleased, on the other hand, to read another recent article which was entitled, "Where Money from Washington Is Being Turned Down." Where, we wondered, in a country where everyone seems to be snatching the most he can get of the taxpayers' money where is such money being refused. On reading further, we learned that it is in the West where people are rising against the acceptance of Federal funds. For example, Westerners are voting down taxpayers' money for a dam in Montana. Private funds will build a dam in Idaho; Federal funds were rejected. The West is giving such strong evidence of wishing to preserve the right to develop its own natural resources that the Secretary of the Interior recent referred to "the rising tide of antifederalism" in the West. Governor Babcock of Montana refused to sanction Government aid in a recent proposed dam because, as he said, it was impractical. The dam would inundate 9,000 acres now irrigated and would irrigate no new land. Other Western legislators are saying with increasing force that too many projects have been proposed by the Government which are not feasible, are economically unsound. These same legislators are willing to accept Federal funds for projects of proved worth, but in so doing they want to make very certain that Washington will not control Western resources.

We heard another heartening story, again from the West. A friend of ours in this valley, who is incidentally a government official, built a fishing stream on his ranch during this past summer. According to law, he was entitled to partial payment of the stream by the Government on the grounds that it was fish and wildlife development. He refused to apply for this aid, however, thinking that since he and he alone would benefit by the stream, it would be less than honest to expect taxpayers to help pay for something from which they could reap no possible benefit.

This same family of westerners was notified by the school which their children attend that they were entitled to a certain sum per month during the entire school year. They live in an isolation area, they were told, and had to provide transportation each day for their children to and from the school bus. But, said the family, it was their choice to live there, they could afford to transport their children to the school bus each day. Therefore, why should taxpayers underwrite the expense? Why should the family be subsidized in this way by the Government? Needless to say, the offer of the taxpayers' money was not accepted.

We do not intend this to be an outcry against the present party in power in Washington. It might be the same story under either party. Whatever the party, our protest would be raised just as loudly and just as vehemently. Is it possible, we wonder, that men in the Government, Democrats or Republican, are so eager for election or reelection, are so determined to have their party in power, are so concerned about having prestige and influence and fame that they no longer care by what means they achieve their ends? If this is so, we need not look with terror at any power which Khrushchev can wield, or at any threat of which Castro is capable, or to any thermonuclear weapons which man has ever invented to find what is the most dire threat to the American people and to the American way of life. The most serious threat lies in the immorality which is being permitted to grow and flourish within our very boundaries and among the very men whose sacred duty it should be to uphold the honor and the trust of their offices instead of so flagrantly abusing them.

It is our desire to share with you as best we can the life and thought which we experience here in our valley. Since we live here permanently now, we hope to circulate our little paper twice each month the year around. We are writing it for our friends and for guests at the Circle H Ranch, but anyone is welcome to copies. Drop a card to The Betty's at Moose, Wyo., or phone us at 086-R4 if you would like to have your name on our list. There is no charge for our paper, but if you would like to have it mailed to you after you leave the valley, please leave with us your winter address and 24 five-cent stamps to cover the mailing. We hope this new venture of ours will meet with your approval.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Elbie Jay has again made the Hoppe headlines as well as contestant, Pierre Salinger, who is running—but not in the 100-yard dash.

Two of Arthur Hoppe's columns which recently appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle follow:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 16, 1964]

MR. SALINGER'S SECRET WEAPON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I'm very worried about my friend, Mr. Pierre Salinger. I think he's overreacting.

You can't blame him. For his most active opponent in the Senate race, Mr. Alan Cranston, pulled off a tremendous political coup;

he got interviewed on television while doing a couple of laps in a sweatshirt.

Now that's easy for Mr. Cranston. An old Stanford quarter-miler, he takes a 15-minute jog every morning to keep in trim. And he was scarcely breathing hard as he discussed dynamic water projects, vigorous civil rights programs, and energetic unemployment policies for the television audience.

But can Mr. Salinger retaliate in kind? There he is, in Bermuda shorts, Keds and cigar. With grim determination, he leaps from the starting block, hurtles forward 47 feet, cries, "We must move forward with (gasp) vigor." And drops dead.

No, it's far too risky. And thus, obviously piqued by this underhanded ploy by his opponent, Mr. Salinger has decided to unleash the ultimate weapon in politics: Love.

Oh, you should just see his campaign headquarters. Pretty girls in French berets handing out heart-shaped balloons and lapel buttons discreetly emblazoned: "P.S.—I Love You."

"P.S.—I Love You." And, so help me, each of these otherwise demure young ladies proudly boasts she is one of Mr. Salinger's many sweethearts. For they are known collectively and officially as "Sweethearts for Salinger."

"Sweethearts for Salinger." I spoke to Mr. Salinger's No. 1 sweetheart, Miss Charlotte Smith, a most attractive and charming blonde who said she began her career in 1960 as a "Lady for Lyndon." But being Mr. Salinger's sweetheart was "even more fun."

"Pierre's got 50 sweethearts in San Francisco," said Miss Smith glowingly. "And I don't know how many in Los Angeles." She doesn't know how many. I don't know how many. Who knows how many?

So there's no question about Mr. Salinger's campaign strategy: In a desperate gamble to win the election in a landslide, he has decided to become our newest—let's face it—sex symbol.

Not that I have a moment's doubt he can do it. A few press releases like: "Black-haired, liquid-eyed Pierre Salinger (pronounced Sal-in-jaire), his passionate French blood aboil, today accused his opponents * * *" And I can see the television spots. There's Mr. Salinger at the piano, playing a Chopin etude in the glow of candelabra while gazing soulfully into the camera and murmuring: "And as for wheat supports, mes cheries * * *"

But has Mr. Salinger thought this through? Sure, in no time the ladies will be tearing off his clothes and swooning when he speaks. But what of us men? Think how you'll feel, men, when your bride comes to the breakfast table wearing a dreamy look and a button saying, "P.S.—I Love You." And your daughter announces defiantly she has become one of Mr. Salinger's many sweethearts.

I beg Mr. Salinger to reconsider. Is even a Senatorship worth the havoc of broken homes and runaway girls his unleased sex appeal would inevitably wreak? No.

I say Mr. Salinger must put our homes and our families above personal ambition, renounce love, and run for Senator in short pants and a sweatshirt. That's the American way.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle]

ELBIE JAY PUTS HIS FOOT DOWN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How you all? Time for another rib-tickling episode of "Just Plain Folks," the ripsnorting TV adventures of the rooting-tooting Jay family—starring ol' Elbie Jay, who's known far and wide as "The Fastest West o' the Pecos."

As we join up with ol' Elbie today he's taking another group of his eastern newspaper friends on a little old tour of his little old spread in his little old family car with its little old 885-horsepower engine, overhead cams and dual carbs.

ELBIE. Mighty nice of you folks to come along. Nothing like a quiet Sunday ride to get to know each other. I expect you want to know where I stand on the issues. Well, let me say I stand smack in the middle of the road and——

GRIZZLED NEWSMAN. Good Lord! Here comes a truck.

ELBIE. Say, now, that fellow was right slow getting off on the shoulder. Like I was telling the National Safety Council, the highway is getting downright dangerous. I'm plumb glad we turn off here. Yahoo! Watch us take this fence. How about that.

NERVOUS NEWSMAN. That was a fence. But if you'll excuse me, sir, your speedometer says 85.

ELBIE (pounding the dashboard). You're right, son. The dang thing sticks and won't go any higher. But, anyway, as I was saying, I'm a moderate in all things, for I reckon that a cautious approach. * * * Say, you figure you could reach around there and remove Cousin Hepzibah's "long johns" from the windshield? I don't know why she's got to string her clothesline between them particular two trees. She knows it's my favorite shortcut. Of course, it's good to see spring is here.

PALLID NEWSMAN. Look out for those cows!

ELBIE. Cows! Why, those are fine Hereford cattle, son, and * * * Ooops, they're a mite slow, aren't they? Well, you all just plan to stay for a fine barbecue tonight, you hear? And we can talk more about my cautious approach to the grave problems of our times. Yes, sir, I believe above all in going slow because * * * Say, here comes the west 40. There goes the west 40, And here's Aunt Tessie's place. Isn't she a spry one? Not many a lady of 84 could make the roof in a single jump like that. And here we are back at the ranchhouse, folks. And there's my pretty wife, Birdie Bird, folks. Folks? Folks?

BIRDIE BIRD. You want me to throw some cold water on them, Elbie? Like the last batch?

ELBIE. Reckon you better or they'll never get their stories written about what a careful, cautious, go-slow, middle-of-the-roader I am. And don't forget to tell them if they're not convinced yet, I'll be right happy to show them some real Texas driving on the way to the station.

Well, so long till next time, friends. And meanwhile, remember this public service message: "Drive defensively—the life you save may be your President's."

Fiscal Aid for Students—Student Paper Supports Education Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention an editorial which appeared in the Butler Collegian, published at Butler University in Indianapolis. The student editor, Ray Gray, who also devoted a column in another issue to a review of the bill, spoke out in favor of the Hartke college student assistance bill, S. 2490, even though he had earlier favored the tax credit approach. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this student editorial may be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, where it can speak for itself.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTKE PLAN FAIR

Senator VANCE HARTKE's (Democrat, of Indiana) four-point plan for fiscal aid to students as an alternate for the already debunked tax-credit legislation proposed by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, is a pleasing program.

RIBICOFF's measure was voted down by a slim 48-to-45 vote in the Senate, keeping college students and parents in the same stalemate regarding financial aid for a college education.

RIBICOFF's proposal was a good idea, and the vote of the Senate shows interest and concern in this matter. We believe HARTKE's measure is more logical and feasible.

HARTKE proposes to:

1. Award undergraduate scholarships—on the need of the student with a $1,000 per year maximum.

2. Long-term student loans—loan ceiling would be boosted to $1,500 a year at the undergraduate level, $2,500 for graduate students with the aggregate limits respectively $7,500 and $10,000.

3. Loan insurance—insure student $2,000 per academic year with repayment extended 10 years after graduation.

4. Work program—colleges would set up a program providing student employment for the needed income to continue an education.

We believe that Senator RIBICOFF was on the right track and that Senator HARTKE has merely elaborated and revised the Connecticut Senator's plan, making it functional.

We hope that the legislators will give Senator HARTKE's proposal the same consideration as they did Senator RIBICOFF's and realize the urgency of such legislation.

Imports Stifle Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks the next GATT Tariff Reduction Conference is due to open in Geneva, on May 4, to be exact.

No one yet knows what will be the outcome of this Conference. There are some possibilities that it may encounter rough going because of several differences that are still unsettled, such as the disparities issue and the protectionist attitude of the Common Market toward agricultural products.

We do know from the great number of industries that have filed before the U.S. Tariff Commission since December 2 of last year, that American industry has a deep concern over further tariff cuts. Nearly all the industries made a plea to be placed on the reserve list of items that would not be subjected to further tariff reductions.

As matters stand, with a few statutory exceptions, all products will be subject to a further 50-percent cut. Others

will be exposed to a possible elimination of what is left of the tariff.

Mr. Speaker, it is really shocking that this country should propose further wholesale tariff reductions when so many industries find themselves already battered by import competition. How can we in all good sense expect to make much headway against the unemployment problem if we insist on pitting many of our leading industries against a type of competition that would be illegal in this country because of the low level of wages from which it draws its advantage?

We establish minimum wages in this country by law, and while most of our wages are far above the minimum, there is not another country in the world beside Canada in which our minimum would not be the maximum or very close to it. In most European countries even, where wages are higher than in many parts of the world, our minimum wage is about twice as high as the average prevailing there.

We are no longer protected as we once were by much higher productivity than that enjoyed in the other industrial countries. It is foolhardy to say that we are so far ahead in know-how and technology that we have nothing to worry about. It is shortsighted to overlook the fast catching up with us that is going on abroad in the matter of productivity while wages continue to lag far behind our levels.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that our economists seem to overlook is the effect that will be produced by further tariff cuts on the business outlook for many industries in this country. If they do not overlook this factor they ignore the dampening of expansion plans that will be induced by the prospects of yet heavier import competition. We cannot look to the scores of our industries that are vulnerable to import competition for expansive investment if the market overlook they face is cloudy or gloomy. It would be irresponsible of such industries to expand and hire more people when the prospects are that they would be unable to sell a greater output. Yet we need growth and expansion if we are to employ the rising number of workers that come into our labor force each year.

The fact is that industries that are hard hit by imports will seek to reduce their costs by installing more modern laborsaving machinery and equipment. The need to remain competitive acts as a compulsion; but in responding to it our industries will throw people out of work. Were it not for the import competition that is already in the market with lower prices it might be anticipated that automation would soon lead to more employment because it would reduce costs and thus attract more consumers.

When, however, imports are rising and already have a considerable share of the market, they will prevent the domestic industry from getting the classical benefit of lower costs; that is, increased sales; and the result will be that the workers laid off will remain among the unemployed instead of being rehired.

Mr. Speaker, this subject is treated in greater detail in a paper prepared by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy. Mr. Strackbein has analyzed in this paper, entitled "Imports Stifle Employment," the forces that have combined to insist on exposing our industry to a withering import competition. This is a matter of deep concern when it must be clear that in so doing they are insisting on a course that would violate the very principles of the American economic system.

I offer for the RECORD Mr. Strackbein's paper and recommend it as reading for all who would understand what the further reduction of tariffs will mean to our economy. The paper follows:

IMPORTS STIFLE EMPLOYMENT

(By O. R. Strackbein)

Our national trade policy represents a major stumbling block to the solution of our employment problem. The contradiction arises from the basic factors involved in the liberalization of trade on the one hand and the requirements of increasing domestic employment, on the other. The two courses collided because the steps that would help in the one case would in many cases aggravate the problem in the other field.

The question then is, which is more important: rising imports and exports, or coping with the problem of unemployment?

We may indeed increase our trade in some sectors without aggravating our unemployment problem; but we cannot follow a meat-ax approach in shaping our tariff without courting disastrous economic consequences that will be reflected in widespread displacement and discouragement of employment; and that is the course upon which we have embarked.

Displacement of workers by rising imports is not half the damage inflicted by tariff reduction. The most devastating blight comes from the smothering of business confidence, the withering of bullish sentiment by sapping the profit motive, and the diversion of domestic capital to other countries. This spells discouragement of industrial expansion. It poses an intolerable situation under the pressures created by a rapidly rising population and work force.

Why, it may be asked, does tariff-reduction pose so desperate a threat? Would such a course not lead to increasing trade, including exports, and would not this process create employment rather than discouraging it?

The question is a fair one and it has been answered undeviatingly in the affirmative by our trade policymakers. What then is wrong with the answer?

The error lies in persistent failure to recognize the wide disparities between the economy of this country and the economies of its various trade competitors. This failure to recognize the obvious may be attributed to the effect of blind adherence to other and nontrade objectives that in turn are thought to demand (1) trade liberalization or (2) trade planning and control.

These two objectives may have diverse supporters who are not necessarily in philosophical accord with each other but who find themselves allied in choice of means to their ends. There may be more than two such groups but the two most readily identified ones are (1) those who believe that trade liberalization represents the best political cement for holding the "free" world together and strengthening its front vis a vis the Communist conspiracy, and (2) those who quite aside from any such objective believe in global economic planning and direction of world commerce by a world trade organization.

The two groups walk arm-in-arm and are closely interlaced. The anti-Communist theme is a creditable one and its objective is laudable. However, because of its alliance, conscious or unconscious, with the other group, it has adopted as a common emblem with the other an impenetrable psychological halo equated with all that is good, forward-looking, progressive, full of heart, and world sympathy. It must do this in order to justify its alliance with the other group and also to answer its refusal to look squarely at the upgly problem of unemployment that its position necessarily underwrites in this country. It proceeds in an air of self-deceptive congratulation in the notion that it is allied with the angels against the gross selfish interests that would keep the American market to itself. While it knows that no one seriously proposes such isolationism it must say this to itself as a matter of gaining the comfort of self-respect.

This group cannot even allow itself to ask whether it is in accord with the objectives of the other group, i.e., the deep-dyed international economic planners and controllers—always keeping in reserve the idea that it will cross that bridge when it comes to it. Unfortunately for such a comforting reflection a point of no return may be reached before the reflection is confronted with the "moment of truth."

The second group, the economic globalists, sing the songs of the first group as a mark of camaraderie, but more than anything else are bent on establishing a tight-fitting international planning system as a replacement for free private enterprise. The anti-Communist theme suits their purpose because of its call for subordination of national economic control to international political objectives. This global planning group is in the forefront of the 20-year-old campaign to strip Congress of its power to regulate foreign commerce. This is a necessary objective because a different-thinking Congress coming in at any time might upset the whole applecart. Therefore Congress must be shackled or bypassed; and this has become a persistent and quite successful goal.

The problem created by this mesalliance has to be examined with care to demonstrate its incongruity.

It seems safe to say that if the group that looks upon further tariff cutting as an instrument for strengthening the free world alliance, became convinced that its road is the wrong one, it would relinquish the alliance. The other group, however, need not relinquish its position under the same circumstances because it would feel that a considerable economic price, such as chronic unemployment, is justified to reach its objective; in fact, the most likely price, i.e., governmental intervention in the economy caused by persistence of subborn unemployment, might be expected to lead the way to the very international economic planning and direction that it has fixed as its goal.

Let us begin our examination by pointing to the distinctiveness of the American productional system. This system prospered and came to world leadership because this country alone discovered some elements of economics and regulatory practices that were foreseen, or turned out, to be pregnant of great developments.

To be sure, our continent was rich and blessed with great expanses of good soil and enjoyed a temperate climate; but richness of resources guarantees nothing of itself toward human enrichment and abundance. The American aborigines did nothing about it. The abundance must be produced; and it was later produced by a species of push from within and a pull in the form of an incentive from ahead. Fortunately the United States was established on a foundation of freedom which released human capabilities but yet kept them subordinated at least in some manageable degree to responsibility. We provided remarkably unabridged rewards

for effort, ingenuity, courage, inventiveness, etc., in the form of private enterprise for private gain.

As this system proliferated over the land to the West and came back again, a taming process came into operation, perhaps none too soon. One of the first steps (the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890) was maintenance of competition as a means of overcoming or preventing monopoly. This was a most important step designed to keep our channels of development clear and unobstructed, and arose from a precious concept. No other country had exhibited such faith in fair competition. Its function was to see that consumers received the benefits of technology in the form of lower prices made possible by lower costs of production.

Our patent system, hand in hand with our profit system, led to astounding inventiveness, and the inventions in turn were converted into industrial uses in an amazing ramification of production.

Then came our vision of mass production, based on interchangeable parts and the moving production line. This step separated us industrially still more from the rest of the world. There were other countries that counted more people than ours as a market, but we were left alone uncontested to develop the potentials of mass production.

Now the stage was set for the greatest industrial expansion the world had seen; but the scene is not yet complete.

The function of purchasing power had not been fully appreciated until Henry Ford, or someone who had influence with him, saw its meaning. He implemented his understanding by adopting the $5-a-day wage. This step marked a still further separation of our system from that of other countries. It provided the mass purchasing power that alone justified and sustained mass production.

Nor was this all. Mass consumption, while based on purchasing power, was perhaps not fully understood and is indeed not yet fully understood; but its dependence in large degree on wages came to be appreciated, while at the same time the high productivity of machinery was recognized as justifying high wages. What has not even yet been fully understood is its equal dependence on elasticity of demand and on confidence that a rich potential demand can at any particular time be courted and won, if a proffered product is one that enjoys an elastic demand.

Industrial expansion in this country was therefore not solely a matter of mass production. The principal function of this process was multiplication of output and cost reduction per unit of output; but that did not dispose of the goods so produced. We relied on competition to assure the passing of a good part of the cost savings to the consumers. To this end we supplemented the Sherman Act with the Clayton, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Robinson-Patman Acts to assure not only competition but fairness of competition. Lowered costs could now duly spark a vast consumer response for many products for which the demand was elastic, as in the typical case of the automobile.

Later, after the system crashed and sprawled because of certain errors of the twenties, we extended fairness of competition to the wage field to prevent the erosion of purchasing power. We adopted minimum wages and maximum hours, outlawed child labor, etc., thus preserving and enlarging the wage pool on which popular purchasing power was based.

With this ensemble of vastly productive forces and the sustaining elements in the form of drive for profits, absorbent purchasing power in the hands of consumers and a highly whetted technology, it is now clear indeed that the remaining factor that was indispensable to the successful operation of the system as an expansive operation was elasticity of demand. Had our productive activities been aimed only at the furnishing of the necessities in food, shelter, and clothing, we would never have achieved a dynamic and spreading economy. Since demand for food is biologically limited, no vastly expanding economy could have been built on the mere provision of such necessities.

We somehow learned to look to the satisfaction not only of primary demand, but also the secondary demand; i.e., the demand for goods that were nonessential but nonetheless pleasing to the consumer.

As income rose hand in hand with higher productivity provided by machinery, consumers had more money to spend. If the cost of a $500 product could be reduced to $100, the market for it might, because of elasticity of the demand, increase ten or even a hundredfold, because the lower price was payable by many more consumers. Advertising for obvious reasons came into its own with all its blessing and horrors.

Yet even today we do not sufficiently recognize the meaning of the difference in the factor of human demand. We are prone to treat agricultural food products the same as products for which the demand is potentially almost without limit if prices come within reach of the popular pocketbook; and we foolishly strain ourselves to export unprocessed farm products to pay for imports of fully processed and finished manufactures, thus imitating the backward agrarian economies.

When Henry Ford dropped his cost and his price sufficiently to reach the pocketbook of America, he laid the foundation of a vast and still-growing industry. No flour miller or meatpacker or sugar refiner could possibly have repeated the phenomenon. The difference lay in the product and the character of the demand.

There is no rigid limit to demand for nonessential nonfood items. Only so much provender, however, can be stuffed into a stomach per day and the number of stomachs increases only with the population.

Very well, having in one way or another found that a market for this or that product was expansible like a rubber band, American enterprisers exploited the possibilities. They relied heavily on technological advancement to extend the market into earlier unreached corners. Employment at high wages duly reached higher levels as time went on. This spelled higher total purchasing power.

Does this then mean that technological progress is under all circumstances a generator of jobs? The answer must be that it depends on the conditions under which laborsaving installations are instituted. Under some conditions it may, on the contrary, produce net and lasting unemployment. Also, the amount of elapsed time between displacement and rehiring, if any, varies greatly, depending on the nature of the product and the demand for it.

At this point, having in mind the subject of this inquiry, another question arises. This is: What has all the foregoing to do with tariff reductions and increasing import competition?

One source of greater buying power in the hands of consumers lies in price reductions extended to them on some products. These reductions release money for the purchase of other products or for more of the same product. Is this process not just as effective as an increase in payrolls when prices remain steady? The answer is, Yes; and this is one manner in which cost reductions resulting from laborsaving machinery will in time result in more employment.

If lower prices thus help spread purchasing power while payrolls remain the same, why do not the lower prices generally associated with imports perform a similar function? Affirmation of this is, of course, the thesis of the free-trade promoters. Goods that enjoy an elastic demand will enjoy rising sales.

If a domestically manufactured bicycle costs a consumer $60 while the imported product sells for $40, does such a transaction not increase the domestic buyer's purchasing power by $20? It would indeed, assuming equal quality.

If the $40 bicycle is bought, the free-trade advocate would point to the remittance of a part of this to the foreign country, perhaps $20 of it. The dollars thus received abroad might be used to buy American wheat or lard or manufactured consumer goods; and so we come to a crucial distinction. Wheat, grain, and lard are labor-sparse products compared with bicycles, dollar for dollar, and the exchange would not be good in terms of employment.

On the other hand, our domestic bicycle makers would feel the negative backwash and this might more than nullify the other benefits in terms of employment.

In view of such varied effects we may ask why indeed our national trade policy represents, as asserted at the outset, "a stumbling block to the solution of our employment problem?"

It is no longer adequate in rebuttal to generalize and to say, for example, that a lively trade promotes employment. It may do so in some products but not in others. The benefits that come to the economy as a whole from exports may be vastly outweighed by the atrophy that may be visited upon it by the sapping influence of rampant low-priced competitive imports.

How will we know what to promote and what to restrain?

An answer in extreme terms may throw some light on the question. If we should export nothing but raw materials while we imported only manufactured products, we would lose heavily in terms of employment. This is one reason why the underdeveloped, raw material exporting countries are usually at a stubborn disadvantage in foreign trade. Also, if we import more and more of the products that enjoy an elastic demand (principally finished consumer goods) and thus allow ourselves to be driven more and more into the production of goods for which the demand is inelastic we will again engage in a losing transaction so far as employment is concerned.

Until the midfifties of this century the trade of the United States had long been balanced highly in our favor in this respect. Only 27.5 percent of our imports consisted of finished goods and manufactured foodstuffs in 1950 while nearly two-thirds of our exports were of these categories. This "mix" reflected our industrial leadership resulting from mass production and was highly advantageous to us in terms of employment. In the past 7 or 8 years, however, manufactured goods, including foodstuffs, have come to represent nearly half of our imports (47.7 percent in 1962) while the share of such goods in our exports has been receding. The outlook is for a continuation of this trend. It points to a regressive effect on our employment; and our trade policy is directly responsible. It led to drastic reductions and seeks to reduce sharply once more our duties on manufactured products. Our tariff had earlier been shaped to favor imports of raw materials and semimanufactured items. This has been changed by slashing the rates on finished products.

Our principal difficulty, however, comes from pitching our system, unique and high-plateaued as it is, with its tariff defenses stripped, against a diversity of foreign economies that have not borne the cost-heavy burdens of our system (high wages, farm price supports, defense expenditures, foreign aid, etc.), while at the same time they have in a few short years reaped the benefits of our technology and methods of production, hand in hand with low wages. (Recent wage

increases abroad have not nearly closed the gap.)

Economic theory is regularly called on by the freetraders to support their position. In the long run, the theory says, wage rates are low because productivity per man-hour is low; and this is true. The other side of the coin says that real wages are high because the productivity of labor is high per man-hour; and this, again, is true.

Translated, this means that foreign low wages have owed their lowly level to the "inefficiency" of foreign labor i.e., low productivity per man-hour. Therefore, even though our wages are and have been higher, we do not suffer from a competitive disadvantage because our advanced technology and our mass production have made our workers so much more productive.

Somewhere in the precincts of these beautiful generalizations lies the fallacy. Theories are like computers. It is what is fed into them that counts. If fallacies are fed in, they take effect and the results will bear their mark. The great increase in foreign productivity in recent years combined with lagging wages must be taken into account if the error is not to be egregious. Also the greater bargaining power of our labor unions compared with the foreign is a factor that should not be but usually is overlooked.

Further, in comparing the competitive standing of our industry with that of other countries we should reflect that not all our industry stands on an equal plane in terms of technological development, size, vintage of machinery and equipment, enjoyment of mass production, competence of management, location, etc. A common error is to compare our best with the foreign ordinary, forgetting that an economy travels on its average performance.

In any massive economy, there will be instances of inefficiency, with some producers in the forefront in this respect, some average and some lagging, even within the same industry. So it is in all countries and in all fields of human endeavor. When two economies are engaged in competition over a long period, as two armies in combat, it is not the few outstanding industries that determine the outcome, but the average, the system as a whole. An army cannot win a war with an elite division or two. These do not turn the tide of war. Otherwise Hitler would have won World War II.

Precisely because the burst of foreign technology has boosted productivity abroad, American industry is now plagued with cries to automate relentlessly as a means of maintaining or regaining a competitive position. Here our double trouble begins. One is that we must become more efficient in order to compete, i.e., to hold our own. This leads to the other trouble, namely, unemployment. The dilemma needs a few words of explanation.

To expect industrial efficiency to respond to a command performance is to misread the American system. Industrial efficiency did not spring from a whiplash in this country but in response to inducement. That is why today the attempt to press the categorical imperative of greater efficiency on American industry is both anachronistic and fallacious.

Actually, our industry is no less efficient than it was when it gained us world industrial leadership. It is in fact creating unemployment at an alarming rate by progressive mechanization and automation.

The great looming difference is that we face entirely different competition today from abroad—a competition that derives its strength from emulation of our system. The foreign industrial nations have indeed adopted our methods and business philosophy with distinct competitive advantages on their side, already mentioned, among them a wide wage gap confirmed by fast-rising productivity and lesser labor union pressure than here.

There is, of course, nothing intrinsically static about that part of American industry that caters to the secondary needs and desires of the population. To proceed full steam ahead it needs only to be confident that a reward is forthcoming if it obeys the rigors of new product development, mapping of its sales outlets, launching a vigorous advertising program, etc. The case is quite different in industries that produce the staples and face an inelastic demand. When these are driven to automation by imports, net and lasting unemployment may be expected. Dropping the cost to zero would increase per capita consumption very little but would empty the plants of workers.

Yet, free trade language has it that any American industry that cannot compete with imports automatically condemns itself as "inefficient." This is wholly unjustified and hearkens to a time that is gone.

Some of our presently more "inefficient" industries may even now cradle a new leadership, while some in the van may fall by the wayside. This fluid character of our economy is ignored by those who call for international specialization of industry—those who would weed out our industries by exposing them to free trade.

In modern times international specialization is rapidly becoming obsolete because of new materials, revolutionary methods of production, and growing independence of certain aspects of climate, location, labor supply, etc. The nongeographical aspects of industrial leadership assume greater importance. Overspecialization achieved by an eager weeding-out process would therefore be foolhardy and would represent a negative and retreating posture in economic readiness. With the exception of mining, tropical products and some agricultural items, there is little advantage left in specialization, comparative or any other.

The principal need of American industry in competitive world trade is a protected flank. This is because we are even now heavily burdened by employment problems attributable to the jump in number of workers and to automation. A tariff policy that of itself greatly aggravates the pressure for laborsaving installations is an odd phenomenon indeed.

We need "growth," as is asserted on all sides; but our tariff policy either stifles it or promotes it under conditions that mean less rather than more employment.

In whose interest do we then establish, continue and increase the exposure of our vulnerable economic flank? We can surely and very easily break more and more of our industries on the shallow and unsupported presumption of inefficiency, without a proper day in court, if that is our real wish.

At some point in the "long run," after much industrial distress thus imposed upon them, ruined industries would perhaps rise again; but on a lower level of equilibrium with their foreign competitors. This "long-run" process could also encompass the economic defeat of this country and surrender of our industries into a common world economic pool. This would presumably fully gratify the doctrinaire global economic planners; but it could hardly please their present confederates since their goal of free-world supremacy would not thus be served.

To pose more clearly the dilemma that houses our double trouble we must ask wherein lies the real threat of further drastic tariff reductions (and some that have already been intemperately made) to our economy and particularly to employment.

The business front in the private profit system faces new and developing market forces with a tentative, probing posture, led sometimes to overboldness and other times to excessive timidity. Its psychological mysteries have not yet been fathomed. In the face of radical changes, such as overcoming exposure to crippling import competition, timidity on the domestic front, taking its cue from the governmental trade program, appears to be the rule rather than the exception. Yet this timidity is not congenital as the great upsurge in our foreign investments has demonstrated. The outlook was simply more attractive over there and not sufficiently attractive at home.

We may now see the dilemma in its sharp outline.

As low-cost competing imports capture more and more of the market the need to reduce domestic costs becomes imperative. Yet, good business judgment looking on the domestic scene might say that the time is not right. Consider then the outlook: the beckoning consumer demand that so greatly cheered our early mass producers when they fed it with lower prices made possible by new inventions, laborsaving installations, etc., is now wooed by on-the-ground imports that already enjoy a price advantage.

The visioned green fields of the earlier days, to be had by diligent cultivation, are now overrun and the pathways contested by the intruders who peddle their wares at "impossible" prices. Expansion does not sprout in a soil so soggy.

Under this new dispensation the enterpriser is in the position, not of initiative, but of responding to a forced play. He is no longer the master. He is forced to act as a matter of competitive survival. He automates as far as the state of technology allows, let us say, and reduces his costs; but he has been robbed of most of the accustomed response of the market to lower prices. Imports are there grinning at him and spoiling the play. The workers he dismisses stay dismissed. He may increase his output and may enjoy a part of the growing market; but his growth is insufficient to call for more workers. Meantime population growth unloads thousands of workers at his gates looking for jobs!

In time the chronic unemployment caused by this violation of the genius of our economic system would precipitate more and more public intervention, deficit financing, artificial bolstering of the market through public works, etc. More and more our economy would be thrown into the arms of the government for its salvation.

This would suit the global planners. Our industries would soon be tamed to their leash; and, with spirits broken and heritage reversed, they would become docile pawns in the hands of the mystic planners.

We would substitute polystatism armed with supranational powers sufficient to impose its economic decisions on the member countries, for the decentralized system of the past, wherein private decisions, guided by the market outlook, led the way.

That is the burden of our present trade policy. Does it represent the aspiration of the American people?

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, hearings on foreign aid have begun in both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Already, President John-

son's new requests are receiving public attention.

The President has emphasized economy in every phase of our foreign operations. He has pledged, for instance, a reduction in the staff of the Agency for International Development by 1,200 employees. The strategy of aid distribution has been designed to maximize our political and economic security and to ensure a strong free world. The President stated on Monday, April 20, 1964, that the requests this year had been "cut to the absolute minimum consistent with our commitments and our security."

President Johnson has successfully combined economy with the essential task of opposing Communist aggression and stimulating economic stability in less-developed areas of the world.

Mr. President, the response to this new economic assistance bill is reflected by an editorial which appeared April 4, 1964, in Missouri's nationally recognized, award-winning Mexico Evening Ledger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POURING MONEY OR BLOOD DOWN THE RATHOLE

What about foreign aid?

Is it "pouring money down the rathole"?

Is it a prime example of waste, of the looney left throwing away other people's money?

What about it?

Maybe one answer lies in another question:

How come every administration since World War II, regardless of the President's party, has endorsed foreign aid?

Surely not all these Presidents, a majority of all these Senators, a majority of all these Representatives were fools or Communists (as the ridiculous right claims).

Surely these national leaders during the past 20 years—again, all our Presidents, a majority of our Senators and Representatives—had sound reasons.

What are those reasons?

They were satisfied that foreign aid was an excellent weapon against communism. They know what the Marshall plan—a foreign aid act—did to save Greece from communism. They know that not a single nation to whom Marshall plan aid was given has fallen to the Communists.

They also know that mistakes have been made in foreign aid. Some silly, inexcusable, and even tragic mistakes. But again, on balance, they believe foreign aid has been a worthy weapon against communism.

However, as prosperity has spread, as countries have rebuilt their strength, foreign aid has been cut back. President Kennedy used to make the point that it should be cut back still faster and that more of our allies, now strong and able, should take over more of our commitments.

To underscore the change, in 1950 our foreign aid expenditures were 2 percent of our gross national product. Last year they were less than 1 percent—0.6 percent to be exact.

In dollars, our foreign aid totaled $3,400 million—not two-thirds of what we spend for tobacco, not one-half of what we spend for liquor.

Strictly military aid goes to 18 countries, strictly economic aid to 33 countries, and a combination to 47 countries.

Again, some of this aid is misused, wasted, and lost. Not much of it. That any is, is to be deplored. But the great bulk of it is targeted in against Communist aggression. And in some cases, these dollars of ours have prevented the loss of our blood, or more of our blood.

May Is Salad Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the people of America, especially, are becoming more and more "nutrition conscious." All persons should pay more attention to their diets.

Schools, governmental agencies, nutritionists, doctors, and dietitians are making special and energetic efforts to inform and educate youth, mothers, and institutional supervisors in improved food selection and preparation methods and practices.

Operators of restaurants, cafeterias, and institutional food dispensing businesses are improving their food preparation and service to better satisfy the nutritional needs of their patrons.

Farmers, processors, and grocers are making extraordinary advances which contribute enormously to the nutritional and enjoyment values of food.

Salads have earned a favored place on the American table. Salads can be prepared easily, are attractive, nutritional, delicious, and inexpensive. Fresh fruit and vegetable salads are universally enjoyed during any season. Fresh fruit and vegetable salads are especially delectable during the spring.

May is a very good month for salads.

The growers of western iceberg lettuce of California and Arizona have declared "May Is Salad Month" and plan a national observance this May to bring public attention to the salad producing industries.

California and Arizona provide our Nation with 80 percent of its iceberg—head—lettuce supply. The per capita consumption of lettuce is less than nine heads per year. For health's sake, it should be twice that. The fresh fruit and vegetable industries account for approximately one-third of the total farm income in California.

Lettuce and many other fresh salad vegetables will be coming to market in plentiful supply in May.

The State governments of Arizona and California are expected to proclaim that "May Is Salad Month." Through wide publicity in grocery store displays, national magazines and newspapers, the people of America will be encouraged to eat more salads and to enjoy their nutritional, artistic, taste, and economic advantages.

Other salad vegetables and fruits will be featured—tomatoes, asparagus, avocados, cucumbers, radishes, onions, cauliflower, artichokes, oranges, apples, grapefruit, carrots, celery, strawberries. Also, dairy products and other salad ingredients will benefit from this first annual national observance.

For a healthful treat, experiment with a fresh fruit or vegetable salad.

Delicious, nutritious. "May Is Salad Month."

The Commercial Future of Helicopters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, while much attention is fixed on the air transportation industry, there is one segment of it which has received little notice but which is quietly developing with a potential which has been insufficiently recognized. That is the successful, although still partially experimental and tentative, development of helicopter transport.

At a meeting of the Aero Club of Washington held on Tuesday, March 24, the president of New York Airways spoke on this matter out of his experience at the head of a major commercial helicopter transport organization. Because of the significant material in Mr. Cummings' presentation, I ask unanimous consent that his speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the course of the last 3 years the scheduled helicopter industry has had, as I guess most of you know, an increasingly serious problem on the Hill. Personally I am convinced that our troubles have arisen because of lack of information and knowledge as to what we have done and as to what our objectives are. In the next few minutes my efforts will be directed to an attempt to bring this matter into more accurate focus.

With the advent of ever faster, long-haul, fixed-wing aircraft the need for expediting passengers and cargo from their actual point of origin to their actual point of destination is becoming increasingly apparent. There is not a single person here present who doesn't know firsthand exactly what I'm talking about and how very annoying it is that very little, if anything, is being done about it. It obviously isn't enough just to worry about the journey from airport to airport. It's got to be the entire journey. Already, passengers, the U.S. mail and cargo using high speed aircraft for transportation between two cities such as New York and Washington frequently takes longer to accomplish the complete journey than was required 25 years ago. That this situation will not long be tolerated by the public, once it becomes fully aware that a reasonable solution is available, is perfectly clear. Today most of us concentrate our attention on the frustration and ulcer-producing struggle to get from the city center to the increasingly remote airport. But there are other time-consuming factors. How often has each of us sat at or rather near the end of a runway waiting for 8 or 10 aircraft to take off or land before we got our chance? How often have we circled an airport consuming valuable time, gradually descending to a point where the pilot at last cheerfully announces that "We are next," and "If there is a gate position, we should be unloading shortly."

With this background, it is well nigh impossible to understand how responsible persons in the airline industry can continue

simply to ignore the problem or, more accurately, pass it off as being primarily someone else's responsibility. How can the handling of the traveling public and the efficient use of expensive equipment and facilities be left to someone else? It is an occasion for aggressive, imaginative leadership on the part of Government, the operators and the manufacturers working together.

The question I would like to pose today is how does the helicopter fit into this situation? What contribution can it make—or, maybe, is it already making?

As a more or less routine matter the helicopters now being operated on schedule in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, and New York are clearly demonstrating their ability to move a good many passengers and a substantial quantity of mail and cargo with consequent saving of valuable time for all concerned. This is plain to the most superficial and untutored eye. However, the very substantial dollar savings in airport construction and location, in navigational aids, in fuel and depreciation on flight equipment and in manpower from the increased use of helicopters have not yet been generally understood or identified. As a starter the FAA has estimated that the annual cost of excessive elapsed time (number of minutes between estimated and actual off time) at 245 high density airports is $339.8 million. This estimate is based upon gross hours of delay and fully allocated aircraft.

That helicopters or possibly some more modern form of VTOL will inevitably be used to minimize this problem, especially in the high density operating conditions that exist on the eastern seaboard, on the west coast and around Chicago, is perfectly evident. Already they are serving this purpose to a limited extent between the airports surrounding the New York metropolitan area.

Looking ahead, therefore, it seems that the contribution of the helicopter in the reasonably near future and as a result of the work that has gone before, can easily be of extraordinarily signficant monetary value.

During the current calendar year New York Airway's fleet is expanding from 4 Boeing V-107 25-passenger helicopters to 7 Boeing V-107 and 3 United Aircraft Sikorsky S-61N 25-passenger helicopters. All of these aircraft will cruise in the vicinity of 150 miles per hour and each is powered by two General Electric T-58 turbine engines. At the same time our company's personnel roster will grow to approximately 500 persons including 60 pilots and 116 mechanics.

New York Airways' ability to expand to meet the obvious public demand has resulted from a series of important, possibly vital, contracts primarily with Pan American Airways and United Aircraft. Although time does not permit the full description of these arrangements it must be recognized that they prove beyond the shadow of any doubt that the commercial utility of scheduled helicopter transportation has become evident to important persons outside of our industry. Beyond that is the fact that now, for the first time, New York Airways has a sufficiently large and modern fleet to do the job of public service which it has so long envisioned and which gives substance to our high hopes for eventual subsidy elimination—but in this latter connection let no one be misled, it requires time—it cannot be done over night or even short of several years.

What of the past? The total subsidy bill for this remarkably short developmental period has been less than $50 million. What has the taxpayer already received for that investment?

Already it has been demonstrated that with respect to one type of helicopter alone (the Sikorsky S-58) the savings to the military as a result of the scheduled commercial operations amounted to between $75 and $85 million. A qualified senior representative of the Department of Defense testified to this.

In calendar year 1963 the number of passengers carried by the scheduled operators approached 500,000 or 226 percent of the number carried by the same operators in the first full year of passenger operations—1957.

The technical advances, all taking time, money, and no insignificant amount of energy, have been multiple and constitute a record which is certainly notable and may be even, by some undetermined standard, unique. After 12 years of expensive experimenting it will soon be possible to operate regular schedules with transport helicopters under IFR conditions. As of today, all operations are conducted under VFR conditions. Very shortly a heliport on the top of one of the highest buildings in the world will be available in the heart of Manhattan. The design of this landing area results from many hours of wind tunnel studies and careful analysis. This project alone represents a capital investment of close to a million dollars. It is undoubtedly the prototype for many other similar city center heliports.

It seems not unlikely that, with the development of larger, faster, and more efficient helicopters short haul flights, those up to 200 or 300 miles, may all be operated by VTOL aircraft operating in air space and under controls exclusively reserved for their purposes and designed to take advantage of their special characteristics.

With this in mind, isn't it possible to think that within the next several years many airlines operating in high density areas will find helicopters not only an adjunct to their present fleet but actually a replacement for some of their fixed-wing aircraft?

II

Only recently I have been startled to find that some key people in positions to affect the continued existence of the commercial scheduled helicopter industry are almost totally ignorant of the very fundamental difference between the economic potential of the helicopter and that of the short-haul, fixed wing aircraft. The helicopter requires minimum landing space. It operates, generally speaking, under the weather. It takes a minimum time in approach and takeoff procedures. In New York our average stage length is 14 miles and our average charge to the passenger is currently 67 cents a seat-mile. Our direct operating cost per available seat-mile has been reduced from 47 cents to 15½ cents and, with the inauguration of IFR operations which we now forecast for January 1965, will show a still greater reduction. With the introduction into service of the new turbine-powered helicopters the percentage of subsidy to total operating revenues has already dropped from 65.8 to 43.8 percent.

It is unfortunate in the extreme that the truly remarkable economic achievements of the helicopter industry are being judged at a time when the older and more mature elements of the air carrier industry have, after a long period of development, attained relative economic self-sufficiency, or at least stability. However, this is the fact. In any case it seems to have been inevitable that intercity travel by air should reach a certain stage of development before there was any compulsion to consider ways and means of expediting the surface portion of an air journey. For this reason alone the role of the present helicopter carriers must, therefore, be viewed in the context of providing services which are required as a result of the advance in air transport as a whole. In other words, the helicopter carriers must be considered as a component in the whole task of expediting travel by air from point of origin to point of destination. Air transportation has grown because it has offered time, savings, and convenience to the user. There is less than no reason to consider these advantages as capable of application only to the airport-to-airport portion of a journey.

It should be noted that the first passenger carried by a certificated helicopter operator on schedule was carried in July 1952. It should be further noted that the first full year of passenger operations by the three scheduled helicopter operators in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York as a group was 1957. Even so, it is only within the last 2 years that multiturbined helicopters have been available for transport purposes. In that period and only because of the existence of this modern equipment has it been demonstrated historically that it is now possible for the first time for operations not only to pay their own way but also to attain within the foreseeable future a position of "break even" without benefit of Federal subsidy. This is no longer a question of hope or estimate. It is a proven fact. The modern turbine-powered Boeing and Sikorsky helicopters have demonstrated their ability to earn upwards of $300,000 per aircraft per annum in excess of direct operating costs. This sum constitutes a contribution to overhead and, therefore, sets a pattern for subsidy reduction which has never been possible heretofore. Prior helicopters have invariably been unable even to come close to earning their direct operating costs.

III

In reviewing the history of scheduled helicopter operations and considering the important contributions that these remarkable aircraft can and will make, it appears almost self-evident that what is needed now is a coordinted effort on the part of Government, manufacturers, and the air transport industry which will provide an accelerated equipment development program. Only in this manner will the next generation of helicopters come into being in time to complement the expanding use of the current jet transport system and to meet the needs of the traveling and shipping public which will use the coming generation of supersonic aircraft. Without such an effort the costly inefficiencies of our present system will only continue to grow and become an even larger drag on the economy of our national transportation industry.

Further, I would urge that the subsidy limitations that have so severely inhibited the recent development and, in fact, which have been threatening the very existence of the scheduled helicopter operations in the United States for the past several years be suspended and that the payments to the carriers concerned now be placed on an adequate basis in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act pending an objective congressional study of the prospects that are inherent in the present operations. Any other procedure would appear to invite unnecessary waste of public and private funds already expended. The justification for such a study at least insofar as the Senate is concerned seems to be already well established. In Report No. 837 of January 1934 the Committee on Rules stated that "The Committee notes that the requests [for investigations] embraced proposals for both fixed wing and vertical aircraft. The feasibility of helicopters for short haul, as distinguished from commuter, air transportation is of considerable interest to this committee. Evaluation of proposals should not be limited to the operating economics of each aircraft as compared to the other, but also in relation to their impact on total Federal Aviation expenditures, including airport construction, air traffic control, etc. Reduction of one budget item such as subsidy, is a deception if the instrument of reduction causes a net increase in the total."

In closing I would like to quote briefly from a recent report of the National Aviation Corp.:

"Small as the problem represented by this group [the certificated scheduled helicopter industry] may appear, there is really a great deal at stake from a national point of view. In short, what these airlines are trying to develop is a system that will mitigate in some

degree the terrible congestion of ground transportation in major metropolitan areas. Furthermore, it is the only means in hand of doing just that at a reasonable subsidized cost in the next decade.

"Stifling this helicopter development, as it is moving forward from 12 to 25 passenger aircraft and has 50 passenger vehicles on its clearly visible horizon, for lack of a few million dollars annually needed until it is self-sufficient, must not be permitted. After all, what is being worked out in four cities today will become mandatory in many others.

"The vision of Congress that supported the domestic trunk airlines as they developed toward freedom from subsidy over several decades should be reinvoked in the case of the helicopter airlines today. If it is, a country-wide public service every bit as essential as the former can be assured. In fact, it must be."

Commendation for the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution passed unanimously on April 16, 1964, by the board of trustees of the Americanism Educational League of California. This resolution was adopted in conjunction with a citation present to William G. Simon, retiring special agent for the Los Angeles office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in appreciation for the vital services rendered by Mr. Simon and all agents of the FBI. The resolution also is a commendation for the outstanding and invaluable leadership of J. Edgar Hoover.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas the award being presented by the Americanism Educational League to William G. Simon, recently retired as special agent in charge of the Los Angeles Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, this 16th day of April 1964, at a special meeting of its board of trustees, brings into focus the invaluable service rendered to this Nation by the FBI: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the board of trustees of this foundation enunciate and approve the following declarations of fact:

"1. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover for nearly 40 years, has rendered invaluable service to law-enforcement agencies throughout the country.

"2. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has succeeded in transcending political, territorial, and economic pressures, and has remained free of disrupting influences in its complete dedication to the ideals upon which the Bureau was founded.

"3. Because the highly trained and dedicated personnel comprising the many branches of the FBI across the Nation has maintained the finest traditions of a national law-enforcement agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has become a primary target for the Communist conspiracy.

4. The Board of Trustees of the Americanism Educational League recommends that civic, patriotic, school, church, business, and labor groups throughout this Nation adopt resolutions in appreciation of the 40 years of leadership provided by J. Edgar Hoover, and memorializes the Congress to prevent any interference with policies which have made the FBI an indispensable arm of our internal security establishment."

Members of the board: A. J. Miller, William T. Huston, Walter Knott, Franklin S. Briles, Dr. William E. Fort, Jr., Arthur C. Arnold, Don Belding, Maurice W. Brainard, Dr. L. Dale Coffman, Alfred Cole, James C. Dolan, George Elkins, Louis L. Goodman, Patrick James Kirby, John Y. Marks, Burt B. Mold, Russell Quisenberry, Loyd Wright, Harry von Zell.

Panama Insults General MacArthur's Memory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were surprised at the recent discourteous action of the Red-dominated Panama Government in demanding the raising to full mast the Panama flag in the Canal Zone at the same time the U.S. flag was at half mast. Such discourtesy is foreign to true Latin character.

I am pleased to include as part of my remarks a press release on this incident by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which follows:

PANAMANIAN FLAGS IN CANAL ZONE AT HALF-MAST OR NOT AT ALL

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 9.—"The Panamanian flags in the Canal Zone should either be half-masted in respect to the late General Douglas MacArthur, as is the U.S. flag, or the Panamanian flag should not be flown at all," so stated commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Commander Lombardo, referring to the reports that U.S. Canal Zone authorities had acceded to Panamanian President Chiari's request that the Panamanian flags in the Canal Zone not be flown at half-mast during the period of mourning for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, said, "there are some very important matters involved in this shocking attitude of the Panamanian Government. The Panamanian flag is flying in the Canal Zone, which is U.S.-controlled territory, through the courtesy of the United States. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, during his long and distinguished career, performed a historic service in helping protect freedom throughout the world, and that includes Panama."

"Consequently," Commander Lombardo said, "Panama's demand that the Panamanian flag not be flown, as is the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone, at half-mast, is an act of gross ingratitude, and constitutes a deliberate affront to the memory of one of the truly great men of our times."

Continuing, Commander Lombardo said, "by having the Panamanian flag fully hoisted while the U.S. flag alongside is flying at half-mast, it means that the Panamanian flag is flying above the U.S. flag over U.S.-controlled territory. The United States must not permit Panamanian discourtesy to the memory of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to be the means by which the prestige of the United States is thus degraded before the world."

Commander Lombardo concluded "The Veterans of Foreign Wars, consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, urges that if the Panamanian Government does not want its flag to fly at half-mast in the Canal Zone alongside the U.S. flag, then the United States should immediately remove all the Panamanian flags from the U.S. Canal Zone."

Test Ban Treaty Safeguard Promises Are One-tenth Kept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, apparently President Johnson detects some public apprehension regarding whether the administration's promised safeguards are being taken to reduce the admitted hazards and risks to the national security inherent in last year's test ban treaty with Russia. It was necessary to get a self-serving letter, dated April 16, out of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg containing ambiguous and sirupy assurances on the subject. The White House released it to the public on April 20.

The promised safeguards are: First, continuing underground test programs; second, maintenance of our nuclear laboratories; third, maintenance of readiness to resume atmospheric testing; and, fourth, improvement of facilities to detect test ban cheating.

Apprehension over the safeguards is well taken and can hardly be set to rest by biased self-assessments from McNamara and Seaborg on how well they are doing their jobs. If they are doing a lousy job, would anyone expect them to write a letter to the President admitting it?

What the public is left with, of an unclassified nature, that can be used to estimate the extent of their work is basically the amount of money cold budget figures indicate they are devoting to it. This record not only generates apprehension, it supports downright alarm.

These figures do not separate out precisely the expenditures of the DOD and AEC on either capital items or operational costs. It is necessary to deal with a combination of both and, necessarily, their totals. Even so, what was being spent on items bearing on the safeguards before the treaty and after the treaty should give some hint as to the vigor or lack of vigor with which the safeguards are being pursued. Here is the record:

The AEC's before test ban fiscal year 1964 budget for 'underground testing; readiness for testing; common laboratory test items; detection; development, production and storage of atomic weapons; and weapons plant and capital equipment items was $941 million.

Right after the test ban treaty, in late 1963, it got a supplemental authorization of $18 million for safeguards

items and for fiscal 1965 has asked for $891 million for the above-listed test-related items. Added together, $18 million and $891 million makes $909 million after the test ban—$32 million less than the $941 million before the test ban. These are not reassuring figures by which to judge the AEC's alleged zeal on the subject of safeguards.

Mr. McNamara has done a little better. On February 3 he told the House Armed Services Committee the DOD spent $224 million on safeguards items before the test ban and now wants to spend $280 million, a $54 million increase. But, when the DOD increase is whittled away by the AEC decrease, total increased spending on items involving the safeguards is only $41 million—a minuscule 3½-percent boost in spending between pre-test ban treaty circumstances, and post-test ban treaty circumstances, despite all the admissions of risks and hazards and all the promises, made with such fanfare, to safeguard against them.

On September 24 of last year, I wrote the late President Kennedy that it would cost at least $1 billion to buy the equipment and build the facilities necessary to implement the safeguards adequately and cost roughly one-fourth billion dollars annually to operate them. These figures were for new and additional expenditures, over and above expenditures then being incurred and which should continue. If only one-fifth the necessary capital expenditures were made this year, $200 million, and the estimated operating expenditures for the safeguards, $250 million, the total safeguards expenditures increase this year should have amounted to $450 million. Yet, according to the above calculations, it actually amounts to only $41 million—a shortage of $409 million, or less than 10 percent of the spending estimated as necessary to carry out the safeguards adequately and protect the national security with assurance.

Inasmuch as the McNamara-Seaborg pat-ourselves-on-the-back letter was released yesterday and pushed out by the headlines of Premier Khrushchev's uninspected promise to be good and not finish some plutonium reactors that are not yet built, the White House probably will make another run on trying to get some safeguards publicity. Those interested might tuck away the foregoing facts somewhere for future reference at that undeterminable time.

Indian Fish Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Indians are frequently criticized for failing to take an interest in the conservation of valuable fisheries resources. Most of this criticism stems from the unfortunate practices of those few Indians who repeatedly violate conservation practices in off-reservation fishing. Recently, however, the Inter-Tribal Council of Western Washington Indians, representing 37 tribes and bands in the western part of my home State, passed a resolution recognizing that they possess "undeveloped and unexplored, valuable fisheries resources." They also asked for assistance in the development of Indian fisheries on Indian reservations.

Because I think this resolution presents another side to the story of Indian fishing, and because I think the request contained in this resolution should be brought to the attention of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this resolution in the RECORD:

INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF WESTERN WASHINGTON INDIANS

"Whereas the Inter-Tribal Council of the Western Washington Indians in regular quarterly session, this 11th day of April 1964, at Tulalip Tribes Community Hall; and

"Whereas the 37 tribes and bands of western Washington, located on 11 reservations, possess undeveloped and unexplored, valuable fisheries resources; and

"Whereas the said tribes are not in financial position to explore the potential fishery resources; and

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife personnel are qualified to undertake a survey; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs has only one qualified officer to undertake the operation of developing Indian fisheries on these reservations; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Western Washington Indians duly request added personnel to assist the lone U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife representative in our area."

Passed this 11th day of April 1964.

(Signed) SEBASTIAN WILLIAMS,
President.

A Son's Legacy: MacArthur's Credo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, whatever the arguments for or against General MacArthur, they will go on for years to come.

Until such time as an unbiased study is made of the whole MacArthur episode, these arguments will continue.

I recently came across an article in the Detroit Free Press of April 6, 1964, headed "A Son's Legacy: MacArthur's Credo," about a prayer written by General MacArthur. I subscribe to it and am sorry I could not have done as good a job as he did in giving my children a creed to live by. I submit this prayer so that my sons may see it now and in the future and I hope many of the sons of other Members of Congress likewise will read and be guided by it.

The article follows:

GENERAL WROTE PRAYER—A SON'S LEGACY: MACARTHUR'S CREDO

WASHINGTON.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur left a spiritual legacy to his son, Arthur—a father's prayer he wrote in the Philippines during the desperate early days of the Pacific war.

According to the general's biographer and confidant, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, the family repeated this MacArthur credo many times during early-morning devotions:

"Build me a son, O Lord, who will be strong enough to know when he is weak, and brave enough to face himself when he is afraid; one who will be proud and unbending in honest defeat, and humble and gentle in victory.

"Build me a son whose wishes will not take the place of deeds; a son who will know Thee—and that to know himself is the foundation stone of knowledge.

"Lead him, I pray, not in the path of ease and comfort, but under the stress and spur of difficulties and challenge. Here let him learn to stand up in the storm; here let him learn compassion for those who fail.

"Build me a son whose heart will be clear, whose goal will be high, a son who will master himself before he seeks to master other men, one who will reach into the future, yet never forget the past.

"And after all these things are his, add, I pray, enough of a sense of humor, so that he may always be serious, yet never take himself too seriously. Give him humility, so that he may always remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, and the meekness of true strength.

"Then I, his father, will dare to whisper, 'I have not lived in vain.' "

Robert Moses: The Engineering-Architect Genius of Modern Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the powerful moving force of the master planner, Robert Moses, unfolds itself today in the spectacular eighth wonder of the world—the New York World's Fair.

There is little doubt that this man, cut in the classic tradition of Michelangelo, Galileo, Archimedes and Sir Issac Newton and who can run a bulldozer, compute with a slide rule and breathe poetic prose in Latin or Greek, will find his place in history as one of the most brilliant public servants of our century.

With a warth that charms his friends and mesmerizes his enemies and a tartness of tongue which shatters his critics, he has fought with and worked with Governors and Presidents, Princes and Kings. He has fought with the high and the low, the Indians and the ladies in Central Park, but rarely lost. He has built highways and parkways, tunnels and bridges, great parks and power complexes.

And this great Fair is another monument to one who resides in my district and in my village of Babylon on Long Island in New York—Robert Moses.

I submit with pride for the RECORD this article from the April 22d edition of the Evening Star.

THEME OF THE WORLD'S FAIR—MANY OF VISITORS WILL NEVER KNOW OF MOTIVATION EMBODIED IN BUILDER

(By Charles Bartlett)

"Peace Through Understanding" is a vaporous theme for a World's Fair that can eloquently teach a more useful lesson to a generation that is impressed by the present and intrigued with the future.

The fair's glories will be related around the world after the lights go on. It is an awesome accumulation of the earth's beauties, blessings, and banalities, lumped together in random splendor upon Flushing Meadow.

A vast spectrum of knowledge and stimulation will be discovered here by the 70 million people whose visits are awaited. But many will leave, chastened in foot and pocketbook, without having learned the motivation that built the fair and perhaps the most valuable lesson that can be taken home from it.

The motivation and the lesson are embodied in the person of a 75-year-old builder, Robert Moses. A brilliant and vexatious man, Moses is more symbolic of the fair than the Unisphere because his character and genius pulled it together. The fair is the gaudiest product of a lifetime devoted to creating dams, parks, highways, and other enhancements of the public domain.

Hectored by critics and boycotted by much of the Western World, Moses worked against odds to bring the fair into being on schedule. Nursing the memory of the $22-million loss from the New York Fair of 1939–40, he proceeded in highly practical terms. "We cater at the fair," Moses said, "not only to the idealist but also to those who figure they can make money where 70 million people gather."

Moses did not take on this huge task in order to build a lagoon so Polynesian girls could dive for pearls before the eyes of tourists or in order to create a setting in which American industrialists could sell their mattresses, autos, and computers. He was assisted but not driven by the prospect that visitors to his fair may leave some $8 billion behind them.

The fact is that Moses, as he built the fair, was looking beyond it to the day when all the garish buildings would be bulldozed away and the rubble would be covered by black dirt and sodded with green grass. New York City does not particularly need a World's Fair—it is an extravaganza in itself. But New Yorkers do need parks to afford the air-breathing lungs of an existence that refutes nature.

The fair is erected, like the one 25 years ago, upon the Corona Dump or, in Moses' words, "upon the skeletons, baby carriages, and old umbrellas of Brooklyn." The first fair left the area in an indeterminate state somewhere between park and dump.

Moses has bent all his efforts to force the fair to yield an improved site and some $24 million in revenues to create a large and beautiful addition to the city's recreation system. "I trust it will not appear absurd," Moses asserted recently, "if I say that what is left of the fair grounds is at least as important to us as the success and imprint of the fair itself."

Only an exceptionally dedicated park planner like Moses would be willing to travel such a long and circuitous route to build a park. But New York will someday look back with fervent gratitude upon the vision and strength of this one man who combated the pressures of his time to protect the requirements that he saw for the future.

The consciousness of the need to reserve parklands is not as keen in other cities as Moses has made it in New York. The national sentiment is reflected in Congress slow progress upon the proposal to establish a 25-year program to acquire these areas.

If the visitors to the fair go home aware that the lavish spectacle was a passing device to secure a permanent park for New York, they may bring some of Moses' foresight into their own communities.

Urban Renewal and Tax Revenue: Detroit's Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a booklet entitled "Urban Renewal and Tax Revenue: Detroit's Success Story," sent to me by Mayor Cavanaugh of Detroit. I have read the publication thoroughly, and it is a success story, indeed. I would like to insert a summary of the Detroit story in the RECORD so that both friends and critics of the urban renewal program can see what it has done for one of the country's most important cities.

In 1950, Detroit pioneered the first residential redevelopment project under the Housing Act of 1949 that set up the original federally assisted slum clearance and redevelopment program. This was the 129-acre Gratiot project. When the program was undertaken, 7,500 people were crowded into some 2,000 badly substandard dwelling units. Violations of housing and sanitation codes were common; no hazard insurance was available in the area. The Gratiot area suffered from all the ills of slums—high rates of disease and delinquency—and all the other problems that are present when people are poorly housed and overcrowded. The 2,000 families were relocated into decent housing. The area has been redeveloped with 1,700 new dwelling units in beautiful high-rise apartments and townhouses. Churches, schools, and a shopping center round out a well-planned neighborhood, replacing the previous blighted conditions.

But, besides improving the living conditions of these families, there is another important benefit—the city gains in dollars and cents. One new building—Pavillion Apartments—pays more taxes than the entire 51 acres of residential property paid before redevelopment. For the entire Gratiot area, the assessed value before redevelopment was $2,884,000; the new assessed value is now estimated to be $15 million.

There are also other benefits. An area that once had nothing higher than a ramshackle smokestack, now boasts twin 22-story apartment houses, which dominate a fine, attractive landscape. These buildings were designed by Mies van de Rohe, one of the greatest living architects, and have won international praise and acclaim for their fine design. Still another benefit to Detroit, the new apartments provide the kind of in-town living that was not previously available and has attracted back to the city many families that had earlier moved to the suburbs.

Another development is a cooperative apartment house that provides low-cost living for teachers past 50 and sponsored by a teachers' association. This building is in a beautiful setting, adjacent to an 18-acre park. The old assessment on the parcel was $71,000, as compared to $446,000 today.

And this is but one of Detroit's projects. Another, the west side industrial project fulfills the vital need for land for new and relocated light industry. The project includes 169 acres, and dozens of new structures have replace the former substandard housing that occupied the area. Using dollars again as an indicator, where previously the assessed value of the property in the project area was $2.5 million, the new valuation in the same area will be $16 million.

Then there is Elmwood, a 460-acre area to be redeveloped in three stages. Upon completion it will provide middle-income housing, schools, churches, recreation areas, and shopping centers. The area formerly consisted of shabby frame dwellings, most of them unfit for human habitation. When complete, the assessed valuation will have increased from $2.735 million to $8.250 million.

The Medical Center project will give Detroit one of the finest medical complexes in the United States. The 236-acre blighted and slum environment will become instead a real asset to the city. New and improved medical facilities, including a new site for the Wayne State University College of Medicine, a $25 million complex of office and commercial buildings, and the building for the Rehabilitation Institute will occupy the site. The first section of the Medical Center will increase the tax base from less than $3 million to a new assessed value of $13 million.

The final urban renewal project covered in the report is the Central Business District No. 1. This area was formerly occupied by dingy pawnshops, rooming houses, and pool rooms—the "skid-row" section of Detroit; but was also the home of Detroit's Chinese community, some excellent restaurants, and interesting curio shops. Replacing this will be new commercial and industrial structures, but most dramatic will be "International Village." This new complex of shops, restaurants, and night spots will recreate the charm and warmth of other continents in the heart of Detroit. Featured attractions will include the Paris sidewalk cafe, the Arabian Bazaar, the Gay Nineties nightclub, the oriental teahouse, and many others. This will also enhance the Detroit financial picture—an estimated $40 million of assessments will replace the old assessed value of less than $4 million.

This is but a brief description of Detroit's urban renewal program. It will result in many important improvements, which are tremendously important to the citizens of the city, but are hard to measure in exact terms. The dollar value can be measured, however, as assessments in the six areas rise from $16,368,000 before redevelopment to $104,250,000 after. This, plus all the better housing that is being enjoyed by thousands of former slum dwellers makes this a pretty impressive record.

The War on Poverty and the Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the American Taxpayers Association, Inc., has issued a statement on the war on poverty which points up a number of difficulties in connection with this program as well as cautions that we in the Congress should be aware of.

It is interesting to note that the President has used his contingency fund to set up an organization before it has even been authorized by the Congress.

The entire statement follows:

TAX INFORMATION SERIES NO. 64-2—THE WAR ON POVERTY AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Governmental economy continues to be an emphasized election year theme in the Johnson administration. Concurrently, however, President Johnson has appointed Peace Corps Director, Sargent Shriver, as special Presidential assistant to implement a federally sponsored war on poverty campaign. Mr. Shriver, along with top personel loaned by the Departments of Labor, Defense, Commerce, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare is developing various phases of the program and specific activities to be legislatively approved and funded. This is not only a great and noble undertaking, but it also has the potential of being an economically practical step. However, there is also the possibility that the program will become an expensive futile endeavor defeated by its own inner contradictions. For this reason, it might be well to briefly discuss the means that will be utilized in the pursuit of these goals and some criteria that could be kept in mind to evaluate its progress.

It is easy to say that the Government will be frugal and prudent, but will also be responsive to the unfulfilled needs of its citizens. No doubt this is the sincere intention of President Johnson. The success of such a broad program demands far more than the dedicated designs of a small group of leaders. It must represent the united endeavors not only of the executive branch, but also the legislative, as the latter is the body most responsive to popular will. It is with some skepticism, therefore, that we learn that Sargent Shriver's poverty war task force has already grown into a staff of 27 officials, plus clerical help, with office facilities including 40 newly installed telephones. The unofficial headquarters and the personnel are being financed by allotments from President Johnson's contingency fund. It is understandable that some research and study must precede the presentation of such a program to Congress; however, extensive planning and projected projects should be authorized by a congressional appropriation. This initial task force should not grow unless it is the will of Congress, for the war on poverty will surely fail if it becomes a bone of contention between the executive and legislative branches.

On the surface, at least, there is an inherent conflict between the policy of frugality and a plan to eliminate poverty through improved opportunities for training, education, and employment, urban and rural community development, and increasing incentives for employment and investment. This opposition between saving and spending will be counteracted and balanced only if all levels and areas of the executive branch are dedicated to the program's success and agree upon the means to be used.

It must be recognized and accepted that some agencies will enjoy a priority on appropriations and others will have to cut down expenditures and possibly discontinue programs. This must also be accepted by our citizenry in general: If poverty is to be the criterion for receiving Federal aid and subsidies, then the demands of other privileged groups and representatives of geographical areas cannot be heeded. For example, there is currently a great deal of pressure on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to dislodge the Wonnies pension bill which originally provided a $100-a-month pension for all veterans of 1917–18. The present bill restricts the pension to World War I veterans with more than 90 days of service and incomes of less than $3,600 ($4,800 for married persons with dependents). We still think it is outrageous and that this demonstrates the potential snag in the poverty war that we were discussing. If antipoverty is to be the theme, then handouts on the basis of service only, amounting to almost $5 billion in 5 years, are out of line. Twenty-three million taxpayers would be contributing to pensions for about 1 million veterans with higher incomes. A successful war on poverty will eventually aid every American directly or indirectly, but a "veteran handout" not a disability payment, mind you, is in direct conflict with an austerity program.

General adherence to a single purpose to guide and motivate concerted action is a rare state of affairs in a governmental structure which is constantly plagued by petty interagency differences and power struggles. The danger of duplicated effort and overlapping policies and authority will have to be constantly watched. Already five Cabinet level departments are taking part in the plans that are being made and some of the announced and proposed programs are clearly similar in structure and/or purpose to programs and policies currently in effect. We do not intend to put a damper on the poverty war or to play the role of a negative armchair critic. However, since the time of the New Deal, Americans have witnessed bureaucratic mushrooming at an alarming rate. Endless debate, campaign slogans, platforms have promises, and two extensive and widely acclaimed Hoover Commission studies have been able only to stem the tide somewhat.

The tide referred to is the basic political tendency for the Government to move forward much more easily than backward. Once the funds and authority for a program have been allocated, there is a tendency for the agency or department involved to keep and expand that authority, and for the money expended to become deeply rooted in the economy. There is also the consideration that suspension of a program may force someone to admit that the money already invested has been wasted. For political, economic, and psychological reasons, then, it is difficult to terminate a program even when the wisdom for continuing it is seriously doubted or its basic purpose is to be incorporated into another program or superceded by it.

A prime example of this is the Navy radiotelescope program, which was never completed. It started in 1948 when Navy scientists desired a king size telescope that would detect radio signals from outer space. By 1956 this developed into the concept of a giant reflector 600 feet in diameter (twice the size of a regulation football field). The cost was estimated at 20 million with a personnel complement of 30 persons. After congressional authorization, the figures ballooned to a cost of 300 million and a complement of 1146 people who required offices, laboratories, housing, etc. The project was cancelled July 18, 1962, after 52 million had been spent. The President's science advisers considered cancellation in 1958 but it took the Department of Defense 4 years to decide to cancel the project. The war on poverty cannot afford such blunders.

Sargent Shriver has demonstrated his ability to implement new, untried plans, with a minimum of bureaucratic growth to conduct field operations. However, the Peace Corp was far removed from any existing program in purpose, substance, and structure. Welfare efforts, agricultural programs, urban renewal, measures to increase employment, industrial and investment incentives, and rural improvements all have been and are now being carried on by the Government. Hopefully, the war on poverty will bring forth not only sounder measures, rather than the stopgap approaches that have too frequently failed in the past, but also integrate the campaign in all areas of Government.

It will be particularly challenging to preach economy at the same time. If a clearly stated program evolves, it should be possible to allow expenditure priority for one area of Government and exact the highest standards of thrift in another. However, such a clear distinction has not been made thus far. It should be openly admitted that this war will be expensive. The current administration will surely be supported and long remembered if poverty and its tragic effects are reduced by its program.

The poverty war must not only be a planned and integrated movement. It must also be proposed, developed, and evaluated with the utmost honesty and frankness. This requires public tolerance as well as political courage. Otherwise costly mistakes may be covered up by continued waste.

The President recently announced various savings in the executive department resulting from unused appropriated funds. The largest single item was area redevelopment funds. In view of the recent emphasis on the need to eliminate poverty, this was a surprising statement which provides an example of a conflict of interest between domestic welfare programs and governmental economy. Programs such as the ARA should be clearly evaluated at the outset of the organized antipoverty campaign. If they have proven themselves to be successful, it would hardly seem to be the time to lower their funds. If they have failed to produce the results intended, why not scrap the program?

The campaign must be geared along the lines of a one-shot stimulus that will enable people to help themselves and overcome particular adversities and misfortunes that have kept them down. It cannot be justified on a permanent basis, although it will obviously take some time for it to be effective. The following letter received by a Member of Congress rather wittily portrays the kind of response that the poverty war should be consciously directed to avoid in deed as well as word:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I hate to tell you my troubles, but I have tried everything else I know. I feel that only you can help me now.

"I have a dependent relative staying with me who has very little fiscal responsibility. He is very good natured and means well, but he keeps buying presents for my wife and me, and our two children. He charges these presents to my account. When he sees something that he thinks we need he buys it for us.

"Many of these things are not needed by us and in very few cases are they exactly what we would have bought if we had bought these things ourselves. Because he doesn't work for a living, money doesn't mean too much to him and he tends to buy the first thing he sees and doesn't shop around like I would do if I were purchasing the items. He is also quite generous to the poor and needy, but often gives to those he doesn't know who feed him a soft line.

I just received a bill for his last spending spree and it gives me a sick hopeless feel-

ing. I keep thinking how much better off I would be if I could just spend that money for the things I want and could give to the people and charities I think are needy. Honestly, he does so much of my spending I tend not to give money to charity anymore.

"He won't listen to me, but he will listen to you because he respects you. Please use your influence to cut the spending habits of my Uncle Sam.

"Sincerely,

"——— ———."

Our intention has not been to encourage pessimistic reception, but rather, sound forethought. Every step in the direction of reducing chronic poverty, unemployment, and ignorance will certainly be a step forward. And, to the extent that steps taken now will eliminate the need for future and permanent subsidies and gifts. It is a practical and economic step also.

We hope that the implementation of the program will be as nonpolitical as the hopes and sentiments that it represents, and that it will be conducted for the purpose of, and with the effect of strengthening our system of private enterprise. The more taxpayers we can produce, the lighter the burden on the rest of us.

Today is a moment of truth for many Americans. We believe it is the responsibility and privilege of every citizen to support his Government by honestly paying his tax (which rates are too high) in accordance with existing law (which is too complex) to enable the Government to honor its commitments (which are too many).

The American Taxpayers Association renews its pledge to fight to lower taxes—fight to reduce unnecessary Federal expenditures—and fight to simplify a ridiculius hodgepodge legislation, which like Topsy, just grew, and, unfortunately, is still growing.

Israel After 16 Years

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in congratulating the people of Israel on the occasion of their April 17 anniversary as a free and sovereign nation. In 16 short years since World War II, these dedicated and industrious people have transformed a desert waste into a prosperous and growing economy; they have taken a population with diverse national and cultural heritages and formed a democratic society with a literacy rate of 78 percent; and they matured as a nation to the place where they now extend technical and economic assistance to 84 developing nations on 3 continents.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would take note of Israel's wise use of the talents of her women in her growth. Mrs. Golda Meir, Israel's distinguished foreign minister, is well known for her contribution to Israel and the free world. Her high position in government is symbolic of the participation and accomplishment at all levels of society of the women of this small but great people. At a time when President Johnson has called for the increased entry of talented women into public affairs, Israel provides an example to the world of the possibilities of contribution to the public good by her women.

The United States has maintained friendly and supportive relations with this nation throughout her existence, and I look forward to many more years of welcome cooperation. I would like to extend my cordial best wishes and those of the people of Minneapolis, Minn., to Israel. Her people can proudly commemorate the anniversary of her birth as a nation.

Our Colleagues Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix an invocation delivered by Maj. Karl Applbaum at the Annual Awards Dinner Meeting, of the Long Island Chapter, Association of the U.S. Army, honoring Steven B. Derounian, James Grover, and Lt. Gen Charles B. Duff, held Thursday, March 26, 1964, at Fort Totten, N.Y.:

Eternal God, Thou fountain of all that is excellent and beautiful in human life—to Thee we turn and ask Thy gracious blessings upon all those assembled here this evening to partake of the bounties which Thou has bestowed upon us. We thank Thee for having blessed us with the presence of Lt. Gen. Charles B. Duff to whom the American people have entrusted the defense of their homeland. Bless him with wisdom and understanding, with knowledge and fortitude, guide his thinking and endow him with all that is in Thy power to give. As we are living in troubled times. May he and his loved ones always enjoy the best of health. Bless the commanding general of this post, Brig. Gen. Bernard Waterman.

May the days which lie ahead give him the joys and pleasure which come to those who dedicate themselves for their country. We thank Thee, Oh God, for the presence on this earth of two Representatives in the Congress of the United States—STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN and JAMES GROVER who have been chosen by their peers to represent them in the citadel of democracy, the U.S. House of Representatives. We of the AUSA have selected them for their love and devotion to God and country and ask Thee, Father in Heaven, to be with them all the days of their lives. May they rise from strength to strength in their service to the United States of America. Guide them in all their endeavors, and be with them every moment of the day. May their voices be heard in the councils of democracy as they fight for what is right. Bless all those assembled here this evening in honoring our honored guests. Inspire us all with special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and impartial judgment, that we may uphold courageously that which is right and fair and follow faithfully whatever is honest and true.

We pray that Thou wilt abate and abolish every selfish ambition and unworthy motive and all feeling of envy and ill will among the various classes in our social order, healing divisions and discord, and strengthening the desires for mutual benefit. In Thee we give thanks now and forevermore. Amen.

"Pappy" Van Winkle: 90-Year, 100 Proof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following article written by George Hackett of the Associated Press. It is indeed a pleasure and honor to represent America's oldest master distiller, Julian P. Van Winkle, Sr., who recently celebrated his 90th birthday. Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the careful attention of the Members of Congress:

"PAPPY" VAN WINKLE: 90-YEAR, 100 PROOF—JIGGER OF COMMONSENSE

(By George W. Hackett)

Age shoved Julian P. Van Winkle, Sr., into a chair behind an executive's desk, but it never has been able to retire him.

Mention of the word "retirement," and America's oldest master distiller explodes.

His ever-present cane beats a tattoo on the floor, and his cigar quivers as "Pappy" Van Winkle explains why he is on the job today—his 90th birthday.

"I keep young by using a jigger of commonsense. Most human beings eat too much, drink too much, smoke too much. And they wear out quicker."

His only concession to time is a 4-hour work day at the distillery (Old Fitzgerald). He started out as one of its salesman at age 19, and now is president of the 22-acre plant.

It is a unique operation because Pappy won't allow a chemist on the grounds.

"You can't make good whisky in a hurry," he said emphatically. "That's what these chemists try to do. Whisky is a matter of time and nature."

When he escorts visitors around the plant, Pappy carefully points out that the more than 2,200 windows in 15 unheated warehouses are open 8 hours a day.

This opening-and-closing operation costs about $4,000 in labor a year, but Pappy contends that "our product sleeps best with the windows open."

Recently, he was taking a Scottish distiller on a warehouse tour when a windstorm arose. As a section of roof flew past his head, the Scot asked his guide, "Dinna ye overdo the ventilation in this place a wee bit?"

The incident eventually found its way into the one of the advertising columns which Pappy prepares for a number of national magazines.

WAS SALESMAN

Most of the anecdotes were collected while he was a salesman covering Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and West Virginia.

O none trip, Pappy encountered a barber with the strange name of "Either One."

Asked how that was acquired, the barber explained: "Mammy allowed she'd name me Abraham. My paw held out for Ulysses. Finally, they agreed to leave it to the preacher. His suggestion: 'Just name him either one.'"

In another little town, Pappy recalled, there was a housewife who baked only mince and apple pies. To tell them apart, she marked the crusts with the letters TM. One for "Tis mince" and the other for "'tain't mince."

ON TO LOUISVILLE

When Pappy enrolled at Centre College in his native Danville, Ky., the family expected him to enter politics. His father and

an uncle were lawyers, and also had served as Kentucky secretaries of state. But college didn't appeal to Pappy, so he came to Louisville, applied for a job at the distillery and was hired immediately.

"Salesmen today don't know what travel is," said Pappy. "Their idea is to be home every night. I'd go for 60 days by buggy and train, come back, and go right out again. You gotta keep busy to make money."

This philosophy is passed along to his salesmen, who meet occasionally in Pappy's office for a pep talk. Eventually, the conversation drifts around to the industry's critics.

"The distiller must face up to his antagonizers," Pappy asserts. "He is not a second-class citizen. Whisky is a Government-regulated business, besides being the highest taxed. Our people go to church and support almost all civic enterprises—with money and not conversation."

Not long ago, the president of a Kentucky college called on Van Winkle for a sizable contribution.

"What would your trustees think of accepting money from a distillery?" Pappy asked, half in jest.

"Don't worry," the educator replied. "We figure that money has been working for the Devil long enough. Let us have it for a while."

Pappy handed over a check.

How To Handle a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, Judge Lester H. Loble, district court judge in Helena, Mont., has an outstanding record in dealing with the juvenile problem in the country. In the April issue of the Reader's Digest is a story on the success that Judge Loble has had in handling juvenile matters through public hearings. In addition to that the judge has been active for a long time in this field and for the benefit of my colleagues I insert here a recent letter I had from Judge Loble concerning the success of another program:

Hon. JAMES BATTIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Over 30 years ago together with others, I helped establish a trade school at Helena. Over 9,000 students have received training there. It operates through the Helena High School and is outstanding. Every 2 years these high school students build a house, under the supervision of the trade school and the various labor unions. The house is sold. This school has trained 4,500 mechanics and technicians. It prepares youngsters for the building trades, welding, flight training—it has trained over 2,500 high school students and has a night school for adults. They have trained pilots, aviation mechanics, welders, electrical workers, radio repairmen and operators, etc. These graduates have been outstanding in Lockheed, Canaveral, and many other places. In short, we have been doing in Helena, Mont., for 30 years what is now being widely discussed in Washington. Someone in Washington who is identified with the new program ought to spend a week here.

This is very helpful in my juvenile program. I have had many youngsters who have been in some minor trouble continue in high school for a half day and go to this trade school for a half day. They have turned out to be very successful and some now own their own shops in the various trades, and some are working for other people. I recall a 14-year-old boy nearly 6 foot tall, who wanted to drop out of school (I knew he was embarrassed by the little kids). He wanted to be a mechanic. He did very well at the trade school.

Best regards,

LESTER H. LOBLE,
Judge.

Pfc. Alan Y. Matsuura Is Sixth South Vietnam Casualty From State of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, although the United States may not officially be at war, we hear—time and time again—of many of our fine young men, barely into manhood, yet serving with the Armed Forces overseas, gallantly sacrificing their lives in the ever-continuing fight for liberty, freedom, and the right to live under a democratic form of government.

One such dedicated soldier was Pfc. Alan Y. Matsuura of Honolulu, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Rokuro Matsuura, who, while in a helicopter at the scene of a battle in South Vietnam on April 12, 1964, was killed as the result of guerrilla attack.

Let us hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that the loss of their loved ones by the mothers and fathers of America, shall not prove in vain. Let us hope and pray that from such tragedies and profound moments of sorrow, as Mr. and Mrs. Matsuura have suffered, there will emerge the compensation of eventual attainment of world peace and the brotherhood of man. For surely, I say to my distinguished colleague, if we cannot learn how to live together, we shall all die together.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include the following article which appeared on the front page of the April 13, 1964, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

SIXTH ISLANDER IS KILLED IN VIETNAM

Pfc. Alan Y. Matsuura of Honolulu was killed yesterday in South Vietnam as a result of a missile wound in the chest, the Army announced today in Washington.

Matsuura, 19, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Rokuro Matsuura of 2633 Maunawai Place, was crew chief aboard a helicopter struck by Communist guerrilla fire, the Army said.

He was the sixth Islander to be killed in the Vietnam fighting.

"To me, it is a senseless war," Matsuura's father said in the morning.

His son was in the Army less than a year. He was sworn in last April 23 and was only home once since then—an hour's stopover while en route to Vietnam.

"We caught a glimpse of him at 3 o'clock in the morning," Matsuura said.

He said his son wrote home frequently, telling him about the work on his helicopter and advising the family not to worry.

Private First Class Matsuura was a graduate of Kalani High School. Before he went into the Army, he worked as a mechanic for a service station.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a brother, Kenneth D., and a sister, Pauline.

Other Island soldiers killed in Vietnam were CWO James H. Ishirhara, Cap. Kenneth Good, Specialists Richard Ellis and James Gabriel, and 1st Lt. Thorstan Scobel.

The Unholy Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the question of how far your Government and mine should go to finance the medical care of our senior citizens is one which has no easy answer. But Mr. Angelo Scott, of the Iola, Kans., Register has advanced a thought which is—sadly enough—overlooked with increasing frequency in today's Government.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial entitled "The Unholy Trinity," into the RECORD:

THE UNHOLY TRINITY

The Detroit Free Press moans: "Once, just once, before this old earth turns to ashes, we'd like to see a bureaucrat get a simple lesson through his head:

"The people and the taxpayers are the same; the Government and the people are the same; the Government and the taxpayers are the same."

How well I agree.

To listen to most pronouncements from Washington these days, you would think that the poor people of the country have nothing but the vote; that the taxpayers are a quite separate tribe, few in numbers and mostly as rich and impersonal as General Motors; and that the whole function of good old kindly Uncle Sam is to take from the taxpayers and give to the people.

But we also hear precisely the same sophistry from the other end of the line. We, the poor people right here in Iola, think it's just dandy if good old kindly Uncle Sam gives us some of the money he has taken from those far away rich taxpayers in the form of Federal aid for highways or flood control dams. That makes it free, doesn't it?

The Free Press was moved to its comments because of a speech in Detroit by a Federal official in favor of medical care for the aged through social security.

Most leaders of this movement, said the official, "have come to the conclusion that the 18 million aged cannot be adequately protected by the voluntary system either at their own expense or at the expense of younger contributors. The question, then, is what form government aid should take."

"There you have the classic trio," says the Free Press. "The poor people, aged and younger, who can't afford medical payments; the benevolent Government, which is going to help, and the taxpayer, who will pick up the tab.

"The catch, of course, is that they're all the same. There aren't any other people in this country except old people and younger people. If they can't pay medical costs between them, nobody can.

"In short, the Government (us) intends to make the taxpayers (us) kick in to provide medical care for the people (also us)."

P.P. & L.'s Operation Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent edition of the Public Utilities Fortnightly there is an article written by Mr. Joseph X. Flannery of my district regarding the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.'s Operation Trees program. This well-written article emphasizes the efforts being made by the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. and its officials to spread a carpet of green over some of the ugly scars left by the mining industry.

I commend Mr. Flannery for his article and the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. for their forward-looking attitude. I believe every Member of the House should be aware of this marvelous program:

WHAT OTHERS THINK—P.P. & L.'S OPERATION TREES

The Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. is carrying on a program to wrap a green curtain around the ugly relics of mining in the anthracite area of northeastern Pennsylvania.

Called Operation Trees, the program is designed to restore the natural beauty to an area pockmarked with piles of mine waste and stripping scars.

Improving the physical beauty of the anthracite area might have been reason enough for the project, but P.P. & L. also expects that adding to the aesthetic beauty of the region will increase its opportunities for economic growth.

An industrial prospect might like the available labor supply, and available industrial sites, low-cost financing, proximity to markets and the area's highway, air and rail transportation system, but he may decide against locating in the coal region because of the unsightly appearance of mining relics.

P.P. & L.'s solution is simple: Hide the blighted areas behind banks of trees. The company's goal for 1964 is to plant 250,000 trees in an area extending from Carbondale, in the northeast corner of Lackawanna County, to Lykens, in Dauphin County. The chief cities in the area are Scranton and Wilkes-Barre.

Ultimately, P.P. & L. hopes that the program will be a spur for the planting of 20 million trees that will transform the land face of some 700 square miles of land in the anthracite area.

Planting trees to cover blighted areas might seem a simple matter, but the peculiar qualities of the soils involved required a considerable amount of research. Some type trees simply would not live in soils composed mostly of mine wastes or stripping subsoils.

For this reason, the tree-planting program was attacked in three phases. With P.P. & L. contributing about $60,000, the first phase was a research and study program carried out by the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The next phase was to locate and map the areas where the tree covers are necessary. The third phase was to do additional experimental work with additional species of trees not encountered in the original survey to determine if they would be adaptable to screening purposes.

All the information was coded on a series of 35 maps covering the entire anthracite region. These maps show highway approaches to communities and major connecting roads; indicate where plantings are prescribed; where bulldozing or grading is required; and also translate the miles of needed tree shield into type and numbers of seedlings required for screening the mine workings.

"Stimulus for developing the program was the basic problem always encountered by the anthracite area people in their efforts to attract new industry," explained R. C. Swartz, vice president of P.P. & L.'s Divisions Operations Department. He added:

"The problem, of course, is that all too frequently potential new industry finds economic factors agreeable. But the lack of aesthetic attractions affects these economic factors. In plain words, industry can find excellent inducements in the form of plant sites, shell buildings, low-cost financing, willing and skilled workers, friendly people, convenience to workers—most everything except perhaps the decisive factor, natural beauty."

It was not always that way in Pennsylvania's anthracite region. The area was once blessed with a wealth of natural resources. Verdant mountain landscapes and sparkling lakes and streams were the area's heritage. Magnificent forests supported a major lumber industry.

But the "black gold," the world's finest deposits of anthracite coal, changed the face of the area. Starting in the early 1800's, the mining of coal became the area's chief industry. However, since World War II the industry has been in a steep decline and the area has managed to stay alive only because of its intensive industrial development programs. P.P. & L. has cooperated with every such program and its tree planting is another phase of this cooperation.

Restoring the face of the land is a major job, however. According to the research done by the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, the total area classified as disturbed by deep and strip mining up to a year ago was about 112,000 acres. Of this acreage, 76 percent was due to strip mining and more than half of this stripped land was devoid of tree cover.

In all, 19 percent of the total area in the coal fields has been physically disturbed.

P.P. & L., while it has borne most of the cost of establishing the tree-planting program, is turning to service clubs and civic groups to help carry out the actual planting. "We believe this is a practical idea, one that can be initiated quickly, and one in which all segments of the community can participate," Mr. Swartz stated.

To enlist help from community groups, P.P. & L. has sent out brochures to numerous clubs and other organizations, providing background data on the program and showing how a community group can undertake a tree-shield planting. Also included were maps of the area, detailing proposed planting sites, a list of nurseries which will offer guidance and seedling stock, and some basic instructions for tree planting.

"For all approved sites—those most suitable and most in need of planting—P.P. & L. will provide the seedlings for community groups," Mr. Swartz explained. In addition, the company will make its own forester, John P. Mikulecky, available to assist in coordinating the individual screening projects. P.P. & L. district representatives also will work with community groups.

While P.P. & L. has aimed primarily at service clubs and civic organizations to sponsor individual projects during the 6-week planting season, it also is seeking cooperation from coal operators, landowners, merchants and industry, unions, school classes, Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, 4-H Clubs, and Future Farmers and Future Homemakers of America.

Mr. Swartz said that the P.P. & L. program will not terminate with the planting of the screens. He said that expansion of the beautification efforts beyond the roadside screens will increase the important collateral benefits, such as reducing erosion, providing timber, wildlife food and cover, and other conservation effects. Thus, the program includes possibilities for turning some of the larger minestripping operations into future ponds for recreation.

The initial tree-screen plantings in the program were made last spring. Local groups participated with P.P. & L. employees in planting 1,100 trees at Hazleton, Scranton, and Carbondale.

These sample areas were chosen for immediate tree planting on the basis of their proximity to major highways, assuring maximum exposure of the trees to residents, visitors, and travelers, and in line with the overall aims of the program. To show what could be accomplished, four- and five-foot trees were supplied by P.P. & L. to provide a better idea of the potential of the screening process.

Mr. Swartz explained that the program is a long-range undertaking. While major accomplishements will be evident within a few years, the entire program likely will take 2 decades.

But he and other P.P. & L. officials are confident that the day will come when the anthracite area will once again regain its original natural beauty—with the ugly remains of the minning industry tucked away behind a living barrier of trees.

JOSEPH X. FLANNERY.

DUNMORE, PA.

Quality Is No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as has been recounted over and over again, it is imperative that we preserve the independent retail outlets of this Nation. The furtherance of our free, competitive enterprise is dependent upon this method of serving the general public throughout the Nation.

Each year we are seeing more and more of the independent retailers fading away and closing their doors. The trend is toward the organized, privately owned outlets, centralized chain store operations and "discounter type" retail outlets. It is estimated that within the next 10 years, 80 percent of the retail business in this country will be performed by this type of merchandising.

Whether or not this trend is designed to drive the small independent merchants out of business is a subject of continual debate. We do know, however, that it is happening in this country. Just as we are experiencing a more centralized Government we will inevitably have a more centralized retail operation which can only lead toward greater monopoly and less competition, the basis of our free enterprise system.

For several years efforts have been made to impede this trend of activity through the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, designed to protect the

quality of products produced by manufacturers and made available to the American people. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the quality stabilization bill almost a year ago. It is admitted to be controversial since it involves highly competitive procedure.

The opposition has been able to forestall any further action.

Recently the Eagle Democrat of Warren, Ark., had an editorial "Quality is No Bargain," which I think is most appropriate to this situation. Under unanimous consent I include it in these remarks:

QUALITY IS NO "BARGAIN"

The discounters are out to kill the quality stabilization bill, designed by congressional sponsors to protect the quality of products bought by the American housewife.

They charge that the sponsors—leaders of both political parties—desire only to impede "progress" of the giant merchandisers, in the face of their own boasts that they will "take over, lock stock and barrel, by 1970, 80 percent of the retail business in the country."

Every housewife knows that price alone is no indication of value. She knows too that manufacturers of national brand merchandise spend millions on research and advertising to develop her continuing loyalty. But first they must build quality into their products because they know that she prefers slightly higher priced quality merchandise to shoddy goods.

The unethical mass merchant literally steals the good reputation of national brand products by using them as loss leaders to build up store traffic. But he does not tell the housewife that he makes up these losses by overcharging on hundreds of unknown products.

Purpose of the discounter is to drive small merchants out of business to control a market area so that he can dictate the whole prices at which he will continue to handle a manufacturer's products. If the manufacturer complies, this usually means a sacrifice in quality.

Quality stabilization protects quality by giving the manufacturer the option to refuse the use of his good name and reputation in unethical and deceptive advertising and to permit him to establish a fair retail price on products bearing his trademark.

So it is easy to see why discounters oppose this measure. They are not interested in quality, but price alone—to bait the American housewife with "cheap" merchandise.

Eighty-eighth Congress Rollcall Record of Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, individual responsibility of elected legislators is one of the requisites of successful representative government. The record of rollcall votes, which becomes a public document, plays an essential part in our governmental system under which Members of the House of Representatives render regular accounts to their constituents at the close of each Congress.

I am appending herewith a short résumé of my rollcall record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress and the 2d session through rollcall No. 54. The rollcalls omitted from this brief summary are, of course, the quorum calls:

Rollcall record of CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., House of Representatives

1ST SESS., 88TH CONG.

Rollcall No.	Legislation	Explanation of action or title of the bill	MATHIAS' vote
2		Election of Speaker	Halleck.
3	H. Res. 5	Relating to rules of the House	Nay.
4	H. Res. 5	Relating to rules of the House. On agreeing to resolution	Yea.
6	H. Res. 249	Authorize expenditure for Committee on Un-American Activities	Yea.
8	H.R. 2438	Extend provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act	Yea.
9	H.R. 4374	To proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States	Yea.
12	H.R. 2440	Appropriations for the Armed Forces. On amendment No. 2	Yea.
13	H.R. 2440	Appropriations for the Armed Forces. On motion to recommit	Yea.
14	H.R. 2440	Appropriations for the Armed Forces	Yea.
16	H.R. 5366	Appropriations for Treasury and Post Office and related agencies	Yea.
19	H.R. 5517	Supplemental appropriations	Yea.
20	H.R. 5389	Repeal certain legislation relating to purchase of silver	Yea.
23	H.R. 12	Motion to recommit: Increase opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel	Nay.
24	H.R. 12	Increase opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel	Yea.
29	H.R. 4997	To extend feed grain program. To recommit	Yea.
30	H.R. 4997	To extend the feed grain program	Nay.
38	H.R. 40	Provide additional facilities at State agricultural experiment stations	Yea.
40	H.J. Res. 245	To provide that Members of Congress be limited to costs of travel outside United States	Yea.
41	H.R. 5517	Supplemental appropriations	Yea.
45	H.R. 5517	do	Yea.
46	H.R. 5517	do	Nay.
48	H. Res. 340	Granting additional travel authority to Committee on Education and Labor	Yea.
51	H.R. 6009	Provide temporary increase in public debt limit. To recommit	Yea.
52	H.R. 6009	Provide temporary increases in public debt limit	Nay.
54	H. Res. 362	Providing for consideration of H.R. 6060	Yea.
58	H. Res. 368	Authorizing appointment of delegates to International Labor Organization Conference	Yea.
59	H.R. 5497	To amend Agricultural Act	Nay.
61	H.R. 3496	To amend the Reorganization Act	Yea.
72	H.R. 6754	Appropriations for Department of Agriculture and related agencies	Yea.
74	H.R. 6868	Appropriations for legislative branch	Yea.
79	H.R. 4996	To amend Area Redevelopment Act	Nay.
81	H.R. 6755	Extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates	Yea.
83	H.R. 7063	Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and related agencies	Yea.
85	H.J. Res. 247	To suspend equal opportunity requirements of Communications Act of 1934	Yea.
87	H.R. 6177	To amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act. On motion to recommit	Yea.
91	H.R. 7179	Appropriations for Defense Department	Yea.
93	H.R. 3179	To provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior	Yea.
95	H.R. 4897	To repeal subsec. (d) of sec. 2388 of title 18 of United States Code	Yea.
96	H.R. 5279	Appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies. Conference report on motion to recommit	Yea.
97	H.R. 5279	Appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies	Yea.
102	H.R. 6518	Programs for prevention and abatement of air pollution	Yea.
104	H.R. 4638	To promote transfer of Executive power. On motion to recommit	Nay.
106	H.R. 3872	To increase lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. Conference report. Further conference	Yea.
108	H. Res. 453	Providing for consideration of H.R. 5207 to amend Foreign Service Buildings Act	Yea.
110	H. Res. 467	Providing for consideration of H.R. 7500	Yea.
111	H.R. 7500	Appropriations to National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Yea.
113	S. 1652	To amend National Culture Center Act	Yea.
115	H.R. 4955	To expand the vocational education opportunities. To recommit	Yea.
116	H.R. 4955	To expand the vocational education opportunities. On passage	Yea.
118	H. Res. 477	Providing for consideration of H.R. 7824	Yea.
121	H.R. 7824	Motion to recommit bill to continue existing temporary increase in public debt limit	Yea.
122	H.R. 7824	To continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit	Nay.
124	H.R. 7525	Motion to recommit District of Columbia crime bill	Yea.
126	H.R. 6143	To authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education	Yea.
132	H.R. 7885	Motion to recommit a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961	Nay.
133	H.R. 7885	To amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961	Yea.
139	H.R. 7500	To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Paired for.
146	H. Res. 504	To create a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by Federal Government	Yea.
151	H. Res. 527	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954	Yea.
156	H.R. 8363	Motion to recommit bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954	Yea.
157	H.R. 8363	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954	Nay.
160	H.R. 5555	To increase rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services	Yea.
167	H.R. 7179	Defense Department appropriations	Yea.
170	H.R. 8747	Motion to recommit bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus	Yea.

Rollcall record of CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., *House of Representatives*—Continued

Roll-call No.	Legislation	Explanation of action or title of the bill	MATHIAS' vote
171	H.R. 8747	Appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus	Yea.
172	H.R. 5871	Retirement benefits of judges	Yea.
174	H.R. 6237	Grants for collection, reproduction, and publication of material for history of the United States	Nay.
176	S. 1576	To provide assistance in combating mental retardation	Yea.
178	H.R. 8821	Methods by which amounts available to the States are restored to the Treasury	Yea.
180	H.R. 5945	To settle political status of Puerto Rico	Yea.
183	H.J.Res. 782	Appropriations for fiscal year 1964	Yea.
184	H. Res. 314	To grant additional travel authority to Education and Labor Committee	Yea.
188	H.R. 6500	Construction at military installations	Yea.
189	H.R. 8195	To amend Agricultural Act of 1949	Nay.
191	H.R. 6143	Conference report on bill to authorize assistance to institutions of higher education	Yea.
192	H.R. 8920	To revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. Motion to recommit	Yea.
194	H. Res. 564	For temporary increases in public debt limit	Yea.
195	H.R. 8969	Motion to recommit bill for temporary increases in the public debt limit	Yea.
196	H.R. 8969	For temporary increases in the public debt limit	Nay.
200	H.R. 8864	International Coffee Agreement, 1962	Nay.
205	H.R. 9139	For military construction	Yea.
207	H.R. 9140	Appropriations for certain civil functions administered by certain Government agencies	Yea.
209	S. 777	To amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act	Yea.
211	H.R. 9124	To amend title 10, United States Code	Nay.
213	H.R. 10	To extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act	Nay.
219	H.R. 6196	Motion to recommit bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton	Yea.
220	H.R. 6196	To encourage increased consumption of cotton	Nay.
224	H.R. 7885	Conference report on bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961	Yea.
226	H.R. 8929	Motion to recommit bill to authorize prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region	Nay.
227	H.R. 8747	Conference report on bill for sundry appropriations	Yea.
228	H.R. 8747	Appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus	Yea.
230	H.R. 6518	For prevention and abatement of air polution; conference report	Yea.
233	H. Res. 579	To provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts	Yea.
235	H.R. 9140	Conference report for appropriations for certain civil functions administered by certain Government agencies	Yea.
237	H.R. 4955	Conference report on vocational education bill on motion to recommit	Nay.
238	H.R. 4955	Conference report on vocational education	Yea.
240	H.R. 9139	Conference report on appropriations for military construction	Yea.
242	H.R. 9499	Motion to recommit bill for appropriations for foreign aid	Nay.
243	H.R. 9499	Appropriations for foreign aid	Yea.
245	H.R. 8667	Appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins	Yea.
246	H.R. 9413	For coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy	Yea.
248	H.J.Res. 875	Supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964	Yea.
251	H. Res. 598	To waive points of order against conference report on H.R. 9499	Yea.
255	H. Res. 600	do	Yea.
256	H.R. 9499	Conference report on appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964	Paired for.

2D SESS., 88TH CONG.

11	H.R. 4879	To amend the Library Services Act. On amendment	Yes.
12	H.R. 4879	Motion to recommit the Library Services Act	Yea.
13	H.R. 4879	To amend the Library Services Act	Yea.
17	H. Res. 582	Providing for consideration of H.R. 6041	Yea.
19	H.R. 6041	To amend the Davis-Bacon Act	Yea.
32	H.R. 7152	To enforce the constitutional right to vote	Yea.
35	H.R. 7381	Relating to employment of civilians in more than 1 position	Nay.
39	H.R. 9637	Appropriations for the Armed Forces	Yea.
43	H.R. 8363	To amend Internal Revenue Code	Yea.
48	H.R. 9022	To amend the International Development Association Act. To recommit	Nay.
51	H.R. 8316	To amend the Communications Act	Yea.

Minneapolis Has an All-America Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in his speech of April 8 congratulating Minneapolis as on All-America City, Mr. Vernon C. Myers, editor of Look magazine, cited Minneapolis for its citizen concern for preservation of its land for recreational purposes. The park system in Minneapolis has always been one of her outstanding features. This is a major reason why people who must leave Minneapolis, leave with deep regret. The following are excerpts from Mr. Myers' speech to consider as the discussion of our national conservation program proceeds:

MINNEAPOLIS HAS AN ALL-AMERICA PARK SYSTEM

In becoming a candidate for the All-America City Award, Minneapolis did not stress in its entry the city's 154 lovely parks within the city limits—a park for approximately every 3,000 people. And not the little postage-stamp-sized affairs that are called parks in some big cities, but spacious recreation areas. I understand that you now have a park system that affords more than an acre of park for every hundred Minneapolitans, so that if, one spring day, every man, woman, child, and dog decided to go to the park at the same moment, there would be space for everyone without trampling down the grass.

It is probably such an old story to you that you tend to take for granted the unusual means by which you have created these parks over the years. But others are impressed by the simple logic of your method. A park, you believe, like street paving and sidewalks, is an improvement that should be paid for by the neighborhood that wants it and will most enjoy it.

I, myself, am particularly impressed by the "citizen action" involved in bringing these parks to birth. Your method is described in an article by Ruth and Edward Brecher, writing in the National Civic Review for last October. The authors say:

"The plan is a shining example of neighborhood democracy at work. A young mother worried about her children playing in the streets, for example, may take her concern to her PTA meeting and suggest a new playground. The PTA joins with the neighborhood improvement association and auxiliaries of nearby churches to consult park officials. They draw up tentative plans for a neighborhood park with a sandbox and wading pool, swings, and teetertotter. Soon other suggestions pour in for tennis courts, a baseball field, sinking the field a few feet so it can be flooded in the winter for skating."

The article then describes the succeeding steps—the final plans drawn up by the park board architect—the estimate of assessments, usually averaging a modest $5 or so per year, per homeowner—and the canvass by the park enthusiasts to obtain signatures of at least 51 percent of the neighborhood property owners.

Your plan is impressive because it is sensible, practical, workable, and as American as fried chicken and corn on the cob. It is the way we have always done things. Back in 1830, the observant Frenchman, Alexis de Toqueville, summed it up during a visit to these shores. He wrote in astonishment—"These Americans are the most peculiar people in the world. * * * In a local community in their country a citizen may conceive of some need which is not being met. What does he do? He goes across the street and discusses it with his neighbor. Then what happens? A committee comes into existence, and then the committee begins functioning on behalf of that need. You won't believe it, but it's true. All of this is done by the private citizens on their own initiative."

Although this was written more than 130 years ago, it is a perfect description of the way in which Minneapolitans go about keeping their city beautiful, whether their community action be for the creation of a neighborhood park or for a massive face lifting of the downtown area.

I have emphasized your park system to this extent because you are doing here on a small scale what should be done on a national scale in every square mile of the land. And it should be done without delay. It is said that the U.S. population will have

doubled by the year 2000, and that is only 36 years away. Land will be eaten up by the homes, stores, schools, theaters, libraries, highways, hotdog stands, and garages needed for this Nation once again the size of the one we now have, even as the demand for recreational space increases.

Secretary Udall of the Interior says the strain on our national parks is already being felt, not only in the crowded Eastern States but in the once great open spaces of the West as well. For example, the Park Service limits the number of horse parties that may enter certain Rocky Mountain fastnessses, because a string of 50 horses not only crops a wide area, but their hoofs damage the turf and prepare the way for erosion. One lakeside area in the Grand Tetons was so badly damaged that horses are no longer permitted there at all. And the breath-taking beauty of the Yosemite Valley has been so threatened by turism that the Park Service has quietly uncrowded some areas by reducing tourist facilities.

Let's think about this for a minute. By the year 2000, the population will have doubled, with all their attendant needs for housing and service. Highways alone take up a surprising amount of space. In 1972, when the Government has completed its Interstate Highway System—now one-third finished—it will have leveled, graded, drained and paved 41,000 miles of right-of-way, enough to cover an area 1½ times the size of the State of Rhode Island.

But side by side with the exploding population, other trends are at work. Shorter working hours, more leisure, more income and greater mobility will bring, not a double, but a threefold increase in the use of recreation areas.

If our children, and their children, are to share any part of our rich heritage of space in which to breathe fresh air, to rest, to look up at the stars undimmed by man-made lighting, to listen to the great silence of the forest, we shall have to act quickly and surely. We shall have to give up, without regret, one of our freedoms—the freedom to missuse, uglify and despoil the land.

What Minneapolis has done over the past 80 years, the entire Nation must now do. It must begin an intensive campaign of land use analysis, and stake out areas for wilderness and recreation now—before the bulldozers come.

The original impetus must come from private citiezns. It must be a case of neighbor meeting with neighbor on a large scale—of citizen organizations pressing for action at the city level, at the State level, and at the National level through their representatives in Congress.

As Secretary Udall says, "Unless we can arouse the people, the whole thing will go by default."

For two reasons, the people of Minneapolis should be the first to appreciate and act on this urgent problem. You have everything to gain and nothing to lose by protecting your own well-known lake districts and spots of natural beauty within the State of Minnesota. And you have proved yourselves master craftsmen in the use and rehabilitation of land within your city.

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am saddened by the passing of Mel Maas. He was not only a friend, but I served with him on the old Naval Affairs Committee in the early 1940's. Since then I have been listening to him for many years trying to do something to help the handicapped people of our country. He was one of the most courageous men I have ever known. A tireless and dedicated worker for all the handicapped.

His biographical background gives some indication of the measure of the man, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to include a brief synopsis of it under leave to extend my remarks.

MAJ. GEN. MELVIN J. MAAS, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE, RETIRED

General Maas was reappointed Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped on March 4, 1961, by President Kennedy. He had previously served as Chairman since appointed on April 13, 1954, by President Eisenhower. In addition, he served as Chairman emeritus of the Committee for the Handicapped, people-to-people program, having been named Chairman by President Eisenhower on May 29, 1956.

His career includes 16 years as a Congressman from Minnesota; service in the U.S. Marines in three wars, rising from a private in Marine aviation in 1917 to his present rank in August 1952. He was a native of Duluth, Minn.

CONGRESS

First elected to Congress from Minnesota in 1926, at the age of 27. Served from 1927 to 1933 and from 1935 to 1945. In 1933 he received national recognition and the Carnegie Silver Medal for heroism when he disarmed a man in the House galleries who was threatening Members with a loaded revolver. During his career in Congress, he specialized in legislation promoting aviation, national defense, and measures to improve the unemployment situation. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, General Maas sponsored several international conferences designed to bring about better relations with foreign powers. Prior to World War II he sponsored legislation to fortify Guam and was joint author of legislation setting up a promotion system for the Navy. He also was sponsoring author of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 which governed the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve until passage of the Armed Forces Reserve Act. He also was the congressional author of the legislation creating the first military Women's Reserve.

MARINE CORPS

Entered the Marine Corps April 6, 1917. Served with Marine Aviation in the Azores throughout the war. In 1926 he accepted a Marine Reserve commission prior to entering Congress. In the summer of 1941 he returned to active duty and served at sea on the staff of Adm. William Halsey and in 1942 with Adm. Frank J. Fletcher in the Solomons campaign. He also served as a Marine Corps observer with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Australia and New Guinea. He was awarded the Silver Star Medal for service with the Army Air Force at the Battle of Milne Bay in 1942. He also won the Legion of Merit in combat. In addition he wears 12 other ribbons. In the fall of 1942 General Maas resumed his duties in Congress but returned to active duty in January 1945. In May of that year he assumed command of the Awase Air Base, Okinawa, where he received the Purple Heart. He was promoted to brigadier general in the Marine Reserve, June 1, 1950. Blindness overtook him in 1951 and on August 1 of that year he retired and was advanced to major general rank for having been specially commended in combat.

PUBLIC LIFE

For his untiring efforts in behalf of the Marine Corps Reserve he was known as "Mr. Marine Corps Reserve." For 6 years he served as a member of the Reserve Forces policy Board in the Department of Defense. He served as chairman of the board, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, and was a past commander in chief, Military Order of the World War, past national commander, Disabled American Veterans (1955–56), and past national president of the Blinded Veterans Association (1960–61).

In his early business career he was salesman and sales manager. Later, he managed a manufacturing firm in St. Paul, Minn. In 1925 he organized his own insurance firm. He was assistant to the board chairman of the Sperry Corp. from 1946 until recalled to active duty in the Korean conflict. He was a director of the United Services Life Insurance Co. and of Mutual of Omaha.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

On June 4, 1954, General Maas was awarded a degree of doctor of laws at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., his alma mater. Subsequently, he had been honored by Marquette University, Goodwill Industries of America, United Cerebral Palsy, National Rehabilitation Association, American Foundation for the Blind, Tri-Organization Scientific and Rehabilitation Conference 1961, and with the Veterans' Administration Citation for Exceptional Service. In 1958 General Maas received the AMVETS Silver Helmet Award for his long career in public service.

On January 17, 1961, General Maas received a Presidential Citation signed by President Eisenhower, noting his major contribution to the cause of the handicapped. On the following day he was presented with the Department of Defense Distinguished Public Service Medal in recognition of his contribution to national defense.

The General resided with his wife, Katherine, and their son, Melvin Joseph, Jr., at 4714 Essex Street, Chevy Chase, Md. His daughter, Pataricia, is a Woman Marine Major. His other daughters, are Mrs. Anthony C. Martino, Richmond, Va., and Mrs. Leo Catterton, Annapolis, Md.

The Independence of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it was 16 years ago that Israel was proclaimed independent. The future of the country in its first moments of life seemed bleak and unpromising. The small wedge of land at the eastern end of the Mediterranean had been torn by a war that left its cities in ruin and its fields brown and barren. And yet there was a dream of hope in Israel for millions of people. Into the new country poured many men and women with their children to begin a new life. They came from all parts of the world, so that Israel, like our own United States, soon became a "melting pot."

The people of Israel, with great courage and resolve, put themselves to the task of building up their country. New and modern cities rose above the rubble

of old ruins, and green fields and gardens began to cover the desert floor. There were many difficulties and hardships to overcome, yet in as little as 16 years Israel has traveled along the road of progress more than any other country in the Middle East.

The United States has played an important role in the success story of Israel. Since 1949, Government aid to Israel has totaled approximately $950 million in economic grants, technical assistance, development loans, and surplus foods. And the role played by private organizations in this country has been of great assistance to the progress of Israel. We can be justly proud of all that we have done to help the hard-working and devoted citizens of Israel.

However, it is they that deserve all the praise and admiration. We have given large quantities of aid to many other countries which are struggling to develop, but none has done as well as Israel.

The Israeli people are not content to stand still while the world admires their many accomplishments. Perhaps the most exicting project they are undertaking in the effort to develop their country is the construction of a pipeline from Lake Tiberius in the north to the Negev desert in the south. Precious water will be piped along the line to irrigate the dry and dusty lands, allowing large areas to be brought under cultivation. This is just one oustanding example of the ingenuity of the people of Israel.

Israel's experience and know-how in the field of development is now being used to help other less-developed nations of the world. It is not surprising to find Israeli technicians and teachers throughout Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In this way they are contributing their part in the rapid rise to prosperity of the countries in these regions.

As they celebrate the anniversary of their country's independence, the people of Israel must find pride in their success. We, too, are proud to extend to the Israel people our congratulations and warm admiration for their many achievements. It is also our hope that the bonds of friendship between our two countries will continue to grow in mutual respect and harmony.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a thought-provoking article about public housing which appeared in the April 7, 1964, issue of the official publication of the Rotary Club of Louisville, Inc. This article was written by Mr. Henry V. Heuser, president of the Henry Vogt Machine Co., and a very prominent and dedicated citizen and civic leader in our community:

SOME FACTS ABOUT PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Henry Heuser)

Last month our board of aldermen approved a request from the Louisville Municipal Housing Commission for the erection of an additional 300-unit project—a high-rise type scheduled for the area near General Hospital. For those who haven't studied the implications of this, the following facts will probably be of value:

Louisville already has 4,993 units, housing approximately 20,085 persons.

Residence is permitted for earnings up to $3,500 per year for two adults and up to $3,600 per year for one adult and one minor. If higher earnings are received, they must move out.

The minimum rental charge for two people for an efficiency apartment is $23 per month which includes all maintenance, all utilities and a range and refrigerator. The average rental charge for an apartment is $1.29 per day of which 43 cents is for utilities or a real rental of 86c per day.

Of the almost $40 million of municipal, tax-free bonds issued to build structures in the 1950's, some will not fully mature until the year 2000. The principal of some of the bonds will not be reduced until beginning in 1984—20 years from now.

In the year 2000, a principal payment of $791,000 will be required on structures erected in the 1950's.

Each year, the Public Housing Authority (Federal) is required to pay approximately $1,250,000 of public funds just to service the bond issue for the Louisville units.

In 1963, the Commission made a total payment-in-lieu-of-taxes to the city, county, State, and our schools of $158,168.01 compared with $671,404.96 in taxes that would have been paid by private housing. The tax subsidy was, therefore, $513,236.95 or 76½ percent of its rightful load.

The Louisville Housing Commission has over $1 million of Government bonds and the income from this approximately $30,000 per year is another means of tapping the public treasury that cannot be found in the regular PHA contributions.

The residents of existing projects are paying only 23 percent of the real cost that private housing would pay (based on 17 percent year income on $40 million required for private housing compared with actual receipts in 1963 by L.M.H.C. of $2,366,333.96 less $779,013.82 for utilities).

Based on the above facts (and on many others too numerous to mention) it is beyond my comprehension how any businessman could approve still more public housing and push us still further down the road to socialism. The population is already divided into two segments—one of them paying taxes to support the other. The action of the board of aldermen further reduced the tax paying segment and increased that part of the population supported by public funds. They removed forever another part of Louisville from the tax rolls.

It would be a reasonable question to ask—"If you object to Public Housing, how do you propose to take care of those who are being displaced by Urban Renewal?" Of course, this was to have been taken care of before any existing project was approved. Irrespective of that slip, it is noted that the care of the poor has been with us since the start of recorded history, and will probably still be with us even after the passing of President Johnson. There is no simple solution—but an ever-increasing number of housing units supported by your and my tax money is certainly not the answer.

Substantially every Rotarian (and most other citizens who are able) contributes each year those amounts of money and hours of effort as his conscience dictates to help those who cannot take care of themselves in a competitive world. At no time, however, is it reasonable to make poverty so desirable that you impose a penalty when a resident has the guts to get out and increase his earnings above the "permissible" level.

The above is being offered for publication with the thought that when responsible citizens more thoroughly understand how close to socialism and complete fiscal irresponsibility we really are, their instructions to their legislators will come through loud and clear.

Local Chambers Support Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, although the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has actively opposed passage of the administration's Community Development Act of 1964, it has come to my attention that perhaps it is not speaking for all or even most of the local chambers of commerce.

A poll taken by the U.S. Conference of Mayors indicates in its early returns that only 5.5 percent of the majors queried reported that their local chambers of commerce were formally opposed to the housing and urban renewal programs. On the contrary, 66 percent of the chambers favored these programs, while the remaining chambers had taken no formal position.

A summary of the USCM poll appeared in the March 15, 1964, United States Municipal News as follows:

LOCAL CHAMBERS SUPPORT URBAN RENEWAL

Local chambers of commerce overwhelmingly support Federal urban renewal programs in their cities despite opposition by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, according to early returns in a questionnaire poll of mayors of member cities by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Of 73 responses in the poll's first 10 days, only 4 reported that local chambers had lined up officially with the U.S. chamber's stand.

The USCM poll was undertaken as spokesmen for the U.S. chamber spearheaded attacks on the administration's Community Development Act of 1964 at Senate and House hearings, where witnesses for the conference and other public-interest groups urged continuation and expansion of urban renewal and public housing programs (vol. 31, p. 17). The U.S. chamber called for an end to both programs, arguing that cities can handle their problems "on their own." It claimed it spoke for more than 3,900 affiliated local organizations representing "an underlying membership of more than 3.5 million businessmen."

Poll replies from the 73 cities indicated that in 48 of them local chambers were participating actively—and often enthusiastically—in urban renewal undertakings, which they formally supported. In 21 cities there was no reported opposition by local chambers to renewal programs, but they had taken no formal position. The remaining 5.5 percent of the chambers were opposed.

The questionnaire returns included signed statements by local chamber officials in cities large and small. There were such observations as these:

"Without qualification, this chamber of commerce supports the urban renewal pro-

gram in Joplin, Mo."—H. Lew Malcolm, general manager.

In East Orange, N.J., "Our executive board and the membership as a whole are very much interested in urban renewal and are stanch supporters of the program."—Raymond D. Seely, executive director.

In Independence, Mo., "The chamber of commerce was the body that called the first meeting to consider urban renewal in 1956. Since then it has always urged and promoted its use."—Earl Annis, president.

Noting community rehabilitation needs and plans in his area, Executive Vice President Arthur J. Lumsden of the Greater Hartford (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce said: "While we think very highly of the national chamber and are members and support them in 90 percent of their activities, we do feel that they have yet to learn that America has changed from a rural to an urban society."

President Harry Rosenbaum of the Stamford (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce ticked off some of the problems confronting his community and added: "It is rather unfortunate that the U.S. Camber of Commerce is so out of touch with the constituent members of the organization all over the country."

An Interview With Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on the Civil Rights Bill by Congressman John Brademas of Indiana and Ben Cole of the Indianapolis Star, WSBT-TV, South Bend, Ind., April 22, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the transcript of a television interview which I was privileged to conduct with the distinguished majority whip of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the civil rights bill now under discussion in the other body.

Joining me in questioning Senator HUMPHREY on this program was the able and respected Washington correspondent of the Indianapolis Star, Ben Cole.

The program, "Washington Report," was shown on Station WSBT-TV, South Bend, Ind., on April 22, 1964.

In my judgment, Senator HUMPHREY's answers to questions about the civil rights bill constitute one of the most useful examinations of what this measure provides, and what it does not provide, that I have seen.

The text of the transcript follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEVISION INTERVIEW ON CIVIL RIGHTS: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY INTERVIEWED BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS AND BEN COLE OF THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR, WSBT-TV, SOUTH BEND, IND., APRIL 22, 1964

Congressman BRADEMAS. Civil rights is the issue most under discussion here in Washington these days as the Senate continues debate on the civil rights bill. It's an issue under considerable discussion in the State of Indiana as well. The spread of civil rights demonstrations into the North, the attention focused on the historic debate now underway in the Senate, and the entrance of a self-proclaimed segregationist southern Governor into Indiana's presidential primary—all these factors have brought interest in the civil rights bill to new heights in our State of Indiana. Because of the great importance of this legislation, it is essential that we should know just what the civil rights bill does provide and, by the way, what it does not provide.

I am delighted to have with me here today the American best qualified to explain and discuss this legislation, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. A U.S. Senator for 15 years, the majority whip of the U.S. Senate, and the floor manager for the civil rights bill, that is to say, the man charged with the responsibility for guiding this bill through the Senate.

And here to interview Senator HUMPHREY with me is the well-known Washington correspondent of the Indianapolis Star, a distinguished Washington reporter and an old Hoosier hand, Ben Cole. Senator, we're delighted to have you here and Ben Cole as well.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Congressman.

Congressman BRADEMAS. To begin with, I think it might be wise if we were to review the major provisions of the civil rights bill. Senator, just what does the bill provide?

Senator HUMPHREY. This bill represents a general treatment of the problems that have arisen in the field of race relations. It includes 11 titles, the first 7 of those titles being the most important. One, protecting voting rights in Federal elections; title II, on public accommodations; title III, access to public facilities, such as parks, playgrounds and libraries, without discrimination; title IV, to accelerate and aid in the process of school desegregation; title V, the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, with some additional responsibility; title VI, to make sure that Federal funds are not utilized to promote or to encourage or foster discrimination and segregation; and title VII, the title that relates to fair employment practices.

Now, those are the key provisions. There is title X which establishes the community relations bureau—this is to facilitate the voluntary approach to the solution of these problems. And then we have one other title—VIII—that authorizes the Department of Commerce to make statistical studies relating to voting and registration so as to facilitate the voting rights of the people.

Mr. COLE. Senator, I'm sure you must have seen advertisements like this one which have raised questions which have alarmed a great many people about the secondary effect of the civil rights bill—that it would establish a Federal dictatorship that would somehow order the whole lives of our citizenry quite apart from the effort to redress an old wrong. Could you comment on that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Could I just see that ad once again because it isn't often that you ought to give the opposition free publicity, so to speak, but this is an ad that says, "One-Hundred-Billion-Dollar Blackjack—The Civil Rights Bill." The very title of this ad, of course, shows its irresponsibility and its misrepresentation. I have had some rather terse comment to make about this ad and, as a matter of fact, many other Senators have, because it does misrepresent the bill.

As a matter of fact, Congressman BRADEMAS, this ad doesn't even take into consideration the many amendments that were added on the civil rights bill in the House of Representatives. It is unrelated, in other words, to the bill that is before the Senate as it came from the House. Actually, I think the ad is an insult to American intelligence and I doubt it'll have very much effect, but it does sometimes tend to irritate.

You've asked about whether or not this bill places undue power in the hands of Federal officials and the charge has even been made, as it does in this ad, that it promotes dictatorship, gives tyrannical power. I think the answer to this charge was best made by the Republican manager of the bill in the House of Representatives, Congressman MCCULLOCH of Ohio, who is the ranking Republican Member of the House Judiciary Committee. The Congressman is not known as a radical. He's a very reasonable man and he surely did attempt to be prudent and restrained in his comment relating to this bill. I have a quotation here that I think is somewhat indicative of what this bill does.

Congressman MCCULLOCH said this bill was "moderate," he says the measure "actually is reasonable, a quite moderate proposal designed to meet only the most serious and pressing injustices."

LIMITATION OF POWERS

And speaking about the charge that the Attorney General would be given dictatorial powers, the Congressman said, "Rather than giving the Attorney General wide powers, it carefully spells out his authority. The power to issue enforcement orders on public accommodations, employment, and voting is limited to Federal judges." There is no administrative power in other words and voluntary compliance rather than compulsion is stressed, and where State civil rights laws exist—such as in my State, or in your State, or in Pennsylvania and New Jersey—and are being effectively administered, the Federal Government will not step in.

So this bill, gentlemen, is tailored to the needs; this isn't based upon any theory; this doesn't add any new authority to the Constitution. This bill seeks to make the Constitution a living document for every American citizen instead of just some American citizens.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Senator, let me ask you this question because it's another fear that I have heard expressed about the civil rights bill with respect to the suggestion that the bill would empower Federal inspectors to require employers to hire people on grounds of race. I wonder if you could say a word about the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and also speak to the issue of whether union seniority rights would be violated by this title of the bill.

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me take the latter part of your question first. Union seniority rights are in no way affected by this bill and no responsible person has ever been able to say so and still look his adversary in the eye.

Second, the bill does not require that you hire on the basis of race. What it does require is that in hiring you do not deny a fellow citizen a job because of his race or because of his religion or his national origin. This legislation could have been of great help years ago—we had people in America a hundred years ago that were immigrants that were denied jobs because they were Irish or because they were Swedish. We've had waves of immigration where the immigrant has suffered discrimination. In this instance we see a good deal of suffering and injustice because of discrimination due to race for the Negro. What this bill says is that race shall not be a factor in hiring, that you shall hire people on the basis of their ability, that you shall hire them on the basis of their citizenship—a citizen of the United States—not an Irish citizen or a Norwegian citizen or an oriental American citizen or a Negro American, but an American citizen. We want only one qualification in this Nation—that's ability, excellence, competence.

And this particular section of the bill, title VII, doesn't give the Fair Employment Practices Commission any authority to enforce anything. It doesn't give them any authority to run in pellmell and investigate. It can, however, receive a complaint from a citizen, it will analyze that complaint and, if two or more Commissioners decide that there is some merit to the complaint,

then the Commission can hold a hearing and, if it feels after this hearing that there is considerable merit to the complaint, it may or it may not go to a Federal district court, to a Federal judge, and place this evidence before the judge, just like a new case of law and ask the judge for a remedy.

You don't have any dictatorial powers by the Commission. All the Commission can do is represent the citizen. The citizen says, "I've been the victim of discrimination." The Commission says, "We'll take a look at it, we'll screen it; let's see whether you have." If there is considerable evidence that there has been discrimination, the Commission then can go to a Federal judge and to a Federal court and can say, "Here are the facts as we see them, Mr. Judge; you analyze these facts, and see if we have a court case." If the judge finds that there has been discrimination, then the judge, not the Commissioners but a Federal judge, prescribes the remedy.

PUPIL TRANSFERS NOT AUTHORIZED

Mr. COLE. Senator, there's another question that I think troubles a great many people and I'm sure your mail must indicate it. Many white parents who live in suburban neighborhoods and large cities will write and say, "We are concerned because this bill would require that our child be taken by bus away from the school where she attended and hauled across town to be integrated into a school that has a shortage of white children in order that we might have a balanced integration." Could you address yourself to that problem—whether it exists in the bill and how it would operate if it does?

Senator HUMPHREY. As I recall Mr. Cole, that particular argument was debated at some length in the House of Representatives and it surely has been debated here in the Senate. As a result of committee hearings, as a result of amendments in the House of Representatives, and as a result of determination here in the Senate, there is a provision in the bill that specifically outlaws that. It says there shall be none of this what you call racial balance by forced bussing back and forth across the city. This is excluded from the purview of this bill but yet the ad that I referred to a moment ago continues to say that there'll be a kind of racial balance provided in schools and that your children will be hauled 10 or 12 miles across cities in buses in order to give racial balance. That is denied, that is excluded in the bill, it is prohibited in the bill, and frankly I would be opposed to it myself.

Congressman BRADEMAS. I think I recall that the late President Kennedy in a news conference once indicated that he also did not favor such a provision, if I'm not mistaken.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. COLE. I also seem to recall, now that the question has come up, did not some of the educators who originally thought this might be a good idea, afterwards reverse themselves and say we have reconsidered this and as professional educators and psychologists we have decided this is the wrong thing to do?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. Let me just quote you here—the bill specifically withholds from the U.S. Education Commissioner "the authority to transfer pupils from one school to another to overcome racial imbalance." So there you are.

Congressman BRADEMAS. We've disposed of that one. Let's turn to another section of the bill, Senator, that has developed a great deal of discussion in the country. I refer to the public accommodations title of the bill. Could you give us some examples of what kinds of businesses would be covered by the measure now under consideration, which was passed by the House, and those kinds of businesses or services that would not be covered?

Senator HUMPHREY. Can we take the not-to-be-covered first? For example, as a general rule doctors and lawyers and real estate men and other professionals are not covered by the bill. Nor are the small retail stores or beauty parlors, barber shops, private clubs, bars, and taverns, and night clubs of a private nature. Nor small, owner-occupied lodging houses of five or fewer persons, grocery stores or general department stores—they're not covered. However, you do have coverage where there are businesses that are directly related to interstate commerce. For example, hotels and motels—this is for transient trade—they are covered; restaurants, lunch counters, soda fountains, other places dealing mainly in food eaten on the premises. For example, if you had a department store with a large cafeteria or lunch counter, then it is covered. Or if you have a hotel with a barbershop in it, the barbershop is covered, because it's in the hotel, primarily because it is related to this interstate business service.

One of the features in this bill that is often distorted is this matter of private clubs. I've heard many people say, "Oh, you can't even have a private club; the Federal Government is going to force you to take in people you don't want." That's just a lot of bunkum; the simple truth is that private clubs are excluded if they are really private clubs. But if you have some sort of a phony operation where it's not private at all except that you come in and pay an extra $2 to do business there, and anybody can come in, then it's a public place. But your country club, for example, your own private club that you may belong to, is private, and no Federal law is going to interfere with it.

Mr. COLE. I think that you might be interested to know that the National Press Club, which is about the only club I belong to, has been integrated for a good number of years.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, and you ladies and gentlemen seem to get along well up there.

FEDERAL AID

Mr. COLE. Senator, this is a tricky question. A great many advocates of civil rights have very strenuously urged that where States failed to enforce the civil rights of their people that they be cut off from Federal aid on the theory that these taxes are collected from Negro wage earners in the North and now they are being used to sustain segregation in the South; whereas, on the other hand, some of the States say this is a coercion thing, cutting off Federal aid is a use of the great Federal power to force us to do things that we would not otherwise do. How does the bill handle this rather delicate dispute between two points of view?

Senator HUMPHREY. This is one of the most touchy and difficult problems that this bill seeks to relate itself to. Here's the situation—you collect money for the Federal Treasury from all people—you know there isn't any special income tax form for the colored people and not one for the white. We don't have a rate, for example, that we charge white folks 25 percent of their earned income and colored only 15 percent. It's a strange thing when the Government starts to collect taxes, they're really out after you and for some reason or other the Government is very colorblind when it starts to collect.

Mr. COLE. So Willy Mays' baseball salary goes right in with——

Senator HUMPHREY. Absolutely, Willie Mays' salary that he earns—because he's a tremendous ballplayer—goes in with salaries of other people who aren't half as good, let's put it that way. But nevertheless, they all have to pay taxes. It is the view of those who have sponsored this bill and support it that the Federal revenues should not be used to encourage segregation or discrimination, and should not be used to establish segregation or discrimination.

For example, Federal funds are utilized today to sponsor schools for the dependents of servicemen or in areas that are heavily affected by defense industry—those funds have in the past often been used for segregated schools. This bill would say, in substance, that that can't be any more.

If you're going to get Federal funds for this particular activity, you must integrate those schools because that is the law as laid down by the Supreme Court in the Brown decision.

The cutoff of Federal funds is related only to the particular service, it isn't a total cutoff. You don't cut off all funds from Mississippi, for example. You cut off funds in an area where there seems to be discrimination, but you don't even do that in a hurry. The first thing that this bill requires is that there be every effort made for voluntary compliance, you really plead with people, "please get your house in order and don't have discrimination here and segregation, try to work it out so that this doesn't take place."

Secondly, if a bureau lays down some rules and regulations to implement this business of denying Federal funds to activities in State or local governments that practice discrimination or segregation, those rules and regulations cannot be issued by any Cabinet officer or bureau chief. They must be issued by the President of the United States himself. This is another check.

Furthermore, there must be hearings; you can't just go around issuing rules and regulations, there must actually be a hearing. There must be notice and even before any action can take place, you have to notify the appropriate committees of the Congress. Take for example, if there was to be a cutoff in funds on some medical type program—Public Health Service, let's say—before that could ever be done, the House Labor and Education Committee, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee would have to have 30 days' notice, each of them, before any such cutoff ever took place and then after that, if a cut did take place, it's still subject, may I say, to court review.

HOUSING

Congressman BRADEMAS. What about the question of housing which is perhaps related to this, because I know a number of persons I've talked to are much upset about what they think the bill may do with respect to integration in the housing field.

Senator HUMPHREY. There's been much to-do about this, Congressman, and here again is an example of how you really frighten people and how you distort the facts and the truths. The answer to this question is so clear that all I need to do is read it to you: "FHA and GI mortgage guarantees as well as veterans life insurance, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation activities"—all of these Federal monetary activities "or contracts of insurance or guarantees"—any form of contractive insurance or guarantees—"are excluded from coverage." So this bill doesn't apply to them, Congressman.

I wish that somehow or other those who are attacking this measure would quit trying to build up these falsehoods because there are honest differences as to how we approach the question of civil rights. I'm not saying that the man who disagrees with me is necessarily wrong; we have a different point of view, but when it comes down to something like housing and Federal Deposit Insurance, for example, I have heard one opponent of this bill say, "Why you won't even get your insurance on your deposit under this bill, the coverage will be excluded, you'll be denied this insurance." Of course, the bill specifically states in title VI that all contracts of insurance and other guarantees are

excluded from coverage, so let's just get that clear.

Mrs. COLE. Senator, you were quoting Congressman MCCULLOCH a moment ago and I observed that you and Senator DIRKSEN have worked closely on this problem, perhaps sometimes with differences in detail, but it's interesting to me the comity of the parties in working on this problem. Would you care to comment on that for us?—how the two parties are working and, by the way, seeming to eliminate from a campaign what ordinarily might be a political issue?

Senator HUMPHREY. I hope it is eliminated from the campaign because it ought not to be a political issue, because it isn't what we call a normal political issue. This whole question of civil rights is a great moral issue affecting the very heart of our Nation, the very life of it, and it isn't sectional, may I say, either. It's national because there is bigotry and discrimination and intolerance regrettably in many parts of our Nation, and it isn't all racial, as I said. Sometimes it's religious and ethnic.

We approached this bill not on a partisan basis. The House of Representatives in passing the bill by a vote of 290 to 130—a little over 2 to 1, that's an amazing vote on such a controversial issue—had 152 Democrats and 138 Republicans. That's about as bipartisan as you can get it.

Over here in the Senate, my coleader, the man who works with me—or I'm privileged to work with—is Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, the minority whip, the Republican leader from the State of California. We work together on every aspect of this bill. We meet together, we have so-called team captains of the Republicans and of the Democrats, we meet together every morning, we get together every evening, there is no partisanship in this, there are some Republicans that are against this bill, and there are some Democrats obviously that are against the bill. One of the happiest experiences of my public life is to work in such close harmony on this great moral and national issue with some of what I consider to be the best men of our public life and I'm delighted to be able to tell people, as I do, that this is a great national effort that's being undertaken by all of us.

INDIANA DELEGATION SUPPORTS BILL

Congressman BRADEMAS. I'd like to add, Senator HUMPHREY, because I think it's of great importance to the people in our State that everyone should know that of the 11 Representatives in Congress from the State of Indiana, 7 Republicans and 4 Democrats, that every one of them voted for that bill. Here are their names: RAY MADDEN, in the First District; CHARLES HALLECK, who is the leader of the Republican Party in the House, and I take my hat off to CHARLIE—and I rarely agree with him.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I do it, too; he was a great help.

Congressman BRADEMAS. He did a good job on this. JOHN BRADEMAS, in the Third District.

Senator HUMPHREY. I take my hat off to him.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Congressman ROSS ADAIR of the 4th District; Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH of the 5th; DICK ROUDEBUSH of the 6th; BILL BRAY of the 7th; WINFIELD DENTON of the 8th; EARL WILSON of the 9th; RALPH HARVEY of the 10th; and Congressman DONALD BRUCE of the 11th. Seven Republican, four Democrats. Though I disapprove of perhaps the ratio, I approve of the fact that they all voted the same—all for the civil rights bill.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I say that both of the Senators, Senator BAYH and Senator HARTKE, approve of this bill. They both have been working very closely with me. In fact, I've had to keep Senator HARTKE in Washington to be one of our floor leaders on the bill, and Senator BAYH is one of our floor leaders. We've asked both Indiana Senators to take a heavy load of responsibility on this. And in Illinois, every Congressman in Illinois supported this bill—Republican and Democrat alike. Senator DIRKSEN, the Republican leader in the Senate, has a solid phalanx of support for the civil rights bill amongst all the Congressmen from the State of Illinois. In Minnesota, since I do represent our State, I'm happy to say that both Senators are strongly for this measure and every Member of our House delegation, Republican and Democrat, voted for this measure; that's about as nonpartisan as you can get it.

Mr. COLE. Senator, the clock is racing and there's a point I think needs to be covered before we end this fascinating discussion and that is that what is going on in our country today is called a racial revolution, and I know you, as a student of history, must have observed that throughout history when an aggrieved minority has reached the point where they come to what we call a revolutionary turn, oftentimes violence is the only means of redress. Now, my question is, Can we avoid this in this country? Are the things that are going on taking this direction, and can this bill prevent that sort of thing?

CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

Senator HUMPHREY. I do believe, Mr. Cole, that this bill can prevent it, that is, if we pass this bill in time. I also must say to you that there is a rising tide of tension that everyone knows. It's growing and it will continue to grow unless we take some affirmative action to remedy these injustices. This Negro revolution, as some people call it, is not based on theory or fantasy. The Negro has suffered indignities far too long. He is tired of it.

Many of our Negroes today are educated. The Negro is unwilling to be treated like a slave; he's unwilling to be a second-class citizen; he wants his full citizenship; he wants that citizenship gap closed, and there is this rising tide of tension, and sometimes it bursts out into violence and disorder. I can't condone that. I can understand it, but I can't condone it. I must say that it doesn't really help our efforts here in the Congress when it becomes disorderly like we saw in San Francisco and Cleveland, and the threats that we've heard of in New York about the world's fair. This doesn't really help. I think I can understand it, but it doesn't help.

But then I want to say this. The Senate of the United States had better do its business, too. Just as we complain of these demonstrations that get out of hand, I think the Senate has a demonstration that's been out of hand, the filibuster. If we're going to sit in in the Senate, we can expect some people to be sitting in some place else. If we're going to refuse to act here in the Senate like responsible legislators and come to grips with this problem and try to legislate, you can expect people to take things in their own hands.

What this bill does is to provide a legal framework within which we can attempt to work out our problems. It takes this fight of civil rights off the streets and out of the alleys and puts it into the courts and the legislative halls. That's where I think it belongs.

And I think that those that come into Indiana, Wisconsin and Maryland and other places to stir up this bias and this emotion, this prejudice, are doing this country a great disservice. They're not helping at all; in fact, they're really asking the people to repudiate the Constitution; they're actually preaching a doctrine of nullification. I can't buy that and support it and I don't think decent people are going to.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Senator, let me make one observation because we only have a moment left and there's one important point I think people should be aware of and then I want to ask you one final question. The fact of the matter is, which a lot of people who are opposed to the civil rights bill we're considering do not realize, that in many States of the Union there are much stiffer State civil rights laws than there are now under consideration here in Congress. For example, our own State of Indiana has a fair employment practices law and an equal accommodations law, in some respects much more stringent than the Federal measure.

A MORAL ISSUE

I'd like to ask you to say a final word about our discussion, perhaps addressing yourself to the role of the churches and religious organizations of our country, and you have about 30 seconds to a minute.

Senator HUMPHREY. As I said, this is a great moral issue and when a moral issue is before us the spiritual leaders of the Nation have a special role and a special responsibility and I think they're fulfilling that because this program is supported by Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish spiritual leaders and laymen. I'm convinced that the margin here of strength that we need for the passage of this legislation is in the hands of these great spiritual leaders.

You're so right about the States—many States do have very good laws, and they've set the pattern. We're not talking now about theory again, we're talking about the experience of American government at local levels and we're transferring that experience now to the Federal level. I think it's good, sound, constructive public policy.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Senator HUMPHREY, and thank you, Ben Cole. Good night.

Manpower for Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a number of Republican Members took the floor to discuss the need for a thorough reexamination of our present system of recruiting manpower for our armed services. The need to revamp the procedures developed in wartime to meet the demands of a cold war situation has become obvious.

An excellent account of the drawbacks of the present system appeared in a Boston Globe editorial on Monday, April 20. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OVERHAUL THE DRAFT

The Army's rejection of Cassius Clay, shortly after he had won the world's heavyweight boxing championship, caused many raised eyebrows. The authorities insist that Clay tried hard to pass the mental tests, and there is considerable reason to believe this to be true. The case was reviewed at the highest level.

But the fact remains that 49 percent of those who are called by selective service are rejected for one reason or another. President Johnson was right in expressing the feeling, at another quickie Saturday press conference, that the country had somehow drifted from the concept of equal sacrifice for all.

Until relatively recent times, a peacetime draft was alien to this country's tradition. The first such measure was enacted a quarter century ago—in 1940—and extended the next

year by the narrowest of margins in Congress, though Pearl Harbor was but a few months away.

After the Second World War it became obvious that the United States could no longer dare wait to prepare for war until after it had been declared. In 1948, the year of the Berlin blockade, the draft was reestablished and continued in 1951, when the Korean war was in progress. It has been extended every 4 years since; the present act expires in 1967.

What has made for the high proportion of rejections, and the drift from the concept of equal sacrifice is that the armed services do not need all the young men who could be made available. To maintain a total force of 2.7 million, only 500,000 recruits are needed yearly.

The existence of the Selective Service Act causes many to volunteer; for several years the Navy and Air Force have depended entirely on voluntary enlistments. Draft calls range this year from 16,000 in January to 12,000 in May.

For obvious reasons, uncertainty about their military obligations has had an unsettling effect on young men. Those who are likely to be drafted have often found it difficult to get work; to avoid conscription many have rushed into marriage too soon. President Johnson announced early this year that those who have reached 18 and have left school would be given military examinations at once, so that they could be in a better position to plan for the future.

The President followed this up Saturday by the announcement of a 1-year study of the draft prepared by the Defense Department. Though this may lead to further quick mitigations in the inequalities of the present law, and the hardships it imposes, no repeal of the Selective Service Act is contemplated, at least until the 1970's.

That is wise. To maintain a force of 2.7 million by long-term enlistments would create the type of political danger Europe long associated with standing armies. Sharp armament limitation by treaty, with effective inspection, is also a possibility, but at present it seems an exceedingly faint one. Even if it should be achieved, this country could not afford to drop its guard; Pearl Harbor would have been impossible if the United States had consistently kept its Navy up to the strength permitted by treaty.

But after 15 years, the Selective Service Act obviously needs an overhaul. It should lead to a more up-to-date manpower policy strengthening this country's security and lessening the burden on its youth.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the March-April 1964 edition of the Consumer's Digest magazine, which discusses the increased tendency of manufacturers to insist upon nefarious price controls and calls for public action to prevent the elimination of competition.

Certainly, this article clearly points out the evils of the so-called quality stabilization bill, now pending in the Congress. That legislation, as its proponents and opponents agree, is price fixing and is, accordingly, the type of evil to which the article refers.

The article follows:

PRICE CONTROLS

If you were hunting turkeys and saw a flock, how would you go about bagging the most game? Of course you would pick them off from behind one at a time, so as not to alert the whole pack with each shot.

Consumers Digest is gravely concerned at this time. There is increasing evidence of dirty work afoot * * * and that you, Mr. Consumer, are becoming one of those turkeys. For some time now Consumers Digest has observed the fair trade problem and has noted the increased activity and tightening of controls by various manufacturers. For instance, Motorola has gone fair trade and so has Wollensak. In addition, General Electric is now moving some of their big guns in this direction by splitting their lines into two groups * * * fair trade and nonfair trade. The price listing in this issue of Consumers Digest shows GE with approximately 25 percent of their automatic washers now on fair trade.

Yes, the die is cast, and we are being picked off State by State, manufacturer by manufacturer and product by product. As each manufacturer gains small successes, he will expand his bridgehead and tighten his controls until price competition is eliminated. And it's all legal.

They are going to get away with it too, unless we wake up and each do our part. Firstly we must let our elected officials know in no uncertain terms how we feel about fair trade restrictions. You are not a small voice in an empty barrel. In fact you would be surprised to know how many individual voices there really are. If we all do our part, that voice can be the roar of a lion.

The second and best way to put an end to this attempt at price fixing is to hit the perpetrators where it hurts the most * * * in the pocketbook. Quit buying products where manufacturers have restricted competition. You can be sure that he will get the message fast.

Veterans Pensions—A Bill To Provide Certain Increases and Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 10970, proposes certain changes and improvements in the non-service-connected pension program for veterans.

This bill represents a comprehensive review, on my part, of the pension program for veterans which has commanded much of my attention during this Congress. This bill incorporates many changes and improvements which will help those veterans who are in the greatest need.

My introduction of this bill will in no way preclude my favorable consideration of any equitable proposal which is now before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I certainly will give consideration at the proper time to any and all proposals which are designed to improve and make more liberal non-service-connected benefits for veterans of all wars.

The major provisions of my bill are as follows:

First. Increases the minimum and intermediate income limitations for both single and married veterans thereby allowing a large number of veterans to obtain larger rates of pension.

Second. Increases the monthly rates of pension from the present maximum of $85 for a single veteran or $90 for a veteran who is married or has a dependent to $100 a month. There are corresponding increases in the minimum and intermediate steps with raises being about $10 to $15 a month, or a low of $50 to a high of $110 per month depending upon income and the number of dependents.

Third. Presumes any veteran who is 65 years of age or over shall be totally disabled for pension purposes. This eliminates the disability requirement for a veteran 65 or older.

Fourth. Increases by 10 percent the pension payments provided in the bill where the veteran served outside the United States. This recognizes the type of service rendered by the veteran and provides an honorarium for oversea combat service.

Fifth. Provides a new pension rate for veterans who, in addition to being totally disabled, are found to be housebound but do not qualify for the additional aid and attendance allowance. This group would receive $35 a month in their pension payments in addition to their basic rates.

Sixth. Increases the aid and attendance rate for veterans who are so helpless or blind they need the aid and attendance of another person from the present $70 to $85 a month.

In determining income the following liberalizations are provided in my bill by excluding the following:

First. Earned income of the veteran's spouse. This provides relief in the case of the wife who is forced to work, and maintains integrity of the family.

Second. The amounts equal to the amounts paid by the veteran for the expenses of burial for his wife or child. This recognizes there are unavoidable and unanticipated expenses beyond normal needs of veterans which should be excluded.

Third. Any profit realized from the sale or disposition of any real estate other than in the course of a trade or business. Sale of home by veteran is not income but a change in the form of assets.

Fourth. Amounts equal to the amount paid by the veteran or by his wife for medical, dental, or hospital expenses of the veteran, his wife, or children. This expense recognizes the increasing high cost of drugs and medical care for a veteran and his family.

Fifth. Any payments received for discharge of any obligated civic duties such as jury duty.

Lastly, my bill also would repeal the resources report requirement for children of certain veterans.

This proposal if enacted would provide many desirable changes in the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, which is referred to as Public Law 86-211 and has been the governing statute respecting

veterans' pensions since July 1, 1960, when it went into effect. World War I veterans now constitute about 90 percent of all those on the pension rolls. Obviously the provisions of this bill will help the veterans of World War I more than any other single group and will eliminate many of the complaints and inequities which have become manifest since Public Law 86-211 has been in operation.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks this bill should not be construed as meaning that I will not give favorable consideration to the many equitable proposals now pending before the House. It is hoped that my bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the committee and the House.

The Late Ben Hecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is sometimes referred to as an age of literary blandness. I do not think the description is appropriate. But whatever its merit, the death of Ben Hecht leaves us a little paler, a little emptier. He was a writer from an age that, whatever its failings, was anything but bland.

Ben Hecht was police reporter, novelist, foreign correspondent, playwright and Hollywood screen writer. But Hecht was more than a writer or observer. He was a glorious character, a participant in the bizarre episodes of his era as well as a chronicler of them. His play "Front Page," written with Charles MacArthur, symbolized the popular conception of the newspaperman of the 1920's as a hard-drinking cynic who knew all the answers.

Today journalists are a more sober and responsible lot. They are more careful; but they have become so at expense of color and style. Color and style Ben Hecht had in abundance. He was never pale; he never bored. As critic Kenneth Rexroth recently wrote of him:

> Ben Hecht's sentimentalism, his loving self-regard and his irrepressibly frisky imagination shine unblemished in his movies. In fact, a generation ago it was said of the industry that you could never understand it until you realized that Ben Hecht was the most intelligent man who ever had anything to do with it.

Ben Hecht will be sadly missed, not only for his literary output, but for the insight he gave us of an age to which we can never return. His admirers everywhere, like his Representative in Congress, send deep and warm sympathies to his widow.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD at this conclusion, the last review written about Ben Hecht and his works. It appeared in the New York Times on April 19, 1964, the day after his death.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1964]

BEN HECHT, 70, DIES AT HIS HOME HERE

Ben Hecht, who chronicled high life and low life in Chicago, New York, and Hollywood in novels, short stories, plays, and a stream of memoirs, died yesterday, apparently of a heart attack. He was 70 years old.

Mr. Hecht collapsed while reading in his 14th-floor apartment at 39 East 67th Street. His wife, the former Rose Caylor, tried to revive him with mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and then summoned a police emergency squad, which administered oxygen.

The writer's physician, Dr. Morton S. Bryer, said Mr. Hecht had appeared to be in good condition in a recent checkup.

Mr. Hecht's experiences as a newspaper reporter in Chicago from 1910 until he went abroad as a correspondent in 1918 provided a reservoir of experience and anecdote that he drew on throughout his life.

He recalled those days in characteristic highly charged style in his autobiography, "A Child of the Century," published in 1954. "I haunted streets, studios, whorehouses, police stations, courtrooms, theater stages, jails, saloons, slums, madhouses, fires, murders, riots, banquet halls, and bookshops," he wrote.

"I ran everywhere in the city like a fly buzzing in the works of a clock, tasted more than any fly belly could hold, learned not to sleep (an accomplishment that still clings to me), and buried myself in a ticktock of whirling hours that still echo in me."

Mr. Hecht was born here on the Lower East Side on February 28, 1894, the son of immigrants from Russia. He grew up in Racine, Wis., where he finished high school. Then he briefly joined a small circus, in which an uncle was the strongman.

While developing his own shoulders, the young Mr. Hecht yielded to the attraction of Chicago and a newspaper career. He joined the now defunct Chicago Journal as what was called a picture chaser, assigned to acquire, by any means possible, photographs of ax murderers and their victims, sometimes pilfering them from the family piano.

Before long, he became a reporter, a job that in an era of journalism untrammeled by notions of responsibility or accuracy, provided plenty of room for creation.

SPECIALIZED IN CRIME NEWS

Mr. Hecht specialized in crime news, a rich field in Chicago even before the start of prohibition. He became expert at turning out stories that began like this:

"If Fred Ludwig is hanged for the murder of his wife, Irma, it will be because of the little gold band he slipped on her finger on his wedding day, inscribed with the tender words, 'Irma—Love Forever—Fred.'"

In 1914, Mr. Hecht joined the Chicago Daily News. In 1919 he was sent to Berlin to cover the revolution-torn capital. Describing the Spartacist revolt, he wrote:

"I visited the enemy's country this afternoon to find out why a mob of 20,000 workmen and soldiers had for 3 days hurled themselves with bayonets and machineguns against their countrymen."

During the World War I years Chicago was also in literary ferment, and Mr. Hecht soon became part of it. He wrote and sold his first short story, "The Unlovely Sin," when he found he was $3,000 in debt, with a newspaper salary of $40 a week as his only likely source of repayment.

The purchaser was H. L. Mencken, the editor of the Smart Set magazine. Like most young writers of the period, Mr. Hecht idolized Mr. Mencken, and a friendship flourished despite the initial check. It was for $45. Mr. Hecht recalled that he had expected $1,000.

"If these convict labor prices were all that the great Mencken could afford to pay for literature he admired enough to print, my task was clear. I would have to write 25 short stories instead of one before I netted $1,000. This I did in the next few months."

In 1921, Mr. Hecht published his first novel, "Erik Dorn," which was largely autobiographical. It was well received and provided the foundation for his later reputation.

Only last year, when it was reprinted by the University of Chicago Press, it touched off a dispute between Mr. Hecht and Nelson Algren, the novelist, who had written an introduction.

Mr. Hecht took exception to Mr. Algren's view that the book, which started well, turned into a cartoon in the second half.

Declining to attend a publication cocktail party, Mr. Hecht, to whom controversy always came naturally, wrote that he had "no hankering to pose in your local festivities as a literary patsy."

He went on to say that he had never read anything by Mr. Algren, who wrote "The Man With the Golden Arm" and "A Walk on the Wild Side." "I haven't the faintest idea of what he writes like," said Mr. Hecht. In this case (the introduction) he stinks."

RETORT BY ALGREN

Mr. Algren then rejoined: "He hasn't done anything good since 'Erik Dorn.' He's made one or two good movies and some awful bad ones." Mr. Hecht had refused "to take the responsibility" for his talent, Mr. Algren added.

Soon after the first publication of "Erik Dorn," Mr. Hecht returned here. His first play, "The Egotist," was produced in 1923. The New York Times' reviewer wrote: "Mr. Hecht strove with might, main, and epigram. Curious how far an exceedingly clever writer can come from writing a clever play."

Mr. Hecht returned to writing novels and stories for a while, publishing three dimly remembered works, "The Florentine Dagger," "Humpty Dumpty," and "The Kingdom of Evil," in 2 years.

In 1926, his "Count Bruga" appeared. It concerned a scapegrace poet, patterned closely on Mr. Hecht's longtime friend, Maxwell Bodenheim. The book was hailed in the Times as showing "a mastery of the medium of the novel." The poet replied with "Duke Herring," a novel lampooning Hecht.

Hon. Michael J. Kirwan

SPEECH

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10939) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in tribute to our esteemed colleague, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, as one of the newer Members of Congress.

I know Congressman KIRWAN, or "MIKE" as he would much rather be called, as a friend. Over a period of 3½ years I have been constantly amazed and impressed by this self-made, self-

educated man. Here is a man who did not have an opportunity, such as many of us were afforded, to gain a formal education. His education, nevertheless, has been a very thorough one, acquired in the school of hard knocks.

No one who has spent any time whatsoever in his company could help but be impressed by the knowledge of our beloved colleague. He is a storehouse of history and factual data on the Congress, its workings, its membership, and its legislation.

He has been a close and intimate confidante of five Presidents. His counsel has been and is sought by all in both high station and low.

Here is my personal reason for holding him in such high esteem. From my first days in Congress he was never too busy to sit down and chat and try to explain the background of legislation and the legislative process to me, as well as to any of the other new Members who sought him out.

I feel that the mark of greatness in this man is the fact that despite the position he has achieved in this country of ours, he has never ever lost the humility which characterized him from his earliest days in Washington.

MIKE, thanks for being with us, and may you remain with us for many years to come.

Short of Goulash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Senator FULBRIGHT and other administration leaders are laying down a propaganda barrage, hoping to obtain public support of their plans to subsidize Communist governments. It is well for us to appreciate the freedom of press that still exists in this country and the firm pronouncements of many of our publications.

I especially direct the attention of the Members to an editorial from this morning's Chicago Tribune which in turn analyzes an article in U.S. News & World Report, by Professor Nutter, of the University of Virginia. It merits our attention and makes a point quite contrary to the Fulbright-Rusk appeasement and coexistence school.

The editorial follows:

SHORT OF GOULASH

After the latest attack on him by Red China, Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union turned up in Hungary and announced that goulash was more palatable than revolution. Granting this to be true, the difficulty is that goulash is in short supply in the Communist world.

A remarkable analysis of the floundering of the Soviet Union has been provided in the magazine U.S. News & World Report, by Prof. G. Warren Nutter, head of the economics department at the University of Virginia. Mr. Nutter has traveled in Russia and is an export on its economy. He says that all estimates of Soviet economic growth has been grossly inflated, that Soviet industrial production is perhaps 30 percent of that of the United States, and that the Russian growth rate has trended downward for a century.

In short, Khrushchev's biggest headache is not what Peiping thinks of him. It is what to do about economic disorganization at home.

Mr. Nutter says that there is a perfectly simple solution to Russia's problem, and that is to change the system. But to move away from communism carries obvious dangers to the Kremlin hierarchy, who might lose their jobs or lives. Another solution would be to externalize Soviet difficulties by stirring up more trouble in the outside world. But this also would entail risks unless the Communists could count on complete acquiescence on our part.

Still another gambit would be for Moscow to seek to persuade the United States to bail it out of its economic difficulties—a prospect which is not too farfetched, considering the recent wheat deal and the belief of Senator FULBRIGHT and others that Communists aren't bad fellows.

But Professor Nutter thinks this would be lunacy, because it would enable the Kremlin to avoid the painful decision to change and reform. But he is none too confident that our leaders will do the sensible thing.

"I'm afraid," he says, "that our foreign policy is sheer romanticism, without any real logic involved in it. Our Government shies away from anything which carries any immediate risk at all, no matter how small, and then rationalizes whatever course is left, even though the ultimate risk is much greater. In cold reality, this leads to nothing more than a policy of appeasement, and I mean this in the literal sense associated with Neville Chamberlain. We know from dreadful experience what appeasement leads to.

"The course being followed now is to be nice and to be friendly, because it seems least risky at the immediate moment. This is rationalized on the ground that fat Communists are less dangerous than skinny ones. But as soon as they become fat—or, rather, fatter—they get more belligerent and aggressive. My feeling is that, at the moment, our best allies are the thin fellows, not the fat ones. They're all the people in these iron curtain countries who have gotten thinner in the last few years."

Professor Nutter asks whom these people are angry with. Not at us, he says, but at their system and their government. They aren't getting the goulash Mr. Khrushchev talks about.

Given the Communist system, Mr. Nutter thinks it's impossible that Russia can ever draw abreast of the United States. But, he says, "We could mess our system up very quickly and without too much trouble if we continue stifling private initiative and free enterprise. I can't imagine their drawing abreast of us—their duplicating what we have—unless our system becomes more like theirs or theirs more like ours."

It should be the business of sensible Americans to see to it that the theory of convergence now so popular in Washington is restricted to a one-way operation. If the Russians want to adopt our system, let them. But to move toward theirs in this country would be suicidal, both to economic progress and to liberty.

Domestic Aid Plan for Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator KENNETH B. KEATING delivered an important address before the Tri-County Long Island Labor-Management Institute's conference on the aerospace industry. The institute is sponsored jointly by the Long Island Press and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Its efforts to stimulate community discussion of the problems Long Island will be facing in days to come is a highly commendable operation and deserves the support of all Long Islanders.

The New York Senator called for systematic local planning by Long Islanders to meet the impact of cutbacks of defense and space spending. As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am very familiar with the problems faced by Government contractors in electronics and other fields who can expect increasing difficulty in maintaining full orderbooks and keeping jobs available.

In my view, Long Island has unique assets. Long Islanders have initiative, special skills, and economic know-how to plan for the future and to adjust to changing business patterns with a minimum of dislocation and unemployment for everyone. An areawide economic group would be a wonderful way to put the area's needs and prospects into an effective plan for economic growth.

It was only a few weeks ago, on March 12, 1964, that I stated my firm belief that we on Long Island have the historic background and experience to produce what the Government wants and needs. As I said then, and repeat: "our Long Island industries must stop competing against themselves and unite to compete with the rest of the country. There are many recent, encouraging indications that they are starting to do this.

"As a local Congressman I will fight to neutralize any political influences in the awarding of contracts. This is why I have led the yearlong fight to stop the Electronics Research Center from being located in Boston. As a member of the Space Committee, I know there is no room for complacency in the space age.

"I will also fight to see that there is more competition allowed in the awarding of contracts in defense and space industries. Congress has passed bills proposing that this be done and although there has been some improvement over 87 percent of the contracts are still negotiated. If more were let on competition, New York would get a larger share, for we are in a position to compete successfully.

"I do not rule out conversion, which should proceed on an experimental basis, but it is a long-range solution and a prerogative of the industry involved.

"Conversion and retraining can be useful to an extent, but what we really need is a cooperative effort of our industrial, labor, and governmental forces to fight shoulder to shoulder to see that Long Island retains its rightful place in the defense and space programs."

I therefore endorse Senator KEATING's suggestion and only add that this Commission's first and foremost task should be to see that Long Island's capacity to compete successfully for existing defense and space business be developed, coordinated, and pushed, and that Long Island develop a consciousness of itself

as a producing unit; ready, willing, and fully able to meet competition from any sector of our country.

Senator KEATING has posed a great and meaningful challenge to the leaders of Long Island communities, labor, and industry, and I am confident that Long Island will be able to meet the challenge of a changing economy ably and effectively. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD following my remarks the text of Senator KEATING's address and an editorial from the Long Island Press:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING

It is a pleasure to be here with you today to discuss a subject of increasing national importance, and a subject of very acute local interest here on Long Island.

First of all, let me make it very clear that I do not appear before you today as an expert in the field of procurement and contracting as many of you are. But after 18 years in Congress, I am something of an expert in the ways of the Federal Government. There are a lot of pitfalls in the path of those who depend on Government contracts and Government decisions for a livelihood and I'd like to explore some of them with you today.

Unfortunately, a number of Long Island's oldest, most experienced, and most capable defense contractors and their workers are beginning to find that times are hard as far as defense work is concerned.

Either the big competition, that has provided hundreds of engineering jobs for years, has been won by someone else, or the proposal that was going to open the way for a big new advance in the state of the art was turned down at the 11th hour because the Department of Defense didn't want to go that fast after all, or maybe the Department of Defense just decided that it didn't need quite so many of that particular line, or else two different services got into a scrap over the problem and the Department of Defense held up the whole procurement for restudy.

DEFENSE WORK CUTBACK

As you all know, from painful experience, there are hundreds of different ways to lose contracts and find a company looking into an empty order book and its workers out of a job. And today on Long Island, as well as all over the country, a lot of firms are beginning to take a very worried look at their future workloads.

Almost every day I receive letters, a lot from Long Island, that go something like this—incidentally most of them are from women:

"DEAR SENATOR: My husband is an engineer (or draftsman or a skilled technician). He has had a good job and been working hard for the last 10 years. We have a nice little house and three wonderful children. But last month he was laid off. He cannot find a job anywhere. We cannot live on unemployment insurance and we don't want to. What can we do? Can you help us?"

It's a terrible picture, of an anxious wife, sitting at home, keeping the house together, taking care of the kids, and desperately asking for help while her husband roams the employment agencies and then comes home at night with bad news.

What can we do about it? Both as officials with community responsibilities and as individuals with some experience of the problem, we have got to do something, and the sooner the better.

First, we must face the facts realistically. We are certainly not on the verge of disarmament, in which all our arms industries are simply going to wither away. Far from it. In fact, disarmament is rather like a cocktail party. Nobody wants to arrive until everyone else is there.

The Federal Government is going to keep on spending billions and billions of dollars a year on weapons systems and equipment, and no doubt even as the spending on weapons declines there will be new spending on electronic devices to keep a check on what the rest of the world is doing, and to backstop any kind of international arms control agreement.

But I think we all see the handwriting on the wall as far as mass production of many kinds of defense equipment is concerned. There is a real squeeze underway in the defense industries. I don't have to tell you what would happen if all the cars on Long Island tried to fight their way through the Midtown tunnel together. That's pretty close to what is happening as far as a good part of defense work is concerned. The doors of the Pentagon are getting narrower. Thousands of contractors are going to continue to get in, because they are going to fight just as hard as they can. But thousands of others are not going to make it.

Frankly, I don't think anyone would want to see the Defense Department or any other part of the Federal Government buying equipment that it didn't want or didn't need with our tax dollars.

SPACE AGENCY CONTRACTS

NASA, the Space Agency, thinks that it can take up some of the slack. To some extent it can, especially among the experienced engineers and skilled technicians and as a member of the Senate Space Committee, I appreciate it. But let's face it, NASA will never need the mass production that provides thousands of assemblyline jobs. There simply are not going to be enough people traveling to the moon in the next 20 years to keep all Long Island busy turning out moon bugs. What's more, when you are working for NASA, the better job you do, the finer equipment you come up with, the fewer models they'll need for testing before they move on to the next step and the faster you'll be working yourself out of job.

Of course, you can try for the astronaut program and launch yourselves into politics that way—but watch out for those slippery bathtubs.

Basically, we face two different kinds of problems. On the one hand, we all want to be just as alert as possible and do everything we can to make sure that Long Island firms don't get squeezed out, where they can do the job and have the capability. And we want to fight, together, just as hard as we can to keep the Defense Department from moving out of the Northeast altogether and concentrating in California, Georgia, and Texas.

At the same time, we want to be prepared to help, to advise, to encourage, and sometimes even temporarily to prop up the firms that may be in a squeeze until they can diversify or find other outlets for their talents and products.

DEFENSE INDUSTRY TODAY SPECIALIZED

Basically, defense and government oriented industries are becoming a more and more specialized field, with very highly developed selling as well as producing skills. It's harder and harder for the same outfit to work simultaneously for private consumers and for the Government. First you need a special kind of intelligence and know-how, like a private CIA or NKVD, to get the job in the first place. Then you need facilities that are unique and altogether different from those needed for civilian production. For instance, during World War I nearly four-fifths of the Army equipment could be produced in ordinary civilian factories. By World War II, about half of the military equipment could be produced by civilian factories that needed only partial retooling. But today, only 10 percent of defense needs can be easily produced while the other 90 percent have to come out of especially designed facilities that are simply unable to turn around and produce consumer goods on a moment's notice.

As a result, seven major industrial groups, firms and subsidiaries get close to two-thirds of all the military prime contracts. Although a great deal less is known about subcontracting, much of that also goes to very specialized outfits, big and small, that look to the Government for a livelihood.

For most of the firms that are heavily involved in the defense business today, then, the immediate response to the defense squeeze, is going to be tough competition, hard times when they lose a contract, better opportunities when they get another contract. The best thing we can do for them, the best way we can help them is to provide the intelligence and skills they need to stay on the top in a highly competitive area.

But for a lot of the firms that are half in and half out of the defense picture, the current situation provides an invitation to sit down and evaluate the future. The old advice "Don't put all your eggs in one basket" can be very appropriate at this point. And if it's one missile or one airplane, that advice counts double. Certainly I could not recommend that any firm tool up now for defense work if there are other alternatives or other directions for expansion.

HELPING THE PEOPLE WHO LOSE OUT

But the biggest problem of all, and the problem that we, as community leaders, have to think hardest about, is how we can help the firms that don't get through those Pentagon doors, the firms that don't get the defense contracts. Or if we really break the issue down to the common denominator that underlies it all, how can we help the individuals—the people—from the top management to the lowest unskilled workers in the firms that don't get the contract they had been counting on?

This is not simply a personal problem for the guy who gets laid off and his wife and kids; it is not simply a management problem for the firm which has to decide how to stay out of the red. And it's not simply a labor problem to figure out who has the least seniority. It is a full-fledged community problem.

This meeting here today, as well as others that have been held and are planned for the future, represent, to my way of thinking, a responsible and mature recognition of the issue. As the title of your last session suggested, we have to meet tomorrow's crises today, and in no field is that more true than defense work today.

What can we do? The first step that we make in our foreign aid programs is to map out the available resources of a given country and try to draw up some sort of country plan for development, so that we're not operating at cross purposes. It is high time for island leaders from Montauk to Manhattan to think about the island's future, its special resource, its advantages and its drawbacks and chart a domestic aid plan for Long Island.

VALUE OF ECONOMIC COMMISSION

One of the first steps I could recommend would be the establishment of a Long Island Economic Commission, to work with labor and industry, and draw up a balance sheet of what you have to offer. You don't, I am sure, want a government bureaucracy, ordering everyone around, but the island could only benefit from a hardheaded regional body that could speak to the area and for the area in its changing economic needs.

It's ironic to think that Long Island already has its natural resources under central control in the Long Island Park Commission. But the economic resources, that provide the livelihood for the people who enjoy the parks, are still uncharted.

I know a lot of Long Island organizations are concerned about economic growth and are moving in this general direction. That's fine. We cannot afford to wait much longer.

PURPOSE OF WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

That's one reason I have called a State, Municipal, and Industrial Action Conference in Washington, April 27 for local and Federal Government officials to explore the programs currently available along these lines. We have to plan now and use available resources to meet the problems of military installation closings and defense contract cutbacks in a timely way.

A regional Economic Commission could pursue this effort consistently and effectively on Long Island. Let me give you an idea of the kind of programs and prospects such a Commission could explore.

LONG ISLAND'S ASSETS

Long Island's industries, already very heavily slanted toward electronics, have a head start in contributing toward the world of tomorrow and the needs of tomorrow's consumers. Maybe my imagination is running away from me, but I have always felt that electronics could make a tremendous contribution to safety in all kinds of fields that have not yet been touched. It was more than just ironic that the astronaut who circled the globe got hurt in his own bathroom. Our homes and our cars, where we spend most of our time, are unsafe places by any standards. Electronic surveillance of all kinds of mechanical devices in the home or automobiles might cut down thousands of accidents. Why we might even reach the point of having electronic babysitters! And think of the consumer's market for such an invention on Long Island.

Another field that offers tremendous promise for the future is water desalinization. As the Western States face a grave shortage of water, the east coast would be able to offer industry a tremendously important attraction if adequate pure free water were available. If atomic power could be harnessed to do the job, the heat by-products might be used to warm our beaches and shores and extend the tourist season by several months. Long Island might not be fully able to compete with Bermuda, but the prospect is an enticing one.

These are areas a regional economic commission could explore and develop.

There have been other important initiatives which can add to the long term assets of Long Island. The Long Island-New England Bridge, for instance, is going to be the subject of a full scale feasibility study by the State. That would bring Long Island producers closer to big consumer markets, but a regional council should be ready to plan for such a breakthrough.

Another major step, which we must not underestimate, is the extension of educational institutions all over the island. For the future this kind of growth is golden.

For the present, and for the guys who have been laid off, the first step may be a retraining program, long or short, that would fit him into the immediate job opportunities in the area. The faster the community responds to this kind of need, the faster the community mobilizes its effort to find satisfactory jobs on Long Island for those who seek them, the faster we can look forward to stepping up the rate of growth and meeting the challenges before us.

IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL INITIATIVES

A full-fledged economic commission to coordinate declining defense production with booming civilian needs and to coordinate the men with the jobs, would boost Long Island today, tomorrow and 10 years from now.

What's more, instead of waiting around for Washington to come up with Federal programs and legislation to accelerate growth, such a commission could draw up its own proposals and bring them down to Washington for action. What kind of tax changes could we use to help defense industries convert to consumer ones? What kind of Government efforts could promote increased sales of U.S. goods overseas? What kind of Federal assistance could really do the best job in pepping up areas of high unemployment?

Instead of meekly taking what some official in Washington proposed, such a regional commission could be an important initiator of valuable efforts. It could speak, in Albany and in Washington, with a voice of authority, that came not from theory, but from practice.

We live in a changing world. And no Long Islander would want it any other way. Our problem is how we can make the best of the changes so that the changes can make the best for us. Long Island is in a unique position of opportunity and advancement. The shadow of defense curtailment may be just the push that is needed to make Long Island a pacesetter for the State and for the entire Nation. We face a great opportunity and a challenge that all of us can—and must—meet.

[From the Long Island Press, Apr. 12, 1964]

DOMESTIC AID PLAN FOR LONG ISLAND

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING's speech yesterday before the Tri-County Long Island Labor-Management Institute's conference on the aerospace industry was a statement of major importance to everyone on this island of ours.

The Senator suggested that a local economic commission be set up to chart a domestic aid plan for Long Island to meet the inevitable impact of severe cutbacks in defense work.

Senator KEATING's thesis is simple: Although we are still a long way from disarmament, the squeeze is on our defense industries. As important as it is to keep fighting for as many of the dwindling contracts as we can get, it is even more imperative to plan reasonable alternatives.

This was no fuzzy-minded visionary speaking; this was a hardheaded, realistic Republican who has been in Congress for 18 years. He doesn't see this as a simple matter of presenting a convert button and presto, a new economy. Quite the contrary. Precisely because there are no easy buttons to push we must think and plan together to meet the coming economic crisis. As Senator KEATING pointed out, "the first step we make in our foreign aid programs is to map out the available resources of a given country and try to draw up some sort of country plan for development, so that we're not operating at cross purposes. It is high time for Island leaders, from Montauk to Manhattan, to think about the Island's future, its special resources, its advantages and its drawbacks, and chart a domestic aid plan for Long Island."

To do this, he suggested the establishment of a Long Island economic commission, "to work with labor and industry and draw up a balance sheet of what you have to offer. You don't, I am sure, want a government bureaucracy, ordering everyone around, but the Island could only benefit from a hardheaded regional body that could speak to the area and for the area in its changing economic needs.

"Such a commission could draw up its own proposals and bring them down to Washington for action. What kind of tax changes could we use to help defense industries convert to consumer ones? What kind of Government efforts could promote increased sales of U.S. goods overseas? What kind of Federal assistance could really do the best job in pepping up areas of high unemployment?"

Too often, those unwilling to adjust to new situations throw up their hands and cry "socialism" whenever that ugly word "planning" comes up. Yet they eagerly embrace Federal controls and Federal funds involving defense work.

Or, as Senator KEATING pointed out, it is ironic that we have careful planning and central control, through the Long Island State Park Commission, of our natural resources for play, yet the resources that provide our livelihood remain uncharted.

The press is proud to sponsor the Tri-County Long Island Labor-Management Institute, together with the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It is the only agency on Long Island in which labor, management and public can get together to solve crises before they get out of hand. The overdependence of our local economy on defense contracts is just the kind of crisis which can be cushioned, if not averted, by proper thinking.

The kind of planning Senator KEATING is urging is quite different from the heavy hand of Federal control; it is a do it ourselves approach that gives the local community the opportunity to better determine its own future. This is neither waiting for a Federal blueprint nor for the turn of a wheel of fortune—or misfortune—but accepting and meeting new realities head on. Refusing to plan for a foreseeable crisis no longer makes sense. For once, let's not be surprised by the future.

George Holland—Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader has recognized the contribution of George Holland as a public servant. George Holland has worked in all phases of Veterans' Administration management and has done a good job. As the Times Leader says, George Holland is living proof that a Negro need have no concern about his acceptance if he possesses qualification for high office. George has succeeded in every assignment, and the Veterans' Administration is fortunate to have his services.

The article from the Times Leader follows:

NEGRO VA CAREERMEN A CREDIT TO AMERICA

The warm reception to George L. Holland, field director of area 1, U.S. Veterans' Administration, on the occasion of his official visit to the regional office in Wilkes-Barre, enhanced the city's reputation for hospitality.

In addition to the cooperation he received on his tour of inspection of local VA facilities, Mr. Holland, who is in charge of VA affairs in 11 States and the District of Columbia, was the recipient of the distinguished service certificate from Wilkes-Barre Post of the American Legion and was guest of honor at the annual spring frolic and dinner of the VA office staff which happened to coincide with the visit.

A careerman with VA, and the successor to the late Bernard O'Hara of Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Holland has served his country with distinction in peace and war. He is living proof that a Negro need have no concern about his acceptance if he possesses the qualifications for high office which Mr. Holland unquestionably has. Mr. Holland commands respect on the basis of his fine record of service and fidelity to duty, which is as it should be.

Men like Mr. Holland in public service will do more to speed a solution to the racial problem than any other factor. He is a credit to America as well as to his race.

Foreign Aid: War on Poverty Throughout the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in his remarks to the editors and broadcasters yesterday in the White House Rose Garden President Johnson eloquently spelled out the real reasons for our foreign aid programs.

The President compared our foreign aid programs to his declared war on poverty here in the United States. He said it was part of the same struggle to provide all people of the world with a decent way of life.

The foreign aid program is vital to our national interest, the President went on to say, because it is necessary for the continuance of world peace. This is not only a moral and humanitarian program—but one increasingly necessary to the preservation of peace in the world.

I commend the President's eloquent and moving remarks to all my colleagues in the House.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TALK TO EDITORS

(Following are excerpts from a transcript of President Johnson's remarks and replies to questions put to him today at a meeting in the White House Rose Garden with editors and broadcasters attending a national foreign policy conference.)

I am glad you could come here before you went home to let me have a very brief visit with you. You occupy a very important place in American life. The destiny of our children is going to depend on the leadership of the present. What is written in your papers and the way in which you conduct your business helps millions of Americans in America's cities and towns in shaping the kind of world that we are going to live in.

Every night when I go to bed I ask myself, "What did we do today that we can point to for generations to come, to say that we laid the foundation for a better and more peaceful and more prosperous world?"

I would like to talk to you about one area in which we can see with some certainty the shape of things to come. That is the fight against poverty around the world.

We are waging an all-out war against poverty here at home. We are committed to pursue that war to final victory. But we are also engaged in that same battle on 100 different fronts around the world, in 100 or more nations.

On three continents, in dozens of countries, hundreds of millions of people struggle to exist on incomes of little more than a dollar a week. In the 112 or more nations, only 6 of them have an income of as much as $80 a month, Sweden and Switzerland, Australia and New Zealand, Canada and the United States.

Here we ought to get down on our knees every night and thank the Good Lord for our blessings, that our income can be more than $200 a month, when more than two-thirds of the people of the world have less than $8 a month.

These people have less to spend each day on food and on shelter and on clothing, on medicine, on all of their needs, than the average American spends at his corner drugstore for a package of cigarettes. They live in rundown country shacks of tar paper. They live in city slums. They live without heat, water, or sanitation of any kind.

Their children have no schools to go to. They have no doctors or hospitals to attend. Their life expectancy is somewhere between 35 and 40 years of age. Worst of all, many of them live without any hope at all. They see no escape from the ancient cycle of misery and despair.

POVERTY AS OLD AS MAN

These are not new conditions. Poverty, hunger, and disease are afflictions as old as man himself. But in our time and in this age there has been a change. The change is not so much in the realities of life, but in the hopes and the expectations of the future. If a peaceful revolution in these areas is impossible a violent revolution is inevitable.

We who stand here in peace and security and prosperity must realize that we are greatly outnumbered in this world, more than 17 to 1 in population, in area, in race, in religion, in color. You take any criteria and measure yourself by that standard, and you will find that we are in a very small minority.

This knowledge has helped create the worldwide boom of vast portent which we know as the revolution of rising expectations. The meaning of this revolution is very simple.

It means that people in the rest of the world want for themselves the same things that you and I want for our loved ones, for our friends, and for our children, and that most of us already have.

They intend that their families shall live a decent life and that they have a job that gives them survival and dignity. They intend that their children shall be taught to read and to write. They intend that the hungry shall be fed and the sick shall be treated. They intend to take their place in the great movement of modern society, to take their share in the benefits of that society.

These just desires, once unleashed, can never again be stifled. The people of the developing world are on the march, and we want to be beside them on that march. I can think of nothing that would give me more satisfaction than the knowledge that I could believe that you wielders of the pen and you molders of opinion, you leaders in public life, could take your stand this morning on the side of preserving humanity and uplifting it throughout the world.

AN ACT OF NECESSITY

Our gross national product in this, the richest of all nations, this quarter, is running at the rate of $608.6 billion. We are asking to distribute in the form of help, aid, and military assistance to all the nations who want to have freedom less than one-half of 1 percent of that amount—3,400 million.

But because of what we call it, and because of how it has been administered, and because it is far away, we don't realize that this investment is not only one of the most Christian acts that this great, powerful rich country could do, but it is an act of necessity if we are to preserve our image in the world and our leadership in the world, and most of all, our society.

We must help developing countries because our own welfare demands it. It takes no great gift of foresight to realize that unless there is progress and unless there is growing satisfaction of just desires, there will be discontent and there will be restlessness.

The developing world would soon become a cauldron of violence, hatred, and revolution without some assistance. How would you feel if you were a member of a family whose total income was less than $80 per year? Yet a majority of the people of the world have incomes of less than $80 a year.

Under such conditions, communism, with its false and easy promises of a magic formula, might well be able to transform these popular desires into an instrument of revolution. That is why every American who is concerned about the future of his country must also be concerned about the future of Africa, Asia, and our old friends in Latin America.

No President who looks beyond the immediate problems which crowd his desk can fail to extend the hand and the heart of this country to those who are struggling elsewhere. We help these countries in many ways, through trade and raw materials and manufactures, with the Peace Corps now working in more than 40 of them, through programs of economic assistance, and through the exchange of scholars and students and ideas.

So I hope you will make this one of your first orders of business when you return to your homes. You can do this in many ways. Your communities can establish direct contact with communities in other countries. You can arrange for exchange of visits. You can arrange for help to schools and hospitals in a similar community, in a sister country, in a developing land.

You can try and establish scholarships to bring deserving students to your local college or to your local high school for education. You can arrange programs of study and discussion about the problems of these other countries that a good many of your folks have not read about or studied about. You can conduct exhibits or performances of the arts and music folklore of others.

If the results of your endeavors here in Washington are to gain enough inspiration to return to your desks and ask the people of our own land to lead the others in ignorance and darkness and disease and all the ancient enemies of mankind that are fighting in other parts of the world, that you are going to take up your shield and try to help them strike them down, it would be a great day in America when we met in the rose garden and launched this kind of an effort.

Thank you and God bless you.

I don't know what your engagements are, but someone suggested that those of you who are from out of town, who don't have an opportunity every day to come here to the White House, you might want to ask some questions of your President. I will be glad to take some time, if you can take it. If any of you have any questions that you would like to ask, I will be glad to attempt to answer them.

Federal Water Development Programs—Resolutions of Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission has recently adopted two resolutions which apply directly to Federal water development programs.

The first, which applies to the Soil Conservation Service, calls for enactment of H.R. 9695, to increase the detention capacity of small watershed res-

ervoirs from 5,000 acre-feet to 12,500 acre-feet. The larger reservoirs would have prevented much of the serious flood damage which occurred in southern Indiana last March.

The second resolution points to the need for recreation user fees, which would, in turn, provide increased recreational facilities. The commission has in mind specifically the Monroe Reservoir, in southern Indiana—a 10,750-acre multipurpose facility financed by State and Federal funds. Present national policy does not permit admission charges to federally sponsored recreation areas.

Both of these resolutions merit the serious consideration of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION—RECREATION USER FEES

"Whereas the growing public demand for outdoor recreation has attracted wide attention; and

"Whereas the growing demand for outdoor recreation has created a need for greatly expanded recreation areas and facilities; and

"Whereas the provision of adequate recreational facilities and the operation and maintenance of such facilities require constantly increasing funds; and

"Whereas experience in the operation and maintenance of public outdoor recreation facilities in Indiana for a period of more than 40 years has demonstrated that such operation and maintenance can be financed through the collection of nominal entrance and user fees without decreasing use of such facilities; and

"Whereas experience has demonstrated that use of facilities for which there are entrance or user fees greatly exceeds use of areas that provide limited facilities but require no entrance or user fees; and

"Whereas the present policy of the Federal Government to require no entrance or admission fees creates a conflict between Federal and State financing policies in Indiana: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission urges the Congress to enact legislation that will make permissible the collection of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges from the users of outdoor recreation facilities by Federal agencies or State agencies licensed to operate and maintain such facilities; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That such fees be used for the development, operation and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities."

Adopted by the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission this 27th day of March 1964.

RESOLUTION: INCREASE IN DETENTION CAPACITY OF SMALL WATERSHED RESERVOIRS

Whereas the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, administered by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has been proven to be of great value to the citizens and the economy of Indiana in the conservation and control of land and water resources; and

Whereas the utility of and the benefits from the said Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act are being limited in an increasing number of cases by reason of the existing limitation on floodwater detention capacity in any one detention structure to 5,000 acre-feet; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress a bill (H.R. 9695) which would amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to permit the provision of up to 12,500 acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity in any one detention structure; and

Whereas such amendment would greatly increase the utility and application of the act and would enable the solution of flood problems which cannot be solved under the existing limitations on floodwater detention capacity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, meeting in regular session this 27th day of March 1964, That the Indiana congressional delegation is hereby respectfully urged to support the enactment of H.R. 9695, 88th Congress, 2d session.

Swords Into Plowshares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Washington Post included an incisive editorial deploring the lack of information currently available on the economic impact of shifts in our defense expenditures.

Layoffs occasioned by the cancellation or termination of defense contracts are already imposing severe hardship, not only on the individuals and their families involved, but on entire communities who have achieved prosperity on what now appear to be the shifting sands of military expenditures.

There are now 21 bills pending in the House for the creation of a National Economic Conversion Commission which would be authorized to make a complete study of the policies which will be needed to absorb these cuts. The Post offered its strong support for a Commission and under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES

President Johnson's decision to curtail sharply the production of uranium and plutonium and the announcement by the Russians that they will move in the same direction are most welcome contributions to the relaxation of world tensions. But as the threat of nuclear annihilation recedes, new economic problems are created. And while they do not pose issues of life and death, their solution, which fall well within the boundaries of our knowledge and experience, is essential to a healthy American economy.

Although national defense absorbs nearly 10 percent of our gross national product, there is scandalously little knowledge about how many jobs are involved or exactly how changes in the level and composition of defense expenditures affects the level of employment. But when individual programs are phrased out or when the overall level of defense expenditures declines, unemployment rises sharply in areas where defense production activities are concentrated.

There is no accurate measure of the number of persons idled by defense cutbacks or the number likely to lose their jobs when defense expenditures decline $1.3 billion in fiscal 1965. But it is obvious that the problem will grow more acute as the possibilities of a genuine detente are enhanced. Former Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric writes in the April issue of Foreign Affairs that a further improvement of relations with the Soviet Union could lead to the elimination of strategic bombers and a 25-percent reduction in the defense budget by 1970.

In the event of a sharp reduction of defense outlays, a way should be found for the orderly conversion of defense industries to civilian use. A massive conversion was easily effected after the Second World War, but the path was then cleared, as it would not be now, by a huge backlog of unsatisfied consumer's demands and an equally huge pool of liquid savings.

Without the pressure of consumer demand, there are no obvious or simple formulas for converting the military airframe industry or firms engaged in producing electronic equipment. The affected companies, many of whose managements have grown lethargic as a result of dealing with one sure customer, must find civilian products and open civilian product markets.

Last December President Johnson appointed a Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. But that body has no staff, no budget and as yet precious little information about the dimensions of a problem which is likely to grow more acute. An organizational framework is required, and it would be most swiftly provided by Senator George McGovern's bill (S. 2274) to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission. Only intelligent forward planning will prevent the blessing of disarmament from being transformed to an economic nightmare.

The Political Good Fortune of Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article concerning two of the most distinguished Members of the Congress of the United States and their long efforts on behalf of medical research.

I refer, of course, to our colleagues, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, and Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama.

The article to which I refer, entitled, "The Political Good Fortune of Medical Research," is by Milton Viorst and is published in the April 17, 1964, issue of Science magazine.

The article follows:

THE POLITICAL GOOD FORTUNE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH: TWO STRATEGICALLY PLACED LEGISLATORS REGULARLY ASSURE CONGRESSIONAL GENEROSITY FOR THE NIH BUDGET

(By Milton Viorst)

(NOTE.—The author is a Washington-based correspondent. He has written for various publications, including Harper's and the Reporter, and is the author of a political biography of Charles de Gaulle, to be published this spring by Macmillan.)

Congress' generosity in the field of medical research stands in sharp contrast to its response to other domestic welfare needs. Every year, for example, little is done to meet the problems of unemployment, air pollution, urban congestion, and education.

Though the existence of these problems is generally acknowledged, Congress continues to argue about how to resolve them but reaches no consensus. Since the war, however, medical research has been a congressional favorite, almost as sacrosanct as national defense. While the proponents of other goods causes plead vainly for dollars, medical researchers have had no such problem.

The figures record the story:

In 1940 Congress voted $3 million for health-related research. By 1957 the figure had reached $186 million. Last year, it exceeded $916 million and will, in this year's budget, come close to $1 billion.

In 1957 private sources provided more funds than Government for medical research. Last year, though private contributions had almost tripled, the Government provided nearly twice as much money as private sources.

In other terms, $1 out of every $4,000 of Federal expenditures went to medical research in 1940; last year the proportion was almost $1 out of every $100.

The explanation for this phenomenon lies, in large measure, in the universality of disease and the remarkable advances made in medicine since the war.

Congressmen and Senators who live in spacious suburbs and send their children to excellent schools may be badly equipped to recognize the welfare needs of our less fortunate citizens. But they all know about cancer, fear retardation in their children, and have friends whose lives heart attacks have brought to an abrupt end.

Thus, the politics of medical research rests on the fact that illness cuts across the political lines which usually divide men in Washington. It strikes Republican voters as well as Democrats, conservatives as well as liberals, Protestants as well as Catholics and Jews. It affects the rich and the middle class, who have much influence in Washington, almost as much as it affects the poor, who have next to none. Unlike farm subsidies on the one hand and urban renewal on the other, it has equal impact on city dwellers and country folk. Medical research, unlike conservation or aid to the arts, has almost universal appeal. In practical terms, this appeal means that no powerful lobbies stand, swords drawn, waiting to slash away at the medical research budget.

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

But medical research would never have reached the current level of Federal support if its only advantage were the negative one of having no enemies. A program, even a popular one, must have a champion. Under the American system of government the champion usually is the President, who initiates legislative ideas through his recommendations to Congress. Rarely does the leadership come from Congress itself. But medical research is a special case. Under neither Eisenhower nor Kennedy did the interest of the White House in medical research approach the passion for the program that has been generated on Capitol Hill. Without vigorous champions, one in the House and one in the Senate, each fortuitously placed to exercise his leadership, medical research might be just another Federal project, hobbling along on routine appropriations, badgered rather than spurred on by Congress, fighting to hold its own rather than seeking new fields to explore.

The bulk of the credit for the Government's massive support of medical research belongs to two men. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama. Each is chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). Though as a general rule in Washington the longer the title the less the authority, on the Appropriations Committees the subcommittee chairmen exercise enormous influence, not only over the budget but, through the budget, over the departments of their jurisdiction. Since the National Institutes of Health, and HEW agency, conducts or supervises the bulk of federally supported medical research, FOGARTY and HILL possess vast power over the support of medical research. The peculiarities of the congressional power structure and the seniority system being what they are, it would have been quite normal for these posts to be in the hands of foes of medical research, just as some other, less generously supported programs have the misfortune to be in the hands of foes. But medical research has been lucky. Both FOGARTY and HILL are deeply dedicated to its objectives. Far from adopting the economizing habits that are characteristic of the Appropriations Committees, they have sought to push their programs up and up. FOGARTY and HILL have earned their reputations as friends of public health.

The two men could hardly be more dissimilar. FOGARTY, a 51-year-old New Englander, is of Irish-Catholic, workingclass background. HILL, 69, is a southern, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon aristocrat. FOGARTY, though given to wearing flamboyant bow ties, is reserved in manner, even timid. HILL is unobtrusive in dress, but outgoing and patriarchal in manner. The two men get along well enough for professional purposes but, having nothing else in common, can hardly be considered close. Together, however, they make up perhaps the most effective leadership team on Capitol Hill.

JOHN E. FOGARTY was one of six children raised in the small Rhode Island village of Harmony. When he finished high school he took up bricklaying, his father's trade. But, intelligent and restless, he went into politice. At 21 he became chairman of the local Democratic committee and, a few years later, the president of the Bricklayers' local union. In 1940, after having failed once to get the nomination, he ran for Congress and won. But he has never given up his membership in the Bricklayers' local, and to this day he builds steps or repairs a chimney for a neighbor during vacation.

SOUGHT LABOR POST

True to his labor background, FOGARTY first sought a position on the Education and Labor Committee in the House, but he wound up with an assignment to naval affairs. It was not until 1947 that he was promoted to a seat on the coveted Appropriations Committee and then, to his displeasure, named to fill a vacancy on the Labor-HEW Subcommittee. Two years later, by the accidents of the seniority system, he became the chairman of the subcommittee.

The Appropriations Committee, in those days, was the private domain of its chairman, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, a shrewd legislator who was mercilessly tight fisted with Federal expenditures. CANNON and the senior Republican, equally tight fisted JOHN TABER, of New York, exercised their will through energetic exploitation of committee rules. Soon after joining the committee, FOGARTY led a revolt against CANNON and, after a bitter battle, managed by a single vote to reduce the chairman's perogatives. CANNON at 84 still rules the committee. But the revolt of 1947 ended his domination and left FOGARTY free of his veto power.

Though intensely proud of his work on the subcommittee, FOGARTY talks about it only reluctantly. His conversation is unpolished and carried on in almost inaudible tones, sometimes resembling a mumble. He seems self-conscious about the attention paid him. He is more at ease in discussing the substance of his work than he is in making abstract declarations about it. But the impression which his words and his actions convey, and which his record sustains, is that he is a man of deeply humanitarian convictions.

"I have always acted on the principle," he said in a moment of eloquence, "that budgetary anemia—induced by cynicism—is an attribute of materialism. It contradicts the notion in our society that the life and well-being of an individual—extended, restored, or eased by the scientific dedication of his neighbors—is a richness beyond all value, a prize without price."

But the House is full of men of conviction. The secret, if such there be, of FOGARTY's personal influence is his meticulous attention to detail. FOGARTY boasts, without exaggerating, that no committee in Congress works harder than his before bringing out a bill. For this, he credits Republicans as well as his fellow Democrats. But it is on him personally that the burden of leadership falls, and when pressed he admits, "I live this thing all year around." It is well established in the House that the better a chairman knows what is in his bill the greater his chances are of having it passed intact. FOGARTY, though by no means a brilliant debater, invariably possesses such a thorough grasp of his material that he can deal in virtuoso fashion with the challenges thrown at him.

Like the day the Turks were beaten at Lepanto or the Moors at Tours, FOGARTY regards April 4, 1957, as the historic day on which he turned back the tide against medical research. An obsession for economy had swept through Congress that year, largely as a consequence of the warning by Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, that an uncut budget would cause a depression that would "curl your hair." When the medical research appropriation proposal reached the House floor, it was submitted to a merciless attack. In the course of the next 2 weeks, FOGARTY went down to one defeat after another in voice votes on amendments. As one Congressman put it, "If the Ten Commandments had been in that bill, they would have been cut to seven." But when the time came for final passage, when every Congressman had to go on record, FOGARTY regrouped his forces and insisted that each of the amendments be reconsidered. A record number of rollcalls was held that day, 14 in all, and, except for minor losses, FOGARTY left the battlefield victorious. Since the fateful "Day of the Fourteen Rollcalls," FOGARTY maintains, his proposals for large appropriations for medical research have never been seriously threatened.

DECLINED SENATE RACE

JOHN FOGARTY does not seem to be motivated by ambition, in any conventional sense. He has received countless citations, which he cherishes, but he is not a seeker of publicity. Nor is he a seeker of riches. When he was given $5,000 in 1959 for the Lasker Award, he used it to establish the John E. Fogarty Educational Training Center for the Mentally Retarded. Since then he has set up the Fogarty Foundation, which he helps support with whatever stipends and prizes he receives, including $8,333 presented to him this past February by the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation. If political advancement were his goal, he would not have declined the chance to run 3 years ago for the Senate, to which he would almost certainly have been elected. If there is any aggrandizement he covets at all, it is the esteem he has won among men he admires. "It's a hell of a privilege," he explained in an interview, "to listen to the best doctors in the world talk about heart and cancer." A smile of pride crosses his Hibernian face when he reveals that, when he suffered a coronary attack a decade ago, he was treated by Paul Dudley White, who remains his friend and adviser.

Politically, FOGARTY is fortunate in being able to give so much time and attention to

medical research without risking the support of his constituency. FOGARTY is careful, nonetheless, to keep in constant touch with the voters. Without fail, he returns home every weekend, not only to see his wife and teenage daughter but to see and be seen by the voters. Although his district was Republican before he won office, FOGARTY received 72 percent of the vote in the last election. The voters of his district, whether sick or well, clearly approve of what he is doing.

LISTER HILL, a Senator since 1938, is not quite so fortunate politically. He comes from race-conscious Alabama, not a liberal working-class constituency. His electorate regards medical research as less important than the concerns generally listed under the heading of "States rights." In that sense HILL finds being a leader in medical research more of a hardship than FOGARTY does. He was, in fact, nearly defeated in the last election by an extreme racist opponent. Political survival requires that HILL, too gracious to be a demagog, boast that he has "stood first and foremost with Alabama and the South in defending southern ways and traditions." But though he serves the South, it is certain that he is happier serving public health.

More than FOGARTY, HILL has an intensely personal concern with the conquest of disease. His father, Luther Leonidas Hill, of Montgomery, was one of the prominent surgeons of the South. HILL proudly recalls that his father performed a successful heart operation early in the century to repair a stab wound. The Senator, named for Joseph Lister, was brought up in an atmosphere of medical learning. His father had one of the finest medical libraries in Alabama. The Senator admits unhesitatingly that much of what he does is out of veneration for his father, whom he regards as "an inspiration and a challenge." For whatever he has achieved in behalf of medical research, HILL said, "my father must get the credit."

HILL might have been a physician too, had he not found, while still a young man, that he could not stand the sight of blood. Even now, there's a note of remorse when he explains that he chose to become a lawyer instead. If he had to do it all over again, he said, he would go through the first 2 years of medical school, "if only to learn the terminology." After talking to HILL, one has the feeling that, having failed to become a physician, he is now paying his debt to medicine on Capitol Hill.

Unlike FOGARTY, HILL acquired his position of leadership over medical research by design. In the Senate it is easier for a senior Member to select his assignment than it is in the more unwieldy House. HILL, after the war, chose to relinquish considerable seniority over national defense matters to preside over medical affairs. In addition to being chairman of his money-dispensing appropriations subcommittee he is now chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which writes legislation concerning the Public Health Service. He thus has double jurisdiction over health matters, an advantage he uses skillfully to advance his favorite cause.

As a Senator, HILL is better placed than FOGARTY to take the lead in appropriations because the Senate in recent years has been considerably more generous with Federal funds than the House. In large measure, this is because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, is not obsessed with economy the way CANNON is. In fact, the Senate has shown itself more liberal than the House in virtually every area. Thus, HILL operates in a milieu more favorable to his objectives than FOGARTY does.

But HILL, like FOGARTY, also commands the respect of his colleagues for his hard work and attention to detail. The difference between them is that HILL enjoys doing his research on medicine, while for FOGARTY it is simply a means to an end. HILL goes home at night and reads medical books and journals. A scholarly, contemplative man, his committee work is his hobby, which he pursues not only for its rewarding results but for its immediate pleasures. It is probably fair to say that HILL does not have FOGARTY's deep, undiscriminating humanitarian impulse. But when he takes the floor of the Senate, his colleagues cannot help but be influenced by the fact that the recommendations come forth not only from duty but from love.

HILL invariably recommends a bigger appropriation than FOGARTY, because it is easier for him to do so. In 1957 the administration asked for $126.7 million for the National Institutes of Health. FOGARTY's committee voted $135.7 million. HILL raised the figure to $183.2 million, which was the amount on which the House and Senate ultimately agreed. Last year the administration asked for $780 million. FOGARTY brought out a recommendation, which the House approved, of $840.8 million. HILL had the Senate vote $900.8 million. The final figure accepted by both bodies was $880.8 million.

Occasionally FOGARTY has complained that the Senate appropriation was too large and that the money could not be efficiently used. Several times, NIH funds have been returned to the Treasury, ostensibly because it was impossible to find worthy projects to spend them on. Though this return suggests that FOGARTY may have been right, it is usually suspected that he does not worry at all about excessive appropriations but finds the technique useful for keeping the economizers at bay. Despite his complaints, he and HILL go merrily on with their game, year after year, adding on funds where they think the funds are needed.

HILL, in defense of congressional largesse for medical research, has glowingly predicted the imminent arrival of a "Golden Age of Medicine." He insists that "within a relatively few short years the world will see a tremendous breakthrough of medical knowledge that will enable us to overcome the dread diseases that have plagued and baffled mankind through the ages. There is reason for confidence," he asserts, "that this breakthrough will yield the answer to heart disease, cancer, mental illness, the virus diseases, and the many other crippling degenerative ailments."

His prophecy of "a relatively few short years" may be unduly optimistic, and as pressures grow on the overall Federal research budget, medical research is, for the first time in a decade, experiencing a few unaccustomed pinches. But when viewed in perspective, it is clear that the medical research budget occupies one of the most enviable positions in the U.S. Congress, a fact for which the gentlemen from Alabama and Rhode Island are in large part responsible.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* 5101 Macomb St.
Edmondson, J. Howard, *Okla.*
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Engle, Clair, *Calif*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y* 1233 31st St.
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn* 7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Mechem, Edwin L., *N. Mex*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* 122 Schotts Court NE.
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Walters, Herbert S., *Tenn*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Edmondson, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, Curtis, and Keating.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McGovern, Edmondson, Walters, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Cooper, Boggs, and Mechem.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Bennett, Tower, Javits, Simpson, and Dominick.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, and Beall.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, McIntyre, Beall, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, and Mundt.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Pell, McIntyre, Ribicoff, Brewster, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Walters, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, Mechem, and Dominick.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy, Bayh, Burdick, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy, Metcalf, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Brewster, Inouye, Bayh, Nelson, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Abbitt, Jones of Missouri, Hagen of California, Johnson of Wisconsin, Matthews, Stubblefield, Harding, Hagan of Georgia, Purcell, Morrison, Rosenthal, Duncan, Olson of Minnesota, Leggett, Matsunaga, Hoeven, Dague, Belcher, McIntire, Teague of California, Quie, Short, Mrs. May, Messrs. Latta, Harvey of Indiana, Findley, Dole, Beermann, Hutchinson, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Whitten, Andrews of Alabama, Rooney of New York, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Passman, Evins, Boland, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Steed, Montoya, Shipley, Slack, Lesinski, Flynt, Smith of Iowa, Giaimo, Mrs. Hansen, Messrs. Finnegan, Joelson, Addabbo, McFall, Jensen, Horan, Ford, Ostertag, Bow, Jonas, Laird, Cederberg, Lipscomb, Rhodes of Arizona, Pillion, Minshall, Michel, Conte, Milliken, Wilson of Indiana, Langen, Harrison, Reifel, and Wyman.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Rivers of South Carolina, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Bennett of Florida, Lankford, Huddleston, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Stratton, Cohelan, Wickersham, Pike, Kilgore, Ichord, Nedzi, Long of Maryland, Burkhalter, Arends, Norblad, Bates, O'Konski, Bray, Bob Wilson, Osmers, Gubser, Becker, Chamberlain, Pirnie, Hall, Clancy, Stafford, Foreman, Schweiker, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Patman (chairman), Rains, Multer, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Reuss, Ashley, Vanik, Moorhead, Stephens, St Germain, Gonzalez, Pepper, Minish, Weltner, Hanna, Grabowski, Charles H. Wilson, White, Kilburn, Widnall, Siler, Fino, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Halpern, Harvey of Michigan, Oliver P. Bolton, Brock, Taft, McDade, Lloyd, Talcott, and Del Clawson.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Dawson, Williams, Multer, Dowdy, Huddleston, Whitener, Cohelan, St Germain, Trimble, Sisk, Diggs, Hagan of Georgia, Auchincloss, Springer, Nelsen, O'Konski, Harsha, Mathias, Schwengel, Horton, Roudebush, and ———.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Powell (chairman), Perkins, Landrum, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Thompson of New Jersey, Holland, Dent, Pucinski, Daniels, Brademas, O'Hara of Michigan, Scott, Carey, Hawkins, Sickles, Gibbons, Gill, Brown of California, Frelinghuysen, Ayres, Griffin, Quie, Goodell, Bruce, Ashbrook, Martin of Nebraska, Bell, Snyder, Findley, and Taft.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Morgan (chairman), Zablocki, Burleson, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Hays, Selden, Pilcher, O'Hara of Illinois, Fountain, Fascell, Farbstein, Diggs, Beckworth, McDowell, Murphy of Illinois, Gallagher, Nix, Monagan, Fraser, Cameron, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Adair, Mailliard, Frelinghuysen, Broomfield, Barry, Whalley, Gross, Berry, Derwinski, Morse, Battin, and Thomson of Wisconsin.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson (chairman), Holifield, Brooks, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Fascell, Reuss, Monagan, Lankford, Macdonald, Roush, Moorhead, Gallagher, Randall, Rosenthal, Riehlman, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Griffin, Wallhauser, Anderson, Reid of New York, Horton, Stinson, McClory, and Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Friedel, Ashmore, Hays, Jones of Missouri, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, Everett, Waggonner, Perkins, Dent, Gibbons, Nedzi, Brademas, Davis of Georgia, Schenck, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Lipscomb, Chamberlain, Goodell, Kyl, Curtin, Skubitz, and Devine.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Aspinall (chairman), O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Haley, Edmondson, Baring, Morris, Rivers of Alaska, Taylor, Johnson of California, Carey, Udall, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Duncan, White, Marsh, Roybal, Gill, Burton of California, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Westland, Hosmer, Chenoweth, Kyl, Abele, Skubitz, Mrs. Reid of Illinois, Messrs. Burton of California, Morton, Martin of California, Andrews of North Dakota, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Harris (chairman), Williams, Roberts of Alabama, Staggers, Rogers of Texas, Friedel, Macdonald, Jarman, O'Brien of New York, Moss, Dingell, Rogers of Florida, Hemphill, Rostenkowski, Healey, Kornegay, Hull, Long of Louisiana, Van Deerlin, Pickle, Bennett of Michigan, Springer, Schenck, Younger, Glenn, Devine, Nelsen, Keith, Curtin, Sibal, Cunningham, Broyhill of North Carolina, and Brotzman.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Rodino, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks, Tuck, Ashmore, Dowdy, Whitener, Libonati, Toll, Kastenmeier, Gilbert, Corman, St. Onge, Senner, Edwards, McCulloch, Miller of New York, Poff, Cramer, Moore, Meader, Lindsay, Cahill, Shriver, MacGregor, Mathias, Bromwell, King of New York, and Martin of California.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Garmatz, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Rivers of South Carolina, Lennon, Downing, Casey, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Vanik, Hagen of California, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Rogers of Florida, Stubblefield, Murphy of New York, Gilbert, Tollefson, Van Pelt, Mailliard, Pelly, Glenn, Ellsworth, Goodling, Tupper, Mosher, Grover, Morton, and Keith.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Morrison, Dulski, Henderson, Olsen of Montana, Udall, Daniels, Beckworth, Staggers, Nix, Pool, Watson, Roybal, Charles H. Wilson, Corbett, Gross, Johansen, Cunningham, Wallhauser, Barry, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Derwinski, Ellsworth, Abele, and Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Kluczynski, Thompson of Louisiana, Wright, Gray, Clark, Edmondson, Johnson of California, Dorn, Henderson, Olsen of Montana, Ryan of Michigan, Tuten, Murphy of New York, Rivers of Alaska, Roberts of Texas, Auchincloss, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Robison, Harsha, Harvey of Michigan, Kunkel, McLoskey, Grover, Quillen, Rich, Cleveland, and Don H. Clausen.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Bolling, O'Neill, Elliott, Sisk, Young, Brown of Ohio, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Smith of California, Hoffman, and Avery.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

Messrs. Miller of California (chairman), Teague of Texas, Karth, Hechler, Daddario, Roush, Morris, Casey, Randall, Davis of Georgia, Ryan of New York, Downing, Waggonner, Patten, Fulton of Tennessee, Fuqua, Staebler, Albert, Martin of Massachusetts, Fulton of Pennsylvania, Chenoweth, Van Pelt, Riehlman, Mosher, Roudebush, Bell, Pelly, Rumsfeld, Weaver, Gurney, and Wydler.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Willis (chairman), Tuck, Pool, Ichord, Senner, Johansen, Bruce, Schadeberg, and Ashbrook.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Haley, Baring, Everett, Dulski, Libonati, McDowell, Kornegay, Roberts of Texas, Secrest, Marsh, Brown of California, Rooney of Pennsylvania, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Saylor, Teague of California, Halpern, Schadeberg, Ellsworth, Bromwell, and ———.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Mills (chairman), King of California, Boggs, Keogh, Karsten, Herlong, Watts, Ullman, Burke, Thompson of Texas, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Bass, Jennings, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, ———, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Curtis, Knox, Utt, Betts, Alger, Derounian, Schneebeli, Collier, and Broyhill of Virginia.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone: STerling 3-5700

Chief Judge

David L. Bazelon

Circuit Judges

Wilbur K. Miller
Charles Fahy
George T. Washington
John A. Danaher
Walter M. Bastian
Warren E. Burger
J. Skelly Wright
Carl McGowan

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone, National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—Giles S. Rich, of New York, 4949 Linnean Ave.
Judge—I. Jack Martin, of Ohio, 9614 Hillridge Dr., Rock Creek Hills, Kensington, Md.
Judge—Arthur M. Smith, of Michigan.
Judge—J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Virginia, 208 Wexleigh Dr., Richmond, Va.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Rd., Sumner, Md.
Judge—James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, 4 Carvel Circle, Westmoreland Hills, Washington 16, D.C.
Judge—Oscar H. Davis, of New York, 1101 Third St. SW., Apt. 513.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D.C.)

Chief Judge Matthew F. McGuire

Judges

David A. Pine	Joseph C. McGarraghy
Alexander Holtzoff	John J. Sirica
Richmond B. Keech	George L. Hart
Edward M. Curran	Leonard P. Walsh
Edward A. Tamm	William B. Jones
Charles F. McLaughlin	Spottswood W. Robinson III
Burnita S. Matthews	
Luther W. Youngdahl	

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Judge	Paul J. Kilday
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

Appendix

Invocation by Msgr. William Carey at Groundbreaking Ceremonies of Pedestrian Mall, Providence, R.I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the invocation given by Msgr. William Carey at the groundbreaking ceremonies on March 26, 1964, of the pedestrian mall in Providence, R.I.

This invocation uniquely expresses the hopes, prayers, and thoughts of all those who desire progress combined with beauty.

Impact R.I., Inc., which is an independent movement to promote action by citizens for tomorrow's Rhode Island, has spearheaded this project and it has finally become a reality.

Mayor Walter Reynolds of Providence, during his 10 years in office, has worked hard to bring the pedestrian mall into being and now at last in his final year as mayor, he has seen these efforts bear fruit.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION BY MSGR. WILLIAM CAREY AT PEDESTRIAN MALL GROUNDBREAKING, MARCH 26, 1964

Dear Father of divine providence, we call on your assistance in this project of the Pedestrian Mall. For us it is an end and a happy beginning. Here is a renaissance timed in perfect harmony with the new life of nature—thoughtfully on Maundy Thursday—close of your resurrection. The work we see begun today—some would say is born of ills and sickness—the sickness of a city wornout and tired—once filled with comeliness, vivid life, and beauty now become venerable, faintly petrified and subtly haunted by the tag of obsolescence.

They may speak the truth—but there is a generation and race of men abroad here in Providence who would challenge these prophets of doom, for they see in our city the beginning of a new golden age—tortuously born, painfully nutured but planted deep and solid in the conviction of high-minded visionary men. In their way and according to their time, pioneers of the new frontier. There may never come a day when men will erect monuments to their memory nor will a word be found in the books of history to tell their deeds. But their contributions will be written in living things—the lives of men and women and children who spelled out their days in a better Providence because this race of men was not afraid to walk down a street "all alone."

The physical and moral vigor of a city is the life and the light of a people—show me your cities and I'll tell you your people. Dear Lord, this is a center of your worship—a center of our commerce, recreation, transportation, and culture.

Help us to fashion it into something good and noble and beauteous, for we are a proud and independent people who plead that you let us use our talents with your guidance.

And lastly, dear Father, we feel in this a true sense of gratitude that here is a project that cuts through religious, ethnic, and racial differences. In this there are no Protestant or Jewish or Catholic spheres of influence or exclusion; you see we can never escape you. By working for a common goal we've learned better to respect and love one another—from this we take our inspiration—how can a work thus begun ever fail. Through Jesus dear Lord. Amen.

The 1964 National 4-H Club Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined with other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation in welcoming our State's delegates to the magnificent conference of the 4-H Clubs. It was an inspiring sight to witness. Delegates from across the Nation and from every State, accompanied by their leaders, were welcomed by Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. The purpose of this annual conference is to provide an opportunity for a select group of older 4-H Club members to learn more about our democratic Government and citizenship in action, as well as to develop a greater appreciation of our American heritage and to better understand their own roles as responsible citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the four young delegates who represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at this great conference. They are Sandra Kupiec, Pittsfield; Rosemarie Regis, Peabody; Gary Blanchard, from my congressional district, Warren, Mass.; and George Dole, Shelbourne. Mr. Merle L. Howes, head of the University of Massachusetts Cooperative Extension of 4-H and Youth Programs, accompanied the group to Washington. He has done outstanding work in this field and I compliment him for his dedicated service in this great work and the fine programs that the University of Massachusetts administers and oversees.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the passage by Congress of the Smith-Lever Act which officially established the Cooperative Extension Service, and such cooperative extension work as 4-H programs. The 4-H Clubs and programs have constantly expanded and adapted to the needs of youth in our modern society, and have opened the door of opportunity for millions of young people through the last half century. The 4-H membership is now 2½ million boys and girls, ages 10 to 21, who benefit from the pooling of talent, time, and money contributed through the Cooperative Extension Service, the National 4-H Service Committee, the National 4-H Club Foundation and other friends of 4-H.

These boys and girls are helped by 4-H to acquire knowledge and skills, explore career opportunities, cultivate leadership abilities, gain satisfaction and recognition by useful work, constructively use leisure time, appreciate agriculture and home economics, value and use research, practice healthful living, cooperate with others, and live by citizenship ideals and values. The 4-H Club work is the youth education program of the Cooperative Extension Service, conducted through the joint efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges and universities and county governments. Members of 4-H have an inspiring pledge which reads as follows:

> I pledge by head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living, for my club, my community, and my country.

Yes, these boys and girls pledge head, heart, hands and health, hence the appropriate club name of 4-H.

THE 4-H PROGRAM IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Speaker, there are 1,800 4-H Club members regularly enrolled in the 4-H Club program in my congressional district. The program is supervised by three full-time professionaly trained county 4-H Club agents. These agents direct the work of volunteer county 4-H Club leaders (see attached list) who meet with local, small groups of 4-H members to teach skills related to the 4-H project.

The major 4-H projects include:

First. Food and Nutrition.

Second. Forestry and Conservation.

Third. Clothing.

Fourth. Gardening.

Fifth. Home Improvement.

Sixth. Child Care.

Literature in support of this teaching is prepared by staff specialists at the University of Massachusetts.

THE MASSACHUSETTS 4-H CLUB PROGRAM

Thirteen thousand young people are currently enrolled in the 4-H Club program in Massachusetts. This work is supported by 2,500 volunteer adult leaders who serve as "teachers" for 1,200 different 4-H Clubs.

The Massachusetts 4-H Club Foundation, a private organization responsible for developing financial support for the

Massachusetts 4-H program, is making a significant contribution to the total 4-H effort. Four hundred contributors, individuals and Massachusetts industries, supported Massachusetts 4-H through the foundation in 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to the host of volunteer leaders serving the 4-H program in my congressional district of Massachusetts, comprising communities in Hampden, Hampshire, and Worcester Counties. They give freely of their time for this worthy cause and work in excellent cooperation with their respective county's extension service and with the University of Massachusetts Extension Service at Amherst. Under permission granted I place the names of these 4-H volunteers by community, with my remarks:

VOLUNTEER LEADERS SERVING THE 4-H PROGRAM IN SECOND DISTRICT, HAMPDEN COUNTY

Agawam: Mrs. Louis Caruso, Mrs. William Case, Mr. Carmen Cirillo, Mrs. George Collins, Mrs. Donald Cross, Mrs. Joseph Della Guistino, Mrs. George Gagliarducci, Mrs. Ronald King, Mrs. Stanley Lipski, Mrs. Edna Radding, Mr. Thomas Reidy, Mrs. George Webster, Mrs. William Yelinek, Miss Kathleen Yelinek.

Brimfield: Mr. Charles Deland, Mrs. Clarence Keith, Mrs. Alexander McVeigh, Mrs. William Pratt, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Prentiss, Mr. Johnstone Prescott, Mrs. Thomas Reed, Mrs. Kenneth Silvius, Mr. Donald Spear, Mrs. George Tetreault, Mrs. Gladys Whitten, Mr. Roger Wightman, Mrs. Herbert Wright.

Chicopee: Mrs. George Bedard, Mrs. George Beeler, Mrs. Albert Boutin, Mrs. Myles Brennan, Mrs. Jean Briere, Mrs. Frank Czaporowski, Miss Janice Langevin, Mrs. Alfred Ducharme, Mrs. August Giera, Mrs. Thomas Houlihan, Mrs. Henry Le mieux, Mrs. Henri Marcotte, Mrs. Ethel Stonina, Mrs. Richard Therrien.

East Longmeadow: Mr. Roland Chapdelaine, Mrs. Theresa Chapdelaine, Mrs. Harry Coles, Mrs. Wesley Collins, Mr. Ed Craven, Mr. Benedict Grabierz, Mrs. Josephine Grabierz, Mrs. Elizabeth Wright, Mr. Merritt Wright, Miss Nancy Wright.

Hampden: Mrs. Antonio Esposito, Mrs. Croyden Kibbe, Mrs. Harry Johnson, Mrs. Ralph Miller, Mrs. Peter Terzi, Mr. James Whipple.

Holland: Mrs. Ronald Croke, Mrs. Raoul Gendreau, Miss Eunice Foster.

Ludlow: Mrs. Ralph Barth, Mrs. Leonard Brennan, Mrs. Herbert Dickey, Mrs. Ernest Flebotte, Mrs. Elizabeth Gaviglio, Mr. Harold Griffing, Mr. Dorval Giguere, Mrs. Donna Haluch, Mr. Ray Haluch, Mr. Dexter Hiersche, Mrs. Elsie Hiersche, Mrs. Martha Hiersche, Thomas Hiersche, Mrs. Robert Koshinsky, Mrs. Herbert McChesney, Mr. Francis McMenamin, Mrs. Francis McMenamin, Mrs. Gerald Paul, Mr. John Polansky, Mrs. Wesley Rhodes, Mrs. Bertha Tower, Mrs. Geo. Walls.

Longmeadow: Mrs. Ann Brunton.

Monson: Mrs. Jane Anderson, Mr. Paul Brown, Mr. Henry Czajka, Mrs. Wm. Emerson, Mrs. Earl Gilbert, Mr. Steve Grudzien, Mrs. Douglas Habel, Mr. William Hubert, Mrs. Randall Ketterman, Mrs. Victor LePace, Mr. Truman Lowra, Mrs. Donald Nothe.

Palmer: Mrs. Joseph Bolow, Mrs. Carl Brodeur, Mrs. Fred Piechota.

Springfield: Mrs. Louis Berrelli, Mrs. Gladys Dykstra, Mrs. David Picard, Mrs. Walter Reardon, Mrs. Clarence Smith, Mr. Clarence Smith, Mrs. Walter Thorn, Mrs. Lester Woodbury, Mrs. Fred Yates.

Wales: Mrs. Agnita Baker,

West Springfield: Mrs. Howard Burnham, Mrs. Ralph Criscio, Mr. Joseph Dupius, Mrs. Mary Dupius, Mrs. Charles Gervickas, Mrs. Samuel Hardcastle, Mrs. Rose Nash, Mr. Thomas Nash, Mrs. Everett Wilder.

Wilbraham: Mrs. Irving Agard, Mr. William Duval, Mr. Thomas Erwin, Mrs. L. W. Gould, Mrs. Herman Grandchamp, Mrs. John LeBlanc, Mrs. Robert Maynard, Mrs. Carl Meier, Frances Mell, Mrs. John Nelsson, Mrs. Ronald Nobbs, Mrs. Elsie Randolph, Mrs. Winifred Rice, Mrs. Denny Richter, Mr. Lucien Riendeau, Mrs. Lucien Riendeau, Mrs. Everett Warner.

VOLUNTEER LEADERS SERVING THE 4-H PROGRAM IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, HAMPSHIRE COUNTY

Belchertown: Mrs. Edwin Whipple, Mrs. Preston Atwood, Mr. Wallace Chevalier, Mrs. Richard I. Cole, Mr. George Foster, Mrs. Julian H. Hussey, Mrs. Fred Opielowski, Mrs. Edward H. Rice, Jr., Mrs. Godfrey Wenzel, Mrs. Omer Dupuis, Mrs. M. McLean, Mrs. Jack Poole.

Granby: Mr. Roy W. White, Mrs. Philip Denette, Mr. Francis E. DeWitt, Mrs. John Erickson, Mrs. Robert L. Hatch, Mrs. Arthur A. Hauschild, Mrs. Harvey LaFleche, Mr. Warren McKinstry, Mrs. Lindolph O. Parker, Mrs. Earl Poitras, Mrs. Roy E. Simmons, Jr., Mrs. Edward Trompke, Mr. Frederick Wilson, Mrs. John Zucker, Mr. Armand C. Cormier, Mr. Kenneth Fortier, Mr. Carlton S. Nash.

South Hadley: Mr. Alfred Sebastyanski, Mrs. Warren Bock, Mrs. John Conant, Jr., Mrs. Raymond Dressell, Mrs. Edward Ezold, Mrs. Whitfield B. Hallett, Mrs. Casimir Klekotka, Mrs. Edward Laferriere, Mrs. Walter Malec, Mrs. Daniel Mulvenna, Mrs. Everett Reed, Mrs. Wistar Goodhue, Mrs. Alfred Sebastyanski, Mrs. John M. Sullivan, Mrs. Michael Sullivan, Mrs. Francis Williams, Mrs. William Williams, Mrs. Alan Craven, Mrs. Felix Gagne, Mr. A. A. Soander.

Ware: Mr. Eugene Bourgault, Mrs. James Bradley, Mrs. Bernard Dulak, Mrs. William Duval, Mr. Michael Guzik, Mr. Julian J. Knapp, Mrs. Frank Krusik, Mrs. Walter Olszewski, Mrs. Alida Phaneuf, Mr. John J. Schott, Mrs. Walter Swinarski, Mr. Lloyd H. Thomas, Mrs. Stanley Wyrobek, Mrs. Mary Riggie, Mr. Francis Cote, Mr. Robert Heavey, Mr. Leo Hevey, Mrs. Joseph Jurczyk, Mr. Charles Lemaitre, Mrs. Donald St. Germaine, Mr. William F. Wade.

VOLUNTEER LEADERS SERVING THE 4-H PROGRAM IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (WORCESTER COUNTY)

Brookfield: Mrs. Michael Pecha, Mr. Michael Pecha.

East Brookfield: Mrs. Sybil Hingston, Mrs. Robert Jaquith, Mrs. Harold Lovejoy, Mrs. John Treadwell, Mrs. Arthur Germaine, Mrs. Richard Pelletier, Mrs. Francis Vivier, Mrs. Philip Terry.

North Brookfield: Mrs. Janet Snelling, Mrs. Edith Prothro, Mrs. Raymond Waydaka, Mrs. George Sullivan, Mrs. Edmund Evans, Mrs. Roger Ducasse, Mrs. Laurence Thayer, Miss Christine Hayden, Mrs. Rene Lambert, Mr. Rene Lambert, Mr. Philip Waugh, Mr. George Frizzell, Mr. Henry Marchessault, Mr. Robert Munyon, Mr. George Cross, Mr. Ronald Fritz.

Sturbridge: Mrs. Stephen Grudzien, Mr. Stephen Grudzien.

West Brookfield: Mrs. Bernard DuPaul, Mrs. Richard Frew, Mr. Richard Frew, Mrs. Oliver Hill, Mrs. David Stevens, Mrs. Stanley Koziol, Mrs. Richard Standish, Mrs. Arvid Silverberg, Mrs. Virgil Martin, Mrs. Milton Potter, Mrs. Francis Ploof, Mrs. John Sauer, Mr. John Sauer, Mrs. Donald Williams, Mr. Donald Williams, Mrs. Roger Persons, Mr. Roger Persons, Mrs. John Lapierre, Mr. John Lapierre, Mrs. Richard Morse, Mr. Richard Morse.

Warren: Mr. James Blanchard, Mr. Boleslaw Doktor, Mrs. Doris Gravelin, Mrs. Robert Hastings, Mrs. Robert McCarthy, Mr. Leroy Richardson, Mr. David Shepard, Mr. Robert Williams.

WAVA's Position on the Racial Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Arthur W. Arundel, president of WAVA radio station, on the racial issue.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAVA'S POSITION ON THE RACIAL ISSUE

Few issues in this century have been more difficult to speak directly to than the racial troubles now besetting the country. This station has refrained from comment on the matter, not because of the nature of controversy, but because almost anything positive said publicly tends to more inflame trouble than constructive action. Nevertheless, in the perspective of the past few months, this is the way, to this station, it shapes up.

We are passing through, of course, a social revolution in which we have determined that segregation on publicly owned property is wrong—that the denial of any American's constitutional rights, notably voting, is wrong—that the full constitutional rights of Negroes must be protected. Our system of government must also defend the right of every man to practice in his private life whatever prejudice he may feel—political, religious, racial, or otherwise—to be intolerant of what or whom he pleases. Equality, the byword of this revolution, has been given meanings recently which warp this essential freedom of the individual.

Everyone is simply not equal—we were born equal, we must have equal opportunity, and it must be there for all those who possess the enterprise and determination in private life to earn it, but there equality in a free society ends. Many now insist that under constitutional equality every American is entitled to have a decent job and to live in a house fit for habitation. This is utter nonsense. No citizen of this country, white, Negro, or anyone else has any such right. This right is provided only in Communist nations, and there it exists in grinding poverty.

Negro citizens do not deserve privileged rights any more than do Polish immigrants or Episcopal ministers in our many-faceted society. And yet, through sheer brute fear, fear of investigation, fear of what others will say, fear of Government coercion * * * a fear that has never so penetrated the internal machinery of the Nation, special privileges are being granted to minority groups—this we have, until now, accepted as making good for slavery's wrongs.

The issue is whether all Americans are to continue equal under the law, or whether one group is to be granted sanction to flaunt the law. This, of course, is anarchy, the aim of breaking down law enforcement and is beyond acceptance by the most tolerant among us. This country is dealing with private, not public prejudice—a prejudice which can be most perfectly resolved in the conscience of each American individual and family, not by legislation at gunpoint.

The increasing threats of extremist demagogs, white and Negro alike, is now inflaming public racism, not eliminating it—worst of all, it is inflaming this private unspoken family intolerance—normal people and fami-

lies wanting racial progress are quietly, but increasingly, getting bluntly, a bellyfull of being tolerant and being threatened if they don't give more. And the more talk there is of race fights, traffic blocks, and dynamite kegs, the greater the chance of violence.

It is not easy to say these things. Yet it would be the less the part of our responsibility not to say them. For they are things quietly in the heart of moderates, the overwhelming majority of Americans of all creeds, races, and national origin, the people who possess the great quiet power and will to resolve this social revolution by themselves.

Imports of Foreign Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry of the United States is now facing a grave crisis in its history. Foreign imports of beef are endangering this industry's very existence.

In my newsletter of April 24, I discuss this problem with my constitutents. I insert this newsletter at this point:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

(By JOHN DOWDY, Seventh District of Texas)

The question of meat imports from Australia and New Zealand continues to press upon our domestic cattle producers; it is particularly pressing upon our own cattlemen of the Seventh Congressional District. The domestic livestock industry of the United States has suffered serious economic difficulties in recent months because of the rapidly increasing amount of meat that is being imported.

This situation has been brought about in the last few years because Congress, over my protest, surrendered to the Executive the power to control foreign commerce, which was given to the Congress in the U.S. Constitution.

When that bill was passed, it gave to the Executive the authority to reduce tariffs which Congress had provided for imports. The tariff on meat was subsequently cut in half, with indication that it may be even further reduced. I am firmly of the opinion that we should first give consideration to the interests of our own producers and our own industries.

In the interest of our cattle producers, I have introduced H.R. 10817, which will impose limitations on imports of meat into the United States.

Meat imports are now 10 times what they were 4 or 5 years ago. It is true, and I am pleased that it is so, that meat imports from Australia have declined substantially during the first 3 months of 1964, from what it was last year, and this decline should be quite beneficial to the domestic livestock industry of the United States, which has been suffering in recent months, not only from the imports, but from the drought.

However, we should make it completely clear that this reduction in meat imports from Australia is not based on any negotiation or any voluntary agreement. There is nothing to prevent a reverse of the present imports position at any time, with a spurt in the amount imported. American livestock producers still desperately need legislation to set reasonable limits on beef imports, and I am supporting this proposal.

It is my hope that Congress will give this matter top priority, in order that we may prevent further serious economic damage to this large and important U.S. industry. If the cattle industry is seriously injured, the entire economy of the United States will suffer along with it.

In Commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, each year Israel celebrates its establishment as a sovereign and independent state. We in the United States remember this event and pay homage to the people of this small but dynamic country; for it is Israel's citizens who have developed their land until it has become the showplace of the Middle East, a model state upon which the newly emerging states of the world may base their own development and progress.

We should not forget, though, the years of intolerance, of prejudicial action, of genocide, through which the Jews were forced to live. Their valiant struggle during World War II against annihilation hastened to create the homeland for which the Jewish people of the Diaspora had prayed for centuries. Perhaps the most heroic stand against Nazi tyranny, which brought home to all the nations of the world the plight of the Jews, was the uprising of the Warsaw ghetto in 1943.

When Poland fell before the onslaught of German might in 1939, the Jews in Warsaw numbered approximately 300,000. From the very first, the Nazis treated them as second-class citizens, applying their Aryan racial principles throughout Poland. Forced to wear distinctive armbands, limited to specified jobs, the Jews suffered their worst humiliation by being put behind walls and barbed wire barricades in sectors of the large cities. Because Jews from the surrounding towns were also brought to Warsaw, the entrapped number in that city's quarter swelled to about 450,000.

From November 15, 1940, the date when the ghetto was sealed, the Jewish population of Warsaw suffered most horribly for the right to be a Jew. Starvation, disease, and merciless treatment took its daily toll. But the Jews clung to life, faithful to the motto of Warsaw—"Defying the storms." Unfortunately the storm reached holocaust proportions. On July 22, 1942, the conquering overlords began a systematic reduction of the ghetto's population, by shipping 6,000 Jews daily to the gas chambers at Treblinka. By September 12, only 60,000 remained.

Realizing the futility of the situation, that it was only a matter of time before every last Jew would be herded into the boxcars for a one-way ride to oblivion, the survivors decided upon action. To die fighting rather than being dragged to ones death was more honorable and would call the world's attention to the brutal extermination of their race.

Resistance began in January 1943, which ended in a surprising victory for the defenders of their ghetto. But this was only a false hope. En masse the Nazis attacked on April 19, 1943, the eve of the Jewish Passover, and began their systematic destruction of the ghetto.

The battle raged for a month and token resistance could still be heard the following September; but the ghetto was reduced by the end of May to smoldering ruins, erased from the face of the earth. Gen. Jurgen Stoop, Nazi commander of the attacking forces, could announce on May 16: "There was a Jewish section in Warsaw, but it no longer exists." A few of the defenders, however, escaped to fight again. A few traveled to Palestine to found a new country, only to find themselves fighting once more for their lives, their new homeland.

Twenty-one years have passed since the Warsaw uprising. Although the Jewish community was totally destroyed, these heroes and heroines have not died in vain. Their courage and bravery live on in the land of Jewish freedom, in Israel. Let us all, therefore, salute those who gave their lives during those black months of 1943, so that their memory will live on in the hearts and minds of the people throughout the world as a heroic symbol against tyranny and injustice.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a touching tribute to the memory of General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur has been written and adopted by Athens Chapter No. 24, Order of Ahepa, in the city of Boston.

This statement, made available by Demos Kakridas, president, and Peter L. Caparell, secretary, bespeaks the love and affection in which this man was held by all Americans. Under previous consent I include it in the RECORD:

A PIECE OF AMERICA

A piece of America has left us. The drum beats will roll but a single and vibrant heartbeat of a piece of America has been stilled. The old soldier has left us—but his old memories—as ageless as time—is the priceless heritage he bequeathed to all soldiers of true democracy.

A piece of America—a solid chip—of the fiber of the Rock of Corregidor, has drifted like a twinkling star into the vastness of eternity.

All members of the Boston Order of Ahepa, young and old, vintages of three worthy wars; salute his memory.

In Brotherhood:

PETER L. CAPARELL,
Secretary.

Purchase of Foreign Steel Products—False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority are boasting that they saved the American taxpayers a large sum of money by awarding a contract for steel transmission towers to an Italian firm rather than to the lowest American bidder.

These press reports stated that the Italian firm which got the contract entered a bid of $2,918,000, whereas the next low bidder, an American company quoted a price of $3,190,000. By simple subtraction, this would indicate that by giving the Italian firm the contract TVA saved $272,000 in funds contributed by the taxpayers.

A closer look at the effects of paying American funds to a foreign company for an American installation reveals something entirely different. Here is a partial accounting of what has been lost to the Ameircan economy through this transaction.

If the contract had been awarded to the American company, using American steel, 34 percent of the price of the contract would have been paid to American employees—steelworkers and others. By extremely conservative estimate, these employees would have paid back to the Federal Government, in the form of income taxes, some 18 percent of their earnings. That would have amounted to $195,000. The contracting company would have paid in corporate income tax $128,000. Stockholders of this company would have paid taxes on their dividends amounting to approximately $26,000.

Totaling those figures shows a direct loss in Federal revenues, from income taxes not collected, of $349,000. Compared with the apparent saving of $272,000 achieved by awarding the contract to a foreign firm, this shows that there was a net loss of $77,000. This figures in only the loss of Federal income tax revenues.

There are many other factors which should be figured in to determine the entire loss. The company receiving the contract would have paid a share of the money it received to other American companies for materials of production. These, in turn, would have used part of that money to pay their employees. And both companies and employees would have paid a percentage in Federal income taxes.

The employees of all companies would have spent much of the money they earned from the job with all sorts of American businesses—grocery stores, filling stations, restaurants and the like—which in turn would have paid Federal income taxes on the money they took in. In addition to Federal income taxes, there would have been Federal excise taxes on some purchases.

There would also have been State and local taxes paid all down the line; and there would have been more money paid in for old age pensions and unemployment benefits.

Today, more than ever before, the steel industry in this country is confronted with the fiercest kind of competition on all fronts. This has resulted in widespread unemployment in the industry and, unfortunately, we in the Birmingham district have experienced this unhappy situation first hand.

In the interest of job security for American steelworkers, it would seem to me that all Federal agencies should consider all factors before placing an order with a foreign steel producer.

All other things being equal—or in this case, better—it simply is not fair to place the American steelworker on the altar of sacrifice by providing jobs for his competitors abroad.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Birmingham News, Apr. 14, 1964]

ITALIAN FIRM TO SUPPLY TVA WITH STEEL

CHATTANOOGA, TENN, April 14.—An Italian firm has won a $2.9 million contract to supply the Tennessee Valley Authority with steel towers for an extra-high-voltage transmission line.

A TVA spokesman said Societa Anonima Electrificazione, Milan, Italy, underbid six other suppliers, including one Japanese manufacturer, to win the contract. The 13 tons of galvanized steel towers will be used on TVA's line from the Widows Creek Steam Plant in North Alabama to West Point, Miss.

The line is one of two extra-high-voltage lines—500,000 volts each—being erected to tie in the TVA system with the so-called Southcentral Power Pool. The latter is a group of private utility systems which have agreed to exchange surplus power with TVA.

The other line runs between Johnsonville, Tenn., and Cordova, Tenn. The American Bridge Division of United States Steel, Pittsburgh, Pa., won the tower contract for that line with a bid of $1,739,702.

Construction of both lines will cost $74 million. Of the major contracts—those for more than $190,000—awarded so far, foreign firms have won seven, worth $10.2 million.

Eight others, worth $8.4 million, have gone to American manufacturers.

Other firms bidding on the tower contract won by SAE included:

Flint Steel Co., Tulsa, Okla., $3,190,325; Bethlehem Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., $3,334,815; Mitsubishi, Japan, $3,382,456; Nashville (Tenn.) Bridge Co., $3,407,802; American Bridge, $3,703,497; Creamer & Dunlap, Tulsa, $3,782,675.

A TVA spokesman said SAE, which submitted a bid of $2,918,176, was low after a $25,000 foreign inspection fee and a 6-percent differential under the so-called "Buy American Act" were added.

Delivery of the towers will be in February 1965.

[From the Birmingham News, Apr. 16, 1964]

FOREIGN STEEL FOR TVA

Announcement an Italian firm is to supply TVA with $2.9 million worth of steel for towers naturally shocks a great many people in this steel-making center. Steel jobs are a continuing problem here. It is commonly known that foreign steel competition has hurt the American steel industry generally.

This purchase offends Birmingham particularly since TVA is rather like "home folks."

But TVA is Government-owned: it therefore is taxpayer-owned. Thus conclusion here expressed is that this is using taxpayers' money to buy foreign products which deprive our own taxpayers of work. In that connection obviously it wouldn't make sense to many people.

TVA in making the announcement obviously felt need of some explanation. It offered this by saying that the Italian company submitted a bid under six other companies, including one Japanese, even though the Italian company had to put up a $25,000 "inspection fee," and bid under a required 6-percent differential. This was essential under U.S. law intended to protect American producers.

Whatever the differentials, as long as American steelworkers are having difficulty holding jobs, the purchase causes dissatisfaction.

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Apr. 16, 1964]

BID WAS LOWER—TVA DEFENDS OVERSEA BUYING

WASHINGTON, April 15.—TVA officials said today they awarded a contract for steel towers to an Italian firm because it would save TVA $250,000 over the lowest American bid.

The Italian firm is Societa Anonima Elettrificazione.

Its bid will come to a possible maximum of $3,793,628.80.

TVA said that five domestic firms and two foreign firms bid on the towers which will be used for transmission lines. Bids were opened April 9, and complaints have been heard in Alabama since then because the award is going overseas.

TVA said that even adding 6 percent to the foreign bid, as required by law, and adding other allocations to it, the Italian firm outbid any American bidder.

An official said TVA does not buy much abroad.

In fiscal 1963, TVA spent $160 million, including its purchase of coal, all of which is bought domestically. Of this amount, only $1.3 million was spent overseas, TVA said.

Israel Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues who have paid tribute to the State of Israel on the occasion of the 16th anniversary of the founding of that pioneering country.

This fledgling nation has come a long way in those 16 years until today it sets an example for the rest of the world with its courage and its independence and its progress.

The world is indebted to many people for the remarkable success of Israel—to the thousands of pioneers whose labor of love made a desert bloom, to the thousands of people in our own country whose generous contributions financed many of the projects.

Israel today is making remarkable progress in feeding its people, in maintaining free and responsive government,

in providing good educational facilities for all its people, even in sophisticated fields of science.

In an area of the world that is too frequently feudal and backward and poverty-stricken, Israel is providing a healthy example of modern change.

On this occasion of the 16th anniversary, I join with my colleagues in saluting those brave and hardy people who made possible these great achievements, who made possible the addition of Israel to the family of free nations.

Mexico: We Saw a Country Growing Right Before Our Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times of April 14, 1964:

MEXICO: WE SAW A COUNTRY GROWING RIGHT BEFORE OUR EYES

In Mexico we saw a country developing right before our very eyes. It reminded us of nothing so much as the moving pictures which in a few seconds show the opening of a flower that actually takes place over several hours or days. Mexico is a primitive land on the one hand, and yet its development now is taking place so fast that you can see it go.

On the edge of San Miguel we passed a man and his burro. The burro he had loaded with two bundles of kindling thrown across the animal like saddlebags. We had seen this same sight hundreds of times, but this time we had a Mexican guide with us so we asked for the story. The man with the burro probably cut the kindling this morning, and is now taking it to town to sell. Undoubtedly he cut it with a hand saw, and it took him several hours.

How much will it bring him?

Six pesos. That's 48 cents for work that takes most of a day, even if he makes a quick sale. At best it will not go farther than $2 would in Indiana. The climate is mild, so clothing and shelter demands are not great. He probably raises corn and beans, and perhaps some chickens, but the living for his family is pretty meager.

This is the poverty that survives out of the ancient days of the country. Our first impression of Mexico was that it was a land in which nothing had happened between the 16th and the 20th centuries. That isn't exactly true, of course, but it is all too true.

Mexico was under Spanish domination for 300 years after Cortez landed in 1519. Queen Isabella had just driven the Moors from Granada, and in return she enacted from the Pope the right of appointment of all the clergy in the Spanish realm. It made every clergyman in Mexico a salaried employee of the Spanish Crown and gave Spain a stranglehold on the people in the colony. After Spain was ousted from Mexico there came the ill-timed and ill-fated adventure of Maximilian, and the turmoil lasted well into the 20th century. So really not much progress was made in Mexico between the 16th and the 20th centuries.

But Mexico is making up for lost time now. It is developing under "forced draft." It has democratic government that is sound and strong. The Government has created a tourist business that is now the nation's largest industry. Most of this money goes directly into the hands of the business people and their employees. The Government has a monopoly on oil from the wells to the filling station pump, and it has a graduated income tax. With its funds it is building new highways that encourage more tourism and provide a transportation system for growing industry. It has built its school system to the point where education is compulsory. Even the man with the borro load of kindling is beginning to feel some benefit; his children are now being educated in free public schools.

New factories are being built at the edge of nearly every large city, many of them with part U.S. capital but always with at least 51 percent Mexican ownership. The Mexican, who has always been a craftsman, is learning new skills. The country is developing a middle class that is living better, saving some money, and in turn investing in Mexico's future.

Good government. Education. Modern highways. Expanding industry. Mexico is growing, and it is growing right before our eyes.

Will it be good for the United States?

You bet it will. It will even be good for the economy of the United States; Canada, a very highly developed country, is now our number one customer. Most important of all, nothing could be better for us than to have a nation of strong, free people as our neighbors.

Bible Reading Remains Great Moral Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as hearings are held by the House Committee on the Judiciary on voluntary reading of the Bible and prayer in the schools, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the following editorial from the Corry (Pa.) Journal.

This great issue has deeply stirred the people of America, and I feel that they want to carry out the intent of the Founding Fathers that America was established on freedom of religion and not freedom from religion:

IN OUR OPINION: BIBLE READING REMAINS GREAT MORAL ISSUE

Pennsylvania's senior Senator, HUGH SCOTT, writing in his periodic letter from Washington, says he does not believe the Constitution gives atheists the right to prevent other people from worshiping as they please.

The Senator's statement is the result of his having received letters from his constituents expressing deep concern over the Supreme Court ruling that it is unconstitutional for a local board of education to direct that Bible reading and prayer be held in classrooms.

SCOTT quotes the first amendment to the Constitution which says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The Pennsylvania Senator points out that the atheist has a right to abstain from taking part in prayer or Bible reading, but he does not believe that that same atheist has the right to prevent other people from worshipping as they please.

SCOTT is now in the process of drafting a proposal which he will introduce as a constitutional amendment. The key to the proposal would be the word "voluntary." In other words, SCOTT would propose that children who so desire could take part in prayers or Bible reading in our schools. Those opposed would not be compelled to do so.

In passing along SCOTT's action on the question which has rankled most Americans since the court ruling, we would like to add that this Nation was founded on the premise that the Government would function by the consent of the governed.

This, presumably, means the majority of the governed.

While the rights of the individual must be upheld, they must not be allowed to infringe upon the will of the great bulk of the people.

This is what is happening in the case of a mere handful of atheists who seek to separate not the church and the state but children and religion.

In these times, the moral fibre of the Nation may well be coming apart at the seams simply because religion has been allowed to fall by the wayside.

Instead of less we need more.

Instead of spiritual abandonment we need spiritual help.

Instead of atheism we need the Bible.

Slowly, but almost certainly, the atheists are whittling away at the basic concept upon which these United States were founded.

A line must be drawn, and quickly, if we are not to be fast-talked out of our heritage, which includes the right of the mass of the people to follow their religion and to suggest that their children do too.

Song of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem, "Song of Peace," by Mrs. C. R. Joan Grant Govan, of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

HYMN OF PEACE OR SONG OF PEACE

(By C. R. Joan Grant Govan)

Come, O era. When all peoples,
  Pledge their friendship and good will.
Nevermore let death bombs thunder;
  Nor let man his brother kill.
Human hearts should speak one language;
  Recognize one fatherhood.
Brotherhood of man, forever,
  Praise the Author of all good.

Let there be no more destruction,
  Wrought by hate and battle fire.
Peace must not be violated;
  Amity is our desire.
Let us ever stay the crimson
  Tide that floods the battlefield.
War's infernal; Peace, supernal.
  Peace by amity is sealed.

Through invincible endeavors
  Age-old hopes are realized.
Armaments should rust and crumble.
  Nations should be civilized.
Hear again the angel message:
  "Peace on earth; good will to men."
Glory be to God, our Father.
  Strife must not prevail again.

Statement Before the House Judiciary Committee by Representative Roudebush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Judiciary Committee opened long-awaited hearings on the question of a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer and Bible reading in American public schools.

The debate actually goes much deeper than that. What is involved is whether or not the great religious heritage of this Nation shall continue to be observed in our public functions and public institutions.

It has been my privilege to support a constitutional amendment to repair the great damage caused by the Supreme Court decision, and this week I was among the Members of the House of Representatives to offer testimony in support of such action.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the text of my statement to the House Judiciary Committee to be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

Perhaps no issue in recent years has so aroused the American people as the Supreme Court outlawing of voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our public schools.

It is no overstatement to categorize this action as shaking the very moral and religious foundation of this Nation.

On June 18, 1963, the day following the second of the Supreme Court decisions banning the religious observances, I introduced my legislation—House Joint Resolution 487, to amend the Constitution to permit nonsectarian prayer in public schools on a voluntary basis.

It is my understanding that since that time a total of 144 resolutions in 35 different forms have been introduced before Congress—all designed to retain religious observances in our public life.

I was also one of the 164 Members of the House who signed a petition to discharge House Joint Resolution 693, a proposed constitutional amendment similar to my own legislation making prayer and Bible reading permissible.

The very seriousness of the situation, and the fact that we do need a constitutional amendment is evidenced by the very circumstance that brings us to these hearings today. It seems incredible in a nation such as ours, which has achieved its stature and impact in history as a free civilization, that we are meeting here today to consider if legislation is needed to permit Americans to pray and read the Bible in public instituions.

Since the very origin of this Nation, our basic laws contained in the Constitution, our great Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights have been based upon public faith and recognition of God.

It is not the design or intent of my legislation, or that of any other Member, to enforce, impose, or regulate religion in any manner whatsoever in our public schools.

Our Constitution clearly demands that there be a separation of church and state, but it was never intended to separate God and state.

And, by the same token, it is discrimination and restraint of the most odious nature to require that the vast majority of our public school students refrain from any prayers or Bible reading because it may offend a tiny minority of the students.

My request for a constitutional amendment arises from a simple prayer which said little more than "God bless my parents, my teacher, and my country."

No child was required to recite this prayer. No child even had to stay in the room during the ceremony if he didn't choose to.

The Supreme Court decided that the use of this simple, nondenominational prayer on a permissive basis was a violation of the Constitution.

I respectfully submit, in my opinion, the Supreme Court was wrong.

If the Court was right one of the first things it should have done was to abolish its own prayers.

If the Court was right the Declaration of Independence might have to be rewritten to strike out references to the Supreme Being.

If the Court was right the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the mint might have to reissue all coin and currency without "In God We Trust."

If the Court was right we shall have to revise the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and remove the words "under God."

And, of course, the Court's ruling raises a question about the rules of the House and Senate which provide that each session shall open with a prayer.

None of these analogies are farfetched. Quite the contrary. In fact, it was reported by Associated Press on April 7 that the same woman who instituted one of the school prayer cases has petitioned the Baltimore School Board to strike the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance.

In California, suit has been instituted to remove "In God We Trust" from our coinage.

If these cases follow the legal path of previous cases, we can presume that they will someday reach the Supreme Court. In view of the past rulings, there can be little doubt as to the ultimate outcome.

Conceivably this tiny minority of citizens who are opposed for whatever reasons to any public recognition of a God, could effectively attack all of the references to God that I have mentioned and thereby succeed in removing such from any governmental function. I would say today that this very probably will happen over a period of time unless appropriate action is taken by the Congress.

History has recorded the decline and fall of many civilizations who have forsaken their religious heritages and beliefs. Judging from the volume of opposition to this move to take God out of American public life, it is my sincere belief that the American people are not willing to see our bedrock foundation of religious principles rent asunder by a hairsplitting Supreme Court.

We could go on citing endless examples to illustrate the absurdity of the Supreme Court's decision in the school prayer case, but this is hardly necessary.

There has been general and widespread confusion and disobedience, which is tantamount to nullification of this particular decision.

But the decision should not be allowed to rest there. Our school superintendents, our teachers, our principals, and our students should not be forced to technically break the law in their daily observances.

There should be a legal nullification and the process of obtaining such can be set in motion through approval by the Congress of my House Joint Resolution 487, or similar measures introduced in the House.

Support of such legislation has become formal policy of the Republican minority in the House, and I wish to strongly associate myself with the resolution adopted in February by the House Republican Policy Committee.

This resolution reads: *"Resolved,* That the House Republican Policy Committee go on record in support of a constitutional amendment declaring the right of individuals to participate or to refrain from participation in prayer and Bible reading in public institutions throughout the United States and the right of the Government of the United States to make reference to God Almighty in public governmental affairs."

Mr. Chairman, one of the most obvious differences in our American system compared to that of the Soviets, is our national belief in God, and the tolerance for all faiths and religions.

This difference should be emphasized and strengthened, rather than weakened and abandoned in favor of the godless Communist idealogy.

It is true, many of our youngsters receive adequate spiritual and religious education in church, Sunday school, and the home. Many do not, and it has been said unless the Bible is used in public schools many millions of children will never know the Ten Commandments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the approval by this Committee of a Constitutional Amendment to keep God in our public life, and the report of such an amendment to the House of Representatives for a vote by all Members.

Thank you.

Fighting for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, four Presidents have supported the foreign aid program as essential to our national security. On Monday and Tuesday of this week, President Johnson again declared the necessity of foreign aid not only for our own welfare but for humanitarian reasons.

Yesterday the House passed without a dissenting vote the $46.7 billion Department of Defense appropriation bill. However, the bare-bones foreign aid request of $3.4 billion—about one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product—is in jeopardy. The President has warned that a reduction below his minimal request in foreign aid will seriously impair our security.

The New York Times in an editorial published today praised the President for his firm stand and pointed out the importance of this program. I urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 23, 1964]

FIGHTING FOR FOREIGN AID

President Johnson has taken the offensive on his foreign aid program. In two separate speeches, he made the point that foreign aid is an "act of necessity" and went on to warn that he will continue to demand supplemental appropriations if Congress fails to provide the $3.4 billion he is requesting. The administration cut out all of the waste and pared all of the frills from the foreign aid package, the President insists, relieving Congress of the necessity of wielding its own economy ax.

Congressional opponents of foreign aid are unlikely to be impressed by these assurances. On the contrary, they will probably make a great show of finding something they can describe as unnecessary expenditure, and

then proceed to cut into the bone. In an election year, those who can cut spending on foreign aid have the extra incentive of winning votes, an incentive that unfortunately does not apply to the program's defenders.

But Mr. Johnson says he will not bargain over the program. In taking a firm stand against further cuts, he is fighting for the very principle of foreign aid. For the issue is not whether one program or another deserves support—there will always be disputes over the relative merits of different projects—but whether the United States can afford the cost of foreign aid. On this score, the amount requested by the administration is truly the bare minimum.

When Mr. Johnson first announced his trimmed-down request for foreign aid, we argued that he could only get what he asked for by refusing to compromise. We welcome both the Presidents' determination to rule out any haggling and his threat to keep coming back to Congress if it persists in carrying out false economies. This is the way to preserve the vital role that foreign aid can play.

Michigan City News-Dispatch Praises Senator Bayh on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial concerning the eloquent remarks on civil rights by the distinguished junior Senator from my State, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH.

The editorial entitled, "The Heart of Civil Rights," published in the April 17, 1964, issue of the Michigan City News-Dispatch, follows:

THE HEART OF CIVIL RIGHTS

During a brief exchange on the Senate floor, Indiana's Senator BIRCH BAYH went to the core of the civil rights issue with crisp clarity.

The dialog was touched off when Senator RUSSELL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, read into the RECORD a letter from a Hoosier doctor opposing the civil rights bill and then went on to suggest that Indiana, like his own State, has segregation problems.

"The Senator is absolutely correct," BAYH replied. "I don't condone the fact that the problem has not been solved completely. I did not say we had solved the problem. I said we had moved further along the road toward solving the problem."

Then, touching on the issue's heart, he said:

"It is my opinion that neither the passage of the bill nor all the Executive orders in the world would solve the problems. The law and the Executive orders are needed, but the problems will have to be solved in the hearts and minds of the people, by what is said from the pulpit, by what is done in the courtroom, by what is said in our homes. This legislation would be only a step in that direction; it would provide a legal framework in which the solution should be made easier."

BAYH made clear that he wants "equality of opportunity" for all people—not "special privileges."

"What (Negroes) are interested in, and what I am interested in, is equality of opportunity," said BAYH. "We want to give all citizens an equal opportunity to utilize their God-given talents to achieve whatever goals they are able to achieve. It [will be] their responsibility to rise and fall on their own merits."

"In my State, we are opposed to the barriers that have been raised * * * that prevent an individual citizen from having an equal opportunity to develop. We are not seeking special privileges."

No matter how many million words are spoken in the Senate as the interminable—and intollerable—debate drones on, the civil rights issue comes down to the two phrases voiced by BAYH—"equality of opportunity" and not "special privileges."

And if anyone still requires a reason to support this legislation, let him take a cue from New Jersey's Senator CLIFFORD CASE, a Republican, who said this in a Senate speech:

"When all the talk * * * is done, we come at last face to face with a great moral issue. I find it hard to believe that anyone in his heart of hearts can deny that injustice and suppression have been the lot of generations of Negro Americans.

"As a nation, we have stood and fought—indeed, are fighting—for freedom in many lands. Can we continue to falter in our stance at home?"

A Tribute to Voit Gilmore, America's First Director of the U.S. Travel Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, Voit Gilmore, our country's first Director of the U.S. Travel Service, on April 6 announced his resignation in order to return to his native State to resume his private and public responsibilities.

With him go the best wishes of his many friends in Congress and his colleagues in Government. We note with pleasure that he intends to continue his distinguished record of public service by running as candidate for the North Carolina State Senate. Although qualified by experience and ability to fill posts of higher responsibility, Mr. Gilmore with characteristic modesty seeks an elective post that will put him close to the people of his area.

It has been 2½ years since the President asked Voit Gilmore to organize and direct our Government's program to increase international understanding and good will, as well as to bring needed dollars to the United States by attracting tourists to our shores. USTS is now vigorously promoting travel to the United States in 42 foreign countries.

The results have been both impressive and gratifying. As was noted by Senator MAGNUSON, able Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and an author of the Travel Service legislation, Voit Gilmore had nine USTS offices open and running on five continents in less time than it takes many new Government agencies to recruit a staff and acquire its furniture.

Government redtape for arriving travelers was slashed. A new attitude of friendliness to strangers improved the worldwide image of America as the hospitable land it is. Mr. Gilmore developed "Americans-at-Home," the USTS plan which has led some two dozen U.S. communities to establish hospitality programs to let international visitors meet Americans and see American homes.

In just 2 years—between 1961 and 1963—oversea travel to the United States increased an amazing 42 percent, contrasted with a previous average annual increase of only 8.5 percent. The 1963 total was 735,000 visitors from overseas, a volume which pumped some $400 million into the American economy. Our distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, has termed USTS "one of the best investments by the U.S. taxpayer in the last decade."

U.S. industry has cooperated closely with USTS and has applauded its accomplishments. The "Visit U.S.A." effort has been an outstanding example of Government-industry cooperation to bolster the American economy. In recognition of this, Mr. Gilmore received the American Motor Hotel Association's distinguished service award for 1961–62, he was given industry's Mr. Travel Award in 1963 and also last year he received Hospitality magazine's coveted silver plate award for his contribution to the travel industry.

Of course there were problems connected with getting so ambitious and so unprecedented a program launched on a global basis. Never before has our Government engaged in a promotional effort of this sort. It has been pioneer work. Many were skeptical of the program and were quick with criticism. The obvious results have turned such doubts to praise.

It has been my pleasure to support the U.S. Travel Service from its legislative beginnings until the present, when its year of greatest accomplishment is in prospect. I share the feeling of my chairman, Hon. OREN HARRIS, who heads the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who has termed USTS one of the greatest opportunities for international peace and commerce yet created by Congress.

Voit Gilmore, the guiding spirit of USTS from its beginning, is due the thanks and admiration of a grateful nation. He flew almost a million miles to get the Travel Service underway. He gave the directorship the utmost of his talent and unbounded energy.

He departs with the satisfaction that his "child" is well begun, well on the way to being one of America's most effective programs to improve world peace and aid our national economy.

Congratulations and Godspeed to Voit Gilmore, a distinguished American. May his days of service be long and fruitful.

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I have learned of the death of Gen. Melvin Maas. He served with me on the old For-

eign Affairs Committee for several years. He was a dedicated public servant.

In a way, he sacrificed his military career for his country. He went blind, writing the Marine Code, at night. But, notwithstanding his blindness, he carried on his service to his country, and his service was outstanding.

Since he retired from the Marine Corps, he was a member of several Presidential Commissions and was active in the Marine Reserve.

When Congress was threatened on one occasion by a man in the gallery brandishing a loaded gun, General Maas walked over in the direction of the man and told him to throw the gun down to the floor of the House.

This was an act of rare bravery. The man might have emptied his gun by firing at General Maas, but the incident was typical of his lifelong courage.

We will miss this great public servant.

Congress Has Lost Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

CONGRESS HAS LOST CONTROL

Congress has lost effective control of Federal spending by clinging to a piecemeal approach to the national budget.

That's the charge made in an article in the April issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey.

Tax reduction has heightened the need to restrain governmental outlays, the bank publication's article says, but doing so "will be difficult if not impossible until the methods prescribed by law and custom for managing the Federal purse are brought into line with the present-day size and complexity of the job."

The article notes that President Johnson and Democrats on the Joint Economic Committee have stressed the need for frugality. "Even if the will to economize stays strong, however," it cautions, "the chances of subjecting the spending process to some meaningful control are slim under the present budgetary system."

In its study of congressional budgetary procedures and of proposals commonly made for their reform, Morgan Guaranty's monthly economic review charges: "The piecemeal approach taken by Congress gives the annual budget exercise a haphazard character which, if fully realized, would shock most taxpayers. Surpluses or deficits are not planned. They just happen."

The publication blames the lack of effective congressional control over the budget chiefly on three things:

1. Failure of the legislative branch to consider spending and revenues together;

2. The practice of acting on a dozen or more different appropriations bills at different times, so that Congress never faces as a whole the total of outlays it is authorizing;

3. The numerous ways by which spending authority bypasses the Appropriations Committees, "in theory the needle's eye through which all Government expenditures ought to pass."

Congress compounds the budget problem, the article says, by ignoring its own directive contained in a legislative reorganization law passed in 1946. Section 138 of the law requires formulation of a "legislative budget" as a congressional counterpart to the President's comprehensive estimate of revenues and expenditures. It also creates a Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. Members of this group are to be drawn from both revenue and appropriations committees in the two Houses in order to integrate income and outgo in congressional budgetary deliberations.

Since 1948, the survey article points out, Congress has ignored section 138 in a display of "sheer self-flouting."

As steps toward improving congressional handling of the public purse strings, the survey article urges:

1. Reactivation of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget as provided by section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and provision of a top-grade staff to assist the committee.

2. Consolidation of all appropriations into one bill, "so that Congress is forced to look at the spending picture as a whole."

3. Reexamination of cases of backdoor financing, in which financial authority is granted without review by the appropriations committees, and maintenance of a "close watch on further applications of this approach."

Recalling that the last major budgetary reform occurred in 1921 and had taken 12 years to accomplish, the article calls for "a brisker pace" in response to the present need. "The price of procrastination is much higher in an era of $100 billion annual budgets," it says. It suggests as "a logical next step" that Congress appoint "a select committee of its Members to give the urgent business of change a high-level launching."

Don Flanders Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to know Mr. Don Flanders, of Fort Smith, Ark., who received the 1964 American Success Story award earlier this month. We are proud of him. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an editorial from the Fort Smith Times Record of April 16, 1964, describing the achievements of Mr. Flanders.

The editorial follows:

FROM SHOP TO LEADING MANUFACTURER IN 10 YEARS; LOCAL MAN HONORED

When a man starts with a small shop and 10 years later is a leading manufacturer in his line of products—he's chalked up a terrific record in any man's language.

That was the record cited for Don Flanders, local furniture manufacturer, Wednesday, when he was one of 10 executives given awards for business success by the American Free Enterprise Awards association.

The awards were made in New York City—to men selected from all over the United States.

It is, of course, a tremendous honor to Mr. Flanders—for which we join in the congratulations.

It's also a tribute to the opportunity of the United States and to Fort Smith as a part of it.

We hope that, with the swiftly booming industry and opportunities of this region, other men from the area also in coming years may claim a place among those cited for outstanding achievement.

How Foreign Aid Has Helped Restore Stability in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it has only been a short time since the situation in the Congo looked hopeless, when the critics of foreign aid were saying that any money spent in the Congo would be wasted. A recent article in the Washington Post tells of the improvements in the Congo which have been made with U.S. assistance. Contrary to the dire predictions of the opponents of foreign aid, the situation in the Congo is considerably improved, and foreign aid can be credited with playing a key role in bringing about greater stabilization.

I think this is a very good example of how shortsighted much of the criticism of foreign aid is, and how with patience and persistence the seemingly impossible can be accomplished using foreign aid.

The article follows.

OUTLOOK FOR CONGO APPEARS BRIGHTER

(By Russell Warren Howe)

LÉOPOLDVILLE, CONGO, March 21.—Since independence broke out on June 30, 1960, things have never looked better in the Congo than they do today.

The 1964 budget is balanced with proportionately less foreign aid than half France's former colonies receive, despite this country's exceptional defense and security requirements. Since the small spurt after devaluation, prices seem to have stabilized, and the cost of living here is well below that of Brazzaville, across the river in the former French Congo.

A more workable constitution is being drawn up. The army is dealing, successfully if gradually, with the jungle terrorists in Kwilu Province.

NOW IS $750 MILLION BETTER OFF

The United Nations operation, which once cost $10 million a month has budgeted only $18.5 million for the first 6 months of this year, and of this $3.5 million will be paid by the Congo, in hard currency.

Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak has been here to settle outstanding financial litigation between the two countries. As a result, the Congolese treasury will now be $750 million better off, as owner of substantial shareholdings in companies including Katanga's Union Miniere, and has been relieved of an external national debt of $500 million. Belgium's NATO bases here—Kamina and Kitona—have been given to the Congolese Army.

The Belgian Government has been hesitant to settle the financial issues in the past, but Spaak was apparently impressed by the French business offensive here and the fear that French President de Gaulle might try to take over this Belgian sphere of influence.

When neighboring Rwanda, a former Belgian trust territory, joined 13 former French colonies in the Afro-Malagasy Union last year, Belgium hastily guaranteed the Rwandese franc to prevent France from doing so.

Belgian support for the Congolese franc would be a gift as important as taking over the national debt. but the Belgians are presumably keeping this one up their sleeves for the moment. If the Congolese franc were to be guaranteed, it would probably be at about 240 or 250 francs to the dollar, making it parallel with the French-African franc, economists believe. The present rate is 150 francs to the dollar.

LITTLE SENTIMENT

Congolese Premier Cyrille Adoula has few sentimental feelings about Belgium. It is no secret that the non-African he has trusted most since he came to power 31 months ago has been American Ambassador Edmund Gullion. Gullion just left after a faultlessly brilliant 30 months as Envoy here, and has been replaced by the next most qualified diplomat, his former Deputy Chief of Mission McMurtrie Godley, whose last post was head of the State Department's Central African Affairs desk, which includes the Congo.

But Adoula prefers Brussels to Paris. He has encouraged De Gaulle's overtures as bait for the Belgians, but has not forgotten France's failure to contribute to the U.N. special fund for the Congo.

He also feels that the Belgians here have a lighter touch politically than the French. He is suspicious of any close association with the French-African States themselves because of their failure to assist the Congo, their French-speaking neighbor, during its 4 years of agony.

Mali, Guinea, and Senegal contributed tiny units to the U.N. force in 1960, but withdrew them after a few weeks when the going was rough. In contrast, army units from Nigeria, Ethiopia, and Sierra Leone, and policemen from Nigeria are still here.

A Success in the Foreign Aid Program—The Public Health Center at Gondar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the kingdom of Ethiopia is a very poor nation, 57 percent of those 20 million people manage to eke out a meager living from agriculture. Since the gross national product is estimated at only $800 million, the per capita income is comparatively low, less than $75 a year. Because of its low standard of living, communicable and other diseases are rampant and it is estimated that 600,000 Ethiopians are received annually at the country's hospitals and clinics. To treat these patients, there are only 200 physicians, the majority of whom have practices in Addis Ababa.

The Ethiopian Government realized that the first step toward combating these contagious diseases, of typhus, malaria, and dysentery, would be to train specialized personnel. Therefore, there was established at Gondar in October 1954 the Haile Selassie Public Health College and Training Center. The purpose of the center is to train first-rate public health workers who adapt themselves to meet the needs of rural Ethiopia. These public health personnel become community health officers, nurses, and sanitarians of preventive medicine rather than practicing physicians and bedside nurses. Graduates from the center will attempt to eradicate malaria by spraying swamps, will attempt to do away with typhus by purifying contaminated water supplies.

The U.S. Government, through the Agency for International Development, closely supports this center at Gondar in cooperation with the Ethiopian Government and the World Health Organization. We provide a director, generally some one on loan from the U.S. Public Health Service, and technicians, five at the present time, who serve as faculty instructors. Laboratory equipment and medical supplies, too, are an integral part of the U.S. program. The Ethiopian Government, in addition to providing the buildings, pay for the salaries of personnel at the center. U.S. assistance is scheduled to end in 1970, when the center becomes self-supporting.

Graduates of the training program now total 225, who are staffing some 60 rural service centers in villages throughout the country. Although received with suspicion at first by the rural population, the health officers were slowly incorporated into the village social life when the people saw for themselves the proof of the good wook of these dedicated personnel. The success of the program has been measured by the enthusiastic support which the graduates now receive from the villagers, by the decline of the communicable diseases, and by the number of young people who volunteer for public health service.

Aid to Industry To Combat Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the deduction of expenditures from Federal taxes for the construction and installation of industrial waste treatment facilities to control water pollution.

It is not necessary to belabor, at this time, the need for clean water and to control pollution in our rivers, streams, ponds, and other water resources. I shall merely quote one brief paragraph from a recent address by Dr. Luther L. Terry, the Surgeon General of the United States and head of the U.S. Public Health Service, who said this about water pollution:

> There is now nearly six times as much pollution in our rivers, streams, and lakes as 60 years ago, and the amount is still increasing. An expanding population increases the demand for a fresh water supply and, at the same time, increases the volume of waste. The crowding of people into urban centers intensifies the problems of waste disposal. Application of commercial fertilizers, and use of a vast array of new herbicides and insecticides contribute to pollution.

While we know the enormity of the problem of pollution and the factors contributing to it, we have not yet been able to solve the problem or to cope with it satisfactorily. It requires much study and research, it requires considerable funds, and it requires the cooperation of the Federal Government, the State authorities, the local communities, business and industry, and the public generally. Only by cooperation on the part of all concerned can we hope to achieve success in the fight against water pollution.

One of my first tasks in Congress last year was to bring this problem, which affects many of our communities in Connecticut, to the attention of committees dealing with such problems. Among them was the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. I was instrumental in bringing this subcommittee, which is headed by our distinguished colleague of Alabama, the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, JR., for hearings and on-site inspection of pollution of our rivers in Connecticut. I understand the committee is working on legislation to deal with the problem.

In my district of eastern Connecticut we have been especially plagued with this problem. Communities along the Connecticut River and the Thames River have encountered a serious pollution problem with which they are unable to cope by themselves. Their resources are limited. The same is true regarding the State. In some instances, local industrial plants are endeavoring to alleviate the situation.

About a week or 10 days ago I visited the area of the Thames River basin in my district in connection with the dedication of a fallout shelter just completed by the Federal Paper Board Co. at its mill at Sprague, Conn. This is an area that is suffering from water pollution. When I pointed out to company officials about the pollution situation and the need to do something concrete about this problem, they told me that the company has appropriated about a half million dollars for this purpose, an expenditure which they had not anticipated when the mill was built. In turn, it was suggested that the Federal Government should extend to such companies, willing to set aside special funds to combat pollution, a tax deduction for expenditures incurred in the construction of waste treatment facilities.

This strikes me as a fair proposal. The funds allocated for purposes of pollution control are nonproductive. That fact should be taken into consideration. By giving these companies a certain tax credit it would serve to encourage them, as well as other firms, to participate in the construction of waste treatment works. In this way our fight against pollution would be accelerated.

About a year ago the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, the Honor-

able ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, and several of his colleagues, introduced a bill to provide such tax relief to private industry as a way of sharing the cost with them for providing facilities to serve the health and safety of the public, such as facilities for control of water pollution. This proposal was subsequently included in the tax bill adopted this year, but the proposal was eliminated in conference.

The Ribicoff bill, S. 736, remains in an inactive state before the Senate Finance Committee. Since all tax legislation customarily originates with the House Ways and Means Committee and there is no companion bill to S. 736 on the House side, I am therefore introducing it at this time in the House in the hope that positive action can be taken on it.

As I stated earlier, it is important to have cooperation on all levels in the effort to combat pollution, including the support of private industry. They are willing to participate in this effort, but it is a big task and requires a big expense. We must provide an incentive for them to install this equipment, and it can be done through a tax deduction for such expenditures.

We already have instances in several States which recognize the enormity of this problem and they have adopted measures to provide State tax relief for this purpose. Massachusetts exempts from taxation any equipment or facilities installed for preventing water pollution. New Hampshire exempts industrial waste treatment facilities from local taxation for 25 years. Maine and Vermont have similar exemption, and so have the States of Arkansas, North Carolina, Virginia, Wisconsin, and possibly others.

I feel that this incentive should be extended on a national basis because the problem of pollution has become a national problem—and it is bound to increase as a health hazard in the years ahead unless we take precautions now. The incentive provided in this bill is logical and reasonable. I urge the Congress, particularly the House Ways and Means Committee, to give it prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article from the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin of April 13, 1964, describing a meeting in which I participated with a group of industrial and civic leaders of eastern Connecticut to discuss the problem of water pollution. The article is as follows:

ST. ONGE TOLD OF RIVER PROBLEMS

PUTNAM.—Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE of the Second District met informally Sunday afternon with eastern Connecticut industrial and sportsmen's representatives for a discussion of the problems confronting Thames River communities and industries.

Present at the meeting were Ken Stober, of the Dow Chemical Co., in Gales Ferry; Jim Herring, chairman of the Ledyard industrial development committee; Jack Schwalbe of the Ledyard community council; and C. B. Campbell of the Norwich Striper club.

The meeting was held in Putnam at the home of Ray Laparle, also a member of the Norwich Striper club.

In addition to discussions of the water pollution problems of the Thames River basin which lies in eastern Connecticut, comments on the overall development of all of the river's resources soon brought the problem into focus as a major development for eastern Connecticut. The program as outlined could benefit sportsmen, industry, recreation and the shellfish industry and lead to elimination of pollution on the southeastern shoreline of the State.

Congressman ST. ONGE recalled that the survey plans for this work were previously authorized by Congress but that funds were never made available.

ST. ONGE COMMENTS

ST. ONGE said, "In listening to your problems, it seems that a complete survey of this problem must be made to determine the type of pollution that we have, the cause of such pollution and the seriousness of the various types that can be found. We must explore the possibility of assistance in this respect from interested State and Federal agencies. We must discover the agencies who could offer help in any way. Further, I have no doubt that the actual survey will require funds from Congress in which you can all assist by enlisting support from the political leaders in your communities."

Ken Stober brought out a special problem that faces Dow Chemical due to the need for dredging in order to facilitate the transportation by water of both materials and products from the company's plant in Gales Ferry. An increase of 3 feet in the depth of the river at this point would alleviate the situation, he said. Stober added, "We are missing our greatest potential on the Eastern seaboard if we neglect the development of the Thames River harbor."

Jack Schwalbe declared, "The possibility exists that continued inattention to this problem (water pollution) could lose us the annual Yale-Harvard boat race, which in tradition and its contribution to our economy is a distinct asset to the region."

The plight of fishermen was especially stressed by C. B. Campbell, or Norwich, who pointed out that fishermen come from many miles to fish in the Thames and that this problem would soon drive them away if it is allowed to grow.

ONE SOLUTION

At the conclusion of the meeting, Congresman ST. ONGE said, "This situation definitely is one which affects several different economic and recreational sections of our area. They seem to all be related to one solution—the general improvement of the river which in one operation, will benefit all groups. I compliment you gentleman for having taken the initiative in this matter for an eastern Connecticut is facing its greatest period of growth, it is well that we take the opportunity to improve all of our resources to keep up with this growth. Such things as tax relief for industries installing filter plants can be presented to the Congress and I am sure that a solution to this problem can be found without any undue pressure on anyone."

C. B. Campbell, of Norwich, was selected as liaison officer to the Congressman and plans have been made for a larger meeting in the very near future to initiate action which will lead toward the elimination of the problems that have been brought out in this first meeting.

Senator John G. Townsend, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of former Senator John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware.

He was one of my closet friends in Congress. We often referred to him as the chicken king of the United States, and the strawberry king, because of his leadership in these fields of agriculture in his home State.

John Townsend was a devoted Republican. He was a devoted American. He rendered great service to his country. All who knew him will miss him greatly.

Armenian Martyrs' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, April 24 is recognized as the commemoration of a most horrible event in history, the beginning of 2 years of extermination of the peaceful Armenian people in 1915.

Armenia was once a thriving nation of 1,250,000 people, located between the Black Sea, the Euphrates River, Russia, and Iran. It encompassed the regions of Anatolia, Cilicia, and part of the Caucasus. The Armenian people were Christians, the first ancient nation to adopt Christianity, and by 1915 they were prosperous, well educated, and highly civilized. Armenian cities were clean and well governed. Every village had a school, and nearly every large town had a college. Armenians were closely allied with Western Europe and the United States and proud of their Christian heritage. Truly, in former days, Armenia was a progressive outpost in the Middle East, setting standards and showing the way to advanced civilization for the whole region.

But in 1915 Armenia was unfortunately a subject state of the Ottoman Empire. Moslems were scattered throughout the Armenian population. The Moslems generally, as latecomers, were poorer than the Armenians, uneducated, unskilled, and envious of their Armenian neighbors. This situation provided the fuel for genocide by the archaic, repressive government in Constantinople. Like the great crusades in reverse Moslems from the north swept into Armenia to eradicate an alien religion and its followers.

The massacre started on April 24, 1915, with the arrest of thousands of leading Armenians who might be able to lead a resistance. Then a carefully planned extermination was carried out, working downward through the populace even to the smallest village, until practically every Armenian in the Ottoman Empire was destroyed.

The men were seized and summarily executed. The young women were sold into brothels and harems. The children by thousands were given to Muslims to be converted. Thousands of old men and women and children were forced to walk without adequate food or clothing many

miles, sometimes for 5 or 6 months without rest until they all died from exhaustion. In this terrible massacre 800,000 Armenians died, and 250,000 fled into Russia. In 2 years Armenia ceased to exist, and the Armenian homeland became a vacuum to be slowly filled by Muslims. Today a decimated Armenian nation survives as a captive republic of the U.S.S.R. The proud, progressive Armenia of 1914 is no more.

This is the saddening event which is commemorated today, appropriately called Armenian Martyr's Day. In remembering it we pay respect to a great nation of long-suffering people, to all Armenians. Mankind dealt unfairly and cruelly with them. Our remembrance of it may help remind all of us never again to permit such a thing.

Israel Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, through many centuries after the Jews were scattered far and wide by the Roman Empire, they had no homeland, while Palestine, their original home, became a desolate, barren desert.

Many, many times the natives of the nations in which Jews were forced to live persecuted and massacred them. The Jewish people tried to settle and make themselves a congenial segment of the population. But whenever they began to feel safe some natural or economic catastrophe would arise, which was blamed on them, and they immediately became victims once again. This state of things lasted for nearly 2,000 years and culminated in the merciless slaughter of 6 million innocent people in World War II.

In the 1880's some Jews led the way toward a goal which became that of nearly all Jews in the last 15 years, the reestablishment of Israel.

On May 14, 1948, the Jews declared the independence of Israel and quickly demonstrated their ability to maintain that independence. From all corners of Europe and Asia Jews streamed into Israel, eager to escape the suffering of centuries endured in foreign lands, amid strange peoples.

Now that once barren, desolate Palestine is a bustling nation of 2 million people, living a comfortable life. They cannot yet enjoy life unmolested and completely secure, but I am sure they live far better than they ever have before.

Problems lie ahead for the Jews of Israel and for other Jews who yet live in fear, for example in the Soviet Union. But as we commemorated the 16th anniversary of Israeli independence last Friday, Jews now have the best hope for the future in many years. Let us hope that reasonable men can forget the hates and conflicts of the ages, so that Jews may come to live in the same peace and freedom for which all men strive.

I find it easy to bring to you felicitous language with which to congratulate the people of Israel on their 16th anniversary, for Israel continues to accomplish so much in the service of humanity, democracy, and freedom.

For my part, I would like to quote the words of a distinguished leader. I would like to put into the RECORD the statement which President Lyndon B. Johnson made in 1958 when, as majority leader of the other body, he offered a resolution celebrating Israel's 10th birthday.

At that time, he said:

Mr. President, the resolution speaks for itself. It expresses the feelings of the American people who have watched the steady growth of Israel for a decade.

Americans have been deeply impressed by the courage, the tenacity, and the determination with which the Israelis have built their country. It is a heart-warming demonstration of what can be done by determined men and women against great—and sometimes overwhelming—odds.

We wish Israel well. We hope it continues to flourish and prosper in dedication to the ideals of freedom and international cooperation, and that it will serve as a force to contribute to peace in the Middle East and in the world.

Hon. W. T. Delaplaine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in an age which seems to have more than its share of bitter controversy, violent antagonisms, harsh competition, and public and private strife, we sometimes forget that there are among us men who are gentle, kind, humble, patient, and mature. Not every community is blessed by having citizens of this kind to temper the climate and to encourage and counsel the people. As I know from personal experience, Frederick, Md., which is my home, has been fortunate in having such a man in a position of community responsibility. On Saturday we lost him, but many of us who grew up in Frederick and who sought his advice and his help will now seek to keep alive the kind of philosophy that he embodied. Although his own life was touched by sadness in some of its most tragic forms, he never imposed his sorrows upon others. Although his responsibilities as the publisher of two daily newspapers and as an orchardist kept him consistently busy, his office was never barred to visitors. By living the life that he thought was right and by being himself, he greatly influenced the world around him.

All of Maryland will miss William T. Delaplaine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the obituary account from Mr. Delaplaine's own newspaper, the Frederick (Md.) News, for Monday, April 20, 1964, and an editorial:

W. T. DELAPLAINE DIES—PUBLISHER OF NEWS-POST

William Theodore Delaplaine, president and manager of the Frederick News-Post, prominent civic leader and orchardist, died unexpectedly at 10 p.m., Saturday, at his home, 273 Dill Avenue. He was aged 73 years. Although he had been recently indisposed, he was apparently recovering nicely and had planned to return to his office this week.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Janie H. Quynn Delaplaine; an adopted daughter, Mrs. Martin L. Bowers, Jr.; grandchildren, Martin F. Bowers and Jane Elizabeth Bowers; two brothers, George B. Delaplaine, Sr., and Judge Edward S. Delaplaine; nephew, George B. Delaplaine, Jr., and a niece, Mrs. Myron W. Randall, of Phoenix, Baltimore county.

FUNERAL ARRANGEMENTS

The body is at the M. R. Etchison & Son Funeral Home, 106 East Church Street, where friends may call after 7 p.m. today and until 2 p.m., Tuesday. Funeral services will be at All Saints Episcopal Church, Tuesday at 3 p.m., conducted by the rector, Rev. Maurice D. Ashbury, assisted by Rev. Paul L. Althouse, pastor of the Evangelical Reformed United Church of Christ. Entombment will follow in the Frederick Memorial Park Mausoleum. Memorial contributions may be made to the Frederick County Heart Fund, 118 West Church Street.

Mr. Delapliane was born in Frederick on January 22, 1891, the third son of the late William T. Delaplaine, Sr., founder of the Frederick News. After graduating from the Boys' High School of Frederick in 1906, he attended Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Va., receiving the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1909. He won scholastic honors each year and was the recipient of the highest award for academic seniors, having also been elected as president of the Student Government Association.

ASSOCIATED WITH NEWSPAPERS

Following graduation, he became associated with the Frederick News, jointly with his brother, the late Robert E. Delaplaine. Upon the death of the latter on August 15, 1955, he became president and manager of the publishing firm, which had in the meantime absorbed. The Frederick Post in 1916, operations continuing under the corporate name of the Great Southern Printing & Manufacturing Co.

Mr. Delaplaine had always been quite active in community affairs, taking part in various campaigns for local institutions, such as the Francis Scott Key Hotel, Frederick Memorial Hospital, the YMCA, and the various World War efforts. He was a member of the board of directors and former president of the Fidelity Building & Loan Association, member of the board and former officer of the Frederick County Products, Inc., member of the board of Stronghold, Inc., former member of the Hood College Board of Trustees, former member of the board of the Francis Scott Key Hotel, one-time member of the Frederick City Board of Zoning Appeals. Long active in Kiwanis Club circles, he served both as secretary and as president.

On November 15, 1916, Mr. Delaplaine was married to Miss Janie H. Quynn, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Quynn, of Frederick. Through the Quynn family, he became interested in farming and fruit growing. Through the papers, he helped to stimulate interest in purebred livestock and in better farming methods, cooperating in all projects to improve agricultural conditions. He was active in the management at one time of five farms with a combined area of more than 1,000 acres. He managed the large fruit-growing enterprise well known throughout western Maryland industry as Quynn Orchards, marked by his association and membership in various agricultural and hor-

ticultural organizations. He also received awards in this field. Mr. Delaplaine was likewise interested in dairying and did much to develop this major enterprise for producers in Frederick County.

INTEREST IN PAPERS UNFLAGGING

Despite his varied activities, Mr. Delaplaine's interest in the newspapers was unflagging. It was traditional in the family, publication of the News having been started by the late William T. Delaplaine, Sr., in 1883. The company also published the Semi-Weekly News, which continued until 1953. The News was the only daily paper published in Frederick County.

It was back in 1910 that competition developed, another company launching the Post, also an evening paper, in December of that year. The News and the Post then began a struggle for supremacy.

PURCHASED MORNING PAPER

Frederick, then a city of 10,000, was unable to support more than one paper and it was a case of survival of the fittest. The Post, sensing a losing venture as an evening paper, switched to the morning field. Finally, in February of 1916, the owners offered their property to the Messrs. Delaplaine and agreement to purchase was reached. The News plant was then located on North Market Street. Both plants were operated separately until the News, in 1917, purchased the Post building on Court Street. The two plants were consolidated and since that time both the News and the Post have been published from the present Court Street plant.

STRESSED WELFARE, IMPROVEMENTS

Stressing the welfare and improvement of the community and tabooing all artificial methods, the growth and expansion of the papers have been consistent in both circulation and advertising patronage. Enhanced plant facilities and a vastly increased number of employees and staff members attests the soundness of conservative Delaplaine management.

Possessing a quiet demeanor and even-natured disposition, Mr. Delaplaine was popular among a wide circle of friends and with his employees. His integrity was unchallenged. He was a member of All Saints Episcopal Church and in politics was generally regarded as an independent Republican. He was one of the electors chosen in the presidential election of 1920.

FOND OF FISHING, GOLF

For diversion, Mr. Delaplaine was fond of fishing, and at one time favored golf. Amateur photography was another hobby, and many of his favorite photos were taken during the course of quite a few trips Mr. and Mrs. Delaplaine made both in this country and abroad.

WILLIAM T. DELAPLAINE

It is with sadness in our hearts that we record the passing of William T. Delaplaine, president and manager of this paper and son of the founder of the News.

Mr. Will's active participation in the News and Post spanned more than half a century, and in 1962 he was honored by the Chesapeake Association of the Associated Press as "Dean of Maryland newspapermen."

When he began his association with the News, an older brother, the late Robert E. Delaplaine, was working with the struggling enterprise. In those days type was set by hand. Machines were operated by steam power, and various machines were run by systems of overhead belts, shafts, and pulleys.

It is during the span of Mr. Will's activities that the News and, a few years later, the Post, grew from these humble beginnings to the modern plant of today using automatic tape-operated linecasting machines and rotary newspaper presses.

Likewise over the years the content of the papers was greatly improved and enlarged through the addition of excellent news services and features, but especially for the importance given to local news—the recording of activities and events in the area served by the local papers.

Under his tutelage, the coverage of area news was expanded and in recent years more emphasis was placed on pages designed to attract women's readership, as well as the youth of the area. His insistence that the small one paragraph "personal" or "sick" item was of equal importance with the "top news" story for the area for the day has given the Frederick News and Post that intimate personal touch which has been so important in the making of a well-accepted community newspaper.

He had a host of friends, and very few persons ever disagreed with him. Those who did came away with a feeling of respect and knowledge they had talked with a true gentleman.

In addition to his interest in the newspapers, which was paramount, he was a devoted worker in the community for betterment and was widely known as an orchardist and farmer.

His smile and warm, friendly greeting will be missed by all who knew him. There is consolation in the thought that his life was exemplary, that his talents were well utilized, and that he did his bit toward making the world and especially Frederick a better place in which to live.

Anyone for Nerve Gas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post which articulates some serious reservations which humanity in general and many Americans in particular have had with respect to the stockpiling and preparation for chemical and biological warfare.

Because the editorial raises some searching questions and because it expresses in positive terms some attitudes with which I concur, I wish to include it below for the benefit of my colleagues and others who may likewise be concerned.

The editorial follows:

NERVE GAS

The Associated Press report on our progress in the manufacture of nerve gas is interesting on two counts. It is interesting because of the glimpse it furnishes into an area of our enterprise about which little is known. It is interesting because of the efforts of the Government to suppress the knowledge of these experiments altogether.

The story was held up for 2 years, awaiting the approval of the appropriate military authorities. The difficulties surrounding the release of this information give rise to reasonable anxiety about how many like horror projects are going forward behind the shield of secrecy. The American people really have a right to know what atrocities are being prepared for their enemies in the sacred name of security.

When they find out, they ought to insist on the destruction of the whole witches' brew of military devices involved. This country, in the new atmosphere prevailing in the world, should take the lead in abandoning the whole assortment of such horrors on which work has been going forward. This country now is sufficiently powerful to be able to forswear, without security risk, the use of nerve gas, chemical devices and germ warfare. We ought to consign to the flames our whole stock of germs, gases and death-dealing chemicals, and invite the rest of the world to do likewise.

In the days before thermonuclear weapons there was some justification for experiment in this area. There was always the possibility that an enemy pioneering in this field, might become the exclusive possessor of a decisive weapon. The thermonuclear weapons remove this hazard. The risk of monopoly in these inhuman devices has diminished if it has not vanished.

President Johnson, who has taken the lead in other measures to reduce world tensions, might well take the lead in ridding mankind of apprehensions about such devices of mass destruction. Americans surely would sleep better nights if their Government abolished experiments with fluids that cause the victims to strangle in their own vital organs. These experiments are going to win the American people a terrible reputation for military frightfulness. Abolishing the whole assortment of these weapons would save a lot of money; but more importantly, it might save our repute as a humanitarian people.

Setting the Record Straight on the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], has supervised the preparation of a memorandum which sets the record straight on the civil rights bill passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 290 to 130. Neither the gentleman from Ohio, who is the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, nor 289 other Members of the House would have voted or this bill if any of the things that are being said about the bill were true. We welcome fair debate and honest disagreement; but we will not abide deliberate distortions.

It is because of these distortions that this memorandum became necessary. I should like to thank my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio, for his continuing leadership and moderation in this field and for the preparation of this memorandum—urge all to read it:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL (H.R. 7152), A SUMMARY PREPARED AT THE REQUEST AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, REPRESENTATIVE TO CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT, OHIO, APRIL 23, 1964

False and misleading charges are being directed at the civil rights bill now in the Senate.

To those people who believe in equality under the law, who support the Constitution, and who love liberty for themselves and

for others, the civil rights bill is moderate in scope, and in accordance with the best traditions of America.

Here is what the civil rights bill does and does not do.

EDUCATION

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to transfer students among schools to create "racial balancing."

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to dictate to schools or teachers as to what they must teach.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to force religious schools to hire teachers they do not want.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the course content or day-to-day operations of public or private schools.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the job or seniority rights of school teachers.

The bill does authorize the Attorney General to bring civil suits to desegregate public schools where individual citizens are too poor or are afraid to bring their own suits.

Only at and after the request of a school board, the bill would authorize the Commissioner of Education to furnish limited technical and financial assistance to those public schools which need assistance in desegregating.

HOUSING

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell any home or apartment owner or real estate operator to whom he must sell, rent, lease, or otherwise use his real estate.

BANK LOANS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a bank, savings and loan company, or other such financial institution to whom it may or may not make a loan.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNIONS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the day-to-day operations of a business or labor organization.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to require an employer or union to hire or accept for membership a quota of employees from any particular minority group.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to destroy the job seniority rights of either union or nonunion employees.

The bill does authorize a bipartisan commission to investigate charges that an employer has refused to hire or that a union has refused to accept for membership an individual solely because of his race, sex, color, religion, or national origin. If the Commission cannot dispose of the charge through the voluntary cooperation of the employer or union, the Commission must either drop the charge or bring a civil suit in a United States district court. In court the Commission must prove its charge by a preponderance of the evidence.

This authority is weaker than that granted to 25 State commissions under State law. And, where a State commission is doing its job, the Federal Commission may not interfere.

FARMERS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with a farmer's operation of his farm.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to impose minority quotas upon a farmer's farmhands or tenants.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with membership in farm organizations.

The bill only requires that a farmer, having 25 or more employees, may not refuse to hire an employee solely because of the color of his skin or his religion.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND VETERANS BENEFITS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to deny or interfere with an individual's right to receive social security or veteran's benefits.

VOTING

The bill neither authorizes nor permits the Federal Government to interfere in a State's right to fix voter qualifications.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to practice "judge shopping," or otherwise interfere with the local Federal judiciary.

The bill does provide limited procedural safeguards to assure that citizens are not denied the right to vote because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

HOTELS AND RESTAURANTS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell general retail establishments, bars, private clubs, country clubs, or service establishments whom they must serve.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with or destroy the private property rights of individual businessmen.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a lawyer, doctor, banker, or other professional man whom he must serve.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a barber-shop or beauty-shop owner whom he must serve, except that such establishment, if located in a hotel, must serve all patrons of that hotel.

All the bill does is to require that the owners of places of lodging (having five or more rooms for rent), eating establishments, gasoline stations, and places of entertainment are to serve all customers who are well-behaved and who are able to pay.

This requirement is weaker than the public accommodation laws of 32 States. And, where these States properly enforce their laws, there is no reason for the Federal Government to interfere.

RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL

The civil rights bill contains no primary criminal penalties. Only civil actions are authorized, to prevent an individual from continuing to violate provisions of the bill. Historically and according to the Constitution, jury trials are not authorized in these types of cases. The laws of the 50 States are the same in this regard.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The bill does not permit the Federal Government in any way to interfere with freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

GRANT OF DICTATORIAL POWERS TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A majority of the States have enacted legislation which is as strong or stronger than the major provisions of the civil rights bill. Nothing in the bill interferes with the effective enforcement of these State laws. And, where these laws are being effectively enforced, there is no reason for the Federal Government to interfere in States' rights.

In each title of the bill, effective administrative and judicial safeguards are provided. Federal officials are granted no final authority to withhold Federal financial assistance or impose penalties upon citizens. Every citizen is guaranteed his day in court with all the judicial safeguards that the Bill of Rights guarantees.

STATE CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

A majority of States have strong civil rights legislation which is effectively enforced. The Federal civil rights bill specifically provides that the Federal law will in no way interfere with the right of those States to continue enforcing their laws. And, where the States do so, the Federal Government will have no cause to enforce the Federal civil rights law in those States. Thus, for the Americans who do not discriminate against their fellow citizens because of race, color, or religion, the Federal civil rights bill will have no effect on their daily lives.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, April 24 each year marks a sad day in the history of the Armenian people. It was on that day in 1915 when some two to three million Armenians—the whole Armenian population in Turkey—were slaughtered or deported. This tragic event is observed annually by Armenians in the United States and in other countries as Martyrs' Day.

On this day, people of Armenian descent and all freedom-loving people, pay their respects to those martyrs who nearly a half century ago were innocent victims of a cruel and despotic regime which sought to further its dreams of conquest by undertaking wholesale massacres of a peaceful people. This was certainly an act of genocide—the murder of a whole people, a tragedy that shocked all mankind.

Beginning on that infamous day in 1915, all prominent Armenians in Turkey were arrested and later deported to various parts of that country—only to be executed there. Among them were clergymen, intellectuals, well-known merchants, artisans and others—in all about a thousand persons representing all classes of the Armenian community in Turkey. But they were only the first group of victims of a well-organized genocide plan to destroy this minority people in Turkey.

Others followed within a matter of weeks. It soon became evident to all Armenians in Turkey that they were doomed to death and destruction, and that they were faced with a tragedy of national proportions—a tragedy which was unheard of until that day in the annals of civilization. In a period of less than 6 months the Turkish Government decimated the Armenians within its borders by massacres, deportation, famine, and other means. Only a small segment of the Armenian community succeeded in escaping.

In the United States today we have several hundred thousand people of Armenian extraction. They are loyal and devoted citizens, intelligent, hard-working, deeply religious, and a great asset to our country. To all of them and to their kinsmen in other countries, I wish to extend my deep sympathy on this day and to join with them in paying tribute to the memory of the Armenian martyrs of 1915. Only by keeping their

memory alive and retelling the tragic events of that genocide, can we hope to prevent such acts in the future.

War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most publicized domestic political program of 1964 is the administration's baptized "war on poverty."

The dubious nature of this package proposal is being argued throughout the land, and I submit for the RECORD as indication of nationwide reaction an article in the Monday, April 20 edition of the Chicago Tribune by internationally known economist, Dr. Melchior Palyi, entitled "Poverty Count Data Have a Phony Ring," and an editorial which appeared in the April 16 edition of the Palos Regional, a weekly newspaper serving the Palos region of south suburban Cook County, entitled "War on Poverty Not for Government."

The articles follow:

POVERTY COUNT DATA HAVE A PHONY RING

(By Melchior Palyi)

Remember the "underfed, underclothed, and underhoused one-third" proclaimed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt? Now, according to President Johnson, one out of every five Americans is poverty-stricken. By that token, we have made quite an inroad into poverty, reducing it from 33 percent to 20 percent of the population. Juggling with percentages is an old trick of Soviet statisticians. Translate the percentages into numbers and a wholly different picture emerges.

In 1935, the population of the United States was estimated at 128 million; now it has passed the 191 million mark. One-third of the 1935 figure is almost 43 million; one-fifth of the latter is nearly—43 million. We did not manage to put a dent in the number of paupers.

There are as many around as there were 28 years ago when the country embarked on the New Deal, on social security and welfare spending, to say nothing of the wealth redistribution by taxation, subsidies, and inflation.

Something is phony about the politicians' approach to the problem of poverty. Are their estimates sheer figments of the presidential imagination? Or have our policies been altogether mischievous?

WHERE'S DIVIDING LINE

To begin with, where is the dividing line between a "modest but adequate" existence, as the Bureau of Labor Statistics has put it, and real deprivation? If starvation is the gage as in India, or the kind of overcrowding found in Soviet housing, then there are very few poors in this country.

On the other hand, the collectivists (who sail under humanitarian flags) allege that undereducation and undermedication are also significant earmarks of wretchedness. Why not declare that a car and a television set are necessities, too? And should not something be done about the unfortunates who cannot afford a winter vacation in Florida, important as it might be for lengthening their lives?

PICK ARBITRARY FIGURE

The official approach consists in choosing some arbitrary income figure. Any individual or family below the line is supposed to be a slum dweller or worse and must be rescued, cost what it may. If a $4,000 income is considered the minimum for a family of four, some 54 million Americans are indigent. There are about 36 million destitute if the minimum is lowered to $3,000—which is apparently President Johnson's choice. A few things should be remembered about such arbitrarily selected income figures. They are:

1. Living expenses are one thing in the big city and quite another thing in a small town or on the farm. National averages mean little more than nothing.

2. In 1956, a Federal Reserve Board survey brought out that 40 percent of the "spending units" with less than $2,000 incomes, allegedly comprising 8 million families, owned their own homes. The vast majority of these "very poor" homeowners, 86 percent, had no mortgage debt. Close to 50 percent of the total number had liquid savings of $500 or more.

ONLY MONEY COUNTED

3. Usually, only money incomes are counted; income in kind defies the measuring sticks. But in the countryside, particularly, people manage to provide themselves with food—and recreation—by farming, fishing, and hunting. And they do not report necessarily what they earn on side jobs. Avoiding (and evading) income and social security taxes is a popular pastime, not just among millionaires.

4. How far an income goes in providing a decent living depends on the person and circumstances. A thrifty family can get along on less than $3,000 a year while the profligate may have trouble making ends meet with double that amount, it may make all the difference if all members of the family are healthy, or some are chronically sick; if the children help on the farm or in the office, or do not; and so on.

5. Last but not least, the statistical methods used in counting the poor are pitifully inadequate. The "experts" of President Johnson neglect to take notice of the pitfalls in the data mentioned above. Their "highly charged rhetoric" is based on totally unreliable samplings.

DERIVING THE FIGURE

"The Administration arrived at [its] estimate of 'the forgotten fifth' by using sample data collected each year by the Census Bureau from approximately 25,000 households," quoting from a recent Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. survey.

"Administration economists simply designated as 'poor' all families with annual money income of less than $3,000 and all unattached individuals with annual money income of less than $1,500. * * * When the sample data for 1962 are blown up to full population size, they yield a money income total of $352 billion. By contrast, 1962 money income for roughly the same population, as calculated by the Department of Commerce largely on the basis of consolidated income tax returns, was $53 billion higher. Commerce's estimate of total income for the year [including nonmoney income] was $68 billion higher."

By such flimsy concoctions, the Presidential advisers arrive at, or near, the ludicrous one-fifth figure of chronic poverty.

[From the Palos Regional, Apr. 16, 1964]

WAR ON POVERTY NOT FOR GOVERNMENT

An interesting sidelight can be cast on the proposal to raise congressional salaries from $22,500 to $32,500, which was temporarily shelved for obvious political reasons, this being a political year.

A new House office building, not yet finished, has been under construction for some 6 years. It has been branded as an architectural monstrosity. That aside, the cost will run—according to estimates, which are almost invariably low—to $122 million, and it will provide office space for only about 170 Representatives.

This comes to $720,000 per member. And now it is urged that still another such building should be started to take care of, presumably, the hundreds of Representatives who will not have space in the new building.

Well, we are to have a so-called war on poverty. We have an economy drive which, so far, seems to consist of such picayune matterns as turning off unneeded lights in Government offices. And we have an office building costing $720,000 for each and every Representative who will occpuy it, and another such in prospect.

Einstein himself could not add up the political spending proposals, projects and schemes and make the slightest sense of them. Such a waste of tax money is no recommendation for increased salaries for the public officials who are responsible for them.

Administration Rejects Proposal for Expenditure Policy Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1964, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee wrote to President Johnson suggesting that a bipartisan Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditure Policy be established with the purpose of making an objective study in this area. I inserted a copy of that letter to President Johnson in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 20, 1964, pages 581–582.

In a letter of April 11, Secretary Dillon has rejected the suggestion of the Joint Economic Committee minority. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Secretary Dillon's letter, as well as my reply to him, be included in the RECORD for the information of those who wish to follow this discussion to its conclusion.

The letters follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The President has asked me to reply to the letter of January 10, 1964, from the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee. Your concern over expenditure policy is entirely appropriate, and we appreciate the constructive and thoughtful approach which has gone into your recommendation for a special advisory commission to review Federal activities and expenditures.

The President's firm position on the importance of expenditure control along with tax reduction in stimulating the sound growth of our economy is, of course, now well known. His determination to eliminate waste and efficiency through a continual review by the executive branch of the usefulness of existing programs and the establishment of priorities among needed and de-

sirable new programs was unambiguously set forth in his first budget. I am sure you agree that the progress we are making toward a balanced budget, as a result of his strict economy measures and the exhaustive screening of existing programs, was an important factor in the early enactment this year of the tax reduction legislation.

It is, of course, a basic and necessary part of the President's duty under the Budget and Accounting Act to propose in each budget the amounts which, in his judgment, are necessary for the support of the Government. The Congress has a similar responsibility when it is considering the President's budget recommendations.

Expenditure policy is, in fact, program policy. It encompasses practically the entire range of matters with which the executive branch and the Congress deal, including national security and domestic economic and social policy. Under our form of government these responsibilities rest with elected officials, the President and the Members of the Congress. Theirs is the basic responsibility for formulating and deciding matters which relate to the nature, size, and relative priority of Government programs and outlays. It would seem unrealistic and unwise to assign to a bipartisan commission a task so broad that it encompasses virtually the whole of the agenda of government.

To be sure, expertise on a more specialized basis—dealing wtih specific programs or with matters of organization and procedures—can and has in the past been of value both to the President and the Congress. Expert knowledge has also been useful in obtaining greater economy and efficiency in selected operations. The President and his operating officials have called in the past for such advice as circumstances warrant, and will continue to do so in the future.

In the final analysis, however, I believe the greatest progress can be made toward your objectives if we concentrate on improving program and management appraisals and reviews within the existing framework—both legislative and executive—rather than through a large temporary commission with broad and far-ranging terms of reference.

Certainly the Joint Economic Committee can, as in the past, contribute to such efforts. I can assure you that the President and each of his agency officials intend to press ahead to improve on the accomplishments we have made to date in careful determinations of priorities, in ever greater attention to efficiency, and in the elimination of any and all unnecessary expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1964.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of April 11, 1964, replying to a letter of January 10, 1964, sent to the President by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee and suggesting the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditure Policy.

I regret that the administration has rejected the idea of an objective and bipartisan review of expenditure policy by a Commission of experts outside of the Government. However, I do agree with you that efforts in this area should move forward by improvements of the existing legislative and executive framework.

In the light of the difficulties in altering established patterns of thought and procedure within Government, however, the Joint Economic Committee minority felt that the recommendations of a blue-ribbon Commission would help to stimulate needed action within the existing framework.

You may be certain that I will continue to press for improvements in the existing expenditure policy machinery. I would, of course, welcome the full support of the administration in those efforts since the chances of making meaningful improvements without administration backing are slight.

Since the January 10 letter to the President was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I intend to place your reply as well as this letter in the RECORD so that those who are interested may follow the discussion to its conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Armenian Martyrs Day, April 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians in Turkey have had their miseries and misfortunes. They had lived under the autocratic tyranny of the Turks for centuries, and had endured all sorts of hardships. Since late 19th century they were being massacred by the tens of thousands and nothing seemed to avert more massacres. All these tragic events had become part of their national history. But their real national tragedy, one that practically wiped out all traces of Armenian communities in the Ottoman Empire, began on the fateful April 24, 1915.

On that day, and during the night of April 23, all prominent Armenians in Constantinople and in other towns, persons active and well known in all phases of communal activity, were arrested and imprisoned, held incomunicado and then under their guard-executioners deported to various parts of the country. Their unenviable lot was sad enough to plunge the whole Armenian community of the country into national mourning, but the lot that was in store for some 2 million Armenians in Turkey was no different. In the course of the next 6 months all of them were uprooted from their native homes. Many hundreds of thousands lost their lives in carefully organized wholesale massacres. Hundreds of thousands more lost their lives by famine and under indescribable hardships. Though some 500,000 managed to escape death by finding refuge in neighboring lands, in Persia, Russia, and in some parts of Europe, the majority of the Armenians simply ceased to exist by the end of 1915. Thus in the course of less than a year the industrious and relatively prosperous Armenian community, with its centuries-old eventful history, was no more.

Such was the legacy of the tragic events which began on that black April 24 of 1915. Today in commemorating the 49th anniversary of that tragedy, Armenians everywhere, even those in the Soviet Armenian Socialist Republic, bless the memory of the victims of that tragedy perpetrated by the Turkish Government in 1915.

Genocide is a crime against humanity. Those who are guilty of such crime must know that as the spirit of the brotherhood of man grows, all mankind will rise against crimes against their brothers.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting report or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Problems Posed by the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Evening Star of April 22, 1964, carried an excellent column by Mr. Richard Wilson on the subject of U.S. foreign policy in dealing with the problems posed by the Communist aim of world domination. I have been particularly impressed with Mr. Wilson's comments and commend them to the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS OF EX-AMBASSADOR MURPHY—HOWEVER TRACTABLE RUSSIANS APPEAR, LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVES KEPT IN SIGHT

(By Richard Wilson)

In this era of the renewed thaw with Russia the lessons learned by former Ambassador Robert C. Murphy are worth reviewing.

Bob Murphy was a career State Department official on the same level as Britain's Harold Macmillan in several critical areas during World War II and in the immediate postwar period. Berlin was one of these areas and it was there that Murphy learned first hand the Russian technique of approaching objectives stage by stage.

The blockade of Berlin began as a probing operation with minor traffic interferences and slowly escalated, stage by stage, into a full scale stricture intended to starve and freeze the Western Powers out. In the early stages a firm Western response would probably have convinced the Russians that the risk was too great. But the first probes seemed to indicate a lack of resolution by the Western Powers. Irresolution met every successive step until the point was reached where breaking the blockade would have meant full-scale war.

As Murphy sees it, the airlift which kept Berlin alive was an admission of failure; we should never have had to supply Berlin this way, but should have insisted on access by normal methods from the beginning, using force if necessary to assure such access. At one stage a lone Mongolian soldier was the only impediment to full access.

It is well to remember how the blockade began, and how the Russian lodgment in Cuba began, in this period when so much reliance is being place on a rapprochement with Russia. The lessons are known but they never can be learned. If the thread of Murphy's analysis is right, the Berlin wall never would have been built if U.S. tanks had pushed away the barbed wire when it was first laid and if the first cement block had been kicked aside when first put down.

In Cuba, the time to have acted was when the first combat troops were installed and not when the missile bases were erected. Russia goes about these matters progressively, moving as far and as fast as the existing risks will permit.

Periods of calm are part of the stage-by-stage strategy also and it is in just such stages as this that the American guard automatically drops. We may find later that in such periods the Soviet espionage apparatus takes advantage of an improved atmosphere to improve its position.

This has happened before, notably in 1958 and 1959, and it has only recently been disclosed that the American Embassy in Poland was thoroughly penetrated and Russian-paid party girls were sleeping with the entire Marine guard contingent. The Soviet espionage department can be relied on to do its level best to live up to its reputation in the James Bond spy thrillers.

This incident has been excruciatingly embarrassing to the State Department, to say nothing of the Marine Corps. But it is hard to convince the State Department that its security procedures are very lax. Senator DODD and his Senate Internal Security Committee have been trying to do this for the past several years. But the procedures don't seem to improve much and such heretics as Otto Otepka, whose crime was telling the truth about his superiors, remain ostracized and in suspension. It was no surprise to learn that Otepka was one of the officials who handled investigations of conditions in the embassy in Poland.

On the basis of the record, therefore, periods of thaw in relations which the Soviet Union are followed by new experiments in the nibbling process which Ambassador Murphy watched grow into the Berlin blockade. Periods of thaw are also accompanied by redoubled efforts of the Russian KGB which have been so notoriously flagrant in England.

However tractable the Russians seem to become they do not lose sight of long-term objectives. The do not hesitate to shoot down our planes while they smilingly assure us that they wish new understandings. Russia is hard pressed now internally and externally but to assume, as does Senator FULBRIGHT, that there can be a new deal with Russia, based on some kind of a poorly defined new world order, approaches the limits of credibility.

The 1963 American Success Story Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1964

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., presents an American Success Story Award to 10 businessmen whose rise to success over obstacles and competition symbolizes the achievement that is possible to all of our citizens in the democratic society that we enjoy here in the United States.

I am proud today to pay tribute to a fellow Georgian who was the recipient of one of the 1963 awards which were recently announced. He is Roy Richards, a resident of Carrollton, Ga., who is founder and president of Richards & Associates, Southwire Co., and Richards Realty Corp. of Carrollton, and also is president of the Peoples Bank in Carrollton, Richards Motor Co., Villa Rica, Ga., and Richards International of San Juan, P.R., and others.

The story of Mr. Richards' outstanding business success is an excellent example of what can be achieved under democracy, where freedom of choice and ability, based on the foundation of a belief in God and in the dignity of man prevails. We in Georgia are particularly proud of Mr. Richards for his achievements and for his contributions to the economy of his State and community.

In accepting the award, Mr. Richards commented:

Under free enterprise, success is possible anywhere in America. I was born in Carroll County, Ga. I built my success there and reached the world with my products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of Mr. Richards' award be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 12th annual 1964 American Success Story Awards were presented today by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., to 10 men who overcame obstacles and competition and rose from the ranks to own or head giant industries. They started as reporters, teachers, newsboys, junkman, mechanic, and odd jobs. Selected as examples of the success possible to all under America's free enterprise democracy, they all praised America's freedoms and opportunities for making their success possible.

Mr. Talbot T. Speer who rose to own one of America's oldest newspapers, the 237-year-old Maryland Gazette, a newspaper chain and the Baltimore Business Forms, Inc., presented the awards as FEAA's awards chairman at the presentation ceremonies held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

Mr. Speer read the citations which stated that the recipients had, "* * * won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice, and ethics, symbolizing the success possible to all under our free enterprise system." He cited them for their dedicated work in civil, religious and philanthropic causes, and contributions to their fields.

Mr. Speer warned that America must prepare to meet the gravest challenge in history to our freedoms, high standard of living, and security. The anti-American campaigns, the subversion of nations once friendly to us, the assassination of President Kennedy and other individual and mass attacks on the United States and democracy everywhere are proof that we are locked in a death struggle with ruthless totalitarian forces. "Every American must find out what they can do to help in the fight for our Nation's survival" he urged.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association was chartered in 1952. With leaders in all fields it promotes incentive and champions the cause of the American free enterprise democracy to bolster the faith of all people in the American way of life.

Roy Richards, 52 (resident, Carrollton, Ga.), founder and president Richards & Associates, Southwire Co., Richards Realty Corp., Carrollton, Ga., President, the Peoples Bank, Carrollton, Ga.; Richards Motor Co., Villa Rica, Ga.; Richards International, San Juan, P.R., others. To be a recipient of the Free Enterprise Awards Association's 12th annual American Success Story Awards as an example of the success possible under America's free enterprise democracy.

Born on farm, worked in father's sawmill, worked way through Georgia Tech, graduated mechanical engineering. Borrowed $256 from professor whom he later employed. Officer, U.S. Army. Started pole line contracting business on $600 loan (later became bank president in hometown) and built Richards & Associates into internationally known construction firm of electrical and gas transmission lines for major utilities. Employs 300, grosses $6 million. Organized Southwire Co., to manufacture electrical wire and cable, in 1950. Highly competitive field, bucking giants of copper and aluminum industry. Now over 300,000-square-foot plant, employs 680, operates fleet of 40 diesel truck tractors, delivering to 40 States, and export. Sales $24 million. Awarded President's E for export award for export sales to 17 foreign countries.

Other business interests include buying and selling 17 theaters, a radio station, and construction and operation of shopping centers. Cited for Southwire Co.'s many industry "firsts." His contributions to southern industry are an example of the awards of free enterprise democracy to those willing to compete for the wealth our economy affords.

Supreme Court Draws on House Small Business Committee Investigation in Outlawing Gasoline Consignment Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in an antitrust case which is recognized as being of greater importance and significance than any other antitrust case decided in this decade. Moreover, in so doing, the Court relied upon and quoted from hearings of the House Small Business Committee.

I refer to the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Simpson against Union Oil Co. of California and to hearings held by our distinguished colleague, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution.

In the Union Oil Co. case, the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-3 vote, outlawed gasoline consignment sales—a method of marketing used by the oil companies to control the price of gasoline sold by service stations to the consuming public. The Supreme Court observed that this system is in reality price fixing and stated:

To allow Union Oil to achieve price fixing in this vast distribution system through this "consignment" device would be to make legality for antitrust purposes turn on clever draftsmanship. We refuse to let a matter so vital to a competitive system rest on such easy manipulation.

Now that the Supreme Court has torn the veil from such an illegal scheme and exposed it for what it in reality is, thousands of small businessmen who operate gasoline service stations and the general public will benefit.

In this case—the Union Oil Co. decision—the Congress can and will take and derive justifiable satisfaction in the fact that the Supreme Court stated, "We are enlightened on present-day marketing methods by recent congressional investigations," and quoted testimony from hearings by the House Small Business Committee.

Because of the tremendous significance and importance of the ruling by the Superme Court in the Union Oil case, I, under unanimous consent, include this decision in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The decision rendered by Justice Douglas follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, RICHARD S. SIMPSON, PETITIONER, *v.* UNION OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—APRIL 20, 1964—No. 87—OCTOBER TERM, 1963

Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court.

This is a suit for damages under section 4 of the Clayton Act, 38 Stat. 731, 15 U.S.C. 15, for violation of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, 26 Stat. 209, as amended, 50 Stat. 693, 15 U.S.C. 1, 2. The complaint grows out of a so-called retail dealer "consignment" agreement which, it is alleged, Union Oil requires lessees of its retail outlets to sign, of which Simpson was one. The "consignment" agreement is for 1 year and thereafter until canceled, is terminable by either party at the end of any year and, by its terms, ceases upon any termination of the lease. The lease is also for 1 year; and it is alleged that it is used to police the retail prices charged by the consignees, renewals not being made if the conditions prescribed by the company are not met. The company, pursuant to the "consignment" agreement, sets the prices at which the retailer sells the gasoline. While "title" to the consigned gas "shall remain in consignor until sold by consignee," and while the company pays all property taxes on all gasoline in possession of Simpson, he must carry personal liability and property damage insurance by reason of the "consigned" gasoline and is responsible for all losses of the "consigned" gasoline in his possession, save for specified acts of God. Simpson is compensated by a mimimum commission and pays all the costs of operation in the familiar manner.

The retail price fixed by the company for the gasoline during the period in question was 29.9 cents; and Simpson, despite the company's demand that he adhere to the authorized price, sold it at 27.9 cents, allegedly to meet a competitive price. Soley because Simpson sold gasoline below the fixed price, Union Oil refused to renew the lease; termination of the "consignment" agreement ensued; and this suit was filed. The terms of the lease and "consignment" agreement are not in dispute nor the method of their application in this case. The interstate character of Union Oil's business is conceded, as is the extensive use by it of the lease-consignment agreement in eight Western States.[1]

After two pretrial hearings, the company moved for a summary judgment. Simpson moved for a partial summary judgment—that the consignment lease program is in violation of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. The district court, concluding that "all the factual disputes" had been eliminated from the case, entertained the motions. The district court granted the company's motion and denied Simpson's, holding as to the latter that he had not established a violation of the Sherman Act and, even assuming such a violation, that he had not suffered any actionable damage. The court of appeals affirmed. While it assumed that there were triable issues of law, it concluded that Simpson suffered no actionable wrong or damage, 311 F. 2d 764. The case is here on a writ of certiorari. 373 U.S. 901.

We disagree with the court of appeals that there is no actionable wrong or damage if a Sherman Act violation is assumed. If the "consignment" agreement achieves resale price maintenance in violation of the Sherman Act, it and the lease are being used to injure interstate commerce by depriving independent dealers of the exercise of free judgment whether to become consignees at all, or remain consignees, and, in any event, to sell at competitive prices. The fact that a retailer can refuse to deal does not give the supplier immunity if the arrangement is one of those schemes condemned by the antitrust laws.

There is actionable wrong whenever the restraint of trade or monopolistic practice has an impact on the market; and it matters not that the complainant may be only one merchant. See *Klor's* v. *Broadway Hale Stores*, 359 U.S. 207, 213; *Radiant Burners* v. *Peoples Gas Co.*, 364 U.S. 656, 660. As we stated in *Radovich* v. *National Football League*, 352 U.S. 445, 453–454:

"Congress has, by legislative fiat, determined that such prohibited activities are injurious to the public and has provided sanctions allowing private enforcement of the antitrust laws by an aggrieved party. These laws protect the victims of the forbidden practices as well as the public."

The fact that, on failure to renew a lease, another dealer takes Simpson's place and renders the same service to the public is no more an answer here than it was in *Poller* v. *Columbia Broadcasting System*, 368 U.S. 464, 473. For Congress, not the oil distributor, is the arbiter of the public interest; and Congress has closely patrolled price fixing whether effected through resale price maintenance agreements or otherwise.[2] The exclusive requirements contracts struck down in *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States*, 337 U.S. 293, were not saved because dealers need not have agreed to them, but gone elsewhere. If that were a defense, a supplier could regiment thousands of otherwise competitive dealers in resale price maintenance programs merely by fear of nonrenewal of short-term leases.

We made clear in *United States* v. *Parke, Davis & Co.*, 362 U.S. 29, that a supplier may not use coercion on its retail outlets to achieve resale price maintenance. We reiterate that view, adding that it matters not what the coercive device is. *United States* v. *Colgate*, 250 U.S. 300, as explained in *Parke, Davis*, 362 U.S., at 37, was a case where there was assumed to be no agreement to maintain retail prices. Here we have such an agreement; it is used coercively, and, it promises to be equally if not more effective in maintaining gasoline prices than were the Parke, Davis techniques in fixing monopoly prices on drugs.

Consignments perform an important function in trade and commerce, and their integrity has been recognized by many courts, including this one. See *Ludvigh* v. *American Woolen Co.*, 231 U.S. 522. Yet consignments though useful in allocating risk between the parties and determining their rights inter se, do not necessarily control the rights of others, whether they be creditors or sovereigns. Thus the device has been extensively

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

regulated by the States. 22 Am. Jur., Factors, 8; *Hartford Indemnity Co.* v. *Illinois*, 298 U.S. 155. Congress, too, has entered parts of the field establishing by the act of June 10, 1930, 46 Stat. 531, as amended, 7 U.S.C. section 499a et seq., a pervasive system of control over commission merchants dealing in perishable agricultural commodities.

One who sends a rug or a painting or other work of art to a merchant or a gallery for sale at a minimum price can, of course, hold the consignee to the bargain. A retail merchant may, indeed, have inventory on consignment, the terms of which bind the parties inter se. Yet the consignor does not always prevail over creditors in case of bankruptcy, where a recording statute or a "traders act" or a "sign statute" is in effect. 4 Collier, Bankruptcy (14th ed.), pp. 1090–1097, 1484–1486. The interests of the Government also frequently override agreements that private parties make. Here we have an antitrust policy expressed in Acts of Congress. Accordingly, a consignment, no matter how lawful it might be as a matter of private contract law, must give way before the Federal antitrust policy. Thus a consignment is not allowed to be used as a cloak to avoid section 3 of the Clayton Act. See *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Magrane-Houston Co.*, 258 U.S. 346, 353–356; cf. *Straus* v. *Victor Talking Mach. Co.*, 243 U.S. 490, 500–501. Nor does section 1 of the Sherman Act tolerate agreements for retail price maintenance. See *United States* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150, 221–222; *United States* v. *Parke, Davis & Co., supra.*

We are enlightened on present-day marketing methods by recent congressional investigations. In the automobile field the price is "the manufacturer's suggested retail price."[3] not a price coercively exacted; nor do automobiles go on consignment; they are sold.[4] Resale price maintenance of gasoline through the "consignment" device is increasing.[5] The "consignment" device in the gasoline field is used for resale price maintenance. The theory and practice of gasoline price fixing in vogue under the "consignment" agreement has been well exposed by Congress. A Union Oil official in recent testimony before a House Committee on Small Business explained the price mechanism:

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. Who sets the price in your consignment station, dealer consignment station?

"Mr. RATH. We do.

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. You do?

"Mr. RATH. Yes. We do it on this basis: You see, he is paid a commission to sell these products for us. Now, we go out into the market area and find out what the competitive major price is, what that level is, and we set our house-brand price at that."[6]

Dealers, like Simpson, are independent businessmen; and they have all or most of the indicia of entrepreneurs, except for price fixing. The risk of loss of the gasoline is on them, apart from acts of God. Their return is affected by the rise and fall in the market price, their commissions declining as retail prices drop.[7] Practically the only power they have to be wholly independent businessmen, whose service depends on their own initiative and enterprise, is taken from them by the proviso that they must sell their gasoline at prices fixed by Union Oil. By reason of the lease and "consignment" agreement dealers are coercively laced into an arrangement under which their supplier is able to impose noncompetitive prices on thousands of persons who otherwise might be competitive. The evil of this resale price maintenance program, like that of the requirements contracts held illegal by *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States, supra*, is its inexorable potentiality for and even certainty in destroying competition in retail sales of gasoline by these nominal "consignees" who are in reality small struggling competitors seeking retail gas customers.

As we have said, an owner of an article may send it to a dealer who may in turn undertake to sell it only at a price determined by the owner. There is nothing illegal about that arrangement. When, however, a "consignment" device is used to cover a vast gasoline distribution system, fixing prices through many retail outlets, the antitrust laws prevent calling the "consignment" an agency[8] for then the end result of *United States* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co., supra*, would be avoided merely by clever manipulation of words, not by differences in substance. The present, coercive "consignment" device, if successful against challenge under the antitrust laws, furnishes a wooden formula for administering prices on a vast scale.[9]

Reliance is placed on *United States* v. *General Electric Co.*, 272 U.S. 476, where a consignment arrangement was utilized to market patented articles. Union Oil correctly argues that the consignment in that case somewhat parallels the one in the instant case.[10] The Court in the General Electric case did not restrict its ruling to patented articles; it, indeed, said that the use of the consignment device was available to the owners of articles "patented or otherwise." Id., at 488. But whatever may be said of the General Electric case on its special facts, involving patents, it is not apposite to the special facts here.

The Court in that case particularly relied on the fact that patent rights have long included licenses "to make, use, and vend" the patented article "for any royalty or upon any condition the performance of which is reasonably within the reward which the patentee by the grant of the patent is entitled to secure." Id., at 489. Congress in establishing the patent system included 35 U.S.C. 154, which provides in part: "Every patent shall contain a short title of the invention and a grant to the patentee, his heirs or assigns, for the term of 17 years, of the right to exclude others from making, using or, selling the invention throughout the United States, referring to the specification for the particulars thereof."

"The right to manufacture, the right to sell, and the right to use are each substantive rights, and may be granted or conferred separately by the patentee." *Adams* v. *Burke*, 17 Wall. 453, 456. Long prior to the *General Electric* case, price fixing in the marketing of patented articles had been condoned (*Bement* v. *National Harrow Co.*, 186 U.S. 70), provided it did not extend to sales by purchasers of the patented articles. *Adams* v. *Burke, supra; Ethyl Gasoline Corp.* v. *United States*, 309 U.S. 436.

The patent laws which give a 17-year monopoly on "making, using, or selling the invention" are in pari materia with the antitrust laws and modify them pro tanto. That was the ratio decidendi of the *General Electric* case. See 272 U.S., at 485. We decline the invitation to extend it.

To allow Union Oil to achieve price fixing in this vast distribution system through this "consignment" device would be to make legality for antitrust purposes turn on clever draftsmanship. We refuse to let a matter so vital to a competitive system rest on such easy manipulation. Cf. *United States* v. *Masonite Corp.*, 316 U.S. 265, 280.

Hence on the issue of resale price maintenance under the Sherman Act there is nothing left to try, for there was an agreement for resale price maintenance, coercively employed.

The case must be remanded for a hearing on all the other issues in the case, including those raised under the McGuire Act, 66 Stat. 631, 15 U.S.C. 45, and the damages, if any, suffered. We intimate no views on any other issue; we hold only that resale price maintenance through the present, coercive type of "consignment" agreement is illegal under the antitrust laws, and that petitioner suffered actionable wrong or damage. We reserve the question whether, when all the facts are known, there may be any equities that would warrant only prospective application in damage suits of the rule governing price fixing by the "consignment" device which we announce today.

Reversed.

Mr. Justice Harlan took no part in the disposition of this case.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] As of Dec. 31, 1957, Union Oil supplied gasoline to 4,133 retail stations in the eight Western States of California, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, Montana, Utah, and Idaho. Of that figure, 2,003 stations were owned or leased by Union Oil and, in turn, leased or subleased to an independent retailer; 14 were company-operated training stations; and the remaining 2,116 stations were owned by the retailer or leased by him from third persons. Union Oil had "consignment" agreements as of that date with 1,978 (99 percent) of the lessee-retailers and with 1,327 (63 percent) of the nonlessee-retailers.

[2] See the McGuire Act, 66 Stat. 631; 15 U.S.C. 45; the Miller-Tydings Act, 50 Stat. 693; 15 U.S.C. 1; *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150.

[3] H. Rept. No. 1958, 85th Cong., 2d sess., S. Rept. No. 1555, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] H. Rept. No. 1958, supra, note 3, at 1.

[5] See H. Rept. No. 1157, 85th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 6–7. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, testified:

"Another issue relating to price fixing concerns certain of the practices which the major oil companies have used to preserve their tank wagon price structure; for example, the placing of the dealer on a commission or consignment agency basis, which narrows his normal margin of profit and effectively fixes the retail price." Id., at 7. The committee report said:

"One of the effects of this expansion of commission and consignment outlets is that more and more service station operators lose their status as independent businessmen. The selling price and gross margin of profit per gallon in the commission-type stations are wholly within the control of the supplier." Ibid.

[6] See hearings, House Select Committee on Small Business, 85th Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 56, pt. III, pp. 79–80. The same official gave this justification for the consignment program—a justification similar to that traditionally advanced for resale price maintenance:

"Consignment is our method of protecting our dealers' profit margins during disturbed retail price conditions, at the same time maintaining our dealers' positions as people handling a premium quality product. We have not used consignment as a means of unfair competition, nor has it been used to price any dealer out of any station. It has instead been used by us to maintain a competitive relationship between our dealers' prices and those of our competitors.

"We are proud of our retail consignment program which has accomplished the ends outlined above. We have been able to make these accomplishments without taking away any of the independence of our dealers. Through our consignment program we have established and maintained under all conditions the minimum guaranteed margins for our dealers that are the best in the industry. It has brought our dealers one other substantial benefit also—and I would like to point this out strongly—they have available for other uses the investment which otherwise would be in gasoline inventories. This amounts to an average of $2,500 per dealer.

"If there is any suspicion or resentment by any dealers or dealer groups, it certainly appears that Union Oil Co.'s retail consignment

program is a greatly misunderstood one. It does not remove any aspect of a dealer's independence other than giving us the right to name the dealer's selling prices. It has not been used to create or disturb any retail price situations and instead has, as a matter of fact, contributed materially to the economic welfare of our dealers.

"If we were today to withdraw the consignment program as it is now set up, we know that such action would be bitterly opposed by our dealers. Any problems that are laid at its doorstep—and there were some problems as there are in any new program—have been corrected to the point that a survey of our dealers today would reveal that the great majority of them are heartily in favor of consignment. We are able to offer the names of hundreds of our dealers who are in favor of the program." Id., at 86–87.

[7] The basic agreement in force during most of the period when Simpson was a consignee provided that his commission was 1½ cents per gallon more than the amount by which the price at which the company authorized him to sell exceeded a posted 'tank wagon" price applicable to those gallons. However, if the authorized price fell below a posted "minimum retail" price, the commission was reduced by 50 percent of the diffeernce between "minimum retail" and "authorized" retail. In no event could the commission be less than 5.95 cents for regular and 5.75 cents for ethyl.

Shortly before Simpson ceased to be a consignee the program was changed. The guaranteed minimum was eliminated and the consignee absorbed 20 percent of the difference if "authorized" prices fell below "minimum retail." If the "authorized" price exceeded "minimum retail," the commission increased by 80 percent of the excess, as compared with 100 percent thereof under the former plan.

[8] See Klaus, Sale, Agency and Price Maintenance, 28 Col. L. Rev. 312, 441, 443–454 (1928).

[9] A. A. Berle recenty described the critical importance of price control to money making by the large oligarchies of business, or the "behemoths" as he calls them:

"Are these behemoths good at making goods—or merely good at making money? Do they come out better because they manufacture more efficiently—or because they 'control the market' and collect unduly high prices from the long-suffering American consumer?

"Again, no one quite knows. It is pretty clear that most prices are established only partly by competition, and partly by administration. Economists are just beginning to wrestle with the problem of 'administered' prices. The three or four bigs in any particular line are happy to stay with a good price level for their product. If the price gets too high, some smart vice president in charge of sales may see a chance to take a fat slice of business away from his competitors.

"But while any one of the two or three bigs knows he can reduce prices and start taking all the business there is, he knows, too, that one or all of his associates will soon drop the price below that. In the ensuing price war, nobody will make money for quite a while.

"So an uneasy balance is struck, and everyone's price remains about the same. Shop around for an automobile and you will see how this works. Economists call it 'imperfect competition'—a tacitly arcepted price that is not necessarily the price a stiff competitive free market would create. Only big concerns can swing this sort of competition effectively.

"We do not really know whether bigs make more money because they are efficient or because, through their size, they can 'administer' prices." Bigness: Curse or Opportunity? New York Times magazine, Feb. 18, 1962, pp. 18, 55, 58.

[10] In *General Electric* the consignee was responsible for lost, damaged or missing items from the stock in his possession and the consignor assumed all risks of fire, flood and obsolescence, while in the instant case the consignee is "responsible to consignor for all gasoline consigned to him, or for loss thereof or damage thereto from any cause whatsoever other than earthquake, lightning, flood, fire, or explosion not caused by his negligence and will pay consignor for all gasoline sold, lost or damaged."

In *General Electric* the consignees were, in their regular business, wholesale or retail merchants of other merchandise and some of them had previously so handled the consignor's lamps, while in the instant case the consignees, although some of them had previously been regular retail merchants, deal exclusively in the consignor's gasoline.

General Electric Co. paid "all" taxes assessed on the stock of lamps, whereas Union Oil pays only property taxes.

General Electric Co. carried "whatever insurance is carried" on the stock held by consignees, while Union Oil apparently is not obligated to carry any insurance.

May 1—Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's issue of the Stars and Stripes-the National Tribune, there appeared an editorial regarding Loyalty Day which will be observed on May 1. It is an important observance and, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert this fine editorial in today's RECORD.

The editorial follows:

MAY 1—LOYALTY DAY

On May 1 millions of Americans will observe Loyalty Day, an occasion which is assuming greater and greater importance to citizens of this great Republic.

We recall the valiant efforts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to have official recognition given to Loyalty Day, and we know that for the past 9 years it has been recognized by Federal, State, and municipal authorities as a day to reaffirm our steadfast convictions to the principles of American democracy.

Loyalty means many different and diverse things to the people of this land. It means adherence to the rights of others, their right to disagree, their right to their own privacy, and their right to worship as they please. To others it means love of flag and love of country.

The day offers an opportunity to take stock of the priceless heritage which is ours and to compare our benefits and privileges with those accorded to the citizens of less fortunate countries. We think back to the bleak existence of persons in the totalitarian states and realize that their fate may be ours if we are not constantly vigilant in upholding and defending those rights and blessings which we are inclined to accept as a matter of course.

We live in a country where peace, liberty, personal security, and other untold blessings are matters of common acceptance.

We should take note that our present situation did not just happen. It was brought about by the courage, determination, and steadfast loyalty of our pioneer ancestors. They overcame tremendous burdens and hazards to provide us with the form of government which is ours today.

We should be especially cognizant and grateful for their heroic efforts in providing for us the American heritage. We can give partial demonstration of our appreciation by participating in Loyalty Day rites on May 1.

Civil Rights Bill Is Not Morally Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Newberry Observer of Newberry, S.C., has printed an important editorial on the so-called civil rights legislation. This editorial is entitled "Civil Rights Bill Is Not Morally Right." In view of the very valid and good point made in this editorial, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL IS NOT MORALLY RIGHT

A comment by President Johnson sticks in our throat like so much hot mush. He was quoted as saying that "we will pass the civil rights bill because it is morally right."

We have yet to see the reasoning behind the bill that would tend to destroy the States' control of their own voting requirements; one which would stretch the commerce clause beyond recognition; one that would wrongly invoke the 14th amendment; one that would undermine the most precious rights of property; and, Mr. President, one that would raise grave questions of citizens' right to jury trial.

Is it "morally right" to pass a bill which would open new doors to the forces of Government regimentation? Is it "morally right" to pass a bill that would ultimately inflict equal harm on every race?

We think not. And we are grateful indeed to the many Senators who are continuing the battle against passage of this indecent piece of legislation.

In the same issue of a publication which carried the above quote from the President, was another headline which caught our attention. It informed that "Mail Shows Much Opposition to Civil Rights Bill."

Mail pouring into the offices of Senators indicates there is considerable opposition to the civil rights bill, the UPI story revealed. And, the story quite emphatically stated, all of it is not confined to the South.

The source said that letters from Minnesota residents run as high as 90 to 95 percent in favor of the bill. But, the report continued, Senator HUMPHREY's mail from outside his home State, which represents three-fourths of the 400 letters he receives daily, opposes the bill about 2 or 3 to 1. We are told, too, that Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, has started getting more anti-civil rights than pro-civil rights letters.

American citizens need to awaken to the fact that their mail can greatly influence the Senators. If the anti-civil rights mail continues, maybe those Senators pressing for its passage will awaken to their grim mistake before it is too late.

Orville Freeman's Own Wire Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, communication and control is a phrase in the lexicon of the military which implies that if you have communications your chance at control is well assured. Apparently Agriculture Secretary Freeman, whose yen to control the American farmer is notorious, has heard about the value of communication. He has set up his own private wire service, at taxpayers expense, of course, and as soon as he drives the taxpaying, free-enterprise communications people out of business he will have complete control. This remarkable continued story of Orville's anxious acquisition of a hotline monoply between the farmers and their customers, entitled "The American Tass," has now reached chapter 3 under title "The Case of the Reluctant Dragon." At least, that is the way the New York Journal of Commerce put it in the following editorial on April 21:

THE AMERICAN TASS—PART 3: THE CASE OF THE RELUCTANT DRAGON

The Department of Agriculture has shown no signs as yet of abandoning the market wire service on perishables it opened last summer under an arrangement with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. But neither has it done much to dispel the mysteries surrounding this curious operation. These continue, in fact, to deepen.

We described this operation at the time as an "American Tass" (the reference being to the Soviet news agency) for the reason that we saw in it precisely what the American Newspaper Publishers' Association saw in it—the first in what could develop into a series of Government wire services operating under conditions that could drive private services to the wall.

When this and other newspapers warned last year that USDA's move could well foreshadow further moves into competition with private services, Assistant Secretary George L. Mehren reacted with indignation. He found such charges "wholly false" and the products of "gross misrepresentations."

Since then documents have been discovered indicating that the Department officials have envisaged a far larger and more comprehensive service than they offer today.

Well back in 1962, USDA's marketing chief was informing A.T. & T., in fact, that "we can envision within a few years public extension drops [subscribers] from coast to coast for most all products."

So the dragon is hardly dead. He may seem dormant for the moment, reluctant to venture any further from his cave until he can get a better measure of what opposition is likely to show up. It stands to reason that the less there is, the more we shall presently see of the dragon himself.

Restaurant Association Honors Grady Putnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington selected and honored Mr. S. Grady Putnam as "Restaurateur of the Year." Having been a longtime neighbor and friend of Mr. Putnam, I was personally pleased by this honor bestowed upon him. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a short news release on Mr. Putnam and his selection for this award.

S. GRADY PUTNAM SELECTED "RESTAURATEUR OF THE YEAR"

S. Grady Putnam, manager of the S. & W. Cafeteria, Washington, an area restaurateur for the past 30 years, was selected "Restaurateur of the Year" by a committee of the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington.

A native of North Carolina, Mr. Putnam graduated from Gardner-Webb College in North Carolina and attended Lincoln Memorial University in Tennessee. In 1959 he received a distinguished alumni citation for outstanding achievement from Gardner-Webb.

He entered the restaurant field in 1927 in North Carolina. In 1930 he worked with the S. & W. Cafeteria organization in Knoxville, Tenn., and Atlanta, Ga. He came to Washington in 1934 when the first area S. & W. Cafeteria opened here and served as assistant manager. In 1938 he became its manager, a position he now holds.

Mr. Putnam joined the restaurant association upon his arrival in Washington and in 1942 served as its president. He has always been active in the association, serving on many of its committees and currently is on its board of directors. During World War II he served on the Industry Advisory Committee to the Office of Price Administration on food rationing for this district.

Active in civic affairs, he is a charter member of the Loughborough Lions Club of Bethesda, Md. During his term as president of the Wood Acres Citizens' Association he spearheaded a move for a recreation center which was dedicated in 1947 and named the Grady Putnam Field. From the board of trade he received a certificate of award for 25 years' interest in the development of the Nation's Capital. He also is a member of the Merchants & Manufacturing Association, the Izaak Walton League of America, Kenwood Country Club, and the National Lodge (Masonic Order).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

An Answer to Misleading Charges About the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1964

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, is more familiar with the provisions of the civil rights bill than are most Members of Congress, because he guided the measure through the House of Representatives.

The Representative from Ohio had a summary prepared at his request, and under his supervision. It answers very thoroughly many of the misleading charges which have been hurled at the civil rights bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorandum submitted by the distinguished Congressman from Ohio.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL (H.R. 7152), A SUMMARY PREPARED AT THE REQUEST AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, REPRESENTATIVE TO CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT, OHIO, APRIL 23, 1964

False and misleading charges are being directed at the civil rights bill now in the Senate.

To those people who believe in equality under the law, who support the Constitution, and who love liberty for themselves and for others, the civil rights bill is moderate in scope, and in accordance with the best traditions of America.

Here is what the civil rights bill does and does not do.

EDUCATION

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to transfer students among schools to create racial balancing.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to dictate to schools or teachers as to what they must teach.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to force religious schools to hire teachers they do not want.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the course content or day-to-day operations of public or private schools.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the job or seniority rights of schoolteachers.

The bill does authorize the Attorney General to bring civil suits to desegregate public schools where individual citizens are too poor or are afraid to bring their own suits.

Only at and after the request of a school board, the bill would authorize the Commissioner of Education to furnish limited technical and financial assistance to those public schools which need assistance in desegregating.

HOUSING

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell any home or apartment owner or real estate operator to whom he must sell, rent, lease, or otherwise use his real estate.

BANK LOANS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a bank, savings and loan company, or other such financial institution to whom it may or may not make a loan.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNIONS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the day-to-day operations of a business or labor organization.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to require an employer or union to hire or accept for membership a quota of employees from any particular minority group.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to destroy the job seniority rights of either union or nonunion employees.

The bill does authorize a bipartisan commission to investigate charges that an employer has refused to hire or that a union has refused to accept for membership an individual solely because of his race, sex, color, religion, or national origin. If the Commission cannot dispose of the charge through the voluntary cooperation of the employer or union, the Commission must either drop the charge or bring a civil suit in a U.S. district court. In court the Commission must prove its charge by a preponderance of the evidence.

This authority is weaker than that granted to 25 State commissions under State law. And, where a State commission is doing its job, the Federal Commission may not interfere.

FARMERS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with a farmer's operation of his farm.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to impose minority quotas upon a farmer's farmhands or tenants.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with membership in farm organizations.

The bill only requires that a farmer, having 25 or more employees, may not refuse to hire an employee solely because of the color of his skin or his religion.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND VETERAN'S BENEFITS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to deny or interfere with an individual's right to receive social security or veteran's benefits.

VOTING

The bill neither authorizes nor permits the Federal Government to interfere in a State's right to fix voter qualifications.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to practice "judge shopping," or otherwise interfere with the local Federal judiciary.

The bill does provide limited procedural safeguards to assure that citizens are not denied the right to vote because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

HOTELS AND RESTAURANTS

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell general retail establishments, bars, private clubs, country clubs, or service establishments whom they must serve.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with or destroy the private property rights of individual businessmen.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a lawyer, doctor, banker, or other professional man whom he must serve.

The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a barbershop or beauty shop owner whom he must serve, except that such establishment, if located in a hotel, must serve all patrons of that hotel.

All the bill does is to require that the owners of places of lodging (having five or more rooms for rent), eating establishments, gasoline stations, and places of entertainment are to serve all customers who are well-behaved and who are able to pay.

This requirement is weaker than the public accommodation laws of 32 States. And, where these States properly enforce their laws, there is no reason for the Federal Government to interfere.

RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL

The civil rights bill contains no primary criminal penalties. Only civil actions are authorized, to prevent an individual from continuing to violate provisions of the bill. Historically and according to the Constitution, jury trials are not authorized in these types of cases. The laws of the 50 States are the same in this regard.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The bill does not permit the Federal Government in any way to interfere with freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

GRANT OF DICTATORIAL POWERS TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A majority of the States have enacted legislation which is as strong or stronger than the major provisions of the civil rights bill. Nothing in the bill interferes with the effective enforcement of these State laws. And, where these laws are being effectively enforced, there is no reason for the Federal Government to interfere in States' rights.

In each title of the bill, effective administrative and judicial safeguards are provided. Federal officials are granted no final authority to withhold Federal financial assistance or impose penalties upon citizens. Every citizen is guaranteed his day in court with all the judicial safeguards that the Bill of Rights guarantees.

STATE CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

A majority of States have strong civil rights legislation which is effectively enforced. The Federal civil rights bill specifically provides that the Federal law will in no way interfere with the right of those States to continue enforcing their laws. And, where the States do so, the Federal Government will have no cause to enforce the Federal civil rights law in those States. Thus, for the Americans who do not discriminate against their fellow citizens because of race, color, or religion, the Federal civil rights bill will have no effect on their daily lives.

History of the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Chesapeake Bay, and Operations of the Maryland Port Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 3, 1964, Alfred W. Kabernagel, director of port operations of the Maryland Port Authority, addressed the Eastern Shore Society, at the Emerson Hotel, in Baltimore, Md.

Choosing as his subject "Land, Water, and Sky," Mr. Kabernagel reviewed the history of the Eastern Shore of Maryland, the Chesapeake Bay, and the operations of the Maryland Port Authority. I believe Mr. Kabernagel's informative remarks will be of value to my coleagues; so I ask unanimous consent that his speech, entitled "Land, Water, and Sky," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND, WATER, AND SKY

(Speech before the Eastern Shore Society, Apr. 3, 1964, by Alfred W. Kabernagel, director of port operations, Maryland Port Authority)

This subject was chosen for the reason that it allows the speaker almost unlimited scope. However, by "land," I have especial reference to the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The word "water" means principally the Chesapeake Bay of Maryland and Virginia.

THE CHESAPEAKE BAY

The Chesapeake is the largest bay in the Western Hemisphere with the exception of Hudson Bay in Canada. In Maryland alone the shoreline of the Chesapeake Bay and tributaries has been estimated at 1,400 miles. Including Virginia, the shoreline equals an estimated 3,600 miles. This exceeds the ocean distance from New York to Oslo, Norway.

Its waters have furnished billions of dollars in seafood life to the State and the United States. It has furnished millions of citizens with some of the finest recreational pursuits. It made possible the location of some of the great cities of Maryland and afforded Baltimore the ranking of second port in the United States in foreign trade.

Has there always been a Chesapeake Bay? According to some geological theories, the answer is "No." It is an accepted geological premise that in the Miocene Age, which represents some 3 to 10 million years ago, the entire eastern seaboard of the United States, from probably New York south, was covered by the waters of the Atlantic Ocean. In the Chesapeake Bay area, this premise is supported by the many fossil remains of sea life that have been found in the high bay cliffs of Calvert County and other areas. Fossilized clams, oysters, scallops, shark teeth, also the 7-foot jawbone of a whale, have been discovered in the Scientists' Cliffs of Calvert County. Artesian well digging in the Eastern Shore area has disclosed evidence at various depth of ocean sand and seashells of various types. This further supporting the theory that once upon a time the Eastern Shore area was under water.

Again, from geological history, we find that millions of years ago the sea receded and later there occurred the great fill-in. This means that from probably New York to Florida, the ocean retreated and thereafter filled in the lowlands of Jersey, New York, Delaware, Maryland, the Carolinas, the savannas of Georgia, and possibly the whole of the State of Florida.

It would appear by geological conclusion therefore, that wherever land is flat on the Atlantic seaboard, it represents land that originated from the sea. We can assume again that this evolution was responsible for the birth of the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

FIRST INHABITANTS OF EASTERN SHORE

Modern history supports the theory that the Dutch and Spanish entered Chesapeake Bay in the 16th century. They did not penetrate to any depth and it remained for the English Capt. John Smith, in 1602, to sail to the head of the bay to Havre de Grace. Surveys were made by small boat and this great seafarer left us a remarkable exact chart of the bay and its tributaries. Copies of these original marine maps may be seen at the Maryland Historical Society, the Tidewater Inn at Easton, and many other places in Maryland. Smith Island, east of Cape Charles, was named after Captain Smith. Tangier Island was originally named Russell Island after the physician on board John Smith's vessel. Captain Smith found the original inhabitants to be so-called Indians of the Powhatan Tribe. Much of this information has been acquired from the volume titled "This Was Chesapeake Bay," by Burgess, and from other Maryland historical sourecs.

THE MONGOLIAN THEORY

I have used the term "so-called Indians" in view of unquestioned evidence that the Indians of North and South America are not Indians, but are actually Asiatics. They presumably entered North America from Asia and Siberia millions of years ago by the short 94-mile voyage across the Bering Sea to Alaska, or by easy boat stages from west to east via the Aleutian Archipelago. Soil, water, and the chemicals therein, along with the sun caused changes in stature, skin color, height and other things but the basic race origin in humans, unless mixed, does not change. It has been said that if we would place an Indian baby alongside an Eskimo or Chinese baby, they would be found physically and biologically similar. The bone structure, color of eyes, skin, texture of the hair, and other things are the same.

This brings to mind a U.S. Army story of World War II wherein our land forces suffered numerous initial setbacks in the Pacific jungle fighting against the Japanese. The Japanese were masters at camouflage, infiltrations; they yelled, blew whistles prior to attack; used many tactics not considered as within the category of classical warfare. In need of immediate instructions to field jungle commands, the then Pentagon requested advice from a retired U.S. Army general who had many years' fighting the Huks and Moros of the Philippines. When asked if he had knowledge of any treatise already in print, that contained information on how to fight the orientals of Asia, he recommended the book titled "Custer's Last Stand." "But, General," the Pentagon replied, "Custer fought American Indians, not Japanese." The general answered "they are the same." They are basically Asiatics. They fight alike, they think alike and act alike.

Columbus was probably guilty of the misnomer "Indian" as applied to the first citizens of North America. The purpose of the voyage of Columbus was to find a shorter route to India. He assumed he had found India and hence called the natives of San Salvador, "Indians." So, my friends, the first inhabitants of the Eastern Shore were not Indians, they were probably Asiatics, and Pocahontas, who pleaded for the life of Capt. John Smith, may have been a fine little Chinese girl.

BOATS AND NAVIGATION

Our knowledge of farming and agriculture is less than 5,000 years of age. Our original ancestors must have been carnivorous or meat eaters. From this we can assume the first occupation of necessity was "hunting." Probably the second, "boat building" and "navigation."

The discoverer of "buoyancy" could have been some caveman who fell overboard and found he could float himself by clinging to a log. By tieing six logs together with vines, he had a raft capable of transporting his family across some river to better hunting grounds. First means of propulsion was probably by pole method. Finding the pole unusable in deep water, the paddle was born. Two paddles are better than one, hence oars were invented. Then came sail, first of leaves and grass until the making of cloth and canvas.

Sail has been superseded by steam; diesel power came next, and presently we are in the nuclear age of marine propulsion.

The use of steam as applied to navigation should be of interest. First record of steam on land was by Hero of Alexandria, 130 B.C. Temple doors were operated by steam power in the 12th century. However, Denis Papin, a French physicist, in about 1680 gave us the cylinder, the piston, and the safety valve. This made possible the first practical reciprocating engine using steam. Prior to Papin was Somerset in 1663, and after Papin came Newcomer in 1705 and Watts of Scotland in 1763. In the United States, Mr. Fitch of Philadelphia designed and built a successful steam-driven ferryboat in 1797. Hence, Philadelphia became known as the cradle of steam navigation in the United States. In 1807 Robert Fulton designed the *Clermont* which made the successful trip from New York City to Albany. Captain Tripp, a distinguished Eastern Shore citizen from Dorchester County, in 1813 designed and built the first successful steamboat to operate on the Chesapeake Bay.

The side paddle wheel steam vessel design by Fulton proved unsuccessful on the Mississippi River by reason of insufficient power to combat the strong currents. It remained for Colonel Shreve of Louisiana to design the wide stern paddle wheel that extended the entire width of the vessel. Freight was now carried successfully from St. Louis to New Orleans. Passenger trade soon developed by adding a second deck to these Mississippi steamboats. The passenger deck was divided into rooms and named after the various States of the Union. Hence they were called staterooms, a strictly American term. They somehow omitted the State of Texas. As a compromise they named the pilot house the Texas house. The term is still used today on some modern craft operating on the Mississippi.

Without question, ships have proved the most economical vehicle of transportation ever devised by man. A ship carries more burden weight as compared to its own weight than any other medium of transportation. Also, no nation ever became a great nation without merchant ships.

We can trace the origin of many races by their type of watercraft. If we accept the theory that civilization originated somewhere in the area of the Holy Land, that 12 tribes formed the nucleus of civilization, we find that the tribe of Ham, or the Negroids, moved south to eventually cover all of Africa. How about the Negroids of Australia and New Guinea, thousands of miles from Africa? There is no question that they proceeded there by boat across the Indian Ocean. This is confirmed by the design of present watercraft used by the headhunters of New Guinea and in other primitive Pacific areas where boats are used that are almost identical in design to those used in Africa today.

Other tribes, such as the Goths, Visgoths, Ostrogoths, the Normans, Britons, Teutons, Slavs, Druids, Picts, Celts, and others, moved northeast and west and settled in what is now Europe, Russia, France, Spain, and the Scandinavian areas. All perfected their particular type of boat design. The Asian preferred skin boats; they are still in use by the Eskimos. The Vikings designed heavy, seaworthy woodcraft that were able to withstand the rigors of the roughest oceans.

There is no question that Columbus was a very late comer to the Western Hemisphere. Columbus landed at San Salvador in 1492. Almost 500 years before Columbus, or about the year 1000, there was an established church at Thule, Greenland. Iceland had a parliament of sorts prior to 1000. This brings to mind historical reference to a Greek captain named Pytheas who sailed out of Marseilles, France, in a vessel 90 cubits long. A cubit was the first unit of measurement created by the Egyptians. Later on came digits, feet, hands, etc. A cubit represents the distance of a man's forearm from the tip of the middle finger to the elbow, or about 21 inches. The vessel was about 160 feet long.

Captain Pytheas sailed the Mediterranean, through the English Channel, around the north of Scotland to Iceland some 500 miles to the northwest. He sailed 2 or 3 days west out of Iceland and saw land. This, no doubt, was Greenland, less than 250 miles from Iceland. The year was 330 before the birth of Christ. You can read about this in a volume titled "The World's Greatest Adventures and Exploration," edited by Vladimer Steffenson. If Captain Pytheas could approach North America in such close proximity more than 18 centuries before Columbus, others must have also preceded Columbus and established settlements in North America.

MODERN SHIPS

Our Army, Navy, Air Force, and other services, would be rendered operationally impotent without supplies. Battleships are designed toward invulnerability against enemy attack. They carry only limited supplies; same with the Army and Air Force. To function effectively, they must be heavily supplied and constantly supplied.

In World War II, 85 percent of military supplies were transported in merchant ships; in the Korean war, 87 percent. Sixty 10,000-ton merchant ships per month arrived in Pusan and Inchon to keep our troops in supplies in Korea. The Hearst columnist, Drew Pearson, stated the 6th U.S. Fleet in the Mediterranean requires 35,000 to 45,000 barrels of fuel oil daily. This is but one of tens of thousands of items as food, medicine, tools, maintenance supplies, ammunition, etc. Despite great scientific advancement in weapons and implements of war, modern armies and navies use more supplies than in former years. Admiral Mumma, U.S. Navy, retired, wrote an interesting report in the American Rifleman magazine a few years ago. The admiral, a specialist on small arms, stated that at the Battle of Gettysburg it required 286 rounds of ammunition to kill 1 soldier. In the Korean war, it required 50,000 rounds to kill 1 Communist. In World War II, as in World War I, we were short of troop transports and freight vessels. We paid the British $100 million just for the *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* to carry our troops to Australia and other areas in World War II. To depend again on foreign ships to guarantee supplies to our military forces would amount to military and national suicide. By reason of the advent of rockets and missiles, we will not again have 2 or 3 years opportunity to build a merchant fleet as this great country was able to do in World War I and World War II.

Modern merchant ships are now among the largest in the world. The MV *Universe Leader* is over 900 feet in length and a 125-foot beam. Many now carry 60,000 tons of cargo.

The MV *Ore Mercury* carried over 50,000 tons of iron ore on one trip into Baltimore in 1963; others, the *Cosmic, Nini, Epic, Bandac*, carried 34,000 to 49,000 tons in single trips to Baltimore. Fifty thousand tons is not very impressive when said quickly, but I point out that to duplicate this transportation feat in railroad cars at 50 tons capacity each would require 1,000 railroad cars. To attempt this by 5-ton trucks would entail 10,000 5-ton motortrucks. To operate such trucks 24 hours daily, as the vessel is operated, would require 3 drivers per car, or a total of 30,000 drivers. The total crew on the *Ore Mercury* is 63 men. So you see the previous statement that a ship has been the most economical means of transportation ever devised by man is neither an exaggeration or an untruth.

MARYLAND PORT AUTHORITY

The Maryland Port Authority was created by an act of the General Assembly of Maryland in 1956, for the prime purpose of increasing waterborne export and import commerce from and into the State. This to the benefit of all citizens of the State. Maryland, in my opinion, should have had a port authority 50 years ago. Houston, Tex., has had an active port authority for more than 30 years; New York over 50 years; London over 100; Liverpool over 150. Ports in Europe have equaled or exceeded that of Great Britain in the age of their port authorities. Since 1956 the Maryland Port Authority has accomplished many port improvements. Mr. J. L. Stanton, executive director of the Maryland Port Authority, has written an illuminating article appearing in the "Anglo-American Trade News" of London, dated March 1964, pointing out a 20th century renaissance of the port of Baltimore.

To date, the Maryland Port Authority has completed, or has undertaken, the following:

1. Purchase and development of Dundalk marine terminal. Initially expended $12 million; by 1965, will have expended a total of $19,500,000.
2. Rebuilt Hawkins Point pier at a cost of $3,041,900.
3. Purchased the former quarantine property for future waterfront development.
4. Completed negotiations for the purchase of the Locust Point Terminal at a final cost in 5 years of $30 million.
5. Designed and completed a marginal terminal and sheds at Cambridge, Md; $500,000 obtained from the Federal Government and $600,000 on loan by the Maryland Port Authority, or a total of $1,100,000. Channel dredged from 18 to 25 feet.
6. At Crisfield, Md., the port authority designed and completed harbor improvement to the extent of $851,900.
7. Along with other State, local, and Federal agencies, we have received approval to provide a 42-foot channel from Cape Henry to Baltimore. Completion of the project will be in 1965.
8. The C. & D. Canal is being improved at a total cost of $100 million.

There have been other improvements toward increase of marine trade in the State. I wish to reiterate again that shipping is accepted as the largest industry in the State affording direct employment to over 40,000, and indirect employment to more than 250,000.

I hope you have found these remarks of interest.

The opinions expressed are personal and do not of necessity reflect the opinion of others or that of any Federal, State, or municipal agency. I express sincere thanks for your attention.

Settlement of the Railroad Dispute

SPEECH

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in expressing great delight, and I think the delight of all Members of Congress and I am sure the people of the United States, in the settlement of the issues between railroad management and the brotherhood employees.

For almost 5 years the country has been plagued with one of the sharpest controversies that has developed in this country in the field of management and labor relations. President Eisenhower wrestled with this problem extensively and tried to help resolve it. President Kennedy had the matter come to a head, and he was really put to the test, as were we in the Congress, in trying to resolve the issues, and you are familiar with what we did. We had a right to rely on the assurances that these additional issues could be settled.

President Johnson has done, in my judgment, one of the most magnificent jobs. I have the highest commendation for the President, Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, and for all those who have worked with them in their untiring efforts to resolve these highly controversial and important issues in this field. It is one of the finest jobs that I have seen accomplished in my experience in the Congress.

I want to pay tribute to the management in the railroad industry and my compliments to the brotherhood for their efforts in really joining together for the first time in some 5 years with hard bargaining, as it was intended under the law, in joining the issues and arriving at a settlement.

I think we all owe them, and certainly President Johnson, and his associates our thanks for their untiring efforts and the accomplishment brought about in the settlement of this most controversial problem, and therefore relieving us of the responsibility, which would have been a very nasty thing. I commend all of those involved with this very worthy accomplishment.

The American people have been relieved of a very real threat that would have had dire consequences and caused suffering and hardship throughout the country.

I am sure we can look forward to cooperation and harmony within the railroad industry in the years to come.

The Polish Constitution of 1791: A Contribution to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 3, marks the 153d anniversary of the 3d of May Polish Constitution, from which I should like to quote:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

These words express the close ties of Polish liberalism with the ideals of our own American Republic. Seven million people of Polish descent live in the United States and, therefore, their May 3 commemoration, sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, is also our commemoration.

The Polish Constitution is one of many contributions of the Polish people to Western civilization. May 12 marks the 600th anniversary of the founding of the Jagiellonian University of Krakow, the only institution of higher learning in Poland with a continuous history. Among the university's alumni is Nicholas Copernicus, regarded by historians as the first major figure in the scientific revolution—a revolution which is still going forward. Of special interest to Americans is the large academy of medicine, now separated from the university, where a children's hospital and research center is being built, partly with U.S. grants.

Poland is now ruled by a Communist government, and I noted with dismay the increased persecution of the Catholic Church of Poland last summer. All Americans hope for the release of Poland from oppressive restriction of liberty. The commemoration of the 3d of May Polish Constitution is, therefore, an important day in our American common life.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

New Boston Looks Good to Visiting City Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the national and international city planners recently held a convention in Boston, Mass. They were interested in city planning, including the leadership and plans and work of the Boston redevelopment administration, an agency of the city of Boston.

In accordance with an article written by Anthony J. Gudis, appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of April 12, 1964, they were very much impressed with the progress made in Boston.

In my remarks, I include this informative article of Anthony J. Gudis:

NEW BOSTON LOOKS GOOD TO VISITING CITY PLANNERS: AMAZED—ENTHUSIASTIC—CHALLENGED

(By Anthony J. Yudis)

National and international city planners left Boston last week with some food for thought to digest on the long plane rides home, a diet furnished by the host city's massive plans for rebuilding itself.

Throughout the 5-day convention of the American Society of Planning Officials at the Statler Hilton, visitors had many questions about the city's program.

And there was no question, after polling some of the visitors, that they were impressed at what's happening in Boston.

Some were apprehensive about the comprehensiveness of the city's program and expressed a fear that in the haste to rebuild in a short time perhaps quality long-range planning principles may suffer and the results may be less than desired.

ONLY FRUSTRATION

One topic discussed at some length by the visitors was Boston's apparently unorthodox departure in planning functions that are unheard of in most cities.

This is the theory advanced by Development Administrator Edward J. Logue, that city planning and renewal functions both should be integrated, each complementing the other.

The purists in city planning concerned with long-range results took the position that mixing of the two violated all sound planning principles.

But the reorganization was defended by Logue who noted that "only an exercise in frustration" can be the result of trying to stem increasing blight with an aloof planning agency.

Also looked on with disdain by many of the planners was Boston's slogan of "Planning With People."

Leave it to the qualified planners and not the "mobs," was the general attitude. Logue, however, admitted it was impossible to plan a renewal program on a block-by-block consent basis and that, in theory, the citizen participation has a limit. In general terms he replied that the unmotivated just can't be motivated to take part.

But on the whole, "impressive" is the word used by many of the visitors who toured the renewal areas here.

WHAT AN ADVANTAGE

"I'm amazed at what Boston is doing," said John D. Spaeth, Seattle city planner, who recalls an earlier Boston visit.

He notes a "marvelous enthusiasm and obviously there's a spirit here that others would like to emulate in their areas. The most important thing that strikes me is the attempt to blend the new with old that is worthy of preservation."

Spaeth said he was impressed with the architectural talent lending itself in design advisory capacity to the city's renewal program and cited the advantage Boston and Cambridge enjoys in that respect.

"Boston's is one of the most dramatic in the country," notes E. H. Hendrickson, planning and public ways consultant, Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington.

Irving Hand, planning director, Metropolitan Planning Commission for Nashville and Davidson Counties in Tennessee, sees exciting things happening here and reminds us that in Nashville there is also a close relationship between planning and urban renewal.

THAT'S COOPERATION

"The emphasis here on rehabilitation and conservation is most significant—and I think the most difficult answer to urban renewal.

"Your Government center," said Hand, "is sure to become a focus for this community."

Hand said he was most impressed with the "tremendous citizen participation in Washington Park. This is the message I hope to take back with me." He made his remarks following a visit to Freedom House in Roxbury where civic leaders detailed their plans and hopes for a new Washington Park.

Toronto's commissioner of development, Walter Manthorpe, trying to sell his community on the soundness of a waterfront development, is looking at Boston for some selling points.

TOO MUCH AT ONCE?

Manthorpe says urban redevelopment is comparatively new in his city "and we are still exploring it, but I am going back very conscious of what you are doing here."

He is particularly impressed with the "enormous complexity of the program and the involvement of so many different agencies. I sometimes wonder if you aren't trying to do too much. But it certainly seems to be one of the biggest experiments in the whole of North America."

"I'm also impressed with the confidence you people have in the ability to achieve rehabilitation. In Toronto, I'm pessimistic about achieving this."

Manthorpe says he's been watching the waterfront development proposals and persuaded the Toronto developers of a similar project to hire Cambridge Planner Kevin Lynch as a consultant. Lynch, who served the same post for the local waterfront project, "has been very helpful in selling the project," said Manthorpe.

Manthrope notes that the Toronto Board of Trade has been opposed to the idea of a fancy residential waterfront and he has to sell it on the idea. He notes the board is equivalent to the Boston Chamber of Commerce, which on the opposite pole, has initiated and financed the planning of the Atlantic Avenue waterfront.

NOW THAT'S LOW COST

Charles A. Blessing, director of city planning for Detroit, says that from what he has seen around the country, "Boston in terms of vitality is setting a high mark."

The compliment is more meaningful considering Blessing's home base has achieved some major renewal accomplishments.

Blessing expressed some amazement at what he considers are the rental schedules sought for the Washington Park area. This would be a definite breakthrough in lower cost housing, he notes.

The effort to involve as many people in the planning process is fundamentally sound and needed, he thinks.

The waterfront project he sees as most promising and "it is certainly most logical to exploit the harbor and water as they intend to do."

He also liked the idea of transforming the old granite warehouses along the waterfront into apartments, "and the concept of leaving the North End as it is also is a sound one."

President Johnson's Leadership in Settlement of Railroad Labor Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Major Victory for Johnson," published in yesterday's Miami Daily News. The editorial commends President Johnson for his outstanding leadership in the settlement of the railroad labor dispute.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR VICTORY FOR JOHNSON

President Johnson can be forgiven his unabashed pride over setlement of the railroad crisis. He worked harder at avoiding the nationwide strike threatened for April 10 than he has worked at anything since assuming office last November, and he succeeded in resolving a dispute which had resisted the efforts of two other Presidents.

The disagreement between the railroads and their unions over work rules dated to 1959. Despite an overwhelming number of findings in support of the railroads' efforts to eliminate unecessary labor costs, the unions refused to come to terms.

Union leaders angrily resented well-founded accusations of "featherbedding." They fought doggedly to preserve the jobs and seniority of their members, and to some extent they succeeded.

Over 5 years of almost continuing strike threats, the case twice went to the Supreme Court, it was the subject of special studies by a Presidential commission, arbitration

board, and emergency board, and once, in 1963, Congress stepped in and forced renewed negotiations.

In short, it seemed that Government machinery had been exhausted when President Johnson on April 8 won his 15-day strike postponement and called both sides to the White House to begin negotiations.

The successful conclusion of those negotiations last week was undoubtedly the result of skillful mediation and reasonable compromise, but the greatest thanks go to the President for his willingness to risk the prestige of his office when a defeat would have been tragic.

Since fair terms for a settlement had been laid out numerous times and rejected by the unions, the agreement in which they gained additional concessions must be counted a union victory.

We wonder, however, how many victories of this kind the labor movement can stand. By carrying their resistance beyond reasonable bounds, the railroad unions have spelled out just how poorly equipped the Nation is to deal with strikes which would have disastrous economic results.

Is it any wonder that Congress, witnessing time and again the failure of the normal channels of mediation to achieve a settlement, is thinking of new legislation which would bring forced agreements—something unions have long professed to abhor?

We think it is significant that the public cheers in the railroad settlement are directed at President Johnson. Toward the railroads there is a sort of quiet sympathy. The railroad unions have gleaned a large measure of public resentment, and they deserve it.

O'Hara's Ringside View From Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post in its April 27 issue, under the byline of Phil Casey, has a most perceptive picture of our colleague BARRATT O'HARA's history as newsman, author, commentator, legislator, and all-around man.

Any further comment would be superfluous. I heartily commend its reading:

O'HARA'S RINGSIDE VIEW FROM CAPITOL

(By Phil Casey)

Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois, called by H. L. Mencken "the world's greatest authority on the history, ethics, and philosophy of pugilism," isn't much concerned about the present sorry state of the old sport. Could be worse, he said, and has been.

"Back in the old days," the Congressman said in an interview on the eve of his 82d birthday which is Tuesday, "the fist was the gentlest weapon they used. They fought with backswords and cudgels. Figg defeated Sutton for the British heavyweight championship in 1719 with a sturdy English rap over the shins with a cudgel."

And then, as now, the fighters usually got the short end of everything, while the managers and gamblers lived it up. There was a British fighter named Bourke, back in 1801, who took a terrible beating and then was thrown in jail for fighting. Poor Bourke was in the pokey 4 months. None of his friends would bail him out, because he was a loser.

O'HARA, who must be one of the most vigorous and alert octogenarians in history, wrote a history of boxing back in 1909, when he was 27 years old. Called "From Figg to Johnson," it was serialized in the Baltimore Sun by Mencken.

Figg was not really the first British heavyweight champion, O'HARA said. He was just the first one whose name O'HARA could find. The first one was a butcher who defeated the Duke of Albemarle's footman in 1681. A reporter for the Protestant Mercury, a British newspaper, covered the thing but neglected to get the butcher's name.

O'HARA, who did not even run for Congress until he was 66, has missed only two rollcalls in the past 11 years. He has a string of 2,207 rollcalls going for him and he is going to keep on showing up.

"I've shown up with a cut head, with torn pants, and feeling real bad," he said, "but I keep on doing it. I've even turned down invitations to the White House because I didn't want to miss a rollcall or a quorum call."

He missed one rollcall because a friend died. "I'd known him for half a century," said O'HARA, "and I figured I should go with him to the graveyard."

The Illinois Congressman's background is a varied, exciting one. At 14 he went on a Smithsonian Institution expedition in Central America and accompanied a military expedition marking the route for an interoceanic canal in Nicaragua. At 15, he enlisted in the Army and landed in Cuba just 3 days after Teddy Roosevelt. He is a veteran of both the Spanish-American War and World War I.

At 20, O'HARA was sports editor for a St. Louis newspaper, and at 21 he was sports editor for the Chicago American. Later, he was Sunday editor for the Chicago Examiner. He had attended the University of Missouri and Northwestern University and studied law on the side. He founded a magazine, Chicago magazine, that lasted several years, and at 30 became the youngest Lieutenant Governor in the history of Illinois.

He headed a commission that fought for the establishment of the first minimum wage law in Illinois. He took over the presidency of a Hollywood motion picture company formerly headed by the famous D. W. Griffith and left this to serve in World War I.

He became a prominent criminal lawyer, handling more than 200 murder cases, never losing a client to the electric chair. He had a nightly radio program for 5 years on an American Federation of Labor radio station in Chicago. He wrote several books, including a history and analysis of the Constitution. This was written with Marie Crowe, who is now his secretary here.

And after all this, at the age of 66 in 1948, O'HARA ran for Congress. He got elected as a Democrat while his district was voting for Republican Thomas Dewey for President. He got beat the next time around, but has been elected each time ever since, and he plans to keep on.

He took out a bound volume of his old magazine, which featured fact and fiction pieces, humor and sports and photos.

In one issue there was a cover photo of a "Chicago bathing girl," and it showed a pretty girl who looked as though she had dressed for a blizzard. And there was some interesting stories: "Mary Elizabeth's House" (being the mishaps of a bevy of six Chicago maids); "Their Secret Sin," and a three-part serial, "O'Reily, the Woman and the Empire—a 20th-century romance setting forth what a man will do for the woman he loves," written by O'HARA himself.

O'HARA not only does not mind his age, he revels in it.

"One of my biggest assets is my age," said O'HARA. "People resent being forced to retire at 65. They don't like the doors being closed to them. Even if they don't like me, they like to see me elected. I'm a part of them.

"Why, when I was first elected, there were more people coming to vote in wheelchairs and on crutches than had ever been seen before. I got the old people voting as well as the young. Once there was a Garden of Eden, and what remains of it, I'm sure, is my Second Congressional District in Chicago."

Survival Through Mineral Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, because of the importance of mineral resources and production to the economic growth, progress, and defense of the United States, I ask unanimous consent that an article which I have received from Dr. Charles Will Wright, former Chief of the Mining Division of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Dr. Wright makes several suggestions which deserve careful and thorough consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVIVAL THROUGH MINERAL STRENGTH: HOW THE UNITED STATES CAN ADD TO ITS MINERAL STRENGTH

The main concern today is how we are to supply future demands for minerals to maintain our industrial and military strength, as well as the needs of our growing population. The latter is being estimated to increase from 187 million to 350 million in the year 2000, or about double, and our gross national product may increase from about $480 billion to over $1,850 billion, or four times. There are several ways to meet these greater demands, namely:

1. Every effort must be made by our administration, through tax and tariff benefits, to encourage American mining companies, with interests abroad, to expand mine operations and development projects and to induce the World Bank, the Eximbank and the Inter-American Development Bank to extend credits to American mining companies, in which local mine investors and banks may participate, for mining and metallurgical projects, which will increase the output of minerals that are in short supply for export to the United States.

2. As the United States is the largest importer and consumer of minerals within the Western Hemisphere, it should urge the American Republics to establish a common market for mineral trade as well as a mineral policy that will be feasible and acceptable to all the republics, not in conflict with the objectives of the United States, and nonpolitical. This should be studied without delay by the local mines departments, the Pan-American Union, and the Inter-American Foundation.

3. Deterioration of our posture in international affairs is at the root of the assaults being made against our foreign enterprise. The outlook for improvement is dismal. In fact some of our mining companies are coming back home. United States and Canadian resources look very good to them now for the long pull. National mineral policy

should recognize this situation and give greater incentives to improvement of our self-sufficiency through stimulus of domestic production and development of its own mineral resources.

4. As our industrial and military strength lies in our ability to produce and acquire mineral products, the vital importance of stockpile is not sufficiently recognized. Those in control who threaten to dispose of them should realize the need to maintain our stockpiles and a defense reserve—protection against being deprived of foreign supply sources upon which we are dependent for many of the strategic metals and minerals.

5. Carry out the 10-year plan for the Americas, as outlined by the Alliance for Progress, to establish local reforms that will encourage development of each country's mineral resources, by private enterprise, and will increase mineral exports that will add to the economic welfare of the mineral producing republics. To avoid misuse of funds, aid should consist, as far as possible, of machinery and equipment for mine and metallurgical plants and supplies.

6. To ban shipments of machinery and strategic materials to the Soviet bloc, including Cuba, from the United States and to discourage such trade by the Western Powers that will build up their industrial and military potential as requested by the U.S. Government, whose wishes are now being ignored by Great Britain, France, Spain, and other countries.

The Red nations are directing their struggle for mineral strength principally against the United States. As metals are the indispensables for industrial and military power, they are striving to gain control of available sources of supply within the free world countries and are contracting with mineral producers for future deliveries. From 1954 to 1962 Communist-controlled nations increased their production of iron ore, steel, and chromite from one-fourth to one-third of the world's total; that of manganese ore and tungsten from one-third to over one-half; of aluminum, tin, lead, and zinc from one-fourth to one-third, and of copper from one-eighth to one-sixth, in 1962. These increases are most disturbing, as there was a corresponding decrease in that of the Western Powers. They reflect a growing competition to acquire mineral supplies by our adversaries.

The United States, with less than one-sixteenth of the world's population, consumes about one-sixth of the world's mineral output. It is largely dependent upon Latin America, the African states, and other free world areas for mineral supplies to maintain industrial and military supremacy. We are in danger of being deprived of some of our traditional sources, such as tin from southeast Asia, cobalt from the Congo, and manganese ore from Brazil, because of political changes and anti-American attitude within these countries, inspired by our adversaries. Communist influence has encouraged Mexico, Bolivia, Brazil, and Argentina to nationalize their mining industries. Argentina has increased income tax on American oil companies to 70 percent and Chile on American copper companies to 80 percent. This is regrettable, as local capital hesitates to invest in mining ventures, and in most cases they haven't the necessary technical and managerial staff or marketing facilities for large-scale operations.

Today's unbalanced situation of the supply and demand problem has been recognized by industry and the Department of Interior. To meet our emerging needs in the event of interruption of regular flow of mineral supplies from foreign areas, stockpiles have and are being accumulated. Fortunately, the vital importance of adequate supplies of strategic minerals is now being recognized by Congress and the President.

How One Iowa School Discourages Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of school dropouts is getting more and more attention, and some school administrators are even looking to Washington for a solution. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, however, to an example of how this problem can be met at the local level through the intelligence and ingenuity of students and their instructors.

At Frank L. Smart Junior High School in Davenport, Iowa, eight students who compose the bulletin board planning committee, and their adviser, Mrs. John Worthman, have come up with a hard-hitting, graphic illustration to all of their junior high school classmates on the value of staying in school through graduation.

They have covered an entire blackboard in one classroom with the help wanted columns of newspapers. Advertisements for menial jobs of the type those without high school educations might expect to get are circled in black. Printed in large letters across the top of the ads is the question, "So you want to quit school?"

A smaller sign over ads for waitresses, laundry workers, and window-cleaning employees warns, "Then your future is here." Across from this is a panel of help wanted ads in which a high school diploma is listed as one of the requirements. The warning sign there states, "This can never be your future."

I want to publicly commend Mrs. Worthman and her student committee for facing this issue so realistically at the local level. It is an idea which can be copied by other schools throughout the Nation.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to include the news stories from the Davenport (Iowa) Morning Democrat and the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, recognizing this valuable project. The stories follow:

[From the Morning Democrat, Apr. 16, 1964]

TAKE HEED, DROPOUTS

Students at Davenport's Frank L. Smart School are seeing graphic evidence of the bleak future that faces the school dropout.

An entire blackboard in one classroom is covered with the "help wanted" columns of newspapers. Advertisements for menial jobs of the type those without high school educations might expect to get are circled in black.

Printed in large letters across the top of the ads is the question, "So you want to quit school?"

A smaller sign over ads for waitresses, laundryworkers, and windowcleaning employees warns, "Then your future is here."

Across from this is a panel of "help wanted" ads in which a high school diploma is required. The somber sign there states, "This can never be your future."

It's all part of a growing campaign to halt mounting school dropouts in Davenport. School officials feel this presentation has been particularly effective.

It lets the student see exactly the types of jobs he can hope to hold if he drops out of school. Low wages and poor opportunities are emphasized.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, Apr. 16, 1964]

PROJECT AIM: DISCOURAGE DROPOUTS

(By Barbara Butler)

A group of Davenport junior high schoolers have launched a project to show their fellow students the need for staying in school.

The eight pupils who compose the bulletin board planning committee at Smart Junior High School, with their adviser Mrs. John Worthman, came up with the idea of graphically illustrating the job future of the school dropout along with that of the student who continues through graduation.

In the main hall of the school, where all students pass by during the day, a giant bulletin board is headed "So you plan to quit school."

The rest of the board is composed of a number of advertisements clipped from the help wanted columns of newspapers.

Over one group covering jobs for cleaning women, dishwashers, carhops, babysitters, and window cleaners is the heading "Then Your Future Is Here."

A second column including jobs which require a high school, and in some cases a college diploma, is headed "This can never be your future."

The presentation has been termed particularly effective by Davenport school officials who are exerting all-out efforts to keep all Davenport children in school until graduation.

Where the West Begins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this is the time of year when the travel sections of newspapers and magazines begin to burgeon with handsome layouts and advertising spreads extolling the virtues of various sections of America.

In a recent editorial, radio station WOW in Omaha joined the trend and urged its listeners to explore the vacation attractions in Nebraska which are both unique and easily accessible.

WOW addressed its invitation to its listeners in the Midwest region. I would like to extend the invitation—to cover the entire country. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE WEST BEGINS

Summer vacation time is almost here again. And while we don't have anything against the big trips—the New York World's Fair, and the like—we do think a lot of people overlook the vacation possibilities in Nebraska.

The slogan "Nebraska, Where the West Begins" is something more than inspiration

dreamed up in the Nebraska Game Commission.

Take longhorn cattle. They are not extinct—thanks to some Cherry County ranchers who rounded up the last of the big brutes in the 1920's. They number some 200 today and you can go up to Fort Niobrara, just outside Valentine, and see something right out of our frontier past. If you do, you will be one of the few alive ever to see a frontier longhorn. Fort Niobrara has also one of the largest buffalo herds in the country, along with elk, antelope, wild ducks, big fish—and dozens of prairie dog towns.

Then, there's Buffalo Bill's ranch just outside of North Platte, and Indian pow-wows at Macy and Winnebago Indian Reservations just north of Omaha. There is the National Homestead Monument near Beatrice, the home of Daniel Freeman, who was this Nation's first homesteader. Or the palatial home of Jay Sterling Morton in Nebraska City—the country's third Secretary of Agriculture and founder of Arbor Day. There is Fort Robinson, near Chadron, where the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur grew to manhood, the son of a famed frontier general. And this is but a sampling. Nebraska in its own way has much to offer. If you're planning a vacation, we recommend you investigate an all-Nebraska tour.

No Substitute for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, "No Substitute for Victory":

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR VICTORY—WORLD TAUNTED BY FAILURE

The towering figure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur fades into history and Americans are left to ponder on what might have been.

What would be the situation in the world today, had the war in Korea been won? Had this situation been celaned up, and the Communists thrown out, would there have been a Laos or a Vietnam? Or even a Berlin wall?

No one can say for sure, but most certainly we did not advance the cause of peace, and effect containment or a rollback of communism, by compromising the war on the same line where it had begun.

Korea is still divided and it, in a way, is a symbol of the division of the world into two irreconcilable systems. Only one will survive.

Since the death of General MacArthur a number of newspapermen have disclosed the contents of reported confidential interviews they had with him from time to time, and their articles have reflected his bitterness—and helplessness—at the trembling indecision of statesmen who could not see beyond the next election.

To General MacArthur, there was no substitute for victory—for us.

Both Washington and London have recoiled at references to the reported political "leaks" of military decisions to the Chinese Communists, and how the British exerted an undue influence on our Government to prevent our carrying the war to the enemy's "privileged sanctuaries."

The valor with which the British people met the onslaught on their tiny island country seemed to have vanished almost overnight. Korea was a long way away. But the fight against tyranny is never won.

As a career military man, General MacArthur did not speak out enough to have changed the course of events. He had been born and raised in the American tradition of military subsordination to civil authority.

Maybe it would have been better for this country, and for the world, had he spoken the thoughts which he reportedly unburdened in private to his friends.

The legacy of our failure in Korea haunts the world today. The Communists learned that if they press hard enough, but not hard enough to throw us into an all-out military effort, we will tire and compromise.

Communism thus has advanced methodically and purposely. That they guessed right, as a result of Korea, was proved in Laos. We settled again, and will lose it all. We are still in South Vietnam, but they are banking again that for them there is a substitute for military victory.

If a victory against the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam is not won, you can be sure that Cambodia and Indonesia, already turning away from the West, will read the final handwriting of history, and know that the MacArthurs are no longer with us.

Some Bum Guesses From a Federal Labor Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, farmers and governmental employment agencies are inexorably coming under the gun regarding the necessary recruitment of farm labor to replace the bracero.

Jack Pickett, a knowledgeable farm reporter for the California Farmer, had the following to say in the April 18, 1964, issue:

SOME BUM GUESSES FROM A FEDERAL LABOR MAN

(By Jack T. Pickett)

This tired and disgusted editor has before him a copy of the speech of Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. The speech was given at Tucson, Ariz., before the National Farm Labor Conference.

We would like to take portions of Mr. Goodwin's speech and debate with him.

Mr. GOODWIN. The biggest question in everyone's mind is, of course, can we meet the impending farm labor problems which could result from termination of the Mexican farm labor program under Public Law 78? The answer to that quetsion is, I think, yes—if we act now, if we plan our actions, and if we follow through with those plans once they are agreed on.

Mr. PICKETT. Looking ahead of the plans as outlined in your speech, Mr. Goodwin, we would be willing to bet that you are way off your base in your optimism.

Mr. GOODWIN. There are a few things I'd like to say about Public Law 78. I would start by saying that it has been a very useful program. Before it came into existence in 1951, the need for supplemental farm labor was, in large measure, being met by Mexican "wetbacks," and as a result there was both confusion and social injustice. The formal agreement between Mexico and the United States radically reduced the number of wetbacks. The apprehension of illegal entrants from south of the border by the Immigration and Naturalization Service had swollen to over a million a year by 1954. Now they number only a few thousand annually.

The Mexican program also has given a predictability to farm labor which is considered highly desirable by many growers. These braceros are a captive labor force and we must admit, this is unnatural in our free, competitive economy. Last year almost 187,000 Mexican nationals were brought into this country for farm work. For the most part, they arrived in areas where they were needed at the proper time; they came to the grower in good health; they were qualified to do the work; they stayed for the duration of the need for them; and they returned to Mexico when the need no longer existed. But their biggest single advantage to the employer was that their availability was controlled and predictable. They were there when the employer needed them; they returned home when he no longer needed them. They did not burden the farm community with their poverty when additional employment was not available to them.

From its beginning, Mexican workers had the benefits of transportation standards, housing inspections, and occupational insurance. The law provided the framework to enforce these improved working conditions not only for foreign workers, but to some extent for domestic workers as well. This has been all to the good.

Mr. PICKETT. Well, if it has been so good, why did your U.S. Department of Labor help stab the program in the back?

Mr. GOODWIN. If everyone today would accept the fact that no foreign workers would be available in 1965, I am sure that farm employers would meet their labor problem, with the assistance of the Farm Labor Service.

Basic to anything we undertake, must be the mental determination to forget about reliance on foreign workers, and resolve to meet our labor problem with domestic workers.

Mr. PICKETT. OK, Mr. Goodwin, the major farm organizations of California have shouted from the housetops that they have given up on the bracero program. Now let's see the replacements you seem so confident you can produce.

Mr. GOODWIN. We must—growers as well as the Federal-State Farm Labor Service—we must exert greater efforts in domestic recruitment than ever before. And right here, I want to pledge that the farm labor service will do its utmost to assist.

Mr. PICKETT. At this same labor meeting you addressed the California State Department of Employment officials who tried valiantly to round up some of the surplus farmworkers from other States, and out of a supposed total of 75,200 workers in other States they were able to recruit less than 500.

Mr. GOODWIN. In all probability, we will have to restructure some migrant routes through our annual worker plan, to funnel migrant workers into those areas which have in the past depended so largely on foreign workers.

Mr. PICKETT. Those are brave words, Goodwin, but you're whistling Dixie when you say you're going to "restructure some migrant routes." We think we have a pretty good bunch in our farm placement service in California and some of them are pretty discouraged about getting any appreciable increase in migrants into this State. And another thing. We have tried the annual worker plan and so far it's been a big failure in this State.

Mr. GOODWIN. But the primary goal will be to fill local farm jobs with local workers. Greatly improved use of day-haul programs, which provide local labor with increased mobility, will be adequate in many areas to offset labor shortages.

Mr. PICKETT. Wrong again, Mr. Goodwin. We will try hard on this, but California is

so generous with its welfare and unemployment payments that an unemployed city worker can get as much money for not working as he can for sweating it out in the fields.

Mr. GOODWIN. Specialized recruitment efforts aimed at attracting additional part-time workers such as youth, housewives, and handicapped workers are being used to good effect across the Nation now.

Mr. PICKETT. No, not quite clear across the Nation, Mr. Goodwin. In California we have a whole slew of laws, edicts, and bureaucratic rulings that keep women and strapping big kids from doing much in the way of farm labor.

Mr. GOODWIN. How do you attract more farmworkers? You offer them a better job. For one thing, that means you offer them better pay.

Mr. PICKETT. According to our friends in farm placement service, it's going to take a lot more than promise of more pay to attract any appreciable number of migrants to California. Apparently we have a lot to learn about just what types of people we are dealing with in the so-called migrant farmworkers. It looks as though they are not the desperate types that fled the Dust Bowl a few years back. Many own small farms of their own and simply refuse to go long distances to harvest strange crops. High wages will not solve the whole problem. We have a real complex problem that has been completely misunderstood and badly managed by the people who thoughtlessly and stupidly kicked the bracero program in the head.

Halibut Industry Opposes Senate Bill 1006 To Subsidize Fishing Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1964, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 285 to request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the 6-day period, May 18, 1964, through May 23, 1964, as National Halibut Week.

My purpose in introducing this legislation was to honor this segment of our fishing industry and especially, Mr. Speaker, to call attention to the present sad situation of the halibut fishermen.

I hasten to point out that the present unfortunate plight of this important industry I refer to is not due to a catastrophe such as the Alaska earthquake. Rather, our Government itself must accept a large share of the responsibility. I have in mind the action last year of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission opening the East Bering sea to the Japanese fishing fleet. This mistake was supported by Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and as a matter of fact Secretary Udall was the one who said that there was evidence that "new concentrations" of halibut had been found in the area.

This contradicted the testimony of Dr. J. L. McHugh, Division of Biological Research of the Bureau of Fisheries. Dr. McHugh stated that the scientific staff of the Halibut Commission had considerable evidence that this fish resource in the area of southeastern Bering Sea already was substantially utilized by American-Canadian fishing.

Leaders in the fishing industry such as Clarence R. Nordahl, Secretary of the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific had warned that the Halibut Commission had reasonable proof that the halibut fishery was already being fished to the maximum sustained yield.

And, referring to the almost 40 years of uphill effort to build a stable halibut fishery, George Johansen of the Alaska Fishermen's Union protested that the American fishermen were not agreeable to pacifying foreign exploiters who had done absolutely nothing conservationwise to build for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the protests of our fishermen went unheeded. The Government dealt an industry that had been already declining over the years what may be almost a mortal blow in its battle of survival.

This year our Pacific halibut fleet barely has been able to recover its expenses due to the depletion of the fisheries as a result of the United States agreeing to open the Bering Sea area to the Japanese which was previously prohibited to them. This eastern Bering Sea area now may well have to be closed and it may well take years of conservation to rebuild it.

A grevious error has been committed and there is no satisfaction for those of us who begged our Government to withhold action. I take no pleasure in saying "I told you so."

Now the Department of the Interior is pressing for passage of legislation which could further harm our present halibut operation. I refer to S. 1006 to subsidize the construction of new fishing vessels. The Department says this bill is needed to aid the Alaska fishing fleet following its loss and damage by the recent earthquake and tidal wave.

Mr. Speaker, this is discriminatory legislation. It would upgrade one part of an industry as against another. Why should one vessel owner receive a 55 percent subsidy and then be in competition with unsubsidized boatowners?

Last week S. 1006 was not considered in the House Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee, of which I am a member. Consideration was withheld at my request.

I wanted time to alert the fishermen I represent to the implications of this bill. As I see it, this bill is being pressed as a relief measure for Alaska. Meanwhile, the Small Business Administration is making 100 percent disaster loans available to fishermen in Alaska who lost their boats. Also, retroactive earthquake insurance legislation is being considered by a Senate committee.

Mr. Speaker, if the Nation would honor the halibut industry by declaring a Halibut Week in May, let us not make a memorial out of such action. Let us not destroy the existing halibut fleet by a subsidy to new vessels so we can set aside a week to honor a dying industry and glory in the past contributions of these fishermen.

I oppose S. 1006 and any legislation that discriminates by providing relief on an unequal basis. I hope Members of the House of Representatives will not support this bill as a relief earthquake disaster measure because it will do more harm than good.

I am for compensating Alaskans including fishermen, but their highly controversial subsidy method is the wrong way to do it and, by the way, S. 1006 is opposed by the following organizations: Fishing Vessel Owners Association, Deep Sea Fishermen's Union, Purse Seine Vessel Owners Marketing Association, Fishermen's Cooperative Association, Halibut Producers' Cooperative, and Fishermen's Marketing Association of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the north Pacific halibut fishermen need our help. Already the Government has done them great harm. Let us not add insult to injury. S. 1006 should not be enacted into law.

Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion in the public mind about recent decisions of the Supreme Court relating to prayer and religious observance in the public schools that there is pressing need for clarification in the public interest. Many sincere, devoted citizens are under the illusion these decisions forbid prayer and Bible reading. On the contrary, they preserved the religious freedom guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution by forbidding only State-required or State-sponsored prayer and religious observance. The facts are ably presented in a clarifying letter published in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 26, 1964, which I feel merits serious consideration. Under previous permission I introduce the letter signed by Ralph B. Kennard, as follows:

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

There are a number of proposals under consideration by the Congress which would change the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States to overrule recent decisions of the Supreme Court on religion in the schools.

These decisions have been widely misunderstood, and some people with deep convictions have been circulating petitions urging such a change. They believe that these decisions prohibit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. In fact they do nothing of the kind.

All the Supreme Court did was to state that it is not the business of any agency of the government to set up any religious practice and to require its use in the public schools. There was not a word against free, voluntary, unregimented prayer or Bible reading.

In the New York prayer case a school board chose a particular prayer and directed that it be used in the public schools. In Pennsylvania and Maryland the State legislatures required certain religious practices in the public schools. Pupils who did not wish to participate might be excused, but no exceptions were made for teachers whose convictions were in conflict with the required ritual.

These decisions of the Supreme Court are essential for the protection of our religious liberty. For we lose our freedom when we let the Government tell us in even the smallest degree what we must do in a matter of religion. This is an area reserved exclusively to the people.

The Government must stay out entirely. There is no middle ground. The adoption of any of the proposed changes to the 1st amendment would open a Pandora's box of religious rivalry and conflict. It will mean at least this: some agency of the Government will have the power to set up a religious ritual and require its use in the public schools. It would mean little to make participation voluntary, as all students would feel the social pressure to conform, and only a few with very strong convictions would abstain.

There is another and even more serious aspect to this question. An act that gives the Government the power to set up an establishment of religion would surely give it the power to support an establishment of religion. That is, the Government would have the power to give tax money to parochial schools. If this should be the result it would mean, in the end, the destruction of our great public school system as each religious group struggled against the others for a larger share of the tax dollar for its own school system. This is not an idle threat; it has happened in the Netherlands.

If we want to preserve our American way of life we must leave the 1st amendment alone. As it stands now it is the cornerstone of our regious liberty.

RALPH B. KENNARD,
Professor Emeritus, American University.
WASHINGTON.

Faith in Power Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union dated April 21, entitled "Faith in Power Is Essential":

LEMAY WARNS OF DANGERS—FAITH IN POWER IS ESSENTIAL

The voice of the military is being heard through the thunder of the Pentagon bureaucracy.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of the Air Force, contends the Soviet Union is slowly but surely reducing the military advantage held by the United States.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was responsible for a rebuttal to General LeMay in which the Pentagon compared the military power of the two countries, missile for missile and bomber for bomber, which showed that we are still supreme.

However, that didn't seem to be the point being made by General LeMay.

He believes, and so do many of our military leaders, that the administration's policy of "planned obsolescence" and its emphasis on purely scientific achievements in space at the expense of military developments, will at some time in the future find us facing the same kind of surprise that burst upon the world with the unexpectedly fast Russian development of the atom bomb and the H-bomb.

A military space platform, for instance, is not inconceivable and could be the surprise Russian achievement designed to muzzle all of freedom's guns and ground all our planes and missiles.

The liberals of America have placed great faith in the asertion of Premier Khrushchev that the Soviet Union has reduced its military forces as well as spending for conventional military purposes. Perhaps the figures are to be believed.

But what is more important, Khrushchev also indicated a great increase in spending in the missile field, not necessarily in production of present weapons, but in advanced technology. The Russians desperately search for the weapon that can upset the balance of power.

The testimony given by General LeMay before a congressional committee, and just made public, tends to support the argument of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER that the United States cannot afford to place too great a reliance on a single weapon or a single means of delivering atom bombs at this stage of technical and scientific knowledge.

As we do not depend on one missile but have three types, the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman, so perhaps, as urged by Senator GOLDWATER, we should continue to have alternate methods of delivering nuclear warheads.

The civilian leadership in the Pentagon has refused to spend enough money, in the view of the Air Force, on the development of "follow-up" missiles, on new methods of propulsion, on super-yield nuclear warheads, on the swifter development of antimissile defense systems, and while stopping production of B-58 and B-52 bombers, has refused to proceed with development of a fleet of supersonic bombers as another alternative to exposed fixed land missile bases.

The theory we need only enough military strength to discourage an attack, to make it too costly, is a good one, as long as the enemy doesn't tie your hands by equalizing your power, where military blackmail is possible, or achieve a technological or scientific breakthrough that could eliminate the opportunity of retaliation.

It seems too much to hope that we are in the process of canceling out war. Faith in power is safer than faith in men. Gen. Douglas MacArthur quoted Plato that "only the dead have seen the end of war."

Hon. Michael Kirwan

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 21, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10939) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege, upon this occasion, to add my personal expression of appreciation for the real contribution which has been, and is being, made to our great Nation by the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio.

His splendid work in the House and on the Appropriations Committee has always been characterized by loyalty, dedication, and steadfastness of purpose. As a friend and colleague, he is admired and respected by all of us for his fine personal attributes.

It is a pleasure to join with his myriad of friends and colleagues in extending the warmest of regards, good wishes for the future, and gratitude for his friendship.

Togo Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, April 27 celebrates another anniversary of Togo's independence. On this memorable occasion, we take pleasure in extending warm felicitations to His Excellency the President, Nicolas Grunitzky; and His Excellency the Togo Chargé d'Affaires to the United States, John Abalo.

Today marks the fourth anniversary of Togo's independence from France. Before that date, this small west African Republic had been under German protection and then after World War I under the French. In 1956 it became an autonomous Republic within the French Union. In a remarkably smooth transition, Togo began its independent life with a democratic form of government under the leadership of a prime minister and legislature 4 years ago.

Togo itself is a small, narrow country of 22,000 square miles which stretches northward from the Bay of Guinea to the boundary of Upper Volta. On the west it borders Ghana and on the east Dahomey. Hilly rather than mountainous, its coastal lagoons in the south give way to alternate stretches of forest, fertile land, and arid plains further inland. Its more than 1 million citizens are divided between different ethnic groups whose diverse languages have left French the only practical medium in commerce, government, and the schools. Most still follow traditional religions, although others have become Christians or Muslims.

In a series of economic and social development plans, Togo has continued the progress begun under the French. The emphasis has been on agriculture, which still remains the basis of the economy and the area of endeavor for most of the population. Industry is still little developed, although some factories, the most important that of phosphates, have been established. Local handicrafts and cottage industries still flourish in parts of the country. France remains Togo's primary trading partner, although the United States is also active.

Under a new constitution democratic forms of government have been preserved at both the national and local levels, which was approved in a referendum last year. Voters elect a national assembly and a president who is both chief executive and head of state.

We heartily extend our congratulations to Togo on its fourth birthday. It has large problems to face, but it has

done much toward their solution already. Let us hope it will do even more in the future.

Red Objectives Not Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union entitled "Red Objectives Not Changed."

DESPITE SINO-SOVIET SPLIT: RED OBJECTIVES NOT CHANGED

The struggle between Moscow and Peiping is real, deep, and ruthless, but it is one for advantage and not necessarily for keeps.

Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Red intellectual, looks down upon Premier Khrushchev, the peasant Red leader of the Soviet Union, and believes he alone is the true heir of Lenin and Stalin.

It is significant that Mikhail Suslov, the theoretician of the Moscow branch of the Communist Party, in a seven-page article in Pravda, revealed that the old Stalin Communists, such as former Premiers Molotov and Malenkov, who have supported Mao's line, have been read out of the party.

Thus Premier Khrushchev fights to retain his leadership at home and of the Communist movement throughout the world, a leadership that is challenged by Mao and his followers, not only in China but within the Soviet Union itself and in many other countries.

Moscow and Premier Khrushchev bank more on successful deception of Western leaders, to accomplish the communization of the world; the Red Chinese leaders believe in more direct revolutionary action, but, like Moscow, stop short of war.

Premier Khrushchev is practicing this deception in a high manner, while he seeks to rally as many other Communist countries and parties as he can and outmaneuver his personal enemy.

He lavishes praise on the foreign policies of President Johnson and the late John F. Kennedy. To him, at this stage, it is essential that the West be lulled into a position where it will not exploit the dispute within the Communist world.

He wants us to see him as a "reasonable" Communist, and the Soviet Union as a believer in "peaceful coexistence."

Too many Western leaders want to believe that a monolithic Communist conspiracy is cracking up. But, Dr. Rodger Swearingen, director of the Research Institute of Communist Strategy and Propaganda at the University of Southern California, says international communism has never been unified or coordinated, and now, because of the power available to individual leaders and countries, the present situation "becomes highly significant and dangerous to the free world."

Americans like to think the communism of Red China presents a danger greater than that of Moscow. Dr. Richard L. Walker, director of the Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, warns that "a soft line of peaceful coexistence from Khrushchev is infinitely more dangerous and convincing and is likely to evoke more concessions if it contrasts with war threats from Mao."

The Communist Party in the Soviet Union too often is seen as mellowing and slowly turning toward capitalism, even as Premier Khrushchev tells Hungarians that goulash is more important than revolutions.

Dr. Philip Moseley, director of the European Institute of Columbia University, says that "* * * to assume that Communist parties can be permanently 'domesticated' and won over to a genuine respect for parliamentary and free institutions would be a great mistake."

No person in the U.S. Government today has had more experience in dealing with the Reds than W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Far Eastern affairs. In an address he declared:

"This is the time for all countries to redouble their efforts to help people who are struggling to resist Communist subversion and aggression."

Such an opportunity may never come again. We should make the most of it.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the two articles that follow appeared in the Washington Star of April 23. They should be read together. First, the one by Mr. David Lawrence, which brings out, once again, the fact that our policy in foreign affairs changes from day to day. It is not clear to our own people, and completely incomprehensible to our friends and allies.

The second article, by Mr. Richard Wilson, brings to our attention the long-range objectives of the Russian foreign policy that are always kept in focus, and from which no deviation is tolerated. The article was inspired by ex-Ambassador Murphy's recent book.

The Russians have a policy that they know and understand. It is no wonder that they are nibbling away so successfully when their only opposition is a changing mirage.

The articles follow:

FORGIVE, FORGET FOREIGN POLICY—NEW AMERICAN MOOD REFLECTED IN CUBAN MISSILE DEVELOPMENTS

(By David Lawrence)

There seems to be a new motto that describes the trend in American foreign policy—"forgive and forget."

The new mood is reflected in developments in Cuba. It has been revealed, for instance, that the Soviet Union is planning to turn over the operation of its antiaircraft missiles in Cuba to the Castro government on May 1, and will withdraw about 3,000 of the 4,000 Soviet troops now in Cuba. It is not clear yet whether Moscow will retain a veto over the firing of the missiles or whether the power of decision will be left with the Russian "technicians" who are to remain on the island.

Not a single public protest, however, has been made by the U.S. Government to the Soviet Government over the continued presence in Cuba of Soviet technicians and missiles. The last official word on the subject, so far as the public is concerned, was spoken in October 1962, at the time of the missile crisis. Despite efforts then to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all Soviet forces and missiles, the United States has had to be content with a long-drawn-out maneuver. But the Soviets still maintain their original position. They insist on giving armed assistance to a government in this hemisphere, and a military base has been established by a European power in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine and of a recent resolution by Congress.

The tendency here is to assume that nothing serious will develop and that, even if the Castro government fires any of its antiaircraft missiles and damages or downs any of the U-2's or other planes which are engaged in occasional air inspection of Cuba, the United States will not hesitate to take retaliatory action.

But the controversy is deliberately continued to the United States and Cuba. Apparently the crime committed by the Soviet regime in invading the Western Hemisphere and supplying arms and weapons and technicians to a country only 90 miles away from the United States is to be forgiven or forgotten. Certainly there is a hesitancy on the part of the Government here even to mention it in any public way.

There is, moreover, a desire in Washington to "play ball," if possible, with the Soviet regime in the hope that some propaganda advantage can be obtained in the international debate over reduction of armament. Thus, while much emphasis is placed on the agreement just made to reduce the production of uranium, this really has no military significance. It is designed entirely to produce a psychological impression that the chances of peace are being constantly improved. The truth is that both sides have plenty of nuclear strength to devastate each other's territory.

Such mutual agreement as the ban on nuclear testing in certain categories and now the curtailment of uranium production—both agreements without provisions for inspection—are, of course, part of the Soviet effort to give the impression that it has no hostile purpose toward the West. This is designed to invite further trade with the West and perhaps even to obtain financial help from the United States by way of long-term credits.

The objective of Moscow is to produce the right atmosphere for commercial interchanges in order to help overcome some of the Communist economic difficulties.

But even while there is an outward appearance of friendliness and peacefulness on the part of the Moscow government, the U.S. Government is constantly being informed of the infiltration by Soviet agents in different countries in this hemisphere as well as in Africa. The Soviet plan for taking over more and more governments, just as happened in the case of Castro, has not been modified.

Meanwhile, an effort is being made here to put some courage into the Organization of American States. A few of the governments in Latin America which have maintained diplomatic relations with the Castro government are beginning to talk of breaking off. But there is no sign yet that any government, including the United States, is willing to sever diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government—which, of course, is at the root of all the trouble.

For the next few months not only the United States but some of its European allies are evidently going to try to "play ball" with Nikita Khrushchev and elicit from him periodically further expressions of goodwill and peaceful intentions. Yet not a word is being said about the record of bad faith the Soviet Government has made in the last few years throughout the world. It has infiltrated country after country. It even reached the point of supplying arms to the Cuban Government and setting up missiles in close proximity to the United States. But there seems to be inside Government circles here a disposition to avoid any controversy

with the Soviet Government about this and to regard the past as past. There is uneasiness among some Members of Congress over such a policy of "forgive and forget."

LESSONS OF EX-AMBASSADOR MURPHY—HOWEVER TRACTABLE RUSSIANS APPEAR, LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVES KEPT IN SIGHT

(By Richard Wilson)

In this era of the renewed thaw with Russia the lessons learned by former Ambassador Robert C. Murphy are worth reviewing.

Bob Murphy was a career State Department official on the same level as Britain's Harold Macmillan in several critical areas during World War II and in the immediate postwar period. Berlin was one of these areas and it was there that Murphy learned first hand the Russian technique of approaching objectives stage by stage.

The blockade of Berlin began as a probing operation with minor traffic interferences and slowly escalated, stage by stage, into a full-scale stricture intended to starve and freeze the Western powers out. In the early stages a firm Western response would probably have convinced the Russians that the risk was too great. But the first probes seemed to indicate a lack of resolution by the Western powers. Irresolution met every successive step until the point was reached where breaking the blockade would have meant full-scale war.

As Murphy sees it, the airlift which kept Berlin alive was an admission of failure; we should never have had to supply Berlin this way, but should have insisted on access by normal methods from the beginning, using force if necessary to assure such access. At one stage a lone Mongolian soldier was the only impediment to full access.

It is well to remember how the blockade began, and how the Russian lodgment in Cuba began, in this period when so much reliance is being placed on a rapprochement with Russia. The lessons are known but they never can be learned. If the thread of Murphy's analysis is right, the Berlin wall never would have been built if U.S. tanks had pushed away the barbed wire when it was first laid and if the first cement block had been kicked aside when first put down.

In Cuba the time to have acted was when the first combat troops were installed and not when the missile bases were erected. Russia goes about these matters progressively, moving as far and as fast as the existing risks will permit.

Periods of calm are part of the stage-by-stage strategy also and it is in just such stages as this that the Amerlican guard automatically drops. We may find later that in such periods the Soviet espionage apparatus takes advantage of an improved atmosphere to improve its position.

This has happened before, notably in 1958 and 1959, and it has only recently been disclosed that the American Embassy in Poland was thoroughly penetrated and Russian-paid party girls were sleeping with the entire Marine guard contingent. The Soviet espionage department can be relied on to do its level best to live up to its reputation in the James Bond spy thrillers.

This incident has been excruciatingly embarrassing to the State Department, to say nothing of the Marine Corps. But it is hard to convince the State Department that its security procedures are very lax. Senator DODD and his Senate Internal Security Commitee have been trying to do this for the past several years. But the procedures don't seem to improve much and such heretics as Otto Otepka, whose crime was telling the truth about his superiors, remain ostracized and in suspension. It was no surprise to learn that Otepka was one of the officials who handled investigations of conditions in the Embassy in Poland.

On the basis of the record, therefore, periods of thaw in relations which the Soviet Union are followed by new experiments in the nibbling process which Ambassador Murphy watched grow into the Berlin blockade. Periods of thaw are also accompanied by redoubled efforts of the Russian KGB which have been so notoriously flagrant in England.

However tractable the Russians seem to become they do not lose sight of long-term objectives. They do not hesitate to shoot down our planes while they smilingly assure us that they wish new understandings. Russia is hardpressed now internally and externally but to assume, as does Senator FULBRIGHT, that there can be a new deal with Russia, based on some kind of a poorly defined new world order, approaches the limits of credibility.

Sierra Leone Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today Sierra Leone celebrates another anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, we take pleasure in extending warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Prime Minister, Sir Milton Margai; and His Excellency the Sierra Leone Ambassador to the United States, Gershon B. O. Collier.

April 27 commemorates the third anniversary of the independence of Sierra Leone from the United Kingdom. By mutual agreement the colonial status of this West Africa country whose connection with Britain extends back to 1787 was changed to membership in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Jubilant celebrations in the capital Freetown marked this great event in Sierra Leone's history. This nation was well prepared under the able leadership of Sir Milton Margai to shoulder its democratic responsibilities. Beginning with the early 1900's, the Sierra Leoneans had experienced more and more self-government Since independence they have demonstrated that they understand the workings of democracy. In the country's unicameral legislature, which is elected by universal adult franchise, a vocal opposition is assured all of its rights.

Sierra Leone itself is a potentially rich country of 28,000 square miles whose mountains, swamps, plains, and plateaus lie wholly within the tropical rain forest area. Shaped roughly in the form of a circle, it is bordered by Guinea on the north and east, Liberia on the south, and the Atlantic Ocean on the west. Like most African nations, the majority of the country's 2,500,000 inhabitants earn their living from agriculture, although minerals, particularly diamonds, have outstripped agricultural produce in value of exports. The country hopes that a new 10-year development plan, which will emphasize agriculture, but also benefit other facits of the nation's economy and welfare, will double the standard of living. Thus, the Sierra Leoneans have not only shouldered the responsibilities of democracy, but have also undertaken the development of their state.

We salute Sierra Leone on its independence day. We are sure that its present economic well-being and political equilibrium will continue and will be an example to other new African states. Prime Minister Margai and other responsible leaders can be proud of their record so far.

Commonsense Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the legislation which I have recently introduced to make it possible for every person who has moved from one place to another prior to election day to still cast his vote for President, Vice President, Senator, and U.S. Representative in his last place of residence until he meets the requirements to vote in his new location, I was heartened by the strong editorial in support of this legislation which appeared in the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette on April 11, 1964.

Since one of the two resolutions I introduced to protect this right to vote called upon the States to take immediate steps to amend their requirements so that a new resident will not be denied the right to vote either in his new State or in the former place of residence, I was pleased to note that the editorial called attention to what the Secretary of State for Iowa, the Hon. Melvin Synhorst, has been doing to fashion a standardized proposition that the various States can adopt. I take my hat off to Mr. Synhorst for his leadership in this vital area. I assure him I will work just as diligently at the national level to bring about the required changes.

The editorial follows:

COMMONSENSE LEGISLATION

We haven't heard any objection yet to the proposition that eligible voters who happened to be moving from one State to another at the time of a national election should retain their right to cast a ballot. Or, conversely, we haven't heard anyone insist that they should be denied their right to vote for President, Vice President, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Representative, because of residency requirements, if they qualify in other respects.

On the contrary, our eardrums reverberate from campaign declarations that every eligible voter has a duty and responsibility to go to the polls on election day—declarations in which we concur. But virtually nothing has been done by those in position to do it to make it possible for voters eligible in every respect except residency to vote.

We're talking about the voter who happens to move from Iowa, let's say, to Illinois a month or so before a general election. He hasn't lived in Illinois long enough to establish residence there. But he is no longer a resident of Iowa. So for all practical purposes he has lost his vote.

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa's First District, and Secretary of State Melvin D. Synhorst, of Iowa, propose doing something to protect the voting rights of these mobile citizens during that short period when they are technically not residents of

any State. Secretary Synhorst has been working with secretaries of other States in an effort to come up with a standardized proposition that all States can and will adopt.

Working at it from the Washington level is Congressman SCHWENGEL, who this week introduced two resolutions to remove these barriers of outmoded residency laws, so America's mobile population will not be denied the right to vote regardless of where they happen to live on election day.

One resolution calls on the several States to take immediate action to change their requirements, so an individual moving to a new State will continue to vote in his former State of residence until he can meet the residency requirements of his new State. This is along the same line secretaries of state have been working. Representative SCHWENGEL's other resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution permitting people eligible to vote in one State to continue voting for national officers in that State until they have established residence in their new State.

According to Representative SCHWENGEL's calculations, of the 19 million citizens unable to vote in 1960's general election, 8 million were restricted because they recently had moved and could not qualify under residency requirements of either their old or new State.

These citizens should have the same right to vote as the rest of us. We hope that right is guaranteed before this fall's election.

Losing Our Bearings?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for a considerable time now, I have been pointing out to the Members of Congress the need for protection for some of our basic industries such as the cattle industry. The Midwest cattleman is being hurt and hurt badly by the imports from foreign countries and yet we are told that this is for the good of our friends throughout the world and we must put up with it. Another basic industry which is being seriously impaired by imports is the ball and friction bearing industry of this country. Bearings are basic to our entire defense structure and yet we are allowing our domestic industry to be curtailed to maintain good international relations. The following article from the Metal Working News of April 20, 1964, shows dramatically what is happening and I hope that it helps to alert others to this import problem.

JAPAN BEARING EXPORTS SEEN UP 10 PERCENT

(By Eiichi Konno)

TOKYO.—Japanese global exports of ball bearings this year will increase an estimated 10 percent over last year's $28 million, according to a spokesman for the Japan Bearing Exporters Council, here.

The optimistic view is based upon an anticipated rise in demand from American and European markets. During 1963 about 40 percent of total exports went to the United States, he explained.

A spokesman for Toyo Bearing Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Osaka, also estimates a 10-percent increase in global exports for this firm this year. Shipments to Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich., which the firm has been making since 1962 at an annual average rate of 10 million radial ball bearings (mostly 10 millimeter radial ball bearings), will remain about the same this year, he added.

Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd., Osaka, could not make an exact estimate for its export expansion. However, this firm is currently negotiating to build a bearing manufacturing plant jointly with the Indian Government in India, according to a Koyo spokesman.

Nippon Seiko Co., Ltd., Tokyo, estimates a 10-percent increase in its global exports for this year.

STEEL BALL FIRMS OPTIMISTIC

The two leading steel ball manufacturers in Japan estimate 10 to 15 percent advances this year in their exports to American ball bearing manufacturers. The two firms are: Amatsuji Steel Ball Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Osaka; and Tsubakimoto Steel Ball Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Nara.

Amatsuji last year shipped about 80 million steel balls, mostly from ⅛ to ⅜ inch, to American ball bearing manufacturers. A similar amount went to European markets, according to a spokesman for the firm.

Tsubakimoto last year shipped about 60 million steel balls for ball bearings to global markets. About 80 percent went to American ball bearing and machinery manufacturers.

Spokesmen for the two firms declined to name the American manufacturers they supply.

Hon. Thomas O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a friendly, loyal, wonderful man. He was a natural leader and yet one of the kindest of men. There was something warm and personal about him which made him easy to know and which quickly instilled confidence.

I do not believe anyone in the Congress possessed more close and devoted friends or could call on more vigorous support from those friends when the occasion demanded it.

Through a long lifetime of participation in public life has was wise in the ways of government and his counsel was invaluable, yet because of his quiet, self-effacing attitude it was hard to realize that he had given 28 years of valuable service here and that only 19 Members of the present membership of the Congress had served longer than he.

As dean of the House delegation of the great State of Illinois he was their accepted leader and his State has lost an able representative, an effective leader, and a strong patriot.

Many have served here. Few have enjoyed the confidence and the friendship which were given to TOM O'BRIEN. His record is like a pleasant interlude to be remembered happily and warmly throughout the years to come.

Feather for Johnson Over Rail Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there has naturally been a lot of discussion on President Johnson's amazing success in settling the railroad dispute. This persistent controversy was 5 years old, but it was settled in 13 days once it came within the President's orbit.

Last Wednesday morning—only hours before the settlement was reached—the New York Herald Tribune published an article by Douglas Kiker entitled "Feather for Johnson If Rail Talks Make Good." In addition to its prophetic headline, the article is especially interesting for its description of President Johnson's handling of the railroad problem.

I am sure all Members will be interested in this article:

FEATHER FOR JOHNSON IF RAIL TALKS MAKE GOOD

(By Douglas Kiker)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson may be on the verge of his greatest personal victory since entering the White House.

There was growing optimism here yesterday that some sort of negotiated settlement to the long-standing differences between railroad owners and operating unions may be in sight.

"Definite gains have been made. The issues have been narrowed down," Presidential press secretary George Reedy reported.

He added that bargaining between the two factions, in progress at the White House on an intensified basis since April 9, now is at the point where "if the toughest issues are solved, the rest would be a matter of a few minutes' conversation."

And the President, speaking to a group of editors in the rose garden yesterday, voiced the belief that "we are making some progress. We hope that we shall have concluded with the deliberations in a few hours or days."

Mr. Reedy said both the carriers and the brotherhoods have submitted position papers covering all issues and that mediators are now "distilling these into a single paper." Deadline for the railroad dispute settlement is Friday midnight.

Negotiations "are going very hot and heavy, very fast and furious," Mr. Reedy said. "Unquestionably there has been a modification of position."

According to informed sources here, there are several factors responsible for this progress in a dispute which has been simmering since November 1959.

Neither labor nor management really wants a national rail strike which is bound to be drawn out and costly to both sides. The problem always has been one of internal politics, especially among the brotherhoods.

Until this spring, there was always some sort of lifesaver that appeared at the last minute and further postponed the inevitable. Either a Presidential study commission was formed, or Congress passed special legislation requiring compulsory arbitration.

This time, however, Mr. Johnson placed the problem squarely and finally in the laps of the railroad people, and in effect, told them: "This is it. Either you solve it

yourselves, or it's not going to be solved."

He appointed Theodore Kheel and George Taylor, two experienced widely respected arbitrators.

He focused the controversy squarely in the national limelight by moving negotiations from the Labor Department over to the White House.

He has been appealing particularly to labor, for some settlement, with the warning that the whole future of collective bargaining is at stake.

Most important of all, he has kept everyone guessing as to the action he will take if there is no settlement. Will he ask for legislation? Or will he let the railroads go ahead and stage a strike neither side really wants?

"We are determined not to bury collective bargaining * * * we are asking the free enterprise system to work."

He added: "I wouldn't want to anticipate action that might interfere with collective bargaining. I think it is best to let them go on and proceed on the assumption * * * that it is going to work and that they will find an answer."

If they do, in the words of one seasoned political observer here yesterday, the Nation might as well not even bother to hold an election in November.

Guilt Not Collective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, December 8, 1963:

GUILT NOT COLLECTIVE

(By Raymond Moley)

Now that the public mind has calmed after a confusion of tongues following the deplorable death of President Kennedy, it is time to consider the reality. The guilt, so far as we know, was not collective or the result of a conspiracy. It is a case of police efficiency, of security by those responsible for the safety of the President, and of new measures that can be taken to prevent any similar tragedy in the future.

As Charles Evans Hughes once said, "Guilt is personal." This is true except in cases of mob violence, and this crime was clearly not that of a mob. Whether there was a conspiracy of which the assassin was the instrument is a matter for determination, although it does not seem likely at this time.

The question of security goes beyond the protection of the President and other public officials. It also concerns the presence in our midst of dangerous characters who are dedicated enemies of public order and of our institutions. Our population also has within it a generous number of demented individuals, dope addicts, and criminally inclined who are completely nonpolitical but dangerous. Identification, surveillance, and control of these is the job of public authority. But many people who should know better have taken this matter into their own hands or, shall I say, their own mouths.

Among these are individuals who believe in collective guilt. We have been told that Dallas, or Texas, or the United States, or "all of us" are guilty. Some have rushed into print, or onto the air waves, even into pulpits. This has been an evidence of dangerous irresponsibility. It could have been foreseen because it has followed other such tragedies in the past.

An attack on Dallas and the rightwing has been implicit in excited voices even after the identity of the assassin was measurably established. Two well-known professors of history have encouraged this prejudice against dissenters in print. One of them, whose history textbooks are widely used in the schools, said the state of the public mind today in the United States "may be" even worse than when Lincoln was killed. This is arrant nonsense, since in April 1865, bloody civil war still prevailed in people's minds although mass murder had been stopped.

A Dallas minister of the Gospel received great publicity for himself by indicting his own city. No more "shame" attaches to Dallas than guilt might be attributed to Washington for the death of Lincoln or Garfield, or to Buffalo when McKinley died. The minister buttressed his "argument" against Dallas by saying that children in a Dallas school "cheered" when the news of the crime was announced. But I know of an instance of this kind in a northern city that claims to be the conscience of the Nation.

Such collective indictments are in themselves a form of mob violence. They do not destroy hate. They are the very seeds of hate.

We must recognize this crime as a matter for greater official vigilance. In two previous instances of Presidential assassination security measures were lax. The guard assigned to protect Lincoln left his post and gave Booth his chance. McKinley's very capable secretary, George Cortelyou, begged his chief to cancel the public reception where he was later murdered. But McKinley insisted upon his exposure.

We don't know all the facts about the assassination of President Kennedy, but the measures to get the facts taken by President Johnson may help to clarify this fog of irresponsible accusations.

Let Our Light Shine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has called to my attention a letter to the editor from the Washington Evening Star of April 16, as a subject of "sufficient importance to merit its consideration by the Congress." I am happy to have the opportunity to insert in the RECORD this expression of public opinion in order that it might be brought to the attention of all interested parties:

The recent advocacy of using less light at the White House was an absurd gesture of economy in Government spending. How preposterous to talk about saving a few hundred dollars here when we are wasting hundreds of millions in so-called foreign aid.

Paris, France, has long been known around the world as the "City of Light." Through the brilliance of her capital city, France has created an image of herself as a country of happiness, beauty, and good cheer. The capital of the United States should shine even more brightly. All buildings within a mile of our Capitol should be magnificent and all major structures and parks in the city should be so floodlighted as to make Washington the showplace of the world.

Let our light shine before all men, and especially let it shine in the Nation's Capital, which is inevitably representative to other peoples of much that is America.

A READER.

Social Security Medical Care a Raid on Pay Envelopes of American Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I have received from George E. O'Connor, president of Mohawk Paper Mills, Inc., Cohoes, N.Y., who I believe has stated some excellent reasons why the problem of medical care for the elderly, under social security, will only result in a further raid on the pay envelope of every American worker.

In my opinion, Mr. O'Connor has presented a very strong argument in opposition to the King-Anderson type of medicare legislation. His thought-provoking comments with respect to the astronomical cost of a medicare program for all those over 65 years of age, brings into sharp focus the effects such legislation would have on the average worker in this country.

Because I feel Mr. O'Connor has presented a good analysis of this medicare problem as far as the average worker is concerned, I am pleased to call his communication to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. O'Connor's communication follows:

MOHAWK PAPER MILLS, INC.,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Cohoes, N.Y., April 22, 1964.

Hon. CARLETON J. KING,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CARLETON: I have written to Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to protest against the medicare bill now before his committee. I think that this is a very unfair and unreasonable bill and I would like to ask you for your support and assistance in opposition to it.

This medicare program is designed for persons age 65 and over who are covered by social security. Those pressing this plan insist that it must be "under social security." This expression is designed to conceal the fact that they want a direct payroll tax on the pay envelope of the workingman. It deducts the money out of his envelope before he can get his hands on it. It is applied to the gross pay, regardless of whether he is unmarried or has a wife and five or six children. There are no exemptions, no deductions.

THE PAY ENVELOPE IS ALREADY CUT UP ENOUGH

It is distressing to look over our payroll and see all of the deductions we are obliged

to take out of the pay of the men and women who work here. There should be absolutely no more deductions and no increases.

We now deduct 4 to 5 percent from our employees for State income taxes, and a minimum of 14 percent for Federal income taxes.

We deduct 3⅝ percent for social security taxes. This will increase to 4⅛ percent in a year and a half and to 4⅝ percent 2 years thereafter. The company pays an equal amount for the benefit of the employee on these social security taxes, but that money comes out of payroll money which otherwise would go to the employee himself. It is classified as a fringe benefit. Thus, the figure now being taken from the employee is actually 7¼ percent which will increase to 9¼ percent without the addition of medicare. With the medicare proposal added to social security the deductions and fringes will exceed $500 from a man with $5,200 of annual earnings.

The unemployment tax is also a payroll tax, amounting to about 2.1 percent. While this is technically paid by us, it actually comes out of payroll funds, which otherwise would go to the employee. It is another fringe benefit.

All of these deductions add up to over 28 percent and will soon be over 30 percent in spite of the recent tax cut.

Under the medicare proposal, these deductions would be based upon the first $5,200 of the employee's pay instead of the present $4,800. This would constitute an additional 8-percent increase in the entire social security tax. We think this is an outrageous injustice to the workingman.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

The proponents say that it will cost only one-quarter percent from the employee and a like amount from the employer, plus the increase in the base from $4,800 to $5,200.

This estimate is completely out of line. For the last 2 or 3 years every Blue Cross Blue Shield organization has been asking increases from 20 to 35 percent to cover increased expenditures for hospital and medical care. Many ask for further increases each year. In our area, in spite of several increases, they have had to ask the hospitals to accept 90 cents on the dollar for their claims because of lack of adequate funds.

The expenditures for hospital and medical care are going up by leaps and bounds. No estimate of cost is sound unless it takes into consideration what is actually going on right now in the field of medical and hospital care. Even then, very substantial growth must be anticipated in the immediate future.

We have never seen any indication as to whether or not medicare would cover both the employee and his wife. If it does not cover the wife it is not much use. If it does cover the wife, the cost will be astronomical.

IF MEDICARE BECOMES A LAW, AN ENORMOUS ANNUAL INCREASE IN BENEFITS IN INEVITABLE

The proposal is limited to those over 65 who are on social security. Obviously, it is going to be impossible to refuse to include those over 65 who are not on social security, but who cannot afford medical care.

What about the poor who are under 65? How can the Government say that a man 65 years old will be taken care of by the Government even if he has ample means of his own, but a penniless sick man of 64 will be left in the gutter.

The provisions for medical care in this present bill are very limited. The pattern of annual enlargement of benefits in social security proves that this medicare coverage will be annually increased. All of this expense will come out of the pay envelope of the workingman.

THE WORKINGMAN SUPPORTS THE WELL-TO-DO

Perhaps the most outrageous feature of this bill is that it provides medical care to every one on social security even though he is fully capable of taking care of himself without undue strain. There are no limitations whatsoever. The wealthiest get this medicare at the expense of the workingman's pay envelope.

We agree that the mere fact that a man owns his small home or has a few dollars in the bank should not oblige him to lose them for medical and hospital expenses. He should have some help from the public. To give free medicare to anyone, regardless of how well off he may be financially, is not merely an injustice. It is a waste of public funds taken by taxation which should be applied only to those who need it and cannot afford it. There are millions of these unfortunate people under age 65 who are not taken care of in this bill.

MOST WORKINGMEN ARE NOW ADEQUATELY COVERED BY INSURANCE FOR HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL EXPENSE

We carry medical and hospital insurance for our employees and their families with a broad coverage, far exceeding anything in the medicare bill. We pay 75 percent of the cost, the employee pays the balance. We continue this for the benefit of retired persons on the same basis as for those who are working. Thus, our people would be getting nothing for their expanding and enforced contributions to medicare.

The same practice is followed in nearly all industrial plants in the country. Thus, most of the workingmen would get no benefit from this tax which they would be compelled to pay.

LABOR UNIONS

We cannot understand why the labor unions do not come to the defense of their members. It is their job to protect them and this is the time when they should come to their defense. Too late they will realize their error.

The labor unions have always been strongly opposed to any sales tax. Medicare is a pay envelope tax. It is much more a direct injury to the workingman than any sales tax would be. It is a mistake to assume that the workingman does not understand. He does understand. He has been awakened and is violently opposed to any more taxes. If this bill is passed, it will backfire on its proponents but then it will be too late. The damage will have been done.

THOSE WHO CANNOT AFFORD MEDICAL OR HOSPITAL CARE MUST BE TAKEN CARE OF

There is no question that those who need medical and hospital care and who cannot afford to pay for it must be taken care of. In the area about us, we believe that all of them are being taken care of in every instance on a local basis. This is the most efficient and commonsense way to take care of people who need such help.

A huge nationwide Federal Bureau is a vast waste of money.

THE BILL SHOULD NOT PASS

I am sure that you are very much interested in the welfare of the people in this country who work for a living. I trust that you will agree that the raiding of the pay envelope by any more taxes should be stopped now.

I am sending a copy of this letter to all our employees as well as to the headquarters for the United Papermakers and Paperworkers, AFL–CIO.

In addition to sending a letter to Congressman MILLS, I have also sent a copy of that letter to all of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. O'CONNOR.

The American Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy delivered a most impressive speech at the American Jewish Committee Herbert H. Lehman Human Relations Award dinner on April 16, 1964, in New York City. In an eloquent statement supporting the civil rights bill, the Attorney General pointed out:

We cannot solve our problems with a law or in an instant, but we can begin to weld laws and men together in an effort to provide a basis for the pledge that America makes to all men.

I urge all my colleagues to read the following address:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 26, 1964]

BECAUSE IT IS RIGHT

(By Attorney General Kennedy)

For weeks now, almost every night the light on top of the dome of the Capitol in Washington has burned late into the evening. Many of the high school students who visit Washington at this time of the year know it means that the Senate is still in session. People all over the country know that the debate over the civil rights bill is continuing. However extended it may appear to be, it is sufficient to realize the significance of the debate.

There are great wrongs in America to be righted and there are millions who appreciate daily that civil rights are more of a goal than a reality. The legislation now before the Senate can do a great deal toward making civil rights a reality. The civil rights bill can help insure equal voting rights. It can help insure and extend their educational and employment opportunities. It can help remove the insult of segregated public accommodations so irrational that in one community, a drugstore which allowed Negroes to be served required them to take Pepsi Cola instead of Coca Cola, to stand rather than sit, and to drink from a paper cup rather than a glass.

More generally, the civil rights bill can also demonstrate to all of our citizens that the Congress of the United States, like Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and like the Supreme Court, is committed to the pledge of equality on which this country is founded. Two centuries ago, Montesquieu wrote, "In the state of nature indeed all men are born equal, but they cannot continue in this equality. Society makes them lose it. And they recover it only by protection of the law."

The Negro's experience in America demonstrates the wisdom of his words and the deeds for the civil rights bill. But not this law nor any law can be a solution. The deep social wound of segregation was cut for too long by too many knives of prejudice to be healed by a single poultice.

The civil rights bill, like law in general, can give us an orderly framework for the resolution of discord and dispute among men. Each new outburst of racial fanaticism in our cities gives evidence of how important that framework can be.

One of the principal aims of the civil rights bill is that it elevates this conflict from the streets to the courts. We must rec-

ognize that law can only provide orderly ground rules. It cannot play the game.

Law also can offer us a moral precept to the extent that laws are founded on morality and on logic. They can lead men's hearts and minds but, once again, this aspect of law can have meaning only to the extent that the constituents of law are moral and are rational.

You and I, reflecting on our own heritage in America, know our forebears faced the realities of prejudice when they came to this country—whether in signs proclaiming, "No Irish need apply," or in unexplained rejection of applications to medical schools. We know that systematic exclusion of Irish or Jews or Italians, or any other ethnic group, has ended not only because laws changed but because men's minds did.

"The problems of our society," President Johnson said last week, "will not automatically disappear with the passage (of the bill). They will still have to be dealt with by all Americans. The civil rights bill can only chart in law the directions that we must take as individuals."

So I come to you today as the chief law enforcement officer of the United States to talk not of Federal enforcement of laws but of individual obedience to their moral statutes. Such obedience must exist at many levels, and, like all responsibilities in a democracy, it must begin with the individual citizen. As John D. Rockefeller III observed in a recent speech: "America, we must remember, is no more than the sum of ourselves."

I think it is necessary for us to start by asking ourselves whether we are satisfied with the present ingredients of America's social arithmetic. I am thinking of two recent examples in this State.

The first occurred only this week in Albany. We all read about it. A distraught young man perched on a narrow 12th-floor ledge ready to jump off for 2 hours. Friends sought to coax him to safety, but the crowd below had a different appeal. "Jump, jump, jump," it chanted. One spectator expressed the hope that the youth would jump on this side. We couldn't see him if he jumps over there."

The other case occurred one night last month. A young woman was stabbed to death over a period of a half hour outside her apartment in Queens. Thirty-eight neighbors looked out and heard what was going on during that time. None came to her rescue. None even called the police. By way of explanation, one of the witnesses said later, "I didn't want to get involved." No further comment is necessary.

Individual concern and individual responsibility deserve better homage in a land which prized individualism and whose greatest hero is Abraham Lincoln.

Charles Morgan, Jr., the young Birmingham attorney, whose own conduct is an example of the point, tells an illustrating anecdote in his new book, "A Time to Speak." "No one knows," he writes, "who will next be called to commit himself or in what way. It might be someone like the tall and lanky soldier in Jackson, Miss., the one with the long southern drawl, who told a white man assaulting Negro Andrew J. Young: "Man, if you want to fight, fight me, I am your size and I am white."

We can reflect on the individual responsibility demonstrated by 200,000 Negroes and whites in the March on Washington last summer. There was dire warning of angry crowds, of violence and of riot. All of us saw what happened instead. A London newspaper called it "the gentle flood."

Individuals can at another level help to flesh out the bare framework established by statute. Consider the example of leadership established by the hundreds of southern businessmen who have acted to desegregate their establishments in the past year.

Last spring and summer, President Kennedy, then Vice President Johnson, and other administration leaders met with almost 1,500 businessmen, ministers, attorneys, and other leaders from all over the country. The purpose of the meeting was to seek voluntary abandonment of discriminatory practices. The progress since then demonstrates that racial attitudes in many parts of the South are not part of a monolithic irrationality.

A recent survey of 556 cities states that significant progress has taken place in the past few months in desegregation of such facilities as theaters, restaurants, hotels, motels and lunch counters. There now has been at least some desegregation in nearly 70 percent of these cities, and almost two-thirds of that progress has come since last May.

It is easy for us in the North to patronize the South. It is so much easier to see the morality of problems in Birmingham if you ares itting in Boston. What these southern businessmen have done can serve as an example for us in the North in coming to grips with problems that are different only because they are our own. The desegregation of these public accommodations in the South comes because their owners plainly acknowledge economic dangers of inaction. They also have recognized the moral need for accommodation.

For half a century the doctrine of "separate but equal" was perverted by citizens, communities and local governments into a license not for simple racial segregation but for racial discrimination. For example, the number of white and Negro students in Mississippi is approximately equal. In a recent year, this State spent more than $45 million for white schools and $26 million for Negro schools. And this is the case despite the fact that "separate but equal has been outlawed for a decade. The lesson is plain that law is not enough.

How can the law be enough when it requires that Negroes and whites not be served in the same room without a solid 7-foot partition between them. How can it be when it requires a motel not to turn away a weary motorist, or a hospital to reject an injured child. Whatever law is passed, whatever statute is enacted without public understanding, it is mere piety. Neither sober statutes nor individual responsibility alone are enough. Men and their laws must march together. What happens when they do not is evidenced from the experience of the past 10 years. The cost of defiance touches every aspect of community and national life.

Five years ago, rural Prince Edward County, Va., closed its public schools rather than desegregate them. How can we measure the cost of that defiance? How did it affect the Negro child whose future has been permanently crippled because he cannot learn to read? How did it affect the white child sent to segregated private schools? How did it affect the citizens of the city who walked past the vacant public school building while children were left to linger in the streets and fields? And how did it affect Virginia?

The point is that the cost of defiance is beyond measure. They touch generations yet unborn. They scar our history.

The lesson of Prince Edward County is the lesson of the entire country. Where were we after the 1954 school decision? Where was the pulpit, the press, the public officials? The answer is that there was a vacuum and a weakness of leadership—a vacuum that existed until it was filled finally by demagogs, with strident slogans of "segregation forever" and "massive resistance." When a whole generation and a whole area is told by its leaders that a Supreme Court decision is a "nullity," how can it be expected that the mortar of public respect will be added to the bricks of law?

Rarely in history are nations presented with a second chance to atone for fundamental failure. I wonder, however, if that isn't exactly the opportunity America has today. When the civil rights bill passes this year, 10 years after the Brown decision, we can have a new leadership of the kind that southern businessmen, public officials, newspapermen, and clergymen have already demonstrated. And we can have a new slogan—not "massive resistance" but "massive compliance" in the spirit of a nation governed by God's law and men of understanding.

The Prince Edward school case is still in the courts, and public schools there are still closed, but Negro children are being educated in a free, private school system which resulted from the efforts of private individuals, private foundations, and leaders and citizens of Virginia.

Not long ago, one of the teachers in the free school system was asked how her students responded. It reminded her, she said, of her childhood on the farm. When you set a chicken on the ground after holding it in your hands, it sits motionless. Only after it is sure of its freedom does it dash away. Her students were like that for the first month, she said—not moving. They moved only when they felt secure in their freedom. When they were secure, they leaped ahead in their desire and their capacity to learn. The freedom of those students—and the spirit of the establishment of their schools—must be the freedom and spirit of our time.

We cannot solve our problems with a law or in an instant, but we can begin to weld laws and men together in an effort to provide a basis for the pledge that America makes to all men.

Benjamin Muse, the Virginian writer, says in his new book about integration in the past decade, "The unrest will end sometime because it is enevitable that in America justice and humanity in time will prevail."

Let us join today in His service. Let us join in the faith in law and in man that President Kennedy expressed last June when he said, "I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity for the Negro, which he neither wants nor needs, but for the one proud, priceless quality that unites us all as Americans—a sense of justice. This year of the Emancipation centennial, justice requires us to secure the blessings of liberty for all Americans, not merely for reasons of economic efficiency and domestic tranquility, but above all, because it is right."

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to join my colleagues in expressing profound regret at the passing of our esteemed colleague and my dear friend, the Honorable THOMAS O'BRIEN.

His long career here in the House, culminating in serving as dean of the Illinois delegation, was marked by devotion to duty, courage, loyalty, and conscientiousness. He was a leader of men, one who commanded their confidence and respect.

His presence and his leadership, along with his warm friendliness, will be greatly missed in the House.

I pray that God will bless and comfort his wife and family forever and a day.

The John Birch Society Goes All Out Against the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many Members may be wondering where some of the vituperative mail they are receiving on the civil rights bill is coming from. It now appears that a prominent and well-financed source is that indefatigable letterwriting group, the John Birch Society. According to an Associated Press story in the Milwaukee Sentinel of April 22, 1964:

RIGHTS BILL TOP TARGET OF BIRCHERS

BOSTON, MASS.—The John Birch Society has called on its members to conduct an advertising campaign against passage of the civil rights bill and urged those opposed to the bill to write their Senators and "as many other Senators as you can."

A spokesman said Tuesday that a recent issue of the John Birch Society bulletin which goes only to members, contained a reprinting of a suggested advertisement which appread in Newspapers throughout the country.

The bulletin urged its members to go ahead "into the most massive protest—by mail, by telegram, by advertising, by the distribution of literature, by personal conversations and in every other practical way—that we have ever undertaken with regard to any legislation.

"For we are confident that the people of the United States simply will not accept this 'civil rights act of 1963.'"

The advertisement said every vote for the act "is a nail for the coffin of the American Republic."

I include also an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 22, 1964:

THEY WORK AGAINST AMERICA

They have finally teamed up. The John Birch Society is telling members to insert advertisements in newspapers asking Americans to write to the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., for an analysis of the civil rights bill by highest legal authority.

The coordinating committee, of course, is the racist body which inserted advertisements in Wisconsin newspapers to aid the cause of Gov. George Wallace of Alabama. The advertisements were fraudulent and wholly misleading. They had no relationship at all to the civil rights bill passed by the House of Representatives and now before the Senate. The bulk of the committee's funds, as Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, has pointed out, come from the Mississippi Sovereignty Commission, a State body aimed at fighting civil rights and retaining segregation.

In its monthly bulletin the John Birch Society suggests that in placing advertisements against the civil rights bill, members do not use the society's name. It suggests a local committee to preserve the American Republic. Robert Welch, John Birch Society founders, urges his supporters to write Congressmen in opposition to the civil rights bill, and boasts that efforts thus far have produced an outpouring of more than half a million messages into Washington against the bill.

These are the superpatriots, as they claim. And what they are asking Americans to do is support the negation of the guarantees of liberty in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. They ask Americans to deny their heritage. Their real goal, whether some of them realize it or not, is to turn the United States into another South Africa complete with total racial intolerance and dictatorship.

Federal Government Continues To Spend Our Money To Compete With Our Private Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from an able independent businessman in my district points up and criticizes a dangerous trend in our Federal Government; namely, a concerted effort of Government to thwart private business and individual initiative and to convert proper functions of free enterprise into bureaucratic agencies.

In addition to the businessman who is being hurt by unfair governmental competition, the general taxpayer is especially injured.

We should consider the taxpayer as well as the tax user.

The letter follows:

SALINAS VALLEY RADIO DISPATCH, INC.,
Salinas, Calif., April 21, 1964.

Hon. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BURT: We understand that the REA is planning to loan money to "rural sections of the different States to telephone companies for the purpose of installing radio telephone service in rural areas." Why?

This company is licensed to do and wants to do all that the REA proposes to loan money for. We are in a position to do it and we have the equipment and capital to do it. However, in many cases we can not do it because the Federal Government stalls our applications for a year or more with their redtape and backlog until our customers grow tired and discouraged.

Ours is a small business striving to make a few dollars on our own invested dollars, seeking to abide by the rules and regulations of the Federal Communicaitons Commission and the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California. We are licensed to do and do have a moral and obligated trust to provide service to those who ask for and desire that service. This we give to the best of our ability within the present statutes and regulations and the slowness of the regulatory powers making their decisions for the benefit of the American public.

If the Federal Government is interested in hamstringing our operations by regulations and then willing to loan money to others at a very low interest rate to go into competition with us, our first question is: "Is this the American way?"

Keep Americans for Americans. Do not let the Federal agencies loan low interest money to create competitors for those who try. their best in the American way of free enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIPS WYMAN,
President.

MacArthur, a Christian Soldier and a Man of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur was a man whose integrity and honor was akin to Lincoln's, whose love of America and desire to protect and defend it could be compared to our revered George Washington, whose single strength of purpose was like the Rock of Gibraltar, whose principles were as strong as a Thomas Jefferson's, yet also a man who had the flare and stature of a De Gaulle, matched with the courage of a Winston Churchill.

Truly here was a man who earned the respect, the admiration, the love of fellow Americans and people worldwide. Typical was the outpouring of affection from a grateful people on his return from Korea. If ever there lived a man who made his mark in this world and goes on to lead another army—God's army in another world to which we who are Christians believe and aspire—that man was Douglas MacArthur.

This man, for all his strength and courage was often a lonely man—as was Lincoln—for it takes courage and strength to say with one's beliefs. Human nature being what it is—at times somewhat fragile—misunderstandings often arise. This man knew what it was to have his character maligned—but this did not deter or cause him to deviate from his stern code of ethics and Christian beliefs.

I have nothing but respect and admiration for this man of strength—this man of ideals—this man of courage—who fought for what he believed in—fought courageously and well. We who have been privileged to know him, to live in his lifetime, have learned much from this man who was not afraid to stand up and be counted for what he believed. He placed duty, honor and country above all else. Here was a man who was a man. May we all strive for the promotion of our American ideals of religious liberty and freedom for all, as this man did.

This man was a symbol, typifying the spirit and strength of America.

It takes wisdom to know that when you are fighting a battle whenever or whatever it may be you are in it to win—not to sit idly by and await sure defeat. In General MacArthur's own words, "In war there is no substitute for victory." We here in America are in a battle over two ideologies—the religious ideology as opposed to the Communist antireligious ideology. Which is to win? With God's help, we are. We have but to take a lesson from the books of history—such as the life and service of a noble and fine American—an honorable man—Douglas MacArthur. We can take heart, we can take courage.

My tribute to Douglas MacArthur's memory is that here was a man who loved

liberty and freedom—who was devoted to the cause of right and justice. A man who respected the inherent dignity and freedom of man—who treated his fellow man with dignity and honor. His code was "Duty, honor, and country." He defended, guarded and protected America's hallowed traditions of liberty and freedom, of right and justice. Douglas MacArthur died with the approbation of his own conscience—able full well to look any and all straight in the face—to hold up his head with dignity and honor. He did not seek to harm his fellow man. He sought only to save him. May his soul rest in peace—the peace he fought for on this earth, but regrettably did not achieve—he will find in another world. There he will lead another Army—an Army of Christian believers. All America echos "A job well done."

Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism Supports Economic Opportunity Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues who did not have an opportunity to personally hear the testimony of Rabbi Hirsch, appearing in behalf of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, in support of the Economic Opportunity Act, I wish to call attention to his very fine statement, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH, REPRESENTING THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 21, 1964

I am Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, director of the Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I appear in behalf of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, a joint instrumentality of the Central Conference of American Rabbi and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Other national agencies which are members of the Commission on Social Action are the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, and the National Federation of Temple Youth.

In consonance with the policy positions taken by the organizations I represent, I come before you today to urge full support for H.R. 10440, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In 1960, the Central Conference of American Rabbis called for "a sustained attack upon all the social and economic conditions which make for poverty," stating that "social progress is realized through concrete solutions of specific problems rather than by the adoption of any dogmatic and inflexible systems. Our aim must be a social order which will provide the maximum of security, education, and well-being consistent with the liberty and dignity of the individual and his right of free choice.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in November 1963, adopted a resolution which states in part: "America faces a serious moral problem in the continuing high rate of unemployment. * * * We heartily commend the local, State, and Federal government programs designed to (a) train unskilled workers; (b) retrain workers who have been displaced by technological changes; and (c) develop a more extensive vocational guidance and training program. We urge that such programs be expanded."

Although our national organizations have not taken positions on the specific details of legislation before this committee, Judaism has formulated a position on the responsibilities of a society to its individual members. I speak to you from the perspective of that historical position.

The economic and social conditions which necessitate Government action to alleviate poverty have changed since Biblical times but the moral issues which motivate our concern have remained constant. The admonition of the Bible applies with remarkable pertinence to our day: "When you have eaten your fill and have built fine houses to live in, and your herds and flocks have multiplied, and your silver and gold have increased, and everything you own has prospered, beware lest your heart grow haughty and you forget the Lord your God, who freed you from the land of Egypt, the house of bondage * * * and you say to yourselves, 'My own power and the might of my hand have won this wealth for me.' Remember that it is the Lord your God who gives you power to get wealth." (Deuteronomy 8: 11–18).

Unfortunately, too many Americans have grown haughty and have forgotten that their personal wealth is not only the fruit of their own labors, but represents the accumulated wealth derived from the labors of countless generations of men. A recent Gallup Poll (March 21, 1964) revealed that 54 percent of the American people believe that when a person is poor, it is because of "lack of effort on his own part." The concept that poverty is the result of indolence or lack of ability is deeply ingrained in the American psyche and is reflected throughout our history from Puritanism to Horatio Algerism.

The fundamental task confronting us today, therefore, is to reorient our own people to a recognition that poverty cannot be solved by individual action alone. We cannot vaccinate people against poverty by lining them up, as we did this week in Washington for the polio vaccine, and dropping a sugared-coated pill marked "incentive" into their mouths. Until Americans realize that most poor people are poor not so much because of their own deficiencies as because of basic deficiencies in society at large, we shall never win the war on poverty. Until that day comes, the real poverty in America will be found not in the slums, but in the impoverished hearts of those who refuse to accept responsiblity for the welfare of their fellow men.

We support this antipoverty legislation, not because it will solve all our problems, but because it will firmly establish a recognition that the problems exist, and that our society, through its Federal, State, and local governments, is determined to embark on a comprehensive, coordinated, continuous campaign to eradicate the problems from American life.

We support this legislation because we need to convince the "invisible Americans" that they have been seen, the "wasted Americans" that they are useful, and the "other Americans" that they are brother Americans.

The impact of poverty on the personality of the poor has been well documented: destruction of self-respect, dissipation of incentive, and feelings of hopelessness and frustration, often accompanied by hostility and aggressiveness. However, we should be just as concerned about the impact of poverty on the rest of the population. Our sages taught that during the years of the famine in ancient Egypt, Joseph used to eat so little that he was always hungry. When people said to him, "Why are you hungry when you have vast storehouses filled with grain at your disposal?" he answered, "I fear that if I satisfy my own hunger, I might forget the hungry." When the satisfied forget the needy, the character of the satisfied is distorted. What kind of values do we inculcate in our children when they see the adult population callous to the needs of the poor? What kind of "mixed-up kids" do we create, when children in school learn about "the land of opportunity" and outside the school see the doors of opportunity closed to millions of persons? What kind of human beings do we produce, when white children feel that people of colored skins are inferior and that persons who live in slums deserve no better?

Fortunately, in this instance our moral concern is buttressed by sound economic policies, and it is possible to foresee the fulfillment of the Biblical statement: "He that giveth unto the poor shall not lack, but he that hideth his eyes shall have many a curse" (Proverbs 22: 9).

Long-term unemployment, depressed areas, vast expenditures of public funds to sustain nonproductive persons, inadequate economic growth, crime, and juvenile delinquency offer vivid evidences of "many a curse" which are the result of hiding our eyes. Conversely, programs such as those contained in this legislation, followed soon, it is to be hoped, by much more extensive and intensive programs, would result in the alleviation of these "curses" to the greater benefit of society. Never before in our history has there been such a coalescence of the needs of the economy and the imperatives of social justice.

This legislation will improve the lot of all persons regardless of race, but it is important to recognize that although nonwhites constitute only 10 percent of the population, they comprise 21 percent of the poor. At the very moment this committee is considering antipoverty legislation, the other body of Congress is considering civil rights legislation. Passage of both pieces of legislation in the strongest and most effective form is essential to the well-being of our Nation. For the Negro, the civil rights and antipoverty bills are the two sides of one coin. The problem of race is inseparable from other social and economic problems.

In a sense, the treatment of the Negro has come to mean what the treatment of the Jew meant in other periods of history—the criterion by which to gage the moral health of our society. The Negro has become America's "chosen people," destined to be God's "suffering servant." The very color of his skin has made all poverty more visible and all injustice more conspicuous. Without fully realizing it himself, the Negro has become a symbol for all Americans. It is as if God, the divine artist, had taken His brush and darkened the face of every 10th American in order to teach all Americans the lesson of social responsibility. So long as there is unemployment, a high percentage of Negroes will be unemployed. So long as Americans are inadequately housed, Negroes will people the slums. So long as the lowest 40-percent income groups do not receive an increasing proportion of the total national income, Negroes will be deprived citizens. All social issues are interrelated, just as all men are interrelated. Racial justice for nonwhites is inextricable from economic justice for all Americans.

We commend the section of the bill (title I) which stresses vocational training and work experience. One of the rabbis of the Talmud declared, "Whoever does not teach his son an occupation, teaches him to become a robber." This legislation would enable our society to provide its sons with

the skills necessary to become productive citizens. It would enable persons who have been enmeshed by generations of poverty to break out of the pattern of inherited deprivation. It would restore a sense of self-respect and dignity, reflected in the dictum of our tradition: "A man prefers 1 measure of his own to 10 measures of his friends."

We support those programs (title IV) geared to offering incentives for employment and investment, in consonance with the spirit of the medieval Jewish philosopher Maimonides who declared that the highest degree of charity is "to give assistance to a fellow man * * * by procuring work for him, thereby enabling him to become self-supporting."

We endorse the section of the legislation (title II) which would enable the Federal Government to encourage and aid financially State, local, and other "community action programs." Federal initiative and finances are indispensable, but the primary responsibility still rests within each community and it is most appropriate that emphasis should be placed on stimulating local action. We note with approval the provision that all funds for educational programs will be administered by public educational agencies and we trust that the principle of separation of church and state will be adhered to throughout the legislation.

The legislation before this committee is only a beginning, but it is a vital beginning in the directon of fulfilling the American dream of assuring every person equal opportunity for dignity, security, education, and maximum development of his human potentialities. We look to you, our elected representatives, to assume leadership in the struggle for justice. "Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and the needy." (Proverbs 31: 9).

Colgate Washington Study Group Has Quarter-Century Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it will interest my colleagues to know that Colgate University, located at Hamilton, N.Y., in my district, is this year celebrating a quarter-century of activity by its Washington study group. This is the oldest such group working in the Nation's Capital and the one group to be led by a professor who functions as a teacher and adviser throughout the entire term the students are in residence here.

There are 11 students in the current group, all carefully selected because of special interest in government and demonstrated ability to do independent work at an advanced level. They will study at close range the governmental activities on the Washington scene in all three branches. Of particular interest to the House is the extended time devoted to listening to committee hearings and floor debate. Also, the day-to-day operation of a Member's office is observed and analyzed. This study extends the horizons of those participating as they glimpse the quantitative and qualitative range of congressional service.

My own experience confirms the motivation which such study develops. Douglas W. Metz, who has served as my administrative assistant for 5 years, was a member of the 1953 study group. His desire for public service was born out of this experience and his subsequent dedication and objectivity has been of the highest. I hope that others with the same outstanding capability will continue to infiltrate the Washington scene.

Clearly the experience which the term in Washington provides is challenging and inspiring to those who participate and the American public benefits from the impact on these young men whether they engage in governmental activities or assume leadership responsibilities in other fields.

This project has received notice from the press in my area and I would like to share with my colleagues the following comments contained in the March 29, 1964 issue of the Syracuse Post Standard, entitled "Exhilarating View From the Top."

COLGATE UNIVERSITY STUDY GROUP HAS QUARTER-CENTURY ANNIVERSARY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Eleven young men from Colgate University are obtaining a bird's-eye view of the power transition in the Nation's Capital. They are spending the spring semester in Washington, studying government in action and earning full undergraduate credit for their work in political science.

The "view from the top" is exhilarating, members of the Colgate-Washington Study Group report. The 1964 group, the 25th to use the Capital as a classroom, feel that this is an especially momentous time to be in the town of decisions. Particularly interesting has been the opportunity to observe the orderly shift of power from the administration of the late President Kennedy to that of President Johnson.

Colgate has been sending study groups to Washington since 1935. As a result of a semester in the field, the university hopes that small groups of carefully selected students will learn more about the function of the Federal Government than they could on any college campus.

The program is directed by Knud Rasmussen, assistant professor of political science at Colgate, who points out that the students are not only observers of the Washington scene, but actual participants. A high point of the semester's experience is the month-long internship which each of the young political scientists spends in selected governmental offices.

For instance, on the seventh floor of the gleaming new State Department Building, Colgate Junior David A. Rosenbloom, of Albany, N.Y., is working for a month with Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. Rosenbloom is presently involved in plans for the sound tape commentaries by distinguished world leaders which will become a key part of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cambridge, Mass.

On the 12th floor of the aging office building that houses the Peace Corps, Arnold Raphel, of Troy, N.Y., assists his supervisor, Research Chief Joseph G. Colman, in the job of finding out what Sargent Shriver needs to know in order to get the new poverty program moving. Raphel is a student at Hamilton College, the only non-Colgate man in this year's group.

In addition to working as interns, the study group members write papers, read books, and meet for biweekly seminar discussions. They also conduct interviews with Government officials of various ranks and interests. One day it may be the President; the next day an Under Secretary.

Undertsanding practical government means shedding many old cliches, the students find. One of these is that bureaucrats are dense and stodgy.

"I was amazed," said Farhad Kazemi, of Teheran, Iran, who is interning in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Bureau of International Education. "The bureaucrats I've met are well educated and bright. They seem flexible, too, and extremely helpful."

"There are an awful lot of sharp people here," said Robert E. Elder, Jr., who has been working at desk level in the Philippines section of the Peace Corps Program Development and Operations.

Bob, whose father directed the group for 11 years, has already written two letters for Sargent Shriver's signature and handled important messages from the Far East. He sits in on regular Far East area staff meetings and the Director says he wants him back to work there in the summer.

Wayne A. Rich, of Charleston, W. Va., has his hands full helping develop programs for the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, while Stephen A. Glasser, of Grosse Pointe Woods, Mich., is right on top of a current civil rights issue. He is checking the effects of civil rights legislation, especially in southern rural areas.

Members of the group will swing into intern jobs on Capitol Hill about the time the debate, or filibuster, over the new civil rights bill is expected to be boiling.

The 11 students split on the question of how this experience in Government at work compares with their textbook studies.

"I'm going to tell the boys back home that it's entirely different here," say Raphel, the first Hamilton College student to participate in the group. "The reality is a great deal different from the theory."

He finds that this reality often involves working in his Peace Corps office from 8:30 a.m. to 7 p.m., and then hitting the books at the Hotel John Kilpen where all the members are bedded down.

"Textbooks will emphasize certain points again and again," say Bob Elder. "These check out here. But I think members of the ground tend to jump on the unexpected and say 'Boy, this is different.' It doesn't happen too often."

Dave Rosenbloom notes that "our studies at Colgate gave us a good background for this. I also got in some extra work on foreign affairs in preparation."

In addition to the work on the Kennedy library project, Dave has been answering Congressmen's questions and taking part in briefings for them. He finds "you have to handle them with kid gloves," especially when regional interests are involved.

While Rosenbloom's purview is the world, that of Charles Tantillo, of Garfield, N.J., is a rundown section of Washington, called the Adams-Morgan area, which will be brought to life again by the Redevelopment Land Agency where he is working. The project's success could have an influence on the rest of urban redevelopment in the country.

Edward M. Zachary, of Queens Village, N.Y., has impressed his boss, Edward Leet, Associate Executive Secretary of the National Labor Relations Board.

"I caught him going out the door after 7 p.m. the other evening," Mr. Leet said. "I thought only I did that."

In addition to helping prepare cases, Ed has also taken side trips to Baltimore to observe union elections and negotiating sessions.

The law is also the concern of Jack F. Fallin, of Warren, Pa. Given a prominent corner in the big Justice Department office of Robert J. Hoerner, chief of the evaluations unit of the antitrust section, he has helped research and document cases.

"Send us some more like Jack," Mr. Hoerner said. "We could use them."

Working with the Young Republicans, Donald H. Messinger, of Clyde, N.Y., is finding the sources of grassroots strength in the organization.

Over at the Securities Exchange Commission, Philip C. Johnston, of Bellaire, Ohio, is seeing all sides of the unit's work in regulating the sale of securities.

The members of the Colgate group, despite the heavy work schedule, also find time to socialize at parties on Embassy Row, the State Department, and other places. "The woman-to-man ratio is a little better here than in Hamilton," one man remarked happily.

The students will return to the Colgate campus at the end of May, ready and eager to share their experiences with their fellow classmates. And that, of course, is one of the reasons for the program.

Senator Church Commended by Idaho Wildlife Federation for Conservation Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Wildlife Federation, District No. 1, of which Vern J. Kidd is president, recently passed a resolution commending Idaho's senior Senator, FRANK CHURCH, for his efforts on behalf of conservation of our natural resources. Because it is also my feeling that Senator CHURCH has made an outstanding contribution to the field of conservation, I would like to insert this resolution in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks.

RESOLUTION

APRIL 12, 1964.

Whereas wise use of our natural resources in the public interest daily becomes a matter of more urgency for the health of our economy and the well-being of our Nation; and

Whereas in the use and control of our natural resources we have an obligation to future generations so that they, too, may enjoy our great outdoor resources; and

Whereas the outstanding wisdom and courageous devotion of Senator FRANK CHURCH to the cause of conservation has been clearly demonstrated by his actions on many occasions; such for example, as his support of a strong wilderness bill, his Salmon River preservation bill, his bill to establish a wilderness park in the Sawtooths, his support of efforts to retain Upper Priest Lake free of commercial development, his support of a sound land and water conservation fund bill—and many other positive actions for conservation; and

Whereas this devotion to conservation has been further exemplified by Senator CHURCH's special trip to Idaho to report on these matters to two sportsmen groups: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That District No. 1 Idaho Wildlife Federation (representing all clubs affiliated with the Idaho Wildlife Federation in the five northern counties of Idaho) expresses its highest commendation and sincere thanks to Senator CHURCH for these efforts.

Approved unanimously in regular quarterly session this 12th day of April 1964 at Nordman, Idaho.

VERN J. KIDD,
President.

Jim Megellas Tells the Story of Aid to Yemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, our U.S. foreign aid program in Yemen is being directed by an outstanding young Wisconsin native, Mr. James Megellas.

The former president of the Fond du Lac, Wis., City Council, Jim Megellas, has been working diligently assisting the people of a far-off, primitive corner of the earth.

Although the Soviets began their aid program in Yemen 3 years before the United States agreed to give economic assistance, Megellas believes that our aid has had a more favorable impact than that of the Communist world.

A recent issue of Front Lines, an AID publication, carried an interview with Jim Megellas on his work in Yemen, and the results. It points up still another success of our foreign aid programs. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

NINE COUNTRIES BACK MANY AID PROGRAMS IN ANCIENT "GEOPOLITICALLY SIGNIFICANT" YEMEN—MEGELLAS CITES U.S. RESPECT

(By Nan Frederick)

The people of Yemen have formed no opinions about the East-West idealogical struggle, reports James Megellas, AID mission director for the strategic Arabic country. They have other things to worry about and the cold war only complicates matters, he said during a recent visit to Washington.

Two months after Megellas arrived in Taiz in 1962, civil war broke out and the 1,300-year Imamate rule gave way to the new Government of the Yemen Arab Republic. Fighting continued, mainly in the northern part of the country, for months. There are still sporadic outbursts.

But this is only part of the picture. Yemen lived in isolation for centuries. Only in the past 10 years has the country begun forming associations with the modern world.

Now there are no less than nine countries, including the United States, involved in aid to Yemen. Five of these are Communist-controlled. This does not count the political interests of Yemen's immediate neighbors, nor the efforts of the United Nations.

AID initiated a program for Yemen in 1960. Two major capital projects underway when Megellas arrived in 1962 were a 250-mile road and a water supply system for Taiz, combined cost on completion (expected this year) is $30 million.

To date, according to Megellas, the base of operations has been broadened to include extracurricular projects—use of technicians, equipment and advisers during offhours from the capital projects to help drill water wells in villages where people suffer from diseases introduced by impure water; bulldozing fields for school-building feeder roads to the new highway, grading streets in Taiz; giving vaccinations to children—responding to the appeals for immediate critical social needs of the Yemeni without additional out-of-pocket expense to the mission.

Two Public Law 480 shipments of emergency wheat came in 1963 to assist the Yemeni whose homes and sources of economy were disrupted by civil strife. Training programs have been enlarged: 18 Yemeni given scholarships for secondary schooling in Lebanon; 59 others in Beirut; 5 nominated for a university management course, and 6 taking a Pennsylvania State University correspondence course in water supply and treatment. This is aside from the 750 trained on the road project.

A Technical Advice Center has been added to the mission to assist Yemeni with small projects, and a new Tiaz Development Committee has been formed. A physician who has been added to the staff serves not only the 80 Americans and families, but the families of the 1,500 Yemeni on direct hire.

Surveying U.S. resources for his people-to-people efforts, Megellas reports working with voluntary agencies, such as the Southern Baptist, and the Catholic Relief groups who are considering assistance to a child clinic and the first Public Law 480 institutional feeding program. The Red Cross has donated drugs and supplies for hospitals.

In short, the program has expanded to involve both Yemeni and other U.S. interests in development. And the reception of such projects has shown a concrete impact of respect, gratitude, and friendship for Americans.

"The history of U.S. foreign aid is known to the Yemeni," says Megellas. "We are known to be the leaders of the world in this business, and we are especially respected for our attitude toward all peoples of underdeveloped countries. They know we are there to preserve their independence, and not to exploit either their geography or people. They know we are offering aid out of our concern for their social and economic progress in an atmosphere of independence and self-respect—no strings attached."

Megellas considers this a pretty fair showing, especially since Russia was working in Yemen 3 years before AID got there. And there seems to be no doubt as to why Yemen commands so much interest. It has "geopolitical significance."

The country of 4,500,000 population is located in the southwest corner of the Arab peninsula at the junction of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden, in the passageway of sealanes runnings to and from one of the richest oil deposits in the world.

Here's the story of what else is going on contiguous to the AID programs.

Russia, which has already built a seaport at Hodeida and a jet airfield at Sanaa, recently announced a new aid agreement. Red China sponsored a road from Hodeida to Sanaa and built their mission headquarters about a stone's throw from the U.S. AID mission. Yugoslavia has an economic mission and Czechoslovakia has a trade mission. East Germany is involved in setting up communications (mainly telephone) and providing farm tractors and water pumps for irrigation.

Free world help has come from West Germany, which has an agricultural mission in operation; Kuwait, which has a new program including agriculture, schools, and hospitals; Italy, which has doctors in Taiz and Sanaa, some of which were present before the revolution. The United Nations Technical Assistance Board is becoming more involved, and the World Health Organization has a small training mission for nurses and hospital technicians under survey.

The major difference in approach, says Megellas, is that the Communists are trying

to work themselves into the country, and the Americans are trying to work themselves out of an aid job.

The Communist countries import and use mostly their own people to work on projects, and are not concerned with training local talent. Megellas says they do not hire Yemeni to work either in their missions or homes. Local employees on the AID payroll outnumber Americans about 20 to 1, since AID puts great emphasis on training Yemeni in modern methodology and techniques at every opportunity—so they can move into a "self-sustaining orbit," economically and politically.

Fortunately for the free world interests, according to Megellas, the Yemeni have grasped the point.

Filling the Sugar Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congress will again be faced this year with the issue of sugar import quotas. Of paramount importance will be the question of what affect this legislation will have on the retail price of sugar to the consumers, the largest bloc of whom are the housewives of America. The housewife is more concerned with the price she has to pay for sugar in the market, than whether the sugar is derived from cane grown in Latin America, cane grown in the United States and its possessions, or domestic sugarbeets. The Washington Sunday Post points this out in an editorial carried in yesterday's edition. I ask permission to have this editorial included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FILLING THE SUGAR BOWL

The housewife who purchases a 5-pound bag of sugar is seldom concerned whether its crystalline contents were derived from cane grown in Latin America, cane grown in the United States and its possessions or domestic sugarbeets. But the question of imports is not viewed with casual indifference by the domestic producers and those whose fortunes are bound up with imports of raw cane sugar. They are now locked in a furious combat, and the task of the disinterested observer is to determine where the public interest lies.

The issue over which legislative lobbyists are spilling blood is how the 9.8-million-ton U.S. sugar market is to be divided. Under the Sugar Act of 1948, as most recently amended, the Government determines how much sugar shall be produced domestically and how much and from where sugar shall be imported. This year more than 58 percent of the market has been allotted to domestic producers with nearly half of that share awarded to the rapidly growing sugarbeet industry.

Because of the cessation of Cuban imports and a sharp rise in the world price, there have been demands that the domestic quota be increased at the expense of the "global quota." In December the Department of Agriculture asked Congress to suspend domestic marketing quotas, a request which in practice would sharply increase the share of the sugarbeet producers. Other legislation would increase the domestic sugar quotas by from 750,000 to 1 million tons. Are these measures in the public interest? We think not.

Increasing the domestic quotas will do nothing to help the consumers in the short run, and in the long run they would be clearly disadvantaged. With the foreign quotas reduced, the effectiveness of the check on domestic price increases would be weakened. And as sugarbeet production would expand most rapidly, the consumers would bear a heavy burden as a result of the high subsidy which is paid on every pound of beet sugar produced.

Even more disquieting is the impact on the cane sugar producing countries, particularly the Latin American members of the Alliance for Progress. The United States already has a sizable export surplus in trade with those countries, and any move which would reduce their import would defeat the purpose of the Alliance. Moreover, the country which is complaining that the Common Market is discriminating against agricultural imports should not close its doors to the efficient producers of tropical cane sugar.

Although the issues tend to be obscured by masses of technical details, it is clear that a reduction in the foreign sugar quotas will work against the interest of the consumer and weaken this country's political position.

Is NATO Through?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, there is a definite impression in this Congress, and indeed throughout the Nation, that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which came into existence 15 years ago this month, has reached the crossroads. It is believed that without the conviction of a common cause it will not long survive. Many of us know that the common cause still exists but has not been kept in proper perspective. If the alliance is to continue a vital factor in our defense of freedom, its course must be charted with diligence and cooperation, not indifference and dissension. That a useful purpose is served by this Organization is emphasized by the following editorial from the Utica Observer Dispatch, which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

IS NATO THROUGH?

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 15 years old this month, is pronounced dead by some and a lively corpse by others. If NATO truly is afflicted, the doctors in consultation differ widely and wildly.

Ambassador George C. McGhee recently told a West German audience that "The idea that dissension is tearing NATO apart, and that the alliance may not be able to weather the storm beyond 1969—when governments have the right to withdraw—is a complete misconception."

Speaking from an opposite point of view is Ronald Steel, former Foreign Service officer: "Although we find it hard to admit, NATO has become obsolete. The alliance we forged with Europe 15 years ago * * * is now a nuisance to our allies and a danger to ourselves. Its advantages for the United States evaporated when the Soviets developed nuclear missiles that could wipe out our cities. And for our allies, its usefulness has faded with every stride that Europe has taken toward strength and self-reliance."

Either argument has a certain plausibility. In its military concept, NATO was supposed to provide an armed force that was to hold massive Russian forces at bay until the U.S. strategic air force struck at the Russian heartland.

Budgetary concerns, foreign conflicts, and worldwide inflation have reduced the NATO "shield against aggression" to little more than an umbrella, albeit a nuclear one.

France under Charles de Gaulle has always failed to meet NATO military commitments and has deprived NATO of atomic bases. De Gaulle has not been without some justification. NATO has refused his demand for an American-French-British directorate in place of what he sees as Anglo-Saxon dominance.

The Norstad-Herter-Kennedy idea of a multilateral naval nuclear force has been kicking around endlessly. And there is validity to Steel's comment: "Our allies show little inclination to spend their money on this military monstrosity."

Whatever the evaluation of NATO, European peace has been preserved, the integrity of Berlin kept, and no Soviet territorial expansion westward has occurred since 1948. Soviet policy seeks harassment or dissolution of NATO, and that is a commentary on its effectiveness.

If NATO is a lie, it is fortunately one that the Russians believe.

Students Yearn for Strong Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the letter to the editor which has received the most acclaim in my district was an open letter to the President, written by a dedicated, concerned government teacher.

Because young people are so important, because this teacher demonstrates a special, dedicated interest in his students and the student's role in our society and government, and because we all should pay special attention to our responsibility for making certain that our youth are well educated and well endowed with a keen sense of our Nation's history, heritage, role, and aspirations, I am pleased to insert a copy of his letter. It contains food for thought for the President, his advisers, Congress, and every responsible, concerned patriotic citizen. He speaks for and on behalf of not only our youth but most of our citizens. Young people want their country to be a world leader; they, especially, want peace; but they want peace and leadership with honor.

The letter follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE SALINAS CALIFORNIAN:

In the years that I have been teaching American Government my primary objective has been to instill into my students a very profound love and respect for their God, their Government, and their country. In essence a genuine love for the American way of life. If this heritage of ours is to be preserved it is the duty of the Government teacher to develop in each student a sense of responsibility and interest in the conduct

of his Government. One of the best ways to stimulate students' interest is to teach them to accept and sincerely believe the fact that they as individuals are important.

In the accompanying letters you have the thoughts of my students regarding your foreign policy, because as you know the President alone is solely responsible for foreign policy.

Now, Mr. President, it is very important that we listen to our young people, not only because they are the citizens of tomorrow but because they are a lot more intelligent than most adults would like to admit.

They represent a fantastic potential for good, and they are just yearning for strong leadership and to be told that they are "really somebody" and that their country is the greatest.

In their letters you will note that the students don't care if our foreign policy is losing friends for us, "we are not looking for popularity they say," their concern is the fact that it is causing great disrespect to our country, a country which the students agree is great, but who also express sincere doubt as to their continued faith in it if it continues to permit itself to be ridiculed and disgraced by so many misguided nations.

"How can the President," my students ask, "permit 'rabble rousers' to burn him in effigy, call him Al Capone, tear down our flag, stone our embassies, etc.? Doesn't the President realize that when he permits them to treat himself in such a manner that he is allowing them to do the same to us? Doesn't he realize he is an elected official—he represents us—that we resent the fact he permits us to be disgraced in front of the world? Doesn't he know of his obligation and responsibility to protect and defend our good name? Doesn't he realize this is the planned work of the Communists?" Very thought provoking question—right?

Don't tell us that atheistic communism isn't the personification of evil. As a once proud Christian nation are we to allow ourselves to listen to an administration that insists on expounding the damnable philosophy of coexistence? God forbid. Is not the primary objective of atheistic communism to destroy man's self-respect and relegate him to the level of a godless animal?

Believe me, when I say my students are disgusted.

The real "crusher" came out when Senator FULBRIGHT advocated a policy of appeasement with respect to Cuba and Russia (they are nothing to worry about). In heaven's name hasn't the Senator learned from history the inevitable consequences of cowardly appeasement? After reading the intellectual gibberings of Senator FULBRIGHT, how would you answer their questions, Mr. President?

I will continue to tell my students that they still live in the most blessed country in the world, and though the Ship of State is rocking badly, they will be able to set it on a true course by their continued dedication and interest in their Government. I shall do this because I am trying to destroy an all too prevalent ideal nurtured by too many students, that they as individuals are nobody.

"This country is run by politicians and big shots, we don't count," my students say.

When I told them the next class project was a letter to the President discussing his foreign policy—they nearly dropped dead. "Yon can't be serious, he won't read our letters, we are nobody to him—we will be wasting our time." That, Mr. President, is the attitude of many of our seniors as they enter the world outside. Tragically, this attitude is too common among many parents.

"Who am I?—I'm nobody." "The heck you're not," I say.

"You are the most important individual in the world, and if any politician or administration through apathy, naivete, corruption or planned subversion attempts to destroy your way of life you let them know of your anger and determination to drive them out of office by making your voice part of many millions of others, the roar of which will stigmatize them forever as perverters of trust, justice, and honor.

Yes, Mr. President, the people of this country are the most important individuals in the world. Why shouldn't we be—are not we the Government? You bet we are.

This country of ours is loaded with red-blooded and proud Americans who are just waiting for a leader who will prove by his acts—not words alone—that he will preserve, with his life if necessary, the good name of America. Then and only then will the people rally around him and once again make this country of ours the most God fearing, God loving, most powerful and most respected Nation in the world.

When this happens the youth of our country will have a goal in life into which they can pour their boundless energy, enthusiasm, intelligence, dedication, and spiritual fervor, uniting them as one in maintaining the integrity and honor of our great Nation and the preservation of peace throughout the world. Should our Government continue in the way that it has in the past—all will be lost because war will be inevitable. Why do I dare say so? History tells me so.

For the first 10 years or so after World War II I did believe that we should exercise patience and use every means at our disposal to try honestly and sincerely to preserve the peace. I am still very much for peace—but not at any price, especially on Communist terms. Their so-called peace will come when they have conquered us, and this they will do unless we institute drastic changes.

After observing the conduct of both Democrat and Republican administrations, I and millions of other people are fed up with our policies of acquiescence.

We, the people of America, used to be very proud of our country and we still know we do not have to back down to any nation. We are intelligent and are very capable of standing up to the truth—either good or bad—and are not afraid to make sacrifices.

We insist that we decide our own future, not Russia or any aggressor nation.

We insist that our representatives keep the welfare of the United States uppermost in their minds—not their own petty interests.

We demand brave and patriotic leadership.

Yes, Mr. President, I am proud to indoctrinate my students—because by doing so I am helping to change the "myth" that we are really nobody—to the truth that we as individuals are really somebody.

We will be looking forward to your answer with great anticipation. Thank you and God bless you.

WILLIAM D. O'BRIEN.

Arva Merrill, Idaho's Second Prize Ability Counts Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, I inserted in the RECORD the first prize winning essay written by Miss Karen Spence, of Caldwell, Idaho, in Idaho's annual ability counts contest sponsored by the Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped and the Idaho State AFL–CIO.

Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the second prizes say written by another constituent of mine, Miss Arva Merrill, of Melba, Idaho.

Her fine essay follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(By Arva Merrill, Melba High School)

Handicapped. Handicapped. And yet, are they? In my community there are many people who have physical defects. One of these is a woman totally deaf in one ear. Modern science has not as yet created a hearing aid to correct her hearing, but she helps herself and her community as she works in the local drugstore and is active in her church. A jolly, round lady, her warmth radiates throughout the countryside.

The man who lives on the hill has only one arm. To watch him work, you would think that he was a man totally whole, but then you see the empty sleeve tucked under his belt. He lost his arm and collar bone in a hay baler about 5 years ago. At that time he had no occupation that could be managed without two arms, but this did not stop him from making a living for his family. He went to school and learned a new trade and went to work supporting his family. Now, again, he is an independent citizen of my community.

Living in the big, white house with the huge barn behind it is a lady whose bad back and heart give her much pain. Still she smiles at everyone and always has a thoughtful word for every passer-by. She reared 3 wonderful children who were adopted. She is an asset to her home and her community.

All of these magnificent, able people are helping themselves and others; yet there is another in my community who stands out in my mind as noble.

My next door neighbor is a good farmer, a marvelous man, and a handicapped person. He has muscular dystrophy. The muscles from his waist down are almost destroyed, but he continues to work and support his family.

His fight with crippling muscular dystrophy leaves one with a sense of awe and amazement. Not only does he run his own farm, but he rents another farm and keeps them both going at the same time. At one time his wife asked him why he did not ask for aid and take life easier. He replied heatedly that he did not need help from another source because he was capable of making his own way and felt it a privilege to do so.

How can he continue with such a physical handicap? Perhaps the answer lies in his state of mind. It must be strong indeed. By securing a livelihood for his family, he has the knowledge and satisfaction of providing for his family; he has the respect and admiration of his fellow friends and neighbors; but most important he has the feeling of a contributing human being, crippled, but not to be pitied—a man to be honored.

I have sometimes watched him and wondered, "In his place could I carry on? What gives these so-called handicapped persons the courage to go on, to make a sacrifice for the things they desire?" Is the answer found in the old adage "The show must go on" no matter what the handicap? Are the obstacles that we face to be compared with that of the handicapped? No. Perhaps the solution lies in the heart of the handicapped individual that cries out for equality in this world set up for the whole—the unhampered.

There is a man crippled from childhood; one leg is shorter than the other by 6 inches. All of his life he has worn a large brace, but he has been working beside his five brothers, hoeing corn, topping beets, and pitching hay. He worked his way through

college as they did, and now supports his family without assistance.

Look around. See all your friends and neighbors who suffer from some kind of handicap; the woman born without an arm works in the courthouse and types with only one arm; the grandmother, deaf in both ears for the past 20 years, plays peek-a-boo with her small grandson; the boy with that little magazine stand on the corner (did you know that he was told he would never get out of bed again or be able to move because of his handicap?); the farmer who has a wooden leg, resulting from a logging accident. They are strong. They are great.

"These are heroes then—among the plain people. Heroes, did you say? And why not? They give all they've got and ask no questions and take what comes and what more do you want?" [1]

These have a desire to be like everyone else, to provide a living, to have a family, to live healthy, happy, normal lives, and to enjoy all the many simple pleasures that we sometimes take for granted. The sound of a baby laughing, the beautiful pink and orange glow of an evening sunset, the footraces on the Fourth of July. What do these things mean to the deaf, the blind, the lame? Through example these handicapped show us that ability counts and that things that are desirable are worth working for.

The handicapped person does not let his disability stand in the way of what he wants. His problem is the prejudice of the people who feel that without a whole, healthy body a person is not capable. As we are confronted with the handicapped, let us remember that they are willing and—most important—they are able.

Remember. Disability is not what endorses the handicapped individual, but his ability, his patience and endurance, his faith and courage. The handicapped are a working part, an untapped resource, of our great, growing America, land of the free and able.

[1] Sandburg, Carl, "The People, Yes."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Addresses by President and Mrs. Johnson at Fundraising Dinner of Democratic Club of Cook County, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the largest Democratic dinner in the history of Illinois and, I believe, in the history of the country, was held last week in Chicago. No fewer than 6,500 persons were present, and they welcomed President and Mrs. Johnson with great enthusiasm.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mrs. Johnson and of President Johnson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AND MRS. JOHNSON TO FUNDRAISING DINNER OF THE DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF COOK COUNTY, MCCORMICK PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mrs. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Mayor, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, when I first received your invitation, my husband suggested that I might come out and speak in his place. But I told him I thought that was carrying the policy of women in government too far.

It is always good to come to town where Mayor Daley is host. Starting out on this trip, I was apprehensive we might be hit by lightning, for reasons you can understand. But Lyndon said, "Don't worry. I have telephoned Dick Daley and he has taken care of it." I am glad to be here because Mayor Daley is one of the warmest and closest friends we have ever had, and I certainly do not need to tell you here in Chicago he is one of the best friends the people of this country have ever had.

There are other members of my family who are better at making speeches than I am, but I hope you will not mind. I hope my husband will not mind, if I tell you some of the things he might find it hard to say.

Any leader who has been in public life for 30 years tries to look down the decades to the future of his country. Some of the things which are closest to his heart are that every child in this country should be able to use all the abilities God gave him. We want him to grow up with a fair chance to provide a decent life for his family and for his children. In a country as free and rich as America, no one should be held back because he was born in a poor family or in a poor neighborhood, or because of the color of his skin.

This is not an idea which belongs to any one party or to any one part of the country. It is as true and important here in your great city as it is on the plains of Texas. It is simply what the America you and I believe in, the America Lyndon believes in, is all about.

I am glad to be here just to let you know and to let Senator DOUGLAS know, and to let all of the delegation of the State know, how grateful my husband is for your support in his effort to build that kind of America.

Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. Mayor Daley, Senator Douglas, Mayor and Mrs. Daley, Governor and Mrs. Kerner, my dear friend Bill Dawson, distinguished guests at the head table, my fellow Americans, a funny thing happened to me on the way out to Chicago. I passed Dick Nixon coming back from Vietnam, and Barry Goldwater, and Nelson Rockefeller going out. Harold Stassen was trying to hitchhike a ride, and Bill Scranton insisted that he doesn't plan to go, but if he changes his mind, he will just walk. I see in the papers that Barry and Rocky have decided to cut down on their appearances in California. This reminded me of the fellow down in Texas who said to his friend, "Earl, I am thinking of running for sheriff against Uncle Jim Wilson. What do you think?"

"Well," said his friend, "It depends on which one of you see the most people."

"That is what I figure," said his friend.

"If you see the most, Uncle Jim will win. If he sees the most, you will win."

A lot of Republicans have not decided who they want to be their nominee. One old man was asked how he was going to vote in the California primary. He said, "Well, I haven't decided yet, but I will tell you this: When I do make up my mind, I am going to be awfully bitter." And I think that is the dilemma that the Republicans face.

On the way out here today, I read where I would be coming into Goldwater country tonight. I read that in one of your newspapers. I find that pretty hard to believe. As I look around and see Mayor Daley and Otto Kerner, who drew more votes unopposed in the Democratc primary than two of the most formidable Republicans combined can draw in that primary, and I see out here tonight the Democrats who turn out here in Cook County for the largest Democratic dinner that I have ever attended, I know, I think I know, and I think you know, this is Democratic country. It is Democratic country tonight, and it is going to be Democratic country come November.

Since last November, this Nation has watched the Democratic Party at every level face the most exacting tests that any party has ever faced in our times. From city hall to the Halls of Congress, from the State house to the White House, the people have seen Democrats hold this Nation on a sure and steady course. They have seen this party keep faith with the young warrior who led us so valiantly and who was taken from us so prematurely, the beloved late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I believe that when November comes, the people will express their approval with a decisive victory at all levels for the party of all the people. I believe that Chicago and the great State of Illinois will lead the way for the rest of the Nation.

It makes me feel mighty good to be here with you good people this evening. I want to pause just a moment to express my deepest gratitude and the gratitude of my family for the great sacrifice that each one of you have made, not only to buy a ticket to come here, but to come here and endure us all evening.

This is a memory that I shall not forget. This is a loyalty that I shall always treasure, and this is a friendship that I will try to return.

It is good tonight to be here with all of you and, particularly, with my old and trusted friend, Dick Daley. I don't ordinarily like to repeat what my wife has said, but I am going to, by saying that he is one of the great mayors of our land, and one of the great Americans of all time.

I am glad to come before this audience to say, "Thank you for your great Democratic Governor, for the great Democratic delegation that you have sent to Congress, led by that fighter for the people at all times, the senior Senator from this State, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, my good friend. I want you people of Chicago and Cook County to know that the people in this country have no better friends and my administration has no more loyal supporters than the Illinois delegation in the Congress that represents the Democratic Party.

There is an empty chair in this hall tonight, as BILL DAWSON reminded us, and an emptiness in all of our hearts, because our country lost one of its finest public servants and I lost one of my oldest friends when death took from us last week that great American, Tom O'Brien.

I never come to Chicago without thinking how great has been our past and how greater still can be our future, for the story of Chicago cannot be told in statistics alone, in charts which show an incredible growth from 4,470 people in 1840 to 3,550,404 in 1960, an explosion which in the last decade has made Chicago the third fastest growing city in absolute growth in all of America. Behind those statistics is the story of individual men and women, pioneers and builders, struggling for jobs and decent homes, driven by the dream of education for their children, longing for a chance to live out their days in freedom and peace. Brick by brick, street by street, building by building, neighborhood by neighborhood, these sturdy pioneer people built Chicago, and people like them built all America. So tonight it is more important to look ahead to where America can go than to spend any time looking back where America has been. We must not abandon our future with a hopeless shrug of the shoulder, saying that everything has been done which can be done, confessing that the new demands of America, the demands of our cities and our suburbs are beyond the pale of our help. There are those in this country who say "There is nothing we can do," or, worse still, "There is nothing we should do." So resigned and so committed, they lay the ax of indifference to the strong oaks of hope, to urban renewal, to low-rent public housing, to aid for public schools, to relief for our hospitals, to medical care for our aging, to air pollution control, to mass transportation assistance, and to a decent poverty program for all of our poor people. Every blow of their ax strikes not at the political agenda of a political party, but it strikes at the agenda of all of America's future.

So I say to you this is not the attitude that built the America we love. This is not the way to the America that we want to build, and it is not the philosophy of the Democratic Party that I have the honor to speak for.

Woodrow Wilson, a great Democrat, once said, "The success of a party means little unless it is being used by the Nation for a great purpose." And that purpose tonight is clear. We have been called upon to build

a great society of the highest order. We have been called upon—are you listening?—to build a great society of the highest order, a society not just for today or tomorrow, but for three or four generations to come. And if the Democratic Party serves that purpose, we do not have to worry about success at the polls come November.

If we do not serve that purpose, all our worrying will not help us to win the people's allegiance, for we will not be worthy of their trust, or worthy of their votes.

So let us, as party and people, think not only of the next election, but let us think tonight and plan for the next generation.

Much depends on what we do to solve the problems of our great cities. For it was Aristotle that said "Men come together in cities in order to live, but they remain together in order to live the good life." Today, more than two-thirds of the American people live in metropolitan areas, but all of us know that too few of those people really live the good life. And all of us know, too, that as long as any Americans live in inadequate homes, and go to inadequate schools, and enjoy second-class citizenship for any reason, eat too little food, get too little work, breathe polluted air, play in cramped and crowded parks—as long as these conditions exist, the vindication of democracy is beyond us and the good life is just a mockery.

To some the indication of democacy in an urban nation is an unreal and impossible goal, for they have been numbed by the magnitude of the task. Only last week a man came to see me in the White House and said to me, "Nothing we do will help. The population explosion is submerging our cities in a sea of futility. The harder we work, the more there is to do."

I feel sorry for that man. I treat him with compassion. I feel as sorry for any American who has lost faith in the capacity of the American people. I feel sorry for the country, too, when even one citizen loses hope. For while we stand tonight on the very edge of a great society, timid dreams and faint resolve will never help us to achieve it. Almost 4 years ago a brilliant young Senator named John Kennedy came to Chicago and he talked about moving this country toward new goals, and he said, "There are 5 million homes in the United States, in the cities of this country, that lack plumbing of any kind. Fifteen million American families live in inadequate housing. The average social security benefit is less than $78 a month for someone who is retired and out of work, and he has to pay food, housing and medical care out of that pittance. Anyone who says there is nothing left to do, that all the things that had to be done were done by Truman or Roosevelt, then I think he was wrong. We in our time still have responsibilities left if we are going to build a stronger society."

What John F. Kennedy said in Chicago on the night of October 1, 1960, I repeat in the same city tonight, April 23, 1964, as the continuing pledge of the Democratic Party and this administration. We are going to build a great society, and we have just begun to fight.

Last night we demonstrated the strength and the substance of our democratic system. The railroad conflict was settled. The world saw and will long remember how reasonable and responsible men respond to challenge and to need, and to leadership. After almost 5 long and dreary years, the railroad men, the company management, the union leadership, with full freedom of spirit, last night won a great victory for free collective bargaining in the American way. And I was never prouder of America than I was last night. Last night proved the lively spirit of the democratic process, but it does not lessen our concern for other problems that confront us today, for the business of building the great society is undone until we have attacked and demolished the inequalities that infect us, and the inadequacies that afflict us. We have attacked and we will continue to attack, the prejudice and the discrimination that give a Negro child only one-half as much chance of finishing high school; that give a Negro child only one-third as much chance of getting to college as other children born in this country; that give him on the average 7 years less to live.

Yes, we are attacking and we will continue to attack not only discrimination, but we will attack the causes of unemployment which now sends 4 million Americans to look for relief instead of work.

Last month, I am proud to tell you, employment in this Nation rose by 172,000 jobs, and unemployment dropped from 5.7 percent a year ago to 5.4 percent.

And if the Democrats will stay behind me and the Republicans will help us just a teeny bit, our war on poverty will make another big dent in those unemployment figures.

We have attacked with three major education bills, and we will continue to attack, the demands of education. Every single year college youngsters in America increase at the rate of 300,000 a year, a rate equal to the entire enrollment of 60 new State colleges every year, Governor Kerner. I do not have to remind you that children whose education suffers from overcrowded classrooms, or suffers from inadequate teachers, can never gain back what they have once lost.

We cannot, in a good society in America, tolerate a second-class system of education anywhere.

We have attacked, and we will continue to attack, the need to preserve our natural resources. One of the great preservers of resources of this Nation of all time is that gray-haired man of wisdom who sits at this table tonight, but who constantly leads the fight to preserve our natural resources in the Senate of the United States, your own beloved PAUL DOUGLAS. He knows, and I know, and you know, that we need more parks and more beaches, and more playgrounds for our little children, more recreational facilities for all American families.

Last year, 94 million people used our public parks. This year the number will be 99 million people who will visit our public parks. More people have more time, thank God, to enjoy more of America's beauty than they have ever had before, and if we, God willing, have another Democratic administration, we are going to give them still more time to enjoy that beauty.

I remind you tonight that beauty is not inexhaustible and it does not automatically replenish itself. Every inch of our natural heritage is a resource which once lost cannot be recovered. My administration is determined that unborn generations will not be denied the privileges of enjoying their Nation's natural beauty.

We have attacked and we will continue to attack the needs of our aging citizens. Ten percent of our population tonight is over the age of 65. Every year that percentage is increasing. What is going to happen to these people, your mothers and fathers, your uncles and your cousins, and your aunts? Who is going to help them live out their days in the dignity that they deserve, in the twilight of their career? Do we want to deny their hopes? Do we want to degrate their lives? This administration's plan for medical care for the aging asked the average worker for $1 per month from the worker's paycheck, and $1 per month from his employer, and nothing from the Government. Surely our people to have this chance to contribute $24 a year for a period of 40 years that will be multiplied by the interest earnings by 3.75, that will ultimately provide each person with almost $4,000 to take care of his medical care after 65. It seems to me that in our way of life we ought to have a chance to provide for people a decent life in their old age.

We have the manpower, we have the means, we have the money to do all that must be done to realize our greatest dreams. All we need now is the will. Let it never be said of the Democratic Party or of America that while the men of past had convictions, the men of today have only opinions. We have our convictions, we know what we want for America. We want an America committed not only to the defense of freedom for our own people, but to the extension of freedom to all people. We want an America that is willing to live in harmony with every other nation that respects human dignity and human liberty. We want an America that always keeps its guard up, but always has its hand out. We want an America that is seeking diligently the day "when nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more."

This week we took a specific step in that direction when we decided to reduce the production of fissionable material for atomic bombs. With that decision, we and the Soviet Union took one step back from the precipice. We will continue to search for new ways to build the common interest while, you may be sure, seeking all ways of preserving the national interest. We are going to go as far as is prudent and as fast as is possible to bring peace to this troubled world. The America we want is an America where every citizen, whatever his race or religion, is treated with equal respect and enjoys equal opportunities to develop his capacity and to provide for the well being of his family. The America we want is an America where no home is unsafe or unsanitary, where children can play in parks and playgrounds, where every family can live in a decent home, in a decent neighborhood, where the water is clean, the air is pure, and the streets are safe at night, and where every man can worship God freely according to the dictates of his own conscience. This is the kind of America that we believe in, and this is the kind of America to which we are dedicated.

I have come here to Chicago tonight under the auspices and the invitation of your great mayor to ask your help, to ask the help of each of you to building that kind of an America, not only for our children, but for generations yet unborn. Thank you.

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a man of outstanding integrity and loyalty. He was a dependable colleague whose word could be relied upon and who always deliver what he promised. It was these fine qualities of his that enabled him to serve with such distinction in his native county, State, and in the Congress. His public service covered a span of many years, which included 4 terms in the State Assembly of Illinois and a term as sheriff of Cook County in addition to the 14 terms for which he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. He was renominated in the Illinois primary for yet another term on the day that he passed away.

TOM O'BRIEN has been a longtime political leader of his party both in Chicago and in the House of Representatives. He was considered the leader of the Illinois democratic delegation for many years and was respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

TOM was particularly helpful to me as a newcomer to both Congress and the Ways and Means Committee and as one who was seeking advice. My short friendship with him on the committee was most gratifying, and his suggestions and assistance were both constructive and helpful in my indoctrination.

TOM's many friends will miss his leadership and good judgment, and Illinois has lost a fine native son. I, too, have lost a kind and helpful friend, whose cheery smile I shall miss, and to whose family I extend my deepest sympathy in their sorrow.

Death of Parker McLauthlin Merrow of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last week, New Hampshire suffered the loss of a distinguished citizen, Parker McLauthlin Merrow of Ossipee.

Publisher of a widely read weekly newspaper, judge of the municipal court of his home community, successful businessman, and recognized leader in civic affairs throughout the State, Parker Merrow enjoyed the respect and affection of the thousands who knew him.

One of the great tributes to his memory was paid by Paul Blanchard, publisher of a neighboring and, in a sense, competing weekly newspaper. Mr. Blanchard's poignant reflections accurately express the feelings of us all, and I ask unanimous consent that his editorial, entitled "Judge Parker Merrow," appearing in the North Conway (N.H.) Reporter for April 23, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE PARKER MERROW

A great friend of this community passed away last Saturday night and the lengthy shadows of sadness will linger for sometime up and down this valley.

As editor and publisher of the Carroll County Independent and the Granite State News, Parker Merrow was loved because of his forthright homespun style. Indeed, it was refreshing to many who found escape from the pressures of the city. For those who lived around here, there was a feeling of sincere affection for this man, who was putting into words their inward emotions.

"Hank" was the name he used in signing his columns and Hank will ever be loved by more people than one can imagine.

Parker had a drive that was tireless right to the end of his days. There are those who believe he knew he was doing too much. There are those who undoubtedly urged him to take it a little easier but this man just did not seem to know how. He would talk about it—in fact, at times it seemed as though he had the vision and the urge to find some little place where the world could go by with his blessing and little work * * * but the spirit to do, the will to accomplish and to bring about better things for the community he held so dear, were uppermost in his mind at all times.

Parker loved the mountains of New Hampshire with the deep and inviting forests. Likewise, the lure of the valley with the cool and tempting lakes, as well as the brooks that babbled a language all their own, sympathetic undoubtedly, to this man's musings, he held dear.

To his Nation, State, county, and township, his contributions were numerous and generous.

As Judge Parker Merrow, he sat in the municipal court at Center Ossipee for 20 years. His decisions were considered fair and sagacious on the part of most folks who came before him but the philosophy which he was able to disseminate will be remembered far longer than any financial judgment imposed.

In service to his State of New Hampshire, Parker spent 2 years in the executive council during the governorship of Lane Dwinell. In this capacity he worked especially for better roads in this county with the full realization that the need was great. He also had time to hear the opinions of others in an effort to select that which had possibility for progess.

His counsel was sought by many and his acts of kindness can only be found in the record books which are kept in the Great Beyond.

Our words today are difficult to find and have but temporal duration. From the Holy Bible and the writing of St. Paul, however, we read:

"I have fought a good fight
I have finished my course
I have kept the faith."

No finer words could we write as we pay final tribute to Judge Parker Merrow.

P. K. B.

Will Peace Ruin Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, interest in the problem of converting our economy from military to civilian production has been heightened recently by the Defense Department announcements of cutbacks in our military spending at certain installations. Private industry will also be seriously affected as defense contract awards diminish and terminate. Many business firms have turned their attention to procedures that will ease the inevitable transition. Some of the lines of approach followed by a number of our largest contractors were outlined in a fine article by Associated Press business newswriter, Darden Chambliss, which appeared in the April 21, 1964, edition of the Lowell, Mass., Sun.

The dialog currently underway in private industry should be supplemented by governmental cooperation. This is the purpose of the more than 20 bills which have been introduced to create a National Economic Conversion Commission. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Chambliss' article in the RECORD:

WILL PEACE RUIN BUSINESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—President Johnson has reported new efforts to ease international tensions. This brings to the fore the question how industry can adjust to defense cutbacks. An Associated Press business writer interviewed industry leaders across the country to find out their plans and what problems they foresee.)

(By Darden Chambliss)

NEW YORK.—Announcement of Soviet and American cutbacks in nuclear production adds fresh impetus to a question that has lately commanded special attention:

How well is U.S. industry preparing for the day when the defense dollar stops coming?

President Johnson, in revealing the atomic cutbacks Monday at the annual Associated Press luncheon for newspaper publishers, emphasized "this is not disarmament" but "it is a step forward."

There have been several previous hints of warming East-West relations, and the sensitive ears of U.S. business have recorded them carefully.

With about 1 of 10 jobs connected with defense, the subject is pertinent.

Recent cross-country interviews with business leaders found general confidence that they can handle fairly well any readjustment they consider reasonable to expect. A sudden drop to zero defense dollars would make things rough, they concede, but they don't think this will happen.

These comments chart four main avenues companies may take. Each has its faults, businessmen say, but in combination they offer a fairly satisfactory answer to cutbacks.

One answer is to shift into different kinds of government business. Another is to diversify into established consumer products. Both courses are being followed already, with mixed success.

A third answer is to create new civilian products. Good, but hard to do. A fourth is to perform public works projects, such as solving air pollution or developing mass transit systems. Good too, these men say, but someone has to place the order.

Radio Corp. of America's scholarly president, Elmer Engstrom, notes that any successful company has had to learn long ago how to switch when markets change.

"Whatever happens in the way of disarmament," he says, "we wouldn't dare to put on the shelf the on-going research that has kept us in the forefront."

Some experts have estimated that the cost of an arms control inspection system would run up an annual bill in the first several years equaling, or even surpassing, current defense spending.

At Lockheed Corp. in Burbank, Calif., Vice President A. C. Ketchian sees a continuing need for conventional warfare equipment. His firm has leaned away from the Polaris missiles it is completing and is hitting harder its troop transport production. At the same time, Lockheed has burst into a future market with its A-11 superplane that President Johnson recently described.

Executives say the defense industry has become overcrowded and hotly competitive, and that further shrinkage in total orders could make the going rough in the areas that remain.

"The defense dollar is a hard buck to make," says Boeing Co. President William Allen.

Therefore, many businesses are looking to a second possibility, such as the one being pursued by San Diego's Fred Rohr of Rohr Corp., who tells of applying aircraft fabrication skills to making sandwich panel homes that can be assembled quickly and cheaply.

This kind of diversification is not a perfect answer either, other executives comment. Emerson Mead, president of Smith-Corona Marchant Corp., notes it's not always easy to switch from making a precision product to making something that will sell well on the store shelf.

Dr. Arnold Beckman of Beckman Instruments comments:

"So much of the conversion that people are talking about would mean going into activities already being carried on by someone else. It would be competing with companies already in business. That wouldn't contribute a thing."

The only kind of conversion that would work, he says, is new products. Other executives agree.

But Beckman and others question whether this transition would be quick or automatic.

Already, there are signs that civilian industry is not quick to snap up engineers and research people being shed by defense contractors. Nor is the demand for college graduates as intense as it was.

Some suggest that the Government may need to step in, one way or another, to quicken the flow of talent into civilian activities. Many executives, inside and outside defense work, seemed to support the idea of special tax provisions or other Government incentives to stimulate development of new products.

These executives also were receptive to Government participation in another area: public projects to convert seawater, eliminate air pollution, rebuild cities, expand schools, develop mass transportation systems.

"Miss Jim" Perry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News of Thursday, April 23, 1964, contains an editorial entitled "'Miss Jim' Perry." This editorial pays fitting tribute to the accomplishments of an extraordinary member of the bar and citizen of South Carolina. "Miss Jim," as she was affectionately known, was, at the time of her death, a senior partner of one of the most respected and capable law firms in the South. She was the first lady to be admitted to the bar in South Carolina. Her contributions to the law and to numerous civil endeavors will never be forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MISS JIM" PERRY

Quite aside from her profession, the late Miss James M. Perry was a remarkable woman and a noble person. Because of her dedication to her family, her church and civic and public affairs generally, and her gifted service to all of mankind, and dumb animals, within her reach, she would have deserved the highest tributes.

But "Miss Jim" also was an extraordinary lawyer, achieving outstanding success in a field in which women are few and in which even fewer succeed on the scale that she did. Yet, living and working in a "man's world" she remained completely feminine.

We never saw Miss Perry in court, and her trial appearances were rare if, indeed, she ever tried a case. But her male partners and colleagues benefited immeasurably from her thorough legal briefs based on penetrating research and from her guiding genius.

In later years, "Miss Jim" specialized in corporation and tax law and dealt with wills and trusts. In this highly complicated area of the law she had few peers.

Born of unusual parents, both with fine backgrounds and interesting pursuits, Miss Perry's was an interesting life from her childhood. Her health permitted her to attend public schools only about 3 years, but through home study she was able to enter college at an early age and compiled an enviable record of scholarship.

Strangely enough, she took her law degree in California and practiced there before being admitted to the South Carolina bar, in which she became a leader.

She was one of the founders of the Greenville Humane Society and probably its most constant champion. She was a leader in business and professional women's groups and recently was honored as professional woman of the year.

Naturally, this strong willed woman had firm convictions and never swayed from them. Her highest duty and deepest devotion was to her church and family, but the law was her life and her service to mankind the measure of the effectiveness of all of these.

We never expect to meet another quite like her, but we shall treasure her memory as will thousands of others.

On Our Knees to the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country do not realize it, but slowly and surely our Nation's foreign policy has shifted until it is now one of appeasement of the Communist.

Allan Keller, in the April 23 issue of the New York World Telegram, tells us what is lacking and why our historical "take no nonsense from anybody" policy has deteriorated to its present state, despite the denials of President Johnson:

ON BENDED KNEE

(By Allan Keller)

It may have been overlooked during the excitement of the World's Fair opening, the cultural renaissance brought over by the Beatles and the Taylor-Burton farrago but I fear Americans are losing some of their sense of indignation. This worries me grievously since no people have long survived once they let their leaders or other nations push them around.

No physician will support this contention, but righteous indignation sharpens the brain, accelerates circulation, aids digestion, abets courage and uplifts the spirit. It is as American as clam chowder, baseball, or affection for an automobile. Or perhaps I should say it was that way until a few years ago.

Today, too many are too prone to take it on chin without protesting. This is true whether the affront involves international relations or a minor personal indignity.

Panama slaps us in the face, telling us when to fly the Stars and Stripes at full staff or half staff in the Canal Zone, and we turn the other cheek. Prince Norodom Sihanouk, chief of state of Cambodia, spits in our eye and we don't even blink. The Russians knock two of our planes out of the sky over East Germany and our official reaction is to issue orders scolding pilots for straying over the Iron Curtain.

We're not just turning the other cheek. We're revolving like a gyroscope and a lot of new two-bit banana republics with nothing much to boast about except a flag and an empty treasury give us hell in the U.N. while accepting medical assistance, technical training, Peace Corps help, and gold infusions to revivify the aforementioned empty treasuries.

I was raised to admire men like Maj. Charles Whittlesey of the Lost Battalion who refused to give in to the Germans in the First World War and Gen. Anthony McAuliffe who said "nuts" at Bastogne when the Nazi panzer commanders shortwaved messages saying his plight was hopeless. Some of the things George Patton did rubbed me the wrong way but I cheered his statement that he had never seen a Russian 10 feet tall.

A few months back their agricultural economy having fallen flat on its face, the Soviets asked us for surplus wheat to get them out of a really bad fix. How bad it was may not be known for years but there are many experts who say our wheat bolstered Khrushchev at a most critical point in his tightrope act as world leader of communism.

Disregarding the insults of the past, we started shipping Russia wheat as fast as we could get ships. While the bread of life was pouring into Soviet grain elevators they shot down our unarmed planes.

Did we stand up like men and say "Apologize, make restitution, and end such actions or you've seen the last of our wheat?" Like heck, we did. No one even became indignant. If I had been a Senator I would have called Dean Rusk before a committee to explain how our policy deteriorated from a strong one to a shameful blue funk. And I wouldn't have let him go out to eat until I got a satisfactory answer.

But the only time many Senators get indignant is when someone suggests they quit putting political garbage in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at $81 a page or when someone else asks "Is this taxpaid junket to the Chilean Andes to study snow-making machinery really necessary?"

There was a time when we walked lightly but carried a big stick. We were not the most powerful nation at the time, as we are now, but we had guts, both in Washington and the rest of the country. We've got the big stick—plenty of them, in fact, scattered around in concrete silos—but we're not even walking lightly. Most of the time we're on our knees.

Upholding Eternal Values in a Dying Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the March 1964 supplementary section of the Canadian Intelligence Service carries a statement entitled "Upholding Eternal Values in a Dying Civilization," which has a direct bearing upon the pending bill which carries the misnomer of a civil rights bill. It is, in fact, a bill that would exchange for a mess of political pottage

the cherished constitutional right of trial by jury in criminal contempt proceedings. Every one knows that the dignity of man is taught in the Christian Bible which became the foundation for a system of laws in the Western World for the recognition of the fact that God was our Creator and endowed each one of us with certain inalienable rights.

The decisive influence in shaping Western civilization—

Said the article in question—

was Christianity. Christianity brought a new conception concerning the nature and the purpose of the individual. It established a new relationship between individuals, and between individuals and their institutions. In England, the system of common law was evolved under the direct inspiration of Christianity and Christian lawyers. The necessity to curb abuses of power by checks and balances stemmed from the concept of freedom and inalienable rights for the individual which were a part of his God-given heritage. Moral standards of behavior in society were developed. The great commandment concerning the necessity for individuals to love one another was translated into practical measures, and not manifest as a type of sickly sentimentality, of which there is plenty today amongst so many Christians who apparently cannot grasp that there is a great deal of difference between stating a law and the application of that law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full statement on this subject may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPHOLDING ETERNAL VALUES IN A DYING CIVILIZATION

Every civilization is the incarnation of certain values and principles. And the physical structure of a civilization continues to survive long after the destruction of faith in the values upon which it was erected. This fact tends to mask the reality of the present plight of the world. Tremendous technological advances mislead many into believing that man is now self-sufficient; that he can dispense with the type of faith which his forebears demonstrated as they worked over long centuries to give tangible, physical expression to the values which they held in many cases were more sacred than human life itself.

PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS ACCEPT ABSOLUTES

Nothing demonstratees more graphically the present sickness of Western civilization, than the charge of "extremism" leveled at any individual or group standing strongly for clearly defined principles. Support for absolutes of any description is derided, except in the field of the physical sciences, where, ironically enough, all successful achievements have been based upon the adoption of an "extreme" approach. Bridgebuilders make a thorough study of the laws and principles governing bridgebuilding. These laws are absolutes which must be applied or there is disaster. Those building airplanes have constantly sought to discover the principles governing planes flying higher and faster than ever before. Passengers using these planes are confident that those responsible for them are "extremists"; that they seek persistently to discover and to apply those truths governing safe flying.

Now, the absolutes which the physical scientist must discover and apply if he is to avert disaster, are but a part of the reality of the universe. The scientist does not invent these absolutes. He discovers them. But they are part of that total reality which comes from the Creator, not from man. However, reality encompasses all aspects of man's life and activities, including his social activities. If these activities are to be successful, they must also be based upon absolutes. C. H. Douglas pointed out that the laws governing human associations are as capable of exact definition as are the rules governing bridgebuilding. There is a law of rightness running through the universe, and to suggest that one can partly ignore this law because support for this is "extremism," proves that the person making this suggestion is infected with the disease destroying civilization.

CHRISTIANITY AND WESTERN CIVILIZATION

The decisive influence in shaping Western civilization was Christianity. Christianity brought a new conception concerning the nature and the purpose of the individual. It established a new relationship between individuals, and between individuals and their institutions. In England, the system of common law was evolved under the direct inspiration of Christianity and Christian lawyers. The necessity to curb abuses of power by checks and balances stemmed from the concept of freedom and inalienable rights for the individual which were a part of his God-given heritage. Moral standards of behavior in society were developed. The great commandment concerning the necessity for individuals to love one another, was translated into practical measures, and not manifest as a type of sickly sentimentality, of which there is plenty today amongst so many Christians who apparently cannot grasp that there is a great deal of difference between stating a law and the application of that law.

It is ironic that the more decadent a civilization becomes, the further it ignores the values upon which it was built, the more difficult becomes the task of those who stand firmly for absolutes in values and principles. The dedicated opponent of communism, for example, particularly if he understands the true nature of communism, is today subject to smear and abuse because Western societies have rapidly become softened by the very philosophy of materialism and collectivism out of which grow policies, financial, economic, and political, which increasingly centralize power at the expense of the individual. Collectivism in all its various manifestations is anti-Christian because it drives the individual into bigger and more highly centralized groups over which he finds he can exercise no control. Thus his capacity for self-determination and self-development, a spiritual necessity, is progressively weakened. And the final result is a nation of people resigned to accept whatever fate is decided for them by someone else. They throw up their hands in despair and say that they can do nothing about their own destiny. Such people are spiritually dead. The most disturbing aspect of the tragedy of this growing spiritual death, is the failure of present Christian church leaders to give any effective lead against the materialistic policies driving so many to spiritual destruction.

TIME TO PONDER ON THE ETERNAL VALUES

However, all is far from lost. Small, but in recent years steadily increasing, groups of dedicated individuals throughout the Western World, particularly in the British Commonwealth and the United States of America, have been successfully upholding the values of their civilization, standing firm against those who smear them as "extremists" or worse, and by their example and educational work, exercising an influence which will be decisive concerning the question of whether a new civilization can be brought to life. We regard our supporters as a part of that growing elite which can bring glorious victory out of threatened defeat.

Result of Questionnaire, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, more than 6,700 residents of the 37th Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent, responded to my questionnaire on national issues this year. Their replies were very informative and helpful. The answers to the questionnaires were recently tabulated and released, and under unanimous consent to have the results reprinted in the RECORD, I insert for the information of my colleagues in the Congress:

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation to—			
(a) Bar discrimination in places of public accommodations?	71.5	24.6	3.9
(b) Withhold Federal funds in programs where discrimination exists?	64.4	28.8	6.8
(c) Prohibit discrimination in employment practices?	73.2	21.5	5.3
2. Should Congress—			
(a) Enact the administration's medicare program to pay hospital and nursing costs (but not medical) for all persons over 65, financed by an increase in social security taxes and by funds from general tax revenues for the persons not under social security?	39.0	53.9	7.1
(b) Expand the present program of Federal-State aid to persons over 65 who need help to meet medical and hospital costs?	65.3	24.5	10.2
3. Should the reduction of Federal personal and corporate income taxes be accompanied by a comparable reduction in Federal spending?	86.4	8.2	5.4
4. Do you favor Federal aid for education to—			
(a) Construct public elementary and high schools?	52.0	43.5	4.5
(b) Pay public schoolteachers' salaries?	29.6	65.0	5.4
(c) Support nonpublic schools?	25.4	70.8	3.8
5. Do you favor amending the Constitution to permit offering of prayers in our public schools and other public places?	85.2	12.9	1.9
6. Should Congress create a Youth Conservation Corps and a National Service Corps as Federal programs designed to provide opportunity for youth?	69.3	24.6	6.1
7. Do you favor the proposed Quality Stabilization Act to permit manufacturers to set minimum retail prices for sale of their goods to the public?	29.3	62.3	8.4
8. Should the Federal Government continue to spend $5,000,000,000 annually for space exploration, including a manned flight to the moon?	39.2	54.7	6.1
9. Do you favor the sale of our surplus wheat to Communist nations—			
(a) If our Government subsidizes the price and guarantees credit?	12.4	76.3	11.3
(b) If we make no price or credit concessions?	52.7	39.1	8.2
10. Do you favor amending the Constitution to provide that Congress elect a new Vice President if that office becomes vacant?	74.8	21.7	3.5

This kind of diversification is not a perfect answer either, other executives comment. Emerson Mead, president of Smith-Corona Marchant Corp., notes it's not always easy to switch from making a precision product to making something that will sell well on the store shelf.

Dr. Arnold Beckman of Beckman Instruments comments:

"So much of the conversion that people are talking about would mean going into activities already being carried on by someone else. It would be competing with companies already in business. That wouldn't contribute a thing."

The only kind of conversion that would work, he says, is new products. Other executives agree.

But Beckman and others question whether this transition would be quick or automatic.

Already, there are signs that civilian industry is not quick to snap up engineers and research people being shed by defense contractors. Nor is the demand for college graduates as intense as it was.

Some suggest that the Government may need to step in, one way or another, to quicken the flow of talent into civilian activities. Many executives, inside and outside defense work, seemed to support the idea of special tax provisions or other Government incentives to stimulate development of new products.

These executives also were receptive to Government participation in another area: public projects to convert seawater, eliminate air pollution, rebuild cities, expand schools, develop mass transportation systems.

"Miss Jim" Perry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News of Thursday, April 23, 1964, contains an editorial entitled "'Miss Jim' Perry." This editorial pays fitting tribute to the accomplishments of an extraordinary member of the bar and citizen of South Carolina. "Miss Jim," as she was affectionately known, was, at the time of her death, a senior partner of one of the most respected and capable law firms in the South. She was the first lady to be admitted to the bar in South Carolina. Her contributions to the law and to numerous civil endeavors will never be forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MISS JIM" PERRY

Quite aside from her profession, the late Miss James M. Perry was a remarkable woman and a noble person. Because of her dedication to her family, her church and civic and public affairs generally, and her gifted service to all of mankind, and dumb animals, within her reach, she would have deserved the highest tributes.

But "Miss Jim" also was an extraordinary lawyer, achieving outstanding success in a field in which women are few and in which even fewer succeed on the scale that she did. Yet, living and working in a "man's world" she remained completely feminine.

We never saw Miss Perry in court, and her trial appearances were rare if, indeed, she ever tried a case. But her male partners and colleagues benefited immeasurably from her thorough legal briefs based on penetrating research and from her guiding genius.

In later years, "Miss Jim" specialized in corporation and tax law and dealt with wills and trusts. In this highly complicated area of the law she had few peers.

Born of unusual parents, both with fine backgrounds and interesting pursuits, Miss Perry's was an interesting life from her childhood. Her health permitted her to attend public schools only about 3 years, but through home study she was able to enter college at an early age and compiled an enviable record of scholarship.

Strangely enough, she took her law degree in California and practiced there before being admitted to the South Carolina bar, in which she became a leader.

She was one of the founders of the Greenville Humane Society and probably its most constant champion. She was a leader in business and professional women's groups and recently was honored as professional woman of the year.

Naturally, this strong willed woman had firm convictions and never swayed from them. Her highest duty and deepest devotion was to her church and family, but the law was her life and her service to mankind the measure of the effectiveness of all of these.

We never expect to meet another quite like her, but we shall treasure her memory as will thousands of others.

On Our Knees to the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country do not realize it, but slowly and surely our Nation's foreign policy has shifted until it is now one of appeasement of the Communist.

Allan Keller, in the April 23 issue of the New York World Telegram, tells us what is lacking and why our historical "take no nonsense from anybody" policy has deteriorated to its present state, despite the denials of President Johnson:

ON BENDED KNEE

(By Allan Keller)

It may have been overlooked during the excitement of the World's Fair opening, the cultural renaissance brought over by the Beatles and the Taylor-Burton farrago but I fear Americans are losing some of their sense of indignation. This worries me grievously since no people have long survived once they let their leaders or other nations push them around.

No physician will support this contention, but righteous indignation sharpens the brain, accelerates circulation, aids digestion, abets courage and uplifts the spirit. It is as American as clam chowder, baseball, or affection for an automobile. Or perhaps I should say it was that way until a few years ago.

Today, too many are too prone to take it on chin without protesting. This is true whether the affront involves international relations or a minor personal indignity.

Panama slaps us in the face, telling us when to fly the Stars and Stripes at full staff or half staff in the Canal Zone, and we turn the other cheek. Prince Norodom Sihanouk, chief of state of Cambodia, spits in our eye and we don't even blink. The Russians knock two of our planes out of the sky over East Germany and our official reaction is to issue orders scolding pilots for straying over the Iron Curtain.

We're not just turning the other cheek. We're revolving like a gyroscope and a lot of new two-bit banana republics with nothing much to boast about except a flag and an empty treasury give us hell in the U.N. while accepting medical assistance, technical training, Peace Corps help, and gold infusions to revivify the aforementioned empty treasuries.

I was raised to admire men like Maj. Charles Whittlesey of the Lost Battalion who refused to give in to the Germans in the First World War and Gen. Anthony McAuliffe who said "nuts" at Bastogne when the Nazi panzer commanders shortwaved messages saying his plight was hopeless. Some of the things George Patton did rubbed me the wrong way but I cheered his statement that he had never seen a Russian 10 feet tall.

A few months back their agricultural economy having fallen flat on its face, the Soviets asked us for surplus wheat to get them out of a really bad fix. How bad it was may not be known for years but there are many experts who say our wheat bolstered Khrushchev at a most critical point in his tightrope act as world leader of communism.

Disregarding the insults of the past, we started shipping Russia wheat as fast as we could get ships. While the bread of life was pouring into Soviet grain elevators they shot down our unarmed planes.

Did we stand up like men and say "Apologize, make restitution, and end such actions or you've seen the last of our wheat?" Like heck, we did. No one even became indignant. If I had been a Senator I would have called Dean Rusk before a committee to explain how our policy deteriorated from a strong one to a shameful blue funk. And I wouldn't have let him go out to eat until I got a satisfactory answer.

But the only time many Senators get indignant is when someone suggests they quit putting political garbage in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at $81 a page or when someone else asks "Is this taxpaid junket to the Chilean Andes to study snow-making machinery really necessary?"

There was a time when we walked lightly but carried a big stick. We were not the most powerful nation at the time, as we are now, but we had guts, both in Washington and the rest of the country. We've got the big stick—plenty of them, in fact, scattered around in concrete silos—but we're not even walking lightly. Most of the time we're on our knees.

Upholding Eternal Values in a Dying Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the March 1964 supplementary section of the Canadian Intelligence Service carries a statement entitled "Upholding Eternal Values in a Dying Civilization," which has a direct bearing upon the pending bill which carries the misnomer of a civil rights bill. It is, in fact, a bill that would exchange for a mess of political pottage

the cherished constitutional right of trial by jury in criminal contempt proceedings. Every one knows that the dignity of man is taught in the Christian Bible which became the foundation for a system of laws in the Western World for the recognition of the fact that God was our Creator and endowed each one of us with certain inalienable rights.

The decisive influence in shaping Western civilization—

Said the article in question—

was Christianity. Christianity brought a new conception concerning the nature and the purpose of the individual. It established a new relationship between individuals, and between individuals and their institutions. In England, the system of common law was evolved under the direct inspiration of Christianity and Christian lawyers. The necessity to curb abuses of power by checks and balances stemmed from the concept of freedom and inalienable rights for the individual which were a part of his God-given heritage. Moral standards of behavior in society were developed. The great commandment concerning the necessity for individuals to love one another was translated into practical measures, and not manifest as a type of sickly sentimentality, of which there is plenty today amongst so many Christians who apparently cannot grasp that there is a great deal of difference between stating a law and the application of that law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full statement on this subject may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPHOLDING ETERNAL VALUES IN A DYING CIVILIZATION

Every civilization is the incarnation of certain values and principles. And the physical structure of a civilization continues to survive long after the destruction of faith in the values upon which it was erected. This fact tends to mask the reality of the present plight of the world. Tremendous technological advances mislead many into believing that man is now self-sufficient; that he can dispense with the type of faith which his forebears demonstrated as they worked over long centuries to give tangible, physical expression to the values which they held in many cases were more sacred than human life itself.

PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS ACCEPT ABSOLUTES

Nothing demonstratees more graphically the present sickness of Western civilization, than the charge of "extremism" leveled at any individual or group standing strongly for clearly defined principles. Support for absolutes of any description is derided, except in the field of the physical sciences, where, ironically enough, all successful achievements have been based upon the adoption of an "extreme" approach. Bridgebuilders make a thorough study of the laws and principles governing bridgebuilding. These laws are absolutes which must be applied or there is disaster. Those building airplanes have constantly sought to discover the principles governing planes flying higher and faster than ever before. Passengers using these planes are confident that those responsible for them are "extremists"; that they seek persistently to discover and to apply those truths governing safe flying.

Now, the absolutes which the physical scientist must discover and apply if he is to avert disaster, are but a part of the reality of the universe. The scientist does not invent these absolutes. He discovers them. But they are part of that total reality which comes from the Creator, not from man. However, reality encompasses all aspects of man's life and activities, including his social activities. If these activities are to be successful, they must also be based upon absolutes. C. H. Douglas pointed out that the laws governing human associations are as capable of exact definition as are the rules governing bridgebuilding. There is a law of rightness running through the universe, and to suggest that one can partly ignore this law because support for this is "extremism," proves that the person making this suggestion is infected with the disease destroying civilization.

CHRISTIANITY AND WESTERN CIVILIZATION

The decisive influence in shaping Western civilization was Christianity. Christianity brought a new conception concerning the nature and the purpose of the individual. It established a new relationship between individuals, and between individuals and their institutions. In England, the system of common law was evolved under the direct inspiration of Christianity and Christian lawyers. The necessity to curb abuses of power by checks and balances stemmed from the concept of freedom and inalienable rights for the individual which were a part of his God-given heritage. Moral standards of behavior in society were developed. The great commandment concerning the necessity for individuals to love one another, was translated into practical measures, and not manifest as a type of sickly sentimentality, of which there is plenty today amongst so many Christians who apparently cannot grasp that there is a great deal of difference between stating a law and the application of that law.

It is ironic that the more decadent a civilization becomes, the further it ignores the values upon which it was built, the more difficult becomes the task of those who stand firmly for absolutes in values and principles. The dedicated opponent of communism, for example, particularly if he understands the true nature of communism, is today subject to smear and abuse because Western societies have rapidly become softened by the very philosophy of materialism and collectivism out of which grow policies, financial, economic, and political, which increasingly centralize power at the expense of the individual. Collectivism in all its various manifestations is anti-Christian because it drives the individual into bigger and more highly centralized groups over which he finds he can exercise no control. Thus his capacity for self-determination and self-development, a spiritual necessity, is progressively weakened. And the final result is a nation of people resigned to accept whatever fate is decided for them by someone else. They throw up their hands in despair and say that they can do nothing about their own destiny. Such people are spiritually dead. The most disturbing aspect of the tragedy of this growing spiritual death, is the failure of present Christian church leaders to give any effective lead against the materialistic policies driving so many to spiritual destruction.

TIME TO PONDER ON THE ETERNAL VALUES

However, all is far from lost. Small, but in recent years steadily increasing, groups of dedicated individuals throughout the Western World, particularly in the British Commonwealth and the United States of America, have been successfully upholding the values of their civilization, standing firm against those who smear them as "extremists" or worse, and by their example and educational work, exercising an influence which will be decisive concerning the question of whether a new civilization can be brought to life. We regard our supporters as a part of that growing elite which can bring glorious victory out of threatened defeat.

Result of Questionnaire, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, more than 6,700 residents of the 37th Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent, responded to my questionnaire on national issues this year. Their replies were very informative and helpful. The answers to the questionnaires were recently tabulated and released, and under unanimous consent to have the results reprinted in the RECORD, I insert for the information of my colleagues in the Congress:

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation to—			
(a) Bar discrimination in places of public accommodations?	71.5	24.6	3.9
(b) Withhold Federal funds in programs where discrimination exists?	64.4	28.8	6.8
(c) Prohibit discrimination in employment practices?	73.2	21.5	5.3
2. Should Congress—			
(a) Enact the administration's medicare program to pay hospital and nursing costs (but not medical) for all persons over 65, financed by an increase in social security taxes and by funds from general tax revenues for the persons not under social security?	39.0	53.9	7.1
(b) Expand the present program of Federal-State aid to persons over 65 who need help to meet medical and hospital costs?	65.3	24.5	10.2
3. Should the reduction of Federal personal and corporate income taxes be accompanied by a comparable reduction in Federal spending?	86.4	8.2	5.4
4. Do you favor Federal aid for education to—			
(a) Construct public elementary and high schools?	52.0	43.5	4.5
(b) Pay public schoolteachers' salaries?	29.6	65.0	5.4
(c) Support nonpublic schools?	25.4	70.8	3.8
5. Do you favor amending the Constitution to permit offering of prayers in our public schools and other public places?	85.2	12.9	1.9
6. Should Congress create a Youth Conservation Corps and a National Service Corps as Federal programs designed to provide opportunity for youth?	69.3	24.6	6.1
7. Do you favor the proposed Quality Stabilization Act to permit manufacturers to set minimum retail prices for sale of their goods to the public?	29.3	62.3	8.4
8. Should the Federal Government continue to spend $5,000,000,000 annually for space exploration, including a manned flight to the moon?	39.2	54.7	6.1
9. Do you favor the sale of our surplus wheat to Communist nations—			
(a) If our Government subsidizes the price and guarantees credit?	12.4	76.3	11.3
(b) If we make no price or credit concessions?	52.7	39.1	8.2
10. Do you favor amending the Constitution to provide that Congress elect a new Vice President if that office becomes vacant?	74.8	21.7	3.5

Constitutional Amendment on Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 22 my colleague, the gentleman from New York [FRANK J. BECKER], appeared before the Judiciary Committee to make a statement in favor of an amendment allowing prayer in public schools and other public places. As you know, this was the culmination of a long and sometimes lonely struggle by Congressman BECKER. His statement is worthy of note and I am, therefore, pleased to spread it in the RECORD so all may have the benefit of his words.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK J. BECKER TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, APRIL 22, 1964

Mr. Chairman, members of the Judiciary Committee, at long last it becomes my happy privilege to appear before this honorable committee. Needless to say, the purpose of my appearance is to give support to a proposed constitutional amendment designed to guarantee permanently the right to pray and read Holy Scripture in the public schools of our Nation. My interest in this sacred matter is intensified by the fact that the same forces which initiated the campaign to outlaw devotions in our schools are now determined to eliminate the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and the words "In God We Trust" from our coins and currency. This fraternity of secularists, if given further leeway, will remove chaplains from our armed services, our legislative assemblies, both State and National, and create in the minds of our children and young people the feeling that a tribute to God in relation to the affairs of our Nation is a misdemeanor, if not a crime.

My resolution (H.J. Res. 693) is designed to make it constitutional to refer to and rely upon Almighty God in all matters related to our existence as a nation. Such a constitutional amendment would preserve inviolate the right to sing in a schoolhouse every stanza of our national anthem. Who could have dreamed that the day would come in our Nation when a stanza from the "Star-Spangled Banner" would be vetoed by people in positions of authority over our children.

Indicative of the grassroots sentiment favorable to this project is the fact that 111 Members of the House have introduced resolutions to amend the Constitution substantially consistent with my Resolution 693. Fifty-eight Members of the House introduced identical resolutions to House Joint Resolution 693.

I have no arbitrary vanity concerning the language used in my resolution, but I must say that it wasn't drawn up hastily. It was not written in its present form until after a meeting with Members of the House who had previously introduced resolutions following the first Supreme Court decision of June 25, 1962. A committee of six members was formed and asked to draw up a proposed amendment on which all could agree. The committee was composed of three Democrats and three Republicans as follows: HORACE KORNEGAY, WALTER BARING, DON FUQUA (Democrats); FRANK J. BECKER, chairman, DEL LATTA, and WILLIAM CRAMER (Republicans).

Through the months numerous meetings were held. The committee conferred with some of the great constitutional lawyers of the Nation, including law professors and legislative counselors.

Why are we here today? What is the true basis for this historic discussion?

"The U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6 to 1 that the reading of an official prayer in New York public schools violated the first amendment to the Constitution. With only Justice Potter Stewart dissenting, the Court said on June 25, 1962, in *Engle* v. *Vitale* that the reading in public schools of a nondenominational prayer drafted by the New York Board of Regents[1] constituted 'an establishment of religion' under the first amendment—although this amendment merely says that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"A year later, on June 17, 1963, the Supreme Court held 8 to 1 in two cases decided together that reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in classrooms, under direction of the local board of education, was unconstitutional. The actions were held to violate the 1st amendment as it applies to the States through the 14th amendment, which prohibits State infringement of the individual's constitutional rights.

"The two 1963 cases—*Abingdon Township* (Pa.) v. *Schempp* and *Murray* v. *Baltimore* (Md.) *School Board*—involved the constitutionality of State or local statutes that require a religious exercise at the beginning of a schoolday, from which any students who objected could be excused. Again, Justice Stewart was the lone dissenter."

In the first decision of the Supreme Court relative to these matters, which was made on June 25, 1962, a member of this committee assured us that this decision would not bar prayers in public schools—it would merely forbid the use of an official prayer. To me that did not seem to be the case, and as it has turned out, it was merely the first step in forbidding reference in our schools of any reliance upon God Almighty.

The second decision of the Court rendered on June 17, 1963, relative to the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases confirmed my observation and there is little doubt in my mind that steps now being taken in the courts will eventually forbid any reference to one's reliance upon God Almighty and one's belief in a Supreme Being. Unless constitutional guarantees are established, devotions will be outlawed in all public institutions.

I am confident that every member of this committee is aware of the fact that for 22 months I have urged the chairman to hold hearings in consideration of these resolutions and the subject in general. It is my deep, personal, and humble opinion that nothing could be more important. The welfare and the entire future of our beloved America depends upon how we handle the most dynamic tradition in our national life—dependence upon Almighty God.

Through these months I have been inspired by the fact that groups have sprung up all over the United States who are concerned over this matter and are determined that this Nation, under God, shall not permanently and officially outlaw in our public institutions the very attributes of faith which have made us great.

I don't need to remind you that I have spoken frequently on this subject—under the 1 minute rule. In every instance I have pressed for hearings before this committee. I had hoped and prayed that it would not be necessary for us to use the discharge petition rule, and for more than 1 year we tried to avoid this necessity.

Some of us have been criticized on the grounds that the discharge petition called for only 4 hours of general debate. This gives rise to the question: How many bills which come before the House are permitted more than 4 hours of general debate? The answer is obvious; namely, very, very few. The rule required that all points of order be waived opening the matter to amendments. This being the case anyone could offer amendments and speak under the 5 minute rule, as we all know. Originally we assumed that only Members of the Congress would appear before this committee, but in fulfillment of requests which have come from nonmembers of the House, time for their appearance has been granted.

It is assumed that many statements pro and con will be made before this committee during these hearings. Some of the witnesses will represent organizations and churches which enroll millions of people. Let us not forget, however, that the Members of this Congress represent all the people of the United States and no one can appear before this committee who represents as many people as the combined membership of the Congress. The Members of this Congress surely are aware of the fact that the vast majority of our people favor a constitutional amendment which will guarantee permanently the right of prayer and scriptural devotions in our public schools.

With 111 Members having introduced resolutions in substantial agreement with my resolution and with 164 Members of Congress already having signed discharge petition No. 3, who can deny that there exists an overwhelming sentiment favorable to this proposition?

I am confident that every member of this committee, like myself, is aware of the unpopularity of the discharge petition, because frequently this technique is employed by people unwilling to play the game in this complex program of legislative endeavor. I am confident that no member of this committee would deny the fact that but for the unpopularity of the discharge petition idea, the petition already signed by 164 Members would bear many, many more names. Any Congressman experienced in detecting rumblings when he puts his ear to the ground, so to speak, should have no difficulty in realizing how public sentiment supports this measure.

The Constitution of the United States makes provision for amendments. The Congress in this instance is not being asked to amend the Constitution, but merely provide the means whereby an approved proposed amendment will be prepared by Congress to be submitted to 50 State legislatures for their approval or disapproval. The wisdom of our Founding Fathers is certainly demonstrated in this formula because after a measure has been approved by the Congress of the United States and then approved by the legislative assemblies of the several States, who could deny that it was the will of the people, and who here is going to deny the right of the people to pass on this life and death issue involving the fabric of our culture, the warmth of our souls and the dynamics of our traditions. If we ignore the compulsion which comes from the hearts of the people concerning this matter, we will be put in the position of throwing off the switch which connects a central dynamo to the lights of a great Nation.

Superficial observers would have us believe that a Supreme Court decision is completely final. Such people even insist that we accept it as not only final but sacred. It is obvious that the Supreme Court itself does not accept this viewpoint because they have reversed numerous decisions made by earlier Supreme Courts. If the present Court does not recognize the sacredness of earlier decisions, how can they expect those of us who honor and respect the Constitution of

[1] Prayer text: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

the United States to define their decisions as final and sacred?

In the first case known as *Engle* v. *Vitale* involving the State regents prayer of New York, the New York State Supreme Court, which is indeed the highest court in the State, and the New York State Court of Appeals, all made up of jurists of the highest caliber, ruled in favor of the regents prayer. Only the Supreme Court of the United States in a six to one decision reversed the State courts.

To carry on a discussion of whether the Supreme Court correctly interpreted the 1st and 14th amendments to the Constitution would be an exercise in futility. I must, however, respectfully disagree with the Court's determination and as a Member of this Congress I will continue in the future, as I have done in the past, to do everything possible to overcome the devastating effects of this decision with which I so vigorously disagree.

Concerning the offering of prayer and the reading of Scriptures in the public schools. I quote from an address by the late Cardinal Gibbons, before the Chicago Women's Education Union, in 1922:

"The men and women of our day who are educated in our public schools will, I am sure, be much better themselves, and will also be able to transmit to their children an inheritance of truth, virtue, and deep morality, if at school they are brought to a knowledge of Biblical facts and teachings. A judicious selection of Scripture readings, appropriate presentation of the various Scripture incidents, born of reflection on the passages read and scenes presented, cannot but contribute, in my opinion, to the better education of the children in our public schools, and thus exercise a healthy influence on society at large, since the principle of morality and religion will be silently installed while instruction is imparted in branches of human knowledge."

I ask to insert herewith a statement by the Reverend W. Hamilton Aulenbach, D.D., rector of Christ Church and St. Michael's, of Philadelphia. The statement was published in Christian Economics under the date of February 18, 1964. I only quote the last two paragraphs but commend the reading of the article which is not lengthy.

I quote this rector who debated with the atheist who was responsible for initiating the protest against Bible reading. Her will in the matter was later confirmed by the Supreme Court.

Said Reverend Aulenbach: "Arrogant, vulgarly, disrespectfully, she disdains God. She spits at the mention of the phrase 'Nation under God.'"

Continuing Reverend Aulenbach says: "Don't you devoutly wish to put 'thanks to God' back into Thanksgiving Day and the Bible and prayer back into our public schools and Christ, the Redeemer of man, back into Christmas? If you refuse to be eternally vigilant, our Nation ceases to be a nation under God and becomes a disillusioned nation worshipping only man himself. How strange that the Supreme Court could decide (and rightly so) for racial integration and then decree religious integration to be a crime."

"THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

"(By Rev. W. Hamilton Aulenbach, D.D., rector, Christ Church and St. Michael's, Philadelphia)

"The price of liberty is eternal vigilance. Americans don't dare even for one moment cease to be alert in their thinking, their doing, their living, their vigilance, if our Nation is to continue a new nation under God. This Government of the people, by the people, for the people—you and you, and I—increasingly secularized cannot long endure without our 'invisible means of support'—God.

"For years this rector has protested vigorously—and does so now—taking 'thanks to God' out of Thanksgiving for spectacular 'welcome to Santa Claus' parades and important—believe it or not—public school high school games at church time. Believing one with God is a majority, this one rector fought against the minority's desire to remove Christmas carols from our public schools a decade ago. Prominent public school officials in some instances vehemently disagreed.

"It was natural that next, prayer was outlawed in New York State and Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer in our Nation's schools actually made a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment. Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer a crime. How degenerate. Actually the Supreme Court was in this instance not qualified to make the decision it did. It was completely unable to distinguish between public worship—a must in our American democracy—and church-state worship not at all a present threat in our land. As a member of Houston Post of the American Legion, your chaplain has year after year talked to the young in Germantown's public schools. Always at the time allotted for Bible reading the pupils were quiet, reverent, meditative listeners, when well chosen passages from the Bible were read well by either teacher or pupil. It was integrated worship which could offend only the atheist. No one else.

"How strange the Supreme Court could decide—and rightly so—for racial integration. And then decree religious integration was criminal. Even the President of the United States was caught up in the belief. Now all go to our homes and our churches to pray. Never in public. He with the Supreme Court advocated making religious ghettoes of church and home where each in his own sectarian way separated from the sectarian ways of his fellowmen could worship only his own sectarian God. Apparently this recent misinterpretation of our Constitution did nothing to provide as did once the public schools for some form of the worship of God, the Father, for the far too many children from godless, spiritually indifferent homes. Let them spiritually fend for themselves, was the implication.

"Our course, our secularization does not end here. On the campus of California State University, a person occupying a campus house cannot bring in his own clergyman to his own home to conduct a service of worship. The clergy involved in any kind of work on the campus cannot be listed as clergymen in the campus telephone directory. In our own State of Pennsylvania, the State department of justice has ruled out baccalaureate services in public schools as unconstitutional. Criminal. Can you imagine such a thing? This rector debated with the atheist responsible for taking her atheistic protest against Bible reading to the Supreme Court. Arrogantly, vulgarly, disrespectfully, she disdains God. She spits at the thought of a 'nation under God.'

"When this rector—your chaplain—carried his protest to Washington, D.C., both Senators and Representatives who felt the Supreme Court decision was the product of confused minds insisted only the people could have this decision reversed. They explained their mail did not indicate today's Americans were concerned. Could this really be so? Don't you devoutly wish to put 'thanks to God' back into Thanksgiving Day? And Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer back in our public schools. And Christ, the Redeemer of man, back into Christmas.

"If you refuse to be eternally vigilant—the price of liberty—then our Nation instead of continuing a 'new nation under God,' becomes a disillusioned nation worshiping only man himself. This can only mean the end instead of the constantly refreshing beginning." Reprinted from the Liaison, American Legion Post No. 3, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

Now with your indulgence I would like to read into the record one of the finest sermons on the subject we are discussing entitled "Should We Have Religious Practices in the Public Schools?" This sermon was preached by a dear friend of mine, Rabbi Bernard Zlotowitz:

"SHOULD WE HAVE RELIGIOUS PRACTICES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

"(By Rabbi Bernard Zlotowitz, Sermon Preached by the Rabbi on Shabbos Chol Hamoed Pesach, Friday Evening, April 20, 1962, Union Reform Temple, Freeport, N.Y.)

"The purpose of the Passover holiday is to make us conscious of the importance of freedom and the worth of the individual. Passover cautions us not to take for granted the privileges we enjoy as free men and women. The seder and its ceremonial symbols serve to remind us that the bread of affliction and the shackles of slavery must once and for all be destroyed so that the dignity of the human being will be raised to a Godly level and all the peoples of this earth regardless of their color, race, or creed will be truly recognized as children of God created in His image.

"It is, therefore, fitting and proper at this season of our joy and gladness when we commemorate the exodus from Egypt and our redemption from slavery to examine once again the religious ideals of our faith and the high principles of our country.

"To be more specific, let us consider whether prayers and Bible reading in the public schools, or for that matter any religious celebration, is in keeping and in harmony with our religious tradition and American heritage—or whether it is a violation of our Constitution and all that we hold dear and sacred.

"Our religion has its roots in the belief in one God who taught us through His prophets and seers that freedom of the individual is paramount and is the ideal of mankind. God himself took us out of the land of Egypt—out of the house of bondage to make us a kingdom of priests and a holy nation—where brotherhood would reign supreme and Godliness reach unprecedented heights.

"Similarly, our own Nation was founded 'in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.' And in order to put teeth into this preamble, the first amendment to the Constitution which the States ratified was the declaration that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"The Founding Fathers knew only too well the dangers inherent in an established church. The experiences of the countries of the European continent were only too vivid in their minds.

"They fully realized that the freedom of the individual could never be complete if there was an official church recognized by the state. This the Founding Fathers wanted to avoid at all costs. They wanted a separation of church and state; and this they achieved.

"But by no stretch of the imagination did the founders of our country ever desire the separation of religion from government. The founders were a godly group of men and this was to be a godly country. Religion imbued them with a spirit of love and high ideals. The Bible inspired them.

"The Liberty Bell bears the biblical inscription: 'Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.' The Declaration of Independence refers to the Deity as the source of liberty. Listen to the words of this great document: 'When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political

bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. * * *'

"From these significant examples we can readily recognize that the founders of this Nation were a godly people and not a godless people. That they wanted a godly nation and not a godless nation. They always sought Divine help in all their deliberations just as the Houses of Congress do today. In fact, there are official chaplains in the Government, who bring spiritual aid and comfort to the representatives of the Government.

"The President of the United States takes a Bible, places his hand on it and raises his other hand to God and swears under an oath to God that he will uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Governors, mayors, judges, and all people who hold public office take an oath to God that they will fulfill the duties of their office to the best of their ability. A nonbeliever cannot hold a public office in our land. The wheels of justice would be at a standstill if witnesses were not 'sworn in.'

"The laws of perjury are based on swearing falsely. Our currency reads: 'In God we trust.' Even the pledge of allegiance has been modified to read: 'This Nation, under, God.'

"All this is in keeping with the spirit of our Founding Fathers. For they realized, as we do, that God and religion cannot be divorced from life. It is as much a part of us as the air we breathe. It was Justice Warren who pointed out when he spoke at the Biennial Convention of the Union of American Congregations in Washington last November—that we are a religious country by virtue of the fact that there is separation of church and state. Thus, in the opinion of the Chief Justice of the United States, our country is a religious nation because we do not recognize one church as the official church, but rather we recognize all houses of worship be they Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or any others.

"We recognize the vital role that religion plays in making our life meaningful. Yet today in our community and in some other communities, a group has seen fit to challenge this concept of our American way of life and to undermine it. Today there is a movement afoot to attempt to supress God in our schools, and to make the mention of God's name subversive in any public school.

"In fact, the matter has gained such serious proportions that the Supreme Court of the United States heard arguments on this issue early this month, and I understand that sometime in the fall, it will render its decision on whether public schools are permitted to have Bible readings and prayer.

"It now behooves us to ask: What is the function of the public school? The purpose of the public school is to teach our young to grow into useful and responsible citizens by preparing them properly for life. This can only be accomplished by having schools transmit our culture and our heritage which in this country is Judeo-Christian. We Jews live in a country where we are a minority—a very small minority at that. The overwhelming majority of the citizens of this Nation are of the Christian faith—and as such, exert a great influence over us. I need only point out as I have on numerous occasions in the past, that we are unduly influenced by Christians not only in our schools which is minute as compared to the influence generated through the mass media of advertising, TV, radio, movies, newspapers, magazines, our business associations, and indeed our whole environment.

"The emphasis on Christmas, for example, is so strong that we have tried to offset this in our homes by overemphasizing the importance of Chanukah, and making of a minor holiday—one not mentioned in the Bible—a major festival. It seems that today we Jews observe three high holidays a year—Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, and Chanukah.

"But to get back to my point—the objectives of the school system is to convey our culture to our offsprings for their well-being as well as for ours. Toward this end, the school gears its curriculum to teach English, citizenship, government, American history, European history, geography, mathematics, sciences, and many other courses which are basic to living a good life in this country. And along with these courses of instruction, the school, in keeping with its desire to reflect the needs of the community, observe what we term religious practices.

"The schools close down during Christmas and Easter because these are religious holidays to the majority in our community. The schools are closed on Saturdays and Sundays because these are religious days. The schools plan no functions on Sunday because it is a religious day. In some parts of this State these schools close on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur because they are holy days.

"In reflecting the needs of the community and in perpetuating its heritage, the school celebrates holidays as does the community. In doing so, it attempts to explain, as it should, what the community is doing and what its citizens believe. Our children, as part of the total community, should understand the community in which they grow up, and where they will eventually earn a livelihood, marry, rear their own children, and make their contribution to community life. The school, if it is to fulfill its obligation, should explain the beliefs of its citizens, be they Christian, Jewish, Moslem, or any other faith. The Jewish child should know about Christmas and Easter as the Christian child should know about Chanukah, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, and Passover. Each child should know and understand the others religious observances. This makes for better relations in the community. This is the school's moral obligation. This is its civic duty. This is its responsibility. The community of which we are a part is a religious community. Nearly everyone believes in God. Nearly everyone worships God. And in keeping with its principle and ideals and goals, to mirror the needs and desires of the community, the school is fulfilling its duty in transmitting our culture and beliefs by having a prayer at the opening of the school day, and/or reading a passage from the Bible, because as a community, we believe in prayer and in the Bible.

"In New York State the following prayer is offered in the public schools: 'Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.' Now, what is wrong with this prayer? Yet some see great danger to our American way of life if the recitation of this prayer is permitted to continue. In fact, they have gone so far as to take this issue into the courts, and thank God, the New York courts have sustained this prayer. It is now before the Supreme Court where arguments as I noted earlier, have already been heard and a decision is to be rendered as to its constitutionality.

"I wonder why these groups don't object to the teaching of the Golden Rule and ethics and morals. After all, these are also religious teachings having their roots in the Bible.

"I think the school would be derelict in its duty if it did not transmit our culture in its entirety. For this is its function and responsibility. I admit that there are abuses connected with religious practices in the schools, and they do at times seem to be sectarian in character rather than nondenominational. But the solution does not lie in eliminating these prayers or Bible reading or holiday celebrations, but rather in correcting these abuses. One does not tear down a house if the roof leaks. He merely repairs the roof. Let us do the same. Let us repair the damage where necessary, but in doing so, let us not destroy the structure. Let us not throw out the baby with the bath water. And let us pray, that in the teachings of this holiday of Passover, we may yet find the truth that will guide us to a solution that will benefit ourselves, our community, and our country. Amen."

I inserted this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when it was sent to me by Rabbi Zlotowitz in 1962. I believe you must agree with me that his reasoning is clear evidence that we must amend the Constitution to restore the right to pray and read from the Bible in our public schools and preserve for all time the heritage of our reliance in a Supreme Being in our public life.

It has been argued by some that children mumbling a prayer in school is meaningless, and reading passages from the Bible, which they do not understand, a waste of time. If this be true, then many of our educational programs involving the memorizing of poems and the reciting of classics are also meaningless.

I am impressed by the fact that the same fraternity of cynics who campaign against tribute to God are cool toward many other of our traditions, such as the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and the devout phrase contained therein, "under God." Naturally, belief in a Supreme Being is meaningless to an atheist, but the negative dynamic of atheism did not build America. I am further impressed by the fact that this fraternity of cynics, atheists and unbelievers who would abolish any mention of deity in our schools and other public institutions manifest opposition to what we call patriotism. If we display enthusiastic affection for the Stars and Stripes, we run the risk of becoming the objects of scornful, materialistic sophisticates who want to brand us as being "chauvinistic." Because of this and numerous other circumstances I find my enthusiasm increased by the nature and personnel of the opposition.

To illustrate: I would like to quote the text of the letter sent out by the Free Thought Society of America, Inc., 4547 Harford Road, Baltimore, Md. This society in responding to a circular which related to the anti-God movement as a national emergency had this to say:

"GENTLEMEN: One of our members sent us a tract that your organization is passing out entitled 'National Emergency.'

"Buddy, you ain't seen nothing yet. This is more than an emergency for you superstitious Neanderthals.

"You are absolutely correct, we fully intend to destroy superstition in the United States of America for once and for all.

"We threw superstition out of the schools, we will throw the chaplains off the battleships, and we will teach American children that Tyrannosaurus was not in Noah's ark.

"The exploitation of sex by the church is another era that has passed.

"Defiantly,

"GARRY DE YOUNG,
"Vice President."

The periodical known as the American Atheist magazine in commenting on some of the sacred slogans, such as "In God We Trust," carried the following blasphemous couplet:

"To fool little children it is a must.
But if we had no men to fight,
No Army, Navy, airplane might,
We'd trust old Jehovah and Mary hail
As far as we could throw a bull by the tail."

I do not question the sincerity of good people opposed to this amendment, but I think if they would make a deeper survey of the question they might be shocked to find what strange and obnoxious company they are keeping.

The American Humanist Association, which is fighting the prayer amendment, reveals on its letterhead the names of Mrs. Madalyn Murray and Corliss Lamont.

A periodical known as the Scholastic Teacher carries an article by one Shad Polier, chairman of the Governing Council of the American Jewish Congress. In the article Mr. Polier says: "BECKER is conducting a one-man crusade which has turned some people's discontent with a historic Supreme Court decision into the most serious challenge to the integrity of the Bill of Rights."

He should rightfully refer to the Supreme Court decisions concerning this matter. These decisions constitute the factor which has created great discontent among our people. Why should I be condemned for calling on the people to exercise the constitutional formula in the preservation of their inalienable rights? Has it become treason to respect the decisions of the American people as expressed through the legislatures of the several States? If we are to deny ourselves the right of amendment as provided in the Constitution, then we are to deny ourselves the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Could that be the intent of Mr. Polier?

I am confident no one here needs to be refreshed on the words of the Constitution which read as follows: "The Congress whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by convention in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

This Constitution, which Blackstone referred to as "the greatest document ever struck off by the hand of man," speaks for itself. In advocating the exercise of the right guranteed in this article, my judgment is supported by 110 other Members of Congress.

My responsibility in this matter requires that I answer further the words of Mr. Polier of the American Jewish Congress, who in his statement summarizes five reasons for opposing this and similar amendments. I shall answer categorically his attacks as summarized in his article.

Mr. Polier makes his points in support of a series of resolutions which were adopted at an official gathering of the American Jewish Congress in opposition to the amendment advocated by myself and others.

1. "It threatens the integrity of the Bill of Rights."

The AJC resolution charged that adoption of the Becker amendment would set a precedent for "further assaults" on the Constitution whenever the Supreme Court handed down an unpopular decision protecting civil liberties. The Bill of Rights is America's most precious heritage, the resolution declared. "It would be disastrous if disagreement with this or that Supreme Court decision should lead to the step-by-step destruction of the basic guarantees of American freedom."

My comment on this attack is: Are the people of the United States to be compelled to submit to a nine-man oligarchy and deprived of their right to dissent or disagree with Supreme Court decisions? If such is to be the case, we will lose the inherent rights which we have enjoyed for 180 years. If we are to be compelled to agree with all court decisions, the American people would gradually and silently submit to a nine-man dictatorship. How can the integrity of the Bill of Rights be imperiled by the exercise of those rights. It would be interesting to know if earlier decisions of the Supreme Court which have been reversed by the present Court are as sacred to Mr. Polier as this decision which seems to him a pet decision. In this connection it might be well to remind ourselves that in 1891 the Supreme Court of the United States passed down a decision declaring the United States to be a Christian Nation (*Holy Trinity Church* v. *United States*).

2. "It threatens the principle of church-state separation."

Since the adoption of the first amendment 172 years ago, the AJC said, "our country has escaped much of the bitter religious conflict and sectarian strife that has divided other nations. This has been due in large measure to the concept of the separation of church and state, one of the truly great contributions the American people have made to Western civilization. The Becker amendment is a direct assault upon this principle."

The answer to this criticism should be obvious to every mature-minded observer. Down through the years devotional exercises in schools, graduation ceremonies, inaugurations, Fourth of July celebrations, etc., etc., have been a fundamental part of what we might refer to as "Americana." The Pledge of Allegiance, "The Star-Spangled Banner," Washington's Farewell Address, the Declaration of Independence, public documents, etc., etc., all fitted into this pattern of America's tradition of faith.

Why now at this late date, knowing these exercises have only brought strength and goodness to our people are we to be challenged and denied this humble right confirmed by time and rich experience?

One of the most confirming facts in this connection is that through all these years America has developed the most harmonious spirit among religionists of all beliefs of any nation on earth. Nowhere in the world is it safer to be a part of a microscopic minority than in the United States. Even in this desire to preserve a custom enjoyed by the majority, I know of no one who desires to compel the minority.

I know of no man advocating this formula for the protection of devotional exercises who has even the faintest desire to weaken the traditional opposition which our people have to the combining of church and state.

3. "It threatens the principle of religious freedom."

While the Becker amendment speaks of school prayers and Bible reading on a "voluntary basis" the resolution declared, "every educator knows and many courts have recognized that it is unreal to speak of voluntary action on the part of young children in the public schools." The resolution quoted from the opinion of Supreme Court Justice Brennan, in the Bible-prayer case, holding that excusing children from prayer exercises "subjects them to a cruel dilemma."

I yield to no one in my support of religious freedom, and I can remember no dilemma faced by any student during my years in school when the Lord's Prayer was said every day I attended school. No one suffered a dilemma when passages were read from the King James version of the Bible, although I am a Roman Catholic. There were Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in my school, but we never thought of one another as such.

My three children attended public schools and were never faced with any dilemma when they participated in reciting the Lord's prayer and listened to the reading of passages from the King James version of the Bible. In fact, it is my deep conviction that they became better citizens and better people through these devotional practices. Our individual beliefs never interfered with our friendship, and I am certain they never will. I am confident that anyone reading the opinion of Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart concerning the Supreme Court decision must admit that he made many telling and valid points in his minority opinion.

4. "It threatens the integrity of the public school system."

The resolution warned that the introduction of school prayers "would divide the children in every classroom into groups of Protestants against Catholics, Christians against Jews, believers against nonbelievers." The resolution added: "If there is one place which should be kept entirely free of sectarian strife and religious rivalries, it is the public school—the chief instrumentality of our Nation to promote and preserve the unity of the American people."

I think it would be extremely difficult to find a situation where sectarian strife was introduced into a public school because of the prayer issue. I have done some careful research on this subject and I find not one single instance until the question was raised in the Herricks School case on Long Island by a handful of people, and I am convinced that this issue is now being raised to prevent the adoption of the proposed amendment. When we refer to the "u ity of the American people" how can this unity be fostered and preserved if the will of the great majority of the American people is to be thwarted. How can we outlaw a sacred practice which has been a part of our lives for 180 years without frustrating an overwhelming majority of the American people. The fact is that the two Supreme Court decisions have created more disunity among our people—in fact, almost the first disunity among our people—concerning such matters. I am confident that no member of this committee could think of planning an address before his constituents opposing the right of tribute to a deity without anticipating unhappy reactions, disunity, and vigorous opposition.

I raise this question: Are we to become so illogical as to believe that the way to promote unity among our people is to outlaw God, step on God, ridicule God, and deny God in our public institutions in a land where we owe this same God a debt of gratitude for the abundance which has been bestowed upon us?

A realistic appraisal of this situation should convince any mature observer that every time a step is taken in the courts seeking to rule out tribute to God it increases the bitterness and the disunity among our people. I have spent a lifetime endeavoring in my humble way to cement relationships among our people. I have never failed to defend the rights of all the people in their freedom to worship according to the dictates of their conscience. I challenge any individual to contradict this fact.

Yes, I must confess that I believe in God and I believe in the principles of peace and I believe that peace on earth among men of good will is the cornerstone of our God-inspired civilization. Like everyone else, my days on this earth are numbered, and some day I shall receive my summons. I claim no superior wisdom concerning the eternal destiny of man or when and how I shall face my Creator, but when I face Him whether it be on my knees in church or before the judgment bar of eternity, I shall never be compelled to confess that I gave any encouragement whatsoever to those who would forbid our little children to pay tribute to their Divine Creator.

5. "It is not helpful, but rather hurtful to religion."

The resolution said that "whatever is good and meaningful in prayer must be inevitably

lost by its mechanical repetition in an atmosphere devoid of the religious spirit which only the home and church can provide." A sectarian school prayer would abridge the religious liberty of children adhering to other faiths, the A.J.C. declared. A "nonsectarian" prayer would "Not only infringe upon the rights of those affiliated with no religious body but would pose the danger of a new, public school religion which, in seeking to be least offensive, will succeed only in being least meaningful—and yet most pervasive."

In my judgment this argument is fallacious. Much of the early education of children is mechanical and repetitive, such as the multiplication tables, the quotation of classical poetry, and the repetition of axioms. These truths are embedded in the minds of the children and frequently do not flower into full meaning until the child begins to develop maturity. The school is an educational organization, and no book has been more a part of our civilization than the Holy Bible. Who would contend that education should not include the history of Shakespeare, the great American poets, Dickens, Thackery, etc., etc. Are we to permit a little handful of oversensitive atheists to carve out of our educational system an understanding of the book and the document which has meant more to our way of life than all the other volumes combined—the Holy Bible.

In a sense I am indebted to the American Jewish Congress, and I have taken this time to discuss their arguments against the constitutional amendment, because I believe that they have summarized the logic of the opposition as completely as any group or any organization whose comment on the subject has been brought to my attention. We should all be thankful that we live in a land where each of us can disagree on subjects such as this without in any way imperiling or sacrificing our personal liberty.

At this time I would like to read from an article by Dr. Jonas Simon, chairman of the Jewish Institute of Research entitled "The High Court and the Court on High." This was written after the first Supreme Court decision involving the *Engle* v. *Vitale* case.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 16, 1963]

"THE HIGH COURT AND THE COURT ON HIGH

"(By Dr. Jonas Simon, chairman, the Jewish Institute of Research)

"(Dr. Jonas Simon is an educator, writer, and lecturer. He was delegate to the first International Peace Conference after World War I at Berne, Switzerland; invited to conferences on educational and religious problems by the late President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University; champion in the fight against calendar reform; interviewing on this matter the foreign delegations of the United Nations in 1945 at San Francisco. He is chairman of the Jewish Institute of Research, Inc.)

"The existence of the Creator, proclaims the believer, is the supreme truth, His word the law of all laws, His will the constitution of constitutions. The constitutionality, therefore, of man-made constitutions is subject to its congruency with the constitution of mankind, the advice of the Creator, who behind the scene of all human turmoil is directing the fate of mortal man.

"If 'Separation of Church and State' does not fall into line, if it will or can be abused as a separation from religion, it has to be cleared legally without vacillations and self-contradictions and, if necessary, to be adjusted by amendments.

"Apparently, it was never meant to be a tool in the hand of atheists or any irreligious groups to undermine and to control the masses of believers in these United States. Therefore we witness now the widespread commotion against the recent decision of the Supreme Court. Even the wisdom of America, the schools of higher learning in this country have grown on the fundamental basis of outspoken religious institutions.

"Also from a political angle the recent Supreme Court decision and its timing was to many a source of deep regret and disappointment. This is a time when our citizenry is sorrowfully concerned about the possible cleavage of its unity through the appearance of the Birch Society on the American scene. It should not have been burdened with additional perils of a dividing character.

"It is also a time, when wise and well informed men of vision weigh gravely the spreading moral decline in all strata of society with no end in sight. The tremendous endeavors for the uplift of American life of an energetic, youthful, and industrious president through domestic and foreign devising were not in a position to change this tragic state of affairs. Evidently, entirely different systems are to be applied to cure this cancerous malady.

"In this fatal period, the Jews of the old historical traditions will set the example for their Jewish brothers to respect and to give preference to the rights of the majority of their co-Americans. They on their part will take on their shoulders as they have done through the centuries, all the sacrifices required to give their children an education of excellence in their own way. Such is the nobleness of the Jewish genius and the expression of its responsibility."

With your indulgence I should like to read an article by the renowned evangelist, the Reverend Billy Graham, which was published in the Chicago Sun-Times, April 8, 1964. It is our hope the Reverend Graham will be able to testify before this committee during these hearings:

"GRAHAM HERE, BACKS SCHOOL PRAYER BILL

"[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Wednesday, Apr. 8, 1964]

"(By Dolores McCahill)

"Evangelist Billy Graham said Tuesday he supports the Becker amendment to legalize prayer and Bible reading in public schools on a voluntary basis.

"Graham gave his views on several topics—including the fact that he has no present plan for a second crusade in Chicago—at a press conference in the Pick-Congress Hotel.

"He came to Chicago for a Tuesday night address to the National Association of Evangelicals, holding its annual convention in the hotel, and talk Wednesday to the National Association of Broadcasters.

"Language in the constitutional amendment proposed by Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, is very close, in some phases, to a resolution by the executive committee of the NAE. The association is composed of some 40 small, conservative Protestant denominations with a total membership of approximately 2 million.

"Graham told reporters he has been trying to raise public opinion for the amendment, asserting:

"'We are reaping a whirlwind in delinquency. Young people do not know what is right or wrong any more. Our young people are not being taught moral values; they are at sea morally.

"'We have removed moral law from the young people. The Ten Commandments could be read and said every day in our schools, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews all agree on the Ten Commandments.

"'I think the schools have read so much on the Supreme Court decisions they think there can be no teaching on religion in the school at all. I say moral values are part of our education. In the secondary schools, I think they have the right to teach the Bible objectively under terms of the Court decisions, but how to do it objectively causes much discussion.

"'I back the Becker amendment. A great many Protestant leaders and most Roman Catholic leaders back it, I believe. What we have seen is only the beginning of what we face. The Supreme Court itself is opened with prayer. If there is a movement by a small minority to remove the idea of God completely from our national life, I think it extremely dangerous.'

"The evangelist said he was very thrilled and satisfied with the record of his Chicago crusade in 1962, and has no plan to hold another one here."

Regardless of our religious affiliation, we must all recognize the fact that Reverend Graham is a man of great influence. Not only does he influence millions of American people, but he speaks for millions of American people. Many of these millions would be only too willing to leave the whole matter up to his judgment.

No man could speak with greater authority concerning the will of the Catholic community than His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman. I would like to quote in part the statement made in behalf of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, Senate hearings, July 26 and August 2, 1962:

"After careful study I have come to the conclusion that the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Engel* v. *Vitale* * * * was a grave error in judicial judgment, a decision out of line with the conscience and religious heritage of the American people and one which foreshadows an ominous tendency to undermine cherished traditions of this Nation (p. 140).

"The root of the Court's error was that it lost sight of the fact that those who drafted the clauses intended not to prefer irreligion and godlessness over religion, but to make certain that Government, while cooperating with all religions, did not establish a state religion or prefer any one religion over others. * * * I respectfully suggest that this committee propose a constitutional amendment which would restore the original concept of the no-establishment clause."

I should like to comment briefly on the staff study report which was made at the direction of the chairman of this committee. This report threw up numerous roadblocks relating to the consummation of a proposed amendment. I do not desire to oversimplify the problem, but doesn't it seem reasonable for us to raise this question: "How was prayer and Bible reading implemented in the school system prior to June 25, 1962?"

Inasmuch as we had no trouble and there was no discord in America concerning this program, why couldn't we revert to the pre-June 25, 1962, formula as practiced throughout the Nation in numerous communities. The research staff which wrote the report threw up imaginative roadblocks with apparent ease, but the anticipated hazards suggested by the research staff appear to be figments of the imagination, because none of these projected hazards caused any trouble prior to the Supreme Court decision of June 25, 1962.

The members of this committee and the Members of Congress should be reminded that the Governors Conference which represents the 50 States of the Union passed resolutions in 1962 and 1963 supporting an amendment to the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools. In both instances the resolutions were passed almost unanimously.

The first amendment to the Constitution, as we all know, reads as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

How the High Court can use this first amendment to support their decisions concerning this matter is beyond my understanding. Congress has never passed any legislation prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and I know of no Member of Congress who so desires. It can be logically concluded, however, that the Supreme Court has made decisions which limit the free exercise of religion.

It is well to refresh ourselves on a portion of the 14th amendment which reads as follows: "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The decisions of the High Court which pertain to this question have deprived millions of Americans of their traditional liberty; namely, the right to pray and honor God anywhere, not only on private property, but on public property.

I covet for every member of this committee and every Member of Congress the opportunity to read a magnificent book by Rev. Charles Wesley Lowry, D.D. The title of the book is "To Pray or Not To Pray." We anticipate with pleasure the testimony of Dr. Lowry before this committee during these hearings.

As indicated earlier in this statement, prayers and devotional exercises are a part of the cultural bloodstream of our Nation. Invocations, devotions, oaths taken on the Bible, etc., etc., are as American and as universal as a taste for apple pie, or ice cream, or watermelon. And I hope you will forgive me for this superficial reference in my attempt to emphasize and indelibilize the idea that prayer and devotions in our public institutions is not something that a handful of religious fanatics has imposed upon us, but is a traditional part of our nature as Americans. I have been in meetings where prayers have been offered by believers of a wide variety, including Quakers, Jews, Catholics, and intensely evangelical Christians. Greek audiences made up of not only these classifications of believers, but many, many other classifications of believers invariably stand in respectful attention and in solemn quietness as these individuals have spoken to God in their own independent manner. It created no controversy, it brought on no contention, because the natural reaction of an American audience is to respect all men who converse with God, regardless of their vocabulary or their credo or background.

A constitutional amendment can easily provide for the release of students whose parents prefer that they not be subject to the customary devotions which have characterized our public institutions down through the generations. Even though such a formula to permit release were provided, I would almost be willing to wager that there wouldn't be 100 such instances in their entire population of the United States.

It is important to all of us that we recognize the priority of this sacred project. We who represent the American people are concerned and burdened by the Herculean problems that beset us, such as poverty, crime, destitute old age, etc., etc., but as for me there is no impoverishment, there is no destitution, there is no inflation or deflation, there is no loneliness in old age, or privation in childhood, or impoverishment in family life, that can equal the destitution which would befall America if we ever permit ourselves to officially outlaw the name of God in our public institutions. I may be old-fashioned and sophisticated cynics may brand me as a "Neanderthal," but I am so convinced of the importance of this program that I believe that if the elected representatives permit this denial of God and this outlawry of God to be fulfilled either by opposition or neglect that the same curse will befall our Nation which has befallen all nations and civilizations of the world that forgot and disobeyed God Almighty.

The right of our people, young and old, to pray together in any building or on any facility provided by any subdivision of government, whether it be Federal, State or local, is essential to the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in the preamble of the Constitution: "Promote the general welfare, secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

At this point, I wish to insert a statement by a college student. I highly recommend that you read his very fine remarks.

I am taking the liberty of inserting herewith a list of those organizations and groups throughout the United States who are supporting an amendment to the Constitution. While many of these people cannot come to Washington to testify at these hearings, I am sure we will all want to take account of their viewpoints, and as far as I am concerned I am very thankful for their support.

I have not taken it upon myself to invite people or urge people to come before the committee to testify on behalf of the amendment. There were perhaps one-half dozen people who asked me to submit their requests to testify before this committee and I have done so. It is my understanding that they have written to the committee, asking to testify, and have been granted time for such testimony.

I have had magnificent support from Members of the House of Representatives and numbers of my colleagues will appear before this committee. These will include many of the 164 who have signed the discharge petition No. 3.

In conclusion I would like to say that ever since June 25, 1962, I have worked as hard and as diligently in support of this cause as my time and energy would permit. In all my activities in relation to this project I have risen above partisan politics and have sought the cooperation of every partisan segment of the Congress of the United States and of the Nation in general. Congressmen who will appear before this committee at my behest are men and women who have disagreed with me on the normal political issues, but faith in God is a nonpartisan matter, and when we fall to our knees and address our Maker, He does not question us concerning our political affiliations. He merely says: "Come to Me all ye that are weary and are heavy laden and I will give you rest."

To the best of my ability I have kept this effort on the highest level possible and have lived up literally to the rules of the House in every conceivable way in the handling of the discharge petition. I shall continue this effort until the desired results are achieved. It is my earnest hope that this task can be completed by this Congress before the year is up. When this Congress adjourns, I shall retire, but I shall never cease to give my energies and my support to this sacred project.

I believe that I can safely say that nothing in my life has ever been or ever will be more important than this outside of my personal faith. I may sound presumptuous, but the surveys which I have made, the contacts that I have consummated and the mail that I have received lead me to believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people feel exactly as I feel concerning the matter.

I take this opportunity to thank the thousands upon thousands of people all over the United States who are working in support of this cause. They will continue to do so. Thousands of volunteers, organized and unorganized, have given freely of their time and effort without hope of financial reward or without even having their expenses paid by individuals or organizations. The devotion and the dedication and the consecration of these people gives one a new faith in the fabric of American life. I actually believe that millions of these people would give their lives, if necessary, to preserve the right to honor God and His word in our public institutions.

The members of my personal staff here in Washington have served this cause beyond the line of duty. They are indeed dedicated people, and I want this record to show my deep appreciation for these loyal and self-respecting individuals who have stood at my side during these months and years. They have carried an extra burden brought about by our heavy mail coming in from all over the Nation. An amazing number of telegrams and telephone calls have come to our office and have been processed with patience and courtesy by these wonderful people who have worked all hours of the night and through weekends and are continuing so to do. They love God, and because they love God they love this cause. It has never been necessary for me to bring pressure upon my helpers in order to handle this increased load. They have carried their share of this inspiring burden because of their dedication to this sacred project.

I am sure that not one person on this committee resents the heavy mail which he has received because of this activity. Occasionally I am blamed for the generating of this heavy mail, but I am not the guilty party. In fact, there is no guilt. This mail has been spontaneous and has come from the hearts of the American people. You will never receive a mail concerning any subject which more sincerely represents the hearts and souls of our people than the mail you have received in connection with this effort to guarantee the right of devotions in our public institutions. I would dread to try to estimate the volume of the mail that would pour into this place if this committee or this Congress were to go on record as vetoing the rights of our people to preserve sacred devotions in our schools and other institutions.

I am confident that most of the thinking on this subject has matured in the minds of the Members of this Coungress. I see no reason why our decision needs to be prolonged or delayed. Why can we not act promptly and quickly in this matter? I am old-fashioned enough to believe that a special blessing will come to the Congress of the United States and to the individual Members of this Congress who cooperate in the fulfillment of a formula which, in my judgment and the judgment of most of our Congressmen, represents the warm, passionate, inspired desires of a God-fearing people.

New York Times Election Handbook, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a group of New York Times political reporters have produced a very useful, and very readable, book called "The New York Times Election Handbook." In a presidential election year one finds quite a few election fact books appearing on the book stalls, some good, some bad. This one is the best that I have seen.

Statistics can be dreadfully dull, but this book presents all the election statistics that one would normally want or need in a handy reference way, and also in a way that gives them flesh and blood. The men who contributed to this small volume are not only good reporters, they

are political scientists and good students of American history. The book is fair—I doubt that even the most partisan party affiliate would claim that it is seriously loaded—and yet it doesn't bore the reader to death by presenting candidates, issues, political strategy, and history as so much cold oatmeal. Even the most mundane political discussion can raise somebody's hackles, and yet this discussion has lively content without offense. The book might even settle some living room or office political squabbles about what happens where and when in a presidential year and is there a precedent?

For example, how many times and why was a presidential election thrown into the House of Representatives because no candidate received a majority of the electoral college vote? How does the electoral college work in the first place? How many Vice Presidents have succeeded to the Presidency? Who is up this year in the States and who won last time?

Good marks go to Harold Faber for skillful editing and to the following contributors: James Reston, Tom Wicker, Alvin Shuster, John D. Morris, Warren Weaver, Jr., Joseph Loftus, Claude Sitton, Edwin L. Dale, Jr., Max Frankel, Cabell Phillips, Robert H. Phelps, Irvin Horowitz, and John Corry.

The book is paperback, 192 pages, including tables and index, published by McGraw-Hill, costs 95 cents and is worth it.

Blue Cross Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have been most concerned about the failure of the major insurance companies to provide adequate comprehensive hospital and medical insurance policies for our older citizens at a price they can afford to pay. Those companies which in the past few years have announced, with a great deal of publicity, the inauguration of policies for those over 65, are now quietly raising their costs and reducing benefits.

Now comes word that the Blue Cross plans, which have increasingly carried a disproportionate share of older citizens and other high-risk individuals, are facing the necessity of pricing themselves out of existence. A recent editorial in the New York Times cites the dilemma of the Blue Cross plan which serves that city. My colleagues will be interested in that editorial:

THE BLUE CROSS DILEMMA

(Editorial, New York Times, April 9, 1964, as hearings opened on the request of the Associated Hospital Service of New York to convert to a "current cost program," a proposal growing out of its precarious financial situation.)

The Blue Cross plan which serves 7,400,000 subscribers in Metropolitan New York is in grave danger. Last year it paid out $17 million more in benefits than it took in. Currently it is paying out $1.26 for every $1 it receives. Since the first of the year it has completely consumed its free surplus, and is now, with the permission of Superintendent of Insurance Henry R. Stern, drawing on its statutory reserves. Unless some quick remedy is found, he may be compelled, under the law, to take it over within the next few months. He is resuming hearings on the whole question today.

The basic reason for its difficulties is something over which neither the Blue Cross nor the insurance department has control: the tremendous increase in hospital costs. The Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has found that the cost per day of patient care in general hospitals nearly quadrupled between 1946 and 1962. There are many reasons for this: new buildings, better equipment, broader services, and most important of all, higher wages for hospital workers.

Faced with this problem, Blue Cross is now endeavoring, in its current application, to change the basic concept under which it has operated since its initiation here in 1934. This is the community-rating concept, under which good risks are overcharged to compensate for the poor risks. It is basically a social welfare concept, not an insurance one. But in recent years more and more good risks—young, vigorous, ambitious men and women—have left Blue Cross because they have found they can get better protection from commercial health insurance plans at only slightly higher costs. Thus, Blue Cross now has a disproportionate number of poor risks.

Now Blue Cross is seeking to convert to a modified experience rating system, based on insurance principles, under which various groups of members would pay different dues, based on the experience of the plan with each group. Inevitably this will mean very large, perhaps prohibitive, rate increases for many poorer risks. And even if the proposal is approved, the forecast is for an increase of about 35 percent, on the average, in rates for next year, and another 11 percent the following year.

Unless the Blue Cross plan and the medical profession which so ardently supports it can find some way of halting these mounting costs, the whole concept of voluntary health insurance, which has worked so well for the past quarter of a century, seems imperiled. One way to avoid this constant escalation of rates would be through passage of Federal legislation for medical and hospital care for the aged. This is the way to relieve the present program of the undue number of poor risks, and to hold the good risks who are now being overcharged.

Heime Eisman "Man of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to report on the good citizens of New York City who make a continuing contribution to the improvement of the city.

Recently a friend of mine, Heime Eisman, was elected "Man of the Year" by the Metropolitan Delicatessen Merchants Association and was honored at a dinner at the Hotel Astor on March 22, 1964. Mr. Eisman is owner of the Radar Food Store at 36 West 58th Street. He has been at this location for 23 years. Mr. Eisman lives above his store and gives great satisfaction and service to the community because everyone knows him, likes him, and he takes a personal interest in everything that goes on in his neighborhood.

The Metropolitan Delicatessen Merchants Association is a fine organization and the members of the association are some of the people who make New York City the wonderful place that it is to live in. Who does not enjoy a stop at his local delicatessen at night when he is returning to his apartment from a late night at the office, or an evening at the lodge?

I always enjoy stopping at Heime Eisman's happy and warm store on West 58th Street. He is a very wise man and he does me the kindness of sharing his wisdom with me. The others who work in the store are wonderful people too and the reason is plain: they like the boss.

At the Metropolitan Delicatessen Merchants Association dinner, Heime Eisman made a fine speech; he said a lot in a very brief statement.

It is with great pleasure that I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the message of welcome delivered by Louis Weisberg, chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Delicatessen Merchants Association, at the dinner in of honor Mr. Eisman; and also the remarks by Mr. Eisman in reply.

My congratulations go to Mr. Weisberg, to the officers and members of the association and to the guest of honor, Heime Eisman.

The speech follows:

"A MESSAGE OF WELCOME"—SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE METROPOLITAN DELICATESSEN MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION DINNER, HOTEL ASTOR, MARCH 22, 1964

(By Louis Weisberg, chairman, board of directors)

The annual banquet of our association is one of the events which I look forward to each year. This year we are honoring Heime Eisman one of the charter members of our association. Heime is honored for his "long years of service and devotion to the delicatessen field." He has been a member of the association's board and operates a store on West 58th Street between Fifth and Sixth Avenues in Manhattan.

This year the honoring of Heime Eisman has an added significance. Beginning April 22, 1964, just a month from the date of our banquet, the New York World's Fair opens its gates a potential of 70 million people. The city of New York during the months in which the fair will be open will play host to people from all parts of the United States and foreign countries.

Since the delicatessen industry is practically unique to the ecenomic life of New York City and thousands of visitors will be patronizing your stores, we felt that it only be fitting that our banquet journal devote several of its editorial pages to the "Billion Dollars Worth of Wonders." Your customers will want to see both at the fair and in the city of New York.

Many of you are quite familiar with the wonders to be found in New York City but a light refresher course we feel would be appropriate at this time.

The New York World's Fair is both educational and entertaining. Under the symbol of the unisphere, exhibits from all parts of the world will be gathered * * * You'll visit gleaming pavilions * * * exotic temples and

serene gardens * * * towering fantasies of glass and steel. You'll stroll picturesque promenades * * * view colorful fountains * * * sample foods from every corner of the globe. You'll wonder at predictions of things to come * * * gaze at re-creations of things past. You'll see water shows * * * theater creations * * * circuses * * * sports events * * * fireworks * * * hear symphonies and brass bands. In this olympic of progress you will truly see the best from all the world.

HEIME EISMAN, PRESIDENT-OWNER, RADAR FOOD STORE

On this occasion, which marks the 32d anniversary of the Metropolitan Delicatessen Merchants Association, I feel quite honored, not only because the association which I have been a member of for over 30-odd years, but the year of 1964 marks a historical milestone—the opening of the New York World's Fair.

Our organization takes pride in presenting to you not only a journal to honor me but, more significantly, it is devoting its editorial pages to the New York World's Fair.

My friends in the delicatessen industry have asked me to give you a short biography of my life. I began my career as a counter-boy in Reubens Restaurant, famous the world over for its fabulous sandwiches and exotic dishes. Within a year I became assistant headman. After I had felt that I was experienced enough in the art of preparing delicatessen foods, I opened my first store in the neighborhood where I am now located. I raised a small family. My daughter is a graduate nurse and my son became a teacher.

I halve always been interested in civic affairs and I am known as a joiner. Many years ago I joined the Masonic order and took the necessary degrees to become a 32d degree Mason and Shriner. I was very active in B'nai B'rith and in charitable organizations. One might call me a philanthropist, since I am vitally interested in those who need help.

My hobbies consist of chess and swimming and, wherever possible, with what short time I have away from the business I devote to these activities.

I want to thank each and every member of the association, as well as each and every officer and director with whom I have had the privilege of working these many years, and whom I have come to respect and admire. I want to thank each and every jobber, wholesaler, and manufacturer who has joined with us in celebrating the 32d anniversary of the Metropolitan Delicatessen Merchants Association, and without whose help and cooperation this affair might not have been possible.

Ominous Implications of the Wheat Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the April 14 edition of the Southwestern Miller has been brought to my attention by Mr. C. M. MacLeod, chairman of the board of Hubbard Milling Co., in Mankato, Minn. The significant comments of this editorial raise many questions pertaining to the administration and possible economic implications of the recently enacted wheat program, and it merits the careful consideration of all those Members of the House who have an interest in protecting the economic status of our Nation's agriculture and those industries which depend on it.

Under unanimous consent I place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

COMPLIANCE WITH HEAVY HEARTS

Milling is an industry that comprises men of stout hearts. They are men who have contended with about every conceivable difficulty in business—great supply variations from drought and pestilences, baffling wheat price fluctuations resulting from wars, depressions, inflation, tariff manipulations, impractical Government controls, processing taxes which the Supreme Court invalidated and the falsities of food faddists. Notwithstanding the multitude of trials and plagues, flour milling is today more economically and more scientifically operated than ever in the interest of consumers. Behind this fact is the will of millers to progress and their dauntlessness in their business, which ranks among the very oldest in the world. With this record, milling will muster all of its capabilities and loyalties to the Nation to comply with the wheat certificate program finally voted by the House of Representatives after midnight last Wednesday by a very narrow margin. But the stout hearts will be heavy, heavy over the failure of the agricultural planners and Congress to recognize the wisdom and logic of the industries deeply concerned that urged simpler, more equitable and more workable solutions of the problem of wheat.

Millers and bakers, now supplying flour and bread to American consumers at the smallest margins of any American industry, are saddened as they confront submission to this certificate scheme. They are saddened by evidence that it was finally voted under circumstances which prompted charges of "raw and bloody power politics" in the House. Still another charge, made in the midst of limitation of debate on the eve of the voting on the measure in the House, was that the procedure was debasing the character and the integrity of that legislative body. The final vote on the bill, H.R. 6196, was announced as 211 to 203. The Senate had previously passed the bill by a vote of 53 to 35 early in March. The Agriculture Department, which formulated the measure, and the administration engaged in almost unprecedented lobbying and dealing to obtain its adoption, casting aside the incontrovertible pleas and objections of milling and baking.

Washington reports even indicate that the pressure from the administration included telephoning by President Johnson to Members of the House to enlist affirmative votes. The President's telephoning is said to have extended "till well after midnight Wednesday." Many in the breadstuffs industry seriously wonder whether the President would have lined himself up for the enactment of this measure if he had studied it as assiduously as he lobbied for it.

BEWILDERMENT WITH INITIAL OUTLINE

It is to the credit of the Department of Agriculture that, simultaneously with the signing of the new legislation by President Johnson on Saturday, it issued the first outline of the manner in which the certificate program will be implemented. The outline, appearing in full in other columns, clarifies some points but is far from complete and has been followed by an intensification of the bewilderment which millers had feared. It is revealed that the effective date on wheat marketing certificates on domestic processing and on wheat exports will be July 1. The first announcement also discloses that all wheat ground into flour ahead of July 1, or all flour on hand in any position as of that date, will not be subject to marketing certificates. But millers in the more northern regions, the spring wheat States, the Far West, and the Pacific Northwest, are bewildered over the situation in which they will find themselves with new crop wheat to be subject to the loan of only $1.30 not to be available to them until after July 1, in instances not before August. Even in the Southwest and the South, the earliest harvesting regions, the July 1 date for the certificate start is not being viewed as equitable to all of the millers in these regions.

To assist in avoiding interruptions in milling operations where the harvest is later than July 1, the Commodity Credit Corporation will offer wheat it owns for sale after July 1 at the higher of the market prices or the statutory minimum of 105 percent of the 1964 loan of $1.30 plus carrying charges. But in what position will millers find themselves in areas where harvests are later than July 1 and where the CCC has no wheat of their required qualities for sale?

Besides the questioning on the availability of wheat at the start of the certificate program, millers are awaiting decisions on the methods that may be employed in making the certificate payments.

CONFUSION AND CONTEST ON PRICES

That the Department of Agriculture is still not realistic on probable price developments under the certificate program is indicated by this statement in the first outline of the plans to be followed in operating it:

"USDA officials pointed out that the combination of market prices for 1964 crop wheat and the certificates will price wheat for domestic use at prices close to those prevailing during the past few years. In view of this, along with the fact that wheat prices are a very small factor in retail prices of bakery products, there will be no significant effect on these prices as a result of the wheat certificate program."

This assumption on the part of the Department of Agriculture is groundless and alarming to milling and baking. It had been hoped that the facts cited in recent days on price changes in the certificate program would prompt the Agriculture Department to recognize the realities of costs and markets, but it has failed thus far in that respect. In fact, the bare outline of the certificate program points to material uncertainties over wheat price levels and costs on flour to millers and bakers. Certificates will be distributed to farmers amounting to 70 cents a bushel on domestic marketing and 25 cents on export marketing with the quantities of each to be equal to 45 percent of the normal prodction of allotted acres irrespective of the actual harvests. With this income, it is already indicated that growers will be in a better position financially to withhold their 1964 harvest or to impound it under loans or purchase agreements, and thus may bolster open market prices. Feed and other crop adversities may add to the withholding of wheat and the bolstering of prices above the basic loan. This is highly important.

The Department has intimated that it will use the selling authority of the CCC to hold down wheat prices, but in that it faces a contest with growers which may be affected by politics in this national election year.

ADVANCE ON BREAD TO CONSUMER

In asserting that wheat prices will be close to those prevailing in the past few years, the Department continues to ignore the fact that the $2 market of the 1963–64 crop year was based on a loan of $1.82 plus an 18-cent direct payment that was made for voluntary acreage reductions below allotments. Thus, as pointed out repeatedly but ignored by the Department, the combination of a $1.30 loan plus a certificate of 70 cents will mean a cost on wheat for milling at least 18 cents a bushel higher than on the 1963 crop. Every

additional rise in wheat over the loan level of $1.30 will force further advances in flour, so bakers fear higher costs that will force advances on bread to consumers.

The true reactions from the certificate plan were presented to Congress in a letter from the Continental Baking Co., which last year showed a net profit equal to only 1.85 cents per dollar of sales, as against the average of 5.7 cents per dollar for 4,000 corporations. The letter, sent by Continental to Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa, follows:

"Continental Baking Co., the largest wholesale bread bakery in the United States, is seriously concerned by the proposed wheat certificate plan. Under the plan the minimum increase per bushel of wheat will be from $1.82 to $2 which represents a minimum increase in flour costs of 50 cents per hundredweight. Our purchasing experts have good reason to believe that wheat and flour prices will increase even more than the amounts stated above. A 50-cent-per-hundredweight increase in the cost of flour will cost this company $5 million annually which represents one-third of its present net income. Profit margins on sales in the industry are low enough and cannot be justifiably lowered any more; consequently this increase in flour cost in all probability can mean nothing but an increase in the price of bread to the consumer. We urgently request your support in defeating this measure."

Partly for political reasons, the Agriculture Department wants no bread price advance as an outcome of its certificate scheme, but the $1.30 farm loan base on open market prices will encounter a lot of resistance from the growers even with the certificate payments. The value of wheat as a feed in relation to corn and the general economic reactions from a wheat loan of $1.30 after a loan of $1.82 in 1963 add to the doubts of maintenance of a $2 base cost for milling.

CONSTITUTIONALITY NOT DETERMINED

Besides all of the uncertainties and questions that have followed in the wake of the passage of this legislation, another factor clouds the outlook for its implementation. This is the question of the constitutionality of the certificates, which was raised in the course of the debating in Congress and which is now being discussed in and out of Washington. The fact that the Supreme Court of the United States previously held that the Federal processing tax was not constitutional prompts doubts of the validity of the certificate levy. The validity question has already been raised in connection with the 25-cent-a-bushel certificate on exports in view of the provision in article I, section 9 of the Constitution that states that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." It is also being claimed that the certificate bill contravenes article I, section 7 of the Constitution because it was originated in the Senate, not the House. A court test would precipitate enormous repercussions in the wheat and flour trade.

CONFIRMATION OF CLAIMS OF MILLERS

The more the Agriculture Department struggles to iron out the complexities which have arisen and the more millers weigh their meaning to their business and to baking, the greater will be the regret that the Miller's National Federation recommendations of last February to the Senate Committee on Agriculture were not accepted. Here is what the Federation said at the time through Carl C. Farrington, chairman of its Committee on Agriculture:

"There seems to be a tendency to look upon the forced sale of certificates to flour millers as an easy and painless way to obtain funds for enhancing grower incomes and controlling wheat production without considering the cost of the certificates as a Government cost. The fact is that all of the certificates issued to growers will be eligible for redemption by CCC and are nothing more or less than direct payments to wheat growers. They constitute a Government benefit and a Government cost and should be subject to usual appropriation procedures. We believe such benefit should be paid for through the usual means of taxation and not force flour millers to become tax collectors. We regard the forced sale of certificates to flour millers as strictly a new form of taxation and we believe an undesirable and regressive form of taxation. We should not pretend that Government costs have been reduced by hiding some of them behind a new form of Government revenue."

Arlington Struggle To Maintain Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed a week in which many thousands of visitors have come to Washington to observe their Government in action. One of the most beautiful capitals in the world, this city attracts the attention of all our people, and deservedly so.

Because of this great interest, however, some problems have arisen. Frank M. Best, associate editor of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal, has spotlighted this most difficult matter in the latest issue of the magazine, and he has drawn the support of the Hartford Courant, the Nation's oldest newspaper, which has reprinted the article. Mr. Best's story is entitled: "Arlington Struggles To Maintain Dignity."

The Courant comments that Arlington National Cemetery, where President Kennedy and thousands of other war veterans are buried, is truly a national shrine. We are nearing another Memorial Day in the history of our country. Our people believe that we must preserve the places of last rest for our veterans with appropriate reverence and quiet.

I would think it fitting in the coming weeks to give special concern to the steps needed to strengthen the dignity of Arlington as it undergoes more national attention in the coming years than it has had for generations.

I offer Mr. Best's piece for reprinting in the RECORD:

ARLINGTON STRUGGLES TO MAINTAIN DIGNITY

(By Frank M. Best)

Arlington National Cemetery—crowded by throngs of visitors to President Kennedy's grave—is finding it increasingly difficult to bury the dead and maintain their final resting places with dignity.

Thoughtless picnickers who leave mounds of litter in their wake and vandals who steal flowers from grave sites are desecrating the Nation's most famous cemetery.

The picture will grow worse as Memorial Day approaches.

Cemetery Superintendent John C. Metzler pledges that he and his 150-man staff will continue to perform their burial and maintenance functions in "an acceptable manner," but concedes that there are formidable "roadblocks."

With thousands of tourists converging on Washington—many of them going to or from the World's Fair—scores of heavy buses each day are taxing narrow roadways at Arlington far beyond planned capacity.

On recent weekends, more than 100,000 visitors have come to the Kennedy grave site. The crowds will increase.

The great majority of the visitors to Arlington are orderly and respectful.

But others are not, says Superintendent Metzler.

Large numbers of thoughtless sightseers are trampling upon grave sites in the area near the Kennedy enclosure. Many lounge on grave markers which offer prime vantage points. Other mount the tombstones for better camera angles.

Eating or selling food within burial areas at Arlington is prohibited. Nonetheless, the trash cans are full and overflow with discarded soft drink containers, candy wrappers and sandwich bags.

Film boxes, wrappers, and discarded cigarette butts litter the ground.

Mr. Edward C. Staples, owner of the Columbia Florist, 3100-B Columbia Pike, Arlington, says of the floral thefts at Arlington: "It's a damn crime. I don't see how people could be so morbid."

He elaborated: "We belong to three florist wire associations. We get nice orders for $25 or $35 on wreaths to be placed on General Pershing's grave and others. The people go over to see the tributes, and they are not there."

Mr. Staples cited the case of a lady customer who received permission to tie a wreath to a tombstone in section No. 42. "When she returned, the wreath was gone and was found in another section," the florist said.

Mr. Dan Conklyn of Conklyn's Florist, 2046 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, says flower stealing is "not really any problem. I think it can happen at any cemetery. People think it is a shame for a plant to dry up and they take it home. It happens at every major cemetery."

Mr. Metzler, who has held his present post since 1951, told J. & R.:

"Because of its size (400 acres), Arlington, like all other large cemeteries, is the victim of individuals who have no sense of guilt in removing flowers from gravesites other than their own."

Mr. Metzler added:

"We're rendering a service to the public. We want to do it as easily, nicely, and gracefully as we can. And once in a while we have roadblocks.

"One of our biggest roadblocks," he explains, "is trying to accommodate the thousands who wish to visit Arlington. The roads at Arlington were never built to accommodate those big buses.

"One of our biggest problems is to route our funerals to get them off the roads the buses use."

"We go all out," Mr. Metzler emphasizes, "to bury the dead—as many as 24 or 25 a day—in as dignified a manner as possible and sometimes this is difficult."

Most of the crowds, Mr. Metzler says, are orderly, respectful, and courteous, but comments: "While we put up barricades, we find some who walk over gravesites. There are just some people who fail to appreciate what Arlington stands for."

For him, Mr. Metzler says, "Arlington is the shrine dedicated to the military and it contains the history of our country engraved in granite."

As Mr. Metzler guided a J. & R. reporter on a tour of the cemetery, with its 123,000 gravesites, his meaning was clear.

There are unknown soldiers from every war, except the Revolution. There are Revolutionary heroes. Marble and granite slabs index the Nation's history—Custis, Wainwright, MacArthur, Dulles, Pershing, Wood, Pate, * * * and thousands of others.

And there are also at Arlington kids drinking soda pop while their parents rest their weary bodies on a fallen soldier's tombstone.

L.B.J. Trusts Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently some of our leaders never learned from history. I am convinced that President Johnson will try to make a deal with Cuba, if the American people do not wake up.

This opinion is expressed by David Lawrence in two articles which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 22 and April 27:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 22, 1964]

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS: FORGIVE AND FORGET POLICY SEEN APPLYING TO CUBA

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—There seems to be a new motto that describes the trend in American foreign policy—"forgive and forget."

The new mood is reflected in developments in Cuba. It has been revealed, for instance, that the Soviet Union is planning to turn over the operation of its antiaircraft missiles in Cuba to the Castro government on May 1, and will withdraw about 3,000 of the 4,000 Soviet troops now in Cuba. It is not clear yet whether Moscow will retain a veto over the firing of the missiles or whether the power of decision will be left with the Russian technicians who are to remain on the island.

Not a single public protest, however, has been made by the U.S. Government to the Soviet Government over the continued presence on Cuba of Soviet technicians and missiles. The last official word on the subject, so far as the public is concerned, was spoken in October 1962, at the time of the missile crisis. Despite efforts then to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all Soviet forces and missiles, the United States has had to be content with a long-drawn-out maneuver. But the Soviets still maintain their original position. They insist on giving armed assistance to a government in this hemisphere, and a military base has been established by a European power in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine and of a recent resolution by Congress.

The tendency here is to assume that nothing serious will develop and that, even if the Castro government fires any of its antiaircraft missiles and damages or downs any of the U-2's or other planes which are engaged in occasional air inspection of Cuba, the United States will not hesitate to take retaliatory action.

But the controversy is deliberately confined to the United States and Cuba. Apparently the crime committed by the Soviet regime in invading the Western Hemisphere and supplying arms and weapons and technicians to a country only 90 miles away from the United States is to be forgiven or forgotten. Certainly there is a hesitancy on the part of the government here even to mention it in any public way.

There is, moreover, a desire in Washington to "play ball," if possible, with the Soviet regime in the hope that some propaganda advantage can be obtained in the international debate over reduction of armament. Thus, while much emphasis is placed on the agreement just made to reduce the production of uranium, this really has no military significance. It is designed entirely to produce a psychological impression that the chances of peace are being constantly improved. The truth is that both sides have plenty of nuclear strength to devastate each other's territory.

Such mutual agreements as the ban on nuclear testing in certain categories and now the curtailment of uranium production—both agreements without provisions for inspection—are, of course, part of the Soviet effort to give the impression that it has no hostile purpose toward the West. This is designed to invite further trade with the West and perhaps even to obtain financial help from the United States by way of long-term credits.

The objective of Moscow is to produce the right atmosphere for commercial interchanges in order to help overcome some of the Communist economic difficulties.

But even while there is an outward appearance of friendliness and peacefulness on the part of the Moscow Government, the U.S. Government is constantly being informed of the infiltration by Soviet agents in different countries in this hemisphere as well as in Africa. The Soviet plan for taking over more and more governments, just as happened in the case of Castro, has not been modified.

Meanwhile, an effort is being made here to put some courage into the Organization of American States. A few of the governments in Latin America which have maintained diplomatic relations with the Castro government are beginning to talk of breaking off. But there is no sign yet that any government, including the United States, is willing to sever diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government—which, of course, is at the root of all the trouble.

For the next few months not only the United States but some of its European allies are evidently going to try to "play ball" with Nikita Khrushchev and elicit from him periodically further expressions of good will and peaceful intentions. Yet not a word is being said about the record of bad faith the Soviet Government has made in the last few years throughout the world. It has infiltrated country after country. It even reached the point of supplying arms to the Cuban Government and setting up missiles in close proximity to the United States. But there seems to be, inside Government circles here, a disposition to avoid any controversy with the Soviet Government about this and to regard the past as past. There is uneasiness among some Members of Congress over such a policy of forgive and forget.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 27, 1964]

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS: CHARGE SOVIETS VIOLATE PLEDGE ON CUBA MISSILES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—An ignominious defeat has been administered to the U.S. Government, a blow to its prestige and influence in world affairs. Russia has deliberately violated a pledge to the American Government and once more defiantly threatens the safety of this country.

This turn of events comes as a surprise to the American people, who were being assured by President Johnson only a few days ago that the agreement to limit uranium production was an indication of the peaceful purpose of the Soviet Government and that a new wave of good feeling had begun.

But the Russian leopard, it has been disclosed, has not changed its spots. In utter disregard of the resolutions of warning adopted by Congress 2 years ago, the Soviet Government has assumed the right to engage in military operations in this hemisphere that are plainly aimed at the United States.

When the American Government demanded in the autumn of 1962 that the Russian missiles and troops be removed from Cuba, the Soviet Government promised in an exchange of notes with President Kennedy to remove the missiles and agreed to a system of inspection by the United Nations to verify whether good faith was being observed.

But Castro—doubtless with the connivance of the Russians—declined to permit the inspection. Accordingly, the United States reserved the right to continue aerial reconnaissance as a measure of protection to the American people. More than 600 flights have been made by American planes during 1962 and 1963, and the diplomatic issue as between Russia and the United States has, outwardly at least, remained dormant. Now Cuba has issued its protest asking the U.N. to support her demand that the American airplane flights be discontinued. Russia immediately announced her concurrence in the Cuban demand.

Thus have the Kennedy and Johnson administrations been grossly deceived by the Soviet maneuvers. Also, inside the United States a certain amount of brainwashing has occurred and there are even strange suggestions heard in our midst that it would be better to let a few thousand Russian troops or "technicians" remain in Cuba so as to prevent a trigger-happy Castro from setting off a military conflict by shooting down American airplanes. This implies a reliance on the alleged peaceful intentions of the Soviets which is contradicted by the latest events.

The Russian official newspapers, for instance, in articles last Friday—unquestionably inspired by the Moscow government—declared that there is no reason why Russia should not supply Cuba with weapons. The flights of American airplanes were denounced as violations of Cuban sovereignty and of the U.N. Charter as well as of international law. Yet the U.N. Charter explicitly recognizes regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine.

The controversy is significant mostly because it reveals that, instead of an improvement in Soviet-American relations, there is underneath no letup in the hostility and intrigues of aggression emanating from the Communist regime in Moscow.

The simple truth is that a small country 90 miles away from our shores was militarily strengthened by Russia, as dangerous missile bases were established in Cuba in 1962. When the United States, in self-protection, takes steps to find out if the menace has been removed, this action is construed in Moscow as a violation of international law. The right of self-defense and the adoption of precautionary measures against attack is inherent, of course, in the sovereignty of every country, and there was no justification in international law or in the U.N. Charter for the original dispatch of 15,000 troops to Cuba by the Soviet Government or the construction of missile bases on an island more than 4,000 miles away from Soviet territory. The only object of such an expedition was to threaten the safety of the American people.

This flagrant violation of international rules has been further aggravated by the manifest dishonesty and unmorality of the government in Moscow, which pretended in its notes to the late President Kennedy to be willing to agree to international inspection of Cuban missile bases and now goes back on its word. Under the circumstances, aerial reconnaissance by high-flying planes is inevitably the right of the U.S. Government.

The net result of the whole controversy could be to convince the American people that further parleys on disarmament with the Moscow regime can hardly be risked and that any agreements signed will not be worth the paper on which they are written so far as compliance by the Soviet Government is concerned.

Discussion of Proposal To Curb Tax-Exempt Bond Financing of Industrial Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include a careful analysis of the problem of local government tax-exempt financing of industrial plants by Ralph Nader in the Christian Science Monitor for April 25, 1964. Mr. Nader points out the danger of this kind of interstate competition for industry and calls attention to the proposal made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and by me in H.R. 10549 and H.R. 10547, respectively.

The text of the article follows:

TAX-EXEMPT BONDS WOO WHOLE FIRMS

(By Ralph Nader)

WASHINGTON.—The use of tax-exempt State and municipal bonds to attract established plants from other States is on the upswing.

In more and more cases, companies are finding the financial benefits which have been built up from these tax exempts too lucrative to resist.

Formal company statements announcing a relocation decision prefer to stress other reasons such as accessibility to raw materials, markets, or lower wage rates. But the competition between States to provide added incentives arising out of tax-free bonds is becoming so fierce that the decision to move is often predominantly determined by these incentives alone.

Some investment bankers, highly critical of the practice, are wondering whether the next step to be taken by States or municipalities will be outright capital grants to attract plants.

Localities which build up this attractive package tied around tax exempts to attract existing plants call it simply industrial promotion. Critics label it plant piracy and a "beggar thy neighbor" policy that harms all in the longer run.

The practice is spreading fast among the States, partly due to pressures of self-defense. Four years ago only nine States had laws allowing municipalities and properly constituted public authorities to issue tax-exempt bonds for industrial purposes. Hitherto, these bonds had been employed to finance public facilities and services.

Now 27 States have such legislation and the amount floated under this practice is estimated at over $1 billion already and growing at an exponential rate.

HOW IT WORKS

The technique is developed along these lines. A municipality with a good bond rating can borrow money 1 to 2 percent cheaper than even blue-chip industrial corporations.

With this money the community builds a modern plant for a company on a long-term lease basis. The low interest rate of tax exempts is reflected in the terms of the lease and comprise the first saving to the company.

The cost of rent is charged off by the company as a business expense for tax purposes. A high annual rental period over a short period can be arranged to give the firm tax advantages similar to accelerated depreciation on capital equipment.

A large corporation can find this quite helpful in offsetting large earnings from other operations.

Since the property is owned by a governmental unit, the industrial tenant is not required to pay local property taxes.

An added feature of vigorous promotion is the sale of these tax-exempt bonds to the corporation leasing the new plant. This enables it to earn tax-free income at the same time that it enjoys lower rental cost owing to tax-exempt financing.

The gain to the company can be very substantial. In one case involving $400,000 in 30-year tax-exempt revenue bonds, a company is not only receiving the equivalent of rent-free premises but is making a profit of $9,560 every year.

LEVERAGE BIG ASSET

The powerful leverage arising out of the use of tax exempts can produce remarkable results.

Little Lewisport, Ky. (population 780), announced last October a $50 million revenue bond issue to build a new aluminum rolling mill for Harvey Aluminum Co. Harvey's credit rating was sound enough to make the bonds attractive to investors, including the Bank of America which took up an $8 million portion.

In March, the Cutler-Hammer Co. announced it was moving part of its manufacturing operations, employing 800 workers, from Milwaukee to Bowling Green, Ky. A key inducement for the relocation is believed to be the offer by Bowling Green to build a new factory for the company financed by the issuance of $6,500,000 in tax-free revenue bonds.

Mounting concern expressed in legislative proposals has recently been directed to stopping this kind of promotion before it embroils all States in a feverish rush to outdo one another.

The AFL–CIO passed a strongly worded resolution at its last national convention condemning the use of tax exempts to encourage runaway plants or to attract new industry by combining such incentives with low wage rates. It called the practice a "flagrant abuse of public funds for private profits."

LABOR LEADERS CONCERNED

To organized labor, the matter is a serious one. Relocation undermines job security rights and high labor standards. The feeling in labor circles, however, is that neither Congress nor the administration can afford to alienate powerful forces behind the practice until the situation approaches what is called "public giveaway proportions."

"Things will have to get worse before they get better," one labor organizer commented, summing it up.

Chief backers of industrial development bonds are the States and municipalities, who rely on such inducements to build up employment; financial institutions; and wealthy individuals in high tax brackets who profit handsomely by buying up such tax exempts.

Some in the latter group feel that a successful attack on tax exempts for industrial purposes may broaden into an attack on all tax exempts.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, composed of various Cabinet members, Governors, and mayors, has made a study of such unrestrained use of revenue bond financing. It has recommended legislation to foreclose what it termed "the development of destructive interstate competition for industry at the expense of Federal revenue and to the detriment of the public interest."

REFORM BILLS FILED

The main initiative for reform is coming from Representative FLORENCE DWYER, Republican, of New Jersey, and HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin. Mrs. DWYER favors tightening the antipiracy clause of the area redevelopment bill now pending in Congress.

Last month, Mr. REUSS introduced H.R. 10547 to curb tax exempt financing of private profit-making industrial and commercial facilities by disallowing rent deductions paid under these arrangements in computing Federal income tax liabilities.

Concerning his bill, which has received the strong endorsement of other Congressmen, Mr. REUSS said: "While the U.S. Treasury has not formally given me a report on it, I have informal assurances that they look with great favor upon it."

The loss of revenues through widening use of tax-exempt financing of private industry is known to be concerning the Treasury.

Mr. REUSS, a member of the Joint Economic Committee, names the following undesirable consequences of such tax-exempt financing:

1. Unemployment, loss of purchasing power, rising welfare costs and eroded tax base in communities losing plants.
2. Inadvertent Federal favoritism to low-wage areas.
3. Overextension of debt and need for costly additions to local public facilities by small communities acquiring plants.
4. Interstate competition of this kind for industry will disrupt carefully worked out standards of national economic policies, especially for depressed areas, through the uneconomic shifting of plants from one area to another.
5. Continued intervention of a host of local governments in business decisions will tend to weaken the foundation of a free-enterprise economy.

Judicial interpretation of State enabling acts authorizing municipal industrial revenue bonds and property tax-free status of such plants has been mostly permissive thus far. A vigorous exception was a decision by the Supreme Court of Idaho declaring the State's act unconstitutional.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent letter signed by an old friend and a distinguished American, Mr. John J. Fitzpatrick, on behalf of the Detroit Metropolitan Council of Senior Citizens in opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill.

This excellent letter well sets forth why H.R. 3669 and S. 774 should be defeated as being out of conformity with the public interest and as being singularly destructive to the economic welfare of our senior citizens.

The letter follows:

DETROIT METOPOLITAN COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS, AFFILIATED WITH THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS, INC.,
Detroit, Mich., October 21, 1963.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: After studying its provisions and discovering the built-in inequities and economic dangers inherent in the quality brand stabilization bill, H.R. 3669 and S. 774, the executive committee of the Detroit Metropolitan Council of Senior Citizens instructed me to convey to you their appreciation of your opposition to the bill.

As you know, Mr. Congressman, retired people, by and large, constitute the least affluent segment of America's total population. They are at an age and condition of life when, for them, employment-produced income has virtually ceased to exist. In fact, the retired person with any income, other than social security, is indeed an exceptional person.

But above and beyond personal considerations senior citizens see in the proposals embodied in H.R. 3669 a real threat to the time-honored free-flow of forthright competition. And they also see substantial indications that if the bill is passed it will severely lessen the equal economic opportunities which, up to now, have been the birthright of all citizens.

Detroit's senior citizens, Mr. DINGELL, earnestly join with their parent organization, the 15 million strong National Council of Senior Citizens in saying to you and your congressional colleagues: "H.R. 3669 and S. 774 should be defeated."

Sincerely,

JOHN FITZPATRICK.

Speaker Won Pat Discusses the Future of Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an interview with the Honorable Won Pat in the April 1964 issue of Pacific Profile, a magazine devoted to Guam and the Pacific. Speaker Won Pat, who presides with marked distinction over the most far-flung legislative body of the United States, is well and favorably known in Washington, where he has exerted much influence in legislative enactments for the benefit of Guam. He left Washington after a fruitful sojourn among us on April 13, 1964, and reached Guam on April 16. Two days later the following interview appeared in Pacific Profile:

MARIANAS REINTEGRATION, YES—ANNEXATION TO HAWAII, NO

Political reintegration of the Marianas Islands is inevitable, and one of the worst things that could happen to Guam is for the American territory to be annexed to the State of Hawaii.

The remarks were made by Speaker Antonio B. Won Pat of the Guam Legislature.

In response to questions asked by Pacific Profile, Won Pat said Guam has for many years provided political, social, and educational leadership throughout the Pacific Trust Territory islands and "it is a matter of ineluctable logic that Guam will continue to provide this leadership which will, in time, bring about the political unity of these islands (Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota) under some form of government within the political framework of the United States."

Won Pat rejected the suggested annexation of Guam to Hawaii, saying that such an event "would be politically regressive and would defeat our hopes for increased local self-government."

The annexation idea was broached several times in the past by members of the Hawaii congressional delegation.

In answer to another question, Won Pat said there is a great need for official representation in the U.S. Congress other than the role presently played by him as speaker of the legislature.

"For the present, it seems that the most feasible arrangement would be for the local election of a territorial representative who would have a fixed term of years in that position. This would permit such a representative of the people to make domestic and business arrangements which would make it possible for him to remain in Washington on a full-time basis thus providing a greater opportunity to work toward eventual recognition in Congress.

The following were questions submitted by Pacific Profile, and Won Pat's replies:

"Do you believe Guam is ready to elect its own Governor? If you do, what makes you believe it is? If you don't, please explain."

I have for a long time believed that Guam has reached a level of political maturity which would warrant its choosing a Governor by local election. It certainly can no longer be successfully argued that there is an absence of qualified candidates and there isn't a shadow of a doubt in my mind that the people of Guam would have any difficulty in judging the relative ability of the candidate for such office.

My sincere beliefs on this subject have prompted me to work for the introduction of legislation for this purpose in both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

"As you very well know, elective governorship bills were introduced in the U.S. Congress during the administrations of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, but they never were seriously considered. What seems to be the major obstacles to such bill's enactment? Is it because most Members of Congress are generally convinced that Guam is not yet ready to choose its own Chief Executive? Or is it because the territory and its needs are not well known?"

It is a combination of both. One must first recognize that apart from the people of our island our territorial political affairs are only of real concern to the members of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs—most particularly to the members of the Subcommittees on Territorial and Insular Affairs. Among these persons the consensus seems to prevail that legislation for an elected Governor should not be considered until there is economic maturity as well as political maturity. The tendency is then to consider all of the territories collectively and while one of these goals may have been satisfactorily reached in one territory it may be unachieved in another territory.

In my opinion political maturity means that judgment used by the electorate in exercising its voting franchise and can be measured, at least in part, by the number of eligible voters who vote as well as the manner in which they exercise this free choice. Guam has long established and Congres has long recognized a satisfactory degree of development in Guam as may be noted from the fact that in the past Congress has delegated more and more power to the territorial legislature. I cite the Saylor bill, the Guam rehabilitation bill, the urban renewal bill, and the submerged lands bill as ony a few of the major examples of Congress having increased its delegation of powers.

There is a noticeable but gradual and favorable change in the attitude of many Congressmen toward Guam and its aspirations for increased self-government through an elected Governor. I am advised that the present administration plans to submit legislation for this purpose in this session of the Congress. The shortage of time and the urgency of other legislation still pending before this Congress does not warrant favorable speculation for such a bill at this time. However, I do feel, for the first time, that such legislation might prosper in the next session of the Congress to convene in 1965.

Would you say that Guam is generally regarded by Congress as a military base, and only secondarily as a civilian community? What do you think is required to counteract such impression?

It is true that Congress places great importance on Guam as a military base but it places equal importance upon Guam as the showplace of American democracy in the Far East. Guam's military importance is a changing condition depending upon world affairs while Guam's political development is a continuing responsibility shared by the Congress and the people of Guam.

Legislation for representation in the U.S. Congress also has been submitted for consideration from time to time. Yet, chances of its enactment appear to be almost nil. What seems to be the attitude of Congress on this matter?

It has been my experience in the last 14 years that Congress generally welcomes information as to the views and desires of the people of Guam in matters relating to their welfare and development. Therefore, in the past, it has been the form rather than the purpose of the legislation presented to it which has received little support. The historical precedent in case of a territorial "delegate" with limited privileges has been that it is a step toward statehood. The alternative, the "commissioner," is identified with a commonwealth status and this also is inapplicable to the presently considered political future for Guam.

In the last Congress, the 87th Congress, the legislation called for a "territorial deputy" who would have some status in Congress and his office would be financed by Congress. Similar legislation has been introduced in this session of Congress, the 88th Congress, by Senator INOUYE and at my request. Two of the principal reasons for objections to this legislation are that it increases the number of congressional Members and that it is an added expense to the Congress.

Do you believe there is a great need for official representation in Congress other than the role now played by you as speaker of the legislature?

Emphatically yes. Under the present arrangement it is necessary for some member of the legislature to be away from his business and family for prolonged periods of time at personal expense and detriment to himself and his family. This practice has been effective, however, because the Members of Congress are also elected officials and therefore they have a sympathetic understanding and relationship with the elected representatives of any group of people. The contributions of the Secretary of the Interior, through the Office of Territories, is also important but in many instances he is bound by the policies of the administration and, of course, the requirement that no territory be favored over another.

For the present it seems that the most feasible arrangement would be for the local election of a territorial representative who would have a fixed term of years in that position. This would permit such a representative of the people to make domestic and business arrangements which would make it possible for him to remain in Washington on a full-time basis thus providing a greater opportunity to work toward eventual recognition in Congress.

Do you contemplate having legislation submitted to grant residents of Guam the right to vote in presidential elections? At least several Congressmen are in favor of this, one of whom is Representative WAYNE ASPINALL.

This is a matter of amendment to the Constitution. However, it is a legitimate aspiration the residents of Guam and should be sought after the election of a Governor and territorial representative in Washington. It would be most difficult to bring all of the

democratic institutions to a territory at one time and they should therefore be pursued in the order of their immediate importance.

Do you subscribe to the proposition that Guam must be economically self-sufficient before it can be granted the right to choose its own governor and have representation in the U.S. Congress? If this is the measure upon which political maturity is determined, then it seems likely that Guam's political status will not change in the near future. What do you think?

It is a generally accepted proposition that no area can be politically independent or autonomous unless it is also economically self-sufficient. In the absence of economic self-sufficiency it is doubtful whether Guam would be politically autonomous with an elected Governor and territorial representative. Guam's problem in this connection is that it has a single rather than a diversified economic base. It is my sincere belief that an elected Governor and territorial representative would immeasurably aid Guam in developing broader and sounder economic base which would naturally lead to more autonomy.

As you know, Guam is often identified with the Virgin Islands. And some Members of Congress seem to think that whatever is done to Guam must also be done to the Virgin Islands. Do you believe this is fair?

Political and economic conditions are no more the same in any two territories than they are the same in two widely separated areas in the continental United States and consequently I feel that it is inequitable to treat them under the same standards.

Do you subscribe to the idea that Guam should be annexed to Hawaii? Would this, in fact, help Guam?

As far back as 1959, I testified in opposition to this proposition when it arose in the course of a hearing before one of the committees of Congress. Such an event would be politically regressive and would defeat our hopes for increased local self-government.

Don't you think that the ultimate destiny of Guam is that it will provide the leadership in an American community (commonwealth) comprising of Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota?

Guam has for a long time provided political, social, and educational leadership throughout all of the islands of the Trust Territory and it is a matter of ineluctable logic that Guam will continue to provide this leadership which will, in time, bring about the political unity of these islands under some form of government within the political framework of the United States.

These Cities Had a Facial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Jack Eisen in the Washington Post described the progress of urban renewal in two of our great port cities: Baltimore, Md., and Norfolk, Va. As one of the local people mentioned in the article points out, Federal investment in urban-renewal programs is rewarded by higher business and personal income tax receipts and healthier cities. The text of the article follows:

THESE CITIES HAD A FACIAL

(By Jack Eisen)

With help from Washington, both Norfolk and Baltimore are taking on a new look by a means now forbidden to Washington itself.

The closest seaport neighbors of the Nation's Capital, operating under liberal enabling laws of Virginia and Maryland, are in the midst of federally aided urban renewal projects that are transforming their downtown skylines and their basic characters.

Washington cannot do this. District law restricts commercial redevelopment. A Senate-passed bill to authorize such work will soon go to the House floor, but it bristles with District Committee amendments that supporters fear may render it inoperative.

In Baltimore, 33 acres of largely nondescript commercial structures sandwiched between the commercial center and the retailing district are being transformed into Charles Center.

Its centerpiece, a 22-story office building with gray walls, is in place and 92-percent occupied. Across Charles Street, just outside the project boundary, another contemporary tower drawn there by the project's existence thrusts skyward.

In Norfolk, the bawdy old tavern row along East Main Street, where B-girls siphoned off a goodly share of sailors' shore leave spending money by sipping ginger ale at champagne prices, is gone.

Today, old East Main Street is transformed into a sheltered pedestrian walkway flanked by planted terraces leading toward the first of two squarish 10-story office buildings and the new $15 million Civic Center beyond.

Civic Center, a group of administrative, court, and police buildings, is a symbol of the new Norfolk. So is the $6.5 million Golden Triangle Motor Hotel, at the far corner of the 161-acre downtown project, which has created for Virginia's largest city a convention industry it never knew before.

Symbolic, too, is the gas works that squats on a strategic site near Golden Triangle Hotel. Its corporate owner, in a demonstration of civic pride, hired a color consultant who chose shades of blue, green, and turquoise for the three drab tanks. The repainting, along with related landscaping, makes a big difference.

While both Baltimore's and Norfolk's downtown renewal projects will affect the central retail cores adjacent to the renewal areas, neither undertakes major surgery on the heart of the existing commercial center.

The projects are intended instead to break the economic stranglehold of obsolescence represented by loft-type commercial buildings, many of them structurally sound, that were built to serve the waterborne commerce of an era long dead.

Norfolk also has used renewal to help cure a bad case of hardened civic arteries. A network of broad avenues replaces arterials dating from colonial days, and more are to come.

In Baltimore, residential slums are somewhat removed from the downtown core.

But in Norfolk, slums described by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's housing chief, Nathan Straus, as the worst he had encountered, lapped up against the city's center. Renewal has been responsible for demolishing slums there occupied by 6,600 families. Some 3,000 public housing units have been erected, mostly on former slum sites, adjacent to the renewal areas.

A high spot of my visit to Norfolk was a stroll through a brandnew shipping center on the edge of the downtown project farthest from Granby Street, this city's equivalent of Washington's F Street NW. As shopping centers go, it is not unusual—an L-shaped group of single-story yellow brick store buildings that front upon a parking lot.

This one was different, however, because the clientele was almost entirely Negro, drawn from the nearby public housing. Here was an economically deprived group enjoying—that word is used advisedly—the outward trappings of what suburbia offers others.

In all of downtown Norfolk, according to an informal survey by the redevelopment agency, 259 businesses (plus 40 taverns and five service stations) were displaced. Of the 259, a total of 203 were relocated and 59 went out of business.

The Baltimore urban renewal agency also plans a small shopping center to be occupied by displaced merchants in a project not far from the old Mount Royal railroad station.

The official who pointed it out to a busload of visiting Washington civic leaders recently also indicated that he had trouble restraining a big food chain that sought to elbow aside the independent retailers.

Revitalization of the downtown core also can mean more eyeball-to-eyeball competition among retailers. Norfolk provides a good example.

Near the Granby Street edge of the project, a firm headed by James W. Rouse of Baltimore plans a multi-million-dollar retailing center that will include a major new department store. Naturally, some local department store executives are restive.

But Lawrence M. Cox, Norfolk's redevelopment and public housing director, defends the plan as good policy for all.

In his view, the more and better merchandise there is available in a diverse and competitive downtown, the more of Tidewater's near million people will come to shop.

The real key to the downtown renewal effort in Norfolk is parking. Renewal will provide about 7,000 publicly owned and operated spaces, plus some 3,000 more in connection with the Rouse Center if it goes ahead.

Cox looks upon the large number of surface parking spaces as a sort of land bank for Norfolk's future. If more land is needed for productive uses, the surface lots can become the sites for space-saving garages.

There are several ways of telling the renewal story statistically or graphically. You can talk about historic sites restored to decent settings as are Norfolk's pre-Revolutionary St. Paul's Church and the Douglas MacArthur Memorial, formerly the old courthouse. You can talk in dollars of cost to the public, generally shared two-thirds Federal and one-third local.

Or there is the increased real estate tax yield—the Golden Triangle Hotel pays Norfolk 18 times as much as the previous slums on its site, and Charles Center when completed will pay Baltimore 5 times the old rate.

While some doubt that urban renewal is a Federal job, former Mayor W. Fred Duckworth of Norfolk, a member of the conservative Byrd organization, sees it in terms of fiscal responsibility.

Addressing a delegation from Richmond in 1962, Duckworth declared:

"I don't believe the Federal Government has spent one red copper cent in giving us $31 million (since increased, by an additional residential project, to $38 million) to help our projects.

"That's because they've gotten it back in higher business and personal income taxes, and a healthier city. I don't think Norfolk has spent any money either, for the same reasons."

Return the Indian to Our Coins and Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, except for the efforts of a handful of devoted champions, the vanishing American would be totally overlooked in the minds

of the later arrivals in the New World. The following article which appeared in the December issue of the Indian News pleads eloquently for the return of the Indian to our coins and stamps.

RETURN THE INDIAN TO OUR COINS AND STAMPS

A California reader of Indian News is sparking a campaign to return the image of the Indian to our coins and stamps, according to the September 27 issue of Coin World.

If you happen to have any change in your pocket, take it out and look at it. Chances are you won't find any that honors the Indian. The only coin likely to be found is the buffalo nickel, which was last minted 26 years ago.

Without movies and TV, the only buffalo most people would know is the one you shuffle off to, according to the once-popular song. Mr. William Klem's contention is that "motion pictures and television have popularized Indians in nearly every country in the world," and he thinks that the adoption of his idea, to return the Indian to our stamps and coins, would meet with popular favor.

Several U.S. Congressmen have responded enthusiastically to the idea, he says, and he makes the point that having the Indian's image on current coins will tend to keep people aware of the plight of the American Indian.

On all his correspondence, Mr. Klem uses a rubber stamp which depicts a coin with the head of an Indian wearing a stylized war bonnet and the words "United States of America," around the edge. Along the outside edge of the coin are the words, "Return the Indian to Our Stamps and Coins."

Those critics who complain of "In God We Trust" on the other side of the coin probably wouldn't like the substitution of "Great Spirit" any better, but it would be appropriate on a coin bearing an Indian image, because the Indians have never been in doubt about the existence of a Great Spirit.

We have no coins of less value than the cent and the nickel, so those would probably be used. This would rule out the possibility of including such slogans as "Remember Kinzua Dam" (commemorating our violation of George Washington's solemn treaty with the Seneca Nation in 1794), or "The Wounded Knee Massacre" or "The Great Black Hills Land Theft."

The coins could bear the likeness of Chief Joseph or Sequoyah or Black Elk or Crazy Horse, to name a few. Postage stamps could commemorate the mass hanging of Pueblo religious leaders in the plaza in Santa Fe or the Pueblo uprising of 1680 or the Battle of the Little Big Horn or the Trail of Tears of the Cherokees.

There could be a Famous Indian Artists series or an Indian Artists and Craftsmen series, in which those decorated by the French Government with the Palnes Academiques would be honored. Important sites on the Navajo Reservation could furnish material for an entire series.

The reservation series could also call attention to the struggle of the Taos Indians to recover their sacred Blue Lake Shrine; depict the Mescaleros' Sierra Blanca Ski Resort, San Gabriel del Yunque, on the San Juan Pueblo Reservation, site of the first Spanish capitol (1598) which antedated Jamestown and Plymouth Rock; the spectacular recreation development on the White Mountain Apache Reservation acquisition, at long last, of the title to their lands by the Mohaves and Chemueves and so on.

The chairman of this Commission, Col. Harold S. Bibo, has suggested the New York World's Fair, with its expected 70 million visitors as a prime opportunity to get across the message of the American Indian.

The possibilities are unlimited. Too bad that neither the coins nor the stamps will be large enough to accommodate the statement of General Crook, the famous Indian fighter, who, in 1879 said: "During the 27 years of experience with the Indian question, I have never known a band of Indians to make peace with the Government and then break it, or leave their reservation, without some ground or complaint; but until their complaints are examined and adjusted, they will constantly give annoyance and trouble."

Too bad also that the statement of R. A. Anderson, one of the prime movers in the campaign to exterminate the Mill Creek Indians of California, cannot be kept before our population. He said: "It is but just that I should mention the circumstances which raised the hand of the Mill Creeks against the whites. As in almost every similar instance in American history, the first act of injustice, the first spilling of blood, must be laid at the white man's door."

It is an interesting switch, that in these days, when the Indians are asking the Indian Claims Commission to have some "coins" returned to them, there is a movement to return the Indian to the coins.

Mr. Klem writes that his idea has the support of the stamp and coin collectors of the Nation, the American Legion, Walter Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers, and others. He would be glad to hear from those who are in favor of his idea. His address is William Klem, 17670 Donmetz Street, Granada Hills, Calif.

"A Living Constitution Today, if a Constitution at All for Tomorrow" Wins David Hobbs, of Marietta, Okla., the Regional American Legion High School Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, David Hobbs, a Marietta High School senior, won the regional American Legion High School Oratorical Contest held in Ottawa, Kans., on April 6, 1964.

The subject of his oration was "A Living Constitution Today, if a Constitution at All for Tomorrow."

This fine young speaker had previously won the Oklahoma Third Congressional District contest, the eastern division contest, and the Oklahoma State contest before winning the regional contest in Kansas.

I know all Members will be interested in the winning oration, which follows:

A LIVING CONSTITUTION TODAY—IF A CONSTITUTION AT ALL FOR TOMORROW

A few years back Lyman Abbot stated, "Self-government assumes, not that every man can safely govern himself, but that it is safer to leave every man to govern himself." Yes, the American way of life, the principles of our democratic society are glorified in the phraseology of Lincoln's "government of, by, and for the people." Yet while we bask with pride over the Constitution of the United States that guarantees us self-government, we are acting and reacting daily in a manner that is leading us into the paths of indifference, yes, even conceivably into paths of destruction, well, maybe I am being a little dramatic with this phrase "path of destruction" but the American people—particularly those of us who have never experienced any government other than that under our Constitution—are grossly indifferent; yes, we take for granted the constitutional way of life, we take for granted the most important document insofar as the American way of life is concerned. Yet, you and I know, have found out for certain that nothing "tolls a louder death bell" than taking anything for granted. However, to the majority, and sad though it may be, a very large majority, the Constitution is one of several things; first, an uninteresting document that is meant to be studied by the Federal judges. Second, a document that we struggled through in school but made no effort to really understand, or third, a document that is supposed to protect my personal rights and the "devil take the hind most" insofar as anybody else's rights are concerned. With this rather gloomy description of the American attitudes toward the Constitution I present to you today my oration entitled "A Living Constitution Today—If a Constitution at All for Tomorrow."

There are two distinct approaches to the idea of the Constitution—a "living document." Almost any history textbook will interpret this to mean that the Constitution is flexible, that it changes with the needs of a growing Nation. A document written to fulfill the needs of 13 States forming an agricultural Nation of 4 million people that has been adapted to meet the needs of an industrial Nation of 50 States and 180 million people. Yes,the Constitution as Gladstone once said, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at any given time by the brain and purpose of man" has weathered 150 years here in America, even withstanding the rigors of a deadly Civil War, yet if it is to stand another 150 years or even another 50 years, it is going to have to withstand the rigors of indifference and unconcern, and this brings me to the second interpretation of the living Constitution, that of an informed Nation—living, practicing, and doing those duties that accompany all of the privileges with which we are so enamored. For the next few minutes I am going to point out some passages in the Constitution that we pay lip service to but that we do not practice.

For example in the preamble, the phrase "establish justice," does this mean justice for everyone. Tinker, tailor, cowboy, sailor, Negro, Indian, Catholic, Jew, and the poor boy. Or do we really mean justice for the white Protestant who has enough money, and comes from the right side of the tracks? We say one thing but we practice another.

In article I of the Constitution it states that "The House of Representatives shall be chosen by the people of the various States who are qualified voters" and later in an amendment that the Senators shall be chosen by the qualified voters of the various States and that these Representatives and Senators shall make up the legislative body that writes the laws that regulate our lives, yet it is common knowledge that the people don't elect our Congressmen. As a matter of record the most that ever go to the polls to help elect those very important lawmakers is slightly over 50 percent of those qualified to vote—and as a rule one-third of the qualified voters express themselves at the polls. The remaining two-thirds figure that their one vote just won't make any difference. I say to you today, that if we don't wake up, that before many more decades pass we won't be bothered with going to the polls—we won't even be given the option. It is sort of

like the coach on the athletic field as he tells his athletes, that a muscle that isn't used becomes weak and useless. Yes, that muscle power of one vote will become useless if we don't exercise it.

Another example—in section 8 of article I, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, and maybe someone better close the doors because when we start to talk about money, we had better say it nice and polite or people will run. Yes, Uncle Sam is the American citizen's Santa Claus, his real "Sugar Daddy". The guy that gives us all we want, the Uncle Sam who builds our dams, our parks, and our roads for our welfare and pleasure. The Uncle Sam that keeps a navy on the sea, an air force in the air, and an army on the land so that we can sleep at night with a secure feeling, an Uncle Sam that guarantees us the right to own property, to say this is mine, an Uncle Sam that guarantees us the right to worship as we please, and as I mentioned before we are like the kid that still believes in Santa Claus, in other words, we want these things we demand these things, yet when it comes time to pay for them, we hedge, and scrounge, and cheat, and lie and deceive on our taxes—then go out and brag about it and belittle the poor dunce who pays at the prescribed rate.

And again, amendment 6 of the Constitution that guarantees to all of us a speedy trial by an impartial jury. Now if any one of us is accused of a crime—we certainly want a fair trial, but, the same we can find a hundred and one reasons why we can't do jury duty. We don't have time. We don't want to get inovlve. We can't. And it goes on and on. If people's lives and a basic liberty weren't involved, it would take on an element of the ridiculous. The way it is, is pathetic. And the speedy trial has long since lost its meaning, why in the average city today it takes a case 2½ years before there there is a chance to bring it up unless it is spectacular enough to command earlier attention. By the time a case comes up, witnesses have moved, memories have dimmed, and the trial is almost a farce.

One last example, amendment 10, the so-called States rights amendment. We scream, we protest, and we demonstrate about States rights when the Federal Government takes actions that go against the grain, yet we blithely forget, that with every right there is a duty. Yet every State should have some guaranteed powers but on the other hand each State should take care of her poor, her indigent, her orphaned. Each State should educate her youth, and build her roads—Yes we should remember that we have some obligations toward ourselves before we ask for so many different types of Federal aid.

In conclusion, the Constitution, a living document, a plan of self-government, a plan for working people, people that demand that the government and courts treat all alike regardless of race, creed, or wealth, a people that go to the polls and cast that one vote, a people that are not "freeloaders" but pay their share of the bill, a people that form in the most impartial jury in the world, a people willing to take the responsibilities of government on their own shoulders asking not what the Government can do for them.

And finally a word of warning, in the words of Rousseau, "As soon as any man says of the affairs of the state, 'What does it matter to me?' the state may be given up for lost." Let's paraphrase that quotation today and say, "As soon as men say of the Constitution, 'What does it matter to me?' the Constitution may be given up for lost."

Lipservice in support of the Constitution is not enough. If we are to, have a Constitution for tomorrow, it must be through a living image today.

The Man Said It Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Covington Leader, an outstanding weekly newspaper of the State of Tennessee and the Nation, an excellent editorial relative to our colleague, JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

The editorial speaks for itself:

THE MAN SAID IT WELL

Representative JOHN LESINSKI, JR., an ultraliberal Democrat from Detroit, this week explained why he voted against the civil rights bill when it passed the House last month.

Representative LESINSKI represents a large part of the industrial area of Detroit, is backed by the United Automobile Workers, is an avowed liberal, and has the record in Congress to back his liberal contentions.

Here is what he had to say about the civil rights bill now before the U.S. Senate.

"None of us want to live under a dictatorship, whether it be a dictatorship by one man or by a small group of the head of the Government and I am fearful this measure could lead to such conditions."

"It can't happen here, some will say. Some said the same thing in Czechoslovakia, at one time considered a showcase of democracy; some said it in Hungary, in Poland, and in other Eastern European countries now dominated by a small group of dictators at the head of a centralized government, where people who once had, no longer have, a voice in their government."

Mr. LESINSKI said many people "do not realize the far-reaching implications of this measure."

"I urge the working man to take a careful look at it because it could affect existing seniority rights. I urge the veterans to consider the bill carefully, for it could affect their veterans' preference rights."

"I urge all citizens of America to set aside their emotions for a minute and take a look into the future for their own good."

"I am in full accord with the basic intent of the measure to guarantee the civil rights of all our citizens, but I believe that in the long run the methods in this bill by which that intent is to be carried out will be detrimental to everyone's freedoms."

He said he agreed with former President Harry S. Truman that there are enough laws on the books already "to correct conditions." He said, "Let those laws be enforced. Let us not today enact more laws which could endanger the future of our country."

Representative LESINSKI said he favors civil rights and improved conditions for Negroes, and noted that he voted for civil rights bills in 1957 and 1960.

The present bill has very little to do with "civil rights." It is almost purely an attempt to extend Federal control into almost every area of our private and business lives.

We think Mr. LESINSKI presents the case against the present bill very well, and since he is a certified liberal his statement may be of more than passing interest to some who may have considered all opposition to the bill a product of unreconstructed rebel southerners.

The man said it all very well.

The War on Poverty: Headed in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, simple statistics deny a casual approach to the problem of poverty. While more Americans than ever before are enjoying a higher and a rising standard of living, millions more—fully one-fifth of our entire population—are living in the "other America" of depravation, cut off from the gates of opportunity.

To be sure the new tax cut will sharply step up our rate of economic growth. By creating 2 to 3 million new jobs it will open exists from poverty at a faster pace.

But open exists mean little to those who cannot move—to the millions who are caught up in the clutches of poverty because of illiteracy, lack of skills and racial discrimination. As Sargent Shriver said in his presentation to the House Committee on Education and Labor, the tax cut and civil rights bills will help provide new exists from poverty. This program will give Americans the chance and the capacity to use those exists.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent article appearing in the Washington Post, columnist Roscoe Drummond has made a number of thoughtful comments concerning the war on poverty program. This is one of the most important issues pending before the Congress and I commend this article to our colleagues for their attention:

WAR ON POVERTY: HEADED IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The critics of President Johnson's antipoverty program are making a great mistake picking at its fringes.

The argument that this must not be the business of the Federal Government is a profitless and out-dated argument.

Any democratic society must be concerned at every level of government with the problem of continued high unemployment in the face of continued high prosperity.

Any democratic society must be concerned at every level of government with the fact that, despite a consistently rising standard of living for many Americans, despite a higher average wage for most Americans, despite a mounting gross national product of more than $600 billion annually, some 35 million persons in this country can afford neither adequate food nor adequate shelter nor adequate clothing nor adequate schooling.

I submit that at no level of government—local, State, and Federal—dare we neglect this pervasive problem of widespread poverty in the midst of widespread affluence.

I think we can't.

Therefore, the central questions to be asked—and answered—are:

Do the proposed actions go to the heart of the problem, to is causes, not merely to its symptoms?

And even if the measures are well conceived, can poverty be substantially done away with?

It seems to me that the war-on-poverty program which its chief of staff, Sargent Shriver, has put together for the President and unfolded to Congress, reflects realistic, workable, and, indeed, conservative economic principles.

Mr. Shriver is not talking about reducing poverty by spreading the wealth of others.

He is not talking about increasing handouts in order to decrease distress.

He is not talking primarily about how to help the poor, but primarily about how to help the poor help themselves.

What are the causes of increased unemployment and continued poverty in the face of increased and long-sustained prosperity? They are, as pointed out by Raymond J. Saulnier, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and no pie-in-the-sky economist: "Lack of skills," "inadequate education," "unsuitable or inadequate work experience," and "discrimination."

These are the root causes and the Shriver program is aimed concretely at these causes as a practical and necessary way to reduce poverty.

These are the things which most often make people poor and keep them that way—often from generation to generation.

I think this Nation cannot accept continued poverty for 9,300,000 families with a median income of $1,800 a year. This kind of poverty is not due to the failure of our economic system. It is due to the failure of our society to provide the education, the job training and retraining, the encouragement and the environment needed to help the poor become productive and the productive become more prosperous.

This is why a panel of practical, experienced business leaders helped to shape and then gave its unanimous endorsement to the program which Mr. Shriver proposed to the White House.

Recently the Gallup Poll reported that 83 percent of the respondents said "no" when asked, "Do you think poverty will ever be done away with in this country?"

I suspect they asked the wrong question. The realistic goal is not abolishing poverty. Some people may not have the will to lift themselves out of poverty even when given a better opportunity. Some may not have the mental capacity to improve themselves even when the chance is put well within their reach.

But it seems to me that the kind of poverty and unemployment we have experienced in the past 15 years ought to be seen as an anachronism not to be accepted.

This war on poverty is headed in the right direction.

What Is Happening to the Postal Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article written by Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks. In his article, "What Is Happening to the Postal Service?" which appeared in the April issue of the Union Postal Clerk and the Postal Transport Journal, Mr. Hallbeck points out that changes by the Post Office Department can bring us to the point where service cannot avoid being further inhibited. The Department will have to cope with over a million additional deliveries each year with fewer employees and reduced personnel budgets. Mr. Hallbeck believes, and rightly so, that automation in our postal service is not the complete solution to the problem.

I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read this very important insight into our postal service problems:

The article follows:

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE POSTAL SERVICE?

(By E. C. Hallbeck)

You don't have to be an expert to know that something is happening to the postal service in this country. Something bad.

Almost every day one sees new portents of declining services.

Item: "Between 1,500 and 2,000 Tar Heel motorists who ordered their license tags by mail this year found themselves without their tags as the deadline neared. The director of motor vehicles registration said the post office had gotten mixed up."—AP story in the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News.

Item: "The Congress and the postal patrons of Philadelphia are up in arms over the reduction of postal services in that city." From the Postal Record magazine of March 1964.

Item: "Mail service in the Berkshires has long been a joke."—Letter to the editor of the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle.

Item: "Recent trends indicate this problem (the volume of missent and delayed mail) has reached such proportions that reached such proportions that positive corrective action must be taken at once."—The Postal Bulletin, February 20, 1964.

That last item is really the most alarming of all. Coming from the Department's own Bureau of Operations it constitutes a confession of deficiencies which can no longer be ignored.

Well, what is wrong?

Plenty of people think they know. One Philadelphia merchant who last month sent out 5,000 pieces of promotional mail to advertise a sale is understandably bitter over the astonishing fact that the 5,000 pieces apparently never were delivered.

He accuses the Department of "socialistic inefficiency" in an angry note which embarrassed postal officials permitted him to stuff into a second mailing for an alternative sale date.

We are sympathetic with his indignation. But we must disagree with his diagnosis.

The Bureau of Operations has its own diagnosis. Demanding an "immediate review" of all mail handling methods and procedures in all offices, it listed recently 11 alleged shortcomings in the collection, processing, facing, supervising and dispatching of the mails.

It summed up its indictment in these words: "It is the responsibility of all postal employees to squarely meet our obligation of providing the public with the best postal service possible, consistent with President Johnson's directive for economy in the Federal Government."

On the score of our responsibility as employees, we are in total agreement. But the phrase above lets at least the cat's nose out of the bag.

For when economy in Government is carried to rock-bottom extremes without sufficient regard to realities or consequences it sets in motion the immutable law of diminishing returns.

The new administration's economies—its personnel freeze, its $30 million cutback to reduce the work force by 5,000 in 4 months, a $10 million cut in the transportation budget—are bringing us perilously close—in our judgment—to the point where service cannot avoid being further inhibited.

It would be unfair, obviously, to assign all the blame for postal shortcomings to the new Johnson administration. The present inadequacies have been a long time in the making. And not all of them derive from meat-ax budgeting.

The first major cutback in service to the public came away back during the Truman administration when the traditional two-a-day home delivery of mail was cut to one. The trend has been downhill ever since with more and more mail being handled by fewer people.

At the end of fiscal 1963, for example, the Post Office actually employed 1,300 fewer people than at the start of the year although the volume of mail increased 2 percent in that year alone.

Before the turn of this century the Post Office employed 150,000 people. Today, 70 years later, there has been only a fourfold increase in employment to handle 16 times as much mail.

Productivity of postal employee has increased dramatically and steadily and never more so than in recent years. The number of pieces of mail handled per employee has gone up 12 percent in the last decade alone.

Yet experts warn that we must cope with an estimated 1.5 million additional office and home deliveries every year into the foreseeable future with fewer employees and reduced personnel budgets.

Management says this will be possible because of the blessings of automation.

The public is learning the hard way, however, that many of the vaunted miracles of the machine, when they are not actually bogus, are (to put it mildly) a mixed blessing.

The public is beginning to find out that:

Machines, not men, are tearing up the packages and chewing up the envelopes.

Machines, not men, break down on the job.

Machines, not men, require platoons of mechanics for proper maintenance.

Machines, not men, are being given a public relations glamor buildup even before they are adequately developed.

Machines, not men, boosted operational costs at Philadelphia by $782,000 a year.

Machines, not men, boosted operational costs at Denver by $624,000 a year.

Machines, not men, are costing $12 million a year for research and development of dubious value in many instances.

Human beings also have their imperfections, of course.

Men, not machines, have been eliminating collection routes all over the country and removing convenient mailboxes from street corners.

Men, not machines, are responsible for the juicy private leasing of 9,900 postal facilities which have cost—and will cost—the taxpayers hundreds of millions more over 30-year-periods than if the Post Office itself had built and run them.

Men, not machines, eliminate railway mail trains that have already cut the intercity network of train service more than 50 percent in the last decade—a major factor in delaying the distribution of mail while it is actually en route.

Men, not machines, have decided that a fifth of the whole clerk-carrier complement shall consist of substitutes working up to 70 hours a week without a penny of overtime.

Men, not machines, are massing the mails in area centralization programs that are more efficient only in theory so long as temporary substitutes and others unprepared through study are assigned to overwhelming burdens.

Men, not machines, have decreed that postal clerks must learn their intricate scheme and route distributions on their own time.

And men, not machines, have postulated the policy that the postal service all too often is fair game for politics as usual.

It's not our intent to imply that the postal clerical force is perfect. Clerks have their human failings like everyone else, although

they make fewer mistakes than some overpublicized machines and phony systems.

But the fact is that when the appetite for productivity becomes insatiable—when the emphasis in practice is placed on quantity rather than quality—and when these gods must be appeased at all costs—there is bound to be trouble in River City.

And when you find careless distribution or casing of mail, or inefficient facing table operations, or substandard carrier service, you will also find in 9 cases out of 10 a shortage of trained personnel involved—a lack of qualified employees.

Add a dash of poor supervision. For supervisory personnel can hardly be expected to do their job properly when they are preoccupied with measuring, clocking, counting, and sweating individual employee performances under the infamous work measurement system.

Compound these ingredients, bring them to a slow boil, and what do you have? More stew than service.

But the Bureau of Operations, demanding an "immediate review" at all levels, apparently believes the admitted problem of missent and delayed mail derives from weaknesses confined exclusively to the operations of clerks, mail handlers, and carriers. It has cited 11 areas of effort in which to whittle down error and delay.

Bravo! For where shortcomings in our own functional areas can be found, we are as eager as management to achieve correction if they are correctible.

Indeed, as clerks, we are proud of our special skills without which the mail could not be moved. And as employees of the Government of the United States we are proud of our careers in the public service. We are devoted to the same objectives as postal management, namely—the rapid, efficient and accurate dispatch of 67 billion pieces of mail a year.

But the inherent problems of this enormous chore require the perspective of a wide-angle lens not the distortions of a magnifying glass.

And let the public no less than the Department recognize that seeds of discord, delusion, and dim sight inevitably yield a harvest that is something less than a bumper crop.

This Is Ridgefield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Ridgefield (Conn.) League of Women Voters has recently published a booklet called "This Is Ridgefield." In it, citizens will find a complete historical and statistical description of this beautiful community and how it is governed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting the following editorial from the Danbury News-Times. The editor's praise is well earned and I am happy to associate myself with it, congratulate the league, and bring its fine work to the attention of the House.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS RIDGEFIELD

"This Is Ridgefield" is the title of an attractive booklet, of some 80 pages, published by the league of women voters in that town as a service to the residents.

The league of women voters has performed a splendid service. And so have those who assisted the women's group by furnishing sketches, articles, and information for the booklet.

A compact history of the community and statistical information is followed by a chapter on local government, which details the duties and responsibilities of various officials, boards, and commissions which serve the town.

Then there is a chapter on town finances, which explains local taxation, State aid, budget making, bonding capacity, and other fiscal matters which townspeople sometimes find complicated and hard to understand.

A table comparing town budgets since 1939 demonstrates graphically the great growth which Ridgefield has experienced in a little more than two decades.

Other sections deal with health and safety services and community life. There are also a business and professional directory and a convenient listing of telephone numbers.

"This Is Ridgefield" is a valuable piece of work—not only for townspeople who will make day-to-day use of it, but for future historians who will find within its covers detailed information of what Ridgefield was like in 1964.

Among other things, they will know that there was in Ridgefield in 1964 a dedicated group of women doing practical things to make their hometown a better place for all.

Civil Rights and the Maryland Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed of late an incredible campaign of extremist activity based upon irresponsible distortions of the provisions of H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill. Governor Wallace of Alabama, appealing to bigotry and hatred—first in Wisconsin, and now in Indiana and Maryland—has challenged all citizens of good will to speak out in support of the basic American beliefs in human dignity and equal justice under the law. Therefore, I commend to our colleagues a recent statement on civil rights and the Maryland primary by Dr. Royce Hanson, professor of government at American University, and Democratic candidate for Congress from Maryland's Sixth District:

STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE MARYLAND PRIMARY BY ROYCE HANSON

I have, like many of you, been brooding more these past few days about our country in light of the Wisconsin primaries. I have been wondering what we can do. I am determined that we must demonstrate our devotion to the principles of human dignity and equal justice. There is one issue of support for civil rights or rejection of all this country stands for in the march of human progress. That one issue is more important than the election of any man to Congress.

We in this country bear a most heavy burden. We are at the door of the Capitol where the rearguard of shameless discrimination fights its last great battle. We are the test of this Nation's devotion to our brave slogans. We are the suburbanites whose possible "revolt" is watched with gleeful anticipation. We can give justification for more delay, for crippling compromises with basic freedoms. Or, we can deny comfort to the enemies of equality. In a very real sense, the fate of a tenth of the Nation's people, and the success of the civil rights bill lies with us. Long before the Senate will vote under its archaic rules, we shall vote. Cloture has been imposed for Maryland for May 19. Talking stops and we must vote. Every citizen in this State carries the moral responsibility for, and the political power to assure, enactment of the civil rights bill. Our action will symbolize our entire Nation before the world.

The primary function of my campaign is to do everything in my power to help meet the great human crisis of our time. This campaign is dedicated to helping good, silent people of our district understand that they must vote May 19 for mankind, for humanity, for America.

Like some of you here, I grew up with segregation and senseless discrimination. Like most of you—I hope all of you—I have long recognized its insensate, demoralizing, costly, dehumanizing character. It is no longer enough to know that and to act in our small ways to help. We no longer have that choice. We must now act in a large way. Everyone must do his part, even prospective Congressmen.

Our work is cut out for us. Governor Wallace will bring his ugly campaign to our county. We will be subjected to a facile campaign which seeks to disguise bigotry with appeals to States rights and free enterprise. We dare not be misled. No one must be allowed to balm his conscience with such shiboleths. The vote on May 19 is for or against pure, venomous, stupid bigotry. There is no nice way to put it. There is no nice way to support it. We are going to see a campaign designed to bring every viper in the State out from under his rock.

If the "decent" people of this State sit home they stand convicted before all mankind and their Creator as unworthy of a free society—as careless of human worth. We must give our wholehearted support to Senator DANIEL BREWSTER. There can be no reservations, no hesitation, no compromise, no sitting at home depending on those who have the energy to vote.

I ask you not to fail. I ask you to join me in helping end the life of racial discrimination, America's "peculiar institution." I ask you to help free yourself and your brothers from injustice. It is time for every man who prizes his own humanity, it is time for every Democrat who cherishes the ideal of political equality, to echo the haunting refrain of the freedom marchers and resolve that in the free State of Maryland, "We shall overcome!"

Armenian Martyrs' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, April 24 was Armenian Martyrs' Day. We recognize this day in memory of those 2 million Aremenian men, women, and children who in 1915 were the victims of the old Ottoman Empire's World War I commitments and desire to retain a static Pan-Islamic society.

As a result of Ottoman persecution, within 2 years over 800,000 Armenians lost their lives and nearly a million were forced to escape to the Soviet Union, thus depriving the Empire of some of the

best of their own society; the educators, the skilled artisans, and the merchants. In Russia and in other parts of the world today, these people remain, a residue of hate and animosity against Turkey that need never have been created.

The attack on Armenia in 1915 was the final gasp of an intellectually and socially bankrupt regime. It revealed the Ottoman Empire for the "sick man of Europe" that it really was, degenerate, outdated, and corrupt. It left a difficult legacy for modern Turkey, a bad memory. It foolishly alienated a progressive and valuable minority. It inflamed religious differences which should have been laid to rest centuries before. This one, single event in Turkish history stands out as a continuing reminder of the need for tolerance and understanding toward all minorities.

DAR Policy on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 27, I placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks in answer to the newspaper advertisement of the Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., which was carried in several Iowa papers under the title "$100 Billion Blackjack: The Civil Rights Bill."

In connection with my remarks, I called attention to a newspaper story on the annual convention of the Iowa Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. During this convention the Iowa Society of the DAR adopted a resolution favoring civil rights. To my knowledge this is the first time a DAR chapter in this country has passed such a resolution. The following is a verbatim copy of a newspaper story on the convention which appeared in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register March 21, 1964.

The text of this story follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.—In a precedent-setting move, the Iowa Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Friday approved a civil rights resolution calling for "an end to the equivocation that tolerates denial to any fellow American citizen of the ordinary rights and opportunities enjoyed by any other citizen of our Nation."

Mrs. F. E. Corey, of Cedar Rapids, chairman of the resolutions committee, called the resolution a new departure in that the DAR never has enunciated a policy in the civil rights area.

"We felt that here in Iowa, at any rate, we ought to take a stand," Mrs. Corey said.

The resolution called attention to constitutional guarantees of equal opportunity and urged those rights be recognized "beginning with the right to gain recognition as an individual on his personal merit."

In another resolution, the more than 225 delegates also declared that in any review of the treaty, the "Panama Canal Zone must not be internationalized and must remain under the exclusive sovereignty of the United States."

The delegates at their closing session also voted to "reaffirm their opposition to socialized medicine and to oppose passage of 'medicare.' ".

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, drew praise in one resolution although the group stressed it was nonpolitical and would not endorse any candidate.

However, the Iowa DAR termed Senator SMITH's seeking of the presidential nomination "a significant move to advance the status of all women" and "the opening of a frontier of service for women of the future."

Maj. Gen. Joseph A. Teece, U.S. Army, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois and of the Nation, Maj. Gen. Joseph A. Teece, U.S. Army, retired, is being honored on May 2, 1964. The occasion marks his retirement as vice president of Fansteel Metallurgical Corp. of North Chicago, Ill. However, General Teece is receiving recognition for much more than his distinguished service as a business executive; he is being honored primarily as a military and civic leader whose influence in the community, the State, and Nation has redounded to the benefit of mankind.

As an 18-year-old lad in Kewanee, Ill., Joseph A. Teece heard that the National Guard was being called to Federal service. He left work at once to answer the call. A private at the start of World War I, he rose to the rank of sergeant as a member of the 33d Infantry Division in the American Expeditionary Force. Following the Armistice he served in the Army of Occupation.

In 1924, he reenlisted and rose through the ranks of the 129th Infantry Regiment to lieutenant colonel and executive officer of the 129th. On March 5, 1941, Lieutenant Colonel Teece was again inducted into Federal service. His career in World War II is a saga of distinguished achievement. He saw active service in north Africa, in the Asiatic-Pacific theater, and in the Italian and Sicilian campaigns. Later he served more than 2 years with the Nationalist Army in China.

Wounded in the north African campaign, he was awarded the Purple Heart Medal. General Teece has also been decorated with the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the EAME Theater Ribbon with three bronze battle stars, six oversea bars, the Victory Medal, the Illinois Long and Honorable Service Medal with Silver Bar and Palm, and two decorations from the Chinese Combat Command.

Following his release from Federal service in May 1946, General Teece was called upon to command the 44th Infantry Division of the postwar Illinois National Guard. Two years later he was given the additional responsibility of commanding general of troops, Illinois National Guard, filling both assignments until 1950 when he was placed on the State retired list as a lieutenant general of the line. With an illustrious military career spanning 33 years and two great wars, General Teece turned to a new career in civilian life.

General Teece waged a tireless war against prejudice and bigotry. He served with distinction as a member of the Illinois Commission on Human Relations. He has been awarded a citation for meritorious service by the Waukegan Chapter of B'nai B'rith.

In the past 14 years General Teece has served two terms as president of the Fort Sheridan Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army, and as president of the Waukegan-North Chicago Chamber of Commerce, director of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, president of the North Chicago Rotary Club, and organizer of Junior Achievement of Waukegan. Currently, he is chairman of the Waukegan Port Authority and Waukegan Airport, a director of the Lake County Civic League and of two important citizens groups affiliated with Lake Forest College. He holds memberships in other civic groups including the Dahringer Post, American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House this record of distinguished service of my esteemed friend, Joseph A. Teece. On May 2, 1964, as some 500 friends and admirers gather at this affair honoring him, I know that we—in the House of Representatives, in behalf of all of the people of our Nation—also join in honoring this citizen and soldier.

Address of Hon. Richard Bolling, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech, the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman BOLLING, cited a number of important reasons why we in Congress cannot be content to rest on our laurels because of the beneficial programs enacted in the "education Congress of 1963." As he so cogently points out we cannot enter the space age with a substantial portion of our educational facilities and teachers' salaries more suited to the era of the little red schoolhouse. I commend his remarks to my colleagues:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY RICHARD BOLLING, CONGRESSMAN, FIFTH DISTRICT, MISSOURI, BEFORE THE MISSOURI ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, APRIL 3, 1964, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Today America is reaching for the stars. We have broken the bonds that have tied man to the earth through the ages. We have sent men to orbit the earth in the silent space outside our own atmosphere. And before this decade is finished it is very likely that man will travel to the moon.

After that—who knows? No dream is too big. The universe is our oyster. Here we stand in the spring of 1964 with head tilted,

arms outstretched, eagerly ready for new worlds to conquer.

It's a heroic posture.

But let's look at it a little more closely.

We stand with the door of the space age open before us and our feet are nailed firmly to the floor of the little red schoolhouse.

The plain, unhappy facts are that while we are looking eager-eyed ahead to the adventures of tomorrow we are overlooking the sad reality of an educational machine geared to yesterday's problems.

Let me point out to you a small indicator of the paradox confronting us. In just the past few years we have seen new words gaining great currency in our society. There are such words as "astronaut," "liftoff," "reentry," and "dropout."

Kids have always dropped out of school, and in the past it was not an overriding national tragedy. In good times most could find jobs within the limits of their skills or knowledge. But in this age of rapidly advancing technology there are fewer and fewer jobs for those with little knowledge or low skills. We see the result in the unemployment figures that are so painfully high. It is also reflected in the rising incidence of delinquency and crime.

And it shows, too, in one of the most appalling statistics I have seen. I refer to the fact that just about one-quarter of all selective service registrants fail to pass the preinduction mental tests. In Missouri, incidentally, the figure for failures is 13.4 percent.

And who can help but be shocked by the fact that in this, the richest and most progressive Nation in the world, 24 out of every 1,000 citizens past the age of 14 cannot read or write. In Missouri, 17 out of each 1,000 of our people are illiterate.

Another bleak picture is that of the thousands of bright, eager youngsters whose brains and talents are desperately needed—who cannot go to college simply because they cannot afford it.

And what of those who do stay in school and have the means to go to college? What do they find? I'll tell you what they find. They find overcrowded classrooms, antiquated laboratories, outdated libraries, and understaffed, underpaid, and overworked faculties.

With the rising population the situation in our schools, already serious, will become critical.

For example, in 1950 there were just over 2¼ million students enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Today there are nearly twice as many and it is estimated that by 1975 there will be nearly 9 million students looking for a college education.

Where are we going to put them? Who is going to teach them?

To meet the needs that are already upon us, it has been estimated that the institutions of higher education should invest an annual average of $1 billion more than is now being spent. It is pretty well established that local and State governments cannot provide the additional funds that are needed now. Private contributions cannot possibly supply the funds.

The late President Kennedy, who realized so well the problems in this sphere said "education is the right, the necessity and the responsibility of all."

I would like, if I may, to state this another way. Education and its problems transcends local, county, and State lines. It is a national problem.

Congress has tried hard to work out the problems of education. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress bold steps were taken in recognition of the necessity for national response to national educational needs. President Johnson has referred to this Congress as the "Education Congress of 1963." This Congress enacted major legislation to provide for training facilities and student aid for the medical professions, training for teachers of handicapped children, major new provisions for expanding and updating vocational education, expansion and extension of the important National Defense Education Act and substantial assistance to colleges and universities for construction of academic facilities.

This latter legislation has been cited by President Johnson as "the most significant education bill passed by Congress in the history of the Republic."

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 provided for $1.2 billion of matching grants and loans during the next 3 years to assist institutions of higher education to build academic facilities so that they may expand their enrollment capacity. It provides especially for strengthening the growth of public community colleges and technical institutions and for the expansion of graduate facilities.

As President Johnson said on signing this act: "We will help to build 25 to 30 new public community colleges every year.

"We will help to construct the technical institutes that are needed to close the gap in this crucial area of trained manpower.

"We will help to build graduate schools and facilities in at least 10 to 20 major academic centers.

"We will help to improve the quality of library facilities in our own universities and colleges."

There is no doubt about it. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 was a pretty good bill. But let's face it. It was not the universal cure-all for the ills facing education.

Then there is the question of teacher's pay. It is ludicrous to me that the men and women to whom we turn over the Nation's children are among the lowest paid of any professional group and in many cases are paid less than semiskilled workers.

It is unbelievable to me that American parents are unmoved by the fact that the average salary for classroom teachers in the public schools is under $6,000 a year. Incidentally, you probably know that the average in Missouri is only $5,438, well below the national average.

I wish I could promise you that Federal aid to teachers' salaries is forthcoming. There are many of us in Washington who are urging such legislation but the facts compel me to say to you that currently, the prospects for such legislation are pretty remote now.

But I am optimistic about future education legislation. The needs in the field have been recognized, as was demonstrated with the passage of last year's bill. There will be more legislation. There has to be.

As long as youngsters drop out of school; as long as youths are deprived of a college education because they haven't the financial means to get it; as long as students are turned away from overcrowded campuses, and as long as teachers are overworked and underpaid we must devote all the time, energy, and imagination required to solve the problem.

Together let us tear down the little red schoolhouse and create an educational launching pad befitting our bold plans for flight into the future.

Heritage Edition of the Atlantic City Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the Second District of New Jersey, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Atlantic City Press of Atlantic City, for the wonderful 144-page heritage edition of the paper published on April 12. This edition was the largest of its kind ever attempted in my district and it gave a vivid portrayal of the historic background of Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland Counties, which comprise my district, as well as the rich heritage of surrounding counties such as Ocean, Salem, and Burlington, as well as New Jersey itself, on this its tercentenary year.

Many of the best writers in south Jersey are represented in this gigantic effort and the material and pictures used show without a doubt the historic importance of this part of southern Jersey, not only in the Revolutionary War, and pre-Revolution days, but through the War of of 1912, the Civil War and the reconstruction period.

It points out how nationally known industries began with the germ of a thought born in Egg Harbor City and Vineland, and how one man—Eugene Grace—the son of a small village storekeeper in Cape May County proved that America is still the great land of opportunity by working his way from a one-room schoolroom to the most powerful steel position in the world.

This combined effort of all the departments of the Atlantic City Press is to be commended as a civic undertaking to tell the world in picture and story about the great coastal countries of our State of New Jersey.

I know this edition will be cherished by the many whose ancestors move through its pages, by the schools for its educational value, and to those outside the State to discover our many moments of great history.

Its editor in chief, William McMahon, deserves credit for a thorough job of assembling this great historical masterpiece. I found this edition fascinating reading and I again want to congratulate the publishers and the various departments whose combined efforts produced one of the truly great historical collections of my district.

The Innovation Industry in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, I had the high privilege of addressing the New York MIT alumni center dinner. It was a great honor to share the speaking platform with Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr., one of the outstanding scientists in the United States and former scientific adviser to President Eisenhower.

Dr. Killian's address merits the close attention of all who are interested in science in this new and exciting era in which we now live. It is my privilege to insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD so that all interested may read it:

THE INNOVATION INDUSTRY IN TRANSITION

(By J. R. Killian, Jr.)

I count it a privilege to share your program this evening with Congressman MILLER and to join you in welcoming him. As a Member of the House of Representatives with a long and distinguished record and as chairman of its Committee on Science and Astronautics, he has made himself a legislative expert in scientific and technological matters. Under his leadership, the committee which he chairs has worked for a wider understanding in Congress of the ways in which science and technology can best serve the national interest and has sought to cultivate, both within and without Government, a deeper knowledge and wisdom regarding their role in our society, a subject on which Congressman MILLER speaks authoritatively and I, academically.

Let us call it the innovation industry[1]—shorthand for "research, development, test, and evaluation." After an agonizingly slow start in the United States it came to maturity in World War II, and its decisive contributions then to the winning of the war set the stage for the spectacular growth it has since enjoyed.

Today it is an $18 billion industry representing nearly 3 percent of the gross national product. That part of the industry devoted to scientifice research and development alone engages the efforts of over 400,000 scientists and engineers.

The growth of our innovation industry is a measure of the progress of the United States toward becoming a research-based society. From the very earliest days of the Republic, it has been recognized that knowledge is power and that the Nation grew stronger by taming nature than it could by framing ideologies. So today we have the research society, affluent in the production of knowledge as well as dollars, with planned discovery, innovation, and experiment constantly renewing its vitality and harnessing the future for the benefit of the present.

When we think of research, we tend to think in terms of science where it has had its greatest exploitation; yet it has great importance in other fields. Spurred on by the spirit and successes of science, the social sciences are gaining new powers and usefulness through research, affording new hope that man may achieve some gains in understanding himself as well as nature.

The art of management provides an example. In a recent article[2] on new concepts of management, Profs. Philip E. Slater and Warren G. Bennis observed: "The challenges facing modern enterprises are, at base, knowledge-gathering, truth-requiring dilemmas. The processes of problem solving, conflict resolution, and recognition of dilemmas have great kinship with the academic pursuit of truth.

"The institution of science is the only institution based on and geared for change. It is built not only to adapt to change, but to overthrow and create change. So it is—and will be—with modern industrial enterprises."

So it is and will be increasingly with almost every department of our national effort. We have built a great and growing "industry" the output of which is a high velocity of change and an exponential growth of knowledge.

During this period of rapid growth of scientific research, the Government has become its principal source of support, and the Government's investment, prompted mainly by the requirements of defense and of space exploration, has now grown to an annual rate of $15 billion (of which only about $1.5 billion is for basic research.) Obviously the rate of growth we have witnessed in the last two decades cannot continue because of a limit on both dollars and men. We have, in fact, reached a point where clearly it is in the national interest to take stock. Are we getting our money's worth? Recognizing that the recent rate of growth will probably not continue, how much additional growth should we accept? Under conditions of lessened growth, how do we establish priorities? Are there imbalances in our total effort? These questions and others are being properly asked today by Congress, by the executive branch, and by the public. They are also being asked by the scientific community itself, as shown by a succession of reports now appearing which deal with science and public policy. One waggish scientist has likened our national management of science in recent years "to a ship with a thousand helms all connected to one rudder with rubber bands." Somehow, though, the ship has regularly made port with highly valuable cargoes.

This period of transition and stocktaking is crucial for the future of science in the Nation, and it is of the utmost importance that we marshal the best wisdom we have to shape any new policies that appear to be needed, especially policies relating Government to science.

In the spirit of the dialog now taking place, let me make some personal observations about factors which seem to me to be important as we review present practices and establish future goals.

The evidence is conclusive that the United States now holds world leadership in science. American science today, as Duncan says in "Macbeth," is "full of growing." Marked both by fecundity and brilliance, our effort is now of critical size, and it represents a powerful partnership between science and engineering, each augmenting the other. While not enough, we have university centers of science and engineering without equal, perhaps in the world. Foreign scientists leave their home countries to take advantage of the intellectual excitement, the ambiance of freedom and esteem for science they find here, the wealth of equipment, and the salubrious research environment, the absence of snobbish class distinctions separating science and engineering. The resulting "brain drain," or "unfavorable balance of trade" in technical personnel, as we know, has become a political issue for at least one of our allies.

This estimate I give is in striking contrast to the observation made by the economist Carl Snyder in 1902 that one could search the world's scientific literature in vain for references to distinguished American achievement. Implicit in this flourishing state of American science, however, are two implications which require careful consideration in this period of review and stocktaking.

The first is the danger, given our present strength, that we may rest on our oars, thinking that the race is won. Actually, we may be only at the beginning of unexampled scientific and engineering achievement, on the threshold of an Augustan age of unparalleled creativity.

With the future so promising, this is not the time to relax our scientific effort or for timid talk about having reached some kind of ceiling in our upsurge of scientific and technological strength.

The second hazard is that our present massive effort and high confidence may obscure weaknesses still present in our program and lead us once again into complacency. Indeed in some quarters, the postsputnik sense of urgency having subsided, we seem again to be growing smug about our strength. As observers said in the midst of our consternation following sputnik, we shifted overnight from apathy to panic, although what had happened hardly warranted such an extreme reaction. I have an uneasy feeling that the pendulum of our concern has now swung back to the contented self-satisfaction which lulled and charmed us during the months prior to October 1957.

As we examine our programs, policies, and attitudes today, we should keep clearly in mind the importance of dampening out these extreme oscillations in our national attitude.

Let me cite three examples which should give us pause as we preen ourselves on our scientific leadership.

The first is the competitive strength of our industrial technology. We are experiencing increasingly able competition from abroad. On the Continent, industrial research is recapturing much of its prewar vigor, and we not reports in our professional press describing European industrial research as an "awakening giant." Britain is currently expending about 2.7 percent of its GNP on research and development, a percentage close to that of the United States.

In its 1964 report, released last month, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress noted evidence that our margin of technological superiority may be diminishing as other nations step up their research and development. The report makes the further observation that despite the huge size of our overall effort, our current level and allocation of "R. & D." expenditures may be inadequate for the sustained and rapid economic growth we need and that the large increase in military and space research in recent years may have created an imbalance in the allocation of our research talent leading to a shortchanging of research in some parts of the private sector.

Despite all we hear to the contrary, we have not yet created the incentives and conditions which would lead to a deep penetration of research and development into our industrial community.

As we congratulate ourselves on the present superiority of our industrial technology, let us not be bemused by it-can't-happen-here complacency. It did happen to Britain about 100 years ago. Prior to 1850 she had undisputed technological leadership, being the home of the industrial revolution. By 1870 she became content, however, and failed to recognize that technology required ceaseless development; there was a withering of innovation and enterprise. Meanwhile, Germany was discovering the contribution which science can make to technology. She pioneered in the development of innovation industry, her universities became the seedbeds of new industry, and she took away from Britain world leadership in industrial technology. This could happen here.

A second example is the importance of maintaining undiminished a steady input of creative ideas in our advanced weapons technology. I am troubled when I hear statements about our having reached some kind of plateau in our invention and development of new weapons. I don't think we have, but I think it is of the utmost importance that we continue a high level of creative activity in this area. The cold war is not over; our military technology, to be superior and even adequate requires unceasing technological innovation and advance. There has been no partisanship in adhering to a national military policy that calls for us to maintain a margin of superiority as the best means for preserving the peace and making progress toward safe arms limitation. This margin, however, can only be maintained by an advancing military technology.

---

[1] Metaphorically akin to the "knowledge industry." See Machlup, Fritz: "The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States." Princeton University Press, 1962.

[2] Harvard Business Review. March–April 1964, pp. 51–59.

By the same token we must be so alert and far advanced in our own technology that we will not be surprised by another sputnik-like event. We may elect not to do certain things, but we should not be taken by surprise and caught in a state of inadequacy. Our science and technology must be so good and so far out on the frontier that it is we who have the capability to anticipate advances and do things unimagined by others.

A third example which should give us concern lies in the domain of education. Our science education, especially our precollege science education, while improving, is still hampered by obsolescence and mediocrity.

In a book, "Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth," published recently, Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers develop some significant indices comparing the manpower resources of countries in various stages of development. One of their comparisons is the distribution of students between science and technology on the one hand, and humanities, law, and the arts on the other. In the percentage of its students studying science and technology, the United States stands substantially below the mean of 16 advanced countries. Sweden, Israel, West Germany, Finland, Russia, Canada, France, United Kingdom, Belgium, Netherlands, and Australia, all have a higher percentage than the United States studying science or engineering. The Soviet percentage is twice that of the United States. We hear sometimes that we are overemphasizing science but this comparison certainly does not support this contention. We actually face a problem of too few students electing science and engineering to meet our national needs. To cite but one need: The President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended that we at least double our production of doctorates in science, engineering, and mathematics by 1970.

Unquestionably Government support in recent years has helped to meet these challenges. The Defense Education Act of 1958 has bettered science teaching resources in precollege schools, as indeed it has strengthened language instruction. The program of the National Science Foundation for strengthening science and engineering at the college and university level has been profoundly important, as has its support of new curriculums developments, such as the high school physics program initiated at MIT. The recent education act passed by Congress will help to meet the vast building needs of our rapidly growing system of higher education.

Federal support of research in educational institutions has served greatly to strengthen our universities as well as American science. This Federal support has been conceived and administered with remarkable effectiveness and, in turn, it has been well used by the universities. Federal support has helped to give American science the world leadership of which I have spoken. Even those of us who are strongly in favor of private institutions privately supported must acknowledge these great assists which the Federal Government has given education.

These general considerations and national requirements should be clearly in view as we reexamine our national science policies, especially those affecting Government participation. In addition there are more specific questions which are currently being examined and debated. Let me note five of these.

First, there is the relation of private funds to public funds in supporting science, especially in our universities. On this question I would be loud and clear in voicing my convictions.

Despite the growth of Government support, private funds creatively deployed must play a crucial role in the advancement of science. They are still the principal source of freedom money and essential venture capital. In a way not usually appropriate for Government funds, they can assist the emerging young scientist and the promising new idea. In our private institutions they provide the core support that is essential for stability and independence and the pursuit of long-term goals. They help in protecting the freedom of science which is essential for its strength and integrity. In all these ways, private funds increase the return on the large public funds which the scale and importance of science now require in the national interest.

Let us not forget, too, that it was private funds that largely created the great graduate schools in private universities which provided the largest number of centers of strength which the Government turned to when it began to provide funds to strengthen science. Thus private funds—plus State funds in the great State universities—provided the essential base for a great Federal research program and thus amplified its effectiveness. This continues.

In my judgment, then, a sound national policy for science must call for the increase and creative use of funds from foundations, corporations, and individuals, along with Government support, and the Federal Government as a matter of policy should encourage and facilitate this private support.

The recent success of a number of major universities in raising large capital funds from private sources has dramatically proved that private support is not drying up. I need only recall MIT's recent success in raising $98 million of private money—an outcome of immense significance in view of the fact that MIT is also a major recipient of Federal funds for research.

Second, there is the vital requirement that excellence be the touchstone of our national research planning. As the President's Science Advisory Committee has emphasized, "In science the excellent is not just better than the ordinary; it is almost all that matters. It is therefore fundamental that this country should energetically sustain and strongly reinforce first-rate work where it now exists." In the support of research, adherence to this policy by Government agencies has been a major factor in giving U.S. science world leadership.

In continuing to reinforce existing centers of strength, we must also create new ones. We need more graduate schools of science and engineering as good as the best we now have. We achieve these, not by diminishing the strength or support of the existing great centers of strength but by encouraging others to develop. The program of institutional grants initiated by the National Science Foundation, is one way of beginning to build new centers of strength and to achieve a wider diffusion of scientists and engineers.

This is not done by building on weakness. It is done rather by identifying those institutions which have shown the initiative and mobilized the support to strengthen themselves. More constituencies—communities and States—should determinedly set about to strengthen their institutions to the point where sources of funds, public and private, can justify helping them grow stronger still.

Third, universities have an urgent responsibility, now that the volume of research they conduct has grown so great, to conduct and control it so that it clearly fulfills its educational function. It is my deep conviction, born of firsthand experience, that basic research in the university can serve to strengthen all of its educational activities but especially undergraduate education. I do not agree with many current statements that the great increase in basic research in recent years carries with it an inevitable diversion of interest, talent, and creative ideas from undergraduate teaching. On the contrary, there is ample evidence that the presence of a vigorous basic research program can serve to invigorate undergraduate teaching. Our universities have a superb opportunity to encourage the penetration of research into the undergraduate domain and to release the full potential of this research to enrich the teaching and to provide an atmosphere of creative vigor for both students and staff in undergraduate programs.

I do not exaggerate or boast when I remark that MIT is devoting intense efforts to be great in teaching as well as research, that it has become a national center for curriculum innovation and reform, and that its efforts encompass teaching ranging from the elementary school to college.

I turn next to manpower utilization, one of the areas most requiring attention now that we are sponsoring such vast R. & D. efforts.

The way scientists and engineers deploy themselves and are utilized is more important than the way we allot our research and development dollar, although the two, of course, are linked.

About 60 percent of all of the scientists and engineers in "R. & D." in the United States are working wholly or in part on projects or programs financed by the Federal Government.

Under these conditions, it is obviously important that Government must try to avoid policies or procedures which may lead to inefficient deployment, building up one area at the expense of another, stockpiling, and so on. When considering the launching of big programs requiring large-scale research and development, the Government, in advance, should count the cost in manpower. We now are in an era when Government decisions can affect small armies of scientists and engineers.

We urgently need more information about manpower utilization. So far we have had to make decisions based on hunches, intuition, or fragmentary data.

In this random list of problem areas, I come finally to the problem of achieving good management in all institutions, public and private, of our massive innovation industry. This need for good management becomes the more urgent in this period of transition when our rate of growth will probably be slowed and the problem of priorities, of responsible scientific choice, will become crucial. Which big project will we undertake and which reject or defer? How do we achieve a proper balance between basic research, which over so long a time we neglected, and applied research and development?

In the Government these questions will have to be answered by both executive and legislative processes, but great responsibility must inevitably fall upon the science administrators and their advisers. Great progress has been made in recent years in creating the necessary posts, such as assistant secretaries for research and development, and generally upgrading the administrative competence available for handling the massive Government program, but much remains to be done.

The Government faces a hard struggle to recruit competent technical, supervisory, and managerial talent. It constantly is up against a dangerous weakening of its management strength, largely because pay scales and personnel policies are inadequate and technically competent administrators are hard to attract and hold. Science administrators, managers who possess a combination of technological mastery and administrative skill, project engineers, and research directors—all these are extremely scarce today. More and better ones can do much to improve the Federal as well as the industrial R. & D. program.

The advisory committees and other mechanisms drawing upon the resources of the Nation's scientific community have served the Government brilliantly in recent years and will continue to do so. It is subject, however, to inevitable constraints.

Some of these constraints arise out of the inevitable institutionalization that comes with time and the growth of programs. In effect, it appears in both Government and non-Government scientific activities. Scientific advisory procedures that in the beginning were effectively informal tend to become more formalized and consequently less uninhibitedly creative.

So great is the Government's reliance on these advisory mechanisms that they have been asked to carry increasing responsibilities for the monitoring and appraising of Government programs, for advice on the selection of projects, and for responding to the important needs of Congress. We need to give careful attention to the invention of ways whereby Government advisers can perform these monitoring and appraisal responsibilities and at the same time be a source of creative ideas. An occasional ad hoc group working full time for a limited period, such as the technological capabilities panel of the mid-fifties, is one way to introduce and appraise fresh ideas. Advisory committees should be rotated and full-time summer study panels further utilized. In all of the many relationships which the Government has with research establishments and other sources of creative scientific activity, it must be recognized that while the Government's interests must be carefully protected by proper supervision and control, such supervision and control, not skillfully handled, can reduce the productivity of scientists and engineers.

I return, in conclusion, to my earlier surmise that we have an "untransacted destiny" in science. Unless we burke the chance, we may be ushering in a golden age with unexampled benefits for human welfare.

The United States, with the scientific strength it has built in the past several decades, has the resources and momentum to play a central role in this achievement—unless we have a loss of nerve or make decisions which hamper or dampen innovation. If we continue to evolve policies, especially Government policies which release the full creative scientific and technological potential of the Nation, we have before us the power to shape a great society, a research-oriented society in which no man need work at less than his full potential and all men can have the profound experience of each being creative in his own way.

It was not a boasting scientist, but the 35th President of the United States, speaking last October at the centennial of the National Academy of Sciences who said, "In the years since man unlocked the power stored within the atom, the world has made progress, halting but effective, toward bringing that power under human control. The challenge, in short, may be our salvation. As we begin to master the potentialities of modern science, we move toward a new era in which science can fulfill its creative promise and help bring into existence the happiest society the world has ever known. I think that never in the history of science has the time been brighter, the need been greater, for cooperation between those of us who work in Government, and those who work in laboratories."

Kansas City and Federal Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following policy statement of the Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce regarding Federal urban renewal programs. Under the leadership of John Breidenthal, president, the Kansas City Chamber has taken a strong policy position opposing the position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The community leaders of Kansas City, who have done and are doing so much for all the citizens of that great community, in so many ways, are to be commended for the clarity of their vision and courage in taking this position.

I include their statement at this point in the RECORD:

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE KANSAS CITY, KANS., AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REGARDING FEDERAL URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

The Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce opposes the action taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in urging elimination of urban renewal programs currently in effect.

While in agreement with the concept of State and local communities accepting responsibility for projects of this type, we believe such action is premature and not in the best interests of our citizens, and, further, not feasible until means are devised for restoring to local governments the financial means for implementing such redevolpment programs.

Public programs such as urban renewal and related activities have been a stimulant to local community upgrading and caused considerable investment of private funds in local areas thus serving as a factor in economic development and total community growth.

As a nation we are today faced with the continuing problem of neighborhood blight and downtown deterioration which directly affects a vast number of our citizens. Unless a program is maintained that will continually attack the problem, the Nation will be faced with a situation of catastrophic blight which will virtually choke off the commercial and industrial vitality and growth of the local communities.

While we recognize and hope that local and State governments will eventually be in a position to assume full responsibility for financing of urban renewal programs within the home communities, we realize that currently this is an impractical situation and has every indication of being so in the foreseeable future. Many States have enabling legislation which authorizes local urban redevelopment projects financed locally; however, until such time as this is prevalent throughout the Nation, it is essential that Federal urban renewal programing continue.

The Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce position on urban renewal favors:

(1) Retention of the existing programing of urban renewal by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Urban Renewal Administration and related agencies.

(2) Continuation of the present sharing of urban renewal costs by the local and Federal Governments.

(3) Providing a means for local communities to have access to Federal funds to be used for planning purposes.

(4) Development of plans which will serve as a catalyst for the entire community to upgrade living standards and business and commercial activity on a cooperative basis through urban renewal, private development, and private financing.

The Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce therefore urges the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to reconsider its position on urban renewal so as not to cause an elimination of this program which would create an undue hardship for the many local communities of the United States currently experiencing successful community development programs.

Adopted by the board of directors of the Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce this 24th day of April 1964.

Beef Import Issue in the Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Guthrian of Guthrie Center and on which I shall not elaborate as it speaks for itself clearly, correctly, and concisely.

The editorial follows:

BEEF IMPORT ISSUE IN THE ELECTION

One of our good farmer friends was in the office last week and in effect he said "* * * Why get so excited about this beef importing * * * it's only accounted for a small part of the drop * * * and we have to do business with other countries, too."

We agreed that it was only part of the trouble, too many heavy cattle was also important. And we agreed that we have to trade with other countries.

But if we wanted to dump beef, mutton, pork, or chicken, we couldn't go to Australia with it. Their meat import-export laws are on a one-way basis—all the meat going out and the money coming in.

The American cattle feeders buy or raise their calves without any guarantees. They take them to the market and say, "What will you give me?" And at the same time foreign packers export meat here and say to the distributors, "Buy this instead. It's cheaper."

We have a token agreement with Australia and New Zealand by which they have volunteered to add only 3.7 percent beef imports per year increase to their spiraling 1962–63 levels. But there is nothing to prevent other countries from supplying us in unlimited amounts, or to prevent the distribution of it through our regular wholesale and retail trade channels.

Senator HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate that would have cut beef, veal, and mutton imports back to the average of the 1958 through 1962 levels. This would have kept imports at about 6½ percent of domestic production.

The bill was defeated 46 to 44. The Johnson administration, including Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, used their influence to keep the high imports. Republican Senators voted for reducing imports by a margin of 24 to 4, but couldn't overcome 42 Democratic Senators who voted against it. Thus the attempt to reduce imports was defeated 46 to 44.

Also over the protests of 26 of the 33 Republican Senators, 52 of 67 Democratic Senators voted through the cotton-wheat bill. It should be noted that the cotton section of the bill calls for paying $45 to $65 per acre for the retirement of 2.3 million acres of land now planted to cotton. And the producers can turn right around and plant those "retired" acres to soybeans, feed grains, and even wheat.

And the Des Moines Register published an editorial criticizing Iowa Senators JACK MILLER and BOURKE HICKENLOOPER for voting for a reduction in beef imports.

We predicted 3 weeks ago that the Johnson administration will have election troubles over this beef import measure. Apparently now someone else thinks so. An Associated Press bylined story out of Washington last Wednesday said that the Johnson administration may be stockpiling some election troubles * * * that the western prairies are on fire with protests. Secretary Freeman testified before a Senate committee that he is opposed to any legislation to place quotas on meat imports.

In some ways Lyndon Johnson looks like a sure thing in the November election. But if he loses all of the meat-producing States west of the Mississippi River to the Republican candidate and Governor Wallace walks off with the Deep South, Johnson could be on the short end by quite a margin.

Kennedy only carried beef-raising Missouri by 10,000 votes out of nearly 2 million cast, Minnesota by almost as close a margin and rancher filled New Mexico by 3,000 ballots and Nevada by 2,000 * * * and even Texas by only 40,000 out of more than 2,250,000 votes cast.

The Johnson administration may find that the beef import issue was not settled by harnessing the huge Democratic majorities in Congress to vote against any import restrictions.

Peoria, Ill., Student Is First Negro Girl To Win MIT Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy today to call to the attention of the House the fact that a fine young Richwoods High School senior from Peoria, Ill., has become the first Negro girl to receive a scholarship to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Upon receiving the news, the Peoria Journal Star pictured Jennifer Rudd in her science laboratory and ran a feature article telling of her exploits. It is most notable that of the 3,500 undergraduate students at MIT, there are only 100 women attending this great institution of higher learning, but even more important, Jennifer is, as I mentioned, the very first Negro girl in the annals of the school's history to win such a scholarship. Jennifer Rudd will, I am sure, excell in her chosen field and we are mighty proud to have her as a constituent and do congratulate her upon her fine record of achievement. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the full text of the article at this point:

FIRST NEGRO GIRL WINS MIT SCHOLARSHIP

(By Jean Budd)

A Richwoods High School senior, one of 10 children in her family, has become the first Negro girl ever to receive a scholarship to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

She is Jennifer Rudd, 18-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Tony S. Rudd, 602 Embert Place, and one of the top 10 percent of the Richwoods graduating class.

MIT, often considered to be the leading science and engineering school in the United States, has an enrollment which is 97 percent male. Of the 3,500 undergraduate students there, only 100 are women.

Jennifer had a choice of three colleges, but chose the one at Cambridge.

"I preferred MIT because I think it's the best institution of learning in the country," Jennifer said. "It virtually creates an atmosphere of earnest study."

Roland Greeley, director of admissions at MIT, said the school was pleased that Jennifer chose to go there. He said his records indicate that MIT has never before had a Negro girl student on a scholarship.

"About half of the freshmen students, male and female, attend MIT on scholarships," said Greeley. "There are some 100 freshmen here now with 40 to 45 of them female."

Said Jennifer:

"I really don't know what specific area of study I will pursue. It's too soon to know. That will come with experience and knowledge gained along the way."

She plans to major in science and mathematics.

"My ambition is to live a life and do the work that will serve God in a way that is pleasing to Him," she said. "My aim for a good education is to benefit not only my race, but to benefit people of all races."

Her father, an architect with the firm, Phillip & Swager, was the one who influenced her toward getting the "best education," she said. The Rudd family includes four boys and six girls.

Her long list of accomplishments are enough to swell the pride of any parent or student or community.

She was president of her eighth grade class at Hines Grade School; secretary of her sophomore class at Richwoods, member of the Student Council in her junior year; president of the Spanish Club her sophomore year; member of the National Honor Society; member of Junior Achievement; and Royalettes—a baton twirling group; member of Girl Scouts; cowinner of the 1964 DAR and SAR awards; cowinner of the Bausch & Lomb Honorary Science Award; winner of the Sterling Merit Award; and one of the winners of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission.

Every Saturday Jennifer helps the Reverend Vincent Dietzen in a phonics class for younger children at St. Joseph's Roman Catholic rectory. She is a member of St. Thomas Church in Peoria Heights and works in the Richwoods library two mornings a week.

She enjoys jazz music, art, cooking, and sewing, swimming, golf, and ice skating. "I didn't get to play much golf last summer, but I have my own clubs and daddy has promised to take me out more often this year," she said.

Her favorite TV show is "College Bowl" and she said she answered seven of the questions on Sunday—"My best day."

Jennifer hesitated at questions on politics, but said, "I think I will be an independent voter when I'm allowed to vote."

She wants a job in a laboratory this summer to help with college expenses. "Just any kind of job will do," she said.

Her goal? "To do my best in life—to get a good education and do with it the best I can."

Federal Water Resource Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest legislative catastrophes which could befall my district and my State is represented by H.R. 9032, which changes the criteria for justification of Federal water resource projects.

This legislation and the policy it contains would kill for all time the possibility of controlling and developing the great interior rivers of Missouri, the Grand, the Chariton and Little Chariton, the Platte, the Meramec, Fishing River, and others.

It does not seem extravagant to say that the new cost-benefit policy embodied in H.R. 9032 is a disaster for Missouri and for every other State in the Nation dependent on proper utilization of its water resources for the welfare of its people.

The St. Joseph News-Press recently criticized H.R. 9032 editorially and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

Backers of the Grand River Basin development program, and similar proposed water resources projects throughout the State, are greatly disturbed over a bill which has been introduced in the House of Representatives in Washington. The bill (H.R. 9032) provides for extensive local participation in any such projects which were not authorized by Congress prior to January 1, 1963.

"Local," in the instance, means either the immediate area or the State must come up with a considerable amount of money. For the Grand River project, it is estimated the local cost under this bill would run anywhere from $11 to $26 million. Obviously, this type of money could not be raised in north Missouri on a subscription basis. And the State at this time, even if the money were available in Jefferson City, has no law to permit such appropriations.

The seven-reservoir Grand River project now is being studied by agencies which would be affected, and by the Governors of Missouri and Iowa. Only after the approval from these agencies and individuals can Congress consider the plan, and possibly authorize it. As the proposal now stands, the estimated cost of more than $275 million would be borne almost entirely by the Federal Government. The only local cost would be for levee works, not for the reservoir construction.

The chances for congressional authorization of the Grand River project look very good at this time. Senators STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD V. LONG, and Congressman WILLIAM R. HULL are strongly in favor of the proposal. Public opinion throughout north Missouri seems strongly in favor. The biggest single obstacle, and it is at this time only a potential obstacle, may be House bill 9032. Should it be approved—and it has administration backing—it would certainly delay, and would possibly kill the Grand River Basin proposals. But lest backers of the Grand River program be discouraged, it should be noted this bill still is in committee. Whether it ever will become law is questionable. Senator SYMINGTON has announced his opposition to it. It is understood Senator LONG and Congressman HULL also are opposed. The bill may well be killed in committee.

The bill has one apparent good point, but it has many bad features. Its purpose is to provide a "uniform policy" for allocation of costs and benefits on Federal multipurpose water resources projects that include recreation and fish and wildlife benefits. Certain costs which have in the past been charged against the General Treasury would be charged "locally," either to the region directly involved or to the State.

The advantage of a bill like this is apparent. It would kill some of the clear "pork barrel" projects which have little real benefit. Everyone wants something when the Federal Government is going to pay all of the costs. But with this one advantage, there are multiple disadvantages. The bill might be likened to killing a person to get rid of his cold. It sure gets rid of the cold, but the bad effects outweigh the good.

What are the bad effects? First, not only would such a bill kill the "pork barrel" projects, it would virtually kill all legitimate projects. The Grand River Basin proposals, where benefits would be $1.50 for every $1 cost, fit into this category. How can regions or even States be expected to come up with the multiple millions? Second, why penalize the States which are already behind in water resources development? Similar projects in Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, Arkansas, and other States have been paid for in Federal funds. Why change policy at this time to further delay the States already far behind in this area? And we should keep in mind that Federal dollars spent to conserve our water supply, so it can meet future anticipated demands, are dollars well spent.

H.R. 9903

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Ohio Coal Association in Cleveland, April 17, 1964:

RESOLUTION OF THE OHIO COAL ASSOCIATION, ADOPTED IN CLEVELAND, APRIL 17, 1964

Whereas the so-called Transportation Act of 1964 (H.R. 9903), now before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in absence of public hearings on its most controversial provisions—a procedure in direct contradiction to traditional and accepted standards of equitable legislative action; and

Whereas H.R. 9903 provides for repeal of the commodities clause of the Interstate Commerce Act, a law enacted in 1906 after prolonged careful study and properly conducted hearings produced incontrovertible evidence that grave abuses and violations of America's competitive system occur when railroads—operating under the privilege of public utility status—are permitted to engage in the mining, transportation, and marketing of their own products; and

Whereas H.R. 9903 further provides for revision of the Interstate Commerce Act in such a way as to bring higher shipping costs for coal moving by water transportation, and

Whereas such injudicious and improperly contrived legislation would seriously impair Ohio's coal industry and have a disastrous effect on the economy of mining communities; and

Whereas the president of a leading midwestern railroad has publicly stated that H.R. 9903 would be detrimental to some carriers; and

Whereas opposition has also been expressed by grain shippers and farmer organizations as well as by sand, gravel, and other producers of bulk commodities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Coal Association implores members of the House Rules Committee to refuse to move H.R. 9903 to the House floor unless and until it is returned to the original committee for necessary revision—under time-honored rules of procedure, including public hearings on all sections in question; be it further

Resolved, That the Ohio Coal Association request by copy of this statement that all members of the Ohio delegation in the House and Senate make known their opposition to H.R. 9903 in its present form and exert every effort to have the bill either returned to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee or tabled permanently in the Committee on Rules.

A Connecticut Scholar Looks at Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an excellent article published in the magazine section of the Hartford Courant on Sunday, April 26, 1964. The article is written by the well-known newspaperman, Joe De Bona, who is the Courant's correspondent in the New London-Groton area of Connecticut in my congressional district.

Mr. De Bona's article is based on an interview he had with Dr. Odell Shepard, who is presently engaged in the writing of a definitive history of New London, Conn., a city which dates back to 1646 and is one of the oldest in the Nation. Dr. Shepard is a great scholar, a former professor of English, a noted historian and writer, a poet and novelist, author of a Pulitzer Prize winning biography, a philosopher, and a former Democratic Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut during the years 1941–43. The article is most interesting, particularly Dr. Shepard's philosophical views mentioned at the conclusion.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A VISIT WITH ODELL SHEPARD: SCHOLAR AT WORK

(By Boe De Bona)

(Pulitzer Prize winner and ex-public official, now absorbed in his "most significant" project, looks at the philosophy of writing, at history and life.)

At the age of 79, Pulitzer Prize Winner Odell Shepard, former Trinity College professor and once Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut, is tackling with all his creative energy what he believes may be the longest, the last, and most significant literary work of his distinguished career.

It's hard work, too—a ditchdigging, enervating sort of job.

Dr. Shepard, in collaboration with his son, Willard, is writing a definitive "History of New London." To compound the inherent difficulties, he intends that this book be read and enjoyed—not shoved into the basement stacks of a few libraries to be camouflaged by cobwebs and screened from all but an occasional dedicated scholar.

"We are not doing a reference book," said Shepard caustically, when I talked to him in his rambling Jordan Cove home in Waterford, only a few miles from New London. "If that's what you want, there is always the telephone directory, in order to make those early people live, we must place our own interpretation on the facts. We wish to bring the soul of old New London into this book."

Dr. Shepard, wearing a worn tweed jacket, slacks, and sneakers, made it clear he first started to think about the history when he moved to Waterford from Hartford 17 years ago. Then a gestation period ensued. He did not start the actual work until 1959, when he was commissioned for the monumental task by the New London County Historical Society headed by Dwight C. Lyman.

Since then Dr. Shepard—alert, indefatigable and still enthusiastic—has engaged in exhaustive research; to date he has amassed nearly a million words of notes on New London history.

"The task now is to incorporate and interpret them," he mused, as he walked the floor of his living room puffing on a venerable pipe. "It is our wish to communicate with the reader—to convey to him the sorrow, the failure, and the horror, the utter grief and ecstasy experienced by these people of early New London. They were English people who came here. How did they change into American people? One hears a bird song and wonders if that was the way it sounded years ago. I am convinced that history is made now—by the writer—through his interpretation."

Unlike those tiresome amateurs who talk incessantly about writing but seldom get around to it, Dr. Shepard, a real pro, displayed an understandable reluctance to discuss the essence of the history, target date for completion, or his work pattern.

"I would rather not say when the book will be finished," he declared. "Just that we are definitely working on it."

He doesn't have any set time for writing, he added.

I am an early riser, and often get up at 3 in the morning," he reported. "I do a lot of reading then. In fact, I read a great deal, and in a wilder field than one might suppose. I feed the old brain with data, then spend most of my time thinking about what it means. This is where most of my time goes—gulping down all the facts I can, then ruminating. The facts have meaning in my records."

Dr. Shepard indicated this work does not go as rapidly as he would like.

"I used to write like the wind," he said ruefully.

A highly articulate man with the flexible voice of an actor, Dr. Shepard can use words as adroitly—and as devastatingly—as an experienced field hand handles a machete. He sparkles as he propounds iconoclastic ideas and theories: He obviously enjoys sitting back and observing the shocked reaction he has evoked. Beneath his somewhat crusty facade, however, one can discern a vast tolerance for the foibles of mankind, an almost puckish sense of humor.

He has been watching me chainsmoke cigarettes with an abandon that should put new heart into the tobacco industry.

"May I have one of those?" he asked finally, putting aside his pipe.

"Why, certainly, sir," I said.

"Aren't you afraid of cancer with all those doctors' reports?" he inquired slyly.

"I don't want to live forever," I told him bravely.

His mobile face twisted as he tried to conceal a grin. Then he nodded approvingly and lighted up.

"A very good cigarette," he said.

Dr. Shepard is not only a historian but also a noted poet, essayist, biographer, critic, novelist, musician, stimulating conversationalist, and philosopher—although a fairly mordant philosopher. He has been a teacher, a newspaperman (he contributed at one time to the Courant and Christian Science Monitor) and politician. As a young man, he worked for papers in Chicago and Los Angeles.

"I enjoyed the excitement of the Loop, but I wasn't a very good reporter," he said disparagingly.

The author of many enduring literary works, Dr. Shepard was Goodwin professor of English at Trinity College in Hartford, where he taught and scintillated from 1917 to 1946. It was during his Trinity tenure, in 1937, that he won the Pulitzer Prize in

biography with his "Pedlar's Progress," the life of Bronson Alcott, who was born on a Wolcott, Conn., farm in 1799. Shepard's treatment of Alcott, the apostle of the Transcendental Movement and father of Louisa May Alcott (author of "Little Women"), was imaginary, although based firmly on factual material found in the protagonist's voluminous journals and correspondence.

As a result, Alcott, peddler and teacher far ahead of his time, lives in the pages of Shepard's book; it is this readable aliveness which Shepard is determined to achieve with his nascent "History of New London."

Although Shepard was born on "a hard scrabble farm of three rooms in a gopher town" near Rockford, Ill., "close to the mud of the Mississippi," he is admirably equipped to do this history.

"New England is where my people came from," he said. "When I got here, I felt I had come home at last. I had a feeling I had been here before."

Shepard, who came under the influence of Thoreau and Cooper at the age of 12, is a recognized authority on New England history and the American Indian. As a matter of fact, in 1941, he was adopted into the Mohegan Tribe under the name of "Chief Many Suns."

Two years earlier, in 1939, Shepard wrote "Connecticut, Past and Present." In 1946, he and his son, who lives next door on Jordan Cove, collaborated on the successful Revolutionary War novel, "Holdfast Gaines."

"The story of Holdfast Gaines, a Mohegan Indian, was definitely located right in New London Harbor,"' Shepard said. "His home was on the site of what is now Connecticut College for Women. In that book, we used the novelist's privilege of changing names and places. It was completely fictitious—but, I hope, also true."

(In 1951, Shepard and his son collaborated on another novel, "Jenkins' Ear," a narrative attributed to Horace Walpole. Shepard regards this work as a "tour de force.")

I asked Shepard if his pleasant home overlooking the water is conducive to work. He assured me it isn't. It and Mrs. Shepard, he complained, make him too comfortable.

"The best place to write is a prison cell, with only bread and water," he said flatly.

In January, Dr. Shepard embarked on a new project: reading—and recording—the works of famous poets, including his own. The recordings are being made available to Trinity alumni throughout the world.

When Dr. Shepard ran off a couple for me, I discovered that although he insists he is "merely a reciter, not an actor," his readings have a lyrical, haunting quality, an astounding range and depth.

He explained, "I go through an intense experience during the readings. It is a revitalization, an experience of living that is almost intolerable. It sometimes becomes overpowering."

That Dr. Shepard succeeds in communicating this intensity of feeling to his audience is manifested by these glowing tributes from Trinity men abroad:

"How wonderfully kind of Odell Shepard to record these poems.

"I got the record and it delights me.

"How kind of you to send me his records. He reads beautifully.

"I received the record yesterday morning. Don't Odell's verse and reflections reveal a world of warmth?"

Dr. Shepard troubled me for another cigarette. He enjoyed his tour of duty as Lieutenant Governor from 1941–43, he told me as he lighted up.

"I learn from every experience," he said. "I try to take the good from each."

Although Dr. Shepard, a Democrat, conceded that "our people tend to look down on politicians," he took sharp issue with this generally unsophisticated point of view.

He asserted incisively, "Great men have to be politicians. When we go back to Benjamin Franklin—statesman, diplomat—the word 'politician' is a noble word. Of course, not all politicians are noble, but we ought all of us to be politicians."

I jotted down these additional Shepard aphorisms:

On life: "Life is not a mosaic; it is a mess."

On men: "Some men can't put their hands on themselves in the dark."

On facts: "Facts are everywhere; just let them lie."

On a woman who wrote a somewhat insipid history of New London: "She was religious, pious, and wrote much verse for children. A charming lady, but not a good historian."

Again, on life: "I have had companionship and solitude in my life—much of both."

On places: "Places have a kind of genius, of holiness—bodiless but unmistakably there."

On body and soul: "We can make no distinction between the human body and the experiences of the soul."

On beauty: "Beauty is not physical alone; it is spirit."

On teachers of "creative" writing (indignantly): "That is like teaching God."

Again on life: "I have had a good life, through no effort on my part."

On history: "History is not as simple as people think. Take a dozen persons who have written about the ancient Roman Empire. These histories are all different because the writers were all different persons."

On Santayana: "You cannot separate the philosopher from the poet."

On order: "I love order, but it needs all the help I can give it. As Holdfast Gaines said, 'The way I look at it, things are becoming complicated.'"

It was almost time to go. I offered Dr. Shepard another cigarette. He took it, we smoked and then I left.

Mr. Computer and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the hucksters try to play the American mind like a yoyo. One day the Secretary of Defense tells us we are ahead, the next day we are behind.

Just the other day the President told the American people how well we were doing in Vietnam, yet in the May 4 issue of U.S. News & World Report there appears a very tragic accounting of neglect of our troops, as indicated by the loss of Air Force Capt. Jerry Shank, who was killed March 24, 1964. I wonder what Mr. McNamara's computer will have to say about this. It is shocking and shameful.

The article follows:

A CAPTAIN'S LAST LETTERS FROM VIETNAM

"We are losing, morale is bad * * * If they'd give us good planes * * *"

(NOTE.—This is an American pilot's own story of the role of U.S. troops in South Vietnam. They are far more than "advisers" to South Vietnam's armed forces. Americans are in the thick of a "hot war," a shooting war. And, often, they are fighting with obsolete weapons against a Communist enemy who is highly skilled and well armed. A vivid picture of the war, the elation and excitement, the frustration and bitterness, emerges from the pilot's letters home—a correspondence ended by his death in combat.)

Air Force Capt. "Jerry" Shank is dead—a combat casualty of the war in Vietnam.

While he lived and fought Jerry Shank wrote to his wife and family in Indiana every chance he got—sometimes twice a day. Those letters make up a moving "battle diary" of a war in which more than 15,000 Americans are fighting and dying in combat against the Communists.

Excerpts from his letters are presented here with the permission of his widow. All references, by name, to his Air Force companions have been eliminated to spare them any possible embarrassment.

NOVEMBER 14, 1963

We're using equipment and bombs from WW2 [meaning World War II] and it's not too reliable. This is an interesting place here. Everybody works together, officers and enlisted. We're out there lifting bombs and such. Every possible time, we give the men a chance to ride. On a test hop or something like that—it gives them a little motivation. We can't take them on missions, 'cause we have to have our VNAF [Vietnamese Air Force] student pilot along.

We 23 Air Force run the whole T-28 war in the Mekong Delta. This will give you some idea of Uncle Sam's part in the war.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963

Been real busy with the armament job—really makes a day go fast. Got all kinds of problems—can't get parts or books or charts describing the different bombs and systems. The Air Force hasn't used any of this equipment since Korea, and everybody seems to have lost the books. The main problem is personnel—no good officers or NCO's over here that really know their business. Most of them are out of SAC [Strategic Air Command] and have dealt only with nuclear weapons. This doesn't apply over here; what we need is someone from World War II. Some days it's like beating your head against a brick wall.

NOVEMBER 27, 1963

Sunday all hell broke loose with the VC (Communist Vietcong guerrillas). We had a big airborne operation against them—both choppers and parachutes. I woke up at 4:30 to fly my first night attack—darker than hell. * * * By 9 o'clock in the morning we had launched 12 sorties, which is a lot for our little operation. The Vietcong got one chopper and one B-26 that day, but we (T-28's) hurt them bad. There is far more detail to this, but I don't want to put it in a letter.

I'm up to 20 missions now and am real confident in myself. I do good work, I feel like a veteran, and I feel like a different man. I think I am older.

I have changed my opinion about the Vietcong. They are not ornery little fellows. They are mean, vicious, well-trained veterans. They are killers and are out to win. Although this is called a dirty little war and it is far from the shores of old United States, it's a big, mean war. We are getting beat. We are undermanned and undergunned. The United States may say they are in this, but they don't know we need help over here.

If the United States would really put combat people in here we could win and win fast. It seems to be the old story of a half-hearted effort.

DECEMBER 4, 1963

I have debated for a week and a half now over telling you of Black Sunday—November 24, 1963. I'm going to tell you and, if you don't want to hear about these things again, well, say so. You do have a right to know.

This was not a typical day. We flew 20 sorties. But the Vietcong hurt us bad. All in all that day, 23 airplanes were hit, one B-26 crew lost their lives, three choppers crashed. The Vietcong won.

What they had done was pull into the little village and commit their usual atrocities, then pull out. But all they had were small arms and rifles on them. So headquarters thought they would teach this little group of Vietcong a lesson and sent this operation I spoke of in after them.

But the crafty little b——s withdrew from the town into foxholes and bunkers and hiding places they had been secretly building for a week. Also, they had many friends in there plus large antiaircraft guns and all sorts of machineguns. So when the first wave of troops went in, they thought it was just a routine chase of Vietcong. But they soon ran against the Vietcong wall and we pilots soon discovered that they had more weapons than pistols and homemade guns. Shrewd plan—and they won.

We could have won, but I could write a chapter on that. I hope you were able to follow that, Connie. A lot happened that day and it happened fast and furious. It's not a good thing to tell a wife, but she has to know—no one else will say it—no one else can or will, I guess. There are no heroes over here but there a lot of fine men—America better not let us down. We can use help. We can win, but America must come over, for the Vietnamese will never hack it alone. We've either got to get in all the way, or get out. If we get out the Vietcong will be in Saigon the next day.

DECEMBER 14, 1963

I do get a kick out of the Vietnamese people. They're poor, dirty, and unsanitary according to our standards, but they're happy and some are hardworking.

DECEMBER 16, 1963

The Vietcong (Communist guerrillas) sure gave them a rough time.

The Vietcong are kind of a Mafia. They terrorize and then they sell "insurance" so that the people will not be harmed again. They strike especially villages where Americans have been seen. They terrorize these villages and then blame it on Americans by saying, "If Americans hadn't come to your village, we would not have plundered and killed, so if you don't want it to happen again, pay us money and don't let Americans into your village."

So you see, they gain from this. First of all, they get money or food; secondly, they instill a dislike for Americans—dirty b_____s. But I do like the Vietnamese I've met and talked to. They are friendly, happy, and childlike—good people.

DECEMBER 21, 1963

We got a briefing today of the total result of that operation on November 24. I'll repeat it briefly.

The air power got credit for 150 to 200 killed. No one can be sure of the amount, for the Vietcong carry off all their dead and wounded. They never let you know for sure how bad you hurt them.

Anyway, there were approximately 700 Vietcong dug in with three .50-caliber antiaircraft guns and three .30-caliber antiaircraft guns, plus many hundreds of other machine guns. They were waiting for us, but we hurt them even though we lost. We lost because we had them trapped and they got away.

It's so mixed up over here—there are over 3,000 Air Force in Vietnam, yet there are only 50 combat crews (B-26 and T-28). What a ridiculous ratio. Also, the Army tried to show the Air Force is no good and vice versa. Ridiculous. Down at Soc Trang, Army and Air Force will die for each other, but up with the colonels and generals it's a big fight for power. And most of these idiots don't even have any idea of what it's like out in combat. They're trying now to find out why we pick up so many hits. The dumb b_____s. We get hit more now because the Vietcong have very fine weapons. There are Chinese over here now.

I think the next few months will tell. Either the Vietcong will quit or this will turn into another Korea. I hope it doesn't take the United States too long to realize this.

DECEMBER 22, 1963

Flew another mission today. We escorted three trains across no-man's land and then struck some Vietcong. Our FAD (the guy in the L-19 who tells us where to hit) received three hits, but we got them. I'm credited with destroying a .50-caliber antiaircraft gun. Bombed him out of this world. I guess I'm a true killer. I have no sympathy and I'm good. I don't try to rationalize why I do it. No excuses. It's a target and I hit it with the best of my skill. It's a duel; only (I repeat) only the best man wins. You can't afford to be second.

DECEMBER 30, 1963

Well, here goes. I got shot down yesterday. We were escorting a C-123 and I picked up three slugs in my airplane. One went into my fuel strainer and I lost all my fuel. I made it to a field called Pan Tho and landed safely. Me and the airplane are both okay, not a scratch except the three bullet holes. No sweat.

JANUARY 3, 1964

Down at Soc Trang, one of the airmen came up with the idea of putting chunks of charcoal in our napalm tanks. Napalm is a gasoline which is jelled into a mass about the consistency of honey. We carry two tanks of it, each weighing 500 pounds. When you drop it, it ignites and spreads fire about 200 to 300 feet. With charcoal in it, the charcoal is thrown about another 200 feet farther, like a burning baseball, and does further damage to Vietcong houses. We've had it at Soc Trang and it works real well.

Tomorrow three birds are going out with one-half of their load of straight napalm and the other half with charcoal napalm (Madame Nhu cocktails). A photo ship is going along to take pictures. If higher headquarters thinks it's all right, then they'll buy us the charcoal. So far we've been buying it ourselves or else "borrowing" it from the kitchen.

JANUARY 7, 1964

Morale's at a big low over here, especially among the combat crews. It's the same old stuff we got in MATS. No consideration for the crew.

Lost two guys today. One was a pretty good friend of mine. The only guess is—the airplane just came apart. B-26—third or fourth that have done that now. Pretty bad day—just hard to find any good news to write. Can't even talk to anybody—nobody has anything to say. Just a blue day.

I don't know what the United States is doing. They tell you people we're just in a training situation and they try to run us as a training base. But we're at war. We are doing the flying and fighting. We are losing. Morale is very bad.

We asked if we couldn't fly an American flag over here. The answer was "No." They say the Vietcong will get pictures of it and make bad propaganda. Let them. Let them know America is in it.

If they'd only give us good American airplanes with the U.S. insignias on them and really tackle this war, we could possibly win. If we keep up like we are going, we will definitely lose. I'm not being pessimistic. It's so obvious. How our Government can lie to its own people—it's something you wouldn't think a democratic government could do. I wish I were a prominent citizen or knew someone who could bring this before the U.S. public. However, if it were brought before the average U.S. family, I'm sure all they'd do is shake their heads and say tch-tch and tune in another channel on the TV.

JANUARY 9, 1964

Had a good target today finally. Felt like I really dealt a blow to the Vietcong. On my second bomb I got a secondary explosion. This means after my bomb exploded there was another explosion. It was either an ammo dump or a fuel-storage area. Made a huge burning fireball. You really can't tell when you roll in on a pass what is in the huts and trees you are aiming at. Just lucky today, but I paid them back for shooting me down.

JANUARY 15, 1964

Another B-26 went in yesterday. Nobody made it out. A couple of guys I knew pretty well "bought the farm."

One of the new guys busted up a 28 (T-28) also yesterday. He thought he had napalm on but he had bombs. So at 50 feet above the ground he dropped a bomb. It almost blew him out of the sky. But he limped back to Bien Hoa and crash landed. The airplane burned up, but he got out all right.

That news commentary you heard is absolutely correct—if we don't get in big, we will be pushed out. I am a little ashamed of my country. We can no longer save face over here, for we have no face to save.

We are more than ever fighting this war. The Vietnamese T-28s used to come down here to Soc Trang and fly missions. But lately, since we've been getting shot so much, they moved up north. I kid you not. First they didn't want to come to Soc Trang because their families couldn't come. Second, because they didn't get enough per diem (additional pay). Third, because they didn't want to get shot at. There were a couple of more reasons, but I can't remember them. These are the people we're supposed to be helping. I don't understand it.

JANUARY 20, 1964

I have never been so lonely, unhappy, disappointed, frustrated in my whole life. None of these feelings are prevalent above the other. I guess I should say loneliness overshadows the others, but that's really not true.

I am over here to do the best job possible for my country—yet my country will do nothing for me or any of my buddies or even for itself. I love America. My country is the best, but it is soft and has no guts about it at all.

I'm sure nothing will be done over here until after the elections. Why? Because votes are more important than my life or any of my buddies' lives. What gets me the most is that they won't tell you people what we do over here. I'll bet you that anyone you talk to does not know that American pilots fight this war. We—me and my buddies—do everything. The Vietnamese "students" we have on board are airmen basics. The only reason they are on board is in case we crash there is one American "adviser" and one Vietnamese "student." They're stupid, ignorant sacrificial lambs, and I have no use for them. In fact, I have been tempted to whip them within an inch of their life a few times. They're a menace to have on board.

JANUARY 26, 1964

I've done almost nothing all week. I needed the rest very badly. I actually think I was getting battle fatigue or whatever you call it. I've got 50 missions, almost all without any kind of a break, and it was telling on my nerves and temper. I feel good today after all that sleep. I kinda hate to go to work tomorrow, for we start 2 weeks of combat again. But I'm rested for it now and am ready.

JANUARY 31, 1964

All you read in the paper is the poor leadership of the Vietnamese, but we are just as bad. Everyone over here seems to be unqualified for his job. Like me—I'm a multi pilot, but I'm flying TAC fighters. We have

no fighter pilots in our outfit. I'm not complaining, but, if the Air Force was serious, they would have sent over experienced fighter people. The same on up the line.

FEBRUARY 2, 1964

I'm getting to like Vietnam. Maybe I didn't say that right. I think it is a pretty country. These little villages in the delta are about as picturesque as you'll find. Tall palm trees, fields of rice, and all kinds of flowers. The people seem happy enough, if it wasn't for the terror of VC raids.

FEBRUARY 6, 1964

We scrambled after a fort under attack. We hit and hit good, but it got dark so we headed up here for Bien Hoa. Pretty hot target and we both were hit. Coming in here to Bien Hoa they warned us that VC were shooting at airplanes on final approach. Well, we made a tight, fast approach and held our lights (it was pitch black) until almost over the end of the runway. I forgot my landing gear and went skidding in a shower of sparks down the runway. Airplane's not hurt too bad. I'm not even scratched. My pride is terribly wounded. That was my 62d mission. I thought I had it "wired" after that much combat experience. Then I go and goof so badly.

FEBRUARY 17, 1964

All B-26's are grounded, so we are the only strike force left.

A B-26 crashed at Hurlburt last week. Another came with the wings just coming off. Finally the Air Force is worried about the airplanes—finally, after six of my friends have "augered in."

FEBRUARY 21, 1964

Tuesday evening ——— ——— got shot down. He fell in his airplane next to a special forces camp and got out without a scratch. The airplane burned completely up, though. [Another airman] was going in on his seventh strafing pass and never came out of it. Don't know what happened—whether he got shot or his controls shot out. That was two airplanes in 2 days. Kind of shook us up.

Not only that, the B-26's have been grounded since Monday because the wings came off one again at Hurlburt. So after the last crash the whole USAF fighter force is down to six airplanes. This should set an example of how much Uncle Sam cares. Six airplanes. Might as well be none.

Rumor now is that B-26's will fly again only with greater restrictions. * * * I'm pretty well fed up. Poor B-26 jocks are really shook. That airplane is a killer.

FEBRUARY 24, 1964

We're down to five airplanes now, all of them at Soc Trang. We have actually got nine total, but four are out of commission because of damage. The B-26's aren't flying yet, but they've been more or less released. I don't know what United States is going to do, but whatever it is I'm sure it's wrong. Five airplanes can fight the war—that's just ridiculous. Tell this to my dad. Let him know, too, how much the country is letting everyone down. * * * We fight and we die but no one cares. They've lied to my country about us.

FEBRUARY 29, 1964

We've got a new general in command now and he really sounds good. Sounds like a man who is out to fight and win. He's grounded the B-26's except for a few flights. But they have to level bomb, not dive bomb—no strain for the aircraft that way. He has ordered B-57's (bombers—jets) to replace them, and has asked for immediate delivery. He has also demanded they replace the T-28's with the AD-6. The AD-6 is a much more powerful single-engine dive bomber. It was designed for this type of work and has armor plating. We are pretty excited about all the new airplanes. We can really do good work with that kind of equipment.

MARCH 13, 1964

McNamara [Secretary of Defense] was here, spent his usual line, and has gone back home to run the war with his screwed-up bunch of people. We call them "McNamara's Band." I hope and pray that somehow this man does something right pretty soon.

Just one thing right will help immensely. He did send a representative over here. All he did was make the troops sore.

One of our complaints was that we can't understand the air controller, so he suggested that we learn Vietnamese. We said we didn't have that much time, so he suggested we stay here for 2 years. A brilliant man. He's lucky to be alive. Some of the guys honestly had to be held back from beating this idiot up. This man McNamara and his whole idiot band will cause me not to vote for Johnson no matter how much I like his policies.

McNamara is actually second in power to Johnson. But, as a military man, he finishes a definite and decided last—all the way last.

Rumors are fast and furious. Nothing yet of B-57's. Rumors that B-26's are all rigged up with extra fuel tanks for long overwater flights. B-26 should never fly again, even if rejuvenated. Also a rumor that B-26 pilots will get instruction in the A-1H—another single-engine dive bomber. All is still in the air—all rumors.

MARCH 22, 1964

Been flying pretty heavy again. We've only got 20 pilots now and 11 airplanes. It keeps us pretty busy. Also got two more airplanes they're putting together in Saigon, so we'll soon be back up to 13 airplanes again. Hope these last for a while.

That was Captain Shank's last letter. He was killed in combat 2 days later.

Edwin Gerald Shank, Jr., was born June 21, 1936, in the small farming community of Winamac, Ind., where he grew up. He studied architecture at Notre Dame University and graduated in 1959 with a bachelor of science degree.

At the university he entered the Reserve Officers Training Corps, received his commission, and was called into active military service in the Air Force in August, 1959. He liked the life of a military pilot and planned to make the Air Force his career. He was assigned to South Vietnam as pilot of a T-28 attack plane on October 15, 1963.

Captain Shank was married to a hometown girl. They had a son and three daughters. He never saw his baby daughter, who is now 2 months old. He was killed while flying an air-strike mission against the Communists on March 24, 1964. He was 27 years old.

A Bill To Strengthen the Antidumping Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, because of the dumping in the United States of substandard low-wage produced fish products and because of the ever-increasing imports of foreign lumber, I am joining with other Members of the House in introducing amendments to the Antidumping Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation which I have introduced jointly with other Members is designed to improve the effectiveness of the Antidumping Act of 1921. There is great need for tightening loopholes and assuring fairer, more effective procedures in connection with this law.

My bill represents a merging of proposals embodied in several amendments introduced during the first session of this 88th Congress plus a few proposals which add to, modify, or delete various provisions.

The bill is intended, Mr. Speaker, to return the Tariff Commission to its pre-1963 standards by stipulating that a finding of injury to an industry would result if "in any line of commerce in any section of the country" the complainant can show that he has been more than significantly injured by dumping. This would be true regardless of the presence of other causes of injury. Also meeting other foreign competition and lack of predatory intent are specifically excluded as dumping defenses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this modified antidumping legislation is constructive and vitally needed to insure that international trade is conducted on a fair and equitable basis. Further, I believe that hearings should be held on this important matter as soon as feasible. It has growing industry and labor support which certainly justifies hearings at an early date.

It is the responsibility of Congress, under the Constitution, to provide guidelines for the administration of a law so vital to our domestic economy as one concerned with injurious dumping. We are particularly aware of the pressure of foreign countries to have our U.S. markets opened up to their exports while retaining their own restrictive measures to limit entrance of U.S. exports. I mention this not in a spirit of protectionist fervor, but in an effort to state what I am sure is discernible as to the underlying realities of international trade.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection let me point up that I am not against full and fair international trade. In closing, let me emphasize, too, that I believe it is imperative for the Congress to act in this field as quickly as possible and my belief is shared, I am sure, by the fishing and lumber interests in my State of Washington who have suffered so from dumping of foreign imports.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee I receive many letters on the problem of adequate medical care for the aged. Older citizens, for the most part, support the principle of hospital and nursing home insurance under social security. Support, however, is not confined to those who will benefit, but includes those who are many years away from retirement. I would like to share with my

colleagues a letter I received today which enclosed a recent letter to the editor. These two letters are typical of the widespread support for the King-Anderson bill.

APRIL 25, 1964.

Congressman ULLMAN:

Am sending a letter from a Baker man, Mr. Dan Martin, which Baker should be proud of. One mistake he made, I went to the doctor and was with him 5 minutes and was charged $4. In social security we receive $141 for both of us. If you will look into the matter they won't let you into a hospital unless you have the money to pay and the cost is so high very few can pay it. President Johnson is so interested in welfare of the older people most of us would like to keep our homes which would be taken away if we had to go to the hospital or to the doctor a few weeks. You are on the Committee of Ways and Means, why isn't something done about it I would surely like to know?

Thank you.

Mrs. W. A. SMITH.

BAKER, OREG.

PUBLIC OPINION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This letter is being printed at the request of Dan Martin, Sumpter Stage.)

To Mr. Sherreib and His Friends Versus Medicare:

I have read your views and opinions in this same column regarding the so-called medicare bill and feel impelled to offer you my own remarks.

But I feel, as a fellow warrior against progress and the humanity of man to his fellow man, that your pitch is a bit off. There are many, for instance, who do not object to this extension of social security coverage; many who do not mind the increased paycheck deductions for this purpose. Some are even glad. They will be hard to reach with your reasoning. I, too, personally feel this way. But since I have many earning years ahead in which I will be paying into the social security fund I shall try hard to come to believe it is evil to lighten the financial burdens of health expenses of the older people. Or anybody else.

Too, you will find people who regard it is practically irrefutable that money is simply one translation of human endeavor. (Like, $5 will purchase 15 minutes of your doctor's services, and an hour and a quarter of a carpenter's skill, or two sacks of oats representing 4 hours of some farmer's endeavors, etc.) Now these people will be found to harbor the notion that a rich and powerful nation that can afford the luxury of a surplus of able and willing workers (some 6 million idle at present) can afford an unmiserly national health program for the aged. Some are ashamed that we are quarreling about such a thing.

Further, many whose support you (I mean we) wish to win are nonaged people—employed, productive—carrying commercial health insurance policies. Some of these people in their best earning years find that their health costs, not covered by their insurance, comprise a very measurable sum each year. My wife's husband presently is trying to scrounge up some $90 to pay his physician for just such uncovered expenses. Now these dense-headed people can never understand how older people paying higher premiums, with more insurance exclusions, and with reduced funds, can have such good and complete medical care as they need and as you point out is so handily available. Now we have a gravely difficult job to put the proper enlightenment in the place of such thoughts.

And that isn't the last of it. I have done some solo polling regarding this dastardly scheme to pick up the doctor bill for these oldsters. And I have found some people, probably depraved, who feel that this proposed program should properly be regarded as a part of the War on Poverty, recently enjoined. Now we must convince these people that the way to war on poverty is not by relieving financial stress on the financially distressed. Obviously all elderly people are not so distressed and that is the note we should stress: If they do not all need help then help none.

All the foregoing, colleagues, is to demonstrate my point that in the noble work of spiking this kind of legislation you should not dwell on the practical aspects because of the prevalence of such obtuse views as cited. You should embrace the moral arguments.

You could, point out, for instance, how hardship builds character, as everyone has heard; and that removing hardship must therefore contribute to the deterioration of character. Obviously no one in his right mind would want to erode the character of people of retirement age after they had gotten safely that far. Just imagine having geriant delinquents as well as the juvenile kind.

Or this telling point. This medicare thing aims a dangerous blow of the hallowed institution of the peck order. This information will alarm and activate many otherwise apathetic people. Anything which effectively inhibits the needless degrading or grinding of the circumstantially defenseless strikes maliciously at this ancient way of things: Anything which denies us to force out of the game those who do not have full-fare-in-hand is mortally opposed to the peck order. Why this kind of protection among the oldsters could lead to horrible things. If the peck order is forced back to the henhouse you and I will know it began right here.

With you, I urge people to write your Congressman. Just say, "Don't corrupt the rocking chair crew, Al." Or "Vote no, Al: I wouldn't part with a measly two bits for all the oldsters in the United States of America." Don't be afraid to be a louse.

Take courage in the nobility of our cause. Continue to think positively. Justice is stopped only a bit at a time, but if we can stop this bit justly due the seniors of our country we too can be patriots.

Let no one be denied the right to the full hardship their poverty permits, nor the freedom to suffer as much ill health as they can without interference.

DAN MARTIN.

SUMPTER STAGE.

Sinister Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the conduct of U.S. foreign policy is subject to legitimate criticism and questioning, especially in view of the serious deterioration of our SEATO, CENTO, and NATO alliances.

One of the contributory reasons for the collapse of NATO has been the policy of the Kennedy-Johnson administration to abuse our allies, and coexist with Communist countries and left-leaning neutrals. It seems that the Kennedy-Johnson foreign policymakers have been extremely zealous in abusing our French, Portuguese, and Pakistani allies. This situation is well covered in an editorial in Sunday's Washington Star discussing pro-Communist forces at work in the so-called liberation of Angola.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Apr. 26, 1964]

SINISTER MAN

The so-called National Front for the Liberation of Angola is headed by a man named Holden Roberto. He and his revolutionary group operate from Léopoldville in the former Belgian Congo. He has been variously described as a moderate and as a murderous pro-Communist, if not a complete card-carrying agent. Whatever he may really be, the record of his activities suggests that he is a quite sinister admirer of Red totalitarianism.

Latest evidence of this is the report that Mr. Roberto has welcomed into his organization a Communist-led military unit that seems to be a sort of African arm of Peiping. The development, of course, comes as no great surprise; it is in keeping with Mr. Roberto's January announcement in favor of accepting aid from China and other Red countries to carry out his revolution against the Portuguese in Angola. Up to now this revolution has expressed itself in unspeakable atrocities not only against whites, but much more severely against Negro Angolans, who regard themselves as full citizens of Portugal and who have no desire to be liberated. No wonder, then, that the great majority of these people are reported to be terrified by the prospect of a Roberto takeover.

Here is an issue which our country should reexamine most carefully. Mr. Roberto now has Peiping-backed military support, and we may assume that if his merciless terrorist tactics succeed, Angola will be driven, step by step into the Red camp. Accordingly, our Government, which in the past has voted against Lisbon on this issue in the U.N., should stand up for the Portuguese (white and black) who are our allies in NATO.

Tribute to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, as we paid homage to our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, millions in our country and all over the world admired the calmness and the stoicism of his widow who went through the ordeal of his death and funeral with such dignity. Her behavior under those very tragic and trying circumstances were most exemplary, and the whole Nation was proud of here.

Americans in all walks of life will long remember Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy as one of the most beautiful and most gracious of America's First Ladies. She motivated many projects of cultural value to the Nation during her brief years in the White House. She was a fine inspiration to the women of America in many respects, as mother, as wife, and as civic and intellectual leader.

The New London County Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs, at its re-

cent meeting held at Montville, Conn., in my congressional district, unanimously adopted a resolution submitted by Mrs. Anne C. Freeman, president of the Federation, to commend Mrs. Kennedy for "her outstanding role as our Nation's former First Lady."

I am pleased to insert the text of the resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It reads as follows:

HONORABLE MENTION TO MRS. JACQUELINE BOUVIER KENNEDY

Whereas we the Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs, do hereby proclaim and commend Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy for her outstanding role as our Nation's former First Lady.

Whereas (1) Mrs. Kennedy exemplified the highest ideals of womanhood; her bountiful versatility in matters of State and National interest and her courage so profound as a mother and as her husband's loyal mate.

Whereas (2) Mrs. Kennedy transformed the White House to its present state, incorporating historical and traditional good taste.

Whereas (3) Mrs. Kennedy was instrumental in the establishment of a cultural center in Washington, D.C., for future posterity.

So let it therefore not be left unheeded but that we give Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy just acclaim: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That my above resolution as proposed be approved for adoption into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dated: December 3, 1963.

Signed,

MRS. ANNE C. FREEMAN,
President of the New London County Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs.

Poverty Politicking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, speaking to a convention of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, President Johnson once again dramatized his so-called war on poverty.

Since his voice is heard around the world, the question naturally arises as to how his words are interpreted and understood abroad. I insert at this point in my remarks an article by Dr. Melchior Palyi which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Monday, April 27, 1964, which comments on the disservice to the U.S. image abroad the President's words produced. The article speaks for itself, and I would only hope that the ghost writers at the executive mansion would take heed.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 27, 1964]

POVERTY POLITICKING A DISSERVICE TO UNITED STATES

(By Melchoir Palyi)

President Lyndon Johnson has done an extraordinary service to the cause of anti-American and anticapitalist propaganda. I am referring to his statement that 25 percent of this country's population lives in miserable circumstances. By his unsupported and misleading arithmetic, as this column pointed out last Monday, there are about 42 million paupers in the United States, just as many as in the great depression. And the President clearly implied that these unfortunates are not just poor—they are hopelessly poor through no fault of their own. That is why the Government should step in and provide them with makework of one kind or another.

What a heyday for the sworn enemies of our way of life, including the Socialists of every denomination and the fuzzyminded [self-styled] liberals. Didn't the celebrated Swede, Gunnar Myrdal, preach for decades the same doctrine, proposing similar [collectivist] medicine? Prof. W. Roepke, a leader of the German Liberals, should be pleased; on his list of despicable things the American way of life, including what he calls our "stinking suburbia," is second only to the Soviet dictatorship.

BRISTLING WITH COMMENT

Patently, the President has rendered an incredible disservice to the country's reputation. The European press is bristling with comments along the lines of his pronouncement. Even a leading Swiss newspaper headline said: "The end of the American dream?" It may be the end, indeed, if the President's words and figures were to be taken anywhere near face value. A system that condemns one out of every five persons to perpetual destruction would deserve to be scrapped.

The President has "put his foot in his mouth" in more than one way. By implication, he has indicted the existence of a welfare state more severely than anyone else ever did. In three decades this country has spent literally hundreds of billions of dollars on the welfare of the people. Where did those colossal funds go? Down the same sink into which the bulk of our economic aid to the underdeveloped countries vanished?

FORTY BILLION DOLLARS FOR WELFARE

Our Federal, State, and local authorities spend annually some $40 billion (nine zeros) on "welfare." That fails to include either the $15-odd billion devoted to education, or the vast credit guarantees for housing construction, let alone the multibillion contributions by private charities. Even so, we are spending $1,000 per capita annually for the alleged poor—on paper. In reality, the taxpayers' money goes largely to the wrong people. To some extent, it serves as inducement to indolence, shiftlessness, and self-imposed unemployment.

Up to 20 percent, perhaps more, of the public welfare spending is absorbed by administrative expenses and sheer waste. Another 10 percent, at least, is accounted for by the Government's overpayment for goods and services used in providing welfare. The net market value of what the authorities disburse is barely two-thirds of the cost to the taxpayers. And most of that is given away to all comers, with little or no control.

AID MILLIONAIRES, TOO

The large majority of beneficiaries of free food, public housing, social security, etc., are lower middle class folks. Millionaires draw social security benefits and are subsidized by Federal Housing Administration loans. Rich or poor, a veteran is entitled to luxuriant medical care free of charge if his ailment is "service connected." Invariably it qualifies.

The crucial point is that the free market economy, if it is permitted to operate by its own rules, tends to eliminate indigence. By the testimony of our Chief Executive, perpetual mass pauperism in the midst of the greatest prosperity is the earmark of the welfare state.

TROUBLE STEMS FROM INTERFERENCE

The trouble stems from governmental and monopolistic interferences with the freedom of the markets; from employment restrictions by trade unions; from inflationary policies which undermine the security of the weakest population strata; from monetary and fiscal mismanagement that channelizes much of the Nation's resources into unproductive or inefficient investments; from pouring funds into "distressed areas," thereby reducing the mobility of labor; and so on.

The remedy for poverty is fiscal responsibility and economic freedom. That was the system under which millions and millions of American-born and immigrant citizens have risen from poverty to affluence—without being exploited for political demagoguery.

Government Support of Science

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month our distinguished colleague, the Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, spoke before more than 5,000 members of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology at a meeting held in Chicago.

He dealt at length with the subject of Federal Government support of science. This is an area in which governmental appropriations have expanded almost 20 times above the appropriations granted for this same purpose 15 years ago.

I am sure his listeners found his remarks enlightening. He classes himself as an "informed layman" on this subject. I consider this a most modest claim, and I feel certain you will agree with me after reading his remarks at this important meeting.

The remarks follow:

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF SCIENCE

(By Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, chairman; Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished panelists, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to have this opportunity to share with you some observations on the Federal Government's role in the support of science. When your chairman invited me to participate in this symposium, I was at first hesitant about addressing so imposing an assemblage of scientists, but after some reflection I decided this would be a splendid opportunity to acquaint those of you who received Government support for your research with the views of an informed layman on this important subject. So, in a sense, I am appearing before you as a "citizen witness." In identifying myself in that fashion, I trust this audience will not mistake me for one of the witnesses who appears before the Appropriations Committees each spring to advocate vastly increased funds for his own special program interest in the National Institutes of Health.

One year ago, your organization, meeting in Atlantic City, adopted a resolution critical of our subcommittee's study of the NIH grant operations and requested the National Academy of Sciences "to enunciate the principles and philosophy which could serve as a basic policy in the future conduct and administration of Federal programs in support of fundamental research." The academy study was recently completed, and I am highly pleased to find the conclusions of its Committee on Science and Public Policy,

which was chaired by Professor Kistiakowsky, substantially in agreement with the position taken by our committee on most essential points. I will make reference to these in the course of my talk.

Inasmuch as your society has taken official notice of the work of our committee, and many of you as grantees have written to me and other Members of Congress, I think this an appropriate occasion to set the record straight as to what our committee has done—and what it has not done. There has been considerable misunderstanding on this score.

The Committee on Government Operations, it should be understood, is principally concerned with reviewing the administrative performance of Federal agencies. Specifically, the committee is charged in this connection with the "duty of studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." Within the committee, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, exercises this responsibility for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and several other departments and agencies.

Functioning with a very small staff, it has been necessary for the subcommittee to approach its broad agency jurisdiction on a very selective basis. Programs are selected for special study in most instances because they involve large amounts of Federal funds and/or because alleged irregularities or questionable management practices have come to the subcommittee's attention. Study of the NIH grant programs was undertaken in 1959 largely on the basis of their size and extraordinary rate of growth.

I think it would be useful to remind you of the magnitude of that growth. NIH appropriations, excluding construction funds, have increased from a level of approximately $50 million in 1950 to around $900 million in the current fiscal year, and the President has requested $957.4 million for 1965. This would mean an NIH budget of over $1 billion for the next fiscal year, including the health research facilities program. More than 80 percent of this money is spent, for extramural research and training purposes, principally in the form of grants and predominantly in educational institutions. Few programs in the history of our Nation have grown so rapidly and have been supported by the Congress so generously.

I think all of us would agree that it is both proper and desirable for the Federal Government to sponsor and assist medical and other health-related research. And over the years I have consistently supported legislation for this important purpose. At the same time, I believe these Federal programs, like all others, should meet the tests of efficient and economical administration, and I have not hesitated to say so.

Appropriations for the NIH programs have not followed the usual course whereby the President's requests are either approved as submitted or in a somewhat modified form, or they are reduced or denied entirely by the Congress. Instead, except for last year, the President's budget recommendations for NIH have been consistently increased by the Congress during the past 12 years—in many years by more than a third. While this unusual situation is not in itself cause for alarm, it certainly suggests the need for careful appraisal of the administration, and the results, of the programs involved. Administrative decisions, I might add, are of extraordinary significance in shaping the character of these programs because the statutory language is extremely broad and general with respect to the Surgeon General's authority to support medical research and training.

When Congress enacts legislation establishing a scientific program, it must of necessity leave considerable room for administrative interpretation if it is to avoid an overly rigid statute. All of the specifications of a program in a technical area cannot be spelled out in advance. When Congress grants a Federal agency such broad statutory authority, the Congress assumes a corresponding special responsibility for reassuring itself and the public that these programs are administered efficiently, objectively, and in accordance with the intended legislative objectives.

The Congress maintains surveillance over the programs of the Federal departments and agencies in a variety of ways. The annual appropriation process is perhaps the best known of these methods. In addition, the Committees on Government Operations select particular programs or problems for intensive study from time to time, and the appropriate legislative or subject matter committees may review a program more or less comprehensively in connection with proposed amendments to the enabling statute.

In 1959, our subcommittee initiated the searching study of the NIH grant programs which resulted in House Report No. 321, 2 years later. That report was accepted by officials of the Public Health Service and elsewhere in the Government as a constructive report—an objective one. Our study was directed to two ends: (1) understanding the nature and administration of these rapidly growing programs, and (2) evaluating the effectiveness of the agency's policies and arrangements for assuring that public funds were being spent prudently and for their intended purposes. It is expressly the statutory responsibility of our committee to inquire into matters of this kind.

I shall not spend time in a detailed discussion of NIH's past administrative shortcomings. This information is available in the committee's reports and hearings. Nor shall I attempt to evaluate the progress which NIH has made to correct its management weaknesses.

However, for the benefit of those who like to dream romantically of the years around 1959 as the golden age of research grants, I would like to describe briefly how NIH policies and practices looked then in terms of responsible public management.

While NIH had developed an elaborate advisory system for the technical review of project applications, it had made very inadequate arrangements for the fiscal management and accountability of grants. For example, there was no formal review of project requirements; and payments for the continuation years of grants were made automatically upon request without any reference to the investigator's actual needs—except when he needed more money. Moreover, institutions were paid, upon request, the maximum indirect cost rate authorized by law, even when overhead rates were obviously lower.

As the NIH programs expanded, there was inadequate separation of advisory and executive functions, with NIH relying increasingly upon its consultants for the performance of purely executive functions. This was evident in the agency's dependence upon study section members for considering the budget requests of grant applicants.

Our committee and the Kistiakowsky committee are in complete agreement that, in its words, "Detailed budget considerations should be the responsibility of agency staffs alone" and "questions of administrative responsibility and agency policy must be dealt with by full-time staff members, and the agency itself must assume responsibility for the final decisions with regard to awards of grants and contracts."

While NIH had liberalized its grant policies over a period of years, it had indiscriminately extended these same policies, designed essentially for basic research, to other inappropriate areas—to organizations operating for profit, to support of meetings and conferences of professional societies, and to service-type functions such as indexing and language translation. Early in our study, for example, we found that NIH gave profit-making organizations title to equipment which they purchased from grants without, as far as we could determine, ever having given any formal consideration to the appropriateness of that practice.

We should bear in mind that although NIH has justified its grant policies in terms of the needs of the investigator doing basic research, only about one-third of the research NIH supports is classified as basic research.

Our committee recognized the value of study sections for the merit rating of research proposals. In so doing, it called attention to certain of their limitations, including NIH's need for special advisory machinery to review large grants that are beyond the competence of regular study sections. We found that grants intended for the support of an entire program or division of a research institution were being assigned for review to regular study sections, despite the fact that some members frankly expressed their inability to evaluate requests of this kind. One such grant at that time was three-quarters of a million dollars. A broader review mechanism has since been established.

In essence, NIH made the fundamental error of assuming that because it shared a community of interest with institutions and organizations in which health research was performed, it could therefore rely upon their individual policies for the management of Federal grants. Moreover, the agency made a very inadequate effort to formalize and communicate its grant policies. NIH depended on the grantee institutions to monitor grants; but it did not attempt to reach a clear understanding on the responsibilities the latter were expected to assume in the management of grants; nor did NIH take adequate steps to make certain that grantee institutions were both capable of and in fact effectively discharging their responsibilities in this connection.

I believe it time for plain talk on the subject of Government support of science. Ever since the issuance of the "Public Health Service Grants Manual," admittedly prompted in large measure by the work of our subcommittee, I and many other Members of Congress have been bombarded with letters and duplicated resolutions from grantees, their institutions, and their professional societies warning of the threat to scientific freedom and productivity posed by this document and the regulations they implement.

For the most part, the complaints have centered around two specific items: (1) accounting for professional worktime charged to grants, and (2) freedom of the investigator to make changes in his project. I should like to discuss these items in some detail because they have considerable significance for the larger issue of mutual understanding and trust that is involved here.

The requirement for establishing the time or effort a professional worker devotes to a project was adopted by the Public Health Service, only after the Comptroller General had produced conclusive evidence that Federal research grants were being used in some instances to pay the entire salaries of medical school faculty members engaged partly in nonresearch activities.

To my knowledge, there was agreement in this situation on the part of the institutions involved, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Comptroller General that NIH research grants are in the nature of cost-reimbursement-type arrangements and are not intended to be unconditional contributions for use by grantees to support activities other than grant projects. However, differences of opinion have arisen

as to the method by which institutions should account for the project time of faculty members whose salaries are charged in part to grants.

Let me state simply that I do not believe this is a real issue. In principle, the Government is responsible for reimbursing an institution for the agreed upon percentage of an investigator's time that is devoted to a grant-aided project.

In practice, the Public Health Service is simply asking each institution to maintain, on a quarterly basis, an internal record of the estimated percentage of time or effort such investigators have in fact expended on their Government-supported projects.

Frankly, I see nothing unreasonable about this minimum accounting for salary charges to grants; it is equally difficult to see any burden being placed upon the investigator who is called upon to make an intelligent and reasonable estimate once every 3 months of the proportion of his total worktime that is to be charged to a Government project. If a man can estimate his time when he submits a grant application, he should be able to estimate his time at least as well in the light of actual experience. No one is suggesting mathematical precision in allocating time between functions.

I hope those of you who are concerned with this matter will seek to work out suitable arrangements with your institutions and the Public Health Service, rather than spend your valuable time further arguing the futility of reporting systems. I can understand scientists becoming temporarily upset upon the initiation of new reporting requirements, but as a rational consideration the Government is certainly entitled to this modest accounting for public funds.

The "Public Health Service Grants Manual," as originally issued, contained a fairly restrictive provision governing the ability of the investigator to modify the direction of his research. I want to make it perfectly clear that we were never consulted in any way about this, or about any other provision in the manual for that matter; and, further, that this provision contrasts sharply with the position taken by our committee in House Report No. 312.

In our report, issued in 1961, the Committee recognized the scientific merit of permitting the investigator free rein to pursue a new lead or to discontinue an unpromising inquiry, and explicitly stated that it did not propose that advance approval be required for initiating changes in research projects.

Instead, the committee suggested that those long-term projects which were found to have made major deviations from their original research objectives should be reviewed for continuation through the normal study section-council mechanism. Such a procedure, the Committee felt, would be fully protective of public funds, and consistent with the ideals of scientific freedom. Previously, NIH had permitted investigators unlimited freedom to change an approved project once the grant had been awarded, a practice which was not in accord with a project system.

As NIH and other Public Health Service investigators undoubtedly know, the revised edition of the "Grants Manual" which was distributed on January 15, 1964, and became effective on April 1, provides modified language to describe the changes allowable in research projects. This liberalized language, I understand, was the result of extensive consultation with grantees.

Just a few weeks ago I received a letter from the president of one of the large national health associations expressing the concern of his organization over this very section of the "Grants Manual." However, for some reason he quoted the original January 1, 1963, policy statement rather than the modified 1964 language. I find this letter from a leading health organization baffling as well as misleading, since I have been assured by the Public Health Service that the organization was supplied copies of the revised manual last January, and, in fact, that it maintains a liaison arrangement with the advisory health council to NIH in its field.

The practicing politician in a democratic society does not and should not discourage people from expressing their discontent with Government. Indeed, that is one of their basic rights. However, he may expect more of some people than of others.

In this instance, one would expect an affluent health organization that elects to comment unfavorably on Govenment policies to do so on an informed basis.

Much has been said about the extra paperwork required of grantees since the issuance of the "Grants Manual." While there is reason to believe much of the complaint has been exaggerated, and made in some cases by persons who are not well informed, I am wholly sympathetic to the principle of requiring the reporting of only such information as is needed and used in an agency's program.

We found in our study of the NIH programs that numerous reports were required of grantees, but some were simply filed upon receipt. Unfortunately, the fact that report data can, and should, serve program purposes was not fully appreciated by the agency. This became very evident when the subcommittee tested the adequacy of NIH's grant policies and procedures for insuring the prudent expenditure of public funds by means of an audit of all grants made to a profit-making organization. The misuse and waste of public funds in that case has been well documented by our committee; so there is no need to present the details here.

The significant point is that a great deal of the subcommittee's field audit findings merely confirmed information available in NIH's inactive files, but NIH had no effective machinery for evaluating and acting on such information.

Some have described this test audit as a "single instance," and "not typical," because the grantee in this instance was a company operating for profit. I emphatically disagree with that interpretation. The subcommittee demonstrated what could, and did, occur undetected under the existing NIH policies and procedures which were applicable alike to all grantees.

A Government agency can reduce the administrative burden on the investigator and on his institution by more than one method. It can be lightened by increasing interagency cooperation and uniformity of practice, as well as by decreasing reporting requirements. It makes good sense to aline the requirements of those Federal agencies supporting basic research, in such matters as the preparation of research proposals, accounting, and progress reporting, and to reduce the need for multiple support of the same principal investigator by interagency agreements, as proposed by the Kistiakowsky Committee.

Our committee has expressed the belief that similar advantages can be achieved through the development of more uniform policies and procedures for the training programs supported by NIH. The committee recognized that some variation in policies and practices may be necessary in view of the individualized nature of NIH training programs. However, many of the differences observed by the committee appear to be due to lack of central direction and coordination. To the extent these differences are not essential to the success of the programs concerned, they are very likely to cause Government waste and inefficiency, as well as to impose an unnecessary administrative burden on educational institutions.

Our committee, furthermore, has expressed the view that certain grant policies should be handled on a uniform Government-wide basis, not according to the predilections of each agency or its divisions. Among these, the committee identified the policies governing salaries paid from Federal research funds. The committee favored, too, the adoption of a uniform Government-wide policy for indirect costs.

Government science agencies share a special problem of having to be both dependent on and independent of their scientific advisers. In the case of NIH, this problem is especially serious because such a large proportion of the agency's consultants are also its grantees.

And the problem becomes even more acute when the agency, in order to gain the confidence of the scientific community or for other reasons, allows executive responsibilities to be exercised by advisers who are themselves beneficiaries of its programs.

What safeguards are available to minimize the dangers of a conflict of interest in this situation? One safeguard has already been mentioned; namely, that executive responsibilities should not be exercised by consultants. Limiting the terms of service of scientific advisers is another.

While NIH formally limits the term of its consultants, in practice the agency has developed a dependence upon a group of senior consultants whose services it has retained for long periods by rotating them among the councils and other advisory panels.

I should like to make a few remarks about the role of scientific advisers in the administration of research grants.

In House Report No. 1958, our committee observed that according to the NIH criteria for rating grant projects, the average quality of such projects has been steadily declining in recent years.

The proportion of the best projects has declined while there has been a corresponding increase in the proportion of supported projects in the lowest priority group.

The committee could not escape the conclusion that the large annual increases in the NIH appropriation in past years had probably contributed to the increasing support of lower quality research. It reached this conclusion even though it was aware that all projects supported by NIH were found by consultants to possess scientific merit.

The main question raised by this development, in the committee's judgment, is whether or not it is good public policy and in the best interest of science that every project found to be technically sound by specialists in a particular field or discipline should receive support, regardless of its relative quality. The committee also thought attention should be given to the related question of whether NIH needed to strengthen its own professional staff capability for determining if the projects recommended by its scientific consultants should be supported in the light of broader policy considerations.

A year or so after our committee issued its report, I was delighted to discover Dr. Alvin Weinberg's splendid article, "Criteria for Scientific Choice," which appeared in the winter, 1963 issue of "Minerva." I thought his article so penetrating and thought-provoking that I promptly requested his permission to make it widely available by printing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—where it appeared in the RECORD for October 22, 1963.

Dr. Weinberg's observations on the weaknesses of advisory panels are certainly applicable to NIH. Dr. Weinberg wrote:

"The panel system, however, suffers from a serious weakness. Panels usually consist of specialized experts who inevitably share the same enthusiasms and passions. To the expert in oceanography or in high-energy physics, nothing seems quite as important as oceanography or high-energy physics. The panel, when recommending a program in a field in which all its members are interested, invariably argues for better treatment of the

field—more money, more people, more training.

"The panel system is weak insofar as judge, jury, plaintiff, and defendant are usually one and the same.

"The panel is able to judge how competently a proposed piece of research is likely to be carried out; its members are all experts and are likely to know who are the good research workers in the field. But just because the panel is composed of experts, who hold parochial viewpoints, the panel is much less able to place the proposal in a broader perspective and to say whether the research proposal is of much interest to the rest of science."

The review procedures of NIH provide a mechanism for evaluating how well a particular research project is likely to be done. But NIH panels, composed of specialists and advocates of the field under review, do not bring to bear what Dr. Weinberg calls the "external" criteria, concerned with the question of whether the research should be supported at a given level or even supported at all, in terms of its importance relative to other fields of science.

Our committee has noted a tendency for institutions to permit project grants to be spent less carefully than an institution's own funds. It found, at the same time, that the policy statements issued for the NIH grant programs did not adequately inform the investigator, or his institution, of the obligations which accompany the discretionary handling of public funds.

I am suggesting that it is basically the Government's responsibility to establish adequate rules for its programs.

Otherwise, if left to the individual scientist or institution, the preference quite often might be for one's own equipment or facilities. The decision as to whether or not something is necessary for a project may be conditioned by who is paying the bill.

I am reminded in this connection of the experience of the Bureau of Public Roads in reimbursing the States for the cost of relocating utility facilities after passage of the 1956 act creating the Interstate Highway System. Prior to that time it was the practice for the States to require the utilities to move their own poles in connection with highway construction. However, when Congress enacted a grant program with 90 percent Federal matching, 10 States promptly passed laws authorizing utility relocation at public expense—but the laws were applicable only to projects on the Interstate System where the 90-to-10 matching was available.

I am pleased to say that the concluding statement of the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy with respect to the responsibility of the investigator in accepting Federal funds is fully in accord with the thinking of our committee.

I want also to associate myself with that committee's emphasis on the individual investigator. If NIH were supporting principally the personal research of individual scientists, I suspect the agency's management responsibilities would be much easier. I have great respect and admiration for the investigator who devotes his life to his work; we are all indebted to men of this kind.

In closing, I want to endorse the recommendation of the Kistiakowsky committee for a selective program of research grants to weaker educational institutions. This important recommendation is quite similar to the proposal advanced by our own committee for a special developmental-type grant. We recommended that NIH initiate such a grant, for a limited time, as a direct means of stimulating research capability in those universities and professional schools which have training responsibilities in scientific fields related to health, but are not actively engaged in health research.

This is a constructive proposal for assisting the weaker institutions which have derived very little research support from project grants and none from the general support grant. Unfortunately, it does not appear to have been given any serious consideration. I am hopeful that the recommendation of the Kistiakowsky committee for this purpose will fall on more receptive ears.

Again, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity which this occasion has afforded me to make some observations and comments on Federal support of science in the context of the National Institutes of Health experience. All of us—scientists, the public and their political representatives—are vitally interested in the same objectives in connection with biomedical research. Society, therefore, will surely profit if science and Government continually strive to understand each other's needs and responsibilities and if they seek, insofar as possible, to accommodate their differences with an open mind.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian people had become victims and martyrs throughout their long and eventful history. During centuries of their subjection to Turkish rule in their homeland they suffered much and sometimes put up with inhuman treatment, including wholesale massacres. But the tragedy that was ushered in by the wholesale and unexplained arrests by Turkish authorities of some 1,000 prominent Armenians on April 24, 49 years ago, was the most appalling. On that day the cream of the Armenian community, clergymen, men of letters, teachers, merchants, and prominent men in all walks of life, were rounded up by the Turkish police, imprisoned and held incommunicado, then bundled off in small groups and under heavy guard deported to distant parts of the Ottoman Empire to be put to death there.

Sad and stunning was this shocking event, even more tragic was what followed it. Gradually a large-scale tragedy began to unfold itself which involved the fate of the entire Armenian community in Turkey. On a carefully and most secretly prepared plan, some 2 million Armenians of the country were uprooted from their homes in the spring and summer of 1915. Some of these met their death in massacres; others were starved to death, and still others died due to indescribable hardships. And by the end of fateful 1915, the Armenian community in Turkey had ceased to exist; it had vanished through the diabolical and inhuman machinations of the then Turkish Government.

That is the awesome meaning of April 24 of 1915 to the Armenian people, and that is why its 49th anniversary is being observed as a day of mourning, as their Memorial Day, in all Armenian communities throughout the world.

"They Cannot Stand Alone"—The Work of the Mennonite Central Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent in my congressional district in Northern Indiana many Americans of the Mennonite faith.

These are among the finest people in my State. The Mennonites are particularly to be commended for their continuing ministry of relief to the hungry and suffering.

I believe their activities in this regard, which are conducted largely through the work of the Mennonite Central Committee, will be of real interest to many Members of Congress.

For this reason, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article concerning the work of the Mennonite Central Committee during 1963. This article, entitled "They Cannot Stand Alone," appears in the 1963 MCC Annual Report.

The article follows:

SO MANY OF OUR FELLOW MEN ARE BROKEN OF MIND, SPIRIT, AND BODY—THEY ARE THE VICTIMS OF IGNORANCE, DISEASE, HATE, HUNGER, AND INTENSE FEELINGS OF INADEQUACY—THEY CANNOT STAND ALONE

The people who receive help through the Mennonite Central Committee each year are not statistics. They are individuals with hopes and aspirations very similar to our own.

This year, to emphasize the person-to-person relationships which characterize so many of the MCC's relief, service, and peace efforts, the annual report focuses on individuals and groups who were helped during 1963. The following illustrative incidents show how MCC workers attempted to take their place beside people who needed encouragement, guidance, food, and other assistance.

The charts and graphs (not printed in the RECORD) which are interspersed throughout the report tell how the Mennonites and Brethren in Christ of Canada and the United States supported the MCC's various activities during 1963 and the 2 preceding years.

ANGOLAN REFUGEES AMBUSHED

It was in the dead of night, September 10, 1963. A party of 180 Angolans was quietly making its way to the Congo border, and to freedom. A few members of the group were soldiers. One carried a machinegun, but otherwise they were poorly armed.

Suddenly, chaos.

Portuguese soldiers, lying in ambush, threw hand grenades at the hapless Angolans.

It was in middle of the snakelike line of fleeing refugees which was attacked. The people in front scrambled out of danger and made it safely to the Congo border. The tailenders quickly returned the way they had come. No one knows what happened to the people in the middle.

The 80 people who got through were a pathetic lot. Most of the children in the group were suffering from malnutrition; some were in such poor health that they had to be hospitalized.

Among the 80 were two brothers, Eduardo, 9, and Manuel, 4. When the members of the party scattered during the ambush, the two

boys found themselves alone. They walked for many hours through the long bushgrass, Eduardo carried little Manuel much of the way. Finally, after much walking, stumbling, and searching, they reached safety.

Fortunately, someone was there to help the two boys and the many other Angolan refugees who were streaming into the Congo. The Congo Protestant Relief Agency, of which the Mennonite Central Committee is a member, stood ready to help. They shipped in food, clothing, and other materials to assist them in getting reestablished in their new country.

HARVEST OF ORPHANS

One of the bitterest results of the Korean war has been the harvest of orphans and abandoned babies which it has left behind. In the vicinity of Pusan, alone, there are 90 orphanages, each of which cares for an average of 110 children under 15 years of age. The number of abandoned babies increased during 1963 as the cost of living climbed. An average of 12 children a day were brought into one Korean home for abandoned children during the early part of 1963.

In 1962 the MCC saw the need for a program which would enable poor families to keep their children. This resulted in the establishment of the family-child assistance plan, which provides school tuition for a child and cash for the family to buy urgently needed food and clothing.

The family-child program, however, did nothing for the children who already were in orphanages. To partially meet this need, a trained MCC worker began child-care training courses for orphanage staff members. The first 3-month course began in March 1963. Twenty-eight trainees from various orphanages in Taegu graduated from the Government-approved course in June. A second course, this time exclusively for orphanage housemothers, was began in October.

Helen Tieszen, director of the training program, summed up the benefits of the first course in these words: "Many of the trainees who were already doing good work in their orphanages gained a deeper insight into their roles and what they might do for the children. A few of them changed astonishingly in their attitude toward the children in their care."

The foregoing is a new project. It shows how MCC volunteers are seeking creative ways of speaking to pressing social problems.

MIGRANT MOTHER LEARNS TO SEW

Mrs. H. is a migrant woman. She has five children, ranging in age from 8 years to 7 months. Last summer, while working in the State of New York, she was introduced to a summer service worker. The volunteer listened attentively as she told of her long-felt desire to learn how to sew.

The worker recognized this as an opportunity to be of real service to this woman and her family. The lessons began the next day. The facilities in the camp for cutting and sewing were primitive, but by the end of the first lesson a new dress for the baby was well underway. Before the first dress was finished, Mrs. H. began on a second project, to test the things she had learned.

Field work prevented her from accomplishing much more during the rest of the summer, but she was looking forward eagerly to the fall and winter when she would be able to make use of her new skill to sew some of the clothes for her growing family.

INDIAN CHURCHES STUDY PEACE ISSUE

When the armies of Communist China invaded India in 1962, the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Churches of India abruptly came face to face with the problem of the Christian attitude toward participation in war. They have been interested in this question prior to the invasion, but it became an urgent problem when the war began.

One of the churches' first responses was to begin plans for the production of peace literature in the Hindi language. P. J. Malagar, executive secretary of MCC (India), was later made available to work on peace interests for all the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ groups in India.

The Indian churches needed help. They requested the peace section to assist them financially and to send a short-term resource person to their country to more actively "promote the biblical teaching of peace."

The peace section responded by sending them a $1,000 contribution for literature and by making plans to send a peace missioner in 1964.

The younger churches need our support and guidance. Members of the worldwide brotherhood need to stand together during these times of rapid change, so that they can better understand each other and the situations in which they are living.

VETERINARIAN SERVICES

Monestine St. Pierre, formerly a watchman at the MCC-operated hospital at Grande Riviere du Nord, Haiti, is now the community's busy veterinarian. The MCC unit at Grande Riviere sent him to Hospital Albert Schweitzer in April 1963 for a 6-week veterinarian course.

After the course, Monestine returned to his home community and held clinics 3 days a week. He and Arlin Hunsberger, MCC director, went to all the churches in the vicinity and requested the ministers to announce the new service to their members.

Monestine was flooded with work. After 6 weeks of operation, he had to change to daily clinics.

A minimum charge is made for his services, but the owners' ability to pay is taken into consideration.

This venture is attractive for two reasons: (1) it provided Grande Riviere with a much needed service, and (2) it enabled a man to become established in a trade.

BABY NURSED BACK TO HEALTH

Juanita Mendoza is a pretty little Bolivian baby. She lives in a small mud hut with her parents and a number of their relatives. Juanita was not as strong as most children. She could not stand up at a year. Her father and mother were too poor to give her the right kind of food. Often they had no food at all.

At 15 months Juanita got sick. Mrs. Mendoza tried all the cures she knew, but none of them worked. The poor mother did not know what to do. The doctor and the hospital were far away. And even if they did take Juanita to the hospital, they had no money for medicine. The little girl's condition grew progressively worse.

Then it occurred to the mother that the nurses at the nearby Mennonite colony might be able to help. She took Juanita there and the nurses promised that they would do what the could. At first the little girl had to get all her food and medicine by needle. She did not like this, but she was too weak to cry. Slowly, day by day, Juanita improved. Finally, she was well enough to be taken home. It will be a long time, however, before she is strong enough to walk.

Perhaps Juanita will grow up to be like her mother, who cannot read or even write her own name. But maybe some things will have changed by the time she reaches womanhood.

BUNDLES IN THE DESERT

Three villages lie huddled in a dry riverbed on the windswept desert of eastern Algeria. The 2,300 inhabitants live in caves dug into the banks of the river. During the civil war they lost all their sheep. Now they have no resources of any kind except what is given to them in distributions.

Christmas bundles were distributed to the children in these villages early in 1963. Alvin Friesen, director of the MCC program in Algeria, describes the event: "I will never forget the sight. About half an hour before we were to begin the distribution, 300 children came up out of the ground from all directions and walked toward our truck. They seated themselves on the ground, girls separate from the boys, and there waited patiently for their bundles.

"It was a real privilege to give these bundles to each child in these villages and then to see them take off their old rags and put on a neat new dress or a pair of pants and shirt."

Many people regard Christmas bundles as one of the most significant parts of the MCC program. One family in Pennsylvania prepares as many as 60 bundles a year.

Occasionally, bundles do present problems, especially when they are distributed to children who ordinarily would never receive clothes of such high quality. Not infrequently the value of a bundle which a child receives is greater than the sum which the father earns in several weeks of hard labor.

Most often, Christmas bundle distributions are the highlight of the MCC worker's term of service. One volunteer wrote: "The distribution of Christmas bundles is, perhaps the greatest pleasure which comes to a relief worker. Nowhere else is the joy which a gift brings quite as apparent. The glow which one sees in the eyes of a child who receives a bundle is something which reaches into the heart."

BOY DREAMS OF BEING A DOCTOR

Shadrack Kaudambi is one of 67 boys in form I at Livingstone College, which is located on the western border of Tanganyika, at Kigoma.

Shadrack's home is in a village 250 miles away. His father used to farm, but he is retired now. An older brother, a teacher, is supporting the family. His oldest sister completed form VI 2 years ago. This is an accomplishment achieved by relatively few African girls. Another sister is in primary school. The children in this family are more fortunate than most Tanganyikans.

When Shadrack is asked what occupation he wants to enter, his face lights up as he answers: a doctor. His dream is to help his his fellow countrymen conquer one of Tanganyika's most dreaded enemies, disease. There are many years of school ahead for him if he wants to achieve his goal, but if he retains his present determination, his dream will come true.

Two Mennonite teachers are on the staff at Livingstone College. They are teaching as one of the most vital services they can render to Africa during its present period of development. It is estimated that African secondary schools will need 7,000 expatriate teachers during the next 10 years.

SUNDAY SCHOOL AT JUNIOR VILLAGE

"What is God?"
"Where is He?"
"Can He see us?"

These are some of the questions popped at the voluntary service workers who conduct a Sunday school program at Junior Village, Washington, D.C.

Junior Village is a temporary home for over 700 children, mostly Negro, between the ages of 6 months and 18 years. A unit of nine VSers is serving in this institution. When they discovered recently that the 4- and 5-year-olds were not receiving any religious instruction Sunday mornings, they decided to have a 30-minute Sunday school in two of the cottages.

The Sunday school begins with a 15-minute assembly. During this period the children sing and listen to Bible stories. Then each of the teachers takes 10 children into a classroom for an additional 15 minutes

of singing, coloring, learning Bible verses, and listening to stories.

The unit members are enthusiastic about the Sunday school. One of them summed it up this way: "We find the children eager to learn about Jesus. Some of them ask us each day if we'll have Sunday school again. We are glad for the opportunity of teaching and witnessing to these young souls."

Can we let Eduardo, Juanita, Shadrack, and Mrs. H. stand alone? No. All that is good within us cries out that they must be helped.

The foregoing are nine illustrations of where the Mennonitie Central Committee tried to take its place beside the people, near and far, young and old, who needed the supporting arm of a friend or brother. The important ingredient in almost every case was the MCC volunteer whose presence and Christian concern gave the act of love a personal touch. This was service "in the name of Christ." There are many, unfortunately, who will stand alone.

U.S. Foreign Policy Still Geared To Trust in the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, recent speeches by the President and the announced actions of his administration show that our foreign policy and the security of the United States is still being based on trust in the Soviet Union. In view of the long history of broken agreements and treaties by the Kremlin it would seem we are following a most dangerous course.

Two articles call attention to the serious lack of understanding of Communist goals by administration policymakers and I include them as a part of these remarks as food for thought. The first, "Another Russian Deception," by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1964. The second, "Johnson Speech Disappointing," from the San Diego Union of April 22, 1964.

Both articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 27, 1964]

ANOTHER RUSSIAN DECEPTION—KREMLIN RENEGES ON CUBAN INSPECTION IN A NEW SLAP AT U.S. PRESTIGE

(By David Lawrence)

An ignominious defeat has been administered to the U.S. Government—a blow to its prestige and influence in world affairs. Russia has deliberately violated a pledge to the American Government and once more defiantly threatens the safety of this country.

This turn of events comes as a surprise to the American people, who were being assured by President Johnson only a few days ago that the agreement to limit uranium production was an indication of the peaceful purpose of the Soviet Government and that a new wave of good feeling had begun.

But the Russian leopard, it has been disclosed, has not changed its spots. In utter disregard of the resolutions of warning adopted by Congress 2 years ago, the Soviet Government has assumed the right to engage in military operations in this hemisphere that are plainly aimed at the United States.

When the American Government demanded in the autumn of 1962 that the Russian missiles and troops be removed from Cuba, the Soviet Government promised in an exchange of notes with President Kennedy to remove the missiles and agreed to a system of inspection by the United Nations to verify whether good faith was being observed.

But Castro-doubtless with the connivance of the Russians—declined to permit the inspection. Accordingly, the United States reserved the right to continue aerial reconnaissance as a measure of protection to the American people. More than 600 flights have been made by American planes during 1962 and 1963, and the diplomatic issue as between Russian and the United States has, outwardly at least, remained dormant. Now Cuba has issued its protest asking the United Nations to support her demand that the American airplane flights be discontinued. Russia immediately announced her concurrence in the Cuban demand.

Thus have the Kennedy and Johnson administrations been grossly deceived by the Soviet maneuvers. Also, inside the United States a certain amount of brainwashing has occurred and there are even strange suggestions heard in our midst that it would be better to let a few thousand Russian troops or "technicians" remain in Cuba so as to prevent "a trigger-happy Castro" from setting off a military conflict by shooting down American airplanes. This implies a reliance on the alleged peaceful intentions of the Russians which is contradicted by the latest events.

The Russian official newspapers, for instance, in articles last Friday—unquestionably inspired by the Moscow government—declared that there is no reason why Russia should not supply Cuba with weapons. The flights of American airplanes were denounced as violators of Cuban sovereignty and of the United Nations charter as well as of international law. Yet the United Nations charter explicitly recognizes regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine.

The controversy is significant mostly because it reveals that, instead of an improvement in Soviet-American relations, there is underneath no letup in the hostility and intrigues of aggression emanating from the Communist regime in Moscow.

The simple truth is that a small country 90 miles away from our shores was militarily strengthened by Russia, as dangerous missile bases were established in Cuba in 1962. When the United States, in self-protection, takes steps to find out if the menace has been removed, this action is construed in Moscow as a violation of international law. The right of self-defense and the adoption of precautionary measures against attack are inherent, of course, in the sovereignty of every country, and there was no justification in international law or in the United Nations Charter for the original dispatch of 15,000 troops to Cuba by the Soviet Government or the construction of missile bases on an island more than 4,000 miles away from Soviet territory. The only object of such an expedition was to threaten the safety of the American people.

This flagrant violation of international rules has been further aggravated by the manifest dishonesty and unmorality of the government in Moscow, which pretended in its notes to the late President Kennedy to be willing to agree to international inspection of Cuban missile bases and now goes back on its word. Under the circumstances, aerial reconnaissance by high-flying planes is inevitably the right of the U.S. Government.

The net result of the whole controversy could be to convince the American people that further parleys on "disarmament" with the Moscow regime can hardly be risked and that any agreements signed will not be worth the paper on which they are written so far as compliance by the Soviet Government is concerned.

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 22, 1964]

FOREIGN POLICY MUDDLED—JOHNSON SPEECH DISAPPOINTING

The barrenness of the present foreign policy of the United States was there for all to hear when President Johnson addressed the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York.

For those who had hoped for a revitalization of our efforts to turn back the threat of atheistic communism, and to reassert our leadership of the free peoples, the President's talk must have come as a disappointment. Instead, we were asked to take a step on the road toward unilateral disarmament.

It curiously but significantly carried on where the late President John F. Kennedy left off in his controversial talk at the American University about a year ago. It was this speech that sounded our abandonment of victory in the cold war, our acceptance of coexistence, and announced our unilateral suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

Now with a President of limited prior experience and interest in foreign affairs, and with our leadership being challenged within the Atlantic community itself, foreign policy has become a jigsaw of day-to-day adjustments over which we seem to have diminishing influence.

The late Mr. Kennedy said that times had changed and we should reexamine our attitude toward the cold war and must not look upon accommodation with the Communists as impossible; and now, Mr. Johnson tells us that such problems as Cuba, South Vietnam and atomic dangers "cannot be dealt with simply by historical judgments or general precepts" and "the pursuit of peace is in the interests of the Soviet Union as it is in ours."

The President says we are "unalterably committed" to Nationalist China. Yet he says the easing of relations with Red China cannot proceed while that nation pursues conflict and preaches violence. He insists that we will continue to "use every peaceful means at our command to isolate Cuba, to frustrate its efforts to destroy free governments and to expose the weakness of communism," but in South Vietnam we support direct military action and insist there can't be a negotiated peace "as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force."

The agreement with the Soviet Union which the President announced, accepting a reduction in the production of nuclear explosive materials, was negotiated in secret and contained no provisions for inspections. It may be we already are manufacturing more atomic materials than we could possibly use under any circumstances, and our gesture is more moral than practical.

But, such an agreement without inspections indicates faith in the good intentions of Communist tyrants. We want peace, so therefore the Russians should want peace.

We indicate our eagerness to pursue disarmament even further, and the President says we will discuss any problem, listen to any proposal, seek any agreement, and take any action, to lessen the chances of war, as long as they don't sacrifice our ability to defend ourselves and our allies.

We plead, almost beg, for peace.

If the Communists would only forego the use of force—and there is no reason why they shouldn't as this country means them no harm—presumably we could all settle down to a friendly competition.

This all reminds us of the story of the man who encountered a thug. Both were armed. The thug suggested they throw their weapons away as mutual gestures of honest intentions. They did. You know what happened next.

boys found themselves alone. They walked for many hours through the long bushgrass, Eduardo carried little Manuel much of the way. Finally, after much walking, stumbling, and searching, they reached safety.

Fortunately, someone was there to help the two boys and the many other Angolan refugees who were streaming into the Congo. The Congo Protestant Relief Agency, of which the Mennonite Central Committee is a member, stood ready to help. They shipped in food, clothing, and other materials to assist them in getting reestablished in their new country.

HARVEST OF ORPHANS

One of the bitterest results of the Korean war has been the harvest of orphans and abandoned babies which it has left behind. In the vicinity of Pusan, alone, there are 90 orphanages, each of which cares for an average of 110 children under 15 years of age. The number of abandoned babies increased during 1963 as the cost of living climbed. An average of 12 children a day were brought into one Korean home for abandoned children during the early part of 1963.

In 1962 the MCC saw the need for a program which would enable poor families to keep their children. This resulted in the establishment of the family-child assistance plan, which provides school tuition for a child and cash for the family to buy urgently needed food and clothing.

The family-child program, however, did nothing for the children who already were in orphanages. To partially meet this need, a trained MCC worker began child-care training courses for orphanage staff members. The first 3-month course began in March 1963. Twenty-eight trainees from various orphanages in Taegu graduated from the Government-approved course in June. A second course, this time exclusively for orphanage housemothers, was began in October.

Helen Tieszen, director of the training program, summed up the benefits of the first course in these words: "Many of the trainees who were already doing good work in their orphanages gained a deeper insight into their roles and what they might do for the children. A few of them changed astonishingly in their attitude toward the children in their care."

The foregoing is a new project. It shows how MCC volunteers are seeking creative ways of speaking to pressing social problems.

MIGRANT MOTHER LEARNS TO SEW

Mrs. H. is a migrant woman. She has five children, ranging in age from 8 years to 7 months. Last summer, while working in the State of New York, she was introduced to a summer service worker. The volunteer listened attentively as she told of her long-felt desire to learn how to sew.

The worker recognized this as an opportunity to be of real service to this woman and her family. The lessons began the next day. The facilities in the camp for cutting and sewing were primitive, but by the end of the first lesson a new dress for the baby was well underway. Before the first dress was finished, Mrs. H. began on a second project, to test the things she had learned.

Field work prevented her from accomplishing much more during the rest of the summer, but she was looking forward eagerly to the fall and winter when she would be able to make use of her new skill to sew some of the clothes for her growing family.

INDIAN CHURCHES STUDY PEACE ISSUE

When the armies of Communist China invaded India in 1962, the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Churches of India abruptly came face to face with the problem of the Christian attitude toward participation in war. They have been interested in this question prior to the invasion, but it became an urgent problem when the war began.

One of the churches' first responses was to begin plans for the production of peace literature in the Hindi language. P. J. Malagar, executive secretary of MCC (India), was later made available to work on peace interests for all the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ groups in India.

The Indian churches needed help. They requested the peace section to assist them financially and to send a short-term resource person to their country to more actively "promote the biblical teaching of peace."

The peace section responded by sending them a $1,000 contribution for literature and by making plans to send a peace missioner in 1964.

The younger churches need our support and guidance. Members of the worldwide brotherhood need to stand together during these times of rapid change, so that they can better understand each other and the situations in which they are living.

VETERINARIAN SERVICES

Monestine St. Pierre, formerly a watchman at the MCC-operated hospital at Grande Riviere du Nord, Haiti, is now the community's busy veterinarian. The MCC unit at Grande Riviere sent him to Hospital Albert Schweitzer in April 1963 for a 6-week veterinarian course.

After the course, Monestine returned to his home community and held clinics 3 days a week. He and Arlin Hunsberger, MCC director, went to all the churches in the vicinity and requested the ministers to announce the new service to their members.

Monestine was flooded with work. After 6 weeks of operation, he had to change to daily clinics.

A minimum charge is made for his services, but the owners' ability to pay is taken into consideration.

This venture is attractive for two reasons: (1) it provided Grande Riviere with a much needed service, and (2) it enabled a man to become established in a trade.

BABY NURSED BACK TO HEALTH

Juanita Mendoza is a pretty little Bolivian baby. She lives in a small mud hut with her parents and a number of their relatives. Juanita was not as strong as most children. She could not stand up at a year. Her father and mother were too poor to give her the right kind of food. Often they had no food at all.

At 15 months Juanita got sick. Mrs. Mendoza tried all the cures she knew, but none of them worked. The poor mother did not know what to do. The doctor and the hospital were far away. And even if they did take Juanita to the hospital, they had no money for medicine. The little girl's condition grew progressively worse.

Then it occurred to the mother that the nurses at the nearby Mennonite colony might be able to help. She took Juanita there and the nurses promised that they would do what the could. At first the little girl had to get all her food and medicine by needle. She did not like this, but she was too weak to cry. Slowly, day by day, Juanita improved. Finally, she was well enough to be taken home. It will be a long time, however, before she is strong enough to walk.

Perhaps Juanita will grow up to be like her mother, who cannot read or even write her own name. But maybe some things will have changed by the time she reaches womanhood.

BUNDLES IN THE DESERT

Three villages lie huddled in a dry riverbed on the windswept desert of eastern Algeria. The 2,300 inhabitants live in caves dug into the banks of the river. During the civil war they lost all their sheep. Now they have no resources of any kind except what is given to them in distributions.

Christmas bundles were distributed to the children in these villages early in 1963. Alvin Friesen, director of the MCC program in Algeria, describes the event: "I will never forget the sight. About half an hour before we were to begin the distribution, 300 children came up out of the ground from all directions and walked toward our truck. They seated themselves on the ground, girls separate from the boys, and there waited patiently for their bundles.

"It was a real privilege to give these bundles to each child in these villages and then to see them take off their old rags and put on a neat new dress or a pair of pants and shirt."

Many people regard Christmas bundles as one of the most significant parts of the MCC program. One family in Pennsylvania prepares as many as 60 bundles a year.

Occasionally, bundles do present problems, especially when they are distributed to children who ordinarily would never receive clothes of such high quality. Not infrequently the value of a bundle which a child receives is greater than the sum which the father earns in several weeks of hard labor.

Most often, Christmas bundle distributions are the highlight of the MCC worker's term of service. One volunteer wrote: "The distribution of Christmas bundles is, perhaps the greatest pleasure which comes to a relief worker. Nowhere else is the joy which a gift brings quite as apparent. The glow which one sees in the eyes of a child who receives a bundle is something which reaches into the heart."

BOY DREAMS OF BEING A DOCTOR

Shadrack Kaudambi is one of 67 boys in form I at Livingstone College, which is located on the western border of Tanganyika, at Kigoma.

Shadrack's home is in a village 250 miles away. His father used to farm, but he is retired now. An older brother, a teacher, is supporting the family. His oldest sister completed form VI 2 years ago. This is an accomplishment achieved by relatively few African girls. Another sister is in primary school. The children in this family are more fortunate than most Tanganyikans.

When Shadrack is asked what occupation he wants to enter, his face lights up as he answers: a doctor. His dream is to help his his fellow countrymen conquer one of Tanganyika's most dreaded enemies, disease. There are many years of school ahead for him if he wants to achieve his goal, but if he retains his present determination, his dream will come true.

Two Mennonite teachers are on the staff at Livingstone College. They are teaching as one of the most vital services they can render to Africa during its present period of development. It is estimated that African secondary schools will need 7,000 expatriate teachers during the next 10 years.

SUNDAY SCHOOL AT JUNIOR VILLAGE

"What is God?"
"Where is He?"
"Can He see us?"

These are some of the questions popped at the voluntary service workers who conduct a Sunday school program at Junior Village, Washington, D.C.

Junior Village is a temporary home for over 700 children, mostly Negro, between the ages of 6 months and 18 years. A unit of nine VSers is serving in this institution. When they discovered recently that the 4- and 5-year-olds were not receiving any religious instruction Sunday mornings, they decided to have a 30-minute Sunday school in two of the cottages.

The Sunday school begins with a 15-minute assembly. During this period the children sing and listen to Bible stories. Then each of the teachers takes 10 children into a classroom for an additional 15 minutes

of singing, coloring, learning Bible verses, and listening to stories.

The unit members are enthusiastic about the Sunday school. One of them summed it up this way: "We find the children eager to learn about Jesus. Some of them ask us each day if we'll have Sunday school again. We are glad for the opportunity of teaching and witnessing to these young souls."

Can we let Eduardo, Juanita, Shadrack, and Mrs. H. stand alone? No. All that is good within us cries out that they must be helped.

The foregoing are nine illustrations of where the Mennonitie Central Committee tried to take its place beside the people, near and far, young and old, who needed the supporting arm of a friend or brother. The important ingredient in almost every case was the MCC volunteer whose presence and Christian concern gave the act of love a personal touch. This was service "in the name of Christ." There are many, unfortunately, who will stand alone.

U.S. Foreign Policy Still Geared To Trust in the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, recent speeches by the President and the announced actions of his administration show that our foreign policy and the security of the United States is still being based on trust in the Soviet Union. In view of the long history of broken agreements and treaties by the Kremlin it would seem we are following a most dangerous course.

Two articles call attention to the serious lack of understanding of Communist goals by administration policymakers and I include them as a part of these remarks as food for thought. The first, "Another Russian Deception," by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1964. The second, "Johnson Speech Disappointing," from the San Diego Union of April 22, 1964.

Both articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 27, 1964]

ANOTHER RUSSIAN DECEPTION—KREMLIN RENEGES ON CUBAN INSPECTION IN A NEW SLAP AT U.S. PRESTIGE

(By David Lawrence)

An ignominious defeat has been administered to the U.S. Government—a blow to its prestige and influence in world affairs. Russia has deliberately violated a pledge to the American Government and once more defiantly threatens the safety of this country.

This turn of events comes as a surprise to the American people, who were being assured by President Johnson only a few days ago that the agreement to limit uranium production was an indication of the peaceful purpose of the Soviet Government and that a new wave of good feeling had begun.

But the Russian leopard, it has been disclosed, has not changed its spots. In utter disregard of the resolutions of warning adopted by Congress 2 years ago, the Soviet Government has assumed the right to engage in military operations in this hemisphere that are plainly aimed at the United States.

When the American Government demanded in the autumn of 1962 that the Russian missiles and troops be removed from Cuba, the Soviet Government promised in an exchange of notes with President Kennedy to remove the missiles and agreed to a system of inspection by the United Nations to verify whether good faith was being observed.

But Castro-doubtless with the connivance of the Russians—declined to permit the inspection. Accordingly, the United States reserved the right to continue aerial reconnaissance as a measure of protection to the American people. More than 600 flights have been made by American planes during 1962 and 1963, and the diplomatic issue as between Russian and the United States has, outwardly at least, remained dormant. Now Cuba has issued its protest asking the United Nations to support her demand that the American airplane flights be discontinued. Russia immediately announced her concurrence in the Cuban demand.

Thus have the Kennedy and Johnson administrations been grossly deceived by the Soviet maneuvers. Also, inside the United States a certain amount of brainwashing has occurred and there are even strange suggestions heard in our midst that it would be better to let a few thousand Russian troops or "technicians" remain in Cuba so as to prevent "a trigger-happy Castro" from setting off a military conflict by shooting down American airplanes. This implies a reliance on the alleged peaceful intentions of the Russians which is contradicted by the latest events.

The Russian official newspapers, for instance, in articles last Friday—unquestionably inspired by the Moscow government—declared that there is no reason why Russia should not supply Cuba with weapons. The flights of American airplanes were denounced as violators of Cuban sovereignty and of the United Nations charter as well as of international law. Yet the United Nations charter explicitly recognizes regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine.

The controversy is significant mostly because it reveals that, instead of an improvement in Soviet-American relations, there is underneath no letup in the hostility and intrigues of aggression emanating from the Communist regime in Moscow.

The simple truth is that a small country 90 miles away from our shores was militarily strengthened by Russia, as dangerous missile bases were established in Cuba in 1962. When the United States, in self-protection, takes steps to find out if the menace has been removed, this action is construed in Moscow as a violation of international law. The right of self-defense and the adoption of precautionary measures against attack are inherent, of course, in the sovereignty of every country, and there was no justification in international law or in the United Nations Charter for the original dispatch of 15,000 troops to Cuba by the Soviet Government or the construction of missile bases on an island more than 4,000 miles away from Soviet territory. The only object of such an expedition was to threaten the safety of the American people.

This flagrant violation of international rules has been further aggravated by the manifest dishonesty and unmorality of the government in Moscow, which pretended in its notes to the late President Kennedy to be willing to agree to international inspection of Cuban missile bases and now goes back on its word. Under the circumstances, aerial reconnaissance by high-flying planes is inevitably the right of the U.S. Government.

The net result of the whole controversy could be to convince the American people that further parleys on "disarmament" with the Moscow regime can hardly be risked and that any agreements signed will not be worth the paper on which they are written so far as compliance by the Soviet Government is concerned.

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 22, 1964]

FOREIGN POLICY MUDDLED—JOHNSON SPEECH DISAPPOINTING

The barrenness of the present foreign policy of the United States was there for all to hear when President Johnson addressed the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York.

For those who had hoped for a revitalization of our efforts to turn back the threat of atheistic communism, and to reassert our leadership of the free peoples, the President's talk must have come as a disappointment. Instead, we were asked to take a step on the road toward unilateral disarmament.

It curiously but significantly carried on where the late President John F. Kennedy left off in his controversial talk at the American University about a year ago. It was this speech that sounded our abandonment of victory in the cold war, our acceptance of coexistence, and announced our unilateral suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

Now with a President of limited prior experience and interest in foreign affairs, and with our leadership being challenged within the Atlantic community itself, foreign policy has become a jigsaw of day-to-day adjustments over which we seem to have diminishing influence.

The late Mr. Kennedy said that times had changed and we should reexamine our attitude toward the cold war and must not look upon accommodation with the Communists as impossible; and now, Mr. Johnson tells us that such problems as Cuba, South Vietnam and atomic dangers "cannot be dealt with simply by historical judgments or general precepts" and "the pursuit of peace is in the interests of the Soviet Union as it is in ours."

The President says we are "unalterably committed" to Nationalist China. Yet he says the easing of relations with Red China cannot proceed while that nation pursues conflict and preaches violence. He insists that we will continue to "use every peaceful means at our command to isolate Cuba, to frustrate its efforts to destroy free governments and to expose the weakness of communism," but in South Vietnam we support direct military action and insist there can't be a negotiated peace "as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force."

The agreement with the Soviet Union which the President announced, accepting a reduction in the production of nuclear explosive materials, was negotiated in secret and contained no provisions for inspections. It may be we already are manufacturing more atomic materials than we could possibly use under any circumstances, and our gesture is more moral than practical.

But, such an agreement without inspections indicates faith in the good intentions of Communist tyrants. We want peace, so therefore the Russians should want peace.

We indicate our eagerness to pursue disarmament even further, and the President says we will discuss any problem, listen to any proposal, seek any agreement, and take any action, to lessen the chances of war, as long as they don't sacrifice our ability to defend ourselves and our allies.

We plead, almost beg, for peace.

If the Communists would only forego the use of force—and there is no reason why they shouldn't as this country means them no harm—presumably we could all settle down to a friendly competition.

This all reminds us of the story of the man who encountered a thug. Both were armed. The thug suggested they throw their weapons away as mutual gestures of honest intentions. They did. You know what happened next.

Wisconsin Officials Back Antipiracy Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and I introduced legislation to curb the pirating of industries from established manufacturing centers through the use of tax-exempt municipal revenue bonds. Our bills are H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549.

We took this action following a particularly blatant example of freebooting which occurred in our home city, Milwaukee. On March 12, 1964, the Cutler-Hammer Corp., announced that it would move part of its manufacturing operations to Bowling Green, Ky.

This latter city had promised to build the Cutler-Hammer Corp. a new plant financed by securities exempt from Federal taxes. As a result, an estimated 750 jobs will be lost to our area. Of course, the impact of such a loss goes much farther than just 750 jobs. It also affects others in nonmanufacturing jobs who serve the 750 worker households.

Recently, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce issued a memorandum describing the effects of industrial relocations. The memorandum points out that for every 750 workers lost to an area, 490 other jobs are affected. At this point, I wish to insert the association of commerce study.

The memorandum follows:

THE ECONOMIC EFFECT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT EXPANSIONS OR RELOCATIONS

Since the recent announcement by Cutler-Hammer that it will relocate some of its Milwaukee operations in a new manufacturing facility at Bowling Green, Ky., questions have been raised regarding the economic effect of this move. The company has announced that the new plant will employ about 750 persons, but has not indicated how many jobs, if any, will be affected in Milwaukee.

If, however, 750 manufacturing workers are gained or lost in this area because of any type of plant relocation, the following would result: $5,325,000 in personal income per year will be gained or lost; $2,482,500 in retail sales per year will be gained or lost; $1,717,500 in bank deposits will be gained or lost; 750 households comprising 2,693 people will be gained or lost.

The following number of nonmanufacturing jobs to serve the 750 households would be gained or lost:

Wholesale and retail trade	143
Professional and related services	105
Business and personal services	46
Construction	38
Finance, insurance and real estate	30
Transportation, communications, and public utilities	15
Agriculture	7
Other businesses	106
Total	490

These statistics show how these dollars earned by the industrial employee turn over again and again. Although one community may be primarily affected by a plant moving in or out, all communities in the metropolitan area and the business enterprises located in them will feel the effect.

Mr. Speaker, because of our concern over the effects of plant piracy, and the growth of the use of tax-exempt bonds for industrial development purposes, Representative REUSS and I introduced bills which would not allow firms taking advantage of tax-exempt financing to deduct their rent in computing Federal income taxes.

In order to acquaint interested persons with our proposal, we prepared a fact sheet entitled, "Combating Piracy in the Marketplace," which follows.

COMBATING PIRACY IN THE MARKETPLACE: A FACT SHEET ON H.R. 10547 AND H.R. 10549

(Identical bills, introduced by Representative HENRY S. REUSS and Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private, profitmaking purposes)

MUNICIPAL ABUSES OF TAX EXEMPTION PRIVILEGES

H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549 are aimed at correcting blatant abuses of the Federal tax exemption privileges which have been granted to State and local government units. These privileges increasingly are being used to assist municipalities in pirating plants from established industrial centers, thereby creating unemployment and distress in those communities. The "freebooting" practice works this way: Government units or their dummy authorities use the traditional privilege of issuing securities exempt from Federal taxes to borrow money cheaply and build industrial plants or other commercial facilities. They then offer the facilities on long-term leases to private corporations, attempting to lure them from their established locations.

This is a gross misuse of the tax exemption privilege. When the Federal Government sacrifices tax revenues on municipally issued securities, it provides a subsidy to local government. This burden on the Federal taxpayer can be justified only when the subsidy benefits public facilities and services like schools, roads and sewers. When the subsidy results in "state socialism"—permitting local governments to own and operate industrial facilities in competition with private enterprises—it must be stopped.

HOW THE LOOPHOLE IS EXPLOITED

A State, city, county or their chartered entities can use this tax exempt privilege in one or all of four ways to build up an alluring deal for a private business corporation:

First, a local government with a good credit rating can borrow money 1 to 2 percent cheaper than even the most solid industrial corporations. When the local government uses this cheaper money to build a new, modern plant for a business on a lease agreement, a business can get an efficient, economical layout at a far lower cost than if it financed its own construction.

Second, a company occupying leased quarters can charge off all of its rental costs as a "business expenditure" for tax purposes. When a firm is dealing with a local government, rather than a private landlord, these expenditures can be manipulated. It can elect to pay a high annual rent over a short period of time, or a low annual rent over a longer period—whichever will benefit the company more as a tax deduction.

Third, when business property is owned by a local government and leased the lessee is under no legal requirement to pay local property taxes during the term of the lease.

Fourth, the local government issuing the bonds can offer to sell them to the corporation leasing the new plant. This enables the corporation to earn tax-free income at the same time that it enjoys lower rental cost due to tax exempt financing. When steps one and four are combined, the company is, in effect, paying rent with its left corporate hand and taking it back as tax-free interest payments with its right hand. The financial gain in this situation is very substantial and very attractive.

WEEDLIKE GROWTH OF THE TREND

The attractiveness of these tax-subsidized lures has resulted in a weedlike increase in tax-exempt industrial revenue bonds. Since 1957 the level of borrowing has risen rapidly to an annual rate well over $100 million in 1963. As the tide of tax-exempt bonds rises, one State after another has decided that it had better get in the swim. In 1960 only 9 States allowed local governments to use these bonding practices; today 27 States have passed authorizing legislation. If nothing is done to stop this movement, every State in the Union will be forced to follow suit—if only for its own self-protection. The resultant cutthroat competition will be at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers.

A CLOSE-TO-HOME EXAMPLE

On March 12, 1964, the Cutler-Hammer Corp. of Milwaukee announced that it would move part of its manufacturing operations to Bowling Green, Ky., sometime in 1965. Some 800 skilled workers will lose their Milwaukee jobs as a result. While the company stated that lower wages and taxes in the new location were responsible for its decision, an important reason could well be the offer by the city of Bowling Green to build a new factory for the electrical equipment company. The city council on March 13, 1964, voted to authorize the issuance of $6,500,000 in tax-free revenue bonds to build a plant for Cutler-Hammer Corp.

THE PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE REMEDY

The companion measures introduced by Representatives REUSS and ZABLOCKI would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so that whenever proceeds from tax-exempt State or local government industrial revenue bonds are used to construct facilities for rent to private industries, such firms may not deduct the rent paid in computing Federal income tax liabilities. The bills would apply to all revenue bonds issued on or after January 1, 1964.

The proposal is limited to revenue bonds, because such bonds have been most widely used to borrow capital for plant construction and subsequent rental to business concerns. While it is no less damaging to the public interest for States and local governments to issue general obligation bonds for the same purpose, the practice is not widespread. Should it become so, it may be necessary for Congress to consider seriously the removal of tax exemption privileges for all State and local government securities.

H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549 currently are pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. Representatives REUSS and ZABLOCKI have requested Chairman MILLS of that committee to obtain a report on the measures from the Treasury Department, and to hold hearings at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, this fact sheet recently was sent to a number of Wisconsin residents interested in the industrial development and welfare of their region and State. It was an attempt to alert them to the dangers of plant piracy and enlist their support for H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549. At this point I wish to include some of the letters we have received in reply.

The letters follow:

CITY OF GREEN BAY,
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
April 16, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: Thank you for the fact sheet on H.R. 10547 and H.R.

10549 introduced by you aimed at curbing the tax exempt financing of industrial facilities, the passage of which may slow up the pirating of Wisconsin industries.

Naturally this legislation is of interest to every individual such as myself who is concerned with Wisconsin's industrial development.

Without the pirating of our Wisconsin industries by other States we have enough to contend with through our Wisconsin tax structure but when municipalities in especially the Southern States will offer land without cost and authorized bond issues in the millions to build new plants, we here in Wisconsin just cannot compete.

While we have not felt this particular phase of pressure against our industrial development efforts here in Green Bay, from the newspapers the last month it certainly has affected Milwaukee.

You state that the bill is currently pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. It will probably draw heavy opposition from southern Representatives because if the ability to float tax exempt revenue bonds to build industrial plants is removed from them there may be a sudden stop to northern plants moving into the South.

Please keep me informed as to the progress of these bills before the committee.

Yours truly,

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
R. C. BRETH, *Secretary.*

CITY OF TWO RIVERS,
April 15, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: I read with great interest your fact sheet on H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549. I am in substantial agreement with this legislation as it affects revenue bonds for financing of new industrial plants.

In the past 5 years I have become deeply concerned over the increasing use of supposedly public dollars for private industrial use and the somewhat popular front to eliminate the tax-exempt status of State and local bonds. It is essential, in my judgment, that every means possible be exerted to preserve the tax-exempt status of State and local government bonds and, possibly, the best method is by enactment of a Federal statute to curb present-day abuses of industrial financing through issuance of revenue bonds.

I have informed several industrialists in Two Rivers of your bill since they have informed me that they intend to expand their operations in the State of Mississippi for tax purposes under a rental arrangement. Also, another consideration for southern expansion is low electrical rates as provided by REA, and to this there is, apparently, no answer.

I would urge you to be extremely sensitive to the preservation of the tax-exempt status of State and local bonds for valid school and public works purposes during hearings on H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. BROUCEK,
City Manager,
City of Two Rivers.

BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF
HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
Green Bay, Wis., April 21, 1964.

GENTLEMEN: Your thoughtfulness in mailing to me the fact sheet on H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549 is very much appreciated.

The manipulations such as described therein had not previously come to my attention. I quite heartily agree that effective action should be taken immediately, to preclude the spread of these iniquitous practices.

Wisconsin has perhaps already suffered extensively through the pirating of our industry by other States. I am glad to know that you propose to do something about it.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. SAINSBURY,
Brown County Port Director.

NEW BERLIN, WIS.,
April 13, 1964.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: The New Berlin Chamber of Commerce, of which I am the president, roundly approves your bills H.R. 10547 and 10549, and will support them in every way we can.

Our organization has been active in the field of industrial development for our area and for the State of Wisconsin. We have worked diligently and believe we have obtained some accurate answers.

First, we believe that working to attract large, well financed companies, although it should not be entirely neglected, is jousting with the wind. If we have what they want they will seek us out.

Second, we do believe that the source of industrial expansion with which we can work effectively is the small- and middle-sized industry. We know they are not likely to move from the State. We know that progressive, well managed small industry will create a magnetic force to help attract large industry to the State. One of the major requirements of large industry are good, well financed subcontract and service facilities. But most of all, if we act now, we will retain our high national ranking for skilled labor, technically trained personnel, and sound management abilities. With the resources we now have available in Wisconsin, given some financial help, we can pull our State up by its bootstraps industrially.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CARR.

OSHKOSH, WIS.,
April 16, 1964.

HON. MR. ZABLOCKI: Re your letter "the Pirating of our Industries," I agree with you on the need for remedial action to curb the use of State and municipality credit for manufacturing facilities, but let's look at ourselves in Wisconsin a bit. We as a State have been rather notorious in throwing curves and roadblocks at industry in the form of high taxes, etc. I feel it behooves us as a State to put ourselves in a more favorable tax climate as it applies to industry. Why try to clobber industry here? This in itself is encouragement to look elsewhere. The tax climate here has continually been under fire. Political hay is made with who should pay (sources of tax revenues). Neighboring States meanwhile benefit. The long-term result of industry being unhappy in Wisconsin of course will be losses of jobs, losses of State tax revenues. This economic vitality we need, so necessary to provide the growth and advances we all want to see in Wisconsin.

I agree with your analysis but I do say, "Let's not blame it all on the financing opportunities of other States. Let's look at Wisconsin objectively."

I am enclosing sheets from a recent publication that is rather typical extolling the advantages in competing States. The competition is tremendously fierce and I do not believe that Wisconsin as a community has really awoke to the real need of improving its competitive position.

Sincerely,

H. E. OLSEN.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in this body to make a thorough study of their own congressional districts with regard to plant piracy. Many will find that established industries in their communities are vulnerable to the practice. One good method of correcting the situation and ending freebooting in the marketplace is enactment of the proposal embodied in H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549. It is my hope that my colleagues will give this legislation their close attention and strong support.

Support of Congressman Bruce Alger's Statement on Dallas, April 27, 1964

SPEECH
OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is neither fair nor reasonable that the happenstance of a tragic presidential assassination that occurred in Dallas should blacken the city's name. This could have happened in any city. As it turned out, President Kennedy was the victim of the poisonous venom of Marxist hatred, and surely this venom is brewed in the snake of communism, not in an American city.

I hope the report of the Assassination Commission helps to remove the unfounded stigma that many columnists, editorial writers, and others seek to fasten upon Dallas because of Oswald's foul deed. I hope too that this report will fully explain Oswald's visit to Mexico City and whether or not, while he was there, he was in contact with any representatives of Castro's Cuba and whether or not this had anything to do with the assassination of an American President.

Marxist-Leninism's doctrine, embracing the use of violence to overthrow this country, is a tenet that cannot be dispelled even by thinking the "unthinkable thoughts" that some contend we must think to achieve coexistence with communism in an ever-narrowing world living in the shadow of nuclear obliteration. Of course, the mess we are in today largely results from our turning the other cheek as Communist aggression has succeeded in country after country, place after place ever since the end of World War II. No wonder our allies hesitate to side with America the way we retreat, fail to act after talking big, and even dissipate the rallying point that was the confrontation of the so-called quarantine of Cuba in October of 1962.

It behooves all Americans to study well and carefully the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, including some important individuals who have much to do with American foreign policy. These tenets have not changed. Nor can they, whether espoused by a Russian Communist or a Chinese Communist.

From some sources it has been suggested that daring to think unthinkable thoughts about matters such as Communist dedication to the destruction of America is courageous. In a very similar way, some of the attacks on the city of Dallas have been equally infamous.

Mr. Speaker, about the only thing one can say of such talk is that it does not take courage to talk like a coward.

Address by S. E. Babington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Bankers Association held its annual meeting in Minneapolis earlier this month. At that meeting, Mr. S. E. Babington concluded his term of president of the Independent Bankers Association.

Mr. Babington is president of the Brookhaven Bank & Trust Co., Brookhaven, Miss., located in my congressional district.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Babington's keynote address to the Independent Bankers Association which was delivered on April 10, 1964. It follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT S. E. BABINGTON BEFORE 30TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION, IN MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., ON APRIL 10, 1964

It is my privilege and special task to keynote the 30th annual convention of our association. This opening address is traditionally assigned to the president, and it becomes for him an opportunity to report briefly upon his term, and to sound a tone that indicates the harmony and mood of our gathering.

My year as president has been a most interesting and eventful one, a busy and a satisfying year. One condition of the office is that one travels a great deal. I have covered many thousands of miles by plane and train and private car to represent the Independent Bankers Association.

My official trips have taken me frequently to Washington, D.C., and to Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and up and down my own home State of Mississippi. My itinerary has crisscrossed our land.

Not all my travels have reached their destination. A few weeks ago, I was invited to represent the Independent Bankers Association at the White House ceremony in which the new Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. Joseph Barr, was invested by President Johnson with the responsibilities of his office. I set out by train, going 125 miles south to New Orleans to board a plane for Washington, but I found Moisant Airport there socked in with foul weather that blocked all air travel. I had to ask our Washington manager, Herschel Schooley, to take my place.

Two of the official trips have been sad ones; to represent our association at the funeral services of my predecessors, Past Presidents Leo Seal, of Gulfport, Miss., who headed our association in 1948–49, and William J. Bryan, of Nashville, Tenn., who presided over the organization in 1954–55.

I wired my condolences to the bereaved family of another past president who died during the past year, Bert Matthews, of Stanford, Mont., and my place at his rites was filled appropriately by our own director emeritus, Ben DuBois, of Sauk Centre.

And belatedly we learned of the passing of still another past president, L. B. McBride, of Fort Collins, Colo. Our deep regret was communicated to his family.

My travels also took me to meetings of our five standing committees held in Minneapolis, St. Louis, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. Their chairmen will have reports to offer the convention later today and tomorrow. Another trip took me to the campus of the University of Mississippi, where I addressed a club of future financiers and sought to inspire them with the principles of independent banking.

As our articles of incorporation declare, the supreme authority of the association is reposed in the general convention, the principal deliberative meeting of the association each year.

Before we launch into our business discussions, it is well, in the words of Robert Burns, to see ourselves as others see us. Who are we, and what do we stand for?

We are a forthright advocate of the independent way of banking and a champion of the dual banking system, an American system now into its second hundred years.

We have the reputation of being a banker group that stands up to be counted, a group that has the courage to express its convictions.

We are more than 6,100 strong—we are independent bankers serving our communities and our country. For 33 years, we have carved a record of honest and aggressive work for the Nation's independent banks.

Robert L. Myers of Lemoyne, former Pennsylvania secretary of banking and former president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, declared in a speech in St. Paul last fall that he deeply respects and admires the forthright vigor and dedication of the Independent Bankers of America in supporting the principles that we espouse.

By nature and experience and conviction, we are essentially a controversial group because we champion and defend the small banks. Fifty-five percent of our more than 6,000 members are banks with assets of $5 million or less. We speak for this large segment of banking, the community, or country bank, and we do it with a firm, clear voice on all banking issues that are important to us. We willingly assume this specialized role, which other bankers' associations cannot.

We see our function as a constructive one. We aim to retain and fortify the independent bank, and to improve banks and banking in general. The independent banker knows his community well and can best serve it. He can act independently, and if he needs to augment his own resources, he can quickly command through a correspondent banking connection anything from sizable chunks of cash to an armored car. His roots are deep in the community which has his loyalty. It is his home.

A wise old banker I know has been serving bank customers since he began as a bookkeeper and teller 55 years ago. This man is deeply convinced that the smaller banking institutions serve our people better than branches, satellites, or subsidiaries of some distant corporation.

This veteran declares that the true story of just how the small bank serves its community has not yet been adequately told. He observes that "the little guy"—and that includes most of us—gets much better banking service from a relatively small bank than he would from a very large bank.

A bank must fit its community and serve it well. Its loan files mirror the economic strivings of the town. The executive officer of one independent bank I know in Minnesota moves from a 4-H Club member loan of $12 to an industrial loan of $45,000 with equal ease, authority, and confidence.

If we are to accomplish our mission as bankers in our communities, the men who meet the grassroot needs, we cannot advance by following the lines of least resistance. To be true to our trust as independent community bankers, we must hold to the public interest as our main concern.

We are going to have to make all the loans and investments possible in our own local communities. We must exert every effort to see to it that no deserving local enterprise is strapped for cash or credit. We're going to have to use creative imagination to keep our money at work in our communities. Our job is to be constructive. We cannot be complacent. We cannot be insulated in any way from local risk.

There are banks which have grown too big to give the fast personal service appreciated by depoistors and borrowers. People like to do business with banks where they can talk directly with the officers who make the final decisions. So far as possible, we must continue to supply this type of personalized service.

During my term as president, our new office in Washington, D.C., has functioned effectively through its first full year of operation. It channels intelligence two ways: by informing Congress, administration and Government leaders of the views of grassroots bankers, and by keeping our members informed of all pertinent and meaningful developments in the Nation's Capital that have a bearing on banking.

The association opened the office in Washington 14 months ago because we needed a closer link with the agencies to whom Congress has entrusted the supervision of banks. Our association has always believed it is prudent and judicious periodically to check upon these agencies. We can do so most accurately, quickly and efficiently through our own on-the-spot observer. Hersch Schooley, our Washington manager, has been intimately associated with Capitol Hill for 20 years, and is doing a fine job for us.

The business of our association's Washington office and the work of our manager there is oriented to what is happening in the Congress and in the various agencies of the Federal Government that deal with matters affecting banking and the economy of Main Street, where most of our banks are located. The large and varied number of matters that must be examined, considered, and reported upon so that the membership of the association is adequately informed at any given period is really amazing. The number of people in key congressional and Government posts with whom we maintain personal contacts is impressive.

Our organization, more than any other I know, is a dynamic example of the time-honored motto, "E pluribus unum," which means "From many, one." Each of us individually represents only one banking institution. In this role, our influence is primarily local. As an organization, working together for common objectives, we command more widespread respect and attention. This has been manifested to me repeatedly each time I have traveled as your president, particularly on my visits to our Nation's Capital.

At the instigation of my predecessor, Bradford Brett, the hearings by the House Banking Committee into conflicts between State and Federal banking laws were scheduled by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN shortly after our 1963 convention in New Orleans.

Pressure generated by the IBA's convention declarations and spearheaded by the vigorous and determined Mr. Brett as spokesman for the IBA, is the factor that led to the hearings last April. Actually they were an investigation into the way that Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon conducts his office, and into charges that he had violated both the spirit and the letter of some State laws.

We provided witnesses, so did the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, and Mr. Saxon appeared in his own behalf. We endorsed the modernization moves in banking that Comptroller Saxon stimulated. But at the same time, plainly and explicitly, we criticized Mr. Saxon for what he has done to encourage expansion of multiunit bank-

ing systems and to harm the dual banking system. He has done irreparable damage to dual banking by his striving to push national banks into a competitively advantageous position in disregard of State banks, State regulations, State laws.

We are not opposed to modernizing bank methods. We did, however, want to make Mr. Saxon less capricious and willful. We wanted to make decisions of the comptroller subject to challenge by specific legal procedures. We recommended to the House Banking and Currency Committee that the National Bank Act be amended to provide:

1. Specific standards to follow in considering applications for new bank charters. At a minimum there should be adequate proof that there is a reasonable public demand for a new bank at the proposed location, that there will be a sufficient volume of business to assure solvency, that the granting of a new charter will not endanger the solvency of other financial institutions in the vicinity, and that granting the new charter will not adversely affect competition or the public interest, and will not tend toward concentration of control of bank assets in the relevant competitive area.

2. A public hearing whenever an existing bank directly affected expresses opposition and a desire to be heard. The hearing should be conducted as an adversary proceeding, permitting both sides to present evidence and to cross-examine the other's witnesses. This is the proved method of testing an applicant's assertions and eliciting the true facts.

3. The Comptroller make findings of fact and conclusions, and to publish the same following the hearing; and provide for a court review, on appeal by either side. This is a minimum protection against unreasonable or arbitrary action.

Adoption of these amendments would bring the National Bank Act more in line with the laws of the various States in this area. The Comptroller repeatedly has criticized State banking laws as being obsolete and archaic. It seems to me that he could make this sort of criticism with better grace if he did some tidying up in his own backyard first.

I would point out, too, that the amendments we proposed might well have prevented the Southern Hills National Bank debacle in Tulsa.

When we appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee during the Saxon hearings late last April and early in May, we were in the unpopular role of "pioneer" critics of the Comptroller. Even the Republican members of the committee joined in praising and defending him.

Subsequent events have sustained our position of a year ago. Committee experience with the Comptroller during the past year has changed the opinions of many of the members regarding him.

In the daily press recently, I noted that Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, and a committee member, has asked for a congressional investigation into the chartering of the District of Columbia National Bank in 1962. Bobby Baker, former majority secretary of the Senate, was one of the original stockholders. The story I saw was headlined, "Comptroller Silent After Probe Demand." It struck me that for the Comptroller to be silent on any subject is noteworthy, especially when one measures this silence against his record of volubility.

The New York Times recently carried a story headlined, "Johnson Aid Tells Saxon His Opinions Are Too 'Contrary.'" The story told how Budget Director Kermit Gordon had written a congressional committee that the Comptroller's opposition to a securities bill was at variance with the views of the administration. The rebuke was termed "unprecedented," but so is the Comptroller. The story also said the letter could not possibly have been written without the knowledge and consent of President Johnson.

If I were advising the President, I would urge that he appoint Mr. Saxon Ambassador to Nyasaland, or someplace equally remote. Certainly his often-demonstrated talent for disruption would be better suited for the climate of ferment and trouble that now prevails in many other parts of the world.

While encouraging keen competition within, banking should remain calmly unified for the reassurance of the Nation. We must not pit one system, the national, against another, the State-chartered banks.

This would show banking as a house divided against itself. We desire competition between banks but harmony between the two counterbalanced systems. May the banker giving the best service prosper. As for systems, we look for cooperation from the Federal Government; equality of opportunity, and a set of fair ground rules under which both systems can flourish and provide ever better service to the American people.

It is our belief that the States can best decide what is right for them in banking. People of Minnesota or any other State know best what they need, and they are the ones who should decide, not an arbitrary Federal official.

It is our association's conviction, based on careful observation down through the years, that branch banking leads to monopoly, while unit banking preserves that traditional American concept, the small business enterprise.

If there were some safe and sure way to see that so-called limited branch banking would in fact remain limited, we would have less reason to oppose branching. But having seen constant pressure grow for easing the wraps on branching makes us skeptical about any new proposal to permit branching on a limited scale.

We believe that improved transportation through the automobile has greatly increased people's mobility and weakens the arguments for branch banking.

Essentially, I believe, the restriction of branching here in Minnesota and in other States is intended to allow each bank to grow naturally in the community it is chartered to serve.

The independent banker believes in growing through natural development under fair rules, as contrasted with expansion under rules that permit bank holding companies and big branch systems to shove their competitors off the street.

Our policy as an organization is to oppose branching in those States where it is not permitted and to restrict it in those States where it is allowed. The reason for this stand is that we favor a diffused system of banking that offers the greatest possible number of alternative sources of credit.

Further, we are opposed to concentration of money and credit. One needs to go no further than the annual report of the FDIC to learn that the heaviest concentration of deposits among a small number of banks exist in those States with statewide branching. The next heaviest concentration is in limited branching States, while the nonbranch States have the lowest concentration of all.

There are faults in the unit banking system, but to try to solve them with branch banking is a case of the cure being worse than the disease.

Because of the fact that our Nation is currently enamored of bigness, it is harder to arouse bankers to the dangers of branching. Some feel there is more profit, efficiency and economy in the big jumbo-size package.

The trend toward multiunit systems has been increasing, but not without significant opposition from supporters of independent banking. Our defense of the unit bank is accomplished largely through legislation. With metropolitan and suburban district representatives increasing through the swing of population cityward, more legislators and Congressmen tend to view branching tolerantly.

We must also defend against the holding company or satellite device for dodging State laws against branching. The only factor that restrains holding company bank expansion is the Federal Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. Our association was instrumental in securing enactment of that law.

Although the act is far from perfect, it has halted interstate acquisitions of banks by holding companies. It also has slowed holding company activities in a number of States. Intrastate expansion of holding companies can best be accompolished by laws such as those already in effect in a number of States, including Illinois, Nebraska, Indiana, and Pennsylvania.

If we are to be consistent with our policy and true to our convictions, we will support legislation to restrict or dissolve holding companies.

The banking system as we know it in America today will be destroyed by holding company and merger activities unless a sincere and effective effort is made to maintain a competitive structure in the field of banking.

The past year brought a momentous decision of the Supreme Court that established helpful ground rules on mergers. The high Court ruled that the Clayton Antitrust Act does apply to bank mergers, and that control of one-third of the bank assets in a metropolitan area constitutes an undue concentration. In rejecting the Philadelphia National-Girard Trust merger, the Supreme Court ruled that any combine is unlawful if competition may be lessened substantially in some commercially significant geographic market.

During the past year, our members clearly indicated their conviction that regulation of the banking industry should not be turned over to centralized economic planning by a few individuals at the Federal level. Our members prefer to continue to rely on the checks and balances of the dual banking system, and they intend to see that competitive enterprise that has made our Nation great shall be continued in our banking system.

To meet the steadily increasing challenge that threatens our independence, we need increased banker interest, greater awareness of how government supervision functions, and additional leadership and active participation in making our views known and felt, both in the statehouse and in Washington.

Our bankers, seeing the complexity of issues facing our industry, are boning up on broad economic principles. We are all reading more, trying to enrich our knowledge of economic laws that will guide our footsteps. Competent management people who know the economic facts of life are more needed than ever in banking these days.

I believe every banker should keep posted on politics, the practical science of government. He should get to know the actual workings of the two-party system, and insist that good men are given the reins. The only way we can insure that the changes in banking are best for our banks is to shape these changes through the people we delegate to conduct our government procedures.

We challenge our members to cooperate actively in strengthening National and State laws that restrain the expansion of multibank systems.

From any fair point of view, commercial banks have served the American people better, in greater detail and in broader range, than any other form of financial institution. Since few outside the banking industry are aware of this, commercial bankers should unite in advertising all the services the banks offer to the public.

Commercial banks can offer all that the competition can, and much, much more.

Banks should show what they can do. This is the positive way. We must sell our banks aggressively as the department store of convenient financial services.

I want to assure you that our struggle to preserve independent banking is necessary and very much worthwhile.

If the trend toward monopoly is not stoutly resisted, if the big and the powerful have their way about unrestricted growth, if the big are permitted to get bigger abruptly through mergers, then there will soon come a day when we awaken to find we have become just a nation of clerks. We will awaken to find we are an army of automatons moving in lockstep, with no power of decision, no role of responsible authority, no way of intelligent resourcefulness to meet our own community's specific needs.

The prospect is not attractive. For the public, for ourselves, and for our children we owe our utmost effort to maintain a system that distributes economic power throughout our society. This is a corollary to the basic principle of our form of government, which seeks to insure that decisions vital to our general welfare are made by many, not by a few.

Thank you for your kind attention.

AAUW Honors Dr. Dorothy M. Quynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of Frederick, Maryland's renowned citizens was the late Dr. Dorothy M. Quynn, world famous author, historian, and lecturer. Dr. Quynn's article on Johann Friedrich Amelung published in the Maryland Historical Society magazine in 1948 was largely responsible for renewed interest in and subsequent excavations at the historic Amelung Glassworks site in New Bremen, Md. As a tribute to this outstanding woman's life and works, the Frederick, Md., Branch of the American Association of University Women is working toward the establishment of a Dorothy Mackay Quynn Fellowship.

Under permission to extend my remarks I include here the interesting life story of Dr. Dorothy M. Quynn which appeared in the April 7 edition of the Frederick, Md. News.

The article follows:

AAUW IS ESTABLISHING FELLOWSHIP TO HONOR THE LATE DR. DOROTHY M. QUYNN—LECTURE ON AMELUNG TO BE GIVEN BY CORNING OFFICIAL

As a tribute to the late Dr. Dorothy Mackay Quynn the Frederick Branch, American Association of University Women, is working to establish a Dorothy Mackay Quynn Fellowship.

The first benefit will be a lecture to be held April 18 at 8:15 p.m. in the Frederick High School Auditorium. Paul N. Perrot, director of the Corning Museum of Glass, will speak on the excavations at New Bremen, the site of the Amelung glass factory.

The late Dr. Dorothy Mackay Quynn and her husband, Dr. William Quynn, a professor at the University of Maryland made their home at Amelung for a number of years.

Mr. Perrot was in Frederick County in October of 1963 when excavations were in process at the site of the new Bremen Glass manufactory of John Frederick Amelung, south of here near Flint Hill and Park Mills. Mr. Perrott is administrative director of the excavation, which closed its second season in 1963.

This article is the first of three which will cover Dr. Quynn, Amelung and the AAUW benefit lecture on the New Bremen excavations.

Dorothy Mackay Quynn was born in San Francisco, Calif., in 1899. She attended the local schools and received her B.A. and M.A. from the University of California. From there she went to France for further study, and in 1921 received her first AAUW fellowship to do research in Paris for the completion of her doctorate.

She was awarded that degree in 1923 from the University of Paris and five years later got another AAUW fellowship to do research on the history of the University of Orleans, also in France. Her study and subsequent action was to be of inestimable value to that university later on.

Having completed her formal studies Dr. Quynn returned to the United States to start a career of college teaching that was eventually to take her from coast to coast. Her first position was about 1923 in the history department at Mills College in her home State, her last with the University of Maryland in 1948. In between those dates she taught at West Virginia, Duke and Goucher. It was at Duke University in 1930 that she saw again Dr. William R. Quynn whom she had first met in 1926 on an Atlantic crossing. In 1934 they were married.

Dr. Quynn never discontinued her writing. Her published works range from medieval hospitals and universities in France, to the migration and thefts of art treasures in Europe, to several histories on France, England, Scotland, the United States, and Maryland. Many Fredericktonians will remember Mrs. Quynn as a lecturer. She was popular not only here but also in France where she spoke at the Institute de Paris and at the Society for Napoleonic Studies. For all her varied accomplishments she was both well known and highly honored.

In 1947 Dr. and Mrs. Quynn purchased the historic Amelung Mansion at New Bremen. They were not to live there for a few years because in 1948 Dr. Quynn, who is a professor at the University of Maryland, was named director of the University of Maryland graduate study program in Paris. Mrs. Quynn was named codirector. Their work kept them in France until 1950. (Over a period of 30 years the Quynns lived in France for a total of 8.)

In 1948 Dr. Dorothy Quynn made a truly beau geste to another university. During her studies at Orleans she had microfilmed many of the records of that university. The German bombardment destroyed these records and in 1948 Mrs. Quynn was able to donate to the Archives of Orleans a large amount of microfilm. In the spring of 1961 she was invited to participate in and read a paper at the annual commemoration at Orleans for Joan of Arc, which that year were combined with the reopening of the university, closed since that French Revolution. The French Government recognized her works by awarding her the Academic Palms in 1950. The Archeological and Historical Society of Orleans made her a member. The only other American ever selected was Benjamin Franklin.

In 1948 Mrs. Quynn also wrote an article for the Maryland Historical Society magazine on Johann Friedrich Amelung, now available in pamphlet form at the local libraries. It was this study, together with the visit of the director of the Corning Museum, that was responsible for the renewed interest in and subsequent excavations at New Bremen. She also wrote a biography of Barbara Haller Fritchie. This was of personal interest to her as the father of her husband was Daniel Haller Quynn, the great-great nephew of Barbara Fritchie. Locally she was active in the Frederick Historical Society and the AAUW, serving the latter as president.

In 1959, at the age of 60, Dr. Dorothy Quynn was awarded a third AAUW fellowship, this time to work on the biography of Betsy Patterson, the Baltimore girl who married Napoleon's brother. At the time of her death, May 31, 1963, she had completed the necessary travels and research. Much of the work was done, and her husband is now completing the book.

Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, at Dedication of the New Law School, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., Saturday, April 25, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Indiana were honored on April 25 with the appearance of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren at the dedication of the new Law School at Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Ind.

Secretary Rusk's address was primarily a report on a 10-day trip across the Pacific Ocean from which he had only recently returned. I am pleased to make a part of the RECORD the important and timely remarks of Secretary Rusk concerning the current situation in the western Pacific:

ADDRESS BY HON. DEAN RUSK

President Kretzmann, Dean Stalland, Mr. Chief Justice, Congressman Halleck, members and friends of Valparaiso University, it is a great pleasure for me to be once more in Indiana and to be here at Valparaiso University in company with my friend from across the aisle, Congressman CHARLES HALLECK. One who has been deeply concerned for many years with foreign policy must pay respect to the indelible imprint which he made upon the history of our times while serving his country as majority leader in the 80th Congress at a time when we were picking up once more, on a bipartisan basis, our heavy responsibilities for the maintenance of peace through such measures as aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, and the beginnings of NATO. It was a special pleasure for me to respond to your kind invitation because it was so strongly endorsed by this distinguished public servant.

Please accept my warmest congratulations and best wishes as you dedicate this law school, an occasion celebrated by the presence of one of the greatest of our legal statesmen, the Chief Justice of the United States. It was my own personal aspiration to become a lawyer but a World War intervened. I have continued to marvel at the role of law in enlarging the freedom of those who are within its compass. I have long felt that the nature of our legal order has been much too much neglected in the education of the ordinary citizen. One can only express some measure of astonishment, for example, that the most pervasive and compelling aspect of our social environment is given so little attention in undergraduate or liberal arts education.

In our relations with the rest of the world, the building of a decent world order is our principal preoccupation—the subject of most of our effort, the content of most of our cables, the commitment of all of our representatives abroad. Little by little that decent world order is coming into being, and law is being given its chance to lay a healing hand upon disputes and to enlarge the area of freedom by allowing more confident prediction about what others will do. Therefore, it is a very special pleasure for me to be a part of this dedication event.

TRIP TO PACIFIC

There are many aspects of our foreign policy which I might discuss with you. But I shall make my talk tonight primarily a report on a 10-day trip across the Pacific, from which I returned Monday evening.

The security of the United States—and of the free world as a whole—is deeply involved in the western Pacific. The vital contribution to freedom being made by Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of China is, I believe, generally recognzied in the United States. We have a defensive alliance with each of those nations. All three were ratified overwhelmingly by the U.S. Senate. Only two Senators voted against the mutual security pact with Japan and only six against the security pacts with the Republics of Korea and China.

Southeast Asia also is vital to our security. Including the island countries off its shores, it has more than 200 million people. It contains rich agricultural lands and valuable mineral resources. Parts of it are relatively lightly populated. Standing at the crossroads between two oceans and two continents, it is a region of great strategic importance, not only to all the people who live in the great arc from Karachi to Tokyo but to the free world as a whole.

Our interest in the defense of that region is recognized through three defensive alliances: our direct mutual security pact with the Republic of the Philippines, ANZUS (our defensive alliance with Australia and New Zealand), and SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. All three of these treaties were ratified overwhelmingly by the Senate.

The Communists are eager to take over southeast Asia. They are trying hard to do so by means short of the overt type of aggression they attempted in Korea 14 years ago. They are attempting to win by subversion—and, in South Vietnam, by acts of terror and guerrilla warfare.

VIETNAM

This assault on the Republic of Vietnam was organized and is directed, supported, and supplied by the North Vietnamese Communist regime in Hanoi. Hanoi also directed, and continues to support, the Communists' threat to Laos, where there is presently an uncertain "peace."

The North Vietnamese spearheads of aggression are supported by the Communist regime in Peiping, which rules some seven hundred million people. And the assault on Vietnam is supported, at least verbally, by Moscow. For, in the upside down jargon of the Communists, this is a so-called "war of national liberation"—and a form of aggression which has the blessing of the Soviet as well as the Chinese Communists.

Fourteen years ago the Communists launched an open aggression against the Republic of Korea. Had that aggression been allowed to succeed, Japan would have come under a more direct threat and the psychological effects of an unchallenged Communist aggression would have been felt all over the world. Probably most of the free countries on the periphery of the Communist world in Asia would have felt it necessary to submit to Communist domination.

Since the Korean war, no Communist state has again ventured an all-out direct aggression. But they have not abandoned the technique of aggression through guerrilla warfare, sustained by infiltrating trained men and arms across national frontiers. That is the technique they are using in southeast Asia.

If the Communists were to succeed in their assault on South Vietnam, the consequences to us, and to the free world as a whole, would be very serious. The rest of southeast Asia would be in jeopardy, and saving it would be more costly, in blood and treasure, than defeating the aggression in South Vietnam. And, the loss of southeast Asia as a whole to the Communists would bring about a major shift in the balance of power. The south Asian subcontinent would be flanked and Australia would be directly threatened. Such an immense victory for the Communists might well undermine the will of free peoples on other continents to defend themselves.

These, very briefly, are the reasons why President Eisenhower decided to assist the Republic of South Vietnam; why, when the Communists stepped up their assault, President Kennedy decided to increase our assistance; and why President Johnson has increased it further and has promised that we will continue to help the Republic of Vietnam until this aggression against it is defeated.

SEATO MINISTERS MEET

The threat to southeast Asia was, of course, the principal subject before the meeting of the SEATO Council of Ministers, which I attended in Manila last week. This defensive alliance was signed in Manila nearly 10 years ago, following the Geneva Accords which brought to a close the war in Indochina in which France had been engaged. The purpose of the Manila Pact was to curb further Communist aggression in southeast Asia, and by a protocol, the protection of SEATO was extended to the three non-Communist states of former Indochina, should they request it. Cambodia and Laos have renounced that option. South Vietnam has not requested assistance from SEATO but is receiving help not only from the United States, but, on a small scale, from other individual SEATO members.

At the meeting in Manila last week, the eight SEATO members considered all aspects of the attack on South Vietnam. None suggested that the free nations should turn their back and walk—or run—away from this aggression. France was already committed to what it calls a political solution—that is to some form of so-called neutralization. But it did not submit any specific proposal along that line. The consensus of the other members was that so-called neutralization of South Vietnam would be only a device for turning it over to the Communists.

Indeed, seven of the eight members of SEATO had little difficulty in arriving at some clear-cut pronouncements concerning the assault on the Republic of Vietnam.

They agreed that it is an aggression and that it is "directed, supplied, and supported by the Communist regime in North Vietnam, in flagrant violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962."

They agreed that "the defeat of the Communist campaign is essential not only to the security of the Republic of Vietnam but to that of Southeast Asia," and that "it will also be convincing proof that Communist expansion by such tactics will not be permitted."

They also agreed that "the members of SEATO should remain prepared, if necessary, to take further concrete steps within their respective capabilities of fulfillment of their obligations under the treaty.

It should be noted that the seven members who agreed on these and related declarations are the regional members—Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand—and the two others which maintain military forces in the area: Great Britain and the United States.

The communique adopted at Manila was by far the strongest ever issued by a SEATO Council. It demonstrated that SEATO is far from moribund. It is a warning which Hanoi and Peiping would do well to heed.

THE PHILIPPINES

While in the Philippines I had the opportunity to talk at length with President Macapagal and his colleageus in the Philippine Government.

The Republic of the Philippines is a vigorous, thriving democracy, committed to constitutional procedures, combining political stability with economic and socal progress. Under President Macapagal's strong leadership, it is shouldering increasing responsibilities for preserving peace in southeast Asia.

The Philippine people have not forgotten Bataan and Corregidor, and General MacArthur's return to the Philippines. They remember that Filipinos and Americans fought side by side. They know that freedom does not come cheap but is for the strong in spirit.

We Americans are rightfully proud of our association with the Government and people of the Philippines, who share so fully with us a dedication to democracy and human rights.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA

At Taipei I had the opportunity to discuss with President Chiang Kai-shek and the members of his government a wide range of matters of common interest. The Republic of China is a rampart of freedom in the Western Pacific. We support it as the Government of China and we remain firmly opposed to any proposal to deprive it of its rightful place in the United Nations and to seat the Chinese Communists in its place.

The Republic of China continues to make remarkable economic and social progress. Its land reform and programs for rural development have been among the most successful in the world. Its citizens have achieved levels of well-being which contrast dramatically with the misery of their kinsmen on the mainland.

Many developing countries could profit from study of the programs of economic and social improvement which have been applied successfully on Taiwan. Also, the Republic of China is educating and training increasing numbers of men and women in various professions and skills which are in short supply in most parts of the world. These provide an expanding reservoir of technical advice and assistance on which other free nations are increasingly drawing.

In the people of the Republic of China, we have talented, vigorous, and resolute allies dedicated to freedom.

OUR POLICY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

In Vietnam, I talked at length with General Khanh and his colleagues as well as with Ambassador Lodge, General Harkins, and other members of our American team. These talks reinforced my confidence in the will and the ability of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to lead the people of that country to victory and a better life.

Our policy is to assist the Government and people of South Vietnam in achieving those objectives. As President Johnson said in New York Monday: "The statement of the SEATO allies that Communist defeat is essential is a reality. To fail to respond * * * would reflect on our honor as a nation, would undermine worldwide confidence in our courage, would convince every nation in south Asia that it must now bow to Communist terms to survive.

"So let no one doubt that we are in this battle as long as South Vietnam wants our support and needs our assistance to protect its freedom."

Our appraisal of the morale and capabilities of the Government and people of South Vietnam is not exclusively American. Seven members of SEATO—all of whom have representatives in South Vietnam—joined in saying: "The Government and people of the Republic of Vietnam have given eloquent testimony to their determination to fight for their country."

The SEATO Council also expressed its confidence in the "program of political and administrative reform, military action, pacification, and economic and social development recently instituted by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam." That favorable judgment was further reinforced in my own mind by what I saw and heard in Vietnam. General Khanh has both vigor and breadth of view. He believes that defeating the Communists requires a combination of military, political, economic and social programs. His objective is not only to root out the Communists but to improve the living standards of the Vietnamese people.

Actually, between the end of the Indo-Chinese war in 1954 and 1959, South Vietnam made great economic and social progress. Its achievements left the vaunted Communist paradise in North Vietnam far behind. Almost certainly that is why Hanoi reactivated the assault on South Vietnam in 1959.

The Communist campaign has, of course, held back South Vietnam's overall economic development. But I saw at first hand that progress continues even in the midst of war. I visited a modern synthetic textile plant and a modern papermaking plant near Saigon. About 200 miles northeast of Saigon I visited a "New Life" hamlet. This is in a relatively secure province—and one which General Khanh described as a "pilot province," an example of what can and will be done elsewhere as the Communists are rooted out. I visited also a large dam and hydroelectric installation built by the Japanese as part of their reparations agreement. This installation will also provide water for irrigation.

I believe that economic and social development should be accelerated in the relatively secure areas of the country. I discussed with General Khanh and his colleagues various ways in which our aid program might be improved and in which other free nations might provide useful assistance, both military and civilian. There is need for more people of several professions and vocations—not least, for more physicians. I believe that several free nations are prepared to send more help, both in people and in critical material.

The Vietcong have scored some gains in the last few months. They took advantage of two successive coups and the resultant turnovers in South Vietnamese administrative personnel to increase their efforts. They recaptured some of the more exposed strategic hamlets. They have managed to launch a few rather large-scale attacks, although they continue to rely chiefly on assassinations and small assaults.

General Khanh's objective is not only to "clear" but to "hold." With American assistance, he is moving ahead with training and equipping of local self-defense forces for villages and hamlets in the less-exposed areas, thus releasing regular troops for offensive actions against the Vietcong. He is increasing his security forces by some 50,000 men. I believe that his efforts are beginning to show results.

We can all take deep pride in the performance of the American military men who are training and supporting the South Vietnamese. We should take pride also in our civilian officials and their families, who work amid danger.

The Vietnamese people are energetic, intelligent, and quick to learn. They have a great economic potential. When they have won the peace and security which they are fighting for, and so fully deserve, they can become, I believe, one of the most prosperous people in that part of the world.

LAOS

In Laos, we support the Geneva Agreements of 1962 calling for a neutral independent country. We continue to support a government of national union with Prince Souvanna Phouma as Premier. However, we recognize that the Communist Pathet Lao and their North Vietnamese allies have not honored the Geneva agreements. There are still North Vietnamese military personnel in Laos inviolation of these agreements; and they assist the Pathet Laos in attacks on Government forces. The Communists exclude the National Government from the areas which they control and refuse to allow the International Control Commission to perform its peace supervision functions in those areas. The Communists also are actively at work trying to subvert areas under non-Communist control. And they still move men, weapons, and other supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam over the "Ho Chi Minh Trail" through Laos, in violation of the Geneva agreements.

There could be peace in Laos and throughout southeast Asia if Hanoi and Peiping would comply with existing agreements to which they solemnly subscribed. The issue of peace is just that simple.

WESTERN PACIFIC

Everywhere that I went on this trip to southeast Asia, my heart was warmed by the manifestations of friendship for the United States. And I have had the same experience during the two visits I have paid to Japan and Korea as Secretary of State.

Also I have found in the western Pacific countries widespread recognition of the economic failures of communism.

The notion that communism is a shortcut to the future for developing countries has been shattered by experience. Communism in China and North Vietnam is not only brutal but an abysmal economic failure. The Soviets have done better but their growth rate has dropped below that of Western Europe and the United States, not to mention Japan. And they have developed serious difficulties in feeding themselves. Indeed, Communist methods are a sure-fire means of reducing farm production.

While Communist China and North Vietnam are bogged down in a morass of misery, most of the nations of the Western Pacific continue to advance economically and socially. Japan, which had a large industrial base before the Second World War, keeps on forging ahead in production and living standards and is making increasingly significant contributions to the technical and economic advancement of other free Asian countries. Australia and New Zealand enjoy high living standards, of course, and are contributing positively to both the security and the well-being of countries to their "far north." The Philippines, Thailand, the Republic of China, and Malaysia have made noteworthy economic progress and, as they continue to surge forward, are able to increase their assistance to other countries.

Despite their economic failures—indeed, perhaps all the more because of these failures—the Asian Communists remain dangerous. Desperation might lead them to deeds which rational men would shun.

The dispute between Moscow and Peiping is partly about the means of promoting the Communist world revolution. The free world must take care not to let any Communists anywhere suppose that they can profit from aggression or militancy.

Most of the leaders and peoples of free Asia know that the free nations are far stronger than the Communist nations. In particular, they realize the power of the United States. What they are not always certain about is the resolve of the free world, including the United States, to deter or defeat aggression. They know that the foremost Communist objective is to get the Yankees to go home. They sometimes fear that we may in fact go home.

Our Armed Forces west of Alaska and Hawaii number in the range of 200,000 men. We have them there for the same reason that we have military forces in Western Europe and elsewhere: to protect the security of the United States, which is inseparable from that of the free world as a whole.

Our programs of military and economic assistance to the free nations of Asia serve the same end. We must take care that they are strong enough, well enough financed, to do the job.

On the trip from which I just returned, I gave renewed assurances that the United States has no intention of accommodating the Communists—of assisting their campaigns for world domination—by bringing the Yanks home. I said that we are in the western Pacific to stay until that part of the world is safe for freedom.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of April 24, 1915, a shocking and evil event befell the Armenians in Turkey. More than 1,000 Armenians, good and honorable persons from all walks of life, were arrested and imprisoned by the Turkish Government. From the moment of their arrest they were held incommunicado. A few days later they were deported under heavy guard and then they were brutally executed. The arrest and execution of these Armenians proved to be the beginning of the end of Armenian communities in Turkey. The extermination of the Armenians and their communities was carried out so effectively, so ruthlessly, that by the end of that year all Armenians had been uprooted from their homes. Some were massacred; some were starved to death; the lucky ones—only a few hundred thousand of them—were able to escape to neighboring Persia and Russian Caucasus. When the First World War came to an end, historic Armenian towns, the villages in which Armenians had lived from time immemorial, were dead towns and deserted villages. More than 1 million Armenians had lost their lives in this almost unprecedented human carnage, and those who had survived were on the verge of starvation. Such was the cruel and cushing legacy of World War I to the Armenian people.

Since that fateful April 24, Armenians everywhere observe the anniversary of that sad event as a national day of mourning, and pray for the blessed memory of the victims of Turkish genocide. On the observance of the 49th anniversary of that sad event, I join the Armenian people in their prayers.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 25, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 25, 1964.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS APPROVED

The House unanimously approved the Defense Department appropriation bill this week (H.R. 10939). The amount approved was $711,733,000 below the request of the President. An unusual feature of this appropriation bill—it was $460,743,000 less than we have spent to date for fiscal year 1964. The usual practice is to cut the appropriation bills below the budget request but up them over the spending for the previous year. In this case we made an actual cut in spending.

The committee report showed:

1. The funds appropriated will continue the maintenance of the strongest Military Establishment in the peacetime history of the United States.

2. The amounts provided will sustain and increase the military strength of the country.

3. Funds are provided to feed, clothe, and equip an armed force averaging 2,687,000 men and women in uniform; to support a total of 687 military installations; to maintain about 875 active naval vessels; maintenance of over 30,000 military aircraft; and the procurement of 2,655 additional military aircraft.

4. The bill provides funds for the construction of 53 new naval vessels and the conversion of 7 existing naval vessels and $1.6 billion for the procurement of Army equipment of all types.

WEAPONS SYSTEMS OF THE FUTURE

One of the most intriguing, and unfortunately for news value, highly classified parts of the Defense budget is that relating to research and development leading toward future weapons systems. Some points that can be stated in this area:

1. The most spectacular development in the past few years has been in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, including the Polaris.

2. The possibility of the development of a defense against the ICBM was heavily discounted in committee hearings. There is yet today no operational system which can make a nation invulnerable to attack from intercontinental ballistic missiles.

3. The current superior qualitative and quantitative military position which the United States holds is gratifying. But it must be noted being ahead does not necessarily insure that one will stay ahead.

4. Possible areas of development; a death-ray type of weapon evolving from laser research; nerve gases resulting from chemical and biological research; space platforms from which weapons can be launched; orbiting weapons which could deorbit enemy space weapons.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

Many in Congress have urged greater emphasis by the Navy on antisubmarine warfare.

There are essentially three fields of antisubmarine warfare.

1. Protection of the continental United States from submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

2. Protection of merchant shipping.

3. Protection of the naval fleet.

The most difficult area is the protection of the continental United States and much greater development must be made in this field.

This is a mere summary of the far-reaching Defense appropriation bill, but it gives some indication of where we stand in this vital matter.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT

President Johnson's announcement that he is ordering a complete study of the military manpower requirements and Selective Service is welcomed. For a number of years a group of Republican Congressmen, under the leadership of Congressman TOM CURTIS, have conducted a comprehensive review of the military manpower procurement system. This week this group presented some of its findings on the floor of the House.

It is my belief that such a study is needed, but I agree with the Committee recommendation that it should be conducted by Congress. As Congressman CURTIS stated:

"* * * a special Congressional committee to review this matter would be best because it is not just a question of the military establishment. That is the important thing, of course. We are trying to get manpower for the military establishment. But this has tremendous implications to the civilian society, and economic consequences, and it becomes very important that the committees that are concerned with this very problem of employment, and this so-called war on poverty, be included."

An overall study should be aimed at eliminating the draft and making careers in the military service more attractive so that our military manpower needs can be met through volunteers.

THE RAILROAD SETTLEMENT

The whole Nation is glad there will be no railroad strike. It should be pointed out, however, that round-the-clock meetings in the White House under constant pressure from the administration is not collective bargaining. Acceptance of this procedure will put the Federal Government squarely in the middle of labor relations from now on. It should also be noted in the settlement, the unions gained almost all their demands and the real issue, the cost of featherbedding to the American railroads and eventually the consumer has not been settled.

The Late Honorable Thomas J. O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to the late THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, a good and dutiful public servant. In his continuous and dedicated service to his city, State, and Nation he has set a high example for all of us of a life well lived. We mourn his passing and we shall miss him, and we hope that we shall be able to live up to his high principles of devotion and loyalty to his fellow man. I extend my heartfelt sympathies to his family and loved ones.

The Bronx 1914–64 Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a happy year for the Bronx, New York, which is celebrating the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Bronx County. I am proud to claim the Bronx as my birthplace, the borough where I grew up and received my education, where I found my loyal, lifelong friends. I had the privilege of serving the Bronx in the New York State Legislature from 1951 until 1960, when I was elected to represent the 22d District in the U.S. Congress and am honored to be serving my constituents in this great legislative body. I have witnessed the outstanding progress which has been made by our borough over the years, and I am certain the future holds even greater accomplishments in store for us.

The young student members of the Public School 51 Historical Society have prepared a Golden Jubilee publication which contains interesting articles. I congratulate them on their splendid journalistic ability. I am inserting their "newspaper" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to learn of our Bronx history, places of interest, early settlers of the area, facts concerning our borough's progress:

THE BRONX 1914–64 GOLDEN JUBILEE

PUBLIC SCHOOL 51 HISTORICAL SOCIETY,

April 1964.

RICHARD A. PETLUCK,
Adviser.
DANIEL F. ZECCOLA,
Principal.

DEAR BOYS AND GIRLS: To those of us who studied the history of our borough, the Bronx brings to mind the names of many heroes of American history. George Washington; the Marquis de Lafayette; President John Adams; President John F. Kennedy; Edgar Allan Poe; all have lived in the Bronx.

Once, not long ago, the Bronx was not a borough of New York City, but rather an area containing many small towns and villages. Many of these places bore interesting and unusual names, such as Melrose, Kingsbridge, Mosholu, Port Morris, Morrisania, Wakefield, West Farms, and many, many others.

Today, these towns live only in the memory of our oldest residents; but their names survive as the various sections of the Bronx. The towns are gone; their names forgotten by today's residents, but many of the buildings survive, and if you search carefully, you can still see a few of these old frame structures, some of which were built in the early 19th century.

There are so many wonderful things to see and do right here in our own borough that almost every hobby and interest can be satisfied. If your fancy turns to sports, there is skiing, ice skating, archery, and swimming, to name a few of the more popular. There are also sports with a foreign flavor such as bocci, hurling, cricket, and curling, which most of us have never seen, much less played.

Look around you the next time that you think that you have nothing at all to do. The Bronx has much to offer to those of us

who will just take the time to search for them.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. PETLUCK,
Guidance Counselor.

THE BOROUGH OF UNIVERSITIES

(By Theresa Ramirez)

For many years, the Borough of the Bronx has been known as "the Borough of Universities." This is due to the many institutions of higher learning within the borough.

One of the largest universities in the city is Fordham University, located at Fordham Road and Third Avenue. It was originally known as St. John's College. Two of the colleges attached to the university are the school of law and the school of pharmacy. The law school is one of the finest in the country.

Manhattan College is located in the northwest Bronx near Broadway. It is noted for its famous School of Engineering.

Hunter College, not far from Manhattan College is an extension of the main school located on Park Avenue in Manhattan. Many of the teachers in New York City have studied at this fine college. It was originally founded as a girl's school. After World War II, men were admitted for the first time.

New York University, or NYU, as it is popularly known, is also a branch of the main school, located in downtown Manhattan. On the uptown campus, many men have studied to be engineers. The renowned Hall of Fame of Great Americans is to be found on the Bronx campus.

The U.S. Maritime Academy on Throggs Neck is the finest nautical training school in the country. Here, men study to become ship's officers. The school is located on the grounds of old Fort Schuyler, which was built in the early part of the 19th century.

Mount St. Vincent's College is an all-girls Catholic College located in the Riverdale section of the Bronx.

One of the newest schools in New York City is the Bronx Community College, which is located in the old Bronx High School of Science Building.

PUBLIC SCHOOL 51, THE JAMES K. PAULDING SCHOOL

(By Ronald White)

James Kirke Paulding, for whom our school is named, was an author during the early part of the 19th century. He was the youngest son of William and Catherine Paulding. He was born in Putnam County in New York State where his family moved due to the Revolutionary War.

In the year 1807, he and Washington Irving published a humorous periodical which was called "Salmagundi." He also wrote several books, some of which are, "Westward Ho!", "A Sketch of Old England," and "A Life of Washington."

In the year 1838, Paulding was appointed Secretary of the Navy of the United States.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT

Two brothers were mayors of the two largest cities in the world at the same time.

Caleb Heathcote was the mayor of New York City at the same time that his brother was appointed lord-mayor of the city of London, England.

ANN HUTCHINSON

(By Carlos Periera)

Ann Hutchinson was born in Lincolnshire, England in the year 1598. She moved to Boston, Mass., with her husband, John Hutchinson, in 1634.

Ann was known for her teachings and her outspoken criticism of the Governors of the Colony. She held weekly meetings where only women were permitted to attend. Someone passing by heard her say that the church and the state must be separate in Massachusetts. For this she was placed on trial and was condemned to banishment.

The family went into the wilderness and finally reached Rhode Island where they were welcomed.

After the death of her husband, she again moved, this time to the Bronx, not far from Long Island Sound. There, she and her family, except for one daughter, were killed by a band of Indians in the year 1643.

While the exact location of the Hutchinson settlement is not known, it probably stood on what is now the Split Rock Golf Course in Pelham Bay Park.

EDGAR ALLAN POE

(By Mary Dionisio)

Edgar Allan Poe, the famous American author and poet, came to live in the town of Fordham in the western Bronx, in the year 1846. There he purchased an old farmhouse which was to be his home for 3 years.

He and his wife, Virginia, moved to the Bronx on the advice of a doctor, as Virginia was suffering from tuberculosis. It was believed that the good, clean air of Fordham might help to cure her of that terrible disease.

Virginia grew steadily weaker, until, on January 3, 1847, she died. She was buried in the cemetery of the Dutch Reformed Church of Fordham, which was located near theh corner of Kingsbridge Road and Sedgwick Avenue.

Poe continued to live in the Bronx until 1849, when he moved to Richmond, Va.

The cottage, built in the beginning of the 19th century, now stands in Poe Park, located on Kingsbridge Road and the Grand Concourse. In the early part of the 20th century, Poe Cottage, which stood on the south side of Kingsbridge Road, was moved to its present site. This was done to save the famous old house, as workmen were widening that road, and the house would have been torn down.

The house is open to the public and one can see furnishings of the period when Poe lived there.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT

One of the greatest lost treasures lies hidden somewhere in the Bronx.

During the Revolutionary War, the British ship *Hussar* sank near the shores of the Bronx. Accordingly to early records. the *Hussar* was bound for Boston with between $2 and $4 million in gold and silver coin and bars in her strong rooms. The money was to be used to pay the British soldiers stationed in the United States at that time.

Over the years, the place where the *Hussar* went down has been filled in without the treasure being recovered.

THINGS TO SEE AND DO IN THE BRONX

(By Howard Gooch)

Many of the parks in the Borough of the Bronx have areas set aside for the purpose of recreation. These areas are enjoyed by young and old alike and the activities range from baseball to bird watching, hiking to horseback riding.

The largest park in the Bronx is Pelham Bay Park, which is located in the northeast part of our borough. Some of the numerous activities you can take part in there are:

Golf, swimming at Orchard Beach, fishing, flying model airplanes, tennis, handball, archery, boat racing (college racing), boating, on Long Island Sound, hiking, picnicking, horseback riding.

Van Cortlandt Park is the second largest park in the Bronx. It can be easily reached by taking the Broadway IRT Subway to the last stop which is right at the edge of the park. This park has even more wonderful things to see and do:

Baseball, football, track meets, cross-country running, tennis, fishing in Van Cortlandt Lake, boating, soccer (also English football), hurling (Irish field hockey), cricket (English baseball), hiking, picknicking, handball, skiing, ice skating, golf, and sledding.

There are several other parks in the Bronx, each one having a variety of activities for boys and girls to enjoy. These are: (1) Bronx Park, (2) St. Mary's Park, (3) St. James Park, (4) Hunt's Point Park, (5) Joyce Kilmer Park, (6) Crotona Park, (7) Claremont Park, and (8) Macombs Dam Park.

Why not visit some of these parks during the summer. I think that you will have a wonderful time doing the different things at each of them.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT

The Bronx was once the Capital of the United States.

In the year 1797, Philadelphia, then the Capital of the United States, was visited by a terrible epidemic of yellow fever. Fearing for his family, President John Adams took his family to live in a large house in Eastchester, which is now part of the northeast Bronx. For several weeks, President Adams conducted the business of the Government while living in the Bronx.

Of all the boroughs of New York City, only the Bronx is a part of the United States.

The Borough of the Bronx, of all the five boroughs, is the only part of New York City which is attached to the mainland of the United States.

Manhattan and Staten Island, as the latter name implies, are islands. Brooklyn and Queens are located on Long Island.

The Bronx is connected to the mainland on the north where it borders on Westchester County. The Bronx is actually a peninsula, bordered on three sides by the waters of the Hudson and Harlem Rivers, Long Island Sound, and the East River.

THE VAN CORTLANDT MANSION

(By Rodrigo Forbes Sandra Knight)

The Van Cortlandt Mansion was built in the year 1748 by Frederick Van Cortlandt. The large, L-shaped building is a fine example of New York Georgian architecture.

The house is located in Van Cortlandt Park and is now a museum, cared for by the department of parks. The rooms are furnished in the period when the house was built. There is a fine collection of ancient arms and documents as well as tools and utensils of the colonial period.

A high, four-poster bed with steps attached is said to have been used by General Washington when he briefly occupied the house after the Revolutionary War.

To the north of the mansion is Vault Hill, site of the Van Cortlandt burial ground. Here, in 1781, General Washington ordered campfires burned to deceive the British while he withdrew his army for the battle of Yorktown, Va.

ST. PETER'S CHURCH

(By Raymond De Jesus)

St. Peter's Church, located on Westchester and Seabury Avenues, was built in 1885 and is the third church on the site. The congregation was formed and the first church erected in the year 1702. Many of the tombstones in the cemetery date to the 18th century.

The parish house, an older building than the present church, served as the New York State capital for a few days during the latter part of the 18th century. A fever plague broke out in New York City and the government was moved to the town of Westchester where St. Peter's Church was located.

The parish house is thought to be more than 200 years old. It was also used as the facilities of the Westchester Boarding School about 1820.

Welcome to the Building Service Employees' International Union Convention Being Held for the First Time in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to an important convention that will take place in California, in the city of Los Angeles during the first week of May. I refer to the 13th Annual Convention of the Building Service Employees' International Union—a large and influential organization which includes some 400 local unions and which represents the economic interest of approximately a third of a million Americans and their families.

California is pleased to welcome this first national convention held by the BSEIU in our State.

DAVID SULLIVAN, PRESIDENT, BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES' INTERNATIONAL UNION

The Building Service Employees' International Union is a growing, militant, and effective labor organization of 325,000 members led by able and distinguished David Sullivan, of New York City. Many of my distinguished colleagues in the House will undoubtedly remember Mr. Sullivan from his appearances before various congressional committees in support of legislation designed to eliminate economic injustice and racial and religious discrimination in our country.

In this period of continuing high level of unemployment and the increasing decimation of jobs by automation, especially in manufacturing, mining, and transportation, the expanding job opportunities in the service industries underscores the increasing future importance of the Building Service Employees' International Union.

GEORGE HARDY, VICE PRESIDENT, BSEIU

In the State of California, this union functions under the leadership of its very able and highly respected vice president, George Hardy. Apart from our close personal friendship, I believe few men in the leadership ranks of organized labor have a record to match the dedication and self-sacrifice of George Hardy.

Other officers include Secretary-Treasurer George E. Fairchild and Vice Presidents Thomas J. Burke, Thomas Shortman, Albert G. Hearn, Charles C. Levey, and Henry A. Kruse.

I believe that this distinguished body should take note of the convention in Los Angeles because of the great work this union and others are doing for our country, both on behalf of the members and on behalf of democracy—since the labor union is often the one way in which the wage earner can speak effectively in his own behalf—to his community and his government, as well as to his employer.

This country is fortunate in having unions like the Building Service Employees to speak for those who would otherwise be unheard, and to remind us in the Congress of the continual need to concern ourselves with the multiple problems of the wage earner and his family.

Pan Americanism: Its Meaning and Its Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the Pan American Liaison Committee of Women's Organizations established an essay contest to be conducted in the high schools of the District of Columbia, Montgomery County, Md., and Fairfax County in Virginia. The essays are a student extracurricular activity and are written on the subject of "Pan Americanism: Its Meaning and Its Purpose."

This year 92 students from 14 schools participated in the contest. Their writings show a tremendous interest in Pan American relations and an awareness of the need for better understanding of the Latin American countries.

The first prize-winning essay in this year's contest was written by 15-year-old Elise Frank, a sophomore at the Walter Johnson High School in Bethesda, Md. Daniel Gordon of Our Lady of Good Counsel High School in Wheaton wrote the essay that took third prize.

I would like to congratulate these two young people for their interest in improvement of Latin American relations and include here in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning essay written by Elise Frank.

The essay follows:

PAN AMERICANISM: ITS MEANING AND ITS PURPOSE

Pan-Americanism is a movement toward political, social, economic, military, and commercial cooperation throughout the Americas, the ultimate objective of which is peace, security, and prosperity for all of the American people. Slowly through the years, since the time of Simón Bolívar who first conceived of the cooperation and solidarity of the Americas, men have struggled for these achievements. From the first Inter-American Conference to the organization of the Alliance for Progress, more than a century later, men have strived to make peace, security, and prosperity a reality.

Working toward peace, the primary purpose of pan-Americanism, James G. Blaine, U.S. Secretary of State, summoned a conference in 1889 to "consider and discuss methods of preventing war." This conference organized the Internation Union of American Republics. The Gondra Treaty in 1923 created the first peace machinery and worked for the prevention of conflicts. The Inter-American Conference for Maintenance of Peace drafted in 1936 a treaty for the "maintenance, preservation, and reestablishment of peace between Bolivia and Peru," illustrating the need and struggle for peace in the Americas. One of the means for achieving peace in our times, the Organization of American States, established in 1948, provides a forum for discussion and prevention of difficulty. Its council is an agency for the peaceful settlement of conflicts, and its Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs can convene in time of emergency.

Striving for internal and external security, nations declared themselves sovereign and independent, agreeing to furnish troops if necessary for common defense and protection at the First Inter-American Conference. Later conferences passed treaties on international law for the maintenance of security and peace and applied the Monroe Doctrine against foreign intervention to the American countries in 1936. The Rio Treaty of 1947, also called the Reciprocal Assistance Act, stated that an attack on one country constituted an attack on all and established a hemispheric defense zone. The Organization of American States Charter banned intervention in internal or external affairs of a nation. The OAS declared itself opposed to colonialism, communism, all forms of totalitarianism, and aggression.

Many economic and commercial agreements contribute to the achievement of the third purpose of pan-Americanism, prosperity for all the American people. Although the OAS has been working for prosperity by promoting economic, social, and cultural development through programs like the Pan-American Health Organization, the most significant advance toward prosperity has been the Alliance for Progress. Formed in 1961 by the 21 OAS nations in Punta del Este, Uruguay, the treaty calls for $20 billion to invest in Latin American development over a 10-year period.

Through the years, men, striving toward the unification of the Western Hemisphere through the Inter-American conferences, treaties, the OAS, and the Alliance for Progress have tried to accomplish the purposes of pan-Americanism, peace, security, and prosperity.

Join Rights Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a fine editorial from the Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch of April 16, 1964, urging the active church people of our country to give their support of the civil rights bill now under consideration in the Senate.

The editorial follows:

JOIN RIGHTS CRUSADE

At the recent Indianapolis convention of Christian Churches of Indiana, more than 3,100 clergymen and laymen approved two forceful civil rights resolutions.

One called for offerings to help finance "an accelerated nationwide civil rights program." The other urged action by individuals and congregations to "bring dignity, equality and justice to all Americans."

It is in this latter field that church people can make a real contribution to the fight for human decency. Here's how:

Currently the civil rights bill is stalled by filibuster in the U.S. Senate. It will remain

so stalled until Southern Senators run out of words, which is highly unlikely, or until two-thirds of the Senate (67) vote to impose cloture—cutting off the filibuster.

Senators, however, cherish the right of "unlimited debate" and must be powerfully motivated to impose cloture. That motivation must come from the public in the form of strongly worded letters.

Not until their mail becomes an angry flood will the Senators stop talking and start acting on this legislation.

Only the people can create such a flood, and church people ought to be taking the lead, as their clergymen and lay leaders urged in convention.

Is Free Thought in the United States Being Suppressed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a very pertinent article by Morrie Ryskind which apppeared in Human Events for May 2, 1964. This article should be carefully considered by all freedom-loving Americans. Under the guise of liberalism we are getting thought control, loss of freedom to dissent, even the loss of the right to disagree with the party in power.

The article follows:

IS THERE A LIBERAL ESTABLISHMENT?

(By Morrie Ryskind)

The burden of much of my dissenting mail holds that what I call the liberal establishment has no existence except in my fevered imagination. My critics say I ignore the real menace of the right-wing coalition headed by that radical extremist, BARRY GOLDWATER, the aim of which Mafia it is to transform the Republic into a Fascist state.

Well, let us reason together. Fascism is the name given to the corporate state, a system in which the freedom of the individual must yield to the greater good of centralized, authoritarian rule; whereas the conservative movement GOLDWATER typifies is dedicated to wresting the powers seized in recent years by the bureaucrats and restoring them to the individual states and the citizens thereof, as specified in articles IX and X of the Bill of Rights.

Indeed, it might be illuminating to contrast the aims of the intellectual left as outlined in "The Liberal Papers" with such works as GOLDWATER'S own "Conscience of a Conservative," Clarence Manion's "The Conservative American" and "What Is Conservatism?"—the last a collection of essays, by such authentic spokesmen for the right as William F. Buckley, Russell Kirk, F. A. Hayek, John Chamberlain, and Stefan T. Possony, edited by Frank S. Meyer. And decide for yourself which is nearer the philosophy of the corporate state.

You have the same unreasoning right to hate BARRY GOLDWATER as George Lincoln Rockwell has to hate Negroes and Jews, but I suggest you pick another argument than the Fascist one: it might backfire.

Now, to the ways of the "mythical" liberal establishment and its loading of the dice. Of recent years, the press has begun to run columnists whose views differ sharply from its own. And it is my observation—bolstered by a stack of mail on the very subject—that the conservative organs give about three times as much space to liberal commentators as the portside papers do to columnists who veer starboard.

On television, the brainwashing is so shameless it is unarguable. I have cited "The Defenders" often. "East Side, West Side" not long ago had a paraplegic veteran whooping it up for public housing and medicare, and only recently it had a Congressman proclaiming the virtues of something noble—I forget the exact topic—and demanding that the subject be aired openly on David Susskind's "Open End." It was—with Mr. Susskind playing himself in the interpolated program. The whole thing was very moving, especially when you realize that Mr. Susskind also has a hand in the production of "East Side, West Side."

Then there is the subliminal attack: on last week's "Arrest and Trial," a kidnaper is sought by the police. Various tips come into the station house as—not unusual in such cases—excited citizens phone to say they have just seen the wanted man in places widely scattered from California to Ohio. But one call is shrugged off by the officer at the desk as "one of those professional patriots who is sure the kidnaper is a Communist."

Now that—as any reporter who ever covered the police beat knows—is not far-fetched. But it is also true that just as many calls come from professional nonpatriots who assert they have just seen the wanted man and that he was wearing a Goldwater button and threatening to blow up a church. What is far-fetched is that any script would mention the latter sort of kook. You should, as the phrase has it, live so long.

And here's a letter from a physician in Arlington, Calif.: "My daughter's chum, a high-school senior, is taking (for extra credits) a correspondence course in 'social civics' for the American School in Chicago. The other day she got back an exam in which one of the questions was, in effect 'Do you have faith in the United Nations? Why?'

"She had answered she thought it had failed and had given several reasons. Her answer was marked 'wrong' and with her paper came four pages of U.N. propaganda, setting forth the United Nations as the hope of the world. There is apparently no room for honest difference of opinion.

"Incidentally, other questions included 'Do you believe in the welfare state and Federal aid to education?' And you know what her answer had to be if she wanted credit."

Oh, yes, Virginia, indeed there is a liberal establishment. And don't let anybody tell you otherwise.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this

EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD office.

Appendix

Collective Bargaining With Something Added

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in announcing settlement of the threatened railroad strike, apparently took it upon himself to claim full credit for what was done. The American people, of course, know that railroad management and the railroad brotherhoods also deserve a lot of credit for bringing about the settlement. In this connection, I include as part of my remarks a most enlightening news story written by James Bartlett which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 28, 1964, as follows:

TAX CONCESSIONS AND RAIL PEACE—TUNNEL DEPRECIATION, FREIGHT RATE BILL SEEN AS INDUCEMENTS TO AGREEMENT

The disclosure that tax concessions were discussed in the process of settling the railroad labor dispute has stimulated curiosity regarding the precise nature of the President's mediation.

At Mr. Johnson's request, the Treasury will shortly review its disinclination to allow the railroads to depreciate their investments in tunnels and gradings. The tax authorities have insisted for years that a hole in a mountain does not depreciate and an official change of mind could be worth $30 million a year to the railroads.

The President also appears to have nudged Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, into renewed efforts to pass the transportation bill. The measure, which would make the railroads' feright rates more adaptable to competition and less subject to regulation, was blocked by an 8-to-6 vote of the House Rules Committee on April 9. Presumed at that time to be dead for this session, the bill has been reviewed by new intimations of White House backing.

Mr. Johnson's interest in these two matters, which hold tremendous advantages for the railroads, is clearly linked to the carriers' decision to accept the compromise of the labor dispute last Thursday. Persons involved in those final negotiations insist there was no deal but the reward of securing the President's good will was obviously one of the railroads' inducements to agree.

Only time will reveal how firmly Mr. Johnson intends to exert his gratitude toward the railroads. He can order a review of the Treasury's tax ruling but he cannot order the tax officials to rule against their interpretation of the law. These are technical decisions that will be awkward to reverse unless Congress changes the law.

Mr. Johnson had indorsed the purpose of the Harris bill, which is stoutly opposed by the truckers and bargelines, some weeks before he entered the labor dispute. The test of whether this was a consideration in the settlement will be whether he now applies that extra measure of presidential leverage which spells the difference between passage and oblivion for a controversial bill.

A President can do many things for a huge industry that is involved at many points with the Government. But the enticement of presidential favor could not have wrung agreement last Thursday, from the carriers or the brotherhoods, without the series of events that had gone before.

The carriers felt able to accept the financial penalties entailed in the final compromise because they had previously won the key battles regarding the engineers and firemen and had broken the back of the featherbedding trend. They were far enough ahead in the campaign that they began in 1957 to feel that they could afford to give a little on this last settlement.

The issues were narrowed to bridgeable dimensions during 10 days of negotiation by the brilliant persistence of Theodore Kheil, Dr. George Taylor, and the Government mediators. But this narrowing could not have taken place if the brotherhoods had not been squeezed for the first time into a unified bargaining position.

The major credit for convincing the brotherhoods that their best course was to get together and negotiate seriously is accorded without reserve to the President. He convinced them that he was determined to have a settlement and he left them confused as to whether they could count on his readiness to seize the railroads if there was a strike.

Mr. Johnson approached this first task of persuasion with the uninhibited, emotional and rawboned tactics of a country preacher. He staged a strenuous and earthy performance that left some of his audience with a feeling that he had lost more in diginity than he had gained in agreement.

But he won his point and went on in subsequent days to show that he could change his pace. His later appeals to the two groups were marked by the same force and determination, but they were calmer and more thoughtful.

Through it all Mr. Johnson used every pressure that was applicable: patriotism and tax relief, the welfare of the economy and the prospects of the election, threats and promises, friendship and hostility. This was collective bargaining with something added.

Alaska Displays Envy: Can't Get Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article from the Milwaukee Journal of April 26, on the gallant fight being made by the distinguished Senator from Alaska on behalf of his devastated State. On Sunday I was in Milwaukee and many Wisconsin citizens who had read this article by the Journal's extraordinarily competent John Nole of the Journal's staff, commented with warm approval on the logic and force of Senator GRUENING's fight.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA DISPLAYS ENVY: CAN'T GET FOREIGN AID

(By John W. Kole)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Alaska would be better off as a foreign country when it comes to low-interest loans for its earthquake devastated economy. This charge was repeated in three Senate floor speeches last week by Senator GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska. GRUENING, 77, has been fighting battles for Alaska for 25 years, including the one leading to statehood in 1959.

"I shall continue to raise the question of why the people of a hundred foreign lands who have suffered no disaster such as has befallen Alaska can receive grants and loans at a rate much lower than our own citizens are afforded," he said.

OFFICIAL WENT TO ALASKA

After the earthquake March 27, Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration (SBA), toured Alaska.

He issued instructions for 30-year loans to businessmen at 3-percent interest, with a 1-year moratorium on interest payments and a 5-year moratorium on principal payments.

GRUENING fired off a letter to Foley contending that this just wasn't enough.

NOTES LOW INTEREST

"I indicated to Mr. Foley that the terms for Alaska disaster borrowers should at least be as generous as those given to borrowers under our foreign aid program where there was no disaster," GRUENING told the Senate.

"Many of our foreign aid loans are made at the rate of three-fourths of 1-percent interest per annum with repayment terms of 40 years and a moratorium on repayment of principal up to 10 years."

As of Saturday, Foley had not replied to GRUENING's letter even though the Senator wrote him again Friday.

Foley declined to comment when asked about GRUENING's appeal, but an SBA spokesman said the agency was already losing money on the loans, at 3 percent.

"We're paying the Treasury almost 4 percent for the money," he said. "Why, it costs at least three-quarters of 1 percent to do the bookkeeping and collection on these loans. We would be better off charging no interest."

CHILEAN CASE CITED

GRUENING noted in his letter to Foley that in August 1961, Chile received a loan of $100 million after getting a $20 million direct grant to deal with earthquake reconstruction.

This 40-year loan was made at three-fourths of 1-percent interest, with a 10-year moratorium on the repayment of principal.

GRUENING said there was "always the possibility" that Chile either would not repay the debt or be forced later to refinance it.

GRUENING has called for many millions of dollars more in direct grants for Alaska than the $50 million which Congress authorized speedily at President Johnson's request.

"In our U.S. foreign aid program, now in excess of $100 billion since its inception, we have been lavish with grants—outright gifts," GRUENING said.

"Yet in the discussion about the rehabilitation of the canneries, fishing boats, stores, and warehouses destroyed in Alaska by earthquake and tidal wave, we are told by administration spokesmen that far less generous terms are in order."

Total earthquake damage in Alaska may reach $1 billion.

American Motto: "In God We Trust"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the National Society, Children of the American Revolution, recently held its annual national convention here in Washington. As a part of the program, there was an oratorical contest in which a young lady from Indiana participated. She was Miss Kay Krueger, of South Bend. Kay spoke on the subject, "American Motto—In God We Trust." What she had to say was so timely and important, that I think it may well be read by all. It follows:

AMERICAN MOTTO: "IN GOD WE TRUST"

(By Kay Krueger)

"In God we trust." All my life I have heard those words—"In God we trust." To trust is to place a confident reliance on the integrity and justice of another. And, there is no better place to put such trust than in God.

The desire for religious freedom prompted many of our forefathers to come to America. It was their hope that in the New World they would at last be free to worship God in their own way.

Later our Founding Fathers were deeply aware, when they discussed the fundamentals of our Constitution, that the rights and liberties of religious freedom must be clearly spelled out for all times.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, thought religion was a vital ingredient in the structure of a free society. He also firmly believed that monopoly by a single religion was one of the surest ways to religious persecution.

The Commander in Chief of the Revolutionary Army, George Washington, had more than military decisions to make. Often it was necessary for him to deal with religious prejudicies. All during the war and his Presidency, he was always mindful of the cause of religious freedom. He held himself impartial on matters of religion in a supreme effort to keep church and state separate.

The feelings of Jefferson and Washington reflected those of the other delegates attending the Convention in Philadelphia which was for the purpose of formulating the Constitution of the United States. This remarkable document clearly states in amendment I, the first of the ten amendments usually called the Bill of Rights, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This amendment became effective December 15, 1791.

Therefore, with faith in God obviously so important to his country, it was but natural for Francis Scott Key, in his famous poem, "The Star-Spangled Banner," to write these immortal lines, "and this be our motto, 'In God Is Our Trust'." On November 13, 1861, when the Union morale was shaken by battlefield defeats during the Civil War, Rev. M. Watkinson, of Ridleyville, Pa., wrote to Secretary of the Treasury Solomon P. Chase, recommending that the inscription "In God We Trust" be placed on our coins. His inspiration resulted in the coinage legislation that made this motto a byword to all Americans.

Today our daily lives are threatened by godless countries which accept the doctrines of absolute communism. Communism, according to Lenin's prophecy, will eventually dominate the world. We must be careful to guard the significance of the inscription, "In God We Trust," and to destroy any forces that would lead to the elimination of our precious first amendment. It is our challenge as CAR members and as young American citizens to preserve the spirit of our national motto. We must stimulate within the people we come in contact an appreciation of and a desire to understand the principles on which our country was founded. For with understanding, they will not hesitate to courageously defend these principles.

In the defense of these principles, we will stand up to communism and proudly proclaim to all our faith in God and country. Our national motto has a long history behind it; let us keep it on our coinage and in our hearts.

Speech by German Bundestag President to Soviet Zone of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on February 17 the President of the German Bundestag, Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier, delivered a radio speech to the captive peoples in the Soviet Zone of Germany. His speech concerned the most patent point of friction between communism and the Western world, the total irreconcilability of the principles of Christianity and communism.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an English translation of Dr. Gerstenmaier's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRRECONCILABLE OPPOSITION BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND COMMUNISM—UNDER NO CONDITION IS IT POSSIBLE FOR ANYONE TO LIVE IN INNER PEACE WITH ULBRICHT AND HIS REGIME

On February 17, 1964, the President of the German Federal Diet, D. Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier held the following speech on radio station NDR/WDR on the broadcast "We Speak to the Zone":

My dear fellow countrymen, recently, I received a letter from two evangelical clergymen in Dresden. I do not want to mention their names, for it was not an open letter. On the contrary, it was of a very personal nature, despite the fact that it was a political letter. It spoke out for a new German peace initiative. Both of the clergymen felt that the complete renunciation of atomic weapons in the Federal Republic as well as in the zone would be an excellent opportunity of bestowing a real help to the world and to our people in both parts of Germany. As you can see, nothing new is being spoken of in this letter—it is the same "old story." Why do I bring it up here, nonethless?

My answer is: First, because the completely honest and convincing tone of this letter has again shown me how an uninterrupted propaganda can obscure the perception and judgment of truth-loving men and because, second, this letter expresses in a touching and terrifying way how some people, in their need for peace, will even go so far as to reconcile themselves to a system, with which—if they want to be truthful—they could live only in a state of basic antagonism and under intense strain.

To the content of the letter itself, I can only answer: The Federal Republic of Germany does not have any atomic weapons, nor is it its aim to acquire atomic weapons. Its aim, on the contrary, is the general and controlled disarmament of the two world blocs, for which a long and hot battle has been in process for quite a long time already, and which has always proven a failure until now, because the Communist bloc has never been willing to submit to the indispensable control which this disarmament entails.

The cause, which these two clergymen assuredly advocated in good faith, is not, as some people might think, a great or small step forward toward the achievement of this general controlled disarmament. On the contrary, it aims at severing the Federal Republic from the mutual security of the NATO, expelling the Americans from Germany and the European continent in order to deliver all Germany into the clutches of Moscow and Pankow. That we are decisively opposed to even the smallest step in this direction does not require any further explanation.

Such a determined attitude, it should be understood, is also in your interest, my dear fellow countrymen in the zone, for a West Germany without resistance and a weak West would only be an invitation to the Communists in Pankow as well as in Moscow to deal with you in an even more unscrupulous and ruthless manner than they do at present.

Furthermore, such a weakened West would not diminish the danger of war—it would increase it. For it was the development of arms and the defense policy of NATO that made Red Moscow realize and will yet make blood-Red Peiping realize, that they will never achieve their goal, Communist world domination, by the use of arms. But they continue to pursue this goal economically and by the use of increased propaganda. We accept this challenge. This means, however, that the battle for the future of the world will be fought economically and psychologically and never again militarily. But I repeat that as long as atomic weapons are not done away with under strict control, they must be preserved and kept up to date as security measures. This is unproductive, but it is necessary. What does this mean for you, my dear fellow countrymen in the zone? According to my conviction, it means two things:

First, that you should not allow your clear vision of the inferiority of the Communist economic and social order in its competition with the free world to be obscured by any propaganda and by any appeal for peace à la Ulbricht. Even in the West, all is not gold that glitters. Even here there is room for much serious criticism. But it is simply a proven fact, confirmed by Khrushchev himself, that the economic production of Russia always falls short of the productive achievements of the free world, despite the fact that almost 50 years of Communist rule in big and rich Russia have undeniably brought along considerable improvements. Communist economy lacks simply that, which alone would enable it to keep constant pace with the free world: the productive force of freedom. If the Soviet economy would achieve

this, then, of course, it would no longer be a Communist economy and society.

And now I have come to the second point: The two Dresden clergymen wrote to me that they, "in flat ideological disagreement with the Marxists, openly and freely support and help establish the new social order." I understand this to mean that these two clergymen have not fully accepted communism in all its facets; i.e., that they have not simply capitulated before Pankow's power and propaganda. Assuredly, they reject the militant atheism, which was again just recently advocated by the Russian atheistic functionaries in Moscow.

Nonetheless, I wonder how it is possible that these men who are Christians and want to remain Christians can so obviously fail to see that it is simply impossible to openly support and help to establish a system, which does not solely intend to replace the so-called capitalistic system by a different economic and social one. Here, there is even room for discussion among Christians, for Christianity is not identical with a capitalistic or socialistic economic system. It is not of absolute decisiveness for a Christian, or for any other human being, that this new social order, i.e., communism, of which the two clergymen speak, is a different economic order—rather that one party claims all the power in the state with an exclusiveness and intolerance which make it simply impossible for one who thinks differently in religious and political matters to really live his convictions.

The sharp irreconcilable opposition between Christianity and communism does not lie in the fact that fundamentally different political ideologies and social orders are represented or championed by one or the other side. Rather, the irreconcilable opposition lies in the fact that this Communist social order, so innocently supported by the two clergymen, subjects man, who according to God's will was created free and self-responsible, in all his thinking, ways and doings to the party and state doctrine from the cradle to the grave. When a state or a ruling group is intent upon enslaving man in both body and soul in this way, how can there still be a question of naturalness and of support for Christians, for freedom-loving mankind? In such a situation, on the contrary, there must be a basic and fundamental tension and struggle—at all events if one wants to live his belief, his very own belief, in that freedom for which he was created and to which he is called—that freedom, to which he has not only a human but also a divine right.

Already under national socialism, the suppression and manipulation of one's views and beliefs was one of its worst aspects. Today, in the Communist world and in Ulbricht's regime, it is not better but worse. This is, in any case, what I am told by those who have left their homes because they could no longer bear to see the spirit and the soul of their children falling into the clutches of functionaries and rulers, who brutally threatened to rob them of the most precious gift which God has given to man.

With deep and heartfelt sympathy and in loyal brotherhood we think of all those people behind the wall and the Iron Curtain who begin each day with the firm conviction that they will not allow their souls and those of their children to be victimized and to fall into the clutches of those in power. This, however, requires a will strong enough to refuse to make inner peace with Ulbricht and his regime under any conditions. As grieved as I am about it, and as hard as it may be each day, here Christianity and humanity do not command peace, but resistance.

"Trade" With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. G. Follis, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of California, has the following to say about trade with Russia. This article was printed as an editorial in the Standard Oil Co.'s bulletin of April 1964:

"TRADE" WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

The U.S.S.R. wants to trade the West for prototypes of advanced industrial plants that will let them bypass five decades of research and experience, keep their technical resources at work on military projects and give them a big competitive edge in world markets.

From all the economic barometers, from reports from within Russia herself, the Soviet economy is sagging; and badly. Growth of heavy industry has slowed to a crawl; in other sectors, such as agriculture, the slowdown amounts to stagnation.

At the same time, there is an apparent relaxation of tensions in the Soviet "cold war" with the West. Whether or not these two things are related cannot be known for sure. One facet of the present thaw is a Soviet invitation for more trade with the West. Even now, to help ease their food crisis, America is selling grain to the U.S.S.R. Meanwhile, Russia continues to dump oil on world markets wherever it can be used to open free world countries to infiltration, and at the same time secure more foreign credits, at whatever price. It is not clear that the U.S.S.R. and the free world have the same understanding of the word "trade."

What do the Russians really want? They have already indicated what it is. Despite their aggressiveness and the advanced technology displayed in their military and related activities, the Russian plant for supplying consumer goods for peacetime use is inefficient and obsolete in many areas. To bring the Russian plant into shape would require years and years of devoting to the task huge amounts of capital and, most important of all, technical manpower which in our unbelievably complex technical era puts a firm limit on what can be done in any society.

What they are asking for, in their trade deals, is industrial machinery. Not to equip their whole industrial complex, but just one or two ultramodern plants in each category: chemicals, steel, petroleum, rubber, and a long list of other vital elements. These are obviously needed for just one purpose—model prototypes. At one stroke, by simply copying (Russia does not believe in patents) they will have bypassed 50 or more years of trial and error, of research, inspiration, and invention. And their plants, unlike those of the West, will all be of the most modern, advanced type, able to pour manufactured goods into the marketplace in quantity and price almost impossible to match. In other words, they want to repeat the massive transfer to them of Western technology which took place in the thirties and early forties. Then, similar plants in a wide spectrum were made available to them—thus relieving their technological manpower so that their energies could be directed to military and other activities.

And what will the Russians use for trade goods to obtain these plants? The most accessible resource the Soviets have to offer the free world for exchange is their oil; they have already opened and disrupted several markets in the West with it. Further evidence that petroleum is their prime trading weapon is its top priority on the list of modern prototype plants wanted. Russia, before any other plants, wants samples of advanced major refineries and petrochemical plants. Once these plants are duplicated and reduplicated and in operation, they may well pay for the prototypes of all the rest.

What is Russia's eventual aim? On this, we have direct evidence. It is in their own statements. One such statement is contained in a speech made by Premier Khrushchev only last December at the Soviet Communist Party meeting in Moscow. It said, in effect, that when the U.S.S.R. had succeeded in obtaining from the West the equipment it needed to avert disaster, it would be able to then inflict a crushing blow on the Old World and establish with incontestable conclusiveness the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

This is not a simple challenge of competition, and not just a matter of the oil industry alone. Petroleum happens to be the vehicle selected to force the door; if the Soviets can obtain the technical prototype machinery in this field, the new plants they will then build can, and will, secure the foreign exchange power needed by Russia to repeat the performance with every other industry.

It can be hoped that our own Government will be foresighted enough in this one field of technical industry or in any other, not to create such competition for its own economy by permitting the sale to Russia of prototype equipment. To do so would be to abet a Russian purpose which is neither constructive nor beneficial. It is, in short, the complete destruction of our economy (including our oil and all other industry) and eventually our entire way of life. Perhaps we could convince some of our allies of this fact, too.

Population Growth and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, millions of visitors to the New York World's Fair will observe America's population explosion on a demograph maintained by one of the Nation's largest insurance companies.

They will see the number of Americans grow at the net rate of 1 every 11 seconds.

Rapid though our population increase is, it does not compare to the growth on the planet as a whole. Earth's population is growing at the rate of nearly 2 persons every single second—7,000 an hour—60 million a year.

In many instances, we in this country postpone, to some obscure future date, the perfection of our facilities and our institutions. We concentrate instead on a race to add the bare minimum of needed jobs, houses, schools, hospitals, parks, etc. But our task in this rich

Nation must appear simple to people in other countries who are desperately trying to raise living standards to a level most Americans would regard as below subsistence.

More and more serious thinkers are speaking out on the effects of the world's tremendous population surge. And this is good for only through open debate are we going to stir the resolution needed to find solutions to the problems caused by this population explosion.

I want to commend to my colleagues one such thoughtful expression of opinion, the following editorial from a fine community newspaper, Tucson Daily Citizen, Tucson, Ariz., of April 23, 1964:

POPULATION CONTROL A MUST IN A WAR AGAINST POVERTY

What's the proper strategy for a successful war on poverty?

Is it to expand the dole by taking from the "haves" and giving to the "have nots"? Such strategy tends to be shortsighted, palliative rather than curative, because it doesn't strike at the root of the problem. And such strategy is politically tainted by a desire to garner the votes of the poor.

Fighting poverty by means of the dole is to wage the kind of war the United States is supporting in South Vietnam. At best, that has been a negative matter of maintaining a precarious equilibrium. At worst, as it now appears, it is a matter of steadily yielding ground to the enemy.

The only way to win the war on poverty is to strike at the root cause while you treat the symptoms. And that means halting the present explosive growth of population.

The rate of population increase must be reduced not only in the United States, but all over the world. Population of the world is growing by nearly 7,000 every hour, by approximately 60 million a year.

It took many thousands of years from the appearance of the first man until 1 billion human beings inhabited the earth, a population point reached about 1830. Just one century later, about 1930, there were 2 billion living people. It took only 30 more years to add a third billion. Recent estimates hold that the fourth billion will have been added by 1975, just 11 years from now. And 5 billion human beings will crowd the earth by 1985, just 21 years from now, unless something is done to halt the explosion.

The prospect is frightening. The population explosion is every bit as dangerous as the H-bomb.

How does population growth affect poverty?

For an example, look to Mexico, where the birth rate is about four times the death rate. If this rate continues for 20 years, there will then be 75 million Mexicans instead of the present 38 million.

Mexico is one of the most progressive of all Latin American countries. But it has to run fast, insofar as economic growth is concerned, just to hold its own insofar as the standard of living is concerned. If the birth rate could be brought into line with the death rate, millions of poverty-stricken Mexicans would start to benefit from the nation's economic growth.

Many other countries rival Mexico's population growth rate but fail to achieve its economic growth. In an effort to improve living standards in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the United States has given more than $15 billion in economic aid in the past 5 years. But there are more hungry people in those areas now than there were 5 years ago, because population has climbed 250 million in the meantime.

Given 36 more years at its current rate of growth, the United States will have 150 million more people than it has today. The Population Policy Panel of the Hugh Moore Fund, a nonprofit educational foundation based in New York, recently stated:

"This presents the prospect of 8 million unemployed instead of 5 million today—of 10 million on welfare, of 30 million elderly and 100 million children to be taken care of. The cost of maintaining such an enlarged burden of nonproducers could of itself add millions of families to those which today are unable to adequately support themselves."

Neither foreign aid to poor people abroad nor Federal aid to poor Americans will prevent the spread of poverty. Population control is the only answer.

"The population problem can be successfully attacked," according to the National Academy of Sciences, "by developing new methods of fertility regulation and implementing programs of voluntary family planning widely and rapidly throughout the world."

The U.S. Government, which is spending billions of research dollars a year, should consider diverting a much more substantial share of them into the fight against overpopulation.

The Federal Government as a Self-Insurer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, sometime after the Department of Agriculture announced on January 10, 1964, a new policy of being its own insurer of commodities owned by the Government and pledged as collateral on price support loans which are in commercial storage, I wrote to the Comptroller General inquiring as to whether the Department of Agriculture had authority to go so far as to act as its own insurer. Although the Department of Agriculture rescinded its announced policy on March 24, I think it would be very worthwhile to have printed in the RECORD at this point the full text of the Comptroller General's letter of April 24, written in response to my inquiry on this subject. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this letter in its entirety at this point:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: By letter dated March 31, 1964, acknowledged April 6, you wrote to our office concerning an announcement by the Department of Agriculture that the Commodity Credit Corp. would assume certain risks which heretofore had been covered by casualty insurance underwritten by commercial insurance carriers. This announcement, which was made in Department of Agriculture press release dated January 10, 1964 (USDA 98-64) stated that the new policy was in the interest of economy and was in keeping with the governmental policy of being its own insurer. The assumption of risks was to be on commodities owned by the Government and those pledged as collateral on price-support loans which are in commercial storage. The risks involved are against loss from fire, windstorm, and other causes. It was pointed out that the wide distribution of commodity holdings by the Commodity Credit Corp. accomplished the same spreading of risk which individuals obtained from insurance. The new policy was to take effect on the renewal dates of the present Uniform Grain Storage Agreement, July 1, 1964, the current cotton storage contracts, August 1, 1964, and other storage contracts covering rice, beans, and oils.

You specifically asked to be advised whether the Department of Agriculture was going beyond the governmental policy of self-insurer when it applied such policy to commodities pledged as collateral on price-support loans.

While you undoubtedly are aware that the Department of Agriculture in a press release dated March 24, 1964, (USDA 956-64) announced the recession of its announced position of January 10, 1964, we would like to take this opportunity to explain the Government's longstanding policy of self-insurer and the application of such policy to commodities in commercial storage which are pledged as collateral on price-support loans.

As far back as February 9, 1892, first Comptroller of the Treasury Matthews advised the Department of State that "it is not the policy or practice of the Government to insure its property." In numerous decisions of the various Comptrollers of the Treasury and Comptrollers General of the United States this policy has been restated and followed. By way of specific example, Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury Mitchell referred to this long-standing policy in his decision reported at 13 Comp. Dec. 779 to the Secretary of the Interior dated May 10, 1907. In that decision Assistant Comptroller Mitchell held that moneys available for the purchase of supplies for use in the education of natives in Alaska were not available for the payment of premiums for insurance on such supplies en route to Alaska.

The theory behind this rule is well stated in decision of April 15, 1942, to the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Virgin Islands Co. (corporation), reported at 21 Comp. Gen. 928, 929. In that decision it was stated:

"It is the general policy of the Government to assume its own risks of loss, upon the theory that the magnitude of the Government's resources makes it more advantageous for the Government to carry its own risks than to have them assumed by private insurers at rates sufficient to cover all losses, to pay their operating expenses (including agency or brokers' commissions) and to leave such insurers a profit."

Of more direct application to the question of carrying insurance on commodities used as collateral on price-support loans, is unpublished decision B-59941, October 8, 1946. In that decision the Administrator, War Assets Administration was advised that the wide distribution of its risks was a factor to permit the Government to assume its own risks.

It should be pointed out that the Government's practice of self-insurance is one of policy and not of positive law. When the economy sought to be attained under this rule would be defeated, when sound business practice indicates that a saving can be effected, or when services or benefits not otherwise available can be obtained by purchasing insurance, an exception to the general rule has been recognized. For example, in unpublished decision B-35379, July 17, 1943, to the Secretary of Commerce there was recognized the need for an exception in allowing the purchase of hull insurance on aircraft where the insurance companies had needed expert appraisers and adjusters and the War Training Service did not, nor could not re-

cruit, an adequate force of personnel to handle the appraisal of damages in fixing the liabilities of certain contractors.

Congress has given tacit approval to the self-insurance policy here discussed on several occasions by enacting laws which grant exceptions to this rule. Noteworthy among such exceptions are the Government Losses in Shipment Act, approved July 8, 1937 (ch. 444, 50 Stat. 479, 5 U.S.C. 134 et seq.), and the act of August 1, 1956 (ch. 841, 70 Stat. 890, 5 U.S.C. 170h(a)), which gave the Secretary of State authority to purchase insurance to cover the Government's possible tort liability arising from the operation of Government automobiles in foreign countries.

With the foregoing background on the policy of the Government to be a self-insurer of its own property, we now turn to the application of such policy to commodities in commercial storage which are pledged as collateral on price-support loans.

On pages 10 and 11 of our report to the Congress submitted November 10, 1959, on our audit of the New Orleans Commodity Office of the Commodity Stabilization Service we made the following recommendation:

"As previously stated, CCC followed the policy of not insuring Government-owned cotton but required that warehousemen carry fire insurance on cotton stored by producers as collateral for price-support loans.

"In August 1956, we recommended to the Administrator of CSS that (1) a study be made of the costs of insuring loan cotton and of insurance proceeds in previous years and (2) that consideration be given to the feasibility of adopting alternative methods of providing protection against losses on loan cotton which would result in lower costs.

"In February 1957, we were informed by the Administrator of CSS that the New Orleans office had started compiling statistics on inventory cotton with respect to fire losses as compared with insurance premium savings and that the statistics and data obtained from the study could also be used to make a similar comparison with respect to loan cotton.

"In March 1959, the New Orleans office advised the Deputy Administrator of CSS that a study of estimated savings accruing as a result of not insuring acquired (inventory) cotton for the period July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1958, had been completed. The net savings were estimated to be $3,059,344 for the 2-year period.

"Based on the demonstrated savings of over $1.5 million a year accruing as a result of not insuring inventory cotton, we believe that CSS should determine whether similar savings could be accomplished with respect to loan cotton by adopting alternative methods of providing protection against losses."

We would like to point out that our Office has not made similar recommendations concerning the other commodities pledged as collateral on price-support loans.

In his justification for the announced policy of January 10, 1964, of the Government assuming the risks attending commodities pledged on price-support loans, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture stated:

"The economic justification cited by the Comptroller General for not permitting the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance (on Government-owned property) applies with particular force to the widely distributed storage holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"* * * * *

"Assumption by CCC of its risks of losses would result in substantial monetary savings to the Government. Studies of operations during fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, demonstrated that out of every dollar of insurance premiums paid by warehousemen under the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement, only 28 cents was collected by CCC in payment of insured losses. Similar information compiled for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 shows that for every dollar of insurance premiums paid by warehousemen under the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement only 27 cents has been paid to CCC as a result of insured CCC losses.

"* * * * *

"Under the present cotton price support program docket, payment is authorized for insurance on cotton during the loan period which is acquired by CCC but the insurance is dropped after cotton is acquired. For the period July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1963, CCC shows estimated savings of $3,569,575 in assuming its own risk on owned cotton. These are not savings to CCC since, in computing this total, administrative and other overhead costs were taken into consideration. It is logical to assume that very substantial additional savings would accrue to CCC if CCC were to assume the risk of loss on loan cotton also.

We feel that the policy of the Government as self-insurer of its property should apply as well to commodities pledged as security for price-support loans. The economic justification is identical and we know of no legal distinction that should be drawn. While a mortgagee has an insurable interest on the mortgaged property to the extent of the debt secured (44 C.J.S., Insurance, sec. 187b., p. 884) we know of no law—absent contractual requirements—which would require a mortgagee to insure his interest.

As previously pointed out, exceptions have been made to the Government's policy as self-insurer of its property. Inasmuch as we view that policy as equally applicable to commodities held as security on price-support loans, the standards for exception to such policy apply as well. Those standards for exception are repeated here as follows:

1. Where the economy sought by self-insurance is defeated.

2. Where sound business practice indicates that a savings can be effected, or

3. Where services or benefits not otherwise available can be obtained by purchasing insurance.

It is apparent from the findings made by the Department of Agriculture that neither of the first two reasons for exception apply in this consideration. We are not aware of any basis for applying the third reason for exception in this matter.

Consequently, we believe that the Department of Agriculture's decision as stated in the press release of January 10, 1964, that the Commodity Credit Corporation would assume its own risks on Government-owned commodities and commodities held by it as security on price-support loans, was in accord with the Government's policy to self-insure.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Dr. Leonard Herzog Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, in New York City, Dr. Leonard Herzog was a recipient of the 12th annual American Success Story Award, presented by the Free Enterprise Awards Association. He is the youngest person to receive the FEAA Award.

The story of Dr. Herzog's success is an inspiration to young Americans. He served in World War II; worked his way through some of the top colleges in the United States; received his Ph. D. in nuclear geophysics at MIT, with additional education at Harvard; and presently is a part-time professor in geophysics and geochemistry at the Pennsylvania State University. He is the president and founder of the Nuclide Corp., established in 1954 as Nuclide Analysis Associates to provide a talent pool of professors consulting in mass spectroscopy. Nuclide undertook its first manufacturing contract in 1957, when it designed and built a mass spectrometer for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Dr. Herzog and his associates have built Nuclide from a one-room laboratory to three buildings, located at State College, Pa., where 125 scientists and technicians develop and manufacture mass spectrometers, spectrographs and other technical apparatus for the analysis of isotopes, gases, liquids and solids. In 5 years the company, under the guidance of Dr. Herzog, has had a 700-percent growth. Today, Nuclide products and services are used in world-wide research and process control by industry, university and Government laboratories.

In 1963 the Nuclide Corp. received the coveted President's "E" Award for "outstanding contribution to the export expansion program of the United States of America." This year's FEAA Award is another fitting recognition of Dr. Herzog's genius and the contribution the Nuclide Corp. which he founded is making in the scientific world. The FEAA citation reads in part:

Won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice, and ethics, symbolizing the success possible to all under our free enterprise system.

The 17th Pennsylvania Congressional District is proud of this distinguished citizen.

Administrative Aircraft

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10939), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in my colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] with regard to the use of administrative aircraft by the services, the question was asked as to the

guidelines used in designating administrative planes.

On checking page 8502 of the RECORD, I find that the definition of administrative aircraft does not accompany the table showing the number of administrative aircraft.

Under the permission granted me to revise and extend my remarks, there follows a description of administrative aircraft as provided by the Department of Defense:

ADMINISTRATIVE AIRCRAFT

Those aircraft assigned to support command administrative, executive, and inspection activities (including 1254th Air Transport Wing, Special Air Missions unit) as contrasted to those aircraft assigned to or supporting combat, strategic and assault transport support, rescue, training, flight proficiency, and test functions.

Specific terminology applicable to the military departments follows:

ARMY

Aircraft provided for the purpose of command and executive transport for high departmental officials and key staff officials in the pursuance of priority command and control functions of the headquarters they represent. For example, support of major Army headquarters (Department of Army and major oversea headquarters), Continental U.S. and oversea Armies and Corps, including Reserve Corps, XVII Airborne Corps (Strategic Army Corps), and other selected major subordinate agencies (Materiel Command, Combat Developments Command, Strike Command).

NAVY/MARINE CORPS

Aircraft assigned primarily for nonscheduled transport of civilian executives and officers of the Department of Navy for administrative purposes, such as staff administration, special official business, courier service, and special missions. For example, support of major Fleet and Air Commands, active and Reserve Training Commands, and selected unified commands (Pacific Command, Atlantic Command).

AIR FORCE

Aircraft assigned to support command administrative, executive and inspection functions. For example, support of major Air Commands, numbered Air Forces, Air Materiel Areas, selected unified commands (Alaskan Command, Continental Air Defense Command/North American Air Defense Command, Strike Command) and selected defense activities.

Free Enterprise Would Be Greatly Helped by Having the Subsidy Payment on Cotton Made to the First Buyer "Usually the Ginner or the Local Cotton Merchant"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the recent cotton-wheat bill, I believe that free enterprise would get a tremendous shot in the arm, so to speak, by having the cotton subsidy payment go to the first buyer.

This would not only put most of the cotton into the free enterprise pipeline, but it would greatly stimulate all channels of private business in this field. It would create more employment and help our economy tremendously while at the same time cost less to the taxpayer. An excellent explanation is contained in an editorial published Monday, April 27 in the Times-Picayune newspaper in New Orleans which reads as follows:

A CHANCE TO FREE COTTON A LITTLE

The Secretary of Agriculture will decide soon at just what stage in the cotton marketing process the Government production payments (so-called mill subsidy) will be made. Will the subsidy—say 6½ cents a pound—be paid to the first buyer (generally the ginner or community cotton merchant) or will payment wait until the end-purchaser, usually the mill takes the staple?

When the production payments are made is of no consequence to the farmer who will get his 30 cents a pound, or thereabouts, for his crop either in the market or by selling it to the Government through the loan.

Cotton exchanges and that part of the trade represented by the American Cotton Shippers' Association want the payments made to the first buyer. They argue strongly that by getting the Government payment matter out of the way at the outset cotton could then move freely in the semblance of a free market. The function of the free market system, including the opportunity for mills to "hedge" or insure the value of their purchases by operating in the cotton exchange futures market would be at least partly restored.

They contend, on the other hand, if the payments are withheld until the cotton moves to the mills, the farmers will be inclined to let their cotton go into the Government loan, with the effect of not only destroying what freedom the market might gain but also forcing the Government, rather than the trade, to carry and eventually market the staple. One outcome of that, according to the president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, would be that such longstanding marketing machinery as the cotton exchanges would probably have to cease to function altogether.

Payment of the subsidy at the first opportunity, that is to the first purchaser, it seems to us would be the sound procedure. For the coming crop, the subsidy payments will be made on both domestically used and export cotton. Prompt payment to the first buyer would free it all, restoring interest in the market and let the cotton move in normal channels, domestic and export, at something approximating the world price. Why should the Government adopt a policy that would tend to keep cotton piling into the warehouses under Government loan when it might reduce the loan operations to the advantage of both the taxpaying public and the normal private enterprise marketing system?

We recommend the matter to the attention of the Senators and Representatives from the cotton area.

Woodbridge Designated as "All America City"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Look magazine and the National Municipal League recently selected 11 communities in the Nation as winners of the 1963 All America City Award.

In the words of the Look magazine article that announced the awards:

The citizens of the 11 cities and towns worked hard to better their communities. They organized to solve the vexing problems of rapid growth, racial misunderstanding and urban blight. They planned for more education and cultural activities, they built hospitals, they kept a close watch on the local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy that one of the 11 cities selected was Woodridge, N.J., which is located in the 15th District—Middlesex County. Recognized for its many activities, progressive programs and good government and led by its distinguished mayor, Walter Zirpolo, Woodbridge has brought honor to the entire county and State.

One of New Jersey's outstanding daily newspapers, the Evening News of Perth Amboy, wrote an article on this gratifying award, called: "Woodbridge Designated 'All American City.'"

The article by Thomas Reilly, staff writer of the Evening News, follows:

WOODBRIDGE DESIGNATED AS ALL AMERICA CITY

(By Thomas Reilly)

WOODBRIDGE.—The official designation "All America City" has been given to Woodbridge by Look magazine and the National Municipal League, cosponsors of the All-America City contest.

The confirmation of Woodbridge as one of 11 winners across the Nation was greeted with marked enthusiasm by local officials, including Mayor Walter Zirpolo, who called it "one of the best things that has ever happened to Woodbridge."

The All-America awards are given each year to communities whose citizens and government have taken effective action in solving major community problems.

GROWTH PROBLEM EFFORT

Woodbridge was selected because of its activities to curb its major problem of explosive growth.

"Problems arising from a swelling population were compounded by ineffective government," a statement by the sponsors of the contest said.

"Efficient reorganization has brought the town's services up to the needs of its expanded population. Eight new schools were opened in 1 year and more are under construction. By this fall, the public school system will open on a single session for the first time since 1932."

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

The sponsors noted civic activities included a project to transform the "claypit" area into a commercial and civic center, the golden age program for senior citizens and a sum-

mer Shakespearean drama festival that draws large audiences.

Woodbridge was sponsored in the contest by the local Jaycees and the Business and Professional Women's Club.

The merits of the town were presented before a special jury headed by Dr. George Gallup in Detroit November 19. Ruth Wolk of the Woodbridge Woman's Club, James Nolan, of the Jaycees, S. Buddy Harris, director of development and planning for the township, and Herman B. Averill, business administrator, represented Woodbridge.

The other winning cities were Oil City, Pa., Alexandria, Va., Aztec, N. Mex., Gastonia, N.C., Louisville, Ky.; Minneapolis, Minn., Roseville, Calif., Seward, Alaska, Sidney, Ohio, and Woodstock, Ill.

CEREMONIES PLANNED

Two special events to celebrate the award were announced by Zirpolo today.

A flag-raising ceremony which will take place April 3 at the municipal building and a presentation banquet at the Woodbridge Armory April 18 at 7 p.m. will serve to emphasize the award.

The dinner will be attended by representatives of the National Municipal League and Look magazine. State, county, and Federal officials will also be invited.

Zirpolo's comment on the award said the recognition gives Woodbridge "an opportunity to further unite our community and to present to the public the image of a progressive municipality * * * but it will serve as a new stimulus to all those citizen groups who have performed so ably in the past to do bigger and better things."

BRILLIANT FUTURE

The mayor said Woodbridge "has a brilliant future before it. We have all the assets to become a truly great municipality—skilled manpower, geographic position, open space, and an outstanding transportation network."

He said the award is evidence that Woodbridge has the citizen groups capable of guiding the future of the municipality.

"With this award under our belt I hope that we can cast aside the petty sectionalism that has been hampering our growth and maturity. I hope that we once again can unite in a common cause—to make Woodbridge a better and more united community."

Cigarette Advertising Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I believe most knowledgeable and fairminded Americans will applaud the action of the Nation's nine major cigarette manufacturers in establishing a cigarette advertising code.

The code provides for an administrator who shall be a person of recognized independence, integrity, and intellectual achievement to the end that decisions by him shall command public confidence and respect.

No advertising for cigarettes may be used unless it has first been "submitted to the administrator and determined by him to be in compliance with the standards" of the code. The administrator is given complete and final authority to make this decision.

I have read and considered this code. In my judgment, it is the answer to the proposals of the Federal Trade Commission respecting cigarette advertising and labeling.

Watches and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a very pertinent and penetrating letter from Paul F. Mickey of the American Watch Manufacturers Association concerning watches appeared in the Washington Post of April 15, 1964.

Since my district is a great watch-producing district and relies, to a great degree, on the health of this industry for employment and subcontracts, I believe that this letter should receive wider circulation, and I include it here as an appendage to my statement.

WATCHES AND TARIFFS

Charles P. Taft has been writing letters for a dozen years against the American watch industry and in support of the efforts of the Swiss watch cartel to lower U.S. watch tariffs. The letter published March 22 shows that his respect for facts has not increased with the passage of time.

The public record at the Tariff Commission shows the following facts, not one of which was mentioned by Mr. Taft. The U.S. jeweled lever watch industry now has only 15 percent of our own market. The Swiss cartel now supplies 83 percent of all imports. In 1954 the U.S. Tariff Commission found the U.S. industry had already been seriously injured by imports. Since that 1954 finding, the U.S. industry has been reduced to three companies—Bulova, Elgin, and Hamilton; U.S. production has declined 40 percent and employment of watch workers has decreased 48 percent. The American industry pays over 2½ times the Swiss rate.

This is the condition of the industry that Mr. Taft said is stronger than in 1954. These are the facts which have led the Tariff Commission in each annual review of the watch industry escape clause action to find no cause for removal of the relief which President Eisenhower granted in 1954. They indicated a need for additional help, certainly not a tariff reduction.

But the most significant fact—which Mr. Taft also did not mention—is the finding of the U.S. District Court in New York, in 1962, in an antitrust suit brought by the Department of Justice, that the Swiss watch industry is an international cartel. On the basis of an 8,000 page record, Judge Cashin concluded that, as early as 1931, the defendants "entered into a combination and conspiracy to eliminate competition in the U.S. manufacture, import, export and sale of watches, watch parts and watchmaking machinery."

These practices, needless to say, are completely repugnant to the stated purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and are specifically condemned in section 252 of that act, which makes a finding of their existence the statutory basis for withholding or withdrawing tariff concessions from the nation tolerating such practices.

It is outright misrepresentation for Mr. Taft to say that spokesmen for the companies "admitted last week that the companies would survive a reduction in the tariff." These spokesmen—the chairmen of the boards of directors of Bulova, Elgin, and Hamilton—said the companies could survive—profitably—by becoming 100-percent importers, but the U.S. jeweled watch production would not survive. And, as one of them, Gen. Omar Bradley, pointed out, this would leave the United States and the Western Hemisphere without a jeweled watch industry at a time when Russia has expanded her industry from a production of 635,000 movements in 1938 to 26,500,000 in 1962.

The small U.S. industry, which produced only 1,400,000 movements in 1963, has made timing devices for practically every missile and spacecraft launched by the United States. It may make sense to Mr. Taft to destroy this capability in order to provide a monopoly for a foreign cartel, but that would not be in the national interest.

PAUL F. MICKEY,
American Watch Manufacturers Association.

WASHINGTON.

Pentagon Review of Long Island Defense Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged to read in the Long Island Press that the Department of Defense, in response to a request from local authorities, has decided to take a look at Long Island's defense network and specifically the plants which will be facing contract reductions.

I hope very much that the Defense Department, in giving its attention to this matter, will increase its understanding of the social and economic impact of arms shifts and cutbacks which will be expanding in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Long Island Press on Tuesday, April 28, be attached to my remarks here as follows:

PENTAGON TO LOOK AT LONG ISLAND PLIGHT

Long Island was assured today that a top Pentagon official would visit its defense plants facing contract cutbacks.

Donald Bradford, director of economic adjustment for the Defense Department, agreed to a personal inspection within a month—in response to an invitation from Representative JOHN W. WYDLER, Garden City Republican, and Lawrence Lentol, a Huntington banker and member of the Nassau-Suffolk Economic Development Council.

Lentol was in Washington yesterday attending a conference on Federal aid available to New York State and local governments.

WYDLER said the council, a group of business and defense contractors, stressed the need for help in adjusting to other work after Federal contracts end.

The conference was called by Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS. A number of Congressmen, including Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Brooklyn Democrat, who is chairman of the bipartisan New York State Steering Committee, attended the meeting.

Others from Long Island who attended were Otis G. Pike, Riverhead Democrat, and Steven B. Derounian, Roslyn Estates Republican, Mayors R. T. Waldbauer of Patchogue, W.

Harry Lister of Rockville Centre and Arthur Levine of Greenport.

During the meetings, Rockville Centre officials, led by Lister, asked Federal urban renewal officials to speed action on the town's 36-acre west end project.

Lister said the sessions had been "helpful" in promoting better understanding between Federal and local officials.

The Wheat-Cotton Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, those of us from wheat producing States have read many editorials and have heard many comments pro and con concerning the cotton-wheat measure. It was a tough vote for many, particualrly DON SHORT of North Dakota, a member of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. Many farmers and others may be quick to pass judgment, depending whether they were for or against the measure, but at the same time the great majority will respect Congressman SHORT who studied the proposal carefully and then exercised his best judgment. A recent editorial in the McLean County (N. Dak.) Independent accurately and eloquently discusses the proper role of a legislator when facing critical votes on critical issues.

RESPECT FOR CONGRESSMAN SHORT RISES

Respect for North Dakota's west district Congressman, DON L. SHORT, took another step higher among many area citizens last week when the Medora rancher voted in opposition to the cotton-wheat bill.

Even those who differed with him are quick to admit they respect his intestinal fortitude * * * although they're quick to add they'll be voting against him this fall.

Congressman SHORT voted against the wheat-cotton bill, he said, because he could not vote for it in all good conscience even though, based on the mail he had received, most of his constituents favored the measure. SHORT said that in his judgment the proposal would not prove beneficial to the North Dakota wheat grower, and he followed his convictions by voting against the bill.

Whether the vote will damage SHORT's chances for reelection or enhance them is difficult to know. One thing, however, seems certain. A large number of Republicans, as evidenced at the party's State convention, are proud of the Medora rancher and will work harder for his reelection.

But equally true is the certainty that his Democratic-NPL opponent (still to be named at this writing) will effectively use SHORT's vote in an effort to unseat him.

Before the debate begins, however, voters in the western district can even prepare for the big campaign by discussing the proper role of an elected official: Should he be truly representative of his constituents or should he follow his convictions and differ with the majority of those he represents when the "need" arises?

A large number of political officeholders almost religiously use polls to determine the opinions of their constituents on issues which face them. While much can be said in defense of that type of action for it is nearly truly representative government, we sometimes wonder about the danger of basing decisions on opinions from an uninformed public.

Congressman SHORT has demonstrated a "leadership" that seems far too uncommon these days. We respect him for his choice in last week's vote * * * and no one can say, with any degree of true knowledge, that his choice was wrong.

Soil Conservation and Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad today to learn from the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, that a revised memorandum of understanding with the soil conservation district, with headquarters at Barre, Mass., in my district, has been approved.

The purpose of this revised memorandum is to reflect the concepts of the sixties as an initial step in more effectively helping private landowners to press forward with their soil and water conservation efforts.

Under this memorandum, the Department of Agriculture, through its various agencies, will continue to cooperate with and assist this district in carrying out its longtime soil and water conservation and resource-use program, which has been updated and modernized.

The areas where the cooperation and assistance by agencies of the Department of Agriculture include programs involving soil and water conservation, watershed protection, flood prevention, farm forestry, and rural area development and encompassing research, education, technical assistance, cost-sharing and credit for conserving and improving soil, water, plant, woodland, and wildlife resources and reducing damage by floods and sedimentation, from which our district has suffered in the past, is a distinct contribution to the well-being and progress of many of the fine communities I have the honor to represent in the Congress and I am indeed very grateful for it.

I am advised that the Soil Conservation Service, which has outstanding leadership in my State and district, will continue to provide technical assistance within the limits of its resources to assist the local farmer cooperators in developing, applying, and maintaining conservation plans to protect and improve their land.

Soil conservation and general conservation of our precious natural resources are of great moment to this Nation as we face the crucial problems of the present and move forward hopefully and with high resolve into the future.

Much progress has been made in conservation efforts in recent years but the pace is not fast enough. We must intensify our work in this field to insure that nothing shall be left undone that can be done to conserve all our natural resources, to banish waste and spoilage and to preserve them as vital accompaniments and invaluable instruments of the public safety, the public health and the public interests.

The population of our great country is growing at a rapid rate and we have special reasons for channeling this growth into constructive lines of happy, comfortable living, constructive endeavors and wholesome, sound progress in promoting the true welfare of the American people.

Schick Electric, of Lancaster, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, for the next 2 years the New York World's Fair will play host to millions of visitors. Among the many intriguing exhibits they will see will be one that shows the history of an ancient ritual that is still practiced each day by more than 55 million American men—shaving.

The display will show the various shaving implements men have used since the first razor was fashioned from flint over 4,000 years ago. It also will show some even more primitive whisker removal devices such as clamshells which were used to pluck whiskers out, and pumice stone which sandpapered them off. However, the theme of the exhibit—and of the fair—is progress. In the history of shaving, progress has been largely the result of American ingenuity.

Shaving is often taken for granted as a normal prerequisite for the business day. But ease of shaving has enormous significance for the average American male. During his life, he will spend 3,350 hours—or more than a year's worth of 8-hour workdays—just shaving. Starting at the age of 15, he can expect to spend up to 15 minutes a day removing his daily quota of roughly 30,000 unwanted whiskers. A 19th century poet once calculated that man spends enough time shaving to learn even languages.

The highlight of the history of shaving as displayed at the Fair is the development of the most modern means of shaving now available, the rechargeable, cordless electric shaver. This is a point of particular pride to those of us who live in the Pennsylvania Dutch country because a neighbor of ours, Schick Electric Inc., of Lancaster, Pa., was founded by the inventor of the electric shaver, Col. Jacob Schick.

The electric shaver represented the first totally new and practical concept of shaving since man decided to place a knife edge to his face to hack off his whiskers. It was introduced in 1930 by Schick, an American soldier and inventor. He conceived the idea for dry shaving while on duty with the Army in Alaska. The cold climate did not lend itself to shaving with blade and lather.

This spurred the colonel to find a more comfortable method.

It was not until years later, it is reported, while immobilized with an ankle sprained during a moose hunt, that Colonel Schick was able to work out the basic principles of electric shaving. He experimented for many years and finally patented his invention in 1928.

One of his many problems was the development of an electric motor small enough to fit into a shaver. The motor which he created for his specific purpose was the most powerful of its size yet devised. It was considered a significant electromechanical achievement.

Recently, in another technological breakthrough—the result of an intensive research and development program—Schick Electric achieved another first. It became the first major American manufacturer of shaving products to introduce stainless steel shaving to the public.

Stainless steel, as those familiar with it can attest, gives a better shave over a longer period than carbon steel. Although its superior qualities have long been known in the industry, complex production problems prevented its adoption. After several years of research, Schick finally solved the problem of producing stainless steel heads at a reasonable cost. Such shaver heads are an exclusive feature of the Schick line.

One of the developments which evolved from the Schick research into uses of stainless steel was a special vacuum furnace. The furnace, which took more than a year to build, treats the metal at temperatures ranging from 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit to 100 degress below zero. The heating and quick-cooling process alters the steel's atomic structure to produce a sharper, more uniform cutting edge. The furnace is part of a production system that has enabled the company to offer stainless steel heads without raising the price of its shavers.

However, the electric shaver is only one end of the shaving spectrum. On the other is the clam shell. In between, men have used a staggering amount of strange utensils in their efforts to appear clean-shaven to the world.

Throughout history, men have shaved with copper knives, bronze blades, and even a razor made from volcanic glass. Steel was discovered by the Greeks in 300 B.C. From that point until the hollow-ground blade was discovered in the early 18th century, there was virtually no progress in shaving instruments. The first safety razor was invented in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1876. Shortly thereafter, the replaceable blade was introduced, and blade-and-lather shaving as we know it today was born.

It remained for Colonel Schick and his invention of the electric shaver to furnish an alternative to the routine of lather, blade, and styptic.

For 32 years since the company was founded in 1930, Schick produced only electric shavers. In July 1962, the firm began an intensive product expansion program which has seen it diversify into the manufacture and marketing of a wide range of electrical grooming aids.

Reflecting this change, and to emphasize its long-recognized competence in electro-mechanical engineering, the firm has just changed its corporate name from Schick, Inc. to Shick Electric, Inc. Under this banner, it now produces a broad line of home hair dryers, electric shoe polishers, and cordless electric toothbrushes—all this in addition to its men's and ladies' electric shavers.

Also new to the company is its president, Jack J. Culberg, who was named "Man of the Year" by the housewares industry in 1960.

With a new name, a new president, and a growing list of new products, Schick Electric continues in the pioneering footsteps of Col. Jacob Schick—searching for new quality products to fill consumer wants and needs.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Schick Electric and wish the company and its dynamic new president continued success.

Mental Health Week, 1964: Let Us Carry On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this week, April 26 to May 2, the Nation is observing Mental Health Week. During this week State and local mental health organizations throughout the country will be holding conferences, sponsoring lectures, and giving annual banquets. Many mental hospitals and clinics will hold open houses or other special events. Meanwhile, in New York City the National Association for Mental Health will officially launch the 1964 Mental Health fund-raising campaign from the World's Fair grounds (Thursday, April 30) with a special program in tribute to our late President Kennedy whose interest and leadership in the attack on this major health problem marked the beginning of a new era in the treatment of the mentally ill. This morning I would like to add my own word of tribute to President Kennedy and pledge my support to the National Association of Mental Health and its member groups in their work to educate all citizens about the problem of mental illness and to raise funds for better care and treatment of the mentally ill.

As a result of President Kennedy's special message to the Congress last year on mental illness and retardation, the entire Nation was made vividly aware of the scope of these conditions and the tragic plight of their victims. We learned, for example, that mental illness leads all other public health problems in cost, prevalence, and distribution with an estimated 17 to 18 million people in the Nation today suffering from mental illness severe enough to warrant psychiatric treatment. We also learned that 70 percent of our public mental institutions are too large, too old and hazardous, too crowded, or too poorly equipped and staffed to be approved by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. With such poor facilities and an acute shortage of trained personnel, many States are able to provide little more than custodial care for their patients.

As a result, although we now have the medical knowledge, the drugs, and the therapeutic techniques to cure many of these individuals in a relatively short time, approximately half of the 515,000 patients in our public institutions in 1962 had been confined for 5 years or longer. As we are belatedly learning, many patients, once they adapt to hospital life, become chronic inhabitants. Public Law 88–164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, will help prevent this needless waste of human resources since it will provide for community centers where mental illness can be diagnosed and treated promptly and where the patient will be able to get help while at the same time maintaining the vital contacts with his family and friends and perhaps even retaining his job.

President Kennedy's Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health estimated that at least 50 percent of the patients now under custodial care can be rehabilitated so that they can live at home without hardship to themselves or their families. This would be a truly tremendous achievement and one of which we, as a nation, could be very proud.

The legislation providing the necessary programs has been enacted; now it remains for us all to work for public support of these services. We heeded President Kennedy's admonition, "We have long neglected the mentally ill. This neglect must end," by adopting the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act in 1963. Now let us carry on.

Quit Tampering With the Motor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial written by Mr. Henry E. Willis, which recently appeared in the Steuben Republican, I think, expresses the attitude of a good many Americans toward radical changes in our Government.

QUIT TAMPERING WITH THE MOTOR

Anyone knows that it takes an expert to work on the fine motors in all of today's new cars. Mechanics must be highly skilled and have proper tools. To eliminate possible mishandling by a "plier and screwdriver blacksmith," more and more of the companies are encouraging owners to drive 25,000 or 50,000 miles before major checkups by the mechanics. And, then, they urge that only the most highly skilled do the job.

The U.S. Government is the most successful vehicle for taking people ahead in progress that the world has even known. Fashioned by skilled designers, and put together

with a great amount of sweat, toil, and sacrifice, this "ship of state" has gotten more people farther in a shorter amount of time than has ever been recorded in history.

Now, when a small squeak appears, or it is time for an oil change, there are many "plier and screwdriver politicians" who have had a short course in political science and feel they are now able to completely overhaul this smooth-running vehicle. All that is needed are a few minor adjustments but even these should be made by experts. The motor is fine and good for many more years of service. Yet these radicals are itching to get at the motor. They want to take it out and put in some new, untried innovation (they think), such as the Socialist electric, or the Communist chain drive, or United Nations hot air. All of these, in the event they do not know, have been tried years ago and found to be failures.

So it is time to make these radicals quit tampering with the motor. If they want to put squirrel tails on the antenna that is alright because it really doesn't hurt the operation of the old car, anyway and may give a little individuality. But when it comes to going places, give us that old free-enterprise horse power drive with its smooth surge of power, its quick pickup that takes it far out ahead of the pack, its economy of action, and its reliability which has furnished transportation to more places, for more people, faster, better and at higher levels than any other system of government ever known.

Let's take the knock out of the motor by removing these inexperienced do-gooders who are experimenting with our future by taking the motor apart just to see what makes it run.

Tariff Commission Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to find that the Tariff Commission has recommended the removal of common pins from the list for upcoming negotiations under the upcoming GATT discussions. This action represents a recognition of the serious inroads which low-wage imports have made in the domestic market and gives reasonable protection to this important American industry, while still permitting a substantial flow of imports.

For the record, I append herewith a letter which I recently wrote to the Honable Christian A. Herter, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in connection with this problem. Prior to this time, I appeared before the Tariff Commission and I am gratified at the action that has been taken.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 13, 1964.*

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: I have already communicated with you with reference to industries in my district whose management are concerned that their protection may be bargained away in the coming GATT negotiations.

I do want to call particular attention to one of these industries which stands in a peculiar position in this matter. I refer to the pin industry which has already been found by the Tariff Commission on February 28, 1962, to qualify for relief under the escape clause and would have received relief but for the action of the President on April 28, 1962.

We, in western Connecticut, have already lost some of this industry to other parts of the country and under present circumstances this trend will continue with the increase of products from foreign sources.

Since Waterbury and the western Connecticut area constitute the major manufacing center of this industry, and presently qualify as areas of labor surplus, the urgency of reasonable protection is apparent.

For your information, I am enclosing herewith a copy of a communication which I sent to President Kennedy subsequent to the action of the Tariff Commission. I request that you give thorough consideration to the removal of this industry from the list of those whose products will be negotiated upon at the coming session of the GATT conference.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of beef imports disrupting the domestic cattle market is one that deeply concerns the people of my district and the entire country. The fact remains that very little has been done to alleviate the problem of the American cattle raiser. Recently, I received a letter from one of my constituents, that summarizes this situation very well. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEAR PETE: As you know I am a small cattle raiser and I suppose you have heard what I am about to say many times lately over this importing of beef into this great country of ours, which we are proud of and love very much.

Now in the last 15 years, we have had a tremendous expansion in beef cattle in the United States. Producers increased their herds from 77 to 106 million head during this time. Everybody has had a hand in this—new and modern packinghouses and processing plants—and the consuming public has accepted the product very well, voluntarily going in and purchasing in ever-increasing amounts. Consumption of beef per person jumped from 63 to 96 pounds during this period, an increase of 50 percent.

The industry has improved the quality of its product with more grain feeding. Processors improved their methods, and retailers put beef on the counters in more desirable cuts and in attractive packages. "It is a true American success story." But here is the sad part of this beef industry all the way through. Prices of feed cattle have dropped below the cost of production, and unless there is a great recovery within the next few months, we will see the price on stocker and feeder cattle very low next fall. Now there are people in Washington, who would say to bring the cattle production in line with the demand; but the big question is, how can we adjust production to a desired level within the borders of this great country when it is plain to see the Federal Government is letting 11.3 percent import of domestic production, come in against the cattlemen of these United States.

Pete, this import is a "new bug" to deal with, and I think it is here to stay, right or wrong; but we have got to control this monster or the economy is busted. As a citizen, I offer no apology for asking for protection from countries where production costs, including wages, are far below those of the United States. But as I understand, protection was furnished the people of this country when article I, section 8, was written in the Constitution.

The first and third grant of power to Congress handed them the authority to impose duties and imports, and to regulate commerce with foreign countries, directly to the legislative branch. To regulate is defined "to bring under control" and fix the amount, and that is what we cattlemen want to see done.

The basic industries of this country were developed and preserved by protection through the use of duties, quotas, and even embargoes, when necessary, in the best interests of this country.

Free trede in the world today consists mostly of letting other countries dump what they don't want or need on the market in the United States. They can ship beef in, but there is no place in the world, that we can market our beef. Other governments sure stop us when they get ready.

If we were to cut production and prices improve, it would only bring more imports, so the present unsatisfactory price will become permanent. As we retreat, our competitors will advance until they become the major suppliers to this country. We used to have a 6 cents per pound tariff on beef, now it is 3 cents. When it comes to bargaining, we Americans don't do very well, and in the field of agriculture we do even worse. Let us take a home down in the hills, look at the impact imported beef made in 1963 on our domestic meat market. In pounds it would be equal to all the beef fed in Iowa, the leading cattle feeding State in the Nation, or, it would equal all cattle sold at the Chicago terminal market, or, it would equal all beef consumed in the United States in 1 month and 2 weeks. In other words cattle feeders and producers had 10½ months to sell a 12-month supply.

On the basis of even 95 pounds consumed per capita, 11 percent of which was imported, and a population of 187 million consumers in the United States, the beef imported in 1963 equaled the total consumed by 20,570,000.

Unless we can change the opinion of the executive branch of our Government, it does not appear that legislation will be passed to correct the present agreement. So, Pete, let's do all we can to get them to change their opinion on this important part of importing beef. So give them * * * if you have to and more power to you.

Very truly,

VAUGHN C. GLASSBURN.

GALLIPOLIS, OHIO.

Through the Farm Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting editorial recently appeared in

the Wall Street Journal of April 20, 1964, based on the Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower.

While I would hope that all of my colleagues of both parties would take the time to read the entire report, I know that time is at a premium. Therefore, this editorial on the "farm fog" attempts to crystallize certain facts of the position paper. I think that it does manage to get across the main point, though surprisingly enough, the use of statistics contained in the appendix to the report. I am happy to make the editorial part of the permanent RECORD.

THROUGH THE FARM FOG

If you can bear with a few statistics on a Monday morning, they tell in brief a good deal about the famous farm problem and how it is steadily worsening:

In fiscal 1955 the Department of Agriculture spent $4.6 billion; in 1963, $7.7 billion.

In fiscal 1955 direct Government payments to farmers came to $229 million; in 1963 to $1.8 billion.

In calendar 1955 net farm income was $11.5 billion; in 1964 it is estimated at $11.6 billion.

At the end of fiscal 1955 surpluses amounted to $6.7 billion; at the end of 1963, $7.3 billion.

And while the farm population declined by nearly 5 million from 1955 to 1962, the number of Agriculture Department employees increased from over 85,000 in 1955 to an estimated 115,000 in 1964.

The figures, all from government sources, are contained in the appendix to a statement just put out by the Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower. The statistical point hardly needs laboring; something is radically wrong when taxpayer costs, surpluses and bureaucracy rise without increasing general farm well-being.

To begin with the more or less obvious, there is no single problem. Farming and farms are highly varied; for convenience, however, two broad categories are recognized—commercial and small scale.

Both types are still mainly family operations, though it is the small-scale variety that the politicians usually have in mind when they talk about the "family farm." Commercial farms represent only about 40 percent of the total and yet sell almost 90 percent of the products; the other 60 percent of the farms sell only a little more than 10 percent.

A major farm problem is generated, the council report notes, "by the excessive productive capacity of the larger commercial farms. Political commodity solutions are based on the false premise that price support programs will solve the problems of low-income rural people and small farmers."

In fact, "price support programs are of small help to rural people who have little to sell. On the other hand, operators of commercial farms have little need for the programs designed for people with limited farming opportunities." It is necessary in the first place to differentiate between the two and deal differently with each.

In dealing with marginal or sinking family farms, present policy is to preserve them as such no matter what. Actually, as the study stresses, many farms are simply too small for modern farming. It would encourage, rather than hinder, consolidation of such farms into family units of economic size. It would also encourage farmers who aren't making a go of it to seek opportunities elsewhere, providing vocational training and other assistance where necessary.

As for the problem of farms with excess capacity, the report urges an end to price fixing in the name of price supports. "Support prices should be so established that market prices would normally fluctuate above the support level," which was the original intention. Making supports a floor instead of a ceiling would help bring a better balance of supplies and markets.

Not least, the council would return more decisionmaking from the Government to the farmer, in contrast to the current attempts to spread regimentation ever wider. It is significant that the commodities relying largely on farmer-made decisions—and they account for three-fourths of farm income—"have experienced growing markets and reasonably good production adjustments * * *. Those commodities which have relied most on Government-made decisions are badly out of adjustment."

This is very nearly the crux of the many faceted problem. Incessant Government intervention for more than 30 years is what has produced this costly failure and it is today further than ever from producting a solution. If the truth could be discerned through the official fog, it is Government policy, not free marketing, which is on trial.

The remedies proposed by the council are neither startling nor drastic; certainly it recognizes the need for a gradual transition to greater reliance on the market after so long a stretch of Federal mismanagement. But the statement does provide needed clarification of the real as opposed to the fancied dimensions of the problem. And because the analysis is sound, the conclusion can point in the only direction promising relief for farmer and nonfarmer alike.

Michigan on the March Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there has been a drastic change for the better in the economic climate in Michigan in the last 2 years.

Our State is moving forward. Michigan's progress is dramatically described in an address given last night by Mr. James H. Campbell, president of the Consumers Power Co., at the 18th Annual Congressional Dinner given here in Washington by the Association Executives of Michigan.

We would like for the Nation to know the strides we have made and with unanimous consent I submit Mr. Campbell's address for the RECORD:

"WHAT'S AHEAD FOR MICHIGAN"—ADDRESS BY JAMES H. CAMPBELL, PRESIDENT, CONSUMERS POWER CO., MICHIGAN CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 28, 1964

It has been reported that when our first parents were driven out of paradise, Adam said to Eve:

"My dear, we live in an age of transition."

We live in it still. Things are changing so fast that it's like shooting the rapids of the Colorado River in a canoe.

The scenery is wonderful, but look out for those rocks.

In Michigan, things are looking better all the time.

Employment is up, production is up, sales are up, construction is up, population is up, hopes are up—and so are we.

The monthly average of nonfarm employment in 1963 was 2,666,700, up 2 percent from 1962. Now it is up to 2,712,000 and by June it will be 2,736,000, according to the magazine "Michigan Trends." That means there will be 69,000 more nonfarm jobs in June 1964 than the monthly average for 1963.

Unemployment averaged 5.3 percent of the labor force in 1963 and Market Trends estimates it will be down to 4.9 percent by July—still too high but well below the 6.7 percent of 1962 and the 10.2 percent of 1961. Unemployment remains a serious problem.

The automobile industry in the first quarter of 1964 turned out 11 percent more automobiles than it did last year, and it is manufacturing more cars this month than in any month in history.

Retail sales in 1963 were 6 percent above 1962. Sales tax collections in every month of 1963 broke the record for that month, and the same thing is true of the first 3 months of 1964.

Residential construction in Michigan was up 22 percent in 1963, and total construction up 10 percent.

Michigan, along with most of the rest of the United States, is in the third year of the greatest boom ever. What of the future? Can we maintain the high level of prosperity already attained? Can we do even better?

I think it's possible but I don't think it will be easy. It will require hard work and clear thinking. Most of all, it will require that we analyze and understand what has already happened.

We are citizens of a great State. But let's not be provincial. Each of the 50 States is great in its own way. Let's be polite and make no comparisons. Some people have to live in other States. Some people—some Michiganites, even—have to live in the District of Columbia. Let's not make them feel worse by gloating over Michigan.

It is only fitting, however, that we solemnly acknowledge with profound thanks the munificence of our Creator in placing Michigan in the bosom of the Great Lakes. We should never cease to praise Him for our sparkling lakes and lovely streams, the richness of our mineral resources, the fertility of our soil, the grandeur of our forests.

It took more than the bounties of nature to make Michigan thrive and prosper. The Indians weren't prosperous before the white man came, nor afterward. They lived hand-to-mouth on the game and fish they could kill, the few vegetables their squaws could raise, and the fruits and berries they gathered in the fields. Their housing was definitely submarginal, and their clothing left a lot to be desired.

White men lived better but not too much so, for the most part, until about the time when this Nation was established. A family had about all it could do to raise its own food, weave its own clothing, grind its own flour and bake its own bread.

Then came the industrial revolution, giving man wonderful tools with which to increase his productivity—the steam engine, the water-powered loom, the cotton gin, the sewing machine, the McCormick reaper, the Oliver plow, and in due course the automobile. Thomas Edison established central station electric service, Alexander Graham Bell perpetrated the telephone, and away we went.

Eli Whitney, besides inventing the cotton gin, pioneered the concept of interchangeable parts. He dumped loose parts for ten muskets on a table and rapidly assembled two muskets with parts picked up at random. This won him a Government contract. Today it's not that easy. Interchangeable parts led to Michigan's astonishing automobile assembly lines.

All these advances resulted from tinkering. Now it is called research and development. The objective was and is to find better ways of doing things, ways to relieve man of drudgery, multiply his productivity, and enable him to live a more abundant life.

It is interesting news that universities in southeastern Michigan spent $50 million on research in 1963 as compared with $36 million in 1962 and only $6 million in 1951.

Think what has happened to farming. In 1800, before farming was mechanized, before Michigan State University and other research organizations had made their wonderful contributions to agriculture, it took the efforts of 90 people out of 100 to produce food and fiber for this Nation. Now it takes less than 7 out of 100, and we're producing so much that the storing of surpluses is a problem and we are paying farmers to reduce production.

PROFIT MOTIVE RECOGNIZED

Industry is producing goods of all kinds in such quantities and paying its workers so well that our standard of living could scarcely have been imagined when the present century began.

Why has the industrial revolution succeeded so well in the United States? Largely because of the economic climate. We have recognized the profit motive as a legitimate and powerful motive. By inspiring the enterpriser, it brings benefits for everyone. Our economic climate encourages people to invest their savings in the tools of production through purchase of shares in companies such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Dow Chemical, Upjohn, and yes, Detroit Edison, Michigan Consolidated Gas & Consumers Power Co. The industrial corporation itself is a tool of production—the mightiest tool of all—and productivity is the keystone of our economy.

Preservation of a favorable climate for industrial productivity in the United States is an important responsibility of both government and industry, as well as everyone else, and it is good that we are together here tonight, men of government and men of business, in an atmosphere of respect and understanding, to take this brief look at what lies ahead.

In Michigan, in the Nation, in the world, population is exploding. Maybe it shouldn't be but I'm not foolhardy enough to suggest any way to stop it. At present the population of Michigan is estimated at something over 8 million. By 1970 it is expected to be about 9½ million and by 1975, which is only 11 years away, about 10½ million. If Michigan is to keep unemployment down to the present level of about 5 percent, to say nothing of reducing it, we will have to create about 75,000 additional jobs in each of the next 11 years. And I do not mean to suggest that the problem will end in 1975.

GOVERNMENT CAN'T CREATE JOBS THAT MAKE PROSPERITY

To whom can we look for all those additional jobs? Certainly we must look to industry. If industry expands to employ 25,000 additional workers per year, possibly 50,000 other jobs will be created in education, in government, and in stores, gas stations, and service establishments of various kinds serving the needs of industrial employees and their families.

The industrial jobs, the productive jobs, have to be created first. They are the jobs on which our economy depends. There are roughly twice as many jobs outside the field of industrial production as there are within it. But they don't come into existence through parthenogenesis. The industrial jobs need to be there first.

This is a basic economic fact which everyone should understand, and I'm sure everyone here does understand it. I get the impression that there are a great many people in this country, some of them with advanced degrees from great universities, who do not understand it as well as they should.

Government can't create jobs. Now, let me amend that statement. Government can't create the sort of jobs that make prosperity. Naturally, in a Nation as big as ours, facing all the complex problems that it does today, a substantial number of people hold Government jobs.

There is no question that Government can make it easier for industry to create new jobs. It has done so by reducing income tax rates and by providing for investment tax credits.

I do not say, give industry free rein to do as it likes. If I said that I'd be way out of date. Industry is already subject to all sorts of laws and regulations and, in general, it is getting along rather well, though I'm sure some of you businessmen could relate stories of ill treatment by the Government that would cause us to break out our handkerchiefs.

We're all in this thing together. Most of the people in this country depend directly or indirectly on industry for their livelihood. Government itself depends on industry for the great bulk of its tax collections. Industry depends on Government to maintain a sound and healthy economic climate in which industry can prosper and expand. There is no real division of interest. It's one for all and all for one.

I feel very strongly that Government should confine itself to governing and refrain from establishing tax-subsidized competition with taxpaying, investor-owned industry. But this is scarcely the occasion to go deeply into that subject. Nor is this the best time to dwell on the upsurge of crime in this country—and particularly the growing disregard for law among younger people—did I say younger—though this certainly is one of the many problems crying for governmental attention.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT CREATE COMPETITION

May I remind you that one of Michigan's great abilities is the ability to rise above untruthful publicity? Such publicity began early. In 1815, almost 150 years ago, the Surveyor General in the U.S. Land Office, one Edward Tiffin, issued a report about Michigan that said there was "not one acre in a hundred, if there should be in a thousand, that would in any case admit of cultivation. It is all swampy and sandy." Not content with that, he issued another report a week later saying that subsequent accounts "make the country out worse, if possible, than I had represented it to be."

Those reports slowed down the settlement of Michigan, but our State has done pretty well. It ranks 7th in population through only 23d in area. More important, it ranks sixth in value of manufactured products and fourth in Federal income taxes paid.

Through manufacturing, Michigan in 1962 added $12 billion to the value of its manufactured products. This was 6.7 percent—about one-fifteenth—of the total value added by manufacturing throughout the United States. Per worker, value added in Michigan was $17,800 as compared with $14,800 in the whole United States. I suspect Michigan did even better last year but 1963 figures won't be available for some time.

We have had great news from Michigan industry in recent weeks. It comes from General Motors and Ford and Chrysler—from Upjohn and Dow and Stauffer Chemical—from Defoe Shipbuilding Company—from the paper companies and from Kellogg. I can't mention them all but you all are aware of the developments in your own communities and your own congressional districts on the radical assumption that you know where your congressional districts are. It seems clear that there will be a substantial increase of jobs in the next 2 years. I think there will be a lot more in the years that follow.

OUTLOOK BRIGHT

I am proud—and I'm sure all of you are proud—of our great Michigan industries who are leading the way so boldly and confidently toward a greater tomorrow. I am glad to know that the automobile companies are establishing good earnings records. They deserve good earnings and must have them to fulfill their essential role in our economy.

No electric or gas company, so far as I know, has a crystal ball, but all of them can judge the condition of the economy by the demand for electricity and gas. Such companies seek constantly to anticipate future demand for services. This they must do, since it takes the better part of 5 years to plan and build a large new electric generating station or to acquire and activate an additional gas storage field. As to electric supply, the Detroit Edison Co. and Consumers Power Co. do their planning jointly. The two systems are interconnected to permit the exchange of power as required, and construction of additional capacity is staggered between the two companies, which reduces cost for both.

Without burdening you with figures, I can tell you that we expect the use of electricity by Michigan industry, Michigan business and Michigan homes to keep right on going up. Consumers Power Co. feels the same way about the use of natural gas and I'm sure this is true of the other gas companies also. We are backing our judgment with large additional investments.

What would stop the expansion of industry, in Michigan and elsewhere?

I'm not worried about the capacity of the American people to consume goods. Our appetite for new goods and improved goods is insatiable. As someone had said, our great-grandfathers crossed the plains with less equipment than we require nowadays to cook a steak in the backyard. Any product that contributes to our needs or to our comfort or pleasure or vanity or prestige has a market waiting for it. You never thought you would be using an electric toothbrush—now, did you? On a larger scale, the market for mass transportation equipment, for getting large numbers of people from place to place in our big cities, has been estimated at a billion dollars.

Do you remember when the automobile industry used to worry about "the saturation point"? Some of you aren't old enough to remember, but when I was a boy back in Pontiac people had the idea that the day was not far distant when everyone who could afford an automobile would have one and the market for automobiles would disappear. Look what has happened. Papa drives one automobile to work, mother uses another for running errands, and as soon as a kid reaches 16 he insists on having one for himself. Fortunately, he doesn't always get it. And last year we scrapped more than 5 million automobiles.

There is no limit that I can see to the amount of goods we can manufacture and consume in the United States. And of course there are vast areas in this world where people have very few of the things they would like to have. These are the unindustrialized areas where population are large, jobs few, and money scarce.

If Michigan and the United States preserve the conditions that have enabled industry to expand and flourish, there is a bright future ahead for both of them.

The times call for wholehearted concentration on the jobs that face us. But I am sure that no man in this room expected or even wanted a life free of problems when he went into Government or into business. If he did there must have been something wrong with his head from which he has since recovered.

We Michiganites are proud of Michigan, and this condition will not change. Possibly—just possibly—Michigan may not lead the league in all departments at all times, but we may be sure that she will always be right up there in the first division—in industrial productivity, in agriculture, in education, and in opportunities for living a busy, useful, pleasant life.

Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake Erie will roll and shimmer as the ships of many nations move across the horizon. Fish will flash in our inland lakes and streams. Sap will flow in the maple trees. Deer will bound through the underbrush, and the Kirtland warbler will sing on the Au Sable.

In our cities and everywhere in our two magnificent peninsulas, the people will be as they have always been. And we know it is the people who have made Michigan the dynamic, progressive and lovely State that it is and will continue to be.

What's ahead for Michigan?

Unending challenge * * * unlimited opportunity * * * and * * * as our generation and those that follow measure up to those that have gone before * * * a satisfying portion of success.

The Threat Posed by Proposals To Reverse the Supreme Court by Amending the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following pamphlet published by the Joint Advisory Committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

I urge all of our colleagues to study the text of this statement carefully. I am certain that if they do so they will agree with me that the first amendment should not be tampered with.

The text of the pamphlet follows:

THE THREAT POSED BY PROPOSALS TO REVERSE THE SUPREME COURT BY AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION

For the first time in American history the Nation is faced with a serious challenge to the integrity of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution a century and three-quarters ago. Until now there has never been a serious effort to abridge it by amendment. Even when the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren handed down decisions upholding freedom of speech and association which some felt weakened America's defense against internal subversion, concerned opposition did not take the form of an effort to amend the Bill of Rights but rather to change the Court's power of judicial review. Today, a determined campaign is being waged under the leadership of Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, to overrule by constitutional amendment the Supreme Court's decision outlawing public-school-sponsored prayer and devotional Bible reading.

Congressman BECKER prevailed upon the 90-odd Congressmen who had introduced separate measures to join on one single bill. After this new measure was referred to the House Judiciary Committee, BECKER began rounding up signatures to a petition for its discharge. Ironically, BECKER himself had before always refused to sign discharge petitions, including those for civil rights bills aimed at achieving equality for Negroes and other racial minorities. The reason for the difference, BECKER explained, is that all other discharge petitions "dealt with material things and material benefits. This one deals only with the spiritual. The urgency of this matter leaves no alternative if we are to prevent the advocates of a godless society to accomplish in the United States that which the Communists have accomplished in Soviet Russia." At the present writing, according to BECKER, 141 of the necessary 218 Congressmen have signed his discharge petition.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The proposed amendment (H.J. Res. 693) agreed to by the various Congressmen and now being pushed reads as follows:

"SECTION 1: Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Bibical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"SEC. 2: Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making references to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3: Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

WHY WE OPPOSE THE BECKER AMENDMENT

1. It threatens the integrity of the Bill of Rights. If this amendment is adopted it will set a precedent for further assaults on the Bill of Rights whenever the Supreme Court hands down a decision protecting civil liberties. A decision upholding freedom of speech or of the press or of association may well evoke an amendment further cutting down the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is America's most precious heritage; it would be disastrous if disaffection with this or that Supreme Court decision should lead to its step-by-step destruction or even weakening.

2. It threatens the principle of church-state separation. Since the adoption of the first amendment, the United States has escaped much of the bitter religious conflict and sectarian strife that has divided other nations. This has been due in a major part to the truly great contribution the American people have made to western civilization: the concept of the separation of church and state. The Becker amendment is a direct assault upon this principle.

3. It threatens the principle of religious freedom. The Becker amendment speaks of a "voluntary basis," but every educator knows, and many courts have recognized, that it is unreal to speak of voluntary action on the part of young children in the public schools. As Supreme Court Justice Brennan said in the Bible-Prayer decision in speaking of a provision for excusing from participation those children who ask to be excused:

"By requiring what is tantamount in the eyes of teachers and schoolmates to a profession of disbelief, or at least nonconformity, the procedure may well deter those children who do not wish to participate for any reason based upon the dictates of conscience from exercising an indisputably constitutional right to be excused. Thus the excusal provision in its operation subjects them to a cruel dilemma. In consequence, even devout children may well avoid claiming their right and simply continue to participate in exercises distasteful to them because of an understandable reluctance to be stigmatized as atheists or nonconformists simply on the basis of their request."

4. It threatens the integrity of the public school system. The public school is the chief instrumentality of our Nation to promote and preserve the unity of our people. Sectarian prayers or similar practices in the public schools can have no more damaging effect than by dividing the children into groups of Protestants against Catholics, Christians against Jews, believers against nonbelievers. Children of different religions pray in different ways. Some kneel and cross themselves. Some clasp their hands or bow their heads. Some pray with head covered and some with head uncovered. And to some all public prayer is objectionable. Different religions, too, hold sacred different versions of the Bible. Catholics do not accept the King James version; Jews do not accept the New Testament; and Buddhists in the State of Hawaii do not accept as holy any part of the Bible. In each community there will be, as has happened so often in the past, conflict and controversy as to whose Bible shall be read and whose prayer shall be recited. If there is one place which should be kept entirely free of sectarian strife and religious rivalries it is the public school.

5. It is helpful, but hurtful to religion. It is unreal to expect that an appreciation of religious values can be communicated to our children by the rote recitation of formalized prayer in public school classrooms. Whatever is good and meaningful in prayer must inevitably be lost by its mechanical repetition in an atmosphere devoid of the religious spirit which only the home and church can provide. If the prayer selected by State authorities for public school recitation is taken from the liturgy of one faith, the action is unfair to and a violation of the religious freedom of children adhering to other faiths. If it is formulated so as to appear nonsectarian, it not only infringes upon the rights of those affiliated with no religious body, but it poses the danger of a new, public school religion which, in seeking to be least offensive, will succeed only in being least meaningful, and yet most pervasive.

WHO OPPOSES THE BECKER AMENDMENT?

Opposition to the Becker amendment is far more widespread than most Members of Congress realize. The mail they have been receiving has been largely from supporters of the amendment. The reason for this is that few persons concerned with church-state separation took the Becker amendment seriously or assumed that it would get very far. Hence, no serious effort was made to counter it. BECKER's free use of the "atheistic godlessness" charge and his threat to make speeches in the home districts of Congressmen who have not yet signed his discharge petition have undoubtedly had a substantial effect in accelerating signatures to his petition and in encouraging mail in its favor. That there is a great deal of opposition to the Becker amendment and to any other proposal to change the Bill of Rights to overrule the Bible-prayer decisions and that this opposition encompasses leaders in all three major faiths can be seen from the following:

National Council of Churches of Christ: Early in February 1964, the National Council of Churches conducted its first 4-day National Conference on Church and State. Some 400 delegates from every major Protestant denomination in the country assembled in Columbus, Ohio, to participate in the conference. On the concluding day the conference adopted a resolution expressing its "acceptance and support" of the Supreme Court's decisions banning State-sponsored Bible reading and prayer recitation in the public schools. An amendment by a delegate to strike out the word support, so that the National Council would not approve and support the decisions, but merely accept them, was overwhelmingly defeated. (The committee which reported the resolutions said in part: "We believe that Christians should welcome the decisions * * * [They] are consistent with our concern for the religious liberty of all men and our unwillingness to coerce in any way a person's response in faith to the gift of God's grace in Jesus Christ.") Earlier, the General Board of the National Council had asserted that "neither true religion nor good education is dependent upon the devotional use of the Bible in the public school program.

Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States: In a statement approved by the governing body of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Presiding Bishop Arthur Lichtenberger expressed his support of the Supreme Court's ruling and declared that it was not hostile to religion but that it reflected "the Court's sense of responsibility to assure freedom and equality for all groups of believers and nonbelievers."

Lutheran Church in America: Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, head of the church as well as of the Lutheran World Federation, stated that public school recitation of the Lord's Prayer debased it and that public school reading of the Bible was of dubious worth as a religious or educational experience.

United Presbyterian Church: The chief executive officer of the church and former president of the National Council of Churches, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, issued a statement jointly with the moderator (chairman) of the church expressing support for the decision and underscoring their firm belief "that religious instruction is the sacred responsibility of the family and the churches."

The Baptist Churches: Dr. E. Emanuel Carlson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs (representing more than 17 million Baptists) stated the committee's opposition to the use of the Bible for devotional purposes in the public schools as well as public school sponsored prayers.

Methodist Church: Bishop John Wesley Lord of Washington, D.C.: "Unless Bible reading and prayer are performed in an atmosphere of religious devotion often not possible in the public school, the very act may be profaned and secularized to the detriment of the pupils."

Catholic opposition to the Becker amendment—Catholic Telegraph (Cincinnati).—"Don't tamper: In our view, it will be less confusing and safer to leave the country's basic declaration about religion untouched. The two clauses about religion, one forbidding the establishment of an official American religion and the other guaranteeing the inviolability of religious freedom, admirably express traditional American convictions. There will always be some disagreement over the precise meaning of these ideas, but if we must rely on amendments to apply these ideas to particular situations, the amendments could become endless, and the Bill of Rights would become a confusing patchwork of words."

Catholic Universe Bulletin (Cleveland): (After referring to Pope John's and Cardinal Ritter's declarations for freedom of conscience): "It will seem impossible to square with such principles a school prayer amendment to the Constitution which would legalize religious exercises which are initiated, sponsored or directed by public school authorities." (This editorial was reprinted in the Catholic Chronicle of Toledo.) America (national Jesuit weekly): "The weightier reason for questioning the wisdom of this move is that, if it should succeed, it would only shake the faith of the American people in the firmness of our most basic civil liberty, freedom of religion. * * * The first amendment's religion clauses ought to be regarded as unamendable." Catholic World: "Campaigns * * * to change the Constitution are deplorable." Catholic Herald Citizen (Milwaukee): "Christians—Catholics and Protestants—would properly be disturbed if their children in public schools were expected to be present for the saying of a Mohammedan or Buddhist prayer. Catholics and other citizens have objected to the public school system being used as an auxiliary to Protestanism. The present decision of the Supreme Court makes the point more clear: tax-supported educational systems are not to be used to promote a specific denominational religion."

Jewish opposition: The joint advisory committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, representing all branches of American Judaism and a number of national Jewish civic organizations and Jewish community councils in all parts of the United States, supports the Supreme Court's ruling that the home, the church, and the synagogue have the prime responsibility for religious training, and that prayers, Bible reading, and sectarian practices do not belong in public schools. The American concept of church-state separation, they believe, has not led to the separation of Americans from God but has led to a genuine demonstration of our people in a more lasting union of America under God.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL AND SECTARIAN CONTROVERSY

The public schools established during colonial times were Protestant religious schools, and even after they were taken over by the States during the early 19th century, they retained much of their Protestant orientations and practices. At this time, however, there began a large-scale Catholic immigration, first from Ireland and later from south and east Europe. The heroic struggle of the newly arrived Catholics for their rights of conscience insured the secularization of the public educational system. In community after community Catholic parents, on the urging of their priests, forbade their children to participate in Protestant religion instruction or exercise in the public schools. This they did notwithstanding the harassment and even persecution often visited upon their children by Protestant public school authorities. At the urging of their priests, they frequently went to court to challenge the legality of Protestant Bible reading in the public schools. We recount briefly a few typical cases.

FATHER BAPST AND DONAHOE *v.* RICHARDS

The first case on Bible reading to reach a State supreme court was the 1854 case of *Donahoe* v. *Richards*. A Jesuit priest, John Bapst, was engaged in missionary work among the Indians in Maine. The school committee of the town adopted a regulation requiring the children to read the King James Bible. Father Bapst advised his parishioners to defy the committee and bring suit to declare the regulation unconstitutional. Acting on his urging, the father of Bridget Donahoe directed his daughter to refuse to read from the Protestant Bible as directed by her teacher. When the rebellious Bridget was expelled, her father brought suit to compel reinstatement.

Father Bapst's action became known to the residents of the town, who indignantly called a town meeting, at which a resolution was adopted to the effect that if Father Bapst ever entered Ellsworth again he would be tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail. A few months later he returned to Ellsworth, and while he was hearing confession one Saturday night, a mob broke into his house, dragged him out, tore off his clothing, tarred and feathered him, and after 2 hours of cruel treatment, finally released him. Although the ringleaders were known and the grand jury was in session, no one was indicted or even arrested in connection with the incident.

When the case of *Donahoe* v. *Richards* finally reached the Supreme Court of Maine, that court declared blandly that the law regards "the pagan and the Mormon, the Brahmin and the Jew, the Swedenborgian and the Buddhist, the Catholic and the Quaker, as all possessing equal rights," and since all could be compelled to read from the [Protestant] Bible the rights of none were violated.

THE CASE OF TOM WALL

Five years later a Massachusetts court was faced with a problem arising from the stubborn rebellion of another Catholic child. Tom Wall was an 11-year-old pupil in a Boston public school where the Bible was read and the Ten Commandments recited weekly. The court records show that Tom's father "had told him for his life not to say them (the Commandments) and that on Sunday the priest while addressing 900 children at church, of whom Wall was one, told them not to be cowards to their religion, and not to read or repeat the Commandments in school, and that if they did he would read their names from the altar."

The next day Tom Wall came to school, "with the determination not to read or repeat" the Commandments. (For this, it appears, he later received a blessed medal from the priest.) Moreover, some 60 other Catholic children likewise announced that they would not repeat the Commandments. Here was rebellion on a large scale, and it was clear to the teacher that Tom Wall was the ringleader. With the approval of the principal, the teacher urged Tom to obey, "but Wall, still refusing, was punished with a rattan stick, some three feet in length and three-eights of an inch, by whipping upon his hand. From the time the punishment commenced to the time when it ended, repeated inquiries were made of Wall if he would comply with the requirements of the school. Some 30 minutes time occupied in the whole," but the conclusion was obvious from the beginning. Eleven-year-old Tom Wall could hardly hold out forever against the majesty and power of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. After 30 minutes of chastisement "Wall submitted to the requirement of the school," and the "master ceased to punish."

Donahoe v. *Richards* and the case of Tom Wall involved instances where the Catholics' grievance was that their children were compelled to participate actively in reading from the Protestant Bible. There were many other instances of this. About the same time that Tom Wall was flogged for his rebellious refusal to participate in reading the Bible, some one hundred other Catholic children were expelled from the Boston public schools for the same reason. In Indiana in the 1880's a Catholic girl who refused to read a chapter from the Protestant Bible as required, recited "Maud Miller" instead. Here again was rebellion, but this time the rod was spared; instead the child was kept after school day after day in an attempt to break her stubborn will. Apparently, only physical force is adequate to break religious conscience, for unlike Tom Wall the Indiana girl never did yield.

CINCINNATI AND RUTHERFORD

Later, however, suits were brought to compel the discontinuance of Bible reading even where Catholic children could be excused from participating or could read from their own version of the Bible. Such a suit arose out of what became known as the Cincinnati "Bible War." Here, the Catholic Church opposed the practice even though children could either be excused from participating or could choose their own version. (Amusingly, Catholic opposition to the practice resulted in a charge by a Protestant minister that the church was seeking to raise the "black flag of atheism" over the public schools of Cincinnati—a linking of Catholicism and atheism which may sound strange today but was not uncommon during the period of the secularization of public education.)

Catholic opposition resulted in the adoption by the Cincinnati school board of a resolution bringing an end to the practice of Bible reading. The constitutionality of this resolution was upheld by the Supreme Court of Ohio in 1872 in the landmark case of *Board of Education of Cincinnati* v. *Minor* ("United with government," the court said, "religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history

shows that the more widely and completely they are separated, the better it is for both.")

Some 80 years after the Cincinnati Bible War, the Catholic Church authorities in Rutherford, N.J., joined the local Jewish community in sponsoring a suit (prosecuted by the American Jewish Congress at the request of both) to prevent the distribution of the Gideon (Protestant) Bible in the public schools of that community. Here, too, no child was compelled to accept the Bible, and during the litigation an offer of compromise was made to allow the distribution of Catholic and Jewish versions of the Bible as well. The offer was rejected by both the church and the Jewish community, and the case went to trial, ultimately resulting in a decision by the Supreme Court of New Jersey ruling the practice of Gideon Bible distribution in the public schools to be unconstitutional.

THE FICTION OF VOLUNTARINESS

The reason the Catholics sued to remove the Bible from the public schools even where their children enjoyed the privilege of nonparticipation was that they recognized early that this privilege did not in reality give the children freedom of choice and that the claim that participation was voluntary was fictional. This is the argument which they asserted in their suits and which won acceptance by a number of State supreme courts. As early as 1890, the Supreme Court of Wisconsin accepted this claim in the following language:

"When * * * a small minority of the pupils in the public school is excluded, for any cause, from a stated school exercise, particularly when such cause is apparent hostility to the Bible, which a majority of the other pupils have been taught to revere, from that moment the excluded pupil loses caste with his fellows, and is liable to be regarded with aversion and subjected to reproach and insult. But it is a sufficient refutation of the argument that the practice in question tends to destroy the equality of the pupils which the Constitution seeks to establish and protect, and puts a portion of them to serious disadvantage in many ways with respect to others."

Twenty years later, in 1910, the Supreme Court of Illinois, rejecting a contrary conclusion reached in Kentucky and Kansas, again stressed the isolation and hostility faced by Catholic children who are nominally accorded the privilege of not participating in Bible reading and prayer recitation in the public schools. The court said:

"The Kentucky and Kansas decisions seem to consider the fact that the children of the complainants were not compelled to join in the exercises as affecting the question in some way. That suggestion seems to us to concede the position of the plaintiffs in error. The exclusion of a pupil from this part of the school exercises in which the rest of the school joins, separates him from his fellows, puts him in a class by himself, deprives him of his equality with the other pupils, subjects him to a religious stigma, and places him at a disadvantage in the school, which the law never contemplated. All this is because of his religious belief. If the instruction or exercise is such that certain of the pupils must be excused from it because it is hostile to their or their parents' religious belief, then such instruction or exercise is sectarian and forbidden by the Constitution."

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE CASE

These were the arguments asserted by the Catholic Church and Catholic parents in State after State and community after community. In some States the Catholic objectors to Bible reading and prayer recitation were succesful in the State courts. In others, perhaps a majority, they were not. But even where they lost in the courts, their perseverance and courage resulted ultimately in the elimination or at least modification of many of the prevalent religious practices.

The reason for this success was that the American people recognized the justice of the Catholic cause. And out of this slow and painful process came the secularization of the American public educational system. Out of this too came the historic Supreme Court case of *McCollum* v. *Board of Education* which, in 1948, laid down the principle that the Constitution of the United States guarantees and protects the secularity of the American public school. Were it not for the century of struggle on the part of the Catholic Church and the Catholic community neither the secular public school nor the McCollum decision would have been possible.

First Annual Congressional Bowling Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, for some years now the Democratic and Republican Congressmen have had an annual baseball game. Inasmuch as there are no records of a single Congressman being called to the major leagues, the Bowling Proprietors of America have decided to give the Congressmen an annual chance to bowl. I am proud to say that my constituent, W. W. Edgar, of Livonia, Mich., was one of the men who helped originate this party together with Bill Williams and Charles Walby. So that all may observe, I enclose Roll Call's account of the party.

DEMOCRATS OUTBOWL REPUBLICAN KEGLERS

The Bowling Proprietors of America put on one of the best parties in congressional history last Wednesday at the Silver Hill Lanes in Silver Hill, Md.

A couple of hundred congressional people were on hand to savor a most handsome and bountiful buffet, enjoy cocktails and run wild on what seemed acres of bowling lanes.

The Bowling Proprietors left no detail undone in their zeal to entertain the Congress. Unfortunately, with civil rights debate and other commitments, only a small portion of the Congress was able to attend.

Democrats beat the Republicans in the main tilt, but nobody really cared. The winners were the fortunate Congressmen and staffers as well as a large segment of the press who enjoyed the warm hospitality.

The lanes were suitably decorated with large signs welcoming Capitol Hill, and a beautiful buffet was set up practically the whole length of the alleys.

The Bowling Proprietors hope to make the Congressional Bowling Party an annual affair, and everyone on the Hill seems to be for it, including those who limped to work the following day and sat propped in pillows.

BOWLING RESULTS

Democrats versus Republicans

[4 leaders on each team]

Democrats	Scratch	Handicap	Total
Representative Lucien N. Nedzi (Michigan)	167 151	9 - 16	176 167= 343
Representative Dan Rostenkowski (Illinois)	122 166	42 - 9	166 175= 341
Representative Thomas P. O'Neill (Massachusetts)	117 111	56 - 56	173 167= 340
Representative Ralph R. Harding (Idaho)	145 160	25 - 9	170 169= 339
Total			1,363
Senator Philip A. Hart (Michigan)	136 150	30 - 16	166 166= 332
Representative Charles H. Wilson (California)	126 144	42 - 20	168 164= 332
Representative Harold M. Ryan (Michigan)	117 64	48 -100	165 164= 329
Representative J. Edward Roush (Indiana)	146 138	20 - 24	166 162= 328
Republicans	**Scratch**	**Handicap**	**Total**
Representative Ralph F. Beerman (Nebraska)	154 154	16 - 16	170 170= 340
Representative Paul A. Fino (New York)	100 116	63 - 48	163 164= 327
Representative Homer E. Abele (Ohio)	135 135	30 - 24	165 159= 324
Representative Robert H. Michel (Illinois)	141 151	20 - 12	161 163= 324
Total			1,315

Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent editorial that appeared in the Bayonne Times, Wednesday, April 8, 1964. It is a well written editorial and sound in its reasoning.

The editorial follows:

SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Since the assassination of President Kennedy, the line of succession to the Presidency has been widely discussed and seriously studied. The problem is not with the Vice President assuming the office upon the death or disablement of the President; rather, it is with the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate succeeding, in that order, after the Vice President.

This is not only an important subject for study, it is also an urgent one because the nature of the Presidency has changed to the point where competence in the field of foreign relations is probably the most important professional requirement for the President's responsibilities.

Granted all this and the fact that the Congress should devise a new line of succession consonant with the requirements of the Presidency in this day and age, the reflections which have been cast upon the Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, have been uncalled for and, in some instances, downright vicious.

JOHN MCCORMACK has been a Congressman for 36 years. He served as House majority leader for 18 of those years. He has served honorably, with distinction and without any dissenting voice from the House as to his competence, ethics, or dedication to country. He has a far better background for the Presidency than many of the men elected to

that powerful office during this country's history.

The line of succession should be changed, but discussion of the change should not entail the downgrading of this public servant and patriot. JOHN MCCORMACK never sought the responsibilities which are within a heartbeat of being thrust upon him. No one would seriously propose him as a Presidential candidate. And yet his record clearly shows that if events propelled him into the White House, there would be no cause for panic.

Trade Policy of Johnson Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat ironic that the trade policy of this administration is adversely affecting two of the most important segments of the Kansas economy. Much has already been said and written about the objection of the administration to any legislation which would limit beef imports. This industry continues to suffer from surplus supply.

Further, however, another vital industry to Kansas is similarly distressed and for almost identical reasons. I am referring to the oil industry in our State. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that there was no attempt made to provide safeguards to the domestic oil industry when the Reciprocal Trade Act was passed back in 1962. Certain Democrats were assured that if they did not support an amendment to the trade bill, the administration would take necessary administrative action to place some reasonable limitation on the importation of foreign crude and residual oil. The administration did make good on this commitment, for the sum total of 60 days. Certain exemptions were then written into the oil import program, and the Kansas oil industry has deteriorated each day since.

The following reprint from the Wall Street Journal of April 8, 1964, clearly sets out the position of the oil industry in our Nation, and I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD.

Further, I want to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the independent oil producers in Oklahoma City, Okla., on April 6, representing Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas.

PETROLEUM PINCH—MORE SMALL OIL FIRMS SELL OUT AS COMPETITION MOUNTS, PROFITS SUFFER—DRILLING COST RISE, CRUDE SAG SQUEEZE INDEPENDENTS; BIG CONCERNS ARE EAGER TO BUY—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STEPS IN

(By James C. Tanner)

In recent days M. H. Robineau, president of Frontier Refining Co., in Denver, has quietly passed the word in the oil industry that his concern, with an annual volume of $44 million, is up for sale. The reason, according to Mr. Robineau: "I've been in this business 40 years but I've got to be realistic. It's getting murderous for the independent refiner."

In deciding to sell out, Frontier is joining a growing list of independent oil companies who are giving up the struggle. With crude oil prices sagging, production costs climbing, and major companies intensifying their fight for customers, the squeeze on many smaller oil companies has become too much to withstand. "Many independents are operating in the red—those making a profit, like ourselves, are an exception," notes Mr. Robineau. In the past 3 years, oil company mergers have run at a $1 billion annual clip (based on selling prices) and many industry officials look for the figure to go even higher this year.

In most cases the independents are having little trouble finding buyers. For some of the same reasons that the independents feel compelled to quit the business, fully integrated major oil companies are ready to take them aboard. Rising real estate and construction costs, for example, often make a merger or purchase of a smaller company a less expensive way for a big firm to establish a strong regional marketing setup than to go out and build their own chain of stations.

EXPLORATION COSTS SOAR

The same holds true of finding crude oil. Exploration costs have soared to such an extent that major firms often regard acquisition of independents as a cheaper way to get oil than by hunting for it themselves. The steep rise in drilling costs points up what firms face in oil exploration. Last year, according to the trade publication Petroleum Engineer, the average deep oil well cost $695,984 to drill, a 6-percent increase from 1962 and 27 percent above the $550,000 average of 1953. Yet, only one in nine expensive wildcat wells ever strikes oil.

Mergers are increasing in many industries, of course, largely reflecting company efforts to diversify. But the trend seems more pronounced in the oil industry and can generally be traced to a different reason: A cost-price squeeze.

"Since 1957 the prices which the company can obtain from its domestic oil have declined approximately 6.5 percent while operating costs have increased approximately 20 percent," says Lawrence S. Reed, president of Houston-based Texas Gulf Producing Co. The company's stockholders this month will vote on a proposal to sell its assets to Sinclair Oil Corp. Directors of Texas Gulf, big independent with interests in Libyan and Peruvian operations and with large U.S. reserves of oil and natural gas, decided to recommend sale of the company for $250 million rather than continue the "increasingly costly and discouraging" search for oil and gas.

"For many, it's become more profitable to sell than to continue in business," comments Minor S. Jameson, Jr., executive vice president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. Though the cost-price squeeze, low production allowables by States and declining rates of return are the immediate factors bringing the sellouts, Mr. Jameson says the independent oilman's woes are more basic. The growing worldwide surplus of petroleum, a slackening in the rate of growth in U.S. oil consumption, an upheaval in gasoline marketing policies and the "increasing intrusion" of the Federal Government into the economic affairs of the industry are at the root of the oil merger trend, he declares.

A DROP IN MEMBERSHIP

As an indication of the extent of such consolidations, the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association reports the number of oilmen in the State has dropped to 6,200 from 6,600 in the past 5 years. "Even more significant is the growing number of operators who have pulled in their horns on drilling and exploration but are not yet on the dropout list," adds an association official.

The merger trend hasn't escaped the attention of Government officials. The Justice Department, in fact, currently is trying to break up one combination—the $385 million sale of assets of Honolulu Oil Co. to Pan American Petroleum Corp. and Tidewater Oil Co.

Now in Federal court in San Francisco, the case is being watched closely by much of the industry because of pretrial remarks made by Government attorneys. "What we * * * propose to show," said the attorneys in a brief, "is that the acquisition is part of a trend which, if not stopped, threatens an undue restriction in the number of independent producers and independent refiners by concentrating ownership of domestic production in the hands of 20 or so large integrated oil companies * * *."

Oilmen don't dispute the trend though they dispute Justice Department conclusions that it may be unduly restrictive on the independents. Sellouts will continue to climb, says one oil company executive, adding: "The only limiting factors are the Justice Department—and the supply."

OLD BREAKUP PLAYS A PART

Ironically, much of the motivation for today's consolidations on the marketing side dates back to the Government-enforced dissolution of the old Standard Oil combine a half century ago. It left some powerful oil companies with only regional markets—a pattern they are trying to break. And, many have found, a quick, painless way to market their brands coast to coast is by acquisition.

Standard Oil Co. of California chose this way to break into five Southeastern States formerly outside its marketing area, with the 1961 acquisition for $170 million of Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky.

Now, Humble Oil & Refining Co., chief domestic subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (N.J.) is following the same route by proposing to buy the west coast refining and marketing facilities of Tidewater Oil for $329 million. Humble 3 years ago began an effort to push into the Far West by building its own stations. It so far has 800 in this region—250 of them in California. With the acquisition of the Tidewater facilities, Humble would pick up 3,900 additional stations, bringing its U.S. total to about 34,000.

"It's hard to justify any big advertising program in an area unless you've got at least 5 percent of the market," says one oil industry executive, putting his finger on the major problem of trying to enter a market by building up from scratch. With the purchase of the Tidewater facilities, "Humble will become a big factor on the west coast in one fell swoop," notes a competitor. "It would have taken years to do it any other way."

WANT MORE CRUDE

In today's fiercely competitive atmosphere, oil companies want not only to have their own outlets for their refinery production but also to be self-sufficient in crude oil supplies. Many integrated oil companies are deficit refiners; that is, they process more crude oil than they are able to produce and have to buy much of the crude from independent producers.

E. L. Steiniger, chairman of Sinclair Oil, says that purchase of Texas Gulf Producing's vast oil reserves will help "to enable the company to compete on more equal terms with competitors now more favorably situated." Following the Texas Gulf acquisition, Sinclair will be able to produce about half of its refinery requirements compared with about 43 percent now, says Mr. Steiniger.

Just getting 100 percent of their crude oil needs now is not enough for many companies, one oil executive contends. "Most would like to have double the reserves they need now, as a floor for future growth," he says. "That's why everybody has been trying to make a deal with Superior Oil Co.

Superior is one of the few independent domestic producers large enough to go abroad in the search for oil. But for some time it has been unable to find markets for

all its foreign petroleum and in late January plans were announced to sell its Venezuelan subsidiary to Texaco, Inc., which has extensive refinery facilities, for about $125 million.

Much of the glow of foreign crude is beginning to rub off as market competition worsens and governments abroad get more fickle about such matters as oil royalties. This has played a role in intensifying interest in obtaining more U.S. crude as insurance in case oversea supplies are cut off.

Not all the sell-outs, of course, can be blamed on a sag in profits by independents. Many independent companies do well despite industry problems—often because they have themselves pursued an active policy in acquiring smaller firms. But the fierce bidding for properties often pushes the price high enough to make a sell-out more attractive than continuing in business. Shell Oil Co., which has been wanting to expand in the Southeast, last month bought the refining and marketing properties of El Paso Natural Gas Products Co., a subsidiary of El Paso Natural Gas Co., for $37 million, though El Paso by no means was a poverty case. Its 1963 net income, according to W. S. Noel, president, varied little from the $3,563,283 earned in 1962. "We thought it was a good sale for us to make," he says.

OILMEN REJECT SHUTDOWN

OKLAHOMA CITY.—Inependent oil producers from Kansas proposed that wells in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas be closed to protest a decline in crude oil prices. But independents from Oklahoma and Texas yesterday declined to go along with the suggestion.

The Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association called a meeting of independents from the three States after several major buyers of Kansas crude recently reduced the top price by 5 cents a barrel to $3. Crude prices in most of Oklahoma were cut by the same amount last year.

George Bruce, president of the Kansas group, told Texas and Oklahoma producers that he would "almost gamble that a 10-day shutdown would restore the price." But representatives of Texas and Oklahoma producer associations said they didn't believe their State laws would permit a well shutdown. Bruce Street, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, added that he "doubted it would be in the best interest of the producers to do this."

L. S. Youngblood, president of the Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, blamed rising oil imports for the price erosion, and representatives of the three groups agreed to push for a Federal study of oil imports and their influence on domestic crude prices. The groups also voted to ask Interior Secretary Udall to review offshore leasing of oil development rights and to consider bringing offshore oil production under market demand proration systems practiced by some States.

About 120,000 barrels of Kansas' 305,000 barrels daily crude production and two-thirds of Oklahoma's 545,000 barrels daily production are currently under the $3 posting.

RESOLUTION

Resolved (in a spontaneous and unprecedented emergency meeting held in Oklahoma City the 6th day of April 1964, attended by eight oil associations from Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas, being TIPRO, OIPA, KIOGA, EKOGA, NTOGA, PPRO, Permian Basin, and WCTOGA representing some 15,000 independent oil producers and royalty owners), That steps be taken immediately by a group in each State to go to their Governors and their respective regulatory agency to explore the feasibility of an investigation by the Governors and the respective State regulatory agencies in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas to determine the reasons for the constant decrease in the price of crude oil in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas and the waste resulting therefrom and the adverse effect on the economy of each State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Interior be urged to call for an immediate review of Federal U.S. oil policy, including the mandatory oil imports program, for the purpose of assuring appropriate action needed to secure recognized security and economic objectives cited in the law; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be importuned to direct a meaningful enforcement of oil import limitations in keeping with the yardsticks set forth in the defense amendment to the trade act, including removal of economic advantages accruing to foreign oil imported here; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary, through the National Petroleum Council or otherwise, conduct a comprehensive analysis of the relatively depressed condition of nonintegrated independent producers in contrast with leading international companies; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Interior be urged to review offshore leasing and development policies to the end that production from this source shall share in market demand proration; and be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be petitioned to include independent producers in a trade practices conference to explore the possibility of a Trade Practice Code on oil product pricing.

The Current That Gets Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Compass, a publication of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., carried a very informative article entitled "The Current That Gets Lost." The article is a clearly written description of a most interesting natural phenomenon and a fine tribute to American oceanographers.

Much of the credit for "The Current That Gets Lost" belongs to the noted explorer and ethnologist, Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge. Commander Dodge has devoted most of his 80 years to exploring the earth and studying its people. I believe that my colleagues will find this piece of his handiwork most enjoyable.

The article follows:

THE CURRENT THAT GETS LOST—A SUBSURFACE EQUATORIAL STREAM THAT STARTS IN THE WESTERN PACIFIC AND ENDS ABRUPTLY AT THE GALÁPAGOS ISLANDS

Some 12 years ago a major underwater current was discovered in the Pacific Ocean that every now and then gets lost. The big questions are: Where does it go? And how did it remain undiscovered for so long?

Most other major currents in the central Pacific have been charted for a hundred years, some even longer. But these are surface currents easily detected and measured by ship-drift observations. Obviously, it's impossible to find a submerged flow by this usual method.

The first hint of something most unusual in the way of Pacific currents did not come until 1951. Even then it was by accident. At the time, a research ship of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on a fishing expedition in the central Pacific encountered a surprising phenomenon. As the ship drifted westward with the South Equatorial Current, gear at the end of long fishing lines, some 50 meters down, was pulled rapidly to the east.

Investigations during the next 10 years established the existence of a Pacific Equatorial Undercurrent. The first oceanographer to study this unusual stream was the late Townsend Cromwell, for whom it's been named. Long and fast and remarkably thin, it's about 1,500 times as wide as it is deep. Measurements also indicate it's at least 3,500 miles long.

Running eastward just below the surface, it is sharply bounded by the generally westward-moving currents around it. Present theory does not explain these characteristics or even why such a current should exist at all. Perhaps the explanation is provided by Prof. John A. Knauss, of the University of Rhode Island Graduate School of Oceanography, and the Narragansett Marine Laboratory at Kingston, R.I. He says that in the open ocean, away from shoals or land masses, the water at any level moves in response to two forces: horizontal pressure and the so-called Coriolis force. Dr. F. G. Walton Smith and Dr. Henry Chapin, in their outstanding book, "The Ocean River—The Story of the Gulf Stream" (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952) set forth: "Physics provided the thermometer, engineering the vessels and mathematics the understanding of the Coriolis force, all of which have helped build oceanography as a scientific teamwork in the service of mankind."

But, as one not so scientifically minded to another, just what is the Coriolis? According to Raplace, who explained it mathematically back in 1775, it's the mysterious force that pulls wind and water into a clockwise spin in the Northern Hemisphere and counterclockwise south of the Equator. His theorem was not applied to the ocean, however, until toward the end of the 19th century. Its effect was noted by another all-time great among scientists, Alexander von Humboldt. He wrote in 1894, "Considering the velocity of the fluid elements which, in different latitudes, in consequence of the earth's rotation, is different, one should be tempted to think that every current from south to north ought to have at the same time a tendency to the east and vice versa, a current from north to south a tendency to the west." Since then, this 155-year-old fact has been proven many times by oceanographers studying ocean currents. Indeed, von Humboldt gave oceanography a big boost by applying physics to this increasingly important science.

Writing about the Cromwell Current in Scientific American recently, Professor Knauss stated, "Because of the rotation of the earth, water currents do not flow directly between points of higher and lower pressure. They are deflected with respect to the spinning ocean floor beneath to the right in the northern hemisphere, to the left in the southern hemisphere. * * *

"At the equator the earth's surface does not twist and the Coriolis force is zero. An observer suspended above the equator would see the ground below him moving in a straight line, not turning like a merry-go-round. Hence the geostrophic (the influence of gravity in determining direction) equation no longer applies."

With the earth being millions of years old, one wonders how any ocean current could get lost and not be found until a mere dozen years ago. It does seem strange. But, then, there's the old saying that "truth is stranger than fiction."

Returning to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the story continues. In the summer of 1952, another such expedition was dispatched to investigate currents along the

equator. It was under Cromwell, Raymond Montgomery, and Richard Stroup. Working near 150° W. (almost due south of Hawaii) they took numerous measurements during a 10-day period. Their method was simplicity itself. It consisted of two markers, one attached to a net buoyed to float, the other to a weighted sea anchor that remained submerged. The rig demonstrated beyond doubt the marked reversal of current at a depth of 50 to 100 meters. At this level water flowed eastward at a speed of more than a knot. The stronger current showed up at the equator, but not at 2° N. some 125 miles away.

In 1955, Cromwell and Knauss carried out the same type of measurement at 115° W. and 105° W. (south of lower California and Mexico). Results were similar. The reversal was not an isolated phenomenon.

Then, as part of IGY, it was decided to devote an entire cruise to the study of this strange equatorial current. The Dolphin Expedition set out in the spring of 1958 with two ships—the *Hugh M. Smith* of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with Joseph King and Maurice Rinkel in charge and the *Horizon* of the Sripps Institution of Oceanography, under Profesor Knauss. The two vessels worked across the current for a month along 140° W. The *Horizon* spent another month tracing it eastward along the Equator to the Galápagos Islands 600 miles west of Equador.

Accurate measurement of currents depends on establishing a satisfactory system of reference. Current meters show the speed and direction of flow with respect to a ship to which they are attached. But Professor Knauss reminds us that the ship herself is moving in an unknown way, under the influence of wind, wave, and surface current. Even when swinging at anchor, she often moves at a speed comparable to that of the current under study.

Professor Knauss tells how this problem was surmounted: "On the Dolphin Expendition in the spring of 1958, a taut-wire buoy as a reference point was used. The key to the stability of this device was a buoyant sphere anchored well below the surface. It held the long, heavy anchoring wire nearly vertical, and a light surface marker fastened to the float by a thin line exerted little horizontal drag on it. The circle of movement of the surface marker could be keep to a few hundred meters.

"The flow of water with respect to the ships was measured with a propeller-type meter incorporating a magnetic compass to determine direction and a pressure gage to indicate depth. The readings of all the instruments were transmitted to shipboard electrically."

In his splendid scientific report published in Deep-Sea Research June 1960 Professor Knauss points out that the Cromwell Current straddles the Equator around Isabella Island, largest of the Galápagos. He states it is weak, but present 16 miles west of the island, but is not found at 89° W., eastern fringe of the group. He further pointed out that the South Equatorial Current, occasionally reaching as far north as the Equator in 131° W. and 122° W., appears to have little effect on the Cromwell Current.

States Professor Knauss: "If the Cromwell Current is a response to the pressure field produced by the wind-induced divergence at the Equator, then the easterly component of the southeast trades is a measure of the driving force. The current should be weak or missing east of 180°, as the streamline charts of the mean surface winds for January and July show no easterly component to the trade winds along the Equator west of 180° during January and only a weak component west of 170° E. during July. The question of the nature and continuity of the Cromwell Current in the western Pacific must be investigated."

Perhaps the biggest problem posed is where the water goes, says Professor Knauss. He asks, is it lost to the sides as the current moves downstream? "The current must be deflected either north or south of the Equator by Isabella Island. It seems likely that the Cromwell Current surfaces at times. This appears to be the case near the Galápagos. Possibly Isabella Island provides an effective block to further passage of the water and makes the current structure unstable.

"Many questions are posed. Upwelling at the Equator needs to be reexamined in light of the Cromwell Current. All the hydrographic data suggest that there is strong vertical mixing along the Equator."

Is the Cromwell Current just an interesting phenomenon or does man stand to gain from greater knowledge of its effects? At the moment, laymen don't know, don't understand. To scientists, however, the possibilities are vast. The fishing trades for example, could benefit immeasurably. Suppose the Cromwell Current subsequently proves to be a factor with tuna schooling. Tuna clippers from the Northern Hemisphere, presently ranging to the Galápagos Islands and beyond could save many hours of steaming if they knew. This is just one possible benefit. There are and will be many more.

Studies will more than likely continue. The instruments that will be employed are ingenious to say the least. Bottom current detectors, Nansen bottles, Sonar, bathythermographs and a rig of compass, pingpong ball and camera, plus many more still not devised will unlock valuable secrets one by one. Once solved, these secrets can only do one thing—pay big dividends in man's fight for survival. Indeed, the world's oceans are due for more and more study by the very special breed of men called oceanographers.

The Significance of Bobby Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Greene County (Mo.) Medical Society Bulletin has written a perceptive editorial on the fuller meaning and implications of the Bobby Baker investigation in Washington.

The existence of two standards of conduct, one for the private citizen and one for the Government official, cannot be justified. Yet the "whitewash" that has been applied to this investigation clearly shows that such a double standard not only exists but is condoned by this administration. Who doubts that if a steel company executive or any other private businessman were suspected of similar wrongdoing, the Department of Justice would not fail to call a single witness who might shed light on the charges? But because a Government official high in the councils of this administration is involved, the selection of witnesses was affected with the discretion of a barefoot baby walking through a field of broken glass.

The editorial follows:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BOBBY BAKER

In terms of dollars and cents, Bobby Baker is nothing more than another extortionist who practiced his art in government rather than in the underworld. His importance is far greater than the discovery of a cheap crook, however, for Bobby Baker has made of himself a symbol of high dealing and low dealing, evidently condoned in official circles which could never have tolerated him without, at the same time, besmirching themselves. It is probable, if the career of Bobby Baker were ever thoroughly investigated, that its ramifications would reveal the most sordid mess of socially accepted dishonesty since the Teapot Dome scandal more than a generation ago.

The important thing is not that Bobby Baker existed; it is that it was possible for him to exist. Many of his dealings were not secretive. Some were practiced quite openly and apparently in the full knowledge of those in high places of Government. Bobby Baker, therefore, is a sad symbol of decay.

Those who are to blame with, and for, Bobby Baker should be exposed and punished, but this will never occur. Unfortunately for the Nation, the matter of right and wrong will be lost somewhere in the welter of party politics and so there will be a token wrist slapping and that will be the end of it. If Bobby Baker's head were to roll, too many others would roll also.

We have been privileged to see a letter from Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and therefore the person in charge of the Baker investigation. His letter was in answer to one urging that the Baker matter be pursued to a forthright and honest conclusion. An interesting paragraph from that letter stated, "I wish to assure you that I will continue to conduct this investigation in the most honest and forthright manner I know how, and, in every case where our committee investigators have turned up business transactions between Mr. Baker and other persons, such transactions have been or will be presented to the committee." Has this been the case? Was there not outright refusal to call some key people who may have come forth with very embarrassing testimony? Also, Senator JORDAN's letter presented only one suggestion, "We hope to make some definite recommendations to the Senate whereby new rules and regulations will be enacted to restrict outside financial activities of Senate officials and employees." Have there been no rules before? We are less interested in seeing new rules made than in seeing old ones invoked.

This is, indeed, a sorry mess and it is all the more sorry because it lends credence to the idea that there exists two sets of standards; one for the citizens and one for the Government official. It is this sort of thing which leads our people to conclude that graft, greed, and expediency are the prime moving forces in the Government of today's United States of America. Whitewashing the Bobby Baker case will give irreparable support to that belief.

If we are to restore confidence in our Government, the Members of Congress must make it clear that we have one set of laws which apply to all people.

Address of Charles J. Maccia, National Commander, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 25, 1964, a testimonial

banquet was held in Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in my congressional district, honoring Mrs. Josephine DeCrescente, National Auxiliary President, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc. Mrs. DeCrescente, a constituent of mine from Mechanicville, N.Y., is one of our outstanding leaders in the field of veterans affairs and her dedicated efforts on behalf of all those who have served honorably in the armed services of this country is well known and well respected. As a tribute to Mrs. DeCrescente, nearly 700 people attended this testimonial dinner in her honor and to congratulate her upon her record and achievement as National Auxiliary President of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an address given at this banquet by Charles J. Maccia, National Commander, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc. Commander Maccia's speech is dedicated briefly to reviewing the aims and objectives and the thinking in general of the Italian American War Veterans who have served honorably in World War I, World War II and the Korean conflict.

Commander Maccia's address follows:

ADDRESS OF CHARLES J. MACCIA, NATIONAL COMMANDER, ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

As your national commander, I take this opportunity to review with you the aims and objectives of this great organization we all love so dearly.

Too frequently, veterans groups express their goals solely on the basis of such terms as patriotism, love of country, preservation of military strength and vigilance against our enemies both from within and outside of our Nation.

Naturally, we stand for all of these things, for they are the very foundation of our society in this troubled and dangerous world. We recognize that without our steadfast dedication to these precepts we could not continue to be the leader of the free world.

But all too often, these precepts and our dedication to them are employed as a cure-all for the many and varied problems that confront our Nation. I say to you, that high-sounding phrases and platitudes are not enough. If we, the members of the Italian American War Veterans, are to exert a more forceful voice in the affairs and destiny of our country, then it is imperative that we prepare and advocate a more specific and detailed program for the guidance of all Americans.

First, I would like to outline our aims insofar as they pertain to our own veterans organization. For the purpose of this discussion, we can refer to them as our internal aims and objectives.

We urge the Congress of the United States to issue to us a national charter. If we are to grow and prosper, it is indispensable that we be allowed to conduct our affairs under the mantle of a charter issued by Congress. In this regard, I am happy to report that to date five States have adopted resolutions memorializing Congress to grant us national incorporation. The most recent State legislature to pass such a resolution was the great State of New York. This resolution was adopted on March 23, 1964. I wish to publicly express our heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to State Assemblyman Anthony Savarese, Jr., of New York, for his untiring efforts in our behalf. In addition to New York, the following States have also adopted a similar resolution: New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. This trend is most heartwarming and augurs well for our organization.

We also urge that the Veterans' Administration in Washington issue to us the necessary accreditation so that we may officially represent veterans in the presentation and prosecution of their claims before this agency. Many other veterans groups now have this privilege and there is no sound reason why the Italian American War Veterans should be denied such accreditation. Sound reason and logic dictates that we are best suited to represent our own members before the Veterans' Administration.

In addition, we request that the proceedings of our national conventions be printed as a House document. It requires no documentation by me to establish our right to this privilege.

In keeping with the use and custom prevailing with the Department of the Army, we ask that we be accorded the use of rifles for ceremonial and funeral uses.

We advocate the formation of a commission, either under the auspices of the executive or legislative branch of our Government, to make a study in depth of the structure of the Veterans' Administration. This governmental agency has grown to gigantic proportions, having at its disposal great power and financial resources. We believe the time has come for the introduction of new, effective and economical procedures for the proper discharge of the service it renders to veterans. The need for sound fiscal policies are in demand today for every branch of government. Perhaps it might be wise for the U.S. Senate to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs to supervise and oversee the functions of this agency.

And now we come to the topic of our aims with regard to the general welfare of our Nation.

I have found in my experience that all too often veterans groups seem to consider themselves separate and apart from the domestic issues that face our Nation. You might almost call it a detachment. Unfortunately, veterans concentrate their vast talents and efforts into two main channels—veterans affairs and foreign policy.

But the truth is that we cannot and must not divorce ourselves from the great and pressing issues that face our land on the domestic front. To ignore them or to deal lightly with them is to shirk our responsibilities as citizens and veterans.

Right now before our Nation are the great issues of poverty, civil rights, school integration, bible reading in schools and many others.

Where do we stand on these momentous issues? I am fully cognizant that these current problems do not lend themselves to easy solution. With regard to the issue of civil rights and school integration, our fellow Americans are divided. These are moral questions. It is regrettable that passions have been inflamed and that extremists have added fuel to the fire.

Under the circumstances, what can we do? There is one thing that stands out clearly that we must do. We must discuss, and if need be, debate this issue. We must discuss these issues dispassionately and objectively. Even more than that, we must bring to bear on these moral issues good will, charity and logic.

Frankly, my own suggestion—(and some may believe this to be an oversimplification) is that we as citizens of this great land apply to these troublesome issues the teachings of our respective religions.

Whether an American be a Christian or Jew, whether we follow the Old or the New Testament, we cannot go astray if we truthfully follow the great and everlasting truths of these religions. Men of good will and pure heart will find a way.

Unless we find the path to internal peace, unity, and tranquility we shall not long remain the leader of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

I sincerely believe that veterans' organizations can perform no better service to their Nation than to honestly grapple with our current domestic problems. We must, as veterans give our Nation leadership in all fields of social intercourse.

Come, let us join hands in this great crusade of the 20th century.

The Polish Constitution of 1791—Witness to the Polish Tradition of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to participate in the commemoration of the 173d anniversary of Poland's Constitution, and I join with my other colleagues in a salute to this brave and freedom-loving nation.

Poland is a nation with a tragic yet inspiring history. "Truth crushed to earth shall rise again," says the poet, and so it has been with Poland. From her zenith as a great state in the 16th and 17th centuries, when her troops saved Europe from Turkish domination, Poland went into a slow but steady decline, culminating in the three partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795. But again and again Poles revolted, and asserted their national identity. In the slow workings of history a revived Poland was to take its place in the family of nations, only to encounter the supreme irony of Communist domination.

Even at the height of its power, Poland was no simple military autocracy. It was a state with constitutional traditions dating back to the Middle Ages. The Polish Constitution of 1791, which we memorialize today, was heir to those traditions. It is one of the historic landmarks on man's long road to freedom. Under it Poland became a hereditary limited monarchy, with biennial parliaments and ministerial responsibility. It abolished the unfortunate "liberum veto" by which the negative vote of one man might block the adoption of any legislative measure, a system which had rendered effective government in Poland all but impossible. The free election of kings, which had opened Poland to external intrigue and pressure was abolished. The executive was strengthened, and old class distinctions were swept aside as the right to land ownership and civil and ecclesiastical office were opened to the middle class as well as to the aristocracy. The groundwork was laid for the abolition of serfdom, and absolute religious toleration was established. Truly the Polish Constitution of 1791 was a model for its time and for the future. If only history had permitted its continued operation Poland would surely have been a shining beacon of light in 19th century Europe.

But the beacon was snuffed out before it really had a chance to burn. Poland disappeared from the political map of

Europe, not to be revived until the end of the first world war. The unhappy story which followed is familiar to us all.

Once again today, however, Poland manifests her will to live. Communist she may be in form, but who can doubt that the hearts of the Polish people are with the West? It is Western models that Poland follows in art, in literature, even in recreation. Outspoken criticism of the government is by no means uncommon. In short, whatever the outward form of the Polish Government, the Polish people are demonstrating every day that their democratic instincts, manifested in the Constitution of 1791, are strong and steady, and that democracy in Poland will yet prevail.

A "Success" in the Foreign Aid Program: Costa Rican Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in considering our foreign aid program it must be realized that the economies of the countries which are receiving U.S. assistance are primarily agricultural. To achieve higher living standards for an entire population dependent upon farming requires modernization of agricultural methods and stimulation of industry to achieve a diversified economy.

Traditions arising out of subsistence farming and outdated agricultural practices naturally impede the progress of the country as much as outmoded commercial practices. The Alliance for Progress has established in cooperation with private and public investment two credit facilities in Costa Rica for the purpose of stimulating and modernizing both agriculture and industry.

Costa Rica is a relatively advanced Central American republic of 19,600 square miles whose tropical lowlands and temperate highlands and plateaus lie between the Caribbean and the Pacific Ocean. Like most underdeveloped countries, Costa Rica's 1,275,000 inhabitants, with an average per capita income of $272, depend heavily for their livelihood on agriculture—coffee, bananas, cocoa. Primarily a land of small farms, the Government is trying to increase their productivity through agricultural education, and research, as well as making available medium and long-term loans to start new or expand existing enterprises.

The Alliance for Progress last year agreed to make a loan to help finance a credit corporation for business and industry if private Costa Rican investors would agree to raise $1 million privately to back the corporation. The million dollar subscription was completed when 75 investors—coffeegrowers, industrialists, merchants, professional men, students, and housewives—subscribed and thus assured the establishment of the industrial credit corporation in their country.

The availability of new development capital on attractive terms is expected to diversify Costa Rica's economy and decrease the reliance on coffee as the principal foreign exchange earner. It is also expected to stimulate industrial production with a corresponding increase in tax revenue.

One of the most impressing aspects of this subscription was the participation of the National Federation of University Students indicating their confidence in the future of their country. Rodrigo Madrigal Nieto, chairman of the board of the credit corporation, noting this, stated that the subscription is "a symbol of unity between the present and the future and the best demonstration of confidence from youth about what the Alliance for Progress can realize with private initiative."

Realizing that modern technology leading to a diversified, sound economy requires progress in agriculture also, the Alliance participates in a credit board for farmers. Where agricultural production may be way below capacity because of insufficient agricultural credit, it is expected that the rural credit board will spark improvements in the life of the farm population and, thus, the country. However, sometimes the transfer to modern technology is more time-consuming than we in our rapidly moving world may be willing to believe. And through such programs as the rural credit board the educational process of changing old attitudes into new has a beginning.

An illustrative case in which this transformation recently occurred involved a small Costa Rican farmer. This small farmer had always planted corn with a stick and harvested with a knife. He had worked for a short while on the Inter-American Highway and, amazed at the machinery he saw, he returned to his farm to ponder these startling innovations. The secret, he concluded, was power which would enable him to grow more corn; but his area had only one ox. Finally, last year, this farmer approached the Rural Credit Board in his nearest village for a loan to buy an ox. Armed with an Alliance-for-Progress-backed loan of $75, which he borrowed for 3 years at 6 percent, he bought his precious ox. Soon, he had trebled his corn acreage. With added earnings he bought his wife a sewing machine, which has enabled her to sew for her neighbors who in exchange provide services for her. Thanks to their augmented income, this family now boasts a galvanized iron roof and a transistor radio.

In our terms, this farmer's progress can hardly be termed to have reached the plateau in modern agricultural methods and high living standards. But fortunately this farmer and others like him have a start. This small loan through wise use has revolutionized the thinking and life of one Costa Rican family who, no doubt, have set a sterling example to their neighbors. Subsistence farming traditions impeding progress are on their way out—evidence that long-range strategy for achieving higher living standards for the total population pays off.

Wisconsin Student Honored for Essay on Employing the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud that one of my constituents, Margaret T. Frawley, 434 Garfield Ave., Eau Claire, Wis., has won second place in the 1964 National "Ability Counts" Contest sponsored by the President's Committee and cooperating State Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped. President Johnson is expected to present the awards to Miss Frawley and the four other national winners at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, being held April 30 at the Departmental Auditorium here in the Nation's Capital.

Miss Frawley, who is a senior at Regis High School in Eau Claire, is the third Wisconsin student to place second in the national competition. Entries in the national contest came from juniors and seniors in public, parochial, and private schools in 49 States and territories.

In her essay, Miss Frawley detailed the progress being made by the people of Eau Claire in the field of training and employing the handicapped. Eau Claire has not only built a Shelter for the Handicapped but is rapidly expanding the services offered by the Shelter to the handicapped and their prospective employers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have Miss Frawley's prize-winning essay printed in the RECORD:

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT "ABILITY COUNTS"

(By Margaret Terese Frawley)

"Ability," that special quality which for more than 187 years has pushed our great country of America always forward in history, progress, and destiny. The early American colonists initiated a chain of ideals and hopes to which we Americans today continue to add many new links. This chain is strengthened and closely connected in each section of history by the one, strong link called ability. Ability counts in our Nation, ability counts in our 50 States, ability counts in the rural areas, and ability counts in our cities. But most significant is the ability found in the individual. I live in Eau Claire, Wis., a community which has recently tapped a wonderful, hidden resource of ability discovered in our handicapped citizens.

"Ability" in Webster's dictionary is defined as "power to do something physical or mental." The majority of people associate ability as being synonymous with the terms "capacity", "attitude", "skill", or "talent." I believe ability includes a much wider scope of vocabulary for the handicapped worker in Eau Claire. The small word, ability, is composed of seven letters which represent the many, varied fields in which the handicapped workers of my community have developed worthwhile contributions, not only for themselves, but for all their neighbors. By splitting up the quality of ability I hope to share with you a part of the story of our handicapped

workers, and their spirit to make my community of Eau Claire greater.

A—Stands distinctively for achievements accomplished by the resourcefulness of the handicapped in Eau Claire. My community is the only one in the district of 22 counties which has built a shelter for the handicapped. This shelter is expanding rapidly in its services available to the city. People of Eau Claire have often demonstrated their personal faith in this project. In November the shelter received an additional 15½ lots on Hastings Way. Our city proudly realizes that the shelter has placed 29 handicapped persons in jobs since it opened in 1959.

B—Brings into sharp focus the picture of betterment in our city through the employment of the handicapped. One short true example can clearly express this point. Before 1942 a shut-in handicapped woman in Eau Claire took in sewing at her home for 10 cents an hour. Now this same handicapped woman is earning $1.25 an hour. She is a taxpayer, where before she depended on relief. For the past 17 years she had been able to be a reliable, happy employee at the Chippewa Valley Sporting Goods Store.

I—The handicapped also appear in the field of industry. The majority of impaired workers are hired in skilled industry. The Duncan Yo-Yo Co. is glad to praise the quality of work turned out at the Eau Claire Handicapped Shelter: "The work put out by the shelter is of a higher quality than other factories produce." The Wisconsin State Employment Service Manager, Mr. D. W. Ickstadt, reports: "Most employers in Eau Claire have had some experience with handicapped."

L—The ability of the handicapped individual signifies leadership. A committee has been established in my community consisting of a group of prominent men who initiate and encourage the placement and hiring of the handicapped. This committee has selected Mr. R. W. Vesperman to receive the honor plaque for his policy of employing the handicapped. The award reads: "The Eau Claire Committee of the Handicapped awards this citation for meritorious service in appreciation for the exceptional contributions in furthering employment of the handicapped." Wisconsin has chosen Mr. Obert Bauer, Business Manager of Broadcasters' Services, Inc., as Wisconsin's "Handicapped Person of the Year," for overcoming serious handicap and for helping to rehabilitate other handicapped people.

I—Proclaims the ideals practiced by Eau Claire's handicapped workers. I learned several interesting facts during my interview with Mr. Vesperman of the Chippewa Valley Sporting Goods Store. The handicapped workers have about the same absenteeism record as unimpaired workers, and do not miss work unless they are really sick. They produce at the same rate as the nonhandicapped workers on the same job because they are not thinking of doing the work only for themselves.

T—The training the handicapped person is given in Eau Claire is excellent and valuable for the entire comunity. At the shelter he receives 75 hours of training, plus 300 hours of personal evaluation. The vocational school employs a full-time teacher, Mrs. Bertha Strum, to train the handicapped and visit at homes around the county to instruct the handicapped. The three main categories these trained handicapped persons enter are these: skilled industries, clerical, and sales work. Mr. Chada of the Vocational Rehabilitation Center in Eau Claire reports that although several counties are larger, Eau Claire was second in Wisconsin last year for rehabilitating clients.

Y—Reminds you and all your friends to encourage the hiring of the handicapped in your community, and to spread the realization of the true value of their ability, their spirit, and their ideals. Respect and appreciation will climb still higher in my community when all people are educated in understanding the ability proven by handicapped workers.

"Ability" * * * that special quality, the foundation of progress, the strong link, the wonderful hidden resource bubbling in the handicapped workers of my community. Ability counts in our Nation, ability counts in our States, ability counts in the rural areas, and ability counts in our cities. But most significant is the ability in the individual.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last fall the House passed H.R. 8200. That bill provided for shelter in Federal buildings and authorized payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space in the buildings of State and local governments and nonprofit institutions.

The Senate Armed Services Subcommittee has deferred action on H.R. 8200 until other decisions on continental defense are made, primarily on the basis that "ballistic missile defense and the shelter program have been closely related, and it is believed that a decision as to both should be similarly related."

My subcommittee is disappointed that the Senate took this action. It is evident from our hearings that a decision on the shelter program can be made independently of other decisions on continental defense. The fallout shelter program can stand alone and will contribute far more to the savings of lives per dollar spent than any other active defense program. It is not dependent on an antiballistic-missile system for its effectiveness.

The views of this committee have not changed as a result of the Senate action. We still think that the shelter program is absolutely necessary. The Department of Defense will again submit a shelter bill next year and the committee will hold hearings on it early in the next Congress. In view of this I will not schedule hearings on the Department's recent request for authorization of additional amounts based on passage of H.R. 8200.

The action of the Senate need not detract from the current momentum of the civil defense program. A full report was recently made to the Armed Services Committee describing actions which could be taken pending a further decision by the Congress on this program.

The Department of Defense has informed us it will expand existing shelter capacity and improve habitability of existing shelters by purchasing and placing in the shelter new portable ventilation equipment kits. In our hearings last summer, we were informed of accelerated research on a cheap, durable and portable ventilation kit to increase existing shelter capacities. This research has now paid off. The equipment can be bought and put in places at a cost of $2.50 per person sheltered. The kits which are either power or bicycle pedal operated can easily be installed in an emergency by persons who have no particular mechanical aptitude. The kit is only 21 by 27 by 39 inches in size. Much of the space already located by the National Shelter Survey which has adequate protection but which could not be used because of inadequate ventilation can now be put to use.

As a further measure to assure usability of fallout shelter space, minor adaptations to the water systems of major buildings will be made which will permit trapping of water in the pipes and making it available to the shelter areas. This will provide an adequate emergency water supply for the shelterees and will make usable many spaces which are not now available because of lack of stored water. Another measure will be to install telephone jacks on a one-time basis in the shelter areas. This will permit communications between the shelter areas and the command and control points.

I understand also that the Department of Defense is to adopt a number of other measures to identify and make usable the fallout protection afforded by existing structures.

As an extension of the shelter survey, the Department plans to find out how much shelter is afforded in home basements and inner cores of small multifamily units and other buildings not covered in the survey.

The information will be analyzed by using computers. It will be particularly useful in rural and suburban areas where the greatest shelter deficit exists.

Also, the Department proposes to make available professional community shelter planning services to local governments for the purpose of creating a working shelter system, determining what each citizen should do in time of emergency and getting that information to the people. The job will consist of identifying specific areas of shelter deficit and the most economical methods of overcoming the deficit, and to assign people to specific shelters.

Last week the Secretary of Defense transferred the civil defense program and the Office of Civil Defense from the Department of Defense to the Secretary of the Army. This was done because the civil defense program is now fully operational and has become an integral part of continental defense. The delegation and civil defense will retain its civilian character. It will not be made a part of the military structure. Nevertheless, civil defense must work closely with the military. General Wheeler recently said:

> Speaking both for myself as a professional soldier and for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a fallout protection oriented civil defense is clearly a necessary element of the total U.S. national security effort. Our potential enemies have a clear capability for nuclear warfare, and we cannot discount the possibility that such a war may occur. Prudence and plain commonsense dictate that we be prepared for it. An adequate program of civil defense should give our population a reasonable degree of protection as well as

increasing the credibility of our military deterrent posture.

The Alaskan experience with civil defense in the recent staggering earthquake underscores the validity of a soundly based, sensible civil defense program. Civil defense at the State and local government level, throughout those disaster afflicted communities, was the nerve center of life saving, rescue and relief operations. Civil defense communications and warning systems were the first to be restored, or in many cases were unaffected. Communications and other equipment purchased with the financial assistance of the Federal Government served as the essential link between State and local government and disaster areas in need. Civil defense organization and training made available to the governor of the State, and to local authorities, an organized system for the immediate and effective arrangements to coordinate the relief efforts of local government departments, to conduct relief operations, and to reassure the public that the Government was in command of the situation and that requests for assistance were receiving prompt attention and effective coordination. The military assistance so promptly and effectively provided was channeled to the places of most immediate need and the men and materials needed for relief operations were more effectively used because of civil defense organization and training. The same pattern would exist, and would be followed in the unlikely event of a nuclear attack. The Alaskan experience underscores the soundness of the proposal to make civil defense equipment and personnel available to combat local disasters.

These steps show progress in the civil defense field. While the progress is not as rapid as the Armed Services Committee thinks it should be, nevertheless, it is probably adequate.

All the foregoing actions, which are an extension of the current survey of the marking and stocking program, can be accomplished without additional legislative authorization. In addition to these measures, two additional actions to strengthen the civil defense program not requiring additional legislative authorization will be taken by the executive branch. The heads of all Federal departments and agencies responsible for Federal civilian and military building programs will design shelter features into new Federal buildings and will construct these features where they can be incorporated without added cost. Where the shelter features require additional funds for their accomplishment, specific authorization will be requested from the appropriate authorizing committee of the Congress, with an indication of the cost of the shelter feature. Upon enactment of the authorization for the construction, appropriations will then be requested from the Congress for the construction.

H.R. 8200 required that shelter features be incorporated into existing Federal buildings as well, and would have authorized appropriations for this purpose. Until the Congress has an opportunity to enact specific legislation for the broad program of shelter in existing buildings, this program will not be undertaken. Thus, in each instance the Congress will be authorizing and appropriating funds for the shelter features.

The Defense Department's regulations on the use of civil defense equipment and supplies acquired with Federal financial assistance will be modified to authorize their use in local disaster. Likewise, regulations will be modified to specifically authorize State and local civil defense personnel supported by Federal funds to engage in local disaster relief activities as the circumstance dictates. H.R. 8200 would have provided for this by legislation as a means to strengthen the civil defense program at the local level, and thus it was an appropriate matter for the congressional enactment. Technically, however, it is a measure now available under the existing authority in the Federal Civil Defense Act.

Conserving Our Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing the country today is the future need for fresh water.

As cosponsor of legislation to upgrade and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an excellent article, "Conserving Our Waters." The article is written by Wallace West. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CONSERVING OUR WATERS

(By Wallace West)

FOREWORD

Americans have abundant supplies of all the good things of life. Nevertheless, every citizen must do his utmost to conserve and make the best possible use of the Nation's natural resources to insure that they remain abundant.

Oilmen and oil companies have a proper concern with this responsibility. They now provide almost three-quarters of the Nation's energy requirements, and use the most modern conservation techniques to assure adequate petroleum reserves for the future. They also voluntarily install expensive facilities and engage in extensive research to help protect the quality of our water and air.

Work being done in this country to maintain and upgrade atmospheric purity is outlined in an American Petroleum Institute booklet entitled "Clearing the Air." This companion piece deals with practices being employed to protect and make the most efficient use of our rivers, lakes, seas, and underground water resources.

It has been prepared because:

1. This country's rapid growth requires that water conservation and renovation efforts be accelerated.

2. The public needs factual information as to what steps should be taken in this direction.

3. Oilmen themselves should know how their companies, their industry, and other groups contribute to the efficient management of water resources. Unbiased, factual information on the subject will help them cooperate in such efforts and put them in a position to explain the true situation to their neighbors.

"Conserving Our Waters" is not a definitive survey. Technical literature on water use fills many volumes. Further information may be found in the American Petroleum Institute's "Water Pollution Abatement Kit" and in the written and filmed materials listed therein.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF THE AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE.

PART I.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF WATER POLLUTION

A history of the human race could be written in mud. The battle against silt—today's No. 1 pollutant—began some 8,000 years ago, soon after the Sumerians invented irrigation to increase crop yields from the fertile plains of Mesopotamia.

Sumeria prospered for many centuries as the world's first civilization grew up around a canal system that is the wonder of modern engineers. Then complications arose. The continued growth of large cities in that area created a tremendous demand for lumber. Sumerian builders cut down the forests on upland slopes of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. As a direct result, flash floods swept vast quantities of silt off those denuded mountains and into the irrigation ditches.

Farmers worked night and day to keep the watercourses open but the task became too much for them. In search of slaves who could be forced to do the spadework the rulers of Babylon, Nineveh and other city states invaded neighboring areas.

The silt that slaves removed from the canals piled up until it stood 50 feet high along their banks. At that point further work became impossible. The irrigation system broke down, crops failed, people starved and Sumerian civilization began its long decay.

The Romans had a similar experience. In the sixth century B.C., they built a storm sewer, the Cloaca Maxima, to drain their low-lying Forum. This big ditch was extended to dispose of city sewage and to change the surrounding Campagna Swamp into fertile farmland.

For centuries the Campagna supported a dense and prosperous population. Then the Cloaca began clogging with silt and garbage. One of the big reasons for Rome's many wars of conquest was to capture slaves who could be used to keep the drains open.

Slaves became harder to capture as the centuries passed. As a result the sewage system gradually fell to ruin. Farmlands near the capital reverted to a disease-breeding swamp known as the Pontine Marshes. Plagues and malaria ravaged the city and countryside. Finally, when barbarian armies attacked, the Roman citizenry was so debilitated that it struck hardly a blow in its own defense.

The Maya Indians of southern Mexico also seem to have met disaster because of a water problem. The Mayas built a high civilization based on lush harvests they obtained after burning off rain forests in that area. They knew little or nothing about proper drainage, however, so torrential tropic rains soon swept their unprotected topsoil away. Crops failed and the Mayan culture crumbled.

Not long ago the southwestern Dust Bowl threatened the United States with a somewhat similar crisis. In the ""blowing thirties," American farms lost half a million acres of topsoil yearly from wind and water erosion. Only heroic measures—contour plowing, flood control, reforestation and the planting of quick-growing grasses and shelterbelts of trees—averted a disaster. Even today, after the expenditure of vast sums and

tremendous effort, mountains of topsoil still pollute water systems, kill fish and aquatic life, clog dams or drift down the Mississippi and other streams to the sea. Anyone who has seen the "Big Muddy" at flood can appreciate that silt remains America's worst water pollutant.

Municipal sewage

Municipal sewage, the No. 2 pollutant, is of recent origin. It was first brought to public attention in the 19th century. That was when some brilliant detective work by Dr. John Snow proved that a London cholera epidemic had been caused by just one sewage-contaminated well. Gordon M. Fair, professor of sanitary engineering at Harvard University, tells what happened after that:

"In the first half of the 19th century," he writes, "London and, later, other communities of the world arrived at a fateful decision. They permitted and, soon after, ordered the discharge into existing storm drains of offensive wastes from households and industry. The water-carriage system of sewerage was born and the gross pollution of natural bodies of water began.

"In present-day parlance, this was a crash program. There was no planning. Certainly there was no weighing of the possible consequences. Soon, therefore, first the small streams of England and then the larger ones became polluted.

"Since they do not date back much more than a century, even in the most advanced cities of Europe, it is not surprising that many younger communities are only today coming to grips with pollutional problems."

Until about 25 years ago, most American cities and towns could have been listed among Professor Fair's backward "younger communities." Prior to that date they confined their efforts to purifying supplies of drinking water with chlorine and to the installation of "primary" sewage treatment plants. These remove the visible and more objectionable particles from municipal wastes.

In the early 1940's a storm of indignation blew up over this disgraceful situation. Resort areas were becoming badly polluted. The quality of streams in many parts of the country was rapidly deteriorating. Municipalities then began building "secondary" sewage treatment plants. These facilities included settling basins to remove solids, and cultures of bacteria to consume wastes held in solution.

About this time, too, farmers halted the Dust Bowl's spread and progressive industries stepped up their installation of treatment facilities for organic and inorganic wastes.

Entry of the United States into World War II slowed these worthwhile developments. Municipalities practically stopped building sewage systems and treatment plants. Farmers ignored erosion as they "mined" their soil to obtain the largest possible crops for the United States and its allies. Industries, working round the clock to supply steel, munitions, trucks, tanks, fuel, rubber and other war materials, could spend little time on improvement of their waste disposal plants.

A change for the better

That potentially dangerous situation began to change for the better when the war ended. By 1947, many cities found their treatment facilities obsolete and began replacing them with new ones of larger size and vastly increased efficiency. Industries followed the same course by revamping their waste disposal plants to keep pace with expanding production.

Even today, however, a big gap remains between what has been accomplished and what is desirable. The postwar population explosion and intense industrialization aggravate this situation. It is estimated that three-quarters of the 1980 U.S. population will live in gigantic metropolitan areas served by sewers.

What will the quality of that 1980 water be like? Scientists and technologists are seeking an answer.

PART II. WATER, THE INEXHAUSTIBLE RESOURCE

Some people have an idea that America is "running out of water." They think that, when one drinks water, when farmers irrigate their fields with it and when industrial plants use it to manufacture steel, chemicals, paper, and petroleum or other products, the water is destroyed and disappears forever.

By following this faulty line of reasoning, they reach the depressing conclusion that, if we keep increasing our use of water at the present rate, the United States soon will resemble the Sahara Desert. As "proof" of this argument they point to the parched plains of America's Southwest.

Many parts of the world do have water distribution problems. The Imperial Valley of California gets so little rainfall that only intense irrigation can make it fruitful. Parts of Brazil, Central America, the Congo, and even Florida's Everglades receive so much moisture that they are almost unfit for habitation. Thickly populated and highly industrialized areas have increased their water demand so rapidly since World War II that available supplies must be renovated and used more than once. Nevertheless, the hard fact remains that water never "wears out," though it has been "consumed" endlessly since time began.

Unevenly distributed though it may be, there is now as much water on and under the surface of the earth and in its atmosphere as there was millions of years ago. It is possible that some of your morning shower was used by Mother Eve to bathe Cain and Abel.

Even when chemists split water into hydrogen (H) and oxygen (O) they cannot destroy it. At the first opportunity these gases recombine to form exactly the same amount of H_2O that was present in the first place.

There is a never-ending abundance of water because of nature's hydrological cycle. Moisture is absorbed and discarded by all plants and by all animals, including man. The discarded water carries waste materials with it. Then one of two things happens:

1. It evaporates. Germs that it may contain dry out and die. Other wastes are deposited on the earth or enter the atmosphere.

2. It sinks into the ground or is flushed down a drain. Sandy soil removes part of the contaminants and pollutants. The rest may remain harmful to health or property until the impure water reaches a stream, lake, or ocean. There it is cleansed by the action of oxygen in the air, bacteria, sunlight, and dilution.

Eventually, all water evaporates and is drawn into the sky by the sun to form clouds. It returns to the earth as rain or snow in a nearly pure state, suitable for further use.

This conservation of water by nature's own renovation processes makes life possible. When man upsets this balance, by withdrawing water from streams at too rapid a rate for irrigation, industrial use or city water supply, or when he deposits too much waste too quickly for nature to get rid of it, he must correct the balance by other means.

Water reuse grows

Nowadays, most municipal and industrial wastes pass through disposal plants which speedily lower the amount of impurities they contain, through the use of biological, chemical, and other processes. After most of the water's contaminants and pollutants have been removed, it may be released or retained for reuse. Sanitary engineers estimate that, by 1980, all water will have to be used at least twice before release. One oil refinery in the arid Southwest already recycles its process water 50 times.

It is estimated that water in the Ohio River is renovated four times before reaching the Mississippi. The cleanup work of agricultural, industrial, municipal and other groups forming an interstate compact known as the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission (Orsanco) is remarkably thorough. It has proved so effective that the Ohio River, an open sewer not many years ago, is again becoming suitable for swimming, boating and other recreational uses. Plans are under consideration to extend such areawide programs to the Missouri, the silt-clogged Mississippi, the Delaware and other rivers and streams.

It can be seen from these facts that, no matter what happens to water, it is never used up. The worst that can happen is that, through lack of proper natural and artificial renovation, it may be allowed to become so dirty that the uses to which it can be put are severely limited.

Before we proceed to a discussion of specific steps being taken by farmers, cities, and industries to keep America's water supplies clean, two definitions are in order. The ones presented here can be disputed but they may, at least, held avoid misunderstanding between the author and the reader:

Contamination: According to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, "contamination" stems from the Latin word "contamen," meaning "the transmission of contagious disease from one person to another." That is, contaminated water carries harmful germs.

Contamination of drinking water is caused by the dumping of untreated human or animal wastes into streams and other sources of supply. When health measures are enforced, germ-laden drinking water ceases to be a serious problem. This is shown by the practical elimination in this country of waterborne diseases such as typhoid fever.

Pollution: Webster says pollution comes from the Latin root "lutum" meaning mud or silt. Technically, therefore, only flat, tasteless, sterile distilled H_2O is unpolluted. Water from the clearest mountain brook contains some silt, plus traces of calcium, iron, copper, and other chemicals. These "pollutants" give the water its delicious taste and make it a suitable habitat for trout and aquatic plants. Trouble arises only when more pollutants get into a stream or other body of water than the normal flow can dilute, assimilate, and render harmless. (It should be remembered, in this connection, that some streams are more valuable to man in removing wastes from the municipality than they would be as trout streams.)

The principal sources of pollution are:

1. Mud or silt washed off the land as a result of farming, housing construction, and highway building.

2. Municipal sewage. (Even though contamination of drinking water by disease germs has been nearly eliminated, hundreds of older sewage systems in this country still discharge vast amounts of untreated garbage.)

3. Industrial wastes resulting from the manufacture of products necessary to our civilization.

Nobody denies that all of these pollution sources require careful attention and abatement. This is true because of:

Rapid growth of population, cities, agriculture, and industry.

The stubborn fact that the volume of waste increases each year while streamflows remain constant.

The further fact that water is unevenly distributed.

The final fact remains, however, that the United States is not "running out of water." We have a wealth of it. If our population increases 10 times, there will still be an overall surplus. But our water will have to be efficiently and properly used and reused.

Today, America takes advantage of only a small percentage of the rain and snow

that falls each year. Its only real future problem will be to keep that water reasonably clean and to use engineering methods already developed that impound and distribute the supply to the right places at the right times.

PART III. THE CONSERVATION OF WATER USED FOR FARMING AND CONSTRUCTION

"He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies," and Henry Clay in the early 19th century.

Comparatively little gully stopping could be done, however, until oil-powered tractors and machinery became everyday tools. Farmers, builders, and highway engineers lacked the equipment needed to contour and grade large areas, dig ponds or drainage ditches, plant forests, and apply other conservation practices. It has been estimated by Dr. Milton Eisenhower that, from colonial days until the end of the dust bowl, the average depth of America's topsoil was reduced by half.

The lost soil not only grew no crops but clogged rivers, dams, and harbors, choked aquatic plants, polluted water supplies, and killed enormous quantities of fish, oysters, and clams. Yet, except for Clay, Jefferson, and a few other conservationists, most Americans ignored the danger threatened by erosion.

Passage of the Soil Conservation Act in 1935 brought a great improvement in this situation. At about the same time tractors which had been soil wreckers and water wasters in inexperienced hands, began to power ditchers, graders, bulldozers, and other conservative tools.

Since that date millions of acres of damaged plains and denuded slopes have been reseeded, often by plane, with fast-growing grasses or trees. Dams and ponds have been built to retard surface water runoff. Overirrigation, which once damaged soil and polluted ground water, has virtually ended. A new generation of farmers and agricultural engineers, trained largely in America's land-grant colleges, is applying science, rather than rule-of-thumb methods, to their professions.

In the late 1940's, new petroleum-based agricultural chemicals began providing better insecticides, fungicides, weedkillers, and fertilizers. These not only increased crop yields to a fantastic extent but, by reducing the need for extensive cultivation, markedly conserved water, and retarded erosion.

Unfortunately, some enthusiastic but inexperienced farmers jumped to the conclusion that, if a little of the new pesticides was effective, a lot would be better. They disregarded instructions on packages and used larger quantities of the chemicals than were specified.

Read the instructions

A great deal has been learned since those early years. Instructions are more widely read and followed. Chemical companies manufacture products that are quickly broken down and rendered harmless by bacteria and other factors in air, soil, and water. If used correctly—according to instructions plainly printed on their labels—modern agricultural chemicals are safe. Moreover they vastly increase crop yields and the quality of fruit, vegetable, cotton, and other crops.

Meanwhile, building contractors and roadbuilders also are learning important lessons about water conservation and erosion control. Builders are abandoning their practices of bulldozing trees, scraping off topsoil, and allowing the weather to work its will on new housing developments until property owners can fill the resultant gullies and plant grass, trees, and shrubs that will hold the earth. Highway engineers are using plastic, asphalt, and other coverings to keep new roadsides from eroding until grass can grow. Soil erosion should soon cease to be a major pollution problem.

Even after erosion is brought under control, agriculture will continue to pose a conservation problem. This is so because plants consume fantastic amounts of moisture. (The word "consume" is used deliberately. Water absorbed by crops is never available locally for renovation and reuse. It evaporates from leaves and stems and is removed from the immediate area by the wind. Eventually the moisture condenses and falls as rain or snow but this may happen hundreds or even thousands of miles away.)

Water lost by evaporation and seepage from irrigation ditches also becomes unavailable for recycling in most cases. The amount of such combined consumption can be grasped through a comparison of industrial versus farm usage:

Seven gallons of water are brorowed, used, reused and returned to streams in the course of making 1 gallon of gasoline. Approximately 10 gallons are employed in the same manner to manufacture a pound of synthetic rubber. But nearly 2½ million gallons are required to grow 1 ton of cotton. Even corn and sugar, which use moisture more efficiently, consume 240,000 gallons of irrigation water per ton of crop.

Oil products and byproducts are helping to reduce agricultural evaporation and seepage. Films of oil-based materials now are sprayed over whole fields. Not only do they slow evaporation; they encourage crop growth, stifle weeds and finally crumble into a fertilizing mulch. Similar liners for irrigation ditches conserve untold millions of gallons of water each year.

As America's demand for food and fiber increases and as irrigation continues to spread from Southwestern into Midwestern and Eastern States, farming's share of water resources will increase. Some scientists contend that, for this reason, methods of farming the sea bottoms or of producing food without the intervention of inefficient, water-wasting plants must be found.

PART IV. THE TREATMENT OF MUNICIPAL WASTES

Water pollution from city sewage may well grow worse before it gets better because of:

America's explosive population growth.

The tremendous number of sewer extensions and treatment plants that must be built in the near future if we are not to drown in our own municipal wastes "like a baby in a bathtub" as Charles Kingsley, the English novelist, grimly expressed it.

The fact that, years ago, most U.S. cities got off on the wrong foot by combining their storm and waste disposal sewers.

Estimates vary as to the cost of needed construction. Certainly it will run into many billions of dollars for the country as a whole. One expert says it will require at least $3 billion to build separate storm and waste disposal systems for Chicago. New York's Bureau of Water Pollution Control predicts that "about $1,675 million must be spent to provide adequate sanitary and storm sewers and sewage treatment plants for the city."

Many combined systems work well, but others cannot cope with sudden heavy rains. When storms occur, water mixed with sewage may flood and disable treatment plants unless bypassed, untreated, into a stream. In either case, the populace may have little protection for several days from wastes that may contain disease germs.

Separate sanitary sewers, which are not flooded by storms, prevent the escape of untreated wastes. So, at a somewhat lower cost, do lagoons that impound flood waters from combined systems until they can be treated or evaporated. Unfortunately, many cities do not have large unoccupied areas where lagoons can be placed, or the long periods of bright sunshine needed for evaporation.

Detergent nuisance ending

Detergents that are only partially consumed by bacteria have posed a municipal waste disposal problem. No proof has been offered that such substances are injurious to health, but their residues can cause foaming. Sometimes foam clogs treatment plants and sewage discharge points if it is not beaten down by water sprays.

The nuisance is nearing abatement. Several oil and chemical companies produce raw materials for detergents that can be completely broken down through bacterial action. (One company spent 10 years and $6 million developing the material.) Soap companies are beginning to place these soft detergents on the market, and the widespread use is predicted in the near future.

Practically all cities of any size in this country give primary treatment to their sewage. In this process, settling basins impound waste water until the solids it contains settle to the bottom. The resulting sludge is scraped out and disposed of in a sanitary manner.

A majority of cities also operate secondary treatment plants. These employ biological processes in trickling filters or activated sludge tanks.

In a trickling filter, waste water is sprayed over a bed of stones covered with biological growths. These bacteria, with the help of oxygen from air passing upward through the bed, consume and destroy a large variety of objectionable organic wastes.

The activated sludge process accomplishes the same end as does the trickling filter. Here oxidation is achieved by bubbling large volumes of air through a mixture of waste water and microorganisms in a tank or basin.

Biological oxidation not only kills most disease germs but reduces the oxygen-consuming potential of waste water. Thereby, it protects the receiving lake or stream from harmful effects. (Sufficient oxygen always must be present if fish and aquatic plants are to thrive. In technical terms, aeration is said to reduce the water's BOD, or biochemical oxygen demand.)

Some cities have installed or are considering the installation of tertiary treatment plants to improve the quality of effluent received from primary and secondary disposal units. The most common tertiary treatment is chlorination. Other methods, still in the experimental stage, show much promise, although they are complicated and expensive. They involve the employment of radiation of exotic chemicals such as ozone to destroy new problem wastes that bacteria in secondary treatment plants do not remove.

PART V. THE RENOVATION OF WATER USED BY INDUSTRY

Widespread cooperative research is opening new avenues to the solution of abatement problems.

Most States give advice and assistance to their cities. Some have enacted laws offering tax incentives to industries that want to improve their waste treatment facilities.

Several interstate compacts like that in the Ohio River Valley devote their attention to areawide cleanup activities of agriculture, municipalities, and industries.

Federal grants-in-aid, which underwrite as much as 30 percent of the cost of new or enlarged municipal sewage systems, encourage construction of such facilities.

Effluents from manufacturing plants are much less of a problem today than they were in the past. Most companies make it part of their business responsibility to avoid giving offense to their neighbors. Since the 1930's, industries have conducted extensive research that seeks to protect water resources. Many firms have installed tremendously expensive equipment to dispose of wastes that necessarily result from their operations. No longer does any American community point to a polluted river as a sign of local prosperity.

Businessmen realize that further development of measures to preserve water quality

is essential. Increasing public demand for more and better products inevitably results in the discovery and use of new chemicals, alloys and other materials. These, and the manufacturing processes needed to convert them into consumer items, create types of wastes that were unknown even a decade ago and that often require treatment by new methods.

Expanding enterprises also use more water each year for cooling purposes. Hot water is harmful to aquatic life. Warm water carries less life-supporting oxygen than does cool. Heat exchangers and aerators are installed, therefore, to reduce effluent temperatures and improve quality, before the liquid is released.

Companies using large quantities of water—particularly those manufacturing chemicals, petroleum products, pulp, paper, steel, and textiles—were early in recognizing the economic necessity for water renovation and reuse. As new plants were built, provisions for recycling were made integral parts of most of them.

Reuse is an obstinate economic problem at some older plants in congested areas. Lack of space and expensive, intricate piping and equipment systems make alterations difficult. If such plants are to continue to make profits and give employment, the costs of their reconstruction must be passed on to consumers.

It is the policy of responsible companies to build conservation into their equipment as fast as this is economically feasible. As production facilities become outmoded and are replaced, this progressive policy will have a cumulative effect on increased water reuse and consequent reduction of wastes.

Another industrial development is the growing use of sea water, brackish underground water and spent irrigation water carrying heavy loads of salt. These sources are blended with fresh water by manufacturers located in arid regions.

In crowded areas, the practice of employing treated municipal effluent for cooling and other purposes is growing. Water from polluted streams also is used.

Modern industry's position is that the abatement problem can only be solved through teamwork involving individuals, companies, farm groups, Government agencies, and others interested in efficient waste disposal, forest management, watershed planning and the protection of recreational areas and wildlife. This is the only logical approach, yet it was never thought of until a few decades ago. As Robert Brittain explains in his recent provocative book, "Rivers and Man":

"There is always something piecemeal and isolated about the river-control and water-conservancy projects of antiquity. They built gigantic and eminently useful structures, they connected disparate streams by canals, but they never seem to have understood the relationship between what was done at one point along a river's bank and what might be done anywhere else. They never grasped the concept of the river as an individual unit. As for the concept of development of the basin as a whole, there was scarcely an inkling."

Much remains to be done in this cooperative field but accomplishments in the Ohio River Valley prove that broad-based regional planning is the basic foundation for water conservation. Even acid drainage from coal mines, one of the most difficult wastes to control, has been reduced in that area through the efforts of responsible industry.

PART VI. OIL COMPANIES ARE LEADERS IN WATER RENOVATION WORK

Considering the size and scope of their operations, American oil companies contribute remarkably little to the overall water pollution problem. They have adopted efficient water management programs, beginning on an industrywide basis as long as 40 years ago. In 1926, some 50 companies participated in a water pollution abatement survey sponsored by the American Petroleum Institute. This study produced comprehensive recommendations.

Three years later the API Committee on Disposal of Refinery Wastes was organized. Operating under the division of refining, its primary responsibility is to develop methods for preventing air and water pollutants in amounts capable of causing objectionable effects in neighboring areas.

Today this committee has a membership of 65 scientists and technologists, including representatives of all major companies. It has published, and keeps up to date, a six-volume manual on the disposal of refinery wastes. It also sponsors research at universities and institutes and publishes technical reports on the results.

The manual has won broad acceptance inside and outside the industry, and its recommendations have been widely adopted. As a result, few of today's refineries cause any serious pollution.

Refiners prove their case

Refiners are very touchy about occasional charges that their wastes cause offense and go to great lengths to prove to safety and health officials and to the public that this is not true. For example:

An east coast refinery developed a large oyster bed just below the point where its treated wastes are released. Careful surveys have proved that the mollusks thrive in this environment.

A Toledo, Ohio, refinery that reclaims its spent effluents has won the friendship of that municipality's water and fire departments. Reuse of the same supply greatly reduces the necessity for withdrawals from city water mains. And an impounding basin holding up to 8 million gallons of effluent undergoing treatment provides the plant with a virtually unlimited water supply for emergency fire protection.

A refinery located in a beautifully landscaped suburban area near Toronto, Ontario, maintains an aquarium that has become a tourist attraction. The refinery's discharge water, cleaned to a high degree of purity, passes through a tank containing scores of trout and other game fish.

A pet goldfish named Yvette lives at a Louisiana refinery in a tank containing a mixture of effluent and Mississippi River water. Whenever Yvette shows signs of distress, company engineers take prompt corrective action.

A California oil company uses schools of stickleback to check the quality of effluent in its refinery settling ponds. The same company has found that large schools of fish congregate in the cool shadows of its offshore well drilling platforms. A wide variety of accident prevention and control equipment is used on these platforms to reduce the possibility of blowouts, leaks, and spills. Good housekeeping is carried to the point where workmen are forbidden to throw even so much as a chewing gum wrapper overboard.

Steady reduction in ocean, lake, and stream pollution from refineries also is a result of developments such as the following:

Plants, built in the past 10 years are equipped with waste treatment facilities that meet or exceed the requirements of State control authorities.

Only about 40 percent of the total crude oil refining capacity in the United States is now located in areas where effluents need be discharged into lakes or streams that provide municipal water supplies or other critical requirements.

About 100 outmoded refineries have ceased operation within the past 20 years. Fewer, larger, and more efficient plants care for the great increase in processing capacity required to meet national needs.

Refineries, like other oil installations, cooperate closely with municipal, State, area, and Federal agencies, and with other industries and groups interested in water renovation and conservation.

A huge investment

An API survey made in 1961 on disposal of water by U.S. refineries showed that there is tremendous investment in facilities used to treat intake and outgoing water. To replace these facilities today would cost more than a quarter billion dollars. The survey also showed that the annual operating cost for waste treatment is about $31 million.

The possibility of pollution also has been reduced because present-day refining processes make better products with less chemical treatment, thus producing smaller volumes of spent materials for disposal. During the 1949–59 period, when refining became much more complex, processing capacity increased 93 percent. Yet there was an increase of only 21 percent in fresh water intake.

A significant development in water treatment has been the widespread use of oxidation methods. The most important of these is biological treatment. Bacteria and algae have the ability to break down various chemical compounds to harmlessness and to improve the taste and odor of effluents. At least 60 U.S. refineries use settling ponds to improve waste quality. Twenty others employ trickling filters or the activated sludge process.

The oil content in refinery waste waters is kept well below levels that might cause objection. This particular improvement has been achieved through good housekeeping, decreased use of emulsifying chemicals, application of biological and various other treatments, the employment of improved oil-water separators, and continuous high-level supervision and research.

The API Committee on Disposal of Refinery Wastes sponsors research on the taste and odor characteristics of water discharged by refineries. It also studies nonbiological oxidation methods that may show the way toward further reduction in objectionable properties.

Another API body dealing with the renovation and reuse of effluents is the air and water conservation committee, which operates under the division of refining. It was organized 10 years ago to sponsor research and distribute technical information. Its 35 members, mostly oil company vice presidents, concern themselves chiefly with community aspects of problems arising from industry operations and the use of petroleum products.

A conservation-conscious industry

Water conservation activities by segments of the industry other than refining also are extensive. Oil and gas producers spend vast sums each year for the safe disposal of salt water, drilling fluid, and waste oil.

Millions of gallons of salt water that come to the surface along with oil and gas are returned to deep underground rock formations where they can do no damage to fresh water supplies. Additional quantities are released to the ocean or to streams that have enough flow to reduce the brine to harmlessness. The rest is pumped back into producing fields. There it helps maintain the underground pressure that alone forces crude oil and gas into well bottoms.

Oil field waste disposal practices are approved by State control officers. Occasional pollution may be caused by accidents, floods, hurricanes and other "acts of God," but producers are well prepared for such emergencies. Cleanup operations start immediately and continue until the nuisance is abated.

Oil transport and storage terminal operators pay equal attention to the prevention or correction of spills. There are remarkably few such spills when it is considered that, every year, almost 4 billion barrels of oil

flow from the fields to refineries and on to consumers—and that these barrels often travel hundreds, sometimes even thousands, of miles. Nevertheless, even a small release of oil can be extremely noticeable. So companies make every effort to clean up any oil inadvertently spilled and to rectify any damage done.

Sources of annoyance about which little or nothing can be done are leaks from the great number of tankers sunk near our shores by German submarines during World War II, and seepage from natural oil formations located in rock strata underlying offshore waters.

High praise from Congress

The petroleum industry endorses rigid enforcement of Federal statutes and of an international convention prohibiting discharge of oil into navigable rivers and lakes or waters within 50 miles of our coasts. It shows its support by self-policing, personnel education, and strict adherence to industry recommendations. In cooperation with such U.S. agencies as the Coast Guard and the Army Engineers it has prepared a manual of good practices and made it available to shipboard personnel.

Records of the U.S. Congress contain much evidence of the industry's good work on sea pollution abatement. One instance appears in Executive Report No. 6 of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations dated June 2, 1960. It reads:

"The Foreign Relations Committee takes this opportunity to commend the industry for the effectiveness of its voluntary measures for oil pollution control. A United Nations report published in 1956 * * * showed the United States has in operation facilities for the disposal of oil wastes, and has in operation rules and regulations governing disposal of such wastes, that are equaled by few if any countries. This favorable U.N. report is largely the result of industry efforts at self-control."

A coordinating committee representing various segments of the industry has undertaken a thorough study of the cause and prevention of occasional oil spills. A close look is being taken at procedures and equipment used or required to minimize dockside leakage that sometimes occurs while tankers and barges are loading or unloading. Attention also is being given to development of better practices for trapping and recovering accidentally spilled crude oil and its products.

All segments of the petroleum industry are in wholehearted agreement that every effort must be made to protect and preserve clean water supplies.

They engage in extensive research designed to improve their conservation methods.

They have helped to create, and scrupulously comply with, the new or improved laws to protect water quality that virtually all States have adopted in recent years.

They support work done by the U.S. Public Health Service in training conservation specialists, providing analytical tools and supplying technical information obtained through Government research.

They cooperate fully with Federal, State, and local agencies, citizens' groups, farm organizations and other industries in voluntary efforts to achieve a common goal.

They reuse process and cooling water as many times as is technically feasible and eventually return it in such condition that it does not harm the quality of receiving streams.

They are convinced from experience that water conservation practices must be different in various localities because of differing geographic, meteorological, industrial, municipal and agricultural conditions.

Techniques that have proved effective in one area may well be inefficient or even harmful if applied indiscriminately. Present process toward final solutions can best be continued at local, State, and area levels by the dedicated individuals and groups that are already at work conserving our waters.

President's Antipoverty Program Faces the Realities of the 20th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the April 15, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

As Mr. Drummond points out, the eradication of poverty is the business of the Federal Government and the able chief of the poverty program, Sargent Shriver, has put together a realistic and workable program.

The article follows:

A PERVASIVE PROBLEM: ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM FACES UP TO REALITIES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The critics of President Johnson's antipoverty program are making a great mistake picking at its fringes.

The argument that this must not be the business of the Federal Government is a profitless and outdated argument.

Any democratic society must be concerned at every level of government with the problem of continued high unemployment in the face of continued high prosperity.

Any democratic society must be concerned at every level of government with the fact that, despite a consistently rising standard of living for many Americans, despite a higher average wage for most Americans, despite a mounting gross national product of more than $600 billion annually, some 35 million persons in this country can afford neither adequate food, nor adequate shelter, nor adequate clothing, nor adequate schooling.

I submit that at no level of government—local, State, and Federal—dare we neglect this pervasive problem of widespread poverty in the midst of widespread affluence.

I think we can't.

Therefore, the central questions to be asked—and answered—are:

Do the proposed actions go to the heart of the problem, to its causes, not merely to its symptoms?

And even if the measures are well conceived, can poverty be substantially done away with?

It seems to me that the war-on-poverty program which its chief of staff, Sargent Shriver, has put together for the President and unfolded to Congress, reflects realistic, workable and, indeed, conservative economic principles.

Mr. Shriver is not talking about how to help the poor, spreading the wealth of others.

He is not talking about increasing handouts in order to decrease distress.

He is not talking primarily about how to help the poor, but primarily about how to help the poor help themselves.

What are the causes of increased unemployment and continued poverty in the face of increased and long-sustained prosperity? They are, as pointed out by Raymond J. Saulnier, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and no pie-in-the-sky economist: lack of skills, inadequate education, unsuitable or inadequate work experience, and discrimination.

These are the root causes, and the Shriver program is aimed concretely at these causes as a practical and necessary way to reduce poverty.

These are the things which most often make people poor and keep them that way—often from generation to generation.

I think this Nation cannot accept continued poverty for 9,300,000 families with a median income of $1,800 a year. This kind of poverty is not due to the failure of our economic system. It is due to the failure of our society to provide the education, the job training and retraining, the encouragement and the environment needed to help the poor become productive and the productive become more prosperous.

This is why a panel of practical, experienced business leaders helped to shape and then gave its unanimous endorsement to the program which Mr. Shriver proposed to the White House.

Recently the Gallup poll reported that 83 percent of the respondents said "no" when asked, "Do you think poverty will ever be done away with in this country?"

I suspect they asked the wrong question. The realistic goal is not abolishing poverty. Some people may not have the will to lift themselves out of poverty even when given a better opportunity. Some may not have the mental capacity to improve themselves even when the chance is put well within their reach.

But it seems to me that the kind of poverty and unemployment we have experienced in the past 15 years ought to be seen as an anachronism not to be accepted.

This war on poverty is headed in the right direction.

Long Island-Built Spacecraft Makes First Lunar Reentry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 14 the so-called Project Fire of NASA was launched and completed. The spacecraft used in this experiment was built by the Republic Aviation Corp. on Long Island. This company is one of those which has been a consistently outstanding producer of defense aircraft for our Nation. It is soundly and firmly established in the aerospace field. The spacecraft they built functioned perfectly and the mission was a success. To me this proves again the dependability and capability of Long Island industry to perform essential functions for our Nation's defense and space programs.

The 579th manmade object to be sent aloft since the Soviets launched Sputnik 1, October 4, 1957, might well have been one of the most significant because it promises to unlock an important barrier to the safe return of American astronauts from a lunar journey. The object—a 200-pound, blunt-nosed spacecraft, built by one of our companies on Long Island, Republic Aviation Corp.—reentered the atmosphere at 25,730 miles an hour, which is more than 7,000 miles an hour faster than the Project Mercury

spacecraft. The 21-inch-long instrument-laden vehicle was launched from Cape Kennedy at 4:42 p.m. e.s.t. on April 14, rocketed to a peak altitude of more than 500 miles, then arched back into the earth's atmosphere more than 5,000 miles downrange. The entire flight took some 32 minutes. The objective of the space agency, NASA, in this test was to learn more about the complex physical and chemical changes which occur during the reentry period when temperature of the gases in front of the vehicle hit 20,000 degrees—which is about twice as hot as the surface of the sun. This marks the first time that the reentry speed of a test flight matched the reentry speed of an actual return flight from the moon.

We read and hear a great deal these days about the complexities and cost of space research and this reentry shot provided some tangible evidence of this. For example, the Republic people explained to me that it took approximately 2 years to design and build the spacecraft itself. Quality control inspections, in which all of the more than 3,000 parts in the vehicle were checked and inspected at least once, represented between one-quarter and one-half million dollars in costs.

During the critical phase of reentry—a period of some 42 seconds—over 100,000 different temperature measurements were recorded and telemetered to ground stations at the rate of some 2,000 a second.

According to officials of NASA's Office of Advanced Research and Technology, the reentry phase of space flight brings a spacecraft into one of the most severe and difficult combinations of environmental conditions it is called upon to survive. It is against this backdrop we must evaluate the performance of Republic, a company which has long been a major producer of frontline military aircraft and is right now making the evolutionary transformation to space. Herbert A. Wilson, Jr., of NASA and Project FIRE program manager, in congratulating the Republic team, told them that they were definitely in the space business. He said the spacecraft's hardware performed very well during the blazing reentry.

The technological competition to share in space exploration is as keen as anything that exists today. Only the qualified stand a chance and the homework necessary to qualify represents substantial expenditures in research, facilities, and, most importantly, in time and experience. In Republic's case, which I feel is fairly typical, Project FIRE was the culmination of effort that began 5 years ago. Work on the problems of lunar reentry dates back to 1958 when the company undertook a study program for the Air Force involving development of a manned lunar observatory. This experience served as a base for more extensive study generated by two subsequent NASA programs, Project Calorie—later canceled—and Project Apollo. Through knowledge gained in such areas as trajectory analysis, heat transfer, structures and materials, electronics, data collection, transmission, and analysis, Republic scientists were able to use an overall systems approach in their proposal for Project FIRE. The contract was awarded in May of 1962.

Republic's space research capability itself stems from the launching of a multimillion-dollar expansion of research and development facilities and human resources 6 years ago to change emphasis from aeronautical to aerospace objectives.

Although in these 5 years the company has received over 200 space-oriented contracts, the result of entering 44 new technological areas—Project FIRE marked the debut of the company at the critical barrier of the launch pad.

Toward an Understanding of the Prayer Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal, not only the largest daily newspaper in Wisconsin but for many decades one of the Nation's most respected, has always spoken out boldly in defense of religious freedom. Indeed, the entire State's long experience of religious harmony has been frequently cited as a splendid example of religious freedom guaranteed by church-state separation. Recent efforts to overthrow the Supreme Court's 1962 and 1963 decisions in this area threaten to disturb Wisconsin's religious tranquility by casting a shadow over its 1848 constitutional ban on public school religious exercises.

Responding to this with a brilliant analysis of what the Supreme Court did and did not hold, the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial in its April 26, 1964, issue. This editorial should set to rest the minds of many, in and out of Wisconsin, who may have misconstrued the Court's opinions and, consequently, advocate hasty congressional action. The editorial follows:

COURT DID NOT BANISH RELIGION BUT PROTECTED IT

If all the people writing pleas and signing petitions to "put God back in the schools" with officially prescribed prayers were devoting the same time and effort to the practice of prayer themselves, in their own hearts and homes and churches, they would much further advance the true cause of religion. One suspects that many just want somebody else to take care of the religion business for them.

All their pressure on Congress to sanction rote piety in the public schools fails to realize that a practice of Government to ordain religious exercises is not wholesome for either Government or religion. It fails to comprehend that the present constitutional ban on such practice is not to banish religion but to assure its freedom, to save it from being diluted and degraded, to protect it from interference by the secular government.

The Supreme Court did not volunteer this interpretation; it was asked what the first amendment meant in this connection and had to answer in the only possible way. Twice in the last 2 years it tried learnedly and devoutly to explain that this principle of separation was written and is being made to operate in favor of religion.

Thus, Justice Black reminded in the 1962 decision that the founders, far from being antireligious, knew how "many people had lost their respect for any religion that had relied upon the support of Government to spread its faith." They took the view, as he restated it, that "religion is too personal, too sacred, too holy, to permit its 'unhallowed perversion' by a civil magistrate."

And Justice Clark was eloquent in the 1963 case: "The place of religion in our society is an exalted one achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind. * * * It is not within the power of Government to invade that citadel" even with benevolent intent.

The understanding has yet to sink in. The emotional reaction persists that the Court threw religion out of American life. Despite the opposite fact, Congress is so plagued that the House Judiciary Committee has now reluctantly begun hearings on a horde of proposals to water down the first amendment. They will take up weeks of committee time.

The hearings may help show, however, what a tinderbox of contention and strife would be opened, how misguided the pressure is. Just what prayers for school use would suit all 83 sizable denominations, not to mention all the smaller ones, and who would decide? What Bible readings would be universally acceptable, and from which version of the Bible? What about the 24 Protestant and Orthodox communions, including most of the biggest, that officially support the first amendment as it now stands interpreted on this point?

Proposing that Government be authorized to "invade the citadel of the individual heart" in a matter of religion is merely disruptive of American religious life and a distraction from right aims of religion.

Wisconsin, certainly no Godless State, has always accepted an absolute bar to such invasion, even more explicit in its constitution since 1848 and as interpreted by devout jurists since 1890.

Statement of Andrew J. Biemiller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Andrew J. Biemiller, Director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Legislation, before a Special Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee on the inherent evils of the quality stabilization bill.

Mr. Biemiller in this excellent statement clearly shows that this proposed legislation will benefit no one. He reiterates the concern we all feel toward the situation small business finds itself in today, but points out that small retail stores would actually lose from enactment of a fair trade bill, because they would no longer be able to compete against mail order houses and chain stores which sell "house brands" and "private label" items. The small busi-

nessman would become more than ever subject to the demands of the large manufacturer. And Mr. Biemiller calls attention to the fact that organized labor has actually been threatened with the argument that wages will fall unless enactment of this bill is accomplished.

The evidence presented in this statement alone is more than adequate reason why not only the consumer, who stands to lose in every way under such a law, but the retail merchant should fight together against the nefarious quality stabilization bill.

The statement by Mr. Biemiller follows:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS ON S. 774, THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON QUALITY STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE, JANUARY 23, 1964

My name is Andrew J. Biemiller, I am legislative director for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. I am appearing in behalf of the AFL–CIO in opposition to S. 774, the proposed "Quality Stabilization Act."

We are opposing S. 774 because it is a Federal resale price maintenance bill designed to achieve by somewhat different means the same purposes as other price maintenance bills proposed in the past and usually known as "fair trade" bills. They are price-fixing bills and they all mean higher prices for the consumer.

Some advocates of this bill have insisted that it is not a "fair trade" bill, and we do not insist on calling it that. We do insist, however, on calling it a Federal resale price maintenance bill, because that is what it is.

Mr. Chairman, the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the AFL–CIO, which met in November 1963, passed two policy resolutions on consumer protection. Both these resolutions urged the Congress not to enact quality stabilization legislation.

Resolution No. 117 reads in part:

"*Resolved,* We ask Congress not to pass the so-called quality stabilization bill (H.R. 3669 and S. 774) which has nothing to do with either quality or honest stabilization of prices. The certain effect of this bill, which travels under the guise of fair competition, will be to establish a vast system of regulated prices set by manufacturers; destroy any semblance of competition, and raise prices for the consumer."

Resolution No. 237 reads in part:

"Anticonsumer legislation * * * in the form of the so-called quality stabilization bill has been moving quickly through the Congress. The proposed quality stabilization legislation is nothing more than the old fair trade bill consistently opposed in the past by the AFL–CIO. It would, like all other resale price maintenance bills, empower private manufacturers to eliminate retail price competition by compelling retailers to sell branded or trademarked goods at uniform prices fixed by manufacturers.

"*Resolved,* We call on Congress to reject all proposals for Federal resale price maintenance legislation by whatever label offered including the presently pending quality stabilization bill. Should this anticonsumer legislation nonetheless be passed, we urge its prompt veto by the President."

Certain testimony has recently been offered before your subcommittee reproaching organized labor for its position against this bill and enumerating 56 reasons why the AFL–CIO should favor the bill rather than oppose it.

We think our reasons for opposing this bill are sound, both from the viewpoint of our own interests and the interest of the public at large. And we honestly do not think the bill will help small business. We trust that our testimony will make our reasons clear and that it will answer any questions as to the appropriateness of our position on this legislation.

The testimony we offer is in line with that presented by all the consumer-interest organizations we know of that have commented or testified on this bill and with that of Government agencies from the Department of Defense to the Consumer Advisory Council. The late President Kennedy's succinct comment at one of his last news conference on October 31, 1963, was: "I've never been for it."

S. 774 is a broadly applicable price-fixing bill, allowing private manufacturers absolute power over prices on branded or trademarked articles at all levels of distribution, with no participation by any governmental agency in the price-determination process.

Virtually all classes of products would be subject to price maintenance under this bill, including such highly important items of consumer purchase as prescription drugs. In particular, the inclusion of prescription drugs under price maintenance provisions is a key indicator of the failure of this legislation to take account of the public interest.

Although the price-setting powers of the bill are vested exclusively in manufacturers, the principal argument, the most appealing argument made in behalf of its provisions, is that it is needed for the preservation of small business, especially small retail business.

In fact it has been alleged before this subcommittee that the purposes and principles of the quality stabilization bill are exactly the same as those of Federal labor legislation and that it should be enacted to afford small business economic protection comparable to that accorded by law to wage earners. I submit to you that such a view is in fundamental error.

The Federal law protecting labor's right to organize and to bargain collectively does not authorize any one-sided setting of the price of labor by labor organizations. The wage contract is reached by bargaining in which both employers and unions negotiate. By contrast, if the principles of quality stabilization were applied, labor unions would no longer have to engage in collective bargaining at all—employers would simply be ordered by the courts to pay whatever was demanded by labor and would cease to have any voice in the wage bargain. In fact, employers would not even have to be under contract with a labor union in order to be legally bound by the wage scales announced by labor organizations.

Nor is the Fair Labor Standards Act, which establishes legal minimum wages for labor, in any way comparable to the quality stabilization proposal. The amount of the minimum wage is set in the law and is thus determined, not by labor unions, but by the public. Under quality stabilization, the public does not set the price—the price is determined by the manufacturer at whatever level he wishes and the courts are then required to enforce it. For a minimum wage law to be comparable, you would have to allow labor unions simply to announce what minimum wage ought to be paid—we are now advocating $2 an hour—and immediately make that price binding through the courts on all employers. There would be no public hearings on minimum wage proposals. Congress would have no function in the determination of the minimum wage, and there would be no Wage and Hour Administration in the Department of Labor. Perhaps the public would save something in administrative costs—an advantage claimed for the quality stabilization proposal—but I seriously doubt that this prospect would induce the public to sanction such a law in behalf of organized labor.

In the past, almost every witness on resale price maintenance, whether for or against the legislation, has deplored and noted with sympathy the plight of small business in whose behalf this type of legislation is offered, whether in the form of fair trade, fair competitive practices, or the current quality stabilization version. We ourselves share this concern, but we simply do not believe that resale price maintenance is a feasible answer to the problem.

The basic argument presented by proponents is that unless retail prices on branded items can be protected from competitive price cuts on the part of large retailers and by discounters, the small independent store will simply have to go out of business. Such price cuts are described as predatory, cutthroat, and unfair, and present remedies under law are claimed to be inadequate.

The manufacturer's interest in the bill is described as dual in nature. It is based on (1) the desire to preserve a large number of distributive outlets and (2) the desire to protect quality name-brand merchandise from debasement and deterioration which is alleged to inevitably accompany lower prices.

Low prices are equated with inferior products and high prices are said to furnish the only incentive and means of producing superior products.

In addition, organized labor has been threatened with the argument that without a quality stabilization bill, wages will fall, the quality of the work force will deteriorate, and unemployment will increase.

Therefore, if we can establish a system under which a manufacturer may, if he chooses, establish a protected resale price on any or all of his branded or trade-marked merchandise, small business will be preserved, an orderly distribution system will be assured, the manufacturer's investment in his brand name will be protected, labor will be assured of high wages and full employment, and the public will be benefited by a reliable flow of superior quality merchandise.

Serious flaws, however, have been shown to exist in this picture of what would happen if Federal resale price maintenance were to become law. Indeed, Judge Lee Loevinger, formerly of the Department of Justice and now a member of the Federal Communications Commission, flatly predicted in testimony before the House subcommittee in 1962 that this bill would "ultimately eliminate small business."

Surely, testimony of so grave a nature from so responsible a source suggests the need for the most serious appraisal of the theory on which the bill is based.

The dangers to small business pointed out by Judge Loevinger and by others rest on two main points:

1. Small retail business would stand in danger of being delivered lock, stock, and barrel into the hands of the manufacturers. The manufacturers of brand-name products will have the power to enforce any price and any profit margin they wish for all resellers on any such brand-name product they wish without regard to the interest of any particular reseller. The reseller is wholly deprived of making his own price decisions based on his own costs and his own competitive needs with respect to such products. He cannot under this bill move his price up or down from the single price or price range fixed by the manufacturer. If, for example, he wishes to compensate for some special disadvantage, such as poor location or lack of credit facilities, by a price cut on name merchandise, he is prevented by this bill from doing so. It would even become illegal for a retailer, on his own initiative, to sponsor temporary sales to move excessive or slow-selling inventories, to reduce prices to meet seasonal demand, to give quantity discounts on large purchases, or to promote advertised specials on any particular product or group of products.

2. Small retail sellers dependent on sales of name merchandise will be faced with accelerated competition from the large retailers, mail-order houses, and chainstores which can afford to buy and promote unbranded merchandise at lower prices under their own labels, the so-called house brands or private labels. These products are frequently identical to the name merchandise and may even be made by the very same manufacturer. The advantage of the high-priced names on particular articles is thus often entirely fictional, as far as the product itself is concerned. If it is to a manufacturer's advantage to switch more of his output to unbranded merchandise, he will undoubtedly do so, without regard to the dependence of small retailers on name merchandise.

Additional points were emphasized in a recent analysis prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisors, entitled "Probable Effects of the Proposed Quality Stabilization Act," which concluded that the protection promised to retailers by price maintenance would be "illusory" and self-defeating. The Council points out in particular that elimination of price competition would encourage costly competition in business expense items such as advertising, store decorations, and the like, and that rising operating costs would eventually reduce the average retailer's net profit margin back to what it was without price maintenance. Also the lure of protected profit margins would attract new dealers into the field, thus tending to lower the volume of sales per store and with it the amount of profit that could be realized by individual operators. The Council concludes that "The gain in retail profits which many retailers foresee from quality stabilization would in fact be only temporary."

The Council points out that small manufacturers would also be endangered since retailers would have strong incentives to favor the products of large firms that are best able to afford heavy advertising expenditures and offer high markups on merchandise.

Statistical studies offered by the Departmentment of Justice at previous hearings have produced prima facie factual evidence of the inefficacy of resale price maintenance as a means of preventing business failures. In fact the very opposite relationship was shown to prevail, through a comparison of the rate of business failures in States with and without price maintenance laws and in States where the laws had been partially invalidated by elimination of the nonsigner clause to fair trade agreements. For each year, 1946 through 1962, business failures were consistently higher in States with fair trade laws than in States with no fair trade laws or with defective fair trade laws. Those with no fair trade laws at all showed the lowest rate of business failures.

Finally we are impressed with evidence that small business itself is by no means solidly behind the proposed legislation, despite the lengthy list of business organizations that have officially endorsed it. Again citing Mr. Loevinger, we refer to a study which he described as follows:

"A recent survey made by an impartial private organization which is experienced in the field of small business and which polled 179,000 small businessmen located in every State shows that a slight majority of such businessmen are opposed to this particular legislation. The vote was 51 percent opposed to this legislation, 45 percent in favor and 4 percent undecided."

For these reasons, we believe the case has not been made that a universally available resale price maintenance system is the key to the preservation of small business. We urge that other measures be developed to help small business survive—measures that hold less danger to the public and to the general economy.

What of the allegation that manufacturers need price protection in order to prevent deterioration of their products and that labor needs quality stabilization in order to prevent deterioration of wages and employment?

Frankly, we simply cannot put much stock in this argument. Our general view is that good quality in a product is its own best salesman. Under free competition in a healthy economy, a genuinely good product will command a sufficient volume of sales at a price adequate to insure its production. Good products, which consumers want, do not need artificial price supports. Our credence of the argument is further stretched by the practice already referred to of selling identical products at high prices with brand names and at low prices under private labels. In such instances the lowering of prices has clearly not altered the product, nor has it deteriorated the wages or the quality of the workforce which has produced it.

Mrs. Sarah Newman, of the National Consumers League, has succinctly observed that these private brand products "are hardly made with inferior labor and materials because they are made in the same factories under the same conditions as the fair-traded items."

During the hearings earlier this year before the House Commerce and Finance Subcommittee, Mr. George Nevole appeared in behalf of National Bellas Hess, Inc., a nationwide retail organization, which sells merchandise with different kinds of brand names—merchandise with its own house brand names, merchandise with unadvertised brand names, and merchandise with nationally advertised brand names. He testified to the increasing degree to which manufacturers sell their products both under their own names and under retailers' house brand names or distributors' private brand names.

"In recent years," Mr. Nevole stated, "there has been an enormous increase in the marketing of these brands; to such an extent, in fact, that manufacturers of national brands are increasingly selling their products not only under their own names but also for marketing under distributors' brand names—at lower prices."

During the 1959 hearings on the fair trade bill in the Senate, Mr. Wilfred I. Meyer, a partner in Schwegmann Bros. Giant Super Markets in New Orleans, gave a very detailed description of Schwegmann purchases of unbranded soap powder from Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co. This soap was sold under the Schwegmann label as "Miracle" soap and it was exactly the same soap as the well-known brand "Fab," also manufactured by Colgate, but "Miracle" carried a much lower price to the consumer.

Chairman Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission has testified to the already widespread use of private labels in chain grocery stores. In his testimony, for example, he cited a study that showed that over 60 percent of the frozen food products sold in the 10 largest grocery chains were sold under private labels.

We further fail to see how the quality stabilization bill would in any way improve the serious unemployment problem facing the Nation today. In fact we fear that by encouraging artificially high prices, the bill might very well result in fewer purchases by consumers, lower levels of production, and a consequent increase in the rate of job loss by labor. The Council of Economic Advisers, in fact, pointed out that a "higher level of total market demand in money terms would be required to maintain full employment at the higher prices associated with retail price maintenance, and this level would not be automatically forthcoming." The Council predicted that in certain types of work such as in the advertising industry, employment might increase, but that "employment in the production of price-maintained goods would tend to decline relative to employment in price-free sectors of the economy." Reduced employment in smaller retail establishments was forecast.

Finally, labor like the rest of the public stands to lose from the viewpoint of its own role as consumer of the products which would become subject to price fixing under this bill.

All impartial evidence has indicated that prices of consumer retail products would rise substantially if Federal resale price maintenance were to become law. According to economic surveys by the Department of Justice, consumers in States with "fair trade" laws pay from 19 percent to 27 percent higher prices than consumers in States without such laws. Estimates of added costs to the consumer under a Federal price-fixing law range from $1.5 billion to $14 billion a year, based on limited coverage under State laws. The potential cost to the consumer might vastly exceed these estimates if a universally available Federal law were enacted; with a possibly much larger volume of products placed under "stabilization" provisions.

The right of the consumer to shop for the lowest price on a distinctly identifiable product would disappear. The field would be increasingly dominated by brand competition—lower priced house brands and higher priced name brands. Costly, competitive brand advertising, and in some instances, competitive efforts by manufacturers to woo their resellers through offering higher resale margins, would increase prices generally, quite apart from the specific price setting to be encouraged for trademarked products.

The recent study by the Council of Economic Advisers has given additional confirmation to other testimony that the consumer would be poorly served by this legislation. In their words, "Retailers would not gain; but their customers would lose."

We would like to comment in particular on the fact that the bill does not offer adequate assurance that the public will be protected from retail price fixing by manufacturers of products which are not competitive as to price at the manufacturers' level. The language of the bill which is supposed to insure that price-fixed items at retail are competitive at the producer level is the requirement that goods "usable for the same general purpose" must be available to the public from sources other than the owner of the brand name and that they must be in "free and open competition therewith."

But no guidance is given as to just how much competition would in fact be required. In 1962, some of the leading proponents of this bill testified that if there were only one other manufacturer of a particular product, that would be considered "competition."

We believe, in fact, that the bill in itself lends encouragement to the elimination of competition, especially through the system of "price leadership" under which prices move upward in mysterious concert after a price increase has been put into effect by one of the producers. In industries where price competition has been successfully eliminated for all practical purposes and at the same time has resisted definite proof of collusion under the antitrust laws, the consumers' remaining protection—namely, competition among resellers—will have been sealed off by this bill.

The Justice Department has produced an impressive list of 126 retail product lines in which the 4 largest manufacturing companies accounted for at least 50 percent of the value of shipments. In all except 16 of these lines, the 20 largest companies accounted for 90 percent or more of output. We consider it a most serious matter to make resale price maintenance generally available

to manufacturers in which so few producers account for so large a share of the market.

S. 774 does not even make an exception for the special and extreme case of prescription drugs, where the availability of competitive products is not only restricted at the manufacturer's level, but may be shut off completely at the retail level by a doctor's prescription. The needlessly exorbitant prices of prescription drugs, even under present conditions, have been thoroughly documented by the investigations of the Kefauver Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. Within just the past few months the Federal Trade Commission ordered six large drug companies to stop fixing prices on tetracycline and other antibiotic drugs.

To turn the final screw on the consuming public through placing prescription drugs under an objectionable Federal resale price maintenance law would be simply unconscionable.

Where a doctor has prescribed a particular drug by brand name, the buyer has no choice whatsoever, either among identical products under different names or among other drugs usable for the same general purpose—the user must buy one particular drug and one particular brand only, as directed by his doctor. The only price competition that can exist on such a product is between the different retail outlets. This bill would shut off such competition entirely. As far as we can see, lowered prices would no longer be available from discount drugstores, mail-order prescription services or even for members of cooperatives.

We can see no justification whatever for further legalizing monopolistic drug prices at the expense of users who, because of illness, have only the choice of buying or suffering the consequences in terms of their life and health.

The Congress acknowledged the problem of excessive prices for brand name drugs when it enacted the Drug Amendments of 1962. This legislation included provisions to encourage more widespread use of generic names in doctors' prescriptions so as to help consumers avoid at least some of the price gouging on brand names. By contrast, the legislation now before you, the quality stabilization bill, gives legal sanction and support to these excessive prices. It thus runs counter to the intent of the Congress expressed in the 1962 general drug reform legislation.

If resale price protection on brand name products were to be written into law—and the AFL–CIO is completely opposed to any such action—then at the very least strong safeguard to the public should be included. One might think of such devices, for example, as requiring certification from the Department of Justice that free and open competition actually exists on any product for which price maintenance is proposed. Another alternative might be to require public review and approval of any proposed resale price that is going to be legally enforced through the public courts. And in any case, drugs bought on prescription should be automatically excluded from any price protection arrangements.

We suggest that the Congress explore less dangerous and dubious routes to the preservation of small business than the one under consideration in this bill. Such measures might include, for example, strengthening of Federal Trade Commission powers to deal with genuinely predatory price cutting. We feel certain that constructive programs in such fields as tax benefits, loan programs, encouragement of pooled purchasing arrangements, and other means of improving the competitive capacity of small business could be developed or strengthened.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes our statement on the proposed Quality Stabilization Act. We thank you for this opportunity to reiterate our strong opposition to such legislation.

Has Television Become a Propaganda Tool for the Leftwing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a most thought-provoking letter from one of my constituents. He suggests that certain television programs are subtly used as propaganda to discredit conservative thinking and to promote extremist, liberal views.

It is my belief that the entire House might be interested in giving some thought to the questions raised by my constituent. Portions of his letter follow:

Recently I have been watching some of the so-called television shows; particular reference to "The Defenders" and "East Side-West Side." These shows are strictly propaganda mills for the liberals which always condemn conservatives, rightwingers, and the like. Their technique is the same in all cases and it is very subtly done. Briefly the technique involves, in the case of "The Defenders" defending a man's right to say and do as he pleases and have his freedom of thought and political convictions. However, when the trial ends, the defendant who is usually a conservative, rightwinger, businessman, or something of that nature, is usually shown to be irresponsible, a kook, nut, or insane.

The same applies in the case of civil rights where the defending attorney who is this fellow by the name of Preston shows that unknowing to him, his client turns out to be biased.

On Sunday night, April 12, I watched "East Side-West Side," and it was the most vicious attack upon businessmen; the profit system; upon Congress, that I have ever seen. It portrays Congressmen accepting bribes for doing the bidding of businessmen. In these cases, the businessmen are all ruthless, hardhearted, and out to put the small guy out of business.

This program was entitled "The Givers" and it appeared on channel 5 in the San Jose area. One of the producers of this show is David Susskind who also has a forum show. In this particular show, a big businessman forced the small businessman out of business because of alleged unfair competition. This unfair competition was in the form of price cutting due to special depreciation allowances he was able to take. Theoretically, the large businessman was capable of making a profit while the little guy was not. This depreciation "windfall" was supposedly due to the fact that the big businessman had bribed a Congressman to introduce an amendment to a House of Representatives bill, which was not germane to that particular bill and covered a special depreciation allowance for this big businessman. I believe the facts are Charlie, that in the House of Representatives any amendment must be germane to the subject of the bill. However, right or wrong; a Congressman was nonetheless portrayed as being bribed to introduce this bill. The result was that this big businessman obtained special depreciation deductions which the small businessman could not take. Now you know as well as I do, Charlie, that this is an impossibility and is hogwash of the first order. It portrayed this shocked Congressman discovering this plot, and while it did not say so, the indications were that practically all the Congressmen were corrupt by going along with the plot and that he alone stood out in the battle for the right. It showed this righteous Congressman crusading against a crooked businessman and the power of the big business. It intimated that anyone successful must be corrupt in order to be successful. At the end, it slying indicated that this small businessman started his business on a shoestring, but never did mention the fact that he is entitled to the same depreciation privileges under the tax laws as any other businessman. Rather, it brought out the point that if it were not for this "special" depreciation, the small guy could have made it. Not once did it point out that advanced technology required new tools and machinery and that this takes capital which the small guy did not have. Of course, if they had brought this out; then, their line would probably have been that a policy of redistribution of wealth is needed.

With reference to "The Defenders," they took on a crusade for the civil rights issue in one of their shows and pointed out how cruel the apartment owners are, and that they are coldblooded and hardhearted. In this particular instance, it portrayed an intolerant businessman in a community threatening the apartment owner with destruction if he did not evict certain tenants.

This last Sunday night, April 19, on "The Defenders" as portrayed the case of a Navy admiral who did nothing but preach allegiance to his country; who was a Navy hero but who somehow went off the deep end and became an extremist. He was tried for sedition and plotting the overthrow of our Government, whereupon the defender (who is Preston) took the case on even though he did not agree with his client. His belief being that anybody is entitled to a fair trial. This builds the "defender's" character as the hero in the plot, defending even those who disagree. However, in the trial, the prosecutor attempted to prove that the admiral was in fact insane and "off his rocker" and this they could not do. The admiral on the stand talked of the very things that you, I, or any other red-blooded American would talk of; namely, God, honor, and country. The admiral stood up for saluting the flag, Pledge of Alegiance, the "Star Spangled Banner" and what today's liberals would call "flag waving." My wife and I wondered how this would all end up since we knew it had to end up only one way; namely, the assassination of the admiral's character some way or another. This was done in the very end when they tripped the admiral for making a statement (which he did make on the stand), and which he immediately denied making, whereupon the court recorder read back the statement verifying that he did say it. What this boiled down to Charlie, is that right then and there they proved the guy was "off his rocker." They also proved that all the patriots, all these military men who are speaking out for our country are all insane, crackpots or extremists. All this is very subtly imbedded in the average person's mind.

Charlie, something should be done about these programs. I don't advocate censorship or any governmental controls over such programs, but neither do I want my children or anyone else's children submitted to brainwashing techniques under the guise of justice. In psychopolitics, this is known as the conditioning technique. It has no place in this country and the producers of these programs should sell their wares to Russia. These are programs very typical of Edward R. Murrow's phony documentaries.

Quite frankly, I smell Bobby Kennedy behind this because "The Defenders" for the past 2 years has been a wonderful program and a good program. The last 6 to 8 months it has become a purveyor of falsehoods, misconceptions, and outright brainwashing. It is designed to create impressions. Many of those who are not knowledgeable as to what

is going on are certainly going to fall and become conditioned in their thinking. The whole thing is aimed at the destruction of conservatism and aimed at the destruction of the right of individuals to accumulate wealth and property. It is aimed against the free enterprise system and beamed toward the individual in order to condition him into accepting Federal control of private enterprise, his life, and management of his affairs. In the case of this admiral, the plot could easily have been one in which leftwingers were plotting the overthrow of the Government. Rather, they selected a military man who was highly respected, believed in his country, and then labeled him as "misguided" and "off his rocker."

Remarks of Congressman Richard Bolling Before Senior Citizens Dinner at Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on Monday evening to address nearly 500 retired workers in Kansas City. These people are very naturally concerned with the fate of medicare legislation. In my remarks I suggested that the techniques that are being used to bring pressure against such legislation might very well be utilized by those who support the bill.

My remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD BOLLING BEFORE UAW SENIOR CITIZENS DINNER AT THE WORLD WAR II BUILDING, KANSAS CITY, MO., APRIL 27, 1964

On a recent Sunday afternoon in Washington more than 1 million people lined up in the rain for a little cube of sugar. Young people and old, the healthy and the halt, bankers and bellhops stood shoulder to shoulder waiting their turn. The sugar cube received looked just like the one you put in your coffee. The one difference was that each of these had been impregnated with Sabin oral vaccine. In the next 6 weeks, this performance will be repeated twice. When it is over, more than half the population of the Nation's Capital will be protected against paralytic polio.

As I watched these lines, I couldn't help thinking that less than a decade ago infantile paralysis roamed unchecked, crippling our children, and killing our young people. Now, to all intents and purposes it has been conquered. Just a few generations ago, tuberculosis and diabetes were certain death. Now, we know how to control them. Even as I speak here tonight, around this country lights are burning in laboratories where dedicated doctors may be on the very threshold of discovering a cure for cancer.

We owe a great deal to our men of medicine. They have provided us with the means to a healthier and a longer life. Largely through the efforts of the medical profession, the American life expectancy is growing longer.

What a cruel paradox it is, therefore, to find that the very men who have created the means by which we can hope to live longer are at the same time almost entirely united in a bitter attempt to keep those very means from the people for whom they were meant.

Now, if that seems like a strong statement, let's take a look at some cold truths.

Truth No. 1 is that as a person grows older his medical needs increase.

Truth No. 2 is that a person past retirement age suffers a sharp decrease in his income.

Truth No. 3 is that the combination results in a situation where the aging must borrow from the bread money to buy medicine—or do without.

Now, taking all these facts into consideration, it has become clear that some means must be devised to provide our senior citizens with the possibility of adequate medical care. The best possible answer, so far, can be found in the King-Anderson bill now pending in the Congress.

This bill would provide health insurance for the aged through social security. In other words, during a person's working years he would increase his social security payments by a few pennies a month and when he reached 65 he would be entitled to hospital and nursing home care as well as home visits by a doctor when he needed them.

This would not be charity. This would simply be the application of insurance that the citizen paid for during the years of his employment. It is not a Government handout.

It seems to me that this plan contains a certain beauty in its simplicity. It would appear almost impossible to argue against it. But I am here to tell you that the very mention of Medicare is enough to make many of our citizens apoplectic.

The principal, and by far the most influential opponent of this bill, is the American Medical Association. When this bill was introduced 2 years ago, it was defeated in the Senate by the narrow margin of two votes. It is pretty generally conceded that the mammoth propaganda campaign waged against the bill by the AMA was the main factor in its defeat. The Brookings Institution in Washington, a nonpartisan, nonprofit research group with an international reputation, has estimated the cost of the campaign to the AMA was $12 million.

Now that the bill is again being brought up for action, the campaign is starting again. There is no indication that the AMA will give up their fight against this bill. On the contrary, there is every sign that they will spend whatever is needed to defeat it.

You can expect that in the next months ads will appear in your newspapers, calling the bill a step toward socialism; it will be said that it is too expensive, that private insurance companies can do it better and cheaper. None of these things is true. And, I might add, none of them is very original, either.

The same arguments were advanced 30 years ago when social security itself was proposed. And, of course, we can remember how desperately the American Medical Association fought against Blue Cross and other medical plans.

Now the AMA tells us that they favored such plans all along. The American Hospital Association, a group that is in a position to know, says that this just isn't so. In their journal they commented editorially: "It is a sad fact that through the 1930's and early 1940's the American Medical Association did not believe in voluntary sickness insurance, did almost everything possible to prevent its development."

And Medical Economics reported that "to Blue Cross executives, among others, the doctrinaire view crediting the American Medical Association with early sponsorship of experimental voluntary prepayment programs emerges as a simple untruth."

Now, as in the past, the American Medical Association has taken a stand four-square in the path of progress and security. The question is, what can be done about it?

In the months ahead, you are going to be asked by the AMA and its local affiliates to write to your Congressman and tell him you are opposed to medicare. If you like, you can also write your Congressman and tell him you favor medicare. I think I can promise you that he will read your letters. But we can really do more than that.

I suggest that we have the responsibility of informing the American Medical Association that most of our people do support medicare. I urge, therefore, that each of you write to your family doctor and tell him just how you feel about this program. Let us adopt the techniques that are being used against us.

Here, I might point out that a program of medical care for the aged is not a matter for our senior citizens themselves. It effects not only their families, but the entire community. After all, if mother or dad falls ill and cannot afford treatment, then their sons and daughters are expected to take on the financial burden of hospitalization. If they cannot, then the load falls upon the community.

If all of us, our friends and neighbors, our children were to let the medical community know just how we feel about medical care for the aged, we might cause our local doctors to wonder just what the American Medical Association is doing in their name. And you might tell them they will not be alone when they lend their support to an adequate health program for the aged. Many prominent physicians have long indicated their support. Among them, Dr. Paul Dudley White, the famous heart specialist who treated President Eisenhower, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the eminent child specialist.

I feel certain that no matter how heavy the propaganda barrage, we will be able to get a medicare bill out of Congress this year. We must. As long as one man or woman lacks the means to ease their suffering then we are obligated to provide those means.

We would welcome the help of the medical professions in providing those means.

I urge the doctors of this Nation to take the mid-Victorian social concepts of the American Medical Association and put them on the shelf alongside the nostrums and superstitions that they abandoned long ago.

In 1964, let our path lead down the road of progress and security—not over the hill to the poorhouse.

Rural Electric Leaders Explore Problems and Opportunities at NRECA Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the 7,500 rural electric co-op leaders who gathered in Dallas, March 9–12 for the 22d annual meeting of their National Rural Electric Co-op Association heard the facts firsthand on the mounting crisis facing the rural electrification program and showed renewed determination to fight for the future of their rural electric systems. During the five general sessions, they listened attentively as speaker after speaker alerted them to the crucial challenges confronting them and urged them to take positive action to save their systems and help strengthen rural America.

In addition, 18 sectional panel forums—more than ever before programed at an NRECA annual meeting—further detailed the problems and opportunities

of the rural electrics. Critical legislative issues, public relations activities, rural area development, and future financing studies were among the timely topics reflecting new dimensions in rural electrification as discussed by panel participants.

Member of one of those panels explored the subject "1964—A Critical Year in Congress." Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a résumé of that panel discussion which appeared in the April 1964 issue of Rural Electrification magazine.

YEAR 1964—CRITICAL YEAR IN CONGRESS

Moderator: Kermit Overby, Director, Legislation and Research Department, NRECA.

Recorder: Robert E. Cronin, Editor, Rural Electric Minuteman, Legislation and Research Department, NRECA.

Panelists: Clark T. McWhorter, Wendell J. Garwood, June Kysilko, Morgan D. Dubrow, Howard Bertsch.

A panel discussion concerned with current and prospective legislation of interest to rural electric cooperative members was held Tuesday morning, March 10.

Year 1964—Critical Year in Congress was the subject of the discussion that considered the attack on REA loan terms, the co-ops' generating and transmission loans, the REA loan fund account proposal, new natural resource projects and area development legislation.

The panelists were Clark T. McWhorter, NRECA Director, Blair, Okla.; Wendell J. Garwood, manager, Tri-State G & T Association, Denver, Colo.; Miss June Kysilko, Press Secretary to Congressman Lester Johnson of Wisconsin; Morgan D. Dubrow, Assistant and Engineering Research Advisor to Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum; and Howard Bertsch, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, Washington, D.C.

The moderator was Kermit Overby, Director, Legislation and Research Department, NRECA.

McWhorter told the audience that the legislative program affecting the REA program is in a critical position—and will continue to be for some time—because of the antagonistic climate created by the skilled group of power company propagandists active in Washington. He said the opponents of rural electrification are focusing their attack on REA loan terms and are particularly determined to eliminate G. & T. loans. Other targets are section 5 rural area development loans and the REA loan interest rate.

Garwood said that the power companies' intensive lobbying and propaganda campaign to make Congress place heavy restrictions on the co-ops' G. & T. program could seriously cripple the Nation's entire rural electrification program. Opponents are challenging the agency's G. & T. loanmaking authority and are pressuring Members of Congress to impose further restrictions. He also cited the Federal Power Commission's attempt to assert jurisdiction over the rural electrics as another serious threat.

Miss Kysilko explained the continuing effort in Congress, proposed again recently by the Johnson administration, to establish a revolving loan fund account for REA. Payments on REA loans now go directly into the U.S. Treasury, she said, pointing out that under the revolving account plan, money repaid on loans would be used for new loans. This would reduce—but not eliminate—the need for appropriated funds each year. She said that this revolving account would demonstrate to the Nation that the money loaned by REA to rural electrics is not lost but is being repaid, with interest, without cost to the Federal Government. Miss Kysilko said she agrees with Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, that REA is the best investment the Government has ever made in a domestic program.

Dubrow disclosed that budgetary programs concerned with construction of power-producing facilities by two Federal agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, would total over 3 million kilowatts of capacity, if authorized by Congress. He said construction this year of at least two extra-high-voltage interties will integrate the Federal power systems of the Columbia, Central Valley, and Colorado Rivers. He noted that negotiations contemplating the construction of an extra-high-voltage intertie between the Pacific Northwest and Southwest is now in progress and predicted there would soon be either a Federal system or one that would do the job. Dubrow said the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project will bring low-cost power to New England.

Bertsch spoke of the Farmers Home Administration efforts to stimulate rural development through technical assistance and loans for such needs as farm and nonfarm rural homes, rural water systems, and rural homes for senior citizens. He referred to legislation in Congress to provide enough rural housing funds to at least make a dent in the eradication of the 1 million rural homes that are a threat to health and safety and the 3 million rural homes that need major repairs. He also cited the Johnson administration's war on poverty, its plans to aid the seriously depressed Appalachian region, and the effort in Congress to revive the area redevelopment program.

Wisconsin Editors Back Plan To Curb Plant Pirating Now Made Possible by Misuse of Federal Tax-Exemption Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include recent editorials in three leading newspapers of Milwaukee, Green Bay, and Wausau, Wis., supporting a proposal to curb the practice of some local governments of issuing federally tax-exempt revenue bonds to build factories for industrial firms and, thereby, to pirate industry from established locations.

The proposal, contained in H.R. 10549 and H.R. 10547 and introduced on March 23 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and by me, would deny to firms, leasing premises financed in this way, the right to deduct rental payments in computing their Federal income tax. It would apply to cases such as the proposed transfer by Cutler-Hammer Corp. of Milwaukee of part of its operations to Bowling Green, Ky., to take advantage of the latter's offer to construct a new plant for the company with the proceeds of a $6,500,000 federally tax-exempt bond issue.

The text of the editorials follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 28, 1964]

UNFAIR LURE TO INDUSTRY

Cheap rent for brandnew factories is the lure used by communities, especially in the South, to attract outside industry. It is a grossly unfair lure when the cheap rent is made possible by the tax-free status of municipal bonds issued to build such plants.

Elimination of such inequity is the aim of a bill introduced in Congress by Representatives REUSS and ZABLOCKI, of Milwaukee. The legislation is prompted by the decision of Cutler-Hammer, Inc., to move part of its operations from Milwaukee to Bowling Green, Ky., but the measure would apply to all such industrial relocations. Bowling Green has authorized issuance of $6.5 million in tax-free bonds to finance construction of a factory to be leased to Cutler-Hammer.

The Milwaukee Congressmen do not propose to restrict the tax-free character of either municipal revenue or general obligation bonds. In most cases both types are issued for legitimate public purposes. What they propose to do is take away any cheap rent advantage from benefiting firms.

Their bill, drafted after consultation with the Treasury Department, would amend the Internal Revenue Code so that whenever proceeds from a tax-exempt municipal or industrial revenue bond issue were used to construct industrial or commercial facilities for rent to private firms, those firms could not, in computing Federal income tax liabilities, deduct the rent paid.

Tax-free financing, as REUSS and ZABLOCKI point out, is a form of state-socialism. Favors rendered by municipalities and States could undermine the free enterprise system. The Reuss-Zablocki bill deserves widespread support.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Apr. 14, 1964]

END AID TO INDUSTRIAL "PIRATES"

Representatives REUSS and ZABLOCKI, both Democrats of Milwaukee, have offered a bill in Congress which could go a long way toward preventing one community from pirating industries from another. The Milwaukee Democrats acted after the Cutler-Hammer, Inc., announced that it would move part of its Milwaukee manufacturing operations to Bowling Green, Ky. Officials of the company reported that the firm would be able to cut expenses by about $1.5 million a year, principally from savings in taxes and wages.

Representative REUSS, however, said he believed that a large part of the savings would result from "ridiculously cheap rent the company would pay to lease a plant built by the Warren County, Ky., Industrial Foundation and financed by a 6.5 million tax-free revenue bond issue."

The REUSS-ZABLOCKI bill would prohibit companies from deducting rent payments on community-financed plants in computing Federal income taxes. REUSS said that this provisions of the law would raise the cost of rent by about 50 percent by increasing taxes that amount. REUSS said that the practice of communities issuing tax-free revenue bonds to pirate industries from other localities was "beggar thy neighbor" financing. He and ZABLOCKI have asked Treasury Secretary Dillon to make an expedited study of the bill.

Since the Treasury Department has expressed interest in the matter, quick and favorable action is expected. The Treasury, of course, wants to prevent the spread of this practice of tax-free financing to other communities since the practice could lead to a race for industries involving every State in the Union.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald, Apr. 20, 1964]

ON PIRATING OF INDUSTRY

Two Wisconsin Congressmen, REUSS and ZABLOCKI, have introduced bills in Congress

aimed at halting the practice of pirating of Wisconsin industries by out-of-state communities which use tax-exempt privileges as lures to our firms.

The bills, H.R. 10547 and H.R. 10549, are aimed at correcting abuses of the exemption privileges of the Federal income tax laws as granted to States and local units of government. These privileges are increasingly being used—correction, misused—to attract plants from established industrial centers, thereby creating unemployment distress in these communities.

The "freebooting" practice works like this: Government units or their dummy authorities, use the privilege of issuing securities which are exempt from Federal taxes in order to borrow money cheaply and build industrial plants or other commercial facilities. Naturally, because of the tax-free status, these buildings can be built at lower cost than if money had to be borrowed at prevailing interest rates and taxes had to be paid on the interest. The municipalities then offer these buildings on long-term leases to private corporations, attempting to lure them from their established locations.

This gross misuse of the tax exemption privilege is nothing new. Wausau workers in the field of industrial development have been aware of it for years. But the practice is growing substantially and is used frequently right within the State, creating unfair competition for communities which will not misuse the privilege.

When the Federal Government sacrifices tax revenues on these municipally-issued securities, it is in effect subsidizing local government and subsidizing the specific industries which are given the opportunity to take advantage of this gimmick. It is not fair to other communities; it is not fair to other industries within the community where this is taking place.

We agree 100 percent with Congressmen REUSS and ZABLOCKI that there is a need for this remedial legislation.

Mr. David Saul Klafter, of Chicago, Wins FEAA Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., a nonprofit corporation chartered by the State of New York, annually presents its national American Success Story Awards to members of the American business community who have achieved outstanding and successful careers in business. These awards symbolize what can be accomplished by any individual because of the opportunities available in our free and competitive society. Through recognition of the recipients of American Success Story Awards, the Free Enterprise Awards Association promotes incentive and champions the freedom of the American democratic system.

One of this year's recipients of the FEAA awards is Mr. David Saul Klafter of Chicago, a resident of the Ninth Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent. Mr. Klafter, 75, was cited "for his enduring contributions to the history of architecture and his unswerving devotion to civic and philanthropic causes." The son of Hungarian immigrants, he was a newsboy at the age of 4 and worked in a cigar factory at 7. A self-taught architect he had, by the time he was 17, designed 16 two-story apartment buildings and at age 21 passed the State architect's licensing examination.

Since then, Mr. Klafter has left the mark of his individualistic talent on scores of Chicago's finest office buildings, theaters, synagogues, factories, homes, and shopping centers; and many of his innovations in hospital and other designs are today's standards. Mr. Klafter is now a member of the Architects Examining Board of Illinois and devotes much of his time to civic and philanthropic causes, serving on the executive boards of over 40 such groups.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the future of this great Nation is indivisibly linked with our ability to continue to produce men with Mr. Klafter's initiative, acumen and drive. It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I join with the Free Enterprise Awards Association in paying tribute to Mr. Klafter on this occasion.

The Effect of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 on the U.S. Citrus Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Congress of the United States, in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, intended that trade agreements entered into under the provisions of the act should bring about mutual trade benefits to the signatories to such trade agreements. It is my conviction however, that it was not the intention of the Congress to permit the use of this act in a manner that would jeopardize the economic well-being of any important domestic industry through the medium of reduction of U.S. import duties.

The forthcoming Kennedy round of negotiations to get underway in a very few days in Geneva, Switzerland, is the first step in implementing the provisions of the act enacted by the Congress. The public hearings required by certain sections of the act have been held. Prior to these public hearings the President of the United States issued a listing of products to be considered for possible reduction or elimination of import tariff rates at the GATT conference. All citrus fruits and products are presently included on this list and are therefore subject to tariff cuts or elimination.

The President of the United States is charged with the responsibility of reserving from this listing any article or commodity which he determines to be appropriate. He must receive the advice of the Tariff Commission and of the Trade Information Committee and may seek advice from other governmental departments before making a determination for reservation. However, the President has free rein in these decisions.

The Florida citrus industry is gravely concerned by reason of the fact that its citrus fruits and products are included on the listing subject to negotiation. In presentations before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee on December 17 and 18, 1963, representatives of the citrus producers in my State, supported by representatives of citrus growers from all other citrus growing States in our Nation, presented briefs and offered oral testimony urging that all U.S. citrus fruits and products be removed from the negotiation list.

I have reviewed the briefs and other data submitted by the citrus industry in this matter. It is my considered opinion that irreparable damage will be done to the citrus industry of Florida and of the Nation if there are any reductions whatsoever in the present tariff structures for citrus fruits or products imported into our country. The business operations of our great $2 billion Florida citrus industry have been damaged already by the mere possibility that such reduction might be forthcoming.

I concur wholeheartedly in the position taken by this tremendously important industry that the President remove citrus fruits and products from the listing of articles subject to negotiation at the forthcoming Geneva conferences.

At this time I would like to present just a few reasons for this position:

First. It is a matter of record that normally citrus production in the United States is more than adequate to take care of our domestic demand.

Second. Citrus production in the United States is expanding at a rate greater than ever before. For illustration, planned plantings of oranges in Florida in prospect for the next 5 years will bring about a doubling of the orange acreage existing in 1962 when the industry was beset with burdensome marketing problems.

Third. The U.S. citrus industry, and in particular the Florida citrus industry, is extremely vulnerable to imported citrus products from countries which have cheap labor and low production costs, enabling them to produce concentrate and deliver it into continental United States at a figure lower than the breakeven cost of the Florida citrus producer, if these foreign countries can evade payment of existing import duties.

Fourth. My State is not a citrus exporting area. The record shows that less than 2 percent of our orange crop is exported annually to countries other than Canada. Other citrus producing countries, such as Spain, Israel, Italy, South Africa, have a natural competitive advantage in supplying citrus fruit and products to the Western European markets. Florida simply cannot get into those markets regardless of tariff structure, nontariff trade barriers, or any other matter. We have tried in the past and we have spent a lot of money, even through the Public Law 480 programs, all to little avail.

The matter that I now discuss is of national importance, for it concerns the economic well-being not only of many thousands of citrus growers, who have investments of several billions of dollars,

but it concerns the livelihood of agricultural workers and vitally affects the economy of my State and of the other States. Citrus in Florida is our No. 1 agricultural commodity.

It is for the aforementioned reasons that I bring this subject to the attention of the Congress at this time and because of the national interest I desire permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under "Extension of Remarks" a recent brief prepared by Florida Citrus Mutual, an organization with 13,000 Florida citrus growers as its members. This brief sets forth in dramatic form and on a realistic basis the danger that is posed to our great citrus industry through a possible lowering of import duties.

I include this brief in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY TARIFFS ON FOREIGN CITRUS MUST BE MAINTAINED

CITRUS TARIFFS AND FOREIGN TRADE—WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The purpose of this presentation is twofold: (1) to give in summary form facts relating to U.S. citrus tariffs and U.S. foreign trade for citrus; and (2) to review how and why tariff adjustments are even being considered at this time.

These are the facts:

1. Citrus products produced in certain foreign countries can be delivered into the continental United States at costs lower that the break-even costs for the Florida citrus producer—simply because there is an abundance of cheap labor for this foreign produced citrus, coupled with the fact that production and handling costs are much less than ours.

2. Normally, U.S. citrus production is more than adequate to take care of our domestic demand.

3. Tariff adjustments will not enable U.S. citrus producers to substantially increase exports into any foreign market.

4. Many foreign citrus-producing countries, due to location, internal trade policies and governmental assistance programs, have distinct competitive advantages in world trade for citrus and have a present productive capacity that makes it mandatory to seek out entry into our own domestic markets.

WHY ARE TARIFF ADJUSTMENTS BEING CONSIDERED NOW?

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 authorized the President of the United States to enter into trade agreements with other countries for mutual trade benefits and upon a determination that any existing duty was unduly burdening and restricting foreign trade of the United States, to reduce out tariffs, or in some instances to remove tariffs altogether.

On October 21, 1963, the White House issued a listing of products to be considered for possible reduction or elimination of import tariff rates in negotiations with foreign countries to be conducted in Geneva, Switzerland, this coming spring and summer. All citrus fruits and products are included on this list and are therefore subject to tariff cuts or elimination.

Contrary to former practice, the forthcoming trade negotiations are expected to be conducted on an across-the-board basis. The Florida citrus industry, in presentations before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee on December 17 and 18, 1963, urged that U.S. citrus fruits and products be removed from the negotiation list and thus not be subject to any across the board or linear reductions or removals in duties.

The showing was made that the present U.S. rates of import duties on citrus fruit and products are the minimum required to permit the continuation of our industry. It was pointed out that any reduction in tariffs would result in a most serious adverse economic effect on the citrus industry without affording a complementary opportunity to increase our own exports of citrus fruits and products to any extent whatever. In these presentations the Florida citrus industry was joined by representatives of other citrus-producing areas in the United States with identical appeals to reserve from negotiations at the forthcoming Geneva conferences U.S. produced citrus fruits and products.

POSITION OF THE FLORIDA CITRUS INDUSTRY

It is our position that each citrus-producing nation should have full opportunity to compete on an equal basis for the privilege of supplying fruit to nonproducing nations. In support of this position we do not seek downward adjustment of rates of duty for citrus established by any of these producing nations; neither do we seek removal of trade barriers that have been established in those producing nations as a means of protecting their own domestic producers.

The citrus industry of the United States, in briefs filed with the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee, has urged that the President remove citrus fruits and products from the listing of articles subject to negotiation at the forthcoming Geneva Conference.

We submit that this action is essential in order to preserve an industry that is vitally important to our economy.

Submitted by:

ROBERT W. RUTLEDGE,
Executive Vice President, Florida Citrus Mutuals.

Florida Citrus Mutual, the world's largest organization of citrus growers, with a membership of more than 12,500, presents this information on behalf of the entire Florida citrus industry.

WHY MUST U.S. TARIFFS ON FOREIGN CITRUS BE MAINTAINED?

U.S. citrus producers' domestic markets are presently extremely vulnerable to producers in those nations whose economy has not yet reached our standards; whose facilities have been financed in part by the United States; whose governments subsidize their industries; whose labor is underpaid; whose corporations enter into monopolies; whose foreign trade is rigidly controlled by their governments.

Foreign countries, notably Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Panama, have the potential to take over our domestic markets for frozen concentrated orange juice in particular.

The only protection we have against this event at the moment is the existence and continuation of an import duty which affords at least a degree of protection.

Concentrators in Argentina and Brazil have a terrific competitive advantage over Florida concentrators, as illustrated by the following comparison:

Costs, per gallon 58° Brix, frozen concentrated orange juice, delivered New York City; excluding import duty, and with no payment to grower for fruit used

[Dollars per gallon]

	Argentina-Brazil	Florida	Difference, against Florida
Fruit production costs	0.30	1.00	0.70
Picking and hauling	.10	.50	.40
Processing, including container	.72	1.12	.40
Transportation, including loading	.49	.17	.32
Advertising tax and inspection fees	Nil	.10	.10
Total out-of-pocket costs	1.61	2.89	1.28

It should therefore be obvious that all persons now engaged in growing oranges in Florida have a justified basis for concern over even a remote possibility of reduction of U.S. tariffs on foreign citrus.

To lower the U.S. import duty on citrus would invite the diversion of a substantial part of foreign citrus production to the U.S. market, thus displacing American produced citrus, causing it to be disposed of at prices ruinous to the American producer.

This situation would seriously affect the economy of all domestic citrus producing States.

Records covering the past 9 years show that the Florida orange grower has received, on the average, slightly over 40 cents per pound of solids for oranges delivered to concentrating plants.

Imports into the United States of just 12 million gallons of frozen concentrated orange juice would have reduced the pounds/solids price by 18 cents. Had this happened, our growers would have received less than cost of production for their oranges.

(This would have affected 807 million boxes of Florida oranges in the 9-year period.)

Experience over the years has shown that total U.S. orange supply is normally larger than the Nation's demand.

In the 1961–62 season, Florida's production of frozen concentrated orange juice amounted to more than 115 million gallons. Because of the inability of domestic markets to absorb this recordbreaking pack, 30 percent of that season's production had to be carried over for disposal in the succeeding season.

Florida citrus is a growth industry.

Here's the record for Florida orange production and acreage devoted to oranges:

Year	Production	Bearing acreage
1941	27,200,000	236,000
1951	78,600,000	325,000
1961	113,400,000	430,000
1975	(1)	851,990

[1] Not available.

Significant fact: Florida's bearing acreage for oranges, by 1975, will be almost twice that of the 1961–62 season when the record crop of more than 113 million boxes of oranges presented almost insurmountable marketing problems.

(From all indications, the potential supply for the years ahead will certainly be greater than our domestic markets can absorb.)

U.S. citrus producers do not have the benefit of "price-support" or subsidy assistance operations of our Federal Government. Through the years, our industry has elected to pursue the course of self-help programs in accordance with the American free-enterprise system.

In particular, the Florida citrus industry, producing in the 1961–62 season more than 80 percent of all the oranges and grapefruit grown in the United States, has pioneered in the development of "self-help" programs, spending many millions of dollars annually for advertising, promotion, market development and research. Funds for these activities have been supplied by the many thousands of Florida growers.

Even in this season of an extremely short crop (resulting from the devastating freeze of 1962) our industry has made available approximately $8 million to carry forward these self-help programs—advertising, merchandising, promotion, and research.

At the moment, a greatly expanded program of citrus research is being activated. Emphasis is being given to the discovery and development of new citrus products, along with improvement in existing products.

All this is being done simply to place our growers in position to market, on the basis of a reasonable profit, the larger citrus crops

in prospect in our State in the immediate future.

Within the next 5 years, our Florida producers will be assessing themselves $14 to $16 million annually for the execution of these self-help programs.

Normally, domestic U.S. markets are amply supplied by citrus fruits produced in Florida and in the other citrus producing areas of our Nation. The Florida grower is incurring these large extra costs for market development and is thereby holding an umbrella over foreign citrus producers who can take away our domestic markets (by reason of much lower costs for the foreign product) if our rates of import duties are reduced.

There are 1,200,000 human beings living in 10 Florida counties where, in 1961–62, were produced 82 percent of all the oranges, grapefruit and tangerines grown in the entire State of Florida. These 10 counties produced in 1961–62 68 percent of all the oranges, grapefruit and tangerines grown that season in the entire United States. (There are 22 other citrus-producing counties in Florida.)

The f.o.b. value of the citrus friut and products produced in these 10 counties is approximately $500 million annually. These f.o.b. returns go to the grower, the shipper, processor, trucker, the picker, the butcher, the supply dealer, the filling station operator, the store owner—in other words, it goes a long way toward the support of the total economy of these areas.

The impact on the total economy of the citizens of these counties and of our great State of Florida is illustrated by the fact that this sum of money at the accepted circulation, or turnover, rate of seven times adds up to $3.5 billion annually.

These 1,200,000 persons comprise 24 percent of our State's population.

The 10 counties in which these 1,200,000 persons live and work are Polk, Lake, Orange, Hillsborough, St. Lucie, Highlands, Hardee, Pasco, Indian River, and Brevard.

Most of these 1,200,000 persons derive their livelihood directly or indirectly from Florida citrus.

They grow citrus, they harvest citrus, they process citrus, they pack citrus, they ship citrus, they sell citrus.

Or they work in the fertilizer plants, the crate plants, the can plants, the machinery plants, the stores and filling stations and professions that depend almost wholly upon citrus for economic life.

They are the human beings that are the life of Florida's biggest basic industry.

These 1,200,000 persons who have built this Florida citrus industry with their own resources and who have built these 10 counties and these towns, have earned and deserve the continuance of the betterment of their standard of living which could overnight be jeopardized by a lowering of tariffs for citrus fruit and products.

We have been exporting citrus know-how, capital, production and processing machinery (including complete concentrate plants) to all the world, largely on an aid or subsidized basis.

The combination of advancing world knowledge, techniques, foreign labor costs far below our standards, coupled with the proposed reduction in our tariffs for foreign citrus, is more than our domestic industry can take.

Many foreign countries, producing citrus, operate under governmental assistance programs, or other artificial stimulants, totally diverse to our own system of free enterprise operation.

These foreign citrus producing countries, due to location, internal trading policies, and with production and handling costs lower than such costs for the Florida grower, enjoy a commanding competitive advantage in world trade for citrus.

Some seven important foreign countries, producing oranges, export annually about 50 percent of their production, while Florida, as an average of the past 4 years, has been able to export (to countries other than Canada) less than 2 percent of its orange production.

In the meantime, even with the protection of our existing tariffs, important foreign countries are making inroads in our domestic markets.

Important foreign countries, producing citrus, enjoy current production, and have further production potential, far in excess of normal market requirements available to those countries.

Therefore, these countries (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Spain, Israel, South Africa, Morocco, etc.) are actively seeking marketing opportunities in the U.S. domestic markets. (They are actually taking over our former important share of the great Canadian market.)

Many of these foreign countries have a definite competitive advantage over U.S. citrus producers by reason of low labor and handling costs.

The $2 billion Florida citrus industry can stay in business only if the present tariff structures are maintained.

Actually, an increase in rates of import duties for citrus fruit and products (rather than a decrease) is justified.

A reduction of U.S. tariffs, thereby permitting frozen concentrated orange juice to come in from foreign sources would have the net effect of downgrading very substantially the quality factors that have been so zealously maintained through the years by our industry. Such action would open up the doors for adulterated, impure, low quality concentrate to the point that the consumer would necessarily look to some other commodity as a replacement for the orange juice that has played such a vital part in the diet requirements for the Nation's families.

It is a matter of record that many of these foreign countries now shipping concentrate into the United States during this temporary period of our own short supply situation, have severe infestations of fruit flies of various types.

Our American consumer has no guarantee whatsoever that the oranges used in the production of this foreign concentrate are free from the larvae of these flies or from many other possible contaminations.

These factors alone, in our considered opinion, justify not only the retention of our present rates of import duties (for citrus products) which are minimum, but, as well a revamping of customs inspection procedures for foreign-produced concentrate to assure at least a fairly acceptable compliance with the standards that have been adopted by our own people.

The Florida citrus industry is a substantial industry—vital to the economy of our State:

(a) Citrus is Florida's most important agricultural commodity—its economic return to the State is surpassed only by tourism.

(b) It has 15,000 growers, with 715,000 acres (bearing and nonbearing) devoted to the production of citrus.

(c) It employs a labor force of 60,000 persons, dependent on citrus for livelihood.

(d) It supports allied industries of enormous importance (transportation, equipment, fertilizer, can companies, etc.).

(e) Its valuation in groves and facilities exceeds $2 billion.

(f) Its annual sales at retail are about $800 million.

(g) It makes annual tax payments to Federal and State governments of more than $50 million.

(h) It is a self-help industry, operating without governmental price supports or subsidies.

(i) Its growers provide a fund of $10 to $12 million annually for advertising, promotion, and research to develop its domestic markets.

(j) It supplies a product (citrus) essential to the health and well-being of the citizens of this Nation.

(k) It seeks to solve its problems by reliance on the time-tested American free enterprise system.

It is our considered opinion that any reduction of U.S. tariffs for citrus will result in economic loss to our producers and industry, and even could threaten the continued existence of this great industry.

Termination of Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who have watched with increasing concern the economic dislocations caused by cutbacks and terminations of defense contracts have been heartened by the growing attention given this problem in the press.

This week two articles have dealt with the economic consequences to business and individual employees of recent defense budget reductions. Ian Menzies, writing in the April 27 edition of the Boston Globe touched on the impact of the closing of Federal installations and AP business news writer Jack Lefler, in an article which appeared in the Lowell, Mass., Sun explored some possible lines of civilian production to take up the slack.

Under unanimous consent I include the two articles in the RECORD:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Apr. 27, 1964]

LONG-RANGE PLANNING: ARSENAL POINTS TO VITAL NEED

(By Ian Menzies)

It's easy to be cavalier about the closing of the Watertown Arsenal.

Except for its atomic reactor, which will remain, history has passed it by.

There is no need these days to have buildings large enough to swing around the giant 15-inch guns of battleships; nor to do the heavy machining which the production of such cannon required.

Nor is it hard to admit that the Boston Naval Shipyard, the future of which is in extreme doubt, is not held in too high regard by the seagoing Navy and is a high-cost yard, though not necessarily the highest.

But it is hard to be equally cavalier in writing off the jobs of the nearly 2,000 persons employed at the Watertown Arsenal and if worse comes to worse the 8,000 jobs at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

At this stage we start talking about people * * * families * * * children and the quickly tossed off phrase sits somewhat awkwardly in the air.

As has occurred in the past, the Massachusetts congressional delegation, led by Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY will make a last-ditch effort to save the arsenal.

The fate of the shipyard, not outdated by history but faced by competition from similar Federal yards, hangs on a report now being prepared for Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

However, there seems little doubt that the arsenal will go and not much doubt that in the long or short run the shipyard will go or be reduced both in size and scope.

If this State is wise it will admit that these facilities are going and the most positive act is to have sufficient long-range planning to absorb the impact.

To put the loss of the Watertown Arsenal jobs in perspective, though admittedly negative perspective, one should remember that over the past 2 years 12,000 jobs disappeared at Raytheon's various New England plants.

In other words the combined loss of jobs, should this arise, at both the Watertown Arsenal and the naval shipyard, would be less than the 24-month layoff of one New England industrial firm.

All of which means that the problem facing New England and Massachusetts is a lot more than just the Watertown Arsenal, or the naval shipyard or for that matter, Raytheon.

As regards the arsenal, it is understood the Government will offer relocation to some 400 employees which is only about one-fifth of those affected.

Where will the others go? Some, the machinists, may be absorbed. Similar-type work is carried out in Worcester.

As regards any possible cuts or worse at the Boston Naval Shipyard, the great hope is a resurgence of activity by General Dynamics which purchased the Fore River Yard of Bethlehem Steel.

The State's two Senators are pushing for every possible contract consideration being given Fore River in the hope that it will provide a safety valve for any adverse decision on the Navy yard.

The urgency, however, is to find alternate employment for those who will lose their jobs and the very people who casually say, "Well, it should be closed up, anyway," often forget that the payroll lost some $10 million annually at the arsenal—can affect their businesses too.

Governor Peabody's trio of economic advisers, Prof. James Nelson of Amherst, Prof. Richard Eckhaus, of MIT, and Prof. Francis S. Doody, of Boston University, anticipated these employment problems and it could and should have been anticipated many years ago had there been the machinery to do so. But there wasn't.

On March 1 the Governor's economic advisers wrote the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in Washington asking for a grant to study the employment shifts in Massachusetts brought about by a changing pattern in armaments and arms control.

These men could do much more to study what is happening in this State but they have neither statutory authorization nor a budget. They need both to enable them to hire a staff to work on these problems and a bill which would make this possible is presently before the legislature.

Research of this type is urgently needed in the State and has been needed for years. Such a group, possibly strengthened and given scope and prestige, could do much.

Despite these employment reverses, Massachusetts is a much healthier State than it was 15 years ago, aided by its university-spawned industries with their higher income jobs.

We are adapting much faster to the 21st century than many other States but we need more high-power thinking and planning to absorb what Churchill would call the soft underbelly of employment.

The tragedy of unemployment is twofold—personal and collective.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Apr. 27, 1964]

AWAIT SHIFT IN FEDERAL SPENDING

(By Jack Lefler)

NEW YORK.—Businessmen are being advised to plan for a gradual shift of some Government spending from defense to civilian programs.

The financial publishing firm, Prentice-Hall, discusses the change and possibilities in the latest issue of its executive report.

"Develop your capabilities so you can take advantage of the big new growth markets that are shaping up," it counsels. "Initiate or intensify research and development of new products and technologies in the directions that growth in nondefense sectors is likely to take."

It is expected that actual and prospective defense spending declines will likely be offset—and outweighed—by heavier expenditures on civil public works and nondefense services.

Prepare now to tap new growth markets in nondefense lines by either expanding into them or merging with firms now active in them.

"Whether you are a defense contractor or not, your business will be affected by defense spending cuts—either directly as contracts and subcontracts get skimpier, or indirectly as the secondary effects of defense spending weaken."

The publisher sees the areas likely to gain most from prospective channelling of public funds into civilian uses as urban renewal, urban mass transit, water and sewer systems, and education and medical services.

To rehabilitate American cities, an average of $10.5 billion annually in public and private funds will be required for the next 20 years. About $1.5 billion was spent for that purpose in 1963.

Financial requirements to relieve growing congestion in downtown areas by fast rail and bus service are officially calculated at $1 billion a year for 10 years. Current annual expenditures run to less than one-fifth of that.

Spending of about $4 billion yearly through 1970 is needed to eliminate the backlog of urgent needs for water and sewer systems. Only about half that amount is being spent now.

Construction of 100,000 classrooms annually is needed through 1969, compared with about 65,000 built in 1963. The market for educational aids will grow faster than school construction as industry and Government manpower training programs expand.

Health services will expand rapidly. About $1 billion is needed to modernize hospitals. Medical schools, now training 8,000 enrolled students a year, will eventually have to take care of 12,000 to meet health service demands.

Risk in the President's Political Joke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial entitled "Risks in the President's Political 'Joke'," which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of April 24 in regard to President Johnson's idea for giving "secret" briefings on foreign policy to presidential candidates.

This editorial explains some of the reasons why this idea might not be as good as it seemed at first blush:

RISKS IN THE PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL "JOKE"

President Johnson's suggestion that he confer personally on foreign policy matters with all other potential presidential nominees would best be treated for what it surely must be—a political joke. Accepting this, however, Mr. Johnson's offer has overtones that are not so amusing.

Briefings of opposition candidates on policy issues go back at least to 1944. But these briefings have always been for an actual nominee. Up to this week no President ever suggested that all potential candidates should have made available to them background information.

Mr. Johnson in part explained his offer by saying that his opposition seems to be talking in all directions at once, and that information "direct from the horse's mouth" would at least permit them to discuss policy matters intelligently. This is too obviously a partisan dig at Republican candidates to be taken seriously.

Even assuming the offer was a sincere one, and that the information extended would be just that and not simply administration propaganda, the idea remains a bad one.

A number of announced presidential candidates, including Democratic Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, can hardly be taken seriously. Yet here is the President offering to make available what presumably is secret or semisecret information to anyone who fancies himself (or herself) a potential nominee. The chance that confidential information might go in the wrong ears, and out the wrong mouths, is a disturbing one.

Indeed, there is some question about the desirability of briefing even the single selected opposition candidate. The reason here is not security, but the possibility of hobbling fair discussion of the issues.

It is too easy in Washington—regardless of which party holds power—to slap a secrecy label on any information which might be embarrassing. To do this through official briefings could have an inhibitory influence on the conduct of a political campaign.

Some things, of course, are best left untalked about. But the area of secrecy must be kept as small as possible. In a democracy an active, probing dialog is essential to the continuance of freedom.

Any moves which might unnecessarily reduce the dialog should be carefully avoided.

A Tribute to Mrs. Anna Strojny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the April 1964 edition of the Senior Citizens News carries an excellent tribute to Mrs. Anna Strojny, who is the chief organizer and corresponding secretary of the largest growing senior citizens group in Chicago.

Mrs. Strojny is a longtime resident of my congressional district, and she is one of the truly outstanding citizens whose entire life has been served in civic pursuits.

She exemplifies the highest spirit of civic virtue, and I should like to join the Senior Citizens News in congratulating Mrs. Strojny for her many outstanding accomplishments toward a better America.

Mr. Speaker, the article about Mrs. Strojny, which appeared in the Senior Citizens News, follows:

"NO TIME FOR ARTHRITIS"—SAYS ANNA STROJNY

Mrs. Anna Strojny, our chief organizer and corresponding secretary of the largest growing senior citizens group in Chicago, has been appointed as vice chairman of the na-

tionality service commission of the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Mrs. Strojny was also nominated to the "Hall of Fame" sponsored annually by the mayor's commission on senior citizens (which will be held in May—this month being declared Senior Citizens Month by Mayor Daley).

Mrs. Strojny is a remarkable person. Crippled by arthritis, she operates solely from a wheelchair but never lets up in caring for her many interests—all pertaining to doing something for others.

Through her untiring efforts, the Polish American Senior Citizens Council of Chicago was organized and has grown into a very sizable organization; and it continues to grow each day. This group is affiliated with the Chicago Area Senior Citizens Association (which is our Chicago affiliate), and the vice president of the Polish-American Council, Jacob J. Twardzik, is serving now as the new president of the Chicago Area Senior Citizens Association.

The Polish-American Senior Citizens Council of Chicago is an affiliate of the National Council of Senior Citizens, and as such, Mrs. Strojny has accepted the appointment of vice chairman of the nationality service commission. She is actively engaged at present in the further organization of Polish-American groups throughout the Chicago area and elsewhere; and she also is engaged in the organization of other senior citizens groups of all nationalities.

She doesn't have time for arthritis, she says, as she hustles from room to room in her wheelchair.

Between her hospital trips, she operates her office from a desk located in her home. She founded the Polish-American Veterans Club, and at Christmastime she handled many, many Christmas gifts to veterans and orphans. Her home was the warehouse, with many ladies coming and going to help wrap and mail these gifts. She didn't get to go when they delivered the gifts to the VA hospitals, but she did get to go later on to the hospitals.

One of her projects (which remains close to her heart) is helping immigrants gain citizenship, and also running the veterans club which she founded. Mrs. Strojny has helped more than 12,000 immigrants get their citizenship.

She is a native of Chicago and conducted neighborhood classes in citizenship. Some time after the group was started, the Chicago Park District let her use a park fieldhouse, where as many as 600 immigrants would come to attend these classes.

Due to problems with her voice she finally had to discontinue the classes but she still continues to give instruction on a personal basis. People come by her home every day when they need help and she assists them in filling out their papers and gives them a "little test" as she calls it. She never stops doing for others.

Her Congressman, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, on Monday, January 22, 1962, placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, entitled: "Crippled, She Still Aids Others—She's Too Busy To Slow Down."

In Florida: A Portent of Things To Come for California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am paraphrasing reporter Jack Pickett of the California Farmer somewhat. The difficulty California farmers are facing should be known to all Americans who depend on California farmers for the very food they eat daily.

From our friends in Florida we have received reports that echo some of our own problems. Southern Florida is suffering from a drastic shortage of farmworkers to harvest their big crop of vegetables.

To meet the situation the Florida State Employment Service did the following things:

First. Radio spot announcements and TV coverage publicizing the urgent need for farmworkers.

Second. Newspaper publicity concerning farm labor demands, including Negro newspapers.

Third. Handbills distributed in residential areas where farmworkers live.

Fourth. Transportation provided by employers on a regular basis from day-haul pickup points to the farms.

Fifth. Personal contacts by appropriate local office staff members with leaders of farm labor groups in the community to solicit assistance in recruiting.

Sixth. Personal contacts by appropriate local office staff members with schools to organize supervised youth placement programs.

The sad part of this story is the total result of all this effort. We quote J. W. Evans, president of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association:

> So far, all reports indicate that these efforts have produced only few additional workers and disappointing results in meeting this emergency.

As the emergency continued a representative of the U.S. Department of Labor visited the area and he advised the growers to start a house-to-house canvass for help.

All we can say to our friends in Florida is, "Let us reason (and commiserate) together; we have the same problem, but we haven't felt the same shock yet."

Also we might add that in California we have an even bigger problem than you have in Florida, so we were quite interested in a recent news release quoting Secretary of Labor Wirtz. He is supposed to have told a closed congressional hearing that we should not wind up the bracero program if the Department of Labor is supposed to replace the bracero through domestic labor programs put in its hands.

Wirtz claims it would be impossible for his Department to handle the big job of replacing 200,000 braceros, half of them in California, on the budget proposed by the President.

In California we have somewhere between 200 and 225 men in the farm placement service handling this type of farm labor placement. Traditionally, only 10 to 25 percent of the farmers of this State have relied on the farm placement service for the farm help.

If we throw the load of obtaining domestic labor on the shoulders of the farm placement service we concede that they would have to greatly expand their personnel. Unfortunately, it takes almost 2 years to train a new man into this job.

I sorely wish that people like the Secretary of Labor had tried to think of these things before they so eagerly ganged up to kick the bracero program in the head. Now I trust they will give some immediate thought to the dangerous situation developing throughout California.

The 1964 Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as has been my practice for a number of years I again have given the residents of the First Congressional District of Washington, which I am honored to represent, the opportunity to express their views on some of the important issues facing our country.

In late March I mailed approximately 100,000 copies of a questionnaire which was prepared by the Department of Political Science of the University of Washington to my constituents. This questionnaire was unique in that it gave the respondent the opportunity of expressing himself in varying degrees as to his feelings. The response to this poll was most gratifying in that the return, according to the independent research organization which tabulated the results, was excellent.

Many different conclusions can and probably will be drawn from the tabulation of this questionnaire, which I believe will be of interest. Inasmuch as the language used was totally prepared by a disinterested group of political science professors there is no question of bias.

Mr. Speaker, believing that the Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD will be interested in the views of the residents of the First Congressional District of Washington I include hereafter the tabulation of my 1964 congressional questionnaire:

THE 1964 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

I. MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

The three most frequently indicated important issues before the country today were named in the following order of importance:

1. Civil rights.
2. Foreign affairs.
3. Unemployment.

II. YOUR OVERALL VIEWS (IN PERCENT)

1. In your opinion, how good a job is the President doing now?

(1) Excellent, 9.8; (2) good, 32.7; (3) fair, 29.4; (4) poor, 19; (5) just don't know, 5.3.

How strongly do you hold this view?

(1) Very strongly, 40.7; (2) fairly strongly, 50.9; (3) don't care too much, 2.1.

2. In your opinion, how good a job is the Congress doing now?

(1) Excellent, 1.7; (2) good, 21.8; (3) fair, 40.6; (4) poor, 26.2; (5) just don't know, 4.9.

How strongly do you hold this view?

(1) Very strongly, 41.5; (2) fairly strongly, 50.1; (3) don't care too much, 1.

III. ISSUES BEFORE THE CONGRESS (IN PERCENT)

These questions give you a chance to express your general feeling about certain issues. You should answer the question about

Federal aid to education, for example, on the basis of your general feeling about the desirability of such aid. Do not answer on the basis of your view about some specific kind of school aid, such as aid for college facilities construction. Of course, different things are important to different people, so we don't expect everyone to have an opinion on all these issues.

1. One issue before Congress is Federal aid to education. Supporters argue that the funds would help relieve crowded classrooms, and that we must educate our children now if we are to remain strong in the long run. Opponents argue that such a program would lead to Federal control of education, and raise difficult questions about aid to parochial schools. How do you feel about Federal aid to education?

	Percent	Total percent
(1) No opinion	0.4	----
(2) Very much in favor	27.2	41.9
(3) Somewhat in favor	14.7	
(4) Neutral	2.7	----
(5) Somewhat opposed	14.4	53.1
(6) Very much opposed	38.7	

2. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs has been proposed. Supporters argue that cities need help to deal with such problems as housing, transportation, and delinquency. Opponents argue that an Urban Affairs Department would lead to more Federal involvement in local affairs. How do you feel about a Department of Urban Affairs?

	Percent	Total percent
(1) No opinion	1.7	----
(2) Very much in favor	13.9	24.8
(3) Somewhat in favor	10.9	
(4) Neutral	5.3	----
(5) Somewhat opposed	16.1	66.4
(6) Very much opposed	50.3	

3. The medicare program is before Congress again. Supporters argue that retired persons need help to meet high medical costs, and that the program would use the reliable social security system. Opponents argue that the needy aged already have some help, and that the social security deduction is too high now. How do you feel about the medicare program?

	Percent	Total percent
(1) No opinion	0.6	----
(2) Very much in favor	33.3	46.5
(3) Somewhat in favor	13.2	
(4) Neutral	3.8	----
(5) Somewhat opposed	11.7	47.3
(6) Very much opposed	35.6	

4. The foreign aid program is an important foreign policy issue. Supporters argue that new nations need help to avoid falling to communism, and that military aid is important to U.S. security. Opponents argue that the program has been badly administered, and that we have been throwing money down "rat holes." How do you feel about foreign aid?

	Percent	Total percent
(1) No opinion	0.4	----
(2) Very much in favor	13.3	33.6
(3) Somewhat in favor	20.3	
(4) Neutral	2.6	----
(5) Somewhat opposed	24.2	60.1
(6) Very much opposed	35.9	

5. Some people say Congress needs to be reorganized. Supporters argue that the present system gives too much power to a few old men. Opponents argue that the present system prevents "railroading" a bill through without necessary debate. How do you feel about congressional reorganization?

	Percent	Total percent
(1) No opinion	6.8	----
(2) Very much in favor	27.7	46.6
(3) Somewhat in favor	18.9	
(4) Neutral	11.8	----
(5) Somewhat opposed	13.7	31.1
(6) Very much opposed	17.4	

IV. OPTIONAL FACTUAL INFORMATION

It is helpful to have some background information for tabulation.

Sex: (1) 72.1 male; (2) 22.5 female.

Age: (1) 7.7 under 30; (2) 43.5 30 to 50; (3) 47 over 50.

Marital status: (1) 6.7 single; (2) 81.3 married; (3) 3.1 divorced, and (4) 7.2 widowed.

Political preference: (1) 18 Democratic; (2) 46.8 Republican, and (3) 29.1 Independent.

NOTE.—Each column does not necessarily add up to 100 percent inasmuch as some persons did not answer all questions.

Foreign Service Contributing in Economic and Social Development of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in our concern and preoccupation with the military crisis in South Vietnam, we have tended to overlook the very real contributions being made by Americans to the economic and social development of that southeast Asian nation.

An Embassy labor attaché, Mr. Ralph R. Moore, of Lawrence, Mass., is a fine example of the high quality American personnel at work with the people of Vietnam. Moore, who is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Moore, of 7 Whitman Street in Lawrence, has worked with the people in the construction of new schools and has made every effort to meet the people in their own environment. He is a credit to the Foreign Service and to his country.

Recently an article outlining Mr. Moore's career and activities appeared in the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune. Under unanimous consent I include the April 27 article in the RECORD:

LAWRENCE MAN IN VIETNAM FINDS TRAINING PAYS OFF

Ralph R. Moore, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Moore, 7 Whitman Street, recently had reason to draw upon his experience as a Lawrence Street Department laborer gained some years ago while working summers to earn part of his college tuition.

Moore, an embassy labor attaché in Saigon, South Vietnam, works mainly with Vietnamese youth, and was recently pleased but apprehensive when invited to join a weekend work detail hauling sand for a school foundation. He said he had not done any such work since his college days when he was a temporary street department laborer here. At the conclusion of the work party weekend, however, he was reportedly "sore all over," but happy he had been able to do the manual labor and assist in the building of the school.

WILLING TO WORK

The State Department attaché commented that it was significant of the changing times that the educated Vietnamese were no longer reluctant to work with their hands. He indicated this willingness to work was a sign that "they care now."

Moore entered the Foreign Service of the State Department in October 1960 after graduating from Boston College as a history and government major, and receiving a master degree from Clark University Graduate School in International Relations to which he had been awarded a fellowship. His initial tour of duty began in February 1961 with assignment to the U.S. Cultural Exchange Reception Center in New Orleans, La.

REQUESTED VIETNAM

Moore requested assignment to the Vietnam area because he feels that is where the big challenge in today's world is, and where the United States has the biggest problems. His interest in youth was partially responsible for his present assignment, he says.

The Lawrence native has high praise for the Vietnamese people, and hails them as "wonderful, attractive and hard working." He claims that what they need more than anything else are some decisive military victories in order to bring about a restoration of morale.

Moore was a former vice consul before his Vietnam assignment, and since arriving in the war-ravaged nation has continually mingled with and met as many as possible of the people of the country.

CENTRAL CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE

He is a 1959 graduate of Central Catholic High School, and was valedictorian of his class. He was an honor roll student at the local secondary school for all of his 4 years, and on two occasions achieved the enviable record of perfect report cards—earning 100's in all subjects. He was a commencement speaker at Boston College where he had maintained a 90-perecnt average in academic subjects, and as a senior was one of 25 awarded the Order of the Cross and Crown, emblematic of achievement of high distinction in studies and other college activities. He was associate editor of the Humanities, a Boston College publication and president of the World Relations League.

Moore was also president of the debating society at Boston College, a continuance of his interest in public speaking which was first evidenced at Central Catholic when he represented that school in the American Legion oratorical contest in 1954.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Representative Bob Sikes, of Florida, at Florida Chamber of Commerce Washington Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech delivered last Tuesday night at the annual meeting of the Florida Chamber of Commerce in Washington. The meeting honored Florida's congressional delegation and the ambassadors and ministers of our neighbors to the south.

The dean of the Florida congressional delegation, Representative BOB SIKES, made the principal speech that evening. It was so appropriate and so artistically and eloquently drafted that I asked Representative SIKES to permit me to place it in the RECORD for the edification and pleasure of all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Representative SIKES' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES, FLORIDA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE WASHINGTON MEETING, APRIL 28, 1964

Florida parties are among the best. By coming here each year, you make the chamber of commerce party one of the best of the Florida parties. My colleagues and I appreciate your presence. It is like a fresh breeze which blows from the sparkling waters off our coasts, or from the stately groves which grace our State, or the clean, green woodlands which stretch mile after mile between Florida's growing cities. Your presence here is the nearest thing we know to being back home.

Our delegation shares your pride in Florida. We are proud of Florida's people and their dynamic progress. We are proud of our State's magnificent picture of growth and the strong economy which accompanies it. Proud we are the bridge between the hemispheres. We are proud that Florida has not submerged its natural beauty in the quest for material things. And I can say to you truthfully that Florida's representation in Washington has never worked more closely together for the enhancement of our State or with greater success.

There have been significant changes since you were here a year ago. There is a new President at the helm of the Ship of State; a strong President who is wise in the ways of government and wise in the ways of Congress. And from what I hear he is wise in the ways of the chamber of commerce too. Because of these facts, there is a closer cooperation between the Congress and the Chief Executive. There is in part a new look—a new flavor in government. I think there is a better balance in government in that the Chief Executive has a more intimate knowledge of the place which business and industry occupy in the American economy.

This has generated a new degree of confidence which offers a reassuring look toward the future, and it would be difficult indeed not to envision a strong economy through the months ahead. Across the water things have brightened a little, or possibly they simply have grown more difficult for the Communists. Brazil is the most notable case for encouragement. Victories should be due in Vietnam where vigorous reorganization of government forces has been in progress. A step has been taken towards disarmament. And it appears that much of the Communist world is orienting itself a little more toward the capitalist viewpoint. However, all is not sweetness and light. There are irritants which continue to defy solution, particularly Cuba and Laos. And on tomorrow there may be another senseless shooting down of an American plane, or the takeover of another bit of territory by the Communists.

For that reason, I can tell you with satisfaction that we continue to have an effective and positive counterforce to communism. We have the strongest peacetime military organization in our history, and we are not the only ones who know it. The Communist dictators know as much about our military power as we do, and I am certain they respect military power more than they respect the arguments and the pleas, as the case sometimes appears to be, which our diplomats advance at the conference table.

In recent days there has been criticism that military costs outweigh civilian appropriations, and that deemphasis of commercial and cultural pursuits have resulted. I would remind you that never have commercial and cultural pursuits flourished as now, and never have appropriations for these activities been higher. It is difficult to see them as being neglected. I see little choice in the world we live in but to continue to maintain the position of military superiority we now enjoy lest we find ourselves without commercial and cultural advantages as well.

It is not the military which is seeking the enactment of police-state bills in Congress, or which is asking that more and more power be delegated to the executive branch of government, or which is usurping the legislative prerogative of Congress through court edicts and decisions. The American people want security in a troubled world. It is like a shotgun behind a farmhouse door. Prowlers respect it. Those who would depend upon logic and the United Nations for our protection are indulging in wishful thinking.

There is an area of international cooperation where the sun nearly always shines brightly, and that is in the relationship between our own country and our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. There are storm clouds at times, but they are few, and I am convinced they will be temporary. It is more significant to consider that our interests are joint interests, that progress always is being made and that it is progress for the future; progress which will guarantee a continuation of freedom and democracy for that part of the world which always has offered most in opportunity and most in freedom. There will be no "ism" in this hemisphere but Americanism, and our kind of Americanism includes both North Americanism and South Americanism.

The Need for Developing Our Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Need for Developing Our Water Resources" which appeared in the April 23 issue of the Hancock Clarion.

The editorial is as follows:

THE NEED FOR DEVELOPING OUR WATER RESOURCES

The Clarion has received a newsletter from the Department of Information of the Kentucky Farm Bureau giving statement in regard to the development of our water resources.

We think this article was well prepared and states a point that should be considered by all our people, and especially by our farmers.

The preservation of our State and National natural resources and the development of those features that will enhance their value and afford better facilities to all our people, is a vital matter that should be considered as time and advancement progress. Our water resources in particular are of such vital importance that all our people are or should be concerned.

As this article from the Farm Bureau declares, in times past water resources were thought of as of importance to our western arid areas rather than to all our country, but now they must and are of such importance as to affect almost every section of our Nation. Water is of such importance in many ways that in the past it has been taken with little thought as to its control. Now water must be considered in two or more aspects: It must be controlled and so harnessed as to afford its wider use and also to prevent its destructive power.

In times past the rains that came dashing down to inundate wide areas and bring destruction to property and lives, was taken for granted, and like the statement of Mark Twain: "Everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it," the flooded creeks and rivers brought their destructive forces and little could be done to prevent. Only in recent years has someone begun to do something about it. Wide areas, formerly flooded by these streams, were afforded preventative measures to harness the waters and bring them under control. Not only to control them and prevent their destructive power, but to harness them for use and service.

Reservoirs and lakes have been constructed in many places to collect the overflow and to impound the water for the use of our people. Especially has this been to the advantage and use by our farmers in times of drought, as well as to prevent their acres from erosion and harm.

The recent flood stage of the Ohio River and its tributaries that flooded so many areas along their ways and many towns and cities flooded and harm brought to this wide area,

we realized the harm that came from that flood. While many of our river towns were protected by floodwalls, many acres of our lowlands were flooded and people driven from their homes. The 1964 flood on the Ohio River was declared the third highest in its history, reaching within a few inches perhaps to the height of that of 1945, and only a few feet less than that of 1937. Engineers have declared that without the numerous impounding lakes and reservoirs that are now in operation, the 1964 flood would perhaps have been as great as that of 1937.

With the existing lakes and reservoirs and those that will probably be constructed in the future, our people along the Ohio and tributaries can look forward to a day when the dangers of great floods can and will be eliminated. Not only will this great danger be ended, but these lakes can and will be utilized for many and varied purposes. The water thus stored can be utilized by those along their shores to afford water during dry seasons and for recreational purposes. Not only will those lakes afford protection and profit, but they can be utilized to afford all our people a better way of life. The farmers on whose land they may occupy will be given a form of profit that they do not now possess. By all means, we think, should our people become aware of this great improvement that can come by these impounding lakes and reservoirs.

Governor Wallace in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, an article by the noted columnist Marquis Childs, published in the Washington Post on Wednesday, April 29, deals with the upcoming Indiana presidential preference primary and the role of Alabama's Gov. George Wallace.

Under the title, "Wallace Waving New Bloody Shirt," Mr. Childs relates the tactics to which Mr. Wallace resorts in his appeal for support. The doctrine Mr. Wallace is preaching, Mr. Childs points out, is really nullification; and he cites Gov. Matthew Welsh:

> What he is saying, in effect, is that we in Alabama would secede if we could afford it. But with all that Federal aid they got down there they can't afford to.

Mr. Childs writes:

> The seeds of rebellion are being planted. Government, in Wallace's perverted fairy tale, becomes the dragon to be resisted at all costs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Mr. Childs be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE WAVING NEW BLOODY SHIRT

(By Marquis Childs)

INDIANAPOLIS.—Having learned the lesson of overconfidence in Wisconsin, no one from Gov. Matthew Welsh on down will speculate about the size of segregationist George Wallace's vote in next week's primary.

Not only were the discontents underestimated but the shrewdness of the Alabama Governor's appeal has also been underrated. In the Midwest he never talks about Negroes, except to say he gets along well with them, or about segregation or racial trouble.

His target is the Federal Government and the evil of its ever-encroaching power. Wallace denounces the civil rights bill as another and more insidious extension of that power.

"They can order you to hire a red-headed Chinese or a Baptist Japanese," he tells Indiana audiences.

Large sums of money are coming from somewhere—the John Birch Society is apparently one source—to help him reach as many people as possible. The Wallace managers are reported to have committed $50,000 for television time in the last 10 days, including three statewide hookups.

"What he is saying, in effect," Governor Welsh remarked after one of these telecasts, "is that we in Alabama would secede if we could afford it. But with all that Federal aid they get down there they cannot afford to."

After a terrible Civil War over secession and 100 years of trying to heal the wounds, that is what Wallace is preaching—nullification. He is exploiting all the discontents of a troubled and uncertain time and focusing them on the effort of the Negro to attain equality of status through action by the Federal Government.

The discontents are abundant here where after a long hassle between Welsh, a Democrat, and the Republican legislature a 2-percent sales tax was adopted. It was the only way out if the schools were to be able to expand to take the rising tide of youngsters out of the postwar boom. But organized labor, the core of Democratic strength, is bitterly opposed to the tax which Welsh supported. The unions are having their own integration problems.

Wallace appeals to second- and third-generation Poles and Czechs working in the steel plants of Gary in Lake County. They are concerned about status and about jobs in an area where the Negro population may be 40 percent. As everywhere it is housing with proposed antidiscrimination ordinances in several cities that is the root of the discontent.

Heading a slate of delegates pledged to President Johnson, Welsh and the Democratic organization are working to hold down the vote for the Wallace slate. But Welsh cannot succeed himself under Indiana's constitution, which seems to have been written shortly after the discovery of the wheel, so his hold is limited. Under the voodoo-doll theory of State governorship the citizenry will stick pins in the Governor to get even for all the discomforts and dislocations of overgrown urbanism. As for the President, private polls show he would carry the State, which gave Richard Nixon his highest percentage of victory in 1960, by 2 to 1 against any Republican if the election were held today.

In 1961 Welsh, working with the Republican legislature, got through a State civil rights act that in some respects goes beyond the measure now before Congress. Last year it was strengthened with only three dissenting votes. With a strong civil rights commission it has been widely accepted.

Currently, and this may be the saddest commentary on the whole business, the seeds of rebellion are being planted. Government in Wallace's perverted fairy tale becomes the dragon to be resisted at any cost.

Nullification suits perfectly the ends of the John Birchers and others who seem to want either no government at all or a tyranny in which all would conform to their iron dogmas. In 1861 Lincoln resolved not to free the slaves, but to save the Union from nullification and secession. Those, it has been said, who do not learn from history are compelled to live it over again.

Tribute to Kirk Douglas in Recognition of the Services He Rendered the United States as Special Ambassador of Good Will for the USIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of this country's most distinguished actors, Kirk Douglas, earlier this year undertook a 4-week tour of the Far East as special ambassador of good will at the invitation of the U.S. Information Agency.

During this time (Feb. 29 to Mar. 25), he addressed thousands of students and met with government officials and business leaders in India, Thailand, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Japan.

The extraordinary effect of Mr. Douglas' visits are reflected in the following press comments:

> Kirk Douglas, whose rating as a dashing stage and screen actor is exceedingly high, probably made more friends for the United States in Bombay during his two brief public appearances than many millions of dollar aid * * *. Kirk Douglas was his natural self and answered questions so deftly as to engender not only admiration for Hollywood but also respect for American democracy, for both of which he must be regarded as a supersalesman.—Bombay Sunday Standard.

> At the outset, it's his popularity as a movie star that draws the crowds, but when he starts talking, it's no longer that which holds their attention but the words he says and the way he says them. In fact, one realizes that he could have been of any other profession and not a movie actor of renown and he would still be as effective in this role of ambassador of good will for his country. His eloquence and that which holds his audiences spellbound is a quality compounded of warmth, friendliness, lack of histrionics and pedantry (which is unusual and rather disarming in an actor), humility, sense of humor, and a genuine liking for peoples (and I do mean peoples, meaning regardless of race and color).—Hhe Manila Times.

> Kirk Douglas comes to Thailand as the Cultural Ambassador from the United States. Both he and Mrs. Douglas were completely suitable for their mission as ambassadors. With great wit and sense of humor they created warmth and friendship among all they met.—Thailand magazine.

The sentiments expressed in the three publications were repeated time and again wherever Mr. Douglas went.

Upon his return to the United States, Mr. Douglas made a special trip to Washington to give a firsthand report on his trip to representatives of the USIA, the State Department, and the White House. Mr. Douglas spent 2½ hours briefing Carl T. Rowan, Director of USIA; Lucius Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs; Thomas C. Sorenson, Deputy Director of the Office of Policy of USIA; Edward Savage, Deputy Director of the Office of Public Information of USIA; Patricia Newcomb, Motion Picture Industry Coordinator for USIA.

During these sessions, Mr. Douglas volunteered his services to the USIA for similar good will tours whenever his pro-

fessional schedule permits. He urged the continuation of the program to send entertainment personalities abroad and offered extensive suggestions for making the program even more effective.

At the conclusion of his report, the group was unanimous in praising Mr. Douglas for the service he had rendered his country and for the sense of high-civic responsibility he demonstrated in making a complete firsthand report to the various officials.

It is therefore, fitting and proper for us as fellow Americans to pay tribute to Kirk Douglas and commend him for his selfless, patriotic contributions, and for his dedication to developing better international understanding.

Efficient Functioning of President Johnson's Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and several editorials the general import of which relates not only to the efficient, thorough, comprehensive way in which President Johnson is administering the vital office of the Presidency; but also the fact that on a day-by-day and issue-by-issue basis he is receiving greater recognition and acknowledgement of his awareness of the fullness of the office of the Presidency and of the competence with which he is administering that office.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT LOOKS AHEAD: THE TRANSITION IS OVER—JOHNSON TAKES CHARGE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The most significant fact in Washington today is that transitional government is at an end and that Lyndon B. Johnson is completely in charge.

It has been accomplished more competently, more smoothly, more rapidly than anyone would have believed possible.

The Johnson administration is now on its own—making its own decisions, creating its own initiatives and cultivating its own image in its own way.

The one thing which to me stands out above all is this:

Mr. Johnson has not merely acceded to the Presidency; he has seized the Presidency with unequaled energy.

Mr. Johnson is not merely presiding over his administration; he is operating the Presidency as if he had been in the White House at least 5 years.

He is no longer looking back at the tragedy which robbed the Nation of President Kennedy. Mr. Johnson is looking ahead. He is no longer appealing to Congress or to the country to accept his measures as a tribute to the memory of the late President. He is asking that everything be judged on its own.

This is no time even to attempt to judge where Lyndon Johnson will rate as a President. But it is amply evident that he brings a special combination of qualities rarely present in one man at the same time. He is the most politically resourceful President since Franklin Roosevelt and the most zestful President since Theodore Roosevelt.

He has just addressed both the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington and the Associated Press in New York. (Most Presidents address either one or the other.)

He has just held three press conferences in the past week, including one big, live televised press conference in the State Department auditorium a la J.F.K. It went well.

The Nation's newspaper editors meeting in Washington—mostly Republican—thought Mr. Johnson would win reelection.

The publishers meeting in New York—mostly Republican—thought Mr. Johnson would run even stronger than President Kennedy would have run.

Few politicians or political writers would have held this view before November 22—that if the Vice President were compelled to take over he would be as strong, or stronger, politically than his predecessor. This is further evidence of how quickly and completely Mr. Johnson has come to occupy the Presidency.

On the basis of his first 5 months in office, it is clear that Mr. Johnson is not disposed to delay, to postpone, to run away from hard decisions.

He dared to take the railroad negotiations, which plagued both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, into the White House—and this was no small political risk.

He ventured upon a personal correspondence with Premier Khrushchev which led to the uranium production cut agreement announced a few days ago.

He listened to conflicting advice within his administration over whether he should give his support to the anti-Goulart military coup in Brazil before one could tell how democratic or undemocratic it was going to prove to be—and Mr. Johnson took the risk of supporting it, rejected the wait-and-see counsel.

I am not suggesting that the record is all rosy. The Panama negotiations were fumbled in the early stages. Our stake in Vietnam needs much more persuasive Presidential exposition to keep public and congressional support for what needs to be done.

What is most visible, as transition government comes to an end, is that a very skilled politician and a massively do-it-now man is filling the Presidency to near bursting.

Those who constantly compare President Johnson with President Kennedy will continue to be disappointed. He will never look and act like Mr. Kennedy. He will always look and act like Lyndon B. Johnson.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 20, 1964]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH TO THE PUBLISHERS

A Presidential address on foreign policy always creates great stir and anticipation. Yet today's speech by President Johnson to the publishers will be listened to with greater attention than usual.

Not since Stalin's death in 1953 has the moment seemed so ripe for a Western initiative. In 1953 Stalin's heirs were in disarray and close to panic. Had there been talks at the summit, as Winston Churchill proposed, the results might have been highly advantageous to the West.

But the Eisenhower administration out of deference to the McCarthy wing of the GOP, which equated negotiation with appeasement, cold-shouldered the Churchill bid. The opportunity was missed.

This may be another such moment. The Sino-Soviet split, the pressures of the East European countries on Moscow for greater autonomy, the Kremlin's economic difficulties, its friendly references to Mr. Johnson, all suggest that Moscow may be in the mood for some serious bargaining.

If so, we could not have a tougher, more resourceful bargainer to represent the Western side than Mr. Johnson.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 20, 1964]

L.B.J. AND THE DRAFT

There is an admirable emphasis on equity in President Johnson's order to the Defense Department to undertake a comprehensive view of the way the draft is working.

The President might have requested a purely technical study focusing on population trends and military manpower needs. In that way he could have avoided prickly issues. Instead he faced up to the broader issues implicit in the complaints that the draft system is bearing down unevenly on different groups of young people.

He was afraid, the President said, that the original concept of a "fair and just system" based on equal sharing of military service obligations "may have drifted" in practice.

This has, in fact, been the case. Knowledgeable men in the field of manpower problems, like Professor Eli Ginzberg of Columbia, have long been stressing the inequities as well as the inadequacies of the present system.

When the armed services need only two out of every five men of draft age, how should the Government decide who is to be excused and who called up? Today the boy who gets married or who has enough money to go to college is deferred.

The result is a far cry from the "universal" system of military service which Congress thought it was establishing. Deferments on the basis of economic status are repugnant to our democratic ethos and deferment on the basis of marriage is hardly wise social policy since it pushes a great many youngsters into hasty, ill-matched marriages. This has long been felt to be true, at last something is being done.

We like also the President's request that the Defense Department examine alternatives to the present system, including the possibility of meeting our military manpower requirement on a "voluntary" basis.

Perhaps this is the answer; perhaps we should be thinking in terms of a genuinely "universal" system in which all young people will be expected to give a year's service to the country, although not necessarily military.

There are cogent reasons on both sides of this argument. The President's order has set the stage for a useful debate.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Apr. 21, 1964]

THE HOPE FOR PEACE

When you have enough high explosives to blow any potential enemy off the face of the earth, it would seem foolish to keep on producing more.

We take it for granted the United States now is fully stocked with nuclear weapons, or is approaching that stage—and that this is the main reason, the only important reason, for further reduction in the manufacture of nuclear materials, as announced yesterday by President Johnson.

The Soviet Union also may be assumed to be well supplied and this explains Khrushchev's announcement that he too is cutting down.

It costs nothing on either side to herald these reductions as a means of reducing international tensions and perhaps they do contribute to that end, however slightly.

But overwhelmingly the greatest tension reducer is the U.S. Military Establishment. As Johnson said yesterday, "If the threat of

war has lessened, it is largely because our opponents realize attack would bring destruction." We would eliminate the word "largely" from that sentence.

The President's speech concisely stated the only substantial difference between the United States and the Soviet Union:

"The Communists, using force and intrigue, seek to bring about a Communist-dominated world * * *" he said. "This activity and this alone is the cause of the cold war between us * * * for the United States has nothing to fear from peaceful competition."

"Today," he continued, "there are new pressures, new realities, which make it permissible to hope that the pursuit of peace is in the interests of the Soviet Union as it is in ours."

We join in that hope, even though its encouragement to date has consisted mainly of words without any definite acts to prove Soviet change of heart. If such a hope is to materialize, it will be due mainly to the continued peacekeeping effect of the American military.

And so we hope, and trust, these announced U.S. cuts in production of enriched uranium and plutonium actually are due to surplus, rather than to any new-found trust in Soviet good intentions.

As Johnson said, our defense effort has been costly. But the costs of weakness are far greater than the costs of strength, and the payment far more painful.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 23, 1964]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST VISIT

Chicagoans getting their first look at Lyndon Johnson since he became President just 5 months ago will be interested to note how his style (that well worked-over catchall word) differs not only from his predecessor's, but in some degree from Senator Johnson's and indeed Vice President Johnson's.

Here—as reporters have been writing and as the Nation's editors discovered at the White House last week—is a man who savors the Presidency as a connoisseur savors fine wine. Proud of his home, his family, and his job, he beamed upon his visitors like the laird of the manor, and danced the ladies round with a skill matched only by his endurance.

Mr. Johnson, if we may offer a guess, is a man who not only vigorously aspired to the Presidency, but also one who never doubted for an instant that he would be a good one.

Sure footed in his assumption of authority, prudently deferential to his predecessor's policies as well as his memory during those first few weeks, he has long since emerged as his own man, and a clear-cut personality at that.

Chicagoans will doubtless see the affable, smiling President accustomed to projecting warmth and confidence to the electorate. But those privileged to gain a closer look may also perceive a tough, at times almost imperious, master politician, looking ahead to August and November, saying those things and doing those things the head of a political party must do to generate momentum for those whose political fortunes are bound up with his own.

There is much on the President's mind just now—situations to be coped with that hold the seeds of disaster even for a political future so seemingly secure as his own. Civil rights, Cuba, inflation, South Vietnam: all of these challenges must be surmounted or an image now lustrous will be tarnished, with prompt and damaging reaction upon public confidence.

We welcome President Johnson, then, with warmth and also with understanding that his Texan's smile may mask a mind not wholly upon the quality of the banquet food or the praises heaped upon him by his Chicago admirers.

No Detours on This "Lane"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, April 8, 1964, at the Surf Ballroom in Nantasket, Mass., the South Shore saluted Percy Lane with a testimonial that was attended by over 1,000 persons. Mr. Lane has been a reporter at the Patriot Ledger of Quincy, Mass., for over 44 years, clerk of committees to Quincy City Councils since 1938, and a publicity agent for many Quincy organizations. He was born on August 13, 1896, eldest of seven children, and still resides a few doors from where he was born on Water Street, Quincy. It has been my privilege to have known Mr. Lane for several years and I know of no other personality who is more deserving of this wonderful tribute. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert as part of the RECORD an article that appeared in the Patriot Ledger on March 31, 1964, which sums up the contributions that Mr. Lane has made for the community he loves so much:

(By Patricia O'Neill)

QUINCY.—Percy N. Lane calls Quincy "the hub of the universe" and spends most of his time at the center of that world.

When Percy walks through Quincy Square his hand is in continual motion as he waves hello with a quick salute to nearly every person he passes.

These are the people the 67-year-old Quincy native has come to know in his 44 years as a reporter at the Patriot Ledger, his quarter century as clerk of committees to the city council, and through his membership in many Quincy organizations.

TESTIMONIAL APRIL 8

These are the people who will attend the "South Shore Salutes Percy Lane Dinner" on April 8 at the Surf in Nantasket.

"Percy at the Ledger," Percy, the familiar figure around Quincy, is quick to point out that the dinner does not mean he has plans of retiring or of giving up his hectic 7-day-a-week schedule.

"I've never taken a day off," says the veteran reporter, who doesn't know what a vacation is. "I'm a committed man."

Then he adds one of his favorite sayings—"When I rest, I rust."

Percy came to the Ledger in 1920 at the age of 24. "I walked off the street and said I wanted to be a reporter and I was hired," he recalls.

The Quincy boy who had always wanted to be a reporter began his long journalism career in the Ledger sports department and later transferred to the city room, where he is still to be found at various unpredictable hours of the day and night.

His work at the Ledger for many years now has been chiefly reporting on the activities of Quincy's many civic, fraternal, and veterans organizations.

And many a person with the story of his daughter's wedding or a business appointment will ask first for Percy when he calls the Ledger, because Percy is the man he knows.

"I've always liked writing nice things about nice people," he says, remembering with distaste the one time he was called upon to cover court.

COVERED KENNEDY VISITS

Placed high among his many memories are his interview with the late poet, Edwin Markham, and the three times he covered visits of John F. Kennedy to Quincy.

He remembers telling Mr. Markham that he thought he was a genius and the poet replying, "It takes a genius to recognize a genius."

He remembers too predicting at a Quincy Elks Memorial Sunday observance in December 1952, that the speaker, a young Congressman named John F. Kennedy, might be "a future President of the United States."

Kennedy, he says, has become the hero of his maturity that Theodore Roosevelt was of his youth. One of Percy's few trips of any distance away from Quincy was made to New York City especially to visit T. R.'s birthplace.

Percy's schedule brings him into the city room about 10 a.m. every day after a mile walk from his Water Street home if it is a nice day and a shave at Angelo's barbershop. He notes with a tone of regret that barbers do not enjoy shaving customers any more.

BUSY SCHEDULE

Until about noon time, he is busy answering phone calls, opening his mail, and writing. Nearly every day, there is a luncheon appointment—Monday, it is Kiwanis, Tuesday, Rotary, and so on.

Afternoon finds Percy busy again at his desk often until as late as 6 p.m. If there is a dinner or banquet in town, Percy will be there. If not, he may head for one of the Quincy restaurants he frequents.

Nights, he is back on the job either as a Ledger reporter or as clerk of committees to the city council. He boasts that he has never missed a city council or council committee meeting, no matter when it has met.

And then there are social visits to the Elks, the Jewish Community Center, the Masons, and the other organizations where he has been active.

His honorary memberships include the Elks, Taleb Grotto, the Quincy Jewish War Veterans, and the Rotary and Probus Clubs. He is a regular member of Kiwanis, the Norfolk County Sheriff's Association, the Rural Masonic Lodge, and the John Adams Eagles Aerie.

For more than 20 years he has been putting out the weekly newsletters of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs and has worked on the bulletins of several other organizations.

AVID READER

A great deal of Percy's spare time is spent reading. He calls himself, "an avid reader," "a knowledge addict," and says he especially enjoys reading about U.S. history.

Well known to Percy's friends and acquaintances are what he calls his "penchant for punning" and his "Percygrams."

Familiar Percy puns include his favorite "I deny the allegation and scorn the alligator."

In his Percygrams, the reporter becomes philosopher—"It is better to make a wealth of friends than a friend of wealth," and "It is better to live by the Golden Rule than the Rule of Gold."

Percy Nathan Lane has plans for the future. He is going to go on being a reporter, civil servant, punster, philosopher, and friend.

A Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, none of us will ever forget those tragic days

of November 1963. Mrs. Adeline Marie Gress Torgerson, of Parshall, N. Dak., wrote a prayer which expressed the feelings of many of us. I ask unanimous consent that the prayer, as printed in the Mountrail County Record, of Parshall, N. Dak., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER

We hear the sound of marching feet
The muffled drums, with steady beat,
As we, our silent vigil keep
Too numb, too sad, too stunned to weep,
On this gray, unholy day
All his shipmates, in dismay
Pray God, this deed had not been done
To one so loved, our chosen one,
Who came to guide us o'er rough seas
Oh, God, have mercy on us please,
And in our moment of despair
Please hear us, in our silent prayer,
For guidance on the steady course
He leads us, with His gentle force,
The world, shocked to reality
That for love of peace and liberty,
His young life, he quickly gave
Our high ideal and peace to save,
The Nation mourns, today in grief
A day of silent disbelief,
This very dark, and very gray
Cold and bleak, November day.

Developments on the Sabine River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial which appeared in the April 26, 1964, issue of the Longview Daily News about developments on the Sabine River. It is impossible to conceive of the great good that will come to our area of Texas and to Louisiana and to other areas of Texas as a result of the development which is taking place now on the Sabine and which will continue to take place in the future. We are on the threshold of a new era because of the abundance of a wonderful water supply in our area which is in fact a blessing of the Almighty. Col. Carl Estes, of the Longview Daily News, has taken a very leading part in bringing about the development of the type described in the editorial. I congratulate and commend him. Senator Morris Sheppherd evidenced great interest in prospective developments. I worked diligently on the problem when I was a member of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. I will continue to try to help bring about the fullest practical development of the resources of this river and our other rivers.

Officials of the Army Department, which is a part of the Defense Department, have budget recommendations of $175,000 for the Neches River next fiscal year and $132,000 for the Sabine River. Hon. Verne Clements, Longview; Hon. A. M. Willis, of Longview, Tex., are aware of the efforts to get this money. They have appeared with me at hearings before the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees.

Incidentally, Mr. John Ben Sheppherd, Mr. Robert Hayes, of the Dallas News, and I worked diligently to stimulate interest in the development of the Sabine River as is evidenced by several pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26, 1950. Mr. John Simmons, of the Texas Sabine River Authority, knows about this work on our part. Mr. Sheppherd and I flew once to Orange to confer with Mr. Simmons and others. Also I attended a meeting with Louisiana and Texas and Army officials several years ago at Shreveport, La. Mr. Sheppherd and I grew up near the Sabine River not far from Gladewater.

The editorial follows:

TOLEDO BEND RESERVOIR

[An Editorial]

Within the next 3 weeks first dirt will be turned in construction of the $60 million Toledo Bend Dam and, when the project is completed 3 years hence, it will stand as a monument to the faith and perseverance of a small group of men who would not take "no" for an answer.

Completion of the dam and creation of Toledo Bend Reservoir will not be the end of the vision. A giant hydroelectric power-generating plant at the dam will serve large portions of two States, and plans are under study for navigation locks at the dam which could very well mean eventual river navigation all the way from the Gulf of Mexico to Longview.

The dam will impound more than 4.5 million acre-feet of water and create a lake 65 miles long—from Toledo Bend to Logansport, La.—with a shoreline of 1,250 miles, making it one of the largest man-made lakes in the Nation.

Its value in flood control and water conservation are almost beyond calculation. As a wildlife preserve and recreational area, it will have few equals in this part of the country and will draw millions of visitors each year, not only from Texas and Louisiana, but from all parts of the Nation. When it is considered that the average fisherman spends $6.50 on expenses each time he visits a fishing spot, the value of the lake as a tourist attraction takes on important proportions.

It is noteworthy that the State of Louisiana already has earmarked $160,000 for the development of 16 recreational areas on its side of the lake. It is certain that the Texas Game and Wildlife Commission will take similar steps soon.

A score of east Texas and west Louisiana cities and communities will have new lifeblood pumped into their economy when the reservoir is completed. They will include Logansport, Mansfield, Converse, Zwolle, Many, Leesville, and DeRidder in Louisiana, and Joaquin, Tenaha, Senter, Shelbyville, San Augustine, Patroon, Millam, Rosevine, Hemphill, Pineland, Wiergate, and Burkeville in Texas.

The dream of a large reservoir on the middle part of the Sabine River is not a new one. Actually, it had its beginnings almost 30 years ago. Those three decades were marked by delays, setbacks, and disappointments. But in spite of it all, the determination of men who had the vision to see far, far ahead won out.

A chronological history of the long-drawn-out fight to get the dam and reservoir is the recounting of the tireless efforts of dedicated men who saw in the Sabine a stream of vast potentialities which would be of great value to the Nation and to generations as yet unborn.

To their everlasting credit, the people of two soveign States—Louisiana and Texas—pooled their interests, their best thinking, their money and talents to build the reservoir, with the result that the Federal Government has no part in its ownership or control. That in itself makes the lake a rarity. The forestry service will receive a small annuity for lands owned by it which will be inundated.

The soundness of the entire undertaking is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that the two State river authorities, in marketing $30 million worth of electric power revenue bonds, sold the entire issue to a major bond-market firm at an average net interest charge of 3.621 percent; a figure much lower than many had expected. The financial as well as the engineering planning of this great project reflects credit on those responsible for it.

To list the names of the men who started the battle and fought all the way to victory would be to name most of the leaders in the two States. But there is one man—John W. Simmons, executive vice president and general manager of the Sabine River Authority of Texas—who stands out as a figurehead of all that Toledo Bend means. During three decades, he has been in the vanguard of those who moved forward to the successful completion of the undertaking.

His counterparts in Louisiana—Claude Kirkpatrick, president of the Sabine River Authority and director of public works for that State; and his assistant, Calvin Watts, deputy director of public works—worked equally hard on their end of the line. D. N. Beasley, president of the Sabine River Authority of Texas, is another who kept the flag flying.

There were many times during these last 30 days when it seemed impossible to go on. But somehow, every time, it was the persistent efforts of the Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana, and the Sabine River Authority of Texas that kept momentum alive and kicking.

During those years, from the very inception of the vision, the Longview Morning Journal and the Longview Daily News, believing in the future of the Sabine River and its effect on this part of east Texas, have given consistent and unqualified support to the development of the master plan of the Sabine River Authority, which includes Lake Tawakoni and the Toledo Bend Dam and power-generating plant. In this final moment of victory, the News and Journal salute those men who fought so valiantly for an ideal and find happiness and satisfaction in having had a part in it.

Now that all obstacles have been removed, let us all put our shoulders to the wheel and work hard to make Toledo Bend one of the most popular recreational places in the Nation and Longview's waterway to the sea.

Achievements of President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a number of articles have been written in recent days with respect to President Johnson's operation of his office, particularly the manner in which he so well handled his large press conference in the State Department Conference Room.

An article was published in the Chicago Sun-Times of Sunday, April 19; and

editorials were published in the Boston Globe of Saturday, April 18; the New York Post of April 23, and the New York Daily News of April 18, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorials be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 19, 1964]

JOHNSON PUTS ON AN IMPRESSIVE PRESS PERFORMANCE

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—On the basis of his televised press conference of last Thursday evening, newsmen have to concede that President Johnson can handle the press in pretty nearly any situation.

Until this occasion, in a dozen or more meetings with reporters, it had seemed that he was apprehensively looking for some way of communicating with the public which would still leave him safe from invidious comparisons with the late John F. Kennedy—who handled these give-and-take sessions so blithely.

Mr. Johnson had held surprise press conferences in his office, in the Cabinet Room, in the White House rose garden, on his ranch behind a few bales of hay and barbecued ribs, in a State Department conference room—everywhere but where Mr. Kennedy used to hold his.

Where Mr. Kennedy held his press conferences was in the pitiless white light of publicity—the main State Department auditorium which looks like a prosperous suburban theater—and "live" on television and radio, without any effort to control the questioning.

DEMONSTRATES HIS SKILLS

The Republicans still are busy resolving the question of whether Mr. Johnson knows how to conduct foreign affairs—an attention which could be assigned to the partisanship of a presidential campaign year.

But neither party denies that Mr. Johnson, in the other areas of Government where he may legitimately have effect, has demonstrated he is pretty skillful, as in making administrative appointments and decisions. and in influencing congressional ones.

The remaining large question about his competence, which was raised mostly by newspapermen, was largely settled by the President's Thursday performance.

He poked a bit of fun at himself, a device Mr. Kennedy had always found useful, over reports that he had driven at high speeds recently in Texas.

He poked some more by saying he had cut short an "informal" meeting over the back fence with some White House tourists, to attend the press conference.

STARTS OUT WITH A LAUGH

In any event, President Johnson started out by raising a laugh, and then went on to use another Kennedy implement of delivering messages in a steadily flowing open statement, instead of waiting, sometimes in vain, for newspapermen to ask the proper questions.

He said the state of the economy was tremendously good, according to a whole set of statistics which he had at hand.

He wanted the threatened national railroad strike settled by traditional American collective bargaining, as opposed to possible Government force; he had new projects reflecting the President's interest in the arts and in scholarship.

He also showed great interest in developing a new sea level canal to replace the Panama one which has kept Canal Zone high school children, and their Nation, in hot water.

Then, after these opening announcements, he opened himself for questions, and showed he had done his homework. Convincingly he supported the civil rights bill now being filibustered in the Senate—and also opposed civil disobedience campaigns, either white or Negro, which might deter its chances of passage.

With an adroit mixture of confidence and deprecation, he managed to suggest that he will, of course, run for election in his own right, and thinks he will be elected.

He seemed willing to take on reporters known for their ability to ask the hairy kind of question—like one involving his family's interest in an Austin, Tex., and exclusive television station.

"Well, * * * I own a little ranch land, something in excess of 2,000 acres * * * Mrs. Johnson inherited some property, invested that property in the profession of her choice, and worked at it with pleasure and satisfaction until I forced her to leave it when I assumed the Presidency."

The President did not recognize only reporters friendly to his cause. He turned away from some, in fact, to get to the hair-shirt types, who he knew would ask him unfriendly questions.

It was a performance that impressed most of the reporters who participated in it, and that isn't easy.

Furthermore, it was achieved, by his request, in the presence of many of their editors, who were assembled here for the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Mr. Johnson's timing couldn't have been either accidental or better.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 18, 1964]

A HIT PERFORMANCE

President Johnson's debut at his first "regular, scheduled, televised, notified-well-in-advance" press conference has been pronounced a hit by that notoriously hard-boiled audience: the Washington press corps. This is high praise from professionals. It is merited.

For in this premiere the President displayed not only the relaxed, ranging skill of the political expert that he is; he came, in the Shakespearean phrase, "with his mouth full of news" for everybody, from high school students to economists, from civil rights supporters to canal diggers, from the jobless to the aged and—last but not least—for the Congress, which was gently pressured to speed work on a heavy schedule he obligingly, itemized anew.

The gathering at Foggy Bottom Thursday has been long awaited. If Mr. Johnson's preparations for it have been cautious, they have been inbued with a shrewd sense of climax. A series of offhand meetings with the press (all unannounced) in his own White House office, his press secretary's, in the Cabinet Room, in the White House East Room, even in the White House movie theater, provided the prelude.

It is accordingly no accident that Thursday's conference broke all records for attendance, eclipsing even the historic Kennedy press conference in 1961 at the time of the Berlin Wall crisis. This week, remarked a veteran correspondent when the show was over, "the Johnson era began in earnest."

The President's welcome report on the thriving conditions of the Nation's economy is balanced by sober warnings to business and labor alike to beware of upsetting the applecart by inflationary cost and wage pressures. That cautionary advice is more timely than many imagine.

Equally impressive are his admonitions against violence in the civil rights campaign. In this the President is reiterating significant warnings uttered this past week by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and a dozen other outstanding champions of civil rights legislation as well as by leaders of the Negro community. "The denial of one right," Mr. Johnson reminds the Nation, should not permit the violation of another right.

One of the happy surprises is the announcement that about 125 "Presidential Scholarships" are being instituted for promising graduates from the Nation's secondary schools, the recipients to be selected from every State and Territory in the Nation, as well as at large.

Of national interest also are the President's plans for exploring the feasiblity of a new sea-level canal through the isthmus. Here a test of cooperative statesmanship awaits, as well as a challenge to engineering.

President Johnson's work orders to Congress, especially those on his war against poverty, medicare, adjustments of pay for Federal officers, and civil rights are clear and unequivocal.

His first full-scale press conference reveals him as a political pragmatist in full command of his role.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 23, 1964]

A PRESIDENT TOPS HIS GHOSTS

Those who heard President Johnson's impassioned plea in the White House rose garden that this wealthy country not shirk its obligations to a world rebelling against poverty were impressed by his "evangelistic" fervor and sincerity.

The contrast with the cautious, often uninspired rhetoric of his speech to the Associated Press luncheon the day before was as apparent as it was dramatic. The explanation appears to lie in the frequency with which Mr. Johnson departed from his prepared text in his rose garden talk: he is much more eloquent than some of his ghosts.

Mr. Johnson's purpose was simple. His foreign aid request is in trouble on Capitol Hill. He asked for a comparatively modest minimum $3,400 million and the initial congressional reaction is that he won't get it. If Congress is to be moved, the country must first be moved.

The President's sermon deftly blended an appeal to the Golden Rule and the national interest. We are engaged in a war against poverty at home, the President said, and he intends to pursue that war "to final victory." But, as a nation, the average American spends more per day on cigarettes than most of the people of the world do on their basic necessities.

He remainded the country that disregard of the responsibilities that go with wealth and strength carries a heavy price. We are "a very small minority" in a world that is predominantly colored and overwhelmingly poor, and if this "third world" cannot achieve a batter life peacefully, "violent revolution is inevitable"—and affluent America will be the chief target.

We hope Capitol Hill was listening.

We hope further that the President's remarks mean that American representatives at the U.N.'s Trade Conference in Geneva will be given new instructions. Under Secretary Ball's words at the opening of the Conference cast a chill on the high hopes with which the underdeveloped countries entered that meeting.

It is time the United States offered Geneva something more concrete and original than Mr. Ball's cautious stricture.

Why not combine the President's speech to the publishers on the nuclear cutback with his remarks to the editors on aiding the poor? Why not take the savings from the nuclear cutback and place them in an international development fund and challenge the Russians to do the same?

And, if we may say so, let us hear the spontaneous, human voice of Mr. Johnson more often over the murmurings of the ghosts.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 18, 1964]

NEW TELEVISION STAR

We're speaking of President Lyndon B. Johnson, who held his first J. F. Kennedy-style televised news conference Thursday, after almost 5 months in the White House.

He handled the whole performance skillfully, and made an excellent impression on the hard-nosed news men and women who flung the questions at him.

It's just another warning to the GOP, if you ask us, that this man is going to be hard to defeat next November 3, and that the Republicans had better pull up their socks, get united somehow, and start fighting the Democrats instead of one another without further ado.

The South in the Building of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an excellent article in the Herald-Register, an outstanding weekly newspaper of Trenton, Tenn., of which Mr. Richard Davis is editor, on Thursday, April 23.

The article was written by Mr. R. E. McIlwain when he was in college in 1921. The article certainly speaks for itself and it follows:

THE SOUTH IN THE BUILDING OF THE NATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was written by Mr. R. E. McIlwain when he was in college in 1921. He submits it for publication at this time to remind the people what the South has contributed to the Nation in the past.)

A half a century ago the South withdrew from the Federal Union and a great civil war followed. The property destroyed—the sorrow entailed—the precious lives lost in that unfortunate struggle of 4 years of awful conflict is not my purpose to speak of. This is too well known ever to be forgotten. But there is danger of allowing the Nation and the world to forget the one great historic fact and that is the noble part performed by the South in organizing and building this American Nation into its present vast proportions. Let us recall a few historic facts:

(1) There were 13 original colonies which in 1776 withdrew from the mother country and became the 13 Original States of this American Union. Six of them, viz, Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia, embraced fully two-thirds of the territory of the new American Nation. And with a generosity and a patriotism most commendable these six southern States gave to the General Government a vast domain as large as the territory which they now possess. North Carolina gave what is now the great State of Tennessee, Virginia gave what is now Kentucky and Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana. And Georgia gave what is now Alabama and Mississippi.

(2) And it may not be generally known that southern statesmanship and generalship has secured almost every square mile of new territory from the beginning of the Government in 1776 until now. Let us again look at the facts.

(a) Mr. Jefferson, a Virginian and third President of the United States, immortalized himself by one stroke of his pen when he signed the bill for what is known as the Louisiana Purchase from France. By this act, a vast empire, larger than all the rest of the United States, was added to our territory more than a million square miles, out of which has been carved at least 10 great States of this Union.

(b) By James Monroe, another southern President, the territory of Florida was purchased from Spain.

(c) And on December 29, 1845, under James K. Polk of Tennessee, another southern President, the State of Texas was added to the Federal Union, including a territory as large as all the New England States with New York thrown in for good count. By this time the territory of the United States has been multiplied and remultiplied until it extends from Canada to Mexico and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. And whence came all this vast new territory? The last acre of it was acquired under southern Presidents. So much for the public domain.

(2) But it required more than statesmanship to organize and build a great nation like ours. The wisest of plans may be adopted but produce no results unless they are executed. And here we need the patriotic soldier, the great military commander. And let me ask, "Has the South furnished her full share of great military leaders?" What is the military history of this Government from the very beginning to 1861—a period of nearly 100 years?

(a) That superb soldier and statesman who loomed up far above every other man, North or South, in the first great war of the Revolution, by which our independence was achieved from Great Britain and we became a new nation, was Gen. George Washington of Virginia.

(b) In the second war with England in 1812 the American cause suffered so many defeats that it seemed that the war would end in shameful failure. One general after another retreated or surrendered to the British forces. Even the Capitol at Washington was captured and burned by the British General Ross. But all was not lost. Old Hickory Jackson of Tennessee appeared on the scene at the right time, fought and won the great battle of New Orleans, and the War of 1812 ended in a blaze of glory for American arms.

(c) We have spoken of the acquisition of Texas from Mexico; and who were some of the heroes who won the independence of the Republic of Texas? Fannin of Georgia, Travis of Missouri, and, last but not least, Gen. Sam Houston of Virginia, the hero of the Battle of San Jacinto, where the Mexicans were completely routed and their general captured and Texas was separated from Mexico and joined to the United States.

(d) This brought on the Mexican War in 1846, when James K. Polk of Tennessee was President. And where did he find the men capable of leading the American forces to victory? Without question the two greatest military lights which blazed with undimmed splendor through all the storms of battle were Gen. Zachary Taylor of Louisiana and Winfield Scott of Virginia. Surely the South has borne her full share in the building of the Nation, when every square mile of new territory has been acquired under southern Presidents and for nearly 100 years, from 1776 to 1861, the American armies were led by southern soldiers: Washington, Jackson, Scott and Taylor. I am not claiming that the South alone organized and build this Nation out of 13 feeble Colonies, but I do claim that in sacrifice and suffering, in blood and treasure, in heroism and statesmanship, she has borne a most honorable part. May the sons and daughters of the South ever prove worthy of such illustrious forefathers.

* * * * *

What Coal Means to Everyone in Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "What Coal Means to Everyone in Hopkins," which appeared in the April 25 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT COAL MEANS TO EVERYONE IN HOPKINS

Back during the strip mine bill dispute earlier this year, we offered some dollars-and-cents ideas about what the strip mine payrolls mean to Hopkins County and its economy.

These figures were a breakdown of where the $3 million payroll likely went in the trade channels of the county and were—we thought—pretty impressive.

Now we have some statistics covering all mining in our area and showing the total economic impact of coal upon the economy of our county. It shows an impressive total of almost $25 million spent on wages, supplies, services, and taxes by the coal industry in Hopkins County.

The statistics come from National Coal Association, National Coal Policy Conference and the United Mine Workers of America and come from a company-by-company survey of the coal industry made by Operations and Policy Research, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

Covering the year 1962, here's what the survey showed about coal and its impact on Hopkins County:

Coal production, tons	10,330,000
Total payroll	$14,991,781
State and local taxes	$959,096
Toal spent by coal companies for services and supplies	$8,676,103
Total contribution of coal to county's economy	$24,626,980

These figures alone give a good indication of the tremendous importance of good old black diamond to our area. But the survey went much deeper into the whole picture and it gives a breakdown on how the $14,991,781 payroll was spent:

Food (28.1 percent)	$4,212,690
Food at restaurant (5.0 percent)	749,589
Food at home (23.1 percent)	3,463,101
Cereal and bakery products (3.3 percent)	494,729
Meats (6.6 percent)	989,458
Dairy products (3.9 percent)	584,679
Fruits and vegetables (4.3 percent)	644,647
Others (5.0 percent)	749,589
Housing (27.2 percent)	4,077,764
Rent and mortgage interest (8.2 percent)	1,229,326
Home purchase (5.8 percent)	869,523
Real estate taxes (1.3 percent)	194,893
Repairs and maintenance (3.0 percent)	449,753
Fuel and electricity (3.4 percent)	509,721
House furnishings (5.5 percent)	824,548
Apparel (8.1 percent)	1,214,334
Men's and boys' (2.8 percent)	419,770
Women's and girls' (3.7 percent)	554,696
Footwear (1.6 percent)	239,868

Transportation (11.7 percent)	$1,754,038
New cars (2.8 percent)	419,770
Used cars (1.7 percent)	254,860
Auto repairs (1.2 percent)	179,901
Gasoline (2.4 percent)	359,803
Others (3.6 percent)	539,704
Medical (5.8 percent)	869,523
Doctors	314,827
Dentists (0.9 percent)	134,926
Hospitalization insurance (1.5 percent)	224,877
Drugs (0.7 percent)	104,942
Other (0.6 percent)	89,951
Personal care (2.3 percent)	344,811
Recreation (5.5 percent)	824,548
Other goods and services (11.3 percent)	1,694,071

It would be impossible to measure the total impact, because every one of the facets of business shown above have owners and employees and suppliers who turn most of their "coal" dollars back into the channels of trade. So the total impact would reasonably be several times the direct impact shown above.

Anyway, it is good to remember from time to time what a tremendous blessing coal is to our county. Knowing the vast reserves of this precious stuff that remain here, we can hardly be anything but optimistic about the future.

Fort Wayne, Ind., Mayor's Prayer Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the International Christian Leadership organization is to be warmly commended not only for sponsoring the Presidential Prayer Breakfast, but also similar breakfasts for Governors and mayors. This brings an increasing awareness of the importance of prayer to leading figures of our Nation.

Just recently my home city of Fort Wayne, Ind., held its first annual Mayor's Prayer Breakfast. Mr. Clifford B. Ward commented on it in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel. Because of what he had to say was of such wide application and truth, I am including it herewith:

Something which was new, unusual and to my mind very worthwhile occurred in Fort Wayne last week. More than 600 men of the city attended the Mayor's Prayer Breakfast at the Scottish Rite Cathedral. The weather was very bad and the starting time was 7:30 o'clock, but in spite of these things, almost everyone who said he would be there, was. I am quite certain that if you distilled all the goodness of all the men assembled, you would probably have less than what is required to make one respectable saint, but that doesn't matter. It was by no means a sanctimonious, goody-goody affair. It was a mass assemblage of a lot of sinners, who arrived sinners and left that way. I suspect that the moral tone of the community was not significantly lifted the rest of that day. So you say, what was the point of it?

The point of such an affair is that 600 men, more or less, from all walks of life and many different faiths, went to considerable inconvenience to themselves to give testimony to their belief that a Supreme Being exists, to whom all men owe much, and upon whom they are dependent for everything, but primarily existence itself. It was unity within variety, a practical illustration of what can be accomplished by a cooperative venture on the part of laymen of many different religious attitudes and beliefs. I don't know how anyone could arrive at any conclusion except the one that it was very edifying, without at the same time being in any way offensive to good taste.

NO PUBLICITY SCHEME

The sponsors of the affair here, which is comparable to many such affairs held over the country under auspices of the President, Governors, and mayors, is not a publicity gimmick for either individuals or groups. To the extent possible, the sponsors desire that advance publicity be played down, as well as reports afterward. That is good, and I say that, even though this discussion of it violates the spirit of the rules.

Forty percent of the population of the world today is living under a system of government which officially denies the existence of God and tries aggressively to destroy belief in God wherever it exists. Even in countries such as ours, where freedom to worship God still exists, a losing battle is currently being fought by religionists. The moral climate, to say the least, is pretty rotten in many places, some of them places high in our Government. People who wouldn't drink out of a common drinking cup lest they take on germs, read the sleaziest kind of literature and feed their alleged minds on pure filth.

MORE CRIMES TODAY

Almost all kinds of crimes are on the increase; murders, rapes, muggings, knifings, stealing, embezzlements, and what have you, are all on the increase. As Jenks Jones, newspaper editor, said about a year ago, someone is indeed tampering with the soul of America, and indeed destroying it. I think it is the subconscious recognition by a lot of people that this is so, that a meeting such as the one last week, allowing men to at least endorse the idea of God, is usually successful. Once again it is being proved that in unity there is strength, and that if those who believe in God don't hang together, they are going to hang separately.

The old, and those rapidly approaching that state, do not merit too much concern. But American children and grandchildren have a right to inherit at least a nation somewhat resembling the kind of nation which their parents and grandparents inherited. Financial estate planning is important, but only to those with financial assets of any importance. But there is also a spiritual estate planning which the Nation has not been paying too much attention to, and every American has the kind of assets involved in that kind of planning.

Fort Sheridan Celebrates 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, Fort Sheridan, which lies in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, is celebrating this year its 75th anniversary of permanent military construction at this post. Indeed, it was 76 years ago that the Congress appropriated funds for this purpose and Fort Sheridan's destiny as a great bastion of defense and freedom was ordained.

As Representative in Congress for the 12th Congressional District, I am proud to report today to the Members of the House Fort Sheridan's glorious history of service to our country.

In 1887 a group of Chicago citizens, desiring the honor as well as the security of an Army post in close proximity to Chicago, offered a tract of land on the shores of Lake Michigan for a military reservation. By joint resolution of Congress on March 3, 1887, the offer was accepted.

During the first 10 years of its history, Fort Sheridan began to build a firm foundation as a military installation which served the purposes of freedom for the next 77 years.

Following the battleship *Maine* incident in 1898 and our country's subsequent participation in the Spanish-American War, Fort Sheridan's military life changed. From vigilance and intensive training, there was the movement of combat troops and medical personnel enroute to staging areas for embarkation to areas of conflict. This defense activity continued on through the Philippine Insurrection period of 1899–1902. The troop strength of the post fluctuated as soldiers moved in and out of Fort Sheridan—to Cuba, the Philippines and China.

In 1913 Fort Sheridan responded to the disturbance on our country's southern border. The Mexican campaign served as a prolog for Fort Sheridan's greater role in carrying out a mission in defense of freedom.

In 1915 Fort Sheridan became the Nation's first post other than Plattsburg, N.Y., modeled after the Plattsburg plan of voluntary military training for officers.

With the actual declaration of war with Germany, the War Department assigned Fort Sheridan the responsibility to train officers from Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, thus creating the most active officer training camp in the country.

Another milestone in the history of Fort Sheridan was the operation of its General Hospital No. 28 which became the Army's largest and most efficient hospital during 1918 and 1919. More than 60,000 patients passed through this hospital in these 2 years.

During this period, the impact of Fort Sheridan in the Midwest was felt when the Michigan Avenue Link Bridge was completed sooner than other civilian projects at the close of the war because the War Department ruled that the road from Sheridan to the Loop in Chicago was a military necessity and released the restriction on steel to complete the bridge.

In 1921, the hospital was officially closed and replaced by a garrison of infantry, cavalry, and artillery troops. In the 1930's Fort Sheridan moved forward with developments in a changing U.S. Army wherein the installation's cavalry and field artillery units were replaced by coast artillery units.

As a result of the first peacetime draft on October 29, 1940, Fort Sheridan's Re-

cruit Reception Center was established as one of the earliest of 13 centers in our country.

It was in March 1942 that Fort Sheridan became the center for the training of antiaircraft units, commonly called AAATC. This program was a part of the sweeping reorganization of the War Department to foster unity and celerity of control, a broad decentralization of detail, and a more intimate relation between air and ground fighting.

Toward the end of 1942 the first members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, later renamed the Women's Army Corps, arrived at Fort Sheridan. The WAC unit continued to render outstanding service throughout the years at this post.

Other major projects during the 1940's included (a) participation in the nationwide programs of rehabilitation of wounded veterans, (b) reception of a half million inductees through selective service and reenlistment, (c) separation of an average of 1,500 servicemen a day in the postwar progressive demobilization, and (d) administration of 46 branch prisoner of war camps in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

In the years since World War II, the post was assigned new missions in the modern U.S. Army and became the hub of logistical support for a network of Nike missile-launching sites directed by the commanding general, 5th Region, U.S. Army Air Defense Command, with headquarters at Fort Sheridan.

The air defense of the great Midwest was centered at Fort Sheridan in the mid-1950's. Antiaircraft units gave way to the highly automatic present-day Nike defense systems to which the major portion of Fort Sheridan's annual budget provides logistical support.

In 1961, with more sophisticated Nike weapons employed, the air defense support lines from Fort Sheridan extended to Minneapolis, Minn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Chicago, Ill.; and Gary, Ind. In 1962 it was announced that the logistical support of the Detroit area Nike sites was to be assigned to Fort Sheridan by 1965. The Nike sites so supported out of Fort Sheridan will protect over one-fourth of the population and industry of the United States.

Besides Nike mission support, Fort Sheridan was given the responsibility for other support missions to each of the 13 Midwest States which comprise the 5th Army of the United States. This very extensive area support in various technical and administrative fields is being administered through the installation at Fort Sheridan and several satellite subposts in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

The Secretary of Defense recommended recently that the 5th Army Command Headquarters should be transferred from Chicago to Fort Sheridan. In accordance with the recommendation, the House of Representatives has approved an appropriation of funds for construction of the new 5th Army Administration Building. Accordingly, Fort Sheridan which celebrates in 1964 the 75th anniversary of its first permanent military construction accepts its role as the proud administrative center of 5th Army activities.

This Defense Department move toward a more economic and efficient military operation assures a new and greater position in history for Fort Sheridan. As the seat of command in the 13-State area of the 5th Army, Fort Sheridan will continue to promote freedom and security throughout the Nation.

Judge Parker Merrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of Judge Parker Merrow, of New Hampshire, was a loss to our State and to the Nation. As editor and publisher of the Carroll County Independent, of Center Ossippee, he wrote in a friendly down-to-earth style and his wisdom and sagacious comments were widely appreciated and respected. Besides being a newspaperman, Merrow was a municipal judge in his home community and took an active part in the public affairs of New Hampshire.

Although Parker Merrow was not a resident of my congressional district, I am saddened by the death of this distinguished civic leader and feel it is a privilege to join Senator NORRIS COTTON in paying tribute to him. On April 28 Senator COTTON presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2093, a perceptively written editorial from the North Conway N.H., Reporter, eulogizing Judge Merrow.

Illustrating the high esteem in which he was held by his fellow newspapermen, the Plymouth N.H., Record, on April 23 published an excellent editorial in honor of their friend and associate Judge Parker Merrow which I would like to have included here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JUDGE PARKER MERROW

All are saddened by the loss of a departed loved one, good neighbor or close friend—yet seldom, if ever, grievous over the passing of a stranger or casual acquaintance. So it seemed unusual when just such a heavy-hearted emotion came over us this week with the news of the death of Parker Merrow of Center Ossipee. It kind of struck us that this was a pretty fair measure of the greatness of this man.

Judge Parker Merrow was editor and publisher of the Carroll County Independent of Center Ossipee and the Granite State News, Wolfeboro—and would on occasion drop in to "talk shop" with his fellow brethren of the newspaper world. It was on one of these rare visits that we had the pleasure of meeting this unusual man and it was an experience we shall never forget. For Judge Merrow conveyed an appearance that shouted out—here isn't just an ordinary man, but an individualist right out of the pages of "My most unforgettable character." For how many editors and publishers do you know who, attired in their back shop finery, toured the countryside on a motorcycle. Judge Parker Merrow did. How many do you know who devoted their all to their profession, not even allowing themsleves time for the pursuit of other pleasures. Judge Parker Merrow did. And how many do you know who served on the bench, par excellence, for over 20 years. Judge Parker Merrow did.

Yes; this man was truly unique in all this world. Yet, the true measure of his greatness is to be found in the "Country Jake" style of his columns which attained nationwide prominence. The droll manner of his writing displayed his deep respect and abiding faith in his fellow man. The literary world has lost an admirable performer.

Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, important hearings are now being conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary here in the House of Representatives on several resolutions which would provide for an amendment to our Constitution to permit prayer and the reading if Biblical Scriptures in our public schools. It is easy for one's emotions to run rampant on this question. It is easy to reach a snap decision. Prayer in our public schools? Why not? A more serious question is involved, however, and I think it deserves a full hearing and a careful consideration of all viewpoints. Freedom of religion is very much a part of our priceless heritage in our country, and I commend to the membership an article carried in the May 1964 issue of the New Age magazine, the official publication of the Scottish Rite supreme council. It was written by Luther A. Smith, supreme grand commander of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction, United States of America, and, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

Rumblings from Capitol Hill indicate there is some life left in the movement started many months ago to pass an amendment to the first amendment of the Constitution which would undertake to reverse the decisions of the Supreme Court in the prayer and Bible reading cases.

Our New Age readers and others interested in preserving religious freedom and separation of church and state should take note of this new agitation. The success of this movement would be disastrous to the religious harmony in the United States enjoyed by our people for nearly two centuries because of the famous 17-word sentence which the Founding Fathers put into the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The Supreme Court held in the cases referred to above that no governmental agency may formulate prayers or religious exercises and require them to be used in the public schools because to do so would violate the above provision of the Constitution. The purpose of the amendment which is proposed in the Congress is to change the law so that State governments may have

the power to set up religious establishments and teach religious practices in the public schools.

The question will immediately arise as to which of the more than 200 different religions will be taught. Since nothing arouses the ire of people more than religious controversy, will it not be a distinct disservice to our schools and children to make the schoolrooms arenas for such squabbles? It will be a big step backward toward the days of religious intolerance and persecution. Our public schools are secular institutions dedicated to teaching academic subjects such as mathematics, geography, the languages, history, etc. During school hours let nothing interfere with or hamper the success of this great educational process.

If the parents in the homes and the ministers and laymen in the churches and Sunday schools cannot teach children such religious and spiritual subjects as they may need, we are really in a bad way and have been derelict in discharging the responsibility reposed in us by the Founders when they implicitly said that religion is a matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the people and with which the Government is prohibited to have anything to do. Public schools are agencies of the Government.

The very integrity and usefulness of the public schools are involved in this question. If the teachers are to be called upon to teach religion and religious practices as an official part of the curriculum, a little reflection upon human nature and experience would seem to indicate that there would be confusion, disharmony, controversy, and distraction among the children and their parents—all to the injury of the educational character of the schools and their social peace and harmony.

It is hoped that the readers of the New Age and all friends of the public schools will see the dangers involved in tampering with the constitutional safeguards established by the Founding Fathers for the protection of religious liberty in these schools. The only safe way to do it is to rely on ourselves, our homes, Sunday schools, and churches to teach religion and religious practices to our children and to deny all governmental agencies any and all power to discharge that duty for us. That is the law of the land now. If we wish it to remain so, a message to our Senators and Congressmen will help. Just say "I hope you will vote against the amendment to amend the religious establishment clause of the Constitution."

Sincerely and fraternally,

LUTHER A. SMITH,
Sovereign Grand Commander.

MAY 1964.

Bonneville Power Stifles Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments often given in defense of public power is that it provides low-cost energy to spur industrial growth and provide new jobs.

The fallacy of that argument is indicated by recent correspondence and newspaper accounts reaching me.

Western Phosphates, Inc., has reported that it cannot develop the large phosphate reserves near Vernal, Utah, if a competitor, Monsanto Chemical Co., is able to get public power at about one-third its own rate.

J. R. Simplot Co., of Pocatello, Idaho, has abandoned a proposed $4 million expansion in its phosphate fertilizer plant because of the subsidized power planned for Monsanto.

The result, of course, is reduced private investment and less employment.

Cause of this concern is the plan of the Bonneville Power Administration, an agency of the Interior Department, to bring public power into Soda Springs, Idaho, to sell to Monsanto for 2.2 mills.

All it is asking Congress for is $1 million to plan the line. If the request is granted, BPA will be back later for more money to build the line.

This is extremely unfair to the owners and workers of the private utilities; to the owners and workers of firms undercut by the cheap power; to coal miners and owners who supply fuel for commercial power generation, and to the taxpayers, whose tax base would be reduced, but tax burden increased.

This tax-sheltered operation has no other purpose than the enlargement and perpetuation of BPA.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members would find interesting the enclosed item published in the Salt Lake Tribune of April 2, 1964:

SIMPLOT JUNKS PLAN, HITS BPA

J. R. Simplot Co., Pocatello, Idaho, Saturday said it was canceling a $4 million investment, which would bring employment to 50 persons, because of the Bonneville Power Administration-Monsanto Chemical Co. contract.

W. Grant Kilbourne, vice president and general manager of the Simplot fertilizer combine, asserted the two and two-tenths mill contract between the Federal power agency and Monsanto, one of the Nation's largest chemical companies, discriminates against the "wet process" producers of phosphate fertilizers.

Simplot is the largest regional producer of high analysis phosphate farm fertilizers. It is totally a "wet process" producer.

The $4 million investment halted Saturday was on the "final phase" of investment by Simplot, which in the last 18 months had doubled its operation. Mr. Kilbourne said that Simplot in the last 8 years had increased production by tenfold.

"J. R. Simplot Co. at Pocatello, Idaho, now has over $25 million invested in plant facilities, made in good faith, and there are 1,000 families depending on this investment for a livelihood," Mr. Kilbourne said.

The executive charged that the BPA-Monsanto contract "will reduce Monsanto's production costs of its finished products by approximately 20 percent, which is far more than the entire profit margin of the wet process producers."

(High analysis phosphate fertilizers may be produced by the so-called wet process, employing sulfuric acid treatment of phosphate rock ore or through electric furnace reduction of the ore. Monsanto is scheduling an expansion of electric furnace operations at Soda Springs, Idaho, as a result of the two and two-tenths mill power contract with BPA.)

Mr. Kilbourne said that the BPA contract "discriminates so strongly against our (wet process) half of the phosphate industry as to amount to a collusion between a Government agency and a giant billion dollar corporation * * * as to force the wet process producer out of business."

"Monsanto," he charged, "will be in a position to dominate the fertilizer industry of the area at the expense of home-owned Idaho industry.

For every job created through expansion by Monsanto or other electric furnace producers with the aid of tax-subsidized Bonneville power, there will be two jobs destroyed in our wet process industry in Idaho," he said.

Mr. Kilbourne stressed that there were other "wet process" producers who have acquired phosphate holdings in Idaho and are actively pl ıning plant construction who will be frozen out by the predatory encroachment of Bonneville power into an otherwise well-balanced, highly competive and rapidly growing phosphate industry."

Selling two and two-tenths mill power to Monsanto—at less than one-half of production—is akin to forming a "Bonneville Sulphuric Acid Administration" to sell acid to wet process producers at less than one-half of the present cost of such acid, Mr. Kilbourne said.

He charged that "bureaucrats and politicians who are backing Bonneville Power have failed in their obligation to the people to recognize the valid arguments against such power as presented by wet processors of phosphate materials in the past many months.

"They have simply ignored the fact that there are two entirely different methods of making phosphatic fertilizers, each equally modern and efficient and each very competitive with the other," he said.

The Wabash Valley Association of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, approximately 300 members of the Wabash Valley Association from Indiana and Illinois are visiting Washington, D.C., this week to attend a series of hearings and meetings concerning flood control and water resource projects.

The expense of these annual trips here to meet with Members of Congress and the various agencies, including the Army Corps of Engineers, is borne by the members themselves who are dedicated to the improvement and conservation of their communities.

It is the pleasure of many of us in the Indiana congressional delegation each year to welcome these hard-working and sincere association members and join them in a series of conferences in which we discuss ways to improve and expedite the various projects proposed for our areas in Indiana and Illinois.

One of the highlights of the 3-day round of activities for members of the Wabash Valley Association is their joint appearance before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to present the requests for fiscal 1965 appropriations.

It was my privilege again this year to appear with our association members and unanimous consent, I include my remarks before the subcommittee in the RECORD.

The remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SIXTH INDIANA CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, ROOM H-140, U.S. CAPITOL, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1964, 2 P.M.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members of the Wabash Valley Association, and members of the Indiana congressional delegation, please allow me to express our sincere thanks for the very generous allotment of time you have granted us to present our requests today.

We are quite aware of the great demands on your time, and we are deeply appreciative.

As proponents and residents of the great Wabash River Valley, we are deeply indebted to this distinguished committee.

If the gratitude of Indiana, Illinois, and other of our neighboring States could be measured in dollars and cents—and that is impossible, of course—it would amount to approximately $290 million—a figure that is nine times more than the total amount requested for flood control projects in Indiana for fiscal 1965.

I didn't pull that figure of $290 million out of thin air. That is the amount of damages prevented by the Corps of Engineers projects during the severe flooding along the Ohio River Basin just last month.

The flood control and water resource projects that this committee has been allocating to our region are paying off in terms of property damage avoided, lives saved, crops conserved, and all the other ravages of floods that have cost our citizens millions and millions of dollars.

Although I support all of the projects requested by the Wabash Valley Association, I will direct my remarks to two areas with which I am vitally interested and are of particular concern in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District.

Of paramount importance to the residents of the Wabash Valley is the completion by 1967 of the comprehensive Wabash River Basin study.

This study will provide us with the knowledge and information necessary for orderly and responsible scheduling of our future projects necessary for the progress of the entire Wabash Valley.

I respectfully request that the amount of $778,000 be allocated for fiscal 1965 to continue this comprehensive study. This amount represents the Corps of Engineers recommended capability for the fiscal year.

The other project for which I want to lend my sincerest recommendation is a $50,000 item for planning work on the proposed Big Pine Creek Reservoir in Warren County, Ind.

This project near the Williamsport-Attica area is another vital link in a series of reservoirs on the Wabash River that are adding immeasurably to our ability to cope with flood threats, relieve drought conditions and provide wholesome and healthy outdoor recreation facilities for our people.

This Big Pine project has been approved by the district, division, and Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, and I am most pleased to report that this week the final report of the project is scheduled to be transmitted with the signature of approval from the Secretary of the Army to the Bureau of the Budget.

We are anticipating early authorization requests to the Public Works Committee, and approval of our planning request by this committee would insure the earliest possible start on this long-awaited and most justifiable project.

Big Pine will be a 1,390-acre reservoir draining 333 square miles.

The damsite will be 2.5 miles upstream from the juncture of Big Pine Creek and the Wabash River in Warren County. Army Engineers estimate they will need about 8,300 acres for the project.

Late last fall, it was my privilege once again to tour the area selected for this reservoir. Together with members of the Wabash Valley Association—many of whom are here with us today—we walked and drove over this beautful area which offers one of the most natural and logical reservoir sites we have ever viewed.

Big Pine will supplement previously authorized corps' projects including Cagles Mill Reservoir on Mill Creek, Mansfield Reservoir on Raccoon Creek, and the Mississinewa, Salamonie, and Huntington Reservoirs in the Upper Wabash Basin, agricultural levees, urban protection projects, and projects of other Federal and non-Federal agencies.

I wish to thank the committee again for the time allotted the Wabash Valley Association, and urge your most careful consideration of our requests. We believe our presentation is a frugal and careful assessment of the water resource and flood control needs for the Wabash Valley, and certainly every penny of this money, as in past years, will be a most wise investment in the future growth and progress of this area in the heartland of America.

Thank you.

Cultural Coshocton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the size of a city is not always an indication of its cultural advantages, Coshocton, Ohio, has a population of 12,000 and yet it houses one of the most impressive collections of western Indian artifacts in the country. The Johnson-Humrickhouse Memorial Museum is the envy of many cities 10 times the size of Coshocton. Being an Ohioan I share the pride that the citizens of Coshocton have in this memorial museum and I invite others who may be traveling through our State this summer to visit Coshocton. They not only will enjoy the fine museum collection, but they will also find their stay in this friendly Ohio town a most pleasurable experience. The article which I am now inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD gives more detailed information about the Johnson-Humrickhouse Memorial Museum:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 28, 1964]

ARTIFACTS CROWD OHIO MUSEUM

COSHOCTON, OHIO.—In a museum in this pleasant town of some 12,000 people, in east-central Ohio, is one of the most comprehensive collections of Western Indian artifacts in the United States.

The Johnson-Humrickhouse Memorial Museum basket collection displays more than 900 known weaves, the baskets being made of almost every material used from Point Barrow to Mexico, by Indians and Eskimos. Baskets woven from osiers, reeds, and grasses of many types, to be used for cooking, carrying, storing, are all on exhibit, from tiny household items to huge containers, including papoose carriers.

Slate and wood carving by the Haida Indians of Alaska portray animals and figures prominent in Indian legends. Many good examples of Eskimo arts and crafts show their interests in seals and other arctic marine and land animals.

INDIAN CRAFTS

From the Southwest come collections of pottery from the Rio Grande area, and Navajo blankets and silver work. The Plains Indians are represented by splendidly executed pieces of quill and beadwork.

There is a large group of clay heads, figurines, and pottery from Mexico, also a number of serapes woven with materials colored with native plant dyes.

The Moundbuilders culture of the Ohio region has yielded much of great interest, including what is known as the Wyrick "Holy Stone." This stone was found by David Wyrick in an Indian mound in 1860 and shows nine Commandments written in Hebrew.

Among the important collections are Chinese porcelains, and many objects from India, Japan, and elsewhere in the Orient. On display is a collection of vases, jars, bowls, and dishes, mostly from the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties, along with Chinese lacquers and cloisonne pieces.

The Chinese exhibit also contains fine carved jade pieces, as well as carvings in amber, ivory, and wood.

India is represented by embroideries, brass, copper, bamboo, and rattan objects; Japan by embroideries, porcelains, wood block prints, and bronze articles.

From Indonesia come figurines and tapa cloth. There is a small but very interesting collection of swords, knives, and armor from Japan, India, and the Philippines. In the gun collection is one very rare item, a square-bore gun from Tibet.

Local history is not neglected. A good collection of implements and furnishing used by pioneer families in Cochocton has been given to the museum. One appealing item is a hand warmer that carried coals.

The museum displays a few pieces of the rare Sandwich glass. Unique to this museum are four pieces of pottery made from local clay, part of the first production of pottery in Coschocton in 1903. It is quit fitting that the clay pieces be exhibited here, for the building, formerly a schoolhouse, was built in 1853 from brick formed from clay dug on the site.

Kennedy Half, Plan of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, complaints from the 15th Congressional District of New Jersey and other areas are mounting on the unfair and unsatisfactory methods of distributing the Kennedy half dollar.

Several constituents have written to me, pointing out that they are unable to purchase this cherished half dollar which honors a great and popular President.

Congress should take immediate steps to assure fair, reasonable, and satisfactory methods of distributing the Kennedy half dollar.

An editorial by Alexander Jones, chief editorial writer of the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., enumerates what remedial steps should be taken to

accomplish an effective plan of action for distribution. This plan should be put into operation now.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Apr. 28, 1964]

KENNEDY HALF, PLAN OF ACTION

Official Washington, with the exception of Middlesex County's Representative ED PATTEN, refused to be alerted to the problems of the Kennedy half dollar before they arose.

Now official Washington knows it has a scandal on its hands. The Kennedy half is in the hands of the speculators and the quick-buck guys are making fortunes. The manufacturers of cheap jewelry have them too. Even a New York department store is advertising a cheap key ring with a Kennedy half attached, at $2.95.

But official Washington doesn't know what to do. Treasury thinks the problem belongs to Federal Reserve. Federal Reserve thinks the problem is Treasury's. Both would be relieved if Congress would "do something."

Here are some of the things that can be done to avert the mushrooming of the scandal.

Federal Reserve shipped to its district banks the first 26 million of Kennedy halves, on a quota basis. It doesn't plan to repeat this. Federal Reserve in New York, for instance, does not now plan to order any more Kennedy halves. It, and the other banks, should be forced to take Kennedy halves for the areas they serve.

Federal Reserve, too, should order the district banks to mix the Kennedy halves in with the substantial supplies of Franklin and Walking Liberty halves they now have. This would put the coins in circulation for a while, instead of in bags for speculators.

What can Treasury do? Well, despite its assertions that it could mint only 90 million Kennedy halves in the year 1964, it managed to strike around 45 million in the first quarter of the year. It could maintain production at that level and the speculators might be forced to unload.

Another thing that Treasury could do would be to announce that it plans to continue minting the Kennedy half dollar with the 1964 date through the years ahead. This might require congressional backing, and it would be a radical departure from past policies. But actually, the placing of a date on coins, and the placing of mint marks on them, go far back into the dim past when such checks were required to make sure the mintmaster didn't shortweight the Nation with his coins. There's no chance of that now. And the interest of the speculators in the coin would wane immediately if they knew it would become plentiful.

Finally, of course, if Congress wants to, it can adopt a suggestion made by us a good while ago, and place the rest of this year's mintage of Kennedy halves in the hands of the post offices, to be distributed one-to-a-customer, at 50 cents per coin, until the little people and the children of the Nation who want this beautiful memento of a martyred president have had their natural desire fulfilled.

These are the things that can be done.

But will they be done?

The Rail Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, everyone in America is relieved that the threatened railroad strike was solved at the bargaining table. Our entire Nation could have been thrown into the grip of an inexorable vise had the railroads become idle.

All Americans are grateful that union leadership and railroad management, working together with President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, settled these points by collective bargaining.

This settlement was a tremendous compliment to President Johnson and his leadership—the type of leadership that distinguished him as the greatest majority leader in the history of the U.S. Senate.

I include in my remarks two editorials—one from the Dallas Morning News and the other from the San Angelo Standard-Times—of April 24 which express in a perfect manner the deep appreciation we all have for President Johnson and his leadership:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 24, 1964]

RAIL SETTLEMENT

Almost as important as settlement of the rail dispute is how it was done. President Johnson climbed far out on the bending willow limb and made it a personal crisis by inviting management and labor negotiators for day-and-night arguing under his nose in the White House. He dropped by several times a day for a psychological effect. He did not extend a casual Presidential request, as so many Chief Executives have done; he put the feet of contestants to the White House fire and told them to sit and work until they had reached agreement.

It was not so much the force of governmental intervention; it was a Johnson invention. And in the personal challenge of persuasion, the Texan is a genius.

In saying that the settlement was more of a Johnsonian intervention than a governmental intervention, the News is mindful that he represents a powerful office. It is true, too, that the long-simmering dispute represented a collision between big labor and big business—which often necessitates a knocking together of heads of big government.

But the technique of using the power of the Presidency was significant. He did not dictate; he persuaded. He did not threaten; he pleaded.

Mr. Johnson's performance was also a tremendous boost to the principle of collective bargaining. He told negotiators at the start of their work at the White House that he had not taken a hand in the case to bury this time-honored American way of settling labor disputes.

Settlement itself makes reasonable awards of points in which both sides emerge with enough gains to overshadow any lasting sense of defeat. Railroad workers as a whole won increased pay without an overturn of the basic wage structure based on miles of a working run as well as the 8-hour day. The railroads scored importantly in the agreement that road crews may be used to a limited extent for certain kinds of yard work after bringing a train into a terminal. The carriers are also allowed to reduce the number of crewmen on self-propelled track repair and maintenance equipment.

In general, the issues resolved were secondary to the toughest one—that of featherbedding costing the railroads $500 million a year in the form of unneeded firemen on diesel locomotives in freight-train service.

Congress last year placed that costly practice under compulsory arbitration, in which the railroads won the decision. Railway labor, barred from striking against that arbitration award, elected to use these secondary issues as a strike threat.

Present settlement is a welcome relief from that devastating threat and a triumph of sanity and good will in which all parties may take great satisfaction.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times, Apr. 24, 1964]

OLD "CAN DO" JOHNSON STANDING TALLER NOW

President Johnson is no magician and he wears a different kind of hat in the Texas style. But he proved that it makes little difference what kind of a hat a man wears, he can occasionally pull a rabbit therefrom.

The rabbit this time was a life-sized animal that had been threatening the economy of the Nation—a railroad strike potential that could have cost the Nation vast million of dollars, increased unemployment percentages, and damaged the image of Presidential leadership. He had gambled that in prevailing on the railroads and labor to accept a delay while negotiators mulled over their problems.

It appeared that only one side would be bargaining during the 15 days respite inasmuch as the railroads had already agreed to the recommendations of a couple of Presidential boards before this and to court findings. Labor had refused to accept a reduction in the number of unnecessary employees.

Labor leaders had threatened moves to nationalize the railroads if they didn't get their demands.

The unions had the power to wreck the Nation's prosperity and a political party's hopes.

It is doubtful they would have accepted the compromises unless they could count gains in some areas. The agreement will not give the rails all they desired in changing the rules. But the compromise will be good for the country, and President Johnson says it allows for needed modernization of lines to survive and prosper.

Negotiators on both sides are to be commended for their moderation, for ending strife that has existed for more than 4 years, and for yielding to the public good, whether that came from Presidential pressure or the innate good sense of the opposing sides.

A good many things depend on peace in the transportation industry. Business decisions were being delayed and there was a bit of foot tapping by investors as they waited the decision of negotiators. Stabilization of the economy should be more certain as a result.

Mr. Johnson added immensely to his image of a "can do" President as he solved a problem that two of his predecessors could not.

Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, full study and serious and careful consideration must be given to the resolutions which have been introduced in this Congress to provide for an amendment to our Constitution which would permit prayer and the reading from the Bible in our public schools. For this reason, I am pleased with the extensive hearings on the question now being held before the Judiciary Committee. Wide judgment must be exercised for we are dealing with free-

dom of religion and the separation of church and state, principles that are basic to our country's greatness. All Members should conscientiously explore the implications of the resolutions that have been introduced and with this in mind I commend for study an editorial by my good friend Reuben E. Alley, which was carried in the April 23, 1964, issue of his excellent Virginia Baptist publication, the Religious Herald. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Annoyance at the U.S. Supreme Court decision against prescribed Bible reading and prayer in public schools provoked a number of Congressmen to offer an amendment to the Constitution that would make ineffective the first amendment as an instrument for separation of church and state. At first these proposed amendments received scant attention because few people with understanding of religious liberty believed that such a threat would gain serious consideration by responsible citizens. It is now apparent that the sense of security was too great. Zealous advocates have already put into operation forces that are shaking the foundations of religious liberty, the greatest contribution by America to the cause of human freedom. In at least two cities of Virginia teenage boys and girls have appeared on the streets asking for signatures to a petition in support of the proposed Becker amendment. Bearing in mind the highly emotional nature of this appeal, sponsors for the amendment could hardly find a more effective way to secure help from the casual citizen. It is a matter of grave concern that those who seek this, or similar amendments, are sometimes receiving comfort from Baptists; for surely members of this denomination should not, through indifference or lack of understanding, turn against the distinctive principle for which Baptists paid so dearly prior to the American Revolution.

James Madison, who played an important role in framing the Constitution and later led the Virginia Convention in approval of the document, was a Member of the first House of Representatives which met at New York in April 1789. Early in May of that year the Representative from Virginia gave notice of an intention to bring for consideration of the body, certain amendments to the Constitution. Most of the States, in adopting the Constitution, had asked for amendments of various kinds. Conventions in Massachusetts, South Carolina, New Hampshire, Virginia, and North Carolina had indicated a need for a bill of rights. It was late August before Madison could get a hearing for his amendments. Since his chief interest was in religious freedom, Madison gave careful attention to wording this amendment and in guiding it through periods of debate. Previously he had expressed fear of a bill of rights, because "the rights of conscience in particular, if submitted to public definition, would be narrowed much more than they are likely ever to be by an assumed power." Experience with Patrick Henry in Virginia had warned Madison against statements of pretense in matters related to religious freedom. The first draft of the amendment by Madison read: "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious beliefs or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext, abridged." After committee action, Madison offered a shorter form which the House approved: "Congress shall make no law abridging religion, or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience." The Senate refused the amendment as it came from the House, but later approved a revision formulated by a joint committee, and this became a part of the first amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This concise statement embodied the idea that Madison had in mind—a complete separation of church and state. A year earlier Madison made clear his meaning on the subject during the debate in the Virginia Convention: "There is not a shadow of right in the General Government to intermeddle with religion. Its interference with it, would be a flagrant usurpation."

Such ideas expertly expressed by "The father of the Constitution" in correspondence and in debate, are in direct conflict with provisions of the amendment proposed by Representative FRANK J. BECKER, of New York.

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

"Voluntary" is the key word in section 1 of the Becker document. The first amendment, as interpreted many times by the Supreme Court in recent years, assures full and unimpeded voluntary religious expression to all citizens under all circumstances. Worship is voluntary only when it arises from purely personal motives and finds expression under purely personal controls. The first section of the Becker proposal is contradictory, because it is impossible to recite a prayer or to read a passage from the Bible for hearing by the captive audience in a free public school and at the same time make participation by each member of the audience a voluntary act. The effect of section 1, if adopted, would be the nullification of the first amendment.

Section 2 by BECKER would nullify possible future decisions of the Supreme Court. Application may be to such proceedings as taking an oath of office, swearing witnesses, offering prayers in legislative halls and courtrooms, and engraving or impressing lengends on coins and currency. It seems unlikely that the Court would rule against these and similar practices, especially the use of the emotionally satisfying but meaningless legend "In God We Trust."

Sections 1 and 2 also raise important theological questions. The text speaks of "reading from, or listening to * * * Biblical Scriptures." "Biblical Scriptures" refer to writings in the Bible, but the Congressman does not say which Bible. The Christian Bible contains both Old Testament and New Testament, but for multitudes of Jewish citizens the New Testament is an offense. Then there is a problem about the Koran which is the sacred writing of Mohammedan citizens, and a problem about the sacred writings of Buddha who is worshipped by thousands of citizens in Hawaii. And still another problem with millions of citizens who accept no sacred writings. The text by Becker states that nothing shall prevent "reference to belief in, reliance upon * * * God or a Supreme Being * * * in any school, institution, or place." Here we have possibility for full religious worship in a public school or any other place. The word "reference" has limitless implications. The question arises about worship conducted by Protestant, Catholic, Mormon, Jewish, or Buddhist pastor or priest before the captive audience in a public school.

Supreme Court decisions upon prayer and Bible reading in public schools have disturbed citizens in many communities, because these citizens persist in looking at the problem from a local point of view. The Constitution is a national document and demands interpretation in terms of the total national life. Rulings of the Court may seem harsh to members of a homogeneous community which long ago accepted prayers and Bible reading in public schools as normal practice. Stirred by emotions of resentment people in these communities may thoughtlessly approve extremely harmful procedures in order to retain their illegal practices; thus good citizens may lose their birthright by allowing their emotions to supplant better judgment. To evaluate the Constitution citizens must lift their horizon and see that the United States is a tremendous complexity. In this complexity every citizen from Hawaii to Maine must have protection in the enjoyment of religious freedom as an individual right. And citizens must ever be mindful of the basic truth that by the American concept of democracy majority rule never applies where human rights become involved.

Public Apathy and Minority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission obtained to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, I include a very forthright and forcible speech delivered by Texas District Judge A. R. Stout, of Waxahachie, to a public gathering in Waco, Tex.

The thoughts expressed by Judge Stout on the trend of our Nation toward the socialistic welfare state is food for thought for all Americans who believe in the system of government devised by our forefathers.

The speech is as follows:

PUBLIC APATHY AND MINORITY RULE

For one, I am disturbed about how our Government is run for the benefit of minorities or rather how minority groups run our Government. I am disturbed about the power of men like Reuther and Hoffa and of the Reverend Martin Luther King and Roy Wilkins and the separate and collective power of the four to make Congress jump and Presidents tremble, without regard to the rights of any other citizen in these United States. Why can these four men, mere citizens holding no office, make a President flipflop and run like a cottontail rabbit, and Congress vote as they dictate? It is, of course, because of their militant political power and the apathy of the general public—you and me.

Why, if a free American wants not to join a labor union, should he be compelled to do so? Is it not slavery in reverse when he is forced to join a group against his will and to pay money to a cause he does not support? Yet I wonder how many presidential and senatorial aspirants in this country today would simply say, without babbling off into space, "I support the right-to-work law," a God-given right that is a part of our American heritage. Why do union heads want to unionize everybody and everything, including even farmers and Government employees, with the power to have a stranglehold on the economic and business interests of our Nation

and to strike against the Government itself? It is because of the economic and political power they would have to dictate that which they will to be done.

Every officeholder either wants a bloc vote or is apprehensive of one. It is always easy to go along with the majority and to yield to an insistent and persistent minority. That accounts for the passage by the House of Representatives, to quote Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, of "the most dangerous and far-reaching piece of legislation that was ever proposed before an American Congress." For the purpose of politics and propaganda it it referred to as civil rights, when actually it is one of the greatest civil wrongs that has ever been attempted to be foisted upon a people who are free or who want to be free. Almost every line of the whole bill, save for the creation of another commission when we already have one that is both active and aggressive, is invalid under American law and the Constitution of the United States, but no one knows what the Supreme Court of the United States may hold. The so-called public accommodations part of the bill is one of the least objectionable features of the whole measure, though this particular portion of the bill is a verbatim copy of an act that was passed by Congress shortly after the Civil War and held invalid by the Supreme Court in 1883. It is hard to believe that the exact language of what has been held invalid by a court would be again proposed to it unless the proponents are numbskulls or in possession of advance knowledge.

A man's place of business is not an open house to the public unless he so desires it. The invitation to the public is a qualified one. No one has to do business with him and he can forbid anyone from coming on his premises if he so chooses. This is recognized State and Federal law from our earliest history. Now, a man's home is his castle, where we have been taught for centuries under English and American law that no man—not even the King—can enter without the permission of the owner, and the same rule of law that governs his home applies to his private place of business. Others' rights end where your rights begin. The right of a man to be let alone and to run his own business is both a civil and God-given right, and a man has no freedom when he is denied the individual liberty to control that which is his own. If this be not true, then the next short step is to take his property away from him completely and divide it up or to take it over and run it by a governmental commissar. Where are we drifting when private property can no longer be protected and nothing is done to protect it against the hue and cry to make it free and divide it up?

There are drastic provisions in this politically dubbed civil rights bill which would require every American, particularly those engaged in public work of any kind, never to be guilty of discrimination in the employment of persons, no matter how incompetent, inefficient or insolent they may be. This is spelled out as to public work, and there are broad and loose terms that are general enough to include every kind of private employment known to mankind. This is what in parliamentary parlance is known as a joker. Upon a failure to meet these impossible ratios or anything else provided in the entire bill, any complainant or disgruntled person could subject the supposed offender to prosecution and imprisonment and heavy penalties and court costs, while the complainant would have furnished to him free of charge all of the Attorney General's 900 lawyers and all of the powers of the U.S. Government. Talk about discrimination and the power to force a man out of business, in many instances without a jury trial, if he does not kowtow in every way. This is only a part of the plot and scheme. By executive fiat and edict, every type of Federal aid in the field complained of (and at the last count there were around 200 of them), including blind relief, farm aid, payments to disabled veterans, old age pensions and retirement benefits could be summarily cut off from a community, district or even a whole sovereign State. Since 1215 A.D. the property of a convicted felon, let alone an untried citizen, could not be legally confiscated. In the same ruthless and un-American manner the election machinery and educational system of States could be taken over by Federal referees and agents. In short, the possibilities (if not the probabilities) under this bill are so great that it amounts to legalized villainy and treason. It penalizes our whole society. It is an insult to American intelligence, a disgrace to our form of government, and a discredit to our institutions. One percent of it is a cloak and the other 99 percent is Fascist power, pure and simple.

In the paraphrased words of John C. Satterfield, a great man and most able lawyer and president of the American Bar Association in 1961, this bill applies to you if you own a home upon which $1 is due to any agency doing any business with the State or Federal Government; if you are an employer or employee; belong to a union; work under civil service, whether Federal or State; pay a license tax to a State or city; offer goods or services to the public, business or professional; borrow money from a bank; deposit money in a bank; benefit from any Federal farm program; have a child in school; vote; receive or expect to receive social security, veterans' benefits, old-age pensions or retirement benefits. It will reduce States to mere appendages and "will, in fact, extend Federal control over business, industry and other individuals * * * in a degree that exceeds the total of such extensions of power by all judicial decisions and all congressional actions since the Constitution of the United States was adopted."

Casting aside the customs of centuries overnight and forcing association among people by Federal laws or bayonets or the further shedding of innocent citizens' blood or chanting mobbism is not going to solve the problems that confront this Nation. Such can only hurt everybody and set back harmonious relations. Nor will problems be met by those political saboteurs who stir up hate and violence and then tell us that we must love the seething hate and violence that they have unloosed. Such persons care nothing about either racial groups or individuals. They are interested solely in themselves and their own political hides. The problems of those who feel downtrodden are going to be solved only when they, by their own efforts, become better educated and reach a higher state of culture and civilization and when we all become a little better Christians—then and only then and not before.

Abraham Lincoln said a great many things worth remembering, and some of them would startle about 100 percent of those who look to him as an emblem of what they call civil rights. On American rights he said:

"You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong;

"You cannot help small men by tearing down big men;

"You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich;

"You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer;

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income;

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatreds;

"You cannot establish security on borrowed money;

"You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence;

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

These truisms by Lincoln have not changed any more than have the Ten Commandments and human nature has changed very little since Christ trod this earth's surface.

The Constitution does not guarantee any man anything except liberty. It does not guarantee that he shall have money or property; in fact, property is not mentioned in the document, though it is implicit that he shall be secure in the property that he acquires or does have. The Declaration of Independence guarantees only life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our heritage and history is that we shall work for what we get, and that God helps those who help themselves.

We have one safeguard that still stands like an ancient sacrifice and that is the average, hard working man who loves his country and is unafraid. He is not the rich man—it is never any trouble to gang up against him—nor the lazy no-account—any demagog who promises more can drown him in the nearest river or lead him to his own destruction. It is the middleman who is the backbone of our civilization and who has accomplished the things most worthwhile in it. He is the man the Communists and the Socialists throughout the world hate most, for they cannot enlist or destroy him. He is the man who furnishes the leadership in war and peace and the one man who cannot be fooled all of the time. We depend heavily upon him for he is the bulwark of our future.

I hope that I am wrong, but as surely as I stand here today, if this bill is passed in its present form, we will be a Socialist republic, beyond hope or redemption, within the next 10 to 20 years. The American dream will have become a myth and American liberty, as we have known it, will be no more. The poor barber in Ohio will be forced to open his shop and cut the hair of customers that he does not want, and an evil tyranny will reign over all men and all business, for we will have become a nation of Socialist slaves.

Those Senators who are giving battle to this monstrous and iniquitous measure, hatched in the minds of fanatics and radicals under the cloak of racism, are fighting for the liberty of all men and all Americans just as much so as did those early Texans at the Battle of San Jacinto when Deaf Smith uttered those historic words: "I have cut down Vince's bridge. Now fight for your lives." If they should fail in their valiant effort, dark indeed will be the future of our Republic, for the lights will have gone out not only in the White House but all over America, never to be turned on again.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the urban renewal program is a fact of life and one that has done, and is doing, much good for the community of Syracuse, N.Y., which I am honored to represent.

It was with considerable interest that I noted the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's position that this program should be terminated.

The rebuttal to this view was swift and vehement from the Syracuse unit of the chamber of commerce. The view it expressed is that the clock cannot be turned back now when so much has been

accomplished economically and esthetically for our community and more is to be done.

To further explain the local thoughts on this matter, I would like to insert here an editorial from the Syracuse Herald-American and an article by Kenneth F. Sparrow, business editor of that newspaper.

They follow:

[From the Syracuse Herald-American, Apr. 26, 1964]

LOCAL UNIT OPPOSES U.S. CHAMBER

(By Kenneth F. Sparrow)

The Greater Syracuse Chamber of Commerce's policy on Federal urban renewal programs is directly opposed to that of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The national chamber is asking the administration and the Congress to terminate the Federal urban renewal and public housing programs and to turn the responsibility for community development back to community leaders.

SYRACUSE DISAGREES

Morrill A. Mace, president, and William H. Brennan, executive vice president, assert that the Greater Syracuse Chamber does not support this policy.

Their opinion is that the only way in which programs for elimination of slums, blight, deterioration of both residential and business areas can be accomplished is by Government and private enterprise working hand in hand.

Brennan points out that while the city of Syracuse in its urban renewal program is continuing to press for the original Federal objectives; namely, the elimination of residential slums and blight, amendments to the law now make possible rebuilding and renewal of commercial areas, particularly central business districts.

LOCAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS

"This new approach is also supported by the Greater Syracuse Chamber," he said. "Our local government sees, in large-scale rebuilding, rehabilitation of some structures and demolition of obsolete buildings, a chance for central cities to maintain or regain their role as the economic heart of the area.

"It was in support of this policy that the chamber appeared twice this year at public hearings to support the development of the so-called office-center plan in which MONY Plaza will be located."

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber, has announced that a research study of the Federal urban renewal and public housing subsidy programs show that the Federal Government, in effect, is taking from the poor to subsidize the rich—that is, the less well-off communities are taxed to give Federal subsidies to the more affluent communities.

Brennan asserts that urban renewal, although supported in large part by Federal funds, is still predominantly a local project in which local government and citizens combine to develop a plan.

VOLUNTARILY ACCEPTED

"It is not something which is imposed on any community by the Federal Government because local citizens and their elected representatives have the final word as to what they want to do," he added.

Brennan went on to explain that some communities have refused urban renewal. However, insofar as Syracuse is concerned in connection with both slum clearance and business economic development, the programs are thoroughly reviewed with citizen participation before adoption.

"The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in its policy, has consistently opposed the use of Federal funds for urban renewal," he explained. "It states that the problems of slum clearance, elimination of blight, and commercial revitalization are solely a local problem and should be handled locally.

UNITS AUTONOMOUS

"While the Greater Syracuse Chamber of Commerce is affiliated with the U.S. Chamber, it is autonomous so far as policy is concerned. While in agreement with a vast majority of the policies of the U.S. Chamber, the Greater Syracuse Chamber of Commerce has not supported the U.S. Chamber policy insofar as urban renewal is concerned.

"It is our opinion that the only way in which the programs for elimination of slums, blight, deterioration of both residential and business areas can be accomplished is by Government and private enterprise working hand in hand. In large-scale downtown developments, the Federal Government's strong power of eminent domain is needed, as well as the moneys made available for clearing of the land so that a private enterprise may develop the area."

Mace commented that from the very beginning of the urban renewal program in Syracuse, the chamber of commerce regarded it as a most important factor in the development of the city. A special committee on urban renewal was appointed early in the fall of 1958 under the chairmanship of Kenneth G. Bartlett with Earle R. Hollings as cochairman.

COMMITTEE ACTION

This committee met frequently with city urban renewal officials and, with the assistance of the Syracuse Governmental Research Bureau, made recommendations to the city regarding the development of the program.

These included the reduction of public reuse of land from 66 to 53 acres, appointment of an official citizens council on urban renewal, realinement of the Community Plaza to better complement downtown, a comprehensive market analysis survey in order to provide a sound basis for redevelopment plans, and a general or master land use plan to be developed to show the relation of urban renewal to the future plans for the city.

Chamber of commerce representation at the first public hearing on the project in May 1960 described the Near East Side urban renewal project as "the most promising opportunity Syracuse has had for major physical development in the last century."

PROJECT SUPPORTED

"At this hearing we supported the entire plan in principle, making a number of recommendations regarding future development and reuse of the area, including amount of space allocated for office and residential use, and street layout," Mace added. "We also recommended that no major change in reuse or alternate reuse be made without public hearing."

Since that time the chamber has appeared at public hearings in support of the development of Presidential Plaza and MONY Plaza. As an integral part of urban renewal, the chamber from the beginning urged a new housing code with adequate enforcement, and supported at a public hearing in 1963 the housing code under which the city is now operating.

Mace explained that the chamber's urban development committee, now under the chairmanship of Clyde H. Harrison, "is continuing to watch developments and is committed policywise to support the broad objectives of these urban renewal plans, which can only be successful when private enterprise and Government work together."

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal, Apr. 27, 1964]

SYRACUSE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE WISELY BUCKS NATIONAL CHAMBER ON URBAN RENEWAL VETO

This newspaper has been deluged with documentation from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to support the national chamber's contention that:

All Federal public housing and urban renewal subsidy programs should be terminated.

The national chamber argues over the signature of Arch N. Booth, executive vice president, that the country would be money ahead if we'd terminate these subsidy grants right now, paid what Uncle Sam owed on current obligations to such communities as Syracuse, and then shut up shop. At least, the national chamber argues, the country would save the cost of handling and accounting for such funds and programs which, it figures, run to around 13 percent of the subsidy payments.

CHAMBER ARGUMENT

Also in the chamber's arsenal of arguments is this statistical contention: Urban renewal and public housing subsidies are going to States which already have relatively good housing and relatively high incomes.

In effect, what the chamber says is this:

New York State residents earn a higher annual income than Alabama residents; they also live in better houses and apartments; and they are getting, in turn, more of Uncle Sam's money for housing the poor and the aged and for rebuilding their communities.

Therefore, to continue the argument, this whole business should be canceled out.

POSITION FAULTY

This kind of argument has been lodged against public housing annually during its 27 years of existence. Now it is being extended to urban renewal efforts.

There's a certain amount of justice in the argument. Admittedly, Alabama has a lot of bad housing; admittedly, Alabama doesn't possess the industrial and commercial base built over the years to produce for its citizens the per capita income that New Yorkers enjoy; admittedly, the Federal principle operates to take from the richer regions to help support the poorer regions.

But a region's capital plant becomes obsolescent. And—such rural regions as Alabama develop subsidized come-ons for the older area's industry and commerce. They also export their populations. And, in turn, they rely more on Federal payments for maintenance of their welfare populations than do such States as New York.

NEW YORK CONTRIBUTES

This is so evident that, without such States as New York and their large contributions to the Federal Treasury, States like Alabama would be forced to scrabble along on next to nothing. For, comparatively, their contributions to the National Treasury don't begin to match the contributions of the older industrialized regions.

In other words, a statistical comparison of incomes, wealth, and subsidies isn't sufficient for developing a national policy.

Finally, to examine the national chamber's argument in a home setting, we wonder where Syracuse would be headed today without (1) its subsidized public housing, and (2) its Near East Side urban renewal project and its downtown one urban renewal development? Where, indeed, would be our hopes for metropolitan rejuvenation?

SYRACUSE DISAGREES

Please note that the Greater Syracuse Chamber of Commerce does not support the national chamber in its contentions.

Indeed, as this newspaper's business editor, Kenneth F. Sparrow, pointed out yesterday, the Syracuse Chamber has been an advocate and a participant in the city's urban renewal plans and efforts right from the start; nay, we'd say a spark plug.

The national chamber, we feel, has lost touch with hometown reality in its eagerness to oppose Federal partnership in a community's rejuvenation.

Prayers and Bible Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented my statement to the House Judiciary Committee supporting the resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit religious exercises in the public schools and the acknowledgment of our religious heritage in our public life. Like many of the Members of this Body who have received a large amount of mail in favor of such proposals, I have been urged to sign the discharge petition which seeks to bring to the floor for immediate consideration the resolution proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. And also like many of my colleagues who support the resolution in principle, I have refrained from signing the discharge petition out of concern for another principle, respecting the ordinary functioning of our legislative processes. Soon after I was first elected, in the 85th Congress, I was urged to sign discharge petitions then at the Speaker's desk. However, after reflecting about the matter I concluded that this was a most extraordinary procedure that should be reserved for the most extraordinary situation and that the very existence of such a rule should in itself virtually insure that it would not be necessary to resort to its use. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21st, 1957, I explained my position as follows:

> While I am not opposed to the rules of the House providing for discharge petitions, I do believe the taking of legislation from the consideration of the propertly designated committee disrupts the orderly functioning of the legislative process. For this reason, I am presently of the opinion that I will adhere to a policy of not signing any discharge petitions. Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in the committees of the House. Although they may not always act the way I might wish, nor as rapidly, nevertheless, our committee system has served the legislative branch of the Government well.

While I had hoped that the House Judiciary Committee would have initiated hearings on this subject at a much earlier date I did not believe that the ordinary procedures of the House had been sufficiently exhausted to require my making exception to my general policy. I preferred to join many of my colleagues in sponsoring individual resolutions of similar content as a means to effect the desired result of scheduling such committee hearings. I am gratified that the committee has now undertaken these hearings and am hopeful that they will result in the reporting of a resolution which the full House membership can consider.

Because of the wide interest and importance of this question I extend my remarks in the RECORD to include my statement to the Judiciary Committee so that it may be available to those who may wish to examine it before the committee hearings are printed.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, OF MICHIGAN, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 802, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO PRAYERS AND BIBLE READING, PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 30, 1964

I have joined in sponsoring a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which reads as follows:

H.J. RES. 802

Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

I have done so in behalf of the great number of people of the Michigan Sixth District who have expressed their interest in such a proposal over the past year and out of the conviction that their case was soundly based.

At the outset, let it be said that the issue before us is not one of being for or against the doctrine of the separation of church and state, nor that those who proposed this amendment would seek to abridge it in any way. This amendment seeks only to restore, not tamper with, the original meaning of that doctrine as it has existed for some 175 years.

WHY A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT?

There are those who believe that a constitutional amendment may be too extreme a remedy * * * that it would be best to wait in the hope that the Supreme Court might clarify the confused situation it has precipitated. There is, unfortunately, at present no indication that the Supreme Court is disposed to take such remedial action, and faced with the probability that any law passed by Congress would be summarily interpreted by that Court as a violation of the 1st amendment, there seems no other recourse than the amendment process. It would, of course, not be the first instance in which a position taken by the Supreme Court was overruled through the passing of a constitutional amendment, as was the case with the 11th amendment which nullified the decision reached in *Chisholm* v. *Georgia*, 2 Dallas 419, in 1793.

THE AIM OF THE AMENDMENT

The criticism has been made that the advocates of this amendment are in reality not taking issue with the majority opinion of the Court in its recent decisions, but with the concurring minority opinions which do not carry the force of law. In a sense this is true, but it is apparent that essentially the same spirit and line of reasoning permeates both the majority and concurring opinions of the Court, even though different conclusions are reached as to specific applications. In any case, it should be noted well by such critics that a major part of the history of the Court is composed of cases wherein an earlier minority opinion has later become the controlling majority view. In addition, it is also to be recalled that the Supreme Court has often sought to justify its assumption of the broad powers of interpretation presumably reserved by the Constitution to the popularly elected legislative branch as being due to some failure of Congress to provide definitive legislation in many areas in which court cases have developed. By initiating this amendment, Congress, therefore, can be seen as fulfilling its proper function.

The essential issue at stake here, I believe, is simply whether the religious heritage of our Republic will be permitted to remain a living part of our Nation; whether in the case of our schoolchildren, they will come to know that heritage from personal experience or, at best, merely abstractly as something dead in our past.

This amendment does not propose that public schools assume the responsibility for the religious education of the child, but only that they be permitted to recognize the spiritual nature of man and to acknowledge the importance of religious knowledge as being of continuing relevance to our public life and not merely something of historical interest. For whether or not the child is permitted to recite, "Man does not live by bread alone," the fact remains that this assertion, which is essentially a religious one, poses a problem which an avowedly secular education cannot avoid. For our society was founded upon a concept of man as a spiritual creature from which is derived his natural rights and freedom. Faced by the problem embedded in that assertion, public education cannot assume the stance of "strict neutrality" which the Supreme Court thinks necessary and possible. It either accepts this concept of the spiritual nature of man and his freedom or it accepts a nonspiritual concept of man.

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE

Each Member of Congress, I believe, received a letter dated April 9, 1964, from the American Humanist Association, Vashti McCollum, president, urging us to oppose any prayer amendment, which stated in part, "This association is composed of individuals who cannot with integrity look to any supernatural order for the solution of man's problems." Members of this association have been in the forefront of those initiating the cases which have borne fruit in the decisions to which we here raise objection. No one would question their right to hold such a view. But we can properly question the validity of that view and the claim that in effect it be given preference over our traditional religious heritage in the conduct of our public life.

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being," so said Mr. Justice Douglas, speaking for the majority of the Court in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313, in 1952. There can be little doubt that this statement represents the consensus of opinion of our Founding Fathers, even of such a rigorous advocate of church-state separation as Thomas Jefferson who once posed the question which confronts us today, "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of

the people that their liberties are the gift of God?" And he, at another time, observed, the "rights of conscience are inviolate because we are answerable for them only to God."

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

It seems incredible that a nation, after fostering nearly 200 years of perhaps the most remarkable period of religious liberty in history should all of a sudden be forced to present arguments to justify the foundation upon which that heritage is based. The original meaning of the first amendment phrase * * * "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" * * * as found in the debates of the First Congress seem to be quite clear. According to James Madison, the Member of Congress who guided the first 10 amendments to passage, "The meaning of the words (is) that Congress should not establish a religion and enforce legal observance of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience." To make the meaning even plainer, Madison sought to place the word "national" before "religion," however, anti-Federalist distaste for the word "national" apparently prevented its inclusion. As Madison explained in the House of Representatives on August 15, 1789, he believed "that the people feared one sect might obtain a preeminence, or two combined together and establish a religion to which they would compel others to conform * * * if the word national was introduced, it would point the amendment directly to the object it was intended to prevent." The first amendment, and presumably this understanding of it, was made applicable to State laws, of course, by virtue of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the 14th amendment.

THE EFFECT OF PRAYER AMENDMENT

As I acknowledged earlier, I believe that the proposed prayer amendment is directed less at the letter of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court than at the questionable reasoning employed by the Justices in reaching these decisions. I believe that the decisions reached in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962), and in *Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), should stand to the extent that I do not believe it is proper that there should be State laws requiring specific types of religious prayers and recitations. Rather, it would be better, I believe, for State governments to follow the example of the President who recommends but does not require the observance of religious days and exercises, such as Thanksgiving. It would then be left to the local school board in each community to determine what form this might take in conformance with the sectarian composition of that community Certainly, such religious activities as provided by the local school board would be on a voluntary basis. Should objection be raised by a scientific humanist or any other believer or nonbeliever, the issue would become a matter for mutual accommodation within that school system. If no accommodation were possible, at the very most it would mean that a particular school board might find it necessary to prohibit such religious exercises in its schools. It has been the great injustice of the Court's decisions that in seeking to redress grievances in one school system, it has struck down blindly religious exercises in all school districts throughout the land, without any regard as to whether such an issue existed in these districts or not. By taking this absolute, unreasoning approach to the doctrine of separation of church and state, the Court has defeated its own claim to remain "strictly neutral" in its interpretation of it.

I do not depreciate the very real difficulties that some school districts have experienced over this issue. The natural tendency has been for the school board to pass the problem on to State officials and legislatures; and it is likewise unsurprising that some of these officials, armed with these Court decisions, would interpret them in the most absolute way in order to avoid having to be responsible for making any distinctions between, for example, the singing of Christmas carols or the national anthem and reciting the Lord's Prayer. However, that many State officials have prohibited such exercises only reveals the barren logic upon which the Court's argument is based. Indeed, the Supreme Court has found it necessary to try to derail the logic of its argument before it reaches its most absurd conclusions, in order to uphold Sunday laws in *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420 (1961), through a quasi-legal distinction between purely religious practices and practices though religiously inspired may be said to have a purely secular purpose. The inference here is that religious practices are unobjectionable so long as they have no significant public meaning or influence. Similarly, Mr. Justice Black in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, *supra*, at 435, suggests that:

There is of course nothing in the decision reached here that is inconsistent with the fact that schoolchildren and others are officially encouraged to express love for our country by reciting historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence which contain references to the Deity or by singing officially espoused anthems which include the composer's professiosn of faith in a Supreme Being, or with the fact that there are many manifestations in our public life of belief in God."

Here again the idea is presented that our religious heritage can be publicly acknowledged only as something of historical interest, something dead in our past.

All of this is not to say, of course, that in some cases, religious exercises in the schools have not been handled in such a way as to give rise to legitimate objections, but such violations in themselves do not necessarily mean that all religious exercises violate the separation of church and state doctrine. Any law may be unconstitutionally enforced or interpreted. It does not follow that the law itself is unconstitutional.

THE MORAL FOUNDATION OF DEMOCRACY

We do not advance religious freedom by prohibiting public acknowledgment of the source from which all our liberties spring and are nourished. Religious liberty has flourished in America, not because a skeptical attitude toward religion prevented the Founding Fathers from establishing a national religion, but on the contrary, because of the great respect all Americans have publicly and privately held for the spiritual nature of man. The success of the doctrine of the separation of church and state rests upon that respect. American democracy itself rests upon a faith in man as a rational, moral and spiritual creature. The Communist mind denies the spiritual nature of man and erects in place of a transcendent God an imminent, Socialist state which demands the absolute, unquestioning obedience of its subjects. Under it, freedom is replaced by serfdom. The Communist state thus represents the most extreme and perverted instance of the fusion of church and state.

Our Founding Fathers did not consider democracy to be an end in itself. Democracy simply offers the best opportunity for men to achieve their full potentialities. Whether this opportunity is realized cannot be assured simply through a rigid, unreasoning adherence to democratic procedures and techniques. After all, both Hitler in democratic Germany and Peron in democratic Argentina came to power in perfectly legal fashion.

As a noted American theologian Reinhold Niebuhr asserts in his book, "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness," * * * "Modern democracy requires * * * a religious basis, not only in order to anticipate and understand the perils to which it is exposed, but also to give it a more persuasive justification. Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."

A professor of political science, John H. Hallowell, of Duke University, in his book, "The Moral Foundation of Democracy," elaborates upon this theme as follows:

"The ideals of democracy never have been and never will be achieved with perfection—they are goals constantly to be striven for but never perfectly realized. In the last analysis, democracy is 'a venture of faith in the moral and spiritual possibilities of man when entrusted with freedom.' Whether that freedom will be used to promote a just social order in which the moral and spiritual potentialities of all men equally will be encouraged to grow or whether it will degenerate into license and anarchy depends upon how each one of us conceives and uses it."

Perhaps no one understood better than Alexis de Tocqueville the moral and spiritual strength which made American democracy achieve what French democracy, torn by the antireligious fervor of the French Revolution, could not. In his classic study of "Democracy in America," based on his observation of the America of the 1830's, De Tocqueville offered the following judgment:

"When the religion of a people is destroyed, doubt gets hold of the higher powers of the intellect, and half paralyzes all the others. Every man accustoms himself to have only confused and changing notions on the subjects most interesting to his fellow-creatures and himself. His opinions are ill-defended and easily abandoned; and, in despair of ever resolving by himself the hard problems respecting the destiny of man, he ignobly submits to think no more about them. Such a condition cannot but enervate the soul, relax the springs of the will, and prepare a people for servitude. Not only does it happen, in such a case, that they allow their freedom to be taken from them; they frequently themselves surrender it. When there is no longer any principle of authority in religion, any more than in politics, men are speedily frightened at the aspect of this unbounded independence. The constant agitation of all surrounding things alarms and exhausts them. As everything is at sea in the sphere of the mind, they determine at least that the mechanism of society shall be firm and fixed; and, as they cannot resume their ancient belief, they assume a master.

"For my own part, I doubt whether man can ever support at the same time complete religious independence and entire political freedom. And I am inclined to think that if faith be wanting in him, he must be subject; and if he be free, he must believe."

IN CONCLUSION

This amendment seeks in no way to promote any sect or religious institution, nor to inflame religious or antireligious passions. This amendment is meant simply as an affirmation of the traditional American philosophy of government by striving to guarantee in some degree that the concept of man and his freedom upon which this Nation was founded will not pass away as if in a dream. It is not a question of compelling citizens to be religious, but simply of confronting them with the truth of their heritage as a living heritage.

Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the majority of the Court in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, supra, at 436, closed his opinion by acknowledging that the Government endorsement of prayer seems relatively insignificant when compared with the governmental encroachments upon religion in the past, but said, quoting James Madison, "It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties." Certainly we must be at least equally concerned with any experiment upon the very source of all our liberties.

For the reasons I have outlined, I have been moved to join many of my colleagues in proposing an amendment to the Constitution. A constitutional amendment is admittedly a most serious undertaking, and I would not claim that the specific wording of the resolution I have joined in introducing necessarily represents the only possible means available to achieve the amendment's purpose. But I would ask that the delicacy with which such an amendment must be handled not be made sufficient reason to prevent the committee from agreeing on language which will restore the traditional meaning of the doctrine of separation of church and state as one which permits the affirmation of our religious heritage in our public life. The apparent need for this amendment far transcends any of the difficulties that may be raised in its path.

Invocation by Rev. Dr. W. S. McBirnie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a prayer by the Rev. Dr. W. S. McBirnie, as being most timely while the Judiciary Committee is holding hearings on the Becker amendment on prayer in the public schools.

INVOCATION BY THE REVEREND DR. W. S. MCBIRNIE OF THE UNITED COMMUNITY CHURCH OF GLENDALE

O God, we pause to remember Thy name for we live in a time when it is so easy to forget Thee. We humbly seek Thy strength lest we foolishly imagine we can be strong enough without it. Open our eyes that we may not be blind leaders fo the blind. Help us to see in crystal clarity the towering issues of our day. Forgive us for letting evil triumph because good men do nothing. Forgive us for selling our birthright of freedom for a mess of socialist pottage. Forgive us for allowing the growth of Communist slavery because we were too busy to care. Forgive our courts for banishing Thy name and Thy book from our schools; in the same year our educators welcomed back to their campuses the "masters of deceit." Forgive us of the church for even the thought of peace at any price or coexistence with the kingdom of darkness. Forgive our political leaders for the moral softness which makes appeasement a virtue and which boasts of accommodation, convergence, and making the world safe for diversity with the barbarians who would destroy Thy name among men. O God, forgive us all for our illusion of prosperity and security at a time when the enemy is both before our gates and inside our defenses; for Thy hand doth even now write upon the wall that we are weighed in the balances. Take from us our pride, our smugness, and our sin. Restore to us the conviction that freedom has a moral right to prevail. Set our will like granite, lest we falter in the fight. Light in our hearts the fierce fires of faith which alone can transform us from mere partisans into patriots. Help us once again to hear the sound of trumpets in the morning and victory when the day is through. And—if it be Thy will—grant a new sense of high purpose to Thy people, that we may fulfill our calling and once again mount the offensive against the tide of destruction—for ourselves, and our children, and for all men who long to be free. To this end we invoke Thy presence upon this occasion, in the name of Thy Son, Our Lord. Amen.

Address Delivered by General de Gaulle, President of the French Republic, Over French Radio and Television, on April 16, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, regardless of our individual opinions of General de Gaulle, President of the French Republic, I am sure we all can understand and appreciate his intense loyalty for France.

On April 16, 1964, he delivered a message over the French radio and television in which he pronounces some very statesmanlike conclusions which could well apply to our own country. I refer especially to his treatment of the subject of inflation and more particularly to his dogmatic statement: "It is above all necessary that what a nation distributes does not exceed what it earns."

His full speech follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GENERAL DE GAULLE, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, OVER FRENCH RADIO AND TELEVISION, ON APRIL 16, 1964

France is one in her diversity. When we speak of her affairs we must, of course, see what is happening in the different branches, but we must also measure the whole. However, on this subject, some want to consider only fragmentary matters or special interests. Then, in these limited areas, they confine themselves to what seems disturbing to them, without taking into account the factors that are, to the contrary, favorable. The result of this is a more or less confused and diffused cloud which risks blinding the country's eyes to the overall situation which concerns it. Therefore it is this overall situation which I am going to speak about today.

At home the goal toward which we are advancing has never been more clear. It concerns our development. Therein lies at one and the same time the mainspring of modern civilization, the desire of the people as a whole, the condition of French independence, power, and influence. But since we are living through the changes day by day, while the results can only be assessed after a fairly long time, many—although of good faith—underestimate what has been accomplished. Since I, myself have, for more than 5 years, maintained a careful watch over the accounts, I can say what point we have reached.

Since 1958 and up to the end of 1963, what France earned increased by 30 percent—yes, 30 percent—its income growing each year by an average of 5.5 percent in relation to the preceding year. This increase is expressed in terms of absolute value, calculated in constant francs, in other words it is the real income, calculated after deducting all factors concerning price variations. Never before has our development attained such a rhythm. Once having subtracted from this increase in the nation's gross profits what is needed in order to raise, for a still better future, the rate of our investments, in order to pay our debts, which were heavy, in order to provide ourselves with gold and exchange reserves—and taking into account our population growth—it is the French standard of living which benefits from the advance. Indeed, during the same period the standard of living rose by 21 percent, or by an average of at least 4 percent annually.

Even, for certain categories which, up to 1958, appeared to be least favored, the improvement has since then exceeded these figures. Thus, this year, wages and salaries paid to the civil service and public enterprises represent an average increase per person of 4.5 percent each year, despite the increase in personnel—chiefly those of the teaching body. Thus, during the past 5 years, the income of our farmers, taking into account the decrease in their number, has increased by an average per person of roughly 5 percent annually, while their access, finally obtained, to the free market of the European Economic Community can open broad and new prospects to their production, their sales and their profits. Thus retirement benefits for the aged have increased in 5 years by at least 25 percent for everyone and by 46 percent for those who contributed to social security, not including additional allowances for the current year. Once again, we are concerned with figures expressing the increase in real purchasing power, whatever the price rise has been.

As regards social investments which, without directly and immediately raising the standard of living of each individual, nevertheless produce a general improvement in living conditions of the nation as a whole, and also in its worth, a few figures make it possible to indicate the impetus which has been given to them. In 1958 we constructed an average of 793 housing units each day. This year we are building 1,000. In 5 years appropriations for public health increased by 57 percent, for scientific research by 100 percent, for education by 136 percent, for youth and sports by 139 percent.

This overall development, which is unprecedented and which, in the long run, should benefit everyone, must be pursued and will be pursued. This must indeed be the goal of a national effort even larger, even more methodical and even better administered. But, of course, it is above all necessary that what the Nation distributes does not exceed what it earns. Otherwise there would be inflation, no matter what could be the argument or pretense. Doubtless, inflation, when one indulges in it, at first produces artificial advantages. But, just as a prodigal, after fleeting euphory, sooner or later finds himself a prey to ruin and misfortune, a country prey to inflation condemns itself to monetary, economic, and social collapse undergoing the worst upheavals. That is why the duty of the Government authorities is to maintain the balance between the Nation's real expansion and successive increases allotted to either the different categories or the various overall transformations required by progress. The stabilization plan—that is, all the measures concerning prices, salaries, credit, public expenditures, the budget—is therefore, of fundamental importance for all the French, precisely for the reason that it counteracts everywhere the spirit of facility, regularizes the progress of each individual, and rejects any outbidding.

As is always the case when the general interest is asserted, the individual desires which are held back thereby find champions to contradict rule and reason. For example, there is no lack of objectors to exclaim: "By wishing to contain excess expenditures, you're slowing up activity and, on the excuse of preventing inflation, provoking recession." However, if it appears that the stabilization plan is in the process of balancing our affairs, we do not see that our production, our trade, our standard of living is in any way

imperiled by this. But they most certainly would be imperiled if we allowed ourselves to go ahead and spend more than we have. Particularly as the European Common Market, which is gradually becoming essential to our prosperity, but which is instituting between the Six a state of permanent competition, could not long incorporate a French economy whose inflation would wreck the balance of accounts, trade, and payments.

Nor is there any lack of claimants to say: "As regards the position of the working categories, this one or that one has been treated unfairly. We must make up the gap. Too bad for stabilization." Well, does anyone believe that in inflation, whatever would be done could be worthwhile and lasting, since the day would inevitably come when everything would fall apart. No. If excessive disadvantages really do exist, we must of course remedy them. But that should be done by modifying, where necesary, the present distribution of the surplus yield of our economy and not by creating artificial surpluses at the expense of expansion, the budget, and the currency. In other words, from now on we need an incomes policy, comprising a whole series of cohesive measures, incorporated in our national development plan. but certainly not hasty and discordant measures, taken in fits and starts, for each branch in its turn, subject to random pressures or fragmentary contingencies. The law of our age is no longer the permanent and systematic struggle of interests, it is the organization of our economic and social solidarity.

Finally, there is no lack of critics to say: "Let us give up endowing ourselves with modern defense means, that is nuclear weapons, and let us stop helping the progress of the people in the world who aspire to our civilization. In this way we could round off the amounts that we allocate to State employees and social investments." Of course, for the time, we would find a certain surplus there. However, one would only have to look further than a simplistic demagogy to see how the consequences of that national abandon would soon be disastrous. So long as the ambition of the Soviets and the nature of their regime brings the threat of a terrible conflict to bear on the free world, on this side and on the other side of the Atlantic, France is in danger of destruction and invasion without having any certainty that her American allies, themselves directly exposed to death, would know how to prevent this for her. For France, to deny herself her own means of deterring the adversary from a possible attack on her, when she is in a position to have these means, that would be attracting the lightning while depriving herself of a lightning rod. But that would also be relying entirely for her defense and, thereby, her existence and, finally, her policy, on a foreign protectorate and one that is uncertain anyway. No. We are worth more than that!

As for putting an end to the friendly, reciprocal and planned cooperation that we practice with regard to a number of developing states, that would mean, first, moving away from them and leaving our place to others. That would lead us also to closing immense fields of economic, technical and cultural action to ourselves, instead of opening them up to ourselves. Last but not least, that would be tantamount to denying the role which is ours as regards the evolution which is bringing so many peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to develop themselves, in their turn, without surrendering to one or the other of the two hegemonies which are tending to share the world so long as Western Europe is not able or does not have the will to organize itself so that the balance may be found. Why then should France, which is surging forward, keep herself apart from a movement which springs in great measure from her traditional genius and on which in the final analysis depend the peace and the fate of the world?

Women and men of France, whether it is our domestic progress or our action abroad that is at issue, you can see that for us the national debate comes back to this question: "Should France be France?" In reply we often hear the glib appeal for letting things be, for dispersion and effacement, which was the appeal in times of decline. But the nation, which finds within itself the sources of a powerful renewal and which sees itself rising among the others has, to the contrary, chosen effort, cohesion, and success.

Vive la République! Vive la France!

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the seventh annual observance of Law Day.

Law Day has three main objectives: To foster a deeper respect for law by teaching how laws serve and protect all citizens, to encourage responsible citizenship by demonstrating that individual rights and freedoms involve individual obligations, and to emphasize the contrast between individual liberty under law and the subordination of individual rights under communism which on the same date stages its traditional May Day demonstrations.

The theme of Law Day this year is "Observe the Law: Key to Order, Justice, and Freedom." In his proclamation issued for Law Day, President Johnson called on the American people to "rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other and to cultivate that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

The observance of Law Day has special meaning for America this year because we are engaged in a great national struggle to extend the rule of law to our Negro citizens who have long been denied their inalienable rights. For more than a century, they have been deprived of the equal opportunity due them in education, employment, and public accommodations.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees Negro citizens the right to vote. Yet the evidence is overwhelming that in some places Negroes are denied the right to vote solely because of their race. Our democracy cannot tolerate such a flagrant abuse of one of the fundamental rights of its citizens. Nor can we expect them to contentedly accept second-class citizenship status. There can be no order, justice, and freedom in the United States until each and every citizen can exercise his constitutional rights without fear of force or the threat of reprisal.

In the past decade the executive and judicial branches of Government have taken effective action to remedy the injustices suffered by the Negro population. But until 1963, the Congress had made only a token start toward redressing the just grievances of the Negro community. Now the House has passed an excellent civil rights bill and the Senate is considering it. This legislation is not the complete solution to our racial problems, but it is a moderate, constructive step which will reduce tensions and take civil rights disputes out of the streets and into the courts, where they can be settled according to law. This is the American way.

In 1964, lawyers have a great opportunity to play a vital role in the fight to guarantee equal justice under law to all Americans. Due to their training and standing in their communities, lawyers are uniquely qualified to explain the constitutional principles on which the civil rights bill is based and to counter the false and misleading propaganda which certain individuals and groups are spreading about this legislation. The Nation's lawyers should make themselves the leaders in supporting this bill and in establishing a national consensus in its favor.

On this Law Day, let all lawyers dedicate themselves to this goal. By such action we will be preserving and strengthening the fundamental principles of our democratic society. There is no more noble or worthwhile undertaking for our profession.

The Federal Professional Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Professional Association about 2 years ago in November held its national conference here in Washington. It was presided over by a former Member of Congress who served with great distinction, the Honorable Robert Ramspeck. Addresses were made by Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Special Assistant to the President of the United States, Ewan Clague, Director, Bureau of Labor Statistics, who spoke on the subject of "The BLS Role in the Federal Pay—Comparability Process," and Dr. Hurst R. Anderson, president of American University, whose subject was "Contributions of Professionals in the Federal Service." The last speaker was the founder and president of the Federal Professional Association, Vincent E. Jay, who spoke on the topic, "Issues and Prospects." Mr. Ramspeck's remarks in introducing Mr. Jay, together with Mr. Jay's speech, follow:

The man was not performing. What were you going to do with him? The Foreign Secretary said to me: "Sir, I have been in Washington; I was attached to the Embassy staff in your city. But what you do not understand is that we have no provision in the public service for the release of an employee for any reason whatsoever. We cannot release people."

(These are two extremes, the Russians on the one end and the Norwegians on the other.)

"Therefore," said he, "if you want to effect a change in the administration of this office in Oslo, what you have to do is to find a job for the man. That is all we can ever do—put him somewhere else, then find somebody else for that job."

We got the man a job and got him moved out.

Now, this is a very decent thing to do; it grows out of a concern for this man as a man. He was not performing; but he is still a man, still a human being.

Now, I know people in the field of business who say the biggest problem is getting people to work together. Our American industry could produce on a much higher level if we could get people to work better together.

The Federal service is just like it. If we could get people to work together more skillfully, we would get a job done more quickly. The problem is not more charts; the problem is a basic understanding of the human relationships involved, so that, when somebody comes into your office, you try to put yourself in his shoes and ask yourself, "What would I do in this man's position?"

In other words, the philosophy of human relationships, it seems to me, is up to the professionally trained people to preserve. I think this is one of the things the professionals could contribute to the Federal service which, over a period of time, would make more difference in the way we operate than anything I can think of.

Now, just one other thing: This business of trying to achieve a balance between group decision and wise leadership is something which the professional is uniquely prepared to help solve. At what point does the group decision have to give way to competence in judgment?

Now, I am sure that professionals in various areas would say the professionalized judgment has to be equated differently, if it is a professional problem than the lay judgment.

But how you bring these two factors together is not a matter of charts or diagrams; it is a matter of the fundamental understanding of the significant contributions of human beings, because they are people and because they have certain capacities.

Chairman RAMSPECK. Thank you very much, Dr. Anderson. That gives us a lot of food for thought, which is what a speech is intended to do.

Our final speaker at this session is the president of the Federal Professional Association. A native of Ohio, he attended Rutgers University and American University. He is assistant to the executive officer, Division of Water-Supply Pollution and Control, Public Health Service, HEW. He has had considerable experience in the Government. I am not going to take up your time to tell you all about it; most of you know him. He is a member of the American Political Science Association, the American Society for Public Administration, the Civil Service League, the Public Personnel Association, and the Society for Personnel Administration. He established and served as chairman of the founding committee of this organization.

I am happy to present to you President Jay. [Applause.]

Mr. VINCENT E. JAY (president of the Federal Professional Association). Thank you very much, Mr. Ramspeck.

Guests and fellow members of the Federal Professional Association, having listened to the preceding speakers, it seems that much of my speech has already been given. The references Mr. Macy made; the challenges which the professionals have in working together, which Dr. Wiesner made, could not have been better. The urging which comes from Dr. Anderson and Ewan Clague, that professionals working together can make a significant contribution, is most encouraging and inspiring, I am sure, to all of us.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to address you on the first anniversary of the association.

First, I want to proclaim, loud and clear, that the issues are many and appear different to different people. However, the prospects are great. In my humble opinion, no organization or group has the opportunities and tremendous potential for good that exists for this association. For the first time in the history of our Nation, career personnel from vastly different executive and professional disciplines and fields are coming together within the framework of one organization to identify common problems and develop mutually beneficial solutions for the welfare of the Nation. The importance of this development cannot be overemphasized.

The association has grown during the first year and we have been credited with some solid accomplishments. Our membership has doubled. Some interesting facts about our membership are that, of approximately 600 members, 536 have earned their bachelor degree, 170 have masters, and 93 their doctorates. There are 38 supergrades, 419 in grades between 12 and 15, and 139 in grades 11 and below. A quick calculation indicates that our membership includes about 5 percent of the total supergrade group. If we had equal support from potential members in grades 15 and below, we would now have approximately 12,000 members.

Now, let me enumerate the major issues and prospects as I see them. They are: (1) The organizing of professionals in the Federal service, (2) the great lack of knowledge about their problems, needs, and aspirations, (3) self-regulatory responsibilities, (4) the relationship of the Federal Professional Association to existing professional associations and societies. Each of these issues is of interest to you, and any one of them could serve as the basis for at least a 1-day seminar. Because of the time factor, I plan barely to identify these issues and discuss the impact they have or will have on our Nation and ourselves.

The first issue, the organizing of professionals, consists of several parts. One is self-examination and analysis. Dr. Charles S. Hyneman, distinguished service professor of government at Indiana University and 1961–62 president of the American Political Science Association, in the preface to his new and important book, "The Supreme Court on Trial," states:

"Our time is a time of national self-criticism. The American people are engaged in a severe examination of their basic commitments, their way of life, the direction they appear to be going."

I concur and submit that career executives and professionals in the Federal service must participate in, and contribute to, this examination. Only through a single, Government-wide organization, designed exclusively for career executives and professionals, can we democratically undertake, in an orderly manner, such an examination. Obviously, we cannot identify for sure, without such an examination, what the problems, needs, and desires of professionals in the Federal service are. As we continue to default, our situation becomes more chaotic and disastrous to the detriment of the Nation and ourselves as individuals.

A second part to the organization of professionals is the attitude of professionals themselves toward supporting and participating in such an effort. First things should come first. However, to what extent are professionals willing and able to support an across-the-board organization of their own? Professionals, generally, are unbelievably busy and harassed. Sacrifices of time, energy, and money are necessary if we are to have a first-class organization, capable of undertaking the myriad tasks that demand attention. The essentials of an action organization are money, participation, and more money. All of the other issues depend primarily on decisions that are made on this issue—the degree of support to be given to the organization representing us.

We are late in getting started. The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada was organized in 1920. Over 60 percent of the professionals in the Federal service of Canada support and participate in the affairs of the PIPSC, in addition to their participation in the activities of their professional societies, their civic organizations, PTA's, etc. We can no lonegr afford to do less.

The point was well made recently by Richard L. Kenyon, editor of the Chemical & Engineering News, when he referred to the growing affluence and prestige of science and technology and cited the tendency that scientists and other professionals have to hold themselves aloof from activities outside of their immediate work interests. Mr. Kenyon properly urges professionals to reorganize their responsibility and become involved in the professional and other problems surrounding them.

Another part of the organizing issue is the matter of conflict of interest. Personally, I can see no reason for this point to be raised as a serious obstacle to membership in the association. Because the organization is designed exclusively for executives and professionals in the Federal service, you would expect to find in it career administrators. Also, because the association does not and will not operate a labor union of grievance procedure, conflicts with management (in many instances its own members) should not occur. Due to the grassroots, democratic decision-making process within the organization, it can be safely predicted that positions on issues will result from majority votes cast by managers and professionals alike after a thorough review and understanding of the facts. The primary function of the organization in this regard is to obtain the facts and reveal the true situation. Thorough investigation, research, and consultation with all interested parties will precede any position taking.

A fourth part of this issue of organizing is recognition. Executive Order No. 10988 provides specifically for professionals to form their own organizations. However, it is not clear as to their status after they organize. Are they to be considered and treated as labor unions? Will they be entitled to apply for automatic deduction of dues, or is this reserved to labor unions? Must they seek a certain form of recognition as provided in 10988 in order to be heard? Because we do not intend to represent individual grievances, we should be able to achieve our objectives outside the framework of Executive Order No. 10988, and I have so recommended. Of course, there are a lot of unanswered questions ahead. However, we must grow considerably before we can face some of these questions. One question of immediate concern is whether we are to be denied bulletin-board space and similar privileges if we do not apply for some form of recognition? I would certainly hope not. This entire area, like so many others, needs thorough study and consideration. We must remember, in connection with this issue, that we are judged by what we do and how we do it.

Issue No. 2 deals with the great dearth of knowledge concerning the problems, needs, and aspirations of executives and professionals. Again, there are several parts. One is communications. As specializations occur, they develop a new or modified language, generally unknown and misunderstood outside the speciality. The number of languages and modifications at this point must be quite numerous. We desperately need to investigate this problem area and estab-

lish a channel of communications between all executives and professionals. We urgently need to know more about the problems, needs, and aspirations of our associates in all professions. Now some professionals openly exhibit contempt and ridicule of their associates in parallel, but different, professions. The prevalence of such conduct is disruptive, degrading, and demoralizing. Conditions such as this must be eliminated from the Federal service. Truck drivers have more concern and loyalty for each other than do some professionals in the Federal service.

Another part of this issue of knowledge is the intricate and sensitive area of intra-organizational (within Federal agency) relationships. What are the relationships, for instance, between executives and professionals and what should they be? Have professionals defaulted on their management responsibilities, or have administrative types usurped professional prerogatives? Here is another area that requires a great deal of on-the-job factfinding, analysis, and consideration. However, I feel sure that proper attention to this problem could produce some guidelines and genuine understanding that would be invaluable, and would go a long way toward eliminating the running cold war that exists between many executives and professionals.

This leads me into the third issue: self-regulatory responsibilities. Of course, the Congress, the Civil Service Commission, and the various administrations have the responsibility for promulgating laws, regulations, and instructions, but how about developing some for ourselves? We are certainly of age and are capable of identifying and implementing rules of conduct and procedure. It will be a great day, indeed, when the Association can appear as "a friend of the court" in appropriate cases and assist in the development and presentation of facts. One of the most important aspects of improving the image of the Federal service, aside from correcting misconceptions, is to warrant a good opinion. This is a matter of identifying and agreeing on certain aspects of conduct and promoting them "within the family."

Executives and professionals should welcome a democratic procedure whereby their problems, needs, and aspirations can be properly and thoroughly considered in a democratic manner. Just as various businesses and other activities in private enterprise are self-regulatory, we executives and professionals in the Federal service ought to exercise a degree of self-regulation. Only in this way can we mature and move in the direction of optimum service to our Nation and ourselves. This vast area of important subissues includes the comparability-of-pay principle, a separate classification and pay schedule for executives and professionals, efficiency evaluation, the broad range of ethical practices, etc.

The next and final issue is the relationship of the Association to existing professional associations and societies. Again, I can barely discuss this briefly. However, it is important that this relationship be considered. The FPA is an individual membership organization. It was deliberately set up in this fashion on the strong and overwhelming advice of many experts in organization who felt that a federation structure would become unwieldy and unworkable. Also, a federation could not accommodate the many executives and professionals who have no existing professional organization ties. They must be encouraged to join and participate in such organizations. In addition, because so many existing organizations have a very low dues structure, we would immediately have the huge problem of financing. Therefore, after much deliberation, the individual membership structure was approved, but with the specific provision for affiliation. In considering this, we must keep in mind the numerous and varied kinds of existing organizations.

Dr. O. Glenn Stahl did some research which uncovered well over 50 major "professional organizations with predominantly or entirely Federal membership." The approximate aggregate membership of this group of organizations is nearly 200,000. In addition, there are many more single-installation, single-occupations, and single-agency organizations. The very minimal dues that most of these organizations have preclude an effective program, particularly at the national level and before the Congress. Very few have strictly enforced membership criteria. Some attempt to represent their members in grievances, are recognized under Executive Order 10988, and are thus operating, in effect, much like labor unions. They are scattered all over the United States and overseas, and they have little or no knowledge of the existence of each other, in spite of the fact that most of their members are struggling with problems, needs, and aspirations common to all professionals.

The organizational problem here is how to harness their tremendous abilities and resourcefulness, get them to increase their financial support of the overall cause, and bring them together under the umbrella of a Government-wide organization without impairing, in any way, their autonomy of operation and sovereignty with regard to their particular professional interests.

It seems to me that this can be accomplished within the framework of the FPA. It will take time, effort, and patience as mutually beneficial agreements are developed and ratified. It will take time for existing organizations to observe and become confident of the ability of the FPA to do for them what they cannot do for themselves, and still to permit them full authority within their own installations, agencies, and professions. Such autonomy and sovereignty now exists for FPA chapters located in various parts of the country.

I would like to note here that one of our officers, Harold A. Stone, has broken important ground with one large organization, in an attempt to arrive at an agreement on objectives; on procedures to be followed jointly in taking positions on issues; on a plan for making a position statement to the Congress, other bodies and officials, and the general public; and on the number of members of each organization supporting the position. In addition, Mr. Stone has sought to arrange for the appointment of a liaison officer in each organization with a clear understanding as to the authority and responsibility of the liaison officer.

A great deal remains to be done in this area, but the foregoing report will give you an idea of the basic problems involved and how we are trying to cope with them. I believe the FPA can and will strengthen existing professional associations by helping them attract and retain members, by doing those things for them that they are unable to do for themselves and thus freeing their time and effort for activities directly related to their particular professional interests, and by the possibility of reducing costs through the use of common facilities and the merging of certain routine office operations and services. The prospects are tremendous.

I served as chairman of the founding committee that met for 2 years at the Brookings Institution. During 1963, I have served as the first president. Now I want to say that I warmly welcome Greg Hartmann, who will succeed me in January as president. We and the Nation are particularly fortunate to have Dr. Hartmann accept the responsibilities of the principal officer of the association. He has many achievements to his credit and has received high recognition, including the 1963 Civil Service League Award, for his significant contributions. In addition, he is totally dedicated to the proposition of a career professional service of the highest order. I know he will lead us to great achievements as FPA makes its impact on the national scene. All of us must ease off to some extent on other time-consuming considerations and commitments to give Greg our wholehearted and full support.

The years ahead will be difficult and the problems tough, but nothing exists nor will arise that we cannot overcome together. Greg and his fine slate of officers will need all the support we can give them in terms of time, effort, and money. Because they are doing the job for the welfare of the Nation and us, the least we can do is to back them up, all the way.

My tenure in office reminds me of a story I heard recently, told by Joe Robertson, Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It seems that prior to the adoption of regulations restricting registration in the Kentucky Derby to horses, a Louisville man surreptitiously entered a donkey. Upon discovering the fact, friends pleaded with him in vain to withdraw his entry. Local business leaders tried to prevail on him to take the donkey out of the race. Finally, a select committee representing the Derby called on him and pointed out that the donkey could not possibly win the race and the Derby would be subject to ridicule. However, he stuck to his guns. In explaining his action, he said he knew that this donkey would not win the race, but added, "Look at the benefit he will get from the association."

The benefit that I have received from the privilege and pleasure of working with Greg Hartmann, Harold Stone, Charlie Burhead, Lew McCann, Rob Ramspeck, the various chairmen of working committees, and the many others in the association, is immeasurable and will live with me forever. So many have put so much into the association that I know it will grow and succeed in assuring our Nation the best Government career service in the world. We cannot afford less, particularly during such critical times. [Applause.]

New Era of Statesmanship Demanded of Negro Heads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of leadership in the civil rights movement is one which has been a source of growing concern to all thoughtful people interested in the problem of guaranteeing equality for all American citizens. Recently a fine article on this aspect of the struggle for equality appeared in the Jewish Times in the State of Affairs column written by Emanuel Goldberg. Mr. Goldberg praises the statesmanship exhibited by the vast majority of civil rights leaders and calls for continued efforts to achieve human dignity. I insert his article in the RECORD:

NEW ERA OF STATESMANSHIP DEMANDED OF NEGRO HEADS

Utterly inevitable is the awakening of statesmanship in the ranks of present-day, responsible Negro leadership.

That is the forest view of the broiling civil rights controversy must eventually assert itself if our shaken Nation is to stand united

and strong, and free of even sporadic jungle law.

This is a tall order for the policymakers of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the NAACP, CORE, the Urban League, and the rest, for they are daily confronted with a lack of organic unity amid internal bickering and frail, human jockeying for power, as well as the noise of external Negro extremists and restless constituents. Certainly the Kings, Wilkinses, Farmers, and Youngs cannot look to the white community for sterling example. The lack of intoxicating moral leadership was never more apparent in the prevailing white power structure.

Yet more than incipient danger signals have been raised for the colored leaders. Nobody in his right mind will shrug off as meaningless the 25 percent of the Democratic Party vote which Governor Wallace of Alabama jubilantly nailed down in the Wisconsin election. As Arthur Krock has pointed out, the very bad and demagogic image which this southern politician has cast across the world accentuates his disturbing support from a protesting minority of 25 percent. Such an across-the-board bloc could easily swing a national election, and all politicians know this.

What did the Wallace vote really mean? It's hard not to subscribe to the view that it represented a protest against the many excesses and pressure tactics now being used by some desperate Negro leaders in order to speed up realization of their otherwise deserved ends.

And this presents a dilemma. A return to gradualism in the old, measured-step sense of the preprotest era seems out of the question if the present Negro heads are to win enduring support of the rank and file.

About half a century ago, Louis D. Brandeis delivered an address on "A Call to the Educated Jew" before the Menorah Society. What the great jurist said in effect to his coreligionists was that a Jew, unlike his neighbor, carried two responsibilities for all of his actions: to himself, as an individual, and to his fellow Jews, as a group. What a Jew did for good or evil not only reflected upon himself but also upon all of his people.

How perspicacious are the Brandeis words today—and they speak in universal and wise tones to the Negro population of America. When a white Protestant commits a crime, the headline on the news story does not blurt: "Local Episcopalian Slays for Loot." But what happens in many States when a Negro or other member of a minority group gets involved on the seamy side?

Just recently many good willed persons were electrified when the Brooklyn chapter of CORE announced that it planned to create a massive traffic jam on roadways leading to the New York World's Fair on its opening day, April 22. Motorists were to be asked to put only enough fuel in their gas tanks to get them onto one of the major roadways leading to the Fair. If enough such cars stalled, Brooklyn's CORE chapter hoped that a tremendous traffic jam would result. This would apparently satisfy the local Negro leadership which had unilaterally concluded that people shouldn't enjoy themselves "when Negroes are suffering all over the country."

It didn't take thoughts about statesmanship to get the national office of CORE to react. The Brooklyn chapter was wisely suspended. This act of self-policing by CORE was, of course, laudable whether it accomplishes the immediate objective or not.

A few months earlier, in a respectable community close to Boston, CORE demonstrated publicly against a local realtor even before the latter had his day in court before the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. Here, even the tactics were questionable because CORE had lowered the boom on its hapless target well before the strategic and necessary moment. The sword of Damocles was removed and frittered away. Instead, a Pyrrhic victory was probably gained with a temporary home going to a fine State Department Negro employee but no broader base for good will and further educational erosion achieved in the township.

The mere thought of a series of wildly irrational, local Negro protests across America is frightening. Obviously, the Negro organizations have gobs of fence-mending and basic bread-and-butter public relations to accomplish before the American white populace is moved from inertia or misunderstanding to solid support of the civil rights movement.

Incidentally, it is imperative that white leadership elements—beyond the clergy, educators, and some public officials—give powerful support to King, Wilkins, Young, when the crucial cards are played by these able men, for without pluralistic white help at the right time, the gong clange on stage for the Black Muslims, the Malcolm X's, and that kind. Then, presumably no household will be safe.

Even Woodrow Wilson's historic brand of idealism ran far ahead of his own people. The statesmen in Negro ranks, with God in their breasts, must now somehow find a pathway for the erring white people to follow.

More Opposition to the Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a message published in the May 1964 edition of the New Age magazine, the official publication of the Supreme Council 33d Degree Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry, Southern Jurisdiction, Sovereign Grand Commander Luther A. Smith has called upon the members of this great fraternal organization to oppose the amending of the first amendment to permit prayers in public schools.

It is a call in which I heartily concur.

The sovereign grand commander's message follows:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

Rumblings from Capitol Hill indicate there is some life left in the movement started many months ago to pass an amendment to the first amendment of the Constitution which would undertake to reverse the decisions of the Supreme Court in the prayer and Bible reading cases.

Our New Age readers and others interested in preserving religious freedom and separation of church and state should take note of this new agitation. The success of this movement would be disastrous to the religious harmony in the United States enjoyed by our people for nearly two centuries because of the famous 17-word sentence which the Founding Fathers put into the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The Supreme Court held in the cases referred to above that no governmental agency may formulate prayers or religious exercises and require them to be used in the public schools because to do so would violate the above provision of the Constitution. The purpose of the amendment which is proposed in the Congress is to change the law so that State governments may have the power to set up religious establishments and teach religious practices in the public schools.

The question will immediately arise as to which of the more than 200 different religions will be taught. Since nothing arouses the ire of people more than religious controversy, will it not be a distinct disservice to our schools and children to make the schoolrooms arenas for such squabbles? It will be a big step backward toward the days of religious intolerance and persecution. Our public schools are secular institutions dedicated to teaching academic subjects such as mathematics, geography, the languages, history, etc. During school hours let nothing interfere with or hamper the success of this great educational process.

If the parents in the homes and the ministers and laymen in the churches and Sunday schools cannot teach children such religious and spiritual subjects as they may need, we are really in a bad way and have been derelict in discharging the responsibility reposed in us by the founders when they implicitly said that religion is a matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the people and with which the Government is prohibited to have anything to do. Public schools are agencies of the government.

The very integrity and usefulness of the public schools are involved in this question. If the teachers are to be called upon to teach religion and religious practices as an official part of the curriculum, a little reflection upon human nature and experience would seem to indicate that there would be confusion, disharmony, controversy, and distraction among the children and their parents—all to the injury of the educational character of the schools and their social peace and harmony.

It is hoped that the readers of the New Age and all friends of the public schools will see the dangers involved in tampering with the constitutional safeguards established by the Founding Fathers for the protection of religious liberty in these schools. The only safe way to do it is to rely on ourselves, our homes, Sunday schools, and churches to teach religion and religious practices to our children and to deny all governmental agencies any and all power to discharge that duty for us. That is the law of the land now. If we wish it to remain so, a message to our Senators and Congressmen will help. Just say, "I hope you will vote against the amendment to amend the religious establishment clause of the Constitution."

Sincerely and fraternally,

LUTHER A. SMITH,

Sovereign Grand Commander.

MAY 1964.

The Republican Coalition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at Yale University last weekend to receive the Law School Association's Citation of Merit Award, Pennsylvania's Gov. William Scranton waited and waited for other luncheon speakers to finish. When he was finally introduced, Scranton remarked that he had intended to give "a long and rather tedious political speech," but that there was no time now. So he scrapped his prepared text and

spoke briefly off the cuff on the need for a vigorous opposition party. What his audience missed was one of the most sense-making Republican speeches in a long while.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts:

[From Time magazine, May 1, 1964]

THE REPUBLICAN COALITION

We have not had major political change, or even much evolution, in the United States since the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt. Americans may approve or disapprove of the New Deal, but they can agree that it changed our politics. It produced a new concept of the uses of power in American politics and government. It took the Democratic Party out of the minority position it had filled for a century, and it cast the Republicans in the role of America's opposition party.

COLLIDING FORCES

To see how little political change there has been since that time, you need look no further than the antipoverty program which has been proposed by the present administration. The merits and demerits of that campaign will be debated in the months ahead, but it is an accurate and entirely nonpartisan observation to note that there is very little in it that is new. It is based almost entirely on proposals first made 30 years ago in the New Deal era.

The forces which have combined to become the Democratic Party are forces which by their very nature collide. It is a party of dreams on the one hand, and of reaction on the other. The party when it dreams has noble thoughts of shining cities, equal opportunities, and social progress. The party when it governs is hamstrung by its reactionaries, who smash the dreams into tiny, unrecognizable pieces. The present majority party has failed to meet its responsibilities to American society because half of the party refuses to practice what the other half preaches.

It can be said that the Democratic Party is a marriage of convenience, while the Republican Party comes closer to being a marriage of common interest. Despite this intrinsic unity, the Republican Party frequently has managed to present itself as an organization split by a conservative-liberal animosity. The first step to unity is for the Republican Party to understand clearly what has happened to it in the past 30 years.

NEGATIVE FORCE

With the election of Franklin Roosevelt, it was thrown into the minority position. The majority party sets its sights on a national problem. The liberal and theoretical wing of that party proposes a solution. The other wing of the party opposes it. The majority party then goes into its customary deadlock, unable to raise enough votes to pass its own program.

Meanwhile, the Republican Party, unable under our present system to speak effectively with one voice, allows itself to appear to be split into parts. The larger segment of its voting strength recognizes, with considerable accuracy, that the Democratic solution to the problem inevitably involves another increase in power for the Central Government. On those grounds, they oppose it. The smaller part of the Republican Party, because it puts predominant stress on solving the problem, swallows reservations about the increase in centralism and determines to support the solution offered by the Democrats, or some version of it.

Then what happens? If the measure passes, the Democrats get credit for it. If the measure fails, the Republicans get blamed because they have been part of the so-called conservative coalition. In either case, the Republicans get a little bit angrier with each other, and the American public gets a little clearer image of the minority party as a negative force in our national life.

For 30 years, the Republican Party has made life easy for its opposition. For 30 years, it has managed to look negative. For 30 years, Republicans have telegraphed every punch they've thrown. All of that can change. Republicans should form a new coalition—with themselves.

POSITIVE FORCE

How much better it would be if the Republican Party would implement a legislative program that recognized that though the Federal Government has the tax resources, the State governments are often far more capable of using the money efficiently and effectively. The Republican Party, as a matter of national policy, ought to embrace a program whereby the Federal Congress outlines in broad terms a national goal in meeting a national domestic problem, appropriates the money to meet it, but gives maximum authority for implementation to a strong, effective State government.

Such a policy, I am convinced, could be the first step toward waging a new political change. It would give the Republican Party its best chance of regaining the political majority because: (1) its potential of solving a problem without handing over excessive authority to the central Government is something the vast majority of Republicans would embrace; (2) the Republican Party would then be clearly positive in its approach; (3) such an approach is the pragmatic way of actually getting this country moving.

In enunciating this political philosophy, we must make it clear what delineation there is between national needs that can be met through implementation of State governments and those which are clearly and most effectively accomplished by the Federal Government. In the latter category are, obviously, foreign policy and our national defense. Given an opportunity and the necessary financial resources, the States can solve many of our domestic problems, in the field of urban renewal and housing, education, unemployment, and other domestic challenges.

If the Republican Party recognizes this and works effectively for it, it can meet the basic governmental challenge for the remainder of this country.

Railroad Strike Threat Vanishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I know all my colleagues in the Congress share my genuine relief that the threatened national railway strike was averted through the collective-bargaining process. There is no doubt that our President, Lyndon Johnson, worked a miracle to bring labor and management together in such a gentle, yet persuasive manner that their leaders, after 5 abortive years, were able to draw lines of agreement to end their long dispute. We in the Congress and the people of our country are indebted to the President for this splendid achievement, and I am confident that my colleagues join with me in rendering to him a hearty salute.

President Johnson has received great praise across our land for his efforts in bringing about the end of this 5-year dispute, and I would call to the attention of my colleagues a very fine editorial on this subject by the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, the afternoon newspaper published in my home city by the Times-Picayune Publishing Co. I would also like to pay tribute to the States-Item's editor, Carl Corbin, and his assistants for this consistently fine editorial writing, of which the editorial below is a good example. I commend this editorial to the Members of Congress.

The editorial of April 24, 1964, follows:

RAILROAD STRIKE THREAT VANISHES

With settlement of the prospective national train strike, collective bargaining shows sign of becoming pink cheeked and robust again.

Yet before President Johnson worked his miracle, Americans found it easy to say that the death rattle was in collective bargaining's throat.

After all, hadn't 5 years of bargaining between rail lines and their workers been productive of nothing but shrill words and a pervading feeling of frustration?

If such a clash of the irresistible and the immovable is capable of solution requiring neither federally imposed compulsory arbitration nor nationalization of railroads, then there must be hope that other potentially bad situations on the industrial horizon will brighten.

For one, there's the opening of contract talks this summer in the automobile industry, frequently regarded as the Nation's economic bellwether. Walter Reuther, head of United Auto Workers, let it be known weeks ago his union would seek increases higher than the growth rate of the industry.

There can be no detraction from President Johnson's important role in effecting the rail settlement. Without brandishing a legislative club, he brought the poles-apart bargainers together with remarkable persuasiveness.

It was this quality in Mr. Johnson when he was majority leader in the Senate that set the background for many legislative accomplishments. And in the White House it still serves him well.

A railroad strike could have turned the country's unprecedented prosperity into a grim reversal. Now that prospect has dissipated and the interest of public, management, and union has been served.

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sadness and a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois. His passing will be a great loss, not only to his beloved State but to the entire Nation.

He was a wonderful friend, and I shall always remember the many happy occasions I was privileged to be in his company. TOM and I served together on the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which I am presently chairman, and in the year 1947 the distinguished gentle-

man from Virginia [Mr. GARY], TOM O'BRIEN and his lovely wife, Nettie, and I visited a number of the countries in Western Europe in connection with our duties as members of the House Appropriations Committee. It was a very pleasant journey and experience that I well enjoyed, and a deeper friendship and a closer relationship resulted with TOM and Nettie O'Brien.

TOM O'BRIEN was a dedicated legislator who was greatly admired for his honesty, his wisdom and his exceptional ability. He was respected by all the Members of this House, regardless of which side of the aisle they were on.

To his devoted and lovely wife, Nettie, I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time we are privileged to pay tribute to Polish Constitution Day. May 3, 1791, was a great day for the Polish people. It remains as a shining symbol of their centuries-old struggle for liberty, and historically it is one of the earliest and noblest landmarks in the universal movement toward national self-determination and political democracy.

After years of struggle, Polish patriots managed to prevail over internal division and external threat long enough to vote a liberal constitution through the representative assembly. The move was praised by Edmond Burke as a bloodless revolution. The enlightened men who drafted this remarkable document placed limits on the power of the landed aristocracy and provided for a limited monarchy including ministers forming a cabinet.

Austria, Prussia, and Russia had already taken portions of Poland 19 years earlier. Russia and Prussia responded to the Constitution of 1791 by crushing the new government and annexing still more Polish territory. A national revolution led by Kosciuszko followed and was put down ruthlessly by Russian forces. In 1795 the three avaricious neighbors divided up all remaining Polish territory between them and decided never to use the word "Poland" again.

Despots have never understood the irrepressible human urge for liberty and this is nowhere better illustrated than by the absurd attempt to eliminate Poland simply by depriving the Polish people of all their territory and refusing to use the name.

As long as the people survived so would the dream of Polish national freedom persist. The people have demonstrated their love of freedom many times during the 120 years of foreign domination that followed. In 1918 a new Polish nation was created in the aftermath of World War I only to be crushed by the same ancient enemies in 1939. This year is the 25th anniversary of the joint Nazi-Soviet attack on Poland.

Today Russia is again in the ancient role of Polish oppressor. And again, in 1956, the people of Poland rose against foreign domination.

We can only hope that what these deserving people have failed to gain through their valiant struggles will come with the inevitable erosion of Communist totalitarianism. We, for our part, must do all in our power to hasten that process of erosion while keeping alive the vision of liberty for all peoples.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, contemporary events always tend to obscure earlier ones and, irrespective of the importance of the latter, these are often relegated to relative insignificance. This happens so frequently that sometimes old happenings of significant importance, and even those of decisive importance, are almost forgotten and buried in our memory. This is particularly true in the case of certain events in modern Polish history. In these days we are so seriously concerned with the fate of the Poles, and so fully preoccupied with current events of crucial importance, we sometimes think of Poland largely in terms of a mere Soviet satellite behind the Iron Curtain, effectively sealed off from the free world. Unfortunately, of course, that is the case. Some 25 million unhappy Poles are virtually imprisoned in their homeland today, and there they enjoy precious few of the freedoms for which they and their ancestors fought so gallantly and fearlessly for centuries.

But there are greater and brighter aspects of modern Polish history that should not be overlooked and forgotten. Great names and lasting achievements abound in Polish history. Their enlightened and imaginative leaders have always fought for human freedoms. This they did sometimes almost alone in Eastern Europe for the preservation of European civilization. In 1683 when the conquering Turks had advanced into the heart of Europe, and were at the gates of Vienna, Poland's great King John Sobieski came to the rescue of the beleaguered city, successfully drove off the Turks, and once and for all eliminated future Turkish threats to Christendom in Europe. The Poles made their signal contributions to our War of Independence in the person of generals Thaddeus Kosciusko (1746–1817) and Casimir Pulaski (1748–79). Besides being gallant fighters for freedom, Poles have also shown great talents in other walks of life, including in the field of government. By their Constitution of 1791 they proved to be pioneers of political reform in Eastern Europe. That Constitution became a great landmark in Poland's history, and today is the 173d anniversary of its adoption.

The true significance of that document is sometimes overlooked because before it was put into full force Poland was invaded and soon lost her independence. The real importance of that Constitution, however, lay in the attempt made by its framers to introduce a responsible cabinet type of government in that part of Europe. Monarchical authority was considerably curtailed by that Constitution, and that of the peoples' representatives was greatly enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local landlords and was placed under the protection of the law. Even more significant than any of these changes was the guaranteeing of religious freedom to all sects. Unfortunately these rights and freedoms have been lost to the Poles since those days, except for the relatively happy period of Polish independence in the two decades following World War I. We are happy to join freedom-loving Poles everywhere in the observance of the anniversary of this truly historic landmark, the 173d anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

A Respect for Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following thoughtful editorial from the April 26, 1964, edition of the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

Despite the insinuations of some of the proponents of the Becker resolution those of us who oppose this attempt to amend the first amendment are not in favor of a "godless society." We do, however, favor freedom of religion and noninterference in religion by the state. To suggest that Government has either the right or the responsibility to impose prayers and Bible reading on the children of parents who do not wish them to engage in these activities in public schools is outrageous.

The editorial follows:

A RESPECT FOR RELIGION

James Madison: "We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society; and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance."

Those Congressmen who are determined to resist rash action supposed to "put God and prayer back into public schools" deserve great credit for common sense, dedication to liberty, and deep respect for religion. It is not they but their opponents who would do a disservice to the American conscience.

So far 147 resolutions to amend the Constitution have been placed before the House Judiciary Committee, where Chairman CELLER of New York promises full consideration. The measures are legislative efforts to override the Supreme Court decisions against state-prescribed prayer and use of the Lord's

Prayer and Bible readings in public schools.

Possibly a few Congressmen regard these proposals as constituting a made-to-order issue, for what politician would put himself in the apparent position of opposing prayer or religion? But the issue is not to be regarded in that simple light. It might better be viewed in the terms used by Representative BECKER, of New York, author of the principal resolution to change the Bill of Rights.

Representative BECKER told the committee that prayers should be permitted in public schools in order to make children of nonreligious families aware of the existence of God. This is an astonishingly bald statement in behalf of official compulsion in religious matters. It was expressly to prevent such Government interference with religious beliefs that the Founding Fathers prohibited an establishment of religion and guaranteed the free exercise thereof. They had seen enough of religious tyranny.

Mr. BECKER's proposed amendment also rebukes basic national principles. The first two sections say that nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit prayers, Bible readings or references to God or reliance upon Him in the schools—while the third section says nothing in the proposal constitutes an establishment of religion. The third section is an effort to overcome the contradictory fact that this is just what the first two sections do propose.

No American should want to invite a situation in which agencies of the state must make religious determinations and discriminations.

Religious minorities have obvious reasons for resenting the subjection of their children to observances prescribed by majorities.

Jews should hope to avoid the attempted indoctrination of their children with beliefs from a Christian Bible and Christian prayer, for that is what the Lord's Prayer is.

Catholics whose children attend public schools should wish to avoid the imposition of prayers and Bible readings by Protestants still largely in command of most such schools. History shows that Catholics have filed numerous suits against required use of the King James version of the Bible in the schools.

Protestants who oppose Government aid to Catholic parochial schools as an abridgement of separation of church and state should wish to avoid setting their own precedent for such abridgement.

And if Americans are not swayed by the obvious dangers to the Bill of Rights and individual freedom of conscience, then they ought to consider that State-ordered religious observances would be harmful and not helpful to religion itself. For the end result would too often be religion by rote—a kind of denatured religion in which officially authorized and mechanically applied repetition of prayer and Scripture would deprive either of real meaning or deep sincerity.

That is why religion must be kept for the church and home, and out of the hands of government and its schools. Where these schools have failed is not so much in providing awareness of religion as in providing respect for religious freedom. Otherwise so many Congressmen would not pretend that religion requires support and indoctrination.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Loyalty Day on May 1 is, as proclaimed by this Congress in 1958, a special day for the reaffirmation of loyalty to the United States of America and for the recognition of the heritage of American freedom.

Initiated in the late 1920's by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the concept of Loyalty Day has provided the American people with a unique occasion to solemnly consider their stake in democracy and to renew proudly their dedication to the ideals of the freedom and dignity of man. The celebration of Loyalty Day also provides a thrilling contrast to the sterile demonstrations and parades annually produced on May 1 under Communist auspices.

President Theodore Roosevelt remarked that:

> Americanism is a question of principle, of purpose, of idealism, of character.

These qualities describe that intangible passion, loyalty, which has sustained our country during its periods of crisis and growth and it has endeavored to secure the blessings of liberty under law to all its citizens and to extend them to less fortunate peoples.

For the idea of loyalty bespeaks not only of principle and belief, but of action and deed, as well. Commitment to freedom cannot be a sometime passion. It must be total; it requires that we put into practice, day by day, the great principles of free government to which we are dedicated.

Loyalty in its finest sense is a continuing merger of deep belief with purposeful action. Observance of Loyalty Day is an invaluable way by which all Americans can be inspired to devote themselves to the task of rendering into actuality their magnificent ideals.

The depth of our loyalty is best expressed by what we do.

No more meaningful celebration of Loyalty Day can be made than by our reaffirmation of our willingness to sacrifice for the cause of liberty until peace with justice and freedom becomes the accepted rule all over the world.

Perhaps the late, beloved Judge Learned Hand described most eloquently the true meaning of loyalty in action when he said during World War II:

> Therefore, as we now pledge allegiance to our flag, shall we not see it as more than a symbol for those alone over whom it waves? Shall we not believe, that, be we never so prosperous and safe, and contented, we shall have failed to grasp its meaning, and shall have been truant to its promise except as we strive to make it a signal, a beacon, a standard, to which the best hopes of mankind will ever turn?

Israel Celebrating 16th Year of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel is celebrating the 16th anniversary of its Independence Day.

We friends of the Israeli people are pleased and proud that Israel has made enormous progress on the road toward economic self-sufficiency. Despite a population increase of about 300 percent, the per capita income in Israel has risen from less than $300 in 1950 to almost $800 at the present time. In 1951 Israel's gross national product was $818 million. In 1963 it reached $2,075 million. In the past year alone, the gross national product has risen 10 percent and national income 20.5 percent. This is a phenomenal rise and indicates the hard work of the Israeli people, and their dedication to their country.

Israel still has a balance-of-payments deficit—but exports have expanded at a rapid pace, from $29.7 million in 1948 to $343 million in 1963, thus reducing the deficit nearly $40 million from the 1962 figure.

This year Israel is redeeming its development bonds which have been sold in this and other countries since 1952. Investors have been paid $54 million.

There is Israeli progress in every area—in agricultural and industrial production, in education and housing, in land development, cultural activities and the integration of new immigrants.

Israel has worked hard but our U.S. foreign aid programs have played a significant role—and Israel is grateful for it. Our Government has extended over $1 billion in economic assistance to Israel since 1948. But these funds would not have been put to such good use without the dedication of these hard-working people. Israel is the shining demonstration of what the U.S. aid programs can do when it is properly applied and used.

Recently, AID Administrator David Bell cited Israel as an example of the effectiveness of our U.S. aid program. He said:

> Israel illustrates what can be done with a most unpromising base of natural resources, by intelligence, hard work, sound policies and the sensible application of modern scientific and technological knowledge. Israel has had extensive help from the United States and Europe, but above all it has had the kindof strong and sensible leadership which has been able to make the most out of its own resources, plus those obtained from outside. * * *
>
> Israel was just recently established as an independent nation whose future was very much in doubt. Today the Israelis have achieved a remarkable economic growth, with an annual growth rate for the last 5 years of around 10 percent—one of the highest in the world. U.S. soft loans and grants have helped in this process; they have done their work and have been successful; and the need for them will soon end.

These words are a tribute to Israel's people. I am sure we are proud of what the Israeli people have done to raise their living standards and to put their country so high in the technological progress. But they are concerned about their future. What Israel longs for most—peace with their Arab neighbors—is at this time being denied them. I hope that by next year the eastern Mediterranean people will have achieved a good measure of progress toward peace and understanding as well. I hope that the Arab States will see that the future progress of all peoples at this most im-

portant crossroads lies in peace and cooperation, rather than futile war and decide to bring cooperation to the whole region.

Address by Chief Justice Earl Warren at Dedication of New Law Building, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., April 26, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the excellent address of the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, delivered at the dedication of the new law school at Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Ind., on April 26, 1964.

The address follows:

I am very sure that everyone concerned with the welfare of Valparaiso University, whether here today or not, is tremendously interested in what we are now doing. It is natural that this should be so because it is basic to human nature to be concerned with law, in fact, to recognize it as the foundation of our civilization.

Every country has a system of law. Few of them, if any, have identical laws, but we all have a sense of order and a realization that there can be no order without law. It is ingrained in every culture and in every political system. It is only natural that these systems should be different because the domestic law of any country is based upon the history, culture, geographical considerations, and the necessities of the nation for survival.

LAW IN ANCIENT SUMAR

I suppose that throughout the free world people believe that their own system is best and that they alone have made it what it is today. In the field of law, neither of these postulates could be further from the truth. There is no system of law in the world today of which I know that has not come in great part at least from civilizations which preceded it by many centuries. In the oldest civilization known to us—that of Sumar which lies along the lower Euphrates—archeologists have turned up tens of thousands of clay tablets recording all manner of transactions. Some of them are of intense legal interest. They describe the earliest code of law known to man, the earliest traces of international law, the earliest international agreements, and the earliest efforts to dispose of international conflicts by arbitration.

Sumar had a well-defined system of law at least 40 centuries before the birth of Christ. How long it was in existence before that time and whence the Sumarians themselves came we do not know, but we do know that when recorded history began people already had legal systems and codes which contain the basic elements of modern law; in fact, it can well be argued which came first—civilization or law. It has always seemed to me that it was the need for law that brought civilization into being because wherever an ancient civilization has been uncovered, no matter how remote from the others, its very existence has been shown to have depended upon a system of law.

This past summer I had the privilege of participating in a conference of lawyers and judges in ancient Greece. Over a hundred countries were represented. They were the countries that believe in the rule of law as distinguished from the will of man. All present were thinking in terms of improving the law so that it might better serve mankind. Exchanging views with these people strengthened the bonds between us and made us realize how interdependent we are and how much we are indebted to the entire world for what we prize as our own systems of law.

Our historians tell us that it was in Greece that Western civilization had its origin. Early in the seventh century before Christ. they began to inscribe their laws on stone or bronze; before that their laws had been written on leather and wood. But they were building in those centuries upon what they had learned from more ancient civilizations in Mesopotamia.

And while this was going on in Greece, a great ferment was taking place everywhere in the world which would eventually touch even our lives today. At the moment the Greeks were perceiving the necessity of law as the creator of civilization, Confucius was making the same great discovery in distant China. He worked the idea out with his own materials in his own way, and essentially it is at one with the Greek outline. As the Greeks took their materials from early civilizations, so the Romans took the laws of ancient Greece as the basis of the Twelve Tables and the principles of Justinian's corpus juris hundreds of years later. The laws of Europe stemmed largely from that of the Romans, and we in America have taken much of our law from the Anglo-Saxons who were exposed to Roman law 2,000 years ago.

OUR DEBT TO HISTORY

It is fitting, therefore, that in this young country of ours we should give recognition to the debt we owe to mankind generally for the hardships they endured in order to develop a society in which we can live in freedom.

In the Supreme Court at Washington, we endeavor to keep this realization constantly before us. On the frieze of the walls of our courtroom, carved in stone, we have the likenesses of lawgivers through the ages. As we listen to the arguments of counsel and judge the cases according to our present concepts of law and justice, these figures look down upon us and we up toward them. To our left are nine lawgivers before the Christian era—Menes of Egypt, Hammurabi of Babylon, Moses and Solomon of Israel, Lycurgus, Solon and Draco of Greece, Confucius of China, and Augustus of Rome. To our right are those who came afterward—Justinian of Rome, Mohammed of Islam, Charlemagne of Germany, King John of England, St. Louis of France, Hugo Grotius of Holland, Blackstone of England, Napoleon of France, and our own John Marshall. John Marshall is our great Chief Justice because his great decisions put flesh and sinews upon the bare bones of our new Constitution and because he did more than any other man of law in our history to weld us into a Nation capable of making a Federal Republic function properly from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. But the principles of the Constitution which he interpreted came to us from these other lawgivers to whom we thus humbly acknowledge our indebtedness. I have no doubt that if they were alive today they would acknowledge their indebtedness to the Book of Books, the Holy Bible, which contains the most basic law ever written.

We must not be complacent or self-satisfied with our law because we are living in a fast changing world, and as conditions change so do the problems, the rights, and the obligations of people change. If the law is to serve its true purpose it, too, must change to meet those changed conditions.

However, traditionally, the law is slow to change. The tendency of the more fortunate to maintain the status quo, the indifference to existing inequalities, and the domination of the powerful over the weak have, through the ages, prevented the people of every nation from achieving the standard of justice which they chose as their ideal.

In his ancient code, Hammurabi of Babylon stated that its purpose was to protect the weak from the strong, and 25 centuries ago Solon was asked how it would be possible to have justice in Athens. His answer was that the people of Athens could have justice whenever those who were not injured by injustice should become as outraged as those who had been injured. Human nature has not changed to this day, and we Americans could say with equal certitude that we can have justice for everyone in our land whenever those of us who are not injured by injustices become as outraged as those who do suffer from them. That should be our goal, and I believe it is in the hearts of most Americans.

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

Over the entrance to our Supreme Court Building, in bold letters, are chiseled the words, "Equal Justice Under Law." How wonderful it would be if we could in honesty say that we had achieved that great objective. However, so long as any Americans are living in abject poverty in squalid slums; so long as any child is denied an education; so long as opportunities to develop are denied to any segment of our society; so long as there is more than one class of citizenship and anyone is denied the right to participate in the affairs of his government; in short, so long as we fail to treat others as we would have them treat us, we cannot say in honesty that we actually have achieved equal justice under law.

We, therefore, need people who will make the law their guiding star. We need buildings such as this for their workshops. We need great libraries where the wisdom of the world will be available to those who are searching for legal truth, and we need fine young students to use these tools.

It has been my privilege in recent years to participate in a number of ceremonies of this kind, and I never cease to be thrilled on such occasions. Invariably, I have the same feeling of awe and inspiration that comes over me in a temple of worship; in fact, I like to think of these buildings as temples—temples of the law. I am sure that all of you who have participated in the creation of this beautiful building view it in the same manner.

On occasions such as this I am reminded of the ancient story concerning the wayfarer who was passing a structure under construction. He stopped to inquire of the three craftsmen who were working on it what they were doing. The first, without looking up, responded, "I am making a living." The second said, "I am following my trade." But the third, rising to his full height and looking straight into the eyes of the stranger, said, "Sir, I am building a temple."

I am sure that Dean Stalland and his law faculty who have such high aspirations for their law school, and the president and faculty who make it a vital part of Valparaiso University all believe they are building a temple. So considered, it can become a temple.

MORAL CHALLENGE

It is good to know that in this day and age, when the physical sciences are the preoccupation of the world, that some American universities are vitally concerned also with the development of law to cope with the changing conditions and the great social problems brought about by the application of science to every phase of life.

There are people who believe that the physical sciences have so outstripped the social sciences that our civilization is in danger of utter destruction because of a lack of the moral changes necessary to control science. They are afraid of science. But it seems to me that this carries an implication that scientists are less concerned with the welfare of the world than are the rest of us. I do not believe this to be true.

When the chemists of the last century worked out by careful experiments the nature and properties of chlorine, I do not believe they had in mind the use of chlorine gas to exterminate massed soldiery as happened in Europe in World War I. When Einstein, at the turn of the century, worked out his famous mathematical formula equating mass with energy, I do not believe he had military uses of atomic energy in mind. When Ernest Lawrence built his first cyclotron on the hill back of Berkeley and split the atom, I am positive that the atomic explosion at Hiroshima was not in his thoughts.

It is not the scientists who are the ogres of our times, and it is not science that is running away and endangering civilization. The danger lies in the lack of a lawful world and the absence of a world ordered under law which will avoid the pressures to use scientific knowledge for destructive rather than for peaceful purposes.

It would be better if, instead of worrying about the advancement of scientific knowledge, we gave more consideration to applying some of the techniques that make science so powerful to the furtherance of the rule of law and the controls and self-restraint that will make the wartime applications of scientific knowledge obsolete.

In all countries and from the beginning of literature, it is traditional to express our ideas about education and the pursuit of knowledge and progress toward ideals by analogy to the sun and to the mysteries of light, and probably such analogies are no less useful today.

Recently the physical scientists have produced a most extraordinary invention which will produce a beam of what they call "coherent light," a kind of light never found in nature and never before seen in the world. The device is called an "optical maser." In this fascinating device, by the application of electric power, atoms are reflected and bounced back and forth within a tube, reaching a crescendo from which a cascade of photons emerges in a beam of light in which each wave is precisely in step with its predecessor, each wave thus adding to the power of the wave which has gone before. Because these waves are all in step, each adding to the force of the other, a beam of light of incredible power can be produced. The "optical maser" has actually flashed a spot of red light on the surface of the moon which could be observed with telescopes on earth. At present, not even the sicentists can estimate the potential usefulness of this device.

RULE OF LAW

On this analogy, I suggest that the law schools of our country could well become a kind of maser for the rule of law. Within their walls the elemental principles of law and justice could be broken down and reflected and re-reflected striking sparks from students and faculty alike, and this mixture, with adequate stimulation, would produce a beam of coherent legal light of immense power and capable of revealing the rule of law in its full glory to any and every part of the earth.

I suggest that you dedicate this splendid new building to that great purpose. Such a contribution can well be expected from this university, dedicated as it is to Christian principles from which all good law stems. Christian colleges in America came into being long before any of our State educational systems. They fathered higher education in all parts of our country, and maintaining their independence have carried on devotedly to this day. Although I am not the product of one of them myself, I have the greatest admiration and respect for them. In this materialistic age in which we are living, they can well be said to be the leaven in the loaf of our higher education.

I wish for all of you continued success and happiness as your beautiful new campus unfolds to its full splendor, and sends out into the everyday world young people equipped to serve both God and man.

Prayer in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the testimony of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen before the House Committee on the Judiciary on the subject of prayer in our public schools.

While it will be some time before the hearings before this committee are made available in printed form, I feel Bishop Sheen's statements are significant, and I feel our people should have the benefit of them at this time. I am in complete accord with the sentiments which he expressed.

They are as follows:

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

The decision of the Supreme Court should be constitutionally amended because:

I. Founded on a myth.

II. It has taken lawmaking out of the hands of the legislators duly elected by the people.

III. Its decision exceeds the competency of any human court.

I. The decision of the Supreme Court on the subject of prayer in schools is founded on a myth—the myth of preventing the establishing of religion or the union of church and state.

Who wants a union of church and state in the United States?

1. Those Protestant churches which enjoyed establishment in nine of our Colonies do not want any establishment today.

2. I know of no Protestant church of any denomination which is in favor of the union of church and state in the United States.

3. The Catholic Church in the United States does not want any establishment of church and state in any shape or form whatsoever.

4. Though Catholics are accused of wanting a union of church and state, the Catholic Church in the United States does not want any change in our Constitution, which opposes the establishment of religion or prevents free exercise thereof.

To outlaw prayer in school on the myth of preventing the union of church and state is as unhistorical as to pass a law barring the importation of Rolls Royces in the United States on the myth that a large body of our citizenry is in favor of the union of the United States and England. No one wants the latter. No one wants the former.

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE BODIES

The rights of conscience of our citizenry are endangered by such a decision of the Supreme Court because it corrodes the check on our liberties by allowing a judicial body of our Government to preempt the right of our legislative body, or Congress. Article I of our Constitution states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But Congress has never passed the law excluding prayer or Bible reading in school. Now Congress is having a hearing concerning a law which was never passed, but which was enacted because Congress was bypassed.

Our concern is: Shall the laws by which the people are bound, be made by an appointed body which is untouchable for life through suffrage (Supreme Court), or shall the laws be framed by a legislative body which is elected, and therefore, removable at the will of the people (Congress)?

Would any Member of Congress present himself for election to the people on the platform of infringing the right to pray in school?

But if this freedom is curtailed by bypassing Congress, what other liberties can be suppressed by a minority group? By the use of similar antiquated figures of speech, like "the wall of separation," how shall we preserve article IV of our Constitution concerning the security of our homes, or any other amendment?

While I fear for a country which outlaws prayer in schools, I fear still more for a people who surrender control over their lawmaking bodies.

We are a democracy with the right to elect our lawmakers. One-third of the world does not elect its lawmakers. Theirs is a so-called legislative body which is handed the laws for applause by the unelected party directorate. The subject at hand, therefore, is not just prayer in schools. It is "How Prayer in School Was Excluded From the Nation Without Passing Through Congress." It is not often that a nation has to decide something almost as fundamental as the right to prayer, but it does now.

III. EXCEEDS COMPETENCY OF COURT

The United States is a pluralistic Nation, with plural political parties, plural religions, plural ownership, pural societies.

Because there are many different views on the subject of reading, it does not follow that there should be no reading in schools. Nor should prayer be excluded because there are plural views concerning it.

A king had thousands of uniforms. It was decided that there should be a parade of his costumes. Hundreds of lackeys filed before him and his people, one wearing knickers, another ermine, another a mountain climbing outfit, another flannels, etc.

The pluralism of costumes was considered a successful event until a boy standing at the edge of the room pointed out that the king was naked.

Granted that the Supreme Court must respect the pluralistic views concerning religion, it must be careful that it does not make our Nation religiously naked.

Does the subject of prayer fall under the competency of any civil court? The most the Court may do is to protect civilly the freedom to pray and the freedom not to pray, but not to deny the right to pray. It cannot do this anymore than it can forbid mothers to nurse their own children.

Once it is conceded that a Court has the right to choose between the freedom to pray and the freedom not to pray, the door is opened to writing into the American Constitution article 124 of the Soviet Constitution in which the State reserves the right to conduct antireligious propadanda while denying to citizens the right of religious propaganda.

I grant to anyone the right not to say prayers, as I grant the right to anyone not to say "Thank You" for the mustard. But I also want him to allow me the right to

pray at the same time that I thank God we have in the United States a wall of separation between church and state.

Protective Tariffs for Domestic Citrus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on protective tariffs for domestic citrus by Florida's able Commissioner of Agriculture, Doyle Conner:

STATEMENT ON PROTECTIVE TARIFFS FOR DOMESTIC CITRUS BY DOYLE CONNER, COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE, STATE OF FLORIDA

As Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Florida, I am convinced that the removal or lowering of existing tariff restrictions on foreign citrus products will be highly destructive and detrimental to Florida's citrus industry, the State's leading industry and a main source of economic lifeblood.

There are several reasons why any modification of the existing tariff structure would be harmful to the U.S. citrus industry:

1. Foreign supplies of citrus are seldom needed. Market reports show that U.S. citrus producers frequently produce more citrus than can be profitably marketed in domestic channels. When inclement weather conditions or other hazard produce a need for outside supplies of citrus, foreign sources can readily be obtained under the existing tariff structure. In fact, oranges from Israel are currently selling in Florida below Florida citrus prices despite existing tariff rates.

2. Florida is not a citrus exporting State. Between 1½ and 3½ percent of the total annual Florida citrus crop is exported, compared to export quotas of 50 to 70 percent for most foreign citrus producing areas. Apparently there is little chance that Florida producers will find themselves able to enter the export market in the future, even though new markets are opening up in Europe, since foreign citrus producing areas with lower production costs are capturing these new markets. In fact, Florida and California citrus producers are already losing the vast Canadian citrus market to Mediterranean, South African, and Australian citrus interests.

3. Any Federal action to remove or lower the existing tariff rates on foreign citrus would invite an inflex of foreign citrus products into the United States at the expense of domestic citrus producers, who would lose all or a substantial portion of the domestic market. With little prospect for entering the export market because of higher production costs, these producers would face unsurmountable economic obstacles. Furthermore, any tariff reduction would serve as further incentive for foreign producers to plant additional citrus acreage which would tend to further complicate the citrus marketing picture.

Any detrimental effect to the citrus industry would result in substantial economic harm to the State of Florida and ultimately to the United States. Since the lowering or removal of existing tariff rates would produce such a detrimental effect to Florida's citrus industry, I strongly recommend that citrus be removed from the list of commodities to be taken up in the GATT negotiations.

Bias in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Robert G. Spivack, which appeared in the April 26, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The kind of persecution detailed by Mr. Spivack is deliberately fostered by the Soviet Government and it should come as no surprise that the Ukrainian Academy of Science has published an anti-Semitic book. On April 23, 1964, I introduced House Resolution 703 condemning Soviet persecution of its citizens because of religion. I again urge that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs consider this resolution.

The article follows:

BIAS IN RUSSIA

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Government was embarrassed recently by disclosures in the West that the Ukranian Academy of Science had published an unmistakably anti-Semitic book.

The Communists have always made a propaganda point of how opposed they were to discrimination and bias. Now twice within the short span of 5 years they find themselves self-indicted on this very score. Not too long ago Negro students from Ghana, Nigeria and other African states said they were victims of racial bias at Moscow University.

The latest example of bias, this time against the Jews, will be harder to hush up—because it is all in print and has been widely circulated. It appears in a book entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment," by one T. K. Kychko.

Books are not published in the Soviet Union without official sanction. The Ukranian Academy has a licensing system, and any book must be approved by several authorities before it is published. The Kychko book was no exception, it even carries a foreword by two members of the academy.

The contents of the book are similar in many respects to the ill-reputed "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," the Bible of anti-Semites in the days of the czar. Now the terminology is Communist, but the ideas are relatively unchanged.

Jews are accused of being clannish, of having links with "American imperialism" and "world capitalism" and the State of Israel.

The illustrations in the book are blatantly anti-Semitic, and caricatures are very similar to those used by the Nazis in their most notorious publication, Der Stuermer.

There are many explanations being made abroad by Soviet authorities as to how and why the book was published. None is very convincing, particularly that it is part of the campaign to make Jews turn against Judaism.

First of all it is written in Ukrainian, a language not too widely read by Jews in Russia. Secondly, according to authorities on Judaism, it contains many factual errors about Jewish religious practice which would be readily apparent to any orthodox Jew.

One British writer who recently visited the Ukraine comes up with a somewhat plausible explanation for the revival of anti-Semitism. Things have not been going well and almost everyone is forced to break local laws and regulations.

For example, this writer reports, people pay artisans to do jobs for them privately rather than waiting for the city Soviet to send workmen, which often means waiting for months or years. To get favors they take or give bribes.

Bribery and this kind of corruption has become so rampant it was leading to scandals which threatened to bring in the national authorities. To cover up, it is said, the Jews of the Ukraine were made the scapegoats with the Kychko book only one of numerous attempts to divert attention from conditions which were causing unrest.

L.B.J. Economy Just Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has made much of economizing but the record shows otherwise. This is succinctly pointed out in a column by Lyle C. Wilson in yesterday's Washington Daily News:

L.B.J. HASN'T SAVED MUCH

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The brakes seem to be slipping on President Johnson's economy bandwagon. It could be, of course, that economy prospects were overballyhooed or that the President overacted his role as a dollarpincher.

It was noted in this space last January that:

"President Johnson's 1965 budget and the publicity maneuvers preceding it have created the public image Mr. Johnson intended to create. It is the image of a slow man with a buck. Not a pennypincher, but a dollarpincher."

That paragraph was written last January 22 after a floodtide of White House budget leaks, all touching on economy. It was an even 2 months after President Johnson succeeded to the White House.

The Treasury has just reported its position as of April 22, 5 months after Mr. Johnson took over. The Treasury figures reveal that in the 5-month period November 22–April 22, the Johnson administration has spent approximately $50 billion and collected in taxes about the same amount. Since November 22, the public debt has increased from $307.7 billion to $309 billion. U.S. gold holdings decreased in the same period by about $110 million.

Spending and tax collection in the current (1964) fiscal year are running well ahead of fiscal 1963. The Treasury issues its daily statements in terms of withdrawals of funds and deposits of funds. These are roughly but not precisely equal to expenditures and receipts. Here are some comparative figures as of April 22, 1964:

[In billions]

	This year	*Last year*
Withdrawals	$101.9	$96.7
Deposits	91.8	85.6
Public debt	309.0	303.5
Gold	15.4	15.8

The eye-popping figure in this daily statement for April 22 is for tax collections on that day, $615,452,900. There is something wrong with a government that cannot live within its income when the money rolls in at such a rate although not every day is such a big payday for the Treasury.

The humpbacked U.S. taxpayer is both patient and generous. The Treasury's receipts from the public in fiscal 1954 were

$71.6 billion of which $29.5 billion was personal income tax. In this fiscal year of 1964 receipts from the public will be $114.3 of which individual income taxpayers will contribute $47.5 billion.

All of these figures will be higher for fiscal 1965, and thereafter. Perhaps the man has not appeared who can reduce Government spending, compel the Government to live within its income and to begin a realistic reduction of the public debt. President Johnson is having a go at it, but he has little so far to show in the way of results. That does not mean necessarily that Mr. Johnson cannot do the job. But it does mean that some persons will want to withhold their cheers for his economy until there is more substantial evidence of it.

Blackie Tells Rusk Red Bloc Trade Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 27, Mr. William Blackie, president of Caterpillar Tractor Co. participated with Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a panel discussion before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. There were no prepared texts of the remarks of each, and until a transcript is available I should like to have read into the RECORD an account of the dialog appearing in the Peoria Journal Star and written by their staff writer, Miss Bernadine Martin, and headlined "Blackie Tells Rusk Red Bloc Trade Conditions."

Inasmuch as the article covers a very sensitive issue of possible increased trade with the Soviet bloc, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I place the article at this point in the RECORD:

BLACKIE TELLS RUSK RED BLOC TRADE CONDITIONS

(By Bernadine Martin)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—William Blackie, Caterpillar Tractor Co. president, yesterday told Secretary of State Dean Rusk the conditions under which his company would be interested in doing business with a member country of the Soviet bloc.

He said they were: Government approval; substantial volume of business; provisions for parts and service; full price for products; no special credit arrangements.

Blackie and Rusk engaged in an hour-long informal chat about the roles of business and government in foreign affairs. Their audience was the 3,400 businessmen attending the 52d annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here.

One of the areas discussed at length was the possibility of establishing a closer relationship through trade with some of the Soviet satellites. Rusk inquired of the Caterpillar president:

"From the point of the businessman, Mr. Blackie, under what conditions would you sell to Russia?"

Blackie cited a memorandum which he issued recently for general guidance of Caterpillar personnel.

"U.S. Government approval would be a basic prerequisite for any trade with any member of the Soviet bloc," Blackie said. "And I would hope that if it were given it would be something more than a mere passive consent.

"We would not be interested in doing business with a Soviet country unless the volume of business were to be fairly substantial. There would be no point in selling a few machines; the time, trouble, and risk involved would not be justified," Blackie said.

He said in his opinion his company should try to concentrate on reasonable quantities of a relatively few models.

Blackie said if these two objectives were attained, it would necessarily take care of the other requisites, which he said, would be provisions for parts and service, full price for products, and no special credit arrangements.

"We should not be prepared to sell in any country unless adequate measures were taken to supply the necessary parts and service," Blackie said. "Our company's success has lain in providing customers with all three basic elements—machines, parts, and service—and we should not depart from this principle in dealing with even Soviet satellites."

Blackie said if there had to be intermediates between the Caterpillar source and the ultimate user, the intermediate would have to get a "margin of reward" out of a price which would be higher than normally realized, as the product should be sold for its full sale value.

His fifth point brought a round of applause from his audience. It was that no special credit should be granted to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

"At this stage of developments we wouldn't be justified in taking anything other than a least-favored-nation position," Blackie said.

Rusk had told Blackie, in response to a question about trade with Soviet satellite nations, that the Government's position is based on the behavior of the countries.

"The differences within the Communist group are very significant at this time," Rusk said.

"Our position is that since these countries no longer form a monolithic bloc in political terms, we should no longer treat them as a monolith in trade terms.

"I personally like to keep my eye on whether they are prepared to leave their neighbors alone and live in peace and whether they are addressing themselves to the unfinished business of their own people.

"In other words we must tailor our trade policies to their pattern of behavior," Rusk said.

He said in the case of Russia, the hard core of the U.S. policy is to prohibit any items of direct military significance, but to permit the flow of trade in food and other consumer goods.

"Some of the Eastern European countries are seeking closer alliances with the West, and in our trade policies we have sought to encourage this," the Secretary said.

In other countries, he said, there are total embargoes. These, he said, include Communist China, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

"Restrictions on trade to Cuba is a basic part of our program to isolate the Castro regime and reduce its capacity to subvert other nations. Cuba is in a bad economic condition, and in our opinion, should not be assisted by free countries.

"What do you see as the problems of expanding trade among the more industrialized nations of the free world?" Rusk asked Blackie.

Blackie said one is the intention of the industrial nations to become more industrialized, and thus more competitive with us.

He said in their endeavors they are frequently favored by lower wages, and tax rates and systems which favor exports.

"In our own Federal system a very substantial portion of our taxes is derived from income sources, and very little from the sale of goods," Blackie said.

"But in the major countries competitive in the Common Market, a very substantial portion of national revenue is obtained from sales or value-added taxes, which are waived in the case of goods exported.

"In third party markets we are lacking an advantage which could only be gained if we decided to modify our tax system to one which places less reliance upon disincentive income taxes and more on value market of similar sales taxes," he said.

Blackie said expanded foreign trade or investment presupposes a continued partnership with European nations, but he told Rusk that in the light of some recent events this seems doubtful.

Rusk said he has no doubt what the present or future long range will be, and that it is toward unity and partnership.

"There are some discussions which seem to throw some doubt on this, but they only have to do with how we write the next chapter, or take the next step, and do not bear on what the relationship would be if the partnership were faced with an external threat," Rusk said.

"This 20-mule team of the free world was pulled just after World War II with just one mule—the others were in the wagon licking their wounds," Rusk said.

"But they are now in harness, and anyone who doesn't recognize that there will be differences in which way to go just doesn't recognize either mules or sovereign states," the Secretary said.

"So we continue to probe to see if we can find areas of agreement and move toward other points whereby we can find out whether in fact peaceful coexistence can come to be as real as ordinary people in the free world can understand it or whether a world of tension is for our future," Rusk said.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the 173d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3. I am proud to join my colleagues in honoring our Polish citizens and their sorrowing friends and relatives in Communist Poland.

The Constitution of May 3 promised great hope for the Polish people. Through the 173 years that have followed its enactment, many tragedies have befallen Poland, yet the people have not lost sight of the high ideals which they adopted in 1791.

Many Poles have found their way to America and have enriched this country with their talents. Polish-Americans are well known and respected in many professions. Their Christian principles and firm awareness of Western culture have made them one of America's most valued assets.

We celebrate this important day in Polish history with strong pride in our Polish citizens, but also with deep sorrow at the misfortune of the Polish homeland.

It is most remarkable, but certainly true, that after more than 2 centuries of attack from all sides, Poles still continue their resistance to subjection.

They are by nature a proud and independent nation. Let us hope that in the years ahead the smothering bonds of communism will continue to loosen and that the independent Poland which produced the Constitution of May 3 will emerge once again.

Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the first sizable joint effort by American private enterprise and a Latin American government to implement the objectives of the Alliance for Progress has been inaugurated this month in Colombia by the United Fruit Co.

On April 22, the United Fruit Co.'s banana carrier, SS *Cibao*, sailed from near Turbo, Colombia, to Bremerhaven, West Germany, with the first regular shipment of bananas of excellent quality and good weight from the Turbo farms. This great American company, which has its headquarters in my home city of New Orleans, has introduced this new joint banana-growing enterprise as a means to develop the area around Turbo, and build of a new community of upward to 300,000 people with an improved standard of living.

I am proud to commend the United Fruit Co. to call to the attention of my colleagues the fine work which this great American company is doing to strengthen the Alliance for Progress program through the use of free enterprise. I am happy to enclose for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress a feature story on this joint enterprise from Turbo, Colombia.

The story follows:

TURBO, COLOMBIA.—United States and Colombian private enterprise have developed a remote fertile area of Colombia of great social and economic promise and on April 22 inauguarated the first regular shipment of bananas from here. The plantilla fruit or first crop of bananas were described as of excellent quality and of good weight.

In the presence of high Colombian Government officials, officials of Compania Frutera de Sevilla and the United Fruit Co., as well as most of the banana growers in the area, the United Fruit banana carrier SS *Cibao* sailed for Bremerhaven, West Germany, with 15,000 stems of bananas from the Turbo farms.

The Corporacion Financiera Colombiana de Desarrollo Industrial of Bogotá and Compania Frutera de Sevilla together have encouraged the settlement and productive use of these lands which previously brought no economic returns. Compania Frutera de Sevilla is an affiliate of the United Fruit Co.

The venture is the first sizable effort by private enterprise to put into actual practice the objectives of the Alliance for Progress to aid the advance and prosperity of Latin America.

When the Turbo development is in full production there will have been invested in the program about $25 million by the growers and landowners, the Corporation Financiera and the Compania Frutera de Sevilla. About 235 growers and landowners will be participating. All proceeds received by the banana growers will be in dollars with the resultant benefits to Colombia's balance of international payments.

Compania Frutera de Sevilla pioneered the program, sending in engineers and soil experts, starting on an intensive scale 5 years ago. Uraba landowners were persuaded to go into the banana growing business. For years whatever use had been made of the land was livestock grazing. Frutera's total investment in this new project will be in excess of $3 million.

Financiera obtained a $6 million bank credit in the United States and is providing the financial assistance needed by the Colombian farmers. The bank establishes the conditions under which it will lend money to the farmers.

The farmers anticipate that with normal conditions the costs of their developments can be paid off within 5 years, and these payments will enter a revolving credit fund for financing of other growers by Financiera.

The president of the Corporation Financiera, Guillermo Herrera Carrizosa, congratulated United Fruit Co. and its affiliate for its pioneering in the area.

The Colombian banana growers are assured a minimum price for their exported fruit by Compania Frutera de Sevilla, which already operates a similar associate producer program at Santa Marta in northeast Colombia. Neither Frutera nor United Fruit Co. produce bananas in Colombia.

Frutera will undertake the export marketing of the Turbo production. Under this kind of partnership arrangement the land and production facilities will be owned by Colombians, and Frutera will serve as technical adviser and marketing medium. Should market prices exceed a previously agreed specified rate the farmers will share half the increased income. The company anticipates the grower will receive a good profit for his efforts and agrees to help stimulate interest in banana industry development by withholding 25 U.S. cents per exported stem to be deposited in a fund that will guarantee amortization of mortgages written by Financiera.

In the Turbo development the Compania Frutera de Sevilla will provide farmers with banana seed as well as technical advice and other assistance, including plant sanitation methods to control Sigatoka leaf virus. The farmers guarantee to maintain their cultivations in good condition. Progress of the commercial planting of bananas has been limited only to the amount of certified seed available and drainage of the area.

In addition Frutera has built roads, drains, banana receiving terminals and dredged three large canals. More than 30 banana barges, pushed or pulled by 10 tugs, will carry the bananas from these terminals or landing stages to oceangoing ships in the Gulf of Uraba. No wharf is yet available to handle large shipping in the shallow waters.

To reach the supply of bananas, Frutera widened and deepened several streams leading into the Rio Leon and the Gulf of Uraba. The growers will carry the bananas over Frutera-constructed roads of some 10 kilometers in length, so located as to connect these streams with the national highway leading to Turbo from distant Medellin. Trucks are loaded at the banana farms and driven to the loading terminals. When the fruit is available in quantity several years hence, two more canals are expected to be built to augment the capacity of the ones now existing.

The planting program will continue in full swing during the next several years until a total of 14,000 hectares (35,000 acres) is reached. Presently planted acreage is in excess of 2,710 hectares (6,700 acres).

Existence of the Turbo area has been known for some time, but its development was retarded because of its lack of communications. Company engineers have been in and out of the area for many years.

During the past 5 years Frutera has maintained a research center there, and extensive studies have been carried on, particularly into soil, meteorological and topographic conditions. During this time six test plots of bananas were grown. From these test plots came the seed to be planted by the Colombian farmers.

Soil engineers, agronomists, pathologists, and entomologists went over a wide area. They found good banana lands extending southward along the Gulf from Turbo. These lands are ideally suited for growing the quality Gros Michel type of banana and are disease free and relatively free of destructive insects, in contrast to many producing areas in Central America and elsewhere where a root fungus infection named Panama disease has hampered this type.

The area requires extensive drainage, but due to the topography of the land, this drainage is not a problem.

The Uraba area has a tropical and humid climate. Its dry season is short: usually the months of January, February, and March. The rest of the year, rainfall, which is essential for the success of banana production, is well distributed with the greatest amount of rain falling in May and again in the September–November period. The yearly rainfall is around 100 inches.

The area has been recommended for growing, besides bananas and cattle, such products as cacao, rubber, oil palm, pineapple, and abaca.

The introduction of the new banana enterprise could provide the base for the establishment of a community of 300,000 inhabitants with a better standard of living and more accommodations than now prevailing in many rural areas, according to a report prepared by the Department of Agriculture of Antioquia, Colombia.

Reckless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of my colleagues to an editorial taken from the Wheeling Intelligencer which discusses the proposal of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee to repeal the law requiring 25 percent of our gold be retained to back our dollar. The purpose of this proposal escapes me completely. Rather, I view it with alarm for in my opinion, it is an open invitation for every nation in the world to immediately convert their dollar reserves. We would suddenly find ourselves bereft of any gold reserves whatsoever.

I heartily recommend to my colleagues that this proposal be examined most carefully before any action is taken.

RECKLESS: REMOVING GOLD RESERVE OPEN BID TO PRINTING-PRESS MONEY AND CHAOS

The dissenting voices of five Republican Members, plus that of Democratic Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, have called attention to the danger inherent in an innocent-sounding proposal of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee that the 25-percent gold backing be removed from Fed-

eral Reserve deposits and Federal Reserve currency in circulation.

The purpose of our gold reserve, which has shrunk from $24.8 billion in 1949 to $15.6 billion at the end of last year under the steady outflow of foreign-aid dollars, is twofold. It meets the statutory requirement of a 25-percent backing for deposits and currency, and it maintains the international gold standard under which we agree to redeem in gold any U.S. dollars held by foreign governments and central banks.

Of the $15.6 billion in gold we still have on deposit, a total of $13 billion is required to back the currency, leaving but $2.6 billion in "free gold" to support foreign-held dollars. Obviously, if every creditor demanded gold, we would be caught far short. So the Economic Committee reasons that if the whole $15.6 billion were made available for this purpose the move would "increase confidence in the determination of the United States to maintain the international value of the dollar."

That is, we think, an open question. As the five objecting Republican members of the committee point out, the gold reserve requirement "is an important balance-of-payments discipline whose existence—far from weakening confidence in the dollar—strengthens it." So they feel that removing the reserve requirement "could be interpreted as a sign of weakness if done in the face of large continuing balance-of-payments deficits."

Senator LAUSCHE points to still another and perhaps more serious objection. "The requirement that there be 25 cents in gold for every Federal-Reserve dollar issued," he declared in a Senate speech, "is an anchor against printing-press money. If that requirement is removed there will be no limitation of any character except the judgment of Federal officials, which changes like the winds."

All we need to destroy confidence in the dollar altogether and to complete the erosion of our fiscal structure is an injection of printing-press money.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MAY 1964

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New reproductions: Color postcards. Pieter de Hooch, "A Dutch Courtyard"; Murillo, "A Girl and Her Duenna"; Raphael, "The Small Cowper Madonna"; Tiepolo, "Madonna of the Goldfinch." Price 5 cents each postpaid.

Color reproductions, 11 by 14 inches. Magnasco, "The Baptism of Christ"; Domenico Veneziano, "Saint John in the Desert"; Cézanne, "Vase of Flowers." Price 25 cents each postpaid.

New publication: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., by John Walker, director. One hundred and sixteen color and 250 black and white illustrations, 6¼ by 8¼ inches, 347 pages, clothbound, $7.50 postpaid.

Concerts: The Gallery's 21st American Music Festival will open on May 3 and continue through June 7.

Lectour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these Lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 27, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 3

Painting of the week: Hubert Robert, "The Old Bridge" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 53, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Theater and Festival in Art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Society and Painting in Seventeenth-Century Holland." Guest Speaker: Horst Gerson, Director, Netherlands Institute for Art History, The Hague, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-first American Music Festival. Alabama quartet, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 4 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 10

Painting of the week: Whistler, "The White Girl" (Harris Whittenmore collection), gallery 71. Tuesday through Saturday,12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Neo-Classicism, Romanticism, and Realism. rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as Creating and Making." Guest Speaker: Milton C. Nahm, professor of philosophy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-first American Music Festival. David Burge, pianist, east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MAY 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 17

Painting of the week: Renoir, "Odalisque" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Impressionism. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The 'Church' and the 'Synagogue' in Medieval Iconography." Guest speaker: Wolfgang Seiferth, professor of German language and literature, Howard University, Washington, D.C., lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-first American Music Festival. Robert Sprenkle, oboe; Francis Tursi, viola; Armand Basile, piano; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 18 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 24

Painting of the week: Holbein, the Younger, "Edward VI as a Child" (Mellon collection), gallery 39, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Post-Impressionism. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Story of Stained Glass from Iran to Coventry." Speaker: Raymond S. Stites, curator of education, National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-first American Music Festival. National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, east garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, MAY 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 31

Painting of the week: Van Dyck, "Philip, Lord Wharton" (Mellon collection), gallery 42, Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Twentieth-Century Painting. Rotunda, Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Friday, 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The New Churches of Europe." Guest speaker: G. E. Kidder Smith, author and architect, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-first American Music Festival. Joel Krosnick, cellist; Howard Lebow, pianist; east garden court, 8.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

West Virginia National Guard Unit Stands Long Vigil in Tribute to the Late President John F. Kennedy—Officers and Men of Troop F, 2d Reconnaisance 150th Armored Cavalry Participate in Moving Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the late John F. Kennedy was a leader who captured the hearts and imaginations of millions of freedom-loving people the world over. His energy, wisdom, and courage set him apart as one destined to mold history and one attuned to the needs and challenges of our time.

West Virginians know that it was the support of the citizens of the Mountain State which helped to start him on the road to the White House in a primary election. And President Kennedy never forgot this demonstration of faith and trust shown him by the people of our highlands. He spoke of West Virginia with special fondness and returned on our 100th anniversary of statehood.

Americans were deeply grieved by the untimely death of the young Chief Executive. Each of us sensed a personal loss. I wish to share with my colleagues one example of the love and respect which John F. Kennedy called forth in the hearts of West Virginians.

In Clarksburg, immediately following the assassination, the officers and men of Troop F, 2d Reconnaisance 150th Armored Cavalry organized a voluntary honor guard for the martyred leader. A crepe-decked picture of President Kennedy was displayed at the Harrison County Court House—and from 6 p.m., Friday, November 22 until 6 p.m., Monday, November 25, members of Troop F stood guard, each for 1 hour. At the conclusion of the vigil a ceremony took place during which taps was played and a rifle salute fired.

The men who took part in this moving tribute were called to active military duty by President Kennedy during the Berlin crisis and served from August until October of 1961. Many of the men traveled considerable distances from their homes to Clarksburg so that they might join in this memorial to their former Commander in Chief. It was a sensitive expression of sorrow in which many Clarksburg residents shared, and which typified the reverence and mourning throughout West Virginia.

Commendations are due the officers and men of Troop F, 2d Reconnaisance 150th Armored Cavalry, for carrying forward this appropriate demonstration of our regard for the late John F. Kennedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this moving tribute in the November 26, 1963 issue of the Clarksburg Exponent be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLLING BELLS SET MOOD FOR DAY OF MOURNING HERE

Except for the mournful toll of church bells, Clarksburg was a quiet and somber place yesterday.

Few people were in the downtown area, most of them were at home watching on TV final rites for the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was felled Friday by bullets from the gun of a fiendish assassin.

A November sun brought an ethereal light to the courthouse plaza where local military men stood guard beside a black-draped photo of the late President, paying homage to a great man—a man who gave his life in the service of his country.

Members of Troop F, 2d Reconnaissance, 150th Armored Calvalry, who maintained the guard, were called to active duty by the late President Kennedy and served from August until October of 1961 during the famous Berlin crisis.

Enlisted men and officers of the troop came from their civilian occupations to stand vigilance at the shrine of the departed leader. It was necessary that some hitchhike from outlying communities so that they too could volunteer their services in the long hours of mourning.

The flower arrangements were donated by florists, banks, business firms, and citizens from throughout the central West Virginia area.

Each man of the troop, including officers took a turn, standing guard for an hour between 6 p.m. Friday and 6 p.m. Monday.

At the ceremony at 6 p.m. Monday the small picture in front of the larger picture of the President was draped with black velvet. The picture had below it a copy of a poem, "Captain, My Captain," written by Walt Whitman, for Abraham Lincoln.

After draping the picture, the flag was raised from the half-mast position where it had flown continuously since the vigil by the National Guard began.

The flag was raised to full staff, after which the entire troop was brought to attention and the rifle squad fired three volleys, which represented the 21 gun salute fired only on the death of a serviceman or to the President.

As the flag was raised to full staff two local citizens, Bunner Palmer, principal of Nutter Fort Grade School, and Don Campbell, played taps.

During the time of taps, the flag descended from the bow staff of the battleship *West Virginia* which was recently dedicated at the courthouse.

Also at the shrine were members of the local VFW Post. Ceremonies at 1 o'clock Monday were conducted by Harold Harden, commander; Pete Aiello, past commander; Kenneth Glasscock, 6th district commander; Arthur Isner, junior vice commander; John Nery, officer of the day; and Harry Johns, colorbearer.

Floral tributes were placed near the photo by members of the VFW contingent.

The flag which stood beside the picture was donated by the local Moose Lodge. Spotlights on the scene were loaned by Mrs. Porter of the Stonewall Jackson Hotel. The white helmets and pistol belts worn by the guardsmen were obtained from the Moose All-Girl Drill Team.

County Commissioner Benjamin Stout gave the unit permission to use all of the courthouse facilities, including the services of maintenance crews and other personnel.

Richard Breisford of the United Fund organization gave his permission to remove the large sign bearing the UF campaign total from its place on the plaza. Mayor Edward Fornash agreed to the dismantling of the reviewing stand erected for the Christmas parade on Friday. The parade was canceled on word of the President's death.

Members of Troop F volunteering their services were Capt. Charles G. Elliott and James Spence, 1st Sgt. Joseph J. Harris, M. Sgt. Harvey G. McGarry, Platoon Sergeant Lister, Sgts. 1st Class Donald D. Davisson, Leroy D. Humberston, Joseph M. Jurick, Rancil E. Bee, Donald W. Nutter, Harry W. Quickle, John H. Sandy, Frank A. Folio, Harley F. Lane, Spc. E-5 David R. Criss, Loren L. Flanigan, Steve C. Kovar, Charles W. Myers.

Lieutenants Ray E. Myers and Paul Goodwin, Spc. E-4 Woody D. Hamrick, Lloyd C. Miller Jr., Jerry C. Webb, Pfc.s Jennings L. Stewart, Robert L. Powell, Glen R. See, Larry G. See, George Smith, Jim McCullough, James Fragale.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, those who believe in a free Poland celebrate May 3 every year as Polish Constitution Day. On May 3, 1791, the Polish people adopted a Constitution which cast off the oppressive bonds of feudalism, and centuries of serfdom and poverty.

For years the aristocrats prevented every attempt at progress in the Sejm, the national parliament. But, in 1791 patriots of great character and courage like Hugo Kollontaj and Ignacy Potocki, arose to demand the freedom and national unity which were the only possible salvation of Poland in the face of increasing imperialist designs by its neighbors. These men led the Poles in a magnificent but terribly brief, national renaissance.

The new Constitution established on May 3, abolished the liberum veto which had given the conservative nobles power to prevent any changes. Feudal priv-

ileges were abolished. Towns were given free governments for the first time. Serfs were put under the protection of the laws with the intention to abolish serfdom. The monarchy was limited and ministerial responsibility established.

The Polish people rallied to this Constitution which expressed their devotion to liberty.

Of course Russia, Prussia, and Austria of that day were not happy with a strong, united Poland. They had already seized half of the country in the infamous first partition of 1772. In 1793 Russia and Prussia conspired with traitorous Poles of the threatened aristocracy to overcome the tiny army of 46,000 men which fought all alone against the two strongest empires of the day. They each seized further large areas of Poland and abolished the new Constitution. Soon the dark days of feudalism were once again upon Poland.

But the stirrings of freedom which erupted in 1791 have never again been stilled in Poland. The movement toward individual liberty and democratic institutions symbolized in the Constitution of May 3, have continued to inspire Poles throughout the last century and a half to fight against oppression wherever they find it.

In 1956 the warning was given to Communist oppressors that Poland has not forgotten its love for freedom nor the courage of the patriots of 1791. The long road toward a free and independent Poland has been difficult and laden with sorrow. To continue the journey will require the greatest courage and dedication among all concerned. But with the aid of all Americans of good spirit and the encouragement of freedom-loving Poles in the United States and abroad, the end of that road is surely ahead.

Indiana Bar Association Supports Alaskan Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on April 18, the board of managers of the Indiana State Bar Association by unanimous vote adopted a resolution of support for S. 2719, the bill introduced by Senator JACKSON to provide relief to individuals who suffered substantial economic losses in the Alaska earthquake disaster.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF INDIANA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the members of the Indiana State Bar Association feel concern for their fellow citizens in the area of Anchorage, Alaska, who suffered from the recent earthquake disaster; and,

Whereas Senate bill 2719, as introduced by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, provides for the relief of such individuals who have suffered substantial economic losses; and,

Whereas said Senate bill is now the subject of hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate under the chairmanship of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico; and,

Whereas the Indiana State Bar Association joins with the Alaska State Bar Association in hoping that favorable consideration will be given to said Senate bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Indiana State Bar Association, by its board of managers, That said association support in principle Senate bill 2719, and respectfully asks that favorable consideration be given thereto by the Congress of the United States.

Dated at Indianapolis, Ind., this 18th day of April 1964.

The above and foregoing resolution was passed by the unanimous vote of the board of managers of the Indiana State Bar Association, with direction that copies of the same be disseminated to the U.S. Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from Indiana and to other Members of the Congress of the United States.

ROBERT A. GEMMILL,
President of Indiana State Bar Association.

Attest:

JOHN R. CARR, Jr.,
Secretary of Indiana State Bar Association.

Tribute to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I sent the following letter to President Truman on the occasion of his 80th birthday:

APRIL 28, 1964.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Independence, Mo.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is a privilege to be among those who salute you on your 80th birthday.

Those of us who serve under the banner of the Democratic Party look upon you as one of the all-time great leaders of the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy.

We who are in the Congress recall with pride your record of distinction in the Senate.

We who today bear the grave responsibility of formulating the legislation necessary to the safety of the free world recall with pride that it was in the Truman administration that the Truman doctrine, point IV, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization all became the shield of the West.

Today there is no higher honor the Republic can bestow than the accolade the American people have already given you—their love and esteem.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Member of Congress.

Harry Holt, a Modern Good Shepherd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I was saddened this week by the death of Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., who died at his orphanage in Seoul, Korea, with the orphan children whom he loved and to whom he devoted his life.

His fine works will live after him. He and his family were responsible for bringing some 3,000 Korean children to American families, many of them fathered by American servicemen. These children are a monumental tribute to Harry Holt. My husband and I were privileged to play a part in assisting him.

The Portland Oregonian in its editorial of April 29 states:

His untimely death at 59 removes one of the noblest Oregonians to have ever become a world figure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent editorial from the Oregonian, together with the news article from the Eugene Register-Guard of April 28, "Heart Attack Kills Father of Baby Lift," may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Apr. 29, 1964]

CLASSIC COMPASSION

Harry Holt of Creswell could have used his moderate fortune from farming and lumbering for the pleasure of himself and his closely knit family. In fact, he tried that. In the Holt farmhouse, almost lost among the paraphernalia for the feeding, housing, and diapering of Korean orphans, is a photograph of Mr. and Mrs. Holt and their six children, all in yachting costumes, aboard a large boat on which they once cruised the waters of Puget Sound. Perhaps if the Holts had continued to relax in this manner Mr. Holt would not now be dead in far-off Korea, the victim of the last of several heart attacks.

But one feels certain that Mr. Holt and his family never regretted using their money to save the lives of more than 3,000 Korean children for whom they found homes in American families and thousands more they cared for in orphanages in Korea. Deeply religious and compassionate, Mr. Holt and his wife and children found the perfect outlet for their money, seemingly endless energy, and deep feeling for humanity. They would not have been really happy on a yacht, knowing the need for love and succor among the outcast children of American servicemen and Korean women in Korea.

The story of the Holt adoption program is familiar to everyone, how the family saw a film of the suffering children at a religious meeting in Eugene and decided they would adopt one child for each member of the family, and how the eight became thousands, scattered across the United States among people who shared the Holt compassion. Mr. Holt fought redtape, sickness, and opposition from some welfare agencies to bring unwanted wai's into American homes. His story is a classic in selflessness and adherence to religious conviction.

His untimely death at 59 removes one of the noblest Oregonians to have ever become

a world figure. May those who shared his labors of love continue the work in his memory.

[From the Register-Guard, April 28, 1964]

HEART ATTACK KILLS FATHER OF BABYLIFT

(By Dan Sellard)

Harry Holt, a humble man who gained world fame as a humanitarian, died Monday night at the orphanage he operated in Korea. He was 59.

Death was attributed to a heart attack. He had a series of attacks since 1950.

Holt continued working at the program which has found homes for more than 3,000 orphans. "I'll die doing this and I'll die happy," he said after his first heart attack. "This is the Lord's work and it'll keep on going without me."

Mrs. Holt was telephoned the news of her husband's death and immediately made plans to fly to Korea Tuesday night.

She said Tuesday morning she will arrive in Korea Thursday and that the burial will take place probably Friday.

Holt will be buried, she said, in the mountainside cemetery where about 250 orphan children are buried. The cemetery is near the Holt orphanage at Seoul.

The Holt story, which attracted national attention in 1955 when he and his wife, Bertha, adopted eight children into their own family of six children, has become an American saga.

From his first efforts back in 1955 until now, Holt had drawn headlines, although he was reluctant about publicity and never quite understood the fuss he was creating.

FOUGHT BUREAUCRACY

He fought bureaucracy and attracted congressional attention, he was denounced by North Korean Communists for what they called his "slave labor recruitment" and was awarded a medal by the Government of South Korea.

Truly a man with a mission, Holt spent more than half a million dollars of his own money and, finally, lost his life to his program of placing the progeny of American GI's and Korean girls in decent homes.

His wife, Bertha, interviewed at her pink-stuccoed Creswell home Tuesday morning, was bereaved but not grief-stricken. She, like her husband, thought of the mission as something bigger than both of them, and was not reluctant to say that "God gave us this work to do and He'll see it carried out."

Operation of the 600-child orphanage, with its hospital and farm, will go on, she said, as well as the placement program.

She said that only Monday Harry had written her that he was having trouble with his leg. "Send me some more medicine," Mrs. Holt quoted him.

"I was going to send the medicine today," she said.

In Korea Tuesday were 35 sets of parents, waiting to return to California with children on Saturday. Recent changes of immigration laws make it necessary for parents in 16 of the States to be physically present to adopt children.

Earlier, through the help of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger and, later, his wife, Senator MAURINE L. NEUBERGER, Federal laws had allowed Holt's proxy adoptions, a program which came under severe criticism by orthodox adoption agencies.

Mrs. NEUBERGER said of Holt's death: "I was sad to learn of the death of Harry Holt. He was with the Korean children that he loved and to whom he devoted his life.

"Truly, Harry Holt typified the Good Shepherd and the Good Samaritan, and his babylift was wonderful. The world is a loser in his passing and I extend my sympathies to Mrs. Holt."

At the state level, Gov. Mark Hatfield called Holt "a rare individual who translated his sincere Christian beliefs into dynamic action in an eloquent demonstration of brotherhood. The continuation of his great work would be a fitting memorial."

Holt was born in a sod hut and was proud of it. He made about $500,000 buying and selling timber and was comfortably ensconced on a 350-acre farm when he saw a movie which told of the plight of mixed-blood orphans in Korea.

He and his wife had six children of their own, the oldest now 30 and the youngest 17, but they decided to adopt one or more of the orphans. Later, the one or two turned out to be eight.

INFANTS NOW TEENAGERS

The eight infants are now nearly teenagers.

One of the Holts' own daughters, Wanda, 26, died in Mexico City in 1961, from asphyxiation in a hotel room. She had been piloting a plane flying missionaries into remote parts of Mexico.

Another daughter, Barbara, gave birth to a child, her third son, April 22, in Seoul, where she and her husband Jack Chambers, live.

Still another daughter, Molly, 28, founded a boy's home at Pusan, Korea. She has just finished a nursing course in Portland.

Condolences were coming to Mrs. Holt from throughout the world, but mostly from parents of orphans Holt had placed with them.

These parents had a tough job Tuesday—they had to tell the children about the death of Mister Holt.

One of the parents, Mrs. George Surdam of Pleasant Hill, told Martha Sue Surdam, now a primary student, whom Harry always called "My precious jewel," about it Tuesday.

Martha Sue didn't cry, but her little dark face grew darker, Mrs. Surdam said.

"She was awfully quiet when she went to school this morning."

More than 3,000 others were to be told the same sad news this morning.

Their very best friend was gone.

MEMORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Contributions to Holt's memory may be made to the Orphans Foundation Fund, Post Office Box 95, Cresswell, Oreg.

A spokesman for the family said that a memorial service might be held later in Eugene or Cresswell, but that none is planned at this time.

El Diario

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I insert in the RECORD an article written on a newspaper with wide circulation in my district among the Puerto Rican population El Diario. This Spanish-language daily, in contrast to the other 18 foreign-language daily newspapers in New York, has quadrupled its circulation in the past 10 years. This is no doubt due to the excellent and exceptional work being done by the paper's human relations department.

The article follows:

EL DIARIO: "CAMPEON DE LOS BORICUAS"

(By Barbara Sapinsley)

Some weeks ago New York newspapers reported that a Puerto Rican laborer had left a paper bag containing his life's savings in a subway car. His first thought was not, as might be expected, to tell the police. He headed straight for the offices of El Diario-La Prensa, a Spanish-language newspaper published daily in New York. Not until the newspaper called did the police learn of the loss and get a chance to do something about it.

About the same time, a Puerto Rican factory worker was blinded in an explosion at his plant. His first step, once the initial shock was over, was to visit El Diario. The paper found a Spanish-speaking surgeon and persuaded him to take the worker's case without fee. From a special contingency fund, it paid for the man's bed and other hospital charges.

Yet another Puerto Rican recently arrived in New York had selected and paid for a small hi-fi stereo combination from a store display. He had been given a prewrapped carton which, it turned out, contained a phonograph that was neither hi-fi nor stereo. When he returned to the store to complain he was brusquely told, "That's what you bought." He went directly to El Diario, which promptly referred the case to the better business bureau. The store suddenly discovered its error and exchanged the non-hi-fi stereo set for the one the man had originally chosen.

These nonjournalistic deeds are all part of a day's work at El Diario, which in its 16 years of existence has become to New York's Puerto Rican community what the Tammany Hall clubhouses were to the newly arrived Irish in the 19th century and the Landsmonschafts to the Jewish immigrants in the early 20th century—a place of refuge and sympathy, a problem solver, shield, and protector.

During the past 12 months alone, some 6,500 people have journeyed through all kinds of weather to the newspaper's offices in a ramshackle building at Duane and Hudson Streets which once housed the now defunct PM. There they wait patiently, sometimes for hours, in the corridors outside the windowless 10- by 14-foot room, scarcely more than a generous-size walkin closet, that is the office of Ismael Lopez, a 41-year-old psychologist and former high school teacher, who heads up what El Diario calls its human relations department. Hundreds more call in or tell their troubles personally to a social worker who travels through the five boroughs of New York, southern Connecticut, and eastern New Jersey in an El Diario mobile unit. In the 9 years of its operation, the department has helped 100,000 people, about one-eighth of the area's Puerto Rican population.

Except for El Diario, none of the 18 foreign language daily newspapers in New York City has anything like a human relations department, much less a mobile unit designed to listen to readers' troubles. Il Progresso, the city's only Italian-language daily, used to have something like it in the person of one Salvatore Pina, a lawyer who handled the paper's legal work and public relations and helped out its readers on the side. The big question in the 1930's for Il Progresso readers, publisher Fortune Pope recalls, was how to register for the newly legislated social security program. In the 1940's it was what to do about the Smith Alien Registration Act.

Similarly, James Vlastos, editor of Atlantis, one of New York's two Greek-language dailies, recalls that 30 years ago Greeks came to the paper's offices with enough problems to occupy a couple of people. Today one man can cope with all the questions—most of them about social security, citizenship, and immigration—that come up. Vlastos also reports, ruefully, that the most popular part of his paper today is the obituary page—a mark of how old his readership is getting.

And Adolph Held, 79-year-old general manager of the Jewish Daily Forward, largest of the three Yiddish dailies left in New York,

says the biggest change in his paper through the years is that the lively "Letters to the Editor" column is now filled with complaints from grandmothers about being neglected by their children and grandchildren. When he was young, Held says, these same grandmothers were complaining about their boy friends and other problems familiar to any reader of Ann Landers. Forward readers, he says, rarely turned to the paper for help; they seemed to have more confidence in the corner druggist.

El Diario's readers, in sharp contrast, do tend to turn to the newspaper for a number of reasons—some familiar, some unique. As the latest mass arrivals in New York, the Puerto Ricans are, of course, lowest in the pecking order. But they face problems considerably more complex than their Irish, German, Italian, and Jewish forerunners had. When these latter groups were arriving en masse in New York, their biggest problem was finding a job at an adequate wage. The country was still expanding and a man's hands were effective tools. If his spirit was willing and his back was strong, there was, more often than not, always something he could do. For many mid-20th-century newcomers in New York, however, willingness to work is no longer enough. "Today society does not pay for strength," as Dr. Howard A. Rusk, head of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at NYU's Medical Center, has observed. "It pays only for two things—the skills in your hands and what you have in your head." Meanwhile, the ways in which the uninformed and the unintegrated can be exploited are bigger and better than ever.

El Diario's protective role in its readers' lives rests on other ground, too. "The average Puerto Rican is brought up to fear God and the cops in that order," says Ismael Lopez. (In Puerto Rico the police double as truant officers, and parents are liable to fine or imprisonment for the misconduct of their children. Thus the policeman as bogeyman is a view of him learned early and reinforced often.) "The average New York policeman doesn't understand this," Lopez says. "He figures that anyone who acts scared must be guilty of something." Thus, many Puerto Ricans prefer to turn to a newspaper that speaks their language than the law or, by extension, authority in any form.

With such things going for it, then, it is no surprise that El Diario alone among the city's 18 foreign-language dailies has been showing a more or less steady growth trend in recent years. It now leads them all in circulation (85,000 today versus 20,000 10 years ago) and has a pass-along readership variously estimated at from 4 to 10 readers per copy. Its editorial staff has grown from an original 8 to 35. In its tabloid format, man-in-the-street writing style, and heavy reliance on features and columnists, El Diario sometimes resembles the Daily News, sometimes the Post. For national and foreign news it relies on the wire services, with particular emphasis on United Press International's Spanish wire from Latin America. Predictably, many stories are narrowly angled (a followup story on the death of General MarArthur was illustrated with a picture of a Puerto Rican boy bearing a homemade wreath of the armory on Park Avenue). But El Diario also printed, along with most papers outside the Iron Curtain, the UPI dispatch from Germany revealing Marlene Dietrich's age.

Elsewhere, El Diario relies on the staples of tabloid journalism: an inquiring reporter ("El Pueblo Habla"), an advice to the lovelorn column ("Consultorio Sentimental"), beauty tips ("Par ser mas bella") and a horoscope. Drew Pearson is there in Spanish along with Walt Disney's "El Pato Donald" and Bud Sagendorf's "Popeye El Marino."

But along with these things is El Diario's unmistakable special sense of mission in speaking for the Puerto Rican community in New York, and being responsive to it. While everything else in the paper is in Spanish, its editorials are printed in both Spanish and English—Spanish for its regular readers, of course, and English for legislators and diplomats in Albany and Washington and in city hall who are on a special mailing list. And more important, in grassroots terms, is its human relations department—a setup unique in American journalism today.

The department was not part of the paper's original prospectus when it was founded in 1948 by Dr. Porfirio Dominici, a practicing physician from the Dominican Republic. As he did battle with La Prensa, for years New York's only Spanish language daily, and tried to build readership as New York's Puerto Rican population soared after the Second World War, Dr. Dominici discovered that so many readers were showing up at the office to get help that his staff of reporters had little time to report. Obviously, his readers needed help and he couldn't refuse them a hearing, but he had a newspaper to get out. So in the mid-1950's, he lined up some volunteer clergymen, social workers, and lawyers for the express purpose of helping New York's Puerto Ricans to learn to help themselves. The volunteer setup gave way a few years later to the four-man staff now headed by Ismael Lopez.

Some of the cases El Diario's human relations department has tackled are bizarre, like the case of the man who was stopped without apparent reason by a policeman, searched, and asked where he had bought his suit. (It no longer had the label inside the coat.) The man said he had bought it at a 14th Street store a few years before. The policeman took him to the nearest police station and charged him with stealing the suit. But the majority of the cases concern the petty injustices which can loom so large when one is a stranger, injustices which, if not adjusted, can turn the law-abiding into bitter, antisocial citizens; rent-gouging, job discrimination, consumer fraud, police brutality, negligent landlords.

El Diario refers some 50 to 70 consumer frauds a month to the State attorney general's office. The most common type is the delivery to a customer of something other than what he bought. Electrical appliance and furniture dealers seem to be the greatest offenders. Overpricing is the second most widely practiced fraud. Lopez himself was victimized this way when he first came to New York 7 years ago. He stopped into a little store on Delancey Street and contracted to buy an Admiral television set for $394 in weekly payments. Some weeks later, browsing in a big appliance store uptown, he discovered the identical model for $199.

The usual housing problem—and there are easily 100 a week—is an apartment with broken windows, leaky plumbing, plaster gone from ceiling and walls, hallways filled with rubbish, a plague of rats and roaches, and a landlord who does nothing about any of it.

El Diario checks the legitimacy of the complaint. If the conditions are as described—or bad enough—it files a complaint with the rent control office and checks to find what the legal rent for the premises is. If the tenant is being overcharged, the office must order the rent lowered. If the rent is legal but no repairs are made, it can order a 10-percent decrease. If repairs are not made within a prescribed length of time, El Diario files another complaint. It keeps this up until something is done. In one Bronx building, these tactics got one tenant's rent reduced to $1 a month before the landlord started to repair.

Unlike the immigrant of an earlier, less industrialized and mechanized age, the Puerto Rican is faced with a string of secondary problems stemming from the basic one of finding a job. An employment agency can bilk him. An applicant may be placed in what the agency says is a permanent job at, say, $65 a week, and might be charged $15 as an immediate first installment on the fee of 1 week's salary. When he reports to work, he discovers that the job is for only 2 days and he will be paid $10 per day. The fee for temporary work is 10 percent, in this case $2. The agency claims the job was permanent and that if it didn't last, the applicant must have failed. A telephone call from El Diario usually produces a refund of the overcharge. The paper also files a complaint with the license bureau. When enough complaints accumulate, the bureau investigates. Some oft-reported agencies have lost their licenses as a result of repeated overcharges.

A constant source of worry to the Puerto Rican is fear of police brutality. Many Puerto Ricans wanted for questioning as witnesses to crimes, or as suspects, turn themselves in to the newspaper in preference to the police or FBI. Puerto Ricans also turn in found property—wallets, passports, checkbooks, money, even an occasional gun—to the newspaper, fearing they will be charged with theft if they go to the police.

Two years ago Dr. Dominici sold El Diario (circulation then: 62,000) to O. Roy Chalk, owner of the Washington, D.C., transit system and Trans-Caribbean Airways. Shortly thereafter, Chalk bought the rival La Prensa and merged them. Since then the paper has increased in circulation and, to a lesser extent, in size. Its American editor has been replaced by a Spanish one, Sergio Santelices, who was its managing editor for 5 years and then the managing editor of La Prensa at the time of the merger. And its political position has shifted from nonpartisan (Dr. Dominici was more interested in politics in Latin America than in the United States) to ardently Democratic.

Editorially, it has also become more militant. Among the causes El Diaro has espoused, some successfully, some not, are:

Literacy tests in Spanish as well as English. (A bill has been introduced in Albany, but the paper sees hard sledding ahead; to pass it would require a change in the State constitution.)

Curbing the sale of firearms, a position intensified since President Kennedy's assassination. (Bills are pending in Albany.)

Apprentice programs for Puerto Ricans in the construction unions.

Maintaining free tuition at city colleges.

Improved housing, especially rat control.

Improved schooling.

As far as this last campaign goes, many Puerto Ricans, though they join Negroes in joint protests of mutually shared injustices, prefer not to be identified with the Negro community. El Diario is less interested in physical integration than it is in better facilities and better teaching. Too often, Sergio Santelices says, Puerto Rican children who don't understand the teachers' questions because of their unfamiliarity with English are classified as mentally backward and relegated to special classes, where they spend year after year modeling in soap and growing up illiterate.

Both editor and publisher feel the human relations department furthers the paper's basic aim, which is to establish a greater affinity with its readers, create reader loyalty, and increase circulation (a nonreader helped usually becomes a reader). El Diario works closely with the city's welfare, fire, and police departments. Police Commissioner Murphy is all for cooperation to improve police-Puerto Rican relations. The welfare office, in fact, has designated one of its staff to serve as liaison with the paper.

Though the number of complaints coming in to El Diario since the early days of

the department has increased, the staff has decreased. The clergymen and lawyers are gone. Many cases which the paper would have handled personally in the past it now refers to appropriate organizations or city departments, on the theory that it is not really helping Puerto Ricans to become New Yorkers unless it can teach them their rights and duties, and how to practice both.

How successful this has been is hard to measure. The city's department of city planning, in a recently released report, claims that the Puerto Rican is in a better educational and economic position today than he was and, in general, is settling in to the melting pot like the immigrants from other lands who preceded him. There have also been published reports that there has been a drop in charges by minorities of police brutality and an improvement in police attitudes toward minorities. Yet very recently, there has been outcry in the press and on the streets over the police killing of three Puerto Rican youths in recent months, and a charge of unprovoked police beating of a Puerto Rican during an arrest. Puerto Ricans continue to come to El Diario in preference to the law.

The melting pot may be at work, but El Diario doesn't anticipate that the need for its human relations department will be melted away in the foreseeable future.

South Dakota "Hope" Dentist Assists People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1964

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the many fine rewards accruing to people everywhere, through the continued assistance to the underprivileged being rendered by Project Hope. I have long been an advocate of people-to-people assistance because in my opinion, these contacts develop a better understanding of the differences among the peoples of the world.

Recently, in the American-News of Aberdeen, S. Dak., there was published an article about the service of Dr. Charles B. Kelly, a dentist from Aberdeen, who has been serving on the SS *Hope*.

The story supports the thesis that through working with people in other countries, we learn to better appreciate their problems and their difficulties and, more important, we bring to them significant assistance in the many fields in which, by our American standards, they are underprivileged.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOPE" DENTIST KNOWS HE ASSISTED PEOPLE IN NEED

(By Evelyn Van Wagner)

Dr. Charles B. Kelly, who returned Wednesday from Guayaquil, Ecuador, brought back many mementos of the trip.

He has two balsa models of the SS *Hope*, which was home for him for 2 months; pictures and slides of that strange South American country; native craftwork pieces he purchased; and a framed honorary diploma from the Ecuadorian Dental School, which he prizes highly.

But the most important thing he has can be neither seen nor touched. Nevertheless it is real.

That is his knowledge that he has really and truly helped some people who needed help desperately.

Dr. Kelly, a dentist, was teaching and treating Ecuadorians during February and March aboard the SS *Hope*. The big ship was, and is, more than a floating hospital. "It has everything any doctor would need," said Dr. Kelly. There are four operating rooms, X-ray rooms, a pharmacy and living quarters for the staff.

The staff includes 40 rotators, one of which was Dr. Kelly. Each stays aboard for 2 months and then another takes his place. The permanent staff numbers 85 and includes, doctors, nurses, X-ray technicians, and other professional people.

Dr. Kelly and the other rotators receive no fees or remunerations. And the permanent staff's salaries are about half what would be received on the outside. Transportation, board and room are provided.

The SS *Hope* is a people-to-people proposition and is entirely free from Government assistance. "I learned," said Dr. Kelly, "that this and the Peace Corps are the best ways to help the people who need help most." He feels that usually Government funds go to the upper echelons and never seep down to the lower classes.

Indigency and physical need were the two things considered in selecting patients for treatment. They were screened at the hospital and also screened by the doctors aboard the ship. Each had to be also a good teaching case for the doctors for this was primarily a teaching mission.

The Aberdeen dentist had other dentists, dental school professors, nurses, and dental school students, in his group. "It was quite tricky sometimes," he recalled, "to devise some way of criticizing the methods of a dental professor so he wouldn't lose face with a student in the same group." At first some of the class had some resentment but using kindness and diplomacy, Dr. Kelly won them over.

Guayaquil is a city of 600,000 people. There are, perhaps, 6,000 people who have means. The rest are destitute, said Dr. Kelly. The population is a mixture of Indians, Negroes, and Spanish. The Indians make craft articles to sell and the streets are lined with vendors selling a variety of things in an attempt to eke out a living.

Dr. Kelly knew enough Spanish to make his way about the city and ask simple questions. "But I got lost when they start talking fast. The trouble was, when they heard me say a few words in Spanish, they assumed I knew the language, which I didn't."

The Ecuadoran people were kindly and friendly, Dr. Kelly says. The poor people—and they are poorer than most South Dakotan's could imagine—were deeply grateful after they received treatment from him.

Everything the patients received including drugs, was without cost to them.

He remembers that one woman whom he had fitted with dentures started following him carrying a long string. Finally, he learned that the poor creature wanted to measure his head so she could make a panama hat for him. The hat is another of his mementoes.

He found it difficult, although he did it, to eat with them sometimes when he was invited to their homes for a meal.

Some of his experiences are not ones to be heard just before sitting down to dinner.

Dr. Kelly has his own reasons for this trip which was at the same time rewarding and sacrificial. Most people, during their lives want to do something for other people that is really unselfish. Dr. Kelly is no different.

Next year, when the SS *Hope* will be anchored for 10 months at a seaport in western Africa, Dr. Kelly will again be one of the rotators during February and March. At least, that is his plan now.

The Federal Professional Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Professional Association about 2 years ago in November held its national conference here in Washington. It was presided over by a former Member of Congress who served with great distinction, the Honorable Robert Ramspeck. Addresses were made by Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Special Assistant to the President of the United States, Ewan Clague, Director, Bureau of Labor Statistics, who spoke on the subject of "The BLS Role in the Federal Pay—Comparability Process," and Dr. Hurst R. Anderson, president of American University, whose subject was "Contributions of Professionals in the Federal Service." The last speaker was the founder and president of the Federal Professional Association, Vincent E. Jay, who spoke on the topic, "Issues and Prospects." Mr. Ramspeck's remarks in introducing Mr. Jay, together with Mr. Jay's speech, follow:

Chairman RAMSPECK. Thank you very much, Dr. Anderson. That gives us a lot of food for thought, which is what a speech is intended to do.

Our final speaker at this session is the president of the Federal Professional Association. A native of Ohio, he attended Rutgers University and American University. He is assistant to the executive officer, Division of Water-Supply Pollution and Control, Public Health Service, HEW. He has had considerable experience in the Government. I am not going to take up your time to tell you all about it; most of you know him. He is a member of the American Political Science Association, the American Society for Public Administration, the Civil Service League, the Public Personnel Association, and the Society for Personnel Administration. He established and served as chairman of the founding committee of this organization.

I am happy to present to you President Jay. [Applause.]

Mr. VINCENT E. JAY (president of the Federal Professional Association). Thank you very much, Mr. Ramspeck.

Guests and fellow members of the Federal Professional Association, having listened to the preceding speakers, it seems that much of my speech has already been given. The references Mr. Macy made; the challenges which the professionals have in working together, which Dr. Wiesner made, could not have been better. The urging which comes from Dr. Anderson and Ewan Clague, that professionals working together can make a significant contribution, is most encouraging and inspiring, I am sure, to all of us.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to address you on the first anniversary of the association.

First, I want to proclaim, loud and clear, that the issues are many and appear different to different people. However, the prospects are great. In my humble opinion, no organization or group has the opportunities and tremendous potential for good that exists for this association. For the first time in the history of our Nation, career personnel from vastly different executive and professional disciplines and fields are coming together within the framework of one organization to identify common problems and develop mutually beneficial solutions for the welfare of the Nation. The importance of this development cannot be overemphasized.

The association has grown during the first year and we have been credited with some solid accomplishments. Our membership has doubled. Some interesting facts about our membership are that, of approximately 600 members, 536 have earned their bachelor degree, 170 have masters, and 93 their doctorates. There are 38 supergrades, 419 in grades between 12 and 15, and 139 in grades 11 and below. A quick calculation indicates that our membership includes about 5 percent of the total supergrade group. If we had equal support from potential members in grades 15 and below, we would now have approximately 12,000 members.

Now, let me enumerate the major issues and prospects as I see them. They are: (1) The organizing of professionals in the Federal service, (2) the great lack of knowledge about their problems, needs, and aspirations, (3) self-regulatory responsibilities, (4) the relationship of the Federal Professional Association to existing professional associations and societies. Each of these issues is of interest to you, and any one of them could serve as the basis for at least a 1-day seminar. Because of the time factor, I plan barely to identify these issues and discuss the impact they have or will have on our Nation and ourselves.

The first issue, the organizing of professionals, consists of several parts. One is self-examination and analysis. Dr. Charles S. Hyneman, distinguished service professor of government at Indiana University and 1961–62 president of the American Political Science Association, in the preface to his new and important book, "The Supreme Court on Trial," states:

"Our time is a time of national self-criticism. The American people are engaged in a severe examination of their basic commitments, their way of life, the direction they appear to be going."

I concur and submit that career executives and professionals in the Federal service must participate in, and contribute to, this examination. Only through a single, Government-wide organization, designed exclusively for career executives and professionals, can we democratically undertake, in an orderly manner, such an examination. Obviously, we cannot identify for sure, without such an examination, what the problems, needs, and desires of professionals in the Federal service are. As we continue to default, our situation becomes more chaotic and disastrous to the detriment of the Nation and ourselves as individuals.

A second part to the organization of professionals is the attitude of professionals themselves toward supporting and participating in such an effort. First things should come first. However, to what extent are professionals willing and able to support an across-the-board organization of their own? Professionals, generally, are unbelievably busy and harassed. Sacrifices of time, energy, and money are necessary if we are to have a first-class organization, capable of undertaking the myriad tasks that demand attention. The essentials of an action organization are money, participation, and more money. All of the other issues depend primarily on decisions that are made on this issue—the degree of support to be given to the organization representing us.

We are late in getting started. The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada was organized in 1920. Over 60 percent of the professionals in the Federal service of Canada support and participate in the affairs of the PIPSC, in addition to their participation in the activities of their professional societies, their civic organizations, PTA's, etc. We can no lonegr afford to do less.

The point was well made recently by Richard L. Kenyon, editor of the Chemical & Engineering News, when he referred to the growing affluence and prestige of science and technology and cited the tendency that scientists and other professionals have to hold themselves aloof from activities outside of their immediate work interests. Mr. Kenyon properly urges professionals to reorganize their responsibility and become involved in the professional and other problems surrounding them.

Another part of the organizing issue is the matter of conflict of interest. Personally, I can see no reason for this point to be raised as a serious obstacle to membership in the association. Because the organization is designed exclusively for executives and professionals in the Federal service, you would expect to find in it career administrators. Also, because the association does not and will not operate a labor union of grievance procedure, conflicts with management (in many instances its own members) should not occur. Due to the grassroots, democratic decision-making process within the organization, it can be safely predicted that positions on issues will result from majority votes cast by managers and professionals alike after a thorough review and understanding of the facts. The primary function of the organization in this regard is to obtain the facts and reveal the true situation. Thorough investigation, research, and consultation with all interested parties will precede any position taking.

A fourth part of this issue of organizing is recognition. Executive Order No. 10988 provides specifically for professionals to form their own organizations. However, it is not clear as to their status after they organize. Are they to be considered and treated as labor unions? Will they be entitled to apply for automatic deduction of dues, or is this reserved to labor unions? Must they seek a certain form of recognition as provided in 10988 in order to be heard? Because we do not intend to represent individual grievances, we should be able to achieve our objectives outside the framework of Executive Order No. 10988, and I have so recommended. Of course, there are a lot of unanswered questions ahead. However, we must grow considerably before we can face some of these questions. One question of immediate concern is whether we are to be denied bulletin-board space and similar privileges if we do not apply for some form of recognition? I would certainly hope not. This entire area, like so many others, needs thorough study and consideration. We must remember, in connection with this issue, that we are judged by what we do and how we do it.

Issue No. 2 deals with the great dearth of knowledge concerning the problems, needs, and aspirations of executives and professionals. Again, there are several parts. One is communications. As specializations occur, they develop a new or modified language, generally unknown and misunderstood outside the speciality. The number of languages and modifications at this point must be quite numerous. We desperately need to investigate this problem area and establish a channel of communications between all executives and professionals. We urgently need to know more about the problems, needs, and aspirations of our associates in all professions. Now some professionals openly exhibit contempt and ridicule of their associates in parallel, but different, professions. The prevalence of such conduct is disruptive, degrading, and demoralizing. Conditions such as this must be eliminated from the Federal service. Truck drivers have more concern and loyalty for each other than do some professionals in the Federal service.

Another part of this issue of knowledge is the intricate and sensitive area of intra-organizational (within Federal agency) relationships. What are the relationships, for instance, between executives and professionals and what should they be? Have professionals defaulted on their management responsibilities, or have administrative types usurped professional prerogatives? Here is another area that requires a great deal of on-the-job factfinding, analysis, and consideration. However, I feel sure that proper attention to this problem could produce some guidelines and genuine understanding that would be invaluable, and would go a long way toward eliminating the running cold war that exists between many executives and professionals.

This leads me into the third issue: self-regulatory responsibilities. Of course, the Congress, the Civil Service Commission, and the various administrations have the responsibility for promulgating laws, regulations, and instructions, but how about developing some for ourselves? We are certainly of age and are capable of identifying and implementing rules of conduct and procedure. It will be a great day, indeed, when the Association can appear as "a friend of the court" in appropriate cases and assist in the development and presentation of facts. One of the most important aspects of improving the image of the Federal service, aside from correcting misconceptions, is to warrant a good opinion. This is a matter of identifying and agreeing on certain aspects of conduct and promoting them "within the family."

Executives and professionals should welcome a democratic procedure whereby their problems, needs, and aspirations can be properly and thoroughly considered in a democratic manner. Just as various businesses and other activities in private enterprise are self-regulatory, we executives and professionals in the Federal service ought to exercise a degree of self-regulation. Only in this way can we mature and move in the direction of optimum service to our Nation and ourselves. This vast area of important subissues includes the comparability-of-pay principle, a separate classification and pay schedule for executives and professionals, efficiency evaluation, the broad range of ethical practices, etc.

The next and final issue is the relationship of the Association to existing professional associations and societies. Again, I can barely discuss this briefly. However, it is important that this relationship be considered. The FPA is an individual membership organization. It was deliberately set up in this fashion on the strong and overwhelming advice of many experts in organization who felt that a federation structure would become unwieldy and unworkable. Also, a federation could not accommodate the many executives and professionals who have no existing professional organization ties. They must be encouraged to join and participate in such organizations. In addition, because so many existing organizations have a very low dues structure, we would immediately have the huge problem of financing. Therefore, after much deliberation, the individual membership structure was approved, but with the specific provision for affiliation. In considering this, we must keep in mind the numerous and varied kinds of existing organizations.

Dr. O. Glenn Stahl did some research which uncovered well over 50 major "pro-

fessional organizations with predominantly or entirely Federal membership." The approximate aggregate membership of this group of organizations is nearly 200,000. In addition, there are many more single-installation, single-occupations, and single-agency organizations. The very minimal dues that most of these organizations have preclude an effective program, particularly at the national level and before the Congress. Very few have strictly enforced membership criteria. Some attempt to represent their members in grievances, are recognized under Executive Order 10988, and are thus operating, in effect, much like labor unions. They are scattered all over the United States and overseas, and they have little or no knowledge of the existence of each other, in spite of the fact that most of their members are struggling with problems, needs, and aspirations common to all professionals.

The organizational problem here is how to harness their tremendous abilities and resourcefulness, get them to increase their financial support of the overall cause, and bring them together under the umbrella of a Government-wide organization without impairing, in any way, their autonomy of operation and sovereignty with regard to their particular professional interests.

It seems to me that this can be accomplished within the framework of the FPA. It will take time, effort, and patience as mutually beneficial agreements are developed and ratified. It will take time for existing organizations to observe and become confident of the ability of the FPA to do for them what they cannot do for themselves, and still to permit them full authority within their own installations, agencies, and professions. Such autonomy and sovereignty now exists for FPA chapters located in various parts of the country.

I would like to note here that one of our officers, Harold A. Stone, has broken important ground with one large organization, in an attempt to arrive at an agreement on objectives; on procedures to be followed jointly in taking positions on issues; on a plan for making a position statement to the Congress, other bodies and officials, and the general public; and on the number of members of each organization supporting the position. In addition, Mr. Stone has sought to arrange for the appointment of a liaison officer in each organization with a clear understanding as to the authority and responsibility of the liaison officer.

A great deal remains to be done in this area, but the foregoing report will give you an idea of the basic problems involved and how we are trying to cope with them. I believe the FPA can and will strengthen existing professional associations by helping them attract and retain members, by doing those things for them that they are unable to do for themselves and thus freeing their time and effort for activities directly related to their particular professional interests, and by the possibility of reducing costs through the use of common facilities and the merging of certain routine office operations and services. The prospects are tremendous.

I served as chairman of the founding committee that met for 2 years at the Brookings Institution. During 1963, I have served as the first president. Now I want to say that I warmly welcome Greg Hartmann, who will succeed me in January as president. We and the Nation are particularly fortunate to have Dr. Hartmann accept the responsibilities of the principal officer of the association. He has many achievements to his credit and has received high recognition, including the 1963 Civil Service League Award, for his significant contributions. In addition, he is totally dedicated to the proposition of a career professional service of the highest order. I know he will lead us to great achievements as FPA makes its impact on the national scene. All of us must ease off to some extent on other time-consuming considerations and commitments to give Greg our wholehearted and full support.

The years ahead will be difficult and the problems tough, but nothing exists nor will arise that we cannot overcome together. Greg and his fine slate of officers will need all the support we can give them in terms of time, effort, and money. Because they are doing the job for the welfare of the Nation and us, the least we can do is to back them up, all the way.

My tenure in office reminds me of a story I heard recently, told by Joe Robertson, Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It seems that prior to the adoption of regulations restricting registration in the Kentucky Derby to horses, a Louisville man surreptitiously entered a donkey. Upon discovering the fact, friends pleaded with him in vain to withdraw his entry. Local business leaders tried to prevail on him to take the donkey out of the race. Finally, a select committee representing the Derby called on him and pointed out that the donkey could not possibly win the race and the Derby would be subject to ridicule. However, he stuck to his guns. In explaining his action, he said he knew that this donkey would not win the race, but added, "Look at the benefit he will get from the association."

The benefit that I have received from the privilege and pleasure of working with Greg Hartmann, Harold Stone, Charlie Burhead, Lew McCann, Rob Ramspeck, the various chairmen of working committees, and the many others in the association, is immeasurable and will live with me forever. So many have put so much into the association that I know it will grow and succeed in assuring our Nation the best Government career service in the world. We cannot afford less, particularly during such critical times. [Applause.]

Governor Wallace and the Indiana Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Indiana goes to the polls on Tuesday to cast its ballots in a presidential preference primary election. Of the Democratic candidates, Governor Welsh as a favorite son is being challenged by Governor Wallace of Alabama.

Recently, the Michigan City, Indiana News-Dispatch took note of this challenge in a pertinent editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "Challenge for Democrats," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE FOR DEMOCRATS

On Tuesday, May 5, Indiana Democrats face a critical moral challenge. They can travel Wisconsin's path of prejudice—or give the cause of tolerance a badly needed boost.

Wisconsin's primary was as astonishing as it was shameful. Democrats there have tried frantically to explain away racist Gov. George Wallace's big vote by blaming crossover Republican rightists, an excuse only lightly supported by cold factual analysis of returns.

Hoosier Democrats won't have that "out" May 5. In Indiana, crossover voting isn't permitted. Furthermore, rightist GOP's won't dare desert their own primary. If Senator BARRY GOLDWATER runs weakly against hapless Harold Stassen, he'll be a dead duck.

Thus, it will be largely up to Democrats to rebuke and repudiate Governor Wallace. And the job won't be easy.

To Indiana's shame, the 1960 elections revealed more than a few pockets of prejudice. The Ku Klux Klan is long dead, but its ugly spirit still lingers here and there.

Wallace will get these votes.

He may also get the votes of spiteful Democrats who have become disenchanted with Gov. Matthew Welsh for one reason or another. By the twilight of his term, every Hoosier Governor has enemies made along the way. On top of that. Welsh has been blamed by many for the sales tax—despite its bipartisan approval.

Wallace, then, has more than fear and bigotry going for him in Indiana—a fact that makes it extremely difficult to administer a deserved rebuke at the polls.

Yet Hoosiers must repudiate Wallace or hang their heads in abject shame.

Let's hope that all but a tiny, inconsequential few come away from the Democratic primary with a clear, untroubled conscience.

Freedom of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is popular these day to take potshots at individual Congressmen or Congress as a whole so it is just a little refreshing to pick up a Hill publication and discover that there is at least one writer in Washington who seems assured of congressional integrity, and who sees an end to Government by the people if Congress is destroyed.

Perhaps that is what professional writers are trying to accomplish, because it is a known fact that if an institution is criticized long enough public faith in it is destroyed. And once Congress is destroyed that opens the way for little Hitlers or so-called "professionals" who govern by discretion and emotion rather than by what people want.

With this thought in mind and unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I introduce the following eidtorial taken from the Capitol Hill Spectator of April 25:

FREEDOM OF THE CONGRESS

One of the great hobbies of today is the discrediting of our neighbors on Capitol Hill, the Congressmen of the United States of America. There is an almost constant cry on the part of the press, radio, and TV that the Congress is crooked, immoral, inefficient, and virtually obsolete.

This writer, who has covered many groups and organizations, feels that this is almost, a deliberate plot to wipe out the last area of individual freedom and dignity in the United States. The bureaucrats, the so-called intel-

lectuals and those who would destroy us as individuals and reduce us to numbers are winning the war of propaganda.

The truth of the matter is that the Congress is probably one of the most dedicated, hard-working groups in the history of mankind. There are always a few men who wander from their course of duty and there are always a few who are incompetent and stupid, but in fairness, any group must be credited or discredited on the basis of the vast majority. On this basis the Congress of the United States is a credit to the Nation.

If one analyzes the objectives of these detractors it is usually found that they are grinding their own political axes or satisfying their own ego. One columnist who specializes in attacking Capitol Hill with lies, half-truths, and misrepresentations, is becoming more and more discredited but no matter how untrue the story—every newspaperman knows that a certain part will be believed. Unfortunately, too, it is also a newspaper fact that unfavorable publicity sells more newspapers than favorable.

Now let us examine what these lies and half-truths really mean and what they are doing to our form of government. These people are, in effect, saying that the people of this Nation are not capable of governing themselves—that bureaucracy is superior to the individual—that they do not have the judgment or discretion to elect honest, competent representatives to our Government. Nothing could be further from the truth. Overall, we have one of the finest legislative bodies in the history of civilization starting with Greek history and the first republics and democracies.

Our Congress is truly determining whether self-government can be carried out. As Abraham Lincoln said, "We are testing whether this Nation, or any other nation, so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

These critics are destroying faith in our self-government they are promulgating bureaucracy and total government. They are smearing the image of Congress because of their petty self-interests but they are—even worse—destroying our form of government.

The Congress is the only—and I repeat only—hope for the individual in our huge monolithic Government that is fast becoming like George Orwell's government state in "1984." If you don't think so, try to get a hearing in Washington from some arbitrary, capricious, vicious and destructive ruling of some local bureaucrat, before one of the top officials of the agencies involved. Then if you don't get the old gobbleygook treatment please let this publication know about it. Your Congressman, overworked beyond all reasonable standards will help you if you have a just cause and are being unfairly treated. Your Senator and Representative are the watchdogs of our Government. They are your protection for your rights as an individual. They are your only hope for a hearing from the most vicious principle ever fostered—administrative law—where the bureaucrats operate without fear of criticism from the courts—where right of trial by jury is denied—where one unjust ruling after another becomes standard operating procedure. The little guy knuckles down because he cannot fight the Government and he accepts it rather than to spend thousands of dollars appealing it and where, unless it violates the Constitution he cannot even get a hearing before the courts.

The Congress of the United States stands as a beacon fighting for freedom, for justice and for equality against the vicious attacks of those who feel that the public can be better taken care of by total government than by themselves. Hundreds of these selfless, dedicated men have devoted their lives to public service and in addition to being underpaid and overworked they are constantly attacked by petty reporters and people who have neither the decency, the integrity nor the devotion to honesty of the Congress they attack. The day the Congress of the United States becomes impotent is the day our form of government will die.

Tariff Reductions Endanger Jobs in Glass Container Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the forthcoming GATT talks starting May 4 in Geneva and what the negotiations may produce under the guise of expanding our international trade program. Further tariff reductions without maintaining adequate safeguards for our domestic industries may well sound the death knell for their continued economic well-being and the communities in which they are located.

I am especially apprehensive of reducing the tariff rates on import items which compete with our domestic glass container industry. Lowering the present duties in this field poses a serious threat to the economic welfare of our domestic glass container manufacturers and employees. This particular industry, with an annual payroll estimated at $400 million, employs over 60,000 people in 109 plants throughout the United States. Two of those plants are in my district and employ approximately 4,000 people.

Without the continued operation of the two companies, the employees would lose their livelihood, purchasing power and economic security. If the two plants are forced to shut down as a result of a flood of cheaper imports, the effect on the area's economy—where the unemployment rate is already estimated to be 20 percent in the largest community—would be disastrous.

The impact of these imports in this field is already being felt. In our expanding economy, the domestic glass container industry is operating at only 77 percent capacity, and inventories have reached unprecedented high levels. While sales are increasing slightly, earnings have dipped to their lowest level in 8 years. On the basis of these facts, it certainly would not appear to be prudent to further reduce the tariff rates on glass container imports.

The glass container manufacturing industry is keenly aware of its foreign competition, as is evidenced by the fact that it invests approximately $10 million annually in research and development. The investment, however, does not alter the situation that foreign manufacturers' production costs are substantially lower than in this country. For example, Japan, where the standard of living is much lower than here, labor costs are about one-seventh of what they are in this country. Furthermore, the foreign competitors have undertaken extensive modernization programs and are realizing the benefits from them. This $10 million expenditure also demonstrates that our glass container manufacturers are not standing still and relying solely on tariff rates as a means of competing with foreign imports. On the contrary, the rates for these items are already more than 50 percent below the 1930 Tariff Act levels.

Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed over what may happen as a result of the talks in Geneva. The prospect of serious economic dislocations is not encouraging. I earnestly hope that our representatives at the GATT Conference will be mindful of the crucial role our industries and employees play in our Nation's economy.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It is a date that is honored by all the freedom-loving Polish people throughout the world. The day will not be honored in the Communist state of Poland of today.

Poland's history as a fully sovereign state in the community of nations has been tragically brief and has been spread over the centuries. For example, from 1772 to 1795 Poland was partitioned three times by its traditional enemies—Prussia, Austria, and Russia. The third partition actually removed the nation of Poland from the maps of the world. After World War I a new Poland was brought into existence. The story of World War II is known to all of us; first, German-Russian conquest, and finally Communist domination. Despite all adversity there still remains in the hearts of the Polish people a fierce loyalty to a free Polish nation. The fact that this anniversary has been celebrated for the past 173 years bears testimony that the 1791 Constitution is, indeed, a true symbol of freedom. It is a symbol not just to the Polish people, but to all the peoples of the free world.

This Constitution represents a high point in the history of Poland. It was written during a time when the nation was struggling to maintain its very existence. The Government established by this Constitution frightened the traditional monarchies. For this, among other reasons, they physically overwhelmed Poland and partitioned it out of existence.

The document is a typical example of the 18th-century liberalism and its peaceful implementation was a sharp contrast to the violence of the French Revolution of the same period. The Constitution was based on the philosophy that civil power arose from the people, that sovereignty resided in the people, not the state itself. It separated the

powers of government into a judiciary, a bicameral legislature, and an executive. Although the executive was to be a king, he was to be elected. Poland was to have a government of laws and not men.

The desire for freedom in the Polish people is indomitable. We are aware of this daily as we note the Polish people's contributions to the greatness of our free Nation.

I join with my Polish friends, neighbors, and coworkers in honoring this anniversary of the 1791 Polish Constitution—a symbol of freedom.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, was a remarkable document at that time in history.

An excellent article on the background in which the constitution was formulated recently appeared in the May 2, 1964, issue of the Polish American Journal, written by Juliana Huszonek. She has done an excellent job in describing the constitution and I commend the article to your attention:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF THE THIRD OF MAY

(By Juliana Huszonek)

The Constitution of the 3d of May, 1791, is the oldest written constitution in Europe and one of the world's greatest documents in the name of Freedom. The framing of the 3d of May Constitution, which drew its strength and its substance from the great legislative past of Poland, astounded the world with its moral greatness, its high political genius and its practicality.

Men like the Potockis, Adam Czartoryski, Malachowski and others, who framed the Constitution, were recognized statesmen. They were classical exponents of Polish patriotism, statesmanship and education.

When the Four Years' Parliament convened in 1788, three courses were open to Poland:

1. To have the greatest Polish magnates, its "princes," set up separate sovereign states;

2. To bind the nation by a monarch who would be more absolute than the despots rising on the ruins of feudalism in Germany and Austria;

3. To unify the state by going back to the great Polish tradition of republicanism of the 15th and 16th centuries.

Poland chose the third course. That is, she rejected, as she always had rejected during her history, the formation or transformation of the state by an absolute ruler who would disregard the will of the people. This means that in returning to her own traditions Poland found that others in Europe had finally caught up with Polish political development and were undergoing bloody upheaval (French Revolution) to obtain human rights and freedom.

Polish political advancement, however, had always been achieved without bloodshed; it was determined by legislative process. The Poles alone, in all of Europe, without disturbance, without bloodshed, but through tranquil deliberations, reformed the form of government to their liking. The 3d of May Constitution was actually completed in 1789 but it was decided to wait until a propitious time to present it to the national assembly. This occurred on May 3, 1791. At about the same time Andrew Frycz-Modrzewski's work—written two centuries previously—De Republica Emendanda, the most extensive reform program of the 16th century, was again published.

In humanity's plodding and painful struggle for civil rights, it is to Poland's lasting credit that she had lighted the torch of freedom and human rights throughout her history by the example of her political development and the progress she achieved in jurisprudence. For in the early Republic of Poland there breathed a love of freedom and toleration, righteousness and justice found nowhere else in Europe at that time. In the year 1347 Casimir the Great had already instituted the statute of Wislica, chronologically the first complete code of Christian Europe. Starting in 1370 Poland elected its rulers. As far back as 1430, Poland issued her memorable law: Neminem captivabimus nisi jure victum (Nobody should be detained unless legally convicted). This law preceded by 249 years the habeas corpus of England and preceded by 359 years the declaration of human rights in France. Polish tradition provided a sound source and fertile inspiration for the framers of the Constitution of the 3d of May.

Surrounded by rigid monarchies, Poland was a republic with a relatively perfect system of national representation which was in conformity with her advanced political development. Poland had a Senate and a House of Representatives as early as the 14th century. She had her local assemblies where representatives were chosen. Even at that early period the Polish Government presented the closest prototype of the American Government. Poland's progressive political ideals gave birth to the early attempt at representative government founded on the principle that the right to govern rests primarily with the people; and on the consequent recognition that the people are entitled to a voice in the government.

Poland extended freedom and religious tolerance to all within her boundaries and for the full autonomy she allowed them Poland has been called a United States of the Middle Ages, a political prototype of America. Poland's territory at its zenith extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and from the Odra to the gates of Moscow. Poland governed this immense territory for centuries with her enlightened policies. Lithuania and Ruthenia had voluntarily joined the Polish Commonwealth to enjoy the protection and freedom of Polish nationality.

The King of Poland, elected by the majority of the voters, occupied the same position to the Government as the President of the United States occupies to the American Government. If America acted on the principle: No taxation without representation, Poland put the same principle into practice as early as the 14th century. Just as America, in conformity with the principles of her Government by the consent of the governed, elects her President, Poland freely elected her kings ages before the first American drew up the American Constitution. And as America possesses a Senate and a House of Representatives, Poland had them centuries before. If America generously received within her shores all peoples, Poland had always been a veritable asylum to all the oppressed. Even as America allows religious toleration, this in Poland was an outstanding feature. These and other characteristics of the two countries are strikingly alike.

Why did Poland allow her people to hold the elective vote while the rest of Europe denied all elective franchise to the people? Why did Poland lead in political ideals? Why had Poland realized the popular government while rigid monarchism reigned supreme throughout Europe? The German Moltke said, "Poland of the 17th century was the most civilized country in Europe."

Van Norman said, "Krakow, Poland, developed, cultured, and civilized long before the three-headed dragon appeared, and she was weary of waiting for her rather uncouth neighbors to catch up with her intellectually, socially and in almost all the other arts of civilization—the politer arts."

Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Polish people have suffered many needless cruelties throughout the centuries. Invaded first from one direction and then another, they have battled constantly just to survive. Under such conditions it is remarkable that Poland has often in the past demonstrated cultural and political leadership of the first order. One such case was in 1791 when Poland was the first country of East Europe to feel the currents of change which wrought the American Revolution. In that year the May 3 constitution was written, which is celebrated this Sunday, the 173d anniversary.

The May 3 constitution was not a revolutionary document. But it was the first written constitution in Poland's history. It gave a firm foundation for effective government. It would have provided elective, continuous government which Poland vitally needed. It no doubt captured the imagination of the Polish people. They were willing to fight long and hard for the survival of the constitution and the new Polish Commonwealth.

Had Poland been able to depend on the unreserved support of every citizen, the May 3 constitution, changing with time, might yet be the foundation of modern Poland. If it were, it would be the second longest lived constitution in history. But it is a sad fact that those few traitorous Poles, rich and very powerful, who were threatened by the fresh breath of democracy sweeping the land, turned against their own people and aided Russia in once again invading Poland. In this way the constitution only lasted 4 years.

This points out how important it is for believers in democracy to support each other with every means. The free Poles must support their compatriots still at home. The citizens of democratic countries must aid democratic Poles. We must speak out in favor of self-determination for the captive nations under the ruthless heel of communism. The currents of cooperation must bring together every freeman, no matter what his race, religion, or nationality, into a united effort to uphold freedom. In this way we preserve our cherished institutions from attack, and we strengthen them, making them able to last through every threat, until they become the way of life for all men.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, May 3, marks the anniversary of a historic moment in the history of Poland and in the development of constitutional democracy—the adoption of Poland's great Constitution of 1791. The May 3, 1791, Polish Constitution was a model of progressive legislation, embodying the principles of representative self-government and justice for all. It represented an advanced and enlightened system of government at a time when much of Europe, including Poland's powerful neighbors, was still in the grip of autocratic rulers. Unhappily Poland's bold venture into a constitutional system was short-lived; within a year after the constitution was proclaimed, Russia invaded the country and in 1795 Poland was dismembered and divided between the great powers of Russia, Prussia and Austria.

Poland's history since 1791 has not been a happy one. Despite division, invasion and occupation, however, this brave land and the indomitable Polish people have maintained their belief in, and commitment to, the principles which inspired their constitution. They have resisted oppressors and fought for the right of national independence and political freedom with a unique determination. Poland today, under Soviet-based control, has yet to reclaim her heritage of freedom and national independence. Polish Constitution Day offers an opportunity for freedom-loving men everywhere to join with the Polish people, and those of Polish descent through the world, in reaffirming their support of Poland's just aspirations as a Nation.

This year marks another important occasion for the Polish people as the renowned University of Krakow celebrates its 600th anniversary. I was fortunate enough to have the privilege of visiting this ancient center of learning during a trip to Poland in 1962. The people of Poland well can take pride in this anniversary: not only does this great university number among its illustrious alumni men who helped shape Western intellectual history, such as Copernicus, but it also can claim an extraordinarily long history as a center of scholarship.

May the day soon come when the people of Poland will have full intellectual and political freedom and no longer be subject to the controls of the Communist state.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Operations of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, May 2, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Time magazine's current issue interestingly describes some of the problems faced by the new Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, a native Hoosier. Before being appointed to his present position, Mr. Barr had a distinguished career, both in private and public life. A graduate of DePauw and Harvard Universities, Mr. Barr was a successful businessman in Indianapolis, was elected to Congress as a Representative from the 11th Congressional District of Indiana, and served as Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury Department.

Because of its general significance, I ask unanimous consent to have this short article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKING—FLESH AND BLOOD

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is soberly known as the Government agency that insures bank accounts up to $10,000—but that is only part of its job. Organized 30 years ago, when depression-hit banks were closing at the rate of 4,000 a year, it has since liquidated the assets of several hundred failed banks, often picking up unusual properties in the process. One of the most unusual came into the agency's possession when it took over $106,000 in mortgages on a small and sleazy hotel in Houston after the First National Bank of Marlin, Tex., failed in March. What the FDIC has on its hands, it seems, is a brothel.

Until this year, the stuffy FDIC would probably never have admitted to such ownership. But the atmosphere has changed under new Chairman Joseph W. Barr, 46, a Harvard-trained economist and former Indiana Congressman who was Lyndon Johnson's first executive appointment. "Banking is a flesh-and-blood business," says curly-aired Joe Barr, "and there's no sense pretending it's not." Whatever part the flesh may have played in the failure of the $3.8 million Marlin bank. Barr is trying to get back some of the blood; the FDIC has filed a $1.2 million civil suit charging that major stockholders of the bank misappropriated funds.

Barr is less disturbed by his odd properties than by the fact that the Marlin bank failure illustrates what may be a trend. Most banks over the years since the depression have gone under either because officers embezzled funds or showed poor judgment in making loans. But the four banks that have failed in the past 16 months had each been acquired by new management just before failure. Barr fears that unprincipled operators may be taking over small banks, paying themselves inflated salaries to recover acquisition costs, and then selling risky loan paper to their own banks. Barr aims to stop such practices, perhaps, with new legislation and certainly with a sharper eye on the Nation's banks.

All this may slow but surely will not eliminate the flow of unlikely acquisitions. The FDIC has taken over a string of race horses that had been bought by a California banker with embezzled funds, has also held resort hotels, antiques, furs, and whisky warehouses. Occasionally the agency is even able to operate such enterprises more profitably than the original owners. It turned an abandoned Idaho gold mine into a tourist attraction, and still owns a Texas oilfield that earns $3,000 monthly.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on next Sunday, May 3, the free world will join with Polish patriots everywhere to commemorate the 173d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, a document remarkably similar in spirit and substance to our own Constitution of 4 years earlier.

Because the House will not be meeting on Sunday, Members are making today the occasion for paying tribute to the courage and love of freedom of the Polish people, the qualities which brought their Constitution into being so long ago, and the qualities which today have kept alive the spirit of independence and resistance to the Communist puppet government which was forced upon the people of Poland.

It will be my privilege, however, Mr. Speaker, to speak on Sunday in my hometown of Elizabeth, N.J., in connection with the Polish Constitution Day program being sponsored by the Elizabeth Federation of Polish Organizations. At that time, I shall report to my friends of the Polish-American community on the broad support being shown here today for the ideals of freedom and independence, which we share so strongly, and on the respect and affection and sense of kinship which our colleagues have displayed toward our fellow Americans of Polish descent. The custom we have followed in the House for many years of setting aside a time to commemorate Constitution Day has been a valuable and inspiring one, providing us with a special opportunity to give voice to our deepest convictions and to consider the present conditions of a people with whom we have had so much in common.

The history of Poland, Mr. Speaker, is the history of a people who have never stopped fighting for freedom. For the people of Poland have been forced to fight over and over again for something which so many of us have taken for granted. Situated as it is between Russia and Germany, Poland has often been the victim of the ambition of its more powerful neighbors, the object of attack and oppression and tyranny. Even during the nation's periods of independence, the Polish people learned never to relax. But this long history of suffering and hardship has toughened the Polish spirit and strengthened its single-minded determination to be free once more.

The present situation in Poland is once again testing this determination, and once again we are witnessing the people's brave response to the challenge of communism. Slowly and sometimes subtly, but systematically, the Communist government has in recent months been intensifying its efforts to subjugate the church in Poland and to tighten its control over leading intellectuals. The government's tactics have ranged from false promises of friendship to outright censorship, harassment, and the denial of money and resources. But its aim has always been the same—to silence the voices of the spirit and the mind of Poland. For it is here, in the words and deeds of their priests and poets, scholars and writers, that the people of Poland have found inspiration to continue their opposition to a regime which refuses to make room for the free expression of religious faith or of intellectual activity.

Nevertheless, Cardinal Wyszinski and his fellow bishops refuse to be intimidated and their voices have been heard from pulpits throughout Poland denouncing the injustices of the Government.

In the same spirit, 32 of the nation's leading intellectuals have publicly protested the Government's increasing restrictions. Even though the regime has retaliated in the severe terms reminiscent of the time of Stalin, the protests continue to grow.

Farmers and industrial workers, too, have added their voices to the growing discontent with Communist policies in Poland, in a wave of work stoppages and demonstrations.

Reports from Poland indicate that the tension and resentment among the people have reached proportions similar to those at the time of the Poznan revolt 8 years ago.

Clearly, communism in Poland has failed—economically, culturally, and spiritually. It has failed to satisfy the people, and it has failed to suppress them or to silence their demands for freedom.

At this critical time in Polish history, our concern is for the people. They have

earned our highest admiration with their unshrinking courage, and they deserve our wholehearted moral support in their struggle to be free.

Mr. Johnson Shows His Talent in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT S. WALTERS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, May 2, 1964

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean, a Democratic newspaper, giving strong endorsement to President Johnson's abilities in the field of foreign policy. It is good to have our President's conscientious and productive efforts recognized at a time when his critics are so vociferous in their attacks. I am glad to have this opportunity to call attention to these well-deserved words of praise.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. JOHNSON SHOWS HIS TALENT IN FOREIGN POLICY

President Johnson's announcement that this country was cutting back on the production of nuclear explosive materials—coming just before a similar announcement by Premier Khrushchev, of Russia—has been widely misconstrued as a disarmament agreement without controls.

Apparently without stopping to examine the details of the decision, some Members of Congress hastily but irrelevantly raised the old objections that the Russians cannot be trusted to keep their end of the bargain (where there was no bargain) and asked, "How do we know Khrushchev will keep his word?"

The President's political enemies—some of whom were represented at the publishers' meeting where the announcement was made and had opportunity to know the details—nevertheless seized upon the misinterpretation in an attempt to make it appear the President had been bested in a disarmament agreement with the Russians.

In his address to the Nation's publishers in New York Monday, Mr. Johnson specified that the nuclear materials reduction was not a disarmament move—although it is a step in the right direction toward reducing tensions.

The simple fact is the Nation has stockpiled sufficient nuclear materials so that it can effect the reduction without weakening the Nation's defense in the least degree. To continue top production in these circumstances would be wasteful and foolish and Mr. Johnson wisely rejected the production of explosives materials as a sort of "WPA nuclear project" to prevent unemployment.

Thus it makes no difference whether the Russians decided to go along with the reduction plan or not. This country's decision was based on its own situation and need and would have been the same regardless of whatever course the Russians took.

Premier Khrushchev, however, undoubtedly saw the propaganda value of such an announcement. The Russians also apparently have all the nuclear materials they feel they will need, and the expense of useless overproduction bears as heavily upon them as it does upon Americans. And Mr. Khrushchev saw the opportunity to make a domestically advantageous move serve him also as a sign of Soviet peacemaking.

Despite its independent nature, the President's decision cannot be discounted as a pacifier of world tensions and a definite step away from the direction of nuclear war.

It should be sobering to all nations to realize that the United States and Russia consider their stockpiles of nuclear explosives as sufficient for their needs under any circumstances. Mr. Johnson's announcement, followed by that of Mr. Khrushchev, should also help to reduce tensions and provide a favorable atmosphere for further negotiations without which no progress toward peace can ever be made.

Although the announcement about nuclear explosives overshadowed other aspects of Mr. Johnson's address to the publishers, the President covered a wide range of world affairs in a hard-hitting speech which signified the development of a vigorous and flexible foreign policy.

He strongly urged establishment of a multilateral nuclear force for Europe, called for new mechanisms for political consultation throughout the world, pledged continuation of the battle in Vietnam and the isolation of Communist Cuba from the inter-American system, and renewed the Nation's commitment in Latin America to the Alliance for Progress.

The President showed he had seized and reinvigorated the positive foreign policy of the late President Kennedy. For Mr. Johnson's detractors who have already been forced to concede his genius in domestic affairs, it must come as a discouraging blow to see that he is adept also in charting the Nation's foreign policy.

Anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, Polish freedom is as topical this May 3 as it was 173 years ago when the great Polish Constitution of 1791 was proclaimed.

Today, as then, the Polish intellectuals are in the forefront of a struggle to win the democratic rights of free speech, the right to criticize authority, and the access to reliable information.

In recent days 34 prominent Polish intellectuals addressed and sent the Polish Prime Minister Jozef Cyrankiewicz a manifesto demanding "that Polish cultural policy be changed to conform to the spirit of the rights guaranteed by the Polish Constitution and to the national good." The signers of the document have steadfastly reaffirmed their proclamation of protest despite threats of severe punishment by the Polish Communist government.

Since May 12 is the occasion of the 600th anniversary of the founding of the Jagiellonian University of Cracow, that great ornament of Polish learning, it is especially fitting that we Americans pay tribute to the courage and the burning desire for freedom which the Polish intellectuals have traditionally expressed on behalf of the Polish people.

By our expressions of sympathy and support, let us rekindle the spirit of Polish liberty so that it can engulf and destroy Communist oppression and bring forth a new nation dedicated to the ideals of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Dr. Paul Dudley White on "More Cycling for the Nation's Riders"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I had the great honor and privilege of participating in the congressional breakfast conference on bicycling in America at the Congressional Hotel on May 1, 1964. This was a kickoff celebration for American Bike Month, which will be held during this entire month.

Representatives of America's finest bicycle makers, Norman and Bob Clarke of the Columbia Manufacturing Co., of Westfield, Mass., attended the breakfast and heard with me an outstanding address by the distinguished heart specialist from Boston, Dr. Paul Dudley White.

The address by Dr. White deserves, in my opinion, wide reading. The many exercise hints given by Dr. White, and the importance of bike riding could prove invaluable not only to Members of Congress but to every American.

It is for these reasons, and to pay special tribute to American Bike Month, that I include the entire address by Dr. White in the RECORD at this point:

MORE CYCLING SPACE FOR THE NATION'S RIDERS

(By Dr. Paul Dudley White)

Mr. Mulligan, Mr. Penfold, Secretary Udall, ladies, and gentlemen, thank you all very much, both those of you who have arranged this breakfast meeting this morning, and those of you who have come to listen to what we have to say.

My own message is primarily in behalf of the health and happiness of the American people, including those of you here now, who, like myself, have both an obligation and a rare opportunity to work for this same important cause. It is we who are leaders in this endeavor throughout the country who must set the example for our fellow citizens by our own pattern of life.

The soft physical condition of the great majority of the American people today is appalling and is reflected in our health. By the introduction of preventive measures we have largely controlled the serious infectious diseases that used to sweep across the country, often in epidemics—diphtheria, pneumonia, meningitis, polio, typhoid fever, and tuberculosis. But now we are faced with different kinds of epidemics which are equally serious and which are also in need of control by preventive measures which are now applicable even though we don't yet know the whole story.

Atherosclerosis—the serious disease (like rusting) of our vital arteries (coronary, carotid, femoral, and renal) responsible for almost all of our sudden deaths, our coronary heart attacks, many of our strokes, and some of our high blood pressure, has clearly been shown to be much more common among peoples like ourselves everywhere in the world who are physically lazy and prosperously overfed.

Due also to the inadequate use of our leg muscles and our hours on end sitting in our automobiles, in airplanes, at our desks, and before our television screens, we are subject to the serious hazard of the blood clotting in our leg veins (sometimes called phlebitis), and the sending off of emboli to our lungs to block their circulation, often fatally. To prevent this trouble I strongly recommend that we never allow ourselves to sit or to stand still for more than an hour at a time, but to get up and walk actively at frequent intervals.

Regular and vigorous use of our leg muscles is essential for an optimal circulation of blood which is, incidentally, essential for the best use of our brains. Our country's welfare may actually depend on your cerebral blood supply. The leg muscles are an important and unappreciated accessory pumping mechanism to assist our hearts physically. Also, healthy fatigue of the leg muscles is the best antidote known to man for nervous stress, far better than the use of the thousand and one tranquilizers and sedatives to which, like tobacco, the American people have become addicted. Incidentally, the diaphragm, a most important muscle, making of the thorax a suction pump, is another aid to the circulation, though rarely recognized as such.

Finally, in referring to the vigorous and habitual use of the leg muscles I would call your attention to the fact that their use in some way has a biochemical effect, still to be investigated, which delays the onset of atherosclerosis in our arteries and so prolongs life as well as the making of such life more pleasant.

You will note that I have constantly referred to the leg muscles more than to the arm muscles. This is intentional for the larger the muscle the greater the advantage in its use. And incidentally, the leg muscles are a greater aid in combating the negative effect of gravity. Hence any kind of work or exercise which uses the leg muscles is to be preferred, whether walking, swimming, golf, tennis, skiing, or bicycling.

This is the beginning of Bicycle Month. Bicycling is a most valuable method of transportation for our health, our pleasure, our convenience, and our economy, and so we are seeking your help to promote it throughout the United States, and to make it safe.

There are about 55 million Americans riding bicycles these days. Their numbers have been growing by leaps and bounds in the last two decades. Their ages range from 4 to 84. They are riding tandems, unicycles, middleweights, touring bikes, adult three-wheelers, racers, and novelty bicycles of all kinds (and this doesn't include several million more who ride tricycles). They ride for fun, health, sport, and transportation. They ride under varying conditions and in every part of the country—in city streets, and in the countryside, to railroad stations, to shopping centers, to elementary and high schools, to and on college campuses, and to their businesses and plants. But they must ride safely.

It is an expression of the need and desire of the American people to live more healthfully and leisurely—to seek again the use of their muscles and to become fit, and to reinvigorate their bodies and their minds. Yes, it's a revolution in reverse—one that will help to restore man to his natural place in a civilization, that has been dehumanizing him. It even accounts for why we find so many indoor bicycles in the recreation rooms and basements of businessmen's homes these days.

Obviously, we're living in a period in our national history when we must provide greater outlets for physical fitness. We still find too many of our young people below par physically—more than 50 percent are still being rejected for military service, and this, 25 years after the first signs of this dreadful physical state was revealed to us during World War II. We find too many people aging prematurely—too many of the middleaged leaving this world before they've lived their Biblical lives.

Many of us in this room have supported Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy—and more recently Lyndon Johnson—in furtherance of their physical fitness programs at the national level. Many of us have been strong advocates of bicycling for all ages as one of the best means of accomplishing and maintaining a higher level of physical health for our people. More and more physical educators, coaches and recreation leaders have been inspired to include bicycling in school programs, although much more is still needed.

Nonetheless, it is to cope with this resurgence of bicycling across the land that we are meeting in this room this morning. This day marks the beginning of American Bicycle Month, dedicated to expanding bicycle riding facilities in our Nation * * * that is, bicycle paths, trails, tracks, and better places to ride. I accepted the chairmanship of this month-long drive now in its eighth rewarding year because I believe in the rightness of the cause—because I believe in the necessity of extending bicycling safety and more broadly across our land.

Let me say at this point, to add a personal note, that 6 decades ago when I was a boy, we cycled for convenience, economy, and fun, but not necessarily for fitness. We cycled a great deal and with relative safety since automobiles were not numerous. We did not need bicycles then to keep physically fit, for when we were not cycling we were walking, skating, swimming, or playing games outdoors and in gymnasiums. To be sure many of us had shorter lives because we succumbed early to contagious diseases such as diphtheria and other infections that I have already mentioned, from which today we are quite well protected. But things have changed drastically since then.

What is needed today to accommodate our riding population are more and safer riding facilities throughout the country. As chairman of the Committee for Safe Bicycling and in association with the YMCA and the American Youth Hostels, I have tried to take a personal hand in influencing the growth of bicycle paths in several areas of New England and other parts of the Nation. While it has been slow going at times, we have made progress. And wherever we have done so, we have also gained enthusiastic community support from the local government, from public-spirited citizens, from business people, and from hordes of others.

We've had a variety of successes in establishing clearly designated bicycle safety routes in many localities. Most notable, I believe, was the nationally publicized plan for Homestead, Fla., where the entire community rallied together to create the Nation's first system of city streets converted into

safe bicycle routes in February 1962. These roads lead from residential areas to schools, shopping centers, parks, playgrounds and cultural centers. They are marked with large blue and white signs designating them "Bicycle Safety Routes." Bicycle riders stick to them; motorists usually avoid them, but may use them if very careful.

I have urged all cities to study and follow the Homestead program. It is the perfect example of individual initiative and municipal cooperation, and demonstrates what can be accomplished by a community at low cost and high enthusiasm. This system has 300 bicycle route signs provided for $1,000. It sets an example for bicycle safety and fun that should be emulated throughout the entire country. It is silly and wasteful of health and money to drive children to school as a rule, although there are of course exceptions.

Before Homestead, we led the movement that resulted in building an 8-mile special bicycle path on the beautiful resort island of Nantucket, and in creating a Charles River Basin bicycle riding route leading from Cambridge into Boston authorized by the Boston Metropolitan District Commission. Several years ago I assisted Mayor Daley of Chicago in opening 36 bicycle paths within that city. There are many other places that provide bicycle trails for tourists such as Yellowstone National Park, Colonial Williamsburg and Sea Island, Ga., to touch on a few.

Bicycle racing tracks, too, have been appearing in many communities, most recently in St. Louis; Encino, Calif.; Milwaukee; Northbrook, Ill.; and New York City.

I have had the opportunity to travel all over the world and cycling has been a part of it. I have always been impressed with the adult attitude European nations take toward their cyclists. They have been given the freedom and safety of the road because cycling is a normal way of life in the Old World and an essential means of transportation for many persons. But no matter where I've traveled there is no finer sight to be seen than that in our own National Capital. It is a tourists paradise, and it should be seen leisurely and savored by the thousands who visit here annually.

Allow me to say, perhaps parenthetically at this meeting that Washington, D.C., with its fitness consciousness and its heavy volume of tourists and traffic, is ideally suited for promoting bicycle paths for conveniently and easily getting to its many places of historic and artistic interest. With some judicious planning, I believe that Washington could set a constructive example for the rest of the country with its own "bicycle fitness paths." These would provide a showplace for the Nation, but more significant, would help solve some aspects of the capital's pressing transportation problems and might even prove a boon to the unused muscles of many of our legislators.

As Congressmen, you can appreciate the power of the written word. For a heart specialist, I am amazed at the quantity and quality of the mail I receive from people who are interested in getting better bicycle riding facilities started in their communities. They usually have a strong sense of the need, but all too often have no idea of how to get a program underway. They express concern for their children's and their own safety in competing for road space with automobiles and trucks wherever they happen to be riding.

The bicycle leaders and recreation and education experts in this room are aware of the fact that there are no easy solutions to such problems. Through the years I have personal knowledge of the valuable leadership they have given in tackling these problems at the local level, particularly with the help of their collectively supported organ; namely, that of the Bicycle Institute of America. This, gentlemen, is an instance of a responsible-minded industry undertaking numerous programs to promote safety for their product. Up to this time, however, it has been possible for them to make only limited progress, important as it has been. They have not only stimulated the growth of local bicycle clubs, but have helped them, along with fraternal and service organizations, police departments, municipalities, to effect worthwhile safety programs. But this had hardly scratched the surface of the problem. Yet, we are convinced that it is within the realm of a real solution. It is my strong belief that as it continues to grow with the increase in the number of cyclists from year to year, it is one that needs to be grappled with at the national level since it is national in origin. Across our Nation today, cities are sprawling or being rebuilt. Urban renewal and rehabilitation are the vogue. What is needed as much or more is the rehabilitation of the soft inhabitants of these cities and suburbs, too, for the sake of their bodies, their minds, and their very souls.

This revolution came about because the Federal Government tackled it. You have been responsible for these community developments, urban renewal, and land-use programs, more of which we see every day in the week. Congress is legislating for its advancement; the executive branch is implementing these projects. It seems quite logical and practical to me that in doing so, the Government must make some provision for the so-called beneficiaries of these programs by providing much-needed facilities such as trails for cyclists and hikers (and they can be the same), hostels, bicycle paths and tracks, bicycle areas and space for many other recreational uses.

We have not come here this morning to ask for Government handouts. But we honestly believe that there is a place for bicycles in these legislative programs. Certainly, the legislative arm should be cognizant of this nationwide need. When you undertake to help communities help themselves the needs of cyclists should be given careful consideration. There are many bills now before Congress where provisions should be made for cyclists. It is of paramount importance and interest to the millions of persons in this country devoted to perpetuating bicycling, including those industry leaders present here this morning who stand four square in favor of such a program. They are prepared to work endlessly with Government in developing whatever legislation may be necessary to get it into action across the land. They are responsible leaders who are not only interested in selling the products manufactured in their plants, but want to make certain that they are safely used, and used so that they benefit the greatest numbers possible.

I have become associated with them through the years because their objectives coincide with my own desire to see this Nation building a happier and healthier citizenry and providing the means for using our leisure time in a way that befits the people of a great nation. I have unwavering confidence that the bicycle is a practical and economical vehicle for keeping our people fit; and I see a greater future for our people and our Nation when it is given the means to remain healthy in body, mind—yes, also in soul.

I want sincerely to thank you for coming here today, giving up these few minutes of your valuable time, and showing such patience in hearing our story. It is a testament to the quality of those who legislate our laws and assure our continuing freedom. Because you have been so kind and patient, may I take your leave with this thought: Whatever you finally do, I recommend that you ride a bicycle for your own health and happiness.

Thank you for listening to me.

Indiana Civil Rights Laws Stronger Than H.R. 7152

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have stated repeatedly in press conferences and on TV and radio programs that the civil rights bill we are now debating would not impose anything upon Indiana residents which is not already provided in State law. This has now been publicly confirmed by Dr. Donald M. Royer, a research sociologist for the Indiana Civil Rights Commisison.

Dr. Royer compares Indiana's civil rights statutes with the proposed Federal bill, and finds that they are, "if anything, stronger than the Federal bill." In an article written by James R. Polk and distributed by the Associated Press, Dr. Royer compares provisions of the two jurisdictions—State and Federal—in education, housing, voting, public accommodations, civil rights commission, courts, and enforcement.

This analysis confirms once more that, to quote Dr. Royer, the Federal bill "guarantees States rights to States having civil rights laws, and that in this, Indiana is in the same position as at least 25 other States which have such laws. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was published in the New Castle, Ind., Courier Times of April 29, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CIVIL RIGHTS: INDIANA LAWS IN SOME WAYS STRONGER THAN FEDERAL BILL

(By James R. Polk)

INDIANAPOLIS.—Indiana made an arena of controversy over civil rights by the May 5 presidential primary fight, is not even affected directly by the Federal civil rights bill, a State official said today.

Indiana's own civil rights legislation already embraces guarantees of nondiscrimination in employment, education and public accommodations, and, if anything, is stronger than the Federal bill, explained Dr. Donald M. Royer.

Royer, a research sociologist for the State civil rights commission, pointed out the Federal bill specifically forbids Federal intervention in States with effective enforcement of their own civil rights laws.

"The bill guarantees States rights to States with civil rights laws," said Royer. "Indiana is in the same position as at least 25 other States with such laws. The act is only directly related to such States as Alabama."

The 45-year-old former professor at Manchester and Earlham Colleges made this point-by-point comparison of the State and Federal civil rights bills:

Education: The 1961 Indiana civil rights bill forbids discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or national origin in admission to public and private schools.

The Federal bill, said Royer, contains the same type of provision for assignment to schools without regard to race.

He said the Federal bill forbids transferring students to other school districts or redraw-

ing school district boundaries because of de facto segregation resulting from racial neighborhood patterns.

Title IV, section 401-d of the Federal bill reads, "Desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

Housing: The State law forbids discrimination only in State owned or municipally owned housing, according to Royer. Both bills affect hotels, hotels and rooming houses, but do not involve private homes or real estate sales in any way.

Employment: The Indiana law bans discrimination in hiring practices and in admission to labor unions.

Indiana's legislation affects all private business and public agencies with six or more employees. The Federal bill, at the outset, affects only private firms with at least 100 employees. This number will be dropped to 25 after 4 years, still well above the Indiana law's level.

"Our coverage is broader," noted Royer.

Voting: The Federal bill would outlaw discrimination in voting and registration. Indiana law has guaranteed the equal right to vote since 1881.

Public accommodations: Indiana law has forbidden discrimination in public accommodations since 1885. The law was strengthened in 1961 and 1963.

Indiana's law, according to Royer, includes "every type of public accommodations, including public services."

The Federal bill has two such sections, one on public accommodations and a separate one on public facilities, such as parks. The two parallel Indiana's single sections.

The Federal bill adds that, in effect, the Federal Government cannot move into the area of enforcing nondiscrimination in public accommodations in States like Indiana where the State itself is already effectively handling the problem with its own enforcement laws.

The same guarantee against unnecessary Federal involvement is contained in the Federal bill's employment section.

The key word in each case is "effective"—if the State is not trying to do an effective job, then the Federal Government may step in to guarantee civil rights.

Civil Rights Commission: The Federal bill creates a civil rights' commission, much like the one Indiana has had since 1961. Again it bars the Federal commission from intervening where a State commission is already engaged in enforcing civil rights.

At the same time, the Federal bill also creates a community relations agency for conciliation services on the local level, although this agency can only participate in such disputes at the invitation of local authorities.

Courts: The Federal bill permits an appeal of a Federal court decision to return a civil rights case to the State courts. Appeal procedures were not previously in this area.

Enforcement: Title X of the Federal bill specifically notes once again that the Federal Government may not take priority over the States' own efforts to enforce civil rights, as long as the States are doing the job effectively.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission is permitted to intervene if it decides a State is not making a conscientious effort to guarantee such rights.

Royer said the Federal enforcement procedure is much slower than the Indiana process.

Under Federal law, a civil suit must be brought in the courts, which can easily become a lengthy and extremely drawnout legal fight.

Under State law, the Indiana Civil Rights Commission, after an investigation and public hearing, may issue a cease-and-desist order immediately.

If the commission's own order is not obeyed, the agency may ask for a State court order. A judge may hold a violator in contempt of court if the second order is not followed. Only then does the enforcement process actually reach the stage of possible punishment.

The results of Indiana's own civil rights efforts are testimony of how negotiation can be effective.

Of the first stage of enforcement, the cease-and-desist order, Royer says, "We have not had to hand down any so far."

Royer notes that the commission investigated 110 cases of complaints of discrimination in employment last year.

More than half of them—60 in all—were dismissed when the commission found no proof of discrimination. Thirty more complaints were dropped by the individual who filed them.

Only in 20 of the 110 cases did the commission take action, and in each case, the action consisted solely of conciliation talks. In every case, Royer reports, the case was settled satisfactorily without resort to the commission's enforcement powers.

The same record was found in the other large category of State complaints, those on public accommodations.

The commission was able to settle 39 of 57 complaints through conciliation. In the other 18, the complaint was either dropped or no proof of discrimination was found.

Poverty in Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, prior to National Library Week, April 12–18, I had the privilege of meeting with the District of Columbia Committee for National Library Week. I was able to relate to this committee some of my own observations about the shocking lack of books in the District of Columbia elementary and junior high schools. I have personally visited many of these schools and have seen with my own eyes that library facilities are practically nonexistent

It is incumbent upon me to sound a note of warm praise to the District of Columbia Committee for National Library Week for its efforts and the promise of progress which has come out of these efforts to get more books into the District of Columbia schools and to put librarians in the schools where now there are none.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to some ways the committee approached this problem. I feel that the groundwork has been laid. I know the results will follow.

The first item is a letter from Mrs. Cazenove Lee, chairman of the District of Columbia Committee for National Library Week, to Mr. Wesley S. Williams, chairman of the board of education for the District of Columbia. This letter will be followed by excerpts from a radio panel discussion on April 16; a commentary by Edward P. Morgan on his regular ABC broadcast on April 17; an excerpt from an interview by Dr. Carl Hansen, Superintendent of Schools, on a television program on April 12, and then a list of members of the committee to whom all credit is due for making the community and the Congress aware of the poverty in books of the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE FOR LIBRARY WEEK, APRIL 12–18, 1964,

April 13, 1964.

Hon. WESLEY S. WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Board of Education of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: On behalf of the District of Columbia Committee for National Library Week I should like to present for the consideration of your Board our recommendations on the school library budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

As you know, our Committee, of which you are a member, met the Superintendent Hansen and other school officials on Monday, April 6, just before your open public hearing. These recommendations are a result of the discussion at that meeting between these officials and the group of civic leaders present.

It is clear that good school libraries can contribute immensely to reading ability, that central skill in the educational process. We recommend the following provision for school libraries in the 1966 education budget, as part of a 3-year program to bring libraries up to an adequate standard:

(1) Full-time professional librarians in each of the junior high schools.

This is a necessary first step but will still leave our junior high schools far below American Library Association standards, which call for 1 librarian for each 300 students, up to 900. As you know, all of our junior high schools but 1 have 1,000 or more students.

(2) Full-time librarians in each of the elementary schools (or combinations of very small schools served by one principal).

This is a big but essential move, building upon the approval of the first eight professional librarians for elementary schools in the 1965 budget as recently passed by the House of Representatives.

(3) An initial appropriation of at least $2,500 for books in each elementary school.

The House appropriation for fiscal year 1965 has established this as a precedent. Actually, more than $2,500 is necessary for a satisfactory initial elementary schoolbook stock, but $2,500 is an acceptable start.

(4) Raise the annual per capita library book purchase allocation to $1 per student in the elementary grades and $1.50 per student in the junior, senior, and vocational high schools.

Here again this is a necessary step forward but leaves a long way to go in order to reach the recommended ALA per-student standards of $4 to $6 per year for library books.

(5) Make adequate provision for library space in new school buildings and, equally important, in alterations of old buildings.

Our schools at all levels have inadequate space to provide an acceptable level of library service. The ALA standards call for collections of 6,000 to 10,000 volumes in schools with 200 to 1,000 students, and 10 volumes per student for larger schools. The minimum seating capacity recommended is 45 to 55 in schools of 200 to 550 students, and 10 percent of the student body in larger schools. The present capacities of libraries in those schools in the District which have them is far below these standards.

In closing, I urge that these recommendations be incorporated in the 1966 school budget. The citizens of the District, the professional educators in our school system, and Members of Congress have indicated their support for adequate school libraries as a small but important part of a general pro-

gram to improve the educational system of the Nation's Capital. We know we can count on your leadership in taking this major step toward providing the kind of education our children must have for today's world.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CAZENOVE LEE.

EXCERPTS FROM PANEL DISCUSSION ON RADIO STATION, WMAL

On Thursday, April 16, Matthew Warren, of radio station WMAL, discussed National Library Week and its application to the District of Columbia with three interested people: Miss Evelyn Bull, director of supervision and instruction on the elementary level in the District of Columbia school systems; Miss Wave Elaine Culver, member of the Capitol Hill Community Council and chairman of the Action Committee for District of Columbia School Libraries; and Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa. These are excerpts from their conversation:

Mr. WARREN. Someone once said that any institution of learning, regardless of the endeavor, is but a source of the knowledge of where to go to find it.

Miss BULL. President Johnson's proclamation for this special Library Week emphasizes one of the things that Representative SCHWENGEL has said: the fact that through libraries, through reading, people can help themselves. I think we know, in our past history, how many people have had a library as the only source of strength, and the only way of rising above the situation in which they found themselves.

You asked me why the children couldn't use public libraries. This is one of the reasons; the people who are self-starters will go to a public library and use it. But where we have children who need to be cranked, we have to have the library close enough so that they can get to it and so that the teachers can help. The teachers should make sure that the books aren't too hard, so that the children don't get discouraged, and see that they have a choice that goes with their interests. Because if we just give children any book they can dislike it as much as they do some of their school books—unfortunately.

Learning to read without a library is like trying to learn to cook without any food, or trying to learn to be a carpenter without any wood.

Mr. WARREN. But in the little red schoolhouse there were no libraries, there were assigned textbooks. The quality of the teaching we will assume was good. The children learned. Is proper teaching, perhaps, the answer, to raise the educational standards in our elementary schools?

Representative SCHWENGEL. First, let me take on this little red schoolhouse business; I went to one of those. But I didn't go to a little red schoolhouse that didn't have books. They were not assigned as textbooks, they were reference books. My little District No. 9 in Westford Township, Iowa, had more books than the elementary schools have here. And they only taught school up to the eighth grade. And when the teacher talked to us about the importance of reading books, she could point to a book we ought to read. And she talked about encouraging our parents to bring books into the home and that sort of thing—and that's going on here, too. But to have the teachers talk about it, and then not to have a place to let the boys and girls read a book in their spare moments. * * *

Miss CULVER. Our Capitol Hill Community Council has put token libraries in: last year in Brent School this year in Webster. We find that the children who come into the readingroom of a so-called library in a basement room in Brent School, for example, walk in, they look at the books for a while and think that something so clean and new should not be handled by them. They're a little reluctant to pick them up. It's probably the first clean, new, bright book they have ever seen.

Then, when the youngster finally takes it up there is absolutely no reluctance on their part to read. They stay and read—and from then on your only difficulty is trying to get the child and the book disengaged so you can call it quits for the end of that hour's reading period. They respond, and their response to us has been that "these are nice clean bright books" and that they "never knew you could learn about these sorts of things."

"The Case of the Missing Librarians" is a shocker—not whodunit fiction but, so to speak, who didn't do it? fact. The fact is that for 18 million American citizens the public library is missing and so is the public librarians. For a nation boasting of its literacy—though there are still entirely too many Johnnys who can't read—this is a disgraceful circumstance in which nearly a tenth of the total population of the United States has no access to a library book.

Since this is National Library Week it is appropriate to stare this situation in the face and a good place to begin, unfortunately, is right here in Washington, D.C. Although the great Library of Congress has close to 13 billion bound volumes of books and periodicals, the power center and the Capital of the so-called free world is pinned down by the crushing fact that library facilities for Washington schoolchildren are among the worst in the Nation. Indeed in the Capital's 135 elementary schools they simply do not exist, in any form worthy of the name. Some schools, old and new, have space for a library but no books. One junior high is so crowded it has to hold classes in what is supposed to be the library. In another parents operate a library in the corridor. This year there is an appropriation of 50 cents per grade school child for library books. Not a dime had ever been set aside for such purpose before. And this in Washington, D.C. The absolute minimum in the American Library Association's standards for school libraries is $4 per pupil per year for books.

It is precisely on the beginning level where "book learning" is needed most. As one Washington elementary school librarian, a volunteer, puts it: "Libraries are supplementary to classrooms in much the same way that books are supplementary to teachers. The aim of elementary education is to get a child interested in learning—in the enlargement of his understanding. Reading is the * * * indispensable means by which this is done.

"If children can be led to develop reading as a habit, if they come to think of reading as a road to achievement and satisfaction and even pleasure, they are on their way to becoming educated citizens: and once they are firmly on that way, no one need worry very much about their becoming delinquents or enemies of the community."

It will take some painful sacrifices, of course, to correct this library deficiency in Washington and elsewhere. Would we Americans, for instance, be willing to alter our personal spending habits sufficiently to provide a little more for books which might be donated to school libraries—if legislators won't appropriate the funds? We live a pretty Spartan existence already and I'm not sure we are ready for further sacrifices. In 1962, for example, we spent something above $3 billion for cosmetics and toilet articles and that was only double what we spent on books and maps for personal consumption. And the $10,665 million we invested in liquor was only a little more than six times the $1,677 million we squandered on books. In 1963 we shelled out a healthy $8 billion for tobacco, up only $326 million over the previous year and at that rate we'd undoubtedly have to budget pretty tightly even to afford a book on the subject of smoking and cancer.

We can have more or less what we want in this country and in terms of public libraries it appears we have already had it. The average age of library buildings in the United States is 53 years. Eighty-five percent of American public libraries were built before 1920. What more do we want? Plainly not much. It took a concerted effort led by that human dynamo from Minnesota, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, to get the Congress of the United States to appropriate $160,400 in 1962 to buy 160,400 textbooks for Washington, D.C., schools. And HUMPHREY had to cart an armload of tattered, obsolete texts onto the floor of the Senate, wave them under the noses of his colleagues, and point out that they didn't even have in the science books adequate passages about the airplane, let alone the space age, before the lawmakers in their myopic majesty would act. One hundred and sixty thousand dollars amounts to less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the net receipts of partimutuel machines at the Nation's racetracks in 1962.

According to a recent report, it won't be long before the Library of Congress is caught up in the revolutionary age of automation and employs computers to search for documents and information. At the rate we're going in our educational system, however, the only place the information can be found will be on the shelves. Already it cannot be found in the heads of too many American schoolchildren because they do not have enough books to fill their minds with knowledge—even if they learn to read.

Happy Library Week.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

DR. HANSEN'S STATEMENT ON WTTG–TV

On Sunday, April 12, Superintendent of Schools Carl Hansen was interviewed on the Mark Evans show over WTTG–TV. In the course of the interview, Dr. Hansen said:

"We should provide incentives for reading, to people who don't ordinarily get reading in their own homes. Children, especially at the early ages, need to use books, need to learn to read—for spiritual rejuvenation, you might say; for entertainment, recreation, and factfinding. It has to be brought in early—it is best in the home, but when it doesn't exist in the home, in the school if possible.

"One of the paramount needs we have is to get books available to children at the very earliest age."

LIST NAMES OF MEMBERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE FOR NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK, APRIL 12–18, 1964

Mrs. Cazenove Lee, chairman.

Mr. Paul Burnette, executive director.

Honorary chairman: Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Honorary vice-chairmen: Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, Hon. John B. Duncan, Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke.

Members: Dr. Hurst R. Anderson, Mr. Albert W. Atwood, Miss Alice D. Ball, Mrs. Adrienne Barth, Mrs. Arthur Blacklow, Miss Evelyn Bull, Very Rev. Edward B. Bunn, S.J., Mr. Thomas Henry Carroll, Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, Mr. Verner Clapp, Miss Wave Culver, Miss Mary Curran, Miss Olive de Bruler, Mr. Clark G. Diamond, Mrs. Tilford E. Dudley, Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, Mr. Robert W. Frase, Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, Mr. Joseph Goodfellow, Mrs. Elizabeth Hamer, Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Miss Virginia Haviland, Mr. John S. Hayes, Mr. John W. Hechinger, Miss Helen-Anne Hilker, Mr. Fred S. Houwink, Mr. Paul Howard, Mrs. Jehu L. Hunter, Mr. John D. Koontz, Rev. James W. Kortendick, Miss Germaine Krettek, Miss Maxine LaBounty, Mrs. Richard Marsh, Mr. William J. McCarter, Rt. Rev. Msgr. William J. McDonald, Mr. Benjamin M. McKelway, Mrs. Johanna Smith Morris, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Dr. James M. Nabrit, Mr. John O'Rourke, Mr. Harry N. Peterson, Mr. Paxton Price, Mr. Eller Ravn-

holt, Mrs. Enid Reque, Col. William A. Roberts, Very Rev. Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Mrs. Carl L. Shipley, Mr. William H. Thomas, Mr. J. C. Turner, Mrs. Jo Jasper Turner, Mrs. Luverne Walker, Dr. Garnet C. Wilkinson, Mr. Wesley Williams, Mrs. Dagmar Wilson.

Executive secretary: Mr. Robert T. Jordan, District 7-8877, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 704, Washington, D.C.

Trade With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

"TRADE" WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

(The U.S.S.R wants to trade the West for prototypes of advanced industrial plants that will let them bypass five decades of research and experience, keep their technical resources at work on military projects and give them a big competitive edge in world markets.)

From all the economic barometers, from reports from within Russia herself, the Soviet economy is sagging, and badly. Growth of heavy industry has slowed to a crawl; in other sectors, such as agriculture, the slowdown amounts to stagnation.

At the same time, there is an apparent relaxation of tensions in the Soviet cold war with the West. Whether or not these two things are related cannot be known for sure. One facet of the present "thaw" is a Soviet invitation for more trade with the West. Even now, to help ease their food crisis, America is selling grain to the U.S.S.R. Meanwhile, Russia continues to dump oil on world markets wherever it can be used to open free world countries to infiltration, and at the same time secure more foreign credits, at whatever price. It is not clear that the US.S.R. and the free world have the same understanding of the word "trade."

What do the Russians really want? They have already indicated what it is. Despite their aggressiveness and the advanced technology displayed in their military and related activities, the Russian plant for supplying consumer goods for peacetime use is inefficient and obsolete in many areas. To bring the Russian plant into shape would require years and years of devoting to the task huge amounts of capital and, most important of all, technical manpower which in our unbelievably complex technical era puts a firm limit on what can be done in any society.

What they are asking for, in their trade deals, is industrial machinery. Not to equip their whole industrial complex, but just one or two ultramodern plants in each category: chemicals, steel, petroleum, rubber, and a long list of other vital elements. These are obviously needed for just one purpose—model prototypes. At one stroke, by simply copying (Russia does not believe in patents) they will have bypassed 50 or more years of trial and error, of research, inspiration, and invention. And their plants, unlike those of the West, will all be of the most modern, advanced type, able to pour manufactured goods into the marketplace in quantity and price almost impossible to match. In other words, they want to repeat the massive transfer to them of Western technology which took place in the thirties and early forties. Then, similar plants in a wide spectrum were made available to them—thus relieving their technological manpower so that their energies could be directed to military and other activities.

And what will the Russians use for trade goods to obtain these plants? The most accessible resource the Soviets have to offer the free world for exchange is their oil—they have already opened and disrupted several markets in the West with it. Further evidence that petroleum is their prime trading weapon is its top priority on the list of modern prototype plants wanted. Russia, before any other plants, wants samples of advanced major refineries and petrochemical plants. Once these plants are duplicated and reduplicated and in operation, they may well pay for the prototypes of all the rest.

What is Russia's eventual aim? On this, we have direct evidence. It is in their own statements. One such statement is contained in a speech made by Premier Khrushchev only last December at the Soviet Communist Party meeting in Moscow. It said, in effect, that when the U.S.S.R. had succeeded in obtaining from the West the equipment it needed to avert disaster, it would be able to then "inflict a crushing blow on the Old World and establish with incontestable conclusiveness the superiority of socialism over capitalism."

This is not a simple challenge of "competition"—and not just a matter of the oil industry alone. Petroleum happens to be the vehicle selected to force the door; if the Soviets can obtain the technical prototype machinery in this field, the new plants they will then build can, and will, secure the foreign exchange power needed by Russia to repeat the performance with every other industry.

It can be hoped that our own Government will be foresighted enough—in this one field of technical industry or in any other—not to create such competition for its own economy by permitting the sale to Russia of prototype equipment. To do so would be to abet a Russian purpose which is neither constructive nor beneficial. It is, in short, the complete destruction of our economy (including our oil and all other industry) and eventually our entire way of life. Perhaps we could convince some of our allies of this fact, too.

R. G. FOLLIS,
Chairman of the Board.

A Prayer Dedicated to the Memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my good, and longtime friend, James Boyle, has composed the following beautiful prayer dedicated to the memory of our late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

("And so my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."—John F. Kennedy. Inaugural address, January 20, 1961, delivered on the Capitol steps, Washington, D.C.)

A PRAYER DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF J.F.K.

(By James Boyle)

The flag of freedom, the stars and stripes
Long may it wave o'er the land and sea.
As a haven and shelter for the oppressed
America, may we always sing that of thee.

Keep hate and false creeds from us
Keep their false doctrines from our shores;
Keep ours a land of internal peace
Here, let freedom linger evermore.

Let not worldwide conflagrations
Destroy that feeling in our land
Come . . . come all ye good and faithful
Lend us a willing and helping hand.

President's Speech on Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that the press is not swallowing all of the propaganda put out by the administration as gospel truth or all-inclusive so far as facts are concerned. This proves the statement that you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

David Lawrence, in his column published in the Evening Star of April 30, makes some very interesting comments on President Johnson's expansive announcements about our economy.

Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON ECONOMY—BUSINESSMEN TOLD ONE SIDE OF STORY; SOME OBSERVERS ARE FEARFUL OF FUTURE

(By David Lawrence)

Most people, upon reading in their newspapers yesterday of a speech by President Johnson telling of the large profits of business and promising further tax cuts, must have gained the impression that everything is all right in the national economy. They probably would be surprised to learn that many observers who have given close attention to economic factors are fearful of the future and believe that the finances of the Federal Government today are in one of the most dangerous positions they have been in during any peacetime year in our history.

When the President made his speech at a dinner of business and financial leaders at the White House, he told only one part of the story. He emphasized that profits in business have risen from $21.8 billion in 1961 to $27.1 billion in 1963, and are expected to reach $31 billion in 1964. He didn't tell his audience, however, that the profits of corporations in 1961 were at a very low rate. They are estimated at 6.1 percent of the national income for 1964, whereas in 1950 they had reached 9.4 percent. This indicates clearly that, while the national income has grown, the rate the profit has actually declined.

One reason for this, of course, is that wage costs have gone up from 65 percent of the national income in 1947 to an estimated 71.1 percent in 1964. Even in relation to the total volume of sales, profits are also down. Thus, earnings after taxes were 6.5 percent of sales in 1947–49, and are now estimated for 1964 at 5 percent.

But most important of all is the impact of unsound fiscal policy on the future value of the dollar. Thus, in his speech, the President said:

"It is too early to make firm promises on further tax cuts, but if this one is a success—as I have every reason to believe it will be—in building production, creating jobs, raising profits, and generating revenues to balance the budget, then I see another tax cut a few years down the road."

But this has not been the experience with previous tax cuts. The gains have been temporary, and the real measure of progress is whether the purchasing power of the dollar declines or rises. The monetary unit has been going down steadily for the last several years.

Nowhere in President Johnson's speech was there a single reference to the enormous debt of the Federal Government. It is around $310 billion—the largest in history.

How long can any government maintain public confidence in its monetary unit if the national debt is not reduced? The argument now is made that the tax cut will soon produce a budget surplus because, as the President puts it, there is an expectation of increases in production and in the number of jobs. But overlooked is the fact that, if the purchasing power of the dollar is steadily cut down, more wage increases are made necessary and, as profits are correspondingly reduced, prices have to be raised. This is what is customarily called an inflationary cycle.

The danger in the present situation is that, if the lending public ever comes to the conclusion that the Government of the United States is going to continue to borrow more every year without reducing its debt, there will have to be a substantial increase in interest rates. The lender who foresees a depreciation in the dollar will want the equivalent of higher wages for the loan of his money. When interest rates on Government borrowings go upward, the interest rates in the commercial world are, of course, pushed higher, too. This adds to business costs and tends to reduce the rate of profit.

Sooner or later, the high interest rates produce a setback in the economy. This was a key factor in the 1929 crash and what ensued thereafter. The President hinted in his speech that he hopes the Federal Reserve System will keep interest rates down, and he warns business to hold its prices down. But business will be helpless against the inflation that is actually caused by the Government's own fiscal policies.

The President, for instance, now is talking about "further tax cuts" and has not indicated that any action will be taken to use any surplus in the budget to pay off debt. What he proposes instead is more tax cuts. Based on past experience, this means more and more deficits and the further weakening of the purchasing power of the dollar.

Unfortunately, in Government circles there is not much of a tendency to look ahead several years. The custom is to look only a few months ahead to a national election, the winning of which is directly related to how widely an impression of prosperity can be conveyed by administration spokesmen. The picture that is being painted by them today is rosy indeed. But it was very rosy in 1929 too, until the facts of economic life began to emerge in a national economy that outwardly was booming but inwardly was struggling in vain against credit inflation and high interest rates.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, although, Rumania lost national independence in 1945 when forces of the Soviet Union invaded that land and smashed its elected Government, many Rumanians and citizens of other nations who are of Rumanian decent still celebrate Rumanian Independence Day, for freedom was for so many decades their way of life.

As a nation they cherished their independence for it was hard won, being finally achieved in 1878 at the end of the Russo-Turkish War.

The period 1878–1945 was the greatest in Rumania's history for, at last the yoke had been cast off and, as a free people, the Rumanians prospered.

In World War II, they were fated to lose all that had been gained during their decades of independence. Their greatest loss, of course, being their freedom.

Although Rumania has been for nearly 20 years a Soviet satellite, her people, having known freedom, keep alive the hope that it shall one day be theirs again. On this Rumanian Independence Day, freemen the world over join them in this prayer.

Freedom of Association: Demanded in North as Well as the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the civil rights legislation is debated in the Senate and all the aspects of this bill are brought before the people of the United States it becomes increasingly apparent that freedom of association can be and must be preserved in our country. The rights of every American engaged in private business, housing, and education must be protected, and the Federal Government must not inject itself into private decisions of persons conducting their own business or in the sacredness of their homes or in the field of education.

This problem of Government intervention into these fields is not restricted to any one section of the country. It is a continuing problem in the North, East, South, and West. The inappropriateness of Government intervention is illustrated by the recent vote in the House of Representatives of Rhode Island. That Northern State had a 1960 population census of 859,488, with 838,712 white people and 18,332 Negroes. On April 10, 1964 the Rhode Island House, as reported by the Associated Press, voted 61 to 32 against a proposal to ban separateness in housing. The Associated Press dispatch referred to this legislation as a "watered-down measure" and that it had both Democratic and Republican support.

This story, as far as I can determine, was not reported in some of the great daily newspapers of our country, and I include the AP dispatch in the RECORD following these remarks.

In an effort to protect the private rights of citizens, both in the North and the South, I have introduced a freedom of association constitutional amendment. This amendment recognizes the right of freedom of association and prohibits the Federal Government from violating that right. I include this amendment at the end of these remarks, and call attention to it for your consideration.

In the last several years the country has undergone a great and unjustified misconstruction of the U.S. Constitution. It is refreshing to see that this challenge to uphold the Constitution is as strong in the North, as exemplified by the action of the Rhode Island House, as it is in the South.

The April 10, 1964, Associated Press dispatch follows:

PROVIDENCE, R.I., April 10.—Civil rights leaders pledged to continue their fight and a legislator's house is under police guard today following a 2 to 1 defeat in the Rhode Island House of a proposal to ban discrimination in housing.

Leaders of both political parties joined the heads of groups which had lobbied for passage of the bill in expressions of disappointment at the 61 to 32 rollcall vote which killed the watered-down measure.

One of the bill's leading opponents, Representative Frank A. Martin, Jr., Democrat, of Pawtucket, told police several threatening phone calls were made to his home last night.

Police set up a watch outside the house.

Earlier, Martin said, he was accosted by an unidentified man and threatened as he was leaving the house chamber after the long and bitter debate.

Party lines, usually maintained rigidly in the Rhode Island Legislature, were shattered on the controversial issue.

Forty-two members of the Democratic majority rejected their leaders' appeals to pass the measure and redeem a pledge made in the party's 1962 campaign platform.

Nineteen Republicans joined in killing the bill, which had been backed by Republican Gov. John H. Chafee and had also been promised in the GOP platform of 2 years ago.

The favorable votes came from 25 Democrats and 7 Republicans. Representative John J. Wrenn, Democrat, of Providence, floor manager for the measure said he didn't expect further action on this issue this year in view of the decisive margin of the house vote.

However, he said, renewed effort will be made to pass a similar bill next year.

The question of a ban on housing discrimination has been before the legislature for 7 years, but yesterday was the first time the issue has been formally debated in the house.

Previous measures were killed in committee or in the Democratic majority caucus.

The senate has passed similar bills twice.

Chafee pledged to use his executive power wherever possible to combat discrimination and enhance opportunities for the State's 22,000 Negroes.

Martin and other opponents of the measure called the vote a victory for the little man whose property rights and freedoms they said would have been infringed upon if the bill became law.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AMENDMENT

ARTICLE —

Freedom of association shall be preserved. The Federal Government shall not compel association of persons in private businesses or in housing or in educational institutions; but may assist in programs to provide equal accommodations and facilities for all, including withdrawal of such Federal assistance when equal facilities are not in fact provided. Each State shall have exclusive jurisdiction over its public educational institutions and may separate students therein

on the basis of sex or race when this is decided by it to be in the best public interest or to assist in preserving freedom of choice in individual associations, provided that equal facilities shall be maintained at all times.

Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner, Public Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recently, we have had our attention directed, anew, at the many and varied qualifications of women and their suitability for equal participation in public life. President Johnson, we know, has undertaken to recruit more and more women into the sphere of public affairs on a scale which has not been seen since adoption of the 19th amendment.

We applaud his efforts because those of us who have been in public life for many, many years know of the many valuable, almost legendary, contributions American women have made in Government, whether in legislative, judicial or administrative spheres. We know them to be able, qualified and dedicated public servants.

One such is the Honorable Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, who, for more than 3 years, has brought new dimension to the Nation's low-rent housing program.

We in Massachusetts are no strangers to the program under Commissioner McGuire's stewardship, which currently provides homes for nearly 560,000 low-income families and elderly in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. In Massachusetts, alone, there are under management nearly 22,000 low-rent housing units, of which more than one-half are in my home community of Boston.

Nearly 1,000 additional low-rent units are in various stages of planning in Boston under the Housing Act of 1961, with 750 of them to be designed and built for elderly persons.

Shortly, I hope to be able to call up for debate in the House a new Housing Act. A new Housing Act is imperative. It is imperative because the authorization of 100,000 housing units for low-income people contained in the current act, the Housing Act of 1961, will be exhausted before June 30, the end of this fiscal year.

To supplement the current program, President Johnson has asked for a total of 240,000 low-rent public housing units in a development program to extend over the next 4 years. Legislation to accomplish that goal already has been introduced and hearings have been held. That bill, among other things, would provide for 35,000 units of new construction annually for the next 4 years, the purchase of 15,000 existing dwelling units each year for the same period of time and their rehabilitation for use by low-income families, and the outright leasing by local housing authorities, with Federal assistance, of an additional 10,000 dwelling units each year through the next four.

It is clearly apparent that a total of 240,000 low-rent housing units over the next 4 years is a modest goal. This is obvious when we know that, according to the Bureau of the Census, some 7½ million American families are forced to live in substandard housing—structures without plumbing, hot water, toilet facilities—homes which in far too many cases are little more than shacks. They are forced into such housing because of incomes so low they can afford neither to rent nor buy suitable or decent housing on the private market.

Despite those awesome figures, a good start has been made in the 27 years the low-rent program has been in existence. We have the reservoir of know-how and the techniques for an all-out assault on the evils of slum housing.

Such an assault has been the goal and cherished dream of Commissioner McGuire, who is a veteran of almost a quarter of a century in the slum housing war.

A pioneer in efforts to improve the surroundings of low-income elderly, she long has been a prominent figure in national housing circles. She exemplifies the skilled professionalism which Mr. Johnson seeks to recruit from among her sex and to bring into the national administration.

Mrs. McGuire has had many signal honors during the course of her long and distinguished career in housing. But among the most noteworthy, I think, was one presented her recently by the conservatively minded American Institute of Architects, the professional organization of America's many talented and respected architects.

The institute cited this gentlewoman for her contributions to the improvements she has sponsored in relationship between public housing and the architectural profession.

So that we can better gage the talents and professionalism brought to public life by women, I would insert the words of the citation the American Institute of Architects presented to one of them, the Honorable Marie McGuire:

ANNO DOMINI MCMLXIV: WE CITE WITH HONOR MARIE C. MCGUIRE, COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

In recognition of her vision and dynamic leadership in the fostering of excellence in design of shelter for low-income American families and elderly citizens; her contribution in stimulating the awareness of the design professions to the human and social dimensions in the provision of such shelter; her sponsorship of regional design seminars for low-rent housing to encourage productive dialogues and increased understanding of objectives among housing officials, local public agencies, and the design professions; her inauguration of a national panel of private design consultants utilized to advise and counsel on the architectural aspects of low-rent developments; her belief in the necessity of generating a positive atmosphere for the creative process by expanding opportunities for individual professional judgment.

These actions delineate her interest in the vital place of the architecture of housing in the development of man's total physical environment and her dedication in employing her office in the furthering of these objectives.

They Should Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a resolution that proposes an amendment to the Constitution to allow a citizen of this country to vote in his last place of residence for President and Vice President, Senator and Congressman until he fulfills the residency requirements of his new place of residence.

At the same time, I introduced a resolution that would call upon the States to implement this suggestion into existing State election laws. There is a great concern in this country for the 8 million people who in 1960 were not able to vote because of residency requirements. This concern is evidenced by the wide attention and approval that my proposals have received. One example of the support for the resolutions is an editorial that appeared in the Chicago American on Friday, April 7, 1964.

The editorial follows:

THEY SHOULD VOTE

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, is right in his contention that Americans should be permitted to vote for President, Vice President, Senator, and Representative in Congress no matter where they happen to be on election day. SCHWENGEL announced Monday that he is introducing two resolutions in Congress urging that the various States act, through their legislatures, to revise their laws on residency.

These require that people moving into the State live there for a certain length of time—the times vary from State to State—before they can vote in any election. These laws disqualified 8 million Americans from voting in the 1960 presidential election, SCHWENGEL said. (In addition to the fixed time that newcomers must live in the State, there are also fixed periods of residency in countries and precincts.)

SCHWENGEL has two suggestions for solving the problem: He proposed that the various States take action to permit people who have moved across a State line to vote for the four offices in the States they have moved out of until they have been long enough in their new States to get the vote. The other proposal would accomplish the same end by constitutional amendment.

In both cases, it would be necessary to set up mail voting arrangements, so the voters would be spared the expense of going back to their old States.

The mail voting privilege already exists for various citizens; there is no reason why it could not be extended to people who move from one State to another.

We think newcomers to a State, county, and precinct should wait until they can get to know local conditions and people before they start casting votes for State and local officials. But all Americans within America should be able at all times to help elect a Chief Executive, the man who will succeed him if he dies, and Members of the two Houses of Congress. No matter where they

are, all American citizens have the opportunity to be informed of the issues in a national election.

President's Speech on Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson made his speech at a dinner for business and financial leaders at the White House recently, he told only one side of the story about our business economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following news story by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 30, 1964. This article, in my judgment, is more accurate than the President's presentation.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON ECONOMY—BUSINESSMEN TOLD ONE SIDE OF STORY; SOME OBSERVERS ARE FEARFUL OF FUTURE

Most people, upon reading in their newspapers yesterday of a speech by President Johnson telling of the large profits of business and promising further tax cuts, must have gained the impression that everything is all right in the national economy. They probably would be surprised to learn that many observers who have given close attention to economic factors are fearful of the future and believe that the finances of the Federal Government today are in one of the most dangerous positions they have been in during any peacetime year in our history.

When the President made his speech at a dinner of business and financial leaders at the White House, he told only one part of the story. He emphasized that profits in business have risen from $21.8 billion in 1961 to $27.1 billion in 1963, and are expected to reach $31 billion in 1964. He didn't tell his audience, however, that the profits of corporations in 1961 were at a very low rate. They are estimated at 6.1 percent of the national income for 1964, whereas in 1950 they had reached 9.4 percent. This indicates clearly that, while the national income has grown, the rate of profit has actually declined.

One reason for this, of course, is that wage costs have gone up from 65 percent of the national income in 1947 to an estimated 71.1 percent in 1964. Even in relation to the total volume of sales, profits are also down. Thus, earnings after taxes were 6.5 percent of sales in 1947–49, and are now estimated for 1964 at 5 percent.

But most important of all is the impact of unsound fiscal policy on the future value of the dollar. Thus, in his speech, the President said:

"It is too early to make firm promises on further tax cuts, but if this one is a success—as I have every reason to believe it will be—in building production, creating jobs, raising profits, and generating revenues to balance the budget, then I see another tax cut a few years down the road."

But this has not been the experience with previous tax cuts. The gains have been temporary, and the real measure of progress is whether the purchasing power of the dollar declines or rises. The monetary unit has been going down steadily for the last several years.

Nowhere in President Johnson's speech was there a single reference to the enormous debt of the Federal Government. It is around $310 billion—the largest in history.

How long can any government maintain public confidence in its monetary unit if the national debts is not reduced? The argument now is made that the tax cut will soon produce a budget surplus because as the President puts it, there is an expectation of increases in production and in the number of jobs. But overlooked is the fact that, if the purchasing power of the dollar is steadily cut down, more wage increases are made necessary and, as profits are correspondingly reduced, prices have to be raised. This is what is customarily called an inflationary cycle.

The danger in the present situation is that, if the lending public ever comes to the conclusion that the Government of the United States is going to continue to borrow more every year without reducing its debt, there will have to be a substantial increase in interest rates. The lender who foresees a depreciation in the dollar will want the equivalent of higher wages for the loan of his money. When interest rates on Government borrowings go upward, the interest rates in the commercial world are, of course, pushed higher, too. This adds to business costs and tends to reduce the rate of profit.

Sooner or later, the high interest rates produce a setback in the economy. This was a key factor in the 1929 crash and what ensued thereafter. The President hinted in his speech that he hopes the Federal Reserve System will keep interest rates down, and he warns business to hold its prices down. But business will be helpless against the inflation that is actually caused by the Government's own fiscal policies.

The President, for instance, now is talking about "further tax cuts" and has not indicated that any action will be taken to use any surplus in the budget to pay off debt. What he proposes instead is more tax cuts. Based on past experience, this means more and more deficits and the further weakening of the purchasing power of the dollar.

Unfortunately, in Government circles there is not much of a tendency to look ahead several years. The custom is to look only a few months ahead to a national election, the winning of which is directly related to how widely an impression of prosperity can be conveyed by administration spokesmen. The picture that is being painted by them today is rosy indeed. But it was very rosy in 1929, too, until the facts of economic life began to emerge in a national economy that outwardly was booming but inwardly was struggling in vain against credit inflation and high interest rates.

Shabby Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial, appearing in the Washington Evening Star on April 29, entitled "Shabby Business." This editorial points up the fallacy of the United Nations' destruction of the Tshombe government in Katanga, the only stable government in all the Congo. The editorial speaks for itself:

SHABBY BUSINESS

In January 1963, a United Nations force, while disclaiming any such purpose, was crushing Moise Tshombe's Katanga army and chasing the "white mercenaries" out of the country.

Still, reforms were promised. The United Nations said the Congo government in Leopoldville had granted amnesty to Mr. Tshombe and had guaranteed him full freedom of movement. The U.N. also put forward an 8-point plan for reconciliation. The first item on the list called for adoption of a new constitution setting up a Federal system under which Tshombe's Katanga would have enjoyed a considerable measure of autonomy.

By June of last year, however, the Leopoldville politicians had gerrymandered Katanga in such fashion that Tshombe could hardly expect to be elected to anything, and he left the country.

By October a 6-month "state of emergency" had been decreed by Leopoldville in order to stop "demonstrations."

And now—just last week—there was a tiny item in the paper which announced that the state of emergency has been extended indefinitely by President Joseph Kasavubu, that public meetings are banned and that civil courts are being replaced by military tribunals.

Our own Government actively encouraged and supported this shameful performance. Surely those responsible for the decision to "smash Tshombe" have nothing to be proud of.

A Letter From a Worried American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a most penetrating and thought-provoking letter from a constituent who classified himself as a "worried American citizen." This is a remarkable document and I include it as a portion of my remarks:

MAY 1, 1964.

Congressman BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: Is the United States really "a wornout horse"?

I am an American citizen who is alarmed by this administration's policy of "shrinkmanship."

Khrushchev contemptuously describes the United States as "a wornout horse." He goes on to describe the weakening of the capitalistic system in general and the softening of U.S. leadership in particular.

Is he right? Is the United States really worn out, or is it only our leadership that is worn out?

There are some things lurking in the Washington woodpile today which obviously need to be smoked out before the American people can have any confidence that their true will and spirit are being adequately interpreted, either to friend or foe. Here are nine specific questions which the American people are not too exhausted to ask:

1. What is love?

How can the President of the United States say with a straight face that "we are a much beloved people throughout the world" when for the past 2 years, some place in the world American embassies, consulates, or agencies have been attacked, burned or looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity? (Most of these countries, of course, are receiving huge amounts of foreign aid from us.

The idea seems to be, "Yankee, go home—but leave money.")

2. If these are "myths," what are the facts?

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee claims, "We are clinging to old myths in the face of new realities."

Is the Berlin wall a myth?

Is it a myth that two unarmed American planes were shot down within a period of a few weeks, three Americans killed, one wounded, and that two others were held for 17 days?

Is it a myth that U.S. traffic to West Berlin is periodically blocked?

Is it a myth that Khruschev's No. 1 man sat in President Kennedy's office in October, 1962 and told him a whole series of bald-faced lies about Russian missiles in Cuba?

Is it a myth that after 4 days of blockade we backed down and still really don't know what's going on in Cuba?

Is it a legend that Castro cut off the fresh water supply at Guantanamo, that we did nothing about it; that hauling fresh water from Fort Lauderdale and preparing to distill it from the sea is costing American taxpayers untold (and undisclosed) millions?

Is it a fairy tale that three tons of Communist arms, ammunition and plans for seizing Caracas were found in Venezuela just before the last election there?

We can only hope it is a myth that hidden deep in the Washington woodpile is a plan for a surrender of our rights in Panama and eventual evacuation of Guantanamo, but certainly it is not very reassuring to hear from Secretary Rusk that we do not propose to renegotiate our position in Guantanamo "in the foreseeable future."

3. When is a satellite not a satellite?

Is Cuba a colony and a puppet of Soviet Russia, or isn't it?

A prominent member of the Senate refers to Castro as "a distasteful nuisance, but not an intolerable danger."

Does not he know about the millions Khrushchev is pouring into Cuba to support this important Soviet base in the Western Hemisphere? About the Cubans trained in Russia to hate us? About the power of the Russian "technicians" remaining in Cuba? About Russia's capacity to store missiles and build submarine pens in the vast cave-and-tunnel system in Cuba? Does he deny that Cuba today is practically a Soviet police state?

In a syndicated article, ex-President Harry Truman wrote "Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia." Apparently this well-known member of the Senate does not agree with him. Is he prehaps "overeducated and underinformed," as Mr. Truman said on another occasion?

Is not Castro actually just a part of the whole Communist strategy of probing for weak spots, of piecemeal conquest?

Cuba is still only 90 miles away. Marxist-Leninist communism is deeply implanted there. The hammer and sickle and pictures of Marx, Lenin and Khrushchev are plastered all over the island. Yet this is something which this administration never talks about in public. The policy, as David Lawrence describes it, appears to be one of "forgive and forget."

4. When is appeasement not appeasement?

The stance proposed by this Senator is not too much at variance with the policy of "reexamination" proposed in the disturbing recent remarks of U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson in a lecture at Princeton, by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a news conference, and by President Johnson himself in recent remarks to union leaders.

Was it merely a coincidence that "reexamination" proposed by Ambassador Stevenson was a key word in the Senator's speech? Are we to assume that we are wrong? Aren't there two sides to this street? Isn't it time that Russia did a little of this "reexamining"?

Many Americans must have shuddered when President Johnson, in a three-network interview March 15, used the phrase "peace in our time," coined by Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, whose policy of appeasement with Hitler gave away much of Europe and so clearly led to World War II.

Isn't there anybody around Washington nowadays who has read "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich"?

Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, has bluntly warned, "Khrushchev is pushing us; we are retreating. The more we retreat, the more he will push."

Is there any doubt that with a continuation of our hand-wringing, floundering state of uncertainty and timidity there will be additional Cubas? Or that the same sweet-spoken arguments against positive action again will be advanced?

If our present policy is not appeasement, it would be enlightening to learn what appeasement actually is, or just what this administration would regard as intolerable appeasement.

This same Senator has publicly denied that his speech was a trial balloon and claims he made it entirely on his own, but are we, the American people, suckers enough to believe that a long, full-dress, carefully prepared speech of this kind by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did not receive top-level endorsement of some kind, leading straight back to the White House?

5. How inconsistent can we be?

How can we continue to support a war of indefinite duration in South Vietnam more than 9,000 miles away with more than 15,000 American troops at a reported cost of more than $1.5 million a day, when we all but ignore the inroads and consolidation of international communism only 90 miles away?

This is not to say that we should pull out of South Vietnam, but it is to say that we cannot live with this policy of flagrant inconsistency and command any respect in any part of the world.

6. What price peace?

How can an administration which until very recently proudly pointed to the 4-day Cuban blockade of October 1962, as a shining example of masterful strength, take the attitude that anyone who proposes a positive program with respect to Cuba today is a warmonger?

With this administration's soft, wait-and-see approach apparently we have to assume that the blockade of 1962 was a dreadful mistake and that under a similar set of circumstances today we would not stand up to Khrushchev as we did for those four frightening but very proud days in 1962. We backed down soon enough, but during that 1 glorious hour we didn't flinch and not a dissenting voice was heard throughout the land.

Is our Government actually telling us that the intrenched Soviet threat in Cuba today does not demand a positive program, even at some risk?

Is it the policy of this administration to ignore such solid facts as those brought to light by the highly respected Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba in its recent pamphlet titled "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba"? We have yet to hear a reaction to it from Washington.

If indeed it is true that an uprising against the Castro regime is now in the making, as this report indicates, what is our attitude going to be when it is touched off? Obviously our policy can either make it or break it. Are we going to let freedom-loving Cubans down again as we did at the Bay of Pigs?

7. Is the Monroe Doctrine dead?

What about the Monroe Doctrine which establishes the principle that no foreign government shall colonize in the Western Hemisphere? Ever since 1823 it has been a guiding principle in our foreign policy.

As far back as 1960 Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying, "The remains of the Monroe Doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay."

The Eisenhower administration replied, "The principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed."

The present administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or action. Its silence on the subject is nothing short of deafening. Does it agree with Khrushchev? Are we going to let them bury the Monroe Doctrine? The American people are entitled to know.

8. How can we hold up our heads around the world?

How can we hold up our heads and command any respect or pose as a leader of the free world in any part of the globe today as long as we continue to give the lie to any semblance of firmness with Khrushchev and abide Castro at our own doorstep? The obvious answer is that we aren't, and we can't. The whole free world is puzzled, including all the new nations. How can we expect them to react otherwise with no examples to command their respect and confidence?

As May Craig, famous Washington correspondent, puts it, "Around the world they do not believe what we say; they look at what we do."

9. How can we earn the cooperation of our Allies?

Even many democratic leaders admit that our so-called "economic blockade" of Cuba is a complete fiasco.

How can we ask our allies to stop or restrict their trade with Cuba under our present policies?

France has made a $10 million truck deal with Castro, and has recognized Red China.

Spain is building 100 fishing vessels and two freighters for Cuba.

Great Britain has sold Castro 100 buses and has 600 more on order.

Four British airliners are being reconditioned for Cuba, and negotiations are under way for the delivery of $1.4 million worth of heavy road-building machinery for Castro.

Other free world countries are freely selling Cuba almost anything it wants in huge quantities, including critically needed oil, without which it could not exist.

All use our wheat deal with Russia as an excuse. "If you have a surplus of wheat," we are impudently told by business interests in Great Britain, "we have a surplus of buses."

As predicted by Republican leaders, our wheat deal with Russia has turned into a diplomatic nightmare.

Isn't it clear by now that in initiating the wheat deals Khrushchev clearly saw the trap he was setting for us?

Are we to go on and on with this kind of a policy, or are we going to start putting on the brakes?

Is the United States, as Premier Khrushchev says, really "a worn-out horse"?

Surely no red-blooded American is ready to admit it.

Certainly a lot of Americans today are getting sore necks turning the other cheek.

It seems equally obvious, however, that too many Americans, involved in their own daily problems have become victims of a feeling that "we can sit this out," that "business is good," that "communism is coming apart at the seams," and that "the Russian-Chinese split will solve our problems." The result is a passive acceptance of things as they are, which this administration is openly fostering and which is the greatest secret weapon of Soviet communism, about which it makes no secret.

None of these Americans wants a nuclear war. But neither does any real American propose to risk the honor and respect of this country in its capacity for leadership down the long road to a lasting peace.

In the attempt to get along with Khrushchev, we must not forget what the appeasers seems to have forgotten, that this is the same man who banged his shoe on the desk at the United Nations, who blocks any serious attempt at peace which involves inspection, and who continues to probe for weak spots through any method that suits his purpose in a long-range pursuit of world conquest by Lenin-Marxist communism.

Is there any real doubt that standing up to Russia in the Cuban blockade actually did more to improve relations than the test ban treaty which is hailed by many as one of the greatest victories of all time?

Isn't it about time we faced up to the sorry fact that this administration has no foreign policy except (as was aptly stated in a recent editorial) "generous thoughts, noble impulses and the showering of favors upon all and sundry."

Even many administration spokesmen have admitted that our foreign policy is "in disarray." Isn't this just a fancy way of saying "in a mess?"

Isn't it obvious by now that we can't look to this administration to do anything about it?

Isn't it equally clear that it's time for some "United Statesmanship" which is so strongly advocated today by the Republican Party and many Democrats as well?

What good old Dobbin plainly needs is a new shot of oats, with Uncle Sam back in the driver's seat.

Sincerely,

A WORRIED AMERICAN CITIZEN.

Rail Settlement: Hollow Victory?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, current praise for President Johnson's efforts to solve the recently threatened rail strike sometime overlooks both the means used in achieving the settlement and the terms of the settlement itself.

With all the pressures of Government brought to bear on the dispute, the agreement can hardly be said to be the result of voluntary bargaining despite the President's claims. It remains to be seen whether the settlement will offer the American public greater service by the more efficient operation of our nationwide railroad system.

James M. Langley, editor of the Concord Daily Monitor (N.H.), has written a thought-provoking editorial "Hardly Voluntary" in the April 24 issue of the Monitor which I commend to my colleagues' attention. Mr. Langley states, "We suspect uneconomic practices have not been eliminated except partially and that the American economy will still have to support the high cost of inefficient work rules."

The editorial follows:

HARDLY VOLUNTARY

President Johnson has announced settlement of the railroad strike and in doing so stressed that it resulted from voluntary bargaining by labor and management.

Technically, no law compelled the settlement. Practically, labor and management were under governmental coercion.

The President first extracted from the disputants 15 days of delay. He used the weight of his office and the personal powers of persuasion with which he is so greatly endowed. Then he virtually imprisoned the negotiators in White House offices. He brought in highly paid professional negotiators. He prodded the negotiators by frequent personal inquiry as to what progress was being made.

It wasn't necessary for the President to threaten congressional or other governmental action if the negotiations failed and there was a nationwide rail strike. The disputants knew the Government would take them over, one way or another. They feared compulsory arbitration would be imposed, by law. In effect it was imposed anyway, not by law, but by the President.

Dire consequences which a rail strike would have brought were listed by the President in his announcement of the settlement. They were the reason the strike could not be permitted to occur. The national economy and safety, plus the political stability of the Government, took precedence over the technical rights of labor to strike.

The general welfare requires of both labor and management responsibilities which amount to disciplined conduct. Such requirements are obvious in a situation such as the threatened nationwide rail strike. They are just as real, if not so obvious, in many lesser labor disputes.

Only a study of details of the settlement will reveal whether the governmental pressures applied in this instance tended to be one-sided. We suspect uneconomic practices have not been eliminated except partially and that the American economy will still have to support the high cost of inefficient railroad work rules.

Fairbanks-Morse Recipient of Navy Polaris Flag of Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, we who are residents of the First Congressional District of Wisconsin are proud of our many vital industries. Today I would like to salute the Beloit, Wis., plant of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. over which there now flies an official Navy Polaris flag of recognition.

The blue and white banner bearing familiar silhouettes of a nuclear submarine and a Polaris ballistic missile is reserved by the Navy for fleet ballistic missile systems prime contractors. Fairbanks-Morse produces the hoisting gear by which the solid-fuel missiles are lifted from place to place and lowered into the submarines' launcher tubes.

Capt. James Lieber, assistant branch head of the launcher and handling branch of the Navy's special projects office, presented the flag to James F. Jones, vice president and general manager of the Beloit plant, and E. M. Perry, Government business manager for Fairbanks-Morse, at a recent ceremony.

Transferring missiles from docks to submarines and subtenders and between resupply vessels and their tenders requires specialized and complicated equipment, designed for precision handling.

The Polaris missile program is considered the Nation's No. 1 deterrent.

In addition to missile hoists, Fairbanks-Morse also supplies auxiliary diesel generating equipment for the Polaris submarines.

Navy officials explained that the Polaris flag is presented as an emblem of membership in the Polaris Navy-industry production team.

As early as 1936 and continuing through World War II, the company also supplied diesel engines to the armed services. Fairbanks-Morse diesel engines propelled more than half the submarines in action in World War II. For these services, the company received the Navy "E" Award.

Also participating in the ceremony was Robert Tilley, president of the Beloit City Council.

The George Washington Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to hear my good friend and colleague, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, speak before the American Good Government Society. These remarks were so outstanding and timely that I felt each of my colleagues should have the opportunity of reading this speech. Mrs. ST. GEORGE's remarks were as follows:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON ADDRESS

(By Katharine St. George)

George Washington's Farewell Address is one of the great historical documents of all time. It is a final testament left to the American people by their first President. The man who could have been king by hardly stretching out his hand. The man who believed in the Constitution and yet warned of those pitfalls that lay ahead.

The word "great" has been overworked to death. When we see the two-bit politicians to whom it is applied daily in the press, and the miserable speeches and documents that are so described, it seems almost an insult to apply it to this great document.

It might be well to apply the word "great" only to somet! ing or someone whose reputation has endured for at least 100 years, and if Madison Avenue can create an image that can survive that test, no one should quarrel about their handiwork.

Every year on Washington's Birthday the "Farewell Address" is read in the Congress of the United States. It is hard to read, as the sentences are long and the punctuation different from the modern. It is also hard to read, because the art of reading aloud is no longer practiced, or taught, in the United States and therefore the modern Member of Congress has usually considerable difficulty in delivering these great rolling sentences with conviction and lucidity. For this reason, and many others, this great testament has rarely been put to use. Like civilization and Christianity, it has never been tried.

I would like to consider the address with you tonight. I would like you to think of

the words of our first President as they apply to the present and how they may be applied to the future. Washington believed deeply in the Constitution and he says, among the very first matters:

"That your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained * * *."

This is something that is increasingly hard to do and one reason is that the complexion of the country and its growth have made another sentence that comes shortly after this first useless today. It follows:

"With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles."

Of course this is not true today and we conveniently forget that a great many people from many lands do not believe in a written constitution and do not believe in a modern mechanized and urbanized state.

The British, for instance, have always held that a written constitution was too rigid and have never had one. But here Washington foresaw the difficulty and gave the answer:

"The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government—but the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all."

Not that you could change the Constitution every other minute, but that when the people by a vast majority demanded change, they could. They not only can, but do obtain these changes when they really demand them. We have seen it most recently in the XXI amendment which repealed prohibition. This fact is, of course, our salvation in a growing and changing world.

As we are gathered here tonight as a nonpartisan group to honor two Senators representing our two great political parties, we should note that our first President was most vehement in his warning against what he termed the "baneful effects of the spirit of party generally." He also said, and this is important to us today:

"It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stiffled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in it greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

"The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner, or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty."

Now we today have very little partisanship. As far as causes are concerned, we all believe in motherhood and the flag and the absolute rights and knowledge of the great teenage American boy or girl, and these are our sacred beliefs, be we Republicans or Democrats.

We have, however, become slaves to looks and personality. We are violent in our likes and dislikes of individual candidates. This is especially true of women, and remember, gentlemen, they have the predominant vote today. It has been well said that for every woman who makes a fool out of a man, there is another woman who makes a man out of a fool. But, ladies, the latter is a harder task, especially in the political field.

This cult for the ideal person for political office is a way to lead the kind of competition that Washington warns us of in my last quotation, and it is infinitely easier today with TV, radio, photography, etc. for an individual with a pleasing and dynamic personality to turn all this to his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty. I am afraid, my countrymen, that we are now quite a way down this road.

We of the legislative branch have no great reason to cheer over our efforts to sustain public liberty. As one who has been in the Congress 18 years I have seen with sorrow the erosion of our powers, our dignities, and our effectiveness. I do not blame this on the executive or the judicial branches. I blame it on the Congress itself. These rights and duties could never have been taken from us; we abdicated them.

Here again George Washington foresaw what might be, and spelled it out. He said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism.

Today we are seeing Members of the House and Senate daily criticizing the manner in which both Houses conduct their business. Well, let us now come forward, with a will to do something ourselves, before it is done for us from above. We have the critics, let us have the builders also. This is indeed a case of "physician, heal thyself."

We have heard much about the first amendment of late, and of the Supreme Court's decision in the matter of prayer in our public schools. Those upholding the decision would have us believe that the Founding Fathers feared the influence of religion and merely granted a free exercise of it. I cannot read any such meaning into the amendment. It is simple; it does not need a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret it. It says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;

What the founders did not want was the establishment of an official church, such as existed in most of the world at that time. Certainly, up to the latest Court ruling, this seems to have been the general interpretation, and most of our States had prayers in the public schools.

On this question of religion, the address is emphatic. It says:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. * * * Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. * * * reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

My fellow citizens, what we need today above all else is a return to these stern principles of morality, and indeed reason and experience prove that they will never exist without respect for and belief in spiritual values.

I will not reiterate at any length the well-known injunctions, to cherish public credit, and to eschew entangling alliances. It is probably too late now to consider either in an age when we are coming near to an era of printing press money. One of your award recipients, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, said recently:

"The requirement that there shall be 25 cents in gold for every Federal Reserve dollar issued is an anchor against printing press money. If that requirement is removed there will be no limitation of any character except the judgment of Federal officials which changes like the winds."

As to alliances, ours today encircle the globe. We have made these engagements and, for better or worse, they must be kept. In the words of the address: So far as have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith.

Finally, let us here tonight, who are dedicated to "good government," think over this great testament left us by the true Father of our Country, not as an interesting historical document, but as a blueprint for a more perfect union and a more perfect government. In the words of George Washington, the first and the greatest President of the United States, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God."

Those Farm Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great regret to me that farming, always considered the backbone of the Nation's economy, should have to be mentioned in the same breath with the administration's war on poverty.

Four years ago, a presidential campaign pledge was made which guaranteed that "farm income would be raised all across the Nation." That pledge has not materialized, and with inflated farm costs, along with all others, we are witnessing continual growth of farm indebtedness, a sharp increase in farm mortgage foreclosures, and an agricultural depression in general.

The dairy industry has been especially hard hit but alas, a disappointing solution is all that has been advanced. Under the poverty program, it has been announced that farmers will receive a grant of $1,500 for equipment if the plan is adopted. I have not heard from a single dairyman urging this ridiculous subsidy be authorized because farmers are practical people who realize that the three or four cows they could buy would only give them a negligible net return. Equipment such as a basic tractor costing at least $4,000 is entirely out of the question, not to mention the other related and more expensive implements needed on the farm.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Chatham, N.Y., Courier of April 23, 1964, sketches the farmers' plight and quite correctly concludes that in spite of increasingly misguided Federal control in the barnyard, they will continue to provide our Nation with the best food mankind has ever known.

THE FARMER'S PLIGHT

In dedicating this edition to Columbia County farmers, it is with a certain amount of justification that the farmer can be excused for occasionally wondering if he is wanted in the picture at all. Regretfully, we are obliged to say that rarely in the past century has the American farmer found himself as confused by what his Government wants of him, expects of him, thinks of him.

Farmers have always relished independence. But, whatever independence farmers have today, or whatever independence the Federal Government wants them to have, is intertwined with complex and confusing proposals and programs. Production controls versus loss of price supports must be con-

sidered in almost every decision that surrounds everything in farm management—from the purchase of a plow to repainting the barn roof. Today's farmer is confused. Truly, he needs a mathematician and perhaps a psychiatrist as much as he needs seed, lime, fertilizer, and machinery.

Alone, among all the myriad segments of our population and industry, the American farmer—and the dairy farmer in particular, has been singled out to do something dramatic for his country—namely, to get along on a lot less income, about $300 million a year less in round figures.

Well, the dairy farmer will sustain this blow just as he has sustained many others. He will take up his belt a notch, get up a little earlier in the morning, work a few hours later in the evening.

Fortunately for the farmer, however, there are some men in Congress, and this includes a number of Democrats, who are striving to combine feasibility, practicality, and some old-fashioned horsesense with the Federal Government's superabundance of ideas, notions, designs, flights of fancy as to how to write farm legislation. The wisdom and courage of these legislators is to be commended.

Yet, as the farmer surmounts one seemingly insurmountable wave of Federal, interstate, State, and local regulations, another is sure to follow. In a nutshell, the farmer is a worried man. He has every reason to be.

Israel Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years the people of Israel have dedicated themselves to the building of a new nation, a land to call their own. They have bravely defended its borders and protected their independence.

To build a new country is not an easy task. It has meant a revitalization of the soil misused and depleted over centuries. It required construction of industrial plants and modern transportation systems, for there were few, if any at the start. There was need for water systems, educational facilities were few and primitive.

The Jewish people, living in a democracy that gave them courage and a reason to seek their goal, overcame tremendous difficulties and solved problems that seemed beyond solution to create a land of promise.

From the mountains of Galilee to the Negev desert, Jews are at work creating new farms, new factories, roads, schools, mines, and whole cities.

The refugees who formerly starved in concentration camps now eat all they want. Israel is nearly self-sufficient in food and even exports a lot of the fresh oranges Americans eat every morning.

Near the ancient mines of King Solomon, copper is once again being produced and contributing a valuable resource to modern Israel.

Oil is being produced in significant quantities along with chemicals, textiles, paper, plastics, leather goods, building materials, ceramics and electric machinery. This provides Israelis with the highest living standard in the Mediterranean area. All of this has been made easier by the virtual elimination of illiteracy.

Throughout the bright new cities and prosperous farms of Israel, Jews are laboring to establish the freedom and comfort they richly deserve. Their accomplishments have been impressive.

As Israel commences its 17th year as an independent nation, it is encouraging to note that she has earned respect for what has been accomplished, but, more important, is the spirit of her people which has made possible what has been done and will, I am confident, make possible even greater accomplishments in the years to come.

War on Poverty in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include the following open letter entitled "War on Poverty in New York," written by Mr. William P. Lynch, international vice president of New York, Local 791, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO:

WAR ON POVERTY IN NEW YORK

Do you know: The New York Port of Authority has invested approximately a half billion dollars of our tax-free moneys into New Jersey ports (Port Newark and Port Elizabeth) while not one red cent was allocated for our Manhattan waterfront. This is a war against New York.

After building said ports, the New York Port of Authority encourges the New York shipping companies to occupy the New Jersey piers; causing many thousands in our city and State to be unemployed.

Is this war on poverty?

Do you know: That 25,864 ships passed through the port of New York in the year 1963? Our harbor handled 41,890,442 tons of oversea cargo and 593,825,000 pounds of domestic cargo? Port jobs held by people who live directly in New York district number 430,000, and provide $2,100,000,000 in wages. With these facts, why is there a movement to cripple the economic structure of New York?

Is this war on poverty?

Shipping is the very heart of our economic system as one out of every four earn their living, directly or indirectly, from our waterfront. This totals in the millions.

The Marine and Aviation Commissioners are planning to demolish a mile of Manhattan piers. In their place, they intend to build luxury housing which will cause mass unemployment.

Is this war on poverty?

Maintaining our piers should be the first major step in the war against poverty. By allowing our piers to be demolished for a riviera, or by losing our shipping companies to another State, will only add to poverty, not defeat it.

We cannot win this war by destroying our economic lifeline. The first battle of the war against poverty should be the New York Port of Authority.

WILLIAM P. LYNCH,
International Vice President of New York.

President's Speech on Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by David Lawrence dealing with the dangers of the recent tax cut without a reduction in spending. Inflation has cut the purchasing price of the dollar 24.6 percent in the last 10 years, which, translated into defense, means that we are getting 25 percent less defense for every dollar spent than we were in 1953. If this inflationary spiral continues for another 10 years, we will be spending $100 billion to get $50 billion of defense.

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON ECONOMY—BUSINESSMEN TOLD ONE SIDE OF STORY; SOME OBSERVERS ARE FEARFUL OF FUTURE

(By David Lawrence)

Most people upon reading in their newspapers yesterday of a speech by President Johnson telling of the large profits of business and promising further tax cuts, must have gained the impression that everything is all right in the national economy. They probably would be surprised to learn that many observers who have given close attention to economic factors are fearful of the future and believe that the finances of the Federal Government today are in one of the most dangerous positions they have been in during any peacetime year in our history.

When the President made his speech at a dinner of business and financial leaders at the White House, he told only one part of the story. He emphasized that profits in business have risen from $21.8 billion in 1961 to $27.1 billion in 1963, and are expected to reach $31 billion in 1964. He didn't tell his audience, however, that the profits of corporations in 1961 were at a very low rate. They are estimated at 6.1 percent of the national income for 1964, whereas in 1950 they had reached 9.4 percent. This indicates clearly that, while the national income has grown, the rate of profit has actually declined.

One reason for this, of course, is that wage costs have gone up from 65 percent of the national income in 1947 to an estimated 71.1 percent in 1964. Even in relation to the total volume of sales, profits are also down. Thus, earnings after taxes were 6.5 percent of sales in 1947–49, and are now estimated for 1964 at 5 percent.

But most important of all is the impact of unsound fiscal policy on the future value of the dollar. Thus, in his speech, the President said:

"It is too early to make firm promises on further tax cuts, but if this one is a success—as I have every reason to believe it will be—in building production, creating jobs, raising profits, and generating revenues to balance the budget, then I see another tax cut a few years down the road."

But this has not been the experience with previous tax cuts. The gains have been temporary, and the real measure of progress

is whether the purchasing power of the dollar declines or rises. The monetary unit has been going down steadily for the last several years.

Nowhere in President Johnson's speech was there a single reference to the enormous debt of the Federal Government. It is around $310 billion—the largest in history.

How long can any government maintain public confidence in its monetary unit if the national debt is not reduced? The argument now is made that the tax cut will soon produce a budget surplus because, as the President puts it, there is an expectation of increases in production and in the number of jobs. But overlooked is the fact that, if the purchasing power of the dollar is steadily cut down, more wage increases are made necessary and, as profits are correspondingly reduced, prices have to be raised. This is what is customarily called an inflationary cycle.

The danger in the present situation is that, if the lending public ever comes to the conclusion that the Government of the United States is going to continue to borrow more every year without reducing its debt, there will have to be a substanital increase in interest rates. The lender who foresees a depreciation in the dollar will want the equivalent of higher wages for the loan of his money. When interest rates on Government borrowings go upward, the interest rates in the commercial world are, of course, pushed higher, too. This adds to business costs and tends to reduce the rate of profit.

Sooner or later, the high interest rates produce a setback in the economy. This was a key factor in the 1929 crash and what ensued thereafter. The President hinted in his speech that he hopes the Federal Reserve System will keep interest rates down, and he warns business to hold its prices down. But business will be helpless against the inflation that is actually caused by the Government's own fiscal policies.

The President, for instance, now is talking about further tax cuts and has not indicated that any action will be taken to use any surplus in the budget to pay off debt. What he proposes instead is more tax cuts. Based on past experience, this means more and more deficits and the further weakening of the purchasing power of the dollar.

Unfortunately, in Government circles there is not much of a tendency to look ahead several years. The custom is to look only a few months ahead to a national election, the winning of which is directly related to how widely an impression of prosperity can be conveyed by administration spokesmen. The picture that is being painted by them today is rosy indeed. But it was very rosy in 1929, too, until the facts of economic life began to emerge in a national economy that outwardly was booming but inwardly was struggling in vain against credit inflation and high interest rates.

Practicality Versus Emotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the April 17, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Alsop dramatizes the two alternatives facing our Nation in the civil rights crisis: practicality and emotion. It is to be hoped that those on both sides will adopt the practical approach to this problem. Equality is not fostered by emotional reactions; neither is justice furthered by creating antagonism.

The article follows:

PRACTICALITY VERSUS EMOTION

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The spotty Communist infiltration of the Negro civil rights movement, which has now been revealed, is merely one more sign that this agonizing problem is moving toward another crisis phase.

Furthermore, this sign, though deeply disturbing, is really less meaningful than other signs of a more public character. In New York, for instance, extremists in the Congress on Racial Equality have alternately been threatening to sabotage the World's Fair and to sabotage the city water system.

On the other side of the ledger, a shockingly large number of Wisconsin voters were willing and even eager to cast their votes for the racist-mountebank, Governor Wallace, of Alabama. And in Kansas City an ordinance forbidding discrimination in housing has just escaped defeat by such a paper-thin margin that one must conclude discrimination was actually favored by a majority of Kansas City's white people.

The fact of the matter is that unreason and excess on one side are promoting and encouraging prejudice and unreason on the other side. The CORE extremists, if they carry out their threats in New York, will only provoke more opposition to their demands. The Wisconsin people who voted for Governor Wallace only gave an argument to the civil rights movement's extremists and Communist infiltrators.

In these circumstances, a heavy new burden of responsibility is unavoidably cast upon the leaders of both sides. The Negro leaders, in particular, now need more than the mere confidence in the justice of their cause, which they so rightly feel. They need to be selective and practical in their aims and astute and coolheaded about their tactics.

The simplest illustration of the challenge facing the Negro leaders is the problem of the de facto segregation that prevails in many northern urban school systems. This is one of the prime targets of the CORE extremists who are now planning to dramatize their indignation by sabotage.

As a practical matter, it is perfectly clear that the white majorities in the northern cities are not going to stand for forcible homogenization of their city school systems. Some are prejudiced. A great many more want their children to attend neighborhood schools. The white majorities will react with extreme hostility if their children are carted hither and yon, far from their own neighborhoods, in order to give all their city's schools a kind of standard, pepper-and-salt complexion.

This reaction has already begun in New York, where the Parents & Taxpayers Association has rapidly acquired a huge following. Among the Negro masses, meanwhile, there is little real desire for a homogenized school system, despite the deep and just resentment of segregation.

New York again offers the proof: for New York parents may opt to have their children carried to schools outside their own neighborhood, which they regard as better than the neighborhood schools. In one Harlem school visited by this reporter, 1,300 children were eligible to go elsewhere, but only 13 had chosen to do so. The citywide percentage is not much more impressive.

Finally, it must also be noted that many children from deeply deprived neighborhoods cannot fairly be exposed to daily competition with more fortunate children. This has nothing whatsoever to do with race, of course. Students of the problem have simply discovered, at long last, the far from surprising fact that children brought up in conditions of extreme poverty tend to be behind in language and other skills. They therefore need special help at the outset, in order to compete on equal terms with other children.

Hence the sensible solution of the northern urban school problem is nothing more nor less than a quite new kind of discrimination. Schools in deprived neighborhoods have twice as big a job to do as schools in happier neighborhoods, and they need twice as much money to do the job. Invest enough extra to give the children of poverty the means of escape from poverty, and they will escape in the end.

If this were asked for, there would be no such resistance as the attack on neighborhood schools has encountered. But this is not being asked for. It probably will not be asked for, either, since the Negro leaders are in competition with one another; and this competition is too emotion-charged to allow much room for down-to-earth practicality.

That also makes it all the more urgent for the white majority to be both practical and generous. For if the Negro minority is not admitted to full membership in the larger American society and given all the help, too, that the minority needs to enjoy that membership, this country will surely find itself with what amounts to a permanent, endemic anticolonial war on its hands. Those who deny justice for too long must always pay in the end.

Jews and Judaism in the Soviet Orbit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article entitled "Jews and Judaism in the Soviet Orbit," by the distinguished clergyman and scholar, Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, Ph. D., of Temple Beth El, Detroit, Mich. Dr. Hertz has served for 2 years as chairman of the Committee on Jews in the Soviet Orbit for the Central Conference of American Rabbis. His report, published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, sets forth in very clear language the situation of practitioners of the Jewish religion behind the Iron Curtain. A portion of that fine work is set out in brief form below:

JEWS AND JUDAISM IN THE SOVIET ORBIT

(By Rabbi Richard C. Hertz)

(Dr. Hertz has served for 2 years as chairman of the Committee on Jews in the Soviet Orbit for the Central Conference of American Rabbis. His report, recently published in the newest Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, summarizes the general situation of Jews and Judaism behind the Iron Curtain. Because it is of interest to more than rabbis, a portion is excerpted here.)

THE GENERAL SITUATION THIS YEAR

Ten years have passed since Stalin's death. For the Jews of the U.S.S.R. who constitute nearly one-fourth of the total surviving Jewish population of the world, Stalin's death removed the fear of widespread de-

portations and violent reprisals. Actually, however, Soviet policy toward Jews and Judaism has remained essentially the same since 1948, except that the terror is gone.

Jews occupy a dual status. As Jews they are members of a minority nationality group. Every Jew must carry the mark of his Jewishness stamped on his identification passport—"Jew." Yet Jews are also a religious group, something that makes their status difficult in the antireligious structure of Soviet society.

While the terror of Stalin's black years has been removed along with the general relaxation of Khrushchev's de-Stalinization program, Jews and Judaism suffer from restrictions and discriminations which have wrecked havoc with their security and their future. Their situation has steadily deteriorated. During the past year, we note five particular areas:

1. Khrushchev's reply to Lord Bertrand Russell on March 1, 1963, describing allegations of anti-Semitism in Russia as a "crude falsehood" and denying the existence of anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R., conceded the Western world's interest in the situation of Soviet Jewry. It has long been recognized that the highest Soviet authorities are sensitive to Western criticism of the U.S.S.R.'s policy of anti-Semitism. Constant repetition of concern for the Jews of the U.S.S.R. at last brought this subject to the open level of public discussion by the chief of state. However, Khrushchev's reply to Lord Russell was the first time that Khrushchev agreed even to discuss the Jewish question. Previously he has insisted on remaining officially silent, though he has not bothered to conceal his own private expressions of anti-Semitism in the past, nor to talk of other sins of Stalin.

2. The execution of Jews for "economic crimes" has been stepped up in the past year. Over 60 percent of those executed have been Jews, though Jews constitute but 1.09 percent of the total population, according to the last census done in 1959. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Jews are being used once again as political scapegoats for ingrained, deep-rooted prejudice against Jews. The Russian press deliberately highlighted the stereotype Jewishness of these "economic criminals." The enormously disproportionate number of Jews sentenced to death for currency offenses, speculation, or embezzlement suggest that a camouflage smokescreen has been put up to use the Jews for political purposes. Russian leaders since the days of the czars have found the Jews a convenient scapegoat for diverting the people's attention from their grim standard of living and their rightful grievances.

3. As in 1962, Passover 1963 found no matzohs baked in Government bakeries for Soviet Jews, except in far-off Georgia, Rabbi Leib Levin at Central Synagogue, Moscow, told his people that they must bake their matzohs at home. Efforts of American Jews to secure permission to fly matzohs as a "Bundles for Russia" program met with no success. The ban on matzohs was one more Government effort to whittle away at the ties that bind the Jews of the U.S.S.R. to their ancient religious faith. Since Passover traditionally emphasizes the national group's redemption from slavery and the story of the freedom march to the Promised Land, Passover is becoming the particular butt of Soviet attack linking Jews and Judaism with subversion and disloyalty. The Kremlin's propaganda stresses an umbilical cord of Jewish chauvinism that ties the religious leaders of Judaism in the U.S.S.R. to the Jewish homeland of Israel, and therefore makes Jews and Judaism suspect, Israel being considered by the Kremlin as a tool of Western capitalist imperialism.

Official antireligious propaganda affects all religious groups. Only against the Jews is the lack of patriotism injected into the propaganda. Prohibiting matzohs at Passover was the culmination to date of the discriminatory pressures against Judaism.

4. Synagogues are the one remaining institution permitted to Jews in the U.S.S.R. Yet even these are being closed up one by one as a means of fragmentizing and atomizing Soviet Jewry, isolating Jews both from their past and from each other as well as from their brethren in other parts of the world. Since June 1961 synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office. Jewish communial leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for such alleged crimes as meeting with foreign visitors at the synagogue.

Synagogues are never opened or rebuilt, only closed. This steady policy of closing up synagogues one by one is part of the general antireligious policy in the U.S.S.R. Yet against the Jews such a policy has been particularly discriminatory. While communism regards Christianity and Islam as "opiates of the masses," the Kremlin treats Judaism as if it were poison gas. Christian and Russian Orthodox groups are permitted national federations and central organizations; no such communication is permitted between the synagogues of the U.S.S.R. No publishing facilities or theological seminaries, such as Protestant and Russian Orthodox have, are permitted to Jews. The major religions are authorized to produce whatever ceremonial objects are needed—candles, crucifixes, icons, beads. For Jews, neither talesim nor tefillin can be produced. Not even prayerbooks nor Bibles can be published for Jews. Hebrew is forbidden. The yeshivah in Moscow in which Rabbi Leib Levin took such pride, located in his central synagogue, went down to four students and now has been officially closed, according to Archbishop Nikkodin, who visited the United States in March 1963 on an official delegation. No such Jewish religious delegation has ever been permitted to visit outside the U.S.S.R., nor to have any contacts whatsoever with any other Jewish religious or national bodies inside or outside the U.S.S.R.

The Government's policy, then, is clear: Cultural genocide for the Jews, spiritual strangulation for the Jews, group isolation from all other Jews, total assimilation enforced upon the Jews.

5. Cancellation of a lecture tour to the United States of the prominent non-Jewish poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko, one of the most popular young Soviet poets, focused renewed attention upon his controversial poem "Babi Yar," written in September 1961. in the literary organ of the Soviet Writers Union. The poem was a protest against the slaughter by the Nazis of the thousands of Jewish martyrs who lie in nameless graves in a gully outside Kiev. Yevtushenko has been disciplined for writing nonconformist ideas; yet the more the Soviet authorities seek to censure him for deviating from the party line, the more attention is focused upon the Jewish martyrs to terror and tyranny for whom no monument rises in Babi Yar.

It seems clear Soviet policy to play down the martyrdom of Soviet Jews during the Nazi invasion. Even the Eichmann trial found scant notice in the Soviet press.

THE FUTURE

The plight of the Jews in the U.S.S.R. is no longer the world's best kept secret. Little by little their story is being told in the mass media, such as the New York Times and Saturday Evening Post, both of which should be commended for their articles this past year. Moshe Decter's article on "The Status of the Jews in the Soviet Union" in Foreign Affairs, January 1963, summed up the best capsule review to appear in print so far. While far from being a "White Paper" documenting the exact status of Jews and Judaism in the U.S.S.R. the Decter piece should be read by everyone seeking reliable background for this grim subject. In a full-page advertisement in the New York Times and other newspapers, the American Jewish Committee published a long cable to Nikita S. Khrushchev demanding to know: "When will will synagogues and Jewish seminaries be reestablished, imprisoned synagogue leaders set free, the ban on unleavened bread rescinded, ritual articles and Jewish prayerbooks made available * * * The world awaits your response. By deeds alone can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man." (Dec. 7, 1962.)

What should be done to help our brethren in the U.S.S.R.? Obviously Soviet Jews cannot defend themselves. It is for those in the free world to raise their voices in protest.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, as a member of the Synagogue Council of America, has joined in making certain representations of common concern to the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

As individual rabbis, we can help mobilize public opinion and present before our congregations and communities the truth behind the news.

As private citizens, we can reassure the U.S. State Department of the need for a high priority of U.S. attention to be given this concern of American Jews, and for the need within the context of American foreign policy to press for the exposure of the situation of Jews and Judaism behind the Iron Curtain before the international arena of the United Nations. The Central Conference of American Rabbis should know that at present the U.S. State Department believes that any direct U.S. intervention or representations on behalf of Soviet Jews would only backfire and do more harm than good to Soviet Jews because of the tension already between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and therefore become a further pretext for the Kremlin to link Soviet Jews with disloyalty and subversion.

On the other hand, the rabbi's greatest tool—molders of public conscience—can surely be used to cry out against the net of spiritual strangulation being drawn against the Jews of the U.S.S.R. By public resolution and by individual protest, this committee urges the executive board to bring the full influence of the Central Conference of American Rabbis to this exposure of the truth. After losing 6 million Jews to the Nazi juggernaut, no more pressing tragedy than the plight of another 3 million Jews held prisoners in Red Russia challenges the survival of the Jewish people today.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the entire history of the Poles is marked with great deeds of gallantry and heroism, but their most recent past may be summed up as misery and misfortune. Through no fault of their own, they have suffered and endured more hardships than almost any other national group in all Europe. Being weaker than their powerful neighbors, both in the West and in the East, they have been unable to withstand the periodic onslaughts against them by their ruthlessly power-

ful foes. In 1772 when Austria, Prussia, and Russia appropriated a large part of Poland, the Poles were helpless to prevent that tragedy. From then on Poland's leaders nevertheless resorted to every means of strengthening the country so as to be able to meet future threats more effectively. They decided to overhaul Poland's governmental machinery, make it liberal, democratic, and bring it up to date. With these lofty ideals in mind the Constitution of 1791 was drafted and adopted on May 3 of that year.

This historic instrument marked a new epoch in Poland's history. By its adoption Poland stepped out of the Middle Ages and advanced into modern times. With the authority of the monarch curtailed, Poland became a constitutional monarchy. A government with ministerial responsibility was established. There was to be a legislature of two chambers, meeting regularly at stipulated times, and having authority to revise the Constitution periodically.

The nobility lost most of its special privileges, and the townsmen were allowed to share other privileges with the nobility. Peasants were protected against the arbitrary power of their landlords. Freedom of conscience was guaranteed and religious toleration established. Judged even by today's standards, the Constitution of 1791 was a liberal and democratic document. Its adoption and promulgation was hailed in all parts of Europe, particularly by the prominent liberal leaders in the West. But at the same time it was bitterly denounced by Poland's implacable foes. A few years after the adoption of the Constitution, and before it could be put into full force, Poland was parcelled out among its three neighbors, and by 1795 she had ceased to exist as an independent state.

Fortunately the spirit of independence and freedom did not die among the Poles; nor the liberal spirit of the Constitution of 1791. At the end of the First World War, when the Poles regained their independence, the spirit of that Constitution was again revived. And the sad events of the last war have put it once more in abeyance while Communist totalitarianism rules in Poland. On this 173d anniversary observance of the adoption of that Constitution, we all hope and pray that the Poles will again attain their national freedom and celebrate Constitution Day in their historic and beloved homeland.

I am well acquainted with the strong national ties which exist among Poles the world over. They properly revere the great and noble Polish Constitution of 1791 which we honor on this anniversary. And, while its tenets are forbidden practice in Poland today, the Poles of free countries do live by its worthy nature. Thus, they help to reinforce the freedom of the United States and other liberty-loving nations.

Mr. Speaker, my home community of Rochester, N.Y., includes a sizable Polish community. These fine men, women, and children over the years have made a major contribution to community life. The great culture which is in the national background of every Pole has benefited Rochester in many respects. We respect our friends and neighbors of Polish descent for their industry, their sense of civic duty, their individual initiative, their family bonds, and their numerous other virtues and qualities which add distinction to our area by their presence.

Mary, Mother of Mankind and Queen of the Universe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Sister M. Rose Eileen, CSC, of Dunbarton College of the Holy Cross, Washington, D.C., addressed the Capitol Hill First Friday Club on May 1, 1964, at its monthly breakfast meeting in St Peter's Hall. This was a most inspiring and erudite message. Since it has an especial meaning for Members of Congress and their staff personnel, I ask unanimous consent that Sister Rose Eileen's address be printed in full at this point.

MARY, MOTHER OF MANKIND AND QUEEN OF THE UNIVERSE

Mr. President, Hon. WILLIAM H. BATES, and distinguished members of Capitol Hill First Friday Club, your request that I speak to you on the subject of Our Lady is a privilege for which I am grateful.

Mary is at the summit of all created greatness. Only the adorable Trinity possessing the fullness of divinity is above her. Though like us a mere creature, she is elevated by divine wisdom to the supreme dignity of Mother of God, relating her thereby to the divine person of the Word made flesh, and conferring upon her all the graces and privileges which make her the incomparable masterpiece of God in the created order. Through this wonderful reality of that relationship she is forever privileged to enjoy an unprecedented intimacy with each of the three divine persons. God the Father and Mary alone can say of Christ, the incarnate second person of the adorable trinity, "He is my Son." She alone can say of Christ, "I am His mother." To contemplate the intimacy of Mary with the Holy Spirit in His fashioning the human body of Christ in her chaste womb defies expression. The foundation and source of the entire mystery of Mary lies in her divine maternity. All her greatness stems therefrom, either by way of preparation for it, as concomitant with it, or in consequence of it. She is conceived immaculate in order to become a living tabernacle for the Son of God made man. She is full of grace to receive Him into her womb and to accomplish her mission as the mother of all the members of His mystical body. Though truly the mother of God, she remains forever a virgin to dedicate her chaste motherhood entirely to her Son. Her divine maternity associates her not only with the sufferings, but likewise with the glorification of her Son. She is not only the mother of sorrows on Calvary; she is the mother of the risen, triumphant Christ, exalted in glory at the right hand of His Eternal Father. Mary alone at this very moment and for all eternity is in the place of unique glory above all creatures at the right hand of her divine Son.

Every period in the history of the church has had its own peculiar way of considering this mystery of Mary. Contemporary devotion contemplates her, not as one lost in ecstasy and far removed by her inaccessible holiness, but as a mother who is ever near her children. Though elevated to the sublime dignity of divine maternity, she was not spared the toil of daily duty, the difficulties of daily life similar to our own. We know her as having lived perfectly by faith as we too must live. Contemporary devotion seeks in our lady, not a dainty delicate young woman, ever so pious, but rather the valiant woman, the virgin mother of Christ, mother of mankind, and queen of the universe, the woman embracing in her maternal understanding and her power of intercession the entire created universe.

And so today, I have chosen two aspects of the mystery of Mary of special significance to this distinguished audience: Mary, mother of God and mother of mankind, and queen of the universe.

Each of you, either directly or indirectly, through the providence of God, and by a particular secondary vocation, participates in a most important way in the divine governance of the universe. You are in a unique position of leadership, working among men for the temporal order in which you are called upon to effect a society in which your fellow men must walk their way of pilgrimage to their eternal destiny, the beatific vision of God. In conceiving the universal plan of providence, God governs all things directly by ordering them to the ultimate end to which His wisdom has destined them. But for the execution of that divine providential plan, God has willed from all eternity to confer on men, His creatures, the dignity and power of participation in His own divine governance. God governs the universe through men. From that day on which He created man to His own image and likeness and commanded him in the person of Adam to "Till the earth and subdue it," God has entrusted men with this sublime dignity of being causes of good in other men. To some He has committed a very special participation in His divine governance through their election or appointment to the exercise of executive, legislative, and judicial power over their fellow creatures. In this vast hierarchical order of dignity and power for the execution of divine governance, you are called to be engaged intimately in the Government of a nation whose charter of liberty and whose Constitution are expressions of the highest ideals intrinsic to the dignity of man's nature as creature of God destined for eternal beatitude. God works in and through you in effecting the good of the temporal order, so that men may find therein the means to live their lives in an environment dominated by peace, justice, charity, most conducive to their use of that temporal order for the attainment of their eternal destiny. Mary, mother of Christ and mother of mankind, and queen of the universe, therefore, has unique significance and meaning in your official, as well as in your private lives.

Humanly speaking, no word evokes such loving response in the hearts of men as that of "mother." Let us look at Mary briefly, not only as the mother who in the particularities of her own existential life in Palestine knew intimately the exigencies of human living, but who knew them in their essential ordination to the eternal. Is there any mother in the history of humanity who knew poverty so keenly, she who was mother of the King of the universe, for whose entrance into the world there was only the stark poverty of a Bethlehem hillside cave and the warm breath of animals to temper the chill of midnight air on the virginal flesh of Him whom she had conceived? At his official presentation in the temple she could offer only the designated offering of the poorest of the poor, two

turtle doves, and came to know experientially therefore the social stigma so often attached to the materially underprivileged. She knew the perpetual anguish of a mother whose only son throughout His 3 years of public ministry was ridiculed, insulted, derided, and who had not whereon even to lay His head; and for His deathbed that of a criminal on the outstretched beams of a hewn tree of shame.

But Mary knew such poverty, suffering, shame, not only in the particularities of her own unique motherhood; God had prepared her for the motherhood of all men. She had been nourished from her earliest years on the strong spiritual food of the inspired Old Testament, from the pages of which she had come to see the social injustices perpetrated by her fellow countrymen, the Israelites, on their own, and to see them in relation to God's judgment in the courageous denunciations of those injustices by the great prophets Isaiah, Amos, Osee, Jeremiah. One has only to penetrate the meaning of Our Lady's sublime Magnificat to know that her mentality has been fashioned on a vision that spanned the long history of God's chosen people and saw that history from the vantage point of Divine Wisdom, the ordering of its temporal exigencies to the spiritual and the eternal, the function and nature of wisdom always and everywhere. How that vision of the temporal order in its relation to the eternal had deepened too in her thinking by the descent of the Holy Spirit at the First Christian Pentecost and through the years when, with John the Beloved as her protector, she saw the church struggling to penetrate the social, economic, political barriers of the captured privileges of the few to bring to men of all backgrounds the glorious good news of Christ's passion, death, and resurrection in glory and their consequent freedom in Him.

Mary, Mother of Mankind. This real and fitting title is an ancient heritage from the days of primitive Christianity learned from the dying lips of Christ himself when to mankind in the persons of Mary and St. John He had said: "Woman, behold thy son; son, behold thy mother." St. Paul in his letters to the early Christian communities echoed and clarified those words: "Christ is the head whose body is the church" (Corinthians 1, 18) "through whom the whole body is unified" (Ephesians 4, 16) "so that we, though many in number from one body in Christ" (Romans 12, 5). From the earliest centuries the foundations of Mary's motherhood of mankind has been seen in her voluntary acceptance of her motherhood of Christ who is the head of the body which is the church. She had uttered her acceptance in that sublime answer to Gabriel's message from the Triune God, "Be it done to Me according to Thy word." St. Pius X has written: "In the same womb of the most pure mother, Christ took flesh but also incorporated with himself a spiritual body composed of those who believe in Him, so that we may justly say that when Mary bore the Redeemer in her womb she also bore in Him all those whose life would be incorporated in His." All of us, then, who live united with Christ are members of His body and have come from the womb of Mary like a body joined to its head. Pope Pius XII in his famous encyclical, the "Mystici Corporis," says, "Free from all sin personal or original, she, who was mother of our head according to the flesh, became by a new title of suffering and glory, the spiritual mother of all His members."

We cannot begin to analyze in detail the true dimensions of Mary's motherhood. Mother of all the sons of men called to become by adoption what Christ is by nature, children of God and Mary in the great family of the Trinity. The maternal heart of Mary, mother of the total Christ, reaches out beyond space and time to enfold in her maternal embrace all the sons of men for whom her Son has won reconciliation with the Eternal Father through His own cross and resurrection. Like a true mother, Mary lives only for her children.

In the intricacies and complexities of your efforts to effect good in the temporal order of American life, Mary is ever ready to assist through her intercession and through her inspiration. What power for good will be yours if you but lovingly think of her often, even momentarily, and call upon her with the confidence of a living faith, "Mother of mankind intercede for me and bring me to see all those with whom and for whom I am called to serve in the affairs of our great America as sons of God, brothers of Christ, your children—either actually or potentially—and loved by you."

But Mary is Queen in the universal kingdom of her Divine Son. Holy Mother Church has called her so since the earliest ages. How often you have invoked her under that title, "Hail, Holy Queen." Such is the daily expression of Mary's role as Queen of the Universe. The glorious triumph over Satan that was effected with the great universal redemptive act of Christ on Calvary is actualized daily in the lives of men through its application to the existential order here and now. But it has pleased God that this application be effected through Mary's queenly power of intercession with and through Christ to the Eternal Father. St. Bernardine of Sienna so beautifully wrote: "As many creatures as serve the adorable Trinity serve the glorious virgin also, for all creatures, whatever place they occupy in creation, are under the scepter of divine government and subject by the will of Christ to the glorious virgin Queen, His Mother." Mary's great power as queen is to win hearts to God and to guide men of all nations, of all ages, of all races to that glorious freedom from the bondage of sin, slavery, injustice for which she bore with Christ the redemptive passion. Pope Pius XII in his well-known radio address to the Portuguese people called Mary's royalty "essentially maternal." As on earth so in eternity the activity of the Mother of Christ, Mother of Mankind, Queen of the Universe, follows the pattern of the reign of her Son. Associated with Christ on Calvary in the very act of our redemption, she is united with Him as Queen in His heavenly kingdom, associated with Him now in the work which is essentially redemptive. All else is ordered to that end, whether it be in the material and temporal order, or in the spiritual. United with Christ in His triumphant glory, Mary is ever before the Father's Countenance to intercede for the application of the effects of redemption to every man born into this world. Her maternal love embraces all in the one and same act of her redemptive supplication. How could she who is Mother of the King of Kings and His Queen see her children in distress and fail to make ardent supplication in their behalf?

She has only to turn to her Son to obtain every good and perfect gift for them. Can the perfect Son of a perfect Mother refuse her anything? But she asks only that which will promote the eternal happiness of her children and the greater glory of their heavenly Father. As Mother of Christ, and as Mother of men, her sovereign rule is characteristic of woman and mother, yet supremely real and efficacious, though always secondary, in relation to the primacy of Christ. She is Queen in the way of a mother serving all her children, guiding them in their most personal and intimate life, as well as in their social and official life, not so much by law and precept as by kindly persuasion. In union with Christ and under Christ, Mary guides the entire Church Militant on the road to the City of God, the Church Triumphant.

And so, whether your daily activities are concerned with the war on poverty, medicare, tax reduction bills, national-origins quota formula, Panama Canal controversies, foreign aid, international relations, or civil rights, you are determining conditions that should and do affect the personal dignity of sons of men in the reign of Christ. From that vantage point the dignity, the challenge and the apostolic nature of your official functions must be seen. You are called to participate in divine governance in the temporal order. The whole of that temporal order must come to be dominated by Christian principles if it is to be brought under the reign of Christ and fully and perfectly ordered to its divinely appointed destiny. You today have the formidable challenge never before so critical to stem the destructive tide of secularism in American and in international life. Essentially that insidous enemy of the true temporal order is a denial of the reality of the relationship of the whole created order to God, its Alpha and its Omega. The forces of secularism, as one of your own associates has recently said so effectively, "seek to remove God from every vestige of our national life." The immanence and the magnitude of this heresy, for heresy it is, has been matter of repeated concern to many of our civic leaders, to our American hierarchy, and to our Supreme Pontiffs. Pope Paul VI's 1964 Easter message to the world pinpointed the same message of concern. May Mary, Mother of Mankind and Queen of the Universe, teach you to see your high office, your special apostolate in the temporal order in the true perspective of its relationship to your participation in the divine governance of the universe and may you become ever more consciously aware of the significance of your activities in the divine plan of ordering the temporal to the eternal.

The President's Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 23, 1964:

THE PRESIDENT'S ANSWERS

President Johnson did not come to grips with the questions asked him at his press conference last week about his wife's monopoly of standard television at Austin and the efforts of the Federal Communications Commission to obtain a look at a document pertaining to its operations. The document is an option permitting Mrs. Johnson's Texas Broadcasting Co. to buy half interest in Capital Cable, which pipes in TV from San Antonio for rebroadcast to homes subscribing for the service. It has only just now been submitted to the FCC by Capital Cable.

Mr. Johnson was asked whether he thought the terms of the option should be disclosed. He replied that the Commission had made no request of his family but if it did "we are willing to comply" and he was sure the same was true of the trustees with whom Mrs. Johnson placed her stock when he became President. Just how Mrs. Johnson could comply when, as the President went on to say, "she participates in no decisions the company makes" under the trusteeship, he did not make clear.

FCC's three requests, beginning in February, for the option to be submitted to it for examination, the last in the form of an order,

had all been directed to Capital Cable, it is true. In view of the President's statement that "we are willing to comply" a Commission aid said he "assumed" FCC would ask the trustees for it. Within a week Capital Cable had turned the document over to FCC.

Mr. Johnson was also asked how he felt about the ethics of high Government officials having interest in Government-regulated industries such as television. He replied that he had no interest in Government-regulated industries and never had. He said "all of that stock has been placed in trust, as has been the practice with other Presidents." and "I see no conflict in any way."

This was in part an evasive reply taking advantage of the wording of the question. The real question is what he thinks of the ethics involved when the fortune of the President's family is in an industry regulated by Government Commissioners over whom the President holds the power of appointment. It was also in part a reply drawing a parallel which the facts do not support. Mrs. Johnson trusteed her stock with three old family friends. This is quite a far cry from the drastic steps taken by Mr. Johnson's two predecessors to avoid so much as an appearance of conflict between public duty and private gain.

The late President Kennedy sold all his corporate stocks and bonds and put the proceeds into Federal, State and municipal bonds. President Eisenhower put his corporate securities in trust under terms which prevented him from knowing how the funds were managed or in what securities they were reinvested, and also prevented his subordinates in Government from knowing what companies were represented.

For the sake of the Presidency and of Mr. Johnson's history in it, we hope he will decide to deal firmly with the duality which is blighting the FCC.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the United States has many responsibilities. We presently carry the heaviest peacetime burden and are more involved in more places than any other country in history. Most of the time our attention is fixed on the dramatic or the threatening world events—jungle wars, revolutions, international conferences. But we should not overlook the many important cares in the world not so dramatic or so threatening. Americans must have room for all problems and a thought for all people. For this reason we often speak in Congress about the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

They now appear to be securely in Communist control. But occasionally a stirring escape through the Berlin wall, a riot in Budapest, a political refugee, remind us that communism was imposed on these many little countries by force. It is incompatible with liberal, Christian ideals of individual liberty and brotherly love which formed the cultural backbone of Europe, East and West, for centuries.

The small band of insatiable despots who have achieved tyranny out of chaos in Russia, have been assiduously expanding that tyranny for nearly 50 years. But even now they must know that they cannot win. They are themselves being forced to change by confronting the superior virtue of Western thought. But no matter how rapid this process, nor how gratifying its character, the terrible injustices of the days of Communist expansion can never be removed.

May 3 is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, one of the hopeful liberal documents of the 18th century which was destroyed in the imperial wars of that age. The occasion brings to our attention one of the long-suffering nations which is too often overlooked because it is not presently seething. But Poland is still not free. Until it is, Americans bear the burden of sending words of encouragement to Poland and transmitting the latest ideas of democracy. We do this through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

As we remember Polish Constitution Day this year, let us resolve not only to think of the dramttic or threatening. Let us also think of the humanitarian, the needs of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

The Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as the wave of testimony has swept through the Judiciary Committee on the various proposals for a prayer amendment, as I review the barrage of mail I have received from constituents on this important subject, as I survey the public comments of my colleagues here on the floor of Congress and elsewhere on the matter, I cannot but recall an incident which sharply reflects my own judgment about the central conflict involved in the considerations.

I was a dinner guest at the home of a member of a foreign embassy staff, whose charming wife was, as he, a Moslem. She was recounting her childhood and young adult experience in the Christian missionary schools established in her land by faiths in America. It developed that almost all of her schooling, including college, had been under the auspices of Christian church activities. A wife of an American Ambassador present concluded after her recital—"I suppose they made a Christian of you in the process."

"No," the hostess quickly said, "but they did make me a better Moslem."

This exchange had deep meaning for me. I recalled that my own mother who had a deep conviction in her own faith had urged all six of her children to go to church somewhere whatever the circumstances in which they found themselves and whether or not our own sect had services available or not.

"I never knew anyone to be hurt from going to church" she said "and whatever you learn will more than likely be of help."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of concern expressed by two opposing extremes over religious observances in public places including schools. In my view both sides obscure the commonsense of the issues. The Supreme Court has stated that an officially designated prayer established by a governmental body or one of its agencies is an infraction of the limitations set forth in the Constitution, and I believe that determination is a correct one.

There are zealous persons who go on to declare that any religious observations are an infraction of their rights to practice their particular brand of religion or their denial of all religion. Such a position is an affront to commonsense and contrary to experience. Tolerantly applied expressions or lessons surrounding the basic tenants of Christianity can only make better Buddhist, Jews, atheists or whatever. Nor should the exchange of knowledge of the basic expressions or concepts of other religions be denied young Christians for it is equally true it could prove to make them better Christians.

It is no different in this matter of prayer and Bible reading than it is in the conflict over teaching the basic tenets of communism or nazism. It depends on whether there is an attitude and presentation as indoctrination or an attitude and presentation of enlightenment. I would be greatly disappointed if the Supreme Court in any of its pronouncements would state or could be interpreted as saying that the great moral and spiritual values of the past were not available to our youngsters everywhere and from whatever religious background to make of them better and more enlightened pursuers of whatever sect or group with which they ultimately freely choose to associate.

I am repelled equally from the position of those who react so violently as to justify sacrificing the division of church and state which has served so well all these years. The containment of the divergence of attitude and conviction in an area of such emotional involvement would hardly be possible in any other legal environment.

May we hope, Mr. Speaker, that commonsense will prevail on both sides. Keep us from rationalizations however purely motivated or logically conceived which propel us to the extremes in this argument. Let tolerance above the heated harangue bring balance back to a belabored people.

The Baker Noninvestigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in his column published by the Washington Post on Mon-

day, May 4, sets forth what a majority of our people are thinking, namely that the Senate Rules Committee did what they could to prove that the committee was a noninvestigating committee, and they went out of their way to prevent material evidence from getting into the record.

His column follows:

NO PROGRESS: THE BAKER NONINVESTIGATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Democratic majority of the Senate noninvestigating committee is showing positive genius in finding ways to prevent itself from getting the evidence in the Bobby Baker case.

I don't mean that the Senate Rules Committee has been idle in its noninvestigation. It hasn't. It has worked arduous hours thinking up ways not to do its work.

It has been quick and alert. When its principal potential witness—Bobby Baker himself—closed one door in its face, the Democratic majority of the committee knew exactly what to do. At its own initiative it closed all the other doors of profitable inquiry and went right back to its work of not getting the facts.

Most Washington correspondents are convinced that the committee closed down its noninvestigation "just in the nick of time," that is, before it found anything embarrassing to anybody in the halls of Congress.

The theory must be that Baker, who used his position as secretary of the Senate Democrats to accomplish we-know-not-what, operated with a dead telephone in an empty office.

And if he didn't, the Senate Rules Committee is apparently determined not to find out.

When he was first solicited for testimony, Bobby Baker let it be known that he was very busy "writing a book." Some hands in the Senate went to furrowed brows. "Is Bobby writing about me?" they worried.

And then when he was finally subpenaed, he took the fifth amendment when he was asked to give his name.

Whereupon the Democratic majority of the noninvestigating committee were unanimously confident that there were no other ways of finding out to whom, for whom, and with whom he had been doing things in the Senate for so many years.

Obviously what the people want to know, need to know, and have the right to know is how Baker was able to manipulate government in the interests of himself and his friends. To what extent and in what ways had individual Senators and the Senate as a whole been involved as pawns, partners or otherwise in the Baker operations?

These are good questions. And there are others. Surely such questions as these should be addressed to the 100 U.S. Senators:

What, if any, business or financial dealings did you have with Bobby Baker?

Did Bobby Baker ever give you, get for you, offer you or offer to get for you any campaign contributions—and with conditions attached? (One Senator, FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, disclosed that he received an offer of campaign funds from Baker and rejected the money because it was made conditional upon his support of the oil-depletion allowance.)

Did Baker offer any other U.S. Senators help to make up campaign deficits through gifts, purchase of tickets or otherwise, any retainer or employment, any preferment in committee assignment, anything of value?

Bobby Baker can, of course, use the fifth amendment to refuse to tell the Rules Committee about his dealings with Senators, but can 100 U.S. Senators take the fifth amendment if they are asked the same questions?

The Democratic majority of the Senate Rules Committee may have reached the peak of its noninvestigation when it refused even to allow Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, to appear before it to advocate this line of inquiry.

It is true that no Senate committee has the power to subpena a U.S. Senator, but Senators can be asked the questions in one way or another.

It is true that they can't be compelled to answer. But even their nonanswers would be revealing.

The Study Club of Lanham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic strengths of our American society results from the willingness of our citizens to work together voluntarily on the local level to improve the communities in which they live. Typical of this important characteristic is the work of the Study Club of Lanham. The Study Club of Lanham celebrated its golden anniversary on Wednesday, April 15, 1964, marking 50 years of service to the community. The motto of the club, taken from Tennyson is: "Self-Knowledge, Self-Control, Self-Reverence; These Three, Lead Life to Sovereign Power." The club's flower is the daisy, the club's goal is "unity in the promotion of education, community work and international Relations."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of the members of the Golden Anniversary Committee of the Lanham Study Club, the club's officers for 1964, and the highlights of 50 years of the club's actions:

HIGHLIGHTS OF 50 YEARS of ACTION

Education: Scholarships: Lanham school construction and school lunches; chartered Future Teachers of America at Bladensburg Senior High School; Maryland Hall of Records tour; Lanham play center (kindergarten); "Teacher of the Year" Awards.

Libraries and the arts: Sponsored Lanham school library; sponsored Lanham play center library; sponsored Lanham lending library; painting group; music group.

Beautification of Lanham: Living community Christmas tree and lighted sign; distributed 300 red bud trees; distributed 100 flowering crabapple trees; garden group.

Community service: World War I—Red Cross work and adopted a war orphan; memorials—from birdbath to wheelchair; cancer collection at each monthly meeting; Lanham road marker; World War II—civil defense first aid stations set up and staffed; monthly sewing at Prince Georges General Hospital; sponsored recent organization of 20th district civil defense unit.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

Marie Essex, chairman; Margaret Cook, vice chairman; Gertrude Chapman, Helen Downes, Annie Mallonee, Alice Martin, Lavenia McGinn, Grace Owen.

OFFICERS—1964

Alice Martin, president; Helen Downes, vice president; Ethel Downes, treasurer; Elva Martin, recording secretary; Elizabeth Patton, corresponding secretary; Clarice Wadleigh, director; editor, sixth district for the Maryland Clubwoman, Marie Essex; sixth district, religion and family life division, Kay Newland; sixth district, resolutions committee, Helen Downes.

Not Really So Rosy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian, Wednesday, April 22, 1964:

NOT REALLY SO ROSY

(By Herbert Lundy)

WASHINGTON.—It is possible to disagree with the repeated assurances of the Johnson administration's highest spokesmen, including the President, that despite certain irritations our foreign situation looks a lot better than it usually does.

The cliff-hanger in Laos, a little country nobody really wants, may be resolved without harm to the U.S. position. But even if that happens, there is no assurance that the Ho Chi Minh trail from Nort Vietnam to South Vietnam, via Laos, can be cut off.

Improvement of the anti-Communist war in South Vietnam now hinges on the ability of Gen. Nguyen Khanh, the latest topman, to convince the people that they should support him rather than the Vietcong. U.S. diplomats think he may be the answer. Also, they discount talk of another coup as Communist inspired. But the unhappy thought is always present of an assassin's bullet. If Khanh were killed or overthrown, after the recent unanimous selection of him—from McNamara to Rusk—as Vietnam's savior, that would be about it.

But one gathers that administration officials are worrying more, while saying less, about Fidel Castro. Uncle Sam crawled out on a limb in 1962, after the nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, when President Kennedy backed down on the agreement he had with Khrushchev for at-site inspection of missile placements in Cuba. Mikoyan couldn't get Castro to agree to that. So President Kennedy accepted as an alternative unhindered aerial reconnaissance.

Now, the administration says the Russians soon will have all their troops out of Cuba except for some technicians and training units. Washington hopes the Russians won't turn over to the Cubans they have trained the SAM missiles capable of shooting down even high-altitude reconnaissance planes like the U-2. But the Cubans talk the other way.

Fidel himself kicked off the new crisis by protesting the violation of Cuban territory by U.S. overflights. The State Department warned Castro that the United States will continue to overfly to make sure that long-range missiles are not reintroduced. The use of Soviet missiles against American reconnaissance planes would create a "highly dangerous situation," said the United States.

Cuba's foreign minister, Raul Roa, replied with a statement that the United States must take full responsibility for future violation of Cuban sovereignty by invading Cuban air space and "ignoring international law."

Thus, the United States must confront a situation brought about by the late President Kennedy's backdown after he forced Khrushchev to withdraw his missiles from Cuba. We do not have an international leg to stand on if we continue to overfly Cuba. But in the primary interest of U.S. security, we have no choice except to continue reconnaissance.

The galling fact is that now the United States must depend upon Premier Khrushchev to demonstrate his love for peace and his respect for capitalist America by restrain-

ing Castro. There is historical evidence to support the idea that Khrushchev is not going to do that for us, assuming that he has the power, without getting a more important concession in another part of the world.

If Castro shoots down an American plane over Cuba, what do we do then? And if we do it, what will the Soviet Union do, inasmuch as it has more or less guaranteed to defend Cuba against U.S. armed attack? Somehow, one is reluctant to accept at face value the extreme optimism of the Johnson administration.

Civil Rights Bill—Title I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and will be written concerning the civil rights bill. Unfortunately, not all of what has been written has aided in the deliberations of this vitally important bill. Some of the articles have been deliberately distorted, while others do not clearly state the facts. Starting today, the New York Times will publish a series of editorials which will discuss each title of the bill. I wish to bring to the attention of all my colleagues these editorials which certainly should aid in the understanding of the bill and contribute to its passage as soon as possible.

The editorial for today follows:

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS—I

Senate supporters of the civil rights bill plan to move this month to force an end of the southern filibuster. The importance of this safeguard for basic American rights, already passed with overwhelming bipartisan backing in the House, makes it essential that it be brought to a Senate vote swiftly. We have repeatedly expressed our own strong support for the measure. However, the long congressional debate has been more successful in befogging than in clarifying the bill's provisions. In a series of editorials we intend to explain point-by-point why we consider its prompt passage imperative.

The most basic of all rights in a democracy, the right to vote, is the subject of title I. That Congress should still be obliged to seek ways to protect that right for all citizens, a century after the 15th amendment forbade the States to deny or abridge it on account of race, is a disgrace. Yet the undeniable facts of discrimination make it urgent for Congress to take further action now.

Registrars in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and some other rural areas of the South are cynical in the obstacles they put in the way of Negroes desiring to register. A college graduate is flunked because he does not pronounce a word or "interpet" some obscure constitutional provision to the registrar's satisfaction. Meanwhile, illiterate whites are registered.

The Justice Department, under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, has been working vigorously in recent years to end such discrimination. But the case-by-case process is slow, and some Federal judges—both Eisenhower and the Kennedy appointees—have dragged their feet.

The thrust of title I in the pending bill is to speed up the process of enfranchisement. District courts of three judges instead of one could be appointed, with precedence for voting cases on the calendar. Registrars would be specifically forbidden to apply different standards to different citizens, to deny registration because of trivial errors or to use subjective oral "tests." Anyone who had finished six grades of schooling would be presumed sufficiently literate for voting purposes unless the State showed otherwise.

Such definite standards should simplify voting suits. The charge that they invade the right of the States to establish voting qualifications is baseless. All they do is to make sure that State rules are applied fairly to all—not, as the Supreme Court has said, with an evil eye and an unequal hand.

Indeed, the real question about title I is whether it goes far enough. The dismaying facts are that only 5 percent of Negroes in Mississippi are able to vote and that many southern counties with Negro majorities have almost no Negro voters. Such facts really warrant more drastic Federal supervision of the registration process than this legislation provides.

The proposed title is a moderate step, an attempt to use the traditional process of the courts and encourage local reform. Taken in conjunction with the bill's other key provisions, it should do much to make concrete the voting rights Negroes supposedly were guaranteed a hundred years ago.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, dauntless and daring fighters for their human freedoms, the Poles are a gifted, resourceful, and industrious people. In the course of their turbulent history they have contributed to mankind great masters of art, science, and statecraft. Their liberal and democratic Constitution, drafted, adopted, and promulgated on May 3, 1791, quite clearly illustrates their skill in the field of government and diplomacy.

That Constitution is a veritable landmark in the progressive process of evolving a constitutional form of government, in an orderly and democratic way. By that historic document the Poles accomplished peacefully what many other people had attempted to accomplish by revolution and bloodshed. In this constitution the king's autocratic and unlimited powers were sharply reduced, and a constitutional government was established with a responsible cabinet. The upper chamber lost some of its powers, while the lower and popularly elected chamber gained considerable legislative power. Religious liberty was guaranteed, and the peasants were taken under the protection of the law. Townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy, and received a number of political rights. For all these and other liberal, progressive features the Constitution of 1791 was hailed as a great advance step in the right direction. Unfortunately, patriotic Poles who framed and enacted the Constitution into law, were not given the chance to see it work. Soon after its promulgation, Poland was attacked and overrun, and finally partitioned among its three greedy neighbors. But the spirit of freedom and progress embodied in that Constitution did not die. Today, on the 173d anniversary observance of the adoption of that Constitution, they still cling to the lofty ideals embodied in their Constitution of 1791.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as we in the United States know so well, the development of and the functioning of government must be within the confines of constitutional guidelines and precepts. Thus are guaranteed the rights of the individual citizens and thus is assured government by the people and for the people.

Soon after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the citizens of Poland adopted a constitution. The year was 1791. Poland had already undergone a partition at the hands of her three powerful neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. In order to forestall further encroachments, certain liberal leaders of Poland, imbued with genuine democratic ideas, had been working on a new constitution. It is that document, adopted in May of 1791 whose anniversary is being observed. That historic document seemed at the time a true bill of rights for the Polish nation. By that constitution a government of limited monarchy was established with definite ministerial responsibility. The electorate of the parliament was considerably enlarged, and numerous privileges formerly enjoyed by the small upper classes alone were made available to other classes. Certain rights of the peasantry were restored and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Even more important, freedom of conscience was guaranteed, and absolute religious toleration was established.

Today, so many years after that epochal event and after so many advances in all phases of democracy, this document may seem somewhat outdated, but nevertheless, it is regarded as a forerunner of later liberal constitutions, particularly in central and Eastern Europe. In many respects it was a pioneering document and therein may be found its real significance.

Unfortunately for the Poles and their friends abroad, there was little chance to put its provisions into operation. Soon Poland was again partitioned by her implacable and powerful neighbors, and is no longer a free and independent and sovereign country. Even so, all Poles regarded, and still regard, this document as a landmark in their history.

I am honored to join in the participation of the 173d anniversary celebration

of Polish Constitution Day. I have visited Poland on several occasions in recent years and I know that the principals embodied in that great document are cherished today even though a foreign nation dominates that country and the people are denied the rights that were once guaranteed them.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I submit for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD my May 1 report to the people of my district. I trust that the Members and other readers will find it interesting and worthwhile:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, Third District, Kentucky, May 1, 1964)

DEAR FRIEND: The Nation was saddened by the death of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He exemplified not only the glory and tradition of our Army, but the courage and valor of all our troops in all our wars. His example stirred men far beyond the limits of the military. His wisdom and foresight will be recorded by all honest historians. Of MacArthur, it can be truly said that he called forth the best in men.

GENERAL DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR—1880–1964

Career highlights—Important chronological events in MacArthur's career:

Commissioned at West Point, a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, June 11, 1903.

Became a colonel of infantry August 5, 1917, and a month later chief of staff of the 42d Division.

Appointed Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy June 12, 1919; married Mrs. Henrietta Louise Cromwell Brooks (a divorcee) at Palm Beach while he was a major general in 1922.

Elected president of the U.S. Olympic Committee in 1928.

Quelled Bonus Expeditionary Force riots and march on Washington, D.C., July, 1932.

Appointed field marshal of the Philippine Army, June 1936, by President Roosevelt.

Married Miss Jean Faircloth of Tennessee, after having been divorced in New York, 1937.

Transferred Philippines' headquarters to Corregidor December 25, 1941.

Returned to Philippines with U.S. troops against the Japanese October 20, 1944; appointed General of the Army on December 15, 1944.

Accepted Japanese surrender aboard U.S.S. *Missouri* September 2, 1945.

During proconsulship in Japan, was appointed Supreme Commander of U.N. forces in the Korean conflict.

Summarily dismissed by President Truman April 10, 1951, for bypassing the Commander in Chief in letters to congressional leaders criticizing American military policy in the Korean war.

HANDS IN YOUR POCKETS

If every taxpayer had to pay an equal share of the Federal expenditures for the fiscal year to February 7, the cost would be $1,279 each—$74 more than at this date last year. And if we decided to pay off the public debt, it would cost each taxpayer $5,165—$91 more than at the same time last year. The public debt is now $309.8 billion, and it takes the total Federal taxes paid from 26 States just to pay the interest.

Congratulations to Mr. Richard Henchey, who is with a Louisville coal company. He discovered that when the specifications were changed for bidding on coal for the local Veterans' Administration Hospital this year that the specifications were written for a lower quality coal with an increased moisture and ash content and for a different size. This inferior quality was going to cost the taxpayers $9,744 more than the better quality coal when the increased freight and mine charges were added. It was not easy to get the General Services Administration to admit their error, but when they did, the specifications were changed and the taxpayers will save $9,744.

MAY IS GRADUATION MONTH

Clip the "Creed for Young America" and give to one of the many graduating seniors. As these young adults make their way to the world of tomorrow, this creed will surely symbolize what it means to be an American.

JOB TESTS PENALIZE NEGROES

Because title VII (FEPC section) of the Federal civil rights bill is very similar to the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission law, the *Leon Myart* v. *Motorola* case has been getting a lot of attention here in Washington. Since 1949, Motorola has hired those who successfully passed a written examination. The test was designed by a professor at the Illinois Institute of Technology, "to help evaluate the trainability of prospective employees." Myart, a 27-year-old Negro, filed a complaint that the 5-minute general ability test discriminated against him. The examiner for the State FEPC ordered Motorola to employ Myart and to stop using the test because it discriminated against "the hitherto culturally deprived and the disadvantaged groups." The examiner said "use of intelligence tests of this sort is a tool serving to discriminate between whites and Negroes, whether done deliberately or not". The final answer as to whether an employer can be permitted to set standards for his employees or whether the State will dictate the standards will probably be decided by the courts. Based on the same reasoning, only last month the New York City Board of Education abolished the use of intelligence tests in the Nation's largest public school system. This was in response to charges that such tests are "middle-class oriented" and are discriminatory primarily against Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

QUESTIONABLE RESULTS

I want to thank you for responding to my questionnaire and know you will be interested in the results.

Questionnaire

	Percent— Yes	Percent— No
1. President's budget: This year Congress appropriated a total of $92,400,000,000. The President recently proposed a budget of $97,900,000,000, which he indicated would result in a budget deficit of $4,900,000,000, based upon his estimate of receipts. What should Congress do with this budget?		
(a) Approve the President's recommendation?	25.4	------
(b) Cut it slightly?	13.5	------
(c) Cut it heavily?	13.4	------
(d) Balance the budget?	47.7	------
2. Foreign-aid program: This year Congress appropriated $3,000,000,000 for foreign aid.		
(a) Do you favor maintaining the foreign-aid program at present levels?	23.2	76.8
(b) Do you favor eliminating the foreign-aid program entirely?	22.6	77.4
(c) Do you favor a complete revision of the foreign-aid program?	81.7	18.3
(d) Do you favor aid to underdeveloped countries that are pro-Communist?	25.6	74.4
(e) Do you favor a continuation of large-scale aid to South Vietnam?	37.2	62.8
(f) Do you favor the Alliance for Progress for Latin America in its present form?	45.1	54.9
3. Man-on-the-moon project: The space agency contemplates spending $20,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 between now and 1970 for the man-on-the-moon project.		
(a) Do you favor Congress appropriating money for this project?	49.9	50.1
(b) Do you favor the combined efforts of the United States and Russia for this project?	34.0	66.0
4. Cuba: Do you favor—		
(a) Maintaining the administration's present policies?	27.9	------
(b) Imposing with our allies a total blockade on Cuba?	36.9	------
(c) Arm and furnish air cover for Cuban exile invasion?	19.1	------
(d) The forcible overthrow of the Castro regime by U.S. military forces?	16.1	------
5. I have introduced H.J. Res. 861 which provides for a constitutional amendment to permit Bible reading and prayer on an optional and nonsectarian basis in public schools. Do you favor such legislation?	90.7	9.3

MORE AID TO COMMUNISTS

I was extremely upset about 2 years ago when I learned that the United States was sending Peace Corp volunteers to help Sukarno in Indonesia. Sukarno had only shortly before said, "I am a Communist of the highest order." A Peace Corp official was reported to have said at that time that we were going to send volunteers "acceptable to Sukarno." "We are not going to send any flag wavers over there, any kids with the Declaration of Independence tatooed on their chests." Sukarno is reported to have recently told U.S. Ambassador Jones that Americans could take their foreign aid and "go to hell with it." All of this seems bad enough, but now we learn that the United States is training Indonesian soldiers to fight against our own friends and allies. There are 280 Indonesian "fighters" in this country being trained not only in police tactics, administration, etc. * * * but also in guerrilla warfare. The State Department has now admitted this to Senator KEATING of New York.

U.S. SALES TO CUBA

Despite the so-called "economic blockade" the United States maintains it has on Cuba, it is very evident that American-made products are being sold to the Latin American country. While State Department officers tour Europe, attempting to argue Western governments into cutting off sales to Cuba, Communist Poland is selling U.S. supplies to Castro. Poland is able to buy strategic materials from us and in turn supply Cuba with the same products under a trade pact agreement. Few of our citizens know that in the last year Poland's central purchasing trust has bought the following items, among others, from the United States, and has sent similar supplies south of our border: Electrical industrial process control instruments, telecommunications apparatus, electronic testing machines, etc. The U.S. Government spends millions trying to counteract Castro's propaganda inside Cuba and to build a fifth column of anti-Communists on that island. This isn't all. The U.S. Department of Commerce has approved the sale of American tex-

tile machinery to Poland, and Poland, under the new pact, sends finished textiles to Cuba. Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, recently said that the "national stance" now is not to help Cuba in any way except to supply some food and medicine. Mr. Hodges also said that he believed it was unrealistic to refuse trade with Cuba but the time is not yet ripe for change. I've got news for the Secretary. The change has come about and the situation is beyond ripeness—it's rotten.

U.N. CRISIS

Although Premier Khrushchev is not at the United Nations banging his shoes on the table, Russia is still causing an uneasiness in New York. The Soviet Union is more than 2 years behind in the payment of its assessments for peacekeeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East and is due to lose its vote in the General Assembly this fall unless payment is made. The Soviet delegation is saying that any attempt to deny its vote will endanger the future existence of the U.N. If Russia is successful in ignoring the penalty, it would in effect have amended the charter by unilateral action and if this occurs the world organization's effectiveness would be even less than at the present. No doubt new concessions will be made to pacify the Russians.

With best wishes from your Congressman.

A CREED FOR YOUNG AMERICA

(By Dean Alfange)

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon. I seek opportunity to develop whatever talents God gave me—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any earthly master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say—"This, with God's help, I have done." All this is what it means to be an American.

New York Federation of Reformed Synagogues Resolution on School Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 19, 1964, the Assembly of Delegates of the New York Federation of Reformed Synagogues adopted a resolution voicing its support of public school integration. The resolution urges all of the member congregations to encourage integration and improvement in the quality of public education.

I commend this resolution to the attention of our colleagues as one more example of responsible action in the fight for equality:

RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL INTEGRATION

We are unequivocably dedicated to the proposition that the integration of the public schools of our community is desirable and necessary in order to provide the child with the best education in the democratic spirit. To achieve this integration of our schools to the maximum degree possible consonant with good educational practice, we call upon the school boards in every community to study and to apply every possible formula and method for reorganizing the present system of pupil distribution and to provide the means by which the reorganized distribution of pupils may realize the integration of the public schools: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we call upon all our congregations to cooperate with and aid all responsible agencies that seek to encourage the integration of our public schools and the improvement of the quality of public education and that they join these agencies through public meeting, petition and resolution in prevailing upon school boards to adopt such measures as will lead to these goals; and further be it

Resolved, That we declare our unqualified confidence in the importance of public school education and call upon our congregations to make every effort to encourage the improvement of public education.

Telegram Drive for Pricing Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Drug News Weekly, October 2, 1963, warning that Members of Congress may anticipate a massive telegram and mail campaign to elicit support for the quality stabilization bills, S. 774 and H.R. 3669.

It would be fair to say that when my colleagues receive these messages from their districts, they are coming only from one group and do not represent any popular ground swell of support for quality stabilization legislation which would raise consumer prices, increase the cost of national defense, place the little retailer at the mercy of the large manufacturer and gut the antitrust laws. It is extraordinary that legislation which has the sole function of protecting "the manufacturer's goodwill" is being so strongly solicited by a retailer group.

TELEGRAM DRIVE FOR PRICING BILLS

LOS ANGELES.—The three largest wholesale firms here are cooperating with the California Pharmaceutical Association in a massive telegram to elicit support for quality stabilization bills, S. 774 and H.R. 3669, according to CPA and wholesale spokesmen.

Soliciting telegrams from druggists throughout the State in their various facilities are Brunswig Drug Co., Los Angeles Drug Co., and McKesson & Robbins, Inc. Roy Schwab, Brunswig chairman, said telephone order personnel in all 15 California divisions were to ask accounts, when they are contacted as part of daily routine, if they would like public opinion message telegrams sent to their legislators.

Although officials at the other two drug firms were not available for comment, CPA sources said all three wholesalers were to operate in the same manner. The CPA has provided them with four different wordings asking for support of the legislation. Wholesalers were to charge 94 cents per telegram to the accounts of consenting druggists and handle the wire for them.

The CPA has obtained special telegram rates for the campaign, which was the idea of Sidney McKay, president of the Pharmaceutical Institute, legislative arm of the CPA.

News Editor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of my longtime friends, and the friend of the thousands who have read his articles in the Tacoma News Tribune, and other publications, recently retired from his post as news editor. A news story appearing in the April 2 issue of the Tribune gives a very brief account of his excellent work in the journalistic field. His writings have contributed much to the growth and history of our community. All of us who know him wish this very fine gentleman and his lovely wife many years of continued happiness together.

PAUL W. HARVEY, TNT'S LONGTIME NEWS EDITOR, DOFFS HIS EYESHADE

Paul Harvey took off his green eyeshade. He spiked a few pieces of late copy. Then he looked around the editorial room.

Fifty-three years of newspaper work in Washington State—47 of them in Tacoma—had come to an end for this news editor of the News Tribune.

One day after his 76th birthday—he was born in Columbus, Kans., April 3, 1888—Harvey retired from the post in which he has edited the news of Tacoma, the State, America, the world.

The chronicling of two World Wars; of fire and flood; of earthquakes, right up through Alaska's March horror; of scientific advances in medicine and in space, including the U.S. shot at the moon; of presidential elections, and the deaths of Presidents; of the million and one other subjects, big and little, that appear in a daily newspaper—all these have been subject to Harvey's news judgment, his pencil, shears and pastepot.

EVALUATED COPY

For it has been Harvey's job to evaluate the thousands of feet of news copy pouring into the News Tribune offices by teletype each day; to scan the scores of photographs sent by wire; and, in large measure, to edit and to determine the play given local news.

Although most of his life has been given to editing, Harvey knows the problems and pleasures of writing, too. Several times a year, usually during vacation periods for other staffers, he has left his "slot" position at the copy desk for the post of editorial writer. Some of his happiest writing in this assignment has had to do with historic phases of Tacoma or the Pacific Northwest.

In 1950 he was awarded a plaque by the American Heritage Foundation for an editorial he wrote for the News Tribune at the time of the Freeodm Train's visit here.

MUCH RESEARCH

History, as pertaining to specific groups or professions, has engaged much of Harvey's spare time and attention the last few years. Day after day, upon completion of his 5:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. editing stine, he has given later

afternoon hours to research and writing. First result of this extracurricular activity was his history of the founding and development of the Masonic Grand Lodge in Washington and Alaska. Titled "Not Made With Hands," this volume was published in 1958.

Then came "Tacoma Headlines," a history of Tacoma newspapers and the part they played in the growth and well-being of the Tacoma area, and of their publishers and staffs. The story of these people naturally involved the news events of which they wrote, so Harvey's chronicle grew into a valuable compilation of historic fact while still dealing primarily with newspapers and their staffs.

BOOK PUBLISHED

The history was published in serial form in the News Tribune in 1962. Then, revised and enlarged a bit, it was published in book form later the same year and has become a treasured part of many home libraries. Many a busy morning at the copy desk Harvey has stopped briefly to autograph a copy of "Tacoma Headlines" for some stranger dropping in to meet the author.

Harvey came to Washington State in 1911, the year after his graduation from the University of Kansas. He purchased and became copublisher of the Elma Chronicle. In 1917 he became city editor of the old Tacoma Daily News. When that paper was consolidated with the Tribune he became editorial writer on the old Ledger. In 1923 he was appointed to the post from which he retired yesterday—that of news editor of the News Tribune.

MORE WRITING

In retirement Harvey probably will find more writing to do. And he will continue another of his chief interests—activity in Masonic groups, with which he has long been affiliated. Recently, too, he was elected chairman of the board of directors of the State Savings & Loan Association.

He and his wife, Nellie, live at 7514 South 24th Street, where gardening is another interest. And there are a daughter, Mrs. Cortland (Mary Gail) Skinner, of Olympia; two sons, Warren M. Harvey, of Tacoma, and Paul W. Harvey, Jr., of Salem, Oreg.; and grandchildren to keep him busy, too.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Polish Constitution Day. This is a day of great importance and significance to the people of Poland. It is a day of special importance to millions of Americans who trace their ancestry to that nation, and their friends throughout the United States.

It is no accident that the first Polish Constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, expresses allegiance for the principles of popular government. This was the first venture in popular, constitutional government in central-east Europe. The Polish Constitution was adopted a short 2 years after we adopted our own Constitution. There is a historic connection between these two great events which binds the peoples of both nations in common cause.

We will never forget the role played by two gallant sons of Poland, General Kosciusko and Colonel Pulaski, in the war for our national independence. They stood with Gen. George Washington, as loyal companions at arms, against tremendous military odds, and helped win victory for the cause of freedom and self-government. At this point in history, when our power as a nation knows no equal, we can do no less than stand up for the people of Poland in their struggle to regain their national independence under a constitutional form of government in keeping with the long traditions of their nation.

Christian Approach to Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald C. Stone, dean of the Graduate School of Public Administration and International Affairs of the University of Pittsburgh and a member of the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of Churches, recently testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His succinct analysis of the moral and religious basis of this country's foreign aid program deserves widespread reading and discussion.

My name is Donald C. Stone. I am pleased to testify on behalf of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., as authorized by its appropriate officers, on the basis of official policies adopted by the General Board and the General Assembly, its policymaking bodies.

I am the dean of the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs of the University of Pittsburgh, and a member of the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of Churches. My profession is public administration, having engaged for 35 years in consulting, operating, teaching, and research activities in governmental programs at city, State, Federal, and international agency levels. As assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget and, later, as Director of Administration of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Security Agency, I was involved in development of our early international cooperation and assistance programs. My school features education and research in the formulation and implementation of development programs. In this connection, I made four oversea trips this past year, covering all continents, to examine why more progress in development was not taking place and what could be done about it.

In presenting these remarks, I shall draw upon what I have observed in the field as well as emphasize the official positions of the National Council of Churches. The National Council is comprised to 33 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox denominations representing approximately 40 million members. While I do not presume to speak for each of these, I do represent the body of policies and views on foreign aid which the council has adopted after careful study, discussion, and deliberation by the policymaking bodies, composed of official representatives of the denominations. The denominations and their individual churches give major study to the foreign aid program of the United States. The National Council strongly supports a major program of assistance and cooperation with the newly developing and other countries of low income—support for a level of assistance far beyond that possible with the limited funds contemplated under the 1965 foreign aid bill.

PERSPECTIVE OF THE CHURCHES

The churches hold it to be a Christian concern and a moral responsibility for the United States to take all appropriate action within its capacity, resources, and ingenuity to promote economic betterment, social well-being, freedom, justice, and peace among the peoples of the world, including our own, and especially in the newly independent, emerging, and low income nations. In support of these goals, the National Council of Churches has given its unceasing support to the improvement and expansion of technical assistance, loans and grants, educational exchange, trade and private investment, and other measures to improve the conditions of life and to create responsible, stable, and progressive societies.

For over 150 years, the churches have engaged in administering oversea assistance and cooperative programs on all continents to improve conditions of life. These programs include education, literacy, medicine, public health, agriculture, industry, mass communications, leadership training, surplus food distribution, disaster relief, and village and community assistance.

While we believe these experiences provide a practical basis on which to judge the Government's assistance programs, the position of the churches is based on moral and religious grounds. In the development of national policy and in the actual conduct of assistance programs, we are dealing with questions of life and death, the nature of man and his destiny, individual and corporate responsibility, and with questions of freedom, justice, brotherhood, and peace. These are moral and religious questions. Mutual assistance and development programs go far beyond material considerations; they reflect our moral and spiritual health in human relationships.

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS BASES

In previous years when I have had the privilege of appearing before this committee, I have outline the moral and religous considerations which the churches believe should be applied to U.S. assistance programs. May I quote one paragraph.

"We believe that governments, as individuals, must conform to the moral law of God. The people of a nation, as children of God, have the obligation of promoting justice, freedom, equality, opportunity, respect, integrity, and mercy in all relationships. So, too, government as the means by which people carry out their collective public concerns and responsibilities, must fulfill these same obligations."

We of the churches are concerned that official arguments in support of assistance programs often lack a solid ethical basis, and consequently are psychologically unacceptable to other countries. Moreover, they don't ring true in the hearts of the American people. The churches want policies and actions of our Government to have solid moral and ethical foundations. Some of the reasons advanced in favor of aid, and destructive criticisms, lack moral justification.

We of the churches are especially disturbed by some official arguments which defend the program almost exclusively on the basis of narrow self-interest, stressing its value in counteracting communism and other threats to our security without genuine concern for the welfare of people as people. In our view, no contest to win over communism in fostering free, responsible, and progressive societies can succeed on that basis.

We are disquieted by criticisms of oversea assistance which stem from a naive expectancy that people of other countries

should be grateful for the programs which we ourselves declare to be carrying out in our self-interest. How can sympathetic feelings and genuine mutuality be created among nations unless moral and psychological conditions essential to understanding, respect, and cooperation are fostered?

We are alarmed by appeals to reduce appropriations on the ground that we should not engage in a mutual help program until all needs of our own people are met. What would be the condition of the United States today if we had applied or should now apply the philosophy that each family, community, or State should live unto itself? Although such a return to the law of the jungle is inconceivable in view of God's moral imperative of human brotherhood, many callous and self-serving arguments in and out of Congress go unchallenged.

We are distressed that economic and technical assistance is so frequently viewed as a handout or as charity—although charity by all parties is required in the conduct of any cooperative program. Rather, this function must be approached as a partnership with mutual contributions and mutual benefits. The participating countries—those of low income and those in a position to contribute most—must feel as partners in a common enterprise aimed at achieving economic progress, social advancement, and freedom.

We are grieved that the amount of assistance requested has been reduced, and at a time when the gap between living standards in our country and low-income countries is widening. The proportion of our national income allocated for this purpose (6 percent) is scarcely half of the percentage of early postwar assistance when we could "afford" it less. The opportunities and needs today are greater than ever before. We trust that there will be no further reduction in the total by the Congress.

STATED POSITIONS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

Through the years, the constituent denominations and the policy organs of the National Council have formulated definitive recommendations with regard to the conduct of assistance programs. They include:

The authorization of programs over a period of several years so that plans, operations, and relationships with participating countries could be freed from impossible deadlines, crisis psychology, improvision, and the waste which results from the 1-year programing cycle.

The separation of development assistance from military assistance.

Increased emphasis on measures which foster initiative, self-reliance, political leadership, and administrative capabilities of the participating countries.

Fostering of trade and other methods of transfer of capital to and formation of capital within the developing countries, including favorable loan terms, to provide the essential base for economic growth.

Greater utilization of the economic and technical assistance organs of the United Nations, regional organizations, and other international institutions

Strengthening and expanding the international programs conducted by voluntary agencies, and placing greater reliance on U.S. educational institutions, business, and service agencies in the conduct of programs.

Expansion of economic and technical cooperation toward the full extent of our capabilities as a Nation and the capacity of the participating nations to absorb assistance.

Improvement in the coordination and administration of programs and more effective recruitment and training of personnel.

SOME KEY ISSUES

The objectives, character, and plan of operation of the AID program as provided in the Act of International Development and in the plans of the executive branch conform on the whole to these principles. But there are difficulties and obstacles in implementation which the Congress can help remedy.

First, it is necessary to enact appropriations sufficiently well in advance of the budget year to enable orderly and efficient implementation.

The delays in Congress which result in funds becoming available to AID in the middle of the operating year create confusion, waste, and frustration both within the administering agencies and in the cooperating countries. This practice makes it very difficult to maintain the integrity and effectiveness of the program, and inevitably result in an unconscionable waste of public funds.

Second, the AID program would be better understood if a clearer distinction were made between the objectives, elements, and methods of short-term politically motivated economic aid and that of assistance which focuses on the long-term modernization and development of a country. The aim of the former is to strengthen friendly countries while the latter is concerned with raising the standards of living in countries of low income through the transformation of social, economic, cultural, and governmental conditions. The latter entails development assistance over a sustained period of time.

Third, there is the need for providing stability and confidence in development assistance by long-term commitments and by continuity and sustained support for established administrative arrangements.

The conduct of the program on a hand-to-mouth basis or by fits and starts, and the frequent "reorganizations" demanded by the Congress, prevent effective planning, design of projects, and scheduling of work, both by the cooperating countries and by U.S. agencies. This state of confusion and uncertainty bewilders other countries, saps confidence in our reliability, and impairs the effectiveness of the administering agencies.

Fourth, success depends on the quality of leadership and professional personnel which the AID is able to muster.

If the Congress were to authorize a suitable system for AID oversea personnel and insist that the executive branch recruit and develop a staff of outstanding merit, the effectiveness of the AID program could be greatly increased. But this cannot be done by indiscriminate attacks on the program, by creation of fear and crisis in administration, or by downgrading the work of agency personnel.

We believe that many of the finest citizens of America will come forward if the Congress and the executive branch will demonstrate sustained support for their AID program, underwrite it for the period of years which success requires, and show a determination to provide administration with the fullest integrity, vision, and moral purpose.

Fifth, the naive notion must be abandoned that in a short time we can modernize and create responsible, self-sufficient nations through the direct transplanting of American technology and provision of some grants and loans.

The goals we esteem require a long-term effort because they involve fundamental social, economic, and political change, similar to that which the United States underwent in its development. But times are different. The leaders and people in these countries have gained freedom with the expectation that conditions will improve, that they will make progress toward the standards of life which exist in the West, and that they will be treated as equals and partners in the fulfillment of these aspirations.

The internal changes must be brought about by the people themselves, with help and encouragement from the United States and other industrialized countries. There must be improvement in government and public services, land reform, education, effective use of natural resources, tax systems, agricultural methods, industrialization, and the formulation and implementation of many other measures and changes. Such efforts to change and build a society call for new approaches, competences, and qualities in the U.S. AID programs. This requires the upgrading and training of present U.S. personnel and Government cooperation with universities in preparing a new generation of talent.

It may take 10 years to put a man on the moon. It will take 25 or 50 years to develop the knowledge and skills required by these countries and by Americans to accomplish the basic tasks of development. Under present limited perspectives and remedies, we may never reach the first stage of our goals.

We must approach the task with patience, perseverance, and wisdom. A new country cannot be built in a day, and it can only be built by its people. Let's not insist that AID personnel can work miracles, yet miracles result when the task is approached in mutual trust and partnership.

May I quote a paragraph relevant to this point from a letter I received this week from a member of AID working in a newly independent country:

"I find myself exceedingly impatient with the Americans who wish to 'pull a hit-and-run play' to try to get something done in a hurry so that they can say 'see what I have done' rather than to be able to say 'this the people have done. They have participated in the decisionmaking processes which brought this, their own institution, into existence.'"

Sixth, in short the task—from which we may not flinch—of helping to build a world of responsible, self-reliant, competent, and cooperative nations will require (a) many years, (b) a lot of money, but less than on a fits-and-starts basis, (c) ingenuity and resourcefulness, (d) organizational skill, (e) intensive training of personnel, and (f) a lot of research to learn how to do the job properly.

Seventh, more resourceful approaches must be used to overcome the various obstacles which impede development. Economic deficiencies and shortages in natural resources, although often critical, are not the primary barriers. I find everywhere that the basic roadblocks are political and administrative.

Some persons assert that assistance should be denied to a country plagued with inept political leadership, unpaid taxes, inefficient government, unstable currency, exploitive business practices, a medieval system of land tenure, and shortages of technical and professional skills. If all of these things were in good order, the country wouldn't need help. Such conditions are the very reasons why assistance is needed, not withheld. AID's task is to tailor the program to fit the ailment. The objective should be to help create the administrative capabilities for implementing plans, programs, and projects; to train personnel qualified to design and establish the institutions, processes, and operating systems essential to achievement of development goals.

While large scale economic assistance may reasonably be withheld if a country's leadership is treacherous or uncooperative or if it refuses to engage in self-help measures, continued technical cooperation which focuses on remedying basic deficiencies may be justified.

Even when reviewing the development situation in certain countries where these unhappy political conditions exist, I have found a large number of persons occupying influential positions who were brought to the United States under AID auspices for training. Many are frustrated by perfidious and irresponsible politicians. While restricted in their effectiveness, these public servants are nevertheless a vital stabilizing factor and a means for development progress. In the

future, hopefully under a better political climate, they could make a tremendous contribution. Obviously, we should continue to train such persons under AID sponsorship, as long as a government, even though objectionable to us, is prepared to select and utilize first-rate nominees. Those of us in the universities who have trained such participants find the results more than worth the effort.

When examined sensitively in reference to such factors, the Congress and the executive branch will see the merit in supporting a new kind of program strategy, and of continuing certain kinds of technical cooperation even with objectionable governments. Governments may come and go but people remain.

Finally, the Congress must recognize that even under a thoroughly efficient AID organization, there would be numerous failures and shortcomings. The job is that complex and difficult. Such failures should be acknowledged, investigated, and, where possible, remedied.

There is, however, too much disposition to make capital of some allegation of an aggrieved employee or rumor spread by a casual visitor to a country who secured only part of the story or who was deliberately misled. There are plenty of trained agents or sympathizers of alien governments, and privileged persons in the developing countries who seek to discredit U.S. motives and achievements. With a ready market for destructive criticism, both at home and abroad, it is not difficult to destroy confidence in the program, embarrass and frustrate AID's most competent personnel, and raise suspicion as to the reliability of our Government.

CONSTRUCTIVE SUPPORT

The remedy is thus not to flog a drugged horse, but to create the conditions under which the AID organization can get on with the job with the best talent the country can supply.

Fuller application of the principles espoused by the National Council of Churches would, we believe, give the people of the developing countries new hope and help restore America's position of leadership.

We of the churches will continue to foster study and discussion of substantive policy and administrative necessities in the achievement of the legislation's noble aims.

However, we need farsighted and courageous leaders both in the Congress and in the executive branch to provide direction and to challenge inaccurate and politically motivated charges. Few of our citizens can be expected to understand the technical aspects and administrative ramifications of the program. But all people have a conscience and respond when the moral principle is clear.

Congressman Vaughan Gary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret that I learned of the decision of the able and distinguished gentleman from Virginia and my dear friend and valued colleague, the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY, to retire from Congress.

I have served with him and listened to him for many years in this great House and heard him deliver some very able, comprehensive remarks on various measures.

The gentleman from Virginia is one of the ablest Members of this body—dedicated in the very highest degree, conscientious, tireless, painstaking, and admirable in every way. He is of great mind and great heart—devoted to God and country and to the best interests of his district.

VAUGHAN GARY is a fine, sterling public servant. The gleaming record he has made here will remain with us for many years to come. I am sincerely sorry that he is leaving the House. We will all miss him. His gracious ways, his generous heart, his inspiring Americanism, his many fine contributions will long be remembered here.

I wish for my esteemed and dear friend, VAUGHAN GARY, and his lovely family, all choicest blessings of good health, success, and happiness for many years to come.

He will leave a great void in our midst, among his very many warm friends and admirers, but we will carry him affectionately in our hearts always. His name will remain honored and distinguished here for unexcelled, outstanding service in this House—to his district, his great State, and our beloved country.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to add my personal best wishes on Polish Constitution Day to the words of many other Americans and Polish people around the world. This year, while we were not in session in this Chamber on the anniversary itself of this historic document, it was my special pleasure to join many of my neighbors in my hometown and celebrate with them on this 173d birthday of this great and important document of world history.

The commemorative program was held in the Polish Falcon-Veteran Home, 790 South 20th Street, Newark, under the chairmanship of Stanley Grabowy of Short Hills, New Jersey. More than 500 of us were there for this happy, yet solemn occasion, including our former colleague and present mayor of Newark, Hugh J. Addonizio. The Lutnia Choir of St. Stanislaus Church provided a very moving musical setting for this patriotic gathering. And a most impressive mass tribute was paid our beloved, martyred President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

One of the speeches delivered during the course of the day was by Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, of Columbia University, who cited the parallel construction of the Polish Constitution with our own and called for all Polish-Americans to be in the forefront of the present civil rights struggle here in America. Professor Brzezinski said that despite our own documents, America cannot truly be great while the Constitution and Declaration of Independence do not apply to 10 percent of our population. Even as the Polish constitution, our own has absolute commitments to freedom and social justice. And as Dr. Brezinski stressed, we must strive to achieve these commitments.

Another very thrilling moment came when a young lad, Frank Linski, Jr., who has excelled as a student and athlete at Newark's East Side High School was presented with an American flag. Frank came to America 7 years ago and became an American citizen on February 29 of this year.

I would like at this time to address to this Chamber the remarks that I delivered yesterday, so that the Polish people throughout the world, as well as all Polish-Americans may understand how deeply all freedom-loving people honor the Polish Constitution and pray that the Polish nation may soon again be free to live under its protection.

GREETING TO THE POLISH FALCON-VETERAN HOME

I am happy to deliver best wishes on the anniversary of this important event in Polish history. Polish leaders like King Stanislaw II, Hugo Kollontaj, and Ignacy Potocki, were brave and dedicated indeed to carry through the adoption of the progressive Constitution of May 3, 1791, in the face of impressive obstacles. But the pursuit of sound constitutional enunciation of the principles of the nation is essential for the survival of the nation. The Poles of 1791 were much like the Americans of 1789 in recognizing this fact. It is a measure of the similar devotion of Poles and Americans to freedom that for the last 175 years they have both been pursuing similar assurances of national unity and individual freedom.

The short life of the Constitution established in 1791 and forcibly abolished in 1795 was surely not due to lack of effort by the Poles. Many people in many lands know the story of Tadeusz Kosciuszko and his tiny army, which almost defeated the combined strength of Russia and Prussia. And the successful defense of Warsaw against the Russians from July 9 to September 6, 1794 is among the most heroic battles of all times. It ranks with the Battle of Warsaw in 1944, when the Soviet Army stood by while the Nazis savagely reduced Warsaw to rubble, as one of the best examples of Polish courage.

It is interesting to remember that the Constitution of 1791 was a part of a national revival in arts, letters, and education which lasted for two decades. Bishop Naruszewics wrote the epic "History of the Polish Nation." Stanislas Staszic composed his progressive political treatises. Hugo Kollontaj undertook the task of reviving the ancient great university at Krakow. Adam Czartoryski wrote the "Polish Bard." And perhaps most importantly King Stanislaw Augustus gathered about him the leading artists, historians, and thinkers of the day, both Polish and foreign. They contributed a great deal to the social renaissance which led to the dramatic adoption of the Constitution of May 3.

All of these things sound familiar to Americans. They are very similar to the events transpiring in the New World in those same exciting years of the 18th century. For this reason the many Poles who have come to the United States seeking the freedom which was denied them in their homeland have been most welcome and beneficial citizens. The liberal inheritance in arts and letters from Poland has done a great deal to enrich American culture. The bravery and physical vigor of Polish immigrants has contributed

to the strength of America in both peace and war. It is saddening that today, after so many years of struggle, the Polish people are still denied the right to determine their national course, are still partitioned once again between predatory neighbors. But we can be assured that the strong Polish love for freedom has not diminished, nor the determination to be independent. If anything is sure, it is that so many sacrifices are not in vain, so much courage is not lost. Poland shall be free again.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, we here in the Congress take special note of May 3, it being the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, for two very good reasons: First of all, we Americans are of kindred spirit with the valiant and brave Poles in many ways, such as our mutual love of freedom and liberty, and our veneration of religion. Second, because of the millions of good people who were either born in Poland or are of Polish ancestry and are now American citizens, we have the benefit of their invaluable contributions in helping make the United States the great Nation it is.

We all gratefully remember Casmir Pulaski and Kosciusko for their distinguished service for our country during the American Revolution. The world acknowledges the part that the University of Krakow for 600 years has played in furthering learning. And we are ever mindful of the fact that the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, clearly embodies the principal that all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people.

The world also will never forget the heroic Warsaw uprising and inhuman Soviet treachery during 1944, when the brave Poles fought against all odds and after 63 days of bitter fighting were compelled to capitulate. Over 250,000 Polish people who rose to heights of heroism and sacrifice perished in this struggle. Warsaw did not die, however, but Phoenix-like, rose from the ashes.

Despite 20 years of Russian-imposed rule, the people of Poland are still vigorous in their opposition to atheistic communism and have maintained their national heritage and distinctive traditions of which they can be justly proud. It is indeed unfortunate that these brave people must suffer Red tyranny and persecution.

In commemorating the 173d anniversary of the promulgation and adoption of the Polish Constitution, we not only give the Polish people hope and encouragement, but serve to render notice for all the world to see that we cherish the great ideals of freedom and liberty and commiserate with enslaved peoples everywhere. May these ideals ever burn brightly to illumine the day when all captive nations shall become free and independent of their oppressors.

Tribute to Dr. Frederick Douglass Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frederick Douglass Hall, who is working now in the State of Louisiana where I was born, is appearing as a conductor in the first annual spring music festival in Los Angeles in my congressional district. I would like to pay tribute to him because he has made significant contributions in the field of music and is one of the Nation's most outstanding musicians to whom proper recognition is long overdue.

Frederick Douglass Hall, music educator, musicologist, composer, conductor, has acquired and maintained the highest standards of excellence in all that he has undertaken. At the age of 5 his alert and talented mother discovered his musical gift, and began to teach him. In elementary school he composed songs and piano selections, and gave recitals of his own compositions. His beautiful soprano voice attracted attention, and he was called upon frequently to serve as soloist in several white churches in his native Atlanta. While in high school he learned to play several orchestral instruments and frequently filled in for his teachers in the Atlanta Theater Orchestra. In college Dr. Hall never was satisfied only with mastering the prescribed courses, but he spent extra time in private music lessons, in attendance at conservatories in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Chicago, and in research throughout the South in Negro music. He also worked as itinerant band teacher in several cities, and as church organist, and organizer and director of community choirs and bands. Even in these early years of his training he practiced passing on whatever he learned to others.

Dr. Hall began his teaching career immediately after graduating from college, but he consistently continued his study and inquiry into everything that had to do with music and education. He earned the bachelor of arts degree from Morehouse College, the teachers diploma from Chicago Musical College, the bachelor of music degree in piano, composition, canon and fugue from the same institution, the master of arts degree in music and music education from Teachers College, Columbia University, the professional music supervisor's diploma from the same institution. This study was done on a fellowship from the Julius Rosenwald Fund. After the masters degree Dr. Hall was granted a fellowship by the general education board for study and research in Europe. For a 2-year period he did residence work in composition, voice and conducting at the Royal College of Music. Concurrently he traveled in England, Scotland, and Wales in research in music education and folk music. The general education board grant was augmented by a stipend from the Phelps Stokes Fund for research in West Africa where for 6 months he traced the relationship between the American Negro spiritual and the music of native West Africa. In preparation for the African trek he pursued special courses in London University's School of Oriental Studies. In recognition of his findings in connection with the African research Dr. Hall was elected a fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institution. His degree, doctor of education, was earned at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1952. At the completion of his final oral examination Dr. James Mursell, director of the department of music stated "The faculty by unanimous vote declared Mr. Hall to be the most outstanding doctoral candidate in music for the year."

Frederick Hall's compositions are numerous, and they are played and sung in all parts of the world. Among his works are included an oratorio, a suite for piano, a fantasia upon Negro spirituals, six volumes of spirituals for vocal ensembles, a volume of Afro-American religious work songs, and a volume of African children's songs. He serves on many national committees and is a member of the Council of the National Fellowship of Methodist Musicians of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church. In this connection he conducts workshops and institutes on church music in many parts of the country.

It has been said of Dr. Hall that he is one of the most versatile musicians that his generation has produced; that he has the unique capacity of molding a group of untrained singers into an organlike unit of tonal beauty; that he is a music missionary, spreading abroad the beauty of music and the wholesomeness of more abundant living. Dr. Hall's name appears in many listings of persons of high achievement, among these the "World Biography."

Quiet mannered, modest, unassuming Dr. Hall, his achievement and eminence not withstanding, chooses to continue giving his life as a teacher of young people. He has served as director of music in several colleges and at present he is coordinator of music at Dillard University, New Orleans. He often has said that his reward comes through seeing those whom he teaches develop into successful and serviceable leaders in our complex society. Today there are thousands who, when his name is called, are happy to say "he was my teacher."

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the message of the distinguished, outstanding President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation on the occasion of Polish National Day, May 3, 1964.

It will be noted that this great leader of his noble people has emphasized in his thrilling message the loyalty and courage of the Polish Army—an army, let it be said, that fought with unexcelled loyalty, courage and unrestrained sacrifice.

The freedom and personal rights of the Polish people may be suppressed for a time by ruthless force. But their unconquerable spirit can never be extinguished in the hearts of millions and millions of Polish patriots. One day soon, pray God, it will triumph. Let us all strive toward that end.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION ON THE OCCASION OF THE POLISH NATIONAL DAY, MAY 3, 1964

His Excellency, August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, has issued the

following message to Poles all over the world on the occasion of the Polish National Day this year:

"Among the many reforms enacted by the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, the status of the armed forces occupied an important place.

"Today, as the Polish nation celebrates the 50th anniversary of the revival of its own armed forces by Joseph Pilsudski, let us recall the principles which the government law of May 3, 1791, so aptly formulated under the heading of 'The national armed forces' that they can serve to this day as a model for every democratic country. Thus, article XI of this basic law reads:

"'The nation itself is bound to defense against attack and to guard the entirety of its territory. All citizens are therefore defenders of the whole national territory and their liberties. The army is nothing else but a defense and security force selected from the general mass of the nation. The nation owes its armed forces reward and respect inasmuch as they devote themselves wholly to its defense. The forces owe it to the nation to guard the frontiers and preserve public tranquility; in short, the army shall be its most powerful shield. Not to err in this task, the army shall remain in constant obedience to the executive authority in accord with the stipulations of the law; it shall take the oath of fidelity to the nation and to the King, and swear to defend the national Constitution. Therefore can the national army be used for the country's general defense, to guard the fortresses and frontiers or to aid the law should whosoever disobey its injunctions.'

"Unfortunately, these lofty principles could not then be carried out into effect. Fearing the possibility of a Poland renascent on democratic principles, authocratic neighbors attacked her and, despite a heroic defense under the command of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, subjected the Polish nation for a whole century.

"But we can proudly point out that the Polish nation missed no opportunity of attempting to revive its armed forces.

"Immediately after the partitions of Poland, General Henryk Dabrowski formed the hard-fighting Polish legions whose soldierly worth was respected even by their enemies. The warlike exploits of the army of the Duchy of Warsaw under the command of Prince Joseph Poniatowski and the gallant but disastrous defense of the Congress Kingdom of Poland against the attack of Russia upon the remnants of Poland's freedom marked the end of an independent Polish armed force for a time. But, even so, the Poles ceased not to attempt the recreation of their armed forces. Poles fought for the freedom of nations during the 1840's under the leadership of Ludwik Mieroslawski and Father P. Sciegienny. During the Crimean War, Wladyslaw Zamoyski and Adam Mickiewicz, the national bard, strove to form Polish legions beyond the frontiers of Poland. Only a few years later, an effort was made to revive the national force during the heroic insurrection of 1863 under the leadership of Marian Langiewicz and Romuald Traugutt. It seemed to many people that the sad end of the insurrection for long blocked the aspirations of the Poles for their own armed forces. Yet, as early as 1905, Joseph Pilsudski launched a new struggle against Russia with the help of the militant organization of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS). But, it was only when the First World War broke out that he could lead regular troops into battle, the Polish legions. Later opportunities during the course of that war made it possible to organize Polish formations outside Poland. A Polish Army arose in France under the command of General Joseph Haller, and Polish detachments under the command of General Joseph Dowbor-Musnicki were formed in Russia by the Supreme Polish Military Committee headed by Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, later President of the Polish Republic.

"After the First World War, these three formations provided the nucleus of the Polish Army which, under the command of Marshal Pilsudski, signally defeated Russia in 1920 and thus saved Europe from being overrun by the Red Army.

"When the legitimate authorities of the Polish Republic went into exile after the disaster of 1939, their first act was to reconstitute the Polish armed forces under the supreme command of General Sikorski. At the same time, General Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz was in Warsaw organizing the cadres of the Polish Home Army.

"In spite of the heroism of the Polish soldiers, sailors, and airmen on all battlefronts during the Second World War, the perfidy of Poland's enemies and the imprudence of her allies brought about the loss of the country's independence once again.

"But, just as during more than a hundred years of subjection in the past, so now are we ceaselessly struggling for the restoration of a free, integral and independent Poland. The struggle must now be conducted by the application of every available peaceful method. Let nobody doubt, however, that should the need arise and armed struggle become possible, the Polish nation will again succeed in reconstructing its armed forces and, in the name of God, fight until victory is gained."

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday is Polish Constitution Day. Free Poles throughout the world celebrate it in commemoration of the Polish Constitution freely established on May 3, 1791. In their hearts the people of Poland also celebrate, but they cannot do it aloud.

Despite many partitions and great suffering, Poles still honor the Constitution of May 3 because it was established with the overwhelming support of the common people and it was their spontaneous expression of a desire to be free from poverty, exploitation, and foreign domination. Poland would be happy today to have the opportunity to so freely determine its own destiny.

Many of the leaders who formulated the 1791 Constitution were connected with the ancient University of Krakow, which is reaching its 600th anniversary this year. Among many other important events in Polish history which deserve special mention in 1964, are the Nazi-Soviet attack on Poland in 1939, the brilliant campaign of free Polish forces in Italy, 1944, and the heroic Warsaw Battle, betrayed by the Communists, in 1944.

These are all significant proof of Poland's 1,000-year history as a vigorous, enlightened freedom-seeking nation. It is proper that we join our fellow citizens in wishing Poland freedom on the 173d anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

"On the Nation's Loss"—A Sermon by Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld Following Tragic Death of Our Late Beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished businessman from Cleveland, Ohio, and a good friend of mine, Mr. Joseph E. Cole, has brought to my attention a very moving sermon delivered by Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld at Fairmount Temple in Cleveland on November 29, 1963, following the tragic death of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Mr. Cole was a good friend and ardent supporter of President Kennedy. Under previous permission I place Rabbi Lelyveld's sermon, entitled "On the Nation's Loss," with my remarks in the Appendix:

Every sensitive soul has been scarred by the events of the last 8 days—we are somewhat diminished in pride, somewhat less certain. Indeed, tonight we find our uncertainty has been increased and we bear a double portion of sorrow. Some may find a contrast between the two events that are inevitably in the forefront of our thinking tonight—the death of our young President cut down by an act of violence—and the death of a great rabbi who has fulfilled his threescore and ten, called in the quiet of his home. Yet there is that which unites them. Both the national leader and the leader of our people symbolized in their lives a conception of man, an attitude toward life and a Messianic hope that made them truly one in their separateness. Tonight as we memorialize the one and the other lies yet unburied, we reflect not only upon life's uncertainty but upon the certainties to which they were both dedicated.

We reassure ourselves by a judgment that only a psychopath could have fired the shot that terminated the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Certainly that is true. The response of this last week—that response which we share as we come here in such great numbers, searching for the strength of community and for that rebuilding of purpose that can restore the diminished portion of self—has shown how universally Jack Kennedy was loved. He was loved above partisan judgments; loved for the image of America that he presented; loved for his youth and his vibrancy; loved for the family joy he reflected, for the democratic goals that he served, for his vitality and for his courage in action, for his practical and down-to-earth skills.

His very election was an object lesson in American pluralism: that a Catholic should be chosen President of these United States. Why, but a century had elapsed from the time of the Know-Nothings, the riots of the APA's, the anti-Catholic and the anti-Irish prejudices of the 1850's and the 1860's, to the joy of America in John Fitzgerald Kennedy, proud scion of the Irish.

This was far more than a paper image, far more than the handsome young man who fulfilled the dream enshrined in our slick magazines. John F. Kennedy was the acme of competence. He was a competent politician who knew the importance of winning

but was willing to accept compromise on detail if never on principles, and who restored through his life and through his writings respect for the venerable and much abused profession of politician.

John F. Kennedy had a mind equal to the complexities of modern government; he was able to absorb and to expound with keen lucidity the details of finance and of military policy and of departmental complications with an articulateness as well as a charm that disarmed his opponents. A Pulitzer Prize winning author whose book, "Profiles in Courage," stands as a brilliant exposition of the meaning of political courage, he himself was a model of the courage which he extolled and which he defined in Hemingway's phrase as "grace under pressure." How often he displayed that grace and how beautifully in the week just ended his widow stood for the same quality of "grace under pressure" with a grandeur and a nobility that no one of us will ever forget.

Pick up "Profiles of Courage," and leaf through it, or read deliberately the biographies he offers of Daniel Webster, Thomas Hart Benton, John Quincy Adams, Sam Houston, Robert Taft—Senators who stood for integrity and whose lives were marked by this virtue of political courage. On the foreleaf of that volume, the young Senator from Massachusetts quoted the words of Edmund Burke, which the great Dublin-born British orator and statesman had used in extolling Charles James Fox for his attack upon the inequities and the tyranny of the East India Co.: "He has put to hazard his ease, his security, his interest, his power, even his * * * popularity * * *. He is traduced and abused for his supposed motives. He will remember that obloquy is a necessary ingredient in the composition of all true glory."

John F. Kennedy quoted Edmund Burke but he spoke his own conviction, remembering at the age of 38 that obloquy, abuse and hazard are necessary ingredients of all true glory. He spoke his own convictions, too, when he asked why these Senators whose profiles he drew acted as they did: they did so, he tells us, because each one's need to maintain his own respect for himself was more important to him than his popularity with others; because of his desire to win a reputation for integrity and courage was stronger than his desire to maintain his office; because his conscience, his personal standard of ethics, his integrity or morality, was stronger than the pressures of public disapproval; because his faith that his course was the best one and would ultimately be vindicated outweighed his fear of public reprisal.

How grim these words seem in retrospect: that his integrity outweighed his fear of reprisal, his respect for self overcame his recognition of hazard.

So often in the past week we have thought of our earlier martyred Presidents and particularly of Abraham Lincoln, of that long train which for 15 days made the journey from Washington through New York and west to Springfield. There is much more than superficial, external event to link John F. Kennedy with Abraham Lincoln in our thoughts. Like Lincoln, he drew upon the model of Scripture in his writing, though his prose style was unmistakably his own. He spoke and wrote with a simplicity that sprang directly from the Bible not only when he quoted Isaiah, but when he summoned us to our destiny: "Together, let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean's depths, and encourage the arts and commerce." Or when he called us to "bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation', to struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

How significant that among his last words was this reaffirmation of the humane and the civilized against the Neanderthal and the primitive, "In a world full of frustrations and irritations America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and of reason."

The contrast is so evident there that this is the stuff of which authentic legends are made, the kind of authentic legends that grew up about Abraham Lincoln "when the barge captain and the flatboat man and the teller of coarse jokes were all forgotten and in the hearts of the people the new legend was weaving."

The legend of Abraham Lincoln is true. The legend of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be equally authentic and equally true because it enshrines the perennial contrast—on the one side, beauty, grace, love, vision, and reason; on the other side, ugliness, brutality, violence, and ignorance.

Out of that contrast flow our national humiliation and shame. "Al tagidu b'Gas—Tell it not in Gath and publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon." For, as James Reston said, "This decent country has been made to look uncivilized." Private anger and private sorrow are not enough to redeem the events of the last 8 days. What we have witnessed is a crescendo of violence that began with the sniper's bullet that took the life of Medger Evans, grew with the bomb that destroyed the lives of four little children in Birmingham and found its climax in the sniper with a telescopic sight who slew our President, and the misguided primitive who slew the alleged slayer.

Our only hope is to face this crescendo of violence and to face it squarely so that the shock will help us to recover a vision of our own. This is the center of our sorrow and the crux of the challenge. Walter Lippmann writes, "The treatment of human beings as things, as the mere instruments of power and ambition is without doubt the consequence of the decay of the belief in man as something more than an animal. The liberties we talk about defending today were established by men who took their conception of man from the great central religious tradition of Western civilization and the liberties we inherit can almost certainly not survive the abandonment of that tradition."

Those are the words of Walter Lippmann who 35 years ago sought to find a new foundation for morals believing that that great tradition which he now calls "the central religious tradition of Western civilization" had lost its potency and that modern man had no choice but to begin to build anew. Walter Lippmann has had many experiences in the last 35 years, as we all have had many experiences, and he has come a long way from the position he took in 1929. We have all come a long way from our rejection of "the central religious tradition"—from the certainties of the twenties and the thirties to the doubts and the existential agonies of the 1960's.

The legend of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, indeed the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, offers us a beacon for direction. He stood with every fiber of his being for that great central religious tradition of Western man—for the Judeo-Christian conception of man as endowed by his Creator with inalienable rights, as filled with potentiality, as entitled to that freedom which will enable him to develop and fulfill his capacities. He lived for that concept of man. He struggled for it. And, on November 22, he died for it.

May we, who are the heirs of his struggle, reestablish now before it is too late, that conception of man as the child of God—reestablish the primacy of reason and learning, the primacy of love and of faith and of brotherhood. Then out of our sorrow, out of our anguish, there may come this measure of good: a nation rededicated to the pursuit of democracy and the pursuit of peace.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Washington Report of May 2, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

RENEGOTIATION ACT EXTENDED AGAIN

The House this week extended for another 2 years the Renegotiation Act of 1951, H.R. 10669. While this is a highly technical bill which most laymen find hard to understand, its purposes and its continued extension are legitimate subjects for serious consideration.

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 was enacted on March 23, 1951, as a result of the outbreak of the Korean war. Its purpose—to authorize the Government to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts and related subcontracts. It applied to:

1. Department of Defense.
2. Department of the Army.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Air Force.
5. The Maritime Administration.
6. The Federal Maritime Board.
7. The General Services Administration.
8. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
9. The Atomic Energy Commission.

The current bill adds the Federal Aviation Agency.

The Republican views on the Renegotiation Act are summed up in minority views in the report on the bill: "We believe that steps should be taken to bring renegotiation to an orderly termination." It is the Republican position that the act should not be made permanent in effect by renewals every 2 years. Instead, sound procurement practices should be substituted for renegotiation. The report states:

"With each extension of the Renegotiation Act, there were representations made to the committee that the procurement practices were being improved with a view toward dispensing in the future with the need for renegotiation. Yet the day never comes when the procurement agencies are willing to throw away the renegotiation crutch, and learn to walk again—and we will never see that day so long as the committee continues its willingness to extend the Renegotiation Act without question.

"The procurement agencies of the Government have ample powers to protect themselves against windfall profits in Government contracts. As a matter of fact, experience in the private sector of the economy amply demonstrates that under a free enterprise system we should be concerned—not with the profits earned by a contractor—but with the prices at which the goods or services are offered to the Government. Renegotiation penalizes the efficient and rewards the inefficient. There is inherent in the renegotiation process the very element of cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracting which is forbidden by law, if done directly."

All 10 Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee signed the minority views in an effort to enact an orderly transition in Government procurement so that it would be made on "fixed rules of law" rather than on the "judgment by men."

DALLAS STORY WELL RECEIVED

Mail from all sections of the Nation shows that many people are grateful for having the record on Dallas set straight. While it is inevitable that there will be those who charge me with political motives in making the speech in the House of Representatives, most Americans are deeply concerned with fairplay and honesty and they appreciate having all the facts on Dallas. In the best American tradition when the people have all the facts their final judgment will be right and those who have tried so hard to downgrade and discredit Dallas will, themselves, be discredited.

WASHINGTON EVENING STAR SUPPORTS DALLAS

A significant editorial was printed in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, April 29, 1964. The editorial follows:

"DALLAS AGAIN

"Repetition is dull. But when a gross error of interpretation passes from the province of papers and magazines into that of books, it must, if it is a matter of national importance, be refuted all over again.

"Such is now the case with the general proposition—or feeling, to be strictly accurate—that the prevalence of rightwing views in the city of Dallas was responsible for the assassination of President Kennedy.

"The feeling was the immediate reaction of some newscasters and some news analysts who got their views into print or on the air before the facts were in. What was even more astonishing was the continuing defense of that feeling even after it became reasonably clear that the late President was shot by a man probably working alone, and that the killer, insofar as he held responsible political views, held those of the extreme left. Serious observers who had spent a good part of the McCarthy era denouncing the conspiracy theory of history immediately embraced the theory and elaborated a vast conspiracy which included the entire Dallas police force just as openers.

"The publication of 'Dallas Public and Private,' by Warren Leslie, dignifies that feeling with hard covers and a dust jacket, and hence requires once more the assertion that President Kennedy was murdered not by antifluoridation thoughts, not by income-tax-repeal arguments, not by skepticism of psychiatry, but, as far as anyone can tell, by an individual named Lee Harvey Oswald."

Commemoration of Horace Mann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, the people of Franklin, Mass., whom I have the great honor and privilege of representing in the Congress, are commemorating the birth of a man who was not only a distinguished citizen of their town and State, but one of the most influential educators this country has produced.

This is the day set aside by Franklin to honor its distinguished son, the famous Horace Mann, who did so much for our Nation, our schools, and our children. It is most fitting that the townspeople of Franklin should pay well deserved tribute to this outstanding native son whose memorable contributions will long inspire and guide us and whose great influence in preparing the forward march of American education will continue to be felt for years to come.

Franklin and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are indeed proud of Horace Mann, who is known as the father of the common school. The story of his life is one of devoted, unceasing service to his country and fellow man. As legislator, he not only served in the Massachusetts General Court from 1827 to 1837, but also in the Congress from 1848 to 1852. He resigned as secretary to the Massachusetts State Board of Education (1837–48) to serve in Congress and after two terms, he took up the presidency in 1853 of Antioch College.

Both as legislator and as educator, Mann gave of himself unflinchingly in the face of financial hardship and hostility from the general public and some of his colleagues in the educational world.

His career contains for us elements of prophecy.

During his service in the Massachusetts Legislature, Mann championed what were for his day the most progressive of humanitarian reforms—issues which even to this day comprise some of the great public questions coming before the Congress for debate and review.

He advocated the principle of religious freedom. He tried to improve the lot of the mentally ill. He saw in the prison system an opportunity for enlightened rehabilitation rather than vengeful punishment. He even anticipated the present war on poverty with his own campaign to eliminate pauperism from his State.

His greatest energies, however, were in the field of education and for these accomplishments he is best known today. At a time when schools were generally exclusive, sectarian, and costly, he worked to achieve free, secular education for all Americans.

His was an overwhelming task, as historians point out. While Massachusetts was the most advanced of the States in education in his day, there was much room for improvement. The public schools were virtually without financial support. Textbooks and teaching methods were antiquated. Public school buildings were few and inadequate.

To these and many other problems, Horace Mann proposed and implemented solutions. His 12 annual reports, as secretary of the State board of education, are considered landmarks in American educational history.

Perhaps his most compelling argument in favor of the expenditure of public funds for schools was that education has a market value. He contended that "the aim of industry is served, and the wealth of the country is augmented, in proportion to the diffusion of knowledge."

He set out to convince Massachusetts' industrialists that educated labor far excelled ignorant labor in productivity and by 1848 the annual State appropriations for education had doubled and local taxation mushroomed.

In updating the curriculum, Mann insisted that education must have a practical value. He studied the problems of laborers, artisans, and machinists, then saw to it that courses of vocational study were offered which would prepare the people for their respective occupations.

Not only did he propose to educate youth for the problems of his own time.—

The history of the future—

He predicted—

is to be widely different from that of the past. The stream of time is changing its direction. * * * We must prepare ourselves to move with safety through the new realms we are now entering.

This wise statement might well be made today.

He attacked the problem of obtaining qualified teachers from two directions. First, he demanded higher pay and better working conditions for teachers. Second, he demanded that teachers be more thoroughly prepared for their profession, and to this end he sought the establishment of the first State normal school in Massachusetts in 1839.

He promoted conventions and institutes to help teachers to improve themselves professionally. He founded the Common School Journal both for the benefit of teachers and as a means of presenting his programs to the public. No group is more indebted for its professional standing and financial security than are the members of the teaching profession to Horace Mann.

In his baccalaureate address in 1859 a few weeks before his death, Mann told his Antioch students:

Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity.

Horace Mann was among those foresighted individuals of the last century who saw in a strong system of free public education a nation's priceless resource. This was his legacy, and as we look back on the achievements and dreams of this great educator, we do well to recall his wise admonition, as timely for our day as for his:

In our country and in our times no man is worthy of the honored name of statesman, who does not include the highest, practicable education of the people in all of his plans of administration.

I am proud indeed to join with the people of Franklin in commemorating the contributions of this great educator to Massachusetts and to the Nation. Horace Mann was one of our greatest Americans. He has brought enduring luster to Franklin and to all of us.

Remarks of the President to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Constitution Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix the eloquent remarks of President Lyndon B. Johnson on April 27, 1964, to delegates attending the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington, D.C.

President Johnson's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CONSTITUTION HALL

(As actually delivered)

Thank you very much.

I suppose it might not be entirely accurate to greet you as "My fellow Democrats," but I am very proud to welcome you to your Capital City as my fellow Americans.

Last week the railroad dispute was settled without a strike, and without compulsion.

The previous week it was announced that our gross national product had reached $608½ billion in the first quarter of this year after the longest period of uninterrupted prosperity in the peacetime history of America.

A few weeks ago, since I became President, the largest tax cut in all American history, almost two centuries, went into effect for American families and for American private enterprise. I understand that some of you here have an interest in taxes. But I must apologize to you this morning. We haven't done anything for business this week.

You know, Vice President Barkley told the story about the man whose son went to West Point. He got his brother a veteran's pension, he gave his daughter a job in the office, and finally he went back and the old man was fighting him and just giving him thunder in the campaign working for his opponent. He said, "How could you do this to me? Here are all the things I have done for you."

He said, "Yes, but you haven't done anything lately."

No, we haven't done anything yet this week, but please remember, this is only Monday morning.

Times are good. As I told your new president when he came down on the plane with me the other day from New York, it is awfully good to be here with you.

Twenty-seven years ago this month I came here as a newly elected Congressman aboard the train with the President. I like to remind my old and dear friend HARRY BYRD that he and I both arrived in Washington and are both still here, and about the only two original New Dealers that are still around.

Washington has changed very little since then. Not long ago I called in one of the very bright and very busy young men I have working with me, and I said to him, rather brusquely, because I was in a hurry, "The people want to know what we are going to do about the farm bill. Let's get our recommendations up right away." He came right back and said, "Mr. President, I don't think we have to consider that. I don't have a file on it. I will look it up, but I think you ought to go tell them if we owe it, we will pay it."

If Washington has changed a little, the country has changed much, and what the country wants and what the country requires and what our national leadership in your National Capital requires, I think you ought to know that it must change from time to time.

A CHANGING NATION

So this morning I want to follow the advice George Washington, our first President, once gave when he said, "Let your discourse with men of business be short and comprehensive." So in these last 150 days of my administration, 5 months, your national leadership has sought to serve the changing needs and the hopes of a changing nation.

Each year for the last 3 years, with the growing population, with new demands and new needs upon us, our local and our State budgets have materially increased over the country. I think it is only natural that our national budget would increase. I hope, as you talk about budgets, that you think of your own budget and what has happened to it over the last 10 years.

During the last 3 years, our budget increased because of increase in population about $5 billion per year, until it got in the general vicinity of $100 billion and 190 million people and a world of 3 billion that we are dealing with.

When I came into office, I had 37 days to wrap up a budget involving $100 billion. The budget last year was $98.8 billion. If I increased it $5 billion, and we have a number of built-in increases like military pay raises—it was already voted; we had no choice; we had to pay them—that budget would be $103.8 billion if we followed the normal, natural, ordinary course that we had followed the last 3 years.

After 37 days and nights, we brought that budget down to $98.9 billion. In other words, we cut last year's budget—the expenditures that we made last year. We asked Congress to give us only enough money to expend this year and we reduced that budget of last year, not increased it by $5 billion, but reduced it by $1 billion. That budget does not go into effect until June 30 of this year. We have to submit it and the Congress has to approve it and take each one of 15 appropriation bills. But we did not ask for $5 billion additional. We asked for $1 billion less.

In doing that, we cut last year's deficit in half. Last year our deficit between our expenditures and our income was in the neighborhood of $9 billion. We proposed to cut that deficit from $9 billion to $4½ billion.

Next, we cut Federal employment. This March—and it is difficult in rising population with increased needs, with State and local governments' expenditures and employment going up like that—to hold to where you are. We cut Federal employment, March of this year, below March last year by some 13,000. That is not much, but I would have thrown my hat to the ceiling if it had just been 1, and I am taking pleasure in delivering a letter to Senator BYRD today, telling him at least 1 month, the month of March, we have 13,000 employees less than we had last year.

When my budget does get into effect on June 30, I think we will materially reduce employees all across the board. One of the reasons for that is Secretary McNamara cut approximately 1,000 out, which had already been appropriated out for, and budgeted for, by closing installations. We closed 1 installation and got 100,000 letters of protest.

I don't know what you think about it, but I do hope that if you are interested in cutting the number of employees and reducing expenditures and operating a wise and frugal and thrifty Government, that you, too, will write once in a while.

CUTTING OUT WASTE

We are cutting waste where we find it. We are cutting inefficiency where we can prove it. We are cutting out the nonessentials so we can better support what is essential. We are determined the people shall have what they need and we hope to have a frugal and thrifty Government, striving for a dollar's value for every dollar spent, a dollar's return for every dollar invested. That was a statement I made 24 hours after I took office. That is a statement I repeat every day to my Cabinet, to my administrators, and to anyone else who will listen to me.

In doing what we have done, we have endeavored to shut down unneeded installations of other wars. We have closed down some obsolete, unnecessary, what you might call illustrative cavalry forts in this missile age. They have been carried over from other times and other needs, but no one has really walked in and said, "I am pulling down the curtain." We have done that so we can sustain the muscle of our might, to have more missiles for these times and the times to come.

I can tell you with positive assurance that your country has never been stronger militarily than it is at this hour. I can tell you without the slightest fear of contradiction for the next months that I am going to be in this office we are determined to keep it that way. We are always going to keep our guard up, but our hand out, searching for some way to avoid a nuclear holocaust. We are determined that no nation shall ever exceed us in preparedness, and none shall ever excel us in the pursuit of honorable peace, for we shall keep both our reason and our readiness at all times.

As this Nation can be reasonable without becoming restless in its relations with other nations, I believe earnestly and genuinely that this Government must be more frugal without becoming less compassionate here at home.

Private citizens and public officials don't have to be loose with the dollar to prove that they are liberals and progressives. They do not have to be callous to prove that they are conservative.

We cut on estimated needs of the military almost $10 billion before it ever got to the President. After it got to the President we cut more than $1 billion, and with other departments, more than $3 billion before we started putting back in. Then we added poverty in Appalachia and other things for hungry children and fathers with 11 children and who have only $20 on which to support them. We put back $2 billion, still staying under last year's budget by $1 billion, but if you take all of the money you are spending on poverty in Appalachia, it is just around 1 percent of the entire budget. I ask you—I ask you—aren't you willing to take a penny out of a dollar to try to make taxpayers out of tax eaters?

I came here this morning because I want you to be a part of this administration, of this Government, whether you are Democrats, Republicans, or whatnots. We have one big tent, and all America is welcome until November, and we will welcome everybody then, but we will expect some of you to go across the street.

This administration is determined to begin on building a great society for tomorrow, something that you can proudly—and Mr. Carey and Mr. Neilan can proudly—say "I was a part of that. I put in the first stone. I helped build that society," something that you can look back on for generations and say, "I was there when it happened," and your people can point—"My great uncle or cousin or aunt or grandpa or grandma had a part to do in that."

THE UNEMPLOYED

We must do those things that are undone and we must fill those needs that are unfilled. Having done what we have done in this generation to make freedom safe from aggressors, I believe that we must move with courage to keep freedom safe from erosion from within, by poverty, by despair, by disease and by poor schools and by poor slums. I don't know how many of you live on the side of the tracks where you even see this. I wish you could have gone with me and looked into their eyes and seen the faith and hope that they have in their country, when I traveled into Pittsburgh and saw the unemployed steelworkers, and into South Bend and saw the 8,300 men all of whom lost their jobs Christmas Eve—auto workers—and into West Virginia and saw the unemployed coal miners. One man with 11 children told me he had 4 days work last month at $4.50 a day, not because he does not work, but because it is not there.

I have gone into these schools and these slums and I have seen these insidious enemies of a stable economy and the ones that really promote inflation and recession. I want to tell you that no segment of our society has a greater stake in these people than folks who are well enough and can

afford to come to Washington and belong to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I talked to an old friend of mine the other day whose brother brought me to Washington as a secretary at $260 a month 32 years ago. He owns the world's largest ranch and he does not have any trouble getting three meals a day, because he has oil and gas under practically every acre of it. But he had invested in some Latin American countries where the ancient enemies of mankind were still operating—disease and ignorance, and illiteracy—and guess what our conversation was about—not about the million acres he owned in the United States which it could have been about, not about the tax bill, but about the 60,000-acre ranch that he once owned in Cuba.

I never want to contemplate talking to the builders and the owners of America about something they once owned here, but before you get too cocky, please remember you are outnumbered in the world 17 to 1, and don't put it on a religious basis or on a numbers basis or on a class basis or on a race basis, because there are a good many more of them than there are of you. Please always remember that if we do nothing to wipe out these ancient enemies of ignorance, illiteracy, poverty, and disease, and if we allow them to accumulate—I saw three families in Inez, Ky. One had 11, one had 8, and one had 6. The father of one had finished the third grade. His boy had grown to 18 and he quit at the third grade too, and his girl quit at 17 in the third grade. I plead with him to please keep those children in school if he could.

If you don't remember anything else, I say to you, remember this becaues it is in the interest of each of you, regardless of what party you belong to and regardless of your balance sheet. If a peaceful revolution to get rid of these things—illiteracy, and these ancient enemies of mankind that stalk the earth where two-thirds of the masses are young and are clamoring and are parading and are protesting and demonstrating now for something to eat and wear, and health—if a peaceful change of these conditions is impossible, a violent change is inevitable. I am just as sure of that as I sit here.

In this political democracy, what you have and what you own and what you hope to acquire is not secure when there are men that are idle in their homes and there are young people adrift in the streets, and when there are thousands that are out of school and millions that are out of work, and the aged are lying embittered in their beds.

HOSPITAL COSTS FACING ELDERLY

This man told me that he sat up until 4 o'clock the morning before with his neighbor, who was 85. He should have been in a hospital. But during his working years he hadn't been permitted to put a dollar per month to match a dollar of his employer's in a fund which would take care of him, after he had worked 40 years, to pay his hospital bill. The Government would not have paid anything, but under a plan, if he could put in a dollar a month and his employer a dollar a month, and he went into the work market at 20 years old and he worked until he was 65, that would have been 45 years at $24 a year, which would have brought him about $1,100 or $1,200, and multiply that by 3.75 over what it earns over 45 years. You get about $4,000 that he would have had, but he is prohibited from doing that because his Government had not gotten that far along yet.

It is like the fellow down in my country—I want you to relax a little and not get too tense, because some of these things are distressing when you hear them—a man went up and bought five hams from him during the war. He charged him $3 a ham, and he gave him a $10 and a $5 bill and he said, "What about the stamps?" The old man lived over in the backwoods of Texas—not far from where I live—and he said, "What about the stamps?" and he said, "What stamps?" You had to get stamps to buy meat in those days. He said, "Well, the OPA stamps. How many stamps do I owe?" "Oh," he said, "You are talking about the O.P. & A. Well, we never did put that in down here."

We never have put in this program where a man can take a dollar a month out of his wages and his employer can put a dollar to match it, and that $2 will provide him at the end of 40 years $4,000 to pay his hospital bills. What he has saved then can pay his own doctor and he can select any doctor he wants to and what he has saved up he can pay on his doctor, but this will take care of his hospital.

Head as well as heart tells us if we look in the head and have good judgment, we will act now. The poverty of other people is already a mounting burden. How much? You are now paying $4 billion a year for public assistance. You are now paying $8 billion a year for police and health and fire departments. The costs are high and they are going higher and higher. Unless you attack the causes of poverty itself, you are going to be shoveling it out to the taxeaters instead of producing and training taxpayers.

I went in this eastern Kentucky town and I was real stimulated to see 600 people being trained. Fifty of them were in a cosmetology class, learning how to fix up ladies' hair, and all of them will have a job when they get out. Another sizable group was in an auto mechanics class, and I said, "What is that great big piece of steel?" and he said, "That is the rear end of a truck."

We are teaching those people who have no skills some skills, and it is costing us $31 a week for them to do it so they can live. But when they get off at the end of 1 year, they will be able to hold a job, and we have a good many more jobs in a good many more classifications than we have people to fill. So if the 9 million families who are poor can earn just $3,000 a year, personal income would climb more than $11 billion per year. All of those people would become taxpayers having deducts made to their checks instead of taxeaters from the deducts from your check.

This is only one simple example that I am giving you. Waste is not unique to Washington. Neither is it only the product of what Government does. Sometimes greater waste comes from a society and what that society leaves undone. Racial and religious discrimination last year, according to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, cost us $15 billion because we wanted to say a Negro or a Mexican or somebody else couldn't work at this kind of a job. Unused or underused manpower costs us even more, and that is why this administration is dedicated to lifting off the burdens which weigh down our national productivity, our national expansion, and our national prosperity.

You know, business has changed since the 1930's, and I can tell you that Government has changed since that time, too. How has business changed?

CONDITION OF BUSINESS

Corporation profits after taxes, when I came to Washington in late 1931, for the year 1932, every corporation in this country, after they paid their taxes, had a net loss of 3\frac{1}{10}$ billion. Now, that was a conservative Government. Mr. Hoover wasn't responsible for all the things that happened, but no one ever charged him with being adventuresome, reckless, and wasteful, but they lost 3\frac{1}{10}$ billion, all of the corporations of America.

Ten years later, in 1942, we changed that loss and made $9½ billion, all of the corporations. That is after taxes, because people talk a lot about taxes these days, but after the taxes were paid they made $9½ billion in 1942.

In 1952, it stepped up to $17.2 billion. I am not talking about administrations, because it is almost double there, and that was President Eisenhower's administration—1942 was ours and 1952 was his—but in 10 years—that was the year he was elected, 1952—but our prosperity continued during his 8 years, with a couple of recessions, where, in 1962, corporation profits after taxes—all of you feel sorry for yourselves now—all of you have a martyr complex and all of you think you are mistreated and all of you who haven't this experience of once owning a 60,000-acre ranch and not owning it any more, I want to show you how bad off you are—you made $24,600 million in 1962, up 17 to 24 from 1952 to 1962.

In 1 year, from 1962 to 1963, it jumped to $27.1 billion, and it is estimated for 1964 to be $30 billion after taxes.

The return on the net worth for the average railroad—and I am getting to be an expert on railroads these last few days—the return they made on their net worth—and they are down at the bottom of the heap, was 2.2 in 1961 but that jumped to 3.7 in 1963, almost double. But on this $27 billion, which is going to be $30 billion this year, the return on net worth for all manufacturing companies was 10 percent. That is the average in the United States.

Now, the first 311 corporations that have been tabulated that reported to the Federal Reserve, a very nonpartisan organization and a very sound organization led by a very able man, Mr. William McChesney Martin, who served under many administrations, the first 311 corporations tabulated this first quarter, January, February, and March, show a 23-percent increase over the same period in 1963. That is what the first quarter in 1964 looks like.

So, in this new day, I do not accept the viewpoint on either side that business and Government are inherently hostile opponents. We would work much closer together if we didn't have some public relations men and mimeographing machines getting statements out for each of us, trying to get our name in the paper and show that we attack somebody.

I remember the Bond Club asked Mr. Rayburn to come and speak to them after he introduced that death sentence amendment, the Holding Company Act, in 1935. They called it a death sentence. It would kill all of them. It didn't kill any of them. They all got richer, but it kept them from swindling a bunch of widow women.

They wanted to be nice to him 1 day when he was presiding over a hearing. They said, "Why don't you come up to New York some time and make a speech?" He felt like making a speech to the Bond Club like I felt like coming to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He was a little bit kind of like a mule, you are trying to put the bridle on and he is a little bit shy and holding back, but he accepted and I thought of what he said when Mr. Carey said he was awfully disappointed I was not going to make it over here, and I thought I couldn't make it here because I have a rough schedule today.

When he was flying back with me, he said, "I just think you ought to come and let us know each other better." I thought about what Mr. Rayburn said. He told them, "Yes, he would come right in the middle of that big fight." He went up there and the fellow that introduced him was a little embarrassed. He was not President and they couldn't do like they did this morning and just say "The President of the United States." You don't have to say any more. You don't have to say a good President, a bad President, a middle-sized President. You just say "The President," and that is the proper way to introduce the President. But I don't always do things the proper way, as you have observed in the newspapers.

There is something good that comes out of everything. When lightning struck Lady

Bird's plane out in Cleveland the other day, it scared us for a moment, but a lot of good came out of it. She is willing to start riding with me again now.

I told Dick Nixon the other night when I went out to Chicago to speak—I met Dick coming back from Vietnam and Rockefeller and Goldwater going out—and I hope they are not too disappointed if we do well out there, because it is all our boys, all of our country, but I told Dick that from now on I didn't know whether I was—I was at the Gridiron Club and they were roasting all of us. I said I don't know whether a fellow is safer being a guest of the newspaper people or whether he is worse off having them as his guests.

But anyway, we put in a new rule at the LBJ Ranch if I ever get to go down there—I have just been down there twice in 5 months. A crisis seems to develop every week, nearly, and they would really ruin me if I happened to be there when a crisis developed, but I will tell you one thing for sure: If any of you show up at the LBJ Ranch, we have some new rules. Everybody is going to walk from now on, and I am going to do what Lady Bird tells me, and we are going to make everybody drink nothing but pure rain water or Pepsi-Cola.

No, I was saying that there is not anything inherently wrong with business and government, along with labor and agriculture and the public at large getting along, that they are inseparable partners in building a more prosperous America.

NEED FOR COOPERATION

Some people say I talk out of both sides of my mouth. I don't know why you have to be antiworkingman and promanager or antimanager and proworkingman because they all three, the capitalist, the manager, and the workingman go together to make up the profit system, and this is the free enterprise system. So tomorrow I am having Mr. Carey, your executive vice president, and a hundred other businessmen to talk about how to keep from raising prices so that inflation won't eat the dollar away and make it a soft dollar instead of a hard dollar, where it will be worth something to you, where you won't have the condition repeated where 10 years ago you buy a house for $10,000 and that house would now cost $22,000, that same house.

Each one of us, with the profits we are making, we are going to try to reduce prices a teeny weeny bit or hold prices where they are, and then I am going to call in the leaders of the workingmen of this country this same week and tell them the same thing. That may be talking out of both sides of your mouth, but the way I feel about it, I am President of all the people.

When this administration came into office, the Nation faced a recession and the challenge of high unemployment. The first thing I did was to reject the expedient of make-work sedatives. I have seen the WPA. I worked very closely with it back in 1933, 1934, and 1935, but instead of having make-work sedatives, I wanted to go after the causes and I wanted to produce a cure, and I think you know the record.

Now, what is the record? The revision of the depreciation schedule was made in 1962. That is for the taxpayers and it was a wise one, and a beneficial one, and it has helped the Government.

There was the Investment Tax Credit that same year. We have had the tax cut this year, the biggest one in the 188 years of history, 175 since you had a President.

We have the Trade Expansion Act to keep American producers competitive in world markets where we can sell something besides just ourselves, and the increasingly successful attack on our balance-of-payments deficit.

The first quarter is always better, and you can't judge the other quarters by the first, and it is not accurate and we are not sure, but I am telling you it makes me mad when I see the first quarter is about to balance out when we have had these huge losses. I said to Secretary McNamara only last night at dinner, "Please get some of your top colonels and generals out talking to these other countries about things they can buy in the way of equipment from us so we can get some of their money back over here.

ECONOMY DRIVE

We have a drive on in every agency of this Government and you may get tired about hearing about it—they already have—I see them leak to these cocktail columnists that run around to each one of these Cabinet departments, "What do you know that you can whisper to me?" and I see they say I talk a little rough to the Cabinet and the independent offices and they say a little corn, and they say I shouldn't be insisting on efficiency and economy and I drive them too hard, and I am going to get sick because I am working too hard, and all that stuff, but we are insisting on efficiency and economy because if we don't stop this spiral, the sky is the limit. We will go the way the other nations have done.

The emphasis, and all of our actions, are on the importance of private investment. All of these have borne fruit in the good times America is enjoying now. I know the total burden of Government at all levels is heavy. I ask you to remember that your Federal Government is large and your share of its burden great, but the expenses of the Federal Government haven't gone up like the State and city. You ought to look at how much they have increased, but your Federal Government has a position that no one else has—we have to stand and preserve freedom in our time.

When we cut the nuclear production the other day, our nuclear production was up here, and all of the targets we would be required to use it against are down here, and that is all we would need. I just cut it that much. I still have that much in between on the chart, that much safety valve. When I tried to do that, you have no idea how much effort, how they tried to hold me back, and they said, "You will lose 400 men in this man's district and he is running for reelection this year." I said, "I am not going to operate a WPA nuclear project or WPA Defense Department. Let's put that over in poverty and let's put that over in Appalachia where we are spending 1 percent of our budget, but let's don't put it over here in Defense where we are spending 50 percent of the budget. Let's have the bombers, the missiles, and the men and the marines that we need. I am not going to use it unless they are needed."

You know, a friend of mine is running for President, and he is higher up in the military than I am. He is a general, and I stayed in about 25 years and never got but one promotion. When I got to be President, I got mad and resigned. But when I quit I was the equivalent of about a major or a chicken colonel, but when Castro got upset and all frustrated and excited, you remember, down in Cuba and cut our water off, I got all these recommendations from these experts and I was new in the job and didn't know quite just how to handle everything, but they told me, "Land the marines. Send the marines in." I studied it over and figured it out and went home and talked to Lady Bird about it—we don't have to shoot from our hip and let's not just go berserk here, because Castro has talked in too strong a voice. Wouldn't it be better to send in one little admiral to cut that water off than to send in all of these marines to turn it on, and that is what we did. But that costs money, even that admiral or that battalion of marines.

You take away arms out of the Federal budget, the military costs, you take away the costs of the past wars, the veterans that are on pensions that lost their legs and arms, you take away the defense and the security items and this year, 1964, Federal purchases of goods and services to our national gross produce will be within one-half of 1 percent of what it was in 1929.

I want you to remember that. When you eliminate the war picture, the defense picture, the thing that is keeping you from having somebody rap on your door at midnight and click their boots and tell you "Get up in your gown and come out to a concentration camp," when you take away that protection, you are within one-half of 1 percent of 1929, and it is going to be lower than at any time in any postwar year.

A GOVERNMENT TO DEPEND ON

You have only one Government, and all of you rely on it a lot more than you realize. You rely on it in Panama and you rely on it in Guantanamo and you rely on it in Cyprus and you rely on it in Zanzibar and you rely on it in Brazil and you never know what moment you will need it. When you need it, you mean business, and you want it to come. If you wipe that out, you are doing just about what you are doing in the Federal Government in 1929. That is 25 years ago, and I challenge any rock-ribbed, private enterprise, freedom-loving member of the chamber of commerce, to tell me his budget is the same as it was 25 years ago, when his revenues had increased proportionately with ours.

So your task and mine is to make sure that that government functions, not to obstruct—you ought not to do that to us. You ought not to oppose. You ought not to prevent it from functioning.

I ask you what would happen to your business if each day your stockholders—and that is what you are in this Government—spent all day long, like one or two of them do at an annual board meeting, criticizing what you do and finding fault with everything you do, and resolutely against you every day, every week—just as fast as those mimeographs can turn them out.

Now, you are stockholders in this Government, and every time you hit me, I am the only President you have. You make me a little bit weaker to do the things that you have hired me to do. I don't expect to muffle criticism. Every one of you say we invite free speech in our country and we want free speech and we want criticism—don't you—every one of you do. But there is a limit to how much you want, and there is a ceiling on how much is good for you.

Most of these countries tear themselves to pieces fighting among themselves, and I have never even announced for the Presidency. I said I am going to stay in this job and be President to all of the people as long as I can. I am going to follow my political philosophy, which is this, and it is stated and written and almost in stone and steel:

PERSONAL CREDO

I am a freeman first, and I am proud I am free and I treasure it and I am glad of it. I am an American second, and you don't know how I appreciate the citizenship that goes with that flag. Being an American is the proudest thing you can be except being free and a public servant honored to be the President of all of the people, third, and a Democrat fourth—in that order.

I have been rejecting the political advice of experts for 32 years that I have been in this game, but I still have the old-fashioned feeling that if you will take care of the next generation, this generation will take care of you, and that is the kind of a course that I embarked on.

So this morning I would like specifically to ask your support, not in the election, but for a purpose that I regard as most vital. I will see you later about the election. Today, in the State and local governments throughout the land, there are 1,000 offices that pay more than the salary of a Cabinet officer. Now,

here are 9 or 10 men with the President who are responsible for whether we send in the Marines or send in an admiral, whether we handle $100 billion carefully—I don't know how many of you handle a billion—I know one corporation made $3½ billion profits this past year, and I was mighty proud to see them make it. It didn't hurt my feelings just a bit and I just thought it was a wonderful year—but these men are handling $100 billion for you. They are handling your children for you. They are handling your life for you, and they are handling your civil defense for your, and there are at least 1,000 of them in State and local governments that made more than they do.

There are at least 290 top appointive Federal executives receiving the same or less pay than a top career man that works under him. I don't know how many of you have people working under you that make more than you do, but that is what you have here with the best Cabinet that I have ever seen assembled here in Washington, and I can say so without bragging because I didn't appoint a single one of them.

Now, I am asking your support, and it is going to cost you very little, and it is going to save you a lot, and it is going to give you a great deal more protection. The middle-level positions pay less than half the comparable scales of business and industry. The few million dollars that the Johnson administration has proposed to correct these inequalities could be paid by an increase of one one-hundredth of 1 percent in the efficiency of the Federal management, and some of the top and most valuable men to me are out in my office now wanting to see me, because they are borrowing money, and can't stand it any longer, and want to go home, and I won't see them. I won't take their resignations. I am not looking for political patronage. I am looking for performance.

I don't want to give any figures, but one of the great economic advisers, one of the ablest men in Government, has to maintain two homes and three children in college and a sick wife, and he has borrowed $16,000 to serve the Government in the last 3 years, so he has to quit. He is giving up. He can get twice as much back in private business working for a university than you allow us to pay him.

Now, I am asking your support to do something about that for yourself, so it will show on your tax return, so I will have some good management, and we can catch corruption, we can stop it before it gets going, we can have some businesslike practices, and we can do a good job, and these men get half of what you pay yours.

Finally, I would say to you this: Whatever else you have—and you may not have much this morning—but you can go home and tell your friends that you have an independent, taxpaying, light-bill-saving President in the White House. You have one who has great faith in his country, because there is no other of the 120 lands where a man could come from where I was to where I am.

OPPORTUNITY

I have a little house where I was born, the son of a tenant farmer, a picture of which is hanging up in my bedroom, because every night when I go to bed and every morning when I wake up, I call it the opportunity house. No one could look at that house and the way it looks, and not say "There is still opportunity in America." So I have faith in America and what I want you to know is that I have faith in private enterprise because it is what made America.

What I know of opportunity and initiative and enterprise I learned from life itself. I started out at a dollar a day on a road gang, working for the lowest bidder. He tried to make up what he had left on the table out of us—and did. It was the best training I got.

I came here this morning to pledge Mr. Neilan and Mr. Carey and the rest of you good people in this organization your Government's restraint and responsibility and to pledge you a hand that means only to help, and I hope never to hinder so long as the public interest is being served. I ask from you only the same restraint in those decisions which you make which affect the general economic well-being, responsibility in choosing to support or not support the policies and proposals of the Government which serves all of the people. That is your business.

These last 27 years since I came here to Washington, representing half our economic history, in that span the material welfare of the average American has gained as much as in the years before, and I am determined that we shall set a course, and we shall hold to it, which will gain for all people more in the next 27 than we gained in the last 27.

I believe this strong and this rich and this successful Nation can bring peace to the world and I believe it so strongly I am going to work for it and fight for it and I hope get it.

I not only want to bring peace to the world, but I want to bring peace to all of our lives and think about the problems that keep you awake at night, and think about what you would do if you were the father of 11 and had 4 days' work, so I want to bring peace to all of our lives. I know you think that is a big order, but I am not going to shrink from it. I am going to work toward it.

They said in the railroad strike, "What are you going to do when the nogotiations bust up?" I said, "I am not thinking about that, because they are not going to bust up. We're going to settle it." They wanted me to threaten them with this and threaten them with that, and guesstimate on this and that, and I just never would do it. I said I was perfectly confident that if these railroad men that run the carriers don't know more about the railroad business than I do, then they have been overpaid for a long time. If these union men don't know more about the needs of their people than I do, they ought to get new union leaders. So if you have free, collective bargaining, let's get the Government out of it and lock the door and you sit down here and work it out and I am going to keep you here until you do.

Labor would raise this question, and carriers would raise that question every time they came in with a bunch of things that haunted them about what the Government might do or what they were doing. I just said there is only one thing I can tell you, and that is, get out your speech, write down your gripe, and the Government will give you a fair shake. I don't care if you are the biggest man in the land or the littlest man in the land, that is what we are going to do to you and go on back and settle this thing, and they did.

So this is the work of our generation, as I see it, yours and mine.

I must get back to your work at the White House and, I guess, let you get back to your work on me.

Polish Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, another years has come and gone, and once again, as we have done for many years now, we pause in our day's work to celebrate Polish Independence Day.

This day and occasion is always hallowed to me, and I am sure to other Members of the House, because it signifies the determined, persevering struggles of the great Polish people to be free, to be liberated from the bondage that encompasses them, from the slavery that binds them, from the tyranny that afflicts and persecutes them.

When will Poland be liberated is a question that we might well ask ourselves today.

Is it just a vain hope, as some believe, that will not be realized in our lifetime, or is it, as I and many others believe, an ever-present prospect that may come upon us sooner than we think, even with startling suddenness. Many favorable factors are working today on the side of Polish independence and freedom.

First, there is that age-old determination, that indomitable will, that dogged resolve never to give in to Communist oppression, that undimmed obstinacy to fight to the end, to rely on God and His help and on friends of the free world, and the great faith and courage which has been so characteristic of the Polish people throughout their long, eventful, tragic history, for who can excel the Polish in personal gallantry, what nation in this world has made greater sacrifices for freedom, for independence, for self-determination and the right to live their own free lives.

What people have been through more blood baths, massive slaughter, frightful suffering, long-sustained tragedy than the Polish?

What people has persevered so long against the great odds of hideous brutal force, against the armed might of godless, imperial masters, against the wiles and cunning of diabolical, ruthless Communist masters?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Poles have given to the world a great, enduring example of gallantry, valor, determination, and loyalty to ideals. Untutored and unsung, unequipped, unarmed for the most part, frequently betrayed and abandoned, often the victims of ruthless treachery so base as not to be duplicated in history, yet nothing could swerve, nothing could block, nothing could prevent the forward march of the Polish people toward their goals, nothing could break their spirit, their will to triumph in the end over their cruel masters.

Our Nation well knows the fine qualities of the Polish people because there are many of them here among us. They have been tested in the fierce crucible of war, they have served and labored in the calm days of peace, but always they have been trustworthy and just and patriotic, always they have come willingly and bravely to the support of the country and its ideals, and its principles, and its free way of life, and they have never given up reliance on prayer and the ultimate redemption of the precious spiritual and human values which the great nation of Poland and the Polish people have so ably fought for, and always represented, through the agonizing bitterness of treachery. Through bitter defeat, bloodshed and incredible suffering

the Polish people have stood unafraid—unconquered, and unconquerable.

It is that unyielding spirit that will one day before long free them from their oppressors and bring them once again into the company of the free world.

That is my hope for the great Polish nation and for their brave people today. Let us resolve today, Mr. Speaker, with all our hearts, to stand beside these people, to render them such help and support as we can. Our sympathy, yes, they are entitled to it always, but something more than just bare sympathy—some assurance of real, tangible support, some willingness on our part ot take some sustained, affirmative action in the diplomatic councils of the world, to help this small, proud, great nation to regain its cherished freedom and be able once again to say, as many other nations can say: "This is my own, my native land. Its soil is saturated with the blood of my people who have died in the struggle to be free. Once again, the great Poland is free, independent and standing on its own feet, proud and dauntless."

And today, let the message ring out clarion clear to the Polish people and throughout the world—We are with you. We will remain with you speeding the dawn of your freedom. May it soon come, we pray.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Challenge Is Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address given by C. Everett Murphy, sovereign grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the World, at Arlington Cemetery, Washington, D.C., at the ceremonies of the pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, sponsored by Odd Fellow and Rebekah lodges from the State of Virginia and District of Columbia, with the approval of the Sovereign Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows—May 3, 1964:

CHALLENGE IS OUR HERITAGE

Man's life is passed on to other men, and the strength of each generation is dependent upon the faith, industry, valor, and vision of the generation preceding.

As we stand near the tombs of unknown American dead, and a short distance removed, the monument to an unknown Canadian soldier, we are so vividly reminded of a great truth which poets and psalmists have written about, and philosophers and statesmen have spoken about—that indeed each generation depends upon the other for strength and fortitude and wisdom with which to build and create.

How unfortunate for man that he is so slow to accept this truth, and must find the equation of this truth in and through the bitter fruits of war.

Each of our dead represented on the green hills of Arlington this afternoon, by the many hundreds of markers—humanity from all walks of life—the laborer, the lawyer, the businessman, the teacher, the professional soldier—the magnificent general who represented our way of life on the many battlefields of past wars—the courageous John F. Kennedy, would all join in one great chorus with our unknown whom we especially honor, in speaking to us in this silent moment where midst the whisper of the soft winds, the song of birds, and the gallantry of God's creation and say to us in no uncertain terms, that happy and joyous living has but one simple rule, such being the love of man for each other, for love is the only intangible part of our human makeup that can replace hate.

If only we as a people of this great and blessed continent would soon learn that if we would but banish bitterness and hate from our hearts as peoples of this part of the world, our personality as nations would captivate the world about, and the ugly evil of fear and distrust would vanish, and we could soon say to those less educated, less governed and with less economic capability, let us sit down together and reason our problems.

History points out to us very vividly that the average age of a civilization is 200 years. The civilization of which we are indelibly a part will soon reach this point and the question is—shall we survive, and if we do not—what of the future?

In thinking of the future I have great faith as do each of you. I have faith that somewhere in the great beyond there is a God—who controls the universe, and He is just as concerned about the lowly songbird as He is the great seas, but most of all He is concerned about the creation He made in his own image and if we permit ourselves to be destroyed, it will be because we lose our goals and fail to pay heed to what the past has taught us.

It would be tragic indeed and perhaps an impossibility and a likely improbability that another civilization would arise from the rubble we would leave.

We have learned that it isn't our big tall buildings, it isn't our showplaces, our roads, our modern offices, our outstanding achievements in agriculture and science and business which have made our continent great; rather, it is the sturdy, determined people who make up this part of the world who have an abiding faith and who realize that all these things we have discussed are merely temples that we have built, but the greatest temple of all is the aggregate of all our men, women and children and their philosophy, a temple not made by hands, but a temple eternal whose foundation is truth.

In this connection it is an evident truth that human life may only be continued through family life where great truths are learned from a dedicated father, and a concerned and loving mother, who carry on the great traditions of family and country—this, my friends, is what makes a country or continent great.

Such simple things as going after a lost child; tunneling in a mine to rescue lost miners; helping distressed in time of floods and earthquake; plowing the field of a neighbor who is ill and giving of our time and money to build educational and charitable institutions without thought of pay—such as erecting monuments to symbolize our thirst for world peace; endowing scientific research, providing educational programs for boys and girls and doing those things which require sacrifice on our part is the tradition of our way of life of which I speak, and if honor comes to us, such comes because of our dedication and not because we have sought such.

We believe that this question of a surviving civilization which thought is more serious than the mere speaking of words—for the sake of words—may only be answered if the economic and social advances thus far achieved can be applied so that the individuality of the individual man and his family whoever he is are preserved as a sacred trust of our creator * * *. That only if the dignity of a man as an individual is assured can there be an assured future, for the past tells us whenever man has become the pawn of kings, and dictators and the slaves of potentates, he lost his initiative to produce and production is essential to a great civilization.

We of this continent have been used to challenges since our forefathers began to toil in this great part of the world, and as sons and daughters of great men and women who feared God, we will accept the challenge of our heritage.

We will not be like the "blue jay" who had gone after his daily worm, but one day looking down at a fisherman with a bucket of worms, made a deal with the fisherman to trade a feather for a worm each day so that he would not have to go out and hunt for his food, and everything went well until he had traded his last feather and couldn't fly.

As were our soldiers, sailors and marines, and men and women of all branches of our services, whether of Canada or the United States, taught to love God, country and home, and the church of their choice, and to love their fellow men—so we will preserve this tradition by teaching our generation of these great truths and help to build a solid foundation for the future.

The story is told of the soldier on the white horse during the War Between the States, where a son became a member of the Confederate forces and his father was an Union officer, because of the differences in political beliefs of that time—never dreaming that as a soldier he would be called upon to make a momentous decision when the battle was going against his forces, and it is said in the thick of the battle he saw an officer on a white horse about to make a move that would be decisive, and obeying an order to shoot, he did, only to discover to his horror, that the officer on the white horse was his father.

War is hell—it not only takes life but destroys dreams of innocent men, women and children; it disrupts future plans and hopes—it requires billions in expenditures, and I believe the big problem today is not to get to the Moon before others for military purposes; is not to determine if Mars has life; is not to control weather by man's ingenuity, but with all our background and wisdom given us by previous generations to find a way to understand each other. If it takes millions or billions to do this then millions and billions shouild be expended.

We may have to go to the Moon and Mars and encourage others to go and spend ourselves into bankruptcy before we learn this great truth, for somewhere out there in the great beyond a Russian and an American might find themselves alone, perhaps with a Chinese, or a Frenchman and have to join hands and put their ingenuity and cleverness together in order to get back home.

There is a certainty today that our greatness, if we possess greatness has been because of our belief in God. An atheist, if there is truly an atheist could never have inspired men to battle for a cause so great as was the cause for which each military man died—a cause of freemen and women, where all nations and tongues and creeds may live in a world and share freely of its bounty.

I am sure that more prayers have gone up from the lips of brave men in trenches, on the seas and in the air for help and guidance than has ever been the solicitude of one who had no belief.

We are proud to be a part of a continent where in every motto there is something to remind us of our eternal allegiance to a heavenly Creator. We are proud to say in God we trust—that a nation under God is working to make a better world, and so we pray today with the spirits of our unknown dead and others who have been just as gallant and sing with a full heart, "Oh beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountains' majesty, above a fruited plain—oh world and all the earth, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea."

And with this prayer and song in our heart we can look at each new day and give

thanks for living in an area of the world where truth and freedom reign, and where God binds Himself to His creatures on the scroll of heaven with the rainbow as His seal, and then we will know that we will be sons and daughters of the world who will not be afraid to beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks for we will surely say as did a young man once—I cannot really understand the mind of man, I can only try, and if I cannot understand the mind of man how can I understand the mind of God, all I know is that I have faith in God, and with this faith, we will and must meet square ahead the years of our future.

Hope in Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, approval of an adequate appropriations for economic development and assistance for 10 States in the Appalachian mountain region should receive the highest priority and the President's program should be approved and implemented.

While our country is enjoying prosperity in many areas, the Appalachian region needs the economic boost to remove the pockets of poverty that straddle this 10-State area of our country. Helping citizens to help themselves should be a prime interest of a people's government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean—a great newspaper in my State—dated May 3, last, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

HOPE IN APPALACHIA

President Johnson has asked Congress for $228 million for economic development of 10 States in the Appalachian Mountain region, including parts of Tennessee.

The need for this assistance is great and Congress should lose no time in considering the bill.

Too little human potential is realized in the mountain region, Mr. Johnson said. The desolation of the people is great and hope has been all but extinguished by years of grinding poverty.

The President is being both practical and humane in emphasizing the need to restore confidence and hope to these people and thereby assist them to become dependent upon their own talent and resources instead of a periodic Government dole.

While the Nation has made much progress in recent months toward a booming prosperity—a prosperity that benefits a great majority of the people and not just the select few—this progress has bypassed the people of Appalachia.

The Nation cannot stand by and permit this small but deserving minority of citizens to be deprived of some of the bounties of this prosperous era, despite the critics of President Johnson's antipoverty campaign and their chief spokesman, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Senator GOLDWATER claims that American business leaders—in showing their optimism over the President's plan for a rising economy for all citizens—are being "taken in by the Johnson administration."

Prosperity that provides a decent living standard for the ordinary citizen is something that Senator GOLDWATER cannot understand. He seems to have acquired the philosophy that the only kind of prosperity that is deserved is that which is inherited, and any effort of the Government to relieve the misery of some of its citizens is to him "the Santa Claus of the government handout."

This must be the reason Senator GOLDWATER seems to feel he has been betrayed by the Nation's business leaders when they indicate a willingness to follow Mr. Johnson's plan and add to their own profits by helping to build a prosperous Nation for all people.

County Residents Pay $1.65 for Every $1 of Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 19th Congressional District are all good citizens and are willing to do their part in providing for a better America.

As I travel the district talking to constituents I sense a feeling of unrest and alarm at the continual growth of Federal controls and projects. There have been a number of questions asked as to how far our Federal Government plans to go in attempting to set up programs for everyone and just how expensive are these programs to the average taxpayer.

An article appearing in the Rock Island (Illinois) Argus, April 30, 1964, gives part of the answer and vividly points out that insofar as Rock Island County is concerned it is costing the citizens of this county $1.65 for every dollar in Federal funds which is returned to the country.

While I have not had a chance to check the figures for other counties in the district I dare say one would find the same sort of diminishing return.

I recommend the attached news story for your reading and suggest other Members make a comparison of figures in their own districts. Perhaps if we kept our tax dollars at home we could solve many of our local problems without asking for Federal aid.

The Washington Daily News points out that Federal, State, and local taxes take an average of 90 days' pay. May I remind you that this country was started by a group of people determined to escape confiscatory taxation.

COUNTY RESIDENTS PAY $1.65 FOR EVERY $1 OF FEDERAL AID

NEW YORK.—As far as Rock Island County is concerned, the Federal aid program is a costly proposition.

Local residents are paying more toward the program, through their taxes, than are people in most parts of the country and are getting back less.

For every dollar that Washington allots to the local area, for public housing, libraries, job training, urban renewal, hospital construction, scholarships, and the many other aid projects sponsored by the Government, the cost, locally, is $1.65.

The finding is based on a new study made by the Tax Foundation, a nonprofit research organization here, on the State-by-State allocation of Federal grants-in-aid. Its figures are for the fiscal year 1963.

It shows that the various aid programs throughout the Nation amounted to $5.3 billion in the year, not counting what was spent for highway and road construction.

TAX, GRANT TOTALS

In 19 of the States, taxpayers paid more than a dollar for each dollar of aid received. As for the other States, one broke even and 30 got back more than they paid out.

The figures indicate that approximately $5,365,000 of the taxes collected from Rock Island County residents went into the aid program. An estimated $3,248,000 came back in the form of Federal grants.

Thus, only about 61 percent of the money sent to Washington from the local area made the return trip.

From the State of Illinois as a whole, $372,300,000 was sent as compared with $225,-300,000 that came back in grants.

The remainder was used, after deduction for administration expenses, in the poorer sections of the country on the ground that it should be distributed according to need and not on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

As a result, communities in two of the States received $1 in aid for every 25 cents they contributed.

The grants-in-aid program has been growing larger and larger each year, the Tax Foundation reports. It is now about three times the size that it was in 1954.

Just how far reaching it has become is evidenced by the fact that it takes a 63-page book to list the kinds of projects for which Federal funds are available.

The book, published by the Area Redevelopment Administration, is entitled "Handbook of Federal Aids to Communities."

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am besieged with requests for more of Art Hoppe's columns, and expressions of interest in his style of political satire of goings-on in and around Washington and other parts of the world.

Four of his articles which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on April 23, 24, 27, and May 1, 1964, follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 23, 1964]

WILL THE DOGS GO TO ELBIE JAY?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? It's time for another, rip-snortin' tee-vee visit with the rootin-tootin' Jay Family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, a very kindly cow puncher. For a man who punches cows.

But as we join up with Elbie tonight, he's in a heap o' trouble. That's him, agettin' ready to go on a tee-vee program in that big white house back East. And those fellers, a-pacin' back and forth, are what's called "party leaders." My, they look worried.

ELBIE. I still don't see why I got to go on this here special tee-vee program. All I did was pose for the photographers, a-picking up my little old puppy dog.

FIRST LEADER (groaning). By the ears.

SECOND LEADER (moaning). That picture will cost us the election. We've still got

97.2 percent of labor, business, the Negroes, the Southerners, the farmers, and the consumers. But we've lost the dog lovers. And as the dog lovers go, so goes the Nation.

THIRD LEADER (bemoaning). Our only hope is this special television appeal.

ELBIE. But I explained at the time why I pick up puppy dogs that way. It's because, I said, I like to hear them yelp.

LEADERS (together). Yelp!

ELBIE (admiringly). You fellows have got that down right good. Isn't it a pretty sound? Reminds me of down home.

FIRST LEADER (groaning). Please, we never pick up a dog by the ears here in the East. Why didn't you raise rabbits instead? Or beat your wife? Or something we could explain. Well, there's nothing for it. Just go on camera with your fine family there and tell an alarmed Nation how kindly you are. Ready, Birdie Bird? And Myna Bird? And Bye-bye Birdie? And Checkers?

ELBIE. Checkers? That dog's name's not Checkers.

SECOND LEADER. It is now. We wanted some nostalgia on this show. Okay, roll 'em.

ELBIE (sincerely into the camera). Evening, folks. Mind if I mosey into your living rooms a spell? Because I want to tell you tonight how kindly I am. "Kindlier than a hourd's tooth," they call me.

FIRST LEADER (whispering from off camera). Good, good!

ELBIE (encouraged). Yes, sir, folks. Notice how my wife Birdie Bird's not wearing any of those furs which require killing little animals. No, sir, she's wearing a good SPCA cloth coat. And my little puppy dog's ears aren't an inch longer than when we left home.

SECOND LEADER (whispering). Great, great! Now, pick up the dog fondly. But, remember, not by the ears!

ELBIE (nodding). No, sir, friends, I always lift up dogs the way the kindly Eastern folks do. See? (As he holds the dog up for display it lets out earsplitting squeals and kicks over cameras and lights.)

THIRD LEADER (emerging from wreckage sadly). Well, wait till 1968. But tell me one thing: why did you pick up that dog by the tail?

ELBIE (puzzled). Now, friend, how many handles you think a dog's got? (With a smile of sheer delight.) But wasn't that the prettiest sound you ever did hear?

Well, folks, that's all for tonight. Except for this bipartisan message to dog lovers and Elbie lovers alike: Chip in now for our fund to buy ol' Elbie a brand new dog. Yep, friends, for his own good we're going to surprise him. With a Great Dane.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 24, 1964]

NOBODY IS THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Joy reigns supreme at the nobody for President headquarters. And alarm is rife among backers of the other hopefuls. Watch them as they privately assess their candidates' qualifications. Invariably they shake their heads and conclude worriedly: "Nobody's perfect."

And indeed he is. Stack him up against the other candidates and he outshines them all.

Take Mr. GOLDWATER. Even the most fervent rightwinger, when pressed, will admit that nobody is more ready to fight than the Senator. Obviously piqued, Mr. GOLDWATER's changed tactics and is now telling everyone that actually he's "a peacemonger, probably the best you ever saw." An idle campaign boast. For the truth is that the Senator can't out-peace-monger nobody.

Not only is nobody a genuinely belligerent peacemonger, but nobody has also taken a safer stand on the issues than Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. Who hasn't taken one yet. While this clever strategy has shot Mr. Lodge to the No. 1 spot in the popularity polls, rest assured that nobody can top that.

As for Mr. Rockefeller, he doesn't stand a chance against our tiger. Not, that is, after we distribute our latest campaign brochure describing our candidate's family life under the simple, moving title: "Nobody Has a Perfect Marriage."

Due unquestionably to these factors, nobody has emerged overnight as a front runner for the GOP nomination. Consequently, there is talk among party strategists of emulating this success and finding some other nobody to run for President. Those mentioned include Mr. Scranton, Mr. Romney, Mr. Stassen and Mr. J. Alfred Prufrock, a Sioux Falls cabdriver. However, all surveys of the man on the street show that compared with these candidates, nobody is more unheard of.

Actually the one opponent we fear most is Mr. Nixon. For while the party at the moment is looking forward grimly to defeat in November, it naturally wishes an experienced leader. And unfortunately, when it comes to experience at being defeated, nobody is second to Mr. Nixon. This explains, of course, why so many experts currently predict the latter will get the nomination. Somehow.

Therefore, it is high time to issue a flat denial of scurrilous reports that nobody is really for Mr. Nixon. These undoubtedly stem from the impression Mr. Nixon gives that nobody is his second choice. But when it comes to secret deals in politics, you may take our sacred word that nobody is simon pure.

Moreover, as the campaign unfolds, enthusiasm for nobody mounts. And while all the candidates publicly predict victory for themselves, it is obvious to an impartial observer that nobody, deep in his heart, means it.

Thus, we millions of little nobodies who support nobody envision a dramatic scene at the convention. The delegates, after listening to all the nominating speeches, will spontaneously begin to chant: "We Want Nobody. We Want Nobody." And nobody will win in a landslide. For at conventions, as you know, a genuine draft is invariably stirred up for nobody.

Yes sir, if there's one thing this campaign's proved so far, it's that in these times of overexposure every candidate has some handicap. Or, as we joyfully say down at headquarters: "In politics today, you can't beat nobody with somebody."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 27, 1964]

THREE CHEERS FOR NOBODY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

In one of the most startling political developments in recent weeks, Nobody opened his campaign headquarters today.

It was a gala affair. Under a huge red, white, and blue sign reading "Nobody for President," a merry throng drank Nobody's beer, ate Nobody's pretzels, and cheered loudly for Nobody.

As is customary at such affairs, Nobody made a fighting speech which swept the crowd of its feet. He cited statistics showing that Nobody was a front runner at this time and "with the hard work and devotion of you people in the coming months" Nobody would win in November.

Stealing a leaf from the other candidates, the leading presidential hopeful promised higher wages, bigger profits, lower prices, more welfare, and reduced taxes. Business, labor, consumers, Negroes, and Dixiecrats alike," he said, "can unite with confidence under Nobody's banner. Remember," he told the hushed crowd in a ringing summation, "that Nobody is your friend."

And there was hardly a dry eye in the house as the big brass band struck up the campaign theme song: "I'm Nobody's Sweetheart Now."

Plain girls, wearing glasses and dowdy uniforms (who are known, of course, as Nobody's Sweethearts) passed out balloons, badges, and campaign literature to the singing, cheering supporters of Nobody.

An inquiring reporter, attempting to analyze this wave of enthusiasm for Nobody which has so dramatically marked the presidential campaign, conducted capsule interviews with adherents in the crowd.

"Why are us common people for Nobody?" said Mr. Algernon Browning-Swinburne, a truckdriver, thoughtfully. "Well, I think it's because Nobody's for us."

"Frankly," said Mr. H. William Way, a political scientist of no mean repute, "I believe it's due to the uncontestable fact that Nobody has a perfect political record."

"Past favors," snapped Miss Anne Thrope, an elderly spinster. "For 42 years I've been calling up city hall to complain. And whom do they send out every time? Nobody."

Others interviewed cited the candidate's winning personality. "Who stands up for you on the bus?" said one lady. "Who contributes to worthy charities without even asking if they're tax deductible?" said a do-gooder. "Who makes a sincere fight to pick up the lunch check?" said a businessman. "With the grave problems we face today," said an eager young student, "we must ask ourselves, who knows all the answers?"

Time and again, as these questions were raised, one name alone, needless to say, made the rafters ring.

And so it was that the Nobody-for-President campaign was officially launched. Pledging their wholehearted support, the fanatical followers of Nobody shoulders their placards and marched off to do battle, holding aloft their simple, moving, universally appealing slogan—a slogan that all present agreed has long been needed in American politics:

"Trust Nobody."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, May 1, 1964]

NOBODY TURNS FAT CATS AWAY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Confidence is running amok at the Nobody for President Headquarters. For there is no denying that, to date, Nobody has waged a perfect political campaign.

The reason, of course, is our candidate's experience. Take raising money. While others may claim theoretical knowledge of how to stage testimonial dinners and other fund-raising affairs, it is an undeniable fact that Nobody has been attending them for years.

Who in politics strives to be first to arrive at a reception? Nobody. Who, I ask you, wants to be last to leave? Nobody. And who listens to the speakers at Lincoln and Jackson Day dinners? Our candidate, that's who.

As a result of these many long and dreary evenings, Nobody has fearlessly inaugurated a new fund-raising technique guaranteed to spare the contributor, ennoble the candidate, and save money: the nonevent.

Reflect, if you will, on the $100-a-plate testimonial dinner. In the history of American politics, no one has ever left such an event without feeling cheated. Not to mention dyspeptic. But, thanks to Nobody, our Businessmen for Nobody Committee is even now arranging a new-type gala $100-a-plate Testimonial to Nobody. All you do is send them $100. And they send you a plate.

Think of the good will. You will be spared the agony of donning a stiff shirt, sawing on undercooked chicken, downing cold coffee, and suffering through 3 hours of speeches. Moreover, you get to keep the plate. And for masochists who like to listen to testimonial speeches, the committee will

throw in a 3-hour, long-playing record of a concrete mixer in action.

Not to be outdone, the Labor for Nobody Drive is sponsoring a fun-filled Traditional Box Lunch Picnic. Send in $10 and they will deliver to your door two traditional turkey sandwiches with suspect mayonnaise on stale bread. But, untraditionally, you can eat them anywhere you want with the friends of your choice. And, comparatively speaking, that will be a real picnic.

But perhaps the most joyous event will be the Happy Times No-Host Cocktail Party and Get Acquainted With Nobody Social Mixer, now being eagerly planned by the Young Nothings for Nobody. For $5 you will receive absolutely nothing by return mail. This entitles you to go down to your neighborhood tavern, get drunk, and try to pick up the barmaid. Good luck, one and all.

Among the many fund-raising festivities for special groups will be the House Tour of Your Very Own House for stay-at-homes; the Intimate Breakfasts With Nobody for sleepyheads; and the big White Elephant Bazaar for elephants who believe in racial segregation.

So pick out the gay nonevent you wish to avoid most. Make plans now to stay away. Think of the suffering you won't go through. And in gratitude won't you send in your blank check to Nobody for President Headquarters today?

We're expecting a flood of donations in the mail. Yes, sir, we're confidently predicting that the vast majority of voters will give generously, as in past years, to Nobody's cause. And when you stop to think of what the other candidates make their contributors go through, it's no wonder.

The Hellenic Psyche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the continuing crisis between Greeks and Turks over Cyprus has tended to obscure encouraging developments in Greece. This ancient land, which last month celebrated the 143d anniversary of its War of Independence, has become, in the last decade, a stable democracy with a steadily improving economy.

At a time when many nations of the free world are troubled by either polarization or fragmentation in their political party system, Greece has now developed two large, responsible, pro-Western, democratic parties and, unlike other nations, there is a democratic alternative to either extreme right or extreme left.

At present, Greece is enjoying a modest economic boom, and it can ill afford a prolonged deflection of national energies nor an economic downturn in tourism or foreign investment. Because of deep ties of blood and emotion, Greece cannot be expected to abandon its brothers in Cyprus.

It is therefore hoped that Greece, with a stable and responsible government, will slowly assume a dominant voice among Greeks in the Cyprus crisis, rather than have its policy made or forced by irregular bands on that troubled island. Leadership and responsible voices from Athens can lead the way out of the crisis.

I now place in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a very interesting article on today's Greece, entitled, "The Hellenic Psyche." It is by Peter N. Marudas, and appeared in the Baltimore Sun of April 6, 1964.

THE STORY OF MODERN GREECE: THE HELLENIC PSYCHE

(By Peter N. Marudas)

Greece has just celebrated the 143d anniversary commemorating the start of her war of independence against the Ottoman Turk.

It was a rebellion which lasted roughly from 1821 to 1828 and it ended with the Greeks acting for the first time in nearly 375 years as masters of their own destiny.

During much of the last century and one-half of freedom, Greece has passed through perilous times characterized by many wars—some started to free enslaved countrymen—recurring political instability and in the modern era, the terror of both Nazi and Communist totalitarianism.

In 1964, however Greece undeniably finds herself in a much more peaceful and freer situation than on that fateful day in 1821 when the bishop of Patras, Germanos, raised the cry "Freedom or Death" proclaiming the rebellion.

Greeks, for the most part, live under one of the world's most democratic governmental systems and even though much of the country is still economically depressed, enjoy the highest standard of living in recent times.

But like many countries, particularly the small, Hellas is subject to those rapid turns of history which provide the true test of any nation's fortitude, strength, and imagination. At present, there is no lack of such challenges.

Most important, of course, has been the resumption of hostilities on Cyprus following 3 years of tenuous peace between the island's Greek and Turkisk populations. The Mediterranean's third largest island is considered by most Greeks as the last outpost of unredeemed Hellenism. Although administratively never a part of any modern Greek state, the people of Cyprus—some 82 percent—are preponderantly Greek in culture, religion, and language. For years, Greece has sought to obtain the island, only to be foiled by the realities of international politics.

Several years ago, she was engaged in a diplomatic deadlock with Great Britain and Turkey over the fate of Cyprus, and finally under extreme Anglo-American pressure signed an agreement creating an independent Cypriot Republic with safeguards for the Turkish minority. Any hopes for the island's union with Greece were immediately dropped.

Since current hostilities broke out on the island, few Greeks on Cyprus or the mainland, have raised the banner of Enosis—union—but it is unquestionable that the Greek psyche burns with such hopes.

In addition to the emotional excitement generated by the Cyprus crisis, Greeks were forced recently to face two other important internal developments both involving emotional and political readjustments. On February 16, the Nation's voters wearily trekked to the polls for the second time in 15 weeks to elect a national parliament and hopefully a majority government. They did, by giving veteran politician and Liberal Party leader, George Papandreou, a resounding electoral mandate.

No sooner, however, had the nation emerged from the political battle, when King Paul I, the Greeks' royal leader since 1947, took ill and transferred all powers to his 23-year-old son, Prince Constantine. A month later, Paul died and Constantine became king.

Greece was stunned, for in a month's time, she gained a new government headed by a seasoned politician who had weathered some of the nation's heaviest governmental storms and lost a regent remembered for his leadership during the nation's chaotic postwar period.

Today, Greece like many nations in this fast-moving era, is in a state of transition, but unlike many other so-called developing countries, she has overcome near-desperate odds and made significant economic and political progress.

When Greece emerged from the ravages of World War II, she was largely controlled by Communist-led guerrilla bands. In 1949, 2 years after promulgation of the Truman doctrine providing large-scale American aid to Greece and a reorganization of national democratic forces, the nation was free but in ruins.

The opportunity for recovery thus came for Greece 4 years later than for most European countries which were by then well advanced in full-scale rehabilitation efforts.

The crying need at the time was naturally formation of a stable national regime. This led to the premiership of war hero Gen. Alexander Papagos, a De Gaulle-like figure who attracted political support from all points of the political spectrum.

In 1955, Papagos died and King Paul rather surprisingly chose the young and relatively inexperienced Constantine Karamanlis, Minister of Public Works, to form a new government. For 8 years, that daring young man of Greek politics held office breaking all records of governmental longevity. He ruled until June 1963, when a combination of international events and internal disturbances forced elections in November leading to his defeat.

Mr. Karamanlis, despite some of his shortcomings, did stabilize the nation and created a badly needed period of domestic tranquility necessary for reestablishment of the nation's economy. Some observers, however, felt that the autocratic and iron-willed Karamanlis had outlived his usefulness to the nation. The ascent to majority power in February of Mr. Papandreou, a veteran of nearly 50 years in Greek politics, was attributable in small part to Mr. Karamanlis' work; also to the success of American economic and political policy and the fierce determination of the Greek people to attain national self-respect.

Mr. Papandreou, although devoutly pro-West and a NATO advocate, is not like his predecessor, an anti-Communist zealot. He has already indicated he will attempt to reintegrate former Communists into Greek society. Presently, most Communists are without basic democratic rights as granted by the Constitution. They do, however, operate politically under the guise of the leftist oriented EDA political party, an amalgam of leftist factions.

In short, Mr. Papandreou, while confronted with immediate economic problems such as raising the rural standard of living and encouraging capital investment, is nevertheless establishing, for want of a better word, an expansion of democracy.

The 76-year-old Premier is surrounded by many of Greece's more moderate politicians such as his son Andreas, a former American citizen and professor of economics at the University of California; and George Mavros, now Minister of Coordination and one of the nation's top financial minds.

If Mr. Karamanlis represented a policy of national entrenchment and zealous postwar anticommunism, Mr. Papandreou reflects the change in international politics where cold war lines tend to become increasingly blurred. His world view seems not an anti-Communist black and white but suggests the politics of conciliation, consistent with his liberal political ideology.

The Premier's refusal to crack down on recent anti-American demonstrations in Athens connected with the Cyprus question indicates the breath of his democratic commitment.

Whether Mr. Papandreou can continue Greece's economic progress and extend it to the nation's masses; arrest the startling exodus of young people abroad, lift the educational level and maintain political stability

and a strong foreign policy are the problems confronting his administration.

At the same time, the threat of war with Turkey over Cyprus still looms large and Mr. Papandreou shows no signs of changing policy. He has stated that if Turkey intervenes in Cyprus, Greece will take immediate military steps.

Any such eventuality would most certainly weaken the NATO alliance and endanger the West's entire defense position in the Mediterranean.

Unlike Mr. Karamanlis, who rarely defied American policy, Mr. Papandreou has strongly backed Greek Cypriot leader and president Archbishop Makarios in his opposition to Anglo-American proposals for solving the current crisis.

The Premier has also indicated he wishes to normalize relations and increase trade with neighboring Soviet bloc nations, particularly Bulgaria—a project entertained by past regimes but half-heartedly pursued.

If Mr. Papandreou's words mean anything, his goals sound much like those of the sort of politician American foreign policy seeks to foster and support. He possesses a strong belief in democratic procedures, a sensitivity to the problems of lower socioeconomic groups and a strong pro-Western orientation tempered by a sound appraisal of relations with Communist nations.

Thus, the problems currently facing Greece are gradually less concerned with basic economic rehabilitation but involve very much more complex decisions and choices. For instance, as an affiliate member of the European Common Market and no longer an American aid recipient, Greece must decide on the direction of the national economy and seek the right financial mixture necessary to beneficial participation in the Market.

And, as with many nations, Greece's dispensing with hard-line anticommunism demands imaginative leadership able to bring about necessary political adjustments leading to meaningful intercourse with Soviet bloc countries.

On this year's national holiday, Greeks pointed with pride at the progress, despite great obstacles, attained during the last 143 years. Although massive problems, both domestic and foreign, remain unsolved, the nation is free and viable.

In 1821, it was a collection of oppressed slaves living under the yoke of a conqueror interested only in his self-indulgence and leisure, Greece was a geographical entity sunk in squalor, illiteracy, and widespread corruption.

If the Greek people hold their heads high in the family of nations today, it is due to their determination to reattain national greatness and reestablish a nation devoted to democratic principles.

The future is full of economic and political uncertainties, but for the average Greek nothing could be worse than a past of slavery, governmental instability, and official callousness.

Incontestably, the Greek people have passed the test. The question now is whether their leaders will take advantage of the opportunities created by years of suffering, death, and an undying commitment to freedom.

On Not Being Antibusiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the two editorials that follow appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 4, and should be read together as they complement each other.

There is altogether too much nonsense talked about the Government being pro- or antibusiness, when the unvarnished truth is that the Government is in direct competition with business in many fields, and if any business was run like the Government it would have gone bankrupt and disappeared from the scene years ago.

No, Government and business can hardly be expected to go down the primrose path hand in hand until they are both judged by the same yardstick of ethics and efficiency.

The editorials follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 5, 1964]

ON NOT BEING ANTIBUSINESS

The Presidnt, ebullient as ever, told his businessmen guests he wasn't antibusiness. "I just don't believe we are anti anything. We are probusiness—and prolabor—and pro the national interest."

Certainly many businessmen agree with him and return the compliment. They like Mr. Johnson as much for his general demeanor and skillful, nondoctrinaire approach to problems as for any particular action like getting tax reduction through Congress.

Still, this whole business of business and Government is always a little more complicated than the attitude of a given President or the specific moves of any administration.

For one thing, when people speak of business they mean, or should mean, the entirety of the Nation's economic activity; that which pays the employees and produces the goods, supports all levels of Government, and ultimately finances everything else. It does so because there is no money anywhere, at least honest money, except what is generated by the people's business.

In this broad sense, every administration in recent times, including the Republican one, has been to some degree antibusiness. At different times the hostility will be more, at different times less, pronounced; there will be more, or less, talk of cooperation and understanding each other's viewpoint. But there must be a limit to cooperation, let alone partnership, not only because business and Government are two very different animals but because modern Government has developed built-in antipathies toward business.

One of these is sheer size. Government in its totality both draws from and presses upon economic activity, pervading all of it and distorting a good deal of it.

So it is all very well to admire the general prosperity and the growth of the gross national product. What is rarely asked is whether the GNP might not be more solidly impressive and more promising for the future were the Government not taking so much of it and wasting so much of it.

Some of this waste is unavoidable. Defense outlays may be excessive, but they obviously have to be high in our era. Even so, they have created the further distortion of making numerous companies partly or wholly dependent on Government. And much other waste is plainly avoidable.

Similarly, it's fine if some businessmen feel they are basking in the glow of the new tax cuts. Yet who in his right mind, not many decades ago, would have considered it normal for the Government to take as much as half a company's income, not to mention the gouging of individuals whose savings and investment are needed for economic growth? Many today believe the growth would be greater if the Government spending which demands and devours the high taxes could be brought down to earth.

Again, it's generally accepted that we need antitrust laws and special regulation for certain industries. It's quite another matter, though, to see how the Government has proceeded from these simple propositions into a veritable morass of regulation, prosecution, and harassment, blundering into everyone's way and clogging the avenues of economic activity.

Not the least of the ingrained hostilities to business is Government's proneness to inflation, partly out of a political desire to keep the economy heated up. Some businessmen like to bask in that temporary glow also—a most unhealthy form of "cooperation" with Government. By its nature inflation, fueled by Federal deficits and easy money, is one of the worst distortions of all, finally harming all who play the game.

Here too Mr. Johnson is appearing on the side of the angels, with his repeated exhortations against inflation. Now he even goes so far as to imply that he would not let his preference for easy money stand in the way of higher interest rates should the consequences of inflation start to get serious. Too bad, though, to have to wait until the fire is going before taking steps that could have prevented it.

For our part, we hope the President will go right on not being deliberately antibusiness, and he will have the Nation's regard if he does. It's just that it is too much to expect one President or one administration, even if they wanted, to remove all the roadblocks to the sound economic advance that is so much in the Nation's interest.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 5, 1964]

SCALING A PAPER MOUNTAIN

Senator HUMPHREY told a group of businessmen the other day something that they surely knew full well already. It was that the files of Federal agencies are bulging with "mountains" of unused business information, often obtained at great cost to both businessmen and the Government.

While Mr. HUMPHREY was speaking, it turned out, some of his colleagues elsewhere in the Capital were getting a look at one of those mountains in the making. A Senate subcommittee, considering appropriations requests from the Federal Power Commission, was wondering why the FPC wanted a computer. The answer, it seems, is that the Commission wants to speed processing of questionnaires sent to producers of natural gas.

The questionnaires are needed, FPC Chairman Swidler explained, to expedite determination of "just and reasonable" prices for gas producers. This emphasis on haste is nothing new; ever since the agency embarked on this price-fixing exercise more than 3 years ago, it has been struggling to speed things up.

Things obviously couldn't have moved very fast if the Commission had tried to set prices for each of the more than 30,000 producers on an individual basis, so the FPC decided on a different approach. Specifically, the agency split the Nation into 23 areas and began setting a single price for all producers in each area, whatever their individual costs might happen to be.

Even this is time consuming; some sources estimated it would take more than a decade. To avoid any hint of free competition in the meantime, the FPC price fixers have haphazardly set "interim" ceilings for each area. Though the purported aim of the new questionnaires is to shorten this interim, they certainly are going to keep the producers and the FPC busy for a good while.

One type of questionnaire, sent to what Mr. Swidler called the 114 "giants in the industry," has 428 pages and weighs 10 pounds. A somewhat lighter version is going to the thousands of smaller producers. One horrified member of the subcommittee figured each of the larger producers would have to spend $85,000 compiling his share of this paper pileup.

It's a little hard to see what's just and reasonable, or even sensible, about the price fixers' operations in this highly competitive industry, but it's easy to see why the Commissioners want a computer. Otherwise, it will be long, dreary work scaling this paper pinnacle. And who wants to be known as the old men of the mountain?

The Greatest Asset We Have in This Country Is Our People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, in Lima, Peru, an outstanding Kansan and a great American was fatally injured when he accidently fell from his ninth-floor apartment. Harlan S. Parkinson, formerly of Scott City, Kans., age 30, was not an ordinary man but an exceptionally bright, resourceful, and capable person whose ability was reflected in everything he did. As reported in the Hutchinson News, "Harlan Parkinson was a young man who began carving his niche in life early." An honor student in economics and philosophy during his 4 years at Kansas University, Parkinson graduated in 1955, having been president of his senior class, a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, national honorary scholastic society, and a member of Sachem, the senior men's honorary society. From 1955 to 1957 his outstanding service in the Army was recognized by his having been chosen "Trainee of the Month" and selected for duty in the Army Intelligence Corps at Heidelberg, Germany. On release from the Army in 1957, he entered Michigan Law School where he was a Campbell fellowship finalist and fifth in his class in moot court argument. In 1961, after a brief law practice in Denver, Colo., he was employed by Great Plains Wheat, Inc., in charge of the association's market expansion program in South America with headquarters in Lima, Peru. It was here Parkinson's leadership reached full expression. The Scott City News Chronicle wrote:

Known as El Gringo Bueno throughout Peru and Chile for his monumental work in establishing school lunch programs for the poverty-stricken areas of these countries, Harlan had been decorated in 1962 by the Peruvian Government with "the Knight of Corrian Order"—the highest award Peru can confer on a foreign citizen—and last year was awarded the Bernardo O'Higgins Grand Order of Merit by the Chilean Government for his service to the people of Chile.

An initial project in Peru soon after his arrival was the establishment of the community of La Morada, which was started with the moving of 30 families from the slums of Lima, to more than 400 miles away to the slopes of the Andes. When aid from the Peruvian Government was denied, Harlan appealed to the people of his hometown, Scott City, to help the destitute Peruvians. They responded by "adopting" La Morada, and the local Lions Club headed up a people-to-people project to furnish them necessary supplies.

The needs of these people were met soon when a crate full of clothing, tools, and medical supplies arrived in La Morada, and the goods were distributed by Harlan and his wife, the former Alise Battha, of Buffalo, N.Y., whose father was former Secretary of Agriculture in Hungary.

The High Plains Journal, Dodge City, Kans., said this of Parkinson's work in South America:

Harlan Parkinson, in charge of the wheat organizations' program for U.S. wheat in South America, was one of the most effective workers the American wheat producers had.

It is not often that a person on a job of this kind can gain the national respect of the countries in which he is working. Harlan Parkinson did just that, however; he caught the humanitarian spirit of the wheat farmers for whom he was working, and combined his job of wheat promotion with that humanitarian outlook.

In a eulogy prepared by a Catholic priest, a friend of Harlan's, it was said:

Harlan: you strode in and out of our lives with those great giant steps of yours, never staying long enough for us to see anything but pieces of you: a piece of your impulsive generosity, your incredible humor, your love for people and charm over children, your inscrutable moods, your restless search for something beyond conformity.

And the pieces were beautiful: temporarily held together in pain, loneliness, in longings that reached far beyond your own happiness to that of your fellow man lost in a reeling world.

Your keen mind and rare sensitivity brought complexities in you we could never fully comprehend, but will never cease to love.

Perhaps the meaning of Harlan Parkinson was best expressed when his friend and mentor, Clifford R. Hope, Garden City, former U.S. Congressman and immediate past president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc. stated:

It is hard to realize Harlan Parkinson is gone. There are few men of his age who have done as much or whose lives held more promise for the future. His brilliant mind and engaging personality was matched by an intense interest in people.

As a representative of Great Plains Wheat in South America he worked hard at market development. But people, to him, were more than customers for wheat. He saw them as human beings in need of both help and understanding.

He projected an image of our country which will be long remembered, not only by presidents and premiers but by thousands of the poor and weak. To them he was the good American who helped them to help themselves.

Harlan Parkinson was a living example of how international good will can be established without spending of hoards of money but by dedication and genuine application of hard work in a spirit of unselfish concern for others. It is sadly ironic when an accident must take this sort from our midst. It is even more tragic when it must deny expression to one who had so much to give and when it must extinguish a source of hope for a better world. For one who knew, admired and respected Harlan Parkinson, it is difficult to accept his loss. If his absence can teach anything, it is in the words of his father, "My family was an average Kansas family. The children grew up in the church. The greatest asset we have in this country is our people."

To Mrs. Parkinson and her 3-year-old daughter, Madeline, and the Parkinson family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Tennessee: Land of 2,000 Quakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, an article relative to our beloved State of Tennessee, entitled "Land of 2,000 Quakes."

Reelfoot Lake is not only in our congressional district, but half of it is in my home county.

The article is so well written by Louise Davis, and is of such historical interest, that I would like to bring it to the attention of the membership. This article follows:

TENNESSEE: LAND OF 2,000 QUAKES

(By Louise Davis)

Berlen C. Moneymaker felt the floor of his fifth-story office in Knoxville rise under him.

That tremor was on September 7, 1956, and Moneymaker, chief geologist for TVA and No. 1 authority on Tennessee earthquakes, stood at attention, all antennae out to catch every quiver.

"It felt like the whole building was being lifted up," the imperturbable Moneymaker said. "Immediately I knew what it was. The telephone began ringing. The newspapers and radio stations were asking me what had happened."

But that was only one of more than 2,000 earthquakes recorded in Tennessee in the last 153 years. Moneymaker says the 1811 earthquake that shook the State from one end to the other and created Reelfoot Lake was "perhaps the most severe earthquake of recorded time."

The Reelfoot earthquake, he said, was even worse than the recent Alaska quake.

It has been his job, since the first TVA structure was planned in 1933, to advise engineers on how much tremor they can expect at every damsite and steamplant chimney. So far, no tremor has caused a crack in a TVA structure.

Of course, nobody knows what a shambles another Reelfoot-sized earthquake would make of the TVA area.

Moneymaker is familiar with records of Tennessee earthquakes for the last 300 years.

The 1811 earthquake warped a 20,000-acre stretch of land in west Tennessee and dropped it low enough to fill with subsurface water and form Reelfoot Lake. It was strikingly similar to the recent quake in Alaska, Moneymaker said.

If the pattern in Alaska continues in similar vein, Alaskans can look for months, even years, of severe jolts.

Tennessee, in fact, has been quivering at intervals, in definite rhythmic pattern, ever since the Reelfoot shake, and geologists believe that these continuing tremors are the dying sighs of that screaming cataclysm of a century and a half ago.

The quakes do come in series, Moneymaker said.

"You will have 5 years when there are hardly any tremors at all, and then there will be 3 or 4 years when there are two or three a year," Moneymaker said.

"We are in a quiet period now. We haven't had an earthquake in east Tennessee since 1960, and hardly a tremor in the State. But that year we had four—strong enough to be felt, but doing no damage."

Nashville, in a basin flanked by the Highland Rim and Cumberland Plateau, is part of the safest region in the State, as far as earthquakes go. The plateau and the rim are the least affected by quakes.

Not since November 27, 1931, has Nashville felt an earthquake—"several light shocks" beginning at 3:23 a.m. There was no damage.

The patterns of place are as definite as the patterns of time, and our long, narrow State gets shaken from both ends. The 1811 quake sheared bluffs off the west end of the State and hurled them into the Mississippi River, while those from the east rattle the mountains, topple chimneys and crack plaster.

The "Reelfoot quake" was centered just northwest of Tennessee at a trading post village called New Madrid, in Missouri, on a bluff high over the Mississippi, and geologists call it the "New Madrid quake."

No quake in recorded history covered a greater area or lasted as long, Moneymaker said.

It was so violent that it sloshed the Mississippi out of its banks from side to side, like coffee in a tilted cup. It shook half the United States, from Boston to New Orleans.

For 2 months, strong quakes churned the countryside almost daily, and for 6 years the strong ones alternated with lighter ones. Vibrations have continued up to modern times.

Twice since then, Tennessee has felt severe shocks—in 1843 and 1895. Both were centered in the New Madrid area and did their worst damage at Memphis and other west Tennessee towns. But they were felt throughout the State.

"In Memphis, the January 1843, earthquake was very destructive, causing chimneys to topple, walls to crack, and similar phenomena," Moneymaker said. "It was felt as far eastward as the Atlantic seaboard and northeastward to Providence, R.I."

The quakes that have shaken Nashville most violently have come from the Charleston, S.C., area, and the one that almost destroyed Charleston on Aug. 31, 1886, caused minor panic in Nashville.

"It shook walls and floors, rattled windows, and caused nausea," the Nashville Chronicle reported next day. "Everybody rushed out of doors.

"No damage was done save breaking of a few panes of glass and cracking of plastering. The first shock was violent, lasting possibly 40 seconds, a tremor changing to distinct vibrations. The second and third were barely felt, and lasting 30 seconds each, at intervals of 7 and 6 minutes respectively. The signal officer says duration of each shock was 30 seconds, and direction east to west."

The next year, on August 2, Nashville, Gallatin, Clarksville, Tullahoma, McMinnville, Columbia, Jackson, and Union City felt a severe shock centered at Cairo, Ill.

In Franklin, Judge John H. Henderson, in his diary, described the October 31, 1895, quake:

"This morning shortly after 5 o'clock there was an earthquake of from one-half to 1 minute. The house shook and the windows rattled. I at first thought it was Mrs. Perkins moving about upstairs, but finally concluded it was an earthquake. * * * This is the second one I ever felt, the first being when I was a boy."

That may have been the particularly heavy one that Henderson's father, Dr. Samuel Henderson, recorded on June 19, 1864.

"Heavy shock of earthquake occurred this morning about 6 o'clock accompanied with a rumbling noise which lasted for some time after the shaking seemed to cease. The hardest I have felt for many years."

Geologists suspect a relationship between quakes that strike opposite ends of the earth at about the same time, Moneymaker said.

On November 18, 1775, for instance, a terrific earthquake at Lisbon, Portugal, killed 20,000 persons in 2 minutes and the shock was felt over much of Europe. In the same month, a strong earthquake in eastern Massachusetts was felt throughout New England, New York, and far to the south.

The same month that the Reelfoot quake shook Tennessee, a violent earthquake struck in Caracas, Venezuela.

The upheavals begin deep under the earth's surface, the big ones more than 30 miles down, some as deep as 447 miles.

There are two kinds of shock waves: those that roll across the surface of the earth like ocean waves, toppling buildings to the ground and tossing people about so dizzily they are nauseated; and there are the "body waves" that travel through the earth at great depths.

Body waves reached out from the Alaska quake to pound against the bottom of Norris Lake near Knoxville. Water washed up 12 feet along the bank and waves stood a foot high in the windless night.

When earthquakes shake countries as distant as Assam or Yugoslavia, Tennessee springs may go dry, and water in wells may rise or fall, Moneymaker said. Sometimes springs that have run cold begin to run warm. Warm springs become hot.

In a quake, houses crumble, streets crack open, bells toll, chandeliers sway, church steeples topple.

The higher the structure, the more severely the quake is felt. A man high in a tall building will feel an earthquake when people on the first floor feel nothing, Moneymaker said.

"The motion of an earthquake is like an inverted pendulum," he said. "That's the reason chimney tops get the full force, and throw bricks out as if someone were inside, tossing them."

Moneymaker said that storks on chimney tops have sounded the alarm of coming quakes. Fascinated with the sensitivity of birds and animals to coming earthquakes, he has collected many examples:

April 1954: Just before the disastrous earthquake struck Greece, storks flew off their chimneytop nests, squawking in wild alarm. Peasants, wakened from their afternoon naps, rushed out of their houses to see what the racket was just before the buildings collapsed. Thus thousands of lives were saved.

August 1959: A Montana lake 12 miles from Yellowstone Park suddenly was deserted by the thousands of terns, gulls, and other waterfowl that ordinarily rest there. Six hours later, an earthquake struck in which several people died.

July 1957: Animals in the Mexico City Zoo—elephants, giraffes, lions, tigers—"came down with the shakes." Veterinarians diagnosed the trouble as nervous disorders. Dog owners reported their dogs nervous. Almost 24 hours later, a severe earthquake struck.

When the disastrous quake hit New Madrid and the Reelfoot area in 1811, there was apparently no premonition. At 2 a.m., revelers at a New Madrid party heard a "deep-throated roar like the sound of an approaching tornado."

The ground trembled and sighed, log houses cracked and groaned, and chimneys crashed to the ground. Partygoers rushed out of the cabins only to be hurled to the rolling earth.

People in bed were tossed on the floor and for 3 hours another tremor came every 8 minutes. At dawn, there was another rumble and shock, and great chunks of the bluff fell into the river.

Earth waves billowed up to tilt trees until their branches interlocked. Sections of the ground heaved up into small hills, while other spots cracked open in house-deep crevasses and filled with water.

Horses "went wild" and the Mississippi "went crazy." One moment, the water swept out of the riverbed, stranding boats on the bare sand. The next moment the water whipped back into the riverbed in "20-foot columns", so powerful they swept whole groves of trees off the banks.

There is no way of knowing how many Indians and farmers at lonely outposts were killed in the disaster. Miraculously, only two people were killed at New Madrid.

But if an earthquake of that intensity had struck in a heavily populated area, the toll would have been catastrophic.

Moneymaker, who has made a 30-year search into Tennessee diaries, letters, newspaper files, has established records of some 300 separate earthquakes in this State (not counting the known 1,874 afterquakes recorded after the 1811 quake).

His charts show that quakes from the west end of the State have shaken Memphis, Tiptonville, Jackson, Brownsville, Covington, Union City, Paris, Bolivar, Dyersburg, Martin, Savannah, Milan, Ripley, Camden, along with Lake, Obion, and Dyer Counties.

Quakes from the eastern end have jarred Knoxville, Chattanooga, Maryville, Cleveland, Sevierville, Carthage, Sparta, Rockwood, Harriman, Crossville, Bristol, Johnson City, Morristown, Tazewell, along with Blount, Sullivan, Roane, and Loudon Counties.

In middle Tennessee, Nashville, Clarksville, Franklin, and Pulaski have felt the tremors from both ends of the State.

Moneymaker's latest project at TVA—advising engineers about how much tremor to expect at the Bull Run steamplant being built near Knoxville—is a real teaser.

There, an 800-foot chimney, the tallest in the world, will reach twice as high as the L. & C. tower in Nashville, 250 feet higher than the Washington Monument. Built-in elasticity will allow the tower to sway 17 inches in a 100-mile-an-hour wind without toppling.

The Appalachia Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Appalachia program, proposed by President Johnson should have the highest priority for speedy approval.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that my newsletter, dated May 4, last, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter, concerning the Appalachia program, follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District of Tennessee)

THE APPALACHIA PROGRAM

The House is giving legislation for Appalachian regional development recommended by President Lyndon B. Johnson the highest priority. The President this week sent a letter to Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK of the House urging speedy action.

Congress is now fully engaged in consideration of this great development undertaking—one of the highlights of the President's program. Hearings on the proposed Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—the program designed to eliminate pockets of poverty

throughout the country—already are well advanced. The overall attack on depressed areas and the Appalachia development program together set a new high mark for American internal improvements efforts involving cooperative Federal-State-local action.

A NEW START FOR 10-STATE REGION THAT INCLUDES PART OF TENNESSEE

The Appalachia program is a broad-scale long-range, comprehensive plan for economic growth and development of a mountain area that straddles 10 States, embraces 340 counties, and includes more than 165,000 square miles, with more than 15 million American citizens in residence. Included in the developmental area under this program are 49 of Tennessee's 95 counties containing nearly 1,600,000 of the State's more than 3.5 million inhabitants. Some 15 of these counties are in our great Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee.

There are many aspects of this regional program attacking problems of the area, and these include the following:

Highways: A developmental highway system of 2,350 miles to provide access to isolated areas and encourage the growth of new industry and other economic activity.

Water resources: Accelerated water facilities development, with emphasis on flood control, industrial and recreational impoundments, and sewage treatment and construction.

Agriculture: Pasture improvement program to convert marginal farmlands to pasture for increased livestock production; also, an expanded Farmers Home Administration program to assist small farmers.

Mineral resources: Expanded programs to promote new use of coal, improve mining practices, and stimulate land restoration following mining operation.

Forest resources: Assistance programs for improved timber production, management, manufacturing, and marketing.

Aid to small business: An expanded Small Business Administration loan and local development program.

Community development: Expanded area redevelopment program and stepped-up human resources programs, with emphasis on education and training, as provided in the Economic Opportunity Act legislation.

For a continuing and sustained attack on the complex problems of the region, this legislation provides for creation of a Federal-State regional commission to guide all levels of Government and private agencies in this work. Achievement of these legislative goals would make it appropriate to call the 88th Congress the development Congress.

In sum, this program will make possible "an active beginning to end an old problem in Appalachia" as President Johnson said in his letter to Speaker McCormack. The cost of the entire program for the first year—$262 million—is included in the President's 1965 budget which was submitted in January to the Congress. Work continues until these goals are achieved.

Liberals Distrust Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Richard Wilson, in his column published in the Evening Star on Monday, May 4, 1964, certainly brings into the open the question as to whether President Johnson is a liberal or a conservative and whether the liberals can rely on the new Mr. Johnson or upon the voting record which he established while he served as a Senator. Mr. Wilson's column follows:

LIBERALS DISTRUST JOHNSON—TEXAS EDITOR SAYS PRESIDENT HAS PLAYED "COLD, FAST GAME" ON BOTH SIDES OF FENCE

(By Richard Wilson)

Amidst the general euphoria about President Johnson, it should be borne in mind that responsible liberal elements in this country have their fingers crossed. This lingering doubt goes a long way to explain why the President is making such an effort to win a broad spectrum of support from all groups. If he can do this it will not matter so much if Democratic liberals distrust him.

Some of them do distrust him now. They have remained largely silent because what he says and does is not yet susceptible to a concerted liberal attack. The impression runs deep that the real Mr. Johnson has not yet emerged and will not until after his election.

A liberal spokesman in Texas, Ronnie Dugger, 33-year-old editor of the hard-to-buy Texas Observer, reflects the liberal distrust in an article in the Progressive, the Wisconsin publication founded by Robert M. La-Follette, Sr. Mr. Dugger sums up a long article:

"During his long career he [Mr. Johnson] has, after all, played a cold, fast, and sometimes a mean game during which he has turned up on many sides of both fences. His idealism has come to seem like an eddy here and there from the rushing current of his life.

"We must take a chance with any President, and there is much guess work in it, but if I had a free choice I would not choose Mr. Johnson. I fear he is an administrator of the establishment, and will continue to be; that he will not militantly wage the war on poverty and the quest for peace he preaches, that he is not a leader who can give the people vision.

"Some of us in Texas simply do not trust him. We desperately want to be able to, and if history has closed around us all and he must be President, so be it; we shall hope for his greatness; we shall watch, until we are convinced, before we shall cheer."

According to Mr. Dugger, liberals of Texas do not find President Johnson's record on civil liberties reassuring. He is accused of undercutting the liberals, the labor unions, the intellectuals and spokesmen for minorities. His closest associates—Jack Valenti, Walter Jenkins, Bill Moyers, George Reedy, Cliff Carter, Horace Busby—are all considered by Texas liberals to be conservatives.

Texas liberals still look upon Mr. Johnson in the context of his financial supporters in the ranching, oil, construction, banking and insurance businesses. They find him to be liberal on matters affecting public power, public works, welfare spending and farm issues, and conservative on union labor, civil liberties, taxation, civil rights and regulation of the oil and gas industry.

Those who are not familiar with all the conventions of the liberal litany might consider such a judgment as the foregoing to be unconvincing. If this is all the liberals have against Mr. Johnson, it might be concluded that they have very little to complain about.

But it is evident that the distrust of President Johnson runs deeper and has an emotional basis. It rests upon distrust of the kind of political power complex which Mr. Johnson considers normal, the interplay of privileged interests so common in Texas.

But it is precisely this interplay of privilege which liberals in other sections of the country fear most. They have found evidences of it in the Billie Sol Estes case, the Bobby Baker case, and the TFX controversy, in all of which the Johnson name figured either publicly or surreptitiously.

At this stage, the liberal plaint seems forlorn. It cannot have much practical application because so many of the labor, racial and intellectual groups are built-in parts of the Democratic Party apparatus, and there is, of course, no possibility that the presidential nomination would be denied to Mr. Johnson.

But these groups can make themselves felt on the choice of a vice-presidential nominee who will be chosen with a more than ordinary awareness that he may succeed to the Presidency.

Then, when all this has been gone through and if Mr. Johnson is still President, the liberals will find out whether or not they have got the President they want. If their worst fears are confirmed, they will have trouble with Mr. Johnson in the future.

The President: Both Advocate and Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of America there appears an article by Jerome N. Eller, entitled "The President: Both Advocate and Candidate."

Mr. Eller, who is administrative assistant to Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY, has long observed the Washington scene from a vantage point on Capitol Hill. What he has to say is often noteworthy but most certainly always colorful and stimulating. I commend Mr. Eller's article to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PRESIDENT: BOTH ADVOCATE AND CANDIDATE

Every successful politician is reluctant to relinquish the prestige of high office for that traditional mixture of mild contempt and studied skepticism with which American voters greet candidates for public position. As the consummate politician, President Johnson is not eager to be identified in the public mind just yet as the Democratic candidate for President, preferring instead to be thought of, as long as possible in this election year, as "President of all the people."

No one knows better than he the vast difference between being the President of the United States and being a candidate for President. This does not mean, however, that President Johnson shares former President Eisenhower's disdain for the political arts and rituals or for the professional politicians. On the contrary, he relishes the practice of politics and has real respect for the true professionals. He is not unaware, nor unappreciative, of the fact that the young and old warriors of campaigns past are about their leader's business in the precincts. For them, November is always tomorrow, and the enemy is ever at the gates.

The President's posture, however, is not a pose. He seems to be trying consciously to develop and articulate a definition of the Presidency both for himself and for his time. Speaking softly at a twilight reception for the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the White House rose garden, the Presi-

dent obviously was not pleading for political asylum when he said: "I am the President of the United States, the only President you will have, God willing, until January of next year." He was trying to explain what he still calls his "job," and his words expressed not only that deepened sense of history which the office seems to inspire in its incumbents, but also that broader vision of responsibilities that extend far beyond next November: "He has to try to see how his decisions will affect not only today's citizens, but their children and their children's children unto the third and fourth generation. He has to try to peer into the future, and he has to prepare for that future."

Mr. Johnson is not just a cornball cowboy turning off lights in the White House carpenter shop or inviting the neighbors in for a stroll through his spread. Nor is he just a New Deal holdover trying to fit the cliches of 30 years ago to the political cliques of today. His pleasures are simple, but he is no simple man. Unlike the practical politicians he is supposed to epitomize, he does not hoard the popular acclaim he seems to enjoy. Instead, he spends it on issues not readily translatable into votes by the usual standards of his trade.

It is too easy to say that he is playing both to the galleries and to the groundlings. By whatever grace of state is operative in the Presidency, he seems to have achieved not only a delight in public affairs but a willingness to accept responsibility for them.

J. N. ELLER.

WJXT Wins Deserved Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished television station in Jacksonville, Fla., WJXT, television 4, a Washington Post-Newsweek station, has been awarded the 1964 School Bell Award of the Florida Education Association.

WJXT has been one of the leaders in Duval County, Fla., in drawing attention to the public school situation and pointing out the needs to meet the challenges of educating the county's 115,000 schoolchildren. I congratulate WJXT and its news department, headed by Mr. William Grove, a learned and articulate newscaster, and also would like to draw attention to Mr. Norm Davis, a bright and alert producer, of the station's Project Four series, which featured the school crisis in its presentations.

I include in the RECORD an editorial from WJXT News of April 27, 1964:

WJXT is pleased and honored to be the only recipient among television stations in Florida of the 1964 School Bell Award of the Florida Education Association. The honor was accorded last week before some 7,000 delegates to the FEA convention in Miami. WJXT was singled out for the "best coverage of an educational problem by a television station," with particular reference to this station's "Project Four" series and its editorial statements.

We believe the award will serve its best purpose if it fosters added realization in this county that our educational problems are deeply serious and in need of immediate, far-reaching solutions. WJXT's entry in the FEA competition was sponsored chiefly by the two large educational groups in Duval County—the Classroom Teachers Association and the Duval County Education Association—and final judgments were rendered on behalf of the 40,000 members of the Florida association. This is vivid evidence that educators here and abroad are constructively concerned with the state of affairs in our public school system.

WJXT's effort in recent years in calling attention to our dangerously ill public schools is an open book, and anyone examining that book carefully will have to conclude that this station has acted only with a deep sense of concern for the economic and social well-being of Jacksonville and Duval County. We intend, moreover, to continue with unabated energy our appraisal of the county's antiquated tax structure, which is rapidly strangling our school system, and of other major administrative and instructional roadblocks which prevent Duval County from having an educational system second to none.

Resolution of the Somerville Board of Aldermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of the House the recent resolution of the Somerville Board of Aldermen commending my longtime friend, Mr. Burton F. Faulkner, for his fine contribution to the betterment of that city. His record of accomplishment as a businessman and civic leader, as a former member of the State senate and former alderman make him one of the most outstanding men of his city of Somerville.

I would like to extend my appreciation for his devotion to his city and I am placing in the RECORD the resolution passed by the Somerville Board of Aldermen.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE (MASS.) BOARD OF ALDERMEN

(In Board of Aldermen, January 9, 1964)

Whereas it is hereby resolved that Burton F. Faulkner, a prominent Somerville businessman, a former State senator and a past president of the Somerville Board of Aldermen, is hereby commended by this honorable board for the outstanding contribution he has made in elevating the property standards of our great city at great financial expense to himself.

With the encroachment of blight and the determination of the city officials to combat the trend and defeat it, it is encouraging to witness the efforts of this man, Burton F. Faulkner, transforming blight properties into impressive looking parcels of real estate; and

Whereas by his courageous actions, he has not only improved the physical atmosphere of the surrounding areas, and aided in the stabilization of the city's financial structure, but demonstrated his affection for, and belief in the future well-being of our beloved city. It is with a deep sense of pride and admiration that the honorable board of aldermen publicly recognizes and commends Burton F. Faulkner for his loyalty and devotion to this great city of Somerville; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the records of the Somerville Board of Aldermen, and a copy of said resolution be forwarded to Mr. Burton F. Faulkner.

FRANCIS LEO MCCARTHY.

Truth and Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a lot of nonsense and ridiculous propaganda has been circulated about the civil rights bill now being debated in the other body.

In the following article from the April 19, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, the lucid writing of Ralph McGill, the distinguished publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, dispels a lot of this fiction:

TRUTH AND FICTION

Mail inspired by the filibuster against the civil rights bill falls roughly into three categories. There is fanatic support of the Senators filibustering and of denunciation of the bill. Much of the latter is based on erroneous information. There also is some approval of the bill's objectives. An increasing number of letters seek information about the bill or portions of it.

A number of Southern leaders who oppose the legislation have assured their constituents it is unconstitutional. If it is, then these persons have nothing to worry about, and one wonders at their agitation. However, only the U.S. Supreme Court, constitutionally established to determine what legislation is in accord with the Constitution, may decide.

Certainly the layman cannot do more than guess.

Those provisions of the bill that would end bias in job opportunities, and in access to places of public accommodation doing business with a public license, now have vigorous indorsement from a distinguished panel of 22 lawyers. They include four past presidents of the American Bar Association and three former Attorneys General of the United States.

Those who sincerely seek information will be interested in the list. The former Attorneys General are Francis Biddle, Herbert Brownell, and William P. Rogers. The latter two served under President Eisenhower. Mr. Biddle was in Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet. The four former presidents of the ABA are:

David F. Maxwell, of Philadelphia; John Randall, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Charles S. Rhyne, of Washington, and Whitney North Seymour, of New York.

Others signing included Norris Darrell, of New York, president of the American Law Institute; and four law school deans, Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard; Eugene V. Rostow, of Yale; John W. Wade, of Vanderbilt, and William B. Lockhart, of Minnesota.

These and other distinguished lawyers from major cities of the United States drew up a legal memorandum. In it the signers said title II of the bill, outlawing discrimination at hotels and other places of public accommodation, had two "sound constitutional bulwarks."

These, the memorandum said, are Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and the 14th amendment's ban on racial discrimination by the States and their agencies. As to title VII, on fair employment, the lawyers said its provisions were well within the

findings of many judicial decisions on the power over commerce.

There will continue to be dissents. That the opinion of 22 of the Nation's best known and experienced constitutional attorneys could be in error is possible, but highly unlikely.

In 1954, and in the years before, there were southern politicians who chose to deceive the people of their States by first declaring that eliminating discrimination in segregated schools was unconstitutional and, secondly, by assuring them that the State laws would be able to maintain discrimination. The people have a right to expect their chosen leaders to tell them the truth even if it hurts. Had they done so, the South and the Nation would have been able to leave the school problem to the professional school administrators rather than making the issue one of politics.

The bill does not—in answer to other letters—interfere with homeowners in selling or renting. The bill does not even mention housing.

Private clubs, organizations, and fraternities specifically are exempted. The bill does not say any public accommodation business "must serve" anyone. It simply says all persons must be treated alike. Rules of dress and conduct may be enforced. Small rooming houses are entirely exempted.

The civil rights bill has nothing whatever to do with curriculum or the hiring of teachers. Nor does it do any harm to unions. The bill does not seek to legislate racial equality. Its sole and total purpose is to establish equality of citizenship. It does not touch the private home, club, or social life.

The truth will help us more than fiction.

FCC Ruling Could Mean Big Profit for Johnsons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that the Texas television interests of President Johnson's family stand to make more than $2 million as a result of the decision of the Federal Communications Commission in rejecting a petition of TV Cable, Inc., of Austin, Tex.

I call to the attention of my colleagues two interesting articles on the decision and what it means to the Johnsons; the first appearing in the Des Moines Register of April 30, and the second in the Des Moines Sunday Register of May 3:

JOHNSON TV RIVAL LOSES FCC DECISION—WON'T LIFT 15-DAY PROGRAM DELAY

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Wednesday rejected the contention that President Johnson's family television station has a control over one of two competing television cable firms in Austin, Tex.

The FCC by a 6–0 vote denied the petition of TV Cable, Inc., of Austin, to waive a commission regulation that forces TV Cable to delay broadcasts on its community antenna television station for 15 days.

FCC REGULATION

Since TV Cable, of Austin, owned by John Campbell, brings its television signal in by microwave radio, it is subject to FCC regulation and an FCC rule that the firm black out for 15 days programs that appear on the Johnson family television station, KTBC–TV.

The competing community antenna firm, Capital Cable Co., brings its television in through the KTBC television tower and distributes it through cables that avoid FCC regulation. As part of this arrangement, the Johnson family television firm has an option to buy 50 percent of Capital Cable.

The FCC decision means that TV Cable must operate under the restriction of delayed broadcasts for all programs that are shown on KTBC–TV.

Since 1952, the Johnson family firm, formerly the L.B.J. Co., and recently renamed Texas Broadcasting, has operated the only very high frequency television station in Austin, a city of more than 200,000.

The Johnson family has taken the position that the radio and television interests of the L.B.J. Co., are owned by Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson and the two Johnson daughters and are not the property of Lyndon B. Johnson.

"NO INTEREST"

President Johnson at a recent press conference said he believed there is no possible ethical problem involved in the situation, contending that he holds no interest in the broadcasting industry, which is under Government control.

A few days after Johnson became President, Mrs. Johnson and the two daughters put their stock in the L.B.J. Co. in a trust. A short time later they changed the name of the firm to Texas Broadcasting.

Campbell has contended that the L.B.J. Co. in 1957 entered into an option agreement to buy 50 percent of Capital Cable, and that this amounted to "an interest" and a "control" by the Johnson family.

In his petitions, he has raised the question of whether it is proper public policy for the only television very high frequency television firm in Austin to have a "control" over a community antenna television firm that is given a right to immediate and unrestricted broadcasts of all programs.

Campbell has contended that the original rule providing a 30-day delay in broadcasts brought in by microwave radio should not apply to Austin, Tex.

AGREEMENT REVEALED

He contended that the delay was for the purpose of protecting small and struggling stations in isolated communities, and that it was not proper to use it to protect the wealthy Johnson television interests in such a large city as Austin. The 30-day delay later was reduced to 15 days.

Campbell demanded to see the option agreements between the the L.B.J. Co. and Capital Cable.

Capital Cable had advised the FCC that "Texas Broadcasting Co. has no connection with nor voice in management or financing of Capital Cable Co.—unless and until such option is exercised."

The option agreement later was made public.

Campbell charged that the option agreement meant that the "Capital Cable, literally and figuratively, has been placed in a corporate straitjacket for the benefit of" the Johnson family television company.

Campbell contended that the Johnson television interests had "control" of Capital Cable in the following ways:

1. Capital Cable was prohibited from disposing of any stock within the 3-year option period except to the L.B.J. Co., and the L.B.J. Co. was to have access to all of Capital Cable books.

2. The L.B.J. Co. was to have "veto power" over capital expenditures by Capital Cable which exceed certain levels.

3. Capital Cable was obligated to use the L.B.J. Co. television tower for a 10-year period, which, in effect, requires capital to pay all of the costs of a community antenna television receiving tower in the form of rental payments to the L.B.J. Co.

4. Capital Cable must have the consent of the L.B.J. Co. to select any person for the position of manager who is without previous experience in community antenna television management.

5. Capital Cable may not "in any manner sell, lease, or dispose of all or any of its assets, whether now held or to be acquired" without the consent of the L.B.J. Co.

Campbell said that "under the agreement, Capital Cable cannot sell—or even give away—an old office chair without the consent of KTBC."

The FCC, which in its initial correspondence had indicated that it would regard "control" of Capital Cable by the L.B.J. Co. as important, said Wednesday that it did not consider the details of the option agreement as relevant in ruling on Campbell's petition.

BLACKOUT QUESTION

The only question about the agreement that was relevant to its decision, the FCC said, was whether it gave the L.B.J. Co. the power to require that Capital Cable blackout programs carried by the station. Since there was no such power, the FCC decided the agreement was unimportant.

The FCC opinion said Campbell had decided to use the less expensive microwave radio for his TV Cables firm, and had indicated acceptance of the blackout period.

The FCC pointed out that Capital Cable had used more expensive cable construction, and its agreement with the L.B.J. Co., to avoid delayed broadcasts except as they might be imposed through its contract with the L.B.J. Co.

Since Capital Cable had committed itself through substantial investments in this manner, the FCC ruled "it would be clearly inequitable to grant the petition for waiver" to the competing firm so that both firms would be permitted to operate without delays.

The FCC said its rules are meant to apply throughout the community antenna television field, and are not to be watered down or waived when particular issues arise in varying cases.

Commissioner Robert T. Barley, nephew of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas, stated: "TV Cable, in view of the competitive race, elected to seek a grant with the condition (of the delayed broadcasts). Having made this business judgment, TV Cable is, I believe, in no position to complain about the condition."

WHAT FCC'S RULING MEANS TO JOHNSONS—VALUE OF OPTION PUT AT $2 MILLION

(By Philip Meyer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Texas TV interests of President Johnson's family stand to make more than $2 million as the result of a favorable decision made last week by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

That is the estimated potential value of the Johnson firm's option to buy 50 percent of the stock of Capital Cable Co., a community TV antenna system in Austin, Tex.

BLACKOUT RULING

It will reach that potential, however, only if Capital Cable emerges as the only antenna system to bring out-of-town TV programs into the homes of Austin subscribers.

The FCC gave a boost toward that goal by ruling that its only competitor must abide by a blackout requirement on certain network shows.

Under the blackout rule, the rival company, TV Cable of Austin, Inc., cannot show for 15 days any programs that the Johnson station, KTBC–TV, plans to use.

"There is no question the decision is going to have a substantial, adverse effect on us," said John Cole, Washington lawyer who represents TV Cable.

"Capital Cable can offer a much more attractive package—and they are getting our customers."

FIFTEEN-DAY WAIT

Cole said TV Cable now has 2,200 customers at $4.50 a month. They must wait 15 days, however, to see any program carried by KTBC.

Capital Cable, which has been in business only a few months, has 700 customers at $4.95 a month. It can offer customers a wide selection of programs, regardless of whether they duplicate those carried over KTBC.

By carrying top network programs outside their normal time slot, KTBC can effectively block rival TV Cable's choice of competing programs.

A viewer who doesn't like what KTBC offers him is virtually forced to turn for live fare to Capital Cable.

Because Austin is one of the Nation's largest cities with only a single very high frequency TV station, it is a rich market for a community antenna system. Industry sources estimate that half of the 60,000 TV-owning homes in Austin can eventually be signed up.

ROUGH GUIDE

According to one broker, a value of $200 a subscriber is a rough guide for figuring the worth of such a system. This gives any system that gains a monopoly in Austin a potential worth of at least $6 million.

Under terms of the option, the Johnsons can own half of this for 50 percent of the original cost, estimated at $1 million to $1,300,000.

Capital Cable could become worth even more than $6 million because income rises much faster than overhead once the number of subscribers passes the 1,000 mark.

"When you get up in that scale, your profit is very big," the broker said of the Austin situation. Eventual worth of a single system there could run as high as $10 million, he estimated.

FCC Commissioners, who would have had to violate some of their own precedents to rule any other way in the Austin case, have been obviously nettled at having to decide a controversy relating to the Johnson family fortune.

NOT OVER

Commissioner Lee Loevinger referred to the "unwarranted publicity" the case has drawn.

The pressure on the FCC is by no means over, however, for it still must answer some basic questions about the community antenna business that will affect the Austin situation.

Capital Cable's rival, TV Cable, had agreed to an interim FCC rule requiring the blackouts in return for approval of its microwave relay system.

The blackouts are designed to protect existing TV stations—in this case, the Johnsons'—from competitive duplication of programs. The Johnson station uses all three networks and tapes many prime shows for later broadcasting.

Capital Cable is not subject to the blackout restriction because it uses cable instead of microwave, which puts it outside of FCC control.

QUESTION REMAINS

The question still facing the FCC is whether to enact a permanent blackout rule. If it decides against it, the restrictions on TV Cable would be dropped and Austin would probably continue to have two systems.

It also is possible that things eventually will be evened up by a move to put Capital Cable under similar blackout restrictions.

FCC Chairman E. William Henry has suggested legislation to give the FCC authority over such all-cable systems.

By the time Congress gets around to such a move, however, Capital Cable may be able to use its no-blackout selling point to sew up the Austin market and eliminate its competitor.

Forecasting Purchasing and Business Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John H. Hoagland, of the Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University, delivered an address at Dallas, Tex., on Tuesday, May 5, on the general subject, "Forecasting Purchasing and Business Trends." This address was delivered before the 49th annual international convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents. Part of the address, especially that which treats of steel strikes and power politics, is of special interest to Congressmen and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That portion of his address follows:

STEEL STRIKES

Research on the information provided by Monthly Change Indices, plus a study of other published and unpublished information, reveals that steel strikes have been the major cause of recent business recessions and business expansions. Steel strikes result in extensive interacting forces which, briefly explained, operate as follows:

The threat of a steel strike endangers many vital sources of supply and disrupts normal procurement channels. To protect against possible shortages of materials needed to sustain production, purchasing executives are forced to accumulate strike-hedge inventories prior to the strike deadline. This is an expensive process, but it is more expensive to shut down production because of a lack of materials. Inventory hedging prior to a steel strike takes many months and is of such a magnitude that it results in a period of business expansion prior to the settlement.

In order to protect against post settlement uncertainties of supplies, purchasing executives engage in presettlement ordering of materials for postsettlement delivery. This causes continued stimulation of business activity for a few months after contract settlement.

By the time normal systems of supply have been fully reestablished, widespread inventory excesses and imbalances have developed. It then becomes necessary for inventories to be liquidated, which results in declining business activity. However, since this inventory liquidation is attempted in a period of declining activity, it takes longer to liquidate inventories than it does to accumulate them. Business activity becomes depressed for many months, and the result usually is a business recession starting within 1 year following the steel contract settlement.

As an illustration of the impact of steel strikes, consider wht has happened to business trends in recent years. The 1952 steel strike was followed by the 1953–54 recession. The 1956 steel strike was followed by the 1957–58 recession. The 1959 steel strike was followed by the 1960–61 recession. The threat of a steel strike in 1962 caused the start of a recession in the latter part of 1962, but the Cuban missile crisis changed conditions, which averted that recession. Last year, in 1963, the moderate threat of another steel strike caused a business expansion during the first half of the year, and the subsequent inventory liquidation caused business hesitancy during the last half of 1963.

Since 1959, the analyses of Monthly Change Indices have emphasized the impact of steel strikes on business trends. Until recent years, however, many have overlooked the importance of steel strikes. As late as 1961, a lengthy Government report erroneously concluded that the 1959 steel strike did not change the course of business trends. Many forecasts for the soaring 1960's were in error because the forecasters did not properly evaluate the 1959 trends.

Lately, there has been a growing realization that steel strikes and inventory hedging do influence business trends significantly. As more people recognize, study, and report on the impact of steel strikes, the forecasting of purchasing and business trends should be improved.

POWER POLITICS

To fully understand steel strikes at least one additional relationship needs to be examined; that is the relationship between business trends and political trends. Historical evidence shows that for over a century the business trends of this country have been the dominant determinant of political trends. When an election has been held during a recession, the party in power almost always has been defeated. Conversely, when an election has been held during good business times, the party in power usually, but not always, has been sustained. This relationship is well-known in some political circles, but it has been overlooked by most people.

The reason for this business-political relationship is that people have voted according to their pocketbooks. Simply explained, people are somewhat like the dog Snoopy in the cartoon strip "Peanuts." In one cartoon, the character Linus is explaining to his friend Peanuts how a fortuneteller uses a crystal ball to tell whether a person is going to be happy or sad. The dog, Snoopy, turns and walks away under the following caption: "I can tell the same thing looking into my dog dish—if it's full, I'm going to be happy—if it's empty, I'm going to be sad." People are very much like Snoopy.

Since people vote according to business trends, the most effective way to influence the outcome of an election is to have either a business recession or a business boom at election time. From my research on published and unpublished information, I am convinced that in this country steel strikes have been deliberately used to influence political elections.

Essentially, it works this way. A steel strike 1 year prior to an election causes a recession during the election, which results in the defeat of the party in power. A steel strike threat during the election year stimulates business and helps sustain the party in power. Note how this sequence has happened in recent years. The long 1959 steel strike caused the 1960–61 recession. The presidential election held during that recession resulted in the defeat of the party in power. When the steel contract was settled in January 1960, the unions went for a peculiar length contract—30 months. This enabled the contract to be terminated in mid-1962. The threat of a steel strike in 1962 did stimulate business and the voters were favorable to the party in power. As forecast in your Bulletin, in 1962 the unions bargained for a 2-year contract which provided a politically auspicious mid-1964 contract termination. In fact, the unions arranged a double billing by also having an automobile contract termination in 1964. The threat of a strike in both of these major industries could have been used to stimulate business in 1964 and this would have helped sustain the administration in power.

To accurately forecast purchasing and business trends one must use many keys and take many factors into consideration. Political and labor situations are among the factors that must be evaluated because they can have a big influence on business trends. Ignoring them has led many to arrive at erroneous conclusions and to make inaccurate forecasts.

Since 1962 several important developments have occurred in these areas, and the business-political situation has shifted. Before examining these developments, however, let us consider more fully why steel strikes have such an impact on business trends.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PURCHASING

Research shows that at least since 1870 the actions and attitudes of industrial purchasers have influenced the timing and magnitude of business trends. Unfortunately, most of those who have written about business cycles have ignored the role of purchasing. Much attention has been given to final consumers, but few have studied the intermediate consumers—the business and governmental purchasers. Many have analyzed the problems of marketing and distribution, but few have studied the importance of purchasing and the problems of acquisition.

It should be recognized that the importance of purchasing is due, in part, to its magnitude and to the fact that purchasing forms a major link in the allocation of our Nation's resources. All available evidence shows that the average manufacturer spends more for purchases than for anything else. In the average industrial firm, for every dollar of product sold, 50 cents worth of goods and services have been purchased to make the product. Purchasers allocate among suppliers one-half of all dollars taken in by the average manufacturing firm. Some people have the erroneous impression that labor is the greatest expense in manufacturing, but it is not. The average firm spends twice as much for purchases as for wages and salaries combined. How and when purchasing is done determines the success of the firm, the success of suppliers, and the success of our business system.

The great profit leverage of purchasing is also worth noting. In the average manufacturing firm, the relationship between purchasing and profits makes a 1-percent savings in purchases equivalent to 10 percent of the profits. Some companies pay close attention to this 10-to-1 profit leverage of purchasing, while others continue to overlook purchasing's profit potential. All should realize there is value to the old saying, "goods well bought are half sold."

In total, industrial purchasing has a staggering impact upon our business system. In this country, aggregate industrial purchases are approximately $15 to $20 billion per month. By way of comparison, this almost incomprehensible figure is 30 to 40 times as much as the recent, much-publicized tax cut. How and when purchasing executives make their commitments determines many of our business trends.

Whereas many forecasters focus attention upon final consumers, in reality it is intermediate consumers who are more important in determining the timing and magnitude of business fluctuations. Most final consumers are followers and lag behind trends in the business system.

Purchasing decisions are influenced by both present and probable future conditions. To sustain production and to protect profits, purchasing executives must vary their forward commitments to meet changing conditions. Chart VII shows how the forward commitments of purchasing executives have varied as much as 1 month or more between periods of business expansion and business recession. These variations have moved many billions of purchasing dollars into or out of the business system. Such gigantic movements are sufficient to cause major business expansions or recessions.

INVENTORY CYCLE

Even though inventory changes are the primary cause of fluctuations in our gross national product, most theoreticians have not been able to forecast accurately the inventory cycle. The primary reason for this is that most theoreticians continue to make at least two erroneous assumptions: The first is that companies try to maintain a constant inventory-to-sales ratio; the second is that the inventory cycle results from poor sales forecasting. Contrary to these assumptions, a study of the practical side of life shows that companies do vary their inventory-to-sales ration; and they do intentionally change the amount of inventory carried, especially in time of supply uncertainties.

When the theorists realize that buying decisions often outweigh selling offers, then they will understand better why the inventory cycle is primarily caused by shifts in buying policies. Research on monthly change indexes shows that, in recent years, all major inventory cycles have been caused by purchasers trying to protect against supply uncertainties caused by steel strikes and strike threats. These inventory cycles can be clearly seen in the inventory graphs shown on charts II, IV, V, and VI.

When analyzing the impact of these inventory cycles, it also should be remembered that these cycles influence new orders, production, prices, capital expenditures, employment, and many other important aspects of our business system. In practice, inventory shifts are often the starting point in the acceleration or deceleration process.

In retrospect, it seems ironical that some people who have cried loudest about unemployment have been the major cause of unemployment. Some who have complained bitterly about the lack of industrial growth have caused the unstable conditions that make planning difficult. Certainly, many people have been hurt by three inventory cycles in the past 5 years.

Clifford Davis Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an editorial in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, complimenting the House of Representatives' action a few days ago in passing the resolution naming the new interstate bridge at Memphis for our distinguished and esteemed colleague, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

I thought I would like to call it to the attention of the membership.

The article follows:

CLIFFORD DAVIS BRIDGE

It is most unusual for the House of Representatives to be unanimous about anything, much less the name of a major item of public works. But the Members are in total agreement that Clifford Davis Bridge should be the name of the new Memphis span over the Mississippi which will link the interstate highway systems of western Tennessee and eastern Arkansas.

This is an honor to one of our fellow townsmen tnat does not come easily. Representative DAVIS has qualified during his many years as a Member of the House, assigned to the Public Works Committee, with key positions in both highway and river projects.

We hope the Senate complies with the House action.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, once again this year, 1964, we join hands with Poles all over the world in celebrating Polish Constitution Day, and in so doing, we salute the Polish people for their great contribution to ordered, democratic society.

On May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the United States of America was constitutionally formed, the Polish people, led by their King and their Diet, accepted a new constitution—a constitution that would reverberate through history for its dedication to the highest principles and ideals of Western political theory.

This Constitution, like all the constitutions of the Western World, and especially the American Constitution, was designed to establish true constitutional government by which national stability and identity could finally be achieved. Like the American Constitution, this document recognized explicitly the existence of human rights, and set up safe guards for the protection of those rights. By so doing, the Polish people were among the earliest to accept and to try to apply the great principles of the 18th century enlightenment.

More specifically, the Polish Constitution took away the unlimited powers of the throne, and established a constitutional monarchy responsible to a cabinet-type government with a popularly elected lower house. Furthermore, the peasants were taken from under the strong arm of the landed gentry, and placed under the protection of law. Throughout the society freedoms were guaranteed. No one could ask any nation in the 18th century to have done more.

The document was hailed throughout the world as, in the words of Edmund Burke, "a great work." Our own President, George Washington, praised the document and the nation, and in Warsaw the Polish peoples rejoiced all night.

But alas the promise of the Constitution was never realized; never put to the test; never permitted to usher in a new era of human freedom in Europe. Because of an envious Russia, and dissident Polish nobility, the country was once again torn from within, and by September 1793, partition was started. Final and irrevocable partition took place in 1795.

The events of post World War I and World War II years are yet too clear to us to have to recount here. Instead, let us remind our Polish brothers that even 173 years later we do have a com-

mon heritage and a common goal. While the Constitution of May 3, 1791, did not live, neither did its spirit die. The Polish people can see it living here in American every day. And to the end of our salute to the Polish people, we should add that Americans do not think for a moment that communism in Poland will be any more successful in destroying the Poles desire to live in freedom and human dignity than were earlier Russian-inspired oppressions.

In Defense of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there have been some sorry attempts in recent times to debase the military uniform and ridicule its wearers. Whether these attempts achieve their objectives of drama or humor is debatable, but there is no question but that they do a disservice to our military men.

The Honorable Norman Paul, our distinguished Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, has written an article which refutes the claims of those who look down on the services. His protest, which appeared in the Washington Star of April 26, 1964, now follows:

IN DEFENSE OF MILITARY MEN WHO MISS THE HEADLINES

(By Norman S. Paul)

(Norman S. Paul, the author of the protest on certain delineations of our military men, is Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.)

We Americans have always prided ourselves on the simplicity of our tastes. Our moral principles are clear and unequivocal. We are in favor of what is right and against what is wrong.

This direct approcah is reflected in our taste for entertainment. Since the days of the first flicker box, the days of Dustin Farnum and William S. Hart. we have cheered the cowboy in the white hat, the good guy, and booed the bad guy, who is inevitably frustrated, in the end, in his scurrilous designs against motherhood, the honest rancher, and chasity. To give the audience an occasional respite from the dreadful tension of the contest between good and evil, which frequently finds our hero in a number of messy situations, we have always provided comic relief, usually in the form of an affable dolt who appears just long enough to win our hearts but not long enough to gum up the plot.

Today we still love westerns, but the basic plot has been translated into a number of up-to-date situations, and in some cases the plot itself has been obscured in the process. Hundreds of thousands of Americans are lining up to see two smash hit films, "Seven Days in May" and "Dr. Strangelove." Each deals, in its own way, with problems of the greatest national and international interest and importance. There the resemblance ceases, except for certain of the cast of characters—specifically the villains and the comic relief. In each film, they wear the uniform of the United States.

A central figure in the near tragedy of "Seven Days in May" is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, an Air Force general. Behind the facade of the rugged physique, the handsome face and the battle ribbons, we see a thoroughly immoral animal, a captive of an American style of fascism, and a traitor to his President and his country. A coconspirator, in the uniform an an admiral in the U.S. Navy, who didn't have the guts to follow through, sips wine in his official quarters, displays a paunchy and generally dissipated appearance, and lies to his President.

VILLAINS IN UNIFORM

In "Dr. Strangelove" we are treated to villains and comic relief, and other characters less simple to define—all in military uniforms. A Strategic Air Command base commander, obviously a general in the Air Force, goes mad and decides to start a war. The Air Force Chief of Staff, bearing a remarkable physical and vocal resemblance to one of our outstanding living military leaders, reluctantly abandons an assignation with what may be loosely described as his secretary, and proceeds to a meeting called by his commander-in-chief in the war room. There, he provides the comic relief so essential to a plot which grinds its way inexorably to the end—of everything.

I don't object to these films, I have, of course, seen both. They are provocative, which is good, and of the highest technical quality. But what disturbes me deeply, however, is the apparent trend in current publications and motion pictures, of which these are but two manifestations, to make the military uniform of our country, and those who wear it, the boobs, buffoons, and villians of the piece.

I am concerned with the human element in defense. The largest part of my job is to recommend policies involving people in uniform—recruiting them, paying them, promoting them, assigning them, keeping up their morale, providing them medical care, educating them, retiring them, and so on, through the entire range of human activity. As a civilian, I have had a unique opportunity to visit and discuss their problems with hundreds of our military people of all ranks and grades. We read often today of our chiefs of staff (although I wonder how many of us could name them all without a little priming) and of the young officers who are engaged in more spectacular pursuits, such as our astronauts.

THREE WHO COUNT

But we hear and read virtually nothing about the thousands of others whom we have to thank, today, for the opportunity to pursue our lives in a world at peace. Take, for example, Walter Beckham.

Col. Walter Beckham is the chief scientist of the Air Force Weapons Laboratory, a position of great responsibility and demanding the greatest scientific and technological proficiency. No egghead is Col. Beckham. He joined the Air Corps in 1941 as an aviation cadet, at that time with only a high school education. As a fighter pilot during World War II, he was a triple ace, with 18 air victories to his credit, when he was shot down and taken prisoner by the Germans in 1944. His decorations include the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with one oak leaf cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross with four clusters, and the Air Medal with five clusters. While in prison camp, he got interested in physics when a fellow prisoner loaned him a college textbook. After the war, still in uniform, he pursued this interest and acquired a B.S. and a masters degree in physics. In the 1950's, he committed himself to an Air Force course in science and technology, and started working on his Ph. D. thesis in physics. He received his degree in 1962, when assigned to the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. Very few scientists, civilian or military, are engaged in work more critical to our security than Walter Beckham.

Andrew Jackson Goodpaster was graduated from West Point in 1939 and commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Corps of Engineers. He served in various assignments in the corps from that time through the war, commanded an engineer combat battalion, and received the Distinguished Service Cross and other combat decorations, including the Purple Heart. After the war, his Army assignments led him into the planning area. Between 1947 and 1950, he received a masters degree in engineering and a Ph. D. in international relations. In 1950, then lieutenant colonel, Andy Goodpaster was assigned to the staff of Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe, and there began a series of assignments under General Eisenhower. He was entrusted with a large number of highly sensitive assignments during that period, and was warmly complimented on many occasions by his chief. Further command assignments followed, then assignment to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in January 1964 appointment as assistant to the Chairman and promotion to lieutenant general. This is the type of man who today we find in the real war room.

We are all familiar with our Polaris submarines, the tremendously complex and expensive weapons system which constitutes such an important part of our strategic deterrent. The captain of such a submarine has an awesome responsibility. Each submarine carries 16 missiles; together they represent more explosive power than all the bombs dropped by all the air forces of all the combatants of World War II.

A NAVY COMMANDER

Comdr. Joe Williams, U.S. Navy, is familiar with that responsibility. He commands the Gold Crew of U.S.S. *Robert E. Lee*. For 60 days at a time he is solely responsible for the on-station readiness of this $120 million ship, her $20 million worth of missiles, and the safety and training of her 136 officers and men.

Commander Williams is 41 years old, married, and the father of two daughters and a son. He is no stranger to responsibility nor to the sea. In 1940 Joe Williams was a seaman on convoy duty in the North Atlantic. By 1944 he had advanced through the Navy enlisted ranks and became an officer. He had completed five semesters at the University of California and is now just 2½ terms away from his engineering degree.

The men I have described were not picked entirely at random, but I can assure you that there are many others like them.

All of us in the Defense Department, in or out of uniform, will readily admit that there is mediocrity in the military, as in other professions. I am a lawyer, and there is plenty of it in mine. But mediocrity of the few is overwhelmingly exceeded by the outstanding devotion, dedication, and performance of the many. Who, in 1940, had heard the names of Eisenhower, Spaatz, Nimitz, Halsey, Bradley, Arnold? But they were there to meet the challenge of history, to the everlasting glory of their professional calling, and their country. Many of the largest corporations in America, which can hardly be described as eleemosynary institutions, have as members of their boards or chief executive officers men who had completed a first brilliant career in uniform—Clay of Continental Can; Rawlings of General Mills; Bradley of Bulova; Burke of Texaco; to name a very few.

Despite his achievements, and the broad base of our society from which he springs, the thought persists in the minds of too many people, be they detractors or flag wav-

ers, that somehow the man in uniform is "different" from the rest of us. To some degree he is. His oath of office and enlistment contract deprive him of certain of the freedoms that other citizens enjoy. He is subject to absolute discipline. He lives and works in places and under conditions that are entirely beyond his control. He will never get rich in the service. He can't walk off the job if he doesn't like the boss' looks or the type of work he happens to be doing at the moment.

On the other hand, he is very much a part of the community in which he lives, no longer segregated within a military post. You will see him at PTA meetings, church suppers, the country club. He pays taxes. His son and yours are in the same scout troop, on the same Little League ball team. Different? Yes, only in the degree of commitment he has made to national service.

In the nuclear age, the galloping obsolescence of military concepts and of the weapons we have long cherished as the indicia of armed might, present new challenges to the military profession. The man in uniform must participate in the competition of ideas and leadership which the nuclear age demands, or he will find himself as magnificently ineffectual, in determining the final results, as Davy Crockett at the Alamo.

The men I have mentioned, and their colleagues, recognize the challenge and are meeting it. Civilians come and go, but the continuing vitality of our defense depends ultimately on the man in uniform. It is a tough, demanding career he has chosen. Surely he deserves better of us than being portrayed, to the world, as the arch-type of the bay guy and the fool which, thank God, he isn't.

Ability Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues an essay on "How Handicapped Workers in My Community Are Proving That 'Ability Counts,'" written by Miss Jocelyn L. Weinberg of my home city of New Orleans, La. Miss Weinberg, who is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George Weinberg of New Orleans and is a senior at Alcee Fortier High School, wrote this essay for the national "Ability Counts" essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in cooperation with Governors' committees and community committees.

For her essay, Miss Weinberg was awarded fourth prize in the national contest; she was one of the five national winners who received cash prizes and plaques for their high schools in recognition of their fine essays. I am proud that a young student from my city received such a splendid award, and I am happy to congratulate her and her parents for their daughter's achievement. Here in Washington, President Lyndon Johnson presented Miss Weinberg with the plaque for Alcee Fortier High School, a first-rate high school in my city, and a certificate for herself. She also was awarded a cash prize of $300 for her essay.

I am particularly pleased with Miss Weinberg's winning essay because she is the first New Orleans student ever to win one of the five top places in this contest. In the 16 years since this contest was first established, six students from Lake Charles High School, Lake Charles, La., had garnered fourth or fifth places, but Miss Weinberg was the first New Orleans girl to do so, and I am proud of her, and happy to salute her for this recognition. By her splendid accomplishment, Miss Weinberg has brought honor and credit not only to herself and to her family, but also to Alcee Fortier High School, to the New Orleans public school system and to the State of Louisiana.

This essay contest is part of the President's Committee's overall educational program aimed at making more persons aware of the problems facing the handicapped in obtaining jobs, in the efforts being made to help the handicapped help themselves, and in the admirable accomplishments of many severely disabled individuals. It is a most worthy contest, particularly for young people who will be tomorrow's leaders in our country, and I commend Miss Weinberg's essay to my colleagues in the Congress. She brings to light the many handicapped New Orleans citizens who have overcome their affliction, made it work for them and thus have become useful members of their community. She also cites the fine work in this field being done in my city by Goodwill Industries Inc.; the Lighthouse for the Blind and the Junior League of New Orleans and others.

Miss Weinberg's essay follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT "ABILITY COUNTS"

(By Jocelyn L. Weinberg)

A leading industrial and trade center of the South, New Orleans is a bustling metropolitan area of over 675,000 people. In a city of this size, there are hundreds of thousands of services and jobs to be done, and the handicapped worker of New Orleans is as much an efficient member of the bloodstream of this pulsating city as is the ablebodied worker.

No job requires 100 percent of a worker's physical capacity. The stress is not on the limitations imposed by a disability but on the positive abilities that remain to be capitalized on. The disabled worker, when properly placed on a job in respect to his capabilities, is not handicapped and can be among the safest, most productive, and loyal employees.

A New Orleans lawyer claims that his blindness serves to his advantage in that he has everyone's attention in the courtroom and that clients find it easier to unburden themselves to someone who does not glare at them. A clubfoot did not prevent a woman from becoming one of our most prominent pediatricians. Nor did losing an arm in the service impede a New Orleans psychiatrist. A 23-year-old man is a physicist at the National Aeronautics Rocket Center in the area, despite the fact that he is a spastic. And one of our community's most respected teachers must get about on braces and crutches because both his legs are atrophied because of polio. A large chain of supermarkets here employs retarded boys, a spastic, and a number of handicapped women. Another firm has a PBX receptionist with wooden legs, a young woman who had infantile paralysis is a secretary in an airline's office, and a salesgirl in a downtown department store has no forearm. The head of a large meatpacking plant tells of a young spastic employee who, realizing that he had little education and could do little manual work, exercised and lifted weights at the YMCA for several years; thus he developed such muscles that he can now lift heavy containers of meat that other coworkers cannot handle. There are many more such cases.

For others with more severe limitations who cannot move directly into normal employment, the New Orleans community offers organizations devoted to providing rehabilitation, training, and sheltered workshop employment. These agencies aid the handicapped by giving them the opportunity and encouragement to help themselves. Goodwill Industries, a thriving nonprofit United Fund-affiliated sheltered workshop, is "dedicated to rehabilitating discarded men and material." Its rehabilitating services, on-the-job training, employment, and wages are exclusively for physically, mentally, or emotionally impaired men and women. There handicapped workers transform discarded donations into salable second-hand merchandise to be sold at low prices in Goodwill stores, the sales receipts paying the workers' wages. The Lighthouse for the Blind, another unique, nonprofit organization, offers a broad range of employment and services for the blind of New Orleans. The facilities include hobby shop, therapy, recreation, social services, and the production department, which is the organization's only means of support except for unsolicited contributions. The industry manufactures over 40 different commercial products, including brooms, mops, mailing bags, beverage cases, and dishcloths. Sales of these items netted almost a half million dollars ($500,000) in 1963. It is quite an experience to visit the Lighthouse during working hours and see how their blind citizens are gaining greater independence. The switchboard operator, the secretary using the Braille writer to type, office assistants, the workers in the sewing room, and the men in the shop handling razor-sharp cutting tools are all blind, yet all are working with speed and agility that is amazing. The Junior League of New Orleans has received national recognition for the work-training center for retarded girls which it sponsors. Sixteen of the 25 girls who were trained last year were placed in competitive employment. The files of the State vocational rehabilitation agency, State employment service, State Welfare Agency, social security office, and the Veterans' Administration all contain instances of men and women who have built or rebuilt their lives despite sometimes devastating physical or emotional damage.

Each of these individuals possesses a vision, a courage, a resourcefulness, and a determination that is awe-inspiring. Each dramatically exemplifies that one's ability, not disability, is the factor that really counts. These people do not want charity, but only a chance—a chance to prove that they can be an economic and social asset to the community—a chance to gain that self-respect, that integrity, and that dignity which are achieved only from earning one's own livelihood, instead of living on some type of dole. More taxpaying citizens, not burdens for the relief rolls, are needed. The public must be enlightened and reminded that every individual should be afforded the information and the opportunity to make his utmost contribution to a better life for himself and for his fellowmen and to a better tomorrow.

Religious Leaders on Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1964, some of the Congressmen from Maryland had a most informative meeting requested by a number of religious and lay leaders on the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would amend the Bill of Rights with respect to the separation of church and state. The text of some of the statements made or read at the meeting as well as some submitted separately follow:

Leland Higginbotham, chairman of the Christian Life Committee, Baptist Convention of Maryland:

Honorable Senators and Representatives, I am Leland Higginbotham, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church of Towson, Md., and chairman of the Christian Life Committee of the Baptist Convention of Maryland.

Our convention at its annual meeting in November of 1963 unanimously adopted the following statement as part of its response to the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court regarding the use of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible as part of religious exercises at the opening of certain public schools. "We, furthermore, call upon our people to very carefully study any proposed amendments to the Constitution in this area, lest the newer amendments create greater problems than the present one that has stood for over 150 years."

In accordance with this directive of our convention, and as chairman of the committee that drafted it, I am submitting the following statement on the proposed Becker amendment. While, because of the organizational structure of our denomination, no one can speak for all Baptists, I hope to present what I consider our main concerns with respect to the Becker amendment. I have singled out this particular proposal, because its several elements may be analyzed with relevance to most of the other forms, but I would like to make it clear that I am opposed to any and all proposals that would change the meaning of the first amendment.

The principal objection to the proposed Becker amendment is its generalized and nonspecific nature, which rather than extending the free exercise of religion, would actually tend to limit it and would destroy religious liberty for any minority.

For example, while the first section of this proposed amendment would define that nothing in the Constitution shall prohibit the offering, reading or listening to prayers and scriptures in schools and other public institutions, it fails to state who shall determine which prayers and scriptures shall be used. Surely Congress realizes that we are a truly pluralistic society with many different religious groups holding beliefs that vary so widely that to use the forms of one would offend others. It was the plight of and concern of certain minorities to end just such long-standing abuse that brought the issue to our Supreme Court. The public institution cannot solve this dilemma without inevitably placing Government in the position of establishing a particular form of religious practice.

The attempt on the part of the authors of this proposal to avoid this problem by placing the practice "on a voluntary basis" is not practical, since some agency of the community must decide what form the "voluntary" practice will take. Were the decision left to the religious majority in a given community, this would make possible the imposition of the religious practices of the majority upon the minority through the use of public institutions and thereby use the agency of government to destroy religious liberty.

Section 2 of this proposed amendment seeks to leave open to statements of belief in, reliance upon, and to invoke the aid of God, such channels of governmental activity as documents, coins, assemblies and schools. Again it fails to make clear what kind of expressions may be made, what form they may take and to set any limits whatsoever as to how far these statements may go in giving official sanction on the part of government to a particular form of religious faith. This could soon involve us in deep religious controversy as one group or another might seek to aline these expressions with their own convictions. The United States has been singularly spared such destructive controversies by carefully avoiding any establishment of any particular religious faith as the official faith of the Government and the Nation. Individual citizens, whether holding public office or not, have throughout our history, been free to express their personal faith in public ways that have been a personal witness to religious belief without seeking to impose this on others through official sanctions.

Section 3 of this proposal foresees these dangers by stating that "nothing in this article shall constitute the establishment of religion." Actually this makes the proposed amendment a self-contradictory statement by first providing the Government the means to establish any from of religious practice or expression thereof, than declaring that these means do not "establish" religion. The amendment, thus fails to be logical and makes impossible a clear definition of what "establishment of religion" means. Such ambiguity goes far toward the day when government may actually control the religious life of the community or thereby even prohibit the exercise of religious faith should an irreligious majority gain control.

Absolute separation of church and state has been and is today the only sure safeguard of freedom and vitality of religious faith and the security of the state.

LELAND HIGGINBOTHAM,
Chairman of the Christian Life Committee Baptist Convention of Maryland.

Rev. Fred H. Webber, general presbyter of the Presbytery of Baltimore of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

In all fairness, I must say at the outset that I am speaking today as an individual. I have not been authorized to speak for any other person or group of persons. Yet, the position I present is based upon an official statement made by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in an action taken on May 21, 1963.

The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church adopted, after amendment, the report of its special committee on relations between church and state. On the subject of "The celebration of religious holidays, Bible reading and prayer in public schools," the report as amended and adopted said, in part:

"Public schools are creations of the whole society operating through civil authority and justify their existence solely in terms of their usefulness to the society. Their role is to nurture the cultural, social, and material advancement of all citizens by a special system of instruction through intellectual and social disciplines and to stimulate a free search for truth within this discipline. In the fulfillment of this role, public schools should not ignore the personal beliefs in God which are a part of the life of its pupils, but should recognize and respect such beliefs. Public schools should neither be hostile to religious beliefs nor act in any manner which tends to favor one religion or church over another.

"In this light the special committee on church and state recommends that * * * Religious observances never be held in a public school or introduced into the public school as part of its program. Bible reading in connection with courses in the American heritage, world history, literature, the social sciences, and other academic subjects is completely appropriate to public school instruction. Bible reading and prayers as devotional acts tend toward indoctrination or meaningless ritual and should be omitted for both reasons. Ministers, priests, and rabbis should be free to speak in public schools, provided their speaking does not constitute religious indoctrination or their presence form a part of a religious observance."

In accord with this position of my church, I submit that the Becker amendment opens problems that are now on the way to solution, rather than solving anything. The present first amendment to the Constitution, even with certain present questions as to its meaning, is an important guarantee, and should be left to stand for itself.

It is no part of the business of the public schools to teach a religious faith, Bible reading and prayer which serve that purpose have, therefore, no place in the program of the school. Bible reading and prayer which do not serve that purpose are meaningless, and cheapen religion in the mind of children who share in them.

It serves no useful purpose, and creates the possibility of untold mischief, to make constitutional and thereby encourage practices which either subvert the purposes of the public schools or tend to make religious observance a cheap exercise with no meaning.

Rev. FRED H. WEBBER,
General Presbyter of the Presbytery of Baltimore of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

John Wesley Lord, bishop of the Methodist Church, the Washington area:

Pressure is mounting for the passage of a constitutional amendment which would allow the return of the traditional rights of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools.

I believe that such an amendment, though sincerely conceived, would be unwise and dangerous, and a threat to our established freedoms. The first amendment to our Constitution is adequate as it stands, to protect the religious freedom of the people. Indeed, it is the finest part of our American heritage.

There is no need for a "prayer amendment," and such amendments as are being proposed, would open the doors to more serious religious problems than we now face.

The decision of the Supreme Court, that the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible as a devotional exercise in the public school were an establishment of religion proscribed by the first amendment, needs careful study.

The Court has clearly proscribed devotional exercises, both prayers and devotional readings of the Bible, as a regular part of the school program, and certainly when such prayers and programs are prepared by State administrators of the public school system. It did not exclude teaching about religion in the curriculum, nor the use of the Bible as a reference text in appropriate courses. Without doubt their will be some difficulty in defining exactly what is a proscribed devotional exercise. It is not yet clear whether a patriotic pageant, even if it excludes a historic religious reference is proscribed. It is clear that a religious pageant that has as its

object either devotion or the inculcation of religion or a particular religion, especially where this is embarrassing to a child of another faith or the child of a nonbeliever, is forbidden.

The basic distinction is between a proper educational effort on the one hand, and indoctrination of either beliefs or religious habits on the other. In making this determination, we do well to consider the words of the opinion of the Court:

"It might well be that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion, or the history of religion, and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly can be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historical qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the first amendment."

We note the distinction between the educational and the devotional purpose. The school may not pray, but it must teach. Religion cannot be excluded from education; nor does the Court's decision intend this.

Prayer and Bible reading in the atmosphere of religious devotion and worship in the home and in the church are of great value, but serious question can be raised about their use in the public school when such an atmosphere does not exist and when pupils come from varied religious backgrounds. Indeed, to secularize or to profane this holy practice is to place in jeopardy the very good that we seek to preserve in the Christian heritage.

However, the Court's decision comes as a challenge to educators and to administrators of the public school system to tackle the tough assignment of offering objective courses in religion. This has now become an obligation and severe criticism should be directed against any school system that fails to introduce its students to the world of religion.

The challenge comes with equal force to the home and church to provide the devotional atmosphere in which the spiritual purpose of such exercises can be fulfilled and maintained. When we consider that one-half of the children in the United States are not related to any church or synagogue, the missionary imperative is upon us. We must see to it through teaching and through devotional worship—that the coming generation has a far better understanding of the role that religion plays in life, than has our own generation.

There are many ways of teaching religion. Principal L. P. Jacks reminds us that: "We teach religion in arithmetic by accuracy. We teach it in language by learning to say what we mean. We teach it in history by humanity. We teach it in geography by breadth of mind. We teach it on the playground by fairplay. We teach it in kindness to animals, by courtesy to servants, by good manners to one another and by truthfulness in all things. We teach it by showing the children, that we, their elders, are their friends and not their enemies."

We hesitate to suggest that proposers of "prayer amendments" might be politically motivated, but we raise a flag of caution. We do not need another amendment. We need respect for the heritage of the free exercise of religion granted by the first amendment in its present form.

(Statement submitted by Rev. Edgar Soper.)

Bishop JOHN WESLEY LORD,
Bishop of the Methodist Church, the Washington Area.

Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt, president of the Baltimore Board of Rabbis:

The Baltimore Board of Rabbis, which consists of the spiritual leaders of 15 of the largest Jewish congregations in Baltimore, representing the orthodox, conservative, and reform wings of Judaism, is opposed to the Becker amendment for the following reasons:

1. It poses a serious threat to the first amendment of our Constitution, which has stood intact since its adoption in 1791, and has been a bulwark of democracy and the chief guarantee of freedom of worship in our country.

2. Instead of uniting the pupils of America's public schools, it would divide them according to their religious beliefs.

3. It would take away the responsibility for religious instruction and worship from the home and the church or synagogue, where they cannot fulfill them without violating the religious liberty of the individuals concerned.

4. It is unnecessary, since the interpretation by the Supreme Court of the first amendment as it stands does not prevent any child from praying privately.

5. It is unrealistic to speak of voluntary action on the part of young children with no one to guide and direct them.

DR. SAMUEL ROSENBLATT, *President.*

The views I have expressed also coincide with those of the Baltimore Jewish Council, which is the clearinghouse of the entire organized Jewish community of Metropolitan Baltimore, in whose name I have been authorized to speak, in the place of its executive director, Mr. Leon Sachs, who is unable to appear on account of a death in his family.

Arthur Kiesz, religious liberty secretary, Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists:

This and similar amendments are designed to neutralize the series of decisions by the Supreme Court declaring unconstitutional required Bible reading and prayer in public schools.

Freedom has been the watchword of the United States from its inception. Man's longing for liberty brought it to birth, and his zeal for liberty has raised it to the highest eminence of worldly power and glory.

Our Constitution has kept us a free people. It will continue to protect our freedom if we will not tamper with its basic foundation.

Traditionally Seventh-day Adventists have stood for the separation of church and state. I think it proper to state that the department I represent has over 43,000 members which share these same convictions. On behalf of our people, I wish to make the following declarations:

1. We are for Bible reading and prayer, but we are against the proposed amendments. Because we believe in Bible reading and prayer we have established our own parochial school system.

2. We are for the first amendment to the Constitution, and are therefore against any amendment that would weaken it in any way.

3. We believe that to adopt one of the presently proposed amendments would weaken and could destroy the effectiveness of the first amendment to the Constitution, which has ever protected the rights of the citizens, both Christian and non-Christian, both majority and minority, in the field of religion in relation to the state.

4. We believe that the proposed amendments are unnecessary. The Supreme Court's decisions do not prohibit voluntary prayer and Bible reading.

5. We are, also, of the conviction that an hour of religious instruction a week in the school is not going to stick to the child who sees no religion practiced in the home.

What America today needs is men and women who prefer imprisonment to the loss of their liberty. We must not sell our individual birthright of freedom for a mess of propaganda. This Nation under God can have a new birth of freedom only when free individuals accept the moral and divine responsibilities of freedom.

Let us preserve this heritage. As long as men cower together under the relentless pressure of state, church, class, or party, there is no basis for freedom.

ARTHUR KIESZ,
Religious Liberty Secretary, Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

Mrs. Dolores Seldon on behalf of the Baltimore Ethical Society:

The Baltimore Ethical Society supports the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions on prayers and Bible readings in the public schools.

The proposed Becker amendment threatens the integrity of the Bill of Rights and poses the first real threat to religious freedom in this country since the Constitution was adopted.

Since the adoption of the first amendment, the United States has escaped much of the bitter religious conflict and sectarian strife that has divided other nations. This has been due in a major part to the truly great contribution the American people have made to Western civilization—the concept of the separation of church and state. The Becker amendment is a direct assault upon this principle.

The public school is the chief instrumentality of our Nation to promote and preserve the unity of our people. The Becker amendment threatens the integrity of our public schools.

We urge all Americans to speak out for religious freedom and against the Becker amendment.

MRS. SELDON,
Baltimore Ethical Society.

Finally, James O. Duncan, editor of the Capital Baptist and one of the organizers of the meeting:

Even though I speak only for one person, I do believe that most of the people for whom I seek to minister would agree with me in stating that we do not want the proposed amendment to the Constitution.

For all these years the first amendment has served all, and has served well. We believe it guarantees to each and all the freedom possible in a pluralistic society.

We do not believe that government, be it local, State, or Federal, should be promoting religion. For the good of both the state and church, each ought to stay separate of the other as much as possible.

The duty of the church is to educate the public concerning the true nature of God, of man, and of prayer The political leader has a moral responsibility to properly interpret the laws of the land and, to the best of his ability, the decisions of the courts where these decisions are involved in proposed legislation.

The church must not expect the public school, a tax-supported institution, to do its work. The propagation of the faith must be the responsibility of individuals, the church, the home.

The political leader ought to be more committed to his task of representing all the people than to some who respond more out of emotions than out of reason to one issue.

JAMES O. DUNCAN,
Editor, Capital Baptist, Publication of District of Columbia Baptist Convention.

In addition, the following letter from Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., of the Georgetown University Law School, was read to the group:

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1964.

Hon. CARLTON SICKLES,
House of Representatives,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SICKLES: At the present time proposals are being made to the Congress to adopt amendments to the first

amendment to the Constitution. These amendments would seek to effect a change in the so-called prayer decisions of the Supreme Court.

I am opposed to these amendments.

To carve out exceptions to the protections and safeguards of the first amendment will be to endanger one of the primary bulwarks of constitutional liberty. A proper appreciation of constitutional procedures indicates that amendments should not be passed merely to achieve particular ends. The principles for which the first amendment stand are far too important to be jeopardized.

While I do not agree with all that was expressed in the prayer decisions, the decisions themselves are correct. The Government has no place in composing prayers or in conducting religious exercises. Perhaps it would have been best had the Court decided that this was a matter peculiarly of local concern, that the minimal Government influence in religious matters was not of constitutional stature. However, having faced the issue, the Court must conclude that the State is powerless to prescribe any particular form of religious exercise.

In my judgment, the Court has erred in other cases in not recognizing the right of parents to see to the religious education of their children even in the public schools. By forbidding such parental control during school hours on school property, the Court has in fact secularized religion. However, the correction needed is not found in State-directed religious exercises nor even in the passage of a constitutional amendment which would clearly establish parental rights. Rather, the solution is to be found in the process of "elucidating litigation." It is to be hoped that persistent and articulate expressions of the real meaning of religious liberty and of establishment may some day effect a reversal of those decisions denying parental rights. But here, too, it is the part of constitutional prudence to avoid the hazards of the amendment procedure and to secure in the meantime those most fundamental rights found in the first amendment.

Hence, I believe that the prayer decisions are basically sound, that in any event the matter is not of sufficient importance to warrant an amendment to the Constitution, and that we must be more concerned with preserving the rights of the first amendment than in carving out exceptions through the amendment procedure.

I am pleased to submit these views for your consideration. I hope that you will oppose the constitutional amendments now being considered.

Sincerely,

DEXTER L. HANLEY, S.J.

Also, the National Council of Churches has sent me the following letter on the amendment of the Constitution:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,

New York, N.Y., April 8, 1964.

Re amendment of the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The National Council of Churches is opposed to efforts to revise the religion clauses of the Bill of Rights, feeling that the first amendment to our Constitution in its present wording has provided the framework within which responsible citizens and our courts have been able to afford a maximum protection for the religious liberty of all our citizens.

This view was expressed by the general board of the National Council of Churches in its recent pronouncement on the "Churches and the Public Schools," which I enclose for your information.

It seemed to me that legislators would want to know that the leaders elected to the National Council of Churches by its 31 major Protestant denominations, aggregating 40 million members, do not support the current efforts to change the first amendment.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. EDWIN ESPY,
General Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in addition I would like to submit for the RECORD a memorandum I have received from the division of Christian citizenship of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the text of a statement of the Executive Council of the Lutheran Church of America issued on July 1, 1963.

To: Members of the House Judiciary Committee and Members of Congress.

From: The Division of Christian Citizenship, the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 815 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The Episcopal Church has taken no stand on the question of the prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, and therefore, cannot officially support nor oppose any of the bills now before the House Judiciary Committee seeking to reverse the sense of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Abington Township* v. *Schempp* (No. 142, October term, 1962) (and concurrently *Murray* v. *Curlett*, No. 119).

The presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church made statements in support of the Supreme Court decision in June 1963. Four of the bishops of the Episcopal Church have written Congressman CELLER supporting the presiding bishop's statement with particular reference to the bills before the House Judiciary Committee. Two bishops are planning to testify against the Becker amendment. The chairman of the National Council's Commission on Church-State Relations plans to do the same.

The division of Christian citizenship of the department of Christian social relations is making available to you for your information:

(1) The presiding bishop's statements in support of the Supreme Court decision.

(2) The letter sent by four bishops to Congressman CELLER.

APRIL 17, 1964.

(Statements made by the Right Reverend Arthur C. Lichtenberger, D.D., presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, with regard to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Abington Township* v. *Schempp* (No. 142, October term, 1962) (and concurrently *Murray* v. *Curlett*, No. 119) in which the Court ruled 8–1 that Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer were unconstitutional when part of a religious exercise in public schools.)

Bishop Lichtenberger's first statement also refers to the Court's decision in *Engel* v. *Vitale* (No. 468, October term, 1961) in which it stated that "it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government."

June 6, 1963—Before reading the Abington opinion:

"Not having read the opinion of the Court, I have only one comment to make at the present time. It should be understood that the Court's action is not hostile to religion. These decisions reflect the Court's sense of responsibility to assure freedom and equality for all groups of believers and nonbelievers expressed in the first amendment to the Constitution."

June 18, 1963—After reading the Abington opinion:

"The Court makes it clear that it is not the task of public schools to inculcate religious beliefs or habits of worship. This is the task of our homes and churches and synagogues. We are indeed a religious people, but our varied beliefs are embodied in institutions which are not governmental and are not dependent on majority votes.

"It is now clear that public authorities are required to show neutrality toward all groups of believers and nonbelievers. In public schools members of religious minorities are not required to choose between participating in religious practices against their conscience and submitting to the handicap of expressing their dissent by conspicuous withdrawal. On this point the Court seems unanimous, although Justice Stewart thought there should be clear proof that dissenters are handicapped.

"We may be thankful that the Constitution does not permit the Government to define and give preference to some general version of Christianity or of Judeo-Christian religion.

"The Court does not rule out objective study of religion in public schools; indeed the Court encourages such study. It forbids the State-sanctioned religious practice of corporate worship through prayer and devotional reading of the Bible. But the Court does not forbid teaching of the place of religions in our culture and history and the importance of mutual respect among religious groups. With such teaching included, public school programs cannot be charged with teaching nonreligious humanism and can introduce students to the full range of our cultural heritage."

APRIL 20, 1964.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CELLER: We wish to express our opposition to the proposed amendment to the Constitution with respect to prayer in public schools and related matters (H.J. Res. 693).

We understand that the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court relate to prayers which are part of official devotional exercises in public schools. We believe that these decisions are not hostile to religion and that it is no proper function of government to inculcate religious beliefs or habits of worship. We are advised that nothing in these decisions forbids the offering of prayers on public occasions such as inaugurations. We therefore believe that the proposed amendment should not be adopted.

We will cooperate with you in seeing that this point of view is represented at the hearings scheduled before your committee.

Very truly yours,

Rt. Rev. JOHN E. HINES, D.D.,
Bishop of Texas, Episcopal Diocese of Texas, San Jacinto Street, Houston, Tex.

Rt. Rev. BROOKE MOSLEY, D.D., S.T.D.,
Office of the Bishop, Diocese of Delaware, Tatnall Street, Wilmington, Del.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM F. CREIGHTON, D.D.,
Bishop of Washington, Diocese of Washington, Mount St. Alban, Washington, D.C.

Rt. Rev. THOMAS A. FRASER, D.D.,
Bishop Coadjutor, Diocese of North Carolina, Hillsboro Street, Raleigh, N.C.

The complete text of the statement of the Executive Council of the Lutheran Church in America follows:

We do not believe that much has been lost in terms of the specific points covered by the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school prayer and Bible reading cases. If the Lord's Prayer were to be recited in schoolrooms only for the sake of the moral and ethical atmosphere it creates, it would be worth nothing to the practicing Christian. The Lord's Prayer is the supreme act of adoration and petition or it is

debased. Reading the Bible in the public schools without comment, too, has been of dubious value as either an educational or religious experience.

The more we attempt as Christians or Americans to insist on common denominator religious exercises instruction in the public schools, the greater risk we run of diluting our faith and contributing to a vague religiosity which identifies religion with patriotism and becomes a national folk religion.

At the same time, in candor, these decisions must be seen as a watershed. They open an era in which Christianity is kept separate from the state in a way that was foreign and would have been repugnant to the minds of our ancestors at the time when the Constitution was written and ever since. They signalize the fact that the United States of America, like many other nations, is past the place where underlying Christian culture and beliefs are assumed in its life.

This event intensifies the task of the church. It heightens the need of the church for strength to stand alone, lofty and unshaken, in American society. It calls for greater depth of conviction in all Christian men and women.

Small Business Administration Continues To Provide Financial Assistance to Greater Number of Small Businesses and Local Development Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a report released yesterday by Hon. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator, Small Business Administration, shows that increased numbers of small business concerns all over the country are seeking and obtaining valuable financial assistance from that agency. Loans recently granted by the Small Business Administration to local development companies in several States will provide more than 400 new jobs for the people in those regions.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that a copy of the SBA release be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

PRESS RELEASE—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 4, 1964.

The booming American economy is creating a heavy demand by small businesses for long-term Government loans, Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley said today.

"The credit gap that exists for small firms seeking capital funds to expand their businesses is clearly shown by the near record number of loan applications," Foley said.

"During March SBA received 1,315 business loan applications for $71.8 million. This compares with 1,045 applications for $57.0 million in February. The indications are that there will be a letup in demand during April."

"Since these loans are not solicited by SBA, it is clear that the heavy demand results from credit needs of small firms," Foley said. "We are working with the Nation's commercial banks to help small businesses obtain the long-term credit that so many of them need. About two-thirds of our loans are made with bank participation."

During March SBA approved 836 loans of all types for $35.6 million. These included 693 business loans for $27.9 million; 97 disaster loans for $800,000; 11 loans for $1.6 million to local development companies; 17 purchases of debentures totaling $2.4 million to assist small business investment companies in getting started or to expand their operations; and 18 loans for $2.9 million to help provide SBIC's with additional operating funds.

The small businesses receiving SBA loans in March reported they had approximately 7,500 employees at present, and many expect to increase employment as a result of the loans. Thirty-five of the loans went to new enterprises. SBA loans to local development companies during March created 535 new jobs.

Many of the loans were for construction, purchase of machinery or equipment, or for purchase of inventory, and thus they help stimulate the entire economy and create additional jobs.

More than 440 new jobs will be created in 4 States including 60 jobs in the hard-pressed Appalachian region of Pennsylvania as a result of Small Business Administration loans, SBA Administrator Eugene P. Foley announced today.

Foley said that 300 jobs will be created in areas of substantial unemployment in North Carolina and an additional 82 jobs will open up in Missouri and Iowa. All the loans are to local development companies.

The Pennsylvania loan will help finance construction of a machine shop factory. The new business in North Carolina will consist of a curtain manufacturing plant and a factory producing knitted goods. Missouri will get a leather glove manufacturing plant and Iowa will expand a precision machinery plant as a result of the loans.

The financing brings to 382 the number of local development company loans approved by SBA since the program started. The loans have totaled about $58.3 million and have created approximately 22,850 new jobs.

Many of the loans, including the five announced today, are for plant construction. Others are for purchase of machinery and equipment. The business generated in these industries provides an added boost to the economy and helps create additional jobs, Foley said.

Against Poverty Since 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, recently published an editorial in the April issue of Nation's Agriculture concerning the war on poverty which I am sure will be of interest to all the Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AGAINST POVERTY SINCE 1776

The fight against poverty did not begin with the President's message to Congress in January—it was launched in 1776 by the signing of the Declaration of Independence. By proclaiming that the rights of man were inviolate because they were God given, not a grant from the state, this Nation began the greatest and most successful battle against poverty in all history. The key to our success is freedom—freedom to choose an occupation, freedom to own property, freedom to succeed or fail, freedom to select those who govern. These freedoms give everyone the opportunity to improve his position and, fired with this incentive, most people are waging their own individual campaign against poverty.

No, we have not completely eliminated poverty; but compared to any other nation, our success is outstanding. The Socialist Manifesto of Karl Marx was a declaration of war against poverty but the method of attack prescribed was the exact opposite of the formula followed in the United States. Many nations have tried to obtain "social justice" but following the Socialist pattern of a government-managed economy to equalize rewards—not opportunity. The Russian revolution of 1917 gave birth to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" but the slave state method of eliminating want has kept living standards low for all except the party elite. Swedish socialism is, at best, a comfortable peasantry which has stifled intiative and encouraged moral decay. Australia, France, West Germany, and the United Kingdom have all experimented with varying degrees of government management of the economy—all are turning away.

No one will deny that a powerful government can divide the earnings of business, agriculture, and labor so that all will have approximately equal shares. The power to levy taxes may be used to confiscate the earnings of those who produce the most so that those who are less energetic may have equal rewards. Most people support the limited use of this power to help the handicapped and unfortunate. The difficulty comes in knowing where to draw the line. Living off the Government is a way of life for an alarmingly high number of American citizens.

The most alarming aspects of this new attack on poverty by legislation are the proposals to further inject Government management into the economy. Medicare for the aged is a foot in the door to socialized medicine. The ARA and RAD programs use chamber of commerce methods but are in fact another form of Federal Government intervention to influence the location of business and industrial expansion. Federal aid to education transfers much of the authority and responsibility for educating our children to the Central Government. The administration's support for Government supply management in agriculture whittles away at the farmer's freedom to choose.

These and the many other huge spending programs now advocated by the Johnson administration are not an attack on poverty. Just the reverse, they attack the very things which have made our Nation relatively free of poverty—freedom to work or play, freedom to spend or save, freedom to own a TV set and a Cadillac but live in a shack in order to do so. We are already too far down the road that leads to socialism—a morally decrepit philosophy which destroys the incentive to do better.

If Government should succeed in dividing everything equally according to need, might it not also succeed in eliminating the most important defense against want and misery—the fear of poverty.

Four Clear-Cut Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in an address before the District of Columbia

League of Republican Women, Clark Mollenhoff, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter for the Des Moines Register & Tribune, offered some good advice to the Republican Party.

In his speech, he listed four clear-cut cases Republicans can use to advantage: The Bobby Baker scandal, the TFX contract investigation, the Otto Otepka case, and the Johnson radio and television interests in Texas.

The following article on Mr. Mollenhoff's speech appeared in the May 5 issue of the Washington Post:

NONPARTISAN PRIZEWINNER CITES TFX BAKER CASES AS GOP ELECTION ISSUES

(By Marie Smith)

Four "clear-cut cases" the Republicans could use to an advantage in this year's presidential election were cited by a "nonpartisan" prize-winning Washington reporter yesterday during a luncheon address before the District of Columbia League of Republican Women.

But, the reporter, Clark Mollenhoff, said, "the Republican Party has not done the job it should in taking advantage of campaign material available * * * and is not interested enough to go into this matter deeply."

Mollenhoff, a lawyer, journalist and author of the book, "Washington Coverup," said the top candidates for the GOP presidential nomination prefer to "talk in quips" rather than going into cases and issues.

"They don't want to do the study necessary to know about these issues," he said, and listed the issues as:

The case of former secretary to the Senate majority, Robert Baker, whom, he said, President Johnson now indicates he "had very little to do with." But Mollenhoff read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD praise Mr. Johnson heaped on Baker when the former was in the Senate.

The TFX contract investigation which Mollenhoff termed "more clear cut" than the Sherman Adams, Dixon-Yates and Harold Talbott conflict-of-interest cases during the Eisenhower administration.

He said that while ruling on the award of the TFX contract to General Dynamics, former Assistant Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric was drawing $21,000 a year from his law firm which was serving as general counsel for General Dynamics.

(In addition, he said, former Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth owned $160,000 of stock in a Fort Worth, Tex., bank that had a $400,000 loan to General Dynamics.)

The case of Otto Otepka who was dismissed by the State Department for insubordination after he gave documents to a Senate subcommittee to support his testimony that conflicted with testimony of his superior. Mollenhoff added that six other men who associated with Otepka have been transferred to other jobs, some regarded as demotions.

The radio and television holdings in Texas of President Johnson's wife and daughters. The holdings are now in trusteeship. "If the President gets away with saying he has no interest in the radio and television stations, they are his wife's, it is because the Republicans let him get away with it," Mollenhoff declared.

"Mr. Johnson and his wife had no radio and television interests when he came into Government, and at the time they obtained television permits, he was on the Senate Commerce Committee that has jurisdiction over the Federal Communications Commission," the reporter said.

He also chided Republicans for letting Defense Secretary Robert McNamara repeat unchallenged week after week that his Department is saving the Government millions of dollars. "There's not a scintilla of evidence to show there'll be a saving," he declared.

"This country is in a serious situation if a Democrat or Republican can be silenced for fear the Defense Department can cut off some money to their district," he said.

Ed Ball: Angel of Mercy for Crippled Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, an angel of mercy for thousands of crippled children in America is an energetic, hard-driving executive with the Nemours Foundation.

The Honorable Edward Ball, secretary-treasurer of the foundation, is considered a moving force behind the humanitarian work this charitable foundation performs for crippled children.

His deep interest in the unfortunate, his unflagging energy, and his tremendous executive skills have meant in so many cases that a child may walk again; may even be cured.

His work is arduous; his schedule imposes demands a lesser man would succumb under. However, his faithful efforts have paid off handsomely for the crippled child.

Mr. Speaker, since the Nemours Foundation opened in 1940, it has provided more than half a million patient-days for crippled children. These unfortunate children, whose parents may be poor or wealthy, but for some reason or another could not obtain the medical skill needed, are treated at the Nemours Foundation crippled children's hospital—known as the Alfred I. du Pont Institute—at Wilmington, Del. Here extensive facilities are provided for treating crippled children.

Though a close personal friend of the late Mr. Du Pont and considered his righthand man, Ed Ball has achieved no small success in business in his own right. The holder of many titles in the Du Pont Estate's individual banks, he is president of the St. Joe Paper Co. in Florida. Additionally, Ed Ball serves as chairman of the Florida East Coast Railway and the National Board & Paper Mills of Waterford, Ireland, with which the Du Pont Estate holds a working arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Ball can truly be called one of the more determined capitalists in the present-day United States—a title he does not disdain.

The humanitarian projects spearheaded today by Ed Ball were originally launched by the late Mr. Du Pont. When he died in April 1935, he left a will which created a charitable, valuable, and lasting aid to crippled children in America.

His will, in part, read:

It has been my firm conviction throughout life that it is the duty of everyone in this world to do what is within his power to alleviate human suffering.

My trustees shall cause to be incorporated a corporation for charitable purposes, to be designated and known as the Nemours Foundation * * * and my said trustees are hereby directed to pay over, at convenient intervals, the net income of my said estate * * * for the purpose of maintaining Nemours as a charitable institution for the care and treatment of crippled children, but not incurables.

Mr. Speaker, what was begun by Mr. Du Pont is being carried on today by Ed Ball.

During the first year of the program, the Nemours Foundation paid for 3,872 patient-day's care for children approved by the Florida State Crippled Children's Commission. At the end of 5 years, the figure had grown to 69,922 patient-day's care, and by July 1, 1962, it had become 89,367 patient-day's care. It is noteworthy that in this period the State of Florida has increased its own budget for the Florida State Crippled Children's Commission to between six and seven times the amount provided in 1948.

Another corollary program that covers 17 States, 15 of which are in the South, has been in the process of expansion by the Nemours Foundation during the past 10 years.

Its purpose is to share the knowledge of the specialists on the institute's staff with the authorities in the States concerned with crippled children. The program takes the form of continuing seminars organized by the institute.

These seminars, sharing the knowledge of the specialists on the Du Pont Institute staff as they do, have brought a substantial advance to the cause of crippled children. They have been attended by State officials, doctors, and all types of professional and lay people, all working with the special groups in the States they represent.

The staff and personnel at the institute have grown until they now number well over 100, including the necessary doctors and specialists, and during the years the hospital has been in operation, it has performed several thousand corrective operations.

I am certain you recognize this has meant new hope to crippled children through advanced methods of medical treatment.

Thus, the earnings of the estate of Alfred I. du Pont are being devoted to humanitarian purposes. After making provisions for his family, he directed the remainder be set up as the Nemours Foundation to support the institute and a future program for old people.

And, as the annuities are fulfilled, 100 percent of the earnings of the estate will go to the foundation. This means, Mr. Ball says, 100 percent of the estate's earnings of such substantial enterprises as the Florida National Group of Banks, the St. Joe Paper Co., and the Florida East Coast Railway will eventually go to the Nemours Foundation for the care and treatment of crippled children and old people.

His wishes are being carried on today by his faithful and devoted trustee—Ed Ball.

New Myths and Old Realities in Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made a speech on foreign policy in which he referred to what he chose to call old myths and new realities. I refer to that speech not with any intent of analyzing it, but only for the purpose of pointing out that myth and reality and jingoism are by no means confined to foreign policy. These same factors of myth and jingoism as contrasted to reality and fact occupy an inordinate portion of the stage in our domestic national affairs.

During the past several years, there has been a great deal of official and unofficial declaiming that the United States is failing its economic and social obligations—that it has not provided full employment, that it has not sustained economic growth, and indeed that it is in imminent danger of falling into the class of a second-rate power. All of this is pure mythology. Yet even after the Soviet Union publicly acknowledged its inability to provide the basic need of bread for its own people—and looked to the United States to fill the gap—the oft-repeated myth of American failure and retrogression keeps emanating from the White House and echoing across the countryside.

The echoes do not stop at the shoreline. When the President speaks, the world listens. When he declares over and over again that one-fifth of America is poverty stricken he is blackening America in the eyes of the world. To people in underdeveloped countries, poverty has a far different meaning than the definition President Johnson gives it. To most of the world's population, an annual income of $3,000 would be regarded as kingly.

How can we hope to motivate the underdeveloped countries to follow our own free enterprise system when our President says that one-fifth the population of free enterprise America lives in poverty?

In reaching eagerly for November votes by exaggerating economic conditions in the United States, the President is unjustly and unwisely damaging the word "America."

With respect to unemployment, we are plagued and confused by the same tendency toward sloganism and mythology. We neglect reality—a simple fact that is too often lost sight of; too often minimized.

That simple fact is this: The American system has created and sustained the highest level of attainment and the highest standard of living any society has ever achieved in the history of the world. And it has reached this pinnacle in a society which accords to the individual the maximum in freedom—economically, politically, and socially. It is an accomplishment of which all Americans should be proud. It is an accomplishment which we should not jeopardize with dubious and ill-conceived experimentations based on precepts foreign to our own.

At this moment there are 70 million Americans gainfully employed in the United States. These Americans earn more, possess more, and live better than any other people on earth, and we should not forget it. We should bury the myth of economic failure in America.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Probably the outstanding recent example of the confusion of myth with reality is the war on poverty recently declared by the President. Every American citizen should read this proposal for himself.

He should not accept the limited descriptions of this package which have appeared in the press, most of which were personal declarations of virtue on the part of those who advocate this program.

This war on poverty began with the crashing of cymbals and the blaring of horns. The proclamation, however, was somewhat delayed by the "blowing of tops" as, in the infighting, departmental officials stoutly resisted the preempting of their established domains by the war's commander in chief.

No sooner had the battle within the administration been stayed than this hastily contrived poverty package was hurriedly messaged to Congress and unveiled to the public—all 7 titles and 47 pages of it. It was introduced as H.R. 10440 and labeled the Landrum-Powell poverty package. Rarely has a political affinity been so rapidly created; seldom was a package so sectionally enwrapped. Some people have even gone so far as to suggest there might be something political in this poverty pact which binds together widely separated stars of the Democratic galaxy.

Almost before the ink was dry on H.R. 10440, an ad hoc subcommittee was appointed and public hearings announced. Here again the administration with much fanfare and even more ado brought forth poverty's commander in chief, the Cabinet officers, and the lesser lights, all to declaim against poverty, all to endorse H.R. 10440. Yes, they were all against poverty. No, they were not too familiar with the contents of the bill. Yes, they felt their administrative efforts against poverty needed to be coordinated. No, their present programs against poverty were not being badly administered. No, the existing programs should not be placed under the poverty czar. And yes, oh yes, politics was the thing furtherest from their minds.

But dawned the next day—into the office of every Democratic Congressman was delivered a "poverty kit," complete with prewritten speeches, prepackaged press releases—with appropriate blanks for inserting the Congressman's name—and digests of various sorts, all proclaiming the merit of the poverty package. And the source of these poverty kits, delivered before many Congressmen had read the bill? Why the Democratic National Committee, of course. But alas, a misdelivery. One of these packages was somehow given to, of all things, a Republican Congressman. Thus, the pragmatic basis of this brave new poltical project was revealed to the world.

THE ELEMENTS OF THE POVERTY PACKAGE

Like most packages which are politically giftwrapped, the poverty bill contains something for everyone; from Harlem to Georgia, from farmer to factory hand, from 17 to 70. Like most gimmicks of this type, it is based on that time-honored political promise, "something for nothing."

TITLE I

Title I of this well publicized tabloid deals with so-called youth programs. Young males age 16 to 22 who are unemployed and who are found unfit for the draft, will be sent to distant work camps where, according to the sponsors of this bill, they will be employed on conservation projects and get vocational training. There are so many obvious questions relating to this proposal, that its predecessor proposal under the late President Kennedy has long lain dormant in the House Rules Committee.

TITLE II

Title II of this proposal authorizes the establishment of so-called community action programs. These programs, for which the Federal Government could defray the full cost, can be carried out either by public or nonprofit private agencies in such fields as health, education, job training, and vocational rehabilitation. These programs carry no provision for participation of established State and local governments, and leave the way clear for the Federal Government, by direct intervention, to support, direct, and finance various types of activities which neither the State nor the community may approve.

In almost every respect they duplicate or overlap programs already in operation at the Federal and/or State level.

TITLE III

Title III of this bill is concerned with poverty in the rural areas where it is proposed first, to make gifts of up to $1,500 cash to poor farm families; second, to make loans of up to $2,500 to the same group to enable them to buy seed, livestock, machinery, or to start a farm business; third, and get this—to make loans to nonprofit corporations to buy up rural property, develop it, and sell it back at a discount to selected farmers in family size plots.

Bureaucrats would call the signals, and taxpayers would cover the losses in this L.B.J.-style land reform. One guess where the idea originated.

The remaining titles of the bill provide loans for the establishment of new businesses designed to employ the unemployed and members of low-income families; provide funds for experimental projects to help unemployed fathers obtain employment.

Finally, the bill authorizes the commander in chief to set up the volunteers for America—a Domestic Peace Corps to embark on community action programs, to consult with Indians, migrant workers, and similar groups.

Mr. Speaker, the press agents and the tub thumpers who are pushing this politi-

cal poverty cart would have the world believe that poverty is their own private discovery; that the U.S. Congress, the State governments, the local governments, and all past American Presidents have gone through life blissfully unaware that the problem of poverty ever existed and have not turned a hand to meet its challenge.

Nowhere is mention made of the fact that existing Federal programs which deal with poverty carry appropriations in the amount of almost $9 billion annually. And this $9 billion does not, lest we become confused, include any expenditures made for social security benefits or for unemployment compensation. If these were included, the total would be about $40 billion per year.

Now when one is exposed to the description of all the things this poverty package is designed to accomplish, one quite naturally regards it as a big project—a truly Texan undertaking. And for a Texan undertaking one would also expect a Texas budget. But no, it is all going to be done on a Rhode Island budget—less than $1 billion. Now there is some real mythology.

This Landrum-Powell poverty package proceeds on the theory that every American family which does not have a cash income of more than $3,000 per year is poverty stricken. This works out to about 35 million Americans so situated. Now if you take the 965 million that the poverty plotters say will do the job, that divides out to $27.57 for each poverty stricken person per year. Who is kidding whom?

This proposal speaks solely about the first year only. During the parade of administration witnesses, various questions were asked about the probable costs of this program for the second year, or the third year, or any year beyond. On most other questions they were brimful of information. Here the questions were met with the syntax of silence, the candor of clams.

When the hearings on this so-called poverty bill were announced, May 1 was announced as the deadline for bringing it to the floor for action.

In a frantic effort to meet this deadline, testimony of witnesses was discouraged, afternoon and evening sessions were held, and at the conclusion of the public hearings, it was announced that the Poverty Subcommittee would meet the second day at 10 a.m. to approve the bill and the full committee would meet at 10:30 the very same day to give it final committee blessing and send it to the House.

But something happened. The Democrats who for a period of 3 weeks had sung the public praise of this bill suddenly found themselves in disagreement. Apparently some of them actually read what was in it. The Johnson poverty express had jumped the tracks.

The Committee on Agriculture, concerned over strange provisions of title III, initiated its own hearings.

Those of us on the Education and Labor Committee are advised that the Republicans are to be locked out of further deliberations until the Democrats have worked out a compromise and close ranks. Best available information indicates the compromise will be presented to the Republicans on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

In all the wordy discussions of this so-called poverty package, there is no reference to responsibility, no encouragement for effort, no directive for determination. But what about those millions of Americans who are making their own way, who are working willingly at whatever tasks may come to hand to stay solvent and move ahead? They will be called upon to pay for this purely political proposal, and they are entitled to know what the cost of this program will be to them this year, next year, and every year thereafter.

We, in America, have always prided ourselves on the fact that this is the land of opportunity. That those with the will to achieve can achieve.

We have always aided and nurtured the oppressed and the downtrodden. But we have never, and we should never, deprive any man of need—indeed the obligation—to achieve by his own efforts. A program which makes idleness attractive will beget idleness.

A program which preempts local responsibility will destroy local responsibility. A program which undermines community and State governments will supplant community and State governments.

The concept of the all-pervading, all-powerful Central Government must be resisted by each of us in the name of survival, for if this power is not contained, neither we nor the free institutions we have created will survive.

If President Johnson really wants to do something new and effective in the area of combating poverty, he might well turn on the White House lights and look carefully and critically at the $40 billion now being spent to combat poverty.

If these United States are actually as poverty stricken as the President is telling the world, the $40 billion antipoverty effort now underway is missing its target but good.

Instead of establishing a new layer of the same old programs, past and present, let us find out what is wrong with the expensive programs already in motion and redirect them.

Surely the President can do better than to offer a war on poverty so thin it will not even pay a respectable sales tax on the programs already in being, so transparent politically that it was promoted directly by the Democratic National Committee, and so harmful internationally that it projects to the world a false image of America as a place of economic squalor.

The clear political motivation was clearly reflected in the May 1 issue of the Wall Street Journal, which quoted an unnamed Democratic member of the Education and Labor Committee as saying:

> We want a Lyndon Johnson bill.

Let us be realistic. This is presidential election year, and the President wants a poverty program he can call his own. There is a way to satisfy the President's political appetite and still be merciful to America's long-suffering taxpayers.

It is easy.

All we need to do is pass a bill imprinting the "L.B.J. brand" on all existing Federal programs which are aimed at meeting some aspect of poverty.

Here are the major items:

The public works acceleration program would become the Johnson public works acceleration program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $214.2 million.

The cooperative extension—Smith-Lever Act—would become the Johnson cooperative extension program to combat poverty. Is is already budgeted at $39.8 million.

The agricultural research—Hatch Act—program would become the Johnson agricultural research program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $39.8 million.

The Farmer Cooperative Service would become the Johnson Farmer Cooperative Service To Combat Poverty. It is already budgeted at $1.1 million.

The Economic Research Service would become the Johnson Economic Research Service To Combat Poverty. It is already budgeted at $6.3 million.

The special milk program would become the Johnson special milk program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $99.8 million.

The school lunch program would become the Johnson school lunch program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $374.5 million.

The food stamp plan would become the Johnson food stamp plan to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $51.1 million.

The direct distribution program—surplus foods—would become the Johnson direct distribution program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $204.4 million.

The Farmers Home Administration rural housing grants and loans program would become the Johnson rural housing grants and loans programs to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $23.1 million.

The rural renewal loan program would become the Johnson rural renewal loans program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $2.1 million.

The rural areas development coordination program would become the Johnson rural areas development coordination program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $100,000.

The Farmers Home Administration direct loan program would become the Johnson direct loan program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $327.5 million.

The rental housing for elderly program would become the Johnson rental housing for elderly program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $5 million.

The Area Redevelopment Administration program would become the Johnson Area Redevelopment Administration program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $222.5 million.

The vocational education program would become the Johnson vocational

education program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $190.4 million.

The National Defense Education Act student loan program would become the Johnson National Defense Education Act student loan program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $135 million.

The National Defense Education Act school equipment program would become the Johnson National Defense Education Act school equipment program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $62 million.

The National Defense Education Act guidance program would become the Johnson National Defense Education Act guidance program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $24.7 million.

The National Defense Education Act area vocational-technical program would become the Johnson National Defense Education Act area vocational-technical program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $15 million.

The cooperative research and demonstration program would become the Johnson cooperative research and demonstration program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $17 million.

The education of handicapped children program would become the Johnson education of handicapped children program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $16.5 million.

The vocational rehabilitation grants to States program would become the Johnson vocational rehabilitation grants to States program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $100.1 million.

The vocational rehabilitation research and training program would become the Johnson vocational rehabilitation research and training program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $40.6 million.

The chronic diseases and health of the aged program would become the Johnson chronic diseases and health of the aged program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $53.7 million.

The communicable diseases program would become the Johnson communicable diseases program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $30 million.

The community health practice program would become the Johnson community health practice program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $22.6 million.

The hospital construction program would become the Johnson hospital construction program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $270 million.

The environmental engineering and sanitation program would become the Johnson environmental engineering and sanitation program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $9.2 million.

The Indian health activities program would become the Johnson Indian health activities program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $62.2 million.

The public assistance grants to States program would become the Johnson public assistance grants to States program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $2,739.4 million.

The public assistance administration, services and training program would become the Johnson public assistance administration, services and training program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $262.6 million.

The Bureau of Family Services program would become the Johnson Bureau of Family Services program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $5.9 million.

The maternal and child welfare program would become the Johnson maternal and child welfare program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $131.8 million.

The Office of Aging program would become the Johnson Office of Aging program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $600,000.

The cooperative research for social security program would become the Johnson cooperative research for social security program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $1.8 million.

The Indian education and welfare program would become the Johnson Indian education and welfare program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $96.9 million.

The Indian resources management program would become the Johnson Indian resources management program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $40.7 million.

The Indian construction and irrigation program would become the Johnson Indian construction and irrigation program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $51.1 million.

The manpower training and development program would become the Johnson manpower training and development program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $411 million.

The area redevelopment training program would become the Johnson area redevelopment training program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $9 million.

The apprentice training program would become the Johnson apprentice training program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $5.5 million.

The unemployment insurance service and U.S. Employment Service would become the Johnson unemployment insurance service and U.S. Employment Service program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $13.4 million.

The low-income housing demonstration programs would become the Johnson low-income housing demonstration programs to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $5 million.

The public facility loans program would become the Johnson public facility loans program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $110 million.

The urban renewal grants program would become the Johnson urban renewal grants program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $1,320.3 million.

The housing for elderly loan fund program would become the Johnson housing for elderly loan fund program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $100 million.

The low-rent public housing grants program would become the Johnson low-rent public housing grants program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $230.6 million.

The low-rent public housing development loans program would become the Johnson low-rent public housing development loans program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $399 million.

The business loans program would become the Johnson business loans program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $197.1 million.

The investment and development company assistance; debenture purchase and loans program would become the Johnson investment and development company assistance; debenture purchase and loans program to combat poverty. It is already budgeted at $105.3 million.

All this comes to the grand total of $8,738,600,000 already budgeted for fiscal 1965.

Simply by changing the names the President could proudly refer to his $8.7 billion program to combat poverty. If the dollar total is an accurate measure of the political sex appeal of a program, then this name-change approach should yield the President more than eight times the votes next November, compared with the vote-pulling power of his billion-dollar package now before the Education and Labor Committee.

If $8.7 billion does not sound fancy enough, we could rename the social security, unemployment compensation, and other similar programs. This would bring the new total to $40 billion.

This indeed would be a Texas-size program to combat poverty, and the beauty of it is the only extra burden of all this—beyond the amounts already budgeted—would be the trifling cost of routing the name-change bill through Congress.

Provocation Is Not a Step Toward Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 22, 1964, marked an unfortunate day in the civil rights fight. It is to be hoped that the Brooklyn chapter of CORE has learned a lesson in responsibility with the failure of their so-called stall-in.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following WABC radio editorial which was broadcast in New York on April 16, 17, and 18, 1964, the week before the stall-in attempt.

The editorial follows:

INTEGRATION

If the goal of Brooklyn's chapter of CORE is integration, it seems to us they forgot it last week. WABC thinks the threat to stall cars all over New York City's highways on the first day of the World's Fair is a sad and senseless move.

It's easy to understand the urgency of the Negro cry for equality. It's easy to understand how right now is many years too late for most Negroes. But it's hard for us to understand how demonstrations planned to provoke public antagonism can help integrate our society.

We don't think Brooklyn CORE's stall-in plan furthered the cause of integration last week. We think their stall-in threat is sad because it may have hurt the Negro cause more than anything that has happened this year. We think it's sad that a few intemperate members of the movement should be able to hurt a struggle that has expressed itself with dignity, with decency and with a sense of humanity.

We're saddened too because we think Brooklyn CORE's rash plan has already given many a racist, many a bigot an opportunity to call the entire integration movement irresponsible. What kind of irresponsibility would block paths for fire engines and ambulances all around New York?

We think the national CORE organization showed sophistication and good judgment in suspending its hot-headed Brooklyn chapter, but damage has been done and is being done. It's being done mostly to Negroes. It's being done most by Negroes. WABC asks the leaders of the stall-in movement: Isn't it really integration you're stalling? Is provocation a step toward integration? Are you fighting for Negro rights or your own ambitions?

A Deceptive Tourniquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the April 1964 issue of the First National City Bank of New York's monthly economic letter contains a useful discussion of the interest equalization tax proposal, which has been passed by the House and which is now before the Senate Finance Committee. Pointing out that it is neither necessary nor desirable to erect a wall around a particular sector of the U.S. capital market, the article points to the proposal as evidence of the pernicious tendency for a chronic balance-of-payments deficit to corrupt the principles of a free international capital market.

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX: A DECEPTIVE TOURNIQUET

Last month, the House of Representatives passed a bill providing for a tax on purchases of foreign securities by Americans. The bill now awaits hearings in the Senate Finance Committee. Although it is generally expected that the legislation will be passed, it may be worthwhile to have yet another look at a measure which even its advocates regard as undesirable as permanent legislation and which, in any event, is due for reconsideration by December 1965.

In spite of this lack of enthusiasm, the administration continues to urge the approval of the tax on the ground that failure to pass it might cast doubts upon U.S. willingness to reduce the large and stubborn balance-of-payments deficit. This effort places the main burden of redressing the deficit on cutting private investment abroad though such investment creates opportunities for U.S. exports and builds up valuable income-producing assets. Furthermore, it constitutes a departure from the principles of free international movement of capital—principles that the United States urges other nations to restore and respect because they make for a flourishing world economy.

The levy, it may be recalled, bears the title of "interest equalization tax" and is designed principally to check purchases of newly issued foreign bonds through raising interest costs by 1 percentage point for borrowers from the so-called developed countries. The legislation, which was proposed last summer when the balance of payments turned sharply for the worse, is to be applicable retroactively to July 19, 1963 (August 17 for securities listed on national exchanges).

While the tax is not law, it has—not unexpectedly—created so many uncertainties with regard to costs of raising funds in the United States that it has shut off practically all foreign bond purchases by Americans. Like the Emperor's new clothes in the fable, the tax does not exist but nobody can challenge its image.

RANGE OF POSSIBLE RESULTS

There is no sure way of estimating the possible results of the proposed tax. Judging by capital shortages throughout the world and by restrictions in London and Continental capital markets, borrowers will undoubtedly continue to seek long-term money in the United States. To provide statistical background, the table sums up purchases by Americans of foreign bond issues over recent years by grouping borrowers according to their tax status under the contemplated legislation.

By far the biggest borrower at long term in the United States market is Canada. Within 48 hours following the administration's announcement of the proposed tax last July, Canadian officials asked for, and obtained, a general exemption for new issues on the grounds of special economic relationships between our two countries. This is to be done under a clause in the proposed legislation giving the President authority to provide exemption from the tax "where required for international monetary stability." As officially stated, only Canada today qualifies for exemption on these grounds—with the understanding that Canada will not increase its official monetary reserves through the proceeds of borrowings in the United States. As Canada will return to our capital market on an exempt basis, the whole scheme has lost much of its potential usefulness as a means of significantly reducing the volume of foreign bond issues.

Less-developed countries are also to be exempt from the tax; but—with the notable exception of Israel—they have raised long-term money in our market only sparingly. The World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank are also exempt.

This leaves only developed countries other than Canada—i.e., mainly Western Europe and Japan—as the area where the tax deterrent might decrease bond sales significantly. Such issues—floated mostly by governments and semiofficial institutions—have gained U.S. investors' acceptance only in recent years. Admittedly, the future cannot be predicted solely on the basis of past experience. While the volume of such borrowings will, in all likelihood, recede from the high level of the first half of 1963, it is doubtful whether the net effect of the proposed tax will be substantial enough to warrant taking such a potentially harmful and unsettling step.

The proposed legislation also imposes a 15-percent tax on U.S. purchases of foreign stocks and other outstanding securities. Such purchases have never been a serious factor in our international payments.

CONTROL AND REGULATION

As originally conceived, the measure represented an intellectual attempt at interest equalization between our capital market and the principal centers abroad. It was to increase costs to foreigners of capital in the U.S. market without any need for U.S. financial authorities to interfere with market processes through controls over, or even the screening of, capital issues. Yet, as embodied in the actual draft legislation, the measure depends more upon controls over the transactions that are exempt from the tax than upon the tax itself. Of the 71 pages of H.R. 8000, as approved by the House, 50 pages are devoted to the listing of exemptions.

Some of these exemptions are to be provided for in the law. Thus, recognition is given to the importance of financing U.S. exports by exempting securities or commercial bank loans that mature in 3 years; recognition is also given to the foreign exchange earning power of oversea investments by American corporations by exempting direct investments. Many exemptions are, however, left to the discretion of the President and the Treasury Department. Thus, the tax, as proposed, would apply to 22 developed countries selected by the administration. For example, Portugal would be exempt, but not Spain; Finland but not Norway; the Philippines but not Hong Kong. The selection is subject to change by Executive order. Canada's exemption, noted above, also rests on the discretionary power of the President.

The exemption proposed for commercial banks is designed to make sure that credit "in support of normal and recurrent business operations abroad will not be unnecessarily impeded," to quote Treasury Secretary Dillon. The "possibility of abuse of this exemption" prompted the Treasury to seek and obtain an amendment to the legislation endowing it with specific authority to obtain from banks detailed reports of their foreign lending activity. The implied threat of taking away the exemption is expected to obtain voluntary compliance with official views.

The real effect of the proposed tax is thus control and regulation. Not surprisingly, some people have suggested that there is a better way to obtain the desired result—a voluntary capital issues committee acting on guidelines established by appropriate governmental agencies to screen foreign plans for borrowing in our market.

Those who regard a capital issues committee as a lesser evil than the proposed tax are aware of the drawbacks common to both: experience shows that "temporary" taxes as well as "temporary" controls tend to become permanent; even if things do not go well, the medicine is all right but just more of it is needed. In addition, one expedient often carries with it a whole sequence of further expedients, each with less justification than the last. The alleged advantage of the capital issues committee is its informality and flexibility.

The difficulty is that a capital issues committee would have to ward off the countless outside pressure which would be brought to bear on it as it performs the thankless task of deciding just how much portfolio investment abroad is sustainable. Such a committee, which would have to make judgments against the background of the country's delicate and complex international relations, could scarcely win many friends and might earn many enemies.

More fundamentally, tinkering with controls may well have unwanted consequences. As the former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank Allan Sproul noted: "We need to avoid experimenting with direct controls, whatever they may be called, which in times of strain may be interpreted as a forerunner of stronger controls of capital outflow, or even of all dealings in foreign exchange, which in turn would heighten the danger of anticipatory withdrawals of foreign funds from our markets."

Investors abroad seek and trust bonds denominated in U.S. dollars. A considerable part of foreign dollar bonds issued in the United States has been sold to nonresidents. Since mid-1963, issues that otherwise would have been floated in New York have been

carried through in European markets but it is the label "U.S. dollar" that makes them acceptable to investors. The smaller shrinkage of the purchasing power of the dollar and its greater freedom of use compared with many other major currencies have not remained unnoticed.

THE BROADER CONTEXT

In this whole context, it needs to be recognized that borrowings in the United States are attractive because long-term interest rates abroad, except in Switzerland, are higher than in our market. This is the result of the very abundance of U.S. savings, together with the reluctance of the administration to condone higher costs and lesser availability of credit. Yet, given the conditions in which the U.S. economy finds itself this year, interest rates may well tend to rise on their own accord. This would tend to slow up new borrowings, including new issues of foreign bonds. Now that tax relief has been given, materially higher interest rates need not darken the prospects of sustained business expansion. They need not restrain investment and output so long as profit incentives and profit expectations are encouraging.

It is neither necessary nor desirable to erect a wall around a particular sector of the U.S. capital market. Whenever Canada, Japan, and those Western European nations which are not dollar rich sell bonds in the United States, the proceeds are used—directly or indirectly—to buy U.S. goods and services. Usually, there is a direct connection: trade follows credit.

The business community makes a strong contribution to our balance of payments. This is unmistakably evidenced by the surplus on merchandise account and the excess of remitted income over the net outflow of private capital for long-term investment abroad. U.S. Government policies to redress the balance-of-payments deficit should encourage this contribution—not hamper it, as does the proposed tax.

The interest equalization tax may well prove to be a deceptive tourniquet. Its enactment should serve as yet further evidence of the tendency for a persistent balance-of-payments deficit to corrupt the principles of a free international capital market. Government policy should serve not to postpone but to expedite action to deal with the payments deficit effectively and resolutely.

New issues of foreign securities purchased by Americans, grouped according to seller's status under the proposed tax

[In millions of dollars]

	1956–60 average	1961	1962	1963		
				January–June	July–December	Year
EXEMPT FROM TAX						
Canada	346	237	457	632	104	736
Latin America	24	18	102	12	23	35
Israel	50	58	60	35	33	68
World Bank [1]	133	12	84	0	0	0
Subtotal	553	325	703	679	160	839
SUBJECT TO TAX						
Western Europe	50	57	195	219	53	272
Japan	7	61	101	108	57	165
Australia, New Zealand, South Africa	30	80	77	18	0	18
Subtotal	87	198	373	345	110	455
Total	640	523	1,076	1,024	270	1,294
Redemptions	127	123	170	83	67	150
Net total	513	400	906	941	203	1,144

[1] Includes in 1962, issues of the Inter-American Development Bank. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

They Speak for Us in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, for every "ugly" American that draws attention to himself abroad, there may be found hundreds of dedicated public servants, serving conscientiously, selflessly, and untiringly to aid our less fortunate brothers in other parts of the world. They are constantly winning friends and goodwill for the United States. In my opinion, such an example is our Ambassador to Japan, the Honorable Edwin O. Reischauer. Together with his lovely and brilliant wife, Haru, they are outstanding as a hardworking diplomatic team that is a credit to the image of American officials abroad.

Recently we were all shocked at the unprovoked attack on his person by a demented Japanese youth. High officials of the Japanese Government have publicly declared their profound shock and regret at what occurred and have stated that in no way were the views of the would-be assassin shared by other Japanese, and it was their expressed wish that he would recover speedily and fully. Although early recovery seemed apparent, development of hepatitis has necessitated Ambassador Reischauer's confinement to Tripler Hospital in Hawaii. I am sure I express the sentiments of my colleagues in the House in wishing a speedy and uncomplicated recovery to Ambassador Reischauer.

Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer was born in Tokyo on October 15, 1910, of American parents. After attending Oberlin College and receiving his bachelor's degree in 1931 he studied, and was awarded his master's degree in 1932 at Harvard, and its Ph. D. degree in 1939. During his postgraduate studies he was granted a Harvard-Yenching Institute Fellowship, which enabled him to study abroad in France, Japan, and China. After receiving his doctorate, he was appointed instructor on the Harvard University faculty where he remained until 1942, while also serving as senior research analyst for the Department of State from 1941. Taking leave from Harvard, Ambassador Reischauer worked for the War Department in 1941 and 1942.

In 1943, the Ambassador joined the U.S. Army, serving with the Military Intelligence Service. He was discharged in 1945 with the rank of lieutenant colonel, after having been awarded the Legion of Merit for the services he had performed.

Returning to civilian life, Ambassador Reischauer was chairman of the Japan-Korea Secretariat and special assistant to the director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs during parts of 1945 and in 1946. In this latter year, he rejoined the faculty at Harvard as an associate professor of far eastern languages. He was named a professor in 1950, and in 1956, named director of the Harvard-Yenching Institute, where he held the post until receiving his current appointment as Ambassador to Japan.

Ambassador Reischauer is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the American Oriental Society, the American History Association, and the Association for Asian Studies, of which he was president in 1955–56. He is also author of numerous books dealing with China and Japan; among them are "Ennin's Diary"; "Japan, Past and Present"; "The United States and Japan"; "Wanted; An Asian Policy"; "Ennin's Travels in T'ang China"; and "East Asia: The Great Tradition."

Ambassador Reischauer is married to the former Haru Matsukata, of Japan, and they have three children. His extraordinary knowledge of the country, its people, and its language and traditions, have aided him in the fantastically successful job he has accomplished of securing better understanding between the two countries, and in the interpreting of the policies of the United States. He has strengthened the close partnership between the United States and Japan in trade, mutual defense, scientific and cultural exchange, and friendly relations.

Mr. Speaker, because of the excellent and outstanding performance of duties by our Ambassador to Japan, I wish to have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Jess Gorkin, editor of Parade magazine, which appeared on April 19, 1964:

THEY SPEAK FOR US IN JAPAN—EDWIN AND HARU REISCHAUER MAKE A HARD-WORKING DIPLOMATIC TEAM

(By Jess Gorkin)

TOKYO.—Hundreds of the most capable and hard-working women serving our country toil 14 hours a day or longer—without pay.

They help supervise staffs in the hundreds, assist foreigners to visit the United States, write letters to thousands of people, plan banquets for visiting dignitaries, make countless speeches—and may even be called upon to settle a border dispute.

These unpaid workers are the wives of our diplomats.

High on the list of these remarkable women is Mrs. Edwin Oldfield Reischauer, wife of our Ambassador to Tokyo. I recently spent a leisurely Saturday afternoon with the Ambassador and his wife in the Embassy residence, where I interviewed Mrs. Reischauer. The Ambassador remained discreetly in the background—except to contribute additional details and some lighthearted banter which went like this:

She: "My biggest problem on the job is getting tired, I guess."

He: "You enjoy the speeches least. Let's put it that way."

"Even your speeches?" I asked him.

He: "She is long-suffering."

She: "The part of my job that I like best is being effective."

He: "Now that's always the diplomat's wife's answer."

Mrs. Reischauer claims the Ambassador "thinks big thoughts and I take care of the small details." That's sheer modesty.

A FULL DAY

From the time she gets up at 7 a.m. until she retires late at night, Mrs. Reischauer may do several or all of the following: address one of the 14 clubs to which she belongs, consult with some of the 300 members on the Embassy staff and their families, select Japanese women who will go to America as part of the United States-Japanese exchange program, answer inquiries from both Americans and Japanese, help volunteers who teach English to the Japanese. Finally, she may wind up her day's activities by accompanying the Ambassador to two evening functions as well as a formal dinner.

"It's very seldom that I can really sit down and relax," she says.

During the 3 years of their assignment as America's first family in Japan, the Reischauers have become very popular here. One reason is that both wer born and brought up in Japan. Mrs. Reischauer is the former Haru Matsukata, the granddaughter of a former Japanese premier. The 53-year-old Ambassador, son of American misisonary parents, lived in Japan until he was 16. He attended Oberlin College in Ohio and then studied and taught Asian affairs at Harvard, where he is at present professor on leave.

The Reischauers are fluent in Japanese. "I think it is essential to know the language of the country—any country in which a diplomat is stationed," Mrs. Reischauser avers. "My effectiveness would be cut down 50 percent if I could not speak Japanese."

Thousands of Japanese citizens look to Mrs. Reischauer as the most direct line into the Embassy. "It's hard to get through on the phone to me," the Ambassador explains. "But everybody can get my wife directly." A great many people have informed the Reischauers, "I never thought I would pay a visit to the American Embassy, but because you're here I feel at ease and happy about coming." Notable among them is the lady Socialist member of the Diet, or Japanese Parliament, who told Mrs. Reischauer at a social function, "Two years ago I was demonstrating outside the gates. But it's much nicer to be inside talking to you."

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

The Ambassador is proud of his wife's role. In his words, "She prompts me a lot and is awfully good at telling me if something is in the wrong tone or might be said in a better way. "But," he adds, "she has other tremendous functions keeping the Embassy running smoothly—especially personal contacts with the Embassy wives and families. Besides that, she has an important role with American women in Japan, officers' and noncoms' wives, and with the Japanese public."

Mrs. Reischauer carries on a large correspondence with Japanese of all ages who write to her about every conceivable problem. Young girls want to be introduced to American pen pals. Other correspondents ask her advice on politics and even to settle family disputes.

"One of the most unusual requests I had," Mrs. Reischauer recalls, "was in a border case between two prefectures. There was a merger of two towns, and it meant that a girl whose home was on the border line and her best friend would have to go to different schools. They applied to town officials and even to the Premier. But nobody helped them. They finally came to me as a last resort." Unfortunately, Mrs. Reischauer could not assist the girls, either.

Marital difficulties between American soldiers and Japanese women consume a considerable amount of her time.

"A lot of cases," she says, "involve women who married Americans and have been abandoned. They ask me to look for their husbands."

One problem that Mrs. Reischauer settled involved some repatriates and an American officer who had aided them 18 years ago, in 1945 and 1946, when they had no food or clothing. These repatriates were planning a celebration, and Mrs. Reischauer helped locate the officer.

The ambassador explains, "We spend a lot of time on public relations, but I think this is part of the new diplomacy. It isn't government. It's people-to-people on both sides. It's important to talk not only to the Japanese but to Americans who come to Japan. We must brief these American tourists, answer their questions. It's a good time for them to learn about Japan."

People-to-people diplomacy is of special importance this year.

The summer Olympics in Tokyo will attract a record number of Americans to Japan. But at the same time, the easing of travel restrictions by their government will enable many more Japanese to come to the United States than ever before. Last year nearly 27,000 Japanese tourists visited the United States in addition to 3,000 students attending our colleges and universities.

The Reischauers consider the need for exchange visits between Japan and the United States to be vital. But this program will be successful only if Japanese visitors are enabled to spend some time with Americans who share the same interests. If they are labor union men, they should get together with American labor union men. If they are professors, with American professors. If legislators, with American legislators. These people are also extremely anxious to see the real America.

"It's so important to get the Japanese into American homes," Mrs. Reischauer says. "And I want them to feel at ease. Before they go to the United States, I have been making arrangements for some groups to spend a night in the home of one of our military or embassy people. It's a new experience for some to sleep in beds.

"We begin by asking the Japanese what they're interested in," she explains, "and then we communicate with committees in America to find out what's available. But in most cases, especially with the women, they tell us that the highlight of their trip was visiting in a home and spending time with a family.

"If groups of Americans are willing to house Japanese—or visitors from any country," she maintains, "they could make a real contribution to U.S. foreign relations right in their own cities." (Americans who want to entertain Japanese labor leaders, social welfare workers, educators, members of the press or television, should write to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Far East Programs, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Also check community service organizations in your own area if you wish to volunteer.)

DIPLOMATIC QUARREL

When the Reischauers travel, they have their own problem. "If I go without her on one of my tours to meet the Japanese people," the ambassador says, "they look awfully disappointed. I feel as though I've really let them down."

"That's one point," Mrs. Reischauer says philosophically, "we argue about all the time. I say they come to look at him, and he claims they come to look at me."

It would be foolish to get in the middle of a husband-wife dispute—especially between a diplomat and his wife. But whichever Reischauer the people really come to see, we are fortunate to have both of them speaking for us in Japan.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another of the important independence days of those many oppressed nations behind the Iron Curtain is being celebrated this Sunday, May 10. This is Rumanian Independence Day, the most important national holiday for all free Rumanians. It is sad indeed that the Rumanian people themselves cannot celebrate their own national independence day. That is one of the penalties of living under communism. While we here freely express our admiration for Rumania's independence, Rumanians themselves must not celebrate. Their recognition is limited to a silent word in their own hearts and clandestine listening to the celebrations in free countries over the radio.

Rumania enjoyed many centuries of independent growth, it was for two centuries a Roman province. From this came the modern name of Rumania, and the romance language which Rumanians speak.

In the middle of the last century the forces began shaping which led to the pronouncement of Rumanian independence on May 10, 1877. The people were sick of many years of cruel invasion and oppressions, first from one side then from the other. During the years when our Nation was engaged in a great civil war, Rumanian leaders were fighting to free their country from Russian-Turkish domination and an archaic feudal land sytem.

Much progress was made by autonomous Rumania under King Alexandru Cuza between 1859 and 1866. On that memorable day in 1877, the Rumanian people demanded and got their rightful independence. It was duly recognized by all the great powers in 1888 in reward for Rumania's gallant fight against the Ottoman empire.

This is the event which rightly holds an important place in Rumanian loyalties. It inaugurated the greatest period of progress in Rumanian history, which was drastically altered in World War II, and shattered completely when the Communists came to power in 1947. Today the very event which founded Rumania as a nation, and the great courage of Rumania's leaders of 1877, are denied to

the people by the Communists. It is well to remember Rumanian Independence Day here, to add our voices to the great outcry demanding Rumania's freedom. In this way we can encourage Rumanian-Americans as well as the Rumanian people to carry on the struggle against tyranny with a view to making it over again an independent nation.

Facts About Antitrust Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in each of the last 2 years antiantitrust articles have appeared in Fortune magazine. Whether we will be favored with another article in the same vein this year, I do not know. After considering the articles at some length I have concluded that an extended comment, at least as to the latter of those two articles, should be made. To echo one whose years and attainments exceed mine, I have not been chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary these many years merely to preside at the liquidation of our valuable antitrust laws.

On reading the article by Professors Bork and Bowman in the December 1963 issue of Fortune, I could only conclude that the Yale Law School of the Thurman Arnold era had gone downhill rapidly. Out of their compound of errors of fact and logic Fortune has found that they have demonstrated that "antitrust has been perverted from preserving competition to preserving competitors from their more efficient rivals." Fortune suggests, therefore, that businessmen urge legislative redress.

Last year Fortune published an article mounting an extreme attack upon the antitrust laws and antitrust policy. In a complementary editorial of much more moderation, Fortune invited debate. The debate in Fortune thus far appears to have been on one side.

One wonders whether the editors of Fortune realize that the authors of the article they so warmly espouse appear to endorse an expanding area of per se violation rules. Is this what Fortune and business desire?

I can certainly agree with the authors' appreciation of the value of per se rules in price-fixing cases. Their general support for competition is also welcome. From there on the area of my disagreement with the writers far exceeds the area of agreement.

Professors Bork and Bowman say that "practices conventionally labeled 'exclusionary'—notably, price discrimination, vertical mergers, exclusive dealing contracts, and the like—appeared to be either competitive tactics equally available to all firms or means of maximizing the returns from a market position already had." This is like saying that the rich man and the poor man are equally free to go to the Riviera or to sleep on a park bench.

The authors pose the example of firm X, which already has 10 percent of a market, signing up on full requirements contracts an additional 10 percent. They suggest that this is meaningless because if this 20 percent entered into such arrangement because of X's greater market acceptance, X's market share would have been enlarged anyway. To this one might answer that greater market acceptance might have taken X only up to 10 percent of the market or a little beyond, and that to obtain the 20 percent it might have been thought necessary to obtain exclusive contracts.

The authors suggest, as another possible reason, that X might have offered an extra inducement. But, they say such extra inducement was available to its competitors. Here again the well-heeled and less well-heeled are deemed to be equally well situated.

They admit the possibility of full line forcing and the imposition of higher costs upon a competitor, but this possibility is summarily disposed of as unlikely or rare. Regarding the use of reciprocity to bring about exclusionary practices, the professors are silent.

From this prefatory rationale we are led to the myth theory of exclusionary practices. The authors aver that "a moment's thought indicates moreover, that the notion of exclusionary practices is not merely theoretically weak but is, for such a widely accepted idea, remarkably lacking in factual support. Has anybody ever seen a firm gain a monopoly or anything like one through the use of requirements contracts? Or through price discrimination? One may begin to suspect that antitrust is less a science than an elaborate mythology, that it has operated for years on hearsay and legends rather than on reality."

The myth theory of antitrust has, in recent years, been advanced on a number of fronts. Thus, under the myth theory, corporations and businessmen plead nolo contendere not because they have violated the antitrust laws, but just because they want the Government to go away. Under the myth theory of antitrust every case lost by the Antitrust Division is proof that it is attempting to enforce the antitrust laws improperly, while the great preponderance of antitrust cases in which the Government obtains a judgment is proof of nothing.

But it has remained for two Yale professors to bring the myth theory to exclusionary practices, going back as far as the 1911 Standard Oil case. I regard such charge as extremely serious. I have, therefore, in an appendix to this article, collected a number of instances of exclusionary practices. There are many more such examples. From these examples one may judge whether it has been the influence of Bullfinch's "Mythology" that has shaped antitrust.

Bork and Bowman made a direct attack upon the incipiency theory of attacking the poison before it has taken effect. They say that "the difficulty with stopping a trend toward a more concentrated condition at a very early stage is that the existence of the trend is prima facie evidence that greater concentration is socially desirable." Under this theory one might rationalize that a trend toward juvenile delinquency is desirable.

One might agree that at the incipiency stage one may be uncertain as to what may happen in the future, but prima facie certainty of the desirability of a final result, because there is a trend toward it, is not supported by experience.

But, say the professors, such trend indicates there are economies of scale which make larger size more efficient. I submit that this is an arrant non sequitur:

First. It is just as likely that a merger trend may be to eliminate competitors or price cutters, to stabilize an industry, to acquire captive outlets, or to obtain capital gains benefits;

Second. As I have noted in an article, in the December 1963 issue of the Antitrust Bulletin, large size is not an assurance of efficiency. Some of our large companies have been notoriously lazy and inefficient. In others, their very size mitigates against optimum efficiency. What is one to think of a company which, in order to become more efficient, needs to acquire other companies?

In the General Electric Co. case—see appendix—the Court pointed out that the dominating position of that company gave it the power of setting the standard of efficiency of incandescent lamps for the entire industry and thus determine what should be their length of life.

Does integration of the small into the large insure efficiency? The independent retailer, prior to his merger, may have bought all or most of his needs from other manufacturers. This may have been because he preferred their prices, their service, their styles, or their quality. Does it make for efficiency or inure to the benefit of the public if he becomes a captive to a manufacturer who wants to make sure his product comprises most of the wares of the retail outlet?

This is not an academic problem. The Government has brought a number of antitrust cases against gasoline companies which prevented their dealers from purchasing auxiliary supplies from other companies. It is worth pointing out that Bethlehem Steel Co., prevented from acquiring Youngstown Steel Co. because of an antimerger suit, has announced plans of building a new modern plant.

Professors Bork and Bowman object to testimony that competitors have been, or are likely to be, injured by a merger or other antitrust action. They argue that it is with competition, not competitors, with which the antirust laws are concerned. They do not suggest what better proof of adverse effect on competition may be available than adverse effect on competitors. Seemingly, in the wonderful world of Nod, in which the professors dwell, there may be competition without competitors.

It would be unusual if a conspiracy to restrain trade or to monopolize, was not aimed at particular competitors. In the abstract the antitrust laws may generally be concerned with competition; in the concrete they can hardly avoid being indifferent to what happens to competitors. The two concerns will often

coincide. And in the case of mergers, since the test is probability of substantially lessening of competition or tendency to monopolize, it would ordinarily take more than an isolated instance of injury to a competitor to come within that test, but once a number of competitors are injured, the likelihood of a substantial lessening of competition becomes more real.

The professors argue, seemingly, that it should make no difference how the inefficient businessman is eliminated, whether because of natural forces, merger, or because of unfair tactics. As to the latter, they would use the myth theory. As to a merger, they would say that mergers are part of the natural business process—Adam Smith said this was also true of price fixing. The presence of even an inefficient competitor as a brake on monopolistic pricing is not thought worthy of mention. And since inefficiency may be a reflection of poor management, the inefficient competitor of today may be the efficient competitor of tomorrow—not so if it has been merged.

Seemingly, moreover, a merged company is ipso facto considered to be less efficient than the merging company. To the writers to be of small size or unintegrated is to be inefficient. Actually often the contrary is true. A reason not infrequently given for acquiring a smaller company is to acquire its know-how which the larger company was unable to match.

As to the attitude of Congress, I would call the attention of the authors to the legislative history of the Celler-Kefauver Act which made it clear that the Congress was concerned over the growth of oligopoly through the merger route. I ought to know; I was coauthor of that act.

The writers return to their inefficiency theme by asserting that the antitrust laws are being used to subsidize the inefficient. Except for the alleged case of the Brown Shoe merger—which I shall come to later—they give no example of such subsidization. I might point out that law enforcement generally "subsidizes" those protected by its enforcement. It does so on the theory that there are recognized wrongs and recognized rights. The fact that the law may protect the embezzler, as well as the saint, from the thug may disturb the profesors. I do not want a system of law under which a man's right to the protection of the law may depend upon someone's estimation of whether he is good or bad.

A final word on this question of efficiency. One might well shudder at the legal battles which might ensue over an issue as to comparative efficiency.

Professors Bork and Bowman charge that the Government's attack on conglomerate mergers is merely an attack upon the competitive advantage of enhanced efficiency. They say, "any law that makes the creation of efficiency the touchstone of illegality can only tend to impoverish us as a nation." This argument assumes many things. It assumes that the greater advertising power arising from greater capital resources is a mark of efficiency which will inure to the benefit of the consumer in better products and cheaper products. It assumes that a company operating as a part of an integrated complex, will be operated efficiently. It assumes that such merger will encourage other independent companies to become more efficient rather than to become more interested in merging into larger companies. It assumes that the likelihood of a substantial lessening of competition or tendency to monopolize—the requirements of the Merger Act—is more apt to promote efficiency and to be more beneficial to the public than the absence of such likelihood.

I note that, ironically enough, in the Brown Shoe Company case, Brown argued in the Supreme Court that examples of unsuccessful integrated shoe companies demonstrated that vertical integration in the shoe industry had no significance.

In the General Electric case referred to in the appendix, the Court noted, with respect to that large integrated company:

> Only when General Electric was caught in a draft of competition to satisfy the demand of the market created by an independent manufacturer of the three way lamp base did it activate itself to produce a similar type base of which its policy had heretofore discouraged the manufacture.

The authors say that the Supreme Court "has with increasing frequency taken extreme anticompetitive positions." To those of us who have had antitrust policy and antitrust enforcement at heart, this is an incredible statement. It will, I wager, create equal amazement among businessmen and the antitrust bar. It has been the Supreme Court which, time and time again, has upheld and promoted antitrust policy and antitrust enforcement when others have faltered badly.

Congress and such antitrust stalwarts as the late Senator Kefauver are taken to task as foes of the free market and as proponents of less competition. Since I am not mentioned by name I shall merely note a few facts. The Civil Investigative Demand Act of 1962 is not referred to by the authors, nor is a pending bill, introduced by this writer, to strengthen section 5 of the Clayton Act. Since the writers have mentioned the quality stabilization bill, I might note that I know Senator Kefauver was opposed to it, and I have been one of its most active opponents.

I consider the authors' generalized remarks about the personnel of the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission grossly inaccurate and grossly unfair. I have known many of them, some have been members of my staff. In most instances their balance of perspective is in sharp contrast to the absence of such balance evidenced in the authors' article.

Professors Bork and Bowman reserve their heaviest artillery for the Brown Shoe Co. case. To hear them tell it, the Department of Justice was wrong in bringing the case, the district court was wrong in its adjudication of violation, and the nine justices of the Supreme Court, who also found the law violated, were woefully in error. On reading what the professors have to say about that case, I find it hard to believe that they were familiar with the Brown Shoe record.

In that merger case, Brown Shoe Co. acquired the Kinney Shoe Co. Let us see what Professors Bork and Bowman say the facts were and compare what they say with the actual facts.

BORK AND BOWMAN

Brown was first primarily, a shoe manufacturer and Kinney was primarily a retailer; second, Brown had 4 percent and Kinney had 0.5 percent of the Nation's shoe output; third, Kinney had 1.2 percent of total national retail shoe sales by dollar volume and together they had 2.3 percent of total retail shoe outlets.

Say Messrs. Bork and Bowman:

Fourth:

> With over 800 shoe manufacturers, the industry was as close to pure competition as is possible outside a classroom model.

Fifth, the Court said the share of the market foreclosed when taken together with the trend toward vertical integration and Brown's avowed policy of forcing its own shoes upon its retail subsidiaries spelled out illegality. The trend was seen in the fact that a number of manufacturers had acquired retailing chains. Thirteen largest shoe manufacturers operated 21 percent of the census shoestores. Accepting that figure for the moment, it is impossible to see any harm to competition, since there would be room for over 60 manufacturers of equal size to integrate to the same extent; sixth, moreover, census shoe stores do not include such key outlets as department and clothing stores; seventh, even if there was complete integration, any new manufacturer could find or create outlets any time he chose. The Court's cited trend toward vertical integration was thus impossible to visualize as a threat to competition.

Eighth:

> Brown's avowed policy of forcing its own shoes upon its retail subsidiaries turn out, upon inspection of the Court's footnotes, to spring from the testimony of its president that Brown's motive in making the deal was to get distribution in a range of prices it was not covering, and also, as Kinney moved into stores in higher income neighborhoods and needed to upgrade and add new lines * * * it would give us an opportunity, we hoped, to be able to sell them in that category.

Say the authors:

> The empirical evidence of coercion was no more impressive than this "avowal."

At the time of the merger, Kinney bought no shoes from Brown; 2 years later Brown was supplying 7.9 percent of Kinney's needs. Brown's sales to others had gone as high as 35 percent and in one case 50 percent of requirements. So, say Bork and Bowman:

> The "trend toward vertical integration" and the "avowed policy of forcing its own shoes upon its retail subsidiaries" was thus almost entirely imaginary.

Ninth. Even if accepted at face value, since Kinney supplied about 20 percent of its retail requirements, less than 1 percent, in fact less than one-tenth of

1 percent of the Nation's total retail sales had been foreclosed by the merger. The Court reached an incredible result on the vertical aspect of the case.

Tenth. The holding of the Court on the horizontal aspects was based on similar reasoning. The Court found creation of market shares as low as 5 percent in any city illegal because of fear of monopoly. Twenty firms in an industry is not oligopoly.

Eleventh. In view of ease of entry into shoe retailing, Supreme Court's fear of oligopoly is simply incomprehensible.

Twelfth. The Court was clearly wrong in suggesting that the merger was bad because Kinney's ability to get shoes cheaper from Brown would give it an advantage over other retailers.

Thirteenth. The Court's statement that the merger statute was designed to protect competition but not competitors is utterly inconsistent with its further statement that Congress desired to promote competition through the protection of "viable, small, locally owned businesses."

Fourteenth. The Brown Shoe-Kinney merger did not even remotely threaten competition.

THE FACTS

First. Although primarily a manufacturer, Brown was one of the largest shoe retailers in the country. It controlled over 1,320 retail outlets. Kinney was the 12th largest shoe manufacturer in terms of sales. It was the eighth largest in terms of assets.

Second, Brown was the third largest shoe manufacturer by dollar volume, and the fourth largest by volume of production. It produced over 25 million pairs of shoes.

Third and ninth. Kinney operated the largest family-style shoe store chain in the United States. It was rapidly growing chain, with about 352 stores at the time of the merger, over 400 in 270 cities at the time of the trail, and and over 500 when the case reached the Supreme Court. Its retail stores had sales of over $42 million annually. Among shoe sellers, either retailers or manufacturers, or both, it was the eighth largest.

Kinney sold 6.4 million pairs of shoes in 1955, which it purchased from outside sources. This exceeded the production of any of over 95 percent of the shoe manufacturers. A market of such size is one of great desirability for many shoe manufacturers. The record showed that in 1955 there were 66 suppliers of Kinney, each of whose sales to Kinney exceeded $50,000, and only 3 of which were large companies. At least each of five of Kinney's suppliers relied upon Kinney to purchase more than 40 percent of the company's total production in 1955.

Since Kinney did not sell high-priced shoes, it is obvious that even on a nationwide scale its market percentage of the type of shoes it sold was well above 1.2 percent, and as Justice Harlan noted:

> In terms of available markets for independent shoe manufacturers, the percentage of Kinney's purchases must have been substantially larger.

What the professors omitted also was the fact that in 27 cities, Kinney accounted for over 20 percent of all shoe sales; in 58 cities, over 15 percent; in 74 cities, over 13 percent.

I might suggest that even 5 percent of a market might mean the difference between small manufacturer being able to sell in a particular city or having no outlet there.

It is a matter of common knowledge that at the retail level the most significant economic fact in recent years has been the growth of shopping centers. In such centers chain shoestores are common; independent stores, rare. Kinney had stores in 115 shopping centers in 1958. Kinney has been going into shopping centers, often as the sole store there, a situation not infrequently brought about by Kinney:

> I checked the particular shopping center in Washington, you referred to; your information is correct, that we have a shoe-exclusive there.
>
> We have a number of these exclusives, and try our darndest to get them in every shopping center we are interested in. (Letter of vice president of Kinney.)

One can hardly ignore, as the writers have, the significance of such markets and effect of a Brown-Kinney merger upon their availability to other manufacturers.

Fourth. Of the 800 plus shoe manufacturers in this country, the top four produced approximately 23 percent of the Nation's shoes. The five companies which were 45th to 50th in size, produced 1.4 percent of the industry's production. The fifth largest company produced substantially less than one-half the production of the smallest of the top four.

In terms of value of shipments, the top four had about 30 percent, the next four 6 percent, and the largest 20 companies 45 percent. In 1957 Brown's production of shoes was over 20 times as much as any company among 97 percent of the industry.

The four largest companies had total assets of over one-third of the total assets of all the other companies in the industry. In 1955 the total assets of 916 shoe companies were roughly equivalent to the total assets of 11 companies. The top 4 companies had 171 plants between them, the next 6 had a combined total of only 41, more than half of which were operated by 2 companies.

Now, what about the trend? There has been a constant decrease in the number of shoe manufacturers despite an increase in total production. In 1947, there were 1,077 manufacturers; in 1954, 970; in 1958, 872. During this same period there was a concomitant decrease in the number of operating shoe plants, but the number operated by the largest four increased by 35 percent—largely through acquisition of other shoe manufacturers. While the position of the smaller manufacturers was deteriorating, the top four from 1947 to 1954 increased their percentage of the value of total shipments by 2 percent.

In 1945 the difference between the volume of sales for the largest shoe firm and the 18th largest was about $139 million. In 1956 the disparity between the volume of the largest and the 11th was over $245 million.

The fact of the matter is that the business is very unevenly distributed. As the trial court commented:

> A few large firms * * * control sizable segments of the business with the balance decided among hundreds of others having minute segments.

Fifth. The authors omit to say that in 1956 six large firms operated 18 percent of the Nation's shoestores.

There was a definite vertical merger trend in the industry. In 1945 the largest company had no retail outlets; by 1956 it had acquired 130. The second largest had 80 retail outlets in 1945, and 526 by 1956. Only a merger suit halted it in that upward progression. Brown had no retail outlets of its own in 1951, but had acquired 845 by 1956. Two of the top six manufacturers had gone from 301 to 842, and 536 to 947 respectively, from 1945 to 1956. Between 1950 and 1956, 9 independent shoestore chains, operating about 1,300 retail stores, became subsidiaries-at-large shoe companies. The record shows other attempts at vertical mergers by the shoe companies. Brown, in the 4 years prior to its merger with Kinney, had been acquiring retail stores on a large scale.

In addition, the large shoe manufacturers were expanding their franchise system by which they controlled many more shoestores.

Moreover, between 1950 and 1956, 7 companies, with 25 shoe plants, were acquired by the 10 companies which operated 20 percent of all shoe manufacturing plants.

The president of Brown noted that "General, Brown, and International acquired the larger companies." It may be noted that when an integrated manufacturer acquires an independent manufacturer, as testified in the Brown Shoe Company case, an independent retailer may find his sources of supply drying up, since small manufacturers vary widely in the type and quality of shoe they make.

To talk of room for 60 integrated shoe companies of equal size in the context of an industry, marked by inequality of size, hardly measures up to responsible argument.

Sixth. There was no evidence that clothing stores represent an important shoe market. As to department stores, the evidence showed that, commonly, shoe selling in department stores was on a leasing arrangement. And the big manufacturers were very prominent lessees. Thus, Brown, in 1951, acquired Wohl Shoe Co., the Nation's largest operator of leased shoe departments. Wohl had 250 outlets in department stores.

Seventh and eleventh. That even though the industry might be wholly integrated "any new manufacturers could create or find new outlets anytime he chose," is poppycock. The case is replete with proof that affiliated stores favored their manufacturer affiliate, and that the independent manufacturer found it hard put to obtain any business from the captive stores. There was evidence, moreover, that since large shoe chains have many of ther own brand names, they concentrate on manufac-

turers who will manufacture makeup shoes for them rather than shoe manufacturers who would prefer to promote their identity and independence through their own brand names.

If it were so easy to create new outlets, it is surprising that the major manufacturers were so eager to use mergers as a means to secure such outlets. One wonders also why so many shoe manufacturers have departed from the scene.

I have already mentoned the situation of the shopping center shoe market.

A manufacturer cannot live on the business of one store. He has to have access to a number of them. Moreover, the manufacture and the retailing of shoes do not involve the same skills and know-how. The able manufacturer may be a poor retailer, and the cost and risk for a small manufacturer to go into retailing in competition with the existing giants is a real one.

Eighth. Even if Brown's alleged forcing policy rested upon its president's letter and upon the portion of Kinney's purchases Brown took over after merger, these would seem to be ample proof of the existence of such policy. But there was other evidence omitted by the professors.

The same president, in another memorandum, stated:

> One of our principal objectives in acquiring retail stores is to protect and guarantee distribution of our products in areas where independent retailers could not give our brands adequate distribution because of their affiliations with other branded manufacturers.

Justice Harlan noted that—

> The result of Brown's earlier acquisition of two retail chains, was in each instance a substantial increase in their Brown shoe purchases.

For instance, Wohl's purchases from Brown jumped from 12.8 percent before merger to over 33 percent after merger.

There was evidence that when other manufacturers acquired retail stores, such outlets curtailed their purchases from other manufacturers and took more from their parent. Thus, an independent manufacturer testified:

> Question. Have you ever suffered any loss of business as a result of acquisition from any other corporation?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. Can you state an example of this?
>
> Answer. Well, Bon Marche in Pensacola, Fla., is an account, we had an order of 427 pairs on hand when that was acquired by International Shoe Co. and the order was canceled and we since have sold them nothing.

Brown entered into contracts with a number of its franchised dealers which provided:

> I will (1) concentrate my business within the grades and price lines of shoes covered by Brown Shoe Co. franchises, and will have no lines conflicting with the Brown Shoe Co. brands.

There was considerable other proof of forcing by Brown.

Tenth. There was proof that Brown and Kinney were in active competition with one another.

On the retail level the acquisition of Kinney moved Brown into second place in the number of owned and operated stores, and, including other stores controlled by Brown, gave the latter about 7.2 percent of the total. By May 1958, Brown with Kenney controlled about 1,840 retail shoe outlets.

The combination of Brown and Kinney gave the former control of over 40 percent of shoe sales in two cities, in five over 30 percent, and in seven from 25 to 30 percent. In 32 cities the combined share of Brown and Kinney sales exceeded 20 percent, and this was true of children's shoes in 31 cities. These figures, moreover, did not include sales of Brown shoes in these cities by retailers not controlled by Brown. Such sales significantly enlarged the extent of the local market occupied by Brown and Kinney shoe sales.

Twelfth. The proof shows that in some instances integrated companies charged less to their retailing subsidiaries than to their nonaffiliated retail customers.

The possible ability of Kinney to get shoes cheaper from Brown might not come from increased efficiency at all. It might be a matter of bookkeeping. In the long run Kinney might lose out by not having the benefit of a number of competitive manufacturers bidding for its trade. It might lose other retailing advantages which would offset lower prices from Brown.

Thirteenth and fourteenth. These points I have already answered. I find it utterly incomprehensible for anyone to say of the Brown Shoe merger that it did not even remotely threaten competition.

CONCLUSION

To me the basic flaw in the professors' thinking is apparent in the complete absence in their article of an awareness of an important aspect of our antitrust laws. On the basis of experience, these laws assume that all too often monopoly or oligopoly power will not be exercised to promote efficiency and low prices, but will be used either inefficiently or to maximize profits by high prices. I have noted some such examples in the appendix to this article. Moreover, such power has consequences in terms of choice of employment, deterrent to new entrees in the field, and political power that involve grave social and economic considerations.

I certainly would not want to eliminate big business from the American scene. A large-scale landscape without some mountain peaks would be dull indeed. They can add much to the welfare of all of us. But I think there is room for, and desirable that there be, enterprises of moderate and small size. I believe that the latter have survived, and have been of great benefit to our competitive system, largely through the policy and enforcement of our antitrust laws.

To the professors I would say: When you use a shotgun, make sure the target is there.

APPENDIX

A. ILLUSTRATIONS OF EXCLUSIONARY PRACTICES

First. *Glass Containers—Hartford-Empire Co.* (323 U.S. 386): A footnote to the Fortune article advises that Professor Bowman was with the Antitrust Division during most of the years 1938 to 1946. It was during that period that the Division brought a landmark antitrust case, known as the Hartford-Empire case. That case involved glass container and glassmaking machinery industries. There was a far-reaching conspiracy between leading glass makers and Hartford-Empire, a patent holding company, to restrict production, restrict entry, and competition. The case abounded in exclusionary practices. But, perhaps the best way to combat a myth is with actual documents.

Thus the secretary of Hartford-Empire wrote in 1928:

> (3) We began our commercial expansion in 1917 when our first feeders were put in production. It was at once apparent that if we put out these machines broadcast, without restriction, we would disorganize the whole industry * * *. In fact, our first group of licensees said so expressly and urged us to take measures to prevent such a result.
>
> (4) Consequently, we adopted the policy which we have followed ever since of restricted licensing. That is to say:
>
> (a) We licensed the machines only to selected manufacturers of the better type, refusing many licensees whom we thought would be price cutters, and
>
> (b) We restricted their fields of manufacture, in each case, to certain specific articles, with the idea of preventing too much competition.
>
> (c) In order to retain more complete control of the situation, we retained title to the machines, and simply leased them for a definite period of years, usually 8 or 10 years, with the privilege of renewal of a smaller additional term.
>
> * * * * *
>
> (6) * * * We felt it to be to our best interests, as well as for the best interest of the whole industry that we should use our influence to steady the industry as much as possible, with a long-distance view toward its general prosperity. The men at the head of our concern took this long-distance view deliberately and have ever since maintained it.

Some 7 years after the Standard Oil case Hartford purchased the Hitchcock patent—exhibit 1852:

> (a) Because of the probable value to us of the Hitchcock rights in suppressing other feeders, particularly that of Tucker & Reeves; (b) to prevent Hitchcock's rights from being acquired by our competitors, and (c) because of the probability that any drawback feeder we might use would infringe the Hitchcock claims.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Corning's patent counsel, V. M. Dorsey, reported to Corning in October 1920 (Ex. 677): "the whole bulb situation would be strengthened if a monopoly could be gotten into one hand, of the flowing field, with right to take bulb licenses from the owner of such monopoly, and that unless the Hartford-Fairmont Co. succeeded in doing this, as they expected to do, there would be a purely competitive field * * *."

In 1921 an officer of Hartford warned his board of directors—exhibit 1889—that—

> The Howard feeder was sufficiently good to upset trade conditions in general, inasmuch as this feeder when operated by the small glass concerns would permit the small concerns to continue to exist and at the same time quote prices which would be detrimental to the general trade.

Hartford met this threat by acquiring control of Howard.

The general manager of Owens-Illinois, the largest glass container manufacturer, in a conversation with an officer of Hartford, said—exhibit 26:

There should be in the glass industry some concern like Owens in a sufficiently strong position practically to force a stable price policy upon all important producers; that if Owens, by the plan as above suggested, had the free use of its own suction feed and the free use of the gob feed it could then go to any other producer who threatened to cut prices and unstabilize the market, and inform him that such a policy was detrimental, but that if the outsider persisted in doing so Owens has a sufficient margin, by reason of its free use of both devices, so that if necessary it could come out on top in a price war and still make money.

According to a contemporaneous memorandum by Carter of Owens, in November 1923, two leading executives of Owens believed—exhibit 611:

The advantage of having the feeder field under some patent control is so great, from a business standpoint, that this company would rather see such control in the hands of Hartford than to have the field open.

And the Court found from the evidence that the purposes of the 1924 agreement between Owens and Hartford were:

(1) Stabilize the prices of glassware.
(2) Restrict its production.
(3) Exclude outsiders from the glassware industry (exhibit 23).
(4) Exclude users of bottles from the glassware industry (exhibit 55).
(5) Effect a monopoly of all patents relating to glassmaking machinery and the issuance of licenses thereunder.
(6) Eliminate competition of other manufacturers of glassmaking machinery.
(7) Allot the control of the licensing of suction to Owens and the control of the licensing of gob feeding to Hartford and Owens.
(8) Avoid competition in glassware by the adoption of a restricted licensing policy by Hartford.

Owens was given veto power over Hartford's licensing others.

Among the competitors the conspirators tried to put out of business was T.R. & B. Hartford and Owens finally bought out T.R. & B. and the latter's licensees were compelled by Hartford to submit to numerous added restrictions to their licenses.

In 1930 an officer of Hartford explained:

In taking out patents, we have three main purposes:

(a) To cover the actual machines which we are putting out, and prevent duplication of them. * * *

(b) To block the development of machines which might be constructed by others for the same purpose as our machines, using alternative means. * * *

(c) To secure patents on possible improvements of competing machines, so as to "fence in" those and prevent their reaching an improved stage (exhibit 388).

* * * * *

We now have a number of applications which were filed to definitely forestall the development of competing machines by others (exhibit 388).

* * * * *

The district court found (U.F. 194, R. 7319) that in the 3 years 1927, 1928, and 1929, Hartford filed a total of 112 applications for the purpose of "fencing in" and "blocking off." During the same 3 years, it filed only 88 applications for the purpose of obtaining "direct patent protection," that is, for the purpose of affording patent protection to its own commercial machines (exhibit 388).

In 1933, while patent litigation was going on, Safford of Hartford noted:

To Hartford's smaller licensees a breaking down of Hartford's licensing system meant freedom from royalties and ware restrictions, which they considered burdensome. To Hartford's larger licensees the amount of royalties paid meant less.

Their chief worry was the unsettled industry which would inevitably result from a breaking down of Hartford's system of limited and restricted licenses. This system had offered very substantial protection in times past to certain restricted fields, and had prevented numerous manufacturers from competing on a par with Hartford's licensees (exhibit 1772 * * *).

Automatic glassmaking machinery consisted primarily of a feeder, a former, and a lehr. Hartford was early in the feeder field but later decided to go into the forming field as well. In connection with the acquisition of a company having former machinery patent applications, an officer of Hartford wrote:

If some kind of control of forming machines can be obtained, it will * * * practically put us into a position where any bottle manufacturer will be forced to come to us for his equipment (exhibit 295).

The Lynch Corp. was an important factor in the forming field. In 1933 negotiations for a deal between Hartford and Lynch were had in which it was noted that:

(1) All parties agree that it is desirable to corner the forming machine business.
(2) The Lynch Corp. is willing to cooperate if they can get a reasonable break assuring them of a future volume of business (exhibit H-6048).

An official of Hartford wrote of this plan:

Reasons for the plan are as follows:
(1) It will prevent extra capacity being put into the glass industry.
(2) Lynch being unwilling to furnish formers it will take away from them [nonlicensees] the incentive to build feeders.
(3) It will also have the effect of taking from other persons the incentive to build feeders that might be used with Lynch machines.

* * * * *

(6) The former patent situation will be considerably stabilized.

Reasons against the plan:
(1) It is very definitely an extension of our feeder monopoly by means of our patent control as opposed to the commercial situation.

* * * * *

We are trying to bolster up a feeder situation, not as strong as we should like, with a spurious forming machine situation (exhibit 320).

Several nonlicensees felt compelled to accept Hartford feeder licenses, in part because they desired to secure Lynch forming machines. They, in common with other Hartford feeder licensees who signed "Former Licenses," could not thereafter use any but Hartford feeders with the Lynch forming machines without subjecting themselves to the payment of the same royalties to Hartford for the use of forming machines that they would have to pay for the feeder and forming machine licenses together.

The district court found that one of the purposes and effects of the forming machine agreement was to cause nonlicensees of Hartford's feeders to accept such feeder licenses and thereby to bolster Hartford's monopoly of feeders. It found that the agreement also had the purpose and effect of giving Hartford complete control over the distribution and use of all narrow-neck forming machines and substantially all efficient fully automatic wide-mouth forming machines and of preventing new capital and additional concerns from entering the glassware industry.

In December 1920 Hartford granted the Thatcher Mills Co. exclusive rights to make milk bottles under certain patents, and some 20 years later it still had such rights. A rebate arrangement as to other patented machinery protected its discriminatory position. In 1927 an officer of Hartford noted that "the milk situation is such that it is practically, to all intents and purposes, equivalent to an exclusive license."

Furthermore, every manufacturer initially licensed to produce milk bottles on Hartford feeders after 1923, except Owens, Liberty, and Winslow (* * * [later] acquired by Owens), was restricted to a specified quota of bottles or was limited in the area in which they could be sold.

On August 2, 1932, W. E. Levis of Owens wrote to R. H. Levis (Ex. 783 * * *): "With the plans we now have, there is certain to be a curtailment of the promiscuous manufacture of milk bottles on nonlicensed feeders, which will result in our company's and the Thatcher Co.'s securing a greater proportion of the available milk bottle business. This should stabilize the price and increase the earnings of the Thatcher Co."

When Thatcher acquired price-cutter Peerless, an officer of Hartford wrote to an officer of Corning in 1934:

The purchase of the Peerless plant was an advantage to the industry and did relieve us of a troublesome situation.

* * * * *

(5) We have not been legally prohibited from licensing single feeders for milk bottles to anybody we saw fit, but during all these years we have protected Thatcher and Berney Bond and Buck by refusing to grant additional licenses for milks. This action on our part has stabilized the price situation and has been worth hundreds of thousands of dollars to Thatcher. It would have been a very simple thing for us to decentralize the production of milks throughout the country (exhibit 246).

In 1932 Hartford informed Ball, of fruit-jar fame, that—

Hartford was continually declining new business in the belief that an association with your company would be more beneficial to us than to take our fruit-jar rights and license a number of concerns. The easiest thing we could do would be to license Kerr, Brockway, Underwood [Knox], Monaca, and five or six more concerns in the East and South, as well as on the coast * * *.

On the other hand, it seems rather a pity to disrupt the existing general fruit-jar situation which, barring a few soft points, is pretty well in hand and affords a reasonable margin of profit (exhibit 181).

In 1933, Brockway asked Hartford for the right to manufacture fruit jars, but "Hartford was absolutely obdurate, the explanation being made that fruit jars were being reserved for Ball Bros."

Thereafter, in 1933, Brockway sold out to Ball. Ball was not anxious to have Owens as an active competitor in the fruit jar field, so a side agreement was entered into between Owens and Hartford restricting the former's production of fruit jars.

In 1930 H. K. Smith wrote of "Hartford's present and long established policy of endeavoring to limit competition between its licensees within reasonable bounds." (Ex. 392).

Exclusionary tactics included fraud upon the Patent Office. Thus, in 1924, patent counsel for Owens in a letter to patent counsel for Hartford stated:

That in his opinion, if we should prove by court testimony what happened at the Hitchcock demonstration at Fairmont, there would be no chance whatever of making an ironclad monopoly on feeders, and that personally, he believed that under such conditions, the Owens Co. could work a plunger feeder, and get away with it, without being held as infringers. He stated, on the other hand, that if we did not disclose the secrets of the Charnel house, he thought we might close up everybody between us (exhibit H-5847).

The "secrets of the Charnel house" were kept secret until the Government instituted its antitrust suit.

Second. Motion pictures: The Schine Theatres case is a classic example of exclusionary practices. Schine was the largest theater circuit, not affiliated with a major producer, in the United States. In 1942 it had approximately 148 motion picture theaters in 76 towns. In 60 of such towns Schine had all the theaters. The late thirties and forties were the hayday of the motion-picture industry. There were eight major distributors of motion pictures in the United States. Large numbers of pictures were produced and distributed by them. It was customary for exhibitors to negotiate with the various distributors for a season's product.

The Schine case had many witnesses and many documents. For the most part the witnesses were former or current exhibitor competitors of Schine who, because of the conspiracy between Schine and the distributors, had either taken it on the chin or were taking it on the chin. The two professors would have us believe that this was because of the exhibitors' inefficiency and that the Government was attempting to subsidize competitors by bringing the suit.

Let us see what the case disclosed:

Schine used the buying power of its theaters in the towns where it had a monopoly as a lever to have the distributors deny pictures to its competitors in competitive towns, whether the competitor had better theaters or not, to impose unreasonable clearances upon them, and to subject them to other substantial discriminations.

Schine obtained franchises from the distributors on their product, covering a number of years. Thus, in 1936, Schine made a 3-year agreement with Fox and, as a result, the Fox product was committed in all the towns in which Schine then operated. Later this agreement was amended to include subsequently acquired theaters by Schine. In 1938 another 3-year agreement was made with Fox.

Schine obtained selective contracts with distributors whereby it could tie up a year's product and play only those pictures it desired to play. It leased closed theaters and renewed leases on closed theaters, paying substantial sums therefor to keep competitors out of towns in which Schine operated. In some instances, where completion started, it would keep such theaters open until a competitor was driven out and then close them again.

In a number of instances it was able to price-cut admission prices, in order to eliminate competition, by obtaining film license contracts with distributors from which minimum admission-price limitations had been deleted, while its competitors' contracts contained such limitations. Schine used a hatchetman to threaten competitors and in at least one instance tried to get his competitor's landlord to break his lease or to lease to Schine effective after the expiration of the competitor's lease.

To look at a number of specific examples:

First. In Amsterdam, N.Y., a competitor asked Warner for a second run. Schine asked Warner not to sell to the competitor, and although Warner's branch manager favored such sale, Warner declined to sell to Schine's competitor. This was so even though the competitor was the only second-run theater in the city.

Second. In Auburn, N.Y., a competitor of Schine, deprived of first runs by Schine, was unable to obtain second runs during a 3-year period when no Schine theater there played second runs.

Third. In Medina, Ohio, a new theater in opposition to Schine's old 300-seat theater, was able to obtain only Columbia product, and one-half the product from two of the eight distributors. As a result Schine got an interest in the new theater without paying therefore, and closed the 300-seat theater.

Fourth. In Corning, some distributors permitted Schine's theater to charge a lower admission price on an earlier run than Schine's competitor was required to charge for a later run.

Fifth. In Lexington, Ky., Schine's "subsidized" price warfare against a competitor was done on a large scale. Inability to get products, and discriminatory terms, led Schine's competition to leave the field, and Schine had all the six motion-picture theaters in the city.

Sixth. In Van Wert, Ohio, Schine's competitor, when it found most of its first-run taken away, tried to run on a second-run policy. With respect to Universal Pictures, we find that the Albany office of Universal wrote to the company's eastern sales manager:

In Van Wert, Dave Miller (district manager) advises that upon Mr. Grainger's (general sales manager) suggestion, he took away the first run from the opposition and sold him a second run. Lynch claims that he does not want a second-run policy to prevail at the second run opposition and has promises from other major companies that they will not sell second run. Wants Dave Miller to reinstate first run at opposition as they will give up the pictures for this town. (Lynch was an official of Schine.)

There also, Fox licensed second run to a Schine competitor for the 1936–37 season on a 90-day clearance after Schine's theaters, but in the following year Fox licensed second run to a Schine theater there on a clearance which read "after Schine Van Wert. Sixty days on third run."

Seventh. In Rochester, N.Y., a competitor of Schine had two neighborhood theaters, the Madison and the Monroe. Schine acquired the Dixie in August 1932 and relinquished the Webster, the first time, in December 1933. When Schine acquired the Dixie the Madison lost its clearance over the Dixie, although the Dixie is a much smaller theater; whereas when the Webster was dropped by Schine it ceased to enjoy the clearance it had previously held over the larger Madison and Monroe. Schine paid less for films for prior runs than his competitor was charged for later runs, and even though the competitor offered even higher prices for an earlier run, with the exception of a second run from one distributor, he could not buy an earlier run at any price.

Eighth. Schine, the efficient monopolizer, in 1933 wrote to Metro relative to six towns:

If there are any other opposition towns where you believe you can sell a second run, I would appreciate it if you would take the matter up with me first before selling.

Ninth. In Corbin, Ky., Schine had two theaters. When a new, superior theater was built in Corbin, its operator was unable to get either first-run or second-run pictures from the distributors. Between the fall of 1938 and the spring of 1940, when Schine was threatened with competition in Corbin, Schine had tied up all the first- and second-run product of all major distributors except Columbia second run. This amount of product was more than the operation of their two theaters in Corbin could use.

After the new theater opened Schine reduced its balcony admission prices at one of its theaters. Fox assisted Schine in this reduction by omitting from its license to Schine any minimum admission prices. After the operator of the new theater sold out to Schine, the latter raised its admission prices and closed one of the theaters.

Third. *United States* v. *General Electric Co.*, 82 F. Supp. 753 (1949): This opinion of more than 150 pages contains a wide ranging survey of exclusionary practices. To illustrate:

The evidence discloses that the relationship between Corning and General Electric generated a condition whereby Corning preferred Westinghouse and General Electric's B licensees' business and that its other and independent customers were required to pay prices in excess of those with which Westinghouse and General Electric's licensees were favored.

* * * * *

The evidence is convincing that the relationship between Corning and General Electric inspired the negotiations between Corning and Hartford-Empire in order to protect the field in which Corning and General Electric had agreed they would operate and it also appears that Hartford-Empire in its dealings with Corning and other glass-producing interests always reserved the rights within Corning's field.

* * * * *

Corning negotiated with Hartford-Empire and Libbey and with Kimble to divide their

glass production in such a manner that the electrical glass field would be strictly the domain of Corning and through it to General Electric. * * *

* * * * *

It is my understanding that we have for many years adhered closely to the policy of declining to sell incandescent lamp parts or materials (with the single exception of bases) to domestic manufacturers who are not licensed under the incandescent lamp patents of the General Electric Co. This has been true of unpatented as well as patented parts and materials (exhibit 239–G).

* * * * *

It is apparent that when either General Electric or Westinghouse could not secure public business on the basis of the lowest bid, their purpose was to exclude competition through the activities of their sales representatives in having bids thrown out and readvertised after new specifications drawn encompassing terms favorable only to them had been adopted.

Fourth. Medicine: In the early days of prepaid medical care, the American Medical Association and local medical societies tried to stop such plans. Their tactics include expelling doctors from medical societies or refusing to admit them to such societies, if they worked for such plans or if they were willing to be reimbursed for their bills through such insurance plans. Consultation was denied to such doctors as were hospital privileges needed to take care of their patients. A case of this sort involving the Group Health Association in the District of Columbia reached the Supreme Court (317 U.S. 519).

Fifth. The press: Not until an antitrust suit was brought were the bylaws of the Associated Press, which prevented competitors of existing members of AP from obtaining AP service, altered (326 U.S. 1 (1945)).

Sixth. Titanium: Letter of president of one of the companies in Titanium cartel:

May I call the proposed combination, for simplicity, a cartel? The whole purpose of the cartel is to obtain a monopoly of patents, so that no one can manufacture it excepting the members of the cartel, and so can raise the prices by reason of such monopoly to a point that would give us much more profit on our present tonnage, but also prevent a growth in tonnage that would interfere with their greater profits in lithopene. *United States* v. *National Lead Co.*, 66 U.S.P.Q. 141, 150 (S.D.N.Y., 1945).

Government Procurements Set Aside for Small Business Show Big Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently announced that Government purchases made under the "set aside" program during the first 8 months of the current fiscal year, totaled more than $1 billion—a record high.

Additional information regarding this development appeared in a recent issue of the publication distributed by the Smaller Business Association of New England.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SET ASIDE PROGRAM SETS ASIDE OLD RECORDS IN 8 MONTHS

More than $1 billion in Government prime contracts were awarded to small businesses during the first 8 months of this fiscal year under the "set-aside" program conducted jointly by the Small Business Administration and Government purchasing agencies, SBA Administrator Eugene P. Foley has announced.

This is a record high in awards under the program for any similar period since SBA was established, Foley said, and represents an increase of more than 25 percent over the corresponding 8 months (July-February) of fiscal 1963.

Under the set-aside program, proposed Federal purchases of goods and services are screened by representatives of SBA and contracting officers of the military and civilian agencies. Those found suitable for performance by small businesses are reserved, in whole or in part, for exclusive competitive bidding by small firms.

The new record reported by SBA was made possible by a sharp increase during the period in the value of contracts awarded to small business by civilian agencies. This increase more than offset a slight decline in the value of military contracts awarded under the program.

Types of procurement included in the contracts reported today were construction work, aircraft parts, packing and crating, bayonets, printing, jet fuel, food supplies, weather forecasting equipment, various electronic items, and research and development work.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Why Food Prices Continue To Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 28, 1964, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission to once again present the case for the livestockmen of Wyoming and the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my statement along with an article from the U.S. News & World Report of April 20, 1964, entitled "Why Food Prices Keep on Rising."

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR MILWARD L. SIMPSON ON BEEF IMPORTS BEFORE PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, APRIL 29, 1964

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Commission to testify in behalf of the State of Wyoming and its livestock industry. I have appeared before this Commission twice before in recent months urging that you strike from the preliminary negotiation list the commodities of beef, beef products, lamb, mutton, wool, and wool products. I hope that the Commission will find it advisable to recommend to the President and his special assistant, Christian Herter, that these commodities be eliminated from the negotiation list. The situation has not improved in the slightest and a reduction in tariffs would bring further injury to the livestock industry. In fact, it has worsened.

Today, I come to you in an effort to demonstrate the need of the Wyoming cattlemen and the cattlemen of the Nation for legislation to curb the excessive beef imports which are flooding our domestic markets.

With the permission of the Commission, I would like to relate, at this time, the significance of the cattle industry to the State of Wyoming and the importance of the vitality and growth of that industry to our local economy. Wyoming is a State of some 97,000 square miles and approximately 350,000 people. Unlike the lush, fertile lands of some States, our grasslands would have little use were they not used for raising cattle and sheep.

Income in Wyoming is derived from three major sources; oil and gas production, agriculture, and tourists, in that order. Agriculture contributes nearly one-fourth of our income and of that figure, livestock and livestock products contribute 85 percent.

There are some 9,700 farms and ranches in Wyoming with an average value of land and buildings per unit of over $72,000. Those farms and ranches employ over 12,000 workers, 9 percent of our total labor force. Many of our small towns are absolutely dependent on the economic welfare of the surrounding agricultural lands.

Cattle and calves in the 50 States in 1963 were valued by USDA (as they stood on the farm) at $14.7 billion; in 1964 at $13.5 billion or a drop of nearly $1.2 billion—a drop of 8 percent.

In Wyoming the drop was even more significant. Despite an increase in cattle numbers of nearly 10 percent on Wyoming farms and ranches from 1963 to 1964 the USDA estimates that there was a drop in total value of some 10.2 percent, $20 million. These figures may strike you as unimportant, but to put that $20 million drop in Wyoming cattle values into perspective for you, let me point out that $20 million is more than it costs to finance the entire operation of the State government of Wyoming for 1 year.

Wyoming ranks 32d in cattle production in the Nation but that production amounts to 61 percent of our agricultural income. Because of the drop in values in the past year, 31 other States are also feeling the squeeze. Many of them, however, have an industrial base which Wyoming does not have.

Wyoming is an arid State, high in altitude, with a short growing season. Its grasslands can be put to economic use only by producing livestock. You cannot think about retraining our cowboys or rechanneling our energies and our efforts. The resources and grasslands in Wyoming are dedicated to the production of livestock. If that use of our lands becomes unprofitable, the whole economic structure of our State is weakened, if not destroyed.

The ranchers in Wyoming and all across the Nation find themselves in a precarious position due to the excessive imports which are being shipped into this country. The Foreign Agriculture Service Division of the Department of Agriculture has informed me that beef and veal imports by product weight for 1962 were up 41 percent over the imports of 1961. The imports for 1963 are up 60 percent over the 1961 base. This is alarming enough, but, when we consider the further fact that imports in the last 10 years have increased by 383 percent, we know that imports are having a direct and significant effect upon the local market. This dramatically emphasizes that corrective action should be taken if we are to preserve and protect the livestock industry of America.

The livestock industry in this country has made a tremendous growth in the last several years. It provides food and fiber for civilians and military alike. In 1948, cattle numbered a little of 77 million head, whereas in January of 1963 we had over 103 million head. In 1940, we Americans consumed 8.23 billion pounds, carcass weight, and in 1962 we consumed 17.3 billion pounds. The per capita consumption of beef has increased from the 1940 level of 54.9 pounds to an estimated 95 pounds in 1963. While the consumption of beef has made a significant increase and the health of our Nation has consequently improved, it is interesting to note that the consumption of imported beef has skyrocketed, in comparison to our total consumption of meat products. If we compare the year's consumption in 1960 with the year's consumption in 1962, we find that total consumption increased 4.3 percent, but that the consumption of imported meat increased 81.8 percent. This is significant, because everytime someone takes a bite of foreign beef, one less bite of American beef is consumed. Consequently, the entire Nation's economy is affected.

We must not forget the tremendous impact the farming community has upon the Nation's economy. Too often, Congress and men in the administration look at statistics, and say that since such a very small proportion of our people are farmers, we do not need to be concerned about them. That is not the truth. When we consider the farming community as composed of not only the farmers, but also the people who service the farmers, make the farm equipment, the automobiles, and all the other related consumer goods, we can see that the farmer has a tremendous effect upon the Nation's economy.

Agriculture is an important customer for the output of the nonfarm industries. Farmers spend $27 to $28 billion a year for goods and services to produce crop and livestock and $15 billion a year for the same things that city people buy—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services. Farming employs 6.5 million workers—more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry. The assets of agriculture total $216 billion, "equal to more than two-thirds of the value of current assets of all corporations in the United States and nearly three-fifths of the market value of all the corporation stocks in the New York Stock Exchange." The value of agriculture's production assets represents about $23,000 for each farm employee. It is important to realize that while the number of farmers nad farmworkers has steadily decreased, farmers total expenditures continue to increase.

Since livestock and livestock products account for more than 55 percent of the total cash receipts from all farm marketings, it is apparent that any condition that would tend to lower farm income from the production of livestock, cattle, and calves in particular, would adversely affect the farmers' financial ability to purchase goods and services produced by the nonfarm industries.

A recent Wall Street Journal article pointed out that, during 1963, farm income dropped 3 percent while the general consumer income increased 5 percent. The 1964 picture is even worse. The present estimate of the Department of Agriculture is a further 5-percent drop in farm income this year. Their pessimism seems well grounded in view of what is in store. If we have another drop in farm income as is estimated, it will push farm earnings to the lowest level in 5 years. What are the causes? One of the principal causes and the greatest single factor in the disappointing 1963 farm income cut was the heavy reduction in cattle prices and one of the chief reasons for the cut in cattle prices was the increase in imports from foreign countries.

With over 11 percent of our consumed beef, or about 1½ billion pounds, coming from foreign lands it is easy to see that, in a free market such as our livestock market is, beef imports do have a direct relationship to the prices obtained by American cattlemen.

Recently, the cattle markets slid better than $5 per hundredweight, and as a result of this catastrophe the feeder markets also declined from $3 to $6 per hundredweight. One of the reasons for this drop in price was that beef imports sold here in the States 5 to 10 cents a pound cheaper than beef can be produced and marketed by our American livestock industry.

It is interesting to note that in comparing production costs we find that, conservatively speaking, one-third of the production cost

of a calf represents investment in land here in America while in Australia the cost of production chargeable to land runs as low as 11 cents per head per year. In many of our States, the State real estate taxes on grazing land are higher than the total cost of production per animal unit in Australia.

A substantial portion of the imported beef is of the manufacturing or processing quality. In fact, about 40 percent of the processing beef consumed in America is imported. It is argued by some that the imported processing beef does not affect the price of our cattle. This is a fallacious argument. The Department of Agriculture has often reported that beef is often its own worse competitor; consequently, when cow or processing beef, 40 percent of which is imported, competes with fed beef for the consumers' dollar, cow prices have a direct effect on fat-cattle prices and vice versa. To wit, if our American people are eating frankfurters and bologna, made from cheap processing imported beef, they will not be buying our domestically raised beef and our prices will be driven down.

I believe that the current levels of imports are having an extremely adverse economic impact on our cattle industry. Legislation is needed which will curb these excessive beef imports. I feel that we should establish a quota equal to a 5-year average of 1958 through 1962. This will permit the importing of a sufficient quantity of beef to meet the processing needs that we do have and yet it will not inhibit the growth and development of our domestic livestock industry which is so essential for a strong economy.

This administration knows that the cattleman is being hurt by the excessive beef imports and it also knows that it has the responsibility of protecting the cattle industry. But it is more interested in things other than the cattlemen and the livestock industry. Consequently, great smokescreens have been set up in an attempt to divert the attention of the cattlemen. After months and months of denying that there was a problem with beef imports, the administration finally admitted that it was a problem and started to negotiate with the importing countries. Agreements were made with those countries but, unfortunately, the restrictions established in that agreement brought little relief, if any, to our livestock industry. However, the agreements did provide New Zealand, Australia, and Ireland a built-in market.

Several of the Federal agencies started buying beef in an attempt to keep the price from declining further. This short-term activity by the agencies does not solve the problem nor does it bring any substantial relief to the livestock industry. It appears to be merely an attempt by this administration to lessen some of the public pressures which have been building up in opposition to the present policies. More recently, this administration and Members of Congress have attempted to divert the attention of the public and the cattlemen from the fact that imports are destroying the domestic livestock markets. An attempt is being made to blame the chainstores for the financial losses of the cattlemen. I do not believe that they are the real cause of the recent decline in the cattle market. I am not, at this time, in a position to defend the chainstores from all the accusations but neither am I in a position to condemn them as members of this administration are doing.

I am quite disturbed at the results this investigation is presently having. It appears that the charges and allegations leveled at the chainstores have weakened the belief in the consumers' minds that beef represents a good value. Nothing could be further from the truth or more damaging to the best interests of the cattlemen and the industry. If this confidence is further weakened the nonbeef products will be in greater demand at the expense of beef and beef products. This would add further injury to the already plagued beef industry.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, the grasslands of Wyoming are good for producing livestock and cannot be used for other purposes. Land is a natural resource and if we are denied the opportunity to profitably utilize our resources, we will have been denied our existence. I have urged many times, on the Senate floor that action be taken which would bring relief to the livestock industry. Unfortunately, my pleas have been ignored by this administration which has refused to assist such a small voting segment of our populace. I beg you, gentlemen of the Tariff Commission, to recommend to the Senate Finance Committee that legislation now before it be enacted.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 20, 1964]

WHY FOOD PRICES KEEP ON RISING

(Congress is up in arms over food prices. There's strong feeling that middlemen prosper while farmers and housewives get the short end of the deal. A full-dress investigation is demanded. Clue to the mystery, found in official figures: Processing today's foods requires lots of labor. The cost of that labor is in a steady rise.)

The price the housewives pays for food keeps on creeping higher and higher.

At the same time, however, the price the farmer gets for his products often is moving lower—with farm income in a decline.

Why? How can that be?

In an election year, politicians are looking for answers to a problem that affects two important voting groups: Consumers and farmers.

President Johnson is asking Congress for a full-dress investigation of food marketing, with emphasis on the growing concentration of the grocery businesses in the hands of relatively few large grocery chains.

Congress, by all indications, is eager to respond to the White House request.

When all the facts are in—based upon official studies and testimony—the investigators are going to learn what is already known.

Facts reveal that the rise in food prices and the increase in "spread" between what a farmer gets and what the housewife pays for food are due largely to higher costs of labor.

When today's housewife goes shopping, she expects service. She wants food neatly packaged and ready to serve, or to pop into the pot or oven if possible.

Says an executive of Winn-Dixie, a large grocery chain in the Southeast: "I am sure you know from observation at home that your wife does not want food that she has to peel, chop, wash, or trim before she uses it."

This kind of processing, say chainstore officials, requires labor and lots of it. The cost of that labor, official figures show, has been in a sharp rise.

In 1947, the average hourly wage of foodstore employees was $1.03. By 1963, it had gone up to $2.17.

As to the spread between live-cattle prices and meat-counter prices—now a hot topic of debate in Congress—the Winn-Dixie executive has this to say:

"A 1,000-pound live steer will weigh 600 pounds when dressed. When we buy that 600-pound carcass in Des Moines, we take off 30 pounds of excess fat before it leaves the packinghouse. By the time we finally finish trimming and boning, we get down to 450 pounds of cuts that go across the retail meat counter."

Concludes the Winn-Dixie official: "Every piece of beef goes to the housewife ready to put on the stove or in the broiler. Her taste for better meat has raised prices at retail."

HANDLING COSTS: UP

Along the way from the farm to the supermarket, there are costs of processing and transportation—also rising.

There likewise is a margin of profit for the supermarkets and for other businesses in the food industry. That profit margin is found to be low when compared to profits in nonfood industries.

Latest available figures show that profits of retail food chains, after taxes, are 1.2 cents for each dollar of sales. The figure for wholesale food distributors is seven-tenths of a cent; for meatpackers, six-tenths of a cent. The baking and canning industries show the best profit margin, at 2.7 cents.

By comparison, profits of all U.S. manufacturers, in 1963 were 4.7 cents on each dollar of sales.

Profits in the food industry are found to be stable, not rising. Retail food chains, for example, had profits of 1 cent per dollar of sales in 1953, compared to the 1.2 cents in 1963. All this is shown in the following table:

Profit margins in the food business

[Earnings after taxes: cents per dollar of sales]

	10 years ago (1953)	Now [1] (1963)
Retail food chains	1.0	1.2
Wholesale food distributors	1.0	[2] .7
Baking	3.5	2.7
Meatpacking	.8	.6
Canning	2.3	[2] 2.7
Dairy products	2.3	2.6
Manufacturers of food and related products	2.0	2.4
All manufacturers (for comparison)	4.3	4.7

[1] Estimated.
[2] 1962, latest available.

Source: 1953, offical data; 1963, official figures on manufacturing, others estimated by U.S.N. & W.R. Economic Unit based on data from First National City Bank of New York and from company reports.

Then why the big debate?

One reason for the excitement over food prices is that a growing number of Congressmen appear to feel that both the farmer and the housewife are getting the short end of the deal.

CITY CONGRESSMEN BACK FARMERS

Urban Congressmen are joining farm-State Congressmen in calling for a sweeping investigation of food prices.

On April 8, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, told a House subcommittee that more and more Congressmen from urban and suburban areas are becoming interested in taking a close look at increases in prices from farm to market. Mr. ROOSEVELT represents an urban district, in Los Angeles.

As shown in the following table, prices paid to farmers for meat, milk, poultry, eggs, and other food products have dropped in the past 10 years:

The stir over food costs: Farm prices drop—Housewives pay more [1]

[Percent change in last 10 years: 1953–63]

Bread, other wheat products:	
Farmer: Down	2.2
Housewife: Up	21.8
Milk, other dairy products:	
Farmer: Down	5.2
Housewife: Up	7.3
Poultry and eggs:	
Farmer: Down	34.7
Housewife: Up	25.3

[1] All told, in 1963, consumers paid $67,000,000,000 for food produced on the farm. Of that, farmers got $21,300,000,000—less than ⅓. The remaining $45,700,000,000 was added along the line between the farmer and the housewife.

Source: House Agriculture Committee.

The stir over food costs: Farm prices drop—Housewives pay more [1]—Continued

[Percent change in last 10 years: 1953–63]

Meat products:	
Farmer: Down	15.2
Housewife: Up	5.8
Shortening, other fats and oils:	
Farmer: Down	25.0
Housewife: Up	1.3
All food products:	
Farmer: Down	5.3
Housewife: Up	9.7

In the same 10 years, prices paid by housewives for these products have gone up, with the exceptions of prices on poultry and eggs.

For all food products in 1963, prices received by farmers were down by 5.3 percent from 1953. By contrast, prices paid by housewives rose by 9.7 percent in the 10-year period.

These figures are taken from a report released on April 5 by the House Agriculture Committee. This report is seen as helping to set the stage for a full-dress investigation of the food industry. It shows year-by-year trends in farm and food prices beginning in 1947.

CHOOSY HOUSEWIVES

In releasing the report, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, said:

"The housewife's preference for processed, precooked, and fancy-packaged foods accounts for a large part of the costs added to food between the farm gate and the retail counter. These costs also have been increased by a very substantial improvement in the wages of workers in processing industries and in the merchandising of food. Without begrudging in any way fair wages for those who handle food, it must be noted that the farmers who produce the food have not enpoyed any improvement in their real hourly income in the 16-year period covered by this study."

FARM WAGES: UNCHANGED

The committee study found that, while the average hourly wage in food-marketing firms rose from $1.08 in 1947 to $2.17 in 1963, hourly wages on the farm were the same in 1963 as in 1947—$1.01.

The farm-wage figure does not include return to farmers on investment in land, buildings, machinery, and so on.

The average investment per farmer is $43,679. When return on this net investment is included, the average farmer still earns less than the average employee in food marketing. The farmer gets $68.66 for a week's work, compared to $86.80 that the employee in food marketing gets for a 40-hour week, and without investing anything in his job.

It is generally agreed that the long decline in prices of beef cattle, more than any other factor, has brought pressure for an investigation of the farm-to-market basket price spread.

On April 8, Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat of Tennessee, said: "Something is wrong when livestock values drop by something like 25 percent over a period of about 15 months, without any appreciable drop in the prices paid for meat by housewives."

The price drop for cattle on the hoof has been from around $29 down to $21 to $22 for choice grade.

Official figures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that, in 1963, the average retail value of a pound of beef dropped by 1.4 cents, while the farmer's share of that price dropped by 65 cents.

Yet, on the day of Senator GORE's statement, a chainstore association made public a report showing that 33 of 46 chainstores in a recent survey had lost money on beef sales.

The study was made for the National Association of Food Chains to which most of the Nation's corporate chainstores belong. The period covered was December 1963, and January 1964.

Many chainstore officials hold that official Government figures on meat—and other foods—do not give a completely accurate reflection of retail prices because they are based on price samples that are collected from Tuesday through Thursday. Thus, say chainstore men, the effect of weekend special prices is missed.

In a letter to all Congressmen, Clarence G. Adamy, executive vice president of the National Association of Food Chains, said:

"NAFC surveyed its membership recently and found that the typical food chain held 33 beef specials in 1962 and 41 beef specials in 1963, a significant increase. Since 70 percent of the shopping is done on weekends when special prices are in effect, this means that the vast majority of the beef which was moved into consumption last year moved at 'special' rather than 'regular' prices."

Many Government economists concede that price samples collected from grocery stores do not give enough weight to the weekend specials. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is reported to be working out new methods that will reflect the weekend bargains.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER?

Against this background, President Johnson has asked Congress to set up a bipartisan commission and empower it to make a full investigation of the food industry.

There is growing concern in the administration that the retail food business has become concentrated in the hands of relatively few large chains.

When the President first called for the investigation, in his farm message on January 31, he stated:

"We know that $1 out of every $2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate, voluntary, or cooperative chains. Our information about how this greatly increased concentration of power is affecting farmers, handlers, and consumers is inadequate."

On April 1, the President sent Congress a proposed bill to set up the investigation. Congress appeared to be in a mood to act quickly on the White House request.

Americanization Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, May 1 is designated as Americanization Day. On that day millions of Americans observe Loyalty Day, a day which is assuming greater and greater significance and importance to the citizens of our country. In my fair city of Jersey City, N.J., we celebrate in a very special way. Each year on Americanization Day, the people of Hudson County gather at Pershing Field to witness a flag raising ceremony and parade. The day offers an opportunity for the people of my district to pause and consider the bountiful blessings of our Nation, and the many freedoms we enjoy, and points out poignantly the necessity of protecting and promulgating our American rights and privileges.

This year a number of our military officials and city officials were present, as in the past, to join in the solemnity and festivities of the day. Feeling, as I do, that their comments are meaningful for all Americans, under previous permission I insert in the RECORD the speeches of several distinguished Americans who participated in our program this year: Hon. Thomas J. Whalen, mayor of Jersey City, N.J.; Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff, New Jersey Department of Defense; Brig. Gen. Clarence W. Clapsaddle, Jr. commanding general, 52d Artillery Brigade (Air Defense), Fort Hancock, N.J.; Col. Arthur A. Gottlieb, commanding officer of the New Jersey Sector Command, II U.S. Army Corps:

SPEECH BY MAYOR THOMAS J. WHELAN ON AMERICANIZATION DAY, APRIL 26, 1964, PERSHING FIELD, JERSEY CITY, N.J.

Today, on this 33d annual observance of Americanization Day in Jersey City, it gives me deep pleasure to extend to all of you—fellow residents and visitors alike—a cordial welcome to Pershing Field.

Your presence here today is a vivid demonstration and reaffirmation of your faith in the principles of freedom all Americans cherish—a freedom that allows Americanization celebrations of this kind.

Many of you were here a year ago to take part in another spirited celebration.

But little did we suspect then that less than 7 months later our Nation and the entire free world was to be shocked by the tragic, senseless, and wanton slaying of our young courageous leader.

To President Kennedy every day of his adult life was Americanization Day.

And just as we shall always remember that fateful day in November, let us never forget John F. Kennedy's devotion to God and country and never fail to seek inspiration and guidance from the legacy he bequeathed all of us.

Little did we suspect when we met on this field a year ago that before we were to assemble here again we would lose another great and brave American—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

At the end of World War II, in the Philippines, and again in Korea 6 years later, it was my honor to meet General MacArthur, another man for whom duty, honor, and country transcended life itself.

It was on the plains of West Point less than 2 years ago, that the general described these hallowed words—duty, honor, country—and on this Americanization Day I think that every American should take stock of the general's credo as he expressed it at his last roll call before the corps of cadets.

Of duty, honor, country—General of the Army MacArthur said: "They build your basic character; they mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the Nation's defense; they make you strong enough to know when you are weak and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid; those words," said the general, "reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, and what you will be."

"They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure but humble and gentle in success; not to substitute words for actions, nor to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm but to have compassion on those who fall; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future yet never neglect the past; to be serious yet never to take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength."

On this Americanization Day think about this advice to Americans by one of the truly great leaders of our time.

And remember it well—for in every nation that has been swept under the tide of communism the trickle started from within.

Carelessness, dishonesty, laziness, disinterest on the part of a few spread to contagion—and the floodgates of communism were opened.

Remember every day what the words "I am an American" meant to such men as President Kennedy and General MacArthur.

In closing, may I thank all of you for taking part in this celebration.

As we in New Jersey celebrate the 300th anniversary of our State may I compliment you too for making this one of the biggest and most colorful tercentenary tributes in the entire State.

To all of you—distinguished guests, marchers, spectators—thank you for a splendid Americanization Day in Jersey City.

AMERICANIZATION DAY ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. JAMES F. CANTWELL, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 26, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen: Many people celebrate the coming of a new year because the calendar tells them that January 1 has come around again.

In my case, I look forward to these Americanization Day exercises each year, because they not only indicate the passage of a year; they remind me that once again I shall come to this great city of our State to greet many old friends and to meet many new ones.

For 33 years you of Jersey City have given public testimony of your faith in the ideals of American citizenship. That is why I am proud that you wish me to celebrate with you.

But, this year, I have an additional privilege; I have been asked by Gov. Richard J. Hughes to represent him at this observance; to extend to you his sincere and warm greetings and his congratulations on your outstanding record of loyalty and patriotism.

This observance, as I see it, is a collaboration of all the citizens of New Jersey. City government is not only represented, it has taken an active part in the planning of this observance. Even your State government is active in this Americanization Day parade and festival.

I have no doubt that every section of Jersey City has someone here to march or just to say "I am an American."

What does all this mean? It means that Americans and Americanism have not really changed. It means that we are a free people who appreciate our blessing of liberty. It means that we are willing to meet and discharge all the responsibilities of citizenship.

In our representative form of government, every individual and every group must contribute to make it work. Otherwise it represents no one but itself.

Freedom and liberty, both political and economic, will move forward only in a truly representative democracy. And this democracy we can obtain only if every individual will work with other individuals to this end.

We—all of us—want a progressive and prosperous community. We will have it only in proportion to our contribution toward such a community.

We can, and should, always ask ourselves "What is Americanism?" and we must answer that question in the spirit which inspired those great documents of the American heritage, the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

Americanism is a way of life, which if not yet fully realized, is presently receiving its test in the reality of civil rights controversy. I have no doubt—I have never doubted—that one day soon all our citizens would enjoy all the benefits of American citizenship, will the full acceptance and equality inherent in such citizenship.

I am very pleased that you have retained the motto of this Americanization Day celebration, "Loyalty Means Liberty," for while brief in words, it is long and deep in meaning.

We have much to be loyal to. American citizenship is basically a set of principles by which we live and by which all our civic actions are controlled.

Ours is the principle of the "Equality of all men," all endowed with equal rights, theirs by natural right and not by some concession of the Government.

If, in my visits to Jersey City, I can leave but one lasting impression, it should be that our American citizenship is a useless name, unless we practice it in our everyday lives.

Do we vote every year? Do we take an active interest in our several levels of government?

Do we keep ourselves informed on all that affects our community? Do we take the kind of actions which will benefit all people, rather than the few?

These are but some of our responsibilities. They are the basic ones because from them come a sure and safeguarded liberty.

By this "liberty," I mean the kind where the Government derives its authority from the people—from us. It is a government in which we control our affairs through our elected representatives.

But the safeguarding of our principles does not and cannot stop with our vigilance over local affairs. Our vision must be broad and far ranging, so that every aspect of our free, American society comes under our vigilance.

"Vigilance," in the old saying "is the price of liberty." This has been repeated so often that it has lost its true meaning. It has, in fact, become almost a cliché.

But let us not forget history, not ancient history, but that of the past 20 years.

Which countries have fallen under the heel of Communist or Fascist oppression? Invariably, we find the answer: those whose citizens were not vigilant in safeguarding their liberties.

We are living in times which defy description or classification.

We live in the midst of potential destruction; we live in the knowledge that our country maintains large armed forces throughout the world.

We hear talk of peace, but see preparation for war in the multibillion-dollar defense budgets.

No wonder that sometimes there is confusion. But, it all comes down to you and to me: a more positive effort, greater vigilance on our part is necessary.

We can, and must, safeguard our liberties through a spirit of cooperation. This way we recognize the dignity and worth of all individuals, at home and abroad.

We can, and must, educate ourselves. An educated citizenry will not lose its freedom by default. Education, we know, starts in our schools. And it grows with experience, with information received from newspapers, books, radio, and TV. And let me emphasize a tremendous responsibility of all parents to insure that your children receive all the benefits of a freely available education. As parents we commit an injustice both to our children and our country, when we allow dropouts. This deprives us of educated and useful citizens.

How else can we know something about the processes of government—of the economic and social conditions of the Nation—of our country's relations with the rest of the world—except by education and knowledge?

Only with this knowledge can we help to guide the course of government at the municipal, county, State, and Federal level.

With a willingness to cooperate with each other, armed with knowledge, we are prepared to take positive action for our public welfare.

This great city of Jersey City tells us the history of our country.

With roots that go back to the early days of colonization—300 years ago—you have grown into a great city, in which we have a mixture of races, religions, and cultures. Jersey City reflects the hard work, the brains, of men and women who came to these shores, from all corners of the world, in the past three centuries.

And now, we are united in the single political faith of Americanism, which should, and will, make for all our citizens a better and greater nation.

Our purpose here today is to give public evidence of our willingness to shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship.

There is much more to being an American than a parade; there is the daily grind of working at it, even when we feel that our efforts are not producing immediate results.

In closing, I can only say to you: "Be good Americans. Without good Americans, the free world is lost, and if the world loses freedom, all is lost."

This is my message. I know that if Governor Hughes were here, he too would say the same, because this is our great need today, good citizens.

Thank you for asking me to be with you. Thank you for the privilege of sharing with you these few hours of friendship.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. CLARENCE W. CLAPSADDLE, JR., U.S. ARMY, COMMANDING GENERAL, 52D ARTILLERY BRIGADE (AIR DEFENSE), FORT HANCOCK, N.J.

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Whelan, officers and members of the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post 132 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, reverend members of the clergy, Congressman DANIELS, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

It is both an honor and a pleasure for me to represent the U.S. Army Air Defense Command (ARADCOM) at this—your 33d annual Americanization Day parade. I wish to congratulate Chairman Bardach and the members of his committee for having planned and coordinated so successfully an event of this magnitude. Congratulations are also due the many participants—and spectators as well—who have set aside this day to express their patriotic loyalty in behalf of our inherited freedoms—a day, it would seem, when each of us should pause to ask the now memorial question: "What can I do for my country?"

The answer to this question as established by the U.S. Army is etched in the annals of American history. In each of 12 wars threatening the basic principles our forefathers held so dearly nearly 200 years ago, your Army has responded as a "protector of our liberties—as a defender of proud heritage." The 145 campaign streamers on the official flag of the U.S. Army pay tribute, in a very real sense, to the 525,000 Army members who sacrificed their lives and to the 1,275,000 members who were wounded in these campaigns.

We in the U.S. Army Air Defense Command are very proud of our association with this heritage of such rich design. We are also very conscious of the overwhelming significance of our mission today which, for the 52d Artillery Brigade (Air Defense), is to defend the vital New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia metropolitan complex against attack from the air.

Since the activities leading to the accomplishment of this mission constitute an investment not only in defense, but also in close and direct relationship with the communities in which our command posts and missile sites are located, I wish to outline the mission in terms of four factors for your consideration.

First, the U.S. Army Air Defense Command (Aradcom) is but one of several component commands supporting the Com-

mander in Chief, North American Air Defense Command (Norad) who has overall operational responsibility for the air defense of our continent. Thus, the extraordinary human, manufacturing, business and communication resources of this immediate area are protected by air defense weapons systems of other armed services as well as by the renowned and highly lethal Nike Hercules guided missile with which fire units of the 52d Artillery Brigade are armed.

Secondly, I wish briefly to describe the Hercules missile as it appears in the parade here today. The Hercules is the second generation in the Army Nike family and is the primary high altitude air defense weapon of the United States that is operational today. The altitude ceiling of the Hercules is in excess of 100,000 feet. Its range is considerable greater than that of the earlier Nike-Ajax which did not have a nuclear capability. A solid propellant rocket booster drives the missile to supersonic speeds. The Hercules missile is guided all the way to intercept by a system of acquisition and tracking radars integrated with a high speed computer. The Hercules missile system is equally effective in fair weather or foul—in daylight or in darkness.

As a third point, I wish to mention some of the characteristics of our operation. Although we have had many visitors to nearby missile sites such as those at Fort Hancock, Holmdel, South Amboy, South Plainfield, Livingston, and Franklin Lakes, the operation, as such, is not well-understood publicly. A basic reason for this is, of course, that the major items of our equipment—powerful surveillance radars, precise target and missile tracking radars and missile launchers, for example—are not only fixed in place but are also required in place 24 hours a day for continuous operation.

I assure you, however, that it is an active operation 365 days a year. Quite aside from maintaining required states of alert, each fire unit is subjected to some 50 tests, inspections or evaluations a year. These vary from frequent operational readiness evaluations covering a period of from 1 to 3 hours on site to the short notice annual practice at McGregor Range, N. Mex., at which each unit is required to go through all phases of the operation over a period of approximately 1 week. The climax of this intensive test of the unit's operational capability comes with the firing of live missiles equipped with training warheads over the wide-open spaces of the range.

Fourth and finally, I wish to highlight the direct contribution that the State of New Jersey is making to the air defense of this metropolitan area. Here I refer to the 1st Missile Battalion, 254th Artillery of the New Jersey Army National Guard which is manning the Nike Hercules sites at Livingston, South Plainfield, and Lumberton. While these units are under the command of your Grand Marshal, Major General Cantwell, they are under the operational control of the 52d Artillery Brigade where, for all practical purposes, they are treated just as if they were units of the Active Army. This is a very real application of the "One Army" concept integrating Active and Reserve forces in a common effort. It has the dual advantage of utilizing the demonstrated professional competence of the Army National Guard and of enabling personnel of the Active Army to meet other commitments.

In conclusion, I hope that you have noted my omission of any reference to the man in uniform. This is quite intentional because I must emphasize that in air defense—as in any other aspect of the defense of these United States—trained and dedicated manpower weigh more heavily than any organizational structure or any weapons system with which it is associated. Yes, exponential advances in science and technology notwithstanding, the soldiers, the sailors, and the airmen still constitute our ultimate weapon.

I am very grateful, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to outline what the soldiers of the 52d Artillery Brigade (Air Defense) are doing for their country.

Thank you.

SPEECH OF COL. ARTHUR A. GOTTLIEB, 33D ANNUAL AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE, APRIL 26, 1964

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, it is a great pleasure for me to be here once again in Jersey City to participate with the members of the Capt. C. E. Fisk Post No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars on the occasion of the 33d Annual Americanization Day Parade.

This is a day of celebration, commemoration, and dedication. We will celebrate with parades, speeches, and general rejoicing, the wondrous fact that we are free people in a free country, enjoying rights and privileges beyond anything that can be found anywhere else in the world. It would be naive to suggest that everything is perfect here. We have our weaknesses and shortcomings, to be sure. We need only to listen to the radio or read the newspapers to be aware of certain controversies that are causing us, as a nation, chagrin, shame, and pain. However, like the many other problems that have faced our great country since its birth in 1776, these, too, will be solved peacefully, equitably, and by due process of democratic law.

We came into our precious freedom only through innumerable struggles and privations, and it stands to reason that the retention and extension of this freedom must also undergo trials and tribulations. In celebrating today, let us think back to the terrible days of the birth of our Nation, when our outmanned and outequipped Continental Army underwent the ghastly privations of the winter at Valley Forge only to continue to fight back and to ultimately emerge victorious. These men of Washington's army willed us a heritage of freedom, and we are expressing our thankfulness with these celebrations today.

We are also commemorating the 300th anniversary of the great State of New Jersey, and, here again, we have much for which to be thankful. The name "Garden State" is not a meaningless appellation. Nor does it only refer to the fertility of the land. New Jersey is truly a garden in which her citizens are free to enjoy the advantages of strong and virile industry as well as a provident and fruitful agriculture. As one of the original 13 States, New Jersey has stood constantly in the forefront during the development of our Nation and has maintained her place of honor in its subsequent evolution into the greatest power in the world.

It is not my place as a soldier to present to you the many statistics applicable to the economic and social growth of New Jersey nor to regale you with a compilation of the advantages that accrue to her citizens. Suffice it to say that I, as a military man, am proud to acclaim her as my adopted State. I am proud of her fabulous contribution to the military history of the United States. Since the days of the American Revolution, when she served as the battleground for so much of the critical action of the war, to the present, when she harbors some of the most important training facilities that support our powerful forces, New Jersey has always been a significant force behind our military might. No less than 52 of her citizens have won the Congressional Medal of Honor. Her 78th "Jersey Lightning" Infantry Division and 50th "Jersey Blues" Armored Division hold places of honor in the roster of American fighting forces. They serve today to underscore the efficacy of our one-army concept at its best.

I am proud, therefore, to hail our beloved State of New Jersey on this commemoration of her 300th anniversary.

And finally, this is a day of dedication or, more specifically, rededication. It is a day in which each of us should thank God that we were permitted the good fortune to be born in these United States or to have been able to settle here. It is a day on which we should rededicate ourselves to continue to work for the preservation of the precious freedoms of America and to defend those rights and traditions which are so strongly embodied in our national life. Such outward manifestations of love and devotion to our country as marching bands, flying flags, and proclamation of undying loyalty must be backed up by a determination on the part that each of us to make whatever personal sacrifices are necessary to support the principles that made this Nation great. I can think of no better guidelines than the motto of our U.S. Military Academy: "Duty, Honor, Country." This motto, which has guided our officers since the inception of West Point, was recently given added significance in connection with the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the greatest heroes of our Nation. His distinguished and legendary career was guided by his devotion to this slogan. Where can we find a better example to follow? How can we find a better way of expressing our determination to keep faith with our ancestors who provided us with this great land, and to pledge to our descendants that we will assure for them the continuation of this wonderful heritage? And so, on this 33d Americanization Day, I would like to leave you with this thought, by quoting from my own personal hero, General MacArthur, "The only politics that I have is contained in a simple phrase known well by all of us 'God Bless America.'"

Thank you.

Siren Songs of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with an article written by Dr. Billy Graham in the May 1964 edition of Guideposts. The article is entitled "Siren Songs of Today," and certainly merits the attention of all Americans, and particularly those of us who serve in the U.S. Congress. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIREN SONGS OF TODAY

(By Billy Graham)

According to a Greek legend, there lived on an island in the Mediterranean Sea a race of fascinating creatures, half woman and half fish called sirens. As a ship would near the shore, the sirens would come with their harps and sing. Because their songs were so enticing, the mariners were drawn away from the hardships of the sea toward the island of promise, and their ships were smashed on the rocks. There are singers of siren songs in our own times. Strange music is again filling the ears of the peoples of the world, promising salvation and peace. As I look at the American scene today, I hear several songs being sung which could cause our Nation to flounder.

First, there is the song that says the West will win over communism—if we wait long enough, that time is on our side.

We were so buoyed up by the Communist backdown in Cuba and the alleged split between China and Russia that we are in danger of being lulled into a false sense of security.

During the past 12 years I have talked to Communist leaders in many parts of the world, and I am convinced that we face a titanic self-confident movement that has no intention of halting its drive toward world domination.

The second siren song that I hear is that our military might will save us. Do not misunderstand me. I am not a pacifist. I believe we should maintain the strongest military establishment on earth. But the danger lies in our dependence on this military power for our security, when the real enemy is our drifting away from our moral and spiritual moorings.

The Bible says, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."[1] Who can forget the picture of George Washington on his knees at Valley Forge? Or Benjamin Franklin calling the Constitutional Assembly to prayer, and out of that prayer meeting emerging the Constitution of the United States? Who can forget Abraham Lincoln on his knees time after time with his Cabinet beseeching God's will to be done in the midst of the Civil War? This is the spiritual heritage of America.

Our Nation is great because, despite our failings, God has blessed and protected us. We still keep the motto "In God We Trust" on our coins, but have we preserved it in our hearts?

The third siren song that I hear is that we can continue to disregard moral law and survive.

God gave to men certain moral laws and warned that if we break them we will pay for it in the destruction of the individual and the society. Who can deny that we are breaking the Ten Commandments at every turn? The first commandment thunders, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."[1] God claims supremacy above all man's loyalties and allegiances; to the extent that the first commandment is observed, men are free. When it is nullified, they are enslaved.

This is why it is so important that the Nation put God back on His rightful throne in our national affairs.

The fourth siren song that I hear is that we can have the highest concepts of Christianity and Judaism without personal commitment and involvement.

As I travel throughout the country, I find that people are nervous and restless, that there is a hunger and a thirst and a yearning for something unknown—something more than material possessions, success or the other things people strive for. Many say that there is no hope.

I disagree. I believe that there is an answer; there is a way out; there is hope for us as individuals and for us as a nation.

As I listen to the cries of modern man for a savior, I try to call back, "A Savior has been given, yet few are accepting Him." Man seeks desperately for some other kind of savior in science, sociology, psychology, political schemes. The astounding truth is that the central event of the whole history of this planet was on that Christmas night 2,000 years ago. Jesus Christ has the key to our frustrations and dilemmas.

He offers the inward security, peace, joy, and salvation that could change your life, your home, your business, our Nation, and the world.

There is no middle ground. None of us can be neutral. Christ said: "You cannot serve God and self; you must make a choice."[2]

Which way will America choose—the commandments of men or the Commandments of God? On that decision rests the destiny of America.

[1] Psalm 33:12.

[2] Matthew 6:24.

Good Lawyers Serve the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week in Miami Beach, Fla., five Jacksonville, Fla., attorneys are receiving special recognition at the annual convention of the Florida Bar Association. These five lawyers—Leon W. Alexander, J. Henry Blount, F. C. Hillyer, D. W. Perkins, and J. W. Shands—have been members of the Florida bar for 50 years, an enviable record, not only because they have been lawyers for that period of time, but because they have all rendered dedicated and brilliant service to their profession and to the people of Florida.

Presiding at the bar association meeting will be another distinguished Jacksonville lawyer, Deldridge L. Gibbs. Mr. Gibbs is a lawyer's lawyer, who has served unselfishly not only the bar but the public in many positions of leadership. On May 2, 1964, Mr. Gibbs made a particularly inspiring speech on the role of the responsible lawyer. I call attention to this speech not only for the benefit of the 315 lawyer-Members of Congress, which is 58.9 percent of the 535 Members, but to all Members. I also wish to include in the RECORD editorials on Law Day from the Jacksonville Journal and the Jax Air News, a weekly paper published at the U.S. Naval Air Station in Jacksonville.

The material follows:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Apr. 30, 1964]

FIVE JACKSONVILLE LAWYERS HONORED

TALLAHASSEE.—Five Jacksonville lawyers will receive special recognition at the annual convention of the Florida bar May 6–9 in Miami Beach when the bar honors its 50-year members.

They are Leon W. Alexander, J. Henry Blount, F. C. Hillyer, D. W. Perkins, and J. W. Shands.

Alexander, a law graduate of the University of Florida, was admitted to practice in 1914. He is a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Jacksonville Bar Association, American Bar Association as well as the Florida Bar.

Blount received his law degree from the University of Virginia and was admitted to practice in 1914. He has served as county attorney for Duval County for the past 26 years. He was chairman of the Florida Board of Law Examiners from 1926 to 1931, and was a member of the Florida Legislature in 1931. He served as president of the Jacksonville Bar Association in 1926.

Hillyer, admitted in 1914, received his law degree from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. He served for 11 years as trial examiner for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and later as vice president of the southern region of the Association of Practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Perkins is a graduate of Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C. He was admitted to practice in Florida in 1914.

Shands received his law degree from Columbia University and was admitted to practice in 1914. From 1942 to 1961, he served as president of the Atlantic National Bank of Jacksonville.

During the Saturday morning business session of the convention at the Americana Hotel, Miami Beach, the Florida bar will pay tribute to 35 lawyers, all active members admitted to practice in Florida for 50 years.

[From the Florida Times-Union, May 3, 1964]

PUBLIC SERVICE HELD IMPORTANT ROLE FOR RESPONSIBLE LAWYERS

(By Clarence Pottorff)

SILVER SPRINGS, May 2.—Deldridge L. Gibbs, of Jacksonville, president of the Florida Bar Association, tonight told about 75 members of the Fifth Judicial District that they must always stand ready to educate and serve the public if they are to fill their obligations as lawyers.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Fifth Judicial District Bar Association in observance of Law Day, Gibbs questioned what a lawyer could tell other lawyers about the event. He said they all are aware that the purpose of Law Day is to demonstrate the difference between our system of law and the Communist system.

He stressed, however, that the lawyers must realize their particular position in society. He quoted Chief Supreme Court Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, of New Jersey, who said lawyers had five functions:

To be a wise counselor to all manner of men; to be skilled advocates in prosecuting and defending the legal rights of men; to improve the profession, the courts and the law. He said Vanderbilt stated that the last two functions are the most important.

He said they were: "In a free society every lawyer has a fourth responsibility, that of acting as an intelligent, unselfish leader of public opinion."

The fifth is: "Every great lawyer must be prepared, not necessarily to seek public office, but to answer the call for public service when it comes. The attorney whose professional thoughts begin and end with his own clients is a pitiable mockery of what a great lawyer really is. Training for public service is a lifelong career."

Gibbs cited an example of a candidate seeking high political office who said last week in Jacksonville that lawyers were trained as masters of deceit.

The lawyer said the candidate later said the incident was a mistake. But Gibbs expressed fear that many laymen may share the candidate's view. He said the candidate had a long association with the law and yet used the phrase which J. Edgar Hoover used to describe Communists.

Gibbs said it was foolish to bear malice toward the man, but lawyers should learn from it.

He urged the lawyers to strive, each day to improve the laws' public relations. He said they must teach all citizens. We must exert leadership and if obliged to accept public service, we must embrace that opportunity willingly. Law is the intangible force that makes freedom and progress possible."

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, May 1, 1964]

LAW MEANS RESPECT

Jacksonville, Duval County, the State of Florida and the Nation in general today

observe Law Day, a day set aside to foster the principles of the American legal system.

It is not a day strictly for lawyers any more than it is an occasion strictly for the courts or law enforcers. It is a time, by proclamation of the President, for each American to ponder the ideals set forth in our Constitution under legal aspects.

Law Day was first established by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1958 and has been honored each year on May 1 since that time.

It comes at a particularly appropriate time this year with the civil rights bill being argued in Congress and so much of the Nation's citizenry at odds over personal freedoms and personal responsibilities.

Law Day attempts to point out not only American heritage and individual freedoms which the law guarantees, but to compare our system of basic values under rule of law with the law of force and fear under other types of government.

Law Day is a time to remind ourselves that we in this country should refrain from illegal acts not because of fear, but because of morality and because we should honor the legal system that keeps us from chaos.

Because the law is important and the courts mean so much to our way of life, Jacksonville and Duval County civic organizations are jointly sponsoring Law Day with appropriate events.

Twenty-two civic clubs are entertaining members of the local bar associations who will speak at meetings. Seven high school classes on Americanism versus communism will be addressed by attorneys.

The Jacksonville Bar Association calls on every citizen of this community to join them, not in honoring their own profession, but to make it a day of respect for our constitutional rights.

The law must be respected and kept. But because it is so vital to our welfare, we must make doubly sure that each act that becomes a law is wise, practical and in keeping with the real meaning of the Constitution.

Congress would do well to pause and give this day a long and meaningful study.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Air News, April 30, 1964]

OUR FREEDOM RESTS ON LAW

This year Law Day will be observed tomorrow, May 1. It is particularly appropriate that once each year we take time to consider and reflect upon the processes of law which are the foundation rock upon which our institutions and freedoms rest.

Our law is not the will of any individual but is shaped by logic, history, custom, and utility, and only comes into being when a substantial segment of the population approve it.

Our law thus expressed the opinion of the majority as to what constitutes accepted standards of conduct with due protection for minority views.

In a state unless chaos is to prevail, the population must learn to live and work together and law governs these interrelationships. Each individual who desires to see his state free and civilized has an obligation to obey the laws which his community has evolved, for his revolt weakens the fabric of order and freedom.

Thus law involves a dovetailed obligation for the individual; he has a role in shaping it and it is his duty to obey it, and his failure on either end will result in bad law or flaunted law and chaos.

With these thoughts in mind every individual ought to take time to rededicate himself to fulfill his civic obligations in shaping and influencing the process of law, and remember that his proper obedience to the law is the cornerstone of our order, justice, and freedom.

Proposal for Civil Rights Bill in 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in my opinion, one of the soundest and most helpful suggestions which has come to my attention since the debate started some 2 months ago on the civil rights bill, the paternity of which has never been disclosed and the meaning of which never satisfactorily explained, was made in today's issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch by a commentator, Ross Valentine, who said that the proper thing to do would be for the Senate to create a special bipartisan committee and instruct that committee to draft a new bill to be deliberated and voted on in 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ross Valentine article entitled "U.S.A.—A Judiciary Monarchy?" may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 6, 1964]

(By Ross Valentine)

U.S.A.—A JUDICIARY MONARCHY?

If a majority of the Senate were motivated by the "patriotic imperative" instead of partisan prestige and profit in a presidential year, the Senators would quit quibbling and squabbling over amendments to the civil rights bill—and vote to discard the bill in toto.

They would then vote to create a special, bipartisan committee, and instruct that committee to draft a new bill, to be deliberated and voted on in 1965. Next year will be an off year, politically. The issues will then be less obstructed and obscured and the Senate less vulnerable to minority duress.

The issue is too important to be voted on under pressure.

The main issue transcends the immediate objective of the bill. Few, except racial fanatics, object to its professed motives. But most Americans do, or should, strenuously oppose the aggrandizement of the judiciary's already vast political powers which the bill—as it now reads—would immeasurably increase.

The bill would tend to make Federal judges no longer responsible to the people. If enacted into law, it would widen the wedge to transform our representative Government into what would be, in effect, a judiciary monarchy—its power concentrated in a Supreme Court whose politically appointed members are irremovable—and responsible only to their individual consciences.

This transformation, during three "liberal"-dominated decades, has been gradual and obscure, but remorseless. Under the guise of "judicial process," its direction has veered toward authoritarianism. The unthinking, preoccupied with economic self-interest and self-indulgent distractions, have been oblivious to this deviation from the democratic process.

In its current dispute over amendments, the Senate can't see the forest for the trees; it has lost sight of the political abuses hidden in this impulsive piece of legislation.

As Virginia's Senator ROBERTSON has repeatedly pointed out, "discrimination"—the keyword of the bill—has not been defined with legal precision. The reason for this is obvious. No one but the defendant—in his own heart—would be able to judge whether or not he has been guilty of discrimination. But the bill would leave the definition to the clairvoyant discretion of a presiding judge.

Nor do most Americans, except vaguely, realize that the summary power of a Federal judge to act as prosecutor, jury, and tribunal in criminal contempt cases can be an intimidating bludgeon, an inherent (self-imposed) power subject to political motivation.

This power does not derive from the Constitution, but from tradition based on cumulative precedent. This gives Federal courts complete discretion as to the size of the fine and/or the length of imprisonment for criminal contempt. Under 18 U.S.C. 402, the fine imposed on an individual defendant may be as high as $1,000, and imprisonment up to 6 months.

The punitive purpose of this tradition is clear enough—to vindicate the authority and dignity of the courts. But this power can be, and on occasion has been, used as a threat to compel obedience.

This practice evolved from the judiciary's arbitrary distinction between statutory criminal acts and criminal contempt, which, in practice, has been considered as not subject to a defendant's constitutional right to a jury trial.

To get back to the bill itself—it is based on a generally false premise—namely, that Americans are biased or prejudiced against any race other than their own. While this is undoubtedly true in some regions and some persons, it is not true of most Americans.

They have been, and will continue to be, instinctively partial to their own race, despite any coercive law that may be bulldozed through Congress. They will continue to insist on the right of preference—for people of their own race, whose company they consider more congenial, and less conducive to mutual misapprehensions.

Is this right of preference unethical, unChristian, or unconstitutional?

Let the Senate ponder that question, rather than amendments such as that introduced by Senator SMATHERS of Florida, who would ban "discrimination because of age" to the verbotens in the catchall bill. Why not add color of hair or eyes, oversize or undersize, overweight or underweight to the list?

The Negro American's constitutional-political rights should be protected, if necessary by specific legislation or by amendments to the Constitution.

But the present bill, no matter how cluttered with weaseling amendments, is the wrong way to approach the problem. Because it is politically rather than ethically motivated, it cannot, and will not, command the respect it should have to be effective and enforceable.

Surely prohibition proved, if historic proof were needed, that unworkable, coercive solutions to social problems, even when incorporated in the U.S. Constitution, will not be respected.

After ratification of that "Big Mistake," some good Christian people who had agitated for it forgot their Christian principles so far as to approve the Federal Government's ultimate, desperate, and despicable practice of poisoning alcohol which, they had reason to know, would be consumed by derelicts and hopeless alcoholics who preferred to risk death rather than go without the drink they craved. I doubt that even Soviet despotism would dare to be that inhuman.

Like the 18th amendment, the currently debated civil rights bill is a politically loaded time bomb. It would hurt, rather than help, the intelligent, educated, self-respecting Negro.

The voluntary approach approved by the Methodist Church commends itself to soul-searching consideration by the Senate. It does not put its faith in coercion and intimidation. It has faith in the average American's sense of justice and fair play to all mankind, regardless of race—a form of persuasion potentially more powerful than a "judicial monarchy's" faith in legislative compulsion.

Program for Mental Retardation Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times:

THE HOOSIER DAY: PROGRAM FOR MENTAL RETARDATION GROWING

(By Frank A. White)

We who have mentally bright children should be so thankful that many other problems encountered are small.

One mentally retarded child is born every 5 minutes in the United States. That amounts to 126,000 retarded infants each year. Ten percent of the entire child population of our Nation is mentally retarded.

Robert W. Spaulding, is director of the division of mentally retarded of the State. A great awakening is underway in Indiana and the Nation regarding mentally retarded.

The last Congress appropriated $631 million for research and aid in the mentally retarded area and Indiana will share, with time, some of these dollars.

The 1963 State legislature appropriated $250,000 for the mentally retarded improvement program for a 2-year period. Already the State division of mental health knows where much of the $100,000 available this year, and $150,000 available for next year will be spent.

There is nationally a Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation, named after a brother of the late President killed in World War II while flying a mission to destroy German submarine pens. There is a sister of the Kennedys mentally ill.

She is Rosemary Kennedy, who has spent half her life in a nursing home. There are 200,000 retarded children in institutions, among 5 million retarded. The Kennedy Foundation since 1946 has spent $16,500,000 to help retarded children.

Not enough Hoosiers distinguish between mental ill and the retarded. A mentally retarded child may not be ill, as we term illness. It is a case where mental processes have lagged and not developed, in regard to the retarded.

There are 100 causes for such a condition, and not much is known about some of them. Common causes are brain damage at birth, infectious child diseases, infection of mother and child when the mother is pregnant, and psychological situations.

Indiana has approximately 4,500 children mentally retarded in our State institutions. Many of them have disabilities in addition to the retardation.

As of the end of 1963, a total of 2,240 mentally retarded children were in the Ft. Wayne State Institution; 2,071 in Muscatatuck State School and 178 at the South Bend State Institution. There is a waiting list of 1,159 combined, at the three institutions. Many of the waiting are tragically ill.

Under the new programs advanced by the Kennedy Foundation, Federal and State help, children with IQ's of 40 to 50 are learning the alphabet and how to talk on a telephone, among other things. The youngsters with 60 to 70 IQ's are learning valuable trades and skills.

A few of these are to be useful in work as bicycle repairmen, nurserymen, poultrymen, cattle feeders, in simple electrical wiring, and many other industrial jobs requiring low skills.

Sargent Shriver, and his wife, the former Eunice Kennedy, administer the Kennedy Foundation for retarded. Over 3,500 public schools now have special classes for the retarded, and there are 20,000 specialist teachers in this field.

Research centers have been established at Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Stanford, and Wisconsin universities in this field. Mentally retarded centers have been set up in Chicago and half a dozen other States. Almost all of the 50 States have taken some steps toward helping the mentally retarded, in the light of new processes.

Shriver predicts that by the end of 1964, at least 20 great universities will have mentally retarded projects underway. He expects by then that at least 10 new major mental retardation centers will exist.

Only those who have a retarded child know the terrific strain that comes from such a disability.

The Position of Montana Power Co. on the Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the June 6, 1963, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly under the heading, "What To Do About REA."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. E. Corette, president of the Montana Power Co., frankly looks on the REA program as a growing threat to the investor-owned electric utility power industry. In a forthright statement along this line, Mr. Corette says:

"The rural electrification program is growing yearly into a greater and more serious threat. No one objects to the original purpose of REA, but that job has been completed.

"Subsidy has always been for the purpose of improving the general welfare of some segment of the economy that was depressed, that needed a subsidy, that justified on additional burden on the taxpayers. Today, rural electric cooperatives are being subsidized to supply prosperous suburban residential areas and commercial and industrial customers. It is ridiculous. Every power company and every citizen should oppose any new appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration. The rural job is finished—the subsidy and the burden on the taxpayers should stop.

"Space prevents further examples. In summary, I believe we have never seen a time when there were as many things being proposed in the electric field that can adversely affect our customers, our stockholders, and the State and Federal taxpayer.

"We should sharpen our wits, improve our ingenuity, and fight harder and harder for the American taxpaying, competitive system. If we don't, nationalization of ours and other industries will ultimately result, and Latin America is an example of what our economy may become."

Who Took the Ore From Oroville?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, not many days ago California's Gov. Pat Brown was in Washington with his hand out. One of the relief lines he passed through was the one which ladles out Federal money for flood control works by States. I say more power to him. As long as other Governors are getting it, why should not California's? Besides, in the case of the Oroville project, Uncle Sam agreed in writing to pay for 22 percent of the project's cost. But both the General Accounting Office and the Congress are being a little difficult about it. In the unlikely event that anyone would take the time to read my statement about it submitted to the Appropriations Committee, my colleagues have kindly and unanimously consented that it be here reproduced as follows:

STATEMENT TO HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON OROVILLE DAM, BY REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG HOSMER

Mr. Chairman, I am asking this committee to come up with the money being asked for the United States to perform its contract solemnly entered into in good faith with the State of California to pay for part of the flood control costs involved in the Oroville Dam unit of the Feather River project.

This contract was 4 years in the making—negotiations commenced in July 1957—the contract was signed March 8, 1962. The Government's flood control contribution on this joint Federal-State partnership project was fixed at 22 percent of the project's cost, less power features, but not to exceed $85 million. This is working out at around $66 million.

If this contract were a can, it would be a can of worms—and mostly hypothetical ones at that. This is because it deals with a number of fictions in the heavily financed public works business, two of the most imaginative of which are, first, ascertainment of hypothetical costs of so-called flood control benefits of a project and, second, establishment of a hypothetical interest rate for the project. A sufficiently imaginative civil servant can hypothesize on these subjects and such related fancies as fish and wildlife benefits, recreational benefits and like until he has created a "bestseller" illusion around almost any scheme for spending taxpayers money at some location along a supposedly navigable stream.

It is safe to say that, except for such exercises in creative environment, business down at the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation would be pretty slack. A high fraction of the dams, water and power works, irrigation canals and such, either built or building, would never stand up under less unrealistic scrutiny.

All this is being said to emphasize this point: neither flood control allocations nor project interest rates are part of the real world. They are part of a euphoric wonderland in which all proposed projects on all rivers, streams, and creeks are beautiful. They are component of the cosmetic kit guaranteed to evoke a continuous stream of "yeas" from Congress as the projects parade past for authorization and funding murmuring "Mr. Legislator, oh, you doll, am I not the prettiest of them all?"

What has happened in connection with this Oroville affair is that somebody is getting things out of focus between the dream world and the real world. Somebody has forgotten that flood-control allocations and project-interest rates are intended only to sweeten the semantics of waterpower projectmanship. They are not intended for crude and profane use such as contract busting. It is not sporting to do so. The "I can get it for you wholesale" approach to flood control, exhibited by the GAO's recent report on Oroville, is particularly offensive in this regard. It uses up 47 pages twisting and distorting these semantics in a disgusting manner—using to sour what was created to sweeten.

The people who wrote the Oroville contract took 4 years to get the formless, substanceless matters of flood-control allocation and interest rate into form and substance in the contract. They created the illusion of accomplishing the impossible. They made a thing of an unthing and put it on paper. Now GAO has the temerity to say they were wrong. That all this could have been done another way, a way in which the Government would put up only $52.35 million instead of $66 million as its share of the project. I say that this is boorish and unworthy.

What is, in fact, "by gosh and by guess" can never be anything but that and cannot have degree or dimension. Yet that is exactly what GAO seeks to do. It says the contract negotiators erred by slightly over 20 percent on the upside in converting the unthing to a thing.

It is my respectful recommendation to the members of this committee that this kind of foolishness be relegated to the same pigeonhole it reserves for speculation over the number of angels which can gather on a pinpoint. Further, that the obligation of the Government, established by the Oroville contract, be honored by appropriation of the necessary sums.

Moscow Will Do All Needed To Rule World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Brooklyn Tablet of April 23, 1964, carries an article containing some very interesting comments by Nikita Khrushchev. Unfortunately, these quotations from Mr. Khrushchev and an interpretation of their meaning for America and the free world have not appeared in other newspapers and periodicals. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this article entitled "Moscow Will Do All Needed To Rule World" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV PROMISES: MOSCOW WILL DO ALL NEEDED TO RULE WORLD

(By J. J. Gilbert)

WASHINGTON.—Nikita Khrushchev has in recent days reaffirmed three facts for the free world.

He has made it clear once again that communism is bent on domination of the world; that it is keeping its armaments secret but strong; that it is antireligious.

Lashing out against Red China, which disagrees with him as to the methods for advancing communism, Khrushchev reassured a large Soviet-Polish friendship meeting in the Kremlin with these words:

"RED FLAG OVER WHOLE WORLD

"I guarantee you that the Soviet Central Committee will do everything so that the Red flag will flutter over the whole world."

Just days earlier, in Hungary, in another attack on Red China, Khrushchev said it was idle to speculate on relative arms strength, "since everyone conceals how many weapons he has," and Soviet Russia can "annihilate" as well as anyone else.

He used the same occasion, a talk to Hungarian workers, to take a dig at religion. He had some humorous observations to make about the Bible account of God sending manna from Heaven to feed the Jews in the desert, and then told the workers they'd have to rely on their own hands, because Soviet Russia had sent astronauts up to look for manna in the skies, and they saw none.

Seemingly, these observations attracted less attention than what Khrushchev had to say about Red China. They were among the most important things he had to say.

NO TIME TO RELAX

The dispute between Moscow and Peiping has caused some relaxation in the free world. This is dangerous, the nations of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, who know something about communism, have warned. At almost the same hour that Khrushchev was attacking Red China in his Soviet-Polish friendship speech, the SEATO nations in session in Manila, said formally: "Despite the sharpening of the Sino-Soviet dispute, world domination remains the aim of communism and thus vigilance must not be relaxed."

Some of Khrushchev's recent remarks have been open to two interpretations, causing confusion. He has been quoted as being against revolution, but he has assured the Reds everywhere that Moscow "will do everything" to spread communism throughout the world. He seems chiefly to be against violence at this time which could provoke a nuclear conflict.

There are observers who feel Red China's Mao Tse-tung has Khrushchev on the defensive in their argument. In this light, Khrushchev is seen as proclaiming that he is just as good a Communist as anyone else, just as atheistic, just as strong militarily, just as determined to dominate the world.

At his 70th birthday party in Moscow, Khrushchev mellowed a great deal. Without naming Red China he said "we shall * * * not break off relations with those with whom we have not full unity now." He added that Russian Communists "have always adhered to and will continue to adhere to Marxist-Leninist positions."

This gives support to the view of some that Khrushchev is playing for time; that he is relaxing his attitude toward the West a little to be freer to solve his differences with Peiping. If peace could be made with the Red Chinese, it is contended, he would return to other problems with new vigor. The West, meanwhile, could regard a divided Communist movement as only a little less dangerous than a united one.

Detroit To Host Biennial National Japanese American Citizens League Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to the 18th Biennial National Convention of the Japanese American Citizens League, more popularly known as the JACL, which will be held in Detroit appropriately enough through Independence Day week, with headquarters in the historic Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel.

From July 1 to 4, more than 1,500 delegates, representing members, and chapters in 32 States, will gather to implement their timely convention theme, "Human dignity—our challenge," as they strive—in the words of their national motto—"To Become Better Americans in a Greater America."

At the same time, they will pay honor to several distinguished Americans who 20 years ago, when Americans of Japanese ancestry were suspect citizens, devoted themselves to helping those of Japanese ancestry gain dignity and opportunity as full fledged and "accepted" Americans.

JACL BACKGROUND

JACL, as most Members of Congress are aware, is the only national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry. All of its members are native-born or naturalized citizens of the United States; most, but not all, are also of Japanese ancestry.

Organized nationally in 1930 in Seattle, as former Congressman Walter Judd declared on this floor on August 2, 1955, in paying tribute to the 25th anniversary of the founding of JACL:

Seldom can the history of a people be identified with a single organization. But, uniquely and unmistakably, the annals of persons of Japanese ancestry on the United States mainland during their most crucial and tumultuous quarter century, when their destiny in this country was secured for all time to come, is the story of JACL.

Indeed, had it not been for JACL, with its skillful use of the tools of democracy, it is doubtful that those of Japanese origin in this land would enjoy the healthy and promising status that is theirs today as integrated and loyal Americans.

JACL's record belies the fact that Americans of Japanese ancestry are among the fewest in numbers and the youngest in average age of all our many nationality groups; that they are only one generation removed from the emigrants of an Asian land whose culture, language, and heritage are quite different from that of most Americans who trace their origins to Europe; and that they were persecuted and prosecuted as perhaps no other racial minority in our Nation's experience.

To have accomplished so much, for any people, in such a short time, and against such odds of prejudice and discrimination, is not only a tribute to the leadership and

membership of JACL but also to the system of government and the democratic processes which gave opportunity and incentive for such progress in human relations.

Today, as all of us recognize, JACL is in the forefront of those national organizations that are seeking meaningful and comprehensive civil rights legislation for all Americans, as well as liberalized immigration opportunities for all peoples of earth.

Having personally experienced both the deprivation of civil rights and exclusionary immigration laws, Americans of Japanese ancestry understand that only in extending social justice and equality in opportunities to all our citizens does the vaunted birthright of every American become truly secure.

DETROIT AND JAPANESE AMERICANS

Early in World War II, in what dean of the Yale University School of Law Eugene Rostow described as "Our worst wartime mistake" and which President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights in its historic 1947 report condemned as "The most striking mass interference since slavery with the right to physical freedom," some 110,000 human beings, more than two-thirds of whom were native-born citizens, without trial or hearing, were evacuated from their homes and associations on the west coast and confined in what euphemistically were called "relocation centers" in the interior wastelands of the West and Midwest.

Their only crime, in the words of the U.S. Supreme Court, was their affinity with the Japanese enemy, an accident of birth.

Some 20 years ago, our Government decided that screened, loyal citizens of Japanese ancestry might be allowed to leave the campus and seek normal lives outside the Western Defense Command. At the same time that thousands of Americans of Japanese ancentry were volunteering from behind the barbed wire fences of their camps to fight, and as many did to die, in the armed forces of our country in all theaters of war, several thousand evacuees hopefully resettled in the State of Michigan, and particularly around Detroit.

So much is known about the gallantry of Americans of Japanese ancestry against both the German and Japanese enemies that it needs no recounting here; suffice it to say that on June 11, 1963, more than 25 of our colleagues from all sections of the country, under special orders, paid more than 2 hours of tribute to the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team of Japanese Americans, the most decorated military unit in size and length of service in American military history and to Japanese-American troops who served under double jeopardy in military intelligence in the Pacific War.

Not so much is known about the Japanese Americans who left the camps in which our Government had interned them to help the war effort in such industrial areas as Detroit. But, let the record show that these civilian Japanese Americans too made their contribution to victory in World War II, working loyally and conscientiously to make America truly the arsenal of democracy.

Notwithstanding rumors and allegations to the contrary, the official records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the intelligence sections of both the Army and Navy reveal that not a single American citizen or a resident alien of Japanese ancestry committed an act of espionage or sabotage before, during, or after World War II in spite of extreme provocations.

In 1946, 18 years ago, in the wake of wartime relocatees to the Motor Capital, the local chapter was organized to bring some degree of stability to these Japanese Americans who had come to Detroit to begin new lives and new jobs among strange-to-them and unique circumstances. In the succeeding years, the Detroit chapter developed a three-pronged program: first, attempting to fulfill the needs of a displaced people; second, beginning the process of orientation-integration to a new community; and third, attempting to show its maturity by contributing more to the cultural, social, and political life of the larger community.

Today, the Detroit JACL chapter is a recognized civic organization that not only cooperates in the various activities of the community but also adds to the cultural makeup of the city. It is an organization that has truly contributed to the betterment of Detroit and of the State of Michigan, introducing to this Midwest metropolis a new citizenry, dedicated to the proposition that, in the eloquence of President Franklin Roosevelt, "Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."

At the same time, JACL has brought to Detroit an awareness that the next great epoch in civilization may be determined around the Pacific basin, where more than two-thirds of the world's people reside. Its members remind us that in spite of a bitter war, the United States and Japan today are partners in the Pacific, in mutual security as well as in economic relations.

CONVENTION PROGRAM

Detroit is proud that it will host the second national JACL convention held in mid-America, the first time since Chicago hosted a national convention in 1950, for our city has many special attractions that are not available elsewhere.

Two years ago, in 1962, the 17th biennial national convention was held in Seattle, Wash. In 1966, the 19th biennial national convention will be held in San Diego, Calif.

And, it seems particularly appropriate that so much of the convention will be devoted to the great moral issue of our times, the right of all our citizens, everywhere in the land, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, to enjoy the constitutional guarantees, the human dignity, and the equal opportunities that are the proud boast and the hopeful promise of our national life.

The 18th biennial national convention actually begins on June 30, when the national officers and the chairman of the various district councils meet as the national board.

The convention proper begins when the national council, made up of delegates from 88 chapters, begin their deliberations on July 1. That evening, as a feature of the opening ceremonies, the finals of the National JACL oratorical contest will be held. The subject for the orations, as well as for the National JACL essay contest, is "JACL and Civil Rights."

The national council sessions will be recessed for an outing at Pine Knob, the former Edsel Ford estate, the afternoon of July 2.

At the official convention luncheon on July 3, various organizational awards will be made to deserving members.

That evening, the testimonal banquet will be held, at which time five distinguished Americans who were especially helpful to those of Japanese ancestry during the resettlement period 20 years ago will be honored. All are still leaders in the current civil rights fight.

They are Dr. Clarence Pickett, then executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; Norman Thomas, crusading Socialist and humanitarian; Roger Baldwin, then the national director of the American Civil Liberties Union; Rev. John Thomas, then the head of the American Baptist Home Mission work among Japanese-Americans; and Mrs. Ruth Kingman, the executive director of the Pacific Coast Committee on American Principles and Fair Play. Each will be cited for outstanding contributions in helping Americans of Japanese ancestry regain their dignity as human beings and to secure equal rights under law.

The convention banquet will feature Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as the guest speaker. JACL properly will honor him for his years of effective leadership in the common cause of equality and dignity.

At the banquet, too, the JACL'er of the biennium and the Nisei—Japanese-American—of the biennium will be announced.

The Nisei of the biennium 1960–62, for having done the most to bring credit upon those of Japanese ancestry, was internationally known architect Minoru Yamasaki, a resident of Detroit. He is the master architect of Wayne State University, as well as for many famous buildings in Detroit and throughout the United States and the free world.

Two years earlier, the Nisei of the biennium 1958–60 was our former colleague, then Congressman, now Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE of Hawaii, the first American of Japanese ancestry to be elected to the U.S. Congress. Another Nisei of the biennium was Hershey Miyamura, of Gallup, N. Mex., the only living Japanese-American Medal of Honor winner, who earned our Nation's highest decoration for valor in Korea.

The traditional Sayonara Ball concludes the convention proper, although the newly elected national officers and the new national board will meet in final sessions to implement the convention mandates on July 5.

NATIONAL BOARD MEMBERS

Members of the National JACL board, the executive branch of the organization, are a typical cross section of America, attesting to the integration of those of Japanese ancestry into the life of the Nation at large.

National president is K. Patrick Okura, of Omaha, Nebr., the State mental health planning executive of the Nebraska Psychiatric Institute.

National first vice president is Jerry J. Enomoto, of Tracy, Calif., the associate superintendent in charge of reception-guidance, Deuel Vocational Institution, California Department of Corrections.

National second vice president is Takeshi Kubota, of Seattle, Wash., a landscape architect specializing in oriental gardens.

National third vice president is William M. Marutani, of Philadelphia, Pa., an attorney at law who doubles as the National JACL legal counsel, member of the distinguished MacCoy, Evans & Lewis law firm.

National treasurer is Kumeo Yoshinari, of Chicago, Ill., production manager of Turtle Wax Co.

Secretary to the board is Dr. David M. Miura, of Long Beach, Calif., a dentist.

National 1,000 Club chairman is William M. Matsumoto, of Sacramento, Calif., assistant district manager, West Coast Life Insurance Co.

Chairman, Pacific Northwest district council, is Dr. John Kanda, of Sumner, Wash., a physician.

Chairman, northern California-western Nevada district council, is John Yasumoto, of San Francisco, Calif., a mechanical engineer with the South San Francisco Plant, Bethlehem Steel Co.

Chairman, central California district council, is Dr. Frank Nishio, of Fresno, Calif., an optometrist.

Chairman, Pacific Southwest district council, Masaki Hironaka, of San Diego, Calif., assistant superintendent, U.S. Post Office, Pacific Beach Station.

Chairman, intermountain district council, is Kiyoshi Sakota, of Rexburg, Idaho, a farmer.

Chairman, mountain-plains district council, is Mrs. Lily Y. Okura, of Omaha, Nebr., administrator of the Meyer Therapy Center for Children, Omaha.

Chairman, Midwest district council, is Dr. James Takao, of Cincinnati, Ohio, a dentist.

Chairman, eastern district council, is Kaz Horita, of Norristown, Pa., a chemical engineer with the Container Corp. of America.

Living past national presidents are Frank F. Chuman, of Los Angeles, Calif., an attorney at law; Shigeo Wakamatsu, of Chicago, Ill., a chemist with Lever Bros., Hammond, Ind., plant; Dr. Roy M. Nishikawa, of Los Angeles, Calif., an optometrist; George J. Inagaki, of Los Angeles, Calif., a real estate and marketing management consultant; Hito Okada, Salt Lake City, Utah, a general insurance broker; Saburo Kido, Los Angeles, Calif., publisher, New Japanese-American News; and Dr. Thomas T. Yatable, Chicago, Ill., a dentist.

National director is Masao W. Satow, with headquarters in San Francisco. Jack Mayeda, also of San Francisco, is the northern California regional director. Isaac Matsushige, of Los Angeles, is the Pacific Southwest regional director, Mrs. Esther Hagiwara supervises the Midwest regional office in Chicago, Harry Honda, of Los Angeles, is the editor of the official weekly membership publication, the Pacific Citizen.

National convention chairman is Frank Watanabe, supervisory engineer for Kelsey Hayes, of Detroit. President of the Detroit JACL chapter is James N. Shimoura, owner of the Oriental Provision Co., wholesale food distributors.

Miss Marilyn Nagano, a student at Wayne State University, will reign as the National JACL Queen. She will be attended by Miss Sarah Shirane and Miss Shirley Kinoshita.

SUCCESSFUL CONVENTION

I know that I speak for my colleagues in both the House and the Senate in wishing success to the 18th Biennial National JACL Convention, for its theme is the basic moral issue of the day: "Human Dignity—Our Challenge."

If the delegates to the Detroit convention will be guided by the spirit of the Japanese-American Creed, which was authored by Mike Masaoka, whom many of us know as the able spokesman for the JACL here in the Nation's Capital, they cannot but do honor to their organization and to their country, the United States of America.

That creed, incidentally, was first read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in May 1941, and reads as follows:

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals, and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise.

She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way: aboveboard, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fairplay will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her Constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

Is the Defeat of Communist Forces Unnecessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, sometimes we find that our young people have a better perspective on the issues of the day than some of the old experienced hands who have been trying to solve the problems of the world unsuccessfully for many years. I have been particularly impressed with an editorial analysis of U.S. foreign policy as expressed in a column written by Mr. Carl Hendricks in the Gamecock, the student newspaper of the University of South Carolina. This column, taken from the May 1, 1964, issue of the Gamecock, is entitled "Is the Defeat of Communist Forces Unnecessary?" I commend this article to the attention of our State Department foreign policy planners, who are evidently of the opinion that there is no pressing need to win the war with communism, and also to anyone in the Congress who seems to be imbued with this same type of fallacious thinking.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE DEFEAT OF COMMUNIST FORCES UNNECESSARY?

Today a perplexing situation exists for the United States in the field of foreign policy and also in certain areas of domestic relations.

Americans are fighting and dying in southeast Asia against a determined and well-equipped enemy. Excerpts of letters which a young American captain wrote to his wife shortly before his death (published in U.S. News & World Report) indicate what some "less informed" citizens have suspected for some time—that the "war" is going badly for us and is getting worse.

This, of course, is contrary to what the politically ambitious Secretary of Defense would have the electorate believe. It has been the Department of Defense's contention that the need for U.S. troops in South Vietnam would shortly be over.

Perhaps this view might have been justified with another of Averell Harriman's neutralist governments. Harriman's neutral government in Laos hasn't worked too well so far. Perhaps a "neutral" South Vietnam would fare better?

An appalling fact disturbs us about South Vietnam. It is this attitude on the part of official Washington that there is no real need to defeat the Communist or Viet Cong forces—this is much the same attitude that prevailed in the Korean war over the obdurate objections of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The concept of war without victory and its resulting attrition seems a bit alien to this writer.

How can we expect other peoples to respect us if we do not speak and act with authority and force? How can we expect our American fighting forces to be trustworthy, brave, loyal, and of high morale if we don't officially and morally support them and equip them with the necessary tools to do the job that

needs to be done? In short, how can we ask them to die for nothing?

World War II equipment was probably fine 20 years ago, but it now is somewhat obsolete and against modern equipment. Well, our boys over there just don't like it. One statement in one of the excerpts was particularly pathetic. It was a wish for some World War II people to operate some of the equipment or show the present force how to do so. That is ridiculous.

Why is it that we must restrain our forces and short change them on equipment and manpower? Our enemy is playing for keeps and unless we start playing ball, we stand to lose a hell of a lot of prestige, bargaining power, and our own self-respect.

South Vietnam could become another Korea and we didn't go out to win that one either. In the long run we didn't—largely because the same sort of fuzzy thinking persisted then that persists now in the high offices of our National Government.

Speaking of fuzzy thinking—how can we trust Nicky Khrushchev now when the record shows that we should not? Why should we limit our nuclear technology? Why should we shut down or reduce 500 military installations? Why should we even be thinking about doing away with the draft, or is this a move designed to get more votes?

Who broke the last nuclear moratorium? What assurances do we have that Russia and China will give up their aim to dominate the world? In this day and time we must not allow ourselves to be weak in any military aspect; we must be strong, and direct and consistent in our dealings with the Communists. What is consistent with all-out support for Berlin and yet toleration for Castro?

The biggest crime of this generation is letting a national leader even think that he can enslave another country without facing the consequences of United States and U.N. intervention. The United States is the most powerful nation in the history of the world and it seems such a shame and waste to see it eroded from without and within by an alien force and ideology which cannot possibly compare with what the United States stands for.

If the United States does not become the "peacemaker" that many have fondly dreamed that she would become, then she will go down in history as just another power which rose and fell. Future students will be able to "compare and contrast" our civilization with that of ancient Rome or any other nation which is no more.

Beet Sugar—No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the anticipated extension of the so-called Sugar Act invites a careful study of all of the elements necessary to balancing consumer demand with available offshore cane, plus domestic cane and beet production.

Representing a district with close economic ties to cane sugar refining in the Philadelphia area I regularly encounter opponents to any expansion of beet sugar acreage who contend that any loss to beets will be reflected in an impairment in local cane refining. In addition, it must be obvious that beet sugar free on board Chicago is going to cost the eastern seaboard housewife more than she is now paying for the cane product.

A distinguished and respected constituent of mine, Mr. Henry R. C. Elser of Paoli, Pa., is in a unique position in that he has investments in sugar refineries located variously in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Billings, Mont. What brought me up short, however, was his recent letter in which he points out that he has always paid a higher price for sugar in Billings than in Chicago "where beet sugar meets competition from cane sugar."

Mr. Elser's letter has been made a part of this extension of remarks and I would commend it to the careful perusal of those who may have a concern for sugar refining as a vital factor in our east coast economy:

PAOLI, PA., *April 27, 1964.*

Hon. PAUL B. DAGUE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAGUE: I fully realize that you have many pressing problems on your hands, and may not have time to give much thought to the joint resolutions regarding the removal of restrictions on beet sugar markets and on beet sugar quotas. I urge you, however, to examine this situation closely.

As one of your constituents, I am in the unique position of being the principal stockholder in three firms. One is located in Philadelphia and uses in excess of 4 million pounds of cane sugar. The second is located in Chicago and uses in excess of 1 million pounds of beet sugar. The third is located in Billings, Mont., and uses in excess of 2 million pounds of beet sugar. Therefore, I feel that I have been able to look at the entire situation quite objectively and have come to the conclusion that it is in the best interest of the country and the consuming public not to remove restrictions on beet sugar markets, and not to increase beet sugar quotas.

I will not burden you with all of the statistics and figures I have available except to make one point, we have always paid a considerably higher price for beet sugar in Billings, Mont. (the home of the largest beet refinery in the country) than we do in Chicago where beet sugar meets competition from cane sugar.

I urge you vote "no" on both of these resolutions.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY R. C. ELSER.

Firemen Recognition Day—Proclamation by Governor Rosellini, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by Governor Rosellini of the State of Washington designating May 4, 1964, as Firemen Recognition Day.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues this action taken by Governor Rosellini as it gives deserved recognition to the members of our society, the volunteer firemen, who contribute so much to the safety and welfare of others. We tend to give our thanks to these men only in times of emergency; yet we owe them much for their vigilance and day-to-day efforts.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Special recognition should be given to the 12,096 volunteer firemen in our State who through their unselfish efforts, respond day or night to our calls for help when fire and other emergencies occur. These volunteer firemen give freely of their time to train, maintain, and improve our fire service, and by our tribute to these men we support a part of our American heritage established in 1736 when Benjamin Franklin organized the first volunteer firemen.

Now, therefore, I, Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington, do hereby designate May 4 as Firemen Recognition Day encouraging residents of the State of Washington, civic groups, and community organizations to honor their firemen by observing May 4 as a State Day of Recognition of Firemen. I call upon each city, town, and hamlet in our State to stop at 12 noon and observe a moment of silence in memory of our firemen who have answered their last call; then through the afternoon and evening conduct programs of recognition of our living firemen.

———,
Governor.

William M. Chadbourne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this week New York is mourning the death of William M. Chadbourne, a man who had a profound impact on the development of New York City government. William Chadbourne was one of the great men of New York political history; he was a key figure in the inauguration of many of the reforms that helped invigorate and vitalize the city's political life.

A few examples illustrate the extent of his activities and influence. He headed the fusion committee that managed the three successful campaigns of the late Mayor F. H. La Guardia. He was a lifelong participant in Republican politics, except for 4 years as an organizer of the Progressive Party under President Theodore Roosevelt. As a Republican, he was for many years president of the National Republican Club, treasurer of the New York County Republican Committee, and a delegate to the Republican National Conventions of 1936 and 1940. He was a distinguished lawyer who furthered and strengthened the tradition of the bar. He was senior partner of the law firm Chadbourne, Hunt, Jaeckel & Brown.

William Chadbourne dedicated his life to public service and the law. He was a Republican, but he made his influence felt throughout the entire political com-

munity as evidenced by his service as president of the Honest Ballot Association and as director of the Association Against Election Frauds. William Chadbourne will be sadly missed by all New Yorkers.

Under unanimous consent, I include this obituary from the New York Herald Tribune in the Appendix of the RECORD:

W. M. CHADBOURNE, RAN THREE LA GUARDIA MAYOR CAMPAIGNS

William M. Chadbourne, 85, corporation lawyer, an organizer of the Progressive Party in New York, and head of the fusion committee that managed the three successful campaigns of the late Mayor F. H. La Guardia, died Saturday in Harkness Pavilion. He had an office at 70 Pine Street and lived at 550 Park Avenue.

Mr. Chadbourne also was a member of the fusion committee which chose and helped elect John Purroy Mitchel as mayor in 1913. He was active in Republican politics most of his life except for 4 years in the Progressive Party under President Theodore Roosevelt. He was a delegate to the Progressive National Convention in 1916.

He was for years president of the National Republican Club, treasurer of the New York County Republican Committee, and a delegate to numerous Republican State Conventions and to the Republican National Conventions of 1936 and 1940.

He also served as preesident of the Honest Ballot Association and a director of the Association Against Election Frauds.

Mr. Chadbourne was born in San Francisco and was graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Harvard University in 1900. He received a master's degree in 1901 and in 1903 a law degree from Harvard Law School, where he was an editor of the Harvard Law Review.

After graduation, he traveled around the world for 15 months, then began the practice of law in New York City, first with the firm of Hornblower, Byrne, Miller & Potter, and then with Masten & Nichols. Later he headed for many years the firm of Chadbourne, Hunt, Jaeckel & Brown, during which he represented Yugoslavia before the Tito dictatorship.

Mr. Chadbourne served for 9 months on the Mexican border as a first lieutenant in the 12th New York Infantry Division, and in World War I he was a lieutenant and then a major attached to the Adjutant General's Department and in the Chemical Warfare Service overseas. He retired as a colonel and received decorations as an officer of the Legion of Honor by France, the Jugoslovenska Kruna II by Yugoslavia, the Order of the Jade by China, and the Order of the British Empire.

After the war, during the Conference of Versailles, Mr. Chadbourne was in Paris as counsel for the U.S. Liquidation Commission. In 1924 he represented the Serbian Child Welfare Association in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Chadbourne was a member of the bar association, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York. He was an organizer of the International Chamber of Commerce and a delegate to its conventions in Stockholm, Amsterdam, Washington, and Quebec. He was a director of the New York World's Fair in 1939.

His business directorates included the Park Sheraton Corp., Foreign Industrial Equipment Corp., the Pittston Co., the Clinchfield Coal Corp., the American Maracaibo Co., the Maryland Casualty Co., and the Drilling & Exploration Co. He was chairman of the board of the Felmont Petroleum Corp.

Mr. Chadbourne was a member of the board of managers of the State Charities Aid Association, president of the American Friends of Yugoslavia, chairman of the Yugoslav Relief Fund of America and vice president of Bundles for Britain.

We was president of the France-America Society and for many years president of the Soldiers and Sailors Club of New York. He was for 3 years president of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, and former president of the Park Association of New York City.

During World War II, Mr. Chadbourne was chairman of the Civilian Activities Division, Second Service Command, and the Army Emergency Relief and a member of the 1st Army Advisory Committee. He also was a member of the New York Society of Officers of World Wars and the American Legion. He was a member of numerous clubs and a Mason.

Mr. Chadbourne was never married. Surviving are two brothers, M. O. and Frank M. Chadbourne; two nephews, and a niece. A funeral service will be held at 2 p.m. tomorrow at Trinity Church. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Civil Rights Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished news columnist, Mr. Holmes Alexander, has recently published two excellent columns analyzing the so-called civil rights legislation now pending in the Senate. One is entitled "The Road to Legalized Caesarism in America," and was published in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., on April 29, 1964. The other is entitled "Undefined 'Crime,'" and was printed in the News and Courier on May 1, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both of these columns be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News and Courier, Apr. 29, 1964]

THE ROAD TO LEGALIZED CAESARISM IN AMERICA

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—In a time of totalitarianism, first fascism and then communism, it is not strange that the American Republic should have to fight these evil forces at home and abroad—it is only strange that the American people should fail to recognize them, even in disguise.

This, in all solemnity, is the fact of the matter with H.R. 7152—the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

The American people who accept the Simple Simon explanation, by President Johnson and others, that this 55-page, 11-part document is a mere extension of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation or a logical development of the Bill of Rights, are being duped. They are in genuine danger of surrendering their liberties to a form of socialistic Caesarism—a legalized dictatorship.

This is not to say that many opponents of the bill, North and South, are not motivated by racial convictions. Anybody who is willing to be honest on this issue should scorn hypocrisy on the point. Many white people in the South, who have known the Negro best, and many white people in the North, who are getting to know him better, believe him to be an underdeveloped "nation" in our midst.

While sympathetic to the Negro plight and not unwilling to be helpful and tolerant, these people abhor any forced association. To be frank, they are prejudiced. They clearly wish to practice discrimination in their personal lives and businesses.

But this group is relatively small. In the Wisconsin Democratic primary, Governor Wallace, running as a segregationist, drew about 25 percent of the vote. In the U.S. Senate, where the bill is now locked in filibuster, the prejudiced minority would not top 20 Senators—no more than one-fifth of the upper body. There are about 20 additional Senators at this writing who oppose the shutoff of debate, called cloture, because they look to a day when their own interests might need the protection of the Senate rules.

Something like another 10 Senators, possibly raising the total of skeptics to a thin majority, might go along with the Dirksen amendments to tone down the Federal enforcement powers. There is a chance, therefore, that the bill will be slightly modified in the Senate and then passed by the House in that form.

But nobody should fool himself into thinking that minor modifications, enough to win the necessary 67 votes for cloture, will alter the nature of this harsh and coercive measure.

If a cell of conspirators, determined to change our republican form of government to one of centralized control over business and labor and over the personal idiosyncrasies of citizens and communities, had sat down for that purpose, they might have drafted H.R. 7152 and added the title of civil rights as a clever sweetener or emotional cover.

No one need adopt this farfetched conspiratorial theory.

I offer it only as hyperbole—a kind of cartoon to stress the faults of the bill.

But there is, and always has been in our history, an underground force of authoritarianism—a poppa-knows-best motif which seeks to achieve social reform by executive order, by Federal decree, by the bypassing of political safeguards and by complex legal machinery which is labeled benevolent but which is nevertheless dictatorial.

There are probably no Americans wholly without prejudice, but there are many who are ashamed of having it. They should not be ashamed, however, of being vigilant for their liberties.

Here is a bill which, if nothing else, gives excessive power to the Attorney General, to the Federal bench, to a new bureaucracy called the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

This bill plays hob with the concepts that an accused must face his accusers, that every miscreant has the right to jury trial, that every citizen should have security in his property and papers, that the Bill of Rights should protect him from his government.

There is no paucity of laws on the books today to give the Negro his chance to climb from his admittedly underdeveloped condition. And there is enough decency in white Americans to expedite this evolution which is clearly taking place in the sports, the arts, the professions, the sciences, the basic industries and many businesses.

I have not found the case against H.R. 7152 more succinctly stated than by Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK of Ohio during the House debate. He said:

"This bill is an attempt to do by force what can only be done by logic and reason."

[From the News and Courier, May 1, 1964]

UNDEFINED CRIME

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—On the morning that the civil rights debate opened last winter, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, met some of us on the Senate floor, and a reporter facetiously

asked if RUSSELL and his fellow southerners were ready with telephone books, cookbooks, and other timewasters to pad the debate.

The fiery Georgian reacted snappishly to the old taunt. No southern Senator since the late Huey Long has made a farce of Senate procedure by those filibustering tactics, although people who don't hear or read the speeches seem to believe that they are nothing but blah. In fact the speeches, both pro and con the civil rights bill, have been filled with learned discussions regarding historical and jurisdictional interpretations of the Constitution.

It might surprise a number of Americans to be reminded that treason, not discrimination, is the only crime that is defined in the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers set a stern example of succinct definition of both the crime and the conviction required to prove the crime. In contrast, the civil rights bill makes "discrimination" a punishable offense, without attempting a definition of it, or of "race" or "religion." Under this bill, the conviction for the undefined act of discrimination would amount to hardly more than an accusation in Federal court.

To see how far we have slipped from the protection which the Constitution intended to give citizens in an unequal contest with their mighty Government, let us have a look at the Constitution's article 3, section 3, which deals with the most awesome of all crimes. It reads:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only [emphasis supplied] in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

There is nothing fuzzy in this definition. It is so explicit as to make it practically impossible to convict a traitor in time of peace. It is so explicit that lawmakers in trying to write laws against peace-time subversives have had to avoid the charge of treason. They have been forced into difficult circumlocutions, like "teaching and advocating" the overthrow of the United States by "force and violence," and of knowingly associating with conspiratorial groups. Even these less-than-treasonable crimes have been hard to prove.

Many a person who would have been summarily hanged in other countries has walked away with a light sentence or with none at all. The citizen, even the unworthy citizen, gets the fullest protection when accused of the most heinous of crimes against the State.

Article III, section 3, of the Constitution goes a step beyond giving an ironclad definition of treason. It reads:

"No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession, in open court."

The contrast is painful between this brief, simple, exact language (totaling less than 50 words) and the rambling cumbersome imprecise language of the civil rights bill (running more than 50 printed pages).

Under the civil rights bill, as advocated by the President of the United States, an offender in the undefined area of discrimination can be accused by the Attorney General of the United States and sentenced by judges of the U.S. Federal Court.

It is hardly an even match. It is a long way from surrounding the citizen, however unworthy, with protections against the mighty arm of his Government. It has taken many months of debate, first in the House and now in the Senate, to bring otherwise reasonable Americans like Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, THOMAS KUCHEL, and MIKE MANSFIELD to the minimum concession of agreeing that offenders ought to have at least partial access to trial by jury.

While men like Alger Hiss can flirt with treason and end up after two trials with a sentence for perjury, a citizen who allegedly "thinks discrimination" could be jailed under the unamended civil rights bill for intervals of 45 days without ever telling his story to a jury.

Address by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, at Dedication of the Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, Oregon Inlet, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, great things are happening along the Middle Atlantic coast. In Virginia a magnificent 17-mile bridge-tunnel complex has just been opened. It is one of the engineering wonders of the world and connects the Norfolk area with the Eastern Shore of Virginia, offering north and south travelers an inspiring trip across the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay.

In North Carolina it was my privilege to be present last weekend at the dedication of the new Herbert C. Bonner Bridge across Oregon Inlet. Named for one of our most distinguished colleagues here in the House of Representatives, the bridge represents another great engineering achievement and offers an avenue to the Outer Banks of North Carolina that will benefit the people there and the visitors attracted by the great recreational opportunities of the area.

Many jokes are told in our area of the rivalry between Virginia and North Carolina. I prefer, however, to view each of our great States as partners in progress. I was delighted, therefore, to be on hand to hear the forward-looking address of Congressman BONNER at the dedication of the bridge which bears his name.

The outstanding Representative of the First District of North Carolina congratulated all who played a part in the development of the bridge—in his words "those who dared to have a vision." Congressman BONNER is also a man of great vision and I commend to you his remarks which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN HERBERT C. BONNER, FIRST DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, AT DEDICATION OF THE HERBERT C. BONNER BRIDGE ACROSS OREGON INLET, N.C., MAY 2, 1964

Secretary of Commerce Hodges, Governor Sanford, Mr. Wirth, Mr. Fearing, members of the Southern Albemarle Association, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am humbly grateful for the generous esteem of the people and the State it has been my privilege to serve for so many years in the Congress of the United States. And I am proud of this tribute you are bestowing on me in the naming of this beautiful new bridge.

Its dedication here today marks the final fruition of the hopes, the dreams, and the untiring efforts of many persons over many years—of those who dared to have a vision.

Luther Hodges was one who had the vision that now has come to pass. He envisioned the Outer Banks as a vast recreational resource, joined by highways and bridges, that one day would bring pleasure and relaxation to tens of thousands of our citizens.

This great bridge was initiated and authorized during his administration as Govneror of North Carolina, and he shall always be rememberd for his part in unlocking the rich potential of this area.

The first effort was carried forward by Gov. Terry Sanford, who also has earned our lasting gratitude. The bridge, erected during his tenure in the State House, will not only stimulate the economic growth of the Outer Banks, but open up one of the world's finest playgrounds for people from everywhere.

This proud span is a symbol of the progess of our American civilization from the log stockade on a nameless and hostile shore to the freest, most prospering society in all history.

It crosses the restless waters of an inlet that was an early gateway to the new world, a world that held for humankind the promise of a better life. And this bridge today holds a promise for us, the promise of a future that can be as great as we make it.

This whole region has been opened up and we can prosper and enjoy a fuller, more satisfying life. We can secure for our children what many of us were deprived in opportunity and educational advantage. There are no limits to the future.

Now that the scene of our earliest beginnings as a nation is fully accessible, many thousands of visitors from our own country and abroad will come here to tread this hallowed ground where the American tradition has its roots.

There are few, if any, places in this great country where the durability of the American ideal can be sensed more strongly than on the Outer Banks of North Carolina where family names trace back to the Elizabethan settlers. Indeed, the idiom of that ancient day is even now readily identifiable in the descendants.

Many of our friends here today and their forebears have been in the forefront of the surge of history that buoyed this Nation to its present greatness.

They braved the North Atlantic in cockleshell boats to establish the first colonies in the new world. They unfurled the St. Andrew's cross as one of the early symbols of freedom and equality in the wild and primitive land that ultimately was to become the last best hope of humanity.

The colonists fought the unrelenting ravages of nature and the hostile savages. They defended the coast against the enemies of freedom. They scratched a bare sustenance from the earth and wrested it from the cruel and untamed sea.

Seafaring people, they encountered Blackbeard and other notorious pirates who terrorized the coast in the early 18th century. They participated bravely and effectively in the Revolution.

Highly independent people, they have enjoyed the freedom of their relative isolation, and yet have always played their part as this country has moved forward.

The inhabitants of these Outer Banks of North Carolina settled in one of the most unique geological regions in the world, where a slender barrier of low-lying, sandy islands give protection from the sea to a broad complex of sounds, estuaries, and flowing rivers. Nature's grand design provided the perfect habitat for waterfowl, upland game, and marine life of all kinds in a bounty whose full limits are yet to be revealed.

In the day of the settler, the Outer Banks were crowned by virgin stands of timber and profuse vegetation. The location in the temperate climate of the 37th parallel was enhanced by proximity to the warm waters of the northward flowing Gulf Stream.

Thus, our ancestors were blessed with abundant sources for food and shelter and by their isolation were protected against the hostile incursions that beset those more exposed to conquest and pillage.

As time went on and civilization flourished on the nearby mainland, the Outer Bankers found new markets for fish and game and new employment opportunities as pilots guiding vessels through the tricky currents and shoals of the ever-shifting inlets.

In the course of history the men of Roanoke Island, the Outer Banks, and contiguous areas took a key part in manning America's merchant ships on sealanes all over the world. They fought aboard her ships of war. Afloat and ashore, they established an enviable record in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Portsmouth Island became a thriving port. Fishing and netting enabled the villages along the barrier islands to prosper.

But even as God created the Garden of Eden and gave it to the race of man, He has never provided man with insurance against his own profligacy.

And so it was, as the American civilization advanced and expanded on our continent the generations of man here, as elsewhere, upset the delicate balance of nature on the Outer Banks. Continued cutting of the fine stands of pine and cedar for shelter, boat-building and heating unsettled the natural stability of the dunes. Stock grazing destroyed the protective cover of grasses and low-growing shrubs.

As nature's own erosion control was stripped from the land it increasingly suffered from the violence of the northeast storms and from the vicious hurricanes that have from time to time battered our coast.

Just as overfishing and the development of petroleum products brought an end to the once flourishing whaling off the coast, the development of road systems on the mainland adversely affected the marketing of seafood caught by the outer bankers until in recent years the construction of new roads and bridges began to connect the banks with North Carolina's magnificent highway system.

By 1930 the inexhaustible land of this great country was beginning to fill up. Exploitation of natural resources had progressed to the point where there was wide appreciation of the need for conservation measures to preserve our forestlands, our fisheries, and our wildlife. The population had grown from less than 4 million persons in 1790, the first year of the Republic, to over 123 million in 1930.

As the economic progress of the United States was buoyed upward and Americans earned the highest wages and family incomes in history, we witnessed the advent of shorter workweeks and longer vacations for the great bulk of our population. These developments increased the need for conservation and brought new demands for recreational opportunities.

By the early 1930's officials of the Department of the Interior were becoming alarmed at the small amount of coastline in public ownership or potentially available to be set aside for future generations. Historic landmarks were being destroyed, and commercial encroachment was spoiling areas of unique natural beauty. It was during this time that a Department of the Interior survey was conducted to determine coastal areas that had recreational, scientific, and historical potentialities that should be preserved and developed in the national interest.

The Outer Banks, having great significance in the field of history, was also recognized for its importance from the standpoint of geology and biology, as well as an unrivaled scenic attraction. At about that time the Outer Banks were literally fighting for survival. Lack of the protective cover of vegetation, combined with the ravages of tides, winds, and storms, had swept and eroded these barrier islands to the point that their continued existence was in jeopardy.

The Works Projects Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps, agencies born of the great depression, embarked on sand fixation and beach erosion control projects extending from the Virginia line to Ocracoke Inlet.

The prospect of creating the Nation's first national seashore park in the Cape Hatteras area was dawning.

Interest in the conservation of natural resources and the preservation of national historic sites had begun with the building of the Wright Memorial at Kill Devil Hills to commemorate the first successful step in man's conquest of the air, the designation of Fort Raleigh as a national historic site at the scene of the first English colony in America, and the establishment of the Pea Island Game Refuge.

I remember well the early efforts of my dear friend Congressman Lindsay C. Warren and other men of vision such as Frank Stick, Bruce Etheridge, Victor Meekins, Ben Dixon McNeil, Theodore Meekins, former Governors Ehringhaus and Scott, and a number of others who visualized the potentialities of a national seashore on the Outer Banks with manifold benefits flowing to the people of the area, to the State of North Carolina, and to the Nation as a whole.

It has been said that, "Men of great genius and heart sow the seeds of a new degree of progress in the world, but they bear fruit only after many years."

It was not an easy road we traveled to achieve the dream. Lindsay Warren introduced the bills authorizing the Wright Memorial, the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, and the National Seashore. He labored vigorously for their passage, and his efforts were crowned with success. But the authorizations expired and the work remained undone.

Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, a tried and true friend to whom this area is greatly indebted, worked stanchly and persistently with me to keep our prospects alive, and finally the authorizations were reinstituted by the Congress.

The National Seashore project has had its ups and downs—its discouragements and its frustrations. Now, through the generosity of many individuals, the understanding of the people who live here, and the cooperative efforts of the State of North Carolina and the Federal Government, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a reality.

Since the park was established in 1953 its forecast potentialities have already been proven.

Figures for 1955 show 284,500 visitors. The number has steadily increased each year, reaching 873,300 in 1963.

Increasing interest in the recreational possibilities in this unique and beautiful portion of North Carolina and of the Nation, coupled with a growing interest among Americans in the history that has forged our heritage, strained the former ferry system across Oregon Inlet to the limit.

As the park developed and the North Carolina State Highway Commission contributed to its success by building and maintaining roads within the area, the early necessity of bridging Oregon Inlet became apparent.

Since the State of North Carolina had built and was maintaining the roads within the park, and would contribute substantially with the Bureau of Public Roads in the Federal-Aid highway program, it seemed only fair and reasonable that the Department of the Interior should also contribute to the construction of the new bridge, which would mean so much to the park. Accordingly, I introduced legislation in 1961 which would provide for a contribution of $1 million by the Department of the Interior.

The great success of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area gave impetus to full cooperation in Washington in support of the authorizing legislation. Scarcely more than a year after introduction of the legislation it had become law, in October 1962. And in November 1963 this 2½ mile, toll-free bridge opened for traffic, providing a major new step forward in the progress of this area and the Nation. Great credit is due those who designed and built the bridge. A major engineering achievement, it has been characterized as "of such beautiful design that it is sheer poetry in concrete and steel."

The faithful old ferries are now retired. It was due to the initiative and enterprise of a native son—Tobey Tillett—the ferry pioneer, that the first regular link to Hatteras Island was established. He must be smiling down on us today from the Great Beyond at the spectacle of this magnificant span.

Where it used to take from 30 minutes to an hour to cross by ferry—not counting frequently long waiting periods—the crossing can now be made in a few minutes, without waiting, and 24 hours a day.

I know that there were some who had sincere misgivings about the effects that establishment of the park might have on the special way of life of the citizens of the outer banks. There have been, and undoubtedly still are, some who fear the effects of improved access from the mainland by means of this new bridge. I certainly respect those views.

But let us examine where we stand and what the future can bring.

First of all, the creation of the park and the efforts which the Federal Government alone could provide have gone far toward staying the destructive forces of nature by restoring long lost vegetation and stabilizing the shifting dunes. Modern roads now join us together so that we can progress not piecemeal, but as an economic whole that benefits everybody.

Bridges span Croatan and Roanoke Sounds to connect historic Roanoke Island with the mainland and the Outer Banks. Yet these developments have been wisely handled in the creation of the park and the historic sites of Fort Raleigh and Kill Devil Hills so as to keep to a minimum the disruption of the lives of the people who live here. On the contrary, the National Park Service program has limited the boundaries of the recreational and historic areas so as to leave plenty of room for the expansion of the local communities.

Just as the sun rises out of the Atlantic, we are seeing the dawning of a bright new day full of great promise for the happiness and prosperity of those who live and work here.

The growing demand and need for recreation by all Americans will be the means of improvement of the lives, education and economy of our people here, without destroying the beauty and privacy which we have held so dear.

Whereas this area has been enjoyed for many, many years by the privileged few who could afford private hunting lodges and clubs and made little contribution to our economy, it may now and will be enjoyed by thousands of people from all over our Nation who constitute our new American society of the privileged many. Now the great body of our people may share these great natural assets with you and create new wealth for our citizens.

Yes, there will be change. It is change for which we must prepare. We must prepare wisely for the inevitable influx of visitors who will want improved facilities of all kinds—more and better hotels and motels, modern restaurants, expanded recreational facilities, improved transportation.

Much is already being done. Your progress is evident, for example, in sound zoning

which encourages orderly community development of business districts and residential sections, protected from haphazard expansion that too often cheapens and despoils an area. You, in cooperation with the accelerated public works program of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson, have put in a modern water system with all that it means in comfort, convenience, and safeguarding of health, not to mention fire protection.

You who live here have built your own way of life around the sea. You know the many moods of the sea—sometimes sparkling—sometimes placid—sometimes cruel and violent—sometimes generous in its yield—sometimes niggardly.

The progress now coming to this area, as symbolized and abetted by this bridge, will improve this life by the sea. Greater accessibility to vacationers will make sports fishing an increasingly larger contributor to our economy.

Improved transportation will be a boon to the commercial fishing industry by greatly improving access to markets. As a result, I feel that there are vast, virtually untapped commercial fishery resources which may now be economically and profitably exploited.

With this improved transportation facility and the existence of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, I can see the prospect of this becoming more nearly a year-round attraction to people of many pursuits.

Finally, while this bridge is bringing people in from the outside to share the natural and historic treasures we have here, it will at the same time be providing the means for bringing our own permanent population closer together and improving the means by which we may in turn have access to the other great recreation areas of North Carolina and the United States as a whole.

There is a saying that goes something like this: "From those to whom much has been given, much is expected."

The efforts which have brought into being these works of great potential have been inspired by the confidence of our people over the years.

The future is in your hands.

New Pope Frustrates Designs of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been pleased to read that Pope Paul VI of the Roman Catholic Church is waging a strong fight against the forces of communism in Italy and around the world. An analysis of the Pope's determination to frustrate Communist efforts to dominate Italy and the world were brought to my attention in an outstanding column by the distinguished and respected news columnist Mr. Constantine Brown, who has been residing in Rome for the past year or two.

Mr. Brown is now visiting in Washington with his charming wife, Mrs. Elizabeth Churchill Brown, who is also noted as a most capable columnist. Recently it was my pleasure to meet with the Browns and to get their views and assessments of developments in Europe and particularly in Italy.

Mr. Brown writes a very interesting column which is published in the Evening Star, the State of Columbia, S.C., and a number of other newspapers around the country. Mr. Brown has many valuable sources of information in Europe and I am constantly impressed by his accurate and behind-the-scenes news reports, and also with his most logical and penetrating analyses of world developments.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD Mr. Brown's outstanding column of April 21, 1964, as printed in the State. It is entitled "New Pope Frustrates Designs of Communists: Now Fighting Reds Around Globe."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW POPE FRUSTRATES DESIGNS OF COMMUNISTS: NOW FIGHTING REDS AROUND GLOBE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The Communists find themselves in an unexpected and unforeseen quandary in Italy. Their well-laid plans for a peaceful takeover seem suddenly frustrated by the opposition of Pope Paul VI.

After the spectacular increase in their majority at the polls last year, everything seemed to be going their way. When the present administration headed by the young, well-meaning but weak Aldo Moro came to power, the Ship of State seemed to be rudderless. This suited the Communists exactly.

The Communists' plan to transform Italy into another Yugoslavia seemed to be progressing.

The new economic and social measures of the government caused the present economic crisis. Capital became scared when the left-of-center government began to nationalize industries such as electric power. Not only investment capital but also savings from banks were sent across the borders to be changed into hard currencies.

Close to $500 million was smuggled abroad. The Italian stock market hit a 4-year low. Industrial establishments, such as Fiat, Montecattini and others reduced working hours because of the decreased demand due to new government regulations exacting a much higher tax on automobiles and a drastic curtailment, from 36 to 12 months, in installment payments.

Washington came across handsomely in Italy's hours of trouble. It loaned $1.2 billion (of which some $300 million were loaned by the International Monetary Fund). This stabilized the lire temporarily and assured the Moro administration at least an 8-month lease on life. But it did not reestablish confidence in the Government or its economic plans, either in Italy or abroad. International bankers regard Washington action as a makeshift political operation.

Everything, on the surface, seemed to be going the Communists' way. But Pope Paul VI has taken up the fight against communism in both Italy and abroad.

It is no exaggeration to say that the new Pontiff is today the most popular man in Italy. Instead of remaining confined to the few hundred acres of Vatican City, as Pope Pius XII was; or making a few short trips outside the Vatican as Pope John XXIII did, he is around and about all the time.

There is hardly a day when the Papal automobile is not seen in the streets of Rome as the Pope visits churches, hospitals and even jails. Wherever he appears enormous crowds, especially young people, gather to cheer him wildly.

Pope Paul now plans trips throughout the country. He is an outstanding orator—no ghost writers for him—and his voice has the ring and emotion of deep conviction, particularly when he speaks about the sufferings of those in countries where not only the Christian church but all those who believe in God are oppressed.

Pope Paul's predecessor, John, was a saintly man who condemned the atheism contained in the Marxist-Leninist doctrines, but believed that there is good in all God's creatures. Consequently, he was convinced that with kindness and Christian tolerance toward the men in the Kremlin the Communist leadership would eventually change their ways. Hence his willingness to extend a friendly hand to Moscow in the expectation that the leaders there would one day "see God."

For this reason he received with friendliness Premier Khrushchev's son-in-law and daughter, the Alexei Adzhubeis, and bestowed his blessing on them.

The Italians, even many of those who pay dues to the Communist Party, are religious people. When they realized that the Holy Father was willing to take to his heart the men from Moscow they saw no longer any wrong in voting for Communists.

Pope Paul, who as Archbishop of Milan, had learned much about Communist tactics and had been in close touch with Red leaders in the Italian industrial north, is familiar with their trickeries. Soon after he ascended the throne, he began to fight against them. Today, after he has established his unprecedented popularity with the people, he has become the most outspoken leader against communism in Italy and the free world.

The Communists, who were jubilant at his election because they believed he would be a "liberal" Pope, are now worried. They see that their well-laid plans may be frustrated by the Pontiff and they can do nothing about it.

Civil Rights Bill—Title II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the second in the New York Times series of editorials commenting upon specific sections of the civil rights bill. The following editorial published on May 5, 1964, discusses section 2 of the bill, the public accommodations provision. I believe this is an important contribution to the debate.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL—II

Title II of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1964, which we discuss today in this series of editorials on the bill now being debated in the Senate, attacks what Negroes have long, and understandably, considered one of the most degrading manifestations of racism as practiced in the United States. That is the exclusion of persons from restaurants, hotels and other places of public accommodation solely because of their color or race.

As passed by the House, the bill forbids racial discrimination in restaurants and other retail food shops; gasoline stations; movie houses and other entertainment halls, and hotels and other places of transient lodging except for owner-occupied rooming

houses with five or fewer rooms. The Attorney General could bring civil suits to enforce the law, but only if attempts by mediators to obtain voluntary compliance were unsuccessful.

Some civil rights advocates have termed the coverage of the title too narrow. They would have included, for example, beauty parlors and some professions. But the fact remains that the facilities that are covered in this bill are those in which Negroes have suffered the worst indignities. It is intolerable that a family traveling through any part of this country should be uncertain whether it can eat at a lunch counter, stop at a motel or use a filling station restroom. These are also facilities in which the claim to exclusive use of "private property" is weakest, for these are businesses otherwise open to the general public. The duty of such businesses to serve the public has deep historic roots in the English common law, with its requirement that innkeepers serve any well-behaved traveler.

The constitutional arguments against title II hardly rise to the level of serious discussion. Congress and the Supreme Court have made amply clear that in our modern, national economy the Federal power over interstate commerce—the principal basis of the title—can reach such an impediment on commerce as racial discrimination.

Senator DIRKSEN has talked about making this title voluntary, perhaps for a period of time, by deleting the Attorney General's power to sue. Compliance will for the most part be voluntary, but it would be foolhardy to remove all teeth from this title. That would continue the now common situation in which one restaurant in a community holds out against desegregation, thereby frightening others away from voluntary steps. A firm, national rule must be made applicable to all.

Civil Rights Bill—Titles III and IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the New York Times published the third editorial in their series on the civil rights bill. This editorial comments on titles III and IV of the bill, and I hope will be read by all my colleagues. It follows:

[From the New York Times, May 6, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL—III

It is now 10 years since the Supreme Court held racial segregation in the public schools unconstitutional. Subsequent cases have made it clear beyond argument that no State may exclude citizens, on account of their race or color, from any other publicly financed or publicly operated facility—library, auditorium, park, courtroom, or the like.

Yet the actuality is remote from what the law demands. In Mississippi not a single public school has begun desegregation. Throughout the South only 1 percent of the Negro public school pupils are in classes with whites. Many other public institutions are for whites only.

A major reason for this disparity between the law and life is the imbalance of legal resources trying to enforce and to resist the Constitution. The burden of enforcement has rested on individual Negroes, while the Southern States have been able to throw all their official weight into resistance.

Titles III and IV of the civil rights legislation now before the Senate are designed to correct this injustice. Title III authorizes the Attorney General to sue for an end to segregation in any public facility aside from schools, and it permits him to intervene in other cases where an individual claims he is subjected to discrimination because of race, color, or religion.

Title IV deals with the schools only. It would allow the Attorney General to initiate school desgregation suits and, in addition, provide limited technical and financial aid to school districts in the process of desegregation. Contrary to false statements by opponents of the bill, it does not deal with racial imbalance in schools and indeed specifically excludes that subject from the title's coverage.

The articulated southern objection to these two titles in the bill is that they give the Attorney General too much power. In general, our legal system is wise in leaving it to individual initiative to enforce constitutional rights. But this bill as approved by the House permits Justice Department suits only after receipt of a signed complaint and after a finding that the individuals themselves are unable to sue for reasons of poverty or fear.

These titles are addressed principally to areas in which racial segregation is most clearly a national problem, and in which it has proved most difficult to enforce the Constitution by private lawsuits. In truth, what disturbs the southern opponents is not any abstract question of power but the possibility that long-declared rights would finally become realities. That day is overdue, and the pending bill takes moderate and appropriate steps to bring it about.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, the Polish people enacted into law their highest aspiration for a free and democratic nation. This was the famous Polish Constitution. It was the result of a century of Polish decline and chaos. The partition of 1772 especially shocked Poland and made the people aware of how seriously threatened they were by the dynamic states on Poland's borders. The intellectual ferment arising from this new realization and dismay produced some of the greatest men in Poland's history in arts, letters, and politics. By their supreme efforts and tremendous courage they adopted the May 3 constitution despite the dark threats of the partitioning powers, Prussia, Russia, and Austria.

It is a measure of the success of the new constitution that in 1793 Russia and Prussia, thoroughly frightened by the renewed unity and vigor of the Polish people, once again partitioned Poland, seizing two-thirds of its remaining territory. Even this, however, was not enough to defeat the new Polish Commonwealth, so powerful was the constitution of May 3. Only when the partitioning powers crushed the pitifully small but magnificent army of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, and divided the remaining area of Poland between them, thus obliterating Poland for a hundred years, did the people finally admit the death of the new constitution.

But the spirit of 1791, as dear to Poles as the spirit of 1776 is to Americans, survives even today. It is sure that the indomitable spirit of Poland is still resisting the Communist ideological offensive. Poland has suffered long enough. It deserves our strongest support. We must realize that our words here are no substitute for freedom in Poland. Let us strive to make all Poles as free as the Poles of the United States.

Panama Tension Easing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this troubled world it is reassuring to learn that the recent flareup in Panama has subsided and that our relations with that country are better. The news comes from an excellent source—from a fellow Texan—Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, who is an active and productive member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. As a matter of fact, it was as a representative of the committee that Mr. GONZALEZ recently went to Panama to attend a meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Following is an article that appeared in the April 19 issue of the Dallas News, "Report of HENRY B. GONZALEZ, keynote speaker of the State convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Texas":

IN PANAMA: RANCOR TOWARD UNITED STATES DOWN, SAYS GONZALEZ

BROWNWOOD, TEX.—Panamanian rancor toward the United States over the Panama Canal has subsided, U.S. Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, said here Saturday.

The Texas Congressman returned from Panama 2 days ago where he attended a meeting of the governors of the Inter-American Development Bank as a congressional delegate.

He told the Dallas News in an interview that Panama is astir over the coming May 10 presidential election. He said overseers told him that former President Arnulfo Arias has the obvious popularity if the elections are honest.

GONZALEZ said the people of Panama have friendly and cordial relations with the American military forces in Panama but not the same feeling toward the Zonians, the U.S. civilians stationed there.

The feeling now toward the United States is friendly, he said. "In my opinion, some Panama leaders are beginning to realize that their business was hurt."

He said tourism has leveled off and there is a lot of poverty and unemployment in the country. The rioting last January damaged only Panama businesses, he said, and the U.S. military forces were strong enough to protect the Canal Zone from the rioters.

Communist agitators joined the rioters after the fighting was underway, he said.

Radio and television broadcasts inflamed the rioting, he said, and caused large crowds of people to turn out for the street fighting,

looting and burning of buildings and automobiles.

It is not generally known to the Panamanians just how much the United States has done for them, GONZALEZ said. The big bridge costing millions that was built over the canal for their convenience is a case in point, he said. "They believe they paid for it."

"Another big mistake is in calling it the Panama Canal Company. This gives the impression that it is a private company making a lot of profit."

The United States needs better communications and relations between the Americans in the zone and the Panamanians, GONZALEZ said. Because many large vessels cannot negotiate the Panama Canal, the Congressman said, either a new sea level canal is needed wherever it is feasible from an engineering standpoint, or the present one should be enlarged.

But this is an engineering marvel, he said. "They even eliminated mosquitoes in the jungles. But 50 miles below there the mosquitoes eat you up." GONZALEZ added that the United States should develop a knack of anticipating trouble spots and not wait until something has happened such as the Panama riots.

GONZALEZ was the keynote speaker Saturday at the State convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Texas.

Title VI of H.R. 7152 Substitutes Legal Wrongs for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the Senate for several weeks has been considering H.R. 7152, the so-called civil rights bill. When the House passed this measure in February, I voted against it.

There can be no question that one of the most vexing problems facing the Nation is that of relations between races. There can also be no question but what persons of all races, and for that matter religions, creeds, and nationalities are entitled to true equality of citizenship. I believe deeply that this is a moral issue and that there can be no further delay in assuring this equality of citizenship. Why, then, did I vote against H.R. 7152?

This bill purports to assure equality, to guarantee each citizen his civil rights. Whetner it achieves these aims is certainly open to question. However, the bill does do other things, many of them contrary to the basic freedoms vouchsafed to us in the Constitution. It grants unprecedented new power with frightening potential to the growing Washington bureaucracy. As just one example of the possibilities hidden within H.R. 7152, I include a recent article by John C. Satterfield, past president, 1961–62, of the American Bar Association, which examines the pitfalls inherent in title VI of the bill, dealing with programs which receive Federal financial assistance.

There are those who argue that a civil rights bill—any bill—must be passed immediately. Thus they push for Senate passage of the House version of H.R. 7152 intact. It is my hope, and there now seems some assurance, that the Senate will not be stampeded into making such a mistake, but will instead make necessary changes so H.R. 7152 can truly become a measure which will guarantee equal civil rights for all Americans rather than perpetrating a new volume of Federal bureaucratic wrongs on the people of this Nation.

I would like to include with my remarks the previously mentioned article by Mr. Satterfield:

TITLE VI OF H.R. 7152 SUBSTITUTES LEGAL WRONGS FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By John C. Satterfield)

If a person were to seek the heart of the civil rights bill—which of its 10 titles is the most severe—a good choice would be title VI. The muscle embodied in it defies the imagination.

Consider it: On the surface it purports to state a propostion so fair and reasonable that no person would raise his voice against it. In substance, it—section 601—says no one shall be denied the benefits of any program receiving Federal financial assistance through discrimination because of race, color, or national origin. And then, section 602 says that every Federal agency which extends such assistance shall—the language is mandatory—shall take action to effecuate section 601.

It is as simple as that.

But look at it for a moment.

In the first place, there are a hundred or more primary Federal agencies "empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, contract, or loan"—that is the exact language of section 602. Then section 711(b) gives the President authority "to take such action as may be appropriate" to enforce the bill through everyone who has a contract with a Federal agency.

Take one such agency, banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The FDIC extends Federal financial assistance by virtue of the fact that it insures bank depositors against the bank's failure. Therefore, banks, which hold FDIC, FHA, SBA, and other Federal contracts become extenders of Federal financial assistance and, thus, enforcement agencies. And as such, by the language of the bill, they "shall" enforce the bill's provisions.

Now then. Let us say a bank customer covered by the bill proves to be a recalcitrant person, bound and determined in the time-honored way to hire and fire as he—and not the Government—sees fit.

But suppose the hiring policies he thinks are best for his business are different than those a Federal inspector thinks to be the law. And suppose it is a standoff, neither the businessman nor the inspector will budge.

Under the bill, the inspector has many recourses open to him; he could end by having the man enjoined and then jailed up to 45 days without a jury trial.. And once he gets out, the whole procedure can be repeated, ad infinitum. By this device the businessman can be clapped into jail for the rest of his life, 45 days at a stretch, without ever being able to obtain a trial by jury.

But suppose the inspector doesn't want to get as tough as he might, so soon. Suppose he prefers first to use what would be, relatively speaking, gentle persuasion. Suppose, instead of hauling the recalcitrant before a Federal judge, there to have him ordered to comply, suppose, instead, he goes to the man's banker. And once in the office of that gentleman, suppose the inspector puts sections 602 and 711(b) of the civil rights bill under the banker's nose and points to the word "shall," that the banker, as an extender of Federal financial assistance, shall take action to effectuate the law.

And the banker asks what does that mean.

And the Federal inspector says it means, among other things, you must cut off your customer's credit.

And suppose, in turn, the banker becomes recalcitrant, protests that this businessman has been his customer, and a good customer, for 30 years.

What then?

Then the inspector would have the authority, under the same regulations and Executive orders authorized by the bill to tell the banker that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will strike his bank from its membership, or the FHA or SBA will blacklist his bank, depending on the program involved.

The banker, above all people, knows he cannot, without undue hardship, operate his bank without FDIC, not with every other bank in town carrying it, nor compete with other banks when they carry FHA, GI, or SBA loans, and he has been blacklisted.

What does he do? He knuckles under, withdraws credit from his customer and thus forces the customer to yield as he has yielded.

Concededly, this is an extreme case. But it is extreme only in that it is improbable either the businessman or the banker could stand so long against the arbitrary force of bureacracy. Extreme or otherwise, it is the law—or it will be if the civil rights bill now pending is passed and signed.

It may be people want this sort of thing. If they don't, they had better write to those who represent them in Congress, their two Senators and their Congressman, and tell them so, before it is too late. The bill is moving.

A Letter From Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic earthquake in the State of Alaska has concerned us all, and I know the sympathies of every Member of this House go out to the families and individuals involved.

Mr. and Mrs. D. E. Parham, residents of my Los Angeles district, have been kind enough to send me a copy of a letter from friends in Alaska describing in a most graphic way how this earthquake was felt and experienced by the people at the scene.

I believe this letter will be of interest to all my colleagues, and perhaps gives a foretaste of what we can expect in the event of a nuclear attack. In addition, this letter dramatizes the need for all possible aid to the State of Alaska. We have made a good beginning in this direction, but more can be done and must be done. Mr. Speaker, I will let this letter from Alaska speak for itself, and I introduce it at this time.

The letter follows:

APRIL 23, 1964.

DEAREST FRIENDS: Your loving concern for Ed and me is deeply appreciated. Your note meant so very much. We are both all right and well. It has been an awesome experience. More than 3 weeks after the Good Friday earthquake it still seems almost im-

possible that such a thing really took place—until one sees the worst damaged areas—then one knows for certain. The April 10 issue of Life magazine had very good picture coverage of some of it.

The quake happened so suddenly that there was absolutely no panic nor hysteria. Everyone seemed to react quickly and in amazing ways. But the days following have been hard on people. Since then the aftershocks go on, and on, and on, and on. At first more than 180 large ones were recorded in each 24-hour period. Yesterday's paper said it was one of the quietest days since, with only 54 aftershocks recorded on the Fairbanks seismograph. Those are the ones large enough to record on the machine. The earth seems never to be still; it is like living on a bowl of jelly. My stomach tightens or churns with each lurch or roll of the building or ground. It is awful not knowing when the next one will come, or how big it will be, etc. When the tremor begins, one just waits to see is it going to grow bigger—or die away. Last Monday we had a heavy one at about 2 a.m., another about 6 a.m., and one at 7 p.m. while we were in the midst of eating dinner. I could just kill that Ed at times, after the first early morning one he was snoring again a few minutes later while I lay there and stiffened with each roll of the building. At dinnertime he casually got up and went out to the kitchen to refill his dinner plate even before the shuddering ceased, said he couldn't let good food go to waste. He doesn't fool me, though, he doesn't like me out of his sight for long; yesterday morning there was another heavy one about 4 a.m. and he sat on the edge of the bed chain-smoking four cigarettes before he got back under the covers.

Our good old Hohn apartments building has ridden out the quake beautifully, one of the few places in Anchorage left seemingly intact. A few cracks in the plaster here and there, but no structural damage that I know of. The Mount McKinley and L Street buildings are terrible. Probably the former will be demolished entirely. There is talk that they can repair the L Street. Corps of Engineers is in charge of all public works and restoration projects. Today they begin razing every building on the north side of Fourth Avenue between A and E Streets. That area sank completely. The marque of the Denali Theater was below ground level. The city had been in dire need of more off-street parking; they have it now, acres of it. All the area that was below Fourth, down in the parking bowl near the Westward Hotel and the Gilded Cage and the depot—it is good for nothing but parks and maybe limited parking space. The business district will of necessity be laid from Fifth up to the parkstrip at Ninth. All the homes behind old Providence Hospital are gone, the west end of the parkstrip fell in, etc. You would have to see it to really comprehend the magnitude of the thing. The Turnagain area is a shambles. Atwoods home, Bob Bakers, and all those on the edge of that bluff either went down and out into Cook Inlet or fell into the great fissures that opened and swallowed them. Ninety houses have been posted as condemned in that area; others appear as bad but are not in the slippage area that is worst right now. With the constant moving of the earth, however, houses that were usable one day are in trouble the next. By actual instrument measurement, the area between Fifth and I Streets and Fifth and L (two blocks) has lengthened 17 feet.

I mailed you one of the Anchorage Times special quake editions. It has lots of pictures and articles you will find of interest. Pics aren't too clear but give an overall idea. We naturally are concerned with the area in which we live, but all the other communities may have suffered as much if not even more than did Anchorage. Whittier lost all the Union Oil storage tank facilities in the fire that followed the tidal wave action. Seward is terrible; the railroad doesn't know if it will rebuild its rails to Seward and that is one of their main livelihoods. Valdez, Kodiak, etc., all suffered most from the tidal wave that followed the quake. Native villages on the islands were wiped out and must be relocated elsewhere. The magnitude of what must be done to get the State back into gear is almost too much to comprehend. And the total population of Alaska is less than that of Tacoma, Wash. Right now the State needs all the Federal aid in the way of huge grants with no strings attached that it can get. These people can't do it alone. Even so, Federal aid cares for public works needs. What is to become of the private individual who had a 30-year mortgage on a house which is now only a hole in the ground or a mess of rubble? Must he continue paying for something he will never have? His business very likely went the same way, or he is unemployed after the quake. What does he do? How does he pay bills—or even just feed and clothe his family? Joint disaster committees, city council, and similar groups are working around the clock on such problems. It is going to require much wisdom to make decisions that are hard and may have to hurt many to save others. Time will tell.

I had left the library at Fort Richardson about 5:20 on Good Friday. I was driving through Mountain View when the car suddenly began shaking and my first thought was I had a flat tire. I pulled over to the side, but the car shook more; I turned off the ignition, and then it really began to rock, just like a boat. At once I knew it was a tremor, but didn't realize how bad until much later. Men came running out of buildings nearby, cars were rolling and rocking, chimneys falling, but after an eternity it slowly ceased. I drove on finally, and it was not till I reached Fifth Avenue at Merrilly Field and saw the partially completed Alaska Sales & Service Building collapsed like a deck of playing cards that I began to wonder. I made it home; the apartment was an utter shambles of everything on the floor, every cabinet and drawer in the kitchen open, the refrigerator moved itself 3 feet across the floor, etc. Took one look and left. Then I tried to get down to the depot, for Ed was due in on a train from Whittier about 6:30. Already police and civil defense was in gear; no traffic could go beyond Fifth—I didn't know what had caved in till much later. Tried driving to the end of Ninth Avenue to see if the railroad tracks were intact—that area had caved in, too. I returned to the apartment, changed to slacks and warm clothes, gathered some blankets and oranges and went to sleep in the car parked out in the parkstrip. One of the neighbors came out and insisted I come into their house—they had the fireplace going and it was warm. They took in others, too. We melted snow and made some horrible instant coffee, but it tasted like ambrosia. We listened to our transistor radios until midnight as civil defense reports came through. I had no idea whether the train had been thrown into Cook Inlet or was safe. I knew it was somewhere on the track beyond Portage at 5 o'clock when I checked with the dispatcher before leaving work. About noon on Saturday word came on the radio that the passengers and crew of train No. 24 were safe at "Jolly-Vis" (later proved to be they made it to Mount Alyeska ski lodge). I breathed a prayer of thanks; didn't see Ed until 8 p.m. Saturday night when he walked in dirty and bedraggled but safe. Tried once to go back into the apartment about noon, but a strong aftershock made me change my mind, grab up a sack of knitting and go back to the neighbors for a spell. Later in the afternoon I did go back into the apartment building and start to clean the mess.

Electricity was restored to our part of the city about 2:30 Saturday afternoon. Thank goodness for the abundant supply of snow on hand. Everyone was out scooping up cans and buckets of snow to melt for water. Boiling it and adding a few drops of clorax made it usable. Takes a lot of snow for a small bit of water. Water came back late Sunday night, and our telephone was back Easter Sunday afternoon. We had no heat for a week, but it didn't grow too cold in the apartment house. Most everyone slept in his clothes the first few nights, and for 2 weeks after I had everything lined up right by the door where I could grab it on the way out if need arose.

Easter Sunday came and went like some eighth day in the week, strange and busy and not like a Sunday. After a bit of breakfast, Ed and I drove to a gas station that was functioning, filled the car, and then went in search of drinking water. People who had wells were announcing over the radio where water was to be had; we filled several containers at the Industrial Air Products plant on Gambel Street from a garden hose they had going to their artesian well. Then we came home, washed our faces with some snowwater, I exchanged slacks for a skirt, and we went to church to give deep and grateful thanks for our well-being. People went to church just as they were—and the closeness and the thankfulness of everyone was almost tangible. Friends greeted friends with "Are you all right? What can we do to help?" Some had been in their homes when they went over the bluff; others had been rescued from crevasses and dark holes in the earth; one woman had to be picked up by helicopter from her house; the ground was so demolished she couldn't go anywhere.

It was not till our phone rang about 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon that we knew it was working again. It proved to be my special services office at Fort Richardson saying the post library was condemned, and they had been working a crew of people all day to get it moved out and to another location. I hadn't given it much thought, for no mention was made of damage to the military bases * * * and there were other things on my mind up to then. Went to work Monday to find our entire building occupied by service club and library was a shambles. Walls had fallen in in the service club, killing a young soldier as he ran up the spiral stairs to get out of the quaking structure. These were cinder-block walls, all those that collapsed. You can imagine what 18,000 blocks on the floor look like, plus all the overhead neon light fixtures which fell, plus several of the big metal book stacks that caved in * * * but not a single window broke. It was a rough experience for our new assistant librarian who came there last September. She was on duty at the time of the quake; luckily it was supper time and only three or four people were in the library at that time. The soldier who was killed had evidently been in the gameroom next to the library, ran up the inside spiral steps and was hit by the walls of the service club office as they collapsed into that stair well. Building 1 and many of the troop barracks buildings suffered from internal walls collapsing also, all the same type of cinder-block construction.

When I reached work on Monday morning the library moving was well underway from Sunday's efforts. They had moved us into the exercise room of the fieldhouse which had suffered extensive damage to the gymnasium end and to the swimming pool. My assistant worked at one end of the line, I at the other, and the soldiers were great helpers. We lined stuff up on the floor in long rows as we unpacked any and all sizes of boxes loaded with books, and we opened for business Wednesday evening. (I had sworn I would never move that library again

after the November 1961 move, but this time was not exactly of my choosing. And we'll have to move again when the building is repaired and we go back into it.)

With no room for any study area, we boxed and stored all our reference books except one set of encyclopedias and a dictionary and almanac. Half the children's books went into storage as did all the Arctic materials, etc. We couldn't move our catalog but did get the shelf list and our two desks over, together with typewriters and some office supplies. So we are in business in a limited way * * * and have our own unique filing system. By now about three-fourths of the stuff is in alphabetical or numerical order again. At first it was lumped by A, B, C of the authors, or all the 100's, 300's etc. in one place. Patrons are real careful as they walk down the long rows, squatting on their heels to read titles staring up at them from the floor * * * makes me dizzy after so long.

The service club is operating temporarily in the basement of chapel 1. The crafts shops are back in operation in their regular place. It was touch and go for 2 weeks as to what the decision would be regarding usability of building 636 ever again. Every colonel who had a few spare minutes would wander through and give his learned opinion. One said he could see nothing wrong with it; the next one would say stay out—it was risking life and limb to go into the building, etc., etc. Corps of Engineers had teams, finally, that seemed to know what they were looking at and for. They feel structural damage is not enough to preclude using the building again. So the walls in the upstairs are all to be rebuilt strongly; after the service club moves back, the library will be the last to go back into the building* * * and that is just fine with all of us. I'm in no hurry to go back into that cracked-wall mess. The metal stacks have been hammered out and put back together and rebolted into the floor and walls. None of our furniture seemed to be hurt by falling books or stacks. And so it is with the library.

The train Ed was on had just pulled out of Girdwood when the quake hit. The engineer got the train stopped finally, with a snowslide in front of it, a rockslide in back. The men heard over their radio of the possibility of a tidal action and they (three passengers plus the traincrew) made it up to the road, commandeered a passing station wagon and went up to the ski lodge on Mount Alyeska. Here they waited until the waters had receded, then returned to the train. With little hand shovels they dug and dug to get the tracks cleared of snow, then inched the train on to Indian and the siding there. A work train was there and they gave the men a warm meal and bunks to sleep. A helicopter took the passengers off late Saturday and brought them on to Anchorage.

I could go on and on, for many pages more, of all that continues to happen. The newspaper articles in your part of the States won't carry details perhaps as do ours—and soon it won't be news, just the long hard pull back up for the entire State.

Seward and Valdez have been dreadfully damaged, mainly from tidal action and fire. The docks are gone, small boat harbors gone, the bottom seems to have dropped out of some of these harbors. Where Seward formerly measured 30 to 120 feet near the dock area, now 350 to 490 feet is the reading in the same area. The land mass is tilted at Cordova so much the razorback clam beds are ruined; at Kodiak and Whittier the land seems to have sunk some 5 to 8 feet. High tides last week had everyone guessing as to what further damage would be done. Portage is virtually gone; there is no road to Seward and no rail lines. The Kenai Peninsula is cut off for us except for air transportation. The Alaska Railroad worked crews around the clock and got a temporary rail laid into Whittier; then the high tides took the whole thing out and it had to be redone. The first train went down the other day. What usually is a 2-hour ride took 10 hours creeping down, 12 hours returning.

"People are pretty wonderful if you just will let them be so," has been proven without doubt during these past days. After determining the safety of their own loved ones, people pitched in and worked around the clock at any and all chores that needed doing. Civil Defense has functioned marvelously; there was no need for martial law at any time, civilian agencies proved most adequate. The military moved in and helped in all conceivable ways—hot food kitchens, water trucks, chemical toilets, flying thousands of pounds of supplies into devastated areas, etc. Warehouse space was made available for some of the large firms whose places in town were ruined—Fort Richardson found space; we later heard that every dollar from all the banks in town was rushed to Fort Rich and held in its vaults for a few days for safety. There were no runs on banks though extra dollars were brought in from outside; in fact people opened accounts on a noticeable increase * * * maybe bringing it out from under the old mattress hiding place. The teenagers proved to be veritable towers of strength, helping everywhere and thus letting off energy.

The 5040th Air Force Hospital had to be evacuated because of collapsed walls in parts; the new Providence Hospital took the shake fine and housed patients from the other areas. Businesses from the Fourth Avenue area that had to be abandoned are being relocated all over town in empty buildings * * * Penny's is opening in three different places—across from Don's Green Apple on Fifth, all of the former Federal Electric Buildings, etc.; Bagoy's is in a place on Seventh and D; Northern Commercial moved over to its former machinery area on Fifth Avenue; Mac's Photo is operating out of his old home on Seventh—so it goes.

How can friends in the other States help Alaskans recover from their earthquake losses? Our greatest need is an opportunity to carry on without a debt burden that is beyond the point of reasonableness. Only the Federal Government is in a position to help. It has been well suggested that Alaskans urge their friends outside to press their Senators and Congressmen for favorable action on legislation to provide Federal relief. It has been shown that Alaskans have the will, the enthusiasm, and the energy to restore the broken economy of the State and of themselves, but they need help; lots of it, and fast.

I must stop this somewhere or it will indeed become a tome. Please write again soon—mail means so very much now. (The blessed mail service began sending out mail the day after the quake, and mailmen began deliveries again on the next Monday.) We thank you for your love and interest in our welfare. We thank God with overflowing hearts for our safety.

Most lovingly,

GINI and ED.

Essay Contest in Celebration of Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Student Bar Association of Rutgers School of Law has shown unusual enterprise in sponsoring an essay contest among New Jersey high school students in celebration of Law Day.

This year the contest drew over 400 entries on the topic, "Observe the Law: Key to Order, Justice, Freedom." The first prize winner, Lawrence R. Spivack, of Elizabeth, N.J., a student at the Thomas Jefferson High School in Elizabeth, received a $75 U.S. savings bond. The second prize winner, Suzanne Cambre, of Chatham, N.J., a student at St. Elizabeth Academy in Convent, N.J., received a $50 U.S. savings bond. The third prize winner, Joseph Pietrzyk, of Manville, N.J., a student at the Manville High School, received a $25 U.S. savings bond.

The bonds were donated by public-spirited New Jersey businesses and were presented to the students at our annual Law Day luncheon on April 30 by Dr. Mason Gross, president of Rutgers University. In addition to the bonds, the top three winners, along with the honorable mention winners, will receive autographed copies of "Mandate for Change," by Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The judges were the Honorable William F. Smith, U.S. circuit court judge; the Honorable John J. Francis, associate justice, New Jersey Supreme Court; Dr. Kenneth E. Miller, chairman, Political Science Department, Rutgers, the State university, Newark, College of Arts and Sciences.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the three winning essays.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[First prize]

OBSERVE THE LAW: KEY TO ORDER, JUSTICE, FREEDOM

(By Lawrence R. Spivack, Thomas Jefferson High School, Elizabeth, N.J.)

The development of organized society may be viewed as the development of law itself. As a codification of the community standard of conduct, law, in a real sense, is society; for without such standards disintegration of the group is inevitable. Yet society matures, and so must its laws; few indeed are the absolutes of human activity. As a reflection of the social climate, law, far from being immutable, should be a dynamic factor changing with the needs of the group.

The concepts of order, justice, and freedom, represent significant developments in the evolution of a democratic society. This sequence is not consecutive but cumulative. The legal structure is based on order, but order alone is insufficient. Observance of the law in such a context is merely a necessity for living, and no more.

When the element of justice is added to the social equation, however, observance of law takes on new meaning. Justice resting on order provides for the equal imposition of legal sanctions. As such it elevates the law from an arbitrary regulative device to one which inspires broad confidence. Observance of the law then becomes a positive goal of the citizen, instead of merely a means to order in an autocratic society.

As the capstone of the legal structure, freedom is our most cherished right. It can only be attained when society is sufficiently developed to control itself by the implementation of order and justice. Ironically enough, every law deprives us of some freedom. Usually, however, the freedom which is lost is repugnant to the group in general. In taking away one's freedom to commit a

crime the law gives to the majority freedom from fear of that crime.

Thus, we are bound by order, justice, and freedom: links which elevate the social standards of society and render the individual's conduct in accordance with that which seems beneficial to all. This constitutes the observance of the law which perpetuates the democracy to which we subscribe.

[Second prize]

OBSERVE THE LAW; KEY TO ORDER, JUSTICE, AND FREEDOM

(By Suzanne Cambre, St. Elizabeth Academy Convent, New Jersey)

Law, the prevailing principle behind every good government and all individual relations, is the giant dike of the modern world, holding back the flood of chaos and destruction. Not to recognize the tremendous force that it is in the preservation of all our social and political ideals, is not only foolish, but dangerous as well.

Since the dawn of Creation, law and order have been irrevocably linked. Without one, the other can have no existence. All order depends on law, which, in turn, presupposes a plan. Every plan must have behind it a being possessing an intellect and free will. It was man who was endowed with these gifts by his Creator, and thus it is the responsibility of man to use these gifts fairly and impartially in making laws to govern himself and those under him. The man who disregards law and order relinquishes the intellectual property of his soul, reverting to the level of dumb animals, creatures of instinct and primitive desires.

Not only order but justice as well is dependent upon law. Every man has certain inalienable rights, gifts of God and guaranteed in our own Declaration of Independence, which, in justice, must be respected by others. To observe the law is to observe these rights in both a moral and social sense.

Civicly, law is the very backbone of the judicial system whose duty it is to mete out justice. Without a guide, such as the law, which is formulated for and by the governed, the legal branches of our society would have no means of preserving the ideals that we as Americans hold dear. The statue of unbiased justice weighs not only mercy on her scale, but the law as well. It is only in this way that she can arrive at a just decision.

All law is not perfect, indeed there are many that should be altered or repealed entirely, but without an established precept for all to follow, there could be no harmony, no justice, and no peace. Unchecked passions can only lead to the detriment of society and the human spirit.

The great statesman Daniel Webster once said, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." Today when liberty is becoming the battle cry of the millions of the world's oppressed, freedom and all it stands for has undergone a critical analysis. Unfortunately while in the process of analysis, Webster's words with regard to restraint have been pushed into the background or forgotten completely. Many do not realize that without a check on our own liberties, the rights of others would be encroached upon. A man who, feels it is a prohibition of his liberty to be subject to the mandates of the law, endangers not only his safety but the very freedom he cries for. We must all realize the need for certain curtailments in order to promote the welfare of all and the common good. The standard to be followed is one which everyone can understand and therefore obey, in other words, law, without which no man's integrity and inviolability are safe.

I feel that that the growing flame of crime and bigotry in the world is flamed by the total disregard for the rights of others, and the ignoring of the intrinsic dignity of man. This rate of infamy will undoubtedly continue to rise unless responsible citizens wake up to their duty to obey the law, and incorporate this respect in their children. The man who gets a ticket for doing 60 in a 25-mile zone, and then proceeds to decry loudly of the "injustice" of it, hardly sheds good example to those who look up to him. Nor do the so-called Americans, who preach, "Liberty and justice for all," and then proceed to scream curses at frightened Negro children trying to get a decent education at a white school, a school that their parents' taxes helped to build. We must all realize that law is not the infallible answer to the world's problems, the magic elixer for curing what ails you, but it is a workable guide, formulated by the heart's blood of honest men, and tried and tested through crisis and everyday experience. Law is flexible, it can be changed if the need arises, but it is up to interested citizens, who care enough to take a hand in the molding of the future, to take the initiative in making sure that all our laws are as just and unbiased as human fallibility can make them.

The key to the door of peace rests in the hands of people such as this—the leaders of today and the heirs of tomorrow. That key is the law. With it we can open the door to a better world, without it we may very well all perish in the frigid flood of our own laziness and indifference.

[Third prize]

OBSERVE THE LAW: KEY TO ORDER, JUSTICE, AND FREEDOM

(By Joseph Pietrzyk, Manville High School, Manville, N.J.)

When Robinson Crusoe lived alone on his island, he had no need for law. There was no one who could interfere with Crusoe's right to complete and unrestricted freedom of action. But as soon as Friday appeared on the scene all that was changed; a social relationship had to be established. There was a chance of conflict between Crusoe's rights and those of his servant. This necessitated the institution of law in order to preserve order, freedom, and justice.

The purpose of law is to define and make clear the relationship among individuals and between the individuals and society. Laws are usually developed from the customs of the people. This accounts for the variation of laws in different sections of the world and at different times in history. It is characteristic of society that what is done by the majority of the people in a given situation takes on the connotation of what ought to be done. Thus law is born.

At first glance, the negative nature of law appears to be its most paramount feature. One gets the impression that the basic purpose of law is to inhibit freedom. But upon closer inspection we find that laws actually preserve the backbone of freedom. For example, the Bill of Rights, part of the law of the land, guarantees our basic human freedoms. Law attempts to give each person as much liberty of action as deemed possible in accordance with the liberty of others. Law establishes the rules of the game: in its positive sense it guarantees you your freedoms; in its negative sense it restricts your interfering with the rights of others.

In spelling out the rules of the game, society creates order in what might otherwise be chaos. Because the rules of the game are created without reference to any specific individual, justice is preserved. Since we cannot all be, nor would we want to be, Crusoes living alone on an island, we cannot have unrestricted freedom of action. However, in defining the rules of the game, society guarantees each of us freedom from arbitrary restriction.

There is a sophism: "laws are made to be broken." Whether done intentionally or otherwise, when laws are broken, the smooth functioning of society is disrupted. No longer are life and property endangered only by accidents; now they become threatened by malicious design. Order becomes fear. The impartiality of society's laws is replaced by the highly selective and selfish whims of the armed bandits. Justice ceases to exist. To combat this evil in its midst, society's law enforcement agencies must assume greater-than-normal powers to restore order and justice. Hence, freedom gives way to varying degrees of martial law.

If this undesirable situation emerges when society's laws are broken, just imagine a world without laws. It would be a world in which brute force, cunning and treachery would be the primary prerequisites for survival. It is possible for man to survive in such a world, for man is part animal and animals abound in the jungle whose only law is survival. But does such a world give birth to man's higher nature; does it permit the emergence of a Michelangelo, a Shakespeare, a Bacon, or a Beethoven? Laws preserve order by laying basic foundations which prevent, to a great extent, irrational or undesirable acts. If laws cannot completely end crime, it can maintain enough order to make civilization possible. Without law, the civilized world as we know it would not exist. With law, civilization is not only possible, it is cherished and nurtured. Civilization in turn, because it needs them for its own advance, puts a priority on order, justice, and freedom. Hence, law, the guaranteer of order, justice, and freedom, is the key to maintaining a civilized world.

Pilgrimage to the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, every year hundreds of thousands of visitors pass through the Alamo, symbol of freedom in Texas.

The Alamo is more than an ancient church, mission fort, or battleground. It is a living symbol of courage and devotion to the ideals which we all hold dear.

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Burns recently led a pilgrimage of those who paid their respects to the heroes of the Alamo. His remarks remind us of what the Alamo was and what it is today and what it means to all of us.

It is proper and desirable we publish them here:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. ROBERT W. BURNS, COMMANDER, AIR TRAINING COMMAND, AT THE ALAMO PILGRIMAGE, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

We gather here today on this hallowed ground to pay tribute to those who gave their lives at the Alamo for the cause that makes men free.

Each man who died here had to ask himself at some point prior to that final battle, am I willing to fight and die for the independence and freedom I so fervently want? How that question was answered, by each of those men, is now recorded history for all future generations to know.

Other men in other places have had to answer that same question. I can but reflect upon the long, silent line of men who gave their lives for freedom before and after that great battle which took place upon the ground where we now stand.

Each of us here have had to, or will have to, answer the question. Are we prepared to die for the cause of freedom? If we fail to answer that challenge, then we have betrayed not only those who laid down their lives at the Alamo, but also the thousands

who have died since in the many battles throughout the world.

There are men at this moment answering the challenge to defend our freedom with their lives. They are prepared to stand and fight. They too have crossed the line drawn with sword in the sand and are ready to be counted among the brave when and if the time should come.

As we go forth with our everyday lives, let us honor those who died for us. However, at the same time, let us honor the living who are defending today our frontiers. These are the men in the swampy foxholes of Vietnam and wherever freedom's frontiers may be. They are the men who guard our country by land, sea, and air.

We live in precarious times. A goodly part of the world wants our way of life destroyed—to place us and our children in slavery. As long as such evil forces threaten our principles, free men and women, whether in or out of uniform, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be prepared to give their lives as the price for freedom. When free man runs away from having to pay that price, then he loses his freedom and becomes a slave.

Freedom is not an accepted way of life. It had to be fought for. After it was won, it has had to be guarded and protected. It will always have to be guarded and protected.

There were 186 men who died here to win freedom for their country, for their loved ones, and their descendants. Let us be willing to make such a sacrifice for our country, our loved ones, and our descendants.

Let not these men to have died in vain. Let us demonstrate to the world that the people of the United States of America and the great State of Texas will still defend our freedom and our way of life.

Address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew F. Quinn, Pastor of Sacred Heart Church, West New Brighton, Staten Island, at Dedication Ceremonies of the New Parish School and Rectory of St. Joseph Roman Catholic Church in Rosebank, Staten Island, N.Y., April 26, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 26, 1964, I had the pleasure and honor of participating in the solemn blessing and dedication of the new school and rectory of the Church of St. Joseph in Rosebank, Staten Island, N.Y.

His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman was the guest of honor and blessed the school and rectory. Rt. Rev. Msgr. John M. Villani, pastor of St. Joseph Church, welcomed the distinguished guests and members of the clergy and introduced Mr. Victor Morone, trustee, who gave an address on behalf of the trustees of the church.

The Honorable Albert Maniscalco, borough president of Staten Island, cited the great contribution to the city of the Catholic school system.

Choral selections were given under the direction of Mother Celestine, principal of St. Joseph School; Mrs. Agnes Morgan, music teacher; and Mrs. Josephine Tagliamonte, choir director.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the dedicatory address given by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew F. Quinn, pastor of Sacred Heart Church, West New Brighton, Staten Island:

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR ANDREW F. QUINN, PASTOR OF SACRED HEART CHURCH, WEST NEW BRIGHTON, STATEN ISLAND, AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE NEW PARISH SCHOOL AND RECTORY OF ST. JOSEPH'S R. C. CHURCH IN ROSEBANK, STATEN ISLAND, ON SUNDAY, APRIL 26, 1964

Your Eminence, Monsignor Villani, Mr. Borough President, my brother priests, dear sisters, distinguished guests, parishioners, and friends of St. Joseph's Parish, it is characteristic of His Eminence that despite the pressure and burden of a relentless schedule, and despite the great fatigue which such a schedule necessarily involves, he accepted, not only willingly, but with alacrity and joy, Monsignor Villani's eager invitation to dedicate this school.

You and I have assembled today to share in this dedication. An so it is fitting that we discuss, briefly, the reason which impelled you to build this school and the reason you send your children here to study.

Education, today, comprises a vast field. Some spheres of education are concerned almost exclusively with established facts. Other fields of education, besides being concerned with facts, are concerned to a great extent with theories and speculations suggested by those facts. Still other areas of education are concerned with events, frequently of the past, and these sciences not only ascertain the events, but they go beyond that, to interpret them, to discover their causes and effects, and on the basis of their conclusions, they chart courses of action for the future.

Hence, while the establishing of facts and the chronicling of events must, of necessity, comprise a large part of any education, it is equally clear that the interpretation we place on facts and events, the conclusions we draw from them and the theories we project from them—these too comprise a large and formidable part of education. Indeed, it is in this area, rather than in the area of naked fact, that the decisions are taken which most intimately and most profoundly affect our lives in politics, economics, law, labor, and other fields.

The ideas the student forms in this large judgmental area of education are greatly influenced and to a large extent even determined by the philosophy of life to which his school subscribes. An interesting illustration of the influence of philosophy on interpretation was afforded us a few years ago when the Russians propelled the first satellite into space. It was a stupendous scientific feat. Despite initial suspicion on the part of many, it soon became apparent that the fact of the Russian achievement was indisputable. One of their Commissars, I believe it was the Minister of Culture, speaking from the point of view of materialistic philosophy, declared that this triumph of Communist technology had annihilated the argument for the existence of God. Since man had placed a satellite in the heavens, it was so longer necessary to postulate the existence of God to explain the earth, the moon, the sun, and the stars.

We, looking at the same scientific fact, but viewing it with our philosophical background, would draw a very different conclusion. We would say that just as the Russian satellite would not be in orbit unless it had been put in orbit, so the great heavenly bodies would not be there unless they had been put there. We would say that just as the Russian satellite postulates a satellite-maker who was highly intelligent and who knew what he was doing, so the planets, which are far more complex, postulate a Maker who is highly intelligent and who has the power to thrust them into space and to send as many of them as He will coursing through the heavens. We are too scientific and too incredulous to believe you can have an effect without a proportionate cause.

We take it as beyond cavil, that in the fast judgmental area of education—an area which profoundly influences the lives of men—the thoughts of the students are largely determined by the philosophy of life professed by the school in which they are studying.

The phrase, "philosophy of life," is rather high sounding, but ultimately this term is reducible to our concepts of God and man. Now, there are two basic concepts of God and man which are struggling to win the allegiance of men's minds in the world today. One is the materialistic concept which finds its fullest and most logical expression in communism; the other, the religious concept. The Communist concept, as we said, is avowedly materialistic. It teaches that there is only matter and the derivatives of matter. There is no God. Man is an animal, albeit a highly evolved animal, but he is nothing more.

The religious concept, on the other hand, is avowedly spiritual. It says that besides matter and material forces there is vital spiritual reality, human and divine. There is a God. Man, it is true, is an animal, but an animal with a spiritual soul endowed with godlike gifts.

These two basic concepts of God and man have given rise to two broad philosophies or views of life. The Communist-materialist view teaches the child that man's origin is unknown; that he has no fixed, predetermined purpose here; that the major goal of his life must be productivity, primarily for the state, secondly for himself; that a subordinate goal in life is physical, intellectual, and cultural enjoyment, always subordinated, however, to the major goal of productivity for the state. The student is told by materialism that his ultimate destiny is oblivion—there is nothing beyond the grave.

The religious view of life, however, teaches the child that man has been created by God out of love; that because of this common paternity of God, all men are brothers; that man is in the world to know, love, and serve his Father who is in Heaven, and to know, love, and serve his brother on earth; that this dual service conspires to the goal of life, which is righteousness or virtue and it leads man to his destiny, which is Paradise.

Now these two philosophies, or views of life—the Communist-materialist and the religious—have each begotten a theory of education. The Communist theory holds that the paramount purposes of education is to take the individual and train him so that he will become the productive utensil of the state. The education of the citizen is to be planned and regimented so that when his training is over, he will fit, like a cogwheel in a machine, wherever the government wishes to place him. Finally, communism in implementing its philosophy of life and education, appeals for motivation to fear and hatred because these passions, inflammatory as they are—easily aroused, easily sustained and, what is most important, easily directed—are presumed to be the most effective sources of stimulation for an animal, even a highly evolved one.

The purpose of education in the religious conception finds its best generic expression in the words of Christ when he said: "I am

come that they may have life and have it more abundantly." Education should contribute to the fullness of life—spiritual life, moral life, intellectual life, cultural life, physical life, economic life, social life, political life. That is the great purpose of education: To bring man to the fullest abundance of life in all its aspects.

In between the two philosophies of education we have been considering—the materialistic and the religious—lies a third which we may call the secularist. It is the compromise system which predominates in our country. Although this system is strongly anti-Communist and although it gives a fine education as far as it goes, its contention is that education should neither affirm nor deny the existence of God and the spirituality of the soul. Education should prescind from these matters and confine itself to the academic training of the student.

Now, the reason you have built this school and are sending your children here to study is because you are convinced that in the face of the widespread materialism of our day, academic training, highly important though it is, is not enough. Academic training is only a part of life's story; you feel that the student should be given the whole story; he should learn of his origin, his nature, his purpose, his ultimate goal. In a word, he should be given a philosophy of life as well as an academic training. Basically, therefore, you have erected this building and your children are studying here because this school is committed to the Christian philosophy of life and it is staffed by qualified, devoted teachers who have sound religious convictions.

What does this commitment to the Christian philosophy of life mean in concrete terms? It means that the child who comes here for education is received and treated as a child of God. He is imbued with a sense of his dignity and value. He is taught that as a child of God, he is endowed with intellect and free will, and that in virtue of these gifts he is responsible for his actions. He is taught, in the parable of the talents, that he must strive to develop himself and to make the fullest use of his abilities in the service of God and his fellow man.

He is taught the true meaning of noblesse oblige: that as a child of God he is committed to truth, honor, justice, and charity. He is told that in virtue of this commitment which obliges him, he has certain inalienable rights. It is interesting to note, in passing, that many people who deny or disregard the existence of God, nevertheless lay great stress upon inalienable rights not realizing how meaningless these unsupported words are. For if there be no God, then, despite the subterfuge of "social contract" and kindred theories, the state is ultimately the source of our rights. And what the state has given, the State can take away. Thus, the concept of inalienable rights on which so much of our American way of life is built, is meaningful only in the hypothesis of a God whose authority and whose gift even the State must respect. Our student is taught that he cannot make capricious use of these inalienable rights, that they are steppingstones to the fulfillment of his obligations.

To imbue a student with a sense of his dignity and to unfold for him the purpose of life and his final destiny is to give him a sense of direction in the world—something which is lacking in much of education today. Some of our educators have to travel a road to its very end before they recognize where it is leading. Our time needs educators with a sense of direction—men who know what the starting point is and who know where they are supposed to be going so that they can recognize where a trend is leading before they have led their following far afield. This sense of direction Catholic education strives to impart.

Education should give a person a sense of values; it should teach him that there is a hierarchy of worth in life and that the less valuable must yield to the more valuable. From the time we ask the child in catechism, "Of which must I take more care, my body or my soul?" we begin to inculcate that hierarchy of values. When the child looks up and sees the crucifix on the wall, he learns the lessons of magnanimity and forgiveness. "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." "Unless you forgive each one of you your brother from your hearts, your Heavenly Father will not forgive you."

Education should provide a student with a gage of success and failure. It should let him know that when life is over the great question will be, not "How much did you make?" "What did you take out of life?" "What did you give?" "What contribution have you made?" In this regard, our students hear the words of St. John which we repeat daily in the mass, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, and the Son so loved us that he gave himself for our redemption." Giving is the Christian gage of success or failure—not taking. Education should supply a student with motivation. Our students hear the words of their Divine Teacher telling them that one day an account will be required of them. They hear Him say further: "To whom much is given, of him much will be required." They come to understand that in studies and in life the standard should be "the best will do."

Education should give a student unfaltering devotion to truth. Our students see their Divine Teacher in the supreme hour of His life as He stood before the Prince of this world. Just a little deviation from the truth could have saved His life. And yet, our students hear Him say: "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world, that I should give testimony to the truth." And He paid for His testimony with His life.

Education should develop in the student an awareness of his position as a citizen, a knowledge of his obligations to the community, a sense of loyalty and devotion to his country. We are proud that in our country a Catholic education is considered by many to be prima facie evidence of unquestioned loyalty.

Education should impress upon the student the importance and the consequence of decision. If life were merely an aimless stroll, it would not matter much what path we chose; but if life is a purposeful journey, and if we are to arrive at a definite destination, then the choice of paths is all important. We must have a sense of urgency about life for life is short and there is much work to be done. Our Divine Teacher tells us that we should work while yet there is day, for soon the night will come when no man can work.

Finally, and importantly, education should be sufficiently liberal to develop the esthetic and cultural faculties of man so that he can derive pleasure and satisfaction from life. Our educational system makes ample allowance for pleasure, enjoyment and satisfaction. Much of our satisfaction in life is the fruit of toil; the rest of it, the blossom of pleasure. Both of these satisfactions are good and both are emphasized in our education. However, we also make it clear that the satisfactions and joys of life are like refreshment and rest on a journey—they are placed there to solace and encourage us on our way; we are not supposed to settle down and make them the central object of our lives.

This, in brief, is the Christian philosophy of life. It is because devoted nuns and layteachers couple this philosophy of life with academic excellence that you have built this school and are sending your children here to study.

International Law Book Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest programs to further human relations and understanding being operated today is the International Law Book Exchange. The director of the exchange, Carl A. Durkee, of Pikesville, Md., deserves a great deal of credit for his efforts and contributions to this worthy cause.

I commend to my colleagues the following article by Carl A. Durkee from the American Bar Association Journal describing the work and activities of the International Law Book Exchange:

THE INTERNATIONAL LAW BOOK EXCHANGE

(By Carl A. Durkee, of the Maryland Bar (Pikesville))

In the October 1962, issue of the American Bar Association Journal, Justice William O. Douglas wrote, "As I have traveled the farthest reaches of the world, I have found practically no libraries of legal and political literature from which the new leaders could understand how to design a free society. In the northern region of Nigeria, for instance, the court has relied on U.S. Supreme Court cases—but the source of information had to be excerpts from American law in 'Basu's Commentary upon the Constitution of India.' "

A Pikesville, Md., lawyer read this. He knew, as most lawyers know, that thousands of volumes of law books are discarded in the United States each year. It seemed that they could fill the great need recognized by Justice Douglas.

The Pikesville, Md., Lions Club agreed to operate a program for the collection and distribution of these books and the international law book exchange was created. The members went to work. One made available a warehouse to collect, store, and inventory the books. Another agreed to be responsible for collections. One of the lawyers in the club agreed to act as liaison with the local bar association. Funds were appropriated. As each task presented itself, someone interested in the program whose business or profession qualified him to handle it pitched in. Stationery, printing, and duplicating were handled by a member in the printing business.

Justice Douglas agreed to lend his support by acting as honorary chairman of the program. Other leaders of the bench and bar as well as religious leaders joined the effort.

Letters were sent to law book publishers, lawyers, and law libraries to locate books. Members met with many people who might be interested in obtaining books or in helping the program.

It was felt that foreign missions and worldwide mission organizations would be helpful in locating schools, governments, and students that could use books. Today, with the help of the book program, the Church Periodical Club of the Diocese of Maryland and a lawbook publisher, St. Paul's University of Tokyo has a complete set of American Jurisprudence, as well as a complete set of U.S. Supreme Court Reports and a U.S. Digest.

Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, has recognized the need for such a program. In the American Bar Asso-

ciation Journal (May 1963, p. 456) he quoted James Paul of the University of Pennsylvania Law School who noted, "There are very few lawbooks in the West [of Africa]. If the common law is to survive, help must be forthcoming, quickly, to give law and the profession a foothold."

The Committee on American Citizenship of the American Bar Association has expressed a willingness to cooperate with the program. Pamphlet copies of "Sources of Our Liberties," have been sent to schools, government agencies and student in Korea, Taiwan, Japan, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Ethiopia, Nyasaland, the Philippines, Nigeria, and Tanganyika.

Pan-American World Airways is cooperating with the program in distributing the books. A number of law libraries and lawbook publishers are cooperating.

Legal periodicals, appellate decisions (all courts, sets, volumes, or advance sheets), legal encyclopedias, textbooks, casebooks, dictionaries, and any other books on law and government are all useful. The greatest demand has been for U.S. Supreme Court Reports, legal encyclopedias, casebooks of the kind used in law school, back issues of the American Bar Association Journal and certain law reviews. Recipients who have required specific books or sets have been the easiest to help.

Due to the available warehousing and clerical facilities, parts of sets are perfectly acceptable. Older books such as "Corpus Juris" and "Ruling Case Law" have great value to students interested in the basis of Anglo-American jurisprudence.

Any group or individuals that have books or want to help may write to the International Lawbook Exchange, 900 Reisterstown Road, Pikesville, Md. The same is true of any persons or groups that need books.

Remarks of Hon. Frank M. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Before the Second International Road Federation Pacific Regional Conference, Tokyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, together with three other members of the House Public Works Committee, it was my distinct privilege and honor to represent the United States at the Second International Road Federation Pacific Regional Conference at Tokyo, Japan.

This international Conference was held between the dates of April 16 and 26 and was attended by almost 900 delegates representing 34 nations.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, Democrat, was one of the featured speakers at the opening session, and did a magnificent job in expressing the point of view of the U.S. Government, as seen through the eyes of a member of a committee of Congress charged with the responsibility of shaping our Nation's road programs.

I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD the speech delivered by our distinguished colleague:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK M. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. CONGRESS, AT THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL ROAD FEDERATION PACIFIC REGIONAL CONFERENCE, TOKYO

It is a genuine pleasure to address this distinguished group, convened here from the four corners of the world to discuss highways and highway transport. We who are so closely involved with road problems in the United States sometimes tend toward myopia; we are so engrossed with trying to meet the ever-mounting traffic requirements within our own borders that we fail to give due recognition to the struggles going on in other countries to solve the same problems.

We sometimes forget, in fact, that the 3.5 million miles of roads and streets in the United States are actually part of a global transportation network that is no stronger than its weakest link. I believe the world and regional meetings sponsored by the International Road Federation are valuable in strengthening this concept of a global transportation system, geared to present and future needs. It is only through the interchange of ideas, face to face, among the highway experts of the world, that we make progress toward solving our mutual problems.

So I appreciate this opportunity to make a small contribution to this Conference from the point of view of a U.S. Congressman who has responsibilities for the progress and conduct of the highway program in my country. As most of you know, the core of our present program is the National System of Interstate Highways, a 41,000-mile network of modern, limited access highways, crisscrossing our country from coast to coast and border to border. Work on the Interstate System began in earnest in 1956 and we expect to have it completed in 1972.

As of now we have about 17,000 miles of this system open to traffic and another 5,000 miles are under construction. This progress has been accomplished since 1956 when Congress authorized the expansion and acceleration of the various Federal-State highway programs. During the same period work has been completed on more than 166,000 miles of highways not on the Interstate System.

Capital expenditures for roads in the United States this year will exceed $8 billion for the first time in history. This compares with about $7.83 billion in 1963—and $4.3 billion in 1955. The portion contributed by the Federal Government has risen from some $700 million in 1955 to the neighborhood of $3.6 billion in 1964.

These figures give some indication of the progress we are making toward providing a road network attuned to the needs of a dynamically expanding population and one that is gravitating more and more toward our urban centers. The Congress has given us reasonable assurance that roadbuilding activity in the United States will continue at the same high level for the next 8 years. But there is presently no assurance for the years after 1972.

For that reason a great deal of expert thinking, in and out of Congress, is being directed to the question: "After 1972, What?" Such thinking is by no means premature. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which set the present program in motion, had its roots in studies dating back to 1938—and a lot of discussions even before then.

The concern is of two kinds. First there is the concern about the severe effect on the economy if the current level of highway activity were sharply curtailed.

By 1972 there will have been a steady flow of Federal interstate money for 15 years averaging $2.5 billion a year. In terms of employment alone, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads calculates that highway construction by all levels of government will provide jobs for 870,000 workers this year. Contractors will employ 370,000 of these on road and bridge construction and another 500,000 workers will be employed off the site in the production of materials and equipment and other indirect employment resulting from the highway program. Obviously then, to cut off or sharply reduce the program after 1972 would cause tremendous economic dislocations.

Of even greater importance, though, is the need to plan for the future transportation requirements of our citizens. Today, we have 82 million motor vehicles on our roads and streets and this number will rise to more than 110 million in 1972. I spoke earlier of the increasing urbanization of our population. And at the risk of boring this audience with statistics, let me cite another one or two. While the total mileage of roads and streets in the United States rose only eight-tenths of 1 percent from 1956 to 1962, the municipal mileage increased an average of 3 percent a year throughout the period.

These were some of the consiedrations that led my colleague, Representative GEORGE M. FALLON, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Roads, to come to grips with the problem. He has introduced in the Congress a bill providing for a comprehensive survey of highway needs after 1972. The study will be made by the Secretary of Commerce with the cooperation of the 50 State highway departments. A report will be made to the Congress in 1967 so that planning can begin early for the post-1972 program.

The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, an agency of the Department of Commerce, is already at work on the study and the head on the Bureau, Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton, has said:

"The underlying problem, as I see it, will be to forecast our long-range transportation needs, which means, first, forecasting future growth and changes of our population and economy, both in size and nature.

"We will have to examine the possibilities of change in transportation itself, through both technology and public desires, and considering both mass and individual transport of persons and goods."

The areas of investigation are many. The study will consider whether the Interstate System—now limited by law to 41,000 miles—should be expanded; whether the present 90 percent Federal contribution to the cost should be continued after 1972 or reduced; whether new and special provision should be made for urban roads and streets; what to do about some 2,300 miles of toll roads incorporated into a system otherwise free of tolls.

These are some of the questions that the study will seek to answer. So today, and in the months and years ahead, we're approaching another crossroads in the long history of the Federal aid highway program in the United States. This program is the product of a unique Federal-State partnership which began in 1916 and we hope will continue for many years to come.

I am confident that the highway administrators will accurately define the problems as they will exist after 1972. Then it will be up to the legislators to provide sound and equitable financing to see the program through. Those of us who are responsible for this aspect of the program no longer look upon transportation as a national problem but one having global significance.

Big Government Wins—Small Boy Loses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, far too often some little-known Government regulation emerges to alert us of ever-present Federal regimentation and control.

A graphic example is described in an excellent editorial which appeared in the April 25, Lyons Daily News, in my congressional district. I insert the editorial so my colleagues may be aware of a ridiculous regulation which deprived an 8-year-old boy of an opportunity to earn money, practice thrift, and learn responsibility:

GOVERNMENT KILLS LYONS BUSINESS

Our Federal Government, which spends millions of dollars each year investigating and prosecuting monopolists in the business world, has conferred upon itself a monopoly which has thrown out of business one of Lyons' newest, and youngest, businessmen.

Eight-year-old Mark Hannah, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dan Hannah, recently began delivering statements at the end of the month, from the News to other firms in the business district. Then, several days later, he would deliver checks from the publishing company for its month's bills. He was paid 3 cents for each piece, which meant several dollars each month for him, and a savings of a couple of dollars for the firm.

Several dollars is a lot of money for an 8-year-old, but the job was more than that. It taught Mark responsibility, and he is the type of boy who proves to his elders he can handle the responsibility they show in him.

The little business had just gotten through its "shakedown cruise" (and a local florist had given Mark a potted plant, as it does all new businesses in town) when it was pointed out (by a person not connected with the postal department) that such delivery was in violation of postal regulations.

Because this seemed ridiculous, a check was made with the General Counsel of the Post Office Department in Washington. Sure enough, a boy cannot be hired to do such delivery work for a firm, unless he is a regular employee of that firm.

The department acknowledges the fact the regulation is not strictly enforced. And, the General Counsel said that he delivered such statements and bills when he was a lad, and would have been pretty burned up over having someone stop him from earning a little extra money every now and then.

We suppose we could have Mark continue and if anyone raised the point, we could say he was a regular employee. But, that would be bending the law, and that is a pretty poor policy to be teaching an 8-year-old boy in his first business venture.

We firmly believe that youngsters who learn the value of responsibility and business sense at an early age will reap harvests from it throughout his life. Now we find that a Government regulation—not strictly enforced, evidently, but still a regulation—prevents such teachings in at least one regard; and does it strictly so the Government can have a monopoly for its business, although it feel monopolies of private businesses are wrong.

It becomes quite evident why the Government thinks monopolies are wrong—P.E.J.

Practical Politics—An Elective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be an appropriate time to take a look at what one company is doing to further its employees' interest in the selection of their elected officials.

About 6 years ago, Aerojet-General Corp., inspired by its board chairman, Dan A. Kimball, a Democrat, initiated a good citizenship program for its employees. Mr. W. E. Zisch, president of the company and a Republican, thought it an excellent idea from then on each election year has seen this company investing money and time to train its workers for political action. Zisch states:

Good citizenship begins when all of us are ready as individuals to back our favorites with our money as well as our votes.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Miami Herald recently and which points up the effective job being done at Aerojet-General:

PRACTICAL POLITICS—AN ELECTIVE

Money for political campaigns is unlike the weather in one way. Nearly everybody complains about it, but at least half a million Americans are doing something about it.

The 500,000 are workers trained in practical politics during the past 5 or 6 years through courses provided by their employers. The popularity of the nonpartisan program among employees was reported last month to businessmen attending the National Association of Manufacturers' Institute on Industrial Relations at Hollywood, Fla.

Why should companies invest time and money to train their workers for political action? The answer comes from W. E. Zisch, president of Aerojet-General, which pioneered in the field 6 years ago: "Good citizenship begins when all of us are ready as individuals to back our favorites with our money as well as our votes. Individual responsibility is the basis of success in civic affairs as in any other cooperative endeavor."

Aerojet-General has launched its fourth good citizenship program in preparation for this year's national political campaign. The need is described by Aerojet's board chairman, Dan A. Kimball, a Democrat, who sold the idea to Zisch, a Republican, and other company chiefs in 1958.

"About $20 million will be needed for the 1964 presidential campaign," says Mr. Kimball. "And close to 10 times that amount will be needed for all candidates, local, State and congressional. The broader the basis of giving, the less the chance for big contributors to inordinately influence the choice of the electorate."

The response of Aerojet's employees, who numbered more than 33,000 during the 1962 campaign, shows what can be done. More than 24,000 of them contributed an average of $4 each to the party or candidates of their choice that year.

Four dollars is a sum within the reach of most workers, yet the total contributed by Aerojet employees reached an impressive $97,000. It was a sharp increase over the $25,000 which they invested in political campaigns in 1958 and their $60,000 in 1960.

In addition, Aerojet employees swelled the ranks of "new voters" by registering at the rate of 2,000 in 1958 and 5,000 each in 1960 and 1962.

Aerojet's program is run by volunteer committees—one Democratic, one Republican. They hold after-hours rallies in company cafeterias during each campaign. Some work at local party headquarters in their home communities. Others serve as precinct captains. A few run as candidates for minor offices.

Aerojet's role is to stimulate nonpartisan interest in the elections through publicity on bulletin boards and in employee publications. Starting in 1960, the company offered a payroll deduction system to encourage donations to political campaigns. The accounting costs have been ruled tax-deductible by the Internal Revenue Service.

If Mr. Kimball's figures are correct, U.S. politics this year will be a $220 million business. Aerojet and companies with similar programs are demonstrating how these millions can be raised in a way that promises to revivify and purify American politics.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], recently introduced a resolution in the House offering congratulations and gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover on the 40th anniversary of his appointment as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The 40th anniversary date of his appointment is May 10, 1964, and the thoughtful resolution of our colleague thanks him for his years of devoted service and expresses the hope that he will continue in his present office for many years to come.

I would like to join in this resolution honoring this great man.

Just as Chief Justice John Marshall is credited with adding flesh to the skeleton of the Constitution of our new Nation during his 34 years incumbency in the Supreme Court, so we can also say of J. Edgar Hoover that he organized and developed the FBI to a new concept of law enforcement. He brought forth and matured an organization the like of which has no comparison in history, either here or abroad. Down through the years, and particularly in the early years, it was sorely needed to combat crime, anarchy, and even the sought after destruction of our Government and our way of life. Yet at all times in his fight against crime the rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution were protected and watched over.

One can imagine what this man went through in the strife-torn and formative days of the twenties—the pressures, the emergencies, and the heart-rendering decisions which he had to make. If his concept of law and order was to prevail, then his actions became inevitable and

he did not shrink from them. But J. Edgar Hoover was a strong man, his sense of duty unshakable. It would have been only too easy for him to procrastinate, to drift, and to indulge in wishful thinking. It must have been a tremendous temptation to "leave well enough alone," but he saw the future of this great country threatened by nationwide crime syndicates and Communist infiltration, and he did not cease his struggle toward developing an organization which could meet every and any emergency that sought to destroy our system of government by law and our national respect for law and order.

It is indeed fitting, therefore, that we honor this great man and the organization which he heads, and it gives me great pleasure to note in passing that when Mr. Hoover was appointed Acting Director by Attorney General Harlan F. Stone on May 10, 1924, under President Calvin Coolidge that his private secretary then and now is Miss Helen Gandy, a native of Cumberland County, a graduate of Bridgeton High School in my Second District of New Jersey, and the descendant of a fine old south Jersey family. I extend to her my congratulation on her lifetime devotion and service to our Nation as the secretary to Mr. Hoover.

J. Edgar Hoover has served under 6 Presidents and 13 Attorneys General, which is in itself a record in Federal service, and I am happy to know that the present reports are that President Johnson is not going to let this public servant retire come next January 1, but intends to waive the retirement rule to allow Mr. Hoover to remain on the job. This is one light that President Johnson is not going to put out.

Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Angie Bass, of Carthage, Mo., has written a poem expressing her views about the "creeping menace of atheism that endangers this great and wonderful land of ours." At a time when the Supreme Court prayer decision is a matter of great public interest, I believe it appropriate to share her poem with you:

"In God We Trust," our coins all say;
But I wonder how soon will come the day
When they'll be discarded for ones quite new,
That hold the atheist's point of view.

The American eagle will vanish too;
For it represents the brave and true
Who founded our country—who fought for right,
With honor and courage, and faith, and might.

The atheist's view welds a message of wrong,
That batters the weak, and makes fools of the strong;
Pounds away at our rights, and chides men who pray;
Engulfing the world with its power today,
A battle of wits is taking place;
And sooner or later we'll have to face
The grim, bare facts that confront you and me—
Thrusts that are threatening our liberty.

Put prayer back in schools, where it rightly belongs;
Speak out unafraid, in sermon and song,
Lest the things that we stand for be discarded for new,
That reflect the atheist's point of view.

—ANGIE BASS.

CARTHAGE, MO.

The War Against Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 6 brings into clear view what is at the bottom of all the sound and fury about prayers in our public schools.

This matter is just a bubble in the ocean. As the editorial title clearly states, this is indeed "The war against religion." Yes, indeed, that war goes on relentlessly, and in our time, with considerable success. But, as the article so clearly says:

The furor need not have arisen at all, had not reason fled the forum.

The article in its entirety follows:

THE WAR AGAINST RELIGION

What is the place, if any, of religion in the public schools?

Contrary to some prevalent views, we think it self-evident that it has a place and an important one. Yet much of the discussion, both for and against, turns on issues that are secondary and even trivial.

Religion has a place in education because it is an integral part of the life of man. No one, whether he professes a religion or not, whether he considers himself an agnostic or an atheist, can escape its presence. It is all about us, in the material as well as the spiritual world.

One of the great streams from which our culture flows is, as Matthew Arnold long ago observed, Hellenism, the legacy of Greece; the other Hebraism, the Judeo-Christian tradition. Over the centuries the two have intertwined and fed on each other and enriched the life of the mind of Western man.

The Judeo-Christian concept gave us not only one of the world's most majestic literary works but a whole torrent of additional poetry and art and architecture. It is more than the direct inspiration in the holy sonnets of Donne or Hopkins or the Pieta of Michelangelo; it is also the implicit fabric of almost all art that is recognizable as such.

For it is the same concept, with its significant Hellenistic heritage which fashions our society, informs our relations with other men and provides us with the philosophical view of the universe that makes it possible to live on a higher plane than the beasts. Even the secular philosophy of humanism is Aristotelian-Christian without the supernatural edifice.

Not to teach the Bible, directly or derivatively; not to teach about religion—this attitude is a silly attempt to escape reality and is in fact all but impossible if teaching is to mean anything. How can anyone presume to teach history or art or philosophy or economics or government without reference to the religious underpinning of it all?

The men who formed our Nation understood the reality well enough. Unlike some people today, they were not seeking to drive religion out of the schools or other structures of society. They were only concerned that no denomination become established as a state religion. They proscribed it and no one is attempting to do any such thing.

Since that is the real as opposed to the imagined situation, the controversy often seems tangential at best. Just how tangential can be seen in Congress, where the Members scratch their heads in a laborious effort to determine what sort of school prayers might be permissible. To use a religious allusion, it is a bit like the famed argument concerning the number of angels that can dance on a pin.

We think the local authorities should be able to decide whether they want prayers; if they do, it's not going to hurt anybody so long as there is no compulsion and no attempt to indoctrinate in a particular creed. But the issue, of course, is much broader than prayers. There is a push to eradicate all traces of religion from all public life, even to the barring of any Christmas observances in schools and communities.

This undertaking would be pitiable if it were not rather formidable. It represents, we suppose, not so much an attack on religion as a hopeless misunderstanding of our culture. Certainly it is the wildest kind of discrimination, not least against the children it would deprive of pleasure and spiritual profit.

The prevalence of such views must reflect something peculiar to and about our age. Perhaps, reduced to fundamentals, they develop because the Judeo-Christian ethic is being denied in other and subtler ways as well—notably the denial of the responsibility of the individual for his conduct and his life.

Whatever the causes, it is an unhealthy and unhappy development. The furor need not have arisen at all, had not reason fled the forum.

Uncle Sam Snubbed Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, an editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item entitled "Uncle Sam Snubbed Again":

UNCLE SAM SNUBBED AGAIN

The United States has failed again to persuade Britain and other Western countries to limit credits to Russia and Soviet-controlled countries to a period of 5 years.

The present 5-year trade agreement expires in June, but a new pact of the same duration was signed last week by Great Britain and the Soviet Union. The two countries will exchange $8,400,000 in consumer goods yearly.

The British, notoriously shrewd traders, tried to foist more goods on the Soviet, but the Communists refused to budge, asserting that "the sterling they earn by exports to the United Kingdom is needed for the purchase of raw material from other countries in the sterling area."

England and other nations that have been recipients of our foreign aid consistently have declined to show us favors, financially or

diplomatically, in the years in which our taxpayers have permitted Washington bureaucrats to scatter our money over the world.

England is solicitous about its commercial and industrial interests. So is Canada, and France is not far behind either of these nations in promoting its welfare, even at our expense.

Taking a long-range view of the situation, what American taxpayer can be censured for doubting whether our former allies will come to our rescue in a financial or international crisis.

Pioneer Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas history is filled with accounts of heroism, privation, suffering, and devotion of its pioneer women. I recently received a most interesting account from Mr. Niles C. Endsley, of Alton, Kans., about his grandmother, Mrs. Harmon Austin, who in 1872 with her small daughter left a thriving and prosperous farm near Buffalo, N.Y., to settle in Bull City, Kans. By rail to Russell, Kans., by wagon to Bull City, Mrs. Austin lost no time becoming accustomed to the rugged life ahead. Upon arrival the Austins were prepared to operate the local hotel but Mr. Austin died and as though there were something contagious about roughing it on the prairie, Mrs. Austin established a homestead where she shared a sodhouse with "snakes, centipedes, and scorpions." Mrs. Austin's daring and unflinching approach to the wilderness was expressed in her many contributions to nearby Kansas communities. For those interested in the role our pioneer women played in the development of the West, I am certain the following account will be appreciated:

FROM NEW YORK TO KANSAS IN 1872

It was in the year of 1871 that James Smith, of New York, decided to go to Kansas and take a homestead. James was a Civil War veteran, and many of his buddies had gone to Kansas for that purpose. He was interested in raising cattle, and the new frontier was calling. His relatives painted a dreary picture of the many hazards in this new country, and urged him to settle down in New York. But in spite of their pleas and tears he decided to go. He went to Russell, Kans., by rail, and made the trip to Bull City with a freight hauler. He made his headquarters in Bull City, and walked in all directions from town to locate the place that suited him best, and what he thought would make the best cattle farm. He picked out land on the Little Medicine Creek southwest of Bull City, and wrote to Harmon D. Austin, his favorite uncle, living in New York. He wrote in glowing terms of this great country, and its wonderful possibilities for cattle raising. He urged his uncle and two sons to come and they would all get land together. In this way they could help each other and be better able to protect themselves against an Indian attack. At this time this was the farthest west town in the Solomon Valley. They would start towns about 10 miles apart, fearing to go farther apart because of the Indians.

Harmon Austin had a good farm 10 miles from Buffalo and was prospering. However, he thought of the opportunity of getting 160 acres for each of his boys. Mrs. Austin was not very enthusiastic about the move, but said she would go if they thought it was the right thing to do. Buffalo was a thriving little city, but little did they dream that their farm of 158 acres would someday be in the heart of Buffalo. One problem must be solved before they could go, as Mr. Austin had the care of his aged parents.

It was May 1872 and all arrangements had been made for the men to leave for Kansas. Mr. Austin had deeded his farm to a neighbor for caring for his parents as long as they lived and giving them a decent burial. They would get their homesteads and build their homes, then send for the women. They went by rail to Russell, Kans., and came to Bull City by wagon. It was a few days before they saw James Smith, and in the meantime, the founders of Bull City, Hiram C. Bull and Lyman T. Earl, had talked Mr. Austin into building a hotel.

The founders of this town were sure this would be the "Metropolis of the Middle West," so many Kansas towns were started with that thought in view. The hotel was to be made of native limestone and finished inside with walnut. It was to have 15 rooms, a lobby and dining room, with a two-story frame building on the end of the hotel, to be used as a kitchen on the lower floor, and the upper rooms to be used for sleeping quarters for the family. They began the building immediately; Mr. Austin was a good carpenter, and stonemasons were plentiful, as so many homes were built out of the native rock. It was November and the hotel was ready. Mr. Austin's wife and daughter arrived in Russell and were brought to their new home in a wagon. They arrived in Bull City November 16, 1872. It was a big change for Mrs. Austin from their beautiful farm in New York, to the bleak prairies of Kansas. The only thing that seemed plentiful to her was the endless prairies, cottonwood trees, sunflowers, and grasshoppers. They had shipped furniture from New York and when it arrived the hotel was opened for business. The first question asked the daughter on arrival was "Did you see the Niagara Falls?" Her answer was no and her parents realized the mistake they had made.

Business was good in the hotel for there were so many prairie schooners coming, and many men walked from the nearest points on the railroad. Indians often stopped at the hotel and asked for bread. They always gave them bread, but said sometimes it was needed for the hotel. The hotel never lacked meat, buffalo was always available, also antelope, and occasionally venison, wild turkey and quail. Milk and other dairy products from nearby farms, and the groceries they needed from General Bull's store. The first term of school was taught in one of the upstair rooms in the hotel in the winter of 1872–73. A baby died in the community, and there were no coffins available. Mr. Austin took one of the partition boards out of the hotel and built a coffin for the child.

Two years after coming to Bull City Mr. Austin died of typhoid-pneumonia. So many of the early day doctors were men with no training for their work. Drugs were scarce and they used the same drug for so many diseases. As a result of those conditions the death rate was high.

Many families of children were wiped out with such diseases as scarlet fever, dyphtheria, and red measles. Smallpox was also a dreaded killer. Mrs. Austin ran the hotel for a few years, then decided it was too much work for two women, and rented it. In later years, Nettie Bryson, one of the early day pioneer women said, "No queen ever ruled over her throne with more grace and dignity, than Mrs. Austin did over her hotel." After leaving the hotel she took a homestead 1½ miles northwest of town. All of the good valley land was taken. She had a half-basement house with walls 4 feet aboveground on the two sides. There were windows in the south and west. A large ridge pole run across the top of the house, with smaller poles running down and resting on the sidewalls. They were fastened to the ridge pole at the top. Brush was laid across these poles, then a layer of prairie hay was put on top of the brush. A layer of clay was spread over the entire top, it was about 9 inches thick when settled. The floor was dirt. This made a very comfortable home, but you had to share the house with snakes, centipedes, and scorpions. There was no way to keep them from coming down through the roof. She said many nights the coyotes would howl at her door and she wondered sometimes if they wouldn't try to come down through the dirt roof, but they never did. In wet times the roof would leak for several hours after it quit raining.

She put out several hundred trees consisting of several varieties of shade trees, Mulberry, and walnut. About 175 fruit trees, with over 100 peach, the balance being cherry, plum, and apple. Wild plums, choke cherry, and wild grapes grew everywhere, and were enjoyed by the early settlers. Also wild currants were plentiful. This wild fruit was very hardy, but not as nice as the tame fruit. She found a ready sale for her fruit, and people came in every known conveyance of the time to buy her peaches. She gave fruit to those not able to buy. She trimmed and cared for her fruit, and in winter she would shovel snow around the roots of the fruit trees. She prospered and was soon able to build a two-story framehouse. She organized a Sunday school for neighboring children and taught them the Bible.

In the front of her new home there were two large crabapple trees that shaded the house. In the spring they were huge blankets of snow with a pinkish cast, and they would be loaded with crabs. These were used for jelly and preserves. She found a ready sale for the surplus.

Every year the relatives gathered at grandmas for Christmas, and it was the happiest day of the year for all of them. Much of the food was her own raising and preparing. She raised all kinds of food, dried, canned, and preserved some. There were not many groceries that she had to buy. One of her grandchildren remarked, "I feel sorry for any child that never knew the love of a grandmother." She left luxury in New York and came to the hardships of pioneer life in Kansas, yet she never complained, and always said that God had been good to her. She said the year of 1874 was the worst year, and that the people couldn't have stayed through that winter, had it not been for the gifts of food and clothing from the East. There was such a wonderful spirit shown by the people that got the food and clothing. They would gather together and open the boxes and divide the contents, and it was always such a joyful time. The grasshoppers had eaten all the crops that year.

At 80, she was still tall and straight, and looked more like she was 60. There was a sparkle in her eyes, and she was very active for one of her age. At 84 she was standing on a chair trimming trees, the chair tipped over and her hip was broken in the fall. She was an invalid from that time on, but her main complaint was that she couldn't get out and do the work that needed to be done. She lived about 3 months after her accident. In her death Kansas lost a noble pioneer.

The Refugee Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as the Miami Herald editorial states, "The great untold story of the Cuban exile movement is that of children."

It is only proper that the first Ethel H. Wise Award for outstanding leadership "in a program which contributes to the welfare of people and thus furthers the goals of social work" was awarded to Miss Frances Davis, director of the Child Welfare Division of the Florida Department of Public Welfare.

As director, Miss Davis is responsible for the organization and maintenance of a program by public and private welfare agencies for the placement and care of unaccompanied refugee children.

Since the initiation of the program in the United States, more than 8,000 Cuban children have been cared for—as of February 1963, 1,177 children were in Dade County. The Florida Department of Public Welfare, acting as agent for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, works with the voluntary child-placing agencies which in turn work with cooperating agencies in the various States. In addition, Miss Davis supervises the direct care provided by the Florida Department of Public Welfare to Cuban children who are placed in foster homes in Miami by its Cuban child welfare unit.

All of this is a monumental job, requiring fortitude, patience, and dedication.

The award was granted by the Columbia University New York School of Social Work and was based on the recommendations of well-known leaders in the field of social service—among them Dr. Alice Winston, Commissioner of Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Miss Frances Davis, for her untiring work in the organization of the most comprehensive program yet devised in this country to meet a wave of incoming refugees and the first program to involve the distribution of Federal financial assistance for maintenance outside of a refugee center, is a worthy recipient of the Ethel H. Wise Award. My congratulations to Miss Davis on this well-deserved tribute.

The Miami Herald editorial follows:

THE REFUGEE CHILDREN

The great untold story of the Cuban exile movement is that of children. Thousands were sent unattended to this country to escape Communist indoctrination. Providing temporary homes and understanding care for them became a problem unlike any faced in this country.

The selection of an official of the Florida Department of Public Welfare for national honors the other day is a tribute to the way this was handled.

Miss Frances Davis, director of the department's child welfare division, organized a behind-the-scenes program by public and private welfare agencies. More than 8,000 Cuban children were placed. Today, 137 agencies in 109 communities in 41 States are still caring for 2,800 of these.

But more than half of the original homeless youngsters are now reunited with their parents or self-supporting.

For her unassuming part in this achievement, Miss Davis received the first Ethel H. Wise Award for outstanding leadership "in a program which contributes to the welfare of people and thus further the goals of social work."

It was a deserved tribute for an unusual service and one in which Dade County and the whole State of Florida share.

The 25th Anniversary of the New Jersey Labor-Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the New Jersey Labor-Herald will celebrate the 25th anniversary of its founding next month. Its editor, Mr. Lewis M. Herrmann, has achieved the unofficial rank of "labor statesman" in our State as a result of his activities on behalf of the International Typographical Union in particular and organized labor in general.

The New Jersey Legislature recently adopted a resolution extending congratulations on this significant anniversary, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have already sent Mr. Herrmann my own congratulations on this occasion, so important to him and his publication.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF 188TH SESSION OF THE NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE—1964

Whereas the New Jersey Labor Herald, published in the city of Newark, N.J., will celebrate the 25th silver anniversary with its June 1964 edition; and

Whereas this publication has over the past 25 years, contributed greatly to the achievement of more cordial relations between labor and management in this industrial State, and was largely responsible for the creation by the legislature of the now nationally famous Institute of Management and Labor Relations, on the campus of Rutgers University; and

Whereas its editor, Lewis M. Herrmann, served with distinction for a number of years, as a member of the house of assembly, representing the county of Essex, from 1947 to 1951: Be it therefore

Resolved by the general assembly and the senate, That we hereby go on record extending our sincere felicitations to the New Jersey Labor Herald and its editor and staff, on the occasion of its 25th birthday, to be celebrated during the month of June 1964; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the general assembly and senate, and forwarded to Editor Herrmann, and released to the press.

ALFRED N. BEADLESTON,
Speaker, New Jersey House of Assembly.
CHARLES R. SANDMAN,
President, New Jersey State Senate.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars in my congressional district sponsor a most impressive Loyalty Day parade and program which is held in the city of Nanticoke. It has been my pleasure to have attended a number of these, the last having been held on Saturday, April 25, 1964. The principal speaker on that occasion was Rear Adm. J. S. Dietz, commanding officer, Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia. In a recent letter to me, Admiral Dietz said:

The Loyalty Day celebration at Nanticoke was as stimulating as it was rewarding. The hospitality, the enthusiasm, and rapport of the citizenry of Nanticoke created an impression which will live with me for a long time to come. Watching democracy, loyalty, and patriotism in action at the grassroots level confirms my belief in the strength and power of the American people.

As part of my remarks today, I would like to include the fine address made by Admiral Dietz. The address follows:

LOYALTY DAY ADDRESS BY REAR ADM. J. S. DIETZ, SUPPLY CORPS, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak at this Loyalty Day celebration today sponsored by the Nanticoke Chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I echo the words of the Honorable Norman S. Paul, the Assistant Secretary of Defense at your 64th National Convention in Seattle last year when he said, "Speaking officially, it's good to know that the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense are continuing to benefit from the counsel and support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Because of your individual personal experiences, your collective viewpoints have been characterized by consistency and realism."

Yes, your loyalty, your patriotism at the grassroots level where democracy begins is most commendable and necessary. It is important that everything possible be done to instill in the hearts of our young Americans this same feeling of pride and patriotism.

Loyalty that breeds the type of determination exemplified by the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he uttered the now famous remark, "I shall return." Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a great military strategist and leader, will serve as a profound inspiration to all Americans following in his footsteps.

The kind of simple pride and patriotism expressed by Colonel Glenn when he stood before Congress and said there should be more of the simple, sincere patriotism and loyalty expressed in America's daily lives.

The kind of pride, patriotism, and loyalty that when one sees a parade with the American Flag and a marching band his heart beats a little more quickly. The feeling of being tremendously proud of being an American. Loyalty in our times sometimes seems sort of old fashioned. It seems to fit at the cradle of our history with such names as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, all dedicated to the establishment of our free Republic.

Our Founding Fathers left us a legacy that lives today.

On display in Washington is a paper that reads in part:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident and that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

Our way of life still rests squarely upon these principles from the Declaration of Independence.

Also on display is another document beginning:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

There in the 52 words that make up the Preamble to the Constitution our ideals of government have been expressed. Each of the phrases could be the subject of a book.

However, the vital portion is the first three words, "We the People."

Our Government is made to serve the people. It exists only by the people's will, exists only for the sake of the individual. Those eloquent 52 words of the preamble to the Constitution should be studied and restudied until they can be voiced verbatim by each of our youngsters and to be carried with them into manhood.

I could not have been invited to a more meaningful tribute than that which you are paying here today, "Loyalty Day."

It is impossible to wear our country's uniform for 35 years and not feel a close rapport with its traditions.

We have grown, prospered, learned sophistication, enjoyed vast material progress since the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. But is the old pride and courage of '76, the old sense of faith in nation and in its destiny, still with us?

Our way of life did not just happen. Men fought for the principles upon which our system is based.

High traditions of courage and loyalty established our country. Loyal and heroic actions continue to assure us liberty and freedom.

As an example, one of the early heroes of World War II was Sgt. John Basilone who fought with the 1st Marine Division on Guadalcanal.

In a fierce frontal attack, the Japanese blasted his positions with grenades and mortar fire. One of Sergeant Basilone's two machinegun sections and all but two of its crew were put out of action. Under a withering fire, Basilone placed an extra gun into action, repaired another and manned it himself, holding the line until replacements arrived. Later, with ammunition low and his position cut off at the rear, Basilone battled his way through the hostile lines, secured more ammunition, and fought his way back through the enemy to reach his guns. His actions virtually wiped out an entire Japanese regiment. For this feat of valor and loyalty Sergeant Basilone was awarded the Medal of Honor, which qualified him to be relieved from combat duty. Instead he volunteered for more action and was killed on Iwo Jima, a rugged beachhead where I personally saw action aboard the U.S.S. *Alaska*.

Sergeant Basilone's acts of bravery, patriotism, and loyalty can be multiplied by thousands.

Not all of us are called upon or expected to perform such heroics for our country. We are called upon to be good citizens and loyal to those principles which have made our country the citadel of liberty and freedom.

Our tribute to the sacrifices that have been made by our war heroes both living and dead must be our determination to maintain in ourselves a patriotic and loyal love of country just as strong and just as self-sacrificing.

There are scores of thousands of people who, having lost their freedom, cry out to us, who are more fortunate:

"Guard your freedom as if tomorrow you might lose it."

History records that ours is a peace-loving nation. Our entire growing up process, our family, our home, our church, our richness in resources, our schools, our Government, all of these channel our thinking process into peaceful pursuits.

However, news stories daily carry ugly pictures of trouble all over the world. These stories have put the United States on its toes, so that every American is looking at the world situation and our position with greatest care.

Thus, while we conscientiously strive for peace we are not forgetting our preparedness. And so it should be. In bygone years when we as a peace-loving nation have been called upon to act with unanimity to protect our way of life when challenged, we have turned to 180° with great energy.

Today the United States is putting forth its greatest peacetime effort for security of a restless world. And well we should. The brutal fact is that we are engaged in a struggle for survival in which our existence is the stake. This is no sports competition. It is for keeps and there can be no second prize.

We do not childlike "carry a chip on our shoulder." We do realize as a mature nation that we must have security against attack. Utopian universal peace and wonderful world brotherhood still are not accomplished facts in this turbulent planet of the 20th century.

Today's cold war may not physically affect our daily, personal lives. We don't have to set up barriers on the beaches to stop an invasion. This is all the more reason we must think, discuss, analyze, negotiate, and do everything in our power to prevent a holocaust. Paradoxically enough to prevent a holocaust also includes the maintenance of a nuclear arsenal.

Indeed if we did not have such an arsenal, we would almost certainly be engaged in the most terrible conventional war in history, with great masses of men on nearly every continent.

More than ever before there is an increasing dependence upon the most advanced weapons and increasing need for well trained, clear thinking men to operate them.

But, more than ever before, we dare not forget that we must face an attack not with new machines aided by men, but with loyal men, patriotic men aided by new machines.

The "man" is the prime factor. Our Nation was founded because men and women were willing to risk staggering odds. By slide rule calculation the Pilgrims should never have embarked on the stormy Atlantic; the odds against their survival were too great. Having arrived they should have departed these shores after the first disastrous winter but they put their trust in God—and persevered.

Had the colonists taken heed of their comfort instead of their principles there would have been none to pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor on July 4, 1776. To stand on principle they had to stand before the fire of the best armies of Europe. They risked the odds, and they won.

They won because they recognized their responsibilities, and because they had the courage to fight for their principles. And it was flesh and blood human beings who pledged their lives—not machines.

New weapons, however, have made our world a smaller and more insecure place to live in. But the development of new weapons should not affect our primary objective. That objective, often forgotten in peacetime, is national security.

National security means maintaining our political, economic, moral, and military strength. It demands the greatest cooperation among all our citizens as well as between the three military services. Apropos to the military services, it seems to me cooperation has never been better. My own command, the Defense Industrial Supply Center, an element of the Defense Supply Agency, is jointly staffed by officers of each service. I, as a Navy admiral, will be relieved of command on May 5, 1964, by an Air Force major general.

Love of our country is best summed up in the words "loyalty and patriotism."

The first duty that loyalty and patriotism imposes upon us, is a duty of self-appraisal as to our responsibilities.

Responsibilities devolve upon Americans as people. And to the adults goes the major task of inculcating into the young a sense of the responsibilities a citizen has—respect the liberty of others; further the welfare of the community; protect the security of the United States.

If the coming generation of Americans does not understand and assume the responsibilities that will soon belong to it, the United States will inevitably fall from its place of leadership among free nations.

Those on whom we will depend to keep America strong are not born with a sense of patriotism, of selflessness, of dedication to principle. These traits are acquired only to the degree that we stress them and practice them ourselves.

We as parents, teachers, soldiers, legislators have a responsibility to tell our youth all these things. To tell them what America has meant in the past and what it means today to so many, many people, to tell them what makes America a bulwark for the world against the forces of tyranny and slavery. We need to teach them faith in their leaders, in their ideals, in their principles, in themselves, in God, and somehow to make them understand that even in the event of a terrible nuclear war we can rise to a bigger and finer America.

To maintain our freedoms and the advantages of our way of life, we must pay a price.

This principle applies to meeting the obligations of domestic living as well as to making purchases over a drug counter. Continuing to enjoy our advantages demands more than wishing. It calls for the payment of a price.

Although part of the price is monetary, it is not so simple a matter as reaching into a pocket for cash. Keeping our representative democracy in business requires spiritual, mental, physical, and material expenditures.

We cannot maintain our way of life unless each of us as citizens accepts and carries out his obligations.

Long ago Plato said, "The punishment of wise men who refuse to take part in the affairs of government is to live under the government of unwise men."

More recently Justice Felix Frankfurter said:

"We are thus engaged in the most difficult of all arts—the art of living together in a free society. It is comfortable, even slothful, to live without responsibility. Responsibility is exacting and painful. Democracy involves hardship—the hardship of the unceasing responsibility of every citizen. Where the entire people do not take a continuous and considered part in public life, there can be no democracy in any meaningful sense of the term. Democracy is always a beckoning goal, not a safe harbor. For freedom is an unremitting endeavor, never a final achievement. This is why no office in the land is more important than that of being a citizen."

As we celebrate Loyalty Day in Nanticoke today, let us not forget the May Day cele-

brations which will be held in many nations and their portent. Many of these May Day celebrations are akin to the urgent S O S signalling extreme danger.

During these May Day celebrations, we will hear many cliches which have been used time and again by the Communist hierarchy.

Again, we will hear one of the most frequently used points of all propaganda aimed at the United States—that its Government is a decadent, bourgeois, capitalistic fraud which is bound to collapse from its own inward rotteness sooner or later. Foolish, yes, to any citizen of the United States who knows his political A B C's.

The trouble is, not enough citizens of the United States know the hows, whys and wherefores of the workings of the Government.

You in this district are indeed fortunate to have as your Congressman, the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD. He knows well his responsibilities as a citizen and as a legislator since 1944.

Again and again, in addition to his legislative duties he has, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, been faced with monumental decisions affecting the security of our Nation.

And he has never forgotten his responsibility to the people he represents. I know this because just a few months ago he had me up in Wilkes-Barre explaining to industry people there, some opportunities to do business with the Government.

To the big lie which will be voiced at the May Day celebration in Communist areas, let it be known what most Americans believe.

Americans believe in the supremacy of the individual; they repudiate the doctrine of inevitable "class struggle" and hold that the economic welfare of all can be achieved through class cooperation.

Americans believe that governmental change should be achieved through peaceful and constitutional means—by evolution, not by revolution, either national or international. Americans despise dictatorship. Secret police, purges, one political party, thought control, and suppression of free speech are not the methods of our democratic Government.

A short time ago, a man told of a dream he had, a dream of America as "the land of hope, the land of freedom, and the land of opportunity." His dream eloquently sums up the sum and substance of America.

"It is an America," he said, "that is renowned not so much for its might, as it is for its morality. An America that is seeking justice at home and seeking peace with all nations. An America that is committed always to the force of law instead of to the law of force. An America that would regard the existence of poverty as a challenge to be actively overcome and to do something about, instead of a social problem to be passively and privately endured. An America where the humblest citizen can speak his piece and write his thoughts and worship his God without the heavy hand of government bias barring his purpose or his hearing a knock on the bedroom door at midnight. An America whose strength would save us from defeat and whose wisdom would protect us from appeasement. Whose compassion is an example for the other 119 nations in the world."

The man who said that was my Commander in Chief and our President of the United States.

So, we press onward toward the mark of making democracy live and work. We cannot claim that we have arrived but we do claim that we are working loyally and patriotically at the task. Our gains have been bought with a price. We do not intend to have them submerged in a Red or any other tide.

Let me conclude with a verse from a famous American poet.

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State,
Sail on, O Union Strong and Great.
Humanity, with all its fears,
With all its hopes for future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Youth Speaks Out on School Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, recently my attention was called to an article entitled "Congratulations Khrushchev," written by Linda Hall, a junior in high school at Traverse City, Mich.

Anyone who thinks the youth of America are not alert to the significance of the prayer amendments pending in the Committee on the Judiciary should read this penetrating, power-packed analysis.

Linda Hall's article was published as a guest contribution in the April 18, 1964, edition of the Traverse City (Mich.) Record-Eagle. Mr. Speaker, in order to assure that it will receive the wide consideration that it deserves, I insert Linda's article at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRATULATIONS KHRUSHCHEV

(Guest Contribution by Linda Hall, Junior, Traverse City High School)

A sign in Long Island reads "Congratulations Khrushchev—No Prayers in Public Schools. God help America." This sign reflects the feelings of millions of Americans. On June 25 the U.S. Supreme Court held that the following prayer said by New York students was unconstitutional:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The students were not forced to say the prayer, and they were welcome to leave the room if they preferred. Then, why was the prayer unconstitutional? Was it because it mentioned the word "God"? If this is true our Government has a lot of revising to do.

The Supreme Court itself opens each session with "God Save the United States and this Honorable Court." The name of God is used in swearing in the President of our country, in the Declaration of Independence, "The Star-Spangled Banner," the pledge of allegiance, and on U.S. currency. According to the Supreme Court decision a prayer in school is illegal. Is saying the pledge of allegiance or singing the national anthem also illegal. Either it is or the Court is being inconsistent.

Our Government hires Chaplains for Congress and the armed services, and holds religious services in Federal hospitals and prisons. The Bible is used in administering oaths, and people who make donations to religious institutions receive income tax credit. If the Court decision is based on minority rights, then income tax credit, etc., is unfair to atheists.

If religion is part of one's life it cannot be turned on and off like a light. The disturbing results of the prayer decision are widespread. In Washington, D.C., one of the largest public schools has discontinued baccalaureate services at commencement. Next, school choirs won't be allowed to sing any religious music. If Christianity is being taken out of schools then should there be no Christmas and Easter vacations? In Wisconsin a school had erected the nativity scene annually for 20 years. Now at Christmas there is only snow in its place. Many don't believe in any celebration at Christmas. Perhaps schools should be left bare of decorations for this holiday, since Christmas is a Christian observance. Instead of "Merry Christmas" should teachers and students be taught to say "Happy Winter Festival"?

Certainly the Bible contains the greatest literature of all time. Since all religions do not believe in it, should all required high school reading containing references to the Bible be eliminated?

America was founded on the principle of democracy. In a Gallup poll 80 percent of the parents of schoolchildren approved of religious observances in schools. Does majority rule? The Supreme Court decision has taken away freedom of religion in schools. Students are no longer allowed to say a prayer even if 100 percent want to. In reference to the Court's decision, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD expressed the thoughts of many when he said, "Somebody is tampering with American's soul."

The War Against Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in support of the Becker resolution on voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our public schools, I place at this point in the RECORD the lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal:

THE WAR AGAINST RELIGION

What is the place, if any, of religion in the public schools?

Contrary to some prevalent views, we think it self-evident that it has a place and an important one. Yet much of the discussion, both for and against, turns on issues that are secondary and even trivial.

Religion has a place in education because it is an integral part of the life of man. No one, whether he professes a religion or not, whether he considers himself an agnostic or an atheist can escape its presence. It is all about us, in the material as well as the spiritual world.

One of the great streams from which our culture flows is, as Matthew Arnold long ago observed, Hellenism, the legacy of Greece; the other Hebraism, the Judeo-Christian tradition. Over the centuries the two have intertwined and fed on each other and enriched the life and the mind of Western man.

The Judeo-Christian concept gave us not only one of the world's most majestic literary works but a whole torrent of additional poetry and art and architecture. It is more than the direct inspiration in the holy sonnets of Donne or Hopkins or the Pieta of Michelangelo; it is also the implicit fabric of almost all art that is recognizable as such.

For it is the same concept, with its significant Hellenistic heritage which fashions our society, informs our relations with other men and provides us with the philosophical view of the universe that makes it possible to live an a higher plane than the beasts. Even the secular philosophy of humanism is Aris-

totelian-Christian without the supernatural edifice.

Not to teach the Bible, directly or derivatively; not to teach about religion—this attitude is a silly attempt to escape reality and is in fact all but impossible if teaching is to mean anything. How can anyone presume to teach history or art or philosophy or economics or government without reference to the religious underpinning of it all?

The men who formed our Nation understood the reality well enough. Unlike some people today, they were not seeking to drive religion out of the schools or other structures of society. They were only concerned that no denomination become established as a State religion. They proscribed it and no one is attempting to do any such thing.

Since that is the real as opposed to the imagined situation, the controversy often seems tangential at best. Just how tangential can be seen in Congress, where the Members scratch their heads in a laborious effort to determine what sort of school prayers might be permissible. To use a religious allusion, it is a bit like the famed argument concerning the number of angels that can dance on a pin.

We think the local authorities should be able to decide whether they want prayers; if they do, it's not going to hurt anybody so long as there is no compulsion and no attempt to indoctrinate in a particular creed. But the issue, of course, is much broader than prayers. There is a push to eradicate all traces of religion from all public life, even to the barring of any Christmas observances in schools and communities.

This undertaking would be pitiable if it were not rather formidable. It represents, we suppose, not so much an attack on religion as a hopeless misunderstanding of our culture. Certainly it is the wildest kind of discrimination, not least against the children it would deprive of pleasure and spiritual profit.

The prevalence of such views must reflect something peculiar to and about our age. Perhaps, reduced to fundamentals, they develop because the Judaeo-Christian ethic is being denied in other and subtler ways as well—notably the denial of the responsibility of the individual for his conduct and his life.

Whatever the causes, it is an unhealthy and unhappy development. The furor need not have arisen at all, had not reason fled the forum.

A Century-Old Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson Publishing Co., of Chicago, Ill., publishers of Ebony, Jet, the Negro Digest, and other first-class periodicals, is an exempliary case demonstrating the fallacy of the contention that predominately Negro enterprises are necessarily inferior and unbusinesslike operations. The Johnson concern has expanded from the germ of a bold idea of owner-publisher John H. Johnson into a major publishing firm which produces superior popular magazines designed to inform the entire American public of the capabilities, interests, activities, and thinking of the Nation's Negro citizens.

It is quite appropriate, therefore, that the firm's pocket-sized, weekly product, Jet, should be attentive to political, social, economic, and other current events of interest to and directly involving Negro Americans. As I commend to you the publications of this prime example of journalistic responsibility, I call your attention to a recent article, appearing in the issue for May 7, 1964, bearing upon the current controversy over Federal civil rights legislation.

The young man who wrote this unsigned article is John H. Britton, an associate editor of Jet. The high caliber of writing skill attests to the high standards of performance the firm demands of its employees. The managing editor of the pocket weekly is Robert E. Johnson, a native of Birmingham, Ala., a graduate of Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., and formally trained in journalism at Syracuse University, Syrcause, N.Y. Mr. Johnson, however, is only one of many employees of the Johnson Co. who have considerable and excellent training and experience in various fields related to journalism and the publishing business.

My own contribution to the article reprinted below is small compared with the magnificent job Mr. Britton has done.

The article follows:

A CENTURY-OLD RIGHTS BILL TOUGHER THAN CURRENT VERSION

One year before the Nation's first Civil Rights Act was passed by Congress in 1866, a President, Abraham Lincoln, was ambushed by a deranged assassin. The murder came at a time when intolerance for an opponent and an opposing viewpoint was considered tolerable, even honorable.

Now, 98 years later, another civil rights bill, milder in enforcement aspects than the first, is inflaming the passions of the Congress and the electorate. Coincidentally—and ironically—another President, John F. Kennedy, has been killed as he, too, lectured the land on freedom and human dignity in an atmosphere corrupted by a Nation's fanatical devotion to segregation.

A noisy Senate opposition currently beats the House-passed civil rights bill to death with millions of tired, meaningless shibboleths. The opposition argues that constitutional government is being threatened; that property rights are more holy than the human spirit of Negroes. But above the din and clatter of Senate filibuster emerged the firm, steady voice of Pennsylvania Democratic Representative ROBERT N. C. NIX with a goading reminder to Congressmen of things past.

With vocal inflection intended to embarrass, Representative NIX flailed his colleagues with the fact that 98 years after the first strong civil rights measure was enacted by the 39th Congress, the 88th Congress is engaged in frustrating efforts to secure and protect some of the very same rights covered in the act of April 9, 1866. And, noted the Pennsylvania solon, "By comparison with the act of 1866, the present legislation is mild."

He began the comparison. The 1866 act, part of the reconstruction legislation, would have, for instance, sanctioned criminal prosecution, jail and fines for, say the Mississippi voter registrars who insist on violating and "nitpicking" Negroes' voting rights. But the current measure only empowers the Attorney General to initiate civil action (which he might lose) for injunctive relief in Federal courts.

The old act gives to the President of the United States the power to direct the judge, marshal, and district attorney of a district to attend, within his jurisdiction, any place where the President has reason to believe that offenses have been "or are likely to be" committed against the provisions of the Civil Rights Act, "for the purpose of the more speedy arrest and trial of persons charged with a violation of the act * * *." Nowhere in the 1964 version is the President granted such broad power.

So tough an enforcement provision was the 1866 measure that the act made it lawful for the President to employ "such parts of the lands or naval forces of the United States, or of the militia, as shall be necessary to prevent the violation and enforce the due execution of this act." The current bill stops short of that step. What the old act meant is that Wilcox County, Ala., today probably would be occupied by military troops because of official hanky panky regarding Negroes' voting rights in that predominantly Negro county.

The overriding difference between the two bills is the enforcement emphasis. Whereas the current effort would tie most enforcement to the courts (with jail a threat only through contempt proceedings), the older measure made on-the-spot arrest and jail a real and imminent threat to all potential violators. And whereas physical incarceration was held out as a penalty in the old measure, severe economic sanctions are set forth in the current legislative product as inducement for compliance.

Eventually, though, various devices were employed to chip away at the 1866 act to render it totally ineffective. Ultimately it was superseded by the first section of the 14th amendment, popularly known as the "due process" clause. Then an 1875 public accommodations law was repealed 8 years later. Ironically, the 1964 version leans heavily on court enforcement, while previous civil rights acts went to their deaths largely because adverse court interpretations led to their increasing unpopularity.

Today, modern solons would be afraid to touch with a 10 foot pole many of the tough measures embodied in aged statutes. Yet, as Nix lectured, "the deprivation of the rights of Negro citizens cries out for immediate corrective measures by Federal legislation. The task remains to be done, perhaps because it has been left to mere men who do not always live up to their commitments to the Constitution in the most positive fashion."

Still goading, Nix concluded: "* * * the text of the act of 1866 should serve to remind one and all that the fight for equality will not subside until all Americans enjoy the same opportunities under the law of the Constitution."

Mr. Charles Hardwick and Mr. Jeffrey Lazarus—Two Outstanding Men From the State of Ohio—Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently the American Humanics Foundation and Salem College of Salem, W. Va., conferred honorary degrees upon two outstanding men from the State of Ohio, Mr. Charles Hardwick and Mr. Jeffrey Lazarus. It has been my privilege to get to know and work with both of these men in Scouting, and I not only join with their host of friends in congratulating them on the

receipt of these degrees, but also congratulate the foundation and the college upon the recognition bestowed upon these outstanding men.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Dr. K. Duane Hurley, president of Salem College, in conferring the degrees and the citations accompanying them, so well describe the characteristics of these outstanding men that, under unanimous consent, I place these in full immediately hereafter:

REMARKS OF DR. K. DUANE HURLEY, PRESIDENT OF SALEM COLLEGE, CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES ON CHARLES Z. HARDWICK

Society rightly puts a premium on initiative, self-help, and service mindedness. Here is a man whose life and works encompass all three characteristics.

Coming up from the ranks in the most dramatic tradition of the successful businessman, Mr. Hardwick has given his leadership to youth work throughout America, both through the resources of his firm and personally. His company and its foundation both reflect his concepts of community service.

Because of your initiative and disciplined strength, your commitment to responsible leadership, and the enormous good which has resulted from your achievements when highlighted by your personal standard of values, we single you out, Charles Z. Hardwick, for special recognition this day.

With the recommendation of the American Humanics Foundation and by the authority of the Salem College Board of Directors, I now confer upon you the distinctive degree of doctor of humanics, admitting you to all the rights and privileges to that degree appertaining.

I hereby cause you to be hooded with the emblem of that degree, and give you this diploma which validates your honorary degree.

(Citation for Charles Zachary Hardwick, executive vice president of the Marathon Oil Corp., as presented by Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America)

I am honored indeed to have the privilege of presenting a candidate truly worthy of our recognition on this significant occasion.

Charles Zachary Hardwick has given leadership to youth work throughout America, both through the resources of his firm and personally.

The Marathon Oil Co. and its name foundation have related themselves to the work of the American Humanics Foundation since 1956, giving helpful and intelligent support to this program of quality youth leadership education. Charles Hardwick has been a part of this growing picture and has a strong philosophy regarding the responsibility of leadership.

The application of this philosophy is vividly exemplified in the role of Marathon in its farflung communities around the globe. Even though worldwide in scope, it retains its perspective in fundamental and worthy relationships to the welfare of mankind.

His greatest youthwork emphasis has been in the Scouting program. He is past president of his council, has served as chairman of the executive committee of Scouting's Ohio-Kentucky-West Virginia region, is currently a member of the National Executive Board of the Boy Scouts of America, and is chairman of its National Camping Committee.

He is a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; a director of the American Petroleum Institute; a member of the board of governors of the National Highway Users Conference—these and many similar posts indicate the role of responsibility he assumes in any organization, business or nonbusiness, in which he is involved:

Because of his initiative and disciplined strength..

Because of the principles which have dominated his hard-driving power.

Because of his continuing integrity in mounting success in life.

Because of his exemplification of community service concepts.

Because of his commitment to leadership.

Because of his foremost emphasis on the needs of youth.

And because of the enormous good which has resulted from his work and influence, we recommend him as worthy of recognition, and I am privileged to present him to you as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Humanics.

REMARKS OF DR. K. DUANE HURLEY, PRESIDENT OF SALEM COLLEGE; CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS ON JEFFREY L. LAZARUS

Some men stand out in the crowd. Upon such a one comes the focus of attention at this moment.

Because your interest in youth work is genuine and you give your time and leadership as well as funds to the programs which you believe are morally sound and are strength building for America.

Because of your faithfulness to your spiritual convictions.

Because your driving force as related to programs of community welfare is invested in widespread activities.

And because of your exemplary devotion as a family man.

To you, Jeffrey L. Lazarus, the American Humanics Foundation and Salem College are proud to award the coveted honorary degree, doctor of laws, admitting you to all the rights and privileges to the degree appertaining.

By authority of the Salem College Board of Directors, and with the enthusiastic approval of all here assembled, I cause you to be hooded with the emblem of that degree, and hand you this diploma as permanent evidence of our love and esteem.

(Citation for Jeffrey L. Lazarus, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the John Shillito Co., as presented by George F. Cahill, Scout executive of Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Mine is a particular thrill and personal joy in presenting this candidate for recognition on this occasion.

Jeffrey Lazarus is a man of consuming motives and driving force in their fulfillment.

As a merchandising executive and a leader in commerce and investments his stature is great. He is a native of Ohio, a graduate of Ohio State, and entered the business world via his father's firm. He is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the John Shillito Co., of Cincinnati, which now involves numerous large stores with federated management.

His interest in youth work is genuine, and he gives of his time and leadership as well as his funds to the programs which he believes are morally sound and strength-building for America. His greatest emphasis in all that he does is on and in long-range involvements. He is equally effective in long-range capital fund efforts and in long-range programing. He is given to constant analysis of social service organizations in relation to their ultimate goals, and has an obsession for the problems of communication and interpretation. .

His service in the ranks of the Boy Scouts of America has been dynamic. He has been a board member of the Scout councils of all three cities in which he has lived—the Columbus Council, the Northern Kentucky Council, and the Dan Beard Council in Cincinnati, where he is currently serving as council president. He is at present a member of the National Executive Board of the Boy Scouts of America and chairman of the National Jewish Committee on Scouting. He has been awarded the Silver Beaver, Silver Antelope, and Silver Buffalo for distinguished service to boyhood. He has been equally active in the Community Chest, United Jewish Social Agencies, and Cincinnati's Red Cross. During World War II he sponsored a dramatically successful Gallon Club (members donating 8 pints of blood or more). He is a Sertoman and received Sertoma's Man of the Year Award in 1956. He is a devoted family man and devout in his faith:

Because of his concern for the strength of America.

Because of his discernment of values which lead to effectiveness.

Because of his devotion to excellence.

Because of his attitude of stewardship responsibility.

Because of his informed and hard-driving interest in the quality of youth programs.

And because of his faithful support and promotion of the structure and the objectives of the American Humanics Foundation for the education of youth leadership, we recommend him as worthy of recognition, and I am privileged to present him to you as a candidate for the degree of doctor of laws.

Theodore "Ted" Bleier Physical Fitness Leader of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in April, America's 12 top physical fitness leaders for 1963 were honored as guests of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and Standard Packaging Corp.

The Jaycees have long been known as young men of action, dedicated to the community and national betterment, and it is fitting that this fine group should be sponsored by them.

The climax of their visit came with a tour of the White House and a visit with President Lyndon B. Johnson, followed by the awards luncheon.

The program, inaugurated at the suggestion of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, was designed to spotlight the fitness contributions of those of all ages and from all walks of life. The 12 leaders were selected from among candidates in hundreds of communities and 46 States..

I was particularly pleased and proud that from all the candidates, a good friend of mine, Ted Bleier, was among the 12 persons selected for this honor.

Ted Bleier believes that fitness training must begin in the formative years especially since an appalling number of young Americans are found physically unfit for military service and better than 50 percent of our youth cannot pass tests for minimum standards of performance.

Ted, who is 57 years old and supervisor in Dade County Public Schools, was instrumental in developing a complete program of health and physical education used daily by 200,000 young people,

while always stressing the "how" and "why" of fitness.

His vigorous program for Miami boys and girls in grades 5 through 12 exceeds the minimum standards suggested by the President's Council for Physical Fitness, and in 2 years of testing yielded returns well above the national average published by that organization. In 1961, 79 percent of the Miami youth passed the AAHPER test, while in 1962, 85 percent climbed the heights of fitness.

Testing plays an important role in Ted Bleier's program. Boys and girls needing special development exercises are identified by exams when they enroll in school. Analysis of test results, kept on permanent file, are combined with individualized programs of fitness building activities, including "homework" in some instances. The programs are followed up with retesting, making certain the student is brought up to the average or better. Certificate awards are available to those who exceed their original test findings.

One of the causes for which the late President John F. Kennedy was most acclaimed was his backing of a renewed interest in physical fitness. President Kennedy said:

> The strength of our democracy is no greater than the collective well-being of our people.

My heartiest congratulations to Ted Blier. We, in Dade County, are indeed fortunate to have such a man directing the physical education of our youth.

The other 11 men honored in Washington were:

Henry Boucher, 42, of Fairbanks, Alaska, a pioneer of baseball in the "last frontier."

Robert Kiphuth, 72, New Haven, Conn., noted Yale swimming coach for more than a half century.

Wes Santee, 31, Lawrence, Kans., former distance running great who now sells fitness to midwestern youth.

Ernest Jokl, M.D., 56, Lexington, Ky., perhaps the world's greatest expert in sports medicine.

Frank J. Manley, 60, Flint, Mich., who opened Flint school doors for nighttime and weekend recreation activities attracting 70,000 weekly.

Edward W. Bradley, 34, Miltown, N.J., who not only innovated the first comprehensive physical fitness program in this city's schools but set up extracurricular activity for young and old alike.

Bill Bowerman, 52, Eugene, Oreg., coach of the NCAA championship Oregon track team and responsible for introducing "jogging" as the secret of keeping fit.

Leland Brissie, 52, Greenville, S.C., former big-leaguer devoting his life to developing healthy boys through baseball.

Roland Carlson, 45, El Campo, Tex., a county juvenile officer who has taken boys off the street and put them in the boxing ring—cutting delinquency 78 percent.

Stephen Bindas, 38, Hastings, Nebr., physical educator and State AAHPER president who has brought national recognition to his city and school system for a communitywide fitness program involving more than 5,000 youngsters.

Alph Stamphill, 48, Muskogee, Okla., physical educator who directed and coordinated the pilot physical fitness program which has served as a national model for the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

Congressman Charles A. Buckley: His Fight for Justice for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1964, Mr. Carl Fell, a distinguished writer in the field of Jewish affairs, published a very interesting and informative article concerning Israel's current needs and the devoted assistance rendered by our distinguished colleague Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY. This article appeared in the American Examiner. This paper is the United States largest independent Anglo-Jewish weekly newspaper.

It gives me great personal satisfaction to see Mr. BUCKLEY's outstanding record on behalf of Israel receive recognition. I recall that Congressman BUCKLEY was in the forefront of those rallying support for the creation of the State of Israel. His untiring efforts in the Halls of Congress, at the White House, and elsewhere, played an important and vital part in the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. Since that time he has consistently sought full economic and political assistance for this young democracy.

On April 22, 1964, at the opening of the Israeli Pavilion at the New York World's Fair, Congressman BUCKLEY was honored for his outstanding contributions to the establishment and existence of the State of Israel. Ambassador Aryeh Manor, Minister of Economic Affairs, Embassy of Israel, said:

> Without friends and supporters such as Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, it is doubtful that there would be a Jewish homeland in Israel today. The hundreds of thousands of persecuted Jews who have found a haven in Israel shall be forever indebted to their faithful friend, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of the United States.

I know that it is reassuring to all those interested in justice and fairness for Israel and the Jewish people, to have in the Congress such a firm and effective friend as Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY.

I herewith further include, as part of my remarks, excerpts from Mr. Fell's article in the American Examiner:

CONGRESSMAN BUCKLEY FIGHTS FOR ISRAEL

In all the turmoil these days of anti-Jewish persecution in Russia, the noisy Arab threats in the Middle East against Israel, one finds it consoling to see a man who on many occasions has proven himself a friend of Israel and the Jewish people. Yes, I'm indeed delighted to bring to the attention of American Examiner readers the fight that Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY is leading on the floor of the House of Representatives on behalf of Israel in that nation's effort to develop water resources in order to survive.

Mr. BUCKLEY said on the floor of Congress:

"Mr. Speaker, I view with increasing concern the unjustified activities by the Arab countries aimed at destroying Israel's legitimate development of its water resources. The ability of Israel to make the maximum use of the limited water available to it is vital to the very existence of this country.

"I am proud of my record of continued support for the development of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and for U.S. support of the young Republic of Israel.

"Israel is the firmest and most consistent friend that the Western democracies have in the Middle East. If we in the United States allow Israel to be destroyed by either economic or military action, we will not only be failing in a great humanitarian cause, but we will be losing for the United

* * * * *

In addition, the prestige of the United States will suffer throughout the world for having failed a friend and ally. The denial of water to Israel is as much of a death sentence to its people as were the gas chambers of the Hitler terror."

Mr. BUCKLEY has served with distinction the people of the Bronx a little over 30 years. That means that the citizens of the community, the borough and county of the Bronx, have voted for him 15 consecutive elections to send him to the Nation's Capital to represent them in the Halls of Congress.

No less a personage than the President of the United States has publicly made it plain that he wishes Mr. BUCKLEY to return to Congress for yet another term. When his speech was published in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (March 25) recording his plea on behalf of Israel he received the following letter from the Ambassador of Israel, the Honorable Avraham Harman. Here is what Mr. Harman said:

APRIL 7, 1964.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCKLEY: May I say how greatly I appreciated reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1964, your remarks regarding Israel. I was deeply interested in your remarks and I would like to take this opportunity of expressing to you my thanks for your understanding of Israel's position. We, in Israel, are greatly encouraged by what you have said.

Sincerely yours,

AVRAHAM HARMAN,
Ambassador.

I herewith choose to conclude with what I once said before:

Mr. BUCKLEY, you were elected to the 74th Congress on November 6, 1934, and have subsequently been sent back to Congress by your constitutency—the 24th Congressional District in the Bronx—in every election since that date. It is the hope and the confidence of this reporter, sir, that the story will be the same in the congressional election this coming fall. And I am certain that when you do return, your voice will continue to be heard in behalf of truth, justice, and humanitarianism.

Pitt Students Light Candles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Pitt, the University of

Pittsburgh alumni magazine, contains a deeply moving article written by Esther Kitzes about a volunteer project being carried on by Pitt students. In the belief that they need to supplement their academic studies with involvement in the realities of the social and economic problems of the community, a number of white and Negro students are tutoring Negro teenagers in the Pittsburgh public schools in English, mathematics, languages, history, reading, and the sciences.

This is the kind of volunteer, local-level project that is so necessary if we are to win the war against poverty. These students recognize that education goes hand in hand with civil rights. It was said of the late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt that "she would rather light candles than curse the darkness." Some 100 Pitt students are helping turn back the shadows of prejudice and ignorance.

The article follows:

PITT STUDENTS LIGHT CANDLES

"How much did we pay the Spaniards for Florida?" she asked.

The eighth grade boy carefully studied the face of his pretty, young tutor, pursed his lips, then took at stab at it:

"I think it was $15,000." Pause. "Or maybe it was $15 million."

"How does $5 million sound?" asked the tutor.

"That doesn't sound right."

"But it is right." She arched an eyebrow and showed him the reference in the history text. Both faces broke into smiles. The face of the tutor—the pretty, youthful face of a University of Pittsburgh senior. Her skin is white. The face of the eighth grader—round, impish with warm, brown eyes. His skin is black.

The dialog, not untypical, took place during a tutoring session in what is now the largest student service program on campus—the Hill District Education Project (HEP) which was founded last fall by Pitt students who believe that "college students need to supplement 'book learning' with involvement in the reality of the social and economic problems of the community."

By offering their tutoring services, free, to Negro teenagers in the city's public schools, HEP volunteers have become a part of the reality that is the Negro civil rights revolution—a revolution that is whirling through the length and breadth of the land, churning up mildewed ideas, ripping through cobwebs of centuries-old prejudices, blowing sky-high the dust of years of neglect and rejection.

Caught in the maelstrom are hundreds of thousands of college students who feel the tugging winds but do not know what to do. Sit-ins, freedom rides, forays with clubbing cops, electric cattle prods, and snarling police dogs are activities a bit too militant for the majority of white college students. But the need "to do something" growls in their conscience.

TO LIGHT A CANDLE

Pitt HEP students have resolved this need. They prefer to light a candle rather than to curse the darkness. They believe that by improving the Negro's educational qualifications they improve his economic opportunities. They are keenly aware of the point made by Eliza Ginzberg of Columbia University who has warned: "If the Negro soon achieves in most regions of the United States his full political and civil rights, but finds that he is unable to move up the job and income ladder, he will have every reason to feel cheated for the second time in American history."

Michael Harrington, in his book "The Other America—Poverty in the U.S.," talks of the invisible poor, people without educational training and without a political lobby for the creation of work at a decent rate. A vast number are Negroes; many are under 18 with no skills, scant motivation for training, and as Harrington notes: "They are beyond history, beyond progress, sunk in a paralyzing, maiming routine."

At Pitt, almost 100 student tutors are trying to overcome the paralyzing, maiming routine which exists among Negro students. Twice weekly, these HEP volunteers meet with 140 Negro teenagers for extra boning-up sessions in English, math, languages, history, reading, and the sciences. The volunteers range from freshmen to graduates. Seven of them are Negroes. Several tutors are non-students—a handful of faculty members (including one dean) and a scattering of University staff members were stirred by the student effort and signed up.

The tutoring site can be the University Tower dormitory coffee shop, the Commons Room in the Cathedral of Learning, the Student Union, the lounge in Brackenridge House or, on balmy days, Schenley Park. Most of the sessions, however, are held on the fifth floor of the Anna B. Heldman Community Center on Centre Avenue in the Hill district. Coming to the campus is nice, but most of the Negro teenagers can't spring the carfare.

Wherever the meeting place, there is more than a meeting of minds—more than talk of history or English, verbs and predicates. The Pitt HEP tutors have pledged themselves "to develop a friendship, to enrich a life, to be enriched, to experience Pittsburgh outside the milieu of the college campus and to allow the high school student to glimpse a world outside of his own."

And so—the HEP tutor and his tutee can be seen at Carnegie Museum taking in the Pop Art exhibit; at the Syria Mosque absorbing an Isaac Stern performance; at the Pittsburgh Playhouse witnessing "The Tenth Man." For the Negro pupil it may be the first time he has been in a theater with "live actors." Indeed it may be the first time he has been inside Syria Mosque though he lives a scant 10-minute auto ride away.

At the end of the fall trimster, HEP tossed a small party for tutors and their charges. A dance and refreshments followed a panel discussion. The topic, chosen by the Negro teenager, was "Dope, Dating, and Delinquency." Both the college students and their pupils agreed that it made for an interesting evening.

Most important, HEP is something happening here and now for the Negro teenager. No myth, no promise, no faraway dream. To study with a real, live college student is a reality that cancels the alienation and hopelessness among capable Negro teenagers who might otherwise be dropouts.

A TWO-WAY PROGRAM

HEP is a two-way program. Not only does the Negro tutee get his desperately needed curriculum and spiritual enrichment, but a number of white tutors say they are receiving a "new understanding of the reality which exists outside of the halls of ivy." One tutor puts it this way:

"What's the use of reading about social, political, psychological, and educational problems in books if you've never set foot in a slum? How can you study civil rights problems if you've never had a Negro friend or been in a Negro ghetto?"

Says a HEP recruiter: "Sometimes in the understanding, a commitment emerges. If enough commitments emerge on enough college campuses, perhaps the pressing problems of the depressed urban areas will no longer be swept under the rug."

Any program, of course, is only as vital as its participants. Archibald Woodruff III, a graduate student in philosophy of science, joined HEP because he felt himself "very much a white victim of segregation."

"I want to have friends and acquaintances crossing all barriers of color, race, and economic background. I'd thought of joining the campus chapter of the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) but I find greater satisfaction with HEP. Meeting Negroes in the middle class is easy enough on the campus."

HEP, says Arch is "a straightforward affair: to help the Negro teenager overcome both racial and economic discrimination."

Straightforward as it is, the results are another thing. Arch Woodruff sadly concedes that one of his pupils is not college material. "There is no sense in kidding anyone about that. I'm up a tree. I don't know what to do for him. There is no middle ground for the Negro teenager. The white teenager who isn't college material has a middle ground to fall back on. He doesn't have the extreme choice: becoming a laborer or going to college. He can be a TV repairman, a plumber, a bricklayer, a skilled craftsman. But the skilled trades are closed to the Negro youngster."

Knowledge is infectious. Arch tells of the Negro youngster who came along with a tutee friend "just to keep her company." The tag-along was doing badly at school—showed no interest in any subject. Arch was tutoring his tutee in algebra. The "friend" sat around, listened. And "I threw a few algebra problems his way," Arch recalls.

Today, the tag-along is Arch's sharpest pupil. He is making remarkable strides in school and, says Arch: "Wait 'til my Henry gets to college. He'll really show 'em."

HEP GETS ITS START

The driving force behind the HEP program is Phi Beta Kappa Freda Kellams who received her B.A. in political science in December. During the preceding summer, two coeds, one from Vassar and the other from Sarah Lawrence, had initiated a pilot tutoring project at the Heldman Center. Freda responded to the call for tutors. Later, at the request of Tom Mellors, Pitt's Student Union Forum chairman who had spearheaded several civil rights panel discussions, she agreed to transform the pilot project into a Pitt volunteer program.

With Harriet Levine, a senior in political science, Irv Garfinkel, a political science junior and Earl Trent, Negro liberal arts freshman, HEP swung into action. To launch it, the volunteers visited the predominantly Negro high schools: Herron Hill, Schenley, and Fifth Avenue. They addressed the student bodies, explaining HEP and handing out enrollment blanks.

Says Freda: "There were 240 students who wanted tutoring help. We had only 100 tutors. Many Pitt students who want to tutor can't afford the carfare to and from the Hill District. That's 60 cents a round trip or $1.20 a week."

The Heldman Center eagerly offered its fifth floor as the central classroom for tutoring, and an interracial steering committee of nine Negroes and seven whites was set up. Anchormen were Earl Trent at Heldman and Freda at Pitt.

On the university end, Kay Pinneo of Pitt's Office of Educational Resources gave HEP a place to meet. "Dear Mrs. Pinneo," said Freda. "She took us out of the cold."

HEP's budget for the fall trimester was as slender as a butterfly's antenna. The cash receipts were: Mrs. Pinneo's office, $100; University Chaplain's Association, $15; Dr. Albert Martin, dean of Liberal Arts, $10; offerings for a month at Heinz Memorial Chapel, $271.68. Grand total: $396.68. The money was used for supplies and mailing and occasionally for the problematical carfare.

Freda and Earl Trent would like to find a foundation that would set up a trusteeship for HEP. Case in point: Gwen Cartledge who tutors twice a week, carries a full academic load and holds down a part-time job as a

typist in a downtown office. "How much better," says Freda, "if she could be earning money tutoring."

HEP has a waiting list of 150 pupils who want help with their studies. Pitt students who work part time find it hard to fit HEP into their schedules.

EVALUATIONS

While Freda and Earl pursue their hunt for a sympathetic foundation or alumni grant, philosophy student Woodruff stirs his coffee and talks to a prospective tutor:

"One reason I tutor is a selfish reason. In the future I'm going to live in an integrated country. Inevitably there will be more contact between Negro and white. HEP is preparing me. Another reason is purely one of pleasure. A true intellectual is a hedonist. He studies and learns for the sheer joy of it. He has a lust for learning * * * just as there is lust in the sex drive * * * there is lust in learning * * * tutoring is to the lust for learning what a Christian marriage is to sex."

Archibald Woodruff III has another reason: responsibility to someone else. "The normal pattern of college life is a selfish one. College students are led to believe they have one major responsibility: maintenance of their academic bank account, their QPA (quality point average). I believe a student has to supplement this responsibility with the responsibility for other people."

At the end of the first trimester of tutoring, evaluations were in order. Wrote one tutor:

"My pupil has a persecution complex that is affecting her school work. How do you help someone like this? What do you tell her?"

Another reported:

"My tutee dropped tutoring because she had to take care of the house when her mother got a job."

And then, from the other side of the fence, from a tutee, came this appraisal:

"A hard subject has to be suffered. With the HEP program it can be faced."

Most of the accolades, however, are unwritten, unspoken. There was the teenager who, undecided about his career, picked law in emulation of his tutor. And there was the saddened teenager who walked all the way out to the Pitt campus the day President Kennedy was assassinated * * * he just had to talk to someone. He chose a friend.

Beef Feeders Take Losses to $50 a Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the Members' attention to an excellent article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on April 27, 1964. It is a clear and concise explanation of the difficulties being faced by the American livestock industry. The Nation's cattlemen last year suffered the largest financial losses in the history of the cattle industry. The situation this year probably will be even worse.

I, together with a number of my colleagues, have repeatedly urged the President and the Congress to take effective action to curtail the importation of meat from abroad—the primary cause of the currently depressed livestock market. Unfortunately our plea has gone unheeded.

However, I again urge my colleagues and the administration to review the situation and to take effective action before the market becomes even further depressed.

The article follows:

BEEF FEEDERS TAKE LOSSES TO $50 A HEAD: PRICES DECLINE STEADILY SINCE 1962

(Widespread unrest among farmers and ranchers over low beef cattle prices has generated a controversy that already has reached the White House and threatens to erupt into a hard election year political issue involving the farm economy, food prices, and foreign trade. This is the second of a series of articles explaining what it's about.)

(By Richard Orr)

The Nation's cattlemen, who in 1962 marketed a record $8 billion worth of steaks, roasts, hamburger, and other beef-on-the-hoof, last year suffered a price break that resulted in probably the largest financial losses in the history of the cattle industry.

Particularly hard hit are cattle feeders—farmers and ranchers who buy calves or yearlings to feed for 4 months to a year and market with 300 to 900 pounds or more of gain. Although some price breaks in the past have been greater than those of the last 17 months, most cattle feeders now have much bigger and more costly operations, and consequently the losses this time have been much greater.

LOSE $20 A HEAD

Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, told the House recently that many cattle feeders lost $20 to $50 a head on every steer they marketed in recent months. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, testified to a Senate commerce committee that he concurs with an estimate by the general manager of the Denver Union Stockyards Co. that cattlemen suffered a $2.5 billion loss in values in 1963 and that $1 billion of the loss was in actual cash out of pocket.

The financial distress of the cattle industry, which is the largest single source of U.S. farm income, has brought vigorous demands on the Johnson administration for action to strengthen prices. In the face of mounting criticism, the administration has responded thus far by cutting back beef imports and calling for an investigation of food marketing patterns—actions which have served only to bring more criticism and heighten the controversy.

Meanwhile, the trend of cattle prices on the Chicago market indicates what has happened. In November 1962, choice steers weighing 1,100 to 1,300 pounds brought an average of $30.62 per 100 pounds. By November 1963, the price had dropped to an average of $23.52.

AVERAGE $21.74 IN MARCH

By March of this year, it had fallen to an average of $21.74, lowest since 1956.

This means that farmers who last fall bought 650 to 700 pounds choice yearling steers at $23 to $25 per 100 pounds found the market price down to $21.74 when it came time to sell them after 4 to 6 months of feeding the animals. But farmers who a year ago bought 350 to 400 pound calves for 12 months' feeding suffered even bigger losses, since those animals cost $33 to $35 per 100 pounds.

The University of Illinois keeps farm management records of actual farming operations, including cattle feeding. These records show that feeder cattle returns to farmers in 1963 were the lowest since 1952.

A. G. Mueller, associate professor of farm management at the university, said that yearling steers bought at 600 pounds and sold last September at 1,100 pounds, for example, lost an average of $12.88 per head on feed costs alone, not including other direct cash costs, such as labor, interest, veterinarian bills, gas, oil, electricity, and taxes. In 1962 the same type of steers brought returns of $45.64 a head above feed costs.

TELL OPERATING LOSS

The records show, Mueller said, that Illinois cattle feeding farms had an average net operating loss of $1,500 in 1963, compared with net income of $5,300 in 1962. The loss pattern, he added, was similar for both large-scale and medium-size operations. Some of the larger operations last year had income losses of $10,000 to $17,000 below 1962, while medium-size farms dropped $6,000.

To make matters worse, if that's possible, prospects are dim for any significant price strength in fed cattle in the next few months. Only a few weeks ago the Department of Agriculture predicted that fed cattle prices this spring probably would increase in response to smaller supplies, and that the price improvement would appear in the second quarter of the year and carry over into the third quarter.

But a more recent Government survey of cattle feeders in 28 major feeding States indicates farmers and ranchers plan to market 6 percent more cattle in the period of April through June than they did in the same period a year ago.

VOIDS EXPECTED GAINS

This report prompted the forecast from Gene Futrell, an economist at Iowa State University, Ames, that an increase in the number of cattle on feed—especially heavier cattle—apparently has eliminated chances for the expected late spring price rise.

However, Futrell added, the increase does not mean a further price decline from present levels, providing marketings are not bunched. He said prices for choice steers at the Chicago market in the April–June period are likely to average $21.50 to $22 per 100 pounds. That would be $1 to $1.50 lower than a year ago, but close to recent levels.

Civil Rights Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this Member has been pointing out from time to time that the civil rights bill now pending before Congress will neither create the utopia some of its overly enthusiastic supporters assert, nor create the chaos its more vocal opponents predict.

This fact was pointed out once again in an article that appeared in the May 1 issue of the Wall Street Journal by Jerry Landauer.

The article follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS CONFUSION: BILL ISN'T AS STRONG AS NEGROES WANT OR AS WHITES FEAR

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—No legislative proposal in recent memory has stirred more passionate advocacy or evoked angrier opposition than the civil rights bill. And none has been more misunderstood by those most aroused.

To Negroes everywhere, the Civil Rights Act of 1963 (so named because it started its stormy legislative journey nearly a year ago) has become a symbol of hope—the hope that

the promises of the Constitution and innumerable party platforms will be delivered at last.

But the very fervency of this hope has added a new dimension to the emotion-laden struggle: The intense resentment of large blocs of whites in the North. To them, the bill has become a symbol of fear—fear of losing jobs to Negroes; fear that neighborhood schools will be flooded by Negro kids "bused in" from across town; fear that homeowners will be forced to sell, if they wish to sell at all, to Negro newcomers.

In point of fact, both the hopes and the fears are exaggerated, with each emotion tending to inflame the other. If rigidly enforced, the bill may deliver to more Negroes in the Deep South the right to vote in Federal elections. It may open to those southerners more schools, lodging places, stores, and restaurants. And it may protect demonstrators against overzealous police intervention.

LITTLE EFFECT IN NORTH

But as its backers themselves acknowledge (and as some are insistently trying to communicate to constituents), the rights bill, though technically applying to every section of the land, will barely affect living conditions of either Negro or white in the North. The provisions affecting schools and homes have been reshaped to limit their application almost exclusively to the South. The jobs provisions have little impact on the North and may have even less by the time they become law.

The widespread misunderstanding among northern whites about the pending bill's provisions is compounded from several ingredients. Some think it still contains the sweeping language contrived by a House subcommittee last fall. Others have been excited by southern propagandists. And a substantial number have confused the school, housing, and job goals of local civil rights demonstrators with the Federal bill's intent.

To take schools first, the House after little debate wrote into the bill an amendment exempting "racially imbalanced" schools from the Attorney General's authority to file suits for integration. In giving the Justice Department authority to initiate such suits, the House specified that "desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalances." In effect, this language limits the law's reach to southern schools segregated by local ordinance or State law.

According to congressional lawyers, moreover, the amendment's definition of segregation won't allow the U.S. Office of Education to offer grants or provide technical assistance to school boards trying to break down racial separation imposed by neighborhood housing patterns. Realining school districts to achieve integration is a prime aim of the rights movement, but here again the bill won't reach beyond the Southern States.

HOUSING EXCLUSION

Another title in the House-approved bill directs Federal agencies to withhold aid, as a last resort, from locally operated programs or activities that don't provide equal benefits to Negroes. As it emerged from the House Judiciary Committee, this title could have been interpreted to cover VA- or FHA-guaranteed home mortgages, and housing loans by banks and savings and loan associations whose deposits are insured by Washington.

On the House floor, though, the fund-withholding title was amended to exclude "contracts of insurance or guarantee." Thus the one provision that might satisfy somewhat the Negro's quest, most acute in the North, for equal access to housing was deleted. (Executive orders against discrimination in housing cover VA- and FHA-insured mortgages; they don't cover the lending practices of Federally insured financial institutions.)

As for jobs, the bill contemplates leaving jurisdiction over equal employment opportunities to States that have set up "effective" antidiscrimination agencies. It's assumed that the proposed Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission won't operate in California, New York, or other industrial States where Negro complaints about job discrimination are loudest. Amendments proposed by Senate Republican leader DIRKSEN go still further toward allowing States and communities to deal with job discrimination pretty much as they have been.

In practice, this means that the jobs title will barely touch most of the 30 States, nearly all in the North, that have created fair employment commissions. "The effect of the Federal law on most employers up North will be exactly what it is under State law," according to one bill drafter.

Much the same is true for the bill's remaining controversial section, which bans discrimination in hotels, restaurants, amusement centers and other so-called public accommodations. Already, 32 States prohibit discrimination in these or similar places that invite public business, and many provide criminal penalties for violators.

A 1961 Ohio law, for example, authorizes fines of up to $500 and jail terms for up to 90 days. In contrast, the proposed Federal statute limits sanctions to civil remedies by the courts, though refusal to comply with court decrees could lead to punishment for contempt.

All this leads inevitably to the conclusion that the bill's impact will be minimal in the northern cities where civil rights agitation is now strongest. Nevertheless, the "white backlash" refuses to abate, and some of it even comes from citizens sympathetic toward or associated with Negro causes. Just one example: A white director of the United Negro College Fund in Wisconsin, in a letter to Senator NELSON, said he couldn't support the bill because it authorizes transfers of white students to correct racial imbalance in schools—which, of course, it does not. An aid to Senator NELSON says, "We get hundreds and hundreds of letters like this from attorneys, businessmen, and others who should know better."

CONSTITUENTS REASSURED

Caught in this tide of critical letters and telegrams (in some offices the antibill mail overwhelms the pro by margins of 10 to 1), Congressmen are trying to stem it by grinding out reassuring statements to their restless constituents—in some cases with help from Attorney General Kennedy.

Republican Representative MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, who helped draft the bill, notes that Ohioans are living under a tougher State code than the one facing a filibuster in the Senate. In neighboring Indiana, where segregationist Governor Wallace, of Alabama, is trying to capitalize on white unrest, Senator BAYH asserts that the Federal statute will have little or no effect on Hoosiers. Senator NELSON told voters in a recent newsletter that none of the 11 titles in the bill would change any of Wisconsin's civil rights practices. A GOP House Member, seeking to soothe the fears of an entreating women's delegation, assured that the bill "doesn't mean a jot north of the Mason and Dixon line."

So far, the white backlash hasn't changed the prospect for eventual Senate approval of an amended, somewhat weakened bill. White resentment failed to turn more than a handful of votes against it in the House; and in the Senate all but a few Members are dug in too far to switch sides, even if they judged retreat would be expedient.

Unless segregationist Governor Wallace scores heady triumphs in the Indiana and Maryland Presidential primaries next month, the crop of fearful outcries against the bill won't do more than prod two to three more uncertain Senators into voting for amendments that will further clarify Congress' intent to limit the measure's impact essentially to the South.

In short, the civil rights bill probably will vault the filibuster's obstacles because it doesn't go nearly as far as Negroes desire, nor is it as tough or comprehensive as Northern whites fear.

The 175th Anniversary Customs Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a joint resolution of Congress and a Presidential proclamation, 1964 has been designated U.S. Customs Year in honor of the 175th anniversary of the inception of our widely respected and honored customs establishment.

In keeping with the sense of the Congress, the U.S. Customs Examiners Association organized and sponsored a banquet at the Americana Hotel in New York City on April 22, 1964. No fewer than 2,500 persons were present, and that included a large number of distinguished guests and leaders from many walks of life.

Two major addresses were delivered that evening—one by the Honorable James A. Reed, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and the other by the Honorable Michael Stramiello, Jr., U.S. appraiser of merchandise.

Secretary Reed's address was primarily a report on the activities of the U.S. customs service during the 175 years of service to the American people.

Appraiser Stramiello's remarks dealt at length with the subject requirements most commonly misunderstood by U.S. residents traveling to and from foreign countries.

I am sure their listeners found their remarks enlightening. I am pleased to make a part of the RECORD the important and timely remarks of Secretary Reed and Appraiser Stramiello concerning the 175th anniversary of the U.S. customs service:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES A. REED, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS EXAMINERS ASSOCIATION

It is a genuine privilege and pleasure for me to be your principal speaker at this magnificent banquet marking the 175th anniversary of the U.S. customs service. Your presence and your spirit are a fitting tribute to the men and women who have made customs one of the most widely respected agencies of our Government and it is a matter of great personal pride that I am closely associated with your distinguished Commissioner, Philip Nichols, Jr., in this worthy enterprise. I bring greetings to you from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, who asked me to deliver his felicitations on this anniversary and to wish you well in whatever you undertake. Commissioner Nichols regretted his inability to attend and also sent a congratulatory message from Laredo, Tex., where he is attending a regional conference of principal field officers in the customs service.

On December 30 last, the Congress adopted a unanimous resolution calling upon the American people to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the customs service with appropriate ceremonies and activities. President Lyndon Johnson issued a proclamation designating 1964 as U.S. Customs Year and reiterating the intent of Congress that the American people take part in activities which mark the customs birthday. It is therefore in keeping with the will of the legislators, as well as with the desire of the President, that we are assembled here today to pay homage to the customs service in the city which was its birthplace, the original Capital of our country, the city of New York.

What an exciting period were those early days of our infant Republic when the people severed their bonds with the mother country, and for the first time exercised their sovereignty by imposing the first American customs duties on imports. By this action, the Colonies showed the rest of the world that they wanted to stand on their own two feet, build their own commercial system and thereby establishing their economic independence.

But, interesting as it is to ruminate on the past, I am sure that all of you are familiar with the widely known and often-told story of our beginnings. What is not so well known and not so often told is the unique achievement that has been made to the development of the customs service by the appraisers and examiners. I welcome this opportunity to provide a forum for this narrative.

What is the role of the appraiser? What is the nature of his task? How has this operation changed down through the years?

Let me begin by reading an excerpt from testimony given to a Senate Committee on Finance in 1887, in which there was given a definition of the appraiser:

"There is no office in this Government, from the President of the United States down, that requires such varied acquirements as that of an appraiser. He must know the language of every country sufficiently to construe the invoices; he must know the currency of every country—francs, florins, piastres, rupees.

"He must know the weights and measures of every country. He must know the value of every article of merchandise known to commerce, its quality and value in every country of the world, on every day of the week; and he must know human nature perfectly—the motives and springs of action which govern men in their transactions with the customs, that he may protect the honest importer against the fraudulent one, and keep in legitimate channels of the trade of the country. * * * He must resent no man for malice, hatred, or revenge; nor must he spare him for love, friendship, or regard. There is no office where skill, tact, good judgment, untiring industry and firmness, and decision of character are more demanded; while integrity, fidelity, and discretion are only a few of the requisites to make him an accomplished public officer."

The U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has gone on record with this statement: "Appraisement lies at the very basis of customs administration." What was true 77 years ago is no less true today. Whether he is a line examiner classifying unripened cottage cheese, or appraising industrial diamonds, or identifying Cuban tobacco, the examiner must be a psychologist, a specialist, an "answer-man," an authority who can handle almost any situation arising out of one of the most complex jobs in the customs service.

The U.S. customs examiner is at the forefront of our economic system, as a devoted, skilled, resourceful agent of Government. In the face of the challenge of the new era in which we live, the examiner has been assigned new, difficult and highly selective duties which enable him to play a significant role in the realization of the tariff policy of our country.

By far the most important new function is the assignment to the customs examiner the task of correctly establishing the nature of imports into the United States.

Some of the significant changes which have been made in his duties are:

1. Interpretation and administration of quotas and embargoes, particularly on cotton textile.

2. Appraisement of merchandise under a dual standard in accordance wtih the Customs Simplification Act of 1956, effective February 27, 1958.

3. Advising foreign and domestic inquirers of correct rates of duty on actual or contemplated importations under the new tariff schedules.

There are more than 300 land, sea and airports of entry in our country. Through these points, merchandise is cleared for entry into the commerce of the United States. This merchandise is broken down into tens of thousands of different items which have to be classified separately as to their dutiable and statistical status. The statutory value of each article has to be determined, and the proper duties and taxes have to be assessed and collected.

The Tariff Act of 1930 vests in customs appraisers the responsibility for determining and reporting to collectors of customs the appraised unit value of imported merchandise, subject to different rates of duties, specific, ad valorem, and compound. The appraiser is authorized by law to make final value determinations, subject only to judicial review by the U.S. Customs Courts.

However, without taking anything away from the appraisers or their trusted assistants, it has often been said that the real "meat and potatoes" of appraisement is in the work of the customs line examiners throughout the United States. During fiscal year 1963, the customs line examiners processed 2½ million invoices which broke down into slightly over 1,600,000 entries. Since January 1, 1962, examiners have been deeply involved in compiling import data for the Census Bureau of the United States. In the fiscal year 1963, they verified almost 3 million items and made substantial changes in the classification, value, quality, and country of origin in almost one-fourth of all (22½ percent of) these items. In addition, they contributed significantly to the accuracy and speed of publication by the Census Bureau of editorial-type revisions in more than 60 percent of all items which come before them on import entries.

The Treasury Department relies heavily on the examiner's reports in antidumping cases, since it is the examiner's knowledge of home market prices as well as export transactions which provide the major incentive for honest and forthright replies by foreign exporters.

I could go in this vein at considerable length, but I must remember that I am addressing a group which has 175 years of experience in operations in the world's greatest merchandise mart. Hence, time will not permit me to dwell on subjects which I know would be of great interest to all of you. Thus, I will pass over the immensely important work of the Customs Information Exchange which processes mountains of inquiries and requests as to value and classification, and maintains and distributes all customs forms, books, and publications.

In addition, I will not be able to dwell upon the work of the fibers administrator who coordinates and supervises the work of customs examiners on importations of wool and other fibers at all ports, seeking to obtain uniformity among individuals in different judgment areas. Nor can I dwell upon the Canadian query program which for the last 7 or 8 years has simplified or eliminated many of the problems of Canadian-United States trade and which has been hailed by the Canadian Government as an important contribution to market development in that country. Neither will I have the opportunity to elaborate upon the matter of the embargo on the importation of all goods from Communist Cuba which has enlisted the skill of our customs examiners, particularly those at New York and Tampa who in cooperation with the chief chemists in Baltimore and New York, have devised a reliable method of identification of the origin of tobacco by gas chromatography.

We are currently working on the revision of the antidumping regulations—a problem in which I am personally much involved—and we hope that existing procedures in the processing of dumping cases can be improved during the next year.

One phase of your work which I would like to especially single out is the program of examiner-verification of import data which, since its beginning in January 1962, has earned high praise from users of these statistics both in and out of Government. The U.S. Tariff Commission has found the customs examiners to be an unfailing source of accurate information, and they have received a tremendous amount of "extracurricular" help from the examiners on many problems. Invaluable comments and suggestions from line examiners throughout the customs service also help to make the "Tariff Schedules of the United States" a much more workable document.

It is obvious that the continued effectiveness of our customs service depends to a remarkable degree upon the selection, training, and promotion of competent, industrious, and ambitious customs examiners. In common with all other agencies of our Government, Customs has been faced with the problem of securing and retaining competent young personnel with the capacity to grow on the job. This condition requires that our customs examiners retain their high morale and pride in their own unit as well as in the service in which they are employed and transmit this enthusiasm to those who follow. I am happy to be able to pay tribute to the work of the appraisers and examiners at this magnificent anniversary celebration and to say with Secretary Dillon that we are very grateful for your skill and knowledge and dedication to the public service.

SPEECH BY HON. MICHAEL STRAMIELLO, JR., U.S. APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE, U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE

Judge Rao, reverend clergy, your honors, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, at the outset, I wish to extend on behalf of Mrs. Stramiello and for myself our sincere thanks to the Customs Examiners Association for inviting us to be their guests tonight.

In addition, permit me to proclaim a "well done" to the officers of the association and particularly to the members of the dinner committee for having created and executed the plans for this most successful and gala affair.

Your efforts and the results you have achieved lead me to say, "I'm very proud of you."

It is interesting to note that this event which commemorates the 175th anniversary of the U.S. customs service marks the resumption of dinners sponsored by the examiners association after a gap of 6 years.

Anticipating that Secretary Reed in his address will outline the historical development of the customs service, I shall, in my talk, briefly touch upon a variety of services rendered by customs with particular emphasis on the role of the appraisers. As I do so, it will become evident that examiners are the backbone, yes, the very lifeblood, of an appraiser's office.

Placing emphasis upon the activities of the appraisers is not to suggest that the con-

tributing services rendered by our sister offices are minimal. The collectors of customs, the comptrollers of customs, the customs laboratories, the customs agency service and, here in New York, the surveyor of customs, the solicitor, the assistant to the chief counsel, and the director of the customs information exchange all function effectively to produce customs service, a product of which we are justifiably proud.

Well-deserved and widespread publicity given to antismuggling activities of our customs inspectors and customs agents often leaves the general public unaware of the less glamorous but most essential work performed by other arms of the customs service.

Within the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department, the appraisers' offices are supervised in the Division of Appraisement Administration by Deputy Commissioner Walter G. Roy, under the overall direction and control of the Commissioner of Customs, the Honorable Philip Nichols, Jr. Uniform action by appraisers is achieved throughout the Nation under their efficient administration. The importance of this result is self-evident.

Let us consider for a moment the day-to-day work of appraisers as performed by customs examiners. In conference with examiner A is an importer of women's wear who is submitting his proposed new line for the examiner's opinion on the probable rates of duty which will apply. This examiner tells the importer that the particular construction feature of the proposed line will subject some of the garments to higher duty rates. The importer leaves knowing the probable tariff treatment which will be given his intended importations. Frequently, because of the examiner's advice, he is able to change the line so as to obtain more advantageous tariff treatment. Although this examiner's position description does not include dress designing, his opinions on clothing construction are often reflected in the finished garment.

Now, let us stop in on the fine arts division—sometimes referred to as the esthetic sixth. There, we find our art expert examining a Van Gogh. One might expect that he is studying the subject of the painting. In fact, he is examining the work with the aid of ultraviolet rays to determine its authenticity.

Proceed with me now to the north side of the building—where our diamond examiner is looking at what appears to be a many-sided piece of glass. In reality, it is an unpolished rough diamond ready to be transformed into a priceless gem for milady.

Let's look in on our coal tar examiner. Right now he has a real puzzler. He is attempting to find a value under the American selling price statute for an imported drug which is in powder form. His problem stems from the fact that the only competitive domestic counterpart is the tablet form of the drug.

There are many perplexing questions to answer which often determine tariff classification. For instance:

When is the jewel in a watch movement functional? Is this medal being worn as an ornament or in religious devotion?

How does one tell mink raised in the Soviet Union from that originating in Finland—one being a prohibited article, the other not?

Which of these products is netting—which is marquisette? Although they are almost identical in appearance, they are subject to widely divergent rates of duty.

When an examiner inquires as to the blood relationship between you and your supplier, don't think that he does so as a student of genealogy. He is not interested in your coat of arms but he is concerned with determining the fair market value of your imports. As many of you know, under our newer value statutes, the relationship between buyer and seller could affect dutiable values radically.

The importance of the examiner's work and the responsibilities it entails become more impressive when one considers their enormity. The value of imports into the United States has risen to more than $17 billion annually. On those imports just under $2 billion in customs duties are being collected. In New York alone my office is currently appraising more than $6 billion of merchandise annually on which upwards of $700 million in customs duties are collected.

Actions which result in duty collections are not the only concern of the examiner. Also of concern to him are the valuation and identification of duty-free products, merchandise which is subject to quotas, prohibited merchandise, and the many regulatory provisions in force for customs and other Government agencies.

These then are examples of the duties performed by these remarkable Government officials, the customs examiners.

Prior to being honored with appointment as U.S. appraiser of merchandise, I had ample opportunity as a practicing customs attorney to observe the work of customs examiners. Because of what I saw, they earned my deepest respect and esteem. They were found to be fair, impartial, industrious, and honest. Since my appointment, the opportunity to observe examiners at work has increased. From this observation, I have concluded that customs examiners are typical of those Government employees who are talented, efficient, and profoundly dedicated to their work. It is extremely gratifying to have been given this opportunity to join you in saluting them.

Loyalty Day and Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 3, it was my very great privilege to serve as honorary chairman of the 1964 Loyalty Day Parade and ceremonies conducted by the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in Willimantic, Conn.

It has been estimated that 100,000 witnessed the parade in which about 25,000 participated. Here was a manifestation of loyalty—to our Nation—which provided something more than a counterbalance to the weakening thunder of the May Day of communism.

I was reminded, as I witnessed the ceremonies in Willimantic, Conn., that May 3 was also the 173d anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, which brought to the European Continent an entirely new concept of human dignity.

With us in Willimantic, in reviewing stand and in the ranks of the parade, were many hundreds of men and women of Polish descent, who were, I am certain, not unmindful of the concurrence of Polish Constitution Day. These were men and women who have been elected or appointed to responsible positions, and who have served with valor and with dignity in the Armed Forces of the United States.

I have been informed that Americans of Polish descent now number approximately 15 million, and these, of course, represent several generations.

Not by choice, but by force, the Polish nation, which in 1966 will observe its 1,000th anniversary, finds itself again under Communist rule. These are brave people. They are religious people. They are freedom-loving people whose history is abundant with records of courage and steadfastness in battle against tyranny and oppression.

The Constitution adopted by the Polish Parliament in 1791 provided:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is not extraordinary that we Americans, being of many ethnic backgrounds, join in the celebration and recognition of Polish Constitution Day, for the Polish Constitution, adopted in 1791, followed many of the principles established 2 years earlier when the U.S. Constitution was adopted.

The spirit of liberty still prevails in Poland. Despite years of oppression, there are some signs that there may emerge modest opportunities for greater freedom. As acting chairman of the Captive Nations Subcommittee, and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I can report that in current hearings on recent developments in the Soviet bloc, we have had an opportunity to examine conditions in Poland, in human rights, agriculture, industry, the arts, sciences, trade, theater, literature and other fields. Our findings have been intensely interesting to us, and I recommend to my colleagues that they familiarize themselves with the printed hearings which now are available, because they demonstrate that the Polish love of liberty and the desire for individual freedom is still strong.

May the day not be far distant when this freedom is fully restored to the great Polish nation.

New Films Show Satiric Therapy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a distinguished political commentator is moved to comment at length on an American film. That Marquis Childs devoted his entire column of March 20, 1964, to two Hollywood products is indicative of the provocative nature of these two movies. "Seven Days in May" and "Dr. Strangelove," or How To Stop Worrying and Learn To Love the Bomb," have created a good

deal of controversy, as well as long lines at ticket windows. In the role of movie critic, Mr. Childs brings the same cogency and clarity that we have come to expect from him in his regular thoughtful analysis of political events:

NEW FILMS SHOW SATIRIC THERAPY

(By Marquis Childs)

In movie houses across the country long lines wait to see two films that are far from the customary froth of Hollywood. "Seven Days in May" and "Dr. Strangelove, or How To Stop Worrying and Learn To Love the Bomb," have both stirred the kind of controversy that in another day grew out of such pictures as "The Grapes of Wrath."

"Seven Days," a real thriller that tells how a plot by top brass in the Air Force to take over the Government was foiled, has been attacked by rightwing publications. Noble words about democratic government and the privilege of free choice are spoken by the fictional President as he strives to hold the reins of authority against military usurpers opposed to a disarmament treaty with the Soviet Union.

But it is "Dr. Strangelove" that has set off the loudest critical firecrackers. On the one hand indignant critics sputter that if this can be shown, as representing American military and civil authority, then nothing is sacred. Others have said that it is one of the most exciting films ever made—bitter, Swiftian satire of a mad age that reckons casualties in a third world war at a hundred million on each side.

The most pointed criticism has come not from movie reviewers but from serious commentators. They say that this wild farcical satire of the American military, a bumbling President and, off screen, a simple-minded Soviet Premier will do America great harm when it is shown abroad. This, they have gone so far as to say, is a piece of propaganda the Communists could not have improved upon, showing a trigger-happy America recklessly pushing the annihilation button.

They point out, too, that the film in showing a mad Air Force general starting the war ignores improved fail-safe procedures making this impossible But "Dr. Strangelove" is, after all, a satire and its aim is to jolt the imagination and jar those who may gradually have come to accept the belief that a nuclear war would not be very much different from other wars. In this it seems to one observer to succeed admirably.

Perhaps the best answer to the anti-American charge has come from England where the picture is also showing to crowded houses. The distinguished weekly, the Economist, writes:

"Except in the sense that anyone is already anti-American to begin with will probably read his own anti-Americanism into it, as a hot-under-the-collar adolescent will probably read pornography into 'Lady Chatterley's Lover'; this is nonsense. That it is nonsense is shown by the fact that the one really unforgiveable act of top-level idiocy committed in the film is committed not by an American but by the Russian Prime Minister, who switches on the doomsday device, thus insuring that the whole world gets blown up without telling anybody."

There is still another answer to the anti-American charge. Except for the most uncritical audiences, who would probably not get the point in any event, the fact that the picture has been made by Americans about Americans shows that we are free to satirize ourselves. We can turn savage laughter against the folly of an era that has at enormous cost built the means of its own self-destruction.

This reporter has a vivid memory of the fantastic press conference which Premier Khrushchev held in Paris immediately following the collapse of the summit conference after the U-2 incident in 1960. At his left was the grim, massive figure of Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky. As the press conference went on the impression grew that Khrushchev was looking over his shoulder to make sure that the marshal approved what he was saying.

Malinovsky is perfectly type-cast for a Soviet satire on the military. But it is impossible to imagine a Soviet film laughing at the Soviet's nuclear warriors. As Life magazine notes in an article highly praising "Dr. Strangelove," Malinovsky recently rebuked Soviet writers and artists for falling short of glorifying the romantic joys of war and the nobility of the Russian soldier and turning instead to antiwar themes.

Only yesterday "Dr. Strangelove" and perhaps also "Seven Days in May" might have stirred active protest from some superpatriots. It is not hard to imagine, in that earlier frenetic time, superheated by McCarthy's fulminations, the 35-year-old producer of "Strangelove," Stanley Kubrick, being called to account before a congressional committee. If we are in a saner mood and Hollywood is encouraged to turn out something other than froth, it is all to the good.

Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, some time prior to the passage of the food stamp plan, I had contacted Gov. Albert D. Rosellini relative to a statement which appeared in the RECORD from the Director of Public Welfare in the State of Washington.

Subsequent to that time I received no reply. When I was in my district during early April, I took the opportunity of asking question in Grays Harbor County where the pilot program of the food stamp plan is in action. Mr. Glen D. Smethers, of Cosmopolis, Wash., a man who for many years has been interested in welfare problems in Grays Harbor County, took the time and trouble to assemble certain facts.

Because of the evidence placed in the RECORD heretofore, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to insert Mr. Smether's letter to me and a copy of his letter to Governor Rosellini. This, I think, will clarify some thoughts of the Grays Harbor County food stamp plan and should present thoughtful material as we place the program into greater and more evident use:

COSMOPOLIS, WASH.,
April 28, 1964.

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: Thank you for your letter of April 17, 1964, asking me for facts about the food stamp pilot project in Grays Harbor County, Wash.

I have made inquiries about the plan to recipients of the food and grocers who distribute the food; while I lack the resource to canvass the entire country, my inquiries have been broad enough to convince me that a fair and impartial survey should be made and the results made available to our Congressmen. See the enclosed copy of a letter to Gov. Albert D. Rosellini.

I ask questions about it from people who have first hand information about the stamp plan, a few of the recipients are reluctant to answer some of my questions, however, when I ask, "How does the food stamp distribution compare with direct food distribution?"

Answer. [Without exception] the stamp plan is the best.

Question. From the standpoint of more food for poor people or, more efficient distribution?

Answer. Both, the recipients would add comment to the answer such as we can get the food we want when we want it with the coupons; with direct food distribution we had to take what they had and sometimes too much or not enough of one thing. Many of them seemed to resent the fact that they could not buy coffee with the stamps.

Some of the storekeepers said that the coupons should be issued in $10 and $1 denominations and the system simplified; all agreed, however, that the plan is worthwhile even though a great deal of extra work is required.

Question. I have been reading in the paper [the Aberdeen Daily World] that the stamp plan got off to a slow start, but is gaining in popularity. Why is this?

Answers varied, such as. The program was not properly explained in the start, we did not know what the score was. People said that the plan was set up to help the banker, not the recipient. I was told that direct distribution would give more food.

One of the grocers told me that a man who has been having a tough go of it had greeted the plan with a statement that the stamp plan was a phony; urged to give it a try, he did so and now he says that it is the best plan ever devised to put food on the family table. The stamps upped his food by $14 a month.

I talked to many people that are now using the stamp plan; they say they like it, that it helps them with the food supply but there is some griping about the rigid means test.

I talked to a family, the man was injured and out of action for many months; the mother said, we like the plan, I don't know what we would do without it; my kids need all the food they they can get but, why does the Government make us take a pauper's oath to get it? I told her that I had hopes the means test would be liberalized but that it was no disgrace to use the stamps.

She said, "The Government donates money and food to the big shots overseas and they subsidize many of the rich people here at home, but it hurts them to do anything for our own people. Damn you, you just go tell the Government that the people are fed up with that kind of business."

I note that you say that Congresswoman SULLIVAN is interested in knowing the results of the pilot project here in our county; she is a Representative after my own heart, she knows the meaning of nourishing food to poor people who have a meager income.

You can tell Congresswoman SULLIVAN that if the food stamp plan is expanded that it will help many people who are on public assistance; it will also keep many people off of public assistance and this is the considered judgment of people who have watched the pilot plan in action.

In 1961 the Legislature of the State of Washington made the necessary law to inaugurate the direct food distribution in our State; however there was an across-the-board cut of 10 percent in public assistance.

I thank you for your vote for the stamp plan in the House and I hope that JACKSON and MAGNUSON vote yes in the Senate.

There are persistent rumors about waste and dumping of the foodstuff in the direct distribution setup. I lack firsthand information but the survey that I have asked

for should run down the rumors and dispose of them, otherwise unfavorable publicity will hamper the distribution of food to the needy.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN D. SMETHERS.

COSMOPOLIS, WASH.,
April 27, 1964.

Hon. ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington
Olympia, Wash.

SIR: I am writing you to ask that a fair, impartial survey be made of the food stamp plan that is underway here in Grays Harbor County. That this be done immediately, that the results of the survey be made available to our Representatives in the Congress and to the public.

In the March 4 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Representative CATHERINE MAY caused to be printed a report by your Mr. L. L. Hegland, the director of the State of Washington Public Assistance, a report which had to do with the food stamp project underway in Grays Harbor County.

Mrs. MAY said, "My vote in committee was against reporting the bill to make the plan permanent because this matter needs a great deal more study to determine whether it is truly superior to the direct food distribution program." She said, "You will note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Hegland expresses very sincere doubt about the expansion of this program." Here is a summary of the Hegland report.

"Basically, the surplus commodity distribution program was designed to do two things * * * use up the surplus foods and supply a more adequate diet to persons of low income. It appears that the food stamp program accomplishes only a part of this, and the direct food distribution program does a much more adequate job both on using up surplus commodities and of being available to a larger number of low-income people. If I can provide you with any further information, please let me know."

Mr. Governor this simply does not jibe with the true facts. I have talked to many people who get and use the food stamps, and to operators of grocery stores. * * * Example: Mullins of the Square Deal Grocery, Cosmopolis; Swanson of Swanson's Aberdeen Store; Scott's Grand Central Market of Aberdeen, and I have yet to find a person who thinks that the direct food distribution does the best job. From firsthand knowledge gained through experience thus far with the food stamp plan, the people most concerned are convinced that this is the best method to increase the food for the poor people.

As you know the people in the low-income groups are inarticulate and few men in high places will champion their cause; unlike Mr. Hegland, they cannot get their views before the Congress.

There are some bugs in the stamp plan * * * it could be simplified, the rigged means test could be liberalized, but no permanent plan can be had much less improvements unless we get a true and accurate report of the Grays Harbor test before the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN D. SMETHERS.

Take Off Your Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Sterling, nephew of Andrew Sterling who wrote such old song favorites as "Meet Me in St. Louis" and "When the Sun Goes Down," has composed new lyrics to his uncle's hit "Strike Up the Band." The tune and lyrics are particularly appropriate for Flag Day, June 14. The following is the text of the new lyric which is titled, "Take Off Your Hat, Here Comes Old Glory":

Take off your Hat
Here comes Old Glory
Hand over heart
Think of its story
Hats off to you
Red, white and blue
It's a cinch
That every inch spells glory.

Demolishing a Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Pittsburgh Press of Monday, October 28, 1963, pointing out the evils to be inflicted upon our free competitive society and economy by enactment of the iniquitous quality stabilization bills, H.R. 3669 and S. 774, now pending before the Congress.

DEMOLISHING A BILL

Paul Rand Dixon is Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), the Government agency more concerned than any with seeing that the public gets a square deal for the things it buys. When it comes to price fixing, the FTC probably is better informed than anybody, since it was price fixing that resulted in the creation of the FTC in 1915.

Mr. Dixon, in the line of public service, has just done a demolishing job on the so-called quality stabilization bill pending before Congress. This is the new name for the fair trade legislation which has been pushed unsuccessfully in Congress for several years.

Mr. Dixon called the bill by its right name, a price-fixing device. If it is passed by Congress, he said, it could cost the consumers $5 billion in a year in higher prices.

Some States, including Pennsylvania, now have fair trade (alias price fixing) laws. In some States these laws have been declared unconstitutional. But in States where the laws still are in effect, Mr. Dixon said, it has been proved that prices are higher than in adjoining States which do not have such laws.

One of the arguments put in favor of the quality stabilization bill is that it would protect small merchants from discount houses. Mr. Dixon demolished that claim, too. He said, on the contrary, the small or independent merchants would be unable to compete with the lower priced brands sold by chainstores, because they would be compelled, as a result of law, to abide by prices fixed by the manufacturers. So they would lose business.

The quality stabilization bill proposes to give the power of Federal law to price fixing which the FTC and the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department are always fighting. It would tend to stifle competition, which is the essence of the American system and the basis for all other Federal law governing business operations.

Mr. Dixon's testimony ought to be enough to kill the bill.

Education Is Top Item in Mexico's 1964 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the Alliance for Progress and in particular as one who believes that education must play a key role in the future of Latin America, I was gratified to learn recently that our neighbor to the south, Mexico, spends 25 percent of its entire annual budget on education.

I understand, moreover, that Mexico has done so throughout the administration of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, which began in December 1958.

After a visit to Argentina in 1961 along with my colleague, Congressman Robert Giaimo of Connecticut, for the purpose of studying higher education in Latin America, I became convinced, on the basis of conversations with university and government leaders in that country, that the universities of Latin America must increase their efforts to turn out the trained men and women who are essential for leadership if Latin American countries are to create free, democratic political institutions that will endure and to enjoy the economic growth which all nations in the 20th century seek.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a release published by an agency of the Mexican Government concerning education in the Mexican budget.

The statement follows:

EDUCATION IS TOP ITEM IN MEXICO'S 1964 BUDGET

With an allotment of $325 million, education is by far the biggest item in the Mexican Government's 1964 budget of slightly more than a billion and a quarter dollars. By comparison, expenditures for all military items will be $90 million.

Up from $240 million last year when it was also the largest single budget item, as it has been for several years, this year's educational allocation will enable Mexico to take a giant step forward in its 11-year plan to assure every Mexican child at least a secondary school education.

The 11-year plan, begun in 1959, has attracted international attention as a model for meeting the educational requirements of a technological age.

Rene Maheu, Director General of UNESCO, addressing educators in Paris last November, called the plan "unbelievably effective and unequaled elsewhere."

Mr. Maheu said, "I was able to see it for myself on a recent trip to Mexico and nothing matches it in any other country in the world right now, whether developed or in the process of development."

Mexico today has 132,509 trained teachers, not counting faculty members of the National University in Mexico City. Another 5,700 will be added to the rolls in 1964 and the 73,000 teachers outside Mexico City will receive raises to bring their salary levels up to those prevailing in the capital.

During the administration of incumbent President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, himself a onetime schoolteacher, Mexico's education program has achieved more concrete results in 5 years than in three decades previously.

Since free textbooks became available in 1960, more than 82 million textbooks and workbooks have been handed out. In 1964, 30 million copies of textbooks will be distributed free to primary school pupils.

Six million pupils attend primary schools today—an increase of almost 2 million since 1958. A total of 215,000 students are enrolled in secondary schools, double the 1958 registration.

An accelerated school building program set up in 1960 has maintained a construction rate of 5,000 classrooms annually—better than one every 2 hours, including nights and Saturdays and Sundays.

The Ministry of Education has devoted special attention to modernizing the curriculum and improving courses in secondary schools, as well as to providing needed laboratories and workshops.

Enrollment in higher education has also risen sharply in recent years. The National University of Mexico this year had 71,000 students, an increase of 59 percent since 1958.

The National Polytechnic Institute had 36,000 students enrolled, 6,800 more than in 1962. The institute offers professional and specialized training at university level, including advanced schools of science, engineering, medicine, nursing, economics, business, and management.

Lester Johnson: A Giant Killer Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin and the Congress will suffer a distinct loss when Congressman LESTER JOHNSON retires at the end of this term. I believe the countless Members who share my deep regret over the prospect of LESTER JOHNSON's absence from this body will be interested in the article on his retirement in the May 9 issue of Labor:

A GIANT KILLER RETIRING FROM SEAT IN HOUSE

Congressman LESTER R. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, a noted champion of workers and farmers, has turned down appeals from constituents that he reconsider an announced decision not to run for reelection.

Back in October 1953, JOHNSON made national headlines when he triumphed in a special election to fill a vacancy created by the death of Congressman Merlin Hull, progressive Republican.

His district, the Ninth, had never before elected a Democrat, so JOHNSON's upset victory stirred a sensation, an he was dubbed "the giant killer."

JOHNSON won reelection for each term ever since, with the support or rail unions. Then, in the past year the Wisconsin Legislature put through a plan of congressional reapportionment, which wiped out his district and attached it to several neighboring "sure Republican" districts.

After long deliberation, JOHNSON recently announced he would not run against either incumbent.

Other solons, paying tribute to his record, voiced regret at his decision, and expressed hope that his wide knowledge of agricultural legislation would be put to productive use in a Federal post.

Sale of Strategic Goods to Reds a Perilous Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the press reports today that the American Government has unsuccessfully complained to the French Government over the sale to Cuba of 20 diesel locomotives. This is but the most recent in a long and ever-lengthening list of failures in the administration's restrictive trade policy toward the Communist bloc in general and Communist Cuba in particular.

There can be little doubt that the weakening of the West's resolve in the question of East-West trade was given its greatest single incentive in the sale of U.S. wheat to the Soviet bloc. Since the wheat deal it has been equally apparent that the American Government's position as leader of the free world has been decidedly weakened. Now there are reports of the Soviet Union's desire to open trade negotiations with Common Market countries and concurrently the desire of certain NATO partners to relax the ban on the export of strategic goods to Communist countries. Fearful that they may be left out, American businessmen are beginning to take up the cry also. Faced with these developments it would be well to remember that, among other things, the profit motive in the cold war is not to make some quick cash but to insure that the forces which threaten free enterprise are not supported and encouraged to prosper. There is at present no evidence that a fat Communist is not a Communist.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a timely editorial from the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., of May 2, 1964, which raises some important questions with respect to the West's Communist trade policy. The editorial follows:

SALE OF STRATEGIC GOODS TO REDS A PERILOUS RISK

America's North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies are reported to be considering easing their embargo soon on export of strategic goods behind the Iron Curtain.

What are described as "informed sources" indicate that the embargo principle will be retained but that thought is being given some modification of current restrictions. How anyone could retain an embargo in principle and not in practice is beyond us.

The modifications reportedly under consideration might open the way for sale to Communist bloc nations of numerous scientific instruments and types of machinery.

Pressure for more trade with the Communists has been coming from two sides—from European countries, especially Britain, and from the Soviet Union and its satellites which have been increasing their efforts to have the embargo lifted.

While the United States has sold wheat to Russia, it has taken the lead in urging strict adherence to embargoes designed to withhold from the Communists all items they could use to strengthen their military posture.

The U.S. stand was effective in one instance. Deals for the sale of oil pipelines by West Germany and Britain to the Soviet Union which had placed the orders last year, were canceled in response to strong opposition from Washington.

Russia is currently trying to buy entire factories in Britain in a $300 million transaction which the British say does not involve restricted items. Britain is prepared, however, to grant credits up to 15 years while the United States opposes long-term credits to the Communists.

James Marlow, an Associated Press writer, reported that about 90 percent of the businessmen at the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce this week voted for increased trade in nonstrategic goods with Russia and her European satellites. Some were said to have wanted trade even with Red China, North Korea, and North Vietnam, which are totally embargoed by the U.S. Government, but there was no vote on this issue.

Speakers explained that if U.S. business is prevented from selling to the Reds the trade will go to business in other Western countries which have fewer restrictions.

If the Communists get the items they want from other Western countries the effect of the more restrictive U.S. embargo would, of course, be blunted, with the U.S. business and its employees the losers in terms of dollars and cents.

The British position is that "a fat Communist is a little less belligerent than a lean one."

Maybe so, but if there is any truth in this theory there is still a question of how much less belligerent.

That there still is a strong feeling in this country against selling anything to Communists on the grounds that it contributes to the total strength of communism was evidenced by the spirited but futile fight in Congress against helping Premier Khrushchev solve one of his problems by selling wheat to Russia.

The NATO alliance was formed to further the aims of peace by developing the members' individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

As we see it, letting down the bars to sale of strategic goods that would directly increase the Communists' warmaking potential would be inconsistent with NATO's proper objective and a dangerous gamble.

As for the sale of nonstrategic items to the Soviet Communists, it would seem that Western countries that are determined to engage in this kind of trade might be able to bargain effectively in terms of Soviet deeds—like tearing down the Berlin wall, halting direct and indirect subversion in other countries and ending the practice of shooting down U.S. planes that inadvertently stray beyond the line that the Kremlin has drawn between the free and Communist worlds.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Poland celebrated on May 3 its 173d anniversary of the Constitution of 1791. Although the Constitution was crushed by the infa-

mous third partition of 1795, its short duration should not be allowed to overshadow its importance in Polish history.

The May 3 Constitution has become a focal point for the continued hope of all Poles for peace and independence. It symbolizes the emergence of Poland from the Middle Ages into modern times in which the people have a right to free elections through a democratic system.

We all have the highest respect for the Polish people. Throughout every trial they have shown amazing courage and dedication to their principles. They fought with us in World War II. They revolted against Nazi troops in 1944. They rose against communism in 1956. On this commemorative occasion I join Americans everywhere in sending our assurances to the Polish people that we share their love for freedom, and our encouragement to Polish Americans in their fight for freedom for the Polish homeland.

Veritable Spree of Moneysaving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, soon we will consider an authorization of $312 million toward the International Development Association Fund. As I have pointed out on several occasions, the United States must grant these funds if we are to be consistent in our demand that other economically strong Western nations begin carrying a greater share of the burden of assistance to underdeveloped nations.

Recently, the San Francisco Chronicle editorially supported this proposal. The article follows:

VERITABLE SPREE OF MONEYSAVING

The foreign-aid message of President Johnson makes him out in the very image of the "prudent progressive" which he said on television the other day he considered himself to be.

Where a year ago, John F. Kennedy asked Congress for a lot and got little, President Johnson asked for little and will get less. His request for $3.4 billion for foreign aid—$1 billion for military assistance and $2.4 billion for economic—is the smallest asked by any administration since the Marshall plan began in 1948. The White House is off on a veritable spree of moneysaving.

Some Members of Congress drew the conclusion from his message that Mr. Johnson was actually beginning the final phaseout of U.S. foreign aid. It was certainly not a ringing piece of salesmanship for the world-saving role of American aid and idealism. The consequence is that foreign-aid supporters may be somewhat in doubt about how hard the President is willing to hit the line for his aid program against the powerful opposition of Representative OTTO PASSMAN, the man who hates foreign aid and, therefore, is placed in charge of the subcommittee responsible for appropriating it.

One note in the message which to us seemed particularly intelligent and hopeful was the President's evident confidence that Britain, France, Canada, and other free world countries are going to take up more and more of the responsibility for development investment. Canada, he noted, will increase its aid expenditures 50 percent this year, and French and British plans "point in the same direction." This should, of course, be encouraged.

Another thing to encourage is the growth of World Bank development lending through its subsidiary, IDA. The President repeated his request for congressional authorization of a $312 million contribution to IDA's capital funds to support long-term development loans. It is obvious that Congress should reverse a particularly benighted vote recently taken to deny these funds.

A Tragic Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a trial of great significance is taking place in South Africa. Nine opponents of apartheid are on trial for their life under a sabotage law which is drawn so broadly as to include the writing of anti-Government slogans in public places. Many fear that, if the defendants are executed, there will no longer be any hope that freedom will be established in South Africa except by violent revolution. A letter written by Donald Harrington, A. Philip Randolph, Walter Reuther, Francis B. Sayre, and Roy Wilkins appeared in the New York Times of May 5, 1964, which outlines the situation in South Africa and explains the nature of the trial. These eminent Americans urge the United States to "call upon South Africa not only to change its tragic racial policies, but also to point out the seriousness with which a death penalty would be viewed for persons whose only real offense is their desire for freedom."

The letter follows:

TRIAL IN SOUTH AFRICA: APARTHEID OPPONENTS FACE DEATH PENALTY, GROUP WARNS

To the EDITOR:

In the midst of the widening struggle for racial justice here in the United States we are moved to voice publicly our deep concern for the fate of nine men, Africans, whites and an Indian, on trial for their lives in South Africa. They are accused of responsibility for 192 acts of sabotage. The Government is demanding the death penalty provided under the 1962 General Law Amendment Act which defines sabotage so broadly that it even includes the writing of anti-Government slogans in public places.

The New York Times of April 21 reported on the opening of the defense's argument with statements by Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu, two of South Africa's most outstanding leaders, who were long in the forefront of the nonviolent struggle against white supremacy in their country. If the death sentence is handed down, there are bound to be repercussions far beyond the African continent, and, in your own words, Mr. Mandela "would become one of the first major African martyrs."

CONTINUING SABOTAGE

We would like to make a few general comments about the trial:

Whatever may be said about the truth or falsity of some of the specific charges in this case, there is no doubt about the fact that sabotage and violence have been and will continue to be carried on in South Africa so long as the Government persists in its present course. The facts about oppression are well known.

Opposition organizations are banned; no vote is given to the nonwhites; repressive legislation grows ever more severe. What outlet is there for nonwhite opposition except what amounts to revolutionary action? A protest against severe penalties is therefore a protest in reality against a whole system which provides no outlet for the victims of oppression save desperate measures.

Much of the evidence against the accused was extracted from witnesses who were not only held under the 90-day clause of the General Law Amendment Act of 1963 ("no-trial" act) but who were physically maltreated. Affidavits presented to the United Nations have pretty conclusively established that at least some of the witnesses were subjected to physical beatings, the use of electric current, prolonged solitary confinement and other methods of refined torture. This is certainly cause for protest.

U.N. SCRUTINY

The U.N. has passed several resolutions in both the Assembly and the Security Council asking for an end to the imprisonment and trials of opponents of apartheid. The United States, we are proud to note, voted for these resolutions. The Security Council is to meet again shortly to consider the South African situation in the light of the trial and in the light of the report of the group of experts it established, which has been submitted 6 weeks ahead of schedule because of the gravity of the present situation.

We feel that the trial of these nine opponents of apartheid is one of concern for all people who cherish freedom, justice and equality, as well as for the people of South Africa. We hope our Government will call upon South Africa not only to change its tragic racial policies, but also to point out the seriousness with which a death penalty would be viewed for persons whose only real offense is their desire for freedom.

DONALD S. HARRINGTON.
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH.
WALTER REUTHER.
FRANCIS B. SAYRE.
ROY WILKINS.

NEW YORK.

The Hoffa Trial

SPEECH

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, many people are beginning to question whether the Hoffa trial in Tennessee was a prosecution or a persecution. A number of disquieting disclosures are coming to light in the form of affidavits, trial exhibits, statements of witnesses and of counsel, the cumulative effect of which is to impel the conclusion that a congressional investigation of the Department of Justice's handling of the Hoffa case would be in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, we should look into this situation. Surely there can be no valid objection from those who from some sources are charged with having used

the powerful law enforcement offices of this Nation in an effort to get a man rather than to prosecute for the commission of a crime. If this has not been the case, an investigation would quickly refute such complaints. Some of the allegations are so serious that the integrity of the Justice Department in the domain of American public opinion appears to be very much at stake. After observing the way television cameras were installed in the Attorney General's Office and in other places preparatory to making political propaganda out of dealing with the very serious and important problem of civil rights confrontations with State authorities, the question arises whether the same motivations may have been applied to the production of evidence against Mr. Hoffa.

This becomes even more disturbing when the President of the United States publicly endorses Walter Reuther, another labor leader whose archenmity for Hoffa is as notorious as is his political alinement with Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

There are so many allegations here that it seems as though where there is so much smoke perhaps there is a fire. I believe we should take a long, hard, careful look into all the corners and all the files of the Department of Justice in this case.

L. Mendel Rivers: "Mr. Charleston"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of attending ceremonies in Charleston, S.C., at the dedication of the gigantic drydock No. 5.

It is possible to place three submarines side by side in this huge repair facility which is located, as you know, in the district represented by our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS. Those of us who have visited Charleston know the high regard and respect in which our colleague is held and there is a reason, for everywhere you look in Charleston, MENDEL RIVERS has had something to do with the facility or activity being there.

I was particularly grateful that we were accompanied by our "classmate" of the 77th Congress, the gentleman from Florida, BOB SIKES. He made the principal address and had many views to express with which I hasten to associate myself, and for that reason bring to your attention the address of the gentleman from Florida [MR. SIKES]:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, OF FLORIDA, AT THE DEDICATION OF DRYDOCK NO. 5, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Officially, I am here for the dedication of drydock No. 5 at the Charleston Navy Yard. Unofficially, I am here to talk about one of the men who brought drydock No. 5 to Charleston and with it much of the magnificent picture of military and naval development which we see here. That man is your distinguished Congressman, MENDEL RIVERS. Now, let me hasten to acknowledge the presence here of South Carolina's great Senator, STROM THURMOND. He is one of the truly outstanding Members of the Senate, and my warm personal friend of long standing. He does great things for South Carolina and the Nation. And he is one of that little group of Senators who are making a last ditch fight to save constitutional government in the United States. If the civil rights bill now being debated there should pass, it would set aside the Constitution, establish a police-state government, and turn our Nation upside down. So, I give full credit to STROM THURMOND, but I shall talk principally about MENDEL RIVERS.

It is a frequently repeated statement in Washington that without MENDEL RIVERS, Charleston long ago would have dried up and floated away to sea. Now, it is possible that is somewhat of an exaggeration. I know Charleston is well founded and that Charleston did endure for some centuries before MENDEL's time, but not as well. So, rather I am concerned with another side of the story of MENDEL's influence on Charleston. It is my candid belief that the more important fact is if MENDEL brings any more military establishments to Charleston, the whole thing will sink from sight through sheer weight of military installations. So, if I appear at times to seek to divert some activities to my own First Florida District, it is only that I have Charleston's well-being at heart. I don't want you to sink from sight through having too many military activities in the environs of Charleston.

In a more serious vein, let me assure you that you are indeed fortunate in having as your Representative in Congress one of the ablest, one of the most distinctive and distinguished, and one of the most persuasive of Congressmen. In the 24 years that I have known him and worked with him and enjoyed his friendship, I have come to know him possibly better than any other of his colleagues. Particularly have I been proud of his courage. It is a time when courage is singularly needed. Unless there are men—in greater numbers than we now have in Washington—who have the courage of their convictions, constitutional government as we have known it in America may disappear.

I congratulate you upon the fact that year after year you have returned MENDEL to his duties in Washington without opposition. You have freed him to work for you. You have supported his efforts, and you have been bountifully repaid. In him you have a great American.

Through the efforts of MENDEL RIVERS, more than for any other reason the Polaris program came to Charleston some 4 or 5 years ago, and signaled the dawn of a new era in Charleston's historical role as a defender of the Nation's peace. The unique weapons system combining the Polaris missile and the nuclear submarine has given this Nation a deterrent to war unparalleled in our history.

Charleston is playing a major role in the support and use of this deterrent. This is only natural since the defense of our Nation is historically entwined with the origin and development of Charleston and the Carolina low country.

One has only to examine the evidence to recognize Charleston's significant and important role in the defense of our country. The preservation of the historical reminders of the past, and thereby the memories of the contributions made by our ancestors to our Nation's heritage, has been exceedingly well accomplished in your lovely city.

Therefore, it is with full knowledge of your origin and contribution to our way of life that I say again, the assignment of Charleston's role in the support of the Polaris program was no accident or freak of history. Rather, it was an assignment which recognized both past accomplishment and potential for the future to make even greater contributions to the defense of our Nation.

I think it is most important that we understand the full significance of Charleston as a home port for Polaris submarines—that we relate this dedication of drydock No. 5 to the bigger picture of Charleston as the only base in the world for the complete and self-contained support of a major part of such a mighty deterrent force as the Polaris fleet, and as the hub of Polaris system support for the entire world.

I underscore those words "only" and "complete," and "self-contained." No other city in our Nation, and no other nation in the world, has such an all-inclusive support base.

Other Polaris support facilities at Guam in the Pacific, at Rota in Spain, and at Holy Loch in Scotland, will supplement and complement the Polaris system; but here at Charleston is the heart of the Polaris system.

Here, the Fleet Ballistic Missile Training Center has complete facilities to train the crews while they are ashore, as the "Blue" and "Gold" crews alternate.

The weapons annex of the naval ammunition depot has the capability to store, overhaul, calibrate and maintain the missiles. The shipping and receiving building now under construction will have the capability of rapidly shipping out all items of supply, large or small, including shipment by air, as appropriate.

Piers have been widened and strengthened, and the utilities capacity has been greatly enlarged, to meet the increased requirements generated by Polaris.

This naval shipyard provides complete facilities for fabricating some of the exotic and often unique components of the weapon and its delivery vehicle.

The tender and floating drydock to be ultimately berthed here will supply the mobile link between this permanent base and submarines on station.

From the standpoint of hardware, then, here in Charleston is the most complete and most sophisticated support for the most sophisticated weapon system.

There is still another advantage here in Charleston. The pleasant climate here permits year-round operations without the difficulties or delays occasioned by the climate in other areas. Other than Florida, I can't think of a better place.

From the standpoint of "people"—and I feel strongly that hardware is only as good as the people who operate it—this base is equally complete and self-contained. Barracks have been added for the Polaris crews, and housing is being added for their families. We hope that housing will soon be adequate for these highly skilled and dedicated Polaris crews.

Again, from the "people" standpoint, I commend the good citizens of this Greater Charleston Area who have made the Polaris crews feel so welcome and at home. Here, too, this Charleston base is complete, for your southern hospitality is not surpassed anywhere in the world.

This, then, is the bigger picture of Charleston as the only, complete, self-contained base of its kind in the world, into which we now fit today's dedication of drydock No. 5.

Now, may I turn to a broader scene. There have been significant changes in recent months. There is a new President at the helm of the Ship of State; a strong President who is wise in the ways of government and wise in the ways of Congress. And, because of this fact, there is closer cooperation between the Congress and the Chief Executive. There is in part a new look—a new flavor in Government. I think there is a better balance in Government in that the Chief Exec-

utive has a more intimate knowledge of the place which business and industry occupy in the American economy.

This has generated a new degree of confidence which offers a reassuring look toward the future, and it would be difficult indeed not to envision a strong economy through the months ahead. Across the water things have brightened a little, or possibly they simply have grown more difficult for the Communists. Brazil is the most notable case for encouragement. Victories should be due in Vietnam where vigorous reorganization of the government forces has been in progress. A step has been taken toward disarmament and it appears that much of the Communist world is orienting itself a little more toward the capitalist viewpoint. However, all is not sweetness and light. There are irritants which continue to defy solution, particularly Cuba and Laos. And on tomorrow there may be another senseless shooting down of an American plane, or the takeover of another bit of territory.

For that reason, I can tell you with satisfaction that we continue to have an effective and positive counter force to communism. We have the strongest peacetime military organization in our history—Army, Navy, and Air—and we are not the only ones who know it. The Communist dictators know as much about our military power as we do, and I am certain they respect military power more than they respect the arguments and the pleas, as the case sometimes appears to be, which our diplomats advance at the conference table.

In recent days there has been criticism from some areas that military costs outweigh civilian appropriations, and that deemphasis of commercial and cultural pursuits have resulted. I would remind you that never have commercial and cultural pursuits flourished as now, and never have Federal appropriations for these activities been higher. It is difficult to see them as being neglected. I see little choice in the world we live in but to continue to maintain the position of military superiority we now enjoy lest we find ourselves without commercial and cultural advantages as well.

It is not the military which is seeking the enactment of police-state bills in Congress, or which is asking that more and more power be delegated to the executive branch of Government, or which is usurping the legislative prerogative of Congress through court edicts and decisions. The American people want security in a troubled world. It is like a shotgun behind a farmhouse door. Prowlers respect it. Those who would depend upon logic and the United Nations for our protection are indulging in wishful thinking.

I came here to talk about the Polaris; about drydock No. 5; and about the great work of your Congressman and your entire congressional delegation. I have wandered far afield. Now, I cannot leave you without commenting on one other aspect of this project and of the Polaris program which is deserving of recognition. The strength, potential, and ability of this Nation and its people to rise to a critical occasion has never been more vividly portrayed than by the example which has been and is being written in the history of the development of the Polaris system.

This development has been characterized by the rapid and effective adaption of new technology to serve our defense needs.

The rapidity with which this weapons system has been developed is nothing short of phenomenal, and I think we should take great pride in its accomplishment. For it is further proof of our people's innate ability to keep this Nation strong and to direct its power to the preservation of peace and the ultimate development of mankind.

But in the accomplishment of modern miracles of technology, let us not lose sight of the broader miracle of the American way of life which makes these things possible. While we build within the framework of the Constitution, there are other architects in our Nation who would rewrite that Constitution and turn this Nation upside down. And if they succeed through the neglect and indifference and preoccupation of the American people, we shall lose the broader miracle of the American way of life and with it the incentive for accomplishments such as we celebrate today. So let us keep our eyes on the far horizons. Let us look toward those things that are good for this Nation and all of its people. Let us not allow ourselves to be blinded to our real goals; let us not lose the glory of America by heeding the shrill cries of small men who see not the stately edifice of freedom but only the small imperfections in its structure. Let us forge ahead as a united people lest we be divided and destroyed by those who would recast the image of America in strange new patterns. Here in America there is room for all. Let us keep it that way, not let it become ruin for all. In that sense and for the greater glory of America I proudly join you here today for the dedication of this important naval facility.

The Peruvian Army's Industrial Training Centers—A "Success" in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to many of the critics of the AID military assistance program, who would cut its funds or abandon the entire military assistance endeavor, I would like to remind them of some of the accomplishments of this area through the example of a program in Peru. The activities of military assistance are often misconstrued as contributing solely to building bigger armies to fight more devastating wars. Military assistance goes beyond guns, tanks, and uniforms as exemplified by the unique Peruvian Army Industrial Training Center. Here skilled workers are trained for industry that presently lacks this commodity. Here the promise of a better life and fulfilling career is offered to people who may never have known such opportunity.

In order to teach needed skills and to develop new careers for its young men, many of whom are migrating from the highlands, where life is hard and land scarce, to the urban, coastal areas, the Peruvian Army began experimenting in 1963 with 3-month training programs.

This project received its impetus from the efforts of the U.S. Army Mission in Peru to assist in training specialists for the Peruvian Army engineering units then receiving aid under the military assistance program. Robert L. Spence, the present AID industrial education advisor, tok part in this earlier program and in the planning and initial phases of the present project before his retirement as a master sergeant stationed with the Lima Army Mission.

The pilot project center at Chorrillos near Lima is run by a Peruvian Army lieutenant colonel, Enrique Falcon. The Peruvian Army provides $150,000 per year which covers the wages of the 10 civilian craftsmen teachers and local necessities. AID contributes $250,000 for technical help and the necessary equipment and tools—all American made.

Army recruits, near the end of their compulsory tour of duty, are selected by their unit commanders for the training program. Their first job was to rebuild the crumbling old military school which houses the school and to construct the necessary furniture and equipment. Now, they not only receive training in such widely varied technical subjects as electricity, plumbing, carpentry, welding and metalwork, painting, masonry and heavy equipment operation, but also rigorous orientation in the principles of leadership, labor unions, rights under labor laws, and community development which gives them background to participate fully in community and national affairs. Each graduate has a specific job awaiting him with an employer if he cares to take it. Currently, about half do, while the rest return to their native districts better equipped for life than before.

Plans are underway to expand present facilities, so that by 1965 all 8,000 to 10,000 men annually leaving the army will have some training. Enrollment should increase at Chorrillos from 225 to 450 students per 3-month cycle and the number of trade courses offered more than double from 7 to 15. Four military districts have or will soon have their own training center which can better coordinate local needs with training programs. Eventually courses in 36 crafts including agricultural skills are anticipated.

Thus, Peru with the help of AID has found one feasible way which is practically unique in the world to train skilled and semiskilled labor. The program is an undeniable success. Certainly to one 19-year-old native of the Andean highlands who recently completed the program, it has. He said:

I'm happy because now I feel like a useful man. I'll leave the army with a profession, knowing that I haven't been wasting my time.

Not in School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Grover, my constituents, a letter to the editor concerning the school prayer decision, which was published in a California newspaper. I believe the letter to be of interest and wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

NOT IN SCHOOL

EDITOR, THE STAR-FREE PRESS:

I am not writing to take sides pro or con on the legal aspects of the prayer controversy

over the Supreme Court decision. On this I am not sure. But I truly do believe there is a place for everything.

I wonder how many people in my age bracket (40 to 65) honestly feel as I do when they look back on their public school years. My teachers in New England were required to read from the Bible daily and lead us in the Lord's Prayer. I remember thinking my teacher always read it quickly and poorly. I would find myself comparing the teacher unfavorably to the minister of my family's church. And I would always repeat the prayer rather self-consciously in school—but never felt that way in church and Sunday school. In school I would see my good Jewish friends not saying it at all and my Catholic friends finishing before I did.

As I look back on my school days, my religious instruction and inspiration did not come from the public school but from my home and church.

MRS. BENTON T. ELLIS.

VENTURA.

Rights Bill Gets Faculty Backing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas M. Cooley II, dean of the School of Law, the University of Pittsburgh, has forwarded to me a resolution signed by the members of the law school faculty. True to the traditions of the noble subject they teach each day, these men have adopted this declaration of conscience in which they petition the Congress of the United States to enact such civil rights legislation as will enable all the citizens of the United States to live in dignity and work in harmony in the true spirit of the American ideal.

The resolution follows:

RIGHTS BILL GETS A FACULTY BACKING

Whereas it is our considered judgment as lawyers, teachers, and students of the law that the continued viability and vitality of the Constitution of the United States demand that all citizens of the United States receive all necessary guarantees of equal rights under the law and equal protection of the law; and

Whereas it is both morally just and legally imperative that all citizens of these United States be accorded the opportunity to exercise their rights and discharge their duties without regard to race, color, creed or national origin: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, as a Declaration of Conscience, do hereby petition the Senate of the United States to join with the House of Representatives in enacting such meaningful legislation as will enable all citizens of the United States to live in dignity and work in harmony in the true spirit of the American ideal.

W. Edward Sell, Professor of Law; Thomas M. Cooley, II, Dean, school of law; David R. Bookstaver, Professor of Law; Herbert L. Sherman, Jr., Professor of Law; Francis E. Holahan, Professor of Law; Ralph Reisner, Assistant Professor of Law; William F. Schulz, Jr., Professor of Law; Thomas S. Checkley, Professor of Law; Robert G. Meiners, Assistant Professor of Law; and Robert G. Meiners, Assistant Professor of Law.

David Halberstam, Pulitzer Prize Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, David Halberstam, the young reporter who won a Pulitzer Prize for international reporting for his work in South Vietnam, is the son of Mrs. Blanche Halberstam, of Winsted, Conn.

Mr. Halberstam, currently a reporter for the New York Times, shares his award with Malcolm Browne of the Associated Press.

David Halberstam worked three summers as a reporter for the Hartford Courant while attending Harvard, where he was managing editor of the student paper, the Crimson, and campus correspondent for the Boston Globe while still an undergraduate.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following news story carried by the Hartford Courant on May 5, the day following the awarding of the Pulitzer Prizes, about David Halberstam:

PULITZER PRIZE WINNER GOT START ON COURANT

David Halberstam, New York Times reporter who was awarded a Pulitzer Prize Monday for international reporting from Vietnam, got his start as a newspaperman on the Courant.

He is the son of Mrs. Blanche Halberstam of 130 Meadow Street, Winsted.

He worked for the Courant as a summer replacement during his vacations from Harvard in 1952, 1953, and 1954 and was a general assignment reporter.

His brother, Michael, of Washington, D.C., now a doctor on fellowship at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., worked with him on the Courant for two summers and both are remembered as competent, cooperative, and willing reporters.

WROTE FROM HARVARD

David, occasionally during the school year, would send stories of interest to Connecticut from Cambridge. He was managing editor of Harvard's undergraduate paper, the Crimson, when a senior there and a staff member from his freshman year on.

He was also Harvard campus correspondent for the Boston Globe while a Harvard undergraduate.

After graduation in 1955, Halberstam worked for 4 years for the Nashville Tennessean, then joined the New York Times Washington bureau in 1960.

CONGO TO VIETNAM

The following year, he was in the Congo for the Times and from there went to Vietnam where he spent 18 months reporting—often in grave danger—the war, political events, and changing powers.

Halberstam, 29, said he was delighted "on behalf of all that small band of reporters in Vietnam who worked so hard under such difficult conditions" when told he'd been selected for a Pulitzer Prize. He is now in New York covering national and city assignments for the Times.

He shares the $1,000 prize money with Malcolm Browne, 33, who covered Vietnam at the same time for the Associated Press.

BORN IN NEW YORK

Halberstam was born in New York and was graduated from Yonkers High School. He made his home with his mother, a widow, in Winsted when he was a Harvard student.

Last March, he was honored by Long Island University for his coverage of the Vietnamese war and the crises in the regime of the Ngo family. He was given a plaque as part of the 16th annual Polk National Reporting Awards.

Monday, it was announced that he and other reporters covering Vietnam were presented an award by the 1963–64 Nieman Fellows for integrity in journalism.

Besides being a reporter, Halberstam is also a novelist. He published "The Noblest Roman" in 1961 based in part on some of his experiences as a reporter in the South.

Cuba: A Course of Action for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news of WTVJ, channel 4 in Miami, addressed the Society of the Four Arts in Palm Beach. The main points of his speech were later aired over WTVJ and I take this opportunity to bring Mr. Renick's timely and thought-provoking editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

CUBA: A COURSE OF ACTION FOR THE UNITED STATES

Tonight I am in Palm Beach at the invitation of former Ambassador Stanton Griffis to address the Society of the Four Arts. The society asked me to talk on "the Cuban situation." Here is what I told the society:

If the OAS does not act with dispatch and boldness against Cuba, based on the documented irrefutable evidence that Cuba has attempted to overthrow the Government of Venezuela, then I suggest the United States do the following on its own:

1. Issue a public declaration to the world that Cuba poses a threat not only to the Latin nations, but to the United States and a state of limited hostility shall exist between the two nations.

2. Organization and recognition of a Cuban Government-in-exile as a means of establishing a lifeline into the island to the operating underground.

3. Full, yet perhaps, covert support of exile groups in their efforts to liberate the island and set up a rebel government in arms inside Cuba.

4. Offer of complete arms and men to any Latin nation requesting aid in fighting revolutionary activity by Cuba or any group operating out of or with the support of Cuba or a mutual security pact to be drawn up and signed between any nation so desiring a pact with the United States. Any attack, small or large, guerrilla or overt, will be considered an attack upon both parties of the pact. Clearing, thusly, the way for armed intervention in any such occurrence.

5. A harsh and clear-cut ultimatum that any type boats, no matter what their avowed purpose, found within our 3-mile limit will be either sunk or captured and all hands held prisoner.

And, finally, constant surveillance of the island by photo reconnaissance in order to spot any buildup in offensive weaponry; such a buildup being considered an overt move against our security.

We must either declare that Cuba is a threat to our security and that of the hemisphere or declare it isn't and establish relations with it.

Some place we must make a stand for what we know is right.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

AID Administrator Speaks on Alliance for Progress at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, too often the Alliance for Progress is judged by absolute terms. The Alliance for Progress must be viewed rather in the context of the tremendous breadth and depth of the multitude of problems that face Latin America. In this context, the Alliance for Progress shows promises of successfully meeting the problems that it set out to solve.

Certainly, Latin America is not a monolith. Problems and progress vary from country to country and from region to region, and headway is made unevenly.

But it is becoming apparent that the nations of Latin America are increasingly engaging in a rational attack to meet and overcome the conditions which heretofore have prevented Latin America from achieving its great potential.

On April 15, David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, made an unusually thoughtful address on the Alliance before the West Point Conference on Latin America. Mr. Bell is factual, realistic, and hopeful. In the belief that my colleagues will likewise find Mr. Bell's address of interest, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BEFORE THE WEST POINT CONFERENCE ON LATIN AMERICAN PROBLEMS, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y., APRIL 15, 1964

The role of a keynote speaker at a conference logically ought to be, I suppose, to range across the entire spectrum of the conference's subject, posing issues and suggesting lines of discussion for the subsequent meeting. I propose to depart somewhat from the traditional role.

Your subject is very broad indeed—nothing less than the economic, political, and social conditions in Latin America, and how they relate to U.S. interests and policy. Rather than attempting to cover this entire field, I should like, if you will permit me, to concentrate on the Alliance for Progress—what it is, how much it has accomplished, and what it can and cannot be expected to achieve in the future. By beginning with these relatively specific questions, I think we will arrive at some issues very much worth the attention of this conference.

I

Anyone who examines the matter objectively would agree, I think, that the Alliance for Progress was a brilliant conception.

It was brilliant because it fulfilled a critical need both in the United States and in Latin America. In Latin America there had been developing for years a sense of urgent need for progress and reform—a sense of the inevitability, and indeed the desirability, of rapid and widespread modernization. The "winds of revolution" were sweeping Latin America, and the critical issue was whether they would bring true progress in freedom, or the false promise of Marxist regimes.

In the United States, after years of concentrating on Europe and the Far East, there had been developing a sense that our closest neighbors needed our help urgently. This was a bipartisan view, which found strong expression in the closing years of the Eisenhower administration in the initiative that led to the Act of Bogotá.

The Alliance for Progress, therefore, gave expression to the urgent interest both of the Latin American countries, and of the United States, that modernization and progress be achieved in Latin America—and that they be achieved under free governments. The Charter of Punta del Este put this point clearly and explicitly in speaking of the joint commitment of the signers to seek "economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty."

The Alliance for Progress was a brilliant conception also in an economic sense. Drawing on 15 years of postwar experience in assisting economic recovery and growth the Alliance, like the Marshall plan, was conceived of from the beginning as a true partnership, in which the Latin American countries would undertake a maximum effort on their own behalf, and the United States would provide a substantial margin of additional resources. Accordingly, the Latin American countries committed themselves to the steps necessary to achieve economic development; to the mobilization of larger resources through higher taxes and better tax collection; to the expansion of educational services; to the diversification of exports; to reforming rural life in order to permit larger agricultural productivity and incomes.

And the United States committed itself to provide technical and capital resources—both public and private—over a 10-year period, to help the Latin Americans achieve economic and social progress. The joint objective—of the highest importance both to the Latin Americans and ourselves—is for each Latin American country to become firmly embarked on the process economists call self-sustaining growth: to achieve the rates of saving and investment, the degree of skills and education, the institutions, attitudes, and incentives, which will assure a steady year-by-year increase in per capita income—without special help from outside.

Looking back, I think it is fair to say that the Alliance for Progress is the most advanced conception ever worked out for U.S. aid to less developed countries: it was based on self-help principles; it was designed as a partnership; it was planned to draw on private as well as public resources; and it was recognized from the start as a long-term enterprise, leading to self-sustaining further progress.

I would not argue that the conception was without flaw. For one thing, the original statements about the Alliance did not perhaps lay enough stress on the differences among the Latin American countries, which should permit several of them to achieve the main objective of the Alliance relatively much sooner than others.

But the qualifications are not major ones, and my proposition stands: I suggest that from the viewpoint both of the Latin Americans and ourselves, the Alliance was an exceptionally well designed act of international statecraft.

II

How has the Alliance fared, in its first 2½ years?

An answer should begin, it seems to me, with the fact of some very impressive physical accomplishments. By June 30, 1964, for example, U.S. assistance under the Alliance will have helped to build over 220,000 houses. By the same date, U.S. aid will have helped to build over 23,000 classrooms and to print over 6,800,000 books. Clean water supply systems will have been furnished for nearly 15 million people in more than 1,000 towns and villages. Over 550 mobile health units, hospitals, and health centers will have been established. More than 200,000 agricultural credit loans will have been made. About 10 million children are receiving a hot lunch every schoolday—with consequent benefit both to nutrition and to education.

There are other measures of change which are also impressive. For example, no less than 16 Latin American countries brought about some improvement in tax administration and tax legislation last year, and 7 of those countries have begun major reform programs. Revenue collections in some countries are up as much as 30 percent. The Latin American countries are today spending 25 percent more on public education than they did before the Alliance. Land reform efforts have been undertaken in 12 countries since 1960. Fifteen countries have established self-help housing programs.

Not all by any means has gone well. Some countries have conspicuously failed to buckle down to the hard economic decisions. Private investment from the United States has not moved in nearly the volume that had been hoped for.

Nevertheless, the tangible evidences of change are impressive. But they are not enough by themselves to answer the question of progress under the Alliance. Two other types of evidence must also be examined.

The first relates to the leadership in the Latin American countries. Everyone would agree that strong national leadership is essential if any development program is to succeed. Has this been forthcoming? How far are Latin American leaders, public and private, committed to progress under the Alliance?

The only honest answer is that there have been wide differences in different countries. Substantial development programs have been undertaken in the last 3 years by half a dozen countries—among them Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, El Salvador, Mexico. Much less has been done by others—notably, of course, by Brazil.

Can we detect a trend? Are more and more of the governmental and private leaders in Latin America coming to understand what it will take to make the Alliance successful—to achieve progress under free institutions? I think there is no more important question to be considered by this Conference.

For what is is worth, my own answer to this question is a cautious yes. I think more of a consensus is developing in many Latin

American countries on the necessity if undertaking strong development programs, and on what that implies by way of sacrifice, reform, and plain hard wok. I think I detect this growing consensus particularly among younger businessmen and younger Government officials—including military officers.

I am sure we will see further setbacks and disappointments. But I think the odds are in favor of gradual improvement in the leadership of the Alliance throughout Latin America. Insofar as I am right in this estimate, credit is due to such strong leaders as Lieras Camargo and Betancourt, to the continuous and able educational work of the "nine wise men" led by Raul Saez, and to the leadership of the U.S. officials concerned, notably Ted Moscoso and more recently Tom Mann.

I believe the action at São Paulo last November, when the Alliance partners agreed to set up a central committee, resulted from this advance in understanding. This committee—called CIAP for short—provides a forum in which country plans can be reviewed, requirements for internal performance, and external resources can be discussed, and a continuous evaluation maintained of the overall progress of the Alliance. The Latin American countries, which had initially opposed such an idea at Punta del Este, joined the United States in advocating it at São Paulo, and the committee has recently been established under the able leadership of Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, until recently Finance Minister of Colombia.

I would think this Conference would wish to consider whether we in the United States are doing all we can to help in developing modernminded, progressive Latin American leaders.

For example, thousands of young Latin Americans come to the United States for education each year. They include college students, professional men and women, military and police officers, and many others. Much is being done to make sure that these educational experiences are effective not only in a narrow technical sense, but also in showing our visitors the workings of our democratic society. But my guess is that much more could be done if all the American institutions, governmental and private, which are involved, paid conscious attention to this aspect of the experience of those who come here. Needless to say, I am not advocating a program of indoctrination, but only a conscious program of making sure that young Latin Americans in the United States have a chance to understand how our system operates—so they can draw their own conclusions and make up their own minds as to what aspects, if any, of what they see here will be valuable in their own countries.

Another way in which we can perhaps assist in the development of constructive leadership is through the Americans who live and work in Latin America, whether these are American businessmen or American point IV technicians. By their own behavior—by their own example, they can communicate the attitudes and objectives of a democratic, progressive, economic, and social system. I know that some American businesses quite consciously guide their officers and employees in this direction, and I hope they will be emulated by others.

Perhaps the most important single method of influence we have is the manner in which we conduct our own governmental operations under the Alliance. If we ourselves hold steadily and firmly to the central concept of the Alliance, that help is given only to those who are willing to help themselves and to share the benefits of progress widely, we should be able to strengthen the hand of those in Latin America who are seriously seeking economic and social progress. We have no interest or intention to dictate to others how they conduct their own affairs. But we do have a responsibility to the Congress and to the peoples of the hemisphere, both in the United States and in Latin America, to make sure that our help is applied in ways that will achieve solid and lasting results.

In assessing progress under the Alliance, we must consider not only accomplishments to date, and the commitment of national leaders. We must look beyond the immediate results of change expressed in terms of numbers of schools and dollars worth of investment. We must ask: Is the process of change becoming institutionalized? Are institutions being established in the society which will produce change and progress—regularly and steadily—for the continuing future? Let me say a word briefly about three aspects of the answer.

First, a continuing growth process requires an institutionalized savings and investment process. One aspect of such a process is the availability of credit. Latin American countries typically have made credit available to only a few, on short maturities and at very high interest rates. A major effort under the Alliance is to establish new credit institutions—aimed at small farmers, medium and small businessman, and middle class homeowners.

Some results have been spectacular, such as the rapid growth of savings and loan associations—virtually nonexistent 3 years ago—which today have over 125,000 members, $45 million in savings, and more than 15,000 houses underway in nine countries.

I think in this and other ways there has been much progress in the credit field. But there is still much to be done to strengthen the savings and investment institutions in nearly all the Latin American countries—and the process is especially difficult in those countries, like Chile, which have a long history of continuous inflation.

Second, a continuing growth process requires institutions for adapting modern science and technology to the problems of the country. In the United States, much of this work has centered around the universities—particularly the land grant colleges. By and large the tradition of the Latin American universities is different, and Latin American universities are not centers of practical work—as distinct from theoretical discussion—on the problems of their societies. Nor have there been strong research traditions in most Latin American industries.

These conditions are changing, and many influences are at work to change them—among others, those of the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations. Under AID contracts, moreover, some 30 U.S. universities are working with 40 Latin American institutions in 11 countries. In some places, and to some degree, we are beginning to see significant improvements.

But in view of the strong traditions that work against such change, I do not think we can be too sanguine of early and large-scale progress.

A third major requirement for a continuing growth process, in the opinion of most of us, is the development of greater strength in the private sector. This is of course a highly controversial subject in many countries in Latin America. It is not one upon which I have time tonight to present a fully stated and qualified position. In summary, however, I think an American audience will understand me when I speak of the tremendous significance in our own history of a wide diversity of sources of initiative and action—in State and local governments, as well as the Federal Government—in millions of individual farmowners and businessmen, as well as a few industrial giants. Private and local initiative and decisionmaking have been crucial to our own economic and social progress.

By and large, and with exceptions, the tradition in Latin America is different, and in some countries sharply different, with a single powerful central government and a small number of major landholders and businessmen.

Not only is it important, in such circumstances, to help establish the institutions of a pluralistic society, through the stimulation of all kinds of action groups—small businesses, cooperatives, farm organizations, labor unions, and so on—in the interest of lively and progressive economic and social action. But it is also important to counter the specious appeal given to Marxist arguments by the apparent relationship between heavily concentrated industry and agriculture and the poor living standards of campesinos and urban workers. Although too many young intellectuals in Latin America regard private initiative and private enterprise as synonymous with "robber barons" and "capitalistic exploitation."

The development of lively, multifarious private and local institutions in Latin America, therefore, faces special obstacles. But no task is more important. And we should, I think, regard the establishment of every successful small business, every successful credit union or marketing cooperative, every successful savings and loan association, every successful village council—not simply as providing a better answer to some immediate economic or social problem, but as strengthening the vital fabric of a free society.

I think that considerable progress is being made along these lines. But the task remains vital and urgent and it will not be accomplished overnight.

In summary, therefore, my own tentative conclusion as to how the Alliance has fared to date, is that substantial progress has been made, and a number of the signs and portents are favorable. Many of the problems are very deep-seated, however, and we certainly have no basis at this point for claiming more than a good beginning.

III

Let me conclude by raising briefly three current issues of importance which are closely related to the Alliance.

The first is the problem of security in relation to development—security in the sense of personal safety to move about, to own and dispose of property, to conduct one's affairs in peace. We have seen in Latin America clear illustrations of the vital necessity for such personal security if economic and social progress is to be achieved. Terrorism in Venezuela. Banditry in Colombia. And our programs both of military and of economic assistance have been substantially affected.

On the military side, the U.S. military assistance programs have been greatly changed in the last 2 or 3 years. In general they do not provide today the tanks, artillery, naval vessels and combat aircraft that were their main components a few years ago. Today, they are composed far more of the kinds of light arms, transportation and communication equipment, and engineering equipment, which are appropriate for internal security and civic action objectives.

On the economic side, we are providing in several cases valuable training, advice, and equipment for local police forces—as in the crucial months last year before the Venezuelan election.

I am sure this conference will want to consider the many problems related to military influence in Latin America. I suggest that in doing so we not lose sight of the fundamental importance of reliable security in a community if economic and social progress is to be achieved.

A second issue relates to population growth. Rates of population growth in much of Latin America are very high—so high that they would if continued result in a doubling of the population in about 25 years.

These rates are not necessarily so high as to prevent a rise in per capita income. Indeed, the imperfect figures we have indicate

that per capita income in most Latin American countries is in fact rising. But these high rates of population growth surely make the problem of achieving economic and social progress much harder. One way of putting the problem is to note that total income in real terms would have to double in 25 years just to maintain today's low standards of living.

A great deal more knowledge is needed on the general relationships between population growth and economic development, on attitudes and opinions, on vital statistics and demography, and on ways of making available to people the information they need to make rational choices in this very complex field. I believe that there is increasing awareness of the many aspects of the population problems in Latin America, just as there is in the United States, and this promises to lead to better understanding of what can and should be done.

A third important issue is trade. External aid under the Alliance affords a temporary boost, but eventually, the Latin American countries must satisfy their need for external resources through trade—and for some of them this is a very serious problem. Commodity arrangements like the coffee agreement will be a substantial help but far from a complete solution.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development is now considering these problems in Geneva, and has before it a number of novel ideas, such as the granting by advanced countries of special tariff reductions on manufactured exports of less developed countries. I am not myself sanguine that most of these ideas will prove useful, at least in the near future.

But I think all of us should be aware of the great need for increased export earnings, and that the Alliance must help in providing positive answers—such as the diversification of export products.

IV

We plainly confront major problems in considering the future of Latin America—and this conference has ample and serious business before it.

As you proceed with your deliberations, I commend to your attention the basic principle stated in the declaration establishing the Alliance for Progress—"The basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations, including those for work, home and land, health and schools." So far as Latin America is concerned, that statement is an act of faith, not an accomplished fact. To help turn it into reality is an objective of the highest importance to all of us in the United States.

Mental Retardation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are all well aware that mental illness and retardation represent an enormous cost to our Nation in human resources—in wasted opportunities—in untold suffering, and tragedy. It is estimated that 1 in every 12 persons in this country is personally touched by this problem, either through their family or their friends.

As president of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation, I was pleased to announce a recent grant of $2.2 million to the University of Chicago toward a multidisciplinary attack on mental retardation, and I am hopeful that the application for a Federal grant will be approved, making the university eligible for an additional $2.1 million for this vital program.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article by Dr. Howard Rusk, an outstanding leader in the field of physical medicine and rehabilitation. Dr. Rusk's analysis of the developments in the field of mental health represents the most advanced thinking today on understanding, diagnosis, and treatment of the mentally retarded.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MENTAL RETARDATION: KENNEDY FUND AND MEDICAL ASSOCIATION PROVIDE FOR VITAL FUNDS AND RESEARCH

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last Wednesday in Chicago, the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation announced a $2.2 million grant to the University of Chicago.

The grant, the largest in the foundation's $22.5 million program, will support a multidisciplinary attack on mental retardation.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who announced the grant, noted that $700,000 of it was to assist in establishing the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation Mental Retardation Clinical Service and Training Facility.

If an application for a Federal grant is approved, the university would become eligible for $2.1 million from the Federal Government, under its 3-to-1 matching program.

CONFERENCE OF EXPERTS

The day after the announcement, the American Medical Association began a 3-day conference of experts in all phases of the problem to seek ways of speeding up the national medical mobilization against retardation.

In terms of magnitude, mental retardation is the most handicapping of all childhood disorders.

There are 5.5 million mentally retarded children and adults in the United States, and 126,000 babies who will be retarded are born each year.

The conference sponsored by the association was led by Julius B. Richmond, M.D., head of the department of pediatrics at the Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, N.Y.

Strictly speaking, Dr. Richmond has pointed out, mental retardation is not a disease or a diagnosis but a functional disorder. As such, retardation is definable only in terms of intellectual levels of functioning Usually an intelligence quotient score of less than 70 is considered a sign of retardation.

EARLY RECOGNITION

One important new concept stressed at the conference is early recognition of the condition. Often in the past it was difficult even to recognize retardation until a child was in school. Now, the detection of some of its forms can start before a child is a year old.

Care in these early formative years can be aimed at enlarging the abilities that the child does possess.

In the opinion of most authorities, mental retardation can best be identified by an alert family physician or pediatrician. These are the doctors who generally see children repeatedly during the so-important first year, and the year before school.

George Tarjan, M.D., special consultant to the conference, has pointed out that there are about 200 known specific causes of retardation.

"Sometimes a single factor is involved, sometime a combination of factors," Dr. Trajan said. "Basically, however, all fall within two general categories—those arising from biological factors, such as disease and accident, and these stemming from deviant psychosocial development.

"The biological causes that can be identified account for about 20 to 25 percent of the mental retardation in this country. Included are Mongolism, prematurity, congenital malformation, phenylketonuria (PKU), congenital syphilis, measles, poisoning—in particular lead poisoning—and RH or other blood group incompatibilities.

"Except for Mongolism, a chromosomal disorder that may go back to the moment of conception, these diseases are treatable or preventable."

Lack of emotional development—the cause of 70 to 80 percent of mental retardation—is not so clear cut as when the causes are biological.

Most cases of retardation are from the early experience of the child, primarily the child's learning.

The brain of a child does not develop automatically. It must be stimulated, and of primary importance in the early stimulation of a child is talk.

Children do not make an effort to talk unless they themselves constantly hear talk. Learning to talk is essential, for it is almost impossible to think coherently without words. The generation of ideas is the linking of words.

Words are the tools of learning, but if these are not developed, the child has no means of development.

Interest, curiosity, emotion, and intellect are then given no chance to develop and the child is retarded.

Social and economic factors also play a role in mental retardation. They can divert parental interest away from the child instead of toward him. They can impede the all-important prenatal care of the expectant mother in pediatric care for the newborn child.

The American Medical Association and the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation are doing a true public service in focusing medical attention on mental retardation and providing funds for both research and service.

Governor Wallace's Victories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, all Alabamians are proud today of the double-barreled victory won by our Governor in the Alabama and Indiana primaries on Tuesday. In Alabama, the people—by a tremendously large majority—believed that voting for the unpledged Wallace slate of electors was the only way to express their vehement disapproval of the vicious so-called civil rights bill now pending in the U.S. Senate. And, while those opposed to the unpledged slate were themselves against this legislation, it was felt by them that a vote for any other than the unpledged Wallace slate could be expected as a repudiation of our Governor in Wisconsin and in Indiana, as

it had been freely stated and predicted in those States that Wallace did not represent the people of Alabama. Insofar as this is now concerned, they will have to "play a different tune" in Maryland.

The best that can be said of Governor Welsh of Indiana is that he is a very poor loser. The charge that "Wallace will say anything he thinks will get a vote" is an outright misstatement of the facts. Everything in the book was thrown at Wallace in Indiana—even two turncoats from Alabama were imported to vilify Wallace and to spread a hate-mongering campaign. Their statements as to his approving of bombings and other crimes are absolutely false. He is in favor of law and order, of obedience to Federal as well as State laws.

Yes, the echoes of Tuesday's victory are reverberating across the Nation. In the U.S. Senate the leader of the forces for the enactment of this punitive legislation states that, "The vote in Indiana is a clear mandate for the passage of this measure." On the other hand, the valiant leader of the southern forces—Senator RUSSELL of Georgia—states that, "Wallace compiled a truly outstanding vote."

I stand with Senator RUSSELL's statement. In fact, I take pride in the fact that I had some part in the worthwhile endeavor of carrying the true message to other States. Several weeks ago, being unable to be in Alabama due to legislative matters, it was my pleasure to tape a recording in support of Governor Wallace's efforts. This message on tape was used in Alabama to assist in raising funds so that the Governor's campaign could be carried to other States and the message of truth about this vicious civil rights legislation could be told the people of other areas.

I firmly believe that people in many sections of this Nation have not had an opportunity to learn what the civil rights bill contains. They have been under the impression that it is just something that will apply to the Southern States, but—thanks to Governor Wallace's campaign in Wisconsin and Indiana and now in Maryland, they are learning the true facts of the matter.

Tribute to the Late Dr. O. T. Scamahorn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, "Doc" Scamahorn, 80-year-old Pittsboro, Ind., country doctor for 56 years, and a personal friend of mine, died recently, in Indianapolis. In 1956, he was named Indiana physician of the year. In his long career, he delivered more than 4,200 babies.

As his obituary in the Indianapolis News stated: "He was a big man, with an abiding faith in people." For 30 years he practiced medicine without ever sending a bill, and for nearly 50 years he was a Sunday school teacher. In recent years he was joined in practice by his son, Dr. Malcomb Scamahorn, likewise a personal friend, who continues to practice in Pittsboro.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tribute of the Indianapolis News to Dr. Scamahorn be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. O. T. SCAMAHORN

PITTSBORO, IND.—Dr. O. T. (Doc) Scamahorn, 80, a country doctor who delivered more than 4,200 babies, died last night at Memorial Clinic in Indianapolis.

Scamahorn, who had been ill several weeks, set up practice here in 1908 after graduating from the Indiana University School of Medicine.

Before becoming a doctor, he had worked as a schoolteacher, embalmer's assistant, and a livery stable hand.

During his 56-year medical career, Scamahorn was credited with delivering more babies than any other physician in central Indiana.

At one time Pittsboro High School's basketball team—including the coach—was made up entirely of the Doc's "babies."

In 1956 he was named Indiana physician of the year by his colleagues.

Two years later, residents of this northern Hendricks County community honored him for 50 years' service.

He was a big man with an abiding faith in people.

Not until after World War II when his son, Dr. Malcomb Scamahorn, joined him in practice, did he ever send out a bill.

"I think people are inherently honest and will pay you if they can," he once said.

Dr. Scamahorn had been a Sunday school teacher for almost 50 years, was a 50-year member of the Masonic Lodge and also was a member of the Eastern Star, Scottish Rite, Shrine, Lions Club, Farm Bureau, and Grange.

He had been Hendricks County coroner, county health officer, chairman of the Pittsboro Town Board for more than 20 years, a member of the county fair board and the school advisory board.

He was admitted to the bar in 1936, but never practiced law. He belonged to numerous medical societies.

Surviving besides the son here are the widow, Mae, and another son, Mr. Milburn Scamaborn, Kokomo.

* * * * *

Off-Target Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this week the ad hoc committee of the House Public Works Committee started hearings on the recommendations of the President's Commission on Appalachia. In view of some of the proposals which fall in the accelerated public works project category, I think it is interesting to take another look at an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal last October under the title "Off-Target Aid."

This informative article by Burt Schorr bears out some of the reservations many of us have about the advisability of assisting slumping local economies by dreaming up public works projects which spend taxpayers' money but do not do much to help an unemployment situation or raise the level of the community's economy.

It is my suggestion that Members of Congress either read, or reread this article and then start asking searching questions about the proposals for Appalachia. The article follows:

OFF-TARGET AID—MUCH PUBLIC WORKS SPENDING MISSES SLUMP AREAS

(By Burt Schorr)

Are federally supported public works the most efficient way to relieve slumping local economies?

Debate on this question, raging since New Deal days, is likely to grow as Congress considers proposals to extend the administration's accelerated public works program. While it may be years before economists can properly assess the true impact of APW, one thing is already certain: APW emphasis on such relatively complicated projects as municipal water systems and air conditioned county courthouses sometimes makes it difficult for Federal planners to concentrate spending on the high-unemployment areas that qualify for aid.

Unlike the leaf raking and mural painting of the thirties, most APW projects are focused on some essential public need, as demanded by Congress. What's less sure is that in every instance they also "contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment" and "stimulate the local economy"—both prime APW objectives. Consider for example, these public works efforts:

In Carrollton, Ala., isolated seat of APW-eligible Pickens County, Uncle Sam is paying half the cost of a new $140,000 county jail. But even though some 50 men will labor on the job before its completion, the number of Pickens' residents in the work force is not likely to total more than a dozen, the majority common laborers who'll earn an estimated total of $7,000. Moreover, the general contractor from neighboring Fayette County believes local purchases of such supplies as gasoline and concrete will total less than $10,000. The balance of project needs will come from out-of-county firms.

MONEY FOR MEDORA

Because of high unemployment in a four-county area northeast of St. Louis, the Federal Government laid out half the cost of a new $202,000 water system just completed in tiny Medora, Ill. (population, 447). An area contractor was low bidder, but union agreements forced him to hire through designated union halls. Result: Only about 25 percent of the job's estimated $45,000 payroll went to residents of the four counties. Cast iron pipe, hydrants, valves, fittings, and pumps costing approximately $100,000, furthermore, had to be shipped from such points as Birmingham, Ala., and Springfield, Ill.

The major difficulty in small communities like Carrollton and Medora, of course, is that skilled labor and necessary construction materials usually aren't available locally. "I tried to buy scaffold board, form plywood and shoring for concrete from the local lumber yard, but they just don't stock them," says Euel E. Lewis, superintendent on the Carrollton jail project. "We had to give up and order them from Birmingham."

Some Federal officials privately express concern over this apparent conflict between basic APW aims and the requirement that construction costs remain competitive. They note, however, that APW legislation specifically permits contractors to obtain "specially experienced individuals necessary to assure

efficient execution of the contract"—a loophole that has on occasion permitted even common laborers to be brought hundreds of miles to a jobsite.

"There is no requirement that materials be purchased locally and you simply can't require this," adds Sidney Woolner, Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Communities Facilities Administration (CFA). The lone APW labor requirement, in fact, is that onsite employment costs exceed 20 percent of the contract payment.

"WINDOW DRESSING"

CFA, which is overseeing half of all public works spending, does indeed require local governments applying for APW money to estimate the percentage of construction dollars expected to wind up in the pockets of local labor. But usually these figures are ignored once a job gets underway. "That labor estimate is only to show how local people thought they would benefit," says a Chicago-based CFA official. "You might call it window dressing. But with the hundreds of jobs we've got in our district, we just haven't the staff to analyze them." Public Health Service, with more than 25 percent of APW funds for hospital and sanitary facility construction, doesn't require estimates at all.

Some predictions of what public works money will do for local unemployment seem remarkable inaccurate. On the Carrollton, Ala., jail project, for example, it was originally calculated that payments to workers from the local area would equal $49,000—seven times the present estimate.

"We don't have many skilled workers around there and I had some reservations about that local labor figure," concedes Judge Robert H. Kirksey, Pickens County's chief administrative officer. "But nobody ever defined that word 'area' for us, and I felt if CFA didn't care, I wasn't going to worry." Adds Judge Kirksey, "I wasn't as concerned about alleviating unemployment as getting that jail built as cheaply as I could."

Pickens County and Medora, Ill., are only two names on the APW list. In the small east-central Texas city of Hearne, municipal officials find that $166,000 in public works funds for widening U.S. Highway 79 through town and building parallel storm sewers will also provide needed drainage of the adjacent 15-acre site of a new junior high school. Hearne originally had planned to spend $170,000 from a 1961 bond issue to begin the highway work on its own; the balance of the work along with the school site would have had to wait until additional funds could be made available.

"When the Federal program came along, we jumped at it," states Norman McCarver, Hearne city manager. "It meant a chance to do the whole job at once. Otherwise, it would have been a long time before it was completed."

Low bidder on Hearne's $303,000 construction contract was Stimson Contracting Co., of Dallas, 145 miles to the north. Payroll records show that during a week of peak employment approximately 24 residents of APW-eligible Robertson County, where Hearne is located, were working on the job. This was over half the total work force; but Robertson men earned only $1,078 of the $3,841 total payroll.

A Stimson official estimates that with higher paid workers, such as machine operators, mainly recruited in the Dallas and Waco areas, only a fourth of the job's more than $75,000 in labor costs will be paid to local residents. And while some $35,000 of concrete, petroleum products, and other materials are coming from Robertson County firms, over $200,000 of big items like pipe and asphalt premix is coming from elsewhere.

In Laurens County, Ga., voters twice rejected local bond issues to finance replacement of a now-demolished courthouse built before the turn of the century. Then earlier this year, with good prospects of APW help, a solid majority approved a plan to split the cost of a new $900,000 air-conditioned, marble-porticoed structure with Uncle Sam.

A. O. Hadden, Laurens County Commission clerk, observes a previous proposal that the county build an $850,000 courthouse with its own bond money would have increased local property taxes $5 per $1,000 of assessed valuation over a 10-year period. But thanks to U.S. assistance, Laurens property owners will only have to pay $3 more per $1,000. "People go for a bargain and that Federal aid sure was a bargain," says Mr. Hadden.

LITTLE HELP FOR JOBLESS

If local taxpayers are being helped, the APW money seems to be doing little for the Laurens County unemployed. According to Harvey N. Spivey, manager of the State employment service officer in the county seat of Dublin, there are some 1,000 job-seekers in Laurens out of 13,500 total workforce. However, roughly half of these are women, mainly interested in apparel factory position while over 20 percent of the males are probably recent high school graduates unsuited to construction work. Even so, "we've had inquiries from more than 400 men wanting to work on the job," Mr. Spivey adds, "but I've been able to place only 2 or 3 laborers."

"You just can't work 75 to 100 men on a job of this type costing under a million dollars," explains E. C. Castellaw, superintendent of the Laurens Courthouse $825,000 general contract for Aaron Torch & Sons, Inc., of Macon, Ga. "We had a 25-man crew at the start and I hired as many unemployed local laborers as I could. But I only needed 15 at the most."

Just how much APW money may be winding up outside the areas that need it is difficult to determine from available Government statistics. It's true, of course, that a good portion of these funds are buoying local economies where availability of labor and materials is no problem. Jersey City, N.J., firms, for example, will get most of the $700,000 cost of a new municipal garage under construction with APW help in that city.

TABLE AND TRAILER SITES

Where Federal agencies have contracted directly for projects 100 percent financed by APW funds, the program also appears to have lived up to expectations. A $100,000 U.S. Corps of Engineers undertaking to build picnic tables, trailer sites, bathhouses and other recreational facilities on the shores of W. Kerr Scott Reservoir in Wilkes County, N.C., in fact, recruited its entire 60-man work force among Wilkes County residents.

Nevertheless, the amount of misguided public works money could be substantial; counties like Alabama's Pickens and Georgia's Laurens and towns like Medora, Ill., and Hearne, Tex., are not isolated examples. But if the public works logic evident in these examples has stirred voices of criticism, they have been few in number. Even in communities noted for their opposition to big Federal spending, civic leaders haven't hesitated to scramble for the Government aid.

"Don't quote me," confides the mayor of one Southern city with an APW grant for its new municipal building, "but in my opinion this is just a way of taking money from the people to glorify politicians." The mayor hastens to add, however, that as long as "everyone else" is getting a slice of the public works pie, his own town should, too.

The Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the American free enterprise system has consistently shown itself to be one of the world's most productive and efficient systems. There is no doubt in my mind that it will continue to hold this position so long as there are those such as Mr. Keiji Kawakami, president of Iolani Sportswear, the subject of a news item in the Monday, May 4, edition of the Honolulu Star Bulletin. Iolani Sportswear is one of Hawaii's foremost garment manufacturing companies.

I am especially proud of Mr. Kawakami because I consider him a long and cherished friend from the days of service together in the 44d Regimental Combat Team. But perhaps even more than that, I am proud of Mr. Kawakami because he chose to embark on this new venture with his employees not during a time of economic adversity but during a peak period of success. To me, this indicates a deep faith in the system and the men and women who work in it to continue to sustain the high level of performance.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OWNER WILL SHARE SUCCESS WITH HIS 100 EMPLOYEES

A businessman who built up Iolani Sportswear from scratch into a successful enterprise, in a little over a decade, is going to try something he has believed in—sharing his success with his employees.

The man is Keiji Kawakami, whose late father operated a small store in Hanapepe, Kauai, and whose older brother, Norito, is a widely respected lawyer and businessman on the Garden Island.

Kawakami is going to turn over the brand-new Kona Street plant into a profit-sharing trust for his approximately 100 employees—80 in Honolulu and the remainder at the Hanapepe branch of the firm.

ON A 50-50 BASIS

In addition, a percentage of profits from Iolani Sportswear will go into the trust fund annually.

The $500,000 two-story building at Kona Street was built by Kawakami and Stanley Taylor, board chairman of Honolulu Paper Co., on a 50-50 basis.

When Taylor learned that the building was going to be put into a trust for workers, he sold out very reasonably, Kawakami said.

The garment factory occupies the entire 30,000 square feet of the second floor but the ground floor is rented out to several businesses.

TRUST FUND

Monthly rental income, after deducting the mortgage payment, will go into the trust fund. The money may be used either to expand Iolani Sportswear or be invested in other areas.

There has been a lot of talk among businessmen, including himself, about social consciousness, he said, but now he is going to back his convictions with dollars.

He insists, however, that this is not philanthropy, but the only way to run a successful business today.

In his case, he is recognizing the contributions of his employees by giving them security and a sense of ownership, and the workers have been attentive to the needs of the business, he said.

"It's this two-way cooperation that is the major ingredient in business success," he said.

Kawakami, 44, started the firm on July 1, 1953, with four employees and armed with a master's degree in marketing from New York University. He rented a small space in the old Universal Motors Building on Beretania Street for $150 a month.

By the time the firm was incorporated in 1955, the work force had increased to 15 and larger quarters was needed.

Kawakami found a place on Makaloa Street which was three times as large, and the move was made in 1956.

The new Kona Street plant was completed in late December 1962, and with the help of his 442d buddies, all equipment was moved in the 2 days before Christmas.

Johnson's Cumberland Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to join with President Johnson this morning in his visit to western Maryland at the start of his Appalachian tour. We landed by helicopter at the Fort Hill High School Stadium, Cumberland, Md. We then proceeded to the office of the Department of Economic Security and in turn to the steps of city hall in Cumberland where the President addressed thousands of overjoyed and greatly inspired citizens of Maryland. I commend to my colleagues the text of President Johnson's remarks which follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT CUMBERLAND, MD., MAY 7, 1964

For many years I have heard Maryland called the "Old Line State." Not until this week did I know that it got that name because of the courageous service of the Maryland line under fire during the American Revolution.

That Revolution is not over. We fight to finish in the 20th century what our fathers began in the 18th. And Maryland is once again in the front line. Your courage—your will to fight—are as needed now as they were then.

Ever since 1634, when the *Ark* and the *Dove* landed 200 settlers on your shores, Maryland has played a vital role in building America. Those pioneers were men with a cause. They had suffered from unjust government at home. They came to find justice in a new land. They came—heedless of hazard—seeking new opportunity.

Those who came later often differed in habits, in custom, in language, and in religion. But they all came seeking a society free of the prejudices, the injustice, the rigid barriers to advancement, which had disturbed their lives in the Old World.

They came looking for freedom and tolerance. They came looking for opportunity and abundance. They came looking to free the human spirit from the bonds of old societies which thought a man's birth and station more important than his ability and dedication.

They came looking for a government they did not have to fear—because it would be their own.

They faced grave difficulties and dangers on these untamed shores. The Piedmont was a wild frontier. But they knew that though the hazards were high, the rewards would be rich.

From this wilderness they carved clearings, and gave those clearing names which ring, even today, with their fears and toil—"Trouble Enough" "Scared From Home"—"All That's Left"—and "Discontent." One Maryland farmer call his place: "I Am Glad It Is No Worse."

But they never lost sight of the desires which had brought them across the Atlantic. In 1638, their representatives won the right to initiate legislation in the Maryland Assembly. This was a landmark in American history. No other colony had made a more dramatic effort to achieve self-government.

And Maryland also became a fountainhead of religious freedom. In 1937, Franklin Roosevelt wrote congratulating Maryland for "its noble service in the cause of religious toleration."

In that same letter he warned, "We must recognize the fundamental rights of man." He wrote that letter because he knew that this was a State which has always fought for the rights of man. And if that battle takes place on different fronts today than it did 300 years ago, Maryland must help to win it.

Because that same spirit still lives in Maryland today, I come here to ask your help in carrying forward the American Revolution.

In many ways today's battles are even more difficult.

Then the enemy was clear.

Today the enemies which menace our people are more complex. They will not yield simply to guns or force. They take the form of disease and poor schools—of untrained men and chronic unemployment—of exhausted mines and obsolete skills.

We are preparing to fight these enemies.

Our first objective is to free 30 million Americans from the prison of poverty. We do this for those who are poor. We do it also for those generations who will be condemned to poverty unless our generation provides a way out.

Franklin Roosevelt said: "It is not the pinch of suffering, the agony of uncertainty that the adults are now feeling that count the most—it is the heritage our children must anticipate. It is not just today that counts. Undernourishment, poor standards of living, and inadequate medical care will make themselves felt for 50 years to come."

Years of poverty in Appalachia are preparing a grim harvest for the years to come.

Here, in Appalachia, almost one family in three lives on an income of less than $3,000. In the rest of the country it's one in five.

Here, in Appalachia, the 1960 per capita income was a meager $1,400 a year. In the rest of the country it was $1,900.

Here, in Appalachia, employment went down 1.5 percent between 1950 and 1960. In the rest of the country it rose 15 percent.

Here, in Appalachia, only 32 out of every 100 people finish high school. Five out of 100 finish college. More than 2 million people have migrated to join the unskilled unemployed in other places.

But statistics alone do not tell the story. Figures do not describe the grim picture of despair and want.

I know what poverty means to people. I have been unemployed. I have shined shoes and worked on a highway crew for a dollar a day. This has taught me some of the meaning of poverty.

It means waiting in a surplus food line, rather than in a supermarket checkout line. It means going without running water, rather than worrying about whether you can afford a color television set. It means despairing of ever finding work, rather than wondering when you will take your vacation. It means coming home each night, empty-handed, to look as the expectant faces of children who lack the playthings of childhood. It means a lonely battle to maintain pride and self-respect in a family you cannot provide for—in a nation where so many seem to be doing so well.

Poverty not only strikes at the needs of the body. It attacks the spirit. It undermines human dignity.

No American can be at ease with himself and his conscience until this kind of poverty is wiped out. It is not enough for the fortunate among us to count their blessings. They should also mark, every day, what they and their country have done to extend those blessings to all.

It is not enough for the Government to propose programs. It is not enough for the Congress to pass laws. We will not win our war against poverty until the conscience of the entire Nation is aroused. We will not succeed until every citizen regards the sufferings of neighbors as a call to action. We will not overcome until every city and town mobilizes its resources to create the true American community, where all are equal in hope and expectation.

This can be done. And we are going to do it.

We mon the first American Revolution because we were a people in arms. We mobilized every resource of a new and weak country. Each citizen had a role to play. In this way we defeated a great empire.

Today we are incomparably richer and stronger. We have the resources and the knowledge to win this war.

The battle will not be a spectacular one. It will consist of thousands of small efforts making up a vast national effort.

For example, this week we approved a new program to train 50 machine tool operators in Cumberland. Their new skills will be put to work in local industries. Fifty more men will have a chance for a decent wage and a productive job. They will leave the ranks of poverty.

In this way, with such small beginnings, do we move toward the great goal Franklin Roosevelt set before us when he said, "The great objective we are demanding for the sake of every man and woman and child in this country is a more abundant life."

This is still our objective today. We strive for this goal by attacking the causes of poverty, not by simply treating the symptoms. We are not trying to give people more relief, we are trying to give them more opportunity.

And this is what they want. They want education and training. They want a job and a wage which will let them provide for their family. Above all, they want their children to escape the poverty which has afflicted them.

They want, in short, to be part of a great nation. And that nation will never be truly great until they are part of it.

So I came here to Maryland—seedbed of American liberty—to call upon the pioneer spirit which made a free country. From these hills again goes forth a call to battle. This time it is a battle to open the gates of the great society to all who seek to enter.

Clarifying Civil Rights Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the April 30 issue of the Wall Street Journal carried an article, by Jerry Landauer, with a Washington dateline, under the heading, "Civil Rights Confusion." As a contribution to clarification of the civil rights debate, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS CONFUSION: BILL IS NOT AS STRONG AS NEGROES WANT OR AS WHITES FEAR

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—No legislative proposal in recent memory has stirred more passionate advocacy or evoked angrier opposition than the civil rights bill. And none has been more misunderstood by those most aroused.

To Negroes everywhere, the Civil Rights Act of 1963 (so named because it started its stormy legislative journey nearly a year ago) has become a symbol of hope—the hope that the promises of the Constitution and innumerable party platforms will be delivered at last.

But the very fervency of this hope has added a new dimension to the emotion-laden struggle: The intense resentment of large blocs of whites in the North. To them, the bill has become a symbol of fear—fear of losing jobs to Negroes; fear that neighborhood schools will be flooded by Negro kids "bussed in" from across town; fear that homeowners will be forced to sell, if they wish to sell at all to Negro newcomers.

In point of fact, both the hopes and the fears are exaggerated, with each emotion tending to inflame the other. If rigidly enforced, the bill may deliver to more Negroes in the Deep South the right to vote in Federal elections. It may open to those southerners more schools, lodging places, stores and restaurants. And it may protect demonstrators against over-zealous police intervention.

LITTLE EFFECT IN NORTH

But as its backers themselves acknowledge (and as some are insistently trying to communicate to constituents), the rights bill, though technically applying to every section of the land, will barely affect living conditions of either Negro or white in the North. The provisions affecting schools and homes have been reshaped to limit their application almost exclusively to the South. The jobs provisions have little impact on the North and may have even less by the time they become law.

The widespread misunderstanding among Northern whites about the pending bill's provisions is compounded from several ingredients. Some think it still contains the sweeping language contrived by a House subcommittee last fall. Others have been excited by southern propagandists. And a substantial number have confused the school, housing and job goals of local civil rights demonstrators with the Federal bill's intent.

To take schools first, the House after little debate wrote into the bill an amendment exempting "racially imbalanced" schools from the Attorney General's authority to file suits for integration. In giving the Justice Department authority to initiate such suits, the House specified that "desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalances." In effect, this language limits the law's reach to Southern schools segregated by local ordinance or State law.

According to congressional lawyers, moreover, the amendment's definition of segregation won't allow the U.S. Office of Education to offer grants or provide technical assistance to school boards trying to break down racial separation imposed by neighborhood housing patterns. Realining school districts to achieve integration is a prime aim of the rights movement, but here again the bill won't reach beyond the Southern States.

HOUSING EXCLUSION

Another title in the House-approved bill directs Federal agencies to withhold aid, as a last resort, from locally operated programs or activities that don't provide equal benefits to Negroes. As it emerged from the House Judiciary Committee, this title could have been interpreted to cover VA or FHA-guaranteed home mortgages, and housing loans by banks and savings and loan associations whose deposits are insured by Washington.

On the House floor, though, the fund-withholding title was amended to exclude "contracts of insurance or guarantee." Thus, the one provision that might satisfy somewhat the Negro's quest, most acute in the North, for equal access to housing was deleted. (Executive orders against discrimination in housing cover VA and FHA-insured mortgages; they don't cover the lending practices of federally insured financial institutions.)

As for jobs, the bill contemplates leaving jurisdiction over equal employment opportunities to States that have set up "effective" antidiscrimination agencies. It's assumed that the proposed Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission won't operate in California, New York, or other industrial States where Negro complaints about job discrimination are loudest. Amendments proposed by Senate Republican leader DIRKSEN go still further toward allowing States and communities to deal with job discrimination pretty much as they have been.

In practice, this means that the job's title will barely touch most of the 30 States, nearly all in the North, that have created fair employment commissions. "The effect of the Federal law on most employers up North will be exactly what it is under State law," according to one bill drafter.

Much the same is true for the bill's remaining controversial section, which bans discrimination in hotels, restaurants, amusement centers, and other so-called public accommodations. Already, 32 States prohibit discrimination in these or similar places that invite public business, and many provide criminal penalties for violators.

A 1961 Ohio law, for example, authorizes fines of up to $500 and jail terms for up to 90 days. In contrast, the proposed Federal statute limits sanctions to civil remedies by the courts, though refusal to comply with court decrees could lead to punishment for contempt.

All this leads inevitably to the conclusion that the bill's impact will be minimal in the northern cities where civil rights agitation is now strongest. Nevertheless, the "white backlash" refuses to abate, and some of it even comes from citizens sympathetic toward or associated with Negro causes. Just one example: A white director of the United Negro College Fund in Wisconsin, in a letter to Senator NELSON, said he couldn't support the bill because it authorizes transfers of white students to correct racial imbalance in schools—which, of course, it does not. An aid to Senator NELSON says, "We get hundreds and hundreds of letters like this from attorneys, businessmen, and others who should know better."

CONSTITUENTS REASSURED

Caught in this tide of critical letters and telegrams (in some offices the antibill mail overwhelms the pro by margins of 10 to 1), Congressmen are trying to stem it by grinding out reassuring statements to their restless constituents—in some cases with help from Attorney General Kennedy.

Republican Representative MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, who helped draft the bill, notes that Ohioans are living under a tougher State code than the one facing a filibuster in the Senate. In neighboring Indiana, where segregationist Governor Wallace, of Alabama, is trying to capitalize on white unrest, Senator BAYH asserts that the Federal statute will have little or no effect on Hoosiers. Senator NELSON told voters in a recent newsletter that "none of the 11 titles in the bill would change any of Wisconsin's civil rights practices." A GOP House Member, seeking to soothe the fears of an entreating women's delegation, assured that the bill "doesn't mean a jot north of the Mason and Dixon's line."

So far, the "white backlash" hasn't changed the prospect for eventual Senate approval of an amended, somewhat weakened, bill. White resentment failed to turn more than a handful of votes against it in the House; and in the Senate all but a few Members are dug in too far to switch sides, even if they judged retreat would be expedient.

Unless segregationist Governor Wallace scores heady triumphs in the Indiana and Maryland presidential primaries next month, the crop of fearful outcries against the bill won't do more than prod two or three more uncertain Senators into voting for amendments that will further clarify Congress intent to limit the measure's impact essentially to the South.

In short, the civil rights bill probably will vault the filibuster's obstacles because it doesn't go nearly as far as Negroes desire, nor is it as tough or comprehensive as northern whites fear.

The Lesson of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the News of Lynchburg, Va., has printed in its April 27, 1964, edition a very interesting and important editorial on the subject of the so-called civil rights legislation now pending in the Senate.

The editorial is entitled "The Lesson of New York." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LESSON OF NEW YORK

Anyone who thinks the civil rights bill will satisfy Negro demands or prevent discrimination has only to look at the example being set in New York State these days.

New York has had antidiscrimination laws on its books for many years. And these laws, in some instances, are most restrictive and encompassing than the provisions of

the rights bill now being debated in the Senate.

New York has enforced its laws, to the extent that its citizens have cooperated. The power of the State—both physical and moral—has been brought to bear upon its citizenry to abolish discrimination.

And still the Negroes complain, and protest, and demonstrate, about discrimination that continues to exist.

Could it be that discrimination is something that cannot be ended by law?

The temptation is to blame New Yorkers for being hypocritical, to accuse them of formenting civil disobedience and violence in the South, to achieve an equality to which they pay lip service but do not practice at home. While this is true in many cases, we do not think it is the real reason why the Negro's plight in the North is as bad, if not worse, than it is in the South.

The real reason, we believe, that New York's laws have failed to create a Negro utopia of equality is that laws cannot create an attitude of "equality" or a fact of "equality" and New York's laws were never intended to. They were intended to see that no man initially was discriminated against because of his color. But how far he advanced through ability was left up to him. Such results as the Negro leaders are demanding today simply cannot exist unless preferential treatment is accorded the Negro. Some of the Negro leaders are aware of this and have openly called for special treatment.

Such treatment, however, would only arouse more intense white resentment and isolate the Negro further from the mainstream of American life. No, the Negroes are first going to have to resign themselves to a fact of life—a fact which, in all fairness, must be faced by the white man, too.

And that is: men can only be accepted as individuals, and judged on their individual merits. They can not be accepted, as the Negro leaders are demanding, as racial or ethnic groups. It is a matter of simple logic that if whole races are to be accepted as equals, then the separate members of those races can not be treated as individuals with disparate abilities.

The harsh truth which lies behind the Negroes' disillusionment in New York is that he is, for the most part, being treated as an individual in that State, and is faring badly in competition with the whites. There may, or may not, be many reasons for his poor showing—ranging from environment, past history, innate dislike and distrust for those who differ markedly in appearance to differences in ability or IQ, in desire or drive and in cultural adaptability—but the fact remains that he is not showing up well in competition. In most cases he is being held at the foot of the economic ladder, not by prejudice or discrimination, but by his own inability.

The South, for the most part, has long recognized that the Negro can not, in his present state, compete with the white on any basis of equality, and has adopted a patronizing attitude which, while it infuriates some individual Negroes, has generally treated the race with more consideration than it is treated in the North.

The backers of the civil rights bill are aware that the bill they are defending so vigorously is a fraud. They know it can not abolish discrimination, nor can it create a climate of acceptance in which the Negro can achieve recognition as an individual. It does not create any new rights. What it does do is give the Federal Government totalitarian power to carry out a policy peculiar to this and the previous administration—a policy based on political expediency.

Now there are indications that this political expediency has been pushed too far and the white voters are beginning to resent it and rebel. Watch what happens in the next few weeks. The civil rights bill is going to be amended. Senator HUMPHREY, who has been waging an undercover campaign for Vice President, tipped the administration's hand this week when he suddenly admitted that a jury trial amendment was a good idea. There will be other amendments. If the white pressure is enough, the bill will be emasculated; and if there was any real ground swell of opposition, it would not be passed. The whole disgraceful affair is political, not moral. The cynicism is in the hearts of a few men in the Congress who are using this bill to further their careers or to vent their own personal spite.

It is also in the hearts of some Negro leaders using their own people to further their careers and line their wallets. And in the shadows behind them stand the Communists, whispering instructions, planting ideas and suggestions, giving encouragement.

The Negro in America must understand that all he can ask for is to be treated as a person, the same as anyone else. He must be given an opportunity to take his place in the mainstream of American life—and he must be man enough to accept that place, even if it does not always fulfill his dreams. White men dream, too, and some are disillusioned.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1964, we are privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and seventy-three years ago, shortly after this great Nation gave birth to our present Constitution, Poland adopted a great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

The people of our great country are cognizant of the hardships that the Polish people are going through at this time. On this day we express our heartfelt sympathy and, at the same time, convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

If you can imagine an America without the right to celebrate our Independence Day on July 4, then you have some idea how the people of Poland feel today. Poland would jubilantly celebrate her May 3 Constitution Day if it were possible for her to do so, but Poland cannot rejoice at this time. Soviet domination will see to that; but even Communist enslavement cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of this great day.

Today there is another Poland—a free Poland which exists, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. Yes, outside of this Iron Curtain this free Poland is just as strong, physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the Polish nation in their fight to protect Western civilization from being overrun by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

It is also just and fair to point out the contributions of many sons of Poland to this great Nation of ours, the United States of America. There was Pulaski, whose monuments and statues adorn many of our Nation's parks and public squares. Pulaski made the supreme sacrifice for this country at Savannah, Ga. His contribution was truly symbolic of the Polish desire to fight freedom's battle anywhere on God's earth. Then there was Kosciuszko who, for a time, was an adjutant to George Washington. His recommendations to build fortifications at West Point and further, that a military academy be established there will always be a monument to his memory. The very names of Pulaski and Kosciuszko are always connected with liberty and freedom; their contributions are indelibly written into the glorious record of American independence.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the valiant people of Poland look to this great Nation of ours for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States of America, a future observance of Polish Constitution Day will be one which the people of Poland can join in with all the citizens of this great Nation who wish her well today.

In paying tribute to those sons and daughters of Poland who died for freedom and christianity, and those who now continue in the noble tradition of the cross held by the White Eagle over Poland's martyred soil, I say: "Have hope you who now suffer and fight. Have hope that Poland will be freed to be a Christian, free, independent and a happy land in a new peaceful world. If there is no hope for you, then there is no hope for the world."

An Eternal Flame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, there have been many tributes paid to our late President John F. Kennedy.

A very touching tribute, in the form of a poem, has been sent to me by a former colleague in Congress. This poem is written by Larry D. Schieving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the poem entitled "An Eternal Flame," may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ETERNAL FLAME

(By Larry D. Schieving)

For three short years a job was done,
A priceless journey was begun,
And through this journey hardships pressed,
A trying, hard, and bitter test.
Until the journey's end.

But, from this journey from this strife,
Enriched a nation, enriched a life,
Enriched a world with love and peace,
Until a short one life did cease
Which was the journey's end.

So now a journey must begin,
To take up reins of that great man,
Whose highest gift a sacrifice,
To God and country paid the price.
So freedom could remain.

Our journey now, for those who ask,
Must be to finish that great task,
That all are equal all are one
Glow now his spirit like the sun.
A great Eternal Flame.

Out-of-School Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include an article by Roscoe Fleming in the Christian Science Monitor (dealing with cooperative agricultural extension work) in the Appendix of the RECORD. As a former agricultural extension worker as well as a user of the Service, it is my judgment that no other effort has done more to raise the standard of living in our country. I wish to congratulate the Extension Service on a record of 50 years of unparalled service.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL EDUCATION

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—The Cooperative Extension Service, perhaps the world's most influential out-of-school educational program, is 50 years old this month.

In the United States it has reached millions of adults and a yearly average of more than two million juniors, in nearly 3,000 counties of which many are wholly urban.

It helped greatly to bring about the production revolution that has transformed U.S. agriculture—has brought new problems of abundance rather than scarcity.

Carried abroad like a seeding wind, by continuous interchange of United States and foreign specialists, it has been adapted or imitated in some 75 nations with problems of scarcity rather than abundance, and is helping feed their people better, and give their farmers better living.

And many other programs with diverse goals, such as the Peace Corps and its numerous cousins both public and private, have borrowed both personnel and ideas from Extension.

It formally began with the signing of the Smith-Lever Act of Congress on May 8, 1914. It grew out of what are now the hundred-year-old programs of the land grant colleges and the experiment stations, founded under the Morrill Act of 1862.

These had piled up a rich lore of better production methods, better land enrichment, better plants and animals which, however, didn't quite get down to millions of grass-roots farmers, who carried on as their grandfathers had. One pioneer "Farmers' Institute" of the late nineties featured "a promising new plant named alfalfa."

But such institutes, traveling train exhibits subsidized in part by railroads anxious for more farm business, displays and lectures at county and state fairs, special short courses—all these together didn't quite suffice to saturate the back counties with the new knowledge.

So the Extension Service came into being as a Federal-State-local partnership, a prime example of what Prof. Daniel Elazar has called "the American partnership," unique in the world.

Federal and State governments contributed funds matched in part by the county. These funds were used to employ county agricultural agents and county home demonstration agents—trained men and women who brought, respectively, improved farming and homekeeping methods to the farm.

The system was such a natural that it was adopted in virtually all States. There were some battles, however, over sponsorship. "County farm bureaus" were organized by local farmers and businessmen as the county cooperating organization. These coalesced naturally into State bureaus. Such State bureaus organized nationally, and presto, the mighty Farm Bureau Federation was born.

Other farmers' organizations resented this, and charged that its tendency was to divert public aid to members of a private organization. After some years the laws were changed so that no single such group sits in the driver's seat.

Meanwhile the intrinsic virtue of the idea was such that it spread and spread. The sun-bronzed county agent became the busiest man in many a county, spending his days and often half his nights visiting individual farms or talking to groups of farmers—someday there should be a statue to him.

His feminine coadjutor, the county home demonstration agent, has likewise stretched her demesne from cookery and housework to home management, wise selection in shopping, plans for home improvement, and so on.

Together the pair have made millions of American farms more pleasant and secure places, aided greatly in recent decades, of course by TV and radio, and aided always by the rural press.

Someone early had the idea of approaching parents through their children—while helping the latter prepare themselves for life—and so the 4-H clubs were born.

Now they enroll more than 2 million juniors yearly, of whom only about half are on farms. But particularly for those children, the 4-H clubs have proved perhaps the greatest beneficial influence, aside from the school system, the church, and the home itself.

Some people contend the need for extension is passing with the decline of farm population. But rural area development, the new idea for a domestic youth corps, and hundreds of regional and local plans for conservation, all argue the other way.

In fact, extension already has many specialists at work in multicounty units covering nearly one-third of our counties. And even in cities, batteries of telephones ring incessantly in the offices of county agents. The enormous work of remaking America into a greener and fitter place to live, is all entwined with the continuance of extension.

Public Opinion Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted two public opinion surveys in my congressional district, Onondaga County, N.Y.

One was a direct mail survey and the other was conducted through the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard.

Because the Post-Standard questionnaire is the largest survey, and since the replies from the two surveys are quite similar, I am inserting the Post-Standard tabulation along with the news story written by Luther F. Bliven. However, it shows the slight differences in the replies of the two surveys.

I hope my colleagues will have an opportunity to examine the opinions of many of my constituents in central New York.

The material follows:

RIEHLMAN SURVEY: POLLS PROBE CNY VIEWS

(By Luther F. Bliven)

Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Tully, knows now how a good cross section of the people of Syracuse and Onondaga County feel on major Federal issues and proposals.

They think:

1. U.S. prestige and influence are decreasing in relation to the power of the Soviet bloc.

2. Strong American forces should not be used to defeat Communist-led troops from North Vietnam.

3. There should be an absolute embargo on Cuban-bound vessels to prevent supplies and arms being shipped to Cuba.

4. Further reductions in foreign aid should be made.

5. Parents should be given tax deductions to cover college costs for their children.

6. The Federal Government is penetrating too far into State and private enterprise.

7. All agricultural subsidy payments to farmers should be gradually eliminated.

8. The Nation's foreign policy is not effective nor well administered.

9. The national domestic policy leaves a lot to be desired.

10. There should be a cutback in the U.S. effort to explore space.

HIGHLIGHTS

These are the highlights of the sentiment voiced by more than 2,100 persons who responded to a 45-point questionnaire, prepared by RIEHLMAN and published in the Post-Standard.

This published questionnaire supplemented a mail survey RIEHLMAN aids conducted among 1,500 persons selected at random in this area. In most cases the results were the same, but there were sharp differences in a few instances.

The replies to the two surveys were not commingled. Results have been announced previously from the mail survey.

RIEHLMAN and his staff members were astounded at the response the Congressman received from the questionnaire published in the Post-Standard. The questionnaire, a long one which dealt with issues that require considerable thought and which took considerable time to read, digest and fill out, sparked a lot of interest.

DIVERTED AIDS

RIEHLMAN had to divert some of his assistants from their regular duties to spend all their time sorting, tabulating and analyzing the replies he received from the Post-Standard questionnaire.

The questions as they originally appeared in the Post-Standard are reproduced here, with the "Yes" and "No" vote recorded by Post-Standard readers.

A surprisingly large number of persons, 1,756, reported they feel the prestige and influence of the United States are decreasing in relation to the power of the Soviet bloc. Only 383 disagreed.

As far as area residents are concerned, U.S. leaders better not toy with the idea of recognizing Red China. Post-Standard readers object, 1,859 to 257, to U.N. recognition of Red China.

And local people think Russia and others should start paying their share of U.N. operation costs. They favor such a policy by a vote of 2,088 to 62. And, by the same token, the readers voted 2,453 to 637 in favor of U.S. withdrawal of its financial support of the U.N. if the other countries don't pay up.

By a vote of 2,033 to 104, those responding to the questionnaire approved the $1 billion reduction in foreign aid by Congress last year, and favor, by a vote of 1,889 to 185, further reductions in foreign aid.

By a vote of 1,867 to 270, those responding to the Riehlman questionnaire registered the opinion the U.S. Government is assuming too many obligations of States and private enterprise. They disapprove raising the national minimum wage from $1.25 to $2 per hour by a vote of 1,584 to 524.

Only by a narrow margin, 988 to 928, are local residents who participated in the poll in favor of the civil rights legislation recently passed by the House of Representatives. And, by a whopping vote of 1,842 to 271, the people who answered the questionnaire believe sit-downs, marches, and civil disobedience do not help the civil rights movement.

MAIL SURVEY DIFFERS

There were several points of differences in the results of the mail survey conducted by Riehlman aids and the questionnaire published in the Post-Standard. In the mail survey those participating favored the proposed $400 million annual program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools for construction purposes by a margin of 61 percent "Yes" and 32 percent "No."

In the mail survey those participating favored the civil rights legislation recently approved by the House of Representatives by a margin of 61 percent "Yes," 26 percent "No." In the questionnaire published in the Post-Standard the vote was 988 "Yes" and 928 "No," a much closer margin.

In the mail survey the vote in favor of Federal aid to colleges for construction of classrooms and other purposes was 51 percent in favor and 38 percent against. In the questionnaire published in the Post-Standard the vote was 1,186 "No," 866 "Yes."

Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN public interest Post-Standard questionnaire

	Yes	No
I. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS		
1. Do you believe the prestige and influence of the United States is decreasing in relation to the power of the Soviet bloc?	1,756	383
2. Do you believe that "slipping prestige" of the United States has encouraged anti-U.S. activities in Panama, Zanzibar, Cyprus, southeast Asia, Ghana, and varied countries of Africa and South America?	1,765	352
3. Do you favor selling surplus farm products to Communist countries?	684	1,448
4. Do you favor U.S. policy of selling such products on credit?	111	2,012
5. Do you believe the United States should take firm and specific action to oppose the sale of vehicles and machinery to Cuba by Britain and France?	1,461	613
6. Do you favor economic aid or loans or credits to Russia or its satellites?	67	2,040
7. Do you favor using strong forces of American soldiers to defeat Communist-led troops from North Vietnam?	942	1,048
8. Do you favor U.N. recognition of Red China?	257	1,859
9. Do you favor absolute enforcement of U.N. regulations regarding payment of costs of U.N. operations by all members?	2,088	62
10. If yes, do you favor U.S. withdrawal of U.S. support if such payments are not made?	1,453	637
11. Do you favor absolute enforcement of an embargo on Cuban-bound vessels to prevent import of supplies as well as arms?	1,541	530
12. Do you believe Cuba constitutes a dangerous threat to the United States?	1,786	349
13. Did you favor the reductions of about $1,000,000,000 in foreign aid enacted by Congress last year?	2,033	104
14. Do you feel further reductions in foreign aid should be made?	1,889	185
15. Do you believe the United States should renegotiate the Panama Canal Zone Treaty?	867	1,168
16. Do you favor foreign aid loans, grants, or credits to so-called neutralist nations under Soviet influence, such as Yugoslavia, Ghana, Indonesia, Algeria?	265	1,851
II. MONEY		
1. Do you favor a balanced national budget?	2,018	111
2. Do you favor major reductions of U.S. programs (other than defense) to make a balanced budget possible?	1,887	216
3. Do you favor tax deductions for parents to cover college costs?	1,419	667
4. Do you favor the proposal to reestablish a strong citizen body similar to the Hoover Commission to analyze Government expenditures and recommend economical, businesslike procedures in all governmental departments?	1,899	211
5. Do you believe the U.S. Government is assuming too many obligations of States and private enterprise?	1,867	270
6. Do you feel socialism is a threat to our form of government?	1,754	432
7. Do you feel socialism in the United States is inevitable?	431	1,769
II. MONEY—continued		
8. Do you favor 6 percent pay raises for all U.S. governmental employees this year?	439	1,655
9. Do you favor substantially higher raises for Federal executive officials this year?	209	1,868
10. Do you favor the proposed $400,000,000 annual program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools for construction purposes?	898	1,191
11. Do you believe the national minimum wage should be raised from $1.25 per hour to $2 per hour for business engaged in interstate commerce?	524	1,584
12. Do you favor gradual elimination (4 to 7 years) of all agricultural subsidy payments to farmers?	1,880	174
III. MISCELLANEOUS		
1. Do you favor a compulsory medical assistance program for the aged supported by an increase in social security taxes?	685	1,418
2. Do you favor expanding and liberalizing the existing Kerr-Mills Act to provide unlimited hospital and medical care for the aged who show financial need?	1,289	649
3. Would you favor reducing the qualifying age of the Kerr-Mills Act from 65 to 62?	1,077	915
4. Do you favor Federal restrictions on cigarette advertising?	1,109	968
5. Do you favor increasing Federal excise taxes on cigarettes to discourage smoking?	1,077	1,025
6. Do you support proposals for a 35-hour workweek?	452	1,638
7. Do you favor proposals to double overtime pay as an encouragement to industry to hire more employees rather than pay higher overtime rates?	507	1,562
8. Did you favor the tax reduction recently enacted which averages about 14 percent?	1,288	770
9. Did you favor the civil rights legislation recently passed by the House?	988	928
10. Do you feel our foreign policy is effective and well administered?	186	1,862
11. Do you feel our domestic policies are sound, advantageous, and well administered?	378	1,511
12. Do you favor granting voting privileges to Americans at age 18?	676	1,443
13. Do you favor the reestablishment of a Federal civil work corps to employ youths otherwise unable to find employment?	1,437	619
14. Do you believe the Peace Corps has been effective?	1,350	538
15. Do you favor Federal aid to colleges for construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, etc.?	866	1,186
16. Do you believe the U.S. effort to explore space should be continued at its current pace and spending of about $5,000,000,000 a year?	758	1,297
17. Do you believe that sitdowns, marches, and civil disobedience help the civil rights movement?	271	1,842

Recommendations for Better Patent Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, there are signs that indicate the need for a major overhaul of our patent laws to aid the cause of the independent inventor. Increases in registration fees tend to discourage and prevent the inventor working on his own from obtaining patents, with the laws working in favor of the large research firms.

The Federal Government and the giant contractors argue over which should have control of patents developed by the contractor using Government funds—overlooking the inventor, who is actually the only one that a patent can be issued to.

There are certainly cases where each—Government, contractor, and the inventor—should have primary control of the patents, but our laws show little cognizance of the fact that a problem exists. A myriad of problems make it next to impossible for the individual inventor to be assured of full consideration for the product of his ingenuity in many cases.

The Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power "to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;".

Indicative of some of the problems and the feelings of the inventors are the following recommendations approved and sent to me recently by the board of directors of the United Inventors and Scientists of America. The recommendations are as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BETTER PATENT LAWS

(By David Resnick, president)

1. We must have a law prohibiting attorneys or corporations from having access to the secrets of the patent applications before the patents have been granted. We must have a law making it a criminal offense for any employee of the Patent Office to disclose a patent application secretly or confidentially outside of the Patent Office; or copying the invention or making use of it in any way.

2. Because the inventor has paid his fees to the Government for the granting of his patents he should be privileged to have the aid of the legal department to protect his rights in every case where they have been infringed upon. It should be made a criminal offense to infringe on patents or on patents pending.

3. We are against such laws that give the inventor 6 months time before the patent

has been granted to apply for a patent in other countries. This law is good for the manufacturer but not for the inventor because some attorneys charge thousands of dollars for patents in Canada and other countries and the majority of inventors cannot afford patent protection in the United States and other countries at the same time. Inventors in many countries do not need permission from their government to apply for a patent in the United States.

4. The U.S. Government spends billions of dollars to help people of other countries throughout the world, but it spends nothing to help its inventor-citizen. We American inventors have hundreds of thousands of inventions lying idle in our basements and garages for lack of market abroad. If our patent laws were internationalized it would help this situation both for the inventor and for the people of other countries, just as the copyright law for books, paintings, and music has been internationalized for the good of the people of all countries.

5. If any individual having a certificate of registration of claims of copyright and someone has infringed on this copyright then the Federal Government takes legal action against the infringers. Also there should be a law against infringers of patent rights.

6. We also recommend the Patent Office to be separated from the Commerce Department. We believe the Patent Office is big enough to be a separate department with representation in the cabinet by the Government. At the last report more than 300,000 patent applications for passage are lying dormant in the Patent Office. It takes from 1 to 5 years for some patents to be issued. The Patent Office has not been changed for the last 85 years. The bill which we are recommending should be the strongest point in the change.

7. The Government should call a conference of many countries to work out a plan for uniform international patent laws.

8. Let's help the inventor to help America.

9. There should be a law, requiring that any promoter or agent assisting the inventor, be licensed, at a fee not less than $100 and not more than $500.

Breakdown of Our Two-Party System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a speech delivered on April 21, 1964 by William Jackman, president of Investors League, Inc., America's oldest and largest union of investors, before the Stock & Bond Club in St. Petersburg, Fla. Mr. Jackman has presented forcefully and sincerely a problem which is of grave importance to Members of Congress. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

BREAKDOWN OF OUR TWO-PARTY SYSTEM?

(By William Jackman)

I have long felt that one of the principal sinews of the strength of our American two-party system of government in America lies in the mutual respect of our majority and minority Members of Congress for each other. Today's majority party may be the minority party of tomorrow. The tendency of today's majority to muzzle the minority is reprehensible. They should respect each others views. Our proposed laws should be made only after those who agree and disagree are given a full and equal opportunity to open debate where their divergent views can be made known. No one can always be 100 percent right and the views of the millions of the minority voters must be respected and considered, and ultimately brought to fulfillment by compromising the differing views of people into the laws which are finally enacted.

This sacred bulwark of our two-party system today is being flaunted flagrantly in Congress, in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

In organizing committees in the Senate, a sincere effort is made to apportion members in ratio of the members of the majority to the minority members of the full Senate membership.

In the House, things are different. Most of their important committees are stacked by the majority. Their committee memberships far exceed the proportion of their party's total membership in the House. This, in itself, is politically unmoral, but it constitutes only the beginning of the inequity involved.

In a sense, it may well be said that our laws are really made in committee, and not on the floor. It is almost axiomatic that the vote of the full Senate or House membership is in direct proportion to the vote by the committee members in reporting out the specific bill for vote by the full membership.

What is little understood, however, is the importance of the congressional committee staff members upon whose research and recommendations the committee members in turn make their recommendations. Perhaps it is these staff members who actually shape a good deal of our legislation. Their political power and importance can not be overemphasized. And we must not overlook the fact that these lawmakers without portfolio are appointed and not elected.

The majority party has succeeded in grossly stacking these committee staffs with their own followers and completely neglect the rights of the minority. This is the two-party system at its worst. The evil is obvious, and must be corrected if we are to preserve representative government.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 intended to provide for completely nonpartisan staffing. The committee staffs were to be appointed "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of office." In spite of this original intention, each committee is empowered to hire and fire its own professional staff by majority vote, with the implicit possibility of majority party authoritarianism. For the most part, the chairman of the committee has become the chief judge of the staffs of that particular committee.

The spirit of nonpartisanship of the Reorganization Act has been flagrantly violated. Only a few committee staffs in the House of Representatives are truly nonpartisan, not in terms of party affiliation but in terms of serving members of both parties equally. On the other committees, the principle of appointment and control of tenure by a majority of the committee has led to virtual control of the staff by the Democratic chairman and almost exclusive control of its time by the Democratic majority party. Democrats outnumber Republicans in the House 3 to 2, yet, leaving nonpartisan committees aside, professional committee staff members responsible to the Democratic majority outnumber staff responsible to the Republican minority more than 8 to 1. In the Senate, majority staff members outnumber the minority 12 to 1.

Quite apart from this incredible abuse, it is becoming increasingly clear that the whole concept of nonpartisan staff is inadequate to meet the requirements of an effective Congress. The role of a legislature is unquestionably to discuss and to choose among alternatives. The role of a minority party is first to be an articulate, intelligent, and vigorous opposition, and then, as the loyal opposition, present clear, constructive alternatives to majority proposals in order to facilitate meaningful discussion and sound choices. The role of a congressional committee in our system is to research complex problems and to report back to the Congress. Nothing is gained—in fact much is lost—if committees blur the areas of disagreement or genuine partisanship. If no effective distinction between majority and minority positions is made in committee, meaningful floor debate, and problem solving responsible to the public are impossible. Responsibility for a decision cannot be associated with a party position.

Minority staffing is not a partisan issue. Both parties will from time to time play the minority role. Therefore, it is unfortunate that in recent Congresses only Republicans have been working for this reform. Leaders of this reform have pledged that when they become the majority party they will continue to fight for adequate staff for the minority.

There are bills pending before Congress to remedy this situation which will have our full support and we will urge that both major parties include such recommendations in their platforms to be adopted at their national conventions this summer, before which your League will testify.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

The Employment Act of 1946 provides that such a report prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisers be delivered to Congress by the President at the beginning of each year. The economists heading this Council for the last 4 years have been noted believers in the Keynesian school of socialist economics. Their report carries great weight. I firmly believe that thought must be given to the wisdom of creating a similar council staffed by members of the minority party, who would prepare and issue, to Congress annually, a minority economic report. Congress would then have all shades of opinion available to help them in preparing sound legislation.

The 25th Anniversary of New Jersey Labor Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us in New Jersey are proud of the contributions made by the men and women of labor to the overall progress of our State. We are also pleased with the cordial relations existing between labor and management in our State and attribute the tremendous industrial progress we have achieved to this apparent cooperative effort.

One of the real factors in bringing about this cohesive effort on the part of management and labor has been the New Jersey Labor Herald, a newspaper published at the city of Newark, N.J., which is celebrating its 25th silver anniversary with its June edition.

As one who has read this periodical with great personal interest and benefit

throughout the years, I join the many admirers of this publication in congratulating its editor, Lewis M. Herrmann, for 25 years of outstanding service to the community, the State, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that I might be permitted to insert in the RECORD a copy of the resolution of the New Jersey Legislature commending this periodical and its editor on the occasion of its silver anniversary.

RESOLUTION OF 188TH SESSION, NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE, 1964

Whereas the New Jersey Labor Herald, published in the city of Newark, N.J., will celebrate the 25th silver anniversary with its June 1964 edition; and

Whereas this publication has over the past 25 years, contributed greatly to the achievement of more cordial relations between labor and management in this industrial State, and was largely responsible for the creation by the legislature of the now nationally famous Institute of Management and Labor Relations, on the campus of Rutgers University; and

Whereas its editor, Lewis M. Herrmann, served with distinction for a number of years, as a member of the House of Assembly, representing the county of Essex, from 1947 to 1951: Be it therefore

Resolved by the general assembly and the senate, That we hereby go on record extending our sincere felicitations to the New Jersey Labor Herald and its editor and staff, on the occasion of its 25th birthday, to be celebrated during the month of June 1964; and Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the general assembly and senate, and forwarded to Editor Herrmann, and released to the press.

ALFRED N. BEADLESTON,
Speaker, New Jersey House of Assembly.
CHARLES R. SANDMAN,
President, New Jersey State Senate.

NAACP Asks Pastors To Help Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, my feeling and judgment at present is that a strong and adequate civil rights bill will be approved by the Senate. If this happens, then there is no doubt but that a strong civil rights bill will be enacted. This will be, in no small part, due to the way in which orderly procedures were followed in the House without use of the discharge petition and without any effort to curtail adequate debate when the bill was on the floor for discussion.

The following letter by the Reverend Franklin L. Henley, president of the Dauphin County NAACP, which appeared in the Harrisburg Evening News of April 25, 1964, presents what seems to me to be the highest type of statesmanlike and Christian utterance on the course we should all attempt to pursue. The final elimination of discrimination must come in the hearts and minds of men and women of good will. Reverend Henley's letter points the way which we should follow. It will take time to accomplish this.

His letter follows:

NAACP ASKS PASTORS TO HELP YOUNG PEOPLE

EDITOR:

The Dauphin County branch, NAACP, is deeply concerned about the situation in this community which has given rise to questions on racial discrimination and bigotry. We feel impelled to make available our good offices to help in any way possible so that this community will be a safe place to live and to nourish the fruits of democracy.

We would like to commend the law enforcement agencies in the entire area for the fine quality of law enforcement which they have exercised throughout several recent outbreaks of law violation.

We wish further to commend the young people who have had no part in the various incidents which have reflected unfortunately upon the youth of this community. We fully realize it is a relatively small number who have caused the trouble.

We are calling upon the church to urge its membership to take a firmer hand and provide mature leadership for the young people of our community. This Sunday, April 26, 1964, we have asked all pastors to stress this to their congregations in order to enlist broad-based support.

We would like to commend the many employers of the community who have seen fit to move toward opportunity on the basis of qualifications. Along with these opportunities go responsibilities if we are to create the proper atmosphere in the community. We stand ready to offer the businessmen and others of our community, cooperation in every way that we can to further this goal.

If there are any unfortunate incidents which might arise along the way we stand ready to assist in any way possible. We suggest that any organization experiencing such difficulty should communicate with the office of the president of the Dauphin County branch, NAACP, to request persons from our organization to participate in discussions to try to determine the cause of the difficulty. Our organization is dedicated to the eradication of discrimination, and we intend to help in every way to insure the normal and favorable operations of businesses who are cooperating with us in this goal.

We know that every crime committed or any act of dishonorable behavior can hurt us in our march toward civil rights. Let us learn from these unfortunate incidents and form together in creating a community where all citizens can walk the streets without fear.

FRANKLIN L. HENLEY,
President, Dauphin County NAACP.

The Not-So-Silent Bequest of Rachel Carson, Scientist and Humanist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, probably no one in this century has done more to warn of the dangers of environmental pollution than the late Rachel Carson.

The chairman of the Audubon Naturalist Society, Irston R. Barnes, recently wrote eloquently of this great lady and her work, and I would like to make this a part of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE NATURALIST: THE NOT-SO-SILENT BEQUEST OF RACHEL CARSON, SCIENTIST AND HUMANIST

(By Irston R. Barnes)

Rachel L. Carson's death leaves an irreplaceable loss in a world that increasingly needs and is belatedly appreciating her unique contribution in seeking to reconcile man to nature.

Too many loud voices have long falsely proclaimed man's triumph over nature. Her quiet voice spoke with a better understanding of man's ultimate dependence upon nature, a truer appreciation of the intricacies of natural law, good advice on how to maintain a compatible environment for man and all forms of life and the wisdom to find joy and inspiration in the wonders of the natural world.

Rachel Carson was both a scientist and a humanist. The passion of the scientist guided her unceasing efforts to understand more fully the patterns of life. The humanist spirit compelled her to communicate her findings to others, chiefly in four books of enduring beauty and wisdom.

The uncompromising integrity that directed both her research and her writings was matched by a personal philosophy that made every success an obligation to move on to other endeavors.

The charm of Rachel Carson's writings lies less in the artistry of her prose than in her deep insights into the dynamic interrelation of all living things. She had more than an operational understanding of how nature works; she knew the meaning and ultimate significance of nature's patterns for all life.

Her knowledge was heightened by her capacity to feel emotionally the value and the rightness of nature in an unending cycle of life constantly renewed and ever evolving. Thus all her writings have a unity and integrity of scientific objectivity, of philosophical participation and of artistic appreciation in relation to whatever aspect of life she is examining. And all of this is conveyed to each reader in full measure according to his capacity to match her perceptions.

In her first book, "Under the Sea Wind," Rachel Carson shone forth as an interpreter of nature and as a writer of high competence. A vast amount of research into the life histories of four creatures of the sea became a story of infinite beauty.

"The Sea Around Us" is a very different kind of book, with a different mood and purpose. Here Miss Carson turned to a strange and unknown world that had for years absorbed all her spare time.

The book caused much excitement, even among scientists, for few even of scientific learning had been able to keep abreast of new discoveries about the oceans. "The Sea Around Us" added immeasurably to the enjoyment of millions who live and play along the shores of the ocean.

"The Edge of the Sea" was more in the nature of a handbook or field guide, presenting the ecology of different life zones of the intertidal frontiers, on rocky shores, and on sandy beaches. Those who have investigated the tide pools and rock cliffs or searched out the hidden life of the sandy beach can be forever grateful for her companionship in their explorations.

"Silent Spring" is at once Rachel Carson's most deeply perceptive analysis of the workings of nature and her most crucial contribution to making the world better for all life, most of all for man.

If this most serious threat to all mankind that she pinpointed is checked in this decade, it will be because Rachel Carson invested the last years of her life in the exhaustive research necessary to expose the false biological foundations of engineered agriculture and the chemical pesticide industry. Every investigation that has followed has con-

firmed the accuracy of her analysis and the soundness of her judgments.

"Silent Spring" is far more than a plea for reform. It is also a wonderfully revealing demonstration of the intricacies of the biological world, of the absolute necessity of an ecological approach which relates all life to its environment, both animate and inanimate.

All that she learned in her other biological studies is used here to illuminate the reader's understanding of abstract principles with currently familiar examples. The pesticide scandal appears as a vast, if unplanned, experiment with the essential life conditions for man and all other creatures.

The world is better because Rachel Carson lived and worked and wrote. We are all much indebted to her. And this debt we can only discharge by appreciating and preserving the natural world whose truths she so vividly and beautifully disclosed.

Eisenhower Stresses Morality in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, April 25, 1964:

EISENHOWER HERE, STRESSES MORALITY

Former President Eisenhower last night said American society is a political expression of basic religious beliefs.

The general spoke of citizenship rather than politics in a talk to the San Diego Uplifters Club in El Cortez Hotel.

"I didn't want to push the political button tonight," Eisenhower told 600 old and new friends in the International Room, "although that is something an old politician might want to do."

THEME STRESSED

Instead, he emphasized the theme of citizenship and public service expressed by the cosponsors of the dinner—the Uplifters and the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

He said the authors of the Declaration of Independence referred to a Creator in describing the inalienable rights which formed the basis of the American Revolution.

"If this is true," he said, "all problems before us today have a moral as well as a material and economic aspect."

And he emphasized that without the morale of its citizens, the economic and military strength of the United States would amount to nothing.

HIGH POINT

Eisenhower's talk was the high point in a day where the General and Mrs. Eisenhower had an affectionate reunion with the citizens of San Diego.

"Hi ya, Mike," were the general's first words when he climbed out of the auto which brought him from his winter home at Palm Desert to El Cortez Hotel yesterday afternoon.

He was speaking to an old friend and comrade in arms, Lt. Gen. J. W. "Iron Mike" O'Daniel, U.S. Army, retired.

Later, O'Daniel introduced him at the dinner as a "soldier, educator, scholar, statesman, and beloved President of the United States."

Eisenhower paid tribute to the Uplifters, a club dedicated "to help uplift the heart of a needy child."

"I can't tell you how much I'd like to belong to such a club," he said.

Mason A. Bowen, Uplifters president, said Eisenhower's influence is worldwide for the betterment of mankind.

The general stressed what he called the basic purpose of the Freedoms Foundation—to make truly good citizens of the United States. He heads the organization as chairman of the board.

Paul A. Terry, regional vice president of the Freedoms Foundation, accepted a $55,000 check from C. Arnholt Smith, San Diego banker and civic leader, from the people of San Diego.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS MORE

Another $1,000 check was given by Bowen on behalf of the Uplifters.

Terry said both would be used in the organization's historical documents program.

This Crusader Needs Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud of the fine job being done by my colleague from Indiana, EARL WILSON, in the matter of bringing economy to our defense procurement practices.

Consequently it is gratifying to see that Congressman WILSON's efforts are being nationally acknowledged as evidenced by the following editorial, which appeared originally in the Denver Post and was reprinted in the Indianapolis Sunday Star of May 3, 1964:

THIS CRUSADER NEEDS COMPANY

The lone crusade against defense budget padding by Representative EARL WILSON, Republican of Indiana, makes us (1) want to stand up and cheer him on and (2) wish there were at least a dozen more like him performing the same bird-dogging chore.

Since the summer of 1961, WILSON has documented more than 70 separate cases of abuse in military spending in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under such peppery titles as "How Many Times Can a Man Be Skinned?" "The Monmouth Mess," "Time for a Woodshed Chat," and "Waging War on Waste."

Last week his attack on the Defense Department's $13.7 billion procurement budget brought an $80,840,000 slash in the Pentagon's appropriations, which were finally approved Thursday.

WILSON calls it unthinkable that the Air Force would ask 287 percent more than it needs to buy a radio and that the Navy would overfund a request for an "image metascope" by 151 percent and a radio by 141 percent. As for the Army, the Congressman discovered that the same radio he found last year to be padded by 100 percent was being requested again—this time for only 65 percent.

"Unthinkable" is a less colorful term than a lot of them the Indiana legislator employed as he stormed the ramparts of Secretary McNamara's domain. Nor did he spare the head man himself, accusing the Secretary of using "psychology" on Congress by saying his budget is "pared to the bone" and inferring that further reductions would endanger our security.

Meanwhile, we might well ask, along with the gentleman from Indiana, How tight really, was this year's total budget? WILSON's figures—and they are just samplings—certainly point to something less than being "pared to the bone."

Use of the Lie Detector by Agencies of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER—13th District, New Jersey—has made a very interesting and informative statement on the use of the polygraph—lie detector—by various agencies of the Federal Government, and I commend the reading of this report to my House colleagues:

STATEMENT ON THE USE OF THE POLYGRAPH BY VARIOUS FEDERAL AGENCIES BY THE HONORABLE CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

(Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, 9 months ago instituted an investigation into the widespread use of the lie detector device by the Federal Government. On the basis of a preliminary report, the House Government Operations Committee this week opened hearings. It is the hope of Mr. GALLAGHER that the hearings will justify the introduction of legislation setting standards for the use of the machine, if it is found to be justified at all, and set up standards of qualifications for operators. Mr. GALLAGHER's investigation disclosed that there are no such Federal statutes presently existing in the Government.)

(By Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey)

Since the beginning of time, man's home, whether a cave, an igloo, or a Park Avenue penthouse, has been his castle. Common law and, in the United States, the Constitution have guarded the privacy of his home and his person, have protected him from unreasonable search and seizure.

Today man's castle, his traditional bastion of privacy, is in danger of becoming a fish bowl, no longer so well protected from prying eyes and ears, mostly electronic. Man's mind, the private vault of his ideas, opinions, and thoughts, is, more than ever before, under psychological and electronic assault.

We are fast becoming a nation of snoopers. Perhaps we have ourselves to blame, if through widespread dishonesty and thievery, a general breakdown of morality, we have compelled the investigative agencies of Government and industry to resort to spying techniques and electronic watchdogs.

There is something about a detection mirror in a supermarket or department store, put there to guard against shoplifting, that casts a shadow over our morality. Yet, certainly, industry and business which suffer tremendous losses annually through thievery have a right to protect their property.

The privacy of man's home and person is more frequently and more effectively being invaded through the use of instruments much more sophisticated than a simple detection mirror. Cash a check and your photograph is snapped; enter an apartment house elevator or corridor and you may be on closed circuit television; sit down at a lunch counter and you may end up on a network TV show (with your permission, of course); carry on a conversation in your bedroom and it may be recorded two blocks away; phone a Government agency and chances are your conversation, if you are

talking to a high-level official, is being recorded.

A person today, who may suspect eavesdropping, won't talk about anything more important than the weather anywhere but along a lonely stretch of beach or some equally isolated spot. But even here there is the risk of conversation being picked up by ultrasensitive directional microphones that are known to be effective up to half a mile or more.

The techniques and gadgets that for so many years were associated with international cloak-and-dagger operators like Mata Hari are widely used today not only by the police and government investigators, but by respectable businessmen and untold numbers of private investigative agencies, some respectable, some not.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives conducted at my request a preliminary investigation of the use of the polygraph (lie detector) by Government agencies. Its finding served to center attention on the widespread use of this instrument not only in Government and police circles, but in business and industry. The polygraph goes beyond invasion of the privacy of the home or person, it attempts to invade the privacy of man's mind, which certainly is his most privileged sanctuary.

The preliminary investigation revealed 19 agencies of the Federal Government had in use 525 polygraphs and a total of 23,122 individuals were subjected to lie detector tests during fiscal year 1963. It revealed no set of standards for the qualifications of polygraph operators and a variance as to the weight various agencies gave to the results obtained. In some instances persons authorized to operate polygraphs had no more than high school educations, although experts concede that operators and interviewers are the detectors, not the machines; and should, therefore, be highly trained, preferably as psychologists.

A hearing by the subcommittee revealed that in the opinion of many who work with the polygraph as many as 80 percent of the operators are not qualified. This to me is a matter of grave concern. The indiscriminate use of the lie detector by unqualified individuals is a serious invasion of privacy. Certain uses of the polygraph, for example in personnel screening, constitute an illegal search of the mind and an unlawful seizure of one's thoughts and are in violation of the fourth amendment of the Constitution.

The unreliability of the polygraph and the high percentage of operators who are either poorly qualified or unqualified is a matter of concern.

I am mindful that a polygraph test of all of the members of the police department of a large metropolitan city led to the resignations or early retirement of 30 members of the force. It later was revealed the tests were administered by an individual who had once been convicted of medical quackery. Incidences such as this convince me of the need for some type of control over use of the polygraph.

While the polygraph is not, by any means, an infallible instrument, the findings of an operator are frequently decisive. The entry on an individual's personnel or investigative record is usually permanent. The simple statement that he was subjected to a polygraph test can haunt him for a lifetime.

If we are concerned with an increasing tendency to invade the privacy of our homes through wire tap and other electronic instruments, let us be doubly concerned with the widespread use of techniques and instruments used to invade the privacy of man's mind.

The use of the polygraph to determine intent or tendency of an individual is a common and highly questionable practice. The real danger, of course, is the tendency to "trial by lie detector," wherein the sole judge may be an unreliable and unqualified operator.

Although interest in recent weeks has centered on the polygraph, the wiretap issue remains very much alive and is of equal concern as is the practice of "mail stops" which has come to public attention recently.

The privacy of home and person extends to communications between individuals. Post Office regulations permit "mail stops" for the purpose of recording the identity of persons sending mail to a designated individual. The Post Office Department admits it will place a "mail stop" on an individual's mail when requested by another Government agency. While it is not permitted under any circumstances to open and read mail, there remains some question whether this practice, too, is an invasion of privacy.

There is no Federal law that guarantees privacy of telephone conversations. In at least six States the use of the wiretap is legal. The Attorney General of the United States may authorize its use in cases involving national security.

Evidence gained through wiretap or similar devices is not admissable in Federal courts. The so-called "fruits of the poison tree" decision precludes even the admissability of evidence that may have been gained indirectly through a wiretap. But a 1928 Supreme Court decision stated that to tap a telephone conversation was not a violation of the fourth amendment.

The fourth amendment protects "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses and papers, and effects against unreasonable search and seizure."

The Federal Communications Act provides, "No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communications and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effects or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

The critical point here is that the act does not prohibit interception alone; it prohibits interception and disclosure.

I am sure we don't want to abandon or even lessen the guarantees of man's right to privacy. If anything, I favor bolstering those guarantees.

In my opinion, we have come to a point where we must determine whether the privacy to which an individual is entitled is adequately protected. Against the rights of the individual, however, we must weigh the protection of the community and the Nation's security. In seeking to protect the individual's privacy, we must guard against being zealous to the point of permitting the organized criminal to operate with less restraint and less chance of apprehension and conviction or of giving aid and comfort to our country's enemies.

The time has come, I believe, for an appropriate committee of the Congress to study the broad subject of invasion of privacy of the individual citizen. The purpose of such a study should be to determine what laws might be necessary to protect citizens from unauthorized and unwarranted invasions of privacy.

It should seek to develop and recommend intelligent and reasonable laws that would assure every citizen in this electronic age in which we live, the privacy guaranteed by the fourth amendment, recognizing that we must weigh the protection of the community and the security of the country against the rights of the individual.

Specifically, there is need for: Uniformity and classification of existing laws, Federal, and State, governing the use of wiretaps and voice recording devices; regulations governing the use of other detection equipment such as hidden cameras; laws establishing standards for operators of polygraphs, criteria for manufacture of such equipment, regulations governing the inclusion of test results in individual's files, policies governing use of the polygraph by Government agencies; review of regulations that permit, mail stops.

The protection of the community is, of course, paramount, but where secret use of detection devices may be warranted in police or government investigations, the determination as to their use should in each case be by competent authority. This would generally limit use of detection devices to major criminal cases and incidents where the national security is involved.

I don't believe we can outlaw the general use by private agencies or business of certain types of detection and surveillance devices such as the hidden camera or the supermarket mirror, but I do feel that law should require that where such instruments are in use, the public should be made aware.

Our Founding Fathers were wise enough to recognize the threats to individual privacy and considered the problem serious enough, even in those times, to establish constitutional guarantees to protect citizens.

Our responsibility now is to strengthen these guarantees to protect against invasions of privacy that go well beyond anything the founders of our Constitution could have envisioned.

World War I Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared first in the April 23, 1964, edition of the Lincoln Star and which was subsequently reprinted in the May 7, 1964, edition of the Stars and Stripes-the National Tribune.

The editorial reads as follows:

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

That hardy perennial, the bonus bill for World War I Veterans, is back in Congress. As usual it is taking a back seat.

The bill usually dies in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Efforts by petition to get it out on the floor have been uniformly unsuccessful. It takes the signatures of 218 Congressmen to force action. The present bill has mustered but 140.

The bill provides for $100 a month for married veterans who had more than 90 days of war service. It would award $75 a month to the single. It is further limited to those whose guideline income is no more than $3,600 a year for the married and $2,400 a year for the single. The guideline income is the amount of annual income less $1,200, considered retirement income.

This is not a lavish request and it guards sufficiently against those who really don't need the extra money.

The ranks of the World War I veterans are thinning rapidly. The total expense of pension would be substantially less than a billion a year now. In a few more years it would be a relatively small item.

The record of the Nation is not good in respect to its World War I veterans. Veterans of all other wars have been much better taken care of. But this group received no GI bill of rights, school aid only to those who received notable disabilities. Beside ex-

periencing the vicissitudes of a harsh and life-wasting war the veterans were clipped by a postwar recession that staggered them and were further frustrated by the great depression. It is true they received modest insurance policies as a national gratuity but most of them had to exhaust their value to keep off relief during the depression.

Is This the Way To Fight the War Against Poverty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that I have raised a number of objections to the operating practices of the Area Redevelopment Administration. There have been too many instances of Federal moneys being used to create jobs in one area of the country while eliminating jobs in the same industry in another section of the Nation. There are examples of such activity within the same areas, as well.

Charles Stevenson has written a timely and revealing article which appears in this month's edition of the Reader's Digest. Because it is concerned with a problem that should command our full attention, I would like to share the article with my colleagues:

IS THIS THE WAY TO FIGHT THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY?

(The Area Redevelopment Administration was set up for a highly worthy purpose. But look at the way this U.S. agency is squandering taxpayer dollars—and callously ignoring the rights of individual citizens.)

(By Charles Stevenson)

As a major Government weapon in the war against poverty, President Lyndon B. Johnson has selected an increasingly aggressive agency—the Area Redevelopment Administration. This decision will come to haunt him. For the ARA has, in the name of helping the poor, become the spearhead of one of the most outrageous Government encroachments on private enterprise in U.S. history. Fred Drew and Mike Kelley are living proof.

As independent loggers in northern Idaho, these partners had endured lean times. But by 1961 they were at last beginning to fulfill a longtime dream. From the State they had leased land on Old Baldy, a 6,280-foot mountain near their hometown of Sandpoint, and were building Sundance Ski Lanes. A nationally known expert certified that the terrain and snowfall would support an enterprise comparable to any of the world's great ski resorts. "We had to start small," says Drew. "But we figured we could grow into a million dollar show."

When a lumber mill folded owing them $10,000 needed for equipment, they had to cut logs to recoup, but every weekend they were back laboring on the slopes. Eventually they got a nine-room base lodge underway. Also, they bought a ski tow. They poured in uncounted thousands of hours of labor, plus more than $50,000 cash.

Then, even as they were preparing to open for business, came the crushing blow. Because Sandpoint was considered to qualify as a "depressed area"—on account of winter unemployment when the lumber industry shuts down—the U.S. Government, through the Area Redevelopment Administration, lent $345,000 for construction of a competing ski resort on a nearby mountain. Next, the Sandpoint City Council was prevailed upon to contribute $32,000 toward building a road into the new ski area, despite Idaho health department warnings that this could contaminate the municipal watershed. Sure enough, Sandpoint's water supply was condemned by the State even as construction of a new filter plant went ahead with an additional $250,000 from Washington.

By last January, thanks to more than half a million dollars in loans and grants out of your taxes and mine, many Sandpointers were jubilant that the new ski run was going full blast. All but forgotten in the glee over Washington's generosity were Drew and Kelley. Having tried to contribute to community growth by their own toil and initiative, in the traditional American way, they were now about done in. Drew said to me, "It isn't right for the Government to use our own tax payments to run us out of business."

Originaly, the idealistic ARA plan was to provide technical help, research and limited financial aid to get more than 40 single-industry regions left blighted by economic change or exhausted resources. On June 9, 1961, 1 month after President Kennedy signed the ARA bill, the agency published a map listing some 110 areas as eligible. Since then, ARA has uncoiled into a monstrous complex of cooperating bureaucracies. These agencies have dragooned or enticed a third of the Nation's counties and 42 million of its citizens into accepting the label of poverty in order to be showered with largess, Sandpoint style.

The bureaucracies enmeshed with ARA range from the Small Business Administration (an independent banking agency) to the Community Facilities Administration (under the Housing and Home Finance Agency) to, most particularly, the Department of Agriculture. So many thousands of U.S. employees are kept so busy helping ARA dish out so many millions of dollars from so many different funds that it's almost impossible to track down the dollars and the agencies involved. The fact that the ARA's methods threaten the livelihood of the Fred Drews and Mike Kelleys everywhere is brushed off. Explained ARA Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., last year: "One man's threat is another man's opportunity."

But crisscross the country for more than 20,000 miles, in investigating on the scene, and you discover that ARA is riddled with bungling, political pressures and untold finagling. Only a thorough congressional investigation can expose the full extent of it.

Specifically, ARA, in the name of helping distressed regions, is making outright "gifts" of millions of dollars. It is accompanying these with loans (up to 25 years' maturity) at rates never higher than 4 percent—less than it costs the Government to raise and handle the money. In doing this, it is perpetrating economic and political injustices.

Look, for example, at Oklahoma, where ARA is dressing up 5,000 acres of wooded preserve on Lake Eufaula with a palatial State-owned resort. It isn't costing the State a penny. The $10,331,000 cost is all taken care of by ARA, with $1,331,000 written off as an outright gift. Whatever money is paid back will have to come out of the business—and jobs—taken from other resorts.

Seven members of the House Banking and Currency Committee took one look and reported: "We wonder how the unemployed in hard-core depressed areas would feel about this diversion of funds, intended for their assistance, to this Oklahoma boondoggle."

This is but a sample from scores of cases that are causing mounting concern. Here are the five main channels through which ARA is fomenting economic woe for America:

1. New installations are being financed by ARA in industries already beset by overcapacity, thus jeopardizing existing jobs.

In Detroit, where two hotels have recently gone bankrupt and others have been forced to lay off half their workers because the city has the lowest hotel-occupancy rate in the United States, the ARA is financing three new hotels and motels. In putting up $1,894,525 for the 432-room deluxe downtown Pontchartrain Hotel, the ARA claimed the purpose was "to generate 450 new jobs."

"All ARA is doing is destroying existing jobs and transferring some to these new hotels," declares Harry Paulson, a former president of the Detroit Hotel Association. Investigating Congressmen have concluded that the net result may be even fewer jobs "if the new facility forces existing hotels, already suffering from excessive capacity, into bankruptcy."

ARA advanced $406,000 to reopen one coal mine and expand another in Carbon County, Utah, where 500 coal-mining jobs have disappeared in the past year, and where those men who are still working get only 3 to 4 days' pay per week. "Demand for increased coal output is just not present," says Utah Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT. "We are not going to sell one more ton of coal, and I am at a loss as to what to do for the scores of other workers who will be put out of work."

The Bata Shoe Co., the refugee Czech concern which from a base in Canada operates in 79 countries, is now using an ARA-financed factory at Salem, Ind. This plant is burdening the abundantly supplied U.S. shoe industry with 40,000 pairs of shoes every week. In 1963, ARA advanced the Salem Redevelopment Corp. $442,000 to purchase land and construct the building to be leased to Bata. ARA also handed over $235,000—more than half of it an outright gift for Bata's water and sewage facilities—and donated $64,000 to train workers. Bata paid for nothing except its machinery.

Thus foreign-controlled, foreign-operated Bata achieved the apex of our Government's new order—the right to have U.S. taxpayers set up a firm in business and so subsidize it that it can pull out without real loss at any time it desires. As a crowning irony, Augustin Dolezal, Bata's president, told newspapermen that his firm had decided to locate in Salem long before it knew anything about ARA. "We would have built in Salem anyway."

2. Areas that are far from "depressed" are getting help.

In Rice County, Kans., I found that even second-class farmers cleared an average $5,925 a year from wheat and beef. Bank and savings-and-loan assets in the county—more than $30 million for less than 14,000 population—have nearly doubled since 1950. "There's a job for almost everybody who wants one," says local newspaper editor Paul Jones.

However, the Agriculture Department's Extension Service made a "study" of Rice County, to suggest further development possibilities. With the help of a "technical staff" from the Rural Electrification Administration and other bureaus, a swarm of Agriculture Department representatives prepared an "overall economic development program" for a planned future. Result: ARA declared prosperous Rice County a depressed area.

Or consider Gregg County, Tex. This county leads the State in gross oil production. Booming Longview, the county seat, has grown from a population of 5,000 in the 1930's to 44,000 today; it has done so by attracting 126 pay-their-own-way plants. At the very moment the "depressed" label was pinned on it, the city ranked third in the Nation in retail purchases per household, led all Texas in manufacturing employment

gains and was waging a national promotion campaign to add still more to its $26-million annual industrial payroll and 5,500 workers.

Why was Gregg pulled into a program designed for poverty-stricken areas? The flabbergasting answer of Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas: The county had made such "real progress" and shown such "vital leadership in bringing new industry" that its inclusion would inspire others to join.

Indignant, three Gregg County chambers of commerce petitioned Washington to release the county from ARA guardianship. One of the leaders in the fight, attorney R. E. Blount, was present when an ARA representative told county officials, "Boys, you've got to get in line for your share. If you don't get it, somebody else will." Gregg County was finally set free, but the struggle lasted nearly 2 years.

"We were mighty glad to get out," says Walter B. Koch, manager of Longview's Industrial Districts, Inc. "Some firms that had invested in our city wondered whether to put in more cash after Washington placed this 'depressed' tag on us. Our industrial development slowed up under ARA, but in the first 6 months after we got out six new industries came to us."

The techniques that engineered Rice and Gregg counties into depressed-area classification have been widely duplicated. The Agriculture Department even put out a handbook called "Action," telling how to get on the gravy train. The agency selected 230 counties "with development possibilities" and invited them to participate in a volunteer self-betterment movement. Then, as disclosed in a Ford Foundation-financed study by George Washington University Prof. Sar A. Levitan,[1] all 230 counties were simply blanketed into ARA eligibility "without reference to the level of income or unemployment that prevailed."

More than 300 additional counties have qualified because of supposed low farm income, including Gilpin County, Colo., which doesn't pretend to be a farming area—it is up in the rocks of the Great Divide and doesn't have a single commercial farmer among its 190 families. It is interesting to note that some 75 Texas county agricultural agents have quit in disgust in the last 2 years. Said one, "They were using us to organize our communities and come up with projects for ARA loans and grants. I quit because I couldn't stomach it any more."

3. Jobs constitute the only excuse for ARA's existence, but the agency provides brazenly inaccurate figures about the employment it generates.

ARA receives reports regularly on the number of persons employed by its beneficiaries. But it refuses to make these available to the public. Instead, it insists that we taxpayers accept entirely unrelated figures contained in its monthly Directory of Approved Projects. In the January 31, 1964, edition, for instance, ARA boasts that 1,281 of its projects, which it financed to the tune of $226,842,000, are creating 63,836 jobs.

Not everyone accepts these statements as gospel. Minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee reported last spring that such ARA claims are exaggerations.

Checking at random, I stopped my car on Route 9 east of Oklahoma City, where a big grain mill was being put together. ARA's book advertised that the $68,000 loan involved would mean 20 new jobs. "Oh, this mill will only need three or four men to operate it," the foreman told me. "It's automated."

Stop almost anywhere, and it's the same story. In Indiana, ARA lent $115,000 to rebuild the North Vernon Processing Co.'s burned-out forging plant and said this saved 60 jobs and created 40 new ones. But Plant Manager Edward Rogers says that "50 persons are employed—15 more than before the fire."

ARA lists 300 persons as toiling in a Wheeling, W. Va., rifle factory which grew from a $272,000 loan. Stop there, and you'll find the place empty. It was built in expectation of a Defense Department contract—but the contract never came.

4. The agency flouts the law under which it was created.

The law clearly stipulates that no ARA aid is to go to any organization able to make "reasonable" financial arrangements elsewhere. Yet the Howard Johnson chain, together with a local concern, accepted a $2,275,000 loan from ARA for a motel in Puerto Rico. In Beckley, W. Va., ARA subsidized the Melpar Corp., a subsidiary of Westinghouse Air Brake, by lending the local development corporation $70,000 to build a factory for it. Similarly, a division of A. G. Spalding & Brothers, the internationally known sporting goods firm, has been set up as a ward of ARA at Ava, Mo. And American Optical Co. has an ARA-financed factory at Chickasha, Okla.

Legislation further requires that the people of a community put up a token investment as a show of faith in any project to be undertaken by ARA. Congress is zealous about this portion of the law; yet ARA has informed its field agents in an unannounced "Policy Guideline No. 2" that they can in effect ignore it.

The law also explicitly forbids ARA to aid "any branch, affiliate or subsidiary which is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations." The Technical Tape Corp., with several plants in the New York City area, provides an example of the way ARA "obeys" the law.

In October 1961, ARA lent Carbondale, Ill., $455,000 to transform a city-owned warehouse into a branch for Technical Tape. In April 1963, ARA handed over another $670,000 to enlarge the plant, plus $150,000 to Technical Tape itself for machinery. At the same time, ARA was spending $109,000 to train production workers for the plant.

When I asked ARA's Deputy Administrator, Harold W. Williams, if the corporation had cut back its employment in the East to build up in Carbondale, he replied, "No. It couldn't. We watch this sort of thing like hawks."

I checked for mysef. In April 1963, Technical Tape closed down its factory in New Rochelle, N.Y. In addition, Lionel S. Frank, president of the chamber of commerce of Beacon, N.Y., spills over with indignation at what happened in 1962 at the Technical Tape plant in his city.

"We then wore ARA's depressed label, too," he says. "Technical Tape was moving its gift-wrap division here, and we wanted them to leave it here. But when the Government offered to finance a new plant in Illinois and train employees for it, too, they moved the division out. What is the sense in the Government inducing an industry to expand in one depressed area at the expense of another?"

5. ARA's power is used to bludgeon votes and to drum up support for ever higher congressional appropriations.

When an ARA loan has been approved, ARA permits the approved deal to be announced by a political friend at a time when it will do both him and the agency the most political good. For example, Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Republican, of upstate New York, testified at a House committee hearing that in 1962 he sought information from ARA about a pending $844,000 proposal to modernize an abandoned pulp and paper mill in his district. He was told there could be no announcement until after the congressional election. Nevertheless, on the day before the election, ARA Administrator Batt wired KILBURN's Democratic opponent that the loan had been approved. Within hours, the entire town knew it.

"Mr. Batt apparently thought he could shift a few votes," KILBURN declared. "The blow-off was that the loan was not approved until 4 months afterward."

At all ARA projects, the beneficiaries are required to erect signs, stressing that here men are being put to work thanks to ARA and the President. The intention, declares Senator BENNETT, is "to tell the people who see the billboards that this has been made possible through the kindness and courtesy of a particular man, when it has, in fact, been the taxpayers themselves who put up the money."

Across the Nation there is a stepped-up campaign to pull in ever more territory for ARA. In the first month President Johnson was in office, Buffalo, Cleveland, Miami, Newark, Oakland, Philadelphia, and Toledo—5 million additional people—were made eligible for election-year assistance from Washington. With ARA and just two of its associated bureaucracies (the Community Facilities Administration and the Small Business Administration) having already committed $1,235 million in loans for the fiscal year ending this June 30, another $1,392 million is budgeted for the following 12 months. Not to mention a mere $35 million more that ARA will give away, not lend. All this in the name of fighting poverty.

We must do whatever we effectively can to cure what's wrong in genuinely depressed areas. But less than $2 out of every $5 from ARA even goes into the areas of highest unemployment. On its record this agency and its cohorts have little to do with curing poverty; instead they seem intent on political takeover of the American economic system.

Whenever President Johnson preaches about Government help for the distressed, I think of Mrs. James R. Willis in Woodville (population 1,900), in his own State of Texas. There is not much reason for Woodville except the old courthouse and some lumber mills. Nevertheless, Mrs. Willis gave no thought to going on relief when her husband died in 1952 and left her at age 57 with a 24-room country motel and an $8,000 debt. Over the years she has paid off the debt, modernized the motel and made it into a highly attractive place.

Because of Woodville's isolation, however, only a dozen or so cars stop nightly, and Mrs. Willis can't remember ever having had to turn anyone away. Yet she was paying her own way in life, and furnishing jobs for four maids and two assistant managers.

So, what has happened? Just down the road, ARA has built a 72-room "luxury motel," with swimming pool, ballroom, beauty shop and various stores. Mrs. Willis' gross income for January 1964, after the new motel opened, was $1,060—compared with $2,260 for January 1963. She had had to let all maids go except one, who now works part-time.

Last fall, as I drove through Woodville, ARA was advertising that 75 persons would somehow be employed to operate the 72-room motel. This is its "economic justification." And outside stood two large signs. One carried the facsimile signature of the President, and read: "We're creating more jobs for America." The other read: "72-room motor hotel under construction. Project cost—$800,000. Financing arranged by Congressman JACK BROOKS through

[1] "Federal Aid to Depressed Areas—An Evaluation of the ARA," published by the Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md.

ARA." Nobody could overlook the implication of these signs.

Sadly, the whole deal went through without anybody from ARA looking up Mrs. Willis or considering what the project might do to her business. I talked with her.

"If the new motel doesn't make money," she said to me, "I and the rest of the taxpayers will have to pay for it. If it does succeed, I'll probably be run out of business. Tell me, what is happening to us in this country?"

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia: "ARA is an unsound spending scheme through which bureaucrats may make or break cities and towns all over the country by granting or withholding Federal money"

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio: "This program is not economically sound. It is not fair to the taxpayers. It is a vote-buying device."

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians celebrate numerous occasions as their national holidays, but May 10, as a great turning point in their national history, has become their real national holiday. On that day in 1877 they proclaimed the birth of their independent kingdom by the union of the two historic provinces, Moldavia and Wallachia. Until then they had enjoyed autonomy, but on May 10 they attained complete independence, and this was recognized by the great powers of Europe. Their independence put an end not only to their subjection to alien rule, but ushered in a new era of national development and growth for them.

The modern history of the Rumanian people has followed a rather uneven course. In the middle of the 15th century Rumania was conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and for more than 400 years Rumanians suffered under the tyranny of ruthless Ottoman administrators. In the 19th century they succeeded in regaining their independence from the Turks only to find themselves face to face with Russian aggression. Nevertheless, these dauntless people managed to keep their independence through the course of interminable wars.

Unfortunately this has not been true since the end of the last war. Even before the conclusion of that war Soviet forces advanced into the country, occupied it, and then forced upon the Rumanian people Moscow-oriented Communist tyranny. That is the tragedy of this industrious and gifted people. For nearly two decades they have been enduring hardships and making sacrifices under the unbending rule of the Communist agents of the Kremlin. On the 87th anniversary of their Independence Day we pray and hope for their freedom from Communist totalitarianism.

Foreign Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the major portion of an article on the unfortunate failure of various governments to pay their just debts to American citizens. The article, which follows, was written by Paul Heffernan and appeared in the magazine, the Weekly Bond Buyer, May 4, 1964:

FOREIGN GOVERNMENT BONDS DOWN THE DRAIN: WHERE DID THE $8.8 BILLION GO, AND WHO CARES?

(By Paul Heffernan)

How can more than $8 billion of private savings—an amount equal to more than half of the Nation's gold store—get lost abroad without Congress sitting up and taking notice?

This colossal money loss sums up 30 years of experience of U.S. private investors with the ownership of foreign government bonds. The original investments in question totaled $5.1 billion; the losses to date run to even more—$8.8 billion.

This is how it happened:

Gold clauses for the protection of investors were not enforced.

Back interest on debt in arrears was in large part forgiven.

Due dates on the bonds were extended far into the future or done away with altogether.

Interest rates on the extended debt contracts were reduced drastically.

The debtors were permitted and even prompted to buy up their bonds in the market cut rate, instead of using their foreign exchange resources to pay the contractual interest, or to redeem the bonds in full on the original due dates.

NO CONGRESSIONAL OKAY

This revamping of debt required legislative approval in all of the nations involved—24 of them—except the United States, the place the money came from.

Even today it is a question if the U.S. Congress has any adequate realization of this 30-year drain that has been going on in the Nation's international payments. There is little in the postwar proceedings of our National Legislature to so indicate.

Losses of investors to international community

[In millions of dollars]

Nation	Principal outstanding Dec. 31, 1947	Accrued interest default	Principal plus interest default	Gold clause loss	Other losses			
					Interest forgiveness loss	Interest reduction loss	Loss by repatriation	Total, other losses
Argentina	234	80	314	219	31		119	150
Australia	248		248	173				
Belgium	99		99	69				
Brazil	357	268	625	472	161	375	178	714
Canada	1,872		1,872	1,307				
Chile	182	89	271	119	76	88	44	208
Colombia	146	161	307	144	132	128	73	333
Cuba	126	33	159	111	22	37	65	124
Denmark	132		132	92			20	20
France	113		113	79			15	15
Germany	531	637	1,168	817	320	297	287	904
Italy	111	54	165	115	32	133	55	220
Japan	249	102	351	245			36	36
Mexico	273	246	519	363	246		238	484
Norway	116		116	81			22	22
Peru	85	81	166	116	64	102	43	209
Others [1]	237	248	485	339	224	248	142	614
Total	5,111	1,999	7,110	4,861	1,308	1,408	1,337	4,053

[1] Others: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Panama, Uruguay, Greece, Yugoslavia. (In complete default ($346,000,000, principal): Haiti, Danzig, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Russia, Greece (notes), China.)

Not counted in the vanished private investment treasure are about $300 million of bonds of Russia and 10 other nations, most of them Soviet satellites. These bonds have been in complete default for periods ranging from 20 to 45 years. Adding in back interest, this further drain on the Nation's international payments is now more than double the original borrowed principal.

How the forgiveness and reduction of interest, the nonenforcement of the gold clause and the cutrate repatriation of debt have enriched foreign nations to the extent of $8.8 billion at the expense of private investors, mostly in the United States, is shown in the accompanying tabulation.

To private citizens and businessmen whose financial doings are shaped largely by the need for living up to contracts, it must be beyond ready comprehension how the Nation could lose more than $8 billion of investment assets without Congress or the public at large being aware of it.

People pondering this incredible loss of a national fortune should keep in mind that the only reprisal against a foreign government defaulter is to not let him get any more money.

Moreover, the business and manufacturing community, out to enlarge its business, is anxious for the defaulter to get new credits. Viewed in this light, it may be something of a miracle that any old foreign bonds are paying interest at all to private investors.

The Securities and Exchange Commission does not require it to be explained in a bond prospectus, but it is a fact that a foreign government bond contract is unenforceable at law because governments cannot be sued without their consent. This means that a government can disclaim an obligation to repay borrowed money and nobody can do anything about it; that is, except not to lend the defaulting government more money.

REVOLUTION? WAR?

Nationals of a state welshing on its debt have no positive recourse but revolution; foreign bondholders have no recourse, either, but to stir up war. Neither the bondholders at home nor abroad are likely to try such reprisals or to get very far if they did.

The settlement of defaulted foreign bonds traditionally has been a responsibility of private negotiating bodies having informal but unofficial ties with their home governments. In the United States, the body that

has negotiated most of the foreign bond settlements is the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council.

Over 30 years, this council has negotiated 38 readjustments of defaulted debt with 24 nations. Most of the adjustments took place in the years after World War II. The settlement formulas of these periods made generous use of interest forgiveness, and of reductions in contractual interest rates.

RATIONALE OF WELSHING

In more recent years, the council has operated under fresh handicaps, some stemming from an indifference to the sanctity of debt contracts shared both by the defaulting borrowers and by the U.S. State Department.

The reasoning of the defaulted debtor frequently takes this line: The people who bought the bonds in the first place made an imprudent investment and therefore deserved to lose their money. And anyone who bought the bonds at low prices after the interest payments stopped were speculators who have no right to be paid in full, either.

The State Department may not go that far for the public record. The Potomac view, rather, has been that the defaulted borrowers' overriding present need is for more money and that some token settlement of his past debts should be worked out so that the U.S. Government, with a straight face, can let him have more money.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION?

Thus having to cope on one hand with the ruthless bargaining of representatives of litigation-immune foreign governments and on the other hand with the indifference of representtaives of their own governments to the old debts, the bondholders council in recent years has been hard put to achieve any material results in defending the lasting sanctity of contract.

Despite the passing of the "dollar shortage" and the low-interest era, the council is stuck with settlement formulas of other days—formulas that work the reverse of the "interest equalization" expedient invoked by the administration for new foreign borrowings.

Repeatedly, settlements have been made permitting defaulted debtors to pay interest of 1, 2, and 3 percent on old loans so that such nations could, with "rehabilitated credit" incur new loans costing 5 to 6 percent or more. One of such settlements—a temporary one expiring this year—had to do with the dollar bonds of Communist Yugoslavia. The most recent settlement was with Greece in respect to dollar bonds in default since the 1930's.

An ingenious provision of most of the settlements has been a marriage of cutrate and mandatory sinking fund provisions aimed at enabling the defaulting government to retire "rehabilitated" bonds at a fraction of their redemption value by purchase in the open market.

If a nation's market credit is, say, 6 percent—that is, if its interest-paying 6 percent bonds are selling in the market at or near the redemption value of 100—and if the interest is arbitrarily cut, say, to 3 percent, the bonds will have a market value of about 50. The debtor government is thereby in a position to retire a large part of the $1,000 bonds outstanding with $500 market purchases.

Probably there is no ready means for tracing such financial coups in balance of payment statistics, but even if the wound is not visible statistically, the drain still goes on.

DEBTS NEW AND OLD

An aggressive influence that is reinforcing the bargaining position of the defaulted debtor is the industrial interest that wants to sell its products to the defaulter. Such trade interests are anxious for their banks and even their Government to extend credits to the defaulter so that he can buy new goods.

How long it might take for a fresh credit to an old defaulter to become an "archive of history"—as Premier Khrushchev described Russia's debt to the outside world—is a point indeed, but one for the bank or the Government to worry about, not the commercial interest fostering the deal.

Foreign Policy Needs People—Including You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the April 20 edition of the Department of State Bulletin carried the concluding remarks made by Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, William J. Crockett, before the 1964 Greater Hastings dinner at Hastings, Nebr., in January.

Secretary Crockett's comments are indicative of his broad and knowledgeable background as a Foreign Service officer, his tours of duty in Naples with the U.S. Maritime Commission, with the Technical Cooperation Administration in Beirut, and with the Department of State in Karachi and Rome, and later as Assistant Secretary for Administration.

On April 3, President Johnson nominated Secretary Crockett to be a career minister, the second highest position in the Foreign Service.

Mr. Speaker, I concur wholeheartedly with the remarks made by Secretary Crockett, and because they are so timely and so perceptive, I am pleased to bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

The remarks follow:

"FOREIGN POLICY NEEDS PEOPLE—INCLUDING YOU"—REMARKS BY WILLIAM J. CROCKETT, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION [1]

However perplexing the problems of foreign policy, whatever our goals may be, whatever the party in power, our policy cannot succeed without involving the efforts of capable, dedicated people.

It takes such people to put a policy into effect, to judge its success, to assess its weakness, to alert us to pitfalls ahead, to evaluate the intentions of our friends as well as our enemies, and to make recommendations as to what policy will best serve America. This kind of responsibility takes good people—trained people, courageous people, loyal people, people who hold the U.S. interest above all else.

The men and women who serve you around the world in your Foreign Service Corps are among the best in the world. They are representative of our country—geographically, socially, culturally, educationally, ethnically, and economically.

We strive to attract to this service the best young men that our society produces. Our entrance standards are tough—tough intellectually, tough physically, and tough by moral standards. From more than 8,000 applicants this year we shall finally take less than 200 into the service of your country. We are selective.

We want people who can speak languages, who have the knack of getting along with other kinds of people, and who will represent America faithfully—often in strange and even unfriendly lands, with risks to health and to life itself. We do not want security risks or persons disloyal to America. We have a rigorous security program designed to insure that your national interests are in safe hands. You are being well served—ably served, loyally served—by the finest and most dedicated corps of men and women every assembled in one group.

Finally there is you, the American citizen. How can you help with our foreign policy problems? What can one man or one community do?

We are a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." This means that all decisions ultimately must pass the test of public acceptance. You elect a House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate every 2 years, and a President every 4. Exercise your responsibilities as citizens. Be well informed—accurately informed—and then vote for the candidates of your choice; but do it to serve one simple purpose—what is best for America.

Although the President and his executive branch are the initiators and negotiators of policy, they can go only so far as you will.

There is an even more intimate involvement between the individual citizen and foreign policy. It has been said that how we dispose of our affairs at home can decide elections, but how we dispose of our relations with the rest of the world can decide the survival of mankind. In a larger sense, how we as individual citizens dispose of our affairs at home will also decide how the world will dispose of its problems—including the survival of mankind.

As we look about our great country with its beautiful cities, its wonderful highways, its productive farms, its mountains and forests and rivers, its educational institutions, we can be justly proud. But if we look closer, we see widespread unemployment, young people dropping out of school before they have acquired the skills with which to earn a decent living, juvenile delinquency, and dismal slums. We see polluted streams and other natural resources ruined forever by our greed. We see a whole people—a people of a different color—who have been denied the fruits of the democracy and justice we proclaim so loudly. No, we don't believe in segregation, but—

Each day we hear, or see in print, words of hatred and bigotry and half-truth that cast doubt upon the honesty, the loyalty, and the competence of those who represent us in positions of leadership. "The Congress is no good"—"the executive branch can't be trusted"—"the Supreme Court has betrayed us." So runs the evil theme. Ah yes, America has many unsolved problems.

What does all this have to do with foreign policy? Why do we have to insure the proper settling of these problems to insure the final victory over communism?

Because a strong America is the only kind that can survive and influence the affairs of the world. The world's judgment of America is as harsh as the judgment of your own conscience. Every American citizen must personally assume responsibility for making America really what we proclaim it to be.

Working on these problems, personally and as a part of the community, is what you can do for your country. It places you shoulder to shoulder with the men and women who are working for American interests around the world.

---

[1] Made at the conclusion of an address before the 1964 Greater Hastings dinner at Hastings, Nebr., on Jan. 20.

Monagan Recommendation To Relieve the Coin Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the May 11, 1964, edition of Numismatic News, which is published in Iola, Wis., and distributed nationally, gives generous coverage in its lead story to the proposals advanced by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, to help alleviate the serious shortage of coins which we are currently experiencing throughout the Nation. The same newspaper also pays tribute editorially to Mr. MONAGAN'S efforts which it states are receiving serious consideration in official Washington circles.

It is Mr. MONAGAN'S contention that the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Mint should return the blanking of coins to private enterprise, and the General Accounting Office has assured him that they will make a study of the economic feasibility of procuring prefabricated coin blanks in large quantities from private industry.

Our mints are currently working around the clock in an unsuccessful effort to meet the demand for coins. Prior to the war, private industry was engaged in the manufacture of strips and planchets for the Bureau of the Mint and this practice was discontinued when all industrial facilities were thrown into the war effort.

Nationally we are in an embarrassing position because of the shortage of coins and banks in many communities have been forced to resort to the practice of buying coins at premium prices. In some instances they are offering a $1 bill for 95 cents in change in order to accommodate the demands of their patrons.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include, herewith, the editorial which appeared in the May 11 issue of Numismatic News:

FOR SERIOUS CONSIDERATION

Just last issue we found ourselves taking a Congressman or two to task for rushing presumptuously forward to legislate, without planning or foresight, remedial action to counter the speculators' invasion of Washington.

This issue we find that we owe a compliment or two to another Congressman for his actions in trying to relieve the serious coin shortage. We find that his suggestions are not without merit, are based on months of research, forethought and careful consideration to the problem at hand.

JOHN STEPHEN MONAGAN, U.S. Representative from Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, has proposed that the U.S. Mint give careful consideration to the possibilities of having coin blanks, or planchets, struck by private concerns equipped to handle the task. The time and effort saved by the mint then could be utilized to the production of the actual coins. It is not something new, something untried. The Royal Canadian Mint is giving it a try at this very moment and it has been done from time to time by our very own U.S. Mint.

Representative MONAGAN'S proposals are not wholly magnanimous, one of the leading producers of blank planchets for the U.S. Mint prior to World War II was the Scovill Manufacturing Co. of Waterbury, Conn., MONAGAN'S hometown. In all probability the Government would not save money on the privately produced blanks, either, but the action could either alleviate or forestall the economic consequences our Nation would suffer should the coin shortage continue to grow unchecked, at least until the new facilities at Philadelphia are completed and in operation.

MONAGAN knew his subject thoroughly before advancing his proposals, it was an education just to review his correspondence with Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary, and Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States.

The letters were more than informative, they expounded on the subject. We find that now the General Accounting Office of the United States is beginning a review of certain operations of the Bureau of the Mint and an inquiry into the economic feasibility of the Bureau procuring such prefabricated stripping or coinage blanks in large quantities from private industry for the production of all coins. The procurement of prefabricated stripping or coining blanks would eliminate several operations and certain types of equipment used in the present mints for the manufacture of coins. The result of this inquiry will have a significant effect on the type of equipment and cost of the new mint to be constructed at Philadelphia.

Congressman MONAGAN'S suggestions do make "cents" (pardon the pun), it is something we have done before and in times of less serious shortages, it is therefore something we can do again.

There is no one left on this continent today that witnessed the great coin shortages of our past when postage stamps, fractional currency, due bills, tokens, and the like had to substitute for coins, when consumers had to make purchases equal to their currency for there was no change. Let us not leave witnesses to reflect on a similar economic catastrophe in our time, either.

E.C.R.

William T. Moore

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the election of William T. Moore to the presidency of the Arts Club of Washington is, in a small measure, recognition of outstanding contributions by Mr. Moore over the years to the cultural advancement of the Nation's Capital and the Nation itself. It is extremely gratifying to me that his efforts have been thus recognized and rewarded.

Bill Moore is a man who cannot do anything but a first-class job on anything he undertakes. For most of the past 22 years he has been a member of the Chicago Tribune's Washington staff, throwing himself so wholeheartedly into his work for his paper that it, the people of Chicago, and the people of my State of Illinois have benefited immeasurably. The same dedication has marked his work for the Arts Club of Washington, greatly benefiting that club and the city of Washington.

It is a great pleasure to join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in extending my congratulations to Bill Moore.

Lobbying by the National Council of Churches of Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with an important editorial which has been printed on page 1 of the April 27, 1964, edition of South, the News Magazine of Dixie. This editorial is entitled "The 'Basket Bearers' Are Restless" and is concerned with the lobbying and other questionable activities by the National Council of Churches of Christ.

I also call to the attention of my colleagues another editorial on this subject from the News of Lynchburg, Va., of March 18, 1964. This editorial is entitled "The Other Face of the NCC." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both of these editorials be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From South, the News Magazine of Dixie, Apr. 27, 1964]

THE "BASKET BEARERS" ARE RESTLESS

Through either ignorance or arrogance—and Christian charity would dictate the former—National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.'s paid professionals continue to intrude into areas beyond their scope. The basic error is that they do this in ecclesiastical cloak, without advice or consent of the 40 million captive members who feed, house, and clothe them.

Current secular spasm displayed by NCC bureaucracy is a fantastic propaganda partnership with the country's more odious strife groups, all of which take at least a portion of their policy direction from people who are a total contradiction to NCC's constitutional purpose.

NCC staffers are now engaged in a massive campaign to pressure Congress by letter, telephone, and pulpit posing. They seek national regimentation through the so-called civil rights proposals. It is almost inconceivable that NCC policymakers would pretend to speak on such for 40 million Protestants, but they do. This is as tragic as it is audacious. It can do nothing more than speed the downhill course of an ambitious ecumenical movement.

Preamble to the constitution of NCC at 1950 founding, simply stated it was formed because "the time has come when it seems more fully fitting to manifest oneness in Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Saviour, by creation of an inclusive cooperative agency of the Christian churches of the United States of America."

NCC's basic goal is to unite. Its hierarchy has fostered divisiveness. NCC called for faith, not distrust. It called for fellowship. Fellowship cannot be coerced. It called for charity, but its "spokesmen" ignore the sim-

ple human fact that love can't be voted. They confuse clubs with guideposts.

NCC spokesmen have glib answers for critics. The answers are hollow.

Earlier this year, on NCC letterhead, a call went out for a "youth consultation" at Nashville (South, Feb. 3, 1964). Principal consultation speakers were NCC paid employees. These people communicate with one another in socioecclesiastical language. To them, picketing isn't picketing, it's "ministry renewal." To them, encouraging children without parental consent to break laws through racial demonstrations isn't wrong. This is known as suffering service.

Among "Faith, Fellowship, and Charity" outcroppings at Nashville was one from NCC's director of evangelism, Dr. Colin Williams. He intoned, "The congregational system no longer has any value for the church, and has outlived its usefulness." NCC's Jay Moore, associate director of its commission on religion and race, suggested that the only thing the church is good for now is for handing out old coats and food baskets and providing money for NCC. John Wood, NCC's youth director, told the consultation, "If I'd done my homework, we should have had CORE organize a picket line when the National Conference of Methodist Youth met."

These and other statements were carefully reported by Nashville Banner's Bob Bell, Jr. NCC'er Wood said later that permitting Bell to attend "was a bad error in judgment." Wood, in a memorandum to NCC general secretary, Dr. R. H. Edwin Espy, declared that the consultation was an exchange of ideas between insiders. One may reasonably assume that these heady ideas were not intended for the ears of basket-bearing outsiders.

Dr. Espy sent off a lengthy letter of protest to the Banner. His letter protested, in part, "In short, whatever the truth or falsity of the specific statements attributed to NCC staff or other participants in this consultation, these allegations concerning NCC policy are totally misleading. In all three cases they are untrue and as general secretary of national council I categorically repudiate them."

Dr. Espy writes with an opaque pen. We subscribe to Banner comment, "it would save the NCC official quite a bit of grief if he would hold a rehearsal at NCC headquarters, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, and check the agitation pitch of his bright young hucksters before they take the high road with their shocking wares and brassy air of condescension. The thin, cellophane-phrased arrogance of a church bureaucracy can be just as insidious and dangerous as its counterpart in government."

The 3-day Nashville event was held upon NCC invitation. Its leaders were, and insofar as this journal knows, are still paid NCC staffers. If their views are not NCC top echelon views, then who is minding the store?

How does NCC set policy? Especially on such things as all-out agitation for enactment of a rights-destroying "civil rights" bill.

Rest assured of one thing. Policy isn't set by vote of 40 million basket bearers. NCC-Riverside wouldn't chance that test. Actually, most "policy" stems from an NCC constitutional provision. NCC's general board numbers upward of 270 members. Actual vote units are about 100 less than that, brought about by a formula based on total basket bearing membership of NCC's 31 participating communions of record. This board, in turn, is about one-third laity, two-thirds clergy. It is mathematically possible for 20 members to comprise a quorum. Just 11 of those can carry or defeat a "policy" point. To recapitulate, that's roughly one vote per 4 million basket bearers, a slight variation of the NCC-Riverside view which favors a standard of "one man, one vote."

What happened to the lay advisory group which used to speak up for the 40 million dues payers? Well, they got into the habit of speaking up on assorted policy matters. The general board wrote them off back in 1955.

Accomplishing disaffiliation from NCC, like once-voted taxes, is no easy matter. Encouragingly, more and more basket bearers are becoming restless. When enough do, NCC might get back to its cooperative agency cornerstone.

[From the News, Lynchburg, Va., Mar. 18, 1964]

THE OTHER FACE OF THE NCC

For some time now, the readers of this newspaper have been conducting, by means of letters to the forum, a running battle over the National Council of Churches. The NCC has been attacked and criticized as sympathetic to communism and as being infiltrated with fellow travelers. It has been defended as a great force for Christianity.

Now, finally, the NCC itself has jumped into the fray, with a letter from its director of information in which he sets forth the goals and programs of the NCC and attempts to discredit its critics and their criticism. We published the letter last Sunday.

Except in unusual circumstances, it is the policy of this newspaper, as it is with most, not to argue with the opinions expressed by individual letterwriters, although we do point out errors of fact. The NCC letter, however, expressed the opinion of an organization and contained statements of policy. It is the opinion not of one man, but of many. And as such, it might be accepted by some as the last word on the subject.

Well, it isn't. Far from it. This high-sounding statement of ideals, this résumé of programs, this explanation of and denial of accusations, contains so many half-truths, distortions of fact, artful dodges and careful omissions as to qualify it as a masterpiece of deception. Instead of turning the other cheek, the NCC has turned the other face.

For instance: "Nothing could be further from the truth—" the letter states in the beginning as a reply to accusations that it is infiltrated with fellow travelers and with Marxist-Communist ideals.

As a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the truth than that denial.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in America was founded in 1950 as a merger of the old Federal Council of Churches and several minor religious organizations. The House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have identified many FCC and NCC officials and members as Communist fellow travelers.

And what is a fellow traveler? The Senate subcommittee defines one as "An individual who from time to time supports one or more organizations or campaigns operating under the indirect and usually unpublicized initiative and control of the Communist Party or its representatives." There are three types of fellow travelers, according to the subcommittee: the conscious, who is aware that he is supporting Communist objectives; the consistent, who sometimes takes issue with the party but continues to support its programs and campaigns even after they have been exposed; and the unwitting, who is a dupe.

On this basis, and documented by the congressional committees, the NCC is shot through and through with Communist fellow travelers, from its longtime official and former president, Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, on down.

The public records of the leftist activities of 658 clergymen and laymen of the NCC have been published by Circuit Riders, Inc., which stated: "In 1961, Communist fronts had the support of more than 1,200 different Protestant clergymen."

On February 25, 1960, Mr. Richard Arens, then staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, testified during a committee hearing that, on the basis of "careful, but yet incomplete checks" it had been shown that "thus far, of the leaders of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, we have found over 100 persons in leadership capacity with either Communist front records or records of service to Communist causes." This testimony was verified Tuesday by the present director of the HCUA staff, Mr. Francis McNamara.

The foregoing should suffice to show that the letter began with a deliberate whitewash.

Among other things, the letter stated that the NCC had "never referred directly to right to work laws." This is a dodge. As the letter stated, the NCC is on record as saying: "Union membership as a basis of continuing employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law." What is this, if it is not a statement against a law which provides that a man does not have to belong to a union to obtain a job?

One of the favorite techniques of the NCC is to have its members and officials promoting a desired program while the organization itself takes no official stand. This is subterfuge.

For example, the letter stated that the NCC has never called for the abolition of the HCUA. Perhaps, technically, it has not. But its officers and members have signed such petitions.

Another example: the letter stated that the NCC has made no statement calling for the admission of Red China to the United Nations. But an NCC-called conference, attended by top NCC officials, made such a statement unanimously. And the NCC urged that the statement be publicized and given great weight.

The letter stated the NCC does not favor repeal of the McCarran Act, but instead, wants to have it changed. However, the changes it wants would make the present act ineffective. Furthermore, past president Dahlberg has signed at least 11 petitions calling for an outright repeal of the act.

We could go on and on, but it is not necessary to prove the point. And that is: on the basis of the public records, the NCC stands convicted of Communist-front activities indulged in by its members and officials. And on the basis of its letter, it stands convicted of propagandistic trickery.

The NCC, on the one hand, has endorsed Christian programs as an organization, while on the other hand it supports atheistic Communist doctrines through the individual efforts of its members and officials. The NCC reminds us of Janus, the two-faced Roman pagan god. It turns the Christian face to the Nation. But we should never forget that other face.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is quite fitting to pause occasionally and commemorate some of the memorable dates and events of history that have contributed to the growth of freedom. May 3, the anniversary of the famous Polish Constitution of 1791, is such a date.

It was on that date that, after a century of political disturbance, Poland adopted a liberal and progressive document that has served as a beacon of independence and freedom for the Polish people ever since.

Although Poland's subsequent history has been marked by successive partitions, invasions, and occupations, the freedom-loving people of Poland have retained the creative spirit and longing for freedom which was expressed in that famous document.

Citizens of Polish origin have contributed much to the history and traditions of the United States. One of their major contributions has been the spirit of independence and love for political freedom which still characterizes the homeland of their ancestors.

I am pleased to join in the commemoration of the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. I am sure that the hope for freedom and the desire for independence still lives in the hearts of the Polish people.

A Return to Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans believe that we invite disaster when we give in to the Communists. They think it would be the height of folly to misjudge the continuing Communist threat, and they were greatly concerned when one of the congressional leaders in foreign affairs expressed the opinion that we exaggerate this threat and are too inflexible in our reaction to it.

In this connection, an editorial in the May issue of the Federationist, written by AFL-CIO President George Meany expresses the assessment of millions of Americans as to what are myths and what are realities, and our unchanging need to face this threat with determination.

The editorial follows:

A RETURN TO APPEASEMENT

(By George Meany)

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a speech before the U.S. Senate on March 25, 1964, maintained that our country's foreign policy is based largely on "cherished myths rather than objective facts." On this assumption, he wants the United States to "start thinking some unthinkable thoughts"—particularly about our relations with the Soviet Union, its European satellites, Communist China, South Vietnam, Cuba, and Panama. The Senator made no concrete proposals for replacing any of the present Washington policies, but inferentially indicated the new course he would have our Nation pursue, especially in its relations with the Communist countries. He significantly omitted consideration of the German question—the pivotal problem in East-West relations.

In his hot pursuit of "flexibility" and "realism," Senator FULBRIGHT found that "the character of the cold war has * * * been profoundly altered" because of the "radical change in relations between and within the Communist world." To him, the idea that "every Communist state is an unmitigated evil and relentless enemy of the free world" is a myth. He insists that "we must distinguish between communism as an ideology and the power and policy of the Soviet state." To the Senator, "it is not communism as a doctrine, or communism as it is practiced within the Soviet Union or in any other country, that threatens us." He recognizes that the Soviet Union is "still a most formidable adversary," but believes that it has ceased to be totally and implacably hostile to the West. It "has shown a new willingness to enter mutually advantageous arrangements with the West."

According to FULBRIGHT, this "profound alteration" dates from the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 when Khrushchev became convinced that aggression and adventure involve unacceptable risks for him and his entire system. But the Senator fails to prove that the Soviet rulers have given up all adventurism and plans for future aggression as a result of the Caribbean confrontation. Moscow's ratification of the limited test ban treaty is no evidence of a profound and peaceful transformation. The late President Kennedy warned against such illusions when he pleaded for ratification of the limited test ban treaty: "This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our needs for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others." There is no guarantee against Soviet aggression in the Soviet-American agreement for cuts in the production of nuclear materials—stockpiled for years in large quantities. This agreement has no provisions for inspection or verification of any kind. President Johnson appropriately emphasized that "This is not disarmament."

It is important to note that on January 17, 1964, Khrushchev assured Castro that "communism is being constructed not only within the confines of the Soviet Union; we are doing everything to make communism victorious over the entire earth." One month later, Khrushchev reaffirmed before the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party that he has not "ceased to be totally implacably hostile to the West" and that: "The policy of American imperialism is that of gendarme-like repression of peoples and of the struggle against all that is new and revolutionary." In the current disarmament talks, Moscow has been most inflexible in its opposition to all effective international inspection and control. At the celebration of his 70th birthday in April, Khrushchev reiterated his Berlin ultimatum.

These are not myths but facts—the reality of the current world situation. Yet the Senator complains that: "We are predisposed to regard any conflict as a clash between conflicting interests. * * * It has become one of the self-evident truths of the postwar era that just as the President resides in Washington and the Pope in Rome, the Devil resides immutably in Moscow." Surely Senator FULBRIGHT knows that it was not the President of the United States who ordered the construction of the shameful wall which divides Berlin. It was not the Pope's divisions that drenched the streets of Budapest with the blood of the workers and students who wanted nothing more than to live in peace and freedom. Only a devil could perpetrate these and other terrible crimes. And this "devil resides immutably in Moscow." In 1964, as in 1939, appeasement of dictators bent on world domination cannot lead to peace, regardless of the profoundest wishful thinking.

The basic differences dividing our country and its allies from the U.S.S.R. and Communist China involve two ways of life. The overriding issue of our times is between Communist tyranny and democracy, imperfect as it may be. The Communists aim to dominate the world and remold it on the Leninist-Soviet pattern; the Western powers do not seek to dominate the world and remold it on any particular pattern of democracy. Though all Communist regimes agree that our democracy and its institutions must be destroyed and replaced with a totalitarian dictatorship, they are not always able to avoid disagreements among themselves over personalities, leadership, or methods of burying us. The extent to which a Communist state is a threat to human freedom and peace depends on its size, resources, economic, and military capacities. Consequently, though all such states are unmitigated evils, they are not equally dangerous.

The totalitarian dogmas and deeds on the Soviet domestic front are integrally bound up with and reflected in the unswerving Soviet foreign policy for fomenting, financing, and directing so-called wars of liberation in Latin America, Africa, and Asia and class war in the free world as a whole. Thus Khrushchev's principal mouthpiece, Pravda, underscored on December 6, 1963, that: "The CPSU and the Soviet people consider it their international duty to give all-round political and economic support and, if necessary, the help of arms, too, to the national liberation struggle of the peoples." But who is to decide what is a national liberation struggle? The Soviet Government, of course. And who is to decide when a people's democracy is truly democratic, for the people? The Soviet Government, of course. This is the most sacred of Kremlin dogmas. To forget this is to forget reality.

According to the Senator, "The monster myth of the cold war is that the Communist bloc is a monolith composed of governments which are not really governments at all but organized conspiracies." It is a terrible truth and not a monstrous myth that all these governments came into power through Communist subversive conspiracy or through imposition by the Soviet armies. They are foreign-imposed regimes. Moscow created the myth about their monolithic unity in order to mislead the Western World into believing that they have popular support. Hence, when the Senator fails to distinguish between the peoples of these countries and the regimes of which oppress them, he, in effect, accepts this Communist myth as reality. Let none forget the East German revolt of June 17, 1953, the turbulence in Poland, unrest in Czechoslovakia, and the revolution in Hungary.

From the very moment that the Chinese Communists seized power, it was clear that Red China could never be just another satellite. The serious rift with Peiping, the divisions in world communism, the severe agricultural crisis and other serious economic difficulties within the U.S.S.R. have forced Moscow to be less rigid in its relations with its European satellites. But it is no myth that Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania are still occupied by the Soviet Army. In Hungary, the Soviet army of occupation totals 40,000. These foreign troops are not helping Hungary evolve toward a free and open society. And in that most "liberal" of all Soviet satellites, Poland, the Gomulka regime has been stepping up its repressive measures against those seeking the advancement of freedom. Yet on the basis of the Senator's flexible approach, our Government would support the dictatorial regimes rather than the forces fighting for freedom.

There have been important changes within the Communist countries and in the relations between the Communist powers. These changes were made in order to preserve and consolidate the corroding dictatorships. But

not a single one of these foreign-imposed regimes is evolving toward a free and open society or discontinuing support of the worldwide triumph of Communist tyranny. To the extent that any of these changes have improved conditions for the people, they have come in response to popular pressure and struggle and not as a result of preferred or flexible treatment of the dictatorial regimes by any Western country.

Senator FULBRIGHT in his talk specifically proposed that our country accept "the continued existence of the Castro regime as a distasteful nuisance, but not as an intolerable danger so long as the nations of the hemisphere are prepared to meet their obligations of collective defense under the Rio Treaty." While emphasizing that Castro is no threat to the United States, the Senator recognized that Cuban communism does pose a grave threat to other Latin American countries. His failure to realize that any dangerous threat to our Latin American neighbors is a threat to us can only encourage and strengthen the subversive Castroite forces financed and trained by Moscow who are continuing their conspiracy designed to destroy the democratic institutions and leaders in Latin America. It is significant that Castro lost no time in welcoming the Senator's notion of reality and flexibility in regard to his totalitarian regime.

Mr. FULBRIGHT seems to have missed the most important lesson of the postwar era. Soviet aggression and expansion westward have been deterred by western unity and strength and not by the "liberalization" of any Communist regime. When Khrushchev's Russia and Mao's China become peaceful and democratic, like the German Federal Republic and Japan have become, then and then only should our Government help them overcome their difficulties. The fact that Moscow has joined us in conducting scientific projects in the snowy wastes of the Antarctic is no proof of its having become truly peaceful.

After the FULBRIGHT address, Secretary of State Rusk hastened to remind the Nation that Soviet ground and nuclear forces are "at the ready" on the doorsteps of Western Europe and that, "in the absence of assured arrangements for the mutual reduction of arms, it would be foolhardy to dismantle the military strength of NATO." The Soviet Government has yet to negotiate seriously on such vital problems as disarmament and self-determination for the German people. However, even in the face of these unpleasant realities, the Senator insists that, "in a perverse way, we have grown rather attached to the cold war" and prefer military rockets to public schools and moonflights to urban renewal.

It is high time to put aside all myths and face the realities confronting our country. The strongest and most aggressive military power in Europe is a Communist power—the U.S.S.R. This is no myth. The strongest and most aggressive military power in Asia is a Communist power—Mao's China. This is reality. The strongest and most aggressive military force in Latin America today is a Communist power—that "distasteful nuisance"—Castro's Cuba. This is far more than a distasteful nuisance. The divisions in the Communist camp will serve to strengthen the free world only if we exploit them in the cause of peace and freedom. On the other hand, the divisions and illusions in the Western camp, if continued, will invite new Communist aggressions. At this moment in history, the paramount task of the free world is to assure superior strength and restore its unity of policy and action.

Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the President's Appalachia proposal is important for the Nation. It is essential to Pennsylvania and to the Sixth Congressional District, which I represent.

The proposal strikes at the waste of real wealth in this region which came as a result of reckless exploitation of land, natural resources, and people over many generations, with little or no concern for the future welfare of the region or its people.

No better answer to the critics of the President's program could be given than the recent article by Columnist Richard Starnes which was dated April 30. Under previous permission I include the Richard Starnes column with my remarks in the RECORD:

APPALACHIA

(By Richard Starnes)

Misreading the mood of the Nation is not a Republican monopoly, but in fairness one must admit that they have brought the phenomenon to a policy few others can match.

There is probably a great deal wrong with the President's program to heal the suffering Appalachians. But what is not wrong is the central theme of it: The American dreams cannot endure the continued affront that is contained in the vast, cheerless sweep of this chronically depressed area; if our system is any good, it can cope with this problem, and if it is not good enough to do it, then it is not good enough to survive.

Recently we spent a few days revisiting some of the forgotten people of eastern Kentucky. Our series of articles was widely used, and nothing written here recently has aroused the reaction that the Appalachian articles did.

Dozens of letters were written in response, and almost invariably they asked: What can we do? How can we help the children stay in school? Where can we send clothing? Money?

The reaction was encouraging, and it suggested that Americans are still a great-hearted, compassionate people. This is a thing that President Johnson understands. He believes the people will support his Appalachian program and his war on poverty; else he would not have launched either in an election year. Lyndon Johnson may occasionally be cornball enough to touch off the gag reflex on a bronze billygoat, but he has the psychic stethoscope tuned to the heartbeat of the people.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is aptly cast as this election's piltdown man. He is persuaded that all that is needed to loose the Appalachians from the thralldom of want is to permit free enterprise to have full sway in the area. Like so many of his attitudes, this one is the product of arrogant ignorance. The coal barons are probably the greatest examples of predatory free enterprise in our culture, and the strip mine is a wholly appropriate memorial to their destructive genre. It is certainly the only one they'll leave behind when their rape of the land and its people is done with.

Poor Senator GOLDWATER is not to be blamed because he suffers from the sort of tunnel vision that is caused by looking at the world through a bankroll. He can't help it, any more than the lemming wing of the Republican Party can help the suicidal atavism that afflicts it. But the truth is that all of the patriotic cliches of celebrating the divine wisdom of our system are meaningless gibberish as long as the hungry, despairing specter of Appalachia haunts us. Whether Mr. Johnson's program costs $4 billion or whether it costs a great deal more, it won't cost as much as continued indifference is bound to cost in the end. Truculent, doctrinaire smugness is a threadbare excuse for a nation that refuses to educate a large percentage of the children in an area larger than the State of California.

A lot of wornout stereotypes will have to be discarded if the United States is to capitalize on the opportunity opened to it by President Johnson's program to restore Appalachia and its people to our affluent society. Foremost among these (and it is one you will hear often in the days to come) is that the people are shiftless, moonshining, incestuous hillbillies who deserve no help. This is of course, a libel. Appalachia contains a higher percentage of children under age 15 than the national average. If these shamefully ill-used youngsters become the cliche people noted above, then it will be a monstrous wrong that will diminish us all.

The second falsehood about Appalachia is that the land itself is ruined and worthless. If the strip miners are not stopped, it soon may become just that, but it isn't yet. It still contains untold mineral wealth. Rainfall averages 45 inches a year throughout its 340 counties. With a wise and far-seeing program of enlightened land use it could became a matchless recreation area—priceless to a Nation whose population will double in the next 50 years.

When the facts become available (as Mr. Johnson is sure to arrange), the American mood will be one of anger and determination. The people will support a sane and compassionate Appalachian program.

The Hoffa Trials

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is to be complimented for bringing to the attention of the House the fact that the great Committee on the Judiciary is going to have hearings on the issues that have arisen in connection with the administration of justice under the present administration. These hearings should be open and above board, and no effort should be made to cover up or whitewash anything. Of course, if Mr. Hoffa is guilty of some crime, he should be convicted and punished; if he is not guilty, he should be acquitted, not convicted.

In any case he should have a fair trial, just as every citizen of the United States

of America should have a fair trial, when accused of any crime.

It is my hope that politics is not being mixed in with the administration of justice here in America; but if it is, then the gentleman's committee will, I am sure, discover and expose it. The Congress should be zealous to protect the American people, and every one of its citizens, against unfair and unlawful treatment at the hands of their very own Government.

The Political Use of Economic Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has taken to personally releasing any economic news, no matter how preliminary or incomplete, that can possibly be presented as favorable. According to an article in the Wall Street Journal of May 5, the President's use of economic statistics is helping to lay the groundwork for the administration's prosperity pitch in the campaign this fall.

The trouble is that many persons both in and out of Government are beginning to fear that the President's careless use of economic statistics may be deceiving the public by creating an exaggerated sense of economic euphoria. There are fears among professionals that Johnsonian recklessness creates misguided confidence that could sap remedial efforts required to solve our existing economic problems.

A case in point is the President's premature release of incomplete first quarter balance-of-payments figures. The President said the balance-of-payments deficit may have been wiped out altogether. The fact is that improvement in the first quarter was largely due to temporary factors and, therefore, is likely to be short lived.

The Journal article also noted that:

Mr. Johnson recently commented that housing starts in March rose almost 16 percent from February, using the seasonally adjusted annual rate for private nonfarm houses. In the same report, the President had, but did not cite, the more widely used seasonally adjusted annual rate for all private houses. On this basis, starts were down fractionally from February * * *. Nor did Mr. Johnson mention new figures, also available at the time, to show that new factory orders for durable goods, a key clue to future output, declined in March for the second month in a row.

In another example of President Johnson's fancy statistical footwork, the Journal notes that:

When he proclaimed that in the first quarter the gross national product rose to a record $608.5 billion seasonally adjusted annual rate, he said it was the "largest year-to-year gain in more than 2 years." What some other analysts considered more interesting, however, was that the figure showed the growth was not as great in the first quarter as it was in the preceding two quarters.

In at least one instance, reporters and economists have not been able to find any statistic to back up what he said. That was when he offered recently, as one reason for his optimistic view of the economy, the assurance that we have less men out of work that we have had at any period.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Journal article referred to entitled, "Prosperity Pitch: Is It Misleading?" in the RECORD at this point:

PROSPERITY PITCH: IS IT MISLEADING?

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is displaying special skill at a feat that has become ritual in the quadrennial circus of election-year politics—economic acrobatics.

Almost as much a part of electioneering as shaking hands, statistical stunting is a favorite technique of the "ins" to convince voters they live in prosperity or, if that's stretching a bit, that it lies within reach. The "outs" perform the same tricks in reverse, seeing gloom today and doom tomorrow.

Few Presidents can resist participation, but President Johnson brings to the performance a flair calculated to compel attention to a center ring aglow with bright and comforting economic lights. Mr. Johnson's technique is the press conference. By its frequency, he insures repetitive appearance on the Nation's front pages. By its informality, he protects against the embarrassment of prepared public questioning.

And it is by this method that Mr. Johnson has taken to personally releasing any economic news, no matter how preliminary or incomplete, that can possibly be presented as favorable. The result is that economic tidbits, which many newspapers normally would bury in their back sections, now are being glorified in headlines across the country, helping to lay the groundwork for the prosperity part of the administration's campaign this fall.

While it may be argued that this is a wholesome contribution to the oft bemoaned lack of economic understanding on the part of the American public, there are those in Government who worry that the L.B.J. brand of economic disclosure may be deceiving the public by creating an exaggerated sense of economic euphoria. While they can't afford to voice their qualms publicly, it's common now for both career civil servants and New Frontier economic seers to make themselves available after each of the many presidential press conferences as something of a fire brigade to discreetly dampen down the image of prairie fire prosperity ignited by their chief.

AN IMPORTANT OMISSION

A few weeks ago, for instance, the President reported happily that the long-nagging balance-of-payments situation had improved so sharply in the first quarter this year that the deficit—the excess of dollars leaving the U.S. over those coming home—may have been wiped out. Much to the discomfiture of the professional Federal dollar watchers, however, the President failed to mention their view that the dramatic improvement is almost sure to be short lived because it rests largely on such temporary factors as the sale of wheat to Russia.

As the story goes, the President garnered this bit of economic intelligence by overhearing a conversation among some other officials. They objected that the figures were much too incomplete and premature to release to the public; it is usually 6 weeks after a quarter ends before the preliminary figures are issued, and they are subject to major revision many months later. Only a few days had elapsed since the quarter's end, but the President prevailed and reported the progress at his next press conference. This set the professionals to muttering about Johnsonian "recklessness," contending that misguided confidence could aggravate the situation badly by sapping administration and congressional remedial efforts.

These mutterings became so audible that the Government cautioned press officers in U.S. embassies across the world to mention that the President didn't seasonally adjust his balance-of-payments report. And the President himself subsequently muted his optimism when he addressed the U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting the other day. In this balance-of-payments discussion, he noted the first quarter is typically better than others, that accurate information wasn't yet at hand, and that results for coming quarters won't necessarily be as good.

MANY STATISTICS AVAILABLE

The $90 million or so Uncle Sam spends annually on statistics produces quite a variety of them, thus giving the President an ample selection from which to make his prosperity point. Thus, Mr. Johnson recently commented that housing starts in March rose almost 1 percent from February, using the seasonally adjusted annual rate for private nonfarm houses. In the same report, the President had, but did not cite, the more widely used seasonally adjusted annual rate for all private houses. On this basis, starts were down fractionally from February, nothing to crow about on the heels of the $11.5 billion income tax cut. Nor did Mr. Johnson mention new figures, also available at the time, to show that new factory orders for durable goods, a key clue to future output, declined in March for the second month in a row.

Like most self-respecting wielders of statistical evidence, the President attempts to put the figures into meaningful perspective by comparing them with those from past periods. In Mr. Johnson's hands, these comparisons, though not always entirely relevant, always turn out favorably. When he proclaimed that in the first quarter the gross national product rose to a record $608.5 billion seasonally adjusted annual rate, he said it was the "largest year-to-year gain in more than 2 years." What some other analysts considered more interesting, however, was that the figure showed the growth wasn't as great in the first quarter as it was in the preceding two quarters.

It isn't always simple for reporters to tell just what figure the President is citing, since he often doesn't risk boring them by specifying whether he is, for instance, referring to the actual number of houses started in a month or the figure after it has been adjusted to compensate for seasonal distortions, and in at least one instance, reporters and economists haven't been able to find any statistic to back up what he said. That was when he offered recently, as one reason for his optimistic view of the economy, the assurance that "we have less men out of work than we have had at any period."

While there's no doubt the job situation has been improving lately, and that it would certainly be nice if the number of jobless men were at a record low, Labor Department specialists report reluctantly that it doesn't appear to be so, with or without seasonal adjustment.

So as election time draws nearer, Federal statisticians are resigning themselves to watching their cherished figures perform dazzling stunts at the hands of the President.

Aimless Slaughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the conflicting reports that are being received from Vietnam, the commuter's schedule being maintained by Secretary of Defense McNamara, when reviewed with the foreign policy views of Senator FULBRIGHT, the undisclosed participation of our State Department in the assassination of President Diem—all add up to a confused and naturally ineffective U.S. program in Vietnam.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we are aware that the military is muzzled and does not have a voice in planning an effective winning military program, and our personnel in Vietnam must operate with their hands tied, while the Communists use sanctuaries in Cambodia and Laos, and an uninterrupted line of supply from North Vietnam augments their forces.

The Chicago Tribune analyzes many of these inconsistencies in an editorial Wednesday, May 6, which I insert into the RECORD at this point, urging that we develop an effective, practical, determined policy before it is too late.

AIMLESS SLAUGHTER

"It was," so the report from South Vietnam read, "one of the worst days for American prestige since the United States began backing the South Vietnamese against the Communist guerrillas in 1962."

But every day is a bad day in Vietnam, and the anxiety of Americans should be focused less on our prestige than on the lives of our military men which are being dribbled away in a war governed by an aimless Washington purpose.

More than 200 Americans, sent to Vietnam theoretically as advisers but actually consigned to fighting, have been killed there. Nine more died there yesterday in the crash of a transport plane. Eight were wounded Saturday in a grenade attack in the capital city of Saigon. The same day an Americn Navy vessel was sunk in Saigon Harbor by an explosive charge affixed to its hull. That incident was also reported as "a major setback for U.S. prestige."

Last year American casualties in Vietnam averaged 42 a month. This year they are at the rate of 91 a month.

These Americans are fighting in the air and on the ground with obsolete equipment. They fly B-26 bombers which repeatedly drop wings and crash because of structural fatigue. They use bombs and systems not in use since the Korean war, without charts or manuals to explain them.

An Indiana flyer, Capt. Edwin Gerald Shank, killed in combat March 24, wrote home, "Although this is called a dirty little war, it's a big, mean war. We are getting beat. We are undermanned and undergunned. * * * Morale is very bad."

What are we doing in Vietnam? Where are we headed? What's the purpose? President Johnson says it is to help the Vietnamese keep their freedom from the Communists. But if he is in a fight, why doesn't he give our military men the means to win it? Has he thought of threats or negotiations to stop the war? What is his policy? If there is one, it isn't visible. It is fitful and inadequate.

Meanwhile, the lives of our young men are being frittered away and the White House talks of sending back two detachments of military police to provide protection on the streets of Saigon. That's how tough the President is going to get. It would be laughable if it weren't tragic.

George Meany Speaks Out on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is to the great credit of our American labor movement that it has not been blinded by the rhetoric and propaganda of communism.

It was not the laboring classes, but rather the intellectuals who, in this country, were attracted to Marxist socialism and the concept of class struggle. The men and women of our labor unions have been the reservoir of strength by which this country has survived all kinds of challenges from totalitarianism of various hues and has gone on to new heights of prosperity.

Labor's understanding of the nature of the Communist challenge often has been more acute than that of other elements of our society. One is reminded of the cold shoulder given Khrushchev by labor leaders during his visit to the United States, as compared to the warm welcome the Soviet Premier was accorded by some of the Nation's wealthiest businessmen.

This tradition of perceptive anticommunism was reflected recently in an article by AFL-CIO President George Meany in the May 1964 issue of the Federationist, monthly magazine of the AFL-CIO. In this article, Mr. Meany opposes the views of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body who recently received widespread publicity for challenging the "myths" of American foreign policy.

Mr. Meany points out that the strongest and most aggressive powers in Europe, Asia and Latin America are all Communist. He emphasizes that the paramount task that faces the free world is to retsore its unity of policy and action to meet the thrust of communism, and thereby assure free world superior strength.

Because of the relevancy of Mr. Meany's statement, I am including it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

A RETURN TO APPEASEMENT?

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a speech before the U.S. Senate on March 25, 1964, maintained that our country's foreign policy is based largely on "cherished myths rather than objective facts." On this assumption, he wants the United States to "start thinking some unthinkable thoughts"—particularly about our relations with the Soviet Union, its European satellites, Communist China, South Vietnam, Cuba, and Panama. The Senator made no concrete proposals for replacing any of the present Washington policies, but inferentially indicated the new course he would have our Nation pursue, especially in its relations with the Communist countries. He significantly omitted consideration of the German question—the privotal problem in East-West relations.

In his hot pursuit of "flexibility" and "realism," Senator FULBRIGHT found that "the character of the cold war has * * * been profoundly altered" because of the "radical change in relations between and within the Communist world." To him, the idea that "every Communist state is an unmitigated evil and relentless enemy of the free world" is a "myth." He insists that "we must distinguish between communism as an ideology and the power and policy of the Soviet state." To the Senator, "it is not communism as a doctrine, or communism as it is practiced within the Soviet Union or in any other country, that threatens us." He recognizes that the Soviet Union is "still a most formidable adversary," but believes that it has ceased to be totally and implacably hostile to the West. It "has shown a new willingness to enter mutually advantageous arrangements with the West."

According to FULBRIGHT, this "profound alteration" dates from the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 when Khrushchev became convinced that aggression and adventure involve unacceptable risks for him and his entire system. But the Senator fails to prove that the Soviet rulers have given up all adventurism and plans for future aggression as a result of the Caribbean confrontation. Moscow's ratification of the limited test ban treaty is no evidence of a profound and peaceful transformation. The late President Kennedy warned against such illusions when he pleaded for ratification of the limited test ban treaty: "This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our needs for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others." There is no guarantee against Soviet aggression in the Soviet-American agreement for cuts in the production of nuclear materials—stockpiled for years in large quantities. This agreement has no provisions for inspection or verification of any kind. President Johnson appropriately emphasized that "This is not disarmament."

It is important to note that on January 17, 1964, Khrushchev assured Castro that "communism is being constructed not only within the confines of the Soviet Union; we are doing everything to make communism victorious over the entire earth." One month later, Khrushchev reaffirmed before the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party that he has not "ceased to be totally implacably hostile to the West" and that: "The policy of American imperialism is that of gendarmelike repression of peoples and of the struggle against all that is new and revolutionary." In the current disarmament talks, Moscow has been most inflexible in its opposition to all effective international inspection and control. At the celebration of his 70th birthday in April, Khrushchev reiterated his Berlin ultimatum.

These are not myths but facts—the reality of the current world situation. Yet the Senator complains that: "We are predisposed to regard any conflict as a clash between conflicting interests. * * * It has become one of the self-evident truths of the postwar era that just as the President resides in Washington and the Pope in Rome, the Devil resides immutably in Moscow." Surely Senator FULBRIGHT knows that it was not the President of the United States who ordered the construction of the shameful wall which divides Berlin. It was not the Pope's "divisions" that drenched the streets of Budapest with the blood of the workers and students who wanted nothing more

than to live in peace and freedom. Only a devil could perpetrate these and other terrible crimes. And this "devil resides immutably in Moscow." In 1964, as in 1939, appeasement of dictators bent on world domination cannot lead to peace, regardless of the profoundest wishful thinking.

The basic differences dividing our country and its allies from the U.S.S.R. and Communist China involve two ways of life. The overriding issue of our times is between Communist tyranny and democracy, imperfect as it may be. The Communists aim to dominate the world and remold it on the Leninist-Soviet pattern; the Western Powers do not seek to dominate the world and remold it on any particular pattern of democracy. Though all Communist regimes agree that our democracy and its institutions must be destroyed and replaced with a totalitarian dictatorship, they are not always able to avoid disagreements among themselves over personalities, leadership, or methods of burying us. The extent to which a Communist state is a threat to human freedom and peace depends on its size, resources, economic and military capacities. Consequently, though all such states are unmitigated evils, they are not equally dangerous.

The totalitarian dogmas and deeds on the Soviet domestic front are integrally bound up with and reflected in the unswerving Soviet foreign policy for fomenting, financing and directing so-called wars of liberation in Latin America, Africa, and Asia and class war in the free world as a whole. Thus Khrushchev's principal mouthpiece, Pravda, underscored on December 6, 1963, that: "The CPSU and the Soviet people consider it their international duty to give all-round political and economic support and, if necessary, the help of arms, too, to the national liberation struggles of the people." But who is to decide what is a "national liberation struggle"? The Soviet Government, of course. And who is to decide when a "people's democracy" is truly democratic, for the people? The Soviet Government, of course. This is the most sacred of Kremlin dogmas. To forget this is to forget reality.

According to the Senator, "The monster myth of the cold war is that the Communist bloc is a monolith composed of governments which are not really governments at all but organized conspiracies." It is a terrible truth and not a monstrous myth that all these governments came into power through Communist subversive conspiracy or through imposition by the Soviet armies. They are foreign-imposed regimes. Moscow created the myth about their "monolithic unity" in order to mislead the Western World into believing that they have popular support. Hence, when the Senator fails to distinguish between the peoples of these countries and the regimes which oppress them, he, in effect, accepts this Communist myth as reality. Let none forget the East German revolt of June 17, 1953, the turbulence in Poland, unrest in Czechoslovakia and the revolution in Hungary.

From the very moment that the Chinese Communists seized power, it was clear that Red China could never be just another satellite. The serious rift with Peiping, the divisions in world communism, the severe agricultural crisis and other serious economic difficulties within the U.S.S.R. have forced Moscow to be less rigid in its relations with its European satellites. But it is no myth that Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland and Romania are still occupied by the Soviet Army. In Hungary, the Soviet Army of occupation totals 40,000. These foreign troops are not helping Hungary evolve "toward a free and open society." And in that most "liberal" of all Soviet satellites, Poland, the Gomulka regime has been stepping up its repressive measures against those seeking the advancement of freedom. Yet on the basis of the Senator's flexible approach, our Government would support the dictatorial regimes rather than the forces fighting for freedom.

There have been important changes within the Communist countries and in the relations between the Communist powers. These changes were made in order to preserve and consolidate the corroding dictatorships. But not a single one of these foreign-imposed regimes is "evolving toward a free and open society" or discontinuing support of the worldwide triumph of Communist tyranny. To the extent that any of these changes have improved conditions for the people, they have come in response to popular pressure and struggle and not as a result of preferred or flexible treatment of the dictatorial regimes by any Western country.

Senator FULBRIGHT in his talk specifically proposed that our country accept "the continued existence of the Castro regime as distasteful nuisance, but not as an intolerable danger so long as the nations of the hemisphere are prepared to meet their obligations of collective defense under the Rio treaty." While emphasizing that Castro is no threat to the United States, the Senator recognized that "Cuban communism" does pose a grave threat to other Latin American countries. His failure to realize that any dangerous threat to our Latin American neighbors is a threat to us can only encourage and strengthen the subversive Castroite forces financed and trained by Moscow who are continuing their conspiracy designed to destroy the democratic institutions and leaders in Latin America. It is significant that Castro lost no time in welcoming the Senator's notion of "reality" and "flexibility" in regard to his totalitarian regime.

Mr. FULBRIGHT seems to have missed the most important lesson of the postwar era. Soviet aggression and expansion westward have been deterred by Western unity and strength and not by the liberalization of any Communist regime. When Khrushchev's Russia and Mao's China become peaceful and democratic, like the German Federal Republic and Japan have become, then and then only should our Government help them overcome their difficulties. The fact that Moscow has joined us in conducting scientific projects in the snowy wastes of the Antarctic is no proof of its having become truly peaceful.

After the Fulbright address, Secretary of State Rusk hastened to remind the Nation that Soviet ground and nuclear forces are at the ready on the doorsteps of Western Europe and that, in the absence of assured arrangements for the mutual reduction of arms, it would be foolhardy to dismantle the military strength of NATO. The Soviet Government has yet to negotiate seriously on such vital problems as disarmament and self-determination for the German people. However, even in the face of these unpleasant realities, the Senator insists that, in a perverse way, we have grown rather attached to the cold war and prefer military rockets to public schools and moonflights to urban renewal.

It is high time to put aside all myths and face the realities confronting our country. The strongest and most aggressive military power in Europe is a Communist power—the U.S.S.R. This is no myth. The strongest and most aggressive military power in Asia is a Communist power—Mao's China. This is reality. The strongest and most aggressive military force in Latin America today is a Communist power—that distasteful nuisance—Castro's Cuba. This is far more than a distasteful nuisance. The divisions in the Communist camp will serve to strengthen the free world only if we exploit them in the cause of peace and freedom. On the other hand, the divisions and illusions in the Western camp, if continued, will invite new Communist aggressions. At this moment in history, the paramount task of the free world is to assure superior strength and restore its unity of policy and action.

GEORGE MEANY.

Mexican Academy of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I was recently greatly honored by being chosen as the recipient of an award from the Mexican Academy of International Law. The Academy's "Order of Law and Culture" bestowed upon me an honorary doctorate, a decoration which is awarded by the Mexican Academy of International Law to persons who have rendered service in the field of international law, world peace, brotherhood and human welfare.

The award, a beautiful certificate, bears the signatures of the Honorable Miguel Aleman, the former President of Mexico; Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, former Secretary of State of Mexico and one of the great statesmen of the Western Hemisphere; Dr. Luis G. Sevilla, president of the Mexican Academy of International Law, and other dignitaries. All of these men are sincere friends of the United States and supporters of democracy.

Needless to say, I am very grateful for this signal honor bestowed upon me. I shall cherish it all my life. In the meantime, I shall continue all efforts to maintain the best possible relations between our country and our good neighbor south of the Rio Grande.

In this connection, it is very timely to insert into the RECORD a brief article on the Mexican Academy of International Law, its history and some of the distinguished Mexican leaders associated with it. The article is written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, a well-known international attorney and former law partner of Dr. Padilla. Dr. Orleans has lived in Mexico for many years and is recognized as an authority on U.S.-Latin American relations. He is a writer, economist, and also a member of the Academy. I am placing his article in the RECORD:

THE MEXICAN ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Fred A. Orleans)

Miguel Hidalgo proclaimed the independence of Mexico on September 18, 1810. His legal adviser was Ignacio Aldama, an attorney, who on the inception of the war for independence became appointed the first attorney general of an independent Mexico.

When the first independent government of Mexico became established in Guadalajara, Ignacio Aldama was requested to formulate the foreign policy of Mexico He assembled the most distinguished and well-known jurists of the time and established a Permanent Seminary of Study of International Law. Thus at the end of 1810 the Mexican Academy of International Law was created.

The academy formulated the doctrine of international law for the Government of

Mexico, who, through the voice of Hidalgo, presented same and it became the declaration of foreign policy of Mexico. This declaration was delivered to the Government of Spain in March 1811 and it enunciated the principles of law which have been in force until our present era and which have formed the bases of international law in America, covering the following:

(a) The right of self-determination of all people.

(b) The right of all countries to be masters of their own destiny.

(c) The rights of nations to have their respective rights respected by others as the basis of peace.

(d) Nonintervention.

(e) Universal cordiality.

(f) Equality in diplomatic treatment.

In 1811 the first president of Mexican Academy of International Law, Ignacio Aldama was appointed Ambassador at Large of Mexico to negotiate an alliance with the Government of the United States and various European countries. He was betrayed during his journey and delivered to the Spaniards. Along with Hidalgo, Aldama was killed by the Spaniards in 1811, and both their heads were exhibited in the fortress of Granaditas in the city of Guanajuato. Thus the first president of the Mexican Academy of International Law became one of the heroes of the war of independence and a martyr of Mexico. The academy was honored by the fact that 14 of the original 19 attorney founders died in the struggle for Mexico to obtain its independence.

The academy has been in existence for 152 years.

The most distinguished jurists in international law have been and are now members of the academy. One of its presidents was the great Benito Juarez, "the benefactor of America." Among its present honorary members are prominent personalities of the world, including the Emporer of Ethiopia; Dr. Henry Spaak, the founder of the Union of European Countries; and several Presidents of Latin American Republics. The honorary president of the academy is Dr. Miguel Aleman, former President of Mexico, and one of the truly great men in the history of Mexico.

Among its directors are included the most distinguished jurists of Mexico. To name but two: Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, who has long been known as the "Chancellor of the Americas" and Dr. Jaime Torres Bodet, former director of UNESCO.

In 1960, in a solemn ceremony that took place at the Castle of Chapultepec, the Mexican Academy of International Law commemorated its 150th anniversary by creating the "Mexican Order of Law and Culture." This is the only organization of its kind and it was immediately registered among international organizations.

The "Mexican Order of Law and Culture" is a decoration awarded to those who through international law, diplomatic service, or international merits, have done something substantial for the advancement of world peace, fraternity of all people, and general welfare of humanity.

The highest decoration is the "Great Collar" which has been presented to two Presidents of the Republic of Mexico and several chiefs of state. The "Great Cross" is bestowed upon ambassadors who through their efforts have promoted international harmony.

It is worthy to mention that the "Great Collar" was bestowed upon its founder, Ignacio Aldama, and this collar is deposited in the crypt of heroes in Guanajuato. The "Great Collar" of President Benito Juarez is now exhibited in the National Palace in Mexico. The President of Mexico, Lic. Lopez Mateos, as well as the former President Miguel Aleman, wear their collars of this order.

The chancellor or governor of the order is Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, former Secretary of State of Mexico.

Dr. Dexter Perkins, America's Professor of History at the University of Rochester, Sums It Up on His 75th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my great thrills as a college student at the University of Rochester in Rochester, New York, back in the 1930's was to be able to sit at the feet of a great teacher and great historian, Dr. Dexter Perkins. I feel sure that my interest in public affairs and in politics stems very largely from an excitement first generated by Dr. Perkins through his enthusiastic and lively view of world and national affairs.

Approaching now his 75th birthday and still as active in mind and body as ever, Dr. Perkins took occasion the other day in an interview with the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle to sum up his views of the present and the future.

I am honored to include this article by John Heisner, which appeared in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle of Sunday, April 26, under leave to extend my remarks.

VIEW FROM HIS 75TH YEAR—DR. PERKINS SUMS IT UP: PEACE AND PROSPERITY

(By John Heisner)

With a 75th birthday coming up soon, Dr. Dexter Perkins paused the other afternoon to take a good look at the Nation and the world.

One of Rochester's more noted men of history says that he feels the world's future lies in constantly striving for improvement. Thus he describes himself as neither pessimistic nor optimistic, but rather he feels that he is an "ameliorist."

Sitting in the quiet of his living room Dr. Perkins explained that he sees a highly prosperous Western society in the years ahead and yet feels that what he calls the chasm between the "have" nations and those in the throes of undevelopment is enormous and, as it grows, so grows trouble.

On the subject of Red China, Dr. Perkins disagrees with the noted historian and philosopher Arnold Toynbee, who, in a Democrat and Chronicle article on April 12 predicted that that nation would be the strongest single national power by the year 2000. And while discussing China he brushed another subject dear to him; planned parenthood.

The Chinese, he feels, do not have the material resources to take over or even threaten the top spot of power. And besides they are "breeding like rabbits," which can only hinder them.

It would take all the columns in a Sunday paper to list the achievements, associations and things that have happened to Dr. Perkins. And if the vitality displayed by this gentleman during our talk is any sign, the list will continue to grow for many years.

Since joining the University of Rochester faculty as a young instructor in 1915, Dr. Perkins has become internationally known as an authority on American diplomatic history, the Monroe Doctrine, and a host of other subjects.

He has taken so many trips to Europe that he could probably sleep through the next one and not miss a thing.

Dr. Perkins retired in 1954 after 28 years as chairman of the university's history department, but from that year to 1959 he was John L. Senior, professor of American civilization at Cornell University. In 1950 he founded the Salzburg, Austria, Seminar of American Studies, hoping to give European students a clearer understanding of our country. He was president of the seminar for a number of years. In 1945–46 he became the first occupant of the chair of American history and institutions at Cambridge University, England.

Obviously, this man's history doesn't end with any of these achievements.

He hopes to lecture in England in the spring of 1965, he says happily, after explaining that he will do the same this fall at Wells College. The man will be 75 June 20 and looks and acts a generation younger.

He bears, as he has been told many times, an almost unnerving resemblance to Winston Churchill. And like Churchill, Dr. Perkins has strong opinions about things in this world.

He sees the Eastern and Western alliances slowly dissolving as various satellite nations in the East operate more freely within their syatems and Western allies, also feeling the need for independent action—De Gaulle, for a big instance—take actions more to their own interest. This explains the England-Cuba bus deal, among recent cases, which may not set too well with us.

However, he does not foresee—and he stresses that in this as with all his thoughts a change could occur any day as things happen about the globe—a situation in which the United States and Russia have to join forces against a powerful China or in what some prophets have indicated might become a "War of the Races."

"Nuclear weapons—notice I stress weapons, not just power—are at least a generation away for China," he said. Then he asked:

"Would Russia tolerate a nuclear China?"

Dr. Perkins is not optimistic about the problems of the undeveloped nations. "Many lack the natural resources and don't have a substantial scale of technical skills to call on. And there is no assurance of honest government in many of those new nations." Here he again mentioned the population problem as being important.

He thinks the best chance for development lies in Latin America. "If those nations," he maintains, "can control their currencies, as the Brazilians have not done, and can adopt reasonable attitudes toward foreign capital, there are substantial possibilities for development."

For our part he considers foreign aid not too heavy a gamble to take. He calls it a "matter of international helpfulness."

Dr. Perkins' range of interests is probably limitless. While we talked in his 316 Oxford Street home, he constantly lighted and relighted the same stubby cigar, and allowed the discussion to range throughout the world, from population and poverty problems to his wife's card-playing ability. And we ended up as most such discussions do, on politics.

Dr. Perkins expressed some concern, although not too much because he is of another political faith, over the dilemma of the national Republican party. "The Republicans don't seem to know just where they are going," he said. He feels that it will take a social upheaval to remove the Democrats from power, just as it took a depression to effectively end an extended period of mostly Republican rule.

We digressed for a moment into the enormous subject of civil rights, a subject which

simply couldn't be touched in the moment or two we had left. But he did, perhaps, sum up his feelings and thoughts on that subject when he said, "I think our Negro people are wonderful in the American way in which they are going about the job. The dignity and wisdom of the top leadership is something marvelous and deserving of comment."

With that we shook hands, he cocked his head in that Churchillian manner of his, and returned to that quiet living room to challenge the leadership of his wife in an altogether different field.

When the interview had begun he had been getting beaten by his charming wife at a card game called Russian Bank. Now he was about to apply some supreme individual effort toward improvement of that situation.

Economic Utopia Ahead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the proposal made recently by a group of economists and union leaders calling for pay without work is discussed in connection with the elimination of poverty in the following article by R. O. Beckman as it appeared in the Ft. Lauderdale News, April 13, 1964. I recommend it to my colleagues:

VINTAGE YEARS—ECONOMIC UTOPIA AHEAD?

(By R. O. Beckman)

Elimination of poverty, proposed by the President, faces many obstacles. Last week another roadblock was thrown in its path by a group of economists and union leaders with the claim that automation has broken the link between jobs and income. They proposed to to L.B.J. that the Government pay everyone an income whether he works or not.

The new economic utopia is expected to follow the application of cybernetics, the science that substitutes musclepower with machines. An adequate income is proposed for all. The "workless" paycheck will be a novel boon for millions of retirees already forced into an unsatisfactory life of leisure. It will also provide beer and skittles for some of the blue-collar workers to whom any work is an abomination. In a workless world it would appear that the rest of the population is likely to die of boredom.

The proposal of the freewheeling economists suggests a world in which a few masterminds will sit in ivory control towers and direct the operation of both machines and of human robots regimented into futile idleness. No proposals are made as to how the needed funds will be obtained nor whether a work-minded world can be transformed into one of leisure.

The English writer and critic, John Ruskin, once said: "Distribute the earth as you will, the principal question remains—Who is to dig it? Which of us is to do the hard and dirty work for the rest, and for what pay? Who * * * the pleasant and clean work? Who is to do no work, and for what pay?" The Western civilization is convinced that, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread": purposeful labor has become a traditional part of its religion. The retirement world has already become a partial vacuum—now a blanket of impotent indolence is to be spread over our wage earners.

Those who question the economic astrologers are asking: How can poverty be eliminated when there is no longer any incentive to perform the labor needed to prevent it? A recent Gallup poll indicated only 1 in 10 persons thought poverty could ever be done away with. A large majority thought that deprivation is due to lack of effort rather than circumstances beyond a person's control.

CAUSE SAME

Among older persons the cause of poverty is much the same as in the case of younger persons with one outstanding exception—large numbers are in need because of creeping inflation, a condition beyond their control. In their old age, pensions and other incomes buy half of what might have been expected in earlier years.

Privation can and will be minimized with intelligent guidance rather than gratuities on the part of Government. The injunction: "For ye have the poor always with ye" is more likely to become a dead phrase if self-inspired physical and mental labor continues to be regarded as a needed virtue.

Israel's 16th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Israel's 16th anniversary celebration, held Thursday evening, April 16, at the Educational Alliance, 197 East Broadway, New York City, under the auspices of the New Era Club—Israel Cummings Forum, Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation throughout my congressional district, delivered before a crowded gathering a salute to our friend in the Near East. It is with pleasure that I insert Mr. Schlacht's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Israel Consul General Judith Beilin, Rabbi Seymour Nulman, Mr. and Mrs. Israel Cummings, George Palley, Congressman Leonard Farbstein, Mannes Lipski, George Freedman and dear neighbors:

It is with a deep sense of elation that I stand before you to express my sentiments in regard to Israel's 16th birthday. Mention of this special day makes my heart and yours pulsate with great joy.

It brings to mind the struggles and tribulations of this young nation since it was founded in 1948, and the great progress it has achieved since then.

It is almost hard to believe how a little nation, with all the odds against it, could have overcome most of its difficulties and won the respect and admiration of freedom-loving countries the world over.

Israel may be small in point of wealth, military power, population or material resources when compared with other nations, but in gallantry and perseverance, in intellectuality and spiritual grandeur, she can match them anytime, if left alone to pursue the paths of peace and goodwill.

To be sure, Israel is a comparatively young nation. She is only 16 years old. In point of history, such a measure of time is infinitely too short to determine in any way the growth, development, and the future of any nation. But in the case of Israel she has performed wonders which would have been considered impossible 16 years ago.

There were nations that predicted her early death, but these evil prophets were fooled, because they did not have the capacity to understand the undying dedication of the Israel people.

The citizens of Israel love their land intensely. They are an indomitable people. They have suffered the deepest sorrows and afflictions of any race. They have endured every conceivable torture in the catalog of atrocities. They remember with trepidation how thousands of their fellow victims—fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters—had been forcibly driven out of their homes and into the streets by ruthless storm troopers, compelling them to march, six or seven abreast, with upraised hands for many long hours, to be finally carted away in freight trains to distant places for extinction.

They recall with vividness how many of their beloved ones had been thrown into huge burning furnaces in order to carry out Nazi Germany's attempt to wipe out every remnant of the Jewish race.

No wonder the Israeli people have been hardened, toughened, chastened by their past experiences, and are alert to any imminent danger to their homeland. They face the future grimly, confidently, prepared, because they know that they must not, dare not, experience the horrows of the past. But they cherish their land, the birthplace of their freedom, and their hopes are focused upon the future.

Strangely enough, Israel is faced with a dilemma, with a paradox, with a contradiction. She wants peace with her Arab neighbors, but cannot have it. She extends the hand of friendship, but it is spurned. Notwithstanding the fact that she was created by the United Nations, her Arab neighbors have proclaimed to the world that Israel must be destroyed at such time in the future as is most suitable for them.

The Arab nations seem to pay no attention to the U.N., even though they belong to it and are pledged under the charter to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Since they manifest such indifference to this world organization, and since they look to our country for economic and financial assistance, might it not be a good idea for the President of the United States to intervene and set in motion peace negotiations to adjust the basic differences between Israel and the Arab world? This is a simple suggestion worth reflecting upon.

The Arab world looks upon Israel with dire forebodings—and with good reason. It cannot afford to expose its people with its rampant ignorance and poverty to the gaze of the Israelis, with their splendid culture, their throbbing cities, and their high standards of living. It will exert every conceivable pressure to thwart Israel's attempt to prosper as a nation.

Israel's rapid growth and expansion are a thorn to the Arab countries. Because of that, the Arab leaders are planning to divert the flow of water in Lebanon and Syria so that Israel will not be able to use sufficient water from the Sea of Galilee and thus prevent her from irrigating the Negev Desert, so vital of her existence. King Hussein of Jordan, now visiting the United States, has said the other day that Israel's plans to divert water would "bring more inhabitants to the Negev and thus increase the mortal danger which the Arabs already feel as a result of the existence of Israel."

Israel is at heart a peace-loving nation, which recognizes the folly and futility of war. Someday the Arab nations will learn to their regret that it is better, for the good of all, to live at peace than to be at war. After all that has been said, we must not forget that tonight is a joyous occasion. It is Israel's "Sweet Sixteenth Birthday." What a fine gesture it would be to pay her

homage by purchasing Israeli bonds or making contributions to the United Jewish Appeal. If your duty to this gallant little nation is fulfilled, then you can truly say with pride: "We too have done our share to advance the cause of Israel."

In Memory of 1st Lt. James R. Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1964, in Scotland Neck, N.C., a plaque from the grateful citizens of that community was dedicated in memory of 1st Lt. James R. Foster, a Marine Attack Squadron 225 pilot who died from injuries when his plane crashed near the town on March 20, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, this young marine from Wichita Falls, Tex., performed a great act of heroism which undoubtedly saved the lives of many of the citizens of this North Carolina community. The jet he was flying developed engine trouble near Scotland Neck as he was returning to Cherry Point from a low-altitude training mission. Lieutenant Foster deliberately delayed ejection until his plane had cleared the populated area of Scotland Neck, and he died in the crash of his plane. He was posthumously awarded a Distinguished Flying Cross.

His lovely mother, Mrs. John R. Foster of Wichita Falls, Tex., was in attendance at the dedication ceremony. She later traveled to Washington, where it was my pleasure to accompany her to the White House. President Johnson invited her for a visit in his office, and spent a great deal of his time in talking with Mrs. Foster.

Mr. Speaker, the dedicatory remarks in Scotland Neck were delivered by Mr. W. E. Debnam, of Greenville, N.C., a well-known news commentator in that area, and a fine public-spirited citizen. I present the outstanding address he delivered on that occasion:

ADDRESS BY W. E. DEBNAM, GREENVILLE, N.C., IN MEMORY OF 1ST LT. JAMES R. FOSTER

Madam President, loved ones of the hero to whom we pay tribute, gentlemen of the military and citizens of the fine town of Scotland Neck, as I stand here this afternoon I am humbled by the realization that I am standing, and we are gathererd, in the presence—in the spiritual presence—of the young man who a little less than a year ago gave his life to defend the liberties of all of us and, more immediately, to save the lives of some of us gathered here.

I can feel the presence of Marine pilot, 1st Lt. James R. Foster—his spiritual presence—and I know you can feel it too and it fills me, as I know it does you, with a deep sense of humility and gratitude.

I am humbled, too, by the realization of my own inadequacy to put into words any really fitting tribute to his act of supreme sacrifice and his memory.

It is fitting, it is eminently fitting, that an expression of this community's appreciation of and gratitude for Lieutenant Foster's act of sacrifice should be perpetuated by the bronze plaque on display here.

It is eminently fitting, too, that this plaque should be displayed in the foyer of the Scotland Neck High School where, let us hope, down through the long generations the boys and girls of this fine community will pause before it from time to time to read the words there and, from the reading, gain increased realization of and devotion to those principles for which Lieutenant Foster, to borrow the words of Abraham Lincoln, gave the last full measure of devotion.

This challenge to rededication, my friends, is not limited to the high school boys and girls of this and future generations.

There are some of us more advanced in years, some to whom our high school days are but a fading memory, who need to read and read again these words to renew our own appreciation of and dedication to the principles of service to our Nation and our fellow man for which Lieutenant Foster had the courage to give his life.

There are many kinds of courage, and many definitions.

One I like is by George Farquhar: "Courage," he says, "is an independent spark from heaven's bright throne, by which the soul stands raised, triumphant, high, alone."

That definition, it seems to me, applies especially to the kind of courage displayed by Lieutenant Foster at that moment when, high and alone at the controls of his jet attack plane, engaged in what had been until then an ordinary low-level navigation exercise, the plane's engine suddenly froze while over Scotland Neck and he was confronted with the decision of whether to eject immediately and make sure of saving his own life or stay at the controls long enough to make sure his plane crashed in an unpopulated area.

The date was March 20.

It was at the beginning of spring and that morning as he soared over our North Carolina countryside, Lieutenant Foster, who had observed his 24th birthday less than 2 months before, must have enjoyed the experience of witnessing again and being a part of the annual miracle of the world's reawakening—that beautiful season of the year when in all of nature the accent is on life and growing things.

It was then that Lieutenant Foster, in the springtime of his own lifespan, had to make his great decision: He had to choose between the certain saving of his own life or risking death to save the lives of others.

He chose the latter course and it cost him his life.

Of what was born Lieutenant Foster's courage—the courage that prompted him, contrary to the inborn instinct of self-preservation, to risk his own life to save others?

No one can answer that question for sure.

But one can speculate upon it.

I think one thing that prompted that decision—and he had to make it in a matter of seconds—was the training he got during the years after he joined the Marine Corps on March 1, 1958.

And I take this occasion to salute his comrades in arms gathered here this afternoon and all others of the military everywhere—especially those who fly and maintain the planes, some of them big, some of them small, all of them fast and getting faster, that are our first line of defense.

Their's is strenuous and hazardous duty—a fact some of us at times forget.

Remember it the next time you look up and see the long vapor trail of a military plane etched high against the sky.

And remember, too, the next time you are disturbed by a sonic boom that that's the sound a plane and its crew make defending our freedom.

But Lieutenant Foster was 19 years old when he joined the Marine Corps. The Corps had him only 5 years.

That day he signed up, his character, the kind of boy he was, the kind of man he would be, had already been decided. And who and what molded that character?

We don't have to speculate as to the answer to that question.

It was molded, my friends, as is being molded the character of millions of other boys and girls throughout this land of ours, by the year after year training by precept and example of his parents.

I quote now one brief excerpt from a letter from Lieutenant Foster's mother to a friend in Scotland Neck:

"Jimmie was born January 29, 1939, in Wichita Falls, Tex., and died March 20, 1963. He was baptized into the First Baptist Church when he was 8 years old."

What volumes are told in that simple statement. There's no need of my enlarging upon it.

We are honored to have Lieutenant Foster's mother—Mrs. Cora Foster—with us this afternoon and we salute her for the vital role she played in the making of the man to whom we pay tribute.

The grass is green now on the grave of marine pilot, 1st Lt. James R. Foster.

Another spring is almost here.

Soon this assembly will end and each will go his or her separate way leaving an empty building with a new bronze plaque, upon the wall, a plaque upon which is engraved a terse report of how a young man gave his life in order that others might live.

But as we go, let there be engraved too in our minds and upon our hearts the lasting memory and appreciation of his sacrifice.

Thank you.

With love and appreciation,

W. E. DEBNAM.

New York State Bar Favors Federal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of the New York State Bar Association urging increased salaries for Federal Judges and Members of Congress, a statement in which I wholeheartedly concur:

RELEASE NO. 35

ALBANY, April 21, 1964.—The Executive Committee of the New York State Bar Association today urged the Congress of the United States "to provide appropriate increases in the compensation of Federal Judges and Members of Congress."

Adoption of the resolution was urged by Lawrence E. Walsh of New York City, State Bar Vice President for the First Judicial District and chairman of the Bar's Committee on Judiciary.

In asking for the increased pay for Judges, Mr. Walsh noted that Federal District Court Judges presently receive $22,500, while those on the U.S. Court of Appeals are paid $25,500 annually. This compares with salaries of Justices of the New York Supreme Court which range from $28,500 to $34,500, while Supreme Court Justices serving on appellate division benches receive from $30,500 to $37,500. Mr. Walsh noted that Federal Courts try a great many cases in which State Courts have equal jurisdiction, thus reducing the load of those cases in New York State tribunals.

With respect to congressional salaries, Mr. Walsh pointed out the trend to longer ses-

sions has increased the living expenses of Members of Congress while reducing their ability to earn income from private employment between sessions. He added that the increased cost of campaigning alone was creating an additional financial handicap to Members and to those seeking election.

Yesterday's Sin Is Tomorrow's Virtue—How Come?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the publication Leather and Shoes of October 19, 1963, entitled "Yesterday's Sin Is Tomorrow's Virtue—How Come?"

The editorial points out some of the evils of the outrageous price-fixing bill erroneously titled "The Quality Stabilization Bill":

YESTERDAY'S SIN IS TOMORROW'S VIRTUE—HOW COME?

Remember the little logics we used to be taught in economics? Like, for instance, that price was the result of the forces of supply and demand meeting in the marketplace * * * and that the United States maintained its commerce at a high level of growth and prosperity through something called free enterprise. Ah, that was the uncomplicated stuff that memories are made of, truisms far too unsophisticated for today's world.

A professor of political science, economics, logic, or philosophy might be hard pressed to explain to his teenage son why, in the recent past, administrators of certain large manufacturing concerns were prosecuted by the Federal Government for the crime of "fixing prices." If, within a few months, the same Federal Government not only gives its blessings to price fixing but has Congress planning to make price fixing both legal and moral by law.

Currently, the measure before Congress is known by a most inaccurate title—the quality stabilization bill.

According to a recent editorial in the New York Herald Tribune:

"A 'quality stabilization bill,' a citizen might suppose, would be a bill having something to do with quality stabilization. But that's where said citizen would betray his innocence of legislative namesmanship."

Continuing, the editorial points out that the bill is "a plain old-fashioned price-fixing bill dressed up in a new name." According to the Herald Tribune, today's proposed quality stabilization measure is "what used to be called fair trade until the silly sham of that monicker got across to the public, then masqueraded in the last Congress as a 'fair competitive practice bill.'"

Reportedly, the legislation has been opposed by the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Justice Department, the President's Consumers' Advisory Council, the American Bar Association, the AFL-CIO, and the American Farm Bureau.

Certainly every retailer and every footwear manufacturer, particularly those producing branded merchandise, should take a long, hard look at what the proposed measure portends.

Regardless of what imaginative name it carries, a bill of the quality-stabilization ilk is a blantant attack on the right to compete—the right to a pursuit of economic happiness.

Essentially, a measure such as this would make it most difficult, to say the least, for discounters to continue the trend toward upgrading merchandise. They would be prohibited from offering branded merchandise at prices below that of traditional outlets.

How serious is this situation in the eyes of discounters? Modern Retailer, trade paper serving the discount and self-service department store field, recently carried as its page 1 lead story an article headlined, "Discounters Form 11-Man Committee To Fight Passage of 'Fair Trade' Bill."

This committee plans, as part of its overall campaign, Congressional liaison, publication of educational booklets, and the distribution of printed matter to key organizations and the general public.

Support is due these people. They are beginning a fight which far transcends protection of the discount industry. Involved is the principle of basic economic freedom upon which pivots the concept of our capitalistic enterprise.

Michigan City News Dispatch Says, "Enlarge This Aid Program"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from a recent issue of the Michigan City (Ind.) News Dispatch concerning one aspect of our foreign aid program:

ENLARGE THIS AID PROGRAM

The $3.4 billion foreign aid program which President Johnson submitted to Congress cuts or holds the line in most fields. But in one it asks a whopping increase from $180 million to $300 million.

Government wants to enlarge the major-risk guarantees given to qualified American firms which are willing to launch private enterprises in underdeveloped countries.

Normally, such guarantees might be undesirable. The essence of free enterprise is calculated risk for reasonable gain. Judgment backed with money can become careless when risks are removed or lessened. Similarly, there is less pressure for crisply efficient operation.

But these are not normal times—particularly in Latin America where there is critical need for development and economic commonsense. One can hardly blame private firms for shunning enterprises which risk expropriation, as in Cuba, or dilution by inflation, as in Brazil.

Thus, major-risk guarantees are both desirable and necessary if these countries are to get stable economics built on a solid base of healthy private industries forced by competition to sustain themselves.

Without the risk-reward, sink-or-swim spirit of free enterprise, aid poured into underdeveloped countries tends to dribble endlessly down ratholes.

When coupled with private capitalism, as in the risk-guarantee program, our aid dollars are more wisely spent. Congress should go along with the requested enlargement of this phase of foreign aid.

Civil Rights Bill—Titles V and VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again the New York Times has done us and the American people a service by its editorial on the civil rights bill. Today's editorial discusses the much misunderstood title—title VI. I urge all my colleagues to take the time to read the following editorial:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 7, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL—IV

Continuing our detailed analysis of the civil rights bill as it now stands before the Senate, we examine today titles V and VI.

Title V provides merely for extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another 4 years, almost a routine matter.

But title VI deals with a much more difficult and complex question: discrimination by State and local officials in the use of Federal aid funds. This is a particularly troubling problem that has agitated Congress for years. An elaborate mechanism to deal with it is set up in the pending bill.

First it repeals all inconsistent provisions of Federal statutes and declares that no person shall be subjected to discrimination "under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Then it directs agencies handling certain programs, not including Federal insurance activities, to take definite steps to carry out this purpose—including, if necessary, termination of aid to any institution that continues to discriminate.

Actual withholding of funds can come only after a series of protective steps. Each agency's rules against discrimination must be approved by the President before taking effect. Before funds are withheld for violation of agency rules, there must be an effort to obtain voluntary compliance, a hearing and 30 days' notice to the appropriate congressional committees. Any final decision to stop funds is made subject to judicial review.

The title does not require suspension of an aid program to an entire State if one county or institution discriminates. The action would be directed only at that place or facility. The title has nothing to do with Federal installations such as Army camps. Its exception to mandatory action for insurance programs was written in to make clear that the individual farmer's crop insurance, the citizen's bank deposit insurance or the homeowner's mortgage guarantee could not be cut off.

Even with all the safeguards written into the title, we admit to some disquiet at the idea of cutting off Federal funds. But it is important to keep some considerations in mind.

One is the unfairness of excluding some citizens from the benefits of Government funds. When Federal money builds a dam and creates a lake in Mississippi, it is outrageous that Negroes should not be allowed to swim in it. A second point is that any southern community can escape the threat of losing Federal support simply by ending its racial discrimination and complying with the Constitution.

There is, third, the practical consideration that the administrator of any Federal program will believe in it and will do anything he can to keep it going. The likelihood is that in almost every case the Government would sue to end discrimination in

a State facility—as titles III and IV of the pending legislation would allow it to do—rather than cut off aid.

The administration originally proposed to end the matter there, by authorizing suits. But the House felt that action to end discriminatory use of Federal money should be mandatory, not discretionary. We have come to the conclusion that if the issue is not faced now, it will have to be later. We think, on balance, that Congress should make its decision now and declare that in the rare case of the ultimate choice, no aid is better than aid to one race only.

"El Diario-La Prensa"—A Newspaper Serves Its Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission, I want to call the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to an article by Barbara Sapinsley, "El Diario: Campeon de los Boricuas," which appeared in the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune on April 26, 1964. "El Diario-La Prensa" has the largest Spanish-language circulation in the Nation. The Puerto Rican population of my own 21st Congressional District in the Bronx are included in this wide circulation.

This popular and exceptional daily paper is well known for its human relations department, its splendid cooperation with the city welfare department and the fire and police departments. Concerned with all phases of human relations—including housing and education—"El Diario-La Prensa" has given assistance and comfort to thousands of American Puerto Rican newcomers to the city during its 16 years of existence, and continues to do so today under the direction of its capable owner, Mr. O. Roy Chalk. My fellow Members of the Congress will find this article interesting and informative:

EL DIARIO: "CAMPEON DE LOS BORICUAS"

(By Barbara Sapinsley)

Some weeks ago New York newspapers reported that a Puerto Rican laborer had left a paper bag containing his life's savings in a subway car. His first thought was not, as might be expected, to tell the police. He headed straight for the offices of El Diario-La Prensa, a Spanish-language newspaper published daily in New York. Not until the newspaper called did the police learn of the loss and get a chance to do something about it.

About the same time, a Puerto Rican factory worker was blinded in an explosion at his plant. His first step, once the initial shock was over, was to visit El Diario. The paper found a Spanish-speaking surgeon and persuaded him to take the worker's case without fee. From a special contingency fund, it paid for the man's bed and other hospital charges.

Yet another Puerto Rican recently arrived in New York had selected and paid for a small hi-fi stereo combination from a store display. He had been given a prewrapped carton which, it turned out, contained a phonograph that was neither hi-fi nor stereo. When he returned to the store to complain, he was brusquely told, "That's what you bought." He went directly to El Diairo, which promptly referred the case to the Better Business Bureau. The store suddenly discovered its error and exchanged the non-hi-fi stereo set for the one the man had originally chosen.

These nonjournalistic deeds are all part of a day's work at El Diario, which in its 16 years of existence has become to New York's Puerto Rican community what the Tammany Hall clubhouses were to the newly arrived Irish in the 19th century and the Landsmonschafts to the Jewish immigrants in the early 20th century—a place of refuge and sympathy, a problem solver, shield, and protector.

During the past 12 months alone, some 6,500 people have journeyed through all kinds of weather to the newspaper's offices in a ramshackle building at Duane and Hudson Streets which one housed the now-defunct PM. There they wait patiently, sometimes for hours, in the corridors outside the windowless 10- by 14-foot room—scarcely more than a generous-size walk-in closet—that is the office of Ismael Lopez, a 41-year-old psychologist and former high school teacher, who heads up what El Diario calls its human relations department. Hundreds more call in or tell their troubles personally to a social worker who travels through the five boroughs of New York, southern Connecticut, and eastern New Jersey in an El Diario mobile unit. In the 9 years of its operation, the department has helped 100,000 people—about one-eighth of the area's Puerto Rican population.

Except for El Diario, none of the 18 foreign language daily newspapers in New York City has anything like a human relations department, much less a mobile unit designed to listen to readers' troubles. Il Progresso, the city's only Italian-language daily, used to have something like it in the person of one Salvatore Pina, a lawyer who handled the paper's legal work and public relations and helped out its readers on the side. The big question in the 1930's for Il Progresso readers, publisher Fortune Pope recalls, was how to register for the newly legislated social security program. In the 1940's it was what to do about the Smith Alien Registration Act.

Similarly, James Vlastos, editor of Atlantis, one of New York's two Greek-language dailies, recalls that 30 years ago Greeks came to the paper's offices with enough problems to occupy a couple of people. Today one man can cope with all the questions—most of them about social security, citizenship, and immigration—that come up—Vlastos also reports, ruefully, that the most popular part of his paper today is the obituary page—a mark of how old his readership is getting.

And Adolph Held, 79-year-old general manager of the Jewish Daily Forward, largest of the three Yiddish dailies left in New York, says the biggest change in his paper through the years is that the lively "Letters to the Editor" column is now filled with complaints from grandmothers about being neglected by their children and grandchildren. When he was young, Held says, these same grandmothers were complaining about their boyfriends and other problems familiar to any reader of Ann Landers. Forward readers, he says rarely turned to the paper for help; they seemed to have more confidence in the corner druggist.

El Diario's readers, in sharp contrast, do tend to turn to the newspaper for a number of reasons—some familiar, some unique. As the latest mass arrivals in New York, the Puerto Ricans are, of course, lowest in the pecking order. But they face problems considerably more complex than their Irish, German, Italian, and Jewish forerunners had. When these latter groups were arriving en masse in New York, their biggest problem was finding a job at an adequate wage. The country was still expanding and a man's hands were effective tools. If his spirit was willing and his back was strong, there was, more often than not, always something he could do. For many mid-20th century newcomers in New York, however, willingness to work is no longer enough. "Today society does not pay for strength," as Dr. Howard A. Rusk, head of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at NYU's Medical Center has observed. "It pays only for two things—the skills in your hands and what you have in your head." Meanwhile, the ways in which the uninformed and the unintegrated can be exploited are bigger and better than ever.

El Diario's protective role in its readers' lives rests on other ground, too. "The average Puerto Rican is brought up to fear God and the cops in that order," says Ismael Lopez. (In Puerto Rico the police double as truant officers, and parents are liable to fine or imprisonment for the misconduct of their children. Thus the policeman as bogeyman is a view of him learned early and reinforced often.) "The average New York policeman doesn't understand this," Lopez says. "He figures that anyone who acts scared must be guilty of something." Thus many Puerto Ricans prefer to turn to a newspaper that speaks their language than the law or, by extension, authority in any form.

With such things going for it, then, it is no surprise that El Diario alone among the city's 18 foreign-language dailies has been showing a more or less steady growth trend in recent years. It now leads them all in circulation (85,000 today versus 20,000 10 years ago) and has a pass-along readership variously estimated at from 4 to 10 readers per copy. It's editorial staff has grown from an original eight to 35. In its tabloid format, man in the street writing style and heavy reliance on features and columnists, El Diario sometimes resembles the Daily News, sometimes the Post. For national and foreign news it relies on the wire services, with particular emphasis on United Press International's Spanish wire from Latin America. Predictably, many stories are narrowly angled (a followup story on the death of General MacArthur was illustrated with a picture of a Puerto Rican boy bearing a home-made wreath to the Armory on Park Avenue). But El Diario also printed, along with most papers outside the Iron Curtain, the UPI dispatch from Germany revealing Marlene Dietrich's age.

Elsewhere, El Diario relies on the staples of tabloid journalism: an inquiring reporter ("El Pueblo Habla"), an advice to the lovelorn column ("Consultorio Sentimental"), beauty tips ("Para ser mas bella") and a horoscope. Drew Pearson is there in Spanish along with Walt Disney's "El Pato Donald" and Bud Sagendorf's "Popeye El Marino."

But along with these things is El Diario's unmistakable special sense of mission in speaking for the Puerto Rican community in New York, and being responsive to it. While everything else in the paper is in Spanish, its editorials are printed in both Spanish and English—Spanish for its regular readers, of course, and English for legislators and diplomats in Albany and Washington and in city hall who are on a special mailing list. And more important, in grassroots terms, is its human relations department—a setup unique in American journalism today.

The department was not part of the paper's original prospectus when it was founded in 1948 by Dr. Porfirio Dominici, a practicing physician from the Dominican Republic. As he did battle with La Prensa, for years New York's only Spanish language daily, and tried to build readership as New York's Puerto Rican population soared after the Second World War, Dr. Dominici discovered that so many readers were showing up at the office to get help that his staff of

reporters had little time to report. Obviously, his readers needed help and he couldn't refuse them a hearing, but he had a newspaper to get out. So in the mid-1950's, he lined up some volunteer clergymen, social workers and lawyers for the express purpose of helping New York's Puerto Ricans to learn to help themselves. The volunteer setup gave way a few years later to the four-man staff now headed by Ismael Lopez.

Some of the cases El Diario's human relations department has tackled are bizarre, like the case of the man who was stopped without apparent reason by a policeman, searched and asked where he had bought his suit. (It no longer had the label inside the coat.) The man said he had bought it at a 14th Street store a few years before. The policeman took him to the nearest police station and charged him with stealing the suit. But the majority of the cases concern the petty injustices which can loom so large when one is a stranger, injustices which, if not adjusted, can turn the law-abiding into bitter, antisocial citizens; rent gouging, job discrimination, consumer fraud, police brutality, negligent landlords.

El Diario refers some 50 to 70 consumer frauds a month to the State attorney general's office. The most common type is the delivery to a customer of something other than what he bought. Electrical appliance and furniture dealers seem to be the greatest offenders. Overpricing is the second most widely practiced fraud. Lopez himself was victimized this way when he first came to New York 7 years ago. He stopped into a little store on Delancey Street and contracted to buy an Admiral television set for $394 in weekly payments. Some weeks later, browsing in a big appliance store uptown, he discovered the identical model for $199.

The usual housing problem—and there are easily 100 a week—is an apartment with broken windows, leaky plumbing, plaster gone from ceiling and walls, hallways filled with rubbish, a plague of rats and roaches, and a landlord who does nothing about any of it.

El Diario checks the legitimacy of the complaint. If the conditions are as described—or bad enough—it files a complaint with the rent control office and checks to find what the legal rent for the premises is. If the tenant is being overcharged, the office must order the rent lowered. If the rent is legal but no repairs are made, it can order a 10-percent decrease. If repairs are not made within a prescribed length of time, El Diario files another complaint. It keeps this up until something is done. In one Bronx building these tactics got one tenant's rent reduced to $1 a month before the landlord started to repair.

Unlike the immigrant of an earlier, less industrialized and mechanized age, the Puerto Rican is faced with a string of secondary problems stemming from the basic one of finding a job. An employment agency can bilk him. An applicant may be placed in what the agency says is a permanent job at, say, $65 a week, and might be charged $15 as an immediate first installment on the fee of 1 week's salary. When he reports to work, he discovers that the job is for only 2 days and he will be paid $10 per day. The fee for temporary work is 10 percent, in this case $2. The agency claims the job was permanent and that if it didn't last, the applicant must have failed. A telephone call from El Diario usually produces a refund of the overcharge. The paper also files a complaint with the license bureau. When enough complaints accumulate, the bureau investigates. Some oftreported agencies have lost their licenses as a result of repeated overcharges.

His union can let him down. A Puerto Rican who loses his job for what he considers insufficient cause might go to his union's business agent for help and be sloughed off. El Diario telephones the business agent and investigates the circumstances. Often, awed by the mystique of the power of the press, the business agent finds that something can be done after all, and the man is either reinstated or placed in a comparable job.

A constant source of worry to the Puerto Rican is fear of police brutality. Many Puerto Ricans wanted for questioning as witnesses to crimes, or as suspects, turn themselves in to the newspaper in preference to the police or FBI. Puerto Ricans also turn in found property—wallets, passports, checkbooks, money, even an occasional gun—to the newspaper, fearing they will be charged with theft if they go to the police.

Two years ago Dr. Dominici sold El Diario (circulation then: 62,000) to O. Roy Chalk, owner of the Washington, D.C., transit system and Trans-Caribbean Airways. Shortly thereafter, Chalk bought the rival La Prensa and merged them. Since then the paper has increased in circulation and, to a lesser extent, in size. Its American editor has been replaced by a Spanish one, Sergio Santelices, who was its managing editor for 5 years and then the managing editor of La Prensa at the time of the merger. And its political position has shifted from nonpartisan (Dr. Dominici was more interested in politics in Latin America than in the United States) to ardently Democratic.

Editorially, it has also become more militant. Among the causes El Diario has espoused, some successfully, some not, are.

Literacy tests in Spanish as well as English. (A bill has been introduced in Albany, but the paper sees hard sledding ahead; to pass it would require a change in the State constitution.)

Curbing the sale of firearms, a position intensified since President Kennedy's assassination. (Bills are pending in Albany.)

Apprentice programs for Puerto Ricans in the construction unions.

Maintaining free tuition at city colleges.

Improved housing, especially rat control.

Improved schooling.

As far as this last campaign goes, many Puerto Ricans, though they join Negroes in joint protests of mutually shared injustices, prefer not to be identified with the Negro community. El Diario is less interested in physical integration than it is in better facilities and better teaching. Too often, Sergio Santelices says, Puerto Ricans children who don't understand the teachers' questions because of their unfamiliarity with English are classified as mentally backward and relegated to special classes, where they spend year after year modeling in soap and growing up illiterate.

Both editor and publisher feel the human relations department furthers the paper's basic aim, which is to establish a greater affinity with its readers, create reader-loyalty, and increase circulation (a nonreader helped usually becomes a reader). El Diario works closely with the city's welfare, fire and police departments. Police Commissioner Murphy is all for cooperation to improve police-Puerto Rican relations. The welfare office, in fact, has designated one of its staff to serve as liaison with the paper.

Though the number of complaints coming in to El Diario since the early days of the department has increased, the staff has decreased. The clergymen and lawyers are gone. Many cases which the paper would have handled personally in the past it now refers to appropriate organizations or city departments, on the theory that it is not really helping Puerto Ricans to become New Yorkers unless it can teach them their rights and duties, and how to practice both.

How successful this has been is hard to measure. The city's department of city planning, in a recently released report, claims that the Puerto Rican is in a better educational and economic position today than he was and, in general, is "settling in" to the melting pot like the immigrants from other lands who preceded him. There have also been published reports that there has been a drop in charges by minorities of police brutality and an improvement in police attitudes toward minorities. Yet very recently, there has been outcry in the press and on the streets over the police killing of three Puerto Rican youths in recent months, and a charge of unprovoked police beating of a Puerto Rican during an arrest. Puerto Ricans continue to come to El Diario in preference to the law.

The melting pot may be at work, but El Diario doesn't anticipate that the need for its human relations department will be melted away in the foreseeable future.

Address of the Honorable J. L. Robertson at the 30th Convention of the Independent Bankers Association on April 11, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Gov. J. L. Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board, made the following address entitled, "Federal Bank Supervision: the Real and the Ideal," before the 30th annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association at Minneapolis, Minn., on April 11, 1964.

Governor Robertson, with his excellent ability to tie together the unfortunate characteristics of the present bank supervision hodgepodge, has again recommended that the Congress enact my bill, H.R. 5874. This bill would provide the supervisory structure of a Federal Banking Commission as suggested by Governor Robertson.

The Governor's remarks follow:

FEDERAL BANK SUPERVISION: THE REAL AND THE IDEAL

A strong nation, like ours, is not afraid to confront its weaknesses. Hence, I regard it as a duty of public officials to speak openly about defects in our governmental structure, especially those for which they think they have solutions. Moreover, in my own case, at least, this is one way of expressing my appreciation for the opportunity to serve in a position of public trust.

Today I want to talk about defects in Federal bank supervision. I might begin by telling you that when I think of it—as it exists today—I am reminded of a trick rider I saw, as a boy, at the Custer County Fair back in Broken Bow, Nebr. He balanced on the backs of a pair of galloping horses—a foot on each one—with a great air of daring and unconcern. Of course, when I recall that scene in this context, the individual banker is in the position of the rider; he does not have any reins or other means of controlling the horses; he has three horses to ride, not two; each of them constantly threatens to gallop off in a different direction; and the rider is anything but unconcerned.

Everyone knows that Federal bank supervision has grown up like Topsy, that it is divided among three agencies, the Office of

the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve System, and that as a result there are overlapping powers and conflicting policies, along with inefficiencies and inconsistencies.

For many years this hodgepodge arrangement worked fairly well, but only because it was manned by people who understood that its successful operation required a high degree of comity and cooperation, together with an atmosphere of candor, patience, tolerance, and willingness to work harmoniously to solve the difficult problems that constantly arise.

However, dangerous weaknesses are built into the structure itself. This caused me to suggest, 2 years ago, that the Federal bank supervisory powers now diffused among the three agencies should be transferred—lock, stock, and barrel—into a single new agency, a Federal Banking Commission. It was my view that this would achieve needed uniformity and greater effectiveness and efficiency—as well as reduce the cost—of Federal bank supervision.

One year ago, a Cabinet-level Committee on Financial Institutions, created by President Kennedy, reviewed, among other things, the practices of the Federal bank supervisory agencies. The Committee noted, in its report, that the agencies had not always been able to achieve the needed cooperation and coordination. It recommended that stronger efforts be made to achieve harmony under common standards, regulations, and procedures. But its recommendation was a wary one, for it also suggested that reviews should be made from time to time to determine whether this approach was proving succesful in anticipating and resolving major problems, and—if not, that consideration be given to a more basic solution, such as a consolidation of functions.

Those who, 2 years ago, or even 1 year ago, doubted the need for overhauling the Federal Government's bank supervisory machinery and hoped that the problems even then apparent could be solved through cooperation must now be convinced that their doubts were unwarranted and their hopes unfounded. Cooperation and coodination between the Federal bank supervisory agencies have not improved; they have deteriorated markedly.

This is an unhappy fact for me to recount, for I have been a long-time devotee of the principle that cooperation and coordination can solve such problems among the Federal agencies. But the facts brook no denial. Interpretations too contrasting to be rationalized have been promulgated concerning a number of banking powers and practices. I refer to conflicts resulting from such matters as a regulation purporting to authorize banks to underwrite revenue bonds in the face of a statutory prohibition; a ruling that "Federal funds" transactions are not loans and therefore are not subject to statutory loan limitations; the question whether indebtedness represented by subordinated notes and debentures is part of a bank's "capital stock and surplus"; the intimation by one agency that national banks are not bound by the definition of the term "executive officer" in a loan regulation issued by another agency pursuant to authority vested in it by Congress; the alleged availability of savings deposit privileges to business corporations; the proposal to duplicate supervisory authority over the international operations of national banks; and assertions regarding the lack of need for mandatory reserve requirements for banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System.

Just running through that abbreviated list calls to my mind the lines of Bobbie Burns, "Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us to see oursel's as 'ithers see us." You will have to forgive me for rendering that quotation in the prairie accent of Broken Bow, Nebr., rather than the burr of the Scottish Highlands, the land of my paternal ancestors. But perhaps bank supervisors collectively may need to ask a larger measure of forgiveness from bankers and the public for having gotten embroiled in such a hullabaloo of differences.

I do not propose to discuss these matters with you in detail today. Arguments over "Who said what, and why," tempting though they are, would impede our efforts to attain the real goal. I cite these differences only to demonstrate the imperative need to achieve coordination of supervisory effort at the Federal level.

Any one of these conflicts, of course, would be bad enough. But the cumulative effect is what particularly bothers me. Bank supervision has been my business for 30 years, and I am deeply troubled by a situation in which different categories of banks are treated unequally under Federal laws which were designed to apply equally to all. Moreover, I see this unequal treatment producing a serious state of confusion in the banks themselves.

To say that these conflicts impair Federal bank supervision is to state the obvious. The evil goes much deeper than that. The result could be to create doubts about the integrity of all Government agencies, and to diminish the confidence of the people of this country in our commercial banks. The recent letter from President Kelly of the American Bankers Association to the President of the United States underscores the existing confusion and unease in the banking community, and President Johnson's directive to Secretary Dillon indicates the need and the will to do something about it.

The question before us is not just whether the regrettable breach among Federal agencies can be patched up once again, and some measure of cooperation and coordination reestablished. The basic question is, put bluntly: Can we continue to afford a supervisory system with the kind of built-in risks that this one has been demonstrated to have? The risk that three Federal agencies will have irreconcilable, public differences of opinion, leaving commercial bankers up in the air, not knowing where they stand? The risk that one agency will fall under the domination of an individual who ignores or distorts statutes which he personally finds unacceptable? The risk that the several agencies will base their decisions—in merger cases, for example—on discordant interpretations of statutory standards, thus compelling banks to make their plans without the benefit of reliable guidelines by which to judge the worthwhileness of seeking supervisory approval? The risk of a "race of laxity" between competing Federal supervisory agencies, each anxious to attract and retain banks in its own fold?

To state these questions is to answer them. It is obvious that we cannot continue to afford this "troika" system of Federal bank supervision. Even if the current crisis were to subside, and the agencies were to return to their traditional hard-to-maintain harmony, the performances of the last 2 years are convincing proof that we must now take steps to avoid being vulnerable any longer to the risks and defects of this clumsy arrangement.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that action of some kind is essential. The problem is how to cut though the jungle of controversy and erect the essential framework of the kind of bank supervision that would best serve our needs.

Suppose we were to start afresh and endeavor to describe the ideal attributes of a Federal bank supervisory structure. Is it possible that you and I here today, and our colleagues elsewhere, could reach agreement on these characteristics? I think so. Let me list the attributes that come most strongly to my mind, and you can judge how closely they jibe with your own list.

I take it that we can all agree that the basic aim of bank supervision should be to promote a banking structure that is sound, attuned to community needs for banking services, adaptable to changing opportunities and technical advances, and competitive in the best sense of American economic enterprise. What are the characteristics of a Federal supervisory structure that would be most likely to help in achieving these objectives?

First and foremost, the supervisor must be dedicated to the public interest. Conflicting detriments and benefits involved in decisions on charters, branches, or mergers, for example, should be resolved in favor of the public as a whole, even though this may result occasionally in a disappointed applicant. Over the long run, what is good for the country will prove to be good for the banking business.

Second, the supervisory agency should be objective in its judgments. Obviously, decisions of the agency should not be biased in favor of the industry, or any segment of it. Nor should they be biased against it, in the sense of trying to fit banking to some preconceived, Procrustean model. The decisions should be based on fact, reason, and informed judgment.

Third, is the need for it to be progressive in its outlook, and in the climate which it fosters within the industry. A positive commitment to progressive action and ideas is needed, for it is very easy for a regulatory authority to become complacent, to succumb to inertia, and not bother to respond to any but the conspicuously troublesome aspects of the industry. Ours is a dynamic economy, and it tends to generate ever-changing needs for banking services. Banks must respond to those needs, not only in order to serve the public interest but also to hold their own with competing institutions. The supervisor should be alert to pioneering efforts within the industry—ready to adjust its regulatory attitude to accommodate resulting changes as soon as they are found to be sound and beneficial.

Pursuit of this objective, however, should not be carried so far as to undermine a fourth attribute of ideal supervision, namely, reasonable stability and consistency in decisions. If rigidity in supervisory posture is undesirable, so is vacillation. Changes in rulings and regulations ought to be promulgated with some sense of how long it takes the industry and its customers to adjust to changes in supervisory attitudes. What the industry and the public have a right to expect is that supervisory rulings will be well thought out, well integrated with one another, and with a probable duration long enough to make the expensive job of bank adjustment a paying proposition.

A fifth need, so obvious that it might easily be overlooked, is the need for basic fairness in the application of standards. Certainly every bank has a right to be treated on a par with the competing bank down the street. Special privilege has no place in the supervisory process.

The principle of fairness should also extend to the various types and classes of banks. It does not help the banking industry for one kind of Federal regulatory status to confer discriminatory advantages, or to impose peculiar handicaps. Such differences distort competitive relationships, and may well lead to pussyfooting among the agencies. A far healthier banking structure can be attained if regulatory authorities aim for an equitable position for their banks, rather than a competitive edge.

Sixth, a necessary characteristic of any good supervisory authority is efficient, economical administration. I mean the good, old-fashioned virtue of getting the most for your money. Economy in government is an important attribute in a democracy, and the supervisory authority ought to set an example in the businesslike conduct of its affairs.

Seventh in my list of essential characteristics is the possession of sufficient authority for the effective performance of supervisory responsibilities. I am not suggesting the need for any new, sweeping, or authoritarian powers, for I think that our present Federal supervisory agencies hold among them all the regulatory power that is needed, if only it were employed in smoothly coordinated fashion. But the essence of bank supervision is the ability to supervise effectively, and there needs to be enough authority to make that possible.

An eighth requirement for a good supervisory authority is that its policymaking personnel should know the banking industry and know its problems. They should understand current banking practices and be aware of the operational consequences of the decisions they are reaching. And they should have enough intelligence and commonsense to put their knowledge to constructive use.

Finally, just to be sure the ideal supervisory agency never acts out of ignorance or misinformation, I would add a ninth requirement—that it have wide ranging and reliable channels of information. Bankers and their customers should be able to communicate their views to the agency promptly and directly. Furthermore, to the fullest extent practicable, these channels should be regular and public in nature, rather than secret. The regulated industry is entitled to be heard, subject to the discipline that what it says should be public knowledge. In that way, we can be best assured that legitimate grievances will be aired and private connivance avoided.

We have ended up with a list of nine attributes of an ideal Federal bank supervisory agency. It is not complete. Upon reflection, each of us can think of others, but we have covered the main characteristics.

Agreeing upon supervisory objectives, however, is one thing and attaining them is another. As Woodrow Wilson reminded the framers of the Federal Reserve Act a half-century ago, financial reformers do not have a clean sheet of paper on which to execute their designs. We cannot reincarnate our system of financial supervision with a mere wish. Yet I am convinced we must reform it. It is admittedly defective. It has grown up haphazardly. Different parts of it were created at different times, and not always with the other parts clearly in mind. Various appendages have been attached without enough regard to how they fit into the total system. As a result, we have a hodgepodge arrangement that no longer can be held together with the glue of good intentions alone.

Even though we must heed President Wilson's admonition, there is still a practical step that we can take to attain a bank supervisory setup at the Federal level that will possess the attributes we consider ideal and yet avoid the risks which make continuance of the present system intolerable. We can weld together the various parts of the system into a unified structure.

The need for more uniform and equitable regulation of banks clearly calls for consolidating the three Federal supervisory establishments into one. The need for wisdom, stability, objectivity, and impartial consideration of various points of view argues against one-man rule and in favor of a supervisory board—a board whose members should be selected on a nonpartisan basis with the same care that is called for in the selection of judges for our highest courts. The need for technical competence and continuous focus on emerging banking problems, with their long-range supervisory implications, calls for a board with but a single job to do—rather than a combination of supervisory functions and others that are basically unrelated.

One ends up with a prescription for a supervisory structure very much like my suggested Federal Banking Commission, which is embodied in H.R. 5874, an exceptionally well-drafted bill that is pending in the House of Representatives. Its general terms, I hope, are so well known that it is unnecessary to dwell on them here. It provides for a single new Federal supervisory agency—a five-man board solely responsible for all Federal bank supervisory policies, actions, and decisions, with two administrative divisions handling bank examination and deposit insurance, respectively, whose actions would be subject to review by the whole Commission.

Looking back over the 2 years of comments and suggestions since the Federal Banking Commission idea was first broached, I am increasingly convinced that it represents a promising blend of the ideal and the pragmatic.

I hope you are convinced that a consolidation of Federal bank supervisory functions in a single agency is a reasonable and good solution to a serious problem. But in any event, I urge you—individually and collectively—to express yourselves on the issue, to think it through and voice your conclusions. If the plan is good, say so, and say so loudly. If it is defective, point out the defects and suggest ways to correct them. The only course I decry is that of apathy, for this issue is too important to be decided by inertia.

You bankers are the people who are most directly affected by the defects in the current supervisory setup and who would be most directly benefited by a shift to a better supervisory structure. You have not only a right but also a duty to speak out on the subject. The public is entitled to have the guidance of your informed judgment—and to have it now. A healthy and efficiently regulated banking system is so vital to the economic well-being of the American people that we dare not temporize and thereby delay the adoption of a solution until after our banks have become bogged down in a morass of inequity and confusion.

Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, May 10 marks the independence and founding of the Rumanian Kingdom.

This day is observed by Rumanians everywhere. It is remembered silently and prayerfully by Rumanians held in captivity. We salute this brave people, cut off as they are from their heritage, a heritage of rich culture and fierce independence. It is the record of a people deeply committed to principles of freedom, free institutions, and liberty.

The forcible seizure of Rumania by the Soviet Union and Rumania's enslavery by force reminds us all that our work is not done. There can be no rest until slavery everywhere is ended.

Mr. Speaker, we join in saluting the Rumanian people and recommiting ourselves to the liberation of captive peoples everywhere.

Hon. Laurie Cormier—A Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my remarks and a news account of the testimonial dinner for my esteemed and beloved friend, Laurie J. Cormier, of Leominster, Mass., who is now Director of Civil Defense for Region 1, which embraces all of the New England States, New York, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico and consists of a total population of more than 30 million people.

This outstanding dinner was presided over by my dear friend, the incredible and incomparable Hon. J. Henry Goguen, highly esteemed Franco-American leader, who has held many high offices at every level of government in Massachusetts, and was addressed by His Excellency Endicott Peabody, esteemed and distinguished Governor of the Commonwealth, Hon. Francis M. Lanigan, the able, distinguished mayor of Leominster, Hon. William H. Tucker, able, distinguished Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission, myself, and others. The dinner was attended by a large group of very distinguished officeholders and public figures too numerous to mention here and a host of friends, relatives, neighbors and well-wishers of Laurie Cormier.

My own speech, which I set forth here in part, covers much of Laurie's career, but I am afraid it was all too inadequate, in trying to encompass the wide sweep and high range of the positions held and the accomplishments achieved by this distinguished leader of city, State and Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Fathers, our beloved, honored friend, Laurie, and distinguished guests and friends.

I am greatly pleased and honored to be here tonight, and I am anxious to thank my dear friend of many years standing, Henry Goguen and his committee, for their kind invitation.

This is certainly a most unusual and richly deserved testimonial dinner. It does high and memorable honor to a valued friend and an extraordinary public servant, Laurie Cormier, and candidly I don't know anyone who deserves it more.

I cannot recall an occasion when I have heard so many fine things said of any man with which everyone completely agrees.

To strike a personal note, Laurie has been close to me for some years now, and I have had an excellent opportunity to evaluate him. He is a many-sided and most versatile individual. His life embraces many activities and many people. He is a devoted family man, blessed with a lovely wife and children, and these are indeed great blessings.

He is exceptionally well trained, well experienced across a wide spectrum of human affairs, a man of many deep and engaging interests.

A recognized leader of the bar, diligent and accomplished student of government,

masterful, outstanding former chief magistrate of his native city, who in his tenure established a record of fidelity to principle, efficiency, economy, and accomplishment which will stand for many years to come, gifted Ambasador to foreign lands bringing his knowledge to other nations, and now head of region one of the vital civil defense functions of the Federal Government, which are so essential to our security, as a protective and possible curative shield for so many millions of our people, and most assuredly, proud scion and gleaming example of his rich Franco-American heritage so fruitful for our country.

Indeed, there are so many other aspects to the life, the work, and the brilliant career of Laurie Cormier that I really could not enumerate them here tonight.

In sum total, however, they add up to three things, character, achievement, and profound regard for the fundamentals of our American way of life, our faith in the living God, and our determined struggles for human betterment at home and abroad.

Though still a young man, he has already built a tremendously impressive record of achievement and personal accomplishment with the bright promise of much more to come.

Beloved by Presidents, Governors, and officials of every rank, and above all by the people whom he serves so faithfully, Laurie Cormier has indeed set a lofty example of what a real, dedicated public servant can be and can do.

He has deservedly won the acclaim, confidence, and gratitude of the wonderful people of his great city, and of all those he has so faithfully served, and of our Presidents and the high officials of the Federal Government which he now serves, and will continue to serve, with such outstanding ability, distinction, and effectiveness.

Tonight he is surrounded by so very many of his family and friends, his beloved spiritual leaders, who mean so much to him, his distinguished fellow public officials and this great company so anxious to express their sense of appreciation, respect, and gratitude for his warm freindship and the fine things he has done and stood for.

This, then, is an opportunity which I eagerly embrace, not only to join in this richly merited tribute, but also to express my own personal thanks for his warm friendship, his generous, unstinted cooperation, which he has so willingly extended me in the performance of my public duties, and to express also my great pride in the brilliant attainments and impressive contributions of this splendid, brilliant, outstanding young American solon, so much loved and admired by all of us.

Laurie Cormier is destined for even greater achievements and greater contributions, and he will discharge the responsibilties of his new, exalted, most important post in the Federal Government in the same articulate, knowledgeable, capable and effective manner in which he has served to this very hour.

It is heartening for all of us to realize at this crucial time in world history and in the affairs of our own great Nation, when our freedoms are being challenged and tested as never before, when we have so many serious problems, demanding early solution, when we are besieged on all sides, not only by dangerous subversion, but by a host of dangerous tendencies and developments in our own country, and in our own body politic, that we have a man of the high caliber of Laurie Cormier giving his talents and abilities, wisdom, and experience so unselfishly to our country.

For it is in the faith, and in the courage, and in the strength of purpose, the determination, and the unswerving loyalty and devotion, high patriotism and Americanism of men like Laurie Cormier that the answers to these great problems will finally be found, and, believe me, my friends, if we remain firm, loyal, and united behind our beliefs and our principles, in our reliance on devine providence, and in our resolution to preserve this free Government and all that it means to us, and strive with all our might to build a world organized on the rule of law and dedicated to peace, justice and human brotherhood, there will be no reason to fear for the future.

From a proud and grateful heart, I extend to Laurie Cormier, and his lovely wife, Muriel, and wonderful family, my heartiest congratulations upon this happy and most delightful occasion, and wish for them many happy, successful years together.

May the good Lord shower His choicest blessings upon them for many years to come.

It has been a real honor and pleasure to be here.

[From the Leominster (Mass.) Enterprise, May 4, 1964]

AT HIS TESTIMONIAL—FORMER MAYOR CORMIER LAUNCHES DRIVE HERE FOR KENNEDY LIBRARY

Former Mayor Laurie J. Cormier last night launched a citywide fundraising drive for the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library when he donated a purse given to him at a testimonial in his honor attended by about 500 dignitaries and friends in City Hall auditorium.

Mr. Cormier was praised for his service to Leominster and the American Government by Gov. Endicott C. Peabody and Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, presented a testimonial purse, a desk clock and writing set and a written citation.

He announced that he will add his personal contribution to the testimonial purse in the name of Leominster and participate in the drive to honor the late President Kennedy as "the greatest man of the century" and "one of the greatest Presidents in the history of the United States."

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Mayor of Leominster for 8 years and a member of the city government for 21 years, Mr. Cormier was praised by Governor Peabody for having "rendered such distinguished service" to the community as he noted that the program honored him not for the position he held but "for the job he has done" and for being the "personification of the great American dream."

Representative PHILBIN in an address which will be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cited former Mayor Cormier for his service to the city, county, State and country.

He called the former mayor, now regional civil defense director "an extraordinary public servant * * * a recognized public leader * * * a diligent and accomplished student of government * * * a masterful chief magistrate with a record of accomplishment which will stand for many years to come * * * a gifted ambassador of our country * * * a gleaming example of his Franco-American heritage * * * destined for even greater achievement and contribution in his new Federal post."

EARNED THE TRIBUTE

Judge Richard Comerford, of the Leominster District Court and a long-time friend, said that Mr. Cormier "earned the tribute" by "his long labors in solving the problems of this city" and expressed confidence that he will provide in his new position "the same excellent public service."

The Right Reverend Monsignor Arthur J. Gravel, the honored guest's pastor, commended him for his service to the church and his family.

Greetings to Mr. Cormier were extended by Commissioner William H. Tucker of the Interstate Commerce Commission, from John McNally and others of the White House staff, Richard McGuire, treasurer of the Democratic National Committee; Edward McDermott, Director of Emergency Planning; and other friends in the Federal Government in Washington, D.C.

A bouquet of roses was presented to Mrs. Cormier by Mrs. Comerford. Presentation of the gift desk set, citation and purse was by Miss Clarisse Mercier for the Franco-American Asociations of Leominster and the guests at the program.

SECRET REVEALED

Visibly affected emotionally, Mr. Cormier expressed his gratitude to the assemblage and attributed his success to the philosophy that the sort of good government is for officials to be honest with themselves and all with whom they work and serve.

He then launched the Leominster campaign for the Kennedy Memorial Library in the name of the city and assemblage by donating the purse to the fund.

J. Henry Goguen, former commissioner of public safety and former secretary of state, was master of ceremonies and introduced the guests and speakers.

Others seated at the head table were Mayors M. Francis Lanigan of Leominster, who extended the city's greetings, George J. Bourque of Fitchburg and Cyrille Landry of Gardner, State Senator Joseph D. Ward of Fitchburg, State Representative Robert Mahan of Leominster, Judge Thomas Dooling of Fitchburg.

Worcester County Sheriff Joseph Smith, Gen. Otis Whitney, judge of the Concord District Court and former State insurance and public safety commissioner; Maj. Gen. Benjamin F. Evans, commanding general, Fort Devens; Louis M. Janelle, U.S. Attorney for New Hampshire; Worcester County District Attorney William T. Buckley, County Commissioner Francis Cassidy, Governor's Councilor Walter Kelly and Robert Cormier, general chairman.

A large delegation of other dignitaries was in the audience, termed by Representative PHILBIN one of the largest gatherings of dignitaries to honor a man.

Support for H.R. 9652

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial of station WMAL here in Washington in support of legislation to combat child abuse.

On January 16, 1964, I introduced H.R. 9652 to provide for mandatory reporting of child abuse cases and I join with WMAL in urging that hearings be scheduled in the immediate future.

The editorial follows:

CHILD ABUSE

Congressman MULTER of New York and the District Commissioners have presented Congress with suggested legislation to combat child abuse. To date no public hearings have been scheduled. Congress should promptly hold hearings and expedite passage of corrective legislation.

Until medical reports on suspected abuse cases are mandatory, an accurate count of actual child abuse cases is impossible. However, reliable estimates indicate that 50 per-

cent of the children who suffer physical harm eventually die from repeated abuse.

Proposed legislation would require medical reports on all suspected child abuse cases, grant doctors legal immunity and prescribe punishment for guilty persons.

The apparent high incidence of infant neglect and mistreatment makes enactment of legislation to curb child abuse in the District a matter of utmost urgency.

Poverty Stories Not Amusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: During the past several weeks the ad hoc Subcommittee on Poverty, of the House Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, has been hearing testimony from many expert witnesses on how to conduct the so-called "war on poverty."

I commend your attention to the following newspaper article, which appeared in the April 21 issue of the Minneapolis Tribune, in a prominent position on the editorial page. It was written by Mr. Leonard Inskip, who is greatly respected in my State of Minnesota for his objectivity and analysis as a member of the Minneapolis Tribune's editorial page staff.

THOSE POVERTY STORIES DON'T AMUSE IRON RANGE RESIDENTS

(By Leonard Inskip)

A reporter from Washington recently traveled to West Virginia to do a story on Appalachia, the multi-State depressed region extending from Pennsylvania to Alabama.

Stopping in a country store at Mossy, W. Va., for a bottle of pop, the reporter engaged the proprietor in conversation.

"I guess you've come looking for poor folks," the storekeeper said sourly when he learned the visitor was a reporter. Then the storekeeper turned to a group of customers at the meat counter and said: "You men come over here and look hungry. This is another reporter."

This resentment by West Virginians and others in Appalachia to the image of the region as one big Tobacco Road is similarly felt in northern Minnesota.

"One wonders by what technique these big-city, sensation-seeking writers assemble their material in presenting distorted stories which presume to chronicle bleak depression, or calamity, in certain sections of the United States—the Mesabi Range, for instance," Burt D. Pearson, the usually mild-mannered editor of the Mesabi Daily News at Virginia, Minn., angrily declared recently.

What touched off Pearson's editorial blast was a January front-page story in the New York Times by Homer Bigart. The headline said: "Poverty Blights Iron Ore Region." Bigart described the Lake Superior district of northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and Upper Michigan as "a problem area whose difficulties are exceeded only by those of Applachia" and one with a future "no brighter than Appalachia's."

Then, in February, Ward Cannel wrote for the Newspaper Enterprise Association, a news service, that "Paul Bunyan's country lies today in the chains of poverty and hunger." To this Pearson snorted, "Libel."

Next, in March, Frederick Taylor, in a Wall Street Journal piece entitled "North Woods' Woes," an account of problems in Upper Michigan, said there was "widespread joblessness and poverty" across the Lake Superior mining district, including Minnesota.

Even though such competent writers as Bigart and Taylor qualify or further develop their remarks, the image such stories leave—some northern Minnesotans fear—is worse than the actual situation in Minnesota, at least. Another problem is the different meanings people attach to such words as poverty and unemployment.

Last July (a representative month in the mining industry) the total civilian labor force in St. Louis County other than Duluth was estimated at 38,300, while unemployment was 2,500, or a jobles rate of 6.5 percent. Itasca County, also a mining area, had unemployment of 6.7 percent. These rates were above the national average and substantially higher than southern Minnesota. But they also show that more than 90 percent of the work force had jobs last July.

This is not to deny that northeastern Minnesota is an area with serious unemployment problems resulting from the decline of direct-shipping ores, technological changes, foreign competition, and sluggish demand for steel in recent years. All available evidence points to a much higher rate of relief and unemployment benefits there than in most other areas of Minnesota. With the shutdown of mines, many workers have had to pull up stakes and depart, tax resources have been lost and the general economy has been depressed well below its potential.

Each year the lowest point in the Iron Range economy (except for the year-round taconite plants) occurs in the winter months, when iron ore mines are closed; when construction has dropped way off and when the resort and tourist business is at a standstill. The unemployment rate in St. Louis County (outside Duluth) rose to 15.2 percent last January, while Itasca County's was 23.8 percent.

Reflecting lack of economic growth is the fact that Minnesota Power & Light Co.'s customer count has changed only slightly in recent years. But consumption per residential customer has risen steadily each year—an indication of a generally improving standard of living.

It also should be noted that economic troubles on the range are spotty. For example, taconite areas on the east have an air of prosperity. Large cities such as Hibbing and Virginia have maintained their business better than some of the declining small towns. To the west of the mining areas, major expansions of paper firms at Grand Rapids and Brainerd have boosted local economies.

Despite trying times, the overall picture of northeastern Minnesota does not show an entire region in the "chains of poverty and hunger."

Plymouth Pilot-News Supports Peace Corps School-to-School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following excellent editorial from the April 17, 1964, issue of the Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot-News which urges that the schools of Plymouth, Ind., consider supporting the school-to-school program of the Peace Corps. The editorial follows:

SCHOOL-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Peace Corps has begun to promote a new and unique plan for foreign aid. This time it goes from U.S. schools directly for Latin American schools.

Here is the plan: Any of our schools that will is to raise $1,000. This sum is to be sent to some Latin American country where a needed school district will use this $1,000 to build a new school, they doing all the work and providing any other costs.

In Columbia alone there is a shortage of 40,000 schools, and most other countries in that continent are as badly off for school needs. If we can help significantly in increasing the education of thousands of people in Latin America, we shall be giving one of the greatest helps possible for those nations.

The plans by which Latin American nations receive large loans or donations do not touch the people as will more schools and teachers. Those people are ready and anxious to have more and better schools, and that hits one of their vital needs.

We suggest it is not too much to expect that Plymouth schools could join in this program.

J. Warren Horton, the Father of Sonar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. J. Warren Horton is the father of sonar, our underwater detection machinery. I would like to share with my colleagues a letter sent to Dr. Horton last fall on the occasion of his retirement by our late President, John F. Kennedy:

NIGHT LETTER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 14, 1963.

CO AND DIRECTOR,
U.S. Navy Underwater Sound Laboratories,
Fort Trumbull,
New London, Conn.:

On the occasion of Dr. J. Warren Horton's retirement, I would like to extend my congratulations and thanks to a man who has made extraordinary contributions not only to the Navy but to his Nation and to the community.

Dr. Horton has been a true pioneer in the field of sonar research. His writing and the scholarly honors he has received attest to the high significance of his work. All of us have been the beneficiaries of the significant and distinguished service he has rendered to our country.

I extend my best wishes to Dr. Horton in his retirement and wish him success and happiness in his future endeavors.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

I also would like to call attention to a fascinating document presented by Dr. Horton at the Acoustical Society meeting on November 7, 1963:

"UNDERWATER ACOUSTICS, 1963"—PRESENTED AT THE 66TH MEETING OF THE ACOUSTICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, ANN ARBOR, MICH., NOVEMBER 7, 1963

(By J. Warren Horton)

On an occasion such as this it is difficult to avoid some mention of things past.

Any remembrance which may be summoned up, however, is intended as a prolog to a brief discussion of the present status of underwater acoustics and its possible future.

The belief was once held—this was a long time ago—that scientific thought was stimulated solely by intellectual curiosity. Such motivation appears never to have been strong in the case of underwater acoustics. Prior to World War I this branch of science existed as only a few isolated items in general physics.

With the sinking of the *Lusitania*, however, underwater acoustics was called to the frontline of our Nation's technological defense. There was no longer any question as to the nature or adequacy of the motivation for its development. The question was, rather, as to the adequacy of the adolescent science for the burden so suddenly placed upon it.

To employ sound waves for unfamiliar tasks, to be performed in an unfamiliar environment, armed forces entered into partnership with scientists to an extent previously unheard of. Few realize, today, how little was then known of underwater acoustics. There was no quantitative knowledge of the magnitudes of underwater sound waves, of the sensitivities of underwater sound receivers, or of the propagation losses of oceans. The concept of acoustic impedance was yet to be formally published.

In spite of its deficiencies, underwater acoustics was employed in submarine warfare during World War I with a success by no means negligible. Any lack in theoretical tools was offset by the ingenuity and skill of men well trained in other sciences. It was an unforgettable experience to have served an apprenticeship under such masters.

The story of underwater acoustics in World War I is a chapter in the long history of military technology which began with David and Goliath. The extent to which military strength depends upon technology was beginning to be clearly recognized. As a consequence, our Government established, in 1923, the Naval Research Laboratory. It was here, at the Admiralty Research Laboratory in England, and at a few similar places, that underwater acoustics was nourished during the interval between the two wars.

During this interval, however, underwater acoustics made more progress in the air than in the water. Acoustics left its birthplace in general physics and became an adult science. Its coming of age was celebrated in this country in 1928 by the formation of this society—the Acoustical Society of America.

Underwater acoustics made its debut before this society at its second meeting. On December 14, 1929, Horatio Lamson gave a paper describing the use of electrical delay lines with multispot arrays for determining direction, the use of timed echoes for determining distance, and the use of ultrasonic frequencies for concentrating sound rays into narrow beams.

The situation at the beginning of World War II bore little resemblance to that at the end of World War I. When, for the second time, submarines threatened our ships, engineers experienced in air acoustics moved without hesitation into the adjoining medium. They were ready with the understanding and with the instruments to make quantitative surveys of the territory to be occupied. Somewhat to their surprise they found that oceanographers had already explored the paths followed by sound waves in water and had made important discoveries concerning their characteristics.

Under the guidance of scientists of the Office of Scientific Research and Development underwater acoustics made remarkable advances during the 4 years of World War II. Theoretical relations between physical quantities of significance to its use were established and statistical information as to the variability of the magnitudes of these quantities was obtained.

By the end of World War II the necessity for bringing scientists into the military establishment was unquestioned. No remaining doubt could survive the atomic bomb. In General Marshall's report to the President we find this statement: "This Nation's destiny clearly lies in a sound permanent security policy. In the War Department's proposals there are two essentials: (1) Intense scientific research and developments; (2) a permanent peacetime citizen army."

The ensuing expansion of both civil and military technology, with its attendant readjustments, has had an effect on the course of science which has not yet been fully evaluated. Underwater acoustics has been swept along on this widening stream. It has, at the same time, been subject to unique influences because its applications are so closely limited to undersea warfare.

As technology became popular scientific values began to be measured in dollars. In 1940 the Federal budget for research and development was $75 million. This has been increased at the astonishing rate of 25 percent each year until today it is nearly $15 billion. Unfortunately, the accomplishments coming from the effort thus funded have not kept pace with its costs.

With these increasing costs there has been a concurrent increase in the fraction absorbed by an ever-expanding system of management controls. This system has greatly affected both the nature of all scientific work done and the manner of its doing. Its influence on the future progress of technology needs careful scrutiny.

This may well begin with an inquiry as to who does the managing. Speaking of research and development, a Committee on the Organization of the Department of the Navy, reporting in 1959, declared that "a process so involved and so vital to the combat effectiveness of the Navy must be directed and supervised by an official who has complete responsibility and adequate authority to act in the name of the Chief of Naval Operations." An examination of the effectiveness with which scientists managed research and development during the war shows nothing to support this statement. It is probable, however, that no other single statement has had as great an effect on the conduct of naval technology.

Because of the belief thus expressed the control of the technical programs of the Navy has been placed in the operating branch of the Navy's bilinear organizations; the technical staff remains in the supporting branch. These programs are, in consequence, subdivided in accordance with operational classifications, rather than with technological classifications. This fragments the technical staff in a manner having no relation to the interdependence of its members. To quote the Hoover Commission, it places authority with those "who review but do not initiate." The result is management by veto.

A notable exception to this is the management of programs sponsored by the Office of Naval Research. These are the only programs controlled by that portion of the Navy's organization which is under the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development. Many of the programs for underwater acoustics, however, are "directed and supervised" from the operating side of the establishment.

Management by the operators is dedicated to two propositions. One is that no work shall be undertaken which cannot be shown to lead directly to some closely specified operational objective. The other is that any duplication of scientific effort is to be averted at all cost. Of the first it may be said that it prevents the proper coordination of scientific programs and fosters the very duplication so deplored by this management. Of the second it may be said that far more concern should be felt for omissions than for duplications. Duplications can be no worse than unprofitable and may well be rewarding; omissions can be fatal.

Regardless of who directs the development of underwater acoustics there can be no question as to the purpose for which it must be developed. Before World War II was ended it was being said that the future needs of undersea warfare could not be met by underwater sound, and that some more capable agent must be discovered. Since that time the capabilities of underwater sound systems have been increased repeatedly. The likelihood of finding a more successful competitor has correspondingly decreased. We must, therefore, continue to rely on underwater sound.

Our present knowledge of underwater acoustics is not sufficient to lead us directly to optimum designs for systems now under development. It is by no means difficult, however, to plan for studies and surveys which will yield information to meet these needs. It is more difficult to make adequate provision for future needs.

We cannot know, except in the most general way, what requirements will be imposed on underwater acoustics should we again be called into combat. Should this ever happen, we, as scientists, must be prepared to respond instantly to fleet demands now unforeseen. The only preparation we can make is to bring our knowledge of underwater acoustics to the highest possible state of readiness. We must not forget that military readiness begins in the laboratory.

What, then, remains to be done? The physical laws governing the behavior of sound waves in the ocean are already well codified. Our knowledge of the variability of the quantities obeying these laws, on the other hand, is far from adequate. Beyond this, relations must be found between acoustical quantities and quantities in neighboring fields of science. Underwater acoustics can make little further progress without the support of sciences dealing with such matters as electrical theory, information theory, data processing, hydrodynamics, oceanography, psychophysiology, and others in our expanding technology. Underwater acoustics must find its place in a community of sciences.

Many scientific programs must be carefully coordinated to bring about a proper technological readiness. The work to be done must be done thoroughly and without waste of time, men, or money. Much of the effort must be directed to projects which do not lead to any operational objective yet specified. Such effort can have no other justification than that based on the judgment of qualified scientists as to its potential value.

The planning and directing of these programs is the inescapable responsibility of the members of the scientific profession. It is imperative that a management system be provided which does not inhibit the full utilization of the judgment of this group. Without this, underwater acoustics cannot be expected to meet future obligations as acceptably as it has met those already satisfied.

We may be gratified by past accomplishments in this field. We must now think of preparing ourselves for even more difficult assignments in the future.

NEED—The Negro Educational Emergency Drive, Pittsburgh's Scholarship Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the story of Pittsburgh's scholarship campaign called NEED, the Negro Educational Emergency Drive, is a story which can be of interest to many communities in any congressional district of the United States. I commend this story to the attention of my colleagues.

THE STORY BEHIND NEED

Pittsburgh's future demands more educated manpower.

New opportunities in technical and supervisory employment require more education.

A number of educational ventures in the Pittsburgh schools are producing a greater number of better qualified students who can effectively use the benefits of higher education.

Students of disadvantaged families, mainly Negro, are among the increasing numbers of qualified students prepared for post high school education.

Although exceptionally able students are usually able to obtain scholarships from colleges, good and average students need local financial aid.

NEED encourages every able student to make the effort to advance himself with his own resources and gives financial aid only where necessary.

NEED seeks to help every student chosen by a committee composed of experienced officials of the schools and colleges and representatives of NEED.

NEED requires at least $100,000 annually to help deserving Negro students to fulfill their potentialities.

Contributions to NEED are tax-deductible. Checks should be made payable to NEED: The Negro Education Emergency Drive, care of Samuel E. Line, Jr., treasurer, 85 Mayfair Drive, Pittsburgh 28, Pa.

THE HUMAN DIMENSION

Mr. ——— graduated first in his class from a local vocational high school. His father, who is not in sympathy with his academic aspirations, is a refuse worker who earns $7,000 a year. There are three younger children in the family. This young man worked as a bus boy during the school year and took two summer jobs in order to save money to supplement a scholarship grant of $500 from the University of Pittsburgh. He cannot continue his education without further aid.

Mr. ——— will graduate from a Pittsburgh high school in June, as a national honor society graduate. He has lived in a foster home for most of his 18 years, but after June he will no longer be eligible for this support. His ability and his record of achievement indicate that he is a promising student, but he must have aid if he is to enroll in college.

Miss ———, 17 years old, the oldest of five children, will graduate in June. Her father works in a steel mill. Since her mother died, she has cared for the younger children. Not quite an honor graduate, she wants to enter college to continue her work in science. She cannot go on without financial aid.

THE STATISTICS ON THE PROGRAM

Of the population of Pittsburgh, 16.7 percent is Negro.

Negro family income is 64.8 percent of white family income in Pittsburgh.

Approximately 7.6 percent of white males in the Pittsburgh labor force are unemployed.

Approximately 11.1 percent of Negro males in the Pittsburgh labor force are unemployed.

Forty-four percent of the Negro labor force in Pittsburgh is unskilled.

Sixty Negro students need financial aid to continue their college education.

More than 200 Negro students graduating in June 1964, have already requested financial aid for post-high school work.

NEED MEETS AN EMERGENCY

Pittsburgh citizens organized the Negro educational emergency drive in July 1963, in the midst of an increasing national racial crisis. Alerted to the problems of disadvantaged youth and spurred by a history of positive action, the Pittsburgh community determined to promote higher educational opportunities for able disadvantaged high school graduates as a key program of united action. The immediate task was to raise funds for the largest number of Negro students in this area ever seeking help for higher education.

In the past the Urban League of Pittsburgh had been able to supply limited financial aid. But the funds were inadequate to meet the need, particularly as qualified Negro students graduated in increasing numbers from the schools and new employment prospects sharpened their desire for higher education. In 1963 more Negro graduates than ever before applied for financial assistance. Clearly a new program was imperative. To meet this emergency, NEED raised money to supplement Urban League funds. Seventy-six students received aid. Most of the grants, which totaled $29,075, supplemented the students' own resources and ranged from a few dollars to $600. These grants frequently stimulated additional aid to grantees from the colleges they attended.

The money raised by NEED came from individual contributions, church groups, a few Pittsburgh industries and small family foundations. Much more money is now required. If Pittsburgh is to meet its responsibilities, NEED must have a wider base of support.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND PITTSBURGH'S FUTURE

Our city has won acclaim for pioneering in the solution of formidable urban problems such as smoke control, flood control, urban redevelopment, slum housing, and legislation for human rights. But the abilities of its people are Pittsburgh's most valuable resource. The development of human resources deserves all the creative attention which our city has so successfully applied to other phases of Pittsburgh's development. Pittsburgh is in the enviable position of being able to devote its full attention to a constructive program of developing human resources because it is not disrupted by the tensions which dominate racial relations in most of the Nation's large cities.

NEED is a practical and visible expression of Pittsburgh's sense of responsibility. Pittsburgh citizens must help to develop the talents of hundreds of young Negroes whose families cannot help them to secure the higher education for which they are now qualified. NEED says that Pittsburgh respects these talents and wants to encourage their development by devoting to them the personal interest and financial resources of the community. NEED proposes to seek out, encourage and assist able Negro students to obtain more education. NEED aims to give students the incentive and the financial aid to get them started in college or technical school so that they can move forward under their own power, utilizing all their own abilities, motivation, and strengths.

PITTSBURGH'S NEW JOBS REQUIRE EDUCATION

The authors of the recently published volume "Region With a Future" (Pittsburgh, 1964) agree that the future of the Pittsburgh area depends upon the quality of education in western Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh has long depended upon heavy industry and unskilled labor as the basis of its economy. In the future new industry will demand highly trained manpower. Education has become more important than ever before to the development of the local economy. More than ever, good paying jobs require training beyond the traditional 4-year high school. More than any other group in the Pittsburgh area, Negroes have not obtained this education.

In the past, few Negroes have been hired for professional, supervisory or skilled positions in Pittsburgh. As a consequence, Negro children often believe that employment opportunities are closed to them. Knowing that their parents earn low incomes and that few scholarships have been available in the past, bright Negro children often give up. Many do not work to their potential in school. Sometimes they neglect to enroll in the courses necessary to prepare them for college. More often than whites, they dropout of school to join the ranks of the unemployed and perpetuate the poverty cycle. Providing aid and loans for qualified students can raise the aspirations of young Negroes so they will be well prepared for job opportunities in the future.

Good jobs are becoming available for Negroes. The doors are no longer closed; the bars are coming down. But not enough Negroes are qualified to fill them. The effect of FEPC during the last decade and the changing climate of human relations have opened up hundreds of positions to Negroes which only whites filled in the past. Although business executives and their personnel directors have been recruiting qualified Negroes for jobs throughout the Pittsburgh area, they have not found sufficient numbers with the required education and training. Only when Negroes can obtain such education can they take advantage of new job opportunities and thus improve their own economic well-being and the welfare of the entire Pittsburgh economy.

EDUCATIONAL ADVANCES IN PITTSBURGH ARE PRODUCING MORE QUALIFIED STUDENTS

With increasing momentum during the past 5 years, the Pittsburgh community has developed a new group of educational ventures designed to provide compensatory education for culturally disadvantaged students. Although many disadvantaged students in Pittsburgh are white, the majority are Negro. With lower family incomes Negro children are more likely to live under adverse conditions, in substandard housing and with poor nutrition. In addition, fewer cultural activities are part of their environment. Many factors like these have combined to deny them access to a good education and have lowered their level of aspiration.

Three years ago, supported by generous grants from the Ford Foundation, the Pittsburgh public schools began new programs of compensatory education for disadvantaged students, predominantly Negro, in eight schools in the Hill district and Homewood-Brushton. This team teaching project has already won a national reputation for excellence. Under the stimulus of this new educational endeavor, Negro students have begun to work harder and to achieve at higher levels than ever before. Within a few years, the first of the students trained in the team teaching project will graduate from high school prepared for further work in college or technical school.

Two years ago the schools reduced the loads of English teachers at Westinghouse High School, whose students are 94 percent Negro, to four classes of no more than 25 students each. This new program has resulted in a marked improvement in the communication skills of Westinghouse students. In September 1964, this program of reduced

teaching loads was extended to Peabody High School where Negroes are 10 percent of the enrollment. Schenley High School, whose enrollment is 50 percent Negro, has installed an entire curriculum for college-bound students including special courses in English and mathematics. Negro graduates of these three high schools, as well as of Fifth Avenue High where team teaching has been installed, are better qualified than ever before for posthigh school work.

Significant additional projects of compensatory education will soon further increase the number of Negroes who are well prepared for college. The board of education plans to extend the team teaching project to 12 additional schools in the near future and to add several new features to the present program. In the summer of 1964, five disadvantaged ninth grade students from Peabody High School will attend Phillips Exeter Academy in Exeter, N.H., for the entire summer under full scholarships provided by the academy. It is hoped that this program will be repeated in the future. Carnegie Tech, in a cooperative program with the Pittsburgh schools, has just received a grant of $106,000 from the Carnegie Corp. to conduct special summer sessions for disadvantaged high school sophomores and juniors to increase their skills in English, mathematics, and science as part of a special program designed to prepare them for college. The Pittsburgh scholars' program, an attempt by the schools to develop entirely new curriculums and methods of teaching for able students, will begin in the fall of 1964 at the eighth grade level and will enroll 1,000 students, many of them Negroes, in 7 centers in the city. Five years from now these students will graduate with one of the best college preparations available in any American city. Significantly, the University of Pittsburgh has recently established an office of equal educational opportunity to expand opportunities for disadvantaged students.

All of these programs will prepare increasing numbers of Negro students for post high school education. Moreover, they will raise the level of aspiration of Negro youth. All of this excellent preparatory work will be of little avail, however, unless funds become available so that high school graduates can continue their education. NEED is the essential link between excellent public school training and increased opportunities for post high school work. Both new programs in the schools and the ideals of a democratic society demand that this link be made as strong as possible.

COOPERATION BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND NEED FOR IMMEDIATE INTENSIFIED EFFORTS

The Pittsburgh public schools have entered into a cooperative project with NEED. The board of education has appointed a well qualified supervisor to implement its directive to counselors and to coordinate their efforts. Counselors have been instructed to make increased efforts to identify able students, help them to understand the new opportunities open to them, and encourage them to apply for college. NEED has also arranged for the county schools to work on these problems with the assistance of the Guidance Department of the Urban League.

Students who apply for financial assistance will be screened by a committee made up of officials of the public schools, representatives from local colleges with extensive experience in granting scholarship aid, and representatives of NEED. In addition, NEED has been offered the services of the college board to assure us through confidential statements that the families of applicants are genuinely in need of aid. Some grants will take the form of outright gifts; some will be loans; still others will combine gifts and loans.

GOOD AVERAGE STUDENTS ARE THE ONES WHO NEED HELP

Present scholarship funds are not sufficient to meet the need. Although exceptionally talented students, Negro as well as white, have a chance for scholarships from colleges, average students with college aspirations and qualifications often cannot obtain scholarship aid. Disadvantaged students face difficult hurdles in the race for competitive scholarship funds. Their home environments often have not given them the social and intellectual skills they require to win scholarships in competition with more fortunate students. In addition, some students even need funds to supplement scholarship grants from colleges. For example, a recent Gladstone High School student with a full scholarship to Rutgers University required assistance from NEED to buy suitable clothing for his college interview. Other students have similar problems.

MINIMUM OF $100,000 REQUIRED BY NEED ANNUALLY

As news about NEED filtered through the schools and the community, applications for funds came in ever-increasing numbers. By April 1964, 260 applications had been received, many of them from students who had participated in 1 or more of the special programs of the Pittsburgh public schools. It is necessary to raise a minimum of $100,000 a year to fill the anticipated needs. The help of responsible private citizens must continue. To this support must be added the greater resources of business, civic groups, and foundations, which have already given indispensable leadership to so many vital civic projects. The hopes and potentialities of many deserving students are at stake.

"Allow the Constitution To Remain as It Is," Says Lutheran Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz is president of the American Lutheran Church with headquarters in Minneapolis. This denomination has 2,410,977 members in 4,967 congregations.

Dr. Schiotz has prepared a statement on why he opposes the Becker amendment on religion in the public schools. His statement is his testimony for the Judiciary Committee hearings and will appear in the May 19, 1964, issue of the Lutheran Standard.

Like Dr. Schiotz, many church leaders are not in favor of the Becker proposal. They do not want to modify the freedom of religion language of our Bill of Rights.

I am sure that my fellow Members of the House have received many letters for the amendment and many against it, just as I have. I place the statement of Dr. Schiotz in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it is typical of those religious leaders who are saying "allow the Constitution to remain as it is."

STATEMENT REGARDING PENDING RESOLUTIONS WHICH PROPOSE AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO BIBLE READING AND PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In 1962 the U.S. Supreme Court forbade the use of a school prayer composed by the New York State Board of Regents. In two similar cases before the Court in 1963, the one from Pennsylvania and the other from Maryland, the Court banned the devotional use of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. The fact that the Maryland suit was brought by Mrs. Madalyn E. Murray, a self-confessed atheist, seemed to many people as though the Court was siding with the atheists against the Christian traditions of our country.

Throughout our Nation seriously concerned Christian people became fearful. One well-known churchman, in a recent letter addressed to pastors of several denominations, expressed his fear in very strong language. Letters have poured in to Washington asking Congress to do something about the Supreme Court decision's apparent threat to religion.

In a manner as important as a proposal to amend the Constitution, a proposal that concerns the church and the Christian faith, it is important that we think with facts rather than feelings.

In the early history of our country, some of the colonies had an established church, that is, an official church supported by the State. By degrees a consensus emerged that this was not good. And so in 1791 the Constitution was amended. The first amendment did two things to guarantee freedom of religion: (1) It denied the right to any one religion or church to be supported by the State; and (2) it guaranteed to all churches and religions freedom to worship according to their own convictions ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;").

Since the adoption of the first amendment, no church or religion has received state support. However, in many homogeneous communities, school boards made provision for Scripture reading and prayer during school hours. This was not established religion in the generally accepted sense of this term; but in principle it was official religion—taught by servants of the state. As more immigrants sought this country, the number of churches and religions multiplied. The time was therefore bound to come when someone would challenge the right of school authorities to require worship in a public school under school auspices. The fact that an atheist contributed to challenging the legality of such practice is incidental.

Walter E. Craig, president of the American Bar Association, in a recent statement on the Supreme Court decision of 1962, pointed out that "far from being hostile to religion, the Court simply sustained the long-held U.S. belief that 'a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and to degrade religion.' "

If the Supreme Court decision were carefully read, many fears would be dissipated. The majority opinion of Justice Clark frankly acknowledges that America's heritage is rooted in faith in God. But he believes that if freedom is to be guaranteed for all, the absolute terms of the first amendment must be observed.

From time to time reports come in suggesting that some school teachers have mistakenly regarded the Supreme Court decision as an authorization to disparage the practice of faith in God, and specifically faith in the Christian religion. Such tendencies should be fought through proper protests rather than by amendment of the Constitution.

Eternal vigilance is the price that must always be paid for freedom—be it in the area of religion or in civil rights.

Now let us look at this matter from the point of view of our church. What do we want for our growing, impressionable children? Religion in general, served in an atmosphere devoid of convictions? Israel's neighbors in the Old Testament period were not irreligious people, but the prophets warned against religions that did not recognize Jehovah. Today, in a society that is saturated with the view that all truths are relative, the Christian Church affirms the authority of Jesus Christ.

The Handbook of the American Lutheran Church gives a very specific answer to the question of religion in general (see p. 192). It counsels our members not to "practice the forms of religion without confessing as a matter of principle the Triune God or Jesus Christ as the Son of God, come into the flesh, and our Savior from sin." It follows that religion in general would be no more acceptable just because it might happen to be found in the public schools.

There is an important interantional dimension in the proposals that are before Congress. Through much contact with peoples of Africa and Asia I know that their eyes are continually focussed on what happens in the United States. If we, through further amendments of the Constitution, should vitiate the strong protection which the first amendment provides for all religions, without preference to any, we may find that the new nations in Africa and Asia will imitate our actions. And should this happen, the preference may not be for the Christian faith. I do not want to support an action that may carry the potential of seriously crippling the proclamation of minority Christian churches in other parts of the world.

For these several reasons I hope that Congress may allow the Constitution to remain as it is.

Dangers in Current Mortgage Lending Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, two speakers warned of dangers and weaknesses in current mortgage lending practices. Carey Winston, president of the association, and Franklin Briese, executive vice president of Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., noted a rise in mortgage foreclosures and questioned whether credit standards have not weakened as lenders compete for outlets for large supplies of lendable funds. Mr. Winston said "the real estate market and the mortgage structure are vulnerable to adverse eocnomic forces," greater than in the recent past.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Wall Street Journal on May 5, discussing this matter, which adds a wholesome cautionary note to the current optimism about economic conditions, in the RECORD:

TWO EXECUTIVES WARN OF DANGER, WEAKNESS IN MORTGAGE PRACTICES—APARTMENT CONSTRUCTION TREND, CREDIT STANDARDS QUESTIONED IN TALKS TO MORTGAGE BANKERS

NEW YORK.—A mortgage banker and a life insurance executive, addressing a meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, warned of dangers and weaknesses they see in current mortgage lending practices.

They attributed the program in part to a leveling off in single-family house building, long a mainstay of the mortgage business, and a sharp rise in apartment construction in excess of immediate demand. Noting a rise in foreclosures, they questioned whether credit standards haven't weakened as lenders compete for outlets for large supplies of lendable money.

The speakers were Carey Winston, president of the association and also president of Carey Winston Co., Washington, D.C., and Franklin Briese, executive vice president of Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., St. Paul.

MIDDLEMAN AND CORRESPONDENTS

Mortgage bankers are middlemen who bring together mortgage lenders and mortgage borrowers. They act as correspondents for such institutions as life insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and commercial banks, placing mortgage loans and handling collections and other services on these loans; they collect fees from these lenders.

Mr. Winston said, "The real estate market and the mortgage structure are vulnerable to adverse economic forces" greater than in the recent past.

He said downpayment requirements on home mortgages have been reduced to the point "where even slight miscalculation may cause trouble. This became evidence with homeowner mortgages as soon as the inflation of house prices ceased to gallop and borrowers weren't so often able to escape their misfortunes through a favorable sale. It will become evident in rental property also, whenever net income fails to meet the suppositions of the appraisal on which the loan was based."

HIGH RISK INVESTMENT

Mr. Winston saw no prospect that present high loan-to-value ratios and long payment terms will change. Under those conditions, he said, mortgages must be recognized as "a high-risk investment" and "any lingering illusions about the unusual safety of mortgage investment that grew up in the early postwar years must be dispelled."

With single-family house building no longer climbing, he noted, construction of income-producing property, such as apartments, hotels, and office buildings has risen "to a prominence not seen since the 1920s." He suggested this trend may be due less to actual demand for space than to tax incentives, relaxed legal restrictions on institutional lending and a plentiful supply of money in the hands of lenders eager for investment. He also said "apprehension" is caused by "the persistent rise in foreclosures and in the troubles of real estate syndicates and corporations."

A March 31 survey by the MBA showed a slight rise from 3 months earlier in the percentage of properties involved in foreclosures, to 0.41 from 0.34 percent. But the survey also showed a decline in the percentage of borrowers behind in their payments, to 3.01 from 3.3 percent.

Mr. Briese echoed many of Mr. Winston's points in enumerating "possible upsetting factors" in the mortgage outlook. He said the life insurance companies, pressed by competition from savings and loan associations, banks, and pension funds, have been switching their mortgage emphasis from residential to business properties, but are finding their competitors also moving into that field.

Interest rates on long-term loans, including mortgages, may rise one-quarter to one-half of a percentage point by year's end, Mr. Briese predicted, "if inflational pressures are kept under control."

Background of Immigration—The "Mislabeled" Ukrainians in the Greater Shamokin Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an article by Dr. Peter Krebel which appeared in a recent issue of the Shamokin Citizen refers to a considerable number of my constituents and points out errors of the Census Bureau and the ramifications in other publications.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this interesting article be included with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"MISLABELED" UKRAINIANS

(By Dr. Peter Krehel)

In late March 1964, the Harrisburg Patriot carried two articles on Eastern European immigrants which interpreted the 1960 Census Bureau statistics on the ethnic backgrounds of Pennsylvania's population. One article from the Congressional Quarterly examined the political, economic and religious factors which brought on the massive migrations from Eastern Europe before 1885 through 1925. The other story was that of Patriot Staff Writer Paul Beers who pointed out the dispersal of immigrants throughout Pennsylvania's counties and noted percentage factors of the various "nationalities."

Neither the Congressional Quarterly article, nor Mr. Beers' recital mentioned Ukrainians, although emigrations beginning in the 1880's from Eastern Europe had to be from either the Czarist Russian Empire, or the Austrian-Hungarian Empire. Those of us who live in the Greater Shamokin area are no strangers to the word "Ukrainian," despite the serious omission in the two articles discussed and the wide circulation they received in Central Pennsylvania.

Let us look at this "mislabeling" and correct the aberrations before they are fixed as correct.

MOST OF SOMETHING

Based on census data, the Congressional Quarterly study poked into these piles of figures to show the central political roles played by the survivors of the gigantic immigration waves, together with their American-born children.

Such a political study is interesting to us only that it reflects the population in congressional districts as being "most Czech" or "most Hungarian," or "most Russian," and significantly for us, "most Austrian." The boiling out of the census data cooked up the "most Austrian" congressional districts in the United States—27 of 30, to be exact—as being primarily in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

By the time that Mr. Beers rehashed the Congressional Quarterly meat loaf, our Sixth

Congressional District of Northumberland, Berks, and Schuylkill Counties, represented by the Honorable GEORGE M. RHODES of Reading, is listed as "15th among the most Austrian."

The neighboring 11th District of Luzerne County is "7th among the most Austrian," while the 10th District of Lackawanna County (city of Scranton area) is "16th among the most Austrian."

STATEWIDE FIGURES

Mr. Beers summarizes at one point that "the Commonwealth ranks second in the Nation with 'foreign-stock Austrians,' 172,-790, according to the U.S. census of 1960. It ranks third with both Polish-Americans, 300,-112, and Hungarian-Americans, 83,417, and fourth with Russian-Americans, 202,255."

The reader will have to await another kettledrum beater for the Hungarian-Americans and Polish-Americans. The concern here is primarily with these mislabeled "foreign-stock Austrians," and secondarily with the "Russian-Americans" in the Greater Shamokin area. A pussyfoot note of caution here: The hyphenated-American used in U.S. Census Bureau statistics is affixed to the children of foreign-stock Americans, and those of us whose parents emigrated from Eastern Europe and gave birth to us here in America are still listed as foreign-stock Americans, prefixed with a hyphenated nationality. All except those who would like to acknowledge the Ukrainian language and culture as that of their parents and ancestors. Ironically, without curtains, we still come out as the "most Austrians" or as "Russian-Americans" in some situations.

BORN IN A BARN

Which only brings up the poignant story of the Ukrainian immigrant who was born in Lvov, the western Ukrainian capital, known as Lwow sometimes, a Polish city between 1918 and 1945 (with exception of September 1939–June 1941). For centuries, it was called Lemberg, the Austrian name, when it was within the Galician Province of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire.

When the immigrant arrived in New York, the immigration officers asked him his nationality, and he replied "Ukrainian." When he told them that he was born in Lvov in 1921, they said that he would have to be marked "Polish" because the city was under Polish sovereignty in 1921.

He insisted on being marked "Ukrainian" with the argument:

"If a kitten is born of a cat in a barn, then it is not to be marked as a calf. It remains a kitten.

"I was born of Ukranian parents in a Polish city, and I remain Ukrainian."

One immigration officer marked him "Polish." Poor fellow did not know it, because it was written in English.

How many such poor muzhiks suffered the similar mislabeling?

It is possible to estimate that the most substantial percentage of the 172,790 foreign-stock Austrians and 202,255 Russian-Americans who were counted in the Pennsylvania 1960 census were and are in fact Ukrainians.

BASIS OF QUESTIONING

These credentials offered by the writer will attempt to give credibility to the conclusion that the Ukrainians have been mislabeled throughout Pennsylvania, not just in the Greater Shamokin area of Northumberland County. We will find our "kittens" strewn all around northern Schuylkill County, through Hazleton and Wilkes-Barre areas of Luzerne County, into the Scranton City region of Lackawanna County. We can suspect the Census Bureau statistics throughout the United States on this most Austrian factor coupled with Russian-Americans.

The writer offers a partial explanation as to why the Congressional Quarterly and Mr. Beers failed to mention the Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian people have not had a national identification until modern times, a short-lived free and Democratic Republic in 1918, followed by the present day Ukrainian Socialist Republic, unwillingly part of the Soviet Union. Equally short lived was the Carpatho-Ukrainian Republic of 1939, since added to the more than 40 million in Eastern Europe today.

During the czarist Russian Empire, the Ukrainians were Russian serfs and subjects who when they arrived as immigrants in the United States, were to be marked as Russian-Americans. Those who lived in the western Ukraine were within the Austrian-Hungarian Empire of Franz Josef, the Province of Galicia, lying along the northern approaches to the Carpathian Mountains. These same mountains separated the Ruthenia Province of northern Hungary, still within the Austrian Monarchy, containing today's Ukrainians who called themselves Carpatho-Russians or Ruthenians (a Latinized version of Rusyn). To a lesser degree, some even called themselves "Hungarians," or were so labeled. For the most part, these Ukrainians (some still resent the word) who reached the United States from Austria-Hungary, they were marked as mislabeled "Austrians."

HOW COME "AUSTRIAN"?

This categorization of "Austrian" is most evident in the immediate Greater Shamokin area of Northumberland County and the scattering of "kittens" mentioned earlier. You will have to screen the Census Bureau's data carefully to find Germanic Austrians throughout the whole anthracite regions. And it will become evident only through examination of religious preferences as to who these "Austrians" are, since they are lumped together in the census figures.

The religious preferences of Ukrainian Catholics or Russian Orthodox of these "Austrians" offer more than surface proof of their Slavonic oneness as Ukrainians.

In Shamokin, the enrollment of the Ukrainian Catholic Church of The Transfiguration finds most of those mislabeled as "foreign-stock Austrians" by the census takers are either former czarist Russian people and their descendants, or immigrant survivors and their American-born children tracing ancestral roots to the Austrian-Hungarians Empire. According to the census of 1960, there are no "Ukrainians" because none of the immigrants came from "Ukrainia." There was no such place on the map only czarist Russia and the Austrian-Hungarian Empire until World War I.

The same holds true for people in Kulpmont, Marion Heights, and the villages of Coal Township who could well claim to be Ukrainian-American (unless they shamefully hide behind a big drum of American patriotism, thereby denying their culture). The St. Mary's Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in Marion Heights of early years has noted that its rite is Greek, but its catholicity is Ukrainian.

In Mount Carmel, the Sts. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church is just full of Austrians, and the St. John's Russian Orthodox Church is nearly equally full of Russians from Carpatho-Russia, or Carpatho-Ukraine (the present Western Ukraine of the Soviet Union).

LEARN AT FIRST HAND

The writer attended parochial night school in the Ukrainian language as a child in Kulpmont. He studied as an American of Ukrainian parents in Czechoslovakia (a kitten with unchanging spots). He traveled widely in Russia. Ukraine, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria over the past 16 years. Based on these studies, these travels, these concerns about his own identification, he has concluded that the Ukrainians have been mislabeled by more than the census takers.

This mislabeling process begins in the Ukrainian-American himself or herself. By failing to recognize our deep cultural roots, to prune the strong poetic and musical branches, to cultivate the free American soil in which we are now planted and a wholesome part, we of Ukrainian descent are allowing the withering, the decay, the indifference, the neglect of the spiritual and material seeds and plants which our forefathers so lovingly and hopefully passed on to us.

The Hoffa Trial

SPEECH

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comment of the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, in his statement to the House that every person is entitled to a fair trial and the protection of his constitutional rights. It is for that reason that I am interested in noting that a special committee of the House Judiciary Committee has been appointed to make a thorough study of a serious and fundamental question: Are individual and constitutional rights being violated by the manner in which the Justice Department is going about the business of prosecuting those charged with law violations?

Whoever the defendants may be—whether it be Jimmy Hoffa in Chattanooga or Roy Cohn in New York, or any lesser person charged with law violation—he is entitled to fair trial under our American system. Without in any way judging the facts of the cases in which these controversies have arisen, I am sure we can agree that the special committee should be thorough in its investigation to determine the merits of the charges that the Justice Department is trampling on those rights.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Award to Rev. Dr. Arthur D. Williams of the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 8, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have recently been informed by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge that it has awarded to Rev. Dr. Arthur D. Williams, of Philadelphia, the George Washington Honor Medal. This coveted medal was awarded for the sermon, "All or Nothing at All."

I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL OR NOTHING AT ALL

Colossians 1: 17: "He is before all things, and by Him all things hold together."

It is one thing to sing, "He Holds the World in His Hands," "Jesus Is All the World to Me," and "Crown Him Lord of All," and it is another thing to live these sentiments in our everyday lives. Most perceptive people will agree that much of our moral armament is on paper. Some will assert that Christianity has not failed. It, they declare, has not been tried. During my 6 years as an Army chaplain, I found that every man wore on his dogtag the letters, "P,", "C," or "J," respectively. Often this meant that the man was merely expressing his preference for the Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish faith. An alarming number seemed satisfied to merely express a preference. It was the civilized and orthodox thing to do.

We are not sure that during these postwar days we have moved far from this practice. David told Nathan that a man who would take the only ewe lamb from his neighbor, when he had many, should be put to death. It was then that the prophet reminded David, "Thou art the man." David had Christianity on paper, but his practice was altogether another thing.

Our text today suggests that America may be in the throes of this coming apart. It would be well if the words would thwack us to awareness that decay, decline, disintegration and death are experiences when matter or men begin to come apart.

Clearly and concisely our Bible verse tells us two things, equally good for an individual or for a nation or nations; namely, we must have a God who is above "all things." Then follows, "by Him all things are held together."

Look at the first truth and you will see that ideals and holy values must be put first. Our God is what we put in first place. It is a hollow and not holy faith that puts church attendance, church membership, giving offerings, and making outside show of prayers and alms, before God. Our standards and values are vain if they do not please God. Today we put a premium on wealth. We generally regard a man as a success if he has power. Sometimes this is physical power, sometimes it is mental power. Sometimes it is material power. We downgrade moral and religious conduct. Not only in the days of John the Baptist, Jesus and St. Paul are men of ideals, hermits, wine-bibblers, impostors and mad, the same is often true today.

The man or nation that neglects to put God before all things, shows a rich capacity for mistreating his fellowman and of ultimately not holding together. There has not survived a people who rejected giving God priority. One after another, nations have been draggled off into captivity and deterioration. My years as chaplain at the Eastern State Penitentiary revealed time and again that men's lives begin to come loose at the seams when they set themselves to low values or regard their power, political, mental, material, or any other sort before that of God. He who trusts in the Lord is like the mountains about Jerusalem. He who trusts in the Lord, and does good, shall dwell in the land, and verily he shall be fed. For those of age we are reminded, "I have been young, and now am old; yet I have not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." For the young the Bible says, "when my father and mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up." All of this is promised to those who set Him before all things, "For the Lord God is a sun and shield: The Lord will give grace and glory; no good thing will he withhold from them that walks uprightly."

Our text declares that He holds all things together. Let us look at man. The man who fails to put God before all things is sure to disintegrate and deteriorate. One of the first signs is his proneness to think of himself. He may claim that he does not think that he is any different from all others whom God created, but he will at the same time act as though there are others who are different from him. This is a form of rationalization which enables him to justify treating others different, "since they are different from me." This treatment will always be just a little or sometimes a whole lot less favorable than he wants to be treated. This is true with all mankind. The natives of the South Pacific would say to me, "we are different from you Americans. We can swim with our eyes open under the water. We can climb the trees without cleats on our shoes or feet. We can weave our huts from palm trees and we can sit on the ground with our feet folded under our bodies." When I talked with the natives of India, again they would say—"your people cannot sit on nails or walk on fire and not be burned." The IQ tests are always to the advantage of the man who creates them! This deadly sin of putting self before God, contains the seeds for its own destruction. The great heresy here is not that man does not believe in God, but that he does not in man. He does not believe in what God has said about not being a respecter of persons. From this follows all the sins of greed, hatred, prejudice, selfishness, and murder. Most all the crimes I know come from treating others different from the way we would that others should treat us.

This same pattern holds among nations. Nations toll their death bell when they put pride and self-interest ahead of the ideals of God. We know a "successful" merchant. He will tell you that he is in business to make money. "I", he asserts, "want to be a success. If this means false packaging, if this means selling food or drugs that are harmful, and I must make a choice between success and the interest of my laborers, my customers, why, I have but one alternative. That alternative is to look out for myself." This merchant is regarded as a very successful man, but this is due to his miseducation and his perverted standard of values. This trend goes for labor and for employer. We are out for what we can get, then we will think of the public afterwards. We may make a contribution to charity or in some way seek to level off the miscarriage of justice. We know that human rights, and civil rights are good, but we want to be elected, we want to be success, so if we have to overlook divine rights for states rights, or even states wrongs, it just has to be. These men believe that realistic is more important than idealistic standards and values.

The principle prevails in the mad race among nations. National leaders swear to uphold certain traditions and principles, but if their success demands that they reject these values, they "have no other alternative."

A moment of reflection would disclose that the alternative that rejects putting God before all things, is sure for disaster and defeat.

Thus I am saddened when I think of the future of my native land, when I see daily the practice of men who neglect to put Him before all things, and know that He will not hold all things together. When men and when nations will flaunt the will of God, I must be prepared to find Him keeping his word. One scholar of the Bible is reported to have counted 33,000 promises in the Bible. He further declares he has not found that God has broken a single promise. God has said He will fight for us and give us the victory, if we obey, and like in Eden he has shown that he will drive us to sorrow, shame and destruction if we disobey. Thou shall have no other god before Him, for the other god will surely cause you or your nation to come apart.

Outstanding Business Leaders Receive University Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 the School of Business Administration of the University of Connecticut will present awards for executive excellence to five of the State's outstanding business and industrial leaders.

These awards are intended to point up the dynamic growth of Connecticut economic stature. I wish to recommend the following article which appeared in the Hartford Courant on May 7 detailing the special 25th anniversary program at the University of Connecticut and the awards which emphasize the economic development during this quarter century. Those receiving awards will be:

Ellis C. Maxey, president, Southern New England Telephone Co.

H. M. Horner, chairman and chief executive officer, United Aircraft Corp.

Lester E. Shippee, chairman of the board, Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.

J. Doyle Dewitt, president, Travelers Insurance Cos.

Beatrice Fox Auerbach, owner-president, G. Fox and Co.

Joseph Burns, vice president, secretary, and general counsel of the Fuller Brush Co.

An alumnus of the University of Connecticut will receive a sixth award.

The above-mentioned article follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT SCHOOL TO HONOR FIVE TOP STATE EXECUTIVES

STORRS.—Five of the State's outstanding business and industrial leaders will receive awards for executive excellence Saturday morning during a special 25th anniversary program at the University of Connecticut.

Recipients of the awards, which are in recognition of the unusual contributions made by these executives over the past 25 years, are:

H. M. Horner, chairman and chief executive officer, United Aircraft Corp.

Lester E. Shippee, chairman of the board, Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.

Ellis C. Maxey, president, Southern New England Telephone Co.

J. Doyle Dewitt, president, Travelers Insurance Co.

Beatrice Fox Auerbach, owner-president, G. Fox & Co.

SIXTH AWARD

The citations, which will be made by the University of Connecticut School of Business Administration, are also intended to point up the dynamic growth of Connecticut's economic stature during the quarter century that the State has had a public university.

A sixth award will be extended to Joseph Burns, vice president, secretary and general counsel of the Fuller Brush Co., for major contributions made to the State's economic development by a University of Connecticut alumnus over the past 25 years.

Burns will also deliver the principal address at an anniversary symposium planned in the school of business administration at 10 a.m. Theme of the symposium will be "Major Business and Economic Developments in Connecticut—1939–64."

Four distinguished Connecticut business and industrial experts will examine the keynote theme from their own professional vantage points, as follows:

Banking and finance, James F. English, executive vice president, the Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.; insurance, Laurence J. Ackerman, president, Norwich Savings Society and former University of California dean of business and insurance; trade and transportation, E. Everett Steichen, partner, Larry Smith & Co., New York City; and utilities, Paul V. Hayden, president, Connecticut Light & Power Co.

In announcing selection of the five award recipients Wednesday, University of Connecticut business dean, Robert O. Harvey took note of their contributions which often transcended professional interests.

For example, he observed that Horner has served as a member of the aviation research advisory committee of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, a director of the Hartford Hospital, and a trustee of the Hartford PMCA, the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, and the National Industrial Conference Board.

Dean Harvey remarked that Shippee had served as chairman of the University of Connecticut board of trustees, a director of nine Connecticut firms, a trustee of the Hartford YMCA and a member of the advisory committee on State legislation of the American Bankers Association.

He recalled that Maxey is a former member of the State board of education, a member of the board of governors of New Haven College, a trustee of Hopkins Grammar School and a director of Grace New Haven Hospital and half a dozen industrial firms.

Dean Harvey called attention to Dewitt's service as a trustee of the Greater Hartford YMCA, the National Safety Council and the Hartford Graduate Center, and as a founder of the University of Hartford.

The University of Connecticut business dean praised Mrs. Auerbach for her establishment of the Service Bureau for Women's Organizations, her service on the board of directors of the Symphony Society of Greater Hartford and the American School for the Deaf, and her activities as delegate to the White House Conference on Education.

The Price of Pussyfooting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 8, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the newspaper the State, of Columbia, S.C., published in its edition of May 5 a very straightforward and impressive editorial entitled "The Price of Pussyfooting." I concur wholeheartedly in the position taken in this editorial, and feel that it should be called to the attention of the policymakers in the administration and also to the attention of all Members of the Congress.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF PUSSYFOOTING

In warfare, moderation is idiocy.

If that military maxim be true, then assuredly we are following the idiot's role in Vietnam.

The cream of American fighting men are in that Red-infested hole of southeast Asia, fighting under political restraints and restrictions which already have cost us tragic losses of blood, lives, and national prestige.

We are fighting a coldblooded, competent, and elusive enemy on his own ground and—again playing the idiot—on his own terms. We are as a tiger with one foot in a steel trap—powerful, courageous, and willing to fight, but bleeding in the grip of a small but merciless foe.

This is no new role for us in Asia. We fought the Reds in Korea with one hand tied behind our back. We poured men, munitions, and money in vast quantities into that "police action," and then stopped short of victory. Even today, that ignominious settlement lives as a reminder of the frustration of two great Americans—Gens. Douglas MacArthur and Mark Clark.

No matter what face-saving words we use to describe our role in the Korean peace, the conclusion of the hot war on that cold terrain brought more prestige to the Communists than to us.

In Laos, we yielded to Communist pressures and agreed to a neutralist regime, knowing full well that Laos would continue to be a transmission belt of Red guerrillas and supplies into South Vietnam.

Now we are in the clutches of an undeclared war in Vietnam, committing our men to combat as advisers and burying them in ever-increasing numbers as human sacrifices to a national policy of timidity.

Someone in Washington must face up to some hard questions and give some hard answers.

Is South Vietnam crucial to the salvation of southeast Asia from Communist domination If it is, do we mean the drive the Communists out of South Vietnam? If we do, will we accomplish that military objective by military action, directed by military men?

If the answers to these questions are "yes," then the Johnson administration must decide once and for all the ultimate issue of Vietnam: Either we fight, and fight to win, or we get out.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last summer, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held its 50th anniversary convention in Washington and once again this distinguished organization made many fine recommendations for the efficient use, conservation, and control of America's rich water resources.

It is my privilege to serve as chairman of the recreation and wildlife committee of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

At the committee's annual meeting, which was presided over by Mr. John Wakefield, several important topics were discussed ranging from the "Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963," to the toxic effects of detergents and pesticides on wildlife.

I think it is significant to note some of the questions raised by this distinguished committee concerning the imposition of user fees which is advocated in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The questions about such user fees which are noted in this committee report are but a few of the many objections which have been voiced in the past year.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the complete text of the recreation and wildlife committee report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RECREATION AND WILDLIFE, 50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 5, 1963

The meeting was called to order and, because of lack of a quorum of members of the committee, it was jointly presided over by Mr. John W. Wakefield and a staff member from the office of Representative ED EDMONDSON, chairman of the committee. Chairman EDMONDSON was detained because of critical committee action before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A number of subjects were discussed, but due to the lack of committee member representation no formal resolutions were adopted. Among those subjects discussed were:

1. Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963: The discussions developed that

while there is vital need for a coordinated effort for a program of this type and while the overall principle is sound, there was much pro and con on the proposed users fee for the projects. Some of the nonmembers present stated they realized there had to be a citizen participation in the procurement of funds with which to obtain and operate these public use areas. Others indicated their public use areas are not now subject to a users fee charge and they did not intend to initiate such a program in the future and were committed to oppose a user's fee plan.

2. It was the majority of opinion of those present that there should be a uniform system of evaluating the benefit ratios of a Federal project, and especially with respect to recreational cost benefits. Each Government agency involved in Federal projects appears to have their own policy with respect to this computation. It was felt that the enactment of H.R. 3620 or S. 1111, Water Resources Planning Act, which are presently before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate, would be a good step in the right direction.

In this connection a resolution was discussed which would permit a specific allocation of water storage space in multipurpose Federal reservoirs where recreation and wildlife benefits are included.

3. There was a considerable amount of discussion on the need for a clear-cut policy with regard to policy powers over Federal projects and other projects in which there has been Government participation. There seems to be a considerable variance of policy and misunderstanding on whether or not a Federal agency is to administer a program of boating safety laws and enforcement of other regulations with regard to recreational areas and Federal impoundments. Consequently, on some projects throughout the country there is a serious lack of enforcement of laws and regulations which are vitally important to the safety and well-being of the general public.

4. Briefly the toxic effects of detergents and pesticides on wildlife were discussed and a report from Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze recommending a delay in legislative remedial action on detergents until next year when a joint study by the detergent industry and the Department has been completed and their recommendations submitted for study by Congress and all others concerned.

Those in attendance are listed on enclosure.

John C. Timman, Atchafalaya Levee Board, Addis, La.

Valcin Gisclair, Atchafalaya Levee Board, Larau, La.

George Lefebvre, Atchafalaya Levee Board, Port Allen, La.

A. J. Blanchard, Atchafalaya Levee Board, Port Allen, La.

Lester Huval, Atchafalaya Levee Board, Cecilia, La.

Sprague Pugh, Atchafalaya Levee Board, Plaquemine, La.

Joseph Cefalu, St. Mary Parish, Morgan City, La.

Haysler Poague, chairman, Missouri Water Resources Board, Clinton, Mo.

George S. Smith, M.D., mayor, Easton, Pa.

Andrew Wyosky, councilman, McDonald, Ohio.

Howard Mendenhall, Rend Lake Conservancy District, Benton, Ill.

C. P. Key, South Carolina State delegate, Lodge, S.C.

John W. Wakefield, Florida Board of Conservation, Tallahassee, Fla.

Otto Wettstein III, member, Florida Development Commission, Live Oak, Fla.

Frank J. Domino, Morgan City Harbor and Terminal Commission, Morgan City, La.

Carroll Swearingen, Sabine River Authority, Quitman, Tex.

A. J. Pattie, Berwick, La.

Dr. C. R. Brownell, Morgan City, La.

American Society for Testing and Materials To Dedicate New Headquarters Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 8, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on May 11 in Philadephia, the American Society for Testing and Materials will dedicate its new $3 million headquarters building.

For 66 years, the society has contributed to our Nation's strength and growth through its research and through its dedication to high engineering standards.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outline of the society's purpose and history.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS

1. HISTORY AND ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS

The American Society for Testing and Materials was originally formed in 1898 as the American Section of the International Association for Testing Materials. Before long, it became evident to these American members that an independent organization could best carry out the important standardization and research work in this country. Accordingly, the American Society for Testing and Materials (then known as American Society for Testing Materials) was incorporated in 1902 as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Its corporate purpose, as stated in its charter, and which has remained unchanged to the present time, is as follows:

"The promotion of knowledge of the materials of engineering, and the standardization of specifications and the methods of testing."

2. MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the society is open to those interested in the educational and technical purposes and work of the society. The 12,000 members of the society include: 8,500 individual engineers, research workers, scientists, educators, and testing experts; and 1,000 governmental agencies and departments (Federal, State, and municipal), educational institutions, libraries, and associations; 2,500 industrial plants and research laboratories. In addition, the society has more than 2,000 student members on the campuses of the engineering and technical colleges of the United States. The membership is drawn from a broad spectrum of interested individuals, agencies, and industries of this country and abroad.

From a membership of 70 in 1898, the society has grown to 12,000 members. All parts of the United States are represented and many memberships are held in Canada, England, Latin American and most other foreign countries.

3. SOCIETY'S ACTIVITIES

Promotion of knowledge of the materials of engineering is effected through investigations and research by committees and individual members of the society and by joint research with the other groups, the results of which are presented as papers, reports, and discussions at society meetings and subsequently published. These publications are available not only to American Society for Testing and Materials members but to the general public.

The standardization of specifications and methods of testing is carried out chiefly by technical committees, each of which has under its jurisdiction engineering materials in a definite and prescribed field or some specific phase of materials testing. Each of these committees is a vital and inherent part of the society's organization.

Approximately 15,000 authorities participate on American Society for Testing and Materials committees with assigned responsibilities ranging all the way from materials for surgical implant within the human body to materials for the vehicles of outer space.

During World War II and the subsequent world crises, there has been great emphasis on the quality, testing, and inspection of materials, all of which stress the importance of the society's work. Many emergency provisions were issued during World War II and were used again during the Korean emergency. Close cooperation with the Department of Defense, National Bureau of Standards, and many other governmental departments and agencies has gone hand in hand with national emergencies or other needs. This may be attested by the memberships in American Society for Testing and Materials held by various departments or agencies of the Federal Government alone. These include Agriculture, Air Force, Army, Atomic Energy Commission, Commerce, General Services Administration, Interior, National Bureau of Standards, Navy, Post Office, and Treasury.

The importance of the society's activities is emphasized because of the prime importance of efficient and economic use of materials. Furthermore, a sound knowledge of materials is fundamental to the engineering and scientific professions. The entire general public benefits from this activity. The society does no commercial testing or other work for gain or profit to itself or its members, other than the result of the education in American Society for Testing and Materials as an institution of learning in the technical fields which it espouses.

4. AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS IS AN ASSOCIATION OR INSTITUTION OF LEARNING

The society's objective has always been, and continues to be, that of an association to promote the knowledge of the materials of engineering—new and old—as the times and needs require; standardization of specifications founded on such knowledge, experience, and research; and the methods of testing to assure adherence to sound specifications. It develops and augments the knowledge of its members and others collaborating with it and its committees—and the general public—in the nature, properties, characteristics, and uses of materials, natural or manufactured, and products therefrom; establishes standards or specifications and methods of test which have won worldwide acceptances. They are available not merely to federal governments, their departments and bureaus, technical and scientific bodies, colleges, universities, state and local governmental authority, but also to all professional or technical persons and to the public at large.

In our opinion, the educational function performed by the scientific and engineering societies in the United States has contributed effectively to the explosive industrial growth and development in this country over the past 100 years. It is the free exchange of technical information upon which additional knowledge is rapidly built that continually contributes to the further education of the members of scientific and engineering professions in this country. This becomes quite evident when a comparison is made with the proprietary attitudes in countries abroad. It is readily recognized here as an impor-

tant part of the educational process of our professional individuals.

In the many research projects which the society and its committees sponsor or in which they collaborate with other associations, including Government agencies; in the preparation of technical papers or articles, discussions in committees, subcommittees, annual or interim meetings of the society and related associations, including the American Standards Association, of which the American Society for Testing and Materials is a founder constituent—all these arranged or administered or under the direction of the society—engineers, scientists, and other professional and technical personnel, and others, including the general public evincing an interest, are the recipients of the fruits of the society as an association or institution of learning with respect to the materials of engineering, establishment of standard specifications and methods of testing, and the results of research.

It is true, of course, that no one collaborating in the work of the society, whether he be chairman or member of a special committee or a subcommittee—excepting only the personnel constituting the staff at the offices of the society—receives financial remuneration for his work, time, and effort, nevertheless they are rewarded for their efforts in the same way as the student who has completed a college or university course in a general engineering or chemical or other technical field, and thereafter attends special lectures, discussions in a specialized field of his choosing, as quasi postgraduate work.

Many foreign countries participate in sending to the American Society for Testing and Materials exchange study teams and students sponsored by the Federal Government and by private organizations. These have been, in the past several years, students from France, Japan, Italy, Spain, Western Germany, India, Turkey, Philippines, Chile, Taiwan (free China), Korea, and others. These groups having had some preliminary knowledge of the importance of the American Society for Testing and Materials work in formulating specifications and methods of testing engineering materials, express keen interest in gaining further detailed informaton. The American Society for Testing and Materials by lectures and conferences instructs these students in the manner in which its standards and methods are developed and gives them considerable background in American methods of production and inspection of engineering materials. In many cases, it arranges for visits to American industrial plants over and above those which have been prearranged. By promoting knowledge of this kind, it is believed the American Society for Testing and Materials is contributing to, and gaining for the United States the good will of the foreign nations participating, and that through the greater uses of standardization, the standards of living in many of these nations will be raised.

Thus the society provides forums for study, research, consideration, and discussion by its members and others with respect to the problems involved in the testing and specifying of engineering materials.

5. INCOME OF THE SOCIETY AND ITS USE

(a) The income of the society is derived primarily from dues of members and sale of publications. It is all used in furthering the purposes above described and does not inure to the benefit of any member of the society of any other individual.

(b) The society also receives and disburses moneys raised in support of research in materials carried on under the auspices of its committees. It maintains a research fund developed primarily from its income and used for support of research in materials and methods of testing.

(c) Fellowships and grants in aid: A fellowship and grants-in-aid program was established in 1959 to further knowledge in the field of research and standardization for materials.

(d) The society maintains lecture funds and a number of medal or award funds, the income of which supports annual scientific lectures and annual awards of medals in recognition of meritorious accomplishments in the fields of science and technology covered by the society's activities.

6. AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS AN ASSOCIATION OF LEARNING ARE WORLDWIDE

American Society for Testing and Materials standards and specifications and methods of testing serve as authoritative guides in technical and scientific matters relating to materials of engineering and methods of testing. They have worldwide use; by many departments and agencies of the Federal Government and foreign countries, who have maintained membership for many years; by many State departments, such as highway and construction departments, and many municipalities; by industries engaged in the production or use of materials; by engineers, chemists, consultants, testing laboratories and others having to do with the application of materials to engineering and industrial structures, and many products. Such use is in various ways; by adoption of or reference to an American Society for Testing and Materials standard in toto, by incorporation in private or public specifications of the significant technical requirements of the American Society for Testing and Materials standards; by incorporation in building and safety codes and similar safety programs; and simply by being used as the basis for the writing of private or public specifications.

It is obvious that the work of the society and its committees contributes immeasurably to the learning of all who have an interest in its broad fields, and hence such work has great educational value.

7. AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO GENERAL PUBLIC

Direct educational value resides in the wide use of the society's standards and scientific findings by universities, colleges, and technical schools in subjects pertaining to specifications and properties of materials and methods of testing, in seminar work, and general references. This knowledge is available to all who wish to improve their know-how of materials and methods of testing.

The society's library, containing extensive data on engineering materials in the form of papers, reports, standards, and other technical information, including many reference works on materials and standards, is available for reference and use by any person or organization, as is also the knowledge and experience of the highly trained technical staff—whether such person be a member or not. The society responds to continuous requests from governmental and other public bodies as well as the general public for information on matters of specifications, properties, and tests which fall within its many fields of activity.

Poverty War Needs Five-Front Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the testimony I presented on May 1, 1964, to the ad hoc subcommittee on the poverty war program:

A FIVE-FRONT WAR AGAINST POVERTY

(Statement of Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, on H.R. 10440, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Poverty War Program, May 1, 1964)

Mr. Chairman, Pittsburgh wants to enlist for the duration in the war against poverty.

Pittsburgh is one of the few large cities which is classified as a distressed area and Pittsburgh has been so classified for a longer period than any other city. Because of this we have more than our share of poverty.

But even in Pittsburgh it is difficult for most people—secure in their jobs, with families and the comforts of life—to understand the problems of those faced with poverty.

The poor are hidden by curtains of loneliness and isolation—curtains symbolized by the hills that shield the valleys of misery, the dirt roads that discourage fast-moving cars, and the ugliness that keeps most of us out of the slums. But they are there—people of flesh and blood.

The solution to these problems is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee and beyond the jurisdiction of any single Department or Agency in the executive branch. Similarly, at the local level the war against poverty will cut across jurisdictional lines. In the field of community development, with the Pittsburgh renaissance, Pittsburgh has demonstrated the importance of civic patriotism and a talent for bringing together business, labor, and Government to work cooperatively for community betterment.

I think this talent to cooperate across jurisdictional lines will make Pittsburgh an ideal frontline soldier in the war against poverty.

We are ready to start now.

Certainly the time for action is now. As Walter Lippmann put it recently: "For a long period—since the end of World War II—the American people at great cost have had to assume the leadership of the free world to hold the line against Communist power. It has cost not only over half the Federal budget but it has cost the time, energy, and emotional concern of our people for 20 years. The result is that we have had to neglect the development of this vast country. And the result of this is seen in the condition of our schools, in the condition of our cities, in the backwardness of our transportation system and in a lot of other things. We must now turn our attention to our own affairs."

H.R. 10440, now pending before this committee, is a good beginning. Aptly, it is named the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 because this puts the proposition in a positive way. We intend a war against poverty not just in the sense of relief or a welfare program, but in the creation of opportunity in this country for some 35 million persons who can afford neither adequate food nor adequate clothing, nor adequate housing.

H.R. 10440 is titled "a bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States." But the bill must not stand alone.

The war must be fought on at least five fronts if we are to succeed in accomplishing its broad objectives. It will involve a five-front war with legislation pending not only before this, but also before other committees of the Congress.

First let us dispose of one myth, the poor are not poor because they want to be. Some there may be who find that our free enterprise system is not sufficiently challenging and who prefer to eke out a bare subsistent existence. However, the overwhelming majority are those who, because of various disadvantages, find the challenge of the free enterprise system to be excessive.

If we look at these groups and their particular disadvantages, we will know how to fight the five-front war against poverty.

Some programs are underway or under consideration for these groups. With this legislation in prospective, let us see how it all fits into the entire picture.

I think of five major groups who have unusual barriers against full participation in our economy. First, the young and undereducated. Their unemployment rate is double that for the population generally. We have some programs such as aid to education and the Vocational Educational Act for the young, but something radically new is needed because our entire educational system is based on the assumption that it would take place in a middle-class community where a great deal of the process of education is carried on at home. In the case of a young person whose parents are poor and uneducated and who lives in rural or urban slums, the basic assumption is false. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1964 will help to eradicate slums and improve the environment in which our young people are growing up; but other programs directed specifically toward this problem are needed.

The second group are the middle aged who are either untrained or whose skills have been shot out from under them either by automation or other technical change. The Manpower Retraining and Development Act is a possible answer to the problems of this group.

The third group are our older citizens and particularly those whose life savings have been, or may be, wiped out by disastrous illness. The Hospital Insurance Act of 1964 now pending before the Ways and Means Committee is this administration's answer to the particular needs of this group.

The fourth category of people are those whose lot is inextricably linked to a geographical area which is economically depressed. One answer to this group is the extension of the Area Redevelopment Act which has been reported by my Committee on Banking and Currency and is now pending in the Rules Committee.

We must also have Federal aid for the development of mass transportation facilities in urban centers.

Another answer to a major geographical area poverty problem is the President's Appalachian program.

The fifth major category are citizens of minority groups subjected to discrimination. One answer to this group is the Civil Rights Act and particularly title VII thereof passed by the House of Representatives and now being debated in the other body.

The common thread running through each of the five foregoing categories is that each one of them has one or more handicaps which make it more difficult for them to participate fully in the free enterprise system.

Worst of all, these handicaps tend to be handed on from parents to the children.

The uneducated father tends to be poor and live in a slum, bringing up his children in a home environment which does not contribute to the educational process. At the same time and to our shame, the schools in such a neighborhood tend to be well below average and, thus, the vicious cycle repeats itself.

The new and exciting thing about this legislation is that with its emphasis on young people, it recognizes that the greatest challenge is to break these patterns of poverty which occur generation after generation.

I believe it was this objective that the President had in mind when in his poverty message he said, "the years of high school and college age are the most critical stage of a young person's life. If they are not helped then, many will be condemned to a life of poverty which they, in turn, will pass on to their children." That is the real meaning of the President's recommendation for the creation of a Job Corps, a work-training program and work-study program.

These proposals are excellent and I certainly urge the committee to support them.

However, I also urge the committee to consider at least on a pilot project basis, a program of special assistance to primary schools located in our poorest neighborhoods. It is in these schools that Johnny learns or does not learn to read. Because Johnny receives less reading assistance at home, these schools should be above average, and yet we all know too well that they are usually at the bottom of the educational ladder. The 6-year-old today who is not learning properly how to read will have dropped out of high school 10 years from now and will be a candidate for the Job Corps for which future Congresses will be called upon to appropriate money.

I call your attention to an article in the May 1964, issue of Harper's magazine. It is entitled "Give Slum Children a Chance: A Radical Proposal." This article is taken from a book to be published by Random House called "Crisis in Black and White." The author is Mr. Charles E. Silberman. Mr. Silberman is a member of the board of editors of Fortune magazine and a lecturer in economics at Columbia University, Mr. Silberman points out:

"The root of the problem educationally is that the slum child does not learn to read properly in the first two grades. Whether because of this reading disability alone, or because of difficulty in handling abstract concepts that stem from independent causes, the slum child falls further and further behind after the third grade; the gap widens, and his IQ actually declines. His failure to read properly affects a lot more than his school work. It has a profound impact on how he regards himself and consequently on how he regards school. Poor reading skill at the start is the major cause of school dropouts and subsequent unemployment."

Dr. Silberman says:

"Nothing less than a radical reorganization of American elementary education is necessary, therefore, if the schools are to begin to discharge their obligation to teach the Negro and white slum youngsters. To reverse the effects of a starved environment. the schools must begin admitting children at the age of 3 or 4, instead of at 5 or 6. The nursery school holds the key to the future—but a very different kind of nursery school from the one most Americans are familiar with."

I recommend that the members of this committee give careful consideration to Mr. Silberman's proposals. In fact, I believe that a highly profitable study could be made of the pilot programs upon which Mr. Silberman bases his proposals.

If we can prevent the problem from developing, we can cut down or eliminate the job corps in the future and know with reasonable assurance that we have broken the pattern of poverty.

It seems to me that the war on poverty program which Mr. Sargent Shriver has put together for the President and unfolded before Congress reflects realistic, workable, and indeed conservative economic principles.

The United States has been hailed for our generosity to people in need in all parts of the world. The American people have given generously of their resources as a matter of responsibility. This same sense of responsibility makes a demand upon the national conscience that cannot be ignored.

Our response to this problem of poverty amidst plenty must come from the heart. It must spring from conviction. It must be intelligent. It must be comprehensive.

America should not settle for less.

Opportunity Knocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the May issue of Connecticut Industry. This article discusses the program of the United Aircraft Corp. at Trinity College's summer engineering laboratory which will guide high school juniors in choosing engineering careers.

I believe programs such as the one which is described here will enable us to alleviate the serious shortage of engineers today as well as encourage our young men to remain in school and drop out without adequate preparation.

I congratulate the United Aircraft Corp. for initiating this fine program.

The article follows:

UNITED AIRCRAFT-TRINITY COLLEGE PROJECT SPARKS INTEREST IN ENGINEERING CAREER

High school juniors of Connecticut get another opportunity this summer to decide whether they wish to become engineers.

For the second year, United Aircraft Corp. will sponsor Trinity College's summer engineering laboratory. The 8-week scholarship program providing full tuition to qualified students will be conducted from June 29 through August 23. It offers two college courses for credit to Connecticut young men who have completed the 11th grade by June of this year.

The unique laboratory program begun in 1963 by Trinity under a grant from United Aircraft was developed by Dr. Robert M. Vogel, dean of the college and formerly dean of graduate studies and director of summer studies at Trinity.

"Development of a serious shortage of engineers today," Dr. Vogel has pointed out, is at least partially due to high school seniors having to make an early choice of career interest with no chance to examine engineering nor to consider its challenges and opportunities. Trinity, felt, however, that high schools are limited in the time they can devote to science and cannot be expected to add introductory courses in engineering.

The summer engineering laboratory was established at Trinity as a partial solution to a double problem: the early career choice faced by students and a shortage of engineers faced by the Nation.

Commenting on this voluntary sponsorship of the program, UAC President William Gwinn stated, "United Aircraft, as a company built around engineering, has long been concerned at the widening gap between the national demand for engineers and the number of graduates coming out of the engineering colleges. We are gratified by the opportunity to join with Trinity in encouraging talented high school students to consider engineering as a career by providing them with an introduction to the field through Trinity's summer engineering laboratory."

In two college courses (introduction to engineering science and philosophy of science) the students are introduced to modern engineering concepts in a program enabling them to investigate the relation of science to man's development and culture.

Last summer, 36 Connecticut high school juniors participated in the laboratory under United Aircraft scholarships. Although too early to make any long-range predictions

concerning its effect on career choices, the program was considered a success. The laboratory was enthusiatically received and the students confirmed what Trinity has believed since establishing the transition to college plan in 1958; that high school students, properly selected, are capable of doing outstanding work at the college level.

It will be noted that eligibility requirements favor no particular industry. To qualify for Trinity's summer engineering laboratory, a student must be a resident of Connecticut who has completed the 11th grade with study including 1 year of chemistry and 3 years of college preparatory mathematics. Further information may be obtained from Trinity College, office of summer session and graduate studies.

New Parity Ratio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the doctors of statistics apparently are operating again down in the Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year I commented on the newly adjusted parity ratio which was being used for the first time at the direction of the policymakers in the Department. Secretary Freeman and his sides apparently are unwilling to accept the fact that the parity ratio of farm income has been consistently skidding ever since he took over the office. The farm parity ratio stood at 80 percent in 1961 when the present Secretary of Agriculture came into office and the parity ratio has been skidding year by year since that time. It now stands at the lowest point since the depression years of the 1930's—the Department of Agriculture reported that the parity ratio for April 15, 1964, was 75 percent—down 2 points from the month preceding and down 3 points from last year at the same time.

Not being satisfied with allowing the farmer's income to fall to depression levels during a period of supposed prosperity for all other segments of our Nation's economy, the statistics manipulators in the Department of Agriculture again seem to be doing their best to sweep the situation under the rug. I refer to the farm income situation report put out by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture for release on April 29 of this year. You will look in vain through this entire publication for any reference to the parity ratio having slipped to 75 percent during the month of April. What is reported in this publication is a parity ratio of 95.6 percent for the year 1962 and this parity ratio is based on an index of 1957–59=100.

The parity ratio that we American farmers are accustomed to is the one established by law in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and for reference purposes this legally defined parity ratio figure is the one which is meaningful and is a true indicator of the farmer's economic plight.

The normal parity ratio figure of 75 percent for April 15 gives a clear indication of the extent to which American agriculture today is being depressed by a cost-price squeeze such as we have never experienced before. To illustrate this point, I include a brief article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, May 5, 1964, stating that "Farm commodities head still lower in price despite the economy's continuing climb," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMMODITY LETTER—A SPECIAL REPORT ON PRODUCTION AND PRICE TRENDS AFFECTING HOMES AND FACTORIES

Farm commodities head still lower in price despite the economy's continuing climb.

While business generally pushes steadily higher, farm prices move in the opposite direction. Prices farmers received for their products at mid-April fell to 236 percent of the 1910–14 average, 6 points less than a year ago, and the lowest for this season since 1957. Such basic farm products as beef cattle, poultry, wheat, eggs, cotton, and tobacco now bring lower prices than a year ago.

A number of farm products may well slide further in price over the coming months. Wheat and cotton are expected to show price decline when the new farm law goes into effect July 1. Sugar prices soften as a result of a bumper beet crop. Some foreign farm commodities are likely to decline, too. Coffee prices are threatened by a possible boost in export quotas, which would swell shipments from Brazil's reserve stock.

The cost of goods and services farmers buy keeps rising, cutting farm purchasing power to the lowest point since 1939.

Student Presidential Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the national student poll on presidential candidates may be of considerable interest because the results of this student vote in the past have reflected the thinking of parents on the selection of a President.

The vote taken recently in the Conrad Weiser High School at Robesonia. Pa.—near Reading—in my congressional district showed the following votes for candidates whose names were printed on the presidential ballot:

Johnson	481
Nixon	118
Lodge	115
Goldwater	61
Rockefeller	24
Smith	20
Scranton	18
Wallace	5
Romney	1
Stassen	0

There was also a scattering of write-in votes. Robert Kennedy, whose name was not printed on the ballot, received 37 write-ins.

In 1956 the student poll came within 1.3 percent of the final national results. The 1960 poll was as follows: Democrat, 53.4 percent; Republican, 46.4 percent. Actual results were Democrat, 49.7 percent; Republican, 49.5 percent.

The Conrad Weiser teachers whose students participated in this poll were: Grade 7, Mr. Thomas Golden; grade 8, Mr. Elwood Himmelberger; grade 9, Mr. Wayne Seifarth; grade 10, Mrs. Howard Suhr; grade 11, Mr. Gordan Jones; grade 12, Mr. Donald Seltzer.

Aircraft in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial which appeared in the May 4, 1964, issue of the Los Angeles Times concerning U.S. aircraft in use in Vietnam.

There seems to be no question that the use of less than adequate aircraft in Vietnam has unduly endangered the lives of Americans and others. This situation has been a matter of concern for a good many months.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the Los Angeles Times editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WEAK VIETNAM AIR ARM

The posthumously published letters of a U.S. Air Force captain killed in combat in Vietnam reveal disturbingly the inadequacy of an important phase of the American commitment to that war, and the shocking lack of preparedness for it.

Capt. Edwin Shank's correspondence indicates that in Vietnam we are trying to fight a war largely with World War II equipment and with flyers who, unfortunately, were trained primarily for the wrong kind of airplanes and the wrong kind of missions.

Trained himself to fly multiengine jet aircraft, Captain Shank was assigned to piloting T–28 modified single-engine trainers, used in Vietnam as tactical fighter-bomber support for ground troops.

The principal U.S. bombers available in Vietnam, at least through March when Shank was killed, were World War II-model B–26's. These planes, he writes, were finally either grounded or limited to level bombing attacks. The reason is that the 20-year-old planes tended to fall apart when subjected to nonroutine stresses.

Captain Shank's letters make it woefully clear that, despite hundreds of billions of dollars spent for defense in recent years, we apparently do not have attack aircraft designed primarily for Vietnam-type conflicts—the kind most likely to be fought in an age of nuclear stalemate.

Blame for this situation rests squarely on the Air Force and the Defense Department. Ever since Korea the Air Force has concentrated on producing strategic weapons—missiles as well as long-range multijet bombers—which are completely unsuited to brushfire warfare. Such a war requires subsonic, highly maneuverable aircraft. Supersonic nuclear bombers are of no value.

Even now, after years of experience in Vietnam, the Air Force approach to the limited war aviation problem is to modify existing planes—T–28's and T–37 jet trainers—instead of developing new ones. The Navy, on the other hand, is preparing to produce

its own limited-war plane, but it will not be available for some time.

Meanwhile, unless better planes are taken from the U.S. stockpile or quickly developed, our airmen—who do a superb job with what they have—will continue to fight with inexcusably inferior aircraft.

And our costly effort in South Vietnam, already limping, will become an even greater cripple.

Weltner Discusses the Need for Action To Make Our Cities Beautiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 1960 census of population found 2 of every 3 Americans living in our metropolitan areas. Most of the increase in our population is occurring in these urban centers. Since the end of World War II, we have spent billions of dollars in our cities, building anew and restoring.

But have we built cities which are beautiful tributes to our civilization? Have we translated our vast outlays, our mastery of technology, and our architectual and planning skills into the best possible environment for our city dwellers. The answer, of course, is in the negative. So it is time to look for the causes and the cures of our failure.

Our very able colleague from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] dealt with these questions in a masterful address to the Georgia chapter of the American Institute of Planners on April 24 in Atlanta.

I believe many Members will find his address, entitled "Urban Design, Planning and Politics," of great interest. It follows:

URBAN DESIGN, PLANNING, AND POLITICS

Thank you for your kind introduction and also for the invitation to speak to the Georgia chapter of the American Institute of Planners. The title of my remarks has already been given "Urban Design, Planning, and Politics," but my subject is the disorganized, disorderly, dirty place where the vast majority of the citizens in the United States live—cities. My first proposition is that cities are ugly and getting worse every day.

We have become so accustomed to this ugliness, to the jarring visual impact of our cityscapes, the dull monotony of the suburbs, that I think, even to planners, the point bears repeating. The present urbanization of America has the potential of being a damning indictment of man's sin against his surroundings.

You may be familiar with Peter Blake's new book, "God's Own Junkyard." The photographs in that book make one indisputable point. We live in an awful and ugly world of our own making. And we have become inured to it. Seeing the photographs, separate and individual, brought home the frightening fact that I had reached the point that I am not aware in the normal day of the mess we live in.

I won't belabor this point, for I am sure you, as professionals, agree that cities are unbeautiful, ungainly sights.

But there is, as I have mentioned, a damning quality to this ugliness—an indictment against us, for we have built our own ugly hells. Since 1946, the first peacetime year after World War II, total construction in the United States has amounted to approximately $725 billion.

This enormous expenditure of money for new buildings, new homes, new suburbs, new cities could have made the United States a handsome nation. We might have built a world of which we would have been proud. Rather we have built manmade vistas that reflect tinsel and shabbiness, disorder and distress, monotony and money.

The larger part of this construction has been in the private sector of our economy, a fact I will discuss later, but much of it has been financed from public funds.

For instance, since 1941, the public housing program, has cost the American Federal taxpayer $1.3 billion for low-income housing across the Nation. And what do we have to show for it? What kind of housing have we built? What has been the visual impact of this publicly financed addition to the cityscape.

Dull, monotonous piles of dirty red brick with pounded dirt yards. The ubiquitous chain fence, the concrete-covered play yard. And if that seems to be a hard judgment, just see what kind of visual image your mind's eye creates if you think of the new high-rise public housing projects in our large cities. Those 15- to 20-storied buildings—4 or 5 all the same—and those little metal framed windows which open on the vista of the other monotonous facades across the concrete and metal playground.

And some planner planned for these eyesores to stand together—a vertical ghetto. And some architect designed those tiled tunnels, those filing cabinets for human beings, and some local public housing authority board approved the project.

The Nation, through FHA, VA, and GI loans, has insured $57 billion of residential construction across the Nation. And what do we have to show for these publicly supported programs?

Those rows and rows of monotonous houses—with the same size living rooms, the same size bedrooms, and often the same colored paint on the same fronts, facing across a street to another row of this sameness.

And some planner planned the sites, and some architect designed the house, not the houses, they're all the same house, and the bureaucrats approved it.

Since 1949, we have had an urban renewal program, federally assisted. To date, more than $3.7 billion of Federal funds have been committed to this program.

The program holds promise but the present realization is small. In most cities, the urban renewal director has to take you on a tour, or you would miss the newness entirely. And often the new land use is questionable, the plan is bad, and the buildings are new shiny ugliness in place of old dirty ugliness.

The Urban Planning Assistance program has committed approximately $60 million of Federal funds since its inception in 1954. We have plans for parks, plans for sewers, streets, and schools, plans for rapid transit systems, master plans and minor plans—the shelves of the planning commissions across the Nation are overloaded with plans. Soon planning commissions will have to apply for planning funds to make plans for storing plans.

We have got to put these plans into practice—we need realities instead of more reams of paper.

My point is that the Nation has expended tremendous sums of private money in the building of cities.

The taxpayers have invested millions and millions of dollars, not only of Federal funds, but also of States and local funds to save our cities, to house our people, to bring order and beauty to our growing manmade environment—and in Peter Blake's terms, we live in "God's Own Junkyard," our suburbs are slurbs and our cities are slums.

Somebody is responsible for the sight of our cities. The title of this talk might well have been, "Who's Responsible, the Professionals, the Politicians, or the Public?" For someone is responsible. Perhaps everyone of these groups is responsible, but that easy generalization leaves us with the conclusion that we hold no individual responsible.

Let me make a layman's assumption at this point. As our economic system is based on profit, our cities must meet three criteria if they are to be considered successful.

They must show a profit.

They must be a place where people can work and live, not simply exist in servitude.

They must be something of which we can be proud. By this I mean, they must be pleasing to eye. As they are the monuments of urban civilization, they should reflect the best, not the worst.

First, let us consider profit. We can assume that business will take care of itself. Many of the atrocities that have been committed on cities are done in the name of profit.

It is easy enough to lay the blame for the present state of our cityscapes and the poor quality of urban design at the doorstep of private enterprise. But this is an easy laying of the blame.

Is it or is it not true that "It don't have to be ugly to make money?" Or as a slogan, can it be proven that "Good design and planning is good business?"

As I see it, the task of answering these questions is your responsibility. If good planning is good business, then the businessman can have both beauty and a profit.

This task, your task, can't be accomplished by articles by architects and planners to architects and planners in the pages of Architectural Forum, The Journal of Housing, or the Journal of the American Institute of Planning. The businessman doesn't see these magazines. You are talking to yourselves.

And how about the politicians? City councils across the country, Congressmen and Senators, governors and mayors aren't committed to the concept of good design. They react. They react to what they know and what they feel the public wants.

The planners have taught the politicians some certain basic concepts. For instance, most cities have zoning laws. And, as you well know, most zoning laws fall far short of the ideal.

In Houston, they don't have a zoning code. There you get a tall, handsome building next to a one-floor hamburger stand with a big sidewalk-overhanging sign, and then a greasy garage.

In Atlanta, we have a zoning code. And here you have a tall, handsome building next to a one-floor hamburger joint, adjoined to a greasy garage.

And you know why as well as I. The "variance"—the way to do anything you want—with the approval of the zoning committee.

How many times at a zoning committee meeting is there a representative of the local chapter of the AIA or the AIP registering the complaint that the variance is against the best interest of the public, that it doesn't fit the "master plan" that is gathering dust somewhere?

Have you ever been to a zoning commission hearing where the local chapter of the AIA or the AIP was not only protesting, but suggesting alternatives—a hamburger stand that could bear some architectural relationship to the tall, handsome building?

At the Federal level, as I have pointed out, there is an interest and concern about cities. The passage of urban renewal, public housing, and planning legislation points this out.

My fellow southerner and colleague, ALBERT RAINS of Alabama, has made a great record as a friend of cities. His retirement at the end of this year will be a great loss to cities.

But just interest and concern is not enough—there must also be knowledge. With the multiple demands upon every Congressman, that is not easy to gain.

I am not shunning this responsibility, but I want to point out how hard it is, the knowledge has to be sought out, for it is rarely given.

One story in this regard may suffice. Last year, my committee held 2 weeks of hearings on the Urban Mass Transportation Act. During those hearings HENRY REUSS of Wisconsin, a ranking Democratic member, seemed to be a lost voice in the wilderness. One day he asked:

"In all honesty, I wish we had a philosopher or two among our witnesses. What I wanted with a Frank Lloyd Wright, if he were alive, or a Lewis Mumford. I don't think we want to prolong our hearings, but I would suggest that letters be addressed to Lewis Mumford, Frederick Gutheim, the president of the American Institute of Architects, and perhaps one of two others whose names will occur to the committee, to ask if they will rather promptly file statements."

Certainly, the committee was at fault for not having called up these professionals. But is it to much to expect that they would come forward uncalled, on this important subject?

Let me bring this matter a little closer to home. Last year, Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania introduced a bill on housing, urban renewal, and community development for purposes of discussion to assist in the formulation of the new housing and community development legislation this year.

I sent approximately 10 planners, many who are here tonight, copies of Senator CLARK's bill asking for their comments and criticism. Though a number of you acknowleded receipt of this bill, I received only one detailed discussion of this legislation, and that was all. This, mind you, from the Atlanta planners. Consequently, we offered little assistance, little guidance in the drafting of the housing bill proposed this year, H.R. 9751.

When this bill was introduced, I again sent it to 10 to 15 planners and others in the field of public housing and urban renewal. This time, the same person who had replied the first time replied again. Another person wrote that his position and comments would be the same as whatever NAHRO decided at its convention a month later.

I wanted to know what Atlanta planners who would have to work with this legislation thought about it. I wanted to know its relation to Atlanta's problems and programs. Only one planner was concerned enough to help me in assessing the merits of this bill.

Perhaps every planning and design school should require its students to take a course in practical politics. It might be titled "How to put your plan into practice" or "You and the city council."

There are notable examples that professionals can convince politicians that "good design is good politics." Edmund Bacon, head of city planning in Philadelphia, drew a plan. But he didn't stop there. He also found himself a politician, Richardson Dilworth, and convinced him that "good design is good politics." The result was not a dream gathering dust on a shelf somewhere, but Penn Center.

Another example which comes to mind is Ed Logue in New Haven and his well-known convert, Mayor Richard Lee.

I briefly touched on the politicians, and the public as profit seekers, but what about the public simply as the people? They simply don't know, they haven't been taught, just as politicians haven't been taught.

There is a very pertinent Scripture that speaks to this problem:

"How then shall they call Him, in whom they have not believed?
And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?
And how shall they hear without a preacher?
And how shall they preach except they be sent?"

—Romans 10: 14–15.

And the preachers are the professionals, and the professionals are you.

When the public is aroused, when it is taught, the results border on the miraculous. Will anyone who cares about cities ever forget that great victory in San Francisco? The people would not allow that double-decked expressway to ruin a magnificent vista of city hall.

The art of the planner and the architect is a ubiquitous one. If plans are to be more than dust gatherers, they must be translated into new cities. And these cities are the habitat of people. They cannot avoid the ugliness of the cities; they can only live in them. They cannot ignore the effect that slurbs and slums, disorder and poor design have upon them. They become apathetic and disinterested.

Not everyone is responsible. Each one is responsible. The politician has the responsibility to learn, the public the responsibility to speak out. But the great and historic responsibility belongs to the professional, to you.

History does not blame the audiences when generations pass without a single notable play or poem—it speaks of the dearth of poets and playwrights. And history will not look upon the manmade desecration of landscapes and hold the politician and public to account—it will speak of the failure of the professionals—the planners, designers, and architects.

Your art is not academic. It cannot be contained in plans and renderings of cities that never rise. Your conversations cannot be among yourselves in professional journals and conferences.

A plan, never initiated, never explained, never taught will be a poor defense to history's indictment.

The Not Exactly Mild-Mannered Man From Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, May 8 is the birthday of a very wonderful young man. Eighty years have not dimmed the twinkle in his eye nor dulled his wit. His enthusiasm for life and for politics as well as his courage, decisiveness, and leadership have endeared him to all of us. Newspapers throughout the country are editorially wishing President Harry S. Truman a happy birthday. The Christian Science Monitor and the New York Times comments which follow are examples of the high regard and deep affection with which we hold the gentleman from Missouri.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 8, 1964]

NOT EXACTLY MILD MANNERED

"I am not exactly a mild-mannered campaigner myself," said Harry Truman in a rare moment of understatement the other day. Suddenly we realized how indelibly the Truman manner remains in our minds. He was supposed to be so colorless when he assumed the Presidency. He proved to have a spectrum all his own.

Now at 80 Mr. Truman warns today's campaigners against sacrificing the national interest for partisan political advantage. As for himself, he has changed his mind and won't run again at 90.

The partisan feelings of politicians and music critics have cooled as Mr. Truman's distance from the White House has lengthened. Or so it seems to us, even though, from time to time, he still says things not calculated to win friends or influence Republicans.

At the opening of the World's Fair, he called himself "an old has-been." The crowd said, "No." And so do we. "I hope you will remember what I have been and not what I am today," said Mr. Truman. As we read of him now, getting to his office at 7:30 in the morning, before the staff comes in, we want to remember him not only for his decisive days as President but his unretiring retirement since then.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1964]

MAN FROM MISSOURI

Harry S. Truman, who is 80 years old today, is a particularly lively elder statesman: having been President of the United States, he is now historian, teacher, peripatetic philosopher and—by no means least—a politician.

Mr. Truman could no more keep out of politics than a journalist could ignore the news. A few days ago one of his innumerable young visitors asked him whether he would recommend politics as a career and he replied that he certainly would "if you like people and can get along with them and are willing to start at the bottom." This is no recipe for becoming President of the United States, although it so happens that the incumbent also fits the description.

Mr. Truman has made history in a big way. The decision to use the atom bomb, the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, point 4, NATO, and the Korean war were all of transcendent importance. Harry Truman has had good reason to observe that "the President of the United States is the world's most influential leader."

As an ex-President he is obviously enjoying life and adding to the enjoyment of others. We hope he is with us for a long time to come, and so, together with most other Americans, we wish Harry Truman many happy returns of the day.

Chief Justice Cites Need for Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Earl Warren delivered the address at the assembly for the dedication of the Gloria in Excelsis Tower of Washington's National Cathedral in Washington on May 7, 1964.

The Nation's foremost jurist said:

Great responsibilities have become ours, and the future of unborn generations depends upon our mature discharge of these responsibilities. I have no doubt that we shall discharge them worthily, but we can do so only with divine guidance. What could more appropriately express our seeking and reaching out for such providential aid than this tower extending heavenward?

There are those who are telling us these days that our High Court is anti-religious or even anti-God. Some of these critics even call for the impeachment of the Chief Justice. Let them read and ponder the words the Chief Justice spoke as he took his text from Isaiah:

And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountains of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and the nations shall flow unto it.

ADDRESS OF CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

(Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, the Assembly for the Dedication of the Gloria in Excelsis Tower, Washington Cathedral, May 7, 1964)

As we stand on Mount St. Albans, 400 feet above the Potomac, there rises above us, still 300 feet higher, the Gloria in Excelsis Tower of the Washington Cathedral. The crest of the tower marks the highest point of this fair city. I was interested to learn that the master carver who supervised the carvings for the tower emigrated to this country from Italy as a young man and came to Washington to do stone carving on the Supreme Court Building. The belfry houses 53 bells in carillon and a ring of 10 hand-pulled bells for change ringing to proclaim occasions both solemn and festive. Before this distinguished assembly and the world, the bells today proclaim the joyous tiding of the completion of this quietly soaring tower that is a sermon in stone.

A story of old comes to mind which seems to have particular significance for the event we are celebrating. It concerns a wayfarer who was passing a structure under construction. He stopped in the manner of a sidewalk superintendent—that ubiquitous personality without whom no building could possibly be erected—to ask of three craftsmen who were working on the building what they were doing.

The first one, without looking up, answered, "I am making a living." The second one said in response to the inquiry, "I am following my trade." But the third, rising to his full height, looked the stranger straight in the eye, and said, "Sir, I am building a temple." I am confident that all who have participated in the erection of this tower derive the same feeling of satisfaction from their inspired labors as did that third craftsman.

I feel highly privileged to share in the dedication of this lovely structure, in part because of its beauty. This is the crowning section of an edifice yet to be completed but which already rivals its French and English medieval prototypes. The sense of sound construction and carefully studied detail and the strength and power of the whole are manifest throughout.

I feel thus privileged, too, because of our treasured historical associations with the cathedral, whose foundation stone from Bethlehem was laid by President Theodore Roosevelt 57 years ago. For this is a national cathedral, which calls itself a "House of Prayer for All People." This great square tower stands for the public faith of a whole people. The cathedral has no parish but looks to its friends of all denominations for nurture and sustainment. In its several chapels, four different denominational groups now worship regularly under their own rites; and many others have done so in the past. It is heartening to note that our Catholic and Jewish friends and those of other denominations and faiths are here with us today to share in this consecration.

And I feel privileged—and humbled—to be a part of this ceremony because this structure stands above our Federal City as a striking symbol of the aspirations of each of us, regardless of individual creed, as he reaches, like the tower itself, beyond our worldly confines and looks to the heavens above. How fitting that this dedication, which marks the fulfillment of a dream of clergy and laymen alike, comes on this Ascension Day.

Some might inquire whether this Gothic architectural fabric is in harmony with the times and properly reflective of the modernism of the space era. But it is not as if we had to choose between the old style and the new. We can afford the best of each. There is much here to suggest stability and maturity and the durability of the beliefs which the cathedral represents. I have no doubt that for countless years to come it will educate, inspire and ennoble those who come to see it and to worship here. This central tower will for generations as yet unborn, as it does for us today, express the timeless yearning of the human spirit. "Man must ever go beyond," as Dean Sayre said in a recent sermon referring to the tower, "and in that restless quest the spires are lifted as landmarks along the way. In this sense, "he said, "our tower is the child of this century too. It is the token of our longing, the sign, not of assertion, but of perpetual seeking. It grows up out of the unfulfillment of the glittering promise of our age; its roots far down in the subsoil of justice, affronted still by unfair status; its pinnacles reaching for that peace which our society knows how to preserve only by the stalemate of terror. Ever man must fend off the emptiness of his life by acknowledging his poverty and craving from Heaven a glimpse of Providence and the new gift of life."

The subsoil of justice—I was taken with this felicitous phrase; for though our Founding Fathers maintained and we have preserved a separation of church and state, we are a religious people. The underlying concepts of our system of justice, the subsoil as the dean termed it, are ethical or religious, if you please. They derive from our convictions about the dignity of man. As the Court with which I have the honor to be associated has said, "The history of man is inseparable from the history of religion. And, since the beginning of that history many people have devoutly believed that 'More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.'" Our national life reflects a religious people who, as President Madison put it, "are earnestly praying, as * * * in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the universe * * * guide them into every measure which may be worthy of His [blessing * * *]." But religion is, under our Constitution, incapable of state establishment; this is for the protection not only of the state, but of faith itself, in all its forms. The interaction of religion and the state is, therefore, made informal and free, not barren and nonexistent as some suppose. It is as fruitful and unfettered as we have the strength to make it.

As we are gathered on the prominence of Mount St. Alban for this jubilant occasion, the words of the greatest of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament come to mind. It was Isaiah—whose likeness is carved on the tower above—who said, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it."

What more suitable description of this inspired building project—"exalted above the hills of our Capital City. How apt, too, for this place in a Capital which is the temporary home of emissaries from other lands are the words, "all nations shall flow unto it." For this cathedral is open to those of all nations just as it is open to all people of this Nation.

"All nations shall flow unto it." That prophetic phrase is fitting not only for this national, and even international, place of worship, but is perhaps even more descriptive of the Capital City itself—today in Washington there are over 100 embassies and some legations, as compared with the time President Roosevelt laid the cathedral's cornerstone, when there were only 9 embassies here and 29 legations.

In many ways this was a detached and insular capital of a country whose international contacts were relatively meager. Its outlook was on the whole internal rather than external. But it has now become a focal point in the world, attracting official and unofficial visitors from the remotest regions and whose very existence has become interwined with the destiny of others.

A fundamental change in viewpoint has, of course, come to our country and its Capital City, a change brought about by two devastating world conflicts, and the accelerated pace of science and technology. It was less than 10 years after the cornerstone ceremony when the swift tide of events prompted Woodrow Wilson, who lies buried within this cathedral, to observe in his second inaugural address that: "We are provincials no longer. The tragical events of the 30 months of vital turmoil through which we have just passed have made us citizens of the world. There can be no turning back. Our own fortunes as a Nation are involved, whether we would have it so or not. And yet we are not the less Americans on that account. We shall be the more American," he said, "if we but remain true to the principles in which we have been bred. They are not the principles of a province or of a single continent. We have known and boasted all along that they were the principles of a liberated mankind."

Great responsibilities have become ours and the future of unborn generations depends upon our mature discharge of these responsibilities. I have no doubt that we shall discharge them worthily, but we can do so only with divine guidance. What could more appropriately express our seeking and reaching out for such providential aid than this tower extending heavenward?

To me there is still other significance and meaning to these spires. Sometimes our sense of values becomes distorted by affluence, and we are inclined by our preoccupation with things of this world to forget that the most meaningful part of life is spiritual. Such a spiritual awareness motivated the greatest accomplishments of those who founded this Nation. Are we lacking today in similar awareness? Perhaps not entirely; but as we stand here today and contemplate these spires we can derive additional inspiration for the spiritual commitment without which our lives can be drab and our labors barren.

A few moments ago I recalled the words of Isaiah which seemed so well to describe this tower. I invite you to remember as well the hopeful passage from the same prophet which follows close upon the other to the effect that the people "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

As one thinks of the areas of strife in the world today; what Dean Sayre has termed "the stalemate of terror"; and even now as one hears the words of those amongst us who seek their own preferment by sowing seeds

of hatred does one falter in his faith in the prophet's ancient words? On the contrary, I submit that this is a time for a firming of our convictions. It is a time for renewal of resolve that the aspirations which this lofty tower symbolizes shall be realized in our individual lives and shall be fulfilled in our national destiny. May our strength never wane; may our purpose never waver, as each in his own fashion rededicates his faith in "the Lord's house exalted above the hills." Gloria in Excelsis Deo.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Address of Francis Cardinal Spellman Before Dinner of American Jewish Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a very timely and eloquent address delivered by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, before the annual dinner meeting of the American Jewish Congress, in New York City on Thursday, April 30, 1964. Cardinal Spellman was introduced by the Honorable Newton N. Minow, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and I would also like to include his very excellent and appropriate remarks:

INTRODUCTION OF CARDINAL SPELLMAN

(By Newton N. Minow)

Nineteen hundred and sixty-four is a time of first stirrings of new interchange between Jews and Catholics—an interchange that utilizes channels of feeling as well as channels of intellect—an interchange which will, we trust, take place with increasing frequency and increasing confidence all over the world. The late Pope John, who projected this spirit as a potent force in our time—and Pope Paul, who is pressing forward this historic work—have won the prayerful support of freemen everywhere. The leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in America, with Cardinal Spellman standing in first rank, have given the most vigorous support to this movement for change. Leading authorities have characterized his Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, as the most influential figure in world Catholicism, second only to the Pope. Those who live and work here in his parish need only look around us to see their achievements that have been accomplished by our Catholic brethren under the full guidance of Cardinal Spellman. We see a great network of religious and social institutions: churches, schools, hospitals, charitable and youth-serving agencies. They have enriched our community and they have enriched the Nation. They are contributing with the dedication, the loyalty, and the vigor of American Catholicism and to his able spokesmen and leaders whom we are privileged to have here with us this evening. As we all know, Cardinal Spellman is quite a traveler—from the North Pole to the South Pole, from Greenland to Korea—there is no corner of the world so far away that Cardinal Spellman will not travel to for the comfort and cheer of the American serviceman. Your Eminence, your trip from the chancellory to the New York Hilton this evening is much shorter than most of your journeys; however, the distance, measured not in miles, but in the progress of interfaith relations, is very great indeed. It is an extraordinary honor for me to present the archbishop of New York, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman.

ADDRESS OF FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN BEFORE THE AMERICAN-JEWISH COMMITTEE ANNUAL DINNER, APRIL 30, 1964

I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to our celebrated guest of honor, Mr. Dean Rusk, on receiving the American Liberties Medallion of the American Jewish Committee. Being Secretary of State is an overwhelming responsibility and sometimes, I am afraid, a thankless one which exposes a man to the slings and arrows of public criticism. While any award is scarcely adequate recompense for Mr. Rusk's trying labors and successes, at least he may know from tonight's citation the gratitude of this company and that of countless fellow Americans for the dedicated service he has rendered to our Nation.

I myself feel greatly honored that you have invited me to give a brief address at your annual dinner. The invitation came originally from Mr. A. M. Sonnabend, who for 2 years served the committee selflessly and effectively as its president, and whose untimely death was, I know, felt deeply by all your members. My prayer is that his soul may rest in peace, and that the important work which meant so much to him will continue to prosper under your new president, Mr. Morris Abram.

The American-Jewish Committee has given distinguished service to the cause of brotherhood. This it has done without ignoring the unavoidable distinctions of race, color, and creed. Today it stands in the forefront of the civil rights movement, thereby fulfilling the best traditions of Judaism. Well might the words of the Prophet Isaiah be its motto: "Seek justice; undo oppression." Its achievements are the more remarkable when one remembers how often and how unjustly the Jewish people have suffered from slander and oppression. Such a people might be expected to concentrate on its own vindication and welfare. The American Jewish Committee has, on the contrary, earnestly striven to promote the welfare of all, and has in its activities given substance to the conviction that we are all children of God and indeed our brothers' keepers.

That we are our brothers' keepers is more than a pious cliche. It is a lesson the whole world sorely needs to learn. As a matter of fact it has become an imperative for survival in our day. By every means at our disposal we must wage war on the old suspicions and prejudices and bigotry which have set brother against brother and have spawned a brood of evils threatening the very existence of our society. Definitely we must win that war.

The sad plight of minorities in many places bears testimony to the existence of racial and religious prejudice. The struggle of millions of American Negroes to achieve first class citizenship underscores it. The shameful murder in this very generation of 6 million Jews and of millions of other innocent victims of tyranny proclaims it. The widespread oppression of Catholic and Protestants and other religious groups both now and throughout the past tells a story of prejudice that darkens the pages of history.

Prejudice is mysterious and its roots are deeply buried. No rational being can fully understand it or comprehend all the reasons behind it. But one thing I do know: prejudice can never be justified by the teachings of religion. Hatred can never be justified by those teachings. The founder of my faith gave one supreme commandment to all who would follow Him: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another."

This point needs stressing in the light of a recent survey examining the reasons behind anti-Semitism. Asked why the Jewish people have often suffered outbreaks of persecution, a surprising number of people replied that in their opinion it was a punishment for their part of the crucifixion of Christ. Frankly I was appalled. This is not Christianity. I don't know where they learned it but surely it was not from the teaching of their church.

It is one of those distorted and terribly harmful notions which somehow gain currency and like a cancer spread among certain people who wish to justify their own biogtry.

The question of responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ must be carefully stated and clearly understood. I am reminded of an incident which happened to a priest of my acquaintance when he was riding in a taxicab here 1 day last year. The cab drivers of New York, as everyone knows, are celebrated for their conversational talents. Not infrequently they emerge as homespun philosphers and this particular driver was even a sort of sidewalk theologian. Over his shoulder he said to the priest: "I understand that those bishops over in Rome are saying that everyone who ever lived is responsible for the death of Our Lord. Does that mean that the poor Indians who were hunting buffalo on the plains of America at the time were responsible? Why, they didn't even know its was happening. How could they be responsible?"

He asked a good question, to which there is only one answer. Responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus as an event of history belongs only to those individuals who were present at the time and who cooperated in His death. It is simply absurd to maintain that there is some kind of continuing guilt which is transferred to any group and which rests upon them as a curse for which they must suffer.

The Christian faith, on the other hand, does teach that Christ Our Saviour died for all of us, in expiation for the sins of all mankind. In this sense we do believe that we are all mystically implicated in His death—but all without exception and all in the same way. And His dying for us must never be thought of as a curse upon anyone, but rather has a blessing upon all.

Anti-Semitism can never find a basis in the Catholic religion. Far from emphasizing the differences which divide Jews from Christians, our faith stresses our common origins and the ties which bind us together. In the early days of nazism, when the wave of anti-Semitism threatened to engulf Europe, Pope Pius XI stated clearly: "Abraham is our patriarch, our ancestor. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with this sublime reality. It is a movement in which we Christians cannot share. Spiritually we are Semites." I recall well quoting those words in my broadcast to the Hungarian leaders and their people in June of 1944, a broadcast which I made at the request of Pope Pius XII to protest

the bloody persecution of Hungarian Jews. I reminded them that their action was "in direct contradiction of the Catholic faith," and I told them that "no one who hates can be a follower of the gentle Christ, and no man can love God and hate his brother."

Pope Pius XII, in his Christmas message of 1942, had passionately lamented: "Hundreds of thousands of persons, through no fault of their own, have been condemned to death or to progressive extinction." He decried their exile and persecution "for no other reason than race." The New York Times on that occasion commented editorially: "This Christmas more than ever the Pope is a lonely voice crying out in the silence of a continent."

In June of 1943 Pius XII again protested publicly: "For centuries the Jews have been most unjustly treated or despised. It is time they were treated with justice and humanity. God wills it and the church wills it. St. Paul tells us that the Jews are our brothers."

This is the teaching of the Catholic Church and it can never be otherwise. My friends, God is love, and His will for all of us is fraternal charity and understanding. It is high time that all, Christians and Jews alike, applied this great religious principle to their dealings with one another. It is high time to stress the bonds of brotherhood which should characterize our relationship. The beloved Pope John XXIII taught the world a lesson which I pray it will neither ignore nor forget, when in greeting a delegation of Jewish vistors to the Vatican in 1962 he opened wide his arms and said: "I am Joseph, your brother." In that one simple gesture, springing from his great heart, he proclaimed to the world the true meaning of the Christian spirit.

Last week our New York World's Fair opened. The fair's motto is one that every man should carry in his mind: "Peace Through Understanding." Understanding is the way to peace. Men are weary of the hostilities of the past. They are tired of the feuding of their forbears. May they all—Jews, Christians, and all men of good will—begins at last to say: Together let us live in peace. Let us try to understand one another better—little by little, step by step, to accept our differences and to respect one another's convictions; to attack prejudice where first we may encounter it, within our own mind and heart. And having conquered it there, let us go forth to work with every man, our brother, for a better, and a happier world.

Persecution of Jews in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, all freedom-loving people share a sense of outrage that in the Soviet Union the religious and cultural life of Jews is repressed.

Last September I joined with 63 of my colleagues in sponsoring Senate Resolution 204 which expresses the sense of the Senate "that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned."

The resolution calls upon the Soviet Union, "in the name of decency and humanity," to "cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

A group of 88 clergymen and leaders in the religious life of Delaware recently sent a message to Premier Khrushchev demanding an end to persecution of Jews in Russia. The list of signatures includes 41 Protestants, 34 Catholics, and 13 Jews.

A news story in the Wilmington Evening Journal, entitled "Stop Persecution of Jews, 88 Here Tell Khrushchev," summarizes their protest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP PERSECUTION OF JEWS, 88 HERE TELL KHRUSHCHEV

A demand from Delaware that Premier Khrushchev end repression of Jewish religious and cultural life in Russia was forwarded to the Soviet Embassy in Washington yesterday.

It was signed by 88 religious leaders of northern Delaware. They also asked for an end to the Soviet Government's persisting enmity toward religion.

Among the 88 signers are the Catholic and Episcopal bishops and public leaders who are active in religious life.

The message to the chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is sponsored by the Delaware unit of the American Jewish Committee and is similar to an appeal sent December 7, 1962, signed by 46 of the Nation's outstanding religious leaders.

The message was sent for forwarding to Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin in Washington by Louis J. Finger, chairman of the State unit of AJC.

The message calls attention to the constitution of the U.S.S.R. which grants freedom of conscience. The message said persistent hostility to religion is, nevertheless, a matter of record. While most faiths are permitted the bare necessities such as seminaries and sacred literature, even these are denied Jews, it continued.

"Hard pressed as they are by blanket restraints," the message reads, "none of the other major religions of the Soviet people, neither the Orthodox, Armenian, Catholic, or Protestant churches, neither Buddhism nor Islam, have been subjected to the extraordinary disabilities inflicted on Judaism and its followers."

The only Jewish seminary in the nation is in Moscow and has only 4 students and was never permitted more than 20. Until it opened in 1956, the message continues, there were none for a generation and the few remaining synagogues are served by rabbis ordained more than 40 years ago. No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years and no articles for Jewish ritual can be produced and, in 1962, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential for Passover observance, was banned.

The teaching of Hebrew is forbidden, according to the statement, and the once-flourishing Yiddish schools, literature and theater have been stamped out even though a half million Jews declared Yiddish to be their mother tongue in the 1959 census. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books, and newspapers in their own languages.

"These conditions conjure up memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime, which you yourself have denounced," the document reminds Khrushchev.

The message called the Chairman's attention to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and said "unless the Soviet Government conforms," it "forfeits the confidence of all peoples."

"By deeds alone, can your government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man."

In addition to Catholic Bishop Michael W. Hyle and Episcopal Bishop J. Brooke Mosley, signers are:

Leon V. Anderson, the Reverend Roberto Balducelli, the Reverend James G. Birney, James B. Brooks, Charles A. Cary, the Reverend Gordon T. Charlton, Jr., Louis S. Cohen, Philip Cohen, the Reverend John J. Conmy, Arthur G. Connolly, the Reverend Chas. J. Conway, Richard F. Corroon, and Philip F. Crosland.

The Right Reverend Monsignor F. J. Desmond, the Reverend John H. Dewson, the Reverend Anthony F. DiMichele, Dominick Di Sabatino, Thomas B. Donahoe, the Reverend Edward A. Dougherty, the Reverend Henry Dreyer, Rabbi Herbert E. Drooz, William Duffy, president judge of superior court, the Reverend William F. Dunkle, Jr., the Right Reverend Roderick B. Dwyer, Samuel Eisenstat, president Jewish Federation of Delaware, Louis J. Finger, the Reverend Henri I. Foltz, Robert W. Frelick, Rabbi Leonard B. Gewirtz, and the Reverend Robert J. Gillespie.

Edward J. Goett, Maurice D. Goldstein, the Reverend George W. Goodley, Karl F. Green, the Very Reverend Lloyd E. Gressle, president, Wilmington Council of Churches, Frank A. Gunnip, Thomas H. Hogshead, the Reverend Paul F. Huber, the Reverend James Hughes, the Reverend Ellsworth Jackson, Jr., Harry Jacobs, E. Melvin Jewett, the Reverend Edmund F. Julien, Edward Kauffman, Robert F. Kelly, the Reverend A. H. Kleffman, Rabbi Jacob Kraft, Morris Leibowitz, and the Reverend Edward M. Leinheiser.

Clement J. Lemon, the Reverend Thomas F. Luce, Jane du Pont Lunger, Stewart Lynch, judge of superior court, the Reverend Malcolm J. MacQueen, Adolph Markel, Jr., the Reverend Philip U. Martin, the Right Reverend Monsignor Wm. J. McElwaine, the Reverend John J. McGee, the Reverend Henry A. Miller, the Reverend Paul R. Miller, the Reverend Ralph L. Minker, Jr., the Reverend Robert E. Mohr, Thomas W. Mulrooney, Frank J. Obara, the Reverend John L. O'Hear, Stewart E. Poole, W. Ellis Preston, Dr. Willard F. Preston, and the Reverend James B. Pritchard.

William F. Raskob, the Reverend Roy E. Raymond, the Reverend Roddey Reid, Jr., Harry J. Repman, the Reverend Percy F. Rex, Harry Rofel, Gilbert S. Scarborough, Jr., Collins J. Seitz, chancellor, Melvin A. Slawik, Edward B. Siedz, the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph D. Sweeney, David R. Treadwell, Sally K. Treadwell, the Reverend Gilbert F. Van Bever, Mrs. Winston J. Wayne, the Reverend Donald C. Wilson, and the Reverend Stuart G. Wysham.

Remember Uncle Sam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in an issue of the Republican Islander, official publication of the Island County Republican Central Committee in my district, a reprint of an article that reminds us of a time

when Uncle Sam held his chin a little higher and walked with his back a little straighter. To me, Uncle Sam has always been important because he is the symbol of everything good this country ought to be. As I read this article, I could not help but think how it might make patriotic hearts palpitate, and, hopefully, long for a return to the spirit of an earlier day. I heartily recommend a reading of this essay and commend it to the attention of all Members of the Congress. Therefore Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the article,"Whatever Happened to Uncle Sam?", be entered in the RECORD:

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO UNCLE SAM?

You remember Uncle Sam? Quite a man was Sam. There was a lean, hard look to his face, the kind of look that even whiskers didn't soften much. And a steely sort of look in his eye that reminded one of the American eagle. He spoke softly, but carried a big stick. Other nations very early learned they couldn't get away with any monkey business when they dealt with Uncle Sam. He didn't feed, coddle and burp his known enemies.

He stood squarely for what America was * * * both feet rooted firmly in the soil and toil of American tradition.

No one ever knew where Uncle Sam came from. Some think he rode with Paul Revere * * * fought at Bunker Hill * * * was with Ethan Allen at Ticonderoga. He despised traitors like Benedict Arnold and loved patriots like Nathan Hale. His feet bloodied the snow at Valley Forge. He was looking on when they signed the declaration. He stood with Lincoln at the crossroads of our Nation's destiny * * * and wept a strong man's tears with Grant and Lee at Appomattox. He loved Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. It was the first civil rights stand. It was Republican. He was happy when our Nation became reunited.

He went over there with Pershing and his doughboys. He thirsted and bled and endured with those who made the death march on Bataan. He was with General MacArthur when he said "I shall return." He was there at Bastogne when they wrote another American saga with a single word—"Nuts." He wept again with all of us on V-Days that signaled the end of a terrible threat to our country.

Yes, quite a man was Sam—our kind of man. The kind we need very desperately now to keep our country strong and alert and tough and independent and honest with itself and its world. But what has happened to Uncle Sam, where has he gone? Have you felt him around recently?

Some think that when the New Frontier walked in, Sam was roughly brushed aside. He wasn't at the Berlin wall. He sure wasn't at the Bay of Pigs. He would have been ashamed by the betrayal of our allies in favor of Communist advancement. He would have sickened at the thought of a no-win policy * * *. Perhaps some of our new-day thinkers, ADA'ers, ACLU'ers, and other hyphenated Americans have put Sam out to pasture as something we once needed but find a little old fashioned now. Perhaps they don't feel comfortable with his gaze beating into their consciences. Perhaps they realize Uncle Sam might arouse the great old-fashioned patriotism that made this country the best place in the world.

We earnestly believe he's just waiting in the wings, thinking and watching, waiting to be called again because he's so deeply needed. We think it is high time Uncle Sam was brought out of retirement.

We Republicans want him back in action. Not because he belongs to us any more than any other American, but because he needs a place to live and think and speak and work. Because America needs him now—and our party has a home for him. Please come back Uncle Sam, before all is lost.

Not 1 Cent for Light Bulbs, but $1 Million for the Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, expressive of President Johnson's covetous and griping penury is the fact that there is not one spare lightbulb at the White House. People passing 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue at night, have observed what appears to be a black blob marking the once-impressively lighted mansion, which has housed every President and his family since 1800. We have heard reports about Mr. Johnson and his guests grouping around like moles inside the blackened building.

Keeping in mind the President's desire to save a few pennies—it costs 1 penny to burn a 100-watt bulb all night—it was interesting to note an article in the May 8, 1964, issue of the Washington Post by Lawrence Laurent. The article states that a new television room will be built in the White House at a total cost of $1 million.

Perhaps we will see on our TV sets some night, the folksy image of Mr. Johnson making his way to his bed chamber—in a long nightshirt and with a candle in his hand. Undoubtedly he will be dragging his beagles by the ears so he can listen to them bay at the moon.

And just think, Mr. Speaker, it will only cost $1 million to arrange this. Under unanimous consent the article follows:

PRESIDENT COTTONING TO TELEVISION NOW

(By Lawrence Laurent)

By all television standards, President Johnson turned in the equivalent of an Emmy Award winning performance at his outdoor, family-style news conference this week. He has come a long way from the grumpy, suspicious, and evasive vice-presidential candidate who appeared on "Meet the Press" in 1960.

(After that "Meet the Press" session, in which Mr. Johnson answered not a single question directly, a frustrated Lawrence E. Spivak was tempted to ask "Now that we're off the air, will you tell us if your name is Lyndon Johnson?" Spivak choked back the urge.)

Now President Johnson is a different man. He reads statistics off the two TelePrompTers at a rate of about 200 words per minute. He could give Arthur Godfrey, Andy Griffith, and Jed Clampett lessons in the effectiveness of the folksy approach. The President exudes a confident ebullience. He's in control and obviously he's enjoying the whole thing.

The President's sudden ease with the tyranny of microphones is also reflected in the terms of a recent agreement he made with the the three television networks. The prime mover in the agreement was Mr. Johnson's longtime friend, Frank Stanton, president of CBS, Inc.

(Broadcasting magazine reported this week that Stanton was in charge of repairs made on the Presidential desk. A small matter of raising the height.)

In a speech this week to CBS-TV affiliates in New York, Stanton went into great detail about the permanent television room that will be built at the White House. It is to be in the West Wing, "across the hall from the President's office and not more than 60 feet from his desk."

Stanton added: "An architect was engaged to design the studio, which will have concealed broadcast equipment, suitable controlled lighting featuring a wholly unobstrusive system, and room for 90 newsmen as well as guests whenever their presence is indicated."

Stanton said that all cameras will be out of sight, "taking pictures through ports in paneled quarter-round corners of the room." There will be directional microphones out of the range of TV cameras.

In the White House TV room, a director will be able to handle pickups from other places such as the East Room, the rose garden, the porticos, and the White House gates. Stanton added: "The new studio will require 75 tons of air conditioning * * *. The total cost of all these installations will come to a million dollars."

The networks will keep the facilities manned and ready 54 hours a week. This will cost the three TV networks "$200,000 to $250,000 a year, and when necessity arises, the President will have only to walk across the hall to go on the air."

One of the big reasons for putting the TV room in the White House was dramatically illustrated when the railroad strike was settled recently. The President was anxious to make the announcement on TV as quickly as possible. To set up all of TV's equipment in the White House usually requires about 3 hours and the President couldn't wait. He sped 5 miles to Broadcast House through Washington's rush-hour traffic. The TV crew had about 15 minutes to prepare the studio.

Said Stanton: "It was a harrowing experience for everyone—for the President, for those responsible for his safety, and for the TV production personnel involved."

He Takes the Rap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Star of May 10, 1964, the following editorial entitled "He Takes the Rap" was published as the lead editorial of that date.

It would appear that anyone who divulges information to the Congress which is derogatory to the actions of those in the executive department risks a loss of his means of livelihood.

Unfortunately, Don Reynolds seems to have suffered the same fate as Mr. Otepka in the State Department. In my opinion, it is extremely serious that such a situation should exist in our country.

HE TAKES THE RAP

Don Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, has been dropped from membership in the District of Columbia Life Underwriters Association for allegedly making kickbacks to Bobby Baker, ousted secretary to the Sen-

ate majority. Mr. Reynolds is burned up, and we don't blame him.

A spokesman for the association refused to discuss the incident, except to say that Mr. Reynolds was dropped because of "conduct unbecoming a member."

Mr. Reynolds flatly denies making any kickbacks to Bobby Baker. But even if some of the Reynolds-Baker dealings might be construed as kickbacks, they are small potatoes compared to the really important deals which Reynolds says were involved in the sale of large life insurance policies to the then majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson.

According to Mr. Reynolds, the underwriters association didn't go into this aspect of the matter at all. Neither did the Senate Rules Committee, whose investigation of the Bobby Baker business would have done credit to a man walking on eggs.

The net result of all this is that Mr. Reynolds takes the rap as an insurance man and the really serious complaint—his contention that he paid for a stereo set for Mr. Johnson and bought useless advertising time on the L.B.J. network at the suggestion of a Johnson aid—remains conveniently whitewashed. We have always thought that this is disgraceful, and we still think so.

H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., Finds Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a fine example of the outstanding business leadership in the Boston area is Mr. H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., president of the State Street Bank & Trust Co.

Mr. Hagemann has been in the forefront of the efforts to create a "New Boston" and demonstrate that our cities can respond to the vital changes of the 20th century.

John P. Carberg of the Boston Herald wrote an interesting profile of Mr. Hagemann which appeared in the May 5 edition. Under unanimous consent, I insert the piece in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MEN AT THE TOP: SHOW ME, I'M FROM MISSOURI—HAGEMANN FINDS ANSWERS HERE

(By John P. Carberg)

Neon signs and rotating clocks were unheard of when a forceful young executive from Missouri arrived on the Boston banking scene almost two decades ago.

But today they play an important role in bank identity and much of the credit belongs to H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., president of State Street Bank & Trust Co.

NEW HIGH

The energetic 57-year-old former park ranger is a product of St. Louis and its Washington University where he set a new high jump mark of 6 feet 4 inches.

Upon graduation he entered the investment business in the municipal bond department of Kauffman-Smith & Co., and 3 years later joined the Boatmen's National Bank, St. Louis, oldest west of the Mississippi.

In 1946 a good offer came from the East. The National Rockland Bank of Boston was looking for a president. Hagemann, a vice president at the time, accepted.

Through merger and consolidation, first the National Rockland with Webster & Atlas Nation Bank in 1948 and the Rockland-Atlas with State Street in 1961, Hagemann found himself holding down the top spot in New England's second largest bank.

"We had 129 people at National Rockland with roughly $60 million in assets. Now we have over $600 million and 1,940 employees."

His first run-in with a board of directors here came over the question of illuminated signs. "When I wanted to put an electric sign outside the bank the board was horrified. Needless to say, I didn't get it through."

CHANGES MADE

Has the banking business changed much in the last 10 or 15 years?

"Yes," says Hagemann, "when I first came here only one bank was in the retail business. Banks have become much more informal and personalized. They are much more customer oriented. A great deal is being done to determine what the customer needs and wants rather than saying here's what we have to offer—take it or leave it."

A boating buff, Hagemann, his wife, Leita, and their four children spend weekends in the warmer months aboard the family boat, *Hide Out*, a 24-foot sport fisherman kept in Marion. His other hobbies include tennis, and gold in relationship to the world economy.

His 9-year-old boy, Frederick III, attends school in Wellesley but his three daughters, Louise, Helen, and Leita, are scattered in schools across the country. One is in California, another in St. Louis and the third in Baltimore.

"I think we ought to buy a telephone company," he said with a smile. "Here we have all these fine schools in New England—but this is what they decided to do."

One of Hagemann's favorite subjects is the "New Boston." He believes that some of the most enthusiastic people on the rebirth of the city and the area are people like himself who were raised in other parts of the United States.

Hagemann's chief concern at the moment is the new State Street Bank Building being erected by the British at 225 Franklin Street.

When completed in 1965, the modern 34-story structure will become the bank's home office. "We will occupy the entire basement, the first five floors and space on various floors including the very top. But when the British call too often he's quick to remind them that "in addition to the building business, I'm also trying to run a bank."

He Takes the Rap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May edition of the Sunday Star:

HE TAKES THE RAP

Don Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, has been dropped from membership in the District of Columbia Life Underwriters Association for allegedly making kickbacks to Bobby Baker, ousted secretary to the Senate majority. Mr. Reynolds is burned up, and we don't blame him.

A spokesman for the association refused to discuss the incident, except to say that Mr. Reynolds was dropped because of "conduct unbecoming a member."

Mr. Reynolds flatly denies making any kickbacks to Bobby Baker. But even if some of the Reynolds-Baker dealings might be construed as kickbacks, they are small potatoes compared to the really important deals which Reynolds says were involved in the sale of large life insurance policies to the then majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson.

According to Mr. Reynolds, the underwriters association didn't go into this aspect of the matter at all. Neither did the Senate Rules Committee, whose "investigation" of the Bobby Baker business would have done credit to a man walking on eggs.

The net result of all this is that Mr. Reynolds takes the rap as an insurance man and the really serious complaint—his contention that he paid for a stereo set for Mr. Johnson and bought useless advertising time on the L.B.J. network at the suggestion of a Johnson aid—remains conveniently whitewashed. We have always thought that this is disgraceful, and we still think so.

Food Shortage in Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Food Shortage in Future," which appeared in the May 5 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville.

The editorial is as follows:

FOOD SHORTAGE IN FUTURE

It's simply hard to believe here in the United States and Canada where food is so plentiful that in just 40 years there may be a shortage of food, even more so than already exists in many countries.

World population is zooming so fast agriculture is not keeping pace. Unless more foodstuffs are produced about the turn of the century there simply will not be enough to go around.

World population is expected to double within 40 years. It is estimated the globe will have 6 billion people by the year 2000. About 20 percent more food has to be produced toward 1970—just 5½ years away—and by the year 2000 production must be doubled.

These figures and statements came out at an International Agricultural Symposium at Augusta, Ga., the other day.

What's the big problem? Simply not enough soil suitable for cultivation, for one thing. Land is becoming scarce. The trend toward suburban living is taking a good share of it out of production. Industrialization is biting away at it. At best only 25 to 30 percent of the land surface of the earth can be recorded as cultivable land.

The answer appears to be more efficient uses of available lands. This will require increased use of fertilizer, mechanization, and teaching those in the less aggressive countries how to use the machinery.

Unless production is increased in the years ahead—and providing the expanding population continues at the present rate—the world may have to turn to man-made foods. They're already in the laboratory stage. Just recently a dinner was served consisting of ham, bacon, sausages which had completely bypassed the animal.

It's something to think about. A man-made synthetic steak to go along with the inevitable baked potato or french fries. Better enjoy a home-grown, home-cooked meal while you can—if you expect to be around 40 years from now.

Who Succeeds the President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have proposed an amendment to the Constitution (H.J. Res. 990) to establish a new procedure of Presidential succession and I have been pleased with the acceptance which my resolution has received as indicated by the letters coming to me, and by editorials in Connecticut newspapers.

Recently, the Connecticut General Assembly realined our congressional districts and one of the major cities added to the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, is the city of Meriden.

I was pleased with an editorial which appeared in the April 27 edition of the Meriden Journal, which has a large circulation in a new area of the Fifth Congressional District.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial herewith:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

A nation without a presidential backstop in the form of a vice president is a nation in danger of confusion and dismay in the event its chief executive is removed by death or incapacitated by illness or accident.

The United States today is in this position, lacking a Vice President and encumbered with a system of presidential succession which would be bound to place an aged, possibly an infirm, man at the helm.

To change the system, even if Congress can agree upon a plan, will be bound to take a great deal of time. Congress, giving its attention to other pressing matters, does not seem disposed to consider a matter which is possibly the most pressing of all.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, has introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which, he argues, would "fit current conditions as well as future uncertainties."

The Monagan bill provides, as at present, that in the event of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired term. Within 30 days thereafter, the new President would be required to nominate a Vice President who would take office upon confirmation by the House and Senate. A majority of those present and voting would be required for confirmation. Similar action would be taken in the event of removal, death, or resignation of the Vice President. The bill also would establish procedure for the Vice President to succeed the President as Acting President if the President were unable to serve. Should the President declare his inability to serve in writing, the succession would be automatic; in the absence of such a declaration, the Vice President could assume the duties and powers of Acting President with the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office. Should there be a controversy, it would be resolved by a majority vote of the Congress. In the absence of a President or Vice President, the order of succession to the presidency would be from the members of the Cabinet in this order: Secretary of State, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The plan is simple; it seems to foresee every possible contingency. We like it better than any of the other plans offered to date.

The long process of amending the Constitution requires the approval of two-thirds of both Houses and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. There is no feasible shortcut.

In the more than 6 months between now and the next election, anything could happen. President Johnson is not a cautious man, and in spite of the precautions erected around him, he often exposes himself in an unsafe manner while mingling with crowds. He drives his car at high speeds when he visits his Texas ranch. Some years ago he suffered a serious heart attack. He works long hours and gets a minimum amount of sleep. His life, it is apparent, is full of more than normal risks.

Next November a new Vice President will be elected, and the country will breathe more easily. But the faults of the present system of presidential succession will remain.

Congress should approve a better plan of succession during the present session, and should start it on its way toward becoming a part of the Constitution.

Representative MONAGAN's bill should receive the attention which it deserves. He has done a real service to the country in proposing it.

Dickinson School of Law Dedicates a New Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Dickinson School of Law was founded in 1773.

On May 2, 1964, a new library was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies, presided over by president, Judge Dale F. Shugart, of Cumberland County, president of the board of trustees.

The main addresses were delivered by two former graduates who subsequently were elected to high positions in their native State of Pennsylvania and are now held in high esteem by all as elder statesmen.

Today, men in every profession might well pause and reflect on their counsel as expressed in the speeches which follow:

First. Former Chief Justice, Pennsylvania Supreme Court, Charles Alvin Jones.

Second. Hon. Arthur H. James, Governor of Pennsylvania, 1939–43.

ADDRESS OF FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE CHARLES ALVIN JONES, AT DEDICATION OF THE LAW LIBRARY AT DICKINSON SCHOOL OF LAW IN CARLISLE, MAY 2, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed fitting, at the outset of this dedicatory ceremony to acknowledge on behalf of all of us alike, faculty, student body, alumni, and friends of the law school, our deep sense of gratitude to Dr. Harry W. Lee, under whose capable and inspired leadership, as president of the board of trustees of the law school, the new library was initiated and its construction begun; and, likewise, to Hon. Dale F. Shugart, under whose leadership of like character, as successor president of the board of trustees, the building was successfully carried to timely and complete fruition, and is now in use.

What we here dedicate today is and for the future will be a repository of what, in truth, constitutes the very core of the facilities requisite for the proper functioning of any school of law. The importance of such a library can hardly be overestimated. Academic learning can be, and frequently is, acquired through lectures or other oral teachings or instructions by professors and preceptors. But, a thorough and competent knowledge of the law can be gained only by the individual student's conscientious and persistent study and research of the books. Therein are to be found the rules of law as exemplified in reported judicial opinions and in law texts or other books and treatises recognized by legal scholars as authoritative.

The physical structure which is the subject of our current dedication is in complete and felicitous architectural harmony with the law school proper to which it is conjoined by a broad and well-lighted enclosed passageway. The ample space, which the first and second floors of the new building affords, has been well apportioned between bookrack requirements and rooms for the student's quiet and undisturbed reading. A room is also set apart for the reception and marking of new books and for the repair of old ones worn by use; another room serves as the librarian's private office. Strongly built wooden tables and sturdy chairs, of like material, furnish the equipment necessary for the convenient use of the books when extracted from the racks and shelves. The book collection itself, as it now exists in the new library, is comprised of State and Federal law reports, statutes, digests, and other legal works, treatises and periodicals essential to a well fitted law school library. Together, the law school and its conjoined library constitute a commodious, convenient, and attractive center for law study and research. A personal inspection will readily so reveal. Upon such an inspection, however, do not be perplexed by the number of empty bookracks now in place; they are but autopic evidence of a wise indulgence, on the part of the law school's planners, in a sound forecast of the library's future needs.

The constant flow of new volumes of Federal and State reports and statutes, the addenda to existing digests, and the current textbooks and periodicals, all of which are a must if a law library is to be kept up to date, continues not only unabated but in ever increasing volume. Truly, the annual output of new law works and publications is little short of amazing. Some 3,000 years ago, the Preacher, as recorded in the Book of Ecclesiastes, adverted to the fact that "of making many books there is no end." One can only wonder what, if the Biblical Divine should return to earth today, His reaction to the annual output of lawbooks and the many other legal writings would be.

The evolution and development of the law in modern times was figuratively described aptly a few years ago by an eminent English jurist, as follows, "Myriads of rivulets contribute to the deep water of our system of jurisprudence." Most of such contributions reflect general tendencies of the times, political, economic and social, some advanced and some retrogressive advocations. Certain it is that such inspirations or agitations were far less numerous some few centuries back when wealth to a preponderant extent

consisted of lands, and when property rights therein and their attendant legal problems revolved around titles and tenures. It was such which the common law of England was then principally concerned.

The beginnings of the English common law, which is the backbone of our own jurisprudence, are to be found in the reign of Edward I, which covered the period from A.D. 1272 to 1307. It was then that the English constitutional system was evolved under which Britain functions fundamentally to this day; it was then that Parliament finally became established as a legislative body for the realm; and it was then that the law was additionally expanded by the enactment of important statutes.

The foremost early writers on the English common law were Glanville and Bracton, both 12th and 13th century judges. According to Dr. Holdsworth, lately Vinerian professor of law at Oxford University—"* * * it is the work attributed to Glanville which is to us the most important, for it is the earliest treatise on the common law." Bracton was no less erudite. To quote Holdsworth again—"His (i.e., Bracton's) works have made this period in the history of English law preeminently the age of Bracton." It was he who introduced to the English law certain influences of the Roman law, both civil and canon, for one example, the law of bailments. Thomas Jefferson, whose wide reading and thorough knowledge of English law was recognized by friend and foe alike, placed Bracton's "De Legibus Angliae" first of four specified stages in the progress of the laws of England from the earliest times to the then present. Recognizing that, "Doubtless there were others before Bracton which have not reached us," Jefferson declared that, "Bracton's is the first digest of the whole body of law which has come down to us entire," for "all records previous to Magna Carta having been early lost * * * [work] is the more valuable because being written a very few years after the Magna Carta, which commences what is called the statute law, it gives us the state of the common law in its ultimate form, and exactly at the point of division between common law and statute law. It is a most able work, complete in its manner and luminous in its method." So wrote Jefferson in his own luminous and inimitable style.

Numbered among other illustrious writers on the English common law during the five centuries succeeding Glanville and Bracton were Britton, Fleta, Fortescue, Littleton, Coke, Hale and Blackstone. Of these it was, first Sir Edward Coke and, a century and a half later, Sir William Blackstone, whose monumental works had the greatest impact upon the study of law in America.

Coke's Institutes of the Law of England, particularly the first, "A Commentary on Littleton's Treatise on Tenures," published in 1628 and popularly referred to as Coke on Littleton, or Coke-Littleton became the chief source of legal learning for the American student at law. Jefferson, who during his student days at William and Mary College, had become an ardent devotee of the work, wrote years later that, "Coke-Littleton was the universal law book of students." However, Coke's Institutes were by no means easy reading and many able and eminent lawyers, who had been trained on Coke recalling in later life their student days spoke bitterly of the difficulty they had experienced in trying to master the institutes. Their depression in their pursuit of a legal education at times amounted to despair and desperation. But they persisted and read and reread, ultimately "seeing the light" or "breaking through" the haze and in the end were rewarded with a fundamental knowledge of the law which served them well throughout their professional lives. Save for the relatively few early American lawyers who had received their legal education at the Inns of Court in London, Coke's Institutes furnished the basis of the legal training of many of that eminent galaxy of colonial lawyers whose notable service in the formation and establishment of our National Government is generally well known.

Just a decade before the American Revolution, Sir William Blackstone, the first professor of law at Oxford University, published his commentaries on the law of England—a work in four volumes. It was at once recognized for what it was—a sound exposition of English laws and customs and a ready source of instruction for students. For a time thereafter both Coke and Littleton and Blackstone's Commentaries were required reading for law students but gradually Coke was read less and less and Blackstone more and more as long as the custom of reading law in an attorney's office prevailed.

Incidentally, even when the law-office system of training obtained, some students did not read under the tutelage of a practicing attorney—a notable example being none other than Abraham Lincoln. He procured the necessary law books and, without instruction from anyone, perfected himself in a knowledge of the law sufficient to qualify him for admission to the bar of Illinois. He read Blackstone's Commentaries and a few other authors on special subjects. In counseling with respect to a young man desiring to read law in his office, he wrote, "* * * my judgment is, that he reads the books for himself without an instructor. Let [him] read Blackstone's Commentaries, Chitty's Pleadings, Greenleaf's Evidence, Story's Equity, and Story's Equity Pleadings, get a license, and go to the practice, and still keep reading." To another young man, applying for admission to his office as a law student, Lincoln wrote "I am from home too much of my time, for a young man to read law with me advantageously. * * * It is but a small matter whether you read with anybody or not. I did not read with any one. Get the books, and read and study them till you understand them in their principal features, and that is the main thing."

By the close of the 19th century, law schools had pretty much superseded the attorney's office as a place for the study of law. The reasons for this are not far to seek and need not be detailed here. With the advent of the 20th century, our political, economic, and social problems had so increased, and continue so to do, in number and complexity, as to require an expansion or extension of legal rights and remedies to fields, wholly unknown to the common law, as to which the present-day student at law must also acquire a sufficient knowledge to be useful to him in the practice of his profession.

From my all too sketchy tracing of the study of law from ancient times to the present, at least, as between the paucity of law books which the student of old was required to master and the virtual plethora of books, treatises and recurrent periodicals with which a law student today must familiarize himself, the contrast is patent. But, at all times, the extent of a student's acquisition of a knowledge of the law depended primarily upon his own desire and industry. The sincere student of Coke and Blackstone read and reread to know and to understand and read again and again until he did understand.

In dedicating the new library here today, may we indulge the hope that the students who enter its portals will, each, dedicate himself or herself to the conscientious and unremitting search for the knowledge which the books will reveal.

For the common welfare, they will have need of it. The public issues with which they will be confronted will not be any less than those with which our country has been met in times of greatest national stress.

Democracy will never survive once it succumbs to mobocracy. Brute force cannot be permitted to trample upon lawful order.

The constitutional rights of the individual are not absolute. Mr. Justice Holmes aptly observed a number of years ago that the right of free speech does not protect against an individual's false cry of fire in a theater. Nor does an overly long delayed recognition of the constitutional rights of any citizen or group of citizens justify conduct which, if tolerated, would before long nullify the constitutional guarantees that must ever be the impervious shield of all of us.

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR H. JAMES

This is Loyalty Day.

When we use the word "loyalty," I'm not sure we all mean the same thing. For that matter, I'm not sure we are certain in our own minds what we do mean.

There are many kinds of loyalty.

Some of them have little connection with our observances today. For example, there are loyalty to families, loyalty to friends, loyalty to our churches. These are all valuable and commendable, but after all they are private and personal attachments. They are not the sort of emotions to be paraded in public ceremonies.

Then there are loyalties of another sort—misguided loyalties. But they can be ardent and binding for all that. Usually they represent a conflict of loyalties, in which the least desirable was the winner.

What is the loyalty we have in mind on Loyalty Day? It is hard to define.

Sometimes I have heard it discussed as though it was loyalty to our Government. This is an attractive view. We are all familiar with Decatur's words: "Our country * * * may she always be right * * * but right or wrong, our country. Certainly there is no higher obligation of patriotism than to give our Nation wholehearted support when she needs it.

But as to loyalty, blind loyalty, to the Government? That's a somewhat different matter. Is it not reversing things a bit? Under our concepts, isn't it more to the point to demand that the Government be unswervingly loyal to the citizens than that the citizens be unyieldingly loyal to the Government? Was not the Government created as the servant of the people, not its master? Does not the basis premise of our Declaration of Independence set forth as a God-given principle the right of a people to alter or abolish a government they believe to have abused its just powers?

If we revise the idea a bit, and put it in the terms of loyalty, not unswervingly to the Government itself, but to our underlying concepts of free government, government by the consent of the governed, the will of the people being supreme—then the thought becomes perhaps more acceptable.

Much the same skepticism may be expressed regarding another statement concerning Loyalty Day—that it is dedicated to emphasizing loyalty to the law and to the Constitution.

This again is confusing. The law itself, after all, is a living, changing, evolving element in our civilization. Old statutes are amended and new ones are passed. Even our Constitution, the supposedly rock-ribbed foundation for our whole legal structure, changes dramatically from time to time. Not only is it amended upon occasion sometimes in the most sweeping fashion, but new interpretations revise its application in still more sweeping fashion.

Every lawyer knows that the standard treatises upon the American Constitution of 50 years ago are now largely obsolete and misleading; what is officially the law today deals in many points with concepts and conditions wholly unknown to the statesmen who wrote the original provisions.

With no intention of disrespect or disparagement to our illustrious Supreme Court,

cannot it be said with all accuracy that some of our Founding Fathers, were they to be able to return today, would be utterly dumbfounded to see the constructions now officially placed upon words they wrote generations ago?

How then can we properly speak of "loyalty" to either law or Constitution? In one fashion only—and that is loyalty to the underlying concept of government by law as opposed to government by edict; administration under definite regulations laid down publicly and enforced publicly by public servants whom the public elected and can, by either direct or indirect act, retire from office if they do not properly perform their trust.

But the word "loyalty" should never be allowed to confuse the mind of American citizens with respect to their right to disagree with specific statutes or with the Constitution itself. Abraham Lincoln, whose loyalty few would care to challenge, not only disapproved of the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision, but disapproved of the Court itself to the extent of suggesting that its decisions not be brought under the principle of stare decisis—that each decision be limited to the particular case it dealt with.

Of all the loyalties of which we can conceive, I think there is one which above all others should be borne in mind upon this day.

That is, each man's loyalty to himself.

Shakespeare said it better: "To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as night the day. Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Honor, like charity, begins at home; it begins with the individual.

No free nation ever went astray from the top—those which have failed and fallen into collapse and dictatorship did so because of decay and materialism at the grassroots level—among the people.

May I recall to you another quotation, this one from Goldsmith:

"Ill fares the land, to hast'ning ills a prey,
Where wealth accummulates, and men decay."

Rome fell when bread and circuses became more attractive to the citizens than public morality and integrity.

Hitler befuddled the German people with glittering promises that dazzled them into ignoring his atrocities at home and his ravishing of Germany's neighbors.

Are there symptoms of this sort to be found in our own land?

Is public morality in America on the downtrend?

Many minds can have many opinions on this subject.

Straws there are which may show a prevailing wind, or merely wandering eddies.

Certainly there seems less censure and less shock in the public's reactions to knavery in prominent spots that some of us would like to see.

There seems to be a general condonement of both force and trickery in attaining objectives—less of a reliance upon lawful and orderly procedures, and more of a willingness to hold that the ends justify the means.

Moreover, I don't suppose anyone seriously challenges the assertion that our national economy is deeply mired in a slowly acting morass which has engulfed many a nation in the past—the quicksands of inflation. The rat race of prices and wages may have been slowed down to a crawl—but the direction remains the same.

We have become so ensnarled with the fantasies and fallacies of slow inflation that we actually take seriously, when it is presented as a national policy, the concept that we can get rich quicker by going deeper in debt, and that the way to balance our swollen budget isn't to tighten our belts but to cut taxes and increase spending.

On the other hand, there is a sturdy commonsense in America which again and again in the past, has come to the fore to bring our ship of state back upon her proper course when it seemed that no intervention save that of the Almighty could preserve us from disaster.

The failure or success of free government hinges in the last analysis upon one single factor—the integrity and honesty of the individual citizens.

If there is any way by which the appeals of Loyalty Day can be directed to inspiring each man and woman of this broad land to view their public officials and their public issues in the terms of simple honesty and fairplay, with equal justice to each and every citizen, and with the current generation playing the role of vigilant trustees of our national wealth and resources for the generations to come, then I believe the value of these ceremonies will be immensely increased.

Taxing Old Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the May 6, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

Yesterday we talked about the general subject of higher taxes and the various activities that go to make up the total tax bill—but we did not discuss the most vicious result of the spiral in property taxes.

If you think your tax is hard to bear, consider for a moment the effect on the person who has only the old home paid for, social security, or other pension—retired people.

Elderly folk have been persecuted by the governments of the United States for many years, at the same time that the politicians talk a lot about doing things for them.

Back when social security was born, President Roosevelt made a very popular speech in which he promised a "managed currency" whereby the dollar would be kept at the same value "for generations."

He had the idea that he could control prices by simply juggling and controlling the price of gold, and maintaining this as a Government monopoly, so to speak.

Instead, of coruse, we went directly into an inflationary situation which has persisted at various rates of speed ever since. Thus, people with insurance policies, pension plans, and other savings were victimized and paid the bill for other gains.

Today, in these United States, there are 17 million people of retirement age and up—more than the total number of union workers.

There are programs to keep them alive by government "generosity" after they have been smashed and broken.

But the biggest single instrument for smashing them and breaking them and putting them in a helpless condition is government itself.

The many, many retired persons who could get along on their pensions and social security if we would just let them—and who would much prefer to maintain their present homes and be independent—are persecuted like no one else by both the shrunken size of the dollar and the upward spiral in property taxes.

A person, retired or otherwise, with just enough income to keep body and soul together, has government on his back hammering with a big and growing annual tax bill.

Common humanity and commonsense both require that the first thing we should do, instead of thinking up high-sounding programs of direct aid, is to get off their backs.

Retirement should bring tax relief to the extent of the homestead, at least.

We ought to quit belting them over the head with an annual property tax, and give them a chance to take care of themselves without this regular blow from the government.

One wonders how many people who could happily look out for themselves and be a burden to none have been driven from their homes and placed in a position where large sums of taxes must be spent on maintaining them under worse conditions than they had in the first place.

Against this background, the glowing promises of politicians for new government-administered programs of spending money for retired folk are rather sickening. If sincere, the first step is for government to quit taking it away from them.

Virgin Islands Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 20 of this year, I brought to the attention of the House certain reports dealing with questionable acts and policies in connection with Virgin Islands printing to be distributed at the World's Fair in New York.

Wisely, the people of the Virgin Islands are not letting this issue be forgotten; many are continuing to voice criticism. One of these is a friend of mine, who recently wrote Virgin Islands Gov. Ralph Paiewonsky a letter, for the record, listing specific complaints. I have been furnished a copy of this letter and, having read it, feel that it warrants not only the attention of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on which I serve, but the attention and concern of the entire Congress.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask, under leave to extend my remarks, that this letter, exactly as it was written to Governor Paiewonsky, be entered in the RECORD:

DEAR GOVERNOR: I am writing the following for the record, because, quite frankly, I do not think the illegal and/or unethical contract between the Government of the Virgin Islands and Robert Lodge, doing business as International Publications, Inc., will be settled by your administration. As an extremely gifted politician, you obviously think this matter will all blow over and that there will be no reprcussions. I do not feel that way.

In a press release dated April 9, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, writing to Lodge, states "the Government's position for the record, i.e., that the Government will consider proposals from other publications for distribution at the Fair, subject to terms and conditions no less nor no more favorable than those negotiated with you [Lodge]."

The government of the Virgin Islands is in no position to back up this statement in any way or form whatsoever. What term or

condition can the Government grant anyone that would equalize the "only piece of overall promotional material which accepts advertising that will be distributed at our [Virgin Islands] exhibit" granted to Lodge? For more than 2 months Lodge has been using this official Government statement to force people to advertise in his publication.

Advertising has been solicited by Lodge on the basis of this official Government statement.

I repeat: what term or condition can the Government grant any other individual or group which would benefit them one hundredth as much as the official Government exclusive which Lodge has held, and used, for more than 2 months.

The fact that the Government now states that it will consider other proposals (under conditions the Government itself cannot possibly meet), and the fact that Lodge has belatedly been asked henceforth not to use for promotional purposes Mr. Kimelman's exclusive guarantee, does not right the wrong that has been done by the Virgin Islands Government to every publisher, newspaper, and advertising agency in the Virgin Islands.

As has been pointed out to you again and again by the Comptroller, himself, a qualified lawyer, the only way to right this wrong is to cancel the contract with Lodge and start all over again.

Any argument that there is not time to do this is specious. High-speed presses can run off a million copies of a 24-page publication, such as Lodge suggests, in 12 hours. Advertising can be sold and assembled in 10 days; editorial material prepared in half that time—as professionals will confirm. The fair has 2 years to run. On hand at the Government's Information Office in New York right now are thousands upon thousands of giveaway literature, both Government and private, which will more than serve the purpose in the meantime.

No, Governor, the righting of this wrong can only be accomplished by canceling the existing contract at the earliest possible moment. This can be done, and should be done, in order, as Government Comptroller Peter Bove publicly states, "that the people of this island will have the confidence and pride they should have in their government."

For the record, the entire, long, and in my opinion, unethical story began shortly after you had appointed Henry L. Kimelman as commissioner of commerce.

One of Kimelman's first actions was to appoint Robert Lodge to coordinate a joint advertising campaign encompassing the Virgin Islands government, transportation industries, and individual businessmen dedicated to the tourist industry.

Lodge did not have the largest advertising agency in the islands. His was not the oldest advertising agency in the islands. Lodge did not have more experience in advertising than anyone else in the islands. As court records show, Lodge's financial background was far from impeccable.

Why then was Lodge given this official government appointment by Kimelman without affording any of the other existing agencies the opportunity to present their qualifications? This is a good question and probably only Kimelman can answer it. Did this appointment benefit Lodge financially? It certainly should have. As coordinator of this joint advertising venture he would be in a better position than anyone else in the advertising and publishing business in the islands insofar as commissions were concerned. Many other advertising representatives here would have rejoiced to receive such a plum from your commissioner of commerce, particularly since hundreds of thousands of dollars in advertising were tied up in this program.

When Lodge's appointment was announced, a group of us asked for and were granted an appointment with you. This group included the two Virgin Islands journalists who are qualified members of the Overseas Press Club; the president of the St. Thomas Press Association, and the only advertising man in the Virgin Islands selected by the New York Times for editorial featuring in its business section. All of us were engaged in publishing or advertising and we respectfully objected to this appointment by Kimelman.

At this meeting you told us that "everyone knew that Lodge was a crook" and you further indicated that anyone doing business with Lodge should have his head examined. Your prescience, in view of later facts as developed below, was nothing short of amazing. However, we all left the meeting with you feeling that Lodge had had his last connection with your administration.

Lodge did indeed coordinate this advertising program. The only problem was that he did not pay the Hearst Corp. for advertising he solicited as the designated Virgin Islands Government coordinator.

On November 26, 1962, Judge Walter A. Gordon of the District Court of the Virgin Islands handed down a judgment of $10,088.65 plus $750 attorneys fees against Lodge and in favor of the Hearst Corp. for advertising run in their magazines and not paid for.

We felt that this judgment handed down by Judge Gordon would certainly end any connection you, as Governor of the Virgin Islands, or your Commissioner of Commerce would have in the foreseeable future with Lodge.

Not so.

About a year after the judgment was handed down (to date, it has still not been paid), Kimelman again began negotiating with Lodge for a publication to be given away at the World's Fair. Again there was the old familiar underhanded and ignoble pattern that keeps cropping up in all Kimelman-Lodge deals. There were no invitations to bid, no consultations with more experienced advertising men or more knowledgeable publishers; secrecy was again the order of the day.

And in addition to the old familiar pattern, something has been added. In an official government letter, Kimelman promised Lodge that the proposed publication "will be the only piece of overall promotional material which accepts advertising that will be distributed at our exhibit." This letter, reprinted and circulated to all potential advertisers, was the basis on which Lodge was able to charge $11,500 per page of advertising. This letter, dated January 28, 1964, made it clear to all prospective advertisers that they had a loaded gun pointed at their heads. tI was a simple matter. Advertise with Lodge, or else.

Kimelman says that Lodge is to pay the Government of the Virgin Islands $10,000 for the exclusive advertising rights at the World's Fair. It has been said, and not denied, that Kimelman or his agents or employees have contracted with Lodge for a full page of advertising in the name of the Government of the Virgin Islands. If this is so, simple mathematics show: Lodge pays Government $10,000; Government pays Lodge $11,500; net gain for Lodge, $1,500 plus the exclusive advertising rights at the World's Fair.

And with his financial background, who can be sure that Lodge will pay the Government $10,000. He still has the more than $10,000 judgment hanging over his head.

On March 31 the Comptroller of the Virgin Islands, Peter Bove, branded this entire action illegal and added, "it would appear to be in the best interest of the government to cancel this contract and to take other steps commensurate with the responsibilities involved now."

And it is my feeling that Comptroller Bove is absolutely right. We will now just have to wait and see what repercussions and damage to the entire reputation of the islands may result.

The Gaelic Athletic Association of New York—50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, the Gaelic Athletic Association of New York is celebrating its golden jubilee. Fifty years ago, in humble surroundings, a small group of dedicated and farsighted Irish-Americans met in New York to form what is today the GAA, a worthy and great athletic association. As a former trackman, and an official timer at track meets and other sports events for the past 25 years, I have a deep interest in sports—and as an Irish-American, I have watched with great pride the growth and achievements of the Gaelic Athletic Association.

The association has seen many difficult years; two World Wars, the depression, a lack of immigration during the war years, the war of independence in Ireland and a civil war that followed. This year, the New York Gaelic Athletic Association celebrates the completion of 50 years of outstanding and inspiring work in promoting the national games of Ireland—chiefly hurling and Gaelic football.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to some of the noble work of the Gaelic Athletic Association of New York. From its very beginning, the GAA has been known for its deeds of charity.

The Christian Brothers had an annual field day and the very best competitions were made available to them. A few years later there was an annual field day established in aid of St. John's Hospital. During World War I there was a series of 5 field days to benefit the Red Cross. Since those early days the GAA has been the benefactor and builder of innumerable churches, schools, and missions. The clergy who have also benefited must number into the thousands. The GAA has not only kept alive the games of ancient Ireland in a foreign land, but it has also helped to keep the fires of faith burning in the far corners of the earth among our impoverished and destitute brethren.

Another charitable cause was the athletic fund of the 69th Regiment. Capt. James J. Archer appealed to the Irish advocate to solicit funds to purchase hurling and football equipment for the young Irish boys who had enlisted to fight against Germany. Money was collected to purchase 50 hurls, 50 pairs of boots, 10 footballs and hurley balls. A competition between companies was started and a 69th championship was played. These men took their sports equipment to France with them and when there was a

rest from battle, they engaged in sport. It was later claimed by some soldiers that the Germans surrendered when they saw Irishmen advancing with camans across their shoulders.

Since 1920 the association has financed, almost entirely on its own, teams to and from Ireland to play in international competitions. Recently, games were held in Gaelic Park for the John F. Kennedy Memorial Fund for an arboretum to be established near the Kennedy ancestral home in Ireland. This year, in commemoration of its 50th anniversary, the Gaelic Athletic Association will send a Gaelic football team around the world to play in Cairo, Rome, Bombay, Singapore, and other cities.

In 50 years the Gaelic Athletic Association of New York has had many occasions of sadness, but many more of joy. The moments of joy were mostly occasions of giving. Any charitable cause known to the association was given a field day and the best available attractions. Great clergymen, such as Cardinal Cushing, have spoken fondly of the GAA and its great work for the Catholic church. The needy and less fortunate are never ignored by the GAA. The hundreds of field days and the thousands of benefit dances that the association has supported have poured millions of dollars into various worthy causes.

In these 50 years in a changing world, the Gaelic Athletic Association of New York is still dedicated to the unchanging ideals that were laid down in 1914. My hearty congratulations and good wishes for the continued growth and prosperity of this fine association, which has done so much for sports and charity.

Hon. J. Edgar Hoover

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that the House of Representatives, by resolution, has offered congratulations and best wishes to J. Edgar Hoover on the 40th anniversary of his appointment as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Few men of our times have contributed so much toward the maintenance of democracy and endeavored to improve law enforcement, and I am pleased to join in saluting Mr. Hoover.

His appointment in 1924 as head of a little known and newly formed Bureau, where he had served as deputy during the previous 3 years, marked the beginning of a transformation in Federal law enforcement that was destined to face problems previously unknown to civilization. Ranging from the ravages which organized crime created in the 1920's to the current dilemma posed in insuring the protection of our national security, the Bureau has become strong and resolute under the leadership of Mr. Hoover because he has succeeded in transforming his personal sense of justice into the characteristic hallmark of the agency he heads.

This achievement has long since been recognized both within and outside of the Government. Virtually every civic organization has named him for an honor and both the Congress and the Executive have saluted him. As recipient of the President's Distinguished Service Award in 1958, Mr. Hoover exemplifies both the vitality and devotion of governmental service, but I doubt that any tangible award will ever give him the satisfaction he must feel in realizing that he has made our justice a better brand through his efforts.

It is for these reasons that I am proud to extend the gratitude of all my constituents in the 28th District of New York to this great American and bid him every best wish for continued good health and success for many more years of distinguished service to our country.

Key West, Fla., Wins the Ward Melville Community Improvement Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my pleasure to speak on a subject very dear to me—the accomplishments of the city of Key West, Fla.

Today, May 11, the city will be awarded the Ward Melville Silver Medal for the city of its population in the entire United States that has made the most outstanding community improvement for 1963.

Mrs. Reta F. Sawyer, president of the Old Island Restoration Foundation, Inc., nominated Key West for this national honor. Many people are responsible and leading the list is Mrs. Sawyer and Mr. Mitchell Wolfson, who restored Audubon House which is one of Key West's finest attractions.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored and proud to bring this outstanding award to the attention of my colleagues and know that they join with me in sending Key West our heartiest congratulations.

Several articles from the Key West Citizen follow:

[From the Key West (Fla.) Citizen, Apr. 12, 1964]

CITY IS PICKED FOR OUTSTANDING HONOR—OIRF WORKS PUTS KEY WEST ON MAP

The city of Key West has won the Ward Melville community improvement medal for cities of less than 50,000 population, for the restoration of Old Mallory Square.

Old Island Restoration Foundation nominated Key West for this national honor, and Mrs. Paul E. Sawyer, president, was notified by telephone from New York that an officer of the Melville Shoe Co. will come to Key West to deliver the medal, on a date selected by the city commission during the week of May 11.

Other winners for 1963, Mrs. Sawyer was informed, are Sacramento, Calif., for cities of more than 300,000 population, and Tampa, Fla., in the intermediate class of less than 300,000 but more than 50,000.

In establishing these annual awards 6 years ago, Ward Melville said, "The awards are intended not only to give recognition to outstanding accomplishments in community improvement with resulting benefits to the winning communities, but also to provide guides to other communities with similar problems.

"One of the most critical problems facing our Nation is the restoration of its cities, towns, and villages to prosperous, pleasant places to live and work."

A distinguished jury is appointed each year to choose the winners. The current jury is headed by Roy O. Allen, AIA, partner of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill of New York, architects and engineers of world fame. In 1961, the jury did not name a winner in the under-50,000 population class, with the explanation that, "While many of the communities nominated had meritorious accomplishments, none complied with the program's criteria, in the opinion of the jury."

In addition to medals, Ward Melville provides for national publicity, both in newspapers and magazines, to inspire other communities to undertake civic improvements.

The Vernon Pope Co. of New York is retained to publicize the awards, and has been in constant communication with Old Island Restoration Foundation for publicity material and before-and-after pictures of old Mallory Square and the adjacent commercial restorations.

"Publicity is important to any community," Mrs. Sawyer said, "but it is vital to a resort area such as Key West. The Old Island publicity has given Key West two banner years; what will 1964–65 be, with this big boost?"

[From the Key West (Fla.) Citizen]

MAYOR LAUDS WORK LEADING TO MEDAL WIN

Kermit Lewin, mayor of Key West, spoke for the city commission and for Key West, in expressing gratitude for winning the Ward Melville Medal for community improvement.

"The award will be presented to us," he said, "but credit must go to many others. First of all, Mitchell Wolfson showed us what could be done, by restoring the Audubon House, Key West's finest treasure.

"Then Old Island Restoration Foundation pushed the idea of making a community center out of the mess of the Mallory docks, in the heart of town, rather than building a convention hall in some salt pond.

"The two preceding city commissions, through the public works board, completed the construction job, and renovated and equipped the community center, at a cost of $241,683 from the bond issue, far less than the estimated cost of filling land and building a convention hall.

"And this figure includes the biggest item, replacing the broken-down docks with a fine reinforced concrete wharf."

Lewin pointed out that other city funds were spent to landscape the area, and will continue to be spent for relatively small improvements. The city has just installed specially designed lights in the square, and graded and surfaced the parking area.

"In my opinion," he concluded, "Mallory Square and Old Island Restoration Foundation are two of the best things ever happened to Key West.

"Together, they preserve the atmosphere of Key West, and promote the city's historic background as our biggest tourist attraction and economic asset."

[From the Key West (Fla.) Citizen]

OIRF HEAD IS DELIGHTED OVER AWARD

Mrs. Paul E. Sawyer, president of Old Island Restoriation Foundation, said she knew that

Key West would win the Ward Melville Award for community improvement.

"But it was a long time coming true," she said. "We sent in the presentation last spring. I sometimes wondered if I should put the file into dead storage, but I never did."

Reta Sawyer went out on the porch of Hospitality House, OIRF headquarters in Old Mallory Square, and sat on a bench salvaged from the Miami east coast station.

"All of Key West's vivid history happened right here. Indians and Spanish explorers and pirates used this anchorage. It was Commodore Porter's base when he stamped out piracy in the Western Hemisphere, and it was the busiest port in the world during the Civil War.

"What is now the community center was built to warehouse salvaged cargo, and wrecker's auctions were held in the arched doorways.

"The city of Key West revitalized a decayed and almost forgotten area by restoring Old Mallory Square, and it got a lot for the money spent, by finding new uses for what it already had.

"But the best part is that it is a community development, not just something done with taxpayers' money. The city leased the other buildings in the square to organizations which improved them at their own expense.

"The Key West Players raised $30,000 to transform a leaky old warehouse into a beautiful modern theater. The chamber of commerce spent $12,000 on its half of another warehouse, and will soon open a fish museum which will be a unique attraction for all fishermen—and who isn't?

"Next door is the marketplace, developed by the nonprofit women's civic league as a place to sell homemade products.

"The Spanish garden was paid for by donations from civic organizations, as were the benches along the wharf.

"Old Island took the quaint Mallory Steamship Co. ticket office for its office and a tourist information center. We have spent $10,000 on improvements, and will spend more as money is available.

"Nearly everybody said that this cooperative idea could not possibly work, but it has. The whole town comes here to fish, to enjoy the cool gulf breeze, to watch the ships go by. You should see the crowds that gather when the Miami Sequarium ship comes in. And the tourists love it. During the season, it is hard to find a place to park in this huge area."

Representative Robison's Statement to the House Committee on the Judiciary on School and Public Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I recently submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary on the proposed amendments to the Constitution regarding prayers in schools and other public institutions, including my own measure House Joint Resolution 913.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I fully appreciate the problems faced by the members of this committee in attempting to deal with this most complex and difficult subject, combining as it does so many elements of legality, history, patriotism, religion, and emotion. All of you are lawyers and therefore appreciate the many problems which exist when one thinks of amending that Constitution which has served our Nation so well since its birth.

Because, as a lawyer, I recognized these problems, I waited more than 20 months after the decision in *Engle* v. *Vitale* in June 1962, before introducing my own amendment in this area—H.J. Res. 913. I delayed because I wanted to observe the effect of that decision, and how it was to be followed and interpreted throughout the Nation. A year later, the Schempp and Murray cases were decided, and again I waited to see the effect. I believe that we can now clearly see that certain ancillary effects, probably not intended by the Court, have been extremely unfortunate, and bid fair to undermine the faith of large numbers of Americans in the treasured belief that the Federal Government, as regards religion, is neutral.

As a lawyer, I could not dissent from the decision on the basic issue involved in the Engle case, but I think it is now clear that the dicta in some of the supporting opinions has been relied on by some authorities far more than the actual holding in the case, which is, as I see it, that the New York Board of Regents had unintentionally violated the 1st amendment (made applicable to the States by the 14th amendment); in composing a nonsectarian prayer for official use in public schools. To me, the Court was saying, "New York's schoolchildren may pray, if they wish, but for the regents to put their official seal on a particular prayer violates the establishment clause."

Regrettably, however, that was not the interpretation placed on the decision by many. Baccalaureate services have been declared illegal in hundreds of communities throughout the land. I understand that the attorney general of West Virginia, has even ruled that a silent period for the purpose of prayer is illegal. I received numerous letters from parents who reported that, on the day President Kennedy was murdered, pupils requested that a prayer be said for him, only to be told by their teachers that this, too, would violate the first amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court. Imagine the effect of such a statement on the mind of a child at such an emotionally searing moment.

By that time, of course, the Schempp case had added fuel to the fire, and had further confused the issue in the minds of the public and, indeed, of school administrators and their legal advisers, as well.

Testifying before this committee recently, the eminent lawyer, Charles H. Tuttle, Esq., general counsel for the National Council of Churches, stated:

"The existing decisions of the Supreme Court do not affect religious expressions in accordance with American tradition and practice, where governmental composition and direction of religious exercises at public expense for audiences gathered by compulsion of law, are not involved."

I quite agree, but this, unfortunately, is not the interpretation being placed on the Court decisions by many school boards, administrators and their legal advisers—local and State. If the Court had included a similar statement in its majority or concurring opinions, perhaps we would not be here today, and you would not be faced with this knotty problem.

I finally came to the conclusion that these unforeseen extensions of the Court's decisions, and their supporting opinions, were causing great harm to the faith of too many Americans in their Government. Many have now come to view the Federal Government as the "enemy" of religion, or at least of public expressions of faith in a Divine Being. This shredding or reliance or reliance neutrality of government in matters religious, can be of serious effect in weakening public confidence in our form of government, and its institutions.

I fully agree with those who say that religion should not be a matter of majority rule. We all know that the first amendment was adopted, among other reasons, to protect minority religious beliefs. But, that is a matter of sect and theology and our problem, today, is concerned with the fact that a majority of Americans do presuppose a Supreme Being, and do feel that the United States has been unusually blessed. Feeling this, they wish to articulate it in public manifestations of divine dependence, and they wish their children to grow up with a similar feeling. Somehow, this much must be permitted under our system of government, or the fabric thereof will be seriously weakened.

I do not think a somewhat mechanical recital of a prayer is truly religion. True religion encompasses such a vast mix of morals, ethics, theological belief and, usually, church-prescribed conduct in and out of religious services, that the mere recital of a simple prayer can never be a substitue for true faith teaching in both church and home. But it does make people who wish to participate, and children in particular, aware that we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being"—to quote from *Zorach* v. *Clausen*, a landmark case on the first amendment. And, as was said in *McGowan* v. *Maryland* in a dissenting opinion: "If a religious leaven is to be worked into the affairs of our people, it is to be done by individuals and groups, not by the Government." But today, we have the Government—not by design but by misapplication—in effect preventing such individuals and groups from working that leaven into our affairs. This I think must be corrected.

I certainly would wish that constitutional amendment was not necessary to accomplish this, but I know of no other way, given the circumstances we face today. May I emphasize, however, that my amendment, and indeed all of those now pending before the committee which I have studied, does not tamper with the first amendment as many have claimed. The first amendment would remain untouched—and this is as it should be. My measure would add a new amendment, which would have the effect of redirecting the interpretation given to the Engle and Schempp cases back toward what I believe the Court intended all along—the voluntary test and the protection of nonparticipation.

I wish to stress that, prior to introducing my amendment, I came to the conclusion that any amendment, to have my support, must adequately protect that right of nonparticipation. Accordingly, my amendment contains the language "* * * the right to decline to participate shall not be abridged."

In this connection I had a most-interesting letter, recently, from a lady in my district. She reported that she was reared in a religious faith which does not permit dancing. During her school days it was common, in the physical education classes which were compulsory, for the girls to be ordered to do various dances. When this first happened, she explained to her gym teacher that her faith did not permit dancing and she was excused. In later years, she sometimes had a teacher who was disagreeable about it, but she always quietly maintained her position, even if it meant going to the school principal for support. She told me, in her letter:

"We just stood for what we thought was right, in a free country, where difference of opinion is allowed. I don't believe it hurt any of us * * * I have asked my own children how they have managed and they said they had asked to be excused and were quietly excused to study hall with no question.

"I have explained this to such an extent because I believe for the present purpose, any who do not choose to take part (in a prayer, etc.) can be allowed to sit quietly

with a book, or even excused to another room, with no undue fuss or disturbance."

Therefore, the two major aspects which must be treated in any amendment are the voluntary nature of any prayer or quasi-religious activity, and the protection of the right to decline. Equal protection of both factors is essential. If such protection is achieved in the end product of this committee's work, there surely will be no violation of the "establishment" clause merely because the expression takes place in a classroom or other public gathering under government aegis. As Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School has said:

"Does our deep seated tolerance of all religions—or to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activity? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the founders that it would?"

We all know that renowned experts in the field of constitutional law differ strongly about the effect of nearly any proposed constitutional amendments.

For those who wish to take refuge in this difference of opinion, there is an ample storm shelter in which to repair while the winds blow. But I do not think this particular "wind" will stop blowing, because distortion of the Court's opinions will probably increase. Therefore, the issue must be faced.

I deeply hope this fine committee and its excellent staff will be able to resolve the problems and pitfalls, and produce a fair and workable legislative product for presentation to the House. It is in that confidence and hope that I have not signed the discharge petition for the Becker amendment, for I feel it would be most unfortunate if this difficult issue came to the House floor by that method, and without full and objective hearings.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite the text of the key sections of my measure, House Joint Resolution 913:

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering or reading of prayers or Biblical Scriptures, in any governmental or public school, institution, building, or place, provided participation therein is on a voluntary basis: *And provided further*, That the right to decline to participate shall not be abridged.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit reference to reliance upon, belief in, or invocation of the aid of God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

I thank the committee for its consideration of this statement.

Virgin Islands Audit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Office of the U.S. Comptroller General has recently published copies of its audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for fiscal year 1963. As a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was particulary interested in this report. I have, in remarks and through the introduction of legislation, been critical in the past of certain practices of the Virgin Islands Corporation. Many of these criticisms are now voiced officially in this audit.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Comptroller General's report did not escape the attention of the Virgin Islands press. On April 20, the Daily News of the Virgin Islands carried a front page story dealing with this audit.

Meanwhile, a friend of mine in the islands has sent to me a letter adding further comment on this subject. The letter opens with a paragraph taken directly from a newsletter published by the St. Croix Chamber of Commerce, and then goes on to other points.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that both of these items warrant the attention of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the story from the Daily News, and the letter to me, be entered in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON AGENCY CHIDES VICORP ON POWER SALE

WASHINGTON.—The Virgin Islands Corporation (VICorp) "should have offered to sell V.I. power facilities to the highest responsible bidder," the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) said, in a recent report criticizing the Federal agency in the islands.

In his annual GAO report to Congress on VICorp, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell noted, "Had such action been taken, the fair market value of the facilities could have been determined by competitive bidding, and it would have been possible to compare the financial terms offered by responsible private enterprisers with the 20-year-terms" proposed by VICorp Chairman Stewart L. Udall.

In negotiations with the Virgin Islands government the corporation has offered to sell the power facilities on a 20-year-term basis.

Commenting on the GAO report John Kirwan, assistant director of territories, pointed out that the law allows Vicorp to match any bid up to the highest, but does not require that the Corporation meet the highest bid. He added that the Government's right to buy scares off responsible bidders, since the cost of determining the value of the property for bid purposes represents an expense to private business of between $25,000 and $50,000.

Further in the report, Campbell took Vicorp to task for spending $600,000 for a St. Croix generator in August and $200,000 for expanding water facilities when transfer to the Virgin Islands Government was contemplated. In the opinion of the Comptroller, the islands government should have paid.

Commenting on this phase of the report, Kirwan replied that the Federal Government will get the expenditure back when the plant is sold and it's "six of one, half a dozen of the other."

The Accounting Office also noted that Vicorp had considered acquiring Navy land property on St. Thomas but had changed its mind.

The Interior Department had told GAO in December that Vicorp would no longer seek to acquire the sub base properties. Thus, GAO added, it's appropriat to sell the properties which appear to have a high sales value and get Vicorp out of their day-to-day operation.

GAO also criticized the Vicorp management for accounting for a $61,000 generator in St. Thomas in March when the generator had become inoperable. The Accounting Office said that the capital cost of the 570-kilowatt unit should have been written down to net salvage value. Thus the report concluded, the net income from the power division operations "would have been reduced by about $61,000, less the unit's salvage value."

LETTER TO JACK WESTLAND, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

DEAR MR. WESTLAND: The following is copied verbatim from the St. Croix Chamber of Commerc newsletter:

THE FBI LOOKS AT THE V.I.

Those who wonder—and they are many—What action if any was forthcoming from the visit of Congressmen (LEO W.) O'BRIEN and (JACK) WESTLAND a few months ago, may be heartened to know that as a direct result, there has been a visit by a team of FBI men a few days ago. These chaps don't talk much, hence we can't say much, but they were looking into various aspects of governmental hanky-panky, and the possible need for congressional investigation.

The biggest steal of all time in the Virgin Islands is about to go forward. This is the sale of the submarine base property to the Virgin Islands government. The legislature has appropriated $200,000 as the downpayment. This land is worth about $50,000 an acre to private enterprise. The figure I hear mentioned that the government will pay is in the vicinity of $7,500 an acre. Also as I understand it, all arrangements (GSA, Navy, etc.) have approved the deal. So it goes.

The local government has more than a quarter of a million dollars worth of IBM machines still in their original crates, unopened since they were bought over 2½ years ago. No one knows how they work or what to do with them. Peter Bove has all the dope on this.

Three nights ago there was on the local TV a picture of Kimelman cutting a ribbon opening the V.I. exhibit at the world's fair; the story accompanying the picture told how many thousands of dollars worth of rum drinks had been sold, the vast number of visitors, etc. Last night a local radio station reported that its correspondent had visited th world's fair and that the exhibit was not only not open, but that it wouldn't be open for some time. That's where the money goes.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Rumanian Independence Day is a matter of the greatest importance to Rumanians everywhere in the world because it not only honors the founding of the Rumanian Kingdom, but modern day national independence which the Rumanian people enjoyed until the hordes of Moscow occupied that land. I am confident that while the people in Rumania are prohibited from open observance of Rumanian independence, they will observe it in ways which leave no doubt that they remain strong defenders of the Rumanian cause and dedicated to a return of their national life in freedom. The ancient culture and tradition of the Rumanian people stand

as a rock of Gibraltar in central Europe, signaling the resistance of an oppressed people who will never yield to the enemy who now occupies them.

It is worth noting that communism in Rumania is a demonstrated and proven failure. There can be no doubt that communism in practice violates all that is Rumania—past, present, and future. The ever-growing tensions in Rumania between the people and the alien regime that occupies them is abundant evidence of the political tempest that is brewing throughout Rumania. In my judgment, the Communist regime is aware of popular feelings among the people, which was the primary cause for that regime's attempts to show its independence from Moscow by playing up to the Pieping regime. While I do not trust any Communist regime, I believe all of us must recognize that even Moscow is becoming more and more concerned about developments in Rumania and throughout all of central Europe.

These developments provide a unique opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its attachment to the principle of national self-determination and the right of all nations to be masters of their destiny. This is a time when our country should be pushing for free elections in all the countries under Russian Communist domination. I will continue my efforts to force a showdown on this vital issue by demanding that no United States credits be advanced to Soviet Russia or any Communist regime until Moscow's outstanding debt to the United States of over $10 billion is paid. The form of payment I have sought is a $1 billion writeoff against this debt for each national plebiscite conducted behind the Iron Curtain under United Nations supervision. By this method Rumania will be free as will all the other once independent nations who are now held by force within the Russian Communist empire.

All friends of freedom everywhere in the world may be assured of my unwavering support for the cause of Rumanian national independence until victory is won.

Why Exempt the "Big" Employer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Peoria Journal Star, May 7, 1964:

WHY EXEMPT THE "BIG" EMPLOYER?

We have commented before on the growing situation in this country of a double-standard, one set of laws for all private decisionmakers and, another law for the Government bureaucracy, itself.

The present civil rights bill includes another extension of this dangerous privileged position of all "bosses" who work for the Government, as opposed to all others.

The civil rights bill will outlaw "discrimination" in many fields of activity, permit the Attorney General of the United States to enter any civil rights case anywhere and make it a Government case, and affect virtually every employer in the country—except the biggest employer of them all.

The Federal Government, the State governments, and local governments are all exempt from the job provisions of the civil rights bill.

Why?

Why shouldn't a man in the employ of the Government, making employment decisions, have the same legal responsibilities to be fair as a man in the employ of a private corporation making such decisions?

This is but one example of a growing practice that alarms us.

People are people, and we see no reason to separate the official bureaucracy from the rest of the population in their basic responsibilities.

We are establishing and expanding a system where that bureaucracy grows and grows in both size and power, and where the responsibility for the use of that power is becoming less and less.

We are creating jobs where a bureaucrat can impose frightful consequences on private citizens and enterprises affecting many such citizens, while standing free and clear of any consequences, himself. He doesn't even have to live up to the very laws he interprets and enforces on others.

One of the things that has bitterly disappointed the Communists has been their forced admission that there exists no classical Marxist class system in the United States.

And one of the things that has disillusioned many Marxists has been the discovery that there does exist a definite class system in Russia—"The new class" being the bureaucracy which has replaced the old "aristocracy" in both power and privilege.

It is the kind of development we cannot tolerate in the United States, and yet we are moving that way by leaps and bounds.

The time has come to insist that legislation for the proper conduct of Americans apply to all Americans—not just those outside the Government bureaucracy.

Their power is becoming ominous enough without according them a kind of privileged sanctuary themselves, to boot.

No one should be above the law, and no law should place them there.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce Gives Strong Backing to International Development Association Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States this afternoon announced its strong support for continued U.S. participation in the International Development Association program. In doing so, the chamber advanced four sound arguments for backing the IDA program.

I include hereafter the letter written today to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee (Mr. PATMAN) from Theron J. Rice, legislative manager of the chamber.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 11, 1964.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: The board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has reaffirmed support for the objectives of the International Development Association.

Therefore, it is our hope that the House of Representatives will reconsider its previous position on S. 2214 and support this measure which provides for a 3-year, $312 million extension of U.S. participation in the IDA program.

The national chamber supports IDA for these reasons:

1. It has demonstrated a businesslike approach toward improving the climate for private enterprise in developing countries.

2. Through the multilateral participation of 16 other free world nations, the burden-sharing concept of development assistance has been promoted.

2. IDA makes financial assistance available on a loan rather than a grant basis, enabling foreign assistance to be more effectively conditioned on performance than is possible through bilateral agreements.

4. IDA's provision of local currencies for development reduces demands on dollar lending for the same projects and purposes.

Sincerely yours,

THERON J. RICE.

(Cc: Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Representative WILLIAM R. BARRETT, Representative HENRY S. REUSS.)

Mr. Speaker, I also include the chamber's press release on its stand:

WASHINGTON, May 11.—Congress was asked today to authorize $312 million for the International Development Association to be paid in annual installments in fiscal 1966, 1967, and 1968.

The request was made by Theron J. Rice, legislative manager of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a letter to Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking Committee, which is considering legislation on the association.

Mr. Rice said that the chamber supports IDA because:

"It has demonstrated a business-like approach toward improving the climate for private enterprise in developing countries.

"Through the multilateral participation of 16 other free world nations, the burden-sharing concept of development assistance has been promoted.

"IDA makes financial assistance available on a loan rather than a grant basis, enabling foreign assistance to be more effectively conditioned on performance than is possible through bilateral agreements.

"IDA's provision of local currencies for development reduces demands on dollar lending for the same projects and purposes."

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, many of our fellow Americans of Rumanian origin and Rumanians in this country commemorate Rumanian Independence Day May 10. It was on this date in 1877

that Rumania was established as an independent nation for the first time in history. Ever since, until Communists seized power in Rumania, May 10 has been the national holiday, as important to Rumanians as July 4th is to us.

Rumania was an ancient province of the Roman empire and has shared for centuries many of the cultural and religious precedents of western civilization. Who has not thrilled to the wonderful Rumanian Rhaposidies of Georges Enescu? Rumanians maintained their unity against repeated invasions for centuries. When the opportunity came in 1877 to fight for independence they were prepared. They acquitted themselves with agreat distinction in the war against Turkey and proved that they deserved independence.

Under King Carol I independent Rumania became an honored and respected member of the international community. Rumanian industry grew rapidly. Despite the destruction of World War I, by 1939 Rumania was a most progressive nation. The combination of destructiveness from war and avaricious fascist groups within reduced Rumania to a state of ruin by 1945. Perhaps a million lives were lost. Even today there are many more women than men in Rumania to testify to the horrible losses of wartime. This weakened nation thus fell to the furious aggression of Communist-led political and military forces in 1947. Independence became a lost word for Rumanians and Independence Day a forbidden memory.

But thankfully many Rumanians around the world still yearn for freedom for Rumania and still celebrate Rumanian Independence Day.

By our words here we encourage Rumanians everywhere to continue their resistance to communism and we contribute to the maintenance of the memory of Rumanian independence. We see with a great deal of hope recent indication of an independent spirit in Rumania. The ties that bind Rumania into the Soviet empire are loosening. Now is the time to speak out more strongly than ever before for Rumanian independence. May 10, 1877, is not completely forgotten yet by any means.

National Commission on Food Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee has today approved a measure to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing. As a cosponsor of the proposal, I would like to commend the chairman and members of the committee for the prompt, yet comprehensive consideration they gave this matter, and for the perfecting amendments which they adopted in this morning's executive session.

Today's action marks a significant step toward what I hope will be overwhelming House approval of the Commission's inquiry. An editorial in this morning's Washington Post provides a sound and balanced view of what that inquiry might encompass; it should be instructive both to those supporting the Commission and to those interested in it.

THE MARKETING OF FOOD

Few of the housewives who are collectievly responsible for retail purchases of food, which run to about $70 billion a year, have the time or inclination to reflect upon the striking change in food production and distribution that have occurred in the last two decades. In moving from the corner grocery store to the vast supermarket and from bins of unpacked foods to such highly processed products as the frozen TV dinner, the American family has been the beneficiary of impressive economies of large-scale production and distribution as well as of advances in the agricultural sciences.

Food purchases today account for less than 19 percent of take-home pay, and in relation to income and variety of foods consumed, the average American family now probably eats for less than those in any other country in the world. But in creating this splendid cornucopia, the traditional relationships between farmers and food processors and between food processors and retailers have undergone radical changes, and it is feared that the benefits to consumers have been confronted at the cost of injury to producer groups.

The proximate cause for alarm, especially in congressional circles, is the decline in the farmer's share of the food dollar. In 1947, 47 cents of the food dollar went to the farmer, and today he receives only 37 cents. A part of this decline, just how much is not known, is ascribable to the trend toward greater processing. The string beans which are frozen in packages are first cleaned, cut, and partially cooked; poultry is now commonly plucked and eviscerated; and completely prepared foods, in which the raw materials constitute only a part of the basic production costs are winning increasing favor.

But not all of the decline in the farmers' share of the food dollar is ascribable to the higher degree of processing or the shift in consumers' preferences. Food producers and processors may be the unwitting victims of changes that have taken place in the marketing structure. Many changes have occurred as a result of the rise to prominence of the vertically integrated retail food chain, the supermarket organization that operates its own farms and packing plants. In dealing with independent farmers, cattlemen and food processors, these companies are in a position to drive hard price bargains, to specify quality standards and delivery dates.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has suggested that these changes in the marketing structure will, through the aggregation of great market power, pose a threat to the family farm as well as to the consumer. But not enough is known about what the Secretary calls the food "marketing revolution" to make any firm judgments. President Johnson has therefore asked Congress to authorize the establishment of a National Commission on Food Marketing. This bipartisan body, with five members appointed by each Chamber of the Congress and five by the President, woud have at its disposal a professional research staff to assist in the important task of distinguishing between fact and fancy, between the genuine economies of large-scale operations and the improper use of market power, between efficiency and a nostalgic attachment to tradition. The cost of the investigation would be about $2.5 million, and in view of the important issues involved, we hope that Congress will go along.

Our Next President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star of Thursday, May 7, 1964, entitled, "Our Next President," be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUR NEXT PRESIDENT

The word from Washington, from the political experts, and from the pollsters is that President Lyndon B. Johnson is a "shoo-in" for election again in the up-coming vote.

We like to keep folks as accurately informed as we can, and it would be nice professionally to tell you with confidence who the next President will be.

However, our memory is not that short, and we have some misgivings about all this confidence and assurance.

We remember at about this same stage of the game when Vice President Nixon "settled the steel strike" much as President Johnson recently "settled the railroad strike," and the same kind of comments were freely made then.

Columns were written about how the Democrats had "nobody"—just a young, junior Senator from Massachusetts who wasn't widely known and was a Catholic to boot, a shopworn southerner recently recovered from a heart attack named Lyndon Johnson, and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

None of them enjoyed national stature or national popularity, only regional at best.

The experts wrote reams about how as vice president, Mr. Nixon would be constantly placed in the public eye receiving ovations abroad, tapping Khrushchev boldly on the chest, settling the steel strike, etc.

Evenly directly on the heels of the conventions, Kennedy was "far behind" said all the observers, and they later "explained" the misjudgment by the unusual circumstance of the TV debates.

That is too simple an explanation.

The fact is that Nixon had wide popularity at the point in events but not deep. It was not a sense of personal attachment. It's the kind that can change quickly.

Also, a number of things happened to open points of harsh criticism, and the campaign provided a spotlight in which the criticism was heard.

We remember, also, that Mr. Dewey was a lead-pipe cinch right down to the wire, not just many months before the election—and it didn't work that way.

President Johnson's activities and programs have offered "something for everybody." He is a conservative, a liberal, a moderate, a southerner, a westerner, a lover of little children, poor people, rich people, of management and of labor, of all races, and a believer in less taxing and more spending by Government.

He is an anti-Communist for peaceful coexistence.

He is everything.

Such a posture offers appeal to just about everybody—but how much appeal?

Who actually identifies himself and his positions with President Johnson and feels the sense of partnership or deep attachment inspired by a Roosevelt, a Truman, an Eisenhower, or a Kennedy?

Johnson's popularity is broad but thin.

How it wears will depend greatly on what happens between now and the election to strengthen it or snap it apart.

With the kind of world we are living in, the high speed changes, and the intense pressures of political campaigning, who can tell, now?

Not us.

Caution Urged in Tariff Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the industries which came to North Carolina under the industrial development program initiated by former Governor Hodges is the watt-hour meter plant of Westinghouse Electric Corp., located on the outskirts of Raleigh. This fine industrial operation now employs more than a thousand people and paid out $6,250,000 in payroll, local taxes and local purchases last year.

The tariff negotiations which are just getting underway at Geneva, Switzerland, can have a most important effect on the operations of this Westinghouse plant and other industrial operations in North Carolina.

There are a number of manufacturing plants of the electrical equipment industry in other sections of our State, and these plants can also be seriously affected if the U.S. tariffs on their products are reduced at the bargaining sessions in Geneva without careful regard for their economic problems.

The watt-hour meter manufacturers in the United States have jointly urged that the rate of import duty on meters not be reduced, since these products can be made much cheaper in foreign countries where wage rates are much lower than those in the United States. They fear that a lowering of the tariff on this product will generate competition from low-wage countries and will cause them to lose business and reduce employment. I am urging Mr. Christian Herter, who is President Johnson's Special Ambassador at the tariff and trade negotiations in Geneva, to give careful attention to the tariff problems of U.S. meter manufacturers.

A short time ago the National Electrical Manufacturers' Association had a breakfact meeting in Washington for nearly 50 Members of Congress. I attended that breakfact and was very much impressed by the straight forward talk given by Mr. John R. Morrill on that occasion. I am inserting a copy of Mr. Morrill's talk into the RECORD with my remarks in order that it will be available for all to read.

I understand that the electrical manufacturing industry made presentations to the U.S. Tariff Commission and to the U.S. Trade Information Committee a short time ago, explaining their attitudes on foreign trade. They supported the principles of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and made a number of recommendations for the guidance of former Gov. Christian Herter and his staff in their negotiations at Geneva concerning the tariff and trade problems of the electrical equipment industry, other than the special problem of watt-hour meters. These recommendations are summarized as follows:

First. Grant tariff reductions on electrical products only in return for reciprocal concessions by foreign nations on the same electrical products.

Second. Obtain effective agreement on the elimination of nontariff barriers as a condition precedent to negotiations concerning the reduction of U.S. tariffs, particularly on heavy utility apparatus.

Third. Establish the need and right of the United States to obtain concessions in return for the continued use by foreign countries of financial and other incentives, including direct subsidies and tax remissions to their own manufacturers.

Fourth. Include suitable representatives of the electrical manufacturing industry in the advisory group to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

Mr. Morrill pointed out that the failure of the U.S. negotiators to observe these principles in their bargaining at Geneva could well have serious adverse effects upon the generation, transmission, and distribution equipment segments of the electrical manufacturing industry in the United States in the years to come.

In order to assure Mr. Herter of my interest in reasonable foreign trade policies, I have joined with a number of other Members of Congress in sending a letter to him on this subject. I am also inserting in the RECORD a copy of this joint letter to Governor Herter:

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. MORRILL, PRESIDENT, JAMES R. KEARNEY CORP., BEFORE THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE, GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION EQUIPMENT DIVISION, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 15, 1964

In the last 50 years the use of electricity has done more to change the way we live than anything else. Think for a moment * * * our lighting, our home, communications, transportation, and the very exploration of space itself are as we know them today because of electricity.

In order to use electricity it has to be created and delivered. Our industry fills the vital role in this process. We build the equipment that creates and delivers electricity to all consumers. The electric power companies operate this equipment, but we are the ones who actually design and build the generators; who design and build the towers and cables which carry the power; who transform the electricity from the 500,000 volts at which it is transmitted across the country down to the usable 115 volts we all know so well and take so much for granted.

The electrical manufacturing industry had its beginnings in Thomas Edison's light bulb of 1879, in William Stanley's transformer of 1886 and George Westinghouse's alternating current system of 1893. From these humble beginnings our industry has grown rapidly. Since its birth, the U.S. electric power industry has on the average doubled in size every 10 years. I know of no other industry that can match this record of sustained high growth for so long a time.

As a result of this phenomenal growth, today the United States leads the world in electric generation and use. With one-sixteenth of the world's population, we possess one-third of the world's electric power capacity. We have three times the electric capacity of our closest competitor, the Soviet Union.

In America 80 percent of our power is produced by steam generating stations using coal, oil, or gas as a fuel; however, there are now over a dozen nuclear power stations in operation, operating on nuclear fuel. Twenty percent of our power in this country is generated by hydroelectric plants.

Most of the equipment in the steam, nuclear, and hydro plants are products of our industry. The size of the products used in these generating stations really staggers the imagination. For example, one large turbine generator will weigh 4 million pounds—one transformer or circuit breaker can be as large as a house and weigh hundreds of tons.

There is hardly a home in the United States without electricity. Whether this electricity gets there over the wires of the investor-owned power companies, REA cooperatives, or TVA, the equipment to generate it and get it there was made by the electrical equipment companies represented here this morning.

Last year this country used 1,000 billion kilowatt-hours. That's a trillion kilowatt-hours. An average residential customer, like you or me, uses 4,500 kilowatt-hours. In 1980 we estimate that in this country we will consume nearly 3 trillion kilowatt-hours, and the average residential customer will use 13,000 kilowatt-hours per year * * * three times the present usage.

But the real miracle of our century is the cost of electricity. For years while the cost of nearly everything else has gone up, up, and up, the cost of electricity has come down. In the last 25 years the cost of living has more than doubled, but the cost of a kilowatt-hour of electricity delivered to your home is less than it was in 1935.

Today the average cost of a kilowatt-hour to a residential user—that is let us say, the electricity used in 1 hour by 10 100-watt bulbs is only 2.4 cents. Here, indeed, is one of the real values of our way of life in America.

How was this remarkable achievement made possible? Primarily by the research and development of the companies represented in this room today, working closely with the electric power companies. For example, the amount of coal needed to generate a kilowatt-hour today is down nearly 40 percent from 1939.

The entire electrical manufacturing industry is mammoth in size, representing billions upon billions of dollars in investment and employing over 1½ million workers in nearly 8,000 factories. That portion of the electrical manufacturing industry meeting with you this morning is also an extremely important part of our national economy in peacetime or wartime. We employ over 150,000 people in nearly 500 plants in 35 States. Our sales are around $3 billion per year.

In 1963, which was not an unusually large year for our industry, the power companies who generate and distribute electricity spent $4.6 billion on new construction. The heart of this construction was our equipment. We estimate that between now and 1980 these same power companies will spend $55 billion on new facilities. I mention these figures to give you some indication of the impact of our portion of this industry on the national economy.

In addition to its importance to our domestic economy, the electrical manufacturing industry has for many years exported to the four corners of the globe and has made an important contribution to the favorable balance of foreign trade which is still enjoyed by the United States. Products of the entire electrical manufacturing industry account for approximately 5 percent of all exports of finished domestic merchandise.

The generation, transmission, and distribution equipment section of the industry has for years exported to foreign countries but primarily to the underdeveloped or developing nations, where purchases have often been tied to American aid programs. Our

segment of the industry would like to do a great deal more in the export field, but we are prevented by the actions of most of the countries in the EEC and the EFTA where the big market is.

These countries naturally have tariffs on our products. Tariff barriers always have a slowing effect on world trade but it's the nontariff barriers which control the export of our products. These nontariff barriers include quotas, restrictive regulations, special taxes, and in most cases, the outright refusal to buy products of our type from any but companies within their own borders. Almost all European utilities are state-owned, with policies of purchasing only from their own domestic manufacturers. This not only protects their home market, but it helps these European manufacturers to compete in world markets—including the United States.

Now please understand, we are not condemning this practice as such. Foreign countries should certainly have a right to operate their own power systems and purchasing practices as they wish. The only thing that concerns us is that our representatives under the provisions of GATT are soon to sit down with representatives of these foreign nations to talk about selling our type of products to each other.

Our GATT representatives are going to Geneva to negotiate reductions in American tariffs on products coming into this country—on products of the type the people in this room manufacture. Therefore, it is of deep concern to us that these negotiators understand that unless they can convince these foreign countries to eliminate their restrictive practices and nationalistic buying, that even if the industrialized nations reduce their tariffs to zero, we will get little additional business from them.

Yet, if U.S. tariffs are reduced, the American market will see a significant increase of foreign products because American public power buyers, in contrast with Europeans, purchase foreign manufactured items whenever the price is lower. This influx of foreign electrical equipment may very well wipe out the trade balance advantage now enjoyed by the electrical manufacturing industry. Worse than that, it will probably result in reduction of employment in many of our plants. There is no question that the lower prices of the foreign goods will depress prices in our industry still further and may result in the closing of some of the smaller companies in our industry in your districts.

On March 6 of this year we presented our industry story to the Tariff Commission and to the Trade Information Committee of the Department of Commerce. We were publicly commended by both agencies for an objective and factual presentation. We stated to them our industry believes in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We believe also that if tariffs are to be reduced on our electrical products, it should be on a mutually reciprocal basis, and, that these foreign countries must eliminate their nontariff barriers as well.

Further, that the EEC and EFTA member countries must agree to exempt American products from their equalization taxes which are not called tariffs but have exactly the same effect. And further, these foreign governments must stop their practices of refunding all taxes to their own manufacturers whenever a product goes out of their country. This makes it extremely difficult for American manufacturers to compete in third countries because our products must be priced to pay all American Federal, State, and local taxes.

We are hopeful that the Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee will study our situation very carefully. We also hope that the GATT negotiating team will take with them to Geneva an adviser who is an experienced representative of the electrical manufacturing industry. We respectfully suggest and would greatly appreciate it if our Representatives in Congress would encourage them to do just exactly this.

What we have said is that our industry is willing and often able to compete with the EEC and EFTA countries even though their labor rates are 40 to 50 percent of ours. But we can't win this 100-yard dash if our Government starts our competitors 50 yards ahead of us. We need your help in insuring that our industry—your industry, since our plants are in your congressional districts—gets a fair shake out of the GATT negotiations.

Our industry also hopes Congress will consider pending legislation to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. The industry believes that such legislation is badly needed to expedite enforcement of the act, to establish shorter time limits to determine violations, and to take prompt, effective action against all foreign exporters, or domestic importers, guilty of selling foreign merchandise in the United States at dump prices. There are several bills of this kind before the Congress and we respectfully urge our Congressmen to analyze and support them.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

GOV. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR HERTER: We want to let you know of our interest in and support of the position taken by U.S. manufacturers of electric utility equipment in March when they appeared before the Trade Information Committee as members of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA).

In their brief, and in subsequent oral testimony, these NEMA members stated that with respect to heavy electric utility equipment, U.S. manufacturers cannot sell their products in industrialized Europe (the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association countries) and Japan principally because nationalistic procurement policies and practices by the government atuhorities which own or control the electric utilities in these countries effectively prevent outside competition.

The NEMA brief, at page 61, says:

"If foreign manufacturers are to continue to enjoy access to the U.S. market—and certainly if they are to have the benefit of a further reduction in present moderate U.S. tariff rates—their respective governments must agree to grant U.S. concerns an equal opportunity to compete in the local markets of the EEC–EFTA countries and Japan. Equal opportunity to compete in those markets means:

"1. Equally valuable reductions in ECC–EFTA and Japanese tariffs on heavy electrical apparatus.

"2. Elimination or reduction of 'equalization' taxes so that the combined tariff-'equalization' tax burden does not exceed the U.S. tariff rate on such products.

"3. Elimination of nontariff barriers including laws, regulations, and government-sanctioned practices which have the effect of limiting the access of American-made heavy electrical apparatus to the EEC-EFTA and Japanese markets to a greater extent than such apparatus made in those countries is restricted from access to the U.S. market."

Representing as we do the plant locations where U.S. electric utility equipment is manufactured, and recognizing the vital stake this industry has in equal opportunity to compete worldwide, we endorse the recommendation of the NEMA brief and urge that unless and until such equal opportunity is made a reality, there be no further reductions in U.S. duties on this category of electric equipment.

(Signed by 20 Members of Congress.)

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 9, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex., May 9, 1964)

HOUSE PASSES EIGHTH APPROPRIATION BILL

The House kept up its pace this week by approving the eighth appropriation bill. Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, totaled $1,702,627,800. There are only four more regular appropriation bills which the House expects to act upon within the next month, thus putting us in a position to adjourn.

However, the Senate is far behind. No immediate end is in sight for Senate action on the civil rights bill. Because the committees cannot meet during Senate debate, the House-passed legislation is fast piling up, with the result Congress will be held in session long past a reasonable adjournment date. The President, in his press conference picnic, indicated he plans to hold Congress in session after both conventions and again after the election. Full responsibility for the failure to dispatch the work of Congress in an orderly manner must be borne by the Democrat Party because it has the majority of votes and its leadership schedules the program for legislation. So, when the President says the people are entitled to a vote by Congress on legislation and he is entitled to it, he need look no further for action than to his own party.

The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1965, defies detailed explanation in the short space of a newsletter. Some specific criticisms represent the objections of some to such spending.

State Department

1. While the budget was cut, spending goes up in State and Justice Departments.
2. Representation allowance, that is, the liquor bill for oversea diplomats, $993,000.
3. International organizations memberships, $93 million, including the ILO, International Labor Organization.

Commerce Department

4. The ARA, Area Redevelopment Administration, operational expense of $14 million, plus $59½ million additional grants.

Judiciary

5. The limousine for the Supreme Court Chief Justice, $8,100.

Related agencies

6. Small Business Administration, $7 million for salaries and expenses plus $28 million transfer from revolving fund for loans.
7. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency increase of $3½ million over $11 million this year for a total of $14 million.
8. The U.S. Information Agency, cost of $166 million.

LEGISLATIVE BOX SCORE

The bills the President has designated as "must legislation" and for which he threatens to keep Congress in session are:

1. Civil rights.
2. Food stamp plan.
3. Government pay increases.
4. Medicare.

5. Antipoverty package.

Of these, civil rights is now in the Senate; has already passed the House. Food stamp plan has passed the House. Government pay increases, defeated by the House once, will be brought up again shortly. Medicare is before the Ways and Means Committee. The antipoverty package is before the Committee on Education and Labor. It is up to Congress what legislation it will enact. Nowhere in the Constitution is the President given authority to demand that Congress pass or reject particular legislation. Congress should not be coerced or stampeded into passing laws which are not needed or which threaten the freedom of the people in a republic. This is the way to dictatorship.

PROGRAM FOR A FREE SOCIETY

Contrast the above legislative demands with the positive program I advocate:

1. Fiscal responsibility through a balanced budget and paying down the debt.
2. Preservation of the private enterprise system by getting the Government out of business in competition with its citizens.
3. Realistic tax reform to halt inflation and maintain the soundness of the dollar.
4. Making big labor subject to the same ground rules which business and industry must follow.

Which program do you think is most effective in preserving the Republic and the liberty of the people?

Proverbs 26: 17: "He that passeth by, and meddleth with strife belonging not to him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears."

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday marked the anniversary of Rumanian Independence Day, and all over the world free people once again raised their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant nation which has been under Communist domination for the past 19 years.

Despite oppression and brutal domination at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the Rumanian people has shone brightly and the heritage of greatness which the free leaders of that proud nation have left behind still is enshrined in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad.

The people of Rumania have been oppressed by a totalitarian power. They have been deprived of their individual political, economic, and religious freedoms. The people of that country long for the day when Rumania will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

American sympathy with the plight of the Rumanian people has been expressed in the press of this country and in Congress. Recently we have noted the Rumanian demands for national freedom in defiance of a colonial system perpetuated from the Kremlin.

We welcome this trend. We are pleased that Rumania has determined to work out its own domestic and foreign policies free of dictation from other powers. Now we desire that the Rumanian Government, realizing the benefits of freedom of action on the world scene, will extend freedom to its own people, for their benefit and the ultimate good of the nation.

It has been announced that the United States and Rumania will hold high-level economic and political talks later this month. It is my earnest hope that these discussions may result in fruitful action on the part of both countries.

In the meantime, we want the people of Rumania to know of the deep regard in which they are held by the people of the United States and of our desire to see them once again free and independent.

Sunsets, Smiles, 101 Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Massachusetts District has contributed many outstanding young men and women to the Peace Corps. They are serving as teachers, medical technicians, and nurses all over the globe. One of these volunteers, Peter Boyer, of Lexington, Mass., is a teacher and lecturer in English at Osmania University in Hyderabad, India.

He described his experiences in the April 1964 issue of the Peace Corps Volunteer. I ask unanimous consent to include his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SUNSETS, SMILES, 101 STRINGS

(By Peter Boyer)

As a volunteer, I am a generalist. Freely translated for those Peace Corps pledges still imprisoned by the language barrier, this means that I have a liberal arts degree and am innocent of any particular technical skill. As such, I am employed as an English lecturer at Osmania University in Hyderabad.

Indian universities, although adapted mainly from the British university system, share with American universities a long summer vacation. The vacation here coincides with the hotter season from April to June (I say hotter because there are only two seasons: hot and hotter). Because of it, I must find some suitable project to fill this gap since the Peace Corps so unreasonably frowns on 3-month vacations for its volunteers.

At first, I thought I might turn to agriculture. But the idea of pulling weeds in the hot sun was repugnant to a sensitive city boy like me. What, I then reflected, is the true function of a generalist in a free society? Ultimately I decided I might best use the time to continue to teach English.

In India, problems of communication are compounded by the existence of 14 major languages and literally hundreds of dialects. Many of the students entering university have never been taught in English—the university's teaching language—so that on their arrival they have to grope desperately to understand their instructors. To minimize this agonizing period, I decided to conduct a course in English for high school seniors.

My first steps seemed like the waltz of a faint-hearted boxer—I danced beautifully but never scored. I approached six or seven high schools, where each principal eagerly promised to give me a list of 10 or 15 students eager to learn more English.

By mid-February, I had received a list from only two schools. Finally I found a school whose vigorous headmaster not only promised to provide students but offered to lend his facilities as well. From this point, matters went rapidly, until there were four centers throughout the city, and 200 students were being daily exposed to English by six volunteers. We taught for 1 month, as planned, and the success of the program can be measured by the fact that not one of the students—or teachers—suggested another day of lessons. What greater tribute?

Actually, my brief story ends in sunsets and smiles and 101 strings. But just one time I would like to hear of a Peace Corps volunteer who struggled through many difficulties, surmounted obstacle after obstacle, and finally proved that his project was a failure.

Finding a workable summer project can really be a trying experience, but if a project is successful there are numerous benefits—such as providing conversations with administrators and articles for the "Peace Corps Volunteer." The biggest problem is to find something that provides direct benefit. If people in India can see advantages to a program, they respond quickly and enthusiastically. Too often, I think, a country is judged by the scope of its problems, and not by its attempt to overcome them. Indians are not inept or unintelligent; they fully recognize their difficulties. Yet it is because the problems themselves are so interrelated that the simple solutions which an observer might hastily suggest are not practicable at all. For example, India's burden of increasing population is linked with attempts to educate millions of villagers, which in turn is connected to the language problem, and this to the political divisions of the country, and so on. Once a useful scheme is proposed, however, responses can be overwhelming. This is one of the things that makes being a Peace Corps volunteer worth while.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1877, the nation of Rumania, after centuries of living under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks, declared its independence. Today, that nation is only one among many forming part of the vast Soviet empire stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In 1939, following the Soviet-Nazi pact, the Soviet Union seized Bessarabia and northern Bukovina from Rumania. In August 1944, as World War II was drawing to a close, Soviet armies marched into Rumania and stayed to supervise the establishment of a Communist regime. Soviet domination brought the political rigors of totalitarian rule, the forced collectivization of the land of the peasants, the submission of the Rumanian economy to the prior demands of the Soviet economy, and attempts to weaken the force of Rumania's cultural ties with the West and to establish a place for the foreign

culture of the Soviet Union. The Rumanians are a stubborn and courageous people, however. They have increasingly resisted Soviet efforts to maintain them in the inferior position of a primarily agricultural country. They have taken an independent line in the Soviet-Chinese dispute. They have sought to increase their contacts with the West. True independence lies yet ahead. But let us hope that it is nearer today than it has been in many years, and that in the not too distant future, Rumanians will once more be able to observe their traditional independence day in freedom.

The Bomber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy over our military force structure. At one time the cold war was such that the most urgent task was to provide for a deterrent against massive aggression—a nuclear superiority that would protect the West from total destruction by a potential nuclear attack. But wars change, and so do the implications of the threat as well as the methods by which wars are fought. Sometimes these changes come about more swiftly than philosophers of warfare can keep abreast.

The cold war threat is now no longer limited to mass military destruction. Rather, the menace is our lack of conventional weapons to meet the threat of limited wars. If we, as a nation, are to be unprepared for limited warfare we are then compelled to rely upon desperate strategies of vast mutual destruction.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from a small weekly newspaper, the Feather River Bulletin in Quincy, Calif., which makes a point of emphasis in the present controversy now before the Nation.

The editorial follows:

THE BOMBER

There has been disagreement for some years between Congress, which appropriates money for military purposes, and the military brass which actually spends it. The point of disagreement has to do with certain proposed military airplanes; Congress wants them built and kept ready for use, and the military does not.

If the military had a record of being right about new military methods and devices one would be much more inclined to agree that, indeed the bomber is obsolete and that the next war, if there is one, will be decided with intercontinental ballistic missiles fired thousands of miles from their targets. One cannot help recalling that when the tank was a new weapon it was necessary to give the military establishment—in this case British—positive orders not to ignore, it but to use it.

One may suspect the chief reason the U.S. military does not propose to use bombers is that the Russian military does not propose to use them. Well, the reason the Russians wont use them may well be that Americans have consistently built bombers that fly faster and higher than Russian aircraft. Why build bombers that will be outclassed? Better to concentrate on ICBM's. This is good logic for Russians but not good logic for Americans. However, original thinking is not something for which the U.S. military is noted. One wonders how many present day Billy Mitchells there may be muttering—strictly to themselves—about the situation.

Military history is full of cases where there was an overlapping of weapons, if it may be called that. Thus in many of the battles of antiquity, though the bronze age had arrived, many an infantryman fought with a stone mounted on the end of a stick. And when the iron age arrived it had no significance for many years, as the price of an iron knife or dagger was about 15 times what the price would have been for a similar weapon made of solid gold—if anyone had wanted a blade made of solid gold.

Gunpowder was invented, so far as Europeans were concerned, in about 1270. It was of course destined to become a chief element in military science. Yet the English longbow was decisive when the English and French fought the Battle of Crecy in 1346, the Battle of Poitiers 10 years later, and the Battle of Agincourt in 1415. True, there were other factors, but cannon used by the French was hardly one of them. In every case the French far outnumbered the English, and in every case the English, not knowing their bows and arrows had become obsolete, won the battle.

It is entirely conceivable that the ICBM has not yet been perfected to a point where we can be sure it will arrive at its destination. It is entirely conceivable that the bomber, which takes the bomb to the target, will be the decisive weapon in the next emergency. At least there is sufficient possibility of this that the bomber should not yet be abandoned.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Rumanian Independence Day. We remember this day in honor of those many Rumanians who joined together in 1877 to establish their own nation.

Rumania's unification and independence came after nearly 400 years of alien rule by her neighbors and the Ottoman Empire. Never, however, during this whole time did the Rumanians cease to work for the attainment of their freedom. In 1877, with the Russo-Turkish War raging in the Balkans the Rumanians saw their opportunity and joined the Russians against the Turks. At the end of the war their efforts were rewarded when the Congress of Berlin recognized their newly won independence.

Unfortunately, the Rumanians did not retain their true independence for very long. Although this nation fought with the Allied and associated powers in the First World War, she was inevitably involved as a helpless victim in the Nazi struggle during the Second World War and by the end of the war found herself under the complete domination of the Kremlin.

For nearly two decades now, the country has been sealed off from the free world and some 17 million Rumanians live in what is practically a vast prison camp where they are continually subject to the worst excesses of Communist totalitarianism. As a result of Russian control, these sturdy peasants are forced to till their fertile land mostly for the benefit of the Soviet Union. Denied all forms of freedom, they have no choice but to obey all Communist dictates, for democracy, as we in the free world know it, is not permitted.

We, in the free world, must hope that the Rumanians will continue to retain the strength and will to fight for independence as they always have in the past. And it is on this 87th anniversary of Rumanian Independence Day that we look with sorrow at the present unhappy state of the Rumanian people and wish that the future will soon allow the Rumanians to regain their lost freedom.

Umpire Jackie Robinson Calls Errors He Sees—By Black and White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the problems of civil rights were just as complicated, if not more so, 100 years ago as they are today. During the war Lincoln found civil rights as a problem. He explored a number of different answers to the problem and finally found the problem had to be dealt with in America. His plan for exporting the Negro was impractical and impossible. The thought of setting them aside in their own community was inconsistent with American policy—so he changed his position on this matter. His final decision on this matter was reflected to Nathaniel P. Banks, who was in control of the 17 of the 48 parishes of Louisiana, in 1863, where he said he hoped they would adopt the Proclamation of Emancipation and while at it, adopt some plan where they could live themselves out of their old relationships to each other and both come out better prepared for the new, adding, "that education of the young blacks should be part of the plan." Then later in letters to Gen. Michael Hahn, who had been appointed Governor, he voiced the desire to allow the Negroes a vote. He then, of course, recommended the passage of the 13th amendment to the Constitution, and I am sure would have recommended the 14th and 15th amendments which came after his death. I am sure, however, that Lincoln would have backed only those plans that provided the gradual extension of basic freedoms by a plan that would have made progress certain. This, of course, is what the legislation before the Congress is doing.

Mr. Speaker, while the minority, with outside help, did a great job and should be given great credit for the job and leadership, it is true that this controversial question could have been dealt with more effectively and adequately had they had the advantage of a larger staff to do many of the necessary studies and take care of the details involved. Mr. Speaker, the minority staff problem remains as a challenge and should not be ignored if we want to have a kind of effective and active Congress the people have a right to expect.

A thoughtful article has been written by Jackie Robinson in which he points out some of the areas which have been made by both sides of the debate.

Because Republicans have to depend upon their own resources while the Democratic majority has access to the huge facilities of the Justice Department and the Civil Rights Commission and other branches of the executive, it is essential that if the Republican Party is to remain the party of Lincoln that it have adequate staff to explore more of the pros and cons of various complicated matters in which are raised in Mr. Robinson's arti- this important legislative battle, some of cle from the New York Herald Tribune, April 26:

UMPIRE JACKIE ROBINSON CALLS ERRORS HE SEES—BY BLACK AND WHITE

(His first few years in professional baseball, he was under strict orders to keep his mouth shut. But ever since then, Jackie Robinson, the man who drove Jim Crow out of the big leagues, has been a loud and influential voice in the Negro battle for equal rights. Mr. Robinson, who is now a member of Governor Rockefeller's campaign forces, is bitterly opposed to the forces fighting civil rights legislation in Congress; but he is equally opposed, as he explains here, to irresponsible Negro leadership and to irresponsible tactics.)

(By Jackie Robinson)

Flying to Detroit, 48 hours before the threatened World's Fair stall-in, I read in my morning paper a warning issued by two U.S. Senators—California's Republican TOM KUCHEL and Minnesota's Democrat HUBERT HUMPHREY. These two proven fighters for the civil rights cause expressed their concern about northern white reaction to the planned tieup of New York City traffic. They said this reaction was making much more difficult their task of getting the civil rights bill passed.

Immediately upon landing, I sent a lengthy wire to these congressional leaders. In my message I agreed that the planned stall-in was an unwise and dangerous tactic. I also made a suggestion. I proposed that some body of Congress take a searching look into the atmosphere now prevailing in our country which has made it possible for anyone, overnight, to become a "civil rights hero" and a "militant leader" simply by advocating extremist and sensationalist tactics.

I sent my wires to the two Senators because they are men I trust. In opposing the stall-in at Flushing Meadow, they were being consistent. For they are also fighting against a stall-in on Capitol Hill, a stall-in which seeks to immobilize the increasingly flowing traffic of human dignity for every American.

OBSTRUCTIONISM

The Capitol Hill stall-in, which has been perpetrated year after year, is a classic piece of obstructionism which would wreck the "engines of freedom." When Senators KUCHEL and HUMPHREY assert that certain extremist methods are hurtful to the civil rights cause, it does not mean the same thing as if the statement had come from master extremists like DICK RUSSELL or STROM THURMOND.

Congressional misleadership and the stall-in example set by certain members of Congress is not the only cause for today's favorable climate for civil rights phonies. There are other causes. In my telegram to the Senators, I raised a question which has distrubed me for some time. I cannot understand why the national press—and I certainly do not mean the Negro press—persists in a policy of glorifying on their front pages the very persons they condemn in their editorials.

An outstanding example of this schizophrenic handling is former Black Muslim Minister Malcolm X. Mr. X, as he is projected by what we regrettably call the "white press," don't even exist. As Dick Gregory has said, Malcolm was "invented" by the people who edit big newspapers, control big television and radio and publish big newspapers and magazines.

Malcolm has big audiences, but no constructive program. He has big words, but no records on deeds in civil rights. He is terribly militant on soapboxes on street corners of Negroes ghettos. Yet, he has not faced southern police dogs in Birmingham as Martin Luther King has done, nor gone to jail for freedom as Roy Wilkins and James Farmer have done, nor led a march on Washington as A. Philip Randolph did, nor brought about creative dialog between business and civil rights leaders as Whitney Young does daily.

DISOWNED

In fact, here is a man who has been exposed and disowned by the very organization which he had so eloquently espoused—the Black Muslims. In spite of all this, Mr. X receives more publicity in national media than is given to all the responsible Negro leaders we have mentioned above. White colleges flood him with speaking engagement offers. You can count on one hand Negro colleges which have invited him, if there are any.

It is the function of media to report, yes. But the Malcolm X image has been distorted rather than reported; distorted so that many whites imagine that Malcolm has a popular following; distorted so that a number of whites and colored people, more concerned with public attention than with civil rights, more hungry for headlines than for jobs and justice, have suddenly reached for mantles of leadership which they are not prepared to wear.

Of themselves, this small, but growing band of rebels without an honest cause is unimportant. But the grievious truth is that more and more misguided sincere people of both races are apparently lining up behind the misleaders, believing in their hearts that they are helping to stand up for justice. These people are obviously impressed by the publicity given to the sensationalists and extremists. Perhaps some of the news media are guided by the fact that sensational news sells papers. The exaggerations voiced by extremists, both black and white, of left and right, make sensational news.

RESPONSIBILITY

But the privilege of a free press, guaranteed by our Constitution, carries with it a concomitant responsibility—that of projecting responsible journalism for the good of our country. When news media more interested in circulation than in humanity give wide currency to such news and play down legitimate and progressive leadership, they fail in their responsibility and perform a distinct disservice not only for their fellow man, but, more important, to the entire concept of freedom of the press. The American press must recognize that leadership is equally as important as readership.

I honestly did not believe that the planned stall-in was a genuine demonstration for justice. I believe that its leaders sought to be leaders of a demonstration rather than leaders in the fight for freedom.

Some months ago, shortly after the March on Washington, I sensed the coming of this counterrevolution. I approached several responsible and liberally oriented white leaders of this Nation and suggested that they sit down around a table with responsible Negro leadership to develop honorable plans. I warned that, if this were not done, the extremists would take over civil rights activities.

The white leaders were offended by the use of the term counterrevolution. They ignored my argument that a northern white counterrevolution could spark an international counter-counterrevolution which could inflame the world in a conflict of color. I pointed out that three-fourths of the world is comprised of colored people, many of whom are wavering between the choices offered by communism and democracy. They are wavering because they cannot equate our passion for freedom in Burma with the hollow roar of police dogs in Birmingham.

EXAMPLE

I am no race leader, no social scientist and claim no special wisdom as a spokesman or analyst. Yet, every dire development which I had envisioned when I vainly sought to talk with these white men of good will, is coming to pass.

I think there is a double challenge which our society black and white, must face. I think the white leadership must learn to listen to the voices of the legitimate Negro leaders who opposed last Wednesday's stall-in plan, but who, in their hearts, knew the reasons why those plans came into being.

I think the black leadership must speak up and speak out more boldly and with more authority so that the press agentry of a Malcolm will not be the only influence projected in our communications channels. I think the Congress of the United States must set an example of leadership and must not compromise in the civil rights challenge. I think that the President must do more than hand out big jobs and say moving words. I think my own people and others involved in the civil rights struggle must move ahead with creative, not destructive protest. Although our Nation's legislators have given us the blueprint for stall-in, we must reject it if we are to vindicate a just cause. For two wrongs do not make a right—not even a civil right.

I have participated in demonstrations—creative, thoughtful, unmalicious and positive demonstrations. I will continue to do so. I will also continue to speak up and speak out. But I am concerned not only for the liberation of black Americans but also for the salvation of all Americans and the authentication of the American dream. After all, my ancestors helped to create it.

Renick Comments on Cuban Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of Florida's most astute observers of the Caribbean and Latin America is Mr. Ralph Renick. Mr. Renick has also earned distinction as a journalist and well-known television commentator for WTVJ, the CBS affiliate in Miami.

Speaking recently before a large audience in Palm Beach, Fla., Ralph Renick put forth his seven-point plan for action against communism in Cuba. As you can see, Mr. Renick's plan has great merit, and the following is a writeup of that meeting which appeared in one of the local newspapers.

I ask that it be included at this point in the record in order that it may receive the widest possible audience.

RENICK COMMENTS ON CUBAN CRISIS

"Communist Cuba is as much a threat to our Nation and the rest of the world as anything in the world today, and if she is a threat today, she will be much more of one tomorrow. Thousands of Cuban schoolchildren are being daily indoctrinated in communism. Cuba is one of the best equipped and bustling Communist camps outside Russia."

These are the words of Ralph Renick, CBS Miami TV commentator who spoke Tuesday afternoon to a large audience at the Society of the Four Arts. His subject was "The Cuban Situation." Based in Miami, Mr. Renick has had an opportunity not only to observe the trend of events but to secure information concerning them.

He explained how in the whole of South America propaganda and lies are being spread to even the smallest villages, often by radio.

"Argentina: Within the last 2 weeks the sixth training center for Communist guerrillas was uncovered.

Dominican Republic: Over 100 Communist trainees in the Lincoln Hotel.

Colombia: At least six states controlled by "The Violets" a Communist group who have received $20,000 from Castro.

Honduras: Communist supplied ammunition, radios, maps. Submarine activity and guerrilla fighting in the heart of the country.

Chile: A youth group of 5,000 are presently convening, called the Congress of Latin American Youth. They are Communists organized by one of Castro's brainiest followers.

Bolivia: The Vice President of the nation is the leader of the Communist Party.

Venezuela: The number one Communist enjoys diplomatic immunity.

Puerto Rico: Early last month a large cache of ammunition was found just off Puerto Rico.

Panama: Turns out Communist agents were in the heart of the trouble.

Peru: Stores of arms and ammunition discovered.

Mr. Renick showed films of the preparation for the revolution up to the final overthrow of Batista and the takeover by Castro "an extrardinary actor and true master of deceit."

He described the inactivity of the United States and their failure to take advantage of the three opportunities to stop the Communist momentum—at time of Castro's takeover. Bay of Pigs, and the missile crisis.

He suggested that the United States should now embark on the following course of action:

1. The United States issue a public declaration to the world that a state of limited hostility exists.
2. Establish a Cuban Government in exile.
3. Full support, perhaps covert, of exile groups.
4. Offer of arms and men to any Latin American nation fighting Cuba—or mutual security pact.
5. A hard and clear-cut ultimatum that any boats inside the 3-mile limit will be sunk.
6. Constant surveillance of the island.
7. Make it as expensive as possible for the U.S.S.R. to maintain the Cuban economy.

Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations on recommendation of its several subcommittees considering deficiency appropriations for departments and agencies in Government for the fiscal year June 30, 1964, approved and submits to the House the following items for its consideration totaling $1,162,800,000, a reduction of $42,467,100 from the requests received. About 92 percent of the bill represents military pay costs and public assistance matching grants.

The various amounts appropriated represent those supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the current year to budget requests that are exceptions to the appropriations prohibited in the antideficiency statutes against accelerated or deficiency spending rates.

The Department of Defense—military; for military deficiency appropriation, reserve personnel accounts, and retired pay accounts. District of Columbia—operating expenses (schoolchildren, transportation), public safety (payments to widows and children of deceased policemen and to those retired); caseload increase in public assistance, service costs for Police Department of District of Columbia in connection with the funeral of our late martyred President, John F. Kennedy. The independent offices—Public Buildings Service, increased costs of selective service procurement operation, selectee travel costs and pay increases of personnel. Veterans' Administration pay increases, employees. Service-connected cases increasing costs per case—disability compensation cases. Loan guarantee revolving fund—program activity to quickly honor valid claims and obligations—Department of Agriculture—forest protection and utilization—funds to replace firefighting costs and provide for emergency firefighting, Department of the Interior—fire suppression, Bureau of Indian Affairs—also fire suppression, National Park Service—the same. Also maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities for pay increases. The same for Smithsonian and National Gallery of Art.

Department of Labor increases in costs of injuries, costs of medical care, wages of civilian employees have a direct effect on the cost of benefits.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—increased wages; St. Elizabeths Hospital increased costs of operating and wages. Welfare Administration—increased grants to States for public assistance. The future indicates need of additional funds for this program.

U.S. Soldiers' Home, approves withdrawal of funds for Soldiers' Home's permanent fund—increases of wages and operational and contract costs.

Legislative branch—Architect's Office wage increase and deceased members widow gratuities.

Department of Defense—civil. Increased wage costs—Department of the Interior—operation and wage costs for Bonneville Power project and costs incidental to Canadian contract under the Columbia River treaty.

Department of Justice: Costs incidental to fees and expenses of witnesses. Increases in wages of employees in prisons. Also increases of costs by State and county institutions for housing and feeding Federal prisoners awaiting trial or disposition of their cases.

The Judiciary: Increases in wage costs.

The Treasury: Increases in wage costs, retired pay, and military increased pay.

Claims and Judgments: To meet necessary payments of claims and judgments against the United States by the Court of Claims and the U.S. District Courts.

Thus the heavy responsibility of Chairman MAHON and his committee in presenting this bill to the Congress—the consolidation of the meticulous work of each of the respective subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, whose responsibilities to determine these separative and respective demands for money to carry on the business of Government was twofold:

First. The study of the request in terms of present expenditures already allotted in their general appropriation; and

Second. The adjudication of the various requests both in projected estimates in some cases and the amounts to be appropriated.

The committees functioning in this consolidated bill and the respective chairmen are to be congratulated in their efforts as well as Chairman MAHON and his committee.

Defense Cutbacks Spurring Civilian Production Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the growing problem of economic conversion is receiving increasing attention from the press all over the country. Hopefully, businessmen, educators, labor union officials, and governments at all levels will come to grips with the problem before the economic dislocations threatened by reductions in defense spending become tragic reality in hundreds of communities all across the country.

Recently, Ed Lambeth of the Gannett papers did a series of three fine articles on the conversion problem. He outlines the Government response to the problem to date and catalogs the complex and varied problems we must handle if we are to avoid severe dislocations and a real dip in our prosperity.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Lambeth's articles, as they appeared in the Elmira, N.Y., Star-Gazette on April 29, April 30, and May 1, 1964, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Star-Gazette, Elmira, N.Y., Apr. 29, 1964]

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES: DEFENSE CUTBACKS SPURRING CIVILIAN PRODUCTION NEEDS—PART I

(By Ed Lambeth)

WASHINGTON.—The likelihood of a plateau or dip in Pentagon spending is forcing defense contractors to rethink the prospects of forging swords into plowshares.

To the big suppliers in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut industrial complex, and elsewhere, the $1.1 billion cut in the 1965 Pentagon budget looks like handwriting on the wall. It marks the first real reduction in defense spending in a decade.

Also contributing to the reappraisal are the nuclear test ban treaty, the mutual but independent Soviet-American cutback in the rate of plutonium stockpiling and a fuzzy yet persistent feeling that arms limitation accords with Russia cannot be ruled out in the years ahead. With Americans dying in Vietnam and on guard at the Berlin Wall, nobody claims that peace is breaking out all over. And almost no one foresees a drastic cut in arms procurement.

That few defense firms are genuinely alarmed about the $51.2 billion budget, stems from the fact that much of the reduction had been predictable. Spending for Polaris and Minuteman missiles has passed its peak. Behind, also, are the doubled budgets for the Army's "beefed up" conventional forces.

Former Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric summed up the trend in congressional testimony last November:

"Unless some currently unforeseen change takes place in the nature of military threats which the Nation faces we do not see the need * * * of a recurrence of the rapid increase in defense spending that has been necessary in the past 3 years.

"Instead, we anticipate a relatively stable overall military budget, but with conditions which would create economic problems for certain industries that would then have to find alternative, nondefense uses for their resources."

As the implication of this forecast sinks into the consciousness of Congressmen and communities already feeling the effects of defense cutbacks, the old "swords into plowshares" debate has been revived with new, more sophisticated wrinkles.

Item: Leaders of the New York and New Jersey district of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers—representing 100,000 members in the two States—recently urged their communities to establish civilian conservation corporations where private corporations refuse or perform in a dilatory manner in converting from defense production to new civilian products.

Item: At the RCA plant in Camden, N.J., hard hit by the completion of work on the ballistic missile early warning system, the issue of conversion has been put on the agenda of a joint union-management study committee.

Item: In the wake of the phaseout of the Rome, N.Y., Air Materiel Area and the cancellation of a Skybolt missile subcontract, in Utica, both conservative Republican ALEXANDER PIRNIE and liberal Democratic Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of Amsterdam, put their names on a bipartisan letter to President Johnson, which read, in part:

"Thorough study of the conversion problem by the executive branch, which will lead to concrete, affirmative action, must, in our view, be instituted at once."

Another signer was Representative JOHN MONAGAN, whose southern Connecticut district includes employees and subcontractors for the huge, defense-oriented United Aircraft Co. Said Monagan:

"I'm not a ban-the-bomber at all. But with so much of United's work with the Pentagon and the prospect of an overall decline in spending, we should begin focusing attention on the problem."

In this same category is Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, who proposed a regional economic commission for hard-hit Long Island that would "coordinate declining defense production with booming civilian needs * * * and men with new jobs."

KEATING, a member of the Senate Space Committee, cautioned against expecting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to take up most of the slack in Pentagon contracts.

The specific focus in Congress is on a bill by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, to set up an economic conversion committee to plan for shifts from defense to civilian production.

In the Senate 12 Senators—all Democrats—are sponsors. Twenty Congressmen, including both Democrats and Republicans, have introduced similar measures in the House. Hearings are planned in the Senate but, thus far, not in the House.

In the opinion of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, a Senate sponsor of the McGovern bill, "the most significant indicator of a new atmosphere on the Hill (toward conversion) is the reception accorded (recently) to Dr. Seymour Melman, the ubiqitous Columbia University scholar and activitist."

Melman's continuing seminar on arms industry conversion at Columbia University stems from his views on "overkill." His theory, disputed by the Pentagon, is that nuclear weapons can be cut back sharply because enough are already on hand to destroy Soviet cities many times over.

Peace groups such as the committee for a sane nuclear policy have picked up Melman's thesis and have put conversion at the head of their 1964 agenda.

But many who reject Melman's position on overkill—including Congressmen with hard-hit defense plants in their districts—regard conversion as a pressing issue.

The administration has told Congress that "we are not persuaded that enactment of the McGovern bill would be an effective approach at this time."

It asked Congress to defer action on the bill until the President's Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament "has had an opportunity to explore these problems further and to see what additional legislation may be called for to deal with them."

[From the Star-Gazette, Elmira, N.Y., Apr. 30, 1964]

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES: FINANCING, MARKETS CHALLENGES OF CONVERSION—PART II

(By Edmund B. Lambeth)

WASHINGTON.—Money, markets, and mismatched manpower are the big headaches that would face defense firms in the event of a major cutback in Pentagon spending.

That, in short, is the message of experts hired to advise the Defense Department on the economic effects of disarmament or—more likely—a limited arms control accord with the Soviet Union.

Neither of these contingencies—assumed in the experts' studies—is predicted for the near future.

Yet the basic points made in the studies are considered valid, for the most part, in the current debate over how the big defense contractors can best diversify to meet the Pentagon procurement.

In brief, Pentagon officials foresee, in the years ahead, a slow decline in the market for strategic hardware—such as missiles and bombers and their electronic components, but continued high funding for research and general purpose forces.

As matters now stand, the Pentagon won't know specifically what this will mean to, say, Binghamton, N.Y., or Hartford, Conn., until Defense's Comptroller Charles J. Hitch and his aids complete their elaborate and complex early warning system on the impact of projected trends in defense spending.

In the meantime, forecasters turn to such studies as the one recently completed for the Pentagon by Murray L. Weidenbaum, former chief economist for the Boeing Co. and now senior economist at Stanford Research Institute.

Weidenbaum concluded that a major shift in the size and/or composition of the defense budget would fall most heavily on the missiles, electronics, aircraft, and shipbuilding industries.

Although Weidenbaum found west coast firms would be hit hardest, the eastern seaboard would also feel the impact, as seen in the distribution of defense dollars within these States:

New York—Aircraft (28.1 percent), electronics (25 percent).

New Jersey—Electronics (41 percent), aircraft (20 percent).

Connecticut—Aircraft (68 percent), ships (18.3 percent).

Qualitatively, the problems of diversifying into nondefense products are more easily defined. Weidenbaum, like other students of conversion, found that:

1. Highly specialized defense industries hold forth today in a business world where existing firms already meet civilian consumer needs. In contrast to the postwar era, there is today little pent up consumer demand.

2. Big defense contractors, thriving in the cost-plus-fixed-fee environment of the Pentagon, emphasize quality and reliability in contrast to the compromises between price and quality made daily by firms in the commercial markets.

3. Past attempts at diversification by defense firms—such as powered wheelbarrows, stainless steel coffins and wall paneling—have failed.

"The surviving attempts," says Weidenbaum, "are actually losing money, barely breaking even, or showing profit results considerably below military earnings."

According to former Boeing economist Weidenbaum, even for the exceptions to this rule—such as the commercial 707 jetliners—"the profit performance has been extremely poor."

"The losses incurred," he adds, "have depleted the venture capital available to seek other commercial business and have reduced the enthusiasm of other defense companies to diversify."

But, taking the longer view, the conversion picture is not so bleak.

Connecticut's United Aircraft Corp., although still 80 percent dependent on defense markets, has doubled its commercial product line in the last decade.

One of its brighter prospects for more diversification is the fuel cell, which converts chemical energy directly to electricity without the use of rotating machinery and with greater efficiency than conventional conversion systems.

Military airframe and electronic manufacturers claim that once the switching problems of Monorail Rapid Transit (a conversion prospect) are solved, the harassed Westchester County commuter—now a slave to the New Haven schedule—would have to wait no longer for his train than a minute or two, day or night.

Ground speeds in modern rapid transit are projected at higher than 100 miles per hour.

If such a transit system were coupled with a vastly improved air traffic control system (now within technical but not financial reach of the electronics industry), the quarrel over a far-out New Jersey site for the New York Port Atuhority's new jetport might become academic.

The "closed ecology" system that will one day allow a capsuled astronaut to regenerate his own food and water supply as long-range implications for sewage and industrial waste treatment—a problem plaguing such multistate river basins as the Susquehanna in New York and Pennsylvania and the Connecticut in New England.

Also, no one disputes the fact that the electronic industry—highly concentrated in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut—is capable of producing controls, teaching aids, medical electronic equipment and the like.

But as Arthur Barber, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Arms Control, noted recently in a speech to an areospace industry conference:

"In our recent studies on the creation of new industries, we found that while new inventions and ideas were essential to the evolution of new products, (the ideas) are in abundant supply.

"The critical element may not be scientists but investment bankers with risk capital and sound business management."

In the same speech, Barber noted that, instead of trying to compete with existing commercial companies, defense-oriented industries should try to create new markets.

The Pentagon, he said, has created a market for ballistic missiles and has, as a result, spurred a new market for civilian space vehicles.

Said Barber: "The question is not whether the Government can create a market. It can. The question is whether the Government can or should create a market which will improve the lives of American citizens.

"In my opinion, the responsibility for the creation of these new markets must lie with industry and the private sector of our economy but there is no question that the executive branch of the Government can and will help when it is appropriate to do so.

"What Government institutions should contribute to these important tasks?"

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star-Gazette, May 1, 1964]

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES: GOVERNMENT ROLE IN FINANCING CIVILIAN TECHNOLOGY A PUZZLER—PART III

(By Edmund B. Lambeth)

WASHINGTON.—When Uncle Sam eventually turns thumbs up or down to funds for a supersonic transport, he will have decided much more than whether the first mach 2 commercial passengers are French, British, Russian, or American.

At issue are some 40,000 to 60,000 new jobs countrywide, about $3 to $4.6 billion in foreign markets, and roughly $5 billion in new domestic spending by aircraft and engine manufacturers and their subsuppliers.

The decision, now in the hands of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and a coterie of his expert aids, could mean the difference, say, between job security and job doubts from Hartford, Conn., to Niagara Falls, N.Y., to San Diego, Calif.

More than any other example, the European-American-Russian race to build a supersonic transport illustrates the deeper meaning of the current debate over how defense firms can diversify to meet the upcoming changes in the pattern of Pentagon procurement.

Pentagon officials claim that with a strong-demand economy, aerospace firms (with a few exceptions) can adjust without serious damage to an expected dip or plateau in spending for strategic hardware.

But they have no answers—and don't feel they should have—for the more fundamental questions:

To what extent should the Federal Government fund the application of new technology—much of it spawned by defense requirements—to unmet civilian needs such as rapid transit for New York-NewJersey-Connecticut, or hydrofoil ships along the Hudson River, or smog and pollution control?

More important, who should decide which project to fund and at what point a company or group of companies should turn to Washington for money?

And how would the democratic mechanism of the mass market influence product choices when the commodity on sale is not toothpaste but a huge, multi-billion-dollar mass transit system?

Some economists believe that finding firm answers to these questions will generate a political debate dwarfing the New Deal controversy in its meaning for the role of the Federal Government in the economy.

The communications satellite filibuster, the supersonic transport dilemma and the railroad work rules dispute are striking examples of that possibility. But there are other, less dramatic examples.

Item: The Commerce Department's Office of Science and Technology, headed by J. Herbert Hollomon, is awaiting Budget Bureau approval of a bill that would establish a State-Federal technical service—a sort of industrial extension service patterned after the agricultural experiment station idea.

Congress twice turned a buzz saw at the idea when Hollomon asked for pilot project funds. He is hopeful of a more favorable response once local initiative and State cost-sharing provisions are spelled out in enabling legislation.

Item: Anticipating the problem, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has named a committee—chaired by Michael Michaelis, Washington manager of Arthur D. Little, Inc.—to define yardsticks for deciding the Government's role in funding the commercial application of new technology.

Item: Congress is mulling over bill that would set up commissions on automation (sponsored by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York); on application of technology to unmet civilian needs (by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan); and on arms industry conversion (by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota)

An administration-backed bill, given a good chance of passing one day, would establish a commission that, in large part, would perform all three functions.

Item: Lawrence A. Hyland, vice president of Hughes Aircraft Co., said in congressional testimony that some type of Federal-private organization is needed to deal with the problems of arms conversion and civilian technology funding. Said Hyland:

"Such an instrumentality cannot be mere window dressing with powers limited to academic recommendations, funded with noble motives and staffed with amateur do-gooders..

"The job to be done is perhaps the most complex, forward looking, and important undertaking in which the United States will be engaged in the foreseeable future."

The issue of funding civilian technology is linked intimately with the defense budget.

Sixty-five percent of all research and devlopment (R. & D.) work performed in the United States is financed by contracts with or grants from the Federal Government, chiefly the Pentagon. Privately funded R. & D. has declined from 47 percent in 1954 to 35 percent in 1962, and is still going down.

Largely as a result of this trend, there are "research starved" industries such as housing, machine tools, transport and textiles.

In a study for the Pentagon, Murray L. Weidenbaum, senior economist for the Stanford Research Institute, proposed a tax rebate to help shift research from defense to "underresearched" nondefense industries.

He also suggests for nondefense firms an aid program similar to the program in which the Interior Department now finances mining exploration and is repaid from future corporate discoveries.

According to John H. Rubel, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, the Pentagon's highly specialized R. & D. projects include "many which have little or no direct, near-term application" to these industries.

Even though there are "spinoffs," such as the diesel locomotive, and the nuclear reactor, they are not, in Rubel's view, the chief contribution of Pentagon R. & D. to civilian uses.

Said Rubel, in a speech that pointed up the emerging new politics of technology:

"Perhaps our new found ability to combine a great diversity of scientific and technical skills and disciplines to make a massive assault on very large scale problems will turn out to be a social innovation of even greater consequence in the long run than the scientific and technical innovations on which most of our attention is generally focused.

"This may be the 'spillover' of greatest national and social consequence, once it can be used. There is no doubt that the development of this new capability has endowed us as a Nation with new powers.

"The question remains open: How can this new social invention be used outside the space and defense sector to which it is presently so largely confined?"

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MAY 1964

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New reproductions: Color postcards. Pieter de Hooch, "A Dutch Courtyard"; Murillo, "A Girl and Her Duenna;" Raphael, "The Small Cowper Madonna"; Tiepolo, "Madonna of the Goldfinch." Five cents each, postpaid.

Color reproductions, 11 by 14 inches. Magnasco, "The Baptism of Christ"; Domenico Veneziano, "St. John in the Desert"; Cézanne, "Vase of Flowers." Twenty-five cents each, postpaid.

New publication: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., by John Walker, director; 116 color and 250 black and white illustrations, 6¼ by 8¼ inches, 347 pages, clothbound, $7.50 postpaid.

Concerts: The gallery's 21st American music festival will open on May 3 and continue through June 7.

Lectour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m., to 4 p.m., Sunday 4 p.m., to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 27 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 3

Painting of the week: Hubert Robert. "The Old Bridge" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 53, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Theater and festival in art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Society and Painting in 17th Century Holland." Guest speaker: Horst Gerson, Director, Netherlands Institute for Art History, The Hague, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: 21st American music festival. Alabama quartet, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 4 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 10

Painting of the week: Whistler. "The White Girl" (Harris Whittemore collection), gallery 71, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Neo-classicism, romanticism, and realism. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as Creating and Making." Guest speaker: Milton C. Nahm, professor of philosophy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: 21st American music festival; David Burge, pianist; east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MAY 11 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 17

Painting of the week: Renoir, "Odalisque" (Chester Dale collection) gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Impressionism. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The 'Church' and the 'Synagogue' in Medieval Iconography." Guest speaker: Wolfgang Seiferth, professor of German language and literature, Howard University, Washington, D.C., lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: 21st American Music Festival: Robert Sprenkle, oboe; Francis Tursi, viola; Armand Basile, piano; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MAY 18 THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 24

Painting of the week: Holbein, the Younger, "Edward VI as a Child" (Mellon collection), gallery 39, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Post-Impressionism. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Story of Stained Glass From Iran to Coventry." Speaker: Raymond S. Stites, curator of education, National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: 21st American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, east garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, MAY 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 31

Painting of the week: Van Dyck, Philip, Lord Wharton (Mellon collection) gallery 42, Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Twentieth-century painting. Rotunda, Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Friday, 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The New Churches of Europe." Guest speaker: G. E. Kidder Smith, author and architect, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-first American Music Festival: Joel Krosnick, cellist; Howard Lebow, pianist; east garden court, 8.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Antitrust Decision Aids Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, together with other materials, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Burger comments on a recent antitrust decision rendered by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. A decision of major importance to small business, it marks out a line of antitrust concern first dealt with by the Senate Small Business Committee as early as 1941.

The long time that it takes the courts to finally confront and decide unresolved issues of large significance to our free enterprise system certainly reinforces the wisdom of the proposal (S. Res. 30) to give the Senate Small Business Committee the authority to report legislation.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., April 30, 1964.

Re Senate Resolution 30.

Hon. KENNETH KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEATING: A short while back you made a major address on the floor of the Senate as to the need for the Senate rules, and the Senate itself, to act on this major resolution that would give long overdue recognition to the Senate Small Business Committee to have the power to report corrective legislation.

You are to be congratulated that you were one of the first cosponsors on the resolution, January 15, 1963.

If there was ever concluding argument of the need for action by the Senate on this you will note the attached which refers to a major decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, in Chicago a few days ago, where large factors in major industry were involved.

Bear in mind there are similar cases pending between other majors in those same industries.

Further bear in mind the lifeblood of 300,000 independent businesses are at stake in the decision, as to their future, and it is more important to note that in the first instance the entire proposition was exposed for the first time in 1941 by the Senate Small Business Committee, which report was concurred in by all members of that committee—Hon. James E. Murray, chairman, Senators Francis Maloney, Allen J. Ellender, James M. Mead, Tom Stewart, Arthur Capper and Robert A. Taft.

Twenty-three years have rolled by, and as one authority stated yesterday: "A business lifetime passed and still that committee is powerless, or its hands tied to bring the needed relief."

Note the findings of the court in part: "It is evident that the service station dealer is more of an economic serf than a businessman free to purchase the tires, batteries, accessories of his choice."

The pattern is following through most major industries today.

You will be doing an invaluable service for small business to have this communication and the enclosures appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are sure that small business of this Nation will welcome your action, and particularly our membership in the Empire State, all independent businesses numbering 11,709.

Thanking you for your usual cooperation in behalf of small business over the many years.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

In its weekend ruling, the circuit court in a lengthy and detailed opinion, declared that "the heart of this case is the economic power Atlantic possesses over its service station dealers.

"Ostensibly," the court added, "they are independent businessmen, but behind the legalistic facade of independence there exists a servitude caused by the coercive pressures which Atlantic exerts upon its dealers.

"The keystone of the actual relationship between Atlantic and its dealers is the lease and the equipment loan contract with their short term and cancellation provisions.

"Without repeating all of the components of the relationship, it is evident that the service station dealer is more of an economic serf than a businessman free to purchase the TBA of his choice.

"We believe the commission, in evaluating the evidence, correctly found that if a dealer wishes to continue in good standing with the company and retain his lease or contract, it is advantageous that he carry sponsored TBA."

FROM THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, today hailed the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, April 24, in the Federal Trade Commission against Goodyear-Atlantic Refining case as a signal victory for small business. In this, the court ruled that tire-battery-accessory arrangements between the rubber company and the oil company are in restraint of trade and tying in nature. In fact, the court held: "It is evident that the service station dealer is more of an economic serf than a businessman free to purchase the TBA of his choice."

Mr. Burger says that this decision, if not appealed, will free the Nation's 300,000 independent service station operators to purchase their tire, battery, and accessory products from suppliers of their own choice, on a competitive price-quality basis. At the same time, it will open up this increasingly important market to independents, including smaller manufacturers of these items.

The federation vice president declared that this court ruling is right in line with the overall sense of the entire federation membership when polled on the underlying issue. He recalls that in a policy-setting poll on the question: "Are you for or against the Justice Department enforcing the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts to break manufacturer control over independent dealers (example: manufacturer use of pressure to dictate what products dealers may handle)?" The membership voted 93 percent for, 6 percent against, and 1 percent no opinion.

These rubber company-oil company tie-in arrangements were first disclosed in Senate Small Business Committee print No. 3, issued in 1941, on which Mr. Burger worked closely with the committee, and the findings in that committee print have now been confirmed by the decision of the U.S. Seventh Court of Appeals in Chicago.

Effects of Garrison Diversion on North Dakota Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Garrison diversion is a project long awaited and much needed by North Dakotans. We have given up a half million acres of the best land in the western part of our State for reservoirs so that downstream States may benefit.

Under the Missouri Basin comprehensive plan of development of 1944, also known as the Pick-Sloan plan, North Dakota was to have been compensated for this loss of land by the development of the Garrison diversion project to irrigate certain areas and, equally important, to provide an adequate water supply for our municipalities.

Laurel D. Loftsgard, professor of agricultural economics of the North Dakota State University, has presented an interesting paper on the effects of Garrison diversion on our agriculture, which I submit today for the information of my colleagues:

EFFECTS OF GARRISON DIVERSION ON NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURE[1]

(By Laurel D. Loftsgard, professor of agricultural economics)

Regardless of the approach used in analyzing economic considerations associated with Garrison diversion, I think it's quite important that we don't lose sight of the overall project situation of costs and benefits. I'm referring to the aces of fertile bottom lands

---

[1] Prepared for presentation at annual meeting of Greater North Dakota Association, Grand Forks, N. Dak., Apr. 6, 1964.

and high-quality grazing lands that have been lost due to the construction of Garrison and Oahe Dams. The inundation of these lands is resulting in annual income losses of a minimum of $10 million to nearly $20 million, depending on the land use that may have been developed.

The major benefits normally cited from development projects such as Garrison Dam are (a) low-cost power, (b) flood control, (c) irrigation and conservation, (d) recreation, and (e) navigation.

A majority of the benefits from low-cost power and flood control accrue to areas, States, and industries that are south and east of North Dakota. Also, the problem of riverbank erosion is creating a continuing loss to adjacent agricultural areas, rather than benefiting them. Recreation and navigation considerations are of very minor importance because recreation uses of Garrison Reservoir are very slowly being developed and navigation benefits do not exist for the North Dakota economy.

This leaves us then with irrigation as being the major real and tangible benefits for the North Dakota economy. As yet, these benefits are based on hopes of a diversion project that is undeveloped.

My assignment here is to briefly bring out the impacts of Garrison diversion on the agricultural economy. To do this, I'm going to look at various aspects such as land use, size of farm, labor, income, and the idea of increasing production when food is already in surplus.

Land use: From our rather limited experience with irrigation and changes in land use as irrigation waters become available, it would seem that the predominant and most profitable land use under irrigation is production of row and forage crops. Tame hay, corn, sugarbeets, potatoes, and various specialty crops are some specific examples. This means that irrigation as compared to dryland farming in this area tends to change the emphasis from cash grain production to specialty crops and livestock production. And for a State such as ours, the significance of this change in land use has several implications not only for the individual farmer but also for his community and the State. The most important implication is probably the fact that irrigation development on his land allows much greater flexibility in his farming operations. In other words, he will have new production alternatives or new enterprises that he can consider, and so be in a position to more readily adjust his farming operations to the demands of the consumer as expressed through the pricing mechanism in the market. One of the most critical conditions for North Dakota dryland farmers is their heavy dependence on cash grain production with crop yields extremely vulnerable to the relatively low and seasonally erratic amounts of rainfall, and with level of income directly related to payment and price provisions included in existing Government farm programs.

In terms of land use, irrigation would thus have a twofold effect of helping these conditions I've just cited. First, it would allow more stable production and make income more dependent on management practices and price rather than the uncontrollable influences of weather. Second, it would allow more flexibility in using farm resources to produce output that accommodates the changing wants of the consumer.

Farm size: It would seem that the net effect of irrigation development on farm size is that the rate of farm size expansion will be slowed down. There are several reasons for this conclusion. In the first place, only a part of the acreage on each farm will be irrigated. Average farm size on farms in the potentially irrigable areas is from 600 to 700 acres. The maximum number of acres to be irrigated on the majority of these farms will be 160 acres. However, this amount of irrigation creates the opportunity for vertical expansion or more intensive land use such that total net farm income can be increased on the same acreage rather than having to expand the volume of business by adding extra acres. The result is that there is much less incentive to increase acreage, and farm size will tend to remain about the same.

Labor and employment: As irrigation is integrated with dryland farming operations, total labor requirements are increased from about 50 percent to over 100 percent. These increased demands for labor stem from the irrigation process itself and from increased numbers of livestock. At the present time, the increased labor requirements will be met on many farms without hiring any "outside" help because operator and family labor is often underemployed in a straight dryland operation. On other farms, extra labor will be needed.

The impacts on this total labor and employment situation are:

1. The tendency for off-farm work will be less.

2. Operator and family labor earnings will increase from the farm business. This means that farm people will not be as vigorously competing with nonfarm people for off-farm jobs.

3. Some additional job opportunities will be made available, at least on a seasonal basis.

Income: Net farm returns are expected to increase from 50 percent to 100 percent when irrigation is added. The exact increase depends, of course, on the amount irrigated, the particular crops grown, and the type of livestock kept. A grade-A dairy enterprise, for example, may give higher returns to the added forage production than a beef cow herd.

In addition to higher income, the stability of income also will be significantly enhanced. Results from some of our own research studies indicated that irrigation as compared to dryland farming increased the stability of crop yields by 44 percent, increased the stability of net income by 18 percent, and increased the returns per $100 of all costs by 24 percent. I think these figures point up some real significant influences of irrigation. The implications are fairly obvious, namely, that as the overall risk and uncertainty are reduced, the chances for business survival and economic well-being are improved because of a higher and more stable average return to resource use.

Economic justification: Finally, let's look at the question of increasing the output of food when we already have more than we can eat, sell, or give away.

I've already indicated that the composition of agricultural output will emphasize commodities such as beef that rank relatively high in consumer demand. This is true in general and over time, even though the present beef situation may cast some doubts on the validity of this statement. Even so, it is naive to gage the needs of irrigation development projects on the present food supply situation. On this basis, there is little or no need for most reclamation projects.

In addition to shifting production emphasis to the kind of output that has a relatively higher demand, the basic economic justification is more nearly alined with costs of production and efficiency of resource use. Several of these efficiencies have been identified as we've discussed the individual factors of land use, farm size, labor, and income. I've tried to point out how these efficiencies emerge as irrigation is integrated with dryland farming. The essence of this is that irrigation can be classified as a gain in technology whereby per unit costs of production are reduced and economic growth is encouraged. Accordingly, there is little economic justification for not approving a project such as Garrison diversion because of surplus production. This sort of reasoning is the same as saying that agricultural research should be stopped because it leads to technological developments that in turn create increased output.

To make this point a little more clear, let's consider a different example of technology such as fertilizer, which is one of the major contributors to the agricultural surplus. Also, it has been very significant in reducing per unit costs of production. In short, use of commercial fertilizer is a technological development consistent with increased efficiency of resource use, and society is better off because of it.

Surplus production is a problem in managing the supply of output or the overall capacity to produce; it is not a problem of production efficiency because increases in efficiency are as important to economic growth in agriculture as in nonagricultural industries. Restraining technology and economic efficiencies is contrary to the dictates of progress.

Looking ahead: Another point of no immediate concern but of potential importance is the demand and cost for producing food in the decades ahead. The frequency of expected land-use changes in this country will affect the optimum location of production. Also, the projected population explosion on the world level will challenge any conceivable advancements in technology to supply adequate food and fiber in the decades ahead.

In these terms, an agricultural production potential created by projects, such as Garrison diversion, becomes a part of our economic and military reserve. But this type of reserve must be planned for well in advance of anticipated need because of the time involved not only to develop the resources but also to educate farmers in the technical aspects of their use. These, then, are some of the reasons for placing high priority on the development of the Garrison diversion project.

UAW Survey of Status of Studebaker Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when the Studebaker Corp. announced late last year that its production of automobiles in South Bend, Ind., would cease, this northern Indiana community suffered a severe economic shock. Nearly 7,000 hourly rated employees, plus many others, lost their jobs, and immediate prospects for improvement seemed bleak.

Despite this major industrial loss, I am happy to report that much has been done to relieve the disastrous effects of such a sudden onslaught of unemployment. Government agencies at the Federal, State, and local level, as well as labor unions, industrial representatives, civic groups, and many individuals joined to seek new employment opportunities and to improve the conditions of those who almost overnight were deprived of their regular income.

Recently Local No. 5 of the United Automobile Workers conducted a careful survey of the status of former Studebaker

Corp. employees 5 months after the factory had closed. This study, based on questionnaires processed at the University of Notre Dame, illustrates the remarkable progress that has been made in less than half a year, but also points out that much yet remains to be done. I ask unanimous consent that this informative document be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UAW SURVEY OF STATUS OF STUDEBAKER EMPLOYEES 5 MONTHS AFTER PLANT CLOSING APRIL 24, 1964

This employment status survey is another step in the union's campaign to overcome the disastrous effects of the Studebaker plant closing.

Since the announcement was made on the 9th of December last year that automobile production in South Bend would stop, the local union officers, along with many of the international union officials, have been working continuously to offset the effects of the unemployment of our local No. 5 members.

With the help of governmental agencies at every level we have been able to alleviate much of the suffering and hardship that normally follows this kind of catastrophe but most of the job still remains to be done.

Our survey is for the purpose of determining progress and to give us a realistic picture of what the position is today.

There are several areas in the survey that indicate that a much greater effort needs to be made if we are to avoid some very critical hardships in the very near future. One is the fact that so many people are exhausting unemployment compensation, and another is that the job retraining program is not able, under the present arrangement, to take care of anything more than a small fraction of those who need retraining.

Another matter of great concern is that our people are being forced to drop their health insurance at a rapidly increasing rate of dropouts. Less than one-third of our laid off members are covered at this time. This means that unless something can be done very soon there will be a major crisis in health needs in our community.

The survey shows that our people have covered a good portion of the Midwest in their search for jobs but that with the exception of those who have high skills, not many have been successful in obtaining substantial employment.

The three new companies that are moving into former Studebaker buildings will provide some jobs but only a small fraction of those needed—and, even these will not be available to any great extent for several months yet.

These new companies have demonstrated a very enlightened and favorable attitude on the hiring of people between 45 and 60 years of age. We are sorry to report that this has not been so well shown by many of the other employers in the community.

It is our considered opinion that while what has been done up to date to help the unemployed has proved beneficial and encouraging, we must still have a great deal more if we are to avoid a vast amount of long-range suffering and hardship.

We believe that unemployment benefits should be extended—that social security needs to be expanded to take care of this type of situation because we are sure that many others are going to occur around the country.

It is very apparent that the present job retraining program needs to be enlarged and speeded up. The present program for the 50- to 60-year-old group, known as Able, will be one of the best aids to our problem that has been put into effect as yet, but it too must be stepped up greatly if it is to meet our pressing needs.

The facts and figures in the employment status survey clearly indicate that the largest and most difficult part of solving the Studebaker plant closing problem still lays ahead of us.

This report is based on data from a questionnaire that was sent to all hourly rated Studebaker employees who were on the payroll in November of 1963, and from information supplied by the Studebaker Corp., the Indiana Employment Security Division, the Vocational Education Department of South Bend schools, and the Benefit Trust Life Insurance Co.

Dr. Frank Fahey, head of Notre Dame's Department of Sociology, processed the information on the questionnaires at the university's computing center.

We extend our sincere thanks to all of those who have helped make this survey of the Studebaker employment situation possible.

The questionnaire was titled: "Employment Status Survey," and went to all of the more than 6,800 hourly rated employees who were at work last November.

Some 4,200 responded but, due to a deadline to complete the computations, only 3,973 of the forms could be used. The questionnaires that came in late do not change the percentages by any appreciable amount.

Approximately 100 of the mailings were returned because the individuals had left no forwarding addresses and several were reported as deceased.

The 3,973 used in this report amounts to 58 percent of the total.

The data from the questionnaires are presented in tables as it came from the Notre Dame Computing Center. Where it is applicable, information from other sources follow each table.

TABLE 1.—*Age of Studebaker employees and ex employees*

Age:	*Number*
65 and over	184
60 to 64	722
55 to 59	771
50 to 55	729
45 to 49	570
40 to 45	516
35 to 40	194
30 to 34	101
29 and younger	183
No answer	3
Total	3,973

TABLE 2.—*Are you working?* [1]

Yes	1,526
No	2,356
Part time	50
No answer	41
Total	3,973

[1] Based on the 58 percent returned questionnaires the 1,526 now working represents approximately 2,700. The 2,356 not working represents approximately 4,000.

TABLE 3.—*Where are you working?*

Studebaker	[1] 602
Elsewhere (South Bend area)	669
Out of town	224
No answer	31
Total	1,526

[1] The Studebaker Corp. reports that there are 870 hourly rated employees now working. This amount will be reduced to approximately 250 by Oct. 1.

TABLE 4.—*Number of unemployment benefits left*

Weeks:	*Number*
None	12
1 to 2	614
3 to 4	230
5 to 6	244
7 to 8	230
9 to 10	180
11 to 12	153
13 to 14	70
15 or more	306
No answer	1,934
Total	3,973

TABLE 5.—*If compensation exhausted, when can you reapply?* [1]

Answer:	*Number*
Cannot reapply	66
Within 3 months	336
4 to 6 months	422
7 to 9 months	115
10 to 12 months	34
No answer	3,000
Total	3,973

[1] The South Bend office of the Indiana Employment Security Division reports that 640 have now exhausted their benefits and 700 to 800 more will be exhausted by the end of June. They say that in many cases new claims can be filed around July 1.

TABLE 6.—*Are you taking job retraining?*

Yes	[1] 138
No	3,459
No answer	376
Total	3,973

[1] Indiana Employment Security Division reports that 181 laid off Studebaker employees are now participating in retraining courses.

TABLE 7.—*Are you retired?*

Yes	[1] 373
No	2,586
Semi-retired	5
No answer	1,009
Total	3,973

[1] By Oct. 1 some 1,050 will be able to retire, but since many of these will be under age 62, and therefore not eligible for social security, no close figure of actual retirements can be projected.

TABLE 8.—*Are you scheduled for retraining?*

Yes	[1] 448
No	2,917
No answer	608
Total	3,973

[1] South Bend school vocational education reports only enough Federal funds to train a small percentage of those that want retraining.

TABLE 9.—*Do you want retraining?*

Yes	[1] 1,673
No	1,153
No answer	1,147
Total	3,973

[1] The 1,673 represents 42 percent of the 3,973; 42 percent of 6,800=2,850.

TABLE 10.—*Do you carry BTL insurance?* [1]

Yes	2,336
No	1,525
No answer	112
Total	3,973

[1] The local BTL office shows that only approximately 1,700 out of the 6,000 laid off still have the group insurance protection.

TABLE 11.—*Number of school age dependents* [1]

None	2,376	
1	667	667
2	460	920
3	254	762
4	125	500
5	53	265
6	20	120
7	11	77
8	4	32
9	3	27
Total	3,973	[2] 3,370

[1] These figures do not include spouses, children not in school, or other dependents.

[2] Total number of school-age dependents. The ratio of 82 schoolchildren per 100 laid-off employees means that the total for the 6,800 would be approximately 5,500.

The greatest percentage of responses to the Employment Status Survey questionnaires came from—the higher age groups—those employed in the South Bend area—those interested in taking retraining.

Excluding the 870 still working at Studebaker the responses from those who have found other jobs comes largely from the skilled trades people—the ones ordinarily referred to as higher skilled production workers—and the lower age group.

As the result of this survey several of the findings are to be investigated further and will be reported on later.

Bill Doherty's Career as Ambassador: A Dazzling Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, when President John F. Kennedy, 18 months ago, appointed, as the first U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, a distinguished resident of Maryland and a distinguished leader of labor, Mr. William C. Doherty, there were some who had misgivings.

Nobody who knew Bill Doherty had any doubts about the wisdom of the appointment. Those in both Houses of the Congress who knew him and had worked with him for many years, felt the appointment was an excellent one. Leaders of organized labor applauded the selection, because they knew that Bill Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers and one of the senior vice presidents of the AFL-CIO, had been for many years, a most effective diplomat in the delicate and extremely important field of international labor.

But, there are always some people who question any and all innovations. After all, never before in the history of the United States had a leader of organized labor been selected for a diplomatic post. Jamaica, a bastion of pro-United States sentiment in the seething Caribbean, was also a brandnew, emerging nation, filled with the same sensitivities and the same vibrant national pride that characterizes all young nations when they first achieve independence. There were those who felt that the job required a professional diplomat rather than an inspired amateur.

After 18 months of service, Mr. Speaker, Bill Doherty has returned to his homeland to resume private life. He has left behind him a solid record of diplomatic achievement. He won the hearts, the minds, and the support of the Jamaican people, and when he and his wonderful wife left Kingston last month, there were those on the dock who wept openly at his departure.

The principal reason that Bill Doherty returned to the United States was to help his friend, Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland, in the presidential primary on May 19. He resigned so he would be free to support a great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, against those who would invade Maryland with ideas and ideologies foreign to everything he stands for.

Excerpts from a front-page headline story from the Star, one of Jamaica's leading newspapers, dated April 25, 1964, stated:

> The Star learns that the primary reason for Mr. Doherty's resignation in his desire to assist Democrat Senator DAN BREWSTER in his campaign to be a presidential elector for Maryland.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. Doherty stands foursquare behind President Johnson and the civil rights legislation, and will no doubt be very active in the forthcoming campaign.

The extent of the love and respect with which the Jamaicans hold Bill Doherty is reflected in the editorial comments which accompanied his departure from their shores. Typical was this editorial from the Voice of Jamaica:

> Mr. Doherty stands in a class by himself. * * * With innate courtesy and skill, born of his genuine liking for people, Mr. Doherty soon endeared himself to all classes by his friendly contacts. His genuine interest in the country and its people has been shown by his eagerness to do everything in his official capacity to help the young nation in every way, and, if all were told, the amount and quality of his assistance would be a revelation to the general public.

The editorial went on to praise the Ambassador's wife, Mrs. Gertrude Doherty, "whose unassuming dignity was undoubtedly of immense assistance," as well as his daughter, "the charming and vivacious Miss (Peggy) Doherty.

In the Daily Gleaner, another influential Jamaican newspaper, the widely read commentator and columnist, William Strong, had this to say:

> If Bill Doherty had memorized Dale Carnegie's famous book, "How To Win Friends and Influence People," he could not have been a greater success as America's first Ambassador to a country that is, frankly, still leery about Americans. On the social and civic scene he has associated himself with everything Jamaican, official and unofficial. When he wasn't around, he was missed. His speeches have been no empty, platitudinous doubletalk. They have been simple, homespun, lucid, sincere—straight from the heart—and now and again, from the shoulder. He and the Prime Minister developed an early friendship that has been more than official. They became bosom pals, and have remained that way. Whoever succeeds him will need big shoes, and a heart to match.

Vere Johns, the top columnist for the Star, was equally enthusiastic:

> Unlike former Consuls General, there are few people in this island who do not know that Bill Doherty is the American Ambassador. He has made friends by the score and acquaintances by the thousands. The assistance which he gave to Jamaica's economy has been outstanding, and largely through his influence and his love of Jamaica. May God go with you and bring you back to our shores one day soon. Jamaica's welcome mat will always be laid out for you, good friend.

All the stories about the departing Ambassador emphasized his deep religious faith and his sincere and devout practice of that faith. This general approbation was particularly notable, since the Roman Catholic Church is is distinctly a minority in Jamaica.

Catholic Opinion, the official diocesan paper in Kingston, added these comments the general chorus of commendation:

> Mr. Doherty sought eagerly, and received, the warm friendliness and cooperation of our Government. Though not a professional diplomat, very few facets of our political and economic life missed his zealous attention; no area of the island was neglected by him. With graciousness he was received in our towns and villages. In cooperation with the U.S. AID mission here, and with the volunteers of the U.S. Peace Corps, the Ambassador charted a policy of mutual self-help that will influence the next few decades of Jamaica's relationship with the West. More Jamaican people are housed, areas of Jamaica's green lands are engineered, and institutions of Jamaica's children are enriched by the workmanlike procedures of Mr. Doherty's office. Mr. Doherty and his charitable wife have enriched the island with their quiet courtesies. They have set a benchmark of competence and quality. His Government has now been placed under an embarrassment. They must give us another Mr. Doherty.

The favorable comments on the accomplishments of Ambassador Bill Doherty would fill up many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His performance has been a tremendous credit to the National Association of Letter Carriers, which he led for more than 20 years. It has been a tremendous credit to the entire labor movement of the free world. It has been a tremendous credit to the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and, most important of all, it has been a tremendous credit to the United States of America, which he represented with such unfaltering distinction.

It is a privilege to welcome Ambassador Bill Doherty back home.

Egyptian and Soviet Threats to Western Positions in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on May 4, I addressed the annual policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. I urged that the United

States stop all aid to Egypt—also known as the United Arab Republic—and that we consider providing defense arms to Israel.

I pointed out on May 4 that President Nasser of Egypt is demanding that we abandon NATO bases in Libya, that he is sending weapons into Cyprus, and that his war in Yemen has—as one of its objectives—driving Great Britain out of Aden as a step toward Egyptian control of the whole oil-rich Persian Gulf area. That was on May 4.

Yesterday I read an account of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's visit to Nasser in Cairo, and I would like to quote the following paragraph from the United Press International story:

He [Khrushchev] also supported the demand of United Arab Republic President Nasser that all foreign bases in north Africa be eliminated. He specifically condemned British bases in Aden, Libya, and Cyprus.

Mr. President, with Western positions of strength threatened, why are we still sending foreign aid to Egypt? And why are we not buttressing Israel's ability to defend our positions?

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the text of my remarks before the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT BEFORE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MAY 4, 1964, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I want to commend the American Israel Public Affairs Committee for many things you do, but especially for two that you are doing tonight.

First, you are demonstrating the need for an informed public opinion about U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. And second, you are illustrating the bipartisan nature of Congress' activities in that vital area of the world.

A constitutional republic demands an informed citizenry and no governmental actions, including foreign policy, can be exempted from public scrutiny. Therefore I take exception to the remark made recently by the visiting foreign potentate who said that U.S. policy in the Middle East was being influenced by certain religious groups in the United States.

My answer to that—and that of my colleagues, too—to that thinly veiled accusation is that I have spoken recently and critically on one side or another of U.S. policies in South Vietnam, Malaysia, and Cuba, and I have no idea how many, if any, constituents I have who may be Vietnamese, Malaysian, or Cuban, although I have taken their side.

U.S. policies in the Middle East are vacillating and outmoded, and no constituent of mine needs to tell me that after 22 years in Washington. All we need do is look at the U.S. foreign aid going to Egypt and see what Nasser, thus fortified with our aid, is doing with it.

He is demanding that we abandon NATO bases in Libya. He is sending Soviet weapons into Cyprus and he has an army of 30,000 troops fighting in little Yemen. I have heard the army is larger than that, but these are the figures we take.

The Yemen war has two objectives. One is to drive the British out of Aden and then sweep on to grab control of the whole oil-rich Persian gulf area.

But Nasser's other objective, of course, is to drive Israel into the sea. His troops in Yemen are being rotated regularly, which is a standard military technique called "hardening." Before he is finished he will have the battle-hardened army he always wanted—beefed up by a substantial amount of Soviet armor and aircraft. As recently as last Thursday, he told a neo-Nazi organization that war with Israel is unavoidable.

But our aid to Nasser continues, despite strong protests from many alarmed Americans and despite a clear mandate from Congress that U.S. aid should not go to a nation which is preparing for aggression against another nation that receives our aid.

Now, Rabbi Bernstein has mentioned to you the fact that I was critical of the Suez crisis at the time. I won't go back that far, because time doesn't permit. That was a fact.

Well, coming along to a later period, in 1959, President Nasser angrily reacting to the Baghdad Pact and to the preferment of Iraq and its identification then with the West, retaliated against London and Washington by letting the Russians and Russian weapons into the Middle East.

Once again we vacillated. We thought we could buy Nasser with the Aswan Dam. And then we changed our minds about that. And some of us know how that was done and how many sharp words were involved on behalf of both parties in connection with the State Department. It seemed logical at that time to meet the Soviet threat by arms and a security guarantee for Israel. So it seemed to us.

Many of us used to call the late Secretary of State Mr. Dulles to urge to send arms to Tel Aviv. That would have been a logical and simple course to take. It would have been a frank and direct answer to a growing threat. But instead of furnishing arms to Israel, Washington adopted a course of indirection. This was under the administration of my party. And the view was: Let the Israelis get their arms from Canada, from the French, from the Italians, and any other back door available, but not from the United States. I do not know who was impressed by this curious evasion. No Arab has ever doubted that our economic aid has indirectly strengthened Israel's defense posture, just as no Israeli has ever doubted that our large-scale economic aid to Egypt was indirectly enabled Nasser to acquire weapons from the Soviet Union.

In 1957, the administration brought pressure to bear on Israel to withdraw from Sinai. There was even the threat of sanctions. And again, many of us appealed to the administration to take another course. We said before Israel withdrew from Sinai it ought to have some guarantees. There ought to be guarantees that there would not be a resumption of the fedayeen raids from the Gaza strip. And we also argued that we should not tolerate a resumption of the Suez blockade, if Israel did agree to withdraw from the vantage ground she had gained in the Suez fighting.

In 1957, President Eisenhower did make a commitment on Suez. That was uttered, you will recall, over a television network in February. But in 1959, when Nasser reinstated the blockade, neither the United States nor the United Nations could muster sufficient courage or resolve to deter him. Indeed, on the contrary, we continued to expand aid to Egypt, and that led, as you will recall, to a strong congressional reaction in 1960.

Again, in 1960, during the last presidential campaign, everyone talked about the need for a new peace initiative. You talked about it. You wrote about it in a policy statement which you adopted at a conference like this one. And the words "direct negotiations" were heard in speeches and written into campaign platforms. But in the fall of 1961, the U.S. delegation at the United Nations startled everyone when it voted against what was called the Brazzaville peace initiative, a resolution sponsored by African and Asian nations calling upon Israel and the Arab States to engage in negotiations. Indeed, the only U.S. initiative we heard about in those years was the proposal that Israel open its doors to Arab refugees, in advance of a peace settlement and at a time when these refugees were being incited to go back to destroy the Jewish state.

Let me, a Republican, praise this Democratic administration for the firm stand it has taken in support of Israel's water development. All of us hope that the Arab States will not fly in the face of commonsense. They should not deceive themselves into believing that the United States or any other great power will condone any foolish military or engineering ventures to prevent the water development either by war or waste. [Applause.]

And while I am on the subject, since I really believe in a bipartisan foreign policy, I cannot praise the Democrats without praising the Republicans, for it occurs to me that the joint Jordan-Yarmuk water development program was pushed by President Eisenhower, who sent the late Eric Johnston into the Arab States and Israel to seek agreement on an overall water program.

What a blessing it would have been for the Arab states and Israel if this program had been accepted and not vetoed by the Arab League. And by the way, it is not too late. There is no reason why it should not go forward—and we hope that good judgment will eventually prevail and the Arab states will go ahead with their own water development program, in harmony with this regional development plan. [Applause.]

All of us welcomed the administration's decision in 1962 to permit Israel to acquire the Hawk missile in order to enable her to meet the threat of Soviet bombers. Perhaps the Arabs may draw from this action the conclusion that they cannot win an arms race in the Middle East and that it would be a shocking waste to continue the costly acquisition of Soviet weapons.

In this connection, let me add again that I did not like Mr. Dulles' policy of indirection in 1955. And I am not happy about a policy of indirection today. If it is clear that the Soviet Union is continuing to arm Egypt and Iraq, then we should face this fact squarely and do all that is necessary to reinforce Israel's security. [Applause.] I share your confidence in the administration's repeated reassurances that we will not permit aggression in the Middle East. These reassurances can be immeasurably strengthened and the need to carry them out will be long deferred if we, ourselves, do all that is necessary to preserve the arms balance.

What emerges from this recital, then, is that over the years the Arab states have been able to exert pressures in Washington that cause us to refrain from straightforward action that is consistent with the United Nations Charter.

Certainly President Johnson is aware of the importance of maintaining peace and justice in this part of the world. He demonstrated that awareness most recently in his firm stand in support of Israel's water development.

Now I hope he will examine the situation again in view of recent clear evidence of Nasser's expansionist and imperialistic drive that threatens not only Israel but Western positions of strength generally in that area.

I say that I hope President Johnson will be aware of this. I had a call from the White House recently, and I said, "Is the President aware of a certain article? Has he read it?"

And the man on the other end of the phone said, "I would be very much surprised if he hadn't." Since the President reads everything and hears everything, I am sure he will hear about what I said here tonight early tomorrow morning. [Laughter.]

So my proposals are these:

First, the United States must stop all aid to Egypt under present circumstances. [Applause.]

And secondly, I urge President Johnson to consider the possibility of providing military defense equipment, as we did in 1962, to offset the dangerous advantage that both United States and Soviet aid has given to Egypt. [Applause.]

And I conclude with this thought: It is time to strike through the fog and the mist, to recognize more clearly those who wish us well and who share our commitment to freedom, and to learn to say the hard word, "No," to those whose cause is not our cause and whose objectives are not our objectives and whose friends are not our friends. [Applause.]

After Saturday's Donnybrook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Chronicle, May 5, 1964:

AFTER SATURDAY'S DONNYBROOK

When President Johnson read returns from Saturday's election, his old campaigner's eye must have picked up the instant message: The national Democratic ticket in November will have a solid base in Texas.

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The President has had generally good support from Texas Democrats in Congress. None of the President's stronger supporters was eliminated in the primaries, and there is a chance a couple of pro-Johnson Democrats may win over Republican opponents in November.

In Dallas, former Mayor Earl Cabell is a formidable threat to Republican BRUCE ALGER. He won handily over Baxton Bryant, and Bryant has already indicated he will back Cabell in the general election.

In west Texas, Republican ED FOREMAN had no opposition. He had been elected in 1962 to replace a Congressman who had been involved with Billie Sol Estes. There will be a runoff between Democrats Malcolm McGregor and Richard White. Either will give FOREMAN a run in November, and both can be counted upon to back administration policies generally.

In the valley, Democrats Lindsey Rodriguez (a Paso-backed liberal) and Eligio Kika de la Garza (a conservative) are in a runoff for Representative Joe Kilgore's vacated seat. Either would lend President Johnson a hand.

Statewide, Harris County's Bob Baker has an uphill climb against incumbent JOE POOL in the Democratic runoff for Congressman at Large. A strong vote in Harris County could do it for Baker, however. Should he then win in November, he will help the administration much more than POOL, who is an extremely diffident Democrat. There are no exciting local runoffs in Dallas, where POOL is strong. A light Democratic vote there on June 6 could hurt him.

COLLAPSE OF THE COALITION

Paso had little leverage in south Texas contests where its efforts were concentrated. And if the Teamsters hope to expand upon the upset engineered last year in Crystal City, they were likewise badly disappointed. Moderate and conservative Democrats dominated most races. The AFL-CIO's COPE proved that its discretion in refusing to become involved in State and local races was justified. COPE's pitch for the administration—it backed Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the President's man—paid off in his renomination by a handsome margin.

John Connally's overwhelming victory over Don Yarborough probably finished the Houstonian as a contender for major State office. Running against the advice of his 1962 supporters, and without significant organization, Yarborough failed completely to find votes enough to match his ambition.

REPUBLICAN RUNOFF

The hot race for the Republican senatorial nomination failed to help the party much. GOP candidates polled some 8 percent of the total vote cast in the primary—about their 1962 percentage.

George Bush scored handsomely throughout the State, but his success in the runoff against Jack Cox hinges on what happens to Robert Morris' 27,000-plus votes. This will probably be the most significant runoff contest.

ABOUT PREDICTIONS

Election forecasts often have a distinct flavor of crow when chewed the morning after. The Chronicle's survey, directed by Bo Byers, chief of our Austin bureau, and published 6 days before the primary, scored with creditable accuracy.

Forecast: Connally, 64 percent of the vote; Don Yarborough, 26 percent. Actual: Connally, 72 percent; Yarborough, 25 percent.

Forecast: Ralph Yarborough, 58 percent; Gordon McLendon, 42 percent. Actual: Yarborough, 55 percent; McLendon, 45 percent.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

The overwhelming lesson in Saturday's vote, besides the fact that Texas supports the Johnson administration, is that Texans likewise find the status quo comfortable. That was illustrated in Harris County, where the late W. L. (Red) McKaskle—longtime constable for precinct 1—had a plurality although he died between filing deadline and primary. The vote was a tribute to Mr. McKaskle's fine service.

Statewide, the Democrats can take heart from remarkable party harmony in the wake of the primary. President Kennedy came to Texas last November with his Vice President to try and take the fuses out of bitter factionalism that threatened to blow the party apart in this national election year. Today, the fuses are gone. President Johnson has strong party support in his home State.

President Johnson's Visit to South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on April 24, President Lyndon B. Johnson visited South Bend, Ind., to inspect the retraining program for unemployed which is operating at Cline School. The President received a tumultuous, enthusiastic welcome from a large audience, and his visit was commented upon most favorably by the local press.

An editorial in the South Bend Tribune, April 25, pointed to the progress made in combating unemployment in the South Bend area which the President had the opportunity to observe firsthand. The Record, a St. Joseph County journal, on May 1 referred to the President's reception as a typical "sample of the impression" which he has made during his short tenure in office and of his widespread popularity.

Mr. President, on behalf of the citizens of South Bend and, indeed, all the citizens of Indiana, I wish once more to thank the President for his consideration and his personal concern in these matters.

I ask unanimous consent that these two short but interesting items be published in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Apr. 25, 1964]

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT

From the moment that the visit was announced to the moment when the helicopters rose above Cline School and headed south, less than 24 hours elapsed. It all happened so fast that, once it was over, it was a little hard to believe it had really happened at all.

But sure enough, the President of the United States had just dropped in on South Bend to look at part of the community's retraining programs for the unemployed and to speak a few words of encouragement.

And it was indeed encouraging to hear Lyndon Johnson praise the community for its efforts to counteract the impact of Studebaker's automotive shutdown. The effects of that unhappy event are still very much with South Bend, but the community has moved swiftly on two fronts to alleviate them.

One front, the training of men and women to take their places in a changed labor market, the President saw. He also saw a pioneering aspect of manpower retraining, classes in which the basic tools of education are provided to those who lack them, to provide a base for later job training.

The other front, the efforts to bring new industry into the South Bend-Mishawaka area, the President did not see. But he heard about the work that has been done and the successes already achieved.

What President Johnson found in South Bend was a community cooperating vigorously with the Federal Government to regain full and stable employment for its citizens. The city could hardly have set up the extensive retraining program it now has without Federal assistance. Nor could Federal money do a thing for South Bend unless the community provided the planning, the manpower, and the leadership.

We are glad the President came to South Bend and we are delighted at the enthusiastic (for a while dangerously so) reception he received here.

He was a most gracious guest.

[From the St. Joseph County (Ind.) Record, May 1, 1964]

BELIEVE IT OR ELSE—JOHNSON IMPRESSES THE NATION

(By Silas Witherspoon)

The friendly enthusiasm which President Johnson stirred in South Bend last Friday when he visited the Cline School to get a firsthand view of the retraining program in action is just a sample of the impression he is making wherever he goes these days.

As, for instance, when the conservative AP service tells of the 5,000 delegates of the still more conservative U.S. Chamber of Commerce and their wives greeting President Johnson with "waves of applause" when he spoke before them and that they interrupted him with waves of applause or laughter and some-

times both, you may know that our President often criticized as being too liberal, is hitting the ball.

The story I mention was carried in the Indianapolis Star (of all papers) which went on in its third paragraph to say: "It was a triumph for the Democratic President and, sensing it, Mr. Johnson strayed far from his prepared text to regale the businessmen with his Texas style quips and anecdotes."

President Johnson has now been in office over 5 months. It usually is about the time when the newcomer's honeymoon is over, particularly in a campaign year. But Johnson's growing popularity seems to rest on a firmer basis, which is one of performance. That he was not just a funny man playing to a conservative audience may be taken from that part of his address in which he said: "If you don't remember anything else that I tell you here today, I want you to remember this: 'If peaceful change is impossible * * * then a violent change is inevitable.' I do not accept the view on either side," he added, "that business and Government are inherently hostile opponents. We'd get along a lot better if both of us didn't have the public relations men getting out handouts."

Here is how the New York Sunday Times thinks he is doing:

"Today there appears to be a clear consensus that Lyndon Johnson is definitely on top of his job. His confidence, vigor and impact seem to be growing daily. While there are some who still object to his style and methods, there is no question that he has been getting results. There is widespread agreement that the mood of the country has changed, that the sense of crisis, transition and uncertainty has passed.

"The President's activities last week underscored the energy with which he has been tackling his job and the record he has been building. He dominated the headlines in a week of speechmaking and news conferences (he has had five in the past 2 weeks), of a trip to dedicate the New York World's Fair and to a Democratic fundraising dinner in Chicago, of private consultations and public exhortations, with interludes of folksy humor and personal contacts with the electorate.

"Two major developments stood out: The President scored a great coup—'a miracle,' some called it—in helping to settle the 5-year-old railroad dispute that had defied all previous efforts at solution; a strike that could have crippled the economy had been averted.

"In putting his prestige on the line by personal intervention in the rail dispute, the President took a large risk that has paid off handsomely in credit for promoting the agreement.

"REACHES PEOPLE AND CONGRESS

"In pursuit of his programs and policies, Mr. Johnson has developed highly individual approaches toward the two elements on which a President's effectiveness depend—Congress and the people.

"REASON TOGETHER

"Toward Congress, he has drawn on his years of experience and intimacy on Capitol Hill, his talent for persuasion and compromise ('Come, let us reason together' is his favorite saying), and his politician's instinct for the use of the carrot and stick.

"It is doubtful if the Members of Congress have ever been bombarded by so many Presidential phone calls, so many invitations to White House breakfasts, luncheons, dinners and kaffee-klatsches.

"An administration official said recently that in dealing with Congress, Mr. Johnson 'likes to stay ahead and anticipate what will happen and how to meet it.' The 'meeting it' might include anything from a flattering invitation to a Congressman to share the spotlight at a White House ceremony to some carefully applied pressure on a minor matter dear to the hearts of a Congressman's constituents.

"Toward the people, Mr. Johnson has displayed a formidable gift for keeping attention focused on the Presidency. If he is economizing on other lights in the White House, he certainly is not economizing on the spotlight. He has already held 16 news conferences and has made 20 appearances on TV. Moreover, whether greeting sightseers at the White House gates, reading a letter over TV from a little girl troubled about a possible rail strike, or touring poverty-stricken areas, the President has managed to project a politically potent image of homespun friendliness and compassion.

"The change in the Nation's mood about the President has been paralleled by changes in his own performance and sense of confidence. The New York Times White House correspondent writes, 'Mr. Johnson was visibly leary of the press when he first took office. Slowly he has overcome his fear of live TV, and the week before last finally mastered the big, formal conference in the State Department auditorium. You could see him loosening up and enjoying himself.'

"The New York Times diplomatic correspondent writes: 'Mr. Johnson is no longer afraid that the Russians might "test" his mettle in this or that difficult situation. He speaks more frankly of the slow pace of events and the frustrations of foreign affairs. "Nothing to throw your hat in the air about" in Latin America, no instant peace conference in the cold war, etc.'

"A number of columnists and commentators have remarked favorably on Mr. Johnson's performance and impact. Walter Lippmann has said President Johnson is 'by nature a healing man' with a great talent for 'finding the point at which a consensus—an agreement—is possible.'

"Arthur Krock of the New York Times has written that Mr. Johnson is exercising the powers of the Presidency 'in a protean political performance of many diverse roles,' and James Reston of the Times has called 'the tireless negotiating skill' of the President 'one of the vital natural resources of this country.' Columnist Doris Fleeson writes that 'the President has arrived and he has the Presidency working for him.' Another columnist spoke of the President's talent for 'digging down deeply into the basic urges of ordinary people.'

"Big problems remain. The civil rights issue has aroused strong feelings throughout the country and is certain to provide hard tests of the President's leadership in the days ahead. Mr. Johnson will be called upon to show results in the 'war on poverty' as opposed to promises and exhortation. Unemployment remains high despite the boom.

"In the foreign field, the problem of how to deal effectively with Castro and the war in Vietnam press for solution. President de Gaulle continues to be a potential source of conflict within the Western Alliance. A switch in Soviet tactics could swiftly alter the whole international picture.

THE FIVE-STATE TOUR

"Nevertheless, the evidence is that President Johnson has strong support throughout the country. His five-State tour last week had something of the aspect of a triumphal procession. He was mobbed in South Bend, hailed by large crowds in Pittsburgh; he mingled with warm and enthusiastic well-wishers in West Virginia and Kentucky. Secret servicemen, in fact, were deeply troubled by the extent of the President's 'exposure.' At this news conference yesterday, Mr. Johnson said he was not 'unduly concerned about meeting American citizens on the streets.' But former President Truman, who was Mr. Johnson's guest at the conference, described himself as 'very much concerned.'

"The President's week reemphasized a fact most Republicans ruefully acknowledge; barring a major setback in the domestic or foreign field, Mr. Johnson is going to be a hard man to beat in November."

We all have cause to be concerned for his "preservation."

Man's Basic Right Is To Own Private Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the struggle in the world today is the struggle of the individual to maintain the right to own private property. Stripped of all the verbiage this is the contest between capitalism and communism. The Communists deny the individual's right to own property. Capitalism, or the private enterprise system is based on this right.

Man's right to own property is older than any man-made law, it is a right derived from divine law as so aptly stated in the great encyclical of Pope Leo XIII in 1891 who said in part:

As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to him who has labored.

With reason, therefore, the common opinions of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have maintained the opposite view, has found in the study of nature, and in the law of nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practice of all ages the principle of private ownership, as being preeminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducting in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquillity of human life. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by the civil laws—laws which, as long as they are just, derive their binding force from the law of nature. The authority of the divine law adds its sanction, forbidding us in the gravest terms even to covet that which is another's: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his."

Pope Leo points out rightly what socialism will mean to the worker. As the United States is being steadily pushed down the road to socialism under the guise of programs to ease human suffering by use of Federal funds and Government programs, it may be well for us to review this great document. The encyclical reads:

The Socialists, therefore, in endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

Compare this warning with the recent words of the President in announcing his "poverty program." The President, you remember, said:

We will take from the haves and give it to the have-nots.

Such a philosophy flaunts moral and natural law, and can lead eventually only

to destruction of the private enterprise system with increased misery for those it is claimed the poverty program is intended to help.

For a further study of the importance of private ownership of property in the life of man, I would like to include an article from the May 9 issue of Human Events. The article, "Property Healthy for Man," written by Russell Kirk, follows:

PROPERTY HEALTHY FOR MAN

(By Russell Kirk)

One of the most evil works of collectivism— whether it be called communism, state capitalism, socialism, "people's democracy," or what you will—is the destruction of true private property. For the longing of man to have something genuinely his own goes back beyond the roots of civilization.

In the Nazi and Communist concentration camps, the wretched prisoners clung, as their last hope, to some particular patch of floor in cell or barracks, where they could sleep every night and crouch during the day. The most extreme cruelty which their jailers could contrive was to shift their victims, frequently, from spot to spot or building, so that even this last shadow of private property was denied them. They had nothing to call their own.

As the bull, doomed in the ring, returns after every charge to his little patch of stamping-ground, so man requires innately some tiny territory that is his. This point is made sagaciously by Mr. Robert Ardrey in his book "African Genesis: A Personal Investigation Into the Animal Origins and Nature of Man."

In man, as in most other animals (not counting insects), Mr. Ardrey points out, the instinct for status and one's own domain is stronger even than the appetite for sex. It is this fact which Marxists and other Utopian reformers ignore, to the gerat suffering of modern mankind.

"We, the approximate class of 1930," Mr. Ardrey writes, "today furnish trusted and vital leadership to world thought, world politics, world society, and to whatever may exist of world thought. But we do not know that the human drive to acquire possession is the simple expression of an animal instinct many hundreds of times older than the human race itself." The rediscovery of this fact, Ardrey goes on to explain, refutes Marxism.

Nearly 90 years ago the great legal authority Henry Maine declared that civilization is the product of personal property. This thesis is reaffirmed in our time by Dr. Gottfried Dietze, in his slim, important book "In Defense of Private Property." If you deprive man of true property, you work for the destruction of culture and a just civil social order.

Human nature is constant. We moderns are not really different, in longing and character, from the ancient Egyptians whose hopes and lamentations we can read in their tombs. And if we deprive modern humanity of one of its natural satisfactions and supports, we reduce mankind to something less than it ought to be.

So it is necessarily evil to be rootless, to own nothing, to be simply a little insecure speck in a kind of tapioca pudding society. And the more personal a piece of property is, the healthier for man it becomes. Merely owning a stock certificate or a bond or a deposit book does not satisfy the instinct for property—though doubtless this is better than no property at all.

Thus the crofter in the Hebrides, or the Portuguese fisherman in his tiny cottage, in one considerable sense is a happier and truer man than the most successful industrial manager in Soviet Russia. He possesses his own little domain, while the industrial commissar is lost in an impersonal, propertyless, gray insect world.

Part I—Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include material in the RECORD, I submit for the attention of my colleagues the response of the Panama Canal information officer to a letter from my constituent, Mr. Conrad R. Hilpert of Rockford, Ill.

The information thus presented ought to dispel numerous misconceptions.

That letter follows:

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
February 5, 1964.

Mr. CONRAD R. HILPERT,
Twin Disc Clutch Co.,
Rockford, Ill.

DEAR MR. HILPERT: It was a real pleasure for me to assist you and your family on your recent visit to the Panama Canal. I am glad that we had the opportunity to meet under pleasant circumstances.

I am grateful for your interest in our attempts to tell the people in the United States a factual account of what transpired in the recent disturbances.

Taking your questions in sequence as you outlined them in your thoughtful letter of January 28, 1964, I will answer them as thoroughly as possible.

1. A non-U.S. citizen who works and lives in the zone, regardless of employment, has the same privileges as the U.S. citizens. He can purchase in Canal Zone stores, attend movies, eat in restaurants, and buy gasoline. (I refer to non-U.S. citizens because we have Panamanian and West Indian employees not U.S. citizens working in the zone. The vast majority of non-U.S. citizens are Panamanians.)

2. To cite one example, 2,800 of the 3,000 employees of the supply division, which includes retail stores, service centers and clubhouses, are non-U.S. citizens. As of December 31, 1963, there are 14,146 full-time employees in the Canal Zone. Of this total, 10,431 are non-U.S. citizens and 3,715 are U.S. citizens. Approximately 90 percent of the non-U.S. citizens in the above employment figures are Panamanians.

At the present time in the Canal Zone less than 2 percent of the Canal Zone wage base work force is made up of U.S. citizens. These are largely dependents of U.S. citizens who are temporarily in lower grade clerical positions. Of the 4,600 positions which are paid at U.S. rates of pay because of the need to recruit wholly or in part in the United States in these occupations, approximately 20 percent (850) are held by Panamanian citizens. The number of Panamanians in these higher rates is gradually increasing as apprentice training, in-service development, replacement recruitment, and internal transfers create opportunities for more U.S. base rate jobs for non-U.S. citizens. At the beginning of the present program which was developed in 1959, this number has increased from 141 to 850 presently employed. Panamanians and U.S. citizens both receive the same base wage regardless of pay base. In other words, for positions paid at locality rates on the Canal Zone wage base, both noncitizens and U.S. citizens receive the same base wage except that the U.S. citizens receive the 25-percent tropical differential.

All employees have equal opportunity for advancement under standard Federal promotion systems which are very rigidly enforced. Training is given without regard to citizenship, except that Panamanians are given preference in numbers in apprenticeship training. Panamanians are now employed in practically all of the occupational groups paid at U.S. rates of pay, including medical officers (including one chief of service), skilled crafts (including supervisory positions), professional engineers, accountants, and wide variety of clerical occupations.

3. The Panama Canal Zone originally was selected because of the shortest distance between two points, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and only because it was more advantageous and economical to finish the major part of constructing the Panama Canal which was begun in the 1800's by the French. After the French were forced to give up due to the ravages of tropical disease which decimated its working population, and the lack of money, the United States paid the French $40 million for the rights to dig the "Big Ditch." To effect this great engineering feat, its health bureau, headed by Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, eliminated yellow fever, the huge killer of men, and made the zone a healthy place in which to work and live. The area through which the canal was built was a tropical jungle. There are many beautiful areas in the interior provinces of the Republic of Panama with farms, plantations, while the sea yields considerable bounty in nearly all types of edible fish, including shellfish, to Panamanian fishermen.

The larger populations are concentrated in Panama City, especially, and Colon. The Republic of Panama has many beautiful beaches along the coasts in the interior while much of its land is cultivated, plenty of areas are avalaible for future cultivation and development.

4. The United States does have adequate harbor and docking facilities at either end of the canal on both the Pacific and Atlantic sides through which ships of all nations carry cargoes to all parts of the world. Docking facilities, of course, were an unknown and nonexistent quantity when the U.S. construction of the canal began. Panama has no deepwater docks or piers and utilizes the canal organization facilities for her export-import trade.

5. Panamanians, regardless of their employment, do live in the canal. As of December 31, 1963, a total of 10,597 non-U.S. citizens, including 9,565 Panamanians, resided in the Canal Zone. On the same date 10,036 U.S. citizens were residents of the zone. For the most part, housing is unpretentious, with no insulation, while the rentals charged are in proportion to the size of the dwelling. The head of the family is obliged to pay for other services besides rent such as electricity and repairs to all appliances he purchases.

6. The Canal Zone has one hotel, the Tivoli Guest House, which is a wooden structure of 132 rooms, accommodating a total of 250 people. It was built during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt and has unpretentious dining facilities and for various civic functions. Guestrooms in this hotel are restricted to Canal Zone employees, their relatives, official U.S. delegations and a few elderly pensioners. No Panamanian hotels suffer from loss of business.

7. There are no regulations prohibiting overnight guests in family apartments rented by non-U.S. citizens. The Canal Zone organization does expect that in bachelor rooms, occupants will make sure that lady guests leave at a reasonable hour.

8. The inference regarding this question is totally false. In direct benefits accruing to Panama, as you will note in part I of one of the enclosures, a total of $84,355,000 was

received by the Republic of Panama compared to their total budget of approximately $77 million.

This may appear to be a voluminous reply to eight questions you posed but I've tried to keep it as condensed as possible.

I am enclosing a copy of the paper "Benefits Accruing to the Republic of Panama" which will be released this weekend as well as a copy of the January 20, 1964, factual account of what really happened during the period of the disturbances.

My very best to you and yours, and again many thanks for your keen interest in the Canal Zone.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BALDWIN,
Panama Canal Information Officer.

BENEFITS ACCRUING TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Part I. Direct financial benefits accruing to Panama.

Part II: Benefits accruing to Panama from Panama Canal Company-Canal Zone Government.

Part III: Benefits to the Republic of Panama through the Armed Forces presence in the Canal Zone.

Part IV: Principal sources of external assistance to Panama (compiled by USAID).

PART I: DIRECT FINANCIAL BENEFITS ACCRUING TO PANAMA

The following is a listing of estimated income received by the Republic of Panama from Canal Zone sources for the years 1961 and 1962:

	1960 (revised)	1961 (revised)	1962 (preliminary)
Net payments, including retirement and disability to non-U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone	[1] $28,183,000	[1] $33,219,000	[1] $36,461,000
Direct purchases made in Panama by U.S. Government agencies	9,611,000	9,743,000	11,781,000
Purchases of goods in Panama by private organizations operating in the Canal Zone	4,416,000	4,600,000	4,400,000
Contractors' purchases in Panama of goods and services for Canal Zone projects	8,400,000	10,415,000	10,668,000
Expenditures made in Panama by U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone	12,990,000	15,675,000	19,155,000
Canal Zone annuity to the Republic of Panama	1,930,000	1,930,000	1,930,000
Total	65,530,000	75,582,000	84,395,000

[1] Includes estimated net payments to all non-U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone by U.S. agencies, contractors and private organizations. Derivation: Gross payrolls less deductions for civil service retirement and employees' expenditures in the Canal Zone for service center and retail store pruchases, medical and hospital services, rent and utilities, and miscellaneous services.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Gardner States Objectives Governing New Trade Organization for Developing Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, convened for the period March 23–June 15, 1964, is now engaged in discussing the principal international trade problems of the less developed countries. Among these is the conviction of the poorer countries that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—does not adequately serve their interests and that a new worldwide trade organization is needed.

Mr. Richard Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, warned the Conference of the dangers in adding still another international organization to the many which already exist and the need to avoid futile duplication.

The text of his statement follows:

STATEMENT TO FOURTH COMMITTEE, U.N. CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT, GENEVA, MAY 7, 1964

(By Richard N. Gardner)

Mr. Chairman, we have reached a critical point in this committee. Three specific proposals are already on the table. Other ideas have found expression in the many interesting statements. We have carefully studied all these proposals and ideas. We now have the honor to place before the committee on behalf of ourselves and other cosponsors a specific proposal which is embodied in the document you have before you, E/Conf.46/C.4/L.9.

The last year has seen the emergence of a hopeful spirit in international relations. Nations have come to realize that despite political and ideological differences they share common interests in peace and welfare. They have begun to set aside the issues that divide them and take up the issues that unite them. They have achieved limited agreements embodying mutual restraints and reciprocal concessions which serve the interests of all. The agreement reached last summer prohibiting nuclear tests in the atmosphere, the resolutions adopted by the last General Assembly in the field of outer space, and the recent announcements of cut backs in the production of nuclear materials were facilitated by the new willingness to seek understandings where understandings are possible on the basis of the highest common denominator of national interest.

The resolution which we place before you now is offered in this same spirit. It is not an extreme resolution introduced as a counterweight for bargaining purposes. To put such a resolution before this committee at this stage of the Conference would do a disservice to our common objectives. It will, I hope, be regarded for what it is—not a Western proposal or an Eastern proposal, not a developed country proposal or a developing country proposal, but a proposal which draws together the common threads of our discussion in a manner which serves the interest of all.

Our attempt, in short, is not to state a thesis but a synthesis. For in the field of trade, and in the other vital areas of international relations, we believe that there is a larger area of common ground than readily meets the eye. We believe this is particularly true on the question of organizational arrangements, with respect both to the ends such arrangements should serve and to the means such arrangements should employ.

The nations which are gathered here in this U.N. Conference on Trade and Development are motivated by a common concern to accelerate on an urgent basis the economic development of the developing countries. The United States ardently shares this concern and this sense of urgency. We want for people everywhere the same things we want for our own citizens—adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, and satisfaction of those political, cultural and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

The nations participating in this Conference are also united by a common concern that improved machinery for international cooperation be developed on an urgent basis in the field of trade to implement these high aims. The United States also shares this concern and this sense of urgency. As President Johnson told the United Nations General Assembly last December: "We favor the steady improvement of collective machinery for helping the less developed countries build modern societies." We take pride in the fact that our country has played a leading role in the creation of international institutions for economic cooperation over the last 20 years. We shall continue to play such a role in the future.

But the measure of common ground in this Conference is not limited to such general objectives. Beginning with the stimulating report by the Secretary General of this Conference, and running through the debate in this committee, one cannot fail to be struck by the growing consensus on three specific objectives which have been defined as a basis for new organizational arrangements in the field of trade.

The first objective is that new organizational arrangements must correct the limitations of existing institutions.

The Secretary General of this Conference has described these with his customary force and clarity. If I may paraphrase liberally—but I hope justly—the analysis on pages 99–100 of his report, he points to what he describes as five essential limitations: the lack of a universal forum for the systematic and professional discussion of trade problems; the lack of an integrated attack on trade problems in the context of economic development; the lack of adequate instruments for dealing with trade problems between industrial countries and developing countries and between developing countries themselves; the lack of an instrument for dealing with trade between state trading and market economies; and the lack of a forum for coordinated action in the field of primary commodities.

So far as the United States is concerned, we agree that the existing machinery could be improved in many of these respects in greater or lesser degree. The resolution now before you proposes new organizational arrangements designed to do this.

The second objective is that new organizational arangements should make maximum use of existing institutions in order to avoid waste and duplication.

Nowhere has this point been made more effectively than in the Secretary General's report (p. 103) where he urges that "practical arrangements should be made to avoid, as far as possible, any unnecessary overlapping of functions, so that the discussions in [new] bodies would not be unnecessarily repeated in other United Nations bodies or in GATT. Apart from its intrinsic disadvantages, this overlapping would unnecessarily take the time of governmental representatives and might thus lead to a situation in which participants * * * might not always be of the appropriate level."

If we are to avoid wasteful duplication of effort we must obviously make full use of existing institutions. In the words of the Secretary General once again (p. 101), "The United Nations is capable of assuming much greater responsibilities in these fields." In the U.N. system and elsewhere, he declares

(p. 100), "there already exists a valuable group of facilities which could be utilized in a regular and systematic manner by making whatever additions or modifications are necessary and giving unity and coherence to what is now fragmentary and scattered."

The United States welcomes this emphasis of the Secretary General, echoed by many delegations, on the need to avoid the creation of superfluous international machinery. We seek the minimum of organizational changes necessary to get the job done. The people of the United States are prepared to make sacrifices in the future as in the past to place capital and know-how at the service of developing countries. But they are understandably skeptical of supporting international conferences and staff which are not absolutely necessary to assure practical international cooperation for economic development.

The United States now belongs to 70 international organizations and programs. In the last 2 years we participated in approximately 1,000 international conferences—more than all the conferences attended by our country between its establishment in 1789 and the beginning of the Second World War. Similar statistics could be cited by other members of this Conference.

I do not cite these figures to suggest a lack of confidence in the great array of international institutions in which we now participate. Indeed, the United States took a leading role in establishing nearly all of them. With few exceptions, we believe that all these organizations and conferences—from the highly specialized ones concerned with fisheries, civil aviation, disease prevention, telecommunications and the like to the political ones like the United Nations General Assembly itself—reflect the growing interdependence of our modern world and serve the common interest of all nations.

I do cite these figures, however, to suggest that we may be reaching the point of diminishing returns in the development of new institutions. In the naive optimism of the early postwar period there was a tendency (from which my own Government was not totally immune) to believe that the solution to any international problem was guaranteed by the creation of a new institution to deal with it. Alas, several dozen organizations and several thousand conferences later we know that it is not so simple. Organizational arrangements can help facilitate common solutions but they are not an automatic solvent for problems where the nations concerned do not share a fundamental consensus and a political will to deal with them.

Millions of people around the world are looking to this conference to find practical means to improve their way of life. This job must be done and will be done. But we will ill serve this great constituency if by duplicating existing institutions we divert to the comfortable setting of New York and Geneva the money and the people so urgently needed in the developing countries.

We do not wish to emphasize the financial drain alone—although it must be realized that financial resources for international institutions are limited and that more for the headquarters does mean less for the field. We are also concerned with the manpower problem. Many of the delegates sitting here today are spending one-third or more of their time at international meetings away from their capitals. This represents a serious drain of governmental manpower even for a developed country like the United States. How much more serious a drain it must be for developing countries which are actually short of manpower for responsible government positions.

In the austerity of wartime a number of our countries sought to curb unnecessary travel with the slogan, "Is this trip necessary?" In a world in which more than two-thirds of humanity are ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed our reaction to proposals for new institutions should be, "Is this organization necessary?"

The third objective is that new organizational arrangements should assure an integrated attack on the problems of trade and development.

As the Secretary-General has said in his report (p. 101), we need an organizational arrangement where the problems of international trade can be dealt with "as an integral part of the general problem of development." This same point has been emphasized, in different ways, by many delegations in this Conference. So far as we are concerned, it is a matter of fundamental importance.

When we turn to promoting the trade of the developing countries, we cannot divorce the problem of exports from the problem of production. And this in turn leads us inevitably into development policy as a whole—the measures which developing countries can take to help themselves and the supplementary role which can be played by developed countries through aid, private investment, and technical assistance as well as trade.

It is the preoccupation with these considerations, no less than with considerations of economy, that should animate us as we consider new organizational arrangements. It is so much easier to create new institutions than to make better use of the ones we have. But if there is a fundamental defect with our existing system of international institutions it is not that there are too few but rather too many independent bodies with independent budgets pursuing independent objectives of a specialized character without adequate integration of effort.

We already have in the U.N. system alone 14 specialized and affiliated agencies. In recent months we have had proposals for three more in the fields of industrialization, housing, and science. And pressure has built up to create greater autonomy within the U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs for the specialists in the fields of population, social development, and human rights.

Have we not reached the outer limits in the proliferation of specialized functions in our system of agencies? Specialists play an indispensable role in turning the wheels of our highly complex international society but they have this great defect: each of them believes that his particular specialty is the key to everything else. We who are gathered here believe, and rightly so, that trade plays an important part in the development of developing countries, but we all know that a similar case can and has been made for such subjects as population growth, education, agriculture, industry, health, housing, science, transport, communications, and labor. There may even be a meteorologist somewhere who believes that weather control will eventually provide the ultimate answer. Given an independent base of operations and an independent budget, the specialists in any of these fields, unless their enthusiasm is appropriately restrained through coordination with other specialists, will tend to spend our limited resources in ways which cannot be justified on the basis of our overall priorities.

To put it bluntly, there is real danger of the economic and social work of the U.N. coming apart at the seams. Our urgent need is not to fragment it further but to bind it together more effectively. It is for this reason that we share the concern expressed by the Secretary-General of this Conference and others that new organizational arrangements should assure the necessary integration of effort in the fields of trade and development.

The proposal now before you seeks to accomplish this objective by making the new organizational arrangements in the field of trade at every stage an integral part of U.N. work on the problems of developing countries. The United Nations, through the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, is coordinating a vast number of activities in the field of development. If we agree that the trade problems of the developing countries should be considered as an integral part of the problems of development, then the establishment of a separate institution for this purpose with a separate secretariat and budget would result in an artificial division between trade and development frustrating that very integration of effort which we are all seeking. On the other hand, to place in such a new and separate institution the functions of development as well as trade would duplicate on a massive scale the ongoing work of the U.N. and gravely undermine the strength and prestige of the world peace organization.

U.S. Proposals for Improvement of Trade Machinery To Help Developing Countries Submitted by Deputy Assistant Secretary Richard Gardner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the United States told the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, meeting in Geneva, March 23-June 15, 1964, that it agrees to needed additions and improvements in present arrangements for international trade discussions and negotiations. To this end, Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, presented the U.S. resolution for consideration by the conference.

The text of Mr. Gardner's statement follows:

U.S. RESOLUTION FOR IMPROVEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE MACHINERY

(Statement of Richard N. Gardner on behalf of United States, Geneva, March 7, 1964)

This Conference has achieved a large measure of agrement on means as well as ends, on specific institutional devices as well as the objectives they ought to serve. As the Secretary General pointed out in his report and as the proceedings of this committee have confirmed, there appears to be a broad consensus that organizational arrangements are required on three levels—a periodic conference of all members of the U.N. system, a smaller subsidiary organ of some kind which would meet more frequently, and an adequate secretariat. The proposal before you is based on this consensus.

A. THE PERIODIC CONFERENCE

The draft resolution provides, in the first place, for a periodic conference with the participation by all states members of the U.N. or of its specialized or affiliated agencies. The Conference would meet regularly every 3 years, and additional sessions could be convened in exceptional circumstances.

To improve the existing machinery in the five respects referred to by the Secretary General the responsibilities of the Conference would be very broad. According to section I.5 of the draft resolution it would cover "(a) the promotion, under the authority of the General Assembly and the ECOSOC, of international trade, particularly in its relation to the economic development of the developing countries, through the formulation of principles and policies to this

end, including policies for the expansion of trade between countries at a similar level of development, at different stages of development or having different systems of social and economic organization; (b) the formulation and recommendation of measures designed to give effect to such principles and policies."

It will be seen from this and other provisions that the membership and subject matter of the Conference, and of the subsidiary organs serving it, would be broad enough to accomplish the first objective referred to earlier and to improve existing machinery in the ways cited by the Secretary General and various delegations.

The second and third objectives—avoidance of duplication and integration of effort—would be assured by providing that the Conference be convened by ECOSOC in accordance with article 62(4) of the United Nations Charter, subject, of course, to the requirement that it be convened every 3 years. Decisions as to its venue and agenda would be made by the General Assembly in accordance with normal United Nations practice. It would report to the Assembly through ECOSOC and, in keeping with arrangements established at the present Conference, would make its recommendations to other international institutions through ECOSOC and the General Assembly.

B. THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The draft resolution before you provides, in the second place, for a Commission for International Trade. Here again the objective of correcting limitations in existing machinery is recognized by giving the Commission a mandate to deal with subject matter fully as broad as the Conference itself.

To help it deal effectively with such broad responsibilities, the Commission is empowered in section II.6 to establish subcommittees on specific subjects and in paragraph II.7 to "recommend to ECOSOC the establishment, in keeping with article 62 of the U.N. Charter, of special ad hoc machinery for the negotiation of legal instruments deemed necessary for the promotion of international trade in cases where machinery for such negotiations does not already exist."

Through the latter provision it would prove possible, in the event that deliberations in the Commission developed sufficient common ground, to provide for the negotiation of contractual arrangements in any area of trade which cannot be dealt with by existing institutions.

In the section of the draft resolution dealing with the proposed Commission, you will recognize once again the concern to avoid duplication and to assure integration of effort. The primary role of ECOSOC as the coordinating body for the U.N. system of organizations is explicitly recognized. Under section II.5(e), for example, the Commission would receive from ECOSOC the periodic reports of institutions of the U.N. system insofar as they bear upon trade and transmit through ECOSOC its comments and recommendations on the work of these institutions.

With the same objectives in view, the Commission under section II.5(f) would assume the responsibilities of and indeed would replace the existing Commission for International Commodity Trade and the ICCICA and would perform a wide range of functions in the commodity field.

Further concern with the importance of avoiding duplication and assuring integration is reflected in section II.5(g) which states that the activities of the Commission must respect the rights and obligations of existing institutions and their members and the independence of their negotiating machinery. Section II.8 further stresses the need to take full account of the work of other international bodies.

The provisions of the draft resolution concerning the composition of the Commission and its subgroups deserve particular attention. Section II.2 specifies that the Commission shall be composed of 34 members and that elections "shall take fully into account the principle of equitable geographic distribution on the understanding that there be equal representation of developing countries and of developed countries, including the principal trading countries."

We regard this provision as of fundamental importance. We are not here proposing, as others have done, the use of weighted voting. But it has been rightly stated in this Committee that the interests of the developing countries as well as of the developed countries will best be served by assuring adequate representation in the formulation of policy of the countries who are expected to bear the principal responsibility for implementing such policy.

Section II.6 makes it clear that countries not represented on the Commission itself will have an opportunity to be members of subcommittees that may be established, particularly when such countries have a special interest in the subject matter. This provision, coupled with the Commission membership of 34, should preserve the efficiency of these organs while assuring representation of an adequate number of members of the U.N. system.

C. THE SECRETARIAT

The draft resolution provides, in the third place, for a Secretariat to service the Conference and the Commission. But this Secretariat is not to be separate from the Secretariat of the U.N. To assure maximum efficiency and integration of effort the U.N. Secretariat itself would provide the necessary services. Since the existing Secretariat will have to be adapted for this purpose, section III provides that the Secretary-General of the U.N. shall "make such additional arrangements as may be necessary."

The United States has already indicated that the appropriate place to base such additional arrangements to assure the adequate integration of efforts in trade and development is the Department of Economic and Social Affairs at the headquarters of the United Nations. Indeed, we feel that the reference in section III to the utilization so far as possible of existing resources and the avoidance of duplication leads inevitably to this conclusion. But the resolution before you does not seek to specify the organization of the Secretariat in precise detail. This is a matter to be taken up in the Budgetary and Administrative Committee of the General Assembly at its next session in the light of the views made available by the Secretary General of the United Nations on how he wishes to organize his staff for this purpose. So far as the United States is concerned, we can say now that we will support at the next Assembly such measures to strengthen the Secretariat as may be necessary to enable it effectively to discharge its additional functions in the field of trade.

There is just one more provision in the draft resolution now before you which deserves special comment. This is section V, which calls upon the Secretary General of the United Nations to make arrangements to ensure that the Commission for International Trade will receive, through ECOSOC, reports on the activities of the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and transmit to the contracting parties, through ECOSOC, appropriate comments and recommendations. This, together with section II.5(g), II.7, II.8 and other provisions, is designed to bring GATT into a relationship to the new trade machinery which will facilitate rather than impair GATT's effective operation.

We recognize that GATT as originally conceived proved to have limitations from the point of view of developing countries. It is in the process of overcoming those limitations. Moreover, as an instrument for the freeing of trade among the developed countries, it has proved to be one of the great achievements of our time.

After the First World War, in the absence of an institution like the GATT, the great trading nations engaged in an orgy of economic nationalism and beggar-my-neighbor practice which strangled world trade and helped to drag these countries and others into the abyss of the great depression. This did not happen after the Second World War. Indeed, through the GATT, the developed countries and others as well engaged in the greatest effort of trade expansion the world have ever known.

Whatever our respective views about GATT's imperfections—and what institution does not have imperfections—let us acknowledge that GATT played an important part in helping avoid in this last postwar period the mistakes of the one before and that as a result it has brought material benefits not just to the developed countries but to the developing countries as well.

It would be a tragedy of the first magnitude to impair the effectiveness of this proven instrument for trade expansion which is now adapting itself to the needs of the developing countries and indeed is now embarking on the most ambitious effort of all time in the reduction of obstacles to trade. The draft resolution before you takes account of this fact while encouraging the hope that, through its relationship with the proposed new machinery, it will pay increasing attention to the trade needs of developing as well as developed countries.

You will have noticed by now that with all these provisions the resolution before you does not provide for an ITO. Nor does it provide by any other name for a new juridical entity in the field of trade with a separate secretariat and budget. What it does do is propose an alternative designed to promote the same objective more quickly and efficiently.

The need for action on the trade problems of developing countries is an urgent need. The way to deal with it most expeditiously is not to embark on a lengthy process of negotiation and ratification which can only lead to disappointment. For we see no prospect now or in the foreseeable future for the ratification of such a new organization by the principal trading countries who would be expected to assume the major obligations. The way to deal with the need for action on the trade problems of the developing countries most expeditiously is to establish within the next year, through the appropriate organs of the U.N., the improved system of U.N. bodies here proposed which can begin functioning immediately.

The resolution before you is not perfect. But it does represent the best effort by the cosponsors to achieve a synthesis of the views already put forward—to turn our attention to the fundamentals that unite us rather than the less essential matters that divide us. We hope the members of the committee will find here the basis for agreement. What matters in the last analysis is not form but substance—not appearance but results.

We offer this resolution in the same spirit which animated the impromptu remarks of President Johnson several weeks ago at the New York World's Fair:

"What we are trying to do is to explore every possibility that we can conceive of that will lead to better understanding. We are trying to be tolerant and recognize the problems of other leaders and other nations, just as we hope that they realize ours. We have no illusions that we can settle all the problems that exist and have all the world live in happiness tomorrow. But we are ambitious, we do have a goal, we are optimistic.

"If we keep a cool head and our feet on the ground, and use some imagination and ingenuity, respecting others, we can find the answer."

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been contended by the proponents of the civil rights bill that the Government, if this is enacted into law, would not be given the power to tell an employer whom to hire or promote.

I find it difficult to reconcile their claims with the following language in section 707(e) of the bill:

> If the court finds that the respondent has engaged in or is engaging in an unlawful employment practice charged in the complaint, the court may enjoin the respondent from engaging in such unlawful employment practice, and shall order the respondent to take such affirmative action, including the reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the unlawful employment practice), as may be appropriate.

The bill stipulates that these courts shall be U.S. (Federal) courts.

If that language does not give the Government the authority to tell an employer to hire a particular individual, I wonder what would. But it appears pretty clear to me.

What has been the record of the Federal Government insofar as the hiring and promotion of employees are concerned?

It has been a longstanding policy that there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, or color in hiring for or promoting to positions in the civil service system of the Federal Government. This policy was established through a number of Executive orders issued from the White House over a number of years.

In practice, how has this policy been implemented? Let us look at a few examples.

You may recall the incident last year in the Dallas, Tex., post office where 3 Negro employees were selected as supervisors, when there were 53 white men with higher ratings on the merit promotion list. Subsequently, as a result of the ensuing uproar the individuals were not put in the supervisory positions; but they were put in positions carrying the same salaries, constituting a promotion salarywise, still over other more qualified white employees.

Similar incidents have occurred in other agencies. I personally have received some complaints from Federal employees who say that preference is given to the minority group when other qualified individuals are also available.

The proponents of the bill also say that it does not provide any ratio system for employment.

Again, let us look at the record of the Federal Government under its current powers.

Last fall the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as a result of the complaints about discrimination in reverse, conducted an investigation into certain Government personnel practices. During the hearings, the testimony brought out the fact that the Department of the Army, at the direction of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for Manpower, issued a directive calling for a ratio of Negro civilian employment to the ratio of Negroes in the population of the community.

I know of no specific direction in the Executive orders which set the policy of nondiscrimination in the hiring of Federal employees that there should be any such ratio.

If these actions are taken by the Federal Government in connection with Federal jobs, what would prevent the Government, under the civil rights bill, from trying to do the same thing insofar as a job in private industry is concerned. The bill gives wide latitude to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which would police hiring practices, "to issue, amend, or rescind suitable procedural regulations to carry out the provisions of this title."

What criteria does the bill establish in the case of an employer who is approached by two individuals, one of whom is a member of a minority group, both with the same qualifications? None. Even if he threw both names into a hat and pulled out the one who would get the job, if the minority individual were not so selected, there still might be a cry of discrimination raised. Is it fair to all applicants that the prospective employer, in order to avoid such charges, give preference to the individual of the minority group?

Is this concern about the Federal Government imposing its will on an employer with respect to hiring employees far-fetched? I direct your attention to the following article by John S. Knight, president and editor of the Detroit Free Press, in which he discusses this section of the bill and refers to a specific incident in Illinois where the Fair Employment Practices Commission ordered a company to hire an individual who had alleged discrimination, even though he failed to pass a regular employment test which the company gave.

If that can be done under a local law, to what extent would it be done under Federal law, if this bill were enacted?

Mr. Knight's article, which appeared in the Sunday, March 22, 1964, issue of the Detroit Free Press is as follows:

UNNOTICED PERIL TO BASIC FREEDOM IS LURKING IN CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Most of the southern and other spirited opposition to the civil rights legislation now before the U.S. Senate is based upon the "public accommodations" section.

This clause would forbid discrimination against Negroes in restaurants, hotels, theaters and all places of business normally open to the general public.

It is my personal view that commercial enterprises which seek business through advertising or other means have no moral or legal right to deny service to a prospective and orderly customer of any color.

In fact, Congress passed just such a law back in 1875. Its constitutionality was attacked in 1883 and after full hearing, the Supreme Court decided it was violative of the Constitution on the ground that Congress sought "to establish a code of municipal law regulative of all private rights between man and man in society."

And so, unquestionably, any new civil rights legislation may have to survive the constitutionality test, but in modern times and under vastly changed conditions.

I am puzzled, however, by the seeming lack of interest in another section of the civil rights bill which, in seeking to broaden job opportunities for Negroes, does at the same time severely limit the freedom of employers, labor unions and employment agencies.

This is the section which would establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, a new Federal agency empowered to police their hiring, firing and advancement practices.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, with headquarters in Washington and field offices in all areas of the country, will have authority to take legal action against alleged violaters if the following proposals are enacted into law:

1. Employers may not deny jobs to Negroes because of race.
2. If a Negro is discharged, the employer must prove the dismissal has nothing to do with race.
3. When promotions and pay increases are given, the employer must show the absence of bias.
4. Government inspectors can examine a firm's records in search of bias. Officials and workers may be questioned.
5. The new bureaucracy can tell employers what kind of employment records to keep.

In the event that the EEOC finds neglect of these and other related provisions of the law, the Commission can file a civil suit in Federal court against the employer, union, or employment agency accused of the violations.

If the court agrees with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the employer can be ordered to (A) change his employment practices; (B) hire an individual who was turned down, or reinstate a discharged worker with back pay.

Failure to comply with the court's order will bring contempt charges, punishable by fines and possible imprisonment.

Even enlightened employers who do not discriminate in hiring and personnel policies must produce records and be able to prove their innocence.

In some instances, the employer is not permitted to turn down women applicants for jobs unless he can convince the Government that men are needed in these particular tasks.

I am quite aware that many well-meaning people justify these extreme measures as the means to a desirable end.

But the piling on of Federal regulations to bring about equal opportunity is in basic conflict with our American concept of individual freedom.

As Justice Whittaker, a former member of the U.S. Supreme Court, has said: "Democracy, as a system of government, was never intended to be a leveler of men. It permits, and was intended to permit, the gifted, the energetic, the creative, and the thrifty * * * to rise above the masses.

"If men really want permanent equality," continues Justice Whittaker, "they may find it only in communism, for such is the central theme of that philosophy. Generally men who are free do not remain economically equal, and men who remain economically equal are not free."

A foretaste of what will occur if the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is created by Federal law was shown recently by a ruling made in Illinois.

In this case the employer (Motorola) gave general ability tests to all prospective job applicants. A Negro who failed the test charged that he was denied employment because of his race.

The Illinois FEPC then gave a reexamination to the applicant, said that he passed the test, and ordered the corporation to hire him. An FEPC examiner held that Motorola's test was unfair to "culturally deprived and disadvantaged groups"; that the questions did not take into account "inequalities and differences in environment"; and that the standards for passing were based on those of "advantaged groups."

In other words, merit and ability and Motorola's standards of performance were cast aside and the employer lost his "rights." This case, which is now pending before the full commission, has created quite a furor in Illinois, and the warning is clear.

If a State commission can riddle good management practices in the cause of "social significance," you can visualize the degree to which employers and unions will be shackled by a horde of inspectors operating under Federal law.

Let no one be deceived by the claim that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will be a toothless agency, or that enforcement will be less zealous or vigorous once the presidential election is over.

The civil rights bill now under consideration is a tough law. It can be used by well organized and amply financed Negro groups to harass business and industry suspected of unfair practices.

It discriminates against the best workers by attempting to bring all down to a common level.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission provision is dangerous to free competition; it stifles initiative; it negates freedom of action and it dilutes the American concept of advancement to the best qualified.

As stated previously, I see no valid reason for refusing public accommodations to a Negro, or to a man or woman of any other color who observes normal and acceptable standards of conduct.

But there is great peril in the police state methods under which the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission would be authorized to operate.

For this is not freedom but tyranny, and the exercise of discrimination in reverse.

Surely, there are better ways to cope with discrimination in employment than for the Federal Government to forge chains for one segment of our society while pleading the need of more freedom for another.

To again quote Justice Whittaker: "Those who would seek to solve our problems through socialistic processes, rather than democratic ones, are heading down the road to darkness."

Those who support the civil rights bill are quite right in their contentions that this is a moral issue in the United States. I agree that it is a moral issue. But how on earth can you legislate morals?

If to achieve complete morality one must give full authority to the Federal Government to direct every aspect of our individual lives, then the civil rights bill is a definite step in that direction. I do not feel that the American public wants this because since I have been in Congress I have received numerous letters from people who abhor a strong centralized government.

My action with respect to the bill was a reflection of the thinking of the majority of my constituents on that point.

The civil rights bill now under debate is strictly a political gimmick to get the votes of a segment of our population at the expense of all people of our land, including those it is purported to help.

Address of Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the 10th anniversary dinner of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee was held on May 4, 1964, at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Rochester, N.Y., was the toastmaster. Representative Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and His Excellency Avraham Harman, the Ambassador of Israel, were the speakers. It was one of the most stimulating and instructive meetings I have ever attended.

The highlight of the evening was the magnificent address given by His Excellency the Ambassador of Israel. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now include that address. I am sure that everyone who reads it will be well rewarded. It is a splendid exposition.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, AVRAHAM HARMAN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL

Rabbi Bernstein, Dr. Morgan, Senator Scott, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure indeed to be with you tonight, and to be made to feel once again the depth of American friendship for my country. It is a matter of the deepest encouragement to us in Israel. We are a very small country, a very small people, very far away from your shores. It is a great thing for us to be made to feel that the United States of America, the greatest power on earth today, feels the way it does about us and adopts this policy of equating itself with small countries throughout the world, seeking for them the freedoms which it has won for itself and extending to them the encouragement and help that they need in making their way forward to freedom.

I have just returned from a very brief visit to Israel. I arrived there just 2 weeks after my country had been celebrating its 16th anniversary. Of course, the natural thing for me to do was to try to pause for a bit and to compare and contrast our situation in 1948 with what it is in 1964. Perhaps the most encouraging thought that I took away from Israel, as I reviewed my trip in the plane during the course of yesterday, was that throughout a week's stay there just hadn't been any time to really make that assessment and comparison. The encouraging thing about the people of Israel to me is that we are not a backward-looking people. We are not concerned with the problems of the past. All our attention is concentrated upon the future which stretches endlessly before us. And our concern is to do what has to be done to make that future one of peace and of human dignity.

Essentially, the few things that I want to say are all of them connected with a remark of Dr. Morgan's. He spoke about the centrality of this matter of national purpose. That is the factor that determines the quality and the destiny of peoples.

We are, of course, faced with external questions in Israel, as everyone in the world is. They can have a far-reaching impact upon us. But none of us in Israel has any doubt, as I am sure that none of you in your country has any doubt, that the decisive factor in the affairs of nations is their own sense of purpose, what they do to fashion their own lives. This is the factor that enables them to avoid the danger of the erosion of their will and the erosion of their liberty. This is the factor that makes it possible for them to summon up within themselves the capacity to withstand danger, to avoid the point of explosion, and to keep moving forward into the future.

And so I would like to spend a few moments trying to sum up the sense of purpose that enabled us to come into existence as a state, that has nurtured us during these last 16 years, and which I am persuaded will carry us forward through the immediate uncertainties of our future to an ultimate future of peace in our area.

The first aspect of our sense of national purpose is our feeling in Israel that we are engaged in a historic and decisive effort to assure the continued existence and creativity of the Jewish people and its civilization in free conditions. We were reminded just these last few days of the historic character of our roots in the land of Israel, what our past is, what are the values that have enabled us to survive throughout these centuries and thousands of years.

I had the privilege of spending last Friday night in Jerusalem with the President of Israel and of hearing from him that, just a few days before, one of our archeological expeditions digging in Massadah, which is the fortress where our ancestors made their last stand against the Romans before the sovereignty of our country was overrun, in those days, had found a fragment of the scroll of one of the apocryphal books, the Book of Ben Sira. Of course, they recognized the immediate significance of their find, because they could read it with almost as much fluency as they can read their daily paper, and with as much ease.

That is our past. That is the depth of our roots in our country. This is the past that we are seeking today to sustain. This is the tradition which we are seeking through our work in Israel to assure an unbroken future for all time to come.

I believe we have not yet completed this task in Israel, but I think that during these last 16 years we have fashioned many of the instruments and institutions which have given the Jewish civilization a new lease on life and a new vitality. The foundations are solid and the structure is rising fast.

The second aspect of our sense of purpose is that we recreated the State of Israel in order to provide an assured answer to the age-old problem of Jewish migration. As a result of our efforts during the last 16 years, about a million two hundred thousand Jews have come to conditions of freedom in Israel. That immigration continues. Its pace today is much smaller than in the early days of our statehood, when our immediate task was to take in the flood of Jewish immigrants from the displaced persons' camps in Europe and those who had to transfer themselves to Israel from the Arab States. However, the immigration does continue and it will continue as long as there are Jews in various parts of the world who experience the need for migration as a means of solving their individual problems as Jews and as human beings.

Our neighbors sometimes express concern on this account. They fear, they say, that if immigration to Israel continues, Israel will be forced at some time in the future to ex-

pand. At the same time, by blockade and economic hostility, our neighbors are seeking to hamper our ability to develop economically inside our own territory. They can't have it both ways. Fortunately, their economic hostility has not hindered our ability to develop our economy, although it has created unnecessary difficulties for us.

After having seen again in Israel this past week something of what has already been accomplished and after having flown just a few days ago over the empty space of the Negev between Eilat and Beersheba, I think I can reassure our neighbors.

In the first place, the dynamism that goes into our economic development in Israel is such that we have no doubt whatsoever that we can continue our rate of economic growth and make it possible for us to put our new immigrants to work gainfully in a progressive economy.

Further, the whole nature of our economic development in agriculture and in industry and in all other aspects of our economy is based on the concept of vertical economic growth. The story of economic development in Israel, as in other progressive economic societies, is to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before—and to make them grow taller. It is because of this process that we have been able successfully to absorb the large-scale immigration of our first 16 years, and we are quite convinced that by continuing that course of economic progress we will make it possible for our country, not merely to absorb any new immigration that develops in the years ahead, but to absorb it at a decent standard of living.

The third aspect of our sense of national purpose is to enlarge the horizons of self-advancement for all our people, and to do it as it can only be done, in conditions of freedom.

One of the first things that we did when we attained independence was to introduce a system of compulsory and free primary education. This is probably one of the central internal problems of Israel. We have a mixed and varied population. Half our children of schoolgoing age are the children of immigrants that came to us from advanced countries in Europe. The other half are the children of parents who came from economically backward and undeveloped countries in the Middle East and north Africa. In seeking to build a sound human basis for our national future, it is absolutely essential for us, in our view, to create conditions of real educational opportunity for all the children of our country. That is why, although it is overburdened with problems of immigrant absorption and of self-defense, the Government of Israel this year has increased its appropriations for the expansion of the educational services of the country.

But this is not just a problem of national survival, not just a problem of social health. This is being done because, in our view, the independence of states is not to be regarded as an end in itself, but merely as an instrument toward the elevation of the individual human being. He is the source of society and he is its end and its purpose.

The fourth aspect of our sense of national purpose relates to our attitude toward the problems of world order. I beg your permission to expand on this theme for just a moment or two, because it has a direct connection with our view of the middle eastern region, of which we are a part.

In the Jewish traditional view of human society, since the days of the Bible, we are told that human society and the world, the universe as a whole, are not to be viewed in monolithic terms. The Divine Genius, as we read of it in the Bible, is the genius of combining in a system of harmony and order an endless variety and diversity. The Divine Genius did not create one planet, but a myriad planets. But He held them together in an ordered pattern of harmony. And on the planet earth, He did not create one species, but a myriad species. And in the human family He also created an endless variety of types and of views. Indeed, a central aspect of the human being that He created was the ability of the human being to think in different directions and to develop in different directions. The human being has a freedom of choice and a freedom of opinion.

The concept of order in human affairs stemming from this traditional view is that it is not to be an order of standardized homogeneity. The concept of human society by which we live is not a monolithic concept. That is why, in the affairs of individual societies, we are commanded to love our neighbor as ourselves. Not because he is exactly the same as us; that would be very easy. The underlying meaning of the injunction is to love our neighbor as ourselves even though he is quite different from us. And that is the view that Jewish tradition has carried into its view of world affairs.

The prophet Micah, describing the millenium, does not say that in the day of the millenium all men will worship one God. He says something very different, that in the day of the millenium all men will live in peace and that each nation will worship its own God. That is the view of harmony and order in world affairs which stems from the tradition of my people. This is the view, as I understand it, which was proclaimed by President Kennedy in his last address to the United Nations, the view that the world order will be an order of unity in diversity, the view, as he put it, that the essential task of the United Nations is to make the world safe for diversity.

And that leads us in Israel directly into the challenge of the problems and the practical issues of the Middle East in which we live. The source of danger, of turmoil, and of trouble in the Middle East these last few years has stemmed from an attempt to impose upon our area a monolithic character, which at no time in its history has it possessed, which it does not possess today, and which it will never possess. Throughout its history, our area, the Middle East, has been an area of a diversity, of a variety of peoples, nations, and ethnic groups, a variety of languages and of faiths. It is so today. Just as on the larger world scene, at various times in history and in the history of our century, the attempt to impose a hegemony on others has led to wars and disturbances, so in the immediate past and at the present time in the Middle East, it is this same attempt which has led to disturbance and to disorder. Peace in our part of the world will come about when there is a general recognition on the part of all countries in our area that the area is diverse, that every component part of it has a legitimate right to exist, that every component part of it wants to exist so much that it can be expected to resist the attempt to dominate it or to eliminate it.

We in Israel are not an anti-Arab country, and we never will be. We recognize not just the existence of the Arab States, but the legitimacy of their existence. We are not against the development of the Arab States. We think it is right that they should seek to develop the status and the level of their peoples, just as we in Israel seek to develop and expand the horizons of opportunity for our own people. Thus, we never objected to their getting help for economic development. The real issue, however, lies elsewhere.

The issue, and the only issue, in the Middle East is that its future must rest on the doctrine of the mutual recognition by every component part of the Middle East of its neighbor's right to exist, its neighbor's legitimacy of existence. That will be the road toward order and harmony in our area. It is difficult to cling to this vision at a time when our neighbors insist that they are at war with us, when they threaten our existence and continuously increase their military preparations. But we do cling to this vision by which Israel seeks to project its policies in regard to the countries neighboring upon it.

And I would like to sum up those policies in three simple propositions which I believe everyone in this great and free country of yours will immediately recognize.

First, the vision is peace and the hearts and minds of people must always be kept wide open for peace. That is the goal. Everything we do by way of defense is barren. It is a necessity. It is not an ideal. It is something that has to be done as long as it has to be done and nobody wants to spend all these resources of men and of money on defense. We do it not because we want to do it, but because we are persuaded at certain stages that there is no other recourse. But the goal is peace, and we shall wait out the time until there is this recognition by our neighbors that the future of our area will be a future of mutual recognition and of mutual cooperation. We believe that time will come.

The second article of this policy is this. That until that day comes and while we are surrounded, as we are, by threats against our very existence, we must take those threats seriously, and not regard them lightheartedly. It isn't pleasant to be told by your neighbor that you are due for eliminatio. We think the world would do well to take those threats seriously.

None of us in Israel believes that we are going to be eliminated, because we are entirely confident of our capacity to prevent our elimination. But when we are told that we are going to be eliminated, we regard these threats, which are continued day by day and week by week, as being an expression of an intention that we must take into account. And when we see that intention being backed up by the escalation of military capacity, that creates a situation which it would be foolish for us to ignore. We appraise it not in panic—by no means in panic—but in a cold determination to make it quite certain that no one will ever be tempted to use that growing military might in order to try to implement that devilish policy.

So we have no alternative but to maintain in Israel at all times a minimum level of defensive strength which is not aimed or calculated to serve the purpose of winning a war. No sensible defense policy in any country in the world today is based on the view that this defense capacity will be used for winning a war. The purpose of defense policy in our days, the only legitimate purpose of a defense policy in a free society, is to retain the capacity at all times that will deter a war, that will avert a war, that will push off the prospect of explosion and keep on pushing it off in order to create the time to bring restraining influences to bear, to gain the time to replace fear and mistrust by a readiness for cooperation.

That is how we look at these threats and is how we look at this escalation of military strength across our border—to retain this minimum deterrent strength, whatever the cost of men and of money, and to keep on retaining it in order to enable us to realize the purpose of averting a war and averting aggression.

The people of my country believe that those forces in the world that do not want to see an explosion in the Middle East, that those forces in the world that think that it is illegitimate for anyone in our world, the world of the United Nations, to proclaim the doctrine of the inevitability of war, that those forces will understand the need for a country in the position of my country to continue to retain and sustain its defensive system in order to make a potential aggressor

think very many times before taking the final plunge.

The last article of our policy is this. There is no point in defending freedom unless one lives it. There is no point in defending freedom at the cost of eroding freedom. The purpose of all this defensive apparatus, the purpose of the retention of this capacity to avert aggression, is to enable our people to live as free men should. There is only one way in a free society of sustaining the defensive morale of people, and that is to live freedom in the very process of defending it. So for all time and in all conditions, the Government and people of Israel are concerned with the content of our lives, and the substance of our freedom. We believe from our experience, what you have shown from your experience here in America and what your very existence and accomplishment here in America teach the whole of the world, that it is only in conditions of freedom that man performs best, and that it is only in conditions of freedom that man defends well.

So we give the priority of our attention to building the national health and the national welfare, developing the character and quality of our people through health, through education and vocational guidance, through the development of the social welfare services, through the growth, the consistent and steady growth, of the economy, through doing the things that will make it possible for our children to live better than we do, to develop their capacities to a greater extent than we can. That is the heart and core, that is the purpose of the whole matter.

Because of this policy and because we are profoundly convinced that free countries everywhere share this general view and direction, because we are profoundly convinced that a policy of this kind has in the past and will in the future continue to command the understanding and support of countries, great and small, throughout the world, it is because of all this that we reject the doctrine of the inevitability of war in our area.

We are living in a twilight period, but so is the whole of the world. We are in a condition which is neither peace nor war. We believe in the capacity of freemen and free countries in the world to bide their time through this twilight period and to steer it in the direction, not of the blackness of night, but of the dawn of an era of peace and cooperation throughout the world. Out of that faith, we derive the confidence that in our part of the world, too, that is the direction that history will take, that the only inevitability about our area is an inevitability of diversity, of unity in diversity, of harmony and diversity and of peace.

Results of 1964 National Issues Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in March I mailed my 1964 National Issues Poll to the residents of the 13th District of Illinois. Tabulation of the results has been completed, and I am placing these results in the RECORD for the interest of the Members of Congress.

RESULTS OF 1964 NATIONAL ISSUES POLL

To Residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois:

It is a pleasure to send you the results of the 1964 National Issues Poll. Your cooperation and that of the 24,000 residents of the 13th District who gave the time and thought necessary to complete the questionnaire is deeply appreciated. I regret that it has been impossible to acknowledge individually all of the many questionnaires that contained additional comments.

The response to this questionnaire indicates that it has stimulated discussion and thought on the issues facing Congress. I hope and trust that you will continue to write expressing your views on the many subjects considered by the Congress and that you will call upon me if I can be of assistance in my capacity as the link between you and your Federal Government in Washington, D.C. By so doing, you will assist me in providing the type of representation that our 13th District merits and desires.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Member of Congress.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you believe that registration of firearms is a matter of Federal concern?	48.3	48.5	3.2
2. The President has submitted a $98,000,000,000 budget for 1964, providing for a planned deficit of $4,900,000,000. Should Congress—			
(a) Approve the budget as submitted?	14.6	67.2	18.2
(b) Reduce defense and military expenditures?	32.1	45.8	22.1
(c) Reduce existing Federal programs (e.g., agriculture, public works)?	58.8	23.8	17.4
(d) Cut or defer new domestic programs (e.g., mass transportation, medicare, Domestic Peace Corps, antipoverty plans)?	54.7	28.3	17.0
(e) Reduce foreign aid from the $3,000,000,000 approved for 1964?	71.6	16.7	11.7
3. Do you feel the recently signed nuclear test ban agreement has reduced world tensions?	40.7	53.6	5.7
4. Do you favor any U.S. trading with Communist bloc nations?	40.6	42.6	16.8
(a) Food, such as the recent wheat sales?	50.0	40.3	9.7
(b) Industrial and consumer goods?	30.1	56.6	13.3
5. Do you favor medical assistance for the aged through—			
(a) Present State-administered Kerr-Mills program providing hospital and medical care to needy citizens over 65?	48.1	31.4	20.5
(b) The King-Anderson bill, providing hospitalization insurance funded by social security taxes, for anyone over 65?	28.0	54.5	17.5
(c) The Bow bill, permitting tax credits up to $150 per year for costs of purchasing private health insurance?	51.8	26.7	21.5
6. Should the United States provide its NATO allies with nuclear weapons?	15.8	77.4	6.8
7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to set aside the Supreme Court decision concerning prayer and Bible reading in public schools?	51.2	44.5	4.3
8. With respect to labor legislation, do you favor—			
(a) Increasing the minimum wage to $1.50 per hour?	43.6	51.9	4.5
(b) Double time to be paid for work over 40 hours per week?	16.5	76.8	6.7
9. Would you favor U.S. financial support and encouragement of a free Cuban government-in-exile?	43.9	49.3	6.8
10. With respect to the war in Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) The present program of U.S. military advisory help and financial aid?	37.3	41.2	21.5
(b) A major military effort to defeat the Communists?	41.0	36.5	22.5
(c) Withdrawing all military personnel and permitting a neutralist government as in Laos?	25.2	50.7	24.1

J. Edgar Hoover: A Remarkable G-Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point an excellent editorial from the Peoria Journal Star citing just a few of the tremendous accomplishments of our esteemed head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover:

J. EDGAR HOOVER: A REMARKABLE G-MAN

J. Edgar Hoover, a man who wanted to be a minister, celebrates today his 40th year as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

President Johnson is urging that Hoover stay on as top man in the FBI.

We, too, hope he stays on. We extend to him today our congratulations on a remarkable performance for four decades in one of the world's toughest jobs.

His campaign against public enemies and organized crime began in the early 1920's, and never eased up. He replaced all the untrained men in his Department with lawyers and accountants, so that once the FBI got someone, they had him. He didn't slip through a legal loophole.

It would take a book to cite John Edgar Hoover's contribution to our way of life, but let us highlight a few. This is the man who:

Built the FBI into one of the most efficient and respected law enforcement agencies in the world.

Held sabotage to a minimum in this country during World War II through strict G-Man coverage of U.S. facilities.

Provided outstanding services to local and State police forces, including identifying fingerprints, providing laboratory services, and helping improve police organization, record systems, and operating procedures.

Compiled the first accurate nationwide crime statistics.

Began training of local police officials in the National Police Academy.

Began investigations of subversive persons and groups in the United States before World War II.

We salute G-Man Hoover as one of the significant men of our time in making our way of life better and safer.

J. Edgar Hoover

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a duty and a privilege to join many others across the land in their praise of that distinguished gentleman and public servant, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, now closing out 40 years of outstanding leadership as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I commend him most highly as a Government official who has directed the operations of one of the most efficient departments in the Federal Government. During his long years in office, his service has been beyond blemish. As the head of a police agency that on many occasions naturally was subject to resentment on the part of those under investigation. Not once has be conducted himself, or permitted the men under his direction to conduct themselves, in a manner that would invite public ridicule.

His department, in my opinion, is thoroughly and completely organized. Its operations are efficient, effective, and exemplary. As a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I have had closer than average acquaintance with these operations, and I can say sincerely that I am comforted by the knowledge that Mr. Hoover and the FBI are functioning.

While I praise this official as an able and dedicated department head, I also praise him for his human traits. I know of numerous occasions when children have been taken on tours of the FBI headquarters that Mr. Hoover has laid aside his busy daily routine to shake hands with them and discuss his activities. There is no better way to create respect for the Federal Government than through the eyes of children.

I cannot be too lavish in my congratulations. He is a man of patience and understanding. In my opinion, the United States has been fortunate during the last 40 years to have him as the Director of its most important policing agency. I hope he may continue as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for many years to come.

A Tribute to the Rochester Joint Board on the ACWA 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 9, was the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America by Sidney Hillman. Through the years, this organization has evolved into a highly honored and widely respected institution. It has pioneered the constructive role labor unions have taken in the economic and social growth of our Nation.

In Rochester, N.Y., a city I am proud to represent, the Amalgamated is a leader in community life. The Rochester Joint Board represents 12,000 members in Rochester and vicinity. Among its many worthwhile interests are programs to retrain workers displaced by automation, to eliminate slums and racial barriers in housing, and to strengthen cultural and educational facilities.

The Rochester Joint Board also is concerned with the health of its members and their families. In 1962, it established the Sidney Hillman Health Center to provide diagnostic medical examinations. The center is operated jointly with the manufacturers whose employees are Amalgamated members.

Under the able leadership of Abraham Chatman, Rochester's largest union has achieved such stature that the National Planning Association has studied its contractural arrangements with one of the city's major clothing firms, the Hickey Freeman Co., as a model of harmonious labor relations.

The Amalgamated has such a high reputation that employees of other Rochester industries have become encouraged to seek representation by the union. Now the union represents workers who produce such diverse items as xerographic equipment, food, buttons, cosmetics, and paper boxes.

I salute the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America on this its 50th birthday. Its sound business and social practices have been instrumental in making Rochester the major clothing market it is today. This fine organization is a credit to the many honest, hardworking Americans who comprise its ranks. I look forward to the continued growth and prosperity of this worthy institution.

This Is Murder, Mr. McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Jim G. Lucas is an on-the-spot reporter in Vietnam and he sends to his newspaper reports on what he sees and hears. Yesterday, his paper printed the most unbelievably shocking details of the deaths of two brave American airmen in Vietnam. According to Jim Lucas, the Communist Vietcong did not kill either Jerry Shank or Bob Brumett but our own obsolete American planes did and this is what he said:

> On April 9, Capt. Robert Brumett, 36, put his craft into a dive and it didn't come out. His buddies, flying nearby, saw the wings fall off and watched in horror as the plane plowed into the paddies.

And again:

> On March 24, Jerry Shank put his ship into a dive between Soc Trang and Back Lieu and its wing separated from the fuselage.

Secretary McNamara is making another one of his trips to Vietnam, which will be followed by more press conferences, but he will not report the facts about the outmoded planes he sends our men over there. So far he has done nothing to improve the deplorable situation in Vietnam. I call upon him and upon our President to give our fighting men a fighting chance.

The Country Owes Chairman Wright Patman a Debt of Gratitude for Keeping Interest Rates From Rising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting tidbit on page 2 of yesterday morning's Washington Post. It only took up about 3 inches, but its significance is much greater than its lineage indicates:

> MARTIN IN STEP: SMARTY PANTS JOHNSON AND THE AMERICAN DREAM
>
> Never underestimate the importance of those escorted strolls around the White House rose garden. Last Tuesday the President's companion for seven laps was William McChesney Martin, the redoubtable Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, a man who swings sufficient influence to nullify the effects of the tax cut by tightening credit. On Wednesday Martin told a large audience of top business executives assembled by the Advertising Council that he had changed his mind about the need for raising interest rates.

According to the Post, William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and President Johnson took seven laps around the White House rose garden last Tuesday. On the following day, Chairman Martin told a panel of the Advertising Council that the Fed was not going to push interest rates up any further at this time. Of course, Mr. Martin did not quite put it this way. He said the market was not going to push interest rates up, but since the Federal Reserve System controls the Government securities market and the total supply of bank credit, this means that the Fed is not going to push up interest rates—for the moment.

Mr. Speaker, the Post article tells only a part of the story behind Chairman Martin's decision, and I would like to take this opportunity to complete the record. This country owes a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. As in 1960, Chairman PATMAN foresaw the recent attempt to push interest rates on Government securities above the 4¼-percent limit which Congress has maintained since 1918. As in 1960, Chairman PATMAN formed an unofficial steering committee to oppose any such attempt.

More than 50 Members, including myself, joined that committee, and when the Treasury pushed its latest offering a few days ago right up to the 4¼-percent limit, Mr. PATMAN was ready.

Tighter money and higher interest rates would have choked off prosperity, increased unemployment, and saddled the American people with even higher charges on the national debt. Between 1952 and 1963 interest charges on the Federal debt rose over 45 percent, at an additional cost to the taxpayer of over

$15 billion. Excessively tight money and high interest rates have increased the cost of local government debt and consumer credit, and most important according to many competent economists, they were major factors behind the three depressions of the last decade, at an enormous cost in unemployment and lost production.

With unemployment at over 5 percent and nearly 13 percent of our plant capacity idle, we cannot afford to humor the Fed's almost psychopathic fear of inflationary tendencies—not inflation, mind you, but inflationary "tendencies," that vague cloud on the horizon, or in the eyes, of the Federal Reserve which has compelled it to tighten money and raise interest rates, even in the face of growing unemployment. We cannot afford to negate the tax cut with tight money and wipe out the benefit of Government economizing with higher interest charges on the Federal debt, simply to anticipate some possible future inflation.

I have been privileged to serve on Chairman Patman's unofficial steering committees in both 1960 and 1964, and I am proud to say that we have again successfully blocked another growing effort to raise the interest ceiling on the national debt. But we cannot rest on our laurels. The Fed shows no signs of being permanently cured of its inflationary phobia. The unofficial steering committee must continue to watch the Fed very carefully in the coming months. I would strongly suggest that more of my Democrat colleagues join this unofficial steering committee to prevent the loss of additional billions of taxpayers' dollars to higher interest rates on the national debt—billions that would only buy growing unemployment, depression, and increased consumer interest charges.

Dispelling Misapprehensions Regarding Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of quality stabilization, I was especially impressed by the testimony of Prof. William R. Davidson, of Ohio State University, in the Ohio cases of Hudson Distributors, Inc. against the Upjohn Co. and Hudson Distributors, Inc. against Eli Lilly and Co. A transcript of this testimony was recently brought to my attention. In this testimony in these cases, Professor Davidson analyzes the injury done brand name trademark owners when their products are misused by retail price cutters.

Since Professor Davidson is currently president of the American Marketing Association and a joint author, with Prof. Theodore N. Beckman, of the widely used textbook "Principles of Marketing," I believe his expert opinion in this vital economic area is of some importance.

Said Professor Davidson when asked in the proceedings of the above-mentioned cases about the impact of price cutting on trademarks:

Specifically, in these situations the brand name owner is damaged in the following ways: (1) The price cutter who accounts for a small part of total sales in the market area and provides few of the services expected of regular retail outlets, creates the false impression that his advertised low price is the value of the product at retail, thus leading customers to believe that the bulk of retail service outlets and the manufacturer through its price maintenance policy are gouging the public through unreasonably high prices; (2) this damages the good will and value of a brand name or trademark which has been appropriated to the price cutter's use; (3) these price-cutting activities prevent the average complying retailer from being able to sell the product at a profit and they must therefore (a) deemphasize the product in their merchandising and promotional strategy, offering it only upon specific demand, and shift selling effort to other items which provide fair compensations for services rendered, or (b) discontinue handling the product altogether, or (c) cut prices in retaliation and an effort to compete, breaking their own agreements with the manufacturer and creating expensive and ultimately unmanageable problems of enforcement for the manufacturer seeking to maintain control of his distribution system; (4) the likely development of retaliatory price wars further devalue the product in the minds of the public and create a hesitancy to make the purchase resulting from the consumer's thought that he may be able to buy the product cheaper elsewhere since he knows that it is subject to footballing and price warfare; (5) since well-established branded merchandise with professional consumer acceptance and known value is a most suitable weapon for advertised price cutting by cutrate organizations, this creates an animosity toward brand name products by the essential small retailer who sees in them the cause of the potential business failure he fears; (6) the price cutter, while using Upjohn's brands as bait to attract commercial traffic, actually places its selling emphasis on other competitive products that afford him a higher margin, thus using Upjohn's brand names established over a long period and at considerable expense to promote the sale of products other than those of Upjohn; (7) the services accompanying sale of Upjohn's products necessarily will diminish as profit margins narrow, thus eliminating such items as advice concerning product use, refrigeration, and care of product, all of which makes the product less desirable to the consumer; (8) by forcing Upjohn to take legal action to prevent price-cutting tactics and protect its distributive system, the price cutter further damages the good will of Upjohn by the publicity surrounding the price-cutting establishment's opposition to price maintenance, thus making it a champion of the consumer and placing the manufacturer in the role of villain.

Professor Davidson also directly takes on and dispels the erroneous notion that manufacturers are disinterested in legislation that would protect their proprietary interest in their products' brand names. This is often argued by quality stabilization opponents, but in his testimony, Professor Davidson effectively refutes this notion. Declared the Ohio State professor—whose textbook serves as the basis for advanced courses in marketing in over 200 universities:

Allegations that price cutting tactics do not injure the manufacturer stem from a failure to understand the significance of marketing services, the injury done to a manufacturer's goodwill by trading on his trademarks and trade name by means of price cutting, and the damage done from disruption of the distribution system by concentrating a product's outlays away from the local independent retailer and into the large cutrate operator. Even the standard argument that the manufacturer is compensated because the larger volume of the price cutter adds to his total distribution is fallacious. Any such gain by additional distribution is more than likely offset by lost sales in regular outlets.

Further, the damage to the manufacturer's goodwill will ultimately mark a decline in the sales by the cutrate organization even though that organization creates an initial flurry of sales by its tactics. Thus the argument that a manufacturer is not damaged because he receives the same price for his product from the price cutter as from the regular retailer misses the issue.

Naturally, the manufacturer desires to maintain his prices as low as possible to compete successfully with similar product lines of other manufacturers and increase his share of the total market for his general class of products. Further, he will be slow to raise the stipulated price in the face of rising costs once the stipulated price has become widely known to physicians, pharmacists, and the public. However, conceding that the manufacturer desires to keep his price as low as possible, it does not follow that it is desirable to the manufacturer to have prices irregularly reduced by price-cutting organizations under the motives which prompt such organizations to act.

So testified one of the Nation's foremost marketing experts regarding the deleterious effect of price-cutting tactics on established proprietary trademarks and brand names. Such brand names are judicially held to belong to their owners, and as such deserve the full protection of our laws against predatory interests which would destroy or take away such property interests. The quality stabilization bill is directed at protecting and preserving these valuable rights. That is why those of us who support this legislation deeply believe that what is at stake here goes to the very root of our free enterprise system. I commend a reading of Dr. Davidson's testimony to those who would understand better the fundamental issue involved in the effect to enact quality stabilization into law.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Slovakian Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15 the Slovak League of America, Cleveland District Assembly 2, observed the 25th anniversary of the Slovakian Declaration of Independence.

The principal address, given by Mr. Stephen B. Roman, is of interest to all of us who are working in every possible way to make the term, "free world," meaningful around the globe.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Mr. Roman's speech:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY STEPHEN B. ROMAN, K.C.S.G., AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, SUNDAY, MARCH 15, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard so many excellent speakers today that I am not going to speak in Slovak but will try to summarize some of the remarks.

I would like to, first of all, take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the opportunity to say a few words on this propitious occasion of the 25th anniversary of Slovakia's independence. My appreciation goes to the sponsors of this affair as well as to all of you people present, and to all the Slovak organizations throughout the United States and Canada for keeping the idea of Slovak independence itself in the minds and hearts of the Slovak people.

The problems that confront the world today brings into sharp focus the history of all civilized nations in their struggles for self-preservation; self-determination and self-government. The fast evolving world that we are living in, makes us, at times, forget the historical circumstances that are always so necessary to judge, from a proper perspective, ambition against rights. I mention ambition against rights because ambition looms through history, in the affairs of nations, as a temporary advantage or serves as temporary glory for the nations that are large and strong; in most instances, conquering nations interfering with the rights of peaceful and smaller nations.

That is the story of the Slovak nation since the destruction of the great Moravian empire. Since Bratislava, we have suffered; we have struggled; we have worked; we have hoped for the day when our nation can be free.

The right of Slovakia to independence was cherished however by many generations who, in one form or another, fought and sacrificed for the day when Slovakia would become free of foreign rule and enjoy equality of rights among civilized peoples. The realization of this struggle dawned on us 25 years ago when, from the chaos that shook Europe, the Slovak nation, on March 14, 1939, by unanimous vote of its parliament declared Slovakia's independence.

We gather here, today, to commemorate with all the Slovaks in the free world, this 25th anniversary of Slovakia's declaration of independence. We, American and Canadian, Slovaks were not in Slovakia when on March 14, 1939, the Slovak Parliament proclaimed Slovakia's independence, and the country of our fathers and forefathers regained, after many centuries of foreign domination, the status of an independent nation. For many of us were watching from a distance, realization of our peoples dream.

For this, as well as for other reasons, it does not become to us to pass judgment on the circumstances which allowed the Slovaks to exercise their right to self-determination, or on the policy of the Slovak Government, which could not escape the pressures of the neighboring powers and the consequences of the geography and geopolitics. As I have mentioned, the Slovaks manifested, through long centuries, their desire to be free and to develop according to their old Christian and ethnic traditions. Geography and stronger neighbors prevented, however, the Slovaks from achieving this goal. It was only in the spring of 1939 that the international situation allowed the Slovak people to apply their right of self-determination and to renew their statehood which they had lost in the 10th century.

Should we not remember the day when our nation, one of the oldest of the Slavic nations, regained its independence, just because it happened in specific international circumstances that were beyond the control of a small 4-million nation? Or, should we not remember it just because those that dominate Slovakia today are against such commemorations? No, ladies and gentlemen, we must in a positive, constructive, and vigorous way show the world that we are not against anybody else's rights; that we are not asking for anything that does not belong to us. We are, however, pursuing the hopes of any self-respecting nation that wants to be the master of its own destiny.

Today, under foreign domination, Slovaks are not asking for anything more than this application of self-determination and self-government.

For the past 150 years, under the impact of the French and American Revolutions, Europe and other continents have fundamentally been transformed in the name of political philosophy which recognizes for every people the inherent right to form a national state of its own, to be politically independent, and to shape its life and institutions in accordance with its own national purpose.

All free European nations and over 45 former colonies created their own states on the basis of this political doctrine, which President Wilson called self-determination. It appears that Slovakia has not only older civilization but has also larger territory than some 15 of those nations and a larger population than some 45 of them. Should the same right not also apply to the Slovak people? In my humble opinion, any historian that can learn from the past should advocate the right to self-determination. Self-determination for every people regardless of its territory; regardless of its population, because God gave equal rights to freedom, and happiness to every individual and to all peoples.

As we all know the human spirit revolts against discrimination. This country, today is the champion for the cause of freedom. It is championing the cause against discrimination and, as such, I am sure, although at times it appears to condone the present state of affairs in the world—is basically for freedom—for justice—and self-government of all the nations.

The world was plunged into difficulties, resulting in the cold war, because of the confused state of affairs in which some nations remained free, and the others, against their will and the violation of their God-given rights, are denied self-determination and self-government. On one hand we are today proclaiming the freedom and, on the other, condoning the tyranny and injustice.

The fact that the Slovak Republic was incorporated into Czechoslovakia in 1945, without regard for the will of the people and, in violation of basic human principles, would indicate today—that the right of the individual, the sacred right of a nation to determine its own course, to create its own destiny, is still overridden by the selfish motivations of the stronger and more ambitious nations. After World War II the Western Allies, in all good faith to create a better world, were taken in by the diabolical schemes of Communist imperialists. As we look back to the years 1944 and 1945 and ask ourselves what way the world would have progressed had we, instead of vehemently pursuing the decision of unconditional surrender, applied the basic Christian virtues of love and charity.

Today, of course, there is only one definite and sure way from the intolerable situation, and that is to apply the principles of self-determination to all people who are capable to govern themselves. We must, as free peoples, proclaim that right to self-determination and self-government, as a basic principle that we stand for; that we fight for; and that we, in necessity, must die for.

Self-governing people, in my humble opinion, in today's world must have their own way to create their regional spheres among free peoples—free nations—in order to safeguard their security and their economic prosperity. The liberation of those nations that suffer under the colonial rule of the Soviet imperialists, and the assurance and help from our side to the people that are threatened by Communist expansion in other parts of the world, is the only safe road toward the termination of the cold war, and also the sure way and the only way to prevent apocalyptic extinction which would result from the atomic warfare.

As for Slovakia, we believe that the Slovak nation, which under the protection of almighty God, survived many centuries on the territory destined for its national development should not have been robbed of its independent status and should not be prevented from exercising its right to self-determination.

We commemorate, therefore, March 14, 1939, as a historic date. The date that made the rest of the world realize that over four million Slovaks have an inherent right to be free and independent. I, for one, would not argue with anybody about Slovakia's war policy, but rather than believe the adversaries of Slovakia's independence, I trust the Slovak patriots, who sacrificed their lives for the people and we accept the opinion of the Special Committee of the American Congress which, in 1958, said:

"Even though the Slovak state was largely the result of a tense international situation, it nevertheless corresponded to the aspirations of the Slovak people for freedom and the principle of self-determination and self-government.

"It reflected a compromise between the past and the present, between an old tradition and a temporarily determined political dynamism of the self-preservation instinct of the Slovak nation."

Slovakia, one of many nations, is dominated by ruthless Communistic imperialists. We are hoping that the free world will not neglect the nations behind the Iron Curtain, and will not let the Communist oppressors destroy the Christian qualities that Slovakia and the other nations hold dearly as their tradition. Slovakia's consciousness of the evolving economic and political interdependence of the European peoples are not catering to narrow nationalism or resentment, but with other vigorous peoples of Europe are trying to forget the past, and build the future for a better. stronger, more just Europe—and the world.

American and Canadian Slovaks hopes of freedom for the country of our origin are, however, not based on any form of government or ideology, past or present, in Slovakia. We appeal to the free world for justice and independence for Slovakia because we believe in the eternal valadity of the famous words of the American Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This, ladies and gentlemen, is all we are asking for—for Slovakia.

Business, Government Are Partners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Chronicle, May 3, 1964:

BUSINESS, GOVERNMENT ARE PARTNERS

President Johnson probably won no convert votes last week, talking to delegates of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington. Judging from their enthusiastic reaction throughout his speech, neither did he make any enemies.

The President showed he was aware he was in the camp of his traditional opponents. He began: "I suppose it might not be entirely accurate to greet you as 'my fellow Democrats'."

He concluded with a quip: "I must get back to your work in the White House and leave you to go to work on me."

What the President said, and the friendly way he managed to say it—plus what he has accomplished—makes an important point. Business and Government are not "inherently hostile opponents," but basic partners in the larger enterprise of this Nation's progress.

Are Commissaries the Next Military Fringe Benefit To Get the Ax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am deeply concerned with the degradation of incentives for pursuit of a military career. The traditional hospital privileges for retired personnel have always been inducement for a man to make a career of the service. Now those benefits are in danger.

The Comptroller General has recently joined in what appears to be a massive campaign to remove all fringe benefits, and has rendered a savage attack upon military commissaries.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial entitled "Pay First—Commissaries Next," which appeared in the May 2 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register. I urge my colleagues to read it.

The editorial follows:

PAY FIRST—COMMISSARIES NEXT

There should be no surprise at the Comptroller General's savage attack upon military commissaries. He made the study at the behest of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, a long-time enemy of the commissary and chairman of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee.

It would have been strange, indeed, if the General Accounting Office's staff of accountants had taken into consideration the human values of the commissary system, the fact that for generations they have been operated for the benefit and convenience of Service families, and that every pay study ever conducted has taken this fringe benefit into view in setting proposed pay rates.

At Senator DOUGLAS' request, the latest report of the Comptroller General's military experts was not submitted to the Defense Department or to any uniformed military people for comments. This will likely come later when Senator DOUGLAS hails Pentagon leaders before his committee.

There is nothing strange or shady about the commissary system. Many civilian firms afford parallel privileges for their employees, and for the same reason—morale. Operators of most department stores and big retail establishments give their employees the privilege of buying at rates much lower than commissaries, at discounts up to 40 percent, again for the same reason—morale.

In the armed services, the commissary privilege is a particularly vital factor in morale for it is one that is of primary concern to the wife and family. If the wife has to travel long distances to civilian stores, or pay high prices for food or provisions, she is unhappy, and if the wife is unhappy, the man in uniform can not do his best job and will be more ready to separate from the service.

On the other hand, the commissary performs a distinct service for the American manufacturer, particularly overseas. This is so, because the commissary stocks the best known and most wanted American brands and thus keeps the military housewife constantly sold on these products even though she may be far from home.

The Comptroller General did touch briefly on the morale problem near the end of his report. He said that the commissary system has become "as a practical matter, a part of the pay structure for military personnel." He even suggested naively that "any inadequacy of pay and allowances to military personnel should be brought to the attention of the Congress as a matter to be decided on its merits, apart from the need for commissary stores."

It could be that the Comptroller General doesn't know (1) that service pay already lags well behind that of civilian government scales and in business life and that (2) Congress has so far refused even to consider the miserly 3 percent and 2.4 percent increases asked by the President and the Defense Department.

If military pay should be readjusted to levels comparable with those of others in government and with civilian life, then, and only then, should a curtailment of commissaries be considered. Until such a time we trust Secretary of Defense McNamara will oppose any such movement with all his powers of force and persuasion.

A Candle in the District's of Columbia's Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the welter of controversy over local government and school management in the District of Columbia, there are many among us who curse the darkness—others who light candles. I am proud today to direct attention of House Members to the efforts of a young teacher from San Diego, Calif.

Lorraine Goldman, still in her early twenties, is a daughter of the veteran San Diego newsman and broadcaster, Harold Keen. Upon coming here with her husband, Don, Mrs. Goldman took a teaching job at Dunbar High School, which lies within a short walk of the Capitol. The conditions she found there, and some of the tasks she undertook to better them, were movingly described in a recent network radio commentary by ABC's Edward P. Morgan, as follows:

"EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS"

(Sponsored by the AFL–CIO on the American Broadcasting Co. radio network, May 5, 1964)

The District of Columbia has been subjected by an arrogant Congress to the humiliation of taxation without representation for generations. The fact that this year for tor the first time District of Columbia residents can vote for President and that today in primary elections both parties have picked their delegates to the national conventions and other officers cannot hide the monstrously larger fact that the Capital of the so-called free world denies its citizens that fundamental right of an open society—the ballot.

Some day this odious situation will be corrected and Washington will have an elected government of its own. Meanwhile this travetsy on democracy is made a little less intolerable by the stubborn courage and marvelous ingenuity of individual people. During National Library Week recently I reported on the shocking conditions of libraries in Washington public schools. Indeed in elementary schools they virtually do not exist. But at Dunbar High, a school in the middle of a poverty-plagued Negro ghetto not far from Congress' newest and most hidious multimillion-dollar office building, things are different. And thereby hangs a tale in which a transplanted teacher from California is the heroine.

When Don and Lorraine Goldman moved to Washington 2 years ago they were stunned by the fact that they had become voteless, that Congress, busy dipping into the pork barrel for home consumption, was frequently downright hostile to the basic educational and other desperate needs of the Nation's Capital. Lorraine Goldman took a position teaching 11th and 12th grade English at Dunbar where the grim faculty joke is that English is a foreign language because so many of the students come from deprived homes with illiterate parents and with whom a book is an alien, useless thing not numbered among the spare household goods.

Enter Mrs. Goldman, young and freshly filled with a logical naivete of enthusiasm stemming from a fine university education. What a rude awakening to an idealist to be confronted with student attitudes about learning ranging from indifference to outright refusal. But gradually an idea began to jell in Mrs. Goldman's mind. She had visited a book display in Washington at which several leading publishers were showing their latest paperback wares. Teachers were invited to take a free armload back to the classroom for trial. The paperback, need it be said, has come a long way culturally since its first girlie-cover days. What, Mrs. Goldman wondered, if she could acquire an attractive selection of paperbacks, keep them handy near her desk, and gradually cajole reluctant teenagers to read?

She and her husband didn't ring up the number of man-hours—and woman-hours—it took them to corral nearly a thousand books but months of letterwriting toil did it. Many came from publishers, gratis. Many more came from a benevolent book dealer friend of the Goldmans in San Diego, Calif. The most surprising source was the children themselves.

"The way this worked," reports a proud Don Goldman, "was beautiful—a result of sheer ingenuity and pure Madison Avenue. She set up a paperback book reading club in her classroom, after shrewdly requiring the reading of a certain number of books per semester for a passing grade. To check out a classroom paperback, whether for required reading or—God willing—for mere enjoyment, a student had to pay a dime rent per book or purchase a suitable paperback

to add to the library. If a boy or girl did the latter, he or she would be entitled to borrow books for the rest of the year free of charge."

But the hardest job of all was to sell kids the idea of reading anything. Mrs. Goldman, "like a midway barker," by her husband's testimony, "kept chipping away at her customers, enticing, threatening, reasoning. At the merest hint a child was weakening she would drag him to her colorful supermarket counter and apply the tour-de-force, her personal appeal. Sometimes she would give the rental dimes to a particularly stubborn nonreader and ask him to help her select a new purchase." Lists of new titles and students' reading records were posted and though they may not have been followed like the major league standings, some children actually began to read.

This has been going on now more than 6 months. No miracles have been wrought, no educational revolutions won but a beginning handful of youngsters has found something unexpected and worthwhile to enrich their lives—lives which had never known books before in poor, overcrowded homes, in overcrowded, understaffed and ill-equipped schools. Exciting little things have happened: The realization of a Negro child, after reading the "Diary of Anne Frank," that others have suffered the brutality of discrimination; the emerging pride in discovering the existence of Negro authors; the strange new job of simply learning to read. The revelation to a Washington slum child that someone else—who doesn't even know him—actually cares, this is a big achievement in itself. "That bookman in San Diego must really like us a lot," one student told Mrs. Goldman.

Who knows when Congress, in its wisdom, will end Washington's colonial status and endow it with the resources of self-government? Meanwhile the Goldmans, in the tradition of great teaching, have begun fortifying the neglected structure of democracy with the resources closest to hand—themselves and their fellow human beings.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Morgan's splendid script I would add only two names. That bookman in San Diego who has contributed so abundantly to the lives of young people a continent away is Art Jacobs. Greatly helping, too, was Mrs. Goldman's mother, Ruth Keen, who devoted long hours at home to binding those paperbacks for the intensive use they will get in a high school library.

The Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Orange County Evening News, entitled "The Real Issue," sheds a great deal of light on the basic arguments involved in current debate on whether or not Congress should override the Supreme Court's decision on prayers and Bible reading.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the RECORD of today's proceedings:

[From the Orange County Evening News, May 8, 1964]

THE REAL ISSUE

Early Christians were accused of atheism, anarchy, licentiousness, and cannibalism. These accusations caused them no end of trouble and were often used as grounds for brutal persecution.

Roman followers of Jesus were charged with being atheists because they rejected the old Roman gods. Suspicion of anarchism came from the fact that they refused the patriotic and religious act of sacrificing to the emperor. Gossip of licentiousness was spread by smirking neighbors because they held their meetings in the evening in private homes.

And cannibalism? This, the weirdest charge of all, was evidently a deliberate or mistaken interpretation of what went on in Christian worship services. It was based on the words in the Lord's Supper: "* * * body * * * take, eat * * * blood * * * drink * * *."

Of course, Christians could have explained away these charges to any openminded person willing to give a fair hearing. Unfortunately, for the Christians, there were too many ready to accept judgments based on snatches of their ritual, bits and pieces of their customs and practices.

Adhering to a religion that suffered so much from misunderstanding and hasty judgments in its first centuries, Christians today should be the most patient with others * * * the most desirous of trying to get the whole picture before coming to a conclusion.

It is evident, though, there are instances in the present school prayer controversy where this is not the case. A prime example is Representative FRANK J. BECKER, leading advocate of a constitutional amendment. He says, "My resolution is designed to make it constitutional to refer to and rely upon Almighty God in all matters related to our existence. Such a constitutional amendment would preserve inviolate the right to sing in a schoolhouse every stanza of our national anthem."

This gives the impression the Supreme Court has banned reference to God and forbade use of a part of the national anthem. If that is what Congressman BECKER believes, he can cling to that belief only by refusing to read or credit the clear words of the Supreme Court itself. In the key 1962 ruling which prohibited governments from composing or selecting prayers for classroom devotional use, the Court says, "There is, of course, nothing in the decision reached here that is inconsistent with the fact that schoolchildren and others are officially encouraged to express love for our country by reciting historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence, which contain references to the Deity or by singing officially espoused anthems which include the composer's professions of faith in a Supreme Being, or with the fact that there are many manifestations in our public life of belief in God."

Last year, the Supreme Court declared, "One's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization." With this in mind, the opinion made it plain that Bible study in schools is constitutional.

Discussions in Washington, D.C., and across the Nation should not be lost in the smoke of what the Court never said. The issue should be what it did say. It did say that Government-sponsored group devotions in schools were unconstitutional. It said that schools should not be put in the position of holding and determining the nature of worship services for pupils. In a phrase, it opposed a trend toward "socialized religion."

One wonders, if BECKER had been an ancient Roman magistrate considering charges of cannibalism against Christians rather than a modern U.S. Congressman reacting to snatches of Supreme Court rulings, how patiently he would have investigated the matter. Thousands of Christians were burned by widespread misunderstandings.

Independence Day of Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Kingdom of Laos celebrated the 17th anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, we take pleasure in extending warm felicitations to His Majesty King Sri Savang Vatthana; His Excellency the Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma; and His Excellency the Lao Ambassador to the United States, Prince Khampan.

On May 11, 1947, Laos became a self-governing country, free of colonialism. It resumed independence under a constitution written by the National Constituent Assembly. The ancient kingdom of the million elephants was reestablished under King Sisavang Vong, and took its place as one of the best known countries in Asia.

Since 1947 the Laotian people have known many years of suffering. Their land has been the scene of almost constant warfare. The ideological struggle of foreign nations has entered their quiet kingdom and disturbed the peace they hoped to find in independence.

But nevertheless the gentle people of Laos, displaying amazing courage and skill, have improved their country significantly. Education is rapidly reaching every village. Some industry is developing and the traditional crops of rice, cotton, tobacco, and so forth are being grown in constantly increasing quantities. Through independence the people of Laos are gradually bringing their nation into a more modern age.

Every year since 1947 the people of Laos and the United States have developed closer relationships. It has been the strong hope of the American people to see an independent Laos making peaceful progress. We have been most happy to aid Laos every way we can. Many Laotians are in the United States now visiting and going to school. And many Americans are in Laos doing whatever they can to help a deserving people preserve and improve their freedom.

There are forces at work which seek to destroy the independence of Laos. The men directing this attack would remove the ancient Buddhist religion of the people. They would destroy the cultural and social characteristics that have distinguished Laos for centuries. It is the struggle of the Laotian people against these men which has been the greatest drawback to independence for 15 years.

As we look around the world we can see many countries where independence day is no longer freely celebrated. To

desire independence in those countries is to revolt against the international empire of Soviet Russia. We are gratified that Laos is able to celebrate its independence day this May 11. Let us hope that many more May 11's will come and go in Laos with freedom and happy celebrations.

On May 11 the people of the United States honor Laos, a gallant nation, and send our words of hope for freedom and peaceful resolution of conflicts. In the words of the Master Buddha Sakyamuni spoken 2,500 years ago:

The middle course is the course in which eyes will be opened and intelligence enlightened. It leads to peace, lucidity and serenity.

Civil Rights Bill—Titles VII–XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of those of my colleagues who might have missed them the last two New York Times editorials regarding the civil rights bill. These editorials were published on May 8 and 9. I believe that the New York Times deserves commendation for the thoughtful and incisive series of editorials on the individual titles of the bill. This series is a much needed contribution to the debate on the civil rights bill.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL—V

The disadvantage suffered by the average Negro in this country because of the color of his skin is nowhere more burdensome than in the area of job opportunity. The unemployment rate is twice as high among Negroes as among whites; median family income is about half as much.

This is a national, not a southern, problem. Commonly in the North, as in the South, Negroes are confined to menial jobs. Throughout the country, large locals of some major unions that control access to skilled employment will not admit Negroes. We need look no further than the disgraceful behavior of a plumbers' local in New York for an example.

Title 7 of the civil rights bill now before the Senate is an ambitious proposal for a national attack on discrimination in employment. It prohibits racial or religious discrimination by companies with 25 or more employees and unions with 25 or more members, after a 4-year transitional period.

To enforce its provisions, this title creates an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which would investigate complaints of discrimination and could sue in the Federal courts if persuasion failed. The misrepresentations by opponents of the civil rights legislation are at their wildest in discussion of this title. It would not, as has been suggested, require anyone to establish racial quotas; to the contrary, such quotas would be forbidden as a racial test. The bill does not require employers or unions to drop any standard for hiring or promotion or membership—except the discriminatory standard of race or religion.

It must be candidly recognized that title 7 would not overnight wipe out inequality of job opportunities for Negroes. This is a large and diverse country, and one Commission in Washington cannot effectively check the hiring practices of every company. The probability is that the greatest effect of a new Federal fair employment statute would lie in the mere fact of its passage by Congress: A standard would thereby be set for the great majority of management and union leaders who want to do justice and obey the law.

What is important is that the enforcement method provided be strong and clear enough to constitute a meaningful warning.

The millennium will not arrive if title 7 is enacted. But there must be a beginning; and it is surely time for a Federal undertaking to end an injustice that is damaging the American economy and, more important, imposing misery and frustration on Americans for no other reason than their color.

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL—VI

The last four titles of the pending civil rights bill, whose other major provisions we have already discussed in this series of editorials, logically round out the Federal Government's role in protecting equality under law.

Title 8 is designed to provide information in an area where it is curiously inadequate, the statistics of registration and voting. The Census Bureau would be directed to determine the numbers of persons eligible to vote, by race, in States designated by the Civil Rights Commission. Those will undoubtedly be the handful of States in the Deep South where intimidation and gross defiance of law now keep citizens from the polls because of their color. It is plain that the country should have accurate information on the extent of such denials of the franchise.

Title 9 addresses itself to the sadly common situation of State criminal trials in which defendants have reason to fear they will be denied justice because of their race. Federal law has long allowed defendants to remove their cases to the Federal courts where they can make a showing of jeopardy to their civil rights in State tribunals. But lower Federal judges often send the cases back to the State courts, and these decisions to remand have been held unappealable. Title 9 allows defendants to appeal such orders.

Conciliation is the noncontroversial objective of title 10, which would set up a new Community Relations Service in the Commerce Department to mediate racial disputes. The one mystery is why the service would be limited to seven permanent employees. This is a ceiling that the Senate would do well to remove.

The final section, title 11, makes sure that the measure would not repeal existing Federal or State law against racial discrimination. And it contains the usual clause to protect the act's constitutionality—as to which we entertain no doubts. Nor are we in doubt about the desirability of speedy passage of the entire bill.

True Story of the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of this House to the May 19 issue of the U.S. News & World Report which carries yet another disturbing story about the conduct of the war in South Vietnam.

This firsthand report places much of the blame for the failure to destroy the Vietcong to an attitude prevalent presumably among many of the Vietnamese military officers who apparently prefer to enjoy the blessings of the $2 million a day flow of American aid to fighting the Vietcong, and who are, therefore, less than enthusiastic about eliminating the Communist menace which stimulates such aid. Consequently, the question is raised as to whether the American investment in South Vietnam is being so handled as to discourage the South Vietnamese from effectively responding to Communist aggression and subversion.

Similar disquieting reports have been persistently appearing. For example, it has been recently alleged that our military personnel have been supplied with defective and wornout equipment. Certainly, regardless of what policy the Government adopts to meet the Communist aggression in South Vietnam, in view of the steadily growing list of American casualties, I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, find it is most difficult to understand why our country has not provided our American personnel with effective fighting equipment.

The deepening concern of many Americans over the situation there has reached the point, I believe, that the repeated trips of Secretary McNamara and General Taylor to Saigon, because of the lack of substantial results, are no longer a sign of encouragement, but of embarrassment.

The time is long overdue for the American people to be given a full accounting of U.S. policy in South Vietnam, for it is clear that if we do not vigorously and decisively defeat Communist aggression in South Vietnam and rally the southeast Asian peoples' confidence and respect for the free world, the Communist Chinese will be greatly encouraged and we will be faced with a much greater military threat in that area. It is now abundantly clear that success in South Vietnam and southeast Asia cannot be achieved through a never-ending series of halfway measures. Either we are committed to defeat Communist aggression or we are not. Only an all-out effort by both this country and the South Vietnamese will be effective. It would be better that we were not there at all than to be there and to fail in our mission.

The article follows:

TRUE STORY OF WAR IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—Go out to the frontlines, in the jungles of South Vietnam, and you get a view of the war that Secretary McNamara and other high Washington officials do not see. One American writer did that, Robert L. Moore, Jr., lived 4 months with United States and Vietnamese soldiers, went on combat missions with them. What this writer saw raises important questions about the way that war is being fought. He found incompetence, cowardice, graft—and no will to win—among many of the Vietnamese officers and public officials directing war operations. In this report, he tells why he thinks the war will not be won until the United States takes over control.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"In his trips to South Vietnam, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was never exposed to the hard,

unpleasant facts facing those Americans who are actually fighting the war against the Communist Vietcong."

These words were written by an American who has spent 4 months living in the field with the United States and Vietnamese fighting forces—actually going with them into combat.

From firsthand experience, this on-the-spot American observer has reached these conclusions:

"The basic problem that America faces in Vietnam is not that of defeating the Vietcong Communists. That could be done in a year or less.

"Our problem is to be allowed to win—to be permitted by our Vietnamese allies to prosecute this war aggressively and end it. This does not necessarily have to involve bringing U.S. battle groups into Vietnam to fight the war. Vietnam has the soldiers and equipment to win.

"But, as U.S. advisers in the field say privately: The war can't be won under the present ground rules because of the inability of most Vietnamese military leaders to lead."

The American who wrote these conclusions is Robert L. Moore, Jr., from Boston, Mass. He was an Air Force nose gunner in World War II. After graduation from Harvard in 1949, he worked in television and in public relations and then turned to writing. His output includes two books.

Last year Mr. Moore got the consent of the Department of the Army to live among the U.S. Special Forces in South Vietnam to gather material for a book about them. In preparation, he took parachute training at Fort Benning, Ga., went through Special Warfare School at Fort Bragg, N.C.

Now, after 4 months in Vietnam, Mr. Moore is returning to write at length about what he has observed there. But he feels that some of his findings are so important and so timely that they should be published quickly. So he has given U.S. News & World Report permission to quote from the first draft of one article that he is preparing.

The story that Mr. Moore tells is a story of a war that Secretary McNamara has not seen. Mr. Moore says:

"Many U.S. fighting men expressed disappointment that the Secretary did not visit American units in daily combat with the Vietcong and find out at first hand from his soldiers what their problems are.

"The U.S. high command in Saigon does not encourage its men to pass their problems along to the Pentagon Chief."

Following, from Mr. Moore's report, are some of those problems that Americans face in Vietnam.

LACKING: A WILL TO WIN

One major problem is the attitude of the Vietnamese. Mr. Moore says:

"The will to fight, endure privations and win is just not in the majority of the Vietnamese military officers."

Mr. Moore questions whether some of the high officials and military officers of that country really want to see the war end. Why? He writes this:

"Never before have so many Vietnamese officers and public officials lived so well in such a booming economy—injected as it is with a daily dose of almost $2 million of American money.

"It is obvious to the Vietnamese who are benefiting from this dole that when the war is over this massive aid will cease, or at least be drastically modified."

ADVISERS IN COMBAT

The official role of U.S. Army Special Forces in Vietnam is that of advisers to Vietnamese combat forces. But Mr. Moore reports that these so-called "advisers" have suffered more than half the U.S. combat casualties, although they make up only about 6 percent of the total U.S. force in Vietnam.

Here, from Mr. Moore's account, is how the U.S. Special Forces actually operate:

"The basic Special Forces combat unit—technically referred to as an 'advisory' unit—is a 12-man team known as an A team. There are 42 such units, directed and supported by four B teams, located in the four military-corps areas of South Vietnam, with a headquarters unit known as the Special Forces Operating Base in Saigon.

"Each A team is strategically situated in an area dominated by the Communists. Anywhere from 300 to 600 Vietnamese civilians—trained by the Special Forces—are quartered in an A-team camp and are used to reconnoiter Vietcong positions and raid their concentrations.

"Also in each camp there is a Vietnamese Special Forces A team which, in theory, parallels the American team in capabilities, composition, and organization—that is: two officers and 10 enlisted men."

Actually, however, Mr. Moore finds a great difference between the United States and Vietnamese "Special Forces."

OFFICERS PICKED BY POLITICS

Mr. Moore gives this description of the Vietnamese Special Forces—and of how they are selected: "The Vietnamese Special Forces—or Luc-Luong Dac-Biet, to use the Vietnamese designation—were primarily a unit of political troops organized under the regime of the late President, Ngo Dinh Diem, to serve as the President's private police and riot squad.

"Coveted positions in this elite group were given out as political favors to the sons of friends and supporters of President Diem and his family. To give the group status and equip it with the finest U.S. military hardware, Diem alined his Special Forces with U.S. Special Forces—thus saddling the Americans with Vietnamese teams made up of youths who had no taste for combat and whose only training was as palace guards.

"To make things worse, instead of the Vietnamese going out to learn from their highly trained American counterparts, the Vietnamese team captain was made camp commander over the experienced American, who can only advise.

"Despite the two recent coups, each supposedly dedicated to a more aggressive war effort, the character of the Vietnamese Special Forces seems to be changing all too slowly. Vietnamese officers move into and out of jail as power changes hands, but their overall quality still stands at a dismally low level."

LUXURY IN MIDST OF WAR

You get this description of how officers of the Vietnamese Special Forces live in the midst of a war:

"Most of the officers have a batman to serve them tea in bed in the mornings. Frequently they refuse to see their American counterpart, particularly if they think he is going to goad them into a combat operation. When they do go out on operations, the officers make their men carry all their equipment. Americans carry their own gear.

"Many 35 or 40-year-old lieutenants and captains—whose lack of political connections accounts for their lack of promotions—are sent to some of the most dangerous areas where the majority of Vietnamese officers refused to be posted.

"With increasing effort by the Vietnamese Government to make the Army more effective, it is usually possible now for a U.S. Special Forces A-team captain to have his Vietnamese counterpart relieved from command. Unfortunately, such officers are merely transferred as camp commander to another Special Forces team in another corps area to begin anew the same cycle of embezzlement of U.S.-supplied funds and deterioration of fighting efficiency."

COWARDICE AND LAZINESS

Mr. Moore tells of the difficulties often encountered in trying to get Vietnamese officers to go out and fight the enemy: "I participated in six combat operations throughout the four corps areas and the pattern never deviated. As soon as it was ascertained that a Vietnamese patrol was closing in on a Vietcong concentration, antinoise discipline disintegrated. Shots were accidentally fired and canteens rattled to let the enemy know that he was being pursued.

"When, in spite of these precautions, the Vietcong appeared ready to dig in and fight, the Vietnamese commander inevitably came up with some excuse for pulling back.

"One excuse for turning from the enemy particularly sticks in my mind. It was uttered by a Vietnamese officer in Tay Ninh Province. We had to ford a river to get at what we judged to be a platoon of Vietcong on the other side. We had a full company. The two American advisers were exuberant at the opportunity of engaging a Vietcong unit. But the Vietnamese officer turned to the Americans and said his men could not cross the river because there were too many alligators in it.

"There are, of course, exceptions to the general rule of cowardice and laziness in the Vietnamese Special Forces.

"I spent some time in the camp of a U.S. Special Forces officer who had nothing but praise for his former counterpart, a Vietnamese lieutenant in his early thirties. This Vietnamese officer was an aggressive fighting man, able to inspire great courage and loyalty among the civilian defense troops.

"The American officer wrote a letter of commendation for the Vietnamese officer, recommending that he be given a promotion to captain. Two weeks later the lieutenant was transferred to Saigon and replaced by a more typical Vietnamese officer—a 22-year-old anti-American captain who has failed to go out on a single operation to date.

"U.S. Special Forces men can hardly be blamed for their bitterness toward the Vietnamese officers who make a difficult job almost impossible."

GRAFT AND CORRUPTION

Among the things that make American soldiers angry are the graft and corruption that are widespread in Vietnam—even in combat areas. Mr. Moore cites a few examples. Here is one:

"In April I visited several camps where Vietnamese camp commanders had under them 200 or 300 Montagnard troops. Montagnards are mountain tribesmen who are the best fighting men in the Vietnamese Army. But the Vietnamese despise the darker-skinned and coarser-featured Montagnards. These Vietnamese camp commanders made the lives of their Montagnard men so miserable by degrading punishment and cutting down on their food that desertions soared.

"The camp commanders failed to report the desserters until after payday. They collected from the Americans the pay for the entire camp roster, indicating on the payroll that all the deserters had been paid while in actuality the commanders kept the deserters' pay for themselves.

"Yet if Americans object too strenuously to such things they are severely reprimanded for not being cooperative with their Vietnamese counterparts."

Another example:

"On patrols, one Vietnamese commander made his Montagnards hunt deer instead of Vietcong. The commander drove out on the patrols in a weapons carrier. After several days during which he ate heartily while refusing to give the troops any of the meat they provided, the commander drove his load of deer carcasses into town and sold them. This same camp commander had just tried to jail the interpreter who had told the American captain that the commander had pocketed the pay of almost 100 deserters.

"Such stories are so common that Americans begin to take it for granted that they are expected to put up with Vietnamese graft and cowardice as part of their job.

"One U.S. sergeant told me ruefully: 'They took $1,700 out of my pay for taxes last year,

and I have to keep my mouth shut and see it wasted over here.' "

Mr. Moore reports: "There is little confidence among Americans working at the combat level that corruption will be significantly diminished by the announcement of Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, the new South Vietnam leader, that he will jail embezzlers of up to $1,000 and shoot anyone who steals more than that."

REDTAPE AND DELAY

Mr. Moore says: "The biggest single fault in the Vietnamese military system is its chronic inability to react quickly." He cites "a heartbreaking example":

On March 26, two Americans were reported overdue and presumed down on a flight over a jungle area. Vietnamese rangers were asked to join the ground search.

It took 2 days just to get permission—first from a Vietnamese general and then from the district and provincial political chiefs.

Ranger officers then refused to move until they got reserves to stand by in their absence—and a special round of field rations. This cost 3 more days of delay.

On April 1, the rangers finally were flown to a camp from which they were to start a search. Then came word that a new Vietnamese commander was arriving the next day for an inspection—and the rangers had to provide an honor guard.

It was April 3—8 days after the plane went down—when the search finally got underway.

HOW TO HANDLE SNIPERS: "WITHDRAW"

Here is an example, cited by Mr. Moore, of how Vietnamese can turn U.S. military tactics into tactics of retreat: "If the Secretary of Defense really wants to see at firsthand some of the reasons we cannot win this war in Vietnam without some policy changes, he should spend a week at one of the Special Forces B teams. They are truly microcosms of the entire war. Most of our basic frustrations and quandaries are reflected in a B team's daily incidents.

"At one B team I found the operations officer laughing wryly over the translation of a recent directive. Vietcong snipers picking off a few men were routing whole companies and battalions. U.S. advisers showed the Vietnamese how to dispatch squads to kill or drive off the snipers. The Americans were pleased when a directive on their methods of dealing with snipers went out from corps headquarters.

"A few weeks later, however, the tactical genius of the Vietnamese military mind came forth in a new communique. It instructed units coming under Vietcong sniper fire to withdraw—leaving ambushes in case the sniper charged."

U.S. EQUIPMENT WASTED

Here is another problem reported by Mr. Moore, from his own observations:

"Secretary McNamara talks about sending more supplies and equipment to help the Vietnamese win their war against communism. This is fine, except that by and large the Vietnamese have no concept of maintenance, much less preventive maintenance. Unless Americans are maintaining the equipment here it quickly deteriorates from sheer lack of care—and then the Vietnamese ask for more."

RESCUE—OR FLIGHT?

Vietnamese pilots were taught to fly U.S. helicopters, then eight helicopters were turned over to them. The Vietnamese painted parts of the helicopters yellow—the color of their flag. Then the Vietnamese took over the flying of rescue flights to evacuate Vietnamese wounded from jungle combat areas.

Mr. Moore tells how this worked out.

"I had heard so many stories about the Vietnamese pilots' flying over the evacuation site at 5,000 feet, well out of range of ground fire, and then flying back without even trying to pick up the wounded that I decided to go along on an all-Vietnamese evacuation flight.

"For 15 minutes the chopper pilots circled the clearing. Finally the chopper in which I was riding descended almost into the clearing. Then it popped up into the air like a cork released under water. The crew chief examined the fuselage for bullet holes. There were none. So the chopper started to drop in again. Lower and lower we hovered. I saw a wounded man, smiling, being helped toward the helicopter. Then suddenly the helicopter began to rise again. The last thing I saw was a sudden hopeless expression wipe out the game smile on the wounded man's face. Vietcong ground fire had apparently frightened the Vietnamese pilot off, although he later told me he was afraid the clearing was too small and the rotor blades would hit the trees—this after he was already less than a foot from the ground."

"Over and over again," Mr. Moore says, "U.S. advisers reported the terrible fall in morale among the Vietnamese troops when they realized that their own pilots were afraid to come down in Vietcong-invested jungles to pick up the wounded. The ground troops automatically gave up hope when they saw the yellow streak on the choppers high above."

WHY VILLAGERS DESERT

Vietnamese strategy is to clear an area of Vietcong Communist forces—and then try to hold that area while clearing other areas. But Mr. Moore reports:

"So far, holding operations by the Vietnamese alone have not been successful."

One instance is cited where Americans trained thousands of mountain tribesmen, cleared the area. Then the camp was turned over to the Vietnamese. Result: "Less than 2 months after the Americans pulled out, the Vietcong attacked, drove the Vietnamese out of the fort and destroyed it." Another example:

"In a program to get the Montagnards away from the Vietcong—preventing them from feeding the Communists or joining them, either willingly or by impressment—the tribesmen were taken from their villages in the mountains and brought into new villages built around forts garrisoned by Vietnamese troops. But the Vietnamese troops refuse to leave their forts after dark. So the Vietcong come into the villages at about 6 p.m. and stay the night, giving political orientations, eating, imposing taxes, and punishing villagers suspected of cooperating with the Government. In the morning, the Vietcong leave and the Vietnamese troops take over until evening.

"Until the Vietnamese muster the courage to go out at night and patrol the areas they are supposed to be securing, the entire 'clear and hold' concept is a joke.

"With no protection at night, the villagers know that death and torture will be their lot if they cooperate with the Government. Hundreds of tribesmen are moving back into the hills. As long as they are going to be dominated by the Vietcong anyway, they prefer to be in their own home mountains. And then, of course, they are turned into hardcore Communists when the Vietnamese Air Force bombs and strafes their villages because they deserted their Government hamlets to go back to Vietcong territory."

SOLUTION: U.S. CONTROL

After watching the war in Vietnam for 4 months, this American writer has reached this overall conclusion:

"Until the Vietnamese military develops the will to win and the courage to face the enemy unflinchingly by day or by night, even if outnumbered, the war against communism in Vietnam will not be won—no matter if we pour in $3 or $4 or $5 million a day in aid.

"The only realistic solution that most Americans see in Vietnam is for the United States to take operational control of the war away from the luxury-loving, coup d'etat-minded, casualty-fearing Vietnamese officer corps until such time as they can develop the leadership necessary to win the war. If we do not take operational control, we merely waste lives and money in a hopeless stalemate."

As Brave Men Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the House meets today in all probability an American boy will die in South Vietnam. It is likely he will be plunged to death in a piece of obsolete equipment fighting a war that is not a war. In those last agonizing moments he may wonder why he is fighting in South Vietnam and why he is dying.

For all those brave young Americans who have already died there, we in Congress must find the answers. We must demand to know why our boys are being sent into battle with old and wornout equipment. We must demand of the administration that we win the war there or get out. To pursue our present policy is to condemn to death more young Americans.

In the Washington Daily News of Monday, May 11, there is a story of the tragedy in South Vietnam written by a correspondent on the ground there, Jim G. Lucas. The News also had an editorial on the Lucas article, "Brave Men Betrayed." I would like to include both these items as a part of these remarks.

I would also like to ask at this time, in the name of the families of Capt. Jerry Shank, Robert N. Brumet, and all the others who have been killed in this Communist inspired war, Mr. President, do we want to win the war in South Vietnam? Why haven't our fighting men been given proper equipment? Is this a political war, Mr. President, that will be called off after the election next November? The people have a right to know and they haven't been told the facts about South Vietnam. What is your answer to the Lucas article, Mr. President?

The two items from the News follow:

JIM G. LUCAS TELLS HOW OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT, USED AS BOMBERS, ARE DEATH TRAPS FOR OUR VIETNAM PILOTS

(The accompanying story from South Vietnam by Jim G. Lucas was submitted in advance of publication to U.S. Air Force headquarters here. It was read but official comment was declined.)

(By Jim G. Lucas)

SOC TRANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, May 11.—The Communist Vietcong didn't kill Jerry Shank.

His plane did.

Nor did they kill Bob Brumet, of 9211 Shelton Street, Bethesda.

His plane killed him.

Here we are, the most powerful nation on earth, boasting every day of our superiority in modern arms, and we send our young men out to fight a ruthless, determined foe with equipment long past its prime.

Jerry Shank and Robert N. Brumet died because they were ordered to fly planes that might better have been consigned to the scrap heap.

TRAINERS

They were T-28's. The "T" stands for "trainer," and that's all it was intended to be.

It was outmoded in 1953. It is practically the last two-seated propeller-driven craft in the Air Force's inventory.

Yet out here we've loaded this antiquated trainer's wings with 500-pound bombs and napalm so that if one is flown long enough it's inevitable that its wings will drop off. The men who fly them know that.

Politically, of course, the T-28 has its points. No one, including the Reds, could seriously object to it.

By using it, we're respecting the armistice terms of the 1954 Geneva Convention, in that we're not introducing new equipment into Vietnam.

BODY FOR PROOF

Also, we can put a Vietnamese in the rear seat, contending he's a student pilot.

Actually, few of them even speak English and instruction is nonexistent.

But if a T-28 crashes, there will be a Vietnamese body in the wreckage, and apparently that's important in this game of hide-and-seek we're playing here.

I'm glad I don't have it on my conscience.

As for Jerry Shank and Bob Brumet—every time they put their planes into a dive they must have wondered if they would come out.

On April 9, Capt. Robert Brumet, 36, put his craft into a dive and it didn't come out.

His buddies, flying nearby, saw the wings fall off and watched in horror as the plane plowed into the paddies.

They called over their radios for the choppers to come in and pick up what was left. The choppers didn't get there soon enough. The Vietcong got there first.

I hope Bob was dead when they found him, because these are the same people who ceremoniously broke the arms and legs of a district leader's wife at Kien Long recently and then killed her. That's the kind of enemy we face.

We need equipment we can count on to keep us out of their hands.

Captain Brumet was full of love of living and as fine a fighter pilot and a man as you could want.

ANOTHER ONE

On March 24, Jerry Shank put his ship into a dive between Soc Trang and Back Lieu and its wing separated from the fuselage.

Jerry was Capt. Edwin G. Shank, 27, from Winamac, Ind. When they shipped his body back, every shop and office in his hometown closed for the day.

Jerry was liked by everybody, and most everybody felt the same way about him. He left a wife and four children.

MATS PILOT

Before he came to Vietnam, he was a MATS transport pilot. He graduated from Notre Dame in 1959 with a degree in architectural engineering.

He did his stint in the Air Force Reserve, liked it and decided to make flying his career.

Jerry had one consuming ambition: He dreamed of being the first American to land on the moon. Maybe he could have done it. He had all the qualifications.

It makes you wonder what kind of official thinking justifies taking the lives of two such young men—and there have been at least two others—and you make up your mind you will find out when you get home.

Such decisions may be easy to come by in Washington, where men are statistics and casualty rates are a wavering line on a weekly chart.

But they're harder to take when you know the brave men who honestly fear their planes—because they can't trust the craft to do the job they're asked to do in their country's name.

REPLACEMENT

The Pentagon says it's replacing the T-28 with a Navy carrier plane, the AD-6, more adaptable to dive bombing. And that's good. But why wait until now?

Moreover, the Pentagon didn't say when this would be done. And every day brave fighting men take off from Soc Trang in their T-28's, hoping the wings will stay glued until those new jobs get here.

BRAVE MEN BETRAYED

Air Force Capt. Jerry Shank is 1 of 131 American fighting men who have lost their lives in combat since the United States began its program of massive assistance to South Vietnam in December 1961. In common with the rest of these brave men, Jerry Shank left a legacy of heartbreak, of a widow's empty, endless loneliness, of little children for whom a smiling photograph must forever be the inadequate substitute for a father's strong arms and loving counsel.

But Jerry Shank left something more than that. He was an articulate, angry man, and he left behind a poignant recital of how courageous young Americans are being betrayed by ancient equipment that is no longer equal to the demands of modern aerial combat.

Jim G. Lucas, a combat correspondent who has shared danger and despair with American troops in three wars, tells Captain Shank's story that no reader will soon forget. He tells it, we think, with cold indignation that is wholly justified. Letters written to his wife by Captain Shank have been published in Life magazine and in U.S. News & World Report. With Jim's story, written from the Soc Trang airstrip in the steaming guerrilla-infested Mekong Delta, they give a shocking account of American men whose courage and devotion is being made a grisly mockery by obsolescent equipment.

Captain Shank died in a T-28, an aging, propeller-driven trainer that was never designed for combat. Loaded with 500-pound bombs and napalm tanks, it cannot indefinitely endure the stresses of repeated dive-bombing runs. Eventually the wings come off. That happened to Captain Shanks' airplane on March 24. On April 9 it happened to the T-28 piloted by Capt. Robert Brumet.

Nor is the T-28 the whole story of courageous young American pilots being betrayed by war-weary, obsolescent aircraft. The B-26, a World War II attack bomber, was outmoded on V-J Day. Until recently it was flying combat sorties in Vietnam and, as Jerry Shank's letters have made brutally explicit, still killing American men. The H-21 ("Flying Banana") helicopter has done yeoman duty in Vietnam, but it is old and slow and is by no means the Nation's best combat-lift chopper. It, too, imposes unnecessary risks on the men who fly it.

Attempts to obtain an explanation of why we are asking our men to fight with inferior equipment have elicited no coherent reply. Some sources habitually insist the T-28 is ideal for antiguerrilla warfare because it is slower than modern aircraft. But no one would suggest that its habit of shedding wings fits it for anything other than a flying coffin.

The loss of Captain Shank and Captain Brumet emphasizes much that is wrong with our war in southeast Asia. The prevailing opinion of the men who are fighting it is that we are losing. Jim Lucas' sorrowing account of young Americans dying in the flaming wreckage of obsolete airplanes gives a tragic insight into one of the reasons we are losing.

Our men deserve better from those of us who remain safe back home.

Coin Shortage Must Be Solved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to contract with private industry for the minting of coins of the United States.

I was motivated to introduce this bill upon learning on one of my recent visits home of the tremendous shortage of coins in the Houston area and finding that this was not a localized condition but that the shortage is acute throughout the Nation.

Unless we turn to private industry for relief, I foresee no particular relief for several years. In fact, it may even grow more acute.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, sent me a letter which backs up my prediction. He also estimates that no relief will come for several years.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that early action will be taken upon this measure to give the business community of the United States early relief in this crisis.

The following is the letter I received from Mr. Martin, which I think should be ample proof of the need of this legislation:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1964.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: This refers to your letter of May 5, in which you ask about the seriousness of the shortage of coin, suspected causes, and possible remedies, and also request that additional supplies of coin be sent to the Houston, Tex., area.

The coin shortage is nationwide, as you mention you have read. The basic problem stems from the fact that production by the mint has not been able to keep pace with the rapid increase in the use of coin. Expansion in the demand for coin has been caused by a number of factors, including greater use of vending machines, parking meters, coin telephones, coin-operated laundry and dry cleaning machines, and toll roads; extension of school hot lunch programs and of the scope of sales taxes; a marked increase in the number of coin collectors, dealers, and investors; and basically, of course, the general growth in population. Also, any fear on the part of the business community that sufficient coin may not be available as needed tends to retard the flow of excess coin back to Federal Reserve banks for redistribution.

The Bureau of the Mint has asked Congress for additional appropriations to build a new mint in Philadelphia and to permit overtime operations at the existing mints in Philadelphia and Denver. While relief from the new Philadelphia Mint is at best 2 or 3 years away, funds to permit a full program of overtime operations at the existing facilities would somewhat ease present conditions and seems to be a move which would most quickly start the flow of additional coins to the commercial banks.

The Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve banks are considering whether the Federal Reserve System can do anything to help remedy the situation, beyond its present effort to keep the available coin in active circulation on as equitable a basis as possible.

Among the suggestions which have been made for increasing the supply of coin are one to eliminate the date and mint indication from the coins, in an effort to discourage hoarding for speculative purposes, and another to utilize under Federal Government supervision the facilities of private industry in the production of coin.

I regret to say that under present circumstances there is no way by which more coin could be made available in the Houston area without worsening similar shortages of coin in other areas of the country. The Bureau of the Mint is making every effort to allocate its production of coin as equitably as possible among the Reserve banks, but the Reserve banks have had to ration their supplies to commercial banks. While such an arrangement is naturally irritating to all concerned, I am sure you will agree that the only hope for some understanding and acceptance of rationing lies in assurance that all banks are being treated alike.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

Springfield Daily News Series on the Startling Rise in the Rate of Medical Care Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most persisent and pressing problems facing Americans today is the startling increases in the cost of medical care. For many persons and families, particularly the elderly who are living on small pensions, the cost of medical care is almost prohibitive. The Springfield Daily News in my home city of Springfield last week ran a two-part series of articles, on this subject. These interesting articles were written by Philip Brunelle, and with permission I place them with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, May 4, 1964]

HOSPITAL COSTS SOARING: MEDICAL CARE EXPENSES RISE AT STARTLING RATE

(The following is the first of a two-part series dealing with the startling increases in medical expenses in the United States in the past quarter century, as demonstrated in a report just released by the U.S. Public Health Service. The first part will deal with the costs themselves, and what comprises them. The second will deal with the pressures these costs have produced nationwide for more Government subsidization of medical care.)

(By Philip Brunelle)

A fast-growing expense is eating away more and more of the American dollar at a startling rate.

It is the expense of medical care.

Joe Citizen is spending a greater percentage of his paycheck just to keep himself and his family on their feet than ever before.

The steep upward climb of this family expense has been carefully mapped out in the latest bulletin on health economics just released by the U.S. Public Health Service.

IMPLICATIONS

And the implications brought to light by these simple, thin lines are not short of astonishing.

The lines show that, even if your dollar were fully as valuable today as it was in 1939, you'd still be paying well over twice as much money a year for your medical expenses, as you did then.

One line on the chart reflects the amount of money each person in the United States spent a year from 1939 to 1964, in pure dollars and cents.

Another line accounts for the constant shrinkage there has been over the past quarter century in the value of the American dollar. It charts the amount the American would have spent each year through to the present, at 1960 prices.

The medical situation in just dollars and cents is, of course, many times worse.

SIX TIMES AS MUCH

In 1939, the average American spent about $25 a year on medical expenses. Now, he spends over $160 a year—over six times as much.

At 1960 prices, he would have spent $60 a year in 1939, and about $150 a year now.

Another chart in the bulletin shows that Federal and State government subsidization of medical costs has remained almost stationary, percentagewise, since 1939.

Uncle Sam is certainly spending many times more in footing the Nation's medical bill each year, but so is everyone else.

In the 1939–40 biennium, the Nation's total medical bill was a little over $4 billion. Of this, combined Federal, State and local government participation in meeting the payments amounted to a little over a billion dollars, or slightly over a third.

A $34 BILLION BILL

In the 1962–63 biennium, the Nation's medical bill had soared to about $34 billion. Of this, total Federal, State, and local payments were about $9 billion, or under a third.

Charts in the eye-opening bulletin also point out that a great deal less Americans are getting medical insurance help in meeting the staggering medical bill than may be thought.

Though over twice as much of the average medical bill was taken care of by insurance payments in 1960–61 than in 1949–50, nearly two-thirds of the bill was still met by direct payments out of American wallets in the 1960–61 period.

Charts comparing 1949–50 with 1960–61, break down private medical expenditures in this way: In the earlier period, direct payments comprised 78.8 percent of the total, and insurance payments 9.7 percent.

In 1960–61, direct payments—out of the wallets—were still 64.3 percent of the total, and insurance payments were 24.2 percent.

HOSPITAL EXPENSE

Another surprising fact brought out in the Public Health Service bulletin, is the big growth in the chunk hospital expenses take out of the average citizen's medical dollar.

Everyone talks about the money doctors charge for their professional work, but the truth is, doctors now are taking a smaller percentage out of the American medical dollar than they did in 1948.

In that year, physicians' services soaked up 32.5 percent of the medical dollar. In 1961, they soaked up only 27.6 percent.

But the percentage of the bill soaked up by hospital care grew much more than any other factor in the entire medical bill breakdown.

Hospital care costs took 22 percent of the medical dollar in 1948. In 1961, they took 27.6 percent.

ROOM RATE CHECK

A comparison check on room rates at any local hospital will quickly point up the startling increase in the cost of hospital services since 1948.

A check on two of three hospitals in Springfield that charge regular room rates, showed similar huge increases.

At Springfield Hospital, private room charges ranged from $11.50 to $15 a day; semiprivate from $7.50 to $9 a day; and the ward fee was $6 a day, in 1948.

Now, at Springfield Hospital, private room fees are from $34 to $37 a day, semiprivate fees from $27 to $32 a day; and ward charges have multiplied to $25 a day—about four times what they were in 1948.

At Mercy Hospital, private room fees increased from $12 a day in 1948 to a current rate of $30 a day. Semiprivate charges climbed to $24 a day from $10 a day in 1948, and ward charges increased from $8 a day to $21 a day.

INTENSIVE CARE

Both hospitals have added intensive care units since 1948, which would account for a transfer of part of the medical dollar distribution from other professional services into hospitals.

The units provide the best emergency medical equipment for critically ill patients, in addition to 24-hour vigilance by hospital personnel. This service in the past was provided often by independent professional nurses.

At Springfield Hospital, the intensive care fee is $40 a day, and at Mercy Hospital, it is $45 a day.

The need for more and more complex and precise research, treatment, and therapy equipment, combined with great increases in pay for nurses and other supporting staff personnel, have pushed up hospital operating costs at a dizzying rate.

The great increases in room rates have been necessary at hospitals in spite of the fact that the Government contributes considerable amounts to the operating costs of the institutions.

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION

The bulletin chart shows the Government contributes 21 percent of the funds used by short-term independent civilian hospitals, and 28 percent to public ones.

The Government contributes 81 percent to the costs of public long-term civilian hospitals, and 11 percent to private ones.

Because of the fast climb in the medical bill, many Americans are finding it harder to meet.

Some are not meeting it, and so there has been more and more pressure in Congress for help from Uncle Sam to give these people the medical care they need.

MORE CARE IS NEEDED: MEDICAL EXPENSE "TAX" TOUGHEST ON POOREST

(The following is the last in a two-part series dealing with the startling increases in medical expenses in the United States in the past quarter century. The series drew from material in a report just released by the U.S. Public Health Service, and from a case study on conflicting Federal legislative proposals for health care for the aged, prepared by Leon P. Gold of Harvard University, for the institution's program in economics and administration of medical care.)

(By Philip Brunelle)

Skyrocketing medical expenses have produced a heavier and heavier tax on the American dollar in the past quarter century.

Statistics and facts in a booklet just released by the U.S. Public Health Service prove it, and they prove something worse.

They prove that this particular "tax" is having a reverse impact on America's various income groups from that of ordinary taxes.

LOW INCOME GROUPS

It is hitting the hardest among the low income groups.

The PHS booklet shows Americans on the average spent 6 percent of their incomes on medical expenses in 1957–58. But this was the mean expenditure for the total population.

The breakdown by income groups turns up some thought-provoking facts.

It shows that in families where total incomes were less than $2,000 annually, medical expenses bit off about 13 percent of the incomes in 1957–58—better than twice the average percentage in the United States at that time.

This was among those who most needed every cent of income they had.

SAME PERIOD

In that same period, medical expenses took an average of 8 percent of family incomes between $2,000 and $3,499; 6 percent of those between $3,500 and $4,999; 5 percent of those between $5,000 and $7,499, and only 4 percent of those above $7,500 annually.

The reasons why the medical cost burden is heaviest where it can least be withstood are easy to find.

First, with smaller incomes, the same medical costs will comprise a larger percentage, of course. But that's not the whole story.

Health Department surveys have shown immunization levels to be lower among lower income level groups, and because of this there is a higher incidence among these groups of infectious diseases, many of which require hospital treatment.

Another factor is the fact that among people in lower income groups, fewer are covered by health insurance, because fewer can afford it.

BELOW-$2,000 GROUP

In the below-$2,000 family income group, only about a third were covered by hospitalization insurance in 1959, about a quarter by surgical insurance, and less than a 10th by insurance covering doctor visits.

In the $2,000–$3,999 group, about 58 percent had hospital, 50 percent surgical, and about 15 percent doctor visit insurance.

In the $4,000–$6,999 group, 80 percent had hospital, 75 percent surgical, and 25 percent doctor visit insurance.

And among those with family incomes over $7,000, about 88 percent had hospital, 80 percent surgical, and nearly 30 percent doctor visit insurance.

This reverse impact has become unbearable among many in the low-income groups—particularly those over 65 who have faced, not only higher and higher medical costs due to increased sickness and infirmity, but also less and less income and ability to earn it.

UNBEARABLE FOR MANY

Because the medical cost burden has become unbearable for many, these people have not been receiving proper medical care.

This condition has produced increasing pressure, especially in recent years, for more government subsidization of medical care among low-income groups, and particularly among those over 65.

The only significant Federal legislation passed in recent years toward this end has been the Kerr-Mills amendment to the Social Security Act, which passed in 1960.

The amendment increases the Federal Government's share of medical payments for recipients of old age assistance, and it also extended combined Federal-State help to the elderly who are not OAA recipients, but still cannot afford their medical costs.

The amendment offers States Federal support for a wide range of medical care benefits to eligible aged persons, but does not obligate the States to establish medical assistance to the aged programs.

NO PROGRAMS

As a result, there were still 23 States at the beginning of 1963 that had no programs.

Massachusetts has one of the most comprehensive medical programs established under the Kerr-Mills amendment. It provides inpatient and outpatient hospital and clinic services, nursing home, physicians' and dentists' services, nursing care outside of institutions, drugs, sickroom supplies, prosthetic appliances, and other selected medical services.

In addition to those who are old age assistance recipients, the Massachusetts program makes eligible for medical assistance to the aged people over 65 with no more than $300 a month income, who own no real estate other than a home and have personal property valued at no more than $2,000 for a single person or married couple if the husband is the applicant. Where the wife is the applicant, eligibility requires possession of personal property worth not over $3,000.

But the passage of the Kerr-Mills amendment in 1960 did not satisfy some Members of Congress. Many believed a broad social insurance arrangement should replace a public assistance program for those in need of help with their medical expenses.

The major, and most controversial, proposal along these lines was the Kennedy administration-sponsored King-Anderson bill, introduced in Congress in February 1961.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE

Under the proposal, all persons reaching the age of 65 and qualifying for social security benefits under the Old Age Survivors' and Disability Insurance program (OASDI) would be entitled to benefits.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that 80 percent of the aged population would be eligible immediately and that by 1970, 95 percent would be covered by the program.

It was to be financed by an increase in the social security tax of one-quarter of 1 percent for both employers and employees.

Many, including the American Medical Association, violently oppose the bill and protest it would bring about too much Government control of medicine.

But backers point out that, although an extensive range of medical services is authorized under the Kerr-Mills amendment, many States have no programs at all, and those in existence in some cases offer almost no benefits, while others offer a great deal.

They object that Federal money—money from every U.S. citizen's pocket, is paying for these programs, yet only the people in a few States are benefiting the most from it.

According to a staff report of the Senate Committee on Aging, 90 percent of all Federal funds for the program go to four States—California, Massachusetts, Michigan, and New York.

In the remainder of the States, with the exception of several small-population ones, people are receiving few benefits, and in many of these States they are receiving none, though support of the program is coming, indirectly, out of their pockets as well as those of every U.S. citizen.

Everyone agrees more medical care is needed. The big argument is over how it should be given.

United States-Portuguese Relations: New Ambassador Sees Continued Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Vasco Vieira Garin, Portugal's Ambassador to the United States, is new to his post in Washington but well-known and respected throughout the Western World for his long and distinguished service as his country's Ambassador to the United Nations.

Several days ago he granted a special interview to Don Larrabee, Washington correspondent for the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass. I commend this article to the attention of every Member of Congress who has an interest in the state of our relations with this longtime ally, the future of the NATO Alliance, and the menacing advance of Communist influence in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Also of significance will be Dr. Garin's timely comments on his country's recent agreement to lease France a base in the Azores, and on our own negotiations with Lisbon for the continued use of key air bases in this area of the Atlantic.

Dr. Garin, a strong supporter of NATO, suggests the possibility of a revised Atlantic Alliance to meet the threat of communism in the developing areas of the world and cites recent problems in Africa as an indication of the potential value of a coordinated system of defenses against this continuing danger.

Of great importance is Dr. Garin's remarks on United States-Portuguese differences over his country's African policies. This is particularly timely, in view of Secretary Rusk's reported discussion on this same subject yesterday at the Hague with the Portuguese Foreign Minister, and in view of the recent reassertion by Khrushchev of the Kremlin's desire to force the Portuguese out of Africa.

The United States has failed on a number of occasions to support Portugal, a faithful ally, on questions arising in the U.N. over Angola and her other oversea territories. This failure was based—even though Dr. Garin refrains from pointing it out in such blunt terms—with our adherence to the once-popular fancy that the bloody Angolan massacre of 1961 was an example of spontaneous native nationalism. Time and the facts have proven these brutal crimes, cloaked in the convenient guise of anticolonialism, were acts directly inspired and supported by a Communist effort to subvert Angola.

Portugal has stood virtually alone in this fight against an increasingly powerful Afro-Asian block in the United Nations and only her determination to protect rightful interests in Africa has presented the rise of yet another Castro and the loss of another critically important area of the free world.

It is encouraging to note that Dr. Garin does not see our differences over Angola as an unapproachable problem and says we can continue to work within the framework and cooperation which has traditionally existed between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of the House will read this article, which I ask to be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

ENVOY LOOKS TO FUTURE UNITED STATES-PORTUGAL COOPERATION

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—A revised NATO force to block Communist aggression in Africa, Asia and Latin America, as it has in

Europe, was suggested today by Portugal's new Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Vasco Vieira Garin.

Declaring that communism is a "worldspread danger" and that the Communist offensive should be fought on a worldwide basis, the Portuguese envoy told the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times: "A convenient revision of alteration of the Atlantic Alliance objectives and scope would perhaps be the proper answer."

Dr. Garin, who assumed his post officially last April 8, after 8 years as Portugal's Ambassador to the United Nations, discussed various aspects of a United States-Portuguese relations in a wide-ranging exclusive interview. Although these relations have been somewhat strained in recent years, the Ambassador said differences of opinion between the respective governments over such matters as Portuguese Africa do not present an "unapproachable difficulty."

He also saw several "important implications"—none of them detrimental to the American position or interests—in Lisbon's recent grant of facilities in the Azores to France for scientific experiments, primarily for the French rocket program. Dr. Garin said the Franco-Portuguese agreement constitutes the first instance where a "great continental European nation has shown interest in the Azores position in the middle of the Atlantic."

The Ambassador said the working arrangement whereby the United States presently uses air bases in the Azores is not affected by the grant to France. The United States has continued to use these facilities on a temporary basis since the expiration of a United States-Portuguese agreement in 1962. Renewal negotiations have proceeded slowly against the backdrop of the U.S. refusal to support Portugal's hold on its African territories.

Dr. Garin said the agreement with France, interpreted in some quarters as a retaliatory slap at the United States, actually enhances the value of the "concessions" Portugal has been granting the United States in the Azores and underscores the "great Atlantic importance" of the territories.

He has already started making plans to visit "my good friends of Portuguese extraction" in New Bedford and elsewhere in the country. He added that he expects to be "rather active" with his visits to the Portuguese-American community during the summer months. At the moment, however, he is busy with what he calls the "indispensable first contacts" that must be made in Washington. Following are some of the significant questions directed at Dr. Garin and his replies:

Question. How would you characterize United States-Portuguese relations today?

Answer. We continue to work within the framework of the traditional friendship and cooperation which has always existed between our two countries, but you might say that in the last few years—and most specially at the forum of the United Nations—our respective Governments have not expressed identical views in regard to African problems in general, and Portuguese African in particular. But this does not signify at all that we regard such a difference of opinion on specific topics as an unapproachable difficulty. As you know, a very important segment of the well-informed public opinion in this country disagrees fundamentally with the double standard adopted by the ONU (United Nations) in relation to Portugal.

Unquestionably, great interests are at stake in this issue, namely the preservation of an area of peace and harmony, represented by the Portuguese oversea provinces, in the midst of a continent now mostly torn by political, economic, and social chaos and conflicts, and the preservation of a genuine multiracial society, such as it truly exists in the Portuguese territories. When most of the African continent has gone either unfriendly neutral toward the West or openly sympathetic to Communist influence, we feel that our position becomes more valid and quite understandable, even to the skeptic ones.

Question. What action, on our part, would contribute most to an improvement in our relations?

Answer. Evidently, it would be presumptuous of me to counsel thoughts and actions to our American friends. We have faith in our friends and we trust their good intention. But I can say frankly what we hope: We hope that in the future our position will be better understood by our friends and allies; we hope that the moral values we uphold in our multiracial policy in Africa will be properly weighed; and we also hope that the tremendous and constant efforts of development—economic, social, and political—which we are carrying out in Portuguese Africa will be appreciated. There is no genuine movement of the so-called native nationalism in any of the Portuguese oversea provinces, and this truth has been verified once and again by hundreds of responsible foreign observers. And yet, many of the preconceived African nations held by certain persons and institutions against Portugal are based on the fallacy of such a concept. For once, however, it has been amply reported that the most publicized terrorist leader, principally responsible for the Angola massacres of 1961, has definitely taken off the mask and showed himself a tool of international Communist subversion.

Question. What is your Government's attitude toward suggestions that the Atlantic Alliance be substantially revised or altered, as to objective and scope of the effort to contain the Communist offensive?

Answer. Regarding NATO, we believe that the alliance was most successful as a deterrent to Communist aggression in Europe. Now that Europe has been made strong, communism seems to be making its greatest efforts outside Europe—in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. To face these new dangers, the West has not been able to devise a coordinated system of defense. A convenient revision or alteration of the Atlantic Alliance objectives and scope would perhaps be the proper answer. Communism is a world spread danger and the Communist offensive should, therefore, be fought on a worldwide basis. In this context, recent events in Africa should give food for very serious thought.

Question. What are the implications of the agreement of April 7 between Portugal and France providing France with a base and facilities in the Azores for scientific purposes? Do you see anything detrimental to U.S. interests in connection with the Azores deal with France? How solid are the United States-Portuguese arrangements in the Azores?

Answer. There are two or three important implications. Although the facilities were given to France for scientific purposes, it is the first time that a great continental European nation has shown interest in the Azores position in the middle of the Atlantic. This is only proof of the revival of Europe, which is full of meaning for the future of a healthy Euro-American partnership. Also, it was again shown how conscious Portugal is of her international responsibilities for the reinforcement of the Atlantic Alliance and of the defense of the West. Therefore, nothing detrimental, much to the contrary, arises from the Franco-Portuguese agreement, to the American position or interests. The new agreement, by emphasizing the great Atlantic importance of the Azores, implicitly gives still more value to the concessions we have been granting there to the United States. The conditions by which the United States uses at present the bases in the Azores, and the working arrangement which is in effect for that purpose were not affected.

The Electronic Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleaues an interesting article on the future of electronic engineers, which appeared in the April 1964 edition of Electronic Industries, by Sidney Feldman, associate editor:

WHERE ARE ELECTRONIC ENGINEERS GOING?

(By Sidney Feldman)

Once again engineers and technologies are being phased out as defense and aerospace contracts decline, while cries of engineer shortage change color to engineer surplus.

The engineer strata within electronic-aerospace fields have long been thought of as being full of ambiguities and imbalances. Line technicians sometimes are lumped in with graduate engineers in surveys and census data, while graduates often do work ordinarily left to technicians. With cutbacks in aerospace and defense contracts mounting, engineers may find themselves in an overcrowded market in one area, while other U.S. regions still claim engineer shortage.

Personnel heads observe that technical people are busily crossing three vocational bridges. First: some draftsmen and technicians gain enough on-job experience and off-job study to qualify as engineers." Second: many graduate engineers move into higher-paying, higher-level jobs in management and marketing. Third: there is a big surge of engineers and scientists going back to school for advanced study.

For these reasons there are about a dozen different definitions of engineer which range from technician through salesman to scientist. Hence, one engineering society official complains that National Science Foundation statistics about engineers may be only 56 percent accurate.

MANY ARE SALESMEN

Several thousand engineers now are salesmen for electronic companies. Such engineers may be manufacturers' representatives, or may work for the companies. Thousands of other engineers hold management jobs from president through to purchasing director.

Greater numbers of engineers will continue to join marketing and management ranks for higher pay, greater prestige, and maybe more job security. Engineers also are becoming consultants, working for themselves or for firms, for banks, or investment houses.

Most engineers who have decided to stay in engineering are participating in a mass "intellectual retooling" movement.

"Rehabilitation of engineers with obsolete skills is the most serious problem in engineering today," says Donald Garr, director of engineering, Ratheon Corp. He cites a surplus of engineering technicians in the Boston area, but suggests a shortage of engineers trained in new defense and aerospace technologies. Demand for engineers is changing mainly from narrow components and equipment specialists to broad systems and interdisciplinary generalists.

FIRMS HAVE IN-HOUSE SCHOOLS

Many companies conduct in-house classes. Arma Division of American Bosch Arma Corp., Garden City, N.Y., teaches its engineers about subjects ranging from microelectronics to systems engineering theory and application. General Precision Aero-

space teaches engineers at the firm's plant in Little Falls, N.J., and sends engineers to Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, with credits applicable toward advanced degrees in systems engineering. These examples are only a few among many.

At Illinois Institute of Technology, Bell Telephone Co. engineers from 14 States and Canada are preparing for the satellite communications era. More than 1,500 selected trainees, mostly graduate electrical engineers, may be trained in electronic advances over several years. There are many other such programs.

Underlying this need for reeducation are two fundamental forces. One is the cumulative effect of new technologies, largely sponsored by Federal researches. The other is the need to develop a new breed of engineer for our evolving aerospace age.

NASA now underwrites grant programs in educational institutions for facilities, training and research, especially at the graduate level. This program, started in 1962, now has nearly 900 graduate students attending 88 schools. For the academic year 1964–65, NASA extends grants to nearly 1,100 students working on doctoral degrees in space-related fields at 131 colleges and universities in 47 States. The National Science Foundation also supports broad technical education and reeducation programs.

A MIXED SITUATION

At best, electronic engineer employment presents a mixed situation; it varies from company to company sooner than from area to area. On the west coast, more than 500 engineers (who may have included technicians) were laid off by Boeing when the Dyna-Soar program was canceled. Yet, Boeing is completing a $16 million aerospace research center. Engineer employment has been high at North American Aviation in California. This firm holds contracts ranging from disarmament studies to modules for the Apollo man-to-moon project.

Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., also in California, is phasing out operations at Van Nuys and transferring some employees to its main plant at Sunnyvale while laying off others because "there isn't enough aerospace ground equipment business."

In the East, RCA let go about 750 scientists and engineers in the Camden-Moorestown, N.J., area (near Philadelphia) during 1962 and 1963. Some were rehired at RCA plants elsewhere. Out on Long Island there is a glad and sad story for engineers in two towns. At Bethpage, Grumman Aircraft Engineering has been hiring scientists and engineers for the orbiting astronomical observatory series, and as subcontractor for Apollo lunar excursion modules.

Next door at Farmingdale, however, Republic Aviation may phase out F–105 aircraft production by his fall. Indicative of this mixed situation, Republic has transferred and fired aircraft engineers. It has hired still other engineers for its aerospace research and development center and electronics products division.

Incentive contracts are said to be discouraging any artifically inflated demand for stockpiled engineers paid for by cost-plus Government contracts. As an argument, DOD refers to the "importance of the profit motive as incentive to improve performance and to lower costs."

U.S. FUNDS BACK MOST ENGINEERS

About 76 percent of all engineers and scientists employed by the electronic industries are supported by Government funds, based on a 1961 survey by Electronic Industries Association (EIA) and the Defense Department.

This report cites about 155,000 engineers and scientists performing all types of electronic work. Of these, 128,000 or 83 percent work for industry, while 8 percent work for the Federal Government. Another 5 percent do research for universities and nonprofit organizations—mainly for Government. The remainder includes consultants, engineers, and scientists between jobs, and those not identifiable by specific activity.

DOD says it will brief industry representatives in classified advanced long range development plans on electronics, command and control, missiles, nuclear products, and research. Apparently, it then remains for defense-aerospace contractors to adjust their future needs for plant and personnel accordingly.

Certain trends now indicate where engineers are going in the intermediate transition period, and for the longer run. Currently, two types of personnel adjustments are being made.

Contractors first may phase out production workers. Then cancellations or cutbacks may be used to excuse the phasing out of unproductive graduate engineers or nongraduate engineers, either of whom may be doing technicians' work. However, vital scientists and engineers are kept on "because they were hard to get in the first place and because keeping a nucleus of key technical personnel gives a firm the best gambit for getting new contracts."

SOME SWITCHING TO CIVIL SERVICE

Some scientists and engineers are switching from indirect civil service, with Government contractors, to work directly through the U.S. Civil Service. Noteworthy, stricter standards for Federal Government engineering jobs involving health, safety, and welfare, will require an engineering degree or professional registration after July 1964.

By 1970 engineer surplus once again may become severe engineer shortage, according to a recent National Science Foundation report.[1] NSF charts about 250,000 unfilled jobs for scientists and engineers, many in electronic fields.

Total annual increased demand for technical people may run about 101,200 by 1970, says NSF, while the supply rises only about 76,500. In electrical equipment manufacturing, about 100,000 new scientific and engineering jobs will open, including replacements. This report anticipates engineering manpower shortages causing postponed or canceled projects and programs, delays, more inefficiency and higher costs.

NSF calls for increased student enrollments and further inducements for graduates to remain as engineers. And, like the same old story in the past, employers again may resort to the good old days of pirating and mounting wages and salaries for scientists and engineers.

[1] "Scientists, Engineers, and Technicians in the 1960's—Requirements and Supply."

Viet Blame Chargeable to McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall wrote an article which was printed in the San Jose Mercury for Saturday, April 25, under the headline "Viet Blame Chargeable to McNamara." General Marshall is an excellent military student, is highly respected and not given to snap judgments. His views are worthy of the consideration of the entire Congress.

The article follows:

VIET BLAME CHARGEABLE TO MCNAMARA

(By Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall)

Several days ago I went over a file of correspondence from senior Army officers serving in the field in Vietnam, away from Saigon.

These were private letters, not intended for official scrutiny. Without exception, they were deeply reflective, and though the individuals were remote from one another, being in different corps commands, with no opportunity to compare experience, they were remarkably together in their conclusions.

Bafflement, rather than pessimism, was the tone. They could see that the war was not being won. It disturbed them more that they could not understand why and therefore were unable to suggest where correction should start.

The consensus was that the average Viet soldier was sufficiently able and courageous to best the Congs. But his army displayed a notable reluctance to close with the enemy. Their guess was that the main block lay in the attitude of junior officers, who were not so much disaffected as disgusted. These were curbstone opinions after random observation; the Americans simply didn't know.

The American correspondent who cables from Saigon that over the countryside public sentiment is about 20 percent actively with the guerrilla cause and 20 percent actively with the regime, while majority opinion is approximately nowhere, is also shooting in the dark. But it is a shrewd psychological assessment indicating nothing abnormal in the Vietnamese character.

Any national or racial group, thus heavily beset would react little different; the contest is carried by small minorities, while in between lies an amorphous mass concerned with tomorrow's dinner and the avoidance of involvement. To deplore that majorities nowhere have strong ideological motivation is a waste of breath.

But one must deplore that U.S. operations in Vietnam are handicapped by greater obscuration than any heretofore known, because that is somebody's fault. To blame the mysterious nature of the enemy is idle; the enemy is always mysterious in war and it is ever necessary to grope toward him through fog, knowing but half of the problem. There is, on the other hand, no excuse for ignorance about one's own forces, resources, and dispositions.

So who is responsible? More insistently, more dramatically, than any civilian administrator has ever done in prior military undertakings by the United States, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has identified himself with the overall conduct of operations in South Vietnam. It is not called the McNamara war but he has so personalized his direction of it by his pronouncement of the buildup, his four troubleshooting trips, and his recent declaration of intent to carry on until victory that the label fits.

As an aside, it is somewhat of an irony that this mismanaged affair rubs off none whatever on the principals who have steered the main decisions. Secretary McNamara, though a Republican, is being mentioned as a vice presidential possibility on the Democratic ticket by columnists who like to play kingmaker. According to the Gallup poll, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has spurted far ahead of other GOP hopefuls. So we may take it that these two strategists in civilian pants are seen in a heroic light by their countrymen while Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT blasts the military for bungling and "splendid indifference" to the national economy, failing to note that the shape of the armed establishment is hand tailored by his friend, Mr. McNamara. How unfair can you get?

Well, you can be a little worse than that.

All along Mr. McNamara has badgered his military subordinates for not providing him

with a "data basis" to illuminate decision-making in the Vietnam involvement. That term is something to pound the desk about, just like "cost accountability." So having demanded that which is still lacking, he should be in the clear, provided the fault is chargeable to the stupid military rather than to his own office.

But that isn't so. Mr. McNamara is himself to blame. Both in strategy and in tactics, the responsibility for the organization of data to guide decision must rest in the same chair where decision is made. A moment's reflection will show why. At no other level can there be complete understanding of what kinds of data are needed.

Secretaries like George C. Marshall, Robert P. Patterson, and Henry L. Stimson well understood this principle and applied it. Mr. McNamara cannot understand it because he has never shared in fighting operations. He is a businessman, fond of computers, which unfortunately do not crank out research data.

Data required for strategic guidance is of multifarious variety. It would perforce include an exacting scrutiny of everything transpiring in the forward zone, the nature of the warfare, weapons effects, supply levels, conservation, communications failures, the morale of forces, the attitude of command, the use and adjustment of indigenous labor, the orientation of training, and the relationship between paramilitary forces and regulars.

But that is just a beginning. The ebb and flow of the national economy, shifts in population, interior police statistics, political undercurrents, and the moral response of people to the strategic hamlet concept are highly relevant areas.

No military officer may develop such a body of data. If Mr. McNamara wants only that which should lie within their competence, he is thinking at a tactical level. But few professionals have even this sort of expertise. It isn't a normal part of training. There are available specialists—a very few—who know this field. Mr. McNamara will not seek their help, being a desk pounder, satisfied with his own image of infallibility.

TXF Design Alarms Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the assurances given by Secretary of Defense McNamara regarding the performance of the proposed TFX fighter plane, as scheduled to be produced by the General Dynamics Corp., of Ft. Worth, Tex., are again subject to serious question, according to a recent issue of Aviation Week.

Writing in Aviation Week, Mr. George C. Wilson says the Navy has become so alarmed about the weight and drag of the TXF as it is scheduled to be produced by General Dynamics that it is giving consideration to withdrawing from the fighter-bomber program.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert herewith Mr. Wilson's article in Aviation Week:

F-111 WEIGHT, DRAG INCREASES ALARM NAVY—SERVICE MAY QUIT PROGRAM UNLESS DESIGN CHANGED; MCNAMARA DENIES SERIOUS DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS

(By George C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Navy is so alarmed about the increasing weight and drag of the General Dynamics F-111B that it may withdraw from the biservice tactical fighter-bomber program unless Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara allows substantial design changes.

Either course would be distressing to McNamara, who has claimed the greater uniformity in the General Dynamics Navy and U.S. Air Force versions of the F-111 (TFX) will save the taxpayers $1 billion—a claim challenged by the former F-111 project officer who did the arithmetic.

Albert W. Blackburn, who concentrated on achieving commonality in the F-111 designs while with the Defense research and engineering office, said his "rough estimate" of the $1 billion saving was made before any contractors had submitted bids (AW May 27, 1963, p. 32).

Shortly after Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze took office last November, he asked for a briefing on the F-111B. The analyses were so pessimistic that some officials in the Bureau of Naval Weapons and in the Navy air staff recommended getting out of the program. But top Defense Department officials persuaded Nitze to wait until more hard facts were in.

Pessimism about both Air Force and Navy versions of the F-111 is concentrated mostly at the lower levels of the Defense Department where the analyses of the performance and cost of the aircraft are actually being done. The pessimistic reports contrast with rosy public statements by McNamara, Nitze, Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert, and General Dynamics spokesmen who insist the development program is going along splendidly. At his March 5 news conference, McNamara said the Navy was not showing any reluctance to buy the F-111, and added that the weight problems "don't appear serious."

Top-level Navy assessment of these conflicting reports is scheduled for mid-July when enough information will be on hand to indicate just what the Navy should do. In advance of this reappraisal, a variety of studies are being conducted by General Dynamics and its chief subcontractor, Grumman, by the Defense Department research and engineering office, and by the Air Force and Navy. These studies range from how to overcome such technical difficulties as excess weight and drag to a cost-effectiveness study of the F-111 as a weapon.

All this is being done in such a highly charged political atmosphere that few people are willing to talk about it for attribution. They know Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, is looking over their shoulders and will make capital out of their difficulties when his investigating subcommittee resumes hearings on the F-111 award.

So the strategy of McNamara, Nitze, and Zuckert is to minimize the development difficulties in public in hopes they can be solved in private. General Dynamics is assuming the same posture while Grumman, whose reputation for building superior Navy aircraft also will be affected by the F-111B, portrays itself as merely a subcontractor which cannot speak out.

Adding fuel to the dispute is the fact that the USAF Aeronautical Systems Division has awarded Boeing, whose loss of the F-111 contract started all the controversy, a contract to study what aircraft should be the follow-on to the F-111. It is really unrelated to the current F-111 fight, but will not be viewed that way by Members of Congress trying to prove McNamara should have given the F-111 contract to Boeing in the first place, as both the Air Force and Navy recommended.

Most worrisome of the development problems to the Navy is the weight of the F-111B. Navy originally hoped to keep the aircraft to about 50,000 pounds. This early goal was raised to 55,000 pounds and mostly recently to 63,500. But the most recent weight estimate is about 70,000 pounds, with predictions that the ultimate weight of the F-111B may be as high as 75,000 to 80,000 pounds.

Compounding the weight difficulty is more drag than the Navy and the contractor originally anticipated—about 2 to 3 percent more acocrding to Navy estimates. General Dynamics declined to comment on this figure, but said the application of the area rule on the fuselage had been modified to decrease the drag. Also, the company said it had designed a cleaner canopy for the F-111.

Pessimists predict that these weight and drag increases threaten to produce marginal performance and an aircraft too heavy for Navy carriers. Also Navy officials assert that even if the weight is reduced through emergency measures, the resulting aircraft will not have the growth capability that the military always desires.

A General Dynamics spokesman at Fort Worth, Tex., plant where the F-111 is being built admitted the weight problems, but said they could be overcome. He said one solution is to add more titanium to the aircraft, although not in the stress-bearing areas. He predicted the resulting aircraft will meet the specifications, and said that General Dynamics already had achieved 6 of the 12 development milestones for the F-111. After its July assessment of the F-111B, the Navy is expected to take one of these courses:

Accept the aircraft as configured at that time.

Wait until after the first F-111A flight—expected in December or January—before making a decision.

Insist on only slight changes, such as dispensing with some of the avionics needed by the Air Force but not the Navy to make the aircraft lighter.

Demand major design changes to correct weight, drag, and lift shortcomings.

Elect to withdraw from the F-111 program altogether on grounds the investment is not justified in terms of either performance or cost.

Either of the last two courses would be objectionable to McNamara because of the stress he has placed on "commonality." The Defense Secretary told the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee that a major reason for choosing General Dynamics was that its design had more areas of Air Force-Navy commonality than the Boeing proposal (AW Mar. 25, 1963, p. 81).

But political developments could make either of those last two actions more palatable at a later date. If President Johnson is elected, McNamara will not necessarily remain Defense Secretary. And if a Republican is elected, the whole F-111 program will be reviewed by the new administration.

All this makes any long-range prediction for the Navy F-111B extremely risky. It would appear that only compelling technical difficulties would prompt Nitze to take any drastic action on the F-111 before the November elections. The July reappraisal is expected to show whether these difficulties are in fact compelling, as some of his technical advisers insist. In short, Secretary Nitze must make his command decision soon on the F-111.

Is National Water Crisis Just Around the Corner?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a provocative article from the Tuesday, May 5, 1964, edition of the Detroit News on the impending water shortage crisis and pollution problems in America today.

This article discusses in some detail the lack of proper water conservation practices employed by responsible authorities and the continuing use of our streams and rivers as disposal areas for dangerous chemicals, detergents, radioactive wastes, untreated sewage, and the many other wastes from construction and industry operations. Attempts have been made to rectify the water shortage and pollution problems, and other large-scale plans are presently under consideration, but general public and congressional apathy toward effective measures to prevent further pollution and promote water conservation has been a major obstacle. Frequently, it has only been where citizens were forced to take positive action because of a critical water shortage that any constructive work in this field has been done.

Presented in this article is a list of areas in America where water problems are most pressing, and it is, indeed, an impressive one. It serves as a warning to every American. Enactment of proper and effective legislation to avert future water shortage and pollution problems is a goal that should receive the serious and active support of all.

The article follows:

IS NATIONAL WATER CRISIS JUST AROUND THE CORNER?—DRASTIC CONSERVATION CONFRONTS UNITED STATES, EXPERTS AGREE

WASHINGTON, May 5.—Growing water shortages—definitely a nationwide problem—can be licked only by costly, drastic water conservation efforts in the next decade.

As the population mushrooms (Census Bureau estimates put the U.S. total at 325 million by the year 2000) and industries expand, more and more fresh water will be needed.

Symptoms of acute national dehydration and pollution are already a part of American way of life:

Drawing a glass of water in Babylon, Long Island, a housewife ends up with a two-inch head of foam. It looks like a glass of beer but it has an oily, fishy taste.

Towns along the Animas River in Colorado and New Mexico, where a uranium mill dumps its wastes, learn their drinking water contains 40 to 160 percent more than maximum safety levels of radioactivity.

Gas bubbles rise from the bottom of the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, where a packing house unloads tons of animal entrails. Some 75 miles downstream, Omaha uses the river as a source of drinking water.

For 140 miles downstream from Austin, Tex., where a chemical plant drops its wastes into the Colorado River, all fish die.

Steel mills at Youngstown, Ohio, using the Mahoning River waters to cool its furnaces, raise the river's temperature so high in the summer that the water is rendered unfit even for cooling purposes.

Dwindling water supplies in Western States, a rapidly dropping water table in the Northern Plains and a salty taste in fresh water wells near the Texas coast partially indicate the extent of the problem.

The country's leading hydrologists agree that the country's water resources are abundant enough to handle future emergencies. But they stress that if a full-scale water crisis is to be avoided, proper research and positive managemnt of national water resources must be substituted for present indifference on th part of the U.S. population.

Greater amounts of water will also be needed for flood control, pollution abatement, navigation channels, wildlife preservation, and recreational needs.

And overriding the basic problem of supply and demand is the ticklish question of water quality which has been plaguing scientists more and more over the last decade.

The late President Kennedy called the pollution situation "a national disgrace." "Pollution of our country's rivers and streams," he told Congress in early 1963, "has reached alarming proportions."

Presently, there is irrefutable evidence that the United States is poisoning its waters with chemical bug killers, quick-sudsing detergents, radioactive wastes, slaughtr house remains, untreated municipal and industrial sewage, oil well brine, pulp mill acids, and tons of silt from highway and building projects.

Says Gordon McCallum, chief of the U.S. Public Health Service's division of water trial wastes clogging the water."

"In city after city, drinking water becomes less palatable as more and more chemicals are added to rid it of pollutants. Miles of stream, bays, and estuaries are lost each year to fish and wildlife, to fishing and swimming because of unsightly, smelly and actually dangerous sewage and industrial wastes clogging the water."

And Surgeon General Luther L. Terry notes:

"We are by no means sur that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfection processes and entering our water mains. Hepatitis may be an example."

In Congress, the struggle for effective pollution controls has been an uphill affair. After guiding the Water Pollution Control Act through the House in 1953, Representative JOHN BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, noted:

"It was a forlorn, distressing experience. Schedule a hearing and three persons would show up. Leaders in both parties grumbled about that 'stinking sewer bill' and couldn't see what all the fuss was about."

The "stinking sewer bill" gave the Federal Government power to force cities and industries on interstate waterways to build treatment plants to eliminate dangerous wastes. Amendments passed in 1961 extended enforcement to all navigable waterways.

Enforcement actions have thus far been brought against over 250 cities, including New York, Pitsburgh, and Portland, Oreg., and also against several industrial giants.

Congress also tackled the water shortage problem. The Senate's Select Committee on National Water Resources, chaired by the late Robert S. Kerr, Oklahoma Democrat, released the results of a monumental 2-year study of the Nation's future water needs in 1961.

The committee reported U.S. water demands will double by 1980, triple by the year 2000. Right now, the country is using about half the water it can trap.

Price tag on the committee's proposed sweeping program of new dams and reservoirs and new industrial and municipal sewage works was $54 billion.

It also noted that 5 areas in the country could run out of water by 1980 unless adequate steps were soon taken. The areas: the Upper Missouri River, the Upper Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers, the Colorado Basin, Lower California and the Great Basin between the Rocky and Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Early in April, the Senate Subcommittee on Western Water Development began evaluating a mammoth proposal to divert water from Alaskan rivers through Canada to the Southwestern and Midwestern United States. This is the distance from Sweden to Egypt.

This could fit hand-in-hand with a Corps of Engineers project now on the drawing boards to build the largest dam in North America at Rampart Rapids on the Yukon River in north-central Alaska. The Rampart dam would create a reservoir slightly larger than Lake Erie, the 12th largest inland body of water on earth.

The striking note about these two $100 billion proposals is not their size, but the fact they're even being considered.

Americans have always taken for granted that the United States was blessed with a cheap, plentiful water supply. New demands for expanding industry and population, coupled with an unwarranted abuse of water and streams by pollution, should smash this smug attitude.

Industry, homes, and farms already use over 300 billion gallons daily. This figure will triple by the time that today's children are buying their own homes.

Building the dams and reservoirs to accommodate needed water is simple compared to the problem of acquiring the land to act as a giant saucer.

Particularly in New England and the Middle Atlantic States—where residents can trace their family real estate back for several hundred years—it is difficult to persuade families to give up their homes to build a dam.

Senator Kerr, was concerned about apparent public indifference to the water pollution problem. Shortly before his death, he told a banquet audience:

"I believe that if most of you got an analysis of the water you drink, you would be shocked and uneasy. The result might even drive you to drink—but not water."

One group which is not indifferent to water problems is the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, a nonprofit, nonpartisan national group which has been lobbying for an effective water policy for 63 years.

In the past, this group has had considerable success in creating awareness of water problems by local communities.

Several cities have developed water conservation systems on their own. In 1957 when water was selling at 50 cents for a half-gallon carton after a 6-year drought, Dallas citizens backed a water plan to build lakes and dams, complete and modern pump lines, and pumping stations.

Water rates rose 34 percent, but during last summer's severe drought, no restrictions were placed on water usage despite a record consumption.

In Culpeper, Va., where George Washington first predicted water problems in 1749—landowners worked together for 5 years to build three small dams on nearby streams to hold back floodwaters and provide reservoirs in time of drought.

The two gigantic Alaska plans would approach the problem on a national level. The first, proposed by Ralph M. Parsons Co., Los Angeles engineers and constructors, would collect surplus water from rivers in Alaska and northwestern Canada and redistribute it to the United States, Canada, and Mexico through a system of canals, tunnels, and aqueducts.

But, in the meantime, the Corps of Engineers is trying to solve some of the more urgent short-range water problems in the

Nation. Following are the most pressing, by area:

New England: Flood control in the southern part, where rivers and streams are unusually narrow bedded; also, expansion of navigation facilities in coastal harbors.

Middle Atlantic: Projected future water shortage for seaboard areas, estimated to be megalopolis by the year 2000. Studies now in progress on Susquehanna and Potomac Rivers as source of extra water. Construction already started on similar projects on Delaware River.

South: Projected shortage of water for industrial needs in Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama; expansion of navigation facilities, such as Trans-Florida Barge Canal, Texas Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, and Chattahoochee River.

Midwest: Flood control on Ohio and Illinois Rivers; sewage disposal in Chicago.

Plains States: Projected water shortage for irrigation; pollution abatement needed on Missouri River.

Rocky Mountains: Projected water storage for both irrigation and hydroelectric power.

Southwest: Current water shortage for booming metropolitan areas of Los Angeles, Phoenix, Tucson.

Northwest: Projected water shortage for hydroelectric power.

Dedication of St. Vladimir's School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 3, it was my privilege and pleasure to attend and speak briefly at the dedication of the new St. Vladimir's Ukrainian Catholic Parochial School in Elizabeth, N.J. It was also the occasion of the 60th anniversary of St. Vladimir's Ukrainian Catholic Church.

The ceremony and the banquet which followed were deeply impressive. Led by Archbishop Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn, a distinguished group of clergymen and laymen assembled to pay tribute to the parish and its pastor, the Reverend Roman Bodnar, and to commemorate the years of past accomplishment and future progress.

For me, Mr. Speaker, it was a particularly welcome opportunity to join with so many of my fellow citizens of Ukrainian ancestry who have, both as individuals and as members of St. Vladimir's Parish, so enriched the life of our community. Through their religious convictions and thei rspirit of selfless dedication to their church, they have built both a physical plant and a spiritual environment which will perpetuate the light of the faith into the long years ahead.

The story of what the people of St. Vladimir's have done, Mr. Speaker, is an integral part of the larger story of America and, as such, I am certain it will be of considerable interest to our colleagues in the Congress. For this reason, I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a brief history of St. Vladimir's Parish, a letter of gratitude to his parishioners from Father Bodnar, and a statement of appreciation to their pastor from the members of St. Vladimir's.

HISTORY OF ST. VLADIMIR PARISH, ELIZABETH, N.J.

EARLY HISTORY

The Ukrainian community in Elizabeth began to form just before the turn of the century, around 1886–1887. By 1900 there were about 40 families and 50 unmarried persons. The city of Elizabeth itself had a population of about 85,000. The ensuing growth of the city and with it the Ukrainian community, resulted mostly from the establishment of great oil industries in the vicinity, such as the Standard Oil Co. Elizabeth today has over 110,000 inhabitants. Its Ukrainian community has greatly increased both because of the normal population growth and of the influx of new immigrants after the Second World War. Today the Ukrainian Catholic Church of St. Vladimir serves about 370 families and 100 single parishioners.

At first the small community of Ukrainians had to depend on an older and more established parish nearby for its spiritual needs. This was the parish in Jersey City whose pastor was Rev. Mykola Pidhorecky. He traveled to Elizabeth to celebrate Mass in a rented place and advised and guided the community in the matter of building their own church.

In 1903 the idea of having a church was born. A church building committee was formed and ground purchased. This formal act establishes the actual formation of St. Vladimir's Parish in Elizabeth.

From then on, the unfolding history of the parish, with its fortunes and misfortunes, is similar to that of many other parishes. Events followed events in the cultivation of a higher level of spiritual life for the people and in the organization of church matters. There were also years of humiliation and despair before the parish achieved its ultimate conformation and consolidation. The reasons for this were many.

The first reason lay in the fact that the initial parish group was weak and small in number, with a varied membership. Both the First World War, Ukrainians from Austria-Hungary emigrated to America, intending primarily to amass enough money to return to their homeland. However, the occupation of Halychyn (Galicia) by Poland put an end to their original plans and they settled here permanently.

The second cause was that this small community too, was not a homogeneous one. It consisted of emigres from different Ukrainian lands. Mainly there were three distinct groups: the Halychany (Galicians), the Lemky and the Carpatho-Ukrainians from Hungary. Sometimes these groups clashed and their differences were reflected in the life of the parish. When time came to divide the diocese into separate ones of Galician and of Carpatho-Ukrainian (Uhorsky-Ruthenian) worshipers, around 100 families left St. Vladimir's to join the new Ruthenian parish.

The third deterrent to parish growth was the fact that the administration of church assets was not yet lawfully established. Ukrainians of former Austria-Hungary had no such opportunity to acquire administrative experience. Decisions on such matters as, for instance, where to build the church, on management, occasioned frequent quarrels, which threatened parish unity. The Elizabeth parish was even threatened with a split, which fortunately did not happen.

All these are symptomatic of a young, growing community, newly formed of divergent groups, and thus symptomatic too of the young parish of St. Vladimir's which formed, grew and became strong in this community.

CHURCH, RECTORY, CONVENT, AND SCHOOL

In 1903 a plot of land at South and Grier Avenues was purchased for $1,050. In January 1905, the building of the church on this land was begun and was completed in 1906. This first church cost $6,500. The money was raised by borrowing from a bank and by assessing parishioners of Elizabeth $15 per family and those living in Elizabethport, Roselle, and Cranford $10 per family. Single persons were assessed $7.50 in Elizabeth and $5 in the outlying districts. Monthly dues were: $1 per family, 75 cents per single male and 50 cents per single female.

The first church could accommodate 100 souls. It was soon evident that the building was too small. In 1909 another church building committee was formed to erect a new, larger church, which eventually was built in 1914 at a cost of $19,500. In 1948 the interior of this new church was painted by the artist Sviatoslav Hordynsky.

From 1956 to 1958 basic remodeling was done on the church both outside and inside. The original wooden structure was faced with brick, new doors and aluminum stained-glass windows were installed, as were new lighting and heating systems. A confessional was purchased, the sacristy was enlarged and the church paintings retouched. Repairs to the outer church cost $45,000, while remodeling the interior cost another $23,000. In this same period, repairs were made to the rectory building and the church hall, which was converted into a schoolroom, all at a cost of $10,000. The original church building was moved to the adjacent lot in 1914 and has since functioned as a church hall.

The new church seats 400. Because of the normal population increase in the parish and the latest influx of immigrants, this church too is becoming crowded.

The first rectory was purchased in 1914 at 347 Grier Avenue for $4,000. In 1953 the parish was able to purchase the new rectory at 307 Grier Avenue and the old rectory was converted into a school.

In 1946 the Sister's convent at 307 Grier Avenue was purchased. The Sisters came to the parish in 1949 and assumed the duties of teaching Ukrainian evening school. In 1954 the full-day parochial school was established in the old rectory, starting with a kindergarten and the first grade class.

In 1957 the $25,000 mortgage held by the Provident Association was paid off and the new school building fund campaign was launched, for the erection of a new school.

In 1959 ground for the school was purchased at 435 Grier Avenue, and plans for the school building and auditorium were drawn up.

In 1961 the adjacent school land was purchased, which gave a total frontage of 179.5 feet and a depth of 200 feet. The total costs of the land were $31,000.

In 1962 the building plans were completed and the erection of the school begun in May.

In 1963 the school was completed at a cost of $308,000. This cost was met partly by contributions and by loans from the Provident Association ($100,000) and the Ukrainian National Association ($125,000). The sum of $23,900 was paid to the architect for his plans of the school and auditorium and for his supervision of the actual building.

From the inauguration of the all-day parochial in 1954, a new, higher grade was added each year. This required new expenditures to provide additional classrooms and somewhat delayed the starting date for the building of the new school building. Since 1963, the full eight grade classes are taught in the new building.

The above dates show the physical growth of the parish. Since 1954, the administration of these now imposing church properties has been conducted according to canonical directives and according to New Jersey State law.

All the above facts at the same time attest to the inner, spiritual growth of the parish,

to its religious activities and to the moral and spiritual education of the parishioners. They also attest to the care and attention given to our youth, to assure them proper religious upbringing and to inculcate our Ukrainian national consciousness.

TO MY PARISHIONERS: A WORD OF ENCOURAGEMENT AND GRATITUDE

"If the Lord did not dwell in our hearts, none of us could withstand the forces of evil, and the winners are those who are endowed with power from on high" (Sunday Matins).

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST: We rejoice upon the completion of our parochial school. The compliments of our neighbors increase our joy. It is a happy moment for me also, but my joy is not complete, because the main purpose is not achieved.

The inspired words of the great apostle St. Paul tell us the only way in which this great purpose may be achieved: "I seek not yours but you," (II Corrinthians 12-14). In other words, if your hearts were filled with the knowledge of God and His truth, then you would be strong enough to perform great, even heroic, deeds.

If this school could speak, then it would say without hesitation: "I ardently desire your hearts, and I am longing to be filled with your children." In fact, this is the desire that this school building proclaims by its very existence. And each and every member of this parish has the sacred duty to do his best to make this school a temple of truth and love, in which the Kingdom of God will be planted and nourished in the hearts of our dear children.

And where truth and love reign, there is knowledge of and respect for everything that is our own. There is also self-respect and enrichment of the cultural heritage of mankind.

We shall attain all this only then, when all our children will attend our school, and our own self-sacrificing, dedicated educators will be their teachers. If this task seems difficult, let us remember that the strong in faith and the confident in divine help are the winners. Then and only then will our joy be full and complete.

The welfare of our children, temporal and especially eternal, is the great desire and concern of my heart. To promote their welfare, I dedicate my work and my prayers; and I entrust it to the maternal protection of our heavenly mother and to St. Vladimir, the patron of this school.

And if I have in any way contributed to the success and completion of this school building, which is the first step to the greater cause, then in all humility I thank the Almighty God for His work; and I extend my sincere gratitude to all parishioners for their sacrifices and cooperation.

All-good and All-merciful God, bless all our parishioners and our beloved children.

REV. ROMAN BODNAR,
Pastor.

TO OUR PASTOR: IN TRIBUTE AND APPRECIATION

We, the parishioners wish to express our gratitude and appreciation to our pastor Rev. Roman Bodnar for his religious zeal and untiring effort to guide us in achieving a much deeper understanding, and a practical daily application of our Catholic faith. We appreciate his unceasing efforts too, in striving to create a harmonious unity among the laity in their common parish aims.

Nine years ago our pastor was faced with a seemingly impossible task. In the ensuing decade, problems were faced and solved: The projected remodeling of the church was completed. Additional schoolroom space was provided by remodeling the church hall. Through characteristic tact, diplomacy, and good judgment, our pastor was able to acquire title for the church, to the present ideal school property. We owe a debt of gratitude to our pastor for his careful foresight during his endless consultations on design and construction, with the architects of our parochial school, in providing us with a building that can boast of fine quality and design. In his desire to provide the best for his parishioners, Father did not hesitate to consult with qualified members of the laity in allied construction problems. We appreciate the fine administrative hand shown by Father in overcoming the myriad problems entailed by a new school opening.

Happy as we are of Father Bodnar's administrative abilities, we the parishioners are more deeply grateful for his being a dedicated pastor to his flock. Through his guidance, we parishioners have acquired a new and proud awareness of our Catholic religion and our Ukrainian rite. Seeds of his sermons have borne fruit in a true spiritual awakening and growth in the parish and parishioners, attested to by the increased attendance at church and increased reception of the sacraments. We know it is our pastor's heartfelt desire to safeguard the future of every child in the parish by receiving the proper Catholic training and upbringing.

With these few words, Father, we give expression to a fraction of our full tribute and appreciation. God bless you.

Development of the Appalachian Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last month President Johnson made recommendations to the Congress for the development of the Appalachian region, and I joined with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and other Senators in introducing S. 2782, which embodies those recommendations. I ask unanimous consent that an article on this program, written from Harlan, Ky., and appearing in the U.S. News & World Report of May 11, 1964, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Louisville Times of April 27, 1964.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 11, 1964]

HARLAN, KY.—Whenever the idea of a war on poverty is mentioned, one area comes to mind—that of Appalachia.

It is in this area that spending of about $4 billion is planned during the next 5 years. A recent visit by President Lyndon B. Johnson dramatized the problems of poverty that exist here.

Appalachia is a region that covers parts of 10 States and contains 15.3 million people. Within this region are some prosperous cities—and some of the poorest rural communities in the Nation.

Pockets of worst poverty are in the once-rich coal mining districts. These, for the most part, are in mountainous areas, often hard to reach.

The people here are mostly of early American stock. Many of them are skilled coal miners. But now many mines have been closed. Others have been mechanized. Mining jobs are scarce. Few of the people here have the skills required to get jobs in industrial cities. And their land is poor for farming.

As a result, the prosperity of the Nation as a whole has left these people on the outside. Many of them live chiefly on relief. It is estimated that a million people in Appalachia get Government handouts of surplus food. The Government pours about $500 million a year into the Appalachian area for relief.

"Crucified" by welfare: Robert Hoskins, editor of the Harlan Daily Enterprise, says:

"Welfare programs have crucified these people. If this goes on much longer, I don't know what will happen. I see signs that people are increasingly satisfied with a low level of living, losing their ambition.

"We have had so many studies, so many promises—and so little action—that the people here no longer get excited over new studies. They will get excited only when they see action."

Latest idea for action is a program submitted by President Johnson to Congress on April 28. It calls for a special "war on poverty" designed just for this region. Congress is being asked to vote $228 million to get the program going this year. So, if Congress approves, Appalachia will provide the first big test for the Johnson "war on poverty."

L.B.J.'s program: Here is what the President proposes to do in Appalachia:

1. Build new roads—a system of 2,350 miles—to open isolated areas to the outside world. Estimated total cost: $920 million, including $90 million in the first fiscal year, starting July 1.

2. Develop water resources—including flood control, development of industrial and recreational possibilities, and sewerage facilities. First-year cost: $45.8 million.

3. Improve pastureland—an attempt to convert marginal farmland into pasture for livestock production. Estimate of first-year cost: $22 million.

4. Restore timberlands—also promote timber manufacturing and marketing. First-year cost: $6.7 million.

5. Revive coal industry—promote new uses for coal, improve mining practices and encourage restoration of mined-over land. First-year cost: $13 million—boosted from $3 million at the last minute on urging by Governors of the Appalachian States.

6. Train workers—prepare them for new jobs in industry. Cost in the first year: A special appropriation of $37 million is asked, to be supplemented by $34 million from other Federal programs.

7. Set up a regional commission—an organization of Federal and State officials—to direct planning and help States and localities develop their own projects.

First-year costs also include $3.6 million for administration and $10 million for grants to local projects.

But the $228 million asked for the first year is only a beginning. Estimates are that the program will grow to a total cost of around $4 billion—mostly Federal funds.

A look at the map above shows the size of the area that is known as Appalachia. It stretches from Pennsylvania across all of West Virginia and parts of Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina, down into Alabama and Georgia—an area bigger than Japan.

Not all of this area is poverty stricken. Within Appalachia are large industrial centers such as Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charleston and Huntington, W. Va.; Knoxville, Tenn., and Birmingham, Ala. Some of these big cities, and some smaller ones, are prospering. Residents of such cities do not consider themselves to be part of Appalachia.

It is in rural areas that Appalachia's real poverty is to be found. Over half of the region's population is rural. By contrast, in the rest of the United States only 28 percent of the population lives in rural sections.

Usually, "rural" and "farming" go together. But not in Appalachia. Here, few of the rural residents are farmers. Most of them

work in coal mines or on railroads or sell goods and services to those who do.

Many have no work at all. The unemployment rate in some parts of eastern Kentucky and West Virginia reaches 35 percent or more. Throughout the rural nonfarm areas of Appalachia, unemployment averages 8.5 percent.

The explanation for the high rate of unemployment is a simple one: From 1950 to 1960, mine employment declined nearly 60 percent, farm employment more than 50 percent. More than 640,000 jobs were lost in these two activities. Railroads and other industries dependent upon mining and farming also cut back sharply.

Manufacturing employment in the area has increased, but not enough to take up the slack. The 1950 to 1960 gain in manufacturing jobs was only 14 percent here, two-thirds that of the rest of the Nation. Moreover, most of those manufacturing jobs were in cities, not in rural areas, and many former miners or rail workers were too old or insufficiently skilled to take the factory jobs.

Appalachia, as it is today, has little appeal to private industry.

Drive through this region, and you can see why.

Roads—where they exist—are narrow, twisting, and steep. Most towns are unattractive. Coal dust settles over everything, helps peel the paint off those houses that have any paint. Schools, hospitals, and public utilities are run down, in need of repairs or replacement.

Even in rural areas, the population is packed densely into the only habitable areas—the narrow valleys.

Few skilled workers: The labor force, though large, contains relatively few young or skilled workers. In addition, coal regions here have a history of bad—even violent—relations between labor and management, going back to the 1930's, when the United Mine Workers organized the industry.

In natural beauty, the area was generously endowed. But manmade ugliness is now spread over huge parts of the country. Big machines have literally torn mountains apart to extract coal. Mud and slag have washed down the sides of the mountains, clogging and polluting the streams.

In such conditions, many people, too, appear to have eroded. You notice that a large proportion are old. Many show the effects of years of improper diet and inadequate medical attention. The educational average is low.

When you talk to the people you find discouragement—but not despair. In Harlan, Ky., a chamber of commerce secretary says:

"We have a real problem. We need help. These welfare checks keep people alive, but that's all. When a person goes on relief, a gradual deterioration sets in. People become beaten. Their pride is gone. We have a generation of children growing up not knowing that people work for a living.

"But the great majority want to work, would welcome the chance. We have every conceivable kind of committee at work here on civic betterment. We are not quitting."

In Appalachia, Va., the town manager, John Fletcher, says:

"This welfare is an unhealthy thing. People here want the Government to help them to help themselves."

In President Johnson's war on poverty, many residents of Appalachia see real hope. But not all are enthusiastic about the program.

Almost everywhere, you find an attitude of "Let's wait and see what really comes out of all these plans."

To bring Appalachia back to prosperity is recognized as a mammoth job that will take years, at best.

In a way, Appalachia is becoming a laboratory test for the war on poverty. If it works here, you can look for similar attacks on poverty in other distressed parts of the Nation.

[From the Louisville Times, Apr. 27, 1964]

DO ENOUGH CARE ABOUT THE POOR?

Whether President Johnson's swift trip Friday really taught him anything about poverty as it exists in the United States is open to question. He went too far and too fast to see very much or very deeply. Besides, the President hardly needed a refresher course in economic distress. He knows where it is and the forms it takes.

Nevertheless, seeing in person what has been known only through reports is instructive. And when what is seen is as dramatically sympathy inducing as what the President saw Friday, it is a powerful call to action.

Thus what the President saw apparently was the final, clinching argument that persuaded him to put his massive support behind a program to bring hope to an area where there has been little hope for many years.

The program, whose ultimate cost is not known, includes highways, water resources facilities, sewage, and water treatment work, a plan to improve pastures, technical help for timber growers, and additional special help for individuals, such as education and vocational retraining.

This is, obviously, a long-range program. It is equally obvious that it is going to cost a good deal of money, which may make many in Congress reluctant. And without congressional approval, all the planning and all the hoping are wasted.

We feel that President Johnson's trip, dramatizing as only a President can dramatize the depressed and even degraded situation of part of our people, will have some effect on Congress. These men can hardly ignore the throngs, eager and yearning, who awaited Johnson. Nor can they disassociate themselves from the feeling in Johnson's statement to one of the groups he met: "We're here because we care."

Whether the President's trip results in anything more substantial than a temporary uplifting of spirits and a flurry of action depends on many things. It depends, first of all, on enactment of the various proposals to bring about a resurgence of life and economic vigor to some deeply distressed areas. It depends on the efficacy of that program, on whether these plans are the most appropriate plans. It depends on the efficiency with which they are put into operation. It depends finally on the desire and the ability of the people to make use of the program.

By making the tour and by requesting his multipoint program, the President has shown that he cares about the poor. The point is: Do enough other Americans care enough to do something effective to help them? Do they have the ingenuity and the desire? Or are the poor only people we read about but don't really know, people for whom we feel sorry in a genteel, uninvolved, and impotent fashion?

Eloquent Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1964, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, testified before a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee in favor of the administration's antipoverty program. His statement was one of the most incisive and eloquent statements to be delivered before a congressional committee. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the reports on his testimony which appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1964]

NEGRO TIES RIGHTS TO POVERTY PLANS—WHITNEY YOUNG ASSERTS IT'S TIME FOR UNITED STATES TO BELIEVE

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—A civil rights leader told Congress today that the time had come for America to say to the Negro, "We believe in you."

Pleading for passage of the administration's antipoverty bill, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, said "the demonstrations that we are seeing in the streets today are the ones fostered by despair and hopelessness."

Responsible Negro leadership, he continued, "desperately needs some tangible evidence of the intentions of this country to right a historic wrong."

Without some victories to show to his people, Mr. Young declared, "the next march on Washington won't be led by the Martin Luther Kings, the Roy Wilkinses, and the Whitney Youngs. This isn't a threat: It's a reality of a desperate people."

PANEL ROOM IS HUSHED

Testifying without notes in a hushed hearing room, Mr. Young told members of the special House subcommittee that is handling the antipoverty bill:

"I think Negro citizens, in the face of the years of provocation, in the face of the historic abuse, have shown an amazing restraint and an amazing loyalty. * * * They have said to America, 'I believe in you.' "

They have said it, he continued, in Jackson, Miss., when they gathered in a church last year to hear the widow of a slain leader, Medgar W. Evers, tell them: "You mustn't hate; you must love."

They have said it, Mr. Young declared, when those who gathered in that Mississippi church stood up and spontaneously sang "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty."

They have said it, he said, when Negro parents remained calm and continued to pray after their children had been bombed in a Sunday school.

THE YEARS OF WANT

All this, he went on, came from a people "who have so little reason to have this kind of faith, who have all the provocation, the abuse, the murders, the years of want, poor housing, and rats biting their children."

While the Nation must have the civil rights legislation, Mr. Young said, it needs the antipoverty program, too.

"Today, some of those most difficult problems we face are in those cities and States like New York," he said. "We are afraid that we might end up here with a mouthful of civil rights and an empty stomach, living in a hovel."

Mr. Young's testimony was hailed by both Democrats and Republicans on the subcommittee as one of the most stirring presentations ever heard on Capitol Hill.

"That was the most eloquent statement I have yet heard, getting at the heart of what is in the hearts and desires of the Negroes of this country," DONALD C. BRUCE, Republican, of Indiana, said.

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, commented, "That was the finest and most eloquent statement I've heard in my work on this subcommittee."

EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, praised Mr. Young for being realistic enough to know that civil rights legislation, while necessary, will not solve all the problems.

She paraphrased James Baldwin, the Negro writer, saying, "What will civil rights legis-

lation mean to a Negro who doesn't have a dime for a lousy cup of coffee?"

CALLED A BEGINNING

In asking for passage of the antipoverty legislation, Mr. Young said that it was not enough, but it was a beginning.

"We will either help Negro citizens become productive, constructive citizens or they will automatically become destructive, disgruntled, dependent," he said.

He suggested that all Americans must be made aware of the Nation's poverty.

Suburban commuters, he said, should look out their train windows and see the slums "instead of burying their faces in the Wall Street Journal."

Noting that nearly 60 percent of the Nation's Negro families were poor, Mr. Young said that "the whole thrust for first-class citizenship" is not merely for social status or acceptance.

The average Negro family, he said, has an income 53 percent lower than that of the average white family, an income 4 percent lower than it was 12 years ago.

CHAMBER PROTESTS PLANS

Earlier, the committee received a prepared statement from spokesmen for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, opposing the antipoverty legislation.

The Federal Government should not set up new programs, chamber official contended. Antipoverty programs—such as manpower development and training, vocational education, work relief for those on welfare rolls—are already available to help eliminate poverty, they noted.

The chamber suggested that vocational education be extended to encourage training of adults; that migrant workers be helped to get to places where jobs are available; that the compulsory school age be raised from 16 to 18; that States train youths rejected by selective service, and that a voluntary group be created to provide loans for adult education.

Most of the work to alleviate poverty, the chamber argued, should be through State, community, and private action.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1964]

RECOGNITION, JOB CALLED NEGRO GOAL—URBAN LEAGUE HEAD TESTIFIES ON NEED OF ANTIPOVERTY BILL

(By Eve Edstrom)

What the Negro wants from Congress is something as simple as being told: "You really are somebody."

Yet he cannot help but fear that he will wind up with a mouthful of civil rights and an empty stomach.

So said Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, yesterday. And both Republicans and Democrats said it was the finest and most eloquent testimony they ever had heard.

Some of Young's words were fighting ones, as when he said the next march on Washington would not be led by the peaceful Whitney Youngs and Martin Luther Kings and Roy Wilkins.

HAVE NO ILLUSIONS

But, as Young made clear, nothing he said was in terms of a "threat." Instead, said Representative DONALD C. BRUCE, Republican, of Indiana, at yesterday's hearing on the administration's antipoverty bill, Young's statement "got at the heart of what is in the hearts of Negroes."

Negroes, Young told the special House Subcommittee on Education and Labor, have no illusions that the antipoverty bill will make skilled technicians out of today's functional illiterates.

But in President Johnson's program, he said, they see a better destiny for their children.

People, Young continued, are moved by example, not exhortation. Therefore, he said, some Negroes now study political science because of Ralph Bunche and some Negroes aspire to baseball because of Jackie Robinson and a Negro like Sidney Poitier can win an Oscar once he's given the chance to act.

TOO FEW WITH JOBS

But while noting the heights to which Negroes can soar when opportunity opens to them, Young concentrated on the most elemental things that Negroes want.

He told the story of the Negro child who was asked on a coast-to-coast broadcast what her hopes for the future were and she replied that she wanted to marry a man with a job.

In the lives of too few Negroes, he said, are there men with jobs. And he emphasized that it is the Negroes who live in inferior housing, who receive less schooling than whites and who die 7 years sooner.

This, Young said, adds up to a "disaster, a national disgrace," which cannot be erased by the civil rights bill alone. The civil rights legislation, he said, must be buttressed by such measures as the antipoverty programs which will permit Negroes to take advantage of opportunities.

AMAZING RESTRAINT

Without such help, Young continued, Negroes automatically will become "destructive, disgruntled dependents."

During the last year when so many acts of violence were committed against Negroes, Young said the Negro has shown "amazing restraint" in the face of having "so little reason to have faith."

It now, he said, is up to Congress and the American people to say, "We, too, believe in you."

This cannot be done, he said, by wrangling over methods of attacking poverty. Such tactics, he said, smack of a "dodge."

And he declared those who criticize the antipoverty bill on the grounds that most of its programs would benefit Negroes are guilty of the "very dangerous" implication that the Government would be less concerned about poverty if it were strictly a Negro problem.

BILL CALLED MINIMUM

Such critics, he said, unwittingly confirm the belief of the Communists and the Black Muslims that the white man is so "morally bankrupt" that he is incapable of concern over the Negro.

Young also knocked down suggestions that existing manpower development and vocational educational programs are the answer to fighting poverty by stating that "less than a handful" of those in need of help are receiving it under these programs.

The antipoverty bill, he said, represents only a "minimum" of what is needed to "paint up the Harlems of this Nation" and to give men "a sense of earning a living."

But, he emphasized, the program represents a historic first, particularly because phases of it will be developed "by planning with Negroes instead of for Negroes."

The important thing, he said, is to get the program moving quickly and to make the impoverished visible even to those "who keep their faces buried in the Wall Street Journal while they ride to Westchester County."

Tying Tariff Policy to Farm Prices Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 5, 1964. The editorial wisely points out the danger in tying economic advancement and tariffs to farm handouts.

I think it is very important that more attention be paid to protecting American industry and American workers in the talks now going on in Geneva. Too often, in the past, we have cut tariffs and allowed the free flow of goods into the United States without reciprocity by other nations. The result has been that our markets have been flooded with foreign goods, forcing American plants to close and American workers to lose their jobs.

Free trade is a laudable goal, but the trade policy of the New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier and whatever "Deal" we have now has not meant free trade for American goods. I think our first consideration should be to protect the jobs and wages of American workers and the investment of millions of our citizens in business enterprises in this country.

The Wall Street Journal editorial, covering merely one phase of the tariff cutting talks, follows:

THE PRICE OF AGREEMENT

If the tariff-cutting talks which started in Geneva yesterday are successful, the price may be exorbitant. We view this prospect with regret, for freer trade remains one of the most promising avenues of economic advance.

The chief aim of the negotiators for two-score nations, meeting under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is a 50 percent slash in industrial tariffs. The largest obstacle, however, is not the still strong protectionist leanings of many industrialists here and abroad. It is instead the apparent determination of the United States and other GATT members to continue their crazy quilt systems of farm protectionism.

Christian Herter, President Johnson's special trade representative, has warned that the United States will not agree to industrial tariff cuts unless something is done also to aid America's farmers. The position of Europe's Common Market countries is hardly less adamant.

Not only that. The price may also include involving this Nation in world price-setting agreements for commodities like grains, dairy products, and meat. And the price may include new devices for assisting the economic development of underdeveloped countries, many of which produce agricultural and other prime commodities.

Maybe by some good fortune the protracted and complex discussions will not develop in that fashion. But, if they do, it will represent a hopeless confusion of the ends and means of both international commerce and economic development.

To begin with, everything possible is wrong with the idea of aiding backward nations with commodity pacts and other gimmicks. These countries have been complaining for years that the terms of trade are against them; the prices of the industrial goods they import keep going up but those of the commodities they export do not. Actually, the terms of trade have been getting more favorable for them in recent years, but that doesn't stop them from demanding that the "rich" nations do something for them.

This world-owes-us-a-living attitude is not particularly admirable. Apart from that, commodity agreements are no remedies for the ills of the underdeveloped nations themselves.

The pacts can artificially raise prices, all right, as the notorious Coffee Agreement has done, but it cannot be seriously contended

that they solve economic troubles which are largely rooted in unsound Government policies. On the contrary, they tend to cement a stagnant dependence on one-commodity economies.

Similarly, the solution of the farm problems of the United States and Europe most emphatically does not lie in freezing decades of imbecility into a new international mold. Here we have a fascinating spectacle of overlapping and self-defeating policies.

First the governments—the United States, for example—decide they have to protect the farmers. The predictable domestic result is a huge tax burden, groaning surpluses, and prices higher than they would otherwise be. Then when the nations want to export they run into comparable networks of protectionism abroad and propel themselves into such unedifying exercises as the chicken war.

The free market has known its failures, but it could not possibly have constructed such a weird farm contraption. Now, instead of seeking ways of gradually dismantling it, the governments insist on entangling agricultural protectionism with the quite separate question of reducing industrial tariffs.

The world needs freer trade, as President Kennedy accurately perceived in advocating the proposals which became law in 1962 and which are the basis of the present conference. Whatever the defects of that law, it opened up new paths of prosperity for both advanced and underdeveloped nations; international competition, no less than domestic, is essential to increased well-being.

It is all the more ridiculous, therefore, that greater freedom should hinge on farm deals and handouts. Or, worse still, that the goal could be sacrificed on the political altar of agricultural policies that are repressive as well as reactionary.

A Complete Wall or No Preference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very significant and penetrating analysis of the basic issues involved in the prayer amendment has been made by the Honorable STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina. In that article Senator THURMOND points out that our Nation now faces a choice between "no preference" and the "wall of complete separation" doctrine in reference to not only school prayers, but the recognition of God and a Supreme Being in all our public affairs.

This analysis by Senator THURMOND is thought provoking. It examines the fundamental issues in a judicious and dispassionate manner. I commend the reading of this article to all who are interested in the pending resolutions to clarify the first amendment to our Constitution, whether they be for or against the proposed amendment.

Under leave obtained, I include Senator THURMOND's report to the people on "A Complete Wall or No Preference?"

A COMPLETE WALL OR NO PREFERENCE?

(Report to the people by Senator STROM THURMOND)

Key supporters of the Supreme Court decisions against prayers in schools are trying to label all seeking to reverse these decisions as being enemies of the concept of religious fredom as set out in the first amendment to the Constitution. It is indeed ironical that some of the top Constitution stretchers in America are now posing as defenders of freedom and the U.S. Constitution.

This is the principal point being raised in the House Judiciary Committee hearings against proposed amendments to the Constitution to overrule the Court decisions which rely on an erroneous interpretation of the first amendment. This is even the position of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. This committee will present testimony against the proposed amendments, giving the impression that the committee speaks for 21 million Baptists.

Baptists and other denominations are justifiably proud of the role of their church in helping to get the provisions of the first amendment written into the Constitution. According, however, to the late Justice Story, the intent behind the framers of this great amendment was quite contrary to the recent Court interpretation. It is thus the Court and the secularists who brought these cases who are the enemies of the first amendment for perverting the true and original meaning of the amendment.

The distinguished constitutional law expert, Edward Corwin, has pointed out that the Ordinance of 1787, establishing the government for the Northwest Territory, was designed in part to promote religion and morality. Article 3 provided that "religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind * * * shall forever be encouraged."

In his famous "Commentaries on the Constitution," Justice Story discusses at length the "no preference" doctrine under the first amendment as opposed to the "wall of complete separation" doctrine. Under the "no preference" doctrine, preference is given to religion over no religion, but no preference is to be given among religions. This interpretation was followed even as late as 1952 in the Supreme Court decision of *Zorach* v. *Clauson*. Here the Court made the point that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." Indeed, this is attested to by the public recognition accorded to the existence of God in public documents and ceremonies from the beginning of this country.

To follow the "wall of complete separation" doctrine to its logical conclusion, all public recognition of God must fall, such as: the national motto, the national anthem, the pledge of allegiance, tax-exempt status for religious organizations, baccalaureate services in schools, public observance of Christmas and Thanksgiving, chaplains in Congress, chaplains in the armed services, use of the Bible in ceremonies, etc.

Some of these recognitions of God are now being challenged in the courts by the same atheists who got prayers thrown out. Other recognitions have been eliminated on the basis of the court decisions. Governor Wallace pointed out recently that the Court decisions permit "smut literature to go through the mails but not recitation of the prayer 'God is great, God is good.'"

According to recent Government policies, our country has been evidently far off base for so many years in giving a preference to religion over no religion, to victory in war over appeasement and accommodation, to patriotism and nationalism over internationalism, to freedom over socialism and centralization, and to the basic American right of trial by jury over star chamber proceedings where the judge sits as prosecutor, judge, and jury. Times do change, but fundamental and immutable principles never change in their value.

In view of the erroneous interpretation placed on the first amendment by the Court and the confusion resulting therefrom, the Congress must clarify the law and propose to amend the Constitution to make certain that we guarantee for all Americans freedom of religion rather than freedom from religion.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A New "Land of Lakes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a new "land of lakes" is developing in the Fifth Congressional of Indiana. I am referring to the three flood control reservoir projects now being constructed in the area.

On Sunday, May 10, the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette published a comprehensive, meticulously detailed news article on the background leading up to these projects, the present activities surrounding their construction, and the potential benefits to be derived through flood control and recreation activities.

The effects of these three great reservoirs will be felt far downstream. These projects will have a substantial and beneficial effect on flood control in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. In addition to this they are going to have a very decided effect on the economy of central Indiana. I believe the article to be one of great interest to my colleagues.

The article follows:

AMONG THE SYCAMORES: A LAND OF LAKES IS TAKING SHAPE

(By Kenneth B. Keller)

The normally placid Upper Wabash Valley has become the scene of a spectacular compromise between man and nature.

In some respects, it seems that nature is driving a hard bargain.

Three great reservoirs in the Wabash, Salamonie, and Mississinewa Rivers are to hold back a periodic rampage of water that sweeps down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in devastating flood stages.

These backwaters, spreading through the contours of four counties which have seen little change for generations, will cover several thousand acres of productive, historic, and picturesque countryside; they will drive hundreds of people from their homesteads of many years.

Each of the reservoirs will be comparable in area to Lake James and Lake Wawasee and even the sanctuaries of the dead will be invaded.

THIS WORK BREWING FOR HALF A CENTURY

This engineering activity in Huntington, Wabash, and Miami Counties is Upper Wabash Valley flood control and actually began in the horrible aftermath of the 1913 flood—it takes that long to prepare for meddling on such scale with the forces of nature. Only 10 years ago this vast engineering project began to take shape; it was quite beyond the imagination of most residents of the valley until a matter of 2 years ago when certain of them along the Wabash, the Salamonie, and Mississinewa Rivers became involved in a sort of "cold war."

This started in the form of a tap on the door by Government land agents.

As a consequence, the whole town of Somerset (a community of about 75 homes and a big school plant) is in the process of moving to a new location; Red Bridge and riverside colonies whose rugged beauty seems foreign to the north-central flatlands, and the community of Monument City are doomed.

The cozy little town of Markle escaped only because it was too big a corporation for the Government to condemn for flood control purposes.

These uprootings make up the bitter part of nature's bargain.

The transformation that is about to occur through the Upper Wabash Valley has made interesting impressions upon two men: Robert G. Petrie, 4647 Old Mill Road, who roamed the valley as a youth in Huntington, and Roy M. Bates, Allen County historian, a student of the backgrounds involved and a former civilian associate of the U.S. Corps of Engineers who are preparing to bottle up the waters.

Petrie, former Huntington High School and University of Michigan athlete, is a lumberman and builder, but far more than business commands his interest in the great undertaking.

He has closely studied various stages of the development—from preparations to move earth in unbelievable quantities to the necessary paper work which has caused so much hardship to those whose homes and properties will eventually be under water.

The local man also understands the special identity of people who have chosen to sink their domestic roots in the rugged beauty of the Salamonie and Mississinewa Valleys.

Both Bates and Petrie visioned a new development of the Upper Wabash Valley once the great reservoirs have met their potential in recreation, beauty and as wildlife sanctuaries.

The people who must give up their homes are in the strange position of being caught between floods—the 1913 disaster and the mechanical floodings designed to tame the raging freshets of the future.

Perhaps few, if any, were even remotely affected by those rampaging waters of more than half a century ago.

Impersonal projection into the future by a trained historian brought this comment:

"In 50 years, the current hardships will have lost their effect." But now, the sacrifices are very real and deeply felt. There is great financial inconvenience, too, among the people who must leave the future beds of the reservoirs.

In one Huntington County crossroads community, Petrie pointed out stacks of fresh lumber that will be consumed in relocating some of the more than 7,200 cemetery graves which lie within reach of the water.

THE DEAD REQUIRE SPECIAL ATTENTION

This facet of the development alone is one that has required painstaking clearances and the mobilization of workers needed to move the remains under meticulous supervision. It is a requirement that these crews be isolated during much of a 4-month tour of duty.

Even the resting place of Frances Slocum, famed white child captured and raised by the Indians and the historic surroundings of the gravesite, the Frances Slocum Trail, will be sacrificed to flood control.

The water will close, too, over Monument City, a tiny community that erected a surprising memorial to soldiers of the Civil War, one of the first such monuments to make an appearance in this part of the State. The school and church there either will be salvaged or left to the water.

Two of the three control towers to regulate the flow of water from the reservoirs already have made their appearance at Peoria in Miami County and Dora, in Wabash County. They are concrete shafts rising an approximate 150 feet above the damsites. The water levels permanently marked on the outside of the Salamonie tower are hard to believe.

Nearly three-quarters of the way up the Salamonie shaft is the level of the top of the dam. Over half the height of the tower is the flood control pool level, which makes it easier to imagine water some 40 feet over the Monument City rooftops. The next graduation, about a third the height of the control tower is the level of the seasonal pool and the lowest, which represents about one-sixth the height of tower is the minimum pool level.

The reservoirs actually will have two shorelines; the largest when waters are impounded temporarily to protect areas which have been the playgrounds of floods and the smaller when the rivers are at their normal flow.

SPILLWAY INDICATES SCOPE OF PROJECT

The spillway of the Peoria Dam is a tube 17 feet in diameter, indicating the volume of this one reservoir alone.

This dam, of roller-earth fill is the largest of the three, according to specifications—8,069 feet long, 140 feet maximum height with a top width of 44 feet. It will have roots in three counties, Wabash, Grant and Miami, and is to serve a drainage area of 809 square miles above the dam.

Relocations involved by the construction here are 1.3 miles of State highways, 17.6 miles of county roads, 3 bridges, 1 school, 10.7 miles of electric lines, 13 miles of telephone lines, two-tenths of a mile of pipelines and 3,790 cemetery graves.

The maximum flow of record at this damsite was 42,000 cubic feet of water a second during the 1913 flood.

The Peoria Dam site is 7.1 miles above the mouth of the Mississinewa; both this stream and the Salamonie are tributaries of the Wabash River and contribute greatly to it flow.

The rolled-earth fill of the Salamonie Dam will have a maximum height of 132 feet and a length of 6,100 feet with footings in Wabash and Huntington Counties. This dam will be 30 feet wide across the top, and the drainage area above the dam totals 553 square miles.

Relocations made necessary here will include 6.1 miles of State highways, 2.3 miles of county roads, 5 bridges, 7.1 miles of electric lines, 2.3 miles of pipelines, and 2,652 graves. The maximum 1913 flow here was 27,000 cubic feet of water per second.

The control tower for the Huntington Reservoir, the smallest of the three, has not yet been constructed. This dam, serving Huntington and Wells Counties, will be 89 feet high, 4,700 feet long and have a top width of 44 feet. There are 707 square miles in the drainage area above the dam.

On this construction the relocations will include 5.2 miles of State highways, 1.5 miles of county roads, 9 bridges, 24 miles of electric lines, 14 miles of telephone lines, and 800 graves.

This reservoir will extend from shortly southeast of Huntington to the edge of the town of Markle. The body of water in the

Salamonie will extend from the Salamonie State Forest almost to State Highway 9 and the Mississinewa Reservoir will extend to within a short distance of State Highway 13. Both the Salamonie and Mississinewa flow northwestward into the Wabash, the Mississinewa emptying dangerously near Peru.

SALAMONIE FOREST TO REMAIN INTACT

The Salamonie State Forest, south of U.S. Highway 24, a natural monument to enterprise born of the Great Depression, will not be affected by the flood control program. Every inch of it was planted as a government work project for youth in the 1930's and it has acquired an amazing beauty from the years, with excellent public facilities. The forest shelters a lake, and the picnic area is graced by a fern-like waterfall.

For those who remember its inception, the towering pines are a startling reminder of the passing of years.

On a winding gravel road between Peoria and Dora there is mute evidence of the temporary status that has settled upon the future reservoir areas. The grizzled trunk of a long dead tree, with a red handkerchief attached, marks a dangerous hole in the crown of the road.

The relocation of people has drawn considerable enterprise into the affected areas. New Somerset is stretched out along a paved highway a mile from the old site—on a tract which has involved an investment of some $92,000. Bare foundations and neglected shells not worth moving to the new site make old Somerset a shambles. The Waltz Township school still stands bravely there; it apparently is doomed for demolition.

Streets and utility services appear to be the present urgent need in the new Somerset, where a continued growth is expected. Markle may be fated a new future by the flood control which has moved so close to its threshold. A new channel will be cut for the river there.

Indeed, the creation of three large bodies of water is expected to draw new recreational attention to this north-central portion of the State. The deep water will provide excellent opportunities for boating and kindred sports, while the countless bayous will provide the seclusion so essential for good angling.

The evidence of this may be a small golf course opened a short distance south of Huntington. A few months ago people shook their heads at the venture, but the other Saturday afternoon the greens were crowded and the owner now is trying to acquire another tract of land across the road.

A new development is sure to follow flood control in the Upper Wabash Valley, observers believe, and maybe it will relieve some of the heartache that has accompanied the sacrifices of a comparative few for the many thousands who have felt the relentless scourge of the rivers for so long.

And as the reservoirs establish their shorelines, mother nature is bound to add decorative touches of her own, too, to replace some of the beauty she surrendered.

Installation of President of Belknap College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on May 2, appropriate ceremonies were held in Center Harbor, N.H., attendant upon the installation of Dr. Royal M. Frye as president of Belknap College.

Installing President Frye and delivering the inaugural address was Mr. John S. Woodbridge, B.A., comptroller of Pan American World Airways.

Belknap is a new college, only a year old; and I believe that one of its wisest moves was its choice of Mr. Woodbridge as a member of its board of trustees.

In the aviation business particularly, and in the business world generally, John S. Woodbridge is regarded as being without peer. He has been with Pan American since 1929. In 1965 he will complete a quarter of a century as comptroller for Pan American. Mr. Woodbridge was on hand when Pan American circled South America, when it conquered the Pacific, and when it flew the first passenger flight across the Atlantic.

Mr. President, in the past I have read the speeches and the writings of Mr. Woodbridge; but I must admit that his talk at Belknap College in Center Harbor, N.H., last week is one of his best. I commend it to every Member of this body, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTALLATION OF PRESIDENT OF BELKNAP COLLEGE, ROYAL MERRILL FRYE—ADDRESS BY JOHN S. WOODBRIDGE, TRUSTEE OF COLLEGE, COMPTROLLER, PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC., CENTER HARBOR, N.H., MAY 2, 1964

We here are participating in a modern miracle, one of great import to the world, to our beloved United States of America, to the golden State of New Hampshire, and to our communities in this scenically beautiful area whence radiates this new constellation in America's intellectual firmament, Belknap College.

Conceived in fiery zeal, not to be confined by circumstances, it rises in a lofty posture as an uncut gem of academic brilliance, destined toward helping to demonstrate that the United States continues and will continue to be the leader in the world of advanced science and its many peaceful facets.

Advanced science is an absolute must in today's history. There will never be too many young Americans imbued with this intellectual spirit to satisfy the technical needs of our great country. Here at Belknap we have the facility for attracting young and clear brains from all over the country, because of the extraordinary nucleus of older and outstanding faculty brains, ready, willing and able to impart their highly trained scientific skills to the receptive and creative souls of the coming students of Belknap. This nucleus, the key to the expected swift recognition of the college as a seat of scientific excellence, was not an accident, but the continuing result of an inspired and carefully planned use of lifelong associations with other outstanding educators, dedicated to their profession and desirous of following it actively and productively amidst serene and thoughtful surroundings. Quality of the end product, and not quantity, should be the goal of a gem of a college such as this; candidates for admission should flock to the door when the college becomes nationally known through the quality of its instruction and of the resulting graduates.

The genesis and development of Belknap College have been startling. They rest on four strong pillars, representative of authentic Americanism of the highest order, rarely seen in such a cohesive combination and interrelationship. First of the pillars is piercing vision, followed by raw courage, sustained by uncanny ability coupled with militant impatience.

Last year the burning concept existed, but not in recognizable form. Now the pattern is clear, the forward road abundantly indicated and the methods of achievement well limned.

Let me reconstruct. The founders of Belknap College and their associates, educators of note, well known and favorable assayed by those who know, selected this lovely part of our country as the seat of this tremendous venture. Unarmed by fortunes and promises, but sure of the solidarity of their ideas as to the training of worthy youth of our Nation, they have forged a vehicle of which we all should be proud and which we all must cultivate.

At this juncture, I wish to salute the towering strength and perspicacity of those responsible for the creation of this astonishing and rewarding addition to American culture. My good friend Royal Frye needs no introduction in the academic field. With an educational pedigree in Who's Who as long long as Lake Winnipesaukee, and complemented by brilliant knowledgeable Dr. Virginia Brigham, an extraordinary faculty of yeasty professional talent has been attracted, capable of future attracting other recognized leaders in the fields of higher science. The third member of this unique team is resourceful Bert Dittus, whose skillful and eminently practical treatment of the "widow's cruse of oil" has been a marvel to those who have observed him in action. In charge of negative finances and with the gift of persuasion, he has coaxed, cajoled, harangued, and otherwise helped the college to acquire physical accommodations straining to keep abreast of the constant influx of new students. The understanding forbearance of suppliers and others in financial relationship, patient with long-range foresight, has been and still is a quiet stream of sound confidence in history that is rapidly unfolding.

We are here assembled to recognize officially the tenure as president of our distinguished colleague, Royal Merrill Frye, Phi Beta Kappa and Doctor of Philosophy, who has held the post of president since the college opened its doors 14 months ago. We consider ourselves singularly fortunate that his creative and pioneering spirit dictated his active participation and continued presence in this venture, and possibly can attribute some of his rugged zeal and ability to the fact that he was born in New Hampshire.

Masterminding the education of a rising generation is an overwhelming challenge. It takes the right combination of scholarship, integrity, administrative skill, fund-raising persuasiveness, and tough resilience in the face of stern criticism and straitened circumstances.

Royal Frye has all of these qualities and others beside, in full measure. He is a strong and personable leader, a man who stresses high quality in his faculty, who has shown that he thinks he knows what the future holds and is willing to tackle it. This has been demonstrated in his prolific contribution to scientific literature over many years, coupled with active instruction in scientific areas such as physics, biology, mathematics, astronomy and chemistry, and even music, at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Lincoln Institute, Northeastern University, Simmons College, and latterly at the College of Advanced Science. To keep himself further honed up, he served as scientific consultant with Operation Crossroads at Bikini, the atomic bomb tests in the Pacific, and later as scientific consultant with the early guided missiles project at White Sands in New Mexico, engaging among other activities in the collection of information about

the upper atmosphere, in which medium he has continued to live.

The record is replete with the inspired zeal of the student body, attacking farm buildings on the campus with hammers, saws, and crowbars and reconstructing them into laboratories, classrooms, and libraries; with the dedicated efforts of the faculty members, accepting stoically and cheerfully the connotations of a presently minuscule treasury; with the conceiving and putting into effect of ambitious but eminently practical plans of providing greatly needed additions to the physical plant, coupled with further like plans for the near future and for the semidistant future; with the unstinted cooperation of local bankers, merchants, and other businessmen, recognizing that college finances have so far been strained to the utmost but being farsighted enough to understand the future. These have been the subject of many favorable articles in the New Hampshire press, which has been most generous in the nurturing of this extraordinary undertaking.

Dr. Jeremy Belknap, teacher and clergyman, for whom the county was named almost 200 years ago, would have been profoundly gratified to have known that Belknap College, of which he was the illustrious academic ancestor, was following his precepts which are set forth in these words of his:

"Nature has been bountiful to you in giving your children genius and capacity; it is then your duty and interest to cultivate their capacities and render them serviceable to the community. Be attentive in the choice of instructors of youth, to see that they be men of good understanding, learning, and morals; that they teach by their example as well as their precepts; that they govern themselves, and teach their students the art of self-government."

I consider that we may all feel privileged to be participating in this modern-day miracle. We may all add fundamental building blocks to this noble edifice of the mind so rapidly being translated into reality, through our realizing its deep significance, through our spreading of its gospel, and through our continued practical enthusiasm and patience.

Top Award for Community Development in Pennsylvania in 1963 Won by Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the third time the Hazleton, Pa., community has become the top winner in stiff competition among the Commonwealth's progress-minded cities and towns. It was announced May 11, 1964, that the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce was awarded first place for community development in Pennsylvania, in the population class of over 25,000.

The Hazleton Standard-Speaker of May 12, 1964, gives a very informative artice, "Greater Hazleton Gets Community Contest Laurels," concerning the nature of this award.

The indicated article follows:

GREATER HAZLETON GETS COMMUNITY CONTEST LAURELS

The top award for community development in Pennsylvania in 1963 has been won by the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, it was announced yesterday.

It marked the third time that this community has walked off with the laurels in the stiff competition among the Commonwealth's myriad progress-minded cities and towns.

Greater Hazleton's award is the top one in the population class of "over 25,000" which includes every major metropolitan area including Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

The $1,500 first prize makes a total of $6,500 won by the chamber since it first entered the contest in 1956. The money, by the rules of the contest, must be spent for further community development.

This is the eighth consecutive year in which the local achievements have been among the winning entries.

The entry of the chamber was based on the accomplishments of the chamber of commerce and its affiliates—CAN-DO HIDC, Community Park Corp., fine arts council and the many chamber committees.

The categories entered included industrial development in which CAN-DO raised over $700,000 in its third fund campaign, enlarged Valmont Industrial Park, acquired new industry, began the Sekisui plant, and was able to list over 700 new jobs for the year.

Also entered was progress in area beautification, including community park improvement, highway tree planting, the home improvement contest, etc.

Highways played a big role in the entry as 1963 marked the start of interstate construction in the Greater Hazleton area.

Community activities included an educational symposium which attracted national attention, the major study of the city schools, fine arts council activities, publication of a convention brochure, and business development projects.

At least 27 categories of various local organizations were given credit in the entry for participating in the prize-winning projects.

They included the mayors and councils and supervisors of the local municipalities, regional service clubs, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, women's organizations, the county commissioners, the county tourist promotion agency, Penn State University at Highacres, civil defense and firemen's organizations and regional school districts.

The prize award will be made in Harrisburg later this month by Gov. William Scranton.

Chamber President Louis G. Feldmann, and Immediate Past President Nicholas Marsilio, in whose tenure part of the contest period fell, today were profuse in their praise of the dozens of men and women volunteers who made possible winning the prize.

Joined by Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, "can-do" president, they said, "The true worth in this great honor is the proof that we have so many people in this community who work unselfishly to improve the place in which they live and to help others have decent jobs, homes, recreational facilities, highways, etc.

"It also offers continued proof to the rest of the State that Greater Hazleton still ranks as one of our most progressive communities."

The community development contest is a project of the State chamber of commerce and it is assisted by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce.

Among its sponsors are the Pennsylvania Motor Federation AAA, Bell Telephone Co., Pennsylvania Chain Store Council, Pennsylvania Electric Association, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation, Pennsylvania Independent Telephone Association, Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, and Pennsylvania Natural Gas Men's Association.

Hazleton's record to date is as follows: 1962, second place; 1961, honorable mention; 1960, first place; 1959, third; 1958, sixth; 1957, fifth; 1956, first.

Prayers in Public Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I know of no Supreme Court decision in recent years which has created as much interest and caused so much concern among people as those affecting prayers in public institutions.

I am frank to admit that I was among those who were somewhat incensed upon hearing of these decisions. Upon closer examination of all factors involved and reviewing the proposed legislation to reverse the Supreme Court decision, I have reached a different conclusion.

Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate an excellent editorial on this subject appearing in the Bismarck Tribune of Bismarck, N. Dak., on May 11, 1964, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TINKERING WITH LIBERTY

To understand the movement to alter the U.S. Constitution so that a governmental body will be enabled to prescribe an official prayer, it is important to recall two Supreme Court decisions.

A 1962 decision related to a prayer drafted by the New York State Board of Regents for recitation by students and teachers at the start of each schoolday.

It was described as a "nondenominational" prayer and so it was neither Christian, Islamic, nor Jewish. But it was a state prayer, prescribed by a governmental body.

Since the first amendment to the Constitution declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise" of religion, the Court declared the New York State prayer was a violation of the Constitution. The majority opinion said that the first amendment "must at least mean that in this country it is not part of the business of a government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the government." Since "the power, prestige, and financial support of Government" were behind the New York State prayer it did tend to make it a religious program carried on by the government.

Those American families who do pray, together or as individuals, are usually solemnly selective in choosing the prayers they will utter. Different churches have different prayers. Most Christians refer to Christ. Roman Catholic Christians also refer to Mary, mother of Christ. To many, a "neutral" prayer, which is what the New York regents' prayer was supposed to be, is hardly a prayer at all.

In a 1963 decision, the Supreme Court held that it was unconstitutional for a local board of education to require the reading of certain prayers, and the Bible, in classrooms. It did not say that prayers could not be uttered by teachers or students or that the Bible could not be read in the classroom. It only said that it was unconstitutional for a State or local body to require religious exercises in the public schools.

If it were constitutional for a school board, or a State board of regents, to prescribe a

prayer for utterance in the public schools, it would follow that a school board or a State board of regents—or a State superintendent of public instruction—very likely could prescribe other religious exercises for the public schools. And if local and State authorities had this power, certainly the Federal Government would have the same power.

People who think Federal, State, or local authorities should have power to prescribe religious exercises will favor an amendment to the Constitution permitting it. Those who believe that the government should not have any authority over religion and religious exercises will be opposed to the amendment.

Obviously, those who drafted the amendments to the Constitution felt that religious liberty was of supreme importance, because they made its guarantee the first amendment.

It is so utterly simple and straightforward that it is difficult to see how any change could improve upon it: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

To tinker with it now is to change what has been an effective guarantee of religious freedom for 173 years.

Where Is the Economy Heading?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, by coincidence, two distinguished economic writers discuss the future of the current economic expansion in their columns of May 4, 1964. Their views sum up the conflicting positions on the economic outlook which have emerged since the passage of the tax cut early this year.

Harvey H. Segal, in a column in the Washington Post entitled "The Mounting Threat of Greater Prosperity" undertakes to refute the position taken by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee in their assessment of the annual economic report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Mr. Segal notes that the minority's thesis that the tax cut would overheat the economy, generate strong inflationary pressures, and possibly lead to a recession has been taken up until there are a large number of "variations on this basic theme." Pointing out that the business cycle is not a mechanical sequence of events, Mr. Segal also notes that adjustments to shocks and disturbances may take the form of variations in the rate of economic growth rather than recurrent expansions and contractions. He also cites a number of favorable developments which will act to dampen inflationary pressures, including an anticipated rapid growth in our labor force, intensive international competition, and better coordination of fiscal and monetary policies of the non-Communist countries.

Murray J. Rossant, in his column in the New York Times, points out that economists in banks and business organizations now think that a full-fledged boom may be in the making, which would be followed by a downturn. He admits that the boom psychology has not developed as yet, but notes that the ingredients of a potential boom are now present and may be realized within 3 to 6 months, or perhaps not until 1965. Mr. Rossant quotes a number of prominent economists to back up his position that the tax cut may be destabilizing, that important bottlenecks may develop in some areas, and that significant pressure on prices is likely to be felt as the economy reaches its "practical capacity" in the second half of this year.

Because these cloumns help to sharpen the debate and increase public understanding of the choices of economic policy, I ask unanimous consent to include them in the RECORD.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 4, 1964]

THE MOUNTING THREAT OF GREATER PROSPERITY

(By Harvey H. Segal)

What the unfortunate architects of the tax cut never anticipated was the anxiety that the prospect of its success would cause.

Before the tax bill was passed, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee set forth the thesis that a tax cut now would overheat the economy and generate strong inflationary pressures, a chain of events which would surely end with recession. And since that time there has been no dearth of variations on this basic theme.

One source of apprehension must be dispensed with before analyzing the more esoteric arguments. There are fiscal analysts, although their number is probably smaller than it was 2 or 3 months ago, who worry about the impacts of the decline in Federal expenditures which are budgeted to occur in the latter part of 1965.

Their fears, which could prove to be justified, are premised on a slow and modest reaction to the stimulus of tax reduction. But if the vigorous expansion of capital expenditures to which the surveys all point, materializes, there should be little cause for concern about breaking the upward trend of Federal expenditures.

But most of the anxiety about the effects of the tax cut runs far deeper than a concern over fiscal trends. There is the recurrent business cycle and unceasing menace of inflation.

When the late Wesley Clair Mitchell first made the "business cycle" a part of the intelligent man's vocabulary, he had no inkling of the way in which his meticulous analysis would be used by those with policy axes to grind.

For Mitchell, who had a deep interest in history and the evolution of economic institutions, the business cycles was not an inevitable sequence of events destined to occur at all times in all places. He viewed the cycle as the process by which the myriad of economic activities adjust to shocks and disturbances, and he was deeply cognizant of the fact this process changes over time.

But there are those—and they include some eminent economists—who have become victims of the illusion of the cycle as a mechanical sequence of events. They note darkly that the present economic expansion, which began in February 1961, is in its 39th month. And in pointing to the historical record, they ask, by implication, how much longer it can continue.

And a number of the cyclical pessimists subscribe to a new version of the overinvestment thesis, according to which the tax cut will lift business expectations, causing many firms to overexpand. One proponent of this view, a prominent Republican economist, is now urging a more restrictive monetary policy. According to his brand of reasoning, a recession is about due in 1965 and a strong expansion in capital outlays may only serve to exacerbate the downturn. So he is now urging restrictive monetary measures. If they worked, we would presumably have a mild recession at the end of this year instead of a more severe one in 1965.

What the rigid cyclicalists overlook is the possibility that the adjustment to shocks and disturbances may take the form of variations in the rate of economic growth rather than recurrent expansions and contractions.

The prospect of more rapid rate of economic growth is equally disquieting to those who have a morbid fear of inflation and for whom the stability of the price level takes precedence over a high level of employment.

Before his death Sumner Slichter of Harvard University shocked many of his admirers in the business community by arguing that a modest rate of increase in the price level was a price well worth paying for a high level of employment. And other economists have analyzed "tradeoffs" between the goals of high employment and price stability in which they estimated the levels of unemployment necessary to maintain a constant price level.

The upshot of much of their analysis is that the cost of price stability, measured in terms of unemployed men and idle plant capacity, is very high.

But there are no compelling reasons for believing that the American economy is confronted with the either/or alternatives of creeping inflation or underutilization. There are reasons for a more roseate view:

The U.S. labor force over the next few years, unlike those in France, Italy, and West Germany, will grow rapidly. New entries into the labor force and those who are now unemployed will slow, if not check the upward movement of wage rates.

International competition, which will grow in intensity whether or not tariffs are cut in the "Kennedy round," should act as a brake on price increases.

And finally there are efforts to coordinate the fiscal and monetary policies of the non-Communist countries now underway in the Common Market and more broadly in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Unfortunately none of these considerations will make much of an impression upon those who place great stock in the dictum that "every economic expansion contains the seeds of a contraction." It's like original sin.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1964]

ECONOMY VIEWS SHIFT—DOUBTS ARISE THAT EXPANSION WILL REMAIN FREE OF INFLATION PRESSURE

(By M. J. Rossant)

Business economists and those working for the Johnson administration no longer agree on the outlook for the economy.

The administration's economists, and the President himself, express confidence that the expansion in business activity will continue to roll along free of inflationary pressures. Their forecast is for an upturn that remains short of boom proportions.

Economists in banks and business organizations had shared this view, but many have been subject to growing doubts. They now think that a full-fledged boom be in the making, which would be followed by a downturn.

There is as yet no trangible evidence of a boom—or of serious inflationary pressures—that would call for a tighter monetary policy. Those who are talking in boom terms admit that it is at least 3 to 6 months away, and might not emerge until 1965.

But the shift in the thinking of economists is significant. Until recently, they have been cautious, if not actually pessimistic, about

the prospects for a further rise in economic activity.

Last September, for instance, the annual poll taken by the National Association of the Business Economists showed that 18 percent predicted a decline in business for 1964.

The majority then forecast a relatively modest rise in gross national product from $585 billion in 1963 to $607 billion in 1964. This increase was based on the assumption that tax reductions would be between $4 billion and $5 billion.

Economists began raising their sights as business activity in 1963's last quarter exceeded their expectations, and when Mr. Johnson reshaped the tax reduction bill, increasing its size and packing more of its punch into the current year, they made fresh upward adjustments in their forecasts.

Thus, in January at the time that the President's Council of Economic Advisers unveiled its prediction that gross national product would touch around $623 billion for the year, the revised consensus was close to that figure. But while the C.E.A. has stood pat, many economists have been busy making further revisions.

Tilford C. Gaines, vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, is one who has joined the boom camp. He observed last week that "what has thus far been an orderly business expansion will probably develop boom symptoms within the next few months," triggered by "a boom psychology among businessmen and consumers."

Mr. Gaines thinks that the current rise may lure businessmen into the old trap of overestimating the potential growth of the market for their products, leading them to expand capacity at a rate and to a degree that would eventually prove to have been excessive. Simultaneously, boom psychology could lead businessmen to stockpile inventories, either in anticipation of boom sales levels or in fear of price inflation."

A boom psychology has not developed as yet, but other economists who note that the ingredients of a potential boom are now present.

A symposium published in the spring newsletter of the National Association of Business Economists reveals some of the danger signs seen by economists.

Commenting on Government finances, Morris Cohen, associate economist of Fortune, notes that the tax cut is bigger than the $11.5 billion estimated by the administration. He puts its size at over $13 billion and argues that it "is introducing a destabilizing force" that could produce shocks to the economy in 1965.

Douglas Greenwald of McGraw-Hill, dealing with the impact of tax reductions on capital spending reports that "pressure on capacity has already developed in the auto industry, especially in components, in textiles, in oil, in papers, and in some lines of chemicals." He thinks that a rising level of consumer demand "could result in important bottlenecks arising soon in many production fields."

SOME OTHER VIEWS

Edmund A. Mennis, vice president of Wellington Management Co., comments that "it seems doubtful that most corporations will willingly pass on the benefits of the tax cuts in the form of lower prices." And William F. Butler, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, predicts that gross national product will be running at a rate of $640 billion in the second half, which will pose "a problem of containing inflationary pressures later in the year."

According to Mr. Butler, the economy will be operating at close to "practical capacity" in the second half. He thinks that this state of affairs will place significant pressure on prices and could mean a tightening in the labor market "to support wage increases in excess of the gain in productivity."

It seems clear that there is a danger that a boom or inflationary psychology will take hold. The administration can state that the availability of labor and plant capacity is ample protection against price increases, but it is asking for trouble by urging businessmen and consumers to spend all of the increase in purchasing power provided by tax reductions. For if this happened, it could result in the destabilizing boom forecast by economists.

So far, though, economists appear to be the only ones afflicted with a boom or inflationary psychology. If businessmen and consumers heed their new warnings, the boom and the ensuing bust may be avoided.

Here I Stand—I, Too, Am Diminished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my link to the medical profession is much closer than the writer, Mr. Frank Morriss of "Here I stand—I, Too, Am Diminished," in the national edition of the Register, which is America's national Catholic newspaper in Denver, Colo., April 26, 1964.

As we slice away more and more individual freedoms in our U.S. Nation's precipitous course toward patent and obvious socialism, the trades and professions which abide on free enterprise, competition, freedom of choice, and lack of third party—Government—intervention, best look to their rights of survival.

Recently I noted in this RECORD the tragic story of the legal profession in Poland being completely nationalized. Have you ever heard of unions or certified-life-underwriters in a completely socialistic state? I commend the writer for realizing that his freedom is diminished in direct proportion to the doctor-patient relationship. Like him, I beg leave to insert this, not to commend or condone doctors striking in the interest of preserving their ancient and honorable professional relations with fellow man and the very humanity they succor. I write it in the hopes that as we vote ourselves additional largess and benefits from the Federal till that we will struggle to remain free in all professions, including the news media, the clergy, and others who have direct servant-humanity contacts. Only in remaining free can the individual be dignified and function properly in a profession. There is no need for insertion of third party interference breaking down the time-honored doctor-patient relationship, destroying research or preventing so honorable a profession from policing itself. Throughout history the end results have justified the means, and as the writer so succinctly states, why demoralize and regiment, to the point where honor and self-determination are eliminated, and all become vassals of the state.

The article follows:

HERE I STAND—I, TOO, AM DIMINISHED

(By Frank Morriss)

I write this neither to uphold nor condemn the doctors' strike in Belgium. The issues in such a situation are so complex that a clear-cut defense or condemnation cannot be made.

I write to remind those who care to listen that the medical profession is an ancient and free one. It is nearly as ancient as priesthood, and, in fact, in some areas seems to melt in origin into that profession. It is absolutely necessary that it remain a free profession itself. It is dictated by the nature of the profession and by the welfare of the recipients of its services. Whether doctors in Belgium used proper methods to attempt to remain free is beside the point entirely. The point is, that in struggling to remain free, they are struggling for every other profession (including the priesthood, if we may here call such a profession). Their struggle, in the long run, is actually in behalf of their patients as much as in behalf of themselves.

But the prime interest of most physicians and dentists is that they remain free because only in remaining free can they function properly in their profession. Pope John himself clearly recognized that the fulfillment of responsibilities of men demands that they remain free in the exercise of those responsibilities.

For a doctor to allow anything extraneous to his own conscience and skill to dictate to him how to function as a doctor would be as immoral as for a writer to allow anything beyond his own conscientious beliefs to dictate to him what to put down as truth.

When he is not allowed to function freely as a doctor, the door is opened to the most dark and disgusting immoral chambers. Those physicians who allowed the Nazi regime to dictate to them in matters of medicine degraded themselves and their profession. If the government has the power to insist he abide by his oath, it also has the power to insist he break that oath. That, in fact, is what totalitarian regimes almost inevitably do demand.

I am not saying, mind you, that doctors or any others should be above laws for protection of the common good. I am saying that the professionals must be beyond the dictation of the government in the exercise of their professions.

Those in Belgium, Canada, the United States, or any other country who are tempted by the offer held out by socialists to control medicine should think twice as to what it would mean.

It would mean that a third party has entered into the relationship between the doctor and the patient. That party (and with recent revelations about Government methods of snooping this is a very real danger) would in a sense be present at every consultation, and would have at least a potential voice in every decision.

The records of the relationship between patient and doctor would no longer be under the complete control of the physician. Those aspects of individuals' lives which are—next to the matters of conscience entrusted to priest and minister—the most intimate and secret would be open to the eyes of the omnipresent bureaucrat.

As the doctor became more and more the tool of that bureaucracy (remember, the Belgium strike was precipitated by an extension of medical benefits the social security law, an extension similar to the ones the Government here says would never be asked for), efficiency would inevitably suffer.

Those of other professions, trades, and skills may stand by unconcerned while this tragedy takes place. But they should take heed from the words of the poet and preacher John Donne. The bell that tolls the death of free medicine is also tolling the death of free

religion, free justice, free press. All the excuses of the common good that apply to medicine apply in different degrees to these other professions.

My only link to the medical profession is that I am a free patron of its services, and that I practice, too, an ancient free profession as a practitioner of true words and opinions.

What diminishes the freedom of my doctor takes from me, too.

Why, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 29, 1964, at the President's press conference, Mr. Johnson stated:

The United States has successfully developed an advanced experimental jet aircraft, the A-11, which has been tested in sustained flight at more than 2,000 miles per hour, and at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet. The performance of the A-11 far exceeds that of any other aircraft in the world today.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on page A-6 of the May 12, 1964, issue of the Washington Evening Star, there appeared two pictures of the fantastic XB-70A. It stated under the pictures:

A view from the front reveals the cobra look of the 2,000-miles-an-hour Air Force bomber after it was rolled out of the huge North American Aviation, Inc., hangar at Palmdale, Calif.

In that same issue of the Evening Star, on page B-4, I noticed that the relatives of the Americans killed in Vietnam took a full page to pose several questions to President Johnson as to whether the lives of the American boys had been given in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I have several questions to add to the list. Why are our pilots in Vietnam using prop-driven trainers instead of jets? In addition, Mr. Speaker, why must our young be sacrificed to appease the forces in the slough of despond who do not want to get out of Vietnam and yet are afraid to make a fight out of it?

Under unanimous consent, the aforementioned page from the Evening Star follows:

WHY? WHY?

The undersigned—parents and grandparents, wives and children and brothers and sisters of Americans killed in Vietnam—have a question for the President of the United States and the Nation:

Why are the young Americans who are fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam—shoulder to shoulder with free Vietnamese soldiers—forced to withstand the onslaught of the Communist enemy without having the opportunity to attack the enemy's own territory in the North?

Why must young Americans give their lives in the jungles and the ricefields in Vietnam in the fight against a Communist enemy when the Government of the United States authorizes trade with Communist countries—trade which is utilized to strengthen Communist power in Vietnam and throughout the world?

Why must our young men die in far-off Vietnam, fighting the Communist enemy, when their Government authorizes "cultural" exchanges with the Communist world—the exchange of ballet dancers to entertain Communist leaders in Moscow while a young American does the dance of death in Vietnam?

Why must we repeat the tragic error of Korea—where 54,246 Americans gave up their lives in a war that we had no intention of winning? Must the same number be sacrificed for the same empty reasons in Vietnam?

Why do we fight communism with one hand—at a terrible cost of our loved ones—and help communism with the other hand? If international communism is the enemy of our Nation, then we must fight. If it is not, then let's bring our young men home—from throughout the world—and submit to international communism's ambition to control the world. We can't have it both ways—it must be one way or the other.

These are only some of the questions that we have—and these questions demand an answer in the name of our national conscience and honor. The men whom we lost were precious to us—our sons and brothers, our husbands and the fathers of our children. They died in the service of their Nation. That they died in vain would be a national crime.

We call on you, Mr. President—and on the Nation—to see to it that the sacrifice of those whom we loved shall not have been for naught. And the only way to make their sacrifice meaningful is to rededicate ourselves to the eternal struggle for freedom against all who would threaten it. If we do not, then these empty sacrifices will continue until our final defeat at the hands of an enemy who has a plan and is willing to implement it in every way.

When freedom is under armed attack—as it is in Vietnam—we must fight back with everything we have. We must destroy the enemies of freedom wherever they are—and not stop at some artificial border created by diplomats in a far-off country who possibly have never known the pain of battle or the loss of a son or a husband.

To make the supreme sacrifice in a war that cannot be won is too great a sacrifice to ask anyone. If we are to battle, let's battle to win.

If we are not to do this, Mr. President, please tell us.

AMERICANS WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM FROM JANUARY 1961 THROUGH MARCH 1964

(This list has been made available by the Public Affairs Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. We believe that this list is not complete and that many more Americans have been killed by Communist bullets in Vietnam than has been reported by the Department of Defense.)

Capt. James H. Allred.
Sp. 5 Marshall Angell.
Capt. John P. Bartley.
Lt. Arthur Bedal.
Capt. Robert D. Bennett.
Capt. Thomas J. Bergin.
Capt. Herbert W. Booth, Jr.
Sp. 4 Donald L. Braman.
Sgt. Verndean A. Brockman.
Capt. James H. Brodt.
Capt. Gordon R. Brown.
Lt. Louis S. Carricarte.
Pfc. Loye T. Christman.
Capt. Howard R. Cody.
Capt. Terry D. Cordell.
Lt. Parker D. Cramer.
Lt. Edward B. Cribb.
Capt. Jerry A. Campaigne.
Cpl. Donald F. Davidson.
Sp. 4 James T. Davis.
Sgt. William L. Deal.
Manuel Reyes Denton, U.S. Navy.
Sgt. Wilbur T. Dunlap.
Capt. Howard M. Eakin, Jr.
Sgt. James A. Ellis.
Sp. 5 Richard L. K. Ellis.
Pfc. Jean Claude Esnault.
Sgt. William Joseph Everhart.
Lt. Clayton A. Fannin.
Pfc. Peter M. Feierabend.
Lt. Bruce Charles Ferrell.
Lt. Charles M. Fitts.
Capt. Woodrow M. Fitzgerald.
Sp. 5 William Edward Flowers.
Pfc. Raymond P. Flynn.
Sgt. Richard L. Fox.
Sgt. Rube A. Freeman.
Sp. 5 James Gabriel.
Sgt. Robert L. Gardner.
Lt. Roger E. Gauvin.
Sp. 4 Arthur W. Glover.
CWO Joseph Goldberg.
Capt. Kenneth N. Good.
Sgt. Jack D. Goodman.
Sp. 5 Harold L. Guthrie.
Capt. Lawrence E. Hackley.
Sgt. Robert J. Hain.
CWO Lawrence D. Hammond.
Capt. Herbert F. Hardy.
Capt. William T. Harris.
Lt. Charles M. Hasper.
Col. Thomas Hergert.
Capt. Vincent J. Hickman.
Pfc. Frank J. Holguin.
WO Charles E. Holloway.
CWO William H. House.
CWO James H. Ishihara.
Lt. Richard E. Jaeck.
Sgt. Larry D. Jameson.
Capt. Charles B. Johnson.
Capt. James H. Johnson.
Capt. Donald E. Koelper.
Capt. Leon J. Kramer.
Sp. 5 James E. Lane.
Lt. Timothy M. Lang.
Sgt. Charles B. Lankford.
Pfc. Boyce E. Lawson.
Sgt. Johnnie G. Lee.
Lt. Daniel K. Lessig.
Lt. Atis K. Lielmanis.
Pfc. Terrance Lovenguth.
Capt. Bernard F. Lukasik.
Sp. James D. McAndrew.
Sgt. Claude W. McBride.
Capt. Morris R. McBride.
Capt. Thomas W. McCarthy.
Capt. Walter R. McCarthy.
Pvt. Charles W. McCary.
Capt. John H. McClean.
Pfc. Garry F. McFetridge.
Capt. Donald V. McGregor.
Pfc. Neil K. MacIver.
Sgt. Wayne E. Marchand.
Spc. 4 Michael P. P. Martin, Jr.
Lt. Bryford G. Metoyer.
Capt. Andrew C. Mitchell III.
Maj. Carl B. Mitchell.
Capt. Clarence L. Moorer.
Sgt. Walter K. Morris.
Capt. Robert K. Mosier.
Pfc. Newman R. Nesmith.
Capt. Ted P. Neura.
Pfc. Grover K. Olson.
Maj. James R. O'Neill.
Capt. Lloyd A. Payne.
Sp. 5 William A. Reid.
Claude Rice, U.S.N.
Lt. Arthur G. Richardson.
Cpl. Luther E. Ritchey, Jr.
Lt. Lynn H. Rothenbuhler.
Lt. Uwe-Thorsten Scobeler.
Lt. Edwin G. Shank, Jr.
Lt. Kenneth A. Shannon.
Capt. John R. Shaughnessy, Jr.
Pfc. John F. Shea.
Capt. Robert L. Simpson.
Lt. Paul R. Smith.
Lt. Lewis L. Stone.
Pfc. John L. Straley.

Pfc. Donald R. Taylor.
Sgt. Robert L. Taylor.
Lt. Col. Anthony J. Tencza.
Capt. Condon H. Terry.
Sp. David Thompson.
Capt. Donald B. Toth.
Sp. Chester Townsend.
Lt. William F. Train III.
Lt. William B. Tully.
Cpl. Charles P. Tuthill.
Sp. 5 Carleton W. Upton.
Capt. Dean A. Wadsworth.
Capt. James E. Wenzel.
CWO Charles F. Whitehead, Jr.
CWO Raymond C. Wilde.
Lt. Ronny L. Woodmansee.
Sp. 5 Wally M. Wright, Jr.
Capt. Don J. York.

LIST OF RELATIVES OF VIETNAM WAR DEAD WHO HAVE JOINED IN SIGNING THIS OPEN LETTER

Mrs. Norma Areyo.
Mrs. K. Boekelor.
Mr. Eugene W. Brockman.
Mr. Melvin V. Brockman.
Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur A. Brockman.
Mr. and Mrs. Chester Brodt.
Mrs. Henry Brodt.
Mrs. James H. Brodt.
Catherine Brodt.
Leslie Ann Brodt.
Mrs. Dalton Brubaker.
Mr. Albert C. Carricarte.
Mr. Albert L. Carricarte.
Mr. Edward C. Carricarte.
Mr. and Mrs. H. R. Cody.
Karen Cody.
Mrs. Myrna W. Cody.
Randy Cody.
Rhonda Cody.
Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Cordell.
Mr. James Arthur Cordell.
Mrs. Elizabeth Cucurullo.
Arleen S. Denton.
Barbara Ann S. Denton.
Mrs. Esmeralda Sanchez Denton.
Sandra S. Denton.
Mr. Dale B. Dunlap.
Mr. Earl H. Dunlap.
Mr. Malcolm Dunlap, Jr.
Mrs. Beulah Mae Ehlers.
Mr. and Mrs. Gaston B. Esnault.
Mr. and Mrs. August K. Feierabend.
Mr. Helmut G. Feierabend.
Mrs. Virginia Halling.
Miss Anita L. Holguin.
Miss Irene Holguin.
Mr. and Mrs. Modesto Holguin, Sr.
Mr. Modesto Holguin, Jr.
Mrs. Charles E. Holloway.
Carol Holloway.
Charles R. Holloway.
Christine Holloway.
David Holloway.
Gwendolyn Holloway.
Mrs. Glenna Hubbard.
Mr. Elmer W. Jaeck.
Mr. Donald Jameson.
Mrs. Mamie E. Jameson.
Mrs. Dumple McCary Jones.
Mrs. Helen Kramer.
Mrs. Hazel M. Lane.
Mrs. Jo Ann Lane.
Cindy S. Lankford.
Mrs. Deanna H. Lankford.
Mark C. Lankford.
Michael R. Lankford.
Imelda Lawson.
Mrs. Mary Lawson.
Mrs. Patricia R. Lawson.
Mr. Roger Dale Lawson.
Charles S. Tuthill.
Mrs. Elizabeth A. McCarthy.
Mr. Bonnie O. McCary.
Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm C. McCary.
Mr. and Mrs. Clayton McFetridge.
Mr. Danny Ray McFerridge.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert McKee.
Mrs. Darla J. Martin.
Timothy Martin.
Michael Martin.
Mrs. James O'Donnell.
Mrs. Caroline V. O'Neill.
Mrs. Theresa Ruiz.
Mrs. Connie A. Shank.
Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Shank, Sr.
Mrs. Kenneth A. Shannon.
Mr. and Mrs. Laron D. Shannon, Jr.
Laron D. Shannon III.
Laura D. Shannon.
Mrs. Lois K. Tuthill.
Miss Deborah T. Tuthill.
Mr. Bradley Upton.
Mrs. Linda G. Upton.
Mrs. Dorothy Wear.
Mrs. Christiane M-G Whitman.
Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Williams.
Mrs. Edeltraut G. Younk.

The funds for this advertisement have been provided by a group of Americans in memory of the gallant young Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam against the Communist enemy and in the prayerful hope that their lives have not been given in vain.

Massachusetts Citizens for Public Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on behalf of the Massachuetts Citizens for Public Prayer and this testimony was given by Rev. Robert G. Howes, associate professor, Catholic University of America:

TESTIMONY OF REV. ROBERT G. HOWES BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE REGARDING PUBLIC PRAYER

We come here today to support the Becker amendment. Proposals to amend the Constitution to permit voluntary prayer and Bible reading in the public classroom were filed in the Congress after the first prayer decision. To date, nearly 2 years later, no effective action has been taken on these proposals. We believe there is a great urgency about this matter. We urge that a responsible amendment be proposed by this committee to this session of the Congress and, in view of the possibility of prolonged hearings here, we supported—and we continue to support should it become again necessary—the discharge petition method of securing such action prior to the adjournment of the Congress.

A truly wonderful thing has happened in America. Accused of indifference to our religious inheritance, we have been stirred to the very deepest grassroots in a cause as basically spiritual as any we have faced as a nation since our ancestors knelt on a cold deck in Massachusetts Bay and invited Almighty God to bless their first civic congregation. When the history of the peoples' amendment for public prayer is written this must, indeed, be its finest chapter. In spite of a continuing and curious campaign to silence them, with little VIP encouragement and an incredibly small notice in many of the news media, over a period of nearly 2 years the American people have sustained their instinctive conviction that the prayer decisions are seriously wrong. Again and again in their local assemblies, by collective petition and individual letter, they have recorded themselves for amendment. On the very day these hearings started 40,000 names from Maryland asking for a prayer amendment were placed before the committee by Representative FALLON. One day later over 100,000 names were similarly introduced by a Congressman from California.

We note also without comment increasing evidence in the Sixty-fourth Maryland District race, here on the very threshold of the Congress, that the prayer amendment is an issue of deep concern to the American people.

Our own experience across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts testifies to the same massive public will for amendment. Suffice it here to note these additional witnesses:

(a) The Gallup poll in September of 1963 showed that the American people were by a majority of 3 to 1 opposed to the two prayer decisions.

(b) The Honorable CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 11, 1964, p. A1255):

"Do you favor amending the Constitution to permit Bible reading and prayers in public schools?" Yes, 80 percent; no, 15 percent; not sure, 5 percent.

(c) The Honorable ROBERT J. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 19, 1964, p. A1447):

Similar question to above (b): Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

(d) The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, of Connecticut, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 8, 1964, p. A1710):

Similar question to above (b): Yes, 80.7 percent; no, 14.6 percent.

(e) The Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 15, 1964, p. A1879):

"Do you believe that a constitutional amendment should be adopted which would restore the status that existed between religions and the schools prior to the Supreme Court decision on prayer?" Yes, 73.5 percent; no, 16.8 percent; undecided, 9.7 percent.

(f) The Honorable HAROLD M. RYAN, of Michigan, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 16, 1964, p. 7891):

Similar question to above (b): Yes, 8,545; no, 3,560.

(g) The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 21, 1964, p. A1983):

"Do you favor prayer and the reading of the Bible in the public schools?" Yes, 90 percent; no, 6 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

(h) The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of New York, polling his home district (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 28, 1964, A2095):

Similar question to above (b): yes, 85.2 percent; no, 12.9 percent; undecided, 1.9 percent.

(i) "Representative SNYDER, of Kentucky, under fire from the hierarchy of his own Baptist church for cosponsoring a prayer amendment, queried his constituents. The result: of questionnaires returned so far, 94 percent support his stand" (the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 22, 1964).

(j) "Of the hundreds of expressions about this matter I have received, only two have been opposed to school prayer. The ratio runs about 500 to 1 in favor of my proposed amendment to the Constitution" (the Honorable FRED B. ROONEY, of Pennsylvania, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 24, 1964, A1506).

In addition to these samplings, Congressman after Congressman testifying here already has witnessed to the huge volume of proamendment mail he has been and is receiving. The public press also, in its analy-

sis of congressional mail, repeatedly indicates that the will of the people in this matter is massively proamendment.

It has been suggested that the people are somehow deceived in their conviction. It has been suggested that because an overwhelming majority of Americans concur in something that thing must, by some strange twist of logic, be wrong. It has been suggested that the majority is not determinative of basic rights. And this latter contention is, of course, true. But, if we in America are to remain a democracy, the majority must remain determinative when it becomes a question of restoring a right which has been juridically lost and of clarifying that right forever beyond the reach of possible future judicial threat. For the rest, we have confidence in the American people as we have experienced them in Massachusetts during the struggle for a prayer amendment and as we have touched them across America in our national association with fellow amendment fighters. We have confidence in the extraordinary and enduring popular wisdom which has produced this struggle and without which, as a previous witness has indicated, these hearings might never have happened. We have confidence, too, in the elemental and proven commonsense of the American people at the local and the State level, once the peoples' amendment for public prayer has been written into the Constitution, to handle as they always have, prior to June 25, 1962, the matter of reverence in the public classroom.

In fact the one golden thread which weaves through our entire position is this. We have confidence in the American people—confidence all the way from the moment they began expressing themselves so emphatically on this matter to that happy day when once again in their local communities and States they can determine for themselves in this critical matter of public reverence. Conversely, the thread which runs through the opposition is doubt about the American people, a certain cynicism, a curious unwillingness to trust the people either as they now express in an almost unprecedented manner their will or as soon again they may, in their best commonsense, precise these issues of public reverence.

We trust there is no Member of the Congress, elected by the popular will and responsive in his other legislative action to that will, who will want to associate himself with the scorn in which certain isolated voices seem to hold the public mind of this Nation.

But the people have not been alone in their convictions. State legislatures, at least in Maryland, Michigan, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, New Jersey, and Louisiana have seconded the public intention. We are proud to notice here that the Massachusetts great and general court is similarly on record.

It is a source of much personal joy to me that in the Massachusetts lower house the proamendment motion was carried largely through the efforts of a good friend and fellow alumnus of Holy Cross College, the Honorable John F. X. Davoren, member from the town of Milford, Mass.

Here is a portion of the resolution of the Massachusetts house of representatives adopted on March 18, 1964:

"It is a basic belief of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of these United States that reading of the Bible which is God's Holy Book and prayer are a basic part of the belief that this State and Nation is a State and Nation under God and that such Bible reading and prayer should be a part of the curriculum of our public school systems. Such Supreme Court decision denies the very great majority of Americans their fundamental constitutional right to express in our public schools their belief in Almighty God. The said Supreme Court decision has made it possible for a very small minority to supress the will, desires, and wishes of the people of these United States."

We notice, too, at this time and present to the committee for inclusion in the record of these hearings, the following resolutions from typical Massachusetts communities. All of the resolutions, the great majority by unanimous vote, call for the preparation and presentation to the people of the United States of a proposal for constitutional amendment to restore prayer and Bible reading on a voluntary basis to the public classroom:

1. The City Council of the City of Worcester, Mass. (twice unanimously).
2. The School Committee on the City of Fitchburg, Mass.
3. The School Committee of the City of Worcester, Mass.
4. The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Northbridge, Mass.
5. The School Committee of the Town of Southboro, Mass.
6. The Selectmen of the Town of Webster, Mass.
7. The Selectmen of the Town of Andover, Mass.
8. The Selectmen of the Town of Norwood, Mass.
9. The School Committee of the Town of Rutland, Mass.
10. The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Boylston, Mass.
11. The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Tolland, Mass.
12. The School Committee of the City of Gloucester, Mass.
13. The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Tisbury, Mass.
14. The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Shrewsbury, Mass.
15. The School Committee of the Town of North Brookfield, Mass.

Also on record for amendment are His Excellency Episcopal Bishop James Pike (see app. item No. 6); His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman (app. item No. 4); the National Association of Evangelicals; the National Conference of State Governors (app. item No. 1); the National Council of Catholic Youth (app. item No. 2); the American Legion; and the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. Listed as members of the board of governors of Constitutional Prayer Foundation, a national organization working toward a prayer amendment are the Governors of Florida, New Mexico, Delaware, Utah, Connecticut, Arizona, Colorado. As supporters of the same organization include the Governors of Montana, New Hampshire, Maine, Hawaii, Virginia, and North Carolina. Among prominent Americans who have disagreed with the Court's two prayer decisions are Henry P. van Dusen, president of the Union Theological Seminary (app. item No. 5); Dean Erwin M. Griswold, of the Harvard Law School (app. item No. 7); and Will Herberg, professor in Drew Theological Seminary.

Dr. Billy Graham, truly a great American, stands also with us.

Gentleman, it was my privilege to join personally with Dr. Graham in the Capitol rotunda on that dark Sunday last November when Mr. Kennedy's remains were carried there for a last farewell. I talked at length with Dr. Graham. And, gentlemen, I can say without hestitation that this outstanding fellow citizen of ours is very deeply troubled by the prayer decisions. His statements to this effect are already in the record of these hearings. I can testify that they come from a strong personal conviction. In any case, we, the Massachusetts Citizens for Public Prayer, are proud to stand with Dr. Graham at this critical moment.

We are saying here quite simply that not only have the American people themselves instinctively sensed the wrong in the prayer decisions and sustained their sentiment over nearly 2 years but responsible voices have been raised individually and collectively which concur, after very careful study of the decisions themselves, with the popular mind.

One hundred years ago a great American stood in Columbus, Ohio, and said of another Supreme Court decision: "When all the words, the collateral matter was cleared away from it, all the chaff was fanned out of it, it was a bare absurdity." Abraham Lincoln said further of the same decision: "We oppose the decision because we think it lays the foundation of enlarging and spreading out what we consider an evil." Nothing could more expertly express our opposition to the "prayer decisions" than these good words of Mr. Lincoln. The evil in them, as it was in the Dred Scott decision, is an instant thing. It is also a deadly precedent. In the light of our history, in the presence of the basic constitutional commentaries of Messrs. Cooley and Storxy, it is finally an incredible thing. (See app. items Nos. 10 and 11.)

Clear away the sonorous paragraphs, uncover the deed of these decisions and, as Lincoln put it, the absurdity is bare for all to see. It is precisely for this reason that the people, unskilled though they may be in the technicalities of law, knew immediately that the decisions were seriously wrong. In their Amicus Curiae brief, prior to the first prayer decision, the attorneys general of 20 States from New York in size to Nevada expressed it this way:

"Our Founding Fathers together with the great and God-fearing leaders of the last century and a half would be profoundly shocked were they to have been told in their day that in this year of our Lord * * * a voluntary nondenominational acknowledgement of a Supreme Being and a petition for His blessing, recited by American children in their classrooms, is being seriously attacked as a violation of the Constitution of the United States."

The superintendent of public education in a large State has written us in similar vein. "How," he asks, "if the conclusion reached in these prayer decisions is so ridiculous can the premises themselves be sound?"

What has happened here, beyond the obiter dicta and the rolling phrases is that the Constitution has been twisted entirely out of its original and traditional meaning. What was for our ancestors a valid principle of resistance to the establishment of Anglicanism, Roman catholicism, congregationalism, or any other spiritual "ism" has now been officially twisted into the sheer unreason of barring all public reverence from the schools of a God-fearing people. In the process a fatal equation has been placed. Any act of public reverence, however nondenominational and however voluntary, has now been equated by the highest court in the land with establishment. Even to question this equation, the Court said in its majority statement in the second prayer decision is "of value only as academic exercises."

There is an old saying, "What you do thunders so loud I can't hear what you say." Curiously enough the American people, as well as all of us who disagree with them, stand accused by the opposition of not having read the prayer decisions. The real difficulty, of course, lies in the fact that the opposition may have read but it certainly has not understood the decisions. In the amicus curiae brief of the 20 State attorneys general to which we make reference above there is this further passage:

"If the voluntary recitation of this nondenominational prayer recited in public schools is unconstitutional, then it should logically follow that the public acknowledgment of and prayer to Almighty God must be banished from all governmental functions."

What the prayer decisions do clearly is to explode a bomb with a deadly fallout. From these decisions, unless we now reverse them

emphatically through a constitutional amendment, must develop an irradiation which goes to the very marrow of the bone of those long traditions of public reverence which have for so many decades distinguished our people.

Mr. Justice Stewart expressed it well when, in dissenting from the second prayer decision, he said that by it "religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage."

To the prayer hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1962 (at p. 18 of the report thereof) Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, made this wise comment: "While I would like to limit the Court's decision as narrowly as possible, I cannot avoid the apprehension that it has put a new gloss on the first amendment under which every public or governmental manifestation of kinship with religion will be in jeopardy." In its excellent editorial on June 28, 1963, the Catholic Free Press, weekly of the Roman Catholic diocese of Worcester, Mass., noted:

"DAM IS BROKEN

"As we suspected when the Supreme Court handed down its decision * * * the dam is broken and the flood has begun. This week the Los Angeles affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union filed suit in superior court in Los Angeles to have the phrase 'under God' stricken from the pledge of allegiance to the flag. * * * There seems little doubt about the intentions of the secularists, humanists, and atheists in following up their recent victories with attempts to drive all vestiges of God and religion out of American public life. * * * The Supreme Court henceworth will find it most difficult to retreat from the present course it has set for itself." (See also app. item No. 3.)

Not only does the record show a widening confusion in local school districts as to what is and what is not permitted in terms of the two prayer decisions but, clearly, those who would force an end to every instance of public reverence now use these two decisions as precedent, as basis for new attacks.

Speaking for His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Roman Catholic archbishop of New York in re the first prayer decision, Attorney Lawrence Cusack called it "a grave error in judicial judgment, a decision out of line with the conscience and religious heritage of the American people and one which foreshadows an ominous trend to undermine cherished traditions of this Nation. * * * The decision has a significance that goes far beyond the legal issue involved."

Speaking to the second prayer decision, the Reverend Walter G. J. Hards, an Episcopal rector from Baltimore, Md., said in a magnificent sermon to his congregation on June 23, 1963:

"On the basis of the Supreme Court decision I can see no logical stopping place except the complete eradication of God from our Government and all its agencies. * * * The decision of the Supreme Court is not antireligious in itself, but in its implications, it encloses religion and in the long run will tend to stifle it."

In short, as our Washington, D.C., representative expressed it in his address to the Bellarmine Society of Law and Government at Boston College on February 3, 1964:

"We are convinced that the return of prayer and Bible reading to the public classroom is one of the great imperatives before the American Nation today. This for two principal reasons. First, because the practice itself is important and the need for it no less and, if anything, greater than it was when our fathers introduced it in this democracy. Second, because its denial is a major step in a series of steps, de facto taken and de jure now probable, which if not reversed must lead logically to the elimination of every surviving instance of public reverence among us."

It has been claimed that human ingenuity as represented in the Congress of the United States will be able to come up with no language adequate to the complexity of opinion as to how a prayer amendment should read. We cannot believe that the overwhelming determination of the American people is beyond the capacity of the Congress to express. Obviously care must be taken, great care with language. But the paramount, overriding and urgent fact here is not semantics but a clear popular mandate. It is no longer at this late date a question of whether or not an amendment is proposed to the American people. That stage is long since passed. What is controlling here is that an amendment must be proposed to the people for their sovereign decision. What we must find here with prayer and the multiplied wisdom of the Congress is what Bishop Pike calls so expertly "the middle way." (See app. item No. 6.) We shall require, as best we may, to phrase an amendment which will meet the situation, even though of necessity some of the edges of that amendment must remain somewhat indistinct. For the rest, we are willing, and we suspect most of the Congress is willing, to place the event in the good, sure hands of the people themselves in their several communities. And, in any case, suppose the converse were true and because of the language difficulty no effect is given to this overwhelming mandate. What a tragedy it would be if for want of a reasonable consensus of the vast majority of Americans with the majority of their elected legislators as to language religion were to remain a stranger in the public classroom and, increasingly, in all public ceremonial and institutions. Surely with His help who sustained our fathers we shall find the words which will accomplish the purpose for which the American people, as seldom before in history, have come knocking at the doors of this Congress. That such words will suit all Americans is, of course, an impossibility. That they will restore our cherished "middle way," and thus suit the great majority of our fellow citizens who support a prayer amendment we feel is completely within the reach of human intelligence "under God."

The difficulty over wording a precise amendment, though real, must not be permitted to obscure the substance of the mandate now before the Congress from an overwhelming majority of the Nation. The Congress has wrestled with controversy before. In this case awareness of the traditional "middle way" with which we have always in the past approached these matters can provide important guidance.

We support in the name of citizens of many faiths and political persuasions across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the Becker amendment. We will, however, rely on the collective wisdom of this committee to suggest a final wording. We think this wording must meet three conditions. The Becker amendment in our judgment does meet them and we would strongly hope that the ultimate language of the committee will very closely follow if not repeat the language in that proposal. Our conditions are these:

(a) The amendment must restore the right of voluntary prayer and Bible reading to the public classroom as that right existed prior to June 25, 1962.

(b) The amendment must remove forever the threat of possible judicial denial from other instances of public reverence, such as chaplains, the motto "Under God" restoring these instances also to the firm security they enjoyed in our national life prior to June 25, 1962.

(c) The amendment must, as has been our practice for more than a century and a half prior to June 25, 1962, return to State and local communities the right finally to determine specific procedures in this as in other educational matters.

We are strongly opposed to the inclusion of the word "nondenominational" in qualification of the word "prayer" in section 1 of House Joint Resolution 693. Here, again, it becomes a question of the middle way, of bringing to bear the best possible human ingenuity on a very difficult problem. While there would, prima facie, seem to be grounds for including "nondenominational" as a qualifier for prayer. There are more compelling grounds for leaving the term "prayer" unqualified. The first of these reasons is that, as has often been said here, it is not the business of the Congress or of a constitutional amendment to suggest to States and local educational authorities the possibility of a particular type of prayer but only the possibility of prayer itself relying, as we do in all similar cases, on the native commonsense of the American people to do the rest. The second, and more urgent reason for leaving House Joint Resolution 693 exactly as it presently appears in re the term "prayer," is that the inclusion of the word "nondenominational" would in fact put us right back where we started from. Instead of knocking out public reverence as "establishment," if its past performance is any guide to its future decisions, the Supreme Court would base itself on the ambiguity of the word "nondenominational" and one by one we would be submitted to the very same denial of public reverence against which the American people are right now so wonderfully engaged.

We make one further suggestion in the matter of wording. Since some fear has been expressed that passage of the Becker amendment might operate to deny practices not specifically enumerated in it, we suggest the committee might wish to consider adding a section 4 to it, in the nature of a savings clause. This section might read:

"SEC. 4. The enumeration of any practice or procedure herein shall not be deemed to prohibit any other practice or procedure involving the recognition of God or a Supreme Being which, on the date of ratification of this article was followed or in being under the laws of any State or of the United States."

We come next to certain objections which have been advanced against the peoples' amendment for public prayer. It has been said that no proposed amendment will solve all existing and potential problems in church-state relationships and that, therefore, no amendment at all should be proposed to the people. This argument would be incredible but for the fact that some responsible persons seem to hold it. Incredible because human experience as a whole, and certainly the legislative experience of this Nation, teams with examples to the contrary. We wonder if the Congress has in fact ever passed a legislative act in any important topical area which has totally exhausted the reach of the said topic. We wonder too if the human race had waited to act in matters of vital importance to our collective development until it had come up with one final answer to all the questions involved in those matters, whether we would now be much farther along than the Flintstones. Take civil rights, for instance, or the war on poverty, or the matter of Government-in-education. Proposed pieces of legislation in all these matters do not totally solve the instant problem. Ought we then refrain from any law because each law is something less than exhaustive and totally definitive? Besides, we suspect there is more than meets the eye in some of these objections. The question of church-state relationships is a vast and enduring question in these United States. It has perplexed the Nation from the start. Happily, as Bishop Pike has phrased it, we had up to the first prayer decision discovered a "middle way" which had worked well. But still no single conference, no single act of legislation can

do the entire job of once and for all specifying all these relationships at every level and in every detail. Neither should any single proposal be penalized because it does only part of the job. To wait for someone to come down again from Mount Sinai with a total answer to such questions is to wait forever. The committee will be well familiar with a device which is occasionally—we understand—used on this Hill to kill a legislative proposal. The committee, with all due deference, will have heard the term "refer it to the committee." So used, the meaning is simply that by burying a proposal in lengthy hearings or even by removing it from hearings altogether we in effect kill that proposal. We are convinced that at least some of the objection to the Becker amendment along these lines is based on the hope that the net effect will be to refer it to committee and thus kill it.

It has been said that the Court may change its mind and that we should be patient. This again, if it were not here and there espoused by some responsible persons, would be incredible. Membership in the Court has not materially changed since the prayer decisions were handed down. These decisions, in any case, laid down certain fundamental principles. These principles are very seriously wrong. These principles push a deadly radiation into the very marrow of the bone of all public reverence in these United States. We cannot relax in any sophomoric assurance that the Court will change its mind. Those who tell us wait would surely have said to little Dutch Peter, "Wait, don't put your finger in the dike, it's only a little hole; wait, perchance the hole may fill itself in." Or, to put it more dramatically, they would say to the man with a pistol pointed at his head, "Wait, don't get excited; your adversary may decide not to pull the trigger." We play a game of Russian roulette with religion in America today. No one can say for sure which practice of public reverence will next take the fatal shot. To tell the American people, "Wait, don't get excited, the Court may not apply its reiterated principle to this or that instance is sheer naivete." Again, with due deference to those who sincerely advance such an objection, we cannot escape the conclusion that the great bulk of the objection comes from sources which are concerned to defeat any prayer amendment whatsoever. The incubus of the prayer decisions is precisely that while they stand on the books no practice of public reverence is safe. Those who have read the decisions but not understood them contend that they are narrow, that they don't do any more than rule out a little prayer. In fact, while they stand, we can be sure of nothing in the area of public reverence. Our answer to objectors who contend that such reverence is not disturbed, that it is completely compatible with the prayer decisions, is perhaps best expressed in the language Mr. Lincoln used (Galesburg, Ill., October 13, 1858) in answering a similar contention by Judge Douglas in re the Dred Scott decision:

"It is a presumption impossible in the domain of thought. It is precisely no other than the putting of that most unphilosophical proposition that two bodies may occupy the same space at the same time. The Dred Scott decision covers the whole ground, and while it occupies it, there is no room even for the shadow of a starved pigeon to occupy the same ground."

It has been said that there are responsible editorials and men of religion who oppose the Becker amendment. We respect honest differences of opinion. But we recall the very interesting comment of one congressional witness Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, before this committee on the morning of April 24, last. The gentleman said that he had been visited by six clergymen from his district who were opposed to the Becker amendment. He added that a survey had been made at his instance of their parishes and the conclusion was clear—they simply did not represent their congregations. The pastor of one of the largest Baptist churches in Worcester, Mass., has told us that while he himself did not favor amending the Constitution to reverse the Court's prayer decisions at least two-thirds of his people opposed those decisions. Nor has the mail which pours into Congress, a very good deal of which must come from church-affiliated persons, given any indication that those who come here claiming to speak for local or national church groups indeed have the backing of their own people. We say quite frankly that isolated leaders and isolated editorials against the backdrop of the expressed will of the massive majority of Americans simply cannot be interpreted as speaking for either the Nation nor, at least in some cases, for the organization itself in terms of the people who make it up at the grassroots level.

What must be going on here, if every indication we have of the public pulse is accurate, is that while this committee will listen and perhaps has already listened to a number of generals who oppose the peoples' amendment for public prayer, they may in many cases be generals without armies. We submit the following items in evidence of what we feel could be symptomatic of a wide pattern across America:

(i) Resolution of the South Carolina Conference on the Wesleyan Methodist Church, 71st annual session at Greer, S.C. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 8, 1964, p. 8051):

"Whereas successive actions of the Supreme Court, occasioned by the persistent appeals of atheists and agnostics seem to indicate a growing inclination to ban from public life all worship of God, in however terms, and all recognition of Him: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference * * * respectfully petitions our legislative leaders to discover for us and for the great God-fearing majority of our people some adequate redress from the above-described disability. We presume that such may require a constitutional amendment."

(ii) On March 26, 1964, an article appeared in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., under the heading: "Area Baptists Back Proposal To Allow School Bible Reading." It read in part:

"Local Baptist ministers generally are in favor of the [prayer] amendment despite a recent announcement from the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. * * * Approval of the Becker amendment was * * * given by Dr. Hamrick [pastor of Charleston's First Baptist Church] and by other Baptist ministers and congregations in the Charleston area. * * * Members of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church unanimously adopted a resolution last night which disapproves and denounces the invalid action of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 31, 1964, pp. 6455, 6456.)

(iii) An article appeared in the Bedford (Va.) Bulletin-Democrat January 16, 1964, under the heading, "Quaker Baptist Protests Court's Prayer Decision:

"One of Bedford County's oldest Baptist churches has taken issue with the Supreme Court ruling of early last year * * * [and] voted disapproval of the action [i.e., in support of the Court] of the Baptist General Association of Virginia. * * * Several Bedford County ministers and delegates who attended the [i.e., association] meeting said they did not recall this resolution having been presented and said they would have voted against it."

It has been said by some who purport to be friends of religion in the public mores of the Nation that while its goal may be proper the Becker amendment is a wrong means toward that goal. We ask those who thus hesitate in that strange land where, for want of the courage of decision, men can speak out of two sides of their mouths at the same time—we ask them, what other means is there which can effectively and permanently do the job which must be done? And if they reply—amendment, si, Becker amendment, non—two things in our judgment of the situation must follow. Either they use their attack supposedly on one possible wording of amendment to disguise what is, in fact, their opposition to any amendment at all, or they have no really valid alternative at this point but to descend from their splendid editorial detachment, roll up their sleeves, move in here and help us, help you, come up with a better wording. It is simply not enough for friends of religion in public life to stand absent from this critical debate on semantic grounds only. If they are sincere, let not alone their sometimes honest caution reverberate through the land but let them bring courage also to this great task. Now is no time for any of the Achilles of American religion to sulk in their tents. Now is the time, if ever in our history, when the counsel of every honest American is needed right here in this committee chamber to assist you in writing the best possible text for a prayer amendment.

It has been said that we smear our opposition as being anti-God. May we say, in passing, that this committee has already been treated to an experience in smearing—directed, however, not by but rather against us. We do not, of course, smear anyone. But the primary and inevitable presumption in our position is that the two prayer decisions do give aid and comfort to the enemies of religion in American life and that, while many among our opponents are wholly honorable men, their reading of the decisions is dangerously inaccurate. And the net result of their mistaken support, coupled with the support of men dedicated against religion, must, if successful, seriously widen the chasm between God and the public life of the American people. We respect the possibility of honesty in error but against the error itself our stand is uncompromising, and unapologetic.

Seldom in their history have the people of these United States been as rightfully indignant about any matter as they are about this. We stand at a peculiarly critical moment. The whole issue of the responsiveness of the Congress to the will of the people is at stake here. There is, we submit, no question but what at this session a prayer amendment must be proposed for the judgment of the American people in their several States. There is no question that the patience of the Nation, now tried and roadblocked for 2 long years, nears exhaustion. To paraphrase Mr. Churchill, seldom in history have so many waited so long for so much from so few.

The decision rests now in your hands. As we look back from these hearings our eternal gratitude in the name of the people of Massachusetts goes out to all who have helped in the long hard fight for a people's amendment for public prayer. We are especially grateful to those Congressmen and their staffs who have, early and late, joined with the people in the fight. We are grateful to those local officials and State legislators who have sustained the fight. More than anything else we say a word of thanks to Congressman FRANK J. BECKER and his inspired staff without whose continuing dedication we would not have come to this point. There is no finer tribute to any Member of Congress than the one which now moves toward Congressman BECKER—that the people's amendment for public prayer must in the history of our Nation stand forever in closest association with his name.

We invite, finally, on this committee the Lord's blessing and guidance as you keep

here your rendezvous with the American people.

OFFICERS OF MASSACHUSETTS CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC PRAYER

Chairman: Mr. Carl R. Griffin, Jr., teacher, Wachusett Regional High School, Holden, Mass.

Cochairman: Mrs. Charlotte M. Judkins, housewife, Rutland, Mass.

Massachusetts representatives:

Rev. Dr. Malcolm M. Matheson, D.D., pastor, Chestnut Street Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass. (president, Worcester Area Council of Churches).

Rev. Stephen Tucker, pastor, Bethany Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass. (past president, Worcester Ministerial Association).

Secretary: Mrs. Chester Oliver, Jr., instructor in Christian doctrine, St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, Rutland, Mass.

APPENDIX

1. Resolution adopted by the National Conference of State Governors, 54th annual meeting, Hershey, Pa., July 3, 1962. This resolution was adopted by overwhelming majority as was a similar resolution adopted at the 55th annual meeting in 1963:

"Whereas the recent majority opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in the New York school prayer case has created far-reaching misunderstanding as to the Nation's faith and dependence in God; and

"Whereas the Governors assembled at the 54th annual Governors' conference acknowledge their dependence upon God and the power of prayer to Him; and

"Whereas the power of prayer has sustained man throughout our history and provided the moral foundation for our great Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governors' conference urge the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that will make clear and beyond challenge the acknowledgment by our Nation and people of their faith in God and permit the free and voluntary participation in prayer in our public schools."

2. The National Catholic Youth Organization:

"NEW YORK.—The National Catholic Youth Organization called on all local CYO groups in the country for active efforts to amend the U.S. Constitution to permit the traditional right of prayer in the public schools.

" 'Preservation of the right of public prayer in the public schools' seemed to become an informal slogan sweeping the 4-day convention attended by * * * young people from all parts of the Nation, as well as many priests, religious, and lay leaders.

"The youths said in their resolution that they were seeking a prayer amendment in view of recent decisions of the Supreme Court and followup actions by many State departments of education, as well as local authorities not only removing any form of prayer, but all aspects of religious respect or observance." (The Catholic Free Press, weekly of the Roman Catholic diocese of Worcester, Mass., Nov. 22, 1963, p. 3.)

3. An editorial entitled "24th Amendment" (the Catholic Free Press, ibid., July 19, 1963): "It would seem that the only way to stem the tide which threatens to banish any reference to God from American public life is the passage of an amendment to the Constitution clarifying the first amendment. We are not anxious to see the Constitution become a patchwork, amended each time a grievance cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction by the Supreme Court of the land. In this instance, however, the implication of the High Court's pronouncements on the relationship between church and state are so patently contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers that a clarification by the people seems in order. We applaud the gesture of the several Senators and Congressmen who have filed resolutions in the Congress requesting that a prayer amendment be made to the Constitution. Proponents of a prayer amendment are all agreed on one basic principle—that the Founding Fathers never intended to identify the separation of church and state with the separation of God from state."

4. A statement on behalf of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman by Lawrence X. Cusack, attorney, Roman Catholic archdiocese of New York (see record of hearings before Senate Judiciary Committee, July 26 and August 2, 1962, at p. 140 ff.): "The Court has misread history and misconceived and applied a great constitutional principle. * * * [This decision] was unrealistic, extreme, and doctrinaire. * * * In legal effect the decision amounted to no more than a declaration that a particular prayer composed by a particular State body could not be officially sponsored for use in the public schools of a particular State. But, in practical effect * * * the decision has a significance that goes far beyond the legal issue involved. * * * I submit the one sure, effective, and early solution is an amendment to our Constitution which would remedy the result of the regents prayer case by correcting the Court's misreading of the no-establishment clause."

5. A statement of President Henry P. van Dusen, of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City (New York Times, July 7, 1963): "Clearly the significance of this new [i.e. the second prayer] decision does not lie in the proscription of somewhat perfunctory exercises of prayer and Bible reading. * * * It lies at a far deeper and more basic level and at two points, one retrospective, the other prospective: on the one hand, in its radical recasting of the intent and meaning of the Constitution; on the other hand, in its possible anticipation of far more drastic and fundamental reversal of the historic and established practices of National, State, and local governments in this country with respect to religion. * * * The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdictions is inescapable; prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances. A consistent application of such a policy would involve a revolution in the Nation's habitual practice in the matter of religion. * * * Nothing less than this is at stake. Is that the authentic will of the American people?"

6. A statement of His Excellency James A. Pike, bishop, Episcopal diocese of California, to hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, July 26, and August 1962 at page 51 ff. of the report of hearings: "The American approach to relationship of religion to the Nation has steered clear of church-state union on the one hand and secularization of public life on the other. We have, unlike countries which have chosen these other ways, steered a middle course reflected in virtually all aspects of our public life, including our schools. * * * The logic of the Court's decision would make it unlikely that any vestige of the middle way would survive. The proponents and the Court itself sincerely believe it would be a neutrality toward religion. But godless institutions are no more neutral than godly ones. There is no neutrality possible here because if you leave out this dimension in our schools and public institutions, then you have an image of a world view which one could describe as men and things without God, time and history without eternity. * * * The result is secularism, whether by intent or by default. I am not implying for a moment that the proponents or supporters of the decision of the Supreme Court intentionally wish an atheistic result. Nevertheless, when it is by default we simply cut off the whole spiritual dimension of life, and without even a reference to it. What we have left is actually a secularist view of life. Secularism is a faith any American is entitled to hold. But there is no reason why, in our public institutions, it should be imposed upon all of us, any more than the school prayer should have been imposed upon the pupils whose parents wished them to withstand. * * * We have somehow in our tradition chosen this middle way, a kind of muddling through, in these things. I think we can rely pretty much on the way things work out. * * * In other words, in this middle way approach (and this describes the way of a number of our American ways of doing things outside of the church-state field), it is not possible to tie up absolutely everything. * * * I am not so much urging that everybody get with it now and adopt this prayer as I am to leaving the freedom to the local authorities and States to work these things out in a sensible way."

7. A statement by Dean Erwin M. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, University of Utah Law School, February 28, 1963: "It is perfectly true that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law 'respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' These are great provisions. But to say that they require that all traces of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Does our deep-seated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history * * * concerning right of minority children to withdraw from the prayer exercise. It is said that this is bad, because it sets [them] apart from other children. But is this the way it should be looked at? The child of a nonconforming or a minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable and educational for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school. And is it not desirable that * * * he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them."

8. An editorial appearing in the Boston Pilot, official organ of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Boston and published in the Boston Globe, June 18, 1963:

"ALL PUBLIC LIFE AFFECTED

"The Supreme Court, in the Lord's Prayer and Bible ruling, has continued along a path unhappily familiar to all from its earlier decisions. The same tedious arguments emphasizing the establishment of religion clause are brought forth to support a position which turns its back on the total American tradition and outlaws the present practices of 39 States.

"Let us suppose that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are excluded from the American public schools for precisely the reasons given by the Supreme Court. What is the next step? Clearly, all other expressions of religion in public life must now be deleted. Let us not wait for them to come up case by case, but in one single gesture let them be suppressed.

"It may take the Court a long time to come to the full understanding of what its decision means, but by that time the American public may make some decisions of its own. In democratic life the tyranny of the few is always a temporary victory; it may be uncomfortable, but its fortunes will ultimately be reversed."

9. A statement by Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry in his book "To Pray or Not To Pray,"

the University Press of Washington, D.C., 1311 G Street NW., 1963: "This * * * is a very radical decision. It marks a turning point in our history. It adds up to a major revolution. The question is, Is religious neutrality not as between churches and sects, but as between religion and irreligion, God and no-God, the American position? * * * It is here that I feel we have fallen into a morass of deep contradiction. But this is for Americans as a whole to say. They can either say Amen to what has now happened or—since the power is in the people—they can insist that the Supreme Court look more steadily at our tradition; or, if necessary, that the Constitution state precisely what the American position is."

10. "Commentaries on the Constitution," Justice Joseph Story (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 11, 1964, p. 4837): "Probably at this time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment now under consideration, the general, if not the universal sentiment in America was that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation."

11. "Principles of Constitutional Law," Thomas Cooley (ibid.): "The establishment of religion is meant the setting up or recognition of a state church or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others. It was never intended by the Constitution that government should be prohibited from recognizing religion—where it might be done without drawing any invidious distinctions between different religious beliefs, organizations, or sects."

12. "The Right to Pray," an editorial by David Lawrence, U.S. News & World Report, March 2, 1964: "Plainly a constitutional amendment has become absolutely necessary to clear up the confusion that has arisen as a result of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States banning prayer in the public schools. * * * The value of prayer once a week in a church, where the attendance covers all ages and large numbers is not as great as the everyday impact of prayer on the minds of children of the same age in a small classroom. * * * The importance of prayer in the schoolroom is primarily that it is strengthened by group psychology and that it is an everyday rather than a once-a-week stimulus to better living. * * * Certainly an individual may pray in silence, but the benefit of articulation by the group is then lost. * * * The problem has been too long neglected. Early action is as vital as the war on poverty or the war on crime."

13. A statement by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston, Mass., as reported in the Boston Herald, June 18, 1963:

"Cardinal Cushing called it [i.e. the second prayer decision] a great tragedy. * * * There is nothing we can do about it but to have an amendment to the Constitution relative to the reading of this masterpiece of literature in our public school. It could be that many of the judges of the Supreme Court think likewise, but, in accordance with their interpretation of this particular phase of the Constitution relative to the separation of church and state, they have followed their own consciences.

" 'Nevertheless there are many outstanding lawyers of this country who do not agree with them and there are millions of citizens who are of the same mind.

" 'The United States, it seems to me, is no longer what we loved to call, this Nation under God.

" 'We should have an amendment to clarify the church-state relationship.' "

14. On the 19th of April last, Patriots' Day in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, more than 1,000 citizens of central Massachusetts signed petitions backing a peoples' amendment for public prayer. These petitions, gathered largely through the efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Chandler Creedon, of Shrewsbury, Mass., are herewith presented for enumeration in the record of these hearings.

15. A statement by Rev. Dr. D. Elton Trueblood, professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. (in Presbyterian Life, issue of May 1964):

"This is a ruling which affects deeply the whole of American life and represents a radical change in the cultural pattern in many parts of the Nation [p. 14]. * * * What is disturbing is not the decisions made so much as the reason given for the decision. The ultimate reason is a doctrine of neutrality. Whatever the Court may have intended, this doctrine if taken seriously creates a new establishment, a secular establishment. Instead of taking a neutral stand as between various religions, the Court rules, in the Baltimore problem, in favor of an atheist claim [p. 15]. * * * What we face * * * is actually the tyranny of a minority. I am opposed as anyone could be to any religious establishment, but I doubt seriously if that is the clear and present danger on our contemporary scene [p. 15] * * * Let us see what absolute or unqualified neutrality must involve:

"1. It must forbid governmental recognition of Christmas.

"2. It must forbid Thanksgiving.

"3. It must forbid opening legislature with prayer.

"4. It must forbid the governmental appointment of military chaplains.

"It is hard to know where to begin and where to stop" (p. 37).

"In short they [i.e. the prayer decisions] propose a form of segregation, something really novel as far as American civilization is concerned. But no vital faith has ever been willing to settle for such segregation. The purpose of any faith which understands itself is to penetrate all of life" (p. 37).

McNamara Optimism Not Enough in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph, a leading newspaper in my district.

Indeed, "McNamara's Optimism Not Enough in Vietnam." This expresses the views of the people I represent. It expresses my views. And I believe it expresses the views of the vast majority of the American people.

We want the facts. We want to know the precise situation in Vietnam, and what we intend to do about it. We want a definitive policy.

The editorial follows:

MCNAMARA OPTIMISM NOT ENOUGH IN VIETNAM

Perhaps President Johnson can't spare anyone else to go to South Vietnam to size up the situation. But his announcement that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara will make his sixth inspection trip to that troubled area doesn't stir up much enthusiasm here, and we doubt if it does in Saigon. McNamara has been quite consistently wrong in his optimistic appraisals of the situation.

Just 2 years ago this month he made his first visit and left saying he felt tremendously encouraged. Conditions continued to worsen.

In July of that year he went to Hawaii for a conference on South Vietnam, his second to that island in a series that ran to five, all to appraise the Saigon situation. He left that one admitting that victory in South Vietnam might "take years rather than months." The internal strife over Buddhist monks developed soon after this visit.

In September 1963, McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor were back in Vietnam. Their report this time was: "We are winning out there" and "things are progressing very well on both the military and political fronts." Two months later President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were assassinated in an internal upheaval.

In December 1963, Mr. McNamara was back in Saigon. He came away optimistic. Back he went in March of this year after a second governmental overthrow. This time he concluded "The path to victory may be hard."

Mr. McNamara is not alone in his announced optimism. As Vice President in 1961, Lyndon Johnson toured the area and was carried away with enthusiasm for progress there. He made 16 impromptu speeches and even compared Diem with the leadership prowess of Winston Churchill.

There is, of course, a recognition in Washington that the psychological factor looms large in Vietnam. These optimistic reports are intended to buck up the Vietnamese who are woefully weak on the will to fight on.

This country has poured $5 billion in aid into South Vietnam in 8 years. We have 18,000 troops there and 220 Americans have been killed.

There has been no lack of supplies. Newsmen on the spot say there is nothing wrong with battle plans. The plans just don't get put into operation.

Some of the top Pulitzer awards in journalism went to reporters who have been covering the Vietnam operation. They have not been seeing the situation as has Mr. McNamara. Perhaps Mr. Johnson should send them along with him on this trip to keep his inspection in perspective.

Continued optimistic reports on a war that obviously is going very badly don't seem to stiffen the backbone of the Vietnamese, and they will weaken American desire to continue the struggle.

It's time for the harsh truth.

The Supreme Court and Our Heritage of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, some people have said that the Supreme Court decision on prayer in the public schools confirmed rather than changed the intent of the first amendment. I do not believe this to be the case, for certainly it changed practices which have been in effect since the very founding of our Republic. To further confirm these traditions which the Supreme Court ruling upset, under unanimous consent,

I insert the following letter which I received from Mrs. Rose Giltner, of Galena, Mo., a former patient and still close friend.

I do not believe this prayer was any more "State sponsored than the 22-word prayer in the State of New York" which the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional and for this prayer to be remembered some 44 years later indicates that it also has a profound effect on the students who participated.

The letter follows:

GALENA, MO.

DEAR SIR: When I was a little girl attending public school (about 1920) our teacher was also a Protestant minister of a union church.

The following prayer was approved by all parents of all faiths: "Bless us O Lord, our President; our Senators, and our Congressmen and guide them to do Thy Holy will."

And to teach children respect for authority, the President's picture, the Congressman, and the Senators pictures were always hanging in the schoolroom. We saluted these pictures and said our prayer. We sang the good old American songs: "My Old Kentucky Home," and so forth, all of which required about 10 minutes.

This delightful old gentleman was a minister of good faith; he believed with all of heart and soul, and he believed in teaching children respect for State officials; and we need that right now.

We were asked to pray in our own way for our American officials at night before retiring asking God to guide them in their judgments and actions; that they may do His will.

Thank you, and God love you.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROSE GILTNER.

P.S. I forgot to mention here that we also saluted the flag and gave the pledge—grade and high school.

Mrs. Eugenie T. McMahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport, Conn., Sunday Herald recently printed a fine editorial on the death of Mrs. Eugenie McMahon of Norwalk, mother of the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. I am honored to bring it to the attention of the House in tribute to a great lady whose influence over events, while indirect and unrecognized, was very great indeed.

The editorial follows:

MRS. MCMAHON

Few women have given the world sons whose wisdom and influence loomed so large in their lifetime, and whose vision had so profound an effect on generations to come, as Mrs. Eugenie T. McMahon of Norwalk.

Mrs. McMahon, who died this week, outlived her great son, Senator Brien McMahon, by almost 12 years. Time and again during those years came confirmation of the rightness of his adamant stand in favor of civilian control of the atom, at a time when this cataclysmic force was in its infancy.

From Mrs. McMahon, Brien must surely have inherited a good part of his obsession with the danger of nuclear war and his deep concern over methods of controlling the absolutely annihilating force of the A-bomb.

The lessons Brien McMahon learned at his mother's knee were reflected in a senatorial statesmanship which led to the firm establishment of the Nation's present nuclear policy. The progress toward nuclear disarmament made under President Kennedy and President Johnson is the outgrowth of the principles for which Senator McMahon fought.

In the year of her son's death, 1952, Mrs. McMahon was honored as Norwalk's "Woman of the Year." In a very real sense, her epitaph might be "One of the world's great mothers of this century."

The Civil Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have always been deeply interested in helping to protect the civil service system of the U.S. Government. Under this system, over the years Government has been able to attract some of the most outstanding citizens in America. Many of these career employees could make more money outside of Government; however, they are dedicated to their jobs, and every American should be grateful for this dedication.

As I have indicated before, I am becoming increasingly concerned that the civil service system is being used for political purposes. I appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee only last week to indicate my great concern over the indiscriminate firing of many career employees in the Agency for International Development (AID). I feel sure that politics is the primary concern in the firing of some of these employees.

But even more shocking to me was a release from the Department of Agriculture dated May 8, 1964, indicating those who would receive that agency's Distinguished Service Award. The Distinguished Service Award program has long been recognized as an appropriate way to recognize career employees—that is, those who have distinguished themselves over a long period of years in Government service. I was very greatly surprised—and to say the least, shocked—to see in the list of those to receive this award many political appointees. For example: Howard Bertsch, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration; Kenneth M. Birkhead, Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture for Congressional Relations; Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, Director of Agricultural Economics. I am sure he is familiar to most of my colleagues in the Congress. Also, Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

I am not questioning for one moment the loyalty and devotion of these political appointees. I recognize that some of them have been in Government service for a long time at the State and local level; however, I am sure that no one would argue that these people have been brought to Washington by this administration and are recognized by everyone as being political appointees.

This will come as a great shock to many of the career people, but I hope they will not despair because it will be my intention—and I am sure many of my colleagues will join me—to do everything possible to protect the civil service system so that we can continue to draw into the Government service outstanding individuals who will devote long and distinguished careers to Government service. I hope that this administration will put a stop to this business of using the civil service system for political gain. I hope that the civil servants will not despair, because I believe this administration will soon realize that they are making a mistake in destroying this great service.

The Missouri Air National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a fine editorial tribute to the important contribution by the Missouri Air National Guard to our Nation's security recently appeared in the Army newspaper, the Star Presidian. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial, by Sfc. Charles S. Hawkins, of the 6th Army Special Troops:

NCO TOPICS

(By Sfc. Charles S. Hawkins, Headquarters Company, 6th Army Special Troops)

I am writing this column while seated deep within the belly of a C-97 aircraft. It is 0300 hours on a Sunday morning. We are whipping along at 4½ miles per minute, somewhere over the State of Utah. The plane and its crew are a part of the Missouri Air National Guard. They are on the last leg of a mission that has taken them from St. Joseph, Mo., to Tachikawa Air Force Base in Japan and return.

It may come as a surprise to you, as it did to me, that the Air National Guard has for some time been flying actual cargo missions for the Military Air Transport Command while concurrently training for a wartime role in global airlift. More than 700 overwater flights per year are being made by the Air Guard's Transport Forces. The crew I am riding with tells me that they are making preparation to fly Army troops to Alaska, Bermuda, and Puerto Rico this summer.

Their long mission to Japan required that they carry a multiple crew. Some of the men are sleeping in canvas seats that pull down from the side of the cargo hatch. An alert, fresh crew is up front tending to the thousand details so necessary to keep this huge monster boring through the trackless night sky to its home base in the Midwest.

I talked with the aircraft commander, Maj. Charles Martin, and his copilot, Maj. William Byrd, and find that they are both combat pilots of World War II. Some of the crew members are combat veterans, others are young lads who have joined the Guard with stars in their eyes.

They know that they are doing an important job and take a great deal of pride in their outfit. Those people who use the term "weekend warriors" rather scornfully should spend a little time with this group.

I look down and see the flickering lights of tiny villages and large cities slide past. The shadow of our huge four-motored winged mammoth slips silently over the landscape, cast there by a moon in a cloudless sky. A sleeping civilian population is unaware of the fact that skies overhead are crisscrossed with military aircraft carrying out missions that contribute to the security that keeps their sleep unspoiled by the growling of unfriendly aircraft bent on the destruction of our way of life. Some planes are carrying troops to distant outposts, others carry needed supplies. Somewhere overhead a SAC flying command post is on the alert. Elsewhere a fighter streaks along on an air defense mission.

Members of the military team are on the alert doing the job while the Nation rests.

Each of us is a member of that team. Somewhere, somehow, what we do contributes to the welfare of our Nation. We insure that our citizens may go to bed at night without fear in their hearts. We may be Regular Army or Air Force, 2-year draftee, obligated or volunteer Reservist, National Guard, or Air National Guard. No matter—we are all on the same team * * * working for the same boss * * * striving for the same goal—peace and security for our people and our Nation.

My flight with members of the Missouri Air National Guard brings the single military team idea into sharp focus. We are calling upon our citizen soldiers and airmen to maintain a high level of readiness. They are ready to help us face any threat of Communist aggression.

New Goods and Services on the Market—A Sign of Real Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the 17th Annual McGraw-Hill Survey of Business Plans for New Plant and Equipment reveals that manufacturing companies now expect that 15 percent of their sales in 1967 will be either in completely new products or products sufficiently changed to be considered new. This is the highest percentage of new products recorded in these surveys since McGraw-Hill first asked the question in 1956.

Interestingly, the relationship between new products and research and development expenditures is also illuminated by the survey. The biggest increases in new product sales will be in those industries that have been spending the most for research and development.

To those who have said that our economy is tired and lagging, I have often replied that one of the most significant indicators of real and significant economic growth is new goods and services on the market. By this test, our economy is surely making an outstanding economic performance.

Under unanimous consent, I include a chart showing new products for a number of industries as a percentage of 1967 sales in the RECORD at this point.

New products percent of 1967 sales [1]

Industry:	Percent
Iron and steel	9
Nonferrous metals	13
Machinery	20
Electrical machinery	16
Autos, trucks and parts	16
Aerospace	N.A.
Other transportation equipment (ships, railroad equipment)	N.A.
Total transportation equipment	24
Fabricated metals and instruments	26
Chemicals	18
Paper and pulp	8
Rubber	19
Stone, clay and glass	14
Petroleum and coal products	3
Food and beverages	10
Textiles	15
Miscellaneous manufacturing	10
All manufacturing	15

[1] Products not produced in 1963.

N.A.—Not available.

Source: Table VIII, "Sales and New Products," 17th Annual McGraw-Hill Survey—Business' Plans for New Plants and Equipment, 1964–67.

Remarks of Hon. H. R. Gross on U.S. Foreign Policy at Naval Academy Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, some 75 colleges and universities throughout the United States were represented at this year's Naval Academy Foreign Affairs Conference, April 22 to 25, entitled "Problems of U.S. Foreign Policy in the European Community."

One of the highlights of the conference was a panel discussion the evening of April 23, the subject of which was "Forces That Shape U.S. Foreign Policy," with particular reference to our policy in Europe.

Participating as a member of the panel was the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and I am pleased to include the text of his remarks:

FORCES THAT SHAPE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO EUROPE—REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE H. R. GROSS

As I reflect on the vacillating course which U.S. foreign policy has followed in recent years, I wonder if the title of this evening's discussion is not loaded—or, at least, whether it doesn't imply something that isn't really there.

When we speak of forces which shape national policies, I, for one, associate that term with strength, courage, intelligent purpose, and consistency. And I must admit, it is difficult to find evidence of such characteristics in the performance of what some are pleased to call our foreign policy.

There are, of course, a number of external factors—Soviet military strength, Western European prosperity, European integration, resurgent nationalism, and others—which play some part in what we do and what we accomplish abroad. Even General De Gaulle, by his sturdy determination to advance the national interests of France, belongs in this category.

These forces, if we are going to call them by that name, certainly affect our performance abroad. In recent years, they have challenged our national interests and security at every turn. At times, they made us spin and squirm. They should not, however, determine the objectives of our foreign policy. We must determine these ourselves, with the primary emphasis on advancing the national interests and security of the United States of America.

This has not been done—and this is responsible for the fact that our foreign policy is the laughing stock of altogether too much of the world today. The one force which has the legitimate right to shape our foreign policy—the dictates of our national self-interest—is conspicuous by its absence.

There is, on the other hand, ample evidence that some neurotic passion for international "do-goodism" has possessed our foreign policymakers. Only this can explain the fact that even those who propose to be our friends abroad cannot quite understand our policy, its vacillations, and its overall result: While some of the needs of our own people have gone unanswered, while our national debt has skyrocketed, we have continued to pour our wealth into every open hand overseas whether it belongs to a truly needy person or to some scheming wastrel.

We have built drinking fountains for camels in the Middle East, financed military support for "penny-ante" dictators, built a luxury airport where there is no air traffic, constructed highways for water buffalo traffic, and even supplied an air-conditioned yacht for a foreign potentate who wants to play at being an admiral of a navy.

Were these ditcated by our national self-interest? Of course not. And that is why our image in the world has reached a new low. People, no matter who they are, have no respect for those who have no respect for themselves.

Let us turn now to a look at the "Grand Design" of our foreign policy: our plans for the North Atlantic Community.

I will start with the economic side of our policy, and then turn to its military aspects.

Since the end of World War II, we have spent $30 billion on economic aid to Western Europe. This, mind you, does not take into account additional billions for military assistance. We have helped Western Europeans rebuild their financial institutions, their industries, their public facilities, their transportation. Some of our aid even helped them to modernize certain segments of their agriculture.

Further, our policy has supported and encouraged European economic integration.

Finally, in order to enable the Europeans to obtain more of our dollars, we have generously lowered our tariffs. As a matter of fact, 2 years ago a very generous proposal on this point was adopted by the U.S. Senate: A proposal to give the President the authority to lower our tariffs by 100 percent. Fortunately, the House of Representatives took a dim view of that idea. Instead, Congress agreed to give the President enough power to lower tariffs 100 percent on those goods in which the bulk of our trade was with Great Britain.

Through this subtle and clever device—fully understood by the Europeans, I may add—our policymakers expected to push Great Britain into the Common Market. The clever plan backfired.

But what have our policies produced in Europe?

The first obvious fact is that Western Europe is prosperous today—while our internal debt, public and private, on December 31, 1963, reached the astronomical figure of $1.70 trillion.

Second, Western Europe has moved along the way toward economic integration. The

Common Market is a reality. Obstructions to trade are coming down within the Common Market—while a high tariff wall aginst American exports is being built outside of it.

In this regard, you will recall that in 1961, the Common Market took the first of three steps to—and I quote—"adjust" their external tariffs. Before we knew it, the tariff on U.S. poultry exports was nearly tripled, and we were confronted with the loss of 60 percent of our market in the country which was a major importer of this American product. Tariff increases affecting pork and lard followed—again reducing our exports. Wheat and feed grains were next on the list.

On February, 25, 1963, the Department of Commerce published a study of 181 items exported by the United States to the Common Market, and concluded that the European Economic Community was, and I quote, "creating increasingly adverse conditions for U.S. suppliers."

But tariffs are not the only way of protecting a national market. Discriminatory regulations, practices, and quotas can be just as effective. And our European friends have not hesitated to use all of these devices. This is the thanks we get for our generosity.

On September 4, 1963, for example, the Department of Agriculture issued what it termed a highly significant study of nontariff agricultural protectionism and concluded that—and I quote again—"all of our major trading partners practice a higher degree of agricultural protectionism through nontariff barriers than does the United States."

These are a few of the facts, ladies and gentlemen—and they tell only the beginning of our economic troubles with Western Europe.

A report issued last September by the research department of one of the largest banks in the world—the Chase Manhattan—predicted that discrimination by the Common Market against the United States and other outside exports will increase rapidly in the period ahead. The report concluded that the Common Market external tariff wall now appears to be considerably more protective than the old national tariffs.

I want to emphasize again that our foreign policy has aided and encouraged the goal of European economic integration—and that thus far we have seen the results of only the first of three steps along that route. What will happen after the next two steps remains to be seen. The outlook, however, is far from encouraging for us.

I am not an ultraprotectionist and I see the value of foreign trade—but not trade based on the confused objectives of our current foreign policy. We have foolishly given away our bargaining power in order to encourage others to do likewise—and we are being taken to the cleaners in return. We lowered our tariffs from an average rate of 53.2 percent in 1931 to 12 percent in 1961—and then granted additional concessions to the Common Market countries on 678 items. We are now beginning to see where our course has taken us. In 1 year alone—in 1963—foreign steel imports have cost the jobs of an estimated 50,000 American workers. In addition, we are losing our traditional markets in Europe and in certain third country areas. And considering the condition of our gold reserves, and the size of our national debt, we cannot afford it.

As I said, I believe in the benefits of world trade—but trade based on a rational policy of national self-interest, not on some impulse to do good or to achieve some "grand design."

Let me mention one more point while I'm on this subject: where is the help that the prosperous countries of Western Europe were supposed to provide to the underdeveloped countries of the world?

The United States has spent some $35 billion on economic aid to areas other than Europe—most of it in the form of outright grants and loans which carry a minimum rate of interest: as low as three-fourths of 1 percent. It is money this Government borrows at an interest rate of more than 4 percent. We were told at one time, when we were asked to vote for economic aid to Western Europe, that the countries of that Continent would help the underdeveloped nations as soon as they themselves got on their feet.

It is true the Germans, the French, the British and others have made loans to the developing countries—but loans which carry interest rates of 6, 7, and even 8 percent. And the Europeans, unlike us, have not indulged in loans with 40- or 50-year maturities. They make intermediate-term loans—5 to 15 years—and they expect them to be repaid promptly and with interest. They undoubtedly will be—and I wouldn't be at all surprised if U.S. aid, in one way or another, makes the repayment of these European loans possible.

Let me turn now to another force which has affected our foreign policy: the Soviet military power.

We took the lead in creating NATO in order to protect Western Europe during the period of post-war reconstruction, and with the hope that it would evolve into an effective mechanism for collective defense which would reduce the demands made upon us in this field.

Where do we stand today?

We are still devoting 11 percent of our gross national product to defense—while prosperous allies like Germany, England, France and others are generally spending less than 6 percent of their respective GNP's for that purpose. If that isn't bad enough, we are still continuing large-scale military aid to some of our NATO allies, and paying in dollars for the support of our own troops in Europe—the two burdens that could have been taken over to a much larger extent by the countries of that Continent.

In the meantime, what has happened to NATO?

The details, of course, are shrouded by the veil of official secrecy, yet this much is known publicly: The integrated military supply system which we have worked hard to establish has not gotten off the ground;

Military contributions of many of the member countries still fail to measure up to NATO requirements and goals. The Der Spiegel affair in Germany certainly exposed the shortcomings of NATO in this respect.

Further, most of the forces earmarked for NATO are not actually under the control of that organization but remain under the control of individual member nations. And, instead of becoming more cohesive, the organization is in effect breaking up. One look at the role played by France, the key to the land mass of Western Europe, will surely underscore that fact.

So where do we stand—and what have our well-intentioned, generous but misguided policies accomplished?

We are still furnishing protection to Western Europe while our allies there are busily reviving old feuds and rivalries, like the Greeks and Turks over Cyprus. While the U.S. taxpayer is groaning under the burden of a $51 billion defense budget, the British and Europeans are conducting over $3 billion worth of business with the Soviet bloc, furnishing our enemy with industrial technology, resources and materials which only strengthen the military threat aimed at us.

I am opposed to war. I am even more opposed to national degraduation and slavery.

The Communists would have long since enslaved us had it not been for the certain knowledge of the deadly reprisal that awaited them—from the missiles poised in their silos, the Polaris submarines, the strategic bombers of the Air Force, and the 6th and 7th Fleets that are constantly on the alert in Middle East and Asian waters.

The fate of this Nation would long since have been sealed had it depended upon the emissaries of the State Department who roamed the world with checkbooks, spending $120 billion attempting to bribe and buy friends, and succeeding all too often in buying only contempt.

Russia claims to have removed its missiles from Cuba, but we learn later the price was a promise that the United States would not invade and remove the cancer of communism that is now being exported wholesale to Central and South America. Incidentally, in one form or another, we dropped $2¼ billion into Cuba in the 10 years preceding the Castro takeover.

Cambodia, on the strategic flank of South Vietnam and into which we have dumped $365 million, tells us to get out of that country. They are now doing business with the Red Chinese.

To Indonesia, the beneficiary of more of our millions, we sent our Attorney General to beg President Sukarno not to start trouble in southeast Asia. Later, on March 25, before a cheering crowd in Jakarta, Sukarno said: "To hell with U.S. aid." Shortly thereafter it was reported that Indonesia would get some 40,000 tons of surplus U.S. rice. How does this serve our national interest and security?

Into India has gone a flood of American dollars. When 35,000 Americans were being killed in Korea and another 100,000 wounded, we asked Premier Nehru for help and he turned a cold, neutral face. But later, when the Chinese charged across his border, he screamed for help and we sent it.

In the United Nations, Russia and her Communist satellites refuse to pay their legitimate bills so good old Uncle Sam floats a bond issue on the American taxpayers, to add to the $312 billion of Federal debt, and we take the lead in paying the Communist bills.

The world watches as the Marxist tyrant, Nkrumah, Ghana's dictator, misses no opportunity to degrade and humiliate Americans, and the same is true in Zanzibar.

It was American blood that saved Britain and France from being crushed under the Hitler heel, and billions of American dollars that rehabilitated those two countries, yet they are offended when we don't like it because the British sold 400 buses to Castro and the French took the lead in recognizing and trading with Red China.

The Russians say they will bury us, then beg for wheat because they haven't intelligence enough to feed themselves, and we sell them the wheat at bargain prices. Then they reward us by shooting down another of our unarmed planes and harass our military forces moving into and out of Berlin.

I could go on interminably citing chapter and verse of duplicity and contradiction that has been what some are pleased to call foreign policy. Our national interest and security requires no such manipulation as this.

Incidentally, the idea that all problems, foreign and domestic, can be settled simply by resort to a checkbook and public funds, has become a fetish with altogether too many high-ranking Government officials. Confronted with an explosive increase in the crime rate in this Nation, a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, instead of addressing himself to the root of the evil, suggests compensation for the victims of criminality or their families.

In conclusion, let me restate my original premise: Advancement of our national interests should be the overriding aim of the foreign policy of the United States. In my opinion, this must be the primary force governing our policy if this constitutional Republic is to survive in the struggle against the Communist world conspiracy.

Who in this audience tonight can name one other government of the world which fails to give top priority to national self-interest in the conduct of its foreign affairs?

As I have tried to show in the time allotted to me, this basic concept has escaped our foreign policy planners. They envision our foreign policy as an instrument for performing good deeds on a global scale—and without regard to the ability of the American taxpayers to carry the burden.

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that this foreign policy based on international "do-goodism" has been tried and found wanting. I submit that it is time for a change.

Let us return to the concept that appears almost forgotten today—the idea that it is not only morally right but imperative for a nation to give top priority to its own self-interest and security.

I do not advocate isolationism. I do not advocate that we refuse to cooperate with other nations of the world. I insist that our policy be based on strength and courage, and consistent. I advocate that we stand firm in support of what is best for the United States of America in our relations with all foreign governments.

It is this policy, I submit, which can best build and maintain a strong, free America—and which can best secure peace and freedom for the entire world.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRENE B. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mrs. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine poem about our American flag by my constituent, Dr. Martin Rywell, Ph. D., editor of Listen, Harriman, Tenn.

Dr. Rywell wrote this poem recently on the occasion of the presentation by my late husband, Congressman Howard H. Baker, of the flag—one which had been flown over the Capitol here—to the Masons.

The poem follows:

POEM ON FLAG

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following poem was composed as a tribute to the U.S. flag by Martin Rywell, Harriman author. Mr. Rywell wrote the poem recently when a flag which had flown over the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C., was presented to the Masons here by Congressman Howard Baker.)

The flag is the embodiment of all our history,
Written by the lives of those who lived under it,
Written by the death of those who died under it.

Our hope, our faith, our strength comes from
Our deep roots in the past.
Strong men chopped a primitive forest,
Chopped in order to build,
A new country,
In a new world, with new men,
With a new kind of life, with a new declaration,
That man comes ahead of society,
That without liberty and equality,
Human life lacks human dignity.
The greatest movement of peoples,
More than ever known before in all history,
Millions of peoples, from all over the earth,
Tore up roots in their homeland and
Left family and loved ones, crossed an ocean,
Braved terrors of the trip, to come to a new world,
Seeking to be free, seeking human dignity, seeking opportunity.
They toiled and built a new nation, with more different
Kinds of peoples drawn into closer contact than ever
Known before on the face of the earth.

Now look, see before your very eyes,
See churches and synagogues, colleges and schools,
Museums and opera house: art galleries and coliseums
Of sports: towers of industry and commerce,
All accomplishments of freemen in free
Competition and government that derives
"Its just powers from the consent of the governed."
One hundred and ninety million Americans have more
Steak and more apple pie,
More schools and more wonder drugs,
More telephones and more televisions,
More laughter and more song,
More than any other people on earth,
Fruits and freedom and courage and enterprise.
We share our fruits of plenty, our blessings,
Our food, with all the poor peoples
Of all the earth,
As no other nation ever known, ever did.
More than a million brave men
Of their own free will and accord
Have died to defend it:
On the green of Lexington,
On the snow of Valley Forge,
On the walls of Fort Sumter,
On the fields of Gettysburg,
On the waters of River Marne,
On the beachheads of Normandy,
On the sands of Okinawa,
On the hills of Heartbreak Ridge.
In the jungles of Vietnam
Brave men
Inspired by devotion
To the American creed.
Hear the solemn bivouac of our dead,
Hear them loud and clear,
Tonight as we rally round the flag,
Heed their message that:
Realization of our tomorrow
Can only be limited by
Our doubts of today.
Tonight as we rally round the flag
See 50 stars light the ever-brightening
Flame of the
Lamp of freedom.
See 50 stars radiate light, more light
To guide our feet in thy path.
See 50 stars,
But only one people,
Tonight as we rally round the flag.

A Proposed Massachusetts Newspaper "Code of Ethics"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention a most interesting editorial from the Massillon, Ohio, Evening Independent relative to proposed legislation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to set up a newspaper code of ethics.

As one who spent four terms in the Massachusetts Senate, I am naturally concerned with legislative activity in my home State.

This enlightened editorial is a great tribute to Massillon paper and indicates the "vigilance which must be maintained at all times to defeat the efforts of those who would deny or sharply curtail the right of Americans to be given the news they are entitled to."

It is also a tribute to the distinguished attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward W. Brooke. The attorney general's words, as quoted in this editorial, amount to a profound statement of our noble heritage of press freedom. I recommend this editorial to all of my colleagues:

THIS BILL SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Attempts to deny Americans the right of information guaranteed them in the Constitution's Bill of Rights protecting freedom of the press are still being made by certain public officials, particularly in the higher echelons of Government, and ambitious bureaucrats.

Only such information, which if made public might endanger the safety of the Nation, should remain secret.

And there is not too much of that any more because agents of foreign countries, mostly Communist-controlled, through their spy systems, gain knowledge of what is transpiring in our innermost offices long before the American people are told about it.

During the past few years we have run across many instances of attempts to set up what has been termed "managed news"—a system whereby Government officials and bureaucrats would determine the information to be given to Americans.

This has been widely assailed as an attempt at establishing censorship of news, something which should never be tolerated in this country, except during a most critical time, such as war.

Enterprising reporters, however, are not deterred by the actions of those who would deprive the American public of its right to know. Handouts from all branches of Government at all levels now are passed out at a prodigious rate but fact-seeking newsmen, digging behind all the froth contained in such handouts, generally come up with the real and newsworthy information.

At the present time the Massachusetts State Legislature is giving considerable attention to what is known as a newspaper code of ethics bill. It is now before the ways and means committee of the house.

Coming out strong against the measure is Attorney General Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts.

The bill seeks to bring under control the reporting of court and criminal news. It also creates a post of assistant attorney general to examine all the State's newspapers to find instances of contempt of the proposed law.

In a letter to the chairman of the house ways and means committee, Attorney General Brooke said that "by its excessive vagueness" the bill would act "to frighten responsible news media from reporting criminal news."

Such a result, he said, "would manifestly deprive the public of information which it ought to have." He said the bill raised "serious constitution questions" and he urged that it be defeated.

The attorney general also objected to the granting of censorship powers to his office. In this connection, he stated:

"The determination of what to print requires the exercise of very subtle judgment balancing the public's right to know and the defendant's rights for an open hearing against the defendant's rights to be tried in an atmosphere free from preconceptions. The best person to make these judgments is the editor. It is he who lives with the problem every day in his professional life. Cynics might say that judgments of this type are determined on the basis of the profit motive only. Yet I think that the facts do not justify such an assertion."

Attorney General Brooke is right. The profit motive is never given consideration by newspapers and newspaper executives who want to provide their readers with all the news that is fit to print.

Editors are not alone in arriving at the decision as to what should be printed. Such decisions generally are arrived at in discussion between the editor and editorial staff associates.

We commend Attorney General Brooke for his stand against the proposed Massachusetts code of ethics bill.

It provides an example, however, of the vigilance which must be maintained at all times to defeat the efforts of those who would deny or sharply curtail the right of Americans to be given the news they are entitled to.

Hiring the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying to hear of the growing number of companywide programs emphasizing the hiring of handicapped workers. In view of the fact that it has been estimated that nearly 1 out of every 10 Americans has a disability that limits his activity, it is important to overcome the doubts that still exist about the practicality of hiring the handicapped. As the President's Committee on Employing the Handicapped has pointed out, a handicapped worker is an average or better than average employee, and many companies having experience with the handicapped will attest to this fact. One example is the Caterpillar Tractor Co., which in the next few weeks, will be honored as 1963's No. 1 employer of the handicapped, following in the footsteps of many other companies such as Bendix Corp. and Ace Electronics Associates, Inc., of Somerville, Mass.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the May 9 issue of Business Week, discussing the programs for hiring the handicapped be included in the RECORD:

USEFUL WORK FOR DISABLED—EMPLOYERS SAY IT PAYS TO FOLLOW A POLICY OF HIRING HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Two weeks from now, a major U.S. employer will receive a coveted award in the White House for doing what comes naturally—being a good businessman. Caterpillar Tractor Co. will be honored as 1963's number 1 employer of the handicapped.

Actually, the title doesn't mean that Caterpillar employs more handicapped workers than any other big corporation—though the 10 percent of its 33,800 employees who have disabilities puts it well beyond the average in that respect. The "Employer of the Year" award pays tribute to Caterpillar's program of work-rehabilitation among the handicapped—a program that other employers are coming to recognize as good business practice.

Indeed, Caterpillar is one of a long list of companies active in the field. Bendix Corp. and Ace Electronics Associates, Inc., of Comerville, Mass., are previous Presidential award winners. Ford, Du Pont, and Sears, Roebuck also are well-known for hiring the handicapped.

IT PAYS OFF

To current award winner Caterpillar, it's a "policy that secures profits."

This conclusion is the theme of an intense promotional campaign by the Government—in cooperation with business and labor—that began some 15 years ago. The results to date: 4 million handicapped workers placed in jobs; 1 million rehabilitated and retrained; some 600,000 disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict helped to private employment.

GROWING PROBLEM

The record is good, but it's dwarfed by the problem. It is estimated that nearly 1 of every 10 Americans has a disability that limits activity. There are some 5 million with heart disease, another 5 million with ambulatory problems. Hearing difficulties affect 6 million. Seven million have arthritis. And because of today's longer lives, the totals are growing.

Seven million handicapped draw paychecks. Those who don't, collect more than $800 million annually in public assistance payments.

ABLE TO PRODUCE

These facts, however, are less significant to a prospective employer than one the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped repeatedly emphasizes—that a handicapped worker is an average or better-than-average employee.

The President's Committee—composed of some 600 volunteers from private life—is charged with echoing this theme before the public and among private employers. Since so many leaders of U.S. corporations serve on the committee, it is also something of a hiring group itself.

NEW PLANS

Last week, the committee held its annual meeting, a sort of combination pep talk and panel discussion attended by more than 2,000 volunteers, many themselves handicapped. Traditionally, the President presented the "Handicapped American of the Year" award—to Jerry J. Walsh, a 41-year-old rheumatoid arthritis victim.

At the same time, President Johnson detailed administration programs for hiring the handicapped, with special emphasis on the mentally retarded. This project began under President Kennedy, when it was discovered that the Government had no mentally retarded employees even though they might be capable of certain simple jobs. At present 12 U.S. agencies employ 22 retardees.

OVERCOMING DOUBTS

Much of the committee's work has been concentrated on breaking down traditional doubts about the practicality of hiring the handicapped.

Employer worries run the gamut from the lesser mobility of employees in wheelchairs to the reaction of fellow workers, from concern over public resentment if layoffs are necessary to the need for extra supervision, medical care, and possibly higher insurance rates.

EXPERIENCE TELLS

Companies with experience in hiring the handicapped discount these fears. Caterpillar policy places great stress on careful placement, avoids assigning a "disproportionate" number of handicapped to one department.

Other companies with similar employment experience, such as Ford Motor Co., claim that a businesslike approach is good rehabilitation practice. Ford employs more than 4,000 physically handicapped in its plants in Dearborn, Mich. They include amputees, totally blind, deaf, and others with diabetes, epilepsy, and heart ailments. Nearly all do production work rather than "light" work.

"No special jobs are created for the handicapped * * *. The individual is not properly placed unless he is on a regularly established job that must be done somehow * * *. All our employees, including the handicapped, must meet the work requirements on the job," Ford says.

Ford's labor contracts with the United Auto Workers take into account problems of the handicapped. These sometimes arise under the seniority system, when "bumping" displaces a handicapped worker from a job to one he can't handle.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. has 4,242 handicapped workers on its payroll, as "operators," as craftsmen, in professional and technical jobs, as clerical and supervisory employees, and as laborers. Most are above average in safety and attendance.

Brooks Research and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, often in paying tribute to those who maintain the defense requirements of our Nation we overlook the contributions of private enterprise. While we properly recognize the readiness of the Military Establishment to respond to any threat to free world security, let us not forget the role played by American industry in turning out the materials that are the framework of our deterrent posture.

In this regard, I am very proud of the many companies located in the 36th Congressional District of New York, which it is my honor to represent, for their part in assuring the military supremacy of the United States. A wide range of strategic items are included in the production of the various industrial and commercial concerns whose employees are my constituents.

Among these firms is Brooks Research, Inc., of East Rochester, N.Y. Operating on the expanding frontiers of science, Brooks Research is producing equipment that does much to protect the high investment all American taxpayers have in the defense and space programs.

At my request, David C. Tait, vice president of Brooks Research has written a brief summary of the company's activities and their relation to the cause of peace. I take pleasure in sharing Mr. Tait's statement with my colleagues in the House:

The company is playing a vital part in many projects of importance to the national interests. Among them are BMEWS, Saturn, Atlas, Centaur, the Gemini project, and in production of McDonnell's F-4 Phantom II fighter aircraft.

The equipment produced by Brooks for these programs is known as SPACE systems, an acronym standing for self-programing automatic checkout equipment. The systems help guarantee the reliability of the equipment they are used to check and thereby are instrumental in reducing or eliminating possible failures that might occur had the equipment gone unchecked or had it been checked in a less comprehensive manner than provided by the Brooks equipment.

Today, reliability is one of the most critical factors in our aerospace efforts. Failure of a minor component can have the most dire effects on a space mission. The implications of the old saying, "For want of a shoe * * *," are nowhere more pertinent than in this area. We are proud to state that Brooks is doing its part to insure the ultimate success of aerospace missions.

The maze of wires associated with many complex electronic assemblies on board aircraft or space capsules must be accurately connected. These connections number in the tens and even hundreds of thousands. SPACE systems completely verify the accuracy of these complex assemblies.

Besides guaranteeing the reliability of vital parts of Government equipment, our systems produce important economies in production by speeding up testing and doing it completely automatically.

The emergence of SPACE systems in many of the aerospace projects is relatively new. Our equipment has been procured for these programs as one measure in meeting the demand for upgrading the reliability of the programs. Lost time in countdowns and even long postponements of launchings have occurred because of failures in what are often considered routine phases of an aerospace shot. By guaranteeing the integrity of entire wiring assemblies, our equipment is fulfilling its part in assuring the eventual success of the programs.

Acceptance of our equipment on a much larger scale is indicated by recent events. The Marine Corps is evaluating our equipment for use in second echelon overhaul and repair depots. The same is true of the Navy.

Brooks is grateful to have an opportunity to serve the Nation in the challenge presented by aerospace exploration.

Interlocking Unilateral Arms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the May 11 Washington report of the American Security Council was written by me, as guest editor, and discusses currently trends in arms control and disarmament as follows:

INTERLOCKING UNILATERAL ARMS CONTROL

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

Another step toward disarmament without inspection has been accomplished through what is called "interlocking unilateral arms control."

Long before ratification of last year's limited test ban treaty the Kennedy-Johnson administration became acutely aware of the difficulties in reaching formal East-West disarmament agreements.

Russian contumacy and hardheaded refusal to negotiate provisions for "detection/inspection" machinery to spot treaty cheating behind the Iron Curtain has been one stumbling block. All pretense of achieving safeguards had to be abandoned in order to get the Moscow Treaty. The Eisenhower dictum, based on consistent past experience, relative to the danger and futility of signing treaties with Communist countries without "self-enforcing mechanisms" was conveniently sidestepped.

Another stumbling block for Soviet-United States treaties is the basic distrust by the American people of Communist promises which makes Senate ratification extremely difficult. A massive public relations campaign, supported not only by the late President Kennedy's ample prestige, but by all other resources at his administration's command had to be mounted to assure the Senate's consent to the test limitation pact.

HOW IT WORKS

Due to such difficulties resort has been made to a murky mass of tacit understandings in order to conclude arrangements on subjects supposedly of common interest to Washington and Moscow, such as arms control. Except for show window exercises at the United Nations and the 18-Nation Geneva Disarmament Conference, traditional forms of open diplomatic negotiations toward public pacts subject to constitutional ratification procedures essentially have been put on ice. In their place have been substituted what amounts to secret negotiations between the heads of the American state and the Soviet state by means of letters which, from time to time, are evidenced circumstantially by strangely contemporaneous, but seemingly independent, announcements of actions or intentions by the two.

Already referred to in Washington disarmament circles as "interlocking unilateral arms control," the currently employed technique is little more than a 20th century adaptation of the one employed in past times by absolute monarchs in their surrepitious dealings with each other. Similarly, the matter of monitoring the adherence to the tacit agreements in this manner concluded appears mostly to depend on the quality of one's intelligence network.

How is all this working out for the United States today?

SIMULTANEOUS CUTBACK IN FISSIONABLE MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The case history of April 20's simultaneous announcements by President Johnson and Premier Khrushchev of cutbacks in production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons provides a clue.

The Khrushchev announcement bore a 1 p.m. eastern standard time release hour. The Johnson speech to Associated Press editors in New York was timed for release at 2 p.m. eastern standard time. Almost within minutes afterward inspired rumors began circulating that surely the pair "will share the next Nobel Peace Prize." Editorial comment was a little more restrained, but generally assessed the events as "an advance toward peace well worth hailing."

On the surface, "interlocking unilateral arms control" seems to be working well for the United States, but, perhaps, a peek beneath the surface should be taken to make sure.

Two fissionable products used in nuclear weapons manufacture were the subject of the Johnson-Khrushchev letters and understanding—plutonium, manmade by burning ordinary uranium in large reactors; and, enriched uranium, the fissionable isotope of uranium extracted by highly secret processes at the Atomic Energy Commission's gaseous diffusion plants.

On the subject of plutonium, Premier Khrushchev merely announced that the U.S.S.R. is not going to finish off two production reactors. He did not indicate whether other unfinished reactors, if any, would be completed. He made no reference to reactors in being and now supplying plutonium to nuclear weapons factories, the amount of their production, or how Soviet scientists might be planning to boost it to higher levels. Khrushchev not only promised no cutback whatever in plutonium production, he left entirely open the possibility that the Soviet Union might be increasing it considerably.

In contrast, President Johnson confirmed, on April 20, his order issued in January to shut down and mothball four plutonium producing reactors and slash the U.S. output by 20 percent.

On the subject of enriched uranium, Premier Khrushchev announced—but he did not promise—what he termed a "substantial" cutback in production to be accomplished "over the next several years." What did he mean by the "next several years"? When does it start? When does it end? How big a slash in Soviet production of U^{235} does he believe warrants the adjective "substantial"?

A possible clue to the definition of this word is found in President Johnson's speech. He described the boost of his 25-percent cutback announced in January to 40 percent in April as substantial. Thus, in the semantics of enriched uranium production, a 15-percent variation appears to warrant the euphemistic adjective "substantial."

ONE RABBIT FOR ONE HORSE

This, then, is the substance of the Johnson-Khrushchev unwritten pact:

1. A 20-percent cutback in U.S. plutonium production in return for a zero-percent U.S.S.R. cutback—with no limits on an actual increase by the latter.

2. A 40-percent cutback in U.S. enriched uranium production in return for what may be no more than a 15-percent U.S.S.R. cutback, to begin sometime.

This bargain can be viewed with even more realism if it is not forgotten that one of the late President Kennedy's first official acts after taking office was, in February 1961, to order a 17½-percent reduction in the Eisenhower administration's U-235 production level. From that point, the combined Kennedy-Johnson cuts amount to 50 percent.

From this perspective President Johnson's try at personal diplomacy appears much less a claim on the Nobel Prize than does a "one rabbit for one horse" swap from which the wily Russians rode away on the steed. Perhaps that is why the AEC's Chairman, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, and others have laid heavy emphasis in testimony to Congress and press releases on two claims: (1) that the levels of U-235 and plutonium production far exceed military requirements; and (2) that the cutbacks really are "economy" movies which would be made anyway, irrespective of what the Soviets do.

If these claims represent the actual facts of the matter, they raise other questions as disturbing as the lopsided relationship between the two countries' cutbacks.

WHAT YARDSTICK WAS USED?

According to the AEC's latest report to Congress in excess of $4 billion have been spent to build its plutonium and U^{235} production facilities. This vast expenditure was justified on the basis of military and civilian needs for the amount of materials these plants can produce. Did the AEC do its work so shabbily that its plutonium figures are 20 percent off and its U^{235} calculations 50 percent in error?

Or does the fault lie in the Department of Defense? Was DOD that much in error in its understanding of our strategic and tactical warhead requirements? If not, has it drastically reduced those requirements? If so, why? Do we no longer seek nuclear

superiority over the Soviets? Or, is the nature of the threat so diminished that superiority can be maintained by a relaxed effort? These and a host of similar inquiries are pertinent to the newly stated relationship between defense needs and fissionable materials production.

On the other hand, if the cutbacks really are economy moves, it is fair to ask what kind of an economy yardstick is being used. This question stems directly from last year's comprehensive report to the President on civilian nuclear power by the AEC. Its burden was that burgeoning demands for electrical kilowatts in the decades ahead compels an unswerving devotion to civilian nuclear power reactors—to the extent that by the year 2000 half the Nation's kilowatts are nuclear kilowatts. These reactors will consume massive amounts of enriched uranium. Vast quantities of electrical energy must be devoted to the enrichment process at some point in time.

Nonetheless, we are told that in the interests of economy today's ample TVA and other hydroelectric kilowatts used to power the diffusion plants shall, in effect, be left in the rivers, to be dissipated into the sea, rather than stored in the form of enriched uranium for future years' nuclear power reactors.

Indeed, the cutback may look good in a single year's budget—some $68 to $83 million annually—but beyond the short term it well may be regarded as a shameful waste of precious power resources.

ANOTHER WAY TO LOSE OUR SHIRT?

This and additional steps toward disarmament through the "interlocking unilateral arms control" procedure should be analyzed most carefully.

Recalling the United States past proclivity for losing its shirt at international negotiating tables, before any peace prize nominations are made it would be well to determine if "unilateral interlock" is just another way of losing its shirt by secret letters, speeches, and press releases.

"Serf Doctors" Will Give Shoddy Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, having practiced for many years as a physician and surgeon in the executive branch of the Government, as well as under our free enterprise system of medicine and surgery as a copartnership clinic type of practice; I particularly appreciate the editorial by Russell Kirk in the Detroit Free Press, April 15, 1964, entitled, "Serf Doctors Will Give Shoddy Care." Certainly, socialization will also eliminate that which has extended the length of our lives and given us high standards of care. In addition, the Supreme Court of Australia predicated upon points of law set forth in the 13th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, has found against enserfing pharmacists et al.

I have visited most of these countries and concur with Mr. Kirk's remarks, particularly insofar as not wanting one other than an inspired one, in competition with his peers, and the open marketplace, to operate upon me.

The article follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 15, 1964]

"SERF DOCTORS" WILL GIVE SHODDY CARE

(By Russell Kirk)

Throughout much of the world, governments and powerful organizations tend to treat physicians and surgeons as if they were mere civil servants.

If this tendency continues, the public will saddle itself with shoddy medical treatment.

In Belgium, doctors are on a protest strike against a new act of Parliament that would determine physicians' fees, setting them lower than present charges; record doctors' income at a central office, so subjecting them to higher income taxes than other groups pay; record every treatment of a patient, destroying the privacy and confidence of the relationship between doctor and patient.

It is difficult to imagine a scheme better calculated to injure Belgian medical practice.

In Britain, doctors are bitterly objecting to the low pay they receive under the socialized national health service, and to the lowered status and responsibility of the physician since medicine was socialized by the postwar Labor government.

In the United States, the medicare plan, now dormant in Congress but susceptible of quick revival, would be the first big step toward socialized medicine.

The vast majority of American doctors energetically oppose the shallow slogans of medicare, knowing that it would endanger their professional independence and responsibility, and the whole character of medical practice.

Why this discrimination against doctors?

Though many doctors have lucrative practices, they also work longer hours, undergo more nervous strain, and spend more years in training than do the members of any other profession.

They form in some ways, the most honorable and intelligent class in modern society. Have we any right to convert physicians into serfs of the mass state?

Can it be that because doctors are a successful, diligent, self-respecting minority, too many people envy them, and would penalize them for their achievement—so killing the goose that lays the golden eggs?

It is not merely racial and religious minorities that have their rights: Occupations and classes have just prerogative and rewards, too.

This columnist would not wish to be attended by a serf-doctor, ill-paid, harrassed into bad temper, overworked by bureaucratic decree, treated by the state as suspect and greedy.

Indeed, probably one might not find even a serf-doctor. For what man of talent and integrity would choose to enter a profession so singled out for paralyzing regulation?

In Soviet Russia, there long has existed a dismaying shortage of general practitioners, competent or incompetent; and this is the necessary consequence of bullying and meddling with a profession once free and honorable.

Calling such a scheme democratic, and incorporating it in an act of Congress or Parliament, does not alter the grim fact that servile medicine is bad medicine.

Northwestern Pennsylvania's Vacationland Described in National Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the May 16, 1964, issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains a 54-page supplement promoting Pennsylvania as a vacationland and area for new industry.

This handsome booklet with three-color photographs is a major project of an organization known as 100,000 Pennsylvanians for the Promotion of the Economic Growth.

A section of the supplement is devoted to northwestern Pennsylvania, including the 24th Congressional District—an ideal vacation area with a rich historical background.

The following article appearing in the Erie Times-News, Erie, Pa., May 3, 1964, is a reprint of part of the supplement:

ERIE, AREA GET FEATURED U.S. BILLING—ERIELAND HIGHLIGHTS PLAYED UP IN MAY 16 SATURDAY EVENING POST

THANK YOU, OHIO

Nature has been fashioning this curved 4,300-acre appendage of land for about 10,000 years.

Geologists believe Presque Isle (French for "almost an island") was originally located in Ohio, but for centuries has been pushed eastward by the wind and currents.

The waves hit the peninsula at an angle and often carry the distinctively colored pebbles the entire length of the peninsula in 2 days. As the waves play at nature's constant changes, they are making sport for swimmers.

BIRDLAND BY THE SEA

Presque Isle (now a State park) is internationally known for a unique geological situation. Starting at the tip of the peninsula and working inland you can see all the stages of nature's succession from fresh beach sand to the climax forest. This process of evolution requires about 600 years for nature to develop. You can see it in 20 minutes.

The peninsula stood for centuries as wilderness. Today, the well-manicured beaches are immaculately clean and unlittered. They surround miles of hiking trails. There are new, modern bathhouses, and State-supervised park concessions. Fifteen miles of dual-lane highways take you to beach areas along the lake, where there's plenty of parking.

The entire beach is edged with shaded picnic areas and wooded coves. Inland lagoons and Erie's natural landlocked harbor make a paradise for fishermen and boat enthusiasts. Hungry black bass, pike (great northern and yellow), and plenty of pan fish await the angler. Hundreds of pleasure boats—from the smallest dinghies with outboard motors to the largest yachts—move in and out of the new marina. Charter boats, sightseeing cruisers and even helicopter rides are available.

FROM OPEN BEACH TO OCEAN HARBOR—100 YARDS

Turn your back on the beach and the lake, walk south across the peninsula, and you face another world. A crowded harbor full of ocean vessels, lake freighters, fishing boats and oil tankers. The ships—half of them Europe bound—take on lumber, paper, coal, petroleum, grain, iron ore, locomotives, machinery, and fish.

Presque Isle Peninsula lighthouse shines 18 miles across the lake and welcomes these ships from all over the world. It's as tidy a little lighthouse as you'll find at Nantucket.

ERIE'S NAVAL BATTLE

In this land-locked harbor Commodore Perry's ships were built for his famous naval battle of the War of 1812. A British fleet was on the lakes. The U.S. lake ports were undefended. Capt. Daniel Dobbins, a native of Erie, saw the desperate need for a U.S. fleet. In 90 days he built two brigs, a schooner, and three gunboats despite handi-

caps of untrained workmen, inadequate materials, and low supplies. Trees that grew in the forest at morning were planks in the side of a ship by nightfall. Finally a fleet of 10 ships was ready for the 27-year-old commodore, Oliver Hazard Perry.

As every schoolboy knows, Perry met the British fleet, had his own flagship shot out from under him, transferred to another ship, the *Niagara*, hoisted his pennant "Don't give up the ship" (the banner was sewn by Erie women at the home of Thomas Steuart) and won the day. He then penned his famous lines, "We have met the enemy and they are ours. Two ships, two brigs, one schooner, and one sloop."

Today, the *Niagara*, newly rigged and restored, stands near Erie's public dock. It is a favorite attraction.

THE "WOLVERINE"—A PEACETIME WARRIOR

Not far from the *Niagara* is the only monument in the United States erected to a ship—the *Wolverine*, the Navy's first iron-hulled battleship. The ship was built in 1843, to the tune of—"an iron ship—you might as well build it out of stone." There were guffaws when the ship was launched, moved just 50 feet, and stuck. But after the crowd left, the *Wolverine* launched herself and cruised peacefully on the Great Lakes for 80 years. Parties and gaiety aboard were in the best Navy tradition. Charles Vernon Gridley of "you may fire when ready, Gridley" fame was once captain of this ship.

The only blood ever spilled on this warship's decks occurred when a 19-gun salute, fired for Vice President Millard Fillmore in 1849, killed seven crewmen.

Erie—named for the Erie Indians who first inhabited this region—offers visitors comfortable, pleasant accommodations. Scores of modern motels line the highways leading in and out of the city. Excellent seafood and lake fish dinners are "specialties of the house" in the many fine restaurants in and near Erie. It is a popular convention town.

Waldameer, and amusement park just off Route 5 at the head of the Peninsula, has some of the most exciting rides you'll find anywhere; and Rainbow Gardens Ballroom there features bigname bands all summer. Summer theater stars perform under a tent at the entrance to Presque Isle.

A SEA OF GRAPES, BUT NOT ONE GLASS OF WINE

Drive along Lake Erie near the town of North East (Route 20), in the late summer and early fall and you see miles of rich grape vineyards and vast orchards—the longest continuous planting of grape vineyards in the world.

Approximately 10,000 acres of grapes are under cultivation. Of these, 98 percent are the finest Concord grapes which are processed into grape juice, delicious jams and jellies and sent to all parts of the world. Concord grapes, because of their lack of natural sugar, are not suitable for most wines. Most Erie County grapes go to grape juice.

If you're in this area in July, don't miss the Cherry Festival; or in late September, the Grape Festival, both at the lovely little town of North East.

More of nature's abundance in this part of Pennsylvania comes in early springtime. When the frost begins to leave, maple trees are tapped and the sweet sap begins to flow in such profusion that "sugar bushes" operate day and night "sugaring off" this delectable sweet to be shipped as syrup or sugar to markets throughout the East.

LITTLE LAKES SOUTH OF THE BIG LAKE

South of Lake Erie there are vacation lakes, where many families go for those long, old-fashioned summer vacations. At Ganadohta Lake, near Union City; and at Edinboro Lake, Route 99, a short distance from Waterford, you'll find plenty of accommodations and many cottages to rent.

At Waterford, 14 miles south of Erie on Route 19, is the Fort Le Boeuf Museum housed in the Judson Mansion and containing an interesting collection of frontier artifacts. A monument commemorates the delivery, in 1753, by George Washington (then a 21-year-old major) of a packet containing a message from Virginia's Governor Dinwiddie warning the French to leave that area.

IT SEEMS LIKE ONLY YESTERDAY

Fifty years ago when "taking the waters" was the fashion, Cambridge Springs (Route 19) attracted visitors from all over the world. Singer Lillian Russell swished around the Bartlett Hotel in her long gowns and gorgeous big hats, and rode in her chauffeur-driven White Steamer.

What once was a famous spa is now a popular golfing resort with two first-class 18-hole golf courses. Where once veiled and corsetted ladies sipped magnesia waters, today's young girls, dressed in Bermuda shorts, pursue a little white golf ball around one of the courses. Beneath the half-mile-long elevated walk, where guests once promenaded to and from the Riverside Hotel to the Spring House for their daily drafts of mineral water, the less robust now play golf on the other 18-hole course. This course, which extends down along French Creek, is shorter and less challenging than the main Cambridge Springs course.

A few miles south is Meadville (Route 19), an important frontier town where General Anthony Wayne put an end to the Indian raids back in 1795. A popular inn now stands on the site of the home of one of the founders of Meadville—Gen. David Mead, who participated in the Battle of Lake Erie. He helped found Allegheny College. Meadville is also the home of the zipper.

SEE THE WORLD'S FIRST OIL WELL

Near Titusville (Route 8), "Col." Edwin L. Drake, a retired railroad conductor and the world's first wildcatter, "brought in" the world's first successful oil well in 1859. At the time it was referred to as Drake's Folly. But the well soon became the center of a great oil boom and spawned such towns as Pithole—now a ghost town—and such persons as John D. Rockefeller, the founder of Standard Oil. (John Wilkes Booth was also in the oil business in Franklin, Pa. One day he left his place of business to go to the Ford Theater and infamy. Some of his letters and a wax replica can be seen in Venango County Museum in Franklin.)

At Drake Well Memorial Park, you can see a replica of the first oil rig, and can visit the fascinating Petroleum Industry Museum.

West of Meadville is Conneaut Lake (Route 322), Pennsylvania's largest natural lake. It's a busy resort. Attractions include an amusement park and Fairyland Forest, wth live animals and nursery rhyme characters. There are two fine golf courses nearby.

LAKE PYMATUNING

In 1934 Pennsylvania built a dam for flood control. The shores of the lake became a perfect setting for a recreation area and the result was Pymatuning State Park. Today this lake is 18½ miles long and 2 miles wide. It has a shore line of 71 miles and is a State park and conservation area. This lake is 12 miles west of Conneaut Lake on Route 322.

THE FISH, THE DUCKS, THE BOATS, ALL COMPETE

The lake is stocked with all kinds of game fish: muskellunge, walleye, great northern pike, both large- and small-mouth bass. The carp, attracted to the spillway by spectator-tossed bread, are so jammed together that the wild ducks literally walk on their backs in a race to get their share. Some of these carp are immense, weigh 35 pounds, and are 36 inches long. Pymatuning has one of the largest outboard motorboat clubs in the world, and tristate championship sailboat races are held from the yacht club.

AS MANY AS 70,000 DUCKS A DAY

During the height of migration, as many as 70,000 ducks have been observed in a single day at this stopoff place on the Atlantic flyway. From 5,000 to 10,000 white swans fly in at one time and rest huddled on the ice-covered lake for a day or two in early spring or late fall. They feed and rest in the refuge area at the north end of the lake, where patches of many kinds of grain are planted.

At the Pennsylvania Game Commission Museum in the park, you can see an exhibit of nearly 300 mounted specimens of wild waterfowl, marsh, and shore birds that visit the region. Practically all the birds on exhibit have been collected in or near the area: mallards, black ducks, blue-winged teal, wood ducks, and other wild waterfowl; ring-necked pheasants, quail, and bald eagles.

For detailed information on travel attractions and accommodations in this area, contact any of the following:

Tourist & Convention Bureau, 134 West 10th Street, Erie, Pa.—telephone 814-452-4229.

Crawford County Tourist Association, Box 117, Conneaut Lake, Pa.

Mercer County Tourist Promotion Agency, Shenango Valley Chamber of Commerce, Sharon, Pa.

Venango County Museum Corp., 1272 Liberty Street, Franklin, Pa.—telephone 814-432-5823.

The Board of County Commissioners, Butler County Courthouse, Butler, Pa.

The Board of County Commissioners, Lawrence County Courthouse, New Castle, Pa.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the public reaction that has followed my proposal for an amendment to the Constitution, House Joint Resolution 990, which would revise the Presidential succession procedure. I believe it imperative that the Congress act without delay to establish an improved succession schedule, and I am delighted that the Waterbury American, which is published in the largest city in my district, is in editorial accord with my proposal.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include a helpful and supporting editorial from the April 25, 1964, edition of the Waterbury American.

A MEASURE THAT DESERVES SUPPORT

U.S. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN has introduced in the House of Representatives a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would spell out a presidential succession of procedure.

There have been other plans suggested; there has been a lot of verbiage on the subject, but nothing has happened so far.

The Monagan resolution provides for the accession of the Vice President to the Presidency, in the event of removal from office, death, or resignation, as at present.

But the Monagan amendment would require that within 30 days after such an event, the President would be required to nominate a Vice President, who would take office upon confirmation by the House and Senate. A

majority of those present and voting would be required for confirmation. Similar action would follow in the event of the removal, death, or resignation of the Vice President.

This strikes us as a sound and logical bill, although there may be some question as to whether a constitutional amendment is really necessary, and whether Congress cannot itself legislate such a plan without resorting to the long and involved amendment procedure.

But something must be done, and the sooner the better. The Nation is now without a Vice President, which is a weakness in our Government structure. The Vice Presidency is no longer what it once was, a sort of sinecure which provided the President a chance to relieve himself of certain official and formal duties—groundbreaking, ribbon cutting, and that sort of thing.

The Nation knows today, as perhaps never before in its history, that the man who stands just a heartbeat away from the Presidency must be a man of ability. We have been fortunate up to now. We may not be so fortunate in the future. We had better be ready.

Our County Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, for the record I should like to present a very interesting article by Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr., which appeared in the Florida Times-Union on Tuesday, April 21, this year.

Dr. King's timely article refers to the outstanding service of our county agents. This article is particularly appropriate at this time because now we are in the process of considering agricultural appropriations for the next fiscal year and I hope that the House will vote for adequate appropriations for all of our agricultural programs, including the Agricultural Extension Service, through which great department the county agents operate.

I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], who is quoted in Dr. King's article in paying tribute to outstanding men and women—our county agents—who over the years have rendered devoted service to both rural and urban youth over and beyond the call of duty.

The complete article by Dr. King follows:

OUR COUNTY AGENTS

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

"Everybody that knows a county agricultural agent is proud of that acquaintance for those agents are the very salt of the earth."

If you have read the foregoing quotation you will know that this article is going to be a tribute to our county agents. And after you have finished reading the article you will know, if you are familiar with their work and achievements that the writer of it knows county agents.

Yes, we have known many of them during our long newspaper experience here in Florida, and our pleasurable dealings with them have convinced us that they are men who have done one of the most effective jobs of character building and developing the highest class of good citizens of anybody that undertakes a leadership role such as they handle.

These men are all alike—of the highest character, well educated, devoted to the cause for which they work, and all bent upon doing a job that is telling in its effect upon the families with which they have dealings as the leader toward better things on the farm.

In their relationship to their farm families, their work has an effect comparable to what happens when an industry moves into an undeveloped area and begins manufacturing the available raw materials and producing marketable goods.

The invariable result that is reported is that value was added by the manufacturing process.

In other words, the manufacturer puts the raw materials, which had not been getting their share of possible wealth, in shape to command good prices and gives them an added value, which makes the process profitable.

That, in effect, is what the county agent does for the farm family.

ROBERT EVERETT, Representative in Congress from Tennessee, points out that county agents work in cooperation with the extension division of the land-grant colleges of agriculture (such as Florida's at Gainesville), and proceeds to pay them his tribute.

The work of the Extension Service in Tennessee has been outstanding, in every respect, he reports. "We have outstanding men and women who are certainly devoted to this work. Their contributions have meant much in the years gone by in helping the economy of our section of Tennessee."

He follows this laudation with an editorial from a weekly newspaper in this district, which reads:

Our county, like most counties with a predominant agricultural income, depends a great deal on its county agents.

They not only must have the answers to technical questions concerning agriculture and related subjects but must be qualified to share in family problems of a personal and social nature.

Our county agents, J. D. Pettigrew, Joe Martin, and Mrs. June Walker, seem to have all the qualities that are necessary in technical as well as extracurricular departments.

Thanks to them we have a well-organized feeder calf and pig association, an active 4-H Club organization and growing home demonstration clubs throughout the county.

We take great pleasure in commending this group for their fine leadership and successful efforts.

No finer chapter will ever be written into the history of Florida than that which accurately reports the activities of our county agents, both men and women—the men working with the farmers, and the women in the home demonstration duties, involving home improvements.

And of course the work of the boys' division must be covered to make the story complete, and that is a separate story, and perhaps the most important, for it deals with making the very best of men out of the fine boys we have in the farm boys' clubs.

Floridians have really got to know the story of the county agricultural agents, the home demonstration women agents, and what the farm boys' clubs are doing and achieving to know their State.

The story begins in Nassau County and follows the border line to Escambia. And starts at the Georgia border and extends to Key West—and there's attractive action in every mile along the way.

It's a grand story. We know because we've lived some of it.

NIBA's Position on Penalty Overtime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for the RECORD the following statement of policy on the penalty overtime bill, prepared by the National Independent Business Association, and sent to me by Raymond C. Kelly, president of the association. In view of the widespread interest in this legislation, I think many Members will be interested in reading the analysis of the National Independent Business Association has made of the probable effects of this bill:

NATIONAL INDEPENDENT BUSINESS ASSOCIATION POSITION ON PENALTY OVERTIME

The Board of Directors of the National Independent Business Association, after careful study of the proposed penalty overtime bill, has recommended unanimously that the bill not be passed.

The National Independent Business Association, which is made up almost entirely of small businesses, believes that smaller companies will be particularly hard hit if this bill is enacted. Instead of eliminating unemployment, it will tend to increase it by raising the cost of doing business, and thereby making expansion—with the resultant new jobs—more difficult. Larger companies, when faced with the dilemma of this bill (to pay more for overtime or hire more people) can more easily adjust because of the greater flexibility they usually have in arranging their workload, and the availability of more elaborate facilities for training new workers. But for many small companies, these requirements are unduly harsh.

The basic premise of H.R. 9802 seems to be that there exists some great pool of unemployed workers who have precisely the skills which a company needs to assist it in meeting peakload requirements, and that these supposedly trained and efficient workers are willing and able to work for short periods of time. A further premise is that a company can absorb the additional fringe benefits and employment costs with no adverse effects.

These premises are not true.

There are few companies, indeed, which use overtime as a permanent policy—that is, who fail to hire permanent employees for permanent increases in workload. The main use of overtime is still to handle temporary peaks in production. And in such cases, the training of temporary personnel is unthinkable, especially for a small company.

Another serious problem in connection with the proposal is that the bill provides authority for constant review and possible changes once an order has been issued. After a committee has made a finding, the Secretary of Labor may, on his own motion or on the filing of a petition, appoint a new tripartite industry committee to reconsider a penalty-pay order. Thus, it is quite possible that industries subject to the act would face constant turmoil and uncertainty, with continual proceedings—or the threat of proceedings—to determine their overtime policies.

National Independent Business Association views this proposed legislation as an ineffective and dangerous approach to the problem of unemployment. In a time when rising costs and inflation are serious economic prob-

lems, it does little good to enact legislation which is going to further increase costs. For those who are unemployed, an increase in the cost of living is certainly no solution to the problem. And for companies which are endeavoring to grow in order to provide more employment, an increase in the cost of doing business is going to bring fewer jobs, not more.

For the foregoing reasons, National Independent Business Association urges that H.R. 9802 not be enacted.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND C. KELLY,
President.

National Hospital Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in 1921 President Calvin Coolidge first proclaimed National Hospital Day for the purpose of focusing attention on the important role of our voluntary hospitals in American community life. Very appropriately, the day chosen for this observance was May 12, the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, the nurse who not only served the wounded soldiers of the Crimean War but who also made a significant contribution to the improvement of hospital organization and nursing care in this country.

As we observe National Hospital Week this year from May 10 to May 16, hospitals all over the country are holding open houses and other programs to acquaint the public with their services, facilities, and problems.

What is important to any individual is not the fact that we have 1.6 million hospital beds or that more than 26.5 million persons were admitted to hospitals last year, is that there is a bed available in his community hospital when he or one of his family needs it and that he receives high quality care. Hundreds of communities have been helped through the Hill-Burton program to build badly needed hospitals in recent years. Due to modern research, we have witnessed tremendous advances in the fields of drugs, surgery, and diagnostic techniques. Consequently, hospital care in this country is now better than ever before.

In the Fifth District of Massachusetts which I represent there are 10 hospitals providing an outstanding level of care for the more than 450,000 residents of the area. In addition they provide facilities for the training of nurses, doctors and medical technicians so vital to an adequate level of health care.

Despite the tremendous advances made by hospitals in recent years, there are still problems to be solved. Administrators are struggling to hold down the cost to the patient, while at the same time improving employee benefits and facilities. Large numbers of specially trained professional people are needed to care for cardiac surgery, radioisotope, and other types of cases requiring expert attention. In many areas of our Nation additional facilities are still needed and in others, modernization of unsafe or inefficient plants is required to meet the needs of a growing population. Here in Congress we must be ever vigilant to provide for the wants of these vital community services. Our hospitals are crucial to the health and welfare of the American people. Today, as communities across the Nation observe National Hospital Week, I want to join in congratulating our hospitals on a job well done and wish them continued success in the future.

The Sugar Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal includes a very comprehensive and informative report on the present situation with regard to the supply and price of sugar, which I commend to our many colleagues who have been greatly concerned about recent activity in this commodity area.

Among other things, the report indicates that administration officials are at last coming around to the viewpoint expressed by several of us here in the House, to the effect that the basic cause of the terribly expensive price fluctuations in sugar go back to the sugar program itself. I hope the administration will act soon to undo the harm that has been done.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Journal article as a part of my remarks:

SUGAR SHAKEUP—ADMINISTRATION PLANS LAW CHANGES TO AVOID ANOTHER PRICE SPURT—PROPOSALS SEEK TO GUARANTEE IMPORTS FAR AHEAD, RETURN TO "NATIONAL QUOTAS" PLAN—BEET MEN VERSUS CANE REFINERS

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—Rather reluctantly, Johnson administration planners are drafting an overhaul of U.S. sugar laws to try to prevent any repeat of last year's spectacular price leap.

The main idea is to insure a continuing abundant influx of sugar from abroad, which ordinarily makes up some 40 percent of the U.S. supply; it was a tightening of this flow that shoved prices up to the highest point in 43 years.

With this aim, the planners propose to backtrack from a sugar marketing setup adopted only 2 years ago, following the shutoff of supplies from Castro's Cuba. This arrangement has featured a novel attempt at a free market in imported sugar—offering half of Cuba's former share of the rich U.S. sugar market as a "global quota" open to all other producing nations on a first-come, first-served basis. Now the policymakers feel compelled to seek more rigid controls designed to guarantee foreign supplies far in advance.

Thus the administration is expected to ask Congress to go back to almost complete reliance on the longtime system of individual "national quotas"; preset slices covering the entire U.S. market, including Cuba's old share, would be parceled out to each of the foreign procedures. (Part of the allotments would be labeled "temporary," and earmarked for possible return to Cuba should a friendly regime some day take over there.) Chief beneficiaries of this shift would be Australia, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, South Africa, India, and the Philippines.

SPECIAL REWARDS

To encourage loyalty to the U.S. market, special rewards would be offered. Foreign producers would get expanded permanent marketing quotas in return for prompt full delivery if shortages loomed anew. Long-term price guarantees, smaller import duties, or some combination thereof may also be proposed. For poor supply performance, however, foreigners' market allotments would be cut back.

U.S. sugar producers, who are almost surely the most reliable suppliers of all, aren't being forgotten, but so far the Administration is shying from the quick, permanent boost in marketings they've been clamoring for. Instead, Johnson proposals may call for an increase effective only in 1966 when present domestic controls expire; U.S. political conflicts and consideration for foreign feelings weigh against more immediate action.

But as a stopgap, the President probably will urge Congress to let mainland American producers market for this year only all the sugar they can raise—an estimated 500,000 tons above their 1964 quota of 3.6 million tons.

The administration's package of sugar recommendations may go to Capitol Hill by June 1, hopefully in time to head off any big new price crises. The new import arrangements would be designed to replace controls due to die December 31, and their reception in Congress seems destined to be warm. Many influential lawmakers, notably House Agriculture Committee Chairman Cooley of North Carolina, are strong for "national quotas" and have criticized the "global quota" as ineffective, especially since last year's price gyrations. "We couldn't renew the global quota as is," says an administration strategist. "We couldn't get it through Congress even with a gun."

WESTERN BEET GROWERS

But at least some legislators will take a cooler view of administration proposals for domestic producers. Many Senators are backing a drive by Western beet growers for permanently expanded marketing quotas starting this year; many House Members, sympathetic to east coast refiners who process imported cane sugar, are adamant against the idea. If this conflict results in a standoff, Congress might find it necessary to pass over the administration's recommendations for the time being and extend the existing sugar law pretty much as is.

As the legislative wrangling suggests, sugar bulks rather large in the American economy. Mainland U.S. production has swelled to around 3.6 million tons annually, from about 2.6 million a decade ago. Beet sugar is grown in a score of Western States, led by California, Colorado, and Idaho; it occupies 25,000 farmers and 30,000 workers in processing plants. Mainland cane is raised in lesser amounts in Louisiana and Florida only, but the cane product comes also from such offshore suppliers as Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Mexico, Peru, Brazil, and India. Refineries handling foreign cane sugar employ 17,500 workers in 10 States, mainly on the east coast.

From all sources, the United States now consumes about 9.8 million tons of sugar a year, up from 8.2 million a decade ago. Despite the weight-watching trend, the average American consistently downs nearly 100 pounds each year. Only one-third of the total heap is used as a dining-table or home-kitchen sweetener; most of the rest is converted commercially into softdrinks, cakes, cookies, candy, ice cream, and other goodies.

A little goes into inedibles: plastics, dyes, drugs, and cosmetics.

While the housewife may have felt little pain from last year's price climb, it was more than enough to cause concern to commercial users. In the big New York market raw sugar wholesaled for as much as 13.20 cents a pound last July, more than double the price of a year earlier. While the price now has tumbled to around 6.75 cents, it's still a shade above the slated Government target of 6.65 cents.

What ignited the explosive uprush in prices? First, after crop failures in Cuba and Western Europe, world sugar stocks unexpectedly ran low late in 1962. Then, under the new global quota setup, U.S. sugar dealers for the first time since 1935 entered world markets to bid against foreigners for shares of the shrinking supplies available. The fear that foreign producers might shun the U.S. global quota to sell at higher prices elsewhere touched off a bidding binge and prompted commercial users to start stockpiling sugar.

The price jump touched off three congressional investigations seeking possible hidden causes, but none was found. The hearings apparently did convince many legislators, however, that the uncertainties of the global quota should somehow be eliminated.

Actually, the President is likely to praise the "global quota" concept and even to retain the label in his coming proposals. One reason is that John Kennedy battled hard to get Congress to adopt it in 1962, on the theory that this flexible arrangement might let some friendly Cuban Government of the future reenter the U.S. market with minimum difficulty.

Under Mr. Johnson's proposals, the present system of using basic national quotas to about 25 lands would be continued; these currently add up to around 2.5 million tons annually, more than one-fourth of the U.S. market. Collectively, these fixed, permanent shares might be called quota A, and the tonnage allocations given the more reliable suppliers would be increased from time to time, with the additions coming either from gradual increases in U.S. demand or from other producers' failures to fill their commitments.

The present global quota, now amounting to 1.5 million tons a year, might be dubbed "Quota B." In contrast to fixed allocations of Quota A sugar, Quota B shares would be issued only temporarily. But they would be parceled out in advance to various nations, not held open for all comers as now.

While Congress might well go along with these recommendations, the arrangement for domestic sugar will be another question. Some top administration advisers think domestic beetgrowers could succeed in their bid for permanently expanded marketings beginning this year. "The beets have got the votes in the Senate," flatly asserts one official. The beet industry is concentrated in Western and Midwestern States fielding such influential Democratic Senators as Majority Leader MANSFIELD of Montana, HUMPHREY of Minnesota, and ANDERSON of New Mexico. Added to pressure from the established producers is constant clamor from would-be growers in Missouri, Maine, New York, and elsewhere.

The beet men argue they are more reliable than foreigners in filling quotas and that a bigger market for domestic beet sugar would buoy the farm economy, switching some acreage from surplus production to a profitable cash crop.

But this drive may bog down in the House, where the refiners of foreign cane sugar have powerful allies. Agriculture Committee Chairman COOLEY, who has repeatedly fought off attempts to carve up foreign quotas for redistribution to American farmers, is expected to do battle again.

Too, Democratic Congressman O'NEILL of Massachusetts, member of the powerful Rules Committee and confidant of House Speaker MCCORMACK, recently marshaled 35 House colleagues for a meeting with Agriculture Secretary Freeman; the legislators, mostly from New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Maryland, where big cane refiners are located, made it plain they opposed any increase in domestic marketing quotas. Representative O'NEILL charged this would "have a damaging effect on organized labor (in cane refineries along the eastern seaboard) and the economy of port areas."

In fact, dockworkers of the International Longshoremen's Association and refinery employees who belong to the United Packinghouse Workers are trying to help derail the beet men's push. But labor is split on the issue; taking the opposite stand are workers in the Nation's 60-odd beet processing plants, mostly represented by the American Federation of Grain Millers.

Is This the Way To Fight the War Against Poverty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1963 when a move was made to increase the authorization for the Area Redevelopment Administration we were told it was necessary as a tool to be used against poverty and unemployment. The arguments were not impressive to me so I concluded ARA instead would be used as an election tool for the party in power.

A recent survey of the activities of the ARA by Charles Stevenson as printed in the May issue of the Reader's Digest proves that my fears were justified and that my negative vote was indeed a vote for the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. Stevenson's article follows:

IS THIS THE WAY TO FIGHT THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY?

(By Charles Stevenson)

(NOTE.—The Area Redevelopment Administration was set up for a highly worthy purpose. But look at the way this U.S. agency is squandering taxpayer dollars—and callously ignoring the rights of individual citizens.)

As a major government weapon in the war against poverty, President Lyndon B. Johnson has selected an increasingly aggressive agency—the Area Redevelopment Administration. This decision will come to haunt him. For the ARA has, in the name of helping the poor, become the spearhead of one of the most outrageous government encroachments on private enterprise in U.S. history. Fred Drew and Mike Kelley are living proof.

As independent loggers in northern Idaho, these partners had endured lean times. But by 1961 they were at last beginning to fulfill a longtime dream. From the State they had leased land on "Old Baldy," a 6,280-foot mountain near their hometown of Sandpoint, and were building Sundance Ski Lanes. A nationally known expert certified that the terrain and snowfall would support an enterprise comparable to any of the world's great ski resorts. "We had to start small," says Drew. "But we figured we could grow into a million-dollar show."

When a lumber mill folded owing them $10,000 needed for equipment, they had to cut logs to recoup, but every weekend they were back laboring on the slopes. Eventually they got a nine-room base-lodge underway. Also, they bought a ski tow. They poured in uncounted thousands of hours of labor, plus more than $50,000 cash.

Then, even as they were preparing to open for business, came the crushing blow. Because Sandpoint was considered to qualify as a "depressed area"—on account of winter unemployment when the lumber industry shuts down—the U.S. Government, through the Area Redevelopment Administration, lent $345,000 for construction of a competing ski resort on a nearby mountain. Next, the Sandpoint city council was prevailed upon to contribute $32,000 toward building a road into the new ski area, despite Idaho Health Department warnings that this could contaminate the municipal watershed. Sure enough, Sandpoint's water supply was condemned by the State even as construction of a new filter plant went ahead with an additional $250,000 from Washington.

By last January, thanks to more than half a million dollars in loans and grants out of your taxes and mine, many Sandpointers were jubilant that the new ski run was going full blast. All but forgotten in the glee over Washington's generosity were Drew and Kelley. Having tried to contribute to community growth by their own toil and initiative, in the traditional American way, they were now about done in. Drew said to me, "It isn't right for the Government to use our own tax payments to run us out of business."

Originally, the idealistic ARA plan was to provide technical help, research, and limited financial aid to not more than 40 single-industry regions left blighted by economic change or exhausted resources. On June 9, 1961, 1 month after President Kennedy signed the ARA bill, the agency published a map listing some 110 areas as eligible. Since then, ARA has uncoiled into a monstrous complex of cooperating bureaucracies. These agencies have dragooned or enticed a third of the Nation's counties and 42 million of its citizens into accepting the label of poverty in order to be showered with largess, Sandpoint style.

The bureaucracies enmeshed with ARA range from the Small Business Administration (an independent banking agency) to the Community Facilities Administration (under the Housing and Home Finance Agency) to, most particularly, the Department of Agriculture. So many thousands of U.S. employees are kept so busy helping ARA dish out so many millions of dollars from so many different funds that it's almost impossible to track down the dollars and the agencies involved. The fact that the ARA's methods threaten the livelihood of the Fred Drews and Mike Kelleys everywhere is brushed off. Explained ARA Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., last year: "One man's threat is another man's opportunity."

But crisscross the country for more than 20,000 miles, investigating on the scene, and you discover that ARA is riddled with bungling, political pressures, and untold finagling. Only a thorough congressional investigation can expose the full extent of it.

Specifically, ARA, in the name of helping distressed regions, is making outright "gifts" of millions of dollars. It is accompanying these with loans (up to 25 years' maturity) at rates never higher than 4 percent—less than it costs the Government to raise and handle the money. In doing this, it is perpetrating economic and political injustices.

Look, for example, at Oklahoma, where ARA is dressing up 5,000 acres of wooded preserve on Lake Eufaula with a palatial State-owned resort. It isn't costing the State a penny. The $10,331,000 cost is all taken care of by ARA, with $1,331,000 written

off as an outright gift. Whatever money is paid back will have to come out of the business—and jobs—taken from other resorts.

Seven members of the House Banking and Currency Committee took one look and reported: "We wonder how the unemployed in hard-core depressed areas would feel about this diversion of funds, intended for their assistance, to this Oklahoma boondoggle."

This is but a sample from scores of cases that are causing mounting concern. Here are the five main channels through which ARA is fomenting economic woe for America:

1. New installations are being financed by ARA in industries already beset by overcapacity, thus jeopardizing existing jobs.

In Detroit, where two hotels have recently gone bankrupt and others have been forced to lay off half their workers because the city has the lowest hotel-occupancy rate in the United States, the ARA is financing three new hotels and motels. In putting up $1,894,525 for the 432-room deluxe downtown Pontchartrain Hotel, the ARA claimed the purpose was "to generate 450 new jobs."

"All ARA is doing is destroying existing jobs and transferring some to these new hotels," declares Harry Paulson, a former president of the Detroit Hotel Association. Investigating Congressmen have concluded that the net result may be even fewer jobs "if the new facility forces existing hotels, already suffering from evcessive capacity, into bankruptcy."

ARA advanced $406,000 to reopen one coal mine and expand another in Carbon County, Utah, where 500 coal-mining jobs have disappeared in the past year, and where those men who are still working get only 3 to 4 days' pay per week. "Demand for increased coal output is just not present," says Utah Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT. "We are not going to sell 1 more ton of coal, and I am at a loss as to what to do for the scores of other workers who will be put out of work."

The Bata Shoe Co., the refugee Czech concern which from a base in Canada operates in 79 countries, is now using an ARA-financed factory at Salem, Ind. This plant is burdening the abundantly supplied U.S. shoe industry with 40,000 pairs of shoes every week. In 1963, ARA advanced the Salem Redevelopment Corp. $442,000 to purchase land and construct the building to be leased to Bata. ARA also handed over $235,000—more than half of it an outright gift for Bata's water and sewage facilities—and donated $64,000 to train workers. Bata paid for nothing except its machinery.

Thus foreign-controlled, foreign-operated Bata achieved the apex of our Government's new order—the right to have U.S. taxpayers set up a firm in business and so subsidize it that it can pull out without real loss at any time it desires. As a crowning irony, Augustin Dolezal, Bata's president, told newspapermen that his firm had decided to locate in Salem long before it knew anything about ARA. "We would have built in Salem anyway."

2. Areas that are far from "depressed" are getting help.

In Rice County, Kans., I found that even second-class farmers cleared an average $5,925 a year from wheat and beef. Bank and savings and loan assets in the county—more than $30 million for less than 14,000 population—have nearly doubled since 1950. "There's a job for almost everybody who wants one," says local Newspaper Editor Paul Jones.

However, the Agriculture Department's Extension Service made a "study" of Rice County, to suggest further development possibilities. With the help of a "technical staff" from the Rural Electrification Administration and other bureaus, a swarm of Agriculture Department representatives prepared an "overall economic development program" for a planned future. Result: ARA declared prosperous Rice County a depressed area.

Or consider Gregg County, Tex. This county leads the State in gross oil production. Booming Longview, the county seat, has grown from a population of 5,000 in the 1930's to 44,000 today; it has done so by attracting 126 pay-their-own-way plants. At the very moment the "depressed" label was pinned on it, the city ranked third in the Nation in retail purchases per household, led all Texas in manufacturing employment gains and was waging a national promotion campaign to add still more to its $26-million annual industrial payroll and 5,500 workers.

Why was Gregg pulled into a program designed for poverty-stricken areas? The flabbergasting answer of Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas: The county had made such "real progress" and shown such "vital leadership in bringing new industry" that its inclusion would inspire others to join.

Indignant, three Gregg County chambers of commerce petitioned Washington to release the county from ARA guardianship. One of the leaders in the fight, attorney R. E. Blount, was present when an ARA representative told county officials, "Boys, you've got to get in line for your share. If you don't get it, somebody else will." Gregg County was finally set free, but the struggle lasted nearly 2 years.

"We were mighty glad to get out," says Walter B. Koch, manager of Longview's Industrial Districts, Inc. "Some firms that had invested in our city wondered whether to put in more cash after Washington placed this 'depressed' tag on us. Our industrial development slowed up under ARA, but in the first 6 months after we got out six new industries came to us."

The techniques that engineered Rice and Gregg Counties into depressed-area classification have been widely duplicated. The Agriculture Department even put out a handbook called Action, telling how to get on the gravy train. The agency selected 230 counties "with development possibilities" and invited them to participate in a volunteer self-betterment movement. Then, as disclosed in a Ford Foundation-financed study by George Washington University Prof. Sar A. Levitan,[1] all 230 counties were simply blanketed into ARA eligibility "without reference to the level of income or unemployment that prevailed."

More than 300 additional counties have qualified because of supposed low farm income, including Gilpin County, Colo., which doesn't pretend to be a farming area—it is up in the rocks of the Great Divide and doesn't have a single commercial farmer among its 190 families. It is interesting to note that some 75 Texas county agricultural agents have quit in disgust in the last 2 years. Said one, "They were using us to organize our communities and come up with projects for ARA loans and grants. I quit because I couldn't stomach it any more."

3. Jobs constitute the only excuse for ARA's existence, but the agency provides brazenly inaccurate figures about the employment it generates.

ARA receives reports regularly on the number of persons employed by its beneficiaries. But it refuses to make these available to the public. Instead, it insists that we taxpayers accept entirely unrelated figures contained in its monthly Directory of Approved Projects. In the January 31, 1964, edition, for instance, ARA boasts that 1,281 of its projects, which it financed to the tune of $226,842,000, are creating 63,836 jobs.

Not everyone accepts these statements as gospel. Minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee reported last spring that such ARA claims are exaggerations.

Checking at random, I stopped my car on Route 9 east of Oklahoma City, where a big grain mill was being put together. ARA's book advertised that the $68,000 loan involved would mean 20 new jobs. "Oh, this mill will only need three or four men to operate it," the foreman told me. "It's automated."

Stop almost anywhere, and it's the same story. In Indiana, ARA lent $115,000 to rebuild the North Vernon Processing Co.'s burnt-out forging plant and said this "saved" 60 jobs and "created" 40 new ones. But Plant Manager Edward Rogers says that "50 persons are employed—15 more than before the fire."

ARA lists 300 persons as toiling in a Wheeling, W. Va., rifle factory which grew from a $272,000 loan. Stop there, and you'll find the place empty. It was built in expectation of a Defense Department contract—but the contract never came.

4. The agency flouts the law under which it was created.

The law clearly stipulates that no ARA aid is to go to any organization able to make "reasonable" financial arrangements elsewhere. Yet the Howard Johnson chain, together with a local concern, accepted a $2,275,000 loan from ARA for a motel in Puerto Rico. In Beckley, W. Va., ARA subsidized the Melpar Corp., a subsidiary of Westinghouse Air Brake, by lending the local development corporation $70,000 to build a factory for it. Similarly, a division of A. G. Spalding & Bros., the internationally known sporting-goods firm, has been set up as a ward of ARA at Ava, Mo. And American Optical Co. has an ARA-financed factory at Chickasha, Okla.

Legislation further requires that the people of a community put up a token investment as a show of faith in any project to be undertaken by ARA. Congress is zealous about this portion of the law; yet ARA has informed its field agents in an unannounced "Policy Guideline No. 2" that they can in effect ignore it.

The law also explicitly forbids ARA to aid "any branch, affiliate or subsidiary which is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations." The Technical Tape Corp., with several plants in the New York City area, provides an example of the way ARA "obeys" the law.

In October 1961, ARA lent Carbondale, Ill., $455,000 to transform a city-owned warehouse into a branch for Technical Tape. In April 1963, ARA handed over another $670,000 to enlarge the plant, plus $150,000 to Technical Tape itself for machinery. At the same time, ARA was spending $109,000 to train production workers for the plant.

When I asked ARA's Deputy Administrator, Harold W. Williams, if the corporation had cut back its employment in the east to build up in Carbondale, he replied, "No. It couldn't. We watch this sort of thing like hawks."

I checked for myself. In April 1963, Technical Tape closed down its factory in New Rochelle, N.Y. In addition, Lionel S. Frank, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Beacon, N.Y., spills over with indignation at what happened in 1962 at the Technical Tape plant in his city.

"We then wore ARA's depressed label, too," he says. "Technical Tape was moving its gift-wrap division here, and we wanted them to leave it here. But when the Government offered to finance a new plant in Illinois and train employees for it, too, they moved the division out. What's the sense in the Government inducing an industry to expand in one depressed area at the expense of another?"

[1] "Federal Aid to Depressed Areas—An Evaluation of the ARA," published by the Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md.

5. ARA's power is used to bludgeon votes and to drum up support for ever higher congressional appropriations.

When an ARA loan has been approved, ARA permits the approved deal to be announced by a political friend at a time when it will do both him and the agency the most political good. For example, Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Republican, of upstate New York, testified at a House committee hearing that in 1962 he sought information from ARA about a pending $844,000 proposal to modernize an abandoned pulp and paper mill in his district. He was told there could be no announcement until after the congressional election. Nevertheless, on the day before the electtion, ARA Administrator Batt wired KILBURN's Democratic opponent that the loan had been approved. Within hours, the entire town knew it.

"Mr. Batt apparently thought he could shift a few votes," KILBURN declared. "The blowoff was that the loan wasn't approved until 4 months afterward."

At all ARA projects, the beneficiaries are required to erect signs, stressing that here men are being put to work thanks to ARA and the President. The intention, declares Senator BENNETT, is "to tell the people who see the billboards that this has been made possible through the kindness and courtesy of a particular man, when it has, in fact, been the taxpayers themselves who put up the money."

Across the Nation there is a stepped-up campaign to pull in ever more territory for ARA. In the first month President Johnson was in office, Buffalo, Cleveland, Miami, Newark, Oakland, Philadelphia, and Toledo—5 million additional people—were made eligible for election-year assistance from Washington. With ARA and just two of its associated bureaucracies (the Community Facilities Administration and the Small Business Administration) having already committed $1,235 million in loans for the fiscal year ending this June 30, another $1,392 million is budgeted for the following 12 months. Not to mention a mere $35 million more that ARA will give away, not lend. All this in the name of fighting poverty.

We must do whatever we effectively can to cure what's wrong in genuinely depressed areas. But less than $2 out of every $5 from ARA even goes into the areas of highest unemployment. On its record this agency and its cohorts have little to do with curing poverty; instead they seem intent on political takeover of the American economic system.

Whenever President Johnson preaches about Government help for the distressed, I think of Mrs. James R. Willis in Woodville (pop. 1,900), in his own State of Texas. There is not much reason for Woodville except the old courthouse and some lumber mills. Nevertheless, Mrs. Willis gave no thought to going on relief when her husband died in 1952 and left her at age 57 with a 24-room country motel and an $8000 debt. Over the years she has paid off the debt, modernized the motel and made it into a highly attractive place.

Because of Woodville's isolation, however, only a dozen or so cars stop nightly, and Mrs. Willis can't remember ever having had to turn anyone away. Yet she was paying her own way in life, and furnishing jobs for four maids and two assistant managers.

So, what has happened? Just down the road, ARA has built a 72-room "luxury motel," with swimming pool, ballroom, beauty shop and various stores. Mrs. Willis' gross income for January 1964, after the new motel opened, was $1,060—compared with $2,260 for January 1963. She has had to let all maids go except one, who now works part time.

Last fall, as I drove through Woodville, ARA was advertising that 75 persons would somehow be employed to operate the 72-room motel. This is its "economic justification." And outside stood two large signs. One carried the facsimile signature of the President, and read: "We're Creating More Jobs for America." The other read: "72-Room Motor Hotel Under Construction. Project Cost—$800,000. Financing Arranged by Congressman JACK BROOKS Through ARA." Nobody could overlook the implication of these signs.

Sadly, the whole deal went through without anybody from ARA looking up Mrs. Willis or considering what the project might do to her business. I talked with her.

"If the new motel doesn't make money," she said to me, "I and the rest of the taxpayers will have to pay for it. If it does succeed, I'll probably be run out of business. Tell me, what is happening to us in this country?"

Remarks of James K. Carr, Under Secretary of Department of the Interior, at the United Jewish Appeal, Fuel Oil and Coal Division Dinner at Hotel Astor, New York City, May 7, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 7, 1964, I attended the dinner at the Hotel Astor in New York City, of the Fuel Oil and Coal Division of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. Robert B. Greene of Public Fuel Service, Inc., was the general chairman and Lawrence Kobre, vice president of Burns Brothers, was the master of ceremonies and introduced James K. Carr, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from Mr. Carr's address.

THE NATIONAL ENERGY OUTLOOK

(By James K. Carr, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior)

Today, energy is our servant and, simultaneously, our master. We cannot advance without it, yet we control it and then unleash it to send satellites and man into space, to build a whole new world of sophisticated devices, to improve our economic strength and to increase our stature in international trade.

I appear before you this evening as a representative of a Federal department that can properly be identified except for nuclear power, as the "U.S. Department of Energy," for the Department of the Interior is involved in a wide range of energy resources, from coal to oil, from natural gas to oil shale, from hydroelectricity to lignite. Many of these are directly competitive, all are part of a complex and changing pattern, for energy is a dynamic thing.

The Department has a vital role in the energy picture. The Nation can ill afford to take any unnecessary action that will dull the cutting edge of competition among sources of energy. Instead, we should stimulate that competition which increases efficiency and which drives down the unit cost of energy. It follows that if energy costs are lowered, uses of energy are increased and we improve manyfold our ability to compete in the marketplaces of the world, especially where energy prices represent a substantial cost factor for our goods.

The use of energy is growing at an astronomical rate. Look back over the centuries, over a span of nearly 2,000 years, for a perspective as to the growing requirements for energy in this world. During the most recent 100 years of that stretch of centuries, we have used as much coal, petroleum, wood, and agricultural waste as energy as in the preceding 1,900 years. The Nation's consumption of fuel is expected to double and then double again before the new century begins.

Today, the United States is responsible for half the world's energy consumption. Individually, every citizen of our country requires 10 times more energy for "the American way of life," than his counterpart elsewhere in the world. To meet these insatiable demands, we rely upon petroleum for about 44 percent and natural gas for 30 percent, coal provides about 22 percent and waterpower, 4 percent.

The application of this energy in the marketplace works out, statistically, something like this: Industry, 35 percent; transportation, 25 percent; space heating, and cooling, 20 percent; and generation of electricity, the remaining 20 percent.

Of all the phenomena that have marked our progress in recent years, none can match the evolution based on our utilization of energy. Most spectacular have been our advancements in what I term mobile energy applications—jet planes, faster automobiles, rocketry, dieselized railroads. Now, however, we are entering an era where stationary energy is progressing rapidly. Here I refer to equipment that stands still while churning out heat and kilowatts.

These are the basic workhorses that bear watching, for they are on the way to greater attainments.

Thermal generating plants, relying heavily on coal, have increased their efficiency so that now less than a pound of coal turns out as much electricity as several pounds did a few years ago.

Axial-flow turbines have developed to the point where lowhead power streams can be harnessed and where tidal power projects are feasible.

More powerful steam turbines are being built and still larger ones are planned for spinning forth electricity.

The distance barrier for moving electricity has been broken. Today you probably live no farther than 60 miles from the nearest generating plant. Tomorrow, generating plants hundreds of miles away will be sending electricity over extra-high voltage lines to your homes, your apartments, your factories. Distance no longer is an overriding determining factor in the location of powerplants.

In the Department of the Interior we see, in the future, electric energy being moved efficiently a thousand miles, from plant to consumer. Compare this with the year 1900 when we learned we could transmit power the great distance of 150 miles.

All these developments, in the planning or building stage, underscore the fact that our economy, in stretching out for more energy, is going to grasp more firmly on the power of the kilowatt.

Electricity today represents 20 percent of the energy. Before the end of this century, in the belief of certain experts, it may well represent nearly 50 percent of the market, a market that includes automobiles, diesel trucks, railroads, and aircraft among the myriad of horsepower producers.

Our overall energy growth rate has averaged 3 percent a year. The consumption of electricity, however, has grown at the healthy rate of 5 percent a year. Our capability of producing electricity today stands at over 200 million kilowatts. Around the turn of the century, in my belief, it will have quadrupled to a gigantic 800 million kilowatts.

A tremendous outlay of money and materials will be poured into new generating facilities to meet soaring demands for kilowatts. During the past 20 years, expenditures for new construction for generation and transmission facilities, public and private, has been about $35 billion. Engineers now predict that to meet requirements for electricity, over $100 billion will be invested in new generating and transmission installations in the next 20 years.

Such astronomical figures dictate that stockholders and taxpayers must be safeguarded by the most careful planning, public and private. Our success in the venture will noticeably affect our growth and our position in the world marketplace.

Where will all this electricity go? To industry, to homes, to farms. It will be required to meet our population growth and its attendant needs for more and more energy. More electricity will be required for electrometallurgical processes, for street lighting, for highway illumination, for heating homes. The market, the growth potential, appear limitless.

The universal acceptance and popularity of electricity in America can be depicted in many ways. Witness, for example, the anachronism that develops from the backyard use of the ancient fuel charcoal to barbecue steaks and the employment of a neat, electrically heated unit to ignite the charcoal and a tiny electric motor to turn the spit.

In contrast, review the incidents of last winter when Communist Bulgaria, East Germany and Czechoslovakia were forced into rigorous electricity-saving measures to meet an acute power shortage that threatened their economy.

"The Bulgarian regime," said the Associated Press, "blamed the troubles on the sharp slump in power production during the hard winter, faulty planning of power supplies for new industries and a rapid increase in household appliances."

At the outset of my remarks, I mentioned the intimate involvement of the Department of the Interior with the Nation's energy needs and supplies.

The Federal Government's responsibilities in the energy field, specifically with oil, natural gas, coal, and the marketing of water power as well as the production of water power, are delegated to the Secretary of the Interior. Other agencies are involved, of course, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Power Commission, but we in Interior have important responsibilities regarding each of the commercial types of energy I have mentioned.

Our Office of Oil and Gas, Oil Import Administration, Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, and the Office of Coal Research have responsibilities for certain phases of our energy programs. In the realm of water power, we have the Department's Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration. All market power in different sections of the United States.

Thus, you can see that activities of the Department touch upon almost every phase of commercial energy in the Nation.

There has been and will continue to be a close interrelationship between our energy sources, availability of supply, our pattern of use, and our progress. We constantly seek the least expensive, the most versatile, the most reliable. We are not a one-energy nation, but have a variety of sources and more in the offing. We have been blessed with a built-in flexibility that excites competition and motivates invention.

The highly competitive energy field is most interesting to observe. Let us examine a few of our prime sources close up and explore some of the exotic alternate ones:

Coal: After a long period in the doldrums, coal appears to have steadied and the future looks much brighter. By mechanization, coal has held the price line and has moved prominently into the electric power production field. Meanwhile, a strong export program is being pushed vigorously by President Johnson to further improve the market for our coal. The Department of the Interior has an aggressive research program aimed at increasing the versatility of coal, for it has a great potential as a producer of gas, of liquid fuels, and other synthetics. Mine-mouth generating plants are under construction to eliminate transportation expenses. Coal-by-wire, made possible through advances in extra-high-voltage transmission of electricity for hundreds of miles, is becoming commonplace.

Lignite, too, is entering the energy field more prominently. A lignite-burning powerplant is under construction in the Midwest, home of billions upon billions of tons of this fuel.

Reserves of coal in the United States are adequate to serve our requirements, at the present rate of consumption, for hundreds of years.

Natural gas: It has had phenomenal increase in use. The average growth rate in the energy field has run 7 percent a year for more than 10 years. Gas has increased its share of the total energy market from 12 to 30 percent in the last 15 years. In terms of quantity—cubic feet—the jump was from 4 trillion to 13 trillion cubic feet per year, or nearly 300 percent. Prices have gone up, too, from an average of 4.5 cents per thousand cubic feet at the wellhead in 1940 to last year's average of 15.7 cents. At the same time, despite new finds of natural gas reserves, the reserve-to-use ratio is steadily declining, reflecting a less favorable reserve position for the future.

Petroleum: We have tremendous reserves, but since World War II we have been a net importer rather than a net exporter of petroleum and its products. Prices, however, have remained relatively constant in the face of inflation. At the same time, despite a large increase in total demand, our proved domestic reserves have remained in the same relative position for more than 30 years. Consumption of gasoline has increased from about 31 billion gallons in 1946 to more than 68 billion annually today, yet the percentage of petroleum used in the form of gasoline has remained virtually unchanged at 41 percent.

There is one aspect of the petroleum industry that your chairman asked me to mention. That is residual oil.

Domestic production of residual fuel oil has been declining steadily since 1955. Meanwhile, the east coast demand for residual oil has been increasing. Therefore, there is a very vocal demand here for an increase in import quotas.

As you know, these pleas have certainly been heard in Washington. This year the residual oil import quotas for District I were increased by 63,000 barrels a day. This is an increase of 11 percent over last year.

There also is the question of possible long-range changes in the residual import program. On the one side, the coal people hope for a freeze on quotas, for they believe they can supply a larger share of the heating market. On the other, of course, oil people would like to see at least a temporary suspension of quotas.

Let me say this to you: As Secretary Udall has stated publicly, the Department of the Interior is now considering all these proposals for long-term changes in the residual oil import program. Within the limitations of national security requirements, the Department intends to assure equal access to the market for all energy sources and low prices to the consumer. Many of you would prefer that I be more specific. You are also fully aware of the complexity of the issues and appreciate that I cannot be more specific until the Department's additional studies are complete.

Oil shale: Big things are ahead for oil shale. The Department of the Interior, only a few days ago, opened the door for an intensive industry research program at its pilot installation near Rifle, Colo. This facility, long idle, will be humming again, pointing the way to economic ways for tapping mountains of shale which contain far, far more oil than found in our petroleum fields. Oil shale is in an assured position as a fuel of the future.

Hydroelectricity: Many of the better powersites have been tapped, but more remain, both in the United States and Canada. We will see more international integration of power resources with our neighbor to the north. Tidal power is economically feasible and technically possible. The Department of the Interior, a leading producer and marketer of hydroelectric energy, will push for optimum development of this field and will continue steadfast in its program of serving preference agencies at the lowest possible cost per kilowatt.

Atomic energy: This field offers great challenges and great promises. In the future we will have dual plants to produce electricity while creating potable water from saline and brackish sources. President Johnson is enthusiastic about this possibility, both in the United States and in water-short countries throughout the world.

In connection with the future of atomic energy, I quote from Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission: "I think I would still agree with those who wrote the scientific forecasts in 1945 that, in the long run, the greatest promise for atomic energy lies in the generation of electric power for civilian purposes. The fact is that the day of civilian nuclear power has already arrived."

We are surrounded by a boundless sea of energy. How we continue to develop it, how we utilize it, will determine our speed of progress and our stature among the world's nations.

We must seek new technologic advances and apply them to hold costs to a minimum and improve efficiency. We must encourage competitive cooperation and inventiveness. We have a heritage, rich in natural endowments. If we utilize these wisely and well in the interests of our people and our democracy, we will move ever forward as a stronger, surer nation.

In October 1963, Prime Minister Eshkol, speaking of another problem said: "My friends, I ask you to look about you—to use your eyes not to see what has been done, but to see what has not."

In this same spirit, whether you distribute fuel oil or coal, whether you work on the problems of Israel or whether you work for the Government—the obligation imposed on all of us is to work in our own respective spheres so we accomplish something.

In the House of Representatives there is a plaque inscribed with a quotation from Daniel Webster directly over the rostrum. The inscription reads:

"Let us develop our resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests to see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Commendation for J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, May 10 marked the 40th anniversary of the date the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover was

elevated to the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, Department of California, unanimously adopted a resolution commending Mr. Hoover for his 40 years of public service as Director of the FBI.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion.

COMMENDATION FOR J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, will soon complete 40 years of public service; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation under his most capable leadership has rendered invaluable service to law enforcement agencies throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has remained free from disrupting influences and from political, territorial and economic pressures in its dedication to the cause of law enforcement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, go on record as commending the remarkable service of J. Edgar Hoover; and be it further

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion oppose any interference with the policies and practices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which have made that organization an indispensable arm of our internal security during the last 40 years; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to J. Edgar Hoover, to congressional Representatives from Los Angeles County, and to the local press.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, my third congressional voting record report for the 2d session of the 88th Congress covers the period from March 16 through May 11. It contains comments on legislation to improve fiscal and administrative practices of the National Bureau of Standards, the Food Stamp Act, and the wheat-cotton measure.

It also contains my comments on events which took place in the House on April 9 when many of our Republican colleagues—smarting from legislative defeat—retaliated by bringing the legislative process to a grinding halt.

During the period of this report I introduced two bills. The first would authorize the President to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to President Kennedy. In the 25th Congressional District, a drive supporting the proposal is being spearheaded by members of the Disabled American Veterans, Frank C. Marpe Chapter 44 of West Covina. To date some 30 veteran's groups, city councils, labor unions, and renowned individuals have adopted declarations of support and I am hopeful that more will be obtained.

STATUE FOR MEXICO

My second bill would authorize the United States to present a statue of Abraham Lincoln to the people of Mexico in commemoration of their country's independence. An identical proposal was recently approved by the Senate and in that body it received strong bipartisan support.

There is no prominent statue of Lincoln in Mexico City although our 16th President is widely respected throughout Mexico. The bonds between our two countries are strong. They are enduring. Our long friendship soared to new heights through the wisdom and guidance of President Kennedy. It was reaffirmed recently during the California meeting between President Johnson and Mexican President Lopez Mateos, a meeting at which I was privileged to be a participant.

It was not long ago that the Senate approved the Chamizal treaty and thereby righted a grievous wrong which had existed for 100 years.

Our two governments are presently trying to resolve the problem of excessive salinity of Colorado River water which flows into Mexico and destroys the soil of Baja California.

I believe presentation of a statue of Lincoln to the people of Mexico is statesmanship in this same vein. It is an act of good will in a world that is racked by conflict.

SENATE INVESTIGATION

Earlier this month I was asked to testify before the Senate Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly. In my judgment, a serious study at the congressional level relating to deceptive and misleading—if not fraudulent—practices in the sale of health and accident benefits is long overdue.

The word "benefits" I use advisedly, for many purveyors of health and accident benefits are not operating as insurance companies—which in the main are reasonably well regulated by the several States—but rather operate under the guise of providing direct service—service available only through preselected physicians and preselected locations.

During my service in the California Legislature, I served continually as chairman of a study committee dealing in this general area. In 1961 my committee made a series of 16 recommendations to the legislature, and many of these recommendations are pertinent to the Senate subcommittee's area of inquiry.

METHOD NEEDED

Foremost among these is the need to devise a method whereby the layman—aided by analyses in easy-to-understand language—can evaluate the relative benefits provided by various plans. Hundreds of times I have seen persons drop plans that provide far superior benefits to those being sold by "suede-shoe operators" with a fancy pitch. They drop these plans because they mistakenly believe the salesman and have no objective means to evaluate the relative benefits of the two programs.

At present, it takes too sophisticated a buyer of health benefits to overcome the purveyor's policy of caveat emptor, and I have long contended that the insurance and service plan trade associations in the health and accident field are destroying their industry by this policy of "let the buyer beware."

It is becoming patently obvious to the public that each year the cost of medical care as measured in the Consumer Price Index rises faster than any other item—and there is a direct correlation between this inflationary spiral and the funds that are bilked from a well-meaning and defenseless public in the name of health benefits.

There are millions of persons in this country who at one time or another have had a disservice done them in the name of health benefits. The Senate subcommittee investigating this problem can help protect the American people against such disservice and I will continue to give the Senate all possible cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my rollcall report.

ROLLCALL NO. 81—NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

There were two overriding issues on H.R. 5838: First, should the National Bureau of Standards be allowed discretionary expenditure of $5,000 annually in undesignated gifts and bequests, and royalties and honorariums to employees; and second, should Government agencies which contract work to NRS be able to transfer funds to the Bureau without requiring approval by the Appropriations Committee. My vote on the bill reflects an affirmative answer to both questions.

To clarify the first issue, the Bureau was not seeking authority to use appropriated funds, but to use funds which it is authorized to accept as gifts. Where these gifts are not specifically designed for a particular purpose, as most of them are, NBS merely wanted to put the money into areas where it is needed most, instead of having the donation revert to the U.S. Treasury. When a donor bequeaths money to a designated recipient it seems only proper that the money go to that recipient.

The second controversial section of the bill involved streamlining the Bureau's administrative and fiscal procedures to bring them into line with those of most other Government agencies. Simply stated, the bill provides that funds for research and development, or procurement, or production of any Government agency may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations of the Bureau—appropriations approved by Congress—when the Secretary of Commerce and the head of the other agency agree to do so, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

COMMON PRACTICE

There is nothing extraordinary about this procedure. It is authorized by statute which specifically grants to any executive department or independent agency of the Government the option to place orders with any other agency for supplies and services, when the head of such an agency determines that it is in the best interest of the Government to do so. Among departments presently

operating under this system are the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department.

Simply because the National Bureau of Standards is a lesser known agency and does not operate in the public spotlight I see no reason for it to function under procedures which obstruct efficiency and economy.

Although the Bureau receives little publicity it is an important scientific arm of government. In many ways it is comparable to a university laboratory or research foundation in its relationship with scientists and scientific agencies. Hampering this relationship with cumbersome procedures certainly does not help to put Government on an efficiency basis.

EXAMPLE GIVEN

For the sake of illustration, examine an efficiently operated city in the 25th Congressional District. Within the public works department is a top-flight stenographer. An important rush job comes up in the police department and the stenographer's services are urgently needed. The public works director agrees to loan his secretary to the police chief until the job is done. The city manager approves the arrangement. It would seem ridiculous for the city council to also have to give its approval on such an administrative matter, especially when it had already budgeted the secretary's salary at the start of the fiscal year. No well-run city operates this way.

H.R. 5838, in effect, points out that the Federal Government still has a lot to learn from local government, and I shall continue to do all that I can to promote this learning process and help equip our National Government with the tools needed for economy and efficiency.

Vote

Roll-call No.	Date	Bill number	R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	Brief description
68	Mar. 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (140 Members absent).
69	Mar. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa (82 Members absent).
70	Mar. 17		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois. (80 Members absent; R.B.C. at meeting with newsmen).
71	Mar. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Findley, Republican, of Illinois (47 Members absent).
72	Mar. 18		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Norblad, Republican, of Oregon (57 Members absent; R.B.C. on radio program).
73	Mar. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (62 Members absent).
74	Mar. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (71 Members absent).
75	Mar. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (75 Members absent).
76	Mar. 19	H.R. 556	Yea	264	99	70	To permit consideration of bill amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards.
77	Mar. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Flynt, Democrat, of Georgia (84 Members absent).
78	Mar. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Stinson, Republican, of Washington (116 Members absent).
79	Mar. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin (122 Members absent).
80	Mar. 23	H.R. 5838	Nay	151	172	110	Motion to recommit bill amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards.
*81	Mar. 23	H.R. 5838	Yea	164	162	107	On passage of amending Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to improve fiscal and administrative practices.
82	Mar. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (64 Members absent).
83	Mar. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. White, Democrat, of Idaho (84 Members absent).
84	Mar. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, of California (78 Members absent).
85	Mar. 24	H.R. 10532	Yea	160	193	79	On adoption of amendment restoring $10,000,000 cut in Coast Guard appropriations (1 Member answered "present").
86	Mar. 24	H.R. 10532	Yea	326	20	87	On passage of appropriation bill for Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies.
87	Mar. 25		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa, (72 Members absent; R.B.C. at meeting with Anthony Bogdanowicz and representatives of the 25th Congressional District Building Trades Council).
88	Mar. 25	H.R. 660	Not voting	357	0	76	Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 10456, appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration (R.B.C. at meeting of Foreign Affairs Committee to hear testimony of Secretary of Defense McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff).
89	Mar. 25	H.R. 10456	Yea	283	73	76	On passage of NASA appropriations bill (1 Member answered "present").
90	Apr. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Fascell, Democrat, of Florida (160 Members absent).
91	Apr. 6	S. 1828	Yea	233	39	161	Appropriations for Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.
92	Apr. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa (41 Members absent).
93	Apr. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Democrat, of Missouri (57 Members absent).
94	Apr. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (77 Members absent).
95	Apr. 8		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (30 Members absent; R.B.C. working in office).
96	Apr. 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (41 Members absent).
*97	Apr. 8		Nay	173	239	21	Motion to adjourn to block consideration of Food Stamp Act of 1964.
*98	Apr. 8	H.R. 10222	Nay	195	223	15	Motion to recommit Food Stamp Act of 1964.
*99	Apr. 8	H.R. 10222	Yea	229	189	15	On passage of Food Stamp Act of 1964.
*100	Apr. 8	H.R. 665	Paired nay	211	203	15	On passage of enabling resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 6196, the wheat-cotton bill; passage of resolution equaled passage of the bill.
*101	Apr. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (52 Members absent).
*102	Apr. 9		Yea	222	132	79	On question to proceed with legislative business by dispensing with reading of daily House Journal.
*103	Apr. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (91 Members absent).
*104	Apr. 9		Yea	232	122	77	On question to proceed with legislative business by dispensing with reading of daily House Journal.
*105	Apr. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (70 Members absent).
*106	Apr. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, of California (69 Members absent).
107	Apr. 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (109 Members absent).
108	Apr. 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Lindsay, Republican, of New York (114 Members absent).
109	Apr. 10	H.R. 10723	Yea	188	131	114	To recommit legislative appropriation bill for amendment to require making a matter of public record the funds and contracts supervised by Capitol Architect.
110	Apr. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (80 Members absent).
111	Apr. 14	H.R. 10809	Yea	344	21	69	On passage of appropriations for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
112	Apr. 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, of Nebraska (88 Members absent).
113	Apr. 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, of Nebraska (96 Members absent).
114	Apr. 15	S. 2394	Yea	347	5	80	On passage of bill to facilitate compliance with the Chamizal Convention between the United States and Mexico.
115	Apr. 21		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (77 Members absent; R.B.C. organizing congressional seminar for discussion of economic and military assistance program with David Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development).
116	Apr. 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Westland, Republican, of Washington (75 Members absent).
117	Apr. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa (90 Members absent).
118	Apr. 22	H.R. 10939	Yea	365	0	67	Appropriations for Department of Defense.
119	Apr. 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri (88 Members absent).
120	May 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (82 Members absent).
121	May 6	H.R. 11134	Yea	312	40	78	On passage of appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.
122	May 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (88 Members absent).
123	May 7	H.R. 10945	Yea	340	3	88	On passage of appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission.
124	May 11		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (154 Members absent; R.B.C. attending ceremonies at opening of new West German Embassy).

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

Speech by Secretary Robert S. McNamara, Before the James Forrestal Memorial Awards Dinner of the National Security Industrial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, the current visit of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to Saigon makes timely consideration of the address he recently made before the James Forrestal Memorial Awards Dinner of the National Security Industrial Association.

In this address Secretary McNamara presents a very thorough and well-documented analysis of the South Vietnam situation. This speech merits study by all of us and I would like to insert it in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE JAMES FORRESTAL MEMORIAL AWARDS DINNER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION AT SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1964

This evening I want to discuss South Vietnam with you. In South Vietnam, as you well know, the independence of a nation and the freedom of its people are being threatened by Communist aggression and terrorism. In response to requests from the Government of South Vietnam, the United States since 1954 has been providing assistance to the Vietnamese in their struggle to maintain their independence.

My purpose this evening is threefold. After recalling some facts about Vietnam and its history, I want:

First, to explain our stake and objectives in South Vietnam;

Second, to review for you the current situation there as General Taylor and I found it on our recent trip;

And finally, to outline in broad terms the plans which have been worked out with General Khanh for achieving our mutual objectives in South Vietnam.

I. DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

Let me begin by reminding you of some details about South Vietnam—that narrow strip of rich coastal mountain and delta lands running 900 miles in the tropics along the South China Sea to the Gulf of Siam. It contains the mouth of the Mekong River, the main artery of southeast Asia. It has a population of about 14 million—almost that of California—in an area slightly larger than England and Wales. South Vietnam does not exist by itself. Mainland southeast Asia includes Laos, Cambodia, and the two Vietnams, together comprising former French Indochina. It also includes Thailand, Burma, and part of Malaysia. The southeast Asian peninsula is a richly endowed land area of over 800,000 square miles—roughly the size of the United States east of the Mississippi—and containing almost 100 million people. And immediately beyond to the east are the Philippines, not far to the west is India, to the north is Communist China, and to the south is what the Chinese Communists may consider the greatest prize of all—Indonesia's resources, territory, and the world's fifth largest population, whose strategic location straddles and dominates the gateway to the Indian Ocean.

The Vietnamese lost the independence they had enjoyed since the 15th century when, a hundred years ago the French assumed control in what is now Vietnam. A quarter century ago, during the Second World War, the Vichy regime yielded French Indochina to the Japanese. In the power vacuum of the war's end, the Communist Vietminh moved rapidly to enhance their position and to build their bases for a power grab in North Vietnam.

The attempt by the French, following World War II, to restore their rule—to buck the trend toward independence as shown in Burma, India, and the Philippines—failed. The returning French encountered a strong military resistance movement which gradually fell more and more under Communist control. For 8 years France sought to control the country while at the same time gradually granting increasing autonomy to non-Communist Vietnamese. Such actions, however, were not enough. In 1954, after the fall of the French stronghold at Dien Bien Phu on May 7, the Geneva Agreements of July 20 were signed ending the hostilities and ending French rule in Indochina. The country was roughly cut in half at the 17th parallel, creating the Communist regime of Ho Chi Minh in the North and a non-Communist state in the South. Although the United States was not a party to those Geneva Agreements, the United States unilaterally declared that it would not violate them and that it would regard any violation by other parties as a serious threat to international peace and security.

Under the Geneva Agreements, it was hoped that South Vietnam would have an opportunity to build a free nation in peace—unalined, and set apart from the global power struggle. But the problems confronting the new government were staggering: 900,000 refugees who had fled their homes in the north at the time of partition in order to escape Communist rule; a long-term military threat from the north, which had emerged from the war with large military forces; a government nearly paralyzed by 8 years of war and lacking sufficient trained officials for effective self-government; acute economic dislocation and lack of government revenues; and persisting pockets of southern territory that had long been held by Communists and other dissident groups. In the face of such problems, hopes were not high for the survival of the fledging republic.

That autumn, a decade ago, President Ngo Dinh Diem of the Republic of South Vietnam turned to the United States for economic assistance. President Eisenhower understood the gravity of the situation; and he determined to give direct American aid to the new Government to enable its survival. He wrote to President Diem on October 25, 1954: "The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." The United States therefore provided help—largely economic.

On the basis of this assistance and the brave, sustained efforts of the South Vietnamese people, the 5 years from 1954 to 1959 gave concrete evidence that South Vietnam was becoming a success story. By the end of this period, 140,000 landless peasant families had been given land under an agrarian reform program; the transportation system had been almost entirely rebuilt; rice production had reached the prewar annual average of 3.5 million metric tons—and leaped to over 5 million in 1960; rubber production had exceeded prewar totals; and construction was underway on several medium-size manufacturing plants, thus beginning the development of a base for industrial growth.

In addition to such economic progress, school enrollments had tripled, the number of primary school teachers had increased from 30,000 to 90,000, and almost 3,000 medical aid stations and maternity clinics had been established throughout the country. And the South Vietnamese Government had gone far toward creating an effective apparatus for the administration of the nation.

A National Institute of Administration had been established with our technical and financial assistance—a center for the training of a new generation of civil servants oriented toward careers of public service as opposed to the colonial concept of public rule.

For South Vietnam the horizon was bright.

Its success stood in marked contrast to development in the north. Despite the vastly larger industrial plant inherited by Hanoi when Vietnam was partitioned, gross national product was considerably larger in the south—estimated at $110 per person in the south and $70 in the north. While per capita food production in the north was 10 percent lower in 1960 than it had been in 1956, it was 20 percent higher in the south.

It is ironical that free Vietnam's very achievements in these 5 years brought severe new problems. For the Communists in North Vietnam, like many others, had believed that South Vietnam would ultimately collapse and fall under Hanoi's control like ripe fruit from a tree. But by the end of 1959, South Vietnam was succeeding, despite all predictions; and the Communist leaders evidently concluded that they would have to increase pressure on the South to make the fruit fall.

At the Third National Congress of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party in Hanoi, September 1960, North Vietnam's belligerency was made explicit. Ho Chi Minh stated, "the North is becoming more and more consolidated and transformed into a firm base for the struggle for national reunification." At the same congress it was announced that the party's new task was to "liberate the South from the atrocious rule of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen." In brief, Hanoi was about to embark upon a program of wholesale violations of the Geneva agreements in order to wrest control of South Vietnam from its legitimate government.

To the Communists, "liberation" meant sabotage, terror, and assassination: attacks on innocent hamlets and villages and the coldblooded murder of thousands of schoolteachers, health workers and local officials who had the misfortune to oppose the Communist version of "liberation." In 1960 and 1961, almost 3,000 South Vietnamese civilians in and out of government were assassinated and another 2,500 were kidnaped. The Communists even assassinated the colonel who served as liaison officer to the International Control Commission.

This aggression against South Vietnam was a major Communist effort, meticulously planned and controlled, and relentlessly pursued by the government in Hanoi. In 1961, the Republic of South Vietnam, unable to contain the menace by itself, appealed to the United States to honor its unilateral declaration of 1954. President Kennedy responded promptly and affirmatively by sending to that country additional American advisers, arms, and aid.

II. U.S. OBJECTIVES

I turn now to a consideration of U.S. objectives in South Vietnam. The United States has no designs whatever on the resources or territory of the area. Our national interests do not require that South Vietnam serve as a Western base or as a member of a Western Alliance.

Our concern is threefold.

First, and most important, is the simple fact that South Vietnam, a member of the free world family, is striving to preserve its independence from Communist attack. The Vietnamese have asked our help. We have given it. We shall continue to give it.

We do so in their interest; and we do so in our own clear self-interest. For basic to the principles of freedom and self-determination which have sustained our country for almost two centuries is the right of peoples everywhere to live and develop in peace. Our own security is strengthened by the determination of others to remain free, and by our commitment to assist them. We will not let this member of our family down, regardless of its distance from our shores.

The ultimate goal of the United States in southeast Asia, as in the rest of the world, is to help maintain free and independent nations which can develop politically, economically and socially, and which can be responsible members of the world community. In this region and elsewhere, many peoples share our sense of the value of such freedom and independence. They have taken the risks and made the sacrifices linked to the commitment to membership in the family of the free world. They have done this in the belief that we would back up our pledges to help defend them. It is not right or even expedient—nor is it in our nature—to abandon them when the going is difficult.

Second, southeast Asia has great strategic significance in the forward defense of the United States. Its location across East-West air and sea lanes flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines on the other, and dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. In Communist hands, this area would pose a most serious threat to the security of the United States and to the family of free world nations to which we belong. To defend southeast Asia, we must meet the challenge in South Vietnam.

And third, South Vietnam is a test case for the new Communist strategy. Let me examine for a moment the nature of this strategy.

Just as the Kennedy administration was coming into office in January 1961, Chairman Khrushchev made one of the most important speeches on Communist strategy of recent decades. In his report on a party conference entitled "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," Khrushchev stated: "In modern conditions, the following categories of wars should be distinguished: world wars, local wars, liberation wars and popular uprisings." He ruled out what he called "world wars" and " local wars" as being too dangerous for profitable indulgence in a world of nuclear weapons. But with regard to what he called "liberation wars," he referred specifically to Vietnam. He said, "It is a sacred war. We recognize such wars."

I have pointed out on other occasions the enormous strategic nuclear power which the United States has developed to cope with the first of Mr. Khrushchev's types of wars; deterrence of deliberate, calculated nuclear attack seems as assured as it can be. With respect to our general purpose forces designed especially for local wars, within the past 3 years we have increased the number of our combat-ready Army divisions by about 45 percent, tactical air squadrons by 30 percent, airlift capabilities by 75 percent, with a 100-percent increase in ship construction and conversion. In conjunction with the forces of our allies, our global posture for deterrence and defense is still not all that it should be, but it is good.

President Kennedy and President Johnson have recognized, however, that our forces for the first two types of wars might not be applicable or effective against what the Communists call "wars of liberation," or what is properly called covert aggression or insurgency. We have therefore undertaken and continue to press a variety of programs to develop skilled specialists, equipment and techniques to enable us to help our allies counter the threat of insurgency.

Communist interest in insurgency techniques did not begin with Khrushchev, nor for that matter with Stalin. Lenin's works are full of tactical instructions, which were adapted very successfully by Mao Tse-tung, whose many writings on guerrilla warfare have become classic references. Indeed, Mao claims to be the true heir of Lenin's original prescriptions for the worldwide victory of communism. The North Vietnamese have taken a leaf or two from Mao's book—as well as Moscow's—and added some of their own.

Thus today in Vietnam we are not dealing with factional disputes or the remnants of a colonial struggle against the French, but rather with a major test case of communism's new strategy. That strategy has so far been pursued in Cuba, may be beginning in Africa, and failed in Malaya and the Philippines only because of a long and arduous struggle by the people of these countries with assistance provided by the British and the United States.

In southeast Asia, the Communists have taken full advantage of geography—the proximity to the Communist base of operations and the rugged, remote and heavily foliated character of the border regions. They have utilized the diverse ethnic, religious, and tribal groupings, and exploited factionalism and legitimate aspirations wherever possible. And, as I said earlier, they have resorted to sabotage, terriorism, and assassination on an unprecedented scale.

Who is the responsible party—the prime aggressor? First and foremost, without doubt, the prime aggressor is North Vietnam, whose leadership has explicitly undertaken to destroy the independence of the South. To be sure, Hanoi is encouraged on its aggressive course by Communist China. But Peiping's interest is hardly the same as that of Hanoi.

For Hanoi, the immediate objective is limited: conquest of the South and national unification, perhaps coupled with control of Laos. For Peiping, however, Hanoi's victory would be only a first step toward eventual Chinese hegemony over the two Vietnams and southeast Asia, and toward exploitation of the new strategy in other parts of the world.

Communist China's interests are clear: It has publicly castigated Moscow for betraying the revolutionary cause whenever the Soviets have sounded a cautionary note. It has characterized the United States as a paper tiger and has insisted that the revolutionary struggle for "liberation and unification" of Vietnam could be conducted without risks by, in effect, crawling under the nuclear and the conventional defense of the free world. Peiping thus appears to feel that it has a large stake in demonstrating the new strategy, using Vietnam as a test case. Success in Vietnam would be regarded by Peiping as vindication for China's views in the worldwide ideological struggle.

Taking into account the relationship of Vietnam to Indochina—and of both to southeast Asia, the Far East and the free world as a whole—five U.S. Presidents have acted to preserve free world strategic interests in the area. President Roosevelt opposed Japanese penetration in Indochina; President Truman resisted Communist aggression in Korea; President Eisenhower backed Diem's efforts to save South Vietnam and undertook to defend Taiwan; President Kennedy stepped up our counterinsurgency effort in Vietnam; and President Johnson, in addition to reaffirming last week that the United States will furnish assistance and support to South Vietnam for as long as it is required to bring Communist aggression and terrorism under control, has approved the program that I shall describe in a few minutes.

The United States role in South Vietnam, then, is: First, to answer the call of the South Vietnamese, a member nation of our free world family, to help them save their country for themselves; second, to help prevent the strategic danger which would exist if communism absorbed southeast Asia's people and resources; and third, to prove in the Vietnamese test case that the free world can cope with Communist "wars of liberation" as we have coped successfully with Communist aggression at other levels.

III. THE CURRENT SITUATION

I referred earlier to the progress in South Vietnam during 1954–59. In our concern over the seriousness of the Vietcong insurgency, we sometimes overlook the fact that a favorable comparison still exists between progress in the south—notwithstanding nearly 15 years of bitter warfare—and the relative stagnation in North Vietnam.

The so-called Democratic Republic of Vietnam, with a greater population than the south and only a marginally smaller area, appears to be beset by a variety of weaknesses, the most prominent of which is its agricultural failure. Mismanagement, some poor weather, and a lack of fertilizers and insecticides have led to a serious rice shortage. The 1963 per capita output of rice was about 20 percent lower than 1960. Before the June 1964 harvests, living standards will probably decline further in the cities, and critical food shortages may appear in some of the villages. Furthermore, prospects for the June rice crops are not bright.

The internal transportation system remains primitive, and Hanoi has not met the quotas established for heavy industry. As for the people, they appear to be generally apathetic to what the party considers the needs of the state, and the peasantry has shown considerable ingenuity in frustrating the policies of the government.

In contrast, in the Republic of South Vietnam, despite Communist attempts to control or inhibit every aspect of the domestic economy, output continued to rise. In 1963, South Vietnam was once more able to export some 300,000 tons of rice. Add to this the pre-1960 record: up to 1960, significant production increases in rice, rubber, sugar, textiles, and electric power: a 20-percent rise in per capita income; threefold expansion of schools, and restoration of the transportation system. One cannot but conclude that, given stability and lack of subversive disruption, South Vietnam would dramatically outstrip its northern neighbor and could become a peaceful and prosperous contributor to the well-being of the Far East as a whole.

But, as we have seen, the Communists—because South Vietnam is not theirs—are out to deny any such bright prospects.

In the years immediately following the signing of the 1954 Geneva Accords, the Communists in North Vietnam gave first priority to building armed forces far larger than those of any other southeast Asian country. They did this to establish iron control over their own population and to insure a secure base for subversion in South Vietnam and Laos. In South Vietnam, instead of withdrawing fully, the Communists maintained a holding guerrilla operation and they left behind cadres of men and large caches of weapons for later use.

Beginning in 1959, as we have seen, the Communists realized that they were losing the game and intensified their subversive attack. In June 1962, a special report on Vietnam was issued by the International Control Commission, a unit created by the Geneva Conference and composed of a Canadian, an Indian, and a Pole. Through it received little publicity at the time, this report presented evidence of Hanoi's subversive activities in South Vietnam, and specifically found Hanoi guilty of violating the Geneva accords.

Since then, the illegal campaign of terror, violence, and subversion conducted by the Vietcong and directed and supported from the north has greatly expanded. Military

men, specialists, and secret agents continue to infiltrate into South Vietnam both directly from the north and through Laos and Cambodia. The flow of Communist-supplied weapons, particularly those of large caliber, has increased. These include Chinese 75mm recoilless rifles and heavy machineguns. Tons of explosive-producing chemicals smuggled in for use by the Vietcong have been intercepted along with many munitions manufactured in Red China and, to a lesser extent, elsewhere in the Communist bloc. In December 1963, a Government force attacked a Vietcong stronghold in Dinh Tuong Province and seized a large cache of equipment, some of which was of Chinese Communist manufacture. The Chinese equipment included a 90mm rocket launcher, 60mm mortars, carbines, TNT, and hundreds of thousands of rounds of various kinds of ammunition. Some of the ammunition was manufactured as recently as 1962.

When President Diem appealed to President Kennedy at the end of 1961, the South Vietnamese were quite plainly losing their fight against the Communists, and we promptly agreed to increase our assistance.

Fourteen months later, in early 1963, President Kennedy was able to report to the Nation that "the spearpoint of aggression has been blunted in South Vietnam." It was evident that the Government had seized the initiative in most areas from the insurgents. But this progress was interrupted in 1963 by the political crises arising from troubles between the Government and the Buddhists, students, and other non-Communist oppositionists. President Diem lost the confidence and loyalty of his people; there were accusations of maladministration and injustice. There were two changes of government within 3 months. The fabric of government was torn. The political control structure extending from Saigon down into the hamlets virtually disappeared. Of the 41 incumbent province chiefs on November 1 of last year, 35 were replaced. Nine provinces had three chiefs in 3 months; one province had four. Scores of lesser officials were replaced. Almost all major military commands changed hands twice. The confidence of the peasants was inevitably shaken by the disruptions in leadership and the loss of physical security. Army and para-military desertion rates increased, and the morale of the hamlet militia—the "Minutemen"—fell. In many areas, power vacuums developed causing confusion among the people and a rising rate of rural disorders.

The Vietcong fully exploited the resultant organizational turmoil and regained the initiative in the struggle. For example, in the second week following the November coup, Vietcong incidents more than tripled from 316, peaking at 1,021 per week, while government casualties rose from 367 to 928. Many overextended hamlets have been overrun or severely damaged. The January change in government produced a similar reaction.

In short, the situation in South Vietnam has unquestionably worsened, at least since last fall.

The picture is admittedly not an easy one to evaluate and, given the kind of terrain and the kind of war, information is not always available or reliable. The areas under Communist control vary from daytime to nighttime, from one week to another, according to seasonal and weather factors. And, of course, in various areas the degree and importance of control differ. Although we estimate that in South Vietnam's 14 million population, there are only 20 to 25 thousand hard-core Vietcong guerrillas, they have been able to recruit from among the South Vietnamese an irregular force of from 60 to 80 thousand—mainly by coercion and "bandwagon" effect, but also by promising material and political rewards. The loyalties of the hard core have been cemented by years of fighting, first against the Japanese, then against the French, and, since 1954, against the fledgling government of South Vietnam. The young men joining them have been attracted by the excitement of the guerrilla life and then held by bonds of loyalty to their new comrades-in-arms, in a nation where loyalty is only beginning to extend beyond the family or the clan. These loyalties are reinforced both by systematic indoctrination and by the example of what happens to informers and deserters.

Clearly, the disciplined leadership, direction and support from North Vietnam is a critical factor in the strength of the Vietcong movement. But the large indigenous support that the Vietcong receives means that solutions must be as political and economic as military. Indeed, there can be no such thing as a purely "military" solution to the war in South Vietnam.

The people of South Vietnam prefer independence and freedom. But they will not exercise their choice for freedom and commit themselves to it in the face of the high personal risk of Communist retaliation—a kidnaped son, a burned home, a ravaged crop—unless they can have confidence in the ultimate outcome. Much therefore depends on the new government under General Khanh, for which we have high hopes.

Today the government of General Khanh is vigorously rebuilding the machinery of administration and reshaping plans to carry the war to the Vietcong. He is an able and energetic leader. He has demonstrated his grasp of the basic elements—political, economic, and psychological, as well as military—required to defeat the Vietcong. He is planning a program of economic and social advances for the welfare of his people. He has brought into support of the government representatives of key groups previously excluded. He and his colleagues have developed plans for systematic liberation of areas now submissive to Vietcong duress and for mobilization of all available Vietnamese resources in the defense of the homeland.

At the same time, General Khanh has understood the need to improve South Vietnam's relations with its neighbors, Cambodia and Laos; he has taken steps towards conciliation; and he has been quick and forthright in expressing his government's regret over the recent Vietnamese violation of Cambodia's borders. In short, he has demonstrated the energy, comprehension, and decision required by the difficult circumstances that he faces.

IV. A PROGRAM TO MEET OUR OBJECTIVES

Before describing the means by which we hope to assist the South Vietnamese to succeed in their undertaking, let me point out the options that President Johnson had before him when he received General Taylor's and my report last week.

Some critics of our present policy have suggested one option—that we simply withdraw. This the United States totally rejects for reasons I have stated.

Other critics have called for a second and similar option—a "neutralization" of Vietnam. This, however, is the game of "what's mine is mine and what's yours is negotiable." No one seriously believes the Communists would agree to "neutralization" of North Vietnam. And, so far as South Vietnam is concerned, we have learned from the past that the Communists rarely honor the kind of treaty that runs counter to their compulsion to expand.

Under the shadow of Communist power, "neutralization" would in reality be an interim device to permit Communist consolidation and eventual takeover. When General Taylor and I were in Hue, at the north end of South Vietnam, 2 weeks ago, several Vietnamese students carried posters which showed their recognition of the reality of "neutralization." The signs read: "Neutralize Today, Communize Tomorrow."

"Neutralization" of South Vietnam, which is today under unprovoked subversive attack, would not be in any sense an achievement of the objectives I have outlined. As we tried to convey in Laos, we have no objection in principle to neutrality in the sense of nonalinement. But even there we are learning lessons. Communist abuse of the Geneva accords, by treating the Laos corridor as a sanctuary for infiltration, constantly threatens the precarious neutrality. "Neutralization of South Vietnam"—an ambiguous phrase at best—was therefore rejected.

The third option before the President was initiation of military actions outside South Vietnam, particularly against North Vietnam, in order to supplement the counterinsurgency program in South Vietnam.

This course of action—its implications and ways of carrying it out—has been carefully studied.

Whatever ultimate course of action may be forced upon us by the other side, it is clear that actions under this option would be only a supplement to, not a substitute for, progress within South Vietnam's own borders.

The fourth course of action was to concentrate on helping the South Vietnamese win the battle in their own country. This, all agree, is essential no matter what else is done.

The President therefore approved the 12 recommendations that General Taylor and I made relating to this option.

We have reaffirmed U.S. support for South Vietnam's Government and pledged economic assistance and military training and logistical support for as long as it takes to bring the insurgency under control.

We will support the Government of South Vietnam in carrying out its anti-insurgency plan. Under that plan, Prime Minister Khanh intends to implement a national mobilization program to mobilize all national resources in the struggle. This means improving the quality of the strategic hamlets, building them systematically outward from secure areas, and correcting previous overextension. The security forces of Vietnam will be increased by at least 50,000 men. They will be consolidated, and their effectiveness and conditions of service will be improved. They will press the campaign with increased intensity. We will provide required additional materiel. This will include strengthening of the Vietnamese Air Force with better aircraft and improving the mobility of the ground forces.

A broad national program is to be carried out, giving top priority to rural needs. The program includes land reform, loans to tenant farmers, health and welfare measures, economic development, and improved status for ethnic minorities and paramilitary troops.

A civil administrative corps will be established to bring better public services to the people. This will include teachers, health technicians, agricultural workers, and other technicians. The initial goal during 1964 will be at least 7,500 additional persons; ultimately there will be at least 40,000 men for more than 8,000 hamlets, in 2,500 villages and 43 provinces.

Farm productivity will be increased through doubled use of fertilizers to provide immediate and direct benefits to peasants in secure areas and to increase both their earnings and the Nation's export earnings.

We have learned that in Vietnam, political and economic progress are the sine qua non of military success, and that military security is equally a prerequisite of internal progress. Our future joint efforts with the Vietnamese are going to apply these lessons.

V. CONCLUSION

To conclude: Let me reiterate that our goal is peace and stability, both in Vietnam and

southeast Asia. But we have learned that peace at any price is not practical in the long run and that the cost of defending freedom must be borne if we are to have it at all.

The road ahead in Vietnam is going to be long, difficult, and frustrating. It will take work, courage, imagination, and, perhaps more than anything else, patience to bear the burden of what President Kennedy called a long twilight struggle. In Vietnam it has not been finished in the first 100 days of President Johnson's administration, and it may not be finished in the first 1,000 days, but, in cooperation with General Khanh's government, we have made a beginning. When the day comes that we can safely withdraw, we expect to leave an independent and stable South Vietnam, rich with resources and bright with prospects for contributing to the peace and prosperity of southeast Asia and of the world.

Hon. Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation should mourn the passing of Clarence Cannon. Every man, woman, and child in the 50 States of this country were his constituents. We, of later generations than the distinguished Member from the State of Missouri, have profited from his early devotion to the establishment of a sound economy.

We could very well say that generations yet unborn were also his constituents for he had as great concern for them as he did for those of us who acted as his contemporaries.

The United States has been blessed with many dedicated individuals. Clarence Cannon was in the foremost ranks of these. When you consider his high degree of intelligence, his great sense of historical values, his great courage in the face of great pressures and add these to his dedication, then one can see how fortunate we, as a nation, have been to have had Clarence Cannon as a Member of this most important legislative body.

I will leave the listing of his attainments, in the 21 Congresses in which he served, to those Members who were privileged in having served with him over a longer period of time than was my fortune.

The great thoughts that came from the mind of Clarence Cannon will perpetuate his name for all time. Future parliamentarians will gain added knowledge from his authoritative writings on that complex subjetc.

The great example that he set in the House of Representatives will spur many of us on to ever-increasing efforts in guarding our economy.

Yes, we mourn the passing of this great American. We have lost a great leader.

The United States of America gives thanks unto God for having pointed Clarence Cannon's steps toward service in the Congress.

Congressman Morris Udall Addresses Oklahoma State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable MORRIS K. UDALL, recently delivered a principal address at the fourth annual Government Week held at Oklahoma State University at Stillwater.

This annual activity is one of only three such programs held in the United States.

It is entirely student planned and student operated and each year outstanding national political personalities are invited to participate. Representatives of both the Democratic and Republican Parties take part in this unique program.

This year, the Democrats were fortunate in being represented by one of our most eloquent and brilliant spokesmen, Congressman UDALL.

The reports I have received on this year's event clearly indicate that every Member of this body should be proud of the thought-provoking presentation which our distinguished colleague from Arizona made to the students and faculty at Oklahoma State University.

Congressman UDALL has won recognition as an outstanding political leader in less than two terms in the House. He has demonstrated great parliamentary skill and exceptional legislative ability in several major debates of this session.

Congressman UDALL's speech at Oklahoma State University is a masterpiece of penetrating political thought, eloquence, and good humor. I sincerely recommend its reading and for this reason I wish to insert the speech in its entirely in the RECORD. Congressman UDALL's speech follows:

"OLD SPOOKS AND NEW ISSUES IN THE 1964 CAMPAIGN"—KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY HON. MORRIS K. UDALL, GOVERNMENT WEEK, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY, STILLWATER, OKLA., MAY 4, 1964

If there is any hope for the future of this country—and I have never had more hope—it lies in our capacity to capture the enthusiasm of each succeeding generation and to utilize that enthusiasm for the betterment of our government institutions. In my judgment the program of Government Week which begins today on this fine campus is an example which ought to be copied everywhere. I am proud to attempt to sound a keynote tonight.

I can't help but recall that this is the State where the lilacs are supposed to grow so green and the cornstalks so tall. Perhaps Oklahoma has something special in its soil to produce all this vigor and vitality.

Vigor and vitality—those are words we can't utter today without a sharp and almost painful reminder of the event of last November 22. President Kennedy in his brief time on stage gave us a lot to remember, but most of all we remember him for his exuberance and vitality. Suddenly, when the country realized this exceptional young man had been elected President, youth was in style. Those of us who were about his age were astonished to realize that our generation had come to flower so soon. In the 3 tremendous, exciting years that he was in office many of the things we had learned to value were elevated in the national consciousness. Young people wanted to serve in government, in the Peace Corps, in Congress. And I am happy to say that they remain there today, a permanent contribution to our heritage as a nation.

But vigor and vitality—these are the things we think of first when we think of our late President. And I can see this infectious stuff at work in gatherings like yours all over our country. Government and politics are once again attracting the enthusiasm and the energy of our youth. Politics is in fashion once more.

There are other encouraging signs, too. Once men of wealth considered themselves above the hurly-burly of politics. They disdained politicians and held government in utmost contempt. Today we have Kennedys, Rockefellers, and Harrimans giving their time and energies to politics, wearing the title "politician" as a badge of honor (which it is). This is remarkable from two standpoints—first, that, assured of lives of ease, they would go to so much trouble to achieve lives of pressure and turmoil; and, second, that the son or grandson of an oil tycoon or railroad baron would have the slightest chance of getting elected to anything. These are evidences, I think, that we do, indeed, have a maturing society and healthy political institutions.

But our Nation can't be governed only by the rich and near-rich. This is a democracy—in spite of what the John Birch Society prints on those little envelope stickers (you know, "this is a Republic—not a democracy")—and we need spokesmen in our government from all levels of society. I am happy to recall that we elected a Missouri haberdasher President a few years ago, and I think this Nation and the world will owe him a debt for generations to come.

Democracy—it's little wonder that Robert Welch and his friends detest the word, for it is such a substantial obstacle to the accession of any kind of power elite such as they would like to impose on our society. Unfortunately, it's also an obstacle to the quick solution of problems which may beset us. We have to contend with public opinion, and the public sometimes shows itself dreadfully uninterested in the hard, tedious homework necessary to get a real understanding of some of these issues. There is no doubt about it, democracy is frightfully slow, ponderous, and inefficient. It's costly and time consuming. In fact, as Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst governmental system ever invented except for all the others." Democracy gives the most to its citizens, but in turn it demands the most from them.

When I was asked to discuss the great issues of 1964 in a frankly political fashion, I was at first taken aback. I'm not used to giving political speeches. Nearly all my speeches are high-level, unbiased, above the partisan fray. But that's what you people want, so I'll have to part from my usual academic manner and speak to you as a Democrat whose goal it is to help my party carry—not 25 to 30 or 40 but all 50 States for President Johnson next November.

Since this audience contains people of all views and parties I might feel a little guilty about the speech I am going to deliver if it weren't that you will be hearing from a distinguished member of the other party—I think it's called the Republican party—the day after tomorrow. I know you will enjoy hearing Senator CURTIS, for he is a man who never hesitates to attempt the impossible. That is probably why he consented to appear before you and defend the record of his party.

You know, we make light of political partisanship, and this is all right. We need a sense of humor. This was another of President Kennedy's contributions to our national life. But, even though we joke about it, political partisanship is an important part of our democratic process. It is the raw material from which a democracy grinds out its decisions. I see things one way as a Democrat, having a certain set of values (the right ones), and Senator CURTIS sees them another way as a Republican, proceeding from his set of values. Between these axes the grist of democracy is worked. So you see I will really be contributing to the advancement of our society by giving you tonight an old-fashioned Democratic speech in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt with perhaps a little Alben Barkley thrown in, and with appropriate quotations from Socrates, Milton, Jefferson, and Barry Goldwater.

The life of nations, like that of individuals, has a way of ebbing and flowing. There are periods of great movement and intense activity, and there are periods of sitting and waiting. There are periods of challenge when we must act or forever regret it. There are periods when we must consolidate our gains and regain our energies.

In different times we have need of different kinds of leaders. Fortunately, our Nation has come forth on most occasions with men capable of leading us through these various phases. I'm even willing to say that a time or two—and I would certainly include the Civil War period—we did the right thing by electing a Republican. But don't press me for too many examples.

The other day President Johnson expressed something like my view on the Republican Party. "I like small parties," he said, "and I would say the Republican Party is just about the right size."

What kind of time are we in now? In my judgment 1964 is an in-between time—a time neither for resting nor heading out in hot pursuit of new and glittering goals. It is a time of decisionmaking. On those decisions may rest our future as a nation—a leader in world affairs or just another nation which once ranked at the top.

We live today in a world which is enduring a rather peaceful kind of war, as wars go, or a warlike peace. We have neither peace or war. Understandably a lot of our people don't like this state of affairs, and they would like to change it. I don't blame them; so would I. But I'm afraid some of them don't care too much which alternative we take; I do.

Domestically, we live in a period neither of prosperity (though we have much affluence) nor depression (though we have much poverty), neither of a stable society (though our institutions are quite secure) nor an unstable society (though we have a real social revolution in our midst).

We live in a time when changes in our economy, our population and our relations with other countries of the world hold the seeds of serious trouble unless we make plans now. What decisions we make next fall in electing a President and Vice President, 435 Members of Congress and about 33 U.S. Senators—to say nothing of Governors and State legislators and all the other public officeholders in our land—will have an important bearing on how we proceed with those plans and on what plans we make. I say the Democratic Party offers the best promise that we will make the right decisions. I say your vote next fall—if you're old enough to vote yet—can play an important part in setting our country on the right course. I want to see it a Democratic vote, and now I'll tell you why.

Let me discuss first the domestic issues which face us, and then I'll turn to world affairs.

In my judgment, when historians survey the sixties and seventies, they will judge our leaders and our political parties by the way they approached and handled two great domestic issues.

What do you suppose they are? Well, I'll tell you two so-called issues I'm not talking about.

I'm not talking about socialism, and I'm not talking about the welfare state. These old spooks, these old, time-worn bugaboos are dragged out every even-numbered year and held up to scare the American people. They have no more significance to our economy, our Government, or our society than "black magic" or New Salem witchcraft. These are not issues, and yet you will be told that they are. You will be told that Democrats are profligate, that they're wild spenders, that they want to take this country down the primrose path to socialism, or worse, that we want to weaken the moral fiber of American people through welfare schemes that will rob them of their dignity and their ambition, that we want to wet-nurse our whole population from cradle to grave, that we want to take from the diligent and frugal and give to the shiftless and lazy, extracting through ever-higher taxes the good citizens' hard-earned money to finance an ever-growing frankenstein monster of government bureaucracy which stretches its tentacles ever farther, strangling the States, taking lifeblood from our people, incurring national bankruptcy and saddling our poor grandchildren with mountainous debt. You will be told that the Democrats, in their evil, black little hearts, are devoted to alien economic systems, determined to destroy free enterprise, and dedicated to the destruction of liberty and freedom wherever they flourish. And, you will be told that you must fear Washington more than Moscow.

My friends, let me quickly take the sheets off these spooks here and now.

While most of the free nations of the world have Socialists in their parliaments, there are none in our Congress, and I know of no one in a responsible position in our Government who advocates anything like socialism.

Looking at the real test of socialism—government ownership of railroads, utilities, airlines, factories, the means of production—the United States doesn't begin to compare with most of the free nations of the world. In fact, if BARRY GOLDWATER succeeds in selling TVA for $1, as he proposed, we'll be about of business, socialismwise.

Four-fifths of our Federal budget, which you are told is so monstrous, goes to pay the cost of defense and past wars.

The only part of our Federal budget which is really controversial, as between Republicans and Democrats, is that devoted to health, welfare, education, and labor. And this portion of the budget, far from growing, has steadily receded until today, taking inflation into account, it is only half the dollar amount expended for the same programs in 1939. And are even these programs "socialism"? Well, they are if you define "socialism" to mean aid to the blind, medical research, the policing of labor unions, and the school lunch program.

Of course, if Senator GOLDWATER were here, he would assure you—and perhaps he is right—that the Arkansas River project is socialism.

You might think that this was good for your State, that it would improve commerce and business, create jobs, and develop your resources. Naturally, when we undertake to build dams, aqueducts, water development, and flood control projects in Arizona, this is not socialism at all.

And while I am on this subject, let me discuss another favorite Republican argument—that the Federal Government is growing out of hand, increasing its employees, building up a burdensome debt for our grandchildren to pay, and all the rest. Here are some figures:

Your Government payroll grew 382 percent between 1946 and 1961.

The number of employees working for your Government grew 172 percent during that period.

Your Government's debt went up 393 percent.

The annual expenditures of your government increased 302 percent.

Taxes collected by your government skyrocketed 159 percent.

Terrible, isn't it? Do you think someone ought to drop a bomb on Washington? Well, before you do that, let me point out that I wasn't talking about your Federal Government. I was talking about your government right here in the State of Oklahoma. What do you think about that?

Do you want to know what our monstrous Federal Government was doing in the same period of time? Here are the figures:

The Federal payroll grew too—132 percent, compared to Oklahoma's 382 percent.

Federal employment increased—6.8 percent compared to Oklahoma's 172 percent. And listen to this: I have just received the figures for 1963, and believe it or not, Federal employment is now 9 percent under that of 1946.

The Federal debt did go up—7.2 percent, compared to Oklahoma's 393 percent.

To be sure, Federal expenditures went up—41 percent, compared to Oklahoma's 302 percent.

And Federal taxes went up—no doubt about it—87 percent, compared to Oklahoma's 159 percent.

Now, I cite these figures, not to be critical of Oklahoma, but to point out the failure of critics to take into account the one reason why our government budgets keep going up. That reason is simple—our population is growing. Oklahoma has had to build roads and schools and sewerlines and all the rest—because Oklahoma's population is growing Your Governors and your legislatures have not just maliciously wanted to increase spending, add employees and increase the State indebtedness. They have done so because your State was growing, and your citizens required those services. The same is true of the Federal Government.

These facts tell a far different story from the one you will hear this fall:

On a per capita basis the Federal debt is steadily declining. In 1946 it amounted to $1,900 per person in this country. It is down now to $1,600.

In relation to the size of our economy—in other words, our capacity to carry debt—the Federal Debt has dropped even more. It was 128 percent of our total national income for a year. It is down now to 56 percent.

Our Federal employment, per capita, is down. In 1946 it was 19 Federal employees for every thousand population. That figure has dropped to 13, and of those 5 work for the Defense Department, 3 in the Post Office, and 1 in the Veterans' Administration. The other 4 of the 13—650,000 of them—are less than people employed by General Motors.

In the decade from 1952 to 1962 we added a population the size of Mexico without hiring any new Federal employees to take care of their needs.

In the 8 years President Eisenhower was in office he neither recommended nor signed any legislation to cancel out social security, the Federal Housing Administration, aid to the aged and blind, Federal deposit insurance or any other democratic programs which orators of his party—and he too—so often characterize as socialistic. Thus I submit that socialism and the welfare state are not issues in the forthcoming campaign.

Furthermore, I reject as false the slogans which claim that our freedoms are being taken away. All our basic freedoms are intact, and with passage of the civil rights

bill they will be even more intact. We can worship where we please. We can say what we please about our elected leaders (and a lot of us do). We can publish newspapers and books and tracts and even hate sheets. We can vote. We can meet and plan how we are going to infiltrate the PTA. We can all exercise—and sometimes do—that great constitutional right to make a fool of ourselves. We can do anything that a free people can do. I say no nation ever had more freedoms that we now enjoy.

I reject, too, the false and simplistic explanation that social legislation leads to socialism, which is one step away from Communism, and so forth. This is nonsense. Look at the countries of the world today. According to the fanatics of the far right we have a kind of sliding scale, mysteriously tilted somewhat to the left. At the far left we have the Communists like Khrushchev. Then we have the Socialists, like Norman Thomas or Charles de Gaulle. (You know, they have a real planned socialist economy in France now. The Government is even in the automobile business.) Then we have, I gather, Democrats like HUBERT HUMPHREY or, getting closer to the center of the scale, HARRY BYRD. On the right side we have Republicans like Senator JAVITS or, moving out a bit, BARRY GOLDWATER. Then we have various gradations of conservatism like the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade and the Arizona Mothers for Earl Warren's Impeachment, and finally we get out here on the very end of the scale with the John Birch Society and outright fascists.

According to advocates of this simplified grading system the way to head off communism is to cluster out here at the far right so you will have the longest possible way to slide before you slither down here to communism. Now I ask you to test this great theory against two questions: First, which of all the world's countries are least likely to adopt communism? I think you will find that our friends Great Britain, France, Sweden, West Germany, Australia—countries such as these—are least likely to adopt communism, even though they have substantial amounts of what BARRY GOLDWATER calls "socialism." In fact, they have many state-owned industries, and they have all sorts of programs such as government medical care and social security. Secondly, which countries are most likely to go Communist? Why, it is the countries where dictators and oligarchies prevail, where any welfare program would be denounced as communism, where the rules are in complete agreement with the philosophy of the John Birch Society.

Is it true, then, that sound, democratically voted legislation leads to socialism, which leads invariably to communism? It is not, and those who use such spurious reasoning do harm to our national discourse.

All right, I have mentioned some of the things I do not regard as issues in the forthcoming campaign. What are the two great domestic issues on which this generation will be judged in the 1964 campaign and in the years ahead?

First, we will be judged in my opinion on how we handle the civil rights revolution. I use that word intentionally, because I believe we are indeed witnessing a real, honest-to-goodness revolution in our country. The Negroes, both in the South and North, have been downtrodden too long, and they are demanding reforms. I believe those reforms will be forthcoming, partly through legislation, partly through changes in social attitudes prompted by necessity, and we will pass this difficult hurdle. .

The second issue I would cite is the challenge of employment resulting from our annual population gain of 3 million and our annual job loss to automation of 1 million.

First let me say something about civil rights. There are people in our midst, including one presidential candidate, who would like to sweep this issue under the rug. Senator GOLDWATER, in his book "The Conscience of a Conservative," makes a strong case for the natural rights of employers to operate their plants when struck, and for States to enact right-to-work laws, but he says "civil rights" is simply "a name for describing an activity that someone deems politically or socially desirable." He makes clear he has little sympathy for legislation to protect the rights of American citizens, whatever their color, to attend nonsegregated schools, to receive equality of economic opportunity, or to be accorded normal courtesy and respect in everyday commerce.

What are the facts, and why is this a matter of such urgency today? Here is why:

In the State of Mississippi there are 900,000 Negroes comprising 42 percent of the State's population, yet they have less than 5 percent of the registered voters. The white population, with 58 percent of the residents, has over 95 percent of the registered voters. The Negroes in Mississippi do not fail to vote because of lack of interest. They are discouraged, intimidated, and prevented from registering by every conceivable kind of pressure. This year, to add insult to injury, the Mississippi Legislature has appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars from tax funds to which Negroes contribute in order to spread false and malicious propaganda all over the country.

Unemployment in this country is high, but more than two out of every three unemployed workers are Negroes.

In many States a Negro of the best character and best education is unable to obtain services provided unquestioningly to white persons of the lowest moral character and least education.

Such conditions are intolerable in a democracy. One thing is very clear. There are going to be changes in our pattern of race relations in this country. We are not going back to the comfortable old patterns of the forties or the thirties, or the 1890's. The time when the Negro "knew his place" and stayed in it is forever gone. We can either handle this revolution honorably and peacefully and start about to make the necessary adjustments or we can let it fester until it erupts into the kind of tragedy they have had in South Africa. The Democratic Party has taken the lead in sponsoring legislation in the current Congress to correct some of these longstanding wrongs. Fortunately many good, sound responsible Republicans have joined in this effort. But vocal among the objectors are men like Senator GOLDWATER and Senator TOWER, of Texas, who sees this legislation as a threat to private property as though the right of property were the one basic right from which all others, including human rights, stemmed. According to this line of reasoning, the State would have on right to restrict the operations of a bawdy house or gambling casino so long as they were conducted on private property.

Right today, a man who owns a motel and restaurant in Oklahoma on his own property is not totally free from Government interference. The State and the Federal Government, through existing laws, fix minimum wages he can pay, maximum hours he can work women employees, minimum wages at which he may employ children; existing laws permit the local government to inspect his elevators and require certain safety practices, limit the size of advertising signs, force him to comply with all the requirements of technical building codes, determine the temperature for his dishwater and the kind of soap he must use, require him to obtain workmen's compensation and unemployment insurance coverage, deduct social security contributions, and match them himself. There are many other present restrictions on the operation of a private business on private property, and I might add that if your proposed right-to-work law passes, the employee in addition will be forbidden to have a union shop even though he might want one.

To all these present "interference with private property," we would simply add one more. The hotel-restaurant owner serving interstate passengers may, if he chooses, refuse service to all citizens who won't pay his room price, to all who are drunk or disorderly. But under the public accommodations section he cannot refuse a Negro, Jew, or Mexican-American for reasons of race or religion. It is a sad fact that many businessmen will now cheerfully serve any gambler, ex-convict or drunk so long as he is white, while refusing to serve a college president if he happens to be a Negro.

Civil rights will be an issue in many congressional races, I suspect, and just possibly on the Presidential level, depending on whom the Republicans nominate. It will be argued that the Civil Rights Act—and I expect it will be an act by campaign time—is so drastic that it will wreck the Constitution. Those who may hear these charges should go to New York or California or any of the cities with public accommodations and FEPC laws already on the statute books, and they will find that these laws have had none of the dire consequences predicted by the apostles of fear. In fact, 70 percent of the American people live under such laws today, and they're still free and their institutions are unharmed.

I happen to be one who thinks that neither all the hopes of the proponents nor the fears of the opponents are justified in regard to this legislation. I think we can and must pass the civil rights bill—and then implement it through wise and prudent administration—but I think both the opponents and proponents are going to be disappointed. New York and California both have stronger laws than we are going to enact, yet in those States there are still many problems, many examples of circumventing the law. And, from the standpoint of the opponents, there are still quite a few white men whose sisters haven't yet married Negroes, there are still quite a few school districts with de facto segregation and many country clubs and athletic clubs who have yet to admit their first Negro, and there are still a few Negroes around who haven't done white men out of their jobs.

These laws in New York, California and elsewhere were just a beginning down a long road. The civil rights bill being debated in Congress is also just a beginning toward a more free and open society.

The Democratic Party has among its members many southerners who oppose this legislation; I don't mean to ignore that fact. Our party is the only national party, it is the majority party, and historically it has been a balky and brawling organization without much discipline. Democrats draft the civil rights bill; other Democrats lead the fight against it. It was Oklahoma's favorite son, Will Rogers, who perhaps put it in perspective when he said: "I belong to no organized political party. I am a Democrat." But the majority of Democrats in the Congress saw in 1963 civil rights was a problem that could fester and explode into open conflict. Real social forces were at work, and the time for action was clearly indicated. Twice in the last decade the Democratic majority in Congress took the lead in enacting first-step legislation in the field of civil rights, but it wasn't until last year that the country had come to recognize the need for more thorough reforms. When that time came, President Kennedy and the Democratic leadership in Congress went into action, and the civil rights bill is the result. When the civil rights bill passes, and Negroes at last have real support for their efforts to register and vote, you will hear the voice of the South in new and more modulated tones,

and it will be more the voice of reason and of justice.

The second issue I mentioned was the challenge of employment. Let me dramatize the statistics in this fashion. Suppose that I were invited back to speak to you on this same day next year. Two important changes would have occurred:

A million Americans who went to their jobs today would be out of those jobs because machines took their places.

Our labor force—the total number of workers working or looking for work—would have grown by at least 1½ million.

There you have our employment problem in capsule form, and I'm sure you agree it poses some serious problems for our economy. We have right now over 5 percent of our labor force unemployed. We need 2.5 million new jobs every year just to stand still, to say nothing of providing jobs for the 4 million Americans now out of work. Failure to act, in my judgment, would be criminal, and yet you hear many Members of the other party saying that if we denounce Government interference with free enterprise loudly enough, the problem will take care of itself. We must maintain an open, incentive economic system but pure free enterprise went out when we passed the first antitrust law.

Our Government is an instrument that belongs to all of us, and we can use it, if we will, to spur our economy, help create jobs, and make our incentive enterprise system better. These problems aren't going to be solved by lectures on thrift or the evils of socialism.

What do the Democrats propose to do about this challenge?

We propose to give the free enterprise system an assist in the same manner as an ill person might be given a blood transfusion. You know, there comes a time in certain illnesses when the patient can't regain his strength without a boost of some kind. Oftentimes one or two blood transfusions will do the trick, and from then on he's on his own, his own body processes picking up momentum until he's a healthy, normal person again. The same can be true of a nation's economy. We propose just such measures to help this languid giant, the free enterprise system, regain his health and vitality.

Democrats are often attacked as "antibusiness" and I think it has been recognized that the greatest drag on our economy in recent years has been the outdated income tax rates. Yet, this antibusiness party in just the last 24 months has provided the business firms of this country with a total of $6.5 billion in annual tax reductions. Let me emphasize this point: If the 7 percent investment credit in the 1962 tax bill had not been passed, if the new liberal depreciation guidelines announced by President Kennedy were not now in effect, if the 1964 tax cut had not been passed, business firms in this year 1964 would be paying $6.5 billion more in taxes than they actually will pay. The "probusiness" party fought these changes and if they had had their way we would have this year $6½ billion less going into new plants, new businesses, higher profits, and new jobs.

In just 3 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations the gross national product has risen from $500 billion to more than $600 billion. Personal income has increased 17 percent, or more than $70 billion. We have had an almost unprecedented period of price stability and corporate profits after taxes represented an alltime peak of $27.4 billion, a 43 percent increase over the rate of early 1961.

But these are accomplishments, not new proposals. We are midstream in the program to create more jobs for Americans. What other measures are needed?

We propose a program of manpower retraining. One of the serious problems we face is the worker whose job classification has ceased to exist. What is he to do? We propose a program supported by the Federal Government to help him gain new skills.

We propose programs to improve the quality and extent of education, particularly in the slums and depressed areas, in order to advance the opportunities of young people to rise above the limitations of unfavorable environments.

We propose a Job Corps for young people, to give them the opportunity to learn useful skills and get a taste of the satisfaction that goes with productive activity, either in the out of doors or in urban training centers.

Finally, we propose an all-out attack on poverty in this land of wealth and affluence. We have the richest nation on earth, and yet we tolerate poverty and unemployment far in excess of most other Western nations. Indeed, some of the free nations of the world have no unemployment and no poverty.

Will the war on poverty be an issue in the coming campaign? You can be sure it will. The Republican leadership in Congress has already made clear it intends to oppose the antipoverty program. Why? It's the same reason they always give. It will take from the rich and give to the poor. It's socialism. It's a devious plan to redistribute the Nation's wealth.

Surely, we have heard this tune enough to recognize how flat it is. We have been hearing it for years. Now let's look at the facts:

They told us the various New Deal programs of social welfare would take from the rich and give to the poor—and ultimately lead us to the leveling of income characteristic of socialism. And what happened? The top 5 percent of our population today receives 20 percent of our income, while the bottom 20 percent gets only 5 percent. The number of millionaires in this country increased more than threefold in the last 10 years alone. The top 9 percent of our population now owns 46 percent of our assets. If this is socialism, I'm afraid Norman Thomas is a capitalist.

Against this picture of great accumulation of wealth must be placed the picture of 10 million families subsisting on a median income of $1,800 a year. This is inexcusable in a nation of such wealth. BARRY GOLDWATER may say that the answer is for these 10 million Americans to get off their behinds and assert themselves or perhaps inherit something but this kind of reasoning is reminiscent of that other great Republican sage, Warren G. Harding, who, in a depression of the 1920's uttered those comforting and immortal words: "When the great masses of people are unable to find work, we have unemployment." These people are not poor because they are lazy. They're poor because our complex society has failed to provide them the education, the job training, the environment, and the job opportunities needed to make them productive units in our economic system.

The poverty program is not a program to reduce poverty by spreading the wealth of others; it is not a program to increase handouts in order to decrease distress. It is not primarily a program to help the poor, but primarily a program to let the poor help themselves.

The Democratic Party intends to wage that war on poverty and it intends to meet the challenge of employment. You may be sure these economic issues will be a part of the forthcoming campaign.

Thus far I have been talking about domestic issues. Now I want to turn to foreign affairs. In my judgment historians will appraise the leaders of this era by the way they handled two international problems:

The first of these is the maintenance of peace with freedom, minute by minute, hour by hour, day by day, in a world capable of destroying itself in the next 30 minutes. We might well reflect for a moment that this year marks the 50th anniversary of World War I and the 25th anniversary of World War II. If the pattern were to continue, we would have a world war this year.

The second problem is our response to the dynamism of four simultaneous world revolutions. These include the political revolution now in progress as the era of empire bows to the era of independence. When the U.N. was formed, it had 51 nations. Today there are 113 members. Also the economic revolution in which 2 billion underprivileged people—earning less than $100 a year, while we sit in an island of wealth with 25 times that amount—are seeking the benefits of modern, industrialized society. And the population revolution, a fearsome phenomenon which threatens to engulf us all as the world's population doubles, and then doubles again faster and faster. And finally, the scientific revolution, with atomic energy, the jet airplane, automation, all combining to release the genie from the bottle, making the world much smaller, more volatile, and more dangerous.

The Republicans' recipe for handling these problems, as indicated in their recent speeches, is very simple and pat. All we have to do is "get tough." That's it. Tell the rest of the world to stop this nonsense right now. Panama wants a new treaty for the canal? We'll go to war with them, a nation of one and a half million people. Cuba shuts off our water? Send in the Marines. This is the pattern—bluff and blunder. I can't imagine any course of action more inappropriate or more likely to lead to almost unthinkable disaster.

The foreign policy of the Democratic Party is based on two or three hard realities. Let's see what they are.

The first is this. If we are not careful, nuclear war can occur. We tend to put this out of our minds but it is a real and very genuine danger.

It must be avoided while, at the same time, we keep our freedom and our honor. While Khrushchev and our American leaders have shown an awareness of the danger of nuclear war, can anyone guarantee that every national leader with the power to use nuclear weapons will hereafter be a person of restraint and judgment? Here, let me pose a question. Science has always outrun the art of government. Suppose that science had been 10 years ahead of the progress it had in this century and that Hitler had had nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Can any reasonable person doubt that this madman, as the Allies closed in on Berlin in 1945, would have refrained from using these weapons? And, as nuclear science becomes available to more and more nations, can anyone guarantee that there will never again be a national leader as unstable as Hitler?

Second, communism is no longer a monolithic, centrally directed movement. It has begun to break up, and in its place we see once again that old "ism," nationalism, emerging as the most significant force in foreign affairs.

At the end of World War II the world was left with but two great powers—the United States and the Soviet Union. For the next 18 years we saw a great power struggle, heightened by the rapid development of nuclear weapons and guided missiles. Other nations, lacking these weapons and fearing the consequences of this power struggle, scurried to find shelter in one camp or another. I think we are nearing the end of this period, and evidence of this is to be found everywhere—on our side and theirs.

No longer are our allies jumping when we say jump. To our consternation they sell busses to Castro, they recognize Red China, and they tell us to get out of southeast Asia. But look what's happening on the other side. Red China, instead of blindly following Kremlin policy, has called for Khrushchev's

ouster and armed the Russian-Chinese border. Yugoslavia has gone independent and turned 85 percent of its trade to the West. Albania has allied itself with China and ordered Russian troops and naval vessels from its borders. Rumania, Hungary, and Poland are becoming more and more Western in their economic and political policies.

What we see today is a world of increasing diversity—a world a little less dangerous, but with many more problems. Democrats believe in facing facts, pleasant or unpleasant. And I think all Americans would be wise to look at the world as it is—rather than as we might want it to be—and face up to these blunt realities:

The American people through their President and Congress can determine what will and will not happen in our 50 States. The American people, like it or not, can no longer decide what will or will not happen in every other part of the world. Through wise policies and vigorous leadership we can hope to influence events outside our borders, but we cannot expect always to control them.

We have people today who imagine that the United States (by brandishing big sticks) can order other nations to jump when we say jump.

Actually, I don't mean to be too hard on the Republican Party in this regard. To be sure, we have some militant stick brandishers speaking out in that party today, and one of them might get nominated next July. But I would remind you that for the past 25 years this Nation has had a largely bipartisan foreign policy. Men like Dwight Eisenhower, Arthur Vandenberg, Christian Herter, and Walter Judd have played an important part in determining this Nation's broad policies toward the rest of the world. I think responsible Republicans will continue to do so. Surely we are all in the debt of Everett Dirksen for the constructive part he played in the nuclear test ban treaty last fall, and in the financing of the United Nations the previous year. I believe the United States should speak with one voice in its international negotiations, and I believe this should be true, no matter which party controls the White House.

But aren't we losing the cold war? How many times have you heard that question asked, and then answered, in ringing tones, "Yes." The Russians are devious and clever. We are stupid. Their policies always succeed. We always blunder and fail. Well, my friends, I tell you flatly that this charge is false. It's just as false as if I were to tell you that we have lost the fight to polio. A few years ago we had a real problem with polio in this country, and we had real problems with the Communists around the world. We met the problem of polio with the Salk and Sabin vaccines. We have met the problem of communism with alliances like NATO, CENTO, and SEATO, with foreign aid, with military assistance, with the building of a defense establishment second to none. Both polio and communism are still there, we still have to work at keeping them down, but the big battle has passed.

Late last year, the magazine, U.S. News & World Report, which is not widely known as an all-out liberal publication, and whose editor, David Lawrence, has been perhaps the most vocal critic of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, carried a factual article entitled "Is Russia Losing the Cold War?" This was the magazine's opening statement.

"Everything points to it: After 46 years of communism, Russia is shown up as a land of failure. A food shortage, forcing Russians to turn to the West for help, is just the latest sign. People at home still suffer repression and want. The arms race is going badly, the space race, too. Russia, clearly, has lost the cold war."

Those eternal pessimists who continue to tell us that communism is on the march haven't been watching the front lately. It is true that from the end of World War II to 1956, when Khrushchev came to power, communism did have a great growth. Ten nations and 800 million people went behind the Iron Curtain. Since then the Communists can claim only Cuba (and perhaps Zanzibar)—neither of these losses was due to brilliant Communist strategy. And even these countries are showing signs of independence and nationalism.

Sometimes you just can't please. You are damned if you do and damned if you don't. In the past three presidential elections the Democrats have been attacked as the party of war because we were in office during World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. No mention was made of the fact that on those occasions the Republicans voted to a man to go to war. Apparently they would want our citizens to believe that the Republicans would not have shot back when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor or the Communists crossed the 38th parallel. However, this year we're hearing another tune. The Democratic Party is no longer the party of war. We're being attacked as the party of peace. Why? Because we haven't yet invaded great military powers like Panama or Zanzibar—a huge and powerful nation almost as big as Tulsa.

This is like a story Alben Barkley told about a schoolteacher who applied for a job in the backwoods of Kentucky. He was asked whether he thought the world was round or flat. "You tell me," he said. "I can teach it either way."

What I have been trying to say this evening is that the Democratic Party is a party of programs, the Republican Party a party of slogans. The next time a Republican orator tells you that he has the ready answer by which we can liberate the satellites before next Christmas, end foreign aid, achieve total victory over communism, repeal the income tax, reduce Federal spending, provide more bombers to replace these unrelibale missiles, and balance the budget at the same time—why not ask him just what specific programs he has in mind for those who are out of work and for keeping communism out of Latin America. We can't simply wring our hands or damn the Federal Government. Some kind of action is required. There is work to be done. Words won't do it.

I think the Democratic Party will win this year, electing President Johnson—a reasonable man, a moderate and progressive man—to his first full term, and electing large majorities in the House and Senate. It will do so, not because of personalities, but because the Democratic Party has constructive programs to solve the many problems we face as a nation. It has always been the party of people, the party of action, and the party of progress.

But perhaps you think I'm biased. Perhaps you have the impression I am partisan in my views. In that case I want to call your attention to a survey made last year of the judgment of 75 leading historians on the achievements of American Presidents. Five Presidents were ranked as "great," six as "near great," about a third as "average," half a dozen as "below average," and two as failures.

Of the 5 great Presidents, three were Democrats—Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. One was a Republican—Abraham Lincoln. One was a Federalist—George Washington.

Of the six near-great President, four were Democrats—Andrew Jackson, James Polk, Grover Cleveland, and Harry Truman. One was a Republican—Theodore Roosevelt. One was a Federalist—John Adams.

In all the history of the United States only two Republicans ranked above average. The two Presidents judged as "failures" were both Republicans—Grant and Harding.

There is an evaluation by a group which can hardly be labeled as apologists for the Democratic Party—75 of this Nation's leading historians. And they say that among the "great" and "near great" Presidents in our history, the Democratic Party outranks the Republican 7 to 2.

It's interesting to note that of the Presidents we have had in the past 50 years—not including Presidents Kennedy or Johnson—these historians rank the three Democrats as "great" or "near great," and the four Republicans as "average," "below average" or "failures."

Now, in the light of this appraisal, I ask you students, "Which party has proven itself as the party of programs?" The answer is obvious. As you continue your studies and as you seek opportunities to become a part of this great political process, I hope you, too, will add to the creativity, the imagination and the energy of the Democratic Party.

But whichever party you prefer, choose one of them and get involved. It was Plato who said:

"The punishment of wise men who refuse to participate in government is to be governed by unwise men."

A New "Peace Corps"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the new features of the foreign aid program now being considered by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in executive session is a proposed Executive Service Corps. On request, American businessmen would help industrial enterprises in developing countries to improve efficiency, cut costs, and make the maximum use of advances in technology.

Support for this proposal to put the tremendous ingenuity and know-how of American business to work for the emerging nations has been forthcoming from all over the country. The Lowell, Mass., Sun carried a fine editorial supporting the Executive Service Corps in its May 11 edition. I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A NEW "PEACE CORPS"

Idealism and business too often are considered to be something like oil and water—they just don't mix.

This fallacy ought to be disproved by news that a group of American businessmen is planning to form its own "Peace Corps" to help small companies in underdeveloped nations abroad.

"We want to show people that the free enterprise system is a good one," says Thomas O. Thomas of the U.S. State Department, as quoted by the National Observer.

Thomas is an employee of the Agency for International Development (AID), the Department's foreign aid office, which will provide an initial $1 million to kick off the project. Eventually, it will operate solely on private donations.

Not yet bearing an official name—it is informally called the Executive Service Corps—the group plans to utilize the experience and knowledge of both retired (but untired) executives as well as younger men. The latter would take leaves of absence from their companies for oversea service of 3 months to 2 years.

Explaining the type of aid the Americans would offer, Thomas cites the example of a shoe company in Colombia. It makes good shoes, has good workers, but is in financial trouble.

"They need something to determine the per unit cost for each shoe," says Thomas, "taking in the cost of leather, labor, overhead, then adding a profit margin, so a fair, but profitable, sales price can be established."

Other types of help would be advice on setting up an assembly line or streamlining manufacturing and administrative methods.

Under the program, the foreign company would pay its American executive the same salary as it would a local man. The corps headquarters in America would pay travel expenses and any salary supplements.

During his tour of service, the American would train a local man to take over the job when he leaves.

This is the kind of "capitalist subversion" we should be telling the world about.

The Consumer and the Economy

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, believing that widespread citizen involvement in public affairs is essential in today's world, I have said often that Members of Congress have a special responsibility to bring substantive issues to their communities for discussion. Every effort must be made to encourage the individual citizen to participate in government and to make his voice heard.

Since my election to Congress, together with the Reform Democratic Clubs of Manhattan's West Side, I have sponsored an annual all-day community conference. Our nonpartisan conferences provide a unique opportunity for a sharing of knowledge and ideas on major issues.

On February 1, 1964, we sponsored our fourth annual all-day conference. This year's topic, "The Consumer and the Economy," attracted more than 1,000 concerned citizens who attended the 6 panels and the plenary session at International House. As in past years, the enthusiastic response demonstrated that this effort to bring together citizens, Government officials, labor and business representatives, university professors, and other experts produces a stimulating forum. The cross-fertilization engenders new thinking and fresh approaches which are vital in a democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a deep debt of appreciation to Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, our former Ambassador to India, and George Collins, acting secretary-treasurer of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, for their contributions to the plenary session and to the experts who participated in the panels. Among the outstanding panelists were: Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; George P. Larrick, Commissioner, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; William Capron, President's Council of Economic Advisers; and J. A. Stockfisch, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department.

The participating clubs were: Ansonia Independent Democrats, F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats, Fort Washington-Manhattanville Reform Democrats, Heights Reform Democrats, J.F.K. Midcity Democrats, New Chelsea Reform Democrats, Reform Independent Democrats, Riverside Democrats, West Side Democratic Club, and Columbia-Barnard Democratic Club.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and congratulate Hermine Brucker and Daniel J. Nelson, cochairmen, whose tireless efforts and leadership made the conference such a success. I also want to express my appreciation to all those who worked along with them, including Janet F. Schmidt, secretary; Ira Zimmerman, treasurer; Susan Cohn, club coordinator; Judith Charles and Carmen Pertierra, publicity; Sara Silon, arrangements director; Robert V. Engle, program design; the club representatives: Frank Baraff, Barbara Blake, Daniel Chill, Robert Clampitt, Gerald Duffy, Daniel Livingston, Eileen Lottman, Leonard Plato, and Emil Schattner; the panel chairmen: Max Dombrow, Noel Ellison, Andrew Goldman, Marvin Lieberman, Kurt Salzinger, Morton Schiff, and Irving Wolfson.

I would also like to note the valuable services of the West Side public officials who acted as moderators of the various panels: State Senator Manfred Ohrenstein, State Assemblymen Albert Blumenthal and Jerome Kretchmer, and City Councilmen Theodore Weiss and Paul O'Dwyer. Mrs. Matilda De Silva of the Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, also served as a panel moderator.

In order to make sure that the program would be open to the public without charge, a large number of community sponsors generously responded, indicating that the people of the West Side are proud to support the annual conferences.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to mention all of the individuals who have worked to make our conferences possible. However, I know that without the incredible energy, devotion, and commitment of the late Gertrude Miller who pioneered the earlier conferences, this year's forum would not have been so successful.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article reporting the address of Senator HART and Professor Galbraith at the plenary session which appeared on February 6, 1964, in the Morningsider, the weekly community newspaper published in the Morningside Heights area:

[From the Morningsider, Feb. 6, 1964]

GALBRAITH URGES BATTLE AGAINST "HUMBUG"

John Kenneth Galbraith, the Canadian-born Harvard economist who has written, talked, or provoked much of the liberal dialog in America during the past 25 years, agitated Saturday in a talk at International House for a "revolution against humbug" in American life, intellect, politics, and foreign policy.

Professor Galbraith and Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, addressed an all-day public conference on "The Consumer and the Economy," sponsored by Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN, the Riverside Democrats, and nine other West Side Democratic clubs.

Congressman RYAN, who was scheduled to address the conference, stayed in Washington Saturday to participate in House debate on pending civil rights legislation. His wife, Priscilla, delivered his speech for him.

Professor Galbraith, who returned to Cambridge last year after serving 3 years as U.S. Ambassador to India, spoke despite an attack of influenza and a stuffed nose.

Hardly referring to his prepared text (which was on The Problem of Poverty), the 55-year-old author of "The Affluent Society" and former Fortune magazine editor, spoke to a standing-room-only assemblage of over 850 in the International House auditorium. A total of nearly 1,100 people turned out for the conference.

Professor Galbraith said that liberals and sensible people must wage a never-ending battle against humbug and profiteering in the political and economic establishments. He said he was delighted that a new generation of muckrakers led by such writers as Rachel Carson and Jessica Mitford were publishing disagreeable books.

"These people name names," he said. They are not afraid, he continued, to offend "General Motors, General Sarnoff, General Clay, or any of the other generals."

"We must show that horrid noises will come from sensible people * * * when concessions are made to the cave dwellers."

In a rambling talk, Professor Galbraith evoked laughter and applause with digressions on Panama ("we try to merchandise our errors and omissions as the machinations of the Communists. Castro has been responsible for everything that happens"), Goldwater ("poverty it would seem is caused by ignorance, lack of ambition, and failure to own a department store"), Rockefeller ("I have great sympathy for Nelson * * * 4 or 5 years ago he was for everything the establishment was for * * * now he's being advised (not even) to talk about home and mother"), and Members of the U.S. Senate ("I would like to see a study made of the effect of age on legislative performance.")

"Tokenism," Professor Galbraith said, "is an extension of humbug. (We cannot) close our eyes to * * * the bypassed people, the people who have been left in poverty."

In the past, we have hoped that a general increase in economic activity—a stepping up of the growth rate—would solve the problem. We have come now to realize that people can benefit from improved economic conditions only if they are able to participate in the economy. This means that they must be physically and mentally prepared. They must be in communities where there are job opportunities and they must not be denied opportunities because of race.

"The attack on poverty must be part of a new and enlarged concern for the quality of our public services. * * * It is the poor who need parks and whose children need swimming pools. Only the poor live in the slums and require the myriad of services that, we may hope, will one day mitigate urban congestion and public squalor * * * it is the schools of slum dwellers and wage and salary workers which would be principally improved by Federal aid to education. * * * It is the poor children who play in dirty streets. It is their fathers who get laid off when public works are suddenly cut back.

"Public services have, to use the economists word, a strong redistribution effect. And this effect is strongly in favor of those with lower incomes. Those who clamor the "loudest for public economy are," Professor Galbraith continued, "those for whom public services do the least. It is evident that tax reduction that affects public services has a double effect in comforting the comfortable and afflicting the poor."

Senator HART said that free competitive enterprise was present in the United States "more in theory than in practice."

"Advertising, promotional efforts, gimmickry and adherence to costly systems of distribution offer the consumer no substitute for price competition. The consumer must ultimately bear and pay for these costs.

"In the pharmaceutical industry, for example, it has been estimated that the $750 million for promotion to doctors alone ultimately may add more than a billion dollars to consumers' bills.

"One physician who appeared as a witness in the hearings of (my) Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly stated that the postage bill alone for the material mailed to physicians would build at least three large hospitals a year, and the annual cost of the advertising which went into physicians' wastebaskets could probably build and equip five hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will be interested in reading the excellent speech of Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, in which he discusses the effects of nonprice competition in today's economy:

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, DEMOCRAT, OF MICHIGAN, TO THE FOURTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, N.Y., FEBRUARY 1, 1964

Nearly 200 years ago an English economist, Adam Smith, propounded a then revolutionary doctrine that the "Wealth of Nations" is best advanced through the operation of a system of free, private enterprise, in which prices are arrived at through vigorous competition among rival producers.

From that seed our own complex economic system has developed with its emphasis on vigorous price competition in free and open markets. The concept was enshrined in our antitrust laws which attempt to insure that prices will be freely arrived at without unreasonable restraint either by way of unfair trade practices, the exercise of monopoly power or combinations or agreements having as their object the placing of chains on an open market.

Yet today this foundation upon which our free enterprise economy is based may be sinking—although slowly—into a quagmire of nonprice competition.

Many forms of nonprice competition perform a useful role in our economy, but they should not become or be considered an acceptable substitute for price competition. For instance, advertising and packaging of consumer goods, when utilized for socially useful purposes, perform vital functions.

But my concern over nonprice competition stems from the fact that it may, on occasion, prevent the price system from performing its traditional and essential functions in our free enterprise economy. In many instances nonprice forms of competition tend to strike at the rational basis for consumer choice. The buyer many times is required to make his choices only on the grounds which the sellers permit—alternatives in physical appearance, packaging, service contracts, or advertising claims and other forms of sales promotion. Thus, in the packaging hearings I held for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I was struck again and again by the roadblocks placed in the path of anyone who tries to buy the simplest forms of consumer goods on the basis of price. The American housewife is an intelligent woman, but this isn't enough when she walks into the supermarket today. Without an engineering degree and a slide rule in her pocketbook, often she simply cannot determine how much she is paying, per ounce or per pound, for anything from cereals to soap flakes. The consumer is faced with a bewildering array of packages in such a variety of sizes, shapes, weights, and possibly degrees of "slack filling" that accurate price comparisons become difficult, if not impossible—particularly if compounded by a net weight designation which can't be found. In this way consumers are forced to rely upon the nonprice competitive efforts of manufacturers who seek to avoid even the appearance of price competition.

In a recent Federal Trade Commission case which involved the packaging methods of a manufacturer of gift-wrapped material, Commissioner Elman had this to say:

"For a seller to package goods in containers which—unknown to the consumer—are appreciably oversized or in containers so shaped as to create the optical illusion of being larger than conventionally shaped containers of equal or greater capacity, is as much a deceptive practice and an unfair method of competition, as if the seller were to make an explicit false statement of the quantity or dimensions of his goods."

Even where there is an appearance of price competition, the appearance itself may be deceptive. One of the charges against the manufacturer in this same case was that he had preticketed his merchandise with fictitious prices so that retailers could have sales which supposedly offered great bargains to the consumer. The manufacturer made no effort to deny the charge; instead he contended that, since practically every company in the industry engages in the same misleading practice, it was unfair to single him out for complaint. These forms of nonprice competition serve only the sharpshooting manufacturer or producer at, literally, the expense of the consumer.

Another adverse characteristic of nonprice competition from the standpoint of the consumer can be its great cost for which the consumer, not the seller, must pay. The most dramatic examples of this cost were found in the course of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee's hearings on the prescription drug industry, in which the manufacturer's selling efforts are directed toward inducing the physician to prescribe by his particular trade name. Twenty-two of the largest drug companies provided data on their 1958 operations to the subcommittee. In that year their combined total of advertising and promotional expenses came to nearly $600 million. It was estimated that the total for the whole industry would have been at least $750 million in 1958, and probably the figure has risen substantially since then.

One physician who appeared as a witness in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly stated that the postage bill alone for the material mailed to physicians would build at least three large hospitals a year, and the annual cost of the advertising which went into physicians' wastebaskets could probably build and equip 50 hospitals. He suggested that: "It would take two railroad mailcars, 110 large mailtrucks, and 800 postmen to deliever the daily load of drug circulars and samples to doctors if mailed to one single city. Then after being delivered, it would take over 25 trash trucks to haul it away, to be burned on a dump pile whose blaze would be seen for 50 miles around."

Another physician pointed out that the amount the industry spent to persuade doctors to prescribe its products was nearly four times the combined operating budgets of all of the medical schools in the country.

The cost of nonprice competition to the consumer is sometimes staggering. Everyone recognizes the producer's need for advertising and marketing the sale of his products. But advertising, promotional efforts, gimmickry, and adherence to costly systems of distribution offer the consumer no substitute for price competition. The consumer must ultimately bear and pay for these costs. In the pharmaceutical industry, for example, it has been estimated that the $750 million for promotion to doctors alone ultimately may add more than a billion dollars to the consumers' bills as the specific markups over cost are added at the various levels of distribution. And if we follow this chain of reasoning through industry after industry, it becomes clear that much of the increase in the cost of living might well be caused by the increased cost of nonprice competition.

As indicated, the reason is that this is a form of competition in which the consumer reaps few benefits when compared to the in-pocket savings which price competition would provide. Nonprice competition also frequently works to the disadvantage of the small competitor, no matter how efficient he may be. Victory in some forms of nonprice competition may go not to the firm with the lower costs or the best product, but to the company which can spend the most on advertising, sales promotion, model changes, etc. In this kind of race the smaller competitive producer can seldom win. And as the smaller competitor loses his share of the market, another element tending to keep prices down disappears. The threat of market entry by new firms, the spur to keeping prices down where many independents are vying for a share of the market, diminishes as concentration in a given product market grows. And concentrated industries, in turn, can use their monopoly power to take even larger shares of the market through nonprice competitive techniques.

In fact, by your purchases you may be subsidizing a rise in your own cost of living.

Contributing to the decline of price competition and the emphasis on nonprice forms of competition is a practice called price leadership. It occurs, most often, in highly concentrated industries or in industries where one firm occupies a dominant position.

The leading firm establishes a price for the product which may or may not have a relationship to supply or demand, the classical regulators of the market. The other firms follow suit. The prospective buyer is faced with a single price for the product or finding a substitute. When this occurs in basic industries, the latter choice is not always readily available.

In this situation, rather than market forces controlling competition, the competitors are controlling the market.

Reference to the subcommittee hearings on administered prices in the steel industry may help to illustrate this problem.

As brought out in the hearings, before the formation of United States Steel in 1901, price competition in steel was the rule rather than the exception. Although efforts were sometimes made to control the market through loose pools or gentlemen's agreements, they generally broke down when demand fell off. It is true that prices rose when the steel business was booming, but it is equally true that prices would fall sharply whenever the demand for steel dropped much below the industry's production capacity.

The reasons for this were clearly stated by the U.S. Commissioner of Corporations in 1911: "In 1890 there were scarcely any consolidations of the modern type in the steel industry. [The industry] was characterized by the competition of a large number of independent concerns * * *. These concerns were distinct entities with respect to ownership."

The formation of the United States Steel Corp. in 1901 changed the industry's structure. Here, for the first time, was a company which—through control of ore and coal supplies, transportation facilities, pig iron, ingot, semifinished and finished steel capacity—was able to dominate the whole industry.

Since that time United States Steel's ability to "set the pace" has remained unchallenged. In 1936 the president of United States Steel could say, with great confidence, to Senator Burton K. Wheeler: "I would say we generally make the prices."

The bout between the late President Kennedy and the steel industry rather dramatically highlighted what I am talking about. At that time the forcefulness of a strong President caused the steel industry to backtrack. Since that time, however, selective price increases have been quietly at work.

Let me emphasize that there is nothing illegal involved in price leadership in and of itself. Nor do I intend these remarks to be a condemnation of the steel industry. So long as others are doing the same thing and the method of pricing does not violate the law, a good argument could be made out for this form of pricing by industry leaders.

The point is that our free enterprise economy does not work according to the classical model on which it is based. If the standard of price-leadership dominates pricing in basic materials. it can result in the consumer paying more for the finished product and lead to even greater reliance on nonprice forms of competition.

It is important that we be aware of these competitive forces at work in our economy and how they reach into the pocketbook of the consumer. It is important that we not close our eyes to economic reality and assume that the market is regulated in all cases by forces that, in fact, do not exist. It is important that we realize that the theoretical foundation of our free enterprise system may be present more in theory than in practice.

Having said this, I confess that I do not have the answers. But as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I can assure you that we will search assiduously for answers consistent with economic freedom. Certainly recognition of reality is the first step to finding solutions.

And I hope that I have also indicated that the antitrust laws are not a vague collection of rules about which only manufacturers and businessmen need be concerned.

The form of our antitrust laws and their administration directly affect every consumer. And the effect is concrete, not theoretical. The effect determines to a great extent how much your dollar will buy. And the buying power of the consumer dollar is in the long run what the antitrust laws are all about.

If I have confused rather than enlightened, let me say that this entire sphere of economic activity has sometimes been confused because of the darkness surrounding much of its operation. Hopefully, our Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in the years ahead can throw light in a way that will benefit both business and the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the morning panel on "Health Care: Cost and Quality" which was prepared by a reporter of the Morningsider:

Speakers: Dr. George Baehr, chairman, New York State Public Health Council; Mr. Edward J. Carroll, director of economic research, Merck & Co.; Miss Evelyn Dubrow, chairman, AFL–CIO Committee on Consumer Legislation; Dr. Gerald Dorman, member, board of trustees, AMA.

Dr. Baer said that the overall cost of drugs in the United States has decreased in the past decade because the consumption has increased. Each person now purchases 5½ prescriptions per year, he noted; the greater use of drugs arises from new medical discoveries. A few years ago, he said, a patient with pneumonia spent 2 weeks in the hospital and had only a fifty-fifty chance of recovering his health. Now, a patient spends 4 days in the hospital, is treated with antibiotics, and has a hundred percent chance of recovering, he continued. The treatment with antibiotics is costly, and individual patients find their care and drug costs expensive, yet, all in all, drug costs have decreased, he said.

Miss Dubrow spoke on the unions and medical care. She said that the unions were among the first to take out health insurance policies for their workers. In another vein, she said that production in factories and in other jobs fell off because workers avoid going to the doctor until they are seriously ill. If they could go when they are simply feeling "out of sorts" and receive a checkup and advice, they would have satisfaction and help, and would not lose worktime. The workers avoid doctors because of the high costs of office visits, but in so doing, they inflict upon themselves the even higher costs of medical care which they require later, when they are seriously ill.

There are many "drug" frauds against the American public, she said. Numerous television programs, she noted, advertise drugs that people can take for deficiencies or illnesses. Most of these drugs are nonessential to a person's health, but the television commercials make them sound absolutely essential, she said. Her answer to the medical problem in America was "cradle to grave" compulsory health programs, sponsored by the Government.

Dr. Dorman said that drugs purchased under their basic names are less expensive than the same drugs purchased under a brand name. As an example he cited aspirin, which is cheaper than aspirin preparations such as Anacin or Bufferin. Doctors are brainwashed by salesmen to purchase drugs under brand names, he said.

Dr. Dorman criticized the union health centers, which labor unions establish throughout the various cities in the United States. He believes that they are not centrally located for their workers' convenience. He also believes that the various unions should consolidate their medical care. Each union has a center of its own for its own workers and the various unions will not "get together" on handling each other's patients, he said.

Mr. Speaker, there follows a summary of the morning panel on "Automation, Unemployment and Poverty" which was prepared by a reporter of the Morningsider:

Speakers: William Capron, President's Council of Economic Advisers; Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America"; George Collins, acting secretary-treasurer, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers; Robert Lekachman, professor of economics, Barnard College.

Mr. Capron led off the discussion. He said, "there's a danger of making this interrelationship too simple (automation to unemployment to poverty). It misses the mark rather widely, and it can lead us down policy paths that we would not want to follow."

"The Government," he said, "has the responsibility to aid technological change, as long as it's discharging its responsibility for the adjustment that's going to be necessary."

In another point, the economist said that unemployment is the result of "inadequate total demand for goods and services," and he noted that the tax cut was instituted to get at the demand problem. It will release billions of dollars of purchasing power into the economy, he said, and that that in turn would increase the demand for labor. Stressing that "it's not a quick cure," Mr. Capron said, "I'm convinced that by the end of this year we'll have an economy that's moving up to total employment."

He continued, "We could cure poverty almost overnight. We could bring every American family up to $3,000 a year. But that would not cure poverty. Its roots lie deep. The lack of income is a symptom of poverty, not its cause. Real poverty lasts not only a lifetime but too frequently passes from one generation to another. For a whole segment of the population, relief has become a way of life."

We must approach poverty, he said, as a longer range problem, to get at its roots rather than eliminate some of its symptoms. The focus, he believes, should be on the younger people. As far as the older people are concerned, he said, it's difficult for them to escape a condition in which they've lived all their lives.

Michael Harrington, whose book is widely credited for having awakened the country to the widespread poverty that exists, spoke next. He suggested three steps that must be taken in a broad attack on poverty: first, that we must know its dimensions; second, that we must realize that what we have is a political problem that must be solved by political means; and third, that there must be Federal planning. The President's war on poverty, he said, "is only the merest beginning * * * It is, thank God, a beginning."

On the dimensions of the problem of poverty, he said, "the actual number of poor is open to argument: According to President Johnson, there are 35 million, or one-fifth of the population; other estimates range higher. My own, he said, is 40 to 50 million. Leon Keyserling, he pointed out, has estimated that 40 percent of the population—or about 77 million persons—are either impoverished or deprived. We now know, he continued, that at least one-half of the people over 65 are "condemned to a lonely, bitter, impoverished old age"; we know that racial impoverishment is an added problem; we know that rural poverty is enormous; and we know that among the poor the largest age group is under 18. There's a grave danger, he said, of "hereditary poverty," the communication of poverty from one generation to another. We also know, he continued, that poor people get sick more often, that they have a higher incidence of neuroses and psychoses. The poor are the least educated in society, he said, and finally, they are ill housed.

On the war on poverty as a political problem, Mr. Harrington said, "The spending of money always involves politics." He called the $200 to $600 million that is going to be spent in Johnson's program "the barest, most impoverished beginning," and he quoted the New York Times as saying that it is hardly enough for a skirmish much less total war. The Dixiecrats, he pointed out, do not want to solve the problem of poverty; as long as they continue to dominate Congress, we are not going to approach the problem as massively as is necessary. We must, he said, have a new alinement. Later, during the question period, he said that the Democratic Party must become truly the liberal party; the Republican, truly the conservative. He said, "The AMA is for the maintenance of poverty," as far as Medicare is concerned; the farm bureaucracy is for the maintenance of poverty, when it comes to the question of the migrant farmworker; the racists are for the maintenance of poverty, as long as the alternative means uplifting the Negro; and the chief city planners—the real estate speculators—are for the maintenance of poverty.

His third point was that "any serious war on poverty has to have Federal norms." He disagreed with Mr. Capron. It is not, he said, simply a matter of increasing aggregate demand. In the next 5 years, he pointed out, an additional 16.1 million jobs will be needed just to maintain the level of unemployment that now exists. If we fail to provide these jobs, unemployment will leap to 8, 9, 10 percent of the working force, he said. The total problem, he stressed, is so massive—housing, education, jobs and many related problems—that there must be a "coordinated approach" to them, and that means Federal planning on a grand scale.

George Collins was the next speaker. The rediscovery of poverty, he said, is "long overdue * * *. The unhappy fact is that we have not achieved one of F.D.R.'s goals."

Each week, he said, 25,000 young people are entering the labor market; while 40,000 jobs a week are being lost through automation. The Nation is without a plan to deal with automation, he said, and "big business and industry show complete indifference." Big business and industry say, "no one knows the extent of the problem," which is a statement designed to delay the solution, he said.

He warned that we cannot continue the excuse "no one knows what to do about the problem" before attacking it. For the worker out of a job, he said, the important thing is that the bills are due, his wife needs medical care, his kids need clothes.

Robert Lekachman then spoke. He said that he was "more inclined to quarrel" with Mr. Capron, an economist. He called Mr. Capron's position (which is also the position of the Council of Economic Advisers) "a cheerful view." If we have unemployment, this view runs, it's the result of "deficient demand," and we "dump money in the right places" so that it will flow throughout the economy, he said. "We tried this recently," he pointed out, "in the bad old Eisenhower days. Remember?" In 1954, he said, "that far-reaching radical GEORGE HUMPHREY" supported a tax cut; the economy's upward turn was undoubtedly the result. "But why," he asked, "has the problem returned?" He said that this consideration led him to an alliance with the other two speakers (Collings and Harrington). "We have never really solved the problem of integrating the bottom segment of our population into the whole society," he said.

He pointed out that the number of jobs with small skill requirements are rapidly diminishing, and the jobs that are becoming available require greater and greater skills. Declaring that there's "a changing shape" to the demands upon labor, he foresaw a future in which machine tenders are going to become fewer and fewer, and it will be necessary for workers to shift occupations two or three times during their lifetimes. This, he said, suggests "a substantial shift not only in the amount spent on education but in the way we approach it." It will be necessary to make education a continuous process, he said. "General education, in other words, should last throughout life."

What we have achieved so far, he pointed out, is a middle-class welfare state; what we should be seeking is a welfare state for the bottom third of our society.

We only "kid ourselves if we believe that a tax cut is a cure-all," he said.

Later, during the rebuttal period, Mr. Capron said that the Council of Economic Advisers has never said that the only problem is aggregate demand and the tax cut the only solution. "We do say," he noted, "that total demand is necessary if we're going to begin to meet the problems of unemployment and poverty." He also said, "sure, skill requirements are on the increase, but they have been for a long time, and the labor force has always been able (to accommodate itself)."

During the question period he was asked why so little—$500 million or one-half of 1 percent—of the total budget, is to be spent on the war on poverty. He answered that substantial funds in the educational and housing budgets are earmarked for the problem of poverty and that this was only a beginning. "We have a tremendous job getting off the ground," he said, "It's not simply a matter of turning on the faucet and water pouring out smoothly. A lot of plumbing has to be done (for the future)."

Mr. Speaker, those who participated in the morning panel on "Advertising and the Public Interest" were fortunate in having the benefit of the views of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon. I am including excerpts from the remarks of the panelists:

Speakers: Paul R. Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Sidney W. Dean, Jr., president, Ventures Development Corp.; Stephen Dietz, executive vice president, Kenyon & Eckhardt, Inc.; Mildred E. Brady, assistant director, Consumers Union.

From the remarks of Paul Rand Dixon:

It is in connection with the maintenance and strengthening of the competitive framework for economic growth that the Federal Trade Commission has, by virtue of the mandates of the statutes it administers, a responsibility in the scheme of our national life that is exceeded by few if any other agencies.

Recent growth of our economy has been phenomenal. Advertising of the proper kind can contribute mightily to this prospective growth and to the more abundant satisfaction of the consumer needs of all Americans which will result from such growth.

And I reaffirm here and now, without equivocation, my long-held position that advertising which helps consumers make intelligent choices is the kind which stimulates growth—without such advertising, we probably could never have achieved our present state of well-being; without it we likely can never substantially improve our position.

Yet, like most good things, advertising has been wrongly used—used in a way that was not in the public interest. For it has been employed, not to help consumers make intelligent choices, but sometimes as a monopolistic weapon to destroy competition and frequently as a deceptive one to corrupt it.

In meeting its obligation to maintain and strengthen our free competitive enterprise system, within the framework of which our growth must occur, the Commission acts not only to eliminate monopolistic practices, but also to remove those that are false or deceptive.

From the remarks of Mr. Stephen Dietz:

Advertising is a means of communication and persuasion. As is oratory.

While its primary use in this country is for the advocacy of the purchase of material things, it is also used by political parties, educational institutions, museums, art galleries, philanthropic and charitable organizations, churches, and various governmental bodies.

What is advertising's economic contribution to the growth of our free society? It is a means available to all of entry into a market. Given a new and superior product, advertising facilitates its entry into the market and its growth.

Advertising promotes growth because it speeds the acceptance of innovation.

The ethics of advertising, as of any public activity, are legitimate matters of public concern. Truth in advertising would seem to be a minimal standard of conduct to which we would all agree. But when we try to define truth, we have difficulty and disagreement, not because one side is good and the other bad, but because truth is not always an easy concept to deal with.

Much criticism of advertising stems from the belief that "persuasion" is necessarily unethical. I cannot agree. It seems to me that persuasion is the very stuff of life, of change, of movement. There are, of course, limits to the kinds of persuasion which are acceptable in the public interest, and these limits are violated in many walks of life. Perhaps the greatest violation, in my opinion, is failure to disclose the self-interest of the individual doing the persuading. Advertising is the most open persuasion there is—for the self-interest of the advertiser is plain for all to see.

From the remarks of Mrs. Mildred E. Brady:

There is no escaping the conclusion that advertising, taken as a total impact on today's living, has simply grown out of hand. Instead of serving the consumer, it abuses him. The most obvious thing about advertising as we experience it in 1964 is that it is excessive—excessive in its amount, excessive in its insistence, excessive in its blatancy.

Advertising expenditures are estimated to be $13 billion a year. And that's a conservative estimate—3.2 percent of disposable income—an increase of 16 percent from 1950 when the percentage was 2.7 percent. It is nearly double the amount we spend for medical and dental services; it is 2½ times what we spend for private education at all levels; it is more than we spend for all the gas and oil to operate the 60 million passenger cars on the road, and it is more than all Americans pay for rental housing.

This is not to say that the use of today's remarkable communications media to convey information about today's highly processed goods is an undesirable activity. On the contrary. Never before have we needed product information so sorely * * *. Advertising as we know it, however, does not measure up to this need and the need is growing geometrically as products multiply and become more complex. Without useful, truthful information about the products we buy, consumer choice on a free market becomes a mockery.

In order to fill the need for product information that modern technology and modern distribution facilities has rendered essential, advertising will have to change its ways.

Recently, and at long last, President Johnson created a consumer post in the White House, appointed Esther Peterson to that office, and also established a President's Consumer Interests Committee to which he appointed a number of private citizens especially qualified to speak for the consumer. Thus, for the first time the unorganized and heretofore voiceless consumer has been granted a small start along the road to a redress of the balance between the pressures for private ends and those for the public good. But, believe it or not, advertisers are already insisting that the consumer representative posts be turned over to advertising and marketing men * * *.

Surely those of us who hold that the public welfare should be the primary focus of government, and those in the Congress who speak for us, should take whatever steps may be necessary to guard against any attempts of advertising, or other commercial interests, to masquerade as representatives of the consumer.

Summary of remarks of Sidney W. Dean, Jr.:

Advertising is the process of "automated mass selling." As a process, it carries no more responsibility for its human consequences than automated mass production. The human consequences must be dealt with by government acting for all of us.

Advertising, furthermore, is a sanctioned form of special pleading, with the same responsibilities as the lawyer pleading for an imperfect client or a political partisan pleading for an imperfect candidate. Special pleading has an indispensable role in an open society to insure free competition between ideas as well as goods and services. The role of government as umpire is to insure that the rules are adequate and enforced to insure fair competition.

Since fair rules of free competition are as important in advertising as in all other business, it is tragic that our antitrust regulatory legislation covers only interstate commerce in goods and products, and excepts services, such as advertising and editorial services.

Thus, the rates and terms of sale of advertising, which is an important component of the price of most consumer products, is largely unregulated.

Similarly, publishers, broadcasters, and networks have taken false shelter under the doctrine of freedom of the press to engage in price fixing and other monopoly practices in the sale of essential news, editorial, and programing services. It is currently reported that the three television networks now own or have profit participations in all but 15 of the hundreds of programs they carry. These participations and "coproduction" concessions have been coerced from independent producers and advertisers in exchange for time clearances and preferences.

The afternoon panel on "Consumer Credit: Truth in Lending" included the following participants: Dr. Warren Banner, Research Director, National Urban League; Professor Persia Campbell, chairman, Department of Economics, Queens College; Louis J. Asterita, deputy manager, American Bankers Association. The following are excerpts from their remarks.

From the remarks of Dr. Warren Banner:

Few will question the purchase of most durable goods on the installment plan. Homes are usually bought this way. However, most of us do not know what is happening not only in the calculations for the costs above the stated price (insurance, taxes, utilities, etc.), but to a greater extent are thrown into confusion about the charges at closing time.

Various reports show that installment credit costs up to 42 percent per year, allowed under State law. Usually stated rates of 5 or 6 percent amount to twice as much where the interest rate is constant even though the outstanding balance is decreasing with each payment. This may sound confusing to some but it is easily understood if review is made of the tables prepared by those who have calculated the actual cost to the consumers of installment buying.

I have always felt that the best deal for all of us of small means is to deposit our funds in a savings bank, where interest is paid each quarter, and make purchases from our cash.

Until there is some assurance that you will not fall prey to the small print of a contract, deal with reputable concerns and there will be less chance that you will be taken advantage of. Buy only what you need and know you can and will pay for it. While lending institutions are anxious to have their money work, you should be just as anxious to have them use some of your money with interest.

From the remarks of Prof. Persia Campbell:

Consumer credit is an advance of purchasing power obtained at a price; it is a commitment of debt on terms. Over the decade the percentage rate of increase for consumer credit (about 110 percent) was almost twice that of disposable income (about 60 percent); from about 13 percent of disposable income, consumer credit has increased to about 17 percent.

Except in particular categories, notably monthly charge accounts, credit is paid for by the borrowers at an estimated average rate of from 14 to 15 percent per year; the strange thing is that the borrowers, now constituting well over half the American families, rarely know what they are paying for it. This strange phenomenon of blind buying has different causes; a significant cause is the fact that credit charges are stated in different ways according to the type and source of credit.

At hearings on the Douglas truth-in-lending bill, Mr. McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, admitted that he himself could not make out the comparative cost of different types of credit under these circumstances, which may all be legal, under the hodge-podge of different laws applying separately to small loan companies, banks, credit unions, pawnshops, and to retail installment sales and revolving credit plans. It was to help the consumer exercise informed choice in the credit market that Senator DOUGLAS and his associates introduced the truth-in-lending bill which requires, in brief, that all types of credit charges be stated both in dollar cost (which enables a quick comparison betwen cash and time-sale prices) and also with the equivalent annual interest rate (to facilitate comparative shopping between different types and sources of credit). Since the vitality of a competitive market, central to our economic system, depends on informed choice, the Douglas bill has been put under the jurisdiction of a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee; it provides for administration by the Federal Trade Commission as part of its fair-labeling program.

Summary of remarks of Mr. Louis J. Asterita:

Banks have not engaged in the installment loan business at high rates, but rather have sought to extend consumer loans on an ethical basis and at reasonable rates. By following the principle of lending to credit-worthy risks for any useful purpose, banks make direct loans to individuals to buy automobiles at lower rates than those generally associated with dealer-originated business. Moreover, bankers discovered they could loan for business purposes on a term basis by making installment loans to small business and adopting the installment credit method. Other loan areas that have been developed include charge account financing, revolving check credit, on-the-job bank service, financing medical and dental expenses and loans to improve or modernize your home. However, the extension of this credit following World War II, has focussed attention upon practices involved in the extension of consumer credit. Consumer credit has grown from 21,395 million in 1950 to 68 billion year-end 1963. Installment credit, which is the credit under discussion today, rose from 14.7 billion in 1950 to 53 billion in 1963.

The afternoon panel on "Environmental Health: Air, Food, Drugs" included the following participants: George P. Larrick, Commissioner, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Arthur J. Benline, Commissioner of Air Pollution Control, New York City; Ethel L. Ginsberg, Citizens Committee for Children of New York City.

From the remarks of George P. Larrick:

Our food and drug law helps to protect the public health, and this of course has great economic significance. But this law has other benefits. It conserves the consumer's purchasing power. It stimulates technological progress. It fosters fair competitive practices. It is an underlying factor in our free competitive economy, by aiding consumer choice in the marketplace based on reliable product information.

Experience has shown that without laws to protect the consumer many dishonest practices would flourish. Vigorous and continuing control is needed to prevent such practices as short-weight packaging, substitution of cheaper ingredients, and the sale of spoiled or contaminated products.

Most of this food was pure and wholesome, safe to use, and honestly packaged. But if—let us assume—there had been a shortage in the net weight averaging only a quarter of an ounce per pound—it would have cost consumers over a billion dollars a year.

Establishment of food standards helps to protect consumer purchasing power and consumer health. The food standard regulations prevent adulteration—for example by added water. They require food to contain what is expected.

Enrichment of selected foods with vitamins and minerals is carried on through the food standards program. This has helped to reduce or wipe out diseases caused by dietary deficiencies.

Under the law the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to establish a food standard whenever such action is needed to "promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers." Thus food standards are also concerned with promoting fair competition in the production and marketing of foods.

There is no way to measure accurately the cost of misbranding and misinformation in the health field. It has been estimated at more than a billion dollars a year. Vitamin quackery and other food fads are said to cost the public half a billion dollars a year. But the cost would be far more were it not for the protection of our Federal, State, and local laws.

Here it would be appropriate to ask what is the cost of the protection provided by the FDA. In the current fiscal year the appropriation for enforcing the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is $35,800,000, about 18½ cents for each person in the United States. We are sure that this insurance saves the consumer many times its annual cost.

Commissioner Arthur J. Benline:

New York City's Commissioner of Air Pollution Arthur J. Benline told the group that smokestacks and chimneys, residential and industrial incinerators, and car, bus, and truck exhaust fumes are the basic sources of air pollution in the city. More research is needed in purifying auto exhausts and in smoke abatement devices.

Protecting health against air pollution depends on preventing pollutants from entering the air. He explained that litter in the streets up to your knees would not endanger public health as much as the pollutants in the air now do.

The afternoon panel on "Taxation and the Consumer" included the following participants: Prof. Emma C. Llewellyn, Department of Economics, Sarah Lawrence College; Peter Bernstein, author of "Price of Prosperity" and "Primer on Government Spending"; J. A. Stockfisch, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department. A summary follows:

Prof. Emma Llewellyn expressed her view that the tax bill did not give adequate recognition for lower income individuals. She took the position that at this time there was a greater need to stimulate consumption rather than investment. Professor Llewellyn stated that the tax bill tended to place too much emphasis on investment.

Peter Bernstein stated that, while he favors a reduction in income taxes as a badly needed stimulant to business expansion, he has reservations on two levels.

First, we have made no real progress on tax reform, he said. We are still allowing too large a portion of high incomes to escape the tax collector's net. Our income tax schedules give an extraordinarily misleading impression of the degree to which our tax structure is progressive: it accomplishes far less in this regard than most people like to believe.

Second, he continued, the tax cut does little or nothing to aid those people who need help most—the families whose incomes are

so small that they pay little or no income tax in any case. Indeed, he would far rather that we begin to look at taxes, not as a burden, but as a means of buying the things we so badly need in terms of cleaner, healthier, safer, more comfortable, and better educated communities.

Mr. Stockfisch explained the main features of the tax bill as it was at that time before the Senate Finance Committee. He explained what income classes would get a reduction and indicated that the bill would have some elements of reform, although not as much as had been hoped for in President Kennedy's original proposal.

He also dealt with the question of whether the Congress would accept the important Treasury amendment on capital gains—to maintain the existing tax rates on capital gains. He pointed out the importance of this amendment, and of eliminating the dividend credit provision which would mean a lessening in the present tendency to tax different types of incomes differently. This in itself would be a very healthy step in the right direction and a type of reform.

Mr. Stockfisch stated that he thought the tax bill would make inroads in areas that had never been touched before and that the bill should be given more credit than its critics are willing to admit.

Connecticut Development Commission Supports Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the Connecticut Development Commission, signed by its managing director Mr. LeRoy Jones, in support of the administration's area redevelopment program. In fact, in his opening sentence Mr. Jones states that the ARA program "has been of considerable help in assisting new industrial ventures in Connecticut".

The letter also refers to a resolution adopted last year by the Connecticut Development Commission recommending an amendment to the Area Redevelopment Act to "permit repayment of the local loan in no shorter a period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than the Federal financial assistance is being repaid". I would strongly urge our colleagues of the House Banking and Currency Committee, who have been working on the bill H.R. 4996, the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments, to give earnest consideration to the amendment proposed by the Connecticut Development Commission. May I add that I look forward to early action and passage of legislation to continue the ARA program, which is benefiting many areas throughout the country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the letter from the Connecticut Development Commission which reads as follows:

MAY 6, 1964.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Congressman From Connecticut,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: The program of the Area Redevelopment Administration has been of considerable help in assisting new industrial ventures in Connecticut. We are very hopeful that Congress will continue the program and are somewhat concerned that action has not yet been taken on passage of the Area Redevelopment Act. We realize, of course, that many important pieces of legislation have been held up.

Anticipating early action on this year's area redevelopment bill, I would like to remind you that our Commission is concerned about one of the major amendment proposals which would make the program much more useful in Connecticut. I refer to the proposal on the amortization of the local funds at the same rate of time as amortization of the Federal loan. In this connection, I would like to repeat a resolution originally passed by our Commission at its official meeting on April 17, 1963:

"Whereas there presently exist in the State of Connecticut 3 redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, comprising 16 municipalities, in which expanding industries are eligible to receive financial assistance from the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such Federal financial assistance is contingent upon local participation to the extent of 10 percent of the cost of the project; and

"Whereas the present requirement of the Government that the Federal loan be fully repaid before any repayments be made on the local 10-percent loan; and

"Whereas this requirement freezes local investment funds for up to 25 years, thus possibly nullifying the locality's capabilities to assist other projects for that time period; and

"Whereas Congress is now considering an amendment to the law to permit repayment of the local share at the same time as the repayment of the Federal share: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut Development Commission urges Congress to enact the amending section 6(b)(9)(B) of H.R. 4996 which would permit repayment of the local loan in no shorter a period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than the Federal financial assistance is being repaid."

We will most appreciate any efforts you can make in behalf of the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act, including this much needed change in the law. If there is any additional information you would like in regard to our feelings about this proposed amendment, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

LEROY JONES,
Managing Director.

Administration Continues To Pile Error Upon Error in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day and with each contradictory statement of administration spokesmen, it is becoming increasingly clear that our top leadership doesn't know how to win the war in South Vietnam or how to get out of it. Meantime, American boys are dying there. Is it too much to ask that at the very least a firm and definite policy be established?

The extent of the errors committed in this tragic affair is outlined in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal for May 13, 1964.

ERROR UPON ERROR

Ten years almost to the day after the fall of Dienbienphu, Secretary McNamara is in Saigon—for the second time in the past couple of months. Yet no matter how many high officials visit Vietnam, or how frequently, nothing gets clarified. Except, that is, the continuing failure of U.S. policy.

Though the conjunction of the Secretary's trip with the anniversary of the French defeat is accidental, it could be unpleasantly symbolic. With a far greater force than the United States has committed, the French fought the Communists for some 8 grisly years, and lost.

Vietnam was then divided north and south, Korea-like, but unlike Korea the border was fluid and not patrolled by large contingents of United States or any other troops. The Communists predictably made the most of their opportunity, first as infiltrators and guerrilla fighters; now they are so strong they can and do attack in force.

Today the French wonder aloud how the United States expects to win at the rate it is going. They are not the only ones; American servicemen and reporters have long been saying we are losing the war. U.S. officials are alternately reassuring and gloomy.

Part of the official attitude appears to be that we are not supposed to win in a formal sense; only help the South Vietnamese drive the Communists out and keep them out. But even this limited objective keeps going glimmering. After all the U.S.-supported fighting, the Communists are said to be in effective control of sizable and important parts of South Vietnam.

In view of that, it is almost impossible to figure out what is the U.S. strategy, if any—that is, how it thinks it can in fact drive the Communists out and keep them out. Not that anyone expects the Pentagon to reveal its war plans in detail; it is rather that the evidence indicates the lack of any plan which promises to be workable against the varied and successful tactics of the Communists.

Not even the commitment of many more American soldiers or the bombing of Communist bases in the north, which has been talked of off and on, would be guaranteed to accomplish the objective.

In other circumstances perhaps, but not necessarily against this particular enemy, in this particular terrain, with this particular ally.

At the same time the French "solution" of neutralizing all of Vietnam sounds like a proposal in a vacuum, at least for the present. Why should Ho Chi Minh, the dictator of the North, want to neutralize when he is doing so well as it is. Of if he did want to, we may be sure he would see it as a means of continuing the conquest.

We do not rule out the possibility that the United States may somehow some day turn the tide, any more than we rule out the possibility that the realities of the situation may finally dictate withdrawal. But whatever happens, the U.S. involvement in Vietnam reveals a series of classic military and political errors from which it may be hoped the Government will eventually profit.

First, the United States drifted into the war, initially intending only to advise. It evidently overestimated the fighting capacity of the South Vietnamese troops while underestimating the Communist Vietcong.

Second, the United States got into a war where the enemy chose the field. The field, moreover, is extremely disadvantageous for us not only in terms of terrain but of distance from our shores.

Third, it got into a war without allies, even though the interests of many nations are effected. If its allies care at all, they are

willing to let the United States do it. Its only ally, South Vietnam itself, has never given an impressive demonstration of a will to win, on the part of the people, the troops, or the successive governments.

To all this it may well be objected that the alternative was to let South Vietnam go down the Red drain, and perhaps the rest of southeast Asia with it. The objection, we think, begs the real issues:

No nation should count on military success, even limited, in the most unfavorable circumstances. No piece of territory is beyond all price, worth any cost, as the French finally discovered 10 years ago after such great cost. And the United States, for all its great power, cannot forever police the world alone and unaided.

Watershed Development in the Decade Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the 11th National Watershed Congress held recently in my home State of Arkansas, at Little Rock.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is sponsored by 17 of our leading national farm, conservation, and business organizations. It does not adopt resolutions or promote projects; it serves as a forum for the exchange of ideas and discussion of problems.

Theme of the congress this year was watershed development in the decade ahead.

Because they contain so much information that will be useful to the Members of the House, I should like to introduce in the RECORD the Watershed Congress addresses of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds of the Soil Conservation Service.

The addresses follow:

THE FIRST 10 YEARS OF PROGRESS IN DEVELOPING THE NATION'S WATERSHEDS

(Address by Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the 11th National Watershed Congress, Little Rock, Ark., April 27, 1964)

I am honored to participate in the 11th National Watershed Congress.

I feel that I have a right to welcome you to Arkansas, and to Little Rock, even though that is not my charge. For this is my home State, and this is virtually my home city. I was born not so far from here, and I own a farm near my birthplace. Although I have spent perhaps half of my professional life away from here, it was my privilege to head the Soil Conservation Service activities in this State for more than a decade, from 1946 to 1957. This is home, and it's always good to come home.

Let me, then, as a native son, add my voice to the welcome you have already received.

You honor us by your presence. And you honor me by the privilege of this platform. This is a distinguished forum, a forum of national stature and prestige. Because many great Americans and many eloquent spokesmen have preceded me to this platform in the 10 years since first you met, I approach with great humility the task of being your keynoter. This, I would have you know, is a high point in my professional career. I beg your indulgence.

My assignment is to discuss "The First 10 Years of Progress in Developing the Nation's Watersheds." This is a topic of such tremendous scope that I'm sure you understand I shall be able to hit only the highspots. Besides, I do wish to save a few minutes to comment, if I may, on the theme of this Congress, "Watershed Development—The Next Decade." For, as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "The great thing in this world is not so much where we stand as in what direction we are moving."

And across the front of one of our beautiful buildings in Washington—the National Archives—these words are inscribed: "What is past is prologue."

I submit that the applicable moral of these quotations is this: What has gone before is worth recounting and remembering not for itself but only for its contribution to the fulfillment of all our hopes and dreams for developing the Nation's watersheds.

Some historical perspective is important if we are to understand our decade of progress.

Although the Department of Agriculture was created 102 years ago, it was not until 1936 that the Congress assigned to it some responsibility in watershed work. The Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a program of "investigations of watersheds and measures for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention on watersheds."

Here, for the very first time, Agriculture was given the upstream equivalent, in principle at least, of the authorization of the Corps of Engineers for "investigations and improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes."

For Agriculture this was a "survey, report, and plan" period—not an "action" period. And, it is important to record, plans for upstream programs were essentially limited to land treatment measures and minor structures for land stabilization. This was true even when operations programs were authorized in 11 river basins comprising 31 million acres by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

When work was started in those basins in 1946, it became apparent, as had long been suspected, that the measures authorized by the survey reports would provide very limited flood protection benefits. There was strong and building desire for more positive flood protection in the small tributaries.

As a result, language was included in subsequent Department of Agriculture appropriations to authorize funds for both land treatment and complementary structural measures necessary to achieve desired levels of flood prevention in the tributary watersheds.

That is how floodwater retarding dams got into the picture in the 11 flood prevention watersheds. And it was a time for bell ringing, that day in 1948, when the very first upstream floodwater retarding dam was completed to supplement a land treatment program for flood prevention. This happened in the Cloud Creek tributary of the Washita Basin in Oklahoma.

Many of you were active participants in significant events from this point on. The broadened concept of land treatment combined with dams in the upstream watersheds received immediate and strong public support.

By 1950 more than 300 watershed associations and similar groups were seeking help in developing watershed projects for flood prevention and allied purposes.

The first bill to provide new legislation was introduced by Congressman Bob Poage of Texas in 1952. Pending legislative action, the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations included $5 million in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1954 to start a widespread pilot watershed demonstration patterned after the work being done in the subwatersheds of the 11 river basins authorized in 1944.

Legislation to implement the small watershed program permanently was in the making when your National Watershed Congress met for the first time on May 21, 1954. You and the organizations you represent had created this climate. And your efforts, with the help of others, quickly culminated in enactment of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, just a few months later that year—in August 1954.

Thus, 10 years ago the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act launched a hopeful experiment in Federal-State-local teamwork for communitywide resource conservation and development.

You as proponents of the program felt strongly that this kind of locally operated watershed program could be a key that would unlock all manner of community development opportunities.

You envisioned water as the common denominator that would bring rural and urban interests together around local conference tables. Beginning with the obvious mutual problem of flood prevention, such groups gained the experience of cooperation that enabled them to move toward solution of other problems such as supplies of water for municipal and industrial as well as for agricultural use. You saw also the opportunity to develop water for recreational and fish and wildlife developments and for a variety of other purposes meaningful in the orderly, desirable development of community resources.

This was the hoped-for goal for the watershed program at its beginning a decade ago.

I believe the program has measured up to the hopes and dreams of its proponents.

It has demonstrated its effectiveness as a tool in flood prevention, sediment reduction, erosion control, and water management.

It has helped to accelerate land treatment and has, in addition, achieved an important beginning in shifting out of crops land ill suited for cultivation.

It has demonstrated its validity as a workable mechanism of Federal-State-local partnership in resource conservation and development.

It has proved an effective means by which diverse community interests can work together toward common goals.

How well it has demonstrated these values can, in fact, be measured.

The program's popularity among local communities is evident in the large and growing backlog of applications for help.

Its acceptance as a valid and purposeful mechanism for Federal-State-local cooperation is seen in the enactment of a large number of pieces of legislation to enable local people to better participate in the program.

Its merit as a means toward multipurpose development of soil and water resources is shown by the fact that more than 40 percent of the approved watershed projects now combine watershed protection and flood prevention with other purposes such as recreation, fish and wildlife development, irrigation, drainage, and municipal water supply.

Its practical value to the States is further evidenced by the growing willingness and interest of the State governments to make substantial financial contributions to the planning process. Contributions of 25 States totaled more than $2 million in fiscal year 1964.

Part of our decade of progress can be traced to improvements in the original Public Law 566 act. These improvements represent an evolution of purpose that calls for brief review if we are to understand why we are where we are, and where we may be headed.

The first amendment to Public Law 566, embodied in Public Law 1018 enacted in 1956, was an enlightened major step for it recognized that watershed projects, like river basin developments, should be comprehensive in scope and have multiple purposes.

This amendment made it possible for projects to include works of improvement for any beneficial use physically feasible and economically justified. It removed the prohibition against the Department of Agriculture sharing in the cost of water storage for purposes other than flood prevention. It authorized dams with a total capacity of 25,000 acre-feet providing that all capacity above 5,000 acre-feet be for purposes other than floodwater detention.

The amendment recognized that more than agriculture is involved in watershed projects by providing that the Public Works Committees of Congress should approve plans that included dams having more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity. It directed the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate costs and to use direct identifiable benefits as a basis for cost-sharing for agricultural water management.

Finally, this first major amendment of 1956 recognized the need for credit by authorizing long-term loans to local organizations at a low interest rate for financing non-Federal costs.

The amendment of September 1958 (Public Law 85-865) authorized Federal financial assistance for fish and wildlife purposes.

Public Law 86-468, approved in May 1960, extended the benefits of Public Law 566 to the 11 flood prevention watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Public Law 87-170, approved in August 1961, broadened the definition of local organizations to include irrigation or reservoir companies or associations of water users not operated for profit. This made it possible to carry out with established framework projects with irrigation objectives.

That brings our legislative review to more familiar ground—familiar because it is of more recent vintage and therefore fresher in our minds. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, Public Law 87-703, approved in September 1962, broadened the watershed act in four important ways.

It added recreational development as a purpose eligible for cost-sharing, including water resource improvement, basic facilities for water-based recreation and necessary land for recreational use. It authorized the Department of Agriculture to advance funds to preserve sites. It revised the basis for cost-sharing and made it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish rates on a program rather than project basis and to follow the principles of assistance authorized under other Federal programs. Finally, the 1962 amendment extended the benefits of the Water Supply Act of 1958 to Public Law 566 so that capacity for future industrial and municipal water supply can be included in a project with repayment and interest charges deferred up to 10 years.

That rather sums up the Federal legislative evolution. It is a record we can be proud of. We have little to complain of, and much to be thankful for, when we consider the legislative tools that we have sought and have received.

During this period important legislative action was going on in the States. Between 1955 through 1963, 43 State legislatures enacted laws to expedite cooperation between State and local agencies and the Department of Agriculture in watershed project activities. In all, 285 laws were enacted in the 43 States during this period.

Federal appropriations since 1955 have shown a fairly steady rise even though they have not fully met the demand. In fiscal year 1955, the appropriation was $7.3 million. In 1959 it was $25.5 million. In 1964 it was $63.6 million.

The number of applications for watershed project assistance per year has maintained a fairly steady rate but there have been ups and downs in the watersheds authorized for planning and for operations, especially in recent years.

In fiscal year 1959, 82 projects were authorized for planning and 80 approved for operations. In 1961, 93 were authorized for planning and 48 for operations. In 1963, 121 were authorized for planning and 88 for operations. So far this fiscal year, up to April 1, 88 have been authorized for planning and 74 for operations.

The number of States appropriating funds for watershed planning increased from 9 in fiscal year 1959 to 25 this year. At the same time, the amount of non-Federal funds provided by local organizations and State governments for project planning quadrupled. This year, local and State contributions will amount to more than $2.3 million.

Nearly half of the watershed projects approved for operations thus far are in counties known to have unemployment problems and have been so designated by the Department of Commerce or Labor. Project construction work in such counties, of course, provides local employment aside from the increased employment that may result from industrial, recreational, or other products of watershed development.

A large number—233 of the 547 projects approved for operations as of April 1—are multiple-purpose projects, which serve community needs best of all. The projects combine flood prevention with one or more of the following purposes: agricultural water management, recreation, fish and wildlife, and municipal water supply.

There is increasing interest in the recreation potential of watershed projects, especially since the 1962 amendment authorizing cost sharing for this purpose.

We have given preliminary approval for 68 recreational developments in 62 projects located in 29 States. These developments involve cost sharing for added reservoir capacity, land, easements and rights-of-way, and basic facilities. The estimated total cost of recreational developments in the 68 projects amounts to more than $30 million, of which $16 million would come from State and local funds. About 4 million annual user-days are anticipated.

An analysis of the first 500 projects approved for operations shows they involve a total estimated cost of $743 million, of which approximately $441 million will be Federal costs and $301 million non-Federal. Of the $301 million non-Federal costs, about $197 million will be the costs of applying land treatment measures and the remaining $104 million will be costs for land, easements, and rights-of-way, administering contracts, and other requirements of local organizations.

We have made important advances during our decade of progress in developing the Nation's watersheds. Indeed, in some respects our progress has been remarkable. But the job ahead is a tremendous one. Indeed, we have barely made a good beginning.

The best estimate we have is that there are 1 billion acres of land and water that need and are suitable for development as watershed projects.

Local organizations through their applications for assistance indicate that they have recognized this need on less than 15 percent of this vast billion-acre chunk of America.

We have authorized planning assistance for less than 7 percent of this area. We have approved plans for and work has been started on about 3 percent of this job.

Measured only against the size of the job ahead, our decade of progress loses much of its stature. But measured by the difficulties of implementing a great new national program, what we have accomplished in 10 years stands out tall and strong as one of the great achievements in American history.

But the size of the job ahead does indicate that the job has lost none of its urgency. Indeed, the fact that it is 10 years later intensifies the urgency of the job. It is imperative that we speed up our rate of progress.

An essential ingredient is wider public awareness of the value of small watershed projects in the economic development of communities across the land—many of which are doomed to a slow but sure decline and death unless they find a way out of the morass into which they are sinking.

Ten years ago we had to talk of the advantages of watershed projects in terms of ideas and opinions, based on limited experiences. Today we don't need to rely on opinions or guess. We have facts. The program has demonstrated its worth. It has proved itself. We don't think we know what a project will do for a community. We know.

Based on solid experience we can say that the 606 projects we expect to be operating in fiscal year 1965 will help some 1,800 communities develop their land and water resources on about 36 million acres involving a population of 4.1 million people. The protection of 2.9 million acres of flood plain will pay returns estimated at $39 million annually and bring one or more new industries to some 150 communities.

Such a statement, if dinned into every ear from every housetop and courthouse and city hall in the land should be enough to gain the attention of every thoughtful citizen.

Maybe we haven't been dinning enough.

If we haven't, let's get going. For surely only through an informed public can we bring to bear all the forces required to stimulate adequate action and support at local, State, and Federal levels.

I could give you hundreds of examples, of watershed project benefits. Each of you knows of several, I'm sure.

The benefits of every project outweigh its costs. Each project is an investment that returns annual dividends of 8 percent on the average.

These are facts. We can document them.

Have the American people ever been offered a better bargain? I doubt it.

To take full advantage of this bargain, this opportunity to invest in the welfare and prosperity of several thousand American communities—and thereby in all of America—that is the challenge.

The challenge is bigger today than it was 10 years ago. For we have in motion a great program that must maintain momentum. We dare not let it slow down or stand still. As Holmes said, "The great thing in this world is not so much where we stand but in what direction we are moving."

Shall we move forward? It's up to you.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT 11TH NATIONAL WATERSHED CONGRESS, HOTEL MARION, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., APRIL 28, 1964

I have looked forward to this opportunity to join with you at your 11th National Watershed Congress, particularly because you are giving emphasis this year to the problems and prospects of watershed development in the decade ahead.

I welcome the chance to look ahead with you, for we have come to one of those rare moments in history where both this Nation and the world of nations seem to pause, to

catch the national breath, and to ask if we know where we are going.

In that wasteland of human hopes which the threat of nuclear war created, there seems today to be signs of new life. All of us, as if a terrible ordeal has passed that once took all our energy, feel the beginnings of a new era.

Eric Sevareid, a discerning and penetrating commentator of our times, wrote about it this way recently: "It is beginning to appear that history may be offering to this generation of Americans a precious gift, and that if we do not recognize and use this gift we will lay a curse on the generation to come. The gift is time."

Few of us are so expressive, so able to put these feelings into words; but all of us recognize that perhaps we do now have some time to think, to plan, to look ahead, to begin considering more fully the opportunities of civilization as well as the challenge of survival.

Let us use this gift of time well, for it will be ours to use only once.

The challenge of this opportunity will fall heavily upon you and thousands of others of us who are dedicated not only to conserving and preserving but also to using the heritage of land and water resources with which we are so abundantly blessed. It is clear that we can no longer cover the land with concrete and expect the human animal to live gracefully on it. It is clear that we can no longer despoil the water we drink and the air we breathe, and expect man to survive in good health.

And it is clear that we can no longer afford to treat as a problem the abundance which agriculture provides. It is a problem only when we fail to make use of it—only when we look to land and water as a source for food and fiber alone, ignoring other uses if not as basic yet equally important in this new world of abundance.

I think it more proper to say we have never taken the time to fully appreciate or utilize all of the multiple benefits which land and water can produce. We now may be graced with some time to look ahead and to plan—to take full advantage of resources too often thoughtlessly misused or unused in the past.

Thus, you are meeting here as an organization of organizations dedicated to the wise use of water resources—the multiple uses that water serves within a watershed—at a highly appropriate period in history. It is fortunate that 10 years ago so dedicated a group as this one began building the framework which has become the small watershed program of today. Without the support and effort which has gone into the gradual evolution of the small watershed program from a single purpose objective to a multiple number of objectives, we would be much less able today to meet the challenges of the decade ahead. For that, please accept my deepest thanks and congratulations.

As you look ahead to the responsibilities the next 10 years will bring, I want you to know that we also are looking ahead with you at the Department of Agriculture * * * and in the highest circles of the administration.

Since early in this administration we have been aware that agricultural policy—the decisions which affect how we use our soil and water resources—should be responsive not only to the farmer * * * but to all Americans whatever their occupation and wherever they live.

In 1962, President Kennedy presented a food and agriculture program for the decade of the 1960's, which recognized that the farm problem—as we popularly call the task of trying to live with abundance—has three broad dimensions.

Nonetheless, most people still treat it as though it has only one dimension—commodities.

For many years the Nation's efforts to solve agriculture's problem have focused almost exclusively on the problems of various farm commodities. Only since 1961 have we started to think more broadly in terms of the human problems of people on less than adequate farms, to think of communities which need to diversify their economic base if they are to survive, to think of the widespread cancer of poverty in rural America, to think of the growing needs of families and individuals in cities and suburbs for land and water and space where they can relax and play.

We have failed to appreciate that abundance is only a problem when we do not use it. There are no real food surpluses so long as there is hunger in this country or in the world.

We are only beginning to perceive that programs such as the food stamp program can make a nutritrous diet available to every American. We have only begun to achieve the real benefits of a sustained and energetic program of trade and aid in our relations with other nations in the world. We have only begun to understand that land and water contain great reservoirs of benefits that can satisfy other appetites than hunger.

These are all aspects of a farm program for the 1960's—and they were drawn in broad outline by President Kennedy early in 1962 when he set down a food and agriculture program for the sixties. The logic of that program is strong and true. Much of it is taking clearer shape today. President Johnson, himself a farmer and a rancher, has made it an integral part of his program and he is giving it powerful support.

It is a three-dimensional policy, which recognizes that:

1. Commodity programs—are designed for the needs of commercial family farm agriculture.

2. Community programs—can develop rural resources to enable people in the country to find work and people in the city to enjoy God's great outdoors.

3. Food programs—which serve those who use food and fiber and in so doing serve those who produce it. School lunch and food stamp programs at home and trade and aid programs abroad provide a wide avenue on which to move the abundant productivity of our farms and ranches.

I want to concentrate today on the second dimension of this multiple program, the community, because community programs are closely associated with the goals of the small watersheds—with the objectives of Public Law 566 as it has evolved.

I would mention commodity programs only briefly to make this point: The food and fiber abundance we enjoy today is the product of the American family farm system of agriculture. The family farm is the most responsive and productive system of producing food abundance the world has ever seen. Yet we need commodity programs to protect and stabilize family farm income while agriculture adjusts to the production revolution now underway. Otherwise we might destroy the very system which has made possible the abundance we are today challenged to put to constructive use.

Commodity programs are, of course, related to the goals of the small watershed program. A knowledgeable farmer will participate in the development of a watershed program to enhance income prospects from his crops. But those with an adequate farm income, protected by commodity programs, will be more likely to participate in developing wildlife habitat and other important nonagricultural benefits which can be provided through the small watershed program.

But, as the makeup of this organization shows, the small watershed program embraces a range of interests far wider than agriculture. You represent a community of interests—farm, conservation of soil, water and wildlife, forestry, industry, recreation, urban and city—all of which depend upon the resources of the watershed.

You represent the community which is one of the essential dimensions of any realistic agricultural policy—and thus the small watershed program is an essential element in the food and agricultural policy of the 1960's.

It is, in fact, one of the key programs to a better life for all Americans, from those who seek to claw their way out of poverty, to those who—more fortunately—enjoy a higher level of income and who look for ways to translate this into activities which bring a more satisfying way of life.

This is so because Public Law 566 is one of the keys to protecting and conserving on privately owned land, our water resources, the most scarce, and the most valuable natural resource we have.

Properly used, as the small watershed program makes possible, this resource serves us all in many ways. For example:

In Alabama, the Chamber County Commissioner's Court saved $28,000 within a year after three dams were completed in the High Pine Creek watershed. The savings resulted from the county being able to build smaller bridges and lower fills on roads in the protected flood plains.

In Arizona, land use changed significantly in the White Tanks watershed project. Farmers converted several thousand acres from cotton and feed crops to vegetables, citrus, and grapes, and income increased from $200 to $400 per acre. Commercial developments include a new electronics plant that will employ several thousand people and a multimillion-dollar harness raceway that includes a racetrack, hotel, restaurant, and other facilities.

Tomorrow, those of you who go on the tour of Six-Mile Creek watershed near Little Rock will see how this project revitalized the economy of the area, including the addition of three new industries.

In Colorado, the Wray watershed project sparked many new developments in the city of Wray, including $230,000 of new construction, $40,000 of improvements to old buildings, and a reduction in street maintenance costs of $5,000 per year.

In New Hampshire, a watershed project made possible construction of a $1 million shopping center that in 3 years is expected to pay to the city of Keene more in additional taxes than the city's $75,000 share of the cost of the project.

In Oregon, the Little Pudding project, although not completed, permitted normal farming operations to resume within a week last April after a 6.5-inch rainstorm. Formerly such a storm would have delayed planting 3 weeks, which would have been too late. The estimated benefit in this single instance was $250,000.

In Kentucky, the Mud River watershed project near Russellville is providing water supply, recreation, and flood prevention. Benefits to date include three new industries and expansion of a fourth and a new water supply for the city of Lewisburg. Recreation assets include: a new boatshop; 15,000 man-hours of fishing and several hundred thousand visitors annually to a 900-acre lake; sale of more than 200 lakeside building lots; construction of 50 cabins, a $45,000 sportsmen's lodge, 30 miles of public roads, a $154,000 bridge, and electric and telephone lines.

These are not handpicked, isolated cases. Similar or other benefits could be cited for every project far enough along to be effective. And they will result from every project to be carried out in the future.

The plain truth, however, is that we must do more in the next 10 years than we have in the past decade. Today, 100 watershed projects have been completed, but there are 2,100 for which applications have been made.

Nonetheless, we can all be pleased that since 1961 progress has been accelerated not only in the number of projects authorized for planning and approved for construction—which have climbed from 264 to 556—but also by broadening the scope of the whole program to become a major conservation instrument.

Prior to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Federal Government could share the cost of such activities as flood prevention, irrigation, drainage, and fish and wildlife development. The 1962 act, truly one of the significant pieces of agricultural and conservation legislation in our history, enabled the Department to share the cost for multiple-water use. We can help you acquire the necessary land rights and provide the minimum basic facilities for recreation. We can assist in developing municipal and industrial water supplies for future use, with deferred repayment; and we can advance for preserving structure sites within the watershed project.

As you know, President Johnson this year proposed that the limitation on the size of water reservoir be raised from 5,000 to 12,500 acre-feet. The growing demands for recreation and for industrial and municipal water make this a vital addition to the watershed program. We are hopeful that the Congress will soon act favorably on this request.

Thus, what began as a measure to help farmers and the local community to control flooding in upstream watersheds has grown to become a major instrument for the development of a multiple of interests. It is the major instrument for conserving water resources on the private lands of America, and nearly two-thirds of our land area is privately owned. It is the major instrument through which the local community, aware of and responsive to the needs of a changing society, can make water and land serve many interests all at the same time—recreation, industry, farm, wildlife, timber, and municipal needs.

The Congress, in the 1962 legislation, recognized that the soil and water resources in rural America would need to be developed and managed for these many purposes. It also recognized that the financial and technical resources in rural America were limited and inadequate for the task. Thus, in addition to broadening the objectives of the small watershed program, the Congress sought to recapitalize resource development in rural areas through additional programs. These generally are administered today as part of the rural areas development effort in the Department.

We can, for example, make loans to farmers and rural associations for the development of recreation, and for other action that encourages shifts in land use to more profitable outlets.

The cropland conversion program, which provides for recreation development, wildlife habitat, grazing, forests, or water storage on land now producing row crops or hay, has been successfully demonstrated in 141 pilot counties across the country.

Earlier this year I authorized planning assistance in the first 10 resource conservation and development projects in which, as you know, small watersheds play a key role. I also have authorized planning assistance in five rural renewal projects, including one here in Arkansas. These projects are designed to assist local units of government in rural areas where substantial poverty and limited opportunity exists to raise income levels by more intensive development of underused resources.

These programs will provide some of the tools which can be used to fashion broader development and use of our natural resources. This is, as each of us knows, a task of growing urgency.

The pressure on our water resources is building at a fast rate * * * and it will continue to build even faster in the future. By the year 2000, outdoor recreation demands are expected to increase by 228 percent. Industrial needs expand almost daily, and municipal needs will grow as our population and income climbs.

This pressure can be met in two ways: One is through Government programs to preserve on public lands a reasonable balance in the competition for water and land and other resources. This is what we do in multiple use management in the national forests. The other way is through the actions of private citizens acting together locally to preserve, conserve, and use these resources.

The small watershed program is a tool designed for the use of private citizens and local government. It provides a means by which the financial and technical resources of the Nation can be made available to the local community and to the individual citizen. It provides for local control and for local direction. It allows local problems to be met by those who are best able to understand and to solve them. But because it is local and decentralized, it is up to you to make it go. It is up to you to make it work so our natural resource problems can be solved before they become so burdensome that massive Central Government action becomes necessary.

This, then, is the direction and purpose of small watershed programs in the decade ahead. There is time now to consider how we can best go about developing our heritage of natural resources so that we can say to our children: "Here, we nearly lost them for you. But we learned in time. Guard them well, use them well, and they will serve you well."

But this will not happen automatically. On the contrary, great effort and large investment will be necessary. Competition for the tax dollar is more intense than ever before. Programs are being cut back, a general reevaluation and reassessment is underway, the role of Federal contributions in all areas is being carefully reviewed.

You and I know that the small watershed program qualifies as a top priority program under the most rigid set of standards that can be applied. President Johnson, long a supporter of soil and water conservation and watershed development, knows this.

But for us to know this is not enough. Others must be made to know, and to understand, and to act.

I will do my part, but only you can bring about the necessary activity and investment. For more than 10 years now your voice has been heard, and it has had impact. I challenge you today to continue to make your voice heard and your leadership felt. The time to act is here, the small watershed program has been thoroughly tested and proved. Let us now put it to work while there is still time to make possible the multiple use of water, our most precious natural resource.

A Success in the Foreign Aid Program: An Attack Against Poliomyelitis in Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, because the geography of Jordan is comprised of vast deserts and arid plateaus, two-thirds of the nation's population of 1,690,123 live a nomadic life. Of the 36,715 square miles which comprise the total land area of Jordan, only one-sixth can be considered cultivable or marginally cultivable under optimum conditions, and this includes grazing land. Yet 80 percent of the population derives its livelihood from agriculture and the marketing of agricultural products. Therefore one of the most important undertakings of the Jordanian Government has been an attempt to settle these nomadic people, thereby hoping to stabilize and develop the economy of the country. To accomplish this feat, schools and community and health centers have been established which the Bedouin may attend, in order to be assimilated into urban community living.

A group of American orthopedic surgeons, working under the aegis of Medico, visited many of these rural health centers and discovered that there was much residual paralysis in evidence throughout the country. Through their suggestions, our AID representative in Jordan proposed that a program of mass polio vaccination be undertaken. Polio statistics show that poliomyelitis has never reached epidemic proportions in Jordan. Yet the cases reported to health centers represent only a partial count of those who contracted the disease, as brought to light by the observations of the Medico team. Therefore, the King of Jordan, Hussein I, endorsed the AID proposal and allocated funds for this purpose. The United Nations Relief and Works Association and the AID contributed like amounts to defray the costs of the program.

Vaccination began on January 18 of this year. Because statistics showed that 95 percent of the cases occurred among children under 5 years of age, it was agreed that only children between the ages of 6 months and 5 years would receive the oral vaccine. Centers were established in the cities while mobile units began an intensive village-to-village tour. Appeals by the King and announcements over the radio and by loudspeaker trucks brought an overwhelming response. The first phase embraced 304,249 children and the second phase, conducted during February and March, reported the vaccination of 282,137. The third part of the polio campaign, begun only on April 4, is, as yet, untabulated.

Of the funds spent on the program to date, the AID, the Jordanian Government, and the UNRWA each contributed $35,000. In addition, the AID allocated $3,000 for the services of a U.S. Public Health Service epidemiologist to assist in formulating plans for the immunization campaign and to help administer and supervise the program.

The Jordanian Director of Public Health and the Director of Maternal and Child Health are now proposing that oral polio vaccine be given to all infants at 6 weeks of age, at the same time smallpox vaccine is administered, the latter being a compulsory requirement throughout the country. Such action would thus prevent an epidemic potential and will reduce the number of future paralytics. Planning such as this and the support given to the program by the

Jordanian Government and the Jordanian people certainly acclaims the polio immunization project to have been a "success" of our foreign aid program.

The 181st Anniversary—German Society of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the German Society of Maryland is almost as old as our Nation, having been founded in 1783 to aid German and Swiss immigrants to this country. It has been in existence continuously since that time and its program has been expanded to meet the needs of the times. It has established an outstanding record of achievements and deserves sincere congratulations on its 181st anniversary, which was observed in Baltimore on May 2.

At the anniversary dinner, a brief memorial service was held to pay tribute to Rev. Fritz O. Evers, former pastor and pastor emeritus of Zion Lutheran Church of Baltimore, and other deceased members. The speaker for that service was the mayor of Baltimore, Theodore R. McKeldin, and I would like to bring to the attention of the Members his remarks on that occasion.

REMARKS OF MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN

Nobody can really know the city of Baltimore without taking into account the strong influence upon the city's life of the German element in its population. Its diversity is fittingly symbolized by the careers of four members of this society to whose memory we pay tribute today—a theologian, a banker, a florist, and a brewmaster—Fritz O. Evers, Alfred Cross, Albert Fiedler, and Karl Kreitler. Also in our thoughts tonight, of course, are four ladies, no longer with us, unfortunately, who were members of the auxiliary—Mrs. Gretchen Lieb, Miss Marie Thies, Mrs. Frieda Arloff, and Miss Ella Schleunes. Just to name them, these departed members of the society and the ladies auxiliary, is to show how the Germanic influence has touched every aspect of the city's life.

But to gain some idea not merely of the diversity, but also of the strength of that influence, I think Pastor Evers is the best symbol. He brought to this city two elements of German culture that our scientific age has too often regarded as incompatible—its profound respect for learning, and its equally profound respect for the nonmaterial.

The dazzling achievements of German science in the last hundred years have obscured, not only here, but in Germany itself, the brilliance of the philosophy whose beginnings preceded the science and that may outlast it in the end. For as technology is the application of science, so poetry, music, and drama are the outcome of philosophy. In all these fields Germany has been preeminent. A symphony and a poem are not material things; but great ones have an immortality that, as the Roman poet Horace discovered centuries before Germany existed, is more lasting than monuments made of bronze.

It was with these things that Pastor Evers was concerned through a long and active life, two-thirds of it spent in the United States and nearly half in Baltimore. It was easy for him to transfer his political allegiance because the realm of the mind and the spirit knows no national boundaries. It wages constant war indeed, but it acknowledges no man as an enemy; its foes are ignorance, superstition, the narrow mind, and the hardened heart. Those dark forces it challenges indifferently in every inhabited corner of the globe.

Pastor Evers fought the good fight among us from 1928 to 1963, 35 years, just half the psalmist's allotted span of a man's life. Moreover, as a spiritual leader of his people, he enlisted them in the same cause. Without doubt it was largely through his influence that Baltimore Germans have been found in every movement that has had for its aim the enlightenment of the mind and the release of the generous impulses of our people—and not only enlisted in the movement, but in many cases leading it.

It is for this reason that I, who am of a different national origin and of a different religious denomination on my father's side of the same national origin on my mother's side, but a citizen of this city, consider it not only a duty, but also a high privilege to render tribute to this man. For he brought to us treasure—not such treasure as the ships of Tarshish brought King Solomon, "gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks," but the far more precious treasure of learning linked to faith, treasure that does not bulge our purses, but that vastly enriches our lives.

Stare Decisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, recently in the observance of Law Day at Halifax, Va., in the district of my colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, the address for the occasion was delivered by Justice Harry Carrico of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals.

Justice Carrico spoke on the subject of "Stare Decisis," which means to stand by decided cases in our courts and to uphold legal precedents. His speech was brilliantly thought out, a carefully worded dissertation so poignant in view of some of our court decisions in recent years that I would like to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include this address. It is as follows:

STARE DECISIS

(By Justice Harry L. Carrico)

Governor Tuck, Judge Mitchell, Chairman Booker, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be asked to have a part in this ceremony. The honor is doubled many times over by being introduced by Governor TUCK. What a tremendous contribution Halifax made to Virginia, and to the Nation, when it sent BILL TUCK to Richmond and to Washington.

I want to congratulate you upon this wonderful courtroom and this beautiful courthouse. It is a real credit to you, and to the other people of Halifax County, especially since its bench is graced, as it is, by the presence of such an able and distinguished jurist as Judge Mitchell.

It is entirely fitting that you should dedicate this courthouse on Law Day. There is no more important material accouterment in the administration of justice than a dignified courtroom, and there is no more important commemorative day in the lives of Americans than Law Day. Not just because it is a day set aside on the calendar to differentiate it from the other days of the year, but because it is a time for us to pause and quicken our appreciation for the American system of government, the American system of law, a plan of government and of justice by rule, reason, and right, rather than by fear and force.

It is an occasion for us to rekindle and reawaken our faith in the fundamental concepts upon which our law is founded.

The theme of Law Day this year is, "Law Is the Key to Order, Justice, and Freedom."

But, we cannot hope to secure order, or promote justice or aspire to be free; we cannot put this, and the other courtrooms throughout our land, to their proper usage; we cannot have Law Day have any meaning, if the key we employ to open the door to the future is a crude, untried product, whittled out of the emotional graspings of the uninformed political opportunists of our times. We can achieve the lofty ideals of which this day is symbolic only if we adhere to those principles which have made this country the finest, freest place in the world. And, we can successfully adhere to those principles only if we know and pay daily respect to a doctrine in our law which is as important to our system of justice as any other single precept. I refer to the doctrine known as stare decisis; and to those of you who are not lawyers, it is spelled s-t-a-r-e stare d-e-c-i-s-i-s decisis, stare decisis. It means to stand by decided cases, to maintain adjudications, to uphold legal precedents. It rests upon the theory that the laws by which men are governed should be fixed, definite and known; and, that when a law has been declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to have a particular construction, such construction, in the absence of palpable mistake or error, will be followed as the law until changed by competent authority.

This unwritten rule in the conduct of our judicial affairs is almost as old as our legal system itself, and arose as a matter of urgent necessity. If the laws were to be declared subject to the whims of each judge, or so as to suit the desires of a particular litigant, or to satisfy the pressures of a special group, we would soon have a confused hodgepodge, rather than a system of justice. Every judge, regardless of the high or low order of his court, should be foresworn to observe this doctrine with infinite care.

It is in the highest interests of the people that there should be stability in the laws by which they regulate their conduct. It is sound public policy that the construction of statutes and the interpretations of constitutions ought not to vary with every change in the personnel or ideas of a court. Consider, for a moment, the alternatives. We would find utter chaos in every aspect of our daily lives. What we did legally yesterday might cause us to be jailed today. The valid, binding, profitable contract we made last week might reduce us to the status of paupers tomorrow. The will we made last year, knowing certain of its validity then, might, when offered for probate, be completely void. No man would know how to conduct either his private or business life; officials would not know how to enforce the law; lawyers could not advise their clients; judges would not have the guide of judicial precedent to assist them in making decisions.

But this is not to say that when a decision is made that is admittedly wrong it must nonetheless stand forever and constantly do harm to one innocent litigant or another. The rule of stare decisis does not apply where the former decision has misunderstood or misapplied the law or is con-

trary to reason. This is because no legal principle is ever settled until it is settled right. And it may be said to be settled right when it is accepted by the people, when it is not reversed by the legislature, when it is reacknowledged by the same and by other courts, and when it is acted upon over a long period of time. But once so settled, such a decision must be accorded the greatest finality as a statement of the law. It should be binding unless and until it is changed by the people, acting through the legislature.

In no other field of law is this doctrine as important as in the field of constitutional law. It has long been a cardinal rule in dealing with constitutions that they should receive consistent and uniform interpretations so that they will not be taken to mean one thing at one time and another thing at another time, even though circumstances may have, perhaps, so changed as to make a different rule seem desirable. Admittedly, changes in times require and demand changes in laws. But it is not up to the courts to make the laws. That is solely the province of the legislature. Once the courts begin to encroach upon the field set aside to the legislature, or the executive invades the area reserved to the courts, or the legislature preempts the powers given to the executive, a decay sets in that could eventually destroy our system of government. The theory of separation of powers, a system of checks and balances, constitutes the very bedrock of our freedoms. Any variance from the delicate pattern set up by the framers of the Constitution is a forfeiture of our rights.

It has been asked, What is the Constitution but the great contract of the people, every individual thereof having sworn allegiance to it? A system of fundamental principles, a permanent and paramount law which should be faithfully and rightfully executed Like any other contract, it is not to be violated. Its violation foredooms its destruction. When the sovereign will of the people has been expressed in a written constitution, it is the duty of the courts rigidly to enforce it, and not to circumvent it because of private notions of justice or because of personal inclinations. And courts must never give way to the pressures of political expediency.

Mr. Justice Roberts, in his dissent in the case of *Smith* v. *Allwright*, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1944, dramatically held up a warning hand when he said, "The reason for my concern in that the instant decision, overruling that announced about 9 years ago, tends to bring adjudications of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket—good for this day and this train only."

Needless to say, I have made these remarks to decry the tendency of some courts to depart from this doctrine of stare decisis, this golden rule of judicial restraint. What I have said is not intended to destroy faith in our judicial system nor to serve the fruitless ends of demagoguery. I merely appeal for a return to a sense of judicial reason that has stood us in such good stead for so many years. I urge a departure from the new course apparently being followed by some courts of abandoning judicial precedent in favor of untried, unwarranted, and untested bases for decisions.

It is time for all of us to remember, as we dedicate this courthouse on this Law Day of 1964, that this country was founded upon a set of ideals and traditions of honesty and decency in government that has never before been known in history. And it is time to remind ourselves that unless we continually stay on the alert these ideals and traditions can be lost.

The courts have been, and must always be, the strongest bulwark for the preservation of these principles. No court must ever retreat from this duty. Every judge must accept the responsibility for the continuation of this heritage with humility and determination. Every lawyer and every citizen share the burden of its future existence. Because, as has been said in words more profound that I can express, "We, even here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

In the highest sense of honor, responsibility and patriotism, we dedicate this courthouse to the preservation of order, justice and freedom for the people of Halifax County. Long may it stand in their service. Thank you very much.

Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no patriotic American can help but be deeply moved by a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, May 12. All America should join with the relatives of those brave men who have died in South Vietnam in demanding of the President to know why?

I include the ad as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help in some small way to pay tribute to those fallen heroes and to remind those who may be complacent about what is happening of the failure of our foreign policy.

It seems to me that when an Administration sends American boys to fight in a war it refuses to call a war, for a purpose that it has not clearly defined, and with outmoded and inadequate weapons, the least the American people have a right to ask is, Why?

Why, Mr. President?

As our Chief Executive in time of peace and our Commander in Chief in time of war, we feel we have the right to ask again, Why?

The undersigned—parents and grandparents, wives and children, and brothers and sisters of Americans killed in Vietnam—have a question for the President of the United States and the Nation:

"Why?"

Why are the young Americans who are fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam—shoulder to shoulder with free Vietnamese soldiers—forced to withstand the onslaught of the Communist enemy without having the opportunity to attack the enemy's own territory in the North?

Why must young Americans give their lives in the jungles and the ricefields in Vietnam in the fight against a Communist enemy when the Government of the United States authorizes trade with Communist countries—trade, which is utilized to strengthen Communist power in Vietnam and throughout the world?

Why must our young men die in far-off Vietnam, fighting the Communist enemy, when their Government authorizes "cultural" exchanges with the Communist world—the exchange of ballet dancers to entertain Communist leaders in Moscow while a young American does the dance of death in Vietnam?

Why must we repeat the tragic error of Korea—where 54,246 Americans gave up their lives in a war that we had no intention of winning? Must the same number be sacrificed for the same empty reasons in Vietnam?

Why do we fight communism with one hand—at a terrible cost of our loved ones—and help communism with the other hand? If international communism is the enemy of our Nation, then we must fight. If it is not, then let's bring our young men home—from throughout the world—and submit to international communism's ambition to control the world. We can't have it both ways—it must be one way or the other.

These are only some of the questions that we have—and these questions demand an answer in the name of our national conscience and honor. The men whom we lost were precious to us—our sons and brothers, our husbands and the fathers of our children. They died in the service of their Nation. That they died in vain would be a national crime.

We call on you, Mr. President—and on the Nation—to see to it that the sacrifice of those whom we loved shall not have been for naught. And the only way to make their sacrifice meaningful is to rededicate ourselves to the eternal struggle for freedom against all who would threaten it. If we do not, then the empty sacrifices will continue until our final defeat at the hands of an enemy who has a plan and is willing to implement it in every way.

When freedom is under armed attack—as it is in Vietnam—we must fight back with everything we have. We must destroy the enemies of freedom wherever they are—and not stop at some artificial border created by diplomats in a far-off country who possibly have never known the pain of battle or the loss of a son or a husband.

To make the supreme sacrifice in a war that cannot be won is too great a sacrifice to ask anyone. If we are to battle, let's battle to win.

If we are not to do this, Mr. President, please tell us:

Why?

AMERICANS WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM FROM JANUARY 1961 THROUGH MARCH 1964

(This list has been made available by the Public Affairs Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. We believe that this list is not complete and that many more Americans have been killed by Communist bullets in Vietnam than has been reported by the Department of Defense.)

Capt. James H. Allred.
Sp5c. Marshall Angell.
Capt. John P. Bartley.
Lt. Arthur Bedal.
Capt. Robert D. Bennett.
Capt. Thomas J. Bergin.
Capt. Herbert W. Booth, Jr.
Sp4c. Donald L. Braman.
Sgt. Verndean A. Brockman.
Capt. James H. Brodt.
Capt. Gordon R. Brown.
Lt. Louis S. Carricarte.
Pfc. Loye T. Christman.
Capt. Howard R. Cody.
Capt. Terry D. Cordell.
Lt. Parker D. Cramer.
Lt. Edward B. Cribb.
Capt. Jerry A. Campaigne.
Cpl. Donald F. Davidson.
Sp4c. James T. Davis.
Sgt. William L. Deal.
Manuel Reyes Denton, USN.
Sgt. Wilbur T. Dunlap.
Capt. Howard M. Eakin, Jr.
Sgt. James A. Ellis.
Sp5c. Richard L. K. Ellis.
Pfc. Jean Claude Esnault.
Sgt. William Joseph Everhart.
Lt. Clayton A. Fannin.

Pfc. Peter M. Feierabend.
Lt. Bruce Charles Ferrell.
Lt. Charles M. Fitts.
Capt. Woodrow M. Fitzgerald.
Sp4c. William Edward Flowers.
Pfc. Raymond P. Flynn.
Sgt. Richard L. Fox.
Sgt. Rube A. Freeman.
Sp5c. James Gabriel.
Sgt. Robert L. Gardner.
Lt. Roger E. Gauvin.
Sp4c. Arthur W. Glover.
CWO Joseph Goldberg.
Capt. Kenneth N. Good.
Sgt. Jack D. Goodman.
Sp5c. Harold L. Guthrie.
Capt. Lawrence E. Hackley.
Sgt. Robert J. Hain.
CWO Lawrence D. Hammond.
Capt. Herbert F. Hardy.
Capt. William T. Harris.
Lt. Charles M. Hasper.
Col. Thomas M. Hergert.
Capt. Vincent J. Hickman.
Pfc. Frank J. Holguin.
WO Charles E. Holloway.
CWO William H. House.
CWO James H. Ishihara.
Lt. Richard E. Jaeck.
Sgt. Larry D. Jameson.
Capt. Charles B. Johnson.
Capt. James H. Johnson.
Capt. Donald E. Koelper.
Capt. Leon J. Kramer.
Sp5c. James E. Lane.
Lt. Timothy M. Lang.
Sgt. Charles B. Lankford.
Pfc. Boyce E. Lawson.
Sgt. Johnnie G. Lee.
Lt. Daniel K. Lessig.
Lt. Atis K. Lielmanis.
Pfc. Terrance Lovenguth.
Capt. Bernard F. Lukasik.
Sp. James D. McAndrew.
Sgt. Claude W. McBride.
Capt. Thomas W. McCarthy.
Capt. Walter R. McCarthy.
Pvt. Charles W. McCary.
Capt. John H. McClean.
Pfc. Garry C. McFetridge.
Capt. Donald V. McGregor.
Pfc. Neil K. MacIver.
Sgt. Wayne E. Marchand.
Sp4c. Michael P. P. Martin, Jr.
Lt. Bryford G. Metoyer.
Capt. Andrew C. Mitchell III.
Maj. Carl B. Mitchell.
Capt. Clarence L. Moorer.
Sgt. Walter K. Morris.
Capt. Robert K. Mosier.
Pfc. Newman R. Nesmith.
Capt. Ted P. Neura.
Pfc. Grover K. Olson.
Maj. James R. O'Neill.
Capt. Lloyd A. Payne.
Sp5c. William A. Reid.
Claude Rice, USN.
Lt. Arthur G. Richardson.
Cpl. Luther E. Ritchey, Jr.
Lt. Lynn H. Rothenbuhler.
Lt. Uwe-Thorsten Schobeler.
Lt. Edwin G. Shank, Jr.
Lt. Kenneth A. Shannon.
Capt. John R. Shaughnessy, Jr.
Pfc. John F. Shea.
Capt. Robert L. Simpson.
Lt. Paul R. Smith.
Lt. Lewis L. Stone.
Pfc. John L. Straley.
Pfc. Donald R. Taylor.
Sgt. Robert L. Taylor.
Lt. Col. Anthony J. Tencza.
Capt. Condon H. Terry.
Sp. David Thompson.
Capt. Donald B. Toth.
Sp. Chester Townsend.
Lt. William F. Train, III.
Lt. William B. Tully.
Cpl. Charles P. Tuthill.
Sp5c. Carleton W. Upton.
Capt. Dean A. Wadsworth.
Capt. James E. Wenzel.
CWO Charles F. Whitehead, Jr.
CWO Raymond C. Wilde.
Lt. Ronny L. Woodmansee.
Sp5c. Wally M. Wright, Jr.
Capt. Don J. York.

(The following is a list of relatives of Vietnam war dead who have joined in signing this open letter:)

Mrs. Norma Areyo.
Mrs. K. Boekelor.
Mr. Eugene W. Brockman.
Mr. Melvin V. Brockman.
Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur A. Brockman.
Mr. and Mrs. Chester Brodt.
Mrs. Henry Brodt.
Mrs. James H. Brodt.
Catherine Brodt.
Leslie Ann Brodt.
Mrs. Dalton Brubaker.
Mr. Albert C. Carricarte.
Mr. Albert L. Carricarte.
Mr. Edward C. Carricarte.
Mr. and Mrs. H. R. Cody.
Karen Cody.
Mrs. Myrna W. Cody.
Randy Cody.
Rhonda Cody.
Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Cordell.
Mr. James Arthur Cordell.
Mrs. Elizabeth Cucurullo.
Arleen S. Denton.
Barbara Ann S. Denton.
Mrs. Esmeralda Sanchez Denton.
Sandra S. Denton.
Mr. Dale B. Dunlap.
Mr. Earl H. Dunlap.
Mr. Malcolm Dunlap, Jr.
Mrs. Beulah Mae Ehlers.
Mr. and Mrs. Gaston B. Esnault.
Mr. and Mrs. August K. Feierabend.
Mr. Helmut G. Feierabend.
Mrs. Virginia Halling.
Miss Anita L. Holguin.
Miss Irene Holguin.
Mr. and Mrs. Modesto Holguin, Sr.
Mr. Modesto Holguin, Jr.
Mrs. Charles E. Holloway.
Carol Holloway.
Charles R. Holloway.
Christine Holloway.
David Holloway.
Gwendolyn Holloway.
Mrs. Glenna Hubbard.
Mr. Elmer W. Jaeck.
Mr. Donald Jameson.
Mrs. Mamie E. Jameson.
Mrs. Dimple McCary Jones.
Mrs. Helen Kramer.
Mrs. Hazel M. Lane.
Mrs. Jo Ann Lane.
Cindy S. Lankford.
Mrs. Deanna H. Lankford.
Mark C. Lankford.
Michael R. Lankford.
Imelda Lawson.
Mrs. Mary Lawson.
Mrs. Patricia R. Lawson.
Mr. Roger Dale Lawson.
Charles S. Tuthill.
Mrs. Elizabeth A. McCarthy.
Mr. Bonnie O. McCary.
Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm C. McCary.
Mr. and Mrs. Clayton McFetridge.
Mr. Danny Ray McFetridge.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert McKee.
Mrs. Darla J. Martin.
Timothy Martin.
Michael Martin.
Mrs. Janet O'Donnell.
Mrs. Caroline V. O'Neill.
Mrs. Theresa Ruiz.
Mrs. Connie A. Shank.
Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Shank, Sr.
Mrs. Kenneth A. Shannon.
Mr. and Mrs. Laron D. Shannon, Jr.
Laron D. Shannon, III.
Laura D. Shannon.
Mrs. Lois K. Tuthill.
Miss Deborah T. Tuthill.
Mr. Bradley Upton.
Mrs. Linda G. Upton.
Mrs. Dorothy Wear.
Mrs. Christiane M-G Whitman.
Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Williams.
Mrs. Edeltraut G. Younk.

(The funds for this advertisement have been provided by a group of Americans in memory of the gallant young Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam against the Communist enemy and in the prayerful hope that their lives have not been given in vain.)

Brainwashing the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is still some loose talk about how hate killed President Kennedy. It should be clear to all those who want to be familiar with the facts that a dedicated Communist killed our President.

David Lawrence, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, discusses President Johnson's disregard of the facts in the following article:

JOHNSON'S TALK ON ASSASSINATION—STATEMENT THAT HATE AND BIGOTRY LED TO KENNEDY'S DEATH IS QUESTIONED

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson made a strange speech a few days ago which surprised many people throughout the country. He attributed the assassination of his predecessor to hate and fear and bigotry. This is something which is too much at variance with the facts published thus far concerning Lee Harvey Oswald, the accused assassin, that it has caused wonder whether Mr. Johnson's address was prompted by an overemotional speechwriter or whether he himself has concluded that the assassination was produced by the alleged hate doctrines of some of the people who were opposed to Mr. Kennedy.

Speaking last Saturday at the dedication of the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center in New York, President Johnson said in part:

"John F. Kennedy was the victim of the hate that was a part of our country. It is a disease that occupies the minds of the few, but brings danger to the many.

"If we had more centers like this, if we had done our job a litle better and we had feared a little less and our hatred had been minimized and our bigotry driven underground—John Fitzgerald Kennedy would be here with us today as our 35th President. He gave his life for his country. He need not have given it except for those who hate and those who fear and those who frighten easily and those who feel insecure."

When the late President was assassinated, there were many people who attributed the murder to the hate wave in America. Almost immediately after the news was flashed across the country, there were numerous comments from Washington and elsewhere which blamed the fact on bigots and extremists. Chief Justice Earl Warren, for instance, said the assassination was "a result of the hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our Nation by bigots."

The inference at the time was that some kind of right wing activity had motivated the assassination. But it was soon dis-

covered that Oswald had spent considerable time in Russia and was a believer in Marxist philosophy. He could have disliked Mr. Kennedy because he felt the President's views were not pro-Communist or pro-Marxist or pro-leftist. But almost every piece of evidence that has been made public since indicates that Oswald had a deranged mind and that his aberration started in his youth. His erratic behavior was noticeable in the years immediately preceding the episode at Dallas. The conclusion of persons familiar with psychiatric problems has been that Oswald, for whom guns and target practice had a fascination, decided to take some shots at the President's automobile.

But is a disturbed mind which goes to such an extreme really related in any way to public questions or to the prejudices that are commonly associated with the pros and cons of public policy? Could Oswald's action have been prevented if there had been less "bigotry" in the United States, and is it conceivable that, even if there were more centers like the Kennedy Cultural Center, John Fitzgerald Kennedy would be here with us today?

Medical history shows that, irrespective of the ideology of any country, there are deranged minds which are responsible for the commission of crimes that are inexplicable on any rational or logical basis. Scarcely a day goes by that the newspapers do not report brutal and senseless killings of young children or aged persons, or attacks on women in their homes or on the streets, committed by individuals who do not even know their victims but are governed by some deep emotional urge that is a form of insanity.

Until now it had been widely assumed that Oswald was insane and that his crime was that of a demented individual. The theory that it could somehow be associated with hate or prejudices or "bigotry" in the land had been pretty well dispelled. But President Johnson's remarks raise the question as to just why, after a lapse of several months, Mr. Johnson chose to revive the theory. Could it be that the Warren Commission has divulged to the President some information that has not yet been made available to the public at large? Authoritative sources deny this assumption.

The whole thing has an air of mystery, because on its face it just doesn't seem consistent with Mr. Johnson's approach in the past. While he has condemned the action of the assassin and has also condemned "bigotry" and hatred and all similar emotions that are to be found in a vast population, he never before has attributed the crime directly to the inspiration of the "hate" groups or a "hate psychology."

Greetings to Bulgarian National Front of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in extending my cordial greetings to the Eighth Annual Convention of Bulgarian National Front of America, I am well aware of the fine and patriotic public service this organization is rendering to the righteous cause of the Bulgarian people. The sturdy and stouthearted Bulgarian people certainly deserved and were fully entitled to their freedom. But instead of regaining their freedom from the U.S.S.R., they have been suffering under U.S.S.R. Communist totalitarian tyranny since the end of that war. This tyrannical regime was imposed upon them by the Kremlin, and it is sustained by the brute force of the Soviet Union. The Bulgarian National Front of America, as the largest and the most effectively working organization among Americans of Bulgarian descent, is serving a noble cause in acquainting the public of this great Republic of the inherent inhumanity of communism in Bulgaria. Wishing you a successful convention, I hope for the betterment of the lot of the Bulgarian people.

The Dartmouth College Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point on a commendable program being undertaken by Dartmouth College students. The article from the May issue of the Dartmouth Alumni magazine describes how the students set up their own peace corps, through the initiative of one student who 2 years ago, became inspired by the need for a small school in a remote Mexican village. The boy's enthusiasm and stories of his summer experience stimulated the interest of the campus and subsequently the Dartmouth project was born. Each student who participates in the program is responsible for financing his own way—more often on a shoestring budget—as well as helps to raise money for the purchase of building supplies. This year their target is the completion of a nursery school in a Mexico City slum. Dartmount College must feel quite proud of their 15-man team.

The article follows:

FIFTEEN DARTMOUTH STUDENTS SET UP THEIR OWN PEACE CORPS

Mexico, if we are to believe travel folders, is a land too exciting, too beautiful to miss. Her Aztec lore, her matchless scenery, the ingenuous charm of her people, all these and more entice the most seasoned of tourists.

For a special group of Dartmouth students this summer Mexico does indeed beckon, but for reasons you won't find in a travel brochure. This is the age of the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress. Their spirit of generosity and responsibility has ignited the idealism latent in many young people. And this summer will prove just how practical and down to earth are the good intentions of the 15 students who form the Dartmouth project in Mexico.

It all began 2 years ago when Paul O'Connell, then a sophomore, from Worcester, Mass., joined a group of Yale students in building a small school in a remote village many miles from the capital. His enthusiasm, born of this experience, ignited the imaginations of two more students the following summer. Ted Howard, 1964, and Dick Corkey, 1956, spent their vacations working alongside the "Yalies" in the old city of Puebla. They lived in the homes of Mexican families, shared their food and their evening recreation, met with the young people of the neighborhood during after-work hours, listened, observed, and learned.

Corkey and Howard are not without their Dartmouth pride. Why couldn't there be a project organized and executed by Dartmouth students alone? On one of their rare excursions into Mexico City, they heard about, and subsequently met, a group of Jesuit fathers whose plans for aiding the people of a large slum area interested them. In the Tacuba section of Mexico City there is need of a social-service complex which would include a work center, a school and nursery, recreational facilities, and, hopefully, a clinic. In the case of most families of the area, both parents are forced to work; the hours are long, the jobs unskilled, the pay substandard. The resulting deprivations for the children are serious.

What, our two young men asked, could a dozen or more Dartmouth students do to help? The answer was immediate: build the nursery school. The architect and an engineer would supervise, the fathers of the children who would be educated there would work on the project in their spare time, no one would be paid for his labor, but the school could be ready for the fall of 1964. There was one more thing: would the Dartmouth students be able to raise enough money for the purchase of bricks, mortar, and tile? Ted and Dick winced. How much? Two thousand dollars. After a brief consideration, the uncertain reply was: we'll do our best.

Returning to college last fall, the two students approached the officers of Aquinas House, the Catholic Student Center on the campus. Peter Steck 1964, the president, and his fellow officers readily agreed to sponsor and publicize the project. Using the chapel pulpit, the campus news media, and the art of conversation, the word went forth and, before long, meetings were inaugurated and plans took shape. Fifteen students caught fire and now set about to prepare for the venture. First of all, there was the problem of language. Without some knowledge of Spanish, communication would be halting and awkward, and this whole experiment in sharing would be crippled. Professor Francisco Ugarte of the Dartmouth faculty offered his services and Monday evening classes began. The professor became especially helpful in another way: orienting the students' minds to Mexican psychology, to the customs, culture, and politics of the country.

The members of this project, "Dartmouth in Mexico," will live in ordinary Mexican homes, sharing meals and evening hours with their hosts. Extended conversations with the university students of the city will be possible, too. Mexico's national elections take place this summer and Latin American politics contrast fascinatingly with our own. Life should not be dull.

Financially, it will be a shoe-string operation for most of the students. Not only is each man sacrificing the earnings of summer employment, but he must draw from his savings for travel and living expenses. The Tucker Foundation, under Dean Unsworth, has thought well enough of the project to aid two students who otherwise could not afford to go. Aquinas House will make a contribution of $300; this is money that was to be spent on hired work around the Catholic Center but which now will be done by the students themselves.

While it is true that the Tacuba project is under the direction of the Jesuits, and that the Dartmouth men center their campus operations at Aquinas House, membership in the group includes students of varying re-

ligious faiths. The Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress, the work of the United Nations, and the social encyclicals of Pope John, not to mention the college's unequivocal suport for international projects and studies, have achieved by their unwitting conspiracy, more than one concrete result on the Dartmouth campus. This "sojourn in Mexico" is a good example.

Profile of Samuel F. Pryor, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD an article from the Hartford Times of April 28, 1964. The article is written by Bill Ryan, a very able newspaperman, and is a profile of Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., executive vice president of Pan American World Airways.

In his article, the author describes among other things the doll museum on Mr. Pryor's farm near Greenwich, Conn., which I had the pleasure of visiting last year with my two younger daughters. It was a most interesting visit and the children still talk of the many dolls from foreign lands they saw at the museum. I believe this article gives an excellent account of Mr. Pryor as business executive, civic leader, traveler and host, which many of my colleagues will be interested to read.

FLYING EXECUTIVE REAPS INTERNATIONAL FRIENDS

(By Bill Ryan)

Samuel Frazier Pryor, Jr., is a traveling man.

He flies overseas with the nonchalance of a commuter catching the morning train to the city. But, unlike most commuters, he loves to travel.

He seems to approach the globe with the idea there may be some corner—somewhere—he should visit because surely there will be interesting things and people to see there.

Mr. Pryor is executive vice president of Pan American World Airways and for the past quarter century there is no place where the giant planes fly that Mr. Pryor has not also gone.

At present he averages about 2,000 miles a week in the air. Add it up at the end of the year and is roughly figures about five times around earth. He shrugs at such figures. The world is a small place to Mr. Pryor. The day of the jet is long here and Pan-Am is among the commercial airlines looking ahead already to supersonic speeds. "You'll be able to have breakfast in New York, go around the world and be back in New York for supper," he said.

That's almost frightening," one of his house guests for the weekend said. "Naw," said Mr. Pryor. Tremendous speeds and great airliners mean that more people from all over the world get to know one another better and he likes that idea.

HOME ON FARM

For the moment, however, the traveling man was on the ground for a few days. He and his wife had visited nine countries in Africa a few weeks before. In a few days he was scheduled to go to Germany. But for the weekend he was home and this is how he likes it.

Home to Sam Pryor and his wife of more than 37 years is a 4-acre farm in Greenwich. It is in the Field Point Park section, one of the most exclusive sections of the city. It is an unlikely place for a farm, but it is indeed a farm.

Up until 5 years ago the Pryors lived in a 33-room English-style home nearby, looking down at Long Island Sound. But their five children were grown and Sam Pryor had always had his eye on the farm.

The farm includes a 1792 house, magnificently restored, a two-story building that once housed chickens but which has been converted into a guest house, a barn that has served as a garage for several decades and in which were two old electric cars Mr. Pryor inherited when he bought the house, and a gigantic barn that may have been the real reason he wanted the farm in the first place.

The great barn stands unpainted in its rural majesty. It looks from the outside as it looked when it was built more than a century and a half ago except it has weathered and taken on the dignity of age.

The interior of the great barn, however, is different from any barn in the world. It is a huge dollhouse.

DOLL COLLECTION

Sam Pryor, the tough businessman who is the executive head of one of the world's few successful airlines—"We work at it"—has the biggest and most varied doll collection in the world.

The collection started years ago when Mr. Pryor, as a favor to a woman at Pan Am, would pick up a doll or two on his travels around the world. The dolls went into the woman's collection. Someday, I'm going to leave them all to you," she told him once, and he didn't pay much attention.

But, indeed, she did leave him the collection in her will. Suddenly he had 300 dolls. And Sam Pryor, who never does anything halfway, was embarked on his most ambitious hobby.

He decided to show that a collection of dolls could reflect the customs, and a great deal of the history, of the world.

He started to acquire more dolls on his travels, seeking them out in native markets, telling friends of his quest. He also bought up a few existing collections.

Five years ago when the Pryors moved into their farm he had the great barn heated, a tile floor installed and he moved his collection inside. It has been growing since. Now he has nearly 8,000 dolls, ranging from little stone dolls that predate Christ to today's Barbi and Ken dolls.

He has dolls of all ages and countries. German dolls of the last century even today seems like mechanical marvels. African dolls are fine primtiive art in their own way.

FORTUNETELLER

"You can read a lot of history in here," said Pryor and it was true. This was Saturday and he was showing off his dolls. He stopped before one. She was a dainty French doll of a bygone age, with a long skirt that was composed of dozens of strips of material.

Fortune telling was banned in France at certain periods and this is a fortunetelling doll, he said. "The fortunetellers couldn't work in the open so they did it with the skirt. A person who wanted his fortune told picked one of the strips of material and each strip represented a different fortune."

He passed along a glass case and halted before a carved ivory reclining nude about 10 inches long of a Chinese woman. It was a piece of art. "This is a Chinese doctor's doll," he said. It once belonged to a highborn Chinese woman. A Chinese woman would never disrobe in front of a doctor. She would point on her doll where she was in pain and her maid would take the doll to the doctor, point out the location of the pain and the physician would prescribe from the doll.

In addition to the doll collection, housed on the main floor and two balconies, the barn also contains Pryor's collection of letters marking inaugural flights of Pan Am planes around the world, a penny-bank collection, a 17th century bedroom, a room that contains early American furniture and a section where Sam Pryor holds his barbecues.

FOR FRIENDS

A friend of Pryor remarked that the airline official has perhaps the largest circle of international friends in the world—and a lot of them when they come to the United States arrive for the weekend at the Pryor farm in Greenwich.

Pryor thinks this is way to be host to friends from other countries. "You know," he said, "people invite guests and they take them to a New York show and out to dinner and what they would much rather do is visit your home. So we ask them here."

The guests on a weekend might include people from countries as far apart as Australia and Ghana. As host Pryor introduces them to the all-American barbecued steak, cooked in a giant fireplace in the doll's house.

Mrs. Pryor makes a salad. She is a tall, soft-spoken woman who mixes in well. She expresses constant admiration for her husband's work on the steaks. "I don't know if he could cook himself a meal but he does good work on the barbecue. He goes around talking to people and you think that the steak is going to be all burned up but he comes back at the right time and it's always good." It was.

The guests at the Pryors on this particular weekend were typical. They included Baron Silvercruys, the former Ambassador to the United States from Belgium and his wife; Mrs. Silvercruys' daughter, whose father was the late Senator Brian McMahon; a director of Pan-Am and his Hawaiian wife and their adopted 10-year-old daughter who is from Thailand; a secretary from Pan-Am in Washington who wanted to see the doll collection and a Japanese girl who was not really a guest because she has been living with the Pryors. Her mother runs a doll school in Japan—where students come to learn to make the stylized Japanese dolls—and she is learning to speak English at the Pryors and helping with the dollhouse.

Sam Pryor mixes well with people of all financial levels and backgrounds. He believes—and often expresses it—that you can't do much in international understanding unless you know the people of the world.

SPEECH CRITICIZED

Someone brought up a recent speech in Washington and Pryor said he disagreed with it because the Senator who had made the speech wasn't familiar with the situation abroad. Someone else said it was difficult for Government officials to get abroad much because of pressure of business in Washington. Pryor disagreed with this also.

"It doesn't take that long. You can fly over in a matter of hours, see these people, find out what they think. You can't make decisions unless you see things firsthand."

In addition to seeing things firsthand around the world, Sam Pryor is a man of many other facets. He is making a collection—live—of the birds of the world. One of his pet projects is the Boys Club of America. This led him into a study of narcotics, which he considers the most particular menace to youth.

When Pryor gets involved in something, he gets involved totally. In the case of narcotics he is an adviser to the U.S. Treatury Department, and, because of his international knowledge, the Department used him in undercover work at one time. "Then I became

too well known. I still go on raids once in a while, to take a look at some of these tough guys who peddle dope to kids."

During World War II Pryor set up a network of 50 airbases so that bombers could hit at the Axis and Japanese forces. He received the Medal for Merit from President Truman. He is modest about the medal. "I told them Juan Trippe (the president of Pan-Am) deserved it. He foresaw the need. I just carried out his plan."

He is an Episcopalian but is a knight commander of the Order of St. Sylvester, presented by the late Pope Pius XII. He may be the only Protestant in the world to be a member of the papal household, to which he is entitled as a member of the order. "I helped the Pope in the fight against communism," he says simply.

CLOWNISH GOP

For many years he was a Republican national committeeman from Connecticut and was a prime mover in Wendell Willkie's decision to run against Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1940. He's out of politics now and says he's disgusted with the Republican situation in the State. "They're clownish. It's a mess. All the factions, and everyone jockeying for power."

At 64, Sam Pryor still has a full head of hair. He's a grandfather a dozen times over and he and his wife talk of their children with pride. The children are furthering the "one world" idea that the father carries out in his work and with his dolls.

One son is a lawyer in New York who is shortly going to Paris. Another is a newspaperman in Louisville, Ky. A third son, and one of the daughters, run a marineland enterprise in Hawaii. The fifth child is Mrs. Lowell Thomas, Jr., who lives in Alaska and barely escaped death with her two children in the earthquake there. Her story will appear in the July issue of National Geographic magazine.

The Pryors get to see their children around the world, because they get around the world a bit.

Where do they vacation, if they vacation? They go to Hawaii, to the island of Maui where they have a hundred acre ranch.

And even on Maui, Sam Pryor found a project. On his land he discovered an old church, built by Connecticut missionaries in 1840. He's had it completely restored, this old symbol of Connecticut in Hawaii.

When the Pryors go to Maui, they go for a few days at a time, "Never more than a week."

There are a lot of other places in the world to visit, and revisit if you're a traveling man. And Sam Pryor, he's a traveling man.

Postmaster General Gronouski's Tribute to Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, more than 115,000 Americans of Polish descent had the great pleasure on May 3 to heart Postmaster General John A. Gronouski deliver a stirring tribute to Polish Constitution Day in Chicago.

Mr. Gronouski was the principal speaker at the annual observance of Polish Constitution Day in Chicago's Humboldt Park.

I am very happy to include for the attention of my colleagues Mr. Gronouski's stirring address which was interrupted time and again by thunderous applause of approval from this massive audience.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the huge welcome which Postmaster General Gronouski received certainly reflects the high regard that the people of Chicago have for him and those principles of democracy for which he and the administration he serves stands for.

I was particularly impressed with the tremendous ovation generated by this huge throng when Postmaster Gronouski paid tribute to President Johnson for his untiring efforts on behalf of America and the survival of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Gronouski's address delivered in Chicago on May 3, 1964, follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE 173D ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, HUMBOLDT PARK, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 3, 1964

Dear Polonia (dear friends), I welcome you here today on the 3d of May—the celebration of the greatest Polish national holiday.

I am pleased that I can welcome you in the Polish language. Since I only recently began to learn it, my Polish is weak, but as the proverb says, "It is better late than never."

In any case, at the beginning of my speech I would like to raise a cry which has been raised every year by millions of Poles:

Long live the 3d of May.

Long live the Constitution of the 3d of May.

(The above is a translation of Mr. Gronouski's introductory remarks in Polish.)

This is the proudest moment of my life: to stand here, where only a year ago a man stood who is now the President of the United States; to come before you as the first American of Polish descent ever to sit in a President's Cabinet.

It is not a personal triumph for me that this should be so. It is the triumph of America. And next month, when I visit the homeland of my grandparents as President Johnson's representative at the Poznan Fair, the memory of this great observance here today will be clearly in mind. I will never forget this day.

For nearly 200 years—since the Declaration of Independence put forth the revolutionary concept that all men are created equal—the United States has occupied a unique position in the minds of people throughout the world. Here there was sanctuary for the oppressed. Here there was oppotunity for the poor. And here there was inspiration for others who dared to dream of freedom in their own lands. The upstart Nation that cared about the individual.

We have not been perfect. We exploited our minority groups. We had to fight a bloody civil war to free the slaves. We denied full citizenship to those slaves even after they were freed. But in spite of it all, our movement has always been forward. Slavery was abolished. Citizenship is becoming a reality to all Americans. And the grandson of an Irish immigrant was elected President of the United States.

And that, ultimately, is the meaning of my appointment as Postmaster General. The Polish people here in the United States have known their share of intolerance, deprivation, and frustration. But they have overcome them all. They have worked long, hard, and honestly. They have died on our battlefields. They have contributed to our industrial might and to our arts and letters. And the tradition of freedom and opportunity has triumphed once again.

On this, the 3d day of May 1964, we are solemnly reminded that it might also have been thus in the land of our ancestors.

One hundred and seventy-three years ago today, the patriots of Poland adopted a constitution that stirred the hopes of the Polish people.

It is no accident that this great Polish document was written only 4 years after the American Constitution, or that they were so similar in content and spirit.

The same spark of freedom that ignited into the American Revolution burned no less brightly in the hearts of the Polish people. Our Revolution was theirs, and to these shores came two of the greatest champions of liberty the world has ever known—Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Pulaski expressed it far better than I when he declared: "Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair." He gave his life in witness of that conviction.

The rest is history: a triumph for America * * * tragedy for Poland. Today, after nearly two centuries of struggle, of invasion, of foreign domination, of partition—and always of bravery—the Polish people still are striving for national independence and the rights of free people. The spark of freedom has never been extinguished.

What can we say to these brave men and women who yearn to be free and independent? What can we tall them to give them faith?

We can tell them they will be free because freedom is the wave of the future.

We can respond to the progress that they have already made, by giving all the support that lies in our power. As Poland, both domestically and in its foreign policy, pursues a more independent course of action; as it takes more account of its own national interest and the needs of its people; as it gives evidence of its desire for better relations with us, we are not hesitant in reaching out our hand in encouragement. Our present policy of trade and of exchanges in every field is intended to do just that.

We can let them see that the United States of America has faith in itself and, having that faith, will help spread freedom throughout the world—by example, by competition, and by unyielding determination.

But it will not be the America of the John Birch Society that will spread freedom throughout the world. Nor will it be the America of racial intolerance; or the America of discriminatory immigration policies; or the America that would disregard the needs of its own citizens.

It will be the America that still cares about people—whoever they are, or wherever they may be. It will be the America that still makes it possible for someone from lowly economic beginnings to break through his particular barriers and fulfill his potential.

I suppose if there is one program that has more of my heart in it—and should have more of your hearts in it—it is the war that is being waged today by President Johnson to drive the last vestiges of poverty from the United States.

It is a program more important than many Americans realize.

When I was teaching school at Wayne University just a few years ago, many of my students who came from fairly prosperous homes, couldn't understand what I was talking about when I discussed the great depression of the 1930's.

And so it is with today's poverty. It's easy to talk intellectually about it. It's easy to look at a page of statistics and see that 35 million Americans are living on incomes of less than $3,000 a year—without our understanding what it means; without understanding that these people are trying to raise a family in one room and struggling to buy coal in the winter to keep that room

warm. It's easy to look at these statistics from our well-heated homes as we have sirloin steak for dinner. It's easy to say, "Isn't that too bad?" and forget about it because it is so unreal to the life we see around us.

But I know from personal experience what poverty is all about. I know there are 35 million people—35 years after the great depression—who are living the great depression.

We are not talking about statistics; we are talking about people. And I do not have to read statistics to know how these people feel. And neither do many of you. We are talking about people who are today going through the same heartrending experience that my mother and father went through back in the 1930's.

I remember those days only too well—when my father was lucky if he was making $15 or $20 a week; when during the winter we found it necessary to close off most of the house and spend our time in the kitchen because we didn't have enough coal to heat the whole house; when I went to the fifth grade with a dozen patches in my pants because we didn't have the price of a new pair of pants; when I used up cardboard by the bale all through the winter months to make inner soles for my shoes because there were big holes in them and we couldn't afford to get them repaired.

I remember when my father became a traveling merchant and went on the road with $7 worth of merchandise—aspirin and razor blades—to carve out a living for his family. And on many a Saturday night we waited for that special delivery letter to have $10 in it before we knew whether we would have a dinner on Sunday. It sometimes didn't come.

And it may sound silly in this day of so-called affluence, but it won't sound silly to 35 million Americans, when I say that we kept body and soul together selling aspirin. In the summer months, when I worked with my father, I found that during a depression there is a good market for aspirin.

It isn't just the lack of a full belly, or the lack of fuel for the furnace, or the holes in the shoes, or the patches in the pants that are important in the world of poverty. It is the destruction of the morale and self-confidence in the young people. It is the despair they feel when they know they don't have an opportunity to better their lives. It is the humiliation and shame they feel when they know that they are standing there—different from the others in the room who have nice clothes, who can invite people into their homes anytime because they know there is enough food on the table for an extra person.

What concerns me and what concerns President Johnson is what this does to people.

Poverty today is different from what it was in the 1930's. Even then there was at least a glimmer hope because we knew this was part of a general depression which we hoped would some day end.

After World War II we took it upon ourselves as a Nation to do the most striking thing that can be done to break the poverty cycle: we saw to it that the young men and women who fought in that war had an opportunity to get a college education.

We didn't talk about States rights. We didn't talk about control of education; certainly my education wasn't controlled. We had a GI bill of rights which gave to me a Ph. D. in economics which I could never otherwise have gotten.

The kind of poverty we are talking about now is not the result of a general depression. Today we have the most prosperous Nation in the world. What we are talking about now is the kind of poverty which does not even give hope to its victims—chronic, long-term poverty and unemployment in the garden of prosperity. Today—right here in Chicago—there are children being born who will be the third generation of their family on relief.

It doesn't do any good to talk about expanding the general economy, or to make snide remarks about people not wanting to work. Economic growth is only for those who are able to take advantage of it. And the environment of today's poor does not prepare them to take advantage of new opportunities. New York City, for example, has 50,000 white collar jobs going begging right now, and at the same time has 430,000 people on public relief. Why? Because these 430,000 people are too lazy to work? No! Because these people have been left behind. Because they do not have the training to qualify them for the jobs available.

And these people will always be poor unless we develop a national program which will at least give them an opportunity to break out of this treacherous and damning and demoralizing cycle of poor education, poor housing, poor training and poor health.

Well, we can help them break this cycle and President Johnson has dedicated his administration to that end.

Harry Truman used to say that 14 million Americans had enough resources to hire people in Washington to protect their interests, and that the other one hundred and fifty or sixty million Americans depended on the President of the United States.

President Johnson has made it abundantly clear that he intends to fulfill that responsibility.

We can find many selfish justifications for waging this war on poverty. By putting the unemployed back to work we will bring more money into the economy. By improving the health of the poor we lessen the chances of epidemics. By clearing our slums we improve our cities. By educating the children of the poor we add to our intellectual bloodstream.

These things are obvious. But I refuse to believe that we have to sell the program on that basis. In the long run, we will fight to eliminate poverty because we are still concerned with the individual—be he rich or poor, black or white.

And that, my fellow Americans, is why our system is the wave of the future, and why I am so confident that we will prevail.

Study on Adolescence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the alert and public-spirited members of the Essex County, N.J., section of the National Council of Jewish Women have conducted a major study of the adolescent during the past 6 months. Mrs. Michael Rubin, National Council of Jewish Women, school coordinator, has kindly furnished me with a copy of the School Summary Report which I know will be of interest to all our colleagues. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the report and Mrs. Rubin's letter be entered in the RECORD:

ESSEX COUNTY SECTION,
NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF JEWISH WOMEN,
Millburn, N.J.

Hon. JOSEPH G. MINISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Since September 1963, 130,000 council members have been conducting a major public affairs program: The National Council of Jewish Women School for Community Action.

For the past 6 months, 3,000 members of the Essex County section have also participated in the National Council of Jewish Women School in cooperation with the Urban Studies Center of Rutgers University. We explore and discussed our subject, "Consider the Adolescent: His School, His World, His Future" in 15 study group sessions, several general meetings, an all-day forum, and an evening forum.

Our study of advantaged and disadvantaged young people in Essex County reveals and emphasizes these significant areas of need:

1. Earlier and expanded higher horizons programs.
2. Earlier and more intensive remedial help and guidance.
3. Work-study training extended to junior and senior high school.
4. Community college for post-high-school education and training.
5. More State aid for local school budgets.
6. Utilize school building round the calendar as learning/training centers.
7. Greater State appropriation for additional vocational schools to match available Federal funds—New Jersey ranks 50th in U.S. vocational school attendance.

Many school and public officials have asked us for the National Council of Jewish Women School Summary Report as presented at our evening forum in March. We are enclosing a copy for your interest, knowing how deeply you share our concern with the problems and needs of youth in our community.

We welcome your comments.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MICHAEL RUBIN,
NCJW School Coordinator.

CONSIDER THE ADOLESCENT: HIS SCHOOL, HIS WORLD, HIS FUTURE

The North Carolina Jewish Women's School for Community Action, which was held in 35 cities this year, and conducted wherever possible in cooperation with a local university, emphasized a major national and council concern: "Equal opportunity for youth."

Here in Essex County our section conducted a three-part community school in cooperation with urban studies center, Rutgers University. We called our topic "Consider the Adolescent: His School, His World, His Future."

Part I took place during January and February under the aegis of our nine divisions, two in Newark, seven in the suburbs. Council members studied the adolescent (both advantaged and disadvantaged) in his home, his community, his school.

Part II was presented on March 11 as an all-day forum. The a.m. session was devoted to a provocative treatment of the subject by two experts, Dr. Jean Noble, sociologist from New York University, and Mr. John Hollister, director of the Conant studies, Princeton education testing center. The afternoon session sent council women into eight classrooms where discussions of attitudes and responsibilities were led by staff members of the urban studies center.

Part II was presented on March 25 as an evening program. Mr. Herbert Bienstock of the U.S. Department of Labor and Mr. Samuel Convissor, director of Newark's youth de-

velopment program, discussed "The Adolescent and His Future."

SUMMARY

First. A workshop definition of an adolescent: "An unpredictable rebellious misunderstood young person who wishes to be treated as an adult." Definition of a disadvantaged adolescent: "Not culturally deprived but different."

His diet: Slum living, family discouragement, racial segregation.

His start in school: Below middle-class expectation.

His reading difficulty: The road to failure.

His lack of motivation: Useful machinery without a motor.

His misbehaviour: A plus.

His school attitude: F minus.

His teacher's attitude: Derisive, rejecting.

His future: Dictated by job training.

Possible solutions:

Saturate fully all preschoolers, schoolers, and parents with culture-enrichment programs.

Sprinkle widely remedial reading centers in cooperation with schools and volunteer aids.

Scale sharply textbooks, methods, and curricular to the slow learner.

Inject deeply an abundance of guidance and counseling into early grades.

Slice literally class dimensions.

Employ freely ungraded primary schools in housing developments.

Redesign artfully for a more understanding approach those who teach the disadvantaged.

Buy selectively good teaching talent, the best, if possible. Money no object.

Fact: In 1922 Americans spent 20 cents out of every tax dollar for public education.

Fact: Federal aid to education is imperative.

Fact: Minimum State aid for education in New Jersey is $50 per pupil.

Suburbs do: Manage by spending 50 percent of their tax dollar for education.

Orange and Newark do not: Have comparable funds for education.

Needed: A revision of the State aid formula.

A must: A broad-based State tax.

Quotations: "There are no problem children, only children with problems," "Children are not born school failures or dropouts."

DROPOUT PREVENTIVES FOR ESSEX COUNTY

Higher Horizons programs for elementary, junior, and senior high schools.

Quiet places to study—Home work-study clubs (such as we are now cosponsoring with the Orange Valley Settlement House).

Intensive guidance, after school, weekends and during the summer.

Vocational training beginning in the sixth and seventh grades.

School and work-study classes at the junior-high level.

Part-time work and on-the-job training in senior high.

A new vocational high school.

A sorely needed community college.

More dropout preventives: How to read a dictionary, read a book, use the library.

How to's for kids: How to take notes, take a test, develop good work habits.

How to's for grownups: How to consult with the teacher; utilize the PTA for parent involvement; communicate with the board of education; how to voice an educational opinion.

What the schools cannot teach: Moral values, self respect, self-discipline, family dignity, motivation, aspiration, hope.

Definition of an advantaged adolescent: "The pause that depresses."

His diet: Too much insulation causing reverse cultural deprivation.

His school: Concentration on the superior gross neglect of the average, overemphasis on college, competition pressures.

His neighborhood: The golden ghetto.

His attitudes: The four C's: Cash, clothes, cars, and conformity.

His motivation: Too easily satisfied—not strongly inspired.

His world: Limited by complacency.

Missing: Respect for the blue-collar worker; respect for the dignity of labor; social experiences of diversity—with a variety of groups.

Missing: An understanding of poverty; caring about others.

Facts: The girls never got off the bus the day they took a trip to see how a southern community lives.

Democracy demands: That young people of different color and background learn together, play together, work together—as a natural part of everyday living—as classmates, teachers, neighbors, friends.

Fact: America's future is the adolescent. We must let them get off the bus.

Final fact: Give every American youngster an equal chance in his school, in his neighborhood, in his hopes.

Community commitment: A multitude of perplexing problems call for a multitude of possible solutions.

Council's commitment: We may be digging the garden with a teaspoon while we wait for the bulldozer. But we're digging—every day.

The Democratic Party Serves Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by my colleague, Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER, on May 9, 1964, in Morgantown, N.C.:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY SERVES OUR NATION

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Democrats, it is an honor that you have extended to me by inviting me to speak again at your county convention. A convention of Democrats is always an exhilarating experience. A convention of Burke County Democrats, however, always gives an extra dose of exhilaration because of the enthusiasm that has been characteristic of the members of our party in your county for these many years.

It is a special pleasure always for me to visit in the home county of my distinguished colleague in Congress, Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr. Throughout the Nation this illustrious Burke Countian has established a reputation for leadership in the U.S. Senate. He is recognized as one of the most learned constitutionalists to be found in the United States. His leadership in preserving for the people the fundamental rights laid down in the Constitution has been a source of great joy and appreciation by all North Carolinians who assisted in making his services available to the Nation. We are justly proud of this great American.

The Democratic Party has been chronicled as the party of all the people. This is a frequently uttered statement that sometimes fails to convey to the individual its full impact because of the frequency of its repetition. Like other fundamental principles which we hear stated so often, we sometimes fail to give full evaluation to the breadth of its meaning. Today, however, I am sure that as we think back through the last few years we can all attest with complete accuracy that this party has meant a great deal to every American.

Our party is the party of the farmer, the businessman, the worker, our youth, and our aged. It is the party which envelops the thinking of the liberal, the conservative, and the middle-of-the-road thinker. Out of this amalgamation of thought our party develops principles and procedures which give to the American people the type of leadership which results more nearly in serving the interest of all that could be attained in any other political organization. As a result of this combined thought we can and do move forward on a sound middle ground, giving recognition to time-honored principles and ideals which afford a meetingplace for all who are interested in the progress of our Nation. There is room in our party for all sincere, honest elements who have a fervent desire to observe the fundamental principles and at the same time plan for the future without a violation of those principles.

The great traditions of the Democratic Party are the source of great pride to me. We have championed the cause of the underprivileged and the elderly, and yet we have captured the minds of our young people who look to us for leadership in making our Nation the type of nation that affords to them the opportunities to which they aspire. In every section of our Nation we have found support in the programs and leadership of our party.

In time of war and in time of peace the Democratic Party has offered leadership to our Nation. In peacetime years we have led our people to greater prosperity than they found while under the leadership of our adversary party. In time of great wars we have furnished the leadership which has destroyed on several occasions the enemies of freedom. This record of leadership in times of economic and military crisis has been of such high standard as to commend our party to all of the people of Burke County and the Nation.

One of the most glittering accomplishments of our Nation has recently unfolded before us. The transition which became necessary upon the tragic death of our late President, John F. Kennedy, has been one which has given pride to all Americans and brought consternation to those foreign enemies who oppose our system. This transition is a tribute to our great President Lyndon B. Johnson; it is equally a compliment to the great party of which we are a part and to the magnificent system of government which was laid down by our forefathers in such a way as to accommodate unfortunate situations such as we experienced last November.

When Lyndon Johnson took the oath of office as President in an airplane in Dallas, Texas, last November, he assumed burdens unparalleled in the history of our Nation. How fortunate was our country that this great man, with his wealth of experience in government, was available to move into the highest office in the world today with courage, ability, and confidence. No man in the history of the United States has moved into the White House with greater qualifications and ability than the great man we now look to for leadership of our party and our Nation during the coming years.

Coming to Washington in the early thirties and rising to prominence under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson moved on to leadership roles in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate. This proven leadership ability made him a serious contender for the presidential nomination in Los Angeles in 1960.

Notwithstanding the heat of battle which had been experienced between Lyndon Johnson and his then opponent, John F. Kennedy, we saw the greatness of the Democratic Party when the heat of battle was cast aside and the young man from Massachusetts laid his hand upon the shoulder of his former adversary and said that "this is the man we want for the No. 2 position in the Nation." How fortunate it was that in his great wisdom during the time when lesser minds would have entertained feelings of hostility the great John F. Kennedy had the vision to override some of his close advisers and bring about the nomination of L.B.J. as Vice President of the Nation.

I believe that the record already established by our tall Texan, who is now the revered President of the United States, is such that he commends himself to people of all political persuasions. We proudly look forward to his unanimous renomination by our party and his overwhelming election by the people of the Nation in the coming November.

The victory which I predict for our party in November is based upon my conviction that the people of America recognize real leadership when they see it. Our President has captured their approval with the forthright positions that he has taken on so many of the problems and opportunities confronting our Government.

Economy in government was one of the first principles enunciated after the Dallas experience. This was not new to the Democratic Party since we had adopted an economy plank in every Democratic platform since the founding of our party. This principle today is more alive than ever in our history primarily because of the action and assurances taken by our leader. Already great savings are underway in every department of our Government. Agencies are being streamlined to meet the challenges of the day, but yet efficiency is being increased, at less cost to the taxpayer than we have seen in many years.

This is all a part of the effort of our party and its leaders to combat inflation and to guarantee as nearly as possible that the American laboring man will have his purchasing power preserved. It is designed to destroy the threat of inflation to his social security, savings, and other assets which he has built up for his retirement years. A direct benefit is being experienced by each American taxpayer because he is receiving more for his tax dollar.

Tax revision and tax reductions were the concept of the Democratic leadership in Washington. We have seen the promise of tax relief brought to reality during the present Congress. This tax relief will be a boon to the individual taxpayer in a direct way in that it lessens the amount that the Government takes from his weekly paycheck. An even greater benefit will be derived by all Americans through business expansion, increased employment opportunities, higher wages, more jobs, and many other ancillary benefits. It does not require the mind of a trained economist to understand the value of the Democratic tax revision legislation. Any citizen can see it daily in his own personal life.

In our own geographical area the economic life has been given a new boost through the recently enacted cotton legislation. Since the textile industry is the greatest employer of people in North Carolina we had a particularly large stake in the deliberations upon elimination of two-price cotton when the measure was before the Congress. I can say to you that it was Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK who brought about the enactment of this legislation through their persuasion and logic addressed to Democratic Members of Congress throughout the Nation. While many of us could see no partisan issue involved in this basic economic problem, apparently our adversaries in the Republican Party were determined to make it such. It was a source of great disappointment to all of our people, regardless of their political affiliation, to find that only 10 Republicans were willing to help solve this problem which was created through the machinations of the Eisenhower administration.

The Republicans have frequently said to our textile people that they were the friends of the industry and the people employed in that industry. I say to you that even the most blindly partisan Republican who values his job in the textile industry should now understand that it is the Democratic Party which is interested in the preservation of his job and his earning power.

The cotton farmer of the Southeast can look upon this legislation with a sense of appreciation equal to that of the textile worker. His markets have been diminishing because of the cheap imports of cotton textile products from all points of the compass. His domestic market has been further threatened because of the great inroads being made by manmade fibers in our own country. Without enactment of the Democratic cotton legislation it is my firm conviction that the cotton farmer in America would have been greatly injured in the future by the loss of his basic market. Had President Johnson and the Democratic Members of Congress not had the vision to see that this grossly inequitable two-price system was injurious to the welfare of all the Nation our cotton farmer would have a bleak outlook. I, therefore, appeal to the cotton farmer to evaluate his own personal interest and then make a decision as to whether it is our party or the Republican Party which will best serve him in the days ahead.

A war on poverty has been declared. This administration is concerned with those people who are so poverty-stricken that they cannot educate their children, provide for their own hospitalization, or make preparation for their older years. The byproducts of poverty are equally disturbing to those who have an honest desire to join in the battle which has been outlined by our President. These byproducts are delinquency, violence, unrest, and even subversion. Our Nation cannot afford to take the risk of an enlargement of the problems which are a part of the poverty picture in our Nation.

This poverty battle is carried on in many ways. There are direct approaches and indirect approaches. Each of us must evaluate the proposals which are presented and in the exercise of our own best judgment support those ideas which will, in our judgment, best serve to eliminate hunger and want in this land of plenty. We will not all be expected to agree upon methods and practices, but I think that the very least that can be expected of any American is that he give serious consideration to the proposals that are made. We should not lose sight of the laudable goal outlined by the President when he said that we should make this land of ours a land of opportunity for those who, because of economic misfortune, have not been given the opportunities that have been enjoyed by the rest of us.

These efforts in behalf of the people cannot be brought to a successful end simply by pronouncements from the White House. No one recognizes this more keenly than President Johnson. He realizes that he must have the support of all of the people of the Nation in bringing about a climate which will result in an acceptance by a democratic system of the basic principles which he sets forth.

His zeal in appearing before countless types of audiences in recent months to present his program has been an inspiration to all of us. It has been evidence of his dedication to the cause of making our Government serve the interests of all of the people, regardless of their economic station in life.

As citizens of this free land we owe it to ourselves and to our fellow citizens to give our best thought and energies to making America great. To help fulfill these goals and to accomplish the mission of service to mankind which all of us should accept I respectfully urge that we can best do it through the Democratic Party. We can unite upon the basic issues and move to victory in November. This victory in November of which I speak is not merely a partisan victory, but a victory for all of the people which we can contemplate with accuracy will usher in another era of national accomplishment unparalleled in our history.

The Democratic Party since the day that it was launched by Jefferson and Jackson has been the party of the people. It has become a symbol of States rights and individual freedom. In years of travail it could always be revived again by a return to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

In times of depression, aggression, and war Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman carried the Democratic Party banner ahead of the Nation and led us to victory over these threats to our survival. These great men of destiny not only fought our domestic battles in a brilliant manner, but they laid down the foreign policy which was a roadblock to communism and other alien ideologies and implanted the love of freedom in the hearts and minds of people throughout the world.

Their service was characteristic of the men who through the years have dedicated themselves to the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Jefferson's philosophy of special privilege to none but equal opportunity to all is still the fundamental precept of our party. Jefferson, as does President Johnson today, realized that to be a great political party worthy of the support of this then young Nation it must be one which would serve the best interests of all the people, and not just of the few.

It was for that reason that he in his magnificent manner launched the Democratic Party as the party which would render the broader service which our Nation needed. He led our people to a better understanding of themselves and their part in a democratic system. He convinced the people, more brilliantly than any other leaders in the history of our country, that with independence and freedom obligations fell upon their shoulders. The people responded by strengthening the democratic system in a way never before experienced.

In 1828 a rough-and-ready individual who is a part of the history of Burke County came upon the national scene and carried the torch which had been lit by Thomas Jefferson. His colorful example challenged Americans throughout succeeding generations to keep this torch ablaze. Andrew Jackson, the first log cabin frontier boy to become President of the United States, without the aid of political machines and great wealth, is one of the bright stars in the Democratic firmament. A native of North Carolina, a valiant warrior for the people, Andrew Jackson can well be revered by all of us who take such pride in our great political party.

Jefferson and Jackson loved and led the people of our Nation. They were concerned about the hungry and the poor. They gave to the people hope and dignity. They pointed out to the people the paths through which there could be an accomplishment of the hopes and ideals which brought about the founding of this Nation. They loved liberty and cherished freedom. They struggled to preserve opportunity. They had a vision of a tomorrow which would offer hope and

promise to the children of their generation. They recognized their role in plotting the course of progress and power by this new Nation which they were honored to serve.

Yes, you and I as Democrats have a grand heritage, a glorious past, and a bright future. We must never turn the wheels of progress back to the days of monopoly and vested interests. This party of ours must not turn the clock back in many other ways that are recommended to us by extremists of the right and of the left.

The Democratic Party must move forward with courage and leadership because it is the principal vehicle available on which our people can ride to a greater tomorrow. We must rededicate ourselves today, as did Jefferson and Jackson, to human rights, property rights, and individual responsibility. We must preserve the liberty and the freedom which has been given to us, and we will best do this by insisting upon adherence to the constitutional principles given to us so magnificently by the Founding Fathers when they met in Philadelphia many years ago.

We will, and can, move forward to a greater tomorrow under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic standard bearers of our Nation in the legislative and executive departments. We can accomplish this purpose only by selecting the right type of leadership. I express the confidence that we will do this as our party has done in the past.

Here in North Carolina we have an equally heavy role to play in seeing that our State government subscribes to the principles which I have mentioned. Our record of service in North Carolina through the Democratic Party has fully measured up to the responsibilities which have fallen upon us as the dominant political force in the Tar Heel State. I have every confidence that whatever the outcome of the 1964 primary election the Democratic Party in Burke County and in North Carolina will have selected as nominees of our party men of vision, stature, character, and ability who will accomplish as far as they have the power, the worthwhile dreams of all of our people.

My friends, the Democratic Party is the party of the glorious past but even more it is the party with a brilliant future. This future is the future of all of our people. I commend you for your zeal in the cause of the party and urge upon you continued diligence as we go forward together trying to meet the goals which appeal to all Americans of good purpose.

Thank you.

Cabinet Member and Other Distinguished Government Officials To Honor Congressman T. A. Thompson in Lake Charles at Testimonal Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, who so ably represents the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, will be honored at a testimonial dinner at Lake Charles next Monday.

The Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, will be the principal speaker.

It is no more than proper that Congressman THOMPSON be so honored because there is no man in the United States who has worked harder or longer in the interest of sportsmen, both individually and with their various organizations. No man has done more here in Congress to promote and foster and protect our wildlife and natural resources.

While it is true he serves on two very important and forceful committees, he nevertheless, by devotion and dedication, has used his membership on these committees in such a way as to bring the unending gratitude of his fellow men who are interested in wildlife, sporting development, and our natural resources. It is certainly a fitting tribute that the Secretary of the Interior and other distinguished officials would so honor him in the largest city of his district, Lake Charles, La.

Today's Times-Picayune had a very timely and excellent account by M'Fadden Duffy in his "All Outdoors" column which explains in detail many of Congressman THOMPSON's accomplishments in this field.

The article is as follows:

ALL OUTDOORS

(By M'Fadden Duffy)

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall will be the principal speaker at a testimonial dinner for Representative T. A. THOMPSON which will be held Monday, May 18, at the National Guard Armory in Lake Charles, according to an announcement by Clyde B. Stephens, Lake Charles, chairman of the committee of citizens who are honoring Representative THOMPSON for his contributions to wildlife conservation.

Stephens also revealed that Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON, Baton Rouge, will serve as master of ceremonies.

One of the highlights of the testimonial will be presentation of a plague to Representative THOMPSON by the Louisiana Wildlife Federation in deep appreciation of his tireless efforts at a national level to bring about wise utilization of the country's wildlife resources, and at the same time to assure perpetuation of all forms of wildlife.

ABOUT THOMPSON

Congressman THOMPSON, of Ville Platte, has represented the Seventh District since 1952. The district is composed of the parishes of Acadia, Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, Evangeline, Jeff Davis, and St. Landry.

His contributions to the cause of wildlife have been made at a national level. He serves in Washington on the House Public Works Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and is chairman of the important Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

THOMPSON's foresight and intense interest in fisheries and wildlife conservation make him one of the outstanding figures in the conservation field today. It is for this reason that he is being honored by the Louisiana Wildlife Federation which consists of more than 80 sportsmen's clubs and leagues throughout Louisiana.

Representative THOMPSON is recognized throughout the country as a man who sees the growing importance of wholesome, outdoor recreation and the steps which must be taken to provide for the future. He feels this is particularly true in view of the fact that the population of the United States is expected to double in less than 40 years; and at the same time persons seeking outdoor recreation in the form of fishing and hunting are expected to triple in that time.

VISIT IMPORTANT

The visit of Stewart L. Udall to Louisiana is important to all sportsmen. We hope that the Secretary of the Interior will be able to remain over for an extra day so that he can personally visit areas of the State where outdoor recreation and industry have been made compatible.

Udall is the 27th Secretary of the Interior. Nominated by President Kennedy shortly after his reelection to a fourth term as Congressman from Arizona's Second District, he was sworn in January 20, 1961.

Secretary Udall's Department has conservation responsibilities for programs dealing with fisheries and wildlife, as well as supervision over national parks, the public lands, irrigation, and reclamation. The Department of the Interior markets all power produced at Federal hydroelectric dams, and supervises the programs for American Indian tribes, the territorial peoples of Guam, the Virgin Islands, Samoa, and the Trust Territory Islands of the Pacific.

NEW BUREAU

Of interest to sportsmen, during Secretary Udall's tenure as Secretary of the Interior, a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has been established. Also, in December 1963, President Johnson delegated to him sole policy-making responsibility over Federal petroleum programs.

Under Udall's guidance, the Department has increased its emphasis on science as the "modern midwife" of conservation, stressing the importance of such programs as saline water conversion, the harvesting of a fish protein concentrate from the high seas, and the harnessing of the tides at Passamaquoddy Bay in Maine.

He described his book, "The Quiet Crisis," published in late 1963, as "an attempt to outline the land and people story of our continent * * * dedicated to the proposition that men must grasp completely the relationship between human stewardship and the fullness of the American earth."

Through his writings and speeches the Secretary has undertaken the task of updating the conservation philosophy and conservation programs of the past for Americans in the sixties.

Udall has represented his country on a tour of Russian hydropower installations. He also took part in a Cabinet economic mission to Japan where he surprised and delighted the Japanese by a winter ascent of Mount Fujiyama. He participated in a World Conservation Conference in Nairobi, Kenya, followed by visits to several other African nations and a climb of Mount Kilimanjaro.

SHRIMP SEASON

Attention was called early this week to opening May 15 of the 60-day shrimp trawling in inside waters. L. D. Young, Jr., director of the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, revealed that the inside waters trawling season will continue until July 15.

Many of the regulations applying to commercial trawling also apply to sport trawling. Sports trawls are those 16 feet or smaller. Night trawling is prohibited from 8 p.m. until 4 a.m.

No trawl license is necessary for sport trawling, provided that the trawl length does not exceed 16 feet and that the shrimp taken are for bait or home consumption. In the case of sport trawling, the catch is limited to 100 pounds of shrimp per boat per day.

Director Young said that strict enforcement of all regulations regarding trawling in inside waters would be carried out by agents of the Commission's enforcement division, utilizing seaplanes and boats.

INSIDE WATERS

We are almost constantly questioned at this time of the year by sportsmen and commercial folks "what are inside waters?" They are all waters of the State shoreward of a

line commencing from the mouth of Sabine Pass in an easterly direction following the offshore beaches to South Point on Marsh Island, thence in a direct line to Eugene Island lighthouse; then continuing in an easterly direction along the beaches to the west end of Isle Dernieres and then easterly along the beaches of Isle Dernieres, Wine Island and Timbalier Islands to the mouth of Bayou Lafourches; then eastward along the beaches of the mainland mass including Grand Isle and Grand Terre to the Mississippi Delta; and then along the shores of the Mississippi Delta, excluding the passes of the river to Bird Island; then in a northeasterly direction to and along the beaches of the Breton Island and Chandeleur Island complex to the Mississippi State line.

TURKEY KILL

The 1964 spring wild turkey season resulted in a greater number of wild turkeys being bagged by hunters this past spring than in previous years. Preliminary reports from hunter success report cards reveal that the kill in the Florida parishes was about double that of the kill in northeast Louisiana.

This longer season and bigger bag is a definite tribute to efforts of the State wildlife and fisheries commission. We can remember the time when wild turkey hunting was closed for several years. Strict enforcement and game management has put the wild turkey back on the list of game birds. In the past few years the season has been gradually lengthened and the kill has been higher.

This is not the result of the closed season but definitely due to present-day game management practices. When it comes to game management, Louisiana has a "go-team." The results speak for themselves.

Mobile Trade Fairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to participate in a most impressive luncheon honoring the signing of a contract between the Department of Commerce and Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc., to increase the display of American made products in foreign ports all over the world.

This unusual contract is the result of legislation sponsored by our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BONNER's legislation makes possible the program of financial and technical assistance toward the development of Mobile Trade Fairs which will carry displays of American made products to all corners of the world.

Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc., is a not-for-profit organization established jointly by the American Export Lines-Isbrandtsen Lines, Farrell Lines, and Grace Lines. The organization's executive director is Mr. C. H. Betjemann.

Yesterday's impressive luncheon, attended by representatives of America's shipping industry, marked the beginning of a new concept of promoting American exports.

I should like at this time to include in the RECORD the remarks of Congressman BONNER delivered at this inspiring luncheon.

Mr. BONNER's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT A LUNCHEON HONORING MOBILE TRADE FAIRS, INC., AT CAUCUS ROOM, CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, MAY 12, 1964

I consider—as did our late President Kennedy—that the Trade Expansion Act is the most important piece of leigslation affecting our economy. American business cannot remain satisfied entirely with the diet afforded by domestic markets. Our products must be marketed and sold in the market places of the world in competition with foreign products.

Unfortunately there has been an apathy and inertia on the part of the most substantial part of our manufacturing firms in attempting to sell their products abroad. Despite the ceaseless efforts of the Department of Commerce in this field, the acceptance of the urgent essentiality of export expansion is being resisted by too large a part of our economy. The consequences of this resistance are alarming, because, without the increased movement of American goods to foreign markets, our economy cannot properly grow and our adverse balance of international payments cannot be corrected. Export expansion is vital.

It is distressing that approximtaely 90 percent of the manufacturing firms of this country do not even attempt to market their goods abroad. This situation must be reversed if the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act are to be achieved. For this reason, I was most anxious and pleased to sponsor and promote the passage of the Mobile Trade Fair Act, which I believe can itself become a most important legislative enactment.

The resistance of a large part of American business to enter the export field is explained by a number of factors. First of all, many companies have considered the domestic market to afford sufficient opportunities. Secondly, many small, medium, and even large size companies are fearful of foreign trade, which they consider a complete mystery. It is in connection with this latter point—in dispelling this mystery—that American-flag steamship companies can perform a most worthwhile public service, while at the same time promoting their own interests.

Certainly, there is no other segment of our economy which has as much collective experience in foreign trade as our American merchant marine. Together, the American-flag steamship companies have thousands of employees and agents in every major market of the free world. Our fine American-flag vessels serve every major foreign port on a regular and frequent basis. This experience and service can be made available to all prospective American exporters—and this is what Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc., proposes to do.

Under the Mobile Trade Fair program, American-flag steamship companies would exhibit the products of American companies in the major foreign ports and commercial centers at a nominal cost to the exhibiters. Actually, the exhibits will be carried by the steamship companies without any cost to the exhibiter, and the program will be conducted as a nonprofit venture. Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc., is in an ideal position to remove the mysteries which confound our potential American exporters. It will assist the exporter in any problem which may seem to exist, and will prove to him—I am told—that there is basically no difference and no more difficulty in doing business in Istanbul or Capetown than there is in Raleigh, N.C.

This is no idle scheme. Its possibilities are unlimited, and its success has been proven by Isbrandtsen Co., which conducted four mobile trade fairs in 1961, in connection with its round-the-world service. Isbrandtsen's trade fairs resulted in the American firms which exhibited obtaining approximately $1 million in foreign sales, and the company was awarded the President's E for Export, in the first presentation of that award.

The results of the Isbrandtsen Mobile Trade Fair proved that American-made products are competitive in foreign markets. In many cases they are preferred. It is obvious to me that when American steamship companies assist an American exporter in establishing a market for his products abroad, they will gain a customer. This is definitely a two-way street. The program of Mobile Trade Fair, Inc., is the most positive step, I know of, for not only promoting our Export Expansion program but, at the same time. for promoting and fostering the American merchant marine.

I am delighted to have had a part in the passage of the Mobile Trade Fair Act, and I am most pleased that Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc., has now entered into a formal contract with the Department of Commerce under that act to carry forward its program. It is a great personal pleasure to see the act being implemented. I look forward with unlimited anticipation and enthusiasm to the results which this program will achieve.

American steamship companies have a critical role to fill in our export expansion program. They must be prepared to assume the obligations of being an instrument of our foreign commerce. I applaud the tremendous step forward that is now being taken by Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc., and its steamship company participants, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Farrell Lines and Grace Line. I also commend the other participants in this nonprofit and public-spirited venture, the Insurance Company of North America, and the banking institutions which are participating.

It is my sincere hope—and indeed my expectation—that this program will soon be embraced by all American-flag steamship companies, and that it will become the unanimous effort of the American merchant marine.

The Cyprus Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many organizations interested in world peace and aroused at the denial of the democratic ideal to the Island of Cyprus, met in Washington, D.C., on March 16, 1964, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel to exchange views on this question. The highlight of this meeting was a speech delivered to the gathering by Mr. George C. Vournas.

Mr. Vournas, a farmer and lawyer of 40 years standing in the District of Columbia bar, is quite familiar with the area and background under investigation, having served with the USAFIM, with headquarters in Cairo, during the last war. He was commissioned as captain and assigned to OSS, and was separated from the service with the rank of major. He has visited Greece and the Middle East often, his last trip in February 1964.

Because of the great interest this matter, at the present time, I would like to have my colleagues share in the remarks of Mr. Vournas, which follow:

THE CYPRUS QUESTION

Cyprus has been Greek from time immemorial. It has been inhabited by Greeks longer than the Greek mainland—even longer than the cities of Athens and Sparta. Greek culture was in full bloom in Cyprus long before the famed Sparta of Lycourgos came into being. The island was known as the "Isle of Aphrodite," and no matter where the archaeologist applies his spade today, he will find evidence of its Greek past and culture.

Times and fortunes changed. The island acquired alien masters—the last one being the Turkish Sultanate, which was succeeded by the British in 1878. Foreign masters and alien occupations notwithstanding, Cyrus never lost its Greek character or identity.

Of course, there is a Turkish minority in the island—17.6 percent—which could hardly be happy with equality, which would mean a reduced status and prerogatives. The task of readjustment is not an easy one, especially when we bear in mind that the Turkish minority, even under British rule, has been the recipient of preferential treatment in harmony with the well-known and time-tested principle of "divide and rue," employed by all foreign masters.

The Greek population of the island—disillusioned that British promises of freedom, repeated times without number, at operating levels during the war, were honored in breach rather than performance—broke out in revolt to secure either self-determination or "enossis" (union) with Greece. The struggle lasted many years, in the course of which Makarios, the Greek ethnarch, was exiled. His exile, however, intensified rather than diminished the struggle, and the British, having concluded that they could no longer maintain their foothold on the island by force, rescinded Makarios' exile and used "negotiation" in lieu of armor, ending with the London and Zurich agreements. Under these agreements—imposed on Cyprus—Great Britain retained the right to maintain military bases on the island, time unspecified, which means in "perpetuity"; Turkey and Greece obtained the right to station troops on the island, and such rights and privileges were written in the constitution for the Turkish minority, as to make it the de facto ruler of the island. To mention a few: Representation in the island legislature was fixed at the arbitrary percentage of 70 percent Greek, 30 percent Turkish instead of the population ratio of 83 to 17 percent; the ratio of civil servants was fixed at 70 to 30 percent; the army at 60 to 40, and power was vested in the Turkish Vice President to veto any act of the Legislature or Government in matters of taxation, security and foreign affairs.

Archbishop Makarios, the elected President of an independent Cyprus was confronted with Turkish hostility and the paralyzing Vice Presidential veto from the very beginning. After 3 years of frustration, he proposed a number of constitutional amendments, the principal ones being the elimination of the Vice Presidential veto; the election of a unified Legislature; the establishment of unified administration of justice; the establishment of unified municipalities and the participation of each ethnic group in the civil services and the armed forces in strict conformity to the population ratio.

The proposed amendments were handed to the leaders of the Turkish community on November 30, 1963, and a copy was forwarded as a matter of courtesy to the Government of Turkey. As soon as Ankara received the text, the Turkish radio and press commenced a systematic campaign, using the "big lie" technique developed by the late Goebbels in order to drive the local Turks to provoke incidents justifying their threatened military intervention. The first incident was not long in coming. On the 21st day of December 1963, at 2:30 p.m., an armed group of Turkish Cypriots refused to stop when ordered to do so by a police patrol. Their refusal and the opening of fire on the police constituted the signal of the long-planned revolt of the Turkish element in Nicosia. The police returned the fire. Fighting spread in Nicosia and the suburbs with casualties on both sides—including innocent people, women and children. It is still going on, and presumably will continue until such time as the Government of Cyprus is successful in disarming all groups and in enforcing law and order.

Both Great Britain and the Government of Cyprus have appealed to the United Nations, the Security Council of which, after due deliberation, resolved to establish a peace force on the island and appoint an acceptable mediator. Neither item, however, can provide a lasting solution.

In the middle fifties, while the revolt of the Greeks was in progress and their battlecry was "Enossis," the Turks, by way of counteraction, cried "Partition." It was not a serious proposal, for the reason that there is not a county, a city, or a village on the entire island where the Turkish element predominates. Then the official Turkish position shifted to national security grounds. They argued that an independent Cyprus or a Cyprus under Greece would constitute a menace to Turkish security. "How could Cyprus, lying 48 miles distant from the Turkish coast, constitute a menace to Turkish security," one might reasonably ask, "while the Islands of Cos and Rhodes, whose distance from the Turkish mainland is measured in yards, do not?" Then came the statement of Prime Minister Inonu of Turkey that the "Turks may live beside the Greeks, but not under them." Yet, Turks in much greater percentages live under the Greeks on the Island of Rhodes and in western Thrace.

What is the solution to the problem of Cyprus? The one and only solution which might bring peace to Cyprus and restore fairly tolerable relations between Greece and Turkey would be the repatriation of the Turkish minority to Asia Minor. It will be recalled that in the middle twenties more than 2 million Greeks were expelled from Asia Minor by the Turks, of whom more than one and a half million were settled in Greece. They were expelled from an area which had been their ancestral home from time immemorial, and the only things they took with them were whatever clothes they happened to be wearing at the time. Most certainly, the orderly repatriation of less than 100,000 Turks will present no insurmountable task—especially since the population density in Turkey is 79.6 per square mile as against 135.6 in Cyprus and 154.5 in Greece. That fairminded people have been thinking along this line becomes evident from an article which was contributed in the New York Times on March 3, 1964, by Mr. A. N. Spanel, chairman of the International Latex Corp. The plan is similar to the one offered by the historian, Harold Toynbee, minus the suggested concessions to Turkey which would be as inequitable as they would be politically unrealizable. Mr. Toynbee seems to forget that Greece's population density is twice that of Turkey, and of all the land only less than a quarter is cultivable.

"Only a permanent solution can insure the future of Cyprus and remove the danger of intercommunal strife and terror on the island, and quench the sparking of a possible war between Greece and Turkey which may spread into a much larger conflagration," says Mr. Eliahu Ben-Horin.

"There are those who have suggested the separation of the two incompatible Cypriot communities—the Greek majority and the Turkish minority—by partitioning the island; but it is extremely doubtful whether partition would work in this case—and not alone because of the determined opposition of the Greek-Cypriot majority which actually controls the Government. For if the island is cut in two, the chances of the Republic of Cyprus ever developing into a viable state would greatly diminish. Moreover, the Turkish-Cypriot community is not concentrated geographically but spread all over the island. Partition of Cyprus would therefore entail considerable internal migration and settlement. Let us therefore consider another solution:

"(a) The establishment of an International Commission to appraise the full value of all real estate, goods, business enterprises and established professional practices such as medical, dental, legal, etc. that are now owned by Turkish-Cypriotes; permitting the government of Cyprus to buy all these properties for their appraised cash values. Then,

"(b) The prompt resettlement of the 100,000 Turkish minority people in Turkey.

"To be sure, this is a radical step, but no less a constructive one. It offers not merely a temporary expedient but a lasting solution. Indeed, a much greater and deeper conflict between Greece and Turkey was once before successfully resolved in this very fashion. After World War I, over 2 million Greeks and Turks were transferred and resettled in an exchange of populations. It has had a most beneficial effect on the relations between the two countries and peoples. Fortunately, to achieve similar results in the case of Cyprus 100,000 people would be moved, not 2 million.

"At the moment, passions run high on both sides, creating a hostile atmosphere for appeals to reason; but emotionalism cannot be permitted to govern explosive political situations. When the problem of Cyprus is considered soberly on its merits, we believe the following conclusions will be clear:

"(1) Turkey is interested, no less than Greece and the Western democracies in peace and stabilization in the Eastern Mediterranean. (2) With Cyprus now an independent nation, Turkey would have no valid reasons—political, economic, or strategic—to oppose a Greek-populated Cyprus. (3) Turkey has more than enough room to absorb the 100,000 Turkish Cypriotes. (4) The latter would find a new life among their own people and better economic, cultural, and moral conditions, with more security, than they now enjoy on Cyprus. (5) The sizable financial investment in their resettlement—which would have to come from international sources—will bolster Turkey's economy.

"Cyprus would be the gainer from this solution as would the NATO partners, Greece and Turkey * * * as would the free world at peace.

"It is time for a bold attempt to defuse the Cyprus time bomb charged with so much that is sinister."

A similar view was advanced by Walter Lippmann, the dean of American commentators, in a column published in the Washington Post on March 12, 1964.

The Cyprus crisis, like the Cuban one of 2 years ago, may prove to be a blessing in disguise. Just as the atmosphere was clarified after a perilous confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba, and a relaxation of tension ensued, so the Cyprus question may provide the climate for a reexamination and reevaluation of U.S. policies with regard to all regional pacts, including NATO, and its southern flank.

The extension of the perimeter of U.S. defense to Greek waters which cold war mythology has presented as "saving Greece from international communism" has been so successfully ballyhooed that the "Truman doctrine" folklore, in less than 20 years

has been elevated to the "Washington never told a lie" and the cherry-tree legend. Yet, Moscow's reaction to it was mild by Kremlin standards. Stalin, the Kremlin tyrant, either because he felt secure after his agreement with Churchill defining their respective spheres in exact percentages (Greece, 90 percent British, 10 percent Russian; Rumania, 90 percent Russian, 10 percent British), as Mr. Churchill reports it on page 227 of his volume, "Triumph and Tragedy," or because he thought American substitution for British interest would undermine Titos influence with that part of the resistance movement that challenged the British in Greece with resort to arms, appeared to be reconciled to American presence in the area.

When, however, American aid was extended to Turkey, a nation having a common frontier with the Soviet Union, the Kremlin became alarmed. What followed is history. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria—nations occupying politically and economically a midstation, being economically neither capitalist nor Communist, were taken over by their Communist parties and are now known as "Peoples Democracies."

The Greeks, who welcomed American presence in their area with open arms, were baffled to say the least, by U.S. generosity to Turkey, an enemy nation during the Frst World War and a neutral with profitable commercial dealings with Hitler during the second.

In disappointment and sorrow they observed that Turkey was given $2 for each $1 they received in aid to rebuild their war-ravaged economy, presumably as rent for U.S. military bases on Turkish soil—unnecessary bases to their way of thinking, or less valuable in terms of geopolitics than the innumerable islands and an entire archipelago which Greece placed at the disposal of Uncle Sam. With the passing of the years the conclusion was forced upon them that U.S. policies, too—like the policies of other great powers—have no permanent friends or enemies—just permanent interests. Hence, disillusionment. Continued U.S. presence in Turkey will be a constant irritant, vested with explosive potential, in the relations of the United States and the Soviet Union. As the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, Senator from Oregon, stated in the U.S. Senate on March 4, 1964, "The world has moved beyond World War II. It is beginning to move beyond the cold war. When are the foreign and military policies of the United States going to move beyond World War II and the cold war? When will the United States develop a foreign and defense policy that will recognize that every event everywhere is not vital to us, and that even if it were, we could not put out enough money and manpower to control all those events? * * * That is the foreign policy challenge that faces this administration. It is the challenge for a post-cold-war, missile-age international policy. It must take into account the breakup of the two dominant world blocs, and the technological changes that have bypassed the need for far-flung bases of the kind that were once needed to carry conventional war to two continents outside the Western Hemisphere."

Rabbi Eisendrath and the School Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations testified today before the House Judiciary Committee in support of the Supreme Court school prayer decisions. Rabbi Eisendrath's eloquent statement deserves to be read by all of us. I urge my colleagues to consider the following statement:

TESTIMONY OF RABBI MAURICE N. EISENDRATH, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS, MAY 13, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my name is Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath. I am president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the central body of 650 reform synagogues throughout the United States. Our membership represents approximately 1 million persons. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations is one of the oldest national Jewish organizations on the American scene. It was founded in 1873 and in less than a decade we will be enjoying our centennial celebration in this blessed land. From its inception to this most crucial moment, a profound commitment to the separation of church and state has animated my organization. In my opinion, American Judaism—and all other faiths, as well—flourished in this free land precisely because here, as nowhere before in the history of the world, church and state were clearly separated.

Jews were the first to fight a war for religious liberty; our holiday of Chanuko is a testimony to man's sacred right to worship his God in his own way. Throughout history, Jews have characteristically been victims of such tyranny. I do not suggest that the Jewish Bible or Jewish theology enjoins us to separation of church and state. Rather, I believe that the totality of Jewish history is a devastatingly powerful argument for church-state separation. No matter what the land or the era, when any religious group was able to control the state, Jews were not free.

We have been, throughout the centuries, living—and often dying—evidence of the persecution which flowed wherever church and state leagued together to extirpate heresy and to compel orthodoxy of belief. Ostensibly in the name of God, religion and the church, Jewish blood was spilled by the Crusaders, by the Inquisition, by the Russian mobs incited to pogroms by czarist priests. Jews have been invariably abused and hounded and discriminated against whenever the state became an engine of religious coercion, no matter which religion commanded. It is no surprise, then, that American Jews are sensitive to the need of a strict policy of separation of church and state; for we believe that the freedom and security of American Jewry is rooted in the blessings of the first amendment, which guarantees religious liberty to all.

I came here today to give voice to a deep conviction that the constitutional amendment which is before you, however well-intentioned the motivations of its sponsors and however noble the objectives contemplated, represents a dangerous experiment upon American liberties. If adopted, it will begin an irreversible process which will result in an unraveling of the historic fabric of the Bill of Rights. It would, I suggest, earn for this Congress the opprobrium of history as the group of lawmakers who presided over the liquidation of a fundamental American principle which sheltered the religious liberty of the people for 180 years.

It is too late in this hearing for a rehearsal of the many potent arguments which have been brought to bear by distinguished persons of all faiths who have stood here in opposition to tampering with the Bill of Rights. I should like here merely to italicize three points which I regard as of utmost significance:

1. The Supreme Court has not ruled out prayer, God, Bible reading, or religious devotions. It has merely reminded us that religious instruction and devotion belong in the church, the synagogue, and the home—and not in the public school. Prayer must come from the heart and not from the school board. The late President Kennedy correctly saw the Court's decision as a challenge to all of us to strengthen prayer and religious education in our homes and places of worship. The worst thing that could happen to the churches and synagogues would be to undermine their sacred role and their integrity by developing in the public schools an American public school religion which would consist of a set of meaningless, watered-down, nonsectarian platitudes. As Santayana has said, religion in general is nothing. What America needs is authentic religious belief and action, which can be transmitted wholly and meaningfully only by each religious group in its own unique way. To be meaningful, religion must be taught in its full integrity, within the emotional and spiritual context of a particular faith, with its own regimen of ceremonies and practices. And this cannot be done in the public schools. Furthermore, religion in public education merely divides the children, creates the real conflicts with the teachings of the home, all the while degrading religion by reducing it to a routine and vapid (or mechanical) exercise.

2. It is said that the proposed amendment would provide for "voluntary" prayers and devotions in the schools. The truth is that there is nothing voluntary whatever about a class of youngsters engaging in prayer or Bible reading in school. Such devotions do not stem spontaneously and simultaneously in the hearts of all the students, but flow very obviously from the direction of the teacher and the school officials. The amendment speaks of voluntary participation, but it would lead inevitably to involuntary action.

Nothing in the Supreme Court decisions on prayer in the schools prevents truly voluntary private prayer by a public school student. The Constitution need not be amended to achieve such an objective for any individual student seeking to exercise his freedom of religion in a personal, conscientious manner. The first amendment guarantees his right to do so, and the Court decisions reinforce his right. However, the proponents of a constitutional amendment know that a personal, private expression of religious devotion is usually beyond the capacity and spiritual maturity of a school child. So they seek to validate the organization and formalization of religious devotions under the authority of a teacher, school and law, to the end that the corporate machinery of the school and State will be used to evoke prayer on the part of youngsters otherwise incapable of doing so on their own. Your proposed amendment may denominate such evocations as "voluntary," but that will not and cannot make it so. Because of the religious incapacity of young children, we would, with these amendments, "organize" his religious conscience for him. We will call a weed a rose, but it will still be just a weed.

3. It is said that public opinion seems to favor a constitutional amendment. No doubt each of you has received much mail in favor of rewriting the Constitution. But, if I may say so, the responsibility of the legislator is the weighing of conscience and principle and not the weighing of mail. The prophet said, "Thou art the man." He did not say, thou art the clerk, or the machine, to register the Gallup poll. If the foundations of the Constitution were to bow to the wind of whatever popular passion stirs each generation, the entire Bill of Rights would already be a relic of history. We knew a dark period in recent American history when millions of Americans were impatient with due process of law, suspicious of the 5th amendment and contemptuous of the right of dissent. There are millions of Americans

today who might be quite happy to see a constitutional amendment in order to strike at the Supreme Court's decisions on racial equality. The fundamental liberties of an American are not subject to majority vote. My human rights and yours are not dependent upon the whim of any majority. This is precisely why we have a Bill of Rights.

Religion by definition, certainly as we have defined it in America, is one dimension of life which is not subject either to the political process or to majority and minority considerations. The Founding Fathers determined that the United States would be a secular state, meaning thereby that the institution of religion and Government would be separate. Why? Because religion is a personal matter between every man and his God, and a man's conscience is violated when his religion becomes a matter of public concern. Because religion, as Madison stated, "flourishes in greater purity without than with the aid of government." Because a religion which in any way is depedent on the state for its sanctions inevitably becomes dependent on the state for its values. When the highest values of religion become coterminous with the highest values of the state, two deleterious consequences develop: (a) religious institutions lose their sense of independent moral judgment and dissipate their capacity to criticize society and state; and (b) religious groups are tempted to use the state to pursue their own sectarian objectives.

Shall we make of the Constitution a sometime thing, a chameleon to be colored in anew by the transitory passions and prejudices of each generation? There is no surer way to undermine the foundations of respect for law, of respect for the Supreme Court and of reverence for the Constitution. There is no better way to make of our sacred Constitution a reckless plaything for itinerant demogogs who mix equal parts of piety and superpatriotism and imagine that they have thus inherited the mantle of God. God's work lies all about us to be done. It lies in the winning of human equality, the elimination of poverty and war. I cannot believe that God requires the imposition of rote prayers upon a captive audience of children in a public school.

One of the real dangers is the growing tendency to use the name of God in so ubiquitous a fashion that it has itself become secularized. We urge a broad interpretation of the first amendment precisely because we want religion. If we were truly secularists, we would encourage such things as nondenominational prayer in the public schools as a tool by which to make life and faith less sacred, less passionate. It would help us "worship false gods who, like pagan deities of old, demand of their subjects words without deeds, conformance without performance, body without soul."

Let us not make a scapegoat of the public schools. Let not religious groups place the blame for low moral standards on the public schools, when these standards have developed during the very period of greatest expansion and burgeoning of religion in American history. Let us not make of our public schools a vicarious atonement upon whom we shall heap responsibility for our own shortcomings and our own failures to perfect ourselves and our fellow men. And let us not indulge in hypocrisy by pretending, as even a distinguished clergyman has done in testimony to this committee, that invocation of the phrase, "In God we trust," would advance either religion or morality. To believe that is to yield to magic and superstition. Have the words, "In God we trust," on our coins truly elevated American morality? To me, it verges closer to blasphemy than to genuine religion. If we plastered stickers proclaiming, "In God we trust," on all public buildings and recited it hourly in every public school, would we be saved?

This present controversy can only serve to divert religion from its primary task—the creation of God's Kingdom for all men here on earth. Precisely because religion has such high status, there is a tendency to equate religion with everything good. Unfortunately, history does not warrant such a blanket assumption. In the past, in the name of religion, and with the authority of the state, men have perpetrated heinous crimes against humanity. In the present, in the name of religion, and ostensibly for the good of the state, some American citizens are impugning the religious sincerity of those who disagree with them. The polarization of religion as the embodiment of all good and of atheism as the embodiment of all evil intensifies the omnipresent danger of judging men by what they say they believe instead of what they do.

Religion can retain its integrity only when it remains unencumbered by entangling alliances with any of the social, economic, or political instruments of society; only when it knows how to distinguish between God and country; only when it seeks to judge the world that is finite from the perspective of Him who is infinite.

We urge this committee not to initiate any action which would deprive religion of its integrity and democracy of its vitality.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Dedication of Conrad L. Wirth Hall and Stephen Mather Training Center at Harpers Ferry, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, April 17, it was my pleasure to attend the dedication of the Stephen T. Mather Interpretive Training and Research Center at Harpers Ferry, W. Va. The center has been established on the campus of the former Storer College and is named for the first Director of the National Park Service.

Personnel of the Park Service will be trained here to carry out programs for public benefit and enjoyment throughout the national park system. The development of the center was for years a major objective of the recently retired Director of the National Park Service, Conrad L. Wirth, and on this same day the principal building of the center was dedicated in his honor.

Participating in this event were the members of the Harpers Ferry High School Band, Miss Camille P. Elias of the National Park Service, and the Reverend Clarence W. Cranford, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church of Washington, D.C.

The Honorable George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Serivce served as master of ceremonies and Russell K. Grater, supervisor of the Mather Training Center, welcomed the visitors to the dedication.

Trustees of the former Storer College present on this occasion were Dr. Cranford, Dr. Madison S. Briscoe, Mrs. Mary P. Dyson, Mr. William D. Johnson, Mr. Jesse W. Lewis, Mr. Bradley D. Nash, and Mr. John W. Newcomer. Several members of the Secretary's Advisory Board on National Parks, Monuments, and Historic Sites were in attendance: Mr. Harold P. Fabian, Chairman of the Board; Dr. Edward B. Danson, Jr., director of the Museum of Arizona; Mr. Paul L. Phillips, president of the United Papermakers & Paperworkers; Dr. Robert L. Stearns; Mr. Sigurd Olson; and Mr. Frank E. Masland, Jr., a member emeritus.

Introduced were the following distinguished guests: the Honorable Ken Hechler, U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Thorton W. Weld, West Virginia House of Delegates; the Honorable Tom Floss, Virginia House of Delegates; Dr. Oliver S. Ikenberry, president of Shepherd College; the Honorable Melville B. Grosvenor, president of the National Geographic Society; Dr. Thomas Henderson, president of the Virginia Union College; the Honorable Gilbert E. Perry, mayor of the town of Harpers Ferry; the Honorable Eivind Scoyen, former Associate Director of the Park Service; and the Honorable Lewis Nichols, former mayor of Harpers Ferry.

Also attending the ceremonies were: Mr. Charles Van Horn, regional manager of passenger sales of the B & O Railroad; Mr. Freeman Tilden, author; Mr. Marling J. Ankeny, Director of the Bureau of Mines; Mr. Clayton Anderson, Assistant Chief in the Bureau of Land Management; Mr. Lewis S. Flagg, III, Associate Solicitor in the Interior Department; Mr. William I. Palmer, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and Mr. Elwood Ashey, consultant with the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. President, the dedication of the Mather Training Center and of Wirth Hall brought about a fulfillment of the dreams of many men. I have been intensely interested in the project in all of its stages including the acquisition of Storer College.

The dedication address of the Stephen T. Mather Interpretive Training and Research Center was given by the Honorable D. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior. Mr. Beasley told of the work of the National Park Service and indicated that the Mather Training Center would carry on the traditions established by its namesake and by "Connie" Wirth.

A response to the dedication was made by Mr. Edward McPherson, son-in-law of the late Stephen T. Mather. Mr. McPherson expressed the gratitude of his family for the honor bestowed on them and spoke of how deeply touched would be the founder of the Park Service if he were there that day. McPherson also said that Mather would have completely endorsed the idea of the training program.

Mr. President, the dedication of the Conrad L. Wirth Hall was of particular interest to me since I have worked closely with Mr. Wirth for years and others who were associated with the creation and development of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. He resigned a few months ago as the Park Service Director after a long and notable career and has been succeeded by George Hartzog, a competent director who comes from field service to this position.

Regional Director of the Northeast Region of the Park Service, Ronald F. Lee, gave the dedication address of the Wirth Hall. He commented on the historical significance of the Harpers Ferry area and of the role "Connie" Wirth has had in the development of the National Park Service.

In response, Mr. Wirth spoke of his years of work in the Park Service and his feelings toward the new Training Center. He praised the ideas for which Stephen Mather worked and of his own hopes for the Park Service of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Beasley, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Wirth, which were delivered on this occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY D. OTIS BEASLEY, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE STEPHEN T. MATHER INTERPRETIVE TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER, HARPERS FERRY, W. VA.

The most recent National Park Service function I attended was the conference in Yosemite National Park, last October. It was at that conference that the appointment of George Hartzog, as the new Director of the Service was announced by Secretary Udall.

One of the most impressive things that George Hartzog said in his acceptance speech at that time was that interpretation will very possibly become the most important single function of the National Park Service.

"Interpretation" as used in the Service's public-minded program has a special—even exclusive—meaning. The key to understanding the meaning of this term "interpretation," is the word enjoyment. The natural, historical, and recreational areas of the National Park Service were established in order that their resources might be enjoyed by all the people.

Many activities are included in the operation of a national park: conservation of the resources, protection of visitors, maintenance and construction, research, land acquisition, planning, and many others. Yet, all of these activities are, in a sense, incidental to people's enjoyment of the parks.

From the inception of the park movement, park people believed that enjoyment was largely dependent upon understanding. The fact that George Washington slept in a certain building—and there are an amazing number of buildings George Washington is supposed to have slept in—makes that structure of historical importance only if people know who George Washington was.

Within sight of where we sit today, we can see John Brown's fort. That building would have little importance if visitors did not know anything about John Brown or his impact upon our national history.

The same need for knowledge is evident in regard to natural features. It was to instruct people in the meaning of nature that the interpretation movement had its beginnings. At first park visitors were taken on nature walks. Trees, birds, flowers, and rock formations were identified and pointed out. In a modest way, the opportunity was provided for those who wished it. This was called nature guiding.

The idea spread quickly, and as it the case with all good ideas, it evolved and developed over the years. It also received a title—interpretation.

Freeman Tilden, who honors us with his presence today, in his book entitled "Interpreting Our Heritage," has defined interpretation in these terms: "An educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and

relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information."

Mr. Tilden has declared that the first aim of interpretation is not instruction but provocation. The good interpreter uses the tools and techniques of his profession up to a certain level of interest and curiosity, and then steps aside.

This summer, in National Park Service areas from the Virgin Islands National Park in the Caribbean, to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, to Mount McKinley National Park, 100 million persons will be viewing museums, reading publications, and following nature trails prepared by park interpreters. The men you see in uniform here today, who are attending the present training session, will be conducting campfire programs, leading hikes, and explaining historic sites in these parks. I hope all America will visit the parks, and enjoy the interpretive programs. This is your program.

Interpretation has come a long way from the first experimental days. Remember the early description of a school—Mark Hopkins on one end of the log and a schoolboy on the other? Certainly this is the most creative association possible between a teacher and a pupil. Such a relationship is seldom possible in schools today.

Yet, the basis of the educational experience in schools and colleges—and in the National Park Service—is still firmly rooted in the tradition of Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a schoolboy on the other. Today we must have all of the 20th century technology for interpretation if we hope to convey to the park visitors the information they need to enjoy our parks. At the same time the National Park Service believes that the basis of the program is the personal service supplied by the uniformed interpreter and ranger.

Before I conclude that part of my remarks which explain the true meaning of interpretation, I wish to advance my own thought as to another quality and purpose of the term. The key word is "enrichment"—not enrichment in the material sense, but enrichment of the mind and the spirit. I have said that interpretation is designed to provide enjoyment. But enjoyment is not measured alone in terms of pleasure; it embraces the satisfaction derived from broader knowledge and appreciation of the glories of nature with which our parks abound. Let us all remember interpretation as a source of enrichment.

There is one aspect of this training center which is of special and intimate interest to me as a management official. The mission of the center is to enhance the ability of Park Service employees to render more effective and more beneficial service to the people of these United States and to visitors from other nations. Training is the cornerstone of efficiency. It is, therefore, an essential and vital part of any sound management formula. In establishing this training center the Park Service is doing more than improving the program of interpretation; it is taking a significant forward step in improved management.

On this dedication day, we should rightfully pay tribute to those who have made the event possible.

The contribution of Connie Wirth has already been acknowledged. It has been my good fortune to work with this dedicated public servant for a long time. The public testimonial to him last night in Washington was an eloquent public tribute to his career.

As most of you know, a very large endowment was made to this Training Center in the name of Conrad L. Wirth, to support a special lecture series which will bring outstanding educators and conservationists to this training center.

Secondly, we should remember today the organization which occupied these buildings, and this campus, for so long, and with so much distinction. Storer College was one of the earlies Negro colleges to be established after the Civil War. It was an outstanding educational institution for nearly a century.

Thousands of students have lived and worked and studied on these grounds. The graduates of Storer College have gont out into the far corners of the country, prepared for their life's work by their stay here in Harperts Ferry.

The outstanding work done by Storer College was made possible in large part by the dedicated faculty and members of the Board of Trustees. Many of these distinguished citizens are with us today as honored guests.

The traditions of education and service so ably advanced at Storer College will be perpetuated by the training center we are met to dedicate. As a part of the development of this training center and of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, the Service intends to memorialize and set aside space to memorialize the history of Storer College. This delights and gratifies me.

The center we dedicate will also be a rich memorial to Stephen T. Mather, whose name it will bear. A man of true greatness, Mr. Mather was the first Director of the National Park Service. The development of our national park system must be credited to Steve Mather's distant vision and unselfish devotion to a great cause.

He dedicated his life to the service of his country. In 1916, when the National Park Service was established, Steve Mather had many suggestions for the administration of the new organization. The Secretary of the Interior promptly invited him to come to Washington and take on the job himself.

He did so, leaving his business behind, and directing his untiring energy and brilliant mind to the task of building a national park system. All of us should take pride in the fact that the national park concept originated in this country, and that our national park system is copied throughout the world. This is the legacy which Steve Mather passed on to us.

In many of our national parks you will see a copy of the plaque which is on display here today, bearing the likeness of Stephen T. Mather and containing this tribute:

"He laid the foundation of the National Park Service defining and establishing the policies under which its areas shall be developed and conserved unimpaired for future generations—there will never come an end to the good that he has done."

Director Mather clearly saw the need for an educational activity in the national parks. Nearly 50 years ago he laid the groundwork for the interpretive movement which has grown and prospered, and brought enjoyment to untold millions.

It is therefore with great pride and satisfaction that I dedicate the Stephen T. Mather Interpretive Training and Research Center. May it carry on the traditions of Connie Wirth, of Storer College, and of its namesake, Stephen T. Mather, in enriching the lives of millions of citizens of America and of the world.

TALK GIVEN BY RONALD F. LEE, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, NORTHEAST REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AT THE DEDICATION OF CONRAL L. WIRTH HALL, STEPHEN T. MATHER, INTERPRETATIVE TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER, APRIL 17, 1964, HARPERS FERRY, W. VA.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Randolph, distinguished guests, and particularly Connie and Helen Wirth: We are gathered here to give this handsome building just behind the speakers' stand a new name in keeping with its new architectural look and its new purpose. We propose to call it Wirth Hall. In doing this, we are expressing in still another way the deep affection and admiration we all feel for Connie and Helen Wirth, and which was so eloquently expressed last night at that wonderful testimonial dinner in Washington.

But in giving this building his name we want to do more than honor Connie Wirth. We hope also that some of Connie Wirth's exceptional philosophy of park conservation and perhaps some of his great qualities of imagination and courage and wisdom will rub off on future generations of the National Park Service family as they pass through these doors and study in these halls.

We are very mindful also that in adapting this building to the purpose of the new Eastern Training Center we are conserving a bit of the history and environment of historic Harpers Ferry and Storer College. If I am properly informed the oldest part of this building was constructed as a residence for the Superintendent of the Harpers Ferry Armory and Arsenal years before the Civil War. Then during that war, it served off and on as a military headquarters for visiting generals. Before and after 1861 on one occasion or another it was visited by a succession of great figures in our history. Robert E. Lee came here probably in 1859 and surely this building must have been at least seen by Stonewall Jackson, and by John Brown. We are told that in 1862, President Abraham Lincoln himself came here. After the war, the sword was beaten into a plowshare and the oldest part of this building became the first home of the first president of Storer College. It was also used as a chapel and then, greatly enlarged, it served for 80 years as Old Main Building of Storer College. Now in this handsome adaptation, it is starting another century of significance public service as an important training center for park conservation and interpretation.

Connie Wirth has been given many honors by his friends and admirers, but I don't think any of them is more appropriate or deserved than this one. Connie started the modern National Park Service training program which is rapidly becoming an outstanding feature of our professional park work. He founded the Western Training Center at Yosemite in 1957. He got the money for it, he staffed it, he supported it, and last September, he dedicated the splendid new buildings that have been put up for the Horace M. Albright Training Center at Grand Canyon. In the past 6 years 386 trained employees have graduated from the Western Training Centers. Then it was Connie Wirth who with the great help and encouragement of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who is here on the platform with us, joined the Senator in the vision to see that Storer College provided a magnificent opportunity for a new Eastern Training Center, that will now be called the Stephen T. Mather Training Center. That was 4 years ago and again with the help of Senator RANDOLPH, Connie Wirth got the money and carried through the project and brought us to the point where we are today. Already, with the class now in session here, 78 employees have attended this new center devoted primarily to the tremendously important interpretive program of the National Park Service.

It is exceptionally interesting to realize that last night in Washington, D.C., as part of this overall program, the Wirth Lecture Fund was inaugurated. At the testimonial dinner, a check for $5,000 was presented to the National Park Service to make it possible to bring to this center and to the Western Center outstanding conservationists, planners, naturalists, and historians to sit down here with our people and exchange with them the latest and best thinking in the field of park conservation.

I count it an honor and a privilege to be on this platform and share in this program.

With the blessing of Assistant Secretary Beasley who is here with us and Director George Hartzog, I now officially name this building Wirth Hall and dedicate it to all the coming generations of the National Park Service family who will receive their training here.

RESPONSE GIVEN BY THE HONORABLE CONRAD L. WIRTH, FORMER DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE STEPHEN T. MATHER INTERPRETIVE TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER

Thank you George. I don't know just how to respond—honestly I don't—because the emotion that I feel toward having this building named in my honor. But to have my name on a building for the Mather Training Center, is certainly an honor that is much greater in my opinion at least to me, than to have the whole school named after me. And I say that advisedly because, Steve Mather brought into the service a spirit, a bit of courage, a vision, an interpretive program, and set the basis for the whole service.

He had with him Horace Albright. They were a perfect team. And you know, as you grow into an organization, you sort of set your stars or your track along the line of the things you like and things you try and copy or imitate. And the story of Mather, the courage he had, the fortitude he had, the things he did, the things he believed, and the things he'd give up in order to carry out the things which would be good for this country and the people, was the kind of thing that attracted me. I tried to follow as near as I possibly could, with my limitations, in his philosophy and footsteps.

And then Bradley Nash and Senator Randolph took it up with George and the Secretary to have the hall named after me. I found out about it after they had made their decision. And as the Secretary said last night, I'm not dead yet. Ickes would never have done this, but it really and truly is a fine tribute and I appreciate it.

I only hope—and most sincerely hope—that every ranger that goes through here, whether he is a National Park Service Ranger or whether he comes from the Forest Service or State parks or any others, the school is going to grow and teach and expand on this idea of interpretation—which was close to Steve Mather's heart—and put it across. I hope that everyone who goes through will be endowed with the spirit of the founder of the National Park Service.

I most sincerely hope in the near future the Secretary can follow both mine and George Hartzog's recommendations and appoint a board of regents for the training centers of the National Park Service so that they may go forward on a good sound basis to instill in the Ranger Force (not that they need any further instillment) the facts, the interests, necessary to carry on the work which is theirs * * * mainly the protection of our great heritage. I've talked too long, but I feel very humble here to have the building named after me in the Stephen T. Mather Training Center. I feel highly honored, and I thank you very much.

Address of Francis Cardinal Spellman Before Dinner of American Jewish Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a very timely and eloquent address delivered by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, before the annual dinner meeting of the American Jewish Committee, in New York City on Thursday, April 30, 1964. Cardinal Spellman was introduced by the Honorable Newton N. Minow, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and I would also like to include his very excellent and appropriate remarks:

INTRODUCTION OF CARDINAL SPELLMAN

(By Newton N. Minow)

Nineteen hundred and sixty-four is a time of first stirrings of new interchange between Jews and Catholics—an interchange that utilizes channels of feeling as well as channels of intellect—an interchange which will, we trust, take place with increasing frequency and increasing confidence all over the world. The late Pope John, who projected this spirit as a potent force in our time—and Pope Paul, who is pressing forward this historic work—have won the prayerful support of freemen everywhere. The leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in America, with Cardinal Spellman standing in first rank, have given the most vigorous support to this movement for change. Leading authorities have characterized his Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, as the most influential figure in world Catholicism, second only to the Pope. Those who live and work here in his parish need only look around us to see their achievements that have been accomplished by our Catholic brethren under the full guidance of Cardinal Spellman. We see a great network of religious and social institutions: churches, schools, hospitals, charitable and youth-serving agencies. They have enriched our community and they have enriched the Nation. They are contributing with the dedication, the loyalty, and the vigor of American Catholicism and to his able spokesmen and leaders whom we are privileged to have here with us this evening. As we all know, Cardinal Spellman is quite a traveler—from the North Pole to the South Pole, from Greenland to Korea—there is no corner of the world so far away that Cardinal Spellman will not travel to for the comfort and cheer of the American serviceman. Your Eminence, your trip from the chancellery to the New York Hilton this evening is much shorter than most of your journeys; however, the distance, measured not in miles, but in the progress of interfaith relations, is very great indeed. It is an extraordinary honor for me to present the archbishop of New York, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman.

ADDRESS OF FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN BEFORE THE AMERICAN-JEWISH COMMITTEE ANNUAL DINNER, APRIL 30, 1964

I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to our celebrated guest of honor, Mr. Dean Rusk, on receiving the American Liberties Medallion of the American Jewish Committee. Being Secretary of State is an overwhelming responsibility and sometimes, I am afraid, a thankless one which exposes a man to the slings and arrows of public criticism. While any award is scarcely adequate recompense for Mr. Rusk's trying labors and successes, at least he may know from tonight's citation the gratitude of this company and that of countless fellow Americans for the dedicated service he has rendered to our Nation.

I myself feel greatly honored that you have invited me to give a brief address at your annual dinner. The invitation came originally from Mr. A. M. Sonnabend, who for 2 years served the committee selflessly and effectively as its president, and whose untimely death was, I know, felt deeply by all your members. My prayer is that his soul may rest in peace, and that the important work which meant so much to him will continue to prosper under your new president, Mr. Morris Abram.

The American-Jewish Committee has given distinguished service to the cause of brotherhood. This it has done without ignoring the unavoidable distinctions of race, color, and creed. Today it stands in the forefront of the civil rights movement, thereby fulfilling the best traditions of Judaism. Well might the words of the Prophet Isaiah be its motto: "Seek justice; undo oppression." Its achievements are the more remarkable when one remembers how often and how unjustly the Jewish people have suffered from slander and oppression. Such a people might be expected to concentrate on its own vindication and welfare. The American Jewish Committee has, on the contrary, earnestly striven to promote the welfare of all, and has in its activities given substance to the conviction that we are all children of God and indeed our brothers' keepers.

That we are our brothers' keepers is more than a pious cliche. It is a lesson the whole world sorely needs to learn. As a matter of fact it has become an imperative for survival in our day. By every means at our disposal we must wage war on the old suspicions and prejudices and bigotry which have set brother against brother and have spawned a brood of evils threatening the very existence of our society. Definitely we must win that war.

The sad plight of minorities in many places bears testimony to the existence of racial and religious prejudice. The struggle of millions of American Negroes to achieve first class citizenship underscores it. The shameful murder in this very generation of 6 million Jews and of millions of other innocent victims of tyranny proclaims it. The widespread oppression of Catholic and Protestants and other religious groups both now and throughout the past tells a story of prejudice that darkens the pages of history.

Prejudice is mysterious and its roots are deeply buried. No rational being can fully understand it or comprehend all the reasons behind it. But one thing I do know: prejudice can never be justified by the teachings of religion. Hatred can never be justified by those teachings. The founder of my faith gave one supreme commandment to all who would follow Him: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another."

This point needs stressing in the light of a recent survey examining the reasons behind anti-Semitism. Asked why the Jewish people have often suffered outbreaks of persecution, a surprising number of people replied that in their opinion it was a punishment for their part of the crucifixion of Christ. Frankly I was appalled. This is not Christianity. I don't know where they learned it but surely it was not from the teaching of their church.

It is one of those distorted and terribly harmful notions which somehow gain currency and like a cancer spread among certain people who wish to justify their own bigotry.

The question of responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ must be carefully stated and clearly understood. I am reminded of an incident which happened to a priest of my acquaintance when he was riding in a taxicab here one day last year. The cab drivers of New York, as everyone knows, are celebrated for their conversational talents. Not infrequently they emerge as homespun philosophers and this particular driver was even a sort of sidewalk theologian. Over his shoulder he said to the priest: "I understand that those bishops over in Rome are saying that everyone who ever lived is responsible for the death of Our Lord. Does that mean that the poor Indians who were hunting buffalo on the plains of America at the time were responsible? Why, they didn't even

know it was happening. How could they be responsible?"

He asked a good question, to which there is only one answer. Responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus as an event of history belongs only to those individuals who were present at the time and who cooperated in His death. It is simply absurd to maintain that there is some kind of continuing guilt which is transferred to any group and which rests upon them as a curse for which they must suffer.

The Christian faith, on the other hand, does teach that Christ Our Saviour died for all of us, in expiation for the sins of all mankind. In this sense we do believe that we are all mystically implicated in His death—but all without exception and all in the same way. And His dying for us must never be thought of as a curse upon anyone, but rather has a blessing upon all.

Anti-Semitism can never find a basis in the Catholic religion. Far from emphasizing the differences which divide Jews from Christians, our faith stresses our common origins and the ties which bind us together. In the early days of nazism, when the wave of anti-Semitism threatened to engulf Europe, Pope Pius XI stated clearly: "Abraham is our patriarch, our ancestor. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with this sublime reality. It is a movement in which we Christians cannot share. Spiritually we are Semites." I recall well quoting those words in my broadcast to the Hungarian leaders and their people in June of 1944, a broadcast which I made at the request of Pope Pius XII to protest the bloody persecution of Hungarian Jews. I reminded them that their action was "in direct contradiction of the Catholic faith," and I told them that "no one who hates can be a follower of the gentle Christ, and no man can love God and hate his brother."

Pope Pius XII, in his Christmas message of 1942, had passionately lamented: "Hundreds of thousands of persons, through no fault of their own, have been condemned to death or to progressive extinction." He decried their exile and persecution "for no other reason than race." The New York Times on that occasion commented editorially: "This Christmas more than ever the Pope is a lonely voice crying out in the silence of a continent."

In June of 1943 Pius XII again protested publicly: "For centuries the Jews have been most unjustly treated or despised. It is time they were treated with justice and humanity. God wills it and the church wills it. St. Paul tells us that the Jews are our brothers."

This is the teaching of the Catholic Church and it can never be otherwise. My friends, God is love, and His will for all of us is fraternal charity and understanding. It is high time that all, Christians and Jews alike, applied this great religious principle to their dealings with one another. It is high time to stress the bonds of brotherhood which should characterize our relationship. The beloved Pope John XXIII taught the world a lesson which I pray it will neither ignore nor forget, when in greeting a delegation of Jewish vistors to the Vatican in 1962 he opened wide his arms and said: "I am Joseph, your brother." In that one simple gesture, springing from his great heart, he proclaimed to the world the true meaning of the Christian spirit.

Last week our New York World's Fair opened. The fair's motto is one that every man should carry in his mind: "Peace Through Understanding." Understanding is the way to peace. Men are weary of the hostilities of the past. They are tired of the feuding of their forbears. May they all—Jews, Christians, and all men of good will—begin at last to say: Together let us live in peace. Let us try to understand one another better—little by little, step by step, to accept our differences and to respect one another's convictions; to attack prejudice where first we may encounter it, within our own mind and heart. And having conquered it there, let us go forth to work with every man, our brother, for a better, and a happier world.

Men of Industry—Carlie L. Crain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American system of free enterprise makes it possible for an individual to make a success out of life through hard work and by utilizing and developing to the fullest extent possible whatever talents God may have provided. This, Mr. President, is the American dream, and this dream has come true for many Americans in this great land of opportunity because they have had the foresight and vision to take advantage of their opportunities and their talents in order to make a success not only for themselves and their families, but also to make more opportunities available to other Americans and to make this Nation a stronger and a better nation in which to live.

I have been very impressed, Mr. President, with an article in the March 1964 issue of Humble Oilways on the success which has been attained in the business world by one of my good friends and an outstanding American, Carlie Crain. Carlie Crain, who lives in Mobile, Ala., is a vice president of International Paper Co., and is also general manager of the organization's southern Kraft division. He has won his war with poverty by a formula which is given at the close of this article. It reads as follows:

A thorough knowledge of the industry, initiative, ambition, patience, humility, a sense of humor, leadership and love of fellow man.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article from Humble Oilways be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD not only as a tribute to the American free enterprise system and a man of strong will and character, but also that his advice for others may be better made available to the American public.

There being no objection, the article by ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN OF INDUSTRY—CARLIE L. CRAIN

Carlie L. Crain has made it up the long ladder the hard way.

As a teenager, he earned money selling ice by the block and carrying water for construction workers in his native Louisiana.

That was nearly half century ago. Today he's a vice president of International Paper Co. and general manager of the organization's Southern Kraft Division, which takes in 10 mills in 6 States and employs a working force of 20,000 people.

Carlie Crain now lives in Mobile, Ala., a little more than a hundred miles from where he grew up in Washington Parish, La. But in a sense the whole South is his home, for he travels through it extensively to keep personal tabs on how things are going at pulp, paper, and paperboard mills in Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida.

He knows these plants well. He's held various jobs in six of them, ranging from a laborer in a steel crew to mill superintendent.

As a vice president, he's also a regular visitor to International's home base in New York.

International Paper last year sold over a billion dollars worth of pulp, paper, paperboard, lumber, insulating board, plywood, and veneer. Its paper products—from newsprint to bags—touch almost everybody in time.

Each of us in this country, Mr. Crain points out, uses almost 460 pounds of paper a year.

Optimistic about the future of both the industry and International, he looks to research to spur the manufacture of new products made from cellulose and to expand the usefulness of the old standbys. International has research centers in Mobile and Glens Falls, N.Y., A Canadian subsidiary has a research laboratory in Ontario.

Good forest management practices assure a continuing crop of trees.

"Ours is the only basic industry in which the raw material is being replenished faster than it's being used," he remarks.

As a top executive, he says, the hardest decision that has confronted him, one that must be faced by all top management sooner or later, is the decision that results in curtailed operations and lost jobs. He accepts the necessity for that "infrequent but painful decision" as part of the management function, and says that it's offset by new facilities or products which create new jobs, and by the satisfaction that comes when people he has selected and developed help accomplish an important company objective.

He and Mrs. Crain have two daughters, four grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. When there's time, he likes to fish and he likes to read—but there rarely is much time, even though he's cut down a bit on the 100-hour week he used to consider normal. There are other obligations. He's on the obard of a Mobile bank and the better business bureau there, serves as a trustee for the country's United Fund, and is a national associate of the Boys' Clubs of America. Mr. Crain also is rather proud of two less demanding titles. He's an honorary colonel in Mississippi and an honorary "Arkansas Traveler."

What would he look for in a man if he were picking his successor? Carlie Crain's answer is a clue to his own talents:

"A thorough knowledge of the industry, initiative, ambition, patience, humility, a sense of humor, leadership, and love of fellow man."

A Dangerous Assumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, recent revelations by Congressman DOLE of Kansas vividly point out that Texas wheatgrowers are receiving a windfall at the expense of our midwestern farmers.

Once again this information should give us cause for reflection, and to raise certain questions as to the advisability of the recent cotton-wheat program which was steamrollered through the Congress.

In addition, questions are also being raised as to whether or not passage of this legislation was needed to prevent a farm income drop of estimated revenues of more than a half billion dollars.

Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 14, 1964, which covers the subject matter:

A DANGEROUS ASSUMPTION

According to the administration's main argument in support of its 1964 wheat program, passage was needed to prevent a farm-income drop of more than a half billion dollars. But that assertion is open to question.

It is, in fact, questioned by the American Farm Bureau Federation. In a recent newsletter the federation considers whether a hypothetical farmer would fare better under the new program than under no wheat program at all.

The new wheat program, of course, is voluntary, so no farmer has to participate. If he does not, though, his wheat can't be used for anything but low-priced animal feed; he won't be allowed to sell it to flour millers or exporters. The Farm Bureau Federation therefore has its farmer electing to cooperate.

Suppose he has a basic wheat allotment of 111.11 acres. To participate in the program, he has to agree to cut his acreage by 10 percent, to 100 acres. He decides to sell half his wheat to millers and the rest to exporters, and his total return, under the program's complex two-price system, comes to $4,390.96.

But suppose there had been no 1964 Federal wheat program. The hypothetical farmer then plants his full 111.11 acres. At an average on-the-farm price of $1.58 per bushel (well below the current actual price) he would receive $4,389.24, or only $1.72 less than under the elaborate Federal program.

This example assumes that farmers generally would refrain from wildly overplanting and thus so inflating the supply that prices would be driven far below $1.58 a bushel. In short, it assumes that farmers, even after three decades of Federal farm meddling, still retain some ability to manage their own affairs.

In Washington's view, however, that is a dangerous assumption. If it began spreading, it could put a lot of bureaucrats out of work; and not only in the Agriculture Department.

District Judge James Sewell, of Corsicana, Tex., Blind, Brilliant, Is One of the Great Trial Judges of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Judge James Sewell, of Corsicana, Navarro County, Tex., is one of Texas' most brilliant trial judges. Before World War II, he was a young construction engineer, building great pipelines across America. A volunteer for his country, he was blinded while serving in combat as a naval officer on a naval vessel in the South Pacific in World War II. Blinded, he returned home to learn a new profession.

Without a murmur of complaint, he entered the University of Texas School of Law, and graduated with high grades.

He was successfully elected as a representative in the Texas Legislature, a county judge of Navarro County, Tex., and now a district judge of the Navarro County Judicial District. In each public office he served with such ability, success and distinction as to earn promotion to a higher office. He was not selected for judicial office because of his blindness, but in spite of it.

His public service has been marked by intellectual brilliance, a zeal and devotion to the public welfare, a continuation of his brilliant scholarship that carried him to a fine record in one of the most highly competitive law schools in the Nation, and by a fine judicial temperament.

Mr. President, I have known Judge Jim Sewell for more than 15 years—"Tiger Jim" as he was affectionately known by his friends back in the days of his political activities, which included being Texas statewide campaign manager for Adlai Stevenson's campaign for the Presidency, in the fall of 1952. I have never known a man more devoted to democracy, and the progress of our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article about Judge James Sewell, printed in the Houston Post for Friday, May 8, 1964, under the caption "Held Court on Isle: Blind Judge Enjoys Visiting Old Friends," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELD COURT ON ISLE—BLIND JUDGE ENJOYS VISITING OLD FRIENDS

(By John Rainey)

"One of the pleasures of being a lawyer is that you can travel all over the country and be among friends."

District Judge Jim Sewell, of Corsicana, who was on the beach at Galveston this week, was among old friends Thursday.

But these were friends that he had never seen.

But then he is one judge who has never opened a law book.

He is a blind man who never held a tin cup, except when in the Navy. And he has never wished for a guide dog, "Unless I could get one big enough to ride," he said.

Judge Sewell spent 4 days on the island, replacing Domestic Relations Judge James A. Piperi.

He finished up work at noon Thursday and went to lunch with two old friends: Jim Simpson, a Texas City lawyer who was in law school with the judge, and Alex Cox, pastor of the First Christian Church in Texas City and formerly of Corsicana.

He lost his sight in an explosion aboard the Aircraft Carrier *Hornet*, in 1944. He was 32 years old at the time, an East Texas farm boy who had always wanted to study law.

There are no law books printed in braille.

So the judge had to depend upon his fellow students and his wife to read law for him while in school.

He began college at the University of Texas in 1946. And about the time he entered law school—as if he did not have enough to do—he was elected to the State legislature.

"He was a brilliant student," Simpson recalls, and always the center of attention in class or out. He's like a giant airliner that flies hardest into the wind. Adversity never slowed him down.

Sewell is an East Texas oddity.

He does not know the color of a man's skin when he shakes hands, and does not care. He does not shun political activity, as many judges do, but enjoys it. He hit the campaign trail recently for Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH.

His liberal friends would like to make him governor.

Harry Truman is a valued friend.

Are lawyers at a disadvantage when arguing before him?

"I don't think so. They argue just as long and louder than ever in my court.

"There was a lawyer in my court recently from Dallas. After 3 days he told someone at the courthouse 'You know, I think that judge has a visual defect.' "

Sewell graduated from law school in January 1951, and was appointed county judge that fall. He was elected to the office one term and in 1957 was elected judge of the 13th district.

Has he political ambitions?

"I suppose any man in political office has aspired to higher office," he said, adding nothing more.

On the bench he can take no notes, as most judges do. "I keep it all up here," he said, pointed to his head. His assistants, mostly college students, read cases for him.

At home his wife keeps him up to date, reading both law and newspapers. Has she become something of a lawyer herself?

"No, you'd think so, but she has not. She can read away to me and all the time be thinking of what she is going to cook for supper."

Sewell grew up at Blooming Grove, the son of a merchant and farmer. His father still lives there. After high school he farmed some, he said, and was working for a midwest oil company when he joined the Navy.

He likes to travel but finds it difficult. He finds his friends where travels through.

He has one trip in mind real soon: Up to Independence, Mo., to see his friend Truman and have his two sons, Jim Lamont and Jay Hoover, see the former President's library.

The First National Study of Critical Skills Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, has announced that a national inventory of training in critical skills is being undertaken to help determine the scope and impact of company-sponsored training efforts at the skilled worker level. This emphasis on upgrading our labor force is to be welcomed.

Under unanimous consent I include a Department of Labor press release announcing the study in the RECORD at this point.

The press release follows:

SECRETARY WIRTZ ANNOUNCES FIRST NATIONAL STUDY OF CRITICAL SKILLS TRAINING

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz announced today that a national inventory of training in critical skills is being undertaken.

The study, the first on a national basis, will help determine the scope and impact of company-sponsored training efforts at the skilled worker level.

Stanford Research Institute will conduct the inventory of training for the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration.

The study is expected to be completed and a report made to the Labor Department by the end of 1964.

The SRI study will be in specific occupations, including maintenance electrician, tool and die maker, electronic technician, maintenance mechanic, stationary engineer, millwright, foreman and welder—jobs which the Labor Department lists as growth occupations.

Answers will be sought for the following basic questions:

1. Where have the workers in these selected occupations developed their skills?
2. What are their backgrounds and training experiences?
3. To what extent does industry train its own skilled workers?
4. To what extent does it rely on public or privately sponsored training?
5. Why do some companies engage in training while others do not?
6. What are the considerations in investing in training as against hiring fully trained workers?
7. To what extent do companies which sponsor training lose their trained personnel to competitors?
8. How do employers assess public vocational education and private vocational training?
9. What is the relationship between a company's scope of training and its size, types of product, and economic outlook?

The survey will involve a questionnaire and interviews with company presidents, training directors, and workers in the occupations selected for study.

The institute's study group will be headed by social psychologist David Bushnell.

Resolutions Supporting Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have been both impressed and encouraged by the support given to passage of the civil rights bill now before us by members of the clergy. I ask unanimous consent that resolutions sent to me by the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania and the Liberal Ministers' Association of Delaware Valley, Pa., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING CIVIL RIGHTS BY THE LIBERAL MINISTERS' ASSOCIATION OF DELAWARE VALLEY, PA.

We, the undersigned, of the Liberal Ministers' Association of Delaware Valley, endorse the resolution of the Commission on Religion and Race of the Unitarian Universalist Association in support of comprehensive legislation to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

The bill currently under debate in the Senate of the United States, H.R. 7152, as passed by the House of Representatives, represents the best hope of bringing the American dream of equal rights for all to fruition and of insuring peaceful and harmonious relations between people of all races and creeds.

We feel that each title of this bill is important—protection of voting rights, relief against discrimination in places of public accommodation, desegregation of public facilities, desegregation of public school education, extension of the Commission on Civil Rights, nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs, equal employment opportunity, registration and voting statistics, removal proceedings in civil rights cases, and establishment of a community relations service.

We urge the Senate to enact H.R. 7152, without weakening amendments, and would especially warn against attempts to diminish the effectiveness of the titles of the bill dealing with the unequal treatment accorded Negroes and other minority persons in public accommodations and employment. We would also urge that Senators support cloture after reasonable debate so that the bill may come to a vote.

Passage of the civil rights bill will go a long way to insure domestic tranquillity and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Rev. I. J. Domas, Rev. Robert M. Doss, Rev. Rudolf C. Gelsey, Rev. David R. Kibby, Rev. Edwin A. Lane, Rev. George, Marshfield, Rev. Mason F. McGinnes, Rev. Tharald W. Olofson, Rev. Kenneth Smith.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING CIVIL RIGHTS ADOPTED BY THE 108TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF PENNSYLVANIA MEETING AT VALLEY FORGE, PA., MAY 5, 1964

Whereas Bishop DeWitt in his first address to a convention of the diocese of Pennsylvania has commended to our attention the radical injustice suffered by racial minorities in our midst; and whereas he has charged all churchmen with responsibility to participate actively in endeavors to redress the grievances of these minorities, especially in the light of the manifestly mounting impatience of whites with the growing impatience of Negroes and the implications of potential human tragedy therein; and whereas he has called our attention to the magnitude of the present crisis in Chester, where a number of clergy and other churchmen have become deeply involved, even to the point of going to jail for their convictions; and

Whereas the convocations of west Philadelphia and south Philadelphia, and a committee from the convocation of Chester, have memorialized this convention, asking that it initiate study and action relevant to our local situations in the diocese in pursuit of civil rights and equal opportunity for all men; and

Whereas our general convention has declared (1952) that "we consistently oppose and combat discrimination based on color or race in every form," and (1958) that "we call upon our fellow churchmen by God's grace to cleanse themselves of all spirit of racial discrimination; and then (call) upon all persons, especially the members of our church, to work together in charity and forebearance toward the establishment, without racial discrimination, of full opportunities, in fields such as education, housing, employment, and public accommodations; "and, whereas, the house of bishops of our church declared (1963) that "it welcomes the responsible discipleship which impels many of our bishops, clergy, and laity to take part in peaceful assemblage and supports them fully (in such a proper expression of Christian witness and obedience)", and, whereas, our Presiding Bishop on Whitsunday 1963 expressed at length our church's position on racial inclusiveness within its own body and its responsibility for racial justice in society and declared that "present events reveal the the possible imminence of a catastrophe: the entire Christian community must pray and act"; and

Whereas the city of Chester in the diocese of Pennsylvania is torn by internal strife centered in the activity of civil rights groups seeking to have their grievances heard; and

Whereas numerous statistics and studies are available, including reports by a special committee convened by Bishop Armstrong, which statistics, studies, and reports indicate the magnitude of the gulf between the Negro and white portions of the city of Chester, as to income, employment opportunities, community representation, housing, and equality of schooling; and

Whereas a situation now exists in which responsible civil authorities and persons who believe themselves aggrieved have inadequate lines of effective communication; and

Whereas there is a grave threat of the miscarriage of justice unless there is highly responsible exercise of power by constituted authority: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention gives its prayerful support to the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunities, both in Chester and throughout the greater Philadelphia area; and that this convention approves of the recent intervention of the Governor and Human Relations Commission of the Commonwealth in the Chester crisis, and urges that persons in high authority make no peace with oppression; and be it further

Resolved, That all churchmen in this diocese be urged to involve themselves personally, through the giving of concern, time, and money, in the work of securing civil rights, and of building a more equitable society in which the needs of all for jobs, housing, and good schooling are taken into account; and be it further

Resolved, That all Christian men and women who hold responsible positions in the governmental or industrial structures of our society be urged to utilize their power to correct the injustice done to racial minorities; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention asks the Diocesan Department of Christian Social Relations to conduct studies designed to reveal facts concerning the distress of racial minorities, and to identify various principles and strategies pertinent to handling these facts, and to arrange area meetings designed to keep open the necessary lines of communication concerning such matters; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention encourages the participation of this Diocense and its people in interfaith and intergroup activities in pursuit of civil rights; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention states its appreciation to Bishop DeWitt for his forthright statement, in his address to convention, on Christian conscience in the matter of racial tensions within the church and society; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention also expresses its appreciation to the presiding bishop, the house of bishops, and the National Council of our Church, and to the general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America for their strong leadership in furthering the cause of civil rights.

'Tis a Grim Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing number of automobiles being driven on our Nation's streets and highways emphasizes the extreme need for a sense of safety responsibility from American drivers.

William A. Smith, managing editor of the Granite State Free Press and a distinguished New Hampshire journalist, has written an excellent and thought-provoking editorial on the hazards of driving and the need for automobile safety, including motor vehicle inspections. I commend my friend and neighbor's perceptive comments to my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD "'Tis a Grim Harvest":

'TIS A GRIM HARVEST

The Travelers Insurance Cos. report that more persons have died on the highways than on our Nation's battlefields; more have been injured in auto accidents than in all the world's wars combined. 'Tis a grim harvest that we are reminded of each week. As we drive along between 50 and 55 miles in a 50-mile zone the cars whiz by us, the drivers wondering why other cars clutter up the highways. Many drivers ignore the solid lines as they speed by—they often appear to be out-of-State cars—in an endless hurry to get somewhere a few minutes earlier. Driving to work Monday morning we heard the squeal of tires as a car rushed by us and then within 50 yards it turned right, into a side street, without the bother of signals. And each week the death toll increases with old records being broken. Radio reports of accidents suggest exciting races for new high levels as former quotas are met and surpassed for each month.

The causes of the grim records of violence and death are many and the solutions apparently not discovered. The Travelers factual report lists excessive speed as the No. 1 cause—a fact that should be apparent to all drivers. Other causes frequently mentioned in the reports of accidents include driving while drunk, violating the rules of the road, failure to dim lights, driving on the wrong side of the road, etc.

We are always annoyed at drivers who pull out to pass and then while still abreast begin to pull back into the right lane, forgetting that we are still moving along at 50 per.

It is true that the big majority of drivers are careful, skillful, and thoughtful of the rights of others. It is sad that the minority cause so many deaths, so much damage, and such high insurance premiums.

Somehow we need to realize that the danger of nuclear warfare is far less than the danger from a speeding automobile.

One definitely constructive measure that helps to restrain the mounting death toll is the required inspection of motor vehicles twice a year. This is the month to have your car inpected. Welcome it as a safety investment for you and your family.

Interpretation of First Amendment to Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 30, 1964, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A2190–A2191 an editorial from the Religious Herald, a publication circulated among Virginia Baptists. The editorial was written by Mr. Reuben E. Alley and was critical of the proposed Becker amendment to the U.S. Constitution. This amendment has been proposed for the purpose of trying to correct the erroneous interpretation of the first amendment by the Supreme Court in its recent antiprayer decisions.

It has now been called to my attention that this editorial has been answered with eloquence and logic by an outstanding young minister in the Southern Baptist Convention, Rev. Charles B. Nunn, Jr., pastor of the Plymouth Haven Baptist Church, which is located between Alexandria and Mount Vernon in Fairfax County, Va. In view of the fact, Mr. President, that Mr. Alley's editorial comments were printed in the Appendix to the RECORD on April 30, I ask unanimous consent that Reverend Nunn's response thereto likewise be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICISM OF COURT DECISION

To the EDITOR:

I appreciate very much your addressing yourself in your editorial of April 23 to the proposed amendment to the Constitution concerning Bible reading and prayer in public schools that is currently before the House Judiciary Committee in Washington, D.C.

As our people are learning in Training Union in April and May, our Baptist heritage is cloesely tied in influence and example to the laws and convictions of countless millions concerning the principle of separation of church and state as well as that of religious liberty embodied in the U.S. Constitution.

Your statement that "an amendment to the Constitution would make ineffective the first amendment as an instrument for separation of church and state" is a judgment of your own not shared by the majority in Virginia, the entire Southern Baptist Convention or the Nation as a whole. A recent Gallop poll in the last 6 months showed that more than 70 percent of Americans questioned endorsed the idea of prayers in our schools. The tremendous groundswell of grassroots opinion on the issue is evidence itself that spiritual apathy and indifference has not yet frozen shut the lips, pens, or influence of our Baptist people in the towns, villages, or metropolitan areas. Our Baptist heritage is still much a part of the present and future, when our people will speak out of their convictions regardless of whether it agrees with what their pastor, State editor or for that matter what the executive secretary of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs is saying and advocating.

The influence of James Madison on the shaping of the first amendment to the Constitution you most effectively outlined. There is obviously room for debate on the pros and cons of the word "voluntary" in section 1 of the Becker amendment, but within a general definition of the word there is still room for a child to be excused or an adult teacher not to be compelled. Within such liberty, I find little room for captivity.

In reference to section 2, I would want to believe with you that "it seems unlikely that the Court would rule against" such practices as references to God in the taking of an oath of office, swearing witnesses, engraving of "In God We Trust" on coins and currency, but recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court do not give me any degree of encouragement. For the United States Supreme Court on two occasions has vetoed the idea of placing the national motto, "In God We Trust," in the court chamber as is presently displayed in each house of the Congress.

As a Christian no soul sensitive to the principles of Jesus would seek to infringe upon human rights because of the American tradition of democratic majority rule nor would we be true to the heritage of our faith and fathers if we in defense of human rights, surrendered to a small minority the privilege of taking God out of our national life and thereby secularizing our beloved America.

I would not be so naive as to pretend that there is not always some inherent danger in seeking to amend the Constitution. But there is a far greater danger that has been revealed already in the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. For the Supreme Court has provided already the easy way to "amend" the Constitution. Instead of going through the Congress or the people, certain minority groups have found it most effective to go around constitutional processes and win their way through a court interpretation of the Constitution.

Thank God we have a democratic system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative and judicial branches of Government which can be exercised if one branch of Government gets too far afield. The Becker amendment is congressional response from letters, telegrams and petitions that have been pouring into Washington from all areas of the country requesting that the Congress act to stop the secularist drive and reverse the court decisions.

The only way that this trend of the U.S. Supreme Court can be checked is for the Congress to approve and submit to the States a proposed amendment to the Constitution. Though this is difficult, because to legally amend the Constitution requires an affirmative vote in both houses of the Congress by a two-thirds majority and then ratification by three-fourths of the States, such action is necessary and the recent poll tax amendment has shown that it can be done.

Who are we to say that many John Lelands are not now needed to influence and support a 20th century legislator who would today seek to amend the Constitution because the original purpose and intent of James Madison and others like him, has been so misinterpreted and circumscribed by recent actions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution has become for some an amendment for the "Freedom from religion rather than freedom of religion."

CHARLES B. NUNN, Jr.,
Pastor.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Dr. John B. Hutson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished public servant, John B. Hutson, was laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery on Monday of this week. The work of this great American touched the lives of millions of people during his lifetime of service. His desire to serve his fellow man accounts for his rise from a farm boy in my home county of Calloway in western Kentucky to Under Secretary of Agriculture and Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations.

Dr. Hutson was chief of the section in the U.S. Department of Agriculture that

was responsible for developing and administering the production adjustment programs for tobacco, sugar, rice and peanuts during the crucial early years of 1933–36. It is more than a coincidence that the production and price support programs for these commodities have stood the test of time—that they have been effective in assuring fair prices to the farmer producers and to consumers with equity to all affected sectors of the commercial community. And this at a minimum cost to the taxpayers.

Because I know personally of the influence his actions and his example have had and will continue to have on those who have known him and known about him, I would like to add to my comments the following:

First, an editorial from the May 10, 1964, issue of the Paducah Sun-Democrat:

DR. JOHN B. HUTSON, ILLUSTRIOUS SON

If Dr. John B. Hutson had stopped to calculate the odds against the son of a Calloway County dirt farmer becoming Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture he might never have started the climb that took him there.

But it was not for the sake of a career that Dr. Hutson began that climb. He believed that life on American farms could be immeasurably improved by the adoption of scientific production methods, and he was far more interested in seeing this done than in the furtherance of his own career. It was his dedication to this goal that led him to become expert in the fields of agricultural production and marketing and, ultimately, No. 2 man in the Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Hutson's illustrious and successful career should be an inspiration to every west Kentuckian. He faced all the regional obstacles that keep lesser men from achieving great things and he overcame them with acquired knowledge, hard work and persistent faith in himself and the worthiness of the cause to which he had dedicated his life.

There is more than personal triumph in Dr. Hutson's remarkable rise from Calloway County farm boy to Under Secretary of agriculture and president of Tobacco Associates, Inc., an international tobacco marketing organization. He rendered invaluable service to the Nation during World War II, first as assistant to War Mobilizer Fred Vinson, then as head of the Food Production Administration. He previously had served the Nation as administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, chief of the Federal Office of Agricultural Defense Rehabilitation and president of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Although Dr. Hutson spent most of his adult life in Washington and the principal cities of America and Europe he was still a Kentuckian, and his death will be mourned throughout the State as the passing of an illustrious son.

Second, a biographical résumé:

BIOGRAPHICAL RÉSUMÉ OF JOHN B. HUTSON

John B. Hutson, president of Tobacco Associates, Inc., died suddenly of a heart attack in Brussels, Belgium, May 5. His wife, Isabel, was with him at the time of his death.

Mr. Hutson was in Europe meeting with leading tobacco industry officials concerning possible tobacco tariff policies to be presented at the Kennedy round of the GATT negotiations.

For the past 17 years, Mr. Hutson served as president of Tobacco Associates, an organization representing the interests of Flue-cured tobacco growers from Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. As part of his duties, he traveled throughout the world furthering the international interests of U.S. tobacco.

Prior to coming to Tobacco Associates, Mr. Hutson had a long and distinguished career in public service including serving as Under Secretary of Agriculture and Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. Hutson was born on a farm near Murray, Ky., September 7, 1890. He received his B.S. degree from the University of Kentucky, paying his own way through school from money earned growing tobacco and teaching in rural elementary schools. Mr. Hutson received his master's and Ph. D. degrees from the University of Wisconsin and Columbia University, respectively. The University of Kentucky bestowed the honorary degree of LL. D. on him in 1947.

Following World War I, he engaged in agricultural extension work and became assistant professor of agricultural economics at the University of Kentucky. In 1921, he joined the staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture doing field work in farm management studies.

Mr. Hutson gained prominence in international agricultural marketing while working as principal marketing specialist in European countries for the U.S. Department of Agriculture from 1930 to 1933. He returned to the United tSates to become Chief of the Tobacco Section of the newly formed Agricultural Adjustment Administration and in 1936 became Assistant Administrator of this agency. He was the chief architect of those provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1933 and 1938 upon which the present tobacco program is based.

From 1940 to 1945, Mr. Hutson assumed numerous duties in agriculture's role in the war effort. He was Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture in the Advisory Commission of the U.S. Council of National Defense; head of the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations; director of the Food Production in the War Food Administration; and Deputy Director for Agriculture in the Office of Mobilization and Reconversion. During most of this time, Mr. Hutson also served as president of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Rising through career Government service, he was appointed Under Secretary of Agriculture in July 1945. He served in this office until March of 1946 when he was called upon by Secretary General Trygve Lie to become Assistant Secretary General at the United Nations.

In addition to his early work in Europe and in the United Nations, Mr. Hutson participated in numerous international conferences. He was a member of the delegation to the International Sugar Conference in London in 1937 and the Second Inter-American Agricultural Conference in Mexico City in 1943. He was head of the American Delegation to the Third Inter-American Agricultural Conference of Caracas, Venezuela, in 1945.

Refusal of Students To Fight Against the Communist Vietcong in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with an editorial column produced by Mr. Thurman Sensing entitled "Behind the Shame." This article was made available to news media on May 7, 1964, under Mr. Sensing's weekly news column Sensing the News. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSING THE NEWS—BEHIND THE SHAME

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern States Industrial Council)

Disclosure in New York City that 87 students at leading northern colleges have signed a statement saying that they would refuse to fight against the Communist Vietcong in South Vietnam is a shameful episode.

While these youths were declaring that "U.S. participation in that war is for the suppression of the Vietnamese struggle for national independence," other young Americans in southeast Asia were the target of enemy bullets and terrorist attacks. This outrageous statement, published in the ultra-leftwing journal the National Guardian, was signed by youths who have had the advantage of education in some of the biggest and best known colleges in the United States. Yet they have failed to perceive the difference between our Nation's fight for freedom and the Communist fight for domination of the world.

Each student who signed the statement must bear personal guilt for what he has done. Nevertheless, the public cannot but wonder what in our national atmosphere would make it possible for a young American to arrive at such conclusions.

Those who have studied the intellectual climate of recent years will readily understand what lies behind the statement by the young men who assert that they will not fight for their country. What's behind it is a steady, unremitting vilification of patriotism and national sovereignty. Furthermore, great numbers of youths also have been told that they must practice revolution within their own country and against its laws and institutions. Is it any wonder, therefore, that these evil teachings should yield evil fruit?

The word "superpatriot" was coined in the last few years as a term of reproach. Prominent Government officials declared that they intend to muzzle the men who devote their lives to service in the Armed Forces of this Nation. From pulpits, young men have heard the values of American life subjected to scorn. Organizations such as the National Council of Churches have been in the vanguard of those who argue that the United States should relax its opposition to Communist China. Within recent weeks, in fact, the World Council of Churches had a spokesman in the United States arguing for a soft policy toward the Communist regimes in Peiping and East Berlin.

Even where youths have not been exposed to leftwing political propaganda, there has been an insidious current of teaching to the effect that sophistication requires that one not view all world problems from an exclusively national standpoint. Young people have been told time and again in college, church, and in books that Americans should be understanding of other nation's ambitions and not hasten to assume that the United States is right.

It is not remarkable, therefore, that some youths—fortunately, a very small minority—have come around to taking the enemy's side instead of their country's side in the worldwide struggle of our era.

The deep love of country that continues to permeate our Republic has not been suppressed by the tricky arguments of those who make a career of running down America. But some young people have been terribly confused.

Then, too, the current praise being given by extremists, some of them, sad to say, wearing clerical garb, to insurrectionary tactics in the streets of the Nation is an added pressure on young people. What are college youths to think when their elders, who should know better and who are supposed to set an example, take part in mass marches on the Nation's Capital and actually incite people to riot? If revolution is preached at home—and it is well to remember that such persons as Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the former Presidential adviser, hailed social revolution in Latin America and elsewhere—then some young people who lack stability will come to think that a Communist revolution in South Vietnam, for instance, is a good thing.

It is not the 87 misguided college students that the Nation has to worry about. Each will have a lifetime to lament a terrible juvenile error of judgment. But the country should be worried about the institutions and supposedly learned adults in places of responsibility who have undermined the morale of some young people by their criminally irresponsible preachments. Each churchman, college alumnus and ordinary citizen should demand that those in authority honor the values of America so that larger numbers of young men and women do not go astray in the future.

The Government-Sponsored Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the most emotional issue of the second term of the 88th Congress appears to be whether or not we shall amend the Federal Constitution to overturn the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and provide for Government sponsorship of prayers in our public schools.

The congressional mailbag is literally filled with letters from well-meaning ministers, churchgoers, educators and various organizations, both for and against any such legislation. It is most encouraging to find that almost every national and regional church organization supports the school prayer decisions of the Supreme Court. The majority of ministers who have written me also support the Court's decision.

In a thought-provoking editorial, "Praying in School", published May 2, 1964, George Chaplin, the highly respected editor of the Honolulu Advertiser has, in my view, correctly analyzed the issue facing the Congress today. He points out the infrequently mentioned facts that the Supreme Court decisions do not prohibit voluntary and unofficial religious activity, in school or elsewhere; that religion in America has traditionally depended upon training in the home and the church. He concluded that we cannot, even in the smallest degree, allow the Government to prescribe what we must do in a matter of religion.

The editorial reads as follows:

PRAYING IN SCHOOL

The country is faced with a delicate and potentially disruptive issue which, hopefully, commonsense and understanding will hold within bounds.

We refer to the 147 separate resolutions in the House Judiciary Committee designed to overturn recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions against officially prescribed religious exercises in public schools by amending the Constitution.

In cases arising in New York, Pennsylvania and Maryland, the Court held it a violation of the first amendment for any arm of government—in these cases, a school board and two State legislatures—to prescribe religious practices.

The Court pointed to the plain truth, that the amendment forbids government to either establish a religion or to interfere with "the free exercise thereof."

Contrary to widespread impression, the Court did not rule out religious activity, provided it is voluntary and unofficial.

Two justices have gone out of their way to underline the true nature of the Court's decisions. Justice Black said in 1962 that the Court took the view that "religion is too hallowed, too personal, too sacred, too holy to permit its unhallowed perversion by a civil magistrate."

The following year, Justice Clark said, "The place of religion in our society is an exalted one achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind. It is not within the power of Government to invade that citadel."

In other words, the Court was in effect saying that it is not wholesome for either Government or religion to countenance officially prescribed religious activity in public schools. The Court acted not to banish religion but to strengthen it.

The extension of the Court's decisions, of course, is that the proper places for the prescription of religious practices are the home and in the church—and that Government has no business intruding, no matter how benevolent the intent.

But the decisions have been widely misunderstood and the result is the 147 resolutions pending in the Judiciary Committee. The sponsors are well meaning, but if any one of them succeeded, he would be changing the first amendment of the Constitution.

The most notable resolution is that offered by Representative BECKER of New York, whose recent statement on the issues revealed the depth of his misunderstanding. Prescribed prayers as a part of the school day, he said, would be valuable because they would acquaint children of nonreligious families with the existence of God.

Is this not an argument for Government intrusion into religion?

The majority of Americans are Protestants. The country was first settled by Protestants who were themselves a minority within Protestantism, seeking a haven where they could live by their beliefs in peace and free from state coercion.

Since then, the Nation has seen the arrival or the rise of many different beliefs. In the United States today there is a minimum of 83 sizable denominations. There are 24 Protestant and Orthodox denominations alone.

There are Presbyterians, Jews, Catholics, Seventh-day Adventists, Buddhists, Baptists, Greek Orthodox, Shakers, Quakers, Episcopalians, agnostics, Unitarians, etc., all living in one land, all following their own beliefs.

The questions for Representative BECKER are these: Who is to prescribe what religious practices in the schools would be suitable for these and the many other denominations and faiths?

Would he have prayers from the New Testament for children of the Jewish faith? Would he prescribe Christianity for children of Buddhists or vice versa, which is a pertinent question in Hawaii, where there are many Buddhists? Would he require the child of an agnostic to recite any prayer?

We do not question the good faith or the genial spirit of sponsors or supporters of any of the pending 147 resolutions. We do, however, question their understanding of both the Supreme Court rulings and the history which produced the first amendment to the Constitution.

Religion does not and cannot draw its strength from a prayer or a Bible passage recited in a schoolroom. It draws its strength from the church and the home.

Throughout our history, these have been the traditional seats of religious instruction for the young. Let it so continue. And let us reflect on this statement by Ralph B. Kennard, professor emeritus of American University:

"These decisions of the Supreme Court are essential for the protection of our religious liberty. For we lose our freedom when we let the Government tell us, even in the smallest degree, what we must do in a matter of religion."

A Tribute to William J. "Bill" Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just written a letter to my constituents in praise of my field coordinator and staff of my district office, and briefly describing the numerous programs and activities through which we are helping our community to become a better and more prosperous place. I believe my colleagues will find the following of interest:

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM J. "BILL" WILLIAMS

Everyday in the year I as your Congressman, and the people who work in my office, listen to public views, problems, complaints, and suggestions that range all the way from where to get a baby-sitter to how to qualify for the old age pension.

The man who directs our local Los Angeles office, supervises the staff, and stands in for me during my absence attending Congress 3,000 miles away, is William J. "Bill" Williams. In paying this tribute to him, I want to involve both you and me in how we benefit from the unselfish devotion of this young man.

In the first place, Bill is the one who usually listens to what you have to say when you consult my office. It is, therefore, important that he not only be patient and sympathetic, which he is but also possess the ability to get things done.

For this work, Bill is highly qualified. In his short 33 years he has graduated from two colleges and is presently completing his work on a doctorate degree at the University of Southern California. He has taught school, served in our Armed Forces overseas, worked for labor, and acted as my legislative aid when I was a member of the California Legislature.

So he is more than a college man. He is a person of practical experience and a great coordinator of community programs.

Thus, while I have fought to have enacted into law a vocational education law, a new mental health program, more job-creating agencies, and youth activities, to mention a few, Bill Williams has been busy in our community to see that

these programs are made available to those who need them.

Under his direction more than 2 years ago we organized a coordinating council on economic development to spearhead an antipoverty campaign in our area.

From this council, which started with only 25 members, we have now involved over 175 persons in an advisory capacity, developed a host of capable community leaders, set up a mental health committee which has already obtained $25,000 to start a clinic in the district to help depressed persons, held several small business clinics for businessmen, provided job counseling and placement for over 2,000 young people, and obtained grants totaling over $1 million to undertake action programs to provide more jobs, training, schools, and better housing.

Nor have we neglected cooperation with private businesses and industry. For example, Mr. Williams has worked in conjunction with the Pacific Telephone Co. to develop a program to train our youth for jobs in this great industry and open up new opportunities for advancement.

On the other hand, we have been equally concerned with helping elderly people and family heads. Our office has been their information center and many have been assisted in qualifying for various pension, training, and medical programs. Through private trade schools, Mr. Williams has obtained numerous free scholarships for vocational training which opened jobs for many who had been turned down in the past because they were over 40 years of age. Also, hundreds of social security benefit claims have been settled satisfactorily and better housing for the elderly located.

Assisting Mr. Williams in the local office is a capable team of coworkers consisting of Mrs. Mary Higginbotham, Mrs. Jerrell Hogans, and Miss Shirley Reid—all residents of our community and persons who believe in our creed: All persons are important.

In my efforts to be "everybody's Congressman," I am pleased to pay this fitting tribute to a great field coordinator whose help has made possible what progress we have achieved, whose commanding qualities have helped our community to become a better and more prosperous place—one who is certainly our unsung hero and faithful friend—William J. "Bill" Williams.

Vietnam Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following statement from Don MacLean's excellent column in the Washington Daily News of May 13, 1964:

Maybe I can sort out the South Vietnam situation for you. It's simple; we've gone from Ngo Dinh Nhu to No Khan Du.

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the high level of unemployment, it is important to recognize the many jobs in our economy that are going begging for want of skilled and trained people to fill them. The irony of unemployment alongside vacant jobs is receiving increasing recognition—as it must if we are to realize the goal of full employment.

An article in the Washington Post of April 26 lists a large number of job opportunities in the Washington area that are available for high school graduates and college-trained individuals. Because it illustrates again the large number of job vacancies in our society, under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

JOBS, COORDINATION BOTH GOING BEGGING

(By William J. Raspberry)

Washington's private businesses have jobs available for high school graduates—or dropouts—as well as for the college trained.

But schools and industry, whose cooperation has been more theoretical than actual, will have to get together if they are to match jobless youths—particularly Negroes—with vacant jobs, a conference of high school counselors was told here last week.

Some of the job opportunities listed at the conference at George Washington University were:

Auto mechanics: Foreign-car dealers alone will need 1,100 new mechanics by 1970. Jobs are also available for youths who can learn to make routine repairs and assist auto technicians.

Laundry and dry-cleaning: Starting pay is low, but opportunities for advancement to managerial positions are good. Training is available for youths in cleaning, spotting, route and office sales, home counseling and clerical jobs.

Building trades: Fewer opportunities exist here than generally is believed. Unemployment is consistently high, and the need for apprentices is low. New construction techniques have reduced the need for bricklayers and other mechanics.

Telephone company: There is continuing need for operators and servicemen as well as for technicians. The company's work-study program gives high schoolers on-the-job training while they are still in school. These jobs usually lead to immediate full-time employment after graduation.

Publishing and printing: Apprenticeship opportunities are practically nonexistent. Employment standards are high, job vacancies few. Employment on Washington's three daily newspapers has increased only 10 percent since 1956 while the population was doubling.

Department stores: Good opportunities, especially for women. Besides sales, there are jobs in office work, counseling, advertising, services—some 400 job classifications at Woodward & Lothrop's alone.

Grocery chains: Crying need for butchers and meat cutters in the area's 250 chain outlets. Opportunities are highest for young people, and on-job training is available.

Hotels, motels, and restaurants: Plenty of jobs but low pay. Opportunities for advancement are increasing. The best opportunities for those of limited education are as cooks, bakers, and bartenders.

Hospitals: Some 400 job classifications here. This is one of the few industries where automation is not a threat. Every new machine requires a new technician.

Engineering and automation: Trend of downgrading jobs is increasing, providing more opportunities for the nonspecialist. Technicians are doing jobs formerly reserved for scientists, and so on down the line. New efforts are being made to find low-skill jobs for automation displaced workers after poor experience with retraining programs.

A Howard University conference yesterday stressed increasing opportunities for Negroes in sales jobs and marketing jobs.

Both conferences urged closer cooperation between public school counselors and personnel managers in developing more realistic school curricula and fitting students to jobs.

A Distinguished New Hampshire Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently New Hampshire lost an outstanding citizen in the passing of a former member of the Governor's Council, a great outdoors enthusiast, and a connoisseur of fine guns, the Honorable Parker Merrow, of Ossipee, N.H. Judge of the municipal court, editor of the local Carroll County Independent, Parker Merrow over the years was a tremendous force for good in my State.

The New Hampshire State Fish and Game Department commented upon Parker's passing in its Fish and Game Newsletter, volume XI, No. 31. This comment was so well phrased that with unanimous consent I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

In his close contact with nature's beauties, his love of woods, wildlife, mountains, lakes, and seashore, Judge Parker Merrow was able to hold that anchor to windward that many Americans need in this unstable and uncertain world of today.

The New Hampshire Fish and Game Newsletter's editorial comment is helpful, in setting the tone of appreciation for Judge Merrow's many civic contributions:

A GREAT MAN LEAVES US

In the passing of Parker Merrow, of Ossipee, N.H., sportsmen as well as members of the fish and game department have lost a friend of great stature and broad talents. Bigness was the quality which best characterized this extraordinary individual. It included not only his capacity to accept people as they really are and make due allowances for their behavior, but vision to place their goals and problems and motivations in true perspective and to take the lead in devising worthwhile long-range solutions. Part of the framework in which he saw all of us so clearly was the natural world around us—the woods and ponds and

rivers, the game and fish that inhabit them—which he deeply loved. Thus, he was peculiarly gifted to shape a conservation ethic for New Hampshire, and to use his big strong voice and colorful personality to proclaim it.

Until you came to know Parker well, it was easy to misread him for he cultivated with all the affectation of a Harvard man the manner of an original—a rough diamond talking the language of the countryman, while underneath this facade was a sensitive and sophisticated person. A graduate of Dartmouth, he retained through life much of the dedication to the outdoors which is so strong a part of that college's tradition.

As editor of the Carroll County Independent, Parker was best known to thousands as "Hank, the Meter Reader," in which character he wrote a homespun column full of pith and wisdom as well as witticisms. As local judge in the Carroll County court in Ossipee, he dispensed justice with such a human flavor as to change the life patterns of many who came before his bench. Meanwhile, many a young conservation officer learned from him the rudiments of courtroom procedure and strategy, while charlatans and shyster lawyers found they had met more than their match.

Stirred to action by tragic hunting accidents he had witnessed or investigated, Parker Merrow became the originator and counselor for the department's hunter safety training program, lending his dramtic talents to script and direct two vital motion pictures produced to aid this cause.

Lie Detector Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the increased use of the polygraph or lie detector in this country encourages apprehensions that we are becoming a "big brother" society. This intrusion by lie detector tests into personal lives, particularly by the Federal Government, should make us alert to the possible dangers and injuries that these investigations can create. It is agreed that the polygraph is only as good as the integrity and ability of its operator, and often serious doubt can be cast on the findings of the tests. An incompetent polygraph operator, for example, can cause a great deal of harm to reputations and careers of innocent citizens, and the machine can be used to ferret out political affiliations and loyalties.

Present trends in the use of polygraph should be studied with continuing scrutiny. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the April 29 editorial, "Lie Detector Under Fire," from the Nashua (N.H.) Telegraph, which discusses current congressional investigation of the use of the polygraph:

LIE DETECTOR UNDER FIRE

The polygraph—or what most people call the lie detector—is under fire right now, giving persons on both sides of the question ample opportunity to debate the moral aspects of a widespread and growing issue.

While national attention was drawn last year to the Pentagon's lie detectors by the threat of an Air Force inspector general to use them to detect the source of a news leak, a move spiked by the late President Kennedy, emphasis now is on industry's increasing use of instruments.

Vance Packard, in his chilling book, "The Naked Society," gives an insight into the terrifying possibilities posed by the polygraph. A leading detective agency, he said, reported it had quadrupled its lie detector business in 18 months. This disclosure is just another indication of the considerable increase in the use of polygraphs in industry to check on employees and as a part of the interview process for job applicants.

Not only are they used just to insure truthful answers or to ferret out untruthful ones, they may be employed to check out previous political affiliations or, for instance, sex habits.

The practice is becoming so widespread that a House Information Subcommittee under Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, began holding hearings aimed at developing some rules to cover operation of lie detectors. The congressional interest was stirred by a subcommittee survey which disclosed that during the year ending June 30, 1963, Federal agencies performed 23,122 lie detector tests.

There are 656 authorized polygraph operators in Government whose so-called qualifications range from a high school diploma to a doctor of philosophy degree. Of deep concern to many persons should be the damage that may be done a person's reputation and career by improper use or lack of understanding of the polygraph.

Two officials of the University of Virginia School of Medicine reported in the technical journal of the American Psychiatric Association last May that the operators of polygraphs are often private detectives of agencies employed to keep watch over employees. Many of these, they claimed, are incompetent to interpret the polygraph charts accurately. They cited cases to prove their point.

Almost all authorities agree that the polygraph is only as good as the judgment and interpretation of its operator. The American Academy of Polygraph Examiners itself is pushing for State licensing laws which would weed out incompetents both in private practice and Government service.

The "big brother" approach to Government needs to be examined carefully, for polygraphs are only a part of the whole complex of eavesdropping in both industry and Government, including wiretapping, snooping, and, as the latest gimmick for keeping tab on employees, closed-circuit television.

Florida Times-Union Is Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the Nation a great service by a distinguished daily newspaper. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., has been named winner of the coveted Mental Health Bell Award of the National Association for Mental Health, Inc.

The national award is made in recognition of distinguished year-round editorial support in the fight against mental illness.

Stanley E. Taylor, president of the Mental Health Association of Duval County, nominated the Times-Union, now serving its 99th year of publishing for readers through Florida, Georgia, and the South, for the award. The unselfish service of Mr. Taylor, Mr. Harry Gonzalez, also of Jacksonville, who is president of the Florida Association of Mental Health, and all members of these mental health groups, is to be commended. I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring this to your attention.

Is Public Works Spending To Rise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has now made clear that a massive increase in Federal spending for public works is in store if the administration's program of tax cuts and higher spending fails to reduce unemployment to an acceptable level. Once again the Democratic administration is prescribing the wrong remedy for the unemployment problem. It is doing so even before the ink is hardly dry on the tax cut bill, which at one time was presented as the panacea for all of our economic problems, including unemployment.

In its lead editorial of May 6, the New York Times pinpoints what is wrong with the President's public works spending approach to solving unemployment. The Times says that an across-the-board step-up in public works spending would be of only limited help in absorbing the unemployed.

Coming at a time when unemployment is already declining, it would add to the potential inflationary pressure on wages and prices.

As the Times noted:

Unemployment has many stubborn and complex causes that cannot be eliminated by the once-and-for-all remedies of tax cuts or public works. It requires a wide assortment of different programs. Mr. Johnson's hope of achieving full employment accompanied by price stability depends on locating and treating the many varieties of unemployment, not on a single massive measure.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Times editorial referred to, as well as an article from the Times of May 5 quoting the President on the subject of public works spending, in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 6, 1964]

TREATING UNEMPLOYMENT

President Johnson is willing to step up spending on public works in the event that tax reductions fail to bring about full employment.

Mr. Johnson is not abandoning his view that the tax cut is the cure for whatever ails the economy; he still stands by his belief that it will result in full employment, faster growth, equilibrium in the Nation's balance

of payments and price stability. But just in case it does not, he is prepared to offer another general prescription in the form of an increase in public works spending.

A faster rate of economic activity generated by tax reductions may gradually whittle down the ranks of the unemployed, but it will not eliminate some special types of joblessness. Specific measures are needed to create work for those displaced by automation and technological change, for those who are bypassed because they live in distressed areas, for those who are the victims of discrimination. A selective program of public works, designed to provide vocational training along with productive employment, is one useful special measure that merits consideration; the proposed Job Corps, which would place young men in conservation work, is another. But these are far different from the proposal for an overall increase in public works.

We have questioned the administration's claim that tax reduction would eliminate unemployment. We hold the same doubts about the President's new promise. An across-the-board step-up in public works spending would be of only limited help in absorbing the unemployed. Coming at a time when unemployment is already declining, it would add to the potential inflationary pressure on wages and prices.

Unemploment has many stubborn and complex causes that cannot be eliminated by the once-and-for-all remedies of tax cuts or public works. It requires a wide assortment of different programs. Mr. Johnson's hope of achieving full employment accompanied by price stability depends on locating and treating the many varieties of unemployment, not a single massive measure.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 5, 1964]

PRESIDENT LOOKS TO PUBLIC WORKS—PLEDGES TO STEP UP SPENDING IF BUSINESS, WITH TAX CUT, CAN'T FIND JOBS FOR ALL

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—President Johnson told a group of labor leaders tonight that if private enterprise, aided by the tax cut, failed to bring about full employment, "we will step up our programs of public works."

The President devoted most of the speech to his familiar appeal to labor for restraint in wage demands to prevent another round of inflation.

But he also gave a strong commitment to full employment. Citing the case of Western Europe, where there is practically no unemployment, the President said, "We too must catch up with modern history."

CITES LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS

"The time has come," he continued, "for labor and Government and business to agree that we are going to achieve—and keep—full employment."

After noting the major legislative action he has asked of Congress, the President said:

"And if all that we do with the help of the private sector cannot employ all our people, the Government will have to do for people what private enterprise fails to do—we will step up our programs of public works."

This was the first pledge of its kind that the President has given.

The basic theory behind the tax cut is that an expanding private economy will gradually bring about full employment without the need for expanded Government spending.

This is still the Government's hope and its basic position, but the President's statement tonight left no doubt that he would increase spending if the goal of full employment remained elusive.

In his appeal to the union leaders for restraint in their wage demands, the President said:

"I do not believe business or labor want a renewed wage-price spiral any more than Barry Goldwater wants to run on the same ticket with Nelson Rockefeller."

The President again defended the administration's "guideposts," which call for wage increases no larger than the average rise in worker productivity throughout the economy. Over the last 5 years the rise in productivity has averaged 3.2 percent a year.

"You must remember," Mr. Johnson said, "and we must never forget that the economy cannot absorb big cost increases and big price increases without endangering our progress."

He said that in recent years both business and labor had exercised "good judgment and patriotism unexcelled in our economic history." But he added:

"As demand increases and unemployment falls, managers will be tempted to raise prices—in spite of already high profits and continuing excess capacity—and unions will be tempted to force wages up faster than productivity—in spite of already high wages and continuing excessive unemployment."

He warned that a renewal of the wage-price spiral would jeopardize the competitive gains made by the United States in world markets in recent years.

And he added, "The case for tightening credit and boosting interest rates would become stronger—and the result could well be a slowdown in the rate of economic expansion."

Sixty-one labor leaders and their wives were the President's guests at a White House dinner like that for business leaders last week.

The same Cabinet members and their wives that attended the business affair were at tonight's dinner. They were Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; and W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

Israel Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, May 14 marks the 16th anniversary of the founding of Israel as an independent sovereign state.

As an American citizen I congratulate the people of this relatively new independent nation and commend them for their splendid achievements. Throughout history the Israelites have been subjected to persecution and tyranny, but they have always had the ambition and courage to rise from the smoldering ashes of hate and tyranny.

This has been accomplished by the hard work and ingenuity of the people themselves. The task has not been easy, but they are now beginning to see the fruits of their labors.

I am proud that as a citizen of our great land our Nation has helped in a small measure to make Israel what it is today.

It is our hope that the nation of Israel will continue to progress and that the friendship existing between our two nations shall continue in harmony and peace.

The Double Standard in the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent history of U.N. intervention is a sorry story of action against the Western nations. There is never any move on the part of the U.N. when atrocities are committed in Communist countries. There is no outcry when free governments are overthrown in the newly emerging African nations and are superceded by police states and bloody-handed dictators.

The full power of the U.N. is thrown into forcing integration in South Africa, but no voice is raised in the U.N. against those nations which practice, with the utmost brutality, black supremacy.

The U.N. cannot be a responsible international organization in support of peace if it continues irresponsible policies and winks at lawlessness, aggression, murder and other reckless acts if such acts are committed by the right countries in the lexicon of the U.N.

If the United States is to continue to be a part of the U.N. and to bear the heaviest part of the financial burden, we had better demand some new rules and we should start with a demand that all member nations live up to the charter.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 11 reminds us how irresponsible the policies of the U.N. are.

CONSPIRACY AGAINST RESPONSIBILITY

For many months the United Nations has resounded with bitter denunciations of South Africa's racial policies. Now a U.N. panel has recommended calling a convention of all South African racial groups to work out better political and economic conditions for the nonwhites. If this is not done by a fixed time, the group advocates economic sanctions against South Africa.

The panel's effort appears to be an exercise in futility. The convention idea can get only a chill reception from the South African Government. It will not satisfy the newly independent African states; at various times they have demanded not only sanctions but expulsion of South Africa from the U.N. and the raising of an African army to liberate the victims of apartheid, or segregation.

So the threat of some kind of U.N. disciplinary action remains. It is a prospect that should trouble all who care to think seriously about the U.N. and the United States' relationship to that organization.

Not that many people would try to defend apartheid; it is white supremacy pure and simple, with some of the trappings of a police state. Nor is it proper to compare it with the racial conflict in this country. There segregation is official policy; here it is against official policy.

It should be possible, however, to understand how white South Africa got into its dilemma. The whites are not colonialists; they settled a wilderness generations ago and built a thriving nation out of it. Today they are greatly outnumbered by nonwhites. The highly critical outsiders might ask themselves how they would find a just solution in that situation.

It should also be possible to understand the feeling of isolation the South African has today, whether he favors or opposes

apartheid. He believes, and we think correctly, that his nation is being most unjustly discriminated against in all the furor drummed up by the Afro-Asian bloc in the U.N. C. W. de Kiewiet, former president of the University of Rochester, puts it well in an article in Foreign Affairs magazine:

"South Africans of all degrees find it difficult to understand the success of the diplomatic generalship of the Afro-Asian bloc, when so many fingers can be pointed at the generals themselves.

"Dictatorship in Ghana and the Sudan, the tragedy of tribal massacres in the Congo, bloody strife in Zanzibar, the perversion of one democratic system after another into a one-party government, arrests and expulsions of dissenting leaders without pretense of trial by law—what title do these facts give African spokesmen at the United Nations to talk about the police state in South Africa?"

Needless to say, no U.N. voice is raised against these brutalities and injustices; when the U.N. went into the Congo, it was to crush the pro-Western regime in Katanga Province.

The hypocrisy does not end there. Who suggests disciplinary action against India for its still highly discriminatory caste system? When has the U.N. moved against the Communist nations for their political repressions and crimes?

In point of fact, the U.N. should not be engaging in such activities, any more than it should be plotting reprisals against South Africa. What a nation does in its own house, however distasteful to outsiders, is not the business of U.N. busybodies.

But all nations should be able to see how the U.N. can move against them if it is so inspired. It would not be surprising to find the Afro-Asian zealots one day demanding action against the United States because segregation exists even though it is not the policy of the Government. And the U.N., though powerless to make peace, is unfortunately not powerless to make trouble.

Meantime the conspiracy against South Africa is a sign of the dangerous degeneration of the U.N. It is not only that hypocrisy has been made a virtue; it is that the organization is getting out of hand.

The United States should have no part in any reprisals. It should, however, give thought to the implications of this spectacle of irresponsibility.

Ground Transportation Service at Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, it is interesting to watch the development of air travel. Now that we are approaching the era of the supersonic plane, a time when travelers can board an airplane in New York and beat the clock on a trip to Los Angeles, it is worthwhile to note that the tremendous amount of money we have spent in research is being returned in the form of this marvel known as supersonic speed.

Unfortunately the speed of airtravel has not been matched by the ground service provided at various airports throughout the United States. There is one, however, in our great Nation's Capitol that has done a fine, outstanding job in transporting air travelers to and from the Metropolitan areas to both National and the famed International Airport. I have been privileged to use the ground service provided by Airport Transport, Inc., and in traveling throughout the country it is hard to find another ground service that offers the courtesy and efficiency of travel as provided by Airport Transport, Inc. My heartiest congratulations to private industry and private investment in keeping abreast of our supersonic age.

I am inserting for the RECORD some little known facts regarding Airport Transport, Inc.:

GROUND TRANSPORTATION SERVICE AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT AND DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Since the opening of Washington National Airport in May 1941, Airport Transport, Inc. has operated the ground transportation service. The original contract with the U.S. Government was for a period of 5 years. Since then, it has been necessary to bid many times against other applicants for a new contract with the Government. The provision of the same exclusive service for Dulles International Airport was added to our contract in 1960.

EARLY OPERATION

The company commenced operation with the haphazard system prevailing in the Washington area then and now. Each driver was an independent contractor, owning or renting his own vehicle. Under this system it proved completely impossible to have taxicabs available at the airport at all times. The whim of the driver or his desire for extra earnings elsewhere often resulted in airline passengers waiting long periods at the airport for transportation.

CONTROL ESTABLISHED

To correct this stiuation, the company stationed dispatchers at terminal doors, hired its own drivers and provided security through guaranteed salaries, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits. Today, Airport Transport has established an organization of personnel and service second to none.

TODAY'S TRAVELING PUBLIC

The demand for taxicab service from Washington National Airport has increased steadily over the years. Thus, while the number of passengers using limousine service has increased because of the greater capacity of the vehicles used, the fleet of limousines itself is only slightly larger. However, the metered taxicab fleet has increased more than tenfold and approximately 105 cabs are now in operation at Washington National Airport. The company has proven its ability to handle normal traffic even at peak periods and places additional equipment in operation as needed.

SAFETY AND EFFICIENCY

The company has compiled an outstanding safety record, having won several national safety contests. The courtesy, efficiency and neat uniform appearance of its operators have set new high standards in Washington. Airport Transport's famed preventive maintenance system has resulted in service without delay, discomfort or danger.

Fares and operations of Air Transport are regulated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission.

THE CURRENT RECORD

The latest contract with the Federal Government, dated August 25, 1960, covers both Washington National and Dulles International Airports. As with all previous contracts, this was awarded on a competitive bid basis after negotiation with several bidders. Airport Transport, Inc. has a current total investment in taxicabs, limousines, motor coaches and other equipment in excess of $1,500,000. This is significant exposure when it is realized that the company contracts run only for a 5-year period.

CONSTANT SERVICE

The contract with Airport Transport has insured uninterrupted, 24-hour, rain-or-shine service to office, home or hotel.

AMPLE INSURANCE PROTECTION—PLUS

Airport Transport passengers have benefited in other ways not always apparent to them. The vehicles are covered by $250,000/$2 million liability insurance—not the mere $10,000/$20,000 which is required by District and WMATC regulations and is the coverage limit of almost all District cabs.

EMPLOYMENT POLICY

The company adheres to strict standards in its driver selection program. Applicants for driver jobs fill out a detailed personnel questionnaire form, and all background and references are carefully checked. After acceptance, drivers receive classroom instruction and a driver-training course. In addition, Airport Transport has a full-time safety director who holds regular meetings complete with safety movies, guest speakers, and the presentation of safety awards won through a liberal driver incentive program. At least half of our employees have been with Airport Transport for 5 years or more, a great number for 10 to 15 years and many for over 20 years. Management personnel, for the most part, have advanced from the ranks.

Our drivers—450 of them—are members of the Airport Transportation Independent Operators Union and have developed security, fair wages, paid vacations and many other fringe benefits.

GOVERNMENT REVENUE

During the calendar year of 1962, under the terms of its contract, Airport Transport paid over $324,000 to the Federal Government and is currently paying at the rate of $425,0000. Nearly $3 million in franchise fees has been paid the Government during the past 22 years.

PLANNED EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT CYCLE

Airport Transport has a planned 3-year replacement cycle in its fleet and rarely has vehicles older than 3 years. The company takes advantage of every technical improvement and assists in the development of special-purpose vehicles to provide the comfort and safety necessary for the airport passengers.

DISPATCHED PASSENGER MOVES

Airport Transport provides a dispatching service at four different exits of the Washington National Airport and under the terms of its contract with the FAA, such coverage is furnished 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and passengers are greeted and directed into vehicles by carfully trained, uniformed dispatchers.

DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—DOWNTOWN TERMINAL

Express bus and limousine service from Dulles to our downtown airlines terminal at 12th and K Streets NW., to Washington National Airport and to our suburban terminals in Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton is provided for every flight arrival. The use of our downtown terminal guarantees flight connections for all departures and our baggage check-through service and seat assignments permit passengers to board their jet plane immediately upon arrival at Dulles Airport and claim baggage at their ultimate destination. Individualized taxicab service is also available from Dulles as well as limou-

sine transfer service from the downtown terminal to Washington National.

SUBURBAN SERVICE

At regular intervals, limousine service is provided between Washington National and our suburban terminals in Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton. Suburban Maryland passengers bound for Dulles are offered this same service on a reservation basis.

GOVERNMENT, AIRLINE, AND PASSENGER APPROVAL

The company has been advised by the airport director and the FAA on numerous occasions that its performance is highly satisfactory. The 13 airlines operating out of National Airport have reiterated the same sentiments in many letters and other communications. In addition, hundreds of unsolicited letters from the public at large similarly express appreciation and commendation.

THE RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

Airport Transport continues to try to perfect its organization and operations. It believes sincerely that considering all factors, it does an extraordinary job for an organization which employs over 450 persons and transports 1,600,000 passengers over 8 million miles per year in the performance of its sole function of serving the public as a necessary adjunct to air transportation.

The Military as a Necessary Element of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are some who feel that our Military Establishment is of little or no importance in modern society; they wonder at its necessity.

It is time that we all learned that a trained corps of professional officers is essential to the preservation of our democracy and to the survival of our freedom.

The Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, our great Secretary of the Air Force, gave a brilliant exposition of this subject at this year's Armed Forces Day dinner, held on May 8, 1964. The text of his speech follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, ARMED FORCES DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 8, 1964

This is an occasion when the military security of the Nation is uppermost in our minds. I want to take advantage of it to call atention to an apsect of long-term national defense which may suffer from lack of recognition of its importance.

My concern stems from the fact that for as far ahead as we can see into the future, an effective military establishment will be an essential structural member of a free society. Freedom cannot be left unattended by the strength to protect it and democracy cannot work unless it is kept safe from the violence of war.

In making an all-out effort to lessen the tenisons which can be a prelude to war, we must not forget that our surest and perhaps the ultimate guarantee against war is the ready and responsive military power to defend ourselves and our allies.

There is no such thing as ready and responsive military power in today's world without a corps of qualified professional people. They are people who have dedicated their knowledge, their energies, and their lives to the demands of military service in an age of constant sociological change and technological advancements.

It is the essence of military service to a free society that not only life itself but lifelong devotion to duty is expected and exacted by the society being served.

But if we expect this obligation and response from our military people, the Nation must return the same.

Initiative, intelligence, courage, industry, and discipline are expected of the people who wear the Nation's uniforms. These qualities, however, hardly flourish in a climate of complaint about such things as amenities which have been provided for many years as a minor form of economic redress.

Educational opportunities, pay schedules in step with economic progress, decent housing, medical care, and confidence in a stable system of promotion and retirement—these are the things a wise nation should recognize as the essentials of a constructive environment for military professionalism.

The provision of these things and the public acknowledgment of the nature of the professional military obligation are the marks of gratitude of the Nation.

More than that, they are good business. Anyone will recognize the waste involved in losing good people—people in whom we have invested heavily in both training and experience.

This is not something to be thought of in terms of fiscal years, congressional biennium, nor presidential administrations. It is a matter for continuing consideration extending to decades and generations. Has it occurred to you that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force—as well as the other services—in the year 2000 should be entering the personnel system next year? I am concerned about what kind of man he will be when he reaches the top, since it will depend upon what kind of environment we provide for his professional development.

It is already and necessarily a different environment from that in which past military leaders have grown up. The job is tougher because of the policy course on which the Nation has embarked. It is the very difficult course of pursuing peace with justice by maintaining a war-ready Military Establishment as a deterrent to war.

We support a United Nations type of approach to the problem because it is consistent with our national ideals and our concept of civilization, but it takes real military strength to back this kind of undertaking.

Effective military strength can be had only by recognition and practice both within the military profession and by the great American public of their interdependence and their obligations to each other.

Tonight, we salute the people selected from among us who provide that military strength which enables us to act like Americans on the world stage. Let's make sure we also act like Americans in our treatment of professional military people at home.

This Is It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is now taking over individual homes to relocate families into residential districts. Although some of us warned months ago that this would happen, there were those who laughed it off. Now it has happened. This is the ultimate goal of public housing.

A story in the Washington Daily News of May 13, 1964, says that the National Capital Housing Authority in the District of Columbia is relocating 50 large families in private rented houses. Now you will no longer be able to pick your neighborhood or choose your neighbors—the Government is going to decide on the makeup of residential areas.

I wonder how far the social planners will go before the American people become fully aware of what a planned economy and an expanding welfare state is going to mean to every American citizen?

The News article follows:

HOUSING

Under a new public housing plan, 50 large families have been relocated by the National Capital Housing Authority in private rented houses scattered throughout Washington. In the pilot project each tenant pays $66 of the $90 cost. NCHA pays the difference.

A Reclamation Program Is Needed for Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1964, the American Farm Bureau Federation held its national natural resources conference at Wichita, Kans. The conference was privileged to have as its guest speaker the able and distinguished Congressman from Pennsylvania, JOHN P. SAYLOR, ranking Republican member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Congressman SAYLOR's address, touching upon the various aspects of water legislation is clear, concise, and most interesting. It should be required reading for every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include Congressman SAYLOR's address, as follows:

A RECLAMATION PROGRAM IS NEEDED FOR RECLAMATION

(Remarks of the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, Member of Congress, before the National Natural Resources Conference, American Farm Bureau Federation, Wichita, Kans., March 23, 1964)

When my good friend John Taylor asked me to make a few remarks to this fine conference meeting, he said he wanted me to "cover the waterfront." But, to do an adequate job of covering all the various aspects of water legislation with which we are concerned in the Congress would take more time than we have available today. For this reason, I will confine most of my remarks to the reclamation program. However, before getting down to the specifics of that program about which I want to share some thoughts with you, let me take just a few minutes to highlight a few pieces of pending legisla-

tion in which you may have some interest.

First, let's look at H.R. 9032, known as the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. As you all know, this bill was introduced by my very good friend and the distinguished chairman of the House Interior Committee, WAYNE ASPINALL.

Let me say here, as an aside, that I think we are fortunate to have WAYNE ASPINALL as our committee chairman because of his sincerity and integrity. I will admit that sometimes I find it necessary to fire his retrorockets when he is in orbit on some of these Federal programs and bring him back down to earth a bit; but, by and large, we have usually enjoyed a cordial working relationship.

With those kudos behind us. H.R. 9032 was written to provide uniform policies and a fixed formula with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water research projects and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for development of reclamation projects under his control.

It was felt that some kind of legislation was needed because the applications of recreation benefits to water projects had been developing in a somewhat helter-skelter way for a number of years. There was no clear and definitive congressional expression of policy guiding the Department of the Interior in this matter. The Interior Committee ordered the bill favorably reported, with amendments, on February 19 of this year and it is now pending on the House Union Calendar.

H.R. 9032 is significant because the functions for which benefits may be included in the evaluation of any given water resource project are just as important as the functions to which costs may be allocated in apportioning the cost of joint-use facilities. It should be recognized that an increase in the functions for which benefits may be included correspondingly increases the likelihood that the project which may have previously been unfeasible may now be feasible—in that benefits will exceed costs. This is particularly true if the added benefits does not involve a commensurate increase in cost. It should also be remembered that the inclusion of added functions to which joint costs may be allocated has a different and distinct impact on the price to be charged for any hydroelectric power produced in the operation of a project.

In terms of the general purpose, I think this legislation may bring some degree of order out of the chaos now existing relative to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits. There are, however, some shortcomings of the bill which should be kept in mind. For example, the formula concerning joint costs together with the provisions for nonreimbursable allocations of other costs can lead to excessive assignments of costs to the Federal Government far beyond anything we have seen before. In addition, it would seem that the provisions of recreation facilities by the Federal Government should be looked at from an overall standpoint and each proposed recreation facility should be weighed in terms of priority with other needed recreation facilities. Furthermore, recreation benefits should not be used as a ruse for making projects possible which would otherwise be unfeasible.

There is an amendment added by the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and approved by the full committee on which I find myself in disagreement with my chairman; and I will do my utmost to have it changed on the House floor. This amendment is found in section 2 of the bill and would prohibit appropriation of funds for construction of recreational facilities or the acquisition of land for recreational purposes which have not been specifically authorized previously at existing Federal water resource projects without further negative action by the Congress. Either the House or Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, or both, would have 60 days from the date on which the Secretary of the Interior submits a report on a proposed recreational development in which to disapprove of any such proposed development. If either committee does not disapprove the proposed development within the 60-day period, the Secretary would be authorized to proceed with an appropriation request.

While I firmly believe the Secretary of the Interior should come back to the Congress for authorization to proceed with the construction of or the purchase of land for recreational facilities at projects already authorized, this authority should be granted by a positive act of the Congress rather than by a negative veto by congressional committees.

This same basic issue of positive congressional action—rather than negative congressional or committee veto—is also involved in such important issues as the Westland amendment to the Northwest regional preference bill and the proviso added by our committee recently to the Missouri River basin authorization bill requiring authorization or reauthorization of any new projects in the Missouri River basin.

During consideration of the Missouri River basin authorization bill by our committee, my distinguished chairman was rather insistent upon the proviso requiring affirmative reauthorization and he pointed out—I think I can quote him exactly—"I see no reason why we should not be absolutely consistent in our approach to other projects." By the same token, I cannot see why we should not be absolutely consistent in our approach to other legislative proposals requiring affirmative congressional action.

Therefore, at the appropriate time in consideration of H.R. 9032, I will suggest this provision be changed to require positive congressional authorization rather than expressing a negative congressional veto. It is my sincere wish that my chairman will see his way clear to support my efforts to be consistent.

I have only a couple of things to say about other water bills in which you may have an interest. The first one is S. 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act on which the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of our committee is holding hearings today and tomorrow. The Senate passed the bill last December 4.

Basically this legislation would establish a Water Resources Council to formulate, for presidential approval, standards of evaluation and appraisal for Federal water resources projects. It also provides for establishment of river basin commissions and authorizes a Federal grants-in-aid program to assist States in water resources planning.

This problem of water resources planning on a broad basis has been considered by several different groups in recent years and many recommendations have been made such as the Second Hoover Commission in 1955, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in 1956, and the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources in 1961. Legislation has also been considered on this general problem in previous sessions of Congress, but no final action has been taken. Personally, I hope this bill will also never receive final approval because I do not think it is the proper answer for the problem.

Next, the water research center bill, S. 2, would establish water research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities to stimulate water research and to promote a national program of water research. This bill was passed by the Senate last April and by our committee early this year. Unfortunately, the House Rules Committee did not see fit to grant us a rule on this bill. For this reason its future is somewhat in doubt.

Now let's talk about reclamation.

I think the time has come for all of us to realize that there is a desperate need for a reclamation program for reclamation. What do I mean by that?

The Federal reclamation program was begun over half a century ago for the basic purpose of reclaiming the arid, barren lands of the West in order to make them more productive. In the insuing decades, and particularly in the past few years, the policies and programs of the bureaucrats in the Bureau of Reclamation have wandered so far afield from this basic goal that it seems reclamation has become of only incidental importance. The present officials of the Bureau of Reclamation have become so preoccupied with attempts to develop unnecessary hydroelectric power projects and Federal power transmission grids that their thinking has become as arid and barren as the western lands they were formerly charged with reclaiming. As a result of this, and other unfortunate policies, there is a serious danger of the honest reclamation program falling into disrepute with many Members of Congress and other thinking individuals. In fact, at a recent hearing before our committee, one of my colleagues from the eastern part of the United States suggested the Bureau of Reclamation change its name to the Bureau of Federal Power. For this reason I repeat, a reclamation program is needed to reclaim the Bureau of Reclamation for its original purpose before it is too late.

One of the first steps which might be taken would be to enact legislation which would clarify the amortization of the irrigation portion of multiple-purpose hydro developments in order to ease the burden on the Nation's taxpayers. This problem was recently brought to mind again when the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee was having hearings on H.R. 3672 to authorize the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa reclamation projects. In questioning Mr. F. M. Clinton, a regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, about Savery-Pot Hook, I pointed out that of the $15 million allocated to irrigation in the project almost $13 million would have to be repaid by power revenues. Mr. Clinton indicated the first need for funds from power revenues to cover this irrigation obligation would not be required until 50 years after the end of a 10-year development period or until the year 2024.

To this statement I replied, "What you are telling this committee and the Congress, in other words, is that from now until 2024, the $12,910,000 will be loaned to this project free of interest." And Mr. Clinton answered in the affirmative.

In other words, this means that for 60 years the taxpayers of the United States are subsidizing the interest payments on that $13 million worth of irrigation facilities in the projects for a small group of people who will directly benefit. Savery-Pot Hook is only one of the three projects in question, but this same principle of subsidy applies to almost every Federal project in the West.

When the reclamation program first began, the irrigators who would benefit directly were required to repay the total allocated costs in a 10-year period without interest. But, through a series of subsequent acts of Congress, we have now arrived at this point where they repay only a small portion of the irrigation costs allocation still without interest, in 50 years plus a 10-year development period. The remainder—and usually this is by far the vast majority of the irrigation allocation—is repaid from power revenues and still this is without interest. Frequently the anticipated revenues from irrigation are not adequate to repay costs allocable to irrigation. Accordingly the irrigation costs beyond the ability of water users to repay must be paid by revenues from

the sale of hydroelectric power or the sale of water.

The so-called Collbran formula, which was developed in 1952 for the Collbran reclamation project in Colorado, is in part responsible for this situation. The formula provides that the construction costs allocated to irrigation but beyond the ability of the water users to repay be liquidated from power revenues after the costs allocated to power have been repaid. This might be considered as a balloon payment at the end where nothing is paid on the principle for 50 years and then a large payment or a balloon payment is made at the end to payoff the irrigation allocation.

This problem was recognized as far back as 1955 by the Second Hoover Commission. In the Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power, volume II, page 632 and 633, it is stated:

"The task group objects to practices which manipulate the returns from project investment, to provide low-cost power and irrigation subsidy. Methods of cost allocation which relieve power revenues of their share of the burden of payment of project cost, particularly where there are features whose cost is nonreimbursable, is one such practice. The recapture of the interest component where the return of interest on power investment is used to pay irrigation costs, resulting in the subsidy by the general taxpayer not only of irrigation but of power by paying interest on the entire capital investment, is another such practice. The currently proposed Collbran formula, under which the part of the cost of a project allocated to power would be paid off within a 50-year period and then payments made to retire the interest-free investment in the project, should be examined with care. Under certain conditions its application may result in a large subsidy being imposed on the taxpayer, but the objectionable feature, to the task group, is the long delay in a return on a portion of the Federal investment. Too much can happen in a 50-year period, if all are to be treated fairly, to defer payment on a project whose eventual cost is very likely to be underestimated at the time of authoriatzion.

"If power installations are to be charged with the cost of a portion of the irrigation development, in addition to those strictly applicable to power, then it is obvious that power cannot be sold at minimum rates."

This type of subsidy is not only unfair to the general taxpaying public but it is also unfair to the vast majority of the Nation's irrigators. It may be noted in the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1963 that there are over 33 million acres in the United tSates under irrigation. While, at the same time, there is a little more than 3 million acres under irrigation from Federal reclamation projects. In other words, over 90 percent of the irrigated land of the United States is being provided by hardworking farmers using their own initiative and relying on non-Federal methods of meeting their problem while paying the full cost of their obligation. Before some Federal bureaucrat attempts to challenge my use of national irrigated acres data since the Federal reclamation program applies only to the West, let me say that over two-thirds of the Nation's irrigated land is located in the West. So, even considering only those western acres, it is still grossly unfair to the seven farmers doing it on their own as compared with the one farmer who is depending on the Federal Government.

The repayment formula for Federal water projects should be changed in such a way as to require that the irrigation allocation beyond the ability of water users to repay should be concurrently amortized with the power costs so that an incremental payment would be made annually to the retirement of both elements of cost. Furthermore, there can be little justification in my mind for the continuation of the policy of charging no interest on the portion of the irrigation costs which is repaid from power revenues. It is all right for the Federal Government to charge no interest to the water users for the small part of the allocation which they must repay. But, I propose that the repayment formula be further changed to require an interest charge be placed on the amount of the irrigation cost allocation of any Federal water project which must be repaid from power revenues. This interest charge should be identified with the rate of interest applied to power portion of the project.

There are other facets of a needed reclamation program for the Bureau of Reclamation that will be necessary to save this activity from total repudiation. Let's hope it is not too late to begin.

Governor Wallace Vote in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last week, I called the attention of this House to what I believed to be a biased account of the recent Indiana primary by the Columbia Broadcasting System. I made particular reference to CBS's reliance on former Democrat employee, Lou Harris, who made the allegation over CBS-TV that the Wallace vote in Indiana was inflated by an 11 percent Republican crossover.

I pointed out the previous statement by the Indiana Governor that any Republicans who attempted to crossover would be challenged and forced to sign an affidavit, and I urged CBS to count the affidavits which had been signed to determine the true number of Republican crossovers.

I have now received a reply from Mr. Fred Friendly, president of CBS news, a reply which in my opinion raises more doubts than it resolves. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, Mr. Friendly's letter and my reply, and I leave it to the judgment of fairminded persons in the news profession to determine if my original charge was right or wrong.

CBS NEWS,
COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 8, 1964.

The Honorable DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Your statement on the floor of the House on May 6 concerning what Louis Harris said on our report of the Indiana primary, on Tuesday, May 5, has come to my attention. I thought you might be interested in knowing on what evidence Mr. Harris based his findings.

There was substantial evidence of a Republican crossover vote of nearly 15 percent. On a statewide basis, there were 14.9 percent fewer Republican votes and 14.9 percent more Democratic votes than in 1960. To put it another way, there were over 29 percent more Democratic votes than Republican, as compared with a virtually equal vote total for each party in 1960.

In our Indiana primary precinct analysis, in which we carefully scrutinized 42 individual precincts which, in aggregate, reflect statewide characteristics, we found individual evidences of crossover. To take one example, precinct No. 1 in Bicknell in Knox County, Tuesday night, showed a Democratic total of 76.8 percent of all votes cast. In 1960, this same precinct voted only 48.4 percent Democratic. We might add that in this precinct Tuesday night, Governor Wallace was the victor with 60 percent of the Democratic vote.

Still another direct connection is a breakdown of our precincts relating the Wallace vote with the amount of change between Democratic and Republican voting from 1960. In those precincts where there were from 1 to 10 percent more Democratic votes than in 1960, Governor Wallace received 29.3 percent. And, finally, where crossover was heavy as in the case cited above—where the Democratic increase from 1960 was 20 percent or more—Governor Wallace won 46.5 percent of the vote.

These figures are based on our 42 model precincts, which, we might add, were accurate as to the State outcome by one-tenth of 1 percent. Our Indiana primary precincts showed a 29.7 percent share of the Democratic vote for Governor Wallace, as against a final total as reported by the Associated Press of 29.8 percent.

We might also point out that affidavits were required of crossover voters only when they were actually challenged by Democratic poll watchers. Our own information is that the poll watchers did not challenge in most cases, and this is verified by the New York Times which reported that "it appeared that the Democratic poll watchers were failing to follow their instructions to challenge Republican switchers."

I hope that this evidence will convince you that there were indeed serious grounds for reporting, as Mr. Harris did, that there were substantial crossovers by Republicans in some parts of Indiana in last Tuesday's primary. And I would like to think that you no longer believe, if you ever did, that CBS News would broadcast reports that had any partisan bias whatsoever. We do not and never will.

Respectfully,

FRED FRIENDLY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1964.

Mr. FRED W. FRIENDLY,
President, CBS News, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. FRIENDLY: I have your letter of May 8, 1964, with its "explanation" of how CBS and Mr. Lou Harris arrived at the conclusion early in the evening of the Indiana primary that there was a "11 percent Republican crossover for Governor Wallace."

May I say that your explanation raises more doubts than it resolves, and that what I hoped was a single case of poor reporting, appears to be based on reasoning that could make it a steady habit. I must preface my comments by again referring to the fact that pollster Lou Harris has a history of sympathy for Democratic causes as evidenced by his previous employment with President Kennedy and the Democratic National Committee. I note a careful avoidance of these facts in your reply of May 8. This seems in conflict with your statement that CBS News "has not and never will" broadcast reports with a partisan bias.

Having high regard for all the exotic equipment to which CBS constantly refers for making election computations, I'm amazed that you apparently took only one statistic—a comparison between relative GOP and Democratic votes cast in the 1960 primary—and made this the basis for your allegation (now raised to a 15-percent Republican crossover).

(I'm not amazed when I remind myself it was not you, but Lou Harris.)

To form such a conclusion, you (Lou Harris) obviously have to assume that approximately the same relative number of Democratic and Republican voters turn out to vote in primary elections regardless of the contests involved, regardless of the drawing power of the candidates, regardless of the national import given to the outcome of each party's race, and regardless of whose ox is being gored.

I find it incredible to believe that the CBS News staff (for which, with the exception of Lou Harris, I have the highest respect) would not take these other factors into consideration and indeed assign to them far more relative importance than a simple comparison of turnouts in the previous primary.

By your (Lou Harris') reasoning, the overwhelming Kennedy victory in the Wisconsin 1960 Democratic primary was the result of a massive Republican crossover.

In that primary election a total of 843,000 Democrats turned out and only 339,000 Republicans voted—far below the usual GOP turnout in a primary. Would you say this represented a heavy Republican crossover? That is exactly your reasoning in Indiana, where Senator GOLDWATER had only token opposition.

The point I make is, why does CBS find it so impossible to credit the larger Democrat vote in Indiana to the simple fact that there was a crucial, exciting, and attention-getting Democrat presidential primary—which could be expected to draw more Democrats out to the polls by any impartial observer, let alone a trained news staff. Perhaps you are beginning to see why I question your use of Democrat Party stalwart Lou Harris.

Then too, if there was a Republican crossover, on what basis does Mr. Harris automatically assume that it went to Governor Wallace as opposed to Governor Welsh? I recall that most Republican Congressmen from Indiana voted for the civil rights bill. Would that not suggest at least the possibility that the Republican crossover, if any, did not give undue advantage to either Wallace or Welsh? Would an objective reporter not raise this possibility instead of making a flat accusation on the same night that meager raw data was being compiled? What about the overwhelming Wallace vote in traditionally Democrat Gary?

And if you go one step further, have you thought about the possibility of a Democrat crossover for Stassen in order to embarrass Senator GOLDWATER? Did Mr. Harris even delve into this possibility? Certainly not, for his interest lies in promoting Democrat Party causes, and "myths."

I do not ask that you take my word for any of these facts. Check previous election records yourself. Find out whether party turnouts vary greatly depending on the contests involved and their national import. Only please don't let Lou Harris do your researching.

To further prove my point that the CBS conclusion about a Republican crossover was based on a false premise, I make the prediction that the Democrat Party turnout in next Tuesday's Democrat primary will be substantially greater than the turnout in the 1960 Maryland primary. If this is so, your reasoning would have to attribute this to a Republican crossover. Yet both you and I know that Republican crossovers are prohibited in Maryland.

The most discouraging factor in all this is that millions of Americans rely on the three major networks for a good portion of their news and have a right to expect and receive hard factual reporting, not inaccurate or biased speculation.

Yet, today the two major newsmen on NBC, when speaking before various private audiences, candidly identify themselves as liberals and Democrats. The two "prestige" newsmen at ABC, Howard K. Smith and Ed Morgan, are both avowed liberals, and Democrats.

If we cannot expect objective, fair reporting from CBS, to whom can the American people turn for a fair presentation of the facts in the coming political campaign? Can the networks not produce news and commentary which presents the American people with a fair basis on which to make a sound, intelligent, and considered choice next November. Must the networks filter out the news and allow the political preferences of their top newsmen to be reflected in their reporting and commentary?

Because I believe the single incident of the Indiana reporting as well as these overall aspects to be a crucial issue, I plan to make widespread dissemination of both your letter and my reply, and any subsequent reply you wish to make.

I also deeply regret that while you saw fit to authorize a televised interview on this matter with Wells Church, you chose not to use the interview on CBS evening news, and thus denied your audience an opportunity to draw their own conclusions.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

Trade Policies for Developing Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important item on the agenda of the United Nations' Conference on Trade and Development is the means to facilitate growth of the developing countries. Many ideas have been put forth with this objective in mind, including such proposals as commodity agreements, compensatory financing to subsidize developing countries for losses arising from a deterioration in their terms of trade, preferential trade treatment for the developing countries, the organization of new regional trade groupings and a new trade organization.

A number of these ideas are useful, and merit further exploration. Others are unjustified and, in the long run, would be harmful to both the developing and developed countries. The fact that is often overlooked is that the solution to the problems of primary producing countries should be sought in measures to diversify their economic base and improve the adaptability and skills of their populations. Above all, it requires the creation of an efficient civil service.

The most glaring omission in the Conference agenda is any real consideration of the role that private investment can and must play in any development. By creating a favorable climate for such investment, countries needing such capital can broaden the base of the economies and diversify their exports.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the April 1964 issue of the First National City Bank of New York's Monthly Economic Letter dealing with this subject in the RECORD at this point.

TRADE POLICIES FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

More than 2,000 delegates representing 122 nations gathered in Geneva on March 23 for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—the largest international economic meeting ever held. Scheduled to run for 12 weeks, its basic aim, in the words of United Nations Secretary General U Thant, is "to create an international trade environment that would facilitate the growth of developing countries, and not thwart it."

The so-called developing countries naturally have the highest expectations for a favorable outcome, since the conference was organized at their request. Western industrial countries have been less enthusiastic, partly because it was feared that the views of the major trading nations would not receive adequate consideration. Moreover, the Communist countries were expected to use it to try to discredit the trade and aid policies of the West. Apprehensions on this score were quickly confirmed when Premier Khrushchev, in a message read to the opening session, charged that "imperialist exploitation, discrimination and artificial barriers" were exhausting the wealth of the underdeveloped countries and retarding their progress. But, as the accompanying chart shows, the Communist countries currently play such a minor role in the trade of the developing countries that the latter may be expected to demand something more than propaganda.

Another concern had been that the conference, coming several weeks before the formal start of the Kennedy round GATT negotiations on May 4, might create distractions from the vital work of lowering trade barriers at the latter meeting. While the GATT negotiators are empowered to make binding decisions for their respective countries, delegates to the U.S. conference are not. Since the developing countries have a large stake in this trade bargaining, however, the overlapping of the meetings may turn out to be a good thing.

Raising the living standards of the underdeveloped countries has long been a major goal not only of the U.S. Government, but also of American business enterprises in their commercial, industrial and financial activities around the world. It is widely recognized in this country that progress toward prosperity is a pressing necessity for the poorer countries themselves, and, at the same time, a prerequisite for greater political stability and peace in the world. Realistic and constructive proposals to this end are, therefore, matters of mutual interest for the developed and less developed countries alike.

THE PREBISCH DIAGNOSIS

Far-reaching changes in trade policies and practices are being proposed at the meetings. The less-developed countries—by far the most numerous in the United Nations—have dominated both the planning and running of the conference. The basic ideas animating the conference were formulated by its Secretary-General, Dr. Raul Prebisch, the well-known Argentine economist, in a lengthy document entitled "Toward a New Trade Policy for Development." This significant paper sets forth the case for the developing countries in seeking to change present trade arrangements.

The United Nations has proclaimed the sixties as the "development decade" for the less-developed countries and set a minimum growth rate target of 5 percent a year to be achieved by 1970. Owing to rapid population growth, this would mean an actual rate of only 2.6 percent on a per capita basis. The main barrier to achievement of this target is said to be "the persistent tendency toward external imbalance associated with the development process." This leads to a gloomy prediction that "if the factors responsible for the present trend in world trade continue,

the trade gap may reach an order of magnitude of about $20 billion by 1970."

Dr. Prebisch asserts that trade between industrial countries and less-developed areas suffers from a congenital structural defect, manifested in a growing imbalance in the international exchange of primary products (foods and raw materials) for manufactured goods. While the demand for industrial imports by developing countries tends to accelerate, exports of primary products grow relatively slowly. This slow growth is regarded as an inevitable result of technological progress in the industrial countries; synthetic materials are progressively developed to substitute for natural products, while ways are found to economize on materials generally. At the same time, industrial countries like the United States and the Common Market nations maintain protectionist policies to insulate their farmers and—to a lesser extent—their mining industries from competition, thus further damaging underdeveloped countries.

Compounding this problem is said to be a persistent tendency for prices of primary products to fall relative to those of manufactured goods exported by the industrial nations. In the less-developed countries, so the reasoning goes, productivity gains are reflected in falling prices of primary products, while efficiency gains in industrial countries are absorbed—through trade union action—by rising wages. Thus, Dr. Prebisch believes that the richer advanced nations are not only reaping the fruits of their own productivity increases but also those of the less-developed nations. He regards deteriorating terms of trade—the average ratio of export to import prices—between primary producers and industrial countries as a deus ex machina retarding the progress of the developing countries.

The insistent need of the developing countries, according to Dr. Prebisch, is for "a political decision of the first importance; namely, a decision to transfer, in one way or another, to the countries exporting primary commodities the extra income accruing to the industrial countries as a result of the deterioration in the terms of trade."

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE TERMS OF TRADE

It is unfortunate that such extreme views of the trade relationship between developed and underdeveloped countries are becoming enshrined as quasi-official U.N. doctrine. Obviously, the world is not in fact neatly divided into two warring camps—developed and underdeveloped, industrial and nonindustrial, or rich and poor. Just as some industrial nations are richer or poorer than others, many so-called developing countries are much further along the road to higher living standards than others. Moreover, some predominantly primary-producing countries—Australia, New Zealand, and Mexico are notable examples—are making faster progress than some more industrialized nations. It should be recognized that all nations are in a sense developing countries—all trying to achieve better living standards for their own people, with more or less success. Through trade, they can help each other to attain the common goal of rising prosperity.

Equally artificial, and even more harmful, is the notion that the terms of trade provide a useful measure of the gains and losses from commercial transactions. Data on import and export prices are often highly unreliable. Since primary products remain generally unchanged over the years while new industrial products are constantly being introduced and older products improved, comparisons of relative prices are bound to be inaccurate and misleading. Even so, it is worth noting that while the terms of trade for developing countries are less favorable now than in the early fifties—when the Korean war and a coffee boom boosted average primary prices—they are considerably more favorable than in 1938 and not much different from the normal prewar year of 1928. Moreover, as Dr. Prebisch himself has noted, more than half the deterioration experienced by the developing countries since 1953 has already been regained within the last year or so. In any case, the terms of trade are a symptom, and not the cause, of the real problems in primary-producing countries, which usually reflect immobility of capital and labor.

Emphasis on this misleading concept may not only lead to extravagant claims of imagined wrongs but to the mistaken belief that a panacea for development problems can be found in "correcting" the terms of trade. The fundamental truth to be grasped is that a trade transaction is inescapably beneficial to both parties or the bargain would never be made. It is the mutual exchange of benefits that makes expanding trade such a powerful generator of the growth process. The broader the scope for free trade, the greater the stimulus for economic development.

WEAKNESSES IN SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

The solutions for the so-called trade gap suggested by Dr. Prebisch as a basis for discussion may be summarized as follows:

1. Industrial countries should set quantitative targets for imports of both primary and industrial goods from developing countries. Within certain limits, manufactured goods from developing countries should be admitted free of duty by the advanced countries for 10 years.

2. Commodity agreements should be enacted to maintain minimum prices at parity with manufactured goods for those products not substantially affected by competition from synthetics or other substitutes.

3. Where commodity agreements cannot achieve parity in terms of trade, systems of compensatory financing should be devised to subsidize primary-exporting countries for both past and future losses from deterioration in their terms of trade.

4. GATT rules that now restrict the formation of free trade areas and other preference groups should be eased to encourage regional groupings of developing countries as a way of promoting industrialization and diversification through enlarged markets.

5. GATT rules that now generally call for mutual reciprocity in trade concessions among all countries should be amended to allow for "structural inequalities" between industrial and developing countries and to permit preferential treatment in trade for the latter group.

6. Because GATT has not proven effective in dealing with the trade problems affecting the developing countries or the Communist nations, a new trade organization may be needed to carry out the policy emerging from this and future UN trade conferences.

Compensatory measures designed to fill the trade gap by transferring back the losses from worsening terms of trade are not only unjustified but are bound to create much greater problems than they solve. A trade gap may reflect the inflationary strains created by overambitious or misconceived development programs. Assuming that some kind of new financial aid is needed to help primary-producing countries, it would be a basic error to tie such help to the terms of trade. Our own unhappy experience with programs to maintain parity prices for farmers shows that such attempts quickly lead to overproduction on a vast scale. Since nations would stand to gain "compensation" by dumping surplus production on the world markets, there would be little incentive to cut back.

The companion idea of setting up commodity agreements to control the marketing of primary products has been disappointing in practice. Though the idea of stabilizing prices at some equilibrium level may be accepted, producing and consuming countries are usually poles apart on what that level should be. In the latest such attempt—the International Coffee Agreement—climbing coffee prices are already creating disenchantment in the United States, while many producing countries are complaining about the smallness of their export quotas. As a practical matter, there are only a handful of primary products whose prices could be raised without inviting increasing competition from synthetics or a decline in consumption. Solutions to the problems of primary producers should be mainly sought in measures to diversify their economic base and improve the adaptability and skills of the population.

MORE PRACTICAL APPROACHES

Rather than trying to set up new mechanisms to control and redirect existing trade, attention should be focused on ways of increasing international trade and investment generally, with particular emphasis on the practical commercial problems faced by the less-developed countries. Since these countries are already earning some $35 billion a year from exports, it is logical to seek changes designed further to enlarge their markets and close the trade gap. Fortunately, substantial progress in this area is well along under GATT influence, and some of the relevant proposals advanced in the Prebisch document are widely supported in international circles.

The principle that less-developed countries need not make full reciprocity in tariff concessions has already been accepted by GATT in its rules for the coming Kennedy round; it has also been agreed that tariffs on most products of interest to these nations should be given special treatment. In many industrial countries, however, nontariff barriers such as highly restrictive quotas on cotton textiles and excise taxes on coffee are more important than tariffs in limiting imports from less-developed countries. The United States has taken the stand that the barriers to tropical products should be eliminated and that existing preferences—such as those favoring African countries (to the detriment of Latin American and other areas) in the European Common Market—should be gradually removed. Also gaining broader support is the idea that regional groupings of the less-developed countries are desirable as a way of creating the enlarged markets needed for industrialization and specialization.

Though farm policy is a thorny problem in most industrial countries, the less-developed nations are fully justified in demanding a moderation of agricultural protectionism as exemplified not only in the European Economic Community's common agricultural policy, but also in the farm trade barriers imposed by the United States, Japan and others. Again, the Kennedy round bargaining could play a key role in influencing agricultural trade policies around the world. The United States itself has much to gain by taking the lead in establishing arrangements for freer trade in farm products.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE CAPITAL

The most glaring ommission in the conference agenda is any real consideration of the role that private investment can play in fulfilling the capital needs of the developing countries and in stimulating their growth. If the sixties are in fact to become the development decade, these countries must recognize that private enterprise—both domestic and foreign—can make a unique and vital contribution to their industrial progress.

Investment by private business cannot only meet needs for capital but can bring the managerial and technological know-how of the kind that has created unprecedented prosperity in free industrial countries. The United States has instituted tax preferences and other measures to encourage the flow of private capital to the less-developed countries. By creating a favorable climate for such investment, countries needing capital

can broaden the base of their economies and diversify their exports.

Based on our own successful experience, the U.S. delegation to the trade conference is emphasizing both the importance of self-help and the vital role to be played by private capital in the development decade. Addressing the U.N. conference on March 25, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball pointed out the basic choice that must be made by the developing countries: "My country, while itself committed to free enterprise does not seek to dictate the form or shape of the economic systems of others. But nations must make their choices of national policy with full awareness of inescapable economic facts. Nations that elect to pursue policies that tend to eliminate the private sector or discriminate against outside investment should be aware that they are denying themselves a source of capital that could otherwise greatly speed their own economic development."

Private capital admittedly cannot be more than one element in an interrelated approach to development. Yet, with regard to this question as to so many others, the developing countries have it within their own hands to determine how fast they will move in achieving growth. Their attitudes and their laws and their procedures will, in most cases, determine whether the flow of external private capital and technology takes place. Experience gives us no limits on how far the process can carry.

On the Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is well for us to note that the civil rights debate in the Senate is a departure from the normal type of filibuster. Most of the discussion is centered on the issue at hand with extraneous material and nonrelevant subjects discussed primarily by proponents rather than opponents of the bill.

It has always been my view that filibuster is one of the proper and sound traditions of the Senate, permitting anyone who is in a minority at any time to effectively express his point of view and defend a legislative position.

The Harvey Tribune, Harvey, Ill., discusses this subject in a concise and effective fashion in its Sunday, May 10, edition, and I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

ON THE FILIBUSTER

Zealots of civil rights legislation are beginning to shout that those few Senators engaging in a filibuster are guilty of thwarting the democratic process itself.

They argue that for so few to blunt the desire of so many is a gross miscarriage of justice.

Whether the Dixie band is right or wrong in its present stand against the pending civil rights bill is a matter of one's approach to the legislation. However, until they are subdued by the legal processes it is their prerogative to exhaust every legal outlet to block legislation which they oppose.

What should be remembered by everyone is that every tactic they are employing has been employed before by others whether they have been conservatist or liberal.

That great deliberative body, the Senate, thrives on adherence to strict rules and regulations. Though those pressing for adoption of the civil rights legislation could have gotten the required votes to alter filibuster rules they didn't push diligently for it because it would have meant the end of the Senate forum as an open deliberative body.

The filibusterers will be worn down eventually, but in the meantime, it should be remembered by everyone, for or against them in this particular case, that they are not thwarting the democratic processes. They are practicing it.

Rev. Joseph James Bevilacqua: Civil Rights Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in Atlanta, Ga., in an address to the State legislature, President Johnson declared:

Because the Constitution requires it, because justice demands it, we must protect the constitutional rights of all citizens regardless of race, religion or the color of their skin.

Heed not those who would come waving the tattered and discredited banners of the past, who seek to stir old hostilities and kindle old hatreds, who preach battle between neighbors and bitterness between States. This is the way back toward the anguish from which we all came.

It has been said that with the passage of the civil rights bill, we shall not achieve Utopia, nor shall we find ourselves amidst the chaos, violence, and confusion which some predict. With the enactment into law of the civil rights bill we shall only be fulfilling, in a small measure, what our Constitution promised the Negroes many generations ago and which has since been reiterated in both party platforms innumerable times, down through the years. Our President has said that in extending equal opportunity to Americans to whom, up to now, democracy has been an illusion—and not a reality—we will be putting our names on the "cornerstone of what is truly a great society."

I believe we must each individually demonstrate our devotion to the principles of human dignity and justice. We must give our wholehearted support to our President in seeing that this vital measure is passed, and soon. It is hoped that the more than 10 weeks it has been discussed in the Senate, under its archaic rule, will come to a swift and affirmative conclusion. Civil rights is closely affiliated, I believe, with the spiritual and moral strength of our country. For that reason it is essential that there be no further delay in enacting this legislation.

There was a pioneer in the field of civil rights, now a theologian, the Reverend Joseph James Bevilacqua. Recently, on May 1, there appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, an article about him, written by Reporter Cornelius Downes. So as to give national recognition to a great American, under unanimous consent, I insert this article into the RECORD:

TODAY IS LAW DAY—CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHTER SEES MORAL ISSUE

(By Cornelius Downes)

In wartime 1942—when Negroes began dying in earnest for their country because the law and their honor demanded it—theology student Joseph James Bevilacqua sat down with three Negroes in the Jack Spratt Coffee Shop in Chicago.

His friends were refused service because the shop didn't serve Negroes. So Bevilacqua and his friends helped found the Congress of Racial Equality. Today it is a major part of a tremendous movement to give justice to millions of Negroes. He was one of the pioneers.

But today—Law Day, 1964, and 22 years after Jack Spratt day—the Reverend Joseph J. Bevilacqua is one of millions who are firmly convinced that the Nation still must pass a great new law to compel whites to treat Negroes justly and fairly and without discrimination.

That law is in the civil rights bill now being debated in the U.S. Senate.

BASIC MORALITY

"Our law today hasn't yet caught up with the basic morality of our people," said Mr. Bevilacqua, now general secretary of the Hawaii Conference, United Church of Christ.

"Our basic morality is a morality of equality. Most people in the Nation favor racial equality. But many are caught up in a system of discrimination which they cannot change. Law must do that.

When we went in to see the Jack Spratt manager, he was fearful. He feared for his business. And we were as much concerned about his rights and his security, as we were about the rights of Negroes.

"We talked, we explained we tried to show him this had to be done. In the end, he continued to refuse to serve Negroes and we staged the first 'sit-in' for civil rights. He eventually had to give in."

SITUATION TODAY

But today, according to U.S. Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, 85 to 90 percent of all restaurants, hotels, motels, theaters, and lunch counters in 98 Southern and Border State cities with population of less than 10,000 are still racially segregated.

"I have a feeling that either we should say Negroes must be restricted—and write that into law, or say they are equal, and spell that out in law in terms of equality of education, housing, voting, employment, and public accommodations.

"Laws give permanency to morality," Mr. Bevilacqua said.

UNJUST LAWS

He was asked, in an interview in his office at Nuuanu Avenue and Judd Street, whether "unjust laws" should be broken by civil rights advocates involved in direct action.

"Laws which violate fundamental human rights must be violated," he said. "Any law which inhibits full expression of a person's opportunity and freedom should be looked at very carefully * * * the higher law which spells out more fully the rights of people must be taken into consideration.

"Unjust laws must be challenged. Someone must go in there and break them to bring them out into the light of reason. If they are not challenged, injustice cannot be changed."

POSSIBILITY OF HARM

Mr. Bevilacqua is fearful, however, that recent events in the civil rights movement, such as the New York World's Fair "shutdown" actions and others by Negro leaders who favor a more militant approach to civil rights, will do great harm to the movement he helped establish.

"We followed Gandhian principles—nonviolent direct action with personal involvement, no retaliation against violence, courteous manner, willingness to suffer, and always explaining in advance to those involved why we were doing what we were doing.

"If we do not soon have some great advance in law to guarantee civil rights, you may see a more violent type of Negro leadership in control. The civil rights bill is a safety valve against a violent revolution.

"But I think the bill will pass the Senate. I think cloture limiting debate will be approved. I'm tremendously hopeful.

"Negroes now have in sight the equality they have fought for for 100 years. The civil rights movement isn't a movement of revolt or despair. It is a revolution of real hope to end discrimination—by law."

Has the President Forgotten We Have a Private Enterprise System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the daily barrage from the White House of new programs with more and more promises of something for everybody with nobody paying the bill, administration spokesmen seem to have forgotten that the economy of the United States is founded upon a private enterprise system.

The President is going to bring about full employment with Federal money and federally sponsored public works. He is going to raise the standard of living for all the people with Federal funds through bigger public housing projects, food stamp plans and federally financed medicare. In the Johnson world of tomorrow everybody is going to have everything whether it is earned or not.

There is just one nagging question: Who is going to pay for it?

The Federal Government has no money of its own. It can only spend what it takes from the people in the first place. Wealth is created by the people through private initiative, private investment, and the willing hands of those who toil. When we reach this rosy tomorrow the President is promising and we have dried up all the incentive for private initiative with everyone working for the Government, where is the money coming from to pay the bill? Would it not be interesting if the administration economists would give us a simple answer to this simple question?

The more logical end of the promises now being made is more likely to be that of stagnation of our economy. The "Promise of Stagnation" is ably discussed in the following editorial from the May 8 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

PROMISE OF STAGNATION

"The time has come for labor and Government and business to agree that we are going to achieve—and keep—full employment."

President Johnson made the remark in talking to a group of union leaders the other evening. He went on to explain that if the private economy, with the aid of the tax cut, cannot employ all our people, then "the Government will have to do for people what private enterprise fails to do—we will step up our programs of public works."

There is reason to believe that the administration would prefer to avoid that course and will not be in a rush to embark on it. All the same, the President's comments are a reminder that this long fashionable theory of public works for full employment has not faded away, despite the various things about it that make its validity highly questionable.

In the first place, full employment is itself a term of doubtful meaning. Most economists no longer accept it in a literal sense, particularly in a farflung economy with a considerable amount of seasonal work, changing demands, and wide disparities of skills and abilities. Right now, much less would be heard about unemployment if the skills were available to fill the job openings that exist.

Accordingly, many people in private as well as public life are exploring what can be done to improve skills to meet the requirements of an increasingly complex economy. But no one should pretend that this and other facets of the problem are easy to solve. Or that particular moves like reducing taxes can be guaranteed to generate enough economic activity to eliminate most of the current unemployment.

In fact, the whole idea that the economy can or should move only upward, with never a pause, is also a little unrealistic. In any economy, whether rigidly planned or relatively free, a number of circumstances can cause a downturn. One of them is an inflationary Government policy. That is why there is so much worry today that the Government may be overheating the economy, already in an unusually long expansionist phase, and risking recession and more joblessness in the next year or so.

Greatly increased spending for public works, in any event, hardly constitutes a workable solution to the problems of upgrading skills or the problems of people who have been priced out of the labor market by statutory minimum wages and other Government or union policies.

As it is, Government spending has been rising rapidly for a number of years without making any appreciable dent in the official estimates of unemployment. Neither the experience of the depressed thirties nor of the postwar recessions suggest that make work programs are a useful alternative to private economic activity, let alone a key to prosperity.

What the more recent experience does show is that the business community can do much to even out the so-called business cycle, keeping booms from getting out of hand and thus moderating the severity of recurrent recessions. But these efforts will be unavailing if the Government itself seeks to stimulate an excessive expansion, with all the dangers of inflation, speculative distortions, downturn, and increased unemployment.

So it seems to us somewhat off the target to talk of a failure of private enterprise in not always employing all who are able and willing to work. Not only has no other form of economic organization provided so much well-being for so many; despite all obstacles, employment continues to grow and can grow more if the economy is permitted to function.

As for Government activity, including public works, it is not something independent of private enterprise but depends on it for its funds; either that, or it must be financed by inflation. What the Government does "for the people," therefore, can be damaging to their interests.

That, we think, is pretty much the essence of the matter. If reasonably full employment is the goal, less Government manipulation and more enlightened Government attitudes are required. To present public works as a means of achieving the goal is to offer a promise of stagnation or worse.

In the Wake of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a sports section of any newspaper yields material which is directly applicable to our deliberations in the Congress. However, an article by Columnist David Condon in the Chicago Tribune's "In the Wake of the News" column discusses in part the keen observations of Abe Saperstein, owner of the Harlem Globetrotters, and his frank commentary on our foreign aid program.

Since we are at the moment deliberating this program in committee and all efforts to effect economies to place practical administration regulations into effect are being ruthlessly crushed by the majority, I feel Mr. Saperstein's comments as reported by Mr. Condon are especially in order, and insert the column into the RECORD at this point:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS

(By David Condon)

A world sports leader yesterday said that a few years and 4,500,000 miles of global touring have left him convinced that American foreign aid dollars "are going down rat holes, and into the secret Switzerland bank accounts of some foreign rulers and bureaucrats. I don't think much of the money is getting into the hands of the little guys."

The sportsman echoing a political opinion was Chicago's Abe Saperstein, who has taken his Harlem Globe Trotters basketball team to 96 nations and visited several of these points many times.

Saperstein said: "When newsmen and diplomats from America visit some out-of-the-way places I know, they are met at the airport and given red carpet treatment. They see only what the big rulers want them to see.

"But nobody meets me at the airport. I see. I hear in French, German, and English. Some of those foreign rules must have numbered Switzerland lockboxes that look like Fort Knox."

Saperstein, just returned from his most recent foreign jaunt, said: "I've been in Spain every year for 14 years. We must have given billions to Spain. But basically, Spain hasn't changed much, except for a little building.

"Once, driving from Belgrade, Yugoslavia, I saw a big concrete bridge. I asked the taxi driver, who spoke English, what the bridge was doing in such an out-of-the-way place. He said it had been built several years before, with Marshall plan money, but they hadn't built any roads leading to the bridge.

"I don't think any Congressman or Senator can show me much advantage to the way we're presently spending foreign aid millions. I've seen too much."

Saperstein scoots around this small globe like an astronaut. He doubled around on this recent whirlwind trip, visiting Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, the Philippines, Nationalist China, Hong Kong, and Japan. At one point, en route, he left Southern Rhodesia to visit Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, England, then back through New York, Chicago, and a return to Australia.

"I found conditions in Japan the best in history. You can't sleep at night because of the jackhammers working on new projects.

"Tokyo will present the most fabulous Olympics ever."

But Saperstein didn't want to talk about sports. He preferred his political assault.

"I think I'm qualified. We've seen plenty. On this trip, the Trotters had a stopover in Saigon, and we were amazed by the number of American military planes there.

"There were so many American soldiers in the terminal that it was just like being at home."

The Globe Trotters have been fabulous entertainment successes around the world. Still, Saperstein senses great antagonism toward the United States "because the little guy on the street doesn't know we're spending tax dollars to help him. He's getting too few of them."

Saperstein has two thoughts on how to spend the American dollars better.

"First," he said, "the money should be spent by tourists. We Americans are nomads. Many people save for years to go to foreign lands. They want to get full value for their savings.

"But the United States only permits them to bring in $100 worth of merchandise duty free. Why, a good camera could cost more than $100.

"We ought to let the American tourist bring in $1,000 worth of duty-free goods. Then, as he traveled around the world, he'd patronize the small shops and pick up souvenirs and knickknacks. He'd spend more.

"Buying from the little fellow would do more good than some American manufacturer can do by dumping his excess tractors into some country that doesn't need them or may not be able to use them."

Saperstein's second thought: "Since we want to spend billions in foreign aid, we ought to do it sensibly and get something for our tax dollars.

"Remember, in the old days the children from well-to-do families were rewarded with a trip abroad after college graduation? This was to further their education. But you had to be well-to-do to have this; otherwise you didn't get overseas unless the army sent you.

"Today it is more important than ever that our young folks see the world—the out-of-the-way places as well as the cultural centers of Rome, Paris, Amsterdam, and London.

"So why don't our colleges put in 5-year programs—with the Government spending foreign aid dollars to give each college 4-year graduate a final year in Europe? We'd be educating our leaders for tomorrow, the kids would be paying money to the little guy as they moved around, and we'd be getting something for our dollars.

"Not just some secret boxes in Switzerland."

While he talked, Saperstein received a packet of mail. One was from the State Department, enclosing a letter from Yang Sen, president of the Republic of China Olympic committee, to the State Department. It thanked the Globe Trotters for a $1,222 contribution to the Chinese Olympic fund.

Another was an airmail from Ketchikan, Alaska. The Trotters just finished a five-game exhibition series through Alaska for the benefit of the State's Babe Ruth baseball league. Ralph Peters, the Alaska State director, wrote:

"The people are still talking about your show, so I am sure your trip throughout Alaska helped a lot in making them forget—at least for a little while—the disastrous quake and its consequences. Financially, I don't suppose it was any bonanza for you, but the good will you left can't be measured in money."

Saperstein has scored again * * * and maybe he has something in his political thinking.

Questionnaire Results

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, because I have the greatest respect for the views of my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New York, I mailed a questionnaire, printed at my own expense, to 90,000 homes of registered voters in the district soliciting their opinions on topics of national and international significance. The returns have been most gratifying. Over 14,000 replies, far above the average, have been received, many of them including penetrating and witty comments.

I feel that my congressional district—affectionately known as the Fabulous Fourth—while unique in some ways, is also very close to the heart of American thinking on many issues. It certainly represents "suburbia" and the middle income homeowner. I am, therefore, including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a tabulation of the results of my recent questionnaire.

These results are extremely significant because of the unusual way in which the questions themselves were formulated. To make sure that the questions were fair and impartial, I had them reviewed in advance by the presidents of two local colleges. Revisions were made in accordance with their suggestions.

Consequently, I feel confident that this questionnaire is reliable and the results are particularly meaningful to me. For example, the response to question 6 regarding the proposed joint space effort with Russia is extremely important to me as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee which has charge of our Nation's space program. Similarly, the strong support shown in question 15 for a tax deduction for parents paying tuition for their children attending college, has reinforced the conviction that my bill, H.R. 9854, which is intended to provide such tax relief has popular support.

The massive response from my constituents, which swamped my office, proved to me that the American people really are interested in their Government. Thousands of respondents mentioned their pleasure at this opportunity to communicate directly with me, telling me they enjoyed doing so and asking for similar questionnaires in the future.

I had anounced before the answers were tabulated that I would make the results public. Subsequently, numerous people requested copies of the final figures. I have decided to share with all of the residents of the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District the composite thinking of their neighbors.

Those who participated in making this first questionnaire a success have my most heartfelt thanks. I hope their response will encourage others in the future to join in this modern day "town meeting" which provides a clear channel for the voice of the individual American to be heard.

The questionnaire follows:

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN POLICY			
1. Do you favor participation of Red China in the U.N.?	13.2	84.3	2.5
2. Do you favor the proposed wheat sale to Russia?	46.7	51.0	2.3
(a) Do you favor such a sale on credit?	6.5	99.6	13.9
3. Do you favor extending foreign aid to Communist-dominated countries?	9.8	86.0	4.2
4. Do you favor withholding voting rights from U.N. members who do not pay their dues?	90.0	7.0	3.0
5. Do you favor increased financial support for the U.N.?	34.2	56.4	9.4
HOMEFRONT POLICY			
6. Do you favor the proposal for a joint space effort by the United States and Russia to achieve a lunar landing?	39.2	54.9	5.9
7. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation:			
(a) To protect the right to vote?	90.9	6.6	2.5
(b) To enforce school integration?	40.5	51.9	7.6
(c) To enforce equal union and employment rights?	71.8	23.0	5.2
(d) To use the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution to enforce access to public accommodations?	56.5	31.3	12.2
8. Do you favor Federal funds for the improvement of mass transit facilities?	49.0	40.8	10.2
9. Do you favor the gradual elimination of subsidies for farm products?	77.6	14.8	7.6
EDUCATION			
10. Do you favor Federal funds for—			
(a) Public elementary and high school construction?	59.4	38.5	2.1
(b) Public elementary and high school teachers' salaries?	41.1	56.2	2.7
(c) Aid to private elementary and high schools?	34.8	61.8	3.4
11. Do you favor allowing a voluntary, nondenominational prayer to be recited in public schools?	84.8	12.9	2.3
SOCIAL SECURITY AND TAXES			
12. Do you favor medical care for the aged by—			
(a) Increasing social security taxes to finance such care?	40.8	52.7	6.5
(b) Expanding the present Federal-State programs to aid those in need?	42.0	48.4	9.6
(c) Or do you favor private, voluntary medical plans with no Federal involvement?	41.1	41.0	17.9
13. Do you favor a tax reduction without a reduction in spending?	17.4	76.4	6.2
14. Do you favor a tax reduction when the budget is unbalanced?	18.5	73.5	8.0
15. Do you favor a tax deduction for parents paying tuition for their children attending college?	72.3	24.9	2.8

Rebuff to India Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in an article appearing in the Washington Post on May 12, J. A. Livingston has made an important contribution to our understanding of industrial development in the emerging nations.

Mr. Livingston points out that in India, for example, with a per capita income of $70, people "haven't enough for food, clothing and shelter and certainly nothing left over for savings—for capitalism as we know it."

And as Mr. Livingston so correctly emphasizes:

We Americans must modernize our cliches. In poor countries, only the government can command the capital—the resources—to build industrial enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this thoughtful analysis to our colleagues' attention.

ANALYSIS OF THE REBUFF TO INDIA

(By J. A. Livingston)

If Members of Congress who blocked American aid to India for a state-owned-and-operated steel mill at Bokaro, 150 miles northwest of Calcutta, are patting themselves on the back, it is understandable.

They battled for private enterprise. They accepted the verdict of the commitee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay that a Government-owned mill would be unfair competition with privately owned steel mills in India.

The topping on the conclusion is the Soviet Union's agreement to do the financing. Obviously the deal was Communistic from the start.

That's oversimplification, General Clay explained this way: "It isn't possible to encourage private capital from abroad to come into a country when the Government itself is competing."

The Government has the power to set prices. It can operate at a loss and make up its deficits through taxes. In the process, it can force private companies out of business.

That is the traditional position. But is it logical in the 1960's.

The great Volkswagenwerke of Germany is partially owned by the West German Government. It competes with private automobile companies which still survive.

In Italy, the Government has helped finance some industries, primarily to increase employment in the southern tier of poverty. The railroads and telephone companies of most European nations are government-owned and operated.

Private capitalism exists side by side with state capitalism in all major capitalist countries of the world, including the United States. We have the federally owned Tennessee Valley Authority, the New York City-owned subways, and many cities and towns operate public utility systems.

A new phrase has developed in Wall Street—"going public." If a company, owned by a comparatively few shareholders, sells stock on the market, it then becomes publicly owned instead of privately owned.

This terminology reflects the collectivistic, the public, character of General Motors, American Telephone & Telegraph, the various Standard Oils, and so on. They are stockholders owned and stockholders, now numbering 18 million are "the public."

In India, the same type of collective ownership is not possible. The total output of goods and services amounts to $30 billions for a population of 450 million. That's $70 per capita.

People with such low levels of income haven't enough for food, clothing and shelter, and certainly nothing left over for savings—for capitalism as we know it. Companies can't "go public" and enlist a mass of stockholders.

India needs steel. Present production is about 11 million tons a year. The new mill will bring this up to 15 million tons or 70 pounds per capita. In this country per capita consumption exceeds 1,000 pounds.

The steel mill will require $1.5 billion. The Indian Government hoped for $900 million in U.S. aid. With that would have gone countervailing exports from this country to India—machinery, materials, and expert help. Now the Soviet Union will get the business and the influence.

Modern technology is beyond the means of private capitalists in underdeveloped nations. Even if the private steel mills in India had undertaken the Bokaro project, foreign financing would have been necessary. The Indian Government undoubtedly would have had to indorse the note. So, in effect, it would be Government-sponsored anyway.

We Americans must modernize our cliches. In poor countries only the government can command the capital—the resources—to build industrial enterprises.

Communism versus capitalism is not the issue, but democracy versus dictatorship—the right of the governed to say something about the Government versus determinism from on high. And in this, we have no choice but to exert an antitotalitarian influence.

Uniform Daylight Saving Bill Will End Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I introduced H.R. 11206, a bill to provide a uniform period of daylight saving time. This bill should end the confusion caused by different areas starting daylight saving time on different days.

Two weeks ago the first group of States and cities went on daylight saving time. Many others will not shift until a month later.

The Fraser uniform daylight saving bill will have all daylight saving time begin at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of April and continue until 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of October each year.

The Federal Government has regulated standard time since 1918. Regulation of daylight saving time would end the disruption of schedules of buslines, airlines, railroads, and television and radio stations. The transportation industry is especially affected because of passenger inconvenience and additional expense caused by the time differences.

In Minnesota, one city, Duluth, was torn between starting daylight saving with other Minnesota cities at the end of May, or earlier when its twin port, Superior, Wis., went on daylight saving.

Twenty-four States put it into effect on the last Sunday in April while five other States do it later. Some States leave it up to local authorities to decide when to put it into effect. This leads to the ridiculous situation often reported: a 35 mile stretch of road between Steubenville, Ohio and Moundsville, W. Va., a traveler passes through seven time changes.

Mr. Speaker, the Fraser bill is short and simple. It is only 14 lines long. It will end confusion. I set it out at this point in the RECORD so that other Members may read it and consider its merits:

H.R. 11206

A bill to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States", approved March 19, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. Whenever the standard time in any time zone, or any part thereof, is advanced one hour by any State or a political subdivision of any State, such advanced time, generally known as 'daylight saving time', shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April of each year and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October of each year."

John M. Rivers: Model Broadcaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, John M. Rivers, president of WCSC–TV of Charleston, S.C., has again shown himself to be a man of charitable nature and with a strong sense of public duty.

Several weeks ago, word reached Mr. Rivers that the USS *Forrestal* was very anxious to acquire some equipment so that they might have television broadcasts aboard ship. Without hesitation, he removed surplus television equipment from the WCSC–TV studios and presented this equipment to the *Forrestal*. The television cameras and controls he gave them have a replacement value of over $50,000.

Mr. Speaker, by deeds such as this we are shown that all is not a "vast wasteland." What a pity that more broadcasters do not follow his lead, rather than spending their time belittling our military, giving them no praise and earning none themselves.

John Rivers—to whom I am not related—has well earned any praise given him. Aside from his personal deeds, his station personifies community responsibility. In hurricanes and other emergencies, they are always with us, offering directions and comfort. His

radio programing represents a degree of quality and taste seldom found in this day.

In short, John M. Rivers is the image of the model broadcaster.

Exporting Democracy Via the Credit Union Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, some 600 representatives of the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) had the privilege and pleasure of hearing a very interesting and inspiring address by my Wisconsin colleague, Congressman ROBERT KASTENMEIER.

In his address at CUNA's 30th annual meeting, which was held in Madison, Wis., Congressman KASTENMEIER detailed the very valid accomplishments of the credit union movement both at home and abroad. As he pointed out, when we export the credit union idea, we are exporting democracy as well as a means of providing low-cost credit.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Congressman KASTENMEIER's speech in the RECORD:

SPEECH GIVEN BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER AT THE 30TH ANNUAL MEETING OF CUNA

It is a pleasure for me to welcome you to CUNA's 30th annual meeting. I extend you this welcome on behalf of the citizens of Wisconsin, and especially for those of us who live in the Second Congressional District, which includes Madison. We in Wisconsin are proud that the international credit union movement has made its headquarters in our State capital. I like to think that your predecessors found the progressive traditions of our State compatible with their own ideas. It seems to me the progressive tradition and the credit union movement have this much in common: they both are founded on a deep respect for the individual.

Looking over this assembly today, I think it is apparent that the roots of CUNA, planted here 30 years ago, have taken firm hold. In 1934, only a thin network of credit unions stretched across the country. In 1964, not only are there credit unions in every State of the Union, and in every Province of Canada, but there are thousands more overseas. As delegates to this historic meeting, you give testimony to the growth that has taken place in the last three decades. You are proving that the credit union movement is still vital; in a very real way the strength of the movement depends on yourselves and people like you around the world who are working so diligently to extend the influence of credit unionism.

It is heartening to me that the leadership of CUNA has taken as its goal the organization of credit unions not only in the United States but in the rest of the world as well. The story that CUNA is writing in Central and South America is one of the most impressive of all emanating from our foreign aid program. It is of great significance that when we in the United States export the credit union idea, we are exporting more than a means of providing low-cost credit. When we send credit union experts overseas, we are exporting democracy.

Overseas, in Latin America, for example, democracy does not have universal acceptance. The credit union technicians being sent to Latin America have all the skills necessary to operate credit unions in a businesslike way. But they need another skill that is just as crucial. They must posses the ability to win people to the idea of the democratic process. Working with the people to overcome their economic problem, the credit union experts also make them believers in democracy. For the first time, these people become active participants in the democratic process; and the United States wins one more skirmish in the war for the uncommitted people. I am convinced that every successful credit union overseas provides an exercise in democracy.

By dwelling at some length on the accomplishments overseas, I do not mean to slight what has been done in the United States. Here at home, the contribution toward understanding of the democratic way of life, although real, is not of the same magnitude as it is overseas. Instead, I should say one of the most important byproducts of credit union development in this country is the encouragement given the cause of the consumer. There has been in the past few years a remarkable increase of concern for the consumer—both within Government and without. Although the subject of consumer affairs has been of interest to many of you for years I think you will agree it has not generally been a matter for discussion in our country until recently.

I think it is fair to say that the late President Kennedy is responsible for this upsurge of interest. He launched the Era of the Consumer. You will remember that one of his early actions was the establishment of the consumer advisory council. In March 1962, he sent Congress a special message on consumer affairs, the first special message on that subject ever submitted. President Johnson has also shown an awareness of the problems of consumers: first by sending his own special consumer message to Congress, and second, by appointing Mrs. Esther Peterson as his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs. The appointment marks the first time that a representative of consumers has been admitted to the highest councils of Government. Were it not for the past work on behalf of consumers by organizations such as CUNA, these recent achievements would not have been possible.

It is gratifying to me that I find CUNA among those endorsing the truth-in-lending bill. I am happy to be a cosponsor of this legislation in the House. In the Senate, as you know, the bill is sponsored by its author, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. I am happy to say that it has been favorably reported from Senator DOUGLAS' subcommittee. The opponents of the bill are working very hard to convince members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to vote against the bill. It is our hope that in spite of their efforts it will be reported favorably to the Senate. I have always been amused by the position taken by some organizations which claim that their members are violently opposed to the truth-in-lending bill. In one case, I saw a poll of a group of businessmen in my district showing they were in favor of the bill by more than 2 to 1. Nevertheless, I was assured by their State organizations that these same businessmen were adamantly against it. As a lawyer from a small town, I have seen the effects of elaborate credit schemes presented to the unwary. Too often the result is either garnishment or bankruptcy. The truth-in-lending bill will provide a means to end the exploitation of the users of consumer credit. I should think reputable merchants would gladly support this bill.

There are other issues confronting the consumer today that have received excellent publicity in credit union publications. Among these would be the truth-in-packaging bill, for example. Just yesterday I submitted testimony to a congressional committee on another issue of serious consequence to consumers; namely, the status of food marketing. We appear to have reached a crossroad in the development of our food distribution system. Because of the dominance of the large food chains, both the consumer and the small producer may be suffering from the lack of competitive markets. This issue, of course, is not related to the consumer credit field. But the credit union movement deserves praise, in my opinion, because it willingly recognizes that the education and counseling of its members should embrace the whole range of consumer matters, not merely those relating to saving and lending.

Just as credit unions aid the average citizen immeasurably, so too can they aid the underprivileged of our own country, the poor. Credit unions in low-income groups are taking on the difficult task of eliminating economic illiteracy. I think it is accurate to say that economic illiteracy must rank with the problems of unemployment, education, health, and housing as one of the factors keeping millions of Americans locked in poverty. President Johnson has declared war on poverty. It is clear from the programs you have initiated that CUNA already has joined in the battle. Once the poverty program becomes enacted, and I predict it will become law before very long, the vast resources of the Federal Government will be directed in an unprecedented way toward the elimination of poverty. You should be proud that the Federal Government is now preparing to overcome poverty with the same determination that has motivated the credit union movement for years.

Your willingness to combat poverty, your eagerness to organize new credit unions, both at home and overseas, your support of consumer legislation such as truth in lending, and your efforts to educate and counsel your members about the whole range of consumer problems—all these programs give an indication that the credit union movement of today is vigorous and alive to its responsibilities. As delegates to this meeting, you are the official policymakers of CUNA. While you review and adopt policy during the next 2 days, I should ask you to keep uppermost in your mind this single fact: the key to the success of the credit union movement has been man himself. Be ever vigilant for opportunities to extend credit union services to the billions of people around the world. I urge you to evaluate carefully the results of your programs, not so much on a dollars and cents basis, but in the light of how they help people. Credit unions are working historic changes; they have grown strong by satisfying the desire of all men to become economically self-sufficient. When a man can stand on his own feet, confident in his ability to meet his obligations, then he is ready to commit himself to democracy. And it is only when he has made this democratic commitment that he can hope to be truly free.

H.R. 21 Endorsed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that the principle of H.R.

21, the Bow bill for medical care of the aged, was endorsed last week at the annual meeting in Chicago of the Student American Medical Association.

I include as part of my remarks a letter from James C. O. Harris, Jr., president of the SAMA chapter at George Washington University School of Medicine:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. FRANK BOW,
U.S. House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: I am sure that the following resolution, passed at the annual Student American Medical Association meeting in Chicago last week, will interest you:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

"Whereas there is a need for financial assistance in obtaining medical care for the aged who are not covered by health insurance or by social security, nor are they entirely indigent; and

"Whereas there is a need for the medical profession to put forth positive ideas in the realm of medical care for the aged; and

"Whereas the basis of individual participation, as well as the lack of Government control of medical care, is of paramount importance to the medical profession: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Student American Medical Association go on record as favoring the following aspects of the tax credit concept in approaching the problem of medical care for the aged:

"1. Voluntary participation.

"2. Minimum Government control.

"3. Making use of established and experienced private health insurance companies.

"4. The relative low cost of administration and the ease of management.

"5. The promise of comprehensive coverage."

In considering the above resolution both the AMA and administration's (Secretary of HEW before Mr. Mills' committee) statements were considered. SAMA also passed resolutions which urged the implementation of the Kerr-Mills bill in the States where it has not been enacted and others which opposed the social security approach to finance medical care of the aged.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES C. O. HARRIS, Jr.

The First New $75 Savings Bond Bearing the Portrait of Our Late Beloved President Was Purchased by President Lyndon B. Johnson, While the Second and Third Bonds Went to Caroline and John, Respectively, the Next 20 Went to the Kennedy Family, and President Truman Purchased the Next Five

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, May 1, 1964, marked not only the opening of the 1964 Operation Security drive for the U.S. savings bonds, but also the offering by the Treasury Department of a new $75 denomination savings bond bearing the portrait of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy.

It seems to me altogether fitting and proper that U.S. savings bonds—the path that has led so many of our people to financial security and well-being—should honor our martyred President.

Perhaps no man in modern American history so captured the fancy of these same people since the first series E bond was sold 23 years ago today.

Savings bonds have enabled American working men and women to earmark a dollar here and a dollar there into a payroll savings plan until suddenly they found themselves in a position of relative financial security. This is attested to by the millions and millions of Americans who today own and hold more than $47 billion in savings bonds—an investment backlog that not only protects these individuals and their families, but strengthens our communities and our country.

This new $75 savings bond could justly be considered a memorial to that great young man who walked with us, battled for us, and led this great Nation of ours with brilliant leadership. It is a fitting tribute to his belief in America and the fact that through savings bonds so many of our people have been enabled to actually own a share in America.

Israel's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, although celebrated in April due to a difference in calendars—it was actually on May 14, 1948—the hopes of millions of exiled Jews around the world were realized when Israel's independence was declared and the ancient Palestine homeland was thrown open for all Jews. There was not much to encourage or sustain an independent spirit; Palestine had become a barren waste over the centuries. But the very thought of Israel has been enough to inspire Jews everywhere with unquenchable enthusiasm. And, as they have often proved, the enthusiasm of the Jews is backed by abundant courage.

In 1948 Israel inherited only 412,000 acres of cultivated land. There were no forests, no electricity, very little irrigation in a parched land. All of the magnificent cities of ancient Israel were gone.

Worse than this, Jews flooding into Israel to escape the horrors of war and the persecution they had known in many other lands were forced to fight for their freedom immediately after arriving. They fought for their very existence against a determined enemy.

Despite these overwhelming obstacles, Israel is today the wealthiest, and most democratic country in the Middle East. A parliamentary system in which all opinions are represented and a constitution that guarantees basic freedoms make Israel unique in that area. Out of the desolate plains and deserts of 1948 are rising bustling new cities like Tel Aviv, Eilat, Ashdod. The Jewish people have at last found a home where they may pursue that peace and happiness desired by all men. It is fitting that we commemorate Israeli Independence Day, May 14.

Part II—Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as can be seen from the following report on Direct Economic Support, which my constituent, Mr. Conrad R. Hilpert, of Rockford, Ill., secured from the Chief of Public Relations of the Panama Canal Company, the United States is indeed a benefactor to the tiny nation of Panama, whose annual expenditures are far less than the annual benefits afforded them as a result of our presence in the Canal Zone:

BENEFITS ACCRUING TO PANAMA FROM PANAMA CANAL COMPANY—CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT—PART II

INTRODUCTION

Outlined below are benefits that accrue to Panama from the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government and from the proximity of the U.S. presence in the Canal Zone. This listing emphasizes benefits currently accruing to Panama; however, highlights and cumulative totals of past major benefits and services are included where appropriate for purposes of perspective and completeness. Dollar valuations are included when applicable to illustrate the extent of capital facilities or the cost of operating programs. Benefits accruing from other agencies on the Canal Zone are not listed nor are all of the direct benefits covered in the estimated $84 million in purchases and payments tabulated as part I of this report.

1. Direct economic support: Increasing revenues from transactions in goods and services with the Canal Zone accounted, in important part, for the 8.5-percent rise in Panama's gross national product for 1962. Increased direct economic support from the Canal Zone also aided in offsetting Panama's worsening foreign trade deficit caused by her increased spending for imports over export sales in 1962.

(a) Direct purchases from Panama by the Panama Canal organization and its contractors totaled $13,300,000 in 1962. In addition, U.S. citizen employees of the canal organization spent approximately $8,500,000 in Panama for goods and services in 1962.

(b) The canal organization currently employs approximately 11,000 non-U.S. citizens, primarily Panamanians, at a total 1962 payroll cost of $25 million.

(c) The U.S. Government agencies in the Canal Zone on September 1, 1963, initiated, at the Republic of Panama's request, a tax-withholding service to collect Panamanian income tax from the salaries of Panamanian citizens employed in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government. The Panama Canal spent $29,000 on startup costs for this tax collecting service and operating expenses will exceed $15,000 annually. Checks are dispatched to the Panamanian Government biweekly to cover the previous pay period's collections. Annual tax receipts of approximately $675,000

are expected to be deducted from the salaries of canal employees and paid to the Republic. Total tax receipts from all the agencies in the Canal Zone will probably reach $900,000 annually.

2. Capital facilities: The canal organization currently maintains heavy investments in capital facilities that provide important services and support to the Republic and to large numbers of Panamanian citizens. The lands and improvements transferred to Panama in the past 20 years with a total market value of $40 million are not included in the items described below.

A. WATER SYSTEM

Perhaps no other Latin American capital city has the safe, modern water system enjoyed by Panama City. During the canal construction era the United States invested $10,600,000 in a water purification and distribution system to handle water needs in the Canal Zone and in Panama's two terminal cities, Colon and Panama City. In 1946, the U.S.-built water and sewer systems in these two cities were transferred to the Republic at an unrecovered cost of $669,000 to the United States.

(1) Last year the Panama Canal Company spent $1,562,733 to operate its Water Laboratories Branch; more than 70 percent of the water it purified went to Panama. In 1963 the Panama Canal Company spent $700,000 for a 30-inch main to meet the increasing needs of Panama City and suburbs. The population of Panama City and Colon has increased from 24,000 in 1904 to 350,000 in 1963. Now under construction is a 14,000 foot pipeline, 12 inches in diameter, costing $110,665 which the Company is building to furnish fresh water to five Atlantic-side communities in Panama. More than $1 million has previously been spent in water system improvements to accommodate increased Panamanian consumption.

(2) Panama is charged for purified water at the relatively low rates of $.075 per unit of 100 cubic feet for the first 100,000 units, and $.07 per unit for all in excess of 100,000 units. Panama distributes this water in her terminal cities at sufficiently high rates to generate a significant income from the sale of this water.

B. PORTS AND HARBOR FACILITIES

(1) Docks and piers: The Panama Canal Company has 11 docks and piers, which total 2.9 miles of berthing space in operation at Cristobal and Balboa. Panama has no deep water docks or piers and utilizes the Canal organization's facilities for her export-import trade. Panama Canal Company docks and piers at Balboa and Cristobal have a plant value of $19 million.

(2) Aids to navigation: The Panama Canal maintains lighthouses and buoys more than 100 miles beyond the Canal's entrance to guide vessels safely to Balboa, Panama City, and Cristobal-Colon. Modern, accurate, and perfectly maintained inner harbor aids assure the safe and expeditious handling of vessels entering and leaving the terminal-city ports. Many vessels dock at Cristobal and Balboa without transiting the Canal, using Panama Canal tugs, pilots, and equipment for this purpose. A portion of the cargoes carried by these nontransiting vessels figures in Panama's external trade.

(3) Floating Equipment: The Panama Canal Company maintains a fleet of tugs, dredges, drill barges, launches, craneboats, and salvage equipment. This expensive, specialized equipment is available to the Republic at nominal cost for special projects, emergency use, etc.

C. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

(1) Panama Railroad: Completed in 1855, the Panama Railroad has played a key role in Panama's development since the Republic's birth in 1903. It continues to be widely used by Panamanian shippers and undoubtedly acts as a lever on transisthmian passenger and shipping rates and as a quality control guide for services rendered by truckers. The Panama Railroad furnishes free carriage of Panama's mails and allows a 50-percent reduction on freight rate for native products. These services have a total subsidy value of $35,000 annually to the Republic.

(2) Thatcher Ferry Bridge: This important link in the Inter-American Highway was completed in 1962 at a cost of $19 million. Prior to the construction of the bridge the canal operated a large ferry service, at an annual estimated cost of $400,000, that was of primary benefit to the Republic. Total cost of operating the Thatcher Ferry from 1930 to 1962 is estimated at $12,500,000.

(3) Highways: The Canal Zone Government currently maintains a paved highway through the Canal Zone that links Panama City and Arraijan, Republic of Panama. This heavily-traveled and well-maintained highway is of increasing importance to the Republic, as it carries all of Panama's expanding commercial and passenger traffic between the capital city and the Pacific interior regions. To handle the increasing traffic, a project to widen and improve the Thatcher (Arraijan) Highway at an estimated cost of $3 million is currently under study. In years past, the U.S. Government has spent a total of $13 million to construct a transisthmian highway and a portion of the Rio Hato Highway in the Republic.

D. RENTAL AND SALES OF CAPITAL ITEMS TO PANAMA

(1) Much specialized equipment, on occasion, is loaned or rented to Panama at nominal charges. This Canal Zone equipment serves as a reservoir or reserve for Panama's emergency or special project use and represents an investment that her economy cannot afford. Special repairs to the Republic's government-owned equipment is also undertaken at times at a token cost.

(2) Panama's Government agencies are furnished, at token cost, much needed equipment that becomes excess to the canal's needs. In the past year or so, such capital items as large generators, diesel launches, garbage trucks, etc., having a total value of over $321,000, were released through property disposal channels to Panama for only $20,000. It has been determined that such direct sales by the Panama Canal to Panama's Government agencies are in the national interest of the United States.

E. HEALTH FACILITIES

The Canal Zone Government maintains extensive medical facilities having a plant value of $5,700,000. The majority of users who benefit from these modern facilities are Panamanian citizens.

(1) Hospitals (general): Gorgas Hospital on the Pacific side and Coco Solo Hospital on the Atlantic side presently provide heavily subsidized inpatient and outpatient services, including dental care, for approximately 60,000 Panamanian citizens. Gorgas Hospital is currently being enlarged and modernized at a projected cost of $6 million.

(2) Palo Seco Leprosarium: The Canal Zone Government continues to operate a 120-bed leprosarium although almost 95 percent of the current patient load is Panamanian. Since there is no similar facility in Panama, the Canal Zone maintains the leprosarium and for each patient admitted at Panama's request bills the Republic a daily charge to recover a proportionate share of the cost of operating the facility.

(3) Corozal Hospital for mental and domiciliary care: This Pacific side facility with its 300-bed capacity currently provides for the care and treatment of an average of 200 mental patients, over 70 percent of whom are Panamanians.

F. LOW-RENTAL HOUSING

The Panama Canal Company currently provides low-rental housing for almost 11,000 Panamanians and other non-United States citizens who otherwise would be dependent upon the critically short housing market in Panama City and Colon. The canal's current capital investment in housing for Latin Americans totals $4,765,000. Additional capital for new construction and modernization is being obligated annually in support of this program.

G. LATIN AMERICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

Cooperating closely with Panamanian school authorities, the Canal Zone Government has evolved an excellent Spanish-language school system on the Panamanian model. It currently provides a full primary and secondary education for over 3,700 Panamanian students. The Panamanian faculty of the Canal Zone Latin American schools, totaling 120 teachers at present, represents one of the best trained and highest paid faculties in Latin America. The school system's physical plant is valued at $2,149,000. Its annual operating cost to the Canal Zone Government is $901,695.

H. POLICE AND FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES

Specialized Canal Zone police facilities for performing ballistic and chemical tests and other crime detection techniques are available to Panamanian authorities on request. The Canal Zone's highly trained and well equipped firefighting force has played a vital role through the years in helping to contain large fires occurring in the tenement areas of Panama's two largest cities.

Project Phoenix—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, more and more we are hearing of what I believe are shortsighted efforts to appease the Soviet Union in the mistaken belief that the men in the Kremlin will abandon their goal of a Communist world if we will assist them in strengthening their economy. It is inconceivable that we would place any such new reliance on the Soviets in the light of an almost unbroken string of broken promise by Khrushchev and his henchmen, and their predecessors.

A paper "Common Action for the Control of Conflict: An Approach to the Problem of International Tensions and Arms Control," dated July 1963 and prepared under auspices of the Institute for Defense Analyses for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and its predecessor agency represents a major effort to promote such "togetherness" with Moscow. This is the kind of togetherness where we do all the giving.

I discussed this report with the House of Representatives back in February of this year in a statement which appears at page 2770 of the February 10, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Newspaper Columnist Alice Widener a number of months ago devoted considerable attention to discussing Project Phoenix. I believe her observations and com-

ments will be of interest to many Members of Congress and the public. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an item Miss Widener did on Project Phoenix:

PROJECT PHOENIX

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—Is it the intention of intellectuals in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that the United States pursue a strategy enabling the Communist empire to rise like a phoenix from the ashes of its economic and agricultural failure?

Is it also the intention of these intellectuals that the United States form an "entente" with the Soviet Union, wedding the United States and U.S.S.R. economies, unifying their weapons strength, and establishing a United States-U.S.S.R. hegemony over a disarmed world at peace?

All during the spring and summer of this year, top officials of the French and West German Governments asserted that the answer to both questions is "Yes." Moreover, other West European statesmen having access to classified intelligence material also claimed likewise. Meantime, some top officials of our Government said the assertion was merely an unfounded rumor and the American public was left in the dark about the facts.

As far as we are concerned, the first hard news about the foundation of a rumored administration-fostered United States-U.S.S.R. entente appeared in the November 18, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report. It headlined on page 64 "New Policy Line for United States—'Togetherness' With Russia."

The magazine referred to "a blueprint for the latest American strategy in the field of diplomacy" in the 141-page paper "Common Action for the Control of Conflict: An Approach to the Problem of International Tensions and Arms Control." This paper is dated July 1963 and was prepared by Vincent P. Rock, under auspices of the Institute for Defense Analyses, for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Only 300 copies of the paper were circulated.

The flyleaf states, "Not to be quoted at length, abstracted, or reproduced without the specific permission of the Institute for Defense Analyses." A specious disclaimer states that the judgments expressed are those of the author and do not "necessarily" reflect the views of IDA or of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Actually, the paper summarized by U.S. News & World Report is only one of a series. The complete text of all the IDA Phoenix studies is in my possession. They are filled with dynamite. No wonder efforts are being made to keep them away from close scrutiny by the press, the public, and Congress.

In essence, Project Phoenix merely embodies the epitome of pet theories advanced for several years by the leftwing Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, by the Fund for the Republic, and by the Cyrus Eaton subsidized Pugwash group. The only new twist is advocacy of the U.S. technique for effecting tacit agreements between the President of the United States and Chairman Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, with the assent of the Kremlin elite.

Since funds for the IDA Project Phoenix come ultimately from U.S. taxpayers, they would appear to have every right to regard the studies as being in the public domain. When I claimed unrestricted right of quotation and abstraction, it was personally acceded to by Mr. James E. King, Jr., director, International Studies Division, Institute for Defense Analyses. So here are a few teaser quotes to spur nationwide discussion of Project Phoenix before it goes into full effect by tacit executive agreement without our knowledge and consent:

From Study Phoenix Paper, June 4, 1963, pages 30–32: "At present the U.S. budget is virtually bereft of funds intended to support a program of growing constructive interdependence with the Soviet Union or to influence Soviet use of resources in the direction of such interdependence * * *. [The] shifts in American resources could be designed, on the one hand, to encourage shifts in Soviet resources toward consumption and, on the other, to provide the intricate web of understanding and communication essential to Soviet-American entente and common action * * * [The] shifts to economic development and class-national nonmilitary security activities in third areas would be desirable."

From Study Phoenix Paper, June 4, 1963, page 33: "Unification— * * *. At present the approach [for central authority in a near monopoly of military power by the United States-U.S.S.R. entente] may appear so radical that it will be dismissed out of hand; nevertheless, its logical simplicity, whether in terms of power and force or in terms of peace and progress, is so compelling that it seems to warrant more systematic investigation. * * * Today, the United States and the Soviet Union combined have for all practical purposes a near monopoly of force in the world. If the use and direction of this power could somehow be synchronized, stability and, indeed even unity might be within reach."

To help bring about unification of United States-U.S.S.R. forces, the Phoenix project calls for a U.S. tax cut to decrease Uncle Sam's revenue and therefore force him to cut back on military spending. And so on.

Space prevents further quotation of the Phoenix papers. They urge "tacit" presidential agreements with Khrushchev to avoid the necessity of getting Congress to approve "a treaty with the U.S.S.R." All we need—it is alleged—is to take the Soviet elite at their tacit word.

To this my only present comment is "My word." More of my alarmed words will soon be forthcoming about IDA's Phoenix project for Soviet-American unification, for a United States-U.S.S.R. entente, for United States-U.S.S.R. economic interdependence, and for a United States-U.S.S.R. world hegemony "for peace."

As of now, it appears that when top officials of the French and West German Governments charged all during last spring and summer that a United States-U.S.S.R. entente was in the making, they were relying on accurate secret intelligence information about the Institute for Defense Analyses Project Phoenix for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, that is, for our State Department.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, passage of the food stamp program can rightly be called the opening salvo of President Johnson's war on poverty. If signed into law the plan will permit needy families in participating communities throughout the country to buy food stamps which when redeemed at the corner grocers will enable them to take home food worth about 40 percent more than the cost of the stamps.

The entire program would be administered at the local level, with all costs to be borne by the Federal Government. Since 1961 the program had been on a pilot or trial basis in 43 communities and has added greatly to the substandard diets of some 400,000 Americans. The cost per person benefiting under the program in 1964 is roughly $2 a week. It is estimated that when the program is expanded it will assist some 4 million persons by 1968, with the cost per person per week dropping to about $1.73.

The Department of Agriculture currently operates a direct distribution program to help the needy. About $200 million annually is spent under this program to help feed some 5.5 million persons. However, direct distribution is limited to foods such as dried milk, wheat, rice, and corn. Americans living in poverty have no chance to gain nourishment from fresh milk, fruit, and vegetables, commodities which most families consider essential as well as commonplace. The program also has all the aspects of the dole or handout. Needy families line up at various distribution points and cart off their packages of dried food in broken-down wagons. The corner grocer is bypassed. He is hurt economically. With a broadened food stamp program it is anticipated that many communities will drop out of the direct distribution plan.

LOCAL CONTROL

Under H.R. 10222 the Secretary of Agriculture can set up a food stamp program only if it is requested by the State government, or by a local community with approval of the State. If a community is suffering the effects of extreme poverty it can also request that it be allowed to continue under the direct distribution plan. To be eligible for the food stamp program a household's economic status must be "a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet." The bill specifically provides that eligibility criteria will be established at the local level and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Examine the case of Willie Johnson, as reported recently in a leading national magazine:

Willie Johnson is a short, stocky West Virginian. He is 55 years old, which means that society expects at least 7 more years of work from him before he qualifies for a social security pension. Like his father, he went into the coal mines at age 13 and worked steadily. Twelve years ago he was earning more than $100 a week. Today he earns nothing. He will probably never work again.

"If a man works hard enough," the middle-class belief goes, "he will find some work." This is hard to believe in Logan County. It is one of the 230 counties of southern Appalachia * * * where 7 million Americans are gasping from economic suffocation. In Logan County, where mining is the sole source of money, there were 14,000 men in the mines in 1954 when Willie Johnson last held a job. Now there are only 3,500.

Willie Johnson's family is on maximum relief in the county. Each month they get $165. Rent is low, $27 a month (four rooms, leaky roof, no running water). Electricity is $7.50. This leaves $130.50 for everything else.

With eight children at home, it is not an easy choice between shoes, books, and food. Books in the public high school cost $28 a year; this can be prohibitive. When he was

in the ninth grade, the oldest son, young Willie, dropped out of school so the younger ones could stay in.

"First 2 weeks we have it right smart," Willie Johnson says of their diet. Breakfast is eggs, salt pork, and brown gravy. Lunch is a bowl of pinto beans. Supper may be two fryers for 10, potatoes, beans, milk for the children and coffee for parents.

The last 2 weeks bring a pinch known to millions of the poor: By then, small catastrophes have occurred—a schoolchild's shoes have literally fallen apart and one has to spend $4 for a new pair that will disintegrate in the first rain, or $8 for a pair that will last. The night they had an unexpected visitor the 10 Johnsons were having berries picked from the back hill, mixed with flour. It was the 25th of the month, with a week more to go before the next welfare check.

PLAN EXPLAINED

Here is how the food stamp plan will work for Willie Johnson's family of 10:

Willie, the head of an eligible household, applys to his local welfare agency for food stamps. After determining that the family normally spends $25 a week for food, the agency then authorizes Willie to buy with his $25, from an issuing office, food stamps worth a larger amount, say $40. The issuing office, usually a local bank, then forwards the $25 cash paid by Willie to the U.S. Treasury.

Willie takes his stamps to his local grocery store and buys $40 worth of food. He cannot, however, buy such items as tobacco, luxury foods, soft drinks, alcoholic beverages, or foods which bear labels identifying them as being foreign products. Willie is restricted to purchasing only necessities.

The grocer takes Willie's stamps to the bank and receives $40 for them. The bank gives the stamps to the Federal Government and is reimbursed for the full $40. Thus the Treasury provides about $15 on each $25 worth of stamps issued by the State or local communities, or $1.50 a week per member of the Johnson family. This loss is the net cost of the food stamp program, other than the administrative costs.

OTHER PROVISIONS

H.R. 10222 also sets criminal penalties for chiseling practices, forbids the Secretary of Agriculture to in any way fix retail prices, and forbids discriminating against stamp plan applicants because of their race, religion, national origin or political beliefs.

President Johnson called House passage of the food stamp bill "a step toward insuring that people can benefit from the Nation's food abundance." It is all this and more. It helps local retail stores and stimulates local business. It provides additional markets for farm products. And importantly, it helps promote the health and dignity of millions of our fellow Americans who are the helpless victims of grinding poverty.

ROLLCALL NO. 100—WHEAT-COTTON BILL

On this rollcall I am recorded as "paired" against the administration's wheat-cotton bill. I paired on the vote so that my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] who was in Hawaii for the funeral of his father, could go on record as supporting the bill. By pairing, we canceled out each other's vote, exactly what would have happened had Congressman MATSUNAGA actually been present on the floor.

In voting against the measure I joined 167 Republicans and 36 Democrats who were opposed to greater Government controls and subsidies in agriculture. My vote was consistent with the one registered on December 4, 1963—rollcall No. 220—when I opposed the Cooley cotton bill.

When the Cooley bill passed the House it carried only provisions for subsidizing cotton textile mills. Already a bad bill when it reached the Senate, it was made even more unpalatable by the addition of a wheat title. The Senate version, now the wheat-cotton bill, was sent to the House where it could register approval or disapproval on the whole package—take it or leave it. I chose to leave it, despite strenuous pressures which were applied by various political leaders and special interest groups.

TEXTILE WINDFALL

The bill's cotton provisions called for as much as $360 million in cash credits to the textile industry. This figure is $100 million more than the entire industry's total profits in 1962. As was pointed out during debate, it is a long cry from the days of relief for the sharecropper to paying dividends out of the U.S. Treasury for shareholders.

Because of high price supports, cotton presently sells for 32.5 cents a pound in the United States, compared with 25 cents a pound for comparable rayon in the United States, and 24 cents a pound for cotton abroad. The bill, which has since been signed into law, permits paying cotton mills a 6 to 8 cents a pound subsidy, and allows the industry to continue using cotton without greatly reducing cotton price supports.

One Senator estimates that under the bill next year's cotton program will cost $753 million, or $187 million over what it would have been had the measure failed.

Another Congressman had this to say about the cotton provision:

Now what you want to do is give Burlington Mills $28 million so that they can buy some new spindles and put more guys out of work and confound and compound your problem and this is exactly what you are going to do.

From the American Farm Bureau Federation:

The cotton proposal before you is the most complicated Government farm program that has ever been devised. It would be tremendously expensive and the first big step toward compensatory payments for all of agriculture. The vast Brannan-type subsidies provided for in this bill cannot be justified. The acreage retirement program would be costly and ineffective.

UNFAIR COMPETITION

Proponents of the bill argue that it would help the American textile industry to compete with foreign imports. But this argument doesn't stand up under the facts. The cotton content of finished textile products is so small compared to the cost of the overall product that there is no reason to believe it will increase our ability to compete with foreign materials.

What the subsidy will do, however, is give the American cotton textile industry an unfair competitive advantage over American synthetic and manmade fiber mills. I hold no favoritism for either the cotton or synthetic textile industry, and therefore, cannot support legislation which in my judgment gives one unfair competitive advantage over the other. In the tradition of our free enterprise economy, let their battle be waged in the marketplace, unfettered by Government aid or restrictions.

Following is a letter which I received from Mr. Eugene Remmer, president of Chemetex, Inc., one of America's leading designers of plants and machinery for the synthetic textile industry:

We have closely followed the developments in regard to the proposed cotton support bill, and are greatly perturbed about the possibility that such an unfair bill might be passed.

The activity of our company is closely related to the manmade fiber field, and legislation which would assure preferential treatment to producers of natural fibers could severely endanger the activities of not only our company, but of several thousand machinery suppliers throughout the country.

Accordingly, we firmly believe that passing of the above mentioned bill would not only severely affect our company and its suppliers, but also the general public. Further development in the manmade fiber field might be severely curtailed in view of cotton's unjust competitive position, because of its artificial support.

WHEAT PROVISIONS

The wheat provisions of H.R. 6196 installed a voluntary certificate program for 1964–65. It guarantees farmers who agree to comply with their acreage allotments price supports of about $2 a bushel on wheat grown for domestic use, $1.55 on wheat grown for export, and $1.30 on wheat used for feed and seed purposes. Nonparticipating farmers would get no support and would have to take the market price of about $1.30 a bushel. The big difference between these provisions and those rejected by farmers last year in a national referendum is that H.R. 6192 is a voluntary program, whereas the referendum program was mandatory.

But are the wheat provisions really voluntary? Voluntarism is achieved through economic pressure. In commenting on a somewhat similar wheat certificates bill, the senior agricultural specialist of the Library of Congress said that "ineligibility for wheat certificates worth 70 cents per bushel—and ineligibility for wheat and feed grain price support loans would be sufficient penalty to assure a high degree of voluntary participation."

H.R. 6196 also denies any share of the wheat export market to farmers who do not want to participate in the program. It has been rightly pointed out that these penalties to noncompliers make a mockery of the word "voluntary."

TAX ON CONSUMERS

The wheat provisions also in effect levy a stiff bread tax on the consumer. There is a close relationship between the price of wheat and the wholesale price of flour.

If the level of wheat prices is low, flour prices will be low. If wheat prices are high, if they are held up by Government subsidy, flour prices are high, bread prices are higher and the public is the loser. It has been predicted that with passage of the wheat bill the support price of $2 per bushel, as compared with the 1963–64 support of $1.82, will be reflected in a hike of about 45 cents per hundredweight of flour.

Unfortunately for the American public the legislation was not defeated. But I was constrained to have voted against the bill and will continue to oppose measures which in my judgment hurt the American consumer.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 100-106

On Friday, April 10, 2 days after passage of the food stamp and wheat-cotton bills, the following lead story appeared in the Washington Post, with the headline "GOP Ploys Stall House To Avenge Late Session":

House Republicans, angry at being held in session past midnight Wednesday for two losing fights, tied the House in knots yesterday and prevented any work being done.

For 4½ hours they forced quorum calls and meaningless rollcalls until the House quit with nothing accomplished.

They finally agreed to meet today on the money bill (legislative appropriations). Whether Republicans avenged two defeats by forcing themselves to answer six rollcalls and attending an unusual Friday session was another question.

What did destruction of this one legislative day mean in terms of dollars lost by American taxpayers? According to a Michigan Congressman who studied the subject, it costs somewhere between $145,000 and $290,000 a day to run the House of Representatives. It is indeed ironical that many of the Republicans who succeeded in tying the House in knots, who prevented legislators from doing the job the public elected them to do, are the same Members who repeatedly make impassioned pleas for greater economy in Government.

Objective observers agree that the GOP's dilatory tactics were prompted by resentment at being outmaneuvered in the parliamentary process on the preceding day. The Democratic leadership, working entirely within the rules of the House, was able to repeatedly ward off Republican delaying tactics and thwart GOP attempts to divide Democrats by alleging that the two national bills were sectional issues.

The obstructionist retribution displayed by Republicans the next day was certainly not worthy of one of America's great political parties. I opposed the wheat-cotton bill, but it passed the House fair and square. There was no violation of the rules in securing its passage. The majority worked its will, as it should in a democracy. Charges to the contrary are merely the frustrated rantings of Republican legislators who have not learned to respect the American legislative process—the greatest legislative process in the world and one that they ably helped to create in years gone by.

Part III—Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as can be seen from the following report on Benefits to Panama's Trade, Commerce, and Industry, which my constitutent, Mr. Conrad R. Hilpert of Rockford, Ill., secured from the Chief of Public Relations of the Panama Canal Company, the United States is indeed a benefactor to the tiny nation of Panama, whose annual expenditures are far less than the annual benefits afforded them as a result of our presence in the Canal Zone:

BENEFITS TO PANAMA'S TRADE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY

A. TOURIST INDUSTRY

1. Tourism is estimated by the Panamanian Government to represent a $14-million-a-year industry in the economy of Panama. It is conservatively estimated that the average tourist spends more than $20 per day while visiting the isthmus. Tens of thousands of passengers, plus ships' crews, who transit the canal annually, stop and shop on the economy of Panama.

2. The Panama Canal Company recognizes that the canal continues to be the prime center of interest for most visitors, whether they arrive by air or sea. To accommodate these tourists and to aid Panama in exploiting this unique tourist attraction, the Panama Canal annually spends $188,000 for tour guides, informational material, operation of tourist launches, etc. In the past several years the Panama Canal has spent over $200,000 to expand and modernize facilities and services for tourist and recreational use.

3. The Canal Zone Government has performed essential customs and immigration services for Panama continuously since 1904. This service currently is estimated to have an annual value of $170,000 to the Republic. During the past year approximately 100,000 ship passengers, including intransit passengers entering the Republic to shop, were cleared by Canal Zone customs and immigration for the Republic.

B. EXTERNAL TRADE

1. The Colon Free Zone, served by the ports within the Canal Zone, in recent years has developed into one of Panama's most important trade enterprises. The Free Zone, the numerous shipping agencies, and the export-import houses with large payrolls based in Panama all enjoy substantial freight advantages over other Central American countries. Within the past year USAID/Panama completed a study which shows that of 129 possible comparisons between Canal Zone ports and other Central American ports, Panama lacks the advantage in only 10.

2. The efficient port service offered by the Panama Canal accounts in substantial part for freight rates to Panama which are low in relation to other Latin American countries. The short turnaround time in canal ports makes this area very attractive to shippers. In addition, according to the U.S. AID report, because loading and unloading of cargo occurs within the Canal Zone, Panama enpoys the lowest pilferage and breakage losses of any port in the Western Hemisphere.

3. Panama has relatively cheap and readily available water transportation to any port in the world due to the presence of the canal. One thousand ships per month pass through the canal while many others dock and work cargo but do not transit. Recently attracted to the area have been such enterprises as the Refineria Panama at Colon. With three of the largest oil storage tanks in the world and an operating payroll amounting to over $1 million per year, this recent addition to Panama's economy exemplifies the benefits of the canal's presence to industries in Panama. Cemento Panama, one of the most modern business enterprises in the Republic, for several years has enjoyed a special handling rate by the Panama Canal for cement exported across Canal Zone piers. The special rate is offered as an export incentive and savings in pier handling costs of $30,000 were realized in fiscal year 1963.

C. AGRICULTURE

1. Canal Zone commissary officials tour the interior to advise Panamanian producers how to upgrade product quality and production so as to meet the Canal Zone's standards and needs. This has resulted in a bigger and more stable market for the Panamanian producer and, in some cases, it has opened agricultural export markets.

2. Inspections and consultations from Canal Zone veterinarians working in the Republic, who inspect all meat and dairy products destined for sale in the Canal Zone, has resulted in a marked upgrading of quality and higher levels of production by the Panamanian producer. As a result, the beef and dairy industries are assuming greater importance in the economy of Panama.

3. Veterinary research and experimentation of Mindi Dairy in the Canal Zone has benefited the Republic's dairy industry greatly. A dairy herd of good yield, hardly enough to withstand the rigors of the tropics, has been developed at Mindi. Blood stock from Mindi is being used to improve dairy herds in Panama. In the past few months, 15 calves worth $1,500 have been donated to small farmers in the Republic. Canal Zone veterinarians are also aiding Panama in its current drive to eradicate brucellosis from its dairy herds.

D. BANKING FACILITIES, INVESTMENT CLIMATE, AND MONETARY STABILITY

1. Panama is the only Central American country having extensive U.S. branch banks (Chase Manhattan Bank alone has six branches in the Republic). In addition, Panama has branches of Swiss and French banks. The existence of the canal and the need for concomitant maritime financing account largely for Panama's excellent banking facilities. The presence of these highly reputable banks insures good commercial services generally; and prospective foreign investors also regard them as trusted and reliable sources for unbiased information concerning investment possibilities.

2. Panama's monetary system, regulated by a monetary agreement with the United States since 1904, is pegged to the U.S. dollar. This represents a boon to Panama's foreign commerce since she has virtually no exchange problems and enjoys perhaps the most stable currency in Latin America.

3. The steadying effect of the Canal Zone on the Panamanian economy, together with the strong American influence that pervades the area, helps Panama in attracting foreign investors and entrepreneurs. Many large business enterprises currently headquarter their Latin American operations in Panama and it is estimated that most of the 3,000 leading U.S. corporations maintain some sort of subsidiary in Panama.

The Flight Service Station at Elmira Can Be Eliminated Only at Great Risk to Flying Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, which was granted me May 11, I include the following statement which I presented May 12 to the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] received testimony on the proposal of the Federal Aviation Agency to phase out more than 40 flight service stations (FSS) in the Nation, including one at Chemung County Airport, Elmira, N.Y. The plan has met with strong opposition from the pilot users of the airport who live not only in Chemung County but in many surrounding countries and in northern Pennsylvania as well.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD W. ROBISON, 33D DISTRICT, NEW YORK, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 12, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, may I begin by commending you for agreeing to inquire into the wisdom of the Federal Aviation Agency's announced plan to consolidate—in the interest of "economy"—a substantial number of existing flight service stations now serving the air-safety requirements of thousands of "general aviation" pilots at some 297 locations across our Nation.

My study of how this consolidation plan developed indicates that it originated during congressional hearings on the FAA's 1964 appropriation request with a proper desire on the part of some members of the Appropriations Committees to inquire into ways and means for reducing the cost of operating our present national Air Traffic System.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that my record during my nearly 7 years of service in the Congress indicates that I am as interested as anyone else in true economy in Federal spending—and I think that all of us here are particularly obligated, in view of the present deficit nature of the Federal budget, to redouble our efforts in pursuit of that goal.

However, Mr. Chairman, my intensive study of this proposal has led me to a firm conviction that, if it is carried out, we would be practicing "false economy", and doing so, perhaps, at the risk of human life.

Although I, personally, do very little private flying, I have come to realize—these past few months—from what has been told me by those who do, and who do so in ever-increasing numbers, how very important the flight service stations are to the overall aviation picture, and what vital functions they perform in the interest of air safety.

My particular concern stems from the proposed closing of the flight service station now serving pilots at Elmira, N.Y.—in my congressional district—and the tentative "remoting" of its services to Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

The FAA seeks to claim that the essential pilot briefing, dispatching, and flight-following services now provided by the Elmira FSS, will be continued—without any detriment to safety and convenience—after the proposed consolidation with the Wilkes-Barre FSS, through direct "landlines" connected with the control station at Wilkes-Barre, and direct toll-free telephone service for pilot briefings and flight-plan filing between Elmira and Wilkes-Barre. The FAA also seeks to claim that such a consolidation will produce an annual "savings" of $40,000—but it has been unable or unwilling, as yet, to give me or anyone else concerned a detailed breakdown or justification for that projected amount.

Let's take a closer look at the Elmira FSS. There is presently no U.S. Weather Bureau airport station at the Elmira-Corning Airport where it is situated. The nearest such station is at Binghamton, N.Y., some 65 miles distant. The Elmira FSS has, thus, been the main source of local weather conditions for general aviation pilots using the Elmira-Corning Airport as well as 14 other smaller airports located within a radius of 70 miles from Elmira-Corning.

It is especially important—I believe—to stress at this point that this region of New York State that we are talking about is a part of the so-called Finger Lakes section of the State, a section notoriously subject (because of its lakes and hills), to rapid and unforseeable weather changes and to violent, local storms. In the summer months, especially, the Elmira area may be subject to sudden thundershowers and gusty winds, accompanied by rapid reductions in ground visibility, at the very time that the sun is shining and there is unlimited flying visibility at both Binghamton and Wilkes-Barre. Or, of course, a reverse situation could be true, and these facts need instantly to be made known to transient aircraft and especially so to those pilots thereof unfamiliar with our terrain.

Within this same 70-mile radius, there are approximately 250 active pilots, all of whom—along with transient aircraft—now depend upon the Elmira FSS for local weather observations, pilot briefings, preflight services, emergency in-flight services (orientation), flight-following services, emergency search and rescue coordination and "notam" (notice to airmen) services. The specialists—and they are "specialists"—who serve in the Elmira FSS have an essential familiarity with our peculiar terrain and weather problems, and possess an unique ability to carry out their prime responsibilities for the safety of those who depend upon them that, in my judgment, cannot be safely "remoted."

In this same connection—in stressing local service—I should like to point out that roughly 30 percent of the pilot briefings now being conducted by the Elmira FSS are of the over-the-counter or face-to-face type—a method considered far superior to the kind of briefings that could be conducted by telephone or radio from a remote location, particularly for the relatively inexperienced or uncertain pilot of whom there are more and more in this fastest growing segment of the aviation community.

Even the more routine services that the more experienced pilot might need or desire from an FSS would tend to be less accessible and efficient—especially during peak hours of activity when a pilot calling a remote facility over that "toll-free" phone would be apt to get a busy signal and be required to accept a long standby delay or else take off without the desired information, and perhaps into unknown and unnecessary peril.

In any remoting plan, Mr. Chairman, there is also an ever-present danger of a communications breakdown which, however temporary, could have serious consequences to the cause of air safety.

But these arguments—and others I might make—may well only be repetitious in that they could also apply to other FSS facilities scheduled for consolidation. While they must all be considered by you gentlemen in your study of the overall problem, I do not wish to intrude upon your time so I shall try to confine the balance of my remarks more directly to the Elmira situation.

The Elmira FSS—you should be aware—also happens to serve a different and unique but important aviation activity which is uncommon to most other FSS facility areas—that of soaring. The sport of motorless flying is part of the history of the Elmira-Corning area. An established soaring facility on Harris Hill near the airport, and the location nearby of a major manufacturer of sailplanes or gliders, as they are more commonly known, attracts hundreds of sailplane pilots to the area each year. The Elmira FSS now renders—and will continue to need to render—vital safety services to the glider pilots and in connection with the several glider competitions scheduled at different times each year. And all this is an important part of the economic base of our community.

Is there a need for continuation of the Elmira FSS as a separate facility, Mr. Chairman? Well, if user figures are any indication, there certainly is. Perhaps it would be well to cite these figures for the Elmira FSS—and to compare them to user data for the Wilkes-Barre station, as well as for that at Williamsport, Pa., a tentative alternate location for remoting services.

The FAA's own figures for total FSS operations for these stations for the calendar year of 1963 are as follows:

Elmira	$34,205
Wilkes-Barre	22,088
Williamsport	24,992

Total aircraft operations for the same year—again from the FAA were:

Elmira	$67,288
Wilkes-Barre	43,705
Williamsport	46,309

These figures for Elmira for 1963, represent a 16-percent increase in user demand; and the tentative figures for the first quarter of 1964 show a further 30-percent increase in user demand over the first quarter of 1963.

Now, it may well be, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that there is some justification for reducing the total number of FSS facilities where geographical spacing, weather service requirements, and the like might permit. I am not sufficiently familiar with the overall picture to say that there is not, and I strongly suspect that it was this possibility that members of the Appropriations Committees, last year, wished the FAA to inquire into, and that they did not thereby mean to imply any "mandate" to the Administrator of the FAA to embark upon any wholesale emasculation of the FSS program, which is about what the Administrator's announced and tentative plans for further consolidations seems to amount to.

However, if there is to be a consolidation program—and if it is to be a wise and responsible one—then I think that consideration should be given to the retention of the more active FSS facilities—such as at Elmira in our area—as representing "key" or "hard-core" stations, and to peculiar weather and terrain conditions of the type I have attempted to explain to you as pertaining in our area, as well as to the local availability of information from U.S. Weather Bureau stations (there are U.S. Weather Bureau stations at both Wilkes-Barre and Williamsport, but none at Elmira as I have said).

On this basis, the Elmira FSS fully qualifies as a "key" facility whose retention is eminently desirable, and this opinion is not mine alone, but is unanimously shared by the several hundred private pilots and air-

craft owners who have contacted me on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, "economy" in Government is essential—but so is air safety, and we compromise with that cause not only at our peril but at the peril of others who must depend upon us to make the right decisions.

I thank you for the privilege of making this statement.

Project Phoenix—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a newspaper column written by Alice Widener concerning Project Phoenix, which I believe will be of interest to many Members of Congress and the public:

PROJECT PHOENIX

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—A blueprint for a new United States policy toward the Soviet Union was published in a full page New York Times ad, November 15, by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (NCASF). Until last May 16, the NCASF was listed as a "Communist front" by the U.S. Subversive Activities Control Board.

Strangely, the NCASF ad calls for a series of United States steps toward the U.S.S.R. that are strikingly similar to those proposed in the new Project Phoenix, a major study issued during June and July 1963 by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; that is, for our State Department.

The Phoenix study bears the byline Vincent P. Rock. A summary of its contents was first revealed to the American public by U.S. News & World Report, November 18. The magazine stated that though only 300 copies of Phoenix were issued by IDA, the document is a "blueprint" for the Kennedy administration's new strategy in the field of diplomacy.

Allegedly the basic aim of both the NCASF and IDA blueprints is world peace enforced by a United States-U.S.S.R. partnership. For "unification" or "interdependence" of the United States and U.S.S.R. both blueprints demand an end to the cold war, vast U.S. agricultural aid to the Soviet Union, greatly increased trade between the two "great powers," and intensified educational, cultural, and scientific exchanges between them. In plain words, the IDA and NCASF blueprints call for United States-U.S.S.R. hegemony over a disarmed world.

The NCASF ad asserts that "the common interests of the United States and the Soviet Union transcend their disagreements" and the ad proposes that "the United States and Soviet Union will assume joint leadership in the achievement of a warless world."

The IDA Phoenix Study first makes the sweeping, utterly astonishing generalization (paper I, p. 57), "No objective reason can be found for the excessive United States reliance on force in its relation with the Soviet Union," and then comes to the conclusion that United States-U.S.S.R. "profound interdependence must be shaped and managed" in order that "great power coordination" be exercised "for the control of conflict."

Here are parallel quotations from the NCASF and IDA blueprints:

NCASF: "Current negotiations for the sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. by private firms should lead to a reappraisal of present obstacles to trade. Besides consolidating peace, the opening of trade would provide new possibilities for American workers."

Phoenix: "It is in this light ('enjoyment of life both in the Soviet and in the United States') as well as from technical security perspective, that policies with respect to possible United States assistance to Soviet agriculture, the spread of Western technology in the Soviet Union, and restriction on trade with the Soviet Union should be viewed. * * * The possibility of United States assistance in the development of Soviet agriculture should be explored. * * * The United States should be prepared to reduce its restriction on trade with the Soviet Union."

The NCASF Education and Action program calls for an expanding American-Soviet educational service, expending cultural and scientific exchange, and hails "a new turn" in United States Government policy toward the Soviet Union.

The Phoenix project calls for "joint studies of the educational process in the two countries (United States and U.S.S.R.)," for increased emphasis on the "communication and information flow between the Soviet and American societies," and for "substantial increase in the directed exchange of scientists and experts between the States."

There is no mystery about why the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship fosters pro-Soviet policies. But it is a great mystery why an American group of intellectuals in the Institute for Defense Analyses at the State Department promulgate a blueprint for Soviet-American world control "for peace" to be effected by U.S. "capital contributions" for the development of Soviet agriculture ($20 billion is mentioned as the needed Soviet figure), for United States sharing of all its technological advances and know-how for Soviet benefit, and for "annual consultations" between the United States and U.S.S.R. "on the national budgets."

It is still more of a mystery why any American should call for equalizing the Soviet military might with our own. "In the absence of disarmament agreements," states Phoenix, "the United States should encourage the development of mutually invulnerable strategic weapons systems as a contribution to the stability of the military equipment." This is nothing more or less than a blatant cry for a United States-U.S.S.R. military stalemate without any kind of commitment from the Soviet Union.

The dangerous measures proposed by IDA in its Phoenix project all are predicated on the flimsy hope that an affluent Soviet Union will devote its primary energies to satisfying the Russian people's consumer wants and needs. The IDA intellectuals state, "The West can choose to * * * assist the development of Soviet society on the assumption that Soviet power will thus tend to become more diffuse and less aggressive."

By such action we Americans would make all the sacrifices, pay all the bills, and run all the risks. Is this a reasonable price for us to pay for an "iffy" peace based on ephemeral "tacit" agreements between two politicians?

Once killed by Soviet aggression, would the American eagle be like a phoenix and rise after 500 years from the ashes of consuming Red fire?

Let us remember that the phoenix was a bird of ancient Egyptian mythology. The dictionary says a myth is "a person or thing whose existence is imaginary." No matter how fascinating is the phoenix myth, we had better not base our strategy for survival on the feathery assumption of Communist good will arising from United States subsidized Soviet affluence.

In my opinion, a logical explanation of the mystery of the IDA Phoenix project is that it is nothing but an economic, military, agricultural, and social rescue operation at our expense for a bankrupt Red empire.

Timber Industry Supports H.R. 3846 With Cooley Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House knows of my interest in the land and water conservation bill (H.R. 3846). In an effort to expedite the enactment of this bill, and at the same time to allay the fears of the private forest industry against indiscriminate forest land acquisition, I have proposed an amendment which I intend to offer when the bill reaches the floor.

I am happy to inform the House that the organizations representing the private forest industry have accepted my amendment and have notified me that they are now prepared to lend their support to early enactment of this bill with the amendment.

For the further information of the House I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a supplemental statement on this subject delivered today to the Rules Committee, embodying a letter from Mr. Bernard L. Orell, chairman of the Forest Industries Council:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, ON H.R. 3846, SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, MAY 14, 1964

On May 6, 1964, I submitted to the Rules Committee a statement in support of a rule on H.R. 3846, the land and water conservation bill, and discussed an amendment which I propose to offer when the bill reaches the floor.

I said then that I hoped my amendment would remove a substantial body of opposition to the bill's enactment.

I am happy to be able to report to the committee now that it appears to have done so.

In a meeting at Portland, Oreg., last week, the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association accepted and endorsed the amendment and adopted a resolution in support of H.R. 3846 with inclusion of the amendment.

On the basis of this action by the private forest industry, I intend to do my utmost to see that the amendment is adopted and becomes a permanent part of the legislation.

I hope that the other agencies, organizations, and State and Federal governmental units which are interested in the enactment of this important bill will also accept the amendment and work for its adoption as part of the bill.

Following is the full text of a letter from Mr. Bernard L. Orell, chairman of the Forest Industries Council, informing me of the action taken last week in Portland. The council is composed of the American Paper & Pulp Association, the American Pulpwood Association, and the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

MAY 12, 1964.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: The forest industry throughout the Nation is pleased and encouraged with your remarks on May 6 before the Rules Committee and sincerely hopes your amendment is adopted. It will substantially remove the widespread fears of an expanded national forest land acquisition program without congressional authorization.

At the meeting of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association last week in Portland, Oreg., H.R. 3846 was a major topic of discussion. Your suggested amendment was analyzed and completely endorsed by the delegates from all over the Nation.

Attached is a copy of your Rules Committee statement as sent to the lumber industry throughout the Nation to get support for the amendment. A similar release has been sent throughout the pulp and paper industry.

Your amendment will remove the roadblock that causes our opposition to this bill which is basically one with objectives that we have consistently supported. I am sure that with the amendment, the forest industry can lend its support to the bill's enactment.

Sincerely,

B. L. ORELL.

Conscience of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, held March 30–April 1 in Madison, Wis., over 500 Wisconsin rural residents sat hushed and moved as Jim Cleary, manager of Jump River Electric Co-op., Ladysmith, read the lines he had written after viewing the site of the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas. Because they hold a message for all Americans, I would like to have those lines included in the RECORD:

THE VOICE WITHIN

(By Jim Cleary)

I stood and gazed upon the spot,
From which the shots were fired.
Then scanned my vision down the street,
On which his life expired.

With jumbled thoughts—emotion filled,
I almost called his name.
To tell him I was sorry,
And take my share of blame.

For he said to love your brother,
Dispel the hate and greed.
And I nodded in agreement,
Though my heart it paid no heed.

For when his words stopped ringing,
New voices came to sound.
I saw myself condemning,
And old hatreds came around.

The voices cried inferior,
Your color is supreme.
So let no man unequal,
Ever share your dream.

Then thoughts so black and deeds undone,
Were vanished in the air.
And I, a self-made Judas,
Once more was standing there.

Then people seemed to gather,
As if by some great sign.
And I knew what I was seeing,
Was a National Living Shrine.

Oh, I wished that you could see it,
For you'll say it isn't true.
The Blacks and White's together,
The Christian and the Jew.

And each in meditation,
With a prayer to reach on high.
In search of human dignity,
From this martyr fresh to die.

So gather up his banner,
That his dying hands impart.
And brand the word equality,
Forever in your heart.

Now the course is clear before you,
The way is wide and paved.
For it takes more to be an American,
Than a flag that's being waved.

And you cannot cloak yourself,
In the red, the white, the blue.
For that mantle covers everyone,
It's just not cut for you.

Project Phoenix—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a newspaper column written by Alice Widener concerning Project Phoenix which I believe will be of interest to many Members of Congress and the public.

PROJECT PHOENIX

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—Since 1945, the United States has spent nearly $100 billion in foreign aid to try to strengthen the free world against "the threat of communism." Is it the new U.S. policy to subsidize the Soviet dictatorship so that it can maintain communism?

Startling as it may seem, the answer appears to be yes, at least it is in Project Phoenix proposed by the Institute for Defense Analyses for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the State Department. Moreover, as things stand now, it appears that Project Phoenix is the blueprint for the administration's new foreign policy.

Issued in June and July 1963, the Phoenix Study carries the by-line Vincent P. Rock but is the final synthesis of peace-at-any-price thinking advanced for years by the Fund for the Republic, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and the Pugwash group of scientists and sociologists financed by Cyrus Eaton.

On November 18, U.S. News & World Report summarized Project Phoenix and reported that the study is the new "policy line" of the United States toward the Soviet Union. The main direction of this line is creation of a United States-U.S.S.R. entente for great power hegemony over a world at peace. Some of the inducements designed by the intellectuals of Project Phoenix to persuade the Soviet Union to join in such an alliance are:

1. Equalization of United States and U.S.S.R. military strength with agreements to "mutually invulnerable" nuclear force.

2. U.S. capital subsidy of Soviet agriculture through grants and long-term soft loans amounting possibly to $20 billion.

3. U.S. export of all its Western technological know-how to the Soviet Union.

4. Political agreements arrived at merely by "tacit agreements" between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev with his "elite" in order to avoid the hindrance of congressional refusal to consent to proposed treaties for a United States-U.S.S.R. alliance.

5. A big U.S. tax cut without reduction in Government nondefense spending or national debt in order to decrease Federal revenue and force a cutback on U.S. spending for arms and weapons development.

6. Greatly increased U.S. trade with the Soviet Union on credit.

7. United States-U.S.S.R. partnership in the moon project.

8. United States-U.S.S.R. partnership in science through "directed" exchange of scientists.

9. Joint consultations on preparation and allocation of United States and U.S.S.R. national "annual budgets."

10. United States-U.S.S.R. agreement on calculated stalemate of all guerrilla warfare and "semiviolent" operations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

11. United States-U.S.S.R. partnership in education.

None of these 11 inducements to Soviet partnership with the United States "for control of conflict" is predicated on abandonment of Communist ideology, strategy or tactics. All are predicated on the assumption that an enriched Kremlin elite will be less aggressve and will "shift" allocation of Soviet resources away from heavy industry for military needs to priority of satisfaction of the Russian people's consumer wants and needs.

Though it may seem to most Americans that such a program is merely the fantastic concept of a group of eccentric eggheads, there is quite some evidence to support the contention of U.S. News & World Report that Project Phoenix is indeed the unofficial official policy of the White House, State Department, and Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Furthermore, the magazine seems to have been entirely correct in stating, "Special attention is being given the Rock (Phoenix) study because of two recent speeches by President Kennedy—one at the University of Maine on October 19, and an earlier one at American University in Washington, D.C., on June 10. In these speeches, and in other statements, President Kennedy appears to have followed closely the policy line suggested by the new paper."

Certainly it is a fact that President Kennedy had urged a tax cut without decreased governmental nondefense spending or reduction of the national debt with its annual $11 billion carrying charge. President Kennedy had indeed called for a joint United States-U.S.S.R. moon shot; he had called for U.S. agricultural aid to the U.S.S.R., and some State Department officials have discussed the possibility of a $10 billion U.S. loan to the U.S.S.R.

Also, there had been a spate of "tacit agreements" reached by President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev of which the contents are unknown to Congress and the American people. Moreover, there are strong indications that the administration is effecting cutbacks in U.S. military strength and is hampering development of new U.S. weapons.

On November 22, the New York Times headlined, "FULBRIGHT Attacks Measure Curbing Soviet Credit," and reported that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT (who acts as spokesman for administration foreign policy, said he refuses to admit "the Communist dogma, per se, is a threat to the United States."

Senator FULBRIGHT endorsed U.S. agricultural aid to the Soviet Union and said the

issue is "whether we are to regard the Soviet Union as an implacable enemy * * * or whether we are to regard it as a powerful and dangerous antagonist whom we can and should influence toward inducing it to abandon its aggressiveness."

Khrushchev himself declared the Soviet Union would abandon its Marxist-Leninist theory of world domination "when the shrimps whistle." Apparently the American authors of the Phoenix project believe they can induce shrimps to whistle by staking the survival of the United States on U.S.-taxpayer subsidized development of an affluent Soviet society.

This fantasy is based on the assumption that the Communist economic production and distribution system can be made to work. It can't. An American effort to make it work through U.S. aid and trade can result only in the useless exploitation of American workers and the decline of the United States as a great nation.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Pennsylvania Women Rescue Landmark Near Chester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, through the initiative and dedicated effort of a very remarkable Pennsylvanian, Mrs. Sarah Pratt Brock of Newton Square, Pa., the only remaining building in our Commonwealth, having a direct association with William Penn is being preserved and restored.

The Pennsylvania Joint Government Committee had been established to determine which important buildings, sites, and remains in the Commonwealth should be singled out for preservation. In 1949 the committee reported that the Caleb Pusy house, near Chester, Pa., which had ben built in 1683 by a friend and partner of William Penn, was "the oldest intact English-built house in Pennsylvania." Its preservation was considered of "prime importance."

But it was not until 1960 that Mrs. Brock, a noted writer and historian who has recently been elected president of the National League of American Pen Women, first heard of this historic landmark. In the intervening 11 years nothing had been done, and the Caleb Pusey house was seemingly doomed.

Despite many obstacles, Mrs. Brock refused to believe that this important part of our heritage could not be saved. She, and Mrs. Mary Sullivan Patterson of Swarthmore, Pa., organized the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, and set out to raise the funds not only to preserve but to restore the Caleb Pusey house.

With determination and imagination as their only assets in the beginning, they eventually evolved a successful formula whereby the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would pay part of the cost of restoration, with the remainder financed by matching funds raised in the local community. Their efforts resulted in a pilot project that made the community equally responsible with the State for the preservation of historic shrines.

The outstanding accomplishment of these two Pennsylvania women merits our attention and our consideration not only because they have notably enriched Pennsylvania's historical heritage, but also because it points the way toward a similar conservation of those sources of inspiration and historic renewal that exist in every State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written at my request by Cecelia Lee Fine of the National League of American Pen Women which tells this fascinating story.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESCUING A PENNSYLVANIA LANDMARK

(By Cecelia Lee Fine)

A marker on the wall reads: "House Built by Caleb Pusey in Year 1683 and Occupied by William Penn During Occasional Visits." Located in Upland, Delaware County near Chester, Pa., this is the oldest English-built house in the State. Only a few years ago it was practically in ruins. Today complete plans for its restoration have been worked out as the result of study by scientist, scholar, and architect. Were it not for the initiative of two Pennsylvania women, Sarah Pratt Brock and Mary Sullivan Patterson, this, in all likelihood, would never have been possible.

It is to their credit that the only home now remaining in Pennsylvania definitely associated with its founder will stand in perpetuity as a visible reminder of William Penn and his friend Caleb Pusey, an enterprising and resourceful early settler in colonial Pennsylvania.

William Penn is remembered not only as an important man of affairs in the State to which he gave his name but also for his enunciation of one of the basic tenets of American liberty in the famous "Privilege Charter," which granted all Pennsylvanians freedom from persecution "because of conscientious persuasion or practice."

Caleb Pusey was William Penn's friend and partner in the Colony's first industry, a mill for grinding grain and sawing boards. He served long years as a lawmaker in the Pennsylvania Assembly. When Penn returned to England for the last time, Pusey continued as a member of the Governor's Executive Council. A writer for the Society of Friends, Pusey also collected information about its earliest settlers and became Pennsylvania's first historian.

The house Caleb Pusey built in 1683 housed a succession of occupants until 1961, a period of 278 years. Pieces of millstone imbedded in its walls came over from England on the *Welcome*, the ship that brought William Penn, himself, to these shores. Written records indicate that George Washington, during the Revolution, directed General Potter to bury the stones at "Chester Mill" so that the British could not grind their corn there.

And yet this historic house was fast falling into decay and would have been beyond saving had it not providentially come to the attention of a woman who could not brook such desecration. One special day in 1960, at the Chester County Historical Society's outing, a speaker movingly described the sorry condition of the Caleb Pusey house. He lamented that only a miracle could redeem it.

The remark struck its target. It triggered into action writer and historian, Mrs. Sarah Pratt Brock. From that time on for 4 years, she has devoted herself unstintingly to whatever work was necessary to insure the restoration of her State's historic shrine. Organizing the Friends of Caleb Pusey House, Mrs. Brock was appointed first president of its board of trustees by the Orphans Court of Delaware County.

She enlisted the help of a good friend, Mrs. Mary Sullivan Patterson, as cochairman. It was Mrs. Patterson's duty as historian of the project to write publicity, letters, and all reports. Together they went to work, plunging hopefully into a sea of problems little knowing how intricate was the going nor how many reefs in the way.

Advised by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, they sought the approval and cooperation of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. They wrote reams of letters and began to enlist backers and sponsoring organizations faster than they could file the names. Then, as a first firm step, they put almost a hundred names of solid citizens to a signed charter making the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House a tax deductible group.

All this time it was Mrs. Brock who searched out the persons whom she could interest, arranged for group and individual meetings, ran benefits, planned exhibits, and, in general, left little to the public imagination in the way of making known that the Caleb Pusey house was in need of being saved for the State of Pennsylvania.

A more difficult task was influencing the legislators at the Pennsylvania State Capital to help with financing the project. In commenting on the many trips made to Harrisburg, an ever-recurring remark runs like a theme through the story of how the Caleb Pusey house restoration was made possible. "Money was short," says Sarah Brock, "but we were determined."

No provision in the law was made for half measures, Mrs. Brock was told. Financial assistance in the end usually amounted to full State ownership, State financing, providing necessary public facilities, and then maintaining and staffing the place with caretakers ever after. The cost, she was told, can become prohibitive when one realizes how richly Pennsylvania is endowed with shrines worth preserving. Under these conditions the State legislature had turned down even "free gifts" or historic property.

The situation called for innovation and it came in the form of a suggestion from the director of the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission. Let the State pay half the cost of restoring the Caleb Pusey house, raise matching funds from the local community which also will maintain the property after restoration. Under such considerations, the Historical and Museum Commission will undertake to administer the project.

The commitment was heavy, but once having determined that the community would shoulder its responsibility, Mrs. Brock and Mrs. Patterson set about learning little by little how to untangle the maze of State politics and blithely cut through redtape to speak to lawmakers about the plan.

Determination won that day in 1961, a year after the project had been started. Says Mrs. Brock: "Senator Bell, Republican, and Senator Thomas McCreesh, Democrat, had sponsored a bill for $35,000 based on our promise to raise a matching $35,000 from local sources. When voting day came, we decided to go to Harrisburg to hear the fate of the bill, not without fear and trembling, however. To our delight, the bill won by unanimous vote.

"Someone told the presiding officer, Lt. Gov. John Morgan Davis, that we were present. At his direction the entire body stood and gave us a rousing round of ap-

plause. It was the most thrilling experience of our lives.

"But the bill had a rougher time in the House. Money was tight and few were very much interested in our project to restore the Caleb Pusey house. But we were determined. We called on the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the majority leader, various representatives, Historic Commission members and any other key people we could find. Then we started a flood of letters to tell about the statewide interest in Caleb Pusey's house.

"The result was an amended bill for $4,000 brought out of committee finally and passed. The Senate concurred. What a happy day September 27, 1961 was when Gov. David L. Lawrence signed the bill 'making an appropriation to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission for the repair and restoration of the Caleb Pusey house.'"

With token assurance of financial support from the State and contributions from many individuals and organizations, it was time to start stripping away the "alterations" and "improvements" that almost three centuries had laid on Caleb Pusey's stone house built in 1683. The aim was to find the original walls and roof underneath the accumulation.

But as work began and day by day disclosed unsuspected doors, an odd-shaped roof, and innumerable artifacts, it did not take long to conclude that here was a "find" that would take many months to uncover. Caleb Pusey's house had become an archeological treasure, the primitive home of a first settler, complete with a hoard of secrets tantalizing the diggers' shovels.

These attracted archeologists, museum people, and experts from the National Park Service to the work at the old stone house and they, too, gave generously of their talents to analyze the findings.

"There is now reason to suspect," wrote Sarah Brock excitedly, "that the right half of this house may have been Swedish or even Dutch, and built 20, 30, or 40 years before the coming of the English. We are learning so much about the house that the roof line will have to be changed back as it was originally. This restoration will be of greater importance than we guessed."

"One of the great joys," said Mrs. Patterson, "has been the happy participation of more than 70 boys and girls who live in or near Upland. They have worked like troopers at the screening tables, their only reward cookies and cold drinks and the fun of a treasure hunt."

"Sunday archeologists" they called themselves, and but for the interest of these volunteers the work would have cost thousands of dollars.

Pottery dating back to 1710 was dug up—milk vessels, pitchers, cups, clay pipes, pressed hobnail glass, early coins, even bones that would enable scholars to study the table diet of the early colonists. The architect had to stop his drawings for new disclosures made it apparent that no restoration could be planned until the digging had fully disclosed its secrets. This restoration, the planners promised, would be the best they could make and as authentic as any in the land—a veritable textbook of the time.

Meanwhile contributions were steadily pouring in, stimulated by the unremitting efforts of Mrs. Brock and Mrs. Patterson. The memo sent out in May 1963, was modest but reported progress that was little short of remarkable.

"Two years and ten months ago we set out to find the necessary money to restore the last remaining house in Pennsylvania where William Penn often visited. * * * We have come a long way since then and are approaching success. We now have 937 contributors, with 125 giving two or more times. Of these 735 come from Pennsylvania. Most of the rest live in 24 other States and the District of Columbia, and 6 from England, Italy, and Yugoslavia. * * * We have banked $28,900 and have pledges for almost $2,000 more. We need to raise an additional $9,000."

In the next 9 months, they had raised $32,000 for the restoration, received $14,000 from the State, and $5,000 from the Laurel Foundation.

The weather vane from the Pusey mill is now a prized possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. It predicts fair weather for the future of the house that was rescued from the past. It is evident that money will be available, but even as the last few thousands are being collected, the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House are thinking ahead.

In addition to outbuildings, a museum must be built for the valuable artifacts that were found in the Pusey house. A log house has been promised the project, one that once belonged to Caleb's great-great-granddaughter who was married in 1785. Plans are even progressing for a restored 18th century village to be built around the house, the kind that Pusey, himself, knew.

United States Loses Fiscal Watchdog in Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been greatly saddened by the unexpected passing of our distinguished colleague, Representative Clarence Cannon, of Missouri.

One of the most impressive tributes to him has appeared in the Hudson Dispatch of Union City, N.J., a leading daily newspaper.

Because of our great admiration for our departed friend, under unanimous consent I place the editorial which appeared in the Hudson Dispatch of May 13 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

UNITED STATES LOSES FISCAL WATCHDOG IN CANNON

Ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal administration came into power during depression days of the early 1930's and that fuzzy-minded proponent of the crackpot economic theory that prosperity depends on a policy of tax, tax, tax, and spend, spend, spend—Harry Hopkins—rode high, wide, and handsome over the advocates of a commonsense recovery, our Federal Government has been guilty of such profligacy in financial matters that, despite backbreaking taxation the national debt has catapulted to the stratospheric amount of $308.5 billion.

The deficit spending practices that Washington has indulged in for more than three decades have led the country to a point where more than one-tenth of the current $98.9 billion budget has to be allocated merely to pay the annual interest on the Nation's ever-rising indebtedness—an amount well over three times greater than the entire costs of running the National Government in 1929, 1930, and 1931. If ever a people have lived in a fool's paradise for a generation and a half, it is we Americans existing entirely upon credit, with no thought of ever paying what we owe—merely meeting constantly increased interest payments.

Since this country found itself inextricably enmeshed in the trap of deficit financing—and the complexion politically of the successive guilty administrations has made no difference, what with Democrats and Republicans equally unwilling to run the Nation's affairs on a pay-as-you-go basis, there have been mighty few men in Congress who have had the courage to fight against the ostrichlike scheme of living beyond our means. Those who have raised their voices in dissent have been crying pretty much unheard in the wilderness.

Fortunately, during these decades of foolhardy and reprehensible Federal financing practices, when most of our national legislators lacked the intestinal fortitude to crack down on administrations that were unwilling to make both ends meet, there have been two stalwarts, one in each House, who have steadfastly lived up to their roles as Treasury watchdogs. One is Virginia's Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and the other was Representative Clarence Cannon, head of the House Appropriations Committee, who died yesterday. Both were old-line Democrats of the Jeffersonian persuasion.

Longtime readers of this newspaper are well aware of our admiration for Senator BYRD's never flagging efforts in combating centralized Government and the dangerous trend in the United States toward creation of a welfare state. Time and again we have cited instances where the doughty Virginian has battled to get balanced budgets, only to be thwarted by legislators of lesser vision who subscribed to the prosperity through spending philosophy which wouldn't lose them votes at home.

The Senate Finance Committee giant had a counterpart in the lower legislative branch, where all spending authorizations originate. For 20 years, Representative Cannon—a true son of the "Show Me" State—held a tight grip on the Federal purse strings. During his tenure as the almost dictatorial boss of the Appropriations Committee, the peppery Missourian gaveled through bills involving an estimated expenditure of more than a trillion dollars, and practically all of them were cut below the sums requested by Republican and Democratic Presidents.

Representative Cannon was proud of his record as a budget cutter, often remarking that he had never seen a money measure that couldn't be reduced. So strongly did he feel about Federal fiscal policies, he repeatedly expressed the fear that "in my lifetime, the Government may go broke if we don't stop unnecessary spending." His quick temper and deep-seated fear of such a national catastrophe involved him in some classic physical clashes with his colleagues during his 41 years in the House. All were touched off by differences over money bills.

Death came unexpectedly to the Missouri Congressman. Although 85, he planned to seek reelection in the fall. As late as last Friday when he presided over a meeting of his committee, his aides described him as "chipper" and "in good spirits." He entered the hospital Sunday after an attack of what he thought was nausea but which actually was the forerunner of heart failure.

President Johnson said Mr. Cannon "left a distinguished imprint upon the decisions and policies of our times," and added: "We shall miss his counsel, his candor, and the courage with which he held steadfastly to his convictions about what was right and best for America."

Moderates on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on May 6, Mr. Walter F. Carey, the new president

of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, made his first speech as incumbent in that office. His address, which was delivered to the National Highway Users Conference at its meeting in Washington, is entitled "Moderates on the March." It is notable for its emphasis, in Mr. Carey's own words, on "a business-government partnership founded upon friendship and mutual respect."

Mr. Carey makes a plea for moderate majorities to work together for the common good. As a prime example of this, he calls special attention to the tremendous highway development which has taken place since the adoption of the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Carey be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

"MODERATES ON THE MARCH" AN ADDRESS BY WALTER F. CAREY, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 6, 1964

It is a privilege and also a comfort to be here with you, my colleagues and old friends, when I make my first speech as president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Here I do not have to pretend that the new office suddenly has endowed me with expertness and vision over the whole economic orbit on which the national chamber courses. You know better.

I am one of you. I am proud to be one of you, and view my selection to head the chamber not so much an honor for me individually as it is a tribute to all of us who are gathered here in this familiar room where we have gathered so many times before.

As most of you know, I have labored in a variety of organizations during the last 30 years, and it has been my privilege, from time to time, to serve several of them in high office.

So I have known before the admitted pleasure, pride, and exhilaration that goes with election to the top post in a national organization. I also learned, long ago, that these pleasant emotions are but a fleeting prelude to heavy responsibility and strenuous effort which can tax to the utmost a man's mental and physical resources.

I long since discovered that election to high office is much less an honor bestowed than it is a challenge to be confronted; much less a reward than a duty. It is in such spirit that I approach this awesome assignment.

My labors in the chamber's vineyards during the last decade were not in search of honors. I have been motivated by an overpowering conviction that the businessmen of America owe it to themselves and to their country to work together in an organized and unselfish effort to preserve and strengthen the United States and its free institutions.

I am aware, acutely, if not painfully, that I have been asked to fill a role which through the years has been filled by some of the most outstanding and able men in America. Each of these men was different—each had his own approach, his own methods, his own style and philosophy.

Each, in his own way, did what he could to enhance and carry forward the chamber's work and objectives. I shall endeavor to do the same, without attempting to imitate any of my illustrious predecessors.

Comparisons inevitably will be made, and though I most certainly will suffer by comparison, I am nonetheless determined to be neither more nor less than Walter Carey.

I must tell you, as I told my colleagues of the chamber just a few nights ago, that I cannot offer new and phenomenal solutions for the serious and difficult problems which confront this Nation.

But I do recognize the existence of these problems and the need for moving in on them hard and fast or else see them spread and undermine our entire social and economic structure.

I believe the businessmen of America have a clear-cut responsibility as well as great capacity for helping to find solutions for these problems and also for helping to carry them through.

Our responsibility is just as great as that of the people in Government. We sell ourselves short and play an unworthy role if we merely sit in obdurate judgment on the ideas and proposals of others.

As far as I'm concerned, the Government is "we," not "they." The Nation's problems are "ours," not "theirs."

So, for better or for worse, I shall dedicate myself in the ensuing year, in both word and deed, to vigorous pursuit of a business-Government partnership founded upon friendship and mutal respect.

I shall pursue this objective without the slightest regard for partisan politics. I embark upon it with deep faith that it reflects the attitude and desire of the large majority in both the business community and in Government.

Most thinking men, both in and out of government, agree to the general principle that private enterprise should provide, to the fullest extent possible, for our needs as individuals and as a nation, with government injecting or substituting itself only in those areas and to the extent that free enterprise cannot do the job.

Carried a step further, this concept holds that proper governmental functions should be performed wherever possible by local government, with State or Federal Government becoming involved only when and to the extent that it is necessary.

I subscribe completely to these sound principles.

There are those, of course, who have only contempt for our free enterprise system and who would, if they could, inject government into every facet of our social and economic life. At the other extreme are those who are contemptuous of government, and who view every governmental action as a dastardly encroachment.

These extreme views are equally wrong and equally dangerous. Fortunately, I believe, they still represent only small minorities.

I am convinced that in both business and government the majorities are composed of reasonable and moderate groups, each respecting the role and objectives of the other.

These moderate majorities must work together for the common good, recognizing that reasonable men can disagree occasionally on details or specific proposals without doubting or challenging each other's motives, patriotism, or ancestry.

The sound way to make the free enterprise system work and to minimize the need for governmental intervention is for business to recognize developing needs and problems, and to take the initiative in working out effective and intelligent solutions.

Many of our problems are economic in origin. They require economic, rather than political solutions. To these specialized problems the American businessman can bring specialized skill, experience, and resources.

Businessmen as represented by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are in general accord with the objectives of the Johnson administration in the renewed war on poverty.

During most of its 52 years, the national chamber has been engaged indirectly in its own war against poverty through the affirmative method of generating economic growth, new jobs, higher productivity and a rising standard of living.

Poverty is an economic vacuum—the absence of jobs, payrolls and productivity. If we fill this vacuum with jobs, we will not have to fill it with welfare checks, and everyone including the poverty victims will be happier and better for it.

Let me give an example. I was interested to read the other day that General Motors will spend $2 billion in the next 2 years to expand its manufacturing facilities. This will create 50,000 new jobs.

Thus there lies behind each new job $40,000 worth of investment in machine tools, power equipment, dies, presses, and other facilities that will be purchased from other manufacturers and suppliers, thereby creating additional jobs.

This is one form of action American business men can take in mobilizing our tremendous capacity against poverty. It is such investment in more efficient productive facilities that provides the best hope for minimizing if not eliminating this sorry blight on our society.

I reiterate that we should never settle for the role of merely passing judgment on the proposals of others. We have a clear responsibility to take the initiative.

There is much that we can do as individual business men. There is much more we can do collectively if we will put our hearts, our minds and our shoulders together.

To that end, and as a starter, we have just established a national task force on economic growth and opportunity on which many of the Nation's leading businessmen enthusiastically have accepted service.

This task force will tackle the problems of unemployment and poverty and the challenge that automation has created. We hope to develop analyses and constructive proposals that will give short-range relief and long-range solutions.

I could not speak before this group about government-business cooperation without mentioning and congratulating you for what I consider one of the outstanding examples of such cooperation in our generation.

I am referring to the big Federal highway program that was launched by the Federal Highway Act of 1956. A great deal of the credit for development of that program unquestionably belongs right here with the members of the Highway Users Congress—and so, I might add, does the responsibility for seeing it through to completion.

But I would remind you that standing shoulder to shoulder with you in leading the attack on what, in the early 1950's was a poverty of highway development, was—and still is—the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

For many years we of the highway user family and the business community had taken the position that highway building and highway taxation should be entirely the responsibility of the States, and that the Federal Government should stay out of it. It was a sound position, no doubt, so long as the States could get the job done.

It was still our position in 1954 when it was proposed that the Federal Government, in the interest of national defense and the general economy, should launch construction of a 40,000-mile system of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Our old position was deeply ingrained and, from long practice, each of us was capable of making a rousing and spontaneous speech in its defense. Therefore, our instinctive re-

action to the proposal was negative, and I have no doubt that the vast economic and political forces represented by these groups could have prevented approval of the program.

But we viewed the matter as reasonable and moderate men. We determined that the Nation needed these highways. We became convinced that, for a variety of reasons, the States could not or would not provide them. Therefore, we joined together and gave the program our full support.

To our everlasting credit, we advocated a sound and unselfish program. We asked for no handout. It is a pay-as-you-go program, with every dime spent by Uncle Sam coming from a special trust fund supplied by special Federal taxes levied against the car, bus and truckowners of the country. None of it comes from the Treasury's general tax revenues.

It has even been described as a pay-before-you-go program. We have been paying these heavy special taxes since the program was approved in 1956, and only now are we beginning to see the road network take shape. I mention this with pride, and not by way of complaint.

We have seen enough of the new road system to appreciate how wonderful it will be and what a disservice we would have done ourselves and our country had we been shortsighted and negative in 1956.

In half a dozen years the Interstate and Defense Highway System will be completed and all tied together. At that time, it will be paid for in full, and it will be there for long decades after all of us here today have gone.

So this marvelous highway system—this greatest construction project in the history of the world—will represent a gift from us to our children and their children, and not a heavy financial burden passed to their shoulders because we refused to bear it. And again, included in this legacy, is a prime illustration of the kind of government-business cooperation we must have in this country.

I realize that I don't have to tell you these things about the origin or character of the highway program, or the heavy financial burden it has placed upon current highway users of all descriptions.

But we need to do a far better job of telling others the true story about the highway program and how it is being financed.

No reasonable man who understood the source of the money could honestly complain about the amounts being spent for roads by the Federal Government.

No fairminded man who understood the heavy and special tax burden assumed by highway users to pay for this road system could in good conscience suggest that we now be deprived of important segments of that system, or that money be taken from the highway trust fund and spent on other projects.

Nevertheless, we hear such complaints and suggestions, and in growing number. They are a distinct threat to the integrity of the highway program and must be strongly resisted.

It is neither necessary nor wise for this resistance to take the form of name-calling against those whose suggestions would do violence to the highway program. Nor do we need to attack the alternative projects which they espouse.

We need only to convey the truth about the highway program and the trust fund to the millions of moderate and reasonable Americans who do not fully understand it. If we do this, we can depend upon justice being done.

However, we cannot be complacent about our success in building a highway system. We know, for example, that by 1970 the growth of our population, and its concentration in "strip cities," will have vastly increased the number of vehicles using the highways. So we must continue to plan today to meet the problems of tomorrow, and this is true not only of highways, but of other areas of public affairs as well. I have in mind modernization of the tax system, and future planning in the areas of education, agriculture, and urban renewal, to name a few. An early and constructive interest in future problems is, I believe, a proper goal for moderate and reasonable businessmen throughout the country.

When I was asked to supply a title for my talk here today, I suggested: "Moderates on the March."

It reflects my own belief in moderation, and it expresses my conviction that the great majority of the American people are moderate.

But more than that, it is a call to arms.

This Nation was founded and has been built to its present greatness by a moderate people led by moderate leaders.

This same moderation tends to keep us silent in the face of an alarming increase in extremism which, if allowed to go unchecked, could engulf us.

I am not talking about any particular extremists.

I'm talking about all of them, whether they are in politics, religion, business, labor, the professions, or any other area of human endeavor.

Every society has a small percentage of genuine zealots and crackpots, but they do not constitute a threat. They can be ignored, or pitied.

The real threat is the calculating extremist who, to gain his own dubious ends, uses extremism as an art form, a device for getting attention and publicity, and thus influencing the ignorant, the uninformed and those who lack emotional stability.

This kind of extremism breeds more of the same, and the danger has been magnified by the phenomenal developments in communications media and the tendency of such media to publicize, if not glorify, the utterances and antics of the extremist.

As a consequence, the extremist can command a degree of attention and wield an influence upon the American thought process that is way out of proportion to his number, his merit, or his cause.

If he is challenged at all it is usually by an opposite extremist.

It seems to me we in the middle should have done with only shaking our heads or clucking our tongues.

It no longer is enough just to be moderate. If moderation is to prevail it must be more than a silent and negative reaction to extremism.

I am suggesting that moderation must become an affirmative objective—a cause to be defended and advocated—actively, fearlessly and, if need be, militantly.

If it is a paradox to suggest that moderates be militant in support of moderation, or in opposition to extremism, then so be it. As with fire, perhaps we must resort to one paradox to combat another.

For the real paradox is to be found in the fact that we, a nation of moderates, sit quietly like observers at a tennis match while a noisy and dangerous few exert profound influence upon our national image, our institutions and our destiny.

Silence is not always golden. It can be a tarnished and shabby haven for timidity and surrender.

I, for one, refuse the shelter of that haven. I am ready to stand up—to be counted—and to march in the front line.

To each of you, I extend a cordial invitation to join me.

Dr. Daniel A. Poling Throws Light Upon Chairman Celler's Prayer Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of hearing testimony given before the House Judiciary Committee by Dr. Daniel A. Poling on the pending resolutions with respect to the prayer amendment.

Dr. Poling is a highly esteemed and widely known religious leader of the Protestant faith. He is editor of the Christian Herald magazine, a monthly publication which enjoys a wide national circulation among citizens of Protestant faith, and editor-in-chief of the Christian Endeavor World, the official organ of the World's Christian Endeavor Union with membership running into the millions.

Dr. Poling serves as chaplain of the Chapel of Four Chaplains at Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., an interfaith memorial established to honor the memory of the four chaplains, of three faiths, who went down together on the S.S. *Dorchester*, which was torpedoed in the North Atlantic during World War II. One of these heroic chaplains was Dr. Poling's son.

Many thousands of our men and women who fought on farflung fronts during the last war will never forget the visits of Dr. Poling, or the comfort and solace which he brought to them in their hours of greatest test and trial. He was no stranger to our front line troops in the Pacific and European theaters.

It has been my privilege to know Dr. Poling over the years. Like all who know him, I admire his tireless efforts to advance the common good, his dedication to those principles and moral precepts upon which our Nation was founded and the courage with which he faces the issues of our times.

The testimony presented today by Dr. Poling goes to the heart of the great national issue growing out of the Supreme Court decision on prayers in our public schools. Because of the confusion which surrounds the Supreme Court decision and the desperate need for clearing away this confusion at the earliest possible moment, I insert in the RECORD the testimony given by Dr. Daniel A. Poling today before the House Judiciary Committee, and commend its reading to all the Members.

DR. DANIEL A. POLING THROWS LIGHT UPON CHAIRMAN CELLER'S PRAYER HEARINGS

I am Daniel A. Poling, editor of Christian Herald magazine, perhaps the most widely circulated independent Protestant monthly in America; also I am chaplain of the Chapel of Four Chaplains at the heart of Temple University in Philadelphia, a memorial to the four chaplains of three faiths who gave their lifebelts to enlisted men and went down together when in World War II the SS *Dor-*

chester was torpedoed in North Atlantic waters. It is true that my board of directors supports my position unanimously, but I testify here only as a citizen of the Protestant faith. Immediately I have been led to speak because official representatives of the National Council of Churches, the ecumenical body of my faith, in their testimony here, a testimony supporting the Supreme Court decision, have proposed mistakenly, I believe, that prayers on special occasions—commencements, et al—could be differently judged than prayers in regular public school sessions. Here is a distinction certainly without a moral difference and, I believe, without a legal difference. If a local school board can permit—and note that the key word is "permit"—prayers for special occasions, why is it enjoined from doing so in the regular proceedings of a public school?

But aside from the testimony itself as offered by the ecumenical hierarchy of my faith, that testimony as it was carried by the press and other public media purported to represent practically all Protestant communicants—40 million is the figure used. Unwittingly no doubt, these distinguished and sincere Protestant fellow-Christians are published as representing me and what is, I believe, the overwhelming majority of my fellow Protestants, though we are in complete opposition to the position they took in these hearings. Every poll and, I believe, the heavy weight of correspondence received by this committee and my own editorial correspondence support the testimony I offer today, and oppose the position of these representatives of the National Council of Churches.

I believe in ecumenicity. As a former president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, my own denomination, I have been a member of the Protestant hierarchy. But no board, no central body, however named, has authority to speak for the Protestant faith as these men have spoken. There has been no plebiscite and without it I find nothing in the constitution or bylaws of the National Council of Churches authorizing the testimony offered here by these council leaders. Indeed, there is evidence fully confirming me in my belief that in their testimony before this committee they have misrepresented the overwhelming majority of their fellow Christians of their faith.

Is not one of the problems in the Supreme Court decision the difference between permissive and restrictive legislation? In the State of New York, the regents wrote a particular prayer. This was obviously wrong on the face of it—wrong for anyone to write a prayer and say to me or you, "This is your prayer and if you want to pray a prayer, this is it." Also it is true, I think, in Maryland and Pennsylvania, that the State required the use of the Lord's Prayer or the reading of a specified number of Bible verses, saying in effect, "You must read this." I would be hard put to defend such an imperative.

With proper humility, I hope, I suggest that the Supreme Court should have been concerned in each case with the difference between compulsion and permission. Surely, the State should not be permitted to say, "You must pray my prayer or read the holy book I prescribe." That would be an abridgement of my constitutional rights. On the other hand, I submit that my constitutional rights are abridged when any court says or implies, "You may not pray the prayer you wish in school or out, or read a devotional book." For me it is as simple as this: No court is competent to tell me where I may or may not take my religion so long as I do not impose it upon another. I support the Court's action that strikes down a requirement, a compulsion for religion in schools. But surely, only those involved, directly involved, the local community under the Constitution, are competent to decide, decide for themselves, what they will not do. Has not this been America for 150 years?

In an article, "The Paradox of the School Decision," appearing in Presbyterian Life, the distinguished Elton Trueblood stresses the point of what is to me chiefly disturbing about the Supreme Court's decision. He affirms, and I agree, that the ultimate reason given by the Court is a doctrine of "neutrality." The words "neutral" and "neutrality" appear on various pages of the printed opinion. And the final argument given is: "in the relationship between men and religion, the state is firmly committed to a position of neutrality."

We need to inquire into the meaning of this word "neutral"—and just what is "neutrality"? Surely, no man can be neutral about justice "for refusal to witness may help the other side." Dr. Trueblood points out that sometimes neutrality aims at moral fairness, as in a situation in which we are waiting for evidence; but in other situations it means moral paralysis. Often, it means cowardice or indifference. And I submit that "a conception so ambiguous and so doubtful is a strange pivotal point for a practical philosophy of human conduct."

I further submit that instead of taking a neutral stand as between various religions, the Court rules, in the Baltimore problem, in favor of an atheist claim. If the vast majority of Baltimore parents are denied the right to pursue a practice which they prize, is not this a prohibition of free exercise? Also, is not this actually the tyranny of a minority? The distinguished Dr. William F. Rosenblum, Rabbi of Temple Israel in New York City, once said in a sermon in his own pulpit, "In this country, the minority must recognize that the majority also has rights."

It seems to me that it is not intellectually honest to affirm a position, or for the Court to affirm a position, unless we are willing to accept what that position entails. And I further submit that this absolute, this unqualified neutrality involves and inevitably must involve:

(1) Forbidding Thanksgiving, which is consciously religious and has been from its beginning.

(2) Forbidding Government recognition of Christmas, which surely is religious. As of the Court's latest decision, must not this Christmas Day as a holiday, on which Government offices are closed, be dropped?

(3) Forbidding the opening of legislatures and courts with prayer. I submit that the Court's latest decision undermines this practice.

(4) Forbidding the appointment of military chaplains by the Government. There are vital arguments and profound emotions centering here, emotions and arguments inexpressively poignant to those who have sons in uniform or memories of sons in uniform. Surely, you would not send our men into combat or prepare them for combat without the comfort, the guidance, the sustaining strength of their religious faith, though there must be no compulsion of religious faith.

Surely, to protect, or in a gesture of protection, seek to protect those who, in their freedom, do not believe in God, we should not destroy or restrict the more than century-old commitments and practices of those who do believe.

The implications of unconditional neutrality, as affirmed by the Supreme Court, are so numerous that it is impossible to know where to begin and where to stop, for our life is deeply influenced by our spiritual heritage, as the Justices themselves agree. And Justice Stewart points it all up, when he says, "We err in the first place if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the free imperatives of our free society, that religion and Government must necessarily interact in countless ways."

It is quite possible, I think, that in an effort to support separation of church and state, we may be maneuvering ourselves into the position of subordinating religion to irreligion and, indeed, of supporting irreligion. Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court in his personal footnotes on the Court's Regents Prayer decision left no doubt of what he believes the future holds for "In God We Trust" on the coins and currency, for the opening of courts and legislative bodies with prayer, for the oath, for the chaplaincy in the Armed Forces, and others. And already these same minority groups have brought action in lower courts seeking to strike down all of these.

Unwittingly, but nevertheless, the resolutions passed by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church and a proposal emanating from the National Council of Churches at the same time, gave comfort to the all-out position indicated by Justice Douglas.

How paradoxical it all became when we filled the air with prayer—though atheists of course were free to remain silent—after the President of the United States was assassinated; and just now, Lyndon Baines Johnson as President of the United States calls for Memorial Day prayers for permanent peace. There is clearly apparent an absurdity in "doing in practice what we deny in theory," and would forbid in law.

Again, I agree with Dr. Trueblood when he concludes, "The separation of church and state is important, but it is not the only conception that is important." The danger, the supreme danger today, is that we substitute a doctrine, a doctrine of neutrality, for a sense of history and an equally vital sense of values.

Is it not true that in more than 150 years, good, and indeed only good, came out of what we now seem to be preparing to discard. Surely, this is not the time, when the moral foundations and indeed the very foundations of our free society rock, to destroy that which has strengthened and enriched America.

The Founding Fathers defined and eventually practiced separation of church and state, but it is abundantly clear that separation was never intended to mean exclusion. To exclude our time-honored religious practices is certainly to recognize and, I believe, also to invite irreligion. This Republic was not so founded and up to now has not so prospered.

I support an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, an amendment that will make it unmistakably clear that separation does not mean exclusion.

National Transportation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have been most impressed with a newsfeature on National Transportation Week prepared by the Transportation Association of America. Transportation is one of our most important and necessary industries; and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAA NEWSFEATURE: THE CONQUEST OF TIME AND DISTANCE

America is the world's best example of man's conquest of time and distance—it provides, under private enterprise, the finest transportation service yet devised.

Today's American citizen has the benefit of quantity, quality and variety of transportation services that his forefathers would have thought impossible at the turn of the century.

As the country moves into the May 10–16 observance of National Transportation Week, the Transportation Association of America noted that U.S. spending for transportation of all types accounts for nearly 20 percent of the county's gross national product—$117 billion of $585 billion spent for all purposes in this country in 1963.

TAA President Harold F. Hammond said that the country in 1963 spent $52 billion on freight transportation and $65 billion on passenger transportation—of which $57 billion (nearly 90 percent of the latter) went for private automobile expenses.

"These massive sums document that transportation is one of the keys to much of our economic progress," Hammond said. "This is why we are doing something meaningful when we mark National Transportation Week."

The TAA official also noted that the United States—3,022,387 square miles in continental size—"is in reality one of the smallest of countries—in terms of passenger and freight travel time."

"The United States is 3,000 miles broad," Hammond said, "but it is only about 4 hours wide by jet and 72 hours wide by truck or railroad car."

TAA is a national transport policymaking organization whose coast-to-coast membership includes transport users, investors and all six types of carriers—airlines, freight forwarders, highway, oil pipelines, railroads, and water carriers.

Many of the milestones in the conquest of time and distance have been recorded in America, the TAA president noted. He gave these examples:

In 1815, the Erie Canal was completed and called the Nation's greatest engineering feat. Only small, horse-drawn flatboats could be used, however, as contrasted today with huge, diesel-propelled towboats pushing integrated tows of 20 or more barges down the Mississippi, their length exceeding that of the 1,019-foot *Queen Mary*. Now we have some 24,000 miles of commercially navigable inland waterways over which move 140 billion ton-miles of traffic.

In 1829, the Nation's first steam locomotive was introduced, and the railway building boom was underway quickly linking the eastern part of the United States. In 1869, the first transcontinental railroad was completed and binded together the East and West. When the inefficient steam locomotive threatened the railroads' existence against new modes of transport prior to World War II, the invention of the diesel put them back in the running. Now railroads move 630 billion ton-miles of freight over 216,000 miles of main-line track.

In 1865, the first oil pipeline was built, opening the way to the development of a vast, and highly efficient network of underground pipelines that now traverse over 124,000 miles of the Nation's countryside. This silent transporter—the Nation's most automated transport made—now moves about 243 billion ton-miles of crude and refined petroleum every year—and at a cost no greater than 20 years ago.

In 1900, there were just 8,000 autos and no trucks or buses. By 1915, however, Henry Ford had built some 1 million autos and now we have 67 million cars and 13 million trucks and buses. The trucks, moreover, hauled 348 billion ton-miles of traffic in 1963.

In 1903, the Wright brothers made the first engine-driven flight of a heavier-than-air craft. The ship flew 126 feet in 12 seconds while commercial jets now fly 2 miles in 12 seconds and the drawing-board supersonic aircraft will fly 7 miles in 12 seconds. In 1963, the airlines lifted 1.12 billion freight ton-miles and 42 billion passenger-miles of traffic.

Hammond gave these other significant facts about the transportation industry:

Transportation provides nearly 18 percent of total Federal tax income, including: 13 percent of corporate revenues; 42 percent of all excise taxes, and 14 percent of individual income, employment, estate and gift taxes.

About 10 percent ($126 billion) of our total net civilian investment in privately owned, reproducible assets is for transport facilities.

Some 14 percent of total civilian employment (about 9½ million people) is in transportation or transportation-related industries.

And those who work directly in the transport carrier field are among the best paid U.S. employees: The average annual earnings of each full-time transport employee was $6,328 in 1962—as against a manufacturing average of $5,715.

Transportation as a key economic force, Hammond said, is a heavy user of basic materials. He reported that transportation industries consume 62 percent of the rubber manufactured in America, 50 percent of the lead, 29 percent of the steel, 23 percent of the aluminum, 50 percent of petroleum, 33 percent of the zinc, 24 percent of the cement, and 10 percent of the copper.

"All in all," Hammond said, "we should always remember—especially during National Transportation Week—that transportation is one of the keystones of the American economy."

Why Does Not Woodside Like Power Poles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, considerable difficulties are being encountered relative to the power supply for the AEC's new $125 million linear accelerator now being built at Stanford University. This research tool, to explore the inner unknowns of atomic structure, is one of the most exciting quests for knowledge in our times. When completed the accelerator will boost the speeds of electrons along a 2-mile path. They will ride radarlike waves produced by klystron tubes, much like a surfboarder rides the waves, constantly increasing in mass as the acceleration continues. Finally, they will strike a nuclear target, the collision will be caught on high-speed photographic film, then the scientists will search this film for new clues to the secrets of the universe. Because of the electron's small mass, the picture on the film is expected to be discriminate and meaningful to the trained viewer. Accelerators, such as Berkeley's Cyclotron and Brookhaven's Bevatron, use the heavier proton, rather than the lighter electron, in a similar way. Due to the very mass of the heavier proton, such destruction is caused when it strikes the target that the resulting trash and clutter obscure some of the basic atomic processes being sought by the scientists.

Both protron and electron accelerators require huge amounts of electric power for their operation. In the case of Stanford's Linac, the AEC wants to buy the power from Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and bring it to the campus on a high voltage line carried by tubular steel poles rather than less ascetic and more conventional steel towers. The city of Woodside, through which the line would run for a brief distance, as well as the county of San Mateo are fighting the line. They claim it ought to go underground. But if it does, it will cost the U.S. taxpayers about $6 million for the line instead of some $1¼ million. Quite a hassle over the issue has been going on for some time, involving the city and county, the university, the AEC, the Joint Atomic Committee, Congressmen, and Senators, as well as innocent bystanders. The following recently was contributed toward its settlement by an anonymous donor:

POWER LINE PRIMER

Look, oh, look. See the power pole. See the pretty power pole.

It is tubular. It is tapered. It is green. It is hard to see against the untrimmed trees.

Power poles are better than steel power towers.

Power towers have four legs. A power pole has only one leg.

Steel towers are tall. Steel towers are ugly. They require extensive tree removal. They require clearing of underbrush.

Steel power towers would rape our skyline. Power poles would never do that.

I like power poles. The JCAE likes power poles. Dr. Seaborg likes power poles.

Power poles are nice. Why doesn't Woodside like power poles?

Separation of Church and State, Soviet Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte, N.C., which operates station WBT is noted for its very eloquent broadcast editorials. I have been particularly impressed which the broadcast editorial of May 14, 1964, entitled "Separation of Church and State, Soviet Style."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, SOVIET STYLE

It is an ironic contrast that finds the United States becoming more and more secular in its understanding of the place

religious principle plays in national life at the same time that Soviet Russia is even more confirmed in its mingling of ideology with national life.

Americans will be surprised to learn that current Soviet publications are attacking Joseph Stalin as having been too easygoing with the church, and for having displayed insufficient enthusiasm in combating religion.

In announcing a new offensive against religion, a Pravda article claims that only since the beginning of the Khrushchev era has atheism begun to really score successes.

In the Kremlin's new anti-God campaign, an institute of atheism has been established, and faculties of atheism opened at all Soviet universities. Attendance at lectures by the professors of atheism is compulsory for all students, no matter what their field of study.

The film industry has been ordered to produce atheist films with a clear message to be circulated all over the country. Whatever religious observances of holidays still exist must be supplanted by Communist red letter days.

In the stepping up of the campaign against believers, over 2,000 of the Soviet Union's 20,000 churches have been closed, and those still open are subject to an 80-percent tax on any revenues. Three of the eight seminaries allowed since 1944 have now been closed.

In the last 2 years, 660 antireligious books and pamphlets have been published with a circulation of 11 million copies.

What Americans do not seem to be able to understand is that communism itself is a faith, based on atheism, which explains creation and the meaning of existence for its followers, and that this intensive indoctrination in atheism illustrates an ironclad church state in Communist countries.

Norman Thomas, the American Socialist, defines communism as "a militant atheism held with all of the fervor of a religion." It has its dogmas and rituals, its saints and martyrs. It does what all religions have done for any group of believers; it gives them something to live for, and it gives them something to die for. Its missionaries are the most dedicated religious fanatics that this century has seen.

Mere disbelief in God is not enough, according to another Communist writer. There is a "bourgeois atheism," he complains, which "amounts to belief in nothing and nobody," rather than in the Communist ideology. This, too, is under attack from the party authorities.

Unlike the Communists, we wisely separate religious doctrine from state compulsion. But if we as a people ever separate religious faith from our national character, we will indeed have nothing to offer in contrast to the Kremlin's creed.

Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest tributes I have seen on the life and character of General MacArthur was that written by Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired, which appeared in the Vicksburg, Miss., Evening Post, on April 25, 1964.

General MacArthur's wisdom, courage, intellect, and character were of such immense proportions that he will ever live in the hearts and minds of civilized men and women as one who gave his total life to serving humanity. His life will inspire future generations to achieve lasting peace and the highest form of orderly society. His contributions will ever be remembered by a grateful nation.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point General Lane's comments on Douglas MacArthur:

ON MILITARY AFFAIRS: GENERAL MACARTHUR JOINS IMMORTALS

(By Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane)

WASHINGTON.—He was a soldier. In other lands the word may have other significance, but in our country it describes a man who offers his life for his country. That sacrifice has been made by thousands of Americans on the battlefields of many wars. They were his comrades.

Doughas MacArthur was raised on the bread of patriotism. He lived among heroes from the time of his birth. At West Point, he embraced the code of duty, honor, country as the rule of his life. He lived in ever-faithful service to his country.

The steel of a soldier's character is courage. Douglas MacArthur had it in superlative degree. As colonel and general on the battlefields of France in World War I, he was at the front, unarmed, leading his men into combat. He knew the obligation of the leader to set an example of fearlessness which would give confidence to his men. In France, he gave combat leadership unequalled in modern history. He was Douglas, Coeur de Lion.

The art of war was to Douglas MacArthur more than the battlefield It was the watch over the security of his country the perception and comprehension of every threat, the prudent preparation of the people and the Armed Forces, the employment of power to serve the Nation with unerring efficiency, the harnessing of all effort to protect the ideals and achieve the aspirations of the American people. To this profession of arms, he gave his great intellect and his indomitable spirit. He achieved a mastery of the art of war unequalled in this age and unexcelled in history.

Because he had mastered the art of war, his campaigns were models of simplicity and daring. Douglas MacArthur had no part of that uninspired generalship which commits men to grinding, bloody stalemate. He used his forces with imagination and skill, selecting unerringly the decisive action. He committed his men to battle with pride and confidence, but never wastefully. Their lives were as his own, his most precious trust.

When others, dismayed by his daring in planning the Inchon landing, urged him to make a more conventional attack on the Pusan perimeter, he rejected their advice. He saved thousands of lives by that decision. When he was removed from command, the war lapsed into a bloody stalemate—the hideous, costly slugging which is called war by those who do not understand war.

For Douglas MacArthur, war held no glory save in the spirit of those who nobly waged it. War was a blight to be ended as quickly as possible, so that the triumph of our arms might restore our people in security to the peaceful pursuits. He knew war too well to be deceived by the counsel of weakness which pleads for peace without victory. This is the road to unending war, and to defeat.

Because he so justly appraised the art of war, he found his greatest pleasure in practicing the arts of peace. His administration of occupied Japan, teaching by precept and example the virtues of justice and charity which flowed from his very being, reflected both his deep understanding of the Japanese people and his perception of the true desires and interests of the American people. If there was no vengeance in his nature, that was because he held vengeance too mean an emotion for accommodation within the American spirit.

It is the misfortune of our country that a President, counseled by men of limited talent, turned away from the great wisdom which was at his service. When the threatening tide of Communist conquest could have been decisively turned back at small cost and slight risk, it was instead tempted to new aggression by fearful men ignorant of war.

Our age offers Douglas MacArthur to the immortals, to stand proudly with Washington and Lee as the best of America. His memory enshrines ancient virtues. May his example ever inspire young Americans to emulate his noble character and his devotion to our country.

Federal Republic of Germany Will Abolish Import Quotas on Bovine Leather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, the Federal Republic of Germany will abolish all quantitative restrictions on imports of bovine leather.

Under a waiver granted in 1959 by the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—Germany has maintained import quotas on bovine leather from all countries which were not members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Thus, the United States together with other non-European countries having a tanning industry have been virtually excluded from the German market, while Germany's Western European neighbors have expanded their sales to the Federal Republic.

The decision of the German Government to dispense with this discriminatory quota system should be highly commended not only because it will open a potential market for the U.S. tanning industry. Coming at the beginning of the difficult Kennedy-Johnson round of GATT bargaining, Germany's action is a welcome earnest of support for trade liberalization which the United States will need to achieve success in these negotiations.

The elimination of the leather quotas, while helpful for U.S. leather exporters, will not mean any dramatic gains for U.S. exports. In 1963, the U.S industry sold less than half of its permitted German quota of about $250,000. Even with no quota restrictions, spokesmen for the industry doubt that annual exports can exceed $750,000. Only over a much longer period can the United States hope to have a more significant share of Germany's total imports of the items hitherto subject to quota. These imports, supplied almost entirely from quota-free European countries, rose from $8,148,000 in 1961 to $12,992,000 in 1963.

To say this, however, is not to minimize the value of Germany's action. The United States should be the first to understand how great the pressures are to grant protection to import-threatened industries and to retain it, once granted. The political cost of giving up protection can often exceed economic gains. Hence, the United States should be duly appreciative of the action of the Federal Republic and seek its cooperation for a general attack on nontariff barriers during the Kennedy-Johnson round.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Antipoverty Program, Ending Compulsory Military Service in 10 Years, and Cutbacks in Manufacture of Nuclear Explosives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, May 16, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, on April 23, 1964, there were published in the Anderson Independent, of Anderson, S.C., two editorials, the first entitled "President Projects Two Big Moves Possible Without Loss of Security," and the second entitled "Investing Money in People Is Wise."

The first editorial deals with President Johnson's hopes to end compulsory military service within the next 10 years and his planned cutback in the manufacture of nuclear explosives.

The second editorial discusses the Johnson administration's antipoverty program.

Madam President, because of the deep interest in these subjects, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Apr. 23, 1964]

PRESIDENT PROJECTS TWO BIG MOVES POSSIBLE WITHOUT LOSS OF SECURITY

Two items of cheering news have come out of Washington.

One is the fact that President Johnson hopes compulsory military service can be ended in the next 10 years. The other is that sizable new cutbacks in the manufacture of nuclear explosives is planned.

Both can be taken as reflecting an improvement in the cold war situation.

President Johnson revealed that Premier Khrushchev plans to make similar cutbacks in Russian manufacture of nuclear materials.

This country has had compulsory military service since shortly before World War II.

The number of men called in recent years for the most part has been small. But the uncertainty of a draft call and the time spent in service is a great handicap to young men in mapping their futures.

If a plan can be worked out to maintain necessary defense forces without the draft, it will be a tremendous benefit to these young men and their parents.

Expense of maintaining the defenses compromises major Federal expenditures. Any saving in this respect, without reducing our Nation's security, could be applied to reduce taxes or applied to domestic needs.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Apr. 23, 1964]

INVESTING MONEY IN PEOPLE IS WISE

We suppose there may be some reasons for questioning aspects of the Johnson administration's antipoverty program, but surely opponents can do better than the argument advanced by a spokesman of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (The Farm Bureau was against the wheat-cotton bill recently enacted.)

"This program," Dr. Harry L. Brown testified before a House special subcommittee conducting hearings on the matter, "does violence to a balanced budget."

Georgia Democrat Representative PHIL LANDRUM, who, able and experienced, is carrying the administration ball on the program, said, "Honestly, Harry, you don't really disagree with what we propose in title I (a job corps, work-training and work-study programs for young people)?"

"Yep," was the reply, and there you are.

Well, any program that involves the expenditure of public funds, of course, may fit Dr. Brown's description.

Spending $50 billion annually for defense does violence to a balanced budget. But spending less than 2 percent of that $50 billion—less than 1 percent of the $97.8 billion projected Federal budget—less than one-fifth of 1 percent of America's gross national product—would hardly seem likely to drive the country over the brink of bankruptcy.

Throwing money away is one thing; investing money in human beings—in human resources, if you will—is quite another.

Genuine prudence, not to mention compassion, suggests the wisdom of developing programs to give underprivileged young people opportunities to acquire the education and skills that can make them better and more productive adults, and programs to help communities fight poverty on their own.

Breaking the vicious cycle of poverty will not break the budget; on the contrary, it is one of the most effective means of balancing not only the national budget but the national economy.

If this country could raise the income of each of the poor by only $1,000 annually, said President Johnson in introducing the antipoverty program, we could add some $14 billion a year to our national output, in addition to the savings in welfare, crime, delinquency, disease, and hunger.

For the first time in history a nation, our Nation, has the capacity to eradicate poverty. It would be tragic if we saw the problem—and the solutions—and then passed on the other side, merely because of a phobia about balancing the Federal budget in every 12-month period.

Nation Honors Noted Statesman—Harry Truman Is 80 Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, last week the Senate was honored with a visit from one of its most distinguished former members, the former President of the United States, Harry S Truman, who was celebrating his 80th birthday.

In this connection, the Anderson Independent, of Anderson, S.C., has written a deserving tribute in the form of an editorial.

Madam President, the Anderson Independent is published by a lifelong friend of mine, Wilton E. Hall, who has been a devoted member of the Democratic Party all of his life. When Harry S Truman ran for President in 1948, when all the pollsters had him defeated, Wilton Hall's newspaper was the only large daily newspaper in South Carolina which supported, openly and strongly, Harry Truman. It is most appropriate, therefore, for the Anderson Independent to publish this editorial.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, "Nation Honors Noted Statesman—Harry Truman Is 80 Years Young," published in the Anderson Independent of May 8, 1964, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION HONORS NOTED STATESMAN—HARRY TRUMAN IS 80 YEARS YOUNG

Today is the 80th birthday of Harry S Truman (note to all: he uses no period after the S).

The occasion has prompted numerous articles and reviews of the crucial years he guided the Nation's destiny.

Unforgotten is the firmness and wisdom he met head on in dealing with worldwide problems he faced when President Franklin D. Roosevelt died suddenly April 12, 1945, elevating Vice President Truman to the Presidency.

Less than a month later—May 6, 1945—Germany surrendered unconditionally.

In the Pacific the Japanese were yet to be brought to their knees. Massive transfer of U.S. men and equipment from Europe to the Pacific began.

Andersonians and other Americans braced themselves for terrific casualties in the planned storming of the Japanese home islands.

Unknown to the public, a new weapon had come into being—the A-bomb.

President Truman had a choice to make: sacrifice of tens of thousands of GI's in a conventional assault upon Japan's shores, or the use of the A-bomb.

Harry Truman, totally in character, acted. He became the first head of state to direct use of the bomb. Japan surrendered.

On December 31, 1946, he officially proclaimed the end of hostilities in World War II.

In the postwar years when Moscow bared its fangs, he proclaimed the Truman doctrine and prevented overrunning of Greece and Turkey by the Communists.

In 1948 he ran for a term of his own. All the polls predicted Republican Dewey would win. One of Mr. Truman's most prized possessions is an election night copy of the GOP Chicago Tribune. The headline: "Dewey Defeats Truman." It was vice versa. Truman was elected to a 4-year term.

The years he served were marked by determination to preserve peace through strength of the United States.

Despite vicious political attacks upon him—and one attempt to assassinate him—historians of the future will undoubtedly classify the former chief executive among the greatest Presidents of the United States.

At the age of 80 he continues brisk, alert, and plain spoken.

Now about that "S" without the period: There seems to have been dispute at his birth on the middle name. One grandfather's given name was Solomon, the other Shippe. Compromise was just plain "S" and Harry himself in later years dropped the period after the initial.

Upon expiration of his presidential term, he was offered numerous lucrative positions by large corporations. It is a measure of the man—who from farm boy to President had no wealth backing him—that he spurned them all.

He returned to Independence, Mo., wrote his memoirs, and now busies himself with the Harry S Truman Library, containing his letters and documents, that was given Independence by the National Archives in 1957.

As the Nation's outstanding elder statesman, he is reversed and respected by millions of Americans, whatever their political affiliations. Anderson County voted overwhelmingly for him—he was our choice over Thurmond, or Dewey.

The Independent joins them this day in saying, "Happy birthday, Mr. President."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered, or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

2

Appendix

The Times-Union Commentary on School Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the continuing controversy over expressions of religious faith in the Nation's public schools has produced a growing collection of editorial opinions from newspapers across our land. While the viewpoints vary, these columns contribute significantly to an increasing public awareness and knowledge of the issues involved. Such expert analyses—bringing all relevant questions into focus—demonstrate the unique and vital role the news media play in our democratic process. Since we in Congress and the country have yet to achieve a consensus on this very important matter, these editorial explorations are performing a great service.

In this light, I am proud to share with my colleagues the incisive commentary of the Times-Union of Rochester, N.Y., which serves my home community. In its lead editorial of last Friday, the Times-Union offered its readers a valuable discussion of the problems presented by restricting religion and relegating its practice to those places that are wholly separate from public life. This editorial by Calvin Mayne, editorial page editor, is a needed reminder that religious reliance in our society goes far beyond the case of school prayer and whatever legislative action we may take in the days ahead should be guided accordingly.

THE PRAYER AMENDMENT: WHY IT IS NEEDED

Those testifying before Congress on the "prayer amendment," as all Americans, should bear in mind what the amendment says—and does not say.

The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The requirement extends to State and local governments, too.

Varying additions to this keystone of the Bill of Rights have been proposed. The one primarily under consideration is proposed by Representative FRANK BECKER, Long Island Republican. It says:

"1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution or place.

"2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of, God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

If the only issue involved were the recital of prayers in schools, there would be less reason for tampering with the Bill of Rights for the first time since its adoption 173 years ago.

But the threat to America's spiritual foundation is far more serious, and the Becker amendment meets it head on.

In a U.S. Supreme Court prayer ruling last year, it was held the the government must maintain "strict neutrality" toward religious exercises, "neither aiding nor opposing religion."

The trend of court decisions indicates that the small but determined band of those who are fighting all government involvement in religion will succeed if the first amendment remains as is.

Carried to its logical conclusion, that would mean that Christmas, Chanukah, and Thanksgiving observances or symbols must be banned from schools, or other government institutions. The national motto, "In God We Trust," must be erased from coins and judges' benches. Prayers must not be said during sessions of any legislative body.

The words "under God" must be deleted from the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. The fourth verse of "The Star-Spangled Banner" will be an illegal part of the national anthem. Government funds may not be used to finance religious funerals of national leaders. Baccalaureate or chapel services may not be held at government-supported high schools or colleges.

Chaplains may not serve the armed services or prisons. Church property will no longer be exempted from taxation. Presidential religious proclamations will be prohibited, and Government officials from the President down must stop appealing to Almighty God for guidance in speeches made on taxpayers' time.

Taken together, such prohibitions would constitute not Government "neutrality" toward religion but Government-enforced atheism, stripping our national life of any official reference to religion.

That is what the Becker amendment is aimed at preventing.

Opponents of the amendment, including many leading church figures, contend that no such result is threatened by the Court rulings.

But it would have strained belief not long ago to think that the High Court would bar recital of nonsectarian prayers and the reading of Bible verses in the schools, even when children could be excused from participation at their parents' request.

The Becker amendment's foes also have predicted, in all sincerity, that its approval will lead to an establishment of religion—that is, the protection or promotion of a religious denomination by Government.

If so, why didn't that happen in the 170-odd years of school prayers and official recognition of God before the Supreme Court acted? And why did almost all the religious leaders who now fear this outcome fail to act against it by calling upon the High Court to rule out the school prayers and other acts they now find so dangerous to religious liberty?

Certainly it is the task of churches and parents, not schools or government, to teach religion to children. But the removal of all references to God from public life would pose a positive menace to religion by fostering indifference to and ignorance of religion among children and adults alike.

We believe in the separation of church and state. We hold with the Founding Fathers that no citizen should be persecuted because of his religious beliefs, or lack of them.

But we also believe, as the Nation's founders believed, that America's liberties and its very existence are bestowed by divine providence. Voluntary expression of belief in God in our schools and in public life must be permitted for the vast majority of Americans who share that conviction.

Medical Care Under Social Security Will Free Aged and Help America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the House Ways and Means Committee is now considering, and eventually there will come to the floor of the Senate, a bill to provide medical care for the aged, under social security. What will happen to that bill is difficult to predict at this point; but, as an excellent editorial from the Anderson Independent of May 13 points out, "The program may not pass this session, but eventually it will; and when it does, the country will be thankful for it."

As the editorial says, "Someday people will look back and wonder what all the fuss was about. Meanwhile, there is nothing to do but to keep on trying, as President Johnson is doing at present; and we are proud we have a President who fights as he does for this issue."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Medical Care Under Social Security Will Free Aged and Help America," from the Anderson Independent of May 13, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY WILL FREE AGED AND HELP AMERICA

"Never in the history of the world," a Replican Congressman declared during the debate, "has any measure been brought in here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery, to enslave workers, and to prevent any possibility of the employers providing work for the people."

What was this "insidiously designed" measure? It was the original social security bill. Today the social security system is well established as the basic program for assuring the income and pride of workers past their prime. By pumping money into the economy it helps prevent business reces-

sions from turning into depressions. It is financially sound.

But the same kind of overwrought accusations as those made by that Republican Congressman now are being flung against the administration's proposal to put medical and nursing care for the aged under the social security system. Opponents are led by the American Medical Association, which 2 years ago spent an estimated $12 million in a propaganda campaign which defeated the King-Anderson bill.

Opponents charge that the program would destroy American medicine. They never spell out how, because they cannot. They say it is "socialized medicine." It is not. It has nothing to do with putting doctors on any kind of Government payroll. It is simply a convenient method by which people can pay, during their working years, for the medical care they will need when they are too old to work and more prone to illness than when they were younger. It is insurance, just like social security.

Opponents charge that the program would cost too much—a few pennies a day. They say private insurance companies can do the job, when it is manifest that private insurance companes are not doing a job that gets harder to do every day. In New York State, for example, Blue Cross rates were just raised again, this time by nearly 33 percent, in downstate counties. The rates had to be raised; otherwise Blue Cross would have become technically insolvent by the end of the month.

The AMA says King-Anderson would destroy the doctor-patient relationship. King-Anderson has nothing to do with the doctor-patient relationship. The AMA says the Kerr-Mills program can handle those who really need medical care but can't pay for it. But Kerr-Mills, a charity program, is in effect in only 32 of the 50 States.

It has 32 different kinds of administrative procedures and benefits. Its costs are high. Its effects are low. And in most States Kerr-Mills itself destroys the doctor-patient relationship, if that relationship refers to the right of the individual to choose his own doctor. Under Kerr-Mills he can't.

This week the House Ways and Means Committee again is considering pending proposals for health care for the aged. The outlook, if not precisely dismal, is not bright. President Kennedy fought for the King-Anderson and failed. President Johnson calls it "must" legislation. Unfortunately, Ways and Means Chairman Mills of Arkansas doesn't see it that way. He's against it, and so are most of the members of his committee.

Some day people will look back and wonder what all the fuss was about. Meanwhile, there is nothing to do but to keep on trying, as President Johnson is doing.

The program may not pass this session, but eventually it will, and when it does the country will be thankful for it.

Tribute to the National District Attorneys' Association and Garrett H. Byrne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have the opportunity at this time to pay tribute to the National District Attorneys' Association and to Garrett H. Byrne, recently elected president of the association. The work of this association and of this group of dedicated and able public servants is something that should give us all a great deal of pleasure, for it is such men as these who are doing perhaps more than any others to give life and meaning to the great ideals by which we live in this country.

The motto of the district attorneys' association says it well: "Organized Law Enforcement Versus Organized Crime." I think it is very important for us, in this time of increased technology and complexity in everyday life, to realize that it is not enough to simply declare our belief in the great ideals of democracy, equal justice under law, opportunity for all, and the rule of law; such ideals are only as good as they work out in practice. And, to very great extent, the way they do work out depends on those who enforce our laws. An ideal or a particular law may be wise, salutary, and even noble, but it may be something else again when it is applied. The law enforcement officials of our country have the difficult and important responsibility of applying the laws that we have enacted, and they have done an extraordinary job of it. One of the reasons the record has been so good is just such organizations as the National District Attorneys' Association.

This association, made up of over 1,700 law enforcement officials in every State, was formed in 1950 in New Orleans to provide a means for coordinating the activities of prosecuting attorneys all over the Nation, for exchanging vital information in the fight against crime and corruption, for the fostering of uniform laws on important aspects of civil and criminal law, and for bringing together, in close personal contact, various law enforcement officials around the country. I think it would not be unfair to say that, prior to the formation of the district attorneys' association, there was not very much cooperation between the various district and county attorneys; they simply did not know each other very well, or at all, not even in the larger jurisdictions. They were frequently unaware of the particular problems in other areas, and of the methods used elsewhere to combat problems they themselves might be facing. What a waste of effort and lost opportunities in the fight against crime.

But a great deal has changed since the formation of the district attorneys association: 16 county and proscuting attorneys from 12 States attended the organization meeting in New Orleans in November 1950. There are over 1,700 members now from every State in the Union and membership is growing constantly as its activities expand. In the years since the founding in 1950 we have seen constantly increasing efforts to effect genuine cooperation and coordination among the prosecuting attorneys across the Nation; uniform laws, such as the Uniform Support of Dependents Statute and the Uniform Rendition of Witnesses Act, have been sponsored successfully by the association; old-fashioned barriers that used to separate prosecutors have been broken down in the meetings and conferences sponsored by the association. How valuable these personal meetings have been. Through the association, prosecutors are personally acquainted with their counterparts in sometimes distant counties and cities, and take advantage of this friendship to consult with these others in the solution of their daily problems. The beneficial results in the fight against crime and corruption are incalculable.

It is heartening to realize that the association has proven so beneficial that its meetings have been expanded to include midyear conferences as well as the annual meetings, and that the bulk of the discussions and reports at these meetings comes from the members themselves, and not outside speakers, as once was the case. Monthly publications now flow from the association and it cooperates actively with other professional groups, such as the American Bar Association and outstanding law reviews, in the furtherance of the general goal of law enforcement. It is also heartening to note the interest taken by the Department of Justice in this group from the very start. The Attorney General attended the first annual meeting of the association in 1951 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation regularly sends representatives to its meetings.

I also wish to pay particular tribute to Mr. Garrett H. Byrne, the distinguished district attorney for the county of Suffolk in Massachusetts.

Mr. Byrne was born November 27, 1897, in Boston, Mass., is married and has one son, Garrett M., who is a practicing attorney in Washington, D.C.

His career as a member of a prosecuting agency started in 1933 when he was appointed an assistant district attorney by the late William J. Foley. After many years of experience as first assistant district attorney under Mr. Foley, he was appointed district attorney in 1952 by the late Governor of the Commonwealth, Paul A. Dever. Garrett Byrne was elected district attorney for his first 4-year term in 1954, reelected in 1958, and again in 1962 without opposition. The most outstanding case handled by his office, which includes Suffolk County, the city of Boston, the city of Chelsea, the city of Revere and the town of Winthrop, was the prosecution involved in the Brink's robbery.

Mr. Byrne was elected president of the National District Attorneys' Association in 1963, after achieving a laudable record as the association's executive vice president for 1962. It indeed speaks well of the association that it has chosen such an able, dedicated, and experienced man as Mr. Byrne to guide it during this year, because it is due to just such men as he that the association owes its splendid record and its future hopes.

It has been my privilege to count Garrett Byrne as a close personal friend for many years. I have thus been able to personally observe his primary devotion and dedication to his wonderful family, the extension of his deep understanding and wise counsel whenever friends have called upon him, his heartfelt sympathy and compassion to all he has encountered in the full discharge of his duties and his unswerving compliance with the highest standards of his most challenging

office. The development and application of these attributes in the daily pursuits of his private and professional life have indelibly marked Garrett Byrne as one of the most esteemed and efficient district attorneys in the history of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The Years and Centuries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor of the Arkansas Gazette, written by a friend of mine of many years, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. His letter contains thoughts which Members of this body might profitably read and consider.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEARS AND CENTURIES

To the EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE:

Death, decay, and passing away are written on the wings of time, and of all things timely. Nothing we see today will we ever see again, after death has "kissed down our eyelids still." All things must pass away. All inhabitants of heaven will be there with new bodies—fashioned like unto the angels. All guests at the marriage supper of the lamb, together with the "Stranger of Galilee," can look to the Master, at the head of the table, and say "I have a new body." Jesus said: "Those who rise from the dead are as the angels in heaven." There are no males nor females in Christ. All are as angels, as Paul wrote in Galatians 3: 28.

Cicero said: "Mortem esse finem naturae." (Death is the end of nature.) The poet Virgil said: "Quem ne lethum vergot." (Whom shall death decline?) In the closing days of his 51 years, Virgil stated: "Aetas fert omnia." (Time removes all things.)

John, the revelator, tells in Revelations 21: 1, he saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and earth were passed away, and all the things he saw in the glorified city were altogether holy. No length of days, nor setting suns, were, or ever will be, known there. They count not time in years.

In World War I, I stood upon the sands where two buried cities of antiquity lay. Also visited 6 days in Rome, that stood for 1,237 years, but lying, now, as "The pale mother of dead empires." All I saw proclaimed that the years must take their toll—and all nations must pass away.

On New Year's night (1964) I sat by the side of my 94-year-old mother near the historic city of Arkadelphia. We talked of the passing years; of her 11 children; of my departed father; of mother's ancestral home in Tennessee (where I spent many years); and of that night, January 1, 1900, when our family gathered to hear the whistle, at midnight, of the old "Roller" or flour mill, (long since gone), and to hear the church bells toll in the 20th century.

Those memories seem as but yesterday, yet I have 14 grandchildren. The cares of a troubled world have never erased the memory of other days, for,

"Memory is the gift of God,
And New Year's night we love to roam,
Back across the years we've trod,
Since we left our childhood home."

On November 24, 1963, I listened to that nationwide sermon from Dr. Billy Graham on "The Brevity of Life." It was delivered just 2 days after our noble young President Kennedy had been brutally murdered, and Mr. Graham was directing his sermon to the brevity of Mr. Kennedy's life, despite his many efforts to succor the lives of all men, around the world.

Our new year (1964) offers us no promise, from the voiceless dead, of all past ages, as to what 1964 holds for our great President Johnson; for our Nation, or for each of us.

The Holy City has walls but no windows. And so from that windowless palace of rest, comes no murderer's bullet, neither comes word of our tomorrows, nor of the destiny of our great Republic.

FELIX LESLIE SMITH.

LITTLE ROCK.

Remarks of the Honorable John Davis Lodge at the Lighting Ceremonies of the "Torch of Truth" at the Hall of Free Enterprise, New York World's Fair, at 12 o'Clock Noon, Friday, May 1, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on May Day, the Honorable John Davis Lodge delivered a splendid address at the lighting ceremonies of the "Torch of Truth" at the Hall of Free Enterprise at the New York World's Fair.

Mr. Lodge, a former Member of this House, former Governor of Connecticut, and onetime U.S. Ambassador to Spain, is presently president of Junior Achievement, Inc., which instills the principles of free enterprise in a practical way in the lives of thousands of young people throughout the country.

I am very pleased to bring Governor Lodge's excellent address to the attention of the House;

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVIS LODGE AT THE LIGHTING CEREMONIES OF THE "TORCH OF TRUTH" AT THE HALL OF FREE ENTERPRISE, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, AT 12 O'CLOCK NOON, FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1964

There is a sharp contrast between the scene which must have filled the streets of Moscow some 10 hours ago as the sun shone through the clouds of poverty and frustration on May Day in the Russian capitol and our gathering here at the New York World's Fair which proclaims the free and affluent society.

The traditional May Day celebrations in Red Square are characterized by a brazen show of military strength and a rattling of swords forewarning the world of Communist strength and determination. We come here today with our rockets and missiles in cold storage. Yet we must declare that we are prepared to move into the battle with force sufficient to protect our national independence and to preserve the political and economic system which has brought us to our present condition of world eminence.

We gather here to celebrate the free enterprise system and the timeless moral virtues which cluster around it. We assemble beneath the "Torch of Truth" to strengthen ourselves for the struggle which must constantly be renewed if the future of our young people is to remain in fact unlimited—if our civilization is to grow and prosper.

The future is threatened; but it is also pregnant with opportunity. Our Nation and the entire non-Communist world are menaced by Russian Communist imperialist aggression. The 1 billion people enslaved by communism since the end of World War II, have been conquered not by nuclear warfare nor by the contagion of the Communist ideology, but by economic penetration, by guerrilla warfare, by the infiltration of infant democracies, by bribery and blackmail, by corruption and by every manner of deceit, by internal pressure and external force. We must learn to fight the war as and where it is being fought and it is being fought in one way or another everywhere. We must learn to be effective in the twilight zone of action where all the Communist gains have been made. For the Russians peaceful coexistence is a tactic—not an objective. For us, plausible appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, it is surrender on an installment plan.

There is a page in a text book used for training agents on the other side of the world in a sort of geopolitical institute in Moscow. The page reads, "If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation, we will have won that country. Therefore, there must be continued propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teenagers in particular."

Our meeting here is an encouraging example of a healthy response to this dread challenge. Unfortunately, not all the examples are quite so encouraging. Last October the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reported the findings of Opinion Reserach, Inc., in a survey of seniors in an eastern high school. It was discovered that 61 percent of them didn't believe in the profit system, 62 percent of them believed that workers should not produce at top capacity, and 55 percent of the graduating seniors believed and endorsed the Socialist philosophy of Karl Marx; "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." What a pointed reminder that freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. These young people didn't inherit freedom in the bloodstream—we can't pass it on that way.

We must constantly strive to enhance the meaning of freedom. Only by discharging the responsibilities which are inseparable from freedom can freedom be preserved.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the editor of the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune stated in a remarkable address to the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago; "The welfare state that taxes away the rewards for responsible behavior so that it can remove the age-old penalties for irresponsible behavior in building on a foundation of jelly." Actually our national welfare, indeed our national survival, and our individual welfare rest on the continued vitality, the dynamic forward thrust of a free economy. Khrushchev will "bury" us only if we hand him a shovel.

Ours is a welfare society not yet a welfare state. Abraham Lincoln in his first annual message to Congress on March 12, 1861, said: "Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights."

Lincoln also said: "Tear not down the house of another * * *. That some are rich proves that others can become rich."

Lincoln understood that there is no natural conflict between capital and labor. The Hall of Free Enterprise contains eloquent and dramatic proof that this is so. In "Mr. Both Come to Town" it becomes wonderfully

clear that the people of this country are both producers and customers. Members of the American labor movement have therefore just as much to gain as all other Americans from the perpetuation of the free enterprise system which has produced the most widespread and the highest standard of living which the world has ever known.

Yet we must beware. President William Howard Taft, little quoted in public gatherings because he served with no great crises to underline his name in history, once said: "A revolution is taking place which will leave the people dependent on Government. Finding markets will develop into finding employment. The next step will be to furnish markets and employment or in default pay a bounty or dole. Those who look with apprehension on these tendencies do not lack humanity, but are influenced by the belief that the result of such measures will be to deprive the people of character and liberty."

Today we realize that this quiet President had the gift of prophecy. In the lifetime of our young people we have seen the Government lay an increasingly heavy hand on education, on farming, on health, on housing, on labor, on management, on virtually every aspect of our life. In this trend the Government has been helped by many of our fellow citizens who see the Government not as the servant of the people, not merely as an agency to perform services for the people but as a source of wealth and wisdom.

Today, many of our compatriots believe that the complexities of the 20th century have grown so great that we can no longer afford our traditional system of individual freedom and of free enterprise. We are told today that we must of necessity move into a government-controlled economy and society. One spokesman for this viewpoint said that he envisioned the end of the cold war as a peaceful transition into a not undemocratic socialism. In other words, as we move to the left into a planned economy, the enemy will give up his fear and mistrust and will come in to the freedom sector to meet us and thus the lion and the lamb will lie down together. And, of course, we must be prepared to throw in a fresh lamb every morning.

Actually what they're envisioning is that we accept the status quo—that's Latin for the mess we're in. Seriously, and I'm sure they don't realize it, what they are suggesting is that we, in the evil name of expediency, accept the enormous injustice of pointing our finger at a billion of our fellow enslaved human beings and tell them to give up their hopes of freedom because we have decided to get along with their slave masters.

In spite of plausible statements to the contrary the campaign against business in America is moving subtly and steadily. Its victory would be a victory for our Communist enemies. The survival of business, the survival of freedom, our survival as an independent nation are at stake.

This is where the Hall of Free Enterprise comes in. This is where Junior Achievement comes in. The advantages of our American business system have been demonstrated over and over again both in peace and in war. Junior Achievers have had occasion to appreciate the values of a free economy. They have had the exciting experience of running a private business, of taking risks. They know what the profit and loss system means. They know that, while loss is regrettable, profit is not evil as some people depict it. It is not an adventitious windfall. Profit is payment for the use of money, of tools of production. They have experienced the wonderful sense of fulfillment which comes from business success. They know, because they have been through the process of learning by doing, that freedoms and responsibilities are indeed inseparable and that as the State assumes the responsibility of controlling your business, you lose the freedom to run it yourselves. They know that our other freedoms such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom from search and seizure will be threatened if we should no longer have the freedom to own and to manage businesses. Human rights depend on property rights.

What is the principal reason why we Americans, with only 6 percent of the world's population produce and consume 40 percent of the world's goods? Natural resources, climate, skilled workers—good leaders? Certainly. Yet the main reason is the desire and the ability of our people to assume responsibility. Unless our citizens—you—retain your sense of responsibility. Our future will not be unlimited. Indeed it will be limited by the responsibilities which Government assumes.

During the past few years, the clamor for protection and security has been rising. As Smythe Gambrell, of Atlanta, Ga., former president of the American Bar Association, said in a remarkable address: "Afraid they may be found wanting, some would choose not to be tried at all. If our people lack confidence in their power to cope with the problems which face them," said Smythe Gambrell, "what reason have we to suppose they will somehow find the infinitely greater wisdom required to choose a leadership who will do the job and that we are still free so long as we elect our keepers. * * * These voices of despair tell us that * * * our opportunities and aspirations will be realized without the pain of effort or the risk of failure if we will only submit our lives and our destinies to the ministrations of some all-wise paternalism."

You know that this is not so. It is a tired threadbare canard launched by those who do not understand the genius of America. It is propagated by people of perverted intellect and insufficient vitality who mistake their own frustrations and failures for the failures and frustrations of the American economy. It is a doctrine advanced by people of little faith in America, by those who have a lust for power and by those who seek to compensate for their own inadequacies by penalizing others. This sort of paternalism is at the heart of socialism. By diminishing American military might, by reducing American industrial power, by crushing the natural dynamism of the American people, it plays into the hands of our Communist enemies.

The sponsors of the Hall of Free Enterprise know that protecting people from the risk of failure inevitably deprives them of the opportunity to succeed. As Smythe Gambrell says: "To be freed from anxiety, mischance or error is equally to be freed from all possibility of growth and achievement." "Achievement" then is the crucial word. "Through the rhetoric of security, the meaning of freedom is being shifted in subtle ways from freedom to do as we choose to freedom from the necessities of choice." Junior achievers have experienced the exhilarating challenge of choice. I am confident that they will not barter it for a security in which the Government is the master rather than the servant of the people. Alexander Hamilton said: "Power over a man's subsistence is power over his will."

If Patrick Henry had said, "Give me security or give me death" his name would not be known today. Jesus said "Seek and ye shall find." He didn't say "sit there and I'll bring it to you."

John Addington Symonds, in a poem called "The Flame of Freedom," wrote:

"These things shall be—a loftier race
Than e'er the world has known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
And light of knowledge in their eyes."

The torch of truth on the Hall of Free Enterprise is a vital symbol of the determination of some Americans that the light of knowledge will continue to sustain the flame of freedom.

Let us then give a dramatic demonstration for all the world to see, that America is still the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Let us sound a clarion call for the opportunities and the responsibilities of freedom. Let us refresh our patriotism. Let us renew our love of America. Let us meet the challenge of our time and generation.

While retaining "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind," we must not be afraid of controversy. We must not try to avoid the struggle. There is no safe place to hide either at home or abroad. Trading power for popularity will lose us both. The foreign policy of a great nation should be measured not by our fears but our unlightened self-interest and our solemn duty as leader of the non-Communist world. When freedom is extinguished in Budapest it is threatened in New York City. When American strength is reduced, when American purpose falters, our communist enemies rejoice and our friends and allies are disheartened.

We should not adjust our national objectives to the random winds of pressure and opinion. Broadmindedness does not mean tolerance of corruption, vulgarity and of the obscene brutalities of our communist enemies. We must match their implacable drive to destroy us with an unflagging determination to preserve for future generations the right of each individual to seek his own salvation. The concept of man's individual destiny lies at the heart of the world's great religions and provides the basis of our political beliefs. It is the essence of the free enterprise system.

While reaching into the future let us not neglect the lessons of the past.

Let us then, in the words of George Washington, the founder of our country, "Raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair."

And on this, the 400th anniversary of the birth of William Shakespeare let us recall his timeless words of wisdom and beauty. "There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the tide; it is well past the flood; the rest, with God's help, is up to us.

Look Ahead, Dixieland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, there appeared in the Tuesday, May 12, issue of the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C., an editorial entitled, "Look Ahead, Dixieland," which I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate. The editorial points up in excellent fashion the progress being made in the South, and necessarily brings attention to the fact that much about this region of our country is not fully understood. While the editorial deals generally with changes in the South, I think it contains food for thought which can be applied in the civil rights debate. The South is greatly misunderstood; and from the debate now raging on the civil rights issue, it is obvious that this could never be more true than at this time and on this particular subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Look Ahead, Dixieland," from the State of May 12, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK AHEAD, DIXIELAND

The South of moonlight and magnolias lingers in nostalgic memory and romantic fiction, but that is not the South of today—nor was it ever the South on any grand scale.

Today's South is something else again: a land of exciting change, of political and economic upheaval, of rapid social adjustment, and of growing pains. No one knows all this better than we southerners, but we occasionally need to back away from ourselves and take a look at our image.

We soon will have such an opportunity through the publication of a comprehensive "overview" of the entire South, compiled and published under the direction of Duke University's Department of Sociology. Last week, a preview of that survey was given at a 2-day symposium held on the Duke campus for southern businessmen, editors, educators, and public officials. Their concern (and the symposium title) was "The South in Continuity and Change."

Consensus of the symposium, to no one's surprise, was agreement that what might be called "the nostalgic South" is on its way out, and that the region is inevitably moving toward greater correlation and coordination with the rest of the United States. In the areas of politics and race relations, this movement is accompanied by jarring dislocation of old attitudes which have not yet accepted alteration.

But it is in the economic and educational spheres that the changes and the challenges are most impressive—and most demanding. The two necessarily go hand in hand, for advancements in each are dependent in large measure upon advancements in the other. They meet, or at least they should meet, most productively in the arena of scientific and industrial research—and it is here that the South lags behind the rest of the country.

But the lag is one of resources rather than of resolve, for the South knows what it needs and is moving in the right direction. The task ahead is to step up the pace toward quality education at all levels so that economic progress in turn will come faster.

Hopefully, all this can be done without completely discarding the social values, the cultural heritage, and the amenities of life which have been associated with the Old South. This region has much to offer the rest of the Nation.

Dr. Douglas M. Knight, new president of Duke University, struck a responsive note when he voiced his own appraisal (as a native New Englander) of the South:

"The things that are best and strongest about this region are not fully understood."

Our job (in which Dr. Knight and Duke University have joined hands) is to foster such an understanding—without apology and without delay.

An Effective Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, silencing the minority party in Congress is certainly no way to make the two-party system work effectively. In the two-party system of government, some provision of a collision of differing viewpoints must be provided. In this way, and in only this way, can the best possible legislation evolve.

However, when the minority party is denied an adequate number of staff on the committees of Congress, it is being denied a basic tool with which to advance its stand on issues. Very possibly, this could lead to a breakdown of our two-party system of government.

We, the members of the House Republican Conference Committee on Increased Minority Staffing, have been waging a battle to increase the number of committee staff personnel solely responsible to the minority for over a year and a half with some results. Newspapers throughout the country have assisted in editorials and news coverage of our activities.

At this point, I would like to conclude in the RECORD two such editorials, one from the San Diego Union, May 8, 1964, and the other from the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer, April 8, 1964.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Apr. 8, 1964]

SILENCING MINORITY NO WAY TO MAKE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM WORK EFFECTIVELY

A resolution into which Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, is trying, without much apparent success, to breathe some life calls attention to a state of affairs of which the general public, it seems safe to say, is not aware.

In the makeup of the 88th Congress there are three Democrats to every two Republicans in the House and two Democrats for every Republican in the Senate. Yet, according to SCHWENGEL, who is chairman of the Republican conference committee on minority staffing, professional committee staff members responsible to the majority outnumber staffers responsible to the minority 10 to 1 in the House and 12 to 1 in the Senate."

This is, to be sure, a lopsided arrangement. It would be bad enough if it involved nothing but patronage. But evidently it goes deeper than that. Here's what SCHWENGEL has to say on the subject:

"Today, most of these staff members are hired, fired, promoted and assigned work by committee chairmen—members of the Democratic majority. Naturally, the staff's allegiance is to the majority, so minority projects and reports tend to be neglected. When the minority membership of committees is denied research facilities by lack of staff, no effective distinction between majority and minority positions can be made, and problem-solving legislation is impossible. The minority must be an articulate, intelligent and vigorous opposition, and at the same time must present clear and constructive alternatives to major proposals."

The argument, we think, makes sense. To deal with the condition complained of SCHWENGEL's resolution would amend House Rules "so as to provide the minority with up to 40 percent of the committee staff."

If this could be accomplished without increasing the number of staff employees beyond the point necessary to carry on the appropriate work of the committees, whether pursuing majority or minority objectives, it should make for more effective operation of the two-party system in Congress.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, May 8, 1964]

MINORITY STAFFING

A Congressman's staff is one of his most valuable assets. It frequently has all it can do to keep up with the business of his constituents. Much of the help he should have should come from staff personnel assigned to his committees.

There is a current dispute between Republicans and Democrats in Congress about assignment of such staff personnel. Republicans say they are able to get far too little

Although Democrats outnumber Republicans 3 to 2 in the House and 2 to 1 in the Senate, committee staff members responsible to Democrats outnumber those assigned to Republicans by 10 to 1 in the House and 12 to 1 in the Senate.

GOP leaders have pointed out that when minority membership of committees is denied research facilities by lack of staff, "no effective distinction between majority and minority positions can be made, and problem-solving legislation is impossible."

The GOP Conference Committee on Minority Staffing is attempting to even up the apparent lack of balance. The committee makes a crystal-clear point when it charges most of staff members assigned to committees are "hired, fired, promoted, and assigned work * * * by members of the Democratic majority." As a result, minority reports and projects often are neglected.

Minority staffing of an adequate nature is essential for the proper operation of the two-party system in Congress. The minority voice has been stilled too frequently for lack of such staffing.

A current resolution asks that House rules be amended to provide the minority with 40 percent of the committee staff. This is an exceptionally fair proposal inasmuch as Republican Congressman received 48 percent of the vote in the most recent election.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered at one of a number of forums which have been sponsored by the Social Science Department of the State University Agricultural and Technical Institute in Delhi, N.Y.

It was delivered by Mr. Donald F. Pease, assistant to the administrative vice president of the United States Steel Corp. on the subject of "Automation and Technological Unemployment: Problem or Mirage?"

It is of particular interest in our modern world of automation:

ADDRESS OF DONALD F. PEASE

I am most happy to be here this evening and take part in your forum on the American economy, or, more particularly, on automation. This has become a glamorous subject, intriguing in many ways, but the essential reason for our concern and interst on this occasion I take to be, not its spectacular splash, but the fact that automation is among those things that constitute the very core of our economic system of free markets or free enterprise—call it what you will. This economic core is one of continuaus change, dislocation, adaptation, reorganization, and the like, for a variety of reasons—all for the purpose of providing the American people the maximum satisfaction of their material desires, that is, their economic objectives.

It is not that automation, or, generically, technological advance, is peculiar to our

system. I suppose it can be said that every society has had a technology of some sort, and certainly every modern society has an advancing one. But the productive powers of each society are dedicated to its economic objectives in somewhat particular ways.

It seems quite clear that the principal economic contrast—clash, perhaps—of your generation will be that between capitalism and communism, and this is, perhaps, as suitable a way as any for me to approach a concept of technological advance for your consideration. Let us note first the surprising gamut of similarities between the American and Russian economies. The Russians have many modern factories and a huge industrial complex. They have managers, labor unions, trade schools; different than ours, but they have them. They have carried out, on a national scale, a massive program of job description and classification leading to standard occupational rates, in a manner quite consistent, apparently, with American industrial engineering practice. The Russians made widespread use of incentive plans. They have a price system. They have even come to recognize that their universal, authoritarian control can benefit from utilizing changes in rates of interest; and they attend international conventions of bankers.

But there are two things that we have and they do not. One of these is unemployment. A Russian will tell you there is no unemployment in a Soviet Socialist Republic as a matter of definition, and this is substantially true. They plan—and with absolute authority. The second thing we have and they do not is consumer choice. A Soviet citizen has many of his wants provided for directly through the state budget, as is the case with housing. It is really much the same with what he buys; the only things available are what the Communist Party, not he, has decided to have produced. No one in Russia will say to Ivan Ivanovitch, "You have worked hard. You have earned much incentive pay and many bonuses. You have made yourself a bundle. Go buy a couple of machines and hire some labor and make some of the things you think the people in your town would like very much to have."

No one will say that in Russia, but it is the sum and substance of what we say to each other, economically speaking, in this country. Thus, there will underlie everything I shall try to say this evening the notion that consumer choice, of freedom, and producer uncertainty, or risk, go together—you cannot have one without the other.

I

I believe the most essential thing to be said about technological unemployment, certainly about unemployment due to automation, is that it has been exaggerated. Observing that constant change is a characteristic of the American economy has long since become trite; but it is true, nevertheless, and the change takes many forms.

Markets have, of course, moved westward with the population, and in many cases this has meant that production has had to move. Very little steel is now produced in New England, for example. This has not meant, necessarily, that established steel-producing facilities have had to be abandoned; it has meant, principally, that the major increment of growth has been in the areas of the new markets. But it has required, among other things, mobility of capital.

Tastes change. Men wear fewer suspenders and more belts than they used to. Women prefer sheer hose, or, in the summer, just suntan. The French vintners are going to tempt the British taste from beer to wine. We have moved back and forth between country and urban living. After some 400 years we are thinking about giving up smoking.

Sources of supply change. The discovery of gold in California caused quite a scramable. Oilfields went dry in Pennsylvania and others were opened in Texas. Uses have been developed for aluminum. New sources of iron ore have been discovered in Venezuela, Canada, and elsewhere.

Products change. One has only to mention automobiles, jets, computers, freezers, television, synthetic fibers, rockets, and atomic power.

Manufacturing methods change. Mass production is the classic example, I suppose. Spray painting also comes to mind. This is the particular area of technological change and is made up almost entirely of complex engineering and scientific adaptation and innovation.

All of these changes, and many others, of which technology is only one type, take place in efforts to better satisfy consumer demand, and each of them causes some increment of displacement and requires some measure of adaptation among capital, labor, management, and everyone concerned with the productive process. This has, of course, always been true in this country. It is, as a matter of fact, one of our own matters of definition that in a democratic economy, or under a price system, or in a free market—whatever your choice of terms—the factors of production must be aggressively mobile—just about the opposite of Ivan's matter of definition.

Now, technological unemployment, and so-called "frictional" unemployment of all kinds, result from this process of adaptation by which the economy fulfills the material wants of its members. Fundamentally, the process of adaptation is a good thing and a healthy thing and not a bad thing. When the new conditions have made their presence felt, and have been adjusted to, things go on as before. Of course, it may soon begin all over again, and is going on at many locations simultaneously, but in each case, the process is essentially one of temporary dislocation. This is why economists say, "In the long run, there is no such thing as technological unemployment." I am, of course, well aware that this invites the famous Keynesian rejoinder that "In the long run we are all dead." But the matter is much too important to dismiss by antics with semantics.

It would be quite improper to suggest that technological displacement does not often bring very difficult and sometimes agonizing problems of adjustment to the people involved. It is one of the paradoxes of this difficult area of economics that the most serious problem of technological unemplyment, the real hardship, arises, not among the employees of employers who make technological changes, but among the employees of employers who do not, and so lose their ability to compete and then, of course, their customers. However they arise, such hardships can be understandingly and successfully dealt with, and this is being done every day, and with ever greater effectiveness. I would like simply to recognize this here and come back a bit later to a fuller discussion of United States Steel's approaches to these problems.

What is most important, it seems to me, is that the genuine concern of many people about our problem of unemployment—and we do have one in this country—has led them to attribute it to technological advance, and this is, I believe, quite wrong. Technol gical unemployment simply cannot, to repeat, as a matter of definition, be construed as a fundamental economic problem. It is, rather, characteristic of a free economy. Some people, nevertheless, seek a remedy for unemployment in quieting or otherwise interfering with our essential and necessarily restless economic core. This is why I have suggested that technological unemployment is being exaggerated. It is not only being exaggerated, it is often distorted out of all perspective. Such superficial analysis has had one result, many times and many places. It has led to attempts, unintentional though they may have been, to frustrate the very functioning of the economy or a substantial segment of it. This is clearly unwise, and self-defeating in terms of employment. The proper action is to accommodate and hasten the adjustment, get it accomplished, not impede it.

Now, just in the interest of an orderly and thorough discussion, let me note that there is one way in which, theoretically, technological unemployment might, for a time, be a problem of general concern. There could be such a widespread surge of technological progress that it might be temporarily indigestible. I emphasize "theoretically" because the possibility is remote. Few of these innovations have application in more than a limited area. Even if one of them has a general usefulness, the process of spreading is a slow one. And if investment is involved, as it almost always is, the difficulty of raising the money will, in most cases, be a time-consuming process.

However, when one narrows the field of examination down to industries, or companies, then, of course, technological unemployment can become temporarily distressing. In such a case, instead of "frictional" unemployment, it is referred to as "structural" unemployment. Both terms mean that the characteristics of available workers—their locations, skills, education, training, sex, age, and the like—do not fully match the characteristics employers are seeking in filling the jobs that are available. The difference is one of degree—the numbers involved, the persistence of the condition, and so on.

In any event, we are not experiencing any unusual national, widespread surge of technological progress at the present time, all the headlines notwithstanding. The Council of Economic Advisers examined current structural unemployment in detail in the course of preparing testimony for the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Their conclusion was that:

"The answer is clear: The evidence we have assembled and the tests we have made do not support the thesis that, overall, the incidence of structural unemployment has increased in importance since we last achieved high employment. There may be some problems that seem more serious today than earlier; but in other areas we have probably progressed." [1]

The Council also concluded that there has been no clear-cut acceleration of productivity trends. Thus, in their opinion current "productivity" improvement is no more than that which typically accompanies a period of increasing production, reversing the prior effects of declining production, and netting out to zero in terms of change in trend.

Another type of unemployment may be recognized as cyclical; that is, related to the business cycle or, what is much the same, to inadequate economic growth. I am one who believes that the root of cyclical unemployment may be found in the obstructions that arise in the economy from time to time to impede business in its role of maintaining existing productive jobs and providing new ones. A self-sustaining, productive job is created in no other way than through someone's willingness to risk an investment. And this depends, more than on anything else, on profit, or its prospect.

There are other views about what causes business cycles and inhibits economic growth. All are outside the scope of our discussion this evening, but the problem, whatever its cause, must be at least mentioned because it is related to technological unemployment. The relationship is that when general business conditions are good the many adjust-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ments which must be made in response to technological and other types of economic change can be made quite easily and with a minimum of difficulty and hardship. Among the people who have made such an observation is Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. He told the Joint Economic Committee that:

"If radical technological changes are introduced slowly, in an economy whose production and employment are increasing rapidly, social and economic dislocations can be minimized.

"Even under such conditions, however, there would be numerous human and social problems that would require solutions. * * * But solutions to such localized and specific dislocations are manageable in a rapidly growing economy." [2]

There is, then, a second paradox, which is that the only economic problem involved in technological unemployment is that there may be concurrent cyclical unemployment. This is why massive attempts to deal with technological unemployment—as though automation, if you wish, threatens employment generally—are, in my opinion, misguided and quite dangerous.

We come now to the steel industry.

The trend of shipment per man-hour in the steel industry over a period of more than 20 years is an average annual rate of increase of about 2 percent. This is only about four-fifths the industry's estimated long-term rate of attrition from retirement and death alone, not to mention quits and discharges. So it seems quite clear that there is not, and has not been in many years, a general problem of technological unemployment in the steel industry. Even at a constant level of output these trends do not produce unemployment. Actually, steel production has increased over the years.

But the rate of output per man-hour increase has been uneven, sometimes a little, or even a loss, sometimes a lot. And, of course, every job that has been eliminated did not just happen to be held by someone who was about to retire anyway. So there have been cases of technological displacement. People have had to face the prospect of finding a new job and, as I indicated earlier, there are ways of dealing with this problem.

I presume it would be helpful to you to know about United States Steel's approach to this kind of situation. While there are some variations in practice followed because of differences in size and location of plants, kinds of operations, and number of employees involved, by and large certain basic procedures are applied.

When plans to abandon, discontinue, or replace certain facilities are developed and, as far in advance of the actual shutdown as possible, an analysis is made to determine the number of employees affected.

Their service, age, seniority status, and ability to perform other work in the plant are determined. Their status with respect to pension, severance, and unemployment compensation benefits is also determined. The job opportunities on replacement facilities where involved, are taken into consideration.

At this point, the scope of the problem is known and the next step is to determine what plans can be made to absorb these employees. The prospects of placement at the plant concerned are appraised as are those at sister plants in the area or elsewhere, and those with outside employers in the area. Estimates are made of which individuals, if any, are likely to exercise their pension, severance, supplemental unemployment benefits, or seniority rights. A determination is made of what is the most reasonable way to alleviate the resultant displacement by such measures as utilizing turnover to absorb such employees and limiting the hiring of new employees where feasible, transferring employees to other jobs, retraining employees either for new jobs on the replacement unit, or providing on-the-job training where necessary in cases of transfer to other jobs in the plant, circulating rosters of available employees and their skills to other plants in the company if prospects of placement exist, and, similarly, contacting other employers in the vicinity or the State employment office in the area.

General announcements and notices are made at the appropriate time to international, district, or local union representatives, to the individual employees either personally or by letter, and to the general public.

At the proper time interviews are conducted with the employees involved to discuss their individual status both as to other employment prospects and what rights they have to pensions, vacations, insurance coverage, severance pay, SUB, other jobs, and so on. The employees decide which of the available options they choose to select.

To the maximum extent practicable the arrangements decided upon are put into effect following the announcement and appropriate union representatives are kept informed as to what is being done and the progress being made.

The degree of success realized through these procedures, of course, varies in relation to the circumstances surrounding each specific case of technological improvement. The range is from cases completely successful in alleviating the change, to those where there simply is no way within our control to obviate the impact upon some of the employees involved.

To return to the economics of the matter, if advancing technology has not really caused the unemployment in the steel industry during recent years, what has? There has certainly been a good deal of it. I will mention two things as a response to this question. The first is a fundamental tendency of the steel industry which, I believe, determines the essential nature of its employment problem. The second is a group of competitive developments that have recently been exerting an overriding influence.

The fundamental tendency of the steel industry to which I refer is that steel operations have been quite cyclical. The swings between prosperity and recession have been about twice as wide for steel as for the economy as a whole. Most products made of steel are durable. They can be made to last a little longer, if customers are in that frame of mind. When business subsequently "booms" people rush to buy previously deferred houses, automobiles, and appliances. Industry invests heavily in buildings, machinery, and other facilities. Adding to the magnitude of the cyclical swings is the tendency of steel fabricators and manufacturers of products using steel to maintain larger inventories in good times to support their higher level of activity and smaller ones in poor times.

These circumstances, coupled with the effects of hedge buying because of strike threats, make it difficult to identify an employment trend in the steel industry. Year-to-year changes have usually been cyclical in nature and obscure the long-term trend rather than illuminate it. One must compare years that reflect similar levels of business activity. For example, the years 1937 and 1946 were very similar years of moderately good business for the steel industry. In the latter year employment reflected an increase of less than 1 percent. Similarly, 1942 and 1950 were both quite good steel years and the employment increase was about 1½ percent. The years 1952 and 1957 constitute another such pair.

It is also important to note that between the years in each of these pairs production increased 10 to 20 million tons. Thus, in these years increases in productive efficiency provided for a growing consumption of steel products, not for losses of jobs. As a result, it may be said that when business has been good the steel industry has employed about as many people as it previously did when business was good and also about as many as it previously did, though fewer, when business has been poor.

Actually, the level of employment related to a particular level of business activity tended to increase somewhat during the decade of the 1950's. Let me repeat that what is considered a good year in the steel industry today represents much more production than a past year considered equally good at that time.

The recent past reflects a number of special and serious problems, the second factor in explaining steel unemployment. It is not that there is less employment associated with a given level of business in the steel industry. It is, rather, I believe, that employment has been low because steel production has been low as a result of certain recent competitive developments—certain recent changes in the marketplace.

The most significant and troublesome of these is that foreign producers are shipping steel products into this country and selling them at prices lower than those they charge in their own domestic markets. This is called "dumping." It violates international agreements but is not easy to control. America is the largest market for steel in the world, and it is advantageous to foreign producers to dispose of, or "dump" here, tonnage they cannot sell at home. An American steel firm has no fear of foreign producers if they are prevented from indulging in unfair competitive practices. But the existing situation is proving difficult to correct. Various people in the steel industry have translated this foreign trade problem—increasing imports and lower exports—into job losses of up to 50,000.[3]

Another problem has been the recent success of certain competitive materials—aluminum and plastic containers and concrete in bridges and buildings, for example.

In addition, competitive forces within the industry have brought about the development of higher strength steels. Also, steel for cans is rolled thinner than it used to be. The result has been that in many applications a given job can be done with a lower tonnage of steel than formerly.

Similarly, many identifiable changes in design, style, size, and technique have resulted in lower tonnages of steel sold. The compact car is an example of this.

Finally, the relative abundance of steel recently has permitted customers to shift from a policy of building inventories to one of decreasing them.

These are the reasons why the tonnages of steel production have fallen below the 3-percent increase per year average trend that characterized the years between 1940 and 1957. Every responsible person in the industry is determined that history shall record this condition as temporary, and a great variety of attacks are being made on the problems just listed, and on many others that have been identified. Last year production increased a welcome 11 percent, although that left it some 19 percent below the prior trend line. Continuation of this rate of increase through 2 more years would be so unusual as to not merit discussion, but it does describe the magnitude of the task of overcoming steel's problem of regaining the level of the prior trend. However, stretching out the period of years to 5 or 6 presumes a rate of production growth that, while high, can, nevertheless, be found

Footnotes at end of speech.

between various pairs of years within the past 20. Those past surges in production were, as I have indicated, predominantly cyclical, and do not, of course, reflect the overcoming of problems such as those facing the industry today. But they did happen.

Please understand that I am not making a forecast. I am, however, expressing every confidence that the skills, talents, and abilities of the steel industry's management, and its employees and their union, are more than adequate to discover satisfactory solutions to these problems—and I do not mean just barely satisfactory; I mean satisfactory in the sense of aggressive competitive success.

If my optimism turns out to have been perceptive, then the currently receding unemployment will be, I suppose, cyclical, and the historical relative stability of employment at given levels of business on which I commented earlier will reassert itself. If I am wrong and the unfavorable competitive shifts persist, or grow—then a competitive adjustment will be unavoidable, and I would expect steel employment to resume, after a time, its relatively stable, though cyclical, characteristics, but at lower levels. The total long-term consumption of steel has been increasing.

Thus, my viewpoint on the more particular aspect of the question before your forum is the somewhat negative one that the unemployment problem which occurs in the steel industry is something other than technological.

III

The need for collective bargaining with respect to technological change will, nevertheless, continue to arise, as it has in the past, on a case-by-case basis.

The definitions we have in legislation and labor agreements seem adequate and applicable. Collective bargaining deals with rates of pay, hours of work, and other conditions of employment. In addition, there is, I believe, a less formal, but firm, consensus that it should be free, and responsible.

Particular cases of technological displacement have been handled in the past in the manner I have described. It follows from what I have said that I see no need for radical changes in the future. Significant technological improvements are being installed in the steel industry, and this will continue for a number of years. I know of no reason for concluding that the impact will be sudden and vast. Even if it is, however—and in some industries it will be, of course—the problems can—indeed, it is my conviction that they must—be handled by our free institutions, including, prominently, collective bargaining. I am sure these institutions can, and will be, improved. I am equally sure that they can prove equal to the strains and tensions that may develop. There will be no need to panic.

To this I will add only the suggestion that when a party to collective bargaining seeks to interfere with, or inhibit, the process of technological change, he is acting in an irresponsible manner. There is really little or no debate over this as a matter of principle. But particular situations are something else.

I have in mind current discussions of a shorter workweek, either directly by definition or by increasing the overtime penalty rate. A shorter workweek is something that people can enjoy, if they wish to, in lieu of increased compensation. But this is not the context in which the shorter workweek is being discussed. It is being advanced as a way of relieving unemployment, generally, even though it is not at all responsive to that problem. It would annul the necessary mobility of capital and labor and prevent adjustments that should be made. Indeed, it would aggravate unemployment, since it involves substantially increased cost.

Now we come to the boiling down. I suggest two things. First, we must continue to concern ourselves with the very real problems of people who are displaced by technological change as it appears from time to time and from place to place. Second, we must be thoroughly skeptical of those who are raising a public alarm about the matter, because it looks very much as though they are converging on a mirage.

---

[1] Statement of Walter W. Heller before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Oct. 28, 1963.

[2] Statement of George Meany before the Joint Economic Committee, 1960, "New Views on Automation," p. 534.

[3] Statement of Henry J. Wallace, administrative vice president, United States Steel Corp., before the U.S. Tariff Commission, Feb. 20, 1964.

Also Thomas F. Patton, president, Republic Steel Corp., "Trimmer Ships and Hardier Crews," at a conference sponsored by John Carroll University and Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 1963.

Also, John P. Roche, president, American Iron & Steel Institute, "Steel and the GATT Tariff Negotiations." Testimony before the U.S. Tariff Commission, Feb. 18, 1964.

Mr. John R. Herbert, Distinguished Editor of the Quincy Patriot Ledger—Cited by the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I commend the distinguished editor of the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger on the occasion of his being honored by the Dominican Republic for his work in helping the press of Latin America.

Mr. Herbert, who is president of the Inter-American Press Association Technical Center was one of 13 newspaper executives to receive the Order of Merit of Duarte, Sanchez, and Mella, grand official grade. This is the highest award that the Dominican Republic can give to a civilian who is not the head of a state. Presentation of the award was made by the ruling Dominican triumverate at the Presidential palace.

Born in Boston, Mass., the son of Dr. and Mrs. Charles J. Herbert, John is married to the former Elsa O. Johnson, of Quincy, Mass. He has two sons, John Alfred and Robert Michael. He is a 1931 graduate of Boston University and commenced employment with the Quincy Patriot Ledger during his senior year in college. He became city editor in 1933, managing editor in 1936, and has been editor since 1952.

He is active in the Inter-American Press Association and has received Columbia University's Maria Moors Cabot Prize for his work toward advancement of friendship and understanding in the Americas and IAPA's Tom Wallace Award for his efforts to promote assistance to Latin American publications. He has been cited by Boston University and holds an honorary doctor of journalism degree from Suffolk University.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF JOHN R. HERBERT

PRESENT AFFILIATIONS

1. Director, George W. Prescott Publishing Co., Quincy, Mass.
2. Director and clerk of corporation, Quincy Co-operative Bank, Quincy.
3. President, Research and Information Center, Inter-American Press Association, New York.
4. Director, Inter-American Press Association, New York; attended annual meetings of Inter-American Press Association in New York, 1950; Montevideo, 1951 (only New England delegate present); Chicago, 1952; Mexico City, 1953; New Orleans, 1955; IAPA delegate to meetings of FIEJ (International Publishers Association) in Brussels, 1952; Paris, 1953; Stockholm, 1954; Zurich, 1955; Berlin, 1956.
5. Chairman, Massachusetts Newspaper Information Committee (legislative committee for Massachusetts publishers).
6. Member, Massachusetts Judicial Survey Commission, appointed by Governor Herter to study reorganization of courts in State.
7. Member of Jury for International Affairs for 1955 Pulitzer Prize Awards; reappointed for 1956 awards.
8. Chairman, Participants Committee, Quincy Patriot Ledger Profit Sharing Trust.
9. Member, American Society of Newspaper Editors: Chairman, nominating committee, 1949; member, resolutions committee, 1952-53; member, advisory committee for the Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, 1954; member, committee on international cooperation, 1955 and 1956.
10. Member, International Press Institute. Attended annual meetings in Paris, 1952; London, 1953; member, the American Committee for IPI, 1954, 1955, 1956.
11. Member, Sigma Delta Chi (journalism fraternity); member, the Advancement of Freedom of Information Committee; member, initiating team of New England Professional Chapter.
12. Member, Kappa Tau Alpha (journalism scholastic fraternity).
13. Member, Massachusetts 4-H Foundation.
14. Member, Boston University School of Public Relations Board of Visitors; member, Development Committee, School of Public Relations; journalism counselor for Boston University; presented the first annual award by the School of Public Relations Alumni Association for "outstanding service to his profession and the school;" member of alumni president's cabinet, 1953.
15. Member, New England Society of Newspaper Editors.

PAST ACTIVITIES

1. Accredited correspondent for Big Four Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, July 1955.
2. Member, Technical Progress Committee, Associated Press Managing Editors Association, 1955.
3. Member, Associated Press Continuing Study Committee for New England.
4. Chairman, committee to establish new journalism division at Boston University.
5. Member, Journalism Accrediting Committee for Columbia University, 1948.
6. Member, Managing Editors Seminar, American Press Institute, Columbia University, 1947.
7. Member, Foreign Affairs Seminar, Columbia University, 1950.
8. Lecturer, American Press Institute, Columbia University, 1949–54.
9. Member, the American Assembly, Columbia University, 1956.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Present affiliations

1. Director, Quincy YMCA; member, finance and building committee for new YMCA.
2. Director, Quincy Child Guidance Association.
3. Director and member, Executive Committee of Quincy Chamber of Commerce;

member, committee handling the disposition of the Squantum Naval Air Station property.

4. Member, Quincy Rotary Club (past president).

5. Troop committeeman, Boy Scouts of America, Troop 9.

6. Member, Quincy Neighborhood Club.

7. Member, Squantum Community Association.

8. Member, Sumner Men's Club, First Church of Squantum.

9. Member, Squantum PTA.

Past activities

1. Chairman, Christmas carol promenade, 1946.

2. Member, Quincy Salvage Committee—wartime trustee.

3. Honorary member, Thousand Hour Club (civil defense organization).

4. Member, 20th Anniversary Committee for Esplanade concerts.

5. Chairman, Boston Harbor Antipollution Committee.

6. Member, Press Committee, Greater Boston Community Survey.

7. Boston University alumni director.

8. Chairman, Quincy Community Chest Publicity Committee.

9. Chairman, Quincy Municipal Airport Commission.

10. Member, Campaign Committee for new YMCA building fund.

HISTORICAL OR MARINE SOCIETIES

Present affiliations

1. Member, Naval Historical Foundation, Washington, D.C.

2. Member, Quincy Historical Society.

3. Member, Essex Institute, Salem.

4. Friend of Peabody Museum, Salem.

5. Member, Peabody Museum Marine Associates, Salem.

6. Member, Marine Historical Society of Mystic, Conn.

7. Member, Steamship Historical Society.

8. Member, Bostonian Society.

9. Member, Editorial Advisory Board of "The American Neptune" (nautical research magazine).

10. Member, Propeller Club—Port of Marine Scribes.

11. Member, U.S. Naval Institute, Washington, D.C.

12. Member, Aero Club of New England.

WHAM Voices Concern Over Reductions in Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the recently ordered reductions in window services and parcel post delivery by the Post Office Department have been met by widespread and warranted public resentment. The people of this Nation are properly protesting paying more for mail service and getting less in return.

Last week I directed to my constituents an open criticism of these postal service cutbacks. I said that I could find no evidence that the economy claimed for these actions would come close to offsetting the horrible hardship imposed on the mail-using public and the further deterioration of working conditions for our dedicated postal workers.

Apparently, because it shares my belief that the public deserves better treatment from the Post Office Department, radio station WHAM in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., has broadcast an editorial comment to alert its listeners to this sad situation. News Director Richard M. Tobias who prepared and presented this "comment" has kindly provided me with a copy of his script. I take pleasure in sharing it with my colleagues in the House:

[Broadcast on Wednesday, May 13, 1964]

COMMENT

(By Dick Tobias, news director, WHAM, Rochester, N.Y.)

Back in the days when Congressman FRANK HORTON was just a boy, a popular American expression had it that "What this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar."

Mr. HORTON grew up to be a U.S. Congressman and took with him to Washington certain memories of that one-time popular expression.

Today, in an era of inflation and cigarette unpopularity, Mr. HORTON has changed the wordage somewhat but has raised a much more interesting and vital demand on America's needs.

He says now, "What this country needs is a good 5-cent stamp."

Congressman HORTON notes that the U.S. Post Office has become the most recent player in what he calls the national game of "Let's Pretend Economy."

The rules of the game are never certain, never established in black and white, but they have to do with attempting to convince American taxpayers that vast sums of money can be, and are, being saved.

Congressman HORTON says the Post Office is eliminating essential service to the great disadvantage of the postal patron.

In all post offices of respectable size there will no longer exist window service on Saturday afternoons and all day Sunday. And Saturday morning service will be cut, in many post offices, to one window for all stamp and parcel post service.

And, in other alleged economy move, parcel post delivery service has been reduced, in many areas, to a 5-day week.

Added to this, as noted by Congressman HORTON, is a certain confusion about alleged economy move. The Post Office says a sufficient number of workers will be employed at all times to assure the best possible service. Yet another announcement says 10,000 postal positions are being removed from the Federal payroll.

Now it goes without saying that there is quite probably no more dedicated a group of people in the Government than the postal workers of America. For far too long they have suffered long hours, pathetic pay, and public abuse.

An economy move in the redtape and red ink of the U.S. postal system is most assuredly not in our best interests if it is predicated on the simplicity of slashing jobs.

As Congressman HORTON points out in his communication on postal service, some 40 regular employee position have been lost in the Rochester Post Office alone.

Whether or not this has saved Americans any money is an impossible question to answer, but certainly it has affected the efficiency of a most dedicated service.

For Americans have seen the price of postage increase monumentally, yet we read and hear of a continuing and overpowering deficit within the Post Office Department.

We note with financial horror the costly issuance of one new stamp after another * * * scores of them each year representing hundreds of thousands of dollars in engraving and design costs, yet learn that men must lose their jobs, and we must lose service because a postal economy move is underway.

Congressman HORTON says he knows from personal investigation that the net effect of these alleged economies is poorer service. He says postal records prove that delays are mounting and employment conditions are deteriorating.

Apparently he is quite correct.

On Monday of this week I dispatched by first-class mail a letter to far-off Dansville, fully 50 miles aways. On Tuesday it was promptly delivered to my home, right back where it started from.

If this is economy we want no more of it * * * what we need is a decent salary for postal people coupled with acceptable working conditions and a vast improvement of service.

The fault quite clearly is not with the postman * * * his troubles are compounded enough, what with dogs and poor handwriting * * * the trouble lies in Washington where false economy is a product spoon-fed to an America starving for the right to a decent mail service.

At least with the Pony Express the only much more vicious enemy * * * redtape. much more vicious enemy * * * red tape.

A Tribute to the Science Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure recently to visit here in the Capitol with two young ladies from Pampa High School in Pampa, Tex., who had been chosen to represent our Texas Panhandle region at the National Science Fair held May 6–9 in Baltimore.

No one could help but be impressed by the scholarly attainments of these young ladies, by the obvious high quality of instruction in science which had enabled them to attain such distinction, and by their enthusiastic interest in pursuing future careers in science.

The two girls are Miss Cynthia Ann Plaster, 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John N. Plaster, and Miss Avril Doucette, 16-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. A. P. Doucette, of Pampa. It was a special treat for me to be able to visit with these young ladies because they are both from my hometown.

Cynthia Ann and Avril won trips to the National Science Fair by having been named winners in the seventh Texas Panhandle Science Fair held earlier this year in Amarillo. For Cynthia Ann, this year's trip to Baltimore was her second in 2 years to the National Science Fair, she having again won one of the two top places in the regional fair. Avril's trip to the national event was her first, and she was honored by being awarded a fourth prize in the botanical sciences section.

On their brief trip to Washington, the two girls were accompanied by Mr. C. C. Dugger of the faculty of Amarillo College, which conducts the regional science fair in Amarillo; by Mr. Wendell Watson, a teacher at Pampa High School; and by Air Force Sgt. Leo Warden, a photographer now assigned to duty in

Washington and formerly assigned to Amarillo Air Force Base. Sergeant Warden, a most thoughtful young man, had met the Panhandle group in Baltimore and made arrangements for them to visit Washington during a lull in proceedings at the Science Fair. Thanks to his interest, I was able to meet the group.

Because of meetings in Baltimore, Mrs. Elaine Ledbetter, of Skellytown, Tex., also a teacher at Pampa High School, was not able to come with the others to Washington. She is nationally recognized for her energetic work as a member of the Science Fair Council, the 21-member panel which has given direction to the development of science fair activity in the United States.

The complexity of the projects submitted by high school students who compete in the science fairs would do credit to students on a much higher scholastic level. Only a person himself skilled in scientific matters would be capable of understanding and evaluating the worth of many of the ambitious projects undertaken by the high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors who participate in science fairs. For example, Avril Doucette's project was titled, "Texas Panhandle Soil Algae as Antibiotics." Cynthia Ann Plaster called her project, "Inhibition by Antihistamines and Analgesics of E. Coli."

The science fairs in this country are coordinated by Science Service, a nonprofit institution for the popularization of science, which has a most important objective the furtherance of scientific interest among the Nation's young people. At the first National Science Fair in 1950, 30 young people participated from 13 areas. At Baltimore this month, 420 high school students from 222 areas took part—including the winners from national fairs held in Japan and Sweden.

Mr. Joseph H. Kraus of Washington, coordinator for Science Service of the National Science Fairs since they were first begun, said that one followup study made of science fair finalists indicated that more than 90 percent continued their educations at the university level and that more than half had gone on to obtain doctorates in science. A new study is being made.

Having been able to observe personally the great worth of the science fair program, I wish to congratulate all of those who have had a part in this most worthwhile activity—the Science Service, the sponsors of the regional and national science fairs, the school teachers who have taken such an important direct interest in the program, and the high school students themselves.

Cattlemen Suffer as Meat Imports Climb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest threats to the cattle industry of the United States, and especially to the very important cattle industry in the State of Florida, are the ever mounting imports of beef from foreign countries.

The Orlando Sentinel, the principal newspaper in my 11th Congressional District and in central Florida, printed a very revealing article about this situation in their May 13 edition. The article had appeared previously in the Wall Street Journal.

I think it worthy of attention by every House Member.

WHILE CUSTOMERS ENJOY LOW PRICES CATTLEMEN SUFFER AS MEAT IMPORTS CLIMB

Beef-eating Americans are feasting on the lowest priced steaks and roasts in 6 years but the meat counter bargains are only prompting howls of anguish back on the ranch.

Contrary to Government predictions that beef prices would rise about 10 percent this spring and offer some relief to profit-squeezed cattlemen, packers now are paying an average of $20.50 a hundredweight—$2.25 below last year and the lowest level in 7 years. What's more, heavy meat imports and growing domestic cattle herds make it unlikely that the hearlded price pickup will develop anytime soon, if at all.

While good news to consumers, the prospect of continuing beef bargains spells only more financial troubles for beleaguered cattlemen. Some already have been forced out of business and others figure to fall by the wayside if prices don't improve. "I'm liquidating the cattle now in our pens, and when they're gone I'll be closing down if prices haven't improved," asserts Sid E. Moller, president of Union Feed Yards, Blythe, Calif. No small operator, Moller last year fattened some 100,000 cattle for Los Angeles slaughterhouses. He figures that for him to remain in business prices would have to rise about $4 a hundredweight.

To help ease themselves out of the red, Moller and other cattlemen are discarding their long aversion to Federal aid and are asking Congress for a lift. Almost universally, they blame low-cost imported beef for their problems, and they're demanding that Uncle Sam slap mandatory quotas on such imports. Specifically, the rangemen want future imports held to 7.5 percent of average domestic slaughter over the last 5 years; this would mean import limitations of around 800 million pounds annually, a stiff 26 percent cutback from 1963's record 1.1 billion pounds. The cattlemen have taken their case to the U.S. Tariff Commission and its findings are expected to be turned over to the Senate Finance Committee for action in June.

But there's far from unanimous agreement on the reason why cattle prices have skidded more than 33 percent in the past 18 months. Agriculture Department officials argue imports are only a minor factor in the price decline, and the agency is dead set against imposition of import quotas on foreign beef. It maintains the quotas are unneeded, too, because Australia and New Zealand, the biggest shippers of foreign beef to the United States, already have voluntarily agreed to cut back shipments to the United States this year by 27 percent.

Instead, Agriculture Secretary Freeman attributes the weak cattle market to growing domestic herds. On January 1, U.S. ranches and feedlots were bulging with a record 106.2 million cattle, a gain of 2.6 percent from the year before. The herd may well grow again this year, despite a climbing slaughter rate at packinghouses, because ranchers and feeders have said they expect this spring's calf crop to be about a million head bigger than last year's record.

The Agriculture Department calculates that heavy domestic supplies of beef accounted for $3 of the $3.70 drop in cattle prices in 1963. Increased supplies of poultry and pork brought on 20 cents of the drop, and rising beef imports were responsible for the rest of the decline, the farm agency says.

Some meatpackers side with the Agriculture Department on the question of imports. Marvin T. Gibson, senior vice president of International Packers, Ltd., Chicago, charges imports have climbed because "U.S. cattlemen have abandoned the hotdog and hamburger market" in favor of the higher priced steak and roast market. He says the supply of better grade beef has doubled in the last 10 years while that of cheaper grades has failed to meet demand. "The imports that have been reviled and maligned by cattlemen's associations and subjected to strong attack by the Congressmen who stand for elections in November have just filled the gap" needed to keep the lower grades of meat in the same supply as 1954, he declares.

But cattlemen generally remain unconvinced and they are determined to put a lid on the imports. They are pressuring President Johnson—a part-time rancher himself—to reject the Agriculture Department view and throw his support behind the quotas. The cattlemen's bid could eventually pose a sticky political problem for the President since the Republican Party's Agriculture Committee and possible GOP Presidential Rival GOLDWATER have come from the quotas.

In a "what comes first—the chicken or the egg" sort of argument, the ranchers take issue with the Agriculture Department's position on meat imports. Ralph W. Cellon, a Gainesville, Fla., cattle raiser, concedes the growing U.S. herds are a problem but says imports are much to blame. "Due to low-cost imported meat, packers can't afford to bid for cows and bulls culled from American herds," he reasons. "That means these animals go back to the range to produce more calves or into feedlots to add to the surplus of cattle on feed." He says a year ago packers were buying about 600 culls from Florida herds each week "but now they're not buying any."

Further, ranchers say some of these culled animals that would normally go to market are being bought by farmers turning to cattle because of Government planting restrictions on crops. "In Oklahoma alone, about 12 million acres of cropland, mostly cotton and wheat acreage, have been converted to cattle pasture over the last 25 years," says William F. Brannan, Maretta, Okla., rancher and president of the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association. "About half of the record 4 million cattle in the State on January 1 were on small farms with fewer than 100 head each."

Until recently the brunt of the low cattle prices fell on the commercial lots and corn belt farms which fatten range animals for market. But now those who raise young steers and sell them later for fattening are being hard hit. Prices of those so-called feeder cattle now stand at an average of $19.75 a hundredweight, down 14 percent from a month ago and 24 percent from a year ago.

"Nearly all feeders, whether farmers or commercial lots, lost money in 1963, and even with the prospect of reduced imports, this year could be as bad," says Edwin Dubbert, a Laurens, Iowa, farmer and president of the National Livestock Feeders Association. "Some cattle producers are at the point they can't get any more bank credit."

"Losses to cattlemen in Colorado in the last 13 months have totaled about $40 million," claims Robert Johnson, Fowler, Colo., banker and rancher.

Caught by the price nosedive are thousands of investors, including numerous movie stars and oil companies, who were lured into the cattle business by the prospect of capital gains. "Our customers averaged losses of $30 to $50 a head in mid-1963, and

even with lower prices being paid for replacement cattle off the range they're still losing $10 to $15 a head on animals in the lots now," reports Earl Brookover, operator of a feedlot at Garden City, Kans.

Rather than absorb such losses, some ranchers are simply going out of business. George E. Light, Jr., a Cotulla, Tex., rancher whose family has been raising cattle for 146 years, recently completed liquidating his half interest in a 10,000-head herd he owned in partnership with his son. "If you want to stay in agriculture," he grumbles, "you'd better go to some other country to raise cattle, or else grow something here you can get a subsidy on." Ranchers complain they can't compete on an equal basis with the low expenses for foreign beef producers who often get subsidies from their governments and frequently enjoy lower taxes.

Rancher Cushman S. Radebaugh, in Orlando, Fla., says, "It costs us a minimum of about $50 to raise an 8-month-old calf, while an Australian rancher can raise a 2-year-old steer for $6.50. Taxes and land costs are big problems. I've been chased out of two ranching locations in the past 9 years, first by a missile base and then by a housing development. Similar conditions are steadily raising the cost of farmland all over the country."

Such cost disparity is also influencing a few ranchers to compete with foreign beef producers on their own grounds. N. V. Bunker, Jr., a Lake Village, Ark., rancher, reports he's shopping for a cattle ranch in Central America. "I was told in Guatemala that you can raise a 2-year-old steer there for $5.25. There's just no place in the United States where you can approach that kind of cost," he says. Mr. Bunker has cut his Arkansas herd to 200 head from 2,000 over the last 2 years and switched 5,000 acres of pasture into soybeans.

"Due to subsidies paid U.S. farmers and exporters, a rancher in Mexico can buy U.S.-grown grain sorghum for as much as 90 cents a bushel under the prices I pay," complains Doyle McAdams, Huntsville, Tex., rancher. "Then the Mexicans turn around and sell their meat in Texas at prices under those for U.S. beef." Agriculture Department figures show that U.S. exports of sorghum to Mexico last year were about 24 times the total 2 years earlier.

TVA Expansion Brings Widening Stream of Benefits to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial captioned "TVA's Expansion Raises Profits in Many Places," the Nashville Tennessean comments perceptively on the radiating nature of the great economic benefits which are coming on increasing scale from this great regional development program. I feel that this editorial is of interest to many Members of this body, and request unanimous consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

TVA'S EXPANSION RAISES PROFITS IN MANY PLACES

The Tennessee Valley Authority has announced that a total of $19 billion will be spent in the Valley during the next 20 to 30 years for construction, distribution and consumer facilities.

Of this TVA itself will spend $7 billion for purchase and construction of needed facilities to complete the 50-million kilowatt system planned by the end of that period. Distributors of TVA power will spend an additional $4 billion to maintain and expand their facilities.

The largest expenditure, however—and the most meaningful from the standpoint of the overall economy—will be made by the consumers of TVA power. TVA board Chairman Aubrey Wagner says these consumers will spend $8 billion for appliances and equipment to use the electricity.

This is money that will be spent in many parts of the Nation, and it will support factories, create jobs and furnish tax revenues for many parts of the Nation.

The $8 billion to be pumped into the Nation's economy by TVA's customers is more than three-fourths as much as the President's tax cut for 1 year—and the effect of the tax cut on the economy is being demonstrated now by the rise in prosperity.

The spending by TVA's customers, of course, will occur over a period of years, but its cumulative effect on the economy should be tremendous.

In addition to these expenditures, the development of private industry along the TVA streams is expected to continue at a rapid pace for the next several years. Private industry, attracted by convenient water transportation facilities, has already invested $1 billion along the waterfront, providing not only jobs for people in the valley but products and profits for consumers and investors in other parts of the country.

These are beneficial effects of TVA which are seldom considered by TVA's critics in other parts of the Nation—such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER—when they are calling for the dismemberment of TVA or advocating its sale for $1.

Some of these critics undoubtedly will profit greatly from the sales of appliances and other items to the people of the valley—sales that could not be made except for the availability of reasonably priced electric power.

It is difficult to understand such opposition to TVA from those who should support it, for it is unlikely that private power will ever be able to add such stimulation to the Nation's general economy. Just recently a large Eastern power company planned such an important expansion that the president of the company felt compelled to make the announcement at the White House so he could point out to President Johnson the company's interest in the economy.

This expansion, however, amounted to only $1 billion over a period of several years, a small fraction of the expansion planned by TVA. Many of TVA's harshest critics don't seem to realize that to destroy the agency would be to cut the jugular vein that has provided the vital lifeblood to a region.

Jaycees Young Farmer Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was recently reminded of the great contribution America's agriculture makes to this country and the world's consumer through the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce outstanding young farmer program held in Madison, Wis.

Through the efforts of the Madison, Wis., Jaycees 45 successful individual farming stories were emphasized in the story of efficiency and freedom in agriculture. I had the privilege to attend part of the session where I participated in an agricultural seminar. Those who have little faith in agriculture and the people involved in farming just have not met the young men and women who successfully provide food and fiber for America.

It is most fitting that we commend those individuals and organizations responsible for conducting a worthy program like this, and honor the 45 farmers selected as the outstanding young farmer in their respective States:

Alabama: Gene Wiggins, Route 5, Andalusia.

Alaska: Not participating.

Arizona: Alfred Warren Austin, Route 1, Post Office Box 78, Lomalita Farms, Tolles.

Arkansas: James L. Staton, Route 1, De Witt.

California: Dale Shannon Harris, Route 1, Post Office Box 720, Arvin.

Colorado: Robert L. Stieben, Route 2, Post Office Box 132, Fort Collins.

Connecticut: Emil A. Mulnite, 200 Miller Road, Broad Brook.

Delaware: Laurence E. Jestice, Route 1, Post Office Box 230, Laurel.

District of Columbia: Not participating.

Florida: Gerald F. Gamble, Route 4, Live Oak.

Georgia: James M. Blitch, Route 4, Statesboro.

Hawaii: Donald S. Shintaku, Post Office Box 308, Pahala.

Idaho: Gene Brumbaugh, Route 2, Caldwell.

Illinois: Fred A. Lagerhausen, Shumway.

Indiana: [1] Marvin Dillman, Route 1, Twelve Mile.

Iowa: Ernest E. Thomas, Waukee.

Kansas: William G. Amstein, Jr., Route 3, Clifton.

Kentucky: Harvey Clendining, Jr., Route 4, Franklin.

Louisiana: Donald Lee Tucker, Route 2, Zachary.

Maine: George L. Humphrey, Poland Spring.

Maryland: Kenneth E. Burrier, Route 2, Union Bridge.

Massachusetts: Not participating.

Michigan: John Paul Jackson, 7442 Carlton Road, Clayton.

Minnesota: Gary R. Hanson, rural free delivery, Nerstrand.

Mississippi: William E. Crenshaw, Route 1, Post Office Box 250, Winona.

Missouri: Paul R. Neitzert, Route 3, Sedalia.

Montana: Marvin R. Costello, Route 2, Stevensville.

Nebraska: Robert Linder, Lommis.

Nevada: Not participating.

New Hampshire: Leonard Gould, Jr., Route 1, Colebrook.

New Jersey: Not participating.

New Mexico: Weldon McKinley, Post Office Box 277, Los Lunas.

New York: Stanley Gurda, Route 1, Pine Island.

North Carolina: Pink Francis, Route 3, Waynesville.

North Dakota: [1] Steve B. Reimers, Carrington.

Ohio: Herman M. Brubaker, Route 3, West Alexandria.

Oklahoma: Billy Ray Gowdy, Boise City.

Oregon: James Lee Kessler, Route 2, Post Office Box 216, Milton-Freewater.

[1] Four national winners.

Pennsylvania: William P. Moore, Chatham.

Rhode Island: Roland E. Burroughs, Hope Avenue, Post Office Box 53, Hope.

South Carolina: [1] Sam E. McGregor, Route 2, Hopkins.

South Dakota: Larry Hutchinson, White River.

Tennessee: James R. Hill, Route 6, Humboldt.

Texas: [1] Bill Lane, Comanche.

Utah: Not participating.

Vermont: George B. Rogers, Pawlet.

Virginia: John Henry McDevitt III, Route 2, Culpeper.

Washington: Kenneth R. McMurray, Post Office Box 317, Pullman.

West Virginia: Philip E. Harner, Route 3, Post Office Box 61, Morgantown.

Wisconsin: Orlo W. Koerth, Route 2, Brillion.

Wyoming: J. D. Hackleman, Riverview Route, Riverton.

Mr. Speaker, also I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, April 13, 1964, as well as a letter to the editor of that paper submitted by Robb Madgett, public affairs director, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Apr. 18, 1964]

MORNING MAIL—COMPLIMENTS TO MADISON FROM NATIONAL JAYCEES

SIRS: On behalf of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, I would like to commend your fine newspaper for the outstanding performance and coverage given the now completed eighth annual Outstanding Young Farmer banquet.

Your farm editor, Robert Bjorklund, has provided our organization's program with its best newspaper coverage. He is to be commended, and we greatly respect his judgment, newspaper sense, and writing ability.

I wish also to take this opportunity to pat the Madison Junior Chamber of Commerce on the back for its outstanding team effort in making this program the best in its history. It is obvious to us at the national headquarters to see why this chapter has established such an outstanding record during its past administration. I wish to commend its president, Jack Johnson, and its most able board of directors.

Madison, Wis., is fortunate to have individuals in its midst such as B. D. Craig, of Oscar Mayer & Co., and Ben Prohaska, of Straus Printing Co. Had it not been for the unselfish and untiring efforts on their part, this program could not have encompassed as much of the city of Madison and the State of Wisconsin as it did.

We wish also to thank the Wisconsin LP-Gas Association, members of the national cosponsor, LP-Gas Market Development Council, for their efforts in behalf of this program.

We, from Tulsa, Okla., have learned that Madison is a fine city and its people are friendly; our wishes are to someday return in a less official capacity. Again, I say thank you. It has been a sincere pleasure for the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce to have the opportunity to be shown true hospitality by one of its finest chapters in America.—Robb Madgett, public affairs director, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Apr. 13, 1964]

AMERICA'S BEST ARE HERE—WELCOME TO OUTSTANDING FARMERS

A new generation of the Nation's agriculture is in Madison today to have its say and to collect the Nation's highest honor as farmers and ranchers.

And we're proud to have these men with us.

The National Outstanding Young Farmer program of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce (JCC) is the one event that focuses on the national farm success story as it should be told.

If for no other reason, it will be rewarding to have these 45 young men—all under the age of 36—gathered here to get across the idea that there can be a better understanding between those who farm the land and those whose lives are urban oriented.

Farming has changed so much that its methods bear little resemblence to the manner that the fathers of these select 45 made their mark on the land. But the human part of agriculture has not changed, while weather and markets varied, from the pioneers who built this agricultural business—the ranking business of America and the world.

We hope 1,000 people join in the national banquet to honor the top young farmers of the Nation so that the full story of agricultural achievement can be recognized.

[1] Four national winners.

Baker Case Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota editors, like a lot of the rest of us, are having trouble understanding the attitude of the Senate leadership in closing up shop on the Bobby Baker case with all the unanswered questions. Under unanimous consent, I include these editorials from the Mankato Free Press and the St. Paul Pioneer Press in the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, May 16, 1964]

BAKER CASE QUESTIONS

Many unanswered questions continue to hang over the political and financial activities of Bobby Baker, former secretary to the Democratic majority in the Senate. The latest Republican efforts to dig deeper into these matters were rejected by a party-line vote in which 42 Democratic Senators lined up against 24 Republicans and 9 Democrats to block a widening of the official investigation.

Partisan political considerations on both sides are undoubtedly involved. However, the public interest should be paramount in affairs touching so closely on the integrity of the Senate as a body and on its individual members. Whether or not this interest was best served by the majority action tabling Senator WILLIAMS' resolution is at least doubtful.

WILLIAMS is the Delaware Republican whose insistence last fall on looking into the Baker record brought about Baker's resignation and the Senate Rules Committee investigation which recently came to an end amid GOP charges of "whitewash." This week WILLIAMS sought to extend and broaden the probe specifically to include connections of Members of the Senate with Baker activities. The Rules Committee has limited its probing to Senate employees and other nonmembers of the Senate.

In opposing the new Williams proposal, Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD termed it a shotgun approach and demanded that WILLIAMS name any individual Senators accused of unethical conduct.

Whatever the technical merits of this argument, what many members of the public will see in the Senate's rejection of the Williams proposal is an indication of more interest in closing the books on the Baker case than in exploring its depths to the fullest. Assuming that all Senators are innocent of any objectionable conduct, a further probe, properly conducted, should injure no one unjustly. As matters now stand, however, charges inevitably will continue that unsavory matters are being swept under the rug.

There is an old rule in politics—not always followed—that the best way of dealing with accusations in such cases is to bring out all the facts and let the chips fall where they may. The Senate leadership has not done this in the Baker case.

[From the Mankato Free Press, May 15, 1964]

THE BAKER CASE

It appears almost a cinch that full exposure of what has become known as the Bobby Baker case will never take place. It is obvious, on the face of it, however, that it would be difficult for a man who never received more than $19,600 a year in salary to build up a fortune estimated at more than $2 million, as Baker did while in the employ of the U.S. Senate. Therefore a complete investigation is in order.

If Baker's activities hadn't taken place while he was working for the U.S. Senate, where the salaries are paid for by the American people, the mystery surrounding his activities wouldn't be so important. But he apparently had close relationships with people in high office and his activities may have involved officials in vital and critical positions.

For this reason alone, it should be in the interest of everybody whose record and reputation in any way might have been touched by Baker, to insist on a thorough investigation and revelation of the facts. There will be hints throughout the coming months that the Bakers scandal, if divulged in all its details, could well rock the foundations of the National Government. Whether the charges have substance or could be easily disproved, it is equally important, in either case that the facts be laid before the people.

This is not merely a political matter. It is something that could well affect the U.S. Government. Nobody has a right to hide the truths from the public.

Pay Your Debts—A Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of Congressmen and their families went over to the U.S. Naval Academy where they attended chapel and afterwards, enjoyed the hospitality of the Superintendent as well as having lunch with their appointees.

While the Congressmen were lunching with their appointees, the wives were entertained at a no-host luncheon at the officers club.

We were all very much impressed with the sermon delivered by Capt. James E. Reaves, Chaplain of the U.S. Naval Academy, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

PAY YOUR DEBTS

"I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish" (Romans 1: 14).

When this sermon subject was written out for today's bulletin I really did not have in

mind the members of the class of 1964 who have contracted for new cars for I know you are planning to pay for them.

Pay your debts. This is good advice for Christian people in any age. Of course there are those people who say, "I don't owe anything to anyone." These are the people who, by their actions indicate that the world owes them a living. And yet, if we take seriously the scripture lesson just read by Midshipment Roberts, there is likely not a single one of us who cannot go along with St. Paul when he said, "I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians." Actually St. Paul was saying that each person who lives owes much to those who have gone before.

On this particular day when we, following the lead of Mrs. Anna Jarvis (who in 1908 organized the first Mother's Day celebration in Philadelphia), can very well pause and say, "I am grateful for those qualities of motherhood, displayed in every generation, which help me to be a better person."

There are always individuals who will take exception to that, of course. On board ship many years ago I preached a Mother's Day sermon in which were enumerated many of the idealistic qualities of motherhood. Afterward, a man came to see me and said something like this: "Chaplain I want to tell you that I think what you said this morning was a lot of hogwash. I don't believe a word of it." Well, he at least had the courage of his convictions—and he had deep convictions on that subject. I asked him to explain if he would and, with a savage gesture, he yanked his jumper up and pointed to two large knots on his ribs. He said, "See, Chaplain. This is what my mother did for me. She gave me this with her foot. When I was 6 years old she knocked me down and kicked me until I passed out. When you talked about our wonderful heritage and mother's love this morning, this is what I thought of. This is what that drunken bum gave to me to remember."

Now this shocks us a little bit, doesn't it? And rightly so for that is an exception to the rule. We do owe a great debt to those mothers who by their devotion to their families, to their sons and daughters, have given the world something that causes us to want to stop and pay our tribute.

Each one of us owes a debt not only to our mother but to numerous other people as well. This morning I would like to speak of at least a couple of other categories where we would certainly all agree that we owe debts to those who have gone before us.

Think of the pioneers in the scientific and technological realms. Think of the ease with which we cross the continent and the oceans—even circle the globe. Less than a hundred years ago travel for any distance was seldom undertaken for pleasure, and often it was extremely hazardous. Now many people in their jobs commute from coast to coast more easily than our forefathers made the trip from farm to county seat. Think of the debt we owe to the Marconis, the Edisons, the Wrights, the Einsteins, the Comptons, to the Pasteurs and to the Salks.

Now move into another area of thought. Just think of the great debt that we owe to those people who have given us our democratic way of life. Narrow it down, if you like, to one person, to Thomas Jefferson who was a mathematician, a surveyor, an architect, a paleontologist, a lawyer, a philosopher, a farmer, an inventor. Name it and Jefferson was it. He established an educational system, he built a great university, he founded a political party, he was President of the United States, and he had a hand in establishing our coinage system. He invented all kinds of things, but when we think of Thomas Jefferson we really don't think of any of these. Rather, we think of him for his contribution to the freedom we enjoy in this land today.

And of whom did Jefferson think? Not too long before his death he said that his boyhood teacher, William Small, was the person outside his immediate family, to whom he owed the most. To Small he attributed the principles by which he thought and lived.

Let's think in another area for a few moments now. Think of those people who pioneered in giving us the Holy Bible. We take it pretty much for granted when one of the midshipmen stands at the lectern each Sunday and reverently reads the lesson from the Holy Book. And yet, a little more than 400 years ago it was a crime in England for the layman to own a Bible in his native tongue. William Tyndall, in his drive to see the people of England have a Bible which they could read, was forced to leave in exile, never to return. However, in 1525, he printed a New Testament in the English language and thousands of copies were smuggled to England. For that crime he was put to death. Imagine, for the crime of printing the Bible in a language the people could read and understand * * * a man was executed. Members of the brigade of midshipmen, friends, the next time you pick up your Bible, just remember those people of yesterday who were not unwilling to die that it might be read.

Then think also if you will of the debt that we owe to the people who pioneered in the development of the church. Think of Paul and Luther, Calvin and Wesley, and of all those who literally poured out their strength in the building of the church. I think of the early days of this country of ours when the Gospel was carried to the frontiers by the circuit riders. Did you know that most of them were dead at age 35? I read somewhere that the average circuit rider had a life expectancy of something like 7 years. It was a hard life with long hours in the saddle and often the wet ground for a bed. Little wonder that so many fell with the fever or pneumonia. Think of the debt we owe those who were willing to lay down life itself to bring the church to the people where they were.

But I submit to you that the greatest debt we owe is not to our mothers, not to the people who have paved the way toward the scientific advances that we enjoy, not even to the people who gave us the Bible and the church. But our greatest debt is owed to a person who stands above all, even Jesus Christ our Lord. You know and I know what He did for us. Not long since, we celebrated the season of Lent and then the joyousness of Easter. Today, let us remember that each one of us can pay the debt we owe to Christ only by doing something for Him as we live from day to day.

In the Alaskan village of Unalakleet there is a tombstone with this inscription: "Rev. Alex C. Karlson, born in Sweden in 1856, arrived in Unalakleet 1888, died January 15, 1910, when he arrived in this village there were no Christians, when he died, there were no heathen."

Alex Karlson made his contribution in the payment of his debt to Christ by giving his life. Not in any spectacular way, but just by day-to-day living and serving.

What about you? Does your life have meaning, are you paying your debt to other people by the way you live? Perhaps you heard of the little girl who was told to bring her birth certificate to school. Her parents gave it to her, with stern warnings not to lose it, but when she got to school it was gone. Her teacher saw her sitting at her desk sobbing and asked her what the trouble was. "I've lost my excuse for being born," she said. We may laugh, but there's a real truth there for each of us. Unless we are making an attempt to pay the debts we owe to those who have sacrificed for us, then perhaps we too have lost our excuse for being born.

Pay your debts. Amen.

Patent Problems of Small Business Inventors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the difficulties faced by small business inventors and patentees in attempting to obtain full benefits from their discoveries and inventions has been one of the matters receiving attention by the House Small Business Committee during this Congress.

It develops that in many cases, these inventors are unable to protect themselves against infringement because of the huge costs associated with patent litigation. In addition, it is noted that while the application for a patent is pending, damages for infringement are not available and, in ordinary cases, the patent applications are on file for 2 years or more before the patent is granted or denied.

In a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean, Staff Writer Larry Daughtrey tells how Mr. Harry Logue and other Tennessee inventors were unable to overcome these and other similar problems. Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be reprinted in the RECORD. The article follows:

SMALL INVENTORS' WOE—BIG ENTERPRISE OFTEN MUSCLES IN

(By Larry Daughtrey)

A Shelbyville inventor named Harry Logue found last fall that he had been so successful he was out of business.

What happened to Logue is a not uncommon example of circumstances which often turn the American dream of making a better mousetrap into a nightmare.

The complex problem he represents is one of the targets of President Johnson's war on poverty, and its solution could bring a dramatic revitalization of American initiative and industry.

BUILDS MUSCLES

Shortly after World War II, Logue was coaching high school athletics. He came up with the idea of applying the ancient principle of overweighting to basketball.

According to the theory of overweighting, an athlete—or a racehorse—is given a heavier burden than he will carry in a real performance. This builds stronger muscles and results in a better performance.

By 1953, Logue had developed a heavyweight basketball which dribbled and rebounded like a normal ball—but it was twice as heavy. The training aid won praise from such coaches as Georgia Tech's Whack Hyder and Ohio State's Fred Taylor.

STILL COACHING

Logue had no interest in making or selling the basketball himself; he was still coaching in an Atlanta high school.

For the next 9 years, he traveled over most of the United States, attempting to sell the idea to a sporting goods company. No one was interested.

Finally, in 1962, Logue ordered some of the balls made by a Japanese import firm to his specifications.

The foreign company delivered 1,500 of the balls in August 1962, and by the end of the year Logue—operating from his home in Shelbyville—had grossed $42,000 on the sale

of 4,000 balls by mail order. The small business employed three persons, with prospects good for expansion.

ASKED FOR PATENT

In the meantime, Logue had applied for a patent and began the long wait for a patent number.

Suddenly, after Logue had demonstrated the product would sell, the same national sporting goods companies which hadn't been interested began to advertise a similar product for delivery in 1963.

Distributors who had been selling Logue's ball were faced with a similar product from their major suppliers. So, in 1963, Logue sold only 781 balls. Sale of others stored in his warehouse is doubtful.

His patent application is still pending. According to Logue, his patent attorneys feel the major companies have infringed upon his patent claims.

At this time, Logue could ask the U.S. Patent Office for an "out of turn" review of his application and ask for a court injunction against the other companies. Legal costs could run more than gross sales.

COULD NOT RECOVER

And if he proved in court that his invention had been stolen, he could not recover damages for the period during which his patent was pending.

If Logue does win a patent on the basketball, he says, larger companies could set up small subsidiaries in different parts of the country and continue manufacturing the balls. A separate suit—and high legal cost—would be needed to stop each of them.

A small business, which could have provided income and employment in a small town, is now dead. Multiplied by the thousands of small investors across the Nation who would like to make and sell their own products, the loss of employment and initiative is staggering.

LITTLE PROTECTION

Harrington A. Lackey, Nashville's only patent attorney, explains the problem in this manner:

"In the case of small items there is inadequate protection for inventors during the time their patent application is pending. The protection of a patent pending is mostly psychological.

"Small items which can be made in a plant easily set up can be copied during this time with little danger. Upon presentation of evidence that someone else is using a device, the Patent Office will consider the patent application out of turn.

"Damages for infringement on a patent during the time it was pending are not retroactive; therefore if someone copies your invention while a patent is pending, you cannot recover after the patent is granted.

"This applies mostly to small items; with such inventions as heavy machinery, there is little chance of this."

Patent applications, Lackey says, are often in the patent office for 2½ years before a patent number is either granted or denied.

NOT ISOLATED CASE

Logue's case is not an isolated one; he estimates there are more than 2,000 independent inventors in Tennessee, most of them tinkerers who hold other jobs. Many, he feels, could go into business with their ideas under the proper circumstances.

Shelbyville, while not an exception, has a local group of inventors who organized last week in hopes of finding an outlet for their products.

For example, a man named D. L. Gammill, who operates a small dairy farm in the Richmond community of Bedford County, has applied a classic phychological principle to an old farm problem.

Several years ago, Gammill was faced with a problem common to all dairy farmers: How to raise small calves away from their milk-producing mothers. The most common method was to feed them with a bucket, a time-consuming, tiring procedure.

For many years, people have tried to invent a calf-feeding machine, but none of the attempts have been completely successful.

Gammill began tinkering and came up with a metal tank with a water jacket, a sanitary pump, and lengths of sanitary rubber hosing, all hooked up to an electric timing device.

A BELL RINGS

Every 6 hours, automatically, a bell rings in Gammill's barn. Small calves lunge greedily to the front of their pen, where a nipple protrudes from the pipe. For 15 minutes, while the bell continues to ring, the calves feed. When the bell stops ringing, the calves back off. Gammill can be far away, tending to other problems, and the calves grow fat—and profitably.

The machine has none of the flaws of other products and has worked successfully for a year and a half. Gammill has applied for a patent.

He believes the machine can be sold for less than $500, and that profits from calves would pay the farmer his investment in the first year.

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Gammill would also like to see the device made in Shelbyville by local labor. But there are problems of capital, management, advertising, and distribution which would have to be met if a plant is set up.

Understandably, banks are reluctant to back such a venture—particularly when a large company may get wind of Gammill's machine and make a similar one.

In the end, Gammill may be forced to sell his product to a northern company, which would make the machine on existing equipment with existing employees—if he can sell it at all.

HARD TO FIND

Even finding a company which might be interested in making and selling a calf-feeding machine is something like the needle in the haystack.

Lt. Gov. James Bomar, an attorney who handles problems for many of the Shelbyville inventors, points out some of the problems they face:

"First, a man with a product of his own that he wants to sell must have sufficient capital to get into the market. The process of getting a patent can run up to $600.

"Second, he must search for help if he wants to sell the idea. It's not easy to enlist a manufacturer to go into a new idea. Finding the right firm is the problem.

"Third, there is no assurance of any protection if he takes the idea to a company. If it wishes, the company can kick the man out the door and use his idea."

Most companies, he explains, require those presenting ideas to sign a release stating that nothing they reveal to the company is in confidence. This protects the company from false claims against it.

NOT PATENTABLE

In addition, Bomar says, many ideas and products which would find a ready market are not patentable. The inventor, however, should realize some profit from the fruit of his labor and ideas.

"There is nothing in the business world for a clearing house for ideas, a place where inventors and interested manufacturers could get together for their mutual benefit," Bomar says.

"If such a clearing house could be set up at the State or National level, it would be a place to start for the man who comes up with a good idea."

All inventors have different problems—and ideas on different ways to solve them.

For example, Gammill believes a University of Tennessee agricultural experiment station could help prove the value of his calf-feeding machine.

NO DISTRIBUTOR

A Shelbyville restaurant operator, Harley Morgan, has developed three varieties of salad dressing. Experience in stores in nearby towns has proved the product, although nonpatentable, will sell.

Morgan can organize, manufacture and package his products with no trouble—his problem is finding a large grocery distributor willing to handle the product.

There are other examples—although less numerous—of men who have succeeded in selling their ideas and setting up prosperous businesses.

Several years ago Bill Witt of Shelbyville was making refrigeration units for trucks. When the units failed, he was convinced it was not because of a fault in the units, but in the trucks.

Witt found that in ordinary truck beds, water condensed between the walls, preventing proper insulation. He developed a process using fiberglass to make the walls watertight and better insulated.

SEVEN EMPLOYEES

With several patents pending, Witt's formerly one-man operation now has seven employees and prospects are good for a growing local industry.

In Knoxville, Elmer O. Thompson, Jr., began alone in 1952 to make a fishing lure out of a lump of lead, a hook, and a tuft of polar bear fur. He called it the Doll Fly.

Thompson says he lived on "beans and potatoes for a while."

In the viciously competitive world of fishing tackle, dozens of other companies began to make imitations as soon as the Doll Fly caught fish.

Although he won't say he has cornered the polar bear hair market, Thompson admits that "we get our share" of the hair, which will not deteriorate in water. This vital ingredient, plus what Thompson says is his demand for quality in manufacturing the lure, has allowed the business to exist in spite of imitations.

Thompson Fishing Tackle Co. now employs 125 persons making about 1,300 patterns of fishing lures.

U.S. Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Smithville, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, said last week the committee is probing similar problems stemming from the patent laws.

"Recent studies point out that in some industries the sources of innovation of major economic significance have come primarily from independent inventors and small firms," EVINS said.

ANTIPOVERTY

Sargent Shriver, head of President Johnson's war on poverty, pointed out in his congressional presentation on the program that a substantial part of the antipoverty bill would help meet this problem.

The bill will "provide new employment opportunities—for the long-term unemployed—by encouraging capital investment, and new opportunities for small entrepreneurs by making credit available."

The bill would provide $25 million in the first year as loans to small businessmen and entrepreneurs.

A man setting up a business in depressed areas would be entitled to up to $10,000 in Federal loans for each chronically unemployed person the plant will hire.

Experience with the Area Redevelopment Agency has shown that for every $3,600 in business loans a new job in private enterprise has been created.

LOCAL RESOURCES

"Most of the loan requests will come from business enterprises based on local natural resources, local markets, and local labor," Shriver noted.

The loan program is an extension of the Small Business Administration policies, with

money being made available to some who are not eligible now for SBA assistance.

This program could help men like Logue, Gammill, Witt, and countless others who have marketable ideas or products—but who lack the means to put them into the marketplace.

With the assistance of more patent law protection, the better mousetrap factory could cut significantly into the problems of unemployment and automation.

Panama: Is Riot Diplomacy Still on Tap?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most extraordinary events in Panama diplomatic history was the recent request of President Chiari of Panama to raise to full height the flag of that country in the Canal Zone territory at the time when the U.S. flag was at half-mast in honor of the late General MacArthur.

This action and current radical demands by Panama concerning the Panama Canal are summarized in an informative news article in the April 13, 1964, issue of the Washington Daily News, which speaks out in support of our citizens in the Canal Zone.

The article follows:

IS RIOT DIPLOMACY STILL ON TAP?

Has the Panamanian strategy of blackmail by public disturbance been abandoned? It remains to be seen. There is evidence that it has not.

Last week's little flag incident raises this question, and also makes timely speculation as to just what Panama's short- and long-term aims are.

When the flags in the U.S. zone (Panama's flies there alongside of the Stars and Stripes) were lowered last week in respect to the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Panamanian students descended on President Roberto Chiari and threatened to stage another riot.

They said they wanted no honor paid General MacArthur with Panama's flag and would pull another "demonstration" unless the Panamanian flag in the U.S. zone was hoisted to the top of its pole.

So President Chiari obediently protested to the United States, and the United States obliged by raising Panama's flag to full staff, over the U.S. flag flying at half staff, which is against regulations.

There are varying reports as to who was responsible, although the reason is clear enough why we obliged President Chiari and the students who tell him what to do.

Obviously, it was done to avoid another attack and melee in the zone, which the Panamanians would claim was another "aggression."

At first, we were told by State that the flag decision was a "low level" one in the Department.

The Washington Daily News phoned the Canal Zone, and headquarters there referred us right back to the State Department. We know there was a conference at the State Department about it. The next day, the State Department said it had nothing to do with it; that it was the Canal Governor's decision alone to oblige President Chiari.

It seems an odd order for a military man to make on his own, but the point isn't as important as the fact that the President of Panama still seems to agree with his unruly playmates that threatened roughhouse is the way to get concessions from the Americans.

Our readers can judge the boorishness inherent in this little incident when we tell them that, on three occasions when the Panamanians wanted their zone flag flown at half-staff, the U.S. Zone command lowered the American flag to half-staff, too, out, of courtesy, so that it wouldn't be superior to the Panamanians' flag.

By reading Panamanian newspapers since the January riots, and watching Panamanian behavior, certain fairly sound indications can be found revealing Panama's short- and long-term plans.

First, of course, is more money from tolls; as much as the traffic will bear, with the additional revenue all going to Panama's political hierarchy.

Second, complete economic control over the civilian personnel in the Canal Zone. These people are increasingly a captive market for Panamanian merchants; but the Panamanian goal is, clearly, 100 percent exclusive exploitation of their buying power. But this is a short term goal, which leads us to:

Third, ultimate liquidation of all American civilian personnel, with the operation and maintenance jobs all going to Panamanians. The number of jobs is in the order of 10,000; the biggest political plum in the country. The political group who could get hold of that could probably stay in office forever.

As extra added dividend would go to Panama all homes, schools, public services and civilian installations built by the United States.

Proof that this is one of Panama's most important goals lies in the constant drumfire of criticism aimed at the "Zonians" in the Panamanian press, and the collateral propaganda planted in some naive U.S. reporters.

Zonians are called "studpid" and "stuffy," "stuck up," and "smug" in their attitude toward Panamanians. Maybe some are, but such reasons are hardly sufficient to evoke suc ha violent hate campaign of which they have been the targets.

Actually they seem to be singularly self controlled and quiet group of people, and the only reason for attacking them is to promote friction which can be used as a reason why they should be sent back to the United States and their jobs and homes turned over to the Panamanians in toto.

Whether the United States will agree to this remains, of course, to be seen; but you can be sure the point will come up when treaty talks begin.

The 35th Anniversary of the Jewish Ledger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 35th anniversary of the Jewish Ledger, the remarkable newspaper which serves the Jewish community in the State of Connecticut.

The paper is remarkable for a number of reasons, but most particularly because of its editor, Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman of West Hartford. Rabbi Feldman has been the Ledger's editor and guiding light since it was founded. Regular readers find in its columns stimulating articles, thoughtful comments, and a flow of varied reports on the contributions individuals and the Jewish community in general are making to the growth, prosperity, and cultural improvement of Connecticut.

I am proud to bring the Ledger's achievements to the notice of the Congress and to salute this newspaper and its outstanding editor on this happy occasion.

China Reports Revealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week newspaper readers have had a rare opportunity to look through a window into Communist China. A group of Western correspondents had an 8-day tour of the country and a two-part report of their visit to Shanghai, Peiping, and Hangchow by Andrew Wilson of the London Observer appeared in the Washington Post May 11 and 12.

The newsman reported, among other things, that China does not expect to be a nuclear power for a long time to come, but is industrializing rapidly. No signs of discontent or poverty endemic in other Asian countries were seen.

While British reporters are very competent, I regret that American reporters were not able to accompany their flight and make a firsthand report directly to their American readers. It is in our national interest for us to know what is going on in this country of some 700 million people. I urge our State Department to make a new, determined effort for a travel breakthrough so that newsmen, scholars, scientists, businessmen, churchmen, and others can visit Communist China.

The sooner we establish some communication between the world's most powerful nation and the world's most populous nation, the better will be the prospects for peace in the world.

I join with Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT in his view:

> The Far East is another area of the world in which American policy is handicapped by the divergence of old myths and new realities (March 25).

I also join with Senator BOB BARTLETT, of Alaska, who said, on February 19:

> It is important, however, in our Asian policies, that we strive to achieve flexibility, flexibility which our policies in recent years have failed to have. We cannot allow ourselves to be frozen forever with a rigid policy hoary with age. In Asia as elsewhere we must be willing to discuss anything with anybody who is willing to discuss in a rational and responsible manner. We are the greatest power on earth and we have no need to fear Red China and no need to fear negotiations.

The articles from the Washington Post are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1964]

WINDOW ON PEIPING I—HAPPY FACES, SHOPS FULL OF GOODS GREET WESTERN NEWSMEN IN RED CHINA

(By Andrew Wilson)

LONDON.—Communist China does not expect to be a nuclear power for a long time to come. This seems the surest conclusion to be drawn from several days of question and answer with officials in Peiping, including Foreign Minister Chen Yi.

Marshal Chen said China would be quite capable of developing nuclear fission when she had "reached the necessary industrial level," but she might not catch up with the most advanced countries for 10, 20, or 30 years.

On the other hand, Chinese industry apparently is capable of producing capital goods, weapons, and electronic equipment in much greater quantities than Western observers have yet been allowed to see.

In an 8-day tour I visited Shanghai, Peiping, and Hangchow. Nowhere was there any sign of discontent or even the poverty endemic in other Asian countries. The people I saw, even in obviously impoverished quarters, seemed happy and purposeful.

Peiping is an old city rapidly becoming modern with wide streets, an up-to-date transport system, some wedding-cake-style buildings on the Moscow scale—and dozens of parks.

Shops are full of goods, not yet of very good quality. The pavements are crowded. There is none of the deadness that characterized Eastern Europe under Stalinism.

Industrialized Shanghai, a city of 7 million people, again is full of the liveliness that makes you forget this is a Communist state.

Hangchow, 150 miles west of Shanghai, has a willow-pattern flavor, full of temples, pagodas, and dragons. It is intended to be one of the chief attractions for foreigners when tours get going as a result of the new Pakistan-China air service by which we made our visit.

There is no doubt that the unprecedented admission of a score of Western journalists was a major gesture designed to go with a new departure in Chinese policy—a suggestion that Mainland China is not inflexibly committed to world revolution by force, that she can mount a peace offensive as effectively as Russia.

We were so hospitably entertained, and our hosts were so careful to avoid the jargon of Marxism, that it was nearly possible to believe that this new peaceful, reasonable China was the only one that had ever existed.

It was only when reading through Peiping magazines like Revolution and Evergreen, with their textbook instruction in revolutionary warfare in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, that one was reminded of the reality of Communist aims.

There were the inevitable flower-waving children and a 12-course banquet given by Hangchow.

PREMIER AT BANQUET

Next day we flew to Peiping, where arrangements were more relaxed. We were able to leave the hotel and walk around the city. In the evening we attended an Eve of May Day banquet in the Hall of the People. Premier Chou En-lai turned up and dined with other leaders, as host to 2,000 guests.

When speeches had been made and official toasts drunk, Chou took his glass of wine and went clinking glasses with the guests. There were no security precautions. Photographers were practically standing on Chou's toes.

He was obviously enjoying himself and later signed autographs.

On May Day we were driven through streets packed with youth processions to the grounds of the summer palace, just outside the city, where hundreds of boats were swaying beneath balloons on the lake and a female soldier sang patriotic songs in the Hall of Great Happiness.

SUMMONED BY CHEN YI

Later there were visits to the Great Wall and a Ming tomb.

Then suddenly we were summoned to an interview with Chen Yi, Chou En-lai's deputy and reportedly Mao Tst-tung's successor, who now rankes as China's No. 2 leader. It was the first major interview given here to a group of non-Communist journalists in 15 years and plainly intended for widest publicity.

For 2 hours, puffing cigarettes beneath carved screens and flower decorations, Chen—a burly genial figure—painted a picture of the New China.

He kept returning to the theme of peaceful coexistence. China, he said, did not want satellites, nor did she want to be a satellite herself. There were broad opportunities for cultural and technical exchanges not only with France but with other Western countries.

By the end of next year China would have repaid her last debt to Russia; she could then concentrate on building up the living standards of her people, Chen added.

ALSO VISITED COMMUNE

The tour given us by the Communist Chinese Government included a visit to a commune. Apparently there have been big changes in the commune system but no relaxation in its application. I visited a commune of 6,700 families (28,000 people) near Shanghai.

Fields were thick with corn and it was not difficult to accept the official figure of a 67-percent increase in production since 1957. There was a flourishing dairy herd and a factory using homemade machinery to make simple tools.

Officials admitted, however, that the basic unit was no longer the commune itself but the smaller "production brigade," of which there were 26 in this commune. The brigade, equal in size to the old Chinese village, is responsible for organizing "production teams"—in this commune engaged in the fields, the dairy farm, the workshop, a fertilizer plant, and fishing the local river.

It was obvious that as a result of early mistakes the unwieldy organization of the communes has now been reduced and decisionmaking brought nearer to the soil.

There was a rudimentary hospital, a number of schools and a store full of dusty luxury goods—radios, toys, patterned cotton cloth and tinned delicacies. Commune members each had an individual 65-square-yard garden plot for their own needs and said all they needed to spend was about 6 yen (less than $3) on rice each month.

Everybody looked healthy and happy despite loudspeakers which 6 hours a day blared songs like "Socialism Is Good for You" "Everybody Is Praising the Peoples Communes' Vegetables."

WINDOW ON PEIPING, II—WESTERN GOODS POUR OUT OF CHINA

(By Andrew Wilson)

LONDON.—Communist China's industry has increased more than tenfold since the liberation.

On our 8-day-tour through Peiping, Shanghai, and Hangchow we saw freely on sale, to those who could afford them, Chinese imitations of Leica and Rolliflex cameras, fountain pens, transistor radios, and watches made by a transplanted Swiss factory.

Cathode ray tubes are being mass produced in Shanghai, for a Russian-type television set with a 10-inch screen, and the prototype of a new six-cylinder car, the Phoenix, is being shown at an industrial exhibition there.

An earlier car, the Red Flag, is claimed to be in production but is not much in evidence.

Toy factories pour out models of motor cars, machine guns, Jeeps and American-pattern tanks, apparently for the southeast Asia market.

Much of this production finds its exit through Hong Kong which, as an official of the Chinese Foreign Ministry laughingly admitted, practically makes mainland China a member of the British Commonwealth for trade purposes.

Production of capital goods is the great enigma. The Shanghai exhibition included heavy electrical generating equipment, tractors, a truck, and a wide range of electrical and electronic goods. All these exhibits have certainly been built in the People's Republic, but are they actually in production?

So far as motor vehicles are concerned, China still relies overwhelmingly on reconditioned Russian and American trucks. But all Peiping trolley buses are domestically produced and China's workshops allegedly built a comfortable double-decker train on which I traveled from Hangchow to Shanghai.

Before we left China, our travels had thrown light on other aspects of the "New China":

Hotels: Mostly used by visiting delegations, the hotels are large and good. Some are preliberation, taken over with all their trappings, like the Shanghai Peace Hotel, formerly the Cathay. Others have been built overnight to quaint architectural plans.

Nor has socialism dimmend the Chinese art of cooking, which is highly regional and quite unlike the debased Cantonese cooking of Chinese restaurants in Europe and America.

Every hotel has a visitors' shop full of goods beyond the pocket of ordinary citizens. Tipping is forbidden; nobody thinks of locking up valuables; and honesty is carried to extreme lengths. Our departure from Shanghai was delayed 15 minutes while a China Intourist official sought the owner of an English penny left in one of the rooms.

Shops: Foreigners can buy cheaply in the so-called friendship shops open to anybody with money. But even Chinese city workers—the best off—have an average wage of only 70 yen a month (about $31 at the official exchange rate).

Of this about 7 percent goes in rent. Sugar costs the equivalent of 28 cents a pound, pork about 42 cents, fish 21 cents, eggs 28 cents a dozen, cigarettes 21 cents a pack. Cereals, most meats, fats, and sugar are rationed. Cakes, fruit, and vegetables are not.

The real shortage is cotton cloth—rationed to 3 yards a year for each person. Nowhere in three major cities or in the countryside did I see any sign of malnutrition.

"Luxury" goods are poor enough by Western standards but one can buy a fair pair of men's shoes for the equivalent of $8.40 or a shirt for $3.50.

Working conditions: Workers are on a 45-hour, 6-day week in most factories and a 63-hour week in the communes. There are no vacations aside from May Day, National Day, and five other "days"—though workers separated from their families may be given a fortnight's leave to visit them each year as a special concession.

Men retire from work at 60, women at 55, on a pension of up to 70 percent of their wages. A factory I visited at Hangchow gave 4 hours' "education" each week after working hours and also provided health and social services.

Women: They earn the same wages as men and participate in everything, including the armed forces. But there are signs that they are tiring of their eternal blue overalls. In Shanghai, which tries to be "with it," there's a fashion for tightly cut slacks and pointed shoes. Business women have one or two

pretty dresses for official parties and those in contact with foreigners—Intourist interpreters and so on—manage to get a smart weekly hairdo.

The question now is what the newly open China will make of Western visitors, and what the Chinese will make of the West. On the aircraft returning to Karachi, my Chinese neighbor looked curiously at the cigarettes offered by the Pakistan airline, embossed with the British royal arms.

Karachi Airport, with its confusion and emaciated porters, must have fulfilled the textbook picture of a country ripe for communism. Will the new leaders of countries like Pakistan be able to match Chinese political dedication, order, and economic self-discipline?

Hon. George H. Mahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist, William S. White, has written a beautiful tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Congressman MAHON who quietly goes about his job in an efficient manner is being recognized and properly so as one of the most able and distinguished Members of the Congress. He is praised not only as an indispensable "nice guy" but a gentleman and statesman.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

ALL NICE GUYS DON'T FINISH LAST

(By William S. White)

Not even in politics do nice guys always finish last. For distinguished evidence of this there is Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, who has just ascended to the chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee in succession to the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri.

For more than 20 years Mr. MAHON has been a significant Member of Congress. For most of these years he has had a responsible hand in the allocation of countless billions of dollars and a critical and decisive role in defense appropriations alone running to more than $450 billion.

For a decade, at least, he has been among the 10 or 12 men who really run Congress, as head of the appropriations subcommittee which has the military directly in its charge. Now, as chairman of the entire committee, his writ runs everywhere and he is unquestionably among the topmost six of Congress.

DOES JOB QUIETLY

In spite of it all, he has been Mr. Anonymous, quietly doing his job, bearing a staggering responsibility for the military safety of this Nation and its allies around the world, and never making the headlines. Ask the first six people you meet to tell you who is GEORGE MAHON and from all six you will very likely get the reply: "Who, indeed?"

Mr. MAHON, a tall, shy, reticent and soft-spoken man of 63 who at a glance could pass for 45, is a leathery product of west Texas who could easily be either the fellow in the white hat or the black hat in any Dodge City of television. His simple, undemanding demeanor masks one of the wisest and most sophisticated minds in the United States in the strategic fundamentals of warfare as seen from the ultimately controlling vantage point held by such political masters of all high strategy.

It is said of him, and rightly so, that he knows the byways of the Pentagon far better than any Secretary of Defense we have ever had—because while Secretaries come and go Mr. MAHON has stayed on and on.

Still, if you met him you might think him a reserved country schoolteacher or, possibly, a sedate rancher in town to see the banker about a loan. It is the Mahons of Congress—the quiet, little-noticed, deeply responsible men who are content with the power and never mind the pomp and publicity—who are its last and best justification.

Mr. MAHON is never seen at the glittering Washington parties. Celebrated hostesses know him not. Nor is he invited to the intimate affairs of the diplomatic and bureaucratic sets. They, too, know him not. And the more fools they, for within the modest seven-gallon stetson he wears is a capacity for real decision over real matters a hundredfold greater than in the more socially aggressive guests who are in the curious order of things, asked in his stead.

In reality, Mr. MAHON to, say, an Assistant Secretary of State, is about what a commanding general of an Army group is to an aide de camp wearing his shoulder cord over the gilt bars of a second lieutenant. But reality escapes many people here—and this is fine with such as GEORGE MAHON. For they have the work to do.

JUSTIFICATION OF FACTS

Moreover, the Mahons as a class, and GEORGE MAHON specifically, are also the last and best justifications of the very two congressional facts of life now under the widest attack from reformers: The seniority system and the one-party system believed by many to be so notably evil.

But for the seniority system mere personal, popularity polls and log-rolling, and not the hard competence that can only come from long experience, would choose the committee chairmen of Congress. And but for the one-party system, with all its faults, men like GEORGE MAHON could never survive long enough to reach that place of power from which the Mahons alone are able to disregard the little local pressures and passing hysterias and so to concentrate on the great and timeless national issues.

At this point they are in fact statesmen; and only politicians some of the time and then only incidentally. They are nice guys, yes; but they are something far more. They are indispensable guys.

More on Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an item appears in the May 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report which bears out a prediction which I brought to the attention of the House last month. At that time I referred to a Farm Journal observation that legislative proposals to restrict the imports of beef would be acted on in the Senate only to be lost over here in the House during the adjournment rush.

Now it is pointed out by U.S. News & World Report that "the White House has no intention of supporting a law that would impose import quotas on beef." Apparently the administration will take no steps to upset the congressional leadership strategy referred to in the May issue of the Farm Journal, and the hard-pressed livestock industry will continue to suffer in the role of a pawn in the political chess game:

WASHINGTON WHISPERS

The White House has no intention of supporting a law that would impose import quotas on beef. However, to appease western Senators, White House strategy is said to be to accept passage of a quota bill by the Senate and then bottle up the measure in the House.

Error Upon Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal expressed accurately, I think, the opinions of many Americans with respect to the situation in Vietnam. It is worthy of a careful reading:

ERROR UPON ERROR

Ten years almost to the day after the fall of Dienbienphu, Secretary McNamara is in Saigon—for the second time in the past couple of months. Yet no matter how many high officials visit Vietnam, or how frequently, nothing gets clarified. Except, that is, the continuing failure of U.S. policy.

Though the conjunction of the Secretary's trip was the anniversary of the French defeat is accidental, it could be unpleasantly symbolic. With a far greater force than the United States has committed, the French fought the Communists for some 8 grisly years, and lost.

Vietnam was then divided north and south, Korea-like, but unlike Korea the border was fluid and not patrolled by large contingents of United States or any other troops. The Communists predictably made the most of their opportunity, first as infiltrators and guerrilla fighters; now they are so strong they can and do attack in force.

Today the French wonder aloud how the United States expects to win at the rate it is going. They are not the only ones; American servicemen and reporters have long been saying we are losing the war. U.S. officials are alternately reassuring and gloomy.

Part of the official attitude appears to be that we are not supposed to win in a formal sense; only help the South Vietnamese drive the Communists out and keep them out. But even this limited objective keeps going glimmering. After all the U.S.-supported fighting, the Communists are said to be in effective control of sizable and important parts of South Vietnam.

In view of that, it is almost impossible to figure out what is the U.S. strategy, if any—that is, how it thinks it can in fact drive the Communists out and keep them out. Not that anyone expects the Pentagon to reveal its war plans in detail; it is rather that the evidence indicates the lack of any plan which promises to be workable against the varied and successful tactics of the Communists.

Not even the commitment of many more American soldiers or the bombing of Communist bases in the north, which has been

talked of off and on, would be guaranteed to accomplish the objective. In other circumstances perhaps, but not necessarily against this particular enemy, in this particular terrain, with this particular ally.

At the same time the French "solution" of neutralizing all of Vietnam sounds like a proposal in a vacuum, at least for the present. Why should Ho Chi Minh, the dictator or the north, want to neutralize when he is doing so well as it is? Or if he did want to, we may be sure he would see it as a means of continuing the conquest.

We do not rule out the possibility that the United States may somehow some day turn the tide, any more than we rule out the possibility that the realities of the situation may finally dictate withdrawal. But whatever happens, the U.S. involvement in Vietnam reveals a series of classic military and political errors from which it may be hoped the Government will eventually profit.

First, the United States drifted into the war, initially intending only to advise. It evidently overestimated the fighting capacity of the South Vietnamese troops while underestimating the Communist Vietcong.

Second, the United States got into a war where the enemy chose the field. The field, moreover, is extremely disadvantageous for us not only in terms of terrain but of distance from our shores.

Third, it got into a war without allies, even though the interests of many nations are affected. If its allies care at all, they are willing to let the United States do it. Its only ally, South Vietnam itself, has never given an impressive demonstration of a will to win, on the part of the people, the troops, or the successive governments.

To all this it may well be objected that the alternative was to let South Vietnam go down the Red drain, and perhaps the rest of southeast Asia with it. The objection, we think, begs the real issues:

No nation should count on military success, even limited, in the most unfavorable circumstances. No piece of territory is beyond all price, worth any cost, as the French finally discovered 10 years ago after such great cost. And the United States, for all its great power, cannot forever police the world alone and unaided.

President Johnson Proclaims National Observance of National Small Business Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, by proclamation has recently designated the week of May 24 to 30, next, as Small Business Week, and called for national observance of the contributions which small business makes to our Nation's progress and well-being.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, which concerns the important role of small business in the development of America, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

President Johnson, by proclamation, has designated next week as Small Business Week.

Nine out of every 10 businesses that supply the needs and wants of the American people are small and independently owned and operated.

Our country's 4.6 million small businesses provide about one-third of the Nation's goods and services.

Small business creates a broad source of diversified employment, continuously broadens the tax base of local communities, States and the Nation, and provides consumers with a wide choice of products.

Small business preserves economic freedom through competition, stimulates the growth of individual initiative, generates new ideas, develops new methods and new products.

In short, small business is the vital center of our free enterprise system.

PARTNERS IN AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE

Congress repeatedly has declared that it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage, assist, and promote small business.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, your Representative is increasingly convinced that the preservation and strengthening of our private enterprise system requires fresh thinking about the relationship between public and private business.

The momentous changes in our economy, both at home and abroad, make it abundantly clear that there must be a constantly more effective private-public partnership.

Our small business committee membership has always sought to serve, encourage, and assist American small business in the hope that in due course it will become big business. The concept of our committee is that what is good for small business, generally, is good for all business, and good for the public at large. Our committee is not against big business as such; it is rather pro small business.

Congress and the executive branch can be—and have been—helpful to business. And conversely, business can be helpful to the Congress and to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government by coming forward with their particular ideas and suggestions for solving various problems that face industries and Government.

The Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration are great and increasingly useful arms of the Federal Government, created and supported by Congress to serve, promote, and encourage all segments of the business community.

A feature of Small Business Week will be the annual meeting in Washington of the National Advisory Council of the SBA. This Council is composed of leading businessmen and women in all parts of the country who are familiar with the problems of small firms in their localities. The regional directors and branch managers of the SBA will participate in this meeting with the Advisory Council members—a meeting which symbolizes, and serves to advance our growing American partnership in free enterprise.

Stop Low Rating the Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "A Dangerous Trend—Ridiculing the Man in Uniform," written by Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, VFW commander in chief, appears in the May issue of the VFW magazine.

The VFW has long been a champion of the serviceman in his effort to obtain a fair pay scale, adequate housing, assured medical care for dependents, and protection of post exchange and commissary privileges. The VFW renews their pledge of support to those in the uniform of the armed services and speaks out against the rash of books, articles, and movies that are holding the serviceman up to public ridicule.

The article follows:

A DANGEROUS TREND—RIDICULING THE MAN IN UNIFORM

(By Joseph J. Lombardo, VFW commander in chief)

One of the most dangerous developments in many years is the rash of books, articles, and movies ridiculing our men in uniform. This is no routine problem.

Rather it is something that strikes to the very heart of our national security.

It is deeply serious because it has the effect—whether intended or not—of holding the serviceman up to public ridicule. This, in turn, undermines confidence in our Armed Forces. Such a trend, if unchecked, could lead only to disastrous results. But the evil effects of such ridiculing efforts also have a damaging effect within the armed services themselves.

Highly publicized, widely distributed books, and movies adversely reflecting on those who are serving our country in uniform could have the insidious effect of lowering military morale. Why this could happen is abundantly obvious. Military esprit and morale stem, in a large part, from a genuine sense of pride on the part of military men in the task they are performing. If the manner in which they are doing their job is ridiculed, if the military man is the subject of jibes and innuendo, both as to his character and competence, the military man's pride in the service he is performing cannot help but be diminished.

We in the VFW are especially resentful and alarmed over this unfortunate trend in books and movies. It is readily understandable why the VFW should be alert to this development. After all, each member of the VFW has seen active oversea combat service. Each man in the VFW knows, from personal experience, the indispensable necessity for maintaining high morale within our services. We know that a sense of respect and appreciation on the part of our citizenry is an important factor in sustaining a serviceman's pride in his profession.

But this present rash of ridicule of the military is nothing new. It happened before. One of the things that contributed most to the unpreparedness of the United States at Pearl Harbor was the antimilitary attitude in the latter years between World Wars I and II. It was during the period of the late 1920's and the 1930's when the Western World was swept by a false belief that World War I was the last war, and there wouldn't be any more wars. During this same period, there was an outbreak of antimilitary writing, the result of which was to cast military men in an unfavorable light. Military service was ridiculed. The impression was created, by so-called literature, that only the "boobs" and those who couldn't earn a living anywhere else went into uniform.

Our Nation, and the free world, are indeed fortunate that there were those who were insensitive to that ridcule. We are free today because there were those like Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. George Patton, Adm. Bull Halsey, Gen. Hap Arnold, and Gen. Archer Vandergrift—to name a few—who had the deep sense of patriotism to serve during those lean years. They had to hold together practically skeletonized forces so that we would have the base for expansion when the war broke, as some knew it inevitably would.

Our Nation is indeed fortunate that those leaders, and others like them, were unmoved by the satire and ridicule to which the military was subjected in those years between the wars.

But, it was this same satire and ridicule that made their task all the more difficult, and by making it more difficult, our Nation was sadly unprepared for the war when it came. In some ways the literary barbs being hurled at our uniformed men today parallel the situation in the 1920's and 1930's.

But, in a real sense our situation today is much more serious. Today, there is an active, bitter, and bloody struggle between communism and the free world. There are brushfire outbreaks in this conflict in practically every portion of the world. Communism has leapfrogged the Atlantic and converted Cuba into a base for exporting aggression and subversion in the Americas. A continuing and bloody conflict is being fought in South Vietnam. The subcontinent of India is being menaced again by Communist subversion from the north. Communism is gaining a foothold in eastern Africa and the southern entrance to the Red Sea. Thus, the Mediterranean world is menaced by Red subversion.

All of which illustrates how tremendous our dependence on military power is for survival in this Communist-threatened world. The VFW has long recognized there is only one language that Communists understand—the language of power. And, when the confidence in our military leadership is undermined, then so is the effectiveness of our military power reduced.

This isn't to say that military men are, as a group, perfect. But, we in the VFW know, from personal experience, and observation, that those who hold high position in our military organizations are, as a group, dedicated, patriotic, and professionally competent. They have achieved their high rank through years of able service. They know what it is to be shot at in combat. Many carry battle scars.

Instead of satirizing our military leaders, it would be more appropriate occasionally to recognize what our Nation owes to these men. Those in high command carry a burden of responsibility unequaled in the business world today. The responsibility of a senior Air Force general, a Navy fleet commander, an Army corps commander, or a Marine landing force commander is practically incalculable in terms of dollars and lives. No one can say that military leaders take on this burden of awesome responsibility simply for the pay they receive. In terms of their authority and responsibility their pay is amazingly low. There is only one real explanation for why they carry such a heavy burden—their sense of duty. It is the code by which our military lives.

Such a way of life, such admirable purpose, should be a subject of literary admiration, rather than pseudosophisticated criticism.

But, it would, indeed, be wrong to believe that our military high command is the only target of this outbreak of antimilitary literature. Just a few weeks ago a leading national news magazine carried a featured article on the ROTC system. The tenor of the article was one of pointing ridicule at the student who was taking ROTC. It undoubtedly left many readers with the impression that only a real "sap" would let himself be induced into taking ROTC.

It doesn't take much imagination to visualize the effect of such an article on the impressionistic youth looking forward to enrollment in college. A student, after reading such an article, would understandably be hesitant in signing up for ROTC courses. Such hesitancy could result, on a nationwide scale, in reducing the number taking ROTC. This would reduce, in turn, the number completing ROTC and, upon graduation from college, being commissioned in the Regular forces or Reserve.

As the VFW has long recognized, the ROTC system is, perhaps, even more important today than it ever has been in the past. Those college students who take ROTC are performing a patriotic duty. They are, while benefiting from the educational advantage of our Nation, also preparing themselves to be better able to help defend our Nation.

To poke fun, to satirize, to ridicule those who make the extra effort, through ROTC, to discharge their obligation as good citizens is equivalent to ridiculing, satirizing, and making fun of patriotism, duty, and good citizenship itself.

The VFW believes that our Nation must be strong to survive. Military power is an indispensable element of the strength we need. Thus, the VFW, consisting as it does of overseas combat veterans, resents the unjustified and damaging books and movies that undermine confidence in and respect for those who are performing the indispensable task of serving in our Armed Forces.

On the occasion of this 1964 Armed Forces Day, the VFW renews its pledge of support to those in the uniform of our Armed Services. We reaffirm our respect for their devoted service to our Nation and the cause of freedom. We promise to continue our efforts to obtain for our military personnel a fair pay scale, adequate housing, assurance of medical care for their dependents, and protection of the post exchange and commissary system, so economically necessary to our Armed Forces.

We take this occasion to say to all those serving in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, "thanks for what you are doing for our Nation."

Lantern Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the recipient of the annual "Lantern Award" for 1964 was National Commander of the American Legion Daniel F. Foley. This annual award is presented on Patriots Day, April 19, 1964, in Boston, Mass., and is given to an outstanding American who has distinguished himself by his patriotic service to his God and country. Prior recipients of the "Lantern Award" are: His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of the diocese of Boston; George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of the diocese of New York; J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the address by National Commander Daniel Foley, presented on April 19, 1964, at the Patriots' Day Dinner held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston, Mass.

BOSTON, MASS.—The high honor conferred upon me tonight is one that I cannot claim for myself alone. It belongs as well to the more than 2½ million American Legionnaires, here in Massachusetts and across the land, who are joined together in dedicated service to God and country. I accept it, gratefully and humbly, in their name.

As a Minnesotan, I want to thank you especially for the privilege of sharing in your observance of Patriots Day.

The sons of Massachusetts whose heroism we commemorate today are the heroes and benefactors of all Americans. They dared to live and die for their God-given right to be free. They gave us not only the light of their wisdom and vision but also the legacy of their indomitable faith in the ideals and institutions of freedom.

I believe this faith in the democratic process is our most precious heritage. In no part of modern America are its roots deeper and its thrust stronger than here in New England.

How else could you have produced, in our own time, a John Fitzgerald Kennedy? I was privileged to know the late President, to visit him in the White House a few weeks before his death, and to pray at his funeral. We who live in other States share your sorrow that he was with us so short a time; we also share your belief that his spirit will inspire and sustain us always.

The Knights of Columbus counts within its active ranks many thousands of America's war veterans. (I am proud to be one of that number.) But I think it ought to be noted that the Knights of Columbus and the American Legion have a community of interest which ranges far beyond common memberships.

The Knights of Columbus is a militant advocate of those moral and spiritual values which underlie meaningful patriotism. So is the American Legion.

The Knights of Columbus has sought to expose and frustrate the evil design of communism since that conspiracy first appeared on the American scene. So has the American Legion.

The Knights of Columbus espouses a positive, dynamic Americanism that welcomes individual responsibility as the partner of individual liberty. So does the American Legion.

We cherish these mutual objectives, and we can take pride in our efforts to achieve them. And yet we must acknowledge, as knights or as American Legionnaires, that our task is far from done.

Let me suggest, briefly, several areas where the challenge to all Americans is both current and acute.

The first, and perhaps the most basic, involves our concept of the role of government in the relationship between man and God.

The patriots of two centuries ago openly proclaimed their belief in the Divine Being and publicly invoked His blessing upon the Nation they founded. The Declaration of Independence, the charter of our freedom, identified the Creator as the author of man's rights and equality under the law. In the lives of Washington, Jefferson, the Adams' and their contemporaries, spiritual values dominated all others.

They conceived the highest purpose of government to be the ordering of a society in which man might best fulfill the promise of his Maker. They recognized that liberty and justice and the pursuit of happiness are meaningful goals only in the light of eternal truths.

Today, we have drifted away from these moorings. Too many of us are concerned less about what is right and wrong and more about what will work. We have permitted the erosion of spiritual values to the point where freedom of religion is widely taken to mean freedom from religion.

There are those who sincerely believe that any form of religious exercises in the public schools is prohibited by the first amendment to the Constitution. The American Legion rejects that view. We are actively

supporting legislation to resolve the issue by authorizing a constitutional amendment affirming the right of school authorities to schedule voluntary prayer and Bible readings.

The nonveteran might wonder why the men and women of the American Legion attach so much importance to the recognition and strengthening of our spiritual heritage. Gen. Douglas MacArthur gave the answer in his farewell address to the Corps of Cadets at West Point on the meaning of "duty, honor, country." He said:

"The code which those words perpetuate embraces the highest moral laws and will stand the test of any ethics or philosophies ever promulgated for the uplift of mankind. * * * The soldier, above all other men, is required to practice the greatest act of religious training—sacrifice. In battle and in the face of danger and death, he discloses those divine attributes which his Maker gave when he created man in His own image. No physical courage and no brute instinct can take the place of the divine help which alone can sustain him."

We have seen in the experience and sacrifice of war the power of those divine attributes of which the general spoke. We believe it is the role of the state to enlarge, not diminish, the opportunity of a free people to merit divine help.

History tells us that a nation that rejects the past can expect little favor from the future.

The American people, I am convinced, understand that our strength and unity stem from spiritual sources. It remains for all of us—Legionnaires and knights alike—to renew and activate that understanding with the faith of our fathers.

We are now in the 17th year of the cold war, and the end is not in sight. Winning it will require moral as well as physical stamina. It will require that we keep in plain view both the nature and design of our adversary and the righteousness of freedom's cause.

Critics of the administration's foreign policy have called for a fundamental change in our attitude toward Communist imperialism. The way to defeat communism, they say, is to modify our opposition to it. We are told that communism is not necessarily evil and that Castro's Cuba is a nuisance rather than a threat to American security.

This is one approach to reducing cold war tensions. Another would be to surrender our rights in Berlin, pull our special forces out of Vietnam, and undertake a program of unilateral disarmament. The end result, in the American Legion's judgment, would be the same: a world handed over to Communist control. We must remind ourselves that the strategy of world communism remains unchanged. The cold war is not a contest for political supremacy. It is not primarily a battle for economic leadership or military superiority or even for the minds of men. It is a battle for the souls of men, and the outcome will fix the destiny of our children for generations to come.

Those who protest that our national policies are based erroneously upon rigid principles of moralism will get little sympathy from the American Legion. We submit that there is no other sound and safe basis for American policy.

Communism denies the existence of almighty God. It holds in contempt every organized religion through which men seek to serve God. It ignores the divine and natural laws which alone provide reliable grounds for mutual understanding and trust.

This, in the final analysis, is what the cold war is about. And this is why we believe the great majority of Americans will continue to support a course of relentless opposition to communism's growth regardless of the burdens and risks along the way.

America's war veterans pray for peace. Because we are veterans we understand, perhaps better than most people, the tragedy of war. But we also know that the surest way to invite attack is to flinch before a resourceful and powerful enemy.

This is not to say that we must rule out hope of resolving some of the East-West differences through negotiation. It may be that the partial test ban treaty in time will produce evidence of a change in Soviet philosophy. There is no proof of that change now, and we would be foolish to anticipate it.

Whether the dispute between Red China and the Kremlin will weaken the worldwide drive of communism is a matter to be determined in the future. The present fact is that Moscow and Peiping are fighting over how—not whether—to bury us.

If the situation in Cuba involved only the unfriendly attitude of an independent government, we could properly treat it as a nuisance. The fact is that Castro's regime is under the direct control of Moscow, operates as an integral arm of the Red conspiracy, and poses a grave threat to the security and stability of all of the Americas.

The American Legion acknowledges that we should negotiate in every circumstance that offers the chance of advancing our national interest. We insist, however, that certain issues are not negotiable—and these include our commitments in Berlin and Vietnam and our determination to break the Communist grip on Cuba.

During the coming months these and other challenges to our country will be the subject of extensive public debate. I earnestly hope that each of you, whatever your views, will participate fully in the process. We have nothing to fear—and everything to gain—from the exercise of our freedom to speak and disagree and vote on the problems that concern us as citizens.

The right too of our neighbor to dissent is the essence of freedom. Our ability to reason out our problems, to honor the integrity of others even if we attack their views, to be merciful and just in our dealings with all of our fellow men—these, too, are an essential part of the heritage of the land we love.

Let us resolve to live up to that heritage. Let us make ourselves worthy of the sacrifices and aspirations of the patriots we salute today.

I repeat let us resolve to live up to that heritage, mindful of what our late President John Kennedy has told us, "On Earth, God's work must truly be our own."

L.B.J.'s Friend From the Old Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the most colorful historian and storyteller of the Southwest cattle country, the Honorable J. Frank Dobie and his wife "spent a spell" with President and Mrs. Johnson. Frank Dobie is without a doubt the most eminent writer in his field and it was comforting to read of his visit in the White House. Marquis Childs tells it so well in his column of May 1, 1964, which is as follows:

L.B.J.'s FRIEND FROM THE OLD FRONTIER

(By Marquis Childs)

Under the Johnsons as under the Kennedys the White House is a hospitable place with a wide range of visitors coming and going. An old friend brought with him the other day the salt and the savor of an earlier Texas.

J. Frank Dobie, whose many books give the feel and the color of that earlier Texas, has known the Johnsons for many years. When he and Mrs. Dobie settled into the Lincoln suite there was a neighborliness about the visit that that other President a hundred years ago would have felt at home with.

Dobie is the most-valued kind of friend, one who tells you what he thinks regardless of position or power. He has kept his roots deep in Texas while fighting the blight of conformity at every opportunity. His course, "Life and Literature of the Southwest," was for years the most popular course at the University of Texas. If the mood was on him he might inveigh against the demagoguery of Pappy O'Daniel or the iniquities of racism.

One of the rewards of his course was when he sang ballads of the trail in his cowboy baritone. In short, he was a unique professor who rejoiced in the qualities of uniqueness that had made Texas great and who hated to see them sacrificed to the conformity of money and power.

Again and again he was embattled with university officials, legislators, and politicians. When in 1936 the university opened a new 27-story office building he said, "It looks like a toothpick stuck in a pie." He refused to have office space in it.

Dobie is 75 years old and while he has mellowed somewhat the flash of the old fire is there. When he smiles his blue eyes seem to light up. Keeping pace with Lyndon Johnson over a crowded weekend, he speaks of the President with affection and concern. He must keep something in reserve, he told him, he must not use himself up so. This is the privileged counsel of one who has known the President across the years and who understands the yeasty, impulsive drive of ambition that has carried him so far.

He talks about his new book coming out in the fall, called "Cow People." They didn't brag, those early Texans, he says. They were quiet people reflecting the silence and the wide horizons of open country. This Texas brag stuff, that came much later.

There was one braggart, a rancher named Shanghai Pierce, a legendary figure when the range was open. He spent a lot of time mavericking which seems to have been a polite name for cattle rustling and he came to a bad end. But then Pierce was from Rhode Island, so he hardly counted as a Texan.

"I was born," Dobie says, "in Live Oak County which is between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. My father had about 7,000 acres. All around us were places with fancy names like Buena Vista.

"I asked my father why we couldn't have a name for our place. 'Son,' he said to me, 'it isn't big enough. You can't really call this a ranch. It's just a place and we won't give it a name.' "

Something of this earlier Texas rubbed off on President Johnson even though he was born 20 years later than Dobie. It is a homespun quality that helps to explain the increasingly popular hold he has on the country. At times this has an incredibly corny look as it comes over the television screen. But the origins are in that earlier Texas—the kind of hospitality reflected in the President's invitation to the Dobies to come to the White House, "stay a month if you can." In the range country no visitor ever stayed less than 3 or 4 weeks.

Dobie speaks with quiet indignation of what he says was a last-minute smear launched against his friend, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, running in the Democratic primary in Texas against a candidate backed by big oil and certain powerful segments of the communications and entertainment in-

dustry. As Dobie sees it, the primary is a test of whether Texans can make an independent choice or whether conformity induced by the techniques of a controlled mass media will dominate.

We live in another America, an America that has changed fantastically since Lincoln slept in the big rosewood bed with its Victorian carving. But there are men like Dobie who speak with courage and independence and pride out of that other day.

Success of Urban Renewal in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Ruth Moore in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 14, 1964:

THE COST OF URBAN RENEWAL? IT'S PAYING OFF FOR CHICAGO

(By Ruth Moore)

Urban renewal in Chicago is more than doubling the assessed valuation of the areas it is rehabilitating and nearly tripling the tax yield from them.

The city's 27 renewal and three conservation projects, by the time they are completed, will have raised the valuation on the real estate involved from an original $35,421,000 to $84,224,000, an increase of more than $48 million.

And the tax return will have been increased from the $2,657,000 the areas paid before removal began to $6,318,000. This higher tax yield will pay off in about 11 years the millions the city is putting into the program.

ECONOMIC STRENGTHENING

D. E. Mackelmann, deputy commissioner of urban renewal and director of the city's community renewal program, pointed out Wednesday that there are three main objects to urban renewal.

"The first is to retain and increase the vitality of the city, the second is to improve it as a place to live," he said. "But there is a third and important aspect of renewal, and that is the economic strengthening of the city."

Cities are finding it increasingly difficult to raise money for necessary metropolitan services. Tax rates are high and few citizens demonstrate any willingness for them to go higher.

If the wear of time and the abuse of property, by landlord or tenant, decrease values and taxes in large areas, the city is caught in a financial squeeze. Income goes down in large sections of the city and cannot easily be made up in others.

One solution Chicago has adopted is to upgrade the slipping areas. The aim is to change them from a burden to an asset, thereby strengthening the tax base.

EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

Mackelmann and others working in renewal point out that the 115-percent increase in tax yield that the city will have obtained in the renewal and conservation areas is evidence this attempt is succeeding.

Nonrenewal areas benefit as much as the rehabilitated sections, Mackelmann emphasized. Without the higher income from the rehabilitation areas, others would have to pay more taxes or do with less service.

Here are some examples of what renewal has done for the tax base in some key areas:

Before renewal, Lake Maedows, a 100-acre area lying along the lake between 31st and 35th, had an assessed valuation of $3,381,000. Dilapidated houses were razed, and the land sold to the New York Life Insurance Co. which built high-rise apartments and a shopping center. The new buildings cover only 10 percent of the land, but the area now has a valuation of $8,595,000.

The tax yield previously was $122,000. It now is $625,000. (All figures based on 1962 tax rates.)

TAX YIELD RISES

On the West Side the Roosevelt-Clinton area before clearance was a mixture of worn-out housing and industry. It had an assessed valuation of $1,073,000 and paid a negligible $53,000 in taxes.

Now the 32 acres are filled with the new plants of many industries. If this land had not been available to them, many would have left the city.

They remained and not only furnish jobs for many Chicagoans, but pay $286,000 a year in taxes, five times more than the area paid in the past. The assessed valuation is $3,799,000.

NORTH SIDE IMPROVED

On the North Side, along Clark and La Salle between Division and North Avenue, a mixture of slums, shops and some industry produced two unsightly streets and menaced neighboring areas with a similar decline. The assessed valuation was $2,895,000 and the tax yield $151,000.

Cleared and now partly rebuilt with the high-rise apartments and townhouses of Carl Sandburg Village, the area is expected to have an assessed valuation of $15,295,000, five times what it was. The tax yield will be about $1,146,000, seven times what it was.

INCREASE IN TAX YIELD

Mackelmann also pointed out that the rebuilding of North Clark-La Salle stimulated a tremendous improvement in the neighboring area, thereby increasing the tax yield in adjoining streets.

When Chicago's 27 urban redevelopment projects—those in which most of the area is cleared—are separated from the conservation projects, the increase in tax yield is 138 percent.

In the conservation projects, where there is almost never more than 20-percent clearance and the emphasis is on the rehabilitation of the other 80 percent of the structures, the tax yield will be increased about 82 percent.

Hyde Park-Kenwood, the city's first big conservation project, demonstrates what happens. In this nearly mile-square area in the vicinity of the University of Chicago, the Federal Government and the city spent about $36,767,000 to clear dilapidated buildings pressing in upon fine homes, shops and institutions.

VALUATION CLIMBS

The money also went to improve the street pattern and general environment, and to make space for the necessary expansion of schools and such institutions as the Chicago Child Care Society.

Before conservation began, the taxable property in the community was assessed at $11,300,000, and taxes of $848,000. When the new buildings are completed on the cleared land, the assessed valuation will go up to $14,500,000. The area will pay the city $1,088,000 a year in taxes, without accounting for what private rehabilitation will do.

On the West Side a conservation project will produce an even larger percentage increase in tax yield. In Southeast Englewood, a residential neighborhood surrounding several old shopping streets, property is assessed at the low figure of $1,737,000. The tax bill comes to $130,000 a year.

When dilapidated buildings have been removed and the upgrading of the area is completed, the assessed valuation will rise to $5,900,000. The tax yield will go up to $443,000, an increase of 240 percent. Nearly all of the increase will come from new buildings.

NEAR WEST SIDE PROGRAM

A third conservation program, on the Near West Side, a residential area of small homes, will have a net project cost of $12,589,000. The assessed valuation is $2,500,000. When rebuilding is finished the valuation will rise to $7,900,000. The tax yield to the city will go from $187,000 to $593,000, an increase of 216 percent.

Areas of small homes, even relatively expensive ones, seldom pay their own way, in more than their own way, in the city. Schools and other city services in residential areas tend to make neighborhood costs fairly high.

Highly taxed industrial property, the Loop, and high-rise apartments yield the surplus that pays many city costs and makes up the deficits in residential areas.

Thus when renewal halts a decline in tax yields in aging areas and brings in more taxes with new building, the city's residential areas benefit, experts said. Residential taxes are not being increased by renewal, but held down by renewal, Mackelmann noted.

Will Lights Go Off in the Southland?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled, "Will Lights Go Off in the Southland?" which appeared in the May 5 edition of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner.

This editorial points up the extremely serious situation developing in the Far Western States as a result of the threatened shortage of water in the Colorado River system.

This water shortage also extends to the supply of electric power and thus poses a grave problem to the people of the booming Southwest.

The immediate problem outlined by the Herald-Examiner is the division of water between Lake Mead, in back of Hoover Dam on the lower part of the river, and Lake Powell, behind the recently completed Glen Canyon Dam serving the upper Colorado River States.

We in California firmly believe, as the Herald-Examiner has well stated, that all parties should faithfully observe the 1962 agreement to maintain a minimum of 14.5 million acre-feet of water in Lake Mead (to protect the prior water rights of those served by that reservoir) while Lake Powell was gradually being built up to a 6.1 million acre-feet storage capacity that would allow the beginning of power generation there.

And, regardless of the Secretary of the Interior's recent announcement to the contrary, we will continue to make every effort to assure that the water and power rights of California citizens are not jeopardized.

In a larger sense, however, the people of the Western States must begin to look

for additional new sources of future water and power supplies to meet the increasing demands of our rapidly expanding economy.

The fast-growing population of southern California alone is expected to more than triple within the next 35 years, and the other States are experiencing similar growth patterns.

So, although the respective rights of all water and power users to existing supplies must be religiously respected, in relation to the region's increasing requirements, these supplies constitute a diminishing asset.

We must begin now to look beyond our present resources to consider utilizing the almost untapped resources of the Pacific Northwest, western Canada, and Alaska if we are to meet our responsibilities to provide a firm economic base for our children and our children's children—so that they may also enjoy the bright promise of America's Golden West.

The Herald-Examiner editorial follows:

WILL LIGHTS GO OFF IN THE SOUTHLAND?

The grave problem of the decrease in recent years of the flow of the Colorado River is causing alarm not only among experts worried about the supply of water for 9 million southern Californians, but it also extends to the supply of electric power.

The problem may become critical within a short time.

Both the Metropolitan Water District and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power have made strong protests against a proposal to the U.S. Department of the Interior to lower Lake Mead water storage.

The proposal has been made by upper Colorado River States that Lake Mead water storage from the Colorado be held down in order to speed up impounding of the river water for power generation purposes in Lake Powell, back of the recently constructed Glen Canyon Dam.

This city's water and power department and the Metropolitan Water District have warned that such a move will pose "grave hazards" to the water and electric power supplies of many southern California cities.

In 1962, Secretary of the Interior Udall agreed to maintain a minimum storage of 14.5 million acre-feet of water at Lake Mead back of Hoover Dam during the period that storage gradually was being built up in Lake Powell to 6.1 million acre-feet. The 6.1 million acre-feet storage in Lake Powell would allow the beginning of power generation there.

Now Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are demanding that Secretary Udall's pledge be broken and the Colorado River flow be held back for Lake Powell buildup.

Samuel B. Nelson, general manager and chief engineer of the department of water and power, warns that penalizing Lake Mead in favor of Lake Powell would reduce next year's storage back of Hoover Dam to less than 10 million acre-feet if 1965 proves to be as dry as 1964. Said Nelson:

"Serious damage would be caused to the generating machinery in Hoover Dam powerplant under such conditions. There would be excessive vibration and highly increased maintenance problems that could jeopardize the entire operation of Hoover powerplant."

Joseph Jensen, chairman of the metropolitan water district board of directors, also warned of the "damage that would occur to the economy of more than 9 million people living in 113 southern California cities who depend upon the water supply of the Colorado River."

The decision may be made within a few days. Unless southern Californians, their representatives in Congress, and their water and power experts put up a strong enough fight, the southland may look forward to a dimmer and drier era.

Our Constitution: The Temple of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the 1964 national high school oratorical contest conducted by the Americanism division of the American Legion was held at Tampa, Fla., on April 16, 1964. The first place winner was a fine young man from Wausau, Wis., in my district. David B. Marth, a 16-year-old junior at Wausau Senior High School, has brought credit not only to himself but to his school and his State and has set a fine example for high school students around the country. His essay, "Our Constitution: The Temple of Freedom," is an outstanding expression of the true meaning of the great principles embodied in the American Constitution. In order to share this essay with my colleagues, I wish to have it be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The essay follows:

OUR CONSTITUTION: THE TEMPLE OF FREEDOM

(By David B. Marth, 1021 Plumer Street, Wausau, Wis.)

"I have built Thee an exalted House, a place for Thee to dwell in forever." These were the words of Solomon in answer to God's plea to build a temple. Why did Solomon build this worshipping place?

In ancient times, the temple was a sanctuary for all. It offered security, peace, and inspiration, vital to the protection of the children of Israel. So in the 18th century in Philadelphia, our forefathers built a political sanctuary that was to offer freedom, peace, and security for 177 years. Carved on the cornerstone were these words: "The Constitution of the United States—1787 A.D.—Temple of Freedom."

In order that we may better understand the principles upon which our country was founded, let us mentally reenact the construction of our temple of freedom.

When Solomon started his tribute to God, he first laid the stones to form a foundation. A strong beginning was needed for firmness and support. In the same manner, the framers of the Constitution constructed a preamble, a statement of belief on which all of their principles were based. It began: "We the people * * *." Notice this little word "we"; it is the key to everything. It did not say, "We the kings and princes of this land"; nor did it say, "We the representatives of separate states," or "We the representatives of the one true religion, whites or blacks." No, it said, "We the people," meaning all the people. Thus, the new temple was to be a sanctuary for all of the people, not for a privileged few.

Second, Solomon constructed huge pillars of equal strength on which the temple depended upon for its stability. So our constitutional forefathers also produced strong pillars for their temple. The first, in the form of article 1, created the legislative department which was to make the laws; the second created the executive department which was to enforce the laws; and the third created the judicial branch which was to interpret the laws. The pillars were of equal strength so that one might balance the other. It embodied the key principle of "checks and balances."

A strong foundation with sturdy pillars, however, was not enough. The temple had to be enclosed with sturdy walls that would protect it from storms from the outside. Our "constitutional builders" selected materials that were to stand the test of time. In the form of the first 10 amendments, they gave us our Bill of Rights. Freedom of speech, press, and assembly, trial by jury, and the right of habeas corpus were but a few.

The basic structure of the temple was now completed. Our forefathers were now ready to furnish it. The focal point was a magnificent altar. On the altar were burning candles, each representing one of our Nation's rich values.

To this altar came people from all over the world. Why? Let us in reverence, but also loving pride, approach the altar and discover anew the values symbolized by the burning candles.

The first candle symbolized "respect for the individual." Every section of our Constitution is designed to preserve this value. Mussolini once said: "The state is all; man is nothing." The burning flame of our candle shouts to the world that the state exists for man, man not for the state.

The second candle represents the principle of "equality." This does not mean that all citizens are equal in ability and strength. It does mean that all people, regardless of their position or wealth, should have equality before the law. We have not always lived up to this ideal, but we should remember that it was the Supreme Court, created by our Constitution, that ruled that segregation in the schools must go.

The third candle represents the principle of "liberty." The fight for liberty began many years ago. The fight still goes on. Our Constitution is our shield in the continuous struggle against autocratic power of all kinds.

The fourth candle represents what A. A. Gray and others have called: "Unity in diversity." Our constitutional fathers designed a government based on a strong sense of unity. But its aims were "unity in diversity." Our national motto, E Pluribus Unum (out of many, one), is a living reality.

These burning candles on the altar in our temple of freedom reflected a sense of values based on a deep faith regarding the nature of man. Man was not to be regarded as a cog in a machine ruled by a strutting dictator; not as an animal ruled by blind mob passion, but man as a free human being with a spark of the divine, seeking ideals, seeking truth, seeking freedom, seeking righteousness.

Are these values being reflected in our country today? Eric Severeid has said: "The greatest danger facing America today is that of 'creeping personal corruption.' The greatest danger of 'creeping personal corruption' is that it slowly destroys the sense of corruption. Where there is no clear knowledge of what is bad, there is no certainty of what is good. Standards may be chipped away piece by piece, and we do not recognize what is going on. Only when blasted by a loud noise do we pay true attention and inspect the inner ramparts of the fortress—the walls known as values."

Can we hear such loud "blasts" today? On November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Tex., came a blast whose noise was heard round the world; our President had been assassinated. Whatever the motives of the killer, men of all political faiths agreed that hate played a major role. Only a few weeks before in

the same State, our Ambassador to the U.N. had been spat upon.

Do we have a climate of hate in some sections of our land today? As we prepare to enter a presidential campaign, will some of us take part in "Hate Johnson" or "Hate Goldwater" campaigns as people did in the "Hate Kennedy Campaigns?" Compare the attitudes of some people today with our constitutional fathers. Historian James Beck said: "They were a group of gentlemen of substance and honor who could debate for months in the hot summer weather without losing their tempers."

Do our political leaders do this today? Can you do it? Are our standards really being chipped away? James Madison said of our constitutional fathers, "There never was an assembly of men who were more pure in motives." Pure in motives? Does this characterize our leaders today? Or do they say, "How much is in this for me and mine?" Can you hear the noises represented by Bobby Baker, Billy Sol Estes, and Jimmy Hoffa? George Washington said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair." Our forefathers raised this standard for us in the form of our Constitution.

High in the dome of our temple is an ancient bell. Listen to its ringing message: "Proclaiming freedom throughout the land."

In the words of John Donne: "Ask not for whom the bell tolls—remember, it tolls for thee and for me," for it is "Our Constitution—our temple of freedom."

Appalachian Poorhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the Palestine Herald-Press of Palestine, Tex. The editorial shows some of the grassroots thinking in Texas about the President's political poverty proposals.

APPALACHIAN POORHOUSE

When the area redevelopment program was set up its proclaimed purpose was to elevate the living standards of depressed areas.

West Virginia, with its hordes of out-of-work miners, was the inspiration for ARA. When the program went into actual effect, however, eager Federal handout specialists found that much larger areas of the country than first advertised were in need of their soothing potions. And, before ARA was well in business, the greater part of the land area of the United States had been branded as being depressed.

Federal salesmen of the handout not only offered Federal funds to all these vast areas. In cases they threatened them with political reprisal if they didn't organize under ARA and get in on the gravy train.

ARA money was supposed to be used to help inspire establishment of industries in areas of high unemployment, and that was supposed to be done by financing new concerns whose promoters couldn't break the barrier of legitimate financing. But about the only successes scored by ARA financing, at least as far as we've seen from here, have been in pouring funds for expansion into established concerns which could have borrowed money from a bank.

There were those skeptics who believed at first that the ARA program was a political boondoggle. The same skeptics, plus a great many others who have seen the thing in operation, still think so.

But ARA, for all its faults and failures, was a piddling boondoggling, or political, scheme compared with President Johnson's plan for relief of the Appalachian States.

Taking in all or parts of 10 States, the President proposes to spend a billion dollars of Federal money—$228 million as a starter right now—to rehabilitate the Appalachian area.

Nobody, it seems, has ever laid out this area before, at least not in the scope of the President's plans. It extends from Lake Erie to Alabama and Georgia.

It is true that the vast strip of territory takes in some depressed mining areas. It is also true that the area embraces the industrial heart of the eastern United States. ARA isn't in the same audacious league as Lyndon's Appalachian "poorhouse."

In that poorhouse is all but a corner of Pennsylvania, a hefty part of Ohio, all of West Virginia, parts of Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia.

If, as a whole, that area can be called depressed and in need of Federal funds, then so can nearly all of the rest of the United States. And it no doubt will be, if Congress goes along with the Appalachian scheme.

In short, it appears that the President at long last has found the answer to a problem that has perplexed many a politician before him—how to get the majority of the entire Nation beholden to the great white father in the White House, whether they want to be or not. Look out, national bankruptcy, here we come.

What Will They Censor Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, some of us in the Congress have been alarmed and shocked in recent weeks by new evidence of the growing censorship which is being imposed on this Nation's military leaders.

Recently, during an inquiry which the Committee on American Services is conducting into military hospital construction policies, a senior Defense Department civilian official disclosed, under questioning, that he had deleted material from statements prepared for presentation to the committee by the Surgeons General of the Navy and Air Force.

These two officers—the senior medical men in their respective services—are the professionals on whom Congress must rely in developing health programs for Armed Forces families. Yet, we were being told, in effect, that we could not have their candid views unless we accidentally stumbled upon them in the questions we asked.

As I said then, and I repeat now, such censorship is designed to blanket the legislative branch in total darkness and ignorance.

Interestingly enough, the statement of the Surgeon General of the Army was not censored. But the statement did not escape the Pentagon's blue-pencil field marshal's because it was worded to reflect only the Department of Defense viewpoint; it escaped because it did not reach the censor's desk until the day after the committee had protested the censorship imposed on the Navy and Air Force and had served notice that these two officers would be asked to tell what had been deleted from their statements. As a result, the Army Surgeon General's statement was allowed to stand as he wrote it.

In other words, our protest helped to stay the hand of the censor. But this is only an isolated example, and Pentagon censorship continues to flourish and grow.

The current issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal discloses that one of the Army's distinguished officers, Lt. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson, who retired on May 1 as commanding general of the 1st Army, is the latest victim.

General Davidson wrote an article which is mildly critical of the present program of reorganizing Army divisions under the so-called ROAD concept. He said the new ROAD divisions have more flexibility than they need, that they were the "product of a crash program" which can ill afford close scrutiny.

But instead of allowing the article to be printed, with perhaps a followup discussion by others of the merits or shortcomings of General Davidson's views, the censors killed the article outright.

Nothing could better demonstrate the mushrooming Pentagon philosophy: "No thinking allowed." It would be no surprise to learn that this message has been printed on cards to hang on Pentagon walls.

The Journal has obtained and published General Davidson's censored article, commented on it in a brief critique by Assistant Editor Daniel Z. Henkin, and in an editorial. I believe all Members will want to read the details, and I wish to include them in the RECORD:

ARMY CENSORS GENERAL'S ROAD DIVISION CRITICISM

(By Daniel Z. Henkin)

The Army has censored, on policy grounds alone, the critical comments of a distinguished lieutenant general, who warns that "the ROAD concept reduces once proud organizations, steeped in tradition, to meaningless entities."

The text of the article by Lt. Gen. Garrison H. "Gar" Davidson, onetime West Point Superintendent and 1st Army commanding general at Governors Island, N.Y., until he retired May 1, is published in full on page 10 of this issue.

The disclosure of how General Davidson has been subjected to policy censorship coincides with reports that Gen. Thomas S. Power, retiring Strategic Air Command commander in chief, intends to publish, after he leaves active duty later this year, a book on strategic air power that previously was banned by Pentagon censors.

General Davidson, whose notable career includes such varied assignments as head football coach at West Point and commander of the crack 7th Army in Germany, says the flexibility built into the ROAD division, whose creation was pushed hard by Secretary

of Defense McNamara, "has been bought at a price of heritage and tradition the Army can ill afford to pay."

J. & R. Editor LeRoy Whitman states in an editorial on page 11: "We take no position on whether General Davidson's views are right or wrong, but we abhor censorship of professional military thinking and expression."

Here are the facts of the case:

General Davidson, 16 months ago, wrote two official letters to the Pentagon expressing his views on the ROAD concept.

"I did not ask that my views be adopted," he told this reporter. "My concern was not so much whether my point of view was correct, but that the Army should find out. "All I requested," the general continued, "was an objective study, either to support my view or lay to rest the uncertainty many officers hold."

General Davidson, who has held star rank since September 1943, never received the courtesy of an official reply to his official letters.

His two requests for an "objective study" were answered in personal letters from appropriate officers. Neither reply, the General advises, "evidenced any desire even to understand the problem, and both rejected the idea of an objective review, principally on the basis of what must have been cursory consideration and individual opinion."

General Davidson is a brave soldier who fights for what he believes. That is why he took further action to obtain a hearing for his viewpoint.

His next step was to submit an article: "What Price-Flexibility?" to the official taxpayer-supported "Military Review," published by the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The editors of this publication, which is read by military men throughout the world, accepted it for publication, "subject to Department of the Army clearance."

It is necessary now for editors of all official Service magazines to submit all copy to the Pentagon for "security clearance" which everyone agrees is essential, but also for "policy clearance," about which many people have deep doubts.

Several weeks ago, as he prepared to leave an active duty career that began with his appointment to West Point in 1923, where he was second captain of the Corps of Cadets and vice president of the class of 1927, General Davidson learned the Pentagon had killed the article. The reason for this action:

"Because of inconsistency with existing policy and because publication would be tantamount to public criticism by a senior commander of official policies and programs."

General Davidson continues today to resist oppressive censorship of military thinking.

Perhaps mindful of the fact that Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, former Army Chief of Staff and now JCS Chairman, did not submit his book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," to the Pentagon for "policy" clearance, and published his controversial views only after retirement, General Davidson comments:

"I have always considered it a duty for any officer when he has constructive suggestions to make, to offer them."

This experienced officer, who at 39 became one of the youngest generals in the ground forces, when the late Gen. George S. Patton pinned a pair of his own stars on him at the close of the Sicilian campaign, said of a professional military man's dilemma:

"Convinced of the importance of a sound solution to an important problem and failing to receive proper consideration, a very interesting question is posed to the individual making the offering.

"Has he the duty to persevere in order to obtain proper consideration or must he follow the dictates of discipline and remain silent? It is quite a problem for the individual to determine which duty is the greater—duty to the welfare of the country as measured by contributions to the improvement of the Military Establishment, or duty to established authority in the interests of discipline and morale."

The General concludes:

"Underlying this question is the more fundamental problem of whether it is possible in a military establishment, without sacrificing essential discipline, to take full advantage of the strength the freedoms of a democracy offer. In my opinion it is. But this is not always done."

Under no compulsion whatsoever to knuckle under to Pentagon censorship—except, as always, where security is involved—J. & R. will continue, as was exemplified in our comprehensive report on congressional testimony made by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, in recent issues, to present the viewspoints of military professionals on matters that are of concern to our Nation's No. 1 problem: National security.

GEN. "GAR" DAVIDSON'S CENSORED COMMENTS ON SHORTCOMINGS OF ARMY ROAD DIVISION

More flexibility than ever will be used has been built into the ROAD division. This characteristic has been bought at a price of heritage and tradition the Army can ill afford to pay.

Its predecessor, the pentomic division, was billed at birth as the modern organization of waging ground warfare. Actually, it was an expedient born of the demands of the moment. Ground commanders everywhere breathed a sigh of relief when they were no longer faced with the grim possibility of having to employ it in combat.

Now we have a new concept—the ROAD division. It, too, is the product of a crash program that would not withstand well an objective review. It was the product of not too many weeks of limited effort, when years and a broad range of experience could have been brought to bear. Concern would be less had the need for the flexibility sought been demonstrated at least by objective analysis if not by test, and if a complete span of alternate means had been fully and objectively explored.

Undoubtedly, weaknesses will be discovered and corrected as they are revealed by tests and experience. Among them should be the degree of flexibility provided.

It is important in any concept to maintain a proper balance among critical factors. Flexibility has always been an important military tenet. The increased destructive power of modern military weapons and the greater mobility provided by present-day vehicles accent its importance. At the same time, cohesion of effort remains a critical requirement for tactical success. Flexibility for flexibility's sake should not be permitted to detract from the coordination and teamwork essential if a combat unit is to reach its maximum effectiveness.

Greater flexibility was built into the armored divisions of World War II than was normally needed or used at battalion level. The following is a tabulation of the attachments to combat commands of all the tank and armored infantry battalions of nine armored divisions for all the days they were in combat in World War II:

Percent of time they operated together (with same combat command)	Percent of battalions	
	Tank	Infantry
100 percent	30	15
90 percent or more	45	37
65 percent or more	63	70
50 percent or more	70	82

It is obvious that more often than not, the same tank and armored infantry battalions operated together under the same combat command. This situation was to be expected, for mutual confidence born of successful experiences shared in training and in combat is bound to provide a stronger human bond than allegiance to a theroetical concept.

It is human nature for a commander to desire to fight the units he trains. It is even more rational for a commander, once having successfully commanded certain units in combat, and for subordinate commanders, once having fought together successfully, to desire to keep the same team in order to retain the advantage of understanding and confidence established up, down, and laterally.

One effect of this urge for extreme flexibility is the incongruous situation in which there are 11 different mixes of battalions in our present 16-division ground force. It is hard to believe that this variety ever will be required. It is difficult enough to predict the organization required for a single campaign no less to provide beforehand for a number of particular battles. This conglomeration of organizations departs from combat-tested principles, particularly simplicity, and complicates doctrine and training—all in the name of flexibility.

It is significant that other military powers were reluctant to follow our lead when we went to the pentomic concept. They preferred to stick with the combat-tested triangular concept. Now we have come full cycle and are back with a triangular organization ourselves.

It is doubtful if any country will change to accord with our latest idea. Heritage and tradition are assets that are too priceless. In the words of General MacArthur:

They are a rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn.

The ROAD concept reduces once proud organizations, steeped in tradition, to meaningless entities. It divorces battalions from traditional regimental allegiances, confuses rights to the symbols of past accomplishments, and, in general, obscures heritage bought with blood and precious lives.

Let us hope not too much time will be lost before the mistake is discovered and priceless heritage is restored to the Gary Owens, the Rocks of Chickamauga, the Devils in Baggy Pants, and our many other old and fine organizations, by assigning instead of attaching battalions to brigades and identifying brigades with our old regiments.

Flexibility is as much an attitude and a state of mind as anything else. As long as an assigned battalion is capable of independent action and the battalion and brigade commanders are prepared to accept detachment and attachment, all the flexibility required—even on the modern battlefield—can be attained without the necessity of abandoning traditional relationships. At the same time, the many important dividends of mutual understanding, confidence, teamwork, and unit pride and morale will not be lost. Much more effective combat organizations are bound to result.

WHAT WILL THEY CENSOR NEXT?

Hard on the heels of the report by J. & R. congressional editor of how the Pentagon has censored congressional testimony of the Surgeons General, there comes the disquieting disclosure by Assistant Editor Daniel Z. Henkin of how the views of Lt. Gen. Garrison H. "Gar" Davidson criticizing the ROAD division concept were banned from publication. What a sad situation it is that military men, in a free country, are being forbidden to express their thoughts and ideas. We wonder why Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who as Army Chief of Staff was himself a victim of such "policy" censorship, does not

protest on behalf of all service people. Unless corrective action is taken, the degrading of professional military thinking, about which Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover has spoken so eloquently in testimony published in the last three issues of this publication, will continue unchecked.

The so-called "whiz kid" types have the opportunity today to express their views, and have them debated in public forums. This is exactly the way it should be. What an advantage they have over military professionals, who are under orders to keep quiet if their ideas are not in step with the official word in Washington—whether it's hospital construction policy or Army division organization.

We salute brave men like General Davidson and Admiral Rickover who exemplify dedication and courage in safeguarding a precious heritage of all Americans: the right of free speech. As was the case in our editorial last week assessing the controversial views expressed by Admiral Rickover, we take no position on whether General Davidson's views are right or wrong, but we abhor censorship of professional military thinking and expression.

Smaller Business Association of New England Presents Proposals for Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the Smaller Business Association of New England has come to Washington to present their annual proposals for congressional action. We welcome their visits and their carefully considered recommendations as reflecting the views and thinking of a fine group of businessmen. It is by the people communicating with their Representatives and Senators that we are better enabled to evaluate their needs and assist them.

These meetings have focused attention upon some of the more serious problems faced by small business and have been a source from which ideas have developed for improving the economic condition of the small business segment of our population.

On Thursday, May 7, 1964, we again had the pleasure of receiving spokesmen for that association who gave us the benefit of their recommendations on a number of subjects of considerable interest to small businessmen everywhere. It was emphasized that they are not seeking special privileges for small business, but only equality of opportunity.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I was especially impressed by the association's statement regarding a number of topics which merit wider notice. Under unanimous consent, I include these portions of the Smaller Business Association of New England's proposals in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They are as follows:

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

INTRODUCTION—PRESENTED BY RICHARD B. LEARNARD, BOIT, DALTON & CHURCH, BOSTON; PRESIDENT OF SBANE

Gentlemen, each year we travel to Washington to call the attention of Congress to the problems of small business, and to offer recommendations for their solution. We believe that we have an obligation to provide recommendations for congressional action because we represent a segment of the economy that is essential to the well-being of our Nation and its citizens.

In our presentations, we stress the fact that we do not seek special privileges for small business, but only equality of opportunity. We try to present the viewpoint of small business and to develop and present constructive suggestions, rather than merely offering negative complaints and criticism.

Over the years, it has been extremely gratifying to discover that you have not only given us courteous and attentive hearings, but that you have carefully considered our proposals and have taken action on them. It would take much more time than is available to us today to present a definitive statement of legislation that conforms to our recommendations, but we could not let this opportunity pass without acknowledging a few outstanding examples.

In the field of taxation, the 1964 Revenue Act reversed and reduced corporate normal and surtax rates, a major point in our 1963 presentation. The provision of the 1962 Revenue Act, which permits a credit against taxes of an amount of up to 7 percent of fixed assets, is a step in the right direction toward the encouragement of reinvested capital that we have advocated for many years. The replacement of the Treasury Department's long-obsolete Bulletin "F" by ruling 62-21 met, in part, our request for faster and more flexible depreciation. Legislation passed in 1958, permitting installment payments of the estate tax over a period of 10 years, made it possible for many small businesses to avoid the need to sell control to pay the taxes due on the estate of a former principal.

Beginning in 1947, our association stressed the need for more adequate financing and advocated the development of long-term credit and equity capital sources for small business.

In 1958, Congress passed legislation which established a system of Small Business Investment Corporations. Although the SBIC's got off to a slow start, they are growing in strength and numbers as much needed sources of long-term credit and equity capital. They are also having the effect of encouraging regular banking circles to be more receptive to the need of small business for financial assistance.

Since the early days of World War II, SBANE has worked for a fair share of Government procurement. We supported the establishment of SBA and are pleased that it has been continued as an agency in the executive branch of the Government to protect and promote the interests of small business. The SBA's set-aside program has helped many small manufacturers and we hope that it will be extended and strengthened. We are grateful for the recognition of small business by Congress through establishment and continuation of the House and Senate Small Business Committees and we have repeatedly gone on record in favor of making them standing committees.

We are proud of the part that the Smaller Business Association has played in the recognition of small business as a dynamic segment of our society, but we could not have accomplished any of our objectives unless you had listened, asked questions, and then took action on our proposals. Our relationship has certainly been a splendid example of democracy in action.

Today, we offer the following program as a partial solution to some of the problems that are limiting the vitality and growth of small business. Our proposals cover the following areas: "Taxation," presented by Henry J. Griswold, attorney and CPA, partner, Lybrand, Ross & Montgomery, Boston; and "Procurement," presented by Paul W. Otto, president, United Engineers, Inc., Boston. The summary will be presented by Laurence K. Hamilton, president, Technifax Corp., Holyoke, Mass.

In its 1963 congressional presentation, SBANE proposed reversal of the corporate normal tax and surtax rates. We wish to acknowledge those provisions of the 1964 Revenue Act which not only met our proposal, but reduced the reversed surtax as well. Before the new act was passed, this was the situation: The normal tax on earnings up to $25,000 was 30 percent, and the surtax on earnings above that amount was 22 percent. This year, the rates are reversed so the normal tax is 22 percent and Congress went one step further by reducing the reversed surtax rate from 30 to 28 precent. Next year, the surtax will drop to 26 percent. The lower normal tax rate provides tax relief that small businesses need to survive, and the reduction in the total tax will make it possible for all businesses to retain more of their earnings for reinvestment in modernization and growth. All small business is grateful for congressional recognition of its needs in this manner.

This year, SBANE offers the following program as a partial solution to other tax problems of small firms.

1. CARRY BACK OR FORWARD OF SURTAX CREDITS

Our present tax structure penalizes small businesses when their earnings vary widely from year to year. Because their products and services normally are not well-diversified, they are extremely susceptible to the ups and downs of the marketplace. As a result, their earnings may exceed $25,000 one year and be nonexistent the next. Under the current provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, serious inequities are common.

As an example, let's take the case of two companies that we shall call company A and company B. In 1964, company A has no earnings, or suffers a loss, so it pays no tax.

In 1965, however, it has an extremely good year, earning $50,000, so it is subject to the surtax, as well as the normal tax, paying a total tax of $17,500. On the other hand, company B earns $25,000 in each year, so it pays the normal tax only. Please note that, although the two companies' earnings are identical for the 2-year period, company A is penalized by a tax inequity of $6,500—59 percent more than company B pays.

The Internal Revenue Code does allow a carryback and a carryforward of operating losses. We propose that the code be amended to permit small business to average this unused surtax credits, through a carryback for 3 years and a carryforward for 5 years.

Under the terms of the proposed amendment, here is how company A would compute its tax. From its 1965 earnings of $50,000, it could deduct its unused 1964 surtax credit of $25,000, leaving a balance of $25,000, on which it would pay a normal tax only of $11,000, the same as the tax for company B.

Fair enough, isn't it? We urge your serious consideration of this proposal.

2. INCREASE THE INCOME EXEMPTED FROM THE SURTAX TO $50,000

In 1941, Congress recognized the need of small business to retain sufficient earnings

to compete and grow, by establishing a surtax exemption on the first $25,000 of earnings. This figure has not been changed since the law became effective on January 1, 1942, however, and devaluation of the dollar, caused by inflation, is seriously hampering the efforts of small business to retain adequate capital. The dollar of 1942 is now worth only 53 cents in terms of the general wholesale price index, 47 cents toward purchase of machinery and motive equipment, and 41 cents toward purchase of machine tools.

We propose that Congress reaffirm its consideration of the needs of small business be recognizing the effects of inflation, through an increase in the surtax exemption from $25,000 to $50,000.

3. LIBERALIZED TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR REINVESTED EARNINGS

Our present standard of living has been achieved by incorporating technological advances into our industrial economy. We have outproduced other nations because our industrial plant has been considerably more efficient.

Today, this is no longer true. The industrial efficiency of Western Europe and Japan is approaching our own, while their wage rates are a fraction of those we pay. Foreign industry is modernizing its plant and equipment faster than American manufacturers. The United Kingdom is now investing 16 percent of its output per year in modernization; France, 18 percent; West Germany, 23 percent; the Netherlands, 24 percent; as against less than 12 percent in the United States.

Congress recognized the need to provide an incentive for more invested capital through the provision of the 1962 Revenue Act, which permits a credit against taxes of an amount of up to 7 percent of an investment in fixed assets. This is a step in the right direction. More incentives of this type are needed, however, if our economy is to attain a higher rate of growth. Furthermore, we urge that such incentives be applicable to investment in accounts receivable and inventories, as well as in fixed assets. As a company expands its output, it must keep increasing the amount of capital invested in these assets, and lack of the capital required slows down the rate of growth.

4. FLEXIBLE DEPRECIATION

Our research laboratories are producing technological advances so rapidly that equipment purchased one year is frequently obsolete a year or two later. "Useful lives" of machines are shrinking at an accelerated rate. The Treasury Department's ruling 62-1 recognized this trend by permitting businesses to reduce the "useful lives" of machinery and equipment in computation of depreciation. This ruling was long overdue and has helped both large and small businesses. We contend, however, that set formulas for useful lives cannot possibly be applicable to each individual situation. Only the individual company concerned can establish with certainty when a machine has reached a point where it should be replaced by more efficient equipment. For this reason, we urge consideration of a completely flexible depreciation policy, subject to regulation, through which a business would be allowed to write off its investment at the pace it chooses.

5. TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT PLANS

The Keogh bill, which was exacted in 1962, was a start toward our objective, but it does not grant the same tax advantages to self-employed persons, that are applicable to employees of corporations which have adopted approved pension or profit-sharing plans. In the interest of basic fair play, we urge passage of legislation that will liberalize tax deductions for funds invested by the self-employed in qualified plans.

1. Strengthen SBA set-asides and breakouts

In the 7-month period of July 1963 through January 1964, approximately 27,000 prime contracts, amounting to $876,700 were set aside for small business.

In the same period of the previous year, approximately 30,000 prime contracts, with a value of approximately $867 million were set aside. Obviously, there was no significant improvement in set-asides in the past year. The gradual growth of the set-aside program, which reached a peak of $1.2 billion in the first 6 months of fiscal 1962, has leveled off, and it is cause for considerable concern. In military construction, set-asides are holding their own on the same dollar level as last year (47.8 percent of $1.2 billion total award), but considerable pressure is mounting to eliminate all set-asides in this area.

Here is the trend of Government procurement and the share that small business has been receiving. In 1957, it received almost 20 percent, but its share has been dropping ever since, reaching a low of less than 16 percent in 1963. Set-asides must be strengthened to stop this shrinkage.

In addition, we strongly recommend that the "breakout" procedure, as authorized be encouraged to its full potential. Small business opportunities can be substantially increased by "breakingout" of the larger contracts, which are not susceptible to small business bidding, those elements which are suited to small business participation. Such "breakouts" should be restricted to small business competitive bidding. Both the set-aside and "breakout" programs, however, can only be as successful as the ability of SBA to review, effectively, highly technical bid invitations. SBA needs more personnel who have a strong, private industry, technical background, because the complexity of procurement is increasing at a tremendous rate, and the small businessman needs more capable representation at the time the set-asides and "breakouts" are determined.

2. Provide incentives for subcontracting

One hundred contractors now receive approximately 70 percent of all Department of Defense prime contracts for $10,000 or more. Yet 300,000 small manufacturers receive only about 17 percent. Approximately 80 percent of all Government procurement is in defense contracts. Is it any wonder, in spite of a booming economy, that there are 19,000 less small manufacturers in business today than there were in 1957?

There is no question but that large corporations are best equipped to handle large defense contracts. If small business is to grow, however, it must obtain a increasing amount of subcontracts. Some progress has been made in providing incentives for subcontracting by the recent Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-808.5, page 367, which takes into account weighted guidelines. It does not provide enough incentives, however, to increase subcontracting to the level which is essential for small business. The situation is worsening since the President's cutback program was put into effect, because, in the face of reduced contract awards, large prime contractors are retaining as much work as possible in their own plants to keep their facilities and employees occupied. We recommend that the ASPR change be studied further, in the light of actual experience, for the purpose of providing better incentives. Competitive bidding by small businesses on subcontracted items should produce lower costs to the Government, which will more than offset the cost of the incentives.

3. Additional protection for small subcontractors

We urge that the Armed Services Procurement Regulations provide prompt reimbursement of small subcontractors, as well as judicious settlement of disputes, by assigning the responsibility for settlement and reimbursement to the contracting officer. He is completely familiar with the situation and could take prompt, unbiased action, whereas small subcontractors must now rely on the counsel of an attorney who is usually not sufficiently acquainted with technical considerations and procurement regulations.

4. Revise patent policy

Many sources of research and development capability are discouraged by the patent policy changes recently stated in ASPR, which now give the authority of determining the patent rights of an R. & D. contractor to the contracting officer, who, in turn, is given guidelines to make his determination. The traditional patent policy, wherein the Government retained the nonexclusive right to use, on a royalty-free basis, patents developed under Government contracts, while the contractor took title to the patents and the right to develop them commercially, has, in effect, been voided by these changes. In developing patentable products and procedures, the R. & D. contractor calls upon his entire reservoir of knowledge, much of which is exclusively his. For this reason, it is unfair for the Government to take title to the patents, and then make available to other firms the fruits of years of research expended by the contractor prior to the R. & D. contract. We urge that the patent policy be restudied with a view to restoring the traditional policy. Otherwise, the Government risks loss of the enthusiastic and creative talents of the small businessman-inventor.

5. Permit averaging of profit and losses on fixed-price R. & D. contracts

At the urging of Secretary of Defense McNamara, many more R. & D. contracts are being awarded on a fixed-price basis, with incentive features. This type of contract appeals to large organizations having unique facilities, since it can result in higher profit margins, but the small businessman is taking a big risk in accepting such a contract, since he has no large surpluses to fall back on. We urge, therefore, that the small business be permitted to average profit and losses on fixed-price R. & D. contracts, so he can accept such contracts without risking business failure.

SUMMARY

Although we are now entering the fourth year of an economic upswing, it is disconcerting to note that three closely linked economic indicators—business profits, business investment and unemployment—have remained at recession levels. At least part of that statement may seem paradoxical in view of the headlines proclaiming that 1963 was a record-breaking year for profits. Last year's corporate profits were 11 percent above the previous high, but compared to sales, they have been declining since 1950.

In the 5 years beginning in 1950, corporate profits averaged 3.6 percent of sales. During the next 5 years, the profit margin was down to 3.1 percent, a 14 percent decline. So far during the 1960's, the margin has averaged only 2.6 percent, a further decline of 16 percent.

Let's see how fast profits have been growing. In 1948, they were $20 billion, rising to nearly $23 billion in 1950, $23½ billion in 1956, and reaching the record total of $27 billion in 1963.

This is an increase of 20 percent. But, in the same period, what happened to other factors in the economy? Gross national product is up 106 percent; employee compensation is up 120 percent, weekly wages in manufacturing are up 70 percent, per capita disposable income is up 56 percent and Government spending—Federal, State, and local—is up 179 percent.

Here is a really significant figure; prices are up 33 percent. This, of course, means that a substantial part of the dollar in-

creases in the other categories is the result of inflation rather than of any real gain.

You will note that profits are the only item on the list that increased less than prices. This leads us to the startling conclusion that since 1950, profits have really gone down, rather than up. When 1963's record-breaking profits are converted to 1950 dollars they shrink from $27 to $20.5 billion, 10 percent below the actual profits of corporations in 1950.

In short, when we measure our performance in constant dollars, we find that 1963 was not the year for recordbreaking profits. The record belongs to 1950. 1948 takes second, with 1963 in third place, only slightly ahead of 1955 and 1956.

When we consider profits as return on investment, we get similar results. In the 5 years from 1955 through 1959, the profits of manufacturing corporations averaged 11.4 percent of stockholder equity. So far during the 1960's, the return has averaged only 9.4 percent, a decline of 18 percent.

In the postwar era, profits have never been so low at a high point in the business cycle as they are today. The trend is plain. Corporate profits amounted to 8 percent of GNP in 1950; they dropped to 5.8 percent in 1955, 5.1 percent in 1959, and 4.7 percent in 1963.

Even though profits are steadily shrinking, there are many who seem to feel that profits are as high, or even higher than, they ought to be. These people apparently believe that corporations can always afford to keep less of their income and give other people more. Since most corporations make far more money than most individuals, this conclusion has a great deal of superficial plausibility about it. It also has a strong emotional appeal, as the popularity of the Robin Hood legend over the centuries testifies.

The trouble with this approach is that it can't possibly do very much for many people very long. Even if you ignore all the side effects that would result from redistributing present profits, they just aren't big enough to go very far. Corporate profits are only about the same size as 1 year's increase in gross national product. In other words, each year, the growth of our economy provides as much new wealth for the American people as the total amount of corporate profits.

This, in turn, suggests that the American people have much more to gain from the continuing growth of the economy than they could possibly gain by dividing up the profits of corporations. It also suggests another approach to the problem of deciding how high profits should be. This approach begins by inquiring into the relationship between profits and growth. What happens to the growth of our economy when the rate of profit goes down, as it has in recent years, and what would happen if we could do something to bring profits back up again?

The relationship between business profits and economic growth is basically very simple. Profit determines investment, and investment is essential to growth. Thus, a steep and continuing decline in profit is likely to mean a serious drop in investment, and therefore, slower growth for the economy. The decline in profits during the postwar period has, in fact, been accompanied by a sharp decline in business investment. Business expenditures for new plant and equipment averaged 7.9 percent of gross national product from 1947 through 1957, but only 6.8 percent after 1957. Last year, business investment amounted to only 6.7 percent of gross national product, well below the lowest level of the earlier postwar years.

This is no petty change. It represents a decline of 14 percent in the share of gross national product going into business investment. To put it differently, if business investment last year had been at the 1947 through 1957 level, instead of at its actual level, $7 billion more would have been spent on new plant and equipment. Seven billion additional dollars in plant and equipment expenditures would have made a great deal of difference in the performance of our economy. Among other things, it would have meant a great many more jobs.

It takes a lot of business investment to provide one job in today's economy. In 1953, American manufacturers had less than $10,000 invested in plant and equipment for each production worker. By 1960, that investment had increased to more than $18,000 per worker.

Total employment is now at an alltime high of about 68.5 million, but we are still nagged by a relatively high rate of unemployment. The latest figure of 5.4 percent is a slight improvement over last year, but it is too high for the so-called boom period we are experiencing. According to the Labor Department, 9.6 million new jobs will be needed in the next 5 years of offset automation alone. Normal population growth will add another 6.5 million jobseekers for a 16-million total. Yet, our civilian employment total has increased only 4.1 million since 1957.

To create more jobs, we need more business investment, and the only way to get more investment is to reverse the steady decline in business profits.

Fortunately, there is reason to hope for some improvement in profits. The reduction in Federal income taxes is an important step in the right direction. By cutting taxes across the board, for corporations as well as for individuals in all tax brackets, the new tax law serves to increase profit and investment as well as to stimulate consumer demand. But the tax cut is not a panacea. It does not guarantee that profit or investment will rise. Its benefits could be lost if rising business costs lead either to inflation or to further pressure on profits.

The responsibility for controlling the rise in business costs is broadly shared. It rests, in part, with business management; in part with Government; State and local as well as Federal; in part with employees and their unions; and in part with the American people.

The program we have present today represents a concerted effort by all members of our association to offer practical solutions to some of our problems. We urge your careful considerations of our proposals, which are summarized as follows:

1. Stimulus to increased investment: freeing of capital for economic growth through liberalized rates of taxation.

2. Increased share of Government procurement: Government procurement is such an important part of our economy today that small business must receive a just share in order to survive and grow. Small business can contribute much more to our defense effort. All it asks is equal opportunity for all businesses, regardless of size.

The Smaller Business Association of New England appreciates the consideration you have shown to small business in the past, and we offer our sincere thanks for the time and attention which you have given us today. May we look forward to continuing cooperation between our association and the Congress of the United States. Thank you.

The School Prayer Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, from the day the Supreme Court made its infamous ruling on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, there has been confusion piled upon confusion. To clarify the intent of the first amendment which not only prohibits Congress from establishing any form of religion, but also expressly forbids us to deny the free exercise thereof, a number of us have supported what has become known as the Becker amendment.

As a help to understanding the controversy, its origination and some of the views regarding it, I would like to include as a part of these remarks the following column by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 8, 1964.

[Herald Tribune, New York, N.Y.]

ON SCHOOL PRAYER RULING: SEARCH FOR A COMPROMISE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—A unique idea has come from the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, Democrat. He has suggested that maybe the House and Senate should pass a joint resolution "advising" the Supreme Court of the United States that Congress is in favor of voluntary worship in public schools, and calling for an affirmation of that principle by the Court.

Lots of people for years have tried to "advise" the Supreme Court, but to no avail. The members of the Court, who are appointed for life, can make any rulings they please, and the only recourse is to adapt a constitutional amendment to reverse any decision of which the people disapprove.

Actually, there have been many drafts of a new amendment to the Constitution on the question of prayer in the schools, but there are some people in Congress who feel that maybe the problem can be solved another way. Representative CELLER, for example, points to a case in a Federal court in New York which upheld voluntary worship, and he says maybe the Supreme Court will uphold this concept before long.

Meawhile, those who favor a constitutional amendment are convinced that nothing is going to be done by the Supreme Court, and that the only way out is to adopt a new amendment.

The situation has been pointedly summed up by Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, an Episcopal minister here who now is president of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order. It was in questioning Dr. Lowry that Chairman CELLER suggested a joint resolution to "advise" the Supreme Court. Dr. Lowry nevertheless stood by his testimony, as follows:

"The years 1962 and 1963 will appear to posterity as years of revolution in the relations of church and state religion and government in the United States.

"The first stage was the decision which struck down the nonsectarian New York school prayer. As this prayer had been uniquely an interfaith effort, developed by and under Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders, its demolition created a furor. There was a tremendous outburst of indignation throughout the country. The great power elites of our society were aroused nearly as much as the plain people. For example, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman denounced the decision in no uncertain terms. The eminent Protestant theologian, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, criticized it in the pages of the New Leader. Bishop James A. Pike asserted that the Supreme Court had deconsecrated the Nation. Another bishop, I am told, remarked that the court had enacted an Eleventh Commandment: Thou shalt not pray in school. Not a few Jewish teachers were disturbed, among them Rabbi Bernard Ziotowitz and Prof. Will Herberg.

"The atmosphere also in both Houses of Congress was very heated. The most outspoken alarm and anger were voiced. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary proceeded almost immediately to hold hearings, which were published in a voluminous and informative volume.

"Then it was, Mr. Chairman, that something quite singular occurred. A combination educational and public relations campaign was initiated, aimed at explaining the Court, smoothing down the ruffled feathers of the Congress, quieting the fears of the people, developing support for an extreme liberal outlook on issues of religion in the public schools, and generally preparing Americans for a further and more decisive action by the highest court.

"Members of the Supreme Court themselves got into action to explain their decision—in itself an unusual act. They were joined by various eminent Protestant clergymen, some as individual voices, others in concert. Many lawyers, civic leaders, publicists, and academicians as well as clergy of the major faiths, were drawn into the picture. By the early spring of 1963, when the Supreme Court heard new cases involving the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in public schools, it was evident that a far-ranging and concerted movement, involving influential elements of key power structures in the country, was in full swing and that its weight was being directed to prepare and condition the American people for a still more definitive and sweeping development.

"The sequel we all know. In June 1963, the highest court again struck and struck hard. This time there was no technicality available about State officials having composed a prayer or usurping the role of a church. But this lack did not stay the reformatory broom of the Justices. They again invoked the no-establishment clause and forbade as prohibited religious exercises saying the Lord's Prayer and reading from the Bible.

"So we come back to the remedy of a constitutional amendment. I was originally reluctant to resort to it, because I am such a believer in the Constitution as we have known it. . . . I am, however, now persuaded that an amendment is the only sure, clear, and definite answer. Without such an antidote, the present confusion and cross purposes among our people will increase. Ahead on this course lie treacherous morasses and beyond them an unfathomable abyss. In addition, I am persuaded that intolerance in our country is on the upgrade and I would like to see this quieted by the application of proper remedies rather than allowed to fester and become more inflamed."

Tree Planting Ceremony: Prince Gallitzin State Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a most impressive expression of a people's desire for world peace was the theme of a ceremony which took place at Prince Gallitzin State Park in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District on April 25. As a living symbol of universal friendship, an eastern hemlock, Pennsylvania's State tree was planted in soil gathered from 34 countries of the world by the Beccaria-Coalport-Irvona Business and Professional Women's Club.

Mrs. Ruth S. Beals, president of the club, who poured the initial shovel of intermingled soils for the tree planting, spoke for all participants when she said:

May our Beccaria-Coalport-Irvona Business and Professional Women's Club tree be a living symbol of genuine friendship, understanding, good will, and peace, whether here or abroad.

Another observation that needs to be recorded here came from Mrs. Thelma Heil, general chairman of arrangements and master of ceremonies, who said as she presented the plaque for the tree:

Of all growing things, aside from food, a tree is man's greatest friend; its memory will ever be the memory of a friend.

Guest speakers at the ceremony were the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé D'Affaires ad Interim of Lithuania, and Maurice K. Goddard, Secretary of Pennsylvania's Department of Forests and Waters. The former described the dedicated and holy life of Dimitri Augustine Gallitzin, prince and priest, and the renowned pioneer, author, and missionary for whom the park was named. Mr. Goddard traced the development of Prince Gallitzin Park and the economic potential which it holds for the entire area surrounding it.

At a part of my remarks, I wish to include the statements made by Mr. Kajeckas and Secretary Goddard.

I invite my colleagues to visit Prince Gallitzin Park. There you will find rest, relaxation, comfort, and the peaceful hope that springs from the newly-planted tree. Bring your families, for the children will enjoy the kind of outdoor enjoyment which comparatively few youngsters in today's busy world have an opportunity to experience. The park is within 200 miles of Washington, though it is a world away from the everyday trials and tribulations to which you are all exposed. You will welcome the change, and our people will welcome you.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AD INTERIM OF LITHUANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF A VISIT TO LORETTO, PA., TO PARTICIPATE IN A TREE PLANTING CEREMONY IN THE PRINCE GALLITZIN STATE PARK HONORING THE MEMORY AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF PRINCE DIMITRI AUGUSTINE GALLITZIN, PRIEST, PIONEER, AND "APOSTLE OF THE ALLEGHANIES," APRIL 25, 1964

I am very grateful to the organizers of a special tribute to Dimitri Augustine Gallitzin for having invited me to participate with them in honoring the memory of a "prince among men." Father Gallitzin was a priest, and a priest is one who offers sacrifice from men to God; yet this priest was a special hero who offered himself—his joys, his sorrows, all his energies, and the works of his life—for the people of western Pennsylvania.

He lived at a time when America was expanding; and with that expansion came the expansion of peoples' dreams and hopes, and their belief in a vision of a world in which men could live in freedom and peace. This was also the vision of his ancestors, and it is his fulfillment of an ancestral history that makes me especially proud to be here to honor him. When one visits his rustic chapel at Loretto, one sees his coat of arms, on which is prominently emblazoned the Vytis, the knight-at-arms who is the proud emblem of the Lithuanian nation. That emblem is on his coat of arms because Gallitzin was a descendant of Narimantas, the son of Gediminas, who was one the greatest rulers the Lithuanian nation ever had and the founder of the capital city of Vilnius. The Lithuanian people have an ancient history, the oldest living language in the world, and an intimate knowledge of persecution and setbacks. Lithuania regained her freedom as an independent state in 1918, and made great progress as a member of the family of free nations until 1940, when the Soviet Union enslaved my country by force, and continues its illegal occupation to the present day. Yet my country's people continue to look to the day when they will be free again.

My country, in other words, is one which knows full well how great things can come from small beginnings, as long as one's faith is strong enough. And this, in a word, is the story of Father Gallitzin, who came to McGuire Settlement in Pennsylvania when it was little more than a clearing in the woods; but he was a man of many "firsts," including the fact that he was the first priest educated and ordained in the United States, by a brother of a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was the first man to bring the Lithuanian national emblem to the United States, and he was the first man to show the people of western Pennsylvania that the way of unselfishness, of genuine brotherly love, and unflagging energy is the way in which last communities are built for the physical and spiritual prosperity of their members.

He did all these things, and the memory of loving dedication to his fellow man is found for many miles around Loretto, the headquarters of his labors. Yet our special tribute to him, the planting of a tree, is one that he would have found commensurate with his great spirit. After all, a tree is something which exemplifies how great things can come from very small beginnings, how one man's work can inspire many tens of thousands, and how the dedication of individual nations to freedom and peaceful progress can inspire the world. He would have understood our emotions, because he was a prince among men, and a priestly apostle who, in the words of another, ancient, apostle taught men to make their freedom not a cloak for malice, but the instrument of spreading freedom and the blessings of freedom to all men. I am therefore most sincerely proud to have been able to contribute a small piece of Gallitzin's ancestral Lithuanian soil to help make our tree of tribute grow long and straight, in emulation of the life of a great man who has enriched us all.

REMARKS BY MAURICE K. GODDARD, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF FORESTS AND WATERS AT TREE PLANTING CEREMONY, WORLD AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF BECCARIA-COALPORT-IRVONA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CLUB, PRINCE GALLITZIN STATE PARK, APRIL 25, 1964

Madame Chairman, Congressman Saylor, Congressman Johnson, Mr. Henriques, of the Portuguese Consulate, Mrs. Best, of the Republic of Liberia, Mr. Kajeckes, of the Lithuanian Legation, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and my many, many friends. Before anything further is said, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for giving me the privilege of appearing before you and adding my words to this ceremony.

I enjoy tremendously the moments when I can return to this park and this area. I try as hard as I can to be impartial in my affections toward any part of the state, but, I must confess, when I return here, it's quite a bit like coming home.

And we're very proud of this place—the trees, the lake, picnic grounds, and everything else that makes it so attractive. But most of all, we're proud of the interest you've taken in Prince Gallitzin State Park. The success of this park—of any park for that matter—lies just as much in the enthusiasm of those living near it and utilizing it to the

fullest as it does with our efforts to create a park.

As you know from newspaper articles and publicity from other media, we have tremendous plans for Prince Gallitzin Park. In the years to come—and we hope they won't be too many and too far away—we want to make Gallitzin a showplace. We already have started in a very minor way to achieve our desired end, but time and money—our old enemies—are still to be dealt with.

But may I be definitive at this time, and direct my remarks to the real reason we're here. We're going to plant a tree. Since my basic occupation has been as a forecaster, no one could applaud your move more than I. Perhaps it will become, as Wordsworth said, part of "A brotherhood of venerable trees." Not to be redundant in my statement, I must, however, say that we venerate the venerable. And no place do we feel more the hushed communion with nature than among trees.

You have selected an eastern hemlock—our State tree—for your ceremony today. Nothing could be more fitting. Long after we are gone this symbol will stand. One of the basic tenets of the founder of this State—William Penn—was that brotherhood should be its cornerstone. Penn knew, long before this Nation's birth, that it would be made up of people from all corners of the earth and all walks of life. Penn knew, too, of conservation, and early admonitions from him to fellow-colonists to conserve the trees which were so abundant then are on record.

Today you have mingled the soils of 33 nations to give this tree root. I dare say it couldn't have any better earth in which to live and grow. And we can hope that it will achieve a dignity denoting the desire for peace and worldwide understanding we all want so much in these days of plain living which involve so many complicated risks.

However, we must turn to the future. Without hope and dreams man would find existence a sorry thing, indeed. It was with such hope and dreams that we conceived project 70. Man is his own worst enemy in many ways, and not the least of these ways is his inability to see into the future regarding open space. He builds marvelous cities, tremendous bridges and highways and forgets how important it is to retain a small part of the land for his own recreation. As an illustration of this, may I point out a classic case. There is a new suburban development near Pittsburgh with a population of nearly 25,000. Nice streets and beautiful homes; but it has less than one-half acre of green space devoted to recreation. Why, if you stood the residents on it like upright sticks, it wouldn't hold one-quarter of all the people.

It's true that right now we have under forests and waters jurisdiction, quite a bit of land. But where is it located? Far from the bulk of our State's population, project 70 is designed to rectify that situation. We want to create recreation areas near the citizens of the Commonwealth. And, I believe, the 113,500-vote plurality project 70 received at the polls last November proves the people want such places.

Our population is spilling over, beyond the corporate limits of our cities. In some cases the cities can't and in other cases they won't do anything about providing open space. Someone has to breach this gap, and it was incumbent upon the State to do so. In no field of endeavor does the Commonwealth measure up to its full potential so much as in project 70. We received full cooperation from two administrations—Governors Lawrence and Scranton—and two separate legislatures. Indeed, Governor Lawrence first introduced it in 1962 and Governor Scranton gave it his full support during the 1963 balloting. May I modestly say that I stumped the entire State for its passage during last year.

All that remains to be done is to get the enabling act passed by the present legislature. And what will we do when it is passed?

First, we will have a total of $70 million with which to work. Forty million dollars will be used by forests and waters and the historical and museum commission to buy recreation space and historical sites for preservation in the State. Recreation site acquisition will be restricted to the critical counties, but we can buy historic sites throughout the State. There will be $20 million for matching grants for political subdivisions under the State to buy recreation and park sites for themselves. We will provide them with up to half of the land cost if they qualify under the regulations to be set up. Finally, the fish and game commissions will split $10 million for their own purposes. There will be no restriction on fish commission acquisition, but the game commission can only buy land in the critical counties.

This entire program will be a large answer to a huge problem. In addition to alleviating the lack of open space in the Commonwealth, it will help Pennsylvania attract the industry it so sorely needs. Today industry keeps its workers happy, and workers stay happy where they find sufficient recreation places. Let's face it: the workweek is growing shorter, and there is more of the paycheck available for leisure spending.

Now to turn to Prince Gallitzin Park, and its present and future. To give you some idea of what Gallitzin means to us, may I point out that as of this date we have spent approximately $4 million to create the park. This included land acquisition, the building of the dam, construction of roads and buildings, and the clearing of land and buildings construction. In addition, we are now committed to a total of $1,609,369 for work now underway, such as the beach marina, day-use area, and administration center.

We also have three general State authority projects approved, but, alas, we don't have the money right now. These are the camping area, water and sanitation, and marina center—slated to cost a total of $814,300.

But, in the vernacular of show business, "This is only the beginning" of our efforts.

We have set aside a 1,500-acre tract in the park for Naturealm. The pensinsula in the lake, as it juts toward the dam, will encompass the entire history of man's dealings with natural resources. Here the citizens of our State and Nation will learn about soil, water, forests, and wildlife. And they will see just what the State is doing to assure that these natural wonders do not become extinct.

I won't go into all the details of the things we want to build here. The news media have done a tremendous job in informing you of this, and they will, I hope, continue.

Let me point out now what we feel it will do for the area. Naturealm itself will provide 438 jobs when it is operating at capacity—completely built. Added to this could be an equal number of jobs in the surrounding commercial areas for a total of 876 people working full time. Assuming an average income of $5,200, this could hike the gross annual payroll here by $4,555,200.

Employment in the areas surrounding the park—in motels, lodges, winter sports areas, and so on—could jump by 1,710 jobs. Services for these employees could create 500 more jobs for a total of 2,210 new positions. Again using the $5,200 figure, we come up with an annual increased payroll of $11,492,000.

In summary, the economic impact from our proposed Naturealm could be as follows: Three thousand and eighty-six year-round jobs; a total of $16,047,000 in annual salaries and a gross annual sales income of over $10 million.

Intangibles such as new home building created by the impetus and the attraction of other, new industries cannot be calculated. It would be of benefit from the educational and the economic standpoints to this area.

Nature, then, is the friend of man. Man has not, as yet, truly opened all the doors nature provides. We hope, though, to make a good start.

Perhaps here, at Prince Gallitzin State Park, we have made a good start, and perhaps opened a door or two.

The Urgent Need for Urban Mass Transit Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman WELTNER, of Georgia, made an excellent speech at the Institute for Rapid Transit meeting here in Washington, and I wish to insert the speech in the RECORD for the benefit of the House.

The speech makes a most compelling case for the need to pass mass transportation legislation this year. H.R. 3881, the administration's urban mass transportation bill, now pending before the Rules Committee, would provide vitally needed aid to help cities cope with their growing problems of traffic congestion. I am hopeful the bill will be scheduled for floor action soon and that we can send this legislation, so urgently needed by urban and suburban communities, to the President for signature.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, TO THE INSTITUTE FOR RAPID TRANSIT, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 14, 1964

The public, of recent years, has become increasingly reliant upon polls. Practically every day we can read a newspaper poll, telling who's slipping, or who's rising, or who's winning, or who's losing. In the Congress, as well, we take polls—called a whip check—to see what chances a bill or resolution might have. Right now, those of us interested in transportation for cities are studying the latest surveys, attempting to gage our strength, speculating on loose votes, and, generally hoping for a favorable outcome to H.R. 3881, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

Now, I'm glad to know that we need not be concerned about a whip check at this meeting today. Each one of you is here because of your interest in, and support of, the mass transit bill. The interests represented are varied. Some of you are engineers, whose profession is vitally connected with the bill. Some of you are manufacturers, whose products will be in great demand as mass systems develop over the Nation. Some are operators of existing transit systems, whose experience and abilities will be essential to sound programs. Some are planners, who see mass transit as an integral part of the cities we are building, and will build during the remainder of this century.

These varied interests have a single goal—passage of mass transportation legislation—this year, by this Congress.

Because of the unanimity of your support, I need not dwell upon the desirability of

this legislation. I am not called upon to persuade you, or entice you, or enjoin you to back this bill.

Nor would it be very profitable for me to render a section-by-section analysis of the legislation. You've seen it analyzed; you've heard it discussed. You're familiar with the grant provision, the loan provision, the labor provision, the recapture provision, and the authorization provision. Thus, it will not be my part to dissect this bill for you.

Nor, do I intend to dwell upon that old feud—between transit interests and highway interests. Roadbuilders want to build roads. They want to sell aggregate, and concrete, and asphalt, and centerline paint, and luminous signs, and curbing. That is well and good. No one will quarrel with the desire of a man to work his trade. They are not subject to criticism on that score, for each of you has comething to sell, "airbrakes, steel, professional services, engineering, and the like."

No, I do not intend to argue for this particular bill, nor to analyze any single piece of legislation, not to enter any feud.

What I hope to do is to lay out some figures, and to review some historical facts. I believe we can establish, right here, that mass transportation is not a convenience, but a necessity; not a desirable urban program, but an absolute urban imperative.

Consider the great cities of the world—Paris, London, New York, Tokyo, Moscow, Boston, Chicago. No one will tell you, "In New York, all we need is a few more lanes of expressways." Hardly. Each of these cities has long had a highly developed system for mass transportation—and those systems are vital to their very existence.

Automobiles, despite their convenience and independence of movement, have created a host of problems. Only last year, for instance, did the Congress pass the Clean Air Act, designed to meet, among other problems, air pollution from automobile exhausts. The great cities of our Nation and of the world could hardly survive with automobile traffic alone. They function as centers of activity—commercial, financial, cultural, governmental—because their systems are capable of moving great numbers of people in and out, back and forth, to and fro. Without that ability, they would rapidly deteriorate.

Let me review quickly the beginnings of some of the world's most famous transit systems * * * the Metro, the Tube, the underground, the subway, the MTA.

The Metro was begun in 1900 when Paris had a population of 2,700,000. The Tube was opened in London in 1863 when that city had a population of 2,363,000. The underground in Moscow, and I am not speaking of the early beginnings of the Communist Party, was constructed in 1934 when the population of Moscow was 3,600,000. Boston opened the MTA in 1897 when its population was 561,000. The Chicago and New York subways were built in 1943 and 1904 respectively, when those cities had populations of 3,390,000 and 3,400,000.

Subways and elevated trains are not new. They began in another era—the railroad age. Then came the automobile, which has proliferated beyond all imagination. Yet the need for these mass systems, predating the automobile, is ever greater—because of the automobile.

Without adequate mass facilities, how would these cities fare? Have you ever been in New York during a subway strike, when commuter trains were shut down? There's the answer.

Yes, this is but one aspect of the lesson that history affords.

The fact to be recognized here is that these cities began their rapid transit systems when they were the same size as a number of American cities will be by 1975, the lead-time required to build new systems:

In 1975, Minneapolis-St. Paul will have—2,100,000 people; Denver—1,500,000; Atlanta—1,470,000; St. Louis—3 million. The nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., will have more than 3,500,000 people in its metropolitan area.

The point of the population figures is this: The early systems were built at the same population stage as these of the emerging cities of the United States today.

What happens when great cities are built without mass systems?

Los Angeles is the child of the automobile age. And what kind of a city is it? More than two-thirds of its central city, if we may speak of a central city in relation to Los Angeles, is devoted to expressways and parking lots. Some might say it is not a city at all, but a highway and parking lot, bordered by a few buildings.

There are 16 lanes of traffic. All are stalled at 6 p.m. There is a story of the Los Angeles helicopter police report: "Traffic is moving at a brisk pace this afternoon on the Hollywood Freeway, approximately 8 miles an hour. On the Santa Ana Freeway, there is a little congestion, due to an accident at the Anaheim exit (some 35 miles away)."

I have a friend in Atlanta who sells advertising specialties. True to his trade, he is given to slogans, of which his favorite is: "No one is entirely worthless. He can always be used as a horrible example."

We can thank Los Angeles for its experiment—and the horrible example it affords. Its experience proves one thing conclusively * * * we cannot build enough expressways to handle traffic in a growing city. There is a type of Parkinson's law working here. "One more lane of expressway will produce twice as many cars as it can handle."

Los Angeles has attempted the single solution approach to urban transportation * * * and it has failed. Now, when more than 66 percent of what was once living room and working room has been given over to the automobile, Los Angeles finds that it must turn to some form of rapid transit. After being scattered all over the southern California countryside, after years of lives spent in automobiles going to and from work, they must build a mass transit system.

I am not passing judgment on Los Angeles, but simply stating a fact—we cannot maintain a growing city whose only mode of transportation is the expressway.

Many critics of mass transportation are blind to these facts.

They will tell you that the concept of mass transportation is outmoded. They will cite reams of figures on declining passenger usage, financially failing public and private transit systems. Yet, these arguments ignore some very simple statistics, some very simple facts. We have tried the freeway solution and it has failed.

In cities of more than 1 million population in the United States, more than 75 percent of the people travel to and from work by some form of mass transit. A transit strike in New York, such as the one in 1957, is a major catastrophe.

Some critics are more charitable. They will accept the argument that the systems we presently have are needed. But they immediately contend that we need no new systems. They say that people will not leave their cars and ride a new system. Yet, history proves them wrong.

Cleveland, a city of 936,000 at the time, built a new subway system which opened in 1955. The passenger load for the first full year of operation was 14.7 million trips. By 1960, the passenger trip figure had risen to 18.3 million—more than double. Automobiles were left at home; the fare box offers irrefutable proof.

Let us now turn to the emerging new cities of America. Atlanta is one of these. They are the regional capitals, with populations between 1 and 2 million. They have grown by serving as the financial, educational, transportation, warehousing, manufacturing, and communications centers for geographic regions of our country. Among them are Atlanta, Dallas-Fort Worth, Denver, Kansas City, St. Louis, Minneapolis-St. Paul.

They are vital cities, growing cities, serving as the center for the countryside and smaller cities around them.

They have all the problems of growing cities—the need for more schools, sewers, parks, the problems of air pollution, water pollution, and urban blight.

But one problem common to all is transportation. All have central cities and central business districts.

None of them have adequate mass transit systems. All are expressway cities—and all—in varying degrees—face serious problems.

Atlanta has been building an expressway system since 1946, when it was a city of 560,000. Today the metropolitan area has more than 1,100,000 people. We're still building, and the traffic situation worsens daily. By 1970, automobile traffic would require 36 expressway lanes north and south, and 22 east and west. Already, more than one-third of our central city is devoted to streets and parking lots.

The absurdity of having only street transportation in Atlanta is obvious just by stating the requirement, 58 expressway lanes by 1970, where we only have built 12 in the last 18 years.

They are growing at an average of 50 percent each decade. Atlanta is growing at the rate of 34,000 people annually. By 1980, it will be a city of 2 million people.

The facts are obvious. Great cities absolutely require multiple transportation systems. But the regional capitals of the United States are moving toward metropolis status with only expressways.

We cannot leave these new regional capitals to the fate of Los Angeles—but that is precisely what we are doing.

If we are to have mass transit systems to meet demands, we must begin now. To postpone mass transit systems is to consign regional cities to the awful and expensive fate of piecing their towns back together in the future.

For, as the Los Angeles experience proves, we will have to build them sooner or later—and the later we begin, the higher the cost.

A very modest beginning toward the development of systems for the regional capitals—and for my home—Atlanta—is embodied in H.R. 3881, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

I say "modest," for this bill provides only $500 million in matching funds for the development of systems.

The projected Atlanta system, alone, would cost approximately $300 million. But H.R. 3881 would allow us to begin. And it would allow other cities like Atlanta to begin to develop alternatives to expressways, traffic jams, parking lots, and carbon monoxide.

History makes no mistakes. Its lesson is plain to any who will read it.

Let us take this lesson back to our cities before it is too late. Let us act before American cities become vast wastelands of concrete and stalled cars.

Let us support this bill, not because it is helpful, or progressive, or forward looking—but because it is an historic imperative.

UROC Hears New Civil Rights Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month approximately 4,500 members of the United Republicans of California met

in Bakersfield for their first annual State convention. One of the highlights of this convention was a speech by Mr. Don Warden, president of the Afro-American Association. Mr. Speaker, I am placing his remarks in the RECORD at this time with the hope in mind that all of my colleagues will find time to read and analyze his new concept of the civil rights program:

WALK IN DIGNITY

(Address by Don Warden, Esq., president, Afro-American Association, Oakland, Calif., before the House of Delegates, United Republicans of California, Bakersfield, Calif., Saturday, May 2, 1964)

It is a great pleasure for me to be here this morning and to talk to this great assembly on a very timely topic—a topic that you have heard a great deal about and a topic which I am going to treat slightly differently.

The approach of the Afro-American Association is an old approach. It is an approach that has been employed by mankind throughout the world in any given nation in any given time. It is a summary of the life and the history of America. Nevertheless, it seems new today because in the area of race relations for the last 100 years, it has not been heard. Many of the concepts will be new and possibly even strange; so, I am inviting your very, very critical attention.

The purpose of my address this morning is not to convince anyone that the Afro-American Association has the only program that will solve the problem of 20 million people in America, but I am maintaining that the Afro-American Association has an analysis—a definition of the problem that, if recognized, will bring meaningful progress to the race and to America.

Our program is based upon the fact that any approach today in America from any group, that does not include the welfare of America, is illegitimate [Applause.]

It makes me very sad to have to describe the condition of 20 million people in America who have been brought to a land reeking with opportunity but who, as a result of a great deal of deceit, have been kept at the bottom: deceit, coming often from their own leader and from a variety of persons who have wanted to use them.

America has attracted to its borders persons from Ireland, France, England, China—from all over the world. After these persons came to America, they made a decision: that you get nothing for nothing, but with hard work and initiative, and sacrifice, we can build ourselves and the country into something worthwhile. [Applause.]

These groups did not come to America with the idea of disappearing. The Chinese began to say that "I am Chinese-American"; the Japanese, because they came from Japan, "Japanese-American," the Irish, "Irish-American."

There is no Negro land. My ancestors came from Africa, and I don't want anyone to forget it. That's the reason we call ourselves Africans or Afro-Americans: to describe our history and our heritage, and after such great contributions by my race in Africa and in America, let me remind you of a few things such as Ibn Batuta traveling throughout the continent of the Ghana kingdom before Columbus discovered America, and meeting 300,000 people living together without any police and without any crime. This was done because that society, in an effort to establish a monument, to establish love and respect that would live forever, built up within their group—within their race—pride, respect, love. And when I look throughout America today at the descendants of these people, I find a fantastic crime rate, so great that the leaders are embarrassed to discuss it.

Throughout the bay area, approximately 67 to 70 percent of the arrests are persons of African descent. If a white person were to make this allegation, he would be immediately accused of being a bigot, and I am immediately accused of being an Uncle Tom. [Laughter and applause.]

But I ask us now temporarily before we become emotionally involved to hold off from placing labels on anyone—let's find out whether it is true or not [applause] and if it is true, let's design a program to solve it [applause]. It is no disgrace or no shame to me to admit the high crime rate, but what is disgraceful and shameful is to not do anything about it, to use excuses and crutches, to use types of sociological analysis which say, "All poor people commit crime, you're poor, therefore you'll commit crime, and until people make you rich, you'll always commit crime. We cannot afford it." [Applause.]

In reviewing Africa before Columbus discovered America, we find the University of Timbuctoo, the University of San Kore. We find economic skills that were in such demand that many Africans from the continent, especially from the west coast, were brought into Latin America to do the early mining. After the African came to America in the West Indies and Latin America, they did not stop trying to build something that would give them pride and dignity. We watched George Washington Carver. We watched Mr. Vannaker design the city of Washington, D.C. We observed Dr. Hale Williams perform the first medical heart operation in America in 1893. We observed Augustus Morgan invent the traffic light, the street light. We observed again Augustus Morgan invent the gas mask that saved so many lives in America. But he did not do these things just for himself. He did it so that his race might live and that his country might advance. [Applause.]

And after these great contributions, today in America educationally over 70 percent of the race is dropping out or flunking out of school, not counting those who will be forced out through different type walkouts. Seventy percent. This is not the spirit that their ancestors established with the University of Timbuctoo. This is not even the spirit of Sonniali, the great emperor, who addressed his people in the 16th century and said, "Without education, we have neither favor nor pleasure—we're absolutely nothing."

We have large numbers of people on welfare and living in public housing. We have a very, very great and vast inferiority complex and, most important, inside of the personality something is missing—a vacancy. There is a vacancy so large and so great, that it is difficult even to describe the type of life that a black man lives. We are one of the most despised groups in the world. Chinese, Japanese, Jews, Irish, Italians—everyone comes to America, but no one wants to live near the Negro. He is despised and he is disrespected. From such a mighty and great tradition, he has become a member of the perennial bog.

The Chinese came to America—they found us at the bottom and they moved up. We're still at the bottom. The Japanese came to America—they found us at the bottom and they moved up. We're still at the bottom. Irish, Italians, Jews, Hungarians, Cubans came to America and found us at the bottom. These groups moved up. We're still at the bottom. The question then becomes, "How did the other groups move up?" This is the question that we present to Lyndon Johnson. This is the question that we present to Rev. Martin Luther King. This is the question that we present to America.

Let's examine the history and find out what is the real genius of America in terms of advancement and in terms of success. The civil rights groups say "we have the answer." Educationally, if we just desegregate the schools, you will solve the educational problem. This is a lie. [Applause.] How do I know this? Again, we promise not to become emotional but to back up and to support everything we say. That's an intellectual responsibility. If desegregating schools were the answer as Lyndon Johnson seems to think, as the present administration seems to think, then we could look to those areas where the schools are desegregated, and we would find educational progress. Even out of the mouths of the civil rights groups comes condemnation. There are greater dropouts in the North than in the South. [Applause.]

The African comes to America. He has gigantic barriers. He came from a village school where the facilities were very, very poor—certainly not equal to anything in Mississippi. He came to America with a language barrier. He had to learn English, and be able to write examinations so that he could pass courses. He came to America with a cultural barrier. The customs were not the same. Nevetheless, in America today, 22 percent of all African students are "A" students. [Applause.] Thirty-three percent are "B" students. That's 58 percent either "A" or "B." Now did they first desegregate the facilities of Africa before they could learn? No. [Applause.] If one were to ask the African "Why do you study so hard? Why do you apply yourself so diligently?" he would say, "My people need me." A sense of responsibility, a sense of purpose, a sense of motivation. [Applause.]

The civil rights groups are sometimes unconsciously reinforcing an inferiority complex. [Applause.] If it is an all-Catholic or an all-Jewish school, they say, "That's all right. That's religion." If it is an all-Japanese school, they say. "That's all right. That's cultural." But if it is an all-black school, they say, "It must be segregation because look at it. It's all black." It reinforces inferiority. It says anything all black is inherently inferior. You can't build pride when you adopt this position. [Applause.]

We want educational progress. Our race is facing a crisis. It's similar to the crisis, mentioned by one of the class speakers, faced during the depression, October 24, 1929. We can't afford a lot of luxury. It's a crisis now. Large numbers of people are flunking out and dropping out.

We have found that by teaching racial pride, the history of the race, it gives the race a sense of purpose. The young man goes to school not asking the counselor, "What should I be when I grow up?" He goes to the community for community support, and he asks the community, "What do you need?" And the community says, "We need doctors, we need lawyers, we need scientists, we need inventors, we need mathematicians." And then he goes to the counselor and wants to know, "Do I have the ability to do what my people want me to do?" This is the pride. This is the sense of motivation, and it kills flunk outs and drop outs. [Applause.]

We must open up a gigantic war on drop outs and flunk outs if we're going to save the race. What the Afro-American Association has done is this: we have gone to school, and marched around the school, and brought all of the parents out on the street and on the sidewalk. A demonstration, but a practical, affirmative one. We brought the people out on the sidewalks, and we had signs telling the kids to meet us at the library. "Honor grades will make you feel good, like black people should." [Laughter and applause.]

Then we tell them "it's what's inside that counts." Then we had them sign pledges that they would use all reasonable effort to obtain honor grades especially in reading, writing, sciences, mathematics and technical skills. Practical. We sang songs so

that they could go to school and come home from school singing words that were meaningful. This is the type of educational program that the Afro-American Association submits. It's practical and it will bring meaningful progress.

The other areas I'm going to summarize more briefly and I apologize for this.

Economics. Because of automation today, if you don't have a skill, you're not going to get a job, white or black, or any other color. [Applause.]

You cannot pass laws to make people want to learn. You cannot pass laws to give motivation. And you cannot pass laws to require people to obtain economic skill. It's again a problem of motivation. [Applause.]

In the bay area and throughout the United States, they have three public schools at night where a person can come and obtain skills and get jobs. The Afro-American Association has an employment office. And for every job we place, we have about 50 that we can't place because of the lack of skill. The openings are there today—without any demonstration—without any picketing. They're open. [Applause.]

I am not suggesting that discrimination does not exist, but I'm suggesting that first things must come first. If you're facing a problem, you put most of your energy where the problem is the greatest. Right now, we need parades organized, demonstrations organized, to march people away from the television—away from Donald Duck, Mickey Mouse, and Porky Pig—into the schools. [Applause.]

Now why should I pay someone to hate me? That reinforces an inferiority complex. It makes me feel stupid. It's the same as the son who is brought up in a family, who is illegitimate. Everyone in the community says, "Well, you're illegitimate. You really don't have any roots here." They say, "Not only are you illegitimate, but your parent, the one that we know about, was a criminal—a dope addict—he's horrible, no good." So the kid wants to run away from home or he wants to go to a new community. He does not have any respect for his family.

Well, this is what has happened to my race. But if we ask Reverend King, "Are you a leader of the race? What race do you belong to?" he says. "I'm not sure because I have Irish blood in me and I have Indian blood in me, and I have Negro blood in me."

And I say, "King, if you're not sure, then don't lead the race. First, find your identity before you lead a group." [Applause.]

"Because we love you, Dr. King, and because we love everyone, we'll give you some suggestions. If you really think you have Irish blood in you, we're going to send you to Ireland, with a shamrock in your hand, and you say, 'I'm coming home, my brother and sister.' [Laughter.] If you think you have Cherokee blood in you, I'll send you to talk with Sitting Bull. You sit in on him and ask him if he will recognize you as a brother."

The issue is that the very race that he belongs to is the race that we have been trying to get away from. We have not had the respect and pride in our own race. Every time a person gets a little money, they want to run away from the race, move away from the race. Someone has to come back into the race to build up the race. You can't do it if everyone moves. [Applause].

In the civil rights (and I'm not per se against civil rights, I'm trying to evaluate it—and that's never been done before—the civil rights groups won't evaluate it) they say that they believe in free speech. We have offered invitations from Lyndon Johnson all the way down to Rev. Martin Luther King. Martin Luther King will debate Black Muslims, he will debate members of the Ku Klux Klan, but the Afro-American Association is the only group he is scared to death to face. [Applause].

And they say they believe in free speech. We don't want to criticize each other, but we feel that the American public has a right to hear both sides, and then let the masses decide. [Applause.]

In Birmingham, Ala., Martin Luther King, the merchants have told me, "I just hate you. Maybe I shouldn't. Maybe I should. But I'm honest. I just hate you. I've told you that."

Reverend King says, "I don't care if you do hate me. I'm going to sit-in, roll-in, crawl-in, beg-in, knee-in, steal-in until you take my money." [Laughter.] Now the merchant is richer, we are poorer, he has our money, and he still hates us. [Laughter.]

It would be more practical to take the millions of dollars spent in Birmingham, Ala., and to put up 100 factories. [Applause.] Then you build the race. Then you have to learn responsibility. You have to learn how to run factories. You have to learn how to make decisions, how to keep books. And these things build the race. Not only that, it means that when the children walk to and from the community, they say, "Mommy, I thank you. Look what you have done for me." It builds up confidence. It's what the Chinese derive when they walk through Chinatown. It gives a feeling of accomplishment and this is the only way you can maintain dignity. [Applause.]

If we put up businesses and factories, which I feel must be done, this isn't a complete solution—but it's a partial solution. It's what the Chinese have done. If you go to Chinatown, you're not going to say, "I'm not going to go back there anymore. Those people are practicing segregation. I don't think that's right." [Laughter.] It's all a Chinese community. No one says it's inferior. The Chinese own one-half of Russian Hill in San Francisco. They could move there tomorrow. But they prefer to take the money to continue to rehabilitate and build up Chinatown, because they love Chinatown. They love to be with each other and they take pride in their accomplishment and achievement.

The same with the Banks of Tokyo throughout the country. It gives the Japanese a sense of achievement. The same with the Jewish hospitals, the Catholic school. What has the civil rights group given the Negro that they can point out and tell their children, "Look what we have done?" [Applause.]

If we put up businesses and factories, then we pay taxes like everyone else. And then we stick out our chest and say, "Race, we've not only helped you, we've helped America." Do you realize, regardless of what Lyndon Johnson says about a declaration on poverty, that we are the only race in America that can balance the budget and reduce national debt. [Applause.]

This is a sense of achievement I want the newspapers to print. The newspapers print only about the demonstrations because they think they sell news. I want new information in the news. [Cheers, applause, standing ovation.]

I want information every year so I know just how far my race has come. I want to know how many more factories we have put up every year. I want to know how many dropouts and flunkouts we have reduced every year. I want to know how much crime we have reduced every year. I want to know how many people we have taken out of public housing every year. So that I can hold these statistics up to my race and say, "Look, we're making progress."

During the depression, when the so-called social reform programs were invoked, we never tested the strength of America on the basis of how many people were on welfare, or in public housing. Rather it was this: How many people who were once on welfare are no longer on welfare? Then we said the country was getting back on its feet. How many people who were once in public housing are no longer in public housing? Then we said the country is getting back on its feet. This is the same test I want the newspapers to employ for the advancement of 20 million people and 160 million people in America. [Cheers, applause.]

This is the reason the civil rights groups don't want to debate us, because everywhere we go, white or black, this is America's program. It's basic. It's simple. There's nothing revolutionary. There's nothing radical. There's nothing extreme. This is what France did after the Second World War. This is what England did after the Second World War. This is what Africa is doing today—a self-help program trying to build accomplishment and achievement that will develop the group and develop the country in terms of prestige and in terms of dignity, endurance, and continuity. This is the only program that can save the race and America. [Applause.]

The last thing I have to say is in the area of crime. We have a program to destroy crime. Most of the crimes that we commit, regardless of what you read in the newspaper, are against each other. Most of the crimes we commit are not crimes of raping white women. They are crimes where we shoot each other up, cut each other up on the weekend. That's true. The civil rights group says we can solve this by breaking up the ghetto. Get a fair housing ordinance, or a Rumford Act. And people use us again.

Governor Brown talks more about the Rumford Act than Rumford does. [Laughter.] And the newspapers print everything he says about the Rumford Act. He can talk to Boy Scouts and it will be in the newspaper that Governor Brown told the Boy Scouts, who are 9 and 8 and 12 years old, that when you grow up, fight for the Rumford Act. [Laughter.]

Now this may help Governor Brown in the election, but it'll leave the masses of the people at the bottom, and let me prove this to you. We don't have to ask ourselves what would occur if the Rumford Act passes. It's already passed. We don't have to ask ourselves what would occur if we could get a FEPC law. We already have one. We don't have to ask ourselves what would occur if there were the right to vote. We already have the right to vote in California. We don't have to ask ourselves what would occur if facilities were desegregated. They're already desegrated in California. And what has happened? The masses of my people are at the bottom.

Civil rights leaders come to California and say that California is as bad as Birmingham, Ala. Now, if it is as bad, why should I spend millions and millions and millions of dollars to get the same laws in Birmingham? [Laughter, applause.]

We can reduce crime because we're going to build up racial love and respect in a race. We're going to give our women more respect than they've ever had. We apologize to our women for the way we've acted in the past. We're telling people that we're going to get off welfare and get jobs. If the blind people thought enough of themselves to come away from the corners with their cups begging and to put up factories and businesses because they knew that it would reinforce their pride and their self-image, I think it's good enough for us to try it for a little while. [Applause.]

The civil rights groups have not put up one business or one factory in their entire history. Not one. Not even as a token, or a symbol of what could be done. We need images to give the race confidence in itself. As we teach racial pride in history, people don't commit crimes against themselves or anyone else.

The Chinese came to America poor but you never found any crime rate. The Japanese came to America poor but you never found a crime rate because of the degree of love and unity. This is what we are attempt-

ing to do. We have to call on our musicians—Ike and Tina Turner, Aretha Franklin, Ray Charles. Some of you don't know him, but your children do. And we're going to ask Ray Charles, "I don't want your money. I don't want you just to raise a benefit for me or the association. That's not the point. I want you to be an artist. Do the type of thing that an artist is supposed to do. I want you to sing a song with all your rhythms, saying 'No flunk-outs and no drop-outs.' Saying 'progress' so that when the kids and the families hear it all day long, no crime."

"Take a song like 'Say it isn't so,' Aretha, sing it differently. Say 'Drop-outs, it isn't so—flunk-outs, it isn't so.' "

This program, we contend, is going to sweep the country in the 1964 election. It's going to be the determining factor because we want a new plank on the political sphere. We're going to make every candidate face up to it. He's going to have to tell my people why he doesn't come out for businesses and factories and racial pride and development. We don't want to move away from every community and be pushed around like little electrons. We want to build a community. If it's a slum now—if we built it into a flourishing community—we give jobs to contractors, real estate agents, insurance people, but we give the race a legacy that they can be proud of for many, many years.

We think our program should also be adopted in many respects by the overall country. We feel that many of the ideas that we have can be equally applied to the overall country to bring educational, social, economic progress both to the race and to America.

The last—the very last thing—I have to say is that we of the Afro-American Association are going to make every political party take note. The Democrats are not going to get the vote just because they're Democrats. Republicans are not going to get the vote just because they're Republicans. They're going to have to, for the first time in 100 years, face the real issue about America—the whole country—180 million people in every strata and the race in every strata, and we're going to look to you to make sure that this is done.

Thank you very much. [Standing ovation.]

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 16, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT, MAY 16, 1964

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

HOW DO WE EXPLAIN TO THOSE LEFT BEHIND?

How can we answer the mothers, wives and children of those who are dying in South Vietnam when they ask, Why? The shocking facts which are only now being brought to light are finally arousing the American people to what a lack of firm and decisive policy by the administration is costing. I have received a letter from a mother in Dallas, pleading for help so that her son will have at least a fighting chance to survive. What can I tell her when we learn that our boys have been sent to fight a war that is not a war, under a plan that is not designed to win, and in outworn and inferior equipment?

The mess in South Vietnam was described this week by Jim Lucas, Scripps Howard reporter who is covering the story first hand. Following the Lucas story of how Capt. Jerry Shank and Capt. Robert Brumett were killed in old and decrepit planes, Congressman STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, of New York, told the House, "This is murder, Mr. McNamara." Congressman DEROUNIAN said:

"According to Jim Lucas, the Communist Vietcong did not kill either Jerry Shank or Bob Brumett, but our own obsolete American planes did and this is what he said:

"On April 9, Capt. Robert Brumett, 36, put his craft into a dive and it didn't come out. His buddies, flying nearby saw the wings fall off and watched in horror as the plane plowed into the paddies.'

"And again: 'On March 24, Jerry Shank put his ship into a dive between Soc Trang and Back Lieu and its wing separated from the fuselage.'

"Secretary McNamara is making another one of his trips to Vietnam, which will be followed by more press conferences, but he will not report the facts about the outmoded planes he sends our men over there. So far he has done nothing to improve the deplorable situation in Vietnam. I call upon him and upon our President to give our fighting men a fighting chance."

Congressman DEROUNIAN was joined by me, ED FOREMAN, and others who urged Congress to demand of the President an answer to why we sent American men into war with inadequate equipment. We believe we should either fight the war to win or get out.

BARRY GOLDWATER, in his New York City address and again on his nationwide television report, reminded the American people of the Republican position that peace can be secured through strength. There would be no American boys dying in Vietnam if we had a clear, unmistakable foreign policy such as set forth in the Republican Declaration of Principles of 1962:

"In foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism, through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence."

MORE TRUTH THAN HUMOR

Don MacLean, a Washington columnist: "Maybe I can sort out the South Vietnam situation for you. It's simple; we've gone from Ngo Dinh Nhu to 'No Khan Du'."

PRAYER AMENDMENT CONFUSION

The first amendment to the Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Supreme Court, in its hotly contested decision, nullified the second part of that amendment by, in effect, prohibiting the free exercise of religion. It is to clarify the intent of the first amendment that Congressman BECKER of New York, joined by me and other Members who believe that our national life is founded upon a firm belief in God, introduced what has become known as the Becker amendment.

The Becker amendment simply proposes:

"An amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place, and making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States."

The proposal does not "establish a religion." I would be the first to oppose the forced reading of a prayer or Biblical passages dictated by an governmental body—Federal, State, local, or school board. The Becker amendment is not in conflict with the first part of the first amendment. It corrects the situation created by the Supreme Court and reestablishes the second part, "the free exercise" of religion. It changes nothing from the practice and custom which has been a part of our national life since the beginning of this Nation. Our religious practices and customs are being challenged by athiests and the Becker amendment merely reemphasizes the right of the majority of our people to exercise, as they have always done, their belief in God.

Report From Rome: Sale of Wheat to Russians Harms U.S. Image Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the State Department negotiators, led by Ambassador Harriman, had discussions which will lead to subsidy of the Communist Government of Rumania. Therefore, I believe it is especially timely that I place in the RECORD an article by the distinguished chief of the Chicago Tribune Washington Bureau, Walter Trohan, writing directly from Europe. The article from this morning's Tribune relates the story of the subsidized sale of wheat to Russia and the ill effect it had on the U.S. image abroad.

REPORT FROM ROME: SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIANS HARMS U.S. IMAGE ABROAD

(By Walter Trohan)

ROME, May 17.—America's sale of wheat to Russia has done more harm to the U.S. image in the non-Communist world than any action in recent years in a foreign policy which European leaders and the European man-in-the-street generally agree is totally unrealistic.

During the week Secretary of State Dean Rusk warned America's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of new world dangers arising from the Cuban crisis and called at NATO's conference at The Hague for the complete isolation of Fidel Castro economically, politically, socially, and even spiritually. He cautioned this must be done to prevent Cuba from subverting other Latin American countries.

The plea met with smiles, first because the United States is feeding its Communist foe and supplying aid to such Communist nations as Poland and Yugoslavia, and second because NATO is viewed as a dying organization. NATO was never more than a paper organization over the years, with European powers generally finding one excuse or another for not living up to their commitments.

DE GAULLE IS PLAYING HARD TO GET

Currently, President Charles de Gaulle of France seems to be determined to let it die on the vine on which it has never borne fruit. Rusk has challenged France to come forward with any changes De Gaulle wants in the structure of the alliance, but De Gaulle is playing hard to get, obviously indicating his opinion that Western Europe can best handle the problem of Communist aggression itself and with the possible help of cash and equipment from the United States.

It is possible that De Gaulle may go so far as to accept the hand as the mailed fist of America but he wants the voice to be that of Western Europe, very likely speaking with

a French accent. De Gaulle can never forget Yalta, where much of the fate of Europe was determined without the voice of those concerned, especially France, and he is determined that it shall not happen again if he and France can prevent it.

Only slightly less damaging to American prestige in Europe than the wheat sales to Russia is American policy in Vietnam. The wheat sales were seen as the rankest sort of opportunism, when principle was sacrified for the dollar. American policy in Vietnam is more of a mystery to Europeans, because they can see in it not pattern, selfish or lofty.

Most observers abroad are convinced that the Americans put the Diems in power and then let them down to set up a government less friendly in aims and purpose then the Diems. The only lesson that Europeans can draw from this area is that the friendship of the United States cannot be trusted fully, because policymakers appear to toss in restless ecstacy.

AGREE AID PROGRAM DEFEATS POLICY

In one thing Europeans generally agree with Americans and that is that the American foreign aid program, as it is being carried out, is defeating American purpose and policy, if any. Almost anyone a visitor talks to—Hungarian, German, Italian, Greek, Briton, or Frenchman—will eventually turn to consideration of American foreign aid in any discussion of international politics.

Each has his own idea as to what should be done. Europeans are not as strong for cutting off foreign aid, as many Americans are, but they favor a complete overhaul of the program under which not a penny of aid would go to enemies of the United States, whether Communists, neutralists, or opportunists.

Europeans cannot understand why the United States rushes in to buy friendship where it is snubbed or disliked—sometimes apparently for the sole reason of stepping up aid. In this they share the bewilderment of many Americans over the fact that the doling out of more than $120 billion since the end of the war has not only failed to buy friendship but also respect.

Senior Citizens Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this is Senior Citizens Month and I know of no more active senior citizen than one of my constituents, Joseph F. Carr, of Yonkers, N.Y. Mr. Carr is a remarkable man who, on his 80th birthday, decided to celebrate by making a world's record as a parachutist—and on his first jump.

His accomplishment is even more remarkable due to a few handicaps, among which were a permanent spine and hip injury as well as defective equipment when in midair he found his earphones would not work so he could not receive vital guidance from ground observers. This did not bother Mr. Carr—who enjoyed it immensely and recalled that he "had the most peculiar sense of the infinite—sublimity and calmness. I felt closer to God than I had in a long time."

Mr. Carr does not confine his activities to parachuting, even though he holds the international record as the oldest man to take a parachute jump and plans his second leap soon. He is active and outspoken on such national problems as water fluoridation, and bringing up teenagers and is a frequent contributor to the Yonkers Herald Statesman describing his travels to Hawaii, Thailand, India, Africa, and France, beside maintaining accountant offices in the firm of Bright & Carr.

Mr. Carr described his jump to me in a letter which I recommend to physically fit minded Presidents, harried Congressmen, paunchy civil servants, discouraged octogenarians, and lively teenagers. I think they will all agree that this country can be quite proud of senior citizens like Mr. Carr.

The letter follows:

Congressman ROBERT R. BARRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARRY: The thought occurred to me, that in view of President Johnson's interest in physical fitness, both he and you would like to know about the following.

A citizen of Yonkers, New York—in spite of permanent spine and hip injuries, managed to make a World's record as a parachutist at the age of 80.

Having seen most of this glorious earth in person, and from mountains and airplanes, I have had the urge to see it from a parachute. About a month after I reached age 80, I placed my back belt on, reinforced by cotton over tender spots, and then wound 4 inch strips (torn from a sheet) tightly around my body, between my legs, and over my shoulders, all fastened with large safety pins. I was driven up to a parachute school by auto; one of my companions was the charming and beautiful daughter of the President of the Japanese delegation to the U.N. Incidentally, we had our pictures snapped, before and after my jump.

Naturally in my trussed up condition, in order to eliminate the possibility of further injuries, my motions were stiffened. I suppose my instructor thought it was just old age. They may also have thought that I would not have the nerve to make the jump, or that I would be killed anyway, so I was given a secondhand helmet without radio reception and no goggles. I had three handicaps—age, no radio reception, and no goggles. However, I made the jump and was surprised to learn that I had broken an international record as the only man to not only make a first parachute jump at the age of 80, but also the only man to make such a jump at my age. A reporter told me that an athlete named Bernarr MacFadden made his first jump at 72, so I have 8 years on him.

Russia may dispute my claim as she has all others. I may concede the point to Russia if Russia will return the 20 percent it charged me at Leningrad, for converting rubles into U.S. currency.

As you may assume, I have had a lot of publicity in newspapers and on TV.

I give the above to you, for what it may be worth to President Johnson and to you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH F. CARR.

[From the New York (N.Y.) News]

GERONIMO! 80, HE TAKES UP 'CHUTING

(By John Randazzo)

For the man who's got everything (and lots of nerve), Joseph F. Carr, 80, of Yonkers, recommends parachute jumping. So, why doesn't Carr go take a jump for himself? He did, the first man on record of his age to do so. Social security, please take notice.

Now the octogenarian plans a second leap, and there are no strings attached to this either. Details of the first feat are recorded in the books of the Stormville, N.Y., Sports Parachute Center, Dutchess County.

Carr took a ride in a plane June 12 (his 80th birthday) and after 2 hours of "simple instructions" bailed out at 4,000 feet. He landed, rose to his feet, dusted off his uniform and walked off. Just like that, and no big deal.

WALKED TO CLUB

Then he unhooked the 45-pound auxiliary cute from his chest, rolled up the 65-pound silks that had landed him safely on earth and took them to the club. Members promptly made him an honorary member.

But, that's all history. Now Carr is waiting for a nice "warmish day" for a second leap. In the meantime, he spends part of his social security payments and what he earns as an accountant for flying lessons at the Westchester County Airport, Harrison.

"Learning to fly is kid stuff compared to hitting the silks," Carr, a 5-foot-10, 165-pound, gray-haired gent will tell you. This, after taking his first flight lesson a few days ago.

But, then everything seems to be kid stuff to Carr, who has sought adventure since he was a boy in Connecticut and worked near the New Haven Freight Yards for the Barnum and Bailey Circus when it came to town.

And there was the time in 1893 when he talked the owner of a balloon into giving him a ride in payment for some odd jobs he did for him.

HAS LED SAFARIS

Carr has also been a world traveler. Over the last 20 years, he has taken safaris to India, Thailand, Tangyanika and Kenya during his vacation. And, during his earlier days he worked as a publicity man.

"But, I'm not doing this for publicity, although I realize it makes good copy," he said yesterday at his home, 101 Highland Avenue. "Outer space is beautiful and serene, when you're floating down on a few strings and a big umbrella."

Carr has four children, Raymond, 39, of Florida; Mrs. Henry Schwartz, of Clinton Corners, N.Y.; Mrs. George Blanchard, of Massachusetts; and Virginia, with whom he works as an accountant in a Yonkers firm.

"So, you see, I've got everything. A nice family, nice friends, enough money, and the time," he said. "Now, I'm going all out to be a parachute jumper, something everyone on social security should do to keep from getting bored."

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, periodically, during each session of Congress, I report to the people of my district on the progress of legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives, and on the way in which I have discharged my duties as their Representative in Congress. This is my report on the current status of the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

THE YEAR OF CHANGE: 1964

The year 1964—and the second session of the 88th Congress—opened under the dark cloud of tragedy which scarcely a month earlier had befallen our Nation.

The brutal murder of President Kennedy, that monstrous deed, had shaken the entire civilized world to its roots. In a flash, the assassin's bullet tore away from us the life which had such great promise, the hand which rested so steadily at the helm of our Nation, the heart filled with hopes of peace and seasoned with the trial of power and responsibility. Each one of us I know recoils with pain at the very remembrance of that tragic day.

It is a great tribute to the enduring qualities of our Nation, and the resiliency of our form of government, that the transition of power was accomplished so smoothly and effectively. President Johnson, a man of vast experience in government, pledged himself to carry out President Kennedy's program. The Congress, deadlocked for months on various appropriations bills, responded vigorously. Continuity of our Government's policies was thereby assured. National and world affairs moved on.

MY WORK AT THE UNITED NATIONS

I returned in January from New York, where I was serving as U.S. Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly under President Kennedy's appointment. The work at the United Nations was demanding, the pace frequently burdensome. I was delighted to learn, therefore, when I returned to Washington, that my efforts contributed something to the implementation of our Nation's foreign policy, to our quest for peace and security in the world. Because I think that you will be interested in them, I would like to share with you the letters which I received from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. delegate to the United Nations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1964.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: May I express my deep appreciation for your contribution to the work of the U.S. delegation during the 18th session of the United Nations General Assembly. It was reassuring that our delegation could at all times turn to you for a forthright and authoritative presentation of the congressional point of view. You gave unstintingly of your time and energy, and I congratulate you on the effective manner in which you helped the delegation advance the interests of the United States. I hope that you also found your experience a rewarding one.

We appreciated your constructive participation in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, especially on the complex subject of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Your work was also most valuable in connection with the expanded program of technical assistance and special fund pledging conference, the effects of atomic radiation, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees pledging session.

With best regards.
Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

The part of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's letter which dealt with my work at the United Nations reads:

I hope you won't become a stranger to the mission now that you have returned to your familiar haunts along the Potomac. You made a real contribution during your autumn tenure with us and, selfishly, we anticipate tapping you for advice and counsel in the future.

I am very proud of these letters. For it is a singular honor to represent our Nation in the United Nations and I will always remember my appointment as a milestone in my career of public serivce.

RETURNED TO WASHINGTON TO VOTE ON ALL MAJOR BILLS

In spite of the fact that the pace at the Unitel Nations was vigorous and the workday long, I returned to Washington on every possible occasion to vote on bills important to our district and the Nation, even though I was excused from this responsibility. I daily kept in touch with my office, and discharged and directed the responsibilities of my office and the problems of my constituents. Some of the bills for which I returned to the House of Representatives and cast my vote in favor of were the following, which are now law:

H.R. 8363, Revenue Act of 1963;

H. Res. 541, Civil Rights Commission extension;

H.R. 7179, Defense Department appropriations, conference report;

H.R. 6143, Higher Education Facilities Act, conference report;

H.R. 8969, public debt limit increase; and

H.R. 9499, foreign aid appropriations.

There were some bills, which are now laws, for which I was paired. I could not return to Washington for these, because I was giving the speech for the United States on that day. These speeches were the following:

October 15: Statement on behalf of the United States pledging assistance to the expanded program of technical assistance and to the Special Fund of the United Nations;

October 18: Statement on behalf of the United States in the Legal (Sixth) Committee on the question of Extended Participation in General Multilateral Treaties concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations. My constituents should know that I was the only nonlawyer appointed to the Sixth Committee, which is the International Law Committee of the United Nations.

October 31: Statement on behalf of the United States in the Special Political Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation;

November 19: Statement on behalf of the United States in the Legal Committee on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. This is a most historic document and one which will be used for years to come. It was a 2-hour speech.

December 3: Statement on behalf of the United States in the Sixth Committee on Consideration of Principles of International Law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

December 7: Statement on behalf of the United States, again in the Legal Committee, on technical assistance to promote the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law.

December 9: Statement on behalf of the United States on contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

Anyone who is interested may obtain copies of these speeches by writing to the Department of State, which has published them in the State Department Bulletin.

PROGRESS OF THE 2D SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

The major bills considered and acted upon to date include:

The $11½ billion tax cut, approved by both Houses of Congress and signed into law by the President.

The $115 million Peace Corps authorization. This bill was handled by my committee and I received the following letter from the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Sargent Shriver:

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1964.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: Many thanks for all your support. I especially appreciate your excellent presentation during debate on the Peace Corps authorization Wednesday afternoon.

I'm grateful.
Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

National Security Agency Act amendments, to assist the Secretary of Defense in discharging his duties by strengthening the security provisions of the original law.

The $16.9 billion authorization for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, ships, and for research, development, tests, and evaluation in fiscal 1965.

The $71.8 million authorization for strengthening the U.S. Coast Guard.

Increased U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank.

Increased U.S. contributions to operations of the South Pacific Commission, whose jurisdiction includes American Samoa, Guam, and trust territories.

Broadened the Small Business Administration's disaster loan authority.

Extended the Federal Airport Act for 3 years.

Renamed the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Authorized the General Services Administration to provide funds and facilities for the orderly transition of Executive power between election and inauguration of a new President.

Established a commission to recommend procedures for settlement of the political status of Puerto Rico.

Suspended the equal time requirement of the Federal Communications Act to nominees for President and Vice President in 1964.

Extended Federal Assistance to urban areas under the Library Services Act.

Replenished the President's disaster relief fund.

Extended assistance to veterans in the form of educational assistance to children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability and allowed conversion or exchange of na-

tional life insurance policies to new plans.

Continued present cotton price-support and subsidy for exporters.

Authorized a new wheat marketing certificate program.

Approved the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964.

Some of the most important bills have been passed by the House of Representatives and are awaiting action in the Senate. These House-passed bills are:

The Civil Rights Act of 1963.

The $46.7 billion defense appropriation bill.

A $15.6 million authorization for civil defense fallout shelters.

A $5.2 billion authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

A $1.59 billion authorization for construction projects at Armed Forces bases.

Davis-Bacon Act amendments.

Revised the rules and limited the use of Government funds allowed Members of Congress for travel abroad.

Authorized a 5-year, $500,000 program of grants for collection, reproduction and publication of original documents significant to U.S. history.

Approved appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and a portion of the funds will be used to implement the many education bills approved by the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

Authorized a 5-year, $5-million-a-year program of aid to the States for nursing home facilities in State veterans' homes.

Extended disability income provisions of national service life insurance policies.

Broadened and made permanent the food stamp program.

Extended the Renegotiation Act for 2 years.

Though Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, can be proud of its record of accomplishment thus far in this session, many major bills are still awaiting action. These include:

The President's war on poverty program, on which hearings are currently being held in the House Committee on Education and Labor; Federal pay raise legislation, on which a new bill has been reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; medical care for the aged; National Service Corps; area redevelopment; youth employment; foreign aid, and housing.

I will report to you on the status of these bills in my annual report at the close of this session of Congress.

Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last week, two Republican Members of this body made a tour to Alabama to investigate conditions on property owned by Mrs. Lyndon Johnson. Reports indicate that the tour was conceived by some political expert on the Republican congressional campaign committee. This type of activity is a discredit to party responsibility and indicates the desperate search for issues against the success of the Democratic administration headed by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Following are two articles which appeared in the Cleveland newspapers over the past weekend, one from the Cleveland Press editorial page dated Saturday, May 16, 1964, and entitled "Cheap Politics," and the second from the editorial page of the Cleveland Plain Dealer dated May 16, 1964, and entitled "Firing at Sparrows."

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, May 16, 1964]

FIRING AT SPARROWS

The attempt by two Republican Congressmen to downgrade the Johnson antipoverty program by inspecting homes of tenants on land owned by Lady Bird Johnson is firing on sparrows when plenty of big game is afoot.

All the evidence indicates that Mrs. Johnson has been something of a benefactor as well as a landlord and is not responsible for the financial condition of four families who asked to be allowed to stay in homes on cotton land after the land had been converted to timber. The families are not employed by Mrs. Johnson.

It is just as wrong to say that the President's wife is responsible for the physical poverty of persons to whom she is giving token rent as it would be to say that the Republican Party is responsible for the intellectual poverty of some of its members.

Let them put aside nit picking, and zero in on the big targets like Bobby Baker or some of the troubles the United States is in around the world.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, May 16, 1964]

CHEAP POLITICS

The report of two Republican Congressmen who turned amateur sleuth to investigate conditions on Alabama property owned by Mrs. Lyndon Johnson hardly can be a source of pride to anyone, including the investigators.

Their low-level gumshoeing, financed by the House Republican congressional committee, was patently political. In that light, their pious charge that President Johnson's war on poverty is "nothing more than an election year gimmick" rings with all the authenticity of a wooden nickel.

Apparently on second thought, they say they probably won't release the clandestinely recorded tapes. To take them without the knowledge of the simple, decent people with whom they talked was a callous invasion of privacy.

The houses they photographed unfortunately are typical of thousands to be seen in share-crop territory, none of which reflects great credit on a prosperous country. But obviously it was news to these tenants that they are living in "deplorable povery * * * shocking squalor."

A 68-year-old occupant of one of the places offered the opinion her home was "as good as most and better than a lot." She has lived there half a century and "these have been wonderful years. I want to stay here 'til the Good Lord takes me away."

Similarly open to question is the charge that conditions in these tenant homes show "little evidence of concern by their millionaire landlords." The White House explains that tract is intended for timber land but Mrs. Johnson didn't want to evict longtime residents from the only homes they knew, so they stay on—for $5 a month. The tenants obviously don't feel exploited, but grateful rather. "I love Mrs. Johnson," one of them said.

Material poverty, poverty in education, poverty of opportunity are genuine national problems requiring constructive attention. This sleuthing with camera and tape recorder through darkest Alabama hardly can be rated as constructive.

Urban Renewal Is Vital to Upper Midwest, Report Shows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a December 1963 report entitled "Urban Renewal: New Opportunities in the Upper Midwest," prepared by Mr. John R. Borchert, Urban Research Director, Upper Midwest Economic Study and professor of geography, University of Minnesota; Mr. Earl Stewart, associate professor of engineering and architecture, North Dakota State University; and Mr. Sherman S. Hasbrouck, director of city planning, New Haven, Conn.—formerly staff member of the UMES urban research program. This report focuses upon urban renewal activities and potentials for the upper Midwest urban communities outside the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. It examines in detail the urban renewal program in Fargo, N. Dak., and surveys the renewal needs and opportunity in 14 smaller cities.

This report contains a wealth of information, and I think that most of the Members will be interested in the summary and conclusion of the report which follow:

As upper Midwest leaders work to increase nationwide awareness of their region, it is important that they be able to point to an array of cities typified by excellent physical condition plus the community understanding, leadership, and organization necessary to maintain that condition. Community physical condition depends upon renewal—maintenance of usable buildings and replacement of those which are deteriorated or obsolete. Urban areas throughout the United States appear to have entered an era of accelerated renewal. The level of maintenance and rates of replacement and demolition have increased sharply in recent years. A community which ignores its renewal needs today will fall behind its neighbors in appearance faster than at any time in the past. Such a decline may hurt the economic health of both the local community and the region.

The present condition and rate of replacement in much of the upper Midwest compares favorably with national norms. However, there are notable exceptions. Blight is mainly in two types of locations:

1. The older central districts in places of over 2,500 population.

2. The small farm trade communities.

Improvement efforts immediately raise two important questions:

1. How is a renewal program organized and pursued?

2. Who is responsible—local, State, Federal authorities; public or private groups?

The conception, organization, and pursuit of a renewal program demands community leadership and professional and technical talent. It also must pass numerous hurdles—legal and fiscal problems, difficulties in scheduling, fear, opposition, apathy. The Fargo case shows how these problems were met and resolved locally in one upper Midwest community where renewal has been systematically undertaken.

The major responsibility for renewal in Fargo was local. A detailed case history reveals that although the project was federally aided, 88 percent of the money and virtually all of the initiative and effort were locally supplied. Fifty-three percent of the money came from private sources.

A survey of the physical condition of 14 smaller communities indicated that the least blighted are not necessarily those with the highest income or the fastest growth. Much appears to depend upon local resources and effort in these communities, also.

Many smaller communities cannot muster the leadership or the technical staff which Fargo found necessary. They may find the key to successful action in new regional associations of municipalities or in new or expanded services from institutions and organizations already established—extension services of land grant colleges and universities, municipal leagues, associations of counties, and State planning departments.

In some cases, a community may face problems not of its own making whose solutions extend beyond the limits of local resources. The solution to these problems may be of importance to the region and to the Nation and merit State or national assistance.

The United States has entered a period of accelerated urban renewal. This means a higher level of maintenance and a higher rate of replacement and demolition of obsolete and deteriorated structures.

To keep abreast of this increased pace, the upper Midwest must:

1. Continue its relatively high postwar rate of replacement construction.
2. Accelerate the demolition of vacant and obsolete structures.
3. Improve maintenance of aging structures still in use.
4. Better inform the people who occupy substandard homes through a combination of modern housing and building codes, enforcement, and education.

The effort will have to focus on the old and partly evacuated central areas of cities larger than 2,500 to 5,000, and the small agricultural trade centers.

The responsibility for this task can seldom be placed upon one sector of the economy or one level of government. Renewal and responsibility for carrying it out have been complicated by the great mobility of American capital and people. Renewal takes time, and while it moves forward the population and land-use patterns of the Nation continue to shift. As a result, a given renewal problem may be of a local community's own making and capable of independent local solution. Or it may be the result of population and business shifts entirely beyond the community's ability to influence or cope with alone.

Regardless of how renewal is financed—publicly or privately, locally or with outside help—it is still largely a local affair. Successful and continuing renewal demands local initiative, leadership, cooperation, and fiscal support. For example, in the Federal-aided renewal project completed in Fargo, N. Dak., the local community furnished 88 percent of the capital ultimately invested in the project area and virtually all of the initiative and leadership. Many small communities will need outside stimulation and assistance.

It is vitally important that the upper Midwest hold or improve its position in the national renewal picture. When regional leaders promote national awareness of this region, it is important that they be able to point to an array of communities in excellent physical condition with the community organization, understanding, and leadership to keep them that way.

It's Norway's Constitutional Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Norway observed the 150th anniversary of their Constitution. Thousands of Americans of Norwegian descent also celebrated the occasion.

Yesterday's Tacoma News Tribune published an excellent editorial describing the events leading up to the historic events. I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

IT'S NORWAY'S CONSTITUTIONAL SESQUICENTENNIAL

The people of Norway today are observing the 150th anniversary of their Constitution. Signed by the Constituent Assembly at Eidsvoll on May 17, 1814, it is one of the oldest in the world. The sesquicentennial is being commemorated throughout Norway, and Tacomans of Norwegian extraction are having an elaborate program at 2:30 this afternoon at Normanna Hall.

Although Norway's Constitution was signed in 1814, the nation's history goes back to 872 when it was united and founded by King Harald Haarfagre (Harold the Fair Haired).

These roving, seagoing Norsemen in their longboats had, by the middle of the 11th century, conquered Iceland, Greenland, the Faroes, Orkneys, Hebrides, and Shetlands. Iceland had been discovered in 983 by Norwegian Eirik Raude. His son, Leif Erikson, who lived in Greenland, discovered America about 1000.

The Norwegian Constitution of 1814, which laid the groundwork for the country's steady and peaceful progress toward democracy, was born in a period of fierce struggle for the spoils of the Napoleonic empire. For nearly 400 years Norway and Denmark had been united under one sovereign.

During this period, however, Norway was dominated by Denmark. The autocratic king, residing in Copenhagen, ruled Norway with Danish officials. Nevertheless, the hope of achieving ultimate independence was kept alive.

In the 19th century Norway became Denmark's reluctant partner on the French side in the Napoleonic Wars, with Sweden fighting on the opposite side. As hostilities came to an end, the Dano-Norwegian king, Frederik VI, was forced to sign the Treaty of Kiel on January 14, 1814, thereby ceding Norway to Sweden.

News of the Kiel Treaty aroused a storm of indignation among patriotic Norwegians. They resented having their country handed from one monarch to another as if it were a private estate. As a result, young Prince Christian Frederik, after discarding the thought to proclaim himself king of Norway, summoned a constituent assembly.

It was comprised of 59 government officials, 37 wealthy farmers, and 16 businessmen and was convened in Eidsvoll, near Oslo, on April 10, 1814. The constitution was approved and signed on May 17, which has been observed ever since.

When the assembly unanimously elected Prince Frederik to be king of Norway, Sweden reacted by launching a military attack. After brief hostilities a truce was negotiated. Under the Convention of Moss, Norway and Sweden became united as separate kingdoms under one monarch. At the same time, King Carl Johan of Sweden agreed to recognize Norway's free constitution. The union lasted until 1905, when it was peacefully dissolved on initiative of Norway's parliament.

The Norwegian Constitution rests on four basic principles: National independence, sovereignty of the people, a division of power, and the inviolable rights of the individual versus the state.

As with the U.S. Constitution, the Norwegian Constitution has been modified from time to time. Among some changes made through the years are these: Parliamentarianism was introduced in 1884, universal suffrage for men in 1898, and universal suffrage for women in 1913.

As Foreign Minister Halvard Lange put it in a Constitution Day address, "Democratic government and a state base on law—that is our heritage."

It is a fine heritage, and a fine background for all in Tacoma of Norwegian extraction who today are proudly observing the major holiday—the Independence Day—of our proud, free friend, Norway.

Renewal of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of May 12, there was a most interesting and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Renewal of Hope," relating to the urban renewal legislation (S. 628) recently ordered reported by the House District Committee. This editorial wholeheartedly supports and indeed compliments the 11 members of the committee who have protested against the so-called safeguards which have been grafted onto an otherwise acceptable piece of legislation. The objections of the six Democratic Members and five Republican Members are contained in a minority report on S. 628 which was filed recently.

In view of the fact that the House may soon be considering this legislation, I strongly urge all Members to read this editorial and further I urge that they weigh carefully the incisive analysis set forth in the minority report. This bipartisan group has concluded that instead of facilitating downtown renewal and development, this legislation as ordered reported will virtually destroy the whole urban renewal program in the District of Columbia, and would impose restrictions on the District of Columbia which are not imposed on any other city in the Nation, regardless of size or location.

It is vitally important that the House pass a good and workable urban renewal bill for the District so that the Nation's Capital may have the same basic legal authority to renew and revitalize its

downtown areas as all other cities throughout the country now have.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, Mr. Rains, an acknowledged expert in the field of housing and urban renewal, said several months ago that the city of Washington deserves the same tools that other cities have in other parts of the country. He went on to say that he "doesn't want a bill for the District that is not in keeping with the bill for the rest of the Nation."

I think that the Members will do well to heed these words of caution from one who has been in this complex field a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the editorial to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD.

RENEWAL OF HOPE

When the House District Committee approved its reprehensible version of the Washington urban renewal bill in March, it was apparent that several members were not in accord with the action.

Now the full scope of that disagreement has been disclosed. No less than 11 of the 24 committee members have joined in the strongly worded minority report just released. The number of the group is immensely encouraging; its bipartisan character is more so.

The most impressive aspect of this minority report, however, is its vigorous language. In its details, the 16-page analysis shreds the arguments in favor of the crippling and unnecessary amendments which were added to the original bill under the guise of "safeguards."

Rather than safeguarding anything, these amendments, in the words of the report, "would virtually destroy the whole urban renewal program in the District of Columbia." As to intent, it states forthrightly that the bill as reported seems designed as "a precedent for attacking the whole urban renewal program throughout the country."

These are not new thoughts. Representative SISK of California expressed them forcefully some weeks ago. We have done so in these columns on numerous occasions, for there has never been the slightest doubt as to the fiction of the amendments as "safeguards." The essential purposes of this bill are to permit urban renewal projects in nonresidential areas, and to improve the standards under which these projects would be carried out.

The Senate has passed a bill satisfying these purposes. The amendments added by the House committee attach a number of mischievous and thoroughly unnecessary restrictions. Coincidentally, an excellent analysis of their effects has just been completed and sent to the appropriate congressional committees by the Washington Planning and Housing Association.

The 11-member minority report does not, of course, actually solve anything. The revitalization of Washington's downtown business section is still stymied. It will remain so until the city receives the required authorization to use urban renewal in business areas. That authorization cannot be provided until the bill is called to the House for vote.

When this eventually occurs, however, the prospects for passage of an adequate and equitable bill will have been enhanced immeasurably by the incisive and timely minority report. Its signers were Representatives SISK, DAWSON, COHELAN, ST GERMAIN, TRIMBLE, and DIGGS, Democrats; and Republican Representatives AUCHINCLOSS, NELSEN, O'KONSKI, MATHIAS, and HORTON. To them all, the community owes a vote of thanks.

Academy of American Poets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Academy of American Poets is an organization that does much to advance the cause of American poetry. It is worthy of much wider notice.

In many other countries much is done by society to promote young poets and to spread the richness of poetry among all the citizens. In the United States poetry has never been given proper recognition. In 1934 the Academy of American Poets was established in order to rectify this situation. Its founder is Mrs. Hugh Bullock who, born in France of American parents, was struck by American poets' lack of recognition and recurring financial crises. With the aid of the late Edwin Arlington Robinson and Louis Ledoux, poets themselves, and a great many others who were interested, Mrs. Bullock began developing plans to help poets, out of which finally evolved the idea for the Academy of American Poets. The five founder members were Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Auslander, Mrs. Bullock, Messrs. Ridgely Torrence and Charles Hanson Towne.

The purpose of the academy is stated in article II of the charter as follows:

To encourage, stimulate and foster the production of American poetry by providing fellowships for poets of proven merit, by granting scholarships, awards and prizes for poetic achievement, and by such other means as the board of director with the approval of the board of chancellors may from time to to time devise and determine.

The academy has been of very specific and practical help to poets and poetry. In the years between 1946 and 1963 $5,000 poetry fellowships were awarded to the following:

Edgar Lee Masters, 1946; Ridgely Torrence, 1947; Percy MacKaye, 1948; Frost 1953; Louise Townsend Nicholl, 1954; Dr. Oliver St. John Gogarty, 1954; Rolfe Humphries, 1955; Dr. William Carlos Williams, 1956; Conrad Aiken, 1957; Robinson Jeffers, 1958; Louise Bogan, 1959; Leonie Adams, 1959; Jesse Stuart, 1960; Horace Gregory, 1961; John Crowe Ransom, 1962; Ezra Pound, 1963; Allen Tate, 1963.

In addition, the academy insures publication of winning manuscripts of poetry by contracting to purchase a thousand copies of what is known as Lamont Poetry Selection. This was made possible by a bequest by the late Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont.

In the last 10 years the Lamont poetry selections have been the following:

Constance Carrier, "The Middle Voice," Alan Swallow, 1954; Donald Hall, "Exiles and Marriages," the Viking Press, 1955; Philip Booth, "Letter from a Distant Land," the Viking Press, 1956; Daniel Berrigan, S. J., "Time Without Number," the Macmillan Co., 1957; Ned O'Gorman, "The Night of the Hammer," Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958; Donald Justice, "The Summer Anniversaries," Wesleyan Universay Press, 1959; Robert Mezey, "The Lovemaker," the Cummington Press, 1959; X. J. Kennedy, "Nude Descending a Staircase," Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961; Edward Field, "Stand Up, Friend, With Me," Grove Press, Inc., 1962; no award, 1963.

In addition to all of this, the academy has been sponsoring other kinds of awards, made possible by the bequests of interested persons and through these bequests various colleges and universities have been the beneficiaries. Poetry readings have been sponsored. Most recently an interesting poetry reading took place at the Guggenheim Museum in New York.

The Academy of American Poets is an organization worthy of support, and I am delighted that it is founded and chiefly sponsored by many of my constituents and friends. I salute them for their contribution to the American scene and for the advancement of a most important cause in the United States. A vote of thanks is owed most especially to Mrs. Hugh Bullock, the driving force behind the whole adventure.

Brazil's Break With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, credit is due the new Government of Brazil for ending diplomatic relations with the Communist regime of Cuba.

This action taken by the Brazilians is a great victory in the struggle for freedom in this hemisphere. Brazil is one of Latin America's largest and most influential nations. Prior to the fall of leftist Joao Goulart's regime this nation witnessed Brazil pursuing a path which seemed to be taking it away from the democratic community of this hemisphere. The United States and the other nations of this hemisphere were all greatly relieved when Goulart's government fell, and was replaced with the new regime of President Umberto Castello-Branco.

Now that another nation of our sister continent has had the foresight to end its relations with Castro, other nations yet maintaining recognition of Cuba should follow Brazil's example. Those nations which still dignify Castro by extending him recognition are Chile, Bolivia, Mexico, and Uruguay.

I urge that stepped-up measures be taken by this Nation in the OAS as well as unilaterally in order that these four remaining Latin American countries may do as Brazil has done and end recognition of Castro. To do so will further isolate Communist Cuba in this hemisphere.

Immigration Proposals Outlined to Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to submit an address by me before the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at its 21st session in Geneva, Switzerland, on May 12, 1964.

My statement follows:

Your Excellency, Mr. Chairman and officers, members of this very distinguished body, reference has been made to the fact that I am dean of the congressional delegation. The assumption is that I am old. I may be chronologically old, but I can assure you that I am young in spirit. And you know what is said that "old trees bear fruit, and while the candle burns, there is much work to be done," and I can assure you even on the subject of immigration there is a great deal of work to be done.

However, I cannot let the occasion go by without expressing a word of compliment to the very fine statement made by the Dutch Minister, Mr. Veldkamp. We heard his remarks with admiration. Now, I intend to make a declaration of immigration policy on the part of the administration in Washington, which I am sure will bring comfort to most of not all the members of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration. We feel in the United States that the time has come for a review and a revision of the U.S. immigration laws. They must be liberalized in the interests of smaller nations. They are presently inflexible and permit of little or no discretion on the part of the administration in the interests of equality and in the interests of humanity. The so-called national origin theory of immigration which you have heard a great deal over the years must eventually be discarded. It is anachronistic, it is unjust; likewise, rigid inflexible quotas must be cast into limbo.

Mr. Chairman, the Director, Mr. Haveman has given us—or gave us yesterday—a truly searching analysis of the background of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration's work at the present juncture. It is well to know that an organization of this character—an organization dealing with, not goods, but with human beings—is continuously adjusting its functions to existing realities and while adhering to the constitutional terms of reference, the organization remains sufficiently flexible to adapt itself to ever-changing conditions in Europe, across the Mediterranean, across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific. It is this flexibility, the flexibility clearly intended by the framers of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration's Constitution, which makes this organization viable.

In order to enlarge upon Mr. Haveman's presentation, I believe I ought to give the Council a brief outline of the situation in the United States as it might affect this organization's future work. I have in mind the determined effort initiated by the late lamented, the late martyred President John F. Kennedy, an effort now fully and vigorously sustained by our present President, President Johnson. Namely, the effort designed to provide for a fundamental reform of our immigration fabric.

As most of you know, I had the privilege of introducing in the House of Representatives a legislative proposal recommended by the late President Kennedy. My bill, called "House Resolutions 7700" was abetted without the slightest equivocation by President Johnson. No less than 57 Members of the House of Representatives have joined in this initiative, by introducing bills identical with my own. A large number of similar bills are pending in the U.S. Senate. President Johnson vouchsafed to me prior to my coming here to Geneva his desire to have the bill passed. The power and the potency and the prestige of the President and his office are all behind this new proposed legislation.

The bill I am speaking about is more than just an amendment to the immigration law which has remained on our statute book since 1952. That law perpetuated the principle of national origins, an antiquated immigration system proven beyond peradventure of a doubt to be unworkable, and was devised in 1921—more than 40 years ago, in an atmosphere of fear bordering on hysteria—a direct result of the unsettled domestic and foreign conditions following World War I.

In one of the very first speeches that I ever made in Congress was a speech inveighing and condemning the national origins theory which was embedded in that old law and was embedded in the new law. Now conditions have drastically changed, the climate can be made favorable for decided change, namely the liberalization of our immigration fabric. The fundamental feature of my bill is the elimination from our laws of the fallacious belief that the place of birth or the racial origin of a human being determines the quality or the level of a man's intellect, or his moral character or his suitability for assimilation into our Nation and our society.

In searching for a brief and comprehensive description of the underlying principle of my bill I use these words: "We do not intend to ask any immigrant 'Where were you born?' We intend to ask him only 'Who are you and what can you do for the country in which you have chosen to live?'" There shall no longer be any preference as to race. And as to preferentials as to race and to those who say that my blood is better than your blood, to them I say: Take your blood to the marketplace and see what it will buy you. The good Lord gave us a common ancestor, Adam, so that it could never be said that one man is better than another. Do we not all come from the same stem?

Instead of apportioning our immigration quotas according to the national origins theory, national origins of an intending immigrant, under my bill our future total immigration quota will be divided, regardless of the immigrant's place of birth, into categories completely divorced from the concept of race, nationality, citizenship, or place of birth. Inclusion of an intending immigrant into one of the categories will depend (i) on his skill, or ((ii) on his relationship to a citizen in the United States or of an immigrant previously admitted to our country, but (iii) a large portion of the annual immigration quota will always remain available for refugees and displaced persons in a spirit of mercy, in a spirit of humanity. And lastly, a category will be raised for so-called new seed immigration, immigration of people who in their own mind have formulated the desire to abandon their old country and seek new opportunities for themselves and their children in the United States.

The process of elimination of the national origins principle will continue for 5 years after the enactment of the bill. The reason for this gradual approach is of a purely practical nature. It is there in my bill for administrative purposes only. Obviously the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, as well as myself, would have preferred that the old condemned anachronistic system of national origins be wiped out immediately. However, we must be practical and recognize that such a drastic change, if imposed overnight, would simply create havoc with the administrative processes of immigration and immigrant visa issuance by our consulates spread all over the world. Thus it is proposed to cut 20 percent of our quota in each of the 5 years succeeding the enactment of my bill, and place that number of visas in a pool operated under the new system. At the termination of 5 years, the new system will be in full effect, and the administrators will all have gained the necessary experience obtained through the gradual use of the new system.

It is important to keep in mind that under the new system the entire quota will be used, will actually be used, in every 12-month period. We will not have then the unfortunate situation which faces us every year at the present time. I have in mind that situation where tens of thousands of immigrant visas allocated under existing quotas are not used by certain nations, by immigrants born in those certain countries, while immigrants born in other countries with small or simply token quotas have to experience waiting time extending in the case of many countries of southern and eastern Europe as well as Asia, for 5 years to almost 25 years. That is horrendous, and has got to stop.

In all frankness I must tell you, gentlemen, that I do not want to sound here a note of undue optimism. The changes that I suggest are somewhat drastic and the climate of public opinion must be developed out of which can spring these changes. But we shall develop that climate favorable to these changes. I have served in the House of Representatives for 42 years. I believe I know its procedures as well as I know its atmosphere. It is undeniable that the reform which we propose is just as drastic as it is necessary. Old prejudices, however—old prejudices I repeat—do not just fade away—they die hard. Old formulas are difficult to change, even more difficult to eradicate.

We have a difficult task before us. We are, however, determined to tackle it with just as much determination as we decided to face the issue. And I repeat, we have the administration, headed by President Johnson, behind us in this regard. And it is significant to know that only recently the House of Representatives passed a civil rights bill which you probably have heard of in the public press. I had the honor of being the House manager of that bill, that bill bears my name. I am proud that it bears my name, but within 5 minutes after the bill was adopted by the House, I received a telephone message from the President of the United States, and he thanked me for my efforts on the civil rights bill and then he significantly added: "Now how about my immigration bill?" That shows you what an activist the President of the United States is. That is very significant, I say to the members of this Committee. He wants this immigration bill that I speak of. And I am going to do all in my power to see to it that he and the United States and the world gets that bill. We have his personal support behind us, and we do not intend to relent in our efforts until we write it into our law books, this immigration statute which will be worthy of the traditions of the United States and of our country's responsibility in the world of today. Unless we do that, we deny that famous phrase in our Declaration of Independence, which says "All men are created equal." This national origins theory says all men are not created equal, because it gives preferences to some and metes out discrimination and proscriptions to others.

Speech by Mr. Walther Casper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, from my good and highly esteemed friend, Attorney George Feldman, of New York City, I have received the excellent address delievered by Mr. Walther Casper, chairman of the administrative board of the Deutsche Entwicklungsdienst, on the occasion of the reception for Mr. Sargent Shriver at Bad Godesberg on April 24, 1964.

As I believe this address should receive wide acceptance in the United States, I am submitting it for the U.S. Congress and the American people:

To welcome you among us, Mr. Shriver, and your colleagues from the American Peace Corps in the name of the Administrative Council and Directors and all assistants of the German Development Service is the pleasant task which has fallen to me.

You have often yourself related the tale that President Kennedy called you to head the Peace Corps since, if the idea failed, it would be easier to fire a relative than a politician. Well, your undertaking has not misfired and today after 3 years the American Peace Corps has become a "mark of quality" under your leadership which the broad American public has fully accepted and which is willingly bought by Congress, which has already granted your 1964–65 budget. Also throughout the world and especially among the new nations, which have started out on the great adventure to a better economic and social future, the Peace Corps has become an appreciated and sought-after beginning. Your volunteers are working in more than 40 of the so-called developing countries, and you have many more project requests than you can manage in spite of the amazingly large number of volunteers already sent out or in the process of training. Countering the image of the "ugly American" is the open, friendly, receptive, young American aware of the dissimilarities of foreign cultures. The first veterans have returned after 2 years' service enriched by experience, capable of improvisation in the best sense of the word and, therefore, predestined for multifaceted activity, bearing the mark of hard work often accompanied by abstinence in foreign climates and surroundings but with unbroken sober idealism. They come as the vanguard of a legion which celebrates its entry into science, industry, Government service, and the independent professions of your country and which in a few years—since one comes into one's own young in your country—will with its characteristic stamp be given to the leadership stratum of the coming America.

The words of Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman directed to you on the occasion of your visit to Bangkok in January of this year demonstrate that this "laudatio" of the American Peace Corps represents not only our own opinion but also the response that it has evoked in the recipient countries.

"It is indeed striking that this important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, of youth mingling, living, working with youth, should come from this mightiest nation on earth, the United States. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great Nation as a wealthy nation, a powerful nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But how many of us known that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful? This is the secret of your greatness, of your might, which is not imposing or crushing people, but is filled with the hope of future good will and understanding."

After you had earned your master's degree with the development and successes of the Peace Corps, you were given by President Johnson the leadership of the "unconditional war on poverty" in your own country. We admire your energy and courage. If one takes a close look at the dimensions and complexity of the problems: overcoming of racial barriers, setting aside structural unemployment, creation of new industrial centers, and educational programs of the most varied nature, then can the task you are undertaking be seen indeed to be one of the boldest attempts at social change in the industrial age. Even if the problems are not altogether comparable, I would like here to be able to mention that the German Federal Republic in the reconstruction period after the war and widespread destruction of its cities and means of production has had to master between 1945 and today the social and economic assimilation of 12 million refugees. We are thankful that in this case the curse turned partly into a blessing; and, perhaps, even though the starting points are admittedly not comparable, and analysis of all the measures and legislative acts which helped in our country and a study of the empirical course of this development could provide content for some of your considerations. To the thanks for your visit with us is added our good wishes for the success of this mammoth new task. Our thoughts and hearts will be with you in the coming years.

Now, however, we have you and your closest associates with us as leader of the U.S. Peace Corps. You are responding to the invitation of Minister School which was issued a year and a half ago at his meeting with you in Washington. You are at the same time fulfilling the wish that President Johnson expressed on the occasion of the meeting with Chancellor Erhard at the end of last December to, as the official communique reads, "conduct talks with your German colleagues concerning the work of both organizations."

"The President and the German Chancellor shared the opinion that close cooperation would be useful for both institutions."

This is in fact the purpose and goal of our association: exchange of experience and study of the possibilities of this cooperation.

In industry the exchange of know-how has been practiced for a long while and been found to be useful. Why shouldn't it make our work more effective even though we know that the weight of experience for the time being will be moving decidedly in the direction from you to us?

You are especially thanked again here for generously allowing us to share in your experience—I recall the exhaustive study that our two delegates were allowed to make with you almost 2 years ago, which made a worthwhile contribution to our own reflections in the period before the official founding of the German Development Service.

If we speak now of close cooperation between us, there need be no fear that one of the organizations must limit or give up its own nature which indeed affects its level of efficiency. The deepened knowledge of one another, however, the cross-fertilization through acquaintance with the successes and perhaps the failures of the other presents a necessity which will certainly be felt in increasing measure in the realm of development policy.

It is certainly a good omen for the takeoff of the Development Service—as our friend Walt Rostow would describe the phase in which we find ourselves at the time being—that through your presence, Mr. Shriver, appears the image of President Kennedy who, together with your wife was witness to the founding of the German Development Service 10 months ago to the day and who exactly 5 months ago was incredibly torn away from us all.

President Kennedy—let me state this quite distinctly at this occasion—took a personal part in the coming into being of a German "Peace Corps" and wanted, therefore, to be present at the moment of its birth.

Perhaps some of his accomplishments will fade away and some of the measures which he introduced in your country will be superseded by new necessities; that is the course of events, that is not the decisive factor. The spirit that he has awaked in the heart of this generation, however, can no more be submerged; neither can the image of the New Frontier that he erected for us all, disappear, "a frontier of unknown possibilities * * *," "a challenge to all who are ready to subscribe to the future and not to the past, to all who desire to master the stern realities of our time."

Kennedy's pathos of sober idealism opened a new view to the beginning of this decade. It allows us to recognize the temporary, stop-gap solutions so often praised as "realistic" and "pragmatic." It has sharpened our gaze over the whole of the problems of this one world and generation that remain to be solved.

The bearer of the most powerful office on earth has thereby to a large extent documented that power and spirit, politics and intelligence do not denote opposites but that their union more than all else is capable of creating the proper and genuine spirit of citizenship.

In these days a check for more than DM3,000 was given to the German Development Service, which schoolchildren of a large city collected from their savings after Kennedy's assassination. A silent march of 60,000 schoolchildren had preceded this action and then came the decision—as was stated in the proclamation—"to want to give recognition to Kennedy's political idea over and above the expression of sympathy."

Our young helpers of both sexes who from this year on will be going abroad in increasing numbers will also be "pilgrims and pioneers on the New Frontier"—they who, God willing, will cross the threshold of the 21st century, that the late American President introduced. The common path of the German Development Service and the American Peace Corps should be lit by the words that form the kernel of the Inauguration Address of January 20, 1961, and which your family, Mr. Shriver, have placed on the picture of the deceased:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tryanny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

Grandchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the eminent writer, Mr. David Lawrence, is a fine presenta-

tion of what has been happening in the world, and especially in our own country.

This article will be most interesting to read in about 15 years, when very likely many of Mr. Khrushchev's predictions will have come true:

GRANDCHILDREN

(By David Lawrence)

Below is a photograph (not reproduced in RECORD) transmitted by telegraphic process from Moscow when Premier Khrushchev took a walk with his grandchildren across Red Square to attend the Communist Party's celebration on May Day. The picture was reproduced the next day in many newspapers throughout the United States and appeared on the front pages of several, including the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune.

Why was this picture judged by the editors to be news of prime importance to American readers? Because it told a story that went beyond the image of a prominent man and his two grandchildren. It reminded us all that, across international boundaries and in lands where the language and the customs and even the religious beliefs are different from ours, there is the same depth of human feeling for the family as is reflected in the picture.

But there is another reminder in the photograph. It recalls a television interview in Moscow with correspondents of the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 2, 1957, when Premier Khrushchev said:

"I can prophesy that your grandchildren in America will live under socialism. And please do not be afraid of that. Your grandchildren will not understand how their grandparents did not understand the progressive nature of a Socialist society."

Mr. Khrushchev, in a speech in 1960, reiterated his prophecy as he declared that our grandchildren in America "will live under communism, and this will be done not by us but by the workers—the toiling peasantry and the toiling intelligentsia of the United States."

Will this prophecy come true? State socialism is a form of totalitarianism which purports to get its authority from the proletariat. It is in fact, however, a dictatorship and autocracy not at all different in its operation from the one-party or one-man governments of the past.

It might be unthinkable that in America any such thing could happen to us. But in these days when we are urged by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committe to begin thinking of "unthinkable" things, it may be wise to examine just how far away state socialism really is and whether our grandchildren will find themselves living under its tyranny.

State socialism assumes that governmental regulation must be exercised almost without limit by the state—that wages and hours and incomes for all classes of workers in the field, in the factory and in the professions must be fixed by national decree.

State socialism in Russia permits only one political party. This is ruled by a hierarchy of the few, and they decide who the leaders shall be and who shall be admitted to membership in the party organization itself. The rest of the people must be obedient to the dictates of the single-party rulers.

State socialism considers itself the enemy of free enterprise as we know it in America, and proclaims the doctrine that the central government knows best what work shall be done and how the national income shal be spent both at home and abroad.

But what has encouraged Mr. Khrushchev to believe that State socialism will some day be accepted in America? Perhaps the doctrines of our own "intelligentsia" today and their denunciations of the profit concept so often heard in our midst have been misconstrued abroad as the beginning of a gradual disintegration of the system that has thus far made the United States the most powerful entity in the world.

Possibly the impression that this country is turning from free enterprise toward State socialism is derived from the continual increase in recent years of the number of governmental agencies which, under the guise of regulating interstate commerce, now hold the power of life and death over business.

As for limiting the membership of a citizen to a single political party, this is still not a reality. But there has arisen a single labor-union bloc which has gradually forced employers to let unions decide who shall have the jobs. The unions in many instances can require the dismissal of any employee who doesn't belong to a labor union or pay dues to it.

Mr. Khrushchev may not accept this as merely group or bloc strength, through it is temporarily in control of a majority in Congress. On the surface, it probably does look to a Russian as if there is in the making here quite an analogy to Communist practice.

Time was when Americans would emphasize the successes of their own system. But today, as the President of the United States goes up and down the land advertising to the world our "war on poverty," this must somehow persuade the Russians that their lot is not so bad after all. Perhaps the Communist leaders keep saying to the malcontents: "Things aren't so bad for you in the Soviet Union. Even in America they have extensive poverty, and their capitalistic system has failed."

It so happens that the profit-and-loss system and the free-enterprise system and the competitive system and even the political system are under frequent attack by critics in our own country. But the principle of individual freedom—the maximum of liberty and the minimum of restriction—remains our goal.

Governmental intervention and governmental subsidy do have a place as pioneering aids to the introduction of needed facilities which private enterprise may not yet be able to supply or finance. This doesn't mean, however, that the opportunities of the private businesses of the Nation should be so restricted that the Government eventually has to take over.

Although the trend toward state socialism in America has thus far been vigorously opposed, the menace has not been removed—and that is why Mr. Khrushchev maintains that his prophecy will come true when our grandchildren grow up.

But will there be grandchildren anywhere to enjoy the fruits of their parents' toil? Will war wipe them all out?

The Moscow photograph can remind us that humanity has not lost its passion for self-preservation and that Nikita Khrushchev is just as eager to save his grandchildren as we are in America. The danger to both the Soviet Union and ourselves arises because personal ambition which seeks dominion over other human beings has not been eliminated and persists irrespective of economic theories.

Safety lies only in the hands of peoples everywhere. They must be ready to overthrow tyranny in whatever form it emerges. For peoples never start international wars. They are concerned for the lives of their children and grandchildren. Mr. Khrushchev and his oligarchy should begin to think more of the risks that the Soviet Government takes as its agents and stooges light the fires of subversion around the globe and produce the chaotic conditions which threaten world peace. The Russian people should be told the truth about their peril.

May the day come when Mr. Khrushchev's grandchildren, too, will enjoy the blessings of a real democracy.

The American Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the message from the President of the United States on the American Consumer which he sent to the Congress on February 5, 1964.

As you will recall, the President's message reiterates the importance of the consumer in our economy and reaffirms the consumer's right to have his interests fully protected. Included, too, in the President's message is a list of recent advances in this field as well as one recommending further legislation. It is this last list and particularly that portion dealing with unfair trade practices and price maintenance which I believe merits particular attention; for it is here that the President states his full opposition to legislation prohibiting competition and freedom of choice. There is no doubt from the position the President takes that the enactment of the quality stabilization bill or any similar legislation is clearly threatened by Presidential veto.

In fact, no other legislation in recent years has been so persistently and continually threatened by Presidential veto. In adopting this stand, our Presidents have given true recognition to the iniquitous provisions of this proposed legislation. Consumers everywhere should follow Presidential leadership by working to defeat the present version of price fixing legislation now pending in this Congress.

The message follows:

[H. Doc. No. 220, 88th Cong., 2d sess.]

THE AMERICAN CONSUMER

(Message from the President of the United States, Feb. 5, 1964—referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed)

To the Congress of the United States:

America's economy centers on the consumer:

The consumer buys in the marketplace nearly two-thirds of our gross national product—$380 billion out of an output of $600 billion.

To meet consumer needs with an ever-widening range and quality of products is the prime object of American producers.

To increase consumer well-being—both the quality and the comforts of life—is one of the highest purposes of private and public policy.

Yet, for far too long, the consumer has had too little voice and too little weight in government.

As a worker, as a businessman, as a farmer, as a lawyer or doctor, the citizen has been well represented. But as a consumer, he has had to take a back seat.

That situation is changing. The consumer is moving forward. We cannot rest content until he is in the front row, not displacing the interest of the producer—yet gaining equal rank and representation with that interest.

Federal action in the consumer interest is not new. To protect the consumer, we have Federal laws and regulations:

To eliminate impure and harmful food, drugs, and cosmetics.

To standardize weights and measures, and improve labeling.

To prevent fraud, deception, and false advertising.

To promote fair competition.

To assure fair rates in transportation, power, fuel, communications, and the like.

To avoid abuses in the sale of securities.

What is new is the concern for the total interest of the consumer, the recognition of certain basic consumer rights:

The right to safety.

The right to be informed.

The right to choose.

The right to be heard.

President Kennedy—in his historic consumer message of March 15, 1962—first set forth those rights.

I reaffirm those rights.

What is also new is active representation of the consumer—and a loud, clear-channel voice—at the topmost levels of government:

1. In July 1962, President Kennedy established the Consumer Advisory Council. In its landmark "First Report" of last October, the Council urged stronger and more effective representation at the Presidential level.

2. On January 3, I appointed a new Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs and established the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, composed of:

Representatives of the Federal departments and agencies most concerned with consumer affairs.

Members of the Consumer Advisory Council.

The newly appointed Presidential Assistant, as Chairman.

My special assistant and the new Consumer Committee will lead an intensified campaign:

To assure that the best practice of the great American marketplace—where free men and women buy, sell, and produce—becomes common practice.

To fight, side by side with enlightened business leadership and consumer organizations, against the selfish minority who defraud and deceive consumers, charge unfair prices, or engage in other sharp practices.

To identify the gaps in our system of consumer protection, information, and choice that still need to be filled.

RECENT ADVANCES

Since 1962, the consumer's position has been protected and strengthened in several important ways:

1. New drugs must now be approved for effectiveness as well as safety.

2. Beginning in May of this year, all television sets produced and sold in interstate commerce must be able to receive all channels, including the ultra-high-frequency ranges. This will bring to millions of American homes a wider range of noncommercial educational TV, as well as more commercial programing.

3. During the past year, the Federal Trade Commission has intensified its programs to protect consumers against:

False advertising as to the safety and efficacy of nonprescription drug products.

Misrpresentation of savings in the purchase of food-freeze plans.

Deceptive television ratings and demonstrations.

Misbranding of clothing.

Bait-and-switch tactics in the sale of consumer products.

4. Federal Power Commission orders on gas rates have channeled millions of dollars of refunds of past overcharges to American families who use gas for cooking and heating.

5. Remedies have now been provided for air travelers who are victims of overbooking.

The job ahead. But the road to consumer safety, accurate information, free choice, and an adequate hearing is never ending. In modern society, the consumer is constantly exposed to the winds of change. Countless new products—and new forms of old products—vie for his attention and his dollar. Services take a larger and larger share of the consumer dollar. Yet they are often performed without established standards of safety or values.

The American housewife—the major American consumer—cannot help but feel confused, and too often unheard, as she seeks the best value for the hard-earned dollar she spends.

This Government is pledged to come to her aid with new legislation and new administrative actions.

RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

Food, drugs, cosmetics, and medical devices

Too often, we await the spur of tragedy before strengthening the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Too often, we discover dangers in foods and cosmetics only through serious injury to a consumer.

Testing and inspection powers.

The Food and Drug Administration now lacks the needed authority:

To inspect fully the factories in which food is produced.

To require a showing that cosmetics are safe before they are offered to the public.

To examine, for safety and effectiveness before they are marketed, medical devices for the diagnosis of symptoms and treatment of illnesses. The improper treatment with worthless devices can be the cruelest hoax of all.

Therefore: (1) I recommend the enactment of new legislation to:

Extend and clarify inspection authority—comparable to that which now governs prescription drugs—over foods, over-the-counter drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutics, diagnostic and prosethetic devices;

Require that cosmetics be tested and proved safe before they are marketed; and

Require therapeutic, diagnostic, and prosthetic devices to be manufactured under conditions that will assure their reliability, and require proof of safety and effectiveness before they are marketed.

Warning labels

The container for the common household drug is a familiar—and often reassuring—sight in our medicine closets. Yet, unless properly marked with necessary warning against accidental injury, it can be as dangerous, and fatal, as a time bomb.

Drugs that ease the pains of adults, for example, might kill a child—yet Federal authority to require warning labels on such containers is far from clear.

A pressurized container, improperly used or handled, can also be a lethal instrument—yet, existing law does not require that users be warned against these dangers. Therefore:

(2) I recommend that existing legislation be extended and clarified to require that labels include warnings against avoidable accidental injury from drugs and cosmetics, and pressurized containers.

(3) In addition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be authorized to subpena evidence in connection with administrative hearings under the Federal Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act. Other regulatory agencies have this indispensable power. Without it, effective regulation is extremely difficult.

Screening of pesticides

Equally important is the growing danger from the use of pesticides which have not been properly screened. We must not recklessly interfere with the harmony of nature. Yet, today the Department of Agriculture is required to register products that it cannot certify as safe—and these may be put to use. Therefore:

(4) I recommend that the Congress enact legislation—already passed by the Senate—to end the present practice by which pesticides may be registered by manufacturers under protest before the Department of Agriculture has passed upon their safety.

Meat and poultry inspection

The inspection of meat and poultry products moving in interstate commerce effectively insures safe and wholesome supplies of these foods, but this protection does not extend to products sold within a State. Therefore:

(5) I recommend legislation to insure that all meat and poultry sold in the United States—intrastate as well as interstate—is inspected for safety and wholesomeness, either by the Department of Agriculture or in cooperation with State authorities.

Unfair trade practices and price maintenance

There are serious defects in the Federal shield against unfair practices and false advertising. Unlawful trade practices may continue during the time administrative hearings are pending. Often, the damage has been done by the time the decision is rendered. Therefore:

(6) I recommend legislation to grant the Federal Trade Commission authority to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders at the outset of a proceeding, subject to court review, when the Commission has good reason to believe that the continuation of the practice would result in irreparable injury to the public.

Freedom of choice for consumers from our storehouse of goods, at the lowest possible prices, is the very cornerstone of American consumer policy. I believe strongly in this principle. Therefore, I oppose legislation which limits price competition, whether under the label of quality stabilization or any other name.

Truth in packaging

We all like interesting packages, and we are attracted by them. In today's markets they are the silent salesmen for their products.

But salesmen should be both helpful and truthful.

When the American housewife comes face to face with one of these silent salesmen, she wants it to report to her the nature and quantity of its contents in a manner that is simple, direct, visible, and accurate.

All too often, she cannot find such labeling today. Hearings on the Hart-Celler bill to require "Truth in Packaging" have shown us that informed judgments are often made difficult or impossible by deceptive or confusing packaging and labeling.

The shopper ought to be able to tell at a glance what is in the package, how much of it there is, and how much it costs.

We do not seek monotonous conformity.

We do seek packages that are easily understood and compared with respect to: sizes, weights, and degrees of fill.

Many of our staples, like sugar and flour, have long been packaged in standard quantities. Much more can be done along these lines.

Packagers themselves should take the initiative in this effort. It is in the best interests of the manufacturer and the retailer as well as the consumer.

The Government has had, and has exercised, a responsibility toward the consumer in this field for a long time. But the case-by-case trail to which we are limited by existing law is a long and winding one.

More clear-cut regulations are needed to deal effectively with the problem of: misleading adjectives; fractional variations in weight which are designed to confuse; illustrations which have no relationship to the contents of the package. Therefore,

(7) I recommend legislation to insure that the consumer has access to the information necessary to make a rational choice among competing packaged products.

Truth in lending

The consumer credit system has helped the American economy to grow and prosper:

Credit is used to finance the purchase of homes, cars, appliances, education and recreation.

Consumer credit and mortgage debt on urban family homes together total over $250 billion.

The cost of such credit must be made as clear and unambiguous as possible, eliminating all possibility of abuse. The antiquated legal doctrine, "Let the buyer beware," should be superseded by the doctrine, "Let the seller make full disclosure." Therefore:

(8) I recommend enactment of legislation requiring all lenders and extenders of credit to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amount of their commitment and the annual rate of interest they will be required to pay.

Truth in securities

American consumers are also investors. Approximately 17 million persons hold stock in publicly held corporations.

Almost a generation ago, laws were passed to assure full disclosure of needed information to persons about to purchase securities listed on national securities exchanges.

But those who purchase over-the-counter securities have no similar protection. They need it.

Legislation broadening these disclosure provisions to include widely owned over-the-counter stocks has already passed the Senate and is pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. This measure will help complement the voluntary changes in rules and practices now being made by securities dealers and stock exchanges to afford greater protection to investors. Therefore:

(9) I recommend prompt enactment of this disclosure legislation for over-the-counter securities.

Better housing

The purchase of a home is the largest investment most American families make. Housing costs, for owners and renters, take 14 percent of the average city family's dollar every year.

Good housing should be within the reach of low and moderate income families—now and in the future. We must have orderly development with look-ahead planning for our sprawling cities.

Therefore

(10) I recommend enactment of the administration's housing program (outlined in my recent Message on Housing) which is designed:

To provide more housing for low-income families by acquiring and improving existing housing as well as by constructing new public housing.

To help local governments and developers plan suburban developments which will include a proper balance of community facilities, recreation, transportation, and business centers.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS

There are in addition, many steps that can—and will—be taken immediately to strengthen our present programs of consumer protection.

First, I am directing the President's Committee on Consumer Interests to undertake the following actions:

1. Under the auspices of its Chairman, the Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, to begin a serious of regional consumer conferences:

Representatives of consumer groups, manufacturers, retailers, advertising agencies, Government agencies, and others will discuss the problems of adequate consumer information at these meetings.

The results will be reported to me, along with appropriate recommendations for action.

2. To develop as promptly as possible effective ways and means of reaching more homes and more families—particularly low-income families—with information to help them to get the most for their money:

Most of the budget management and consumer publications now available are geared to middle-income families.

They often do not penetrate to the lowest 20 percent of the Nation's income groups.

Yet it is the poor who suffer most from sharp practices.

I am asking all Federal agencies now engaged in consumer educational activities (a) to cooperate in this effort and (b) to explore fully such possibilities as the adapting of the extension service concept, so successful in rural areas, to an urban setting.

3. To examine the many programs for consumer education in our schools, to stimulate the development of curriculums and training materials, and to encourage larger numbers of our young people to seek instruction in the fundamentals of budgeting, buying, and borrowing.

4. To develop means of keeping the public continuously informed of developments of importance in the consumer field.

Second, as I have emphasized in my Economic Report, we must make sure that any upward pressures on costs and prices that may develop as the economy expands do not get out of hand:

Price stability is essential to an economic climate favorable to consumers.

Price increases, without improvements in performance or quality, would erode dollar values.

Our record of overall price stability in recent years has been excellent. But the trend of consumer spending for services has been constantly rising; and the safeguarding of the consumer's interest in the area of services is comparatively weak:

Because of their personal and informal nature, services cannot be treated in the same way as foods and drugs.

Yet, they are equally subject to the abuses of poor quality, high prices, and exaggerated claims.

I am asking the Committee to make recommendations for improvement of protection in this area; and we will also call upon the interested industries for their advice.

CONCLUSION

All these proposals for consumer protection would cost us as taxpayers only a small fraction of what they would save us as consumers. And there is no measure of what they would prevent in human suffering.

But in the last analysis, the remedy for errors of taste, poor judgment, and disorder in our economic life is not to be found in the legislatures or the courts but in the leadership of those who care.

This is an individual matter.

But it is also a matter for corporations and organizations dedicated to the public interest.

I know that the program outlined here to improve the safety and welfare of our consumers will help all Americans to pursue the excellent and reject the tawdry—in every phase and in every aspect of American life.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 5, 1964.*

Rebuilding With Imagination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago is second only to New York in the size and extent of its federally assisted urban renewal program. As a matter of fact, on a per capita basis, Chicago's effort is even more ambitious than New York's, involving almost $150 million in Federal grant reservations.

In a recent issue of the Chicago Sun-Times and Chicago Daily News, Mayor Richard J. Daley rendered his annual report to the citizens of Chicago. The report covered all the multitude of activities and services that the city government engages in. In his opening statement, the mayor set the stage for the report and asked that each citizen should ask himself or herself the following questions about city government:

How much does it cost? Am I getting my money's worth?

Can I get a better buy elsewhere? Does my family really need it? Shall I spend more for a better quality product?

While the report details the whole gamut of essential services which the city government provides—fire, police, health, welfare, schools, and all the others—I am going to point primarily to two areas about housing and urban renewal. The section of the annual report which deals with these programs is aptly entitled "Rebuilding With Imagination."

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

REBUILDING WITH IMAGINATION

Chicago's urban renewal program encompasses 27 redevelopment projects and 10 conservation areas. It has already added $18,700,000 in new assessed valuation to the tax rolls, and projects now in execution are expected to add another $13 million in the next 2 years.

The urban renewal program has improved housing and community environment, provided new jobs and new tax revenues for the benefit not only of those immediately affected, but for all the neighborhoods of the city.

New construction amounting to more than $65½ million and impressive gains in rehabilitation of older residential buildings marked urban renewal progress in 1963.

The new construction, in eight projects, included residential, educational, industrial, commercial, and institutional development. The bulk of this represents the $44 million first phase of the University of Illinois campus at Congress Circle and the $14 million Mercy Hospital first phase development at 25th and South Parkway.

Th university complex is rising on a 105-acre site in the Harrison-Halsted area on land being acquired and cleared by the Department of Urban Renewal. During the year the department conveyed to the university three segments totaling 58½ acres. Construction is being speeded as rapidly as land can be cleared and conveyed to meet the university's target date for opening classes of February 1965. The total price of

the university site is $4.5 million. The new public university is a vitally needed addition to the city's educational and cultural resources. In addition, it will be a dynamic force in the rebuilding and rebirth of the entire West Side.

Mercy Hospital, one of Chicago's oldest and best known medical institutions is rebuilding and expanding in the vicinity of its present location at 25th and South Parkway.

The obsolete buildings will be demolished as the new facilities are completed over an 8-year building program. Besides a new 500-bed main hospital building, the development will include residence buildings for interns and nurses, two research buildings, a nursing home and a home for the elderly. The department conveyed 8½ acres of the 13-acre hospital site during the year and construction began in November.

An important element in urban renewal is the assembly of land for industrial and commercial use. A 5½-acre site in the Roosevelt-Clinton industrial district was sold to a group of displaced wholesale firms who formed the Jeffro Development Corp. to construct and operate a modern wholesale center. Construction started in August and is expected to be completed early in 1964 at a cost of approximately $1,500,000. Three other industrial buildings were started on the West Side at a cost of $850,000.

The 49 buildings and parking facilities which were completed in 1963 cost approximately $23 million. These include the four 29-story Carl Sandburg Village towers, an apartment building for the elderly in Hyde Park-Kenwood, 24 town houses in Groveland Park, the 53d-Kimbark Shopping Plaza, the Chicago Child Care Society center and 21 industrial buildings.

The 53d-Kimbark Shopping Plaza, a retail center, was built by a group of displaced business and professional men who had been in business in the Hyde Park-Kenwood community. The 2½-acre site of the new shoping center just a few blocks from most former places of business, was acquired and cleared as part of the urban renewal program. It was sold to the displaced businessmen for $204,564. The Department assisted in arranging financing for construction of the center and in obtaining loans for purchase of fixtures and equipment for individual establishments. The construction cost and investment in fixtures is estimated at $1,500,000.

One of the encouraging measures of urban renewal progress is the increase in rehabilitation of older buildings as evidenced by building permit data from the Department of Buildings for the Hyde Park-Kenwood and Lincoln Park conservation areas.

In 1963 the total value of permits of residential rehabilitation in Hyde Park-Kenwood amounted to $1,613,139 as compared to $715,617, in 1962, a 125-percent increase. Between 1959, when the project was approved, and 1963 there has been a 932-percent increase in money spent for residential rehabilitation. These are records based on building permit data. It is estimated that millions more have been spent for other repair and maintenance work which does not require building permits.

To expedite the rehabilitation phase of the program the city established a neighborhood service center in the community, staffed with technical consultants. The neighborhood service center provides free advisory services on architecture, construction and financing to owners of property in the project area. During the year a $737,300 loan, the largest FHA-insured loan ever issued for rehabilitation of a multiunit building, was made for Cornell Towers, a 120-unit building in the Hyde Park-Kenwood project. Similar neighborhood service centers are being provided in other conservation areas.

In the Lincoln Park conservation area where planning is nearing completion for the first project, rehabilitation also made impressive gains during the year. According to permit data, money invested in residential repair in the Lincoln Park community amounted to $1,228,980 as compared to $903,608 in 1962, or a 36-percent increase. A general neighborhood renewal plan was approved for the 1,008-acre Lincoln Park area in February 1963.

Federal capital grants for two conservation projects and a residential redevelopment project were approved in 1963 by the Urban Renewal Administration. A capital grant of $8,389,598 was approved for the Near West Side; a capital grant of $6,246,651 was approved for southeast Englewood and a capital grant of $1,980,966 for the Noble-Division redevelopment project. Land acquisition has started in these areas. In the Near West Side and Southeast Englewood projects as in Lincoln Park and Hyde Park-Kenwood the major emphasis will be on the rehabilitation and upgrading of existing buildings with clearance limited to the removal of blighting influences.

During the past 2 years, there has been a substantial increase in the land conveyed to redevelopers. Nine acres of land were conveyed in 1961, 60 acres in 1962, and 120 acres were conveyed in 1963. In 1964 another 200 acres of land will be conveyed for redevelopment.

Early in 1964, planning will be completed in project 1 of the Lincoln Park area, and the project will move into the execution stage. The Central Englewood and Pershing-Cottage Grove projects should also move into the execution stage.

Address by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1964

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, during the period May 14 to 16, 1964, the U.S. Armor Association held its 75th annual meeting at Fort Knox, Ky. An informative and interesting meeting was held at the home of armor and was participated in by hundreds of former soldiers of Armor including enlisted men, noncommissioned officers, officers and commanders, together with the commanding general of the Armor Center and the Armor School, unit commanders, instructors, and others.

Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, retired, President of the U.S. Armor Association, onetime commanding general, Continental Army Command, and a former commanding general, U.S. Army Europe, has completed 2 years of outstanding service as president of the association. At the meeting on Friday, May 15, 1964, he delivered an inspiring keynote address to more than 4,000 present and former soldiers of armor.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, and with an enduring sense of pride in armor and of course in the entire Defense Establishment of our country, that I include as a portion of my remarks, the address of General Clarke.

It follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY GEN. BRUCE C. CLARKE, RETIRED, PRESIDENT, U.S. ARMOR ASSOCIATION, 75TH ANNUAL MEETING, FORT KNOX, KY., MAY 15, 1964

I want to express the appreciation of the U.S. Armor Association to you, General Bastion, and to the officers and men of the Armor Center and the Armor School for your hospitality and the splendid displays, exercises, and programs.

I am honored to speak for armor at this 75th annual meeting of our Association.

First, I would like to recognize members of the tank corps of World War I. The exploits of these pioneer tankers of 1918—46 years ago—are a part of the proud heritage of armor today.

Second, I would like to recognize the presence of the great number of distinguished retired Armor officers whose services to the Army and armor have contributed so much to the successful history of our country.

Armor has a proud heritage from the horse cavalry of the past, the mechanized cavalry, tank corps of World War I, tank units and armored divisions and the great armored forces of World War II fashioned by those great soldiers and leaders, Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee and Gen. Jacob L. Devers. The armored divisions, armored cavalry regiments, cavalry squadrons and separate tank battalions of today carry on that proud heritage.

I am glad to see so many noncommissioned officers take an interest in the U.S. Armor Association. I have always worked for a strong, effective, noncommissioned officers' corps with the prestige that is due them in their important positions. They are most important in the armor and Army scheme of organization, training, and employment. We must always remember this and build them up.

I have not been a cavalryman or always a member of armor. I came to the mechanized cavalry brigade in 1940 here at Fort Knox as an engineer. This meeting closes out an intimate association with armor and armor officers and men of nearly 25 years. I have been honored to have finished this official association as your armor association president.

Armor has drawn its great strength from those who embraced its battle-winning concepts regardless of branch or service of origin. Its outstanding commanders have come from cavalry, infantry, artillery, and the Corps of Engineers, supported effectively by signal corps personnel and units and by the technical and administrative branches of our Army. Armor has enjoyed close tactical cooperation with the Army Air Corps and now with the U.S. Air Force. For strategic deployment and support, we are ever mindful of our close association with the U.S. Navy.

What I have said in preface is to lead up to the main subject of my talk which is:

BALANCE

You have heard me say often that the best organizations of our Army are those that are excellent in all aspects of their requirements. They may not be outstandingly flashy in any one. However, they have balance and because of that they have great flexibility. They can carry out any assignment with better than acceptable results and have done so many times. Such units have reliability which can be counted on.

Our armored divisions have always enjoyed great balance in organization and concept of employment. As a result, there has been a great blending together of the arms and services to produce a balanced combat team of the combined arms which had balanced tactical and logistical mobility and great fighting and sustaining power. They have demonstrated both great offensive and defensive ability.

Those in armor were particularly quick to realize that the present ROAD concept followed the general pattern of balance, and flexibility of organization, which armored divisions have enjoyed for so long. The ability to balance tactical organizations in the light of their missions and to modify rapidly the organization to fit a newly developing battlefield situation, have always been concepts of armor. These are proven and tested concepts of which we are all justifiably proud and in which we hold great confidence.

Armor has long pressed for equipment that had balance. It has realized that its equipment is always a compromise between armor, gunpower, speed, flexibility, mobility, weight, transportability, and other conflicting considerations. When we have strayed from balance in our equipment we have increased our costs, reduced our combat effectiveness, and lessened our real mobility.

I can cite an example. Between World War II and the Korean war we put our main effort into tanks that were too light in armor and gunpower with the thought that tactical mobility, or more truly "rapid movements" would overcome these deficiencies. We found we were wrong in Korea, and there followed a crash program of producing a very heavy tank—the M-103. While this tank had a fine 120-mm gun it had so many deficiencies in balance it was not a battleworthy assault tank. We have not yet found the right balance between armor protection, gunpower, and movement capability.

Equipment for armored units is heavy and expensive. Hence, there is always a tendency to look for a bargain basement solution on the part of budget-oriented people. The result is often unbalanced equipment. The cost is ultimately paid in unnecessary battle casualties.

Since World War II it has been popular to place great emphasis on air transportability and fordability. These characteristics are desirable in a portion of the Army's equipment, but to unbalance all for the benefit of limited requirements for some such equipment is not the best solution. The equipment needed by the Seventh Army facing the armored might of the Russians is not always the best for Korea and Vietnam and vice versa.

Armored personnel carriers for our infantry are very valuable in adding to our mobility, saving casualties, and saving the effect of the infantry in moving from place to place. We must realize, however, that they have limited armor—and are very vulnerable to many weapons on the battlefield. They must be handled expertly because of the valuable and vulnerable squad of 11 fighting infantrymen in each of them. The APC's require an adequate balance of tanks to work with them as a team to protect them. This has been provided in the armored division.

I am happy to see Army aviation's increased capabilities being made organic to our armor units in the form of the air cavalry troop. I favorably visualize the air cavalry brigade and look forward to its early testing. This is a logical extension of armor doctrine and concepts. As defined in existing doctrinal literature, the mission of the air cavalry brigade is, as part of a larger combat team, to destroy enemy forces by aerially-mounted offensive combat, using fire, maneuver, and shock effect. The missions, methods of employment, type of attachment, and organization of this unit all correspond closely to those of armored cavalry formations. Our experience in Vietnam is clear evidence of successful use of air vehicles employing cavalry type tactics on raids and reconnaissance and security type missions.

However, in integrating Army aviation capabilities into armor units, and indeed within the Army as a whole, it is most important that the principle of balance not be overlooked. Even the mighty eagle must have a secure nest.

We are well into a technological period where equipment begins to be obsolescent before it is off the production line and in troop hands in quantity. Each new generation of weapons and equipment usually costs more than double that which it replaces, and replacement is being demanded at shorter and shorter intervals. Thus the technological pace in research and development places an extraordinary premium on balance, on the ability to assess developing trends correctly, and on the courage to make and back decisions firmly while retaining the flexibility to change plans when necessary.

I have felt strongly for years that one of the great strengths of Armor has been the balance between Active Army and Reserve components armor units. There has always been a mutual respect and close tie between these components, fostered particularly here at the Armor School.

Armor as a close combat arm has never created elite or special purpose type units. Rather, its members have felt it was elite enough within itself. Thus, it has avoided problems such as morale and has retained balance within the arm. I suggest that this be a firm, continuing policy.

Armor has been known as the arm of mobility, firepower, and shock effect. The tactical mobility to put the firepower and shock effect on target depends upon a proper balance with logical mobility. A balanced system of command, control, and communications within its units and in the hands of those commanding the forces in which armor units serve is also of paramount importance.

It is obvious that we must have an in-being capability to deploy quickly a large part of our Army forces overseas to meet emergencies. This has led to strong military and public demands for more adequate strategic airlift. The filling of this demand in recent years beyond doubt has increased segments of our military posture. But in the emphasis on more strategic airlift, we have not taken enough interest in a balance of strategic sealift. We now find ourselves unable to move quickly by sea the very sizable force of armored, mechanized and other heavy military units which may be required to meet a strong aggressor. The recently completed and notably successful Exercise Big Lift in fact was essentially a personnel movement. Troops of the 2d Armored Division were deployed by air with their individual equipment and a minimum of personal supplies. Over 97 percent of the division's equipment, and all of the combat supplies to enable it to engage in sustained operations, were prepositioned in Europe many months in advance as a result of a general long-term theater buildup using sealift. Let us not forget balance, as we read the headlines related to peacetime exercises.

The unbalance in strategic surface transport is of serious concern to armor, particularly because it has so much essential equipment that cannot be flown even if we had much more heavy air transport.

This consideration suggests also the importance of a balance between troops deployed overseas and those in the strategic Reserve.

Finally, a word about training and the balance needed here between the theoretical and the practical as we develop our younger officers and noncommissioned officers for leadership positions. In armor let us not fall easy victim to the philosophy of those who believe that victory can be achieved without closing with the enemy on the ground.

I am aware that I am speaking to armor officers and men. However, I am sure you realize, as I do, that armor has always been an advocate of the Combined Arms Team. In so doing, it has helped add balance to the whole Army.

I cannot quit the stage as your spokesman for the U.S. Armor Association without point-out that armor, as conceived by Van Voorhis, Palmer, Chaffee, Crittenberger, Patton, Devers, and others, represented a great breakthrough in organization, equipment, and tactics for the 1940's. It produced a military tool which was far enough ahead of its time to provide a substantial part of the victory of U.S. arms on the World War II battlefield. It was conceived and forged by men who dared to forecast the unknown future, and stake both their professional careers and their personal lives on its success in combat—the ultimate test.

These great leaders were smart enough to realize that any breakthrough in military capabilities often produced unbalance and therefore caused violent swings of the pendulum before balance could be restored. Such unbalance was largely prevented by them in 1940 and 1941. New planners with modern weapons should be equally skillful in maintaining balance.

It has been my purpose to point out that the best leaders in our Army are the balanced ones, the best equipment is balanced and the best organizers are balanced and the best concepts of tactics and strategy are balanced. I am sure I could prove that these are also the least expensive in money and casualties in the long run.

Is American Shipping Policy Seaworthy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1964

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on May 15, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was granted unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advance release of a speech prepared by Mr. George Killion, to be delivered on May 21, at Honolulu, Hawaii, before the Chamber of Commerce and the Propeller Club of Honolulu.

The Public Printer has just advised the Senator from Washington that the printing of the speech in the RECORD will require approximately 3½ pages, at a cost of $315.

On behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the aforementioned estimate, the speech by Mr. Killion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IS AMERICAN SHIPPING POLICY SEAWORTHY?

(Address by George Killion to Chamber of Commerce and Propeller Club, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 21, 1964)

I

I have wondered, while I have been here, whether it is not time to turn the course of history back upon itself. Hawaii's ties to the United States were knit, almost a century and a half ago, by missionaries from New England. The time has come, it seems to me,

to send missionaries from Hawaii to the mainland.

You have much to teach us. In particular, at this point in mainland history, we need to learn from our newest State that just as men can live and work together with different colored hair so they can with different colored skins. After your missionaries established that bit of Hawaiian brotherhood on the mainland, I would then ask them to turn to the weather, where there is almost as much room for improvement up to the Hawaiian standard. I exclude San Francisco, of course. I should hope, if your own eastbound missionaries can accomplish these objectives, that the mainland could reward them as suitably as we are said to have done with their westbound predecessors.

Easter Island, so Heyerdahl tells us, is regarded by its residents as the navel of the world. Their proof is irrefutable, for so the world does stretch about it, to the north and the south, the east and the west. But Hawaii's claim would be the more impressive. Your lovely islands form the crossroads of the Pacific. Your citizens have come from all points of the compass and have built together a strong economy and a wise and tolerant society. I rather believe that one of the most enduring of your accomplishments, as a fitting bridge between the continents, will be the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii which was established here 5 years ago, under the far-sighted leadership, I may note, of then Senator Lyndon Johnson.

I expect, however, that my experience makes me better equipped to discuss the roadways across the Pacific than the cultures which lie at either end. And in all truth the Pacific Ocean and the ships which sail it are a topic large enough and complex enough for any speaker.

II

I need not explain to an Hawaiian audience the importance of the merchant marine to our Nation. Your markets and your supplies, whether to the east or the west, must be reached across 2,500 miles of ocean. You are a close and an important part of the United States because of the merchant ships that knit your docks to those of San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York.

My own company, American President Lines, while it is not the primary factor in your cargo trade with the mainland, it is one of the largest carriers between Hawaii and the Orient. Our offices in Tokyo and Yokohama, in Manila, Hong Kong, Singapore, Bombay, and elsewhere, have all been instructed to sharpen their eyes for new outlets for your exports that are essential to the economies of nations around the world.

I am not here, however, to explain to you what American President Lines has done for your foreign trade. If we have done our job, you know it already. If we have not, you will want action, not words.

Instead, I believe we might profitably spend a little time on our American Merchant Marine generally. What is its present condition, and what is its future?

III

The state of the merchant marine, like most topics of any complexity, has its elements of inconsistency, if not of paradox.

Our domestic fleet, to take the part closest to Hawaiian interest, is in general in a condition midway between attrition and extinction. Where, before World War II, there were 300 dry-cargo ships in the domestic ocean trades there are now only 90. Entire companies, such as Luckenbach, American-Hawaiian, and Bull have gone out of business.

Yet the Hawaiian trade is in a strong position. Our friends in Matson have done an outstanding job in moving your cargo. Their program of containerization and its speedy and efficient cargo handling surpasses anything that those of us in the foreign trades have been able to develop to date. I only regret that the primitive nature of other ports we serve, the irregularity of the size and kind of cargo and other factors have made our job of containerization a more difficult time-consuming task. But along with these benefits to the shipper that are possible because of assured patronage to the dominant carrier, you have also States Steamship Lines, an aggressive and growing company, to say nothing of the Department of Justice, ready to apply the spur of competition should anyone grow fat and lazy.

But these are matters better developed by those with a direct experience, and I shall turn instead to the policies which govern the merchant marine in our foreign trades.

IV

It has been almost a generation since the Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The policy of the act, as expressed in its opening section, covers a broader area than its implementing provisions. The objectives declared by the statute are to have a merchant marine, composed of the best available vessels, sufficient to serve as a naval auxiliary in time of war and to carry "a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import commerce of the United States." It reaches, then, to ocean shipping of all types.

The implementing provisions are, however, directed to the liner trades alone, where in a variety of detailed ways they seek to subsidize the American operator to the precise extent necessary to equalize the advantages of his lower-cost foreign competitors. As most of you know, the term "liner" refers to regular berth vessels carrying package-type cargoes on a regular scheduled basis. This is in contrast to so-called "tramp" vessels which go wherever cargo is available and normally carry only full loads of bulk-type commodities such as ores and grain.

Whether the 1936 act has worked poorly or well depends entirely upon whether the test is drawn from the broad statement of policy, covering all foreign shipping, or from its implementing provisions directed to the liner trades alone.

Because of this act, the subsidized lines of the United States have been able to resist the downward trend of American shipping. For in the past decade our total Merchant fleet in the domestic and foreign services declined by 16 percent while merchant ship tonnage in the rest of the world has risen more than 30 percent. Today U.S.-flag merchant ships carry less than 10 percent of the Nation's exports and imports, a sharp contrast to such other maritime powers as Great Britain, Japan, and Italy where 50 percent of their foreign trade is moved in ships of their own flags.

Less than 20 years ago a full 60 percent of dry cargoes of our foreign commerce moved under U.S.-flag compared to 10 percent today. Unable to compete with lower cost foreign tramps, the dry-cargo tramp vessels in operation today exist largely upon Government-aid cargoes. Not a single bulk carrier has been built in an American yard since World War II. American-flag tankers, for the same reason, are even scarcer.

If we turn, however, to consideration of the liner service, we find a brighter picture. U.S.-flag ships engaged in foreign commerce carry 37 percent of our total liner movement as measured in revenue tons and while not spectacular, this is a respectable showing.

We have about 400 freighters and 30 passenger or combination vessels in liner service. This fleet is exceeded in size only by that of the United Kingdom.

Our showing is even better when we look at the quality of our liner fleet. We dominate the world in terms of high-speed freighter vessels. A full 80 percent of the world's freighter fleet capable of 20 knots or better is found under the American flag. Three out of every four ships of 19 knots or better in recent years have been built in an American yard under the subsidy program of the 1936 act.

I would say, then, that on this Maritime Day of 1964, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has for the liner trades come reasonably close to meeting its objectives, and thus has served the Nation well. This is not, however, to say that it has been a perfect instrument, or that it can unaided carry us through the waters that lie ahead as successfully as it has through those that lie behind. A large measure of credit for accomplishments of the maritime industry is due, of course, to the persevering efforts of the many far-sighted Senators and Congressmen who have encouraged foreign commerce and supported legislation aimed at strengthening our fourth arm of defense. In particular, I should like to single out our Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee; Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, member of the Senate Commerce Committee; Congressman HERBERT BONNER, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and Senator ENGLE, of California, chairman of the Maritime Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. Senator ENGLE, as you know, is presently recuperating from a serious illness that has unfortunately forced his withdrawal from the present Senate race in California.

Hawaii now as a State with its interest in the merchant marine has its own Senators and Representatives in the Congress and, too, its two Senators and two Representatives will have a vital voice in shaping the fortunes of this industry.

A newcomer to the maritime scene but one who will, I predict, make a significant mark upon it, is President Johnson's recent appointee to the post of Maritime Administrator, Nicholas Johnson. Mr. Johnson, who is no relation to the President, has tackled a complex and difficult job with verve and enthusiasm, and he may be assured that he will receive the complete support and cooperation of the maritime industry so long as we work together toward our mutual goal of keeping this Nation's merchant marine supreme on the seven seas of the world.

If time permitted, I could name many others in a long and distinguished list of Members of the Congress, and those in the executive and administrative branch of the Government who, aware of the merchant marine's vital role in our country's economy, have been in the forefront of those who support it with courage and conviction.

V

We face problems in this decade which differ both in degree and in kind from those we have known before. One of our threats is found in the rapid conversion of the Soviet Union into a major maritime power. They are building ships, all over the world, at a rate unequalled in the peacetime history of any nation. In recent years, for example, their new construction rate is about four times that of ours in terms of vessels and double ours in terms of deadweight capacity. They have now more merchant ships than the United States and in 10 to 15 years will have probably the world's largest merchant fleet, and one of new and modern design.

That fleet will be a challenging experience for the rest of the world. Its bulk carriers are going to carry the cargoes, and to move in the trades, which is determined for them by the State rather than the play of supply and demand. Its liners are not likely to join the steamship rate conferences of the free world, nor to have much respect for rate stability or for the convenience of any shipper other than the Soviet Government.

But it is not really necessary to look so far as the Black Sea and the Baltic to find cause for concern. Within the boundaries of our own country we are building homegrown threats to an effective merchant marine which could easily become more dangerous than any operation of the Soviet fleet. No one in itself is necessarily of ruinous impact. In the aggregate, these dangers could spell catastrophe.

VI

The most fundamental and enduring of the problems of the American merchant marine is caused by the happy circumstance that American labor enjoys the world's highest standard of living. None of us wants to deteriorate the living standards of the American seaman or shoreside employee. At the same time it must be recognized that American ships are in every port of the world berthed alongside competitors whose wage costs, the predominant element of expense, are anywhere from one-seventh to one-third those of the American vessel. Much the same holds in the area of shipbuilding; American yards are more than twice as expensive as the major foreign shipbuilding centers.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 undertook to solve this otherwise impossible competitive relationship by paying to the steamship lines and shipyards a subsidy to equalize the excess they had to pay over their foreign competitors. Let me stress that these sudsidies do not accrue to the shipowner. The wage subsidy passes to the seaman; the ship construction subsidy goes directly to the shipyard.

Measured by the overall results in the American liner fleet, the act as I have noted has worked very well. But it must be recognized that the subsidy program necessarily offer incomplete equalization of steamship costs and could develop along lines which would generate its own failure.

There appears to be a developing trend within the Maritime Administration to reduce the amount of subsidy payment at every possible point of discretion. This is natural, since maritime subsidy costs are both large and growing. Yet, as each reduction in subsidy payments increases the foreign-flag competitive advantage, it is at least conceivable that the objectives of the 1936 act could be lost by a cumulative nibbling at the effectiveness of the subsidy program. As you can imagine, mine is anything but a disinterested judgment, but I do feel that, when the Congress has made the choice for subsidy equalization, that decision should not be impaired by acts of administrative attrition.

Another area of regulation illustrates rater well the high costs of being subsidized. Our foreign competitors can according to their own best judgment from one month to the next choose the trades they will serve, the frequency of their sailings over these routes, the number of their vessels, and when those vessels will be built. We cannot. All of these matters are spelled out in subsidy contracts of 20 years duration. Their terms can be changed only by convincing the Maritime Administration that change is desirable. If a new trade is to be served, or if more service is to be given an old trade, it is also necessary to engage in about 2 years of litigation with any American-flag line that wants to assert an adverse competitive effect.

We have in consequence the world's fastest freighter vessels and the world's slowest decisional process. I blame nobody for this; the Maritime Administration has its regulatory job to do, and in this area does it rather well. But the results are not altogether happy. And this loss of freedom has, I fear, tended to reduce the capacities of subsidized steamship executives for daring, for experimenting and for improving. I doubt that our New England clippers could have dominated the Pacific a century and a quarter ago if their owners and their masters had been required by a subsidy contract to do nothing new, or to do nothing, new or old, without, in a term so familiar to the subsidized operator, "the prior, written permission of the United States." It is, in short, at least possible that I along with the other subsidized steamship executives, have purchased something approximating parity with our foreign competitors only to find that we have in the process lost some of our capacity for prompt and bold decision.

American President Lines has taken a modest step to regain some room for managerial decision, and last November asked the Maritime Administration that we be allowed to move three freighter vessels between any of our three services without prior approval. As it is, somewhat unaccountably, under contest by some other subsidized lines, I probably should not discuss its merits. But I may properly observe that it would seem to me good if such a pattern of flexibility became general in our liner trades. The good could be immediate, in increased profits for a largely marginal industry and also long-term, in forcing a steamship management into an enlarged habit of making decisions.

VII

Another major threat to the American steamship industry seems at the moment to be easing, but only the future can tell whether it is a shift of wind or only a transient calm. That is the pronounced instability of our labor relations.

We have in the maritime industry too many unions and too many strikes. There are more than a dozen major seagoing unions. My own company deals with seven, plus two longshoremen's unions. Any one of these can tie up our ships, and the leadership of most of those unions has often seemed to management as primarily interested in showing that they can be more militant, and can extract more from management, than can a competing union. In result, more than a third of the Taft-Hartley injunctions issued have been in the maritime industry. In further result, the west coast steamship lines have in the last 3 years been strike-bound five times, for a total of over 3 months and with a disruption to cargo booking which extends for weeks on each side of each strike. And when it is a strike of a seagoing union, only the American vessels are tied up; the foreign-flag ships carry the cargo in those periods and often gain permanent customers who have grown fearful of strike-bound American ships.

The high American wage costs, when considered along with American technological genius, would be expected to produce the world's most heavily automated ships. Until recently, however, that situation had not resulted, and we would be lagging behind Japan and a few other countries in this vital area. Now, however, a number of U.S.-flag mechanized vessels are being built including three for our company in San Diego. The east coast unions have reached an understanding with management, and we on the west coast have started a series of sober, sympathetic and hopeful discussions between management and labor which we hope will lead to sensibly manned modern ships. The Department of Commerce, according to recent testimony of its Under Secretary, has now felt able to advise that Federal aid will be granted only for vessel construction which provides for automation features which they estimate will permit a reduction in manning of about 15 men per vessel.

I can understand labor's doubts about automation, or the cybernetic revolution as some writers have called it. I have the same doubts about nuclear energy and, from time to time, about the airplane, the automobile, and the telephone. But it does no good to wish that these things would just go away. They won't. They are here and our job is to learn to live with them. If our low-cost competitors automate, so must our high-cost fleet, or else vanish from the seas along with the sailing ships of the last century. If we don't, we will have the highest paid unemployed seamen in the world.

VIII

Another major threat to the effectiveness of the American merchant marine needs no emphasis to a Hawaiian audience. Within the past 5 years the pasesnger line has been threatened with eventual extinction.

In 1958 there were three passenger lines serving exclusively between Hawaii and California; today there is one. In 1958 APL was preparing to build a 1,500-passenger superliner, to serve the transpacific trade including Hawaii. Today there is no real evidence that the necessary appropriations will ever be requested, nor that the special legislation which in 1957 authorized an Atlantic and a Pacific superliner could today produce a feasible project.

APL continues to serve the transpacific trade, and Hawaii, with three fine, luxurious vessels—the SS *Presidents Cleveland, Wilson,* and *Roosevelt*. But we have last month withdrawn the older and slower *President Hoover* from service, and will within the next 18 months retire from service two of Hawaii's oldest friends, the *Presidents Polk* and *Monroe*.

American President Lines plans construction of 11 fast, modern cargo liners with luxurious accommodations for 12 passengers. Three of these ships, capable of speeds in excess of 20 knots, are under construction in San Diego now. When the last of the 11 joins the fleet in 1968, the company will have completed its long-range cargoliner replacement program in excess of $100 million.

An airplane will, of course, carry a passenger as far in an hour as a ship will in a day. The ship retails, however, advantages of great weight, and nothing, except perhaps a maiden in the springtime, has the beauty and the glamor of a well-built and polished ship. Nothing can so rest and restore a man as a voyage by sea. If we can but supply the ships, I have no doubt of the pessengers to fill them. Tourists in the Pacific area are on the move. This year alone tourist travel will increase by at least 15 percent over 1963, according to the Pacific Area Travel Association. Part of this upsurge will result from the relaxation of travel restrictions by the Japanese Government that will permit Japanese to travel to Hawaii, or any destination of their choice, for the first time in many years.

The rub of the matter is that it is no easy task to supply the ships. A modern superliner is going to be priced at $100 million upward in an American shipyard. The lines can't, under the ordinary construction subsidy, afford to build them. The Defense Department, for its own part, seems to consider that the wartime defense utility of the passegner vessel does not warrant the Government's share of their cost.

I have neither the desire nor the capacity to take issue with Secretary McNamara upon the defense needs of our Nation. Yet I should be surprised if the present evaluation remained unchanged. The ship is a less efficient carrier of troops than the airplane, if movement can be staged, first, between fixed and protected airfields and, second, over some period of time. But there will sometimes be docks and lighters when there are no airfields. And what is needed will sometimes be a mass departure, such as civilian evacuation, or a simultaneous arrival of troops in regimental or division strength. I am not able to price out the worth of these needs in dollars. I can, however, speak for a company which, with its predecessor Pacific Mail Line, has been operating passenger vessels across the Pacific and to Hawaii for nearly 100 years. In two wars our ships have

promptly sailed to the aid of our Nation, and in crises of a considerable number and variety we have diverted our passenger ships to the emergency needs of American citizens abroad. I do not myself believe that there can be no national emergencies in the future, or that those which arise will always be adjacent to a secure and efficient airfield. And as Admiral Mahan said many years ago: "Navy, plus bases, plus merchant marine, equals sea power." Our U.S. Navy is still the largest and strongest in the world. We hope there may be soon a favorable reevaluation of the merchant marine by the Department of Defense. Then perhaps, when our present ships retire from service, new and modern luxury passenger ships will make their grand entry on the Pacific Ocean to continue a service that is historic, desirable, and essential.

IX

The movement of any social or political institution is likely to be that of a pendulum, and not in a straight line. This assuredly is the case with our regulation of ocean carriage.

Almost every nation in the world but ours takes it for granted that there can be no effective or prudent regulation of the rates and practices of the international ocean steamship business. We can't regulate export carriage without regulating another nation's imports. We can't regulate our import carriage without asserting power over another nation's exports.

But in the Shipping Act of 1916 the Congress undertook to do just that. A number of regulatory provisions, for the most part drawn from the Interstate Commerce Act, were applied without much thought to their feasibility or to international usage to all common carrier steamship lines in our foreign commerce.

This was ambitious legislation, but it produced no significant problem since for 43 years it slept largely undisturbed in the statute books. This may have been due to official sloth and indifference, as it is now the fashion to charge, or it may have been due to a lively appreciation of what was feasible and proper. In any case, at least in the import trades, the 1916 act remained a hortatory essay, unrefined by application and untested by enforcement.

Then came the hearings by Congressman CELLER, of the House Committee on the Judiciary, in 1959–60, and the Senate Douglas hearings, of the Joint Economic Committee, of last year and this. Congressman CELLER was shocked, at the Government agencies and the industry alike, to discover widespread malpractices which the 1916 act had undertaken at least in words to abolish. The Douglas committee is shocked to find a good number of instances where import rates are apparently less than export rates.

This is hardly the place to conduct a reassessment of the merits of these investigations. What is important to the maritime future of this Nation is that the Maritime Commission is pursuing with rejuvenated vigor an objective impossible of attainment. I for one can't really believe that the Congress in 1916 was so naive as to impose upon a Washington agency the job of ferreting out rebates, or discriminatory arrangements of any type, in the back streets of Bombay, Genoa, and Hong Kong. The first principle of effective government is to refrain from unenforceable legislation. The Commission can't learn of these transactions, and if it does, it can neither summon witnesses nor even obtain documents from abroad. Any attempt to enforce an American proscription upon the foreign transactions is immediately and naturally viewed by the foreign governments involved as an effort to regulate matters within their jurisdiction which are of no legitimate American concern.

The new program of enforcement has produced a lively furor of diplomatic complaint and litigating challenge to the Commission's authority. It seems at the moment to have stopped the reach of the Commissions at the American boundaries, but in no way to have diluted its energies where it has steamship lines which it can reach. The Commission, typically, issues its rulings and its orders with the same universal breadth as found in the statute, but as to transactions abroad they seem in practice to be enforcible against, and obeyed by, only American-flag lines. The U.S.-based companies stand then subject to all the restrictions of the Shipping Act, while, at least in the inbound trades, our foreign-flag competitors have practical immunity under the law.

I believe that only a minority of the foreign-flag lines take advantage of their opportunity to engage in the practices, such as gaining cargo by rebates, which are forbidden by conference regulation as well as by American legislation. But a number do, and with a frequency sufficient to put the American lines at a severe and probably increasing disadvantage. To this we have so far found only one solution, the formation of pooling arrangements. These divide the traffic according to agreed percentages and thus remove the incentive to malpractice to gain additional cargo. But now the Douglas committee is inveighing against traffic pools and the Commission itself seems to be on the verge of reaching a hostile judgment about pools. In many ways I agree with their judgment: Traffic pools in general remove competitive stimulus, neutralize the advantages of superior American ships, and often betray a tendency to give the largest percentage reward to the line with the most unsavory practices. But before our mentors forbid pooling, I do hope that they consider that it is often their own necessarily discriminatory enforcement which makes pooling necessary.

My company has from time to time urged the Maritime Commission and its predecessors and the Congress that they abandon the hopeless effort of regulating every transaction in every part of the world which may affect the foreign commerce of the United States. Instead, we have urged, there should be devised a regulatory system which is directed to the conferences, designed to insure that the conferences themselves accomplish the regulatory job which they have undertaken. We have seen no sign that anyone in authority has given any consideration to this, or indeed to any other, escape from the present regulatory dilemma. It seems to me certain, however, that a major reconstruction of the regulatory system will inevitably take place within the decade. I view the regulatory problem, therefore, as essentially a short-range and not a built-in threat to the American merchant marine.

X

I want to address my final concern over the American merchant marine to the chamber of commerce section of my audience. That is because both its cause and its cure lie in your hands, and those of your mainland colleagues.

In every other maritime nation of the world the businessmen as a matter of course turn first to the vessels of their own flag. What is called nationalistic preference and pride in their flag is the backbone of the great fleets of the United Kingdom and of Japan.

For example, Japan Transportation Minister Ayabe last month issued a statement calling upon Japanese industrial and trading circles to utilize Japanese ships by taking note of the need to improve the nation's trade balance. It was of utmost urgency, he said, for Japan to improve its trade situation in such fields as shipping, aviation, and tourism. Our merchant fleet similarly specializes in our own trade, but has never won an equally consistent support of our own business community.

But recently the Federal Maritime Board did establish an office to encourage American businessmen to more full utilize American ships. It is headed by a competent executive, Maitland S. Pennington as special assistant to the Maritime Administrator and it is hoped his efforts will be recognized by the Nation's business leaders.

By and large our ships can offer faster service and better cargo eare than our competitors. We offer a service that will be at your call whatever crises affect the ships of other flags. We offer the readiest and most effective way to remedy the balance-of-payment problems that have recently troubled this country. The American merchant marine is even now the third largest earner of foreign exchange, exceeded only by the aircraft and automobile manufacturing industries. With some added support from American shippers it could be a good distance toward eliminating the problem.

I have said the problem is yours to solve. This is not to deprecate the energetic work being done in Government offices and in our own trade associations to promote the use of American ships. The American citizen in general, and the American businessman in particular, has a tendency to reach his own decision upon his own grounds. I should rather leave it to you. If our service is poor, complain to us. If our ships are too few or our space is too short, complain to the Maritime Administration. If neither is the case, you might find it in your own interest as well as ours to turn first to the ships which fly the American flag, and employ your own American workman.

XI

I have taken you over a long road, and we have glimpsed more than our share of perils along the wayside.

I would find it impossible to make a tidy addition of the strengths and the weaknesses of the American merchant marine, and to derive a resulting balance, whether positive or negative, which would be worthy of belief. It is certain enough that the ships which sail your flag have shoals ahead and heavy weather behind.

We are bound together—Hawaii and the mainland—in a common destiny. We are united in spirit and purpose to maintain a strong and free economy and by working closely together and with the sustained help of our representatives in Congress and the executive branch of the Government we will continue to build a stronger and more vital merchant marine—second to none in this tempestuous and troubled world.

It has been for me an inspiration to spend this brief period of time with you—and for us to enjoy the wonder and the beauty of this lovely and tranquil part of our globe. It would be a great blessing to us if Mrs. Killion and I could spend more time each year in your midst and enjoy your amazing hospitality. You truly possess an incomparable capacity to make people comfortable, contented, and happy. We thank you for the privilege of being with you. It has been for us a moment in our lives which we shall always cherish.

Federal Power Commission: The Ravenous Regulators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of this body, including myself, have been critical of recent actions

and decisions by the Federal Power Commission.

I feel, as I am sure many do who are familiar with the oil and gas industry, that the FPC has gone far afield. Its decisions have not only placed unworkable hardships upon a vital industry but, in fact, have added to the ultimate cost to the consumer.

On May 12, the Wall Street Journal's editorial criticized one of the Commission's recent decisions. I believe the criticism is constructive, and in my opinion, certainly merited, and I draw my colleagues' attention to it at the end of my statement.

In addition, I would like to cite the House statements made in a recent communication to me by a constituent familiar with the petroleum industry and the FPC, who is critical of the 1963 annual report submitted to Congress by the FPC:

In this report it is stated that "the Commission has put into effect a workable plan" for regulating producers of natural gas. It further states that during the year it has made considerable progress and solid gains in producer regulation. Thus, the report seeks to create the impression that all is well with respect to producer regulation. The facts show to the contrary.

For 10 years, since the Supreme Court *Phillips* decision in 1954, the FPC has been experimenting with producer regulations. Utility-type regulation was abandoned as unworkable after 6 years. For the past 3 years, the FPC has been experimenting with the area price method involving 23 separate areas. The first area proceeding is still underway, being far from final determination and even then subject to question as having no legal basis. The record therein shows that in groping for a solution, the Commission is resorting to absurd schemes and theories of regulation.

This 10-year experiment by the FPC has involved a tremendous waste of public funds, unnecessary costs to the industry, and higher prices to the consumers of natural gas. I believe this situation warrants investigation by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that it is time Congress took a close look at the operation of this regulatory agency, and respectfully draw the attention of my colleagues to this communication and the recent editorial which follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 12, 1964]

THE RAVENOUS REGULATORS

Though the reason for Federal regulation of business supposedly is protection of the public interest, it often seems that the regulators must have something quite different in mind.

This certainly appears to have been the case the other day in a decision handed down by the Federal Power Commission. Not content with its price-fixing power in natural gas, the FPC is moving farther toward wiping out free competition in the industry.

The decision involved United Gas Pipe Line Co., which had been buying gas from Continental Oil Co. under a 10-year contract. Shortly before the contract was scheduled to expire, Continental notified United that it would not be renewed.

Instead, Continental demanded that United sign a new 20-year contract—at a 45-percent increase in price. United said, No thanks, and began buying elsewhere the gas that it distributes to several areas of the country.

But United reckoned without the FPC. First, the agency approved Continental's price increase. Then, astonishingly, it ordered United to resume buying gas from Continental at the new, higher price.

How did the Commission acquire such arbitrary authority? Well, according to a majority of the Commissioners, the facilities through which United had been getting gas from Continental had been "dedicated' to public use; the public eventually got the gas that flowed through them. So, said the majority, United could not stop using these public facilities without an FPC OK.

The majority was unmoved by the fact that United's switch of suppliers had not cut its delivery of gas to consumers. Nor was it influenced by the view of a dissenting Commissioner that the ruling surely would raise the average price of gas. What apparently mattered most was that the FPC now was not only rigging prices but dictating what, in most areas, would be routine business decisions.

It's hard to see how this ruling serves the public interest. But perhaps protecting the public becomes boring when regulators develop an overwhelming hunger for power.

Kluckhohn Book Cites Otepka Case

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Frank Kluckhohn has written two new books, "The Inside on L.B.J." and "Lyndon's Legacy." They are just off the press. In the latter book, chapter 5 is devoted to the infamous Otepka case which has been one of the storm signals on the path of the New Frontier which should alert all Americans to the appeasing policies of the State Department and their appalling lack of proper security measures. Mr. Kluckhohn has done an excellent job on this part of "Lyndon's Legacy" and I include that chapter with these remarks:

"LYNDON'S LEGACY," CHAPTER 5—AN END TO SECURITY—THE OTEPKA CASE

"For on his choice depends the safety and the health of the whole state." Shakespeare, "Hamlet"—I, iii, 17.

It was a foregone conclusion that with Adam Yarmolinsky—the great critic of Federal security against loyalty and security risks—actually in the Kennedy-Johnson inner circle, there would take place an effective smashing of security procedures in sensitive Federal departments and agencies. The effective smashing of the Security Office of the State Department might well be called Adam Yarmolinsky's "51st case."

The last hurrah for the State Department's security setup came immediately after the advent of the Kennedy administration, when the State Security Office ruled that now Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland should not be given even a temporary security clearance, and this ruling was upheld by the State Department's Acting Administrator of Security.

However, Secretary of State Dean Rusk personally waived security requirements for Cleveland. Rusk revealed this in a letter he wrote to a Congressman, and claimed that his personal clearance of Cleveland was "based on FBI reports"; but if this is so, the State Department's professional security officers certainly had drawn quite different conclusions from Rusk's.

Indeed, a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report issued in the autumn of 1963 revealed that up to mid-1962—more than a year before—Dean Rusk had personally waived security checks for 150 new key State Department employees, most of them over the violent objections of State's Security Office. In fact, many others had been personally cleared by Rusk and were working in the State Department without the Security Office's even knowing about them.

After the State security office had refused clearance to Cleveland, the security division was reorganized, reportedly along the lines planned by William Wieland, "ex-president of the Fidel Castro Fan Club."

The first reorganization move of the Kennedy administration was to abolish the jobs of 23 of State's professional agents. They were given 30 days to show cause why their jobs should not be abolished. Other security men were given minor and meaningless jobs calculated to make them resign. Many key security professionals, who had memorized dozens of security files and who could be "troublesome" if they were accorded too much of "the treatment," were sent abroad to meaningless jobs. Some of these were given foreign assignments on security, which were so laughable, they could be compared to giving J. Edgar Hoover a job as a traffic cop.

One top security official who received a show cause notice was Otto Otepka, chief of all personnel security, whose "security risk" findings at State skyrocketed into headlines across the Nation in the summer and autumn of 1963, when Otepka revealed to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland was trying to worm Alger Hiss and a number of other known security and loyalty risks back into the State Department. Otepka told the Senate subcommittee a lot more about the hanky-panky at State, too.

Otepka was no mere cog in the wheel in the State Department's security setup. He was the top man, the ranking Deputy Director of the Security Office, and was in charge of the entire personnel security organization of the U.S. State Department, both in Washington and in American embassies and consulates throughout the world.

Otepka was a hard-nosed security boss and, until the advent of the Kennedy administration, his security office of the State Department had been one of the most highly professional organizations in the Federal Government. It was Otepka's security organization, for instance, which—only a short time before Otepka received his pink slip from the Kennedy reorganizers—had fingered Foreign Service Officer Irving Scarbeck, who was subsequently convicted and imprisoned for giving American secrets to a female Soviet Polish spy in Warsaw. The Communist Mata Hari revealed in a U.S. court that the Soviet espionage apparatus had forced her to become Scarbeck's mistress in order to wean American secrets from him.

Otepka was absolutely nonpolitical, and had been drafted into the State Department in 1953 from the Civil Service Commission because he was regarded in Government circles as one of the finest, most dispassionate and most objective appraisers of personnel records in Federal career service. In the Federal Government since 1936, Otepka has the ability to realize that many people may have at least one skeleton in their family closets, but never to let this by itself disqualify an applicant for service, recognizing that in some cases, one can tell a workman by his chips. In fact, in 1958, Otepka was given the State Department's Meritorious Service Award for his outstanding work.

As chief of personnel security, it was Otepka's duty to investigate State Department mistakes about hailing Castro as a Robin Hood and letting Fidel establish a Communist bastions and a staging area for communizing all of Latin America, 90 miles

from American shores. Of course this involved investigating William Wieland, who had been Chief of State's Office of Middle-American Affairs during the Eisenhower administration and who is a carryover onto the New Frontier. Otepka did a thorough investigation of Wieland and wrote a sizzling report on him, which has never been published; but it is known that Otepka said Wieland definitely should be dismissed.

Wieland had not been fired by the administration; in fact, the President was pleased with Mr. Wieland. This was brought to national attention at Kennedy's January 24, 1962, press conference when he informed the Nation that he had personally cleared Wieland for security (making it clear that he had acted on Dean Rusk's advice) and asserted that Wieland could perform his duties "without detriment to the interests of the United States."

Indeed, far from being dismissed, Wieland was, in fact, the senior officer (with two others, one of whom was reportedly J. Clayton Miller) who reportedly planned the Kennedy administration's "reorganization" of the State Department's security setup. Naturally, the State Department has denied that Wieland even had a hand in helping to smash State's security organization. Even putting aside Wieland's hideous pro-Communist record, it was a case of a man under investigation as a loyalty and security risk firing his chief investigator, Otto Otepka.

As soon as the State security office had been effectively smashed, the Foreign Service officer in charge, William Boswell, was one of those transferred overseas.

What security against loyalty and security risks now remains in the State Department? Even those few experts still in State's security office are so subjected to pressures from the top that there is no longer any effective security there. Actually, the New Frontiersmen and the Foreign Service are still policed, except that they now police themselves—politically, but certainly not for security and loyalty, most observers declare.

Self-policing of "security" is now standard procedure throughout much of the Federal Government under the Johnson administration. This chapter on State Department security is written only to give the public an idea of the situation throughout Washington and at our Government posts overseas.

This self-policing of security procedures extends even to our supersecret Government agencies which handle atomic and military secrets, as could be seen in the autumn of 1963, when two traitors were tabbed by the FBI for feeding top-secret Strategic Air Command (SAC) secrets to a ring of Soviet spies. Both men, John Butenko and Jack Conklin (Conklin died mysteriously in an auto crash before arrest) worked for International Electric Corp. on highly secret Air Force contracts and had been cleared by the Air Force Office of Special Investigation, which explained, "It is up to the individual plant to determine what type of clearance is required for an employee. The plant itself can give a lower clearance classification."

When the case broke it was discovered that Butenko, who held a top-secret security clearance, had Russian parents, a police record, and had been fired from the Navy in the middle of World War II on a medical discharge "because of constitutional traits which rendered him unfit for naval service." Conklin, who had a secret security clearance, had also been strangely discharged from the service in the middle of World War II, had a police record for cruelty to his child, was a habitual drunk, had been married five times, had beaten his fourth wife, and wife No. 5 never knew about wife No. 4.

The New York Journal-American's reporting of the case declared: "Is the Nation's internal security being jeopardized by inadequate screening of persons working on 'classified' Government defense contracts?" The answer is "Yes."

What happened to Otto Otepka is an excellent example of what now happens to anyone working for the Federal Government during the Johnson administration who raises questions about loyalty or security, or who knows too much.

During Otepka's decade of service as a State Department top security official, he had appraised the file of every State Department employee. Otepka was a highly competent professional security agent, as seen by his sleuthing and breaking of the Irving Scarbeck case. In some cases Otepka refused, after careful and impartial investigation, to clear State Department employees, among them Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland.

Otepka obviously was a danger to the administration, because of his detailed knowledge and prodigious memory of the pro-Communist records and activities of New Frontier appointees, as well as other appointees' "defects" in character. So Otepka was to be ditched, along with the 23 other State security officers. However, such a howl was raised in Congress, that Otepka was retained, but the New Frontiersmen officially abolished his job and he was demoted to the relatively minor job of evaluating security files. A concerted effort was then made to get rid of Otepka, and finally, when he had adamantly refused to resign, State Department VIP's tried to shunt him off to the National War College in May 1962. He refused to go, recognizing the move as another step in the plan to get rid of him.

In October 1962, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings to investigate William Wieland, and subpenaed Otto Otepka for testimony; and what Otepka told the Senators blew the whistle on Wieland. Otepka also told the Senators that in the adverse report he had written on Wieland after his investigation, he had specified and documented "serious questions of the man's integrity," and had urged that Wieland's case "should be reviewed and adjudicated under the Foreign Service regulations of the Department of the State."

Early in 1963, as part of the Senate subcommittee's continuing interest in Wieland and in other controversial State Department security cases, the subcommittee scheduled hearings to delve into additional State Department cases. Otepka was subpenaed to testify in secret session.

Otepka testified for 6 days—and what he told the Senators nearly blew the ceiling out of the hearing room, with what one Senator on the subcommittee termed "political dynamite."

One Senate aid, emerging bug-eyed from the hearing room, grimly told the author: "The number of security risks whom Otepka turned down—only to have them 'cleared' by the top brass of the State Department—is greater than anyone in the Nation has realized."

It has been made public that Otepka declared the State Department to be riddled with men of questionable security backgrounds, many of them in the high echelons of the Department.

It is known that Otepka named Walt "The-Soviets-Are-Mellowing" Rostow (who sets all policy for the State Department and has set the pattern for the whole "Soviets-are-mellowing" policy throughout the administration); Harlan Cleveland; and William Wieland as being among the men whose backgrounds he considered "questionable."

Then the Senators called to these secret hearings several State Department officials to testify about the same cases which Otepka had discussed. These officials swore that the facts were absolutely opposite to what Otepka had described, and furthermore, they said, Otepka had never even brought these questionable cases to their attention.

The Senators recalled Otepka and ordered him, under oath, to document his previous testimony about the questionable security cases.

Otepka produced State Department memorandums and papers from State Department files, in what one Senator described as "ironclad documentation" of every word Otepka had previously uttered about the security cases involved, and in documented refutation of what the State Department officials had sworn about these same cases.

Furthermore, Otepka also proved that the State officials had lied under oath when they testified that they knew nothing about the cases and that Otepka had never brought the cases to their attention. Otepka produced papers about the cases, initialed and noted in reply to Otepka's bringing the cases to their attention—by the very same State Department officials who had sworn they knew nothing about them.

The personal cost to himself of Otepka's testimony can never be fully realized by the American public. After he gave his first testimony, and word of it reached the White House, Otepka was given the full treatment with ruthless efficiency, reportedly at the personal order of Bobby Kennedy.

On June 27, 1963, Otepka was called into the office of John J. Reilly, State's chief security officer, and a personal friend of Bobby Kennedy. Reilly told Otepka that his duties were being taken away from him. His new assignment was to update a handbook on security. As the two men walked back to Otepka's office, six security officers joined them, entered Otepka's office, seized all his records, the contents of his 14 safes, and started making arrangements to change the combinations. Otepka went out to keep a luncheon appointment, and when he returned, he found that he was barred from his office and given a cubbyhole in which to update his handbook. His secretary was taken away from him and he was to be allowed secretarial help only with the permission of Reilly.

His cubbyhole was "bugged;" his telephone was tapped and then taken away from him; the trash from his wastebasket and "burn bag" was collected and searched surreptitiously by Reilly, who had the little burn bag (which is used to destroy classified waste material) marked with a red *X* and brought to the State Department mailroom, where he sneaked it into his briefcase. Junior G-man Reilly then laboriously pasted together scraps of Otepka's torn papers, peered at reams of wornout typewriter ribbons, and devoted hours of the taxpayers' time and money to "git" Otepka. Otepka faced Reilly and asked him for an explanation of the whole thing, but Reilly refused to explain. Finally Bobby Kennedy dispatched FBI investigators to interrogate Otepka for hours on end.

But bravely Otepka struggled on. He refused to resign. He forced the security risks to fire the security officer.

The Senate subcommittee hearings were getting so hot, that Secretary of State Dean Rusk conferred personally and privately with President Kennedy about strategy in the matter of purging the patriot who had struggled to keep security risks out of the State Department. The decision was reached. On August 15, Abba Schwartz, the State Department's Administrator of Security—a political appointee who has had some experience in immigration cases, but who does not have a single day's training in security procedures or regulations—issued an order forbidding State Department employees to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, or to have anything to do with the Senate subcommittee personnel. Reilly also gave the same order to his own personnel. The move was lashed in Congress as "an outrageous interference with the right of Congress

to investigate, and an interference with the right of free speech."

On September 23, 1963, as soon as the Senate was sewed up to approve the testban treaty, the State Department held charges of "misconduct" against Otepka for allegedly improperly turning over State Department documents to J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Otepka was given 10 days to answer the charges, procured a 10-day extension, and was scheduled to be suspended without pay. Since the State Department could not charge Otepka with falsifying testimony before the Senate subcommittee—because he himself had refuted the perjured testimony of State Department officials—they charged him with "misconduct" in giving documents to Sourwine.

The fact is, however, that Otto Otepka had responded to the subpena of a duly constituted subcommittee of the U.S. Senate to substantiate charges he had made against alleged security risks in the State Department—in answering Senators' specific questions—by producing documented evidence carrying notes and initials of the selfsame State Department officials who had sworn they had never laid eyes on the documents. Otepka's act of refuting, chapter and verse, with documented evidence—under subpena of a Senate subcommitee—the perjury of the New Frontiersmen about security cases was alleged by the New Frontiersmen to be a violation of security.

The State Department, caught dead to rights in the act of lying to a Senate subcommittee, based its flimsy charges against Otepka on the basis that he violated a 1948 Executive order issued by Harry Truman—to bar congressional probes into the case of convicted Communist William Remington and into the Alger Hiss case—which says that files on Government employees are not to be given to Members of Congress, except through the President.

However, that same year, 1948, Congress passed a law, title V, section 52 of the United States Code, which reads:

"The rights of persons employed in the civil service of the United States * * * to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

Furthermore, in 1958 a concurrent resolution was passed by both Houses of Congress which reads:

"Any person in Government service should put loyalty to highest moral principles and country above loyalty to persons, party or Government department."

Otepka cited the United States Code statute in his October 14 rebuttal of the charges against him, and furthermore he denied that he had ever furnished classified documents or other restricted information to any unauthorized person. Moreover, Otepka cited a Senate report as proof that Dean Rusk himself had shown classified loyalty documents to a Senator.

In the meantime, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, enraged by the total lack of cooperation and the gag order of the State Department, had been trying since early July to get Dean Rusk to testify about the case in secret session. Rusk had first pleaded that he was too busy about negotiations with Russia; then the Senators forced him into making several appointments to testify, all of which he broke. Finally, on October 2, the entire bipartisan Senate Judiciary Committee took the unprecedented step of dispatching a U.S. Senator to deliver a document by hand—a 10-page bill of particulars and statement of charges to Dean Rusk, who was having secret conferences in New York with Soviet officials. The committee dispatched Senator THOMAS J. DODD, vice chairman of its Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, with the document and a covering letter signed by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the committee.

The sizzling document charged the State Department with covering up laxity in State Department security operations; it charged perjury by the State Department officials who had testified in opposition to Otepka's documented evidence; and it demanded that Dean Rusk produce witnesses, including himself, to testify about the questionable security procedures and cases in the State Department.

At a press conference, President Kennedy was questioned by a reporter about the State Department gag order, about the whole Otepka scandal in which Otepka had named William Arthur Wieland, Walter W. Rostow, and many others, Kennedy completely evaded answering the questions about Rostow and Wieland and many others, and simply said that Rusk would appear before the Senators and clear up all those little difficulties.

The Senators finally got Rusk into the testimony chair and grilled him for hours in secret session. Unless Rusk performed some magicians' tricks, he must have had some pretty uncomfortable hours trying to answer the Senators' charges. At this writing Rusk's testimony has not been released, but not a few Americans are looking forward with interest to seeing it.

On October 3, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat revealed that it was beginning to appear that there is even more behind the effort to oust Otto Otepka "than was first suspected":

"Suspicion is strong in Washington that the plot against him goes even beyond the State Department—that the character moving in on Otepka is a more powerful figure in our Government than the Secretary of State—none other than the President's brother, Attorney General Bobby Kennedy.

"What's it all about?

"It's more because Mr. Otepka is a career man in Government service of unquestioned loyalty who thinks Congress is entitled to know what's going on, who wants real security measures carried out. In other words, Mr. Otepka has been a hard-line, anti-Communist State Department official—just like Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, who has been in constant hot water with her superiors for the same reason.

"With Bobby Kennedy trying to move in Kennedy people to run things the administration way, Mr. Otepka drew the line at some characters he considered dubious.

"The flimsy charges about what he told the subcommittee are reported incidental to getting rid of the State Department security official who guarded the door."

Not incidentally, the three-ring-circus Valachi hearings were stage-managed by Bobby Kennedy at precisely the same time as the Otepka case broke into October's headlines. The Otepka case, of course, is of enormous significance to the future well-being of our national security; whereas, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (and as corroborated by Hoover's opposite number in the Canadian Government), every word uttered by Valachi has been known for years by U.S. law enforcement officers. Many observers asserted flatly that staging the Valachi hearings at that precise moment was an attempt by the Kennedy administration to distract public attention from the security risks scattered throughout the Kennedy administration—as then being enunciated by Otto Otepka.

On November 5, Otepka received his dismissal notice from the State Department. Senators immediately rose to Otepka's defense. Senator STROM THURMOND declared that Otepka was "railroaded with methods characteristic of a police state. Otepka should be reinstated, exonerated, and commended for his courage. The dismissal points to the pressing need for a full investigation of the State Department."

THURMOND denounced Otepka's dismissal as "a clear-cut case of retaliation against a Government witness for cooperating with a Senate committee." He declared that the State Department action is "an offense against the Congress," which may "constitute contempt of the Senate, which is punishable by imprisonment."

THURMOND declared that the "American public, newspapers, and private citizens have joined in demanding that the State Department, this bureaucratic nightmare, be cleaned out * * * the State Department is in bad need of a purge."

The Senator further declared, "It now appears that a purge of personnel is being attempted. Unfortunately, it is the very opposite of what the critics of the State Department have in mind, for it is, in effect, an attempted purge of patriots. * * * The State Department's attempted purge of patriots must not be tolerated, and this very attempt is further evidence that a thorough investigation of the State Department is in order."

The Charleston News and Courier pointed to the fact that the possibility of disloyalty in high echelons of the State Department is hardly to be written off: "In view of the fact that persons of proven disloyalty have held high posts in the State Department in years past, the subcommittee has a duty to dig deeply."

A sample of what one newspaper described as a case "which demonstrates honor as it now exists on the New Frontier" came to light in November. Three of the State Department officials whom the subcommittee had summoned to discuss Otepka's previous testimony and his whole case were: Elmer Hill, Chief of State's Technical Services Division; John Reilly, Otepka's boss, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, who is a personal friend of Bobby Kennedy, placed over Otepka when the New Frontier made its debut, and the man who set up the bugging of Otepka's cubbyhole, the tapping of Otepka's telephone, and the months-long harassment of Otepka—all reportedly at the personal order of Bobby Kennedy; and David Belisle, Reilly's special assistant.

The Senators asked the three men whether or not they knew anything at all about the bugging and telephone tapping. All three men swore under oath that they knew nothing about it. But in November, when the subcommittee's investigators informed the Senators that they had ironclad evidence that the bugging and tapping had been done, and that Hill and Reilly had actually set it up, Senator Tomas Dodd charged Hill and Reilly with perjury. Quick as a wink, all three men hastily dispatched letters of clarification to the subcommittee. Hill and Reilly admitted that they had not told the whole story under oath, and had, in fact, been the men who bugged and tapped Otepka's cubbyhole. On November 17, Reilly and Hill resigned from the State Department. Belisle pleaded that he had no firsthand knowledge of the shenanigans, but admitted that he knew about them, and that he had been out of the country when they took place. At this writing, Belisle is still ensconced in the State Department, and Bobby Kennedy has not yet given his friend Reilly a new job on the New Frontier.

At this writing, the Otepka affair bodes to be one of the bitterest clashes between the State Department and the Senate in American history, and M. Stanton Evans, editor of the Indianapolis News, has written an excellent prognosis of the case:

"The episode as a whole presents a rather unhappy picture of operating procedure in Foggy Bottom. We have, in order:

"1. State Department Official William Wieland covering up the true nature of Fidel Castro's 26 July Movement, helping steer the United States into diplomatic catastrophe in Cuba.

"2. State Department higher-ups covering up for Wieland, overriding sensible security practices to do so.

"3. State Department denial of the true facts of the security situation, in order to cover up for their previous coverup of Wieland.

"4. State Department reprisals against a man courageous enough to tell the truth about security procedures, in order to cover up for their general coverup in the security picture as a whole.

"In an interview with Williard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune, Otepka commented concerning coverup No. 3: '"This put their testimony in conflict with mine and with my official knowledge. Their testimony was untrue. Since they had used the subcommittee forum to make their statements, I felt entitled to rebut their statements and present the true facts. * * * I'm charged with violation of orders when all I did was defend myself.'

"Considering the Department's overall record in this field, it seems unlikely its campaign against Otepka is inspired by zeal for security. The Kennedy officials are obviously concerned to prevent Congress from knowing of their misfeasances—merely the latest flowering of Executive arrogance toward the legislature. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee means to assert the rightful preorgatives of the lawmaking branch, and it is to be hoped the result will puncture the hubris of the foreign policy bureaucracy.

"There are yet other ramifications of the Otepka case, embracing Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland. According to testimony before the subcommittee, Cleveland has been bringing people of dubious security status into the State Department. Simultaneously, evidence has accumulated suggesting a sustained effort to dismantle the security office of the Department—a move described by former Security Chief John W. Hanes as either 'incompetence or a deliberate attempt to render the State Department's security section ineffective.' It was Otepka's difference with the New Frontier on these matters that allegedly brought on the vendetta against him. The subcommittee has also been examining this aspect of the controversy."

The lesson of the Otepka case is plain. The State Department security against penetration by Communists and against other security risks has been smashed and exists effectively no longer.

And the man most knowledgeable on the subject, the man who struggled hardest and the most bravely to keep security in the State Department, is a man hunted, then destroyed, by the security risks themselves.

Why? Because he did a good job, and because he answered the subpena of a duly constituted committee of the Senate and told what is going on in the State Department, revealing that the men around the President use strange means to get their strange friends into the State Department over the violent objections of men like Otto Otepka.

Another man ditched by the administration's effective smashing of security in the State Department is Elmer Hipsley, who had been in charge of worldwide physical security in State's Office of Security, as Otepka had been in charge of worldwide personnel security.

Hipsley had been responsible for the safekeeping of such vital items as secret documents, secret codes, and safes in U.S. embassies around the world. He was responsible for the personal safety of the Secretary of State wherever the Secretary traveled; and for the protection of all foreign officials visiting the United States.

Hipsley, big, red-haired and a tough ex-policeman, was—like Otepka and others—nonpolitical. In fact, he had entered State from the Secret Service. He is personally a quiet, though a fabulous, man. During the course of his work Hipsley has met the leaders of communism personally, and he understands and detests communism.

Hipsley was the Secret Service agent alone with Franklin D. Roosevelt when he died in Warm Springs, Ga., in 1945. Hipsley stood behind F.D.R. at Yalta, and knows firsthand what transpired at that disastrous conference. Hipsley was with President Harry Truman at Potsdam, and is believed to have handed Truman the message of the first atomic bomb explosion at Hiroshima.

Hipsley is respected by international security men ranging from Scotland Yard to Moscow and the Sûreté. In his work he has known many of the world's Communist leaders, including Stalin—who did a good deal of talking with F.D.R. at both Yalta and Teheran.

Although every patriotic American detests Khrushchev and the Communist slave system, many Americans were genuinely concerned about the possibility of war or similar disaster should harm befall the Soviet boss when he made his first unprecedented visit to this Nation in September 1959, and covered 6,000 miles from east coast to west and back. Elmer Hipsley was in complete charge of Khrushchev's safety from the time his plane set down at Andrews Air Force Base until his departure and, as Aemricans will recall, Nikita arrived, saw Eisenhower, and departed without an incident.

Security arrangements for a trip of this kind take not only highly professional skill but also most detailed planning, involving split-second timing. The problem was complicated by the fact that we have no national police force in the European sense of the word. While Hipsley had the support of the Secret Service, FBI, CIA, and other Federal agencies, he was largely dependent upon his own arrangements with local police forces, whether Khrushchev was traveling slowly through crowded cities or eating lunch in the middle of an Iowa wheat field.

Khrushchev, receiving hostile treatment from American crowds and protesting pickets, tried to gain sympathy by making a play involving security. Khrushchev complained that he was not being permitted to go to Disneyland, on the outskirts of sprawling Los Angeles, although it was his own security chief, General Zaharov, who had made that decision. After that play fizzled, Khrushchev claimed our security was so tight that he was not able to meet Americans freely. As he traveled north toward San Francisco, photographs showed Khrushchev visiting with some children at the Santa Barbara station platform where his train stopped. The Washington Daily News (a Scripps-Howard paper) printed this picture and captioned it, "Khrushchev after the Relaxation of Security." In the photo, standing with his arms almost circling Khrushchev, was the omni-present Hipsley. Incidentally, the crowd in San Francisco belied press reports by being as hostile as crowds elsewhere.

Elmer Hipsley's finest protective job, however, was in connection with Khrushchev's historic visit to New York, along with all the satellite stooges from Europe and even Cuba, for the opening of the United Nations General Assembly in 1961.

Few in Washington thought that so many Communist masters of mass murder and bloody oppression could escape from New York unscathed or without some incident. There was Nasser of Egypt in an area of strong Jewish concentration. There was a racial minority in New York (and a large one throughout the Nation) from every satellite nation which has been raped and subjugated. There were, for example, Baltic and Polish peoples whose whole families had been executed or who were still in slave-labor camps. With luck, it was said in Washington, Red leaders might leave the United States alive, but without incident? Impossible.

"New York's finest"—her police force—received well-deserved credit for the fact that nothing happened. (Actually, so many New York police were assigned to guard Khrushchev on his first visit to New York that the city later sent a bill to the U.N. for $1 million in an attempt to recoup for the taxpayers' money they had expended. The U.N. never paid. By statute, the State Department—and that meant Elmer Hispley—was in charge of the safety of all these visitors when they were away from the U.N. building itself.

In a control room in the Waldorf-Astoria, although it was never revealed, sat Hispley with a top New York police official. An around-the-clock agent was assigned to every foreign visitor. When one of the visitors prepared to leave his quarters or office for another location, Hipsley's agent reported. So close was the coordination that sometimes the New York police officer and sometimes Hipsley himself cut in on the radio bands and set up police protection along the route of travel. When Castro, faking an incident, moved from midtown to a Harlem hotel, it was Hipsley who accompanied him on his midnight shift. When it was all over, and Khrushchev left, one of his last acts was to give Hipsley grudging thanks for his protection.

As for Castro, Hipsley had protected him on his first trip to the United States, too. When Fidel's security guards fell asleep, Castro slipped out onto the women-laden Washington streets to try his luck. It was Hipsley who saw to it that police cars discreetly trailed him—something unknown to the Cuban dictator to this day.

To Hipsley flowed police and other security agency reports of all kinds, including those about would-be killers moving in from Miami to get Castro, or of a man slipping in from Mexico to kill Khrushchev. And Hipsley's orders were to prevent that man from getting to his target—to take him "out of play." In addition, so-called "nut" reports run into thousands during such visits, since the mentally disturbed often react violently to certain visitors receiving top billing in the news. It has been Hipsley's job to separate the nut reports from genuine threats when the cards are down—a business he has spent a lifetime learning.

Some might ask, "Why stop assassins from killing Castro, or Khrushchev, or other world Communist leaders?" There is probably no one who knows and detests communism more than does Elmer Hipsley. But he is a "pro" at his job—and the United States cannot afford the game of having its official guests either assassinated or molested.

For a professional job well done, one might expect a decoration of Hipsley. No. He was given a pink slip, too, just like Otepka's. Then, when the fear of investigation and consequences developed, the group at State headed by J. Clayton Miller, the IPR man whom President Kennedy publicly "cleared" at Dean Rusk's request, officially minus Wieland, naturally, since Wieland was not officially involved—even though he sat in the same office—put through the reorganization plans for the Office of Security. Hipsley was taken from a worldwide anti-Communist operation to a small domestic operation with 20 men under him. Later he was sent to Switzerland, no less, as security officer. This was a long, long way from effective control of anything resembling worldwide physical security for the State Department.

Appendix

Law Day in Isabella County, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Law Day took on unusual significance in Isabella County, Mich., this year when members of the county bar association joined members of the county board of supervisors in the dedication of a new circuit courtroom and law library in the courthouse at Mount Pleasant. Furthermore, this year marks the centennial of Isabella County, giving occasion for a review of the history of the court and the bar of the county.

As a part of the ceremonies, Mr. Walter W. Russell was given an award as outstanding citizen of the centennial year. The presentation was made by Mr. Edward N. Lynch. A certificate was presented to Virgil W. McClintic by Mr. Byron Gallagher designating him dean of the bar. The chairman of the program was Mr. Gerald J. Cotter, president of the Isabella County Bar Association.

The highlight of the program was an address by the Honorable John C. Schaeffer, prominent Michigan jurist and former judge of the Gladwin County, Mich., Circuit Court. His topic was "Liberty Under Law," and I present it for the RECORD because I feel it is a splendid address:

ADDRESS OF HON. JUDGE JOHN C. SCHAEFFER AT THE LAW DAY PROGRAM, ISABELLA COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MOUNT PLEASANT, MICH., MAY 1, 1964

Mr. Chairman, members of the bar, members of the board of supervisors, and ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to meet with and renew the acquaintance I had with the members of the Isabella County Bar in years gone by. My fondest recollections are of their appearances before my court and those recollections are of lawyers who prepared their cases and tried them well. I think the same thing may be said generally of lawyers outside of metropolitan areas. There is certainly a great difference, and I think that the lawyers I speak of now, such as you people, are just plain better lawyers. If I was not of that opinion when I started in on this judgeship business, after a few years of serving as visiting judge in the metropolitan areas you come to believe the statement that I have made.

Also, I want to congratulate the board of supervisors as well as the bar upon refurbishing your courtroom and law library, as I am sure that they are entitled to a great deal of credit for what has been done in this refurbishing job.

Now to get back more to the topic of law today in this country. The efforts of the colored race for equality under the law during the past couple of years in our country has brought into prominence more discussion, not only of the guarantees of freedom of speech, press, assembly, religious worship, and equal protection under law, but the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, than has taken place in the 50 years that preceded it and, as a result thereof, more discussion of the duties of our citizens in attempting to maintain or deny such efforts. It has occurred to me that a few minutes discussion of liberty under law, which goes along with Law Day, would not be amiss on this occasion.

As one justice of the U.S. Supreme Court has recently said, and I will quote, "We all assume that we know what liberty means. We think we understand clearly the difference between liberty and totalitarianism. Yet, however hard one tries, those everyday words, liberty and freedom, prove hopelessly elusive when we try to capture their meaning on paper. The plain fact is that at least in our Nation, there is no simple, commonly accepted, ready-made definition of freedom. It is the very spirit of this liberty we have such difficulty in defining that each of us is free to disagree with one another as to what we mean. When we lose this freedom to disagree we lose the essence of our liberty."

Certainly our democracy is based on liberty or freedom of the individual, freedom of religious belief, conscience, of speech, of individual action. But, and the "but" is the core and sinew of the great strength of a free society. In the liberty or freedom of the individual it is very necessary to preserve the same rights of others. The liberty and freedom we enjoy has been termed by some writers as "ordered liberty." Obviously, the words themselves contain an internal contradiction. Order on the one hand suggests restraint, liberty on the other hand suggests license, and the enigma is fused into one idea. These seemingly contradictory elements indeed constitute the ideal of a free and open society governed with the consent of the governed, there being a majority and a minority on almost any question. Yet we can still live and work together effectively, each recognizing the rights and responsibilities of the other, and our Government's primary role is to secure equal and exact justice for all men regardless of race or creed.

Now to get a clearer concept of liberty under law or ordered liberty, whichever term you prefer, Justice Holmes pointed out more than 40 years ago that there is no freedom more sacred to us than the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution. It gives every man the right to say what he pleases without fear of censorship or punishment for new or unpopular ideas. But this freedom of speech, he continues, does not mean that a man has the right to start a stampede in a crowded theater by yelling fire when, in fact, there is no fire.

As another example, under our Constitution it is basic that a man has the right to own private property and to use it pretty much as he pleases. This does not mean that the man who owns a very fine new car—it is duly licensed, and he himself as the driver is dully licensed by the State to drive the car—it does not mean that he may drive over his neighbor's lawn because it is the shortest way for him to get home.

Freedom of the press is another example, the freedom to print and publish without censorship. This does not give anyone the right to maliciously print that you are a Communist or a criminal when he knows it is not true. Even the stanchest proponents of freedom of the press agree that it is proper for the Government to provide you with some recourse against the publisher.

The fact that liberty does not permit us to do everything we might conceivably like to do or are physically able to do does not mean that we live in a society of fair-weather freedoms or that we preach one thing in our Constitution and practice another in our courts. Liberty does not mean the complete absence of all restraints and responsibilities. For liberty so defined would lead only to chaos, anarchy, and disaster. The essential ingredient which gives Americans the liberty to think and act and speak and print freely, but which also stops us short of chaos, is the ordered half—the ordered liberty. It is the very presence of order which guarantees liberty, and without order there can be no liberty. That also is what we mean by liberty under law.

These restraints which are the essence of order include not only those against the greater crimes such as murder or treason, but equally those laws, minor though they may be, which regulate speed on highways, or even the regulations of stoplights and stop streets and parking in our cities. Even such seemingly trivial laws may be absolutely vital to the protection of our great constitutional liberties as speech, press, religion, and property. As was pointed out by one of our Supreme Court Justices, how safe would the public speakers be if there were no laws against assault and battery? How long would the press of the unpopular printer last if the law did not forbid the breaking and entering of his shop, and without laws against arson and robbery how much would any man's private property be worth?

I have sometimes thought some of our State courts have at times forgotten or overlooked the necessity of restraints for individual action where unquestionably the public good requires it. I have reference now to the search and seizure provisions as they relate to habit-forming drugs and the carriers of dangerous weapons. I think there isn't anything as an occupation any more insidious, any more depraved, or any more harmful to the teenagers of our land than the men who go around peddling dope to these youngsters, willing as they are to try anything new. We may laugh about the Beatles and the youngsters making such a fuss about them, but this in a few months blows over. We read in the papers not long ago that students at a Michigan college went out and had a beer party when they were under age, but they will get over that. But the youngsters that get stuck with this narcotic addition don't get over it that easily.

A week or so ago, on the opening of the World's Fair, when they threatened to block highways leading into the fair, we heard a great outcry about the rights of the public that were being taken away from us. Now it seems to me that it is high time that some of our courts recognize the rights of the public that might be taken away from them. Now, of course, this is my own personal opinion, gentlemen. This was put in our Constitution by a vote of the people. It wasn't an act of the legislature that might be changed the following year, but it was something that the people themselves voted in—that they were willing to surrender some of

their constitutional rights so that protection might be given to these youngsters who are the victims of drug peddlers. Don't think that this is just something that happens in the big cities. As long ago as before I left the city we had those fellows up around Houghton Lake in the summertime peddling their wares, and it is something I think we should give great concern to. But, as I say, that is only my own personal opinion—the opinion of a retired and sometimes very tired old judge.

While I am expressing personal opinions, may I point out that in the present civil rights movement they are having infringement on the constitutional rights of others on both sides. We read of the dynamiting of Negro churches, the shooting of leaders or spokesmen on both sides, the stalling of automobiles on highways, or the halting of subway trains. These are not the proper ways in a democracy to obtain civil rights laws or to prevent their enactment.

It may well be asked, what about bad laws? I think no one knows better than a judge that not every law is a wise law. It is the essence of a free and responsible society that we are always free to criticize those laws that we think are unwise or unnecessary. As citizens we can work to the best of our ability to have them changed or repealed. This is a vital part of our civic responsibility, and we have only ourselves to blame if our legislators enact unwise laws and we let them go unchallenged. But this does not mean that we have a right to flaunt or evade the law or to violate other peoples' constitutional rights simply because we do not like this or that law. There are proper channels through which to protest those laws we wish to change, and if we start disobeying or protesting a law outside those channels we have abandoned the basic principle of ordered liberty.

It has been truly said that liberty is a precious and a delicate commodity and is always in danger. With the growing complexity of our society and the expanding influence of government in all phases of our lives, the opportunities for collision between official power and individual rights are constantly increasing. It is to the lawyers of our country that the people must turn more and more, and the lawyers must be ever vigilant of those collision points, to guard against infringement of individual liberties while at the same time maintaining the order our system requires and on which the rule of law must rest. For our entire country is dependent on the lawyers for the preservation of our liberty under law. And may God grant that, during our lives and the lives of our children unto the third and fourth generations and forever, there may never be raised against the skies of this Republic the white flag of cowardice, or the red flag of blood and anger and communism, or the yellow flag which might aptly symbolize racial hatred; but that liberty shall always be found here and this shall be the greatest country for its growth.

I thank you very kindly.

Johnson Makes Too Many Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

JOHNSON MAKES TOO MANY CLAIMS

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's almost daily claims of new achievements in economy and government are beginning to worry men in both parties and business and labor interests.

Republicans grumble privately that the President has "promised something to everyone" but has timed various programs so that their weaknesses will not become apparent before the November election.

Even in international affairs, they charge, Mr. Johnson is gambling that he can postpone or avoid any serious crisis until after November 3.

Republicans have hammered hard for clarification of the U.S. position in the South Vietnamese war. Many claim, with expert military backing, that the situation is conting to deteriorate and that only massive U.S. assistance or intervention can stop the Communist Vietcong.

They admit, however, that President Johnson may be able to postpone this potentially unpopular decision with his buildup of aid and reinforcement of U.S. military advisory forces.

Democrats are concerned that the President may be setting too fast a pace.

"He is popping up with some new proposal or some new saving almost every day," said one Democratic Congressman. "I hope he can keep it up. I think he's doing a great job, but I'm afraid he may be promising too much. And these cuts are hurting some agencies."

The President was applauded several times during his address this week before the usually conservative U.S. Chamber of Commerce convention. He said that businessmen would realize $30 billion in profits this year and he claimed "record peacetime prosperity."

In another address on the same day, Mr. Johnson's chief economic adviser warned that it may be necessary to enact more tax cuts if the prosperity is to continue. Any move toward further tax cuts would face stiff congressional opposition unless an effort was made to retire part of the $300 billion national debt or unless it had built-in curbs against inflation.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, warned pointedly that the President does not have the right to tamper with wages or profits.

Many of the President's programs also worry men in both parties because they involve long-term commitments. Mr. Johnson is asking $220 million for a start on his Appalachia relief program, but the total cost has been estimated as high as $4 billion.

The antipoverty program calls for $750 million this year, may involve total expenditures of more than $10 billion.

Mr. Johnson is calling for passage of a medical care for the aged program that will involve increased social security payments. The plan is attractive to many Democrats, particularly those from big urban areas, but it also involves long-term commitments.

Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has already warned that current social security taxes may become a "drag" on the economy. Some Congressmen say these taxes may have to be increased just to meet retirement obligations, to say nothing of medicare.

The President also has felt forced to deny that any secret promises or pressures were used on railroad and union officials to win their contract settlement last week. Railroad management people are already grumbling openly that the White House pressured them into surrendering on key issues.

Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, reports rumors that Mr. Johnson promised rail executives tax reviews and lenient treatment by the Internal Revenue Service.

Some rail union officials refer to the contract as a "victory," but their enthusiasm has faded since the Supreme Court upheld an antifeatherbedding arbitration board ruling that could cost 50,000 railroad jobs.

The charges of politics also reach into defense industries. Wholesale closings of Navy shipyards are not expected until after the election. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara insists that time is required for more studies. Political leadeers point out that large blocs of votes are at stake in cities like Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

Republicans also have accused the White House of injecting politics into the supersonic airliner program. A special GOP report claims the SST decision will be put off until November to avoid alienating any aircraft centers.

One Johnson move that may bring the loudest outcries after election day is the tax cut.

While only half of the tax cut is applicable to 1964 earnings, the full withholding reduction took effect in March. This means that many taxpayers will find that they owe a substantial amount in addition to withholding taxes when they calculate their 1964 returns.

"But all this comes after election day," said one Republican. "Lyndon Johnson so far has been a master politician.

"He talks of economy, and yet he is getting a record budget through Congress. He boasts of unequaled military strength, yet he may be making serious cuts in our Defense Establishment. He claims to have fired up the economy, but he is also risking inflation. He practices 'downpayment government.'

"It's a hard combination to beat."

How Come?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been directed to the serious economic problems of the region known as Appalachia. Other areas of the United States share these same problems, and some of them are in southern Indiana.

Henry J. Taylor, writing in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, May 16, 1964, discusses one of these problems:

HOW COME?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The missing ammunition in President Johnson's war on Appalachian poverty is the administration's continued and agonizing failure to smack down State Department timidity. There's an eel under this rock some place and the public is entitled to know what it is.

President Johnson has had absolutely first-class advice about at least one needless contribution to Appalachian unemployment. He has not acted on it. Neither did President Kennedy. Why?

They got the facts from the nonpartisan National Coal Policy Conference, representing not only the miners' union but all major coal producers throughout Appalachia and the Nation as a whole—more than 30 coal-carrying railroads, many electric utilities, mine-machinery makers, etc. The most important element in the stricken area is the jobmaker. These diversified conference members are the jobmakers.

The conference explained to President Kennedy throughout his tenure of office, and has continued to explain to President Johnson, that the administration's residual oil policy is a complete reversal of everything said and promised for the relief of unemployment in Appalachia.

Residual oil is a leftover, waste product from petroleum refining. It is dumped here in enormous quantities from Saudi Arabia, Colombia, Venezuela, etc., at whatever prices any market will bear. The effect is lethal on jobs in the very region that our taxpayers' money is supposed to rescue from a tragic situation. This is not free trade. Since when is dumping free trade?

As this writer recently reported, every million barrels of foreign waste oil dumped here displaces about 250,000 tons of coal. Each million tons displaced costs the jobs of about 427 miners and 200 workers in transportation industries.

When President Kennedy took office the allowable annual import was 154 million barrels. His administration lifted it three times to 191.8 million barrels. The effect was felt not only in distressed Appalachia but in Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Colorado, Alabama, Arkansas, and Kentucky—but chiefly in Appalachia because Appalachia is largely a one-crop country: coal.

State Department timidness in not wanting to "displease" Saudi Arabia, Colombia, Venezuela, etc., is a potent factor in sponsoring no curtailment. So is the international oil lobby. But no matter what the whys, the Johnson administration has accepted this job-killing Niagara. Astoundingly enough, it will go still further—since Mr. Johnson announced his war on Appalachian poverty, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall announced that the April 1964–April 1965 foreign waste-oil allowable is being increased another 23 million barrels.

During the next 12 months while the taxpayers' money flows into Appalachia, inrushing foreign waste oil will also flow into our markets at an alltime high of 233 million barrels. This dumping here will cost Appalachian employment the equivalent of 55½ million tons of coal. As a result, as Macbeth discovered, you can murder Banquo but you cannot lay his ghost.

Failure in most of our national affairs is seldom due to an absence of plans. There is generally an abundance of plans, like the proposed employment betterments in Appalachia. The failures arise because the plans are not good plans. They do not work. Success in these may well require Government spending, but it first requires sound policies. They must go together. Like health and happiness, they are indivisible.

Charity begins at home. It is perfectly preposterous to be so nervous about our relations with Saudi Arabia, Colombia, Venezuela, etc., that we sacrifice desperately needed employment in a heartbreakingly distressed area.

Only 5 days before the Dallas horror, National Coal Policy Conference representatives spelled out this contradiction to President Kennedy for the fourth time, without avail. Mr. Udall is completely familiar with the effect in Appalachia. So are Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary Averell Harriman. So is Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges. All have been fully and personally briefed.

No one this writer can find can give a coherent answer to why President Kennedy failed to act, and President Johnson continues to fail to act, on the Appalachian problem. Taxpayers and the wretched, jilted unemployed alike are entitled to ask: How come?

Olin Teague Performing in a National Key Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to request permission to insert in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the Waco (Tex.) Times-Herald, which is entitled "OLIN TEAGUE Performing in a National Key Role."

Congressman TEAGUE is my chairman on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I am privileged to serve; but this editorial relates to his impressive work on another committee—the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, on which he is ranking member.

This editorial describes the exhaustive on-the-spot investigation, headed by Congressman TEAGUE with other designated committee members, of the laboratories and plants throughout the country where space projects are in progress. The editorial points out that this thorough investigation had favorable implications and results for the bill authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which passed the House on March 25 on a rollcall vote of 288 yeas to 73 nays. During the course of the discussion of the bill, Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, advised this membership that the strict evaluation of NASA's management of its resources and funds is the single responsibility of the NASA Oversight Subcommittee, which he had established last year for the purpose and which had as chairman, Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas.

Chairman MILLER added:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, 5 minutes after the full committee voted on H.R. 10456 [the authorization bill then before the House], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] called the Oversight Subcommittee to order in the hearing room to begin a series of investigations into problems of nuclear propulsion which confront NASA. You can see that he is losing no time at all.

It was as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, however, that the extensive hearings, briefings, and tours of major NASA contractor facilities contributing to the manned space flight program were accomplished by Congressman TEAGUE and his subcommittee members, and these activities were geographically described by Mr. TEAGUE on the House floor on March 25.

My purpose today in inserting the editorial on Congressman TEAGUE's activities is to point up the fact that although he is chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to which he gives a dedicated and highly knowledgeable generalship, Congressman TEAGUE is also giving expert and dedicated service to a committee far removed in content from the Veterans' Committee. His labors and accomplishments in wearing two hats in his service to these standing committees of the House are characterized by his objective and informed approach to the problems involved. His nickname, as this membership well knows, is "Tiger," and it is an apt one, for he is a tiger for performance and strength in the cause of good and responsible legislation, and his resistance powers to ill-advised and shortsighted legislation are also well known and well applauded and are just as tigerish.

The editorial pointing out my chairman's versatile talents and accomplishments follows:

OLIN TEAGUE PERFORMING IN A NATIONAL KEY ROLE

When the House Committee on space and aeronautics gave unanimous approval last week to the annual appropriation bill for the U.S. space program, it was a tribute in part to Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of the Sixth Texas Congressional District. TEAGUE bore the brunt of an exhaustive on-the-spot investigation of the space program by designated committee members. This required the members to go to all the laboratories and plants where space program work is in progress. So thorough was this investigation under "Tiger" TEAGUE's leadership that the unanimous vote of Democratic and Republican members of the committee came with unusual speed. The Congressmen knew what the multibillion-dollar program involved, and they also knew by that time that any stretchout of the space program would add a billion dollars to the final cost. They were able to effect economics without harming the pace of the program.

Of course, this was only the first step for the space appropriation. It must be handled on the floor of the House, then go through Senate committee and floor action. Representative TEAGUE will be busy the rest of this month directing the course of the bill through the House. He is confident of favorable action.

The 6 weeks of travel, listening, looking, asking questions, and obtaining answers, took TEAGUE and his colleagues through plants and laboratories in Florida, Alabama, New York, Missouri, Louisiana, California, and Texas. They went on weekends, their only available time. One Member reported after the 6 weeks of inspections, "I bet we walked 40 miles every weekend. Some of those plants are enormous." "Tiger" TEAGUE was on every one of the walking tours despite his war-crippled left leg.

The central Texas Congressman at the same time kept up with his voluminous work as chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and with the normal workflow in the House. This flow, as all who pay attention know, is steady and vigorous. In addition to all his duties in Washington, "Tiger" TEAGUE is giving such time as he can find to his campaign for reelection. The constitutents in the Sixth District can be proud of their Congressman's record. They are supplying the Nation with one of its very ablest, most conscientious Congressmen. Their own local needs that involve Federal action of any kind are in the best possible hands because of the respect and esteem for Congressman TEAGUE in the National Government structure.

At this time, and for quite a period recently, Mr. TEAGUE's mail has come from all over the United States. Two-thirds of it, in fact, originates outside the Sixth District. But the residents of that district who write

to their Congressman know full well that their letters and problems receive the highest priority in Congressman TEAGUE's office. It is remarkable that he can do this for them and still work so effectively as a key leader in multibillion-dollar, complicated national efforts in space and veterans' affairs. Men of OLIN TEAGUE's ability, character, and intelligence are needed in the Congress of the United States more critically today than ever before in our history. The good news of 1964—when it comes—that OLIN TEAGUE has been reelected will be a substantial lift to the Nation's Government leaders at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington.

The National Democrat Program Is Difficult To Sell in Texas or Texans Are Not for Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, our good Texas folks are not so much Democrats or Republicans as they are straight thinking, responsible Americans who still refuse to find shame in our power or creed. They still believe that the American story of individual freedom, responsibility, and dignity is worth telling. Most of them are still puritanical enough to believe that a man and a government should pay its debts, and not continuously spend more than it takes in. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are concerned, independent, freedom-loving Americans who want to see our country continue to progress and grow, to stay free and strong, so that their children will know what freedom is.

For these reasons, and more, it is growing exceedingly more difficult for Texans to buy many of the socialistic features of the national Democrat program, even though our distinguished President is a native son and influential political leader of the great State of Texas. Even though we have much respect for our President and his political party, we have great difficulty in buying such so-called "must" legislation as the administration's civil rights bill, war on poverty, urban renewal, medicare, Federal aid to education, and so forth. It appears that there is considerably more "politics" in these proposed programs than there is American principle, more emotional publicity than reason, and more prejudice than honest, sensible production. Many of the best answers to our problems lie not in more new Federal agencies but in less burdensome Government which will permit a higher rate of growth, development, and production.

Because of this prevalent feeling and apparent majority opinion in our great State, I was both interested and entertained by a very excellent news article written about the dilemma that our fine Texas Democrat women found themselves in during their recent meeting at the 1964 Democrat Women's Campaign Conference in Washington, D.C. I can certainly understand the tremendous perplexing problem they are faced with in attempting to sell the national Democrat program to independent, freedom-loving Texans. I am pleased to include the news column about this, as it was written by that very outstanding and capable Washington lady and news correspondent, Sarah McClendon.

A WEST TEXAN IN WASHINGTON

ONE-ACT PLAY: "WHAT IS WRONG WITH DALLAS?" OR "HOW TO SELL DALLAS ON THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY"

(By Sarah McClendon)

Place: The 1964 Democratic Women's Campaign Conference in Washington, D.C.

Time: Just after Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter's speech on what's it like to work for the Johnson family.

Setting: An afternoon roundtable discussion group on personalities and how to win votes.

Characters:

Mrs. W. S. White, Chicago, chairman, who tries to keep order.

Mrs. Byron Skelton, of Temple, wife of the national Democratic committeeman from Texas.

Mrs. Joseph Ray, El Paso, wife of the president of Texas Western College.

Mrs. Mike McKool, wife of the chairman of the Democratic Men of Dallas County, who is chairman of the Democratic Women of Dallas County.

Mrs. Harry Hoffman, Texas, campaign worker.

Mrs. Ann Chud, Dallas, chairman of a Dallas Democratic women's group, who moved to Dallas from "up North."

Judge Edith Sampson, Chicago, elected judge of the small claims court, Negro.

Mrs. Edison Dick, Illinois, U.S. representative to the United Nations Social Commission and long a coworker and close friend of Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.

Mrs. Nolan, New York City, campaign worker.

Miss Nolan, New York City, campaign worker, daughter of Mrs. Nolan.

As the curtain rises, Judge Sampson is talking in a loud, revival-like preachment.

"Why don't Texas people realize they are part of the Union?"

Mrs. Chud: "It will be extremely difficult to get people there to vote Democratic."

Mrs. Ray: "Don't quote me—or people will be sure to think it is my husband talking. I was just visiting in nearby Maryland. But I am so interested in the Democratic Party, I just had to come to this workshop.

Mrs. McKool: "My husband says that it is now or never to get BRUCE ALGER, the Republican Congressman, out. He is not at all sure we can do it. But he says if we don't do it this time, then he will be in there forever."

Mrs. White: "Now, now, let's get back on the subject—how are we going to present issues to the people of Dallas County to get them to vote Democratic."

Judge Sampson: "Sell them on medicare. That's what we did in Chicago. There are lots of old people."

Miss Nolan: "Why not poverty? Among the Puerto Ricans in New York."

Mrs. Chud: "That's not going to go in Dallas County. They don't like this idea of spending so much Government money to get rid of poverty."

Mrs. Skelton: "No, those issues will positively not go in Texas."

Mrs. Ray: "It's going to be a hard battle. Take my city, El Paso, for example. I am not at all sure we can sell the Democratic Party program there."

Mrs. Nolan looks uncomfortable but says nothing.

Mrs. Dick: "How about trying to sell them on the United Nations?"

Mrs. Skelton, Mrs. Hoffman, Mrs. Ray, chorus: "Then you would lose them."

Judge Sampson: "Then how about telling them that it costs more to have crime and jobless due to lack of education and sickness for folks who can't afford to pay for their own."

Mrs. Cloud: "That's a good idea. The people of Dallas are only interested in what affects their pocketbook, material things."

Mrs. McKool: "That's right but actually people don't vote on the issues—they vote on personalities, only."

Loud chorus from all the others of: "That's not so, no, no. They vote on the issues at all times."

Mrs. McKool: "People vote according to personality."

Mrs. Dick: "You can't sell them on civil rights?"

Mrs. Chud, Mrs. Hoffman, Mrs. Skelton, Mrs. Ray: "Certainly not."

Mrs. Ray: "Although I will say that out in my part of the State we have the best race relations. We get along fine with minority groups."

Miss Nolan: "We hear in New York that Texas people do not pay as much as they should in taxes. We hear that they escape taxes on oil and then we in New York have to pay more."

Mrs. Nolan registers a wry mouth but says nothing.

Judge Sampson: "You Texans so rich in oil——

Mrs. Chud: "That's not true now. The oil industry has been so cut back in production that many little independents now are suffering. The oil industry is not so prosperous any more. The big companies may still be profitable but many independents are hurting."

Mrs. Dick, Miss Nolan, Judge Sampson lift eyebrows in surprise.

Michigan Legislature Urges Aid for Great Lakes Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Great Lakes fishermen, and Michigan commercial fishermen in particular, have been plagued by a series of setbacks in recent years with the result there is a serious threat to survival of the industry.

Many Members of Congress from the Great Lakes States have urged the Federal Government to provide a greater amount of assistance. This would include financial assistance as well as a tightening of regulations on fish imports.

The following is a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 38

(Offered by Representatives Erlandsen, Good, and Morrison)

Concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to aid the fishing industry of Michigan

Whereas the Great Lakes fishing industry has suffered a serious setback in recent years due to circumstances beyond their control such as the lamprey, pollution, botulism, and problems of a related nature; and

Whereas due to misinformation, untruths, and lack of understanding, the fish-buying public has been led to believe Great Lakes

fish were unfit for human consumption, while, in fact, properly handled Great Lakes fish in all forms have had a perfect record as a healthy and edible product; and

Whereas the fishing industry has experienced great financial losses since October 25, 1963. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the legislature request the Congress of the United States to speed the proposed financial assistance to the Great Lakes fishing industry, the same as was done during the late cranberry scare, from import moneys now directed to the fishing industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States is urged to immediately undertake a strong program which will include a quota and inspection system of fresh water fish coming into the United States from the Canadian Provinces; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house April 29, 1964.

Adopted by the senate May 1, 1964.

BERYL J. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Serbian Orthodox Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in further support of my remarks pertaining to the Serbian Orthodox Church appearing on page 8953 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 27, 1964, I submit for the RECORD a second letter from the Department of State replying to four questions of importance to the subject:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 12, 1964.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: Thank you for your letter of February 5 addressed to the Secretary of State referring to previous correspondence relating to the Serbian Orthodox Church. Your questions are answered below in the order in which you listed them.

Question No. 1. Could the Serbian Orthodox patriarch from Belgrade take over the property belonging to the church which is situated in the United States and is incorporated under the laws of the United States?

Answer. No. The property in the United States used in connection with the religious activities of the Serbian Orthodox Church belongs to the parishes and to the dioceses in the United States. It does not belong to the patriarch or to the holy synod or to that part of the Serbian Orthodox Church situated in Yugoslavia.

Question No. 2. Has the patriarch from Belgrade tried to take this property at any time? Have they sent any orders from the mother church which would be beneficial to the Communist cause?

Answer. We have no information indicating that the patriarch has expressed any intention or has tried to take this property. We believe the patriarch is well aware that the property in the United States is in the hands of the parishes and the dioceses in the United States.

The second part of question No. 2 cannot be answered categorically. The Department of State is not informed concerning the content of communications which may have been exchanged between members of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the United States and the mother church in Belgrade.

Question No. 3. Is there anything derogatory on file about the three newly elected U.S. bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church?

Answer. The derogatory information on file consists of unevaluated and unverified allegations and accusations made by members of both factions directly relating to the principal figures in the current dispute within the Serbian Orthodox Church in America. The allegations and accusations referred to have been similar to those published in recent months in the Serbian-language press in the United States and Canada.

Question No. 4. Does the State Department consider the removal of ex-Bishop Dionisije as a political act or as an internal church problem?

Answer. The Department considers the suspension of Bishop Dionisije on May 10, 1963, and his subsequent removal from office on July 27, 1963, as an internal religious matter. The controversy concerning Bishop Dionisije has arisen from complaints by some members of the Serbian Orthodox Church community in the United States which have involved allegations of misconduct on the part of the bishop. It is the Department's understanding that both Bishop Dionisije and the three recently elected bishops have supporters among the clergy and within the church community in this country.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

"Bourbon" Whisky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19—to designate Bourbon whisky as a distinctive product of the United States—I am including herewith a statement made by Lewis S. Rosenstiel, board chairman and president, Schenley Industries, Inc., and founder of the Bourbon Institute, with reference to said resolution.

The declaration confirms a fact known to distillers since the founding of the Republic—namely, that bourbon is as distinctively American as scotch is distinctively Scottish, that Canadian whisky is distinctively Canadian, and Irish whisky is distinctively Irish.

None of these whiskies legally can be produced except in its country of origin.

Bourbon, which I personally believe is the best of all, belongs in this select company.

The congressional resolution will tend to give official status to bourbon whisky, help to spread its fame around the world, and ultimately open new international markets for it.

The industry's gratitude is owing to the Congress for passage of this economically helpful resolution. Credit also is due the Bourbon Institute, headed by Kentucky-born Adm. Bill Marshall, for its efforts to achieve for a product of the Bluegrass Oval a recognition so richly deserved. This is a great day for all of us in the bourbon industry.

Mrs. Anthony Maiullo Conquers the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, America grew great and prospered because there came to her shores peoples of many other nations who, together with their descendants, made varied and important contributions to American culture and life.

Among these people one finds many names of Italian origin. A signer of the Declaration of Independence, William Paca, was of Italian descent. In more recent times, the name of Enrico Fermi stands high among those who contributed significantly to the strength of America through his work with atomic energy.

On the cultural side, I commend to your attention the efforts and activities of a lady from Detroit, Mrs. Anthony Maiullo, who recently was the subject of an article in the Detroit Free Press in its series, "Great Ladies of Detroit." I have the pleasure of knowing personally the charming Mrs. Maiullo, her prominent husband, Anthony, and their children, and have visited their home on a number of occasions.

The following article appeared in the Sunday, May 3, 1964, issue of the Detroit Free Press:

MRS. MAIULLO CONQUERS THE ARTS

Mrs. Anthony Maiullo is an elegant, sophisticated and superbly poised person.

She has known the poet Tagore, the late Shah of Persia, the world-renowned singers Rosa Ponselle and Tito Schipa, the music immortals, Puccini and Toscanini.

She is a woman of very particular tastes: For instance, she never wears street clothes in her home. Immediately after entering 52 Chicago Boulevard, she changes into one of her chic and charming hostess gowns to enjoy the colorful comforts and beloved objets d'art of her drawing room. She exudes a seductive aura of rare perfume.

Many artists have played and sung in the Maiullo home, which abounds in such widely divergent impedimenta as a magnificent Chinese desk writhing with dragons, a collection of figures of the saints, works of the eldest daughter, Mrs. James Merriam Barnes, and a gigantic floral painting executed by the maitress de maison, herself.

Dozens of signed photographs of music and art greats are hung in the upper hall.

The household consists of Mr. and Mrs. Maiullo, Mr. and Mrs. Barnes and their daughter, Toni, and two very vocal poodles, Cindey and Sister.

Mrs. Maiullo was born in Amherstberg, Ontario, to John and Madlyn Ducatelli Tarquin. She was named Minerva, and the child proceeded to fulfill the classic connotation: "Minerva, a goddess of the handicrafts * * * whose temple was the center of worship of the Roman guilds."

Both her parents were musically gifted, and small Minerva was caught up by the

Muses almost from the start. When just out of high school, she met and married young Anthony Maiullo.

They were wed in 1907 and traveled to Niagara Falls, then the place to go for honeymooners. Their first home was on Montclair Avenue on the east side of Detroit, "practically in the suburbs" at that time. Her youthful husband was on his way to becoming one of the top criminal lawyers of his era.

Florence, Joseph, Madlyn, and Betty were born in the house on Montclair. The girls were trained early in the gentle domestic arts and, later, in their particular talents.

With Florence, it was mostly languages and the piano, though she later developed into an excellent modeler and sculptor. She came under the supervision of world-famed pianist Jose Iturbi. Rather than make a debut to Detroit society, however, she chose Rome as the setting.

Madlyn, after being graduated from Miss Newman's School, attended the Stella Villa in Rome and, tall and stately and coolly beautiful, is the wife of William A. Ternes. They are the parents of Lynn Ann, Barbara Ann, and Patricia Ann.

Betty also attended the Stella Villa and later did collegiate work in Indianapolis. She is the wife of John Philip Moses (whose father was one of the founders of the Detroit Athletic Club) and resides at Quartermore, their lovely Bloomfield Hills home.

All the Maiullo maidens had classes at the Convent of the Sacred Heart and all had the benefits of studies and travel abroad.

Joseph attended Howe Military School and, clanking with medals, was graduated cum laude. While at Harvard, he met Muriel Agnes O'Connor, of Boston, who is now Mrs. Maiullo and the mother of Diana, Anthony II, and Joseph A., III. He saw service with the U.S. Army and has been in partnership with his brilliant father for many years.

When "Jo" was just 13 and with his mother in Italy, they attended the funeral of Puccini. Sincerely revering the great composer of opera, Mrs. Maiullo was deeply moved at the solemn scene.

Head bowed, she did not notice reactions of her son. He, too, was moved—in the direction of the coffin. On his hands and knees, he gently removed a sprig of laurel from the coffin while Verdi's great Requiem soared throughout the cathedral. Jo still has this momento.

The family, while still intact, had moved from the Montclair house to the Indian Village Manor where they resided for 6 years. Palmer Woods was next and West Boston Boulevard before the move to the present home.

Aided and abetted by her devoted and understanding husband, Mrs. Maiullo had been concentrating on the development of her magnificent singing voice and in time, she experienced a thrilling and gratifying debut in Verona.

It was on one of their numerous visits to Italy that Tony and Minerva Maiullo purchased four of the outstanding works of the highly-controversial sculptor, Alceo Dossena. The artist, fascinated by Mrs. Maiullo's classic features, had sculpted a bust of her in marble.

Later, equally fascinated by the medieval treatment of others of his works, the Maiullos bought his St. Francis of Assisi, a charming baptismal font and, in plaque, a tender and beautifully executed Madonna and Child.

Born in Italy, but brought to this country by his parents at the age of 1, Tony Maiullo was educated at St. Joseph Parochial School, Eastern High School, and the Detroit College of Law.

The one-time boy soprano rapidly rose to become one of the most colorful and successful figures in the courts, and, although his public life was devoted to the law, his private life abounded in music (he is an excellent pianist and organist), golf, and gardening.

The Maiullos have given many annual awards and much encouragement to artists and the Detroit Institute of Arts.

Mr. Maiullo has been:

Vested with the Italian Croce di Cavalieri, thereby making him a Knight of the Crown.

Admitted to the private chambers of the late dictator Benito Mussolini for a long and friendly audience.

A candidate for mayor of Detroit.

Appointed to the Civil Service Commission by then Mayor Miriani.

Mrs. Maiullo's many interests have included the Colony Club, the Detroit Symphony Orchestra Women's Association, the Detroit Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's City Club, Glen Garda in Windsor, Maybury Sanitarium, and Boysville.

A Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the former colleague of many Members of the House of Representatives, my good friend CLAIR ENGLE, now U.S. Senator from California, was instrumental in seeking authorization of the Sacramento Valley canals unit of the Central Valley project. President Truman signed this authorization September 26, 1950.

It is the hope of many of us in California that the next stage of this project, known as the Tehama-Colusa Canal, will get underway this year. The feeling in the community is best summed up by the enclosed editorial in the Sacramento Bee.

At this point I would like to insert the editorial:

SPEAKING OF PROJECTS OF LONG STANDING

Harry S. Truman was in the middle of his presidential term, and the Korean war had just got well underway when Congress approved a bill by then Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, authorizing the Sacramento Valley canals unit of the Central Valley project.

Few persons thought then that in 1964 only one phase of the canal system would have been completed, and the initial appropriation for the second phase would be before Congress, but such is the case.

The Corning Canal to serve lands in Tehama County is complete. The Chico Canal to serve lands in Butte County is in a state of suspended animation. The appropriation, a modest $950,000, is to start work on the Tehama-Colusa Canal to irigate lands in Glenn, Colusa, and northern Yolo Counties.

While the Bureau of Reclamation states there is a lack of interest on the part of Butte County landowners to negotiate for water from the Chico Canal, no such situation exists in relation to the Tehama-Colusa works.

Districts to take water were formed as long ago as 1954 and 1955 and sufficient contracts have been negotiated to insure repayment of costs and operation and maintenance expenses.

In other words, no sound reason exists why there should be further delay in getting the work underway. Moreover, by the end of this summer the Red Bluff diversion dam on the Sacramento River, to divert water into the canals, will have been completed.

Throughout the area to be served by the Tehama-Colusa Canal, water levels are falling at an alarming rate. The situation is especially critical in the area between Williams and Dunnigan where the water table is dropping as much as 5 and 10 feet per year, and the farmers are suffering losses due to a shortage of water.

Hearings before the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee on the matter will be held May 5 and 6 in Washington, D.C.

Congress would do well to get this long delayed and much needed project on the road. Backers of the central Arizona project have taken the stand that their proposal has been before Congress for a decade and now should be approved. Well, speaking of projects of long standing, the Sacramento Valley canals would seem to have just about top priority.

The Need for a Trade Regulation Rule for the Marketing of Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the chaotic conditions that exist in the marketing sector of the petroleum industry have been cause for widespread concern in the industry itself. A number of groups have followed the lead of the Mid-Continent Independent Refiners Association in petitioning the Federal Trade Commission for trade regulation rules for the marketing of gasoline.

On May 7 Mr. T. B. Murphy, president of the Mid-Continent Refiners, addressed the Oklahoma Oil Marketers Association on this subject. His speech documented the need for an industrywide approach to this problem and contains so much information that will be useful to the Members of the House, that I should like to introduce it in the RECORD.

The address follows:

THE NEED FOR A TRADE REGULATION RULE FOR THE MARKETING OF GASOLINE

(By Mr. T. B. Murphy, president, Mid-Continent Independent Refiners Association before the annual convention, Oklahoma Oil Marketers Association, May 7, 1964, Oklahoma City, Okla.)

I appreciate having been asked by the Oklahoma Oil Marketers Association to speak here today. I've been in the oil industry since 1920 and happily recall my first visits to Oklahoma in the early 1920's; taking me over to an oil refinery at Cushing. In later years I had many occasions to visit Oklahoma and in 1951 made my residence in Tulsa as the general sales manager of an Oklahoma based producing, refining, and marketing company.

From 1952 I served as sales vice president of an independent marketing company at Minneapolis and later from 1961 to 1963 as president of that same company and its refinery affiliate.

It was necessary that I have knowledge of the flow of petroleum products and the pulse of oil marketing from Oklahoma to the Canadian border in mid-America; for 30 odd years rubbing shoulders with oil jobbers and their problems.

The topic of my remarks today, as suggested by your executive vice president, Hugh

Wright, is "The Need for a Trade Regulation Rule for the Marketing of Gasoline."

Some friends present will be surprised when I do not come up with a few humorous short stories—but the seriousness of oil marketing conditions and practices dictates that I get down to the subject assigned to me.

I will take a few minutes to recite an incident of my very early years. Not that it is humorous but to place it in your minds for later reference. The setting was in the then outskirts of Chicago. I was perhaps 5 years at the time. All us little shavers loved a small cur dog—apparently homeless. We found it difficult to pet the little cur, as it was constantly twisting, scratching, biting itself, and rolling in the dirt. Of course, the reason was that he was full of fleas. There was a type of blacksmith shop and horse barn in the neighborhood—set up on timbers embedded in cement which allowed about a 2-foot clearance.

Late one fall day, our little cur, in distress as usual, raced under the blacksmith shop and would not come out when we called to him. All us kids were just plain scared to go under that long barn, each daring the other to get the dog out. It was decided by lot with broken matchsticks and I lost. I was dressed warmly with the long knitted stockings, the sweater, the straight-knee pants, and the tossle cap of those days. I started under—more scared than I have ever been since—aided by some well placed shoves from my pals. After about 10 feet it was black dark but I kept moving along and calling for the dog. I could hear him in front of me. I crawled through virtually a 50-foot wall of spiderwebs, before I saw a glimmer of light at the far end. The dog moved out and the other kids grabbed him. Aside from dirt and muck, I was covered with a veil of spiderwebs; hundreds, if not thousands, compressed to a thickness of about a full inch. It took my good mother an hour or more to rid my clothes of this matted veil of webs into which had been trapped dozens of live spiders. Now I know that all this is of no interest or importance to you in this room. I mentioned it only because I intend to refer to it again, by way of comparison, in this talk.

The Mid-Continent Independent Refiners Association is referred to by the short word "MIRA." For the past 9 months I have been president of MIRA. As the name implies the membership consists of independent oil refining companies in States east and west of the Mississippi River, including, among others, refining companies in Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. Five of our member companies operate Oklahoma refineries.

It is public knowledge that MIRA has filed a petition with the Federal Trade Commission asking for an oil industry conference to consider the problems and causes of the longtime and continuing widespread chaotic conditions in retail gasoline marketing.

MIRA's petition simply asks the Commission to codify, with reference to gasoline, existing laws as interpreted by the Commission and Supreme Court; and asks for the promulgation of definite guidelines, in the form of trade regulation rules effective on a specific date, which "would give all members of the industry an opportunity simultaneously to abandon undesirable practices that are now imposed by competitive necessity."

MIRA believes that the exchange of views in proceedings before the Commission, would be of great benefit to the industry.

Such guidelines would simplify Federal Trade Commission enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act without, as some critics have claimed, putting it in the position of price fixing. Favorable action on MIRA's petition would permit oil industry representatives to air their views before the Federal Trade Commission.

MIRA's formal petition is a legal presentation. Not being a lawyer I will make no attempt to analyze the legal points made or the dozen or more references to previous cases mentioned in the petition.

Returning to the talk I am expected to give today—"The Need for a Trade Regulation Rule for the Marketing of Gasoline"—I see clearly why oil jobbers and dealers, be they major branded, independent refinery branded, or private branded, should be greatly interested for their own welfare and should move heaven and earth to make certain that such a trade conference do be held at as early a date as possible. In making such a statement a speaker should be prepared with good, sufficient and compelling reasons why jobbers and dealers should actively work toward the calling of such a conference.

As Oklahoma's beloved Will Rogers used to say, "All I know is what I read in the newspapers."

Gasoline pump prices throughout much of the country have been very low in many, many States and price wars have occurred and recurred time and time again in hundreds of towns and cities for years. The situation has been particularly bad during the early months of this year.

It is possible that you jobbers in Oklahoma have been enjoying good retail markets and have not had to suffer the experiences of your fellow jobbers in other parts of the country—but I doubt it.

But let's assume that you in Oklahoma have been singularly blessed. I know that you, all of you, as oil jobbers, should be interested in a short rundown of some price conditions and changes, over a few weeks period, in other States as reported by Platt's Oil Price Service.

Here are some examples:

On March 10 of this year Platts reported the Kansas City pump price at 11.9 cents exclusive of taxes. On that same date they reported the Wichita, Kans., dealer tank wagon price at 7.4 cents.

Let's stop here a moment. A dealer tank wagon price in Wichita, Kans., of 7.4 cents means that price protection is in effect and if the dealer is supplied by a jobber, the jobber gets a minimum margin of 2.5 cents. That allows 4.9 cents to the supplying company. Now let's deduct say 1 cent as transportation; pipeline and transport truck; to reduce the return to 3.9 cents to the refinery seller. This 3.9 cents is before considering refinery throughput cost of 1.7 cents per gallon as a minimum, and brings the net back to the refinery down to 2.2 cents or about 92 cents a barrel. With crude oil posted price at $2.90 to $3, you can readily understand the severe pressure on the crude price structure, that can and has developed.

On March 9 at Schenectady, N.Y., Platts reported the dealer price at 9.9 cents and also on March 9 that the Peoria, Ill., price dropped 4 cents; and again on that same date that Davenport, Iowa, dropped 6 cents.

Continuing on that same day the Denver price to dealers was 7.9 cents or about 4 cents to a local refinery on sales made through jobbers; equal to about 50 percent of crude cost; again without considering throughput cost, overhead and sales expense.

In that same week at Springfield, Mo., Platts reported that the dealer tank wagon price dropped to a record low of 5.9 which after jobber margin, transportation, and throughput cost, left the refiner with just about "nothing" at all for crude oil.

And again in that same week at Hutchinson, Kans., that the dealer tank wagon dropped to 5.9 with the same result as at Springfield.

At Fort Worth, Tex., the pump price dropped to 9.9 cents a gallon, ex tax. Subtract, say, 6 or 6½ cents for minimum dealer and jobber margins and what have you left for transportation and throughput cost to say nothing about crude oil?

At Minneapolis and St. Paul pump prices have been subnormal 75 percent of the time over the past 8 or 9 years. A 24.9 pump price there figures 6.6 cents back to an Oklahoma refinery before refinery throughput costs, etc.

At Detroit, Mich., the DTW price recently dropped at 7.8 cents. Here let me quote "in part" the vice president of sales of the largest midwest marketing and refining company as reported in the April 15, 1964, issue of the Oil Daily to the effect that in 1963 his firm was compelled to change its dealer tank wagon prices 87 times in the Detroit market because of competitive conditions. Competitive conditions! (That's a polite word for "choas" as I see it) and he is further reported as saying that during 1962 it was necessary to make 60 such changes. This adds up to a change exactly every 5 days including Sundays over a 2-year period.

Need I go further?

If you jobbers in Oklahoma have not had gasoline market price problems—you are lucky indeed.

Are there excessively bad and continuing gasoline pump price problems throughout much of the United States?

Again I'll follow the advice of Will Rogers and see what the press has to say editorially—just a few short samples: The National Petroleum News in October, 1963, stated that for years gasoline markets have been volatile; and that in the past 2½ years—they have often been chaotic.

On December 3, 1963, the NPN Bulletin reported that the gasoline market was plagued by weak spots.

On November 22, 1963, the publisher of the Oil Daily editorialized that "everyone in the industry says it's the duty of someone else to deal with—that old villain the price war."

The NPN Bulletin of April 6, 1964, reported that the gasoline retail market (nationally) has deteriorated so bady it is just exactly where it was in March 1962, when the market touched bottom. It quoted a marketing vice president as saying "the dismal thought is that there is nothing hopeful on the horizon."

Now let's see what a number of top executives of very large companies have to say on this subject of gasoline marketing and price wars (and these are only a few "quotes" to make the point and not to take up too much of your time.)

The following—out of many—are from speeches or statements of major oil company executives printed in one or another of the following excellent publications servicing the oil industry—the Gasoline Retailer; the National Petroleum News Bulletin; the Oil Daily; and Platts News Service.

A major oil company vice president: "It's time to regain our business senses."

A major oil company president: "Gasoline price wars plague our industry."

A major oil company executive vice president: "The marketing segment is afflicted with a debilitating illness which threatens its whole future."

Another major oil company president: "It's almost impossible to localize price wars."

Still another major oil company executive vice president is reported as saying, "If Federal control comes, we have ourselves to blame."

A major oil company president said, "There is nothing at present to indicate the end of gasoline price wars."

A major oil company vice president of marketing is quoted as saying that "marketing is in a 'sadistic' rut that could result in economic suicide."

A major company sales vice president, noting an increasing profit squeeze on both suppliers and jobbers, cited price wars as "without a doubt" the primary cause.

An executive director of a large independent marketers association resigned, warning of economic suicide.

And here are a couple of very late ones. On April 28 of this year, little more than a week ago, in the Oil Daily one large major oil company president is reported as stating that "product markets early in April 1964 had dropped to their lowest level in nearly 10 years."

And in the same publication and again on the same date the president of another large major is credited with saying, "There is no end in sight to gasoline price wars."

Surely these words spell out plainly what the situation has been and still is. There are more statements of a similar nature. Quotations describe the gasoline marketplace very graphically—"chaotic"—"sadistic rut"—"no end"—"plague"—"debilitating illness"—"economic suicide." Choose your own description—it all adds up that the gasoline marketplace is in a "hell of a mess."

Apparently, top executives honestly see "no end" to the price wars that have been plaguing our industry for far, far too many years. Surely major oil company officials do see the need that something must be done.

It is MIRA's expectation that the major oil companies (whether they agree or disagree with MIRA's premise or approach) will not take a position in opposition to the calling of an oil industry "Trade Conference" to attempt to seek out, with the Federal Trade Commission, an answer to the mess, the chaos, the insanity—which so many major officials so frankly and so honestly admit they themselves see "no answer to."

Your parent organization, the National Oil Jobbers Council, while not necessarily agreeing to MIRA's approach (after all they do not represent refining companies—major or independent) surely must see the need for a Trade Conference to help our industry pull itself out of this unending mess.

Is this continuing chaos in gasoline marketing costly?

Let's again follow Will Rogers' advice and turn to the papers. Your own Oklahoma Oil Marketers Association publication of last December printed a talk by a sales vice president of one of the Southwest's largest refining companies who pointed out that price protection costs for his company alone for the year 1962 totaled $26 million.

The NPN Bulletin of March 23, 1964, states an unnamed official estimated that the oil industry's price protection costs for the first quarter of 1964 would be $300 million. On an annual basis this to me would add up to $1,200 million. This is surely a tremendous price to pay for the pleasure of having chaotic price wars—but by no means does it represent the total cost.

A price protection bill of $1.2 billion is only a part of the total cost. Price protection does not start with the first one-tenth of a cent drop in price at the gasoline pump. No indeed. Dealers and jobbers between them must absorb at least 2 cents a gallon before price protection comes into effect. Collectively over the country, the combined dealer and jobber losses before price protection could equal or exceed the price protection cost to the supplying companies. Refining companies themselves, major and independent, aside from protection costs, suffer additional very heavy losses, as market prices collapse.

To what extent does price protection really help jobbers and dealers?

All it does is attempt to keep jobbers and dealers alive—to help them survive. Price protection to the dealer and jobber is but to sustain him. Under price protection virtually all dealers are at a level of margin which denies them any chance to make a profit. In many cases it may not permit the dealer to pay his bills or keep operating over a long pull. He could be forced to sell out, at a low price, what could have been a good living for him if there was reason and sanity in gasoline marketing. The same is true with many jobbers.

Who is to blame? What are the reasons; the causes; of the existing chaos in oil marketing? In my thinking, it is: no one company—major or independent—no one marketer—no one jobber—no one dealer—no one reason—no one factor. The reasons are as numerous as fleas.

In 99 cases out of 100 he who is guilty (and many are at one time or another), can usually explain away his latest marketing manipulations and point in another direction in justification. To trace the chain of causes, of factors, of reasons, would be like a dog chasing his tail.

I blame no one. I accuse no one.

I do agree with the many major oil company officials who see unending chaos, insanity and senseless practices in gasoline marketing. I feel the time has long passed when something should be done about it.

Let's go back to my experience as a 5-year-old boy—the old blacksmith shop (all washed out now with an overhead superhighway)—and to that little cur dog infested with fleas who led me through that forest of cobwebs. It would be just as easy to determine which of those thousand spider webs, attached to my clothing, was the first spun by a spider, as it is now to trace back and pinpoint responsibility for the insanity that has infested and continues to infest gasoline marketing. And, to a degree, I can liken that little dog of long ago, with the hundreds of fleas biting him, to the horrible price war curse that has infested so much of our industry these many, many years. Now and then a number of the fleas got enough of the dog's blood to fill their bellies and they quieted down for a while—but there were always enough others biting and biting to keep him moving like a whirling dervish.

Is this not what is happening to oil marketing? Bad markets are restored and remain quiet for from a couple of days to a week or sometimes a month. Retail prices go up and down like a yo-yo. It's so like the flea that with his belly full lay sleeping on the poor dog's hide. He awakened hungry and started biting again. Has not that happened in almost the same manner time and time again in gasoline marketing?

Gentlemen, many individual jobbers and dealers, and local dealer and jobber associations, as well as independent refining associations, and an independent producers association, have supported MIRA's request for a trade conference to the Federal Trade Commission.

I repeat that MIRA expects that the major companies of our industry will support the call for such a conference. The words of many of their officials confess "no hope for" and see "no end to" the problems in gasoline marketing.

If they do not support an oil trade conference called by the Federal Trade Commission where everyone can be heard; where the troubles and problems can be openly and freely discussed and where we in oil can hope to end up with same Trade Regulation rules; they must come up with an alternate—some better alternate—but what can it be?

Members of the Oklahoma Oil Marketers Association—I have tried to recite some reasons why jobbers and dealers here in Oklahoma, and in every other State should see clearly the need for a trade regulation rule for the marketing of gasoline and why each of you should write to Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., with copies to your U.S. Senators and to your particular Member of the Congress and let them know that the gasoline market situation in your State of Oklahoma, or in your county, or in your town is shockingly bad and has been, on and off, and continuously in many spots, for years and that you, as jobbers and dealers, deserve something better; that you want something done, that you demand a return to sanity in gasoline marketing; and that you definitely want a rules conference called under the authority of the Federal Trade Commission; to hold hearings; to openly consider and study the situation; and to come up with some sane and fair trade regulation rules for the gasoline marketplace—if you Oklahoma jobbers and dealers hope to survive in what for so many of you has been your life's work.

Thank you—all.

Raising the American Flag in Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Mr. Adger Emerson Player, American Embassy, Ghana, gives a highly important personal interpretation of his celebrated action in defending the American flag on that soil this past February. I submit it at this time for the information and understanding of my colleagues in Congress because of its basic relevancy to the civil rights issues now confronting this Federal Legislature.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I have been the subject of much publicity since February 4, 1964. Although unaware of all the various interpretations of my action of raising the American flag in Ghana, I am concerned that some quarters in the United States and abroad—not fully in sympathy with the aspirations of the American Negro—may be interpreting that action in a way detrimental to the increasingly vigorous struggle that we American Negroes are now waging for full equality of opportunity in the American society.

President Johnson wrote that I "have the gratitude of free men everywhere who respect the principles and ideals for which our flag stands." The American dilemma is still the contradiction of racial bondage, injustice and inequality as practiced by some Americans with the American principles of liberty, justice and equality. I would like to set the record straight regarding what I consider the true meaning of my action.

My action was something that any American—black or white—would have done. However, my raising of the flag decreases in real significance when compared with the real acts of heroism and sacrifice by countless American Negroes who since August 1619 and continuing through today have lost their lives because they asserted their God-given rights as human beings and as Americans. I did only what American Negroes have been doing from the very beginning of the history of the United States—loyally defending the country that our ancestors made along with other Americans of all origins and races. This is our country in every respect. We have a perfect right to defend it. In addition, we must honor those Negro Americans of yesterday who sowed American and foreign soil with their lives so that generations of today and tomorrow may reap the rewards, benefits, duties and responsibilities of free men and women. These—our ancestors—were real heroes and courageous American Negroes whose names have been hidden in America's history far too long.

I feel most Americans still have to experience that as Negroes and whites interact in

work and pleasure, they discover that they have the same cultural and historical foundations and the same aspirations and ambitions for themselves and for their country. I feel most Americans still have to realize that Negro Americans are determined to obtain full equality of opportunity in every facet of life in the United States.

White Americans must allow the American dream of equality, freedom, and justice to live in their hearts and to be reflected in their everyday actions toward their black brothers. It will never be enough to pass civil rights laws and to speak in glowing terms about the patriotic deed of one American Negro. White Americans must demonstrate as much love for their black fellow Americans as they do for the red, white, and blue American flag. Yes, we—American Negroes—are loyal to the United States. This proven loyalty in no way diminishes our firm resolve to be accepted as Americans in the fullest extent. We will share in the privileges, rights, and responsibilities as completely free American men and women.

I hope that all the words of praise for my deed in raising the American flag in Ghana will be translated now in the United States into respect and full acceptance of American Negroes. If this full respect and acceptance does not take place, then one must draw the sad conclusion—as many American Negroes and other people throughout the world will—that the American flag was raised once again in vain.

Sincerely yours,

ADGER EMERSON PLAYER,
American Embassy, Accra, Ghana.

J. Edgar Hoover: Unusual American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, among the fine tributes paid J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation recently, is an editorial which appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Bay City (Mich.) Times.

As a great admirer of the wonderful job Mr. Hoover has done during his long career I submit the editorial for the RECORD:

J. EDGAR HOOVER: UNUSUAL AMERICAN

It gave us a particular feeling of reassurance to read the other day that J. Edgar Hoover, chief of one of the world's top security forces, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has entered his 41st year in that job physically fit and full of enthusiasm and with the intention of staying around for quite a few years yet.

Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States when J. Edgar Hoover became Director of the FBI. Since then, incoming Presidents (six since Coolidge) have made it a point to announce at the outset that J. Edgar Hoover was being asked to stay on the job.

This is easy to understand. The FBI was established in 1908 by an act of Congress to publish uniform crime reports based on crime statistics collected from the various States and police agencies. The FBI still publishes this report, but its duties and jurisdiction over the years have increased enormously.

Most recently, it has been invited to cooperate with the Secret Service in the protection of the President of the United States.

The record of the growth and accomplishments of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover is too long and broad to adequately cover in a brief space; but there are some general highlights that reflect the image of a remarkable man and a remarkable organization.

National security during the war years and after subsequently have found the FBI doing quite a job keeping tabs on communism, subversion and in the cloak-and-dagger field, espionage.

Many of us will be old enough to remember that several decades ago there was an era of big law violators, interstate gunmen and kidnapers. The FBI netted some mighty big fish through accounting methods as income tax evaders when other police methods had failed; the FBI has a staff of sharp accountants.

It also will be recalled that on the occasions shooting has developed, Hoover's men have not run away. Standards of admission to the FBI ranks under Hoover have been very high. This has paid off, and it is plain that many of the increasingly efficient State police forces in the United States use FBI standards as a model wherever possible.

J. Edgar Hoover at 69 (President Johnson has waived a requirement for mandatory retirement at age 70) is at once self-effacing and mightily articulate about some matters he considers vital to the good of the Nation.

As he began his fifth decade in office, he warned against Communist activity in the United States; against parental neglect, to which he traces the rising crime rate; and of a passive feeling on the part of the public toward crime in general.

Asked to describe a typical day in the FBI, he said: "There is no typical day—the nature of our duties does not lend itself to routine * * * if there is anything that could be called typical about every day in the FBI, it is my practice of closely following every important matter being handled by the Bureau to insure that each is receiving proper attention."

The statement is the mark of an unusual American. We hope he will be on the job for a long time. He has been a good man to have on our side.

What Constitutes Distinguished Service in the Department of Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Mr. Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, is today being given an award for distinguished service in the Department of Agriculture. This comes as a surprise to me in view of the fact that this branch of our Department of Agriculture came under considerable criticism during the Billie Sol Estes investigation.

Lengthy hearings before a Senate subcommittee clearly revealed the confusion, the mismanagement, the lack of records, the duplication of such investigations as were conducted—and they revealed a woeful lack of management and knowledge of what was going on in the Estes case, particularly in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service headed by Mr. Godfrey. I would like to refer to the testimony of Paul Kamerick, assistant counsel of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate. This subcommittee in its attempt to get information as to the whys and wherefores of the Billie Sol Estes scandal assigned expert investigators to try to unravel the mess, and Mr. Kamerick testified:

Almost all of the meetings and conferences involved in the Estes allotment case were recorded only in the memory of those who attended. Thus, it is now impossible to produce records that should have been made but were not. It is inevitable that the Department itself must be handicapped by these and other deficiencies. At the outset some difficulty was experienced in locating documents believed to be germane to this investigation. We were informed that there was no central repository for records where most or all of the information concerning Billie Sol Estes might be located. No such repository exists. This deficiency has greatly complicated and impeded the progress of the investigation. In the interests of securing adequate coverage and of saving time, we met separately with the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the General Counsel, and Assistant Secretary John Duncan, and asked to have assembled for our review, all information under the jurisdiction of their offices relating to Billie Sol Estes and any of his business enterprises. We also met jointly with the ranking officials of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service including representatives of the Administrator and the five Deputy Administrators who supervise the activity of this agency, and made a similar request from them. As a result, material concerning Estes was located and furnished to us by 16 different offices in the Department's Washington headquarters. This demonstrates a cumbersome and ineffective recordkeeping system which causes unnecessary operations difficulties and directly affects the efficiency and economy of the Department.

I must say at this point that we are not sure yet that we have all the documents in the Department of Agriculture pertinent to Billie Sol Estes. We have tried for weeks to assemble them and we believe the officials of the Department have tried to assemble them. We feel we have most of them, but, under the existing system, we cannot be certain.

On page 9 of the hearings appears further information that I think should be referred to at this time, in testimony by Mr. Kamerick:

The structural weakness of the Department of Agriculture is further demonstrated by a breakdown of communications between the Department and the subordinate organizations at the State and county levels. Some instructions issued by the Department apparently either do not reach the subordinate organizations or are disregarded if they do reach them. There is no method of receipt or followup to make certain that such instructions actually reached their destination. In some areas of activity, the subordinate organizations of the Department are almost autonomous.

There is a similar lack of communication between agencies within the Department of Agriculture in Washington. Within the Department there are 11 internal audit groups, including one attached to the Office of the Secretary. Each of these groups has no authority and little interest in anything that transpires outside their own narrow assignments. In October 1961, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service investigation division completed a comprehen-

sive 3½-month inquiry into the questionable cotton allotment transfers engineered by Billie Sol Estes. Two or three months earlier, in September 1961, the Internal Audit Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service, another of the Department's agencies, initiated a separate inquiry into Estes' financial position, based on rumors of unreported mortgages. Neither investigative group was aware of the inquiry being conducted by the other until February 1962 and the parallel investigations were not coordinated at any time. In fact, the Internal Audit Group terminated its inquiry early in April of 1962, and the two units were still not coordinated.

Such malfunctions could not come about if there existed within the Department a single unified audit-investigation group with authority and responsibility to report to the Secretary. It is paramount that such a group report at the highest level. It seems clear that any program head who controls his own audit-investigation staff is, in the final analysis, evaluating himself. Few officials can be completely objective about their own operations and an audit-investigation group can be only as effective as the operating head permits. A group equipped and manned to audit, investigate, and monitor all of the varied activities of this important Department could save the Government many millions of dollars each year and at the same time improve the services of the Department.

Recalling accounts of the Billie Sol Estes case, it is my recollection that great difficulty was experienced by those who wished to dig into the facts and the gentleman in charge of the records suddenly found himself out in the cold and a new man in charge of records.

Without question, information had come to the attention of people in high position within the Department as to the unsavory operations of Billie Sol Estes. In spite of this information, Billie Sol Estes was appointed to the Cotton Council.

Many other points could be added, but it seems strange that an award could be made to a man who is in charge of this agency and program where investigation has revealed poor organization and where obviously information was not made available to investigators and where obviously a coverup was attempted in the entire Billie Sol Estes case.

"The 'Forgotten' Farmer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission I include the following editorial, entitled 'The 'Forgotten' Farmer," appearing in the Chicago Tribune of May 11, 1964, in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

THE "FORGOTTEN" FARMER

Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK, Republican leaders in the Senate and the House, emphasized the wrong point when they charged the Johnson administration with having forgotten the farmer. The two GOP leaders, speaking for the entire Republican leadership in Congress, were right, however, when they said the farm economy has slipped badly under 3 years of Democratic policies.

What the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have or have not done for the farmer is not as important as what they have done to him. The parity price ratio, which averaged 84.5 during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, now is down to 75, lowest level in 24 years. This ratio, by relating prices of farm commodities to production costs, is supposed to provide a measurement of farmers' purchasing power.

In their 1960 platform, the Democrats pledged "positive action" to raise farm income to full parity with the incomes of workers in business and industry, which would have required raising the parity price ratio at least to 100 and probably much higher.

The Johnson administration is trying to make some political hay with its new subsidy programs for wheat and cotton. The cotton program is going to encourage southern farmers who take cotton land out of production in return for payments to plant more soybeans in competition with midwest farmers, who already are producing as many beans as the market can take.

The wheat program, by dropping the market price of wheat substantially, is likely to throw big supplies of cheap wheat on the market in competition with corn and other feed grains that are already in surplus. Thus it threatens further expansion and an even greater price debacle than has already occurred in the overexpanded beef cattle industry.

It was the Kennedy administration's feed grain program, which dumped vast quantities of cheap feed on the market, that helped stimulate the current overexpansion in cattle that has brought the most severe financial losses to cattlemen in the history of the industry. Prime cattle are bringing the lowest prices in 18 years. Prices are so low, in fact, that older cows and bulls which should be culled and sent to market are, instead, being held back to produce more calves or are being bought by farmers turning to cattle because of Government crop restrictions.

All this chaos and more has been accomplished through unprecedented Federal spending on agriculture. This year Government payments to farmers will alone total an estimated $2.1 billion, and that comes on top of the nearly $5 billion in payments in the last 3 years.

Farmers are now reaping the bitter harvest of Democratic policies which have been ill advised, misdirected, and severely disruptive to the farm economy. The Democrats have not forgotten the farmer. He would have been better off if they had.

The Alabama League of Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama League of Municipalities recently held its annual meeting in Montgomery, Ala. Under the most able direction of Mr. Ed Reid, the executive director of the league, the meeting was not only a huge success, but had an outstanding list of speakers for the occasion.

One of the speakers being a man I greatly admire and with whom I have had the pleasure of working with on legislative matters, was the distinguished junior Senator from Maine, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE.

Mr. Speaker, under permission I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Birmingham News April 28, 1964, which has reference to the meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities:

ALABAMA'S VALUED CITIES

As usual, Director Ed Reid and his capable assistants have cooked up meaty fare for city fathers to chew upon in Montgomery at the annual convention of the Alabama League of Municipalities.

Maine's Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, seen by some as a dark horse Democratic vice-presidential nominee, is back in a followup to a very well-received visit several years ago; Newsman Merriman Smith—best known as the voice which with a bellow of "Thank you, Mr. President," signals the end of Presidential news conferences, but whose contributions to thoughtful attention to national affairs go much deeper—is a guest this year; Governor Wallace will take time out from presidential campaigning to appear.

The league's consistently topflight convention program always gets attention, so much so that some might be tempted to judge the organization a once-a-year thing. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Alabama League of Municipalities is a 52-week-per-year servant of its constituents, the communities which are its members. Birmingham, Mobile, Montgomery, Huntsville, and the other larger cities are members, of course; so are Red Bay and Brantley and Pine Apple and dozens of small towns whose interests and needs vary widely from those of the big cities but are just as real and get the same attention from league offices.

That binding together of small towns and large—municipalities which by geography and economy and political persuasion and a dozen other gages are dissimilar, but which are all linked by a common interest in a greater Alabama, consequently surer prosperity and stability for each of them—may be the league's most important single service.

The League of Municipalities is certain to grow in importance and influence as the trend toward urbanization of the State continues. More and more Alabamians, more than half of the population of this once-rural State, now live in and around cities.

This has been reflected in court-ordered reapportionment of the legislature (still to be completed as far as the senate is concerned) and it will be reflected in uncountable other ways. The league will play a vital role in helping the State through this transition as smoothly as possible, in helping see to it that the cities' interests are properly served and their needs properly attended to.

There is a message here for those who preach States rights: If a State is to retain its rights it must exercise its responsibilities, and too often in the past this has not been done in regard to cities. The result has been—not just in Alabama, but nationally—that cities have turned more and more to Washington for Federal assistance. Those opposed to further extension of Federal activity should see that neglect of municipalities at the State level only encourages "going to Washington." They should keep in mind, too, that the time when urban areas gain effective political power commensurate with their growing size is not unforeseeable.

The News sends greetings to mayors assembled in Montgomery. The League of Municipalities is an important voice in behalf of each of the communities represented.

Centralizing Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Undersea Technology entitled "Centralizing Oceanography":

CENTRALIZING OCEANOGRAPHY

There has been an aura of expectancy permeating the Washington scene during these recent weeks. The Navy announced the proposal of a Naval Institute of Oceanology to strengthen its research and engineering capability, and the National Security Industrial Association released a special report suggesting the establishment of a multibillion-dollar-budgeted National Ocean Science and Technology Agency.

Now, while the oceanography bill (H.R. 6997), calling for legislative recognition of oceanography, sits in the Senate Commerce Committee waiting for debate, Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, has introduced a bill (H.R. 10904) which would create a "National Oceanographic Agency" (NOA).

In effect, NOA would "establish a coordinated national program for oceanography and related sciences including meteorology." To meet this objective, all oceanographic activity currently being carried out in the various agencies of the Government—with the exception of that being performed in the interest of national security—would be transferred to the new agency.

Congressman WILSON's justification of the bill is quite simple, yet plausible. There are 37 congressional committees and subcommittees that have a finger or two in the oceanographic budget, which is divided among 15 Government agencies. Consequently, the question of duplication of efforts arises, invariably leading to budget cuts. As it stands now, there is no single person, no single authority that represents our whole oceanographic program.

The security of this Nation could be greatly endangered should we lose control of the seas. Our ocean supremacy is largely dependent on our knowledge of the oceans. The concentration of effort which a single agency could produce would be more likely to result in sufficient funding for oceanographic research and development—funding long overdue and often lost in the confusion engendered by a multicommitteed Congress. Furthermore, the agency de facto would mean a central contracting office, greatly reducing many of the problems now involved in contracting with a decentralized operation.

Arguments against such an agency usually stem from those who feel that much of the now-accomplished research would be lost in the shuffle. They base this on Air Force claims of a 3-year setback in their space efforts when NASA came into being. However, section 7 of the NOA bill specifically states that "no function shall be transferred under this act which the President determines should not be transferred in the interests of national security."

Nearly a decade ago, it took a Soviet man-made, earth-orbiting satellite to make us get off the dime in space. Does this mean we must wait for evidence of a "gap" in oceanography before we forge ahead? Congressman WILSON stated that it is Congress' job to prevent an "oceanography gap." Well, in light of the Russians' massive submarine fleet, their merchant marine fleet, their fishing fleet, and their oceanographic fleet (all larger than ours), and in view of the caliber of their scientific personnel, the quality of their instruments, the size of their budget, and their damnable determination, Congress had better take a second look and reevaluate their "gap-preventing" responsibility.

By the very nature of this hydraheaded monster—oceanography—our Government has assumed liability for it; the objectives in toto are for national benefit; i.e., improving defense through naval superiority, utilization of ocean resources for our future welfare, and increasing our gross national product.

The agency envisaged by Representative WILSON is already getting support on the Hill and in Government corridors. Possibly, the bill could be accepted by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, be approved by the House, and sent to the Senate before Congress ends. However, the Senate stalemate over the civil rights issue would probably prevent further action on it this year. And I doubt if it would be sanctioned by the administration in an election year. But within the next 12 to 14 months something is going to happen * * * and it just might be a National Oceanographic Agency.

RICHARD E. MUNSKE.

Automation: A Community Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday at the annual meeting of the Maryland State Conference of Social Welfare in Baltimore, James R. Dumpson, New York City's commissioner of welfare gave a thought-provoking talk entitled "Automation: A Community Responsibility."

The text of his remarks follow:

SPEECH AT THE MARYLAND STATE CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WELFARE, "AUTOMATION: A COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY" BY JAMES R. DUMPSON, COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE, CITY OF NEW YORK, AT BALITMORE, MD., MAY 15, 1964

The committee responsible for the planning of your conference is to be applauded for directing attention and consideration to the impact of automation on the people of your State. The swift development of technological automation has received some attention at the Federal Government level—at least a recognition there of the need to prevent the problems that may accompany technological automation. Regretfully, there has not as yet been any solid planning in that direction nor any leadership provided to the States and local communities where, of course, the real preventive step must be taken. One or two States have established commissions to study this matter. But, to my knowledge, you are the first group of social welfare pepole who have assigned the kind of importance required to the subject of automation and devoted a full day to its consideration. Would that other State welfare conferences do the same thing. Then we would not be so notorious in our failure to plan to meet problems of the community involving people until they reach crisis stage—and often are beyond our competence then, to deal effectively with them.

One thing is clear: that all of our national efforts, whether those efforts be in business and in industry, of Government and of voluntary philanthropy—have a common objective—to enable each individual to achieve that measure of dignity to which he is entitled by virtue of being born and, thereby, to knit together a society that is socially, economically and morally secure. As we work toward that common objective, our Nation's security will be increasingly assured and its greatness furthered. Our goal is a nation, an economy, a society based upon individual dignity, which is the best path to collective security. In working toward that objective, what obstacles do we in social welfare face as we contemplate the impact of automation? We have learned of the promise of automation. It will create more consumer goods and they will be of a finer quality and at a lower cost. In addition to promising a better material life for mankind, automation will free people from long hours of monotonous physical labor and allow them to employ their uniquely human qualities—of intellect and empathy, of wisdom and morality—for appropriately humane activities.

This is the promise of automation and we welcome it. However, we must concern ourselves with other consequences as well.

In testimony given to a congressional subcommittee it was reported that due to technological processes from 1953 to 1960, 200,000 mining jobs were lost; 400,000 railroad jobs; and 1,500,000 jobs in factory production and maintenance. John Snyder, chairman and president of U.S. Industries, stated just recently "At last count, automation was eliminating jobs in the United States at the rate of more than 40,000 a week." And then he made a statement that must give all of us who share responsibility for the welfare of individuals and families serious pause—"The second myth we must bury," said Mr. Snyder, "is that all those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money." These are not the words of an alarmist; rather they are the words of one of our leading industrialists who believes intensely that if you and I and the American people have the facts, we have or will develop the skill, the programs, and the know-how to protect the productivity and dignity of people. What does this all mean to us in social welfare, to those of us in the helping professions, and to those on whose support and cooperation we depend?

Our profession is dedicated to helping those dislocated from the economy and to restore them to a life of productivity and dignity. Many observers have viewed the impact of automation as only a matter of temporary dislocation, suggesting that the social welfare effort must be devoted merely to softening the blow of unemployment by providing insurance and assistance payments and school-continuation and adult-retraining programs. As important as these programs are, is the problem really that simple? If portions of our population are permanently dislocated from the economy, social welfare is faced with far more complicated challenges. Our involvement in the lives of people may have to be measured in decades of the life span rather than merely months. Every other technological revolution that transformed the economy had lasting effects on other significant aspects of the society and we must expect automation to, also.

We have long known that he who fails to learn from history must relive that history. Before the industrial era, the clan and extended family were economic as well as kinship entities. In the craft system and the later domestic system of manufacturing, the immediate family was the production unit. The development of the factory system, in which workers operated centrally-located machines, entailed the separation of kinship from production. Of course, families remained consumption units but no longer was responsibility and authority in the home directly tied to responsibility and authority

at work. No longer could a youth inherit his father's tools and skills, as his father did before him, and thus secure his livelihood for life. And, as factories were located near the sources of power that drove the machines, workers and their immediate families moved away from their extended kin.

The innovations of inexpensive power transmission and the segmentalized operations that constituted mass production manufacturing had their impacts: factories were relocated near the urban consumer markets which were also the sources of the inexpensive, unskilled immigrant and domestic migrant labor needed for the assembly lines—internal migration in the Nation increased and the cities grew to metropolitan regions, people with economically interrelated but familially unrelated souls.

And now automation promises to sweep the assembly lines clear of the unskilled operatives. Like the other technological innovations, the electronic console of the automated factory will bring social as well as economic changes—a promise not likely to provide consolation for us. For our functions must undergo an evolution in light of the social changes that this economic revolution will bring.

Let me identify just a few of the social problems that illustrate the impact of technological automation on the people and suggest the gravity of the tasks that lie ahead for all social welfare. There are regions in America dependent upon a single industry for economic prosperity—a coal mining region, for exemple. What happens to a community in that region as its primary industry becomes increasingly automated? Initially fewer and fewer workers are needed. As consumer purchasing power declines, other firms lay off and the economy becomes depressed. In other words, fewer and fewer residents of the community are fully participating in the economy. An equilibrium is reached with fewer buyers and sellers and its level threatens to decline further. If an alternative primary industry can be developed, and capital found for it, the situation might be reversed. In such a situation, social welfare is faced with difficult but temporary problems. Unemployment insurance and financial assistance, if their payment standards are adequate, will maintain a decent stndard of living for a time and retraining and counseling programs can provide for a transition to the alternative industry. But suppose no alternative is present—as is often the case? Or suppose the alternative undergoes automation? Or suppose it moves out as easily as it moved in? Temporary programs are insufficient. Outmigration begins, slowly at first but the tempo increases. The young adults are most prone to leave the cities, relegating the older people to familial isolation. Soon, it is not only the economy that is depressed but the spirit of the community. How can public welfare provide finanical assistance to older workers for extensive periods if the tax base is lowered? And how can social welfare accomplish the restoration mission if its contributory base is lowered? What are we supposed to restore these older workers to?

Further, the lower tax base means deterioration of the public school system, so that the very young will be even less prepared for the automated economy. In time, they too, will migrate—unskilled for employment in an automated economy and unprepared for urban living. Now what of social welfare in the metropolis to which the young migrate? Even if we have done a very thorough job of protecting our city's social welfare needs, including those involved in the transition to an automated economy, and preparing for them, we are now confronted with an unforeseen migration. These new migrants are not accustomed to metropolitan living. In an alien environment without the social controls of the family, church and hometown community, they are without the skills needed for employment in the metropolis and without the basic education to acquire those skills. They are poor and so they are forced to settle in the crowded slums and ghettoes of the city. They are young and soon their children swamp the schools and swarm in the streets. They are ambitious and eager, so much so that, in their desire for gain and in their frustration at being denied it, they may overburden the law enforcement and correctional facilities.

Social welfare in America is still viewed as a local matter though our economy is regionally interdependent and we pride ourselves on our freedom of internal migration. Automation, like other economic changes, involves nationwide consequences. In both the "have" and "have not" communities, there will be social problems—of different sorts—with which the local social welfare agencies must cope though the nature and dimensions of these problems are beyond their immediate control. These are not temporary problems of economic transition. One-industry communities may become permanently changed due to automation. And in them, the social welfare agencies may have to develop new tactics: a community of the too old without spirit, biding their time between funerals, and the too young without hope, biding their time until they can flee such a community, needs a restoration program which goes far beyond vocational retraining and counseling. When the people of a community discuss the obituary pages of their local newspapers more than the sports pages and the fashion section, it is, for us, a cry of alarm.

The receiving metropolis faces multifaceted problems—in education, housing, mass transportation, health, hospitalization, law enforcement—all compounded by automation. Everyone admits that these problems are interrelated, but in most cities in America we still lack a coordinated governmental approach to them, let alone a coordinated public and private agency approach. Further, these problems involve the many adjacent cities and counties which may comprise the metropolitan region. Yet, in this era of revolutionary economic change, we still cling to the artificial political boundaries of a long-gone era—metropolitan regional government is virtually unknown and even cooperative relationships between social agencies in adjacent cities are still in their most formative stage. We still hear demogogic talk about States rights, the welfare state, and the intervention of the Federal Government as threatening individual initiative. Clearly, to accomplish our professional mission to help maintain standards of decency and to restore to productivity and dignity, the metropolitan social welfare agencies must be involved with not only material aid, casework counseling, and group work programing but with education, discrimination, housing, health, hospitalization, and the other concerns. Clearly, to the extent the socioeconomic parameters of the metropolitan region transcend city limits, social welfare agencies must be involved with more than just their own community. These changes involve more than temporary reactions to a technological innovation. They are fundamental and durable. New forms and structures and coalitions must be established within the social welfare field and between it and labor, industry, labor and politics.

The economic problems of any community are going to affect various segments of its population in different ways. We have heard of the differential deleterious effects of automation upon deprived minorities in America, especially the Negro. When we win the current battle for full implementation of social, political, and economic freedom for Negroes—and win it we must and shall in every town, city, and State of the Nation—we will still face the need to compensate in training and retraining programs for Negroes to overcome the ravages of the educational neglect and segregation of the past if we are to overcome the widening gap between the skills needed for automated labor and vocational equipment. The alternative is economic crisis for the Negro and the Nation. The problems are serious and their causes are rooted in more than our economic system. Yet, even if, in the coming decade, we erased all vestiges of caste privilege in America—as indeed we must—economically related problems unique to specific sex and age groupings will remain. For example, women presently constitute a significant portion of the labor force. Their earnings increase the purchasing power and raise the standard of living of their families. Indeed, female employment has helped create the enlarged demand for goods that contributes to the economic feasibility of automated production. The petrochemical industry, one of the most automated in America, owes much to the wives whose earnings help pay for the new cars and new houses and the gas and oil needed for their operation.

Domestic service employment declined with the appliance-mechanization of household chores. Most of the employed women in America are in factory-operative and clerical occupations. What will happen as these pursuits become automated? We may expect a temporary dislocation, with female employees from automated industries transferring to the as yet unautomated. A "bumping" process may occur with the less qualified deferring to the more qualified. This, in turn, may cause many families, presently financially independent due to the wife's employment, to become dependent upon public assistance when she becomes unemployed. Increasing automation may thereby result in an expansion of the unemployment insurance and public assistance rolls. But this is temporary. What of the long-term problems? Automation replaces the use of human physical labor with the employment of mental skills—a quality with which both sexes are equally endowed. Given the desire for female employment and our commitment to equal pay for equal work and given the smaller size of families in America, men and women will become earning competitors more than ever before. In the lower income groups, we may find many wives outearning husbands and this may lead to marital difficulties. Desertion in the lower income groups presently accounts for a significant portion of the social welfare chronic caseload. And the causes for such desertion frequently involve the husband's comparatively low earning capacity. This may be another of the nontemporary challenges wrought by automation.

And what of the youth of the Nation? Automation will undoubtedly increase the need for additional schooling, indeed of a revolutionized educational experience, entailing a further delayed entry into the labor market. The remedial teaching of educationally deficient children and the reschooling of "dropouts" are reactions to what we hope are temporary conditions. But social welfare is faced with the following long-term facts and deeply significant facts. Firstly, while entry into the labor market will occur at increasingly advanced ages, the age at marriage is declining. And secondly, the earlier the age at marriage, the higher is the proneness to desertion and divorce. Will the early termination of parental family financial responsibility—due to youthful marriage—compounded by the necessity for more years of education for vocational advancement, increase the divorce and desertion rates and thereby add to the chronic social welfare problems? Allied to this is the problem of the aged. Automation may hasten the lowering of age at retirement. And this in an era of increasing longevity. Each community will find itself with an ever-increasing proportion of its population per-

manently dislocated from economically productive pursuits due to age. And, because this era is also characterized by the ever-increasing mobility of the population, especially the young, the psychosocial problems of familial isolation are added to those of economic dislocation. What do restoration to productive life and maintenance of dignity mean here? Retraining and reemployment may be inappropriate for the retired. Perhaps, if self-maintenance cannot be a suitable goal, self-realization might be. And restoration to a productive and dignified life may mean a contribution to one's community in other than economic terms. Here, too, the social welfare must give new meaning to his mandate.

And what of the employed men—the husbands and fathers? Like the other revolutionary technological changes, automation promises to alter not only the nature of their employment but also to reduce the workweek and the workday. Our grandfathers toiled sunup to sundown, 6 days a week . In the space of less than three generations, the workweek was reduced from 72 to 60 hours and then, with the 5 day week, from 50 to 45 to 40 hours and, for many, it is now 35 hours. Will automation result in the 4 day week? Will it reduce the workweek to 32 hours or 30 or 28? If so, how can we in social welfare plan for the creative and satisfying utilization of this nonworking time?

The advances in science in the foreseeable future, when applied to medicine, may grant us eight decades of life. The advances in science, when applied to technology, may entail our spending the initial two or three decades preparing for participation in the economy and two or three decades in retirement from it. Every community in America must face and resolve the social problems of these economically unproductive decades. Of course, the temporary problems caused by the transition to an automated economy must be faced and resolved. But we must also look beyond them, to the changes in living patterns wrought by automation, of which employment is only a part. And, because we are concerned with people's lives and how they live, we in social welfare must plan for these future contingencies and redefine our role in light of them.

This conference should lead to increased constructive action in behalf of all people. But I will suggest three or four directions that thinking and attitudes in the Nation might take as we move ahead in implementing any agreements we have reached here or in exploring questions and propositions we have posed.

First, I suggest we seek to create a climate of opinion that accepts that there are adults in today's society who are not going to be economically productive in the foreseeable future and maybe never at all. These are workers rendered obsolete because of the lag in our income and work distribution, the lag in our educational processes that make it absolutely impossible for these workers to meet entry requirements of labor. We must consider whether our concept of work as being chiefly related to economic values is still valid. These are individuals who have become the dropouts of our economic system. I say that we must accept this and then accept its corollary—that provisions must be established for their care and use and that these provisions must be paid for out of the productivity of our economic system. If we can secure acceptance of this then we will be able to move more quickly and constructively in the development of programs and tools that truly individualize the help we make available.

Second, let's begin to question publicly whether by national policy, welfare should be called upon to strip people of their last vestige of dignity before they are entitled to, in some places the term is "worthy of," help they need. In short, we might well explore whether, in our present socioeconomic environment, we have not outlived the means test as a cornerstone of welfare operations?

This is not as revolutionary as it may sound. In the field of agriculture, the Federal Government has for three decades recognized the deleterious effect upon farm families of economic forces beyond their control. Farm families are subsidized to insure the maintenance of adequate income, to insure that they receive a share of the Nation's wealth, to insure that the whims of the economy and even the progress of the economy do not endanger the primary asset of our Nation—healthy and secure families. If all of the people on public welfare and all of the people dislocated from the economy planted crops, the Departmet of Agriculture might actually pay them to desist from such employment. And Congress, including even our legislators from the South and the Midwest, would probably favor such "agricultural" supports. But if we say that mothers on ADC should desist from employment because they are needed by their children, because this is our way of fostering healthy and secure families, that becomes a welfare support and these same legislators vehemently reject it.

We are now an urban nation, and those on welfare and those dislocated from the economy live in cities, so they cannot plant crops and then be paid to desist from agricultural production. But they too cannot be allowed to suffer because of economic forces beyond their control. Mass production of farm machinery had such an effect upon workers in the agricultural economy that supports of economically dislocated rural families were necessary. And automation will have such an effect upon the industrial economy that supports of economically dislocated urban families will be necessary. If the prevailing climate of opinion, "agricultural subsidy" is a positive term and "welfare subsidy" is a negative one, perhaps we should coin a new term. But new term or not, the objective is the same, the idea is similar, and the need is even greater.

Third, and really a part of my second proposition, as we recognize the impact of automation on people, maybe we now should abandon setting people off, welfare recipients and nonwelfare recipients, in the development of human services. I am convinced that social welfare services—including health, education, and vocational training—are basic supports for all people and can no longer be geared to financial dependency. They are a concomitant of a technologically automated society. Special training, literacy education, retraining efforts geared to and a condition of eligibility for basic human services for people who happen to be in financial need may better be replaced by a revolutionary, integrated, educational and training program, national in scope and federally supported for people whose total pattern of living may well be quite different from anything we have known. And our part as social welfare professionals will be to integrate what has been uniquely ours in services to people with what education, industry, the labor movement and government have to offer, joining with all those who are people-centered for healthy social living.

Our communities are composed of more than economic agents. People are thinking, feeling, and moral beings whose uniquely human qualities must be developed and channeled. Up to now, automation has been characterized by programing guidance systems for machinery. But for automation to fulfill its promise for mankind, we must develop programs to guide communities, as well. For this task, a total community responsibility, social welfare has already begun to retool.

A.M.E. Bishops' Statement on Smoking and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Council of Bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, America's oldest Negro-directed religious demonination, on February 18, 1964, issued a policy statement on smoking and health. The 17 member Bishops' Council met in New Orleans for its annual midwinter sessions—Union Bethel A.M.E. Church, February 18–19, 1964.

Issuance of the statement by Bishop Carey A. Gibbs, council president, followed a report on smoking by a panel of three church-connected physicians, Dr. J. Leonidas Leach, Flint, Mich.; Dr. Robert W. Mance, Washington, D.C.; and Dr. R. A. Billings, Atlanta, Ga. Medical director of the A.M.E. Connectional Health Commission, Dr. Leonidas Berry, of Chicago, Ill., was unable to participate in the panel discussions.

The text of the Bishops' statement follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT

"The Council of Bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church wishes to express sincere gratitude to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service for making public the clear and factual report of its advisory committee 'Smoking and Health.'

"In view of the relationship this report apparently bears to the health of our people, the bishops of the church consider it a part of their stewardship to seek the professional guidance of trained physicians associated with us.

"There would certainly appear to be a moral question involved if we failed to apply our best efforts to the problems raised by the Surgeon General's report. We are already duty bound, and have a moral obligation to consider the health of our membership. We firmly believe that the Christian church has a clear-cut role in developing public awareness of health hazards.

"We confirm the opinion that smoking, particularly cigarette smoking, appears to be a health hazard. We, therefore, urge our various leadership groups to so regard it.

"We are especially concerned over the possible effects of current advertising in various media—newspapers, radio, and television—which project cigarette smoking by young people as some sort of asset or instrument for gaining greater social acceptance from their fellows. We commend the industry for any adjustments they are bringing about.

"Those responsible for this type of advertisement should reconsider their output lest some form of Government control be needed to curb it.

"The heads of our church-supported educational institutions will no doubt have special problems in interpreting the correct facts on smoking. We suggest that physical and health education courses be expanded to include more of the pros and cons of habitual smoking. We urge that where feasible the report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee be made mandatory reading for students.

"Our churches, scattered as they are throughout the Nation, would do well to widen their support and cooperation with organizations such as American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association. Their quest is for a better, a longer and a more productive life for all Americans and they deserve our full support.

"The Richard Allen Foundation, a nonsectarian nonprofit organization bearing the name of the founder of the A.M.E. Church deserves unstinted praise for bringing this report to our attention.

We especially wish to thank Drs. Leach, Mance, and Billings for their able report. We regret that our distinguished medical director, Dr. Leonidas H. Berry could not participate."

Dr. Leach, panel chairman and executive secretary of the Richard Allen Foundation, commenting on the bishop's statement called it encouragingly, frank and forthright. The Flint, Mich., physician stated that he took a realistic view of the problem. He stated that the Allen Foundation would sponsor health seminars in many metropolitan areas within the coming months.

"Our young people, and older ones too for that matter, have a right to smoke if they want to. They also have a right to all of the facts about smoking and what it involves in relation to their futures. This is an enormous social problem, one to be approached calmly and cautiously. It is a challenge the Richard Allen Foundation intends to meet."

Post Office Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, upon request and with leave to extend my remarks I quote herewith an editorial from the May 14, 1964, issue of the Times-Register published in Salem, Va.:

COSTS UP; SERVICE DOWN

The remarkable progress of the U.S. Post Office within the last 10 years is enough to give the average stamp buyer a solid lesson in governmental economics. The more money taken in, the fewer services are offered. This is known as "efficiency."

It began as an "economy move" in the Truman administration. Someone in the upper reaches of the postal power echelon decided that two letter deliveries a day were too many. Henceforth, only one home delivery would be made. This, the post office assured us, would mean much faster processing of mail.

Next, the price of stamps went up from 3 to 4 cents. This was necessitated by the increase in the speedup of mail brought about by the decline in the deliveries mentioned.

Between 1962 and 1963, 1,300 employees in the post offices over the country were eliminated, and the price of stamps went up to 5 cents.

And then, the Post Office anounced that remarkable improvement called the ZIP code. The zip code, we were told, was necessary in order to speed the mail even faster than it already was not going through. As yet, the U.S. postal machines made necessary by the zip code are not in use, though entire businesses have geared their mailing practices to this automated phantom, after having been assured that the mail would travel at the speed of light. At present, we are told, the zip code is merely a method of "educating the public."

Meanwhile, the productivity of remaining postal employees increased 12 percent. And we are told that subsequent economics will produce a savings to the taxpayer of $12.7 million next year.

Therefore, by the logical reasoning of the postal authorities, the Post Office is further curtailing its services after hiking prices on all second- and third-class mail.

Henceforth, there will be a reduction of parcel post deliveries which will be cut back from 6 to 5 days a week. And this, of course, is a perfectly logical development. Rates on parcel post have increased 13 percent, while the services will be reduced 18 percent.

It merely stands to reason that the more you pay, the less you will receive.

But the customer is not supposed to mind the inconvenience. In fact, postal authorities call their cutbacks in service by the Federal gobbledegook term of "limited adjustments." And a stamp buyer is expected to stand in line all day, if need be, at the stamp window. Time was, when there were three windows open on Saturdays. Now, only one window will be open for 4 hours. And there will be no money orders available on Saturdays.

This will be fine for the customer, however, who is being taught a valuable lesson in planning. If you want your stamps, taxpayer, you better show up on Friday.

And while you are making this "limited adjustment" it would be wise to adopt the plan-ahead philosophy of the post office and stock up on 5-cent stamps which come in $5 rolls. This promotion of stamps is being undertaken by post offices all over the country in order to discourage the last-minute stamp buyer. The Post Office Department insists on cash on the barrelhead in advance of delivery.

No cash. No delivery. And the public be damned.

Any private industry engaged in interstate commerce which operated on the principles and philosophy of the Post Office Department would go out of business. But the U.S. postal service, one of the oldest services in the executive branch of Government, is made rotten by political patronage.

No one in his right mind would suggest that our local Veterans' Administration offices be run by a local political appointee. No one with any brains at all would suggest that the operation of the VA hospital be awarded to a local political favorite with no experience in medicine.

The post offices in the Nation deserve the best talents and minds available. But local postmasters are appointed through political persuasion. Salem was actually told by a high U.S. postal official that the real reason the town has been without a permanent postmaster for over 3 years is simply that we have a Republican Congressman.

If this is true, then the U.S. Post Office Department ought to take a long, cold look at its own interior. And then it should start worrying about the public.

Of all the Government agencies in this country, none has a closer contact with the general public than has the post office. And none has a more deplorable public-relations program. Shorthanded, overworked, and plagued by governmental paperwork and political interference, postal employees often give short shrift to their customers.

Businesses suffer, too. For example, weekly newspapers have learned the hard way that unless they bag and label their mail by zone, load it into trucks—and, in many cases, deliver it themselves—the newspapers simply will not be delivered on time. The Post Office Department which is supposed to perform these services, shrugs off its responsibilities and puts the burden on the bulk mailer.

In most small businesses which use the mails to distribute their products, special mailrooms have had to be set up at their own expense, to perform the work which the local post offices shirk.

It is time for a public outcry. The "limited adjustments" of the Post Office Department will ultimately lead to no Saturday deliveries, higher postal rates, fewer employees to serve customers, and a severe blow to business and industry.

Whoever asks that the Department of Agriculture (and we must nod in the direction of Orville Freeman and the scandals which have racked his administration), the Department of the Interior, the Department of Labor, or even the State Department meet their annual budgets? Taxpayers shell out billions to these departments which are so liberal with their handouts. But the Post Office Department, by some odd policy decision, is supposed to pay its own way at the further expense of U.S. taxpayers.

We would paraphrase a famous line. "Ask not what the post office can do for you; ask what you can do for the post office"

Virginia PTA Program Guide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, as the schools of our Nation approach the end of another year, parents and teachers are taking time to reflect on the accomplishments of the past several months—and to look ahead to the future. Most of us in this body are parents and know what the end of a school year means to our children. Some of us have been teachers and we know what is needed in the way of preparation for the years to follow.

I am sure that many of my colleagues have been members of a most outstanding organization that exemplifies the highest ideals of our Nation—the Congress of Parents and Teachers. This is the time of the year that thousands of local PTA organizations are concluding their year's work and electing their offices for the coming year.

It is a time of action and planning. It is a time of setting goals for our schools and our children. It is a time that makes all of us proud and grateful to be a part of the American way of life.

Dr. Charles G. Caldwell, president of the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers recently spoke to a district PTA meeting in my congressional district.

As quoted in the press, Dr. Caldwell's remarks on the subject "Growing Up in Virginia" were very enlightening and inspiring. I was prompted to secure and read the Virginia PTA Bulletin for April. Much of what he said in his recent speech was included in the bulletin's "President's Message" and I include the text with my remarks:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By Dr. Charles G. Caldwell)

Growing up in Virginia in this 20th century can and should be an exciting adventure. In spite of the usual and special crisis of life and the pressures of our rapidly

changing social and technological environments, there are challenges and opportunities for the young and growing which have never before existed in man's history.

Many of us have the tendency to insulate our children from the innovations and discontinuities of the socialization process. This we cannot do; and attempting to do so would deny the young of the satisfactions and confidence that are gained from meeting change capably and well. And yet we know that some guidance must be provided, some protection is necessary; for growing up in today's world can be overwhelming unless those who have "grown up" know and understand the processes which mold, the relationships which shape, and the conditions and situations which determine the stable and productive personality.

Growth is a universal attribute to all organic life. We are all interested in this phenomenon, especially as it applies to human beings. As adults we have experienced the process and as parents, teachers, and youth leaders, we see the problems, concerns, and bewilderment that the process often brings to our children.

Two familiar observations on human growth have the profundity of utter simplicity. The first is found in the nursery rhyme and concerns the elf man who said to the child when encountered in a garden, "I'm just as big for me as you are big for you." This states the importance of considering size as quality rather than mere quantity. The second was uttered by Topsy when she said, "Me? Why, I just growed."

To understand human behavior during the growing process is one of the greatest challenges facing adults today. To understand is to accept, and acceptance is the basis of constructive human relationships and human endeavor. Perhaps the only enduring remedy for world tensions and the human misery which often attends these tensions is an understanding mind and a receptive heart.

The parent-teacher movement was founded 67 years ago on the basic premise that the welfare of children and youth is dependent upon action based on an understanding of the causes shaping the behavior of the young. This is the underlying premise of the action program of the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers for 1964–66, designed to give increased attention to the historic goals of our organization. It is offered as a challenge to parent-teacher associations throughout the broad expanse of our Commonwealth.

If used wisely and well this action program will help to make each parent-teacher meeting an exciting and inspiring adventure. No group of parents and teachers gathered together in the mutual interests of our children deserves less. We have no right to expect a parent anywhere to interrupt his busy schedule to attend a gathering whose program is characterized by a sterile repetition of half-baked truths; or to sit and listen to routine business which could best be resolved in an executive meeting and reported in a series of written announcements; or to stand and be counted for a room prize.

The purpose of this action program have been stated well by the committee which developed it. They are:

First, to awaken the desire to learn more about the growth and development of young people;

Second, to encourage the exploration of recent findings by behavioral scientists and others;

Third, to initiate widespread discussion of both growth needs and practical ways to meet them; and

Fourth, to promote the kinds of action which will assist in understanding and meeting specific youth needs locally and statewide.

The program itself is based on the theme of the Virginia Congress for 1964–66, "Growing Up in Virginia," and consists of 21 growth needs, each followed by three questions appropriate to the preschool age level, the elementary school child, and the adolescent and youth. It is intended to awaken curiosity, to begin a questioning attitude, to motivate careful examination of the suggested growth needs of the individual child and youth, and to facilitate discovery of useful insights.

Our theme: Growing Up in Virginia.

Our motto: Study—Discuss—Act.

This is our challenge. How you meet this challenge depends on your concern, your imagination, your values, and your convictions. We have faith in your ability to make growing up in Virginia an exciting adventure for every young person in every county and city in our State.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Caldwell has summarized the action program of the Virginia PTA for 1964–66, "Growing Up in Virginia." This is an excellent program prepared by members of the PTA board of managers with Mrs. Edward B. Strait as chairman.

This program is available to parents, teachers, clergymen, and community leaders and can serve as a very fine guide to their work with young people. I am asking for several copies and will have them available in my office to anyone desiring to have a copy for reference. It is in a convenient leaflet form. I feel certain the Virginia PTA would be more than pleased to have any PTA throughout the Nation refer to this program as plans are made for coming school years.

"Growing Up in Virginia," in Mrs. Strait's words, "reflects widespread determination to gain greater understanding of today's young Virginians."

I must commend the Virginia PTA for its work to develop this action program. We are constantly striving to meet the problems faced by our young people today. The Virginia plan can help all of us, whether we are an active member of the PTA or not, and I invite each of my colleagues to review it.

Cold War Threat Must Be Met

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of April 28, 1964, entitled "Cold War Threat Must Be Met":

ISSUE IS CLEAR CUT—COLD WAR THREAT MUST BE MET

The conduct of foreign policy will be the principal issue of the Republican presidential campaign. In this knowledge, President Johnson has offered confidential intelligence briefings on world affairs to all candidates so they can chart a positive course.

A positive course, however, may be defined as the one most favored by the administration.

Certainly none of the candidates wishes to embarrass the United States in its daily negotiations and discussions with a hundred or more nations. But day-by-day events by themselves are not the basic concern of candidates for president except as they might provide further evidence of a course of success or failure.

What the Republicans are concerned about is the failure of the administration to meet the primary challenge of the cold war. This issue is within the public domain, and all discussion and debate must flow from that one point.

The active and potential Republican candidates such as Senator Barry Goldwater, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Gov. William Scranton and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon are not exactly babes in the international woods. Even Governor Scranton has had service in the State Department.

On the high level on which such men operate there are few secrets of government, domestic and foreign, that are not known or easily available to them, either in a specific or general way.

Foreign affairs, in fact, hold few secrets from the American people. We know what the administration's attitude is toward Cuba, and how it is trying to affect its program, though the administration from time to time may withhold from us salient facts such as occurred in the case of the missiles and later regarding the pace of the withdrawal of the Russian expeditionary force.

Whether this information was withheld in the best interests of the country, or for political purposes, has been a matter of debate, and will continue to be so. We can't imagine a Republican candidate's being bound to secrecy on the placing of nuclear missiles on Cuba by the most powerful enemy of Western civilization.

Domestic issues will play a large part in the coming election, but the overriding concern in this country lies in our confrontation with the Communists.

The inability of this and other Democratic administrations to project the fundamental struggle for survival has led us into a blind search for peace, to draw differences between one Communist dictator and another, and to exhibit a fatalistic willingness to surrender force when we know in or hearts that this country wouldn't survive for an hour without it.

The American Free Enterprise System Versus the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include excerpts from a speech by E. F. Scoutten, vice president of the Maytag Co., of Newton, Iowa, to Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, last November, which follows:

THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM VERSUS THE WELFARE STATE

(By E. F. Scoutten)

A discussion of the merits of the American free enterprise system as contrasted with the welfare state could obviously fill several volumes. Since I have only a limited time, and since I do not pose as an economist, I suggest that it is essential that I limit my remarks this morning to the basic elements

of these two economic systems. It is not really important that we consider the almost unlimited fringe areas of these two ideologies. If we understand the essential differences, we should be able to determine the relative merits.

THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

It behooves us, I think, to take a moment in a brief clarification and definition of terminology. When I speak of the American free enterprise system, I am referring to the economic system as it has operated in this country, subject to reasonable regulations and controls. Many of the critics of the American system, when they attack it, deliberately define it as it existed perhaps 100 years ago. In effect, they define it as a laissez faire economic system which is free from governmental control or regulation. There has been no laissez-faire system in this century. To attack the American free enterprise system as though it existed today as it did 100 years ago is as meaningless, unfair and inaccurate as it is to criticize business management as though it still operated in the fashion which was current prior to the Civil War.

I submit that it is quite proper that reasonable limitations, regulations, and controls should be imposed upon the functions of our free enterprise system. There can never be any system which is totally free. There must always be limits. The limit to your right to swing your arm ends where another person's nose begins. The right to freedom of speech does not entitle you to shout "fire" in a crowded theater. I know of no intelligent person who argues that our free enterprise system should be totally free and without restrictions. The various governmental regulations designed to prevent monopoly control of a commodity, or to protect the individual worker against possible exploitation, or to guarantee the consumers against misrepresentation, are all desirable limitations. No qualified businessman is opposed to the regulations of government which provide workmen's compensation for injured employees, or which require fair and ethical procedures in the labeling of products for the protection of the customer, or which prohibit the formation of cartels for artificially maintaining unrealistic price levels. As a matter of fact, responsible businessmen everywhere would insist upon such regulation, even if it were not currently available. And yet, it seems to many businessmen today that what began as a reasonable limitation upon our free enterprise system is fast turning into a deliberate attempt to destroy our free enterprise system and the form of democratic republican government under which it has existed, and to produce, in its stead, a welfare state under a socialistic form of government.

Let's be sure that we understand what we are talking about. When I speak of free, I have reference to freedom in the great Anglo-Saxon tradition as meaning independence from the arbitrary will of another person or another group. When I speak of our free enterprise system, I am referring to the freedom which any member of our society enjoys to engage in business enterprise with the privilege of making a profit or suffering a loss. Such persons have frequently been called entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs, having elected to exercise their talents in our free enterprise system, usually begin by assembling the capital necessary to create enterprise. The formation of this capital occurs either by their having saved it from their earnings or, frequently, by joining with others so as to accumulate the necessary funds. Having assembled the capital, they then usually develop the product or the service which they hope will find some significant need in the marketplace. They then invest it in the building of a plant and the purchase of machinery and equipment. They hire and pay a labor force to produce the product. They seek a market for the product so that the plant and the labor force can be kept working. They attempt, in the face of competition, to sell the product at a price that will yield sufficient profit to enable the business to continue. Sometimes they are successful. Frequently they fail. The most basic and significant element of the American free enterprise system, however, is that such people have the freedom to embark upon such a venture.

They have the freedom to risk their savings and the savings of other like-minded persons in an attempt, through the provision of a service or a product, to earn the favor and the consequent profits which result from their filling a consumer demand.

The most drastic shortage in this country today is a shortage of able people who are willing to accept such responsibility and get things done efficiently and effectively. Science and invention are progressing at an amazing pace and will probably continue to do so, but, as always, the work of translating the discoveries of the scientists and the inventors into marketable products must wait upon people with talent and energy to produce, distribute and sell.

There is probably little or nothing being done in American business today that cannot be done better. American business and industry and the American consumer are awaiting anxiously the future growth and development which can be realized if our free enterprise system is permitted to flourish and grow.

One of the great needs in our economic system is for the continuous and increasing availability of venture capital. Let's examine that term.

If you have saved, inherited, or otherwise acquired $1,000, there are a variety of things you can do with it. You can put it in a savings bank or in a Government bond where it will be readily available, but where it will earn comparatively little interest.

You can invest it in a corporate bond, or a secured loan, or a mortgage. It will be perhaps not quite as safe, and it will not be quite as readily available when you want it, but the rate of return will be a bit higher.

Or, you can buy a so-called blue chip stock, which is even a little more risky and sometimes is a little more profitable.

VENTURE CAPITAL ESSENTIAL

Or, finally, you can use the money to go into business on your own or perhaps buy stock in some new or struggling enterprise, the future of which is still in doubt. In such a case, you are taking a very real risk of losing all or part of your money. In return, however, there is also a chance for maximum gain or profit on your investment. This is venture capital. Such capital is the lifeblood of our free enterprise system. Without it—without people who have saved money from their earnings and who are willing to risk it on new ventures—free enterprise, as we know it, could not exist.

Obviously, the prime consideration which motivates a man to invest his savings in the form of venture capital is the possibility of realizing a significant profit. There are some people who would have you believe that profits, in and of themselves, are objectionable and that the individual or the business enterprise which earns a profit has somehow or other done so at the cost of the sweat, blood, and tears of other human beings. Actually, profits are the lifeblood of our free enterprise system, which has given us the highest standard of living that the world has ever known. Incidentally, it should be noted that profits are also the lifeblood of any system of government based on taxation. Furthermore, there is no such thing as an excessive profit. There is no such thing as an excessive profit because when the system is permitted to perform its legitimate function, any excess profit is automatically self-correcting.

FUNCTION OF PROFIT

If an enterprise in a new venture succeeds in realizing an unusually high profit, it automatically has the effect of attracting other capital to the same field, to the same activity and to the same market, until such time as the profit on the invested capital, through the force of competition, declines below the level that capital is earning generally.

In this fashion, therefore, the so-called excessive profit serves as a signal to direct the flow of capital into those areas where additional capital is obviously needed. And, by the same token, the level of the profit, when it becomes ordinary, likewise serves as a signal to direct the flow of new capital to other areas or activities.

Let's illustrate specifically: When the Ford Motor Co. in the early part of this century began to realize unusually high profits, resulting from a high volume and a standardized product, there was, as a result, a tremendous flow of capital into the automotive industry to help supply the demand which Ford had unearthed. Literally hundreds of corporations were established and competition for Ford sprang up everywhere, until such time as the profit rate in the automotive industry sank back to normal levels. During this development, of course, hunderds of different automobiles were marketed, of which more than 90 percent failed and ultimately disappeared from the market. Those automobiles which remain in the market today are there and available only because they have successfully weathered the drastic tests of competition and have earned a share of the consumer's dollar. The Ford profits signaled the need for additional capital in the industry. As soon as this need was supplied and the profits returned to or below a normal level, the capital was diverted to other fields.

It should be noted that the level of profit which is returned on the capital investment serves as a signal in directing the investment of additional capital by other investors. The level of profit, however, is merely the signal. The effective determinant of the level of profit is the consumer—collectively called the marketplace.

If a company's product and service meet a need of the consumer, the company will be rewarded with a profit. When competitors flock to supply the same need, the competition which is created forces all competitors to refine the product, improve the service and better satisfy the consumer's need. Those enterprises which fail to keep abreast of competitive developments presently fail entirely and disappear from the scene. It is this refining effect of competition which has guaranteed the continuing improvement in the standard of living of the American people.

THE WELFARE STATE

Opposed to and contrasted with this system of competition, as it operates under the free enterprise system, is the concept of the welfare state. When I use this term, I am referring to the elemental notion that a central government should, in whatever fashion may be required, undertake to guarantee the welfare of all of its citizens in all aspects of their existence from the cradle to the grave. This concept undertakes to guarantee the citizens with employment, with medical care, housing, clothing, food, education, and usually a great many nonessential benefits ranging without limit into such things as cultural activities. This concept is based upon the assumption that a governmental bureaucracy, directed by a group of supposed experts, is better able to direct the activities of the people than are the people themselves. It assumes, furthermore, that the people will prefer this absolute and benighted direction, and, in fact, that they will welcome it in preference to a regulated free enterprise sys-

tem which guarantees the citizen a right to succeed and a right to fail.

You will note that in this definition of the welfare state, I have deliberately made no reference to the political form of government involved. This omission is because there is only one kind of government structure under which the welfare state can be operated: This is a strong and absolutee central government. It makes no difference whether you call such a government fascist, or socialistic, or communistic, or anything else. It is invariably the same kind of government: A dictatorial, powerful, central direction which reserves unto itself the decisions and choices which, under a representative form of government, are left to the people. It reserves to itself the regulation and control, ultimately, of all aspects of the citizen's existence. It makes all the decisions.

If through regulation and control of profit, as occurs under a welfare state, it becomes impossible for the consumer to make his wishes decisive, then all the merits of competition and the free enterprise system disappear. If a government bureaucrat is entrusted with the authority of determining what products are to be produced and who is to produce them; and when they are to be produced; and where they are to be produced; and what their selling price is to be, then we have eliminated the consumer judgment factor and have entrusted the development of the economy to a fallible human being who cannot conceivably exercise judgment in these matters which even approaches the quality of judgment which results when all of the populace participate. This system of state control and state direction has never succeded anywhere in the history of the race, and it is not succeeding now in those countries where it is being tried, including those relatively limited areas of our economy where it is being applied in this country.

MONOPOLY CONTROL

Under the laws of our country, which for many years have been directed toward the reasonable regulation of our free enterprise system, it is impossible to acquire or sustain a monopolistic control of a commodity or of an industry, except when the government, in effect, assumes, creates and sustains such a monopoly. In every instance in which such government-supported monopolies have been created, they have proved to be failures and they have failed to accomplish the very goals for which they were originally created.

Farmers' organizations, for an untold number of years, tried to maintain farm prices through collusion. They had no appreciable success until the Government took over. Labor unions tried for a hundred years to create monopoly control in individual labor markets, but they failed miserably until the Government came to their aid and foisted a monopoly control of labor on the American economy.

How long has the Government been "helping the farmer?" It has been going on for more than 30 years. Today there are fewer farmers and there is some evidence to suggest that those who are producing crops in the Government program are worse off than those who are not covered. We are paying out billions of dollars a year to maintain agricultural prices at a false level, yet the subsidized farmer's income is still falling. This is nationalization of farmers. It is expensive and it is morally wrong. The consuming public pays a subsidy through taxes, and then, in addition, pays the higher food prices which result from price control. Still, every year thousands of farmers quit the farm. It was only last spring that the wheat farmers in this country came to their senses and voted out the Government's newest proposal in the subsidization, monopoly control, and nationalization of the wheat farmers. It took the wheat farmers 30 years to discover that the rewards of the free enterprise system are superior to the results produced by the welfare state controls.

GOVERNMENT, ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Our type of government, as created in this country, took the form of a republic. So long as it retained the elements of a republic, it prospered and grew in a fashion unprecedented in the history of the race. It has been only since significant attempts have been made to convert it into a dictatorial welfare state that many of the problems confronting us today have emerged and that our progress as a nation is becoming increasingly reduced and even stultified.

The success of our form of government depended upon the functioning of our free enterprise system. The two systems are complementary and mutually interdependent. Our form of government could not exist in the absence of a free enterprise system; nor can a free enterprise system exist in the absence of a republic. And yet, today, there is considerable evidence to indicate that we are trying to convert both our form of government and our economic system into a dictatorial welfare state.

And let's recognize another fact as we proceed: There is no essential difference between an absolute monarchy, a dictatorship, a fascist form of government, and a welfare state. It makes no difference how tortured the semantics are—whenever you create a form of government which makes decisions for the people; which directs their economic activities; which limits their choice of economic alternatives; and which attempts to provide an unlimited security, then you have created a dictatorship—and you may call it socialism, communism, or fascism, or anything else you choose. It makes no difference, because there is no difference.

It is important, I think, to examine very carefully these great and basic issues which are presently being debated in our country. Millions of our citizens, without adequate training or means to distinguish among the several alternatives available to them, are being deluded, misled, and purchased by demagogic politicians who, either ignorantly or deliberately, are attempting to destroy not only the American free enterprise system, but our form of government and our standard of living. Let's examine briefly how we got into this situation.

MONETARY AND MORAL VALUES

Free societies have always been those in which the individual has been required to accept responsibility for not only himself, but for his immediate family. Such societies have accordingly permitted the individual a considerable freedom of choice and have likewise permitted him to enjoy the results which he was able to achieve. When he occasionally failed, he was likewise accorded the privilege of failure.

In free societies, remuneration to the individual has always been made in accordance with the value of his services and contributions. The value of such services and contributions has been determined by his fellows. Very often, this has caused some concern among the society, because the remuneration to many people seemed to be inconsistent with their opinion of the individual's moral merit. There has frequently been noted a discrepancy between moral merit and the individual's remuneration. It must be noted, therefore, that personal esteem and material success are not necessarily identical. The free enterprise system is the only kind of society which provides us with ample material means, and still leaves us free to choose between material and nonmaterial rewards. Our free enterprise system deals only with economic means. We are required, as individuals, to accept the responsibility of making what we choose of our freedom. If men are to be free to use their talents, we must remunerate them accordingly, but we ought to esteem them in accordance with the use they make of the means which they thus acquire for their disposal.

NATURE OF EQUALITY

We must also note that there is in our society at the present time a confusion with respect to the democratic process, the free enterprise system and equality. No political thinker of any stature in all history has ever interpreted democracy as necessarily meaning equality in all things. When the Founding Fathers incorporated into the Declaration of Independence the phrase, "All men are created equal," they referred only to equality before the law and equality of opportunity to each individual to fulfill his highest potential. That is the American ideal.

In recent years, however, our basic concept of government has begun to give way to the sentimental and superficial notion that people should somehow be made equal in fact. Our public education system during the past 25 years has contributed tremendously to this ridiculous objective. Along with this attempt has come an unwarranted emphasis upon security. As Dr. Felix Morley has said, "The desire for security has become the opium of the people in America." Whenever a society dedicates itself to the totally impossible goal of making all individuals equal and to the equally objectionable goal of providing perfect security for all members of the group, that society immediately loses the boldness, the dedication and the responsible citizenship which, otherwise, would be available to it; its members cease to be masters of the State, but, rather, they become its wards. When the citizen accepts the Government as his guardian, our form of government will decay.

CHALLENGES TO DEMOCRACY

If the American people will permit it, our Federal Government will be glad to do all our thinking and planning and spending for us. The theory of the welfare state, which presumably protects the citizens from the cradle to the grave—which guarantees them a living whether it be in the form of living on the welfare rolls or working as assigned by a bureaucrat in Washington—is a throwback to the old feudal system under which the lord of the manor was not only the master of the people, but the source of their livelihood, as long as they acknowledged his authority and obeyed his orders.

Many of the innovations of the welfare state are, in fact, throwbacks to former social systems which men now regard as malevolent. They are systems which men have fought to overthrow over hundreds of years. The slave, the serf, the communal peasant, all had ultimate security. It seems to many people that this alleged progress toward the welfare state is, in fact, a retrogression to what the race of men have found to be anathema in generations past.

The chief elements with which the welfare state concerns itself are in reality local matters. They can and should be solved locally; but when the Federal Government steps into the picture, local efforts cease. In the welfare state in the Soviet Union, the state regulates almost every aspect of life and there is little room left for individual initiative and little need for individual self-reliance. From the cradle to the grave, the individual is under the protective custody of the state, which has the authority to educate him; doctor him; tell him where he is to work and how much he is to make; what he is to eat; what he is to wear, and for how long a time.

This shift toward centralization which has been going on in our country for more than 30 years is a very gradual thing. Freedoms have been surrendered little by little in pieces thought to be too small to be worth fighting for, until now it is necessary to look back

many years to realize the tremendous distance we have traveled toward centralized, dictatorial control. In 1913, a 31-word Federal personal income tax law was enacted. It limited the rate to 1 percent on taxable income below $20,000 and a maximum top rate of 2 percent. Today, this 31-word law has grown to over 450,000 words and it takes 23 cents out of every dollar earned, with a minimum rate of 20 percent—10 times the maximum rate in 1913—and with the maximum rate of 91 percent.

In 1930, the entire budget of the United States was $3 billion. This year, the budget will approach $100 billion. In 1930, there were 592,000 government civilian employees. Today, there are more than 2½ million. Our national debt has increased from $16 billion in 1930 to over $300 billion at the present time. If you add the unfunded pension liabilities to government employees; contracts; commitments to defense, welfare and government, and the actuarial deficit in the social security system, the national debt today is more than $1,000 billion—more than a trillion dollars.

Years ago, the socialist leader Norman Thomas said, "The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism, but, under the name of liberalism, they will adopt every fragment of the socialistic program, until America will one day be a socialistic nation without knowing how it happened." We are long gone down that road.

There is an evident assumption that Americans should be coddled, subsidized and regimented from the cradle to the grave. Concurrently, there is a naive notion that when our neighbor departs for Washington and moves into an office in some Federal bureau, he somehow or other magically attains an expertise and is thereby qualified as an authority on matters about which he never seemed to know very much when he lived down the street.

James Madison said, "We rest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

The free enterprise system, which has worked so well for us for so many years, is now faced with its ultimate death, because we have failed to realize that we cannot have the superficially attractive benefits of the welfare state and, simultaneously, continue to maintain and expand our standard of living. If we are to destroy our free enterprise system, we must recognize that, with it, we destroy our democratic form of government. Inferior as it is, the welfare state still exacts a tremendous price: the creation of a dictatorship of the central government.

Science and the Race Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following report of the AAAS Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare:

SCIENCE AND THE RACE PROBLEM—A REPORT OF THE AAAS COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE IN THE PROMOTION OF HUMAN WELFARE

(Reproduced by Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, with permission of copyright claimant)

(The members of the committee are Barry Commoner, Washington University, chairman; Robert B. Brode, University of California; T. C. Byerly; Ansley J. Coale, Princeton University; John T. Edsall, Harvard University; Lawrence K. Frank; Margaret Mead, American Museum of Natural History; Walter Orr Roberts, National Center for Atmospheric Research (ex officio AAAS Board representative); Dael Wolfle (ex officio). Responsibility for statements of fact and expressions of opinion contained in this report rests with the committee that prepared it. The AAAS board of directors, in accordance with association policy and without passing judgment on the views expressed, has approved its publication as a contribution to the discussion of an important issue.)

Certain statements published during the last few years by persons of academic attainment have asserted that scientific evidence proves that the members of Negro races are inherently less competent than individuals of other races of mankind. The authors of these statements also claim that the alleged scientific data justify inequities in Negro civil rights and ought to invalidate the U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1954 on school segregation. On the other hand, numerous scientists competent in the study of race have strongly rejected both the validity of these assertions regarding the characteristics of Negro races and the political conclusions apparently based on them.

The issues raised by this conflict go far beyond the usual limits of a disagreement among scientists, which members of the profession can resolve among themselves in the normal course of scientific procedure. The issues concern not only the validity of allegedly scientific conclusions but also fundamental principles that affect the integrity of science. Moreover, the alleged evidence is being used to challenge a principle fundamental to our political system, and to influence the outcome of the present crisis in the relations between racial groups in the United States.

Claims regarding scientific evidence of the "inferiority" of Negro races have been put forward in their most coherent form by W. C. George and Carleton Putnam,[1] who make the following main assertions.

1. They claim that recent judicial and political decisions to end segregated treatment of Negroes fail to reflect the weight of modern scientific evidence. This evidence, they assert, shows that human capability is racially determined and that Negroes are inherently less well endowed than white persons with respect to intelligence, and with respect to other factors which lead to competent behavior in a modern society.[2] They assert specifically that the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, declaring segregation in the scohols illegal, fails to recognize scientific evidence which supposedly establishes that Negroes are inherently less capable of benefiting from education than white persons.[3]

2. They allege that certain groups of scientists have misled the public and Government officials and that, for political reasons, these groups of scientists have conspired to suppress and minimize evidence which is purported to demonstrate important Negro-white inequalities.[4] This allegation has now affected the educational community itself, for a resolution adopted by the Louisiana State Board of Education on July 25, 1961, states:

"Whereas there is increasing evidence that the sciences of biology and anthropology are being distorted and perverted to serve the purposes of certain pressure groups whose aims are inimical to the customs, mores, and traditions of this Nation."

These allegations confront the scientific community with an unavoidable challenge, for in our view all scientists bear a responsibility toward the proper social application of scientific knowledge and have the duty to resist the corrosive effects of social and political pressures on the integrity of science. It is essential, therefore, that we determine whether these claims are valid, and, whether valid or not what their significance is to the scientific community and to the public.

Of greatest concern to those who assert that there is a scientific basis for maintaining social inequalities between Negro and white persons is the U.S. Supreme Court decision on segregation in the public schools (*Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, May 17, 1954). According to Professor George this decision fails to consider scientific evidence on racial differences, which his paper is intended to present.

The background of this decision is relevant to our considerations. The principle of equal access to the benefits of citizenship by all citizens, regardless of racial origin or religious belief, has continually been affirmed as a fundamental principle of American Government and is embodied in its basic instruments, especially the Constitution and its amendments. Since the end of the Civil War, when the specific applicability of this principle to Negroes was established, there have been a series of judicial examinations of the material circumstances which are to be considered "equal." However, there has been no successful judicial challenge to the basic principle of equal civil rights for all citizens. In 1896, in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the principle of equality could be implemented by "separate but equal" facilities for Negro and white persons. The question at issue in the 1954 Supreme Court decision was whether separate school facilities inherently lead to inequality of treatment; again the basic principle of equality was not at issue.

The only reference to science in the 1954 Supreme Court decision appears in connection with footnote 11 to that decision. This footnote refers to a section of the decision that considers the question, "Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?" The Court answers this question in the affirmative and states, with respect to Negro children, "To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. * * * Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* this finding is amply supported by modern authority."

Footnote 11, which then follows, is a list of references dealing solely with the social and psychological effects of school segregation on Negro children. Thus, the only purpose of the Court's reference to "science," or to "authorities," is to further support the Court's finding that segregation has untoward effects on the hearts and minds of Negro children. There is nowhere in the Supreme Court decision an appeal to science that relates to the nature and the origins of racial differences.

The evidence cited in Professor George's paper, which in his view supports the conclusion that Negroes are inherently less capable than white persons, is quite irrelevant to the issue under consideration. If he wishes to counter the scientific support in the Supreme Court's decision he should come forward with contrary evidence regarding the effects of segregation on Negroes. His paper does not offer such evidence.

In our opinion, the defect exhibited by Professor George's paper seriously compromises the usefulness of science to the judicial process, in which science is a necessary means for establishing the material circumstances germane to the issue. Like society

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

generally, the courts must depend on the integrity of science for assurance that factual matter put before them has the validity which we associate with scientific evidence. Such validity depends on the accuracy and completeness of the data, but also on their actual relevance to the issue. To criticize a judicial decision by means of scientific evidence which is on its face wholly irrelevant to the issue is to conceal a fallacy in the cloak of scientific precision.

There is, in our opinion, no evidence to support the claim, advanced by Professor George and Mr. Putnam, that a group of scientists has conspired to mislead the public about the scientific evidence regarding racial differences. This assertion can only reflect a lack of understanding of the nature of the scientific process.

A scientist can obscure the truth about a scientific question only by keeping silent about what he knows, or believes he knows, or by otherwise obstructing the publication of scientific results. Erroneous statements, so long as they are openly published, do not indefinitely impede the progress of science, for they are ultimately corrected by new observations and interpretations. If scientists adhere to the rule of open publication of results, interpretations, and theoretical derivations, nothing that they do can prevent the operation of the self-corrective processes of science. It is this very process of claim and counterclaim which accomplishes the gradual progress toward truth in science.

The scientists who have opposed the notion that Negroes are inherently inferior have been far from silent. If these scientists have assiduously expressed what they know and what they believe about racial difference, then their duty toward the truth has been performed. If their ideas have spread and attracted the attention and support of other scientists, then it should be clear that they have in fact successfully withstoood scrutiny and criticism.

SIGNIFICANCE OF AVAILABLE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

Setting aside, as unfounded, the claim that scientific evidence which domonstrates important inequalities between Negro and other races has been suppressed, what can be said regarding the state of modern scientific data on the characteristics of racial groups? What is the relevance of the present information to social judgments regarding Negro civil rights?

The scientific study of the characteristics of racial groups[5] involves, at the least, a determination of the relative degree to which such characteristics are influenced by inheritance, by the physical and cultural environment, and by the effects of interactions among racial groups. The total problem is enormously complex, and contains within itself a series of successively broader subproblems: the biological mechanism of inheritance of individual characteristics, such as blood type, which can be measured precisely and objectively: the variability of such characteristics within specific population groups of various sizes in different environments; the problem of measuring more complex characteristics, such as "intelligence," by procedures which distinguish between innate ability and the effect of cultural factors; the influence of particular social factors on the expression of potential innate characters in the individual; the effects of interactions among groups whose members come in contact with each other through education, immigration, social mobility, and intermarriage. These problems differ greatly in their accessibility to precise scientific investigation and in their relevance to the issue of Negro civil rights.

Scientific study of the simpler characteristics observed in individuals of different racial origins—for example, the genetic basis of blood protein characteristics—is readily accomplished by a number of analytical techniques and has made notable progress in recent years. However, while such results can make important contributions to our knowledge of general biological processes they tell us little or nothing about the capability of any particular group to participate successfully in a given culture. On the other hand, characteristics which might be relevant to competence in a particular culture, such as "industry," "drive," and "persistence" (terms sometimes employed to describe alleged differences between races) are themselves so strongly dependent on social factors that they cannot be evaluated in a social framework which sets arbitrary limits, based on an individual's racial origin, on his opportunity for development.

Negroes in American society are still subject to discrimination with respect to economic, educational, and social opportunities. This basic fact has such a profound effect on the expression of Negroes' innate capabilities, and may so distort the meaning of the criteria used to evaluate them, as to effectively obscure the meaning of attempted measurements of such capabilities. In general, the more closely we approach the estimation of those human characteristics which are of greatest significance in social interactions, the less exact are the observations and the more they are encumbered by the distorting effects of the culture on the observer himself. In these circumstances, an objective scientific evaluation of interracial differences in our society, which imposes significant limitations on social behavior on the basis of race, is almost impossible to achieve.

These difficulties preclude the effective use of measurements of competence as a valid basis for questioning the ethical judgment, so firmly incorporated into our principles of government, that all citizens are to be regarded as equally entitled to the benefits of citizenship. We know of no scientific evidence which can challenge this axiomatic political principle. The assertion that such evidence exists ignores the rule of relevance and the limitations inherent in our knowledge of the complex interactions among social groups. In addition, by fostering the illusion that the social decisions about interracial relations can be determined by "objective scientific fact," it shields the individual's conscience from a confrontation of the grave moral issues which at present confound the relations among racial groups.

SCIENTIST'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The issues raised by alleged scientific evidence to justify social segregation of racial groups confronts the individual scientist and his professional associations with serious responsibilities.

All science is concerned with the extension of what we know about nature. Man, as a part of nature and as a unique form of life, is, of course, an important area of study. There are, we believe, no valid barriers—beyond those dictated by humaneness—to preclude scientific study of the biology of man, including the nature of racial characteristics and their inheritance. Such research will surely add—to a degree dependent on the significance of the observations—to what we know about nature.

Such investigations are difficult of analysis, the results often attenuated by inadequate definition and by relatively large errors of measurement, and the interpretations open to disagreement. Despite these difficulties, science contains well-proven methods for approaching the truth, for winnowing the data, reducing the errors, and re-examining interpretive ideas. But these will succeed only if scientists follow the cardinal rule of scientific discourse: to offer their results and interpretations for open publication in places which are subject to the scrutiny of their scientific peers.

When scientific questions become closely related to public policy there may be a tendency to forego publication in the open scientific literature. Instead, basic scientific considerations may then appear only in special reports prepared at the request of an agency of government. This practice is regrettable, in our opinion, for by precluding the self-corrective effects of open publication it deprives not only the public but also those who have commissioned the report of the full benefits of scientific knowledge.

An example of the effective operation of this self-correcting process within the scientific community may be found in a series of events associated with a UNESCO report on the race problem. This report was prepared by a group of anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists convened by UNESCO, in December 1949 and published by UNESCO on July 18, 1950. After the report appeared, the British Anthropological Journal, Man, published a critique which held that the document tended to confuse race as a biological fact and the concept of race as a social phenomenon. In our view, the report is also open to criticism because it attempted to provide a scientific justification for the ethical judgment that all human beings are equally entitled to the benefits of society. In response to criticism, UNESCO convened a second conference that included many physical anthropologists and biologists, which prepared the revised statement of 1951, "Statement on the Nature of Race and Race Differences." This is an excellent example of orderly scientific procedure, which is essential in all aspects of science, and particularly important when the scientific evidence deals with a matter of immediate public concern.

In contrast, Professor George has chosen to report his highly contentious views on racial differences in a form which is not readily amenable to the corrective effects of scientific criticism—a report commissioned by the Governor of Alabama.[6] Surely in an area which is subject to such serious disagreement, no scientist can properly put forward his own personal conclusions as representative of the state of knowledge without first subjecting them to the open scrutiny of his scientific peers.

For reasons already stated we believe that available scientific data about human heredity and racial differences are not applicable to the ethical judgments that determine the civil rights of racial groups. Those who present their own views on this judgment as though they were scientific evaluations are simply creating a controversy unlikely to be resolved by scientific means. Such a disagreement will remain as a perplexing exception to scientists' devotion to objective truth, and thereby erode the usefulness of science for the orderly solution of social problems.

The resolution of this controversy does not require an authoritative restatement of the scientific evidence regarding racial differences. More important is improved education which might help the public understand when scientific evidence is relevant to problems of racial adjustment and when such evidence only serves to cloak a moral issue. We believe that the public should be informed that any effort to use purported "scientific evidence" regarding biological distinctions between racial groups to screen an attack on the principle of equal civil rights for all citizens finds no support in either the available evidence or in the principles of science.

There is, however, another type of scientific evidence which stands in quite a different relation to this problem. There is a considerable body of evidence on the way in which racial groups affect each other; how race differences become embodied in the cultural framework of human relationships, and how these interactions affect individual members

Footnotes at end of speech.

of majority and minority groups: Myrdal's "The American Dilemma," which is referred to in footnote 11 of the 1954 Supreme Court decision, is an outstanding example of such research. At this time, when the contradictions between the Negroes' legal right to equality and the actual state of American society have become so acute, it is important that all citizens understand how inequalities in the civil rights of different groups may affect the lives of individuals in all groups. Scientists can do a great deal to help the public understand this problem and thereby contribute to a more harmonious resolution of our present difficulties.

CONCLUSIONS

We conclude that the available evidence on the measurable differences among racial groups cannot properly support a challenge to the principle of human equality, which is assured by the Constitution of the United States. The use of purported "scientific evidence" to justify noncompliance with the Constitution debases both science and the human conscience. A continuing effort must be made to improve public understanding of what is known about the results of disharmony among racial groups and to illuminate the causes and the effects of this conflict, which continues to threaten the welfare of all mankind.

---

[1] Wesley Critz George: A.B., Univ. of North Carolina, 1911; A.M., Univ. of North Carolina, 1912; Ph. D., Univ. of North Carolina (zoology) 1918; Prof. Biol., Guilford College 1916–17; Maule Fellow, Princeton, 1918; Adj. Prof. Zool., Univ. of Georgia, 1919; Assoc. Prof. Histology and Embryology, Univ. of Tennessee, 1919–20; Assoc. Prof. Anatomy, School of Med., Univ. of North Carolina, 1920–24; Prof. and Head of Anatomy Dept., 1940–49, Prof. emeritus, 1949—. Carleton Putnam: B.S., Princeton, 1924; L.L.B., Columbia, 1932; author of "High Journey, a Decade in the Pilgrimage of an Air Line Pioneer" (1944); "Theodore Roosevelt" (a biography) (1958); "Race and Reason" (1961).

[2] Professor George states: "Experience has shown that Negroid peoples have the desire to utilize the products of a high culture but they seem not to possess the combination of human qualities necessary to originate them. Nowhere in the world have they demonstrated that they have the creative capacities (the intelligence, the industry, the drive and the persistence) to make a civilization; nor is there an advanced civilization in any area where there has been a high degree of absorption of Negro genes into a white population." [In "The Biology of the Race Problem," prepared by Commission of the Governor of Alabama, 1962 (pp. 73–74).]

[3] Professor George states: "When the Justices of the Supreme Court abandoned former legal precedents and the historic meaning of the Constitution, and based their decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* upon 'science' and the opinions of 'authorities' they inevitably made the validity of their ruling dependent upon the truth and validity of their scientific material. This should have been subjected to critical examination and was not * * * As a contribution to presenting such evidence and for the purpose of weighing the merit of dogmas built up and imposed upon the public as the basis for revolutionary social and political programs, it is the object of this study to ask certain questions of a fundamental biological nature and to see what answers are given by the facts as discovered and reported by the most credible scientists. Some of these questions are:

"(1) Are babies born equal in the biological sense, or are there significant differences between them before environment plays a part in molding them?

"(2) What is the mechanism of biological inheritance?

"(3) Is the difference between the white and Negro races primarily a 'paint job' or are there differences of such fundamental nature and significance that they should be taken into consideration in deciding upon social and educational policies involving the relations of the races?

"(4) Are significant differences in individuals and in races hereditary or are they produced anew in each generation by environmental influences?

"(5) What should we expect to be the long-range results of a program that would lead to racial amalgamation?" [Ibid., pp. 1–2.]

[4] Mr. Putnam states: "I do not believe that ever before has science been warped by a self-serving few to the deception and injury of so many." [C. Putnam, "Race and Reason" (Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1961) p. 22]

[5] The definition of "race" provided by S. M. Garn in "Human Races" (Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1961) is appropriate here: "A race in man, as in any living form, is a population, a population of men, women, and children; of fathers, mothers, and grandparents. * * * Members of such a breeding population share a common history, and a common locale. They have been exposed to common dangers, and they are the product of a common environment. For these reasons, and especially with advancing time, members of a race have a common heritage."

[6] "Race and Science" (Columbia University Press, New York, 1961).

Computer Navy Questioned: Fighting Qualities Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union which appeared Tuesday, May 5:

COMPUTER NAVY QUESTIONED: FIGHTING QUALITIES ESSENTIAL

The military is finding itself in a crossfire. Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover is shooting at the Navy's educational system as not adequate for training men for a technological Navy for scientific warfare.

Social uplifters are charging that all three services, the Navy included, have set too high standards for enlisted men and are suggesting that the draft age be lowered and recruitment be used to relieve unemployment among school dropouts.

Admiral Rickover has been particularly critical of the educational program at the U.S. Naval Academy and the emphasis placed on activities other than academic.

He has been answered by Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., commander of Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet, who formerly taught physics at the Naval Academy. He agrees with Admiral Rickover that a naval officer must be well grounded in the sciences and liberal arts, but for the rest, he says the admiral who headed the Navy's nuclear submarine program is dead wrong.

The primary mission of the Academy is leadership, and, as Admiral McCain says, "In leadership there's no such thing as a master's degree. We've got to develop that type of officer who has the tools to develop his own leadership qualities."

Without proper leadership, no matter how many experts in the sciences are aboard ship, he says, the armed forces cannot perform their mission—"creating the best organization to go to war and die if it has to."

The practice of hazing, so engrained in the Academy routine, was defended as a vital part of the training of a military man.

"There must be injected into a military man's character an immediate and unquestioning response to an order," Admiral McCain says.

In his experience in many commands, he says that contrary to Admiral Rickover's statements he has found no difference in the performance of Naval ROTC and Naval Academy graduates, since leadership is an individual business.

"If a young officer has missed this essential ingredient in his educational development, it will not be made up by a 20th century computer," says Admiral McCain.

The Naval Academy, as well as the graduate instruction available to officers at many stages of their careers, has continually upgraded its courses to meet the demands of advancing technology.

This has meant, too, an upgrading of the men who must operate this equipment, and the suggestion that qualifications of enlisted men should be downgraded flies against all judgment.

The military services cannot be made a welfare program. Many years ago the idle and the lawbreakers often were given the option of joining the Navy or going to jail. The modern Navy has become a career Navy and a married Navy.

But if a Navy will demand more of its officers tomorrow, it certainly also will demand more of its enlisted men.

USDA Now in Position To "Manage" Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, one of the more widely circulated publications throughout the Midwest is Wallaces Farmer, the current issue of which carries a feature called Washington Report.

The report of the week of May 2 discusses a phase of the farm production scheme related to the Department of Agriculture and makes the conclusion that although we are not aware of it, we have a supply-management concept on the farm now.

With this thought in mind and with unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I introduce the following editorial taken from Wallaces Farmer:

USDA NOW IN POSITION TO "MANAGE" FARMING

Whatever happened to supply management, the onetime hope of the New Frontier? For more than a year, since before the 1963 wheat referendum, Federal speechwriters have avoided the two-word term as though it were some unspeakable four-letter word.

But while the phrase was carefully avoided, the fact has been largely accomplished. The fact is that with recent passage of wheat and cotton bills, the USDA now has most of the powers it set out to win little more than 3 years ago.

It may come as a surprise to some of you that supply management is here now.

What's more, it could be argued that as it presently exists it is in some ways even more absolute than that proposed by Secretary Freeman early in 1961. As suggested then the major decisionmaking powers would have been vested in elected farmer committees. Within certain limitations imposed by Congress, the decisions are now made not by farmers but by USDA.

For anyone who might doubt the presence of supply management, consider some of the specifics:

In the case of each of the major farm crops—feed grains, wheat, and cotton—USDA has ample authority to "manage" the supply, the effective demand, the prices, and the level of producers' income. More important, the authority permits manipulation of these ingredients independently of one another.

Say, as an illustration, that it is deemed desirable to boost farm income without disturbing demand, supply, or prices. Solution: Raise the level of direct payments.

Or suppose that the aim is to reduce production without causing an increase in price. Solution: Higher diversion requirements, with participation encouraged by a stepup in price-depressing CCC sales.

The variety of possible combinations is almost endless. The upshot is that, despite some setbacks, a remarkable degree of Federal supply management has been accomplished. The measure is the extent to which Washington is now able to substitute its own judgment for that of the marketplace.

There are, of course, two views on the existing state of affairs. It is loudly contended by one viewpoint that the place for market decisions to be made is in the market. This is the "let the chips fall where they may" approach.

But in fairness and in fact, it needs to be rebutted that where the chips most often fall is Washington. When supply or demand or surpluses are too large or too small, or when prices or incomes are too high or too low, the buck is inevitably passed to Washington. As former President Truman once remarked of the White House, "This is where the buck stops."

So long as Washington is to be held politically accountable for the welfare of farmers, efforts to strip it of its authority are largely an exercise in double talk.

Those who argue "the less Washington the better" will, however, soon have their day—and perhaps their way. Feed grain, wheat, and cotton laws all expire after the 1965 corps. What happens next will be up to Congress.

Meanwhile, supply management is here.

The administration's passage of the controversial wheat-cotton bill undoubtedly comes close to setting a new all-time high—or low, depending on viewpoint—in the exercise of Presidential power. It's been a long time since so many Congressmen voted for a bill that they'd have felt much more comfortable being against.

The Johnson-Freeman success was even greater than the narrow 211 to 203—margin of victor would indicate. What it fails to show is the number of votes, understood to be as many as half a dozen, which Johnson had in "reserve."

"Reserve" votes are a standard procedure that few Congressmen are willing to admit to. In this case it meant that some six city lawmakers who, for back-home political reasons, preferred to vote against the farm subsidy bill, had pledged to give Johnson their votes if he needed them to pass the measure.

Had Johnson "called" all of the votes which were committed on this basis, the farm bill would have been passed by a margin of 20 votes.

Address of Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina, Before the Institute for Rapid Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in inserting a speech recently delivered by my colleague, BASIL WHITENER, of North Carolina, on the proposed rapid transit in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. WHITENER is well versed on this subject, and I hope each Member of the House interested in transportation in the Nation's Capital will take time to read Mr. WHITENER's address.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF BASIL L. WHITENER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE INSTITUTE FOR RAPID TRANSIT, THIRD ANNUAL MEETING, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1964, 9:30 A.M.

Mr. McCarter, members of the Institute for Rapid Transit, and distinguished guests, I want to thank the members of the institute for inviting me here today to talk with you about rapid transit in the Nation's Capital. It is a subject in which I am much interested, and I know that you are, too. And I think it is a matter of importance to our Nation for our people care about the future of their National Capital and rapid transit is an essential element of that future.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I do not pretend to be an expert on transportation. In my experience, Congressmen who try to be as expert as the experts invariably get into hot water. The only worse thing a Congressman can do is to assume that the experts are always right.

So that I see the problem not from the mountaintop—that high position is reserved for the experts—but from the down-to-earth vantage point of a person who is a citizen and who, as a Member of Congress, has helped lead the effort to build a rapid transit system for the Nation's Capital.

First and foremost I am a citizen—like the rest of you—who takes pride in his country's Capital. Over 15 million of our citizens visit the Capital every year. They see the city as an important part of their national heritage. They want it to be a city of beauty and dignity representative of our great national aspirations. Few who come leave disappointed, but many leave with the feeling that there is much to be done that is not being done. Some of my own constituents have remarked to me about the things that detract from the appearance of the city, including traffic congestion, and several of them have remarked that they find it hard to understand why the city doesn't have a subway.

I must say that I, too, find it strange that the capital city of every major European country has a subway system while ours does not. And I wonder how we can talk about being far ahead of the Russians in all fields of endeavor when Moscow has one of the finest subway systems in the world while we are still talking about building one for Washington.

The second vantage point from which I view rapid transit in the Nation's Capital is that of a Member of Congress who is chairman of Subcommittee No. 6 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the subcommittee to which the proposed National Capital rapid transit legislation has been referred.

I should point out that I did not begin as an advocate of rapid transit or of any particular form of transportation in Washington. Before I had seen the proposals of the National Capital Transportation Agency, I was aware of the work the agency was doing, but I had no preconceived notions as to what the right answers were. Like most of my colleagues, I am a part-time resident of the District of Columbia, and I knew firsthand that the city's streets and highways were very congested and that this congestion was mounting. It was apparent to me that new highways would be needed. But past experience indicated that highways alone would not do the job and that, in addition to the highway program, some new form of transportation would have to be provided. And commonsense suggested that inasmuch as the streets and highways were going to be overcrowded some way would have to be found to move people in large numbers on an exclusive right-of-way free from traffic and underground in the central area.

That, in a very general way, was how I saw the problem before I really got into it. And so, when the late President Kennedy transmitted to the Congress the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, together with a bill that would authorize the construction of an $800 million rapid transit system for the Nation's Capital, my mind was still not made up as to what should be done.

Our committee then held extensive hearings on the proposed legislation. We heard from every interested Federal agency, from the local jurisdictions of the region, and from many, many citizens' groups. Those hearings served to clarify the issues in my own mind, and it was then that I became convinced of the need for a rapid transit system in Washington.

First, I had never seen as much public support for a program affecting the Nation's Capital as the support that was demonstrated for the proposed rapid transit system.

Second, the only groups to testify in opposition to the program were the local bus companies. I never have entirely understood the reasons for that opposition. I have an interest in three local bus companies back home in North Carolina, and I know a little bit about bus operations. I am aware of the fact that bus operations in a congested downtown area are very slow and are, therefore, very costly. It seems to me that rapid transit would have the virtue of relieving the bus companies of their obligations to provide some of these high-cost services and would not be injurious to the bus companies.

The third impression I had of the hearings was that the evidence and the facts that were submitted to the committee showed that the proposed $800 million rapid transit system recommended by the President was a very good system and that the time had come—if it wasn't already overdue—to begin building a rapid transit system in Washington.

I do not want to burden you with a long recitation of these facts, but a few are of interest. While the city's streets and highways are already jammed, there will be an estimated 48-percent increase in morning rush hour trips to and through downtown Washington between now and 1980. If all of these trips are made by auto—and it looks as if that will be the case if we do not improve public transportation—there will be three additional autos on our downtown streets and highways for every four autos congesting these facilities today.

These figures alone are enough to demonstrate to my satisfaction the need for a rail rapid transit system. The figures show that without such a system the city may be paralyzed and the Washington portion of the interstate highway system will not be able to do the job it was designed to do.

In short, the hearings convinced me that rapid transit in Washington was one of those rare public programs that is beneficial to all—to the people throughout the Nation who want the Capital to be a fine city, to the people who live here, and to the truckers and motorists who suffer from wasteful traffic congestion.

While the hearings served to convince me of the need for rapid transit, and of its importance to the appearance and to the orderly growth of the National Capital, I also felt that the financing formula that had been proposed by the administration for the system was an attractive one. Those of you who are acquainted with my record know that I am opposed to excessive Federal spending and to giveaway programs. I, therefore, was convinced that it was desirable that the riders of the rapid transit system should pay as heavy a portion as possible of the cost of the system. Correspondingly, I felt it was important that the financial burden on the Federal Government and on the government of the District of Columbia be made as small as it could be made.

I know that there may be some in the audience who come from cities favoring low fares. And I certainly have no desire to get into a philosophical discussion about the desirability of such policies. But I do feel that, in view of the existing burdens on the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia, in Washington at least we should try as hard as we can to see to it that the rider, and not the taxpayer, pays for the ride.

Under the proposed financing plan, $120 million of the $800 million required to construct and equip the rapid transit system would have been provided by the Federal Government in grants. This was all the Federal Government would have had to pay. And an $800 million rapid transit system for $120 million struck me as being a good bargain from the standpoint of the Federal Government.

At the same time, some of the members of my subcommittee and I were concerned over the question of how extensive a program Congress should authorize. We discussed this matter with administration officials. Ultimately, we concluded that it would be desirable to cut the system down, to the extent possible, to the physical borders of the District of Columbia, the area over which Congress has complete jurisdiction. The result was a $400 million version of the $800 million system.

That system seemed then, and still seems to me, to be an excellent one. I should point out, however, that at least one of the subcommittee members—FRANK HORTON of Rochester, N.Y.—felt that the $800 million system was so good that we should stick to it. He later said so with considerable force during the floor debate while at the same time stating that he was supporting the smaller system in the hope that some day the larger one would be built.

The full committee agreed, however, to endorse the $400 million rapid transit system and favorably reported the bill which I had introduced to authorize the construction of such a system. Thereafter, as all of you know, the House, by a disappointing vote, sent the bill back to our committee.

I see no point in speculating at length as to the causes of that vote. The important question is what does it mean for the future.

I do not believe it was a vote against rapid transit. Neither then nor since have I encountered more than a very few Members who doubt the need for rapid transit in Washington. To the contrary, I believe there is general agreement on the need for such a system. Many of those who voted to send the bill back to committee have since assured me that they believe such a system is needed and that Congress must assist in its creation. By and large their problem with the bill as reported appears to have been with the financing formula which, many felt, placed too heavy a burden on the Federal Government and too little on the District of Columbia. That is certainly a problem that can be solved, and I am hopeful that a revised formula, one that my colleagues will consider more equitable, can be developed at a very early date.

Far from being deterred, I am convinced that rapid transit in the National Capital must become a reality and that Congress should do its share in making this possible. I have not changed my belief that the $400 million system would provide a solid and economically feasible rail rapid transit system in the Nation's Capital. Authorization of such a system would not commit the Congress to do anything more in the future. On the other hand, the system could be expanded at a later date, if this proves desirable.

The estimates are that the system will carry upward of 50,000 people in the morning peak hour into and through the downtown area. And if we do no more than carry into the city on rapid transit 50,000 people who are today clogging the streets, we will have accomplished a good deal to ease congestion in the Nation's Capital. We will have done much to preserve and enhance the appearance of the city. We will have done much to make life more pleasant for those who live in the city and for the many millions who come to the city every year.

I am confident that these things will ultimately be done. It is true that the democratic process is often slow, and we all know how irritating at times that slowness can be. But the great thing about our democracy is that by providing a means whereby the people govern themselves it ensures that public needs are met.

A great National Capital is one of this country's needs. We cannot meet that need unless we solve the city's transportation problems, and a rapid transit system seems to me to be an essential part of that solution. And since I believe that we will do what must be done—as this country always has in the past—I have no doubt that in the near future there will be a rapid transit system in Washington.

The Federal Reserve to the Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the financial press of May 8 carried the news that the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee had just injected over $1 billion into the commercial banking system by purchasing that amount in Government securities.

This purchase was intended to relieve a temporary decline in commercial bank reserves due to larger public demands for cash.

The Fed is mighty quick to jump to the assistance of banks by making some such technical adjustment as this. And I think they should. But what is discouraging is that the Fed does not respond so eagerly nor with such agility in attending to the needs of the economy as a whole. Testimony given before the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Domestic Finance indicates that the Fed has frequently failed to maintain an adequate money supply. As a result, the economy has been allowed to founder on the rocks of recession with underemployment of plant and equipment and underemployment of people.

The article which appeared in the Journal of Commerce follows:

U.S. SECURITY BUYING HIKED BY FED BANKS

The Federal Reserve banks this week purchased $1,089 million of Government securities, an unusually large weekly acquisition, which pushed the System's total holdings of Government issues to a new all-time record of $34,228 million.

The principal reason for the large operation in Government securities was to provide banks with additional reserves in the face of a rise of $186 million in currency in circulation plus a decrease of $450 million in currency and coin held in bank vaults. Required reserves of banks went up $223 million. United States Treasury deposits were $167 million lower.

RISE IN RESERVES

The massive Government security purchases brought about a sharp rise in bank free reserves as of Wednesday night to $461 million, compared with only $78 million a week earlier. Daily average reserves, however declined to $127 million from $131 million a week earlier. Free reserves are what banks have for new loans and investments.

On the international front foreign banks and governments again made a purely nominal addition of $7 million to their holdings of U.S. dollars. U.S. gold stocks were unchanged for the 12th consecutive week at $15,463 million.

Business loans at New York banks improved by $33 million this week in contrast with a decline of $90 million for the similar period of 1963. At Chicago, bank business loans were up $4 million compared with a rise of $15 million in the like period of last year.

There was a big shift of private deposits into Government deposits at all commercial banks as a result of the collection of April 15 tax checks.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportune time to take note of the fact that May 17 is Norwegian Independence Day. In 1814 Norway joined the many other revolutionary nations of that time and declared its independence from a union with Denmark. The Norwegian people had made their feelings known, and they prepared the way for the democratic Norway which is today America's close friend and ally in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

May 17, 1814, was one of the highest moments in Norwegian history. It brought together many of Norway's greatest historical figures. They en-

couraged a new national consciousness. And in the Constitution they wrote, the democratic practices and aspirations of Norwegians were put into words.

Since 1814 the history of United States-Norwegian relations has been one of closest, most cordial cooperation. Not long ago large numbers of Norwegians came to America to live. Here they have proved themselves welcome and capable citizens. It was easy for them to feel at home, for they were after all from a free country.

When Norway fell before the dreadful Nazi onslaught in 1940 many Americans were extremely saddened until Norway again joined the family of free nations.

Through many years of uncertainty and tribulation the memory of May 17, 1814, has steadily inspired Norway. Norwegians know that the peace and rapid progress of recent years can be traced directly to their declaration of independence and the Constitution of 1814. We as Americans join our friends in Norway in pay homage to the courageous national leaders of 1814. We hope for many more years of Norwegian progress under independence.

The Nonsense of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what nonsense the bureaucrats make. A striking example of how foolish bureaucratic decisions can be is contained in the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 19, 1964, "Bad Guesswork":

BAD GUESSWORK

The House of Representatives has voted a deficiency appropriation of $60 million to bail the Veterans' Administration out of troubles resulting from guaranteeing too many sour housing loans.

The VA maintains a revolving fund through which it guarantees home and business loans made by private lenders on easy terms to veterans of World War II and the Korean war. When a borrower defaults on such a loan, and when neither he nor the lender can sell the property for enough to cover the mortgage, the VA is called upon to take it over, pay off the lender, and try to get what it can for the property. It has thus, in effect, a guaranteed loss which, with VA loans, is now running about $1,773 on each house.

When the 1964 budget was drawn up more than a year ago, the VA expected to have to buy 20,535 properties and to spend $300 million in the process. It now appears, according to Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., that the VA will have to buy 24,600 properties and will have to pay out $360 million—a miscalculation of 20 percent. Meanwhile, its sales of houses thus acquired are showing no signs of improvement.

Foreclosures have been rising throughout the housing industry for several years; the VA's budget estimate was thus not only off 20 percent, but was foolishly optimistic as well. Foreclosures are increasing because the value of houses is not rising as fast as it was, and in many instances is falling. Therefore, owners and mortgage holders are often unable to sell houses for enough to cover the mortgage. That's why the Government is asked to step in more often, and that's why its average loss per house is rising. Both trends should have been foreseen.

Statistics show, in addition, that the rate of defaults on VA loans is twice what it is on conventional loans, and that the record on FHA loans is worse still. Under the circumstance, a sensible government would try to tighten up on its loans and thus save embarrassment for the veterans as well as itself.

But is this being done? Not at all. Only recently, as part of Mr. Johnson's program to stimulate housing, the Senate was persuaded to make VA loans even easier than they are. It voted to extend the maximum repayment term to 35 years.

Here it is 11 years since the last veteran became eligible for these loans and the Government is still losing money on them and taking steps to assure that it will lose even more. A private bank in such a fix would promptly be closed. But, as an FHA spokesman said not long ago, the Government is in business to lose money.

Remarks of Perry I. Prentice Before the Western Forest Industries Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as you know, a controversy has been raging for some months now over the new proposed lumber size standard. As is the case in any controversy, there are two sides to this question, represented by those who favor the proposed standard and those who oppose it.

Additionally, however, there is another area of disagreement in this matter, which is procedural rather than substantive. Many proponents of the new standard feel that it should be officially accepted without further delay or discussion. On the other hand, many—including some who, like myself, have no technical knowledge upon which to base a firm opinion for or against the proposed standard—feel strongly that it is imperative that all of the facts on both sides be brought out before a decision is made by the Secretary of Commerce.

To this end, my Subcommittee on Distribution of the House Small Business Committee plans to hold hearings on the matter in the near future to afford both sides an open forum to present their arguments.

On April 25 I was in San Francisco to address the annual convention of the Western Forest Industries Association, one of the principal organizations opposing the proposed change. At that time, I was privileged to hear an eloquent exposition of the case for change, delivered by Mr. Perry I. Prentice, vice president of Time, Inc., and the former editor of House & Home magazine. While I do not agree with the procedural point of view expressed by Mr. Prentice, who sees no need for further discussion or exposition of the facts, I nonetheless wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this forceful presentation of the case for immediate adoption of the new size standard.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Prentice's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

P. I. PRENTICE, VICE PRESIDENT, TIME, INC., SPEECH BEFORE THE WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 25, 1964

First I want to thank Joe McCracken for giving me a safe conduct pass to get out of San Francisco alive after I finish my talk to you here this morning.

I came here under a flag of truce, I came to talk peace, I came to smoke the peace pipe with you. And I came to assure you that I am still your friend even though you and I don't always quite seem to agree on technical questions.

Some of you may think I came here to argue with you about dry lumber sizes, but let me assure you right away quick that nothing could possibly be further from my purpose. I may not have sense enough to keep out of this lion's den, but I certainly know it never does any good to argue with anybody about anything, and least of all would it make sense for me to start a scientific argument with the lions into whose den I've dropped.

I didn't fly 2,571 miles to waste my time and your time arguing with you about lumber sizes. Believe it or not, I came here for just one purpose—to see if I can't tell you a few things you don't seem to realize, in the hope that by helping you open your eyes to these things I can help all of you make a lot more money than you could otherwise make or lose a lot less money than you would otherwise lose.

I'm sure a psychoanalyst could have a fine time trying to make sense out of why I agree to fly 2,571 miles to San Francisco last night and another 2,571 miles back home this afternoon just to talke to you for 20 minutes this morning, for it couldn't make less difference to me personally whether the dry lumber standards stays 1⅝ inches or changes to 1½ inches.

I guess I'm here out of pure cussedness, because it seemed to me high time some completely disinterested party stood up and told you some of the facts of competitive life in today's homebuilding market, and that somebody might as well be me. Specifically, it's high time some completely disinterested party stood up and told you how the vast majority in the industry that buys your product feels about this wet versus dry foofaraw and why your future sales to the industry that buys your product will be a lot bigger if more accurate grading and standards make it possible to use our product more economically. And perhaps some one should remind you that wood no longer has a near-monopoly of the housing market; at least five other industries are out to take a bigger and bigger share of this market away from lumber.

Year after year these other industries have been horning in on a bigger cut of the market that used to be all yours, and year after year you are going to lose more of the market unless and until the whole lumber industry—green producers and dry producers alike—adjusts your standards and adjusts your grading so the homebuilding industry can take full engineering advantage of all the qualities and all the economies wood can offer. And this falloff in the sale of forest products for homebuilding would have been bigger still were it not for the fine promotion some of the other producers have been spending so much money to buy.

Now first let me assure you I know you've had a lot of problems and a lot of troubles, and let me assure you that you have my deep sympathy about these troubles and problems.

I know, for example, that in Douglas County alone all but about 50 of the 1,200 small lumber mills that were operating at a profit just 6 years ago have since been squeezed out of business, and that must have been some squeeze. I know you've lost most of the eastern market for green lumber because your friends and political allies in the shipping business charge you so much more for shipping your output east in American bottoms that the only way you can compete with Canadian imports is to cut your price at the mill enough to cover the higher shipping cost. I know that the Government's high interest rate policy is forcing a lot of big timber owners who used to be big customers of yours to cut more of their own timber to pay down their loans instead of buying lumber from you. I know that you are being squeezed hard for cut prices by your friends and allies, the California builders, who are now the biggest market for green lumber even though I think they use less wood products per house than the builders anywhere else except Florida—California builders whose only reason for lining up on your side of the green versus dry argument is that they think you green producers are easier to squeeze. I know that in your big California market you are also being squeezed and squeezed hard by lumber dealers so tough that they don't want to pay you for boards because they think they can save a few cents resawing boards out of framing lumber—lumber dealers so tough they like to buy lumber ungraded and then pocket a small extra profit from resorting the lumber and getting it upgraded locally. Not just in California but in every market I know it is tough to have to sell what you make on the straight price basis that what you are selling is cheaper than what the customer can get from somebody else.

And finally, I know that like all the other lumber producers—green or dry, big or small—you are being squeezed by the competition of new and better engineered materials that have been taking a bigger and bigger share of the housing dollar that used to be all yours.

All this is tough, and you have all my sympathy in your troubles. You also have my respect and admiration for the way you have borne up under the adversities that have put so many other green lumber producers out of business. In the face of such a squeeze, and more specifically in the face of such a squeeze from the people you seem to consider your best friends and allies in the green vs dry fight, I think it is nothing less than wonderful that so many of you are still going strong, and I'm delighted to hear that some of you are still able to buy Cadillacs.

Next, having assured you of my sympathy with your troubles, let me congratulate you on the terrific fight you have put up. Not since Leonidas and his 300 Spartans held the pass at Thermopylae against 100,000 foes has so small a minority held the line against such overwhelming numbers. The fight you put up has been magnificent—even though I'm tempted to add what the French general said when he watched the suicidal charge of the Light Brigade—"It's magnificent, but it's no way to win a war."

More particularly, I congratulate you on the great selling job you had to do to make so many politicians believe you green producers are such bad businessmen that you will all go broke unless you can keep dry lumber handicapped by a standard that calls for putting 8 percent more lumber into a dry piece than you put into a green piece and then requires lumber dressed dry to be 10 percent stiffer and 12 percent stronger than the green you sell in the same dimensions—10 percent stiffer and 12 percent stronger than it makes any sense for it to be.

Gentlemen, I think you're a lot smarter and a lot more capable than you seem willing to admit. I'm mighty impressed by your demonstrated ability to survive a lot of troubles, and it's just plain preposterous to say and still more preposterous to believe that you'll all go busted if you lose the umbrella of a technically indefensible lumber standard that has been making homebuilders and home buyers pay $100 million a year too much to get the advantages of dry lumber.

And now, most particularly, I want to congratulate you on your success in actually making Congressman ROOSEVELT believe you haven't been given a chance to register your objections when the truth is that the American Lumber Standards Committee delayed its decision nearly a year to give full consideration to your arguments, that every trade association in the lumber industry has been deluged by your protests, that at your insistence even the technical decisions of the Government's own Forest Products Laboratory have been submitted to a recheck by a university of your choice in your own local area and, in brief, you have come so near deafening all of us with your outcries that most of us have had to buy earplugs so we could hear ourselves think.

Just because almost nobody who understands the problem agrees with you doesn't mean that nobody has heard you, and you must have done a great selling job on Congressman ROOSEVELT to make him believe, while you were deafening everybody else with your protests, that in fact you hadn't been given a chance to open your mouths.

For this piece of supersalesmanship I do indeed congratulate you.

So now you have the assurance of both my sympathy and my congratulations.

But, you can't eat sympathy and can't cash congratulations, so now I bring you a third peace offering—a peace offering that should be worth millions of dollars to you.

I bring you news that you can't afford not to act on fast.

I bring you news that the war over, whether the standard for dry lumber stays 1⅝ inches or is changed to 1½ inches—that war is all over and there is no use doing any more fighting. While you've been doing a great job on the political front intimidating FHA and intimidating the Department of Commerce and stirring up Congressman ROOSEVELT and his Small Business Committee, the dry forces have just bypassed you the way MacArthur bypassed the 100,000 Japs who were all set to stop him at Wewack. As some of you may recall, MacArthur just sailed past the Japs who were waiting for him at Wewack and landed way behind them at Hollandia, and after that time the 100,000 Jap soldiers bypassed at Wewack nearly starved to death. In somewhat the same way, while you've been putting up such a big fight in FHA and the Commerce Department, the dry lumber manufacturers have just bypassed you by switching to 1½ inches dry as a nonstandard size.

Whether you win or not in your fight to keep 1⅝ inches the standard, the plain fact is that by next year hardly anybody will be making 1⅝ inches dry, nobody next year will be buying 1⅝ inches dry when everybody will be able to buy 1½ inches dry cheaper.

So that's that; 1⅝ inches dry is a thing of the past, whether or not the standard stays 1⅝ inches dry or not. All the codes will accept 1½ inches dry for the same spans as 1⅝ inches green, because the Forest Products Laboratory has supplied the technical data needed to justify that acceptance. Many FHA local offices are already passing 1½ inches dry even if the FHA Commissioner in Washington is not; and the plain truth is that there is no legal way FHA can stop the use of 1½ inches dry lumber in FHA houses, because right now the present lumber standard recognizes the use of nonstandard sizes when plainly so marked. And the U.S. Savings & Loan League, whose members finance three times as many new homes as FHA—in fact, they finance more than half the houses in which green lumber has up to now been used—has not only accepted 1½ inches dry; it has advised all its members in writing to recommend the use of 1½ inches dry to all the builders whose houses they finance.

So, as I've now said twice before, that's that; 1⅝ inches dry is dead, and there's no use fighting any more about it. The beginning of wisdom is to know when to stop fighting, so you might as well call off Senator MORSE and Congresswoman GREEN and Congressman ROOSEVELT this morning and start planning how you can best adjust your business to the reality of 1½ inches dry and stop worrying about the ghost of 1⅝ inches dry.

But first, I think it might be wise for you to give some thought to what your heroic fight to block the new standard has cost you.

If I were in a joking mood, I think I might be tempted to say it reminds me of Roy Riegel's great Rose Bowl run in the wrong direction that won the game for the other side, for I'm afraid you too have been running too well in the wrong direction and that green lumber is further behind than it was before you started your run.

Until this foofaraw started hardly anybody except the lumber manufacturers themselves knew the difference between green lumber and dry, and so few people cared that in 1953 even the American Lumber Standards Committee decided not to care either and voted to let green and dry lumber be accepted as equally good, even though the scientific fact is that lumber dressed dry will end up something like 10 percent stiffer and 12 percent stronger than lumber dressed before it has shrunk. This gave green lumber an enormous competitive advantage in many markets because, as long as so few people know the difference, why should anybody pay more to buy his lumber predried and preshrunk?

Eventually and I think inevitably, the American Lumber Standards Committee began having trouble with its conscience about this and decided that dry and green sizes should be "equated," whatever that may mean, at a determined moisture content. This all sounded so highbrow that, looking back, I think you might have been smart to keep quiet and let the equating go through without attracting any more attention than was absolutely necessary. Even after the equating green lumber would still have been cheaper, and if you had kept quiet so few people would have known or cared about the difference that I think you could have gone on selling green lumber to almost everybody who was buying green lumber before.

But you didn't keep quiet. You started a regular civil war. And finally you got the Department of Commerce to publicize the difference, not to the old list of 3,000 accepters (only 100 of whom bothered to answer the last previous lumber standards ballot), but to a new list of some say 13,000 and some say 20,000 accepters, and now, I think, you've really done it.

Thousands of builders who never cared about green and dry before now know that although green lumber is cheaper to buy it may well be more expensive to use, because unless the builder carries the green lumber in stock until it dries (which is expensive) or slows down his construction operation to let it dry in the frame (which is still more expensive) the green lumber will be the No. 1 cause of costly callbacks to correct nail popping and fix plaster cracks, and if he uses it green it will also run up his bill for

carpenter labor. Thousands of mortgage lenders who never knew that green lumber meant moisture content intead of color now know that houses framed with green lumber aren't quite as good; thousands of appraisers now think that houses framed with green lumber should get a lower appraisal; and today even customers are beginning to get wise and ask questions about moisture content they never asked before.

I don't think all this new awareness of the difference between green and dry is going to be much help to you.

However, there's no use wasting any more time worrying about spilt milk. What we should be taking counsel together about this morning is what the smart thing for you to do next would be.

To that end, I'm going to offer four suggestions:

First, I'd call off the civil war right here and now before it gets any more publicity. 1⅝ inches dry lumber is a dead issue new, whether the American standard stays 1⅝ inches or changes to 1½ inches. Any more publicity you give the green-vs-dry battle will just be bad for you.

Second, I'd make as long a list as you can make of the many uses for which green lumber is just as good as dry lumber, and when you make your peace with the rest of the lumber industry I'd insist that one of the first articles of the peace settlement should be their promise to give green lumber what the radio people call equal time and to promote green lumber for use where green lumber beyongs just as hard as they promote dry lumber where dry lumber is worth its higher cost.

Third, I would repeat to you the best of all political advice—"if you can't beat 'em, join 'em." I'm pretty sure that in the next few years the market for dry lumber will grow faster than the market for green lumber, so it should be smart for as many of you as possible to get over into the dry lumber market and put in drying equipment yourselves. I'm told that drying equipment for three carloads a day can cost as little as $50,000, and I can't think of a better investment you could make.

And, finally, I would urge you just as strongly as I possibly can to close ranks with the rest of the lumber industry to fight the battle of wood—dry wood and green wood together—against the new industries that now challenging wood's age-old eminence as the one best material for homebuilding.

Twenty years ago wood had a near monopoly of the housing market. In fact, 20 years ago it could almost be said that the homebuilding industry was really a part of the lumber industry, or perhaps you might have called it the construction division of the lumber industry.

Today, that monopoly is gone. Wood is being challenged for almost every use in homebuilding—challenged by steel, challenged by aluminum, challenged by glass, challenged by plastics, challenged by concrete. All these industries are challenging wood with materials that are more precisely engineered, so whatever is good in them can be utilized more efficiently.

So the one best way for everybody in the lumber industry to make more sales and make more profits is to work together to make an engineered product too and then to make every homebuilder, every home mortgage lender, every home appraiser, every home salesman, and every home buyer believe that wood is the one best material and the one most economical material with which to build better, more salable, more livable homes.

A Confusing Story: Missiles Still Red, and Aimed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union entitled, "Missiles Still Red, and Aimed":

[From the San Diego Union, May 7, 1964]

A CONFUSING STORY—MISSILES STILL RED, AND AIMED

There is a peculiar theory being pushed these days by the radical liberals in Washington. They would have us believe the Russian influence in Cuba actually is to our advantage.

They say, in effect, the Russians are disturbed by Fidel Castro and that they, the Russians, want to control any pushbuttons that might trigger nuclear war with the United States.

Then came the reports the Soviet had pulled out all but second rate nuclear weapons from Cuba. The story was leaked from the State Department, then denied by the Defense Department.

The conflicting stories from two branches of Government left the American public in abject confusion. The principal question asked was whether the Soviet still would support Cuba if the latter country resorted to its missiles to attack U.S. reconnaissance planes?

The Soviet, although it has worries about Castro, would be ideologically prone to go to his aid. Realistically, the Soviet would write Castro off as a bad investment in the event this Nation was forced to take decisive action.

This country must not forget the Cuban crisis was fired by the Soviet. Russian missiles on Cuban bases are not there because of Castro's influence but because, through Castro, the Soviet had found an easy way of aiming its missiles at the United States.

The fact remains that Castro has missiles. These are missiles that were placed there by Communist Russia. Whether the men responsible for pulling the trigger are Russian or Cubans is of no consequence. The trigger, and the missiles, remain.

Castro's Cuba remains off the very near shores of America. The proximity of the issue cannot be denied by long-range blueprints that indicate establishment of a lifeline between the United States and the Soviet.

We are getting too intimate, diplomatically, with the Russians in Cuba. They still have missile bases there. The potential of these bases is a matter of debate. But the striking power exists.

It is easy to ignore an enemy on the threshold because he carries the credentials of neighborliness. This is the effort being made by Khrushchev. The radical liberals in Government would pursue this policy.

We cannot get friendly with Cuba. What do we do? It would be wise at this point to firmly restate the Monroe Doctrine and all its implications.

Castro will understand such strong language. And so will Khrushchev.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, political personalities here in Washington and across the country in California vary to a noticeable degree. However, each fits well into the satirical scene as Art Hoppe sees it.

Three recent columns which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle follow:

LET'S HEAR IT FOR L.B.J.—YELP! YELP! YELP!

(By Arthur Hoppe)

You have to hand it to Mr. Johnson. Some thought him a compromiser, a man who'd back down in a tight spot. But, no sir, with unswerving devotion to principle he has defied public opinion to do what he believes right: He's picked up that dog of his by the ears again.

This placing principle above popularity is undeniably the sign of true leadership. For it's Mr. Johnson's principle, as you know, to make dogs yelp. Because, he says, a yelping dog dangling by its ears is a happy dog.

Unfortunately, the first time he displayed this principle it did not exactly catch on with dog lovers. Many envisioned Mr. Johnson putting his happy dog to bed. On the clothesline. And it was the rare parent who, on catching a small son dragging a yowling puppy around by the ears, cried: "Oh, joy, some day he will grow up to be President."

Personally, I figured Mr. Johnson would wilt under the blast and take the easy way out. Perhaps a discreet ad in the classified: "Free to good home. Two beagles. Very long ears." And there'd be a lot of pictures of our President climbing ladders to put poor little baby birds back in their nests.

So imagine my stunned surprise to come across another photo of Mr. Johnson lifting up his dog-eared beagle once again. How I had misjudged the steely backbone of the man. How imbued he is with the spirit of true leadership. How, then, did he ever get elected anything in the first place?

For, if you ask me, true leaders seldom get anywhere in our political system. Oh, a politician can stand firm on principle. Just as long as it's a popular principle. But if he happens to believe in an unpopular principle, he's either got to compromise or find honest work.

Yet here was Mr. Johnson, who has risen to the very top in politics, publicly upholding a clearly unpopular principle. Here was an iron-willed leader who spurned wishy-washy compromise, who grimly seized an issue and yanked it up before public view despite the howls.

Just a minute. This time, I notice, the dog didn't yelp. This time, I see, the dog's hind feet remained firmly on the ground. Indeed, the story flatly says that Mr. Johnson, unlike before, didn't exactly dangle the dog in midair by the ears. But merely lifted it up "into a standing position." Or kind of halfway up.

Thank heavens. What a magnificent compromise with principle. It restores my faith in our whole political system.

And I'm glad. For I happen to believe the great thing about our system is that it doesn't

produce true leaders. I mean the kind who defy opinion to do what they think is good for us.

No sir. The trouble with true leaders is that they always want to lift up us common people and make us happy. Their way. And I say the best thing to do when one comes along is to clap both hands over your ears.

SOMBER PIERRE OR HAPPY AL?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Mr. Pierre Salinger and Mr. Alan Cranston are both waging typical modern campaigns for the Senate nomination. And it looks as though Democratic voters will have a difficult choice to make on June 2.

Yes, they will have to choose between a warm, colorful, jolly sort, and a sober, serious, thoughtful type. And the difficult decision they will have to make, of course, is which candidate is which.

Oh, I know the distinction was clear in the beginning. Mr. Salinger, sometimes called "Portly Pierre," was clearly the joyous man's candidate. And Mr. Cranston, our State controller, was just as clearly the thinking man's candidate. But have you seen them lately?

Mr. Salinger is going around in dark suits, neatly buttoned vests, and black times. And when he looks sincerely into your eyes as he grimly shakes your hand, your kind of want to express condolences for whomever it was who died.

And Mr. Cranston. When last heard of, he was up on the stage at a local political gathering singing, so help me: "Alan's campaign is a roller,/Can't you see him in a bowler?/Who will be the next controller?" And so forth.

A bowler? It was, I suppose, inevitable. For as soon as the campaign started, both candidates naturally hired public relations men to work on their images. And the first thing a public relations man does about a candidate's image is, naturally, change it.

It never matters what it is. Are you warm, colorful, jolly? "Look," says your public relation man, "you want the voters to think you're a good-time Charlie? You got to get out there and be sober, serious, thoughtful. From now on, wear shoes two sizes too small and speak statistics."

Or perhaps you are sober, serious, thoughtful? "For crying out loud," says your public relations man, looking you over. "A voter would as lief identify with you as with the great depression. You got to be warm, colorful, jolly. Bone up on Joe Miller's Joke Book. Learn to play the ocarina while smoking a big cigar. And maybe you'll be a Senator yet."

Naturally, both candidates are working hard. And you can even now envision the climax of this modern campaign as both saturate television on election eve with 60-second spots:

"Hi there, folks," cries Mr. Cranston, wearing a lampshade, putty nose, and spats as he comes on camera doing a buck and wing. "This is, ha, ha, Al (Chuckles) Cranston, your happy-go-lucky controller, bringing you, ho, ho, songs and patter. Now, a funny thing happened to me on my way to the Senate."

So you switch stations and there's Mr. Salinger, hands clasped in front of his heart. "Dear friends," he begins somberly, "we are gathered on this sad occasion to mourn the .0082 salinity content per 843,617 acre feet condoned by the 1878 Treaty of Tijuana and."

Which all goes to show that the prime purpose of the modern campaign is to give each candidate a chance to prove to the voters that, whatever he may be, he isn't. Let's wish them all lots of luck.

ANY NEWS IS GOOD NEWS—ELBIE JAY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all. It's time for another visit with "just plain folks," the rib-tickling tee-vee adventures of the Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, the friendliest wrangler ever to wrangle his way on to the front page. Daily.

As we join up with ol' Elbie tonight, he and his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, are just settling down to sleep.

BIRDIE BIRD. You look a mite tired tonight, Elbie.

ELBIE. Well, I don't mind confiding that the very important affairs of state sometimes get a man down. And today I had a terrible setback.

BIRDIE BIRD (worriedly). Another coup in Vietnam? More threats from Castro? Or is that poverty's winning the war?

ELBIE. (glumly). Worse. The afternoon paper used that picture of me crowning Miss Greater East Yonkers Prune Festival. On page 37.

BIRDIE BIRD (aghast). No.

ELBIE (dejectedly). Yep. That's a 36-page setback. A dog act is sure tough to follow.

BIRDIE BIRD. Well, you just got to try a bit harder to make news. Maybe if you had a new kind of press conference?

ELBIE. I reckon you're right. But they're getting a bit hard to think up. I thought all through my daily breakfast press conference, my daily follow-up press conference while shaving and my daily mid-morning lunch, and coffee-break press conferences. And I couldn't think up nary a thing.

BIRDIE BIRD. Let's see. How about a press conference while doing seven laps around the house?

ELBIE. Now, you know I've done that a dozen times. And the fatter reporters are getting kind of petulant.

BIRDIE BIRD. Maybe in your car, then. Driving down the road.

ELBIE. You trying to pick a quarrel?

BIRDIE BIRD. I forgot. Well, you've tried holding them in your office, the Rose Garden, the press office, the State Department Auditorium, the lawn. I did like that one you had for the reporters and their children on the lawn with pink lemonade.

ELBIE. Wasn't that a dilly? It's too bad I had to chalk off that next one for reporters and their moms. But the orphans in the press corps started complaining about news management. And, leaping lizards, I didn't want to be mean to orphans.

BIRDIE BIRD. Well, Elbie, don't you fret. You know you think better when you relax. Maybe something will come to you tomorrow when you're skinny dipping in the pool.

ELBIE (elatedly). Skinny dipping. That's it. Talk about maximum exposure. You solved my problems.

BIRDIE BIRD. That's fine. Good night, Elbie.

ELBIE. Good night, Birdie Bird. And good night, Merriman. Good night, Scotty. And all you other fine newspaper fellows. Hope you're comfy there on the floor. But don't doze off. Like I told you at my after-dinner press conference, I talk in my sleep. And I don't want you boys to miss a word.

Will Elbie suffer from overexposure? Will the press? What next? Tune in again soon, friends. And meanwhile, as you mosey down life's long trail, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say: "What is a man profited who gains the whole world? If he don't get good press notices."

Foreign Aid and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there is a great diversity of views in this country on foreign aid and perhaps because not enough is said about its actual accomplishments. In the following article from the New York Times a doctor speaks out on the rich rewards of the U.S. foreign assistance program through helping to wipe out disease throughout the world.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sunday, May 10, 1964]

U.S. AID AND HEALTH—PROGRAM HAS REAPED RICH REWARDS IN WAR ON DISEASE THROUGHOUT WORLD

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last week, Sol Linowitz, chairman of the Xerox Corp., announced plans for the formation of a citizens committee to support the U.S. foreign aid program. This is an encouraging action, for there is probably no aspect of our Government that is as misunderstood as our foreign aid program.

For the fiscal year beginning next July 1, President Johnson has recommended an appropriation of $3.4 billion. Of this, $2.4 billion would be for economic aid and $1 billion for military assistance.

Of the $2.4 billion for economic aid, $225 million would be devoted to technical cooperation in Africa, the Near East, south Asia and the Far East, and $85 million to the Alliance for Progress.

Some of these funds would be used to pay the salaries of experts and other technicians; to finance contracts with American universities, private firms and other institutions and to provide demonstration equipment and commodities needed by these experts and contractors.

DIVIDENDS IN HEALTH

Other projects would include the financing of the training of teachers, health workers, agriculture experts and other consultants and the operation of programs in industrial development, public safety, public administration, transportation, housing, agriculture, and health.

There is probably no aspect of our foreign aid program which has earned such rich dividends as our activities in the field of health. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk testified last month before a House committee:

"The doctor with his mobile health unit, the technician who frees a village from measles, the agricultural specialist and the teacher are to millions of people in the world the symbol of America."

Measles in West Africa, for example, have long been recognized as a major cause of mortality. They are responsible for the death of about one of every four or five children.

This high mortality rate is probably due to nutritional deficiencies, malaria, and parasitic diseases, combined with unfavorable climate and hygenic factors.

MEASLES ARRESTED

In a 5-month cooperative project of the Ministry of Health, Upper Volta, the National Institutes of Health and the Agency for International Development, 731,000 children in Upper Volta were vaccinated against measles. As a result, the spread of measles appears to be stopped and thousands of lives have been saved.

The program has now been extended on a demonstration basis to the Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Niger, Guinea, Senegal, and Mauritania. The total cost of the program, exclusive of the vaccine, which was contributed, was approximately 14 cents a child.

Health projects often demonstrate to the people—frequently for the first time—that their governments actually serve them rather than exploit them.

Today, for example, the number of cases of malaria throughout the world has declined from 350 million to less than 100 million annually.

The economic, social, and political factors of this achievement have been of great significance in countries such as India, Taiwan, and the Philippines, where millions of people previously crippled by malaria have been freed from this age-old problem.

ETHIOPIAN HEALTH CENTERS

In Ethiopia, assistance by the Agency for International Development has resulted in the development of a rural community health program financed by a local health tax.

Currently, 50 community health centers have been established with personnel trained in the Haile Selassie I Public Health College and Training Center in Gondar.

Through the community organization, which must be created before these health units will serve a community, an institution is created that results in a self-generating social and economic development.

At the end of World War II, the National Taiwan University Medical College, which had been good by Japanese standards in the 1930's, was destroyed. The withdrawal of the Japanese left a skeleton faculty out of touch with modern medicine and education and without means of improvement.

INSTITUTE IN KARACHI

With assistance from the Agency for International Development and concurrent help on a smaller scale from the World Health Organization, China Medical Board, American Bureau of Medical Aid to China, Asia Foundation, and other groups, the school had been completely modernized and now graduates about 100 modern trained physicians a year. It now conducts its program with a minimum of outside help.

Merrimack Valley—Need Studied for Switch to Peace Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as hard as it is for many of our communities and industries to believe, the era of defense production oriented prosperity may be at an end. John J. McKone writing in the May 17, 1964, edition of the Boston Globe, has pointed out that the growing imbalance in defense spending is having a detrimental impact on the economy of some Massachusetts communities in the Merrimack Valley. Fortunately, many firms and communities are taking the initiative to prepare for this transition. More must do so, as Mr. McKone points out so clearly. Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MERRIMACK VALLEY—NEED STUDIED FOR SWITCH TO PEACE INDUSTRY

(By John J. McKone)

When Senator TED KENNEDY advised mid-valley businessmen a few days ago, he spoke of the need for conversion to peacetime manufacturing due to future uncertainties.

Some took it as a good tip about things to come. Like, for example, Washington's swing of the ax hitting defense industries in the Merrimack Valley.

In this area, there have been hints of it for months. The imbalance in defense spending has aroused jittery conclusions because of the drying up of many jobs. Production is less, and there is far less call for certain talents.

Not long ago employment in defense and associated industries equalled close to 18 percent of the number employed in some local communities.

Only a government study of data could determine the force of impact in a defense plant closing, for much depends on where the employees live. Hundreds often commute from distance. It works the other way too. Many valley residents make 30-mile trips to jobs in defense industry.

Government-customer operations gave the economy hereabout a wanted boost, offsetting somewhat continuing unemployment conditions. In some places the number of idle rates a "distressed" classification.

"It's hard to believe that defense firms will ever become a liability in a district so well adapted," is one comment.

But Lawrence and Lowell recall the boom-and-bust of military production.

Conversion to consumer goods may be a slower project for some concerns. One large company has begun the operation.

Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE believes the Federal Government should aid in the transition to peaceful manufacturing. He has suggested that his (fifth) district, which includes Lowell and Lawrence, be set apart in a unique plan for a tryout of the changeover effect. It would be a sort of peacetime lab, subject to expert scrutiny. Results might steer firms toward more profitable policies, he says.

He has already requested consideration of this pilot project by the President's Committee on Economic Conversion.

Prudence Is Still a Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fiscal responsibility, prudence in spending have always been American virtues. When we forgot these virtues and adopted the ways of easy living, free spending and an "easy come, easy go" attitude, we have always had to pay the piper.

At a time when there seems to be no end to prosperity, when the Federal Government leads the way in spreading the philosophy of big spending, big debt and deficit financing, perhaps we should pause to consider the virtue of prudence.

In this connection I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, the following editorial, "On Living It Up—And Down," from the Wall Street Journal of May 19, 1964:

ON LIVING IT UP—AND DOWN

Will people never learn? Once again, the answer to the old refrain is, apparently not. We have in mind particularly some indications of excess in the business world.

Actually, the record in the postwar years is pretty good on the whole. The business community has exercised sufficient restraint—in terms of inventory accumulation, credit extension and other ways—in boom periods to moderate the recurring recessions. Because there has been relatively little speculative excess most of the time, the Nation has been spared anything comparable to the depression of the thirties.

But prolonged prosperity and the dimming of the memory of the depression are showing their effects in various places. A notable one at present is real estate, and more specifically the mortgage market.

Since World War II, mortgage debt, as Mr. O'Donnell's recent article on this page noted, has risen eightfold to $281 billion; what is worse, some of the big gains have been quite recent. The suspicion grows that the building binge stems more from easy financing than from demand for space; that there is, in fact, a lot of overbuilding.

Many lending institutions are so heavy with cash that they have made their mortgage terms extremely loose, and the equity of so-called owners of both home and commercial properties is frequently reduced almost to the vanishing point. It is instructive that foreclosures on single-family homes last year were the largest since 1939, while a number of real estate investment and development companies are going through sweeping debt liquidations and refinancings.

The real estate phenomenon, moreover, is only one reflection of what is learnedly called a deterioration in the quality of credit. In other lending areas as well, terms are excessively easy and credit is too often extended for dubious undertakings. What is the explanation?

Though we don't propose to dwell on it, the Federal Government is one institution which has played an unmistakable role in the drama. Certainly it set the style for practically nonexistent equities with the terms on its Federal Housing Administration loans. For other agencies, such as the Small Business Administration, you just about have to be a poor credit risk to qualify for a loan.

In addition, the Government has been inflating. People can go right on saying they descry few signs of inflation on the horizon; the fact is that the authorities have greatly expanded the money supply in recent years. All that easy moeny has got to go somewhere.

Government policy, however, cannot be accepted as a complete justification for business imprudence. In any event, other factors are also at work.

Unfamiliarity with anything except prosperity is such a factor. Mr. O'Donnell quoted Franklin Briese of Minnesota Mutual Life putting it on the line to a mortgage bankers meeting: "Many of you lack the experience and education furnished by the depression. In truth, there has been no severe test of mortgage credit for more than 25 years."

We recall the words of an industrialist who went further; the country, he said, needs another depression to wake it up. The words are harsh—far too harsh, in our opinion—but the meaning behind them is worth some thought.

What the man meant was the something-for-nothing attitude of labor unions, the get-rich-quick efforts of some entrepreneurs, the thoughtless basking of some businesses in Government contracts, the notion that the individual isn't necessarily responsible for making his own way; in short, the whole psychology that life, if not always beautiful, must definitely be easy. He just didn't see how it could go on forever.

Not the least mischievous part of the psychology is the widespread belief that a depression of the magnitude of the thirties simply can't happen again; the economy has so many built-in safeguards and all that. And it's true enough that vast changes, and some improvements, have been wrought in the economic and financial structure in the past three decades.

But it strikes us that when people are so positive about the future is a good time for skepticism. While the Nation does not by any means have to go through all that suffering again, facts are still facts: A nation that practices inflation and generates an inflationary psychology and speculative excesses is risking trouble. We doubt that any economy can be made secure from public and private folly.

If that is so, the conclusion is inescapable. The best possible safeguard will be public and private restraint while there is still time to think and learn from the economic excesses of the past.

Commemorative Copper Penny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan State Legislature has recently passed a resolution petitioning Congress to issue a commemorative copper penny honoring the copper country of Michigan.

The production of copper in Michigan, and especially in Houghton County, being its oldest and one of its and the Nation's leading industries, establishes the Michigan copper country as deserving of this recognition. I would urge that the Congress act favorably upon this petition.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84

(Offered by Representative Hellman and Senators Lundgren, McManiman, and Rahoi)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the minting and issue of a copper penny recognizing and honoring the Michigan copper country

Whereas copper is the world's oldest known economic metal, having been used as early as 5,500 years ago; copper's use marked man's transition from the stone age to the metal age and copper was the basis for the historical bronze age; copper was the first metal used in the construction of tools and weapons; and

Whereas copper is one of the world's most useful metals, being second only to iron; copper is the basis for many of man's most important nonferrous alloys; copper is indispensable to the electrical industry and to this electronic and atomic age; and

Whereas copper production and use constituted Michigan's most ancient industry, being at least 4,000 years old; and copper made Houghton County, for a period, the second highest taxpaying county in Michigan; and Michigan, for many years, ranked first among the copper-producing States in the Union and production for 1963 was valued at nearly $50 million, and copper is one of Michigan's great heritages: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature respectfully urges and requests the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the minting and issue of a special copper penny recognizing and honoring the copper country of Michigan and its manifold contributions to the copper mining industry for many years; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be transmitted to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Michigan Senator and Representative in the Congress.

Adopted by the house April 29, 1964.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate May 1, 1964.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Report of Committee on Inland Navigation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 50th National Convention, June 7, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 of last year, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held its 50th national convention.

At that time, its Committee on Inland Navigation adopted a number of resolutions and drafted a policy statement which are worthy of our serious consideration.

I am presenting them herewith for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INLAND NAVIGATION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

The committee met in the Potomac Room of the Mayflower Hotel at 10 a.m. at the call of the chairman.

Present at the committee meeting were:

Hon. Gleason N. Stambaugh, Sr., chairman, Florida Inland Navigation District, West Palm Beach, Fla.

Phillip W. Fitzpatrick, consultant, port authority, St. Paul, Minn., chairman, subcommittee on hazards and aids to navigation, channel dimensions, and maintenance.

Col. Hubert S. Miller, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, retired; vice president and general manager, Trinity Improvement Association, Fort Worth, Tex.; chairman, defense value of individual channels subcommittee.

F. M. Hendry, Hendry Corp., Tampa, Fla.; chairman, subcommittee on design and equipment of floating craft, fuels and propulsion, and cargo handling equipment.

Thomas B. Casey, chief waterway engineer, State of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

Joel C. Wilcox, Port of Palm Beach, West Palm Beach, Fla.

James W. Lee, Palm Beach City Traffic Bureau, West Palm Beach, Fla.

George R. Collier, Sante Fe Railroad Co., Galveston, Tex.

J. R. Spease, Fairmont, W. Va.

K. M. Lloyd, Mahoning Valley Industrial Council, Youngstown, Ohio.

R. O. Fisher, Illinois Division of Waterways, Springfield, Ill.

Clifford L. Summers, Missouri Water Resources Board, Jefferson City, Mo.

L. V. Bruno, Congaree Navigation Authority, West Columbia, S.C.

Mrs. Andrew Woytovech, city of Utica, Utica, N.Y.

H. C. Beckman, Jr., Florida Inland Navigation District, Stuart, Fla.

George Kumpe, West Coast Inland Navigation District, Bradenton, Fla.

James F. Hammond, Columbia, S.C.

Ted L. Murphy, Lexington, S.C.

J. Paul Comola, assistant general manager, Trinity Improvement Association, Fort Worth, Tex.

R. H. Merritt, Escambia-Conecuh River Development Commission, Pensacola, Fla.

R. H. Anderson, Stanley Engineering Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Robert R. Brooksher, mayor, city of Fort Smith, Fort Smith, Ark.

Mr. Fitzpatrick (Minnesota) reported on his subcommittee's analysis of bridge clearances and submitted for approval of the full committee, the enclosed Resolution 1 and Resolution 2. After discussion the committee approved these resolutions as submitted.

Mr. Comola, substituting for Col. Hubert S. Miller, who was temporarily out of the room, gave the report of the Subcommittee on Defense Value of Individual Channels. The report is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes. The proposed resolutions, as set forth on page 4 of the subcommittee's report, was approved unanimously by the full committee.

Chairman Stambaugh reappointed the present subcommittee chairmen to serve in their respective capacities on the subcommittees for the ensuing year, and be prepared to make a report to the Committee on Inland Navigation at the next called meeting of the committee to be announced at a later date.

It was announced that any Member of the Congress desiring to serve on any of the subcommittees of the Committee on Inland Navigation let the fact be known to Chairman Stambaugh or Mr. Webb.

The meeting was adjourned.

J. PAUL COMOLA,
Acting Secretary.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION BY THE ANNUAL CONVENTION JUNE 1963 OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

Bridge clearances

This congress has continually opposed construction or erection of any fixed structure on all or any waterway which might result in an obstruction to navigation. Tonnages on inland waterways are substantially increasing, involving larger tows and towboats with greater height, as a safety factor. The rapid developments in the new technologies of nuclear power and space exploration require the preservation of the ability to move large vessels and the large structures characteristic of those technologies; and industrial development connected with them, in all sections of the country, must be encouraged and preserved.

We therefore urge that Congress adopt an amendment to section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946 whereby the Secretary of the Army shall not approve the plans for any bridge construction, reconstruction, or alteration which would have the effect of reducing the least bridge clearance provided for vessels moving between any point on any commercially navigable river or waterway, extent on June 1, 1963, in the continental United States and the sea, excepting intracoastal waterways, on which latter, adequate bridge clearances shall be maintained.

RESOLUTION 2 APPROVED

During the past year severe difficulties were encountered in the maintenance of various inland navigation channels due to heavy silting and ice gorges appearing in certain areas. These problems were energetically attacked, as they appeared, by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and the National Rivers and Harbors Congress extends its thanks and commendations to the corps for their prompt and successful endeavors in correcting and eliminating such difficulties.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE INLAND WATERWAYS OF THE UNITED STATES

Human nature is such that dramatic events excite our imagination and absorb our interest while the more prosaic activities suffer neglect. Yet it is the latter which make the former attainable.

So it is with our inland waterways today. The space age and intercontinental ballistic missiles are new and dramatic in appeal. Waterways are as old as civilization and as fundamental as water itself. Both missiles and waterways are a means of transportation. and transportation is a primary factor in national defense.

Space vehicles are the most expensive transportation yet known to man. They open the way to destinations unexplored and will provide benefits unpredictable.

Waterways provide the cheapest means of bulk transportation ever designed and provide specific benefits. It is the purpose of

this paper to propose positive recognition of the national defense benefits of our waterways.

It has been an accepted national policy, at least since World War I, that the economic capacity of a nation was of equal or greater importance than the Armed Forces in winning a major war.

The tremendous growth of new industry along our navigable waterways since World War II clearly demonstrates the benefits of low-cost transportation to our peacetime economy.

The coming Common Market and growing South American trade make the cost of transportation from the interior to deep-sea ports a critical link in world competition. The case for low-cost water transportation in developing our peacetime economy has been made eloquently. The case for the national defense benefits has not been expressed adequately.

We believe Congress has foreseen the need for this reevaluation in Senate Document 97 which states (par. E-11 defining acceptable navigation benefits), "A project's contribution toward meeting specific needs for servicing international treaties or for national defense may also be included."

This sentence reads "may" and not "will" be included but at least the door is opened. It is our firm belief that this permissive phrase should be made positive and that methods of computing defense benefits be prescribed and followed by all reviewing agencies.

Our history in this matter has been most erratic. After each war studies and reports have been made clearly demonstrating the tremendous defense value of our waterways. As the next war seemed a long way off these reports were filed and forgotten. When war came we worked frantically on what should have been done long before.

It is not the intent to repeat here these past studies. In summary they developed the following points concerning waterways.

1. A great capacity for quick expansion in transportation capacity which is impossible by rail.

2. A minimum of critical material required to construct barges as compared with rail cars.

3. A great expansion of industrial facilities made available, for example, Navy floating equipment including submarines were built in the Mississippi Valley and moved to deep water.

4. Total wartime demands far exceeded rail and truck capacity and could not have been met without waterways.

5. Safety of movement provided. For example: Petroleum products were shipped by intracoastal canal instead of by the open sea.

6. Provides greater dispersal of industry which has long been a military defense objective.

Similar studies were made after both World War I and World War II and forgotten. We seem to have overlooked the fact that it takes years to plan, design, and construct these projects. When war comes it is too late.

Our Government has always recognized the national defense value of waterways but too little and too late. A few early examples illustrate our historical interest in this subject and our sporadic efforts for adequate preparation.

The first waterways improvement authorized by Congress was for national defense. In 1809 Congress authorized the enlargement of the Carondelet Canal to make it "sufficiently deep throughout to admit an easy and safe passage to gunboats" (2 Stat. 517, 1809). It connected the Mississippi River with Lake Pontchatrain in New Orleans.

The War of 1812 granted the now familiar flurry of interest in defense use of waterways. In 1819 the Honorable John C. Calhoun, then Secretary of War, reported to Congress:

"There is no country to which a good system of military roads and canals is more indispensable than to the United States. Many of the roads and canals which have been suggested no doubt, of the first importance to the commerce, the manufacture, the agriculture, and the political prosperity of the country, but are not, for that reason, less useful or necessary for military purposes."

This statement made in 1819 sums up the entire range of our past experience briefly and accurately. We have always recognized this fact but done too little about it.

The findings of all previous studies pertain in this space age with greater force. The need of a stronger economy is more acute, the factor of transportation costs is increasingly important, dispersal of industry is more to be sought, time to prepare for war emergency can be shorter, quantities of material to be moved will be greater and in all respects the old problems remain in number and increased in magnitude.

To this we must now add the new transportation problems of the space vehicles themselves. Many assemblies are too large to move by rail or truck and can only be moved by barge. If they cannot be moved from construction site to launching facility they are useless.

An attempt was made in the preparation of this paper to assemble basic facts upon which some specific recommendations could be made. No satisfactory study by any Government agency could be found. Due to the classified nature of some of this material no complete picture could be developed.

Missile launching sites are well known. The number, variety, and dispersion of prime and subcontractors supporting these contracts is surprisingly great and no complete list is available. The accompanying map locates such facilities and could be assembled from various sources. Obviously these numerous components must be transported to some assembly plant and then shipped to the launching site with minimum delay. Several conclusions can be drawn from this map.

Production of components is concentrated in three regions: New England States, California, and a more dispersed concentration in the Ohio to Indiana area. Scattered contractors facilities appear in almost every State.

The picture of launching facilities for the major space vehicles is quite different. One site is in California. The other lies in an area called the Space Crescent which includes Houston, Memphis, Atlanta, and Cape Canaveral.

Also enclosed is a map showing the Inland Waterways of the United States. Comparison of these two maps show a clear relationship. The California area of necessity stands by itself. Nearly all other facilities can have adequate water connection by way of the Mississippi, Ohio, and tributary systems and the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal waterways with their connecting waterways.

From these basic facts it is obvious that the waterways have a new defense value in addition to those demonstrated in two World Wars, that the need is more acute and that national defense benefits definitely should be included in the evaluation of navigation projects serving areas where defense industries are located. This means that the provisions of Senate Document 97 should be specific and that instructions should be issued prescribing the details of computing such benefits.

It is therefore recommended that the Navigation Committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress propose for adoption the following resolution:

"It is resolved that, while the national defense benefits of inland navigation have long been recognized in principal they have not been accepted in fact to the extent the National Rivers and Harbors Congress believes to be justified.

"The National Rivers and Harbors Congress therefore recommends that the provision of Senate Document 97 be amended to direct that the appropriate agency prepare administrative instructions for computing such benefits."

H. S. MILLER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Defense Value of Inland Navigation.

How To Beat the Coin Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, each day brings new reports of the seriousness of the coin shortage in this country. In her recent column Sylvia Porter, who is widely read as an authority on money matters, stated that the coin shortage "is the worst in history and is growing steadily more critical."

Miss Porter's column, which I read in the Waterbury, Conn., American, and I also note was carried on the same date, May 14, by the Washington, D.C., Star, and many other newspapers, stressed the opinion that "the best way out of the temporary emergency would be to enlist private industry to help produce coins."

I have called attention to the problem of the coin shortage in previous statements and I have communicated with the Treasury Department, the Appropriations Committee, and the Bureau of the Budget, to recommend that we call upon private industry at this time to produce for us, as they did in previous years, the metal and the blanks for coins. As we all know, our mints are working at full blast in an unsuccessful effort to cope with the problem, and we have appropriated funds for the construction of a new mint in Philadelphia. It is obvious that our present minting facilities are inadequate and that our new mint cannot and will not be constructed and in operation for some time and, therefore, it is imperative that the proper steps be taken, without delay, to produce coins with the readily available assistance of private industry.

At my request, the Bureau of the Budget is currently making a study of the economic feasibility of awarding contracts to private industry for the production of coin blanks. Public reaction is strongly in support of this proposal, as evidenced by newspaper editorials and comments in trade publications, some of which I have previously called to the attention of my colleagues.

In further support of my proposal, I include here Sylvia Porter's column which was distributed by the Hall Syndicate on the subject "How To Beat the Coin Shortage":

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, May 14, 1964]

HOW TO BEAT THE COIN SHORTAGE

(By Sylvia Porter)

What are we doing and what can we do to beat the unprecedented shortage of coins in the United States today—a shortage which already is the worst in history and is growing steadily more critical?

Rationing of coins is in effect right now. Federal Reserve Banks across the country are limiting the amounts they distribute to commercial banks. Banks in turn are rigidly restricting sales of the new Kennedy 50 cent pieces to individual customers. Weeks ago, after a frenzied rush on its silver dollars had virtually exhausted supplies, the Treasury halted sale of the silver cartwheels.

Construction of a new modern U.S. Mint to replace our antiquated Philadelphia mint is a certainty. Coin production has been hiked to an estimated 4.2 billion this year against a half billion in 1950, but the Treasury itself admits it would have to make 6 billion coins in 1964 just to meet present demands. Other sources insist the total of coins now in circulation must be doubled to wipe out scarcities. Congress hasn't yet appropriated the money for the new mint but it will.

Even if the new mint were built at a record speed, though, it couldn't be put into operation in time to meet today's massive coin shortage problem. So what else?

A first high probability is that the Treasury will call on private industry to take over part of the coin-making process—so that production can be swelled at once and the hoarders discouraged.

The mints are even now buying "nickel strip"—ready made sheets of metal—from private industry to make nickels. Under consideration is the prospect of doing the same for pennies, most numerous of our coins.

"FREEZING" THE DATE

A proposal is that manufacturers of tokens—who have the know-how to produce coins—be enlisted to cut coin "blanks" which the mints could then stamp into the finished product. (It's against the law for a private firm to make money.)

There are drawbacks to this. For instance, Congress would have to appropriate funds to permit the Treasury to buy the blanks. And if the plan were used for any coin containing silver (dimes and up), there could be a ticklish security problem, for the blanks might be stolen and used as slugs. Still, say a Treasury official, "if things get really bad, we might have to take that security risk."

A second suggestion, which has the backing of the American Bankers Association, would freeze the date "1964" on coins indefinitely.

A variation of this would eliminate dates and other mint markings from coins—often the collectors' measure of numismatic value. "If there were only one kind of coin to collect," an expert argues, "the speculators might not collect so many of them."

A third possibility for the future is a law reducing or eliminating silver from coins. This move would conserve the Treasury's dwindling silver supplies and surely take some of the glitter out of coin collecting.

Inexpensive metals with no intrinsic value would be used instead of silver. Melting of coins also might be prohibited by law and hoarding of coins would be policed. The Treasury is now conducting a major study on the role of silver in the U.S. coinage system.

A fourth idea—elimination of coins altogether and the substitution of all-paper money—is out. Both the Treasury and Congress have rejected this one because of the high cost involved.

Coins are more expensive to produce than paper currency, but a $1 bill has a lifespan of only 18 months and replacement costs would be phenomenal.

What is increasingly obvious is that unusual actions must be taken. The coin-collecting and coin-hoarding craze is reaching the proportions of madness. We cannot wait for the new mint's production.

The best way out of the temporary emergency would be to enlist private industry to help produce coins—for this, as the Journal of Commerce put it in a recent editorial, would "give them coin until it comes out of their ears." Then the Treasury's and Federal Reserve's happy problem would turn into finding valt space for the dishoarded coins.

Senior Citizens Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, May is the month which has been designated to honor our senior citizens, a month in which we should all be especially reminded of the contribution of our senior citizens to this Nation. President Eisenhower called the first White House Conference on the Aging and maintained a special staff to study the needs of senior citizens.

Likewise, the New York State Governors since 1954 have set aside the month of May as Senior Citizens Month, and active clubs throughout our State have done much to proclaim the rights and obligations of America's senior citizens. One such group is the Senior Citizens Club of Crompond, N.Y. I would like to include in the RECORD a letter to the editor sent to 18 Westchester County, N.Y., newspapers by the chairman of this group, Mr. Paul Leith, calling for greater awareness by young and old alike of the contribution of our senior citizens.

The letter follows:

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH PUTS SPOTLIGHT ON RIGHTS, OBLIGATIONS OF OLDER GROUP

To the EDITOR:

President Lyndon B. Johnson, like his predecessor John F. Kennedy, proclaimed the month of May as Senior Citizens Month. Since 1954, New York State Governors have done likewise.

May is the month in which people of all ages should be especially reminded of the Senior Citizens Charter which was adopted at the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. Here it is:

"RIGHTS

"Each of our senior citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, is entitled to:

"1. The right to be useful.

"2. The right to obtain employment based on merit.

"3. The right to freedom from want in old age.

"4. The right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources.

"5. The right to obtain decent housing suited to needs of later years.

"6. The right to the moral and financial support of one's family, so far as is consistent with the best interest of the family.

"7. The right to live independently, as one chooses.

"8. The right to live and die with dignity.

"9. The right of access to all knowledge as available on how to improve the later years of life.

"OBLIGATIONS

"The aging, by availing themselves of educational opportunities, should endeavor to assume the following obligations to the best of their ability:

"1. The obligation of each citizen to prepare himself to become and resolve to remain active, alert, capable, self-supporting, and useful so long as health and circumstances permit and to plan for ultimate retirement.

"2. The obligation to learn and apply sound principles of physical and mental health.

"3. The obligation to seek and develop potential avenues of service in the years after retirement.

"4. The obligation to make available the benefits of his experience and knowledge.

"5. The obligation to endeavor to make himself adaptable to the changes added years will bring.

"6. The obligation to attempt to maintain such relationships with family, neighbors, and friends as will make him a respected and valued counselor throughout his later years."

(Reprinted from the April issue of Senior Citizens News, monthly paper of the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

The Senior Citizens Club of Crompond at its latest meeting adopted this charter as a guide to its activities, and urges all other senior citizens' groups in Westchester County to do likewise.

May is the month in which community newspapers, radio and television stations should devote special space or time to news of senior citizens' affairs. A month is which newspapers should carry special editorials on this subject. A month in which broadcast media should schedule special interview programs expressing the views of senior citizens in their community. A month in which senior citizens should write to their local newspapers to express their views on important topics of community and national interest. A month in which mayors, supervisors or other local civic heads should meet with a delegation of senior citizens, invite the press and make a ceremony of it. A month in which local school authorities should encourage schoolchildren to devise special projects to honor their grandparents.

Honor thy father and thy mother. Honor all senior citizens.

PAUL LEITH,
Chairman,
Senior Citizens Club of Crompond.

Mr. R. V. Tidwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding American passed from our midst on May 2, 1964.

Mr. R. V. Tidwell, of Graham, Tex., was a pioneer citizen of north Texas. He was a man loved and respected by all who knew him. His life was dedicated to serving his fellow man. I am very proud to have known him as a friend.

The official publication of the Rotary Club of Graham, Tex., the Scandal Sheet, carried a fine tribute to Mr. Tidwell in the May 15 issue.

The tribute follows:

R. V. TIDWELL, OCTOBER 10, 1879–MAY 2, 1964

It is with extreme sorrow that we pause to record the death of our fellow Rotarian and friend, R. V. Tidwell.

"Virgil" was a good man. He probably did far more for Graham and the people of this area than most of us.

He became a member of the Rotary Club of Graham, Tex., in June 1940 and served with distinction as our president in 1943–44. A stanch supporter of the Rotary Foundation, he was our largest contributor. His annual programs, masterpieces of logic, commonsense, and homespun philosophy were always eagerly looked forward to by our club and the other clubs of Graham.

A pioneer citizen and longtime president of the Graham National Bank, we often called him our "philosopher banker." He was a banker among bankers, kind, quiet, thoughtful, he was a friend to everyone from the highest to the lowest. They all loved and respected him and under his leadership his bank grew and prospered to the magnificent institution it is today.

Here truly was a man in every sense of the word: a devoted husband and father, outstanding citizen, stanch churchman, loyal American. The life of R. Virgil Tidwell will remain carved indelibly on the hearts of everyone who knew him. What he has done will forever affect the future of his community and its citizens.

Resolution of Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Students of Fremont High School in Sunnyvale, Calif., have enlisted my cooperation in paying an unusual tribute to an outstanding student, who will graduate during the month of June from that school. This young man is named Owen Whetzel.

It has been my pleasure to know Owen personally and to observe his many unselfish actions taken in behalf of his classmates and his country. The resolution which was recently passed by the Fremont High School student body is an eloquent statement of the fine accomplishments of Owen Whetzel and I shall not attempt to elaborate on it. It is a pleasure to assist in honoring this young man by inserting the resolution passed by the Fremont High School student body into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Whereas the Fremont High School Associated Student Body wishes to show its appreciation and gratitude to Owen Whetzel for his outstanding contributions to our student body during his 4 years here; and

Whereas Owen has demonstrated exceptional leadership ability in student government throughout his 4 years at Fremont, culminating with his service as student body president; and

Whereas for 3 years, Owen was chairman of the youth-for-hope program, hospital ship SS *Hope* project. Through his efforts, over $9,000 was contributed to this charity. His work in this field resulted in a statewide program for high school students to assist in further fundraising for the SS *Hope* in California; and

Whereas while his interests were also extended into the speech field, he became a leading member in the National Forensic League from the many top honors he received in debate, impromptu and extemporaneous speaking and at Student Congress. These honors brought recognition to our school.

Therefore the students of Fremont High School, wishing to express their gratitude to Owen Whetzel for the honors he has bestowed upon Fremont through his efforts and leadership, have wholeheartedly endorsed this resolution of appreciation.

FREMONT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT BODY,
JERALD HALEY.

Newark—A Climate for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a business or industrial firm, like an individual, is expected to practice good citizenship, to be a responsible member of the community. Recently the subject of corporate citizenship was discussed in an article in the Realtor, official publication of the Real Estate Board of Newark, Irvington and Hillside, North, in New Jersey. The comments of Mr. David Kislak, a prominent New Jersey realtor, I am certain, will be of interest to many and I include them in the RECORD.

The article follows:

NEWARK—A CLIMATE FOR PROGRESS

(By David Kislak)

What makes a city great?

The answer, of course, is very complex. Greatness in a city arises out of so many factors. It involves such things as location, natural resources, transportation facilities, proximity to markets, and the like. We all know about such things; they are part of our everyday working vocabulary.

As realtors, therefore, we're well aware of Newark's many unique advantages. At the same time, however, we're also aware of some of its problems.

Certainly, Newark is not unique among cities in that it faces certain fiscal problems. Again, Newark is not unique in that it faces problems arising out of a changing population during a period of transition. Traffic problems are not unique to Newark, either.

We're not even unique in the fact that so many of our business and professional people do not live and vote in the community in which they work.

Since I came to Newark, I have given a great deal of thought to these problems. I've tried to analyze cause and effect. Some people, I've found, appear to take some perverse pleasure in voicing only the most pessimistic view of the city's future. As for myself, I've weighed the pros and cons, and I say that for my organization, Newark is great.

Moving our headquarters to Newark about 3 years ago was a major decision for us. It meant leaving the county where our business was started, and where we had been located for 55 years. It also involved our making a tremendous investment in an old long-vacant building which we had to rehabilitate completely.

But even before we came here, we had confidence in Newark. We felt strongly then, and believe even more strongly now, that Newark's many pros far outweigh the cons.

We were confident that in Newark we would thrive as an integral part of the industrial, financial, commercial hub of the State. That confidence was not misplaced.

In less than 3 years, our organization has doubled its personnel, and we have also doubled our business volume. With Newark as our headquarters, we have branched out into new offices in New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Del.; and Newport News, Va. We are continuing to look even further afield for expansion of our activities. But we are satisfied that our headquarters office will remain in Newark.

There's a vastly important ingredient in Newark's greatness. It is the attitude of Newark's business community, and the confidence that business leaders have displayed in the future of the city. All around us we may see evidences of the very substantial investments they have made here. Their confidence is based on the certainty that the city can be preserved and that it will progress and prosper.

Personally, I have found it very gratifying to join hands with other members of the business community. These leaders do more than build buildings. They accept more than their fair share of responsibility for the welfare of the people of the city. The Kislak organization has thrived here and it is our philosophy, too, that we owe a debt to the community.

Our gratitude has found expression in many ways, notably in our work for charitable causes such as the United Appeals and other drives. On the cultural side, we've supported projects such as the concerts of the New Jersey Symphony. Even though many members of my organization live outside of the city, they feel the responsibility to support many charitable and cultural endeavors.

From a strictly "dollars and cents" business point of view, when one considers the time and effort involved in projects such as the sale and development of the Newark Academy site, and the distribution center on the meadowlands, it may not be the most profitable way for a realtor to spend his time. But if the city is to be preserved and is to grow, it requires just this kind of effort on the part of everyone equipped to do it.

If realtors, who have the experience and the ability to plan for this kind of growth, won't do it, who will?

What I'm getting at is just this: Newark can be a great city. We realtors can make it great.

Warehouseman Replies to Comptroller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29 there appears a letter from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, to one of my colleagues, Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois. This letter explains the general policy of the Government to act as self-insurer of its property.

Thereafter, I received an ably reasoned letter from a friend of mine in Texas, Mr. Al Reed, pointing out among other things that there are difficulties in the way of the Government becoming a self-insurer of property which it does not

own. Specifically, where the Government holds cotton as loan collateral, it appears that some strict State laws impose liability upon the warehouseman, as a bailee-for-hire. This makes it necessary for the warehouseman to cover his liability by carrying insurance. I hope that the Comptroller General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other affected Government officials give Mr. Reed's letter the careful attention it deserves.

The letter follows:

MAY 11, 1964.

Re insurance on cotton deposited as collateral by a cotton farmer in order to obtain a Government loan (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD No. 84, pages A2144–A2145, Apr. 29, 1964).

HON. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: In your letter of April 24, 1964, to the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, of the House of Representatives, you state a factual assumption and on that basis reach an ultimate conclusion that the Government should assume the risk of the self-insurer on Government loan cotton. We believe your assumption is in error, and that you accordingly have reached a conclusion which is not supported by the facts. Your letter is being used in a way that might injure cotton warehousemen and the producers of cotton. We ask an opportunity to present the facts concerning insurance on Government loan cotton for your consideration. We shall present a brief summary of them in this letter. In addition we offer to appear before you or any other branch of the Government, interested in this subject matter, to establish the accuracy of our facts and the logic of our conclusions.

The assumption which we believe to be in error is as follows:

"It is logical to assume that very substantial additional savings would accrue to CCC if CCC were to assume the risk of loss on loan cotton also."

This assumption follows your statement that for the 5-year period (from 1958 to 1963) CCC estimated its savings, from assuming the risk on acquired cotton, as $3,569,575. The assumption that greater savings would result on loan cotton overlooks a vast amount of detailed facts which exist in the instance of loan cotton which are not present in the risk the Government assumes on acquired cotton. As a matter of fact it can be shown that the Government, on acquired cotton, assumes the minimum risk; but deducts from the warehousemen's revenue the insurance cost for the total risk which it does not wholly assume. The greater part of the insurance risk assumed by the insurance companies on a bale of cotton relates to the receiving and the shipping of the bale by the warehouse company. These two periods are called the "hot periods" of the insurance risk because experience shows that these two periods account for the greater part of the fire losses sustained in connection with the cotton. Insurance rates are based on the ratio of losses on insured bales to premiums paid. These conditions which exist during the hot periods are averaged with total conditions to arrive at the insurance premiums; but CCC assumes, on acquired cotton, only the minimum risk which exists while the cotton is held in dead storage in the warehouse facilities.

Although CCC does not assume the total risk, it nevertheless collects from the warehousemen the maximum insurance rate based on the total conditions involved in the receiving, handling, storage, and shipping of the bale of cotton. Hence CCC savings from insurance deductions on acquired cotton from the warehouseman's storage revenues greatly exceed the risk which it assumes. In order to understand why the situation would be different in connection with loan cotton it is necessary to consider the history of the warehouseman's negotiable insured warehouse receipt and the facts surrounding the handling of all cotton including loan cotton and acquired cotton.

HISTORY OF NEGOTIABLE INSURED WAREHOUSE RECEIPT

This receipt did not originate with the loan program. The first loan programs were handled under "Non-Insured Warehouse Receipts." The insured warehouse receipt resulted from a series of circumstances and events wholly unrelated to Government loan or acquired cotton. These events were directly related to the ownership of the cotton and the warehouseman's responsibility as a bailee-for-hire. Prior to the advent of the Government price support and loan programs the cotton merchants purchased from the insurance company a policy known as the cradle-to-the-grave coverage. (This policy is also used today by cotton merchants.) It insured the bale from the time title was acquired by the cotton merchant, usually at the gin, until delivery was effected to domestic mills or on board ship for exportation. This included the holding time in the warehouse awaiting sale. For many years prior to 1930 the cotton merchants carried the insurance on the cotton and the warehousemen generally carried only legal liability insurance. Legal liability insurance could be procured by the warehousemen at nominal costs. Then came the Cameron, Tex., and Jonesboro, Ark., fires. The insurance companies paid the merchants' losses under the cradle-to-the-grave policies and proceeded against the warehousemen under the subrogation clause of such policies and recovered the amount of their losses. The warehousemen in turn recovered from the insurance companies under their legal liability coverage. Thus, the insurance companies found that they were simply going through the maneuver of transferring their money from one place to another. As a final result, they increased the "legal liability" premium to where it equaled or exceeded the "specific" rate for the storage of cotton. Accordingly the warehouse industry gradually adopted the practice of issuing insured negotiable warehouse receipts. Generally, today, the warehousemen issue only insured warehouse receipts. Such receipts are and were issued at the normal tariff charges for receiving, handling, and storage of cotton. It was not an additional cost collected from the producers of cotton.

In other words, the insured warehouse receipt was not an added cost to the storage rate but that rate included the cost of insurance. There were, and are today, some exceptions where the insurance cost is stated separately.

Following the Cameron and Jonesboro fires an investigation covering all cotton-producing States was conducted by the warehouse industry which was used to support its negotiations with the insurance companies concerning the question of an insurable interest in a bale of cotton which was in the possession of a warehouse as a bailee-for-hire. Later the same study was used to support the claim of a warehouseman that if the Government canceled the insurance on acquired cotton it should protect the warehouse industry to the same extent that such industry would be protected under its insurance. (A copy of that brief as presented to CCC is inclosed with this letter.) The CCC, Counsel for the Department of Agriculture, and the Attorney General of the United States, supported our position that, if CCC deducted from the warehouse revenues the cost of insurance which the warehousemen had procured to protect their legal liability, it should afford the warehousemen the same protection they had under their insurance. Accordingly you will find in the acquired cotton contract a provision to that effect. This detailed statement on the insured negotiable warehouse receipt has been presented to show that such receipt is an absolute necessity of the warehouse industry.

The results which followed the cancellation of insurance on acquired cotton cannot possibly be obtained by cancellation of insurance on loan cotton. This is true for the reason that the insurance costs to the warehouseman on the same bale of cotton after it is introduced into the loan as collateral will not be reduced by such cancellation but such insurance costs will more than likely be increased as a result of the cancellation suggested in your letter.

There will be nothing to deduct from the warehousemen's revenues to be classified as savings by the CCC. In order to understand why this is true it is necessary to understand the function and the relationship of the Government loan in the marketing process of the producers' cotton. The loan was originated as a means of affording the producer an opportunity to market his cotton over a period of many months rather than to sell it on a distressed market at the time of gathering.

In warehouse operations there is no dead period in the handling of loan cotton, such as we find in connection with acquired cotton. The loan program is an important part of the marketing process of the producers' cotton. The warehouse is an integral part of that marketing process. The record shows for a period of 30 years, during which there were loan programs, the following facts:

1. Cotton production (1933–62), 381,455,000 bales.

2. Introduced into the loan by the producer during that same period, 87,857,000 bales.

(a) Only 23 percent of production was handled through the loan by the producer.

3. Repossessed by the producers from the loan and sold into marketing channels, 39,826,000 bales.

(a) Forty-five percent of the loan cotton was repossessed by the producer and sold for the obvious reason that a higher price above the loan value was secured by such repossession.

4. Loans were foreclosed and title taken by CCC and the loan cotton became acquired cotton to the extent of 48,031,000 bales.

(a) Thus only 12.6 percent of the total production for the 30-year period became acquired cotton.

It should be quite clear that the assumption of the risk by CCC on the loan value would leave the warehousemen with an obligation to insure the producers' equity which he realized on 39,826,000 bales of redeemed cotton. The warehousemen could not cancel their insurance simply because the CCC assumed the risk on the loan value. This fact, however, is not the most important one which should be considered. It is obvious from the above figures that the loan cotton is constantly being handled and rehandled, by the warehousemen. It is not a dead, immobile stock of cotton to the same extent as we find in connection with acquired cotton. All cotton is received by the warehousemen without knowledge as to how it will be marketed by the producer.

Attention is called to the fact that 77 percent of the production was marketed independently of the loan. Only 23 percent entered the loan and 45 percent of that quantity was repossessed by the producer and sold into normal marketing channels. (Less than 13 percent was acquired by CCC.)

It is an established fact that when cotton is first received by the warehouse it is exposed to its greatest danger from destruction by fire—fire-packed bales from gins (this means that without the knowledge of the ginner a smoldering fire is packed inside the bale of cotton) and many other such

fire hazards. When it is reworked, after entering the loan, for sampling, reweighing or shipment, it enters another so-called hot period. Now, if you will investigate and consider the three well-known facts involved in the handling of all cotton—the two hot periods, the short holding time prior to introduction into the loan, and after redemption from the loan or sale by CCC—we feel sure that your conclusion will be that the warehousemen cannot procure insurance at anything approximating the present cost of insurance.

As of the end of March 1964 (the most recent data available), there were in public storage 14,744,654 bales of cotton. 5,173,064 bales (35 percent) were owned by CCC. The remaining 65 percent was covered by insured warehouse receipts. Had insurance been cancelled on the 6,804,806 bales held in loan status (46 percent), the volume available for insurance (2,766,784 bales) would be only 19 percent. Thus we find the warehouse industry in the position of being forced to obtain insurance on 100 percent of the cotton for the two hot periods and left with only 19 percent of the volume during dead storage, the low risk period. The 19 percent figure, for the end of each of the past 5 cotton seasons, would be respectively 6.3 percent; 14.7 percent; 68.4 percent; 22.9 percent; and 10.1 percent. We are sure you know that insurance rates are based on averages. The suggestion that insurance on cotton during its loan status be cancelled would create an 80 percent bad risk upon which to base the warehousemen's insurance rates. In some instances this, as shown above, would be more than 90 percent bad risk period. It is not logical to assume that the warehouse industry can obtain the same insurance rate under a high average bad risk as would be obtained with a low average of such risks. The insurance companies, while this matter was pending before CCC, informed us that they would not cover the two hot periods for the same rate that they now charge for average of the total time the cotton is in possession of the warehousemen. We quote from a typical notice of one of the principal cotton insurance underwriters:

"Cotton rates are based upon premium-loss ratio of private warehouses. If the CCC leaves the private underwriter with the hazard of freshly ginned cotton prior to loan acceptance and the danger of "break out" fires when cotton is released from acquired stocks, the limited premium and increased losses may well result in increased rates. The CCC would subtract the increased "insurance charge" from its payments, so you would be paying increased rates on every bale of cotton in the warehouse."

If CCC should cancel the insurance for the period the cotton was in the loan it would leave the insurance companies with the burden of the greater losses and the warehousemen with increased insurance costs. In addition, the warehousemen, for the reasons shown in the brief inclosed, would have to carry insurance on the farmers' equity while the bale is under loan status. The insured warehouse receipt was born of the warehousemen's legal liability and in the case of the loan cotton those liabilities never cease until the cotton becomes acquired by the Government. Such liabilities cease then because the Government has guaranteed to hold the warehousemen safe from loss in consideration of the insurance premium it deducts from the warehousemen's revenue for storing the acquired cotton. Here CCC assumes the minimum risk because the two hot periods are covered by the insurance of the warehousemen covering all cotton not just loan cotton. It should be remembered that when acquired cotton is sold by CCC it immediately returns to its insured status for the benefit of the holder of the insured negotiable warehouse receipt originally issued to cover the cotton before it became either loan or acquired cotton.

The Government cannot become a self-insurer of property which it does not own. It does not have title to the producers' cotton while it is in the loan. So long as the loan status exists the warehousemen are confronted with the necessity of carrying insurance covering their liabilities as a bailee-for-hire. There could not possibly be any savings to deduct from the revenues of the warehousemen to accrue to the CCC in connection with loan cotton.

We hope you will reconsider our difficulties and responsibilities in connection with this matter. We stand ready to appear before you or anyone else to prove the accuracy of these facts and the logic of our conclusions.

Respectfully submitted.

A. L. REED.

Address by Mr. Thomas W. Martin Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 Alabamians took great pride in commemorating the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, which was of profound significance in the development of this Nation.

This battleground in Tallapoosa County, Ala., became a national military park in 1956, by the long and tireless efforts of many of us but none of whom worked with more dedication than Mr. Thomas W. Martin, a former president of the Alabama Power Co. which donated the land for this historic park. Mr. Martin is also one of our State's leading citizens and scholars and I would like for my colleagues to read the very fine address which he delivered on March 27, 1964, 150 years after the great battle at which Andrew Jackson crushed the Creek Nation and opened the Southeast to American colonization.

Following is Mr. Martin's address:

ADDRESS BY MR. THOMAS W. MARTIN

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cox, Regional Director, National Park Service, Governor Wallace, Congressman Rains, Mr. Hambly, Acting Superintendent of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, and the thousands of distinguished citizens of Alabama who are here today, thank you, Mr. Chairman. In behalf of our association, permit me to express first to Mr. Cox and Mr. Clarence Johnson, and others of the National Park Service, our appreciation of this opportunity to appear, and also for the very effective work they are carrying out to more clearly mark and define the battleground area.

It was with great satisfaction that we were advised by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on August 3, 1956, that he had approved H.R. 11766; being the act which provided for the establishment of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. Many prior efforts had been made to have the battleground thus recognized.

We are assembled today for the purpose of taking notice of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, and to dedicate the park.

In approving the act, President Eisenhower wrote me expressing his appreciation of "interest and support of this action giving national significance to the importance of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend on March 27, 1814."

You will recall that the land, 2,040 acres, was donated to, and accepted on behalf of the United States on April 24, 1959, by Secretary Seaton. It was my privilege to present the deeds to Secretary Seaton without cost to the United States.

Later, the President by his proclamation of August 11, 1959, found that the requirements of the act had been fully complied with, and by virtue of authority vested in him, he dedicated and set aside the 2,040 acres as a national military park. The letters from the President were presented recently to Mr. Clarence Johnson, superintendent of the park, for placement in the museum.

The Battle of Horseshoe Bend brought the Creek War to a victorious close just 33 years after Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown. It was the intention of England to impose terms and conditions of a treaty of peace of the War of 1812 which most certainly would have involved both the fate of the young United States in its second struggle against England, and the westward expansion of the Nation from the South. In addition, the battle gave little-known Andrew Jackson the national attention which launched him on his military and political way and set in motion the future Democratic Party.

The Battle of Horseshoe Bend has been the subject of many stories. At the beginning of the effort of this association, we requested Mr. William H. Brantley, Jr., noted historian of Alabama, and a trustees of the association, to prepare a history of the battle, which he did. This has been of great value in the work pursued by the association through the years.

Historians have long since agreed that the services of Andrew Jackson in the Creek war earned for him the appointment of major-general in the regular Army, and the command of Military District No. 7, with headquarters at Mobile. It was this which put him in command at the Battle of New Orleans and launched him into national life.

After the battle, General Jackson marched his troops to the confluence of the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, where on the ruins of old Fort Toulouse the French had built a fort more than a century before. This became Fort Jackson, and here the treaty of peace was signed on August 9, 1814 by General Jackson on behalf of the President of the United States and the few surviving chiefs of the Creek nation.

General Jackson then moved to Pensacola and Mobile, defeating attempts of the British to land at both places. The national significance of Jackson's victories was enhanced by evidence of their relation to the Treaty of Ghent, a factor more or less neglected in the years since the battles took place.

Representative RAINS introduced the bill in the House and Senators HILL and SPARKMAN introduced the bill in the Senate.

At a hearing on June 13, 1956, before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, and later before the Senate committee in July 1956, the argument for the battle as of national significance was presented. The views expressed on these occasions by Representative RAINS and myself were set forth in a narrative which we presented to the committee.

At a meeting on April 24, 1959, in the office of Mr. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, Congressman RAINS, acting as spokesman for the association, introduced those present who had been active in the effort to bring about the national military park. He then called upon me as chairman of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Association, explaining that I was also chairman of the board of Alabama Power Co., and that on behalf of the various groups I would present the deeds to the lands conveying the park area to the United States.

Later on the same day, April 24, 1959, a luncheon was held on the invitation of Congressman ALBERT RAINS, at the dining room of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The chairman presented me, explaining that I had made a study of this subject at London, and it was reviewed at some length.

As stated before, the park as defined by the President's proclamation contained 2,040 acres. Embraced in this area is the so-called Horseshoe, in which the Creek Indians assembled and barricaded themselves for their forthcoming battle with Andrew Jackson on the 27th of March 1814.

Some decades ago, part of this area, including the Horseshoe, was acquired by Alabama Power Co. in connection with a proposed hydroelectric development downstream from the Horseshoe. This development was not carried out, because Chief Engineer Thurlow and I, when we visited the area in 1923, concluded that the battle area should remain in its natural state, in the hope that at some time the national significance of the battle would be recognized, and its military and its civic importance declared by act of Congress. Later Alabama Power Co. requested the Federal Power Commission to cancel its license.

At Horseshoe Bend I made a note of our visit and the inscription on the monument which had been erected, and on my return placed the note in volume I of Colyar's "History of Andrew Jackson." I did not examine the memorandum for over 30 years, and then only after we had organized the association to present the subject to Congress. Colyar's history made the very full and positive statement that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and others had been known to the English and to their peace commissioners and were most helpful in the making of the treaty of peace at Ghent.

On this occasion it does not seem appropriate to go into the details of the diplomatic history having to do with the Treaty of Ghent. I should like to say however, that following the introduction of the bill, the association caused an extensive study to be made at the British Public Record Office, the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office, the War Office, and the British Museum, all at London, of the correspondence between the American and British peace commissioners at Ghent and between the British commissioners and the British Foreign Office, during the period of negotiation—that is, August through December 1814.

For this purpose we engaged the service of a British historian, Miss Vera Ledger, to examine available records. This work began in 1956 and carried through more than 18 months. Over 1,200 pages of manuscript were sent to the association, from which it was clearly apparent that between the first meeting of the peace commissioners in August of 1814 and the final meeting which resulted in the treaty of peace on December 24, 1814, the British attitude markedly changed. Thus the conclusions of Colyar were confirmed. It is clear that Lord Castlereagh and others of the British Foreign Office were deeply concerned with the effect of several military defeats the British suffered, and more particularly with the effect of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and of General Jackson's successes at Fort Bowyer at Mobile, and at Pensacola during that period.

When Jackson learned the British were concentrating upon New Orleans and realized that he did not have a sufficient army to protect that city, he ordered Carroll, who was raising troops in Tennessee, to go down the river to New Orleans. He also ordered Coffee to cross the country and reach New Orleans as soon as possible.

The subsequent victory there was one of the notable ones of American history, even though it occurred after the treaty of peace had been signed, but before it was ratified by the U.S. Senate.

At the conclusion of the treaty of peace, the hope was expressed by John Adams, one of our most distinguished peace commissioners, that "it would be the last treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States." Peace has endured between these nations for 150 years.

Had General Jackson not subdued the Creeks at the Horseshoe, and had he not repulsed the British at Mobile and at Pensacola, thereby pacifying the southern country and giving reassurance to the people of Tennessee, he could never have recruited an army for the defense of New Orleans, and that place most certainly would have fallen. And if the British had captured New Orleans they would have found ready excuse to hold the entire Mississippi area, since their contention was that France had never obtained clear title to Louisiana from Spain and therefore could not cede it to the United States.

There have been few men privileged to have so dramatic and important a part in the life of our country as Andrew Jackson—first at Horseshoe Bend and later at the battles of Mobile and Pensacola, followed by the great victory over the British at New Orleans, January 8, 1815. And again when Andrew Jackson, as President, on April 13, 1830, attended the annual Jefferson Day dinner, he was called on for a toast. And well may we recall it: "Our Federal Union—it must be preserved." That occasion lives in history, for Jackson's patriotic words. He preserved the Federal Union from dismemberment at the hands of Great Britain and her Indian allies long before the issues of that day provoked this toast.

When General Jackson came into the picture, he had in view not only the termination of the Creek War, but an end to the struggle for what are now parts of Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi, by cutting off the Creeks from contact with the British and the Spanish. He well knew that the Creek War had been prompted and supported by the British as a major part of the War of 1812.

Among the Cherokees who fought in Jackson's army were Chief Junaluska and Sequoyah. Sequoyah was to distinguish himself as the inventor of the Cherokee alphabet, by which the Cherokee Nation became the first American Indians to have a written language, and for whom the great trees of the West were named.

It was by reason of the now yellowed note in the Colyar book, placed there by me after my visit to the battle site in 1923, and my reexamination of the book 33 years later, that the very significant additional material having to do with the battle's effect on the Treaty of Ghent came to light.

The original terms of the British included demand for the surrender of the Louisiana Purchase, the perpetual use of the Mississippi River by the British, the outright cession by the United States for a permanent Indian territory and of areas including what are today all or parts of the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Missouri, and North and South Dakota. It would have been dismemberment of the great nation ours was destined to be. Both American and British were to be barred forever from purchasing land in the area, although the Indians might sell to others. Thus it was hoped to halt the transcontinental expansion of the American people.

The five-man American treaty commission consisting of Henry Clay, John Quincy Adams, Jonathan Russell, J. A. Bayard, and Albert Gallatin, represented the most experienced and distinguished public men of the time. This commission is probably unsurpassed in the history of American diplomatic relations. They met the English commissioners for the first time at the Hotel des Pays Bas in Ghent on August 8, 1814.

Discussions continued between the commissioners of the two States until December 1814. Meanwhile the diplomatic records show that the British commissioners gave up many of their farreaching demands, and the treaty which was signed had been prepared by the American Commission.

Perhaps there were reasons not known to the Commissioners why the British felt that they would be able to destroy the treaty by sending soldiers and ships around Florida to New Orleans.

The evening of the 24th of December 1814 the Commissioners of the two states met at the house of the British Commission for the purpose of attaching their names to the treaty. It was signed in triplicate, the British Commissioners furnishing three copies and the American Commissioners furnishing three. These were signed and exchanged; Lord Gambier delivering the three British copies to Adams, and Adams in turn delivering the three American copies to Lord Gambier.

Much has transpired since 1815, and our country and Great Britain have been associated in many efforts for world peace. Nothing has transpired to disturb this relationship since the Treaty of Ghent—it did indeed prove to be the last treaty of peace between these great nations.

The Battle fo New Orleans, fought January 8, 1815, was one of the most brilliant defensive victories in history. Some historians have classed it as a needless victory in that it was fought after the treaty of peace was signed. That is an error, for the peace treaty, signed by the Commissioners of the two states provided that it should not be effective until ratified by both states. The news of the victory at New Orleans came at a critical time in the history of the country and was followed by the ratification of the treaty by the United States Senate February 17, 1815. It settled forever all question as to the title of the United States to Louisiana.

In Sir Winston Churchill's "History of the English-Speaking Peoples," volume 3, he discusses the War of 1812. He notes that the British in the spring of 1814 (pp. 363–364) proposed to strike in the South, at New Orleans. "In December," he says, "the last and most irresponsible British onslaught, the expedition to New Orleans, reached its base. But here in the frontier lands of the Southwest a military leader of high quality had appeared in the person of Andrew Jackson.

"Meanwhile 8,000 British troops had landed at New Orleans under Sir Edward Pakenham, who had commanded a division at Salamanca." Sir Winston then notes that Jackson hastened back from Florida "and entrenched himself on the left bank of the river. His forces were much inferior in numbers, but composed of highly skilled marksmen. On the morning of January 8, 1815, Pakenham led a frontal assault against the American earthworks—one of the most unintelligent maneuvers in the history of British warfare. Here he was slain and two thousand of his troops were killed or wounded. The only surviving general officer withdrew the army to its transports. The Americans lost 70 men, 13 of them killed. The battle had lasted precisely half an hour."

Mrs. Sadie Mitchell Elmore (Mrs. Franklin Harper Elmore) of Montgomery, and Dr. Fern Wood Mitchell, her nephew, have recently made an important gift to the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park museum consisting of the "Whale" rifle. The rifle bears this much-worn engraved inscription on a silver plate: "Presented by J. Madison, President of the United States to Whale, the reward of signal valor and heroism, at the Battle of the Horse Shoe. March 1812."

It was in 1813–14 when General Jackson was recruiting his army for the attack on the Creeks, that several Cherokee Indians volunteered to enlist a company of Cherokees in General Jackson's army. These included Cherokee leaders of the time, such as Sequoyah and Whale.

Much has been written of Sequoyah and the part he played at Horseshoe Bend and later as the inventor of the Cherokee alphabet; but very little has been written about Whale and other chieftains of the Cherokee tribe who took part in the battle.

As the battle began at Horseshoe, General Coffee with a detachment of Cherokees and volunteers from Tennessee and Georgia, crossed the river below the fort so as to surround the enemy and prevent their escape in their canoes, which they had assembled below the fort. But General Coffee decided that these canoes should be taken from their moorings; and Whale, a Cherokee warrior of great bravery, and two companions swam the river and captured several of the Creek canoes. The heroism and valor of the Cherokees was so striking that it was made the subject of a special report by General Coffee.

After the war, the President presented rifles to the Cherokees, including Whale.

In after years, the Whale rifle came into the ownership of the late Colonel Reuben A. Mitchell, who was for many years an officer of Alabama Power Co. On his death in 1937 it passed into the possession of his daughter, Mrs. Elmore, and his grandson, Dr. Fern Wood Mitchell. By letter of August 22, 1956, Mrs. Elmore and Dr. Mitchell delivered the rifle to Dr. Brannon, Director of the Department of Archives and History of the State of Alabama, as the custodian pending the erection of a museum at the Horseshoe Bend Battle site. Dr. Brannon has since turned the rifle over to the museum at the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.

"It was the hope of my father," said Mrs. Elmore, "that a national park would be established at this site. He thought that the battle had far greater national significance than had been recognized by historians generally, and I am glad of the opportunity to present this rifle in memory of my father."

The victory over the British at New Orleans was the turning point in the most critical part of American history. The Creek campaign, the victory at Mobile Bay, and the victory at Pensacola, made the victory at New Orleans possible by Tennessee soldiers.

The Creek, Fort Bowyer, and Pensacola campaigns and the Battle of New Orleans proved Jackson's extraordinary military capacity. Historians have described Jackson as the most forceful natural leader in American history. None other possessed in such abundant quality the will to win. What he may have lacked in military training and study he compensated for in the most ample fashion in his ability to impart resolution and his own dominant spirit to his followers.

After the British had been driven from Louisiana soil, General Jackson prepared an address to be read at the head of each command, which contained these words: "Let us be grateful to the God of battles, who has directed the arrows of indignation against our invaders, while he covered with his protecting shield the brave defenders of their country."

And General Jackson proposed that there should be a day of prayer for the success of the armies in deliverance of New Orleans from the invaders. This was held on January 23, 1815, in the Cathedral in New Orleans.

General Jackson, his gallant officers and his troops, although loaded with earthly honors and greeted with the acclamations of a grateful and protected people, did not omit to render that homage which is due to that Almighty Being who "reigns in the armies of heaven above, as well as in the earth beneath."

Upon this occasion the Reverend Dr. Dubourg, the minister apostolic of the diocese of Louisiana, delivered to the general an address replete with the pious effusions of the Christian.

The venerable minister of the gospel thus addressed the hero of New Orleans, and the gallant officers and soldiers who had followed him to victory, and now joined him in adoration; "General, while the State of Louisiana, in the joyful transports of her gratitude, hails you as her deliverer and the asserter of her menaced liberties * * * while thus raised by universal acclamation to the very pinnacle of fame, how easy it had been for you, General, to forget the Prime Mover of your wonderful successes, and to assume to yourself a praise which must essentially return to that excellent source whence every merit is derived. But, better acquainted with the nature of true glory, and in approving yourself the worthy instrument of heaven's merciful design, the first impulse of your religious heart was to acknowledge the interposition of providence, your first step a solemn display of your humble sense of His favors."

What was Andrew Jackson, and what did he do, that he should receive such honors while living, and, when dead, should gather a nation around his tomb? What was he? He was the embodiment of the true spirit of the Nation in which he lived. What did he do? He put himself at the head of the great movement of the age in which he lived.

And Andrew Jackson—what of him? Born to command and destined to rise—no pen can fairly record the course of this man. Let it here be said that he won the love and confidence of the people west of the Appalachians by his leadership at the Horseshoe, that he justified this trust at the Battle of New Orleans, and when his troops there defeated General Pakenham's army which had been trained for years in mighty encounters in Europe, he, Jackson, settled finally the course of the United States—that this country would be American and not Indian nor British.

In Alabama Andrew Jackson cast the longest and strongest shadow of any public man ever to serve her interest, for he earned and kept the love and admiration of her people even unto this day. The people of no State in this Union ever served him more loyally or revered him more deeply than the people of Alabama.

Thus you will see that the history of this part of American life is a record of great achievement, in warfare, and in diplomacy, in the face of almost impossible odds. It is a record filled with achievements too long obscured; it is filled with high drama and difficult decisions; with bravery and with tragedy; with incidents which only through this occasion could be brought to light. Here we see hope revived in certain parts of our Nation by events in the southeast, then a remote area; soon to be followed by conquest of wild areas and the settlement of a great part of our continent.

They helped the Nation at a vital and important time to reestablish its sense of identity and purpose to become "earth's great place in earth's great time."

The Pentagon Helps Its Layoffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph R. Slevin which appeared in the May 12, 1964, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

Secretary McNamara is to be highly commended for the excellent program being established by the Department of Defense to seek out a new job for each permanent employee who is laid off as a result of the current closing down of unneeded military installations. I hope it will work.

The article follows:

PENTAGON HELPS ITS LAYOFFS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—Late last year, the Army closed down a big west coast arsenal and 2,300 employees lost their jobs.

Some were white-collar workers. Most wore blue collars. An overwhelming majority had worked at the arsenal for many years. A large number owned their homes.

The closing of the west coast arsenal was a disturbing event that is being repeated at dozens of other military installations throughout the United States as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara presses his drive to lop off unneeded facilities. Navy yards, supply depots, air bases, Army camps, and repair and training centers are feeling the bite of the McNamara ax.

But there is a bright side.

The Defense Department is the biggest single employer in the United States with more than 1 million civilians working at more than 1,000 installations—and Mr. McNamara is trying to set an example that other employers will follow.

His program calls for searching out a new job for every permanent employee who is laid off. The west coast arsenal was one of the first big test cases and reports reaching the Pentagon give heartening reason to believe that the program will succeed.

The Defense Department placed 1,400 of the 2,300 employees in new jobs. Most still are working for the military but 79 were hired by other Federal agencies and 71 shifted to private companies.

Of the 900 people who were not placed close to 500 turned down a chance to move with their jobs to another facility in a different community. Another 400 retired, resigned, or died.

The west coast arsenal story is one of three such case histories that the Defense Department can point to. It had similar success in finding jobs for displaced workers at an east coast arsenal and at a facility in the Pacific Northwest.

A big inducement is a Department policy that calls for paying transportation and moving expenses for a worker and his family. If need be, the Department will retrain the worker, too.

"This is a very serious undertaking," a high-ranking Defense Department official declares. "This is the right thing to do. It goes far beyond the benefits in private industry. It is the most progressive program in the Federal Government. This is no window-dressing program."

It long has been Civil Service Commission policy to give job rehiring priority rights to a worker at Government offices within commuting distance of his home.

But the Defense Department now has gone far beyond that. There are 10 large civil service regions in the United States and any laid-off Defense Department worker now has rehiring rights within the full region.

"We even will place him in another region if that is necessary," the Defense official declares.

Orders from the Secretary of Defense's office spell out what the rehiring rights mean.

For one thing, active installations are forbidden to fill jobs from the outside so long as laid-off workers have not been taken care of. For another, no facility may promote one of its own employees into a vacancy unless he is better qualified than a laid-off worker.

The latest Pentagon move is to bring Mr. McNamara's favorite gadget—the computer—into the act. It is an experiment that covers the Chicago civil service region—a six-State

area embracing Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky.

There are 105,000 civilian employees at more than 70 installations within the Chicago region. All workers who are to be laid off are entered in the computer, with a full rundown of skills. A list of the job-seeking workers then is sent weekly to each facility.

"We think we can place most of these people in our own installations," an official says. "If the computer works the way we think it will, we can use it in each of the regions—or perhaps even nationwide."

Part IV—Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as can be seen from the following report on "Canal Zone Leadership in the Development of a Skilled and Productive Labor Force," which my constituent, Mr. Conrad R. Hilpert of Rockford, Ill., secured from the Chief of Public Relations of the Panama Canal Company, the United States is indeed a benefactor to the tiny nation of Panama, whose annual expenditures are far less than the annual benefits afforded them as a result of our presence in the Canal Zone:

CANAL ZONE LEADERSHIP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SKILLED AND PRODUCTIVE LABOR FORCE

(a) Diversity of skills: The Panama Canal Company-Canal Zone Government possesses a greater diversity of manpower than almost any other agency in the Federal Government. Over 15,000 employees, occupying more than 900 distinct job categories, are required to maintain and operate the canal, its supporting services, and its governmental functions. Approximately 11,000 of these employes are Panamanian citizens whose efficiency, productivity, and job skills are continuously being upgraded. During the past 4 years Panamanians employed in higher paid professional, technical, and administrative positions have increased from 141 to about 850 out of the 4,000 such jobs. In addition to being the largest single employment agency for Panamanians, the canal occupies the position of wage leader and pace setter—by training and example—for Panama's growing industrial labor force.

(b) Industrial training program (crafts): The Panama Canal in its drive to upgrade the skills of its Panamanian workers carries on extensive craft training programs. Twenty-five young Panamanians are hired each year to begin intensive 3 to 5 year apprenticeships in a variety of the electrical, machine, and metal and woodworking trades. Approximately 140 apprentices now receive both academic and carefully planned shop work so that full journeyman status and pay are awarded upon graduation. An increasing number of these highly trained craftsmen will find their way into Panama's growing industrial work force. In addition to apprentice training, the Panama Canal offers periodic refresher and special skills training programs to journeymen and others. Operating cost of the Industrial Training Branch and the apprentice program is approximately $136,000 annually.

(c) Other training: Continuous training is being carried out by the Panama Canal in such fields as heavy equipment operation, cargo handling, warehousing, merchandising and selling, clerical and administrative skills, fire-fighting, food handling, safety methods, etc. The canal's 1,500-man stevedoring force, for example, through training and rotational job assignments, is probably the most productive and best paid cargo handling force in Latin America.

(d) Panama's labor force: The effects of the canal's leadership in wage rates, job efficiency, and productivity can be clearly traced into Panama's work force as a whole. Panamanians, employed in Panama, are generally regarded to be the highest paid wage earners in Central America and, partly due to the training and example from the Canal Zone, Panamanian production per worker is one of the highest in Latin America. Panama's per capita gross national product in 1962 is estimated at $445, the highest in Central America and one of the highest in Latin America. Panama (population 1.1 million), with an estimated $500 million gross national product for 1962, is exceeded in gross national product only by Guatemala (population 4 million) and El Salvador (population 2.8 million). Additionally, due to the U.S. influence in the Canal Zone, the labor force of Panama City and Colon is largely bilingual. This is a great attraction to a potential investor in Panama, whether he is concerned with blueprints, instruction manuals, or needs a bilingual secretary.

(e) Technical personnel available to Panama: During emergencies or for special projects and studies, technical and professional employees in the Canal Zone provide Panama with expert counsel and guidance that would not otherwise be locally available. To cite an example, Panama maintains no meteorological service. Recently the Panama Canal's chief hydrographer and a senior geologist investigated and reported on earth tremors in the Chiriqui Province at the Republican's request.

4. Health benefits: Since the advent of its canal construction effort in 1904, the United States has provided the vigorous leadership and the enormous monetary investments required to conquer and control the numerous environmental health menaces on the isthmus. Today Panama enjoys one of the highest life expectancy rates in Latin America. Life expectancy in Panama is estimated at 62 years, compared to Costa Rica's 60 years, Colombia's 46 years, and Guatemala's 37 years.

(a) Public health and sanitation programs: The epic struggle to transform an area of tropical pestilence into a healthful environment still stands as a world-renowned triumph for the United States' early sanitation efforts on the isthmus. In addition to operating the water and sewer systems of Panama City and Colon for 50 years, the canal also performed street-cleaning and garbage disposal services for these cities. Between 1926 and 1955, the United States spent a total of $2,600,000 on these services to Panama. From 1904 to 1955, U.S. health offices and services were maintained in Colon and Panama City at a total cost of $9,200,000.

(1) The canal currently operates an extensive environmental sanitation program in the Canal Zone costing approximately $400,000 annually. Programs of insect and rodent control are carried on continuously and malaria has been all but eradicated from the populated areas in the Canal Zone. The canal's sanitation experts offer cooperation and consultation and training services to the Republic's sanitation authorities.

(2) Preventive medicine programs conducted in the Canal Zone in the fields of adult, school, and industrial health and immunization programs provide experience and support to Panama's health authorities, who are invited to observe these activities. The Canal Zone's support and leadership to Panama in her recent extensive polio immunization program and antituberculosis campaign typify this cooperation. Many thousands of dollars of medical care is provided to tubercular patients from Panama each year.

(3) The canal's quarantine service prevents the introduction, by ships, of human or animal diseases into the Canal Zone and the Republic. Panama's growing cattle industry has been protected to date from the dread hoof and mouth disease that has attacked most other areas of Latin America.

(b) Medical research and training programs: The Canal Zone Government maintains facilities and personnel for considerable research and training in the medical and veterinary sciences.

(1) Tropical and communicable disease research is carried on continuously to provide information on the early detection of health hazards and the development of preventive methods. The results achieved through the efforts are shared fully with Panama.

(2) In addition to its contributions to the beef and dairy industry, the Canal Zone's veterinary research program has yielded a great deal of knowledge recently concerning the menace of batborne rabies on the isthmus.

(3) Some of the finest physicians in the Republic received training or early experience in the world-famed Gorgas Hospital. Each year Gorgas Hospital graduates a small number of young Panamanians as fully qualified laboratory technologists. Canal Zone doctors and interns spend a considerable amount of their own time in Panama's outpatient clinics and in the interior regions combating epidemics and giving general medical aid. Laboratory and other medical equipment worth several thousands of dollars was donated to medical institutions in Panama last year.

Littleton's "Art" Trepanier: A Servant of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this year the Massachusetts Department of the Disabled American Veterans has been headed by one of the most devoted workers for the cause of our veterans I have ever known. Arthur H. Trepanier of Littleton has served with high distinction in his post. Arthur is a respected friend of mine and I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine article which appeared in the Lowell Sun on April 26 under the byline of Ralph J. Jacobs:

LITTLETON'S "ART" TREPANIER: A SERVANT OF PEOPLE

(By Ralph J. Jacobs)

LITTLETON.—It was June 1963. The place: Springfield, Mass. The occasion: The 42d Annual Convention of the DAV. Arthur Henry Trepanier was elected the new department commander.

A few days later in a letter from Washington, D.C., Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE said "The DAV made a wise choice, and I am confident that your leadership will guide the veterans to even greater accomplishments in their endeavors for the communities."

Congressman MORSE had good reason to express confidence in the new State commander. In Lowell, in 1962, Congressman MORSE was present when the commander, at that time Senior Vice Commander Trepanier, was honored by the Edith Nourse Rogers chapter, DAV, for his outstanding work during the annual forget-me-not drive. The proceeds from this annual fund raising drive are designated to aid needy disabled and hospitalized veterans.

Arthur Trepanier joined the DAV in 1945. Through the years he has been elected to a higher office, every year since. Of his work and accomplishments, probably no one could have expressed it better than did State Representative Chester H. Waterous when he said, "I know how many, many hours you have devoted to the DAV and related activities. While they have been pleasant hours for you, still, they meant real sacrifice at times and were certainly invaluable to the group itself."

Those many, many hours would make fascinating reading indeed. It would be a long story of a devoted veteran who has faced difficulty and challenge for the cause of the veterans, their widows, and their families. Although resolute and determined, in his tasks he is humble and gentle in success. And what a success. He is a past Golden Rodent of Dugout 303 Trench Rats of DAV; past commander, Minuteman chapter, DAV; past district commander, District 4, DAV.

In other organizations his success is again evident by his many accomplishments in past years. He is past commander, of the local American Legion post; past chef-de-gar, American Legion 40 & 8; past exalted ruler of Littleton-Westford Lodge of Elks; and past district deputy of Massachusetts East Central district, BPOE.

Mr. Trepanier is now serving his second 3-year term on the local planning board. He is an active member of the Holy Name Society and is now the secretary of the Republican Committee in Littleton.

The second of three children, Arthur is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Emile Trepanier, formerly of North Cambridge. Born in August 1919, he attended Our Lady of Pity High School in North Cambridge where he graduated in 1936. Even while Arthur attended high school he helped his parents through the long years of the depression. He worked for a grocery store, delivering groceries with a push cart.

In 1941, he was employed by the Hersey Sparling Meter Co. in Dedham. He has been an employee of the company for 23 years. Today he is a field engineer there.

Arthur entered the military service in February 1942. The Army recognized his administrative and leadership abilities almost immediately and sent him to the Army Administrative School at the University of Mississippi. Upon his return to Fort Devens and the 45th Infanty Division, although assigned to limited service, he was offered the chance to go to officers candidate school. He chose not to accept it, but remained in the Army until August 1945.

In November 1943, he married the former Alice Stowell, of Lowell. She was a nurse at North Reading. They had met in 1940. They now have two children. Lois Jane, 17, is a senior at Littleton High School, and James Francis, 10, is in the fifth grade of the Shattuck Street School.

After his discharge from the service, Arthur continued his education. On the GI bill of rights he attended night school, first at Wentworth Institute in Roxbury for 4 years and another year at Northeastern. To round out this engineering course he has also subscribed to an international correspondence course.

Among the commander's most pleasant memories during the 19 years he has served the DAV was his assignment as child welfare officer. He was also chairman of a supplemental drive for retarded children. On that committee he worked with the late Kay Furcolo, wife of Governor Furcolo.

Early in June this year, the commander will be honored at a testimonial dinner at a Boston hotel. Congressman MORSE is scheduled to deliver the major address there.

Among the many other dignitaries attending, the testimonial will be Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN. Congressman PHILBIN recently attended one of the many DAV functions here. In a letter to Commander Trepanier he says, in part: "I am extremely proud of you. You are making a magnificent, outstanding record of service to our disabled veterans and for the cause of the veteran."

Arthur Henry Trepanier, in his cause for the men who have served the profession of arms and their families, with his quality of imagination, and the vigor of his emotions, by virtue of his love, loyalty, and achievements, must long endure the plaudits of a grateful following.

Nathaniel Hawthorne and New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today in Plymouth, N.H., Nathaniel Hawthorne, one of the great figures of American literature, died.

Just a short while ago, I had the honor and privilege of participating in ceremonies at Nathaniel Hawthorne College in Antrim, N.H., at which a portrait of Hawthorne was presented to the college. This was a particular pleasure because this fine young college, with its bright promise for the future, helps keep alive the name of a distinguished American from the past. It was an even greater pleasure because the excellent portrait was painted by a friend of mine, the noted artist, John Sargent of Georges Mills, N.H.

In the May 14, 1964 issue of the Plymouth Record, published in that beautiful New Hampshire community every week, a column by Leon M. Huntress discusses Nathaniel Hawthorne on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his death. Mr. Huntress, who writes regularly for the Plymouth Record, does an excellent job of capturing the spirit of the man and his associations with New Hampshire.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 100th anniversary of Nathaniel Hawthorne's death, it seems appropriate to ask that this column by Leon M. Huntress be made a part of the RECORD:

FROM THE SIDE OF THE ROAD

(By Leon M. Huntress)

In the early morning of May 19, 1864, an event happened in Plymouth upon which we might reflect when the 100th anniversary of its occurrence appears on the calendar next Tuesday.

Nathaniel Hawthorne—one of the truly great figures in American literature—had passed away at the Pemigewasset House.

This community had served him well in his early days before his genius blossomed into full expression, for here he came to spend much time for several summers for rest, recreation and inspiration. From here he set out on many trips tramping through the mountains and returning to our midst to record many of his impressions. There is no record available, but who would not say that there is reason to believe that his immortal "The Great Stone Face" might have been put in final form in this town?

Mr. Hawthorne was born in Salem, Mass., on the 4th of July, 1804. His father was a sea captain, making long trips to the East and West Indies, South America, and Africa. He died of a fever in far away Surinam in 1808, leaving a wife and three children of whom Nathaniel was the second. Then ensued one of those cruel forms of mourning by the widow which occasionally manifested itself in days gone by. The mother removed the family to the home of her father, and shut herself off from the world, denying even the children the right to have converse with her. Her meals had to be left unattended on a tray before her locked bedroom door as she mourned in silence for many years.

Obviously, this mood would be reflected in the young boy and as he grew into adolescence, he took refuge in solitude. He walked extensively, exchanging the narrow streets of Salem for the boundless, primeval wilderness. Through the kindness of an uncle, he was entered at Bowdoin College in the fall of 1821. On the stagecoach trip to Brunswick, Maine, he encountered another young man at Portsmouth who had just come across State from Hillsboro enroute to register as a student at the same college. This young man was Franklin Pierce who was to become—32 years later—the 14th President of the United States. A lifetime friendship developed between these two young men to terminate only in death, for Mr. Pierce had accompanied Mr. Hawthorne on his final trip to Plymouth. A third young man, from Portland, 3 years younger, was to join the group later in the day, as a freshman at Bowdoin. His name was Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

Hawthorne's college days were marked by his excellence in classical studies, his compositions being remarkable for their elegance. He made graceful translations from the Roman poets and wrote several English poems which were creditable to him. Graduating in 1825, he returned to Salem and to a life of isolation, devoting long hours to study and writing, emerging only at night for long walks along the rocky coast. He was scarcely known by sight to his townspeople, and had but slight communication with the other members of his family.

One of his early admirers was Sophia Peabody of the famous Peabody sisters, and they were married in 1842. They made themselves a home at the old manse at Concord, Mass., still standing near the famous bridge, where Mr. Hawthorne devoted himself diligently to literature. Financial returns were few, and the family was frightfully poor. Within 4 years, they were to return to Salem where Nathaniel received appointment as surveyor of the port—a government job which offered some security. During this time, he wrote little but studied much. With the change of administrations, he was out of work. But by that time, he was ready to start on the Scarlet Letter which was published in 1850. Any doubt of his genius was settled for all time by this powerful romance.

In 1852, the Hawthornes returned to Concord to move into the old house known then as now—The Wayside. Then were published "Twice Told Tales," "Tanglewood Tales," and many others known to students of American literature. He was induced to write a campaign biography for Mr. Pierce and when this New Hampshire man was elected President, he appointed his college friend as consul at Liverpool. The Hawthorne family spent 7 years in Europe on Government service and in extensive travel. Several months in Italy

produced the delightful "Italian Note Book" and the elaborate work "The Marble Faun." Hawthorne returned to The Wayside in 1860 but as he sought to resume a former life, he wrote with a heavy heart. He was surrounded by the throes of a great civil war, and his friend ex-President Pierce was being stigmatized for his attitude on the slavery question. Mr. Hawthorne laid aside his pen and his health began to fail. Mrs. Hawthorne could not secure his permission to seek medical attention, but she did maneuver a visit by her husband and Mr. Pierce at the Boston office of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. The kindly physician saw that nothing could be done for his friend, but did suggest that a leisurely carriage ride through the New Hampshire hills might bring some comfort. The two friends took the train from Boston to Concord, N.H., where they hired a horse and buggy. The first night, they got to Tilton, the next day to Laconia, and the third night saw them at Center Harbor. On the evening of May 18, 1864, they arrived at the Pemigewasset House. Mr. Hawthorne was too weary to dine and so Mr. Pierce arranged for adjoining rooms. Mr. Hawthorne retired; when Mr. Pierce returned from the evening meal, his companion was quietly sleeping. The next morning, Mr. Pierce arose early but found that his friend had passed away.

Thus came to an end the earthly existence of a profound anatomist of the heart. He had worshiped conscience with his intellectual as well as his moral nature; it is supreme in all he wrote. He possessed the literary quality of style, a grace, a charm, a perfection of language which no other American writer ever possessed in the same degree.

On next Tuesday, a delegation from the Plymouth High School will place a wreath at the monument on the Village Common which earlier classes made possible a few years ago. May the rest of us pause for a moment to pay tribute to the man who loved this area and in his weariness of spirit and body, was content to enter his final sleep here on the banks of the old Pemigewasset, 100 years ago.

Pertinent Address Has Timely Significance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by Merle Lighton, author, of Twentynine Palms, Calif., at a board meeting of the Morongo Unified School District at Joshua Tree, on April 6, 1964. While these remarks are directed to one school district, they are applicable to every school district in the Nation and should be carefully considered by every school district. What is happening in the Morongo Unified School District at Joshua Tree, is happening in every school district. The radical leftwing people are trying to take over our school system, removing local control from the parents and placing it first in Sacramento; second in Washington, D.C., and ultimately, under United Nations control under UNESCO.

The address follows:

PERTINENT ADDRESS HAS TIMELY SIGNIFICANCE

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am taking the liberty tonight of assuming that every last one of us present loves this country.

I ask your indulgence to speak concerning what I know to be one of the most vital subjects now facing us in this Hi-Desert area—indeed, throughout the Nation—the subject of good sound American education which includes those in positions of responsibility for it. And I choose to speak of constitutional freedoms as they apply specifically at this moment here—not anemic "academic freedoms" as voiced by some of today's so-called intellectuals.

No matter the imperfections of this presentation, I believe the importance of what I shall mention holds greater significance at this particular time than any other we might consider.

Seldom have I chosen to read what I have to say to an audience but there is a time and place and reason for everything. I wrote this in the aftermath of the last school board meeting and I implore you to seriously weigh and act accordingly for the day is almost here when you may regretfully wish you had.

First, I shall tell you that I have reasons to believe we have a good school board and administration in this unified district and that I find considerable segments of efforts at the local level to compose a requiem for certain members, as such. Also that some of the segments responsible are not even subtle and they, including the subtle, appear to have little to no real comprehension of the danger to their own personal freedoms and those of their children in the immediate future of this Nation.

As I would hope all of us know, it has been in the offing these many years for the State to try to take over education completely and knock out school boards. I am speaking of the Nation as a state—and anyone who has not increasingly heard the term "Federal control of education" has, indeed, been out of touch. We now have that attempt more out in the open in the State of California, as a driving wedge—piecemeal as usual—a step at a time—divide and conquer. And the proposed accomplishing of this feat, entwined as it is with deceit, intrique, and mental sleight-of-hand innuendos now at both the top and grassroots levels, is just too much for even the average halfway honest person to understand even when that person makes an energetic and comprehensive study of it.

The sea of socialism-communism, or bureaucratic control if you favor the term, is so large that it would be foolish to think of paddling to shore without a compass. Upon this course, we are having more trouble among our own people from extreme need of Americanism and principles than with communism—such have Communists intended. And let me say right here that communism has had its proper soil to work in right from the start.

Communism is not defeating us. To put it quite truthfully we are, all over the Nation, defeating ourselves while communism merely takes up the slack. Anyone with an ounce of intelligence should know this.

He should also see that no President can save us—that it is only we the people who can do this right at grass roots—yet we the people passively await while some pray for a President who can take us out of this mess. No one man can do it. No one man could even start unless the people are prepared, willing, and already busy saving themselves. Might we not better pray for men by trying to set an example? It is a matter of personal integrity and honor. This is not just a personal opinion—the evidence is complete. All communism has to do is use the tools we supply. It is as simple as that. We have become selfish to the extent of not knowing when we are selfish and of not knowing the enemies of our freedoms. We have compounded our selfishness to the point where it so often seems the honest thing to be. I am speaking of the wrong kind of selfishness.

Shades of ancient Carthage. Shades of ancient Rome. Shades of any nation of a people mentally rotting, unknowingly, in its own satisfaction with no fighting spirit left. Would you care to ask the people of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Estonia, Yugoslavia, Poland, East Germany, Cuba, and those in the Soviet Union of slave states proper how what has happened to them?

I predict to you, and I have made a number of these in writing in the past 20 years, none having missed so far, that if or when local school boards and administrations are knocked out—and I use the word advisedly—and control goes to far off higher levels to keep company with progressive income tax and heaven only knows what all else, we here and people wherever it hapens, will remember with painful regrets when local school boards and administrations, especially the conservative ones, were much more to our liking than we had thought. And that is a minium statement.

We still have them here. They are not yet gone. You sit with them at this moment. Look at them well and think, for these individuals with whom you are acquainted comprise the local bulwark which can stand with you between your still innocent children and a bureaucratic teaching prepared to take them afar off to another mental state. Make no mistake about this—nor in how far removed from the Utopia of our own fathers' and forefathers' making. How difficult to stand with one foot in the future but for a moment and see where we are now headed.

This board you now look upon approved an Americanism program October 7, 1963. It was enthusiastically accepted by the administration and members of the faculty and, I understand, is now getting underway for fuller effect. Mind you, this district is becoming more widely known for its general excellence in education.

In February of this year, some 4 months from the October 7 mentioned, I am directly informed three of these board members, including the one who presented the Americanism program, were named in a file for recall. This is electrifying to all decent people who realize something has to be very much amiss somewhere. Another member, so named, commands my own respect as few men have in this community, for his honesty, his forthrightness and his honest-to-God patriotism. The remaining man with whom I am less acquainted bears, in action, the earmarks of intelligence, and a third patriot.

Let us not permit ourselves to be unduly swayed by the simple age-worn maneuver of persuasion and evasion. Will we never get our eyes off the little bouncing ball as a decoy while the main objective of the moment is reached? It happens in Congress and State legislatures much of the time. Right now, one Jesse Unruh in the California Legislature is using the old parry and thrust gimmicks in preparation for dictated education in this State. He doesn't like what he calls "the status quo." So what does he propose? A gradual phasing out of school districts. Local people don't know what is best for them so all is to come gradually under centralized control at Sacramento. Does this sound familiar? Of course State aid is the enticement dangled on a string—and don't forget, the string is attached—to our money and a growing dictatorship supported by it. He would "permit" certain voluntary unifications under his plan until January 1, 1967. At that time, the State board of education

would have authority to compel unification of any nonunified areas. As I understand it, at the time of this writing, his less drastic proposal was passed out of the education committee without a fair hearing and sent to ways and means by a vote of 12 to 8.

This manner of doing things is one half-step removed from Washington. Increasing force from the top down—exactly opposite from the U.S. Constitution we like to think we still have—functioning. And what are the children to be more rapidly taught? Quit guessing. Collectivism. And in one corner of the schoolroom you could soon expect the U.N. flag—or rag as I call it.

Let's face it, the bureaucratic government entity in Washington does not intend that we shall run our own lives. And, as of now, most of our people show very little inclination to do so. Once Sacramento takes over education, do you think a locally lifted voice will get anywhere?

The farther away from home control our children's education originates, the less time remains for the Nation to sink into total slavery. It's a matter of instinctive observation and history bears this out. And I might add, we have plenty of room to worry—the influence of the enemy is not just 90 miles away. Would you like to step into what may well be your own future by going behind the Iron Curtain and getting the feel of the "progress" made?

If it should be thought some of these remarks are irrelevant to the subject, let me assure you they are quite pertinent. One of the most irritating factors in today's internal battles comes when a few chosen words are uttered without much effort in the wrong places at the wrong times and then others have to waste valuable time at a critical moment to offset the results. It is like someone setting a fire with a match that takes a fire department to bring under control. And, by the same token, many fires are set by the comparative innocent under more subtle direction.

All of us realize, I hope, that not one member of this board draws a salary of $75,000 for his presence here. Even if he drew any salary at all for his more or less thankless efforts, he would not be perfect. But room should be left to expect that members are trying to do their best for the community under varied conditions and that their total best way be far removed from busy unclear rumors—often rumors with an ulterior motive not recognized for its exact origin and very real primary purpose.

What is the real reason for this attempted recall and by whom? Is it to agitate and try to cause good people to make mistakes? Is it to start generating a dislike and distrust for board members in general? Is it to muddy the waters so something unseen can move in? How far afield do the links in the chain extend?

There can be and should be serious question here as to the precise reason, beyond known persons, for an attempted recall with rumors as to lack of faith accompanying a petition to pave the way. Who are the ones really trying to instill and perpetuate a lack of faith in these three? Who are in mind to take the place of board members in question? Is it fully realized that this is one way to get directly at the administration itself? Surely this effort is not intended to be a halfway measure. These are very important questions to consider, individually, before giving support to this stringent procedure. An even greater question of importance can be asked. Are all those in favor of our board and administration on vacation? Do they have false notions about what a few can do? A stitch in time can save years of labor but it can take only a moment to tear down the accomplishments. Such is the price of vigilance which reflects far more than a local issue—as I have indicated.

I am confident there is not one person in this room who has not been used or been the subject of an attempt to be used toward the intricate downfall of this country by way of false education. I use the word confident because I know it could not be other than a fact. A mere sample may be found in that few people are not subject to some sort of brainwash. Certainly we are all subject to influences, and in the case of bad ones, all the more where we don't know what is back of them. I have not made this strong enough. The Nation has been quite thoroughly brainwashed and still remains so.

The influence of rumors are of many kinds. It is like planting a seed. When planted in certain fertile ground it is apt to grow more prolifically. But who planted the seed in the first place? And where did the seed come from—originally?

What we need here in this district, as in the case of any other district, is to know what we are talking about before taking a chance upon helping to tear down the good that has been built up. Rumor and "attempted" assessments devoid of sufficient foundation teach us, in the long run, to be more careful. And I suggest that whoever is responsible for this attempt at recall, including those who participate, had better take a long hard look at the ground upon which they stand and at their own signatures they so freely give.

This Nation, at this very moment, is in a perilous plight. For a person, basically American, to say different is to show almost complete ignorance of the subject, including ignorance of his own relative position. Our plight could hardly be emphasized too strongly and the coming months will increasingly bear this out. From a growing preponderance of available information, including Government publications, it could not possibly be any other way.

There is no intent here to point a finger toward anyone present concerning loyalty to country and I will tell you why. Regardless of what may be each one's lack of information at the moment, I am quite serious in saying that well within a year and half from now, it is possible there may not be one person present but who, with many a regret for past blindness, will feel a strong surge of loyalty to the United States of America as a nation fighting for its sovereign life. I like to think of our people with such future loyalty in mind—a loyalty of action so sorely needed now. This does not mean I, personally, will not resent and resist many actions I believe to be born out of misinformation for I do not think in terms of waiting to be directed. I cannot afford to and neither can you.

Law means control—good or bad. If all of us knew one-tenth of what is actually already held in store for us for the decisive balance of this year and next, it would frighten every one of us into immediate action to stop dead in its tracks this profusion of unconstitutional bills from being passed into laws of the land. If we do not act, we face the prospect of either fighting in an entirely "different" atmosphere or sinking to the bottom through a now rapidly progressing slavery. If you think these strong statements are too extreme then consider how weak-kneed and weak-willed we have become.

An American education for children is the primary issue here. Any deviation of thought must or should return to it—though I fail to see how I have actually deviated from it at any point because of the grave importance of what children should be taught.

As stated in the beginning I have chosen to speak upon the subject of good sound American education which includes those in responsibility for it. I felt this necessitated three items to be touched upon for they are interlocked: this local issue of recall for most of the board members, the greater issue of attempt within the State to deprive local control and a statement of the overall issues at stake—mainly, our own selves where freedom is entirely dependent upon courage. Surely it is difficult to do these justice in so short a time. Actually, I am trying to give food for live thinking.

Let us look at our board members and administrative leaders, either present or absent, with children well in mind. If we think any one of them is letting our children down or is shirking moral responsibilities publicly accepted, then it behooves us to get adequate facts, both positive and negative before proceeding to further action. And it behooves us to attend school board meetings while we still have such opportunities and before making any unsubstantiated accusation which places us in a wrong light. Let us ask for an understandable answer from those responsible for an action or lack of action in question. Questions asked in honesty will, in my opinion, be answered with due regard. Let us stay with the honest American way of allowing the privilege of presenting one's position. Sometimes one is accused of another's past guilt and sometimes a greater guilt could just as easily be found with the accuser—or his supporters.

Recall of those whom we elect is a very serious matter. It is not even ethical in a constitutional republic unless there is traitorous evidence or almost complete lack of responsibility. Otherwise, it is bound to contain elements of involvement as sticky as fly paper before election time.

It behooves all of us to try and help—not hinder. The time is long overdue to seriously close ranks—it is not a time for groundless bickering as the middle of the road becomes a strange no man's land. Such tactics, as well as an obvious misrepresentation out of context, can have a lesser known familiarity.

A disappearing gnat in a hamburger sandwich, to a starving man caught deep in the desert, is no reason to throw the sandwich away. No—not six gnats. In fact, if he becomes angry and eats it, there is a big chance he may live to eat his dessert at home.

Personally, I would not want anyone on the board or within the administration who is perfect because I know there surely would be something wrong. Then too, I wouldn't have that person to sympathize with in my own imperfections. Mainly, what I care to know is that he is an American—not "pro" American but American—without today's price tag. I will draw quite a few conclusions from there because I know what he is already up against. Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Protestants and Other Americans Oppose Becker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement by C. Stanley Lowell, representing Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State before the House

Judiciary Committee, opposing the tampering with the first amendment as proposed in the so-called Becker amendment.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY PROTESTANTS AND OTHER AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, TO A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION TO LEGALIZE RELIGIOUS EXERCISES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND OTHER PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS AND PLACES, APRIL 22, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my name is C. Stanley Lowell. I represent here today the organization Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, a group which, as its name suggests and its charter stipulates, is dedicated to "the single and only purpose (of assuring) maintenance of the American principle of separation of church and state upon which the Federal Constitution guarantees religious liberty to all the people and all churches of this Republic." This organization, founded 17 years ago by top churchmen, constitutional lawyers, educators, and other national leaders, does not endorse or oppose specific legislative proposals. It seeks rather to educate and inform the American people as to the advantages of their traditional arrangement in church and state and to interest all responsible bodies in its perpetuation. We are here today because we see in House Joint Resolution 693 and related proposals a danger to our tradition of church-state separation as it has been enunciated in the first amendment and in the laws and constitutions of virtually all our States.

House Joint Resolution 693 and 50 or more related proposals carry the following provisions:

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or biblical scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

We question, Mr. Chairman, the political and social desirability of such a proposal. We believe that such an amendment to the Constitution would inject the Federal power into the area of religion. We have witnessed a steady progression of Federal power into one area after another that has been traditionally reserved to local or private authority. One of the very few areas which has not yet felt the impress of Federal power has been the area of religious faith. For the past century and a half the American people have insisted that this area was properly private and personal and not subject to legislative decree. We believe that such a concept of the role of religious faith is vital to the preservation of church-state separation in the United States. We believe that the proposed amendment would have the effect of forcing religious practices into the schools and imposing these upon the children assembled under compulsory education laws. We believe that this would result in a serious disregard of the rights of minority faiths and would lead to increasing association of religious groups with the administration of civil power.

An examination of the text of the so-called Becker amendment will disclose our reasons for apprehension. This amendment would make possible and encourage the use of public schools, and indeed many public places and occasions, for religious exercises and teaching. The amendment provides that prayers may be offered, or biblical scriptures may be read in any public school or governmental institution or place. This in section 1. In section 2, encouragement is provided for all kinds of religious observances under government auspices. The language is sweeping and inclusive. It pronounces legal and thus officially encourages "making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God of a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place * * * of the United States."

While it is true, Mr. Chairman, that section 3 states that "Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion," it seems evident that the other articles provide, in effect, for just such establishment. The fact that the amendment chooses to say on the basis of its own definition that this is not an establishment, does not change the fact of it. What is envisaged here is official religion and in the true sense of the words this would mean an establishment of religion. This is a repudiation of the American tradition in church and state.

It might be helpful, Mr. Chairman, to explore the intention of the Founding Fathers when they drafted the first amendment to the Federal Constitution, an amendment which would be, in effect, repudiated and set aside by the current proposal. In the drafting of our first amendment, the Founding Fathers had more in mind than the barring of a single church establishment. They had in mind the exclusion of government from setting up an official religion of one particular denomination or group of churches but also barring government from official concern with the theologies and programs of religion. They intended to bar government from just the kind of interference with religion as is envisaged in the current proposal.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter is a well-known paragraph from his assent in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education* (1948) said:

"We are all agreed that the 1st and 14th amendments have a secular reach far more penetrating in the conduct of government than merely to forbid an 'established church' * * *. We renew our conviction that 'we have staked the very existence of our country on the faith that complete separation between the state and religion is best for the state and best for religion.'"

As James Madison expressed it: "Religion is not within the purview of human government."

There are two valuable sources, Mr. Chairman, which indicate the intention of the Founding Fathers in the first amendment. These are The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, I, compiled by Joseph Gales, Washington; Gales and Seaton (1834), and Journal of the First Session of the Senate, Washington; Gales and Seaton (1820). Here we have the record of the debates on the first amendment, the various wordings which were proposed and rejected, and the eventual emergence of our present first amendment. Here it is clearly disclosed that the intention of the first amendment was to postulate the noninvolvement of government with religion. The fathers wanted to take the government out of the business of religion. They drafted the first amendment to clarify the status of the churches as free, voluntary societies functioning separate from the civil power.

The proposed amendment to the Constitution would change all this. This amendment is designed not to take the Government out of the business of religion, but to put Government into that business. The official religion that could be permissibly established under this amendment might very well be of an innocuous and nominal kind. It is the extent of the enablement which we need to assess. Who knows how far this might reach? Prayers may be offered, Biblical Scriptures may be read. There may be references to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God in connection with any official meeting or function in the United States. It is true that the amendment stipulates that participation must be "on a voluntary basis." This probably means that students who cleared the matter and got permission might be free to walk out and not participate in the religious exercises. This provides a modest easement from the compulsion, but not a complete easement. It is evident from the looseness of this language that virtually any kind of religious exercise or ceremony could be brought into the public schools. This means that almost any kind of religious observance could be officially imposed upon children in the public schools under compulsory attendance requirements with only the protective provision that they could walk out if they did not like it. This could mean, and probably would mean, that Catholic prayers would be imposed in communities where Catholics were in the majority. Fundamentalist Protestant prayers would be imposed where this group was in the majority. Liberal Protestant prayers would be imposed where liberal Protestants were in the majority. Jewish prayers, Buddhist prayers, or Moslem prayers would be imposed where any of these groups was in a majority. This opens the way to religion by community option. Or it might open the way to a least common denominator public school religion nationally imposed upon all children. We believe that any of these alternatives would be most unfortunate. We believe that government ought to avoid the management of religious operations. We believe that both state and church would be better off if our traditional separation is preserved.

In our first amendment, in the State laws which deal with church-state matters, and in the impressive weight of juridical opinions which support and explicate them, we believe that a desirable church-state pattern has been developed in the United States. In this pattern the churches have been voluntary societies. There has been no coercion of government to provide them with membership, with attendance at services, or with funds to support their operations. Government has carefully avoided the interlocking of its processes with those of religious groups. It has carefully and consistently refused either to finance or to promote such groups. It has afforded religious groups full freedom so long as their operations were consistent with public order and health, but it has afforded them nothing more. They have needed nothing more. Under this strategy of a letting alone by officialdom, the religious enterprise in this country has grown in dimension and health. Over 61 percent of the American population have joined churches on their own and contribute to their support. All of this without government compulsion of any kind.

We believe in this arrangement. We believe that the existing first amendment adequately handles the church-state issue. It provides a proper balance. It provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or forbidding the free exercise thereof." The proposals before you would upset this balance. They would do so by injecting Government promotion into the religious enterprise. Under our system Government does not belong in this area; Government ought to keep out.

We believe in the second place, that Congress should reject these proposals to amend the Constitution because they carry a heavy freight of potential mischief. The United States is a religiously pluralistic nation. There are many denominations and many faiths. These are not nominal and titular

but are going operations. The various religious enterprises in the United States are supported by their followers with verve and unction.

To open the way for religious practices in the public schools and in public functions of the community is an invitation to intercreedal strife. Religious protagonists who cherish their beliefs with such vigor can be relied upon to take a lively interest in the nature of official religious observances in the community. The nature of these observances, once the possibility of them has been opened up, may become a political matter in one community after another. It is quite possible that Protestants would campaign against Catholics in order to put the Lord's Prayer and the King James version or the RSV version of the Bible into the schools. Catholics might campaign for the Hail Mary and the Douay version of the Bible. The Jews might seek control in order to assure that practices compatible with their faith shall be installed. Liberal Protestant might battle Fundamentalist Protestant. And so these morbid battles may burgeon throughout the Nation. It was this book of sectarian controversy which the Founding Fathers sought to keep closed in this country. Let us not open it by the kind of proposal which is now before you.

We would oppose these proposals in the third place because we believe they might displace the first amendment in a way to provide government financial aid to religion. When government gives official recognition to religion and makes permissive provision for religious exercises in the public schools, as is proposed here, the next step—tax support for religion—may be forthcoming. In carrying out what they deem to be the purpose of the first amendment, our States have in many instances spelled out a specific ban on the use of public funds for the support of churches or their schools. The clear intent of Congress in this matter can be seen by its stipulation that all new States to be admitted to the Union after 1876 must adopt an irrevocable ordinance requiring religious freedom, and also making provision for "the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control * * *." The Supreme Court of the United States has on one occasion after another interpreted the first amendment as imposing a ban on tax support of churches or their schools. For example, in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (1948), Justice Black, speaking for the majority, said:

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or remain away from church against his will, or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion * * *. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

This doctrine of the first amendment was reiterated by the Court in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education* (1948), in *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (1952), in *Torcaso* v. *Watkins* (1962), the Sunday Laws cases (1962), in *Engel* v. *Vitale* (1962), and in *Murray* v. *Curlett* and *Schempp* v. *Abington* (1963). It is significant that in the Torcaso case, Justice Black, speaking for a unanimous Court, picked up for special emphasis the ban on tax support for church institutions contained in the previous decisions. Quoting the passage from the Everson decision which I have cited, and other famous sentences, Justice Black said: "We were urged to repudiate as dicta [these sentiments]. We declined to do this."

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that any injection of the Federal power into the program and operations of religion might well open up the first amendment in such a way as to lead to state financial support of religion. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, quite a number of the proposals that have been advanced to amend the Constitution are such that, under them, aid for churches could be provided on a nonpreferential basis. With a financial subsidy to church institutions, the last vestige of separation of church and state would vanish. We would have a financial and functional union of the two and would be well on the way to those excesses of clericalism and anticlericalism which have cursed the Old World.

In the fourth place, we oppose the kind of collusion between government and religion proposed in this amendment because we believe it represents a serious reflection upon the churches. The whole implication here is that the churches have failed in their duty and that the government must take over. We not only doubt the wisdom of this; we question its necessity. The churches have not so conspicuously lagged in their spiritual mission that they now require the Federal Government to step in and impose religion upon the school population. The glory of the church enterprise in the United States has been its voluntary character. Men have gone to church, said their prayers, contributed to the support of religious work, not because they had to, but because they wanted to. In this country we have had neither clericalism nor anticlericalism. There has been no occasion for either. If men became suspicious of the growth and power of the church, all they had to do was stop attending and contributing. If we commence the business of allowing government, whether Federal or local, to compel religious observances upon the people or to tax them for their support, we have taken a long step back into medieval night. We are, in effect, saying we must now coerce people into doing what they would not do of their own volition.

The difficulties of officially coerced religious observances can be seen in the controversy which rages today over compulsory religious worship at the chapel of the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado. Here, a policy of coercing the students into attendance at a Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish service, according to their faith, has resulted in blazing resentments among the cadets. Local pastors in Denver have taken up the cudgels on behalf of students who are by this policy effectively denied access to services of worship in their own churches. An official order for cadets to stop discussing and protesting this matter has only aggravated the problem. Where religious faith is concerned, any kind of coercion is better omitted. Religious experience has deep roots within the individual. At that point he cannot be coerced and any attempt to do so is apt to provoke an intense emotional reaction.

If churches and synagogues have demonstrably failed in the religious task, then some alternative method of carrying it on might well be considered. We believe that no such failure has taken place. The churches can always do better, of course. So can the government. We do not believe that an exchange of functions either way at this stage would be helpful.

We propose, rather, that each keep its appointed place in our cultural pattern. The church is not benefited when some men use the powers of government to force others to watch them pray. Government is not benefitted when it seeks religious sanction through the imposition of compulsory worship upon the people. Let government be government; let the churches be the churches. Let neither attempt to control the other. Let neither seek to preempt the field of the other. Let neither seek to use the other for its advantage. Let neither seek to interlock its operations with that of the other. The tradition—it has often been called the separation of church and state—has been the glory and the guerdon of our culture. There is no warrant for abandoning it or eroding it now.

Conversion Urgent—Industry Needs Peace Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the dimensions of the problem of economic conversion are becoming clearer: Each time a military installation is closed, a particular weapons component is changed or eliminated, or a defense contract terminated, the problem becomes very real to the worker, the contractor, and the community dependent on defense dollars for its economic well-being.

The financial writer for the Boston Globe, Ian Menzies, recently wrote an excellent article in which he points out the potential impact of all of these shifts and called for greater attention here in Congress to conversion. Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONVERSION URGENT—INDUSTRY NEEDS PEACE WORK

(By Ian Menzies)

There are signs that Washington is beginning to pay attention to a problem that has been asking for recognition for at least 5 years.

The problem: The industrial conversion from military to civilian production.

In some cases this conversion problem could be considered an elective (industries which wished to avoid the sea-saw effect of 80- to 100-percent military contracts) or a necessity (the phasing out of bread-and-butter military contracts).

But whether an elective or a necessity, there is little doubt that the conversion problem has contributed to the Nation's growing unemployment rolls.

Some have called it cynically the "threat of peace"; others the ultimate effect of arms control.

And superimposed on military-civilian conversion, and in effect part of it, has been the closing of military establishments with still more closings and phaseouts pending.

Many have tended to downplay the conversion problem, pointing out quite realistically, that Department of Defense dollar contract volume has scarcely diminished.

But while the dollar volume may remain high, the distribution or spread of contracts has narrowed thus eliminating certain kinds of hardware without a compensatory employment effect in industries receiving additional money on contracts already underway.

The money remains the same but fewer share the benefits.

And all of this is somewhat outside the war on poverty which is tackling a different phase, though with certain overlaps.

The hopeful signs that the conversion problem is being realized are these:

The Defense Department, the biggest single employer in the United States with more than 1 million civilian workers, is en-

deavoring to step up its program of placing displaced workers in other Government jobs.

Joseph R. Slevin writing of this program in Tuesday's financial page said the Defense Department hopes that its program, not a show window, will be followed by private industry.

Employees at Boston's Watertown Arsenal, already hit by cutbacks, should be able to test these claims.

In addition, two bills have been introduced in Congress, one a House bill by Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, to create a National Economic Conversion Commission. The other is a Senate bill with similar goals.

MORSE has received the backing of 26 other Members of Congress, among them Massachusetts Representatives CONTE, BATES, O'NEILL, and BOLAND.

Thus far the administration has acknowledged the seriousness of the problem but has directed it to the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament which was formed last December.

MORSE feels the urgency of initiating some action, however, cannot be taken care of by the Economic Committee's present timetable.

So long as such pressure does not become political, one can only indorse MORSE's efforts and hope that at least the question will receive greater congressional debate and action.

New England has quite a stake in this one.

Part V—Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as can be seen from the following presentation which my constituent, Mr. Conrad R. Hilpert of Rockford, Ill., secured from the Chief of Public Relations of the Panama Canal Company, the presence of the United States and its Armed Forces represents an economic boost to the Republic of Panama:

BENEFITS TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA THROUGH THE ARMED FORCES PRESENCE IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. General: The U.S. military presence in the Canal Zone reduces the necessity for the Republic of Panama to organize, maintain, and equip its own Armed Forces for its national defense. Personnel and funds which would be required for an Armed Forces establishment can be utilized to improve and develop other facets of the nation's economic, social and cultural progress. The only froce in being of a quasi-military nature in the Republic is the Guardia Nacional, which serves primarily as a national police force.

2. Economic impact:

(a) Purchases made and contracts let by the Armed Forces in the Canal Zone are included in totals compiled and to be submitted by the U.S. Embassy in Panama. In brief, appropriated and nonappropriated fund procurements by U.S. Southern Command components made total purchases of $10,369,544 in 1962.

(b) Four thousand, eight hundred and eighty two non-U.S. citizens are employed by the Armed Forces in the Canal Zone. These personnel, citizens of or resident in the Republic of Panama, have an annual payroll of $13,163,920.

(c) In addition to purchases by appropriated and nonappropriated fund activities, U.S. military and civilian personnel of the Armed Forces and their families spend an estimated $8 million annually for personal purchases of merchandise, recreation, and services.

(d) Disposal of U.S. Military Surplus Property:

(1) During fiscal year 1963, the U.S. Southern Command provided the Guardia Nacional equipment costed at $35,000 at a nominal price of $3,500 (10 percent of costed value). This equipment, if sold at usual prices, would have realized approximately $9,000 to the U.S. Government.

(2) Property Disposal Office sales to Republic of Panama business enterprises through its standard disposal procedures netted the Republic approximately $15,000 in duties paid to the national treasury by the purchaser upon import of the merchandise into the Republic.

3. Trade, commerce, communication:

(a) On April 1, 1963, a commercial communication cable from the Canal Zone to the United States via Jamaica by I.T. & T. (American Cable & Radio) was completed. This facility, containing 128 channels for voice and teletype communication, was constructed primarily because of military requirements. If U.S. forces were not stationed in the zone, it would not have been feasible to construct the facility as a commercial enterprise at this time. Services from the cable are available to the Republic of Panama, providing effective communication to the United States.

(b) U.S. Navy forces in the Canal Zone provide record (teletype) communications facilities for Republic of Panama official government traffic to the United States. One hundred and ten messages to and from Washington are handled monthly. This service eliminates the requirement for the Republic of Panama to provide facilities for such communication, or to contract for them commercially.

(c) The U.S. Navy provides maritime communications for commercial vessels in the waters off the Republic of Panama. This service processes messages to commercial stations, where they can be refiled worldwide to the final destination. Charges from the refile point to destination are paid by the sender. By this service, the Republic of Panama is absolved of the expense of maintaining maritime communications facilities. Approximately 4,700 messages from ships are handled monthly by the Navy.

(d) Approximately $200,000 is expended annually by U.S. forces to maintain the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway, major transisthmian route. This highway, built by the U.S. Government, has been deeded to the Republic of Panama. In return for maintaining the highway, U.S. military forces are entitled to use of all Republic of Panama roads without payment of any fee or toll.

(e) Inspection and guidance provided by U.S. military veterinarians to Panamanian suppliers of meats, dairy products, seafoods, fruits, and vegetables, and other foodstuffs have raised standards of the Panamanian industry whereby their products are acceptable for purchase by military forces in the Canal Zone. Without this assistance, in many instances products would have been of inferior quality, and major sales to the Canal Zone could not have been effected.

4. Air-sea rescue and mercy flights:

(a) Military forces in the Canal Zone have flown 91 air-sea rescue or mercy evacuation missions thus far in 1963 in the Republic of Panama. In 1962, 73 missions were completed. The average cost per mission is approximately $400. Its greatest contribution, however, is in the relief of suffering and saving of life of the citizens of Panama.

(b) Many of the missions flown are to remote, inaccessible regions of the Republic of Panama to evacuate seriously ill to medical facilities in major Panamanian communities. The Republic of Panama does not have the air or sea capability to provide this humanitarian service for its population.

5. Disaster relief: Military forces in the Canal Zone stand ready to provide relief in event of disaster in the Republic of Panama. An example of such a relief function was the supply by air of 10 large tents to house homeless as a result of a disastrous fire at Garachine, Panama, on June 18–19, 1963. The tents were airdropped to the stricken village.

6. Public health:

(a) Medical personnel of U.S. Armed Forces have provided voluntary medical services, both medical and dental, to various isolated communities in the Republic of Panama. In many instances, these services have been virtually the sole source of medical care available to the recipients. Examples are dispensaries operated on a continuing basis at Rio Hato on Taboga Island.

(b) Personnel have on a continuing basis made voluntary contributions of blood to hospitals in the Republic of Panama. These donations have been made both by members of the Canal Zone military and civilian community and by crews of U.S. Naval vessels temporarily docking in the Canal Zone.

7. Geodetic and mapping operations:

(a) The Inter-American Geodetic Survey, headquartered in the Canal Zone, since 1946 has mapped approximately 25 percent of the Republic of Panama and has provided 1/50,000 scale topographic maps to the Republic without cost. The mapping and survey of the Republic of Panama is conducted under a joint agreement signed by the United States and the Republic.

(b) Exclusive of military salaries for 30 military personnel on full-time duty establishing supplemental map control and conducting field classification surveys in the Republic of Panama, IAGS expended approximately $130,000 in fiscal year 1963 in the mapping program for the Republic.

(c) The IAGS Cartographic School in the Canal Zone has trained more than 100 Panamanian citizens in phases of mapping procedures since 1952. These provide a repository of personnel of the Republic skilled in mapping procedures.

(d) Not included in IAGS expenditures are grants for mapping provided the Republic of Panama by the Agency for International Development (AID). Portions of an AID grant of $1 million have been expended by the Republic of Panama for large scale (1/10,000) mapping programs in the Republic which are supported by the IAGS.

8. Science and technology:

(a) U.S. military forces in the Canal Zone have numerous survey scientific and technical facilities in operation. These facilities provide information and guidance to the Republic of Panama, which in many instances does not have the trained personnel or equipment for such endeavors. Among such facilities is the U.S. Navy Corrosion Laboratory and Tropical Exposure Station where periodic testing of the effects of the tropics on materials, metals, and petroleum is conducted. Another is the Navy Branch Oceanographic Office, which studies tides, currents and prepares chart work of regional waters. Results of their studies are made available to the Republic of Panama.

(b) Sea transportation assistance has been provided to archeologists on official research trips to otherwise inaccessible areas of the Republic of Panama.

9. Military training:

(a) During fiscal year 1962, training under the military assistance program was provided to 418 members of the Guardia Nacional. This training was provided primarily at the U.S. Army Forces, Southern

Command, School of the Americas, and included courses in pure military skills and techniques, as well as in such technical fields as maintenance of weapons, vehicles, and communications equipment, communications procedures, and radio operation. The U.S. Navy Forces, Southern Command, trained 12 personnel in maintenance and operation of small craft in fiscal year 1962. In fiscal year 1963, 221 Guardia Nacional personnel received MAP-costed training. Thus far, some 900 personnel of Panama have been trained at the School of the Americas since 1949.

(b) In addition to training provided under MAP, the U.S. Air Forces, Southern Command, School for Latin America, has trained Guardia Nacional personnel on a non-reimbursable, space available basis in such subjects as electrical radio repair and operation, fundamental communications, administration and supply, and aircraft mechanics and maintenance. Since 1953, 324 Panamanians have received such training, with 52 of these graduating during the current calendar year.

(c) Training received at Canal Zone military service schools has added to the efficiency of operation of the Guardia Nacional. The technical training received has also added to the Republic's repository of personnel skilled in numerous technical fields.

10. Civilian training: Non-U.S. citizen civilian employees of the U.S. military component commands in the Canal Zone have received substantial training through the years in a variety of technical, supervisory, and management skills required by the diversified functions of the command. English language instruction has also been given. A total of 1,953 persons received training under this program in fiscal year 1963, materially improving their earning capability and job competency.

MILITARY PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAMS

Tangible monetary benefits to the Republic of Panama, resulting from the presence of U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone, have been uniquely supplemented by highly successful people-to-people programs conducted by the U.S. military community. These programs cannot, and should not, be measured in dollars and cents. Their ultimate purpose is to achieve a mutual understanding of material, social, and cultural environments of both countries.

The people-to-people programs fall under the broad title of military community relations. Army, Navy, and Air Force community relations efforts in Panama can be summed up through a prime example known as Operation Friendship. This active program was conceived by the U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command, in 1960, to meet an urgent need for improved relationship between the people of Panama and those of the United States.

Operation Friendship activities have touched virtually every facet of life and activity in Panama. Schoolchildren have benefited through hot lunch programs and school supplies; military units have adopted entire orphanages; local athletic programs and facilities have been developed through assistance by the military; interchange athletic contests have been held; local festival participation has been encouraged. These Operation Friendship projects often involve monetary contributions, but more important are the contributions of compassion, interest, knowledge, labor, and enthusiasm by participants.

Dependents of military personnel have joined wholeheartedly in the community relations programs. Women's and youth groups have given assistance to hospitals and orphanages, including many hours of volunteer service, and have participated in joint social and athletic activities with Panamanian groups.

Many of the community relations projects have been successfully consummated through the combined efforts of civic, religious, and social leaders of Panama working in concert with members of the U.S. military community. Each contributes according to his means and abilities, and in the achievement of a common goal, increased understanding and harmony between the United States and Panama and the people of the two Republics has been realized.

Remarks by Mr. Hugh Downs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 in Washington, D.C., the three major military service associations—the Association of the U.S. Army, the Navy League of the United States, and the Air Force Association jointly sponsored a dinner in observance of our 15th annual Armed Forces Day.

The master of ceremonies at that dinner was Mr. Hugh Downs, whom we all know as the host of the nationally televised "Today" show. Many of us have appeared on his program and we have come to recognize Mr. Downs' talents and ability as a television personality.

Therefore, I was interested in Mr. Downs' comments at the Armed Forces Day Dinner in which he addressed himself with extreme frankness to a number of matters which are tending to undermine the strength and morale of our Armed Forces. He refers to criticism of the so-called "military-industrial complex"—and where, I might ask, would we as a Nation be today without it? To the growing list of books and motion pictures that question the character and integrity of our military leadership, and to the fact that, while we as a Nation do not hesitate to impose fringe liabilities on the man in uniform, we continue to downgrade his few remaining fringe benefits and his economic status in relation to civilian counterparts.

I urge you to read Mr. Downs' remarks and include them in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MR. HUGH DOWNS OF NBC'S "TODAY" SHOW AT THE NATIONAL ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 8, 1964

Armed Forces Day is the annual civilian salute to the military—to the men and women of the military who serve us—around the clock—around the globe.

I have noted the joint statement of the sponsors in the program for the 15th National Armed Forces Day dinner.

"In a world grown weary of crisis and tension," it states, "we too often forget the dedication of those who man the weapons, the planes, and the ships that protect our way of life."

This is so true, that it's really an understatement. And it's worth asking ourselves, on a night like this—Why is this the case?

The answer, I suspect, is linked to the fact that we are now maintaining a large and costly Military Establishment * * * no one knows for how long * * * no one knows how large and how costly the force ultimately must be.

Never before, as a nation, have we been called upon to do this. The threat to our security, up to now, has been "quick and dirty" * * * and we have been quick, if not dirty, in getting the boys into uniform—and out again. After a war, we have been quick—and I might add, fortunate—in being able to return to business as usual—pleasure as usual—life as usual.

In the fanfare of major war we have rallied to the cause of military service with relative ease. But today, in the low key tempo of minor war—despite the huge and constant total threat—military service represents the unnatural, and the unwanted, in our soft and prosperous society.

There are those among us in the civilian community who, in their resentment, leave the impression that this Military Establishment is of its own making. They forget, not only the people in uniform, but what put them there. They forget how military demobilization after World War II took place only on one side of the world. They forget how a still mobilized Russia continued to employ military force—until our own military revival became a reluctant necessity of life itself.

Others in our cozy civilian world not only forget this postwar history—they wishfully rationalize the threat and intellectually bypass even the relatively recent Cuban crisis. They would push the pendulum full swing—from massive retaliation to massive accommodation.

It has become fashionable of late, in some literary quarters, to forget a few more things—including basic responsibilities of the creative artist. And so the military leader—as a symbol of modern power—becomes an ideal modern villain for the fiction writer.

They have the right, thank God, to fantasize on any theme or situation they choose. But, when these writers, as some of them have done, place their military villains in plots which, as they claim, do not represent fiction; but sober truth, then these writers must be judged against the facts of the case. And when these facts do not support the plot—these writers deserve to be publicly condemned.

But what of the creative artists who indulge in self-proclaimed fantasy with their military villains—always with a blownup world as the grand finale?

Praise be the cause of poetic imagination and, as I said, free expression—both are important national assets—but those possessed with a fixation to create without regard for truth—would do well to listen to the words of John Updike. Mr. Updike recently won the National Book Award for his novel, "The Centaur"—judged the most distinguished book of fiction of 1963. In accepting the award, Mr. Updike said: "What is needed is an instinctive habit of honesty on the part of the writer" (and remember, he was speaking of the fiction writer).

Such a writer must, he said, "instill his wrists with the refusal to write whatever is lazily assumed, or hastily perceived, or piously hoped. Fiction is a tissue of literal lies that refreshes and informs our sense of actuality. Reality is—chemically, atomically, biologically—a fabric of microscopic accuracies. The capture of such accuracies is the surest pleasure a writer receives * * * by taking pains to be accurate, we put ourselves on the way toward making something useful and beautiful and, in a word, good."

All who have been exposed to the novels "Fail Safe" or "Seven Days in May"—and others on the military-villain bookshelf—can well afford to mull over those words of John Updike.

There are those among us who would never consciously downgrade the military man—yet who still forget him. Most of us, to one degree or another, fall into this category.

The military services—today and tomorrow—can secure and maintain a large—and mediocre—military force with little trouble.

But to meet the education, training, and experience requirements of the modern military establishment—that is a problem. And frankly, in talking to the experts about it, I gather that no one really has a long-range solution. The problem is that serious. Yet, we quibble about the pay scales and the so-called fringe benefits of military service as if we were in a buyer's market—as if the supply of top-quality men exceeded the demand—as if the record of retaining bright young men for military careers was good—which it decidedly is not.

The military can contract outside for many of its requirements—but as Gen. Nate Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said: "There are two things in this life you can't delegate, no matter how good an executive you may be—your lovemaking and your fighting."

Incidentally, I am told that our dinner sponsors—the Army Association, the Navy League, and Air Force Association—are working closely together on a number of military personnel problems. They present a united front, for example, on the subject of military compensation. Just recently they advised the Secretary of Defense of their joint belief that his proposal for a military pay increase, now before the Congress, "left much to be desired," and could be supported by them only as a "step in the right direction."

In the arguments over military compensation, there is much talk about the "comparability" of military pay with civil service and industry—about the cost effectiveness of military personnel assignments * * * about commissaries and other so-called fringe benefits.

But I hear little or nothing about the "fringe penalties" of military service.

The joint statement of the sponsors in our program refers to the devotion of those who have died in line of duty as "a priceless heritage." President Johnson, in an official Armed Forces Day statement, has described the contributions of military men and women as measureless.

Since the last Armed Forces Day dinner in this hall—just 12 months ago this week—92 American military men have been killed by "hostile action"—that's official wordage for enemy action. Ninety-two Americans killed—without the United States being engaged in war.

How comparable is that to civil service and industry?

How do you rate the cost effectiveness of that fringe penalty?

Or, to be more blunt about it, how do you cost out human life?

To those who specialize in adding up the fringe benefits of the military—let's not forget the fringe penalties. Let's not forget the hostile action deaths of the so-called cold war. Let's not forget that military service represents "measureless" service—and it is "a priceless national heritage."

Why do we forget the men and women in military service? Sloth, wishful thinking, a desire not to be reminded of the necessity of defense. So many reasons.

Armed Forces Day is designed to make us remember.

It is a reminder of that old World War One phrase—"Lest we forget, lest we forget."

I noted earlier that it has become fashionable, and I should add—profitable—to downgrade our military leadership in some of the best-selling literature of the day.

To the military villain—in many of these artistic ventures—has been added the industrial villain—the defense industry leader—also a symbol of modern power.

Together they form what has become known as the military-industrial complex. And in fairness to my colleagues in the world of arts and letters, this term was not their own creation. It was handed to them from on high—and from this very center of the political arts.

Since that inauspicious occasion, words have been piled upon words to create a monster out of the so-called complex. And it is to the shame of us all that relatively few words have come forth—from those in high office or in letters—to counter or denounce this trend.

Here tonight—in a room filled with military and industry leaders—it seems appropriate to report—for the record—statements of three distinguished public servants who have chosen to speak out in behalf of the military-industry team.

Take these words, for example:

"It has been fashionable of late to view with alarm a so-called military-industrial complex * * * rather than a conspiracy to fear, this is a partnership in the national interest, freely arrived at, joining together multiple talents and resources to maintain freedom and peace with honor."

These words were spoken when their author served as Secretary of the Army—which he did until January of this year. Before that, he had served a wartime tour in the Navy, had practiced law in New York, had served the U.S. Senate as special counsel to its Committee on Armed Services.

Since the first part of this year, he has served as Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance.

Or take these words on the military-industrial complex:

"A popular pastime among some of our intellectual idiots is to raise the long-discredited cry that our military and industrial leaders glory in, and insidiously encourage, war and the unnecessary purchase of the weapons of war.

"Thank God for American big business and its leaders who outproduced every other nation in the world in World War II; thank God for the American Military Establishment and its leaders who outfought the enemy with these weapons to preserve our freedom; thank God for the free enterprise system they represent and defend, and the individual initiative they possess; thank God for their patriotism, their foresight, and their achievements."

That is a statement from a Congressman—a gentleman of the South—from South Carolina—who has represented his home district in the House of Representatives for 24 years.

He is the second ranking Democratic member of the House Armed Services Committee. He has demonstrated, again and again, great leadership in sponsoring legislation to improve the lot of the serviceman * * * and thereby strengthen our defense posture.

From Charleston S.C., Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Finally, I offer you these words:

"All too often in history men have invented a villain on whom all their troubles could be blamed. For some among us—I have no label to apply to them—it is the military-industrial complex.

"Some people take for granted that a so-called military-industrial complex wants a war every so often to stimulate business.

"Who started the cold war? Who compels us to spend so much of our income on defense? Who blocks progress toward disarmament?

"Is there any historical evidence to prove that democratic nations with a large industrial base start wars? I know of none."

Those words were spoken by a gentleman from the State of Washington who served six terms in the House of Representatives and has been a Member of the U.S. Senate since 1952. He is a distinguished member of the Senate's Committees on Armed Services, on Government Operations, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He has long been one of our great leaders in national security affairs—Senator HENRY M. JACKSON.

If you have been exposed to the monster of modern literature—the so-called military-industrial villain—these statements from three men, each high in public office, are worth remembering. We thank these gentlemen for speaking out on the vital role of the military-industry partnership in our society.

Eastman Kodak Earns Presidential Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the pleasure to attend a special ceremony at the White House. There, I joined my constituent, William S. Vaughn, president of the Eastman Kodak Co., as he received an Export "E" Award from the President.

I am very proud of Eastman Kodak for the significant strides it has made in international marketings of its products, and for the national recognition these achievements now have gained. Further, I am very proud of the men and women—countless thousands of whom I have the honor to represent in Congress—whose work as Kodak employees contributed to the earning of this award.

Mr. Speaker, the exciting story behind the award which Kodak has received is related in the following news account which I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues:

KODAK RECEIVES EXPORT "E" AWARD FOR SUCCESS IN FOREIGN MARKETS

President Johnson presented Eastman Kodak Co. with an Export "E" Award yesterday at the White House.

William S. Vaughn, president and chief executive officer of the company, accepted the award in Washington at a special ceremony sponsored by the Department of Commerce to mark the 500th "E" Award presentation.

Kodak received the award for "success in export markets." Principally due to higher export sales, Kodak has earned a total of almost $500 million in foreign exchange for the United States during the past 5 years, a report indicated.

That sum represents the amount by which Kodak receipts from abroad exceeded expenditures for imports, additional dollar investments in foreign subsidiary companies, and dividend and royalty payments to foreigners.

Sales to export dealers and to Kodak associate companies outside the United States during 1963 totaled $140.2 million, about 10 percent higher than those recorded in the preceding year. Exports accounted for about 13 percent of the company's total sales in 1963, compared with 12 percent in 1962.

A report submitted by the company at the request of the Department of Commerce indicates that Kodak's exports increased $45.7 million or 56 percent from 1957 to 1962. In that same interval, total U.S. exports of merchandise increased 6 percent and total U.S. gross national product rose 25 percent.

The report listed three examples of the company's approach to international marketing. The first of these concerned the development of the Kodak Instamatic camera and its introduction in February of 1963.

Kodak designed the camera to appeal particularly to international customers. The product was announced at press conferences conducted simultaneously in more than 2 dozen countries. The Instamatic cameras, their Kodapak film cartridges, and accessories were stocked in advance at more than 35 distribution points here and abroad. Advertising materials were prepared in 25 languages.

Kodak has exported cameras for 75 years, but the company had never before planned so specifically and so intensively for international sales.

During the first 6 months of 1963, the report states, total U.S. exports of still cameras surpassed exports for the entire year 1962. The dollar value of total U.S. still camera exports rose to $2.7 million, about $1.4 million above the January-June total in 1962. Exports of Instamatic cameras were largely responsible for these substantial increases, the report stated.

Another example of Kadak's effort in the export field lies in the area of photographic products for professional, commercial, industrial, and scientific use, the report notes.

Total foreign sales of Kodak products for business photo systems, principally Verifax copiers and supplies and the microfilm products of the Recordak Corp., have more than doubled since 1959 and today represent a multimillion-dollar business.

Sales growth in these market areas requires careful identification of customer needs and the adaptation of American equipment to local requirements. An example is Kodak's work with the Government-operated post office in Switzerland.

Through the post office, the Swiss Government provides a banking service, similar to a checking account, for the payment of bills. Transactions number about 200 million a year and are increasing at a rate of 10 percent annually.

Swiss postal authorities used to record checks by hand, until Kodak representatives from Lausanne studied the accounting operation and suggested a new system based on check microfilming procedures in the United States.

The result: Recordak microfilm machines produced in the United States have been installed in 24 of the 25 district check offices in Switzerland. The system has been so successful that the Swiss post office is now considering the use of microfilm to record parcel and registered letter traffic.

To develop oversea markets further for business photo systems, the report states, Kodak organizes intensive technical training for representatives of subsidiary companies and distributors.

Local employees, through these training programs, learn how to devise a business photo system, how to sell it, how to install and service it—in short, how to provide a complete marketing service in the office equipment field.

The company's oversea sales are not limited to photographic products. Exports of manmade fibers, plastics, and industrial chemicals from the Tennessee and Texas Eastman divisions have been growing despite intense competition from foreign manufacturers.

Exports of manmade fibers and dyestuffs by Eastman Chemical Products, Inc., a Kodak marketing subsidiary, have doubled since 1959.

To foster further increases, the Tennessee Eastman organization has strengthened its network of specialized foreign distributors with additional marketing and technical support, added offices and warehouses abroad, and increased the participation of Tennessee Eastman personnel in the foreign marketing operations.

In Europe, a new and expanded sales headquarters was established in 1960 at Zug, Switzerland. From this point, and from a smaller office in The Hague, technical representatives operate in Europe, the Middle East, and Africa.

ECPI opened a branch in Hong Kong in 1960 to improve sales and distribution of Far Eastern markets. Japan, Australia, the Philippines, and other countries in Asia are serviced through the Hong Kong branch.

The ceremony at the White House and the reception which followed were attended by Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, Senator Kenneth Keating, and Representative Frank J. Horton.

Financial Assistance to the Great Lakes Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan State Legislature has recently passed a resolution urging that Congress speed the proposed financial assistance to the Great Lakes fishing industry and further urging that an inspection system with respect to fresh water fish imported from Canada be instituted.

As I am sure a great many of my colleagues are aware, the Great Lakes fishing industry has suffered a decline due to misinformation in part fostered by an agency of the Federal Government, and I urge that they seriously consider this petition for certainly in light of all the discussions of our poverty problems, the Government should not overlook an opportunity where it may promote economic welfare while at the same time ameliorating justified grievances.

The resolution follows:

MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 38

(Offered by Representatives Erlandsen, Good, and Morrison)

Concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to aid the fishing industry of Michigan

"Whereas the Great Lakes fishing industry has suffered a serious setback in recent years due to circumstances beyond their control such as the lamprey, pollution, botulism, and problems of a related nature; and

"Whereas due to misinformation, untruths, and lack of understanding, the fish-buying public has been led to believe Great Lakes fish were unfit for human consumption, while, in fact, properly handled Great Lakes fish in all forms have had a perfect record as a healthy and edible product; and

"Whereas the fishing industry has experienced great financial losses since October 25, 1963: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the members of the legislature request the Congress of the United States to speed the proposed financial assistance to the Great Lakes fishing industry, the same as was done during the late cranberry scare, from import moneys now directed to the fishing industry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States is urged to immediately undertake a strong program which will include a quota and inspection system of fresh water fish coming into the United States from the Canadian Provinces; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Adopted by the house April 29, 1964.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate May 1, 1964.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Senior Citizens' Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Governor Rockefeller of New York has proclaimed the 10th anniversary observance of May as Senior Citizens' Month in New York State. This is an important observance, Mr. Speaker, not only for the elderly of New York, but for the entire Nation. May, in fact, is being observed nationally as Senior Citizens' Month. The observance is important because it gives us a chance to renew our interest in, and rededicate our energies to, the plight of the elderly in America today.

I take this opportunity to call this body's attention to a bill I introduced early this year to provide hospitalization and nursing care for the aged. The bill is an effort to help defray the increasing costs of hospital and nursing care. These costs, coupled with a steady increase in our elderly population, have made health protection for the aged a major national problem. We must remind ourselves of these painful facts at a time when the House Ways and Means Committee is considering numerous proposals to alleviate the plight of the elderly. Hopefully a measure will emerge from committee, and subsequently from the Congress, that will go far in meeting the needs of these people. This year we must work to make a meaningful hospitalization and nursing care bill for the aged a reality.

Under a unanimous-consent agreement, I place Governor Rockefeller's proclamation in the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Ten years ago this month, the first statewide observance of May as "Senior Citizens' Month" was proclaimed by Governor Dewey—the first in the Nation.

In the decade that has followed, we have witnessed great advances in programs and services for the elderly in our State—many of them pioneering efforts. During the past 5 years we have established new programs to aid older persons and strengthened and expanded existing programs. We have reason for pride in the provisions that have been made for health, housing, employment, education, and recreation, to mention but a few. We recognize that much remains to be done.

The experience of this decade has made us realize that the added years given to us do not of themselves make us old. Aging is an individual and life-long process. Older persons are just as different from one another as youth from youth, or a person of middle age from another person of middle age.

We observe this month, in recognition of this anniversary and the contributions made by countless citizens of this State, fully realizing that it is but a small token for those to whom we owe so much. The task before us requires our dedication every day of the year.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of May 1964, as "Senior Citizens' Month," in New York State.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 24th day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four.

By the Governor.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Bill Scranton—What He Is For and What He Is Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

BILL SCRANTON—WHAT HE IS FOR AND WHAT HE IS AGAINST

(By Paul Martin)

HARRISBURG, PA.—Gov. William W. Scranton says unemployment cannot be cured by massive Government spending.

It must be solved on a pinpoint area-by-area basis, taking into account varying local conditions in each community, he said in an interview.

Necessary tools include research and development, education, private investment in new technology, cooperation by labor and industry and a sympathetic attitude on the part of government.

"It is the private sector of the economy—not government—which create lasting prosperity," he declared. "Government's role is to provide the climate under which the free enterprise system can flourish for the benefit of all."

That is what Scranton said he has been trying to do since he was elected governor in 1962, ending 8 years of Democratic rule in the Pennsylvania statehouse.

During his tenure, unemployment has declined to the lowest annual level in the Keystone State since 1957, more than 1,000 jobs have been eleminated from the State payroll and 56,000 persons have been taken off relief.

At the same time, 700 new or expanded industries have come into the State, construction has been completed on 2,500 school classrooms, a record $70 billion has been committed for public and private colleges and more State highways have been completed than any previous year.

Scranton, something of an unknown quantity in the search for a Republican presidential nominee, has stated that he would like the public to know where he stands on major issues.

Here are his views:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We must have a strong foreign policy. This means taking leadership from the free world everywhere. Call it brinkmanship or what you like, whenever the Communists threaten the free world, we must take a strong stand, even though there may be danger.

It is stupid to think that we can stop the Communists without taking some chanees. The only thing they understand is strength. And it has worked in the past, in Greece, Lebanon, Cuba, Korea, Quemoy, and Matsu.

CUBA

Castro's Cuba has become a center of subversive activity threatening all of Latin America, which is sitting on a volcano. The Communists are conducting subversive activities in many countries including Venezuela, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and now Panama.

It has gotten to the point where action is necessary, but what kind of action? There are all kinds of blockades, depending on what our intelligence reports show. At some time, undoubtedly we are going to have to take action, including the use of armed force if necessary.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

We have got to make up our minds whether we intend to win the war in Vietnam or not. I favor a more concentrated effort to win the war and insure a stable government. Look at the job they did against the Communists in Malaya and the Philippines.

I have always thought that our 1961 agreement with Russia for so-called "neutralization" of Laos was a major mistake. It amounted to turning over that country, or most of it, to the Communists. It gave them a privileged sanctuary for running guns and guerrillas into Vietnam.

GERMANY

We should not give any recognition to Communist East Germany. Everything is on our side—the people, the economic situation, and despite the position of Berlin geographically, we are in good shape militarily in Central Europe. I am willing to sit down and negotiate, but there is no necessity for us to yield on anything. We can make headway if we put on enough pressure at the right times.

NATO

The Atlantic alliance is still the cornerstone of our strength. Though I recognize the advantages in trying to widen the split between Soviet Russia and Red China, it should not be done at the expense of our alliance. As for President de Gaulle, I don't know what he really wants.

UNITED NATIONS

I favor our participation in the U.N. I feel that generally it is an effort for good in the world. Some study could be given to whether the U.N. is operating efficiently, fairly and with justice for all countries. An effort should be made to change the rules to require prompt payment of dues by all member nations.

RED CHINA

I do not want Communist China to be admitted to the U.N. because it is not a "peace-loving" Nation. But I do not think we should say in advance what we would do in event we were overwhelmed in our opinion, or that we should cut off any possibility for holding their power to a basic minimum if they do get in.

NUCLEAR TREATY

I favored the nuclear test ban treaty reluctantly. History makes it abundantly clear that the Soviet Union considers any treaty a piece of paper, to be torn up whenever it suits the Kremlin. The American people must not be lulled into euphoria over this bare beginning in the long walk toward nuclear peace.

SOVIET TRADE

It is difficult to talk about trade with the Soviets unless you know what is going on inside Russia. If I knew this, I might not complain about the wheat deal. Putting power in the hands of the President on negotiations of this sort is advisable in the long run. Trade with the Communists gives us a tool for negotiations, and a piece of weaponry in the cold war.

FOREIGN AID

When I was in Congress, I supported foreign aid. But I am very worried about Latin America. We are still not getting aid down to the people, instead of the higher echelon pockets. We should be able to cut down on foreign aid funds, since we have an enormous backlog in accumulated appropriations.

DEFENSE

I do not have the latest information, secret or otherwise. From what I do know, our general policies are correct. We have considerable superiority in both defense and potential offense. We must continue to maintain this superiority.

However, we could cut down on some of our military expenditures, and continue to maintain our defense superiority. I don't object to the buildup of ground forces for guerrilla and conventional warfare, but so far we haven't made any use of them. We haven't done anything with them in situations where they would apply.

BUDGET

I'm a balanced budget man—there is no doubt about that. I am not a Keynesian theorist. I don't see how we can keep going on in the Government, good year after good year, coming up with budget deficits.

We missed a golden opportunity for a sound fiscal decision in the spring of 1961. We were coming out of a recession fast. Inflation was under control, and the gold outflow was diminishing. If we had cut expenditures so we had a balanced budget then, we had an extraordinary opportunity for a sustained business boom.

TAXES

I'm for a tax cut. It would stimulate business and industry, and aid in the creation of new jobs. But we have got to keep the budget down. If we don't cut Government spending, over a longer period of time this turns into an inflationary spiral, which would be more damaging to our economy than the stifling tax structure.

INFLATION

Deficit spending results in inflation. The people who have the most to lose are 80 million American adults who depend for their future security on life insurance, savings deposits, U.S. savings bonds, pension rights, and other assets with a fixed dollar value.

GOLD OUTFLOW

Our exports are still greater than our imports. What this comes down to is control of Government spending abroad. The deficit in the international balance of payments, and outflow of gold, is just as bad as it has ever been. It is in the Government sector—foreign aid and military spending overseas—that we have got to deal with this problem.

TRADE

I favored the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1962. But the most difficult situation we face in the next 12 years, apart from war or peace, is how to make progress in international trade without damage to our domestic industry from imports produced by cheaper foreign labor.

STATES' RIGHTS

We must present to the people a specific program to redistribute the tax revenues of the Nation, to enable State and local governments to assume more responsibility, and keep government closest to the people.

The Federal Government takes 70 cents out of every tax dollar, the States get only 17 cents. If the Federal Government would turn over $16 billion in excise taxes on such things as gasoline, cigarettes, and liquor, the

States could and should do more in housing, urban redevelopment, education, and creating new job opportunities.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I approve the objectives of every title of the civil rights bill before Congress. The Federal Government should take action on public accommodations. The No. 1 piece of unfinished business in America today is providing full equality for all people without regard to their color, religion, or ancestry.

I am hopeful that Republicans can gain strength in the South, and yet have it remain on a very liberal basis so far as civil rights are concerned. President Eisenhower was very popular in the South, and he has some pretty strong feelings on this matter.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

I don't think that any State can do the job without additional funds. The National Government should give assistance to higher education. The States and localities can take care of the primary and secondary fields.

MEDICARE

Even with the Kerr-Mills bill, together with private health insurance groups, there is still a need for additional Federal legislation. But I am opposed to financing this by social security taxes. It would put an inequitable burden on those least able to pay, and eventually raise payroll taxes above 10 percent. That's too high.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH, WILLIAM WARREN SCRANTON, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Home: North Abington Township, 10 miles north of city of Scranton.

Office: Governor's Office, State capitol, Harrisburg, Pa.

Birth date: July 19, 1917.

Education: Yale University, Bachelor of Arts, history major, 1939 Yale Law School, LL.B., 1946.

Married: On July 6, 1942, to the former Mary L. Chamberlin.

Children: Susan, born December 25, 1945; William W., born July 20, 1947; Joseph C., born September 28, 1949; and Peter K., born May 12, 1954.

Military: World War II Air Force (1941–45); pilot, operations officer; left active duty with rank of captain; presently major in Air Force Reserve.

Public service: Served as special assistant to Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter. Administered Secretary's private office, interpreted U.S. foreign policy for press, represented United States at conferences in Latin America, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, United Nations.

Elected to 87th Congress in November 1960 over Democrat incumbent Stanley Prokop by vote of 97,012 to 80,097 (this was 54.8 percent majority of total vote for Scranton). At time of election Democrats had 34,000 registration majority in district. Scranton carried Lackawanna County (most populous county in district) 65,204 to 64,416, while Kennedy was carrying it 80,098 to 49,636 over Nixon. In Lackawanna County, Democrats had 50,000 registration majority. Member of Congress (Banking and Currency Committee) from Pennsylvania's 10th District including Lackawanna, Wayne, Wyoming, Susquehanna, Pike, Sullivan Counties (under 1962 reapportionment, Bradford County replaces Pike).

In the 1962 gubernatorial election, Scranton carried the State by 486,000 votes over his opponent, Richardson Dilworth.

Political: Under Congressman Scranton's leadership the Republican Party in November 1961 elected William T. Schmidt mayor of the city of Scranton after 16 years of Democratic control. Schmidt won by 717 votes, overcoming a Democratic registration majority of nearly 21,000. Also elected was John W. McNamara to the heretofore solid Democratic Scranton City Council.

Business experience: Joined law firm of O'Malley, Harris, Warren & Hill (1947). As troubleshooter joined team that worked for 5 years (1947–52) to revitalize International Textbook Co. (division of International Correspondence Schools, headquartered in Scranton, Pa.). By 1949 had been named a vice president and director.

When revitalization program had been completed successfully and company was on firm footing, became director (1952) of Scranton-Lackawanna Trust Co., and later president (1954). Trust company later merged into Northeastern National Bank & Trust Co. Among firms Mr. Scranton has served as member of board of directors (resigned all after election to Congress) are International Salt Co., Lackawanna Railroad; International Correspondence Schools World, Ltd., and International Textbook Co.

A pioneer in television in northeastern Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton formerly served as chairman of the board, Northeastern Pennsylvania Broadcasting, Inc., former operators of Radio Station WARM and WARM-TV. (WARM-TV has become WNEP-TV.)

Civic activity: Is or has been: director, Boys Club of Scranton; Family Service of Lackawanna County; vice president, President's Council University of Scranton (administered by Jesuit Fathers); trustee, Westminster Presbyterian Church; trustee, Keystone Junior College, LaPlume, Pa.; director and member of executive committee Scranton Chamber of Commerce; member-at-large, National Council of Boy Scouts; vice president of board of directors, Geisinger Memorial Hospital and Foss Clinic, Danville, Pa.; special advisory committee and executive committee United Community Chests and Councils of America; campaign chairman 1957 Lackawanna United Fund (raised $1¼ million). Recipient of B'nai B'rith Americanism Award and St. David's Society Distinguished Citizens Award.

Industrial development: Has been a leader in world-famous effort of Scranton, Pa., and surrounding area to pull itself "up by its bootstraps" economically since depletion of anthracite coal. Leader and fund raiser of Lackawanna Industrial Fund Enterprises (LIFE) and Scranton-Lackawanna Industrial Building Co. (Slibco), both nonprofit community groups working on industrial development. Also leader on Industrial Development Committee and New Industries Committee of Scranton Chamber of Commerce.

Memberships: American Legion; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Lackawanna Bar Association; Pennsylvania Bar Association; Reserve Officers Association of United States; Friends of Scouting, Forest Lakes Council, Boy Scouts of America; Lackawanna Historical Society; Everhart Museum Association; Pennsylvania Farmers Association; American Farm Bureau Federation; Scranton Advertising Club; Seniors International, Scranton Chapter No. 1; Lackawanna County Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs; National Rifle Association of America; Scranton Chamber of Commerce; Mid-Valley Old Timers Athletic Association; variety of other civic groups and organizations.

Family background: The Scranton family (for whom the city of Scranton is named) first settled in Pennsylvania from New England in 1840. The family operated the first iron foundry established in northeastern Pennsylvania in 1840. Two of Mr. Scranton's forebears served in the U.S. Congress (George W. Scranton, one term from 1859 to 1861, and Joseph A. Scranton, elected to five terms between 1881 and 1897).

Mr. Scranton is the son of the late Worthington Scranton, long active in Pennsylvania politics, and the late Marion Margery Scranton, Republican National Committeewoman from Pennsylvania, 1928–51 and national vice chairman, 1940–44.

Janeway Suggests Trade With Russia Be Governed by Rule "Sell Processed Commodities, Not Raw Materials"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the well-known publicist, Eliot Janeway, warned in a May 3, 1964, column that U.S. businessmen should not do as the British have done in expanding export sales to the Soviet Union. He points out that the British are borrowing short in order to extend long-term credits to Moscow. By so doing, they are exposing themselves to money problems and political blackmail. Better, he says, to do as the Germans and Swedes have done—sell processed commodities for maximum cash payment. If, for example, we follow the rule of selling leather, instead of hides, our economy will get extra jobs, and the Russians will have to pay for U.S. products, incorporating U.S. wages.

The text of Mr. Janeway's column follows:

HARD-NOSE TRADING MAY PAY POLITICALLY

(By Eliot Janeway)

What about doing business with Russia? It's a question that's been asked more and more. Businessmen arguing for it fear that Britain and our other allies may be stealing a march on us in a rich growth market. The politicos advocating it point to the thaw in the cold war, as evidence by Russia's troubles with China and her gestures toward nuclear disarmament.

American opinion has become understandably gun-shy about this kind of debate. There's a feeling of defeatism throughout the country which assumes that we will always finish last in intricate dealings with sophisticated foreigners.

This dyspeptic view has some basis in recent experience. Take the money mess this country got into over the balance-of-payments crisis of 1960–63. On the face of it, we seemed to be making more money out of our dealings with the outside world than ever before. Then, one day we woke up to find that we'd been kidding ourselves—that we had been paying out our own money to do what we had thought was business.

More broadly, the legislative logjam and public relations illusions of the Kennedy years have left a good deal of confusion between aid and trade. Many aid programs, which were promoted on the claim that they would build trade, ended by eating into it instead. By the same token, recent experience has bred a deep-rooted suspicion that it's the other fellow who profits from American trade.

GOT INTO SAME TRAP

As a matter of fact, the British—for all their reputation as a nation of shopkeepers—have got themselves into the same kind of trap in their dealings with the Russians. They're literally buying export sales and in a particularly dangerous and costly way: by borrowing dollars at short-term and freezing these debts into long-term credits to Moscow. This is a passport to money trouble and to political blackmail.

It's also a warning to us of how not to do business with Russia. President Johnson seems to have taken hold of, and to have sharpened, the demand welling up in the country for trade policy that will make

sense for us—and money too. Witness the way he laid down ground rules for selling grain to the Kremlin; and then passed the business by when they preferred to let their people go hungry.

Cash payment was one ground-rule. Splitting the freight business with U.S. flag ships was another. Both are good business, and sharp diplomacy, too.

Here's a new suggestion for a practical condition to guide us in negotiating with the Russians. We have basic materials they need—hides, copper, molybdenum, for example. When we let them take out our unprocessed commodities, the cost of materials to our industries goes up; the earnings squeeze on our taxpayers sharpens; and the inflation of our consumer prices becomes more worrisome. But if, instead, we oblige them to buy our hides after they've been processed into leather and our copper after it's been worked into wire, the cost-price push will be slowed down; and our exports will serve their classic economic purpose—of making extra jobs.

PLAY THE TRADE GAME

Let the Russians pay our labor U.S. scale wages for the U.S. products they know they need. This is the way the Germans and the Swedes have played the trade game with Moscow, and it's one good reason they've done so well out of it.

There's a possible bonus here, too. The Marxists never separate economics from politics. Tough business trading may very well pay off politically. Who knows? We may see U.S. goods first reach the Berlin wall and then knock it down.

Bachelor of Science Degree for Billerica Father of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it has become a truism to say that we appreciate the value of education. It is less often that we see someone act on that principle. A Billerica, Mass., father of seven will receive his bachelor of science degree from Boston University. Frank Smith has been studying part time for 8 years and will graduate with a better than B-plus average.

The Lowell Sun paid tribute to Mr. Smith's achievement in a fine article in its May 14 edition. Under unanimous consent I include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I wish to congratulate Mr. Smith and welcome him to the ranks of BU alumni:

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE FOR BILLERICA FATHER OF SEVEN

BILLERICA.—Eight years ago Frank Smith didn't have a college degree or a familly.

On Sunday, June 7, Boston University's Commencement Day, he'll count one academic achievement and seven of the parental kind.

And the Smith offspring—William, 7; Charlene, 6; twins Marilyn and Maureen, 5; Stephen, 4; Paul 3, and Rosemary, 1—will comprise a pint-sized cheering section when their daddy steps to the rostrum at commencement ceremonies at the university's Nickerson field to receive the bachelor of science in business administration degree it took 8 years of part-time evening study to earn. And he did it with a better than B-plus average.

How does it feel to have set such a believe-it-or-not record for classroom perseverance, while holding a full-time job and raising a family? "I'd do it again," he says.

"There's a lot to be said for the economics of starting something like this when you don't know what's ahead of you," said the boyish-looking 33-year-old student, his graying temples tattling slightly on the effects of the last 8 years.

The daddy-degreeholder gives much of the credit for the feat to his wife, Arline, whom he's trying to discourage from planning a huge party to celebrate his graduation. Her cooperation, patience, and "taking each day as it comes" attitude "were my help in getting through it," he says.

The "it" in January of 1956, 5 months after the Smiths were married, when Frank started in undergraduate work by going 3 and 4 nights a week to university classrooms from the Kenmore Square branch of the National Shawmut bank, where he worked for 7 of the last 8 years. This past year he's been employed at the bank's downtown office as a supervising analyst in computer research.

The short walk from work to school was helpful (I didn't have to buck traffic"), and before-class super-study hours were spent at the university.

He didn't get back to his three-bedroom ranch house in Billerica until 10:30 p.m., some 16 hours after he left it in the morning. "The effect on the children, though, wasn't as harmful as you might think," he says. "It became a way of life with them. The older ones would qeustion why I was never home, but they learned to understand."

School was financed on the Korean bill until it ran out 2 years ago. A university loan has helped him finish.

One of those rare individuals, who requires little sleep, Smith used the time others need for slumber to do his studying. "I need only 5 or 6 hours sleep a night," he says, and at exam time he's up and buring the post-midnight oil at 2 and 3 a.m.

Noise doesn't bother him either, and with the youngsters ushered off to the basement playroom to whoop and holler, and the radio going strong, he finds he can polish off a mathematical brain twister with relative ease.

He's proud that his scholarly abilities have won him membership in Beta Gamma Sigma, a distinction awarded those ranking tops academically in the business field, but admits he had to "work for the average."

Smith has fared well physically on a schedule that would have broken many another. The second semester of the second year he lost 20 pounds, but "every other year I thrived on the routine," he says.

In the 8 years, he's never had a late assignment, has cut only five classes, and then only because of blizzards.

"And Arline always arranged to give birth to the babies on nights when I didn't have school," he smiled. The classroom pace slowed down to one course the semester the twins were born, as he secrificed studying for diapering.

His philosophy about the years—"Don't stop or you wont' go back." Wife Arline's—"The more courses you take the sooner you finish."

"No classes in the summer" was an unshakable rule, though, and weekends too have been reserved for family life. "You can squeeze a lot in on a weekend," Smith says and trips to the beach, picnics, outings, and even some studying, were Friday to Sunday fare.

Employers have been understanding, he says, and "always interested in how things were going." Neighbors, too, sympathized with the rigorous schedule. Last August when he took the children to the beach and his wife stayed behind for a few days to clean the house, neighbors threw a surprise party and trekked in with paint and brushes to remove wallpaper and redecorate the house.

Wife Arline, who has filled the evening hours with rugbraiding, and sewing ("she doesn't get out as much as she should," her husband says), is glad he is through for another reason—now she wants to go to school.

She has her eye on English extension courses being offered at Burlington high school. "Now I'll be the babysitter," Smith says.

And admitting that after 8 years he has a strongly ingrained study habit, he says his degree probably won't mean the end of the academic line. He's thinking about a master's degree or selected course. "But it will be just 1 night a week," he said unhesitatingly.

The Befuddled American Council for Judaism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a very small group of American Jews has recently obtained what they believe to be some kind of concession from the State Department on a problem which does not exist.

As my good friend Rabbi Harry Halpern, of the East Midwood Jewish Center, says in the May 15, 1964, edition of the center's bulletin, the members of the American Council for Judaism consider themselves second-class citizens.

I commend Rabbi Halpern's article to the attention of our colleagues:

FROM WHERE I STAND

The infamous American Council for Judaism, well known as an implacable enemy of zionism and the haven for scared Jews, is jubilant because of its most recent achievement. After pressing our Government for a declaration for more than 21 years, the organization has now received what it calls a historic document, a communication from our State Department. What does it say and what gives it such significance?

It is a letter, signed by Phillips Talbot, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, which says, "that the Department of State does not regard the 'Jewish people concept' as a concept of international law." The council thinks that this statement is most important because of the fact that the Zionists had made of Jews a transnational people. But now we know, once for all, that Jews must not be guilty of dual loyalty.

Is there any American Jew of any intelligence who ever doubted this? Have we not made it clear, through all the years of struggle for a Jewish state, that we owe allegiance only to the land of our birth or adoption? Were Louis Brandeis, Stephen S. Wise, or Abba Hillel Silver disloyal to America because they "espoused the Zionist cause"?

The American Council for Judaism represents a small sector of American Jews who are terrified lest their patriotism be questioned; Jews who in their own estimation regard themselves as second-class citizens, who must always demonstrate their loyalty. Only paranoid people are so obsessed with

feelings of their own unworthiness and insecurity.

We maintain that we are a people by virtue of an historic memory, of shared experiences, of long-lasting traditions, of a language which has received a new grant of life, of a martyrdom which makes us blood brothers the victims of Hitler. I repeat, we Jews are a people, but not in the sense of giving fealty to a foreign land.

The council says that, together with other American Jews, it has a concern for the people in Israel. Has the organization ever spoken out against the injustices perpetrated against Israel by the Arabs, against the lying propaganda of Israel's enemies, which is financed by oil revenues? If my memory serves me, the council has taken the Arab point of view, constantly.

At this time, German rocket experts are in Cairo, helping to supply Egypt with weapons which Nasser has threatened to use for the destruction of Israel. Did the council raise its voice when John Foster Dulles and Dwight Eisenhower stepped in to save the glamorous Colonel Nasser from ignominious defeat in 1956? I am sure that when Zionists raised objections to the shortsighted Near Eastern policy of our State Department, the council was greatly distressed. And now, forgetting, if we can, the interest of the State of Israel, what do we have?

We have a Nasser who is supplying arms to Yemen and Aden so that these countries can shoot British soldiers. We have earned ourselves the enmity of De Gaulle. We have the spectacle of Khrushchev going to attend the opening of the Aswan Dam. In short, Nasser can flash his smile on East and West simultaneously and reap the fruits of an actual defeat which even a victory does not bring to others. Does the American Council for Judaism say anything about this?

There was no need for the State Department statement except to provide an opportunity for scared Jews to knock down a nonexistent opponent.

Speech of Congressman Albert Rains at the Dedication of the National Horseshoe Bend Military Park, March 27, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently several thousand Alabamians and guests commemorated the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend at the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park in Tallapoosa County, Ala.

It was my privilege to have led the fight in Congress to get this historic site recognized as a national military park, a recognition which came in 1956. The historic significance of the great battle that was waged there should be familiar to all Americans and I would like to submit, for the RECORD, a copy of my address at this commemorative occasion.

Following is my address at the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park on March 27, 1964:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN ALBERT RAINS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NATIONAL HORSESHOE BEND MILITARY PARK, MARCH 27, 1964

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this date, the 27th of March 1964, marking the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, and this occasion, the dedication of the National Horseshoe Bend Military Park, is of truly great significance to Alabama and the Nation.

For many years now I have looked forward with keen anticipation to this time and date and place. Almost a dozen years ago I first introduced into the Congress a bill to declare and to designate this historic spot here in the bend of the Tallapoosa River as the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. It was in the 2d session of the 84th Congress that the bill was approved unanimously in the Senate of the United States. Then in conformance with the action taken in the Congress, President Dwight Eisenhower on the 25th of July, 1956, by proclamation, designated this site as Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.

It is not possible for me, ladies and gentlemen, in a brief address, to mention all of the outstanding citizens and all of the great and wonderful organizations who gave active and helpful support to this endeavor. I would be derelict in my duty, however, and most unkind, if I were not to mention a few of those who took a very leading part.

I make this plain statement that this national military park would have never become a reality, not in our generation certainly, except for the untiring efforts and the generosity of Mr. Thomas W. Martin. In another occasion I said to Mr. Martin, that the esablishment of this military park was brought about by the philanthrophy, the patriotism, the scholarly study, and the research of Mr. Martin. In my rather long legislative career in the Congress, I have had the opportunity to work in league with Mr. Martin in some very great undertakings for Alabama. Always I have been impressed with his wisdom and his meticulous concern for the public good.

It would be an interesting story for me to recount for you the long months of work and toil and effort which went into the legislative enactment to provide for the development of the great Coosa River system by Mr. Martin's great company. I have often remarked, however, that the pride and joy of Mr. Martin is another development, the establishment of this national military park in this very historic place. Because of his painstaking research and diligent effort, we were able to prove in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United Sates with certainty that this Battle of Horseshoe Bend was something more than an Indian battle, and that it was in reality a battle of great historical significance in the building of our great country.

The combined efforts of all interested public officials and private citizens finally resulted in obtaining deeds or patents to the park area of 2,040 acres and these deeds were formally presented by Mr. Martin to the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Seaton, on April 24, 1959. At the time in accepting the deed on behalf of the United States, Secretary Seaton said:

"At this time I want to thank Mr. Martin, chairman of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Association, for his important statement concerning the meaning of this historic occasion and for his generosity in presenting the deed of this valuable property which will now comprise the newest addition to the national park system. In particular, I want to emphasize the patriotic vision of a business leader like Mr. Martin whose firm, the Alabama Power Co., long ago purchased the key historic land at the site of Gen. Andrew Jackson's great victory and the loop of the Tallapoosa River for the purpose of building a hydroelectric dam, but under Mr. Martin's wise guidance recognized the historic value of the site, and gave up the proposed dam in order to preserve the battlefield in its natural state for future generations."

That was a great compliment and well deserved.

Another distinguished citizen, ladies and gentlemen, to whom great credit is due for the establishment of this national military park, is your chairman today, Judge Jack Coley. Judge Coley has been one of my longtime, dear friends, and over the years—20 years from now—when I would come visiting in Tallapoosa County, Jack never missed a single opportunity to talk to me about the need and necessity for the passage of an act in Congress to bring about the occasion which we celebrate today. His drive, his organizational ability, his historical knowledge, and his dedication, in a large measure, are responsible for this achievement.

I also want to commend Tom Russell, as the chairman of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Association for his untiring efforts, and Robert Russell for his long, zealous work on this project. I would like to mention all the historians. I must mention some of the people in the Alabama Legislature, Judge Charley Adams, Tom Johnson, the late Senator Broughton Lamberth, Governor Folsom, because the legislature provided $150,000 which helped buy part of the land which is now in this park. There are many more that are deserving of mention, but time will not permit.

Then, ladies and gentlemen, I would be untrue to myself if I did not pay tribute to the U.S. National Park Service. It is one of the really outstanding agencies of the Federal Government. It actually and truly, serves the people by preserving historical sites, by providing for recreation, by taking care of our timber resources, and many other great benefits to the people. I want to thank Mr. Elbert Cox, the regional director, I want to thank all of those who have been connected with the development of the park as we now see it.

Now a brief statement about the actual occurrence. In early 1814, 150 years ago, while our country was engaged in a war with Great Britain, the Creek Indians gained control of most of the territory in the triangle of the Alabama River and Florida and Georgia. The British had been active in stirring up trouble among the Indians in the South, generally, because the British were trying to win the War of 1812. But their efforts were strongest along the frontier of Spanish Florida—Spain controlled Florida—and that part of the Mississippi Territory which was later to become Alabama.

The news that the war between the United States and Britain had begun caused great excitement in all the towns of the Creek Indians. A party of warriors from the Creek Indian villages here set out to the north where they attacked on the river on January 22, 1813, murdered two families in Ohio on their way back. Soon 2,000 warriors from 29 of the 34 towns of the Upper Creek had taken up arms. They were in league with the British. Incident followed incident. The massacre at Fort Mims occurred and the inhabitants of West Tennessee were daily expecting an attack. It was only by the failure of the British, frankly, to furnish the Creeks with the supplies, that such an attack never occurred.

On September 18, 1813, there was a meeting of the leading citizens in the area of Nashville who decided that a strong force ought to be sent at once into the very heart

of the territory of the Creeks with the mission of destroying the villages and forcing them to make peace. The Nashville citizens asked the legislature to authorize such a move and they requested the Governor, Governor Blount, to call out the Natchez Volunteers, which he did. The assembly called for 3,500 attached militia for a 3-month tour of duty and the committee called on Andrew Jackson and asked him to serve as the leader of the volunteers. He at once assumed direction for defense and called for the volunteers to assemble at Fayetteville, Tenn., on October 4, and arranged for supplies and food and ammunition.

Jackson and his troops crossed the Tennessee a few miles south of Huntsville, in fact, right close to Guntersville, and moved in a southeasterly direction to the mouth of Thompson's Creek where they built a fortification called Fort Deposit. It was Jackson's base of supplies on the Tennessee. He planned a campaign which provided for this supply base on the Tennessee at the southernmost part and a military road to be built for 50 miles to 10 islands on the Coosa, not far off Highway 77 between Talladega and Gadsden, where another fortified post would be established. Actually the second fortified fort which Jackson built was called Fort Strother. There for the first time he came within striking distance of the enemy. The hostile village of Tallaschhatchee, 13 miles to the east, was destroyed, and another successful engagement was fought at Talladega.

During the Creek War the Indians showed an unusual knowledge of warfare. They had some able leaders of mixed blood who understood the advantages of military discipline. They selected the strongest available point on the Tallapoosa River and they believed it to be impregnable. This was Towopeka, or the Horseshoe. While they waited for an attack, Jackson had time to complete the organization of his army. On February 6, the 39th Regiment of Regulars, 600 strong, arrived. The Regulars have a nucleus of permanent authority independent of militia.

Then news that 1,500 men with ample provisions were about to move from Fort Strother. And now Jackson thought was time to take advantage of his long sought opportunity. He hesitated no longer in leaving his river base. He marched through the forest to that point on the Tallapoosa 60 miles away, in which the enemy during 2 months had been preparing for their last stand. He reached it early in the morning of March 27, 1814. In a horseshoe like bend of the river there were a thousand warriors, the major force of the hostile Creeks.

Within the bend across the narrow part of the peninsula, there was a zigzag wall of logs from 5 to 8 feet high, 450 yards long, pierced for a double row of holes for rifle fire. The angles of the zigzag enabled the defenders to cover the ground in front of it with a crossfire. An area of about 100 acres was thus enclosed. In the part nearest the wall the trees had been felled in order to provide cover by their interlaced branches.

Jackson formed his plan of attack quickly. He would surround the Indians and make the destruction complete. He placed the infantry opposite the forbidding looking walls so that they could take it at the right moment. Commanding the whole zigzag defense he placed his two small canoes on the hill a distance of 80 yards. He ordered the cavalry and the friendly Indians, the Cherokees to cross the river and to hold the opposite bank in order to prevent escape in that direction. So at 10:30 in the morning, 150 years ago today, on this hallowed historic ground, the military forces of the United States of America and the warriors of the great Creek Confederacy, locked in mortal combat.

Fighting under the gallant Andrew Jackson, were some of the most fearless men who ever wore the uniform of our country. There was Lt. Lemuel Montgomery for whom Montgomery County was named. He died with an Indian rifle ball in his head as he led his men in the frontal attack. It is said that "Old Hickory" shed tears when he saw Montgomery's body. And he said, "I have lost the flower of my army." And then there was Ens. Sam Houston who leaped to the top of the breastwork as Montgomery fell. Although wounded in the thigh by an Indian bullet, and in the body by a barbed arrow, he fought bravely on to the end of the furious battle. His gallantry in action won him Jackson's undying gratitude and friendship. Houston, as you know, went on to attain greatness as the Governor of Tennessee, President of the Republic of Texas, U.S. Senator from the State of Texas, and a beloved American.

Sequoyah, the great Cherokee chieftain, and many of his braves fought with matchless valor alongside Jackson and his men. No reference to those who fought in this battle would fail to mention the resolute, dependable and vigilant, Gen. John Coffee, who was General Jackson's strong right arm. General Coffee remained Jackson's faithful and devoted friend through all the years of his life.

When the smoke and fury of battle had cleared away, 800 braves had been killed and 300 women had been taken prisoners. Jackson thought that not more than 20 warriors had escaped. The Americans lost 45 killed and 145 wounded. The battle gloriously won, Jackson then was ready to move on to Pensacola, Mobile, and to eternal fame at New Orleans. This victory broke the power of the Creek Confederacy and freed a vast section of our country for our American settlers. It also eliminated the power and influence of the Spanish in Alabama and Florida. It was the prelude to the removal from the Continental United States of the domination and influence of all foreign powers. It was the springboard which catapulted Jackson from the role of a border chieftain to national and international eminence. It was the beginning of the Jackson era.

In August 1907, the Alabama Legislature, by resolution, petitioned the Congress of the United States to take favorable action on a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable J. Thomas Heflin, an illustrious predecessor of mine, as the Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Alabama. The petition to the Congress was signed by the Governor, Braxton Bragg Comer, and by members of the Horseshoe Battle Park Commission. The concluding paragraph of the commission is quite interesting, and apropos. It said:

"The establishment of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park would not only be a long deferred recognition and commemoration on one of the great historic events in the life of our people, but it would be another expression of the patriot and educatory value of the lessons of the past. Its establishment would be a lasting memorial to the brave men who fought and to those who fell in those trying days when Indian aggression threatened our frontier civilization. But it would be more. It would mean that a grateful government could always be relied upon to do its duty not only to its patriotic dead but to its patriotic living as well."

In later years, the Congress of the United States, and this is important to us, declared that before any historic event can be commemorated, it is necessary to establish the national significance of the event. In presenting to the Congress our plea for the passage of the legislation under which this military park was designated, I said that if the winning of the Battle of New Orleans is of national significance, then Horseshoe Bend is of national significance, because it was the same troops, many of them, under the same great leader, Andrew Jackson, that later won the Battle of New Orleans. After the British had burned our Capitol in Washington, burned our White House, and had overrun practically all of the northern and eastern section of our country, if the Treaty of Ghent was a matter of national significance to end the War of 1812, it was brought about, as historians can prove, by the victory at Horseshoe Bend.

Honor is thus paid to Andrew Jackson and his troops who fought here on that day so long ago and to the military virtues and sacrifices, the tragedies, the triumphs, of early years as a nation.

As we look upon this peaceful vista today, and it is beautiful, it's difficult indeed for us to bring our mind's eye to focus upon the scene of war and destruction that I have just described, in very shallow detail to you, as having transpired at this very spot where you sit. Perhaps it is just as well that it is so. But at least we should remember our old heroes with veneration and thanks. Their courage was employed and their lives were given for our country and for us, the Americans who came after them.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, I have the high honor, and the very great privilege, and pleasure of dedicating this U.S. national military park to all of the heroes of our country from Bunker Hill in the Revolution to Pork Chop Hill in Korea. To those who fought and to those who died. To those who lived and to those who toiled. And to Americans all over the Nation, this now is their ground. This is hallowed ground, made so by the blood of the men who here fought and fell.

One other word I would like to say. I have served in the Congress of the United States now 20 years. I went there during the war when Franklin D. Roosevelt was President. Many of your sons and many of you were on foreign battlefields. I served through all of those years, and the longer I served the more I came to appreciate just what the flag means. The longer I served, the more I came to truly appreciate just how great and glorious it is to be an American citizen. As we dedicate this park, ladies and gentlemen, let us remember that the grandest, most glorious privilege a human being can have is to be an American citizen.

Lowell Technological Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our community colleges are destined to play an ever-increasing role in our higher education system in the years to come. Lowell Technological Institute of Lowell, Mass., is a fine example of a community college which has continued to carry out its original purpose to provide training in the textile technology field even while adapting to the tremendous advances in science. Under the dynamic leadership of President Martin Lydon, Lowell Tech is equipping engineers and technicians for important roles in industry and is providing in-service training for State and local government employees.

A detailed profile of Lowell Tech appeared under the byline of Richard J. Connolly in the May 14 edition of the Boston Globe. Under unanimous con-

sent, I include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LOWELL TECHNOLOGICAL INSTITUTE—THE EDUCATIONAL WEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

(By Richard J. Connolly)

LOWELL.—A lot of thread has left the spools since 1895, and its purpose, curriculums, and physical structure have changed drastically.

Even in this nuclear age Lowell Technological Institute is meeting the educational needs of today's youth without losing its original dedication to the textile industry.

Its success is obvious in its placement records

"There are eight job offers for every graduating senior and many of the jobs are along Route 128," its president, Martin J. Lydon, reported.

One senior, who barely met the entrance requirements 4 years ago and became a top student, will move into an $11,000 a year job as soon as he receives his degree next month.

The average starting salary for LTI graduates this year will be $8,500.

"Our textile engineers are in tremendous demand," Lydon, a native of this once-flourishing textile community, said.

There are more than a dozen textile laboratories, equipped with the world's latest machinery, on the expanding campus of 11 buildings.

When it opened in 1895 in rented rooms in downtown Lowell, the school started instruction in all phases of the textile industry.

Its name has been changed, but LTI is still known throughout the world for its training of textile engineers.

And as it diversifies itself to meet the needs of this age of science and technology, the institute enjoys a universal reputation for its efficient education of men and women in other fields.

With an expanded curriculum, it sends its graduates into the fields of chemistry, electrical engineering, industrial management, mechanical engineering, nuclear science, paper engineering, physics and plastics.

NEVER A DULL MOMENT

LTI serves the industries of Massachusetts. But with a thorough technical knowledge, it provides its graduates with a broad cultural background.

There are 1,500 day students—three times the enrollment of 10 years ago. Many commute from the industrial communities of the Merrimack Valley.

Thirty-five other States and 30 foreign countries are represented by the student body.

Through most of the year, the college is in use from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. Monday through Friday and part of Saturday. Twenty-four hundred students are enrolled in the night program.

It maintains a special in-service training program in 12 cities and towns of the Commonwealth for employees of the State department of public works and other State agencies.

The State-supported program, conducted in such communities as Pittsfield, Greenfield and Worcester, trains the State employees in the evening for associate degrees in civil engineering.

As an example of the institute's active program, summer sessions start 3 days after the regular curriculum ends in June.

The institute pioneered by offering applicants for the freshman class a special summertime refresher course in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and English.

The program was started 12 years ago when the institute found that applicants were not prepared properly.

Now students can take a 6- or 4-week course, at their own expense, to prepare them for their freshman studies. They receive no credits.

And if they don't pass at the end of the course, they are not admitted. More than 800 enrolled in the summertime program last year.

Administered by some of the institute's 325 faculty members, the summer program is self-sustaining and needs no financial help from the State.

In addition to the refresher course, the program includes professional advancement courses for industrial personnel and undergraduate courses for deficiency clearance and advanced standing.

Like other public-supported colleges in Massachusetts, Lowell Tech provides low-cost education. With tuition only $200 a year, commuting students who otherwise could not attend college find the cost within their budgets.

LYDON OF LOWELL

For $1,100 a year a student can reside on campus and meet most of the expenses.

The man who is leading Lowell Tech through its period of expansion in the space age was born here 46 years ago, attended Lowell High School and received his A.B. with honors in economics from Harvard University in 1940.

President Lydon's background in teaching includes work as an English instructor at Howe High School in Billerica and as an instructor in sociology at Lowell Tech.

He has an M.A. degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Education and was dean of students when he was selected for the president's job in 1950.

Lowell Tech is administered by a 17-member board of trustees, representing business, labor, and education. A nine-member building authority represents the trustees, the alumni, and the community.

Currently, the institute is in the middle of its most ambitious building program.

Later this month it will break ground for a $2,200,000 physical education plant with swimming pool, fully equipped gym, replacing one in use since 1905, hockey rink and rifle range.

By late this year it hopes to begin construction of its nuclear center with a "swimming pool-style" reactor for instruction and research—only the second such center in the State. MIT has the other center.

The $4,400,000 complex, including a classroom and reactor building, has been planned for 6 years. The design must be approved by the Atomic Energy Commission before construction can start.

There are also plans to extend the library building by constructing a $1,700,000 addition which will be connected to two dormitories built in 1948.

To show the need for additional dormitory facilities, President Lydon reported that the present dorms were designed to accommodate 220 students, but a total of 360 is residing there.

The LTI building authority has authorized the trustees to build new high-rise dormitories for 600 students on a self-liquidating pay-as-you-go basis.

This project will extend the campus across the Merrimack River into an urban renewal area.

FOUNDATION A BOON

In its across-the-river expansion program, the institute had found new quarters for the Lowell Technological Institute Research Foundation.

The foundation will move into a modern building formerly occupied by a supermarket.

With a fulltime staff of 72, the foundation is a nonprofit organization, handling research contracts for industry and the Government.

It has done research in satellite and deep space probe tracking; ionospheric and upper atmospheric physics; infrared systems for missile detection; and in efforts to find easy-care performance features for wool garments.

LTI facilities are being used by the Wool Bureau of the U.S. Branch of the International Wool Secretariat.

Under study are all-wool stretch fabrics, machine-washable wool products and permanent creases in slacks and pleats in wool skirts.

Frazar B. Wilde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Economic Development recently chose an outstanding economist and chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. to be chairman of the independent research organization.

Mr. Wilde has been a distinguished citizen in our community and in the Nation. He has served willingly on many boards which have furnished assistance in the formulation of public policy, is an expert in the field of fiscal and debt policies, and has loyally given time and effort to many occasions which have benefited the people.

His career and some of his contributions are told in the news release which I offer for the RECORD. I would add that he was cochairman last year of a Businessmen's Committee for Tax Reduction which assisted in bringing the facts of tax policy to public attention.

His interest in the growth of his own city has been marked by leadership which brought us a magnificent new home office in Bloomfield, Conn., classified as one of the great architectural achievements of recent years in New England. He has taken pride in the changes marking our community, and he returned just last weekend to the illustrious high school from which he graduated, to dedicate its new $9 million plant, a wonderful new home for the school founded in 1638 by Thomas Hooker.

The Committee for Economic Development, which he heads, is and should be familiar to us all. It presents an informed and constructive point of view on many issues of deep moment to the Nation. Sometimes its views have been controversial. Other times, it has taken the lead in exploring difficult questions of metropolitan government for example, where it has cast new light for those who must wrestle with deep and serious problems.

For a number of years, Mr. Wilde headed the research committees which undertook such studies. Later he was chairman of the Commission on Money and Credit, which submitted an independent report on changes which is believed practical in a monetary and banking system that has been growing at top speed.

I believe this new recognition is characteristic of a man whose idea of public service has carried him into many hours of hard work for his community, his State, and his Nation, above and beyond

the call of his daily participation in business. I offer this news release for the RECORD:

FRAZAR B. WILDE ELECTED NEW CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

NEW YORK, May 14.—Frazar B. Wilde, chairman of the board of directors of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., was today elected chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development (CED) at the semiannual meeting of the economic research organization in Chicago.

Mr. Wilde succeeds Thomas B. McCabe, chairman of the Scott Paper Co., who has been acting as chairman of CED since the death last November of Theodore V. Houser, late head of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Mr. Wilde becomes the ninth chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, an organization of 200 businessmen and educators which was established in 1942. A nonprofit, nonpolitical group, CED issues findings and policy recommendations for the "preservation and strengthening of our free society" through high employment, increasing productivity and living standards, and greater economic stability.

Since 1950 Mr. Wilde has been one of CED's most active trustees. He has been vice chairman of its board of trustees and chairman of its research and policy and program committees. He has participated in the formulation of many CED statements on national policy. He has been particularly active on CED's studies in the field of fiscal, monetary, and debt management policies, which helped lay the groundwork for the 1964 Federal tax reduction.

Mr. Wilde was chairman of the Commission on Money and Credit, a group established by CED in 1957 as an independent organization to make a 3-year study of U.S. public and private money and credit systems. Its report, published in June 1961, and entitled "Money and Credit: Their Influence on Jobs, Prices, and Growth," contained more than 80 recommendations for changes designed to improve the functioning and coordination of Government and private financial institutions.

Mr. Wilde has been a consultant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, a panel member of the Special Studies project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc., a member of the Armed Forces Advisory Committee, and a member of several organizations interested in economic problems.

He is a director of Aetna (Fire) Insurance Co., the Connecticut Bank & Trust Co., of Hartford, Conn., the Bankers Trust Co., of New York, the Lehman Corp., New York, the Emhart Manufacturing Co., Hartford, and several smaller corporations.

In Connecticut, Mr. Wilde has served on several committees and councils dealing with the financial problems of that State. He also is chairman of the board of Connecticut College and member of the board of trustees of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Connecticut. He holds honorary degrees from Trinity College, Hillyer College, and Wesleyan University.

The Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the magazine supplement to the Washington Sunday Star, This Week, dated May 17, 1964, carries a feature article entitled "Where American History Lives." This article, excellently written by Thomas J. Fleming, narrates the fascinating stories of six of the highlights of our great history. All six, as well as countless others not mentioned in this article, are of deep interest to all Americans. But, as the Congressman from the 20th District of Texas, the story of the Alamo is of particular interest.

The Alamo was founded as a mission about 250 years ago. Today it stands as a symbol of faith, dedication, and unswerving loyalty to our democratic way of life. With the unanimous consent of the Members of this House, I would like to submit for the RECORD the section of the article relating the story of the Alamo.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, May 17, 1964]

THE ALAMO

In 1718, Father Antonio de Olivares crossed the Rio Grande and with a group of other Spaniards founded a mission named after his patron saint, St. Anthony of Padua. It was on the edge of a vast unpopulated region called Texas.

The good padre never dreamed that a hundred years after his death his 4-acre mission with its two-story "convent" for the monks, its chapel and thick quadrangle wall enclosing the broad plaza would become first a fort, then a bloodstained monument to the courage of free men.

Long before this happened, the mission itself had been closed and the friars had been recalled to Mexico, their attempt to Christianize the Indians a failure. For a while it was used as a barracks for soldiers from Alamo del Parras in Mexico. The citizens of San Antonio called them "Los Alamos" and their home "El Alamo."

By the 1830's when adventurous men from many nations, England, Ireland, but especially the United States, began flocking to Texas, the old mission had been abandoned for a quarter of a century, a ruin used by occasional campers and freighters. The chapel roof had collapsed, the convent was sagging. The English-speaking settlers called the place simply "the Alamo."

These first Texans did their best to prove themselves good citizens of Mexico. But then an arrogant politician named Santa Ana tore up the constitution and made himself the nation's dictator in 1833. In 1835 after several skirmishes between the settlers and Mexican soldiers sent to discipline them, Santa Ana sent his brother-in-law, Martin Perfecto de Cos, north with an army of several hundred.

At San Antonio he collided with the Texans and promptly surrendered. All-out war was now inevitable. Without funds and with little or no authority to discipline their unruly volunteers, leaders such as Sam Houston, and Stephen Austin struggled to centralize the government and build an army.

Meanwhile, Santa Ana, who called himself "the Naopleon of the West," marched north with 6,000 men, vowing to wipe out all foreigners in Texas. His first target was San Antonio.

When Gen. Sam Houston learned of Santa Ana's advance, he ordered the handful of men guarding San Antonio to retreat. The order was ignored. The Alamo had already become the Texans' military depot. They now went to work to turn it into a fort. In command was William Barret Travis, a South Carolinian who held a lieutenant colonel's commission in the regular Texas army. Sharing the command with him was James Bowie, inventor of the knife which still bears his name.

A few days before the fighting began they were joined by ex-Congressman Davy Crockett and some of his "Tennessee boys." Convinced that reinforcements would come, they stood their ground even as regiment after regiment streamed into San Antonio, across the river.

Called on to surrender, Travis answered with a cannon shot. Santa Ana then hoisted to the tower of the San Fernando cathedral the dread red flag which meant no quarter would be shown henceforth to the defenders of the Alamo. The Texans converted the threat into a battle cry, "Victory or death."

But Travis knew their situation was desperate. He sent his friend James Bonham through the Mexican lines to Goliad, begging for reinforcements. Other urgent pleas for help brought 32 men from Gonzales. But the 500-man Texan army at Goliad, threatened by another Mexican force, did nothing.

For 12 days Santa Ana pounded the Alamo with his cannon. Minor skirmishing taught the Mexicans bloody lessons about the fearful accuracy of Texan rifles. But in spite of losses, the Mexicans slowly moved closer. Time was running out for the Alamo.

In the 10th day of the siege, Travis lined his men up in parade formation in the courtyard and told them exactly what they faced. Drawing a line in the dirt, he said that any man who chose to leave could do so now without disgrace. Those who wished to stay would step across the line. Every man stepped across.

At dawn on the 13th day in weather that had turned bitterly cold, the men on the Alamo's walls were awakened by the eerie bugle calls known as deguello, meaning attack with no quarter. Santa Anna's legions stormed toward the Alamo.

A hail of rifle and cannon fire cut them down by the hundreds, but their officers grimly drove them forward. Soon they were pouring into the mission.

The Texans fell back to the convent. Fighting from room to room, they died to the last man. Dealing death with gun and knife from his cot, where he was bedridden with typhoid fever, Jim Bowie met the same fate. When the carnage was over, all 187 of the Alamo's defenders were dead. Only about 16 women and children were spared. Mexican casualties were etsimated at over 1,500.

But Travis' last letter "to the people of Texas and all Americans in the world" electrified Texan resistance. Forty-six days later, shouting "Remember the Alamo," the men of Gen. Sam Houston's army smashed Santa Anna at the battle of San Jacinto and won independence for Texas.

As for the Alamo, it endured long decades of neglect interspersed by sporadic use as a military depot and later as a wholesale grocery and liquor store. In 1903, Clara Driscoll, wealthy granddaughter of a Texas hero, entered the struggle of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas to prevent the shrine from being razed.

Within 2 years the State fathers capitulated to these determined ladies, bought the property and conveyed it to the Daughters "to be maintained in good order and repair without charge to the State."

Today 600,000 people from every State visit the Alamo each year. Annually on March 6 a service is held in the old church to commemorate the sacrifice the heroes made. Although many, like Davy Crockett, had been in Texas only a month, the Daughters of the Republic proudly declare, "Texas honors and claims them all."

Coin Shortage Hits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following story appeared in the Lincoln-Belmont Booster, one of the most prominent newspapers in my district, published by Mr. Leo Lerner. It describes very graphically the coin shortage which is now being experienced by merchants throughout Chicago and the Midwest. It states in more eloquent terms than I could marshal why it is imperative that a new mint be established without delay in the Midwest.

I am very happy to have joined my colleagues from Illinois in sponsoring legislation which would establish a new mint in the Chicago area.

It is little consolation for the businessman of the Midwest to know that the Philadelphia mint is now going on a 7-day schedule because the Treasury Department itself admits that it will be at least 2 years before any substantial relief can be brought to the people of my area. In view of the population growth and the economic expansion, I am convinced that even a stepped-up schedule is not going to meet our needs for coins. It is for this reason I hope the Congress will not delay in authorizing a new mint in the Chicago area.

The Lerner newspaper article follows:

IT MAKES CENTS—BRING CHANGE: COIN SHORTAGE HITS NORTH SIDE STORES

A national problem, coin shortage, has hit North Side stores and local merchants are asking customers to circulate more coins.

Talking with store managers, this newspaper learned that the coin shortage is not a new problem but that this time, it has lingered longer.

The store managers said the cause was a combination of factors. They listed these reasons: seasonal fluctuation with the mint running behind its appropriation plus people saving coins for collection purposes.

"There are plenty of coins around in parking meters, vending machines and stamp machines according to some experts I've talked to," asserted Don Miller, manager for Jewel Tea Store at 659 Diversey, "but we just haven't been getting it."

"We are asking that all customers make change for purchases," he said.

Steve Connelly, manager at Janson's Fine Foods, 2758 Racine, told this newspaper, "Yes, there is a shortage of coins." He urged that customers break up their piggy banks and make purchases with coins. Considering the shortage "severe," he related that it has been a problem for the last 4 months.

"We are limited to the amount of change we can get at the banks," he said, "and this creates a problem."

"Bring as much change as possible," James Hoghaug, manager at Osco Drugs, 651 Diversey, urged. "This is quite a problem."

Harry Stupner, manager at Walgreen's 3213 Ashland, stated, "This has been the problem for about 6 months."

Asked if this was a new problem, he answered, "No, it has happened before. This time it hasn't gone away. We are asking our customers for change."

Barnard's Leading Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that Barnard College, one of our Nation's finest colleges for women, is located on Morningside Heights in the 20th Congressional District. Barnard College, in the 75 distinguished years of its existence, has provided the Nation with women who are not only of the highest intellectual caliber, but also have acquired through their Barnard training a finely developed sense of community service. In the 75th anniversary issue of the Barnard Alumnae, Annette Kar Baxter, Barnard 1947, who is an associate in history at the college, writes of the roles played by five leading women in the history of Barnard. I recommend the following article to all who are interested in American education.

[From Barnard Alumnae magazine, Spring 1964]

THE COLLEGE'S LEADING WOMEN AND THEIR ROLES—AN INTERPRETATION

(By Annette Kar Baxter, 1947)

Five major figures in Barnard's history—Ella Weed, Emily Putnam, Virginia Gildersleeve, Millicent McIntosh, and Rosemary Park—are reliable guides through the first 75 years of a singular educational institution. They also offer insights into the changing status of those provocative people, educated women.

Ella Weed is a name little known to the current generation of students. Not only does she deserve to be remembered, but she quickly becomes unforgettable to anyone who studies her life and career. A humorous, energetic spinster from Newburgh, N.Y., she was a Vassar girl far more intriguing than certain ones of later vintage. In fact, she published in 1883 a satirical Vassar novel of her own, "A Foolish Virgin," which stirred up sympathy for the cause of women's education with its portrayal of a heroine who tries to hide here intellectual superiority. But it was Miss Weed's reputation as educator and administrator, first at an Ohio girls' school and then in New York as head of the day school at Miss Brown's, that brought here to the attention of Annie Nathan Meyer when that determined young woman needed a collaborator in the drive to establish a female annex at Columbia. As chairman of the academic committee when Barnard opened in 1889, Ella Weed almost singlehandedly created a first-rate educational institution for women. In the critical years of the college's infancy, she insisted on the two policies that brought immediate stature to Barnard: matching Columbia's entrance requirements, and having the supervisory power of Columbia applied to all instruction at Barnard. The record of her intense, her almost frantic, activities, clearly indicates that Ella Weed's sacrifice of literary ambitions, as well as a private existence apart from her career, enabled here to lay the solid foundations of our college. Her death at the age of 41, from "nervous prostration" attributed to overwork in summer educational ventures, was recognized by Barnard as a heavy loss, but her obituary in the Newburgh press made little of her achievement, and her grave in the family plot there is neglected today.

Because the hopes of Ella Weed and the Barnard students of her day were shared by so few feminine contemporaries, their pioneering remained relatively free of the psychological struggles over "the role of woman" that have plagued us since. The small corps of women in search of the then impossible—an education equal to the best available for men—were too narrowly focused in their aims to anticipate today's broader conflicts. It was eccentric enough to want a Barnard degree; it would be outrageous to let it atrophy through marriage.

With Emily Smith Putman the picture changes scale. Miss Smith was a brilliant graduate of the first class at Bryn Mawr, a classicist with an array of human as well as scholarly talents, warm and witty, sufficiently expert at academic politics and intolerant of fools to keep not only Barnard, but the neighboring institution from which she elicited historic concessions, continually on the alert. All the more impressive, therefore, is her correspondence with President Low and Dean Van Amringe, with its scrupulous referral of all policy questions to the Columbia administration. Her acquisition in 1895 of three distinguished scholars for Barnard prodded Columbia into a regular exchange of faculty time. In 1900 she negotiated the agreement establishing Barnard-Columbia relations on a then uniquely privileged footing for an affiliated woman's college.

But meanwhile, fatal step, she had married, and not long after she became pregnant. The legend is that only the need to reassure trustees panicked by her mysterious illness persuaded her to reveal her approaching motherhood. Soon Mrs. Putman was prevailed upon to surrender the deanship as unbefitting a mother-to-be. Declining to sulk, she returned to a part-time teaching career at Barnard, and produced books, translations, and articles.

Among her writings was "The Lady," a study of upperclass women from ancient Greece to the ante bellum South, written in a cool, elliptic style that underplays the range of its author's scholarship and disguises the contemporary relevance of her remarks. Adherents to the school-of-self-commiseration will come away from "The Lady" with the unconsoling suspicion that women are hardly worse off now than they have even been, for Mrs. Putnam's evidence discredits all recent conspiratorial theories that would get women off the hook of under achievement.

In addition to her writing, Mrs. Putnam shared the career of her publisher husband, George Haven Putnam, and promoted important civic and educational causes in New York. Alvin Johnson, grand old man of the New School for Social Research, credits her with supplying direction when in 1919 plans for the new school were stalemated by disagreement among its founders. "She was the strongest figure at that meeting—which determined the principal purpose of the new institution—and at successive meetings. She was the strongest figure on the Board, after we got organized," he has recently recalled. After the death of her husband Mrs. Putnam lived with an older sister in Spain, escaping dramtically during the Civil War, and ended her days in Jamaica. Today she is remembered with worshipful affection by surviving members of her family.

Returning from this untypical woman to the all too typical circumstances surrounding her resignation arouses an uneasiness which mounts when we find that she was succeeded for a period by Laura Drake Gill, a lady of good instincts and education but apparently without the temperament that would find the deanship congenial. We wonder whether Mrs. Putnam's loss was inevitable.

The dilemma reflected in Mrs. Putnam's resignation was not seen by Virginia Gildersleeve as capable of easy resolution. Undertaking the deanship in 1911 at the age of

34, Miss Gildersleeve, an alumna of the class of 1899, guided Barnard into its full maturity and retired in 1947 when she had twice seen it through the displacements of a world war. And it was her character—she never flinched before an old-fashioned concept like "character"—that anchored Barnard to its professed ideal: whatever else serious women might do, whatever format their lives might assume, they were not entitled to betray their intellectual capacities. Because Virginia Gildersleeve never herself swerved from that principle, she gave the thousands of students under her administration the sense of its being a first principle, to which all other considerations had somehow to be accommodated. As her years lengthened, Dean Gildersleeve came to serve on an endless series of committees, federations, boards, and advisory panels, including the Democratic slate for the Electoral College, the American College for Girls in Istanbul, and the United Nations conference of 1945 in San Francisco. Her extracurricular activities were recognizably those of the most distinguished woman in American education of her time.

So dedicated to scholarship and public service, so formidable in her person and in the demands that she made on herself in the name of educated integrity, Dean Gildersleeve may have seemed to many of those who looked up to her to have denied the need for family and home that they themselves found insistent. That this conflict could, under the most auspicious circumstances, be resolved was illustrated in the life and career of Barnard's next dean.

Through 15 years of vigorous examination of the problem, Millicent McIntosh brought Barnard and the world to a closer acknowledgement of the dual needs, intellectual and emotional, of woman and was even courageous enough to suggest their interdependence. Publicly, as the mother of five children, she was known as the first of Barnard's deans to carry off the duality successfully in her own life; privately, by her students and faculty, she could daily be seen tackling the more difficult assignment of making her own extraordinary achievement appear not simply desirable but a practical possibility for more women.

As Barnard's first president (the changeover from dean occurred in 1952), Mrs. McIntosh had to meet the college's spiraling postwar budget by continually wheedling and cajoling its alumnae and friends, while maintaining a firm administrative stance at the head of a scholarly institution. Two quite incompatible roles—during a period when her charges were not just parading in Bermuda shorts but manifesting a major revision of their personal values. Like her predecessor, Mrs. McIntosh became, before and after retirement, the Influential Woman, more concerned with airplane schedules than with her reserves of energy. A less committed lady would have turned aside half of the gratuitous tasks she accepted. Out of these pressures came her distinctive contribution. She brought into intimate, responsive relation the liberating potential of education and the restricting realities of women's situation.

Now Barnard under President Park is obliged to pursue this relation, to continue the dialog, to sight fresh opportunities for women and to make them accessible. The mind and temperament of the new president are equal to the task, for, obviously a thinker, she is apparently incapable of thinking in clichés. In a talk delivered at the 1956 Barnard Forum on Women in Politics, while still president of Connecticut College, Miss Park explored some of the reasons for the failure of women to participate more effectively in American political life:

"It seems to me we ought to continue, with all the power at our command, to indoctrinate this younger generation with a sense of responsibility for the effective conduct of their democratic society, and I would have to admit that this is somewhat more difficult to do with women than with men. If this were entirely a feminine audience, I would whisper in your ear that women still have in the back of their minds the feeling that someone is going to take care of them, and this goes over a little bit into politics, I'm afraid. There's a little reluctance to stand on your own feet just as there is a little reluctance to enter professional life too."

In other words, neither self-commiseration nor self-congratulation will be condoned behind what's left of the college's green fence.

The major question looming before Barnard in the immediate future is the advisability of closer identification with Columbia. This entails working out a modern rationale for the separate woman's college. Certainly the burden of proof will rest with Barnard if it chooses to retain its independence: the example of Radcliffe's surrender of its separate academic identity is a powerful one, and none of the other leading women's colleges confronts a great university within easy merging distance. The demand for amalgamation with, which actually means absorption into, Columbia has grown in recent years with the desire for free access to more courses, for administrative efficiency, and for joint faculty appointments. Will Barnard's separateness become an anachronism, or will a valid reformulation of its institutional integrity be found?

The choice that Barnard faces is the choice, written large, that the graduates of Barnard have to face. Whether married and devoted to their families, working and devoted to their careers, or hybrids precariously balancing the two, they always risk absorption by the male world. The early feminists passionately believed in two ways of reducing this traditional risk and, in the process, confirming and enlarging the human endowments of women. Those two ways were public service and private creativity. Fortunately, the feminist impulse in Barnard women dies hard. To recall the history of Barnard's leadership is to revive that impulse in its most venturesome guise.

Water: Promises Aren't Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exceptionally fine lead editorial appearing in the May 13, 1964, edition of the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Water: Promises Aren't Enough."

This editorial take sharp issue with the Secretary of the Interior's recent announcement that he was ordering water storage at Hoover Dam reduced in order to build up the storage capacity of Glen Canyon Dam further upstream on the Colorado River.

As is obvious, this decision could easily jeopardize southern California's primary water reserves and power generation potential at Hoover Dam.

And it also illustrates graphically the extremely serious situation developing in all the Far Western States as a result of the threatened water shortage in the Colorado River system.

Under the circumstances, our first and primary task is to assure that the present water and power rights of the people of the Pacific Southwest are respected.

For instance, we must preserve the 1962 agreement to guarantee that the water storage capacity of Lake Mead, in back of Hoover Dam on the lower part of the river, is not sacrificed to the desire to speed the beginning of power generation at Glen Canyon Dam serving the upper Colorado River States.

In addition, the rules, regulations, and agreements contained in the Colorado River Storage Act and the Colorado River compact must be faithfully adhered to by all parties affected.

And finally, the recent Supreme Court ruling on the division of Colorado River water between Arizona, California, and Nevada is accepted as authority on this matter.

Having said all this, we are still faced with the unhappy fact that, in comparison to our region's continually increasing requirements, the present water and power supplies of the Colorado River constitute a diminishing asset.

The fast growing population of southern California alone is expected to more than triple within the next 35 years, and the other States of the region are experiencing similar growth patterns.

In a larger sense, therefore, the people of the Pacific Southwest region must go beyond merely preserving their present water and power rights. They must begin to look for additional new sources of future supplies to meet the increasing demands of our rapidly expanding economy.

The Times editorial states this proposition well when it notes that there is "no time for delay in finding a sound regional solution to the shortage."

In my opinion, we must begin now to look beyond our present resources to consider utilizing the almost untapped resources of the Pacific Northwest, western Canada, and even Alaska, if we are to provide the firm economic base we need so that our children and grandchildren may also enjoy the bright promise of America's Golden West.

The Times editorial points in this direction:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 13, 1964]

("Equal rights; liberty under the law, true industrial freedom." Harrison Gray Otis, 1881–1917; Harry Chandler, 1917–44; Norman Chandler, chairman and president, Times Mirror Co.; Otis Chandler, publisher; Nick B. Williams, editor; Frank Haven, managing editor; Robert D. Nelson, vice president and general manager; and James Bassett, director, editorial pages.)

WATER: PROMISES AREN'T ENOUGH

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall this week mixed politics and water—and southern California came out on the short end.

Breaking a pledge he had affirmed in 1962, the Secretary ordered the water storage at Hoover Dam reduced in order to build up the Colorado River Water behind Glen Canyon Dam. As a result, southern California's primary water reserves and power generation potential at Hoover Dam will be dangerously cut back.

This manmade shortage is so serious that the Metropolitan Water District warned that another dry year could mean that there won't be enough Colorado River water for the MWD's 9 million customers.

There are as yet no generators at Glen Canyon Dam, but apparently a full head of political pressure had been built up. Secretary Udall not only bowed to the demands of the Upper Basin States but also had the temerity to propose that Southern California, Arizona, and Nevada voluntarily use 10 percent less water.

The Secretary nevertheless has probably done the States dependent upon the Lower Colorado a good turn in spite of himself.

First, his decision painfully illustrates that the shortage of Colorado River water may be much closer than the experts' estimates. Even the most pessimistic had assumed that the pinch would not be felt before 1970 or until the central Arizona project was in operation.

Obviously there is no time for delay in finding a sound regional solution to the shortage. And just as obviously the safeguards to California's basic water rights in such a solution must be clearly defined.

If Secretary Udall can break faith with California and Arizona on taking water from Hoover Dam, how can we accept the glittering promises in his Pacific Southwest water plan? There can be no doubt now that California's right to 4.4 million acre-feet from the Colorado River must be guaranteed by law.

This is set forth in the far better regional water plan introduced by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California, Kuchel's bill provides for both this State's rightful share of the Colorado and for the central Arizona project, with the search for additional water broadened beyond the boundaries of the region.

Arizona, which suffered the Hoover Dam cutback with California, must now agree that the Kuchel water plan has never looked better.

Bill Doherty, Our Fine U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Bill Doherty, U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, deserves the thanks of the U.S. Congress and the American people for the fine and successful service he rendered during his tour of duty in Jamaica.

Having made several trips to Jamaica during the past year, I can report of my own knowledge and direct observation. The officials and people of Jamaica highly approved of Bill Doherty's service. They warmly liked Bill Doherty and his good wife Gertrude, and are sincerely sorry to see the Dohertys leave Jamaica.

I am calling to the attention of the U.S. Congress several articles pointing out Ambassador Bill Doherty's outstanding success as U.S. Ambassador in Jamaica:

[From the Star, Kingston, Jamaica, Apr. 25, 1964]

Au revoir, Bill and Gertrude. Jamaica's welcome mat will always be laid out for you. Diplomats come and diplomats go and to most Jamaicans it means little or nothing. They feel that these consuls exist solely for the purpose of attending to the interests of their nationals in, or visiting, Jamaica. With one exception—the consul general of the United States of America. The office (if not the man) has ever held great interest for all Jamaicans, as every man, woman, and child continually dreams that some day they will be able to enter the big republic, if even as a visitor.

Business with the American consul general brought Jamaicans into direct contact with consular officers only. There was no reason for them to see the man who sat in the chair of the consul general. Over the years I doubt very much if the majority of Jamaicans even knew the name of the consul general, or would recognize him if they saw him on the street. He was that impersonal. No fault of the man, it was just the way the cookie crumbled.

Then history changed. In 1962, Jamaica became an independent nation and the status of consulate became Embassies and these required Ambassadors. So this country had to have an American Embassy and an American Ambassador.

In Washington, the late President John F. Kennedy selected a man for Jamaica. He was Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. And to Jamaica he came. Now he must go. He leaves Jamaica today having resigned his post as Ambassador.

Unlike the former consuls general, there are few persons in this island who do not know that Bill Doherty (he likes to be called Bill) is the American Ambassador. Or was. Many know him personally and no one who has ever had a good reason for seeing him was ever denied access to his office.

A large-bodied, genial, affable man, always with a smile and a hand outstretched in greeting, Mr. Doherty has endeared himself to all Jamaica both as a man and as the American Ambassador. He has made friends by the score and acquaintances by the thousand. The assistance which he gave to Jamaica's economy has been outstanding, largely through his influence in Washington and love of Jamaica.

Mr. Doherty's most recent gesture in securing his President's favor to our ailing Prime Minister, Sir Alexander Bustamante, will long live in the memory of the Jamaican people. It was an act above and beyond the call of duty and I feel sure he would have done it no matter who was Prime Minister.

In her own quiet way Mrs. Doherty made quite an impact on our social and philanthropic circles. A perfect hostess in her Long Lane residence with her husband and herself making their guests feel that they were visiting friends, rather than diplomat and wife. Also, in her quiet way, she would attend social functions geared specially for women and/or children and say a few encouraging and beneficial words. A perfect helpmate, a love that will endure to the end and into eternity.

FIGHTER

The true character of Bill Doherty, 62, is not seen in his diplomatic work for that is only 2 short years. One has to read his autobiography, "Mailman, U.S.A." (as I have been privileged to do) to get the full picture of this man.

With characteristic modesty he put little of his own personal life into the story, but confined it to the great uphill fight others and himself made (particularly in the last 50 years) to lift the American mailman into his proper place in the sun. Says Bill "The man who marches the streets of urban American in uniform of gray, delivering the Nation's mail, stands as the living symbol and personification of the greatest system of communications ever devised by the human mind."

He should know, having once marched through the streets of his native city, Cincinnati, Ohio, with his mailbag.

The story of the long struggle of the National Association of Letter Carriers (of which Mr. Doherty was president, 1940–63) shows what a great and relentless fighter he is when the cause is just. No opponent was too formidable, whether Postmaster or President of the Nation, they were met head on and vanquished.

By political persuasion Bill is a Democrat and he says "I was born a Democrat, I proudly live as a Democrat. I shall die a Democrat." By religion he is a devout Catholic. As a family man, he has 9 children and (as he puts it) "42 unbeatable grandchildren."

"Mailman, U.S.A." is dedicated "To the former telegraph operator who signed herself 'GD'—Gertrude Dacey Doherty." This is the Cincinnati girl who Bill first talked with on the key (thinking "GD" was a man) then learning the truth, made a blind date, fell in love and was married.

So I say simply "Au revoir, Bill and Gertrude, and may God go with you and bring you back to our shores one day soon. Jamaican's welcome mat will always be laid out for you, good friends."

AMBASSADOR DOHERTY

With deep regret we received the announcement of the resignation, effective this week, of Mr. William C. Doherty, U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica.

Mr. Doherty's resignation deserves more than ordinary attention since he served as the representative of our neighbor to the north to Jamaica's first government of independence. It was his arduous task to conduct the multifarious negotiations between the two governments and thus set the intricate pattern of all further relationships. It was he who charted the path of our business with the giant of Western democracy.

During nearly 2 years with us here in Jamaica, Mr. Doherty sought eagerly and received warmly the friendliness and cooperation of our Government. Though not a professional diplomat, the Ambassador swung quickly into his work and manifested his keen interest in the affairs of the island. Very few facets of our political and economic life missed his zealous attention; no area of the island was neglected by him. With graciousness he was received in our towns and villages.

In cooperation with the U.S.-AID mission here in Jamaica and with the volunteers of the U.S. Peace Corps, the Ambassador and his assistants charted a policy of mutual self-help that will influence the next few decades of Jamaica's relationship with the West. Already, scattered through the island, are physical witnesses to the zeal of the entire American mission. More Jamaican people are housed, areas of Jamaica's green lands are engineered and institutions of Jamaica's children are enriched by the workmanlike procedures of the Mission's officers. We know that these are due in no small part to the diligence of Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. Doherty and his charitable wife have enriched the island with their quiet courtesies. They have set a benchmark of competence and quality.

Mr. Doherty, we are sure, will agree with us when we express our fondest wish that his departure will not be a negative one; we know that he wishes only that the work begun will be carried on. His government now has been placed under an embarrassment. They must give us another Mr. Doherty. A large order, yes. But we hope and pray that the witness to democracy carried by Mr. Doherty will not fail in his absence. We pray for continued good health, good life, and final bliss for our first American Ambassador.

THE DOHERTYS

The EDITOR:

On Saturday, April 25, the *Santa Rosa* will carry from Jamaica two people who have in a brief time won the hearts of all Jamaicans: His Excellency William Charles Doherty, first

U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, and Gertrude Dacey Doherty, his wife, good will ambassador extraordinary.

In 1½ years the Dohertys traveled to all parts of our country, meeting Jamaicans of every walk of life. Not only did they see Jamaica and Jamaicans, but they understood us and loved us.

The frank, blunt charm of the Ambassador carried the conviction of truth and sincerity both in private talks and before the public. Though political appointees are usually not favored by U.S. Foreign Service officers, Mr. Doherty gained great popularity with his staff and many of them have expressed sincere regret at his leaving. The wit and graciousness of Mrs. Doherty have become legend in the city and the country. Despite poor health she has maintained a strenuous round of activities matching her husband's.

The Dohertys were the independence gift of the late President Kennedy to Jamaica. They now return to their country to lend their talents to its interests at home and to the new President.

To them, as they leave, we say: "The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord show His face to you, and have mercy on you. The Lord turn His countenance to you, and give you peace" (Numbers 6: 24–26).

Sincerely,

A GRATEFUL JAMAICAN.

KINGSTON, *April 21, 1964.*

How Conservative Can You Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a commentary on the Conservative Party of New York by Walter L. Kirschenbaum which appeared in the April-May edition of the Liberal Party News.

The article follows:

[From the Liberal Party News, April-May 1964]

HOW CONSERVATIVE CAN YOU GET?

(By Walter L. Kirschenbaum)

A reading of the New York State Conservative platform is like looking at a clock that has stopped. The second hand has stopped somewhere midway between yesterday and tomorrow.

It is regrettable. There is a need for a Conservative Party into which tired political souls can enter and continue their exercises in frustration. This should be the repository of the Democratic and Republican conservatives who, in this democracy, must someday, find political repose together. To liberals the Conservative Party should not be an ogre but a vindication of the philosophy that states candidly that if there is to be a two-party system the voters would be better served if the two dominant wings of both major parties whose basic tenets are in consistent and constant conflict were separated into their legitimate and respective political arenas.

The New York State Conservative Party platform has the starchiness of a McKinley collar. It attacks the welfare state but has no solution for poverty; it attacks rent controls but has no solution for fighting slumlords; it looks down its nose at those who want a better tomorrow on the grounds that yesterday was 1890 and today's claim of being 1964 is a subversive plot. It is a platform that talks about free enterprise the way an exploiter speaks about "my people."

What does the conservative party want in 1964 that was not already proven wrong in 1900? Can we meet automation and the problems it creates by returning government to a philosophy that cares nothing for the economically displaced human beings involved? Can we truly turn our back on those in need and rely on private charity to eke out doles in place of human dignity? Can we, in 1964, give succor to the prosegregationist philosophy that the conservative party nourishes by its States rights attitude? The answers are obviously in the negative.

The conservative party in New York has no future because it has no faith in the future. Its platform is built on corroded timber. It is a souless platform and without soul a political platform is nothing but a waste of words woven together to inflame rather than teach.

In the international arena the conservative party is a Goldwaterian echo chamber. While liberation of captive nations and peoples is a goal we all share, what trigger is released and on what—to do the job? Do we have allies or do we renounce them? How does a platform steeped in an anti-U.N. venom speak for those who must be liberated from all forms of totalitarianism? It is the conservatives, when they get into power, who became soft on communism first and fastest. Is not De Gaulle a conservative? Is not France? Is not Sir Alex Home?

How has the world come to this pass? If you read the literature of the conservative party it is all to be blamed on the liberal party. With foot-in-mouth (not relegated to farm animals but a conservative disease) and not tongue-in-cheek, their newest folder blames the liberal party for Nelson Rockefeller's financial hold on the State's purse strings; for the ADA's endorsement of Senator JACK JAVITS and for Mayor Wagner's control over the Democratic Party. In addition, the liberal party is also "guilty" because no statewide primary elections are held. So much for scapegoatism.

As the conservatives take to their dinosaurs and ride the countryside warning about the "liberal plot" to take over the country, I, for one, hope they are right. For if it is constitutional government, individual liberty, victory over all forms of totalitarianism, close to 400,000 liberal New York State voters as opposed to over 100,000 conservative voters know the difference between getting to these goals via positive means as opposed to negative routes. Let the clock tick toward tomorrow without compromise.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Boy Builders of Bloomington (Ind.), Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, one of the cardinal problems facing the Nation today is that of high school dropouts. It is indeed alarming to realize that statistics clearly indicate that the income of our boys and girls who leave the public school and private school systems is materially affected when they are deprived of the advantage of a high school diploma. There is a growing awareness of this problem and its effect not only upon the families involved, but also on the total economy of the Nation. Many communities have organized efforts to attack the problem. One such effort has been organized by the citizens of Bloomington, Ind.

Boy Builders of Bloomington (Ind.), Inc., is a nonprofit organization designed to help youths 16 years of age and older, who have dropped out of school. This program will provide substantial assistance to youths who are often unable to obtain jobs because they have not been able to finish school, and therefore are deficient in education. I believe this program will make a valuable contribution to community life.

Because of the great interest of Congress and the administration in programs which are designed to promote the welfare of youth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief synopsis of the main features of Boy Builders of Bloomington, Ind.

It is imperative that this program and all the other programs being established in this field be carefully studied by us, so that we may arrive at the best possible one in an all-out attack on the problem of high school dropouts.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOY BUILDERS OF BLOOMINGTON, INC.

SYNOPSIS OF ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAM

Boy Builders is the prototype of a community sponsored work-study program designed to combat the increasing waves of juvenile delinquency and unemployment resulting from the school dropout problem.

Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc., is an Indiana not-for-profit corporation chartered on September 17, 1962, by the secretary of state, State of Indiana, for the directors of the corporation. The executive board of directors and the advisory board of consultants reads like a Who's Who of Bloomington.

The program calls for a special academic and vocational opportunity for boys with educational deficiencies (socioeconomic problems, rather than physical handicaps or mental retardation) which have caused them to drop out of public school as quickly as possible, only to learn that the majority of acceptable employment opportunities are closed to them until they become 18 years of age.

It is not organically related to either the public school system nor with Indiana University, but was organized by a group of citizens concerned by the high rate of public school dropouts and the lack of an adequate vocational education program.

The organization was not founded in conflict with the public school program, nor to embarrass already harassed public school officials who are well aware of the problem. The purpose is to provide an experimental study of an unusual nature where public tax support was not available.

Dr. Lawrence Read, superintendent of the Bloomington metropolitan school system, in a front-page article of the Bloomington Daily Herald-Telephone, dated March 9, 1963, said, "It is common knowledge that the property tax, which provides over two-thirds of our total educational revenue in Bloomington, has been exhausted in this community as a source of educational income. Until such a time as a new source of income is found for the support of education, it is encumbent upon school officials to live within their income and examine with care and objectivity the total school program to make certain that proper priorities have been established for spending."

Officials and teachers from the Bloomington metropolitan school system, the Monroe County school system, and Indiana University are serving without pay on the advisory board of consultants.

It was determined that a community sponsored work-study program, with the leadership and consultation of business, education, industry, labor, professions, and religion should attack this tragic waste of American youth and project a different type of academic and vocational program which might easily be adapted to other communities facing similar problems to those of this community.

The administrative and staff requirements and portions of the necessary tools and equipment have been assured by the local business and industrial complex and a grant of $30,000 from Lilly Endowment, Inc., of Indianapolis. Other foundations are also being invited to consider a grant-in-aid program. National business organizations and industrial firms are being contacted for financial assistance or equipment grants.

Boy Builders is a projected 3-year program growing out of 5 years of studies and projects which have gone into the research for this new program. "A committee will determine and make recommendations as to whether the continuing program should be incorporated into some phase of the tax-supported institutional structure of the community; or—if it should develop that additional financial assistance is needed—shall apply for membership in the local United Fund agency and organizational structure; or whether it should remain as a privately supported project of business and industry, labor, and education; or in what manner Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc., should be perpetuated." (Prospectus: Plan for the Future.)

The immediate objective is to provide an inbetween program for the boy who is legally permitted to drop out of public school at the age of 16, but is limited in his vocational opportunities until he is 18 years of age because of insurance and compensation regulations.

It is also the purpose of the program to call attention to the need for additional technical training within the framework of the public school system and recognized as having comparable inmportance to that of academic instruction. Emphasis will be placed on a preapprenticeship program under the direction of skilled craftsmen.

The program has national significance in that it will provide data and information for many communities, through basic research, as to new methods for the prevention of delinquent behavior and the rehabilitation of alienated and agressive youth.

It will also offer an opportunity for both undergraduate and graduate students attending Indiana University from all over the world to observe and participate in a program which provides a practical program for dealing with the problem of school dropouts.

There are no restrictions placed on membership in Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc. Any boy 16 years of age or older is eligible for membership in the organization. Unlimited opportunities are available to boys regardless of origin, race, religion, creed, or degree of academic and vocational deficiency.

The boys are involved in a comprehensive program beyond the normal concept of a 5-day week regular school program. Each boy will have an opportunity to indicate his individual needs through a series of tests and evaluations to be administered by professionally trained faculty and staff members of Indiana University.

Each boy will have an individual tutor or counselor, using the wives of faculty members or retired teachers, to whom he will look for guidance and assistance. A broad course of diversified cooperative education leading to high school graduation is being projected through educational channels from the local to the State level. No boy will be forced to complete the required academic work, but it will be available to any boy who desires to better himself by working in a program of study designed to award him with a high school diploma.

The vocational program will center around the house construction industry. Each boy will have an opportunity to work in all areas under the direction and instruction of skilled craftsmen and instructors. He will start with the preparation of the ground for footers and the foundations and continue through to the capping of the chimney and the landscaping of the grounds.

The program is designed to offer a preapprenticeship program which may lead to acceptance as an apprentice in the trade of his choice when he becomes 18 years of age and can satisfy the entrance requirements for apprenticeship training. Boys whose manual dexterity or mental ability prohibit entrance into skilled apprenticeship programs will be directed toward employment commensurate with their abilities.

The boys will not be paid salaries, but will be taught the value of service as the houses will be built for, and with the help of, young married couples within the community who otherwise would not be financially able to build or purchase a house. It will embody a self-help plan, again under skilled crafts-

men, which will permit the young couple to build up a "sweat equity" of their own. Although the boys will not be paid, each will receive a personal allowance of $5 a week. Hot lunches will be furnished. Clothing and shoes will be furnished. Foster homes will be provided where needed. Those who wish to engage in sports may be members of basketball, softball, bowling teams, etc. Clothes, equipment, fees, etc., will be paid by the organization.

Each boy will receive regular medical, dental, and optical examinations and checkups. Several different kinds of insurance, including health and accident, are carried on each member of the organization. Saturday will be outside work day and assistance will be given to boys who wish to earn additional money. The hourly rate has been established at $1.25. The work must be within the framework of what the State regulations will permit.

Development of the Susquehanna River Watershed Through Three-State Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening I had the distinct pleasure of introducing Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., as the principal speaker at a dinner meeting of the Susquehanna River Basin Association at Havre de Grace, Md. As the original sponsor of the measure in the House for the proper development of the Susquehanna Watershed through the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, I was particularly interested and impressed by the highly informative address which Secretary Carver gave on that occasion. The association's members who were present were, I am sure, also impressed and encouraged by the Secretary's remarks. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the text of the Secretary's address on Friday, May 15, 1964.

Secretary Carver's address follows:

REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR.

Earlier today I spoke to a group in Washington concerning the development of the Potomac; 2 weeks ago in the Pacific Southwest I dodged questions about the regulation of the Colorado; and one of the biggest stories in my native Northwest is the covetousness of the parched Southwest to tap into the Snake and the Columbia. But I must confess that it was not until Secretary Udall's emergency change in plans called me to the pinch-hit role tonight that I had ever given much thought to the Susquehanna.

Whether I can qualify as an expert on the Susquehanna may be doubtful, but I think I know something about the kind of activity that your association represents. For an examination of history shows that major development of a river system is always preceded by the vision, the idea, or the inspiration of individuals, and that unremitting private and community effort involving hundreds of thousands of unpaid hours, are necessary to get the wheels turning.

On one of his last trips, President Kennedy dedicated a dam and reservoir in the West with these words: "The fact of the matter is, as a general rule, every time we bet on the future of this country, we win."

President Johnson is betting on the future of this country—the whole country, and the Susquehanna Basin. He is betting on a renaissance for Appalachia. The concepts in the Appalachian program have meaning for the work of your association, of which I'll speak a little later.

Conservation of natural and human resources was called by President Kennedy the highest form of national thrift. The State which produced Gifford Pinchot, the veritable father of the modern conservation movement, has a worthy successor in Maurice K. Goddard, Secretary of Forests and Waters. Maurice Goddard, Mayor Frank Slattery, of Wilkes Barre, and Joe Clark, a great U.S. Senator, are among the other conservationists who have put their time, talents, and energies in the wager on America's future, by their unremitting efforts for Appalachia and the Susquehanna Basin. Congressman FLOOD has been called the father of the Susquehanna Basin survey, and his efforts started many years before he persuaded the Public Work Committee to authorize the Corps of Engineers study.

Harold Wilm of New York, and James Van Cherie in Havre de Grace, and Senator William James, of Harford County, ably represent their States in this illustrious role.

Let me begin by discussing the multi-State approach which your association symbolizes. Many of your leaders were also leaders in the long fight to get the Delaware Compact drafted, ratified, and implemented, and it is entirely logical to hope to profit from that experience.

From all I can understand, the Delaware Commission's performance is matching its promise—the prophecies of difficulties between the States and the Federal Government are proving to be unfounded.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled hearings on one of its integral components, the Tocks Island National Recreation Area, for June 8th and 9th.

It seems to me that this particular form of interstate and Federal-State cooperation holds immense promise for the future. The rivers, the harbors, the drainage areas, and the economic forces pay little attention to State boundaries. But the States are here to stay, and article I, section 10, clause 3 of the Constitution, which requires the consent of Congress for compacts between States, certainly also contemplates that such compacts will be made.

Congressman FLOOD, who sits on the powerful Appropriations Committee, has performed a most useful service with his bill H.J. Res. 296. Such bills do not get action in one Congress, and as I've said, sometimes a generation elapses. But a bill pending in Congress is an anchor for discussion, a starting point for identifying differences and beginning the process of ironing them out, a basis for effective study and research.

A different approach to river basin organization—which would provide joint Federal-State planning in major river basins throughout the country—is also being considered by the Congress as S. 1111, already passed by the Senate. This proposed Water Resources Planning Act, supported by many States and by the administration, would meet in part the needs envisaged for the Susquehanna by the proposed compact.

The really exciting development, the one which holds greatest promise for resolving many of the knotty problems of the Susquehanna, is President Johnson's and under Secretary Roosevelt's imaginative plan for the Appalachian region, drawn in cooperation with the Governors of nine States, including Pennsylvania and Maryland.

What this can mean to the attainment of your objectives, has, I'm sure, occurred to all of you.

The approach of the Presidential Commission to Appalachian problems with reference to the traditional cost-benefit tests for additional investment has particular relevance to the Susquehanna Basin's development. Much of our orthodox project planning is built around meeting the needs of a growing population, growing spending power, growing leisure. In Appalachia generally, and in parts of the Susquehanna Basin, the projections will be negative in some instances, unless something is done to reverse the present course.

It is the genius of the plan that the Federal Government, under President Johnson's personal leadership, is willing to spend money to reverse the downward trend. The infusion of capital for this effort must follow a philosophy clearly delineated by the Appalachian Commission:

"The quantity of such investment is essential. But its character is even more important. It must be directed to the stimulation of growth, and not to the problems which result from growth as is the case with most of our present public investment.

"Roads have been constructed in the region, as in the Nation, largely to ease the congestion caused by existing traffic. New schools have been erected to provide for the overflow from existing classrooms. Sewer and water lines have been financed to service the raw acres of new subdivisions. Most dams in the East have been placed to protect the present owners of private and commercial property.

"The Commission proposes an investment program founded on a reverse concept—an investment from the other side of the coin. We submit a highway program to create traffic—not a traffic count to create highways. We suggest a water control effort to attract new investments in property—not a program solely to protect present investments.

"In many underdeveloped countries the conclusion was reached that investments in basic public facilities would have to be undertaken before economic development could occur. That part of our international development program which fosters capital investment should be incorporated into Federal programs that affect the regional development program for Appalachia."

This approach opens doors; it unlocks our thinking from the traditional and orthodox patterns which have led to so much frustration in attempting to justify programs we instinctively know to be right.

A similar freshness marks the very interesting Research Report of the Battelle Institute on using computer-based techniques to estimate the economic impact of systems of works in the basin. I've examined this report and have found the idea stimulating. I don't know whether the traditional measures of computing cost-benefit ratios would be denominated as "static" by the authors, but it does seem to me that the "dynamic" methods they advocate, which utilize a feedback into the system of the results which follow from varying investment assumptions, tend to support the basic idea of the Appalachian Commission's ideas on investment programs. Both suggest a water control effort to attract new investments in property, not just to protect present investments.

To amplify on the Appalachian Commission's report to see its relevance to the Susquehanna Basin, we can note that it proposes a many-sided attack on the problems of Appalachia. One of its four principal categories will involve steps to develop, conserve, and protect the region's water resources—a subject of prime interest to your organization.

Appalachia has plenty of water. Whereas Western water development centers on collecting, saving, and carefully distributing a scarce commodity, Appalachian water development centers on control of water volume and quality.

The President's Appalachian Regional Commission has recommended an additional $35,800,000 to accelerate flood control and water development work by the Corps of Engineers. Protection of industrial, commercial, and domestic developments in the flood plains of the area, creation of new opportunities for outdoor recreation, furnishing of peaking capacity for electric power systems, and adequate supplies of domestic and industrial water are among the multiple purposes to be served.

Pollution from domestic sewage, industrial wastes, acid and alkaline drainage from both surface and underground mines, and silt from surface mines, have challenged regional and local planners for years.

Acid mine drainage particularly is an inhibiting factor for the diversification of the upper basin, as changing industrial technology has closed plants employing thousands of people. Pennsylvania, the basin State most affected, has had pollution control acts since 1905. In 1937 and 1945 its sanitary water board was given authority over industrial wastes and acid mine drainage control. On the latter problem, it has long had an active program, and has shared the knowledge gained widely.

But the development of economical and practical means of reducing the formation and discharge of acids and alkalis from strip, augar, and underground mines remains one of the major unsolved problems, perhaps the major unsolved resource problem in America today. Here, in the Susquehanna Basin, let us try to find an answer to it.

Only 3 weeks ago, following President Johnson's meeting with the Appalachian Governors at Huntington, W. Va., the President was asked for immediate public works effort to control the undesirable effects of coal mining. The President agreed to add $10 million to the Appalachia program for the express purposes of controlling underground mine fires, surface fires in mine refuse banks, surface subsidence, and stream pollution by acid and alkaline mine water drainage.

Secretary Udall last week discussed the problem with the Special Committee of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, referring to the role of the Bureau of Mines, the Public Health Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

The latter bureau, for example, has authority to make grants to State fish and game commissions to restore fish and wildlife habitat. Such grants can be used to abate stream pollution which destroys fish life and to restore strip-mined areas to provide wildlife habitat.

The Susquehanna Basin sustains many new opportunities for outdoor recreation. The region is highly scenic, but this asset remains locked up by lack of access. This isolation will be overcome by the new roads recommended in the proposed development highway system, including those for central Pennsylvania, and by local access roads to serve specific recreation areas.

The acceleration of water resource development by creation of multiple-purpose reservoirs, such as Raystown, Blanchard, Cowanesque, and Tioga-Hammond will provide opportunities for water-based recreation.

Rehabilitation and corrective measures to repair the acid and alkaline drainage damage which changed the natural ecology of large areas of the region will also set the stage for development of game habitat and greatly improve the hunting and fishing opportunities.

Income- and job-producing recreation complexes and on-farm recreation enterprises can be augmented by basic conservation objectives of the outdoor recreation agencies of the States, such as the program proposed in Pennsylvania's imaginative Project 70, identification and establishment of additional national recreation areas, parkways, recreation ways, and scenic roads, and long-term loan financing for the development and management of private outdoor recreation enterprises. Congressional enactment of the land and water conservation fund would enable the Interior Department through our Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to render major assistance to States and local governments in planning, acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas, including those in Appalachia.

To summarize, things are beginning to move. The Delaware breakthrough presages a far easier time for the aspirations of the leaders of the movement to do something similar for the Susquehanna. The region of which the basin is a part, Appalachia, is being recognized for what it is—a region apart, geographically, and statistically. Its needs are being recognized, not in terms of welfare but in terms of an investment philosophy to permit it to reap the benefits of its natural endowments of minerals, forests, recreation opportunities, croplands, and skills. It is recognized that prosperity in the urban centers cannot reach desired levels unless the hinterlands also prosper.

This investment philosophy is typified by a key sentence: "We suggest a water control effort to attract new investments in property—not a program solely to protect present investments."

President Johnson has infused a spirit of "can-do" throughout the land. This is the spirit which has marked your own efforts. I wish you continued success in your public-spirited and effective cooperation for the development of this great region by sustained local, State, and regional pressure.

The Civil Rights Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed by an outstanding column by the distinguished news columnist, Mr. Lyle C. Wilson. This column is entitled "Rights Storm Warnings," and was printed in the May 14, 1964, edition of the Washington Daily News. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTS STORM WARNINGS

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Realistic contemplation of the civil rights problem now lowering over the Nation turns up a fact that should alarm all concerned, white and black, North and South.

That fact is that the problem of civil rights does not respond readily, if at all, to legislative solutions. For example, in New York City, the capital city of civil rights, there have been threats and achievements of shocking civil disorder. In his "editor's notebook" published in the Knight newspapers, John S. Knight well stated the situation, like this:

"The irony of such rabblerousing (by civil rights leaders) is that New York has done more to protect Negro job rights, assure open housing, provide equal accommodations and use buses to transport children from segregated neighborhoods than any other city in the country."

New York has plenty of law. Moreover, the elected public officials of New York City and State are dedicated civil rights politicians, some of them because they need the Negro bloc vote. Both State and city have civil rights laws. These are administered by sympathetic public servants. Until the problem of civil rights plopped into the job market or the house next door, it was assumed that a great majority of New Yorkers aggressively believed in all-out civil rights laws and their enforcement.

In this friendly legislative and administrative environment, New York Negroes still feel themselves to be so deprived and put upon that they must undertake all sorts of angry means of self defense. And this is what makes for more alarm.

If self-imposed State and municipal civil rights legislation supported by a majority of whites will not do the job in the friendly New York environment, what chance is there that Federal legislation will be able to accomplish more in a resentful, unfriendly South?

The bleak answer is, not much.

And if Federal legislation falls far short in the South of achieving its objectives, what then? Then, of course, will come the overwhelming political pressure of northern whites and Negroes for the Federal Government to enforce in the South a Federal law.

The South will be ridiculed and condemned and, perhaps, its cities invaded and occupied by Federal troops or marshals. And all of this will be applauded by northerners whose own States and cities enact but scamp the enforcement of civil rights legislation. A chilling prospect. There is a chill for the North, too.

On April 27 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People complained that State fair-employment-practices laws had failed to bring about any basic change in the status of Negro labor in Northern States. NACCP spokesman was Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the association. He said State fair employment commissions had been timid, reluctant to act. He warned that these attitudes must change, and fast.

"This is now especially important," Mr. Hill added, "as it becomes clearer each passing day that the next great crisis in American race relations will be in the North."

That is fair warning to those naive citizens and politicking statesmen who assert that enactment of the pending civil rights bill will bring racial peace to the United States.

Hon. Oren Harris Commended for His Work as Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the board of directors of the Transportation Association of America has passed a resolution commending our distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, for his work as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In order that this resolution may come to the attention of all Members of the Congress, I herewith place it in the RECORD:

Whereas it became evident 7 years ago that an urgent need existed to reexamine the administration of the provisions of law guiding six of the Federal Government's principal regulatory agencies (Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and Federal Communications Commission); and

Whereas a Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was established on April 9, 1957, for this purpose, proposed by Committee Chairman OREN HARRIS and stanchly supported by the then Speaker Rayburn and the then Majority Leader McCORMACK; and

Whereas Chairman HARRIS held hearings over the next several years of this Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight on suggested improvements in the administrative process and on several bills designed for this purpose; and

Whereas Chairman HARRIS advised the Chairmen of the six regulatory agencies listed above that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would consider it the responsibility of each such agency to carry out the recommendation of the Administrative Conference of the United States that "each agency promulgate a code of behavior governing ex parte contacts between persons outside and persons inside the agency * * *"; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and Federal Communications Commission have all taken constructive steps toward protecting the administrative process from improper influences; and;

Whereas all of the six regulatory agencies, except the Federal Communications Commission, have established the practice of delegating responsibility for preparation of agency opinions to individual agency members; and

Whereas the Transportation Association of America has, since January 1960, had in effect policy positions in support of (1) legislation to establish standards of conduct for agency hearing proceedings, and (2) agency action prescribing individual member responsibility for the preparation of agency opinions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Transportation Association of America express to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, its sincere commendation for persistent and productive efforts to safeguard the integrity of agency procedures; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Chairman HARRIS, the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the respective chairmen of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission.

The So-Called Civil Rights Bill and the Antiprayer Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with editorials from the Suncoast News of St. Petersburg, Fla., on the subject of the so-called civil rights bill now pending in the Senate and the proposals now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee for overturning the recent antiprayer decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these excellent editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Suncoast (Fla.) News, Apr. 30 to May 6, 1964]

WHY SHOULD ANYONE SUPPORT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS ACT?

We have long contended that the Civil Rights Act is both un-American and unconstitutional.

It is un-American because it will completely destroy all of the theories of government that made America great. It will destroy the powers of the States in local police matters. It will give vast powers to the Attorney General, a nonelective Federal official. As passed by the House of Representatives it will abolish trial by jury.

As an outcome of the Civil War, slavery and peonage were abolished. It is now unlawful for any employer to force anyone to work for him against the will of the employee.

The Civil Rights Act restores slavery and peonage in reverse.

If it is passed, the Federal Government, through the Attorney General and the Federal courts, can force an employer to hire and maintain on his payroll men and women he does not want to employ.

This is just another form of peonage, except this time the worker brings about the forced labor.

It was decided a hundred years ago that peonage in America should be done away with.

Yet there are those who claim that the senior Senator from Florida should not be returned to office because he is fighting a vicious bill in Congress that will bring serfdom and peonage to American employers; and that his position is a hundred years behind the times.

We do not believe in giving the Federal Government authority through the police power, to force any American businessman to do what he does not want to do so long as his business is honorable, fair, and lawful.

Remember, it was force action that brought about the American Revolution and caused us to cut our ties with England.

Can it be true that we have grown so soft in recent years that we can look upon a force bill with favor?

Then too the Civil Rights Act is clearly unconstitutional. A bill very much like the present one was declared unconstitutional by a far greater and more able Supreme Court in 1883.

It must be remembered always that the Federal Government is a government of granted powers. It does not have all power. Before it was created, the States had all power and all jurisdiction. They organized a Federal Government and granted unto it certain enumerated powers. All other powers were reserved to the States.

Before any bill that passes Congress can be declared constitutional, the power to pass such a bill must be found in the Constitution. If it is not there, then the bill is null and void. And so a great Supreme Court held in 1883 that a civil rights bill was entirely beyond the power of Congress to enact; and that such bill was null and void.

It must be pointed out that there have been no amendments to the Constitution since 1883 giving Congress additional power to enact a civil rights act. Hence it is as clearly unconstitutional today as it was in 1883; and should be voted down by every Member of Congress who took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution.

We protest the Times' unmitigated gall in setting themselves up as a judge of candidate qualifications. This is an insult to the public intelligence for the great majority are capable of making up their own mind. A newspaper publisher who determines to choose candidates and dictate the public vote is a threat to the security and welfare of the community.

Past performances of the Times on election matters has discouraged many good candidates from running for office. The detrimental effect of the Times' ill-advised and improper antics at election time must come to an end.

[From the Suncoast (Fla.) News, May 14, 1963]

PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Congress is now considering an amendment to the Constitution allowing prayers in our public schools.

Several Congressmen, of the liberal type, have cried out that this action is being taken in order to criticize the Warren Court.

This, of course, is nonsense. In order to criticize the Warren Court all of the news media that believe in constitutional law should point out that the Warren Court never had the slightest authority in the first place to hold that prayer in the public schools violated the first amendment.

Members of Congress should stand up on the floor of the House and U.S. Senators should take their positions on the floor of the Senate and denounce the Warren Court for the unlawful seizure of power that took place when the Court assumed authority to prohibit prayer in the public schools of the several States.

On July 4, 1963, the Suncoast News took the Court to task for the usurpation of power in this decision.

Since the matter of prayer in the public schools is very much in the public mind, we will again touch upon some of the highlights of the Constitution and the proper rules of constitutional construction that will demonstrate to any student of constitutional law that the Court had no power whatever to give any consideration to the case.

The first amendment to the Constitution reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Note carefully the language. You are bound to observe that the first amendment does not say "the legislatures of the several States shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Yet that is the language that the Warren Court put into the Constitution of the United States.

We contend that the Court has no authority whatever to add verbiage to the Constitution which does not exist.

Let us review a little constitutional history. During the debates in the Thirteen Original States as to whether the several States should adopt the Constitution as proposed by the Constitutional Convention, it was pointed out time and time again that the proposed Constitution did not place enough limitations on the power of the Federal Government to guarantee to the States and to the people all of the liberties and freedoms that Englishmen had fought to achieve down through the centuries.

Hence a great demand arose to have certain amendments adopted immediately after the Constitution became effective to curb and restrict the powers of the Federal Government so that it could not seize powers it was not intended to have, or to exert authority that would cause the people to lose any existing liberties.

The first 10 amendments were submitted to the States by a joint resolution of Congress, adopted September 25, 1789.

Everyone understood, except the Warren Court, that these amendments were intended to restrict Federal power.

Everyone understood, except the Warren Court, that these amendments were never intended to impose any restriction of any kind upon the legislatures of the various States.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the very early case of *Permoli* v. *First Municapility*, 3 How. 609, held "the Constitution makes no provision for protecting the citizens of the respective States in their religious liberties; that is left to the State constitutions and laws. Nor is there any inhibition imposed by the Constitution of the United States in this respect on the States."

The 14th amendment was declared ratified by the Secretary of State on July 28, 1868.

Some of the liberals contended that this amendment embraced all of the first 10 amendments and made them restrictive on the powers of the States.

This argument was killed completely by the Supreme Court in the year 1900 in the case of *Maxwell* v. *Dow*, 176 U.S. 581, which held that notwithstanding the 14th amendment the first 10 amendments were restriction on the Federal Government and on the Federal Government alone, and that the 14th amendment did not in any sense change their legal effect so as to make them restrictions on the legislatures of the several States.

Here was a case squarely in point construing the Constitution the way it should be construed.

16 C.J.S. page 114 announces this rule of law: "where a written Constitution has been judicially construed, such construction, accepted and acquiesed in for many years, is as much a part of the instrument as if it had been written into it at its origin."

The 1900 decision of the Court had been accepted for 62 years. The only way to change it was by an amendment to the Constitution adopted by three-fourths of the States.

Yet the Warren Court ignored the clear language of the first amendment, ignored the former decisions of the Court construing it, and proceeded to amend the Constitution making prayers in the schools of the States unlawful.

And in utter disregard of the language of the first amendment and prior decisions of the Court, it held that first amendment prohibited the legislatures of the several States from making a law respecting an establishment of religion.

If the Warren Court is not checked it will destroy the very essence of the Constitution.

Faith and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over whether or not voluntary prayers and Bible reading should be permitted in the public schools continues in the Halls of Congress and in the communities all across our land.

Dr. Luther Joe Thompson, pastor of the First Baptist Church, in Chattanooga, Tenn., delivered an eloquent and moving sermon on June 30, 1963, which I believe deserves serious attention by members of this House as they weigh the pros and cons of voluntary expression of faith in the schools. I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and commend it to your attention:

FAITH AND FREEDOM

On Thursday of this week we shall celebrate our national independence. This morning it seems appropriate to begin this sermon with the following:

"I am your land.

"I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things and many people. I am your land.

"I am 180 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

"I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington and Jefferson and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys, and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant, and Abe Lincoln.

"I remember the Alamo, the *Maine*, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called, I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock of Corregidor, and on the bleak slopes of Korea.

"I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat fields of Kansas, the coal fields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the magnolias and Spanish-moss of the Deep South, the prairies of the West, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*.

"I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific 3 million square miles throbbing with life and industry. I am cities and villages, forests and fields, mountains and deserts. I am schools and churches, athletic arenas, and halls of government. I am the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, the responsible and the irresponsible. I am your land.

"I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Thomas A. Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers, and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, and Jonas Salk. I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman, and Thomas Paine.

"Yes, I am your land, conceived in liberty and dedicated to justice, equality, and opportunity for all men everywhere. My life depends upon your loyalty, your courage, your faith, your character. And you will determine my future.

"I am your land." [1]

It speaks of a heritage that is rich and full. It inspires us and challenges us and makes us humbly grateful for the land of our birth and choice. Yet, it also frightens us because it reminds us of the risks of freedom, the disciplines involved in liberty.

We live in a day when patriotism is no longer a popular virtue and when men are more concerned with rights than with responsibilities. In an era of educational advance and scientific achievement we find ourselves confronted, on the one hand, with an ever-mounting rate of violence and crime and, on the other hand, with widespread public apathy and unconcern. Guizot once asked James Russell Lowell, "How long do you think the American Republic will endure?" And Lowell replied, "So long as the ideas of its Founding Fathers continue to be dominant." One is reminded of the inscription on the New Hampshire tombstone which reads: "My son, that which your father hath bequeathed to you, you must earn if you would keep."

What is the Christian's responsibility to the state? It is not a simple question to answer. The Herodians and Pharisees came one day asking Jesus about the propriety of paying tribute to Caesar. A more incriminating question could not have been asked. Palestine was an occupied country. The tribute was a device of exploitation and therefore the symbol of imperialism. To approve paying the tribute would infuriate the Jews and to disapprove of it would bring down the wrath of Rome. The reply of Jesus was skillful and adroit. He asked to be shown a specific coin, a denarius. This was a silver coin minted outside of Palestine. The time was the reign of Tiberius. The denarius bore a bust of the Emperor crowned with laurel as the sign of his future divinity with the inscription, "Augustus son of the divine Augustus." The Emperor was thus celebrated as the head of the pagan religion and as the divine son of divine parents. While the Jews hated the thought, they seemed to have no scruples about using the coin. Then He asked whose inscription was upon the coin, and His questioners answered simply, "Caesar's." His reply might be paraphrased, "If then you trifle with your scruples and carry tainted coins, give back to Caesar what he has given to you, but remember your prime allegiance is to God." [2] No wonder Mark writes, "and they were amazed at Him." Indeed ours is a dual responsibility: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

However, the Apostle Paul is more explicit than the Gospels with regard to the role and authority of the state. He writes of this in the first six verses of the 13th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Historically the passage has received three interpretations: First, that the coercive power of the state was ordained of God because of sin and should be administered by sinners. The saints should submit to all commands not contrary to conscience but should not collaborate. This is the ancient doctrine of withdrawal from the world. It was the teaching of the Anabaptists in the age of the Reformation. Second, that the state was indeed ordained because of sin; but Christians, though they would not need the state for themselves, should nevertheless assume political responsibilities, because otherwise it would collapse without their help. This was the view of Martin Luther. Third, that the state was ordained not only because of sin but also to foster righteousness and faith.[3] Such was the view of John Calvin and our Puritan forefathers. It was this view which led to the establishment of state religions and the compelling of faith by the civil magistrate's sword. Its implementation led to religious persecution and the protest of men like Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and Jefferson and Madison and the Baptists in Virginia. And it was this religious devisiveness and persecution which led to the adoption of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

What does this amendment mean? It reads in part: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibit the free exercise thereof." When the Constitution was adopted, eight of the Colonies had established state churches, supported by taxation and guilty of religious discrimination in varying degrees. It was toward this devisive and arbitrary political arrangement that the amendment was directed. To the Founding Fathers it meant essentially two things: First, that the U.S. Government would never place its seal of approval on any church. Second, that in its relationships with religious organizations and groups, the Government would be impartial and nondiscriminatory. The first amendment was never intended as a means of removing religion from our national life or separating religion and politics. The Founding Fathers were convinced that a republic could not exist for long apart from moral principles and spiritual values. Practically all of our national historical docu-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ments, such as the Mayflower Compact and the Declaration of Independence, take the existence of God for granted. As someone, commenting on our modern secular assumptions, has said. "A secular nation is not what we were at the beginning. Then we said it was God who gave us liberty, God who brought forth the Nation, God who hath preserved us a nation. * * * We are a theistic people."[4] It is almost impossible not to conclude that the reasons for the restrictions expressed in the first amendment were to provide the basis for the fullest possible religious expression with the largest measure of individual freedom.

On June 17, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that required Bible reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools is a violation of the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Grave national concern has been expressed about this ruling. Three comments seem appropriate:

(1) It reverses a practice which has existed from the beginning of our Republic. Sometimes we forget that until 1830 our publicly supported schools were almost exclusively run by clergymen with a heavy dose of religion and that Horace Mann prescribed Bible reading as necessary to a rounded education. It is difficult to see how the authors of the first amendment would have seen any conflict between religious devotions under public auspices and the first amendment. Are we saying our Founding Fathers were wrong?

(2) Don't majorities have rights as well as minorities? Is the nonreligious minority seeking rather to limit the majority's religious freedom than to protect their own? As someone has said, "Rarely have so few changed the way of so many." Back in 1860, Dr. A. A. Hope of Rutgers University said:

"It is capable of exact demonstration that if every party in the state had the right of excluding from public grounds whatever he did not believe to be true, then he that believes most must give way to him that believes least and he that believes least must give way to him that believes absolutely nothing."

Has the nonbelieving minority been given the right to restrict the believing majority? The first amendment also says concerning religion "or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Constitution in the first amendment guarantees the free right to be religious just as much as it protects from a prescribed religion. Perhaps the time has arrived for the Court to rule in this area also.

(3) The Supreme Court has rightly been concerned about required prayer and Bible reading in the public schools as a violation of the first amendment to the National Constitution. There is a vast difference between required and voluntary. Would Protestants be willing to send their children to public schools where the recitation of the rosary and the Jewish shema were compulsory? It is not the responsibility of the Government to teach religious commitment nor to indoctrinate in the faith. Nor is it the function of the state to support sectarian endeavors with tax funds. These are responsibilities of the home and the church.

There are however certain questions that we must ponder long and hard: (1) Is the country turning its back on its religious past? (2) Is it inevitable that public education must be completely secularized in America? (3) Can democracy remain neutral to all religion and survive? (4) How can morality, even if it is proper state business, have other than a religious source? (5) In this day of statism and family fragmentation, how can we implement the teachings of religion in the home and in the church?

It has been frequently observed that we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. That remarkable Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, in 1831 in his book, "Democracy in America," points out that "Religion in America takes no direct part in the government of society, but nevertheless it must be regarded as the foremost of political institutions of that country."[5] And he adds further, "Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot." Lord Bryce wrote in the American Commonwealth 80 years ago:

"One is startled by the thought of what might befall this huge yet delicate fabric of laws and commerce and social institutions were the foundations it has rested on to crumble away * * *. It is an old saying that monarchies live by honor and republics by virtue. The more democratic republics become, the more the masses grow conscious of their own power, and the more do they need to live, not only by patriotism, but by reverence and self-control, and the more essential to their well-being are those sources whence reverence and self-control flow."[6]

And as James Reston said last week, "The ideals of personal duty and conduct still reach back to religious beginnings," which is why "free government has prospered best among religious peoples."[7]

If freedom is to be sustained, certain principles must be borne in mind. We must encourage and nurture private initiative and individual responsibility. It is the lifeblood of a democracy. The idea is abroad that security, achievement, and the good life—all can be appropriated in Congress and dispensed from Washington. It's all a matter of government planning. At least that's the way the argument runs. When I think of government planning, I always think of the story of the installation of the first telephone in the White House. It came during the administration of President Grant. He was intrigued by it and after being convinced that it really worked, he said, "Yes, it is remarkable; but who in the world would ever want to use one of them?" Now Grant was in many ways a remarkable man but think what might have happened to the communications industry in this country if it had been relegated to a government planning committee appointed by him? Sometimes we underestimate the genius and faith of free men.

We must find ways of keeping government a servant and not a master of men. The solution to America's problems is not in terms of big government, nor big labor, nor big business, but in big men, submissive to the will of God. In a democracy, government exists to do for men what they cannot do for themselves and, while it can be a beneficent servant, it can be a devastating master.

We must encourage men of character to seek political office. We must stop thinking of politics as a dirty word. It is a part of the machinery of democracy. If it is dirty it is our business to clean it up, remembering that good government cannot exist without good men. For a businessman to say he is not interested in politics is like a drowning man saying he is not interested in water. Our obligation to Caesar is part of our obligation to God and the Christian must devise ways to bring his faith to bear in the political realm. We must remember it is responsible men of character who make freedom possible. Too often the aspect of individuality and responsibility in the idea of freedom has been allowed to erode away.

Finally, true freedom cannot live apart from a valid faith in God. In the rotunda of the Jefferson Memorial in Washington you will find these words:

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed the conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?" This has been called "Jefferson's most searching question." It has been appropriately said, "Civilizations fail not from conquest but from evaporation of belief within." Faith and freedom are inseparable. Without the former the latter will perish. May I close this sermon with my texts? "Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14:34.) "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." (Psalm 33:12.)

Remember, your choice this day helps to make it so.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Adapted from Norfolk & Western Railway advertisement, Newsweek, permission granted.

[2] Bainton, Roland H., Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace, Abingdon, Nashville, c. 1960, p. 58.

[3] Ibid, p. 59. I am indebted to Dr. Roland H. Bainton for his remarkably clear analysis here.

[4] Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, Washington National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., quoted in Christianity Today, July 1963.

[5] Tocqueville, Alexis de, Democracy in America, D. Appleton & Co., 1904, p. 329.

[6] Quoted in James Reston, New York Times News Service column in the Chattanooga Times, June 19, 1963.

[7] Ibid.

Importance of Extended Debate in the U.S. Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Dallas Morning News, of Dallas, Tex., carried in its April 25, 1964, edition a very eloquent editorial column pointing up the importance of extended debate in the U.S. Senate. This column was written by Mr. Ken Thompson, an editorial staff writer for the Dallas Morning News, and is entitled "Senate Filibusters Defended."

I take pleasure in calling this column to the attention of Senators, especially during this time when the Senate is engaged in educational debate over the pending so-called civil rights bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE FILIBUSTERS DEFENDED

(By Ken Thompson)

After several weeks in the Senate, the civil rights bill has stirred up a number of auxiliary issues of increasing importance—not the least of which is that concerning the merits of prolonged debate or filibuster (the choice of terms depends on which side of the question you're on). The longer the Senate debates civil rights, it seems, the more discussion outside the Senate tends to center on this auxiliary or tactical issue, rather than the merits of the bill itself.

Yet, many of those who talk about filibusters know very little about them. Recently Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, a legislator, lawyer, and parliamentarian with few peers, wrote an article for the New York Times magazine which sheds considerable light on the historical, philosophical, and constitutional background of the filibuster.

Since 1841, RUSSELL notes, there have been 53 filibusters in the Senate. The first con-

cerned a rather prosaic issue, a bill to remove Senate printers.

In 1863, an unsuccessful filibuster was waged against a bill involving President Lincoln's wartime suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

Two celebrated filibusters were the 28-day battle by Senator Robert La Follette against an Emergency Currency Act in 1908 and another which blocked President Wilson's armed ship bill in 1917.

More recently, Senate liberals have used the filibuster to oppose President Eisenhower's tidelands oil bill in 1953 and to oppose the communications satellite bill in 1962.

RUSSELL cites this history to demonstrate that the filibuster is not the exclusive weapon of any philosophy, party, or section of the country. It has been used to support minorities of all kinds, and has been employed by some of the greatest men who ever served in the Senate—including La Follette, Borah, and Norris.

William Gladstone once called the Senate "the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics." His esteem was based on the fact that the Senate is the only Federal institution in which the smaller States exercise equal influence, the last bastion in Washington where the rights of the States and minorities are protected.

Small States are at a great disadvantage when it comes to choosing a President. The last President elected from one of our smaller States was Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, in 1852.

It is possible, RUSSELL notes, for as few as 12 of the most populous States to elect a President, even if he is solidly opposed by the remaining 38. In the House of Representatives, the smaller States have an even greater handicap. Congressmen from the 9 largest States could, by voting as a bloc, force any bill down the throats of the remaining 41 States.

"Few rational thinkers," says RUSSELL, "would maintain seriously that * * * the will of the numerical majority should prevail absolutely and at all times." The majority can be wrong, popular opinion can be fickle—as the prohibition experiment demonstrated—and it is conceivable that the day will come when the Senate is in the hands of zealots (left or right).

Those who want to give the numerical majority its way at once, RUSSELL adds, should ponder the consequences of such a situation, for they may be sowing the seeds of their own future downfall.

When our Founding Fathers met in Philadelphia in 1787, they were determined to protect the smaller States from being overwhelmed by the sheer force of numbers. To do so, they gave each State equal representation in the Senate and provided that no State could be deprived of representation in the Senate without its consent.

This is the only section of the Constitution that can be altered only by the unanimous consent of all of the States.

If this principle—or the Senate's rules on prolonged debate which protect it—should be altered, RUSSELL maintains that our system of checks and balances would be thrown out of kilter and the Senate would be reduced to "little more than an ineffective appendage to the House of Representatives * * * Senators would serve little other purpose than to act, in effect, as additional members of their State's delegation in the House."

For 175 years, says RUSSELL, full and free debate in the Senate has served the Nation well. He says that he cannot recall a single vital piece of legislation killed by a filibuster—"though many bad and vicious bills have been delayed, modified, and sometimes defeated."

"I would be the last to deny that there have been abuses of freedom of debate in the Senate," he says, adding that "there also have been abuses of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and all other constitutional guarantees."

Would those who want to curb free debate in the Senate because it has been abused, he asks, also advocate repeal of the Bill of Rights because the freedoms it guarantees have been abused?

According to RUSSELL, there is a popular misconception that a Senate filibuster consists of long and dilatory speechs wholly irrelevant to legislation at hand. This, he says, is unfair. The object of a filibuster, he adds, is to "inform, to educate, to expose, and, if possible, to convert." For the most part, opponents of civil rights legislation have stuck to the issue.

Senate rules do not permit unlimited debate. Cloture can be invoked by two-thirds of those present and voting. Senator RUSSELL notes that, while the Senate has been called a "graveyard" for civil rights legislation, the only civil rights bills passed by Congress since reconstruction were approved by the Senate without curbs on prolonged debate.

Fewer than 20 Senators voted against both bills. Thus, supporters of the bills could have invoked cloture at any time, if they had so desired.

This fact alone refutes charges made by many that the minority of Southerners can prevent the Senate from acting on civil rights legislation.

As RUSSELL points out in summarizing his article, "the action of a majority with respect to the civil rights bills may not have satisfied either the dedicated advocates or opponents of this type of legislation. But the point is that a majority of the Senate was able to work its will and was able to pass the legislation within the existing rules of debate."

A Twice-Told Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, in 1954 a select committee of the House of Representatives conducted a year-long investigation of Communist aggression in which 50 public hearings were held both in the United States and in Europe. A total of 335 witnesses testified, most of whom were eyewitnesses to Communist aggression in Central and Eastern Europe. One report of the committee entitled, "Treatment of the Jews Under Communism," stated in part:

> The Communist attitude toward the Jews was not substantially revised after Stalin's death. Only its forms were modified: anti-Semitic drives are now less publicized and better concealed from the free world.

Despite the long and demoralizing chronicle of Communist brutality to members of Jewish ancestry, so responsibly documented in the House committee report, many hoped that the downgrading of Stalin signaled the relaxation of Communist oppression and the advent of increased liberty and freedom.

Unfortunately, the following resolution of the Indiana and Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Councils verifies the fact that Jewish life under Khrushchev—his claims to the contrary notwithstanding—still suffers in tyranny.

We are indebted to the councils for helping to bring to light the conditions of mass repression, intrigue and two-facedness under which the Jewish people continue to suffer in the Soviet Union.

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM ADOPTED BY JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL APRIL 29, 1964

The board of directors of the Indiana and Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Council wish to express with one voice our deep concern with and our determination to protest the plight of our Jewish brethren in the Soviet Union.

Soviet Jewry constitutes the second largest Jewish community in the world and is the last remnant of the once great East European Jewish community. This remnant exists largely because of the heroic resistance of the Soviet Union to the Nazi hordes which destroyed the great majority of European Jewry.

The approximately 3 million Jews of the U.S.S.R. have a special claim on the conscience of all who are zealous of securing human rights, and, more particularly, on the conscience of all Jewry. Soviet Jews are the heirs of a tradition that stretches unbroken over 1,000 years of Jewish history in Eastern Europe, a tradition which produced an enduring heritage of scholarship, piety, and ethical idealism. They are the kin of the millions who went forth from Russia to other countries, bringing with them the social idealism of their tradition enhancing the cultures of their new lands.

With the lessening of repression and persecution so widely acclaimed following the death of Stalin, it was hoped that the Soviet Jews would share in the new atmosphere of relaxation of tensions. Now, however, with anguish and indignation we witness Soviet Jewry being denied its natural right of group existence. It is fragmented from within and kept isolated from without. Though formally recognized as a nationality and as a religious group, the Soviet Jewish community is deprived of those rights granted to other nationalities and other major religious bodies in the U.S.S.R. A process of attrition forces Soviet Jews to live only a most attenuated Jewish life and threatens to crush their spirit and to sever their ties with the Jewish people.

Soviet Jewish youth, traumatized by the Nazi holocaust and by Stalin's anti-Semitic excesses, are now seeking to reestablish their links with Jewish life. But they are denied even the most meager opportunity to learn, enhance, and transmit their Jewish heritage.

The whole of Jewish culture, and Yiddish artistic and literary expression in particular, once so flourishing in the U.S.S.R., are now represented by the merest tokens. The links of Soviet Jewry with its tradition are being destroyed by increasing restrictions against fundamental and sacred Jewish practices. Synagogues are closed down; the public production and distribution of matzoth and of other essential religious articles are banned. Soviet Jews are cut off from contact with their brethren at home and abroad. Jewish opportunities in higher edecation and in certain fields of employment are being curtailed.

Simultaneously, a campaign of vilification of the Jewish past and present is conducted in the press and other official publications. Judaism and Jewish history are falsified. Anti-Semitic stereotypes are exploited to portray the synagogue as a breeding ground of economic and social crimes.

We appeal to the Soviet Government to redress these wrongs, to restore the rights of Jews and of the Jewish community and to grant them equality with other religious and nationality groups as required by Soviet constitution and law.

We also call upon the Government of the United States, our President, our Secretary

of State, our Congressmen, our Governor, and our mayor, to protest to the Soviet Government, through diplomatic and other channels, against the oppressions herein detailed.

We appeal to the Soviet Government:

1. To declare its policy of eradicating anti-Semitism by a vigorous educational effort conducted by Government and party.

2. To permit the free functioning of synagogues and private prayer meetings.

3. To remove hindrances to the observance of sacred rites such as religious burial and circumcision.

4. To make possible the production and distribution of phylacteries, prayer shawls, mezzuzoth, religious calendars, and other religious articles.

5. To restore all rights and facilities for the production and distribution of matzoth and kosher food.

6. To make available facilities to publish Hebrew Bibles, prayer books, and other religious texts in the necessary quantities.

7. To permit the organization of a nationwide federation of synagogues.

8. To sanction the association of such a federation with organizations of coreligionists abroad.

9. To permit Jews to make religious pilgrimages to the holy places in Israel.

10. To make it possible to allow all qualified applicants to attend the Moscow Yeshivah, to provide facilities for the establishment of additional Yeshivot as needed, and to enable rabbinical students to study at seminaries abroad.

11. To provide schools and other facilities for the study of Yiddish and Hebrew, and of Jewish history, literature, and culture.

12. To permit Jewish writers, artists, and other intellectuals to create their own institutions for the encouragement of Jewish cultural and artistic life.

13. To reestablish a Yiddish publishing house and to publish books in Yiddish by classical and contemporary Jewish writers.

14. To reestablish Yiddith state theaters in major centers of Jewish population and to publish Yiddish language newspapers with national circulation.

15. To eliminate discrimination against Jews in all areas of Soviet public life.

16. To end all propaganda campaigns which use anti-Semitic stereotypes, implied or overt.

17. To halt the discriminatory application of maximum penalties, including the death sentence, against Jews for alleged economic crimes.

18. To make it possible on humanitarian grounds for Soviet Jews who are members of families separated as a result of the Nazi holocaust to be reunited with their relatives abroad.

We make this appeal within the framework of our ardent desire to see an end to the cold war and to lessen and hopefully to eradicate existing international tensions. Our aim is to mobilize public opinion into a moral force that will save Soviety Jewry from spiritual annihilation.

We are bound by the moral imperative of our history, which demands that we speak out on the fate of our brothers in the Soviet Union. We pray that our voice will be heard and that it will be heeded.

Many States Have Arts Councils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, legislation to create a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation is pending before the Committee on Education and Labor. Identical legislation has been enacted by the other body.

One of the purposes of the legislation is to stimulate cultural development activities by the States. A modest program of grants to States is authorized by the bill, H.R. 9587, for this purpose. The States having an art council will be better equipped to accept Federal grants.

One of the most ardent backers of this legislation is Mr. James B. Shaeffer, president of the Council for Nebraska's Cultural Resources. I am indebted to Mr. Shaeffer for a compilation of the "Status of Art Councils by States."

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Shaeffer's summary tabulation as a part of my remarks:

Status of art councils, by States

State-supported types	State-sponsored types	Planning stage	No council
1. Appropriated funds for operation 2. Statutory authority	1. No appropriated funds for operation 2. Statutory or executive authority	Governor considering arts council	Letter from Governor's office
	STATUTORY AUTHORITY		
California Florida Georgia *Kentucky Louisiana Michigan New Jersey New York *North Carolina *Rhode Island Virginia	Connecticut Minnesota Ohio Utah Washington	Arizona Delaware Maine Texas	Alabama Alaska Arkansas Colorado Idaho Iowa Kansas Maryland Massachusetts Mississippi Montana New Mexico New Hampshire North Dakota Oregon Pennsylvania South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Vermont West Virginia Wyoming
	EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY		
	Hawaii Illinois Indiana Missouri Nebraska Nevada Oklahoma Wisconsin		

STATISTICAL RECAPITULATION

Councils	Number	Percent	
State supported	12	24	56
State sponsored	12	24	
State planned	4	8	
No council	22		44
Total	50		100

*Selective art support.

Prepared from correspondence received from State Governors, as of April 1964, by the Council for Nebraska's Cultural Resources, Grand Island, Nebr.

Louie Richkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I knew and appreciated Louie Richkie. He was a very outstanding citizen of Longview, Tex. The editorial that appeared in the Longview Daily News of May 7 which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today pays to him tributes which are appropriate and befitting to this great citizen who passed away recently. To all of his folks and his friends I extend my sincere sympathy.

LOUIE RICHKIE

A mighty oak in the forest of the free enterprise system fell in the passing of our good friend, Louie Richkie.

He exemplified the truism that where there is a will there is a way. Coming to America from his native Austria while he was still a young man in his early 20's, he was guided by destiny to Longview, then a small town with but few opportunities to offer a stranger from a foreign land. He was a man of ambition and desire, and these attributes spurred him onward as he worked tirelessly in the tailor shop he opened here to achieve the goal of which he had dreamed before coming to this country.

Louie Richkie was a quiet, modest, unassuming man who had aspirations of becoming a useful citizen and a successful businessman, even before reaching maturity. It was this desire which brought him to Longview in 1906—and it was this same inspiration that kept him active in his advanced years.

To him, work was essential to a useful life. He could have retired many years ago and enjoyed the fruits of his labors, but he was not constituted that way. It was through his personal efforts that he built a successful business and acquired considerable property. As he improved his financial status, he continually invested in Longview real estate. He wanted to do his part in building the town that had been good to him, and which he loved. He never faltered in this faith, even during the dark days of depression or when other hard times befell the community. This,

in his own way was his manner of showing his appreciation.

Louie Richkie was a highly respected man and had an ever-widening circle of friends in varying strata of society. He did not know the meaning of ostentation. He was content to live honorably, honestly and simply. There was never an attempt to change the pattern from which he was cut.

Mr. Richkie was a good man—good to his family, his friends, his temple of worship, his community. Although not generally known, his benefactions were manifold. The number of those who have benefited from his counsel and aid would run into the thousands.

In the death of this fine man, Longview has lost a great citizen and many of us have have lost a very dear friend.

We shall sorely miss Louis Richkie * * * but the memory of him will live on and on as an inspiration to those who seek to attain higher goals of citizenship and success.—CARL L. ESTES.

Wheat Plan Discriminates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the so-called voluntary certificate wheat plan may favor wheat producers in Texas and other early harvest areas to the tune of between 50 cents and $1 per bushel.

Under present law, the price-support level will not change until July 1, and is presently $1.82 per bushel. On July 1, under the newly enacted program, the support price will drop to $1.30 per bushel, and the market will no doubt drop a like amount.

This, in effect, means that Texas wheat producers harvesting now, or who will be in the near future, will gain a tremendous advantage. The Department of Agriculture reports that the cash market price Monday, May 11, on No. 1 Hard Red Winter wheat at Fort Worth, Tex., was $2.50 to $2.60 a bushel. The law will permit Texas wheat producers and others in areas of early harvest, who are in compliance with provisions of the 1964 program to receive the present high market price and, in addition, diversion payments of between $5 and $8 per acre as well as certificates valued at 70 cents per bushel for 45 percent of normal production, and certificates valued at 25 cents per bushel for 45 percent of normal production. In other words, Texas and other southern wheat producers will receive between 50 cents and $1 more per bushel than Kansas farmers, which may explain the big push and White House pressure to enact the wheat-cotton bill.

From now until July 1, the Department of Agriculture has established a transition plan whereby certain wheat processors will be able to purchase domestic food certificates at only 18 cents a bushel. Even though the Government will be paying Texas and other early harvesters, 70 cents a bushel, only 18 cents will be recaptured from processors.

Wheat farmers in Kansas and other other later harvest areas, and the general taxpayer are discriminated against under present regulations governing administration of the new wheat-cotton law.

Private Ownership of Fissionable Fuel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will begin hearings on important legislative proposals, drafted by the Atomic Energy Commission, to permit private ownership of fissionable fuel. The proposals are considered the most important to the nuclear power industry since the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Hearings on the proposals were initiated by the committee last summer but did not lead to legislation because they generated complex problems for which there were no immediate solutions.

Our colleague from California, Mr. HOSMER, who is the ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee, has made an important contribution to an understanding of the major problem areas which the coming hearings will turn to—and suggests some solutions—in an article which appeared in the May 18 issue of the trade publication Electrical World. In this article, Representative HOSMER demonstrates why he is considered to be one of the most knowledgeable nonscientists in the country in the field of nuclear energy.

I commend the article to the reading of Members and include it at this point in the RECORD.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF FUEL EXPLORED—JCAE MEMBER ANTICIPATES QUESTIONS LIKELY TO COME UP IN HEARINGS ON PROPOSED FUEL BILL, SUGGESTS PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS

(By CRAIG HOSMER, Congressman, 32d District of California)

Last summer the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on a bill, drafted by the Atomic Energy Commission, to permit—and ultimately require—private ownership of special nuclear material used as fuel in power reactors. The bill would have authorized: (1) Long-term agreements to toll-enrich privately owned uranium in Commission-owned facilities; and (2) Government purchase of plutonium and uranium 235 recovered from spent fuel, the former on the basis of its fuel value.

The result of these hearings was not legislation but identification of numerous problem areas with which any legislation must deal. Industry and committee members have since devoted considerable thought to possible solutions, but details of most are yet to be spelled out. Meanwhile recently announced cutbacks in production of enriched uranium have caused some uncertainty as to the costs of toll-enrichment.

This article will analyze seven facets of the problem and, where warranted, suggest possible solutions.

1. Private financing of nuclear fuel might be more expensive than the present system under which fuel is leased from AEC at an annual use charge of 4¾ percent.

Government policy has been to promote development of commercial nuclear power, offering a variety of assistance programs. Leasing special nuclear material at an annual charge of 4¾ percent to reactor licensees has enabled the Government to recover its cost of money and permitted licensees to save the difference between 4¾ and the 10 to 12 percent capital cost of utilities.

Fuel costs, today, are based on uranium concentrates purchased by AEC at $8 per pound. Based in part on continuation of AEC's uranium purchase program through 1970, incremental production of uranium concentrates might be acquired privately from domestic suppliers at about $5 per pound. Estimates show a possible 0.1 mill per kwhr increase over present leased fuel costs if uranium concentrates costing $5 per pound were toll-enriched and financed with private funds costing 10 to 12 percent a year. Such an increase is an insignificant penalty for placing the atom in the ordinary stream of commerce and thereby increasing the confidence of industry and State commissions in forecasts of atomic power costs.

The private ownership legislation would permit the fuel cycle activities preceding geasous diffusion to be influenced by competition. This, in time, should spur cost reductions and technological advances which could offset the increase, if any, in private financing costs.

2. Nuclear fuel processors and fabricators might find it difficult to finance inventories of nuclear material.

Some independent processors and fabricators have asserted that under private ownership they would be competitively disadvantaged. Because of their relatively small size and the disproportionately high value of enriched material from gaseous diffusion plants, they would be unable to finance fuel material at the prime rate. Larger competitors might be able to do so.

Many believe that this is an academic problem. For many years most electric utilities have financed, often by progress payments, the construction of expensive turbines and related heavy equipment, relieving the manufacturers of financing burdens. This results in lower equipment costs to utilities who obtain capital at lower costs than manufacturers. For similar reasons it is likely that utilities will either purchase enriched material from AEC or acquire the raw material and finance the processing, enrichment, and fabrication. Those who simply provide processing or fabrication services would not be expected, under ordinary circumstances, to finance material in their possession.

Some utilities, of course, may decline to assume financing costs prior to completion of the core, preferring to pay such costs as part of the overall core costs. For competitive reasons, moreover, some fabricators and processors might elect to absorb financing costs.

To permit independent processors and fabricators to compete if any of the foregoing possibilities materialize, the proposed amendments could authorize the AEC to (a) continue leasing special nuclear material to processors and fabricators at current use charge rates, to be sold on behalf of the Government when fabricated fuel is transferred to the utility; or (b) defer payment of AEC's toll enrichment charges until completion of fabrication, possibly with interest comparable to private rates assessed on the amount deferred. AEC's proposed legislation does not, in its present form provide either.

3. Private ownership might encourage mergers of uranium mining and milling companies with others engaged in chemical processing and fabricating. This might result in antitrust violations and be detrimental to nonintegrated fuel processors and fabricators.

Private ownership and the availability of toll enrichment might encourage formation of integrated fuel cycle companies. The extent to which they will be allowed to organize and the extent to which their operations will be limited will unquestionably be a matter for scrutiny by antitrust authorities. Integrated operations do not necessarily conflict with antitrust policies.

The formation of integrated companies represents a threat to nonintegrated processors and fabricators only if the latter are thereby deprived of access to low-cost uranium. Ten or eleven U.S. uranium producers are expected to stretch out their contracts with AEC to December 31, 1970. Assuming that five or six of these producers integrate with processors and fabricators, there will still be four or five independent producers ready to sell uranium in the early 1970's. Moreover, additional supplies of uranium will be available to the extent that importation of foreign uranium is permitted.

4. Long-term agreements to toll-enrich privately owned uranium in Government facilities might adversely preclude reduction of Government stocks of uranium which will accumulate until December 31, 1970.

Whether Government stockpiles of enriched uranium are adequate, insufficient, or excessive may be determined by the following criteria:

(a) Military needs, short- and long-term; (b) commercial power needs, short- and long-term; (c) research needs, short-term; (d) known domestic and foreign uranium reserves; (e) anticipated additional domestic reserves and costs of new discoveries; (f) size of current stockpiles of uranium, enriched uranium and plutonium; and (g) anticipated receipts of uranium concentrates under the uranium purchase program.

Recently announced cutbacks in production of enriched uranium and plutonium suggest that current stocks are at least adequate. Whether or not Government stocks are excessive in light of military requirements is not publicly known. If they are not excessive, private purchases of uranium with toll enrichment in lieu of private purchases of AEC-enriched uranium would not adversely affect the Government stockpile. Furthermore, toll enrichment of private uranium for civilian power use would assist in maintaining adequate Government stockpiles.

On the other hand, if Government stockpiles are excessive, they could be trimmed by drawing on them for civilian power. The extent to which private purchases would reduce the stockpile depends on the demand for civilian reactors. The cumulative North American demand for uranium concentrates for civilian purposes from 1970 to 1980 has recently been estimated at about 70,000 tons, most of this during the second half of the decade. Between now and 1971, civilian demand is estimated at 9,000 to 10,000 tons.

These figures may be conservative. As compared with purchase of 15,750 tons in fiscal 1963 and estimated purchases between June 1963 and December 31, 1970, of 84,500 tons, the civilian demand between now and 1975 would not appear significant. Accordingly, reliance cannot be placed on such demand for material reduction of stockpiles, and toll enrichment, therefore, would not adversely increase them.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, if it appears inconsistent to permit toll enrichment of uranium during AEC's uranium-procurement program, the legislation could postpone until January 1, 1971, AEC authority to enter into long-term agreements to toll-enrich uranium for domestic reactors. Similarly, it might be worthwhile to make a gesture toward reducing the stockpile by requiring one-fourth or one-third of each civilian fuel loading taken from the stockpile. This could, however, adversely affect the economics of private ownership.

5. Continued purchase of plutonium recovered from spent reactor fuel might adversely increase Government stocks of plutonium.

AEC's proposed bill would authorize, but not require, AEC to purchase plutonium produced in private reactors and to guarantee purchase prices for it. As in the case of enriched uranium, recently announced production cutbacks suggest an adequate Government supply of plutonium, determinable of course, only on the basis of military need. Even if stocks are adequate, plutonium produced in civilian reactors between now and about 1975 should be considered in relation to the size of the projected stockpile in determining whether to continue the plutonium-purchase program. It is understood that AEC anticipated production in civilian reactors in planning its future plutonium program.

6. Opportunity for toll enrichment of foreign uranium in Government facilities for U.S. reactors, together with absence of a large domestic demand, might constitute a serious threat to domestic producers.

For a variety of reasons, including the obvious long-term needs for civilian powerplants, long-term military needs, and the substantial investment in the domestic uranium-producing industry, survival of the industry is essential to national interests. Accordingly, any policy determination involving imports of foreign uranium must be consistent with the viability of the domestic uranium industry. This does not necessarily mean that the national interest always requires restrictions on imports and foreign competition. On the contrary, other national interests will often be served by importing foreign uranium. It does, however, require circumspection in permitting foreign competition when domestic demand is insufficient to maintain the domestic producing industry.

It may be useful to examine the relationship of supply and demand during these three time periods:

Years 1964–70: AEC's "stretch-out" uranium-procurement program extends to December 31, 1970. It is anticipated that 10 or 11 uranium producers will accept AEC's proposals, thus assuring a reasonably active domestic industry throughout the period regardless of toll enrichment and importation. If private ownership and toll enrichment are permitted prior to the close of this period, some of those who agree to the "stretch-out" may benefit by added sales of incremental production. Those who decline and whose contracts expire on December 31, 1966, are unlikely to receive any of this benefit.

If unrestricted foreign imports are permitted, it is possible—perhaps probable—that foreign producers will absorb all the added sales based on private ownership and toll enrichment because of their ability to price uranium lower than U.S. producers. But the availability of lower cost foreign uranium might enhance the prospects of additional nuclear powerplants thereby, in the longer run, benefiting domestic suppliers.

If a decision is made to delay toll enrichment until the conclusion of AEC's uranium purchase program the issue of free imports becomes moot.

Years 1971–74: This period may be very significant for domestic uranium producers. As things stand now, AEC's procurement program will have ended, foreclosing any subsequent sales based on incremental costs. (It will be possible, of course, for domestic producers to produce extra uranium at incremental costs and store it for delivery after conclusion of the AEC program.) On the other hand, a Canadian producer's contract with the United Kingdom does not expire until October 1971, and the South African contract extends through 1973. Both Canadian and South African producers, accordingly, will have the opportunity to sell incremental production to the disadvantage of U.S. producers.

It is anticipated that domestic demand for uranium for power reactors in 1971 will be about 2,500 to 3,000 tons of U_3O_8 for new reactors and replacement of consumed fuels in existing plants. Not until 1975 are such requirements expected to reach the probable level of AEC purchases of 6,000 to 7,000 tons in 1970. Even if there is no requirement that a percentage of new fuel be drawn from Government stockpiles, domestic demand in this period will barely support domestic producers. Unrestricted importation could result in the whole domestic demand being supplied from outside the United States. Obviously this would be inconsistent with the national interest in continued survival of the domestic uranium industry. Restrictions, such as tariffs or quotas, should be considered for this period.

Beyond 1974: The civilian demand for uranium should approach 15,000 to 16,000 tons annually by 1980, the rate of recent delivery to AEC. This should permit domestic producers to survive.

7. Recent cutbacks in enriched uranium production have caused uncertainty as to costs of toll enrichment.

Presumably, costs and budget studies were of primary importance in planning the cutbacks. These studies should provide sufficient basis for AEC to modify its price schedule for enrichment services. Publication would increase confidence in long-term nuclear fuel costs.

The effects of production cutbacks on toll enrichment prices are troublesome to contemplate. If all depreciation and interest costs on all diffusion plants are allocated solely to the reduced throughput, unit costs could increase dramatically—perhaps to the point where the enriched-uranium-reactor technology might have to be abandoned. This would not only jeopardize the U.S. reactor program but it could make the diffusion plants worthless.

Tribute to Louis J. Sanguinetti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to note a recent award of the State of New Jersey to Louis J. Sanguinetti of Landisville in Atlantic County.

As a longtime leader in New Jersey agriculture, he was recently awarded the Gold Medallion of the New Jersey Agricultural Society at the organization's annual meeting. This highest award of the 184-year-old society, the Medallion, was presented to Mr. Sanguinetti for distinguished service to New Jersey agriculture. He is presently a retired sweet potato grower and has always been active in community affairs.

He has served on the executive committee of the Atlantic County Board of Agriculture for 40 years and is a past president. He is also honorary chairman and a trustee of the New Jersey State Sweet Potato Industry Association.

Among the other offices he has held are president, New Jersey State Horticultural Society; chairman, State farm-

ers home administration committee; member, State advisory 4-H committee; field supervisor, Atlantic County Agricultural Conservation Association; member, Roadside Marketing Committee of the New Jersey Farm Bureau; and member, Atlantic County Board of Vocational Education. In his home community, he has served as township treasurer and member of the board of education.

I can think of no better testimonial than that which was given in the testimonial brochure, awarded to Mr. Sanguinetti in Mercerville on May 13, 1964, and I quote it in full:

LOUIS J. SANGUINETTI

Yours has been a lifetime of service to others. As a member of one of the pioneer families in Atlantic County, you have contributed much to the agricultural development and vigorous growth of the southern New Jersey area.

Ever modest and unselfish, you have served for a half century as an outstanding and respected leader. Successful in your own farm enterprise, you have always given generously of your time and talents in advancing the interests of others.

A true son of New Jersey soil, you have demonstrated a rare capacity for leadership in building stronger farm organizations. Because of your sincerity of purpose and genuine interest in the betterment of your fellow farmers, you have been honored with many offices, both local and statewide. In every instance, you have rendered loyal and devoted service.

Your efforts to build a stronger vegetable industry, particularly your role in the testing and marketing of new varieties of sweetpotatoes, have won wide recognition. Growers continue to look to you for counsel and guidance.

In keeping with a longstanding tradition, your associates on the board of trustees desire to pay tribute to your long and noteworthy career and so award to you the medallion of the society as an expression of sincere gratitude on the part of countless New Jersey farmers.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me add my own good wishes to this dear friend of many years standing.

We have attended many agriculture affairs together. I have many times sought his advice in matters pertaining to farming and products of our south Jersey soil, and have always found him to be dependable, capable, and cooperative, and one who is certainly deserving of this honor recently bestowed.

The "Castro of the Colorado" Mixes Politics and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Udall, the "Castro of the Colorado," has curbed the flow of the river's water to southern California, Arizona, and Nevada by closing the floodgates of the newly completed Glen Canyon Dam in Utah.

The purpose, he says, is to fill Lake Powell, behind the dam, with water to be used for generation of power at the damsite. To say that this action is somewhat premature may be an understatement when we consider that there are as yet no generators at Glen Canyon Dam.

The serious consequences of the Secretary's action with respect to the water needs of the Lower Colorado River Basin States are outlined in a Los Angeles Times editorial of May 13, titled "Water: Promises Aren't Enough." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial at this point.

WATER: PROMISES AREN'T ENOUGH

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall this week mixed politics and water—and southern California came out on the short end.

Breaking a pledge he had affirmed in 1962, the Secretary ordered the water storage at Hoover Dam reduced in order to build up the Colorado River water behind Glen Canyon Dam. As a result, southern California's primary water reserves and power generation potential at Hoover Dam will be dangerously cut back.

This manmade shortage is so serious that the Metropolitan Water District warned that another dry year could mean that there won't be enough Colorado River water for the MWD's 9 million customers.

There are as yet no generators at Glen Canyon Dam, but apparently a full head of political pressure had been built up. Secretary Udall not only bowed to the demands of the Upper Basin States but also had the temerity to propose that southern California, Arizona and Nevada voluntarily use 10 percent less water.

The Secretary nevertheless has probably done the States dependent upon the Lower Colorado a good turn in spite of himself.

First, his decision painfully illustrates that the shortage of Colorado River water may be much closer than the experts' estimate. Even the most pessimistic had assumed that the pinch would not be felt before 1970 or until the Central Arizona Project was in operation.

Obviously there is no time for delay in finding a sound regional solution to the shortage. And just as obviously the safeguards to California's basic water rights in such a solution must be clearly defined.

If Secretary Udall can break faith with California and Arizona on taking water from Hoover Dam, how can we accept the glittering promises in his Pacific Southwest water plan? There can be no doubt now that California's right to 4.4 million acre-feet from the Colorado River must be guaranteed by law.

This is set forth in the far better regional water plan introduced by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California. KUCHEL's bill provides for both this State's rightful share of the Colorado and for the Central Arizona Project, with the search for additional water broadened beyond the boundaries of the region.

Arizona, which suffered the Hoover Dam cutback with California, must now agree that the Kuchel water plan has never looked better.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in my report to my constituents which appears at page A2578 of the RECORD of May 18, I inadvertently omitted a letter from Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Under permission granted, I submit herewith the matter referred to:

The Civil Rights Act of 1963, which I supported, and as a result of which I received the following letter from Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

APRIL 7, 1964.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: On March 30 the Senate began formal consideration of H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill passed by the House February 10, 1964, by a vote of 290 to 130.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People thanks you for your aid and for your vote in passing the most comprehensive civil rights bill in our history in a forthright effort to meet the greatest human rights crisis to face our Nation since the Civil War. We are advising our members in your district of your valued support for human rights.

We have also advised them and the general public that Congressmen of both parties who voted for the civil rights bill consistently in the Committee of the Whole where amendments were considered, as well as on final passage, deserve the support of voters at the polls next November.

We are working hard to persuade the Senate to follow your example and to enact H.R. 7152 substantially as it came from the House.

Very sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary.

A Peculiar Way To Run a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's request for $125 million more for military and economic aid in South Vietnam should give Members of Congress food for thought.

Asking for more money seems to me just another gesture to attempt to fool the American people that we are really doing something to improve matters.

May I remind you we have already poured a half billion dollars into this war and certainly have very little to show for it. Well, I guess we do have something to show—a growing list of casualties.

Just what kind of a war are we running? Just what is our policy? It occurs to me that the approval of an additional $125 million is not going to do any good until we come up with a clear program of action.

Furthermore, what about the billions of dollars which are already allocated for defense? Was no thought given to what might happen in southeast Asia?

As an editorial in today's Wall Street Journal points out, this is a peculiar way to run a war. I recommend it be read.

A PECULIAR WAY TO RUN A WAR

In asking Congress for an extra $125 million for Vietnam, President Johnson says

the money can't be squeezed out of programs already budgeted. If so, it makes one more sad commentary on the state of the Nation's military and financial affairs.

Now, $125 million is no small sum by any standard. Compared with the totals for the relevant programs, however, it does not bulk so large; of the additional money, the Administration wants $70 million for economic aid and $55 million for military aid.

Disregarding carryovers, Congress appropriated $8.4 billion for foreign economic and military aid for the present fiscal year, and many expect it to approve about the same for the new year beginning July 1. It is all but inconceivable that $125 million can't be found in more than $6 billion, especially since these assistance programs are notorious for their waste and dubious ventures.

Or suppose we ignore for the moment the distinction between so-called economic and military aid—after all, there is a war on. What about the defense budget itself? It runs over $50 billion a year. Again, it is hard to believe that such a fantastic sum leaves no leeway at all for intensified prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

This proposition is all the more remarkable in that military spending has been considerably increased in recent years. In large part, it was said, the purpose was to develop more and better conventional (nonatomic) forces, the kind deployed in Vietnam. In other words, it would seem the Pentagon should already have been in position to fight a "little" war without still more money. As it happens, what the Nation hears about are pilots flying ancient aircraft and soldiers using makeshift equipment.

By the administration's own account, moreover, it apparently was not anticipated when the budget was submitted in January that there might be a need to step up the war; at any rate, the statement to Congress says no provision was made for any major new requirements that might emerge. Since the war was going badly in January and long before, it sounds like a curious form of military planning.

We realize that Vietnam is a notably difficult and disagreeable operation at best. But if this request represents the kind of military and financial thinking that has been going on, it is perhaps not surprising the United States is making no headway against the Vietnamese Communists.

Coming of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, few people stop to realize the important role that animal health products play in the feeding of a nation, either as end products, byproducts or intermediates.

Because of the direct bearing which this industry has on each of us, I wish to make available to fellow Members the remarks of Mr. George L. Varnes, the outgoing president of the Animal Health Institute, made before the 24th annual meeting of the institute here in Washington in April of this year.

COMING OF AGE

(By George L. Varnes)

It is a pleasure to welcome members and guests to the 24th annual meeting of the Animal Health Institute.

I am sure that each of you derives as much pleasure as I do in looking back at the growth and development of this association. Advances in products and procedures during the past 24 years have revolutionized the industry, and the members of the Animal Health Institute have certainly been part of that revolution. All of you can be proud of the contributions that you have made in the field of animal health.

If there was a need for the Animal Health Institute in 1941, that need has certainly been increased manyfold in recent years. While our principles and purposes have remained the same, our membership has increased and become more active. But our growth has not been restricted to size alone. The institute has matured. In short, we have good reason to believe that the Animal Health Institute has come of age.

The institute has become the spokesman for the industry and is gaining recognition from legislators, regulatory agencies, the press, and allied industries. Such recognition is not awarded indiscriminately. We have had to earn it.

In our association we now have a depth of experience to contribute toward the solving of animal health problems. It is up to us to speak out strongly for worthwhile proposals and against those that are not in the public interest.

Let us hope, however, that our voice will not always be raised against proposals. I think that it is rather obvious that if we work for something we know is wise we will have less in the long run to fight against. Let us concentrate, then, on volunteering our years of experience in the form of knowledgeable proposals of our own.

Although coming of age means recognition, it also means responsibilities. All of us here are aware of the thousands of organizations that exist today. They range the alphabet from the Aaron Burr Association to the Society of Systemic Zoology. Many are doing a fine job but, unfortunately, many are organizations in name only.

The status of any organization must be earned. If the Animal Health Institute is to continue to be effective, it must be built on a foundation of hard work, cooperation, and acceptance of responsibilities.

Due to the very nature of our business, our responsibilities are many and important. They include the public, ourselves, the Institute, and the State and Federal regulatory agencies.

Let us not forget that all of our products serve the public in one way or another—either as end products, byproducts, or intermediates. It is up to us, as an industry, to help supply the public with high-quality meat, milk, and eggs at lower cost. We must continue our search for new and improved products that will make this possible. We must maintain—and, wherever possible, improve—our rigid quality control checks. These checks assure safe and effective products.

As individual manufacturers we have a responsibility to ourselves and to each other. Our integrity and reputation must remain unquestioned. In today's world the thoughtless actions of one firm can cause industrywide repercussions. Let us carry out our business ventures in a manner that will be a credit to ourselves and to the industry.

As members of the Animal Health Institute, we must be willing to work. We must accept committee assignments and positions of leadership, and we must work at them. Without effective participation, the Animal Health Institute, its programs, and its goals, will remain little more than unfulfilled ideas.

If we voluntarily meet the obligations I have outlined we will have done much to meet our responsibility to State and Federal regulatory agencies. There is more to be done, however.

As leaders in the animal health industry, we are in the best position to know what should be done, what can be done, and what will result if nothing is done. Therefore, it is our responsibility to communicate this knowledge to those whose decisions can and do affect our industry.

I would like to quote from a speech made at the American Feed Manufacturers Association's public affairs workshop last October. Former New Jersey State Senator James F. Murray, Jr., pointed out that we cannot have all the benefits of government and none of the responsibilities. He went on to say that, in his legislative experience, the average businessman is generally complacement about government and legislation—at least, until governmental action is going to immediately and adversely affect his industry, his business, his branch, and his office. Then, as Senator Murray put it: "He is prodded out of his ivory tower of indifference. He will descend upon you wherever you may be in office with all the fire in his eyes of a vestal virgin on the steps of the Roman temple the morning after."

Senator Murray's point is clear. We cannot wait until governmental action has been taken before we make our voice heard, for then it may be too late.

Commenting further, Senator Murray said: "It is better, in terms of the preservation of free enterprise, to stand up with a courageous informed opinion and be defeated than it is to have a most-informed opinion but to be unheard from."

I am sure that Senator Murray would be refreshed by the attitude of the Animal Health Institute toward government and legislation.

The Institute recognized that there was, and is, a need for specific legislation in the animal health field. The application of laws originally enacted for the protection of the human consumer of drugs has created problems for both the regulatory agencies and the animal health industry.

In an effort to provide a regulatory framework for animal health products, the Animal Health Institute has encouraged the passage of H.R. 7247. In our view this measure will insure animal health products of the highest quality and will continue to provide the regulatory agencies with the necessary authority to protect the public.

Gentlemen, the Animal Health Institute came of age with H.R. 7247.

Our sponsorship and support of this bill is a concrete example of this industry's effort to help establish workable laws and rules.

H.R. 7247 provides an opportunity for cooperation between industry and government to bring animal health legislation into line with today's requirements. By separating consideration of new animal drugs and new human drugs, the bill will speed scientific advancement and benefit the public, our customers, and the industry.

There are some who feel that our actions in trying to get this bill passed have resulted in an improved regulatory climate and that there is now no need for the bill. Perhaps this is an indication of our need for better communication with allied industries and associations. It is important for all to understand that we are not looking for temporary resolutions to long-term problems. H.R. 7247 is designed as a long-term solution to a long-time problem.

I have said before that the AHI is the spokesman for the industry. If we are to be an effective spokesman we must broaden our lines of communications. We are endeavoring to do this. The Institute's public relations committee is organizing a press contact program that is designed to acquaint newspaper and magazine editors with the Animal Health Institute and its programs. Through the press contact program we hope to reach agricultural audiences, the city-dwelling

public, and our legislators and regulatory agencies. This program can be effective, but it will take the cooperation of all of us with our public relations committee.

As individuals we can do much to further the institute's communications efforts by establishing personal contact with local, State, and Federal governmental personnel. It is essential today that we have a speaking acquaintanceship with our legislative representatives.

Whenever possible, the institute should attempt to schedule working meetings with allied industries and with regulatory members of the USDA and the FDA. Closer liaison and cooperation among us cannot help but lead to workable solutions to present and future problems.

At this time I would like to express my appreciation for the cooperation I have received as president this past year. During my term of office I attended many committee meetings—and I was always impressed with the amount of hard work that was being done. For example, our ad hoc committee and our regulatory section certainly distinguished themselves by their efforts on behalf of H.R. 7247.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the board of directors, with whom I have had an opportunity to work closely, and to Dal Bruner, who has diligently executed his assignment as executive secretary. A word of commendation is also in order for all those who have worked so hard in arranging this year's annual meeting, with its interesting program and distinguished speakers.

However, the Animal Health Institute does not consist of committees or boards of directors. If the institute is to continue its successful growth, it will be due to your individual efforts. Each of you must contribute your time and experience in the future as you have done so ably in the past.

As an organization, we can look back upon our past years with pride. Much has been accomplished in the field of animal health, and many of you here in this room are responsible for some of the accomplishments.

However, we should also sense the challenge of the future. There is much to be done. For example, the United States cannot afford its annual $2 billion animal loss due to disease if the "exploding population" is to have food. Although we have come of age as an association, as member companies we are indeed facing a "production challenge for the future."

DAV Services in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of New Mexico citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly or indirectly.

The Disabled American Veterans, a congressionally chartered veterans' organization has a State department and 25 local chapters in the State of New Mexico. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it during time of war. I have been a member of the DAV since 1950.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. The present national commander is Douglas McGarrity from the State of Michigan. The national headquarters are at Cincinnati, Ohio. The national service headquarters of the DAV are located at 1701 18th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 15 percent of our counrty's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disability—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veterans' organizations. Nevertheless, the DAV has maintained the largest staff of any veterans' organization, of full time, trained national service officers who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans Administration and its central office in Washington, D.C. They have access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, the national services officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well informed claimants.

DAV SERVICE FACILITIES IN NEW MEXICO

The DAV presently maintains one national service officer in New Mexico, Mr. Henry J. Dudoich, located in the VA regional office in Albuquerque. The department commander is Dr. W. W. Darr of Las Cruces. The department adjutant is Harry B. Trollinger of Albuquerque. The department headquarters are at room 247, Korber Building, 200 Second Street, NW., in Albuquerque.

Two hospitals are maintained by the VA in our State, a 500-bed GM hospital at Albuquerque and a 222-bed hospital at Fort Bayard. The DAV department of New Mexico has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Services Advisory Committee at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing New Mexico veterans. They are: Albuquerque Hospital, Mr. Albert Guhr, 440 Manzano NE., Albuquerque; Fort Bayard Hospital, Mr. Harry Carlson, 2422 Yucca Drive, Silver City, N. Mex.

During the last fiscal year the VA paid out $39,139,399 for its veteran program in New Mexico, including disability compensation to its 13,606 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in New Mexico furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Nearly 26 percent are members of the 25 DAV chapters in New Mexico. This 26 percent record is much above the average, but not nearly good enough in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV service office in behalf of New Mexico veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted, estimated: 30,100.

Claim folders reviewed: 30,100.

Appearances before rating boards: 16,280.

Compensation increases obtained: 3,200.

Service connections obtained: 820.

Nonservice pensions: 575.

Dealth benefits obtained: 257.

Total monetary benefits obtained: $2,640,000.70.

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Adminisrtation, handling appeals and reviews, or in its two district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 2,036,806 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $300,543,498.43 and in the central office, they handled 68,334 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $4,327,016.01; proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for New Mexico veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

The DAV department of New Mexico operates a salvage industry, the proceeds of which have provided, in the past 6 years, $28,324.58 for veteran rehabilitation, $7,074.94 for emergency relief, and $237,067.64 for wages for disabled veterans in a sheltered workshop among other services to the community.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation, or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and business, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death, or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the

laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claim.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV national director of claims, Irving Peltz, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. I urge every disabled veteran in New Mexico to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $16,832,000 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $4.25 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $9.75 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $24.50 for each favorable award obtained, or about $135 for each service connection obtained, or about $63 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $16.75 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits wil generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by their DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives or their widows or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,900,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 168 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating approximately $2 million for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having thus been nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by dequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust funds originated about 8 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of DAV, which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Benefactors from 39 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor roll.

Inasmuch as only the interest earnings from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its national service officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for New Mexico. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, updated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in New Mexico by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can, and should, also become a DAV member, preferably a life member.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative, by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interest and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV. I consider it a privilege and an honor to belong to the Disabled American Veterans.

An Honor for Good Work on the Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the Nation are the great benefits of soil conservation work more dramatically apparent than on the high, windswept plains of the Texas Panhandle. Because of the progress made by Soil Conservation Service employees, district supervisors, and the farmers and ranchers themselves, it was most fitting that the Agriculture Department has chosen an SCS work unit in the panhandle to receive one of the Nation's two Unit Superior Service Awards.

The Follett work unit which directs work in the Lipscomb County Soil Conservation District has been so honored. And this week, Mr. Albert R. Hodges—the Follett work unit conservationist—came to Washington to be honored in ceremonies at the Agriculture Department as representative of the unit and its work. Mr. Hodges was accompanied by his charming wife and young daughter, Janet Lea.

The other men of the Follett unit who were honored by the award are Mr. Glenford W. Fowler and Mr. Al Schneider, soil conservation technicians, and Mr. Martin F. Graham, soil conservationist. Credit, of course, also goes to the district supervisors of the Lipscomb County Soil Conservation District and to the participating farmers who have done so much in their county.

The Department's award was worded this way:

> For outstanding technical assistance to the Lipscomb County Soil Conservation District in planning and applying an effective conservation program, and for exceptionally effective administration of the Great Plains conservation program.

The other award in the United States was made to the work unit in Alma, Nebr., and I am sure that unit's accomplishments were no less important.

Our efforts to preserve the soundness of our agricultural economy today has an important objective: To prepare American agriculture for the heavy demands to be placed upon it tomorrow. Soil and water conservation efforts are vital in insuring future as well as present farm productivity. By 1980 the population of the United States may top 274 million persons. By then, the problems of our agricultural surpluses may be a matter of history as our farmers supply not only greatly increased domestic requirements but also vastly larger markets around the globe.

I salute the men of the Follett work unit—and all the many thousands of men all over the country who are engaged in this very challenging and very essential work.

The Stay-in-School Committee of the Anti-Crime Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, with so many Federal-aid programs sapping the initiative and independence of communities and individuals, accounts of successful locally sponsored programs are at once refreshing and encouraging. Such an undertaking is the Stay-in-School Committee of the Indianapolis Anti-Crime Crusade in which the important dropout problem is being attacked positively to encourage continued school attendance. With excellent cooperation from the local school authorities, this program has been a shining example of individual effort at the local level—and all without a cent of Federal aid.

As adequate proof that responsible community efforts can be fruitful, I wish to insert the resolution of the Indianapolis Board of School Commissioners commending the Stay-in-School Committee for its fine efforts in behalf of secondary school students.

RESOLUTION 4607, 1964

Resolution expressing board's gratitude to the Stay-In-School Committee of the anti-crime crusade

Whereas the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis is cognizant of the efforts of the Stay-in-School Committee of the Indianapolis Anti-Crime Crusade ("the Committee") to encourage Indianapolis children to complete their secondary school educations, which efforts have included counseling and the provision of money, employment, clothing, books, supplies, food, and transportation to many children who, for lack of one or more of those items, had discontinued, or were on the point of discontinuing, their secondary school educations; and

Whereas during the first semester of the 1963–1964 school year, those efforts of the Committee resulted in the return of 131 children to the Indianapolis public schools, 72 of which children remained in school throughout such first semester; and

Whereas in the opinion of the Board those efforts of the Committee and the persons associated with it are highly meritorious and should be continued: It is therefore

Resolved by the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis, That the Board should, and it hereby does, express both its gratitude to the Stay-in-School Committee of the Indianapolis Anti-Crime Crusade for that Committee's efforts to encourage Indianapolis children to complete their secondary school educations and its earnest hope that those efforts will continue and will be as fruitful as they have been hitherto.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

Commissioner Coble moved that Resolution 4607, expressing the Board's gratitude to the Stay-In-School Committee of the Anti-Crime Crusade, be adopted and approved. Commissioner Mottern seconded the motion and being placed upon its passage prevailed unanimously.

MARCH 10, 1964.

Testimonial to Mr. Art Chipman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 in Vallejo, Calif., one of my most valued constituents will be honored at a testimonial dinner. This distinguished community leader and progressive businessman is Mr. Arthur L. Chipman.

It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Chipman for many years and have an opportunity to observe this remarkable man.

A proven leader in the field of transportation, Mr. Chipman first established his moving business in Vallejo, Calif., in 1939, known as the Chipman Van and Storage Co. Since that time he has been a leader as agent for the Aero Mayflower Transit Co., served as director, regional vice president, California president of the Moving and Storage Warehousemen's Association and many other offices in the industry, including the office of president of the Mayflower Warehousemen's Association, the Nation's largest standardized moving and storage organization.

I plan to personally attend the testimonial dinner in honor of Mr. Chipman and pay tribute to one of California's leading businessmen. I would like to submit for the RECORD an article appearing in a past issue of the Mayflower Warehousemen's Association magazine which was printed subsequent to his election as president of the association.

The article follows:

ART CHIPMAN IS FIRST MWA PRESIDENT-ELECT

The name of Arthur L. Chipman will go down in MWA history. Not only because of Art's many association activities, but for the fact he is the first president-elect and will assume his duties next year.

This was announced while the association convened in Las Vegas last month where Chipman was first nominated by the nominating committee, then officially elected to the newly-created post by the membership.

The association couldn't have selected a more appropriate leader for this "first," either. Art has served in numerous capacities since joining MWA 12 years ago, the most current being a member of the local advertising and promotion committee. The Mount Sterling, Iowa, native has been a district director and vice president with the association, as well as formerly handling the chores of Research and Development Committee chairman. Under his direction a number of R. & D. improvements were adapted and copied by the industry.

Actually Chipman is affiliated with three warehousing concerns, the Chipman Van & Storage Co., Vallejo, Calif., of which he is the owner; Chipman Van & Storage Co., Napa, Calif., which he also owns; and Goodwin Moving & Storage Co., Spokane, Wash., where he serves as president.

The Vallejo organization's warehouse contains 38,000 square feet of storage space, while the company can handle 6,000 square feet of household goods at Napa, and 75,000 square feet in Spokane. Other Chipman Van & Storage service includes low bed, heavy hauling.

Chipman reports his firm's primary sources of business in the Vallejo area include Benicia Arsenal, Travis Air Force Base, Mare Island Naval Shipyard, General Mills, Hercules Powder, and American Smelting, while the company's Spokane business is mainly with Kaiser Aluminum, Fairchild Air Force Base, Geiger Air Force Base, and a few insurance companies.

Along with his numerous efforts helping to bolster MWA, Chipman was honored a year ago this month by the Vallejo Lions Club at a "This is Your Life, Arthur Lester Chipman" affair. Many of Art's friends, as well as local dignitaries, were present to recall interesting incidents in Chipman's past. Vallejo Mayor G. Wilfred Hewitt paid special tribute to Art's participation in civic activities.

Several telegrams were received during the program, one from L. R. Benson, vice president of the Aero Mayflower Transit Co., who was unable to attend the festivities. "Benny" recounted numerous events leading to the signing of Chipman Van & Storage Co. as a Mayflower agent and MWA member.

During the narration of Art's life, it was told how Chipman became associated with the Transit Co., and soon afterward became one of the original operators of Calmay Van Lines.

Among those speaking out to laud Art's community service were: representatives of the city council; captain of the Solano County Sheriff's Posse, the famous horseback riding group which has performed in Hawaii, throughout the west coast, and on several occasions in the annual Tournament of Roses Parade at Pasadena; competitors, and numerous other friends.

As a climax to the 1958 "This Is Your Life" event, much to Art's complete surprise, his attractive wife, Dorothy, and their five children appeared from an adjoining room and all were given a standing ovation. Art was presented an authentic Ralph Edwards leatherbound book inscribed: "This Is Your Life, Arthur Lester Chipman."

Arthur Lester Chipman, who will be * * * years old April 21, is a past president, Vallejo Moving & Storage Association; member of the Elks Club, the Eagles, the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, and he's a director, Vallejo Chamber of Commerce. Art is also past president, Tennessee Street District Association, and effective July 1, this year, will become president of the Vallejo Lions Club.

Chipman is married to the former Dorothy Neil. Besides horseback riding, his favorite hobbies include: family (first), hunting, then fishing and golf.

Art Chipman is extremely proud of his association with the MWA and Mayflower. That, coupled with the fact he is such an energetic individual, it is a leadpipe cinch he will make a mighty fine president in 1960.

Reinstatement of Certain Veterans Under National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1964, the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y., passed a resolution memorializing the Congress to pass H.R. 3503, which would permit the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans. Under leave to extend my re-

marks, I wish to include the resolution which follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, BUFFALO, N.Y., MAY 13, 1964

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 12th day of May, A.D. 1964, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas many American war veterans allowed their national service life insurance to lapse, and

"Whereas in many cases this was due to inadvertence, or in an effort to disassociate themselves with the service after having served during the long and difficult war years, and

"Whereas Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI, as a member of the Veterans Committee of the House of Representatives, has introduced a bill to correct this situation and allow certain veterans, heretofore eligible for the national service life insurance to be reinstated and allow such applications for reinstatement to be accepted for one year: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this board go on record as favoring such a proposal and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact H.R. 3503 to amend title 38 of the United States Code."

DANIEL A. BUCZYNSKI,
RANDOLPH A. MINEO,
EDWIN L. KANTOWSKI, Jr.,
ANTHONY T. BUSCAGLIA.

Attest: WALTER A. HORZ,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Surprise Decision To Close the San Diego Naval Repair Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union:

NAVY SURPRISE AT CLOSING OF SAN DIEGO BASE TOLD

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's decision to close the San Diego Naval Repair Facility caught the Navy by surprise, testimony made public last night indicates.

The move was so unexpected, in fact, that the Navy had included the base in early drafts of its 1964–65 military construction budget. McNamara issued the phaseout order last December.

The Navy's position was explained at a March 18 House Appropriations Subcommittee hearing by Rear Adm. George W. Pressey, director of the shore activities development and control division of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

The hearing was closed to the press and public. Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD, Democrat, of California, chairman of the House military construction appropriations subcommittee, made public the Pressey testimony last night.

NOTHING IS SAFE

During the session, SHEPPARD, obviously angered, charged that under McNamara "nothing is safe and everything is secret—at least as far as Congress is concerned."

"I can come ultimately to one conclusion," SHEPPARD said. "Any base is possibly here today and gone next week despite these glowing terms of military (budget) requirements."

He said that if the Defense Department cannot determine a year ahead of time what bases it will need, "someone there should be looking for a new job, and I do not care who it may be."

SHEPPARD at first accused both the Navy and the Defense Department of responsibility for the decision to shut down the repair facility. He noted Congress appropriated $522,000 for a new electronics shop at the base less than 1 month before the close order was announced.

QUESTION RAISED

He asked Pressey why the subcommittee should consider any of the Navy's current requests for shipyard construction projects.

"We had no knowledge that the San Diego Naval Repair Facility would be closed. In fact, initially, we had in this year's program a second increment to be granted there on the electronic repair building," said Pressey.

Howard Buffett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House who were colleagues of former Congressman Howard Buffett were recently grieved to learn of his death, and I believe they would appreciate the opportunity to read the inspiring and consoling words of Dr. Edward W. Stimson at the funeral services May 1 at Dundee Presbyterian Church in Omaha. The Reverend Stimson's eloquence expresses the feeling of sorrow and respect of many, many people throughout this Nation at the passing of a distinguished American:

FUNERAL SERVICE OF HOWARD BUFFETT BY DR. EDWARD W. STIMSON, DUNDEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MAY 1, 1964

(Howard Buffett, August 13, 1903—April 29, 1964)

John 14, Romans 8, John 8:25–32.

"If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free." John 8:31.

Let these words of Jesus, which were Howard Buffett's favorite Scripture, speak for him today, for they were the inspiration of his life, and the essence of his message.

Freedom. A free nation. The free society. Free enterprise. The free man under God. This was his passion. As his good friend and the cograndfather of some of his grandchildren, Dr. William H. Thompson epitomized his character for me. "Howard was essentially a free man. He had paid the price of his convictions."

His moral and intellectual roots were in the heritage which has made America great—Puritan and Huguenot. His mother was a French Huguenot Duval, who, while doing all the work of rearing five children, took time to write her convictions on what was right to the public pulse. So he was nurtured in the public interest. He was brought up to be a Christian, and never departed from it.

As an avid and omnivorous reader he fed his eager mind from many sources. Emerson often delighted him, as his words encouraged his independence and self-reliance—as in the essay from which he often quoted:

"There is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide; that he must take himself, for better, for worse, as his portion; that though the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through his toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given him to till. The power which resides in him is new in nature, and none but he knows what that is which he can do, nor does he know until he has tried."

Or again—

"It is easy in the world to live after the world's opinion. It is easy in solitude to live after your own. But the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude."

Howard Buffett truly achieved that kind of greatness.

In the same essay Emerson also said, "To be great is to be misunderstood," and sometimes Howard Buffett earned that honor. He would rather feel he was right, according to the dictates of his own conscience, than be successful.

He would say, "We are not responsible to succeed in what we do if we give it our best. It is not required that you carry the whole burden; neither is it permissible that you fail to bear your share."

So he accepted civic responsibility. So long as he saw it was his duty to do it and not out of personal ambition.

One day as a young man he was talking with John L. Lewis in a lounge car on a train, expressing some of his strong convictions. John L. Lewis replied, "You are young and able, what are you doing about it?"

Thereupon he set about trying to get someone else to run for Congress who would represent his convictions, feeling that if he could not get someone else to run, he would have to do it himself. He, therefore, waited until the last day to file, and he did it from a sense of duty.

He would quote Burke, "All that is needed for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

He would say, "You are a good citizen. What are you doing about it? What matters most is not what men say, and the language in which they say it, it is what they mean to do and the intensity with which they mean it."

Where did all of this devotion to duty and freedom come from. It came from his Christian faith, from his prayer and Bible study, from his direct dependence upon God.

When he first felt the call to public service he told his devoted, life partner, when the children were young:

"I must seek reinforcement of my spiritual resources."

He had served on the school board. Now he started to teach a Sunday evening Bible class, the original congenial couples class here at Dundee Church in 1939. Teahcing made him delve deeper into Biblical truth, for he always based his teaching on the Biblical truth, and applied it to modern life.

He was elected an elder in 1940, and remained one until 1951, while away for four terms in Congress.

So the source of his devotion to freedom and his own independence was his personal faith and devotion to God's will. It was his leadership of the Sunday school class that encouraged him to run for Congress, to seek to apply to our Nation's life the truth of applied Christianity. He attributed his success

in the first primary to the support of his class. But it was the deeper effect of his faith that was most influential. His favorite text said, "If you abide in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is not just knowing the truth. It is gaining a clear conscience by obeying Christ, continuing in His word, that opens the door to the understanding of the truth that makes us free. This Howard Buffett did.

When he got to Congress and Washington it was wartime. He already had his convictions and his principles, and no one could swerve him. They tried to buy him only once—and after that left him alone. His spirit sustained by regular weekly worship and private prayer, he maintained the integrity of his principles; wouldn't cut corners, or condone it in others. With great faith in the average man in our democracy, he trusted the people would understand, and he made his contribution as he saw his Christian duty even when it meant conflict with his own party.

So he was a freeman in a world that was bartering much of its freedom for an illusory security. And his freedom rooted in its puritan source in God and a strong God-inspired conscience in divine obedience. The hymn says it:

"Make me a captive, Lord,
And then I shall be free;
Force me to render up my sword,
And I shall conqueror be.
I sink in life's alarms
When by myself I stand;
Imprison me within Thine arms,
And strong shall be my hand.
My power is faint and low
Till I have learned to serve;
It wants the needed fire to glow,
It wants the breeze to nerve;
It only stands unbent
Amid the clashing strife,
When on Thy bosom it has leant,
And found in Thee its life."

So Howard Buffett gained the strength of his freedom and served to the best of his rich ability.

Meanwhile, he practiced his principles, not only in public life, but privately in his home. He believed in freedom and reared his children to think for themselves and be free. The truest kind of a family man, as a father he always expected his children to do their best, and used persuasion and example, rather than any dictatorial coercion.

Yet the greatest test of his spirit was still to come—in prolonged and painful illness—4 years of arthritis and cancer, with two serious operations and prolonged and difficult treatment. Yet through it all he never complained.

He rejoiced in the opportunity to go into business with his son, and had great hopes of using the office—yet never complained when that hope was denied him, and continued to serve his clients from the chair that eased his pain in his home.

How often I have visited with him these past 4 years, and always it was a double feast for this pastor—a feast of the mind as we discussed current events and a feast of the spirit as he showed the continued victory of his spirit over the weakening flesh.

His faith gave him freedom from disappointment and depression of spirit and freedom from fear of death.

He carried in his pocketbook this note in his own handwriting:

"I am God's child. I am in His hands. As for my body, it was never meant to be permanent. As for my life, it is immortal. Why, then, should I be afraid of anything?"

Therefore, when the terminal time came, he could speak frankly and without any inhibition of the coming journey. He welcomed my suggestion of a message to someone on the other side. I could pray with him and the family frankly without having to guard any words. He was ready and willing to go with hope and joyous anticipation.

In closing I would quote some more of his favorite words, which fit him so well, from the epilog of Robert Browning's "Asolando":

"One who never turned his back
But marched breast-forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted
Wrong would triumph.
Hold we fall to rise,
Are baffled to fight better
Sleep to wake.

"No, at noonday in the bustle of man's worktime
Greet the unseen with a cheer.
Bid him forward, breast and back as either should be,
'Strive and thrive,' cry 'Speed—fight on.
Fare ever there as here.' "

The Virgin Islands: A Further Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have had a continuing interest in circumstances surrounding Virgin Islands literature to be distributed at the World's Fair in New York. You will recall that on April 20 of this year, and again on May 11, I made this the subject of extended remarks, which were entered in the RECORD.

A later development in this situation has now come to my attention through letters shared with me by Mr. Ariel Melchior, editor and publisher of the Virgin Islands magazine published at St. Thomas.

The first letter is one received by Mr. Melchior and signed by Henry L. Kimelman, Commissioner of Commerce for the Virgin Islands. Mr. Melchior's reply is contained in the second letter.

I believe the Congress will find both of these letters to be of interest in a situation that I feel continues to warrant close attention. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place these letters in the RECORD:

LETTER TO MR. MELCHIOR

DEAR MR. MELCHIOR: In view of the recent criticism in connection with this Department's granting a contract for distribution of literature in the World's Fair without advertising and bids, we, after discussing this matter with officials of the Department of the Interior have decided that effective immediately, all purchases of literature by this Department will be done after notification by advertising and the solicitation of bids. In the near future, we shall draw up specifications for the type of publication similar to yours which will promote the Virgin Islands tourism program and which we can distribute free in our various offices in St. Thomas, St. Croix, New York, and San Juan.

We certainly hope that your publication will enter its competitive bid. We look forward to working with you in the future.

HENRY L. KIMELMAN,
Commissioner.

LETTER TO MR. KIMELMAN

DEAR MR. KIMELMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 8 in which you advise that, in view of criticism of the Department of Commerce for granting a contract for the distribution of literature at the World's Fair without advertising and bid, you plan to change that policy and seek competitive bids for all purchases of literature and for the distribution thereof.

There are several points in the letter which need clarification. Does your intention to purchase literature after advertising and bids, refer to Virgin Islands literature to be distributed at the New York World's Fair?

Has the issue raised by your department's drawing an exclusive contract with the Lodge publications been completely settled?

We do not understand the reference in your letter to "specifications for the type of publication similar to yours," by which you evidently refer to the Virgin Islands Magazine. Does this mean that the specifications you suggest, and which you state you intend to draw up, are to conform to the type, format, and quality of this particular magazine?

Does this statement appear in the letter which you evidently sent to other potential bidders? In view of the many differences between our publication and several others in the Virgin Islands, it is not clear what you mean when you write, "publication similar to yours."

Is the bidding for production and publication of promotional literature to include also the distribution of this literature? You appear to use these terms interchangeably.

Further, in view of the recent appointment of your successor, who, we understand, will assume responsibilities of the office this month, we question the advisability of formulating a policy to which a new commissioner might not be in complete agreement.

Please understand that we are looking forward to the opportunity of working with the Department of Commerce, and we regard the new policy of competitive bidding to be an excellent solution to the important matter of promotional literature.

However, we must say that we shall not be interested in any such program if it is to be marked by the subterfuge and favoritism which has characterized it in the past.

ARIEL MELCHIOR,
Editor-Publisher.

The Night Thief Gives Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Joseph Alsop from Saigon appears in today's—20th of May—Washington Post. Mr. Alsop's article comes just after a letter from Madame Nhu, written some time ago, reached my desk.

Everything that Mr. Alsop has recently discovered has been known to Madame Nhu for some time. In fact, she predicted that if the coup against her brother-in-law were to succeed, as it would if the United States promoted it,

communism would soon take over the country.

It is now abundantly clear that this dire prediction can only be prevented by the pouring out of our blood and treasure.

Once again we have, I fear, many "Mea 'culpas'" to say—

THE NIGHT-THIEF GIVES WARNING

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—Like a thief in the night, with muffled foot slipping from shadow to deceptive shadow, a great national disaster is creeping up on the United States—and on this poor country, too.

The disaster is a final Communist triumph in Soviet Vietnam. What is happening in Laos is peripheral, for the future of Laos will eventually be settled by the outcome here in Vietnam.

What is happening in Laos is a clear warning that the Communist timetable is much shorter than the Washington policymakers seem to suppose.

Even if the Communist advance proceeds no further and an immediate crisis-showdown is thereby avoided, the aims—and gains—of the enemy are obvious. To begin with, they have gained elbow room in Laos, the corridor country, which will be very useful in a future crisis of the war in Vietnam.

They have gained in Vietnam, too, since unpunished Communist successes in Laos naturally cause Vietnamese doubts about America's strength of will. And, finally, the Communist policymakers in Hanoi must also be concluding that they have made an important test of this American strength of will, with delightfully encouraging results.

Hence the Laotian warning is dangerous to ignore. Yet it is far more dangerous to ignore or misread what is happening here in South Vietnam. In a nutshell, the war effort here is approaching a breaking point.

There are three solid reasons for believing that the breaking point may not be far off—unless the United States begins to take preventive acttion. The first reason is simply the growth of war weariness, the loss of patience and endurance. These have been the most striking consequences of the successive coups d'etat, beginning with the fall of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

The psychological climate is therefore unhealthy, as the desertion rates in the army and civil guard units clearly attest. The hope of creating a healthier psychological climate is all too slim, in turn, because of the unhealthy military situation.

President Johnson has asked for more aid for South Vietnam, and he has told Congress that the new, more vigorous leadership of Gen. Nguyen Khanh is a very hopeful factor. He is dead right on both points. But he might better have told Congress that even the efforts of General Khanh, vigorously aided by the United States, are most unlikely to turn the tide here. By doing more of the usual things, we can at best hold on.

The enemy is attacking in heavier and heavier strength, often with disturbing success. To turn the tide, General Khanh needs to find another 150,000 men, to fill up his existing units and to create the additional forces planned with Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Without these added men, Khanh has no margin of advantage. But as the alarming desertion rate too plainly suggests, recruiting this many more soldiers will be a slow business if not an impossible task.

Meanwhile, in some provinces in the Delta, and in Quang Nai in the center of the country, the South Vietnamese regular army has already lost the upper hand in the contest with the Communist forces. In sum, the situation already exists that General Giap classically seeks to create.

The defending forces are at stretch, and they have no large, easily mobilizable reserves. Thus South Vietnam resembles a bowl of water, or rather a bowl of poison, which has just reached the brimming-over point. Put more into the bowl and there will be the devil of a mess.

Finally, the third reason for intense alarm is General Giap's obvious preparation to put a lot more into the bowl. This is the real meaning of the battalions of North Vietnamese Communist regulars which are now deployed just across the Vietnamese border, in Laos.

To this must be added a grim probability. The probability is that the U.S. military leadership out here is wrong in its belief that our continuing superiority in firepower and mobility will overcome any crisis the enemy can create.

Firepower and mobility cannot be exploited to win a battle begun by surprise at dusk, and over and finished before sunrise. Yet a night's battle, ending in capture or destruction by the Communists of no more than a thousand or two thousand Vietnamese regulars, might well cause the kind of paroxysm of alarm and defeatism that would bring this war to an end.

This is the crucial point. The position in Vietnam today—is above all—fragile. To shatter this fragile position for good and all, the enemy need not plan anything as ambitious as the fight at Dien Bien Phu—a small battle but one that went on for a long time.

In one night, almost before we know it, we may be overtaken by the disaster that is creeping up on us.

Rockefeller Aid Puts Steam in Oregon Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the extraordinary talents of Mr. Robert Price, one of the outstanding campaign managers in the Republican Party, by inserting an article by one of Washington's leading correspondents. The youthful Mr. Price has proved what hard work combined with imagination and skill can do and I think he should be an example to the seasoned veteran as well as the newcomer in politics. My congratulations to Miss McGrory for this fine and accurate piece of political reporting.

ARCHITECT OF VICTORY—HOW OREGON WAS WON

(By Mary McGrory)

PORTLAND, OREG., May 16.—The principal architect of the stunning Rockefeller upset victory in Oregon is 31-year-old Robert Price, a New York lawyer and political buff who doesn't believe in polls.

Mr. Price took over the organization of the Oregon campaign as a personal favor to George L. Hinman, Governor Rockefeller's chief political agent. A graduate of New York University and Columbia Law School, he has managed all of New York Representative LINDSAY's campaigns for Congress.

Young Mr. Price, a cheerful, bespectacled Manhattan intellectual, came into the State as a result of a telephone call from Mr. Hinman at a moment when the Rockefeller fortunes were at their lowest ebb. The Governor, bewildered by his poor third-place showing in New Hampshire, was dubious about embarking on another handshaking tour, and the local Rockefeller managers were demoralized by a poll published April 5 which showed the Governor fourth both nationally and locally.

In company with William E. Walsh, the Rockefeller State chairman; F. F. Montgomery, and William Moshofsky, Mr. Price took off in a small plane for a 3-day tour of Oregon's 36 counties. When it was over he sat down and wrote an entirely critical report, with which the three local men concurred. On Friday, April 10, he sat down with 14 members of the Governor's political staff at the headquarters at 521 Fifth Avenue and told them the bad news.

After 3 hours of such depressing items as the fact that there were only two Rockefeller headquarters in the whole State, Mr. Hinman asked Mr. Price to go back to Oregon and take over.

Mr. Price is a man who believes that a campaign manager should have full authority and full responsibility. He took the job on the condition that he have a free hand. It was granted.

He returned to Oregon on April 11 and began 5 weeks of traveling and organizing. He started a notebook. He called on every Republican he could find, from Gov. Mark Hatfield to the editors of local papers.

Early, as he slogged through hamlets too small to get into the atlas, he made a key decision: Oregonians like to see their candidates. They particularly like to see Eastern candidates. They are sophisticated voters.

What gave him the clue was that in some settlements he was gladly greeted with the words, "We haven't seen an eastern Republican here since Tom Dewey was through in 1948."

In his first move on April 15, he sent out to 380,000 Oregon Republicans a letter signed by William Walsh, asking for Rockefeller support and enclosing a card to be mailed back. Those who returned the card got a handsome personal letter on engraved stationery over Governor Rockefeller's signature thanking them for their interest.

GRASSROOTS CAMPAIGN

Culling the lists of the card returners, Mr. Price began the hunt for 36 county chairmen. Advertisements began appearing in papers all over Oregon announcing the chairmen. Pacific Northwest Telephone installed 200 telephones. Mr. Price told his chairmen to set up their headquarters in 2 days, promised to come and address the volunteers as soon as there were five on hand. He traveled 20,000 miles in pursuit and encouragement of them.

Volunteers were set to work on a telephone canvass. An instruction sheet headed "Recommended Telephone Talk" told them to stress the Governor's experience, his victories in New York, and especially the note that "he cares enough to come to Oregon."

He called his county chairmen every other day. On May 5, he had a dinner in Eugene for the county chairmen at which the Governor appeared. He suggested that the Governor speak always of the local application of Federal issues.

On April 20, he cut out 75 percent of the weekly $10,000 Rockefeller television budget. On April 27, he eliminated the whole television coverage. Governor Rockefeller was being overexposed on the screen.

DIVORCE ISSUE RISES

The Governor spent as much time as possible in the State. The posters announced, "he cares enough to come" to the Gateway Supermarket or the Ace Shoe Co. or wherever it was.

"He was doing the one thing none of the other candidates was doing," Mr. Price said. "Lodge couldn't come, GOLDWATER didn't

choose to, and this is one thing the Governor does supremely well."

Throughout, Mr. Price got complete cooperation from New York, which was seeing its first real Rockefeller campaign manager in action. He brought in Senator JAVITS and Representative LINDSAY for weekend visits. He asked for and got personal appearances in the past week from the Governor's daughter Ann and son Rodman.

The only problem he could not manage or fathom was the insistent question of the Governor's personal life. For every one question about the Rockefeller stand on social security or the United Nations, he got 50 on the Governor's divorce and remarriage. Mr. Price suggested that the county chairman tell questioners that the Governor had shown courage and integrity in his private life, that difficulties occur in many marriages (Oregon has one of the highest divorce rates in the country) and that Governor Rockefeller should be judged on his record as Governor.

HOPED FOR BEST

In vain he pleaded with the New York staff to persuade the Governor to confront the issue head on.

It was the one thing New York could not provide.

By the day before election, Mr. Price, like Governor Rockefeller, was hoping at best for second place.

He said, just before the amazing vote began to roll in, "We did the best we could. We tried to educate the voters, find the friends of Rockefeller and bring them to the polls on primary day."

Not since the heyday of the Kennedy organization has there been a campaign with more attention to detail and attention to the voters. Mr. Price has not read Lawrence O'Brien's campaign handbook, but he operates in the same way.

Mr. Price now intends to go back to his law practice in New York. But after what he did with his lists and his notebooks and his handholding in Oregon, it is doubtful the Rockefeller people will let him stay there for long.

Whose Prayer Will Be Used?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite evident that nearly everyone these days wants to be on record in support of God. I have taken note of a recent flurry of pro-God statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I have read accounts of many more in the daily and periodical press. If nominalism would get this Nation to heaven, I think we could all take heart at this outburst of religious fervor.

Unfortunately, certain proponents of a change in our Bill of Rights have taken the position that they are on God's side, and those who do not immediately accept the merits of their proposal are anti-God. In this connection I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial published May 2, 1964, in the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz. The editorial follows:

WHOSE PRAYER WILL BE USED?

The appearances of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen and Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, before the House Judiciary Committee Thursday testifying for an amendment to the Constitution to allow prescribed prayer in schools showed abundantly why such is unfeasible under the American way of Government.

The bishop is in favor of a simple, "In God we trust."

The Governor apparently wants something different.

This is an ancient issue with an oldtime answer. Here is what the Supreme Court said of it in its famous opinion:

". . . It is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the Government.

"It is a matter of history that this very practice of establishing governmentally composed prayers was one of the reasons which caused many of our early colonists to leave England and seek religious freedom in America."

Catholics might recall that Henry VIII's insistence on such a course was one of the many reasons why Sir Thomas More was beheaded, because he would not conform.

Protestants might recall that insistence on rigid public prayer was a cause of the Pilgrim movement to America. Who can deny that God was on the side of the Pilgrims?

As the Supreme Court pointed out:

"The Book of Common Prayer, which was created under governmental direction and which was approved by acts of Parliament in 1548 and 1549, set out in minute detail the accepted form and content of prayer and other religious ceremonies to be used in the established, tax-supported Church of England."

This was two decades after Henry's passion for Anne Boleyn and his wish to divorce Catherine of Aragon, his brother's widow, caused a cleavage in English Christianity. But it was born out of that event.

The Supreme Court went on to say:

"Its (the clause separating church and state) first and most immediate purpose rested on the belief that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and degrade religion."

There is a difference between teaching religion in public schools, and teaching about religion; and, also, the use of public facilities for religious purposes on a basis where attendance is voluntary.

The Arizona State stadium at Temple has been the site of a Billy Graham crusade. The University of Arizona stadium has been used by the Tucson diocese of the Catholic church for special services. The university has religious centers located adjacent to the campus, and a religious life week is observed, but on a voluntary basis.

A tragedy of thinking in the extreme rightwing attack on the Court's prayer decision lies in the effort of the extremists to identify themselves with God, and thus to imply that those who disagree are atheists.

Americans might remember that Abraham Lincoln pointed to the fallacy of any human being thinking that God necessarily was on his side. Lincoln said in his second inaugural, of the South and the North:

"Both * * * pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should try to ask God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully."

What eloquent testimony, then and now, to the very thing Bishop Sheen and Governor Wallace perhaps unwittingly proved in Washington. The very divergence of thought between the bishop and the Governor as to what prayer should be used shows the value of the Court decision and the danger of changing the Constitution to accommodate the extremists. Congress has better things to do than to send such an amendment to the States and the people.

Dropouts Peril Dropout Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the House Education and Labor Committee is considering H.R. 10440, the Landrum-Powell Poverty Package recommended by President Johnson.

One of the provisions of that bill would create a so-called job corps for youths between the ages of 16 and 21. This corps would be administered by a poverty czar to be named by the President.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is not new. It is fraught with uncertainties. Its potentialities for accomplishment has by no means been established. There is much more to be learned before we embark on programs of this type. Premature action in this area can be disastrous—not only to the young people involved, but to the taxpayers as well.

Mr. Speaker, the need for careful thought in this area is pointed up by the tragic experience encountered by the State of California with a similar program—wherein more than 50 percent of the enrollees dropped out of the program in less than 6 months. This $300,000 State program for the benefit of dropouts has itself become a victim of the dropout problem.

Mr. Speaker, the sorry results achieved under the California program are recounted in an article written by Charles Hillinger of the Los Angeles Times which was carried in today's issue of the Washington Post.

I am hopeful that this article will cause those who are hellbent to enact this job corps proposal to lay aside their political motivation and look before they leap. A program of this nature, unless it is carefully delimited and safeguarded, may well do more harm than good.

DROPOUTS PERIL DROPOUT PROGRAM

(By Charles Hillinger)

BEAUMONT, CALIF.—A $300,000 State program to teach work skills to youths who have dropped out of school has itself become a victim of the dropout problem.

During the first 6 months of the program at the Oak Glen Forestry Youth Camp, 10 miles north of here, 101 of the 194 youths enrolled have dropped out. Of the remaining 93, a group of 11 completed the full 6-month course last week.

The camp's dropouts could have national significance.

The project, the first of its kind in the Nation, is a prototype of President Johnson's $200 million Job Corps, a revamped version of the depression-spawned Civilian Conservation Corps.

The administration program is intended to provide job training for many of America's 750,000 young men who lack skills to get jobs.

DIRECTORS OPTIMISTIC

Despite the dropouts and the spotlight of national interest, the State camp's directors are optimistic about the program's ultimate success.

"You've got to expect a large number of dropouts," said Eugene Grauer, resident State Department of Employment counselor.

"These are boys who have been dropping out all their lives. They wouldn't be here if they didn't have a problem.

"Another reason is that some boys come to the camp unwillingly. They're pressured by their parents or others and are determined from the outset to resist any attempt to help them."

Grauer maintained that not all the boys who left before the end of the 6 months should be written off as program failures.

"Many of them were actually ready to leave," he said.

Robert E. Green of the State division of forestry said, "It bothers me every time a boy quits and goes down the hill. If they can't adjust here, what's to happen to them?"

CHANGES PROPOSED

Both Grauer and Green feel that changes should be made in the program, especially in admission requirements.

"First change I would make," said Grauer, "would be to raise the minimum age to 17½."

The program admits youths from 16 to 21. Sixteen also is the minimum age under the Johnson program.

"It is obvious 16-year-olds are too immature," Grauer said.

"Of the 42 who came to Oak Glen, 29 have dropped out already. Even if they complete the 6-month training period, where do they go from here?"

They are too young for military service and not old enough for job placement by the State employment agency, he said.

Green would like to see a restriction requiring that a boy have at least a sixth-grade education. "To equip them with job skills they should have some basic ability to read and write," he said.

The program is costing roughly $1,500 per boy. Training at the mile-high camp on the southern slope of Mount San Gorgonio began November 1.

"They arrive here, head hanging, feet dragging," Green said. "They think the world is against them. They've been turned down time and time again looking for work because they have no experience or lack education."

VFW Defends Military Commissaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our armed services are experiencing serious difficulties in obtaining and retaining highly qualified officers and NCO's, the recent attack on military commissaries by the Comptroller General of the United States was both unjustified and illtimed.

Consequently, it was encouraging to note that the Comptroller General's attack on the commissary system was, in turn, quickly attacked by one of our Nation's largest and most respected organizations, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. As many Members of this House are well aware, the VFW has become an extremely alert and vigorous spokesman for our military personnel, active, retired, and their dependents. When the VFW speaks in defense of our servicemen, it is with a voice of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans. Such a voice should be heeded.

I believe that many Members of this House will agree with me that the statement of Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in defense of the servicemen's commissary system is straight to the point. Commander Lombardo very rightly points out that "a reduction in the commissary system is a reduction in the pay of our servicemen." Also, Commander Lombardo emphasizes the importance of the commissaries to the servicemen in terms of actual dollar savings.

Once again, we are indebted to the VFW for taking such a strong and persuasive position on the side of our fighting men and their families.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the recent statement by Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, VFW commander in chief, in defense of military commissaries. The text of Mr. Lombardo's remarks follows:

VFW DEFENDS MILITARY COMMISSARIES

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 30.—"It's high time that the professional budgeteers and selfish commercial interests stop sniping at the fighting man's commissaries," so stated Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in an interview today defending the military commissaries.

Explaining the VFW interest in the matter, Commander Lombardo said, "the VFW is deeply concerned over the continual loss of the so-called fringe benefits which have been an integral part of military life. The commissary system is an established feature of military compensation. The savings to the military man have been taken into account repeatedly in military pay studies. Consequently," Commander Lombardo continued, "any reduction in the commissary system is a reduction in the pay of our fighting men."

Continuing, the VFW commander said, "at a time when our defense leadership, both civilian and military, are struggling with the problem of keeping officers and noncoms in the service, it is certainly not in the best interest of our national security for a high Government official, such as the Comptroller General, to trigger another raid on the serviceman's pocketbook."

"It must," Commander Lombardo said, "be kept in mind that the commissaries save an average service family of four, according to recent studies, over $32 a month."

"Thirty-two dollars a month," Commander Lombardo emphasized, "may not be important to some highly paid civil service employees, but it is extremely important to the junior officer and enlisted man, who has to make not only every dollar, but also every penny, count in providing for his family. Loss of commissary savings will fall heaviest on the young officer and the NCO, whose pay is lower, but who also have families to house, feed, clothe, and educate."

"One of the best ways," Commander Lombardo said, "to encourage military personnel to stay in the service of their country is to assure them that such things as commissaries, post exchanges, dependent and retired medical facilities, are going to be increased and improved, rather than taken away."

Concluding, Commander Lombardo said, "On behalf of the 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I urge that President Johnson, and the Congress take measures which clearly demonstrate that the Comptroller General's attack on commissaries does not represent Presidential and congressional thinking. The American fighting man must not continue to be fair game for Government penny pinching and selfish commercial interests."

The Draft Studies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is rapidly becoming evident that a study much broader in scope than the one contemplated by the Defense Department is needed if this country's conscription policies are to be adequately examined. A reflection of this increasing awareness is an editorial which appeared in the New Yorks Times of May 20. In a word, the editorial suggests that what is needed is a long-term, comprehensive examination of the draft. There is little reason to believe that such study will be forthcoming from the Pentagon.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call this body's attention to a number of bills, introduced by myself and several colleagues, to provide for a much broader study of draft policies needed in the nuclear age. The House should seriously consider these bills during the current session of Congress.

To give this timely and thoughtful editorial wider circulation, I ask a unanimous-consent agreement that it be inserted in the RECORD.

THE DRAFT STUDIES

Fluctuating draft calls, the high proportion of young men rejected for physical and mental reasons, and the impending increase in the size of the Nation's military age group all emphasize the importance of the draft studies recently announced by the Pentagon. Such studies are important—in fact essential—to any future revision of our draft laws. But, unfortunately, the current studies are not broad enough.

As Senator KEATING and many others have pointed out, what is required is a long-term, comprehensive examination of procurement and personnel policies needed in the nuclear age to provide and to retain professional military forces of a requisite size over a long period of years. Present systems are inadequate; they are discriminatory and wasteful; and perhaps the draft, in the years ahead when our 18-year-olds will increase so greatly in number, will be unnecessary.

No really comprehensive study of the draft has ever been made. What are its military effects; is it vital to maintenance of our security forces? What are its political and economic results? What has been its psychological result; have we become more militarized or more democratic? Many of our forefathers fled Europe to escape conscription; do we now tacitly accept it is part of the "garrison state" of the nuclear age? How does it affect the educational level of the Nation and our social structure? What are the possible alternatives to this system of compulsion?

What kinds of incentive are needed to encourage voluntary military professionalism. and, in turn, what kind of an impact would these incentives have upon our democratic structure? If 40 to 50 percent of our young men fail to qualify for military service, are the service standards unreasonably high, or is our national fitness dangerously low? What kind of remedial action should be taken to increase the fitness of the rejected?

These are obviously questions as broad as government; indeed, as broad as our society. The Pentagon's military studies are an essential base upon which to build. But if Congress and the Nation are to have a really thoroughgoing study of a problem which has affected every American family, a Presidential Commission, or a committee made up of representatives from many branches of Government, from Congress, from education, and from experts in civilian life should be established to commence now the compilation and analysis essential to informed action some years from now.

A "Success" in the Foreign Aid Program—Poultry in Nepal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, AID has done a remarkable job in many countries in improving agricultural methods, often revolutionizing the entire production output, and at the same time contributing to better nutrition and health of the people. One such program was initiated by AID in the country of Nepal in 1959. The program is now almost entirely sustained by the Nepalese:

POULTRY IN NEPAL

No people can have the strength or good health to lead an active and fruitful life who do not have a nutritious diet. The Nepalese, snuggled high in the Himalaya Mountains had just such a lack of proteins. Poultry meat and eggs are the most widely accepted sources of animal proteins in the diet of the Hindu Nepalese, but their native chickens are small, tough and traditionally kept as scavenger flocks. Each laying bird produces a maximum of 50 to 75 undersized eggs per year.

Sensing inexpensive way to enrich rapidly the Nepalese diet with a food that was already widely accepted, U.S. AID officials decided in 1959 to undertake poultry development as one of our major agricultural activities there. At that time there was no breeding flock, no hatchery, no trained operators, no commercial feed suppliers and virtually no technicians trained in poultry husbandry.

Mr. I. C. Brady, of the U.S. AID/Nepal Agricultural Extension team, set about to provide all of these, while four Nepalese with both practical experience and academic preparation, were sent abroad for specialized training. The Parwanipur Agricultural Station in south-central Nepal was selected as a site for a hatchery and laying houses. The Heifer project donated 1,700 chicks, while U.S. AID local currency support provided funds for the buildings. Some equipment had to be ordered from the United States, but others were designed so that they could be reproduced at minimum cost from locally available materials. Mr. Brady "lived" with the project 2 years. There, he was an effective combination of builder, incubator specialist, poultry feeder, equipment and management advisor, electrician, plumber, and, most important of all, thorough teacher for his Nepalese associates.

From the very beginning the project was a complete success; 19,195 chicks were hatched in the first hatching season (1961) and sold to 648 villagers. During fiscal year 1963, 56,607 chicks were hatched and 53,496 sold all over the country at the rate of $13.50 per hundred with the remainder held for the replacement flock.

In the Kathmandu Valley area the whole poultry industry has been revolutionized within a 2-year period and the undersized eggs and small, tough native birds are fast disappearing from the local market. As a result of intensive efforts by poultry specialists in the Extension Service, growers have been trained in care and management of both laying flocks and broiler production.

Success does not end here for the project has stimulated more than one local private enterprise. One young man, starting with 300 straight run chicks expanded until with the help of private capital support he is now able to brood 6,000 chicks. Local feed manufacturers, stimulated by Mr. Brady, first mixed their product manually and then in a specially designed manually operated mixer. However, this method is already too cumbersome for growing demand. The owner has now filed a loan application with the Nepal Development Corp. whereby modern milling equipment can be imported from the United States.

With one hatchery unable to meet the growing nationwide demand for chicks, plans are underway for starting a privately owned hatchery in Kathmandu.

U.S. AID advisory assistance terminated a couple of years ago. Short-term participant training which is scheduled for fiscal year 1964 will complete training requirements. In view of increasing project income, local currency support can be terminated at the end of fiscal year 1965.

Once again, the United States has initiated and then withdrawn from a successful undertaking once it has become self-perpetuating. However, the poultry project has been more than just a stimulator for local initiative and private enterprise, it has also helped to enrich the diet of the Nepalese and to show them the value of innovation.

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON]. I think he has done a real service in calling again the attention of the House to the seriousness of this problem. It is not only a problem that can be considered a major problem for Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio, but if this pest spreads to the other grain-producing areas, it is going to cause some real, real problems. As he has pointed out, the question of control is one that is being worked on now. What we need is more research money for eradication. This can be done in cooperation with the States who are doing the best they can. We have fine research centers at Michigan State University and Purdue University, who are capable of undertaking this research. I am pleased to have the assurance of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], that there are funds available if the Department of Agriculture recognizes the seriousness of this problem, and I trust they will.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Battered Child Syndrome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the April 24, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune concerning the ever-increasing problem of child abuse.

The Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in an effort to take a constructive step toward the control of child abuse cases, has recommended that legislation be enacted in the various States directing the reporting of such cases by hospitals and doctors and granting immunity to those making the reports.

I have introduced H.R. 9652 to establish compulsory reporting of child abuse cases in the District of Columbia. This is badly needed legislation and I hope that we will see action on my bill during this session.

The article follows:

CHILD BEATING SUBJECT OF SOCIAL STUDY

WASHINGTON.—Hundreds of thousands of children in the United States are in mortal danger—from their parents.

Many will be brought to hospitals suffering a variety of injuries, the result of "accidents."

Some of the parents will be arrested for beating their children; many will not be detected.

Three Philadelphia social workers who have explored the motivations that lie behind child beating have reached some conclusions as to how these parents can be identified.

The researchers concluded that most parents who mistreat their children actually want to be caught—they are speaking their parental incapacities in action, and asking to be stopped.

"Why else," the social workers ask, "do they bring their children to hospitals and so run a high risk of punishment?"

And they answer their own question: Such parents see themselves facing "internal per-

sonality disintegration" which "is even more terrifying" than the risk of jail.

The researchers are Marian G. Morris, a former director of the social work department of Children's Hospital in Philadelphia and staff workers Robert W. Gould and Patricia J. Matthews.

THE BATTERED

They have chosen to call the victims of child beatings "battered children" since very few fit into such categories as mentally retarded, underprivileged, or maladjusted.

Rather they are the helpless targets of sometimes helpless parents—parents beset by frustrations or other explosive emotions.

The social workers said a hospital can identify a childbeating or neglectful parent by watching for these signs:

The close-mouthed parent who is not only evasive but self-cotradictory and is irritated when questioned.

The parent critical of his child and angry with him over his condition.

The parent who shows no guilt or remorse about a child's suffering and no concern about prognosis and treatment. This father or mother may even leave the hospital right after a child's admission.

The parent who does not visit his child or, if he does, seldom touches or even looks at the youngster.

Other signs include a father or mother who are more disturbed about what will happen to them rather than the child; those who insist the child injured himself; those who consider their child's condition a personal assault on them; those with no visible perception of a child's physical or emotional pain; who also disregard the feelings of others and are preoccupied with their own lives; and those who regard themselves and their child as worthless.

The trio charted recurring types of behavior among the battered or neglected children. They said these symptoms speak eloquently of the tragedy of mistreated children:

The child cries hopelessly while under treatment or examination but very little thereafter.

He does not look to his parents for assurance and shows no real expectation of being comforted.

He is wary of physical contact with his parents and anyone else.

Instead of crying "I want to go home," he asks, "When am I going home?" Or announces, "I'm not going home."

Address of Maj. Gen. Fred C. Weyand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently New Orleans celebrated one of its most memorable Armed Forces Days.

The day is outstanding and will live long with those who attended because of the address by Maj. Gen. Fred C. Weyand, one of the brilliant young minds in the Army. General Weyand is finishing his tour as the Army's Chief of Legislative Liaison, during which time he became known to many Members of Congress. He will assume command of the 25th Division in the Pacific, a command which is both challenging and rewarding, and will certainly test the mettle of this gallant young officer. Those of us on Capitol Hill regret to see General Weyand leave, but we know that in his departure we will have grateful memories for having known him as he ascends the ladder of success in his chosen profession.

Throughout the years it has been my privilege to introduce the speakers in New Orleans on Armed Forces Day and to benefit by the reactions of the audience following the address. I have never known in all these years a speaker to have been so warmly received and so genuinely applauded as General Weyand following his address, which I here place in the RECORD for your benefit:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. FRED C. WEYAND

I can't begin to tell you what a tremendous thrill it is for me to be on this platform today. To appear before you as a representative of all of the Armed Forces is in itself a great honor and when you add to this the pleasure of personally experiencing the friendly reception and warm hospitality of you wonderful people and your great city, it makes for one of those once in a lifetime experiences.

I've visited New Orleans several times with the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff and on each occasion I have left with the feeling that I had sampled something uniquely and fundamentally American here. New Orleans has always played a vital role in sustaining and developing America and it will continue to play that role long after you and I have left the scene. It also has a unique place in the military heritage of this country.

New Orleans has traditionally made this Armed Forces Day a communitywide event that is not duplicated anywhere in the United States.

Part of this is because you have men of such drive and dedication and community spirit as Lansing Mitchell, Pete Miller, Buck Wright, Bill Turner, and Ray Sparkman.

You know, I suspect that I may know more about the military heritage than many of you here today. The proudest unit with which I have fought in combat was the 1st Battalion of the 7th Infantry Regiment in Korea in 1950 and 1951. We were known as the "Cotton Balers," the name that men of this unit have borne ever since the 7th Infantry Regiment, threw up breastworks of bales of cotton along Rodriquez Canal from behind which they decimated British Army attacking New Orleans in 1815.

It's hard to visualize what New Orleans was like in those days 150 years ago but we do know that even then it was part of the vital heartbeat of the United States. When the British prepared to attack New Orleans in the winter of 1814 the entire Nation held its breath. Battles and blockade had left us without an effective Navy and the Army was on its last legs. Our Capitol City of Washington had been overrun, sacked, and burned. The American people no longer had any confidence in their political or military leaders. There was a widespread belief that if New Orleans fell, the country would fall with it. But New Orleans did not fall, thanks to a herotic citizenry, a heroic bunch of "cotton balers" and a heroic major general by the name of Andrew Jackson.

The people of New Orleans stood side by side with the Army in those critical days of 150 years ago and it's evident today that time has not changed that relationship. Your support for the men and women of the services and your concern for the security of this Nation have deep roots and helps to explain why a soldier like myself who has never lived here feels in a sense that he is home and among friends.

I suppose that there is no way that you could accurately measure the tremendous contribution that New Orleans and Louisiana with all the activity related to space, exploration, and national defense are making toward the present and future security of the United States. But some measure can be drawn. Do you know that last year New Orleans gave 1,400 of its men to the Armed Forces and almost 7,000 men from Louisiana put on the uniform of a soldier, sailor, airman, or marine.

The fact that literally thousands of young men and women enter the military each year from this one community and State points up the magnitude of our defense effort. It affects and concerns all of us. Traditionally, today is a day on which some general, admiral, or secretary comes before you to report on the state of our national defense program. It's probably a good thing, too. that this is done so you can get the word from the horse's mouth because I know that even in Washington where people like to think they know better than any body else what's going on, it's pretty confusing for the average person when he reads in the same day where the Secretary of Defense says we're in good shape and continuing to improve, a presidential candidate says we're losing ground, and a prominent Senator says we've got too much. And I'm not certain that I am going to clarify all of this for you. For one thing, you'll probably be a little suspicious of me anyhow because you know that the Army did not send me down here to report that everything was going to pot. And even if this weren't true, you've had enough generals and admirals in and out of here to know that their opinions are not necessarily blessed with heavenly infallibility.

You know Mr. HÉBERT is one of the nicest, friendliest men you could ever meet on the street but when you are sitting before him in a witness chair during a congressional hearing, he is something different. He is likely to say: "Now General, I'm very pleased to have your opinion. But would you also just give me the facts so I can sort of figure it out for myself."

So, rather than give you my personal opinion, I want to give you the opinion of a man whose word I think you will trust—Mr. VINSON, the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on the Armed Forces, a man who has served in the Congress for 50 years, and a man along with Mr. HÉBERT who knows more about the military, what it is, and what it does, and what it should do than many generals or admirals that I know. Last February, after sitting in secret session over a period of several days, with the service Chiefs of Staff, Mr. VINSON said: "We have got the best peacetime Army we have ever had—the strongest Air Force—and our Navy is more powerful than all of the other navies of the world combined. So there need be no fear on that score." The only thing I might add to this is that this year the Defense Department will spend $51.2 billion on our national security program and if we generals can't provide this country with an adequate defense for that kind of money then we'd better hope that the good Lord is watching over us for sure.

I don't want to bore you with a lot of facts and figures but I want to give you some idea of the magnitude of our national defense effort. Counting the civilian employees, we have 3.7 million people actively involved today in the Defense Establishment of this country. The Army has half of its 16 combat-ready divisions located outside of the United States in positions to counter Communist aggression long before it reaches the United States.

The Air Force that 5 years ago had zero operational capability in the intercontinental ballistic missile field, today has more than 600 operational long-range Atlas, Titan, and

Minuteman missiles ready to fire—and these are supplemented by about 1,300 Strategic Air Command bombers that have kept this country safe from nuclear destruction for the past 10 years or more. Over 500 of these bombers are maintained on 15-minute ground alert and a small number are actually in the air every minute of the day. This is about twice the bomber force that is available to the Soviets.

The Navy has 17 Polaris subs commissioned and this force is being added to every year. By 1968 we'll have over 40 of these unbelievably powerful boats prowling the underneath area of the seas surrounding our enemies. Added to this is the Navy's aircraft carrier force that alone can deploy more atomic bombers than the entire Soviet bomber force. And along with this, ready to give somebody a good punch in the nose, is the Marine Corps with three divisions and three air wings. And there's the Coast Guard doing its tremendously important job of maritime navigation, safety, and security.

We have made real progress in strengthening our defenses over the past 3 years and our forces will continue to improve in their combat effectiveness. Compared with 1960 we have made a 100-percent increase in the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert force; a 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions; a 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear force deployed in Western Europe; a 75-percent increase in airlift capability; and a 100-percent increase in general ship construction. All of our Army divisions have been reorganized to take maximum advantage of the modern weapons and equipment that is being produced for them. Our increased use of helicopters and light planes, for example, is permitting a tremendous increase in battlefield mobility that in turn permits us to develop entirely new tactics in defeating the enemy by surprise and shock action rather than the traditional slow-moving costly ground attacks. When you take all of this together and back it up with the finest, most ready reserve force that this country has ever had, this is the most powerful force we have ever assembled in peacetime.

The other day I listened to a speech by Senator JACKSON from the State of Washington in which he made the point that a good policy, if effective, tends to invite its own discard. The point being that after a tough problem is countered we forget it ever existed. As an example, we have for some time now pursued a policy of military superiority over the Russians. We have spent untold billions of dollars to attain and maintain strategic superiority and in recent times we have spent more billions of dollars to bolster our strength in the area of limited wars and subversion. As a result of this policy of military superiority we have relative peace and we have deterred further Communist aggression. Now, because we are not menaced by overt Communist aggression there is a tendency on the part of some to say: "Well, now that the Communists have apparently lowered the gun, we don't need to worry so much about our security."

As Secretary Rusk recently indicated we should not be under any illusions as to the designs of the Communists against us and the entire free world. The Communist menace is deadly serious and the fact that they move from the direct attack to the indirect, or that they lower the loaded gun does not alter in one iota the fact that Moscow, as well as Peiping, remains committed to Communist world revolution. Because of this I am certain we will move with great care in making any significant changes in current national security policy. At the same time, it is probable that as this period of relative peace, which in a literal sense our policy has forced upon the Russians, continues, there will be more and more voices raised calling our attention to the improved international situation and insisting that the high tide of danger has subsided and we can now afford to carry a smaller stick.

One authority recently said: "We should make our defense forces more unobtrusive." I suppose I tend to oversimplify these complex issues but I believe it is necessary that our defense forces be clearly visible to our potential enemies. I heard a speech not long ago in which the speaker in support of his thesis of preparedness said: "Last year there were 50,000 armed robberies committed in the United States and only 2 of these were committed against uniformed policemen." And I think that tells the story pretty well.

In this connection people often ask me why we keep so much of our Army overseas. Why do we keep troops in Berlin or why do we need 5 divisions of troops in Europe or 2 divisions in Korea or 15,000 men in Vietnam? The answer is a fairly obvious one. We have learned from bitter experience that communism by its very nature moves like floodwaters into every power vacuum or unprotected area left by the free world. We have learned from experience that the only way to stop Communist aggression is to meet it at its borders. The place to prevent a flood is at the river bank, not at your own doorstep.

We are in Berlin, in Europe, in Vietnam, and in Korea primarily because it is in our self-interest to be there, and not out of some purely altruistic motive of protecting the other fellow. There are two opposing power centers in the world—one Russian and one American—and the stakes in the conflict between the two is the survival of our way of life. We need all the friends we can get on our side and we want them to be as strong and contribute as much to our mutual defense as they possibly can. This is why we assist them by selling, and in some cases giving them military equipment. This is why we train and advise them. The South Vietnamese, in fighting to prevent a Communist takeover in southeast Asia, are fighting not only their fight but our fight.

In a sense, we are playing in a poker game where the stakes are as high as they can get: survival. This isn't a game we can withdraw from without losing and it isn't one that is likely to be won by bluff. We need the high cards—and this means military might; we need house men—and this means friends; and we need patience—because this is not a short-term proposition.

I often hear the question: "Can we afford these heavy defense and military aid expenditures?" I hope you will agree that the answer—involving as it does, the security of this country—has got to be "Yes." We're going to spend about $50 billion on defense next year. This is an amount that almost staggers the imagination. Yet, do you realize that we spent $33 billion on gambling last year? Or that we spent $22 billion on vacations? My point is that we can afford whatever it takes to secure our way of life. And my commitment to you as a representative of the Armed Forces is that we will keep this Nation free and we will do it at the lowest possible cost.

I can't resist the opportunity to at least comment on the assignment that I have had for the past 3 years of handling the Army's business with the Congress. This is an experience that comes to far too few of our military officers. I doubt that even you good citizens fully realize the work that is done in your behalf by your delegation in Congress—and I must say that it is a potent one.

Mr. HÉBERT for example is one of the most senior men on the House Armed Services Committee that is responsible for practically all military legislation. Of course, I am most familiar with the work of Mr. HÉBERT and this committee that has done so much in shaping our current military force structure, has led the effort to make our Reserve forces the positive force they are in national security, has tightened the laws under which most of the vast procurement expenditures of the Department of Defense are made, has laid the groundwork for our national civil defense policy—in other words, if you really wanted to learn something about the Armed Forces this afternoon, the fellow who ought to be talking to you is Mr. HÉBERT.

And then you have HALE BOGGS, the majority whip in the House of Representatives, second in line behind the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that is responsible for the tax structure of this country, not to mention the power on the Democratic side to make all new committee appointments. You have Senator ELLENDER who is only chairman of the Committee on Agriculture but also sits as a senior member on Appropriations. And Senator RUSSELL LONG, the ranking Democrat behind HARRY BYRD on the Senate Finance Committee that controls all legislation affecting the financial basis of the United States. These four men alone, not to mention the rest of your fine delegation, wield great influence over the affairs of our Nation.

This is a fast moving world we're living in and the pace seems to be constantly increasing. As the world has grown smaller to the point where even the countries fartherest from us are only a few hours away, all the world has become our neighbor and their problems have more and more become our problems too. In such an environment there is a terrible temptation to seek quick solutions to problems, to discard principle for expediency, to permit the ends to justify the means.

Fortunately, one of the built-in safeguards against such tendencies in our system is the Congress. It represents the people and because it does, it moves with deliberate speed. It does so because, as a body, it is highly conscious of the principles and the heritage upon which our way of life is based and it moved with extreme caution to avoid violating either that heritage or those principles.

I have come to deeply appreciate the role that Congress plays as the conscience of our Armed Forces. It serves as an effective voice or spokesman for the men and women within the services.

We owe a great deal to men like Mr. HÉBERT in Congress, who understands the problems facing the sergeant with 20 years' service trying to raise and educate a family on $345 per month take-home pay. Who knows what the $30 per month that this sergeant saves at the commissary means to him. Who knows the agony that this sergeant feels when all too frequently he must leave his family to fend for themselves as he leaves for duty overseas. Who knows the crying need of this sergeant for a reasonably adequate house when he is reunited with his family. And who knows that this sergeant never heard of a 40-hour workweek.

I have talked earlier about our increased strength in terms of new equipment and new weapons. But the true measure in our increased effectiveness is in the caliber of the men and women of the Armed Forces. In the Army, about 75 percent of our enlisted personnel are high school graduates and about 90 percent of our lieutenants are college graduates. Ten years ago these figures were only slightly more than half of that. These standards are directly related to the great technological changes in our Armed Forces and the need for higher technical skills and greater aptitudes.

The Army's global missions today demand that the modern soldier be trained and ready to carry out a multitude of demanding assignments. I can testify that our soldiers, sailors, and airmen are of a breed of men you can trust to defend our Nation on any field of battle—now or in the future. They serve with dedication and pride and very little recompense and they deserve your support. In my book a general has two jobs—

to win battles and take care of his men. I have been well trained in battle tactics and I am confident in that regard, but I am going to need your understanding and your help in taking care of my men—your men. If I had one thing to ask of you today, it would be that you hold in your hearts for the other 364 days of the year the compassion and regard for the men and women of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines that is so wonderfully demonstrated by your presence here today.

The Air We Breathe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the passage of time continues to bring fresh evidence of the dangers posed this country—urban and rural areas alike—by certain chemicals and various pesticides. Recently New York City had a near crisis, caused by the prevalence of sulfur dioxide in the atmosphere. This episode has been documented by findings of the Public Health Committee of the New York Academy of Medicine, and discussed in a New York Times editorial of May 20.

With each passing day our streams become more defiled, the air we breathe more polluted, our natural environment more eroded. Mr. Speaker, it is time for action on many fronts. As the Times editorial observes, these issues must be "resolved without delay in favor of public, not private, good."

Under unanimous-consent agreement, I ask that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

THE AIR WE BREATHE

New York City faces a critical situation every day because of the prevalence of sulfour dioxide in the air we breathe. The city's millions narrowly escaped catastrophe last October, when atmospheric inversion nearly caused smog such as brought about 7,000 deaths from pulmonary disease and cardiac insufficiency in London in 1952. These somber findings of the Public Health Committee of the New York Academy of Medicine were presented to the Air Pollution Control Board a few days ago.

In the light of such dismaying medical testimony, what can be said of the attitude of the fuel companies that assert they can't supply enough low-sulfur fuel for the needs of the city because it would cost more? Echoing the positions of the cigarette manufacturers and the makers of pesticides, the oil companies contend there is no conclusive evidence that their product is a health hazard. More research is needed, they blandly argue; meanwhile, they want to continue business as usual.

When the public health is involved, we think the stakes are much too high to permit such a gamble. A conflict between disinterested medical evidence and economic arguments advanced by those who have a strong vested interest in the matter should be resolved without delay in favor of public, not private, good.

A bill introduced in the city council yesterday that would limit the sulfur content of fuel oil and coal, and indications that there is a growing awareness of the need for more funds for the Air Pollution Control department are welcome developments.

The air should be safe to breathe.

Johnson Voices Inflation Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleague's attention to an excellent article on inflation by Edwin L. Dale, in last Sunday's New York Times. Mr. Dale points out that since there has been no inflation in this country for 6 years, "The constant discussion of inflation in the United States is reminiscent of the family that calls off the picnic when the sun is shining because something in their bones tells them it is going to rain."

The article also warns that if inflation appears, monetary policy may not be appropriate to meet it. There is a difference between demand-pull inflation and cost-push inflation. Demand-pull inflation occurs when there is a demand for more products than the economy can produce. Cost-push inflation, however, results from the ability of some labor unions and businesses to set their prices by decree; thus cost-push inflation may take place without capacity demand.

Monetary policy can only fight inflation by reducing total demand. Thus, if inflation is of the cost-push variety, tight money can only combat it at the cost of excess capacity and growing unemployment.

With unemployment greater than 5 percent and almost 13 percent of our plant capacity unused, we have little reason to fear a demand-pull inflation. If inflation does occur, it will probably be a cost-push inflation. In that case monetary policy would be inappropriate, since it would "virtually guarantee the continuation of high unemployment and might even bring on a recession."

Our monetary managers must restrain their anti-inflationary zeal when their weapons are inappropriate. And Congress should begin to search for more appropriate means of combating cost-push inflation, means that will not result in high unemployment and slow growth.

The article follows:

JOHNSON VOICES INFLATION FEAR—PRESIDENT IS APPEALING TO LABOR AND BUSINESS FOR RESTRAINT

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The constant discussion of inflation in the United States is reminiscent of the family that calls off the picnic when the sun is shining because something in their bones tells them it is going to rain.

There is no inflation in this country and has not been for 6 years—certainly none to speak of by the measure of the price indexes. While some prices have gone up others have gone down. Yet Americans are so used to associating good business with rising prices that they cannot believe the strengthening of the boom forecast for this year could possibly take place without a revival of inflation.

Since 1958, wholesale prices have not risen at all and consumer prices have risen only 1.3 percent a year. Part of this rise in consumer prices may represent an improvement in quality of goods, and part stems from the continued slow drift upward in the price of services.

JOHNSON'S PROGRAM

Despite the record of stability, part of the "feeling in the bones" about inflation exists in the Government as well as in the public at large, though the Government's economists are on the whole more optimistic than business and banking economists that the price line can be held. Because there is the certain feeling, President Johnson has developed what can be termed an antiinflation program—a program against an inflation that does not yet exist.

It is a program that is made up essentially of a "jawbone attack"—appeals to the leaders of business and labor along with broad governmental guidelines for wages and profits. But before describing the program, and assessing its likely results, it is worth noting some of the characteristics of prices in the United States, and hence some of the factors involved in inflation.

The first point is that a very large number of the prices paid by consumers have little or nothing to do with the decision of big business and big labor. For example, a generalized winter freeze that puts up the price of fresh fruits and vegetables because of short supply affects the Consumer Price Index more than any increase within reason of the price of new cars.

Prices of such things as medical care, beef, haircuts, auto repairs and restaurant meals depend only in the most remote way on what happens to the price of steel or aluminum.

THE PRICE INDEX

In this context, headline-catching price increases for familiar products, such as steel sheets or an important chemical or wrapping paper, do not necessarily have enough importance to affect the broad price indexes. While the iron and steel component of the Wholesale Price Index went up last year, the index as a whole stayed stable because some things went down, such as fertilizer and many oil products.

Despite this situation, the President still believes it is important to use the jawbone attack on the leaders of business and labor, as he has done at two large White House dinners in the last 2 weeks and in a half dozen speeches and news conferences. The experience of the 1955–58 period has given some evidence that big price and wage increases in key sectors of the economy did play an important role in the inflation of that period—and, as a matter of practicality, leadership is all the President has to work with.

What, then, does he tell businessmen?

First, he tells them what they presumably know—that their profits have risen rapidly in the last 3 years and are now at record levels. Profits statistics can be interpreted in many ways, and some businessmen claim, with considerable force, that profits are still too low.

In any case, with the background of high profits the President asks that individual businesses "not increase prices and where they can, reduce them."

What does the President tell the union men?

He tells them, time and again, that labor stands to lose as much as anyone from inflation. For example, the President noted this week that, because prices had been stable recently, working men got larger real gains, despite smaller money wage gains, in the 1961–64 period than they did in the Korean war boom period of 1950–53.

He tells them, like the businessmen, that this country's international competitive position, which deteriorated sharply in the decade of the 1950's, has recently recovered, but that it could slip back again if wage costs, and hence prices began to rise again. He praises them for a recent record in which average wage increases have been only as large as annual average gains in productivity.

Then the President, and the Council of Economic Advisers, urge that the unions simply maintain that record, and that they ask for increases only in line with productivity gains for the whole economy, which have averaged 3.2 percent annually for the last 5 years.

EVASION EASY

The difficulty with these general "guideposts" is that they are very easy to evade in specific situations. Suppose the paper industry, for example, despite rapidly rising labor productivity, has been in a period of depressed profits and urgently wants to raise prices as soon as competitive conditions permit?

Suppose the United Automobile Workers believe that industry profits are simply "too high," and that the industry can easily "afford" a wage increase of 5 percent without raising prices? This is the position Walter P. Reuther, president of the auto workers, has taken.

The record of this and other countries has not been particularly good in jawbone attacks. The performance this time may be no better.

This does not necessarily mean, however, a general rise in the price level. That would depend on many other factors besides individual wage bargaining and leading-industry price decisions. But if the price level does start to creep up, what does the President have in reserve?

The chief answer is monetary policy—a move by the Federal Reserve Board toward a position of greater tightness of credit and higher interest rates.

CURB ON BOOM

Such a policy would work to curb overall demand and spending in the economy. Thus it would undoubtedly slow down the boom, without necessarily working very quickly to check the price increases. That is why President Johnson does not want to use it unless absolutely necessary.

Thus the monetary and fiscal weapons are at hand to halt inflation, as the 1955–58 inflation was eventually halted. But use of these weapons would virtually guarantee the continuation of high unemployment and might even bring on a recession.

Thus jawbone it is, at least for now. With the existence of idle plant and idle labor, the administration is convinced that the United States need not suffer an inflation caused by excess demand. And it believes that "responsible" behavior by business and labor is a reasonable hope, to prevent an independent "cost-push" inflation caused by private decisions.

Restrictions Eased Against Polish Protest Signers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, addressing the House in commemoration of the Polish Constitution of May 3 on April 30, I referred to the reprisals taken by the Polish Government against signers of a letter of protest against restrictions of freedom of information and discussion.

At that time, it was my expressed hope that Polish leaders would reconsider their policies toward the intellectuals who signed the protest letter.

I was gratified to note a press report last Sunday that disciplinary actions against the signers apparently are being rescinded. This indeed is good news and the Polish Government is to be encouraged for its enlightened reappraisal of the situation.

Let us hope that this action is only the first in a series by which Polish writers, scholars, and scientists are given the freedom necessary to pursue their work. Continuing liberalization of the Communist regime in Poland would go far toward advancing Polish culture and learning, and would be received with approval in the entire world.

Under permission granted, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a copy of the story on the situation by Correspondent Paul Underwood which appeared in the New York Times on May 17:

POLISH REPRISALS IN PROTEST EASED—PASSPORTS ISSUED TO SIGNERS OF ATTACK ON CENSORSHIP

(By Paul Underwood)

WARSAW, May 14.—A Polish scholar, Jan Kott, left Warsaw by air for Vienna this week to accept an international prize for his essays on Shakespeare.

There would be nothing especially noteworthy about his trip except that Professor Kott was one of 34 prominent Polish intellectuals who signed a letter to the Government in March protesting official censorship.

The letter raised a storm, particularly after reports had circulated within Poland and abroad that reprisals had been taken against some of the signers.

According to Warsaw rumor, Dr. Kott was one of several who had been disciplined by having applications for passports refused. Others were reported to have been suspended from their jobs.

How many of the rumors were originally true is difficult to ascertain. Many of them seem to have been. But the authorities are now moving to prove most of them untrue, at least as of the present time.

Professor Kott is one of several to receive passports in recent weeks. University sources said that as of now none of the signers is under suspension from teaching duties. Only the column once written by the poet Antoni Slominski is still missing from the humorous magazine Szpilki.

The authorities have moved to a new kind of counteroffensive aimed at making foreigners the villains for allegedly trying to use the incident to discredit the Polish regime.

The Warsaw newspaper Zycie Warszawa carried a statement signed by 155 Polish writers earlier this week protesting what it called "foreign interference with our internal problems and with our cultural policy, which is the common problem of the creative intelligentsia and the political and governmental leadership of the country."

Today's issue reported that 233 more persons had signed the statement. The newspaper also reprinted a letter sent to the Times of London and signed by 10 of the original 34 protesters objecting to what were described as factual errors in published reports of the affair.

Professor Kott, who was not reported to have signed either this week's statement or the letter to the British newspaper, said today he had received his passport "several days ago."

He had been invited to attend ceremonies at the University of Vienna tomorrow at which the German-financed Herder Prize for literature will be bestowed on him. The prize carries with it an award of 10,000 Swiss francs (about $2,287).

American Society for Public Administration Favors Federal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of the National Capital Area Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration favoring increased salaries for legislative, judicial, and executive officials.

The statement follows:

PAY OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS

By any standard, the present salaries of Members of Congress, the Federal judiciary, and high-level Federal executives are inadequate and inequitable.

They are inadequate in view of the range, complexity, and overwhelming importance of the Government's activities. The Government needs the highest type of managerial and professional accomplishment in the executive branch and needs farseeing leadership in Congress and on the Federal bench. Existing remuneration is disproportionate to the responsibilities of high national office and is incompatible with compensation standards in business and in other fields of public service.

Present Federal salaries for those officials are inequitable when compared with executive pay in private firms and some other governmental jurisdictions. While such salaries need not be directly comparable with the private sector, the gap has become dangerously large. Individuals should not be expected to make excessive sacrifices for the privilege of public service nor should inadequate pay restrict Federal office to those with independent means.

Current salary limitations at the top also block appropriate increases in the upper portions of the career civil service. Under present legislation, such a confused pay situation exists that some supervisors make less than their subordinates. Promotions become adverse personnel actions, and many levels of responsibility within an agency are compressed within a salary spread of a few hundred dollars.

The President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems has recommended a Federal executive salary structure ranging up to a Cabinet Secretary salary of $50,000; congressional pay of $35,000; and Federal judiciary pay from $35,000 to $60,500. These proposals would increase the Federal payroll by less than two-tenths of 1 percent. Several bills now before Congress include modified versions of the Panel's recommendations.

The National Capital Area Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration urges Congress to enact promptly an adequate salary structure for high Federal officers. This action will further the

salary reform begun with the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 and will provide our National Government a more equitable and adequate salary structure.

Lively Doings for Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as a nation, it is our duty to do all we can to enable our older people to enjoy the leisure years so deservedly earned through decades of hard work and sacrifice. One highly important way in which this obligation can be met is by providing suitable housing. Older people face special problems in finding suitable homes. These problems include the fact that a very high proportion of the elderly are in the lowest income brackets; their age makes it difficult or impossible for them to obtain mortgage financing on liberal terms; and some special design and neighborhood features are needed to meet their housing requirements adequately.

The various Federal aids designed to meet this problem have been of tremendous value in enabling our communities to provide good housing suited to the requirements of senior citizens and thereby helps them to achieve better, fuller lives. The city of East Orange, N.J., which enjoys a national recognition as one of the cleanest, most progressive cities in the Nation, has characteristically constructed a most attractive project "Concord Gardens" for senior citizens and has developed an excellent program of activities for them. Mr. George R. Genung, Jr., the able executive director of the city of East Orange, recently stated:

The city of East Orange and housing authority are not only very proud of our outstanding first public housing project, but are gratified by the excellent senior citizens program that is being carried on at the building. The combination of a superior building, excellent management, and a comprehensive social, health, and recreation program are the elements that have our local councilmen demanding a similar project in their ward.

I am pleased to insert below a story that appeared in the Newark Sunday News on April 26, 1964, which gives recognition to the excellent program being carried out at Concord Towers:

LIVELY DOINGS FOR ELDERLY—EAST ORANGE PLANS PROGRAMS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Don Dust)

A concerted, citywide effort is in progress in East Orange to make life for its senior citizens interesting and lively.

An exceptional combination of volunteer talent and city agencies, centered on the first floor of Concord Towers at 210 Grove Street, is working at a four-point program of recreation, education, health and information.

Concord Towers is a sleek, new, 64-unit, 9-story building where 82 older people pay moderate rents for the specially designed housing. The main floor of the building, however, is devoted to the use of the entire senior citizen population, 11,063, or 14.3 percent of the entire city population.

The day center, as it is called, is under the sponsorship of the mayor's council on senior citizens, which handles funds for the center's financial support.

IMPROVED OUTLOOK

Mrs. Peter E. Ollendorf, council chairman, said the active atmosphere prevailing at the center has improved not only the outlook of the people using it, but, in some cases, their health. The people who are making use of the center are encouraging their friends to drop by, she said.

On Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays, the floor buzzes with activity. Within the octagonal building there are groups playing cards, or other games, watching television, reading or taking lessons in cooking, attending weekly film programs and, when weather permits, outdoor games of shuffleboard and croquet.

The setup is complex, with 8 agencies and 75 aids gearing their activities toward the city's senior citizens.

The city council paid $6,900 for part of the furnishings of the center. The health department has given influenza shots, and conducted diabetes tests there. The recreation commission, under the supervision of Mrs. DelRey Coleman, handles the activity programs, and the library has donated 500 books and makes films, slides and records available.

OTHER SUPPORT

Members of the Junior League of the Oranges and Short Hills are paying Stanley S. Moss, the center's acting director for this year, a $2,000 stipend. The league also has five members staffing a counseling and referral service.

The service is designed to direct senior citizens with problems to agencies and people who can help them. The problems include social security questions, and health and welfare problems. The United Community Service is training the Junior Leaguers for this service.

Meals on Wheels, an organization which delivers prepared meals to people unable to cook for themselves, uses the kitchen in the center to cook and package the food. The Red Cross sends a representative once a week to teach methods of cooking for one and two people, economically and with limited facilities. This is geared mainly to people who live outside the project.

A "get-well cupboard" makes available for modest rentals wheelchairs, special beds, and all kinds of other equipment for recuperating elderly people. The cupboard is run and financed by the united churchwomen of the city.

George R. Genung, executive director of the city's housing authority termed the abundance of activity and interest "unique." The authority is responsible for constructing and tenanting the building. Genung is quite pleased that while most public housing developments suffer from a lack of community interest, this one is enjoying success.

Big Man for a Big Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Texans are proud of our able friend and colleague, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, the new chairman of the Committee on Appriations. They are proud of his record of service in the Congress, and his dedication to the best interests of the United States. I share this feeling of pride with other Texans. Since I came to the Congress, I have come to know GEORGE MAHON as a dedicated American, an outstanding statesman, and a wonderful friend.

The distinguished publisher of the Vernon (Tex.) Daily Record, Mr. T. B. Quillin, recognizes the capability of Chairman MAHON to handle the tremendous responsibility which now rests on his shoulders. In an editorial on May 17, 1964, titled "Big Man for a Big Job" the Vernon Daily Record congratulated Mr. MAHON, and expressed its confidence that the Committee on Appropriations is in good hands.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on that same date, the Dallas Morning News carried a very fine article on Chairman MAHON written by Mike Quinn, titled "Representative George Mahon: Scholar, Statesman."

I commend both the editorial and the article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Vernon (Tex.) Daily Record, May 17, 1964]

BIG MAN FOR A BIG JOB

Death of Representative Clarence Cannon of Missouri at 85, dean of the House and longtime chairman of the important Appropriations Committee, shifts the spotlight to a highly respected Texan, GEORGE MAHON, of Lubbock, Member of Congress since 1934, who, as ranking Democrat on the committee, is scheduled to succeed to the chairmanship.

The late Representative Cannon was distinguished in a number of ways, skilled parliamentarian, length of service, but more especially as an advocate of economy in Government. Size of appropriations in recent years suggest that efforts in the direction of economy had met with little success, but it would be hard to estimate the number of billions the tough-minded, tough-talking Missourian trimmed from money requests from the executive branch of the Government.

Even more significant is the fact that the cuts would have been much deeper if the full committee and ultimately the House had followed Mr. Cannon's recommendations. The chairman of a congressional committee can have great influence on the fate of legislation considered by his committee. But there are definite limits on his authority as, of course, there should be.

But in GEORGE MAHON the House of Representatives will have leadership quite as capable and quite as devoted to prudent spending of tax money as the late Mr. Cannon has been. It is doubtful if any Member of Congress has greater knowledge or better understanding of the overall Government establishment.

Mr. MAHON's long service as a member of the Appropriations Committee make him uniquely qualified for the tremendously important duties that go with the chairmanship. Oftentimes there is voiced a criticism of the custom of making committee assignments, and particularly the chairmanships, on the basis of seniority. But in this instance seniority and qualifications happen to meet.

Congratulations are in order. To GEORGE MAHON for recognition and an honor based on integrity and devotion to duty, but more importantly to the Nation in the fact that one of the most powerful committees in Congress will be under capable leadership.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, May 17, 1964]

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE MAHON: SCHOLAR, STATESMAN

(By Mike Quinn)

WASHINGTON.—GEORGE HERMAN MAHON, new chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, is a high school dropout.

However, the 63-year-old holder of the Nation's purse strings had a good reason for leaving high school his senior year. MAHON, who looks more like 50 than 63, had a chance to teach school, of all things, so he dropped out of school.

With a gleam in his eye, MAHON recalled last week how while at Loraine High School (Mitchell County) he took a test and qualified for a second grade teaching certificate.

"We didn't take education very seriously in those days, MAHON smiled. "So I dropped out of school to teach."

However, let it be said quickly that he went back to Loraine after 3 months, graduated with his class and headed for old Simmons University in Abilene.

From there his degrees read more like those of a scholar than a legislator. Actually MAHON is both, quoting Shakespeare as easily as he holds committee hearings.

After graduating from Simmons, he got his law degree from the University of Texas in 1925, then attended the University of Minnesota. MAHON, tall, easygoing, and quiet, also holds honorary doctor of laws degrees from Waynesburg College in Pennsylvania, Wayland Baptist College in Plainview and Texas Tech in his hometown of Lubbock.

MAHON in midweek became the center of attention on Capitol Hill. With the death of Representative Clarence Cannon, Democrat, of Missouri, MAHON moved into the chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee.

This committee is one of the most important, along with Ways and Means, since all money bills originate in the House and all departments of Government must go to this committee for their annual budget.

MAHON himself has been chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, and since he took over this job in 1949 has approved military spending in the neighborhood of $500 billion.

In that post, MAHON has developed a reputation for being exact, precise, and for giving the American taxpayer the most for his money.

His precise nature has been the subject of several stories on the Hill but the most popular one involves a discussion with a fellow member of the Defense Subcommittee. During testimony a question was raised about the use of a word. MAHON disagreed with the use and ordered an aid to produce a dictionary. Committee business stopped while the aid looked up the word.

In seeking exact answers from witnesses, MAHON often gets into involved questions. Some criticize him for his lengthy inquiries but those close to him say that when MAHON asks a question he has a reason and he wants an exact answer. MAHON feels the only way to get the precise answer is to ask a precise question.

After nearly 30 years in the House, MAHON has learned to ask questions precisely. The record reveals he gets good answers too.

While MAHON has suddenly come into the limelight, he can easily look back on the days when things weren't so good.

He was elected to the 74th Congress in November 1934.

At the time, MAHON recalled some years ago, "I hadn't seen more than three or four live Congressmen in my life."

Moving from a district attorney's job in west Texas to Washington, though, suddenly developed its miseries. First, MAHON had been on the firing line. Now as a very junior Member of the House, where seniority counts, he found himself on five committees which for all practical purposes never met.

MAHON said that within a short time he began to feel depressed and that "I had no part in the big game although I had the right to vote."

During his second term things were no better and as he recalls "the frustration became more acute."

However, the young legislator had some pretty fair country legislators looking over his shoulder and encouraging him. These included the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, then Vice President John Nance Garner, the late Senators Tom Connally and Morris Sheppard, and Representatives Ewing Thomason (later a U.S. district judge); and Marvin Jones (now chief judge of the Court of Claims).

Garner, in fact, recognized something special in MAHON, and predicted that MAHON would become a statesman.

Garner evidently had keen insight.

MAHON's frustrations of the mid-1930's left as he was named to the Appropriations Committee in 1939. A colleague pointed out that MAHON has had something to say in U.S. spending during the most crucial years the country has seen.

MAHON, out of the early days, has developed a respect defying description for the seniority system of the House. He also respects the rules of the House.

After returning from Cannon's funeral in Missouri, MAHON asked for a copy of the rules of the House—ironically written by the same Cannon. These rules call for the full House to approve chairmanships of standing committees. This the House will probably do Monday in MAHON's case.

During his years in the House, MAHON has kept his sense of humor and kept in touch with the people he represents.

About 4 years ago, he called Miss Janice Stalcup, then secretary to the president of Texas Tech. He asked Janice to have lunch with him and Mrs. Mahon.

The lunch produced the usual chitchat, but at the end MAHON said: "You are going to work for me in Washington January 1."

There was no mention of salary or of whether Janice wanted the job.

In late December, Janice arrived at National Airport. The rain was pouring. But there at the bottom of the plane ramp stood MAHON all alone. He held a big, multicolored golf umbrella, as Janice walked up to him, MAHON took her hand, kissed it, and said: "Welcome to Washington."

While MAHON has his light side, he is in the main serious.

He takes the business of spending the taxpayers money to heart and watches money outflow continually.

Observers feel in this area, there will be little change from the day of Cannon's chairing the Appropriations Committee.

However, there will probably be two obvious changes.

First, MAHON is close to President Johnson and in areas such as foreign aid he will tend to listen to the White House more than Cannon or Foreign Aid Subcommittee Chairman OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana.

This is not to say Mr. Johnson will get all he wants. Undoubtedly, from his past voting record, MAHON will see that foreign aid is cut. But in speeches, he recognizes that foreign aid is a necessity in some areas. He is also a realist in seeing that 80 percent of foreign-aid money appropriated is spent in the United States—and this helps the economy.

He also knows that foreign-aid money has saved free China and Chiang Kai-shek. He knows it saved Western Europe from communism after World War II.

Bue he is opposed to humanitarian-only foreign aid and in this he could be crossways with the White House.

There is another area where MAHON will differ with Cannon. The late Missourian was apt to abruptly abolish subcommittees and charge new ones. MAHON will move slowly and there will be no changes at all until January. Committee sessions will continue to be closed.

While MAHON has moved into the Nation's spotlight for the moment he is still very cognizant of why he is in Washington. He knows he represents a district and that he must still work for that district. As he puts it:

"The people vote for a man because they like him. If he happens to be important in the councils of the Nation they will take pride in that fact, but regardless of his importance, if they do not like him, his politicals days are numbered."

James T. Ramey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement of the reappointment of James T. Ramey to a full term as Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission is a wise and well-justified action.

Commissioner Ramey, a graduate of Amherst College and a skillful attorney, has an unusual background of experience in Government service and administration. Shortly after he received an LL.B. degree from Columbia University in 1941, he went to work as an attorney with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Following 6 years of service in the TVA, in 1947 Mr. Ramey was appointed to the staff of the General Counsel in the Atomic Energy Commission. From 1947 until 1956 he worked for the AEC, during which time he served as assistant general counsel in the Chicago operations office and assistant to the manager of the Chicago operations office. In these positions he had extensive experience in Government contract negotiation and administration.

On April 1, 1956, the then chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, appointed Mr. Ramey as staff director of our committee. During the next 6 years he was a diligent and dedicated servant of our committee. His previous 9 years of service in the Atomic Energy Commission gave him a background of comprehensive knowledge of the whole AEC program. Equally important was his wide acquaintance amongst the scientists, engineers, and administrators of the sprawling AEC facilities. His knowledge and evaluation of the capabilities and experience of the top professional people in the AEC was invaluable in evaluating the programs which they sponsored and supported.

In 1962 a vacancy occurred on the Atomic Energy Commission and most of the members of our committee joined in recommending to President Kennedy that James Ramey be appointed to fill that vacancy. The President nominated Mr. Ramey on August 7, 1962, to fill the unexpired term of John S. Graham. This term expires on June 30, 1964. The new term to which Mr. Ramey has

been appointed will be a 5-year term ending in 1969.

During the past 20 months Mr. Ramey has rendered a valuable service as an AEC Commissioner. His 17 years of background in the Atomic Energy Commission and on Capitol Hill, as staff director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have given him an unusual background of information and experience in both the executive and legislative branches of Government.

Our Nation is fortunate in having the services of many individuals of dedication and ability, such as Mr. Ramey. The dedicated services they render go far beyond the monetary value of the rewards which they receive.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate—the announcement by the President that he is reappointing James T. Ramey to a full term as Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission is a wise and well-justified action.

J. Doyle DeWitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, which appeared in the Hartford Courant on May 18, 1964, about J. Doyle DeWitt, the president of the Travelers Insurance Co. Mr. DeWitt has received many awards and honors and yet remains a modest, unassuming man.

DEWITT DIRECT, SIMPLE—TRAVELERS PRESIDENCY HASN'T CHANGED HIM

The head of the 100-year-old Traveler's Insurance Cos., their 20,000 employees, and 50,000 agents and brokers is a modest, direct, and simple man.

Old acquaintances say of J. Doyle DeWitt: "Being the head of one of the largest insurance companies in the world hasn't changed him. You still see him walking along the street, hands in his pockets, and whistling. He still gives you the same big wave and hello."

Ask DeWitt what kind of a golf game he plays and he answers: "Lousy."

Ask him to what he owes his success and he says: "If it is success—to what everyone else says, hard work, I guess."

The J. in his name is for John but he has never been called that because there were so many Johns in his family.

Of the name Doyle, he shrugged and said: "I don't know where it did come from."

JOINED FIRM IN 1925

Born in Sully, Iowa, DeWitt joined Travelers in 1925 as a claims investigator at Des Moines, shortly after he had to leave Drake University for financial reasons.

In the next 18 years, he rose to the position of secretary of all the Traveler's Claims Departments. Two years later, he was advanced to assistant to the president of the companies, and in another 7 years became the sixth president of the larger multiple-line insurance organization in North America.

Asked if he would call himself a self-made man, he answered: "I don't know what that expression means."

And he has no Horatio Alger story to tell of himself. He was transferred from Des Moines to the home office here in 1927, the same year he was married. "I was moved here and I don't know why I was moved," he said.

However, when he is considering promoting someone, he looks for "intelligence, industry, and devotion to his work."

A recent issue of "Insurance," trade magazine of the industry reports that DeWitt has led the Travelers to record highs in premium volume: "Pioneering in the establishment of package forms of insurance protection, he has helped create a character for the companies which permeates its every endeavor.

"In recent years, under his direction, the Travelers has branched into new avenues of civic concern and corporate responsibility."

The reference is to the Traveler's role in Hartford's urban renewal project, familiar to all local residents. His employees point out that it was because of DeWitt's personal belief and commitment to the future of Hartford that he authorized the establishment of Constitution Plaza, Inc. to provide the necessary financing for redevelopment just when it was about to founder.

ON 21 BOARDS

Although DeWitt is a board member of 21 companies and seldom misses a meeting of any of them, he spends 75 percent of his time in his handsome office in Traveler's Tower which gives him a breathtaking view of Hartford and environs.

A typical day finds him at his desk at 8:30 a.m. or 9. His hours are spent in discussions and meetings and the time left over is used for dictation.

DeWitt has no advice for anyone aspiring to succeed in the insurance world. "I don't think there is any set pattern," he said; but he feels there is much more opportunity in the field now than when he started because of the great growth in the forms of coverage. Under his presidency, new programs of management training and career development have been instituted.

Concerning a wife's role in her husband's advancement, DeWitt said: "She can be of great assistance to her husband in a number of occupations we have, particularly those dealing with agents and the public; but I don't believe in the corporate wife pattern. I don't believe that there is such a thing."

Personal touches in DeWitt's green-carpeted office give a hint of his interests outside of it.

On a table is a picture of him with Comedian Bop Hope on a golf green. (DeWitt tries to get out a couple of times a week, he says and also likes to play bridge.) On one broad wall is a handsome breakfront with bust of Lincoln and other Americana.

LINCOLN SCHOLAR

DeWitt is almost as well-known as a historian as he is an insurance expert. He is a Lincoln scholar and his collection of American politican mementos is unique. There are close to 20,000 items in it and DeWitt remembers all about each one of them.

His interest in history started him on his collection 30 years ago. Today it includes all types of political, cultural and historical Americana from Washington to the 1960 election.

Each election year, it is displayed for the public to see at Traveler's in an exhibition called America Goes to the Polls, and 100,000 people have seen it to date.

DeWitt has given the collection to the University of Hartford of which he is a founder.

When he made the gift, he said he did so to provide the university, high school and college students and the general public source materials in American cultural and political history for research and study of a type not available through textbooks and courses of instruction.

He hopes eventually to see the collection housed in a wing of the university library.

MUM ON ELECTION

DeWitt is a Republican, but refused to say who he is backing this year.

"Haven't you decided, or aren't you telling?" he was asked.

"Both," he answered.

At a rather youthful looking 61, World War I Navy Veteran DeWitt is gray haired and erect, the grandfather of five, father of a son and a daughter. He is married to the former Marjorie Aileen Everett.

He can look back on numerous sucesses and honors. Just two of these are a Freedoms Foundation Medal received in 1950 for a historical article he wrote that was published in his company magazine; and his most recent accolade, the Executive Excellence Award from the University of Connecticut.

Good Citizens: Aerojet-General and Herald Press Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, as another campaign year goes into full swing, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a unique political program which is appropriately labeled a "Good Citizenship Campaign."

In this era of skyrocketing campaign costs, it is important that all citizens help bolster the Democratic process by contributing to it with their votes, their voices, and their dollars.

Dollar drives—whether initiated by political parties, labor unions, or corporations—provide a lubricant for the wheels of government at a time when they are most apt to creak and groan—the time of the political campaign.

Aerojet-General Corp. of Azusa, Calif., is certainly in the forefront of business' efforts to promote greater participation in government as it relates to politics. Through Aerojet's "Good Citizenship Campaign" more than 30,000 employees are encouraged to give personal financial support to the party or candidates of their choice. Strictly a nonpartisan program, other major corporations throughout the country are examining it with the thought of inaugurating similar campaigns.

The Azusa Herald, which like Aerojet works diligently to promote greater citizen participation in public and political affairs, recently carried an editorial which pays proper praise to Aerojet for its efforts.

The editorial follows:

GRASSROOTS FUNDRAISING

With local elections now over and the next thing on the California political calendar the upcoming primary, it seems to be a good time to turn to a nonpartisan movement which originated in Azusa 6 years ago and now has won nationwide repute.

We refer to Aerojet-General's good citizenship campaign through which the company's more than 30,000 employees are encouraged to give personal financial support to the party or candidates of their choice.

In 1958, when the company had 15,000 employees, a total of $25,000 was collected. In the Presidential year 1960, with about 25,000 on its payroll. Aerojet stimulated its employees to give a total of $65,000. Two years ago, with nearly 33,000 on the payroll and an exciting gubernational campaign on the fire, Aerojet employees gave to the party or candidates of their choice to the tune of nearly $100,000 with 75 percent participating and individual contributions averaging $4.

The Aerojet campaign stemmed from the "give a buck to the party of your choice" drive which was organized on a nationwide basis in the late 1950's, but never took hold broadly. Both the Republicans and the Democrats tried to promote it, and it had the backing of the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council—yet, except for sporadic door-to-door campaigns in a few communities or neighborhoods, it never spread broadly to the grassroots.

The philosophy behind the Aerojet drive was expressed simply by the company's president (now board chairman) Dan A. Kimball back in 1958, when he said: "If a man's got a couple of bucks on a horse, he's going to be more interested in seeing him run well."

Happily for the Aerojet drive, there was a good mixture of both Republicans and Democrats in the top echelon of management. At the same time, the committees running the campaign were made up of a broad cross-section of employees—management, technical, clerical and union. Volunteer solicitors were oganized on the basis of one to each 20 employees and an accounting system was set up so that nobody's political preferences were revealed to their fellow employees. All the way it was an on-the-level effort to promote greater personal participation in politics. That's why it has worked so well.

Besides encouraging employees to support their favorities financially, Aerojet sponsors voter registration drives for both the primary and the general election. This year, a total of 1,898 voters were registered at Aerojet plants through deputy registrars who worked at cafeterias during the lunch hour. A great many of these persons might have never registered if they had to go to city hall or otherwise locate a registrar.

As part of the campaign, in-plant rallies are held, which have attracted major candidates. Such stalwarts as Richard Nixon, Governor Brown, Senators Kuchel and Engle, former Governor Knight and former Senator Knowland, Ted Kennedy, John Rousselot and many other have taken part in these Aerojet rallies. They enable employees to see, hear, and judge the candidates for themselves before casting their ballots.

Throughout the country major corporations have inquired into the Aerojet system with a view of inaugurating similar campaigns. Among these companies are such as Western Electric, Aluminum Co. of America, Pet Milk, General Foods, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., Bell & Howell, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and many others. Eminent newspapers such as the New York Times, the Washington Star, the Los Angeles Times and the Herald-Examiner, the Baltimore Sun, Louisville Courier-Journal, and many others of their character have pointed to the Aerojet idea as a pioneer effort that could do much to shake the tentacles of large financial "angels" from both parties.

The Herald-Press newspapers are happy to congratulate Aerojet on this achievement in the political field which matches the company's great triumphs in missilery and space. When we can put political candidates into orbit without launching them from a big contributors pad, we will have better results at all governmental levels.

Let's hope a great many companies, not only large ones, but small ones as well, will follow the Aerojet lead. Most persons don't realize that a presidential campaign alone costs both parties together something like $20 million. If 200 companies in the land did as well as Aerojet did in 1962 with its good citizenship campaign, this sum could be easily raised and postelection deficits would be eliminated, as well as the need for $500 and $1,000 a plate dinners to get party managers out of the red.

We recommend the drive to our neighbors who are in business in the San Gabriel Valley and throughout California.

However, not to be outdone by Aerojet, the Herald Press News Publications came up with its own original idea to promote political interest. In a recent edition, a full-page spread entitled "Political Showdown" calls upon readers to participate in a cash-prize contest by defining "liberal" and "conservative." Included in the group of judges will be representatives of both national political parties, historians, publishers, political science teachers, civic leaders, labor officials and housewives.

Mr. Speaker, based on their performance, I am sure that Aerojet-General and the Herald Press Publications would subscribe to the ideas set forth by the late President Kennedy in a 1961 article, "The Teaching and Practicing of Politics." His theme was "every citizen holds office" and at this point in my remarks I include excerpts from President Kennedy's statement:

Disdain for the political profession in our schools and communities did not matter quite as much in the days when active participation in the political affairs of the Nation was limited to a select few.

But today, the implications of national policy make politicians of all of us. Today, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics "holds office"; every one of us is in a position of responsibility; and, in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of political leadership, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

The American political education with which I am concerned is that of each and every American citizen. His opinions, his votes, his efforts define the limits of our policy, provide its guideposts, and authorize its implementation.

In Lincoln's words, that man on the street, the average citizen, the educated voter, "makes statutes possible or impossible to execute." His attitude toward taxation and selective service, foreign aid and alliances, the United Nations, imports, immigration, even his attitude toward members of minority groups in his own country—all of these have an impact upon foreign policy far beyond his knowledge. Without his indispensable support and loyality, no American foreign policy in times such as these can possibly succeed.

There are, of course, dangers in this increased participation of the public in the policymaking process. Public opinion in a democracy has, on many occasions, in this Nation and in others, been too slow, too selfish, too shortsighted, too provincial, too rigid, or too impractical. But in these times, in facing these issues which deeply touch the lives and fortunes of every citizen, in making these hard decisions which require overwhelming public support, we as a nation cannot—we dare not—exclude the people or ignore their opinions, whether right or wrong. Instead, in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them—but to inform their discretion (by education)."

I consider myself fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to represent a district with such active civic leaders as Bert Stolpe, publisher of the Herald Press News Publications, and Dan Kimball, president of Aerojet-General. They belong to opposite political parties but they stand united on the important issue of public responsibility. They truly understand the anatomy of government and politics and, like doctors of medicine, are doing everything possible to keep the patient active and healthy.

On Being Free With the People's Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always easy to be a free spender if you are not spending your own money. The President is doing quite well in winning votes for his party by his generosity. The only trouble is it is not his money, it belongs to the people. He has not had to sweat to earn it, but the toilers of the Nation have.

Columnist William F. Buckley, Jr., said it well in his column in the Washington Daily News of May 19, "The Kingly Gesture."

His article follows:

THE KINGLY GESTURE

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Lyndon Johnson, for all his simplicity, is acquiring some kingly habits. Wherever he goes now a days he seems to have got into the habit of making a royal gift, like the kings of yore who when visiting their provinces would scatter about a chestload or two of ducats among the peasants, as evidence of their royal favor.

Considering how much Mr. Johnson is given to traveling about, there is some fear for the endurance of the patrimony. His trip to Appalachia cost the royal exchequer $1 billion. When he went up to the World's Fair to speak to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union he was not in a munificent frame of mind, and dropped therefore a mere million dollar gift to the cause of juvenile delinquency in Harlem. There was a splendid opportunity there, I thought, for Nelson Rockefeller to upstage him by making a gift of $2 million: but Nelson Rockefeller is busy these days, spreading his wealth among the peasants of California.

It is a very interesting precedent, this business of facing an audience, making a grandiose Executive commitment, and then sitting back to watch Congress writhe in embarrassment.

One night in 1961 John F. Kennedy called in for a good dinner at the White House a bunch of Latin American diplomats, and before the evening was over had promised them $20 billion in the course of the next 10 years—an expensive dinner. The routine, as I say, is to make the promise—then stare Congress in the face and more or less challenge it to call you a deadbeat. Congress being as Congress is these days, i.e., fearful of public opinion, benumbed by the ignorance of the average voter about the source of all those funds he is constantly showering about the country and the world (they come,

of course, out of the voter's own pocket), weakly succumbs.

An observer said once about Mrs. Roosevelt that she treated all the world like her own, personal slum project. Mr. Johnson, who told a reporter in December of last year that he considers himself more liberal than Mrs. Roosevelt, doesn't exactly do that: it is not a part of his psychological makeup to suggest that all the world is a slum. His buoyant optimism and joie de vivre combine a sort of Coueist optimism ("every day in every way the world is getting better and better") with a Donne-like sensitivity ("every man's death diminisheth me, for I am involved in mankind") to human want. He desires to settle all the problems America has—even while assuring us that America doesn't have many problems. He wants to solve the problems of race relations, of poverty, of old age insurance, of deficient schooling, of communism and of Cyprus.

His contribution toward the solution of this last is Senator FULBRIGHT. His contribution toward the solution of the others is to spend more money, enact more laws, and trust in the good faith of the Soviet Union.

An extraordinary man, no doubt about it. A man with chiliastic fervor: "See that problem? Believe in me. See now the problem is gone."

Here indeed is a true difference between the liberal and the conservative mode, for the conservative recognizes the problem, seeks to do something about it primarily by harnessing human instincts, rather than by harnessing governmental machinery. Thus the problem of poverty is one that is met more successfully by the same means that brought this Nation out of poverty into affluence in the past 200 years.

The liberal mode, so much more appealing to so many more people because of its capacity to give instant gratification, is to do away with problems by acts of corporate national resolution. Lyndon Johnson is a perfect embodiment of that kind of national exuberance, and he is giving us a wonderful ride.

Appropriation for Construction of the New Los Angeles Veterans Hospital To Be Located at Hazard Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern about the 10-percent reduction made in the President's budget recommendations for funds for replacement and modernization of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities.

These funds include amounts earmarked for the new Los Angeles Veterans' Administration Hospital scheduled to be built in Hazard Park in my 30th Congressional District.

The amount requested by the President in January was $22,628,000 to construct this urgently needed 1,040-bed facility. A 10-percent cut would involve over $2 million and could severely restrict essential portions of the project.

As you know, California now has more veterans than any other State in the Union—over 2,100,000—and our rapidly increasing population brings more and more veterans into the State each year.

The problem is particularly acute in the Los Angeles metropolitan area with over one-third of the State's population living there.

No one can doubt the great need for this new veterans hospital. For this reason, I was greatly disturbed to learn from this week's committee report that the 10 percent reduction was recommended.

In my opinion, we can find much better places to save money and reduce Government spending than in our veterans hospital programs. There are definitely no frills or extravagant expenditures included in the plans for the new Los Angeles hospital. In fact, it is my understanding that several desirable features were not included in the original plans, and it has been my hope that they could be provided for in future year appropriations.

We dare not forget for a minute the real moral and legal obligation we have assumed to care for the needs of veterans of our past wars. This obligation is particularly heavy in the case of our older veterans whose health is declining.

So it would be my hope that, before this bill is approved in final form for the President's signature, that most, if not all, of this 10 percent cut will have been restored, and that any remaining reduction in appropriations will not adversely affect the essential construction requirements of our veterans hospital program.

Address of Hon. David E. Bell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Bell, former Director of the Budget and present Administrator of the Agency for International Development, gave an address at Occidental College in California on April 30, 1964.

In my opinion, Mr. Bell is an outstanding public servant. He has brought to the difficult task of international assistance a hardheaded sense of realism.

In this address he clearly sets forth the reasons for supporting the AID program.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks:

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

I

It is a great pleasure for me to be here tonight at Occidental College. As a Californian—and especially as a graduate of Pomona—I am well acquainted with the high quality of this college, and I am honored to have been invited to speak here.

I have been getting some letters recently asking why we don't stop spending so much money on people in other countries under the foreign aid program, and instead spend that money on eliminating poverty here at home. The question is a proper one and I'd like to respond to it here tonight.

The first and most compelling answer is that both the foreign aid program abroad and the war on poverty here at home are necessary in our own national interest.

It is, I should think, entirely clear why we must in our own interest strive to wipe out the pockets of poverty that mar our otherwise prosperous country.

I also think that a moment's reflection will make it equally clear to anyone that we must, in our own interest, continue to support the cause of freedom, democracy, and progress in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

You who live here in California cannot overlook the logic. Look south, and you see Latin America, which can be an area of prosperity and economic growth—providing good markets for our exports, good prospects for our investors, good neighbors for all of us in a deepening partnership for freedom and progress. Or Latin America could be an area where communism, fed and supported from Castro's Cuba, expands its blighting control, shutting off trade, stopping the free flow of ideas, deferring the hope for the larger society for freemen in the Western Hemisphere.

Merely to state the alternatives demonstrates where our interests lie. And it is plain that in a strictly monetary sense it is only commonsense for us to spend something now, under the foreign aid program, to help strengthen free countries in Latin America. Vastly larger sums would obviously be required for our own protection if those countries became strongholds for communism.

The same point is equally clear to any Californian who looks west across the Pacific. Plainly we want to see more of the Asian countries developing like Japan—where free inquiry and free institutions are taking root, where U.S. exports have tripled in the last 10 years, where indeed a sizable Japanese foreign aid program has been mounted in recent years to help the growth of less developed countries. Plainly we do not want to see more Asian countries fall like mainland China under the domination of a hostile and dangerous Communist party leadership.

The circumstances in southeast Asia, in India, and Pakistan, are difficult, as they are in Latin America. It will not be easy to establish conditions for sustained progress in freedom. The bitter struggle in Vietnam, the grinding poverty in India—these, no less than the extreme disparity of income between rich and poor in many Latin American countries—are severe obstacles that must be conquered.

But the fact that there are obstacles in the way of success cannot obscure the basic logic of my proposition. We in the United States cannot turn our backs on those who are striving to achieve progress in freedom in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If we did so we would be untrue to our own national interest. And we would not, in fact, even save money in the long run.

Hence my first reply: Both a strong aid program abroad and a strong antipoverty campaign at home are necessary elements of current U.S. policy.

II

The letters I receive sometimes put the question in a different way: Can we afford both a foreign aid program and an antipoverty campaign?

Here I speak with some confidence as an ex-Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The evidence that we can afford both is that both are included in the budget for fiscal year 1965 that President Johnson submitted to the Congress in January—and the total expenditures proposed in that budget are smaller than the total expenditures antici-

pated in the present fiscal year. Let me repeat: The Federal Budget, including the costs of both the foreign aid program and the antipoverty program, is going down next year, not up. Plainly the costs of these two programs is not placing a severe strain on our Federal finances.

Let me add a word about the cost of the foreign aid program. Fifteen years ago, at the height of the Marshall Plan, expenditures for foreign assistance totaled $4.5 billion; the comparable figure for next year is $3.4 billion. Taking account of the great expansion of the U.S. economy since then, the drop in the real cost of foreign aid has been even larger. In 1949 we devoted close to 2 percent of our natinoal output to foreign aid. Next year the corresponding figure is less than six-tenths of 1 percent.

It is also worth noting that in recent years the cost of the foreign aid program has been reduced in terms of the U.S. balance-of-payments. A few years ago foreign aid dollars were spent wherever in the world prices were lowest. Today, with few exceptions, we limit the expenditure of foreign aid funds to the United States. At present over 80 percent of the foreign aid appropriations go directly to purchasing American goods and services—and it is those American goods and services, not American dollars, that are sent abroad under the aid program. The aid program, as a result, has a smaller impact today on the U.S. balance-of-payments that it has ever had before.

The conclusion is clear: we can afford, without strain, both the foreign aid program and the antipoverty campaign.

Indeed I think it is fair to say that we could ill afford not to conduct either program. The antipoverty campaign is fundamentally and in thetrue sense an economy measure because its purpose—President Johnson has put it so crisply—is "to turn taxeaters into taxpayers." And the foreign aid program is fundamentally and in the true sense an economy measure because its purpose is to get other countries on their own feet, able to contribute to the cost of the common defense of freedom, and able to contribute to the growing strength of the economy of the free world.

III

And this brings me to the third major point I want to make tonight, which is that the antipoverty campaign at home and the foreign aid program abroad share a common philosophy and a common approach, and much can be learned from the experience of each that can be of benefit to the other.

What is the basic concept of the foreign aid program? Essentially and in simplest terms it is to assist the people of other countries to acquire the ability to solve their own problems. This is a finite and limited objective: Once another country can go ahead on its own, our aid can stop.

This is what happened in Europe under the Marshall plan. We helped them temporarily, with technical advice and training, with capital loans and grants of capital. Soon their economies were strong enough to move ahead on their own, and our aid came to an end.

This is what is happening today in the less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The United States—and incidentally, other advanced countries as well—are providing technical and material resources for the time being; as the economies of the aided countries become strong enough, our aid can end.

You may not realize how far this process has gone. Economic aid has been ended thus far in some 17 countries, primarily in Western European countries and Japan. And we have identified 14 more countries which are now in the transitional stage, where economic aid will soon be needed no longer. These include such notable success stories as Greece, Israel, and Taiwan.

It is most important to recognize that we are not trying through the aid program to equalize incomes or standards of living around the world. What we are trying to do is to help equip the people of other countries with the initial skills and capital they need so they can themselves achieve rising incomes and living standards continually, year by year, into the future without needing special help from us or anyone else.

Let me cite to you, as an illustration, the Republic of China, or Taiwan. Over the last 15 years, the United States has provided very substantial assistance to the free Chinese on the island of Taiwan. With our help, the Chinese have built roads, ports, power stations, communications facilities. They have carried out a highly successful land reform program, and raised agricultural yields per acre almost to the level of those in Japan.

The United States has provided technical advisers, capital assistance, surplus agricultural commodities. The Chinese have taxed themselves, increased their own savings, worked hard, avoided luxury consumption.

Today the economy of free China is advancing very rapidly. Production, incomes, and exports are rising. Note that the per capita income in Taiwan is still only in the neighborhood of $150 per person. But there is 90 percent literacy; 80 percent of the children finish six grades of school. There is enough of a trained leadership, public and private—there is enough of a capital base—the attitudes and incentives are such that the Chinese can go ahead on their own from here. The need for aid from the United States is coming to an end—because the forces that will result in continuing economic and social progress have been established in Taiwan.

Instead of a vicious downward spiral of poverty breeding more poverty, the Chinese on Taiwan have established the beginnings of the benign upward spiral of steadily larger production yielding steadily larger incomes leading to steadily rising living standards.

What has happened on Taiwan is what we want to see happen throughout the less developed countries.

What is required is very plain: strong measures of self-help by the governments and people of those countries, and strong measures of assistance from outside—from the United States and from the other advanced countries.

Now I would call to your attention that this recipe, which we have made familiar in the foreign aid program, is exactly the recipe prescribed for the areas and groups that are suffering from exceptional poverty in the United States. In the President's messages and speeches, in the debates and discussions in the Congress, you will hear the theme repeated time and again: what is needed to combat poverty in the United States is strong measures of self-help by those suffering from poverty, plus strong measures of assistance from Federal and State Governments.

The reason the recipe for action is essentially the same for the antipoverty campaign as it is for the foreign aid program is because, as I indicated earlier, the basic philosophy is the same. Neither program is intended to be a dole, to put or keep people on relief. Far from it. We want through both programs to help people get on their feet, learn now to meet their own problems, develop the capacity and find the opportunity to achieve ever-rising incomes not as a result of someone's charity but because they earn them for themselves.

Fundamentally both the foreign aid program and the antipoverty program are designed to permit people to live in self-respect and to be self-supporting. And for this reason they rest on enormously strong bases of personal motivation.

IV

I think it is of more than passing interest that we have applied in the foreign aid program many of the techniques learned from observation of the history of economic growth in the United States. We have for example, sought to use in many of the less developed countries that great American invention, the land-grant college, with its combination of agricultural research, extension, and education, making it possible to apply modern science and technology to the problems of the farm communities served by the college. Needless to say, the exact U.S. model does not fit exactly into the situation in other countries—but modified versions adopted to the environment of those countries are beginning to take root and yield results.

Other American institutions also are being tried and tested for value in the less-developed countries. One that seems very successful in Latin America is the savings and loan association. We are trying the comprehensive high school, the modern American business corporation, the agricultural marketing cooperative.

All these and many more institutional arrangements are being tried out in less-developed countries. But what I also want to call to your attention tonight is that we have something to learn from the experience now accumulating in the less-developed countries. As we undertake to stamp out the last vestiges of poverty in this country—and indeed as we face other serious problems here—let us keep alert to what we can learn from our foreign assistance efforts.

The most outstanding current illustration is of course the Peace Corps. Here is something invented to serve a need in the less-developed countries—stunningly successful there—and with obvious immediate applications here in the United States. Even in the absence of congressional action to establish a domestic Peace Corps, efforts are starting. I know of examples in Washington, D.C., and I am sure there are others elsewhere in the country, where ex-Peace Corps volunteers have found Peace Corps-type jobs for themselves, working typically with underprivileged young people in slum areas, overcrowded schools, and so on. We have also learned that there are some measures that do not do the pob, or do not do it well enough. These we can avoid at home where the costs would be higher and the disillusion more sharp.

I hope we will be alert to the experience of foreign aid work—and not too proud to apply in Washington or Los Angeles what may have been learned in Lima or Calcutta.

We are dealing with the fundamental human problem of equipping people to earn a living successfully in the modern world. The problem has endless variations around the world. But it also has common elements from which valuable lessons of general applicability can be learned.

We look around under the foreign aid program to country after country reaching the stage of self-sustaining growth and our aid in consequence coming to an end. I do not expect the process to be rapid but I expect it to be steady.

And as we help the people of India, and Nigeria, and Colombia lay the foundations for progress in freedom, we will, I believe, also be learning lessons which will help the people of Kentucky and Arkansas and California also improve the foundations for our own progress in freedom.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to include the following questionnaire which I have forwarded to my constituents under date of May 20, 1964:

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

(From your Congressman, JOHN J. RHODES)

World events are moving at a fast pace. At the same time, we face many domestic problems. As your Representative, I need to know your thinking on these many problems. Your response to this questionnaire will tell me what your thoughts are. We both realize that the responsibility of my vote in the House is mine, but in order to make this vote more meaningful I would like to know how you think on various issues.

Your ideas will be carefully considered as legislation is presented to the Congress. Results of the responses to this questionnaire will be published in a later newsletter.

Please return your completed questionnaire to my district office—6081 Federal Building, Phoenix, Ariz., 85025. An envelope is enclosed for your use. Also, since the questionnaire is being tabulated by computer, will you please add any additional comments you might wish to make on a separate sheet of paper, rather than writing them on the questionnaire itself.

	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not sure (3)
1. How would you vote on a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in public schools?			
2. How would you vote on the idea of paying for medical care of the aged through the social security system?			
3. In the civil rights bill, which passed the House, there are 10 titles considered to be controversial. Please check how you would vote on each:			
(a) Voting: Strengthens previous laws; calls for standardized literacy tests for Federal elections; 6th-grade education is evidence of literacy			
(b) Public accommodations: No discrimination by any establishment or service that has any contact with interstate commerce			
(c) Public facilities: Permits the Government to file suit and argue cases, on complaint, of discrimination in any publicly owned facilities			
(d) Education: The Attorney General can file suits to force desegregation; authorizes aid to communities that are trying to desegregate			
(e) Civil Rights Commission: Continues the present Commission for 4 more years; prohibits it from investigating the policies of private groups			
(f) Federal aid: Prohibits discrimination in distributing Federal aid. Agencies may cut off aid only after hearings, court review, notifying Congress, and receiving Presidential approval			
(g) Employment: Prohibits discrimination by private employers and unions on the basis of race or sex. Nonemployment of atheists and Communists is not considered discrimination			
(h) Voting census: Directs the Census Bureau to take a census of voters by race in areas designated by the Civil Rights Commission. This could lead to reducing representation in the House by invoking the 14th amendment			
(i) Remand: Permits appeal, on a Federal court order that refuses to take a civil rights case out of a State court even though such appeals are not permitted in other legal cases			
(j) Conciliation: Establishes a community relations and conciliation service in the Commerce Department to conciliate racial disputes			
(k) How would you vote on the whole bill?			
4. In regard to Cuba, would you—			
(a) Resume diplomatic relations to try to win her over?			
(b) Go on trying to persuade others not to trade with her?			
(c) Put on a blockade against strategic materials only?			
(d) Put on a blockade against any commerce in any materials?			
(e) Organize a Cuban emigre army and support an invasion?			
(f) Use all conventional sources necessary to oust Castro?			
5. In regard to Panama, would you—			
(a) Insist on strict enforcement of the 1903 treaty?			
(b) Agree to renegotiate the entire treaty?			
(c) Agree to renegotiate payments to Panama?			
(d) Agree to a partnership arrangement with Panama?			
(e) Have the United States build a new sea-level canal?			
6. In respect to Vietnam, do you believe we should—			
(a) Get out?			
(b) Continue our support at the present rate?			
(c) Increase our support?			
(d) Strike at the bases in North Vietnam used to supply the Viet Cong?			
7. When a nation expropriates American property and holdings, should we—			
(a) Intervene militarily to satisfy our claims?			
(b) Use all diplomatic channels to firmly insist on payment?			
(c) Deny the nation all foreign aid until payment is made			
8. In regard to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, do you think we should—			
(a) Abandon it?			
(b) Strengthen it by dealing with the Soviets only after we have NATO approval?			
(c) Increase economic ties through a NATO Common Market?			
(d) Continue our present policy?			
9. As to trade with Communist nations, would you believe—			
(a) It should be done only for dollars or gold			
(b) It should be done on the basis of loans and credits, as with our allies			
(c) Not at all			
10. Since 1960, do you feel the U.S. prestige in the world—			
(a) Has increased			
(b) Has decreased			
(c) Has not changed			
11. How do you feel in regard to disarmament?			
(a) It would be a mistake to consider disarmament at this time			
(b) Universal disarmament should begin, but be done in stages, with thorough inspection and control			
(c) The United States should begin disarming regardless of others, as an example to the rest of the world			
12. In regard to unemployment, do you believe the Federal Government should—			
(a) Assume full responsibility for solving the problem			
(b) Share the responsibility with the States and free enterprise			
(c) Allow the States and free enterprise to solve the problem			
13. How would you vote on establishing a "job corps" with work-training camps throughout the country?			
14. Should a domestic "Peace Corps" be established to provide training and services upon local request?			
15. How would you vote on a federally subsidized retraining program for people whose skills have become or will become outdated?			
16. Generally speaking, would you consider yourself—			
(a) A "Liberal"?			
(b) A "Conservative"?			
(c) An "Independent"?			
17. To help analyze the results of this survey, please check one ..... Male ☐. Female ☐.			
18. In terms of age, are you—			
(a) Under 30?			
(b) From 30 to 45?			
(c) From 45 to 60?			
(d) Over 60?			

Part VI—Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the following summary of principal sources of external assistance to the Republic of Panama for fiscal years 1961–63, showing that indeed, the United States is a benefactor to the Republic of Panama.

This was furnished to me by my constituent, Mr. Conrad R. Hilpert of Rockford, Ill., who is to be commended for his interest and diligence in developing this information as a result of a recent trip he made to the Canal Zone.

It represents the results of some searching inquiries he directed to the Panama Canal Company information officer in the U.S. Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, the information follows:

INTRODUCTION

The attached summary of principal sources of external assistance to Panama from fiscal year 1961 to 1963 includes the major contributors only. It should also be noted that the amount of U.S. grant assistance for development projects accounts for only the U.S. contribution and does not reflect the amounts contributed by the Government of Panamá.

The Alliance for Progress program in Panama began in fiscal year 1961. This is a joint effort between the United States and Panama in both financial support and practical implementation. Although the Alliance program was initiated in fiscal year 1961, U.S. technical assistance to Panama dates back to World War II and programs administered by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Since World War II, there has been a continuous program of technical and economic assistance involving both grants and loans.

U.S. economic assistance listed in this report represents assistance to Panama since fiscal year 1961.

Principal sources of external assistance to Panama, fiscal years 1961 to 1963 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. loans	21.1
U.S. grants	18.1
Total	39.2
Loans, international lending institutions	24.5
Total, all assistance	63.7
U.S. loans (AID, Ex-Im): fiscal year 1961:	
AID: feeder roads, November 10, 1960	5.3
AID: budget support, November 30, 1960	5.0
Ex-Im: Tocumen Airport, 1961	.3
Total	10.6
Fiscal year 1962:	
AID: Low-cost housing, February 9, 1962	2.5
Ex-Im: Garbage collection equipment, April 18, 1962	.4
Ex-Im: Highway construction equipment, June 1962	1.6
Total	4.5
Fiscal year 1963: AID: Panama City water and sewer	6.0
Total	21.1
Loans, international lending institutions (IDB, IBRD):	
Fiscal year 1961: IBRD—feeder roads	7.2
Fiscal year 1962:	
IDB: Low-cost housing, Aug. 22, 1961	7.6
IDB: Agricultural credit, Jan. 10, 1962	2.9
IDB: Water and sewer (interior) June 14, 1962	2.8
Total	13.3
Fiscal year 1963: IBRD—electrification, central provinces, Sept. 14, 1962	4.0
Total	24.5
Summary of loans by function (since fiscal year 1961):	
U.S. loans:	
Road construction	6.9
Housing	2.5
Health—water and sewer improvement, garbage equipment	6.4
Airport improvement	.3
Budget support	5.0
Total	21.1
Loans—international lending institutions:	
Road construction	7.2
Housing	7.6
Agricultural credit	2.9
Health	2.8
Electrification	4.0
Total	24.5

[1] This report includes only the major sources of economic assistance to Panama since fiscal year 1961. It does not include assistance granted under programs sponsored by the U.N. OAS, military assistance program, and food for peace, and therefore, should not be construed as representing the total external assistance efforts during the past 3 years.

Principal sources of external assistance to Panama, fiscal years 1961 to 1963 [1]—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. grant assistance:	
Fiscal year 1961:	
Rural development	1.2
Description: Projects covered agriculture development, agrarian reform, rural cadastre and resources survey, and water resources and power development.	
Financial institution and private enterprise development	.2
Description: Projects covered industrial development institutions, housing credit institution, self-help housing, and national economic planning studies.	
Human resources development	.8
Description: Projects covered higher education, nursing education, and advisory services for education, including University of Panama.	
Nongoal activities	.2
Description: Projects covered public safety and program support.	
Terminating activities	.5
Total fiscal year 1961 grants	2.9
Fiscal year 1962:	
Rural development	9.2
Description: Projects cover agricultural development, agrarian reform, farm-to-market road construction, aerial photo and mapping, self-help schools, contract school construction, rural health facilities construction, water resources, and power dedevelopment.	
Financial institutions and private enterprise developments	1.0
Description: Projects—Private enterprise development, industrial development institutions, self-help housing, mineral resources survey, national economic planning.	
Human resources development	.8
Description: Projects cover higher education, nursing education, government management and administration, manpower training, and advisory services for education including University of Panama.	
Nongoal activities	.9
Description: Projects cover public safety, sewer design, program support, hospital design, technical studies for electric power development.	
Terminating activities	.5
Total fiscal year 1962 grants	12.4
Fiscal year 1963:	
Rural development	1.1
Description: Projects cover agrarian reform, farm-to-market road construction, self-help schools, rural health facilities, and water resources and power development.	
Financial institutions and private enterprise development	.3
Description: Projects cover private enterprise development, housing credit institution, self-help housing, and national economic planning studies.	
Human resources development	.5
Description: Same as fiscal year 1962.	

Principal sources of external assistance to Panama, fiscal years 1961 to 1963 [1]—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. grant assistance—Continued	
Fiscal year 1963—Continued	
Nongoal activities	.9
Description: Projects cover public safety, sewer design and program support.	
Terminating activities	----
Total fiscal year 1963 grants	2.8
Summary of grant assistance fiscal year 1961–63:	
Rural development	11.5
Financial institutions and private enterprise	1.5
Human resources development	2.1
Nongoal activities	2.0
Terminating activities	1.0
Total grants	18.1

NOTE.—All grant figures represent obligations only.

All loan figures represent the total authorized amount of the loan, not the drawdown or amount expended.

Sources: U-203 reports fiscal years 1961–63; implementation approval documents fiscal years 1961–63; AID Report W-224, "Status of Loan Agreements," CPB fiscal year 1961 to fiscal year 1963; USAID/P status of external loans report Sept. 30, 1963; AID S. & R. Division Report, "U.S. Foreign Assistance," July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1962.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Dynamics of Government Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, David G. Davies, associate professor of economics at Duke University, points out in an article in the May 1964 issue of Challenge that agencies tend to survive, even expand, after their original purpose no longer exists. Professor Davies has done a case study on REA which, under unanimous consent, I include at this point:

THE DYNAMICS OF GOVERNMENT GROWTH

(By David G. Davies)

Since 1900 the gross national product of the United States has increased by approximately 33 times, and the labor force by a little over 1½ times. During the same period Federal governmental expenditures jumped by 234 times and employment by 9 times. Between 1960 and 1963 the rate of growth in governmental employment was about five times as rapid as it was for our civilian labor force.

However interesting these aggregate data are, they do not explain the nature of growth in the public sphere. It would be useful, therefore, to examine, in an eclectic way, the activities of several public agencies in order to gain some insight into the process of growth within the governmental sector of the economy. We shall see, as my colleague Prof. Calvin Hoover notes, that "not only does an agency keep on growing in its own field, it tends to expand outside its field, even in the absence of a vacuum."

Perhaps the most recent and widely published case concerning the process of governmental growth centers around the Rural Electrification Administration (REA). One of the reasons for the survival and continued growth of this agency, despite the fact that almost 99 percent of our farms are now electrified, can be found in REA's policy of subsidizing generation and transmission loans (G. & T.). Although, historically, the bulk of REA funds has gone into developing cooperative distribution systems (about 77 percent of the total), the REA Administrator abruptly changed policy in 1961, without congressional approval or disapproval, and placed greater emphasis on G. & T. loans.

Since 1961, while distribution loans continue to increase G. & T. loans have increased by about 180 percent and now represent approximately 63 percent of the new loans granted. The rapid increase in subsidized G. & T. loans seems especially anachronistic in light of the very fast growth of public utilities which could provide power for the co-op distribution system.

The increased activity in G. & T. loans caused REA to open a new Power Supply Division in 1961. Among many other functions, this Division provides assistance to subsidized co-ops on the "management, design, construction, operation and maintenance of electric systems of power-type borrowers." In addition, REA created in the same year an Office of Assistant Administrator for Operations, a Controllers Division, a Program Services Division, an Electric Standards Division and a Telephone Standards Division.

REA's policy of keeping downward pressure on electrical rates is another factor leading to its growth. With lower rates, naturally a greater quantity of electricity will be demanded. For example, farmers and other rural residents have been steadily increasing their consumption of electricity for home heating and exterior lighting around the farmstead, as well as for air conditioning, cooking, refrigeration and water heating. In fact, the trend on farms regarding water heaters is toward the quick recovery, high-wattage type, and toward two water heaters per home. With more consumption of electricity, co-ops are now applying and reapplying for, and obtaining, REA loans to "beef up" present facilities.

Another factor in the growth of REA is the change in the type of customer that the subsidized co-ops serve. In 1936, when Congress passed the Rural Electrification Administration Act, most rural residents were farmers. Currently, five out of every six new customers served by REA borrowers are nonfarm customers. Many of the new customers are schools, churches, commercial firms and industrial plants.

Indeed, between 1955 and 1961 the number of commercial and industrial consumers of REA co-ops increased by 30 percent, while revenue from these sources jumped by 100 percent. A recent study shows that approximately 24 percent of REA borrowers received 25 percent or more of their electrical revenue from sales to commercial and industrial enterprises. One co-op received more than 90 percent and three others more than 80 percent of their electrical receipts from the fast-growing commercial and industrial source.

A second feature of the changing type of customer that the REA-subsidized co-op serves centers on the definitions of the term "rural." According to the 1936 law, communities in excess of 1,500 residents are not eligible for REA subsidies. Much of the land that was rural in 1936 is now urban or suburban. Yet if a geographical area had less than 1,500 people when REA subsidies first started, it remains eligible for subsidy as far as REA is concerned. This interpretation of the law permits REA borrowers to serve many towns whose populations now exceed 1,500. Due to this reason, future growth prospects for both the co-ops and REA are very bright.

REA loan policy is another factor that contributes to this agency's growth. The U.S. Treasury, which is the source of REA money, is now forced to borrow long-term money at more than twice the interest rates that REA charges its borrowers. The interest rate of 2 percent charged co-ops is most conducive to the growth in REA's loan account.

Ironically, approximately half of REA borrowers' general funds are invested in Government bonds. The balance of these general funds is earning interest and dividends in bank deposits, corporate stocks and bonds, savings and loan associations, and in loans guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration.

The type of loan offered is another factor explaining REA's growth. Until July 1961 almost all loans under one section of the REA Act were granted for wiring rural houses, the purchase and installation of electric farm equipment, and for refrigeration locker plants. With neither approval nor disapproval from Congress, REA switched to a policy of granting loans to finance the purchase and installation of electrical machinery and equipment for commercial and industrial firms, as well as agricultural enterprises. These new loans of public money for ski lifts, artificial snow-making machinery and outdoor lights caused some public criticism, but loans to subsidize other businesses have not yet brought much adverse reaction.

REA also furnished money to cooperatives for the purchase of private power companies as well as governmental utilities and other non-REA cooperatives. Between 1958 and 1962, 46 such power systems were purchased. In one case, three REA borrowers outbid a private firm by putting down just $40,000, or about 1.8 percent of the total price, while REA furnished the other $2,160,000. Officials of the outbid private firm, which formerly sold power to the purchased firm, rather ungraciously claimed that the REA combine paid an excessive price.

REA has assumed, or has been asked by Congress to perform, certain functions not included in the original act of 1936. Among these are: the lending of public money to subsidize the use of telephones, the sponsoring of engineering conferences to provide co-op engineers with more knowledge of the REA system and procedures, and the provision of new technical knowledge and inventions developed by REA engineers to co-ops.

REA provides management assistance to borrowers, including help on operating budgets, ratemaking, and personnel problems. REA has helped to train foreign engineers under an Agency for International Development (AID) program, and also created a rural areas development staff to provide assistance in developing areas that coops serve.

REA is now almost 30 years old and rather accustomed to the ways of Washington. It might be useful in our cursory look at the activities and growth in governmental agencies to examine some of the newer organizations. For instance, in May 1961 Congress created the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) and charged it with the responsibility of establishing an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. The Secretary of Commerce was given the job of designating these redevelopment areas.

Redevelopment areas are found in all 50 States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The vast area for redevelopment, consisting of over one-third of the Nation, is considerably greater than the approximately 79 or 80 "pockets of poverty" Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, had in mind when he first proposed the program in 1955. The large size of the redevelopment area is also somewhat anomalous for other reasons. The 1964 Council of Economic Advisers report on poverty shows, based on an arbitrary definition of poverty, that the percentage of poor families has decreased continuously since World War II. In fact, the decrease in the percentage of poor families has been approximately 40 percent since 1947.

ARA loan and grant policy is very conducive to the agency's growth. While ARA

loans are not as attractive as REA loans, the terms are much better than private financial institutions can offer. It is also possible for a businessman with just $5,000 in equity funds to combine an ARA loan with a Small Business Administration (SBA) loan to gain control of $140,000 for plant, machinery, equipment, and working capital expenditures.

In addition to loans, ARA subsidizes areas with direct grants. This money may be used to provide water systems, access roads, railroad spurs, as well as other facilities deemed necessary for the development of industrial park sites. Grants are also available for developing tourism.

ARA provides money for technical research projects. Such programs do not have to be initiated by individuals in a redevelopment area. Under this phase of ARA's balanced attack against poverty, public funds have been granted for research projects such as a study of economic potentialities in tourist and recreation development of Warm Springs Indian Reservation, and a study of economic feasibility of marketing sea lion hides and meat. Some of these projects may prove to be quite worth while. They may provide us with some basic information about the problem of poverty in addition to giving employment and income to economists and other researchers.

As often happens with governmental agencis, ARA has not only expanded because of growth within its original function, but also because Congress has explicitly requested it to assume new responsibilities. Under the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 (APW), ARA was given the responsibility of coordinating the Federal public works program.

Under this program, Federal funds are given to local areas suffering from chronic unemployment. The grants are for local projects that, according to law, must meet an essential public need. In implementing this program, Federal tax money has been used to construct city swimming pools, municipal game rooms, a boardwalk by the sea and a 12,000-seat municipal stadium. Citizens in one city reduced their local taxes while receiving Federal tax money for their local projects.

Another area conducive to governmental growth is our intelligence complex. Large-scale intelligence as a continuing function, while formerly a repugnant characteristic for an open society, is a rather new feature for the citizens of the United States. The secretive quality that permeates our intelligence community is precisely the characteristic that permits robust growth. Congress can exercise only the most limited surveillance over the intelligence area because such budgets are normally hidden in the allocation of funds to other agencies. Estimates of our intelligence costs are around $1 billion.

In our intelligence complex we have the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Defense Intelligence Agency, which is viewed in some quarters as a future competitor of CIA. Other top-level intelligence organizations are the Division of Intelligence of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Board of National Estimate, the FBI, the National Security Agency, the National Security Council, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the Intelligence and Research Division of the State Department, and the U.S. Intelligance Board.

Although the climate is changing, the most rapidly growing and sacrosanct program in Government is space. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been able to obtain Budget Bureau approval for huge outlays with much more ease than have other agencies. Expenditures at NASA have rocketed forward so rapidly that even the General Accounting Office has had difficulty keeping pace. Nevertheless, GAO recently reported a waste of approximately $100 million in the moon program.

NASA is constructing many new facilities which duplicate those of other agencies and their own, and which are now underutilized. NASA even requested $100,000 to research its own public relations program. In denying this request for shoring up the NASA image-making machine, Congress saved the public untold future millions of dollars. Nevertheless, growth prospects for NASA are outstanding. It might truly be said of this Agency that the sky is the limit, for after the Moon and a few planets, all of space remains.

In one of the most artful stratagems of the year, the Peace Corps secured an international secretariat. The Corps first sought approval for a secretariat and staff in fiscal 1963. Congress specifically refused to authorize money for this purpose, but the State Department contributed $40,000 toward the support of the secretary general and his staff. In fiscal 1964 Congress increased the appropriation to the Peace Corps by 60 percent, but again stipulated that none of the money should be used for the international Peace Corps secretariat. Thus, despite definite congressional disapproval, the Peace Corps obtained the secretariat it sought.

Many other agencies repeat the general pattern of growth described in this article. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, for example, is spending billions of dollars on the renewal of urban areas, despite the fact that we know very little concerning the impact of urban renewal on urban life and society. The Small Business Administration now not only helps small businesses directly, but has created a new empire of small business investment companies which also help small businesses. Meanwhile SBA, with congressional approval, has substantially increased the size of a loan any one firm may receive.

SBA loans are also granted for bowling alleys, luxury hotels, golf courses and other recreational purposes. Indeed, since REA, ARA, the Farm Home Administration, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Urban Renewal Administration each lends or donates public money for one or more of these purposes, it sometimes appears that the various governmental agencies are in competition with each other.

In a classic case of internecine competition, the Federal Power Commission, with some justification, recently sought to establish its authority over electric co-ops. The REA, together with the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and interested Congressmen, successfully resisted the Federal Power Commission's attempt to expand its function. Moreover, after examining this bid for increased power, the House Appropriations Committee, noting the FPC's 40 percent increase in staff from 1960, applied drastic cuts to its proposed budget. REA did not emerge unscathed either, for Congress placed over one-third of REA's 1964 electric loan borrowing authority in reserve.

Agencies do not, of course, always compete. As a result of the efforts of a REA-subsidized borrower, individuals living in Death Valley now receive electric service. According to a REA report, these people, through the "miracle of pump irrigation," are now growing cotton and alfalfa where only cactus and the cresote bush once grew. Subsidized power is responsible for increasing the output of subsidized cotton. The production of more cotton in turn provides more work for the Department of Agriculture's Stabilization and Conservation Service which must purchase our oversupply of cotton.

There are many reasons behind the activities and processes described in this article. A fuller explanation must await important basic research in social psychology, sociology, political science and economics. At the superficial level, however, we have noted that, in some cases, Congress simply votes for more growth in governmental agencies. In other cases administrators blandly or boldly assume an increasing role for their agency with either silent or ignorant approval by the legislature. Finally, administrators are sometimes successful in absorbing new functions despite outright congressional disapproval.

"Why the Minority Voice in the Election of the President?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Why the Minority Voice in the Election of the President?", written by Judge Joe Eaton, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article appears in the May issue of the Florida Bar Journal.

Judge Eaton, of Miami, is a very distinguished jurist, a former State senator, and an outstanding citizen of Florida.

This article, in my opinion, is an excellent one, indeed, and affords food for thought toward moving in the direction of much needed reform in our archaic electoral system.

I have long been interested in modernizing our present system; and I sincerely hope that through articles of this kind the American people will become more aware of this much needed change, so that every ballot cast by every qualified voter will carry with it the weight to which it is entitled.

I believe Judge Eaton certainly deserves to be congratulated for the time he has taken in attempting to bring to the forefront this issue of vital importance and significance to every citizen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE MINORITY VOICE IN THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT?

(By Judge Joe Eaton)

(Judge Joe Eaton has served the Eleventh Judicial Circuit Court bench in Miami since December 1953, except for taking time out to serve as State senator from 1956 to 1959. He formerly was an assistant State attorney. A graduate of the University of Florida College of Law, he later was lecturer in law at the University of Miami. He has served as director and second vice president of the Dade County Bar Association.)

There is no provision in the U.S. Constitution so generally misunderstood, I think, as the provision having to do with the method of naming the President of the United States. One could write this general lack of understanding off as a curiosity of our politics were its significance not so grave with import of danger in the future if a clearer understanding of the subject is not attained. Granted, the procedure for casting the ballot by electoral college may be antiquated, and useless, but the well-designed scheme which

provides that the people of each State vote independently of the people of all the other States (a scheme which Alexander Hamilton described as the only part of the Constitution not condemned by its opponents), is as deeply ingrained into our republican form of government as is the Bill of Rights.

The theory under which this Government operates is concerned with minority rights as well as majority rule. The legislative branch is structurally established on that foundation. The constitutional method of choosing the President is established on that foundation. James Madison explained that this Republic chose a system designed to guarantee insofar as possible that elected officials serving on a national level should be elected in such a way that a local view should not be forced upon them, but at the same time to insure so far as possible that local views are not engulfed in the national view.

In 1787 there was equality of States under the Articles of Confederation. One view pressed at the Constitutional Convention of that year was that Congress should be elected on a population basis. The other view was that each State should have one vote in Congress. There resulted a far-reaching compromise: There would be direct representation in the House of Representatives and a Senate would be created wherein each State would have an equal voice. The identical concept was written into the method of choosing the President, the one who was to carry into execution the laws enacted by that Congress. The number of presidential electors authorized for each State is equal to the number of Senators and Representatives of each State. In Thomas Jefferson's words, this arrangement makes for "a happy compromise of interests between the great and little States." Its purpose is to provide, insofar as it is possible to do so, that the will of the majority shall prevail, but the position of the minority shall be considered.

From what I have heard and from what I have read, it appears that many Americans have the impression that the electoral college is an antiquated but relatively harmless gathering of political figures who have garnered a trip to the State capitol for no really useful purpose other than to rubberstamp the vote. Further, it seems that a significant number of Americans, with a superficial understanding of the workings of a republic, look upon our system of choosing a President as an institution which is likely to thwart the public will by means of some mysterious arithmetic formula which is highly dangerous. Most Americans, I think, are of the opinion that the present system should to some degree be scrapped.

ABOLISH ELECTORAL COLLEGE

I personally have no quarrel at all with those thoughtful persons who say that the electoral college ought to be abolished. It has, in my opinion, outgrown its usefulness. I concern myself only with the oft projected attitude that the whole system of electing a Chief Executive is miscast and that anyone with any view that tends toward the modern must recognize that the people, by an en masse national vote, should choose the Executive that the 50 States now choose to direct the affairs of the United States.

The records of the Constitutional Convention reflect that the specific electoral voting procedure adopted (that is, the method of casting the ballot through electors, the canvassing of the vote, the legislative supervision) was designed to prevent the violence and disorder it was thought would occur under a system of "general ticket" voting by the public and the corruption it was anticipated would result in counting ballots and reporting the vote in the days of the now largely outmoded "ballot box." The proposed alternative to the "general ticket" method of voting was the naming of the Chief Executive by the legislative branch. That proposal was thrust aside because of the indispensable necessity of making the executive independent of the legislature. The result of the deliberation was the electoral plan we are here discussing, a carefully wrought plan which, it was hoped, would result in the deliberative and independent choosing of a Chief Executive by leaders from each State, chosen by the people of each State under whatever plan each State decided to employ.

As a historical fact, the elections in our annals which proved most dangerous to the peace of our Nation were in 1801 and 1825, when the election fell into the hands of the House of Representatives under the procedural system adopted in 1787, and in 1876 and 1888, when candidates (Tilden and Cleveland) won the popular plurality but lost in the electoral tally (to Hayes and Harrison). It seems to me that the reasons underlying the electoral college itself are no longer controlling. The development of political parties over the years has practically reduced the electoral college to a routine ceremony. The American people do not now accept it as sound and they take no pride in it. Therefore, there appears no substantial reason for maintaining it.

But the rather widespread assertion that an en masse vote would be more consonant to republican principles is false. An en masse system would conflict with other established forms of the Constitution, which Constitution provides for the choice of the Government through the medium of the States. The electoral plan recognized the authority of the States in the election and it also recognized the people. Were the President the maker as well as the executive of the laws, the principle of universal suffrage might dictate the direct choice of the President on a national basis by the people. The President's executive duties consist in enforcing statutes devised by Representatives who are not chosen by the Nation at large, and by Senators who are the choice of the several States. If the people desire a more direct choice of the powers that be, the election of a national legislature (which cause I do not espouse) by general ticket would meet their view. En masse election of the President alone would not accomplish their purpose.

The people who formed this Union had previously bound it into States. Those people were bound to the States interests before the Union won their allegiance. The people of the States reserved unto the States every right and power not directly, or by necessary implication, vested in the Federal Government. The power to elect the national leader was specifically granted to the States. It is true that the Union was a far looser federation in 1787 than it is today and the industrial revolution created both rural and urban patterns not necessarily envisioned by the framers of the Constitution. However, the basic constitutional premise that the force of the majority should not engulf the will of the minority is as sound today and is as of great import today as it was in 1787.

This discussion is not written from the perspective of a citizen of one of our less populated States. Neither is it written to subtly promote or defend positions taken by any particular State on any present controversy. Critical issues continually present themselves. Controversy has always been with us, and we trust and pray that it shall always be so in America. This is a nation whose people freely exercise their right to agree or dissent, to lawfully press for change or to lawfully resist it. This is the greatness of our Nation. The greater the controversy, the more necessary and desirable it is that we maintain a system that allows the voice of the minority to be heard.

DECENTRALIZATION OF POWER

Decentralization of power on matters internal is one of the primary aims of our system of government. We endeavor to limit and control the power that any group possesses. The designation of the President by the people of the several States, rather than by the people of a few great States, is one of the cornerstones laid into the building of America.

A republican form of government (as distinguished from a pure democracy) allows for stable progress. It is not conducive to rampant change, but necessary and desirable progress can be had, through expression from the people themselves. Under our system of representative government (as carried into execution by the President), the tumultuous voices of the people of one particular area of America do not completely subdue the voices of the people of a less populated area. The majority voices do control, but the minority voices are heard.

So, to summarize: It would seem to me that the electoral college itself could well be done away with, but that in so doing, the integrity of the States in the electoral process should be preserved. Not only would a surrender of the States' independence be revolutionary when considered in the light of the contitutional purposes, but any discussion having to do with abolishing the method of electing the President by States would, I think, become academic if the people were armed with the facts of the proposition. It seems to me that three-fourths of the States could not be expected to approve any amendment which would deprive them of their present status as independent entities in the Federal representation.

At the risk of over simplification, but in the interest of laying a predicate for a later discussion of a presently proposed constitutional amendment, let us examine the present system in operation in Florida. In 1960, more Floridians voted for Mr. Nixon than for our late President, Mr. Kennedy. Therefore, Florida cast all its electoral votes for Mr. Nixon. In other words, Florida voted for Mr. Nixon for President. The majority of the people of my State were for Mr. Nixon. Therefore, my State was for Mr. Nixon. Mr. Kennedy received a majority of the electoral votes cast State by State. He became President. The people within the State spoke for the State itself in the electoral vote it cast "in solido" for its candidate.

PROPOSAL BEFORE CONGRESS

What, then, is the proposal which would abolish the electoral college and yet preserve the integrity of the States? The proposal is now before the Congress of the United States. It has been there before. It was formulated and introduced into the Congress by Mr. Maish, of Pennsylvania, in 1877, and by Senator Buckalew, of that State, in that same year. Senator Norris, of Nebraska, was the sponsor of a similar proposal just prior to World War II. Such a plan was advocated by former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, subsequent to World War II. The proposal was passed by the Senate of the United States in 1950, but failed to pass in the House of Representatives. Florida's Senator SMATHERS is presently advocating congressional acceptance of a proposed amendment which would accomplish that desired result. Under the proposal, each State would be given a number of votes equal to the number of its Senators and Representatives in Congress. In ascertaining the results of the election, each person voted for would be entitled to have counted in his favor a number of the electoral votes of each State corresponding to the proportion of the population vote received by him in each State. The people of each State would continue to vote as they now vote, independently of the people of all other States. Voters in the several States would not become voters of the United States, but would remain voters of their respective States. Such a plan would continue in effect the primary purpose of the

original plan; that is, to secure minority expression and to preserve the integrity of the States in the political structure. Nothing in this plan is at variance with the fundamental principles of the Constitution except that the plan would abolish the electoral college system. The electoral representation of each State would remain intact. Under this plan it would be just as important to secure a large vote in one State as in another, but the demoralizing contests for the control of doubtful or pivotal States would not occur. Only upon this plan would each voter within the State be placed in a situation of equality with every other such voter. Each voter in each State would be given his due share of influence.

Thomas Jefferson wrote, in a letter to James Madison that the people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty. In that same letter he wrote that if the people should approve the proposed Constitution in all its parts, he would concur in it cheerfully in hopes they would amend it whenever they find it works wrong. The abolition of the electoral college itself is a desirable change, but for the people to completely divest the States of the right to name their President would be for them to divest themselves in part of the sacred right to be heard above the din of the mass. This they will not do if they make available to themselves the information upon which to act.

George Washington left us this admonition: "In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country." The constitutional system of checks and balances upon which our republican form of government is fashioned has met the test—the sure standard of experience. It demands no radical change. It deserves far greater understanding. It commands our allegiance—and our respect.

Washington's War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as we consider proposals designed to alleviate poverty in our country, it is good to reflect on the ultimate, long-range effect of the many programs which may be included in this all-out "war". While on the surface offering aid to those people who through no fault of their own have been unable to find employment and maintain an adequate standard of living is a most commendable objective, we cannot ignore the price which must be paid in other areas when we undertake massive relief on the Federal level.

A constituent of mine from Okemos, Mich., called my attention to the following article by the Reverend John E. Coogan, S.J., which appeared in the May 10 issue of "Our Sunday Visitor" and which I feel is deserving of careful consideration. I hope that all my colleagues may read and ponder this short but provocative article:

WASHINGTON'S WAR ON POVERTY

(By Rev. John E. Coogan, S.J.)

Obscene poverty has no friends anywhere. He who has seen it, stripped of all decency, must feel something of a thrill when he hears our Federal Government declare upon that poverty an all-out war. He realizes that in such a war costly mistakes may be made. But he feels that those mistakes are on the right side. Doing nothing can be the greatest mistake. And yet, mistakes need not be taken for granted. With proper care and foresight they can be avoided or kept at a minimum.

In any war on poverty, the first question to ask is the size of the problem. President Johnson estimates it as including 35 million people, roughly one-fifth of our population. Those are the families with an annual income of $3,000 or less. But among those are many that would resent being thought a government charge. Many have homes of their own or savings they use as an income supplement. Many others living in rural areas raise much of their own food—and love it. Surveys of the poor in "the heartland of the depressed area" have shown 85 percent have washing machines, 67 percent have TV's, 42 percent have telephones, and 59 percent their own cars.

It is a generous instinct to rush aid to the handicapped, but we should first ask whether they can be helped to help themselves. This is the lesson friends of the blind, for example, must learn: that there are many things the blind can do, while growing in happiness and self-respect from the doing. The late Bishop Eustace, of Camden, long since warned us of a similar danger in the matter of State aid. "If we are not vigilant as to the direction from which social security comes," he warned us, "we may some day awake to find ourselves with perfect social security, indeed, but without a vestige of liberty."

The same fear has been expressed repeatedly by the noted economist, F. A. Hayek, of the University of Chicago. "Without realizing it," he reminds us, "we may be drifting into a system in which everyone becomes permanently dependent on the state for certain basic needs and will eventually become more and more dependent. Not only are the social services no longer self-liquidating; they are self-propagating."

CONFINE TO EMERGENCIES

As far as possible, state aid in the form of pure relief must be confined to real emergencies. Dependence upon it should not become a way of life. And aid must take forms acceptable to the financially responsible, the taxpaying public, rather than to the indigent and the professional politician alone. The self-supporting citizen is eager to have the dependent raised to his own condition of responsibility whereas the politician may be too complacent about maintaining a mass of appreciative poor relief voters.

This danger of our raising up a proletariat looking to our Government for "bread and circuses" was foreseen by the English historian, Lord Macaulay, more than a century ago. He predicted that the time would come when our legislators would seek votes through promises of more and easier state aid, to the intolerable burden of the taxpayer. "There will be, I fear," he said, "spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress, the distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stop you." Macaulay then spoke a warning that is daily becoming more timely: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor."

He predicted that once we entered the downward course of using state aid as the price of votes (the growing "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect, and elect" policy), "either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of Government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th—with this difference, that the Huns and the Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

PROTECT LIBERTY

We need not charge with evil intent the politicians who campaign on promises of evermore generous poor relief. Their intentions may be good. But here Woodrow Wilson, political scientist as well as President, reminds us: "Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficient. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

We cannot take it for granted that a national administration will safeguard us from political paths so disastrous. Administrations are made up of men as fallible as ourselves. Governments are full of political accidents. A contested election and a dubious recount can change the whole course of government. And while it is not true that "the best government is the one that governs least," we must be particularly on our guard against that government that is most prodigal of the dole. As Thomas Jefferson remarked, "Free government is founded on jealousy not confidence. It is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind those we are obliged to trust with power."

A CAREFUL LOOK

All this is not to question President Johnson's war on poverty. But let us look carefully to the form it takes. In a responsible society, families live on families' incomes, each family being a mutual aid society. Income normally means pay for work done. The fight against poverty, then, should distinguish between those poor who could reasonably be expected to work at least a part of their own way, when given an opportunity; and those poor who should be a cherished charge upon society. Taxpayers and industry should be consulted as to how men can be put to work. Industry should be appreciated as a source of wages, rather than of endless taxes.

Statement by Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on the occasion of the National Days of Prayer for Soviet Jewry on May 22–23, the Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia has issued a statement condemning the Nazi-like persecution of Jews in Russia.

I urge that everyone who believes in human dignity and the rights of man read this statement and offer a prayer for those who are suffering intolerable agonies behind the Iron Curtain.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOARD OF RABBIS OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA STATEMENT ON NATIONAL DAYS OF PRAYER FOR SOVIET JEWRY

On the occasion of the National Days of Praper for Soviet Jewry to be observed by the American Jewish community this Sabbath of May 22-23, we, the Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia, some 100 rabbis representing the corporate spiritual leadership of the 350,000 Jews in this area, express our deep sorrow and indignation over the religious plight of our brethren in the Soviet Union and pray for their spiritual and physical welfare. We are all the more concerned because our kinsmen do not themselves have the freedom to protest the disabilities under which they live. We fear that their integrity as a distinctive historical group is fast being eroded because they are denied self-expression in religion, culture, and language. Only recently an antisemitic book, published in the Ukraine, heaped vile abuse upon them in terms reminiscent of Goebels and Streicher.

This recrudescence of the basest Nazi-like accusations provoked a worldwide storm of protest, whereupon the Soviet Government denounced the book and withdrew it from circulation. This gives us hope that a series of protests by Jewish and non-Jewish communities throughout the world and strong expressions of concern by our Government may elicit an alleviation of the harsh measures which now militate against the survival of a substantial Jewish community in the U.S.S.R.

We therefore urge our fellow citizens of whatever faith to write to President Johnson to intervene personally with Chairman Khrushchev. We call upon the Jews of our community to assemble in their synagogues this weekend to seek divine guidance and mercy and to pray that a once great and still creative segment of world Jewry shall not perish from the earth.

A Czech's Respect for Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the world recently joined the people of the United States in mourning the death of a great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. A moving tribute to the general's memory was sent to me by a Czech refugee now living in Munich, Germany. This is the letter, written by Mr. George Brada:

APRIL 21, 1964.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: I would like to express with you my deep and sincere condolences in the death of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

I came as a Czech refugee from communism in 1948 to Austria and Germany and did not see too many hopes for freedom at that time. In 1951 and 1952 I read General MacArthur's speeches in U.S. newspapers and texts which I received from General Whitney and a new world opened to me.

I firmly hoped that MacArthur would be nominated in 1952 for President and predicted he would be the keynoter at the Republican Convention. I was deeply unhappy when he was not nominated. Had MacArthur been elected President, our world and all subjugated nations would be today free and secure, without war. In 1952, the greatest failure of freemen took place. Maybe the decision for all ages fell at that time.

I had not the honor to know General MacArthur personally although I have letters from him. I have known personally some of his associates, as Generals Willoughby, Wedemeyer, del Valle, Fellers, Senator Knowland, the late Congressman Reece, and others. I have always been proud of it.

It was the speeches of MacArthur which called my attention to the Congress of the United States in the same way as his association with the late Senator Taft, and in 1951, I started reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I discovered that there were many men in the United States who shared the views and the greatness of General MacArthur. I discovered that MacArthur personified the great qualities of his great Nation and I found these qualities also in the Congress of the United States.

The only weakness of MacArthur was that in 1952, he did not actively take up the primaries fight for Presidency. This gesture of not seeking egoistically himself this top position would have been also a quality of greatness, if we did not live in an infiltrated world.

All sides of General MacArthur were great. He was the greatest man, in whose time I have lived and maybe of all times. He was peer with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. He was an inspiration for all freedom-loving men; he typified the greatness of human beings. All nations can envy America for having had MacArthur. We all should be proud that such a man lived in our world and in our time.

His spirit remains an inspiration even after his death. His words are immortal. Out of these, I have to think now of what he said before the Texas Legislature on June 13, 1951, about the American Nation and in this way about the free world:

"As it is yet unconquered, so it is unconquerable. Its history still lies ahead. Our finest hours are yet to come."

With my personal regards,
Yours very sincerely,

GEORGE BRADA.

Wildcat Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at page 11076 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 20, is a charge by Representative WAGGONNER that the Washington Post sheds mountainous waves of crocodile tears because there are those who oppose the FEPC clause in the current civil rights while stoutly resisting the efforts of the Washington Newspaper Guild to include such a clause in their contract with the Post.

The Washington Evening Star is also a supporter of the pending civil rights bill but recently had its own civil rights violated by a wildcat strike which cost the Star a considerable amount of money. The union, which had not authorized the strike in question, forced the Star in agreeing to reemploy the union's chairman of the composing room who had been discharged for violating the rules of the company to likewise agree not to ask compensation for the damages it had suffered by reason of the illegal strike.

The implications of that situation were discussed by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, in an article on May 13, last, which other papers which carry the Lawrence column published, but which the Star did not see fit to publish. However, as Representative WAGGONNER has pointed out, so many tears are being shed over the alleged discrimination against nonwhites, I ask why no concern appears to be felt by the proponents of so-called civil rights by the apparent inability of an employer to recover from a union, as provided by statutory law, damages resulting from a violation of the union contract.

Mr. President, I ask that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the discussion of this subject by Hon. David Lawrence in his article of May 13, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID LAWRENCE SAYS: "WILDCAT STRIKES VIOLATE EMPLOYERS' CIVIL RIGHTS"

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—Citizens may begin to wonder whether there is any protection for the civil rights of those employers who undergo severe financial losses because of the arbitrary acts of persons engaging in wildcat strikes or walkouts.

Within the last few days, unions have had to call on their members to obey a Federal court order which prohibits wildcat strikes that have arisen in some railroads over the terms of an arbitration award. Also, there are "wildcat" strikes on construction projects in different parts of the country.

And in the Nation's Capital a group of printers caused suspension for 4 days of the normal editions of the Washington Evening Star and Sunday Star, resulting in losses not only to the owners but to the merchants of the city who depend to a large extent upon day-to-day advertising for their sales.

PRINTERS' WALKOUT WAS NOT DENOUNCED

The city of Washington doesn't have a mayor, and has to rely upon the President and the Congress for laws to protect the citizens. But neither President Johnson nor Members of Congress even denounced the wildcat strike.

The Constitution forbids Congress to pass any law that would abridge the freedom of the press, but it does not prevent a labor union organization or its members from accomplishing virtually the same purpose.

The fact that a walkout occurs without the authorization of the national union and in violation of a contract, as happened in the case of the printers here, and that an effort publicly was made by the union officers to persuade the workers to go back to their jobs does not erase the loss.

Is there a remedy under existing laws? The right to strike is recognized in the National Labor Relations Act. Redress, however, can be sought when individuals conspire with each other and engage in a "walkout." Section 301 reads as follows:

"Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States

having jurisdiction of the parties without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties."

UNAUTHORIZED STRIKES STILL GO UNPUNISHED

"For the purposes of this section, in determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling."

In the Washington case, the walkout by the employees was not sanctioned by the national union. But the statute makes it possible to hold the labor union itself responsible nevertheless for breaches of contract. What happened in the current instance was that the foreman of the composing room discharged a shop chairman of the printers union for allegedly violating the rules of the company. The contract between all Washington newspapers and the printers union provides that such disputes must be submitted to arbitration. The union argued that the employee should first be reinstated without prejudice, and it was the publisher's refusal to do this which led other employees to walk off the job. When the strike was finally settled, with the issues to be submitted to arbitration if necessary, the shop chairman was reinstated as demanded by the strikers but with the loss to him of one day's wages.

But who will pay the employer's financial losses incurred? This question has arisen many times before, and customarily when a strike is settled there is a tendency to let bygones be bygones. This has led to the impression that "wildcat" strikes are never going to be punished, and that hence no risk is taken by those who start them. Whatever penalty there is thus remains on the side of the employer whose property is damaged.

One reason is that the employers do not relish a continuance of the dispute and are usually anxious to settle the matter. The proposal, for instance, by Federal Government mediators submitted to both the union and the newspaper publisher here contained the following paragraph, which was subsequently accepted by both sides:

"That, in the interest of promoting harmonious relations, neither the company nor the union take any punitive or legal action against any individual or against each other in relation to this controversy."

The civil rights controversy has properly emphasized individual rights where there are discriminations due to race or color or religion. But there are many other forms of discrimination which have not yet been covered by law. One of them appears to be that exercise of arbitrary power by a conspiracy of individual citizens to tie up a plant or a factory or a railroad without themselves undergoing any substantial penalty.

The Government's Role in Consumer Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1964, the University of Toledo and the Consumers Union, Inc., sponsored a conference on the Government's role in consumer protection on the university's campus at Toledo, Ohio. Among the highlights of the conference were addresses by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan; Mr. George P. Larrick, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration; and William H. Orrick, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Because what these three distinguished public officials have to say is of such vital importance on the timely subject of consumer protection, I know my colleagues will be as interested as I was in them.

The addresses follow:

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN CONSUMER PROTECTION

(By William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice)

You have asked me to discuss the Government's role in consumer protection as viewed from the executive-judicial perspective. That is a tall order indeed, for one could give an entire law school course on the protections courts alone have fashioned for consumers. For example, until Judge Cardozo's landmark decision in the 1916 *McPherson v. Buick Motor Co.* case,[1] a consumer had no right to sue a motorcar manufacturer for an injury arising out of a defect in his automobile. Until that time he could sue only the dealer who sold him the automobile. It is reasonable to suppose that the imposition of that direct liability on the manufacturer had its effect in terms of the care with which automobiles were thereafter designed and manufactured.

There are many, many more examples of protections afforded to the consumer by the courts under the law of negligence, breach of warranty and other doctrines familiar to contract and tort lawyers, but I shall restrict my remarks here this afternoon to the role which the antitrust laws have in protecting consumers.

Those laws, which I am sworn to enforce, are designed to protect the functioning of our particular economic system of free enterprise. All antitrust enforcement is ultimately directed to the benefit of each individual man, woman, and child in this Nation. These laws have a direct and obvious impact on the consumer in terms of the ultimate price that he must pay for goods and services. A study completed late last year showed that the Antitrust Division had 70 enforcement matters pending in food alone, 23 of which were cases. Bread and milk, which absorb over 10 billion consumer dollars a year, were the subject of about half of these matters. Less obviously and directly, but perhaps of greater importance to the consumer, the antitrust laws prevent interference with our system of economic democracy in which consumers vote by their expenditures how this Nation's resources are to be allocated.

Competition, and more particularly price competition, is the premise on which our economic system is founded. I am sure that all elements of our society—labor, management, consumer, government—would agree. Yet too often I see the Sherman Act. Criticized as an "antiquated"[2] "horse-and-buggy"[3] statute, passed in an earlier century, which somehow needs rethinking and updating.

I don't agree with these criticisms. It is no more antiquated than the freedoms of speech, press, religion and assembly which date back to the adoption of the first amendment in the 18th century. These freedoms remain today, April 24, 1964, fundamental in our system of ordered liberty. So it is with the Sherman Act in the sphere of economic liberty. Were the act merely a particularized prohibition of specific abuses which have since disappeared, the charge of obsolescence would be warranted. But the Sherman Act is more than that. Its sweeping language makes illegal "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States." It has truly been called a "Charter of freedom."[4] As head of the Antitrust Division I have occasion to "rethink" the Sherman Act almost daily. My rethinking has only reinforced my belief in the prime importance of competition to our system and the wisdom of the Sherman Act's protection of competition. Competition is as basic as the wheel, but as modern as the missile.

Any economic system has to apportion the production of goods and services to the various sectors of the economy on some basis. The techniques within our own system for achieving this allocation are numerous. Some of them doubtless are not wholly consistent with an idealized free enterprise system but experience has proved them necessary in certain limited situations. Among these are Government ownership, as with our own post office, Government competition with private enterprise, as in certain areas involving the production of defense material, and various types of regulation and licensing. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Communications Satellite Corporation are still other techniques.

But in most sectors of our economy it is competition on which we depend to maintain a proper allocation of goods and services in the market. In general, as demand for a product or a service increases, suppliers of that product or service tend to increase the price. As an increasing price makes that particular activity more profitable, new capacity will enter the market, either through new companies or through expansion of existing companies. While there are imperfections in the free market mechanism, I am satisfied that this is the best system. In this connection, I might note that current Russian problems with agriculture and fertilizer production certainly suggest that, even apart from the sacrifice of liberty that goes with their system, they have not solved technical and economic problems as well as we have.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not say that our own system of private enterprise is also the best possible system for all other places and times. Indeed, as just indicated, we ourselves depart from it in a variety of special circumstances. The problems of underdeveloped countries are not the same as those of the United States. Our friends in Western Europe have great democracies although their embrace of the free enterprise ethic is perhaps less comprehensive than our own. For this country however, I think that competition as the market regulator will achieve the best possible results.

Since competition occupies so basic a position in our system it is natural that any attempt to tamper with it produces ill effects which ripple through the entire economy. If there is overcapacity in an industry, for example, competition would ordinarily force the price down. When, however, there is an agreement which keeps prices artificially high, the normal market response continues to produce even more capacity. The problem becomes increasingly acute until the stress produced by the overcapacity finally forces prices to fall drastically.[5]

Not only may additional capacity be attracted to the industry in which the prices are kept high, but a price conspiracy may provoke foreign competition. Indeed, elimination of tariff protection was widely supported as a trust-busting technique at the time the Sherman Act was passed.

Perhaps the most fundamental impact of prices kept high by agreement is that products so priced are simply beyond the reach of the budgets of some consumers. Some

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

companies may agree not to compete in price on the ground that the public is well-enough served by their continued competition in areas of quality, service, and innovation. But if I have only $5 to buy a widget and there are no $5 widgets available, it is not much solace that for $10 I can buy a sterling silver widget, or a widget that can be turned on and off by remote control, or a miniaturized widget. I don't have $10 and so must do without any widget.

The impact of antitrust violations, even in nonconsumer goods, is ultimately felt by consumers. In the Philadelphia Electric cases, for example, involving in large part price fixing on major electrical equipment purchased only by public utilities, the conspiracy had an impact in dollars and cents terms on individuals. To the extent that the cost of that equipment was put into the base on which State commissions set the rates which the utilities charged, the base and therefore the rates were higher than they otherwise would have been. In such cases, consumers had to pay higher electric bills.

I do not agree that unrealistic price levels set by collusion are justifiable as a spur to research and development. In many cases the results are precisely to the contrary. If a good profit is being made with the current product, the companies involved may have little incentive to upset their economic applecart by developing new products.

Thus, any agreements or other activities which tamper with competitive factors, particularly prices, jeopardize the proper functioning of our economic system. Not only does such activity put products out of the financial reach of some consumers, but by disrupting the ability of the market mechanism to reflect the true needs of an expanding economy, it deranges the proper allocation of goods and services within this economy. In short, when businessmen act to tamper with the market by agreement they throw sand in its mechanism. As Attorney General Kennedy has so aptly put it, this is nothing more nor less than "economic racketeering."

Since that free market mechanism depends upon competition, and particularly price competition, we in the Antitrust Division are distressed over the persistence of price collusion in our economy. Unfortunately, there is nothing new in this. As long ago as 1776, Adam Smith, the classical spokesman for free enterprise, said: [6]

"People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."

More recently, in testimony before the Federal Trade Commission, a businessman said: [7]

"I could go on and on and on—but I want to say that when any two businessmen get together, whether it is a chain institute meeting or a Bible class meeting, if they happen to belong to the same industry, just as soon as the prayers have been said, they start talking about the conditions in the industry, and it is bound definitely to gravitate, that talk, to the price structure in the industry. What else is there to talk about?"

We are equally concerned over the tendency among certain businessmen to disparage price competition. Associations of pharmacists have openly claimed, incorrectly,[8] a right to fix the price of prescription drugs. Other associations promulgate codes of conduct which make price competition "unethical." Concerns which compete in price are frequently given the label "chiselers" by their competitors. But even unilateral refusals to compete in price or to sell to retailers who compete in price may very well be as corrosive of our economic and ultimately our political liberties as actual illegal agreements. When the affairs of an industry are so conducted, the kind of competitive incentive necessary for product improvement and greater efficiency is missing and the self-regulatory character of the market is disrupted. The industry stagnates. Direct Government intervention by Congress becomes a political possibility. In short, the entrepreneur or company which engages in price competition is in the great American tradition. It is his detractors who are literally the chiselers, for they chisel away at the economic underpinnings of our personal liberties.

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice enforces the law to some extent by announcement of its enforcement intentions. Last week for example, in a speech to the American Bar Association, I discussed some of our current thoughts on a program to combat overconcentration. In similar fashion, I consider that I am enforcing the antitrust laws by addressing these remarks to you here today, for I am taking this occasion to stress the Attorney General's particular concern over collusion which results in higher consumer prices, including illegal resale price fixing and abuses of the so-called fair trade laws. His concern reflects the President's own concern with the welfare of consumers which led him to appoint Mrs. Esther Peterson as the first "Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs." Through our activities in this field the Antitrust Division makes its contribution to the administration's war against poverty.

This special concern over competitive consumer prices has, of course, been a matter which has for long engaged a good part of the energies of the Antitrust Division. It has recently produced several significant cases. Among those cases are the following:

On December 27 of last year, a complaint was filed against a major producer of cosmetics, Max Factor & Co., in which it was charged that Max Factor had agreed with retail sellers of its products that those sellers would sell only at prices fixed by Max Factor, with the alleged result that "retail prices of Max Factor cosmetics have been maintained at noncompetitive levels." [9]

On March 10 of this year, a civil action was filed against four major manufacturers of swimwear, Jantzen, Catalina, Cole of California, and Rose Marie Reid. That complaint charges that defendants agreed among themselves on the date on which they would permit retailers to reduce the price of swimwear to the public, and that they exchanged information with respect to retailers who would not abide by defendants' wishes in this matter. Apart from this alleged meddling with the business judgment of the retailers who had purchased and paid for defendants' swimwear, this activity is alleged to have resulted in the prices of swimwear being "fixed, maintained, and stabilized at high and artificial levels." [10]

Twenty days later, on March 30, a civil action was filed against the O. M. Scott & Sons Co., a seller of lawn care products. That complaint alleges that Scott has entered into resale price-fixing agreements in States where those agreements are not lawful, which has allegedly had the result of "forcing consumers * * * to pay noncompetitive prices for lawn care products manufactured by defendant O. M. Scott." [11]

The flying public may be interested in two related complaints which we filed on April 2 against major producers of light aircraft, the Piper Aircraft Corp.[12] and the Beech Aircraft Corp.[13] Among other things, both of these companies are alleged to have entered into arrangements preventing their distributors from selling airplanes in territories assigned to another distributor, with the effect of maintaining prices of their airplanes to consumers "at arbitrary and noncompetitive levels." A suit filed against the Bay West Paper Co. on April 1 charged the same type of offense.[14]

In addition to those cases which have been filed in the past 4 months, three other cases, all charging unlawful agreements by members of druggists' associations to enforce so-called fair trade prices, have recently been settled by consent decrees prohibiting those practices.[15]

The significance of the cases which I have just discussed is emphasized by the relief which is demanded in them. As you may know, two Federal statutes provide an exemption from the antitrust laws for resale price fixing on branded articles in certain limited situations.[16] The Department is seeking to enjoin the defendants who have misused this limited "fair trade" exemption from thereafter fair trading any of their products as the only effective way to prevent recurrence of the violation.[17] Thus, in the Max Factor complaint, the Department seeks to have defendant "enjoined from applying or seeking to apply any State fair trade laws against any person buying or selling Max Factor cosmetics." Similar relief is requested in the Swimwear complaint.[18] In addition, there the Department is asking that "each defendant be enjoined from preticketing its swimwear with a retail price" and "from suggesting any price to be charged by any retailer for swimwear." In the Beech and Piper cases, each prayer requests that defendant "be enjoined from suggesting or otherwise disseminating retail or resale prices * * * to its distributors, dealers, or other purchasers for resale."

Thus we have been and will continue to be taking action against those concerns which illegaly fix consumer prices and thereby abuse the narrow fair trade exemption. We shall also seek to prevent defendants from thereafter engaging in any resale price maintenance activities, where appropriate to prevent a recurrence of the violation.

I wish to emphasize one further point. The Swimwear civil case, which I have previously mentioned, was preceded by a criminal indictment against those same four companies for agreeing on the date at which they would permit their dealers to set swimwear prices independently.[19] All four companies have pleaded nolo contendere, which is the equivalent of guilty for the purposes of that case, and last Monday were fined a total of $68,000. It has been clear to every responsible antitrust practitioner and every company which sought responsible legal advice ever since at least 1940, that any agreement "formed for the purpose and with the effect of raising, depressing, fixing, pegging, or stabilizing the price of a commodity" [20] is a criminal violation of the antitrust laws. Nor, as the Supreme Court reminded us in *Simpson* v. *Union Oil Co.*,[21] decided last Monday, can there be any possible question that resale price maintenance not carried on within the narrow confines of the "fair trade" exemption [22] is a criminal antitrust violation, as is a horizontal agreement to enforce so-called fair trade prices. This has been established Department policy since at least July 18, 1951, when the Department issued the following release: [23]

"Those who are engaged in programs or schemes of the following type, involving commodities which flow in interstate commerce, should know that they may be subject to criminal prosecution: Agreements among competing retailers to maintain and adhere to specified minimum prices; agreements to coerce and induce wholesalers or manufacturers, through threat of boycott or other reprisals, to refrain from selling to price-cutting retailers; agreements to coerce or induce manufacturers or wholesalers to enter into so-called fair trade contracts; agreements to coerce or force retailers to sign such contracts; agreements on the prices or margins of profits which should be set

Footnotes at end of speech.

forth in such contracts and on methods to require producers or wholesalers to specify certain prices or markups in such contracts."

Indeed, in the last 20 years, the Department of Justice has instituted case after case where State fair trade laws have been used to cloak illegal price fixing. These cases variously involved agreements among competing manufacturers,[24] wholesalers,[25] retailers,[26] and among manufacturers competing with others at different levels of distribution.[27]

In view of these demonstrated abuses of existing "fair trade" laws, I unqualifiedly oppose the so-called quality stabilization bill [28] which would legalize resale price fixing on a nationwide scale. As President Johnson said in his message on consumer interests of February 5, 1964:

"Freedom of choice for consumers from our storehouse of goods, at the lowest possible prices, is the very cornerstone of American consumer policy. I believe strongly in this principle. Therefore, I oppose legislation which limits price competition, whether under the label of 'quality stabilization' or any other name."

I was not merely using a figure of speech when I said, in my testimony before a special Senate subcommittee: "The bill might more aptly be named 'The Consumer High Price Act.'"

In conclusion, I desire to emphasize in the strongest terms what I have already said—that price competition is the foundation of our economic system, that price competition is in the finest tradition of the American way of doing things, and that we are a freer people today because price competition has been at the core of our economic system. As our recent cases clearly indicate, the Department will vigorously attack illegal agreements influencing consumer prices, whether horizontal or vertical, and whether by large companies or small. A climate in which price competition is disparaged, even if not pursuant to an illegal agreement, is an unhealthy climate for this country. I leave you with the words of Senator Sherman, who had this to say of those who take into their own hands the regulation of the economy for their private gain: [29]

"If we will not endure a king as a political power, we should not endure a king over the production, transportation and sale of any of the necessaries of life. If we would not submit to an emperor, we should not submit to an autocrat of trade, with power to prevent competition and to fix the price of any commodity."

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART AT GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN CONSUMER PROTECTION CONFERENCE AT UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO, TOLEDO, OHIO, APRIL 24, 1964

Let me begin today with a statement you may not believe.

It's that I think ideally there should be no consumer legislation.

Now, I admit, that statement may be a bit suspect coming from a man whose assignment is enacting laws—and furthermore, from one who has spent hundreds of hours working for the adoption of truth in packaging.

Yet, why blink the fact, the loudest acclaim—if I could work it out so there would be no consumer legislation—would come from my colleagues in the Congress who have discovered in recent years that this legislation is more often than not a bone in their throat.

The only other group who would be more ecstatic in their joy, I suspect, would be the manufacturers who claim that every time the Government sets out to repair the free enterprise system, it gets its finger meshed in the balance wheel.

Footnotes at end of speech.

But—and there is the "but"—to eliminate consumer legislation, we would have to eliminate the need for it.

One of two situations would be required for that, as I see it. Consumer legislation would not be needed if we had a nation of producers who agreed not only in philosophy, but in deed, with the father of free enterprise, Adam Smith, when he said that the only reason to produce goods and services is to serve consumers' needs.

Frankly, I think if Adam Smith were a student at the University of Toledo today, he might get his usual A in economics for that philosophy. But I doubt if he would do better than a "C minus" from his professor in psychology. For the statement demonstrates a lack of understanding of human nature.

The first purpose of business is to make a profit.

In itself, that purpose necessitates a self-interest. Granted, along the road to piling up a profit, the needs, wants, and desires of the consumer must be taken into account. But the focus is still back on the balance sheet. And each of us here can list cases where a business is indeed making a profit and yet not serving the best interests of the consumer. If you lack examples, I would be happy to supply books of testimony taken at truth in packaging hearings for your enlightenment.

Let me emphasize, I am not condemning anyone for this focus of interest. You can't keep your sights focused on two things at once and in the competitive business world, that balance sheet represents survival.

Allowing that the businessman is not going to assume the major responsibility for the consumer, the alternative would be to have the consumer watch out for himself.

Ideally, if consumers were well educated in their shopping, if they took the time needed to read, to study, to compare, supposedly, they could protect their own interest.

But there is a flaw in this Utopian idea, too.

Experts in fields related to consumer interest—economists, consumer's league representatives and even the director of the Food and Drug Administration, George P. Larrick, who is with us today, testified at the truth in packaging hearings.

They all said that under current conditions many times not even the experts can spend wisely.

For the information needed for informed choices simply is not available to the consumer.

To put it arithmetically, every equation needs a numerator and a denominator. In many cases today, we are denying the consumer the denominator.

Granting the need for consumer legislation, then, the question looms: what specifications should be set for its design.

To me, there are two simple ones:

It should guarantee the consumer the information he needs to spend his money wisely.

And, it should establish guidelines for all business—guidelines which would help to offset the self interest of profit making and put the marketplace back on the keel Adam Smith had in mind.

This is exactly what is being attempted by what are certainly the two best-known pieces of consumer legislation now in Congress—the two truth bills.

There are many packages in the supermarket today that give the consumer all the information needed to make an informed choice.

But still two cans of coffee may sit side by side on the shelf—each apparently containing 1 pound. Only when the housewife has made her selection and lifts the tab to place the key to one at home will she—possibly—note that under the tab is printed, in microscopic type "12 ounces."

Certainly, the housewife may still select the 12-ounce can, based on quality, even if she knows it costs more per ounce. But, truth in packaging would at least see that the weight of both brands was printed prominently so the housewife could know what choice she was making.

This is the type of information to which the consumer is entitled.

And, just as the consumer is entitled to information, ethical businessmen are entitled to the protection of guidelines. Several manufacturers have told the Antitrust Subcommittee—off the record—that they would be delighted to have truth in packaging. Without it, they said, they are being forced into competitive practices with which they do not like to be associated.

They would be much happier, they said, if all must play by the same rules.

Senator DOUGLAS' truth in lending bill fulfills the same specifications as truth in packaging.

It says simply that borrowers from all concerns should know how much interest, and what rate, they are paying annually.

But, from the uproar this bill has touched off, you would think lending institutions were being told they must stop charging interest altogether.

Which brings us to one of the most interesting—and real—problems of the legislative perspective of consumer legislation.

The Senate and House Office Buildings in Washington are filled, or so it sometimes seems, with representatievs of interest groups—trade associations, manufacturers' representatives, lobbyists for thousands of special interests.

And although I may be damning with faint praise—despite the unfavorable connotation the word "lobbyist" is gathering—they often serve a useful purpose.

A Senator is sent to Washington to serve the best interests of his constituents—and the Nation.

To do so, he should know all the ramifications of each of thousands of pieces of legislation each year.

In the 87th Congress, more than 20,000 measures were introduced. Less than 1,500 were enacted into law.

Say a Senator is in full agreement with the bulk of a bill—and all the amendments look sound enough on the level of primary study. Yet, in reality, one of the amendments may so severely hamper a major business in his State as to force it into bankruptcy—at a great loss of employment and tax revenue.

The lobbyists, you can be sure, would be quick to bring this amendment and its effect to the attention of the Senator.

But, the special interest groups do more than put the finger on an and/or clause in a bill. Once they have spotted a piece of legislation and deemed it beneficial—or detrimental—to their interests, they crank up a full barrage.

Pressure is brought to bear, briefing sessions are held with elected officials and representatives of organizations who have an interest in the bill, letters are written—aimed at initiating a letter barrage to Congress.

In short, they incite the public—at least the part affected by the legislation—to action. They give those on their side a target to fire at—they concentrate attention on one issue at a time.

But who represents the consumer in the Halls of Congress? Who looked over each of the 20,000 measures proposed in the last Congress with the interest of the consumer in mind? And who spotlighted special areas of interest at which the consumer could aim his barrage?

Unfortunately, no one did.

But, at this date in history, the consumer does have at least one strong new ally in Washington—Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs.

Last December, I asked President Johnson to create this office and in January, he named Esther Peterson to the post.

Yet, as talented and as dedicated and as hard working as is Mrs. Peterson, she simply can't do the job alone.

With the limited staff she has, she can—at best—only skim the surface.

The best solution would be a Department of the Consumer—staffed with sufficient counsel to inspect each proposed piece of legislation to assess its effect on the consumer. Also, the Department could represent the consumer before regulatory agencies.

But, perhaps most important, it would alert the public that its interest is involved.

Unfortunately, this Department of Consumer, I fear, is far from being realized.

What can we in Congress do in the meantime to help?

It seems to me, in the absence of a lobbyist for the consumer, that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee—which I chair—has a special responsibility.

This subcommittee handles probably more matters of direct interest to the consumer annually than any other legislative committee.

In this position, we are able to spotlight one problem at a time, to rally the forces of public to the front to state strongly their desires.

And, we may be able thus to present the other side of the case to Senators and Congressmen who otherwise would not hear it.

Clearly, in the past, when the parade of special interests reached a Senator and presented their case the situation was much like a judge being asked to rule when only the defendant's attorneys made a courtroom presentation.

The arguments are usually logical. They usually show the reasons a vote in the manner the lobbyists desire would benefit the Senator's constituents.

And there has been no one to point out that although a vote one way may benefit one special interest—and thus a certain number of the Senator's constituents, that many more constituents—the consumer public—would be severely hampered by such a decision.

This is the role—perhaps more public defender than lobbyist—which the Antitrust Committee will be playing in upcoming months as we spotlight such areas of consumer interest as: the high cost of funerals, doctor-owned pharmacies and doctor-owned drug repackaging plants.

And, it will be the role we will be playing for perhaps years as we investigate the broad field of concentration—the control of one market area by a limited number of firms—and its effects on the price the consumer pays.

Certainly, it is clear to me that someone must give the consumer a flag to rally around. And, until someone else steps out to carry it—the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will be the standard bearer.

THE FDA'S ROLE IN CONSUMER PROTECTION

(By Geo. P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is a pleasure to take part in this conference under the joint auspices of the University of Toledo and Consumers Union.

Our subject, "The Government's Role in Consumer Protection," is a timely one. It would be a wonderful thing to have similar meetings in every community of our country, so that all of us could become better informed about our mutual interests and problems as consumers.

The mission of the Food and Drug Administration is to protect the consumer—particularly where he is not able to protect himself.

The Food and Drug Administration is a part of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is a law enforcement agency of the Federal Government.

Equally important, it is a scientific institution.

Thus, it applies the scientific method, and scientific facts, to the job of consumer protection. Approximately, its motto might be: "Science working through law to protect the public."

Let me give you an illustration of what this means:

Not so long ago, near San Francisco, a family was sitting down to dinner. They were unaware that in the next few minutes they would set off a chain of events that would cost half a million dollars and prevent the illness of hundreds—perhaps thousands—of other people.

The meal included one of the new heat-and-eat frozen food products. Shortly after eating the entire family became ill and one member had to be taken to the hospital.

The hospital called the county health department. They in turn reported the occurrences to the San Francisco District of the Food and Drug Administration. Since no packages were left of the original purchase, the FDA Inspector collected samples from the local supermarket. Bacteriologists at the San Francisco FDA laboratory checked the samples and found staphylococcus bacteria in quantities sufficient to cause the reported illnesses. A seizure action was immediately filed in the Federal court against the remainder of the shipment in the hands of the local distributor and it was thus promptly taken off the market.

Meanwhile, the San Francisco district had reported its findings to the district where the manufacturer was located. Another FDA inspector visited the factory and found conditions that would have led to the bacterial contamination of the product. Several other lots that had been distributed were seized and the company undertook a nationwide recall of all of the suspected products. A total of $211,000 worth of this food item was destroyed. The company, now very much aware of the need for strict sanitary and bacteriological control of its operations, promptly made very extensive improvements in the plant and adopted procedural changes costing altogether almost a quarter of a million dollars.

Just recently I learned there was a sequel to this story. The experience of this firm led to an industrywide study of bacteriological control with the result that other producers have also taken additional steps to insure the safety of their products.

Our food and drug law helps to protect the public health, and this of course has great economic significance.

But this law has other benefits.

It conserves the consumer's purchasing power.

It stimulates technological progress.

It fosters fair competitive practices.

It is an underlying factor in our free competitive economy, by aiding consumer choice in the marketplace based on reliable product information.

CURBING DISHONEST PRACTICES

Experience has shown that without laws to protect the consumer many dishonest practices would flourish. Vigorous and continuing control is needed to prevent such practices as short-weight packaging, substitution of cheaper ingredients, and the sale of spoiled or contaminated products. Another common form of cheating is the misrepresentation of products through false labeling and advertising.

In the year 1962 consumers spent $74½ billion, about 20 percent of their disposable income, for food. This does not include what they spent for alcoholic beverages. Most of this food was pure and wholesome, safe to use, and honestly packaged. But if—let us assume—there had been a shortage in the net weight averaging only a quarter of an ounce per pound—it would have cost consumers over a billion dollars a year.

Without a strong FDA it would be much easier to market adulterated products—for example, fruit juices diluted with water, jams with less fruit and more sugar and water, dairy products short in butterfat, cheap varieties of fish labeled as more expensive kinds, spoiled eggs in place of fresh eggs, ground cocoa shell in place of cocoa, horsemeat labeled "beef" and decomposed foods trated with chemicals to conceal their true condition. These are just a few of the kinds of food adulteration that are kept in check by constant vigilance. If only 1 percent of the food dollar were spent on such cheats it would cost the consumer another three quarters of a billion dollars.

CONSERVING CONSUMER PURCHASING POWER

The food and drug law also helps to conserve or increase the consumer's purchasing power in some less obvious ways.

For example, FDA inspection activities help to insure sanitary handling of food commodities. In addition to insuring clean foods this prevents tremendous losses from spoilage and pest contamination. Even so, it is necessary to remove some rather large quantities of unfit food from sale. Last year over 8,000 tons of food were seized in Federal court actions, and nearly 12,000 tons were voluntarily destroyed or converted to animal feed or other purposes under the supervision of FDA inspectors.

The American food supply would be far more costly and less plentiful without the use of chemical pesticides to control insects and plant diseases. But the use of these pesticides must be carefully regulated to insure that residues of such materials are kept within limits that are safe for humans and livestock. Without the controls required by law it would be impractical to use many of these pesticides and the cost of our fruits, vegetables, and other foods would be increased. In America, one farmworker can now feed and clothe about 25 fellow Americans. A Russian farmworker can clothe and feed only 2½ fellow Russians. Pesticides help to make that difference. Similarly, medicated livestock and poultry feeds help to increase the supply of meat and eggs and keep down the cost of these important foods. Here again, the food and drug laws are necessary in the interest of safety.

PROMOTING CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

Another economic contribution of strong food and drug law enforcement is through promoting consumer confidence in our foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Nowhere in the world do people buy with so little hesitation. Americans readily accept new products, assuming they would not be on the market if they were not safe and satisfactory. This has had far-reaching effects. It has made it possible for new industries to grow rapidly—for example, frozen foods, which have grown from 268 million pounds in 1938 to well over 5 billion pounds today, with a retail value of over $2.5 billion.

A very important trend has been the development of so-called convenience foods—like the cake mixes and the frozen dishes that need only to be heated and served. They are especially helpful to the 24 million employed women—over half of them married—who now comprise about 35 percent of our working population. Such foods are safer because of the pure food law.

Establishment of food standards helps to protect consumer purchasing power and consumer health. The food standard regulations prevent adulteration—for example by added water. They require food to contain what is expected. When you buy jam, for example, it is a product made from 45 parts of fruit

to 55 parts of sugar. Bread must not exceed 38 percent moisture; butter and oleomargarine must have an 80 percent fat content; raisin bread must contain raisins equal to 50 percent of the weight of the flour; cream cheese must contain cream equalling 33 percent milk fat, and so on. In such ways does the law maintain the intrinsic value of many foods. And this also contributes to their nutritional integrity—a fact of significance from both the health and economic standpoint.

Enrichment of selected foods with vitamins and minerals is carried on through the food standards program. This has helped to reduce or wipe out diseases caused by dietary deficiencies.

Under the law the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to establish a food standard whenever such action is needed to "promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers." Thus food standards are also concerned with promoting fair competition in the production and marketing of foods. All of us are familiar with how business reacts when one firm discovers some way to cut corners and sell an item for less, or to promote it by some sales gimmick. Too often the other firms must follow suit or go bankrupt and the consumer loses. This type of opportunism in business can sometimes be nipped in the bud by prompt enforcement action, but a great deal more is prevented by the existence of standards.

THE PROBLEM OF CHOICE

The American consumer is very fortunate as compared with the consumers of other countries because of the high quality and great variety of products made available in the marketplace by American industry. But this in itself creates a problem, the problem of choice. Ours is a free-choice economy, with production influenced by the millions of choices made every day by the consumer. But such choices, to be effective, must be informed and rational. Here again the food and drug law has an economic role because of the information it requires to appear on labels for consumer protection.

If consumers would make greater use of label information the manufacturers would give more information on their labels and the consumer would be better off. If people would read and heed the label warnings on drugs and other products used around the home there would be fewer cases of accidental poisoning—especially of small children. Housewives would save money by making better buys. Following the label directions carefully can make a tremendous difference in safety and satisfaction.

DECEPTION, FRAUD, AND QUACKERY

Now I should like to turn to another aspect of consumer protection that is more personal because it so directly affects the individual or his family. I am referring to protection against deception, fraud, and quackery.

Recently I learned of the case histories of several people who were users of an unproven cancer remedy. One woman patient who had cancer of the breast paid approximately $8,000 for this drug. She had three operations between 1959 and 1963 and died of cancer in June 1963.

A 35-year-old woman who used the drug intermittently has paid a total of $5,000. Her treatment dates from 1952, when she had surgery, and she had another operation in 1961.

These are typical of the expenditures people will make for unproven and ineffective remedies when they are motivated by the fear of cancer. They are not exceptional.

A more unusual case was one recently called to our attention by a Member of Congress. The person involved was a victim of a nervous ailment. During one year he paid $28,600 for treatments with a machine represented as being capable of performing psychoanalysis and treatment of mental conditions, as well as other diseases. For similar treatments a college student paid $2,600 out of his educational fund to improve his capabilities as a student.

The medical "con man" who is a big-time operator can bilk the public of millions. In December the Federal court at Indianapolis sentenced a man (Roy DeWelles) who is reliably estimated to have made $3 million with a machine to give enemas. It was supposed to "detoxify the colon" and cure everything. He got 10 years in prison for mail fraud in a case brought by the Post Office Department.

During 1962 and 1963 the Food and Drug Administration secured the destruction of over 1,000 machines called Micro-Dynameters. They were being used by health practitioners to diagnose and treat all kinds of ailments, but were completely worthless for any medical purpose. The machines themselves sold for $875, but the big loss was to the thousands of patients who paid $3 to $10 per treatment.

The cost in money, of course, may be unimportant compared to the consequences of improper diagnosis and treatment.

The biggest money is made by the promoters who appeal to a mass market. Not long ago we stopped the sale of a product called Acnotabs. It was being advertised to teenagers and their parents as a sure cure for pimples. It sold for $5.95 per bottle, and nearly 4 million of the tablets were seized in one lot. This action stopped a high-powered sales campaign that would have cost our teenagers millions of dollars.

In New York the grand jury recently indicted the promoters of a worthless reducing remedy called Regimen. The advertising featured testimonials by people who had actually lost weight—not because they were taking Regimen but because they were on starvation diets. Over the last 6 years the weight conscious public has spent $10 million for this product.

There is no way to measure accurately the cost of misbranding and misinformation in the health field. It has been estimated at more than a billion dollars a year. Vitamin quackery and other food fads are said to cost the public half a billion dollars a year. But the cost would be far more were it not for the protection of our Federal, State, and local laws.

Here it would be appropriate to ask what is the cost of the protection provided by the FDA. In the current fiscal year the appropriation for enforcing the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is $35,800,000, about 18½ cents for each person in the United States. We are sure that this insurance saves the consumer many times its annual cost.

Today we are seeing a revival of interest and action in all things concerning the consumer. It has been given great impetus by the President, in his recent message on the American consumer, and his appointment of Mrs. Esther Peterson as his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs.

Various factors have contributed to the heightened interesting matters affecting the consumer. Paradoxically, a movement that was born of the depression of the 1930's is having a comeback in these more prosperous times of the 1960's. One reason for this is the urgency of certain questions affecting the consumer:

How can we assure continuing safety of the human environment in our increasingly complex and highly technological civilization? The water we drink and the air we breathe, as well as the purity of food and drugs, are now a matter of public concern.

And how shall we best protect the consumer's pocketbook in a multiple free choice economy, which presents such a tremendous variety of competing options to spend the family income—whether wisely or foolishly?

But this revival of interest in the consumer interest is also a conscious effort because many people have thought deeply about how to secure an adequate and fair representation of the consumer in our society and in our Government. I recall a meeting of the Council on Consumer Information in 1960 where Orville Freeman, then Governor of Minnesota, made the statement: "If the voice of the consumer is too weak in our councils, then Government should make a special effort to strengthen that voice."

In 1962 President Kennedy crystalized this philosophy in his historic message on consumer rights: The right to safety, the right to be informed, the right to choose, and the right to be heard.

President Johnson has now established an action program to make these rights more of a reality in our national life. In his message to Congress on February 5, 1964, the President made some recommendations.

"Too often," the President said, "we await the spur of tragedy before strengthening the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

"Too often, we discover dangers in foods and cosmetics only through serious injury to a consumer.

"The Food and Drug Administration now lacks the needed authority to inspect fully the factories in which food is produced; to require a showing that cosmetics are safe before they are offered to the public; to examine for safety and effectiveness before they are marketed, medical devices for the diagnosis of symptoms and treatment of illnesses."

The President recommended enactment of new legislation to extend and clarify inspection authority—comparable to that which now applies to prescription drugs—of foods, over-the-counter drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic, diagnostic, and prosthetic devices. I would like to tell you briefly why this authority is needed.

Most people have assumed that the Food and Drug Administration is able to make whatever kinds of inspections are necessary to enforce the law. But that is not the case.

In 1952 the Supreme Court ruled that the inspection provision of the 1938 act was invalid because of legal uncertainty about the penalty for refusing to permit inspection. The law provided for criminal prosecution for refusal to allow inspection but said the inspector had to have permission to enter. The Court thought this was inconsistent and too vague to stand as criminal law.

An amendment was promptly introduced to remedy this defect. As passed by the Senate it would have provided authority to make a complete inspection without advance notice. But in the House certain Members put on record their understanding that the bill did not include authority to inspect certain business records, such as formulas, complaint files, qualifications of key personnel, records of interstate shipment, and the prescription files in retail drug stores. This legislative history is, in effect, a part of the law.

Today production and distribution are carried on very largely through the medium of records. Thus, Food and Drug inspectors are shut out from access to information which may have an important bearing on law violations.

For example, when sources of bacterial contamination of food must be traced, it is essential to obtain control records and other information about manufacturing processes.

Another example—the food additives amendment allows manufacturers to use materials that are safe in proper amounts but which may be harmful if used in excessive amounts. FDA inspectors cannot effectively check on this unless they have access to manufacturing records.

Adequate investigation of cosmetic injury reports is impossible without a complete inspection.

Congress has remedied this situation with regard to prescription drugs. The prescription drug amendments passed in 1962 au-

thorize examinations of all things, including records, which have a bearing on compliance with the law. Financial data and certain personnel and research data are exempted. Inspectors do not and should not have authority to go through private papers that have no bearing on the legality of a product.

Modern cosmetics have a generally good record for safety, but every now and then we have experiences that make us realize that new cosmetics, like drugs, food additives, and colors, should be cleared for safety in advance of marketing, as recommended by the President.

Shampoos and other hair preparations have caused serious injuries when they got into the eyes. Products used on the nails have caused painful and disfiguring injury to hundreds of women. We do not know whether certain hair dyes are safe for use. The lack of authority to review formulas and complaint files presently makes it practically impossible to resolve this question.

Industry should not be the sole judge as to whether cosmetic products used by millions of people are safe.

Therapeutic devices and cosmetics are now the only products under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which are not subject to premarketing clearance.

I have already mentioned the problem of the pseudoscientific electronic gadgets, such as the Micro-Dynameter device, that are used by some health practitioners to diagnose or treat all manner of disease.

The litigation necessary to stop distribution of the Micro-Dynameter took 2 years, ending with an appeal to the Supreme Court which was denied. Far better protection would be a requirement that devices, like drugs, be cleared for safety and effectiveness before they are used on the public.

Another class of devices are the prosthetic devices used in surgery. Here, for example, is a nail which had to be removed from a broken hip because it corroded after it was implanted in the bone. Prosthetic hip joints have proved defective after insertion into the bodies of patients and have had to be removed from the victims through additional surgery. It is unthinkable that such devices should continue to be marketed to the medical profession without a prior determination that they have been adequately tested and are suitable for their intended purpose.

Any discussion of the Government's role in consumer protection must take into account the very great impact of industrial technology. This is shown in the development of a host of new products which frequently raise new questions and problems of consumer protection. All of us—industry, Government, consumers are concerned in the solution of these problems. Consumer protection is not really achieved until industry has taken the necessary steps. We commonly say that the law protects the consumer, or that the Government protects the consumer, but neither one is effective until the manufacturers comply with the law. In the last analysis, they have to provide the protection.

The American people enjoy a standard of living that is unsurpassed throughout the world. They participate in an economic system that is unique in productivity and quality of consumer goods. They are protected by the law of the land and by its enforcement machinery. And they are protected by less tangible forces—for example, by generally high ethical standards in business and professional conduct. No country in the world pays as much attention to consumer protection in all its many aspects.

And yet, paradoxically, American consumers tend to be complacent and to neglect their own interests, while other elements in our society are organized and vocal. And this is the significance of our meeting today.

A true free-enterprise economy cannot exist unless the consumer is able to perform his basic function as a discriminating purchaser. Industry, government, and the consumer—each has a distinctive role in the great drama of the marketplace. And all these roles are directed to a single purpose—to supply the needs and wants of all our citizens.

---

[1] 217 N.Y. 382, 111 N.E. 1050 (1916).

[2] Time, p. 94, Apr. 24, 1964.

[3] The Wall Street Journal, p. 18, Feb. 11, 1964.

[4] *Appalachin Coals, Inc.* v. *United States*, 288 U.S. 344, 359 (1933).

[5] In American Metal Market, Annual Copper Supplement, p. 5, Sept. 16, 1963, it was said, following the sentencing for price fixing of certain companies in the brass industry, *United States* v. *Anaconda American Brass Co.* (D. Conn. Cr. 10–725):

"Long before the Hartford sentence was pronounced, the industry had learned another lesson.

"The lesson simply is that if prices seem high enough, and productive costs look attractive in relation, the marketplace will automatically attract additional supplies. The rugged laws of economics are such that nothing fails like success. In an economy of abundant capital, successful industries attract investment, capacity expends, prices fall and expansion is forced to a halt awaiting a further growth of consumption."

This served to confirm the conclusion in "Report of the Federal Trade Commission on the Copper Industry," p. 249 (1947):

"Past efforts to stabilize prices upward have, in fact, produced not stability, but wide fluctuations in price which have been disastrous to the industry as a whole. The stronger and more comprehensive the controls have been while they lasted, the more severe have been the effects on the industry when they broke down. Their failure constitutes an indictment of cartels, and monopoly."

[6] "Wealth of Nations," Mod. Lib. ed. 1937, p. 128.

[7] "In the Matter of Chain Institute, Inc.", FTC, Docket No. 4878, quoted in Jacobs, "Statistical, Standardization, and Research Activities," 6 A.B.A. Antitrust Sec. Rep. 80 at 80–81 (1955).

[8] *Utah Pharmaceutical Assn.* v. *United States*, 371 U.S. 24 (1962) affirming 201 F. Supp. 29 (D. Utah 1962); *Northern California Pharmaceutical Assn.*, 306 F. 2d 379 (9th Cir. 1962); *cert. den.* 371 U.S. 862 (1962) (a criminal case).

[9] *United States* v. *Max Factor & Co.*, (W.D. Mo. Civ. No. 14757–1).

[10] *United States* v. *Jantzen Inc.*, (D. Ore. Civ. No. 64–111).

[11] *United States* v. *O. M. Scott & Sons Co.*, (D.D.C. Civ. No. 760–64).

[12] *United States* v. *Piper Aircraft Corp.*, (M.D. Pa. Civ. No. 8447).

[13] *United States* v. *Beech Aircraft Corp.*, (D. Kan. Civ. No. W 31 29).

[14] *United States* v. *Bay West Paper Co.*, (E.D. Wis. Civ. No. 64–C–86).

[15] *United States* v. *Nassau-Suffolk Pharmaceutical Society, Inc.*, (E.D. N.Y. Civ. Nos. 63 C 1206 and 1207), entered Dec. 9, 1963; *United States* v. *Hawaii Retail Druggists Assn.*, (D. Hawaii Civ. No. 2064), entered Nov. 19, 1963.

[16] Miller-Tydings and Maguire Acts, found, respectively, in provisos to 15 U.S.C. sec. 1 and in 15 U.S.C. sec 45(a) (2)–(6)

[17] See e.g., *International Salt* v. *United States*, 332 U.S. 392.

[18] In a consent decree entered Dec. 30, 1963, *United States* v. *Roehr Products Co.* (D. Conn. Civ. No. 9370), defendants are precluded from "fair trading" for 3 years after entry of the judgment.

See also consent decree entered Mar. 15, 1962, *United States* v. *Band-It Co.* (D. Colo. Civ. No. 7796).

[19] *United States* v. *Jantzen, Inc.* (D. Ore. Cr. 64–25).

[20] *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150 at 223 (1940).

[21] No. 87, 1963 Term, decided Apr. 20, 1964.

[22] *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *John D. Park & Sons Co.*, 220 U.S. 373 (1911).

[23] 2 C.C.H. Trade Reg. Rep. par. 6160.10.

[24] E.g., *United States* v. *Maryland State Licensed Beverage Assn., Inc., et al.* (Cr. 23212, 1955; Civ. 9122, 1956; D. Md.).

[25] E.g., *United States* v. *National Wholesale Druggists Assn.* (Cr. 618–C, D. N.J. 1942).

[26] E.g., *United States* v. *Utah Pharmaceutical Assn.* (Civ. C, 30–31 D. Utah 1961).

[27] E.g., *United States* v. *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.* (Civ. 76–50, SDNY 1952).

[28] S. 774; H.R. 3669.

[29] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2457.

Meat Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Orlando Sentinel has been regularly publishing articles on meat imports, primarily from Australia and New Zealand, which have had the effect of depressing the market, insofar as our ranchers and cattle raisers are concerned. The Orlando Sentinel, through its publisher, Martin Andersen, has been militantly presenting this case. It has been a very convincing case, to the effect that Congress should take steps to limit these importations.

On May 13, there was published in the Orlando Sentinel an article entitled "Cattlemen Suffer as Meat Imports Climb." Actually, the article is a reprint from the Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATTLEMEN SUFFER AS MEAT IMPORTS CLIMB—WHILE CUSTOMERS ENJOY LOW PRICES

Beef-eating Americans are feasting on the lowest priced steaks and roasts in 6 years, but the meat counter bargains are only prompting howls of anguish back on the ranch.

Contrary to Government predictions that beef prices would rise about 10 percent this spring and offer some relief to profit-squeezed cattlemen, packers now are paying an average of $20.50 a hundredweight—$2.25 below last year and the lowest level in 7 years. What's more, heavy meat imports and growing domestic cattle herds make it unlikely that the heralded price pickup will develop anytime soon, if at all.

While good news to consumers, the prospect of continuing beef bargains spells only more financial troubles for beleaguered cattlemen. Some already have been forced out of business and others figure to fall by the wayside if prices don't improve. "I'm liquidating the cattle now in our pens, and when they're gone I'll be closing down if prices haven't improved," asserts Sid E. Moller, president of Union Feed Yards, Blythe, Calif. No small operator, Moller last year fattened some 100,000 cattle for Los Angeles slaughterhouses. He figures that for him to remain in business prices would have to rise about $4 a hundredweight.

To help ease themselves out of the red, Moller and other cattlemen are discarding their long aversion to Federal aid and are asking Congress for a lift. Almost universally, they blame low-cost imported beef for their problems, and they're demanding that Uncle Sam slap mandatory quotas on such imports. Specifically, the rangemen want future imports held to 7.5 percent of average domestic slaughter over the last 5 years; this would mean import limitations of around 800 million pounds annually, a stiff 26 percent cutback from 1963's record 1.1 billion pounds. The cattlemen have taken their case to the U.S. Tariff Commission and its findings are expected to be turned over to the Senate Finance Committee for action in June.

But there's far from unanimous agreement on the reason why cattle prices have skidded more than 33 percent in the past 18 months. Agriculture Department officials argue imports are only a minor factor in the price decline, and the agency is dead set against imposition of import quotas on foreign beef. It maintains the quotas are unneeded, too, because Australia and New Zealand, the biggest shippers of foreign beef to the United States, already have voluntarily agreed to cut back shipments to the United States this year by 27 percent.

Instead, Agriculture Secretary Freeman attributes the weak cattle market to growing domestic herds. On January 1, U.S. ranches and feedlots were bulging with a record 106.2 million cattle, a gain of 2.6 percent from the year before. The herd may well grow again this year, despite a climbing slaughter rate at packinghouses, because ranchers and feeders have said they expect this spring's calf crop to be about a million head bigger than last year's record.

The Agriculture Department calculates that heavy domestic supplies of beef accounted for $3 of the $3.70 drop in cattle prices in 1963. Increased supplies of poultry and pork brought on 20 cents of the drop and rising beef imports were responsible for the rest of the decline, the farm agency says.

Some meatpackers side with the Agriculture Department on the question of imports. Marvin T. Gibson, senior vice president of International Packers, Ltd., Chicago, charges imports have climbed because "U.S. cattlemen have abandoned the hot dog and hamburger market" in favor of the higher priced steak and roast market. He says the supply of better grade beef has doubled in the last 10 years while that of cheaper grades has failed to meet demand. "The imports that have been reviled and maligned by cattlemen's associations and subjected to strong attack by the Congressmen who stand for elections in November have just filled the gap" needed to keep the lower grades of meat in the same supply as 1954, he declares.

But cattlemen generally remain unconvinced and they are determined to put a lid on the imports. They are pressuring President Johnson—a part-time rancher himself—to reject the Agriculture Department's view and throw his support behind the quotas. The cattlemen's bid could eventually pose a sticky political problem for the President since the Republican Party's agriculture committee and possible GOP presidential rival GOLDWATER have come out for the quotas.

In a "what comes first—the chicken or the egg" sort of argument, the ranchers take issue with the Agriculture Department's position on meat imports. Ralph W. Cellon, a Gainesville, Fla., cattle raiser, concedes the growing U.S. herds are a problem, but says imports are much to blame. "Due to low-cost imported meat, packers can't afford to bid for cows and bulls culled from American herds," he reasons. "That means these animals go back to the range to produce more calves or into feedlots to add to the surplus of cattle on feed." He says a year ago packers were buying about 600 culls from Florida herds each week, "but now they're not buying any."

Further, ranchers say some of these culled animals that would normally go to market are being bought by farmers turning to cattle because of Government planting restrictions on crops. "In Oklahoma alone, about 12 million acres of cropland, mostly cotton and wheat acreage, have been converted to cattle pasture over the last 25 years," says William F. Brannan, Maretta, Okla., rancher and president of the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association. "About half of the record 4 million cattle in the State on January 1 were on small farms with fewer than 100 head each."

Until recently the brunt of the low cattle prices fell on the commercial lots and corn belt farms which fatten range animals for market. But now those who raise young steers and sell them later for fattening are being hard hit. Prices of those so-called feeder cattle now stand at an average of $19.75 a hundredweight, down 14 percent from a month ago, and 24 percent from a year ago.

"Nearly all feeders, whether farmer or commercial lots, lost money in 1963, and even with the prospects of reduced imports, this year could be as bad, says Erwin Dubbert, a Laurens, Iowa, farmer and president of the National Livestock Feeders Association. "Some cattle producers are at the point they can't get any more bank credit.

"Losses to cattlemen in Colorado in the last 13 months have totaled about $40 million," claims Robert Johnson, Fowler, Colo., banker and rancher.

Caught by the price nose dive are thousands of investors, including numerous movie stars and oil companies, who were lured into the cattle business by the prospect of capital gains. "Our customers averaged losses of $30 to $50 a head in mid-1963, and even with lower prices being paid for replacement cattle off the range they're still losing $10 to $15 a head on animals in the lots now," reports Earl Brookover, operator of a feedlot at Garden City, Kans.

Rather than absorb such losses, some ranchers are simply going out of business. George E. Light, Jr., a Cotulla, Tex., rancher whose family has been raising cattle for 146 years, recently completed liquidating his half interest in a 10,000-head herd he owned in partnership with his son. "If you want to stay in agriculture," he grumbles, "you'd better go to some other country to raise cattle, or else grow something here you can get a subsidy on." Ranchers complain they can't compete on an equal basis with the low expenses for foreign beef producers who often get subsidies from their governments and frequently enjoy lower taxes.

Rancher Cushman S. Radebaugh in Orlando, Fla., says, "It costs us a minimum of about $50 to raise an 8-month-old calf, while an Australian rancher can raise a 2-year-old steer for $6.50. Taxes and land costs are big problems. I've been chased out of two ranching locations in the past 9 years, first by a missile base and then by a housing development. Similar conditions are steadily raising the cost of farmland all over the country."

Such cost disparity is also influencing a few ranchers to compete with foreign beef producers on their own grounds. N. V. Bunker, Jr., a Lake Village, Ark., rancher reports he's shopping for a cattle ranch in Central America. "I was told in Guatemala that you can raise a 2-year-old steer there for $5.25. There's just no place in the United States where you can approach that kind of cost," he says. Mr. Bunker has cut his Arkansas herd to 200 from 2,000 over the last 2 years and switched 5,000 acres of pasture into soybeans.

"Due to subsidies paid U.S. farmers and exporters, a rancher in Mexico can buy U.S.-grown grain sorghum for as much as 90 cents a bushel under the prices I pay," complains Doyle McAdams, Huntsville, Tex., rancher. "Then the Mexicans turn around and sell their meat in Texas at prices under those for U.S. beef." Agriculture Department figures show that U.S. exports of sorghum to Mexico last year were about 24 times the total 2 years earlier.

GOP Chiefs Are Backing Direct Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N.J., included comment in a recent edition relative to a housing bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, WILLIAM WIDNALL. It deserves the attention of every Member of Congress and I include herewith the article:

GOP CHIEFS ARE BACKING DIRECT LOANS—VIEW REHABILITATION AS A WEAK SPOT IN HOUSING BILL—BUDGET OFFSHOOT

(By Hugh L. Morris)

WASHINGTON.—Republican housing leaders in Congress have identified residential rehabilitation as a weak spot in the administration's housing bill and are pushing hard—with a fair chance of success—for a direct-loan program to help people fix up their homes if they cannot get the money from private lenders.

Administration officials are in the embarrassing position of having to say the plan is not needed and won't work, while at the same time seeking approval of a related proposal smaller in scope and limited to elderly homeowners.

As much as anything else, this position was dictated by economy-slanted budget considerations and by a judgment of what Congress might go along with.

However, Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, wrote into his housing bill a $300 million, 3-year direct loan program to help homeowners in urban-renewal areas meet housing code requirements for upgrading homes throughout a neighborhood.

GAINING SUPPORT

Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, introduced the same bill in the Senate.

WIDNALL is the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Housing, and TOWER is a member of the Senate Housing Subcommittee. Their usual opposition to Democratic direct-loan programs makes the whole situation more interesting.

While the administration feels it has to oppose the plan, some Democrats in Congress do not. The idea is gaining support and it is not at all unlikely that some plan along this line—perhaps with a compromise feature which would permit the administration to endorse it—may emerge in the final housing bill.

Rehabilitation has been a major stumbling block in efforts to improve cities through urban renewal ever since it became obvious several years ago that the whole answer was not to bulldoze everything and try to rebuild from scratch.

According to Census Bureau definitions, some 12 million homes—about 1 out of every 5—are deteriorating without effective efforts to save them or already are below

standards accepted as decent, safe, and sanitary.

PROGRAM INEFFECTIVE

Only about a half million of these houses are located in urban renewal projects actually underway now in 422 cities, and about half of these are homes which have been earmarked for demolition in whole areas to be cleared for redevelopment.

The housing agencies have struggled mightily with this problem under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

First there was the approach of a workable program for community improvement which required as a prerequisite for Federal financial assistance a number of local steps, including adoption and enforcement of housing codes.

This has never been effective generally because of lack of trained inspectors or money to hire them, plus the impracticality of widespread condemnation of homes simply because owners could not borrow money to make required repairs.

Then, to meet this problem, Congress set up in 1961 two programs of Federal insurance of rehabilitation loans of up to $10,000 with 20 years to pay at 6 percent interest. The loans could even be in the form of second mortgages.

Hailed at the time as the salvation of existing homes in cities, the programs have been almost a complete flop—applications have been made for only 2,882 homes and only 1,282 of these have reached the stage of actual work so far.

Now, the administration is taking a small first step in another direction by asking direct loans to help elderly homeowners in urban renewal areas.

Sponsors of the Republican housing bill say this is not enough—the problem applies across the board to all urban renewal area homeowners who cannot afford to rehabilitate, and it should be attacked that way, directly and immediately.

An Appeal to Reason—The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT S. WALTERS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I am pleased to submit, for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial, from the Nashville Banner, commenting on Dr. Walter R. Courtenay's sermon entitled "The Problems of Equilibrium." Dr. Courtenay, minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, made a forceful plea for a moratorium on efforts to enact civil rights legislation at this time. Such a cooling-off period might well be in order now, that we may avoid hasty or ill-advised action that might need to be repealed at a later date. I commend Dr. Courtenay for his reminder to his parishioners and to the rest of us to act in an adult fashion and to take responsible action to offset the possibility of repercussions in the future.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, May 19, 1964]

DR. COURTENAY'S MESSAGE—AN APPEAL TO REASON

America needs the reminders which Dr. Walter R. Courtenay put into words Sunday, in a sermon entitled "The Problems of Equilibrium." For the Nation is in a state of imbalance, the more precarious for the failure, generally, to think it through. Thus when the blind passions of sheer emotionalism rule, the direction is downward; the retraining influence of reason is sidetracked. Tempers, jealousies, and pressures whipped into fury by demagogic extremists, are on collision course.

From the legislative battleground in Washington—where these are centering—to strife-torn streets rocking in civil commotion defiant of authority, the message is needed because disaster lurks if such appeal to individual and public conscience goes longer unheeded.

There is no acceptable substitute in jungle law for the legal processes of justice under accredited statute; no improvising athwart the Constitution that can produce anything but chaos and ultimate conflict. The message is to Washington, and notably to those hands tugging at strings of political caprice.

Well did Dr. Courtenay advocate a moratorium on racial pressures—a cooling-off period in which, by acting as intelligent adults, responsible people irrespective of race can restore the harmony without which national peril is invited.

"We need a cessation of the effort to compel white people by threat of force to meet the fair and unfair demands of the colored leaders," he said. "Such a moratorium would do more to restore national equilibrium than all the laws Congress can pass in the next 4 years."

That is reason speaking, and putting emphasis where it belongs—the avenue to justice for all concerned via mind and heart; neither of them amenable to coercion and threat. For this is a free land; a free people who are the government, by a legacy that would be lost should it become, by authoritarian decree, a battleground for "rights" to the complete eclipse of responsibilities.

Conscience speaks again, and for comprehension of realities all should listen, in the reminder of the facts where America's natal event was concerned * * * the reason for the Nation's sovereign existence; the why and how it arrived. All too many, in the postwar spree called decolonialization, have prated that thus America was born; so, ergo, we must play midwife to anticolonial groups all over the world, regardless of preparedness or lack of it to assume the estate of self-government. It is from that contagion that the present disequilibrium of the world itself stems; and they have both misjudged and affronted history who profess to find in this reckless adventure for instant democracy everywhere a parallel with America's 1776 case.

The philosophy of a world in ferment has, by careless treatment of fact, slopped over into a fringe of this Nation's policy thinking; and there are those who actually have the audacity to suggest that our "image," assertive of responsibilities attending rights, needs corrective attention, or we'll somehow hinder the cause of liberation abroad.

Pride in America belongs to every American, for its basic instruments of freedom, and for individual opportunity. It is moving and can move to broaden opportunity; but that isn't to be achieved by a whiplash of political coercion, and with it the violent backlash of emotionalism, contemptuous of law and seeking redress with threat of anarchy as the ultimatum.

The moratorioum proposed, whether formally declared or just adopted by common consent, would provide the opportunity for a concerned nation—in all its parts—to pause and take its bearings; then move away, as reason would decree, from the precipice so clearly discerned.

It is an appeal for unity in purpose; that purpose the intelligent, patriotic solution of the present problem, and survival of a free American society. The internal strength and equilibrium of America—of concern to every right-thinking citizen—depend upon that unity. To maintain the one and recover the other are the joint concern of a responsible citizenry. They are not to be brought to pass by force measures. The moratorium on recklessness, inciting to violent dissension, is needed.

The Riderless Steed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem written by Mrs. Mary Leath, of 1003 Guinn Drive, Tyler, Tex. I regard it as very outstanding. I commend the reading of the poem to all of my colleagues:

THE RIDERLESS STEED

(By Mary Leath)

The Caisson moves forward in saddened procession,
Bearing mute note of National reflection.
Saddened and fraught and frightened and sickened;
Lowly of spirit in pronounced Benediction.
The spirited, spirited riderless steed—so much
Like his Chief—protesting the need—
Of violence, of hatred, of thoughtless greed!
The rustling of flags, the beating of drums,
The gathering of people, all silent and stunned.
The beautiful, the brave First Lady bereaved;
Depicting example of that which must be!
Staunch in conviction and following her Love,
To plead with her nation—to keep it above
Hatred and bigotry—for that which he died.
The spirited, spirited riderless steed—goes
Onward and onward and onward and on!
The gathering of Greats from land of afar
To pay their respects at Crossing the Bar
Of this our Beloved—a servant of men—
Meeting his Maker untainted by them.
The spirited, spirited riderless steed—protesting,
Protesting for freedom and peace.
Anthems and Crosses and prayers and tears
Shall ring in our hearts through the cadence of years;
Baring our souls to our God and to men;
Pleading forgiveness of unsavory sins.
The spirited, spirited riderless steed—caught up in
The fervor of souls full of fears.
A blare of bugle and intonement of prayers;
Tell the whole world that our hearts truly care
For freedom, and love and the welfare of nations,
For forgiveness of sins and better relations.
A Warrior has fallen—mid cadence of life,
Mid struggles and chaos and hate and strife.
While the spirited, spirited riderless steed—pleads always
And ever that no more shall bleed!

Mortgage Misgivings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a strange uneasiness is afflicting mortgage lenders at a time when their business is booming. The current building spree is felt to be more in response to generous financing than immediate demand for more space. The suspicion that this is true is being fueled by reports that there are big vacancies in new buildings and that owners are resorting to liberal concessions to fill them.

In order to avert foreclosures, many lenders are allowing builders to defer amortization, and in some cases, even interest payments, until income improves sufficiently to restore full mortgage repayments.

Concern is also growing about the small equities of many owners. One fact making lenders so generous is the pressure to lend created by the swollen assets of many institutions. Many mortgage bankers believe the dangerous debt structure created by sharp competition has resulted in a deterioration of credit standards which make the mortgage structure highly vulnerable to adverse economic forces. Particularly disturbing is the fact that rising foreclosures and other credit troubles are increasing even though the general economy is moving ahead.

In the light of the economic euphoria being generated by the administration, I have unanimous consent that a cautionary article dealing with this subject that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 14 be included in the RECORD at this point:

MORTGAGE MISGIVINGS: LENDERS FRET ABOUT SHARPLY RISING DEBT, SHRINKING EQUITIES

(By Laurence G. O'Donnell)

NEW YORK.—When Carey Winston, president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, addressed a conference of his colleagues here the other day, he described "a curious apprehension" and "uneasiness" among mortgage lenders at a time when their business is booming. His comments struck a responsive note; many of the listeners nodded approvingly.

The mortgage market has grown enormously since 1945 as the Nation has gone steadily deeper into hock to finance the spectacular postwar real estate boom. Mortgage debt has risen eightfold to a staggering $281 billion.

What then is now bothering mortgage lenders? Principally it's the fact that the big gains in this debt total have been posted just recently—at a time when, significantly, the mortgage market has shifted dramatically in favor of borowers and the real estate market has shown signs of being oversupplied in many parts of the country. In 1963 alone, real estate debt outstanding expanded 11 percent as new loans exceeded repayments of existing ones by a record $29 billion.

As the supply of credit and new construction has started to outpace demand, many lenders have begun to suspect that much of the current—and continuing—building spree is largely in response to generous financing rather than the immediate demand for new quarters. And this suspicion has been fueled by reports that there are big vacancies in new buildings and owners are resorting to liberal concessions to fill them.

DEFERMENT OF PAYMENTS

What's more, slow renting and concessions are putting such a crimp on income that many lenders, to avert foreclosures, are allowing builders of apartment houses and office buildings to defer their amortization—and in some cases, even their interest—payments while they struggle to boost their income.

Such concessions have heightened the concern of some lenders about a related—but potentially more troublesome—problem: The small equities of many owners. These builders and property owners have such small cash investments, and so little reserves, that lenders are taking almost all the risks, it's reasoned.

The small equity problem, of course, isn't new; for years homeowners have been able to arrange mortgages with small or no downpayments and long pay back periods if they could qualify for Government mortgage insurance. But recently the low equity, long pay back trend has been spreading to conventional home loans and mortgages on income producing real estate.

Mortgage men assert that it is now possible for a home buyer to line up conventional mortgage financing on terms almost as generous as on Government-backed loans. Too, builders of apartment houses, office buildings, and other commercial properties are finding it easier to finance out—that is, refinance temporary construction loans with a permanent mortgage large enough to cover their entire building cost and leave them with none of their own cash invested in the completed building. Such mortgages are perfectly legitimate when they're based on appraisals that calculate value on the basis of the rental income of the building rather than its construction cost.

SUSPECT PRACTICES

Some lenders charge that the low equity trend is also being accelerated by suspect practices of some competitors. They contend they're losing loans to other institutions, who are searching for—and apparently getting—liberal appraisals of value that will justify their large loans. In this way, more conservative lenders charge, competitors can get around legal restrictions on the ratio of loans to appraised value and still satisfy the demand of borrowers for enough cash to cover all their costs.

What's making lenders so generous? The chief reason is the pressure to lend created by the swollen assets of many institutions; they have attracted hordes of cash in recent years through higher interest payments and dividends to savers. These lenders are stressing mortgages either because—as in the case of savings and loans associations—that is their traditional outlet or because they're searching for the higher yields mortgage loans produce in comparison with most other types of investments. In addition, the concentration of savings institutions on mortgage loans has developed at the same time many pension funds have started to hunt for mortgages.

An equally important reason, though, is the attitude of these lenders toward real estate investments. Far from being pessimistic, they're convinced demand for new homes and rental space will continue to grow as population and personal income expands; they dismiss current pockets of overbuilding as temporary.

Apprehensive mortgage men have no particular quarrel with such reasoning. What worries them is the dangerous debt structure that competition has created. Some describe it as an irrevocable deterioration of credit standards.

Mr. Winston, in his speech, put it this way: "* * * We have to admit that the real estate market and the mortgage structure are vulnerable to adverse economic forces in a way that did not prevail during most of the past decade * * * because equity requirements have been reduced to a point where even slight miscalculations may cause trouble."

He added: "Market vulnerability is something we shall have to live with for as long as we can see. We shall have to live in this exposed condition because it has been built into the mortgage credit structure through the high loan-to-value ratio and the long maturity. It has been built in so firmly that no reversal is likely."

Many lenders think adverse effects of easy credit are already showing up. Foreclosures on single-family homes totaled 99,000 last year, the largest number since 1939; the rate of foreclosures per thousand mortgaged homes rose to 4.44, up for the 4th consecutive year and the highest since the statistic was first compiled in 1950. In addition, many real estate investment and development companies have gotten overextended and are now undergoing sweeping debt liquidation and refinancings.

Rising foreclosure and other credit troubles disturb lenders because they're increasing even though the general economy is still strong. These lenders wonder what will happen during a recession. They contend that low equities and the related trend to liberal refinancings, which tend to keep debts large, are offsetting the protection of lenders that steady amortization of mortgage loans is supposed to insure.

Veteran lenders are worried about the experience of the mortgage men now making most of the loan commitments; the oldtimers fear that the current generation, buoyed by postwar successes, lacks the skepticism hard times often produce. In a speech to the mortgage bankers meeting, Franklin Briese, executive vice president of Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., put it bluntly: "Many of you lack the experience and education furnished by the depression. In truth, there has been no severe test of mortgage credit for more than 25 years."

COMPLACENCY FEARED

Some of the veterans are also fearful that the dearth of solid information on commercial mortgages and detailed information about the absorption of new construction has lulled many lenders into complacency. They note that vacancy statistics on apartments, for example, don't break down the unrented rate by the age of the building; they suspect that the stable rate of vacancies above 7 percent in recent years may be misleading. The high rate of vacancies in new buildings, it's figured, may be offset by demolitions of many old buildings, a trend that removed vacancies from the market and the vacancy statistics. What's worse, though, is the complete absence of any vacancy or foreclosure figures on many types of commercial real estate, veterans contend.

Still another concern: The inferior construction and building designs that lending competition is subsidizing. Because of easy financing, it's argued, builders are able to put up structures that lenders ought to veto. An insurance company loan officer cites an example of a bad layout he recently encountered. "To get to the bathroom, you had to go through two bedrooms," he says. "Can you imagine that? We turned down the loan application but that doesn't mean the project won't get financing elsewhere."

Not all lenders are ignoring the warning signals, of course. Many institutions, including some of the biggest insurance companies and pension funds, are moving very cautiously on new mortgage commitments, especially in areas where signs of overbuilding are evident. They are also turning down poorly designed projects and requiring builders to achieve certain levels of occupancy before they'll advance permanent mortgage

financing to replace building loans. Some lenders are also getting independent appraisals to supplement the findings of their own staff appraisers.

Many of these steps are coming under pressure from Government agencies. The Federal Housing Administration has tightened many of its mortgage-insurance requirements; it now makes apartment house builders post sufficient reserves to carry them through tough renting periods. And the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has been running spot checks on the appraisals used by some of the savings and loan associations under its jurisdiction; it has also required increased reserves by some associations against possible loan losses.

Too, some mortgage experts contend that the intense pressure on lenders to lend is starting to ease. They detect signs that the flow of funds into saving institutions is leveling off, albeit at a high rate.

But there is no assurance these measures will reverse the trend to relaxed credit standards. Mortgage men still complain about the "borrowers' market," and some are apprehensive that concessions from lenders, allowing amortization and interest deferments, are only making matters worse by encouraging builders to build in saturated rental markets. As one lender recently summed it up: "The orange flag is waving and in some cases the red flag. But people don't choose to look. If a lot of loans come home to roost, the whole mortgage profession is going to get a black eye."

Business Life Begins Anew at the Ocean's Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding maritime leaders, Adm. John M. Will, president of the American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines, spoke today to the World Trade Council of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on the timely subject of "Business Life Begins Anew at the Ocean's Edge." Taking a phrase used by our late President Kennedy and making it a topic of his speech, he pointed out the importance of expanding and promoting our world trade. It was an excellent speech and I recommend it to every Member of the House who is interested in world trade and in our merchant marine:

BUSINESS LIFE BEGINS ANEW AT THE OCEAN'S EDGE

(By Adm. John M. Will)

I am greatly honored by your kind invitation to address your World Trade Council membership today and am most happy to be with you.

Almost exactly 4 years have passed since I had the privilege of speaking before the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh. At that time, I participated in the community visit of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, known as CASL. Some 50 steamship line executives from our 4 coasts were in attendance. Please note that I have mentioned four coasts. With the opening of the St. Lawrence waterway, the Great Lakes became our fourth coast to serve foreign commerce. All of us were extremely pleased with the warm reception accorded us here during that World Trade Week. I, personally, derived a great deal of satisfaction and encouragement from my meetings with the executives of many of the large and important corporations having their headquarters in this area.

In the remarks I made here 4 years ago, I said: "There isn't a city in the United States that has a greater dollar interest per capita in foreign trade, than has Pittsburgh." That statement holds just as true today. I think this accounts, in large measure, for the close kinship we in the shipping business feel toward your community, because our very existence depends upon a foreign trade.

I was impressed and pleased to learn as a result of a recent spot check, that the value of your ocean trade since 1960 has increased in all departments; that a total of 400 western Pennsylvania firms employing 300,000 people, are active in exporting; that Pittsburgh stands fourth among the Nation's cities in establishing new foreign business outlets in recent months; and that Pennsylvania's yearly export value has about reached the $1 billion mark.

When talking about foreign trade, I am reminded of an amusing story I heard at the time of the CASL visit here. It seems that when James Lawrence, of "Don't Give Up the Ship" fame, sailed from Pittsburgh to Marseilles around 1800 with a cargo of pickled pork, French officials threatened to jail him for airing a "tall tale." They asked how anyone could sail from Pittsburgh—an inland city—across the Atlantic to France? Lawrence was released, the story goes, only after pulling out his charts and convincing the French that he had traveled down the Ohio to the Mississippi, thence via New Orleans to the ocean route.

Even today, many Americans still ask a question similar in nature: How can a landlocked city be affected by world trade?

Greater Pittsburgh provides an excellent answer. You have developed sturdy ties with the sea lanes of the world, on all of which American-flag ships are available to serve you. It is, indeed, a far cry from the days of pickled pork, wind and sail, to your city's present world trade of $250 million annual business, affecting hundreds of thousands of workers producing scores of products for oversea delivery.

I selected the title of my talk today from a phrase used in a speech made by our late President Kennedy. When discussing the export expansion program, which he conceived and ardently supported, he said: "Business life can begin anew at the ocean's edge." I think this expression provides a most appropriate text for adoption by any group interested in discussing the promotion of our world trade.

It may come as a surprise to you to learn that more than 90 percent of the manufacturing concerns in our country make no attempt whatever to market their products abroad. Nevertheless, this is a fact. Why this apathy and inertia should prevail I find most difficult to understand. Basically, I suppose, these companies consider that our domestic market affords sufficient opportunities. It is to be hoped that our internal economy will remain so strong as to indefinitely justify a continuation of this philosophy. We are, however, living in a rapidly changing world and foresight might dictate the wisdom of these companies looking beyond their present horizons for potential markets.

Another possible reason for the reluctance of so many companies to seek outlets abroad is explained by what I can only describe as an actual fear of foreign trade. They look upon it as something clothed in an aura of mystery. They become alarmed by such things as export controls, import quotas, duties and taxes, currency restrictions, letters of credit, export declarations, marine insurance and the many other required formalities that become quite routine after the initial plunge into exporting has been taken. For companies such as these, I believe that we in the liner steamship business have the answer and can demonstrate that there is no black magic about exporting. No other segment of our economy has as much collective experience in foreign trade as our American-flag liner companies. Together, we have thousands of employees and agents in all of our domestic areas and in every major market of the free world. Their knowledge and experience is readily available to any and all prospective American exporters.

As another and practical means of encouraging American manufacturing companies to explore possible markets abroad for their products, the use of mobile trade fairs is being introduced by American Export, Isbrandtsen Lines, Grace Line, and Farrell Lines. Perhaps it would be more accurate for me to say that these fairs are being reintroduced because this concept of promoting America's foreign commerce was experimentally tested in 1960 by the Isbrandtsen Co., Inc.

At that time, eight especially designed aluminum containers, 8 by 8 by 20 feet equipped with special hinged sides, housing the exhibits of some 64 manufacturers, were sent forward on Isbrandtsen's vessels. They were displayed at each foreign port of call for several days. The merchants of these foreign countries, most of them for the first time, were able to see American products in a convenient, attractive display. This initial contingent was followed by three others, featuring different product categories. These fairs resulted in the American exhibitors (many of whom had not previously exported) making foreign sales of approximately $1 million. As a result of the outstanding success of this experimental program, the Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., received the first "E" Award from President Kennedy.

The present program represents the extension of this idea on a much larger scale, with the efforts of three cooperating steamship companies and with the encouragement and financial support of the U.S. Government, through the Department of Commerce. The lines participating provide service to the entire Mediterranean, South and East Africa and the North and West Coasts of South America. We are hopeful that in due time, other American lines will become participants, thereby broadening the areas for exhibits. The exhibitors pay only for the space required for their exhibits. Through Mobile Trade Fairs, Inc. (a nonprofit organization controlled jointly by the lines), the steamship companies provide the containers. They also assume the costs of loading, discharging and ocean transportation, while the Government bears the expense of certain of the costs for appropriate display of the containers ashore at places abroad.

The project I have outlined is but one of the means by which the American liner companies are attempting to assist in furthering the administration's export expansion program. Just last week, the Delta Steamship Lines, in collaboration with the Mississippi Valley World Trade Council of New Orleans, cosponsored a trade fair mounted aboard the S.S. *Del Sud* which sailed on May 14 for a 44-day tour of six west coast of South America ports.

It should be conceded that the motivation for our sponsorship of these exhibitions is not entirely patriotic or altruistic. We naturally hope to benefit from the success of the trade fairs. In other words, to paraphrase a remark often quoted a few years ago, we believe that what is good for our country's foreign commerce, is good for the steamship industry.

In my own company, we are convinced that by containerization a more economical means of transporting export and import general cargo from point of origin to ultimate destination can be provided for shippers, receivers, and carriers. To expedite this

development, we have created a seperate division—the Export Despatch Division.

As I am certain most of my listeners are aware, the use of containers in domestic movements is quite efficiently systematized and is increasing week by week. We feel that the benefits this method of transport affords shoudl be extended to oversea shipments on a much larger scale than is now the case. It is the function of our Export Despatch Division to promote this idea. The advantages to shippers are many. By the use of containers they can simplify and reduce the cost of their packaging and documentation. Savings in marine insurance premiums should result and by eliminating the repeated rehandling of individual packages in the course of transit, possible loss and damage is minimized, thereby giving greater assurance that goods will reach the customer-consignee in sound condition.

Up to now, I have discussed foreign trade only from the standpoint of our exports. Webster defines "trade" as: "the act or business of exchanging commodities by barter or sale." It is obvious, therefore, that we must recognize foreign trade as a two-way street and, for a properly rounded picture, must also take imports into consideration.

We are quite prone to take for granted, the extent of our material abundance. Very few stop to realize that the United States consumes annually about half of all the nonagricultural raw materials that the world produces. Unfortunately, we do not produce half of the world's raw materials. At an ever accelerating rate, we are dependent upon imports. Aside from such everyday products as coffee, tea, cocoa, spices and natural rubber, we import 30 percent of our iron ore, 85 percent of our bauxite, and 83 percent of our manganese. We are deficient to the extent of 80 to 100 percent in tin, chrome, quartz, and great variety of other minerals essential for our industrial complex. The only means of transporting these commodities in quantity is by ship. In recent years, too, we have been importing increasing quantities of liner-type general cargo comprised of manufactured articles, automobiles and steel and steel products. I imagine that mention of the last item does not strike an exactly cheerful chord in this community, but facts are facts.

It has been demonstrated throughout history that for any nation to develop and maintain its foreign trade, an adequate merchant marine is a prime requisite. Time has made so change in this requirement and if we are to carry and sustain our trade beyond the ocean's edge, we must have a thriving merchant marine. To thrive, our ships must have the willing support of our own nationals such as that given by the British, Norwegian and Japanese nationals to the ships of their flags.

Of course, we could rely upon the shipping of other flags to perform our ocean transportation. Surprisingly enough, such a policy is frequently advocated by a number of otherwise sound-thinking Americans. In their case, it is apparent that they have very short memories, or that their thinking as to shipping is impeded by a lack of knowledge or appreciation of historical facts.

We have only to look back as far as 1914. Up to that time, and extending from the end of our own Civil War, we had been content to let the foreigners provide our shipping needs. With the outbreak of World War I in 1914. practically all of the British, French, German, and Austrian ships that had been predominant in serving our commerce, were withdrawn from their normal pursuits to meet the war demands of the belligerents. With few, if any, ships to move our goods, our foreign trade was at a virtual standstill—not only to the warring countries, but to South America, the Far East and almost all other world areas. Our principal port cities were clogged with export shipments awaiting transport and our needed imports were shut off. Such little shipping space as was to be had was made available at fantastic rates, sometimes as high as 1,200 percent above normal tariffs. The crash shipbuilding programs we undertook at the time of this war, and again during World War II, involved an expenditure of some $20 billion. Such is the price we paid for our shortsightedness.

With the pasage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, our shipping outlook became much brighter. It is by virtue of the "parity" philosophy of this act that the CASL liner companies are operating. Under its provisions, these companies receive operating-differential subsidies designed to equalize their ship operating costs with those of their principal foreign-flag competitors. Approximately 85 percent of these payments represent the difference in crew wages and their subsistence. The balance is to offset our higher insurance and vessel repair costs. The subsidy covers no part of the operator's overhead or shore expense, nor does it guarantee a profit. The operator must maintain a stipulated number of sailings, in good times and bad, on the route or routes determined by the Government to be essential for maintaining our foreign waterborne commerce. He is committed to employ only American citizen personnel afloat, purchase only American-made products and to set aside specified cash reserves for the replacement of his ships when they reach statutory age. If profits for a stipulated period exceed 10 percent of capital necessarily employed, the excess is divided 50–50 with the Government until the entire subsidy is repaid. This, in fact, is the only subsidy paid by our Government that is subject to recapture. I have felt it necessary to give you this detailed explanation of the subsidy program because it is understood by so relatively few and is the target of frequent attacks by the uninformed.

The soundness of the purposes of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 are attested to, I believe, by the following:

1. With the solitary exception of the United Kingdom, our present cargo liner fleet is larger than that of any maritime power on earth.

2. Our cargo liner fleet includes more fast ships than any fleet in the world, and even today the privately owned CASL fleet includes five times as many 20-knot cargo liners as the rest of the world combined.

3. In the early 1970's, when our building program is completed, we will have the newest and most modern fleet of cargo ships flying the flag of any nation. This 300-ship construction program is costing the 15 CASL operators $2 billion. Already, 81 ships have been delivered and 34 are now under construction.

4. As the result of recent breakthroughs in the field of shipboard mechanization we have a fleet which technically is second to none.

5. American liner operators have been pioneering in the development of better and more efficient cargo-handling techniques. At present, our fleet has more and better cargo-handling equipment than any nation in the world.

This, gentlemen, is the fleet that we proudly present to carry our foreign trade beyond the ocean's edge. This is the fleet for which we seek the support of American exporters and importers. This is the fleet with which we will assist you in finding new markets for your products. This is the fleet upon which you may rely for regular, frequent, fast and dependable service on all of the world's major trade routes. This is the fleet that is available to serve our country in times of war or national emergency.

From time to time, nowadays, you may read reports that our merchant marine is carrying only 10 percent of our cargo in foreign trade. That this low percentage is evidence of the rapid decay of our merchant marine and that great amounts of public funds are being wasted. When accepted as an index of performance for all segments of our merchant marine, this percentage is totally misleading. It would make as much sense to evaluate the performance of our railroads, trucks, pipelines, bargelines, and other forms of domestic transportation as a single entity. Our merchant marine is comprised of four distinct segments:

1. Ships engaged in regular, scheduled general cargo liner services in oversea trade. In this group are the CASL ships, forming the hard core of our merchant marine.

2. Tramp ships and bulk carriers available to lift cargoes in bulk from and to anywhere in the world.

3. Tankers and specialized bulk liquid carriers engaged in foreign trade.

4. Cargo ships and tankers engaged in our domestic coastwise and intercoastal services.

The 10-percent average embraces the combined performance of all of the first three segments and includes the huge movements of petroleum, coal, ores, and other bulk commodities. Of general cargo moving on the liner routes, our ships carry approximately 37 percent. It is this segment of our merchant marine that the act of 1936 was designed to develop and, as I have said, I consider that the soundness of that legislation has been amply demonstrated. Unfortunately, the tramp and tanker segments cannot be charged to the ineffectiveness of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Any Government assistance for their relief will necessarily have to be taken care of by new legislation which, up to now, the Congress has not been disposed to consider.

Incidentally, let me say that the 37 percent of the general cargo our liner services are carrying, does not compare at all favorably with the average of 55 to 65 percent carried by the British, French, Norwegian, and Japanese in the ships of their flags. It is our constant effort to induce American exporters and importers to help us to bring up our average to a more fairly comparable level.

One of the principal reasons for the introduction of the trade expansion program by the late President Kennedy, was his concern about the constantly mounting deficit in our balance of payments. It is unlikely that we can change this to the other side of the ledger so long as we continue our foreign aid and military assistance programs and maintain military forces around the world. The deficit can, however, be materially reduced by increasing our exports.

A little known fact is that the American-flag merchant fleet now contributes nearly $1 billion a year toward our favorable balance of payments. This, notwithstanding that many of our ships sail with less than capacity cargoes. Greater use of ships of our flag by American exporters, importers, and travelers would contribute substantially to a further reduction in our balance of payments. This is the point we are using our combined efforts to drive home, stressing the obvious fact that every dollar spent by Americans for shipping or travel on foreign-flag ships simply adds that much to our deficit.

As a corollary to all that I have said about the service the CASL companies are prepared to offer, the question of cost to shippers naturally arises. As it happens, the subject of ocean freight rates is very much in the forefront today. This is the result of the Federal Maritime Commission's well-publicized investigation of ocean freight conferences and that of Senator DOUGLAS' Joint Economic Committee into alleged disparities between export and import ocean freight rates.

The use of the conference system is over a century old. It was adopted originally by the British to provide stability in ocean rates so shippers could make sales and advance

commitments with knowledge that their competitors would have no advantage in ocean transportation costs.

Because the nature of the conference system was found to be in conflict with our antitrust laws, in 1912 a congressional committee began an investigation of conferences and conference practices. This investigation lasted for 4 years and resulted in approval of the conference system. The reasons for this approval are every bit as valid today. I quote one very significant statement in the committee's report:

"To terminate existing agreements would necessarily bring about one of two results: the lines would either engage in rate wars which would mean the elimination of the weak and the survival of the strong; or, to avoid a costly struggle, they would consolidate through common ownership. Neither result can be prevented by legislation, and either would mean a monopoly fully as effective and it is believed more so, than can exist by virtue of an agreement."

More recently, Congressman TOLLEFSON of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, had this to say on the floor of the House:

"The conferences have been investigated five times in the last 50 years by our Government. Imperfections have been recognized but every investigation has concluded that the conferences are the best system yet devised to harmonize divergent international interests and maintain order where otherwise the natural state of affairs would be chaos."

Regulation of ocean carriers is provided for under American law. As an American carrier, we cannot object. If the law is administered wisely and with restraint, regulation can be beneficial provided it does not upset international relations or trade.

Unfortunately, unfair competitive practices spring up under the system from time to time. These practices result, however, not from the conference system itself but from the nonobservance of conference rules. These are best controlled by the regulatory bodies. Our own Federal Maritime Commission has been insisting that adequate self-policing provisions be incorporated in each of the conference agreements. We believe this is necessary and should have a healthy effect.

The basic nature of conference line operation is to offer regular service at rates that permit the maintenance of dependable service in times of depression as well as prosperity. Through the mechanism of the conference it is possible to come closer to coordination with shippers and the mutually satisfactory settlement of rate problems than would be possible through any other vehicle that has so far been tried.

Rates are published in tariffs which are made available to the public by each of the carriers. Shippers or consignees can bring their complaints to the conference chairmen when conditions of carriage or rates are unfair or prejudicial to their interests. There is ample opportunity under the mechanics of the system for a shipper to have a rate on a commodity adjusted so that the commodity can move competitively in international trade. The system is flexible in its ratemaking. I personally know of no case where a rate was not adjusted when the request had merit. By merit, I mean that the adjustment would permit cargo to move in greater amounts and at the same time permit the carrier to recover its costs.

Shippers and consignees can rely on conference freight rates as fairly well defined and fixed costs. Without the conference, a merchant would have to review the shipping market each time he had a shipment, and in any emergency situation or if there was a surge of exports or imports, he would experience meteoric rises in freight rates. The fact that these would be followed by meteoric drops would not help him at all in establishing a sales price for his commodity and, in fact, would make his buyers more reluctant to commit themselves to future purchases.

As conferences continue to evolve, better organization will be designed to fit our respective needs. Conferences do not deserve the bad press they have received in recent months nor the castigation they have received at the hands of the Joint Economic Committee.

The investigation of ocean rate disparities was based initially on the allegation that American steel products could not compete in open markets abroad because the rates on these products were higher from the United States than rates in the opposite direction. The consensus of representatives of American steel exporters appearing before the committee was that ocean rates are not the cause—that even if the steel were shipped free, we could not compete. This appears to be borne out in a brief filed last February with the U.S. Tariff Commission in Washington by Mr. John P. Roche, president of the American Iron and Steel Institute. He ascribed these four major causes to the deterioration of steel exports:

1. The greatly changed domestic supply-demand situation in major steel-producing countries and the trend toward self-sufficiency in supply among traditionally steel-importing countries.

2. The growing importance of pricing practices followed by major foreign steel exporters which discriminate against their home market customers, forcing them in effect, to subsidize low-priced exports.

3. The rapid worldwide trend toward parity of technology and facilities among the major world steel producers, to some degree a byproduct of U.S. foreign economic assistance, which has reduced the traditional American advantage in quality of product and productive efficiency.

4. The low absolute and relative level of U.S. tariff rates on steel products and the absence of nontariff trade barriers in the United States in contrast to their continued existence abroad, which have contributed to the rapid rise in U.S. imports.

Mr. Roche presented the following sample of the tariff and duty barriers plaguing his industry:

"A typical example of common steel product, butt-welded pipe, which constitutes a large fraction of international steel trade, will illustrate this fact. A 100-foot quantity of standard 2-inch pipe shipped from the United States to France accumulates French duties, stamp taxes and transactions taxes to the amount of $18.71; a similar shipment from France to the United States is assessed only the $1.10 U.S. duty. Corresponding charges in other countries are: West Germany, $9.06; Belgium, $9.95; United Kingdom, $8.60; Canada, $12.17. Such handicaps have placed U.S. exports to Europe under a severe disadvantage."

Nowhere in his brief, does Mr. Roche mention ocean rate disadvantages as a reason for the decrease in steel exports.

It would appear that there are elements other than ocean freight rates that are impeding the broadening of our exports. This may apply to more than the movement of steel but such things are beyond my sphere and I shall not attempt to deal with them. I do want to point out, however, that the shipowner, no less than the merchant, must always guard against pricing his product out of the market. With the current excess of shipping in the world, this factor is more than ever important when determining the level of rates. It is basic to the task he undertakes, that the shipowner should contribute to the greatest possible flow of traffic and not restrict it. Against the essential background of recovering his costs, this is an ever-present consideration in the fixing of ocean freight rates.

In closing, let me say again how happy I am to be with you today, and to thank you for your kind attention.

Supermac the II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today, Secretary McNamara will be called before Congress to answer charges that the deaths of Americans in Vietnam were due to obsolescent equipment. This is being done, despite the fact, according to the New York Times:

The administration has sought to avoid a formal congressional inquiry into the war in South Vietnam.

It was also interesting to read the editorial from the May 12, 1964, issue of the Washington Evening Star concerning Robert S. McNamara, alias Clark Kent.

Under unanimous consent, the articles follow:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 13, 1964]

CONGRESS WEIGHS VIETNAM INQUIRY—HOUSE COMMITTEE WILL CALL MCNAMARA ON EQUIPMENT

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara will be called before Congress to answer charges that the deaths of two U.S. pilots in South Vietnam were due to their obsolescent planes rather than enemy fire.

Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, who is chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, announced today that the committee would summon the Secretary of Defense to a closed session.

Congressional sources indicated that a decision on a full-scale investigation into the adequacy of the military equipment in South Vietnam would depend on the Secretary's report.

It appeared that if such an investigation were ordered, it would inevitably cover the conduct of the war itself.

The administration has sought to avoid a formal congressional inquiry into the war in South Vietnam.

President Johnson was asked at his news conference last Wednesday what he thought of proposals for such an investigation. He replied that Government officials regularly investigated the situation there and cited the recent visit of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the visits of Secretary McNamara.

But considerable pressure for the inquiry appeared to develop today with the publication of charges regarding the death of the two pilots; a full-page advertisement in the Washington Evening Star, in the form of an open letter to the President, and statements by Members of Congress.

The war was heatedly discussed today in a closed meeting of the House Armed Services Committee. Following the meeting, Representative VINSON said that the Members were disturbed by allegations in a dispatch from Vietnam by Jim G. Lucas, published yesterday in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

The article attributed the deaths of the two U.S. pilots, Capt. Robert Brumet, 36

years old, of Bethesda, Md., and Capt. Edwin G. Shank, 27, of Winamac, Ind., to the obsolescence of their T-28 planes.

The article stressed that the T-28 was a trainer plane and that's all it was intended to be.

Mr. Lucas said that the T-28, a two-seat propeller-driven plane, was outmoded by 1953. He noted that the Pentagon had reported plans to replace the T-28 with a Navy attack plane, the AD-6. "But why wait until now?" he asked.

According to Mr. Lucas, Captain Brumet put his plane into a dive on April 9, and the wings were torn off. On March 24, he added, Captain Shank was killed in an identical accident.

Mr. Lucas wrote that the T-28 was virtually the last two-seat propeller-driven craft in the Air Force's inventory. "Yet out here," he added, "we've loaded the antiquated trainer's wings with 500-pound bombs and napalm so that if one is flown long enough it's inevitable that its wings will drop off. The men who fly them know that."

Mr. Lucas noted that the United States did not use more modern aircraft in Vietnam because of the terms of the 1954 Geneva agreement that ended the French Indochina war.

[From the Evening Star, May 12, 1964]

SUPERMAC THE II

Superman as a term of endearment was American to begin with. We loaned it to the British in the form of Supermac. Now it's time to call in the loan and get it back.

We have our own Supermac and he behaves more like the original Superman than poor Harold MacMillan ever did on the glory road from Suez to Profumo.

As any 10-year-old will be glad to instruct you, the main thing Superman does is to rip off the glasses and fedora hat of his Clark Kent identity and soar off into the air, to come down halfway around the world where his services are needed as Superman.

That's exactly the way our own Supermac performs. One minute he's sitting quietly at his desk, the next he's off and away. At Saigon the cry goes up: "It's a bird. It's a plane. It's Supermac." In he comes—to solve problems, right wrongs, run briefly for mayor of Saigon and get away. Before they know he's left, he's back at his Washington desk, glasses on nose, fedora on head: Clark Kent, Secretary of Defense.

As it must to all heroic ages, technology will come eventually to this one. Sooner or later, Clark Kent's boss is going to let him in on a secret device he has called the telephone, and that will be the end of Supermac the II.

Apollo Space Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, setting an arbitrary target date to put a man on the moon and then spending extra billions of tax dollars trying to meet it for prestige is foolish. So, also, is buying hardware for the Apollo moonshot that requires a rendezvous in space before we have proved in our Gemini program that we are capable of doing this in space.

To help in explaining these views under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD my separate views filed with the Independent Offices Subcommittee last week:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN LOUIS C. WYMAN—NASA APPROPRIATIONS

In terms of priorities in spending—of deciding on what we shall spend of available dollars to spend—I am convinced that we are spending too much money on our civilian space programs. As I view it, without harm to any legitimate interest and concern of the United States and with benefit to the economy by contributing to fiscal stability by achieving a more reasonable flow of Federal funds, the present space appropriation can and should be reduced by at least a billion dollars. I am convinced that such a reduction would neither wreck the program nor interfere with the proper security interests of the United States.

Two things are seriously wrong in our space spending: First, the 1970 target date for a man on the moon; and second, advance contracting for Apollo before we know that Gemini is going to work.

TARGET: 1970

One thing is certain amidst all the uncertainties of our space effort. This is that the 1970 target date (to put a man on the moon) is foolish. It is like setting up a strawman but not knowing whether he is straw or steel. If he's steel, we're not going to be able to knock him down, and we will lose more face. If he's straw, nothing has been accomplished except the wasting of tremendous additional billions of taxpayers' dollars by being in a hurry in a field where apparently nobody else is in a hurry, even the Communists, at least to get to the moon. Our target date in terms of American space policy should be simply that we will go to the moon if, as and when our space technology and our pocketbook find it possible to do so, not by any set date.

APOLLO LEADTIME

A fact of great significance is that the entire Apollo program is contingent on the success of Gemini—on the establishment of a clearly defined rendezvous capability in space. Despite this fact, billions of dollars in the space program are being committed to long-lead-time advance contracting for Apollo launch and space capsules and modules (including the so-called lunar excursion module) that we may never be able to use at all if Gemini doesn't work. If this is sought to be justified because of the so-called 1970 target date, it is inexcusable. It is waste, pure and simple, and the people of this country who are paying these tremendous sums ought to be informed of these facts. There is no need to risk these billion dollar losses.

We should defer the long-lead-time contracting in Apollo until after Gemini is proven and the feasibility of the lunar orbit approach system is proven. If anyone has any doubt but that there are substantial non sequiturs in the assumptions concerning presently projected sequence of steps to a manned lunar landing, they should read Dr. Hugh Dryden's "Footprints on the Moon" in the March 1964 issue of the National Geographic magazine.

WHY MEN RATHER THAN INSTRUMENTS?

As NASA justifications are presented to the committee, one is compelled to return again and again to the question of why a man on the moon. Why would not instruments do just as well and at vastly less cost?

We hav neot been able even to make a soft landing of instruments on the Moon as yet. Projecting a manned landing with the costly emphasis of American concern for human safety in the process costs now and will require in the future billions upon billions of extra, sorely needed tax dollars, largely for prestige. There isn't much else in the near vacuum that prevails on the moon, with heat and temperature ranges approaching 500°. No air to breathe, no water to drink—a strange objective indeed.

The Moon is no place for man to be. It is a hostile environment to human life. This we know now. It is not a matter of speculation. The moonshot glamour is no voyage of Christopher Columbus. We can see and even photograph the lunar surface. Isabella could only imagine what lay beyond the horizon at sea.

To allow a human being to exist for a single second in the lunar atmosphere requires costly pressurized space suits. Even for the Gemini preliminary tests, these suits cost $60,000 each. One can only hazard a guess as to the cost of a space suit for a man on the moon to be able to survive even a matter of hours. To this must be added the millions upon millions in costs for all the tests and preparations to develop what is believed may be a workable suit for a few steps on the surface of the moon. I do not believe this cost is worth the loss to Americans of other demonstrable societal benefits that we are denied because of the fantastic drain of Federal funds in extra billions in a space program targeted at civilian scientific exploration of the Moon with the follow on of Mars and Venus.

WHAT ARE OUR REAL OBJECTIVES IN SPACE?

It is fair to ask once again, what are our real objectives in space? The only justification for such vast expenditures of money at a time when we are heading toward national insolvency would be something in the nature of a National Security Council advisory that, should Communists get to the moon before we do they might use it as a means to force us to capitulate by way of some futuristic application of laser beam or other as yet unknown means of hemispheric destruction. There is no such testimony, nor does NASA under existing law even have a permissible military objective, such as integration of weapons systems in capsule mockups. So, aside from showing we can accomplish something we set out to do for so-called prestige, when all these billions have been spent the lunar landing program, even if successful, will have accomplished for those presently living very little, if anything, except to deny all of us a great deal of alleviation of misery in life on earth as well as saddling our children with an even greater mortgage on their future ability to continue life under the free enterprise system.

MILITARY ROLE IN SPACE

Maneuverable capsules in inner space, with military capabilities of observation and intercept, are an obvious necessity with responsible indication that the Communist space program is oriented toward just such a capability. We will look foolish with our two- and three-stage boosters behind a scientific junket should Communists continue their march toward world supremacy by having devised some new method of space warfare.

With space funds limited as they are, it is vital that we do not spend ourselves broke and overextended in civilian, scientific space programs. The emphasis should be upon military necessities in space—with the civilian space program complementary thereto.

In my opinion, the justifications for spending in space programs that have been submitted to the Appropriations Committee have failed to establish any pressing need or justification for the Apollo program in the manner in which it is being programed.

CUMULATIVE COSTS

The hard economic facts of space costs to date are that we have appropriated nearly $12 billion in our space efforts. The current requests amount to $5.445 billions more, and the overall program designed to yield a single landing on the moon, with consid-

erable fallout to gigantic booster capabilities and other interplanetary and lunar observations, will cost in the admitted vicinity of at least $34 billion. Thus, with the appropriation in the current bill of $5.2 billion, we are but halfway in the single, most expensive civilian program ever undertaken by the United States and which is being continued under pressure of haste although our governmental debt is astronomical and our Government is allowed to be operated at a loss of billions more each year.

Single launches for the Saturn I test shot cost $50 million each. The projections for the Saturn V monster launches are $100 million each, with some 15 programed. Even if successful, unless related to a prime security concern of this Nation, what is proved except that we can do it? Man in space faces greater hazards to existence than he would 5,000 feet under water. Except as may be necessary to preserve or protect our survival on earth, it is difficult to justify billions for such ventures. There is vastly greater reason for oceanographic exploration than for junkets to the moon.

CONCLUSION

It is fair to ask, why the hurry? Why the extra billions for a manned moon landing? Why the tremendous commitments to lunar excursion modules and orbital space vehicles before the capability to rendezvous has been proven? The whole cost of Gemini is less than the single year's cost for this increment of Apollo.

We should slow down in our spending on space, reassess the situation and bring the programs back to a more realistic, down-to-earth basis. The U.S. Treasury is not a bottomless pit, but some of the space advocates seem to think it is. We should cut back the present space appropriation by at least a billion dollars, or to an appropriation for fiscal 1965 of $4.2 billion. This is not going to wreck anything except the best-laid plans of a few space contractors. But it will help a great deal in providing additional funds for some of the pressingly important things we must do now on earth.

Prayers and a Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to amend our Constitution by modifying the first amendment has caused great confusion in the minds of many sincere religious people. As the legislation is debated, however, many people see that the basic principle of separation of church and state is the paramount issue and they find that 25 of our States forbid religious practices in public schools.

A very clear statement is contained in an editorial published on May 16 in the Whittier Daily News, published in Whittier, Calif., a city in my congressional district. The editor, Mr. Mynatt Smith, is to be congratulated for his concise statement on this issue.

Under unanimous consent I place the editorial in the Appendix:

PRAYERS AND A MINORITY

One of the contentions in favor of a Federal amendment to the Constitution allowing prayers and Bible reading in public schools is that a majority of the people should not be denied such a right by a minority that is not religious.

Aside from the fact, however, that a majority of the people do not attend public schools, a majority of those who do, if counted by States, have no such practices at present. Twenty-five States, in fact, forbid religious practices in the schools—California being one of them—and 10 others have no prayers or Bible readings as a regular routine. This leaves nine States where such practices are a tradition and six where religious services are required by law. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, and Idaho.

Thus an amendment requiring such services or practices would, in actuality, provide such rights to students attending public schools in a minority, not a majority, of the States.

California has suffered no blotting out of religion or the church with its law. The same possibly is true of other States where no religious practices are allowed or required in the schools.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights have stood the test of time for a great number of years. They should not be amended now to allow the believers in anything religious to use the public schools to transmit their beliefs or practices.

The largest religious group in this country is that which professes a belief in Christianity. The heart of Christianity is love, not force; voluntaryism, not requirement. It does not need the public schools to espouse its ways; the home and the church are the places where it should be taught and practiced.

Wise indeed, prudent beyond their times, were the writers of our Constitution, a document whose own terms argue against what is proposed in the prayer and Bible reading amendments.

A Bill To Strengthen the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen the social security program. My bill would provide for long-range improvements in the scale of general benefits. It would remove a number of existing inequities. In all, approximately 2 million social security recipients would benefit next year alone. It provides for financing the cost of the improvements.

For many years, hospital care for the elderly has been the major consideration of Congress in the social security field. I have supported in the past, and will continue to support health care legislation. But, in addition, I believe that we also should give attention to a number of existing inequities in the social security law and to its long-range adequacy.

No legislation can meet every need, remove every obstacle, pay every bill. But my bill is an effort to help resolve some of the more troubling inadequacies and inconsistencies.

In substance, the bill:

First. Helps those who wish to continue to work past retirement age of 65 by permitting them to earn $1,800 a year without losing social security benefits, rather than $1,200, which is the present ceiling on outside earnings. Beyond this improvement, the bill would reduce the present penalty on outside earnings between $1,800 and $2,400 a year by allowing retention of $1 in benefits for every $2 earned between these amounts. The provision, as a whole, would materially assist about 900,000 social security beneficiaries in the first year of operation.

For some, forced retirement at age 65 creates more than financial hardship, important as that is. People are living longer and feeling better for it than at any time in the history of man. Forcing them out of the work force before their time often destroys their sense of usefulness, stability, and personal worth.

Second. Provides an increase in the earnings base on which taxes are levied and benefits paid from the first $4,800 of income to $5,400. This would increase the maximum family benefit from $254 to $274, and the maximum benefits for the individual worker from $127 to $137. In the first year alone, this provision would benefit 700,000 family members, and, eventually, all who receive social security will benefit.

This change is required to keep up with increases in the cost of living and to maintain a closer relationship between current salaries of workers prior to retirement and the amount of benefits on which they must live following retirement.

Third. Pays benefits for children up to age 22 instead of 18 years, if the children are full-time students. When these benefits were established in 1940, it was presumed that, by age 18, a child would have completed his schooling and would be capable of supporting himself. This is no longer true.

The number of professional, technical, and other jobs requiring higher educational qualifications is growing at a much greater rate than the number of unskilled jobs.

A study made by the U.S. Office of Education in 1956 and a 1960 study by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan each showed that about 60 percent of the cost of college attendance came from family contributions. Another Office of Education study, published in 1958, reported that lack of financial resources was a major cause of college dropouts. And families that have lost the earnings of the family breadwinner are more likely to lack financial resources than are other families.

Not only may the child be prevented from going to college by loss of parental support and loss of his benefits; he may also be prevented from finishing high school.

This provision would benefit, in its first year, 350,000 individuals who would, otherwise, be ineligible.

Fourth. Eliminates a serious restriction in the payment of disability insurance benefits by assuring benefits to an insured worker, who has been totally disabled for a continuous period of be-

tween 150 to 180 days, for each additional month in which the worker continues to be totally disabled. Under present law, disability benefits are not paid unless the worker's disability is expected either to result in death or to continue to be total for an indefinite period. In the first year, this provision and the following one would bring benefits to a total of 585,000 disabled workers.

Fifth. Reduces the waiting period for disability benefits from the present 6 months to 3 months. Under this provision, disability benefits could be paid beginning with the fourth full month of disability, not the seventh, as under present law, and a worker's first check would reach him within 120 to 150 days after being disabled.

Sixth. Provides benefits for disabled widows. Under existing law, a widow, whether healthy or disabled, cannot receive social security benefits until she reaches age 62. Yet a widow who is disabled needs money to live on at least as much as the widow who can work. My bill requires that to be eligible for benefits, a widow be disabled either at the time of her husband's death or within a 5-year period after his death. This would cover 60,000 widows next year.

Seventh. Corrects certain technical aspects of the retirement test which, under present law, bar some beneficiaries from receiving benefits upon reaching age 72.

On the cost side, the bill would require expenditures from the Social Security Trust Fund amounting to 0.39 percent of payroll. Of this, 0.24 percent would be financed by the provision, which I have already described, increasing that portion of an individual's annual earnings which are taxed and credited for social security benefits from $4,800, as at present, to $5,400.

The remainder of the benefits would be financed by substituting decimals for fractions in determining future tax rates. This change would not only have the effect of increasing slightly the income to the trust fund, but would be consistent with the change already made in the social security rates for self-employed people under the amendments of 1961. Further, it would simplify computation of taxes.

My bill also permits transfer of social security income from the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Fund to the Disability Fund, thus assuring stability for both funds in the light of the cost of my amendments.

Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday, May 19, a fellow Tarheel, a native of North Carolina, and a good friend of mine, Mr. Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, was awarded the U.S. Department of Agriculture's distinguished service award.

Mr. Godfrey has had a long and highly successful career as an Administrator in the State government of North Carolina and now in the Federal Government. Included in his many recent accomplishments is the fact that since November 1962, Horace Godfrey has saved 545 man-years of Federal employment through more efficient organization and improved employee productivity. This represented savings in excess of $3,300,000 annually. I understand further additional savings are anticipated of more than $4 million in the current fiscal year.

This kind of record is all the more impressive to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our subcommittee is continually urging the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to improve their operations, to hold down expanding personnel costs, and to improve services for the citizens. Here is a concrete example of what our subcommittee is striving for departments and agencies to do. I will not attempt at this time to list the many fine accomplishments of Mr. Horace Godfrey. However, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix at this point a record of his performance:

DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF HORACE D. GODFREY, ADMINISTRATOR, ASCS, FOR WHICH HE RECEIVED THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD, MAY 19, 1964

BACKGROUND

Mr. Godfrey was appointed Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (then known as the Commodity Stabilization Service) and Executive Vice President of the CCC in January 1961. For the preceding 12 years, he had served as State administrative officer for the ASC State Office for North Carolina. In this capacity he supervised the operations of the State office and 99 county ASC offices which reported to it. Prior to becoming State administrative officer, he had served continuously in farm program administration since 1934 (except for wartime service in the Air Force).

North Carolina farm program operations rank near the top in volume among all the States and practically all crops involved in price support and related operations are produced in the State. Thus, the problems of administration of farm programs were relatively difficult in that State. Mr. Godfrey was recognized as the outstanding administrative officer among those for the 48 States, and in 1957 he was presented by the Department of Agriculture with an award for superior service for leadership in bringing about an outstanding degree of accuracy and efficiency in the operation of North Carolina ASC State and county offices, and for achieving the fullest cooperation of all agricultural agencies in the State. He received subsequent recognition for sustained superior work.

Mr. Godfrey's deep understanding of the needs and purposes of the farm programs which he administered and his keen perception of the necessity for and means of accomplishing program operations in the most effective and economical manner possible were the characteristics underlying his outstandingly successful administration of farm programs in that State. These same characteristics underlie the distinctive performance of the tremendously broader and heavier responsibilities involved in administering all of the programs of the agency on a nationwide basis (through 50 States offices, nearly 3,000 county offices, and 7 large commodity offices) which he assumed in January 1961.

This particular time was a critical one for agriculture. Price supports for major commodities had been successively lowered, farm prices had declined and farm income had dropped to low levels at the same time farm operation costs steadily increased. Government stocks of such important agricultural commodities as feed grains and wheat had climbed to record levels, and the costs of these and other major price-support operations (including cotton and dairy) had skyrocketed. Soil bank programs initiated in the 1950's had failed to stop increases in surpluses and cost tremendous sums of money and had seriously affected local communities where large proportions of the farms had been retired from production. Conservation efforts had become confused and were not encouraged by developments. The organizational structure of the agency administering these programs (CSS) was not adequate for the job.

All in all, it was a time which called for aggressive action, tuned to the needs of farmers, and performed in such a way as to provide maximum assurance of success. Immediate formulation of the objectives of the new administration, plans for achieving them and immediate operation of the mechanisms by which programs are carried out were problems faced by the Department in January 1961. This was the situation into which Mr. Godfrey walked when he was selected to assume the responsibility for administering CSS (later ASCS) and CCC programs. In addition to these overriding problems, he was faced with the necessity to become acquainted not only with a new Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretary and their methods of operation, but he had to also learn the capabilities and characteristics of his Associate and Deputy Administrators. Mr. Godfrey quickly appraised and evaluated his staff, his superiors and the organization with which he had to work, and has in the 3 years since January 1961 performed his major responsibilities with distinction.

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. Godfrey has rendered distinctive service to the agricultural industry and rural living throughout the United States through his never-wavering insistence on program operations designed to increase farm income and to encourage the conservation of land and water resources on individual farms. He has demonstrated extraordinary skillful public administration by his success in accomplishing the increased workload required to attain program objectives with a smaller expenditure of manpower and at less cost.

Farm income

As a key advisory to the Secretary and the Under Secretary, as a member of the CCC Board of Directors and as the official making many final decisions concerning methods of carrying out established program policies, Mr. Godfrey has had a major influence in shaping program objectives and operations so as to increase farm income to the maximum extent possible. He has been influential in achieving increases in farm support prices within budgetary and other over-all policy limitations, and changes in operations to provide more income to farmers from their crops. Examples of the latter include elimination or reduction in fees and other deductions made from farmers' price-support benefits, more adequate recognition of grades and qualities in setting support prices, and more effective use of reseal loans to provide timely storage income to farmers and to give

them the benefit of higher prices that might occur during the reseal period. His long familiarity with detailed program operations and his intimate knowledge of how they work at the farm level have enabled him to make recommendations and decisions concerning incentive payment rates and the application thereof under the new feed grain and wheat stabilization programs which have furthered the objectives of the programs and increased farm income. He has made a major contribution toward better public understanding of the necessity for adequate farm income in consultations with individual Members of Congress, appearances before congressional committees, public speeches all over the country, and in meetings with State and county ASC committeemen.

Conservation

Mr. Godfrey has long had a deep-seated interest in conservation. His conviction that more conservation should be practiced by more farmers every year has resulted in a revitalization of the agricultural conservation program. Under his guidance and direction, the number of participants in this program, under which the Government shares with producers the cost of needed conservation, was increased by 11 percent in 1 year. This was done through encouraging community committeemen to visit their neighbors, on their own time, and convince them of the need for practicing more conservation on their farms. It was done without increasing the cost of the program, either for expenses or for cost-share assistance. Mr. Godfrey has recently initiated a full-scale review of the objectives and operating policies relating to the ACP program with the view toward reorienting them to provide greater assistance in meeting current needs and to more effectively meet the problems which are being attacked by the rural areas development program.

Similarly he has been a strong advocate of a sound cropland conversion program, under which land used for producing unneeded crops could be diverted to other uses. His influence was of major importance in the approval by Congress of a pilot program for 1963 and consideration being given by Congress to an expansion of the program for 1964 and thereafter.

Mr. Godfrey was one of the first to see how conservation programs could be effectively used as a part of the attack on rural poverty in certain areas of the country, such as the Appalachian region. He has proposed that assistance be given by the Federal Government to small landholders to enable them to plant to grassland which would then support grazing and thus provide some income where none is obtained now, and at the same time conserve the soil.

Administration

Mr. Godfrey has the rare combination of deep concern for the welfare of farmers and ability to visualize effective programs to meet the needs, along with an exceptional ability to direct the actual administration of complex and difficult operations. He has a tremendous capacity to understand the most complicated details of administration. He has proven himself able to lead his people and to motivate them to greater and greater effort. He has a lively interest in and full understanding of administrative management techniques. He loathes the status quo, frequently expressing his opinion that there must certainly be a better way to get the job done, and has often pointed out specifically how an operation can be changed to increase effectiveness or reduce manpower and money costs. He is adept at challenging the necessity for work being performed, personnel being employed or money being spent for equipment and other purposes. His concepts of the organization required to perform the wide variety of program operations which have been his responsibility have been fresh and successful. He has recognized the abilities of his subordinates and delegates reponsibility to them in large measure. He has through example, challenge, untiring effort, and persistence in making it clear that he expects his agency to steadily improve, accomplished a record of outstandingly successfuly administration in the past 3 years. He has done his best, at considerable personal sacrifice, to attend every important meeting of county committeemen in each State to carry directly to them his ability to increase their understanding of program objectives and his desire for continuous effort to improve administration.

ASCS operations are large and complex and the controversy concerning farm program policy places these operations in the spotlight at all times. They include price-support, production adjustment, conservation assistance, surplus inventory management and dispositions, sugar and wool payments and many related activities. These operations involved paying out about $7 billion in Government funds and receiving back about $3 billion in the fiscal year 1963. They involved transactions in practically every county in the United States growing out of individual dealings with the great majority of all farmers, warehousemen, banks, cooperatives, overland and water carriers and others. Decisions made in the administration of these activities directly affect markets, general business operations, international relationships and individual consumers and taxpayers, in addition to directly affecting the welfare of farmers. It took 34,000 man-years of employee time in the fiscal 1963 to perform all of the work involved. Obviously, this is a massive responsibility placed on the Administrator of ASCS.

Immediately after being made Administrator in 1961, Mr. Godfrey worked closely with the Secretary's office and advisory committees in formulating an emergency feed grain program. The urgent need for this program—to increase farm income, reduce stocks, and reduce Government costs—was recognized by the Congress and legislation was approved by the President on March 22, 1961, just 2 months after the new administration took office. On the day following the President's signature, the first regional field meeting was held by Mr. Godfrey in Omaha, Nebr., to explain the new program to ASC State committeemen and their staffs. Other meetings followed immediately afterward. The time was extremely short for obtaining an understanding of the program, getting the necessary forms and documents to the counties, and getting farmers to sign up to divert acreage from feed grain production. Through Mr. Godfrey's leadership, and with the personal assistance of Secretary Freeman in the regional meetings, program goals were met and the administration of the program was handled smoothly and effectively.

This legislation was followed in August 1961 by a new wheat stabilization program for the 1962 crop of wheat plantings which began in the fall of 1961. Again there was a tight time schedule to meet, but it was successfully accomplished.

These are two major examples of a number of "crash" progams which have been inaugurated in the past 3 years for which ASCS has had responsibility. Mr. Godfrey's keen appreciation of what was needed for successful operation plus the confidence in his leadership which he generated in the ASC State committees (most of them newly appointed) were major factors in their success.

Mr. Godfrey perceived soon after January 1961 that the organizational structure of ASCS was not adapted to the most effective operation of farm programs. While circumstances prevented him from going as far as he would have liked at the time, he did recommend substantial changes in the structure, including changing the name of the Agency to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and these were approved by the Secretary in June 1961. These changes more specifically and appropriately placed responsibilities on the deputy administrators, and provided for absorption of the former ACP Service and the administration of milk marketing orders into the organization. It streamlined the organization and reporting structure and represented a good start toward improvement in operations.

In the summer of 1961, Mr. Godfrey proposed to the Secretary the establishment of a Data Processing Center in Kansas City, Mo., to be used to handle ASCS program work. He recognized that the great expenditure of manpower involved in handling the masses of paperwork generated by ASCS program could be considerably reduced by use of modern data processing equipment. This proposal was approved and the Center was immediately established. It has been outstandingly successful and is in the process of taking over responsibility for accounting and related work for all CCC-owned grain inventories in the United States, in addition to handling all CCC price-support loans on grains.

In November 1962, the Administrator obtained the approval of the Secretary to fully carry out his concept of the organization of ASCS necessary to more effectively perform the program responsibilities of the agency with less expenditure of money and manpower. The new organization, approved November 13, 1962, realined responsibilities, functions, and reporting channels, reduced the number of Deputy Administrators from 5 to 3, reduced the number of organizational units reporting to the Deputy Administrators from 25 to 13, and closed three large commodity offices in the field. Lines of authority and responsibility were straightened and established on a functional basis. The policy advisory functions, previously performed by Division Directors also responsible for administrative details, were removed to a small group of policy staffs (two top men for each of six major commodity groups and one conservation group). These policy staffs report directly to the Administrator and in effect are his eyes and ears in their respective fields. This is a fresh approach which has proven successful and will doubtless be used elsewhere. Despite the fact that this massive reorganization involved closing three large field offices employing nearly 1,000 people, moving another field office employing over 400 people and reassigning the functions and responsibilities performed by about 550 people in Washington, Mr. Godfrey's skillful and expeditious handling of the changes enabled the agency to complete the whole reorganization within a 4-month period, with little or no loss in overall effectiveness during that period. The net result of this reorganization and other increases in efficiency was a reduction of 545 man-years of Federal employment in the fiscal year 1963 from the 1962 level (saving $3,320,000) and it is expected that the man-years of employment will be further reduced by 493 in the current fiscal year, saving an additional $4,117,000. Some further reduction in employment will occur in 1965 as direct result of these moves.

Mr. Godfrey has placed great emphasis on the need for improvement in county office administration also. These small offices, nearly 3,000 in number, are the points at which program operations are effected in dealing with individual farmers. They use about 70 percent of the total operating expenses of ASCS (over $220 million). Mr. Godfrey's highly successful administration in North Carolina was based on improving in every way possible the ability of the county offices to serve farmers more effectively. He

has insisted that the same principles be applied to the administration of all county offices in the United States, and the results have been more effective program operations and savings in manpower and money. Among the specifics that he prescribed and insisted upon were effective use of the farmer committee system, elimination of substandard office space, use of modern office equipment, higher qualification and performance standards, fairly determined pay scales, intensified training related directly to the work to be performed, improved procedures and handbooks, more adequate supervision and direction, better information to local people concerning program provisions and operations, simplification of systems used in performing program work, use of work measurement as the major device to control use of manpower and money, insistence on well-conducted meetings including the use of visual aids, and others. Some of these improvements cost money initially, but result in substantial savings later. The net result has been performance of a greater volume of work (measured) per man-year of employment in the county offices. The number of man-years worked in the fiscal year 1963 was nearly 6 percent less than in the preceding year, or nearly twice the reduction that would have been expected from changes in workload. This trend will continue in 1964 and subsequent fiscal years as a result of the base for improvement in efficiency which has been established by Mr. Godfrey's insistence on revitalization of the committee system and on better performance. It would not have been accomplished without his personal leadership.

Mr. Godfrey has also watched closely for opportunities to make savings in costs other than personnel costs and other operating expenses. He has made admiinstrative decisions concerning payment of warehouse charges, cancellation of insurance, and similar items which have resulted in savings of millions of dollars.

As a result of Mr. Godfrey's skill and leadership in administration, ASCS as an agency, has been able to take on a substantially increased workload and perform it effectively with less manpower. It was one of the very few agencies of Government which actually reduced employment last year and the reduction accomplished was greater than that for any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Godfrey is not yet satisfied with the improvements that have been accomplished, and has recently initiated the use of additional techniques to ferret out further possible sources of additional economy and greater efficiency. These include a detailed review of the work and staffing pattern of each Washington division and office of the agency, in which the head of the division is required to justify to the Deputy Administrators the necessity for each individual position in his unit. This involves an analysis of the work performed by each individual in terms of its volume, the necessity that it be done, and whether it can be assigned to someone else, deferred or discontinued. Also, management surveys of the operations of each of the large field offices are being undertaken by teams of skilled management personnel, in the course of which the necessity for and the form of the workload input to the office, the methods in which it is handled and the use of manpower are challenged in detail. One such survey has been completed and considerable improvement in operations is expected. Similarly, surveys of all State offices are being undertaken (six have been completed) and sample counties will be surveyed. In addition, Mr. Godfrey has directed that specific operational analysis of individual programs be made, without regard specifically to the organizational units performing the work, to determine whether program objectives can be met and operating policy carried out in a more effective manner. Such a survey has been made of the ACP program, and while the report has not been completed, it is apparent that improvements can and will be made. They are anticipated in the 1965 budget estimates along with other further increases in efficiency.

U.S. Imports of Agriculture Products and the Financial Loss Caused the American Farmer in Competing With These Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a report made to me by the Sandersville-Washington County Chamber of Commerce stressing the need to cut importation of competing commodities which depress the market price of domestic products. I am acutely aware of the financial loss suffered by our American farmer in competing with imports of beef and other commodities and I strongly urge that we carefully weigh the facts cited in the chamber's report as forwarded by Thomas A. Hutcheson, president:

U.S. IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS AND THE FINANCIAL LOSS CAUSED THE AMERICAN FARMER IN COMPETING WITH THESE IMPORTS

Item 1: The American consumer enjoys the highest income in history.

Item 2: The farmer's share of the consumer dollar is now 19 cents which is proof that he is subsidizing the consumer.

Item 3: This means 7 percent of the population that are farmers must subsidize the remainder of the population by producing cheap food for the Nation in competition with the production labor of foreign nations who get no pay or only a few pennies a day.

Item 4: The farmer's return per dollar invested is the lowest of any group.

Item 5: This cheap imported beef, pork, poultry and egg prices will effect prices of grain, concentrates, and labor which are of farm origin to the extent that we will be increasing our poverty problem instead of solving it.

Item 6: The American farmer is the largest consumer of products of industry of any group its size in the Nation (7 percent of our population).

Item 7: The American farmer pays the highest prices for items of production in history due to Government-protected wages to industrial workers, this wage cost passed on to the farmer.

Item 8: Washington County's income is determined by its farm production costs and profits. Over 60 percent of the county income is due to its farm production.

Item 9: Washington County people are being forced off the farms due to cheap prices of farm commodiites making profits impossible.

Item 10: Washington County farmers owe more on mortgages and accounts payable than ever in history according to the number of people farming and farms in operation.

Item 11: The risk of farm production are the highest of any group in our economy.

Item 12: Without our farmers in times of national emergencies our Nation could not survive. They are more important than a lot of our defense efforts. We must protect our farm production abilities.

Item 13: When 10 to 15 percent increase in available supplies of any product are thrown on the market the result is a very unstable condition of prices. If 15 percent more cars, radios, TV, or other items are supplied on the American market the results would be the same pricewise as beef.

Item 14: The taxes that maintain this Nation, property, and income, must be paid in part by the American farmers.

Item 15: Foreign producers are being subsidized by the American Government, this money arrived at by taxing the American producer.

In considering all the foregoing facts this Agriculture Committee of the Sandersville-Washington County Chamber of Commerce would like to go on record as being opposed to importation of any farm commodity or food item produced from such commodity when the domestic prices of such commodity are lower than the average prices which would give the producer his cost of production, interest on his investment, and an income comparable with any industrial worker of like training and ability. Our American farmer should be able to maintain a standard of living and care for his family in such a manner as any employees of any governmental agency or corporation of equal status. We therefore request your earnest effort in our behalf in order that importation of competing commodities which depress the market price of domestic products be cut to a bare minimum or eliminated entirely.

EUBERGENE NICHOLSON,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee, Sandersville-Washington County Chamber of Commerce.

Carpetbag Senators Are Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I here include an editorial from the Jefferson Herald, Jefferson, Iowa, which deserves nationwide reading, that deep thinking Americans seriously ponder.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure our Founding Fathers did not for a moment anticipate that a citizen of any State would ever even think of being a candidate for an elective office in any State other than his own. I hope the voters in the thus affected State of our Union will by their votes next November start putting a stop to such anti-American political practice.

The Jefferson Herald editorial follows:

CARPETBAG SENATORS ARE COMING

It has always seemed strange to Americans that British Members of the House of Commons do not have to be residents of the districts from which they are elected—but America now appears to be headed in that direction.

Pierre Salinger, former Press Secretary and close friend to the late President Kennedy, decided he'd like to be a U.S. Senator so he looked the field over and decided it should be California. He packed his bag, left the East where he had been living for many years and began campaigning in the Golden State. He's the favorite to win.

This week Attorney General Robert Kennedy, brother of the late President and a native of Massachusetts, is making political soundings in New York State. He too, would like to be a U.S. Senator—and it would be a little thick to have two Kennedy brothers holding both Senate seats from Massachusetts.

The fact that the Attorney General has never claimed New York as his residence need apparently not deter him. The Supreme Court in California ruled in the case of Salinger that the only residence requirement imposed by the U.S. Constitution was that he be a resident "at the time elected." Presumably the same interpretation would be made by the State of New York and the U.S. Supreme Court.

"Residence" under the law is a rather nebulous matter and actually depends on a state of mind. If you decide you want to change your residence, about all you have to do is decide where it is to be, get a place to sleep—and you're "in."

There is no logical reason why Mr. Salinger should not represent California nor why Mr. Kennedy should not represent New York. The voters have the final decision, just as they have always had.

However, let there be no misunderstanding. The character of the Senate is facing a wholesale change if the Salinger-Kennedy pattern is followed.

Since the Nation was born, the U.S. Senate has been truly representative of all sections of the country—and in those diversities has come its greatness and some of the greatness of the Nation. There has been the drawl of Southerners, the twang of New England, the earthiness of the Midwest, and the vigor of the West. The Senate has come to know of the Swedes in Minnesota, the Germans of Nebraska, and the French of Wisconsin. It knows the mountaineer from Kentucky, the rancher from Montana, the miner from West Virginia, and the planter from South Carolina.

What is apparently coming is a Senate composed of Washington administrators and lawyers who are successful in getting entire States to become their "clients." Those with the greatest influence in the right places will get the big States with the important electoral votes; the lesser fry will serve the smaller States. Periodically, as new personalities emerge from the Washington bureaucracy, States will change their Senators like big corporations take on new advertising agencies. Whoever can "deliver" the most in the way of Federal handouts will get the job.

Perhaps a State cannot be blamed for wanting to "feather its nest" in this way but something great will have been lost from the Senate when the States no longer "grow their own."

Prayer Is an American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, from a moral point of view, as well as from a democratic point of view, the denial by the Supreme Court of the right to pray on a voluntary basis in the public schools is a shocking development in this great country that was in its inception, and always has been, irrevocably dedicated to belief in God and the principles of ordered personal liberty.

If this judicial decree is carried to its logical conclusion, it would ultimately bar prayer from every phase and segment of American public life. It would remove every reference to God from our courts, from the executive and legislative departments of the Government at every level. In fact, if followed to its logical conclusion, it would officially make us a prayerless nation and a prayerless people, a nation prohibited by our own highest court from mentioning the name of God in public. What a travesty.

This would mean that the word God would in time be eliminated from oaths that are taken in the courts or elsewhere, would strike "In God We Trust" from our coins and wherever else it may appear, it would bar prayers at public ceremonies and meetings, it would strike down the words "In God We Trust" above the Speaker's rostrum in this great legislative Chamber. It would forbid prayers here, if this be dared.

It is not sufficient to say these things shall not come to pass. It only needs to be said that the first step toward these things has taken place by Supreme Court decision, against the wishes and convictions of an overwhelming number of the American people.

Thus, at one stroke, we have accomplished two things that will certainly come back to plague us. We have driven the mention of God from our public schools, from the ears of our youth who will be the leaders of our Nation in the future, thus educating these leaders, upon whom this Nation will have to rely for its existence and retention of our freedoms, without mention of God in the places where they are being trained for this vital leadership in all the affairs of Government and of our national life.

At the same time, we strike down the principle of majority rule by going counter to the will of the majority. It is not sufficient to say that this is an instance of where minority rights must be protected. There is no challenge presented to the protection of minority rights, in fact, the leaders of every branch of the Government, under the law and under American policy, are unchangeably committed to the protection of minority rights, which are safeguarded here as in no other nation on earth. Hence, the prayer ban decision makes it possible for the views, held by only a very small minority of the American people, to prevail in critical, important and crucial areas of American life against the wishes of an overwhelming number of our people.

A onetime, celebrated American humorist once put on the lips of Mr. Dooley the expression, "that the Supreme Court listens to the election returns." It has not done so in the prayer decision. But the Supreme Court has a greater obligation than that. It must listen to, carefully study, and obey the Constitution of the United States and the moral and spiritual codes, usages and mores of the American people, which have been followed here since the start of this great, free Government. The Court must interpret the Constitution as it is written, not remake it after its own heart. It is a court of interpretation, not a legislature. It construes the law, not creates or changes it.

There has been no real effort made by the Court to check the flagrant, indecent, flammatory, derisive attacks that are directly made upon the Almighty in the spoken and written words of atheists, agnostics, and other disbelievers and Communists, although there have been instances when these scurrilous attacks have been so bitter and so vicious that they could well have sparked serious public disorders in our midst.

Why do we not listen to the counsel of some of the great men of American history to interpret the Constitution the way it was written, and not by what judges may want to write into it, men who understood the place that religion, morality, ethical standards, and spiritual forces have, and were intended to have, in American life, in our government and in our affairs.

I would suggest that some of those who are now inveighing so strongly against prayer in the public schools on the theory that such prayers violate minority rights and constitute the establishment of a religion, a statement which, taken in proper context, is so fantastic as hardly to require rebuttal, might turn their attention, if ever so briefly, to the prophetic words of the great Abraham Lincoln, who once said:

> We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved in peace and prosperity. We have grown in wealth and power as no other nation ever has grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace and prosperity. And we have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts that these things were produced by some wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

If we look around this country and this world today and observe what is transpiring, it would be very easy for reasonable men to conclude that what the Nation and the world needs most today is more prayer, not less, more faith in Divine intercessions, not less, and more regard for the Constitution and its plain, simple terms, not less.

If we were to follow such a course, a course clearly desired and strongly sought by an overwhelming number of the American people, it would be a better reflection of American democratic institutions and a more promising, augury for the early reclamation and effective buttressing of the moral truths, spiritual standards, and practices of our way of life which have contributed more than all else to the origin, the growth, the prosperity, the greatness, and the freedom of this glorious Nation.

Shall Americans remain supine and unmoved by the sinister attacks upon our sanctuaries of liberty?

Or shall we rally as God-fearing people should to preserve them?

The prayer decision must go. If it remains this Nation will lose its most valuable asset—the spiritual faith and loyalty to free principles of our people. We will lose the very soul of America.

Poverty in an Affluent Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished journalist in my district, Mr. Robert J. Arthur, has written two articles on the problem of "Poverty in an Affluent Nation." I believe that these articles merit the attention of every Member of the House for their informative insight into a problem which has plagued humanity since time immemorial:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Scrantonian, Feb. 23, 1964]

POVERTY IN AN AFFLUENT NATION—PART I

(By Robert J. Arthur)

President Johnson's declaration of war on poverty promises to make the general public newly aware of the plight of millions of Americans who have no share in the benefits of the country's so-called affluent society.

Two writers who are said to have influenced the administration's decision to make a broad-scale attack on poverty—John Kenneth Galbraith and Michael Harrington—have referred to the Nation's poor as forgotten or invisible. Galbraith asserted that the poor were neglected because they were an inarticulate minority and because most people assumed that poverty was rapidly disappearing in America. Harrington observed that the majority of Americans had so little acquaintance with the life of the poor that they tended to ignore them except as a faceless statistic.

Interest in the continuing existence of poverty in an economy of abundance has nevertheless been growing. It began to increase during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Since Johnson became President, the concern has been raised to the level of a crusade. It now appears that the drive against poverty will provide major issues for next autumn's presidential campaign. Nothing comparable has occurred since the early campaigns of Franklin D. Roosevelt three decades ago.

The problem of poverty today is different from what it was in the 1930's. At that time, destitution was widespread and it affected millions who had known comfort and seemingly assured security only a few years earlier. There was popular support, therefore, for radical measures to restore the economy and for enactment of basic social welfare legislation. Now, in contrast, social welfare programs have been functioning for a generation, and the economy is thriving. The poverty that persists thus appears to be of a kind that is immune to the influence of general economic growth and to that of welfare programs designed specifically to relieve want and destitution.

New knowledge gained from recent studies of the poverty-stricken, and fresh insights gained from pilot programs that take new approaches to the problem, all point up one significant fact: That present poverty in the United States amounts to more than the misfortune of particular individuals or families who can be helped by direct assistance. It is, rather, a symptom of complex and interrelated problems which there is little hope of solving unless they are attacked at their source.

There are many reasons why attention is turning again to the problem of poverty despite the fact that the condition directly affects only an inarticulate minority. For one thing, technological advances, which help spur growth of national wealth, are drastically diminishing the supply of unskilled jobs that used to be held by the poor. In addition, the technological changes are reducing men formerly ranked as skilled workers to a state of more or less permanent unemployment.

Another reason for increased attention to poverty is that social ills arising from concentration of poor people in big cities are becoming more worrisome—and a more costly burden—to the remainder of the population. The protest movement of Negroes, who make up a relatively large segment of the Nation's poor, has given new urgency to efforts to clean up conditions generating social unrest. It has been pointed out, moreover, that court decisions on reapportionment of State legislatures and congressional districts promise a more powerful political voice to urban voters concerned with the "pathology of poverty" as manifest in delinquency, crime, drug addiction, and dependence on public assistance.

President Johnson devoted a major portion of his first State of the Union address, January 8, to a proposal that the evil of poverty in the United States be attacked from every possible direction. He told Congress: "This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America and I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort." The main objective, he said, would be "not only to relieve the symptoms of poverty, but to cure it, and above all, to prevent it."

The President took up this theme again in his Economic Report to Congress on January 20. He observed then that although Americans generally enjoy the highest standard of living in history, this was "a hollow achievement" for the one-fifth of the population who "often live without hope, below minimum standards of decency." The country could not wait for gradual growth of the economy to lift up the "forgotten fifth of our Nation"; many poor people would receive little benefit from overall economic growth.

Solutions for the problems of poverty would not be found in any single new program, Johnson said, nor could they be attained solely through Federal action. "Instead we urgently need to bring together the many existing programs—Federal, State, local and private—and focus them more effectively in a frontal assault on the sources of poverty." At a news conference, February 1, Johnson announced that he had asked Sargent Shriver to undertake the task as a special assistant to the President while continuing to serve as Director of the Peace Corps.

The ultimate cost of a full-scale, antipoverty campaign has not been estimated. The President told Congress in his budget message that he was asking more than $1 billion in new obligational authority "to begin an all-out attack on the problem of poverty in the United States." He plans to spend $600 million in the next fiscal year.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Scrantonian, Mar. 1, 1964]

POVERTY IN AN AFFLUENT NATION—PART II

(By Robert J. Arthur)

Poverty has been described as "the most ancient of tragedies" because the majority of the earth's population has always lived at or near the subsistence level. Only peoples of highly industrialized countries of the modern era have been better favored.

The economies of ancient and medieval societies rested on labor of slaves or serfs. Skilled craftsmen of the Middle Ages were reasonably well remunerated, but the breakup of the manorial system led to an oversupply of labor which depressed wages and kept most workers at subsistence levels for centuries.

Although the industrial revolution ushered in an unprecedented growth of national wealth, it also created a new type of poverty, represented by hordes of low-paid workers laboring and living under conditions deleterious to health.

Classical economists accepted poverty as unavoidable in the working class because wages would be held down by a plentiful supply of labor. In the United States a steady stream of near-penniless immigrants from Europe, and the entrance of women and children into the ranks of factory workers, made cheap labor abundant during most of the 19th century.

Eventually new forces generated pressure for a rising wage level which was ultimately to lift a large proportion of American workers out of the ranks of the poor and into a measure of well-being unpredecented in all history. Among these factors were the growth of collective bargaining, increasing productivity of labor, acceptance of the principle that high wages are good for business and, finally, intervention of Government to sustain personal income through unemployment insurance and by other means. Poverty nevertheless perisisted throughout the period when the American standard of living was gaining worldwide notice as an incredible achievement of comfort and security for the working man and his family.

Poverty is said to be relative; what is poverty to one may be affluence to another. Even the poorest American today may have access to what a rich man would have considered luxuries in the recent past.

Rational efforts to determine how many really poor people there are date back only to the beginning of the present century. The estimates are usually based on the amount of family cash income. This is recognized as an inadequate criterion, for many other factors affect the quality of life lived by those at the bottom of the economic scale. But in general it has been found that statistical results are not changed very much when other less tangible factors are taken into account.

In the early 1930's, Rexford Tugwell, then Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and a member of President F. D. Roosevelt's "brain trust," reviewed the changing fortunes of the American people and found that a large percentage had suffered serious deprivation throughout the prosperity decade of the 1920's. Of the Nation's families in 1918, 20 million were said to be really poor, 14 million living at below minimum subsistence and 2 million suffering acute privation. The incomes of the groups ranged from under $2,000 to under $1,000.

The economic disaster which followed the stock market crash of October 1929 gave a new dimension to poverty in the United States, reduced many middle-income families to destitution, and forced the poverty issue into the main stream of American politics.

The prosperity of the 1940's and 1950's though punctuated by business recession after the war, reduced the incidence of poverty and all but removed the Nation's poor people from political view.

Poverty in the past resulted in part from a general insufficiency of goods and in part from the operation of economic systems that channeled the lion's share of wealth to the few. Poverty today appears to result from a combination of insufficient earning power and various other factors that tend to block off the poor from opportunities to better their condition.

The striking fact about most poor people in this country is that they have always been poor. A study by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center showed that three-fifths of the poor had never earned as much as $3,000 a year and that two-fifths had never earned as much as $2,000. The big

problem now is to find out what causes poverty to be chronic among certain families.

"The single medium most conducive to the growth of poverty and dependency is poverty itself," states one study. A lifetime of deprivation appears to have the effect of virtually destroying hope for escape. Adults do not expect ever to qualify for decent paying jobs, and children do not expect to excel in school.

Unlike the immigrant poor of yesterday's slums, today's slum dwellers do not appear to be goaded by poverty to better their conditions. On the contrary, they seem inclined to regard their state as one decreed by an unkind fate. The most difficult task in a serious antipoverty drive, such as the one promised by President Johnson, therefore, may be to bring about change in an outlook which might otherwise survive material improvement in most aspects of living for the poor.

President Johnson's antipoverty program will be detailed in forthcoming presidential messages. To be effective it will have to go beyond present alleviating measures.

Inflation Retards Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the May 4 issue of Newsweek magazine, Henry Hazlitt points out how inflation distorts and falsifies economic calculations and serves as a powerful enemy of economic growth. It does this primarily by destroying the function of the free market in penalizing inefficiency and misjudgment and rewarding efficiency and good judgment.

Regretfully there are a large number of administration officials who believe that economic growth can be promoted by inflation. Because of this widely held opinion, I think it would be useful to call Mr. Hazlitt's comments on the subject to the attention of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include his article from the May 4 issue of Newsweek in the RECORD at this point:

INFLATION VERSUS GROWTH

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In practically every country of the world today the great fetish is an increase in the rate of "economic growth." And the almost universal assumption is that that can best be promoted by inflation.

This policy, however, is almost never recommended under that name. The growth planners simply argue that growth has been slow because of an "insufficiency of aggregate demand." They think this can be rectified by more Government spending. Some of them are candid enough openly to advocate Government deficits and the creation of more money, i.e., inflation.

Those who propose the inflationary solution for unemployment usually forget to ask what has caused the unemployment. The cause is nearly always some discoordination of prices and wages. An injection of new money can, it is true, at least temporarily increase employment if it restores wage-price coordination—if, for example, it leads to increased demand or higher prices for products without leading to higher wage rates.

Yet any price-wage adjustment brought about by inflation is likely to be only temporary. For unions, encouraged by demand for more workers, or trying to "catch up" with higher living costs, will demand still higher wages, with the result that the discoordination of wages and prices may occur all over again, and the situation can be cured once more only by a still fresh dose of inflation. On the other hand, if governments follow sound labor policies, inflation is unnecessary.

ILLUSORY PROFITS

Inflation is not only unnecessary for economic growth. It is the enemy of growth. It distorts and falsifies economic calculation. An economy grows and functions at its maximum rate, and the production of thousands of different commodities and services can be kept in optimum balance when producers, on the basis of current prices and wages, can make reasonably correct anticipations of supply and demand, of costs, profits, or losses.

But when inflation forces up prices, prices do not all rise in the same proportion or at the same rate. Businessmen cannot distinguish between what is lasting and what is merely temporary, or know what the future demands of consumers will be or what the real costs of their own operations are. Depreciation and replacement allowances will be inadequate. Profits will be overestimated. Businessmen everywhere will be deceived. They will be using up their real capital when they think they are increasing it. They will think they have profits or capital gains when they really have losses.

By distorting economic calculation and creating illusory profits, inflation destroys the function of the free market in penalizing inefficiency and misjudgment and rewarding efficiency and good judgment. Because nearly everything seems to prosper, there are all sorts of maladjustments and investments in the wrong lines. Solid work tends to give way to speculation and gambling.

EFFECT OF CONTROLS

The price and wage rises brought about by inflation will lead to demands for price and wage controls. But such controls will reduce and distort production, and do far more harm even than the inflation itself.

What is likely even before price controls is some sort of exchange control, to prevent the quotation of the home currency from falling in terms of other currencies. But the effect of such exchange controls will be to bring about a deficit in the balance of payments. It will discourage exports, because they will be overpriced compared with foreign goods. It will encourage imports. The exchange authorities, to prevent this, will institute quota and licensing systems. But these will disrupt foreign trade and domestic production.

Thus the longrun effect of inflation can only be to distort production and to retard economic growth. Of coures, this effect can be concealed from many people for a long time. For prices and wages and incomes will all be constantly going higher in dollar terms. The official gross national product figures will be constantly soaring. The euphoria can temporarily lull all misgivings. But eventually the bitter moment of truth must arrive.

No Wheat Referendum This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, reflecting on the wheat certificate program put into effect this year despite farmer opposition to a similar scheme last May 21, a wheatgrower penned this somber essay and delivered it by hand to me:

WHEN IS OUR WHEAT REFERENDUM THIS YEAR?—THERE AIN'T NONE

In Germany, Hitler held frequent elections until the people started voting against his program, then he eliminated the elections and later he eliminated the objectors—in a concentration camp—boom.

In Russia, Stalin held frequent elections until the people started voting against his program, then he eliminated the elections and later he eliminated the objectors—sent to Siberia—never returned.

In the United States, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture held frequent elections on the wheat program until the people started voting against their program, then they eliminated the elections, and as for the objectors——

(You can complete this paragraph yourself in 25 words or less and if you win first place, you may be the first to go. Send all entries to Secretary Freeman.)

The Price Is Not Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1964 issue of Rural Electrification, an editorial criticizes the Edison Electric Institute and its president, Mr. Walter Bouldin. The NRECA is certainly entitled to offer rebuttal to Mr. Bouldin's comments, but I think we should review what Mr. Bouldin has said before we evaluate the statement: "Bouldin's comments echo those made in power company propaganda ads—an intense campaign to wreck rural electric systems by eliminating their right to generate their own power."

Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Bouldin's speech before the EEI fourth financial conference at Colorado Springs, Colo., on May 5:

THE PRICE IS NOT RIGHT

(By Walter Bouldin, president, Edison Electric Institute, before the EEI Fourth Financial Conference, Colorado Springs, Colo., May 3–5, 1964)

One of our better known makers of epigrams called a cynic "A man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing." There is enough truth in that to make an epigram; but the deeper truth is that, under the rules of the American system, price and value are almost synonymous. For if the price is much greater than the value, no one will buy; and if the price is too much less than the value, we will produce enough for the supply to bring the value down. In the electric utility industry, we reach much the same result in another way. We sellers of electricity are in much the same position as the sellers in the Rubaiyat in that there is little we can buy that is one-half so precious as the stuff we sell. So, the price we receive for our product is largely based on cost—original cost, or reproduction cost of plant, or cost of operation and cost of capital. That basic rule is enforced by stringent regulation so that under our system, we can nearly always say the price is right. It's a

good system; it is a pity so many look at its faults instead of its fruits.

Electric power sold by the Government is the glaring anomaly in our system of the right price. The American people quite a while ago realized that the sale of securities on inflated values was not in the public interest, and they took firm legislative steps to insure that in the security business the price is right. It's rather saddening to realize that Government in the power business is wreaking the same something-for-nothing injustice that can be done by inflated security values. Government power works its injustice not by inflating but by deflating costs. The result is that masterpiece of misnomenclature, "cheap public power."

It does not require a high moral sense to recognize that it is an injustice to conscript one man's labor for the benefit of another without fair compensation. Yet Government power conscripts without fair compensation the labor of many for the benefit of the few. The labor of many men, in the form of taxes, has been conscripted to build Government electric power facilities; and the great majority of those many men receive no fair compensation for their labor. The relatively few men who use the Government power pay for that use of the earnings of the many only a fraction of what those earnings were worth to the men from whom they were taken.

Spenders for Government power largely overlook this cost of that power. They disregard the basic fact that when a man's earnings are taken from him by taxation, he loses every year thereafter the return he could have obtained from investment of those earnings; or he loses what may be worth far more to him—the use of those earnings for such purpose as the education of his children. When his earnings are taken from him to build electric facilities for the use of others, he is entitled to receive from those others the value of what was taken from him. The cost of his labor is as truly a cost as any other cost. If a person loses money through investment, at least it is a result of his own choice. The taxpayer whose earnings are invested in Government-power facilities has no such choice; and having no choice, he is even more entitled to just compensation.

You don't have to be a tax expert to see that it is unjust for a citizen to escape taxes for the support of his Government on benefits he enjoys while his neighbor, under the same circumstances, pays taxes for those same benefits. And that, too, is inherent in "cheap public power." A customer of an investor-owned power company, for the benefit of using electric power, pays about 23 cents for taxes in every dollar's worth of electricity he buys. In contrast, the customer of Government power pays only about 3¼ cents for the support of his Government in each dollar's worth of electricity he buys. I have never heard even a plausible argument to justify a situation in which one citizen pays about seven times as much taxes to obtain electric service as a fellow citizen does. If those Government-power customers were underprivileged, there might be some justification; but, by and large, those customers are the same kind of Americans as the rest of us. And it is, of course, no answer to our customers to say that they must pay taxes because there is a profit involved. If all business were operated on a nonprofit basis, all of us would still have to pay taxes. Government would still be necessary, and Government would still be expensive.

Let's assume that these basic ethics were applied to the pricing of Government power, that the taxpayer who built the Government-power facilities is entitled to adequate compensation for his earnings, and that American citizens of the same kind should pay the same amount of taxes for the same benefits.

Let's apply those principles to some specific Government-power installations. Bonneville Power Administration by the end of fiscal year 1962 was selling electric power produced at 15 Federal projects with a generating capacity of about 6½ million kilowatts, and Bonneville had under construction five other projects having a capacity of about 2 million kilowatts. These 20 projects, as of June 30, 1962, had cost the taxpayers about $2.5 billion, of which $1.8 billion was allocated to power facilities. Let's assume that the taxpayers who built these projects were given a fair break and the customers of Bonneville were required to pay a modest 5 percent per annum compensation for the use of taxpayers' money and were required to pay taxes on the same basis that customers of investor-owned utilities pay; that is, at the rate of about 5.3 percent on electric plant in service. Bonneville power customers would have had to pay $165 million more for their power in fiscal 1962 than they did pay; Bonneville's rates to its customers would have been increased by 221 percent; and the taxpayers of the United States would have been better off by that amount of $165 million.

One of the expressed justifications for the Tennessee Valley Authority was that it would be an instrument for seeing that the price was right. It was even given the name of "yardstick." This gigantic power system, at the end of fiscal year 1963, had a generating capacity of 12,700,000 kilowatts. Only 30 percent of that capacity was operated by waters which TVA was created to develop. Seventy percent of that capacity was operated by steam. At the end of 1963, TVA had an investment in electric power facilities, exclusive of those devoted to serving the Atomic Energy Commission, of approximately $1.8 billion. Of this amount, approximately $1.2 billion represents contributions made by the taxpayers and earnings on those contributions. Now let's assume that TVA prices were made right by giving the taxpayer the same fair break we have assumed in the case of Bonneville. The TVA rates would have been increased about 75 percent to about the same level as investor-owned utility rates; and the TVA customers, returning the American taxpayer no more than he was due, would have paid for the benefit of the taxpayers $130 million more in that year than those customers actually paid.

The same simple device of disregarding the cost to the taxpayer which has been so useful in promoting government-owned power has been adopted by the Rural Electrification Administration. When REA began its work, it was under no pressure to adopt such a device. Everyone knew that the price of bringing electric service to all rural America would be high, and very few taxpayers begrudged the $3.5 billion they contributed without adequate return to accomplish that purpose. The need for such service, and the resulting benefit to our whole economy, was a sufficient justification. But REA was not content to do that useful job of bringing electric service to people who didn't have it. REA undertook a program of providing generation and transmission (G. & T.) facilities to its co-ops; and because these G. & T. facilities must necessarily displace the facilities of investor-owned utilities, REA, too, to excuse that displacement, must disregard the cost to the taxpayers of its G. & T. loans. REA says it will make these G. & T. loans where generation by co-op plants is "cheaper" than the rates offered by investor-owned companies. But in estimating the costs of G. & T. generation, REA does not take into account the cost of these plants to the taxpayers. And every one of those loans involves a very high cost to the taxpayers, because the co-ops, too, pay for the use of our tax money only a fraction of its worth and because the taxpayers must carry the tax burden which these co-op plants escape. Again, as in the case of the federally owned plants, the price of federally financed power is largely paid by the unfairly compensated labor of taxpayers.

Disregard of taxpayers' cost almost reaches the point of oblivion in the proposal to harness the tides of Passamaquoddy Bay. This project, together with the proposed hydroelectric power project on the St. John River, would cost the taxpayers about $1.2 billion. These two projects would have an installed capacity of about 1,750,000 kilowatts in order to provide 1,125,000 kilowatts of firm capacity at the load, a million kilowatts of which would be available for only 1 hour a day. The firm output of Passamaquoddy is estimated to be not more than 1.3 billion kilowatt-hours, with an additional billion kilowatt-hours of predictable offpeak energy. If the cost to the taxpayers were computed as we are doing, every firm kilowatt-hour generated by the project would be priced at almost 10 cents, over 5½ times the average rate per kilowatt-hour paid to the investor-owned utilities in this country in 1963. A combination of pumped-storage plants and a steamplant could do the same job at an average cost of approximately 13½ mills per kilowatt-hour, including a return of 6 percent on the money invested and Federal taxes of some $3.7 million a year. In other words, Quoddy would be a $60 harness on a $10 horse.

There is now pending before the Congress legislation which involves these principles. There are, as you know, plans to build a Federal transmission intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest.

The Westland amendment to the regional preference bill would give Congress an opportunity to scrutinize the costs and other important aspects of this project by requiring Federal authorization prior to Federal construction of transmission lines outside the Pacific Northwest. This amendment was contained in the bill as passed by the House. The principle of this amendment is, of course, even more important than the immediate projects involved; it is essential to preserve basic congressional authority, authority over Federal policy and public purse.

The American taxpayers have now contributed for Federal Government-owned power facilities and REA generation and transmission facilities about $8 billion. If the customers of those facilities paid the American taxpayer a fair compensation for that investment and paid taxes equivalent to those paid by the customers of investor-owned utilities, the American taxpayer would be better off by about $500 million every year. That is a measure of what the pricing of "cheap public power" is now costing us. If these Government-financed facilities continue to expand at the rate they have in the past, in 10 years those facilities will have a generating capacity of about 65 million kilowatts; they will represent an investment of approximately $20 billion; and the annual cost to our taxpayers will be about $1.5 billion per year.

The price of "cheap public power" is not right; but the costs of Government power are real, as real as taxes. And those costs are as great as or greater than the cost of investor-owned power. The difference is that investor-owned power customers pay the cost of their power; the cost of Government power is paid in large part by the taxpayers who do not use Government power. Americans pay enough taxes for the legitimate purposes of their governments; they should not be required to pay taxes to reduce their neighbors' electric bills.

The fine disregard of the taxpayers' cost in the pricing of power from Government projects does the taxpayer a grave injustice. This is compounded by the injustice which that policy does to investers in our industry and the employees of our industry. That

policy also does an injustice to every community which is competing for development with communities which are served by Government power. Chambers of commerce please note these injustices could be easily remedied by making the price of Government power right, by placing the costs of Government power where they belong—on the people who use it. The Government takes great pains to see to it that we citizens make our prices right; we citizens should see to it that our Government sets a good example.

Hon. Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the body of the RECORD today I have joined my colleagues in our sad farewells to the memory of CLARENCE CANNON, a tower of influence in this House which has been only infrequently matched. These remarks are addressed to a subject related closely to the acquisition of that influence. The power of the purse is practically absolute, and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations exercises a control which is felt to the outermost corners of our far-flung Government. It was my great privilege to work with Mr. CANNON in saving billions for our taxpayers.

By the time a man such as Mr. CANNON has lasted in this House long enough to become chairman of the Appropriations Committee, or any of the major committees, he has been distilled into an experienced public servant. He has faced the voters many times, and they have responded by returning him to the Congress time and time again.

No fraud, no phony, can manipulate a confidence game through the several terms it takes to become chairman of an important congressional committee. The voters are sure to find him out sooner or later, usually sooner.

The Washington Daily News commented on the congressional seniority system the other day in an editorial which is a relief to read when compared to so many we see in which the Congress is condemned because a writer or an editor thinks popularity should be substituted for long experience.

In the long run, I am sure this country is a lot better off because its most valuable public servants do not make decisions based on whether or not it will improve or hurt their public image.

At this point I would like to include the pertinent parts of the News editorial which relates to CLARENCE CANNON, GEORGE MAHON, and the occasional genius of the seniority system.

POWER THROUGH SENIORITY

The death of CLARENCE CANNON plus the succession of GEORGE H. MAHON offers the country a glimpse into how our Government works. There is nothing secret about it. The glamour of the Presidency simply distracts attention from a handful of powerful men in the House of Representatives whose influence in their chosen fields is second only to that of the man in the White House. Since they stay on and on, while Presidents change, this influence even may be greater.

CLARENCE CANNON, Member of the House for more than 40 years, had been chairman of the House Appropriations Committee for 22 years. Mr. MAHON, who now becomes chairman, has been a member of the same committee for 24 years.

Appropriation legislation must originate in the House, hence this committee, and particularly its chairman, may be said to hold the Government's purse strings. Chairman CANNON fought the spending trend, working long hours at it. Overall it was a losing fight but his sharp pencil saved billions. Congressman MAHON seems a man of similar stamp. Son of a Texas tenant farmer, he knows the value of a dollar and is dedicated to the job.

These two men are among the finer products of the much-criticized seniority system which tends to bring a Congressman to power if he lives long enough and keeps getting reelected. Another is CARL VINSON, soon to retire after half a century in Congress. As chairman for 16 years of Naval Affairs and, for the last 14 years, of the Armed Services Committee, he has contributed perhaps more to the defense of this country than any living man.

Other outstanding and devoted legislators who have risen to power by means of the seniority system could be named.

It is not likely that Congress will abandon its seniority system any time soon, particularly not so long as, even occasionally, it produces men of the caliber of CLARENCE CANNON.

Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major questions concerning Americans these days is the cause of business failures. Two things are known: business failures are increasing, and little is known why they fail. In light of this, it is encouraging that business itself is seizing the initiative to find the answer to this question plaguing the business community.

In a recent speech, Robert Beyer, managing partner of the international accounting firm, Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart, said U.S. Government agencies and business should unite in a "war on business failures." Relating his proposal to the current focus on poverty in America, Beyer pointed out that business failures are wasteful, dislocate communities, and create unemployment. Thus, Bayer suggests the creation of a task force by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Department of Commerce and other interested groups to "investigate in depth a number of business failures each year to determine the exact causes of these failures. These findings," Beyer adds, "would help to establish guidelines which might help to reduce this needless waste."

Mr. Speaker, Robert Beyer has made a useful contribution to the current effort to revitalize the country's sluggish economy. I include a portion of his speech, which was made before the 68th Annual Credit Congress of the National Association of Credit Management in Los Angeles, in the RECORD:

BUSINESS FAILURES

Here are just a few sobering facts that appeared in newspapers in the last few months, buried more or less by the flashier financial headlines about record sales, stock splits and soaring stock averages.

In March 1963, business failures were reported to have risen about 30 percent over the preceding 5-year period.

In November 1963, Dun & Bradstreet reported 13,470 business failures for the year. In just 1 week, failures among companies with assets of over $100,000 were almost double those of the same week in the previous year.

In 1962 close to $1½ billion was lost as a result of business failures and there was a 40-percent rise in failures of companies with indebtedness of a million or more dollars over the previous year.

Business blunders come in all sizes and in all shapes. Some involve small businessmen. Others involve giants. For most of these, the statistics speak for themselves; thousands of failures every year, many of which could have been prevented by a proper application of effective managerial control tools which are now available.

What to do about all this? Well, what we're doing right here is good. We're talking about it, and, through this discussion, creating greater awareness. But there is more that can and must be done.

We have all heard about President Johnson's war on poverty. A worthy undertaking indeed. I would propose that there is another aspect to the war on poverty that may have been overlooked. Every time there is a business failure it dislocates communities and its citizens. It creates more unemployment.

Let's stop accepting these business blunders and failures as a sickness that must be with us. Of course not every business will succeed. But we must learn everything we can about business failures and apply our intelligence to help reduce these failures to an absolute minimum. According to a somewhat limited study made by the Bureau of Business Research at the University of Pittsburgh, there is a general feeling among people that a shortage of working capital is the underlying reason for most bankruptcies. There is a strong indication in the report that this may not be the case. While a shortage of working capital exists in nearly every bankruptcy, it may be that it is only symptomatic of a more basic deficiency—thoroughly inadequate managerial information.

To help achieve some forward progress in this area I propose that the U.S. Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, join forces to establish a series of conferences across the country to investigate the causes of business failures. Let's establish some task forces that will investigate in depth a number of business failures. And let us use this information to help establish guidelines that will help reduce this waste—much of which is needless.

And in addition, gentlemen, I would propose to your association that this subject of business failures be considered as a major topic for serious investigation at your next year's credit congress. There is to my mind no topic of greater importance to the progress fo American business and the welfare of our Nation.

Gentlemen, we who are concerned with numbers face a great challenge. More and more industry is turning to numbers-oriented men like you and me for greater leadership. We must prepare ourselves to provide this leadership.

In many large corporations such as General Electric, Chrysler, and others, top management comes from the ranks of those who are at home with numbers. And the challenge is also to our schools to turn out the men and women equipped to provide the leadership that will, more and more, be required as industry becomes more and more concerned with planning for profits.

Your Air Force: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the miracle of flight is today often overshadowed in the public mind by the glamor of space experiments. Some already look upon aeronautics as a "dead science."

This is regrettable, for there is nothing—rockets or otherwise—that can compare with the incredible growth and achievement of the airplane in the last half-century.

Great though the past may be, it is but the threshold of what we hope to accomplish in the future. Neither man nor his imagination is any longer earthbound; we must not rest until we are equally as competent in the air as on the ground. We must continue to expand our frontiers into space—hand in hand with air science, not as a superseding science but as a parallel development.

Along these lines, Gen. Mark Bradley, U.S. Air Force, Commander of Air Force Logistics Command in Dayton, Ohio, has made an excellent address. I can recall no peer to this fine summary of past developments and future hopes. General Bradley's speech now follows:

YOUR AIR FORCE: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

(Address by Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., Reserve Officers Convention, Youngstown, Ohio, May 2, 1964)

Good evening. I am both honored and pleased to be in Youngstown for this occasion. I always welcome the opportunity to meet, address, or associate with members of the Reserve components of our Nation's Armed Forces.

I have often remarked—in talking about the Air Force Logistics Command—that the element that really keeps the Air Force at "go" is its people. People are our most important resource. In my opinion, this equally applies throughout the Department of Defense and especially to the Reserve components.

Since the heroic Minutemen rallied to Lexington in 1775, the Reserves have maintained their professional military capabilities in peace, and effectively and willingly responded to the Nation's emergency calls when war or the threat of war made their services necessary. Despite the marvelous advances in technology and the miracles of pushbutton electronics, the importance of people has in no wise diminished. A trained, organized, and responsive Reserve force remains as the most vital defense resource in support of the Regular establishments.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize the city of Youngstown and its contributions to the strength and defense of our country. I cannot begin to list each and every product manufactured or produced here which is used in the country's defense effort, but from my own experience during World War II, I am personally acquainted with the interlocking landing mats—fabricated here in Youngstown—which quickly provided serviceable landing strips for close air support in the Pacific area. And today, thousands of tons of Youngstown steel encase our hardened missile sites, and are incorporated in our most modern weapons of war.

Every segment of our defense establishment has an important role to play—whether on land, at sea or in the medium we have come to describe as aerospace. They must work well together as a team, and it is an encouraging fact that they do. Their missions are big enough and difficult enough to keep them all busy around the clock, every day in the year.

Since I have been in the air arm throughout my career, I want to talk to you on the subject: "Your Air Force—Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow."

When we think about the beginning of military aviation in this country, we are impressed by how little we had to work with and how far we have come since then. Even planes of the type I flew 30 years ago are now museum pieces.

We had no radios. Whenever we went higher than 10,000 feet we were in a hostile environment. We had no pressure masks, no high altitude suits, no pressurized cabins. We got our oxygen from a rubber tube held between the lips.

In World War I, the first use of the airplane was for reconnaissance. The early days were marked by a kind of chivalry. Pilots waved politely to members of the other side as their planes passed.

This situation, as could have been expected, didn't last long. As air reconnaissance began to decide the outcome of battles, both sides realized the need to control the skies. Airmen began to fight, first with small arms and air-to-air bombs and then with machine guns. After that came the bombers and the entire concept of warfare was transformed.

The airplane proved its importance in World War I, but there were still many people who remained unconvinced. The job of developing airpower continued to be a hard struggle. Years after the end of hostilities, the Army was still using balloon squadrons. In short, as World War II approached, we were still preparing—as far as airplanes were concerned—to fight the First World War. Our aircraft engines were not designed for fighting at the highest possible altitude. They were really only the commercial type engine. We had not put enough money or effort in development to have proper military engines.

There has been a fortunate and heartening change in public opinion since those days. The American people now are well aware that superior aerospace power is essential to their security and they give it full support.

In talking about the Air Force of today, it must be pointed out that the service has many great missions. The operating of aircraft and missiles is just the most visible part, the portion of the iceberg that can be seen above the water. Examples of other missions include the providing of missile test range facilities for all the services and the National Aeronautical and Space Administration. Then there is our communications network, which is one of the most extensive and efficient in the world. And in weather forecasting we furnish another service that has obvious importance.

On the more visible side is the difficult and complex task performed by the strategic forces, our principal war deterrent. A considerable portion of the startegic air command's striking power is still provided by manned bombers.

The last B-52 was delivered in October of 1962. To lengthen and enhance the service life of this aging bomber we began a major structural modification program last year and made additional improvements in its penetration capability. The B-58's capabilities also are being increased by various modification programs.

Approximately 50 percent of the strategic bomber force was maintained on alert at the beginning of 1963. The force consisted of B-47's, B-52's, and B-58's. The total number on alert decreased by the end of the year. This was because of the phase-down of certain B-47 wings. The trend will continue during 1964 for the same reason.

There have been significant developments in the field of strategic missiles, with more to come. We have completed deployment of the Atlas and Titan I and Titan II, the latter of which uses storable fuel.

An important milestone was reached early last month when SAC acquired its third wing of combat-ready Minuteman missiles. Completion of this wing—at Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak.—increased the force of these instant ICBMs to 450, the half-way point in the program. Our success in fielding this missile has been phenomenal. The Minuteman is proving reliable; it has been on schedule.

The Tactical Air Command continues to improve an already effective capability for close air support of the Army and tactical air warfare any place in the world. TAC's fleet is being modernized as the F-4C's come into the inventory. This is a truly wonderful airplane, developed by the Navy. Since the day I first flew one in 1961, I have had my hat off to the Navy.

This brings up an example of the excellent teamwork between the services that I mentioned earlier. We have worked out procurement and support arrangements with the Navy for all models of the F-4 aircraft, resulting in lower costs and improved management. Also demonstrating interservice cooperation is the Air Force's use of 29 F-4B Navy aircraft for combat training.

Good progress has been made in the TFX program. The Air Force version, known as the F-111A, is due to make its first flight by the end of the year. With its relatively short takeoff and landing characteristics, this is our tactical fighter of the future. The F-111A will be an excellent weapon system, capable of high speed at low and high altitudes and carrying versatile ordnance.

An important element of this system is the joint Navy-Air Force participation in its acquisition. The Air Force is responsible for management; but complete integration of project personnel throughout the management and technical areas has been achieved by the two services.

Our airlift capability was well demonstrated in Operation Big Lift, conducted last October by the Military Air Transport Command. For the first time in military history an entire division was airlifted from one continent to another.

The movement required what might be described as a 5,600-mile air bridge to Europe. More than 350 planes took part and over 15,000 Army troops were flown to Europe together with 1 million pounds of battle equipment. The exercise was completed in 63 hours and it could have been done in less time had the Army required it.

Here again we see an example of excellent teamwork between the Air Force and the Army. And the Logistics Command is proud of the job it did in assuring that the trans-

port planes involved were in a "go" condition.

A big step forward in airlift capability will be made with the entrance into the inventory of the C-141 Starlifter, which began flight testing last December. This is a truly modern jet transport, specifically designed for its tasks. It will add a new dimension to our long-range transport ability.

In thinking about the Air Force of tomorrow, we realize we face a twofold challenge. We must make the proper selection of weapon systems for the future; we must direct research leading to systems even farther off. Decisions made now will determine what weapons we will have in the seventies.

In the area of military capabilities in space, the Air Force has a problem of research and development that seeks to assure that this country is first. There is some reason for optimism. Our Titan III program is proceeding in a satisfactory manner.

The Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL), which has been approved for development under Air Force management, is the next major step. It will provide the means of determining the usefulness and capabilities of man in space and the advantages which may come from military space operations. Also, it will serve as a platform to support testing of procedures and equipment.

At this point I would like to deal with an area that may seem a bit away from my subject. But it's a matter of concern to me, and I'm sure to many of you. I refer to the rash of books, movies, and articles attacking the military and the so-called industrial-military complex.

Much of this is labeled as fiction. Personally, I think it's all fiction, whether so described or not. I realize that the desire to write a best seller is natural. Also, that fiction—to be dramatic—must tell about conflict between the good guys and the bad guys.

As in all walks of life, leaders of the military and of defense industry are not perfect. But for my money their ethics and patriotism are of the highest standards. And certainly they are far above the depraved portrayal which seems currently to be popular with some people.

Last month we lost a great American hero—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He devoted his long and immensely useful life to great ideals—duty, honor, country. Other generals I know—while not matching him in stature—are jsut as dedicated to those great ideals.

The real world is quite different from the imaginary one. Our real opponents are the Communist leaders whose goal is the defeat of the free world. In the real world, our military forces and our defense industry are keeping them from reaching their goal. It would be appropriate at this time to take a look at the record of the military, especially during the recent past—a record that most of you will remember. Initially, the United States suffered several losses—at Pearl Harbor, at Bataan, and at Wake Island following the surprise attack of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor. From that time on, the leadership by the military created a record that is probably unsurpassed. The U.S. Navy fought the submarines in the Atlantic and the Japanese Navy in the Pacific, and won commanding superiority of all the seas. The Air Force, then under the Army, fought the air battle in Europe along with our allies, mainly the British. We were never turned back from an offensive raid.

We bombed the factories, centers of transportation, airfields and other targets and shot down the enemy's fighters until we had won complete air superiority. We and the Navy similarly won the air battle in the Pacific. Our Army, except for its early losses at Bataan and approximately 2,000 prisoners at Kasserine Pass in Africa, never lost sizable groups of prisoners to the enemy. Every other major power involved in the war, friendly and enemy, lost soldiers by the tens of thousands. Our forces have never been turned back from an organized landing. You will remember Normandy, North Africa and many landings in the Pacific. General Eisenhower, General MacArthur and General Clark all commanded allied forces. We can be proud of the leadership that we have found among the military professionals of this country. I have no doubt that similar leadership is available today.

Certainly, we have a large and capable defense industry. The American people can be thankful for that. In the real world of nuclear weapons, there is no time to convert our factories from the production of consumer goods, as in the past.

Our military power and our defense industry are no threat to world peace, regardless of what imaginary characters may say or do. On the contrary, in the real world they serve to deter war—they represent power for peace. SAC's motto is: "Peace is our Profession."

Now, I want to summarize some of my main points:

(1) Airpower has made almost unbelievable advances since the early days of aviation.

(2) Superior weapons and men—in the air, at sea, and on land—are preserving peace and protecting the security of America and the free world.

(3) The weapons of the future depend on the decisions that are being made now. The Air Force sees the need for continuing and improving a flexible mixed force of missiles and manned aircraft.

(4) We must have military capabilities in space in order to prevent space from being dominated by aggressors.

(5) There is no resemblance between the real world, in which our military strength serves to keep the peace, and the imaginary world we are being exposed to in some books, movies and articles. Our officers and our leaders in industry are patriots of the highest order.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that we cannot be satisfied or complacent—we cannot ignore the need for constant improvement. History shows that new weapons do not long remain invulnerable. In a dangerous and quickly changing world, we can never afford to be second best in military power—either in men or weapons.

Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial from the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., gives an excellent argument for voluntary prayer in our public schools and elsewhere, and a very clear analysis of the Becker amendment.

I trust the editorial will be read by the opponents of the amendment as they do not realize, in most instances, how far the Supreme Court decision can lead us.

It is my understanding that there is already a strong move underway to strike the words, "under God" from the oath of allegiance.

The editorial follows:

[From the Newburgh (N.Y.), Evening News, May 19, 1964]

PRAYER AMENDMENT

Those testifying before Congress on the prayer amendment, as all Americans, should bear in mind what the amendment says—and does not say.

The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The requirement extends to State and local governments, too.

Varying additions to this keystone of the Bill of Rights have been proposed. The one primarily under consideration is proposed by Representative FRANK BECKER, Long Island Republican. It says:

"1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from or listening to prayers or Biblical scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school institution or place or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

If the only issue involved were the recital of prayers in schools, there would be less reason for tampering with the Bill of Rights for the first time since its adoption 173 years ago.

But the threat to America's spiritual foundation is far more serious, and the Becker amendment meets it head on.

In a U.S. Supreme Court prayer ruling last year, it was held that the government must maintain "strict neutrality" toward religious exercises, neither aiding nor opposing religion."

The trend of court decisions indicates that the small but determined band of those who are fighting all Government involvement in religion will succeed if the first amendment remains as is.

Carried to its logical conclusion, that would mean that Christmas, Chanukah, and Thanksgiving observances or symbols must be banned from school or other Government institutions. The national motto, "In God We Trust," must be erased from coins and judges' benches. Prayers must not be said during sessions of any legislative body.

The words "under God" must be deleted from the pledge of allegiance to the flag. "The Star-Spangled Banner" will be an illegal part of the national anthem. Government funds may not be used to finance religious funerals of national leaders. Baccalaureate or chapel services may not be held at Government-supported high schools or colleges.

Chaplains may not serve the armed services or prisons. Church property will no longer be exempted from taxation. Presidential religious proclamations will be prohibited, and Government officials from the President down must stop appealing to Almighty God for guidance in speeches made on taxpayers' time.

Taken together, such prohibitions would constitute not Government "neutrality" toward religion but Government-enforced atheism, stripping our national life of any official reference to religion.

That is what the Becker amendment is aimed at preventing.

Opponents of the amendment, including many leading church figures, contend that no such result is threatened by the court rulings.

But it would have strained belief not long ago to think that the High Court would bar

recital of nonsectarian prayers and the reading of Bible verses in the schools, even when children could be excused from participation at their parents' request.

The Becker amendment's foes also have predicted, in all sincerity, that its approval will lead to an establishment of religion—that is, the protection or promotion of a religious denomination by Government.

If so, why didn't that happen in the 170-odd years of school prayers and official recognition of God before the Supreme Court acted? And why did almost all the religious leaders who now fear this outcome fail to act against it by calling upon the High Court to rule out the school prayers and other acts they now find so dangerous to religious liberty?

Certainy it is the task of churches and parents, not schools or Government, to teach religion to children. But the removal of all references to God from public life would pose a positive menace to religion by fostering indifference to and ignorance of religion among children and adults alike.

We believe in the separation of church and state. We hold with the Founding Fathers that no citizen should be persecuted because of his religious beliefs, or lack of them.

But we also believe as the Nation's founders believed, that America's liberties and its very existence are bestowed by divine providence. Voluntary expression of belief in God in our schools and in public life must be permitted for the vast majority of Americans who share that conviction.

Exchange of Letters Concerning NATO Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican task force on NATO unity, of which I am chairman, desires that constructive, bipartisan action be taken to strengthen the Western Alliance.

We recently wrote President Johnson, concerning a specific recommendation which my colleagues and I feel would go far toward strengthening the structure of NATO. The text of our letter to President Johnson and the reply we received follow:

The problems you are encountering illustrate the dangerous disarray of this vital free-world association and the urgency of revitalizing it.

We believe the time has come for an immediate and thorough study of the NATO structure itself. The house of freedom can be no stronger than its foundation and framework. We hope structural improvements can be accomplished which will make NATO more durable and effective in serving the many common interests of the North Atlantic community—economically and politically, as well as militarily.

The task is urgent and vital. It calls for the very best talent the United States and other NATO nations can offer. We therefore urge that you invite former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S Truman to head a blue-ribbon delegation of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations for the purpose of formulating and proposing for ratification improvements in the structure of NATO.

General Eisenhower and Mr. Truman had more to do with the formation of NATO in 1949 than any other two men.

They have intimate, firsthand knowledge of the NATO structure and its problems. They are held in high esteem throughout the North Atlantic community, and their appointment to this task would undoubtedly motivate other NATO heads of state to select their very best talent too.

Our committee consists entirely of Republicans, but we view this as a responsibility and opportunity which calls for full bipartisanship. We therefore offer our fullest cooperation and would like to meet with you at your convenience.

Mr. Speaker, the letter was signed by Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, who is chairman of the task force and all of its members. They are: CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan; JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona; HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts; ROGERS MORTON, of Maryland; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York; ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana; CHARLES GOODELL, of New York; JOHN BALDWIN, of California; JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire; TOM CURTIS, of Missouri; PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois; GERALD FORD, of Michigan; and ROBERT ELLSWORTH, of Kansas.

The reply follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 18, 1964.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to acknowledge the letter of May 14 to the President signed by the House Republican Task Force on NATO Unity.

Your recommendations will have the President's careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

"Hidden" Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Federal spending outside the administrative budget is becoming an increasingly important factor in measuring the total flow of Federal expenditures and their economic impact. Including the spending of 76 public enterprise funds, which appear in the budget only on a net basis, and 134 trust funds, total Federal outlays or gross expenditures in fiscal 1965 will approach $150 billion.

This compares to an estimated $97.9 billion of expenditures in the administrative budget alone. Administrative budget expenditures now represent less than two-thirds of total gross Federal spending, as compared with 72 percent in 1958. Since 1955 trust fund spending has increased more than 245 percent, while gross disbursements of public enterprises increased 150 percent.

With regard to public enterprise funds, one effect of netting their receipts and expenditures is to obscure a substantial segment of Federal financial operations. During the current fiscal year, gross disbursements of these funds are estimated at $22.2 billion. However, the administrative budget shows only a net expenditure for such activities of $3.7 billion.

Even the total of nearly $150 billion in gross Federal disbursements does not provide the full picture of the scope and depth of Federal expenditure transactions. A number of Federal activities, including the Federal Reserve System, are classified as self-supporting. Their expenditures are not subjected to Presidential review and, for the most part, they are omitted from the budget document. Outlays for these activities are in excess of $6 billion this year.

Intragovernmental revolving and management funds are also excluded from the above totals. Within the Defense Department, gross disbursements of such funds will total an estimated $11.6 billion in fiscal 1965.

The danger of these developments is that the full scope of opportunity for control of Federal spending can no longer be grasped from the administrative budget alone. Nor can the public appreciate the full economic impact or the potential scope for improved efficiency in Federal financial operations except from the gross figures.

A recent study published by the Tax Foundation on the "Federal Budget for Fiscal 1965," develops this subject in considerable detail, and under unanimous consent I place No. 6 in the foundation's series on budget briefs in the RECORD at this point:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1965—GROSS FEDERAL SPENDING APPROACHING $150 BILLION—NO. 6 IN A SERIES OF BUDGET BRIEFS

With but few exceptions previous bulletins in this series have dealt with Federal administrative budget totals—those most commonly referred to in citizen discussion of the Federal budget. For many years almost all major Federal financial transactions were reflected in the administrative budget totals.

Although the administrative budget remains the principal vehicle for management and decisionmaking purposes, in recent years Federal expenditures outside the regular budget totals have become an increasingly important factor in measuring the total flow of Federal spending. This has come about primarily through the increased use of two types of funds which are reflected only in small part, or not at all, in the regular budget totals. These are:

Public enterprise funds, which are used to finance a cycle of operations organized usually on a business-type basis and whose expenditures appear in the administrative budget totals only on a net basis (the excess of expenditures over receipts); and

Trust funds established to account for receipts which are held in a fiduciary capacity by the Government for use in carrying out specific purposes and programs.

Actually, total Federal outlays or gross expenditures in fiscal 1965 will probably approach $150 billion. Moreover, in recent years administrative budget expenditures have represented a declining proportion of the total gross Federal expenditures. Table 1 traces the growth in public enterprise and trust fund operations, as compared with administrative budget expenditures.

Though administrative budget expenditures have increased since 1958, from $71.4 billion to about $98 billion, these expenditures represent less than two-thirds of total gross Federal spending now as compared with more than 72 percent in 1958.

Although the major portion of expenditures under both trust and public enterprise fund activities is carried out through a few of the larger funds, there has been in recent years a remarkable proliferation of funds. By actual count, 134 trust funds and 76 public enterprise funds are listed in the detailed appendix to the fiscal 1965 budget—though many may not be active in each fiscal year.

TRUST FUNDS

Trust fund receipts and expenditures are completely outside the administrative budget, though they are included in the consolidated cash budget totals.

Trust fund receipts are derived primarily through (1) taxes which are, in effect, earmarked for certain purposes (as in the case of the social security, unemployment benefit, and highway programs) or (2) contributions from individuals (as in the case of the Federal employees' retirement and health benefit funds). A third significant source of income to these funds is interest on investments; in fiscal 1965, for example, the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund will receive an estimated $553 million from interest on investments in U.S. securities.

In fiscal 1955 trust fund receipts totaled $9.5 billion. By 1960 the total had risen to $21.4 billion, and for fiscal 1965 it is estimated that they will rise to $30.9 billion.

While administrative budget expenditures have risen greatly over the past decade—from $64.4 billion in fiscal 1955 to an estimated $98.4 billion in the current year—trust fund expenditures have increased much more sharply in percentage terms. From $8.5 billion in fiscal 1955, trust fund spending has jumped to an estimated $29.3 billion in this (1964) fiscal year, and to a predicted $29.4 billion in fiscal 1965—an increase of more than 245 percent.

Table 2 provides totals indicating the expenditures of the major trust funds and the overall increase in trust fund spending over the past decade.

The Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, through which social security retirement benefits are paid, is by far the largest of the trust fund operations. Its expenditures are estimated at more than $16 billion in the next fiscal year. An additional $1.4 billion will be spent through the disability insurance trust fund, of more recent origin. These two funds account for about 60 percent of estimated trust fund expenditures for fiscal 1965. The highway and unemployment trust funds are the next largest—with expenditures in 1965 estimated at $3.7 billion and $3.4 billion, respectively. In fact, the combined expenditures of these four funds currently account for more than 80 percent of all trust fund spending.

PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUNDS

Certain Federal activities are carried out through government corporations or revolving fund operations which generate their own receipts, primarily from the public. As previously indicated, these are, in Federal budget terminology, classified as public enterprise funds.

Such operations are reflected in the administrative budget on a net basis only. In other words, the receipts generated by these activities are not include in the administrative budget receipts, but rather are deducted from the gross disbursements of these funds to derive a net expenditure figure.

One effect of this netting process is to obscure a substantial segment of Federal financial operations. For example, in the current fiscal year the gross disbursements of the public enterprise funds are estimated at $22.2 billion. The administrative budget, however, shows only a net expenditure for such activities of $3.7 billion. From year to year the net expenditure figure carried in the budget has fluctuated widely, often by $2 billion or more.

There has been a substantial increase in the gross disbursements of public enterprise funds in recent years, though the increase is not nearly so sharp as that shown in trust fund activity. In fiscal 1955, the gross disbursements of such funds totaled $14.3 billion. In the following 2 or 3 years the amount dropped somewhat, but since 1959 gross disbursements have been steadily increasing, to a peak of $22.2 billion in the current year. For 1965 a slight decline to $21.5 billion is estimated.

Table 3 shows the gross disbursements of public enterprise funds, by agencies, together with the overall totals of applicable receipts and net expenditures, for selected years.

The postal service, the farm price support and other activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, and certain of the Federal housing programs are probably the most familiar of the government activities which come under the public enterprise fund classification. These programs account for about 80 percent of the gross expenditures of such funds at present.

The postal service provides an example for demonstrating more specifically—and dramatically—the scope of Federal operations which are not reflected by a simple analysis of the administrative budget. It is estimated that the Post Office Department in fiscal 1965 will make gross disbursements totaling $5.1 billion. Most of this will be covered, of course, by revenues from the sale of stamps, etc., so that the administrative budget shows only the postal deficit—the excess of disbursements over receipts, amounting to an estimated $475 million.

GROSS FEDERAL SPENDING NEAR $150 BILLION

When trust fund and public enterprise fund spending is taken into consideration, it becomes readily apparent that the gross expenditures of the Federal Government far exceed the $98 billion total in the administrative budget. The total gross expenditure estimated for fiscal 1965, in fact, approaches $150 billion, as follows:

	Billions
Administrative budget expenditures	$97.9
Trust fund expenditures	29.4
Public enterprise fund disbursements not reflected in the administrative budget	19.9
Total	147.2

Moreover, even this huge total does not provide the full picture on the scope and depth of Federal expenditure transactions. For example, the 1965 budget for the first time includes detailed statements with respect to a number of Federal activities which are classified as self-supporting, including the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Such agencies or programs have heretofore been omitted, for the most part, from the budget document, primarily because they are not subjected to Presidential review—though the Congress does pass upon these activities, to a limited extent. The outlays are substantial, involving gross expenditures in excess of $6 billion in both the current and ensuing fiscal years.

Very large amounts also excluded from the above totals are involved in the operation of intragovernmental revolving and management funds, created to facilitate financing operations within and between Federal agencies. Such revolving funds finance a cycle of operations, similar to the public enterprise funds, but with receipts primarily from within the Government. Management funds permit the pooling of advance payments from two or more appropriations to carry out certain types of activities.

The Department of Defense is the primary user of this type of transaction. Examination of the budget reveals the gross disbursements of such funds within that Department will total an estimated $11.6 billion in fiscal 1965. In the administrative budget, however, these funds show up with a negative expenditure total.

CONCLUSION

In some instances there are convincing reasons for operating Federal programs and activities through financing arrangements outside the regular budget. In fact, the success of some such operations has drawn commendation—the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation being an example. On the other hand, there is ground for complaint about the growth of Federal operations outside the administrative budget, for it serves "as the principal financial plan for conducting the affairs of Government."

For some purposes gross spending is more significant than the amounts shown in the administrative budget. (1) There can be waste, greater or lesser efficiency in spending, of amounts from trust, enterprise-type, and revolving funds. The potential scope for improved efficiency, in other words, extends beyond the administrative budget. (2) The influence of Federal spending on the economy can be measured far better by the gross figures than by the incomplete amounts of the administrative budget. The complete totals themselves are important. In addition, the conditions attached to Federal spending—the various restrictive regulations and personnel rules—apply to some expenditures outside the administrative budget. The Post Office, of course, is one of the biggest employers. (3) The dollars raised, whether in taxes, contributions, or charges, to cover the costs are not available for other purposes.

The public cannot appreciate the full scope of Federal financial operations except from the gross figures. Nor can the full scope of opportunity for control be grasped from the administrative budget. The startling growth of expenditures outside the budget, and the increasing complexity of these funds, multiply the difficulties of effective citizen or congressional control.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of gross trust fund and public enterprise fund expenditures with administrative budget total*

[Selected fiscal years; dollar figures in billions]

Expenditures	1958		1960		1963		Estimate, 1964		Estimate, 1965	
	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total
Administrative budget	$71.4	72.1	$76.5	68.0	$92.6	65.7	$98.4	65.6	$97.9	65.7
Trust funds (gross)	15.3	15.4	21.2	18.8	26.5	18.8	29.3	19.5	29.4	19.7
Public enterprise funds (gross)	12.6	12.6	14.8	13.1	21.8	15.4	22.2	14.8	21.5	14.4

TABLE 2.—*Expenditures of major trust funds*

[Selected fiscal years; in billions]

Description	1955	1960	1963	Estimate, 1964	Estimate, 1965
Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	$4.5	$11.2	$14.5	$15.4	$16.1
Disability insurance trust fund		.6	1.3	1.3	1.4
Unemployment trust fund	2.0	2.7	3.8	3.6	3.4
Railroad retirement account	.6	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Federal employees' funds	.4	.9	1.1	1.3	1.4
Highway trust fund		3.1	3.0	3.6	3.7
Veterans life insurance funds	.6	.7	.8	.6	.5
Federal National Mortgage Association trust funds		1.0	−.7	(1)	.1
Deposit funds and other trust funds	.4	.7	1.4	1.5	1.9
Interfund transactions			−.5	−.5	−.5
Subtotal	8.5	21.8	25.9	27.8	29.3
Government-sponsored enterprises			.7	1.5	.1
Total, trust funds	8.5	21.8	26.5	29.3	29.4

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

TABLE 3.—*Gross disbursements, applicable receipts, and net expenditures of public enterprise funds*

[Selected fiscal years; in millions]

Agency or department	Gross disbursements				
	1955	1960	1963	Estimate, 1964	Estimate, 1965
Funds appropriated to the President	$642	$453	$929	$1,131	$1,106
Department of Agriculture	6,449	6,133	11,042	10,627	9,240
Department of Commerce	14	6	46	96	124
Department of Defense	93	191	128	132	119
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2	3	4	8	8
Department of the Interior	29	70	148	170	138
Department of Labor	2	3	176	259	262
Post Office Department	2,733	3,920	4,640	4,899	5,058
Treasury Department	301	(1)	1	1	(1)
Independent agencies:					
Export-Import Bank	229	471	548	708	739
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,266	2,631	2,796	2,789	3,419
Small Business Administration	29	173	340	363	386
Tennessee Valley Authority	386	281	348	367	388
Veterans' Administration	157	362	618	581	487
Other independent agencies	1,988	68	44	96	39
Total	14,320	14,765	21,802	22,227	21,512
Applicable receipts [2]	10,526	10,472	17,237	18,460	19,869
Net expenditures	3,793	4,293	4,565	3,767	1,643

[1] Less than $500,000.

[2] The largest items of applicable receipts in 1965, together with amounts are as follows: Commodity Credit Corporation, $7,000,000,000; Post Office Department, $4,600,000,000; Federal National Mortgage Association, $1,600,000,000; and Export-Import Bank of Washington, $1,600,000,000.

Prayer in Public Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision declaring as unconstitutional the use of the New York State Regents prayer in public schools has aroused the concern of the American people, and the several proposals to amend the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in public places have likewise attracted widespread attention and interest. There is genuine fear that this startling decision may not be the final step, but rather just the first in a series of decisions that may ultimately eliminate the historic relationship between our belief in a Supreme Being and our American form of government and its institutions.

The Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union, one of the leading publications of the Gannett group, has recently printed a thoughtful analysis of the prospects and concern for the future of our system of government. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of this thoughtful commentary, I am including with my remarks the editorial entitled "The 'Prayer' Amendment: Why It Is Needed," as it appeared in the Friday, May 15, 1964, issue of the Rochester Times-Union:

THE PRAYER AMENDMENT: WHY IT IS NEEDED

Those testifying before Congress on the "prayer amendment," as all Americans, should bear in mind what the amendment says—and does not say.

The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The requirement extends to State and local governments, too.

Varying additions to this keystone of the Bill of Rights have been proposed. The one primarily under consideration is proposed by Representative FRANK BECKER, Long Island Republican. It says:

"1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution or place.

"2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of, God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

If the only issue involved were the recital of prayers in schools, there would be less reason for tampering with the Bill of Rights for the first time since its adoption 173 years ago.

But the threat to America's spiritual foundation is far more serious, and the Becker amendment meets it head on.

In a U.S. Supreme Court prayer ruling last year, it was held that the Government must maintain "strict neutrality" toward religious exercises, neither aiding nor opposing religion."

The trend of Court decisions indicates that the small but determined band of those who are fighting all Government involvement in religion will succeed if the first amendment remains as is.

Carried to its logical conclusion, that would mean that Christmas, Chanukah, and Thanksgiving observances or symbols must be banned from schools or other government institutions. The national motto, "In God We Trust," must be erased from coins and judges' benches. Prayers must not be said during sessions of any legislative body.

The words "under God" must be deleted from the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The fourth verse of "The Star-Spangled Banner" will be an illegal part of the national anthem. Government funds may not be used to finance religious funerals of national leaders. Baccalaureate or chapel services may not be held at Government-supported high schools or colleges.

Chaplains may not serve the armed services or prisons. Church property will no longer be exempted from taxation. Presidential religious proclamations will be prohibited, and Government officials from the President down must stop appealing to Almighty God for guidance in speeches made on taxpayers' time.

Taken together, such prohibitions would constitute not Government "neutrality" toward religion but Government-enforced atheism, stripping our national life of any official reference to religion.

That is what the Becker amendment is aimed at preventing.

Opponents of the amendment, including many leading church figures, contend that no such result is threatened by the Court rulings.

But it would have strained belief not long ago to think that the High Court would bar recital of nonsectarian prayers and the reading of Bible verses in the schools, even when children could be excused from participation at their parents' request.

The Becker amendment's foes also have predicted, in all sincerity, that its approval will lead to an establishment of religion—that is, the protection or promotion of a religious denomination by government.

If so, why didn't that happen in the 170-odd years of school prayers and official recognition of God before the Supreme Court acted? And why did almost all the religious leaders who now fear this outcome fail to act against it by calling upon the High Court to rule out the school prayers and other acts they now find so dangerous to religious liberty?

Certainly it is the task of churches and parents, not schools or government, to teach religion to children. But the removal of all references to God from public life would pose a positive menace to religion by fostering indifference to and ignorance of religion among children and adults alike.

We believe in the separation of church and state. We hold with the Founding Fathers that no citizen should be persecuted because of his religious beliefs, or lack of them.

But we also believe, as the Nation's founders believed, that America's liberties and its very existence are bestowed by divine providence. Voluntary expression of belief in God in our schools and in public life must be permitted for the vast majority of Americans who share that conviction.

Discriminatory Acts Against Russian Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, as Americans we are greatly disturbed by recent evidences of discrimination against Jewish citizens in the Soviet Union. The suppression of Judaism is the suppression of all religions. For this reason, I have joined in sponsoring a resolution, House Resolution 728 by which the House would condemn discriminatory acts against Russian Jews.

As we all know, the Soviet Constitution is superficially a fine and democratic document. It purports to invest full and equal citizenship in the Jews. But present Russian rulers ignore this provision as they have ignored so many others. The Constitution's safeguards of religious freedom have become a mockery in the light of actual experience.

When the Soviet era began, there were more than 3 million Jews in Russia. They attended their own theaters, they ran their own printing shops, they published their own newspapers. These institutions kept alive their ties to a historic heritage. Systematically, Stalin crushed these institutions. His vicious campaign was culminated by an infamous purge of Jewish intelligentsia following the abortive doctors' plot of 1948.

And although Khrushchev has emphasized his de-Stalinization policy of recent years, he has failed to mention Stalin's anti-Semitism. More importantly, he has done nothing to curb it or to revitalize Jewish cultural institutions.

Today, in the Soviet Union, there is not a single Jewish daily newspaper—nor a Jewish theater. And Jews must identify themselves as Jews on their internal passports.

All America is appalled by this discriminatory pattern. It not only oppresses Jews in the free exercise of their religious faith but causes their deaths in retribution for so-called economic offenses.

I ask all concerned Members of Congress to join with me in condemning these acts. Through this resolution, we express the conscience of troubled Americans who abhor anti-Semitism. Our appeal to Rusisan authorities to cease their inhumane conduct—an appeal that must be fortified and augmented by the organized outcry of private organizations—will make it clear to the world that we cherish religious freedom and will seek ever to preserve it.

California Publisher Warns of Dangers in Political War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under what authority of the Constitution does the Federal Government assume the responsibility to feed, house, clothe, provide jobs, medical care, and other necessities of life for the people? I have been unable to find any such sanction. It has always been my belief that our Founding Fathers created a republic within a democracy through which we could operate a government of, by, and for the people, in which each individual would be free to rise to whatever heights his own talent, ability, and willingness to work would carry him.

The New Dealers, Fair Dealers, New Frontiersmen and the present wheeler dealers have another idea. They do not trust the people, nor do they believe in the wisdom nor the ability of the people either to govern themselves or indeed take care of their individual needs. The social planners think that a certain select few possess the wisdom to govern, and only carefully selected bureaucrats know what is best for you and me. This philosophy is the basis of the proposed war on poverty. The administration has no faith in the private enterprise system and therefore proposes full Government control of a program to increase job opportunities and to raise the standard of living for those the bureaucrats decide are underprivileged.

How some Americans feel about the program is seen in the following editorial by Cliff Smith, publisher of the Downey Herald American, Downey, Calif. I strongly recommend Mr. Smith's editorial to you.

WAR ON POVERTY SEEMS TO BE ANOTHER STEP INTO SOCIALISM

(By Cliff Smith)

President Johnson's announced war on poverty appears to be the final step in converting this Republic into a Socialistic welfare state. It is an admission that the Democratic Party since 1933 has been unable to attain the goals of economic growth through the free enterprise system, which is the American way of life. President Johnson is very adept at dealing with opposites. He appears on national television with a glowing report of prosperity and great economic gains, and, with only a change of scenery, he appears from the wings of the theater with a devastating presentation of abject poverty.

You can rest assured that the European press, both in the free countries and the Communist countries, is picking up only the story of "America, the Land of Poverty," and using it to prove that the capitalistic system is a failure and that Marxism is the only answer to the fulfillment of happiness.

The President returned from a 2-day trip to Appalachia where great unemployment and much poverty does in fact exist. He announced that he was amazed at the crowds that came out to greet him. He apparently did not realize that he was regarded as Santa Claus with a pack on his back, overflowing with taxpayers' money to be given away for the asking. The President's economic adviser, Walter Heller, says that poverty is a national disgrace. Poverty is not a disgrace. It is a misfortune, but it cannot be resolved by a national dole. The only disgrace is that our Government has been unable to create a favorable climate in which business can have confidence in Government and can expand.

Examining some of the legislation passed by Congress, it appears that we have done much to curtail economic growth and create unemployment. Among these is the refusal to grant a tax deduction for salaries paid to domestic help and caretakers. A million jobs would be immediately available to the lowest economic segment of unskilled labor, without any capital investment, if such a deduction were permitted. Minimum wage has created unemployment for those persons unskilled and unable to perform work at the minimum wage, even though they would like to work for less but are forced to go on welfare. Our uncontrolled imports from low-wage countries have caused widespread

unemployment. For example, pig iron is coming into America from East Germany at $35 a ton, as against $70 a ton for American-produced pig iron. Imported fabricated steel from modern mills, built with our foreign aid money, is also causing unemployment in our steel centers.

The welfare state is not a Utopia. It is a condition bordering upon slavery, and can only be maintained by external force. As proof of this, I suggest you examine the welfare state which exists in your State penitentiaries where the unfortunate inmates are supplied with food, clothing, lodging, medical care, and free burials. The only thing that is lacking is liberty. There are bars on the windows and a 24-hour guard—not to keep the people out of this Utopia, but to keep them in.

A number of European Socialists, among them Gunnar Myrdal of Sweden, are most welcome guests in Washington, to advise the Supreme Court on sociological decisions which have nothing to do with our Constitution, and to advise the administration on how to eliminate poverty through socialism. No one in America knew there were 30 million Americans living in poverty until these foreigners told us so.

Nothing can destroy initiative and self-reliance more quickly than a government dole. The more you do for people, the less they will do for themselves. Poverty and indolence expand proportionately with the expansion of welfare programs. This is evident in the fact that, last year, total welfare in the United States exceeded $43 billion, and there is more poverty today than there was 30 years ago when less than a quarter of that amount was being spent on welfare.

The President has presented to Congress a package bill which creates an Office of Economic Opportunity in the Executive Office. The Director would have wide discretionary authority in administering the act, and allocating the $962.5 million to be appropriated for the first year. There are no matching requirements for the State and local agencies. The OEO would be a super-duper Federal bureaucracy, superimposed upon the now existing 42 Federal programs that have a direct application to poverty, even though these 42 programs would remain under the existing agencies rather than under the new one, and there is no authority for the Director to coordinate these programs under the new OEO.

To open this assault on poverty, its Director, Sargent Shriver (now "General" Shriver) arrived at Capitol Hill in a chauffeur-driven 1964 Cadillac. Concurrently, the President demanded a $7,500 a year increase for Congressmen together with other salary increases amounting of $500 million.

You will note that the $962.5 million to be appropriated for poverty is only a 2½-percent increase in total welfare spending, and would not be a drop in the bucket. The objectives of the poverty bill can best be achieved by Government's encouragement of local initiative and by the long-range improvement of Government-business relationships aimed at stimulating general economic growth—rather than by welfare types of approaches which have been tried in the past and proved unsuccessfull.

We are advised by the planners that the Puritan ethic of working for a living "by the sweat of our brow," is as outdated as they say the Bible is. I will not accept the belief that a system of moral principles should be abandoned for materialism.

"Education and the American Economy"—An Address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, at Cornerstone Laying Ceremonies for the New Associates Investment Co. Building, South Bend, Ind., May 19, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the community of South Bend-Mishawaka, Ind., took an economic leap forward this week as Gov. Matthew E. Welsh laid the cornerstone for the new Associates Investment administration building, one of three buildings comprising this company's multimillion dollar home office complex.

Joining Governor Welsh in this cornerstone laying ceremony was Mr. Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr., chairman of the board of Associates.

This company is ranked as the Nation's 91st largest corporation in terms of assets and is the largest independent finance company in the United States, with diversified finance, insurance and banking operations throughout the United States and Canada.

Another distinguished guest on the occasion was the Honorable Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, who delivered an outstanding address at a luncheon attended by civic leaders from the South Bend area in the newly completed Associates personnel and training center.

Because I believe Commissioner Keppel's remarks on this occasion on the relation between education and the American economy, with particular emphasis on vocational education, to be so thoughtful, under unanimous consent, I insert the text of the Commissioner's speech in the RECORD:

EDUCATION AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

(By Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Yesterday I flew from Washington to South Bend with your distinguished Congressman.

Last night I talked with schoolteachers and college professors from communities throughout northern Indiana.

At breakfast this morning I met with college and university presidents from this area and I have just had the opportunity of chatting with your Governor and Lieutenant Governor and with your mayor and other leading citizens of your city. I like Indiana and I like South Bend.

I am happy to be here on a most significant day in the life of your community—the cornerstone laying of this splendid new $3 million Associates Investment facility. I say "significant" because this substantial investment is obviously a reflection of the great confidence which the Associates Co. has in the present economic strength and the future economic vitality of South Bend, Mishawaka, and, indeed, the entire St. Joseph County area.

South Bend is world-famed for its many products and so I know you must take great pride in the remarkable success of Associates Investment as one of the largest finance companies in the Nation.

VIGOROUS COMMUNITY

Congressman BRADEMAS told me on the plane yesterday of some other recent developments which, like this new Associates building, are clear evidence of the vigor and potential of this community—from the new construction plans of your Indiana and Michigan Electric Co. to the new YMCA building to the recent acquisition of Studebaker facilities by the Kaiser-Jeep, Cummins, and Allied Products firms, and many others. He really gave me quite a list.

Incidently, I would like to say a special word about Congressman BRADEMAS. As a member of the committee of the House of Representatives with principal responsibility for legislation affecting education, JOHN BRADEMAS played a key role last year in drafting and helping to pass two of the most important education bills Congress has enacted in many years—the Vocational Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act. He has won widespread respect among educators throughout the United States for his deep commitment to the strengthening of American education.

Essential as the many examples of new business and industrial investment are to the economic future of your area, I believe it equally significant that the South Bend-Mishawaka community is also increasing its investment in another indispensable factor in economic growth—the investment in human beings.

For example, only this morning I visited Notre Dame's extraordinary new university library, the largest university library, I understand, in the Nation.

And I am looking forward after lunch to a tour of what I understand is one of the finest private personnel training facilities in the United States, which is part of your expanding Associates Investment plant here in South Bend. With your own in-house training programs and your own data processing systems, you at Associates are providing dramatic evidence that farsighted business leadership recognizes the importance of continuing education.

It seems to me, therefore, as one who must be concerned not only with the shaping of education policy but also with the contributions which educated men and women make to our national wealth, that it is most fitting that the chief executive of the Associates Investment Co. should be a man whose life has been so strongly identified with concern for education.

O. C. CARMICHAEL, JR., LEADING CITIZEN

I have known Mike Carmichael both personally and by reputation for some years. He was a college president at Converse College, South Carolina, and a dean of students at Vanderbilt University. I am not surprised to learn that here in South Bend, as one of the leading citizens of this community in private business, he continues to display a deep concern for education. For example, as no doubt many of you know, he is serving as chairman of the Temporary Committee for Higher Education in North Central Indiana.

Today I would like to talk with you about a collaborative effort for South Bend, for Indiana, for all America in which the interests of business and industry and of education are closely bound and coincide. My theme is vocational education—the education of our youth to meet the specific economic demands of our time, and the new legislation designed for this purpose.

It calls for a collaborative effort because American industry, without a strong underpinning in vocational education in our schools, will lack a substantial base for its future—and because vocational education, without the active support and interest of the business community, will lack purpose and thrust and touch with reality.

Out of this new, bold and concerted approach by American business and industry and American education, I can see a glowing economic hope and promise in every community across the land. But before we consider the glow, let us first examine some of the hurdles we face.

The facts that confront us today are by no means comforting, nor are the vocational schools as they now exist.

Today, most of our vocational schools offer training in a minimum of skills while our economy offers employment in hundreds of occupations.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Today, when jobs for skilled technicians of all kinds show an increase of 300 percent in just 1 year, there are more than 4 million unemployed, most of them because they lack employable skills.

Today, while our economy reaches ever new heights, hundreds of thousands of youngsters seek to enter a world of work for which they are ill-equipped and in which they shortly become unemployed.

Our unemployment figuers today alarm us—as they should. In a time of unprecedented prosperity, our statisticians show us an unemployment rate of 5.7 percent of our labor force. Among American youth from 16 to 19 years of age—young Americans who are out of school and looking for work—the unemployment rate is three times the national average and still on the increase.

Do these grim figures mean that our society, our economy are falling apart? To my mind, they are not the sign of an economic decline, but rather of an advance—of the sweeping advance of our technology and productivity, of our dynamic movement from an era when production depended upon the brawn of men to a day when it depends largely upon the trained, skilled minds of men.

The challenge that unemployment presents to us is not the slowing down of our economy but the overriding need to bring our people, all our people, up to the levels of skill and knowledge they require to share in the opportunities of American life.

A few decades ago, many jobs in the United States could be filled with dignity and success by men and women who had completed only an elementary school education. Today most of these jobs no longer exist.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

If we are to meet the economic requirements of our day, we will need to find new directions in vocational education that are truly responsive to economic change. And we will need to support this enterpise at every level—from the Federal Government to the States and communities throughout the country.

Half a century ago, when the effects of industrialization began to be felt strongly in America, Congress responded with the first program of Federal aid for training people for work. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was a bold and visionary attempt to insure the United States in that era against the hazards of unemployment for want of skill.

Unfortunately, in the years that followed, vocational education has marked time and the early vision of economic reality became blurred. Meanwhile, our society has undergone enormous shifts through the population boom and rapid developments in science and technology.

In the sprawling complex of our modern cities, many of our early vocational schools remain as remnants of the past, as red brick monuments to a day gone by. Remote from the mainstream of modern technology, they are training young people for vocations already becoming extinct. Within the educational community, they are often regarded as institutions for youth who are failing in academic pursuits, as "dumping grounds" for the poorly educated. Within the business community, these schools until now have received little attention, either in financial support or support in creating training programs that bear a valid relationship to our modern economy.

But now, I trust, we have come to an awakening—to the realization that sound vocational training is essential to the continued strength of our economy. It is this awakening which led the Congress last year to pass the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

NEW APPROACH

The new act, a landmark in our history of vocational education, calls for a sharp break with the past. It aims to replace the bleak, negative approach of educators and business and the public to these neglected schools with an affirmative determination to make them vital, contributing centers in the world our technology is shaping.

Under this act, Federal funds to expand vocational education can be more than quadrupled. The Congress has authorized an increase in appropriations from some $57 million a year to an additional $731 million over the next 4 years. These funds are to be matched by the States in building new schools and creating a whole new range of vocational programs to reflect the changing needs of the labor market.

We would deceive ourselves, however, to think of these Federal funds as more than "seed money," or to believe that the future course of vocational education can be arranged and fashioned in Washington. These funds will go a long way only if the States and communities use them as an impetus to stimulate a far greater output of funds and energy on their own part.

To this end, the law is solidly backed up by a requirement for State boards or committees composed of members from management, labor, and education to review and advise in the development of modern vocational training.

This provision of the act I regard as essential if we hope to succeed. These advisory boards, now in existence or being created, will be called on to keep our vocational schools in tune with the fluctuating wavelength of regional and local economic conditions.

COMMUNITY ACTION

But beyond the Federal law and its requirements, I see the ultimate burden resting upon the communities—and here I suggest the need for local advisory groups, committees on which you can most ably serve. In communities which have already established such advisory bodies, the new era of vocational training is already underway.

In and of itself, of course, Federal legislation will not assure us of a vocational structure reaching all our people, or one that meets the particular and varying job requirements of our communities, or, indeed, that the skills we teach today will necessarily be the skills we will need tomorrow.

President Johnson, in his recent Manpower Report, set down the limitations as well as the possibilities of Federal aid when he said: "The Federal Government can provide leadership, information, and other assistance, but fundamentally it is action carried forward in each community that will decide how well we achieve our national objectives."

In the long run, of course, we will accomplish little in vocational education if we merely repeat the patterns of the past.

The new stimulus of legislation requires more of us than merely replacing the status quo of 1917 with the status quo of 1964. Our new vocational schools must be living enterprises, continually responsive to economic needs, or they, like their red brick predecessors, will also become monuments to obsolescence in the years ahead.

WHAT IS REQUIRED?

In creating these new vocational schools, how shall we assure their continuing vitality?

Clearly, our first requirement is to build a sound and durable pattern of collaboration between industry, business and education. For too many years, we have remained isolated from one another. We need to know each better, to see and respect each other's point of view.

On the national level this cooperative pattern already exists. We in education have turned to business and industry for counsel on personnel and on strengthening vocational education. This we will continue to do. Through our State advisory boards, we must extend this pattern, establishing genuine meeting grounds for vocational education, not mere appendages of education or of business.

As educators, we must recognize the realities of industrial life if our vocational schools are to play a meaningful role in our society. We have much to learn from the realistic and skillful training programs now employed by American industry for its specific needs. And industry, in turn, must recognize that the growth of vocational education is an investment in the growth of industry itself. In as realistic terms as the growth rate of our gross national product, our investment in education today is the surest measure of our economic strength tomorrow.

Second, we must seize the present opportunity and the critical needs that brought it about for a truly long-range effort. We will fail if we regard the challenge of our advancing technology as only a present emergency, a brush fire we can put out by summoning the bucket brigades. We will fail if we merely put up new buildings, train new teachers, create new technical curriculums.

Technology will not stand still. It will lead to a world 50 years from now as different from ours as the present is different from the world of a century past. If we would succeed in these new schools, we must plan for the future, creating a stethoscope of vocational research that is sensitive to the pulsing change of technology and apply the products of that research to our schools.

Third, and finally, we need to see vocational training as part of the mainstream of education, not as a minor tributary. This calls for raising its quality and its standards, making it one of the best, not the least, of our educational efforts. This calls for an end to the idea that the vocational school can be second rate, a "dumping ground" for the failures of education. This will put our whole educational structure on notice that poor education can no longer be tolerated, that wherever our schools are weak, they must be strengthened and that a failure in any segment of education affects the whole enterprise.

A NEW BEGINNING

In our meeting here today, I see beginnings of a vitalizing force in vocational education and in all education, a force that brings to the communities of America the purpose and vision that have made us strong and will assure our future strength.

I know that you here in the South Bend-Mishawaka area have been quick to realize

the significance of the new vocational legislation. Only a few weeks ago I met in Washington with Dr. Jardine and Mr. Dake and Congressman Brademas to discuss an application which South Bend has made for Federal funds to build a new area vocational school here to serve northern Indiana and southern Michigan.

Your Congressman tells me that only last week you asked for additional funds to provide residential facilities for this school. You all understand, of course, that there is the most intense competition throughout the United States for the funds which Congress has provided us for this program so that it would not be appropriate for me to make any commitment to you on your application except to say that you can be assured your interest will be given the most careful consideration.

Tax Credit for College Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, all of us realize how tremendously the cost of obtaining a college education has increased in recent years. These costs, so the experts tell us, will increase even more in the years to come.

Plainly, something must be done to relieve the financial pressures on parents who are trying to assist their sons and daughters in receiving university training. Two remedies to this problem have been proposed.

The first would increase the number of scholarships and loans now available from the Federal Government to college students. The second would provide a tax credit to parents for educational expenses incurred by a son or daughter at institutions of higher learning.

Many people believe the second method to be much preferable to the first. Federal loans and scholarships to needy students cannot begin to solve the problem. What is needed is the direct approach envisioned in the tax credit principle.

The arguments for this system of aiding education in our Nation are clearly and cogently put forth in an article in the May 16 issue of America magazine by the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, director of the political science department at Marquette University, Milwaukee.

For a number of years Father Blum has been in the forefront of the movement to establish a program of tax relief for parents with children in college. His article "Tax Credits for Education," demonstrates the careful thought he has given to this issue.

Of particular interest in his concept of an "absolute" tax credit which would assist even those who pay little or no income tax, and thereby would not receive proportionate benefits under a tax credit as it is currently conceived.

Under unanimous consent, I include Father Blum's article in the RECORD at this point, and earnestly urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

TAX CREDITS FOR EDUCATION—A PLAN TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO HELP MEET THE CONSTANTLY RISING COST OF COLLEGE

(By Virgil C. Blum)

(NOTE.—Father Blum, S.J., is chairman of the Department of Political Science at Marquette University and author of "Freedom of Choice in Education".)

By 1970 the average American family with a child in college will need about $500 a year in financial assistance to pay for his education. For the majority of families, the costs have already soared out of reach. It is not easy to estimate how much help they now need. But Dr. Rexford Moon, director of the College Scholarship Service, predicts that by 1970 families with children in college will need $3.7 billion in educational help of one kind or another. This means, on an average, $500 for each of 7 million students.

To enable families with low or middle incomes to send their children to college, this deficit will have be made up by grants, loans, tax credits, and scholarships. No single one of these aid programs is likely to bring higher education within the reach of every American family. But a combination of such programs on the State and Federal levels would help a great deal.

It is pointed out that government loans for college education costs have proved both workable and acceptable. This is certainly true of National Defense Education Act loans. But to compel the children of poor, low-income and middle-income families to rely heavily on loans for their education is inequitable, undemocratic and uneconomical.

Congressmen and the administration have repeatedly told parents that their children's intellectual development is the Nation's greatest natural resource. College education for youth, they insist, is essential to our economic, professional, scientific, and technological development; the best investment we can make is to spend public funds on developing brainpower. Parents have in effect been told that the college education of their children is indispensable to the national welfare and defense.

And the parents have been convinced. They are now demanding that the Federal Government pay a fair part of the costs.

For this reason, they are not likely to approve Senator VANCE HARTKE's Federal aid bill (S. 2490). While this measure would provide scholarships and work-study programs for a number of needy and worthy students, its main purpose is to obtain more loan funds for children of families with low or middle incomes. Parents, however, view loans as only a partial solution to their education problems. They do not want their children—particularly their daughters—to go deep into debt. This is why more and more parents are demanding tuition grants such as New York State now provides, or tax credits on tuition and fees.

The Hartke bill, which was rushed to the Senate floor on February 3 to head off approval of Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's tax-credit program, does not meet these demands. Its loan provision was admittedly designed as a substitute for the widely supported Ribicoff tax-credit plan, which would have given help to nearly every college student in the Nation. Whereas the tax-credit proposal is designed to help families and students pay for the cost of education, the Hartke loan program is designed to throw the cost of education upon the students.

It is undemocratic, however, for the Government to saddle private and nonresident public college students with heavy debts for an education that substantially benefits the Nation, while it pays, for the same sort of benefit, nearly the full education costs of other college students. Since college education is essential to the national welfare, the sons and daughters of low-income and middle-income families should not be forced to go deep into debt to obtain it.

To compel college students to mortgage the future is, as President William C. Fels of Bennington College said, "an abdication of our generation's responsibility to its children." Moreover, "it is a contradiction of the ability-to-pay principle that underlies our tax structure to tax these youngsters equally, whatever their income or assets, for a part of their education." This is what the Hartke bill would do. It proposes that, if youngsters don't have the money to pay for their education, they should, contrary to the ability-to-pay principle, be taxed equally.

But even if a general loan program that excluded tuition grants and tax credits were equitable, it would be unacceptable on educational and economical grounds. Such a Federal program would almost inevitably result in state monopoly in education to the detriment of freedom and diversity.

Dr. John F. Morse of the American Council on Education considers student loans for higher education as inadequate. "The dollar gap between costs at public and private institutions," he points out, "grows greater every year. And the dollar gap is the really significant figure. So to tell institutions, good solid institutions, that the solution to most of their problems is to raise their fees, to charge closer to actual costs, and to use long-term loans to finance needy students is to ignore entirely the competitive situation." The effect of a continuously widening, loan-inspired tuition gap, Dr. Morse predicts, would be more and more empty classrooms in private colleges.

Some students will, for personal reasons, borrow $6,000 to pay tuition at a private university. But these students are not typical. The typical student will no more borrow $6,000 to get an education at the University of Detroit, when he can attend Detroit's Wayne State University for only $1,200, than his father would borrow $6,000 to buy a black Cadillac at a private auto dealer if he could buy a white Cadillac at a tax-supported, State-operated auto agency for $1,200. The education discount—which here amounts to 80 percent—is, of course, made possible by the hidden taxpayers' subsidy given to all students in public institutions.

Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, remarked several years ago: "It is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away." The financial collapse of Milwaukee-Downer College several years after the founding of the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee next door clearly demonstrates how difficult it is to market education at a fair price when down the street someone is selling it at an 80-percent discount. And I might add that it is infinitely more difficult when the prospective buyer must borrow money to pay the fair price.

The widening gap in public and private college tuition has already resulted in a rapid shift in the balance between students attending private institutions and those in State institutions. In 1950 more than 50 percent of college students attended private schools. Today the figure is less than 37 percent, and it is predicted that by 1975 it will, at best, be 20 percent, or possibly, due to colleges' financial collapse, as low as 5 percent.

This shift of students, directly traceable to soaring tuition charges, is costing taxpayers literally billions of dollars. While tens of thousands of vacancies exist in our private colleges and universities, taxpayers are even now building facilities for scores of thousands of students at a cost of $6,000 to $10,000 per student, and, moreover, subsidizing their education at about $1,600 a year. While no fewer than 795 accredited colleges and universities reported vacancies in the fall of 1963, public institutions across the

Nation are engaged in a high-cost building boom to accommodate the influx of students. Among the schools with vacancies are 456 4-year liberal arts colleges. These institutions, with an average enrollment of 545 full-time students, have tremendous potential for development and growth. But with tuition already three to five times higher than in a local State college or university, they cannot attract the necessary students. Much less can they improve the quality of their faculty and educational program. Substantial tuition grants or tax credits would enable many parents to pay tuition in private and out-of-State public institutions that are now beyond their means.

To remedy the situation, scores of Congressmen have introduced tax-credit bills. Most of these would provide a 30-percent tax credit on tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher learning. But after Prof. Roger Freeman of Stanford University, appearing before a congressional committee in 1963, recommended the sliding tax-credit formula, the idea caught fire. Congressmen of both political parties, including Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and BARRY GOLDWATER, incorporated a sliding formula in new tax-credit proposals. The most popular and, in my opinion, the most acceptable formula was proposed by Senator HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY's bill (S. 1677) provides: a 75-percent credit on the first $100 expended on tuition, fees, books, and supplies; a 40-percent credit on the next $400; a 30-percent credit on the next $500; and a 20-percent credit on the next $500. Thus a parent who sends his son to Marquette University, where (1964–65) tuition is $1,100, would receive a $75 credit on the first $100, $160 on the next $400, $150 on the next $500, and $20 on the next $100, for a total of $405. In out-of-pocket money, his tuition payment would be only $695.

When he introduced his bill, Senator HUMPHREY said: "The sliding tax-credit schedule provides a sensible and workable system of Federal assistance that helps every student * * *. It is essential that an across-the-board tax-credit program be initiated to assist every person currently facing the considerable expenses associated with higher education."

The Humphrey proposal, like all the other tax-credit proposals, has, however, one defect: It would provide no tuition benefits to poor families that pay no Federal income tax, since the credit is a credit on tax liability. This defect can be easily remedied to give low-income families equal tuition benefits by making the tax credit absolute, rather than conditional upon a tax liability. Under this plan, parents who pay no income tax, but are entitled to a credit, would receive from the Internal Revenue Service an amount equal to the credit to which they are entitled. The credit would be treated like a refund. The absolute credit would in effect be a Federal tuition grant to the children of low-income families.

The enactment of the Humphrey tax-credit bill, with this amendment, would greatly help parents pay tuition charges that have soared beyond their reach. With such help, all parents would be aided in sending their children to college, and many of them could then send them to private or out-of-State public colleges and universities.

The tax-credit plan is, of course, not a new idea. Congress has thus far enacted five different tax-credit programs. It has provided: (1) a retirement income credit, (2) a dividend-received credit, (3) a partially tax-exempt interest credit, (4) an investment credit, and (5) a foreign-tax credit.

Several years ago, Congress gave a 7-percent tax credit to businessmen on capital investments. Most parents would agree, I think, that if a tax credit is useful to stimulate and help capital investments, it is even more useful to stimulate and help the education of youth—the Nation's most valuable capital investment. As a nation, we cannot afford to downgrade the importance of intellectual development, while on the other hand upgrading the importance of industrial development.

The tax credit plan has much to recommend it. Since there are no adequate alternatives to financing higher education, it deserves the support of parents and the consideration of Congress. Here are some of the points in its favor:

This plan is a fair one. Since the taxpayer is already subsidizing each resident State university student by about $1,600 a year, the plan would give more aid to parents who send their children to private and out-of State public colleges. (It should be noted, however, that on a percentage basis, HUMPHREY's sliding scale would give tax-supported students more aid than tuition-paying students. And as tuition increases in public institutions, tax credits will become increasingly more important to their students.) Besides, it would give a credit to any person, including the student himself, who pays a part or all of his tuition.

The plan is more equitable than a tax deduction. While the tax-deduction plan would give families in higher income brackets more than those in lower brackets, the tax credit plan would give equal help to all parents, regardless of income.

It is the most efficient way of providing Federal help for the college education of the Nation's youth. It would give help where help is most needed—to tuition-paying parents. Tax credits for tuition-paying parents would be in sharp contrast to existing Federal programs, which in fiscal 1962 gave $1.2 billion to a handful of private and public universities (Harvard received $33 million), while hundreds of other schools that are educating many thousands of students for the national welfare got nothing.

It would help every family with children in college—not merely those with children in State institutions. It would help low-income, nontaxpaying families as much as families with middle or high incomes. They would receive the amount of the credit as they would a refund claim; this would in effect be a tuition grant for the education of their children.

It would save taxpayers billions of dollars. It would enable many parents to continue to send their children to private colleges and universities, thus relieving taxpayers of the need to build public college facilities for these students at a cost of $6,000 to $10,000 per student and to subsidize their education at a yearly cost of about $1,600. Under the present system of financing higher education, which has resulted in a rush of students to tax-supported institutions, the cost of State education is mounting so rapidly that, Dr. Morse believes, "there will be a taxpayers' revolt."

It would stop the rapid trend toward State monopoly. It would preserve free enterprise, competition and diversity in education—an essential condition of academic freedom. Students would have some measure of freedom of choice in education.

It would avoid the highly controversial (though groundless) church-state issue. Following a long line of Federal precedents in both education and welfare programs, it would subsidize the demand, not the supply. That is to say, it would directly aid the student, not the college.

It would provide Federal assistance for higher education without establishing a basis for Federal control. Since the Government would aid the demand, there would be no legal basis for controlling the supply.

It would be easy to administer. The student or his parents would prepare an income tax return and take the appropriate credit. No new Federal bureaucracy would be needed to direct and control the flow of public funds.

It would remove such discriminations against parents as now exist in the Internal Revenue Code. To parents who pay for their own children's education, it would extend tax concessions the code now gives to persons and corporations that help pay, through large contributions, for the education of other people's children, mostly at prestige colleges and universities. Moreover, by adopting the tax credit plan, Congress would treat parents with the same consideration it now shows corporations, which may deduct every dollar spent for the education of personnel and the training of executives.

It would remove a tax that many parents resent—a tax imposed by Congress on the education of their children. One of the complaints of parents is that the taxes they must pay on tuition charges for their own children's education are spent to give other people's children a free education at State colleges and universities. Furthermore, there is something radically wrong with a system that compels students to pay taxes on earned-tuition payments at private and out-of-State public colleges, since they are thus compelled to subsidize the education of children from families of middle and high incomes attending local State institutions.

There are gross inequities in the financing of higher education in America. Whether we correct them depends largely on the initiative of private education, parents, and self-supporting students. Sentiment in Congress is decidedly favorable. But the pressure against tax credits for parents—as demonstrated in the Senate vote on the Ribicoff amendment—is so great that even Senators who had cosponsored or advocated the measure were forced to capitulate. If the forces pressing for State monopoly in education continue to dominate Congress, parents are not likely to be relieved of the tax on their children's education.

Some Senators and administration leaders argued, during the Ribicoff amendment debate, that the Nation cannot afford to help parents pay the high cost of their children's college education. But Congress gives oil producers, who are hardly in need of Federal aid, $2 billion a year in tax benefits. Moreover, it gives a $2-billion tax credit to businessmen for capital investments. Hence the argument is not convincing.

Since college education is so important an asset to our Nation, the Federal Government is surely justified in making a $750 million tax-credit investment (Internal Revenue Bureau estimate) in the education of more than 4 million college students. Even with this Federal investment, it should be noted, parents in 1970 will need an additional $2 billion from other sources to pay their college education bills.

A considerable lack of concern among both private educators and Congressmen about the gigantic problems involved in the education of 8,500,000 students by 1975 was clearly evident during the Ribicoff amendment debate. Here is the conclusion reached in "Bricks and Mortarboards," a report from Educational Facilities Laboratories: "Somehow there is still no real appreciation of these figures even by the institutions of higher education themselves, much less by the general public."

If the situation does not change, by 1975 taxpayers may well revolt against the high cost of monopoly public education, and higher education itself—amid the rubble of hundreds of private colleges and universities—may be in a state of utter confusion.

"Education: Our Needs and Prospects"—An Address by Hon. Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, South Bend, Ind., May 18, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was highly honored to be able to present to the educators of my Congressional District in Indiana this week the distinguished and able U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Honorable Francis Keppel.

On May 18, 1964, Commissioner Keppel addressed an audience in South Bend, Ind., composed of elementary and secondary schoolteachers from the public and parochial schools as well as members of the faculties of the several colleges and universities, both public and private, of the Third District of Indiana.

Because I believe Commissioner Keppel's address on this occasion contains such a useful discussion of some of the major actions of the 88th Congress in the field of education as well as an assessment of our future needs in education, under unanimous consent, I insert the text of his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EDUCATION: OUR NEEDS AND PROSPECTS

(By Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

There are several reasons I am pleased to be in Indiana tonight and especially here in South Bend.

This State and this community have given outstanding leadership to education in the United States.

Bob Wyatt, for many years a champion of better schools and better teachers in Indiana, is currently president of the National Education Association and his vigorous voice for education is now heard across the land.

If Ohio is the mother of American Presidents, Indiana must be the mother of American university presidents—from your own Father Ted Hesburgh of Notre Dame to Fred Hovde of Purdue to Herman Wells, now Chancellor of Indiana University—and I cite only three.

The editor and publisher of your newspaper, Franklin Schurz, is well known in Washington for his role in putting South Bend on the map as a pioneer in manpower training programs, and President Johnson's visit here last month is a tribute to the leadership your community is giving in this increasingly important field.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS

I want to say a special word about your Congressman, JOHN BRADEMAS. As a member of the committee of the House of Representatives with principal responsibility for legislation affecting education, JOHN BRADEMAS has won widespread respect among educators throughout the United States. He is admired and honored for his talent, his diligence, his deep commitment to the strengthening of American education.

As the ranking member of the two subcommittees that write most education legislation in the House, Congressman BRADEMAS played a key role last year in drafting and helping pass two of the most important education bills Congress has enacted in many years—the Vocational Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act. The second of these acts includes a measure of his own sponsorship—the technical education bill, which is aimed at producing more of the semiprofessional technicians now in such short supply.

This evening, here in the educational family, I would like to observe with you a new season for U.S. education and, hopefully, the start of a new era. For all of us dedicated to the strength and stature of our American schools and colleges, this year can be historic—a time to celebrate legislative accomplishments in the past year * * * and a time to prepare for wise and purposeful action in the months ahead.

THE 88TH CONGRESS AND EDUCATION

Looking back to 1963, we may reflect that never have the possibilities been brighter for the house of education. In its first session, the 88th Congress passed more significant educational measures than perhaps any Congress in a century. Looking ahead in 1964, we have the opportunity to act without delay in using these new ways and means made available to us * * * and the opportunity to focus intensive public attention on the still unfinished business of education.

Let us turn now to three major legislative acts which were passed last year by the Congress—in higher education, in vocational education, and in the education of the Nation's handicapped and retarded children. These acts, as President Johnson has declared, are "new landmarks in educational progress." They are also a financial landmark in national educational support. Our measure of success, however, is not the Federal authorization of $3 billion, as massive as it is. The real measure is how wisely and well we employ the funds that are appropriated.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

First, let us consider the act directed to higher education. It provides for substantial and substantially needed funds. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, $1.2 billion is authorized over three years to help our colleges and universities build certain types of laboratories, classrooms, and libraries * * * to prepare these institutions for the surging enrollments in the years just ahead.

The forces of a generation ago which raised educational opportunity to include the high school now demand an opportunity for higher education for those who want it and can benefit by it. In every occupation, the level of educational competence is being constantly raised. The last decade brought a 54 percent increase in the number of jobs requiring four or more years of college, and young Americans are responding to this demand with a nice mixture of realism and enthusiasm.

Today 4.4 million students fill our colleges and universities. In 1965, just two Septembers hence, 5.2 million students will probably be enrolled. By 1970, we must prepare for 7 million college and university students—almost twice the number at the start of this decade.

The new legislation for higher education comes at a time when our colleges and universities face the requirement of doubling their physical capacity within a single decade. It comes none too soon. For administrators of these institutions, it can turn an outlook of profound concern into one of reasonable hope. And for hundreds of thousands of young Americans, it can open doors to the highest skills and training which will enrich our society for generations.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Second, we turn to another educational flank, to a major act to strengthen and expand vocational education. In funds for this purpose, the Federal contribution can be more than quadrupled—from some $57 million annually to an additional $731 million authorized over the next 4 years. The act also incorporates other programs, among them aid to school districts affected by Federal employment, and its total cost will be approximately $1.87 billion during a 5-year period.

Through vocational education, we have a notable chance to focus our attention on economic reality, on the besetting fact that millions of young Americans today are unemployed because they lack the necessary skills for employment. Moreover, their ranks will surely increase tomorrow as our technology grows in complexity—unless we take these steps now.

Vocational education, in itself, is no novelty in the United States, although we would be wise to view it in fresh and novel ways. In the big cities of our country, the vocational school often stands as a monument to another time, a red-brick memorial which prepares students for jobs that are becoming extinct and fails to prepare them for the new jobs our economy requires.

The present legislation will help if we employ it to establish new directions for vocational education, to bring job training for American youth into harmony with the economic and social realities of our time. Moreover, we need to recognize vocational training as a vital and related segment of our educational system, not as a poor relation.

This undertaking can succeed only with the able planning, the support, and the enterprise of the States and communities, recognizing the economic needs of their own regions. It cannot be manufactured in Washington alone. It will depend in greatest measure upon the leadership which you and your fellow citizens bring to it.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES ACT

The third of these three legislative supports is for the education of the mentally retarded and handicapped. Under the Mental Retardation Facilities Act, $51.5 million in grants is authorized during the next 3 years for research and the training of teachers of some 5 to 6 million handicapped children, including those who are impaired in hearing, sight, speech, and the emotionally disturbed.

Today, only one-fourth of these handicapped children are given special educational opportunities. Three-fourths are struggling to keep up in regular school grades, or are not in school at all.

Needing special attention, these children require specially trained teachers. And here, as in so many other areas of education, there is a serious teacher shortage. The legislation we are now discussing can help us to remedy this shortage. It will enable us to train educators in specialized skills and research, helping them to transmit their learning through our universities and colleges to qualify teachers to serve the needs of the handicapped.

Here, again, our new legislation moves toward the principle of educational opportunity for all—to bring to the physically and mentally handicapped a maximum potential for useful, productive lives. To the extent that we succeed in fulfilling this principle, we will meet both the demands of our conscience and of our social well-being as a Nation.

At the outset of these remarks, I observed that the climate has never been better for the improvement of American education. We may enthusiastically greet this legislation which deals significantly with three major areas of need—in higher education, in vocational education, in education for the handicapped.

But we would woefully deceive ourselves if we regard these measures, however well we administer them, as more than steps along a difficult road. They are by no means cure-

alls for the ailments of American education, nor will they—or any legislation—help education to cure all the ills in our society. As hopeful solutions to parts of the problem, however, they should encourage us to move on to the rest of the unfinished business of our Nation's schools.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

I, for one, see no limitation to the potential of education. I see it as the principal lever which can move our society forward. If this makes me a salesman of education, I have no apologies to offer. I am delighted to promote this product whenever and wherever I can before any group—and especially before this assembly of knowledgeable educators.

Now, in 1964, I suggest that it is high time for us to make a fresh start, a time to deal with the total needs of American education without further delay. It will not be enough for us to plan for the expansion of our universities and colleges; we will fail if our efforts stop here. Nor will it be enough to modernize and expand our facilities for vocational education: again, we will miss our ultimate chance if we do this alone.

If we mean to succeed, we must go to the heart of American education and here we will find two great tasks awaiting us. One is an old problem, which we have recognized for more than a generation. The second is rather new, even for us, and it might seem somewhat revolutionary for the public generally. But revolutions should not be too alarming in this country, which began with one.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Our first task, the first essential of our unfinished business, has to do with the state of our American elementary and secondary schools. Here are the neglected but basic foundations upon which every educational program depends. If our Nation is to achieve the intellectual, moral, and economic greatness we seek, we must improve the quality and quantity of these fundamental educational resources. To do so may not, by itself, insure the happy destiny we seek as a Nation. But to fail in this effort will assuredly destine our national failure to meet our ideals.

From the Halls of Congress to the gatherings of educators, these woes of basic education are already an old story. Here the fine edge of debate has long since been dulled by almost endless repetition. The needle has nearly worn out the grooves of the record. And yet the faint and gloomy melody lingers, a scratched mockery of our democratic ideals.

Through neglect of our elementary and secondary schools, we have inherited a chronic shortage of qualified teachers and of suitable classrooms. Indeed, there is only one essential to education that is not in short supply—and that is the students who enroll each year in growing numbers and with such large and often frustrated expectations. But these shortages of teachers and classrooms need not exist. If what we say in 1964 is clearly and firmly said, perhaps it may not need to be said again in 1965, or again and again through the remaining years of the decade.

TEACHER SALARIES

Clearly, we must improve the quality of teaching, for our schools cannot be better than the teachers we employ. And we can hardly expect excellent teaching until we bring taecher salaries within shouting distance of salaries paid to other professional groups.

Across the Nation during 1962–63, the average annual salary of public school teachers was about $6,000—and in many depressed areas, the averages were under $3,000. Such salaries are from 50 to 100 percent lower than those paid to other professionals such as accountants and chemists, to auditors and lawyers. They are even a poor match for the wages we pay to plumbers and television repairmen and washing machine mechanics. And yet to these undervalued and underpaid teachers we entrust our most valued possession, our children.

Obviously we must make teacher salaries competitive with other professions if we hope to raise the level of education. We must increase beginning salaries if we mean to encourage able young people to become teachers, and we must raise maximum salaries if we want experienced adults to continue in teaching as a career. This is no mere statistical problem for the Federal Government and its Office of Education, or for the harried bookkeepers in your local boards of education. It is a problem for every responsible American family.

CLASSROOM SHORTAGES

Our next shortage is in classrooms and here, too, we have neglected to balance our educational budget. An inventory of the Nation's school facilities made last year tells us that about one-sixth of all American classrooms were constructed before 1920, that more than 50,000 are built of combustible materials, and that 37,000 of the classrooms now in use are in such makeshift quarters as quonset huts and abandoned military barracks.

For more than 10 million American schoolchildren today, classrooms are seriously overcrowded, with 30 or more pupils in every room. To reduce this average to 30 or less will require more than 66,000 new classrooms—aside from the construction of schoolrooms needed to meet present hazards of health and safety. These additions to our national school plant, however, will merely remedy the deficiencies of 1964. They will not prepare us for the growing enrollments of schoolchildren, an increase from 38.8 million today to 45.2 million by the end of this decade.

Our unmet need for better paid teachers and more classrooms can afford no further semesters of neglect. It has already become a national scandal. It needs to be dealt with and dealt with now.

AREAS OF TROUBLE

No less important than meeting these chronic and evident flaws in American education is coming to grips with acute areas of trouble which recent understanding and awareness are bringing to our attention. Today we are accustomed to seeing a world division between the developed and privileged nations and the underdeveloped and underprivileged. We have learned that this gap between the poor and the well off is intolerable if our world is to achieve stability and peace. But we have not yet accepted the fact that the division also characterizes our own country. Here at home we are also dangerously divided between the "haves" and the "have nots."

The United States, on one hand, is an affluent society, shaped by a complex and expanding economy. More scientists are alive and working today than in the whole history of mankind. The mind of man is now unlocking the secrets of nature not merely on this third planet from the sun, but throughout our universe. We have come to an era in history in which almost every boundary of knowledge is yielding to the trained and exploring mind.

But in this day of unlimited possibility, we are also outdistancing millions of our fellow Americans, consigning them in growing numbers to a shadowland of ignorance and deprivation. We are failing dismally to bring to them an equality of educational opportunity, or even a hope for equality. I place this failure squarely before the house of education because it is here that the revolution in thinking and attitude is long overdue.

The revolutionary concept I would offer is simply this—that we resolve that no child within our society is either unteachable or unreachable—that whenever a child appears at the doors of our schools he presents a direct challenge to us and to all our abilities. These are not new words or ideas, of course—to carry them to reality, however, would be revolutionary.

THE CHILDREN OF POVERTY

I say this fully aware that children in our city slums and in our depressed rural areas are hard to teach; that their family and neighborhood environments are generally inhospitable to learning; that they bring to our schools, already beset with problems, a whole new range of serious problems. Their parents are frequently unemployed. Their homes are usually shabby and often dangerous, without space for a schoolchild's desk for the labors of homework. Their language abilities are often limited and monosyllabic.

When sociologists view these children—and they number about 30 percent of our school age population—sociological labels are customarily applied. They are, we are told, "culturally deprived and handicapped," "socially disadvantaged and limited." Among them are Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and poor whites who have migrated to the big cities or the foreign born who have emigrated hopefully to the big country.

I have no quarrel with the sociologists and their labels. As well as language and ability permit, they accurately describe the conditions of people within our society. My quarrel, instead, is with those who easily adopt these descriptions as excuses for neglect. For educators, the question is not the environment that children bring to the school from the outside, but the environment the school provides from the inside.

If our schools are generally weak from a poverty of teachers and classrooms, they are specifically weak for the children requiring the best of education and getting the worst of our efforts. If we fail these children who need education most, where shall we take pride for success?

STEPS TO THE FUTURE

Now, in 1964, we are given a new opportunity through specific legislative acts—purposeful steps to the future. We shall see new schools created, new beginnings in many areas of education. Not the least among these beginnings is the improvement and development of vocational schools to prepare our children for the needs of tomorrow.

I know that you here in the South Bend-Mishawaka area have been quick to realize the significance of this important program. Only a few weeks ago I met in Washington with Dr. Alex. Jardine and Dr. Donald Dake of the South Bend Community School Corp. and Congressman BRADEMAS to discuss an application which South Bend has made for Federal funds to build a new area vocational school here to serve northern Indiana and southern Michigan.

Your Congressman tells me that only last week you asked for additional funds to provide residential facilities for this school. You all understand, of course, that there is the most intense competition throughout the United States for the funds which Congress has provided us for this program so that it would not be appropriate for me to make any commitment to you on your application except to say that you can be assured your interest will be given the most careful consideration.

Connecticut Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, medical authorities throughout the country

have been expressing concern over an epidemic of German measles. In the words of Dr. Franklin M. Foote, commissioner of the Connecticut State Department of Health:

Although German measles is a fairly mild infection with relatively few aftereffects, its chief importance is the possibility of affecting the fetus of an expectant mother when the disease is present during the first trimester of pregnancy.

Recognizing the seriousness of this epidemic, Dr. Foote has initiated a survey of Connecticut physicians to maintain a complete file of the incidence of the disease in Connecticut.

After having the importance of this survey to the health and welfare of Connecticut residents called to my attention by Dr. A. E. Reichenbach, of Waterbury, Conn., and on his pointing out that the Nation needed a similar effort, I called this action to the attention of the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Donald Henderson, Chief of the Surveillance Section, has taken the trouble to study the Connecticut program and his comment is:

The Connecticut study is eminently sound and is deserving of commendation.

Dr. Henderson told me in a letter that he presently knows of no other State conducting such a study and added that he plans to call the Connecticut study to the attention of the other States in the belief that several might be interested in embarking on a similar program.

I believe that Connecticut's commissioner of health, Dr. Foote, is deserving of commendation for having taken the initiative in this matter. I note that since January 1 more than 20,000 cases of German measles have been reported to the Connecticut State Health Department, which is more than the total for the previous 5 years—1959–63—which was only 16,600. In Massachusetts, the number of cases in 1964 was five times greater than that for 1963, and in Rhode Island, there were 50 percent more cases this year to date than were reported in all of 1963. New York City currently has 17 times the number of cases reported for the same period last year.

In order to present the full significance of the Connecticut survey, I include here the circular letter distributed by Dr. Foote to Connecticut physicians and the letter written to me by Dr. Henderson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, commenting on the Connecticut study:

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Hartford, Conn., April 27, 1964.

To: Physicians.
Re: Epidemic of rubella (German measles).

DEAR DOCTOR: If one of your patients has had German measles during the first 3 months of pregnancy, would you please report the following to us through your local director of health:

The name of the patient and onset of her illness.

The name of the hospital where she expects to be delivered.

The expected date of delivery.

If gamma globulin was given, the date of the injection and amount of globulin.

Our plan is to contact physicians reporting rubella during early pregnancy and obtain reports on progress of pregnancy, any pathological examinations of abortions or stillbirth, and examinations of newborns. Ophthalmological, pediatric cardiological and audiological diagnostic consultations could be provided on request through the crippled children section of the State department of health, and treatment and rehabilitation services, if there is a financial need, through this and other agencies.

Since the first of the year, more than 20,000 cases of German measles have been reported to the State department of health. This number is greater than the total reported in any single entire year, the largest being 1943 with 14,000 cases. The total for the past 5 years, 1959–63, was only 16,600. This epidemic is widespread throughout the United States.

Although German measles is a fairly mild infection with relatively few after effects, its chief importance is the possibility of affecting the fetus of an expectant mother when the disease is present during the first trimester of pregnancy.

Studies have shown that such infants may have congenital malformations including cataracts, heart disease and complete deafness. Passive immunization through the use of large doses of immune serum globulin may prevent or modify the disease. The Committee on Control of Infectious Diseases of the American Academy of Pediatrics suggests a dose of 20cc. of gamma globulin, but notes that the protection effect is uncertain and unreliable.

Sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN M. FOOTE, M.D.,
Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1964.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: We appreciate being informed of the interesting approach taken by Dr. Franklin Foote in endeavoring to identify and appraise the sequelae of rubella during the current outbreak. As you indicate, the problem is a serious one of significant consequence.

We have embarked on a number of different approaches to measure the extent and magnitude of the rubella problem this year. A preliminary appraisal of the situation was presented in the morbidity and mortality weekly report some weeks ago. I inclose a copy for your information. A later summary will be presented during June. With several State and local health departments, we are conducting a number of field studies to assess various facets of the problem; a measurement of the frequency of congenital malformations of the type associated with rubella will be available from 30 States in about 6 months.

The Connecticut study is eminently sound and is deserving of commendation. Although such a study would not be possible in some States because of limitations of personnel and resources, I suspect that there are several who might be interested in embarking on a similar program. I plan to write them directly to call this study to their attention. I presently know of no other State conducting such a study.

Our thanks for your interest in this important problem.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD A. HENDERSON, M.D.,
Chief, Surveillance Section, Epidemology Branch.

What About the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD three recent articles on the draft; one by William F. Buckley, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 27, 1964, another from the Christian Science Monitor of May 11, 1964, and the third is an editorial from the New York Times of May 20, 1964.

The Times editorial makes the point that the studies continually under way in the Department of Defense, though of some use, do not meet the real need. It is necessary to have a thorough study of military manpower, not just from the standpoint of military needs but also from the standpoint of the social and economic efforts resulting from the system.

On April 21, 1964, fifteen Republican Members took the floor of the House to discuss in considerable detail various aspects of the draft. This dialogue appears on pages 8310–8324 of the RECORD of that date.

On March 11, 1964, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10395, to create a commission to study the matter. Other Members of the House and Senate have introduced similar bills. I am hopeful that the Congress will move this matter forward promptly.

The articles follow:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Apr. 27, 1964]

END OF THE DRAFT

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

President Johnson has said he foresees the possibility that the draft can end 10 years from now. That is hardly exhilerating news. Anything can end 10 years from now, including the world.

It is curious that a President as temperamentally impatient as Mr. Johnson—every item on his legislative budget he has insisted be passed now, this month, immediately—should look forward to the end of the draft almost as one would look forward to the end of the Pleistocene Age.

I do not know whether the draft could be terminated, say, by the end of this year. But I do believe that the principal consideration against its early elimination is not the requirements of the national defense, but the requirements of ideology. The notion that if anyone has to serve, everyone ought to serve.

Shortly after the Second World War, a fierce debate raged on the subject of compulsory universal military training, a cause championed by President Harry Truman, who kept telling everybody "I had military service and look what it did for me," to audiences that were bewilderingly undisposed to rush to the opportunity of bringing up their sons like Mr. Truman.

Mr. Truman lost the battle, but won the war—shortly after the Korean invasion Congress, having become convinced by the military that that was the only way to staff our burgeoning armed services, passed a

draft law. And now Congress has got into the habit of renewing that law every 4 years, as a matter of course.

But protests against it are growing, and it is in response to them that Mr. Johnson has spoken.

The case against the draft law is both philosophical and practical. As a free nation we are devoted to the proposition that involuntary servitude is wrong. We waive that objection, quite rightly, when it becomes necessary to do so in order to provide for the common defense.

The practical question arises whether the draft is truly necessary for the common defense. Consider the rough figures: To maintain the necessary armed strength of 2,700,000 men, we now need 500,000 recruits per year. There are well over 1 million young men who become qualified to serve every year.

Already then, not allowing for the physical or psychological rejects, we are conscripting substantially fewer people than are available in the manpower pool.

Notwithstanding this, the draft boards persist in making every young man's life perpetually insecure. Week after week, month after month—year after year, even—a young man who is unwilling to enlist in the armed services will while away his time, going from job to job, being turned down by many employers, never able to plan his future, hoping he may slip through the exposure period unscathed. They are years of demoralization and insecurity.

And they encourage, at worst, reckless, draft-immunizing marriages; at best, deception: college courses you don't ever really care about, phony illnesses, phony reports from employers who pretend to need you desperately—anything to appease a draft board which is quite easily appeased, since many of them have such a considerable surplus of manpower in their pools, and don't know what to do with them.

And once in the services, tens of thousands do not do a hard day's work in a week, and and cultivate habits of sloth and boredom which may dog them for the rest of their lives—I would hope that the President's Commission would call in at random a hundred or so troops halfway through their services and ask them to account day by day, hour by hour, how they spend their time.

Congress should take immediate action to allocate by lottery a number to every potential draftee, indicating the order in which he stands to be called up.

That's the way it was done in 1939: And on the basis of one's number one could guess fairly close what was the likelihood of being called up. The not so very long-term objective should be to eliminate the draft in favor of a professional army of volunteers, who would greatly increase the efficiency of the armed services, and relieve the civil population of an experience which, insofar as it is unrelated to true necessity, is debasing, and an unnecessary—and therefore inexcusable—encroachment on individual freedom.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 11, 1964]

U.S. DILEMMA—WHAT ABOUT THE DRAFT?

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Certainly one of those most responsible for the new presidential interest in the draft law is Columbia's Dr. Eli Ginzberg, whose three-volume work on the "Ineffective Soldier" is a basic text on the whole subject.

Dr. Ginzberg—whose credentials include being a professor of economics in Columbia's Graduate School of Business, chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Committee, and a member of the President's group on domestic issues—highlights these opinions:

In looking at what could be done about the draft, it would be a big mistake, he says, to think of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps as already being purely "voluntary," in terms of the way they get their personnel. He stresses the threat of the draft as being an important factor in the so-called voluntary process.

He feels that the machinery set up for the draft is ideal for providing the information needed for taking remedial action that would help the disadvantaged youth in the Nation. However, he emphasizes that he would not be in favor of continuing the draft for this purpose alone.

FAIR SYSTEM WANTED

Dr. Ginzberg feels deeply that if the draft is to be continued, a more equitable system of choosing personnel should be arrived at—perhaps a national lottery. He sees no need for exemptions for those who go to college, or who marry.

Looking at the overall problem, Dr. Ginzberg said there are "several important things about the draft." First, he said, "is whether it will be needed, in light of the present and prospective size of the Armed Forces." Continuing:

"It is very hard to assess this question. There is no valid experience to go by * * * the number of people willing to volunteer for the draft depends on:

"1. The number of men reaching military age.

"2. The volume of employment opportunities.

"3. The size of the Armed Force's requirements for military personnel; they have some opportunity to turn some of the jobs over to civilians.

"4. The salary structure—premium pay and such matters.

"We have had the draft continuously since 1940—except for a short period in 1947 and 1948. So we have no experience about what would happen to a completely voluntary system."

DRAFT PRODS "VOLUNTEERS"

"It is ludicrous," said Dr. Ginzberg, "to talk about the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps as being purely 'voluntary' services—relying solely on volunteers. No knowledgeable person has any doubts that some proportion (in my own opinion not less than one-sixth and it might be as high as one-fourth or even higher) go into these services because of the threat of the draft.

"Now * * * unless these 'volunteer' services would reduce their demand for manpower by at least the foregoing one-sixth to one-fourth, they could encounter shortages if the draft were eliminated.

"As far as the Army is concerned, there would be a gaping hole in its requirements since it has been drafting about 10,000 persons a month.

"In addition, many reserve units are getting the manpower they require as the result of the draft.

"What also is often overlooked is the fact that the armed services would probably encounter difficulty in getting adequate numbers of officers were it not for the draft.

"It is foolish therefore to say that one can easily get rid of the draft."

"What is true," said Dr. Ginzberg, "is that with the number of young men reaching draft age increasing very rapidly—about 30 percent this year and remaining at the higher level in the years to come—it provides a much larger pool of eligibles.

"The nub of the draft problem to begin with is that in the absence of a deterioration in international affairs, there will be many more eligibles than the Armed Forces will need to meet their needs.

"This then raises the question of equity in selection for the services—if we find that the armed services cannot get on without the draft." Continuing:

"In the past about 7 out of every 10 young men have some military service. Currently, because of lower needs and greater availability, possibly as few as 5 or 6 out of 10 will serve. And with the large number of youngsters coming of age, under the present setup as few as 4 out of 10 will ever serve.

INEQUITIES NOTED

"I consider it intolerable—and I gather the President and Senators do, too—to look forward to a system of compulsory service, the impact of which is only felt by a minority.

"The situation gets worse when we realize that youngsters who are able to go to college and universities are able to be deferred, and if they marry, they continue to be deferred.

"The only reason I can discover why President Kennedy issued instructions to defer married men was to reduce the size of the pool of eligibles.

"I consider this to be a socially undesirable policy since it contributes to early and irresponsible marriages. And further it makes no sense to me why marriage should be the basis for deferment for military service under compulsory law.

"If the studies now underway [the Defense Department has asked Dr. Ginzberg to be a consultant on this study, which the President has requested] find the draft must be continued, it will be of paramount importance, in my opinion, to introduce a more equitable system of selection.

LOTTERY SUGGESTED

Here Dr. Ginzberg said he had no firm opinion on what course should be taken to get a more equitable system. He said he was listening for good suggestions.

"The only one I've been able to think up, to date," he said, "is a lottery which will determine the probability of service for all youngsters when they reach the age of 18, thereby making it a matter of course whether one will serve or not, rather than on such irrelevant grounds as ability of one's parents to provide for college, or one's desire to get married." Continuing:

"I would have no occupational deferments, for two reasons.

"First, I think, under a lottery system, the armed services should be in a position to require that those people who are vulnerable to serve come in young—at age 18 or 19—which from the military point of view is the preferable age.

"Second, most of the skills that the armed services require are skills for which they must train men. There are a few special situations—such as physicians and certain other highly specialized skills for which a long education and preparation is required.

"I suggest that special financial arrangements in the form of education subsidies are needed to meet this requirement." Continuing:

"The widespread notion that the armed services represents a negative influence in the development of talent and competence is not self-evident. It is true that enlisted men have little scope for meaningful assignments, especially if they are in for short terms—2 years.

"On the other hand, young men who are willing to serve as officers for 3 years are frequently getting more valuable experience than they would get as junior executives in a large corporation.

"I see no reason to be distressed when young people take their chances (as in his lottery system) of serving in the military."

Of the possibility of draft changes, Dr. Ginzberg said: "I am encouraged by the fact that the President has begun to stir * * * that the President has acted * * * and that a group of Senators are increasingly vocal about the need for action. Once the elections are out of the way, I hope we will be on the way to a sensible national dialog."

HUMAN RESOURCES

Here Dr. Ginzberg said: "There is another aspect of the draft that has been recently

recognized for the first time by a President—that it offers the possibility of contributing substantially to improvement of the Nation's human resources.

"The draft mechanism provides us with the best personal inventory that any country could ask for. We can learn about the education, health, and general adjustment of all 18-year-old men.

"When we find large numbers suffering from serious defects—mentally, physically, and morally—it would behoove a big, rich country like ours to do something about it through remedial actions. * * *

"If the draft continued, I would contemplate, favorably, the induction of these people and undertaking remedial programs within the military situation, or at least a paramilitary situation."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 20, 1964]

THE DRAFT STUDIES

Fluctuating draft calls, the high proportion of young men rejected for physical and mental reasons, and the impending increase in the size of the Nation's military age-group all emphasize the importance of the draft studies recently announced by the Pentagon. Such studies are important—in fact essential—to any future revision of our draft laws. But, unfortunately, the current studies are not broad enough.

As Senator KEATING and many others have pointed out, what is required is a long-term, comprehensive examination of procurement and personnel policies needed in the nuclear age to provide and to retain professional military forces of a requisite size over a long period of years. Present systems are inadequate; they are discriminatory and wasteful; and perhaps the draft, in the years ahead when our 18-year-olds will increase so greatly in number, will be unnecessary.

No really comprehensive study of the draft has ever been made. What are its military effects; is it vital to maintenance of our security forces? What are its political and economic results? What has been its psychological result; have we become more "militarized" or more "democratic"? Many of our forefathers fled Europe to escape conscription; do we now tacitly accept it as part of the "garrison state" of the nuclear age? How does it affect the educational level of the Nation and our social structure? What are the possible alternatives to this system of compulsion?

What kinds of incentive are needed to encourage voluntary military professionalism, and, in turn, what kind of an impact would these incentives have upon our democratic structure? If 40 to 50 percent of our young men fail to qualify for military service, are the service standards unreasonably high, or is our national fitness dangerously low? What kind of remedial action should be taken to increase the fitness of the rejected?

These are obviously questions as broad as Government; indeed, as broad as our society. The Pentagon's military studies are an essential base upon which to build. But if Congress and the Nation are to have a really thoroughgoing study of a problem which has affected every American family, a Presidential commission, or a committee made up of representatives from many branches of Government, from Congress, from education and from experts in civilian life should be established to commence now the compilation and analysis essential to informed action some years from now.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Airports and Hydrofoils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a recent article from the New York Journal American has just come to my attention. The article by George Carroll, aviation editor of the Journal-American, tells of a Norwegian experimental program involving the transportation of airplane passengers from Oslo to a suburban airport. The article goes on to compare the situation in Oslo with that of transportation to airports in the Metropolitan New York area. During rush hours on our highways, it can take longer to travel from New York City airports to midtown Manhattan, than it takes to fly from Washington, D.C., to New York. I understand that hydrofoil vessels could operate from the marine terminal at La Guardia Airport to 26th Street and the East River in approximately 15 to 18 minutes.

The use of new forms of economical transportation must be explored if we are to continue to safely move traffic in and around cities such as New York. I commend this Journal-American article to my colleagues as it certainly provides a great deal of food for thought.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD OF AVIATION—OSLO "FLYPLASS" USES HYDROFOILS

(By George Carroll)

OSLO, NORWAY, May 13.—The Norwegians began experimenting May 1 with 30-passenger hydrofoil boats to run passengers back and forth between downtown Oslo and Fornebu "Flyplass" (Norwegian for airport), a 10-minute taxi ride from town.

The same system may one day be used for the New York airports if the right kind of boats come along. It's under study.

The Norwegian kind go about 40 miles per hour and a ride costs half a dollar. They turn around downtown at the inner recess of Oslo Fjord, practically on the doorstep of the ornate city hall.

Ottar Kollerud, manager of Fornebu and an old friend of all the brass in the Port of New York Authority—Austin Tobin, John Wiley, Tom Sullivan, Herb Fisher—told me the boats collect passengers from the suburbs, too.

"They use their two-way radio to advise what passengers are going where," Mr. Kollerud said.

He is not only an old friend but a vast admirer of port authority people, for he told me:

"Odd Nansen, son of our great explorer-philanthropist, Fridtjob Nansen, served as architect on our new airport terminal.

"But the port authority helped us tremendously with our airport planning. Mr. Tobin is the most forthright man I ever met."

It is not surprising to find Norsemen marrying boats to airports with all the water they have up here—what a combination you could have by merging Norway with New Mexico and Arizona—but Mr. Kollerud did startle me with one of his troubles.

AIRPORT NOISE

Here you have a city of less than 500,000 so spread out in the wide open spaces they have ski runs in the midde of town, and "Flyplass" neighbors have gone to court about jet noise.

Not only that, they're Johnny-come-lately neighbors, according to Mr. Kollerud who remarked sadly:

"Our field is surrounded by water on three sides. In 1951, only 30 persons were living north of us; today there's 4,000 and they're threatening to bankrupt the whole country with their lawsuits."

So it's not only folks around La Guardia and the Idlewild that was, who're screaming; the Norwegians are doing it, too.

The King of Norway appears to be a much nicer fellow if you can credit the stories going around.

Among the cars he drives is a 1938 Buick, so the stories have it, and the other day he got involved in a minor traffic accident but confided to one of his friends later:

"They didn't arrest me, though."

During June and July many U.S. tourists will be flying north out of Fornebu on Scandinavian Airlines System excursions to see the midnight sun from Bodo. This will tip them off they can reach the "Flyplass" by hydrofoil.

A Tribute to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, my desire to acknowledge the valuable contributions of the Library of Congress is prompted by the fact that in a laudatory article which appeared on May 2, 1964, in the Christian Science Monitor concerning the Library, no mention was made of the unique and specialized services being performed by the Legislative Reference Service, under its able Director, Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree, his Deputy Director, Lester S. Jayson, and their highly qualified staff of trained technical specialists. Educational training and experience in one or more of the basic fields of political science, public administration, economics, science, technology, or law is required. However, the staff specialists are also expected to be somewhat of a "generalist" in various other fields. In addition, they must be familiar with Federal programs and with executive and congressional organization and procedures.

The Legislative Reorganization Act imposes upon the Service the duties of assisting the Congress in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals and recommendations, and of furnishing to the Congress information having a bearing on legislation. Ever since the LRS, as it is called, was first established in 1914, most every Senator and Representative has, at one time or another, felt the necessity to utilize the services available to them by this excellent adjunct to our legislative branch. True, the committees in Congress have excellent legal counsel and professional staffs; but the individual legislator has no such resource. For this reason, therefore, it is encouraging and gratifying for the Member to be able to call upon the staff of highly experienced, conscientious, and dedicated specialists of the Legislative Reference Service for needed assistance. The time thus saved by the Member of Congress permits him to devote more detailed attention to his committee activities and to his attendance on the floor of the House.

An idea of the volume and scope of the work carried on by the Legislative Reference Service can be judged from the fact that they answered more than 100,000 congressional inquiries in the past year. To be precise, the figure was 105,152—an increase of 25 percent over the preceding 2-year period. The present total is more than double that of 10 years ago. The number of inquiries continue to increase.

At times I feel impressed—and even overwhelmed—by the depth and range of a Congressman's duties and responsibilities. It would be difficult to obtain adequate information on the multitudinous problems and issues on which we must come to a decision and cast our votes without the detailed background material supplied us by the Legislative Reference Service. Our legislative responsibilities cannot, of course, be delegated to others. But they can be made more effective by our being furnished with relevant research and informational material which is pertinent to our work. The high standard of performance unceasingly displayed by the personnel of the Legislative Reference Service attests to the superior education and preparation which marks their work.

In recent years, there has been an upsurge of interest in organized contests of debate by high school and college students on subjects of national significance and concern. I am constantly besieged with requests from our youthful constituents for pertinent and useful material to be used in their school projects. To assist the Members of Congress with these inquiries, the Legislative Reference Service prepares basic compilations of selected debate materials which present both sides of the annual debate questions. These booklets have proved to be invaluable to the Con-

gressional offices, and requests for the high school and college topics often exceed 75,000 copies per session.

In view of the foregoing, it is most apparent that the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is playing an ever-increasing role in aiding Members of Congress to handle their increasing workload and to complete their assignments more expeditiously. It is invaluable to the work of our legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that credit should also be given to the Library of Congress for its excellent service to the public, and especially to the scholars of our Nation. I therefore present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article, which appeared in the May 2, 1964, Christian Science Monitor:

WORLD'S LARGEST LIBRARY

(By Cynthia Parsons)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It has 270 miles of bookshelves. Its fine print collection numbers more than 588,000 pieces including works of contemporary artists.

It has "Fred Ott's Sneeze," the first motion picture ever copyrighted, and negatives of photographs taken by Mathew Brady.

It also has a copy of the first issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

In 1814 it was burned to the ground, and in 1851 more than half of it was razed by fire. In 1815, Thomas Jefferson's entire library was purchased by it, and in that collection is a "rough draft" of the Declaration of Independence in the handwriting of Thomas Jefferson.

It registers copyrights. It sells catalog cards, recorded poetry, and American folk music.

It sponsors chamber music concerts and literary readings. It also commissions works of music.

A staff of more than 2,900 persons spent more than $29 million directing its activities in 1963.

Its two buildings take up more than 6 acres of ground, and within the buildings there is more than 36 acres of floor space. The main building, completed in 1897, is one of the most ornate examples of the Italian Renaissance style in the world.

By now, you know that "it" is the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. But what you may not know is that this largest of all libraries in the world is not for the exclusive use of Congress, but is open for public use.

ADMISSION

Admission is free. No introduction or credentials are required to become a reader if you are over 16.

(Students who are younger than 16 must either be accompanied by an adult or have a letter from their school principal stating that the material they wish to read is not available in their hometown or school libraries, that it is for a special project, and must state the subject to be studied.)

A tour of the Library of Congress—with no stops for reading—can be taken from the office of the captain of the guard, main building, Monday through Friday. Guided tours begin at 9:15, 10, and 11 in the morning, and at 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the afternoon.

The exhibition hall in the main building is open from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. on weekdays and from 11:30 a.m. to 10 p.m. on Sundays and holidays. The hours are the same for the annex except that it is open only from 2 to 6 p.m. on Sundays and holidays.

Since many buildings and exhibits in Washington are closed on Sunday, this makes the Library of Congress a popular place to visit.

EXHIBITS

Some exhibits are put up for only a month at a time, but the following will be on display all through this summer and fall:

Outstanding news photographs of 1963.

The Gutenberg Bible and other notable books printed from 1450 to 1550.

Instruments from the Dayton C. Miller flute collection.

First and second drafts of the Gettysburg Address written by Abraham Lincoln.

A facsimile of the Magna Carta.

But if you have the time and interest, reading at the Library of Congress is an unforgettable experience. You need not be a scholar to do so, but chances are you'll be seated next to one if you decide to take advantage of the more than 12 million books and pamphlets on every conceivable subject written in a multitude of languages available to you.

There are two general reading rooms: the main building (awesomely beautiful in itself), and the Thomas Jefferson Room on the fifth floor of the annex.

Any book from the general classified collections in either building is available in either of these rooms. They are open the same hours: 9 a.m. to 10 p.m., Monday through Friday; 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays; and from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. on Sundays and holidays. Books must be applied for at least 3 hours before closing time.

FOR READING

The arrangements for getting a book, pamphlet, or periodical to read are quite simple. If you know the title, author, or subject of a book or a pamphlet, you can find the full information in either of the general card catalogs connected with the Main Reading Room or the Thomas Jefferson Room.

Once you know what you want to read, you must fill out what is called a call slip. But before you fill out the call slip, you must choose an empty desk at which you plan to sit while you are reading.

Each seat is numbered. After you have presented your call slip to the main desk, you must return to your seat and the book or books you requested will be delivered to you. This should not take more than 30 minutes, and seldom takes that long.

There are librarians on duty who enjoy, and that's really true about these people, giving assistance to readers. They will assist you in the use of the catalog, in the making out of call slips, and in referring you to other works if those you have requested are "not in."

In addition to the two main reading rooms, there are a number of rooms for special materials. They include:

A law library.
Local history and genealogy room.
Map reading room.
Music reading room.
Periodical reading room (for unbound general periodicals and newspapers).
Prints and photographs reading room.
Rare-book room.
Science reading room.
Slavic room.

Veto of Civil Rights Bill by President Andrew Johnson in 1866

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, through the courtesy of my esteemed friend and constituent, James E. Green, editor of the Orange Review, I have received a copy of the veto message by President Andrew Johnson of the civil rights bill of 1866.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that that veto message may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETO OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

To the Senate of the United States:

I regret that the bill which has passed both Houses of Congress, entitled "An act to protect all persons in the United States in their civil rights, and furnish the means for their vindication," contains provisions which I cannot approve, consistent with my sense of duty to the whole people and my obligations to the Constitution of the United States. I am, therefore, constrained to return it to the Senate, the House in which it originated, with my objections to its becoming a law * * *

In all our history, in all our experience as a people living under Federal and State law, no such system as that contemplated by the details of this bill has ever before been proposed or adopted. They establish for the security of the colored race safeguards which go infinitely beyond any that the General Government has ever established for the white race. In fact, the distinction of race and color is, by the bill, made to operate in favor of the colored, and against the white race.

They interfere with the municipal legislation of the States, with the relations existing exclusively between a State and its citizens, or between the inhabitants of the same State in the absorption and assumption of power by the General Government which, if acquiesced in, must sap and destroy our federative system of limited powers, and break down the barriers which preserve the rights of the States. It is another step, or rather stride, toward centralization, and the concentration of all legislative powers in the National Government. The tendency of the bill must be to resuscitate the spirit of rebellion, and to arrest the progress of those influences which are more closely drawing around the States the bonds of union and peace.

ANDREW JOHNSON,
President of the United States.

MARCH 27, 1866.

Eulogy for Congressman Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest sorrow that I express my condolences to the family of the late Hon. CLARENCE CANNON. We shall sorely miss him, as he has represented, as few men have, a bulwark of strength and dedication. He had the kind of fortitude and strong character to carry out his convictions often in the face of tremendous opposition, as he believed deeply and sincerely that his particular philosophy was in the best interests of our country.

We are indeed fortunate that he left a legacy of such far-reaching importance to those of us who are in the House of Representatives and those who will follow us in the coming generations. His compilation of legislative precedents is a great and wonderful achievement. Having had the privilege of watching him in action at so many Democratic conventions, I will long remember his contributions to those memorable occasions.

Although I so much regret his passing from our midst after so many, many years of service to this body and to this Nation, I am glad that he lived a long and fruitful 85 years.

Chicago Tribune Joins in Tribute to Mayor Richard J. Daley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in its edition of May 22, 1964, joined all of Chicago in welcoming Mayor Richard J. Daley back from a most successful 3-week tour of Europe.

Mayor Daley returned to Chicago with his very lovely wife, Mrs. Daley, Wednesday evening.

The Chicago Tribune editorial reflects the pride of all the people of Chicago for the manner in which Mayor Daley represented them during this very pleasant tour. Throughout the world, the press had noted what a fine impression Mayor Daley made during his many interviews.

I am particularly gratified to read in the Chicago Tribune an acknowledgment that Mayor Daley is a "real expert in municipal government."

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

WELCOME HOME, MR. MAYOR

We have had disagreements with Mayor Daley from time to time, and probably will continue to have them, but today we are pleased to say "Welcome home" to him and his gracious wife. In company with all other Chicagoans we followed with great interest the news stories of his travels, especially his visits to Queen Elizabeth, to the Vatican, and to the land of his ancestors.

Wherever he went, Mr. Daley conducted himself with the dignity befitting his position as the head of a great city. He was generous with his time at press conferences, thereby surprising European newspaper reporters who are accustomed to dealing with high officials through flunkies.

In some foreign countries hardly any news about Chicago is published unless it deals with crime. It must have been a surprise to the people of those countries when the mayor of Chicago appeared without a machine-gun and proved to be a gentleman who could speak intelligently about municipal problems. Mr. Daley is a real expert in municipal government, as well as in the allied academic discipline known as municipal politics. His sensible statements and his demeanor on the tour of Europe no doubt corrected many false notions held about Chicago. For this reason alone the tour was worthwhile.

In addition, Mayor Daley deserved a vacation. He has taken few holidays since he became mayor and is known to be one of the hardest working public officials in America. Yesterday he appeared at the City Hall promptly at 9 o'clock, although nobody would have blamed him if he had taken a few days to rest.

We are glad he is back safely and are proud of the way he represented Chicago abroad.

Dallas Rolls Up Its Sleeves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article from the Wall Street Journal of May 22, 1964, "Self-Help in Housing."

This article is a firsthand account of how Dallas is cleaning up its slums and revitalizing our city through our own efforts and without Federal aid. I take some pride in the progress Dallas has made in better housing and in rebuilding its skyline to one of the most magnificent in the Nation during the 10 years I have served in Congress. I would not be so immodest as to claim credit, this belongs to the people of Dallas, homeowners who have improved their properties with their own hands and toil and sweat. It belongs to forward looking investors, bankers, and home loan companies, real estate operators and developers, and civic leaders, all who have contributed to making Dallas a better community through the combined efforts of all its citizens.

I am proud that even those who were inclined to doubt the ability of the people of Dallas to do the job and were willing to call on the Federal Government for help now support the self-sufficiency of Dallas. Two years ago the mayor of the city spearheaded a move for Federal public housing, but the proposal was roundly defeated at the polls. The Frank Morgan article points out the former city official now is opposed to the Federal programs for improving the city. Dallas is united in opposing Federal housing.

Mr. Speaker, Dallas has shown the way to rebuild our cities in the American tradition. We have said to the rest of the country, "We will not ask you to pay for cleaning up our slums and for providing better housing for our people. This is our responsibility which we proudly accept. All we ask is that you do not ask the people of Dallas to clean up their own slums and pay for cleaning up yours, too. We will do our job in building a better America for all the people by improving our own community and we ask that you do the same."

If we can get local communities to accept responsibility for local problems as Dallas has done, we can begin to get the Government back into the hands of the people. Then we can reduce the huge Federal bureaucracy which is now draining the lifeblood of every working man and woman in the United States. Then we can really cut Federal spending and reduce taxes and our people will be able to have even more of their own money to improve their individual status and take care of community needs.

The Morgan article follows and I commend it to you.

SELF-HELP IN HOUSING: DALLAS ENCOURAGES HOMEOWNERS TO FIX UP, SHUNS FEDERAL AID

(By Frank Morgan)

DALLAS.—Nine years ago "Little Mexico," a residential-industrial section in the shadows of downtown Dallas' skyscrapers, was a deteriorating slum. The area's 2,000 residents lived in 334 structures, of which three-fourths were judged by the city to be unfit for human habitation.

Today "Little Mexico" presents a distinctly different picture. Sagging porches and leaky roofs have been repaired. Many houses are freshly painted. Indoor plumbing has eliminated most outhouses. Flowers bloom in freshly spaded gardens where refuse once collected. Significantly, all but 3 percent of "Little Mexico's" residences now meet the city's minimum housing standards.

"Little Mexico's" transformation results from Dallas' self-help urban rehabilitation program which openly shuns Federal aid on political grounds and, according to City Manager Elgin Crull, "because it's a bad business proposition." Persons living or owning property in "Little Mexico" and two other formerly blighted areas, Dallas West, and Dewberry, have upgraded their neighborhoods, through their own efforts and at their own expense, with guidance and firm nudges from the city.

POLITICAL ANATHEMA

In this citadel of conservatism, the word "Federal" has an unpopular connotation, but connected to "aid" it's political anathema. Former Mayor Earle Cabell, a Democrat who will oppose Republican Representative BRUCE ALGER in November, recently explained publicly the rehabilitation program that was active under his administration. Mr. Cabell's foes jumped on his statement as meaning he favored Federal urban renewal. A few days later Dallas newspapers printed a full statement by Mr. Cabell explaining his disapproval of the Federal program.

Observes a Dallas business leader: "This city has always had a propensity for individualism and for doing things itself."

Of course, Dallas' slum problems aren't as serious as those in many other cities that are using Federal funds to revitalize residential areas. Notes City Manager Crull: "We have no blocks of tenement slums here that need to be bulldozed. We have single residences that are just badly run down." And Dallas isn't bothered by absentee landlords as many big cities are. Most persons living in the three project areas own their homes and are employed. Nevertheless, the city's residential rehabilitation program has been inspected by urban renewal experts from a number of other cities, and it's a point of pride among most Dallasites.

Mr. Crull and others connected with the rehabilitation project assert it has disproved the popular theory that slum-dwellers really don't want to better their lot. "These people didn't like what they had but they didn't know how to live otherwise," says Mr. Crull. Dallas city officals also credit the improvements in the three project areas with stopping the spread of slum conditions to adjoining neighborhoods.

In attacking the blighted areas, the city's urban rehabilitation office was armed with a minimum housing standards ordinance. It incorporated the city's previous fire, health and building requirements which had been

only sporadically enforced. All 4,300 houses in the Little Mexico, Dallas West and Dewberry areas were inspected, and owners were advised what was needed to bring the houses up to minimum standards. "We didn't play policeman just to enforce the ordinance," says John Sellon, who directed the program until he resigned recently to go into private business. "Once the people learned we were trying to help, they took the job out of our hands and did it themselves."

Dallas was so successful in encouraging homeowners to help themselves that only 53 had to be taken to court to get compliance with the ordinance. This contrasts markedly with the dictatorial approach of some other cities in rehabilitating slums. Baltimore, for instance, sent swarms of inspectors into one area and they none too tactfully ordered many homeowners to repair or improve their dwellings. Irate residents were thus put more in a mood for resistance than compliance.

Sam Fennell, a 52-year-old Negro father of four who formed and became president of the Dallas West Citizens Committee, recalls that his neighbors "didn't trust" the city when it launched the rehabilitation program and doubted that much could be accomplished. "We called several meetings at the beginning," he says, "and had a hard time getting people out. Then when they found it was a must, we set up seminars on carpentry, painting and plumbing and the people really turned out."

Ben Rusher, a construction worker who has lived in Dallas West for 22 years, says the city's extension of streets and sewers, half of which was paid by homeowners, has had much to do with property upgrading. "A man's crazy if he wants to live in slums all his life," Mr. Rusher comments. "We wanted places that could be respected just like everybody else but the dust ate us up, the place was a marsh when it rained and it didn't do no good to fix up anyhow."

It's impossible to say how much money has gone into improving property under the rehabilitation program. In many cases, it involved do-it-yourself repairs. In others, Mr. Sellon says, homeowners spent from $250 to $3,500 for repairs while taking on payments of $30 a year for street paving and sanitary sewer improvements. Only those financially unable to repair their homes are exempt. In the Dewberry project, a 108-year-old former slave lives in a dilapidated shack on the corner of one of the most improved blocks. A 70-year-old widow has no money to bring her two-story home up to minimum standards, but almost daily she climbs a ladder to dab paint on her house.

The spruce-up has increased property values in the three areas. Mrs. Ebby Halliday, owner of a big Dallas real estate agency, estimates the general upgrading in Little Mexico has boosted home values there by 33 percent in recent years.

The Little Mexico project was phased out 15 months ago. The Dewberry program, begun in 1958, is expected to be closed with 90 percent of the 1,000 structures repaired to standards. Six years ago, three out of four houses in the Dewberry section were substandard. Dallas West has been the biggest undertaking. When the rehabilitation program started there 4 years ago, 12,000 people lived in 3,029 structures, of which 82 percent were severely deteriorated, and 85 percent of the streets were unpaved. By this summer the city expects to have 70 percent of the Dallas West structures up to minimum standards.

PROBLEM OF FINANCING

Financing has been the program's most serious problem. Half the cost of street paving and sewer improvements are paid by homeowners, but the city has extended the payment period to 10 years from the usual 5 years. Many residents who own their homes signed notes to contractors for repair work they couldn't do themselves. Savings and loan associations loaned money for some of Little Mexico's improvements because the section is near the downtown area and considered good security. A few residents like Sam Fennell, who is supervisor of maintenance at the Dallas Housing Authority, were able to get bank loans.

"There has been some thought among business leaders to forming a private, nonprofit corporation that would underwrite the loans of the hardship cases and pick up the tab if they defaulted," says Mr. Crull. "The advantage of such underwriting is that it leaves the people with some feeling of independence and some kind of responsibility for meeting their debts, while not condemning those who can't pay. But this is only in the thinking stage."

The program, however, will move on to other areas of blight. A citywide program based on spot complaints registered by individuals or city agencies has already begun. Dallas is bent on proving its point that where slums are concerned Uncle Sam is no substitute for self-help.

Hate Is a Gun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Bay Stater, publication of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Massachusetts Medical Society, in its first issue prepared since the tragic assassination of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy last November 22, has published a poem "Hate Is a Gun," composed by Mrs. Katherine D'Avanzo, wife of Dr. Charles S. D'Avanzo, of Longmeadow, Mass., in my congressional district.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mrs. D'Avanzo's poem with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HATE IS A GUN

Oh man with a gun
What have you done!
The anguish and tears
We'll remember for years
Our beloved fallen hero
Was always so near you
Did he cause you real pain?
Could he to you e'er explain
That life is not play
Real courage they say
Comes to men in good time
From a Being Sublime
If we try but to pray
And our God in His way
Will give courage to men
Life's battle to win
But not with a gun!
No, not with a gun.

Was hate in your heart
So great from the start
Your miserable life
So filled with real strife
Was not of his doing
To cause deeds ensuing
Did you know of a love
Of our Being above
Take note of the fate
Although now seems so late
With a prayer in our heart
Let us now make a start.
Think of hate as a gun
When fired you must run
Fight hatred we must
And in God place our trust
But not with a gun!
No, not with a gun.

As good men well know
And without prejudice show
Hate is as lethal
As cold steel and metal
Man can destroy
Or turn grief into joy
Is death hatred's goal?
Is hate, death's foul soul?
Men oft not agree
This must e'er be
But not with a gun
To shoot and then run
Were you proud of your deed
As black demons you heed
You had but to pray
And your gun put away
You man with a gun
Man with a gun!

He held his head high
To the blue of the sky
While lurking you sat
As your venom you spat
Now heaven is weeping
As mankind is seeking
For peace and good will
That man will not kill
Has a lesson been taught
To us who are fraught
With seeds of despair
Instead of a prayer
Now face up to life
With all of its strife
Keep the light on his grave
For the dear life he gave
For all men with a gun
Men with a gun.

—KATHERINE D'AVANZO.

The Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us were deeply grieved to learn Tuesday morning of the death of our longtime friend, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

Mr. CANNON last March 4 celebrated the 41st anniversary of the commencement of his service as a Member of the House of Representatives. For 23 years, he served as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

During this long service, Chairman CANNON amassed a record of service to this Nation and the people of Missouri that has been seldom equaled in this country's history. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee since 1941, he presided over the appropriation of more than a trillion dollars, far more than any other man in history.

As all of us, who have had occasion from time to time to discuss with him various projects for which we were endeavoring to get funds, recognized, he was truly the "watch dog" of the Treasury. Always fair and understanding, he very rightly knew that his was the re-

sponsibility of giving the American people value received for their tax dollars.

We Members of Congress who have served with him over the years join with tens of millions of other American citizens and taxpayers who mourn his passing. His presence in this House will be greatly missed.

Senator Frank J. DiLoreto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, our State and the Nation were deprived of the services of a hard-working and thoughtful legislator this week when death took Senator Frank J. DiLoreto, of New Britain. He was 42 years old.

It was an irony of life that Senator DiLoreto had been severely wounded in World War II and was given only a short time to live. He recovered, however, returned to Connecticut, and made his mark in public life.

Perhaps his finest monument will be the State program for education on which he worked as chairman of the State legislature's education committee. He worked for the act which created the State commission on higher education and was the motivating force behind the creation of the State scholarship program.

My own sense of loss of this friend has been sharpened by the knowledge that he was so young, had already contributed so much to his State and country and had such great promise for the future. I know the House would wish to extend its sympathies and condolences, as Mrs. Daddario and I have done, to his family in their time of sorrow. I also believe the House should note the following editorial which appeared in the New Britain Herald regarding this fine man:

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, May 20, 1964]

SENATOR FRANK J. DILORETO

Our hearts are heavy this day at the news of the untimely death of Frank DiLoreto. Death is never timely, of course, but in the case of this man, this vibrant, popular, respected leader, it is particularly saddening.

A young man with a great future, they said of him. Ah, but it was more than that. Yes, he would have had a great future, had not the frailties of mankind claimed him so early. But he also had lived a great life. He had a great past.

He had, in his too few years among us, carved a mark that will be long remembered. He had a fine career in law, a fine home and family. He was tremendously successful in every field he entered, starting with an outstanding football career. He was a war hero, in the fullest sense of the word. He was a religious man, and he was civic-minded to a degree that is rare among his contemporaries. The offices he held were wide and diverse, and but a reflection of the esteem and confidence in which he was held. And whatever the office, he did his job well. He was an outstanding member of the State senate, hard-working, respected by all. It was said that he could have been mayor of New Britain at any time in the past half dozen years. We believe it.

But this isn't the eulogy that Frank DiLoreto would have wished. Perhaps what he would have wished would have been to be remembered as a person with a zest for living. He liked fun, he liked people, he liked to laugh and tell jokes, and State opinions, and argue. He crammed every minute with activity, with doing, with talking. He always enjoyed having people around, because above all else, people are life, people are the excitement, the challenge. Not things, not property. People.

The sickness that struck him but a few short months ago came as a shock to all who knew him, and to those thousands who knew only of him. We all hoped and prayed for him. But his full recovery was not destined to be. God, in His wisdom, deemed otherwise.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow once wrote:

"There is a Reaper, whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen,
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between."

To his grieving family, to his legion of friends, Frank DiLoreto was one of the finest of men.

Eulogy of the Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of an outstanding Member of this body, the late Honorable CLARENCE CANNON.

Chairman CANNON had the unique distinction of being a legend in his own time. That legend was composed of a record of outstanding service in one of the most prestigious positions in the House of Representatives, coupled with Chairman CANNON's singular personality.

Coming from America's "show me" State, he combined native American shrewdness, commonsense, skepticism, and hardworking practicality in dynamic proportions. Through his efforts year in and year out, waste and inefficiency in Government were denied sustenance. He always demanded that the executive branch be as "lean and mean" as he himself was reputed to be. Through his judicious budget-cutting efforts, he saved the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

Yet for all his ferocity when faced with bureaucratic boondoggling, CLARENCE CANNON was a warm and kindly man. Many of us have memories of unexpected words of commendation from him, words to be treasured since their sincerity was beyond question. I warmly cherish some words of commendation and encouragement spoken by Chairman CANNON to me after I had made a statement on a matter of mutual interest at a meeting in the White House. It was all the more surprising to me since I was unaware that the chairman knew that I was a Member of Congress.

CLARENCE CANNON, powerful political figure and grandfather, has carved a firm niche for himself in our Nation's history. The chroniclers of our times must give him their attention, for he was instrumental in molding a responsible, responsive Government to lead our Nation in times of peril and plenty.

Missouri can well be proud of her native son, for CLARENCE CANNON was a truly distinguished American.

"The College Crisis" in Indiana, An Editorial Statement by WFBM, Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a most thoughtful editorial on the needs of colleges and universities in the State of Indiana.

This editorial, entitled "The College Crisis," was broadcast on WFBM, Indianapolis, Ind., the Time-Life broadcasting station in that city, on May 13, 1964.

The editorial follows:

THE COLLEGE CRISIS

The heads of Indiana's State colleges and universities laid the problem before the public this week: More facilities are absolutely essential if the State's going to continue to meet the higher educational needs of its young people.

The college-age population of Indiana was about the same in 1960 as it was in 1935. But by 1970, it'll be more than 40 percent larger than it was in those years. And it'll still be climbing.

Back in the 1930's, about one out of eight college-age Hoosiers went to college. By 1960, it was one out of three. And it may soon be one out of two.

In addition, a greater percentage of those who enter college now are fighting through to graduation. And a greater proportion are going on for advanced and professional work.

The combined effect of all these factors was dramatized this week by figures contained in the report of the four State schools. For instance, the number of freshmen in the State in 1963 was 25,000. In 10 years, the number is expected to be nearly 50,000. The total enrollment in Indiana's private and public colleges and universities in 1963 was 118,600. By 1973, it's expected to be 190,000.

These figures are bound to be realistic, since every child included in the projections is already in grade school. So, with present college facilities over the State now taxed to capacity, the problem is evident.

Already 22 cents out of every dollar in the State's general fund is going for higher education. And while everyone won't agree on any specific recommendation for meeting the new demands, we believe every parent, every taxpayer, and every candidate for the 1965 general assembly must recognize that solutions to this problem can't be chosen solely on the basis of how much they cost.

As Indiana University President Elvis Stahr has said: "If we don't get the job done, our failure will be measured in unemployment statistics, in the lack of adequate economic development, in a tragic waste of human talent, and in a mockery of our boast that America is a land of opportunity."

Idaho Jaycees Told About Partners of the Alliance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant in the partners of the Alliance program, Alliance for Progress, recently returned from a trip to Colombia and Ecuador, where he worked with the USAID economic mission staff in developing methods for a wider participation of the private sector in the Alliance for Progress program. Upon leaving Ecuador, he traveled directly to Idaho, where he addressed a business meeting of the State convention of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Moscow on May 15. It is my understanding that the Idaho JC's have sent Mr. Fleetwood's recommendations to their committee on statewide projects for action. Thinking that Mr. Fleetwood's remarks may be helpful to my constituents in explaining the operation of the partners of the Alliance program, and the significant role that Idaho is playing, I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, Jaycees and Jaycettes, ladies and gentlemen, I have just come directly to Idaho from Pelileo, Ecuador. It was, to me, the most important stop on my visits to Bogotá, Cali, Quito, and Guayaquil. It did not have the burgeoning population of Bogota, the balmy climate of Cali, the quiet charm of Quito, nor the spectacular growth of Guayaquil. But its people have an amazing will and determination to build their town again for themselves and for their children.

In 1949, Pelileo was completely destroyed by a great earthquake and 5,000 of its people lost their lives. Every building was level. The great slide roared down the mountain with such immense force that the debris was carried across the valley and half way up the opposite mountain. This town was the epicenter of the quake and resulted in a state of disorganization which even today is a factor in retarding the area's social and economic development. But that was the old Pelileo. Today there is a new Pelileo a few miles from the scene of that disaster. The Ecuadorean Government has helped in some of the reconstruction. But the amazing and most satisfying part is that the people of Pelileo themselves launched an important self-help program of their own—on a new site and with great resolve to make their city live again. They have done 80 percent for themselves. They have made wide streets, have built schools for 600 children, a hospital and a cooperative. But their one great lack is water. Pelileo has no potable water—the limited water supply in the urban area is undrinkable. The town's irrigation system was destroyed by the great quake and has never been reactivated. One project on which they are working is to develop soil conservation techniques, improve irrigation facilities, and in so doing bring about increased production.

These people have developed a town plan—a comprehensive plan based on their own tremendous efforts and looking toward assistance from Idaho in completing their self-help projects to provide the basic necessities of life. The plan includes water development, a cannery cooperative, a training center for weaving, crop improvement, and steps needed to provide needed hospital equipment.

I was proud to represent our State in Pelileo a few days ago in a city's demonstration of courage and faith. I visited there with two other members of AID and a representative of the American Embassy in Quito. We led a parade to the municipal center. Nearly 3,000 people participated. I pledged that I would go directly to Idaho and seek the assistance these people need. As one man said to me, "We don't need money for money's sake, but for tools to work." I'm here today to seek that assistance to bring these people water as well as hope that their town plan can develop and grow to bring them a better life. I'm here to explain how the people of Idaho can launch a great effort as a partner of the people of Pelileo.

I'm honored to speak before the State convention of the junior chamber of commerce for special reasons.

One, as a graduate of the University of Idaho, I have a chance to come back to Moscow and visit with old friends and relive warm memories of my undergraduate days. Second, I'm bringing a message today to one of the most dynamic and imaginative groups in the Nation—for the JC's are noted for their resourcefulness and their well-earned reputation as community leaders. I'm here as an Idahoan and as a civil servant in the executive branch with the interests of Idaho, as well as those of the Nation, in mind. For the interests of both are parallel and demanding at the same time. I have served in the legislative branch on Capitol Hill and have only recently become an employee of the Agency for International Development in the Department of State. I am now a special assistant in the new partners of the Alliance program, a new dimension in the Alliance for Progress. This new program has the full and complete backing of Idaho's congressional delegation, is considered a high-priority program by AID, and was mentioned by President Johnson in his news conference of May 6 as a program that merits support since the encouraging report of its progress by Tom Mann, Assistant Secretary for Latin America and Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress.

The idea of the program began when my associate and director of the program, Jim Boren, served as Deputy Director of our economic mission in Peru. He traveled throughout the country to meet the people and learn their ways. He saw much evidence of self-help.

For example, in many villages the people had organized night literacy classes. In one that he visited, the people studied by candlelight and shared a stub of a pencil. Because of the high-priority allotment of funds in the aid mission, he had no money available to help these people helping themselves. So he wrote to friends in Texas—in the Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, or JC's. They raised the money—$120—to airmail a small, portable, 12-pound generator to Peru. This generator runs 5 hours on a gallon of gas and lights a few bulbs. When he delivered this generator to the people, they whitewashed the walls and ceiling so that the bulbs would reflect a little more light. You can imagine the impact that this generator had in the village. People came from miles around to see.

In another instance, he observed a local project to develop an irrigation system where the only tools were a pick and an iron bar. He got a jackhammer unit to complete in weeks what would have taken months and years. That jackhammer is still making the rounds in Peru to complete self-help projects.

One group of people built a community center but lacked the funds to buy the doors and windows. A group in Houston gave a hand.

In every case it was an action of people helping people, without calling on the Government. It was a new approach in that our Government is not giving another handout but is acting, under this program, as a catalyst to stimulate the more effective use of the private sector in our foreign aid program—a better use of our institutions and industries which are willing and able to help.

When Boren returned from Peru just 7 months ago, he was given the opportunity to mold such a program on a hemispherewide scale. There are now 23 States actively interested and over 10 now participating in a meaningful way.

I'm proud that Idaho is a leader in this partners of the Alliance program. We saw Idaho's congressional delegation, Senators CHURCH and JORDAN, and Representatives HARDING and WHITE, in Washington prior to visiting Idaho in response to interest. We were given their full and bipartisan support. This program is too important to become a political football. I'm sure it will continue to enjoy the confidence of both sides of the aisle.

We came to Boise last February and discussed the program with a representative group—civic club's business and professional groups, educational institutions, local and State governments, and private individuals. Enough interest was present to warrant the formation of a local partners of the Alliance committee. I'm pleased to report to you today that it is still the wonder of Washington that the Boise Junior Chamber of Commerce took a project on the spot after that meeting—secured four sewing machines and a typewriter that are now in an orphanage in Ecuador—and all before a team had been sent to explore the ways and means to marshal the resources of Idaho, both natural and human, in a meaningful partnership with the people there.

Idaho's distinguished and bipartisan team is in Ecuador today. I'm only sorry I missed them. I had hoped to personally encourage them to look well at the people and the problems there so as to come home and put together a solid program. And also, to look well at the business-like operation our economic mission is conducting in Ecuador. Moscow's Dr. Boyd Martin is a member of that team for Idaho, as is George Wilhelm, of Boise Casade, and John Chapman, Boise attorney, and Gayle Allan, builder. Most of them are former JC officers.

These men will report their findings to the larger statewide Idaho partners of the Alliance Committee and make their recommendations as to areas where the people of this State can lend their skills and talents in technical assistance, and also be the coordinating force in effectively promoting wide participation. This committee will receive specific projects from specific villages or organizations in Ecuador and will retail them out to various civic clubs, high school and university student groups, trade associations, cooperatives, business and professional organizations, League of Women Voters and other groups in the private sector willing and able to take on these projects as their contribution to the cause of economic and social development in the hemisphere. These projects may range from $50 to $300 each.

Even before Idaho's team left for Ecuador, the committee had farmed out 19 small projects. Each when completed will bring great impact to an area of Ecuador. There is still much to do.

This is not an old clothes program—that smacks of charity. It is a program which responds to specific efforts of villages or slums in meeting a productive need when there has been a demonstration of self-help. Most of the items needed are available in the country and about 90 percent are U.S.-produced. Though it is possible for you to ship donated goods directly to Ecuador, you may wish in the interest of speedy response and simplified administrative handling, to send the funds raised by local groups directly to the person designated in the American Embassy as the partner's program representative. He will see that the materials are properly purchased, delivered to the partnership project, and put to its intended use. He will also arrange, where possible, for pictures of the completed project to be sent to the donating organization.

Here is a program that puts needed items right into the hands of villagers. It is a direct alliance between a U.S. group and a Latin American group to work toward the establishment of a lasting neighborhood relationship outside official channels. The only function of our Government in this grassroots approach to the Alliance for Progress is to bring these two groups together in partnership. By so doing, we hope to buy a little time until the institution building economic development programs of the alliance make themselves felt. By so doing we tend to give a real sense of movement to the alliance here and abroad.

Members of the Idaho Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention, if I could commend to you a high priority project, to undertake on a statewide basis, it would be to restore the water system to Pelileo. Idaho is famous for irrigation. It has made us productive and has provided us with a better life for ourselves and our children. If it is within our power to do so, we should do no less for our partners in Pelileo.

My friends in Idaho, Latin America is one of the most critical areas in the world today. Believing that in listening and learning, sharing and serving, we obey the claim laid upon us to be a neighbor, let us join in this alliance as partners in a meaningful way.

Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, CLARENCE CANNON's passing brought great sorrow to this Chamber and I doubt that these eulogies will render any less painful the great personal loss which his family knows and must bear. Nonetheless, it is indeed fitting that we pause to reflect on this great American's contributions to the Nation and the Congress.

His vacancy may be dimmed by time, but those who grew to respect and love him for his steadfast integrity will find, as I have, that there is a void in this body. A giant in every measurable way, CLARENCE CANNON was a friend to all who revered sound government. There was no in between.

Whether or not you agreed with him, you had to admire him for his was greatness of the first order. I feel that the finest tribute which we could bestow on his memory would be to adopt his cause of fiscal integrity and sound government in these troubled times. My sympathy likewise goes out to the bereaved wife and daughter.

President Johnson Pays Tribute to Polish Constitution Day on May 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during his recent visit to Chicago to participate in the 173d anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski brought with him a personal message from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

This message recalled, for more than 115,000 Americans of Polish descent in Chicago, the very inspiring moment last year when President Johnson, then America's Vice President, personally participated in the 172d observance of Polish Constitution Day in Chicago.

Mr. Johnson was received by the largest gathering of Americans of Polish descent to assemble in these annual tributes to Poland's Constitution in Humboldt Park. It is indeed gratifying to know that now as President, Mr. Johnson continues to show his deep and sincere understanding for the Polish people.

Mr. Speaker, I should like today to include in the RECORD President Johnson's personal message to the people of Chicago.

The President's message, which was received with a tremendous ovation, follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1964.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General,
Sherman Hotel, Chicago:

Since our earliest history, when freedom-loving Poles helped us win our independence, there has existed between the American and the Polish people a bond that neither time nor trial has been able to erase. Today we are strengthening that bond with the Polish people at every opportunity.

When Postmaster General Gronouski goes to Poland next month, he will be more than my representative. He will be a symbol of my personal determination to bring the people of our two great nations even closer together. May we rededicate ourselves to this effort on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Benton County (Ark.) School for Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article in the Sulphur Springs, Ark., Beacon concerning the dedication of the Benton County School for Retarded Children at Vaughn, Ark. It is a fine tribute to Benton County, one of our greatest counties, for the work it is doing to help mentally retarded children.

The article follows:

BENTON COUNTY LEADS NATION IN CARE FOR RETARDED CHILDREN

Approximately 350 persons passed through the School for Retarded Children at Vaughn, 6 miles southwest of Bentonville, when the institution held an open house last Sunday afternoon to dedicate the new $30,000 structure.

Judge Sherman Kinyon, of Centerton, gave a brief address of welcome to the visitors at 2:30, saying that no one person could be singled out as the founder of the movement, which started in October of 1958, with classes begun in November of 1959 in sunday school rooms of the Methodist Church in Rogers.

"This has been truly a group effort," said the county judge, who likened the current project to the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem many hundreds of years ago under the leadership of Nehemiah, who attributed his success to the willingness of many persons who "had a mind to work."

Although practically every State in this Nation has excellent schools for retarded children, Benton County is the first place in the United States to establish such a school at the county level.

At present there are 6 instructors in the school, and more than 25 children enrolled at latest computation.

A team of four young specialists who work out of the State School for Retarded Children at Conway spent Monday through Wednesday of this week at the Benton County unit, interviewing parents and testing children, some of whom will be new enrollees.

Bob Lamberson, editor of the Journal-Advance at Gentry, introduced the speaker.

Dean Newberry, pastor of First Baptist Church, Rogers, read a portion of Scripture from Matthew 25, the familiar passage in which Christ states that we serve Him when we do a kindness for "one of the least of these, my brethren."

The complete text of Judge Kinyon's address follows:

DEDICATORY ADDRESS

"This is, indeed, a special day for this county, and for those who believe in contributing to the welfare of our young society. Certainly we share the fruits today of those who have labored so hard to make this a reality and a success—of those who believe that where there is a will there is a way.

"I would like to take a moment of your time and take you back to the days of the Prophet Nehemiah. He was a man with the will to work, a desire to contribute his time to a very worthy cause. The walls of Jerusalem and the city itself had been ravaged by the enemies of God, and Nehemiah, although a prisoner himself, made a request to King Artaxerxes to allow him to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. Harassed by his enemies and those who made fun of him, Nehemiah and a faithful few rebuilt the walls and fulfilled his desire because as he said: 'For the people had a mind to work.'

"If our goals are honorable, if we care for our way of life enough to want to improve it, then we shall continue to make a stride in the right direction.

"In the year 1787, 55 delegates attended a convention in Philadelphia for the sole purpose of revising the Articles of Conferedation. During that hot, tiresome summer, they wrote a remarkable plan of government called the U.S. Constitution. When we can put ourselves aside and lend our time and efforts to worthy causes such as these great men did, who wrote our Constitution, then we can rightfully take our place in society knowing that we have made a contribution for our betterment.

"In December of 1961, in the Benton County quorum court, there was made a request to this honorable court to levy a 1 mill voluntary tax for the creation of a Benton County School for Retarded Children. The gentlemen who made this request, as well as the men behind the scenes, were farsighted, and devoted to the welfare of a special group of our growing society. They were mindful of those who could not render a normal service and live a normal life because they were retarded children. Surely there was a need for this school. Of course, there were those, as there were in the days of Nehemiah, who scoffed at the idea that this school could, or would ever become operational with such a small amount of financing and backing.

"A group of businessmen were asked to give of their time by serving on a board as the groundwork began to be laid for the construction of this school. These men did much and are still serving this worthy cause today.

"I would like to give you the names of all those who have contributed so much to this great cause, but I am hesitant to do so, mainly because I might omit someone.

"In 1963 this school became an incorporated body and the board purchased this plot of ground and entered into negotiation with a contractor for the construction of the school. The result is this beautiful building we see here today.

"We can select no individual and give him singular praise. This has been truly a group effort. This school will make it possible for these youngsters, who are and will attend this institution to find a reasonable place of service in their communities.

"We who have been blessed with good health must be made aware of those who are physically handicapped in this life. We must be made aware of our responsibilities to their needs.

"We know that life is a grab bag of complex problems. But we must not allow ourselves to become wrapped up with the material world to the extent that we are forgetting the spiritual part of life. Much happiness can come only to those who contribute to the needs of their fellow men.

"Through the efforts of the men and women who visualized this school and made it a reality, today must be a truly rewarding experience in their lives.

"I am proud to have had this part in helping to dedicate this school. It stands today as a symbol to those who have answered the call of these handicapped youngsters. As we see these children develop, we can all have a sense of pride in a job well done. We can have a knowledge that the people of Benton County have thrown out a challenge to the rest of this great country by accepting this responsibility.

"Much thanks should be given to the president of this organization, to its board members, and to all of those who have given of their time and means.

"I would like to close with these few thoughts. We need to revaluate our service to our people. We need to acquire the capacity to render rather than to be served. We need to realize that the only way to acquire this capacity is for each of us to develop and use a spirit of give and take—a willingness to surrender self-interest in the public interest, a willingness to seek spiritual guidance in our daily living."

A Challenge for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently President Lyndon Johnson delivered an address to an audience of students at the University of Athens in Ohio.

The President's address dwelt on the challenges of today. In this connection the Anderson Daily Mail of May 13, 1964, carried an editorial entitled, "A Challenge for Tomorrow." It is excellent commentary on the President's address and I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE FOR TOMORROW

"Our challenge, not tomorrow, but today, is to accomplish objectives which have eluded mankind since the beginning of time," President Johnson told the young people who made up most of his audience at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio.

These objectives, the President listed as the rebuilding of cities, clear air, pure rivers, the elimination of poverty, of illiteracy and of disease and insuring equal justice to all citizens.

Yes, most of these aims have eluded mankind since the beginning of time, and for a very good reason. Practically every one requires not alone money, effort and dedication, they might even require changing human nature itself.

He also told the students at Athens, "I know we live in an age when it is considered

correct to play it cool, when it is right to be reserved, when it is not good form to show great faith, but I believe with Emerson that no great work is ever achieved without enthusiasm."

We have seen, here and there, a few cynical commentaries to the effect that Mr. Johnson is setting out to do in months, or at most a few years, what humanity has failed to do for itself in all the years since man emerged from the stone age.

Now if Lyndon Johnson is anything he is a practical man. And not even the world's greatest idealist and dreamer would for one second believe that even one, much less a half dozen of these utopian situations can be accomplished in a year, a decade, or even within generations.

But the world's wisest man, King Solomon, also said in his Proverbs: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Thus in stating in brief, concise language some of the things that mankind needs to work for—starting today—the President has given Americans, especially young America, objectives for tomorrow any of which would be worth devoting one's life to.

Perhaps all of these things will never be accomplished. In fact, the Bible itself says that poverty, which is the President's immediate goal, will never be wiped off the face of the globe, but an honest effort in that direction will lift its burden from millions of backs and bring a better world into being.

What Mr. Johnson has done is to toss out the challenge.

Whatever is done toward accomplishing the ends he has mentioned will make this a better world than he—and all the rest of us—found it.

Hon. Charles Devall and Hon. Ellie Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written March 1, 1964, by our well-known Texas publisher, Colonel Carl Estes, in connection with recognition which has been given to two outstanding newspapermen of east Texas, Publisher Charles K. Devall of Kilgore and Editor in Chief Ellie Hopkins of the Longview Daily News, Longview, Texas. I congratulate Mr. Devall and Mr. Hopkins.

NATIONAL HONORS

Two Gregg County citizens were given national recognition this week for a type of public service in which they have become proficient and which is all too uncommon in our America of today. We refer to Publisher Charles K. Devall of Kilgore and to our own Editor in Chief Ellie Hopkins, recipients of the George Washington Honor Medal awarded by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

These well deserved national awards were based upon editorials which the Longview and Kilgore newspapermen wrote in 1963. In nationwide competition, their editorials were cited by the Distinguished National Awards Jury of Freedoms Foundation as "outstanding achievements in bringing about a better understanding of the American Way of Life."

Longview and Kilgore owe these men public gratitude and respect for the fine public service and example of citizen patriotism which on numerous occasions has brought them local, State and National honors. Their respective contributions to a more alert and responsible citizenship and to a greater appreciation of the basic principles of Government on which our Nation was founded have brought most favorable national attention to their home cities and to the east Texas area.

Charles Devall, our longtime close personal friend and neighbor publisher on the other side of the Sabine, has twice won Freedoms Foundation awards for his writing. His prior award was based upon a moving narrative, full of description and patriotic spirit, which he wrote on a visit to historic Valley Forge. His service to his community through his award-winning newspaper, as well as his many personal contributions in civic positions of community and State leadership, are well known and need no elaboration here.

Editor Hopkins has become a veteran in winning regional, State, and National honors as an editorial writer. Seven times, during the 15 years since Freedoms Foundation was established, he has been awarded honor medals in national competition for his distinguished editorial support of the hallowed American traditions of the dignity of man and the citizen's responsibility to preserve the dynamic system of constitutional government which proclaims and protects the individual freedoms and rights that have become our great heritage.

In further recognition of his accomplishments in editorial commitment to the cause of freedom and devotion to God and country, our editor has been named to the Board of Lecturers of Freedoms Foundation. He will go to Valley Forge later this year to appear on lecture programs held for teachers, veterans, service clubs, and other groups at the American Freedom Center.

A working newspaperman of better than 36 years' experience, we chose him from our staff 18 years ago to become our editor in chief. As our close working associate across the years, we have seen him develop into a resourceful and dedicated writer whose editorials bear the stamp of reason and conviction and hold high those moral and patriotic ideals and principles which are the basis of good citizenship and honorable living.

Longview and Kilgore are better cities in which to live because of the example in deed and the written word of our associate and our close friend. Our cities are more widely and favorably known because of their accomplishments and the honors that have been accorded them as newspapermen. All of us are better citizens because of their clear and forceful contributions to a better understanding and greater appreciation of our American way of life.

We commend them for their effective work across the years in the interests of a more responsible citizenship and preservation of our American heritage, and extend to each of them our warmest personal congratulations on the notable honors they have been accorded.—CARL L. ESTES.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following resolution passed by the Vestry of St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Honolulu, Hawaii, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I believe that the resolution is one of the most succinct and clear statements ever made with regard to the necessity for early passage of H.R. 7152.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ST. PETER'S CHURCH, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides for justice, domestic peace, common defense, and the blessings of liberty and equality, segregation has nullified these aims where minority groups are concerned; and

Whereas the 15th amendment guarantees the right of citizens to vote regardless of race, color, or previous servitude, many Americans have been denied this right and have been subjected to personal, social, economic, educational, and legal harassment and denials, thereby making a mockery of American democracy;

Whereas segregation threatens domestic peace and negates American democratic ideals in countries where communism competes for leadership and control;

Whereas Hawaii, unencumbered by segregation, has developed her multiracial citizens into loyal Americans who enjoy the fruits of life, liberty, and justice as guaranteed by the Constitution, but which are being denied to some Americans;

Whereas Hawaii, enjoying racial tolerance, understanding, and harmony, ranks among the most progressive and prosperous States, and exemplifies in practice the brotherhood of all men: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the congregation of St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Honolulu, Hawaii, representing almost every racial element found in the 50th State, is dedicated to the proposition that it is the inescapable moral duty of the U.S. Senators, our elected leaders in Congress, to reaffirm the conviction upon which our Nation was founded: that of equal opportunity and justice for all regardless of race, color, or creed, and to meet the ultimate test of our sense of moral right and social equality by passing the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152; and be it further

Resolved, That the congregation of St. Peter's Episcopal Church sincerely believes that the passage of civil rights bill, H.R. 7152 unamended is imperative, if we are to create a more acceptable image of American democracy at home and abroad and recapture the world's respect for and confidence in our way of life.

E. Lani Hanchett, Rector; Hilton Soong, Junior Warden; Samuel P. K. Liu, Treasurer; James E. Kau, Senior Warden; Robert S. C. Ho, Clerk; Edith I. Kam, Vestryman; Warren Chang, Vestryman; Katherine Kong, Vestryman; William Lee, Vestryman; Daniel Ching, Vestryman; Ben Pang, Vestryman; Robert M. G. Chung, Vestryman; Gerald Liu, Vestryman; James Y. S. Chang, Vestryman.

Employment—The Role of State and Local Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 24–25, 1964, a conference

took place at the State University of New York School of Law at Buffalo, formerly the University of Buffalo Law School, in "Employment—The Role of State and Local Action." In attendance were such experts as Madison S. Jones, executive director, New York City Commission on Human Rights, Dean Clyde Ferguson, of Howard Law School, John Feild, of the Potomac Institute, members and staff of the New York State Commission for Human rights, members of civil rights groups, representatives from Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Cornell law schools, and others who have worked with and thought about these problems. Prof. Herman Schwartz, of the University of Buffalo Law School, chaired the conference.

The law school is to be commended for its imagination and enterprise in conceiving and holding this conference. I am sure that publication of the papers and proceedings will be a great help to all concerned with this problem and hope the issue will get wide circulation.

I should like, at this time, to insert into the RECORD three newspaper reports of the conference, two appearing in the Buffalo Evening News on April 25, 1964, and one in the Buffalo Courier Express on April 26, 1964.

The articles follow:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Apr. 25, 1964]

FAIR-EMPLOYMENT GROUPS ARE URGED TO BE AGGRESSIVE

Fair Employment Practices Commissions should take "a more spontaneous and affirmative role in overcoming discrimination" a State university of Buffalo conference was told today.

"It is time for a major change in the administration of these Government commissions," Prof. Robert A. Girard, of the Harvard Law School said.

Declaring that these Commissions should be aggressive, he said:

"They should be forceful in condemning and active in eliminating discrimination.

"We need rapid progress. It is no longer adequate to proceed wholly or even principally on the basis of complaints filed by others."

MEET IN MEMORY OF HALPERN

"FEP Commissions should initiate their own inquiries and complaints."

Mr. Girard spoke during second-day meetings of a conference in memory of Supreme Court Justice Philip Halper. Today's sessions were in the Faculty Club on the university campus.

The conference theme is "Toward Equal Opportunity in Employment: The Role of State and Local Government." It is sponsored by the State university of Buffalo Law School.

Sol Rabkin, national law director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, suggested that State and local FEP Commissions have concentrated too much on a legalistic approach.

UNWILLING TO TAKE RISK

He said very few cases have entered the courts and commented:

"One of the problems has been unwillingness to take a risk. Commissions have not wanted to go into court unless they were pretty sure they had an airtight case."

He said a time limit to processing complaints is necessary to convince people that complaints pay.

"Let's not get so lost in procedures that we discourage complaints," Mr. Rabkin urged.

Prof. Louis L. Jaffe, of Harvard Law School said most fair employment practices laws have been "lightly operated simply because there was no political basis for anything else."

"Now we have an entirely different political situation—one that makes significant choices possible. These commissions are going to become tremendously more important."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Apr. 25, 1964]

ANTIBIAS ENFORCEMENT ON JOBS WEAK, PANEL SAYS—TWO-DAY CONFERENCE HONORING MEMORY OF JUSTICE HALPERN OPENS AT UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO LAW SCHOOL

State and local fair employment practices commissions are generally weak in enforcing nondiscriminatory hiring of Negroes and other minority groups.

This conclusion was reached by four panelists Friday evening in the Statler Hilton, where the State University of Buffalo Law School opened a 2-day conference in memory of the late Supreme Court Justice Philip Halpern.

A former dean of the school, Justice Halpern had a life-long concern for human rights. "Toward Equal Opportunity in Employment: The Role of State and Local Government" is the conference theme.

At the opening dinner, Dean Jacob D. Hyman, conference cochairman with Herman Schwartz, associate professor, reviewed Justice Halpern's career.

CAUTIOUS AND TIMID

He read the inscription of a memorial plaque donated to the school by Joseph Silbert of Williamsville.

While there are now 22 States and more than 50 cities with FEPC laws, the unemployment rate for Negroes actually has been twice as high as that for whites "for every year since the Korean war," John G. Field, Washington, D.C., declared.

The former executive director of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunities and an associate of the Potomac Institute, Mr. Field added:

"The authority of the regulatory agencies is limited because they cannot initiate actions, and they are generally administered with a high degree of caution and timidity."

Citing, among others, Illinois, which has more than 40,000 employers but only 5 FEPC staffers with a $50,000-a-year budget, Mr. Field asserted that most State agencies have "pitifully inadequate budgets."

FIFTY TAKE PART IN SESSIONS

Others participating were: Dean C. Clyde Ferguson, Jr., Howard University Law School, Washington, D.C.; Herbert Hill, New York, NAACP labor secretary, and Prof. Louis H. Pollak, Yale Law School, acting as commentator on the other papers.

Henry Spitz, general counsel, New York State Commission for Human Rights and Joseph B. Robison, assistant director, Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress, are among the 50 participants at today's sessions in the University of Buffalo Faculty Club.

"Negro militancy in the North has created a new set of conditions for State FEP commissions," Mr. Hill said, adding:

NONDISCRIMINATION ASSURED

"Now they must proceed boldly to the attack upon discriminatory patterns in entire industries and crafts. If instead they continue to operate timidly and reluctantly, then they are obsolete."

Concentrating on Federal powers, Dean Ferguson noted the President and all executive departments are compelled to assure nondiscrimination in the administration of Federal programs.

Agreeing with the other panelists, Mr. Pollak reported that New Haven, Conn., now will assume enforcement of Connecticut FEPC laws "because the State has obviously failed."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Apr. 26, 1964]

FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW CHANGES URGED AT UB

Today's social conditions call for a "major change" in fair employment practice laws and their enforcement, according to a paper presented Saturday by two Harvard Law School professors at a conference on the role of State and local government in equal employment opportunity.

The conference, held Saturday at the Faculty Club at the University of Buffalo, was sponsored in memory of former State Supreme Court Justice Philip Halpern, by the University of Buffalo Law School.

The paper, presented by Profs. Louis J. Jaffe and Robert A. Girard, stated that the present method of handling complaints on an individual basis "seems manifestly inadequate—a patent frittering away of the (human relations) commissions' resources and potentialities. Commissions that proceed in this fashion are measuring progress by the eyedropperful, when there is a swamp to be drained."

The paper suggested that State and local human rights commissions "should assiduously seek out important discrimination and make carefully coordinated, imaginative, forceful efforts to eliminate or ameliorate such discrimination on a plant wide organization wide, even industry wide basis."

Other speakers at the morning session were: Henry Spitz, of New York City, general counsel of the New York State Commission for Human Rights, who described in detail its operations, and Sol Rabkin, of New York City, national law director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, who discussed ways of improving enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws.

Commentators on the morning discussion were Joseph B. Rosinson, of New York City, assistant director, Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Conference, and Prof. George Brooks, of Ithaca, of the Cornell University School of Industrial Labor Relations.

The afternoon panel, led by Prof. Herman Schwartz, of the University of Buffalo Law School, concerned State and local enforcement of nondiscrimination clauses in public works contracts and the problems of job training and coordination with citizens and trade groups.

Madison S. Jones, executive director of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, concurred with Girard and Jaffe in urging more aggressive action on the problem. "In the final analysis, the very fact that racial bias has existed with great damaging economic, political, social, and moral consequences for a period predating the life of the Nation assures success in this field only by remaining consistently on the offensive," he said.

John P. Walsh, of Washington, deputy director of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, described Federal training programs.

J. Edward Conway, of New York City, a member of the New York State Commission on Human Rights, described the State's work in enforcing antidiscrimination clauses in public contracts.

STATE, LOCAL ACTION STRESSED

Frederick B. Routh, of Washington, executive director of the National Association of Inter-Group Relations Officials, emphasized the importance of State and local action on the problem of discrimination in employment, warning officials not to leave everything to the Federal Government.

Commentators on the afternoon panel were Meyer Fine, of New York City, a member of the American Jewish Committee, who spoke on the role of private organizations, and

George Culberson, of Washington, director of contract relations for the Air Force, who stressed the importance of regular surveillance of contractors.

Samuel Antonio, a representative of the Plasterers Local No. 9 and the Buffalo Building Trades Association, spoke during a general discussion, saying there is no discrimination in the building trades in western New York.

Citing the area's unemployment, he added: "If work was here, there would be no problem."

Law School Dean Jacob D. Hyman, said the proceedings of the 2-day conference will be published in an issue of the Buffalo Law Review.

Tribute to Hon. Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a Great Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we in Virginia share with the Nation a feeling of loss at the resignation of our adopted son, the Honorable Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Commissioner Caplin came to Charlottesville, Va., first as a student and then as a professor of law in the university. He served with distinction in the university and in 1961 was chosen by the late President John F. Kennedy as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, has informed me that, in spite of the fact that the Congress has passed two major revenue bills, a relatively unnoticed bill passed in 1961 could be one of the most significant tax measures ever passed in this Nation. This 1961 legislation provided for numbering taxpayer's accounts. It was pushed by Mr. Caplin as a direct outgrowth of his experience with automatic data processing. By providing numbers to substitute for names, it will eventually be possible to record all taxpayer's returns on the memory drums of the computers in the National Service Center, located in our neighboring State of West Virginia. I agree with my colleague that this can be one of the most significant changes in the tax collection procedures of this Nation, and I insist, Mr. President, that this project exemplifies the forward looking thoughtfulness of Commissioner Caplin.

As Senators know, I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that has jurisdiction over Treasury appropriations. In this connection. I have come to know Commissioner Caplin well. I can assure my colleagues that Mr. Caplin has proved himself to be a truly outstanding administrator. He has been in charge of a bureau of more than 60,000 employees involved in a difficult and demanding line of work. Mr. Caplin has maintained the morale of his employees at a high level; he has seen to it that they give a dollar's work for a dollar's pay; and, he has instilled a sense of pride and urgency throughout his whole organization. Where there has been deadwood or corruption, he has not hesitated to move vigorously. Where there has been outstanding performance, he has made certain it was recognized.

Last of all, Commissioner Caplin has proved himself to be a man of the highest integrity in a post that is subject to terrible pressures. He has enforced the law fairly; he has collected the taxes due; and he has developed in the bureau the thesis that revenue agents are not to harass taxpayers to fill a mythical quota, but to collect the taxes due and not 1 cent more.

We in Virginia are proud to have given to the Federal Government this outstanding public servant. We wish him well on his return to his previous career of teacher and lawyer.

Panama Canal: Reprisals Against U.S. Citizens Opposing Alien Infiltration of Canal Zone Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, since the Panamanian outbreak on January 9, 1964, and the ensuing Red led and directed mob assaults on the Canal Zone, the most astonishing proposal on the part of our officials to placate radicals in Panama was the revealment of a plan of the Governor of the Canal Zone to employ alien Panamanians, who bear no loyalty to the United States, as members of the Canal Zone police force. Condemned on the floor of the House on March 9, 1964, by my distinguished and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] as being "tantamount to treason," the disclosure of the Governor' plan aroused a storm of criticism and protest in the Canal Zone, the Congress, and over the Nation. As a result, the proposal has yet been consumated. Nevertheless, it has had serious consequences in the Canal Zone in the form of official reprisals against the patriotic individuals who exposed this scheme for what it is and endeavored to prevent what would inevitably bring about Red infiltration of a force charged with protection of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

The employees against whom these retaliations were taken include Pvt. Richard Meehan, president of the Canal Zone Police Union, who on April 16, 1964, was notified that he would be discharged within 30 days; Pvt. Samuel Roe, Jr., legal adviser of this union, who was similarly notified; and Arthur C. Payne, budget officer of the Canal Zone Community Service.

Mr. Speaker, these three prominent Canal Zone leaders no doubt spoke out vigorously in opposition to the proposed personnel policy but, in so doing, they represented the views of practically the entire mass of U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone. They were not subversives willing to betray the interests of the United States through acquiescence, but loyal citizens who understand the dangers on the Isthmus and seek to guard against them.

The facts of the proposed plan to hire Panamanians for the Canal Zone police force have not been adequately covered in the press of the United States or in Panama Canal official publications as they should have been but they have been presented in the Panama American of Panama and circulars originating in the Canal Zone among persons well qualified to prepare them.

In order that the Congress, especially its appropriation, investigating, and legislative committees, may be informed as to developments in this important matter affecting the lives of our citizens and the security of the Panama Canal, I include the news stories from the Panama American and a public "Memorandum on Loss of Constitutional Rights in the Canal Zone" prepared in the zone. Since the poem and paper mentioned in the last paragraph of the memorandum were quoted in remarks to the House on February 27, 1964, by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], they are not included.

The indicated memorandum and news stories follow:

[From the Panama American, Apr. 16, 1964]

PANAMA CANAL FIRES MEEHAN, ADVISES ROE OF SAME FATE IN MAY

The president of the Canal Zone Police Union was fired today and the union's legal adviser was notified that he would be discharged within 30 days.

Richard Meehan, the president of the union, was dismissed from his job as a police private after being found guilty by the Panama Canal government of conduct unbecoming a police private and other infractions.

Samuel Roe, Jr., also a police private was notified of the intention to fire him within 30 days on similar charges.

A third Panama Canal employee, Arthur C. Payne, Budget Officer for the Community Services Bureau and the third Panama Canal employee to face a discharge from service since February, appeared this morning before a hearing examiner to present his defense against Panama Canal charges.

Meehan termed his discharge "a blow to the freedom of speech and an obvious attack on Canal Zone unionism." He said he will appeal to Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr. and, if this fails to have him reinstated, to the Civil Service Commission.

The Police Union president was found guilty by the Panama Canal of the three charges filed against him February 20 after the publication of a poem and "citizens" letter which received wide circulation in the Canal Zone and the United States. Both poem and letter objected to since-shelved Panama Canal plans to hire Panamanian Nationals into the Canal Zone police force.

Meehan was charged with conduct unbecoming of a police private; failure to obey instructions from his superiors and failure to obtain clearance from the office of the Governor before releasing for publication article pertaining to government activities in the Canal Zone.

Payne, author of the poem, and Roe are reportedly facing similar charges. Roe was previously suspended by his superiors for 10 days and the charges against him today appeared to surprise Zonians.

Meehan, represented in the hearings against him by Albert J. Joyce, Jr., was retained by the police force even after the 30-day notice of the canal's intention to fire him elapsed. The canal stated at that time that Meehan's dismissal was only a proposal.

It is claimed by the Panama Canal Government that both the poem and the letter were "libelous, intemperate, sarcastic, and contemptuous and referred to the Governor of the Canal Zone and his policies and also to the executive branch of the government in general."

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD read the poem to the Congress and it was officially entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shortly after its publication.

The letter of dismissal received by Meehan today bore the signature of E. A. Doolan, personnel director of the Panama Canal. Reliable sources said the hearing examiner also recommended Meehan be fired. Doolan said the charges against Meehan were "fully supported by the evidence."

Meehan said both the American Federation of Government Employees and the Canal Zone Police Union will back him in his appeal. "However, I'm no longer a Panama Canal employee and no longer head of the union," Meehan said.

"Paraphrasing a U.S. Congressman, this is a petty reprisal by the Canal Zone Government for the union's opposition to the Panama Canal plan to hire Panamanian nationals for the zone police force," Meehan said.

"It is an obvious attack on Canal Zone unions—AFGE unions in particular. The government in the Canal Zone has made its intentions perfectly clear ever since the formation of the Canal Zone Police Union in 1957 by discharging from Federal service three out of the four men who have headed the union.

"Further evidence of this attack on unionism is that the second vice president of Lodge 14 is also in the process of being discharged. It is plain that freedom of speech has suffered a severe blow in the Canal Zone.

"The zone government fails to realize that in overriding freedom of speech it reflects in the eyes of Latin America as being a poor example of democracy," Meehan said.

[From the Panama American, Apr. 20, 1964]

THE MEEHAN CASE

(By Colin Hale)

The discharge of policeman Richard Meehan is a severe blow to unionism within the Federal service, a blow which, if successful, could have effects reaching far beyond the narrow confines of the Canal Zone.

It also apparently culminates a campaign by the canal organization to stifle any criticism of its policies, especially criticism by the people most affected by those policies, the residents of the Canal Zone.

For about the past 18 months, the residents of the Canal Zone have witnessed a steady whittling away of their right to express opinions—in public, at any rate.

The civic councils, originally formed by the canal organization as forums through which Canal Zone residents could air their complaints have been changed, by insidious pressures, first into mere debating societies, latterly into captive audiences for, presumably, administration-approved lecturers.

Now the canal organization is attacking the strongest union, and the strongest organized opposition to certain of its policies, the Canal Zone Police Union.

The canal organization has charged Meehan, the union's president, with conduct unbecoming of a police private, failing to obey instructions from his superiors and failing to obtain clearance from the Governor for publication of articles pertaining to Government activities in the Canal Zone, but by whatever name they choose to call it, the fact remains that it is an attack on the police union in particular and unions in general in the Canal Zone.

Basically, a union is a group of employees who have banded together, since in unity lies strength, to bargain, collectively, with their employer for better wages or conditions or in other ways to improve their lot. As such, a union is a body, apart and separate from the employer and it must be so treated.

Obviously, a union cannot owe allegiance to an employer. Its very purpose prevents it. Rather it owes allegiance to its members and their cause.

Equally obviously, as a body apart from the employer, a union needs a voice, a spokesman whose loyalty, when acting in that capacity, must lie with the union and its members even if, as in Meehan's case, he is a Federal employee.

By its actions in this instance, the canal organization apparently expects every item of union activity, be it calling a meeting or issuing a public statement, to be subject to the employer's veto or scrutiny—akin to Walter Reuther asking a clearance from Henry Ford II every time he wants to open his mouth.

To carry the analogy further, had Meehan been a fulltime paid employee of the police union, and not a Federal employee, the canal organization would have been powerless to impose any punishment for the alleged transgressions.

As it is, since the union is small and unable to afford paid employees, the canal organization is using its position as the employer of the union president to not only discharge him, but to threaten all future union presidents with a similar fate should the union voice its differences with the organization.

This constitutes coercion or reprisal, violating the spirit, if not the letter, of regulations framed under President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 10988 of January 17, 1962, which state, in the opening paragraphs on policy: "Employees may form, join, or assist any employee organization or refrain from such activities without interference, coercion, restraint, discrimination, or reprisal."

And this reprisal is aimed not a mere member, but at the president, the leader, the spokesman, the man who apparently enjoys the full support of the union in presenting its views. And if he cannot voice the union's views, who can?

It may be that he has been intemperate, but so was John L. Lewis. It may be that he has violated some petty civil service regulation, but only in his role as union president. It may be that the canal organization has whata it considers a valid case against him, but it is a case which reeks not only of injustice but of vindictiveness.

MEMORANDUM ON LOSS OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN THE CANAL ZONE, APRIL 1964

This is what the average U.S. citizen can lose for calling the attention of his fellow citizens to what he regards as mistaken conduct of public affairs by public officials. It is a state of affairs that the U.S. public should know more about, as there is now in their minds a wrong image of the Canal Zone U.S. citizen, an image that proves very convenient for those who have something to withhold from the American public.

The Panama American, an English newspaper edition of Panama, climaxed this situation by revealing on April 16, 1964, latest information on the status of three prominent U.S. citizen employees of the Government agency administering U.S. jurisdiction in the Canal Zone. It is slightly ironic that the only freedom of the press in the Canal Zone is that which is granted to us by the Panama American because of its Canal Zone circulation, and despite its being most strenuously criticized by the Canal Zone administration for doing so.

According to a front page release, Richard Meechan, president of the police union, was fired from his job on April 16. Samuel Roe, Jr., the police union's legal adviser, received a notice to fire him in 30 days, also on April 16. Arthur C. Payne, second vice president AFGE Lodge No. 14, was, on April 16, in the second day of a hearing in which he was defending himself from a notice to fire him. Are these three adverse personnel actions significant of anything? What are the pertinent facts? This the American public is entitled to know.

These three men, prominently active in civic and other isthmian activities, had the courage of their convictions to oppose the mxed employment of Panamanian nationals with U.S. nationals on the Canal Police Force, an employment in positions which are guaranteed as security positions only for U.S. citizens by Government regulations and statutes of law. (Canal Zone merit system and Public Law 8550.)

The Canal Zone Government agency is required in dealing with unions to seek union advice early enough in any such proposals affecting employment to allow proper evaluation by all concerned and to prevent any premature action by management. This was not done, but actually leaked out, and as a consequence both union and management tempers flared spontaneously in the Canal Zone.

The proposal to hire Panamanian policemen could not have come at a worse time. We had just been through the January riots and seen that the Panamanian policemen did nothing at all to control the Panamanian mobs. And—what good Panamanian would fire on his own countrymen to save Americans? The proposal was made by Gov. R. J. Fleming with the advice of certain management officials. Prominent among these was Robert Walker, Chief of Internal Security in the Canal Zone. Mr. Walker was the official who advised the Governor to allow the Panamanian student delegation to leave their main group and advance to the Balboa High School grounds where U.S. students were protesting Governor Fleming's instructions to cut down the American flagpole.

It is understood from reliable sources that Mr. Walker felt he could make American citizens allow the Panamanians to raise the Panama flag dually on the same flagpole, a Panamian whim that had nothing to do with the differences between the U.S. students and the Governor. The Governor had been ill-advised by his Internal Security Chief. Why is this important? Because it is the same Internal Security Chief who handles other security matters in the Canal Zone, particularly as to clearing Panamanian nationals for security type jobs.

Governor Fleming's proposal, which is called a suggestion by officials in Washington, was definitely an untimely one, considering that in January Panamanian rioting against the Zone had resulted in Panama cutting off diplomatic relations.

Governor Fleming's proposal was also an unwise one. It might appear innocent enough on the surface. It would involve hiring Panamanian policemen for townsites of Panamanian residents, but there is failure to show that many U.S. citizens are employed in the functions of administering a townsite. This would place U.S. citizens under Panamanian nationals in police matters, a delicate situation. The Canal Zone code guarantees U.S. citizens U.S. police protection.

As a part of the proposal, a Panamanian policeman would be paired with an American policeman in the streets near the border.

This places a gun in the hand of a Panamanian and tests his loyalty by requiring him to fire upon his own countrymen. This would hamper the U.S. police in the fullest exercise of their duties to secure the safety of U.S. facilities and U.S. citizens. It would also further jeopardize the U.S. policemen in what is hazardous work already.

Governor Fleming states that his proposal would not affect the security of the Canal Zone. The three employees, Meehan, Roe, and Payne, who face loss of jobs, say it would. They can prove it. He cannot. A pertinent fact is that U.S. security-type facilities in these townsites would be entirely under Panamanian nationals' authority in policing a U.S. jurisdiction area. What will the liberal and international minded officials think of next?

Who is right? The proof is in the attached petitions intended for distribution to Congressmen by all interested parties. Who are the interested parties? The U.S. policemen, all other U.S. employees and their families and friends here and in the United States who have concern for their welfare here.

One Edgar or Egar Harrison, a Panamanian, was a good example of conflicting loyalties during the January 1964 riots. Mr. Harrison had good reason to be loyal to his employment since he had been exposed to democracy by serving in the U.S. armed services during the Korean war. He was given employment with the Panama Canal Company as a terminal pier security guard. In the January riots, pictures were taken of Mr. Harrison while in the act of sniping at American soldiers. He was on a balcony of the Johnny Walker Building in Colon looking directly down the throats of our American soldiers in the Masonic Temple in Cristobal. A street between the two buildings marks the border between the Canal Zone and Panama. In that Masonic Building, American soldiers were shot while under order not to fire on Panamanian snipers which included Mr. Harrison. Is that the chance the American people want to take with Canal Zone security as proposed by Governor Fleming? Who is right? The Governor? Or Meehan, Rod and Payne?

Our Canal Zone Code provides that Mr. Harrison as a foreign national in the Zone could be prosecuted for active parts in riots in the Zone. He was not. Despite concrete evidence, he was taken in and out of the back door of the Cristobal Police Station and released in Panama. Congressman Flood was advised by Governor Fleming that Harrison had resigned his job while under investigation for sniping activities. How ridiculous.

Attached are papers that Meehan, Roe, and Payne are accused of distributing. These three U.S. citizens will lose their jobs while the Panamanian sniper, who very possibly could have shot our American soldier through the throat, merely resigned his job and was permitted to escape to Panama. Are the American people going to stand passively by and allow these patriotic employees to be deprived of their constitutional rights in this highhanded manner? If so, this will spread throughout our country and the police state will have arrived.

Freedom of Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we Americans are indeed fortunate that our agriculture problems stem from overabundance, rather than dire shortages. We must never let our agricultural plenty blind us, however, to the fact that, around the world, 10,000 persons die every day of starvation. We must never let it keep us from seeing that 500 million people throughout the world suffer from sheer belly hunger, and 1 billion suffer from malnutrition.

A distinguished agricultural expert from my own State of California, Lionel Steinberg, of Thermal, recently delivered in Berkeley, Calif., a speech which succinctly and expertly outlines the magnitude of the problem of hunger throughout the world. Mr. Steinberg, a vice president of the California State Board of Agriculture, and a national trustee of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, speaks with clarity and experienced skill on this subject. I ask that the text of his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS FREEDOM FROM HUNGER PROGRAM

(By Lionel Steinberg)

Five years ago, I wrote an article which I titled—"Food, Freedom, and a World in Revolution." My thesis was that—"It's 1776 all over the world and that communism is not the last hurdle to continuous peace." I stated that world chaos would continue throughout the remaining years of this century even if all the Communists in the world were to suddenly and unaccountably fall dead. World revolutions—not the Soviet Union—are the sign of the times.

Two-thirds of the people of the world go to bed hungry every night of their lives. Some 2 billion of them live on less than $100 each year. In fact, most of the world's people suffer from conditions which are the basis of the greatest revolution in history: Hunger, poverty, disease, the pressure of increasing population, limited supplies of food, foreign exploitation, the exploitation of natural resources for quick profits, colonialism, bondage, absentee ownership of most of the land, corruption of officials, oppressive taxation, no access to capital, disastrous interest rates, no freedom of speech, no freedom of press, no freedom of assembly, no right to vote or hold office.

In 1962 and 1963, I led two California delegations of outstanding farmers on people-to-people good will visits to the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Italy, East Germany, West Germany, France, England, Israel. One of the most important aspects of our tour was the opportunity that we California farmers had in conferring in Rome with Director General B. R. Sen of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. In full-day sessions, with participation by technicians from all over the world, we were given extensive briefings on the worldwide freedom from hunger campaign. Despite the significance of its role in the world, FAO remains a relatively small organization. The total number of its staff is only 1,500, and the annual budget is a meager $15 million.

Dr. Sen told us that 500 million people in the world today suffer from sheer belly hunger and 1 billion suffer from malnutrition. Around the world, 10,000 persons die every day of starvation.

Unfortunately, most of us find it difficult to respond to such gigantic statistics, whether they relate to hunger, to U.S. gross national product of $600 billion, or to Federal budgets of $100 billion.

I believe that in talking about world hunger it is necessary to discuss it in terms of "one human being" or simply "a family."

The effects of hunger have been described in this manner: "First the belly swells. Then the hair turns gray and the skin cracks crazily. After awhile the victim dies in mute misery—and since the victim is usually a child, his fate seems that much crueler.

In Africa the disease is called kwashiorkor—"The disease the old baby gets when the new baby comes," because there is no mother's milk and hardly any protein for the child. When there is drought, too, as there now is in the black reserve of South Africa's Transvaal, things get even worse. There, the crops of maize and peanuts have been killed and more than 100,000 Venda tribesmen are ravaged by hunger.

High in the Peruvian Andes, a farmer hoes a tiny plot of sweet potatoes. In his cheek swells a wad of cocoa leaf dipped in lime juice to dull his hunger pains and his senses.

One hundred miles away, in the capital of Lima, his 3-year-old son, Roberto, eyes staring from a sunken face, lies quietly in an iron bed in the hospital in Les Del Nino, one of 11,000 starving children that the hospital treats each year. If he is lucky, Roberto will walk out of the hospital on wobbly legs with a 50–50 chance at living to be 40.

In a mud hut in the Indian village of Sultanpur, a father watches dully as his wife cooks a meal over a cow dung fire. Then, with their six ragged children they sit around a fire eating wheat cakes and perhaps a bit of chutney. He and his family represent 50 percent of India's 500 million living in semi-starvation.

In Calcutta, undernourished men and women collapse every day on the streets and are taken to a home for the dying destitute.

Twenty-three million peasants face a state of starvation in drought-ridden northeast Brazil, and hundreds of thousands sleep on the sidewalks in overcrowded Hong Kong.

By tomorrow morning, there will be 140,000 more youngsters in the world to feed, for the world is growing at the rate of 50 million people each year. In the year 1830, world population was 1 billion. It took until 1930 for world population to reach 2 billion. It has taken only 35 years for world population to increase to three and a quarter billion in 1964, and the FAO tells us that in the next 35 years, world population will double again to reach six and a quarter billion.

Dr. Lester R. Brown, an economist in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, recently published a book: "Man, Land and Food—Looking Ahead at World Needs." USDA findings are described as startling by experts who make it their business to chart population growth. The study shows that even with expanded farm imports, if the less developed world succeeds in raising the food available per person 20 percent above present levels, by the year 2,000—

1. It will have to nearly triple present output.

2. Add to present food output an amount approximating the current food production of the entire world.

3. Achieve, with limited resources, an annual rate of increase in food output considerably higher than that ever reached by the industrial Western World.

When delegates from over 100 nations met in Washington, D.C., to attend the World Food Congress last June, Arnold Toynbee, in a pessimistic speech, said that there is little hope without worldwide birth control. He warned—"Today, mankind's future is at stake in a formidable race between population growth and famine."

Delegates to this congress, sponsored by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, were told that there is

an ever-growing disparity between "the have" and "the have not" nations. One-fifth of the world's population—the people of North America, Western Europe and Australia—live in plenty. The average American, for example, consumes about 4⅔ pounds of food per day. If he is lucky, the Asian eats 1¼ pounds of food per day—mostly rice.

Some experts estimate that enough food is thrown away in the United States each day to feed China's 700 million population for several days. I recall a Wall Street Journal article last year reporting that America's 50 million pet dogs and cats eat more and better food than the average Indian worker.

Last December, I had the pleasure of attending a 2-day conference in Los Angeles sponsored by Dr. Robert Hutchins' Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. One of the prominent speakers, Adm. Hyman Rickover, famous for his quick tongue and impatience with bureaucracy in Government and in American education, told us that when he becomes most disturbed, he reminds himself that it took 100,000 years to develop the stone knife.

In 1959, I had the honor of attending a world farmers' convention in the State of Israel. Some 400 delegates from 35 nations—from Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe and the Middle East attended, to discuss the problems of modernizing world agriculture so that it might meet the needs of the 20th century.

I shall never forget two incidents that occurred. One was a conversation in a jeep with an agriculturist from a new African nation. We were on our way to see rich lands formerly covered by the hulah swamp from Biblical days. These lands were converted to lush crops by modern drainage methods. I was describing American wheel tractors that cultivate 100 acres a day when the African turned to me and remarked quietly: "In my country there are areas where they have not yet discovered the wheel."

The second incident occurred one early morning when a group of us were having breakfast in the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. On my left was a member of the Agrarian Reform Movement of Ghana. He reached into his robes and pulled out a brown wafer and proceeded to crush it in his cup, filling it with milk. I asked him if the tablet was some kind of "instant cocoa" since that is the major crop of his country. He said, "Oh, no." He put his hand on his stomach and said he had ulcers.

He then went on to tell me of the problems of the emerging nations where there are so few trained for civil service with so much to do and not enough time to do it in. He commented that ulcers were a common ailment among civil servants in his country.

Americans are fortunate to be living in a nation where one farmer provides enough food for 28 people. The average American family spends only 20 percent of its income for the finest quality and the most varied diet the world has ever known.

In the Soviet Union, half of that nation's work force is engaged in agriculture, and is unable to provide more than a plain diet of staple foods of poor quality. In most places of the world, 80 percent of the work force is engaged in agriculture.

We Americans can take pride that the United States has done more than any nation in the world to assist the underfed. Over the past 8 years $15 billion worth of U.S. farm products have been distributed in nearly 100 countries.

Over 40 million schoolchildren are being served by the U.S. oversea school lunch programs. Another 35 million people in family units are being fed by U.S. volunteer agencies. While the good efforts of the United States have, in these instances, alleviated famine, it is apparent to all that charity is not a permanent solution. In fact, if all the surplus production of the United States, Canada, Australia, and Western Europe were to be distributed among the countries with a food deficit, it would feed their people for only a few months.

An ancient Chinese proverb says—"Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day. Teach him how to fish and he will eat for the rest of his life."

The FAO is engaged in the only effective solution to the problem—helping underfed nations themselves to produce enough of the right kind of food to improve health and living standards. The scientists of the FAO are convinced that an adequate food supply is available for all mankind. For example, only one-tenth of the land surface of the world is cultivated and 90 percent of the people of the world grow only 12 of the 300 known crops.

The sea covers 75 percent of the earth's surface and is rich in food of high protein content; yet, it now provides only 1 percent of the world's food. Some FAO scientists believe that the sea can provide more food than the land if properly utilized.

A most dramatic example of this took place in Ceylon where the average catch of a fishing boat was 13 pounds per day until the FAO supplied inexpensive modern fishing gear and a small outboard motor. With a few hundred dollars, worth of changes per boat, the daily fishing catch was increased to 139 pounds, providing more food that reaches the market more quickly and in better condition.

If only 20 percent of the unused tropical soils can be brought under cultivation, that production could solve the world's food problems.

Increased use of fertilizer offers much hope. The less developed nations use only 5 million tons of fertilizer each year.

If these less developed nations are to increase food consumption 10 percent by 1980, it will require use of 35 million tons of fertilizer per year—seven times present applications.

The Food and Agricultural Organization is one of a group of 15 agencies making up the United Nations family. I am sure that many of you know that FAO was first proposed at an international conference called by President Roosevelt at Hot Springs, Va., in 1943 to discuss the world food situation which had been made so much more serious by World War II.

There are now 106 full member governments and six associate members of FAO, assisting with the work to increase agricultural production and living standards. The only Communist nations affiliated with the FAO are Poland, Yugoslavia and Rumania.

The FAO, in 1960, launched a 5-year freedom from hunger campaign which has now been extended indefinitely. Forty-two countries have already organized their own national campaigns for freedom from hunger to help other nations. The campaign has three goals:

1. Information and education to arouse real interest in the problem.

2. Research into causes and effects of world hunger.

3. Action programs to increase food production and improve nutrition in the less developed countries.

There are hundreds of projects already underway in 57 countries. They seek to eliminate livestock disease, increase crop yields by use of new hybrid seeds, make new foods available such as showing Nepalese herdsmen how to make cheese.

FAO teaches Chilean farmers to rid their fields of the potato blight. In Thailand, FAO technicians proved to farmers that an edible fish from East Africa can be cultivated in the paddies along with rice.

In Libya, they exterminated fruit flies, helping farmers to increase their citrus exports by 200 percent.

In Yugoslavia, they introduced Italian varieties of wheat, and production doubled.

In India, modern dairy plants are being constructed.

In some of the African nations, elementary health measures must start with teaching the children to eat with a spoon rather than with their hands.

These small success stories are just a beachhead. In most of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, food production is not even keeping pace with new births. Director General B. R. Sen reports—"In the Far East, including the most densely populated countries of south and southeast Asia, but excluding China, food production has increased by 25 percent since before the war, while the population has gone up about 30 percent. Dr. Sen predicts widespread world famine by 1980 unless world efforts are multiplied.

A group of six countries—Australia, Japan, Mexico, Israel, Greece, and Yugoslavia has demonstrated that an increase in production in excess of an increase in population can be achieved. The increases in these six countries have been achieved largely by applying modern methods of intensive cultivation, high level of technical knowledge, increased capital investment in agriculture, and introduction of new industries such as that of livestock in the uplands of Japan.

Most of the underfed nations (unlike the Japanese or the Israelis or the Europeans just mentioned) have neither the education, the capital, nor the will to change.

In Africa, for example, tribes of Kenya drive thousands of head of cattle across the plains turning the land into a giant dust bowl. Children may be starving, but the Masai tribesmen will not slaughter their cattle. These tribesmen have been quoted as asserting that they can get more children, but not more cattle. For protein they drink a concoction of cow's blood, milk and urine.

Some agronomists like France's Rene Dumont emphasize political and social solutions. They are convinced that the archaic systems of landownership are the major block to agricultural progress. In many parts of the world, absentee owners or tribal chiefs take the majority of the profit, which discourages farmers from improving their methods.

In South America, the Latifundia (large private estates) at one extreme, contrast with minute holdings by sharecroppers who pay interest rates as high as 3 percent per month. Mr. Dumont and others insist that modern agricultural technology can bring only limited results until the way is cleared for profound agrarian reform. He concludes that if we wait too long it will be a Fidel Castro type of global plan.

Solving world hunger is a task of such magnitude that it must be approached in a world framework with a global plan. American techniques are exportable. However, the tiny nation of Israel which, 15 years ago, had to import two-thirds of its food supply, now has a 20-percent surplus of commodities. Much of their production comes from farm cooperatives and collectives.

Teams of experts from Israel's communal settlements are working in many African nations teaching Western methods, but they may be offering a framework of farming more adaptable to nations accustomed to a tribal way of life where large-scale private and commercial farming may be generations away.

It will take decades for primitive farmers to apply even the simplest ideas of modern technology. The capital requirements are enormous. An adequate supply of fertilizer would require an investment of some $20 billion over the next 10 years.

The world spends $120 billion a year on armaments, with the United States budgeting $20 billion alone to place a human being on the moon. America's annual military

budget is $50 billion a year, ostensibly to prevent war and save American lives. Ten percent of our Nation's military budget properly employed in a worldwide program could do more to eliminate the threat of world communism and war than missions into outer space.

Sicco Mansholt, vice president of the European Economic Community, and a top European agricultural expert, points out that foreign aid from the developed nations to the underdeveloped nations is offset in full by the recent drop in prices of the raw materials that these nations sell in the world market.

At the 12th session of the FAO in Rome last November, Director General Sen called for world agreements to assist countries which are depending on a few export products such as rubber, coffee, cocoa, palm oil, and fiber.

Proposals at that session called for reasonable long-term credit, a world seed campaign, insecticides and pesticides; and pointed out inadequate education and training facilities, and lack of administrative and extension services. Agrarian reform and new social structures are needed in most developing countries to provide incentives to higher productivity.

In the developing countries, it is necessary to direct training along many lines, assisting the farmer to grasp the results of modern techniques quickly and effectively. Methods must include audiovisual aids, demonstration, and oral instruction. Training of women in home economics needs special attention.

Agricultural prosperity in the United States was built up by the land grant college system which was established 100 years ago. Spectacular progress requires instruction, training, research, and extension.

Mark Twain said, "Training is everything. The peach was once a bitter almond; cauliflower is nothing but cabbage with a college education."

There is need for systematic research for the discovery and utilization of new sources of low-cost foods such as Bulgar wheat and powdered fish.

The American Freedom From Hunger Foundation was established to work with the United Nations. It needs to raise funds from private sources to help on a multitude of agricultural projects in the less-developed countries. Some of the American projects participated in by churches, unions, and farm organizations provide farm implements, fertilizer, and seed; facilities for storage and preservation of food, sending American farm experts abroad, and training foreign agricultural leaders in the United States.

Projects needed include community development, housing, roadbuilding, public works, drainage, and irrigation. American surplus foods are being used in many parts of the world to provide payment in kind to supply wages for laborers working on these types of projects.

In December a conference was called in the office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ronald Renne. Participating were representatives of the Peace Corps, Food for Peace, AID, the Foreign Agriculture Service, People-to-People, and the FAO.

I called to the attention of this group that many of the 100 California farmers who partipicated in the 1962 and 1963 People-to-People tour to Eastern and Western Europe are willing to train upon their farms agricultural technicians from the less-developed nations without charge, except for transportation bringing the visitors to the United States. In addition, I reported wide interest of many American farmers in serving 3 months' periods abroad in the less-developed nations to show and assist agriculturists in learning American farm methods. It is my hope that this program will be accepted and get underway during 1964 under the sponsorship of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

I urge each of you to take a personal part in some capacity in the American Freedom From Hunger Campaign. It is my hope that California business, clubs, unions, churches, schools, farm organizations will sponsor projects to lessen hunger and malnutrition in some part of the world.

Winston Churchill once remarked, "How democracy works, nobody quite knows. It is the worst system of government in the world—except all those other systems."

The stomach is acting as secretary of state for half the population of the globe today.

Soviet communism and American democracy are competing, each seeking to prove to the less-developed nations that its system is the best. There is no question in my mind that this is a fight that we will win decisively.

We Americans share the privilege and responsibility of giving leadership to the world. I know that Californians will lead the way.

Independence Day of Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Kingdom of Jordan today celebrates the 18th anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, we take pleasure in extending warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Hussein; and His Excellency, Saad Juma, the Jordanian Ambassador to the United States.

I have been made to feel at home and among friends.

This was said by King Hussein of Jordan as he began his third official visit to the United States last month. Extensive newspaper and magazine coverage brought to Americans a picture of this amiable man who has been this country's stanchest Arab friend. Moreover, President Johnson paid tribute to King Hussein by saying:

While the world knows you as a courageous soldier, your friends in America know you as a wise and effective leader for peace.

The most commendable homage, though, which was paid to the King was given by a columnist when he said that Hussein personifies Jordan's independence, for he wants to make his country a model democracy and to bring a better life and opportunity to his people by using the monarchy as an instrument for progress through evolution.

Jordan is poor in natural resources. There is little water to irrigate the vast desert tracts. Furthermore, the population is divided among Bedouins who rove the countryside in search of pasturelands, urbanities, and Palestinian refugees, whose wish is to recover their former lands in what is now Israel. Since 1946, though, when Great Britain terminated its mandate and granted to Jordan full independence, this desert state has struggled against these negative and diversifying factors to progress from a backward tribal nation to a unified one in the throes of modernization and industrialization. The capital, 'Ammān, a mud town of 30,000, 15 years ago, is now a thriving metropolis of 200,000. Aquaba, the nation's only outlet to the sea, is being developed as a resort and tourist haven as well as a modern port. An American engineering company is designing this city as a "lush park in the desert," complete with palm-lined streets and luxury hotels. Phosphate production, completely disrupted during the Palestinian war in 1948–49, now accounts for 38 percent of the total value of Jordan's exports. Furthermore, the national income has increased at an annual rate of approximately 9 percent over the past decade. This figure is expected to increase by 60 percent at the termination of a 5-year plan now in progress.

Many of these accomplishments are a direct result of foreign aid which our Government has extended to Jordan. Since the program's inception in 1949, economic aid has totaled $438 million, with approximately $45 million extended annually at the present time. The largest single project undertaken with American foreign aid has been the East Ghor Canal. This waterway, expected to be completed sometime this year, diverts the waters of the Yarmuk River in the north to the arid plains in the south. When in full operation, hundreds of thousands of acres will be irrigated, and 2 million kilowatts of power will be generated, which in turn is expected to increase the gross national product by 14 percent, or $7 million.

When King Hussein recently stated that it was his sincerest hope to have always the best relations with the United States, based on good understanding, mutual respect, and cooperation, he was expressing the sentiments of the Jordanian people as well. Therefore, as the Jordanians celebrate their independence anniversary this day, it is with pleasure that I extend to them congratulations in their achievements and for their efforts to create a progressive nation. It is also my sincerest wish that the amicable relations between the two countries will continue and that the rapid rate of development will persist so that prosperity will soon be attained for all.

Report on the Connally Reservation by the Committee on International Law of the New York City Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the United States ratified the World Court Convention in 1946 the Senate added a clause that reserved for Congress the sole power to decide whether or not questions were domestic matters and were therefore within or without the Court's jurisdiction. This reservation gives the United States a veto over the jurisdiction of the World Court in an

international legal dispute and thereby reduces its effectiveness in helping to establish the rule of law among nations. Over 33 nations of the free world have accepted the jurisdiction of the World Court without reservation and I have repeatedly urged the Senate to strengthen our position as the world's leading force for peace by repealing this reservation. No basic right to safeguard U.S. domestic or foreign policy freedom of action will be compromised thereby. This position is strongly advocated by the American Bar Association and by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Pending repeal, however, the New York City bar has issued a report which concerns itself with the proper utilization of the Connally reservation as it stands, without going into the issues of repeal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the committee on international law of the New York City Bar Association, Carlyle E. Maw, chairman, February 1964.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL LAW, OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, PENDING REPEAL OF THE CONNALLY RESERVATION, FEBRUARY 1964

I

On November 27, 1963, the United Kingdom abandoned the principal limitation—a national security reservation—to its acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Earlier, France, India, and Pakistan abandoned their reservations modeled on the Connally reservation of the United States.[1] The United States, however, continues to withhold unreserved acceptance of adjudication by the International Court.

This association has recorded its firm conviction that the Connally reservation should be repealed.[2] The International Law Committee urges renewed and vigorous measures to secure early consent of the Senate of the United States to abrogation of the reservation.

II

Even as it pursues a spirited campaign to abandon the Connally amendment, the executive branch, we believe, should find an early opportunity to begin to use the International Court of Justice for the resolution of disputes to which the United States is a party. There is, of course, nothing in the Connally reservation, or elsewhere in U.S. law or policy, to prevent the United States from accepting the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the resolution of a particular controversy. Indeed the action of the United States (even with the Connally reservation) in accepting the jurisdiction of the Court implied a willingness if not an undertaking to resort to the Court, whether as plaintiff or defendant. Surely, there are a number of disputes between the United States and friendly nations, not involving major political interests of either side, which could be brought to the International Court of Justice for friendly resolution in accordance with international law. Such agreed submissions would build the significance of the Court and the rule of law in relations between nations which the United States has long proclaimed and promoted.

III

Pending repeal of the Connally reservation, also, we believe it desirable that the Department of State take an occasion to dispel misapprehension as to the meaning of the Connally reservation, and to announce the proper interpretation of the reservation in accordance with its original purpose and purport. There is a common impression that the Connally amendment reserves to the United States a veto on any efforts to bring it before the International Court of Justice. This interpretation, of course, would render the acceptance by the United States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court wholly illusory. It also encourages similar interpretations by other nations which have similar reservations, and in particular by those who invoke such reservation on the basis of reciprocity in proceedings brought by the United States.

In fact, as the language and the history of the reservation make clear, this is a serious misinterpretation of what was originally reserved. In 1946, it will be recalled, the Executive asked the consent of the Senate to a declaration of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. Competence of the Court, it was recognized, is limited to deciding disputes "in accordance with international law." (Statute of the International Court of Justice, art. 38(1).) Compulsory jurisdiction accepted under article 36(2) is, by the express terms of that article, limited to disputes concerning questions of international law, treaties, or other international obligations. Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution, the resolution reported out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee spelled out what was clearly implied—that the Court's jurisdicition did not extend to matters which did not involve international law or obligation and which were "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America."

If that reservation had remained as drafted, it would only have articulated the agreed limitations on the jurisdiction of the Court, and, strictly, would not have constituted a reservation at all. In those circumstances the Court would have decided whether any dispute before the Court in which the United States was defendant involved issues of international law or obligation (so that the Court had jurisdiction) or issues only of domestic jurisdiction (so that the Court had no jurisdiction). On the floor of the Senate, however, there was added, on Senator Connally's motion, the phrase "as determined by the United States." Clearly, then, this phrase sought to leave to the United States rather than to the Court the right to determine whether a dispute involved questions of international law or only strictly domestic issues. It was this legal question on which the United States reserved the final judgment; it did not reserve the right to decline the Court's jurisdiction at its own unfettered will.

The difference we are suggesting is critical. What the Senate sought to reserve, what the United States reserved, is the right to determine, in doubtful cases, whether a dispute involved questions of international law or obligation. It did not reserve the right to refuse to go to court in a dispute which admittedly involves a question of international law or obligation. If the United States is brought to court, then, the State Department is entitled, under the reservation, to consider and determine bona fide whether the dispute involves international law or obligation. (Or, the United States may forego its reservation and instead leave that question to the Court for decision.) But the State Department should not, may not, reject the jurisdiction of the Court where it must, bona fide, admit that the dispute involves not a matter of our domestic jurisdiction but clearly a question of international law, or the interpretation of a treaty, or some other issue of international obligation.

This interpretation of the amendment is not novel. It was clearly that of Senator Connally himself, who expressed assurance that the United States would not "corruptly and improperly" claim "that a question is domestic in nature when it is not"; he did not believe that the United States would "adopt a subterfuge, a pretext, or a pretense in order to block the judgment of the Court on any such grounds." (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10695 (1946).) The interpretation we here urge is reflected, too, in official pleadings of the United States before the International Court of Justice.[3] At one time, indeed, when Bulgaria invoked the Connally reservation against the United States on the basis of reciprocity, the United States urged that even under the reservation a determination of domestic jurisdiction which was "an arbitrary determination, in bad faith," could be disregarded by the Court.[4] Later, the United States reversed its position, adopting the view that any determination of domestic jurisdiction under a Connally reservation was final and binding on the Court. But the United States did not suggest that for its part in making a determination the reserving nation had the right to say that something was domestic which clearly was not. Rather, the U.S. agent announced that the United States has adhered to the policy of not making any "arbitrary determination" under the reservation.[5]

If the Department of State clearly reaffirmed and applied this interpretation of the Connally reservation, the reservation would be small indeed (as was intended). The reservation, then, would not render American acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction wholly illusory. The United States, then, would have accepted as compulsory the Court's jurisdiction for the large majority of disputes to which the United States is a party. The United States could then, in turn, bring to the Court its complaints involving international law or obligation, and urge and expect that other countries also refrain from invoking this reservation improperly or arbitrarily. The Connolly reservation, while damaging still to the national interest and ignoble to maintain, would be reduced to the small, remote, and contingent import intended for it, pending its total abrogation.

Committee on International Law: Carlyle E. Maw, Chairman; Mitchell Brock, Carl F. Farbach, George W. Haight, Michael A. Schwind, Frederick A. Yonkman, Manuel R. Angulo, Jack P. Jefferies, Alan Richard Kasdan, Isaac Shapiro, Lowell C. Wadmond, Peter A. Bator, Louis Henkin, William A. Perlmuth, Leonard V. Quigley, Lyman M. Tondel, Jr.

---

[1] The only other countries retaining Connally reservations are Liberia, Mexico, Sudan, and the Union of South Africa.

[2] Resolutions calling for repeal were adopted at stated meetings of the association on January 20, 1948, and on December 8, 1959—1948 yearbook 251; 1960 yearbook 289.

[3] This interpretation seems implied too by the Legal Adviser of the Department of State in 1958 who in a public address said: "Moreover, I have a serious question whether 'as determined by the United States of America,' if fairly applied, would mean any more in the way of excluding the International Court from passing upon truly domestic issues than the words 'as determined by the principles of international law.'" Becker, Proceedings of the American Society of International Law (1958) 267.

[4] Case concerning the aerial incident of July 27, 1955 (*United States of America* v. *Bulgaria*), I.C.J. pleadings at 308.

[5] *Id.* at 677.

Portland Oregonian Willing To Look at Diverting Surplus Columbia River Water to Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the water-short West it is necessary to conserve resources with skill and good will. One of the possibilities for conserving water which wastes to the sea from the Columbia River is to divert a reasonable amount to the Colorado River. This would be accomplished by an aqueduct from the Columbia, running through Nevada to Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam. In commenting upon the proposal, the following editorial in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner discusses the editorial attitude of the influential Portland Oregonian on the subject:

A FAIR APPROACH

Recently, in an editorial we expressed the belief that the high officials and the people of the Pacific Northwest States of Oregon and Washington might be receptive to suggestions that surplus water from the mammoth Columbia River be channeled south to solve the water shortage problems of the Southwest.

We have expressed the opinion, from estimates by California and other water experts, that the Southwest could be bountifully supplied with fresh water for many years to come by the diversion of only around 5 million acre-feet of the 170 million acre-feet of surplus Columbia River water which annually is wasted into the Pacific Ocean.

It is encouraging to note the fair editorial approach that has been made by one of the Pacific Northwest's most important newspapers, the Portland Oregonian. We quote herewith those portions of the Oregonian's editorial which are particularly significant to the Pacific Southwest.

"The Pacific Southwest's desire to funnel off for irrigation, mainly, a part of the 170 million acre-feet of water the Columbia River system pours into the ocean is understandable. The Pacific Northwest's instinctive reaction is a protective one. Yet we do not 'own' the waters and really all we need is assurance that total regional needs of the future will be met.

"No one yet, however, has proposed a truly economic plan providing benefits to both Northwest and Southwest and built-in guarantees of noninterference with future supplies and uses.

"Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, proposed creation of a Western States water commission to look over the shoulder of Federal planners. The Northwest should not object to that so long as it is founded on impartiality and fair play.

"The movement of millions of acre-feet of surplus—and we emphasize surplus—water from the Northwest to the Southwest must be considered in the economic base in relation to the timetable for production of cheap fresh water from the south. What the Southwest wants is an interim supply we gather. But it has yet to arrive at a carefully planned proposal. A lot more study, not immediate political pressure, is needed."

We second the Oregonian's motion that considerable study and careful economic planning is necessary.

We believe that study should begin as soon as is practical, and that it be done with the calm and friendly cooperation of officials of California and other Southwest States, by officials of the Northwest States and by U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and other Federal water and reclamation officials.

We're not down to the last old western water hole, but we might be if we don't begin careful planning.

The Meaning of the Centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a recent address before the Seventh Annual National Workshop for Religious Liberals a distinguished New Yorker, Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, who is professor of psychology at the City College of New York, summed up in a most moving way the real meaning of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS ON 100 YEARS AFTER EMANCIPATION: A TIME FOR HOPE OR DESPAIR?

The 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation was celebrated in a most unusual way. This momentous event in man's tortuous struggle for freedom and justice was not marked by a World's Fair and monuments of steel and concrete symbolizing man's rededication to the attainment of the ideals of justice and the preservation of democracy for all men. In fact, there were few formal ceremonies. There was no dancing in the streets—no parades and no flamboyant patriotic speeches. And certainly, there were no rhetorical proclamations from politicians seeking reelection. White America seemed curiously embarrassed by this centennial and sought to cloak its awkwardness with an uneasy silence.

Negroes, however, chose to make 1963 the year of confrontation rather than celebration. It was in this year—100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation—that Negro Americans insisted that the unfinished business of human freedom and dignity promised 100 years ago be delivered now.

A century of broken promises, cynicism and cruelty culminated in an eruption of impatience, anger and revulsion against continued hypocrisy. In place of ceremonies, there were sit-ins. In place of the free spending at the Fair there were selective buying campaigns. In place of dancing in the streets, there was the March on Washington.

In 1954—soon after the historic Brown decision—the national convention of the NAACP adopted the slogan: "We Must Be Free by 1963."

This goal was not fully realized during 1963. Ten years after the Supreme Court school desegregation decision less than 5 percent of Negro children attended desegregated public schools in Southern States. The majority of Negro children, probably over 80 percent, in Northern and border States are still required to attend predominantly Negro—or de facto segregated—schools. The stark facts are that the Supreme Court decision has been honored more through the evasion of tokenism; has been ignored completely in those communities in which Negroes do not take the initiative in obtaining even token compliance; and the few, if any, cases of good faith compliance with courts decision to desegregate American public education. The self-defeating anachronism of "white schools" and "Negro schools" remains a part of the vocabulary and way of life of Americans.

The majority of American whites continue to resist the Negroes demands that he be included within the total fabric of American democracy. In both the North and the South:

Negroes are systematically discriminated against by labor unions and employers in their quest for jobs and economic security.

Through an effective conspiracy of banking and real estate interests, Negroes are confined within deteriorating and dehumanizing residential ghettoes.

Negro children are not only still required to attend segregated schools—but these schools are still educationally inferior. They spawn functional illiterates by the hundreds of thousands, and contribute to the perpetuation of the cycle of personal damage, community pathology, and group ineffectiveness.

These general and fundamental problems of economic, residential and educational discrimination and deprivation which make victims of Negroes throughout the Nation are compounded by special burdens imposed by the Southern States. It is difficult for any reasonable person who has not been distorted by American racism to believe that in the 7th decade of the 20th century there are States in the United States—the leader of the democratic world—where Negroes are denied the elementary democratic right to register and to vote for those who are to represent them in the halls of government. Although a criminal conspiracy of State officials and others deny the Negro the right to vote in these States, he is still required, indeed compelled, to pay taxes. He must assume all of the responsibilities and obligations without the rights, privileges, and protections granted to white citizens. This is a mockery of democracy. This is self-defeating cynicism. This is tyranny.

The context within which this moral venom could exist includes an accepted pattern of rigid, petty, blind cruelty which demands that a fellow human being be denied ordinary courtesies in places of public accommodations—and that he be humiliated or assaulted if he seeks to enjoy conveniences which any white American can take for granted if he is able to pay for them. The human degradation and tragedy inherent in this constricted view of man's responsibility to his fellow man is matched only by the tragic irony of otherwise intelligent, sophisticated Senators—trained in our best universities and concerned with profound moral issues in our society when they are not defending a racist way of life—trapped by the level of their constituents into making filibustering spectacles of themselves.

The racial crisis of 1963 has been described by many words. Probably the most frequently used word was the word "revolution." This is a dramatic—but a misleading term. Revolution usually connotes the use of weapons or some violent or military approach to social and political change. In addition, the term revolution usually demands some basic changes in the economic, social, and political system. The Negro's demands on his Nation do not meet these requirements. He is not seeking any fundamental or radical changes in the American economic, political, or social system. He is merely asking to be brought within the existing system. He is conservative. He is excepting the American system. He is identifying with the American ideology and is insisting that the American protestations of de-

mocracy be taken literally, seriously, and be inclusive of him.

If he is not included, American protestations of democracy and moral leadership cannot be taken seriously by anyone—including Americans. If the Negro succeeds, he will help to strengthen America. If the Negro fails, the fatal moral weakness behind the facades of American military and industrial power and verbal democratic posturings would be revealed before the world.

The civil rights demonstrations of the last few years which culminated with the awe-inspiring August 28 march on Washington, were most powerful and dramatic methods of calling attention to the Negro's predicament in the United States. These demonstrations were part of the world revolution against white supremacy, colonialism, and other forms of arbitrary and unjust use of power to subjugate or dehumanize human beings. The American Negroes' desire for freedom and justice will and must continue until these goals are obtained, but the momentum and dramatic impact of direct action, nonviolent demonstrations will decrease. These demonstrations appear to be more difficult to sustain psychologically than are military operations because they do not have the same pattern and total context of psychological reinforcement found in a sustained military operation. The individual involved in these demonstrations must also tend to the day-to-day routine of living. They must work and take care of their families. These demonstrations are psychologically exhausting. The more they are used the more they tend to become routinized and reach a point of diminishing returns in terms of impact and effect.

The positive value of these demonstrations can be conserved only if they are not permitted to become diffuse and unrelated to specific targets and goals, and are engaged in for their own sake or as a form of emotional catharsis or blowing off of steam. It would be most unfortunate if these demonstrations became a form of bread and circuses which provide an outlet for Negroes but did not deal with the basic social, economic, or political problems. This would not only be a dissipation of precious human energy but would also be a cruel hoax. In this regard, one could look with suspicion on the tendency of some white political officials to join some of the more respectable demonstrations and the equally disturbing tendency of some Negro leaders to embrace this type of surface but skillful neutralization of a protest movement.

Another danger which threatens the future effectiveness of these demonstrations is the tendency to use them as vehicles for the projection of the egoes and personal ambitions of local and would-be leaders of Negroes. These individuals, who often do not have the responsibility for the effective functioning of a complex organization, can assume postures of militance and make flamboyant statements which appeal to the crowd without regard to the realities of implementation. They need not concern themselves with such mundane things as planning, strategy, and followthrough. It is enough that they have an arsenal of words and are adept at name calling and are ruthless in their ability to ascribe nefarious motives to anyone who disagrees with them. The most successful of these "wild cat" civil rights leaders attempt to use the technique of demagogic intimidation of the more responsible civil rights leaders. To the extent that they are permitted to be successful, they are serious threats to the effectiveness of the movement. The potential anarchy of this situation is analagous to a military organization in which a corporal is permitted to intimidate or countermand the orders of a general.

If this type of disorganization and lack of discipline is permitted to develop and grow an important weapon in the civil rights struggle will become a farce and unrelated to the resolution of the basic and serious racial problems. Serious thought must now be given to the problem of determining under what conditions certain techniques and demonstrations will be used. This should be done not because these demonstrations will anger or alienate white friends. This argument is unacceptable to thinking Negroes because white friends who are not angered by the injustices but become angry at attempts to remedy them are rather peculiar and clearly useless friends. Furthermore, that type of white friend and admitted enemies are more likely to be angered by appropriate and effective use of demonstrations rather than by inappropriate and ineffectual ones.

The student sit-ins, freedom rides, and bus boycotts were successful in the South because these methods dealt directly with desired objectives. They were clear and focused, and directly dramatized a specific injustice. The selective buying campaign in Philadelphia is an example of effective protest because Reverend Sullivan and his associates organized it masterfully, pinpointed his targets, was able to sustain and follow through on his demands, and was able to measure directly the degree of his success. The following would seem to be reasonable criteria for determining whether a boycott is or is not an appropriate technique to be used:

1. When it is directed against a product rather than a service.
2. When the economic damage or inconvenience is clearly to be borne by the proprietor rather than by the boycotters.
3. When the goals and demands are clear and obtainable.
4. When the action can be sustained until the demands are met.
5. When there is minimum inconvenience to persons who are not responsible for the injustice.

Given these criteria, serious consideration should be given to the use of the boycott technique in dealing with the problem of education. There might be times when the boycott of schools is the most effective method of dramatizing and calling attention to longstanding educational deficiencies and ills—but this objective can be attained most effectively if the boycott threat is not abused.

The possibility of eroding the moral strength and power of the civil rights movement is greatest if civil rights leaders permit themselves to be caught in the trap and rigidity of militancy for its own sake. Given the fact that the Negro in America does not have military, economic, and numerical power with which to wage his war for unqualified equality he must rely upon a cold, calculating use of intellectual and moral power. He cannot permit himself to be shackled to gestures, postures, slogans, and oversimplifications. He must be free to deal with the realities and he must be tough minded as he seeks every advantage in a war of maneuver and propaganda. Irrationalities, emotionalism, and rigidity in the name of civil rights goals are no more acceptable than the irrationalities, emotionalism, and rigidity of racism. The fight for racial justice is essentially the fight for the ascendancy of reason and logic over ignorance in man.

The civil rights crisis in America has now, itself reached a stage of crisis. The passage of a meaningful civil rights bill by the U.S. Senate is mandatory. The symbolic significance over and above the practical and realistic imperatives for the passage of this bill without emasculating amendments is indicated by the catastrophic despair and frustrations which will erupt in the Negro people if this bill can be killed by a small cynical group of Senators. This irrationality can elicit terrifying irrationalities in the Negro people. But the crisis in the Negro's demands for full equality as American citizens involves the additional dimension of the need for comprehensive planning and strategy if these goals are to be obtained actually rather than merely symbolically. This would seem to be true even with the passage of a "strong" civil rights bill. The Negro organizations and groups are now required to address themselves to the difficult task of planning and implementing a comprehensive and coordinated strategy. This strategy to be efficient and successful must involve the creation of effective coordinating machinery which has the responsibility of making decisions on specific objectives, delegating responsibility to appropriate groups and agencies, and evaluating performance and effects of action, and, if need be, exerting discipline or exercising some controls over inefficient, uneconomic, or ineffectual activities.

Certainly a comprehensive and coordinated plan and strategy must necessarily include decisions concerning the priorities and the energies to be expended, and the methods to be used in eliminating racial discrimination and segregation in the key areas of:

1. Education.
2. Employment.
3. Housing.
4. Voting and citizen rights and responsibilities.
5. Public accommodation.

A general appraisal of the present level of civil rights activities would seem to suggest that it could be made even more effective through systematic programs for the gathering of information and intelligence, public education, and evaluation of effectiveness of techniques and programs.

It is increasingly clear that the civil rights movement has received the maximum support that one could reasonably expect from the Federal courts. Obviously there will be cases brought before these courts in the future, but the basic legal decisions of these courts clearly establish the fact that race is not a relevant criteria in the enjoyment of the rights of American citizens. It might be necessary however, for the Negro to explore and utilize the technique of using taxpayers suits to prevent Southern States from using public funds to perpetuate, directly or indirectly, any form of racial discrimination and segregation.

The executive branch of the Federal Government within the past 3 years seems clearly to understand the gravity of the racial crisis in America. There is little doubt that President Lyndon Johnson shares completely the goals of the late President Kennedy, and has been using his extraordinary political skill and the power of his Office in seeking rational and democratic resolution of these issues. It is imperative, however, that Negro and white civil rights groups continue their vigilance in seeing that anyone who occupies this high office in the future continue this pattern.

More effective ways must still be found to influence the legislative branch of our Federal and State governments so that they are more sensitive and responsive to the moral, practical, political and international imperatives of this issue.

A summary of the positives and the negatives in the present civil rights crisis would seem to highlight the following as clear gains within the past 2 years.

Religious groups have become more seriously involved in action geared toward the elimination of racism in our society. The activities of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the intensified activities of the Catholic Church, together with the clear commitment of the organized Jewish groups have contributed significantly to the awakening of the dormant conscience of the American people.

There is also evidence that business and industry are now beginning to understand more clearly that it is not to the interest of the capitalist system to have one-tenth of our Nation underemployed and restricted

from the consumer market. In spite of the moral and ethical aspects of the civil rights struggle, the factor of the artificial reduction of the gross national product which inevitably results from racial discrimination in America, may turn out to be the most pivotal determinant of change. The vitality and growth potential of our economy may well depend upon the capacity to change old patterns of attitudes and behavior and make it possible to exploit constructively an underdeveloped area within our own Nation. One is reminded of Gunnar Myrdal's recent observation that at this period in history practical economic imperatives and American idealism have converged.

On the minus side one still is confronted with the fact that American labor unions reflect for the most part, a racial rigidity which is inimical to the national interest and, of course, is detrimental to the interests of organized labor. This paradox—this blindness—can only be self-destructive. Therein probably lies the hope for change.

Continuing evidence of the pervasive moral apathy and political cynicism in the American mass culture must also be counted as a most significant negative in appraising the possibilities of serious success of the civil rights struggle. If the practical imperatives for constructive change were to be controlled by the chance and possibilities of profound, moral conversion in the American people, there might be cause for pessimism. Pragmatism, rather than ethical and idealistic insights might be our only basis for hope.

In summing up, it is possible that we cannot answer the question posed in the title of this paper with any degree of certainty. Whatever answer is offered might reflect only the wishes or the cynicism of the particular observer. There seems to be no clear guarantees of unalloyed success of the civil rights movement. On the other hand, it would be irresponsible to assert the certainty of failure or the perpetuation of hypocritical tokenism as the accommodation to the lack of any basic commitment to freedom and justice. To this observer, this is neither a time for hope nor for despair. Rather, this is the time for realistic, difficult, and if necessary, painful reappraisal, planning, and effective action. Negroes and whites who are deeply concerned about the future of mankind, the future of our Nation, and the significance of the democratic idea must now redouble their efforts to be effective. We now know that there is really no easy road to the attainment of social justice. This is a tortuous and taxing process. We cannot now settle for the form without the substance. We cannot settle for the slogans without the actual demonstration of change. To do so would reveal the moral emptiness which is the antithesis of social health and national vitality.

Castro on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, having earned himself the nickname of "Castro on the Colorado" by shutting off the flow of the river at Glenn Canyon Dam, Interior Secretary Udall apparently wants to nail down the title for all time. He has a so-called Pacific Southwest water plan which would give his home State of Arizona 1.2 million acre-feet of Colorado River water annually at a cost of something over a billion dollars. Then, he says, after Arizona has got this water out of the river—which southern California then can no longer use—southern California can come whistling to Congress for several billions to get replacement water from the northern part of the State. Congress would be unlikely to respond to such a costly call. Thus California, under the Udall scheme, will be left no higher but a lot drier. An alternative is being suggested by myself, Senator KUCHEL and others which involves putting more water into the Colorado, using surplus water from the Snake or Columbia Rivers or any other available source. This alternative is sensible in all respects, financially feasible and otherwise beneficial. All the Castro of the Colorado is doing is to hoot at the new plan. He is joined by a chorus from Arizona which chants an everything-for-Arizona - but - nothing - for-nobody-else theme in the background. This is discussed in the following editorial published May 7 in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

PROTECTING OUR WATER

Expressing what is apparently a widely held belief among Arizonians, a Tucson newspaper accuses California of trying to override the interests of its neighbors in the water of the Colorado River.

The Arizona Daily Star charges southern California with preventing Arizona from using its rightful share of the river to develop a gigantic water diversion and delivery system, known as the central Arizona project.

No person of official standing in California has disputed Arizona's need for additional water; no California agency has sought to curtail Arizona's rightful share in the Colorado River; and in fact, California water interests do not flatly oppose the central Arizona project.

California merely insists that existing water projects, serving millions of people, receive priority over any new projects in the distribution of Colorado River waters. This is in harmony with water law prevailing since the opening of the West.

If the central Arizona project is built, without imports of new water into the Colorado River Basin, major California water projects that have existed for many years would ultimately suffer.

Therefore, California proposes, in a bill offered by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, that the central Arizona project be authorized only upon the condition that any risks from water shortages shall be taken by the new project rather than by the existing ones.

Senator KUCHEL's bill is actually an enlargement upon the vast Pacific Southwest water plan proposed by Secretary of the Interior Udall. It is truly regional in scope, and it calls for a 3-year study by the Interior Department of all possible sources from which to draw more water into the Colorado River Basin.

Augmenting the Colorado's flow would be of more benefit to Arizona than to California, incidentally, since Arizona has no place but the Colorado to look for more water. Does this sound as if California is trying to override the interests of its neighbors?

California's position is actually conciliatory. This State could flatly oppose the central Arizona project until firm provision is made by Congress to provide replacement for any water delivered to central Arizona. Instead, California is willing to accept the central Arizona project on the stipulation that any shortages will be borne by that project. There is doubt that Arizona can get a better deal than that.

This doubt is supported by statements by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior indicating that enactment of the central Arizona project is not to be expected in the near future without Arizona-California cooperation.

The Budget Bureau has said that it is "unable at this time to recommend authorization" and that the "tentative plan will benefit from review and criticism by the Congress and the people of the region." The Secretary, speaking of the entire regional plan, notes that agreement has not been reached on major aspects of any plan, and "within the executive branch of the Government, also, there remain divergent views as to the scope and content of a regional plan."

California and Arizona, working together, can do much to determine the scope and content of a regional plan. Meanwhile, there is every reason to trust the statement of Northcutt Ely, attorney on behalf of California water agencies, to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last month:

"We do not believe that the Congress will reverse a century of the evolution of the water law of the West, to destroy an existing use to provide water for a new one."

The Mandela Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently the Minister of Home Affairs for the African Government of Kenya delivered an address in Peiping, China, in which he appealed for help from Red China to wage war against South Africa. It was an inconspicuous piece of news and did not get much attention in the press, but thanks to the alert editorial staff of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., a very fine editorial entitled, "The Mandela Case" resulted. This editorial sharply analyzes the situation and shows that this newspaper is knowledgeable of this affair.

Because this editorial is rather unique on this particular issue, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANDELA CASE

Speaking in Peiping May 6, Mr. Oginga Odinga, Minister of Home Affairs in the Kenya Government, appealed for Red China's help in a war against South Africa.

"Comrades," he told the cheering audience, "the war in Africa needs your help."

This appeal, reported by the Times of London, should wake Americans to the character of the world-wide buildup now taking place against the West's strongest bastion on the African Continent.

While Americans have been devoting primary attention to domestic problems, leftists from Red China to the United States have been busy promoting a new international crisis in Africa.

Colin Legum and Anthony Sampson, writing in the London Observer, spoke for these leftists in mid-April when they proposed a

naval blockade of South Africa. They did not rule out use of Soviet warships for this purpose. These same political types are utterly opposed to a naval bockade of Communist Cuba.

The sensational element in this campaign to deprive the West of its principal gold supply and control of the Cape of Good Hope is a buildup of Nelson Mandela, admitted saboteur, into an international hero. Leftists clearly intend to make the trial of Mandela and other terrorists into a new Sacco-Vanzetti case.

Mandela and other members of his terrorist group are on trial in South Africa for attempting revolution by violence. Innocent and not-so-innocent Americans have been drawn into the campaign to turn loose these revolutionaries. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, and the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean of the Protestant Episcopal National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., are among the prominent liberals who have jumped on the "Free Mandela" bandwagon.

We wonder whether Mr. Wilkins and Bishop Sayre know that Mandela has stated:

"I admit immediately that I was one of the persons who helped form Umkonto We Sizwe (The Spear of the Nation—the main sabotage movement in South Africa), and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August 1962."

Mandela also is on record as saying that he prepared for his career as a terrorist by studying the writings of Mao Tse-tung and Ernesto Guevara, Castro's righthand man. In a statement published April 26, Mandela hailed the Communists and spoke bitterly of the white man's "ingrained prejudice against communism." This is the man that Mr. Wilkins, Bishop Sayre and their comrades believe should be given his freedom.

This is not the first time that a global protest has been organized to spare a tool of communism. Americans well remember the international frenzy that preceded the execution of the Rosenbergs, the atomic spies who gave U.S. secrets to Russia. This special kind of frenzy is reserved for leftists. We didn't hear Mr. Wilkins or Dean Sayre protest the execution last week of Ngo Dinh Can, brother of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam.

Aside from artificial commotion over the Mandela case, the U.S. public should stand firm against boycott of South Africa. Americans are not among Oginga Odinga's comrades in Peiping. The U.S. national interest consists of protecting a Western society in Africa, not in plunging it into chaos as a prelude to Communist control.

A Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD a fine tribute to J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which appeared as an editorial this month in the Yakima Daily Republic of Yakima, Wash.

The editorial follows:

ONE MAN'S MONUMENT

J. Edgar Hoover, Mr. FBI, is not a man to wear his ribbons and medals, or to wave his honorary degrees in pride. Yet few can boast 18 honorary college degrees and at least 142 citations from widely varied American clubs and civic groups. The honors are certain to pour in upon the 69-year-old crime fighter this year in conjunction with Mr. Hoover's May 10 anniversary signaling 40 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

What manner of man is this, who has done more for the cause of crime prevention and detection than any other in history?

It would require an endless collection of adjectives to describe the many facets of a man so dedicated.

Not content with heading up a limited-purpose Federal organization, Mr. Hoover has spent 40 years making sure that FBI research, techniques and skills spread their benefits among all interested law enforcement agencies.

His FBI Academy has trained countless policemen, sheriff's deputies and patrolmen to better fill their jobs.

His FBI records are used by some 13,000 law enforcement agencies in a tightly knit nationwide network. His career-long theme has been to give this Nation absolutely the best law enforcement machine possible.

Mr. Hoover's personal behavior, beliefs and expressions have done immeasurable good among juveniles who otherwise might have teetered on that narrow fence between good and bad. He is a hero to millions, old and young.

Guided by a desire to promote good citizenship Mr. Hoover has in the process proved himself an outstanding citizen. Inevitably he will some day step down as head of the vast FBI force, but if he retired tomorrow J. Edgar Hoover could do so with the knowledge that in his devotion he has built a monument to law enforcement that probably will never be equaled.

Helping Small Farmers Build Hill Pastures Proving Remarkably Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Licking Valley Courier, West Liberty, Ky., entitled "Helping Small Farmers Build Hill Pastures Proving Remarkably Successful":

HELPING SMALL FARMERS BUILD HILL PASTURES PROVING REMARKABLY SUCCESSFUL

Remarkable success of the ASC's special pasture program for small farmers is proof that mountain people can work cooperatively for a good program even when some do not get to share in the benefits.

The 90 percent Government aid to small hill farmers for establishing pastures and improving old pastures on hill land is a pilot project being tried out in three Appalachian counties—Morgan, Breathitt, and Knott—to test its practicability and its workability.

The fact that the program is designed only for small farmers—ones who lack financial resources to participate in the regular 50–50 cost-share programs of ASC—meant that the ASC had to differentiate between farmers, approve some and reject some. This is always a ticklish business—sort of like playing favorites.

But this danger was circumvented by the manner in which the program was launched. Everything was up and above board, so to speak. The program and its purposes were fully explained. Rules of eligibility were established and explained. The test was for a way to help the little farmer. It was for the little farmer and that is the one who got it.

Over 400 applied and only 249 were approved. And we have heard so little complaint that it has amazed many people; for hill people are clannish—and of all hill counties, Morgan, Knott, and Breathitt are about as clannish as anywhere in Appalachia. Yet, everyone hails the program as a good one, probably the best approach yet made toward solving the submarginal standards of living of rural families in the hills, especially the hill counties with hundreds of small independent farmowners, the counties where the economy depends majorly on small hill farmers.

Why did it work so well, and quickly? Everyone was informed what the program was designed for, and everybody played by the rules—and it was up and above board.

A lot of credit goes to the county ASC committees and the State and regional ASC personnel, even to the community committeemen. For they set the rules, and then explained the program to farmers in community meetings. Everyone knew the purpose of the pilot program, whom it was designed to help, and how. And they understood too that when one group is helped economically, all are helped ultimately.

The county committee worked day after day qualifying those eligible under the rules set up, and then in checking progress.

Farmers whose applications were approved felt they were honor bound to make the program work. And it has been heartwarming to see how hard they worked and how well they did the job. Even more heartwarming has been the cooperation from many of those whose applications were rejected—for they have pitched in and helped the "small farmer" get his pasture work done, and have spurred him on.

In Morgan alone the program means that the county's small farmers have some 1,370 acres of additional grassland, and that this will help these small farmers pull above a marginal living standard, not just for this year but for years to come. They will be helped—and all the county will be helped—and there will be less need for welfare checks in the future.

Actually everyone involved has been working night and day, almost to meet the deadline. The program had the support of farmers and businessmen and civic groups, all.

The 90–10 cost-share program to help small farmers in the hills demonstrates it will work, and we think it is the logical approach to help small farmers get on a solid economic footing. They will find it profitable, so much so that they will continue the pasture program and this will continue to serve them, their county's agri-business, and the conservation needs of hill terrain.

I Studied Him With a Poet's Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid poem written by Thomas Jarrell Coody, one of the history teachers in John Tyler High School, Tyler, Tex. I trust it will be read by many:

I STUDIED HIM WITH A POET'S HEART

(To John F. Kennedy)

I studied him with a poet's heart,
Felt after him with intuition;
Pondered his face to seek to chart,
The course of his ambition;
As he, my heart's gauntlet ran,
It spoke to me, "Ah, here's a man!"

What we are, doth in subtle emanations
Stream through our eyes, imbue our face,
And thus these quiet intimations
Are the study which I embrace;
My heart I have learned to heed,
Thus the soul I seek to read.

The forming of a man,
'Tis the work of God;
He breathes, we expand,
The fire glows fiercely in the clod;
Each battle doth impart
Season to the heart.

When a man doth inly sense
He is held by Destiny,
He sheds the residue of pretense,
Embraces in joy Life's mystery,
Abandons himself unto that Hand,
As within he becomes a man.

I saw the thrust of that Hand,
Thrust you into life's heaving forge,
Then hammer, hammer, out a man,
Thrust for temper in bitter gorge,
'Til I sensed you did feel
Thy soul's iron transformed to steel.

What a sword He formed, was forming!
Your resilience did sing of Life;
Unto thy great task were warming,
Marching to that inner Fife,
Which best men tread to cross the pages
Of man's story through the ages.

Like a great oak upon a crest
Stretching upward toward the Light,
Nurtured upon Nature's breast,
Growing a Titan within our sight,
Whose oaken strength would shield our treasure,
Your very countenance give us pleasure.
Wait! Who is he, ax in hand,
Perversion written in his face,
His soul more beast than man,
An anomaly to his race,
Upon our Titan is softly stealing,
His blackened heart past feeling.

A deed so dark, past wonder,
That Nature's work in transcendent beauty,
A soulless Iago should plunder
In a madman's sense of duty.
Down the man which God did make,
The earth did tremble, its people quake.

O brother, friend, you can't be gone,
Hewn down in strength of summer;
I knew you in the inner Dawn,
I marched to that same Drummer;
My heart hath slowly loosed its hold
Upon thy form in death grown cold.

You as a lamb were slain;
Yet from weakness God ordains strength,
For from our hearts' throbbing pain,
Sacred lessons we learn at length,
As passes something of thyself
From the great man's Commonwealth.

The clay is cold, yet the spirit,
Its living warmth is shedding;
Its grace America doth inherit,
Its vision quietly spreading
Within the human breast a light,
Pulsing with a quiet might.

And thus in an illumined grief,
My heart reflective still,
There rises a paean, "Hail to the Chief";
I bow unto that Will
Which steeled thy soul to stand
And made of thee a Man.

—*Thomas Jarrell Coody.*

The Policy of the USIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important address by Carl T. Rowan, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, which he delivered before the National Press Club on April 26, 1964. In the following address Mr. Rowan makes a very able explanation of the fundamental policies of the USIA.

The address follows:

THE POLICY OF THE USIA

(By Carl T. Rowan, Director, U.S. Information Agency, before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., April 29, 1964)

President Dear, members of the Press Club, guests, it's a real pleasure and honor to be with you here today, and to share with you some of my early thoughts about this new—and great—responsibility with which President Johnson has entrusted me. Your task and mine have much in common, although they are far from identical: I hope in the give and take of this occasion and continuing dialog in many forums, formal and informal, we may grow in mutual understanding and the reinforcement of our common purposes.

You believe in telling the truth. So do we. You believe in responsible reporting. So do we. You have an obligation to your clients that goes beyond parochial or commercial interests. So do we. You deal in communications. So do we. You apply the process of editorial selection. So do we. You attempt to supply fact, balance, perspective to your readers, viewers, and hearers. So do we. Vis-a-vis your opposition, you attempt to get there fustest. So do we.

Most of you speak for an independent, nonofficial, nongovernment publisher, editor, or producer. We do not.

Our ownership is the American people. Our board of directors is the Congress of the United States. Our publisher is the President of the United States. Our charter is a combination of the Constitution of the United States, the Smith-Mundt Act, and the Hays-Fulbright Act. Our business office is the power of the purse on Capitol Hill.

No less than you, and no more than you, we must be responsive to the direction of the management. No less than you, we brook no compromise with principle or truth.

From these parameters of truth and responsibility to the American people—through their chosen representatives in the three branches of Government—the responsibilities and limitations of the U.S. Information Agency can be defined with some precision.

The responsibility as defined by President Kennedy and affirmed by President Johnson, "is to help achieve United States foreign policy objectives." We have no other business.

We are instructed to do this, among other things, by influencing public attitudes in other nations. We are the fourth dimension in foreign affairs: to the diplomatic arm, the military arm, and the economic arm has been added the information or psychological or propaganda arm—I let the semanticists choose the precise word.

Let me ask you, where would you begin this task? You have a mandate from the President to help achieve U.S. objectives abroad, your field is information, and Congress has given you, in the current fiscal year, $145 million to do the job.

Before we go on, a word of perspective on these resources. I am not pleading poor mouth, but it should be noted that at our present respective rates, the annual appropriation of the Department of Defense would run USIA for 338 years, or until the Year of Our Lord 2302. The AID budget would carry us for more than 20 years. If we count as our clients all the people of the world outside the United States, which they essentially are, we could not afford to send each one of them one post card a year.

The answer, of course, must lie in selectivity. Selectivity in audience. Selectivity in message. Selectivity in priority. Selectivity in effort. Selectivity in use of media. The same kind of selectivity which writers, editors, directors, and producers apply every day in conveying a message to anyone anywhere.

We are painfully aware of our major public opinion problems overseas. Some grow out of the facts of American life and policy: The problem of race and discrimination, the problem of poverty in the affluent society, the maldistribution of the costs of medical and hospital care, the conflicting voices of a free society. Some grow out of the efforts of the adversary: Lies, distortions, misrepresentations, shibboleths actively propagated to undermine our position. Some grow out of the genuine accomplishments of the adversary; the spectacular Sputnik I and subsequent Russian space shots; the irresponsible and unnecessary terror of the 100 megaton bomb.

With its resources—and here I paraphrase Lincon's famous words—USIA cannot tell all of the truth about the United States to all the people of the world all of the time, however desirable that may be.

We have evolved, therefore, a system of priorities. They reflect official policy, and are periodically examined and revised as required.

Here are the five things we believe the people of the world most need to know about U.S. foreign policy at the present time, if they are to make intelligent decisions:

1. The United States has no more urgent task than the pursuit of peace. In the words of President Johnson, "We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ." We believe this search for an attainable and honorable peace should be based on a gradual evolution in human institutions and on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements (such as the limited nuclear test ban) leading to general and complete disarmament. The United States will continue to encourage the settlement of international issues by peaceful means rather than force.

2. The United States, matured and tested under the responsibilities of free world leadership, will maintain its strength in all fields to protect its own freedom and to aid in the defense of other free nations against threats to their independence and institutions. The United States can and will keep its commitments to its allies and to other countries.

3. The United States believes in a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future, free to build and change their own systems so long as they do not threaten the freedom of others. We believe in the dignity of the individual, and will continue to help other nations in their efforts to modernize their societies, to resist coercion, and to construct and maintain free institutions.

4. The fundamental commitment of the United States is to freedom of the individual, of the community, and of the Nation under law. This commitment is the hall-

mark which distinguishes societies of freemen from societies where rule is based on privilege and force. Historically, the rule of law was a commitment of the people of the United States to themselves; today it is the cornerstone of both our domestic and international policies. We will continue to work toward perfecting the rule of law at home and encourage its extension to and among all nations.

5. The United States will continue its full support of the United Nations, seeking in concert with other countries to strengthen the U.N.'s peacekeeping machinery. It will also continue to support U.N. functions which assist all free nations, large and small, to maintain their independence and to move toward political, economic, and social justice.

Our media have been instructed to help convey these cardinal truths by all means at our command.

Our mandate from the President also contains an injunction to "identify the United States as a strong, democratic, dynamic nation" qualified for its leadership role, and to emphasize "those aspects of American life and culture which facilitate sympathetic understanding of U.S. policies."

Here are the aspects of the United States which we currently believe the people of the world most need to understand to make intelligent decisions.

1. The United States has the most diverse population in the world. In the melting pot process, minorities have often suffered in the United States, as they have historically and still do in many countries. But the U.S. democratic, social, political, and economic system has provided a means for them to join and be absorbed into the mainstream of American life, in all its richness and variety. The last such large minority—Negro Americans—are now actively in this process of full integration. Progress will not always be easy, but, with the support of the Federal Government and a majority of the citizenry, will continue until the process is complete.

2. The United States has developed the most powerful and productive economy the world has ever seen, based on a dynamic balance among business, labor, and Government. Incentives provide opportunity; Government protects against abuses and excess fluctuation of the business cycle. The U.S. economy continues to grow rapidly, and there is no evidence that the Soviets will overtake it soon or in the foreseeable future. The strength and productivity of the U.S. economy permits the United States to provide its people with material standards and welfare measures which the Communists have only promised; to keep itself and the free world armed at a level adequate to protect against all forms of attack; and to provide substantial aid to less developed countries.

3. Social benefits, strong labor unions, a progressive tax system, broad capital ownership by the populace, and Government regulatory agencies contribute to widespread ownership and enjoyment of U.S. productive wealth. The American system of "capitalism with a conscience" differs radically from the capitalistic system vividly attacked by 19th century writers. Despite this progress, the United States seeks still greater economic opportunity and equality for all its citizens—thus our current war on poverty.

4. The United States is one of the leaders of the international scientific community, with a depth and breadth of pure and applied scientific research unmatched in any other country. After a late start, the United States has taken the lead in space technology and exploration. The quality of the U.S. educational system also ranks with that of the most advanced nations. The American system is unique in the large percentage of its citizens who receive a higher education. I found recently in Hong Kong that newsmen were incredulous when I told them that the percentage of U.S. Negroes in colleges and universities is higher than the percentages of whites in Britain, or France, or Germany, in institutions of higher education. Higher learning is available without regard to economic or social classes. Claims that the rigid Soviet educational system is likely soon to overtake the American system in either quality or quantity are not borne out by the facts or by authoritative projections for the next decades.

5. Drawing upon its native inheritance and the wealth of intellectual, artistic, philosophic, and religious traditions brought by immigrants, the United States has created its own variegated, dynamic, serious culture. Its hallmark is freedom: There are no more barriers to expression in art than there are in speech; there is no cultural party line imposed from the top. While respecting tradition and continuing to study and appreciate the classical inheritance, current American intellectual life, art, music, literature, and other cultural manifestations are characterized by vitality and a will to experiment. Culture in the United States is not reserved for a privileged few nor confined to the capital cities; it spans the breadth of the people and the land. The United States believes in the freedom to create, not only in the United States but for the people everywhere, and the free flow of culture among nations.

Our media have been instructed to convey these cardinal truths by all means at their command.

No doubt you have noticed in your press that when USIA tries to reflect this freedom of expression, in art or elsewhere, we sometimes face a bit of criticism from the element not being reflected at that particular time.

At our field posts, we go one step further. Our mandate from the President says that "individual country programs should specifically and directly support country and regional objectives" of the U.S. Government.

Our country activities are thus not scatter shot operations. They are carefully designed under a written plan which attempts to persuade the right people of the right message at the right time. We do not use all mediums in all countries; we do not attempt to say all things to all audiences; we seek not to waste our ammunition on the already convinced nor dissipate our resources on the unnecessary or the impossible.

And many things are impossible for USIA. It is, after all, what the United States does, rather than what it says, that has the most profound and permanent impact overseas. We can explain and interpret; we can project and persuade. But we cannot unmake history, or undo policy, or hide what is unhideable in a free and open society. We usually cannot please both parties to a quarrel not of our own making. We cannot make policy palatable for those to whom it is a bone in the throat.

USIA cannot defeat the Vietcong, get less developed countries on the road to economic and social viability, resolve the Kashmir, Arab-Israel, and Cyprus conflicts.

But given intelligent and effective American policies, given the continued dedication of the American people to their own best heritage as we seek to solve our remaining problems, USIA can and will make an important contribution to our objectives overseas.

I have today deliberately avoided the subject of hardware, as our colleagues in the Pentagon like to speak of it. I could have told you at length about the number of transmitters we have here and around the world, the volume and spread of our daily radioteletype file, the success of our exhibits in the Soviet Union, the drama of USIA in the front lines of South Vietnam as I saw it only 10 days ago.

Instead I have chosen to stipulate by implication that we have the technological resources and know-how to communicate.

Our success or failure will be determined by the quality and appeal of the message we have to convey. It will be determined by the quality and dedication of the people—both in and out of USIA—sent by our Government to convey it. It will be determined by the wisdom of our policy and the zeal with which we pursue it.

We shall continue to reflect the important truths about America with all the technology and all the wisdom we can command.

We will yield to none in our standards of objectivity, responsibility, balance, and perspective.

We will hold with the words from John that "the truth shall make you free," and we intend to play our part.

Observe the Law—Key to Order, Justice, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by our former colleague, Judge Christoper C. McGrath. This address was given before the Rotary Club of the Bronx, N.Y., on the occasion of their observance of Law Day, May 1, 1964.

In the printed announcement issued by the Rotary Club they cited Judge McGrath as follows:

Speaker: Hon. Christopher C. McGrath, Surrogate of Bronx County.

Judge McGrath, the father of six children, is a graduate of the Fordham University School of Law, class of 1924. He has served in the New York State Legislature for eight successive terms; he served as justice of the municipal court, New York City, from 1935 to 1948; from 1949 to 1952, he was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives; in 1952 he was elected Surrogate of Bronx County.

Much could be written about our speaker, but space prohibits its recounting here. Suffice to say he has received many awards (in 1961 an honorary life membership in the Zionist Organization of America in recognition of support given to new state of Israel when a Member of Congress), and in January of this year—(Outstanding Citizenship Award from Parkchester Lodge and Chapter of B'nai B'rith.) He has written many articles for legal publications. We are privileged to have him address us.

The address follows:

OBSERVE THE LAW—KEY TO ORDER, JUSTICE, FREEDOM

To adequately understand the full meaning of law and the necessity for its observance, a moment should be taken to comprehend the meaning of law.

There have been many definitions—just as there have been many civilizations which were based on various codes of law. It may be excellently defined as: A rule of action, mandatory in form, freely established and promulgated by competent authority for the common good.

Note that law is a rule of action: action which results as a reaction to the needs and demands of society. It is a living organism, constantly developing and responding to the requirements of a constantly developing society. The growth in, and development of society, necessitates an equal growth and development of law. Consider the advent of workmen's compensation legis-

lation. While laws of this nature would always have been beneficial to the laboring man, it was not until we were far advanced as an industrial society, with attendant physical dangers to workers, that such laws were enacted.

Similarly, the legislature breathed life into minimum wage, social security, and all the acts of social welfare legislation, only when our society had cried out for their conception.

The most effective example of this response to law is demonstrated in an almost forgotten page of a glorious achievement. In the early 1930's, unemployment was rampant. Life savings were depleted—only the house remained. Foreclosures were the order of the day. Disorder threatened. This Government created the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The foreclosures stopped—not the mere house was saved, but, far more important, the home was saved. The family kept together. There were those, at that time, who cursed uphill and damned down dale the President of the United States who conceived this idea, and the Congress that gave it life. The dire prediction that financial ruin in the United States would follow, was answered when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation repaid the Government every penny and returned a profit. The essential needs of the people at that time were met by a corresponding growth in law.

Another example of this concept, is the Securities and Exchange Act. Recall, at the turn of the century, the entry of the small investor into Wall Street, and the resultant tragic experiences, and you will recall the immediate reaction of law to a need of its society.

As society grew more complex, and law expanded in its company, so did order, justice, and freedom. This is evident when we consider the following three areas: Labor relations, individual rights, and civil rights.

First, in labor relations of the 19th century and early 20th century, all will concede, management disregarded the rights of the workingman. The lot of the worker became so horrible that, from the pits of despair, men and women took to the streets to do battle for life itself. Industrial relations reached such a degree of strife in the 1930's, that the Wagner Act came into existence for the avowed purpose of diminishing the causes of labor disputes obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.

Adjustments followed by both groups. Better will prevailed, and law restored order.

Second, interference with, and denial of, individual rights, as manifested by illegal search and seizure. It had too long been the practice of authorities to disregard the rights of individuals, especially of minorities and the poor, in their quest for the perpetrators of crime. Those so abused turned to the Federal courts for the justice guaranteed in the Constitution. Their pleas were not in vain—for law, taking the form of judicial mandate in such cases as *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, guaranteed to all defendants in State prosecutions, the full, effective protection of their constitutional rights. Law made justice a reality.

Third, human relations and the denial by some Americans of the full rights and privileges of other Americans—the vile and base wish of some to hold their brethren in a subtle type of bondage. This, again, is a situation which was allowed to continue too long. Those who were so oppressed, turned to our Federal courts, and they, too, received relief. But the judicial mandates were effectively denied the oppressed in many areas and in many ways. This minority turned to Congress for solution of this social plague, only to be met in the Senate by a southern filibuster on the civil rights bill. These groups of oppressed people, again from the pit of despair, took to the streets across the Nation, to obtain complete freedom. It is sad and regrettable that, in protesting, some people, perhaps frustrated over the continuous affronts to their dignity, have themselves resorted to disobedience of the law. But, we are confident that, with good will of all citizens, we will be able to say: law established freedom.

Through law developed specifically to meet the needs of our country, we do not find that the members of our society automatically observe the law which we developed for their common good.

Of course, the majority of people do observe the law, but, a shockingly great percentage can rightfully be charged with either nonobservance of the law or deliberate disobedience of it. There is a distinction between nonobservance and disobedience.

By nonobservance, we refer to the citizen who knows of the existence of the law, does not willfully disobey the rule, but avoids his responsibilities and violates its spirit. Nonobservance is most commonly manifested by nonparticipation of citizens in the life of the community. This is a constant danger, because it is so easily adopted by each of us, and results in indifference to justice and freedom. If there is a rise of extremism from both the right and left today in the United States, I believe that it is the immediate result of nonobservance of our laws respecting the rights and privileges of others.

Surely, the bitter lessons we have learned from our traumatic experiences with nazism, fascism, and communism at home and abroad, have not been lost on us. Those in Germany and Russia, who shut their eyes to the injustices being perpetrated against a few at first, then hundreds, then thousands, and, lastly millions of fellow human beings, lived long enough to rue the day on which they had ignored the injustices visited upon their neighbors.

Equally present, and infinitely more dangerous, is disobedience of law. Disobedience is the deliberate, calculated, rejection of authority and its mandates. This disobedience is, of course, perpetrated by fewer members of the community.

However, disobedience of law, though committed by only a few, immediately results in the deliberate disorder, injustice, and calculated deprivation of freedom.

Only when you have full observance does law have the capacity effectively to promote order, justice, and freedom. This is not a nebulous or theoretical goal. Each of us has the responsibility to contribute to the development and observance of law. All must recognize that, to every right, there corresponds a duty.

Participation of the people in National and State discussions is an important part of the legal process. Legislators seek out the views of the people on current issues. Silence will not aid them in seeking an answer to a problem. Judges, in coming to their decisions, must look for the legislative intent, and not just the statutory verbiage. Legislative intent is frequently discovered only by searching out the minutes of legislative hearings, where citizens appear to express themselves on proposed measures. After passage, the right to test a statute in court, is essential. For it is only when we participate in legal process that the law will continue to develop.

The acceptance of the supreme law of the land, once it is interpreted by the Supreme Court, is fundamental. In its acceptance, we reserve the right to dissent, to argue, to question, but we do not reserve the right to disobey.

May I ask: What of the future? The fundamental question of our civilization today and tomorrow is this: How do you protect the rights of the individual? This is not an easy question to be solved with a glib answer. It will require the best brains, and the best thinking of all of our citizens.

How do you break up the criminal conspiracy of hardened gangsters, who use all the modern techniques in electronic communications; shift operations from State to State, and employ procedures within the scope of our laws, which were originally designed to protect the rights of the individual? How do we help our law enforcement officers bring to justice criminals who overlook no opportunity or the protection of any law, to achieve their unlawful and unethical ends?

How do we achieve the aims and goals of social justice, which are taught to us by our religious leaders? How can legislators and the courts cooperate in solving the great social problems plaguing our executive leaders? How do we provide legal mechanisms to make up for the denial of opportunity to our minorities for a first-class education—a chance for employment—and promotion in jobs? How does our society preserve the rights of the individual, whether he is a conscientious objector or a person desiring religious liberty?

Recognition of these problems is not enough. Admission of the fact that they exist is not sufficient. We must attempt to work out solutions, acceptable to most of our people, without running into the disorder which comes from nonobservance or disobedience of law.

I return to my original thesis: This Nation has become great because we have provided solutions to complex and complicated problems through the evolution of legislation, interpreted through the years by our courts.

May that greatness continue, under God, through observance of the law, the key to order, justice, and freedom.

The Oliver Wendell Holmes Bill of Rights Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union made the first presentation of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Bill of Rights award. This distinguished award will be presented annually to the person who has made the outstanding contribution in the area in promoting dedication to the principles of the Bill of Rights.

Judge Thurman Arnold, Judge David L. Bazelon, Judge Francis Biddle, Dr. James Nabrit, and the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre were the committee who designated the recipient of the award. I can think of few greater accolades than to be chosen as worthy of distinction by such an illustrious group of men. That Alan Barth was their choice caused no surprise to anyone who knows Mr. Barth, his writings, or the causes which have had his support over the years.

I am proud to count Alan Barth a friend, but long before I came to know him personally, or to know of his editorials for the Washington Post, I knew him through the three excellent books he has written. "The Price of Liberty," "Government by Investigation," and

The Loyalty of Free Men" constitute three of the most important sources available to anyone who is concerned about civil liberties and the principles of the Bill of Rights.

Among the people who heard Mr. Barth's speech on the occasion of the presentation of the first Oliver Wendell Holmes Bill of Rights award were prominent members of the bench and the bar, distinguished writers, and, of course, many friends who love and respect him for what he is and what he does. The response to the invitation was so overwhelming that many could not be accommodated. For that reason, and also because I believe his remarks on that occasion deserve the serious reflection of every Member of Congress, under unanimous consent, I include the following statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS BY ALAN BARTH, EDITORIAL WRITER, THE WASHINGTON POST; AUTHOR RECIPIENT, FIRST OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES BILL OF RIGHTS AWARD, PRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, MAY 6, 1964, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I have made every effort, let me assure you, to believe that the Holmes award was given on a merit basis. In view of the eminence and integrity of the judges, I have tried hard and conscientiously to believe that recipient deserved the honor. But the effort, I am sorry to say, has proved unavailing.

There must be some other explanation. On reflection, I think I recognize the award you have given me for what it really is: an expression not of judgment but of generosity—and, I should like to think, of regard, even of affection, as well. As such, it is, of course, immeasurably more prized and precious to me.

This would be a rough world if each of us got only what he deserved. Happily, we sometimes get much more—the kindnesses of friends. You have given me something far greater than pride in an award; you have given me a degree of happiness for which I simply have no adequate means of expressing my gratitude.

There was a press release issued some time ago announcing that if I lived long enough and behaved myself, I would become the recipient of the Holmes Award. There was no attempt to justify the choice—except for an implication that the judges had taken into account some books which identified me as their author and for which I assume full responsibility and some editorials which I may, or may not, have written.

The anonymity of editorial writing is sometimes irksome. But it is by no means without its compensations. When anyone asks me how to identify the pieces I contribute to the Post's editorial page, I blush as prettily as possible and say, "It's really very simple; mine are the superb ones that seem to hit the nail right on the head." All of us on the editorial page get blamed at times for one another's shortcomings; we need suffer very few qualms, therefore, if we take what credit we can get for one another's successes.

But credit for an editorial page belongs to the newspaper as a collectivity, an institution. I could not, in good conscience, fail to point out what is, undoubtedly, altogether evident to you, that editorial writers can be no better than their newspapers want them to be. If the Washington Post has good editorials, it is because it wants them and demands them from its editorial writers.

I am immensely glad of an occasion to say publicly something about the pride and gratification I have enjoyed over a period of 20 years as a member of the Post's editorial staff. There are no more than a few newspapers left in the United States which want their editorial pages to serve as vital forces in the community. Happily, the Post is one of them.

The Post's editor, J. R. Wiggins, is here this evening, and I think I'll say something about him. When he heard sometime ago that you were going to allow me to talk at this dinner, he threatened to ask for rebuttal time. But I'm confident you won't give it to him; and anyway I figure I can filibuster him out of it.

The noncommittal, on-the-other-hand type of editorial is not much in his line. On the contrary, he tends to exhort us not to spare the horses. As a result, he sometimes gets good, strong pieces from us; and quite often he writes them himself.

It is a mistake, you know, to suppose that editors are altogether useless. It is true that they are frequently troublesome. And I do not mean to make any exception for present company. But it is nice to have them on hand to deal with outraged subscribers and to accept the blame for all of the paper's imperfections.

Russ Wiggins presides over a little collection of prima donnas ineffectually disguised as editorial writers. Somehow, he manages to keep our matutinal editorial conferences from becoming actually riotous. Indeed, he makes them, as a rule, exciting intellectual exercises from which, by some alchemy, a consensus is at last distilled. It is one of the happy aspects of my job that I have a part in this process.

It is important for a newspaper to be right in its editorial judgments—as often as mortal men can manage to be so. But is perhaps even more important for a newspaper to be willing to run the risk of being wrong. We are not law givers, nor are we lawmakers; what we say is entitled to whatever weight may be deserved by the arguments adduced in support of it—nor more, no less. But it is our obligation, I think, to question, to challenge, and to protest.

In Washington, the arguments offered by the Post are often contradicted—and very ably, too—by the Evening Star and the Daily News; so that those who read may run in whichever way they choose. The community benefits, I think, from this conflict of opinion.

Unhappily, however, in most American communities today this kind of conflict no longer exists. And in most American newspapers, the editorial page serves no more than a ceremonial function. It is there because it was once recognized as the heart and soul of a newspaper. But too often it has become a mere adornment, perpetuated long after its purpose has been forgotten, as men continue to wear on the sleeves of their jackets buttons which do not open and which have become altogether devoid of utility.

The press in the United States is, in many respects, the most privileged of American institutions. Although newspapers are big business enterprises operated for private profit, and although they are subsidized by the Government in some degree through second-class mail benefits, they are shielded by the first amendment to the Constitution from any official interference or regulation.

Moreover, this privileged position is no mere legalism or abstraction. It has been strengthened by time and buttressed by popular reverence. Freedom of the press is an American shibboleth. And although the phrase, like freedom of religion, is not precisely understood by everyone who uses it, most Americans would probably fight for it and, perhaps, even die for it.

The reason for this extraordinary grant of freedom to newspapers lies in the fact that the founders of the American Republic desired them to serve as one of those safeguards designed to keep governmental authority within prescribed bounds. Far from wanting censorship of the press by the Government, they sought censorship of the Government by the press.

Jefferson spoke of the press explicitly as a censor of the Government. "No government ought to be without censors," he wrote to Washington in 1792, "and while the press is free, no one will." And although the federalist journals of his day treated him with malicious cruelty, he was still able to write to a French correspondent in 1823: "This formidable censor of the public functionaries, by arraigning them at the tribunal of public opinion, produces reform peaceably, which must otherwise be done by revolution.

Well, a press which enjoys such independence of the Government is almost bound to be, by definition, in some degree irresponsible. A measure of irresponsibility was the price which had to be paid—which the founders of the Republic were prepared to pay—in order to enable the press to discharge its censorial function.

For my own part, I do not look upon this irresponsibility as the gravest of dangers. I do not mean to make light of the threats which reckless journalism may pose to rights of privacy, to the right to a fair trial and to other individual rights. These are serious problems. I am more concerned, however, with a different danger—with the danger that the press in the United States today has become excessively responsible—has become, in fact, to an alarming degree, a spokesman and partner of the Government, rather than a censor.

In a time when international tension seems a normal condition of existence, newspaper support of the Government, especially in its foreign relations, tends to be considered a requisite of patriotism. But when men hold in their hands such malevolent instruments of destruction that official error may mean universal annihilation, criticism and challenge may be far more useful, far more genuinely patriotic—may contribute far more to true national security—than uncritical acquiescence or than any amount of flag-waving.

My country right or wrong is a dangerous sort of sentimentality for individuals; for newspapers, it represents a total abidcation of responsibility. For the responsibility of a newspaper is not to governments; it is to values, to ideas, to human beings.

In international affairs more than in any other area—because here are posed the great questions of life and death—a newspaper needs to probe and challenge—to ask whether the policies said to serve the interests of a nation can be said also to serve the interests of mankind.

A captious, even an irresponsible, press is to be preferred, I think, to a supine or complacent press. And, although constant and perhaps carping criticism may irritate Presidents or police chiefs or directors of the U.S. Information Agency or other conscientious public officials, it operates also to keep them up to the mark, to make them justify and scrutinize all that they do; and thus it raises the caliber and quality of government. And it may well be that in the long-continuing struggle between totalitarianism on the one hand and government by the consent of the governed on the other, press censorship of the Government may give the latter just the mechanism for correcting error, just the margin of fitness and efficiency it needs for survival.

It seems to me that all the aspects of contemporary life are tending to produce a homogenization of society. International tension makes dissent seem dangerous. Urbanization—the compression of people into great cities and often into slum areas—makes diversity seem difficult. Automation and cybernetics and technology seem almost to eliminate individuality.

More and more, in the name of national security, in the name of public safety, in the name of religion, in the name of convenience masquerading as necessity, we are permitting constitutional shortcuts which involve serious trespasses on those individual rights which the Founders of the Republic thought fundamental to a free and pluralistic society.

The vital function of a free press is to stand guard against such trespasses—to sound an alarm whenever governmental power threatens to invade areas from which the Constitution excluded its reach and range. It is essential to remember that the eternal vigilance which is so commonly referred to as the price of liberty has always meant eternal vigilance against duly constituted authority—against ourselves and our own extravagances and passions.

A free press is, of course, but one of the devices which freemen have provided for the protection of their freedom. For the effective vindication of their basic rights, freemen must turn to that most characteristic of all American institutions, the voluntary association, the real motive force of American political life.

Among the multitudinous voluntary associations pushing and pulling for divers interests in this pluralistic society, the American Civil Liberties Union stands preeminently as the champion of freedom. For nearly half a century, it has ridden into battle, fearlessly and unflinchingly, to defend those inalienable rights which are the richest portion of the American inheritance.

All of us here tonight who are members of the ACLU are entitled to pride in its performance. No other single body has contributed more to the liberty of Americans—or to their national security. Let us keep it armed and vigilant.

For me, an award from the Civil Liberties Union has special meaning and extraordinary value. There is no organization whose accolade could mean so much to me. And the significance of the award is immeasurably enhanced for me by the character of the judges who determined it. I have no words with which to give adequate expression of my gratitude. I can only say that though it is unearned, I shall try in the future to earn it. And I shall cherish it always as a remembrance of your generosity and your friendship.

Ed Wimmer—Friend of the Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Ed Wimmer, is an old soldier in the battle to keep the small businessman going. His contributions toward the development of small business and for the benefit of small businessmen from coast to coast have been recorded consistently through the years.

For more than three decades he has been pumping life, spirit, and guts into the small businessmen of America. Just recently he covered 45,000 miles as an evangelist for their cause.

In the many years that I headed the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives, I could always count on Ed Wimmer when the going was rough and the chips were down.

I am, therefore, delighted to insert into the RECORD a piece by Joe Green which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer recently:

IF YOU WERE EVEN TEMPERED, YOU MIGHT BE COMPLACENT

(By Joe Green)

Ed Wimmer, Greater Cincinnati's fiery champion of small professional and businessmen, vows he isn't a "preacher," although many of his pronouncements have roots in the Scriptures.

For the past 33 years Ed has used his own form of evangelism to carry on a campaign against "national socialism" into every State in the Union and into Canada with some of the zeal that made Billy Sunday a household word.

The articulate vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business is often called "a lone voice in the wilderness." But he spreads his message wherever people gather—at national, State, and local conventions of all kinds; before service clubs, civic, and other groups.

"I traveled 27,000 miles in February on 35 assignments," he says. "I think nothing of traveling 1,500 to 1,800 miles to appear before a Rotary club. Getting invitations to speak is one of those things that snowball. I speak before one group and immediately get invitations to go before others."

Born in Sparta, Wis., in 1900, Ed was educated in Canada where his father was a pioneer in the opening of Alberta. He left there after World War I and traveled all over the United States. He came to Cincinnati in 1928 and started a small candy business.

"I was hit hard by the financial crash of 1929," he says. "It was then I realized that something had gone wrong with the economic machinery of the country. I became convinced that economic power in the hands of a few led to that crash and was determined then to follow what I believed the best method of preventing a recurrence of such a situation."

He set up the Forward America Publishing Guild, Inc., of which he is president, in Cincinnati, and about 2 months ago moved its headquarters into a refurbished building at Second and Court Streets, Covington.

Not long afterward the organization became the public relations division of the National Federation of Independent Business, which has headquarters in San Mateo, Calif.

"Now we have 197,000 members and 300 field men in the NFIB," Ed says. "There are 2,500 chairmen who compile our monthly ballots. We are doing work in England, Australia, and Japan out of our office here. The monopoly problem has become worldwide.

"These countries want to fight this thing—monopoly socialism is what we're getting. As never before, Lenin's dream is coming true in the marketplace."

Ed is in favor of capitalism. He says the American way of life is the "only way to preserve freedom in the land."

"The basis of capitalism is the widespread independent ownership of farm, home, and business enterprises wherever practical and possible, with local control over local affairs in government," he contends. "America became the greatest nation in the world because it gave more people and more places an opportunity to participate as individuals in the production of goods and services.

"Capitalism is the best system ever devised, because it has made more somebodies out of more nobodies than any other system."

Ed says the general attitude of educators today is not in favor of capitalism: "Dependency on government has become the climate of college and high school today."

And, he believes "the only free society we can look forward to today is an ethical society."

"When closing my speeches I always tell businessmen to try for 30 days, when opening their doors, to stop just a moment and say: 'I'm going to try to be an ethical man today, no matter what it costs,'" he says.

"There's a feeling that a man must be competitive at any price to his character, the respect of his employees and family or the risk he must take with his customers. This feeling is widespread in the whole marketplace.

"I ask men in my audiences these questions: Is there any other country in the world today that has the material wealth and the wealth of idealism to turn the tides against socialism and atheism? In the 20th century America stands alone with that responsibility resting on her shoulders.

"And I always ask: Are we meeting that responsibility? Or are we doing as was mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount—building a house on sands?"

Ed inevitably refers to Thomas Jefferson in his crusade.

"Jefferson was a devout believer in the goodness of the human person," he says. "He felt that a system had to be devised that would bring out all the hidden talent of people.

"This was one reason Jefferson hated all undue power—why he felt that mass movement of any kind would lead ultimately to tyranny.

"I believe that if the world would come almost to an end and if there were only two men left, they would talk about Jefferson. I've studied all the philosophies and found he was the only one who could wrap it all up and deliver it in a package that could be understood by all classes and creeds."

What is Ed's political philosophy?

"I am a radical conservative," he says. "I want to eradicate those things that are bad and conserve those that are good."

Ed Wimmer is an affable man with a booming voice. He speaks to almost everybody and at the slightest response hands out ball-point pens on which his name and organization are imprinted. He has been passing out pens since 1956.

Ed is 6 feet tall and has graying hair and blue eyes. He always wears "5-gallon" hats—another of his trademarks. He and his wife, Britmarte, live at 2 Page Road, South Fort Mitchell. They have a son, Edward Michael, a student at the University of Cincinnati, and a daughter, Mrs. Gary (Hope) Meiman, Florence, and two grandsons.

Ed has no time for hobbies. A Protestant and a Mason, he goes to church "whenever I can." He's "in favor of all types of music except that put out by the Beatles."

"Am I even tempered?" he storms. "Who could be even tempered today in the face of all the injustices taking place. If you were even tempered you might be complacent."

For the past 12 years Ed's column attacking monopolies in big business and presenting the case of the small businessman have appeared in the Enquirer weekly. The copyrighted feature, a paid advertisement, appears also in the Dayton Daily News, and is picked up without copyright, he says, by some 100 other publications.

Ed has an "unswerving conviction" that free enterprise was born on Main Street, U.S.A., and that Main Street is becoming its burial ground.

"This leaves no room for anything but to dedicate yourself to stopping the funeral," he quips.

Other Wimmer preachments are:

"All America can give a salute to the capitalistic system whenever they see the opening of a small new business, especially by someone under 25.

"Why this motto: 'The teachings of Christ or Chaos?' I believe that religion and morality are synonymous with individual

dignity and freedom at all levels of society. They alone, religion and morality, preserve family life and make public office a trust.

"Only morality and religion stand in the way of predatory robbers of trade, and without their protection, free society disintegrates, and dissolution of family life and public office begin. People sunk in moral depravity always bring the free society to its grave."

Testimony of Rabbi Edward E. Klein Before House Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Edward E. Klein of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue testified on May 20, 1964, before the House Judiciary Committee on the school prayer issue. Rabbi Klein, one of the most respected and revered rabbis in America, is chairman of the Committee on Church and State of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. The conference, which has 850 members serving approximately 1 million members of Reform synagogues in the United States, is the oldest rabbincial body in the country. I am sure Rabbi Klein's wisdom will be of great guidance to the committee in its deliberations, and all Members of Congress can benefit from his insight. Rabbi Klein pointed out:

Religious men drafted the first amendment to protect freedom of belief. And six Justices of the Supreme Court in our day, all of whom are church members, supported it in their decision out of the same motivation. The Supreme Court did not rule against God, prayer, or the Bible. And I say this as one who has dedicated his life to the teaching of religion. Prayer is a dialog with God. It springs from the soul's sincerest desire. It has roots in religious tradition and historic experience. It needs an atmosphere of solemnity and reverence. To make it a classroom exercise is to demean prayer and render it meaningless. To some children crossing themselves or kneeling, folding hands or covering the head are essential to prayer. To permit such ritual acts in the classroom would be divisive in one of the few institutions where children are merely children, regardless of race or creed. To prevent such ritual acts is to deprive prayer of essential historic and sectarian associations and so dilute it as to deprive it of significance.

I urge all of my colleagues to contemplate the following testimony:

TESTIMONY OF RABBI EDWARD E. KLEIN, AT HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS, MAY 20, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my name is Rabbi Edward E. Klein. I am chairman of the Committee on Church and State of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the organization of Reform Rabbis, now numbering 850 and serving approximately one million members of Reform Synagogues in the United States. The Central Conference of American Rabbis, founded in 1889, is the oldest rabbinical body in the country, and almost from its inception delegated a committee on church and state to report on violations of church-state separation and propose action by the Rabbis in conference assembled. The founder of the Conference and father of Reform Judaism in America, Isaac Mayer Wise, was sustained by the courts of Cincinnati, Ohio when he opposed the introduction of Bible reading in the schools.

At our June 1963 convention in Philadelphia, the Central Conference of American Rabbis unanimously adopted a report which hailed the Supreme Court decision on Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. Our report read, in part, "We view the decision as a clear delineation of the separate functions of church and state, thoroughly in accord with American constitutional principles and the ideals of high religion. Religion abdicates its responsibility when it imposes upon the institutions of the state the obligation to conduct religious exercises which properly belong only to church and synagogue. By the same token, in a pluralistic society, the state assumes unwarranted religious authority when it conducts such religious exercises. The decision is thus in the best interests of religion and the democratic ideal. We see in it a challenge to intensify our efforts to encourage our children to make worship an intrinsic part of their lives and to secure for them a more effective religious education at home and in our houses of worship."

My presence here today, at the behest of our conference, is for the purpose of expressing our opposition to the constitutional amendment which is before you as a serious breach in what Thomas Jefferson termed "the wall of separation between church and state." So intent was Thomas Jefferson on this principle that when he was rector of the University of Virginia, a State-supported institution, he refused to permit Sunday religious services to be conducted on University property. In drafting the first amendment to the Constitution, America's Founding Fathers, all deeply religious men, were aware that in maintaining the separate functions of religion and the state they were insuring the fullest flowering of American democracy and the free development of religion. Their intuition proved correct. Thirteen Colonies became a Union of 50 States, bulwark of freedom in a world questing to remain free. And religion, today, has a higher status here in the United States than anywhere else in the world. Consider the burgeoning membership rolls of churches and synagogues today in the light of the fact that at the time of the American Revolution only 10 percent of the people belonged to a church.

Religious men drafted the first amendment to protect freedom of belief. And six Justices of the Supreme Court in our day, all of whom are church members, supported it in their decision out of the same motivation. The Supreme Court did not rule against God, prayer, or the Bible. And I say this as one who has dedicated his life to the teaching of religion. Prayer is a dialog with God. It springs from the soul's sincerest desire. It has roots in religious tradition and historic experience. It needs an atmosphere of solemnity and reverence. To make it a classroom exercise is to demean prayer and render it meaningless. To some children crossing themselves or kneeling, folding hands, or covering the head are essential to prayer. To permit such ritual acts in the classroom would be divisive in one of the few institutions where children are merely children, regardless of race or creed. To prevent such ritual acts is to deprive prayer of essential historic and sectarian associations and so dilute it as to deprive it of significance.

I am aware that the proposed amendment speaks of voluntary prayers. A period of prayer or devotions could not possibly be voluntary in a classroom. The very fact that it takes place in the classroom, supervised by a teacher, authorized by a school, endows the exercise with the authority of the State. Unfair onus is put on the child who demurs. Children are conformists, and the pressures of their peers and the opinions of their elders are decisive. As Mr. Justice Frankfurther put it, "That a child is offered an alternative may reduce the constraint; it does not eliminate the operation of influence by the school in matters sacred to conscience and outside the school's domain."

The proposed amendment would not make children or their schools more religious or more moral. Religion must be both taught and caught by precept and example at home, in the synagogues and churches. Religion and the home must not look to the school to do their work. Let us rather intensify our own programs of religious education, and let us join hands across the faiths to redouble our efforts to improve the public schools, that in the cooperative atmosphere of the classroom, in the example of dedicated teachers, in the content of history and literature and science expertly taught, our children's values will be elevated. But the expression of those values in devotional exercises and their rootage in theology must be left to the home and our religious institutions.

I, therefore, submit, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed amendment would seriously infringe upon an inalienable right, prove violative of the religious spirit at its best, while serving no useful purpose. The comment of the late President Kennedy on the Supreme Court decision deserves quoting and requoting, "I would think that it would be a welcome reminder to every American family that we can pray a good deal more at home, we can attend our churches with a good deal more fidelity, and we can make the true meaning of prayer much more important in the lives of our children. That power is very much open to us. And I would hope that, as a result of this decision, all American parents will intensify their efforts at home."

Restraint of Trade in Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to reconcile the President's exhortations for fewer trade restrictions with the textile legislation he has insisted upon. An article entitled "Moral Fiber?—King Cotton Had Better Mend His Ways," in the May 18 issue of Barron's Weekly states the contradiction dramatically.

It follows:

MORAL FIBER?—KING COTTON HAD BETTER MEND HIS WAYS

The General Information Bulletin of the National Council of American Importers, Inc., as its most ardent admirers would doubtless concede, is not light reading. However, the latest issue must have called forth from council members at least a wry grin. The front page dutifully notes that the President of the United States "has proclaimed the week beginning May 17 as 'World Trade Week.' In this proclamation, the President asks all the people to hold meetings and other functions to emphasize the importance of international trade to the United States."

On page 2 the Bulletin gets down to business with a deadpan report on the latest moves made by the Federal Government in blatant restraint of trade: "The Interagency Textile Administrative Committee has taken the following actions with respect to imports

of cotton textiles and cotton textile products: (1) Has established new levels of restraint and revised existing levels in a number of categories under the bilateral agreement with Spain * * * (3) In the bilateral agreement with Taiwan, it established a subceiling of 1.8 million square yards for duck fabric under category 26 during the 12-month period beginning October 1, 1963. * * * (5) Set a limit of 500,000 square yards in category 9 from Brazil during the 12-month period beginning October 28, 1963; (6) Has renewed restraints from Korea in category 43 at 15,750 dozen and in category 50 at 20,000 dozen, during the 12-month period beginning April 2, 1964 * * * and (8) Has concluded a bilateral agreement with India covering categories 9, 18, 19, 22, 26, and 31."

The contrast between words and deeds in Washington by now is an old story. In the case of cotton textiles, however, the plot contains several new twists. After years of tugging and hauling, Congress recently granted the industry, which has suffered under the burden of an overpriced raw material, a measure of relief. However, the proposal passed (by the slimmest of margins) less on its merits than as part of a sleazy legislative package deal. Furthermore, while labeled and sold as a means to lower price tags, the program—especially when tied to existing tariffs and import quotas—is far more likely to raise profit margins at the mill. Trade restraint and subsidy make a seductive blend, but they are scarcely the stuff of sound policy, public or private.

Policywise, King Cotton and his subjects have been in trouble for years. Their woes stem mainly from farm price supports, which have succeeded in keeping quotations for the natural fiber artificially high at the expense of demand, both at home and abroad. After the fashion of the camel in the tent, one Federal intrusion inevitably has led to another. Nearly a decade ago the Department of Agriculture, in an effort to expand shrinking sales, began to subsidize U.S. exports of cotton. The move, which gave a cost advantage to textile mills outside the country, quickly led domestic manufacturers to seek new Federal protection. Atop the steep tariff which they have always enjoyed, they persuaded Washington to impose a network of more or less rigid import quotas on textiles and textile products. Finally, last month Congress passed the so-called Cotton Equalization Act, which enables American mills, thanks to Federal bounty, to buy at the same price as their foreign competitors.

On its own the cotton bill might never have passed. However, it squeaked through in one of the most adroit displays of logrolling on record. In order to rally the support of what used to be called the farm bloc, cotton and wheat were linked together in one piece of legislation. Its sponsors then bid for the votes of big-city liberals, who ordinarily would be cool to the scheme, by pledging to line up behind an expanded food stamp plan. Southern backing of a pay raise for Congressmen tied a ribbon on the package. Despite all the wheeling and dealing, however, the cotton-wheat measure passed the House by exactly eight votes. Moreover, its provisions run for only 2 years; next year the issue will come up for fresh debate.

The limited mandate suggests that plenty of lawmakers take a dim view of the whole idea. Well they might. Both prior to and since its passage, the measure has raised hob with the cotton market. The mere prospect of the subsidy—which amounts to 6½ cents per pound—for months caused buyers to hold off. Hesitation and confusion still prevail throughout the trade. For until the Secretary of Agriculture, as empowered by law, decides where the subsidy will finally go—whether to country dealers, merchants, or mills—nobody knows how much to pay for cotton for future delivery. As various rumors swept the marketplace last week, cotton futures fluctuated wildly. Amidst the general uncertainty, only one thing seems clear: contrary to industry forecasts, precious little of the subsidy will trickle down to consumers. Since early April, when the bill was signed, the cost of cotton has declined. Price cuts on piece goods, however, have conspicuously failed to appear.

Price cuts are rare these days in most lines. Few, however, enjoy the privileged market position which the President and Congress have lavished on cotton textiles. Thanks to the subsidy, the industry's cost of raw materials henceforth will match that of the rest of the world. In addition, the mills will continue to benefit from the longstanding, and proliferating, patchwork of protection. New England, of course, has always stood for high protective tariffs. Hence, according to one knowledgeable source, the U.S. duty on 16 standard cotton constructions today exceeds that of Canada by roughly 21 percent, Great Britain by 50 percent, and West Germany by 125 percent. Overall, this country exacts nearly 27 percent on the value of imported cotton goods, one of the highest levies of the kind in the Western world. In the so-called Kennedy round of negotiations on lower tariffs, the industry is urging, with preliminary signs of success, that bargaining by-pass its products.

As for the products of others, domestic mills in recent years have been highly successful in barring them from these shores. The Eisenhower administration negotiated the first "voluntary" import quotas with Japan. Since then, under the so-called Long Term Agreement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles, the pattern has spread to every other exporting country. In this blanket of controls—some strands of which were cited above—Washington has smothered much of the competition for the American textile market. Thereby, to change the metaphor, it also has raised impassable barriers to the principal line of manufacturers which so-called developing nations (notably India, which has just resigned itself to a quota) can hope to sell over here. Trade, not aid, is a worthy precept. In cotton textiles, however, the United States has displayed scant moral fiber.

A Matter of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the city of Schenectady, N.Y., which is part of my congressional district, was honored recently by a visit from the distinguished Postmaster General, the Honorable John A. Gronouski.

We do not see many Cabinet officers up our way and we were impressed by the dignity, ability, and kindness of this gentleman from Washington.

During his visit, the Postmaster General delivered the following talk which I believe is worthwhile reading for every Member of this House:

A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

(An address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, before the annual communion breakfast of postal employees, St. Adalbert's School Auditorium, Schenectady, N.Y., May 17, 1964)

I have chosen to call my talk this morning "A Matter of Conscience," thinking it would be suitable to the occasion, and hoping that your very presence at this communion breakfast would make you receptive to what I have to say.

I come before you both as a Catholic and as a member of the President's Cabinet—but in that dual capacity, I come neither to preach nor to politic.

Nor does that dual capacity cause me any discomfort. If one American tradition calls for the strict separation of church and state, another tradition calls just as strongly for the fusion of religious morality and statesmanship.

All too often Americans tend to view their Federal Government as something separate and apart from their private beliefs and everyday lives. And just as often they write off the programs of their Government as a form of political maneuvering.

But the fact is that our Constitution, our form of government and our national objectives find their basis in the mainstream of the Judeo-Christian tradition—and it is in that tradition that the success or failure of any administration will be judged by future generations of Americans.

The programs of our Government are nothing more—or less—than extensions of our national philosophy, and they should be extremely personal to us all.

It is easy to become crass and jaded in this world of ours, and to look for selfish justifications for the things we do.

It is easy to say we must take care of our poor because poverty is a blight on our national economy, or because poverty costs us too much money to maintain.

It is easy to justify our foreign aid program by arguing that it is saving half the world from the menace of communism.

It is easy to support the civil rights bill on the theory that we're going to have trouble if it isn't passed.

And for too many Americans it is just as easy to oppose these programs without giving any thought to the moral questions involved.

But there are moral questions involved—questions that relate directly to the fundamental principles of our religious faith—and we ignore them at our peril.

And there are more pressing arguments behind these programs than purely selfish ones.

I said a moment ago that I did not come here to politic, and I meant it. I have come here to talk to you about these programs because they are right. And they would be just as right if another administration had proposed them and someone else were Postmaster General.

What are our efforts to alleviate poverty at home and abroad but expressions of Christian charity; reaffirmation of our belief that we are our brothers' keepers?

What is civil rights, after all, but an extension of the brotherhood of man?

We must not be ashamed to say we are generous or that we care about people. When we reach out to help those who are less fortunate, let us remember the words of Christ: "As long as you have done it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me."

Today, in this great Nation of ours, the "least" of Christ's brethren are those millions of citizens who are suffering from racial intolerance or economic want. All too many are suffering from both.

In seeking to help these people, President Johnson has pleaded that partisan politics be cast aside. We are attempting to give millions of underprivileged people a new lease on life. We must not make them political pawns in the process.

I must admit I lose some of my Christian tolerance when I hear a man of national reputation accusing President Johnson of perpetrating a "cruel hoax" on our impoverished citizens. I want to tell Richard Nixon

that there is a "cruel hoax" all right, but it has nothing to do with the President's antipoverty program. It has to do with the fact that 35 million Americans are not earning enough to meet the basic needs of life—in this the richest nation in the history of the world. And it has to do with the fact that 20 million Negroes are denied equal opportunity—in the Nation that lit the torch of freedom throughout the world.

It is significant that President Johnson's favorite Biblical quotation is from the Book of Isaiah: "Come now, and let us reason together." And this is what he is asking the Nation to do now: to reason together as children of God so that, in the end, all of our citizens can have the opportunity to fulfill their highest ambitions.

These are aims that all of us—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—can support. They are aims that we, as Christians, must support. It is more than a matter of national policy. It is a matter of conscience.

As Catholics, we can take pride in the efforts our church has made to alleviate poverty and to end racial discrimination.

Not only has our church supported programs at every level of government in the field of public welfare, but it has also encourage its members to give of themselves. In many of our cities, college students have formed tutoring groups to aid children in slums. Retired teachers have volunteered to give their evenings to help the illiterate acquire at least a minimum level of reading and writing. There are settlement houses and neighborhood projects to bring hope and incentive to those who seem to have no future. Halfway houses have been established for former prisoners, to ease their transition into normal community life.

But I think particularly of the leadership the church has given on civil rights. In 1958, the Catholic bishops of the United States said in their statement on discrimination:

"It is a matter of historic fact that segregation in our country has led to oppressive conditions and the denial of basic human rights for the Negro. This is evident in the fundamental fields of education, job opportunity, and housing. Flowing from these areas of neglect and discrimination are problems of health and the sordid train of evils so often associated with the consequent slum conditions."

The Catholic Church was one of the earliest groups to recognize this inherent relationship between discrimination and poverty in the United States and it has been most successful in bringing this relationship before the American public.

But the church has moved far beyond the educational phase of segregation. Now, the byword is action.

The Catholic bishops have stated on three separate occasions that "the settlement of the race problem is for all of us a sacred duty * * * which can be fulfilled only on the basis of justice and in the spirit of charity."

Already the Catholic schools have been integrated in Louisiana, and come next September, they will be integrated in Alabama as well.

Catholic interracial and interfaith councils exist in some 70 archdioceses of the Nation. Working together, the clergy, laity, and press preach Catholic principles of interracial justice through every available medium.

In Maryland—the first State south of the Mason-Dixon line to enact a public accommodations law—Catholic leaders hailed the bill's passage 2 months ago as a "triumph of legislative wisdom."

And in the presidential primaries in Wisconsin, Maryland, and Indiana, the Catholic press has done a magnificent job, reacting swiftly and forcefully against what it has called the "moral evil" of those who were running on a distorted anticivil rights platform.

But in spite of all our progress in the areas of poverty and civil rights, the major tasks lie still ahead. And nothing less than a truly national effort will suffice. We are now in the opening stages of the most massive attack on discrimination and human want in the history of the world. President Johnson has called on all of us to support him in this attack.

Let us give him that support. In the years ahead, let us truly be able to say, "We gave our hearts and our hands to those in need—in the name of Christ."

Thank you.

Antipoverty Bill Runs 47 Pages—Everybody Talks About Johnson Plan but Few Have Read Resolution 10440

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones appeared in the Washington Star of May 21.

The article is provocative and should encourage Members of Congress to take a very close look at the 47 pages of H.R. 10440:

ANTIPOVERTY BILL RUNS 47 PAGES—EVERYBODY TALKS ABOUT JOHNSON PLAN BUT FEW HAVE READ RESOLUTION 10440

Tolstoy's "War and Peace" is a classic that everybody talks about but that not many people have read. The same goes for House Resolution 10440, the bill under which President Johnson intends to wage his much-heralded "war on poverty."

The bill occupies 47 pages and like Venus it is surrounded by thick clouds of vapor and shines brightly. Among many other things, it seems to be a land reform measure unique in American history. Under its provisions American taxpayers will go far toward buying farms for people who think they would like to farm.

Section 302 provides for grants (i.e., gifts) of up to $1,500 to low-income rural families for purchasing farms, reducing mortgages on existing farms, or "to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income."

There will also be offered 15-year loans of up to $2,500 per family. This will be in addition to loans presently available under other Federal programs. But that's not all.

Section 303 calls for Federal assistance for "family farm development corporations." Such corporations will buy land, divide it into family-sized farms, build farm buildings, fences, etc., and sell it "at appraised value when used for agricultural purposes."

In many States "appraised value" for tax purposes runs 30 percent or less of actual value. But Uncle Sam will take care of that, too. For subsection (d) says: "The Director is authorized to make grants to such corporations in amounts sufficient to make up the deficiency between the cost of the farms and the net proceeds received from the sale of such farms."

What this all seems to mean is that while Citizen A, if he wants a farm, must make his own downpayment and borrow the rest at commercial rates, Citizen B, being deemed underprivileged, will get a Government gift of the downpayment, plus a loan, plus a sale price below cost.

With the Nation already suffering from a glut of farm produce, much of which must be purchased by the taxpayers to rot or be given away, it remains to be seen how much the national economy will be improved by creating thousands of new Government-subsidized family farms for the benefit of those who haven't been able to make the grade otherwise.

Section 411 on page 29 carries a curious proposal to make loans to employers who will agree to hire more men. It would lend up to $10,000 multiplied by the number of new jobs. The new jobs are to be filled (the bill reads) by "persons not already employed by the borrower, a majority of whom will be recruited from among the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families."

This seems to mean that an employer wanting to build a $100,000 plant can get his money at Treasury rates if he hires six jobless people at minimum wages and another four men away from some other employer.

If you like shotguns filled with fine birdshot you might enjoy section 602 (k) and (l) as follows:

"The Director is authorized to, notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property by the United States, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash or credit at his discretion any properties acquired by him in connection with loans, participations, and guarantees made by him pursuant to titles III (programs to combat poverty in rural areas) and IV (employment in investment incentives) of this act;

"To collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obigations until such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit, or collection."

If this is the English language these passages exempt the Director from all existing laws governing the handling of U.S. property plus granting him the privilege of "compromising," i.e., forgiving, part or all of loans advanced in good faith by the U.S. Government until such time as these loans "may be," not "must be," referred to the Attorney General for collection.

What is this but carte blanche for a new Federal giveaway?"

There's a lot more in, this bill, including the stirring windup on page 47, calling for an appropriation of $962,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965 "and thereafter such sums as are necessary to carry out this act."

"War on Poverty." It's a terrific slogan, particularly in an election year. It puts doubters under the unenviable suspicion of being in favor of poverty.

But if you haven't read H.R. 10440 ask your Congressman for a copy. If you show enough interest maybe he'll read it—himself.

The Hill-Burton Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a graphic illustration of the manner in which the Hill-Burton program has been of direct, forceful aid to a State, I include a listing of all the hospital and medical facilities approved for my State of Rhode Island under the Hill-Burton program from the inception of the act in 1946 up to date.

Status	Location		Name of facility	Ownership	Category	Type of construction	Adjunct facility	Beds provided	Estimated cost		Initial approval
	County	City							Total	Federal share	
3	Providence	Cranston	Osteopathic General	1	1	2	4	42	$575,670	$153,080	June 1960.
3	do	do	Osteopathic General DTC	1	9	2			58,456	28,839	Do.
3	do	do	Osteopathic General	1	1	4		24	300,836	75,000	June 1962.
3	do	do	State Hospital	4	3	2		150	975,895	365,183	May 1955.
3	do	do	State Rehabilitation Center	4	6	1			174,545	87,273	June 1956.
3	do	East Providence	Emma Pend Bradley ASF	1	3	2	4		212,243	25,000	March 1960.
3	do	do	H. I. Chaffee Nursing Home	1	0	1		*39	958,460	456,454	June 1958.
3	do	North Providence	Our Lady of Fatima	1	1	2		100	2,968,744	400,000	September 1959.
3	do	do	Our Lady of Fatima NH	1	1	6	2		3,292,126	300,000	June 1960.
3	do	Pawtucket	The Memorial	1	1	5	4	*16	567,476	170,238	January 1955.
3	do	do	The Memorial ASF	1	1	2	4		58,278	23,311	June 1959.
3	do	do	The Memorial	1	1	5		56	504,418	201,767	May 1950.
3	do	do	Jane Brown Pav RI Hospital	1	1	5		*8	504,441	50,000	December 1958.
2	do	do	Miriam Hospital DTC	1	9	5			1,006,423	402,778	April 1962.
2	do	do	Miriam Hospital	1	1	5	4	*110	4,616,054	96,074	Do.
3	do	do	Miriam	1	1	1		150	1,715,358	670,143	December 4918.
3	do	do	Providence Lying In	1	1	5		69	1,893,128	514,607	June 1956.
3	do	do	Providence Lying In DTC	1	9	5			299,262	100,000	Do.
3	do	do	Rhode Island Hospital RF EQ.	1	6	3			82,864	26,869	June 1959.
3	do	do	Rhode Island DTC EQ	1	9	2			200,000	100,000	June 1958.
2	do	do	Rhode Island Hospital NH	1	1	2	6		2,769,385	212,756	July 1962.
3	do	do	Rhode Island Hospital EQ	1	1	2			8,756,578	240,000	September 1955.
3	do	do	Rhode Island Hospital RF EQ.	1	6	3			3,947	1,473	June 1962.
3	do	do	Rhode Island Hospital	1	G4	5		32	571,237	235,741	June 1956.
3	do	do	Roger Williams General	1	1	2		50	1,002,055	240,673	June 1957.
2	do	do	Roger Williams General NH	1	1	2	6		635,062	60,008	September 1963.
3	do	do	Roger Williams General DTC	1	9	2			362,256	181,128	June 1957.
3	do	do	Roger Williams General ASF	1	1	5	4		107,882	39,833	October 1956.
3	do	do	Roger Williams General	1	1	2	4	48	975,937	390,374	February 1950.
3	do	do	St. Elizabeth Home ASF	1	G4	3	4		95,394	41,449	December 1959.
2	do	do	do	1	0	3	4		217,818	93,651	December 1962.
2	do	do	St. Joseph Hospital	1	1	7	4	*182	6,396,628	685,069	March 1962.
3	do	do	St. Josephs EQ	1	1	5	4		687,111	10,000	October 1954.
3	do	do	Woonsocket	1	1	5	4	39	252,190	100,159	August 1958.
3	do	do	Woonsocket Hospital	1	1	5	4	54	490,211	192,969	October 1961.
3	do	Woonsocket	Woonsocket	1	1	5		*8	1,128,307	280,704	December 1948.
3	Washington	Exeter	Ladd School Nursing Home	4	0	2	4	45	1,385,178	300,000	October 1960.
3	do	do	Ladd School Rehabilitation Center.	4	6	2			675,699	112,956	June 1960.
2	do	Wakefield	South County Hospital	1	1	5	4	17	748,416	266,266	November 1960.
2	do	do	South County Hospital DTC	1	9	2			43,048	21,524	November 1960.
2	do	Westerly	Westerly Hospital	1	1	2		*32	1,697,417	150,000	October 1962.
1	do	do	Westerly Hospital DTC	1	9	5			389,259	118,724	April 1964.
3	Kent	Warwick	Kent County Memorial	1	1	2	4	120	1,875,804	664,731	January 1959.
3	do	do	do	1	1	1	1	100	1,244,354	431,742	December 1948.
3	do	do	Kent County MemorialDTC	1	9	2			337,683	168,841	January 1959.
3	do	do	Kent County Memorial ASF	1	1	2	4		170,504	68,151	August 1958.
2	Newport	Newport	Newport Hospital	1	1	6	4	*26	956,163	75,000	March 1962.
2	do	do	Newport Hospital DTC	1	9	6			265,317	132,659	March 1962.
3	do	do	Newport ASF	1	1	2	4		38,400	15,360	April 1950.
3	do	do	Newport EQ	1	1	2	4		120,714	16,738	April 1949.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The following defines the codes used in the following listing:

Status: The status of a project is indicated as follows:
(1) Approved but not yet under construction.
(2) Under construction.
(3) In use.

Location: Locations are listed alphabetically by county within a State.

Name: The name used is that indicated by the project sponsor in the official application.

Ownership: The type of ownership is indicated as follows: (1) Voluntary nonprofit, (2) city, (3) county, (4) State, (5) special district, and (6) city-county.

Categories and authority for programs: The various categories, grouped by program authority under title VI of the Public Health Service Act, are indicated as follows: (1) General hospital, (2) tuberculosis hospital, (3) mental hospital, (4) chronic disease hospital, (5) public health center, (7) general hospital and public health center, and (8) State health department laboratory. Programs under part G: (G4) Chronic disease facility, (6) rehabilitation facility, (9) diagnostic or treatment center, and (0) nursing home.

Type of construction: The type of construction is indicated as follows: (1) New (2) addition, (3) remodeling, (4) replacement, (5) addition and remodeling, (6) addition and replacement, (7) addition, remodeling, and replacement, and (8) remodeling and replacement.

Adjunct facility: The adjunct facility being constructed is indicated as follows: (1) Laboratory, (2) nurses home, (3) outpatient department, (4) service facilities, (5) nurses home and service facilities, and (6) teaching or training facilities.

Beds provided: Indicates beds provided for patients by the project. Where no beds are listed the project is for equipment only (EQ); a health center (HC); rehabilitation facility (RF); diagnostic or treatment center (DTC); nurses home (NH); nurses school (NS); or adjunct service facilities (ASF). An asterisk (*) in the "beds provided" column indicates a project which includes other facilities as well as beds.

Estimated cost: Includes the estimated total project cost and the estimated amount of Federal participation. A project may be a total facility or part of a total facility.

Initial approval: Represents the month and year in which the initial project application was approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

We Can Win in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in spite of official assurances from time to time that we will eventually start winning the war in Vietnam, it is apparent that we have been losing that struggle. Even now the administration is asking the Congress to approve the expenditure of additional millions in an effort to turn the tide in our favor.

While these additional funds will be of help, they are by no means the full or final answer to the problem.

I should like to call the attention of the Congress to a copyrighted article appearing in the Wyoming State Tribune in which Editor James Flinchum presents the views of Col. Wendell Fertig, retired, who is now the executive director of the Colorado School of Mines Alumni Association of Golden, Colo.

In World War II, Colonel Fertig organized and successfully carried out guerrilla warfare activity against the Japanese invaders in the Philippines, and thereby became one of our greatest authorities on guerrilla warfare.

As members will see, Colonel Fertig astutely assesses the problems we are up against in Vietnam, and he offers as a formula for victory what certainly appears to be an effective approach to them.

As Colonel Fertig says, "Money and equipment alone won't win this war."

Both Colonel Fertig and Editor Flinchum are to be congratulated for bringing this realistic approach to victory to the attention of the American people.

The article follows:

WE CAN WIN IN VIETNAM WITH GUERRILLA TACTICS

(By James M. Flinchum)

Can the United States and its southeast Asian allies ever hope to win the war against the Communists in South Vietnam?

If so, what is the formula for success in this costly, seemingly endless struggle that has been underway for years?

There is a hope for victory.

The United States and the South Vietnamese can triumph over the Red Vietcong politically and militarily—but only if the former recognize certain immutable facts, and then put into effect policies consistent with those facts.

The formula, a relatively simple one, comes from one of America's greatest authorities on guerrilla warfare, the type of combat that

is being waged right now by the Vietcong Communists against the South Vietnamese troops and our military advisers in the rain forests and swamps of the Mekong delta country.

The man who spells out this formula is a mining engineer who as a Reserve Army officer in 1942 refused to surrender to the Japanese forces in the Philippines and became the guerrilla leader ultimately of an Army of 35,000 American and Filipino troops who fought the invaders right up to the Japanese surrender in 1945.

The name of this man is Wendell Fertig, colonel, U.S. Army Reserve, retired, and now the executive director of the Colorado School of Mines Alumni Association at Golden, Colo.

For one reason or another, a considerable number of Americans did not surrender to the Japanese in the Philippines after the surrender at Bataan 22 years ago this month; most of them became guerrilla leaders, but of all who did, the name of Wendell Fertig, the mining engineer who left his job in 1941 to respond to a call to active duty as an officer in the Army Engineer Reserves, is the most famous.

Fertig ultimately wound up in the island of Mindanao, the largest of the Philippines, with the forces of Brig. Gen. William R. Sharp. When Sharp and his troops surrendered Fertig took off into the jungle. Eventually he found a core of resistance among Filipinos and Americans, organized it, and when the party got going full tilt, Fertig was the head man of a military and governmental setup that operated its own currency and postal system, had a navy of sorts, manufactured a crude radio that put them in touch with the mainland United States, and was fighting the Japanese to a standstill when the U.S. forces returned to the islands 3 years after the surrender.

The full story is set forth in a book published last year called "They Fought Alone," by John Keats.

As an expert on guerrilla warfare, then, Fertig ranks at the very top.

Since the war in South Vietnam is for us essentially a reverse of the situation in the Philippines from 1942 to 1945—with conventional military forces occupying key towns as the Japanese did, and sortieing forth from their strongholds in an effort to wipe out an enemy who fought according to no rules, who employed stealth, ambush, and all the weapons at the command of irregulars—it seemed that Fertig should be the man who would know how we should fight the Vietcong in the rice paddies, swamps, and rain forests of South Vietnam.

This is what Fertig told me in an interview:

First of all, we must instill in the South Vietnamese people the will to achieve victory in this war. This can be done through a variety of ways but we must make sure that their lassitude over this struggle that has been going on for nearly 18 years, is overcome.

One adverse situation, says Fertig, is that not enough U.S. aid in the form of supplies and other succor gets down to the people who really count—the peasants who live out in the countryside and who are the ones who could really stand to benefit from this aid.

This is essential to what Fertig regards as a basic requirement: That the South Vietnamese must win the war themselves; the United States never can put enough troops into that area, he says, to secure the victory for them if they lack the desire for victory.

At the same time, the United States itself must take control of the entire situation, says Fertig, warning that "you can't run one of these shows unless you actually take command." Fertig proved the soundness of this doctrine by seizing control of the guerrilla operation in Mindanao in 1942 against a Filipino factional leader who sought to use him merely as a figurehead chief of staff. Fertig ended up being the No. 1 man.

Furthermore, we must recognize, says Fertig, that South Vietnam is a guerrilla-type operation staged in the jungles of southeast Asia where conventional-type weapons that work well in ordinary-type warfare are virtually useless.

The Vietcong, Fertig points out, use guerrilla tactics and we try to counter them with air attacks and forays with regular forces. This won't work.

There is only one way to defeat guerrilla forces in terrain of this type: by using counterguerrilla tactics.

So he suggests that this basic tactic be adopted: Organize a special corps of South Vietnamese guerrilla warfare specialists, equip them with the necessities but no more, and send them into the field to fight the Vietcong with the same hit and run shadowy tactics that the latter favors now. But follow these special counterinsurgency forces with regular troops to be used only as a holding force. As the villages and rural areas are cleaned out of the Vietcong and the latter are either eliminated or forced back, secure the terrain with the regular troops.

The latter, says Fertig, can be used as goodwill ambassadors, making sure that they are just that and not pillagers and rapists. They can pass out candy to the children and chuck old ladies under the chin; they also can prevent a return of the enemy, while ahead of them moves the real combat forces—the counterguerrillas.

There is nothing new in this; the late President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines successfully used the same tactics in overcoming the very same type of politico-military problem against the Communist Hukbalahaps.

"The only successful counterguerrilla tactics in history have been those that employed the same methods of the guerrillas themselves," says Fertig.

In carrying out this program, however, the U.S.-South Vietnamese leadership must also recognize an axiom of guerrilla warfare: Never oversupply a guerrilla force. Photographs of South Vietnamese troops operating in the field against the Vietcong make Fertig wince. They are shown wearing U.S. G.I. steel helmets, full field packs and all of the standard infantryman accouterments while the Vietcong are a barefoot rabble clad in shorts.

Too much equipment destroys the mobility of a guerrilla force and permits it to be pinned down by attackers; "any time a guerrilla is pinned down," observes Fertig, "he is defeated."

Development of the people in the countryside into willing allies will provide another benefit; this is information of the enemy's movements which Fertig calls "G-2 from the people to you." The forces attacking the Vietcong are blind unless they can be kept informed on the latter's every move; contrariwise, news about one's own movements or plans must be sternly denied to the enemy.

When Magsaysay moved against the Hukbalahaps, says Fertig, he organized six special companies under Col. Napoleon Valeriano and sent them into the field with the regular army following along behind.

But more than a reversal of tactical policy is necessary in southeast Asia, in Fertig's opinion. This Nation to secure victory is going to have to abandon its "no win" concept of warfare if we hope to achieve a decision; and furthermore, we are going to have to get tough with North Vietnam and other countries that actively supply the Vietcong.

"Tell the North Vietnamese," says Fertig, "they must curtail their support of the Vietcong, and make it plain to them that if they don't we shall consider it a hostile act. And then if the Red Chinese replace North Vietnam as the primary source of supply, take the same action with them."

Fertig also thinks this country must stop worrying about whether other countries will develop a poor opinion of us as in the case of Cuba where, he says, "we were afraid of what the U.N. or the South Americans might think if we acted against Castro."

"You can't be a great power," he says, "and be loved. The rest of the world is going to hate your guts," adding: "I just can't feel it is necessary for us to justify our action against Castro, for example, to Guadeloupe in the Caribbean."

"This all adds up to the fact that we are sending our young men to fight a war which we say is not a war," says Fertig, "and yet they are expected to defeat an enemy who will use any tactics in the world including terror and sabotage."

There is just one other thing to remember, says Fertig, who once waged a war against absolutely incredible odds with only guts, a driving determination and chopped-up curtain rods for bullets: "Money and equipment alone won't win this war."

Mess in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item:

MESS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Where are we going, and what are we getting into in southeast Asia?

Do President Johnson, Defense Secretary McNamara, or Secretary of State Rusk have the slightest idea?

Our involvement in South Vietnam, for example, is costing us about $400 million a year. That is nearly half a billion dollars. The other day President Johnson proposed an extra $125 million to finance additional military and civil operations in South Vietnam.

How long is that supposed to last? It can't be for long, at the rate we are going. Then will there have to be more?

Apparently President Johnson and his advisers have long since given up on the idea of getting our troops out of Vietnam by the end of 1965. In fact, McNamara recently returned with the gloomly outlook that a long road is ahead. He says we can win, with "persistent" efforts.

Incidentally, what will we have to do before we can decide we have won? What, exactly, are our goals?

Protests over our policy in South Vietnam, whatever it is, are beginning to mount in the Congress.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, an Oregon Democrat who has been a persistent foe of our involvement in South Vietnam, wonders if President Johnson's call for additional funds in Vietnam is nothing but a subterfuge to enable the administration to carry on a war without the Congress ever declaring war.

Remember President Truman's "police action" in Korea? That never was declared a war. Unfortunately, those American boys who gave their lives in Korea, and who now are dying as "instructors" and "advisers" in Vietnam are as dead as those killed in declared wars.

From Senator KARL E. MUNDT, a South Dakota Republican, has come another suggestion. He wants someone other than Secretary McNamara to conduct a fact-finding trip to South Vietnam. Senator MUNDT, too, wants to know what we are doing, and what our goal is in respect with the war in that country.

On top of our troubles in Vietnam is news now that the Communists are on the march again in nearby Laos, which was supposed to have been "neutralized."

What we are doing about that borders on the ridiculous.

Reports from Washington are that we are making approaches to Red China to help preserve the neutrality of Laos. And Great Britain has asked the same thing, not only of Red China but also of Soviet Russia.

How in the name of sense can our country and Great Britain have even the slightest hope that Red China or Soviet Russia will do anything to save the hides of the free world? Their object is to conquer us, not to help us.

Russia already has called the proposed additional $125 million proposed for use in Vietnam as "extending aggression and bloodshed."

We are getting in deeper every day. The more we flounder the worse it gets. What soft-headed fools the Communists must take us for.

Admiral McDonald Writes of Navy's Tasks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David McDonald, U.S. Navy, writing in the June edition of the Officer magazine gives insight to today's vital tasks which must be discharged by the Navy in the following excellent article:

THE NAVY: TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Adm. David McDonald, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations)

One of the rewarding aspects of being Chief of Naval Operations has been the opportunity to become more personally familiar with the Naval Reserve program than was possible for me during my recent years of mainly oversea duty. On Washington's Birthday, for instance, I spoke to the Reserve Officers Association in Atlanta and visited the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center there. The following week, I attended the annual midwinter banquet of the ROA here in Washington. On these occasions and others like them, I have been greatly impressed by the caliber, interest, and enthusiasm of the people I have met and talked with, and I look forward with pleasure to a continued close association with the members of our Naval Reserve.

I did not have to be convinced, of course, of the imperative need for strong and ready Reserve forces. Every officer—not only of my own service but of our sister services as well—knows how essential the Reserve is. I have seen this demonstrated many times, both as Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which position I have studied many of the problems and needs of the Army and Air Force as well as the Navy.

Great danger continues to face our country. Powerful forces would like to see our form of government go down, and although their efforts to undermine our Government and those of the world's other democracies have not (for many years) brought about a major war, the continued fighting in Vietnam and tension in Berlin—to give only two examples—indicate that the threat is still there. It will be there, I am afraid, for many, many years to come. If we had to counter it by maintaining on active duty all the forces which would be needed for each of our services to engage in actual war, the cost to our country would be fantastic. In fact, I would have some very serious doubts as to whether our economy, vital as it is, could stand the strain. It is you in the Reserves who enable us to "have our cake and eat it, too." Because of the sacrifices of time and energy you make, we need keep on active duty only the forces required to deal with our current responsibilities and the more likely contingencies, having, in you, great residual strength to be called upon if we need it. We have done that, as most of you know, as recently as the Berlin crisis of 1961, when 40 Reserve ships and 18 Reserve patrol squadrons returned to active duty.

I should like to give you who are our backup team a little idea of the Navy's present numbers and capabilities, discuss some of the problems and projects currently of particular interest, and then take a few looks into my crystal ball and hazard a few guesses as to where we are going in the future.

NEW METHODS, OLD JOB

By the end of this fiscal year, we expect to have 873 ships in our active fleet, with another 114 under construction. We will have 7,087 operating aircraft, 669,992 personnel in uniform, and an additional 340,000 civilians. Last year, our budget was $15 billion. That's a lot of money, a lot of people, a lot of hardware. What are we doing with it? The answer is pretty simple: we're doing what we've always done—seeing that the seas remain free, that the ships of all nations can move on them in peaceful trade. Additionally, we are showing the flag at ports around the world, keeping ourselves ready through fleet exercises and joint exercises with other navies for whatever actions we may be called upon to take. There are also some new facets to the role we play in the defense of the United States. For instance, our Polaris submarine have taken their place as a major part of America's nuclear deterrent, and we are exploring the possibilities of a multilateral force with our NATO allies. These, however, are in a way, simply modern ways to help accomplish a centuries-old job.

We are not without our problems, of course—none of the services are. One of the most absorbing and challenging of these, at the moment, is the study of how much and how quickly the Navy should convert to nuclear propulsion. There is pretty general agreement that submarines should be nuclear-propelled, for this modern method of propulsion makes a spectacular difference in underwater craft, enabling them to go without surfacing for weeks—almost, literally, as long as their food and other stores hold out.

NUCLEAR SHIPS FORESEEN

In regard to nuclear power for surface ships, however, there continues to be a good deal of honest difference of opinion, and this is something I think we'll be talking over for many years to come. I believe, however, that eventually a large part of our surface ships will also be nuclear-powered, especially as our scientists and technicians bring down costs and reduce the physical size of powerplants. Nuclear power represents (in my opinion) the greatest advance in propulsion since the change from sail to steam—far greater than the improvements brought about by the change from coal to oil. At present, of course, it is only practical for our largest surface ships, and even for those, as you will have read, there is disagreement as to whether the advantages justify the cost. The military advantages are very evident and, I believe, universally accepted. Nobody's denying, either, that this method of propulsion is expensive. The question is—and for at least the immediate future will continue to be—twofold: (a) are these advantages essential, and (b) are they worth the price?

Our present thinking is that, long range, we want nuclear propulsion for all submarines and for all surface ships where it would give a definite military advantage and where it is technically and economically feasible. Short range, we hope to complete an entirely nuclear task force built around *Enterprise* as soon as possible, and to build a second such task force as soon thereafter as we can.

PERSONNEL PROBLEMS REMAIN

I do not mean, of course, that we have any idea of junking all our ships that are not nuclear powered. Far from it. The experience we have already had of running nuclear and nonnuclear ships together in the same task force shows that this can be done effectively and that these mixed groups have a capability superior to that of a conventionally-powered group. We will, however, on a gradual, planned basis, replace our older ships with new ships, an increasing number of which will be nuclear powered. For many, many years to come, we will be steaming mixed groups of nuclear and nonnuclear ships, and in many of our smaller ships, of course, nuclear power may never be considered practical.

Among other matters much discussed in the Navy at the moment is our continuing difficulty in retaining personnel beyond the period of their obligated service. Many leave the service because they are offered better-paying jobs in industry. We have succeeded in improving the situation in regard to pay and a number of the other factors which influence morale, such as adequate housing, but much more must still be done.

Antisubmarine warfare continues to be a tough, demanding task, requiring our best efforts. We are gaining, improving our techniques not just in individual units, but in the coordinated tactics among the members of our air-surface-subsurface ASW teams. ASW, however, continues to be one of our most challenging problems.

I certainly do not mean to imply, however, that I think the Navy is in trouble. What you are trying to improve always comes to mind more quickly than the things you are satisfied with. I am glad to say that I am pretty happy about the present condition of the Navy—not only our capabilities, but the way we are organized, the plans we have made, the people we have on board. I think we can face the future with confidence, knowing that any challenges we may face will be forthrightly met and conquered.

That we will keep on doing so is my first prediction—we will continue, I believe, to perform with efficiency and distinction the tasks allotted us. My second prediction is that we will not find that these tasks have become any fewer. Castro has shown that he means to keep Guantanamo in the forefront of world attention. In Vietnam, the stabilizing effect of a U.S. naval force standing off those troubled shores may at any moment be required. At any time, we may be called upon to respond to some threat, or, very possibly, several threats at once.

Whether the threat is thermonuclear war, non-nuclear general war, limited war, or the brush-fire border disputes and civil insurrections so common to the cold war, our forces can counter quickly, using the precise degree of force the situation seems to call for—and our potential enemies know of our capabilities and know, too, that we are determined to use them if we must.

We can take action without alerting anyone or asking their permission. We simply

utilize the internationally-accepted right of any nation to move at will upon the high seas. This may be of great importance in an era when there is such a delicate interplay among political, psychological, and military pressures. We can fight on arrival, or we can stand by, self-contained and ever-ready, indefinitely. No bases have to be built for us, no nationalistic or Communist-inspired minorities reconciled to our presence on their soil. No other than our normal sources of supply are needed. And when the crisis is over, we can go as swiftly, as efficiently as we came.

It is interesting to note how many of the trouble spots of the world are on islands, on coasts, or otherwise easily reachable by sea. This is natural, because the seas formed most of the principal routes of trade and war (and therefore of both culture and conflict) in the ancient world. To a great extent, they have remained so. The fate of essentially land-oriented governments may depend on naval action. As Athens, always more famous for her army than her navy, broke the power of the land-based empire of Persia on the waters of the Bay of Salamis, so in our day world powers, whether or not essentially land-powers, may reach a showdown on the seas.

With this in mind, the Navy stands watch. As we on the bridge peer out into the stormy night, it is good to feel confidence in the ship beneath our feet and the men with whom we serve. It is good, too, to think that so many are ready to come to our help if we should need you. I speak now not only of the Naval Reservists who are members of our own family, but of the members of the other services, both active and Reserve, who—on bases, in patrolling aircraft, or simply on call if needed—serve with us in the defense of our country and of the freedom of the world.

Party Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News:

PARTY RESPONSIBILITIES

While disunity is hardly a novelty in either party, there is something especially abrasive about the present disarray in Republican ranks. The key to it is the campaign of Senator GOLDWATER, or rather the GOP opposition it has engendered.

So points out the Wall Street Journal in a recent editorial. It recalls, among other things, that in 1952 the so-called Eastern Republicans fought bitterly enough against Robert A. Taft, but when the convention was over and they had won, Taft and Eisenhower made peace; the Ohioan loyalty supported the party nominee. It was somewhat similar in 1960. After Vice President Nixon's nomination neither Governor Rockefeller's forces nor any other significant Republican group sat on their hands.

This time the possibility arises that some prominent "liberal" Republicans may indeed withhold their support if GOLDWATER is the nominee. They profess to find his views totally unacceptable; they say he is wrecking the party.

But it is fair to ask who is wrecking what. The choice of the convention, if he is it, or those who refuse to support the convention's choice? As GOLDWATER himself put it recently, loyalty to faction cannot supersede loyalty to part, at least if the party is to survive. A better way to guarantee electoral defeat is hard to imagine.

Regarding the alleged unacceptability of GOLDWATER's views, certainly no man should be expected to endorse positions he cannot reconcile himself with. In that event, however, assuming the party itself does endorse the man and the positions, it would seem to become a matter of political conscience for the dissenters to ask themselves whether they still belong to the party.

Actually, as the Journal states, political realities being what they are, reconciliation need not be all that difficult. A presidential candidate will almost always be willing to make compromises with other factions in his party. In the same way, if the candidate becomes President, he knows he has to adjust; he cannot do all the things he might think theoretically desirable to do.

Senator GOLDWATER has made this clear. He offers his party—and the Nation—not the specifics of "extremism" but a broad consensus of principles already arrived at by leading Republicans in Congress.

The principles include emphasis on individual dignity and freedom and action instead of Federal paternalism; local, State or regional handling of all problems that can best be so handled; establishment of priorities of government programs, putting needs against resources.

Such basic tenets, GOLDWATER says, "cover our approach to limited government, to local responsibility, to the prudent rather than the reckless use of taxes and to the civilized resolution of civic problems."

Why that political philosophy, especially in view of the wide leeway it provides for specific policymaking, should be unacceptable to any Republican is not easy to understand. If it is unacceptable, then it can be asked why there should be a Republican party at all; the country may as well settle for a one-party paternalistic state.

And to avoid that, of course, is what GOLDWATER is trying to do: To show that the GOP, at any rate in its origins in Lincoln, is a party of limited government and regard for the individual, and hence constitutes an alternative to the Democrats. He is trying to state its essence.

For our part, we by no means agree with everything the Senator has said on specific questions. Watching the campaign so far, we do not know that he would be the best choice of the Republican convention. Or for that matter, whether any of the current GOP possibilities would be a better choice for the Nation than the probable Democratic candidate.

But we respect Mr. GOLDWATER's integrity and we very much respect his effort, in the face of what seem considerable odds, to give the Nation at long last a choice of political philosophy. That effort transcends the interests of the Republican Party and becomes a matter of fundamental direction for the country.

We suggest, for that reason, the would-be sitters-out in the GOP ought to start thinking less about their pique and more about their responsibilities to party and Nation.

California Legislature Speaks Out on Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have been hearing a great deal about the importance of beef imports upon our domestic cattle industry. Many of us have introduced legislation, the enactment of which we feel would constitute a major step in correcting the present high-import levels. This is, of course, of tremendous economic importance to the State of California. The California State Legislature has made its voice heard through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 4 which I would like to have inserted into the RECORD at this point:

Whereas the beef cattle industry in California and the United States is suffering severe price and economic damage from beef and veal imports into the State and the Nation; and

Whereas these beef and veal imports imported into the United States in 1963 set an alltime record of nearly 2 billion pounds, of which 23 million came through the four Pacific Coast ports during a single month, which is equivalent to almost 54,000 head of grown cattle; and

Whereas beef and veal imports have had a rapid growth over the last decade, particularly subsequent to the modification of the United Kingdom-Australian meat agreement in October 1959, from 2.4 percent in 1953 to 11 percent in 1963; and

Whereas continued price depression will inevitably result in removal of capital from California and the United States to foreign countries with concurrent employment losses; and

Whereas the production potential of beef in certain low-cost producing countries exporting beef to California and the United States is virtually unlimited; and

Whereas since cattle raising and cattle feeding uses approximately 42 percent of the total tonnage of all feedstuffs and byproducts of countless agricultural crops produced in California and the United States, the industry is essential to the growth and welfare of the State of California and the American economy; and

Whereas the meat agreement negotiated between the Government of the Unitd States and th Governments of Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland establishing quotas, to limit their beef, veal, and mutton imports into this country to the 1962–63 average level, about 6 percent below the record level of 1963, does little to alleviate the depressed conditions in the cattle industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is requested to establish quotas on imports of beef and beef products into the United States with principal exporters at levels substantially below the recordbreaking beef import years of 1962 and 1963; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States.

President Johnson's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, another article by Mr. Joseph Alsop from

Hong Kong appeared in the Washington Post of May 22.

Mr. Alsop is beginning to "see through a glass darkly," but he does not see the cause of the trouble. The cause, Mr. Speaker, is the same as it was in Cuba: We backed the wrong horse, a happy faculty that we have displayed over and over again.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Alsop notes the results, but the causes are still a baffling enigma.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CHOICE

(By Joseph Alsop)

HONG KONG.—As long ago as last February, when the intelligence first began in indicate serious deterioration of the situation in Vietnam, Washington policymakers were already saying, "This may be President Johnson's Cuba." They could not have been more right.

Demonstrably, the U.S. world position will simply come apart at the seams if the President ducks the challenges of Vietnam, just as our world position would have come apart at the seams if President Kennedy had ducked the challenge of the Soviet missiles in Cuba.

The challenge in Vietnam is the threat of a decisive Communist victory there—a threat that is now growing afl the time. A Communist victory will also be a gigantic American failure; and just as nothing succeeds like success, it is also a rule of history that nothing fails like failure. Hence the unavoidable consequences of such a gigantic failure may be listed as follows.

First, the whole of southeast Asia will become an area of predominant Communist influence—and Chinese Communist influence at that. Some States, like Laos, Vietnam and probably Cambodia, will be formally incorporated in the Communist bloc, Chinese department.

Others, like Thailand, will seek to save themselves through neutralism, though with little hope of success in the long run. Others, like Malaysia, will swiftly founder with ugly though not precisely predictable results.

Second, and perhaps more serious, Japan will move toward neutralism; the Philippines will go further than Japan; South Korea will be convulsed, and Taiwan may well be destroyed. And the American transpacific bases, on Okinawa, at Subic Bay and elsewhere, will be lost in the process.

In sum, the United States will be forced out of business as a Pacific power; the American lives laid down on the beaches of Iwo Jima and Tarawa will have been lost in vain; and we shall be pushed back to Hawaii.

Meanwhile, the area of effective Communist power will be extended in a great south-thrusting wedge toward the sea frontiers of Australia.

After such a catastrophe, no sane man would bet a nickel on the future of the present regime in India, or would expect eventual stabilization in Africa. Even the American position as an Atlantic power would be gravely undermined. For this kind of staggering failure on one side of the globe never passes unnoticed on the other side.

At bottom, the reason we are threatened with such a disaster is our continuing acceptance, following the precedent first set by President Eisenhower, of illogical rules for the Vietnamese war.

In both Vietnam and Laos, the rules permit the enemy to push in any number of men he pleases, and to do any amount of damage he can manage, on our side of the line, while we are not permitted to do as much as blow up a backhouse on the enemy's side of the line.

Communist North Vietnam, the enemy base and command post of the war, has therefore been wholly inviolate hitherto, and this although the North Vietnamese Communists have flagrantly broken every promise of the Geneva treaties of 1954 and 1962. Yet North Vietnam is both fragile and supremely vulnerable.

North Vietnam is fragile because no Communist regime, with the possible exception of the Chinese, has exposed its people to such a long ordeal of wretchedness and near famine. It is a noviable state in the best of circumstances, and conditions there have not been improved, to put it mildly, by the combination of Socialist agriculture and Communist military-industrial policies.

Tribute to Horace Godfrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina citizens are pleased with the recognition recently accorded one of their own by the Government of the United States.

Horace D. Godfrey, native of North Carolina, is a recent recipient of the Department of Agriculture's highest award for distinguished service. The recognition is richly deserved. Horace Godfrey is a keyman in farm-action programs affecting farm production and marketing.

As Administrator of the Department's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, he heads up programs that influence the production, conservation, and use of soil and water resources on millions of farms throughout the Nation.

As executive vice president and a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department's bank agency, he participates in policymaking that puts millions of dollars annually into the Nation's economic bloodstream, protecting farm income and encouraging the orderly and increased marketing of farm commodities both at home and abroad.

The award citation reads:

For distinctive leadership in the development and operation of major programs affecting farm income and conservation, and for outstanding skill in administration resulting in increased efficiency and economy.

Mr. Godfrey was appointed administrator of ASCS (then known as the Commodity Stabilization Service) and executive vice president of the CCC in January 1961. Except for wartime service in the Air Force, he had served continuously in farm program administration since 1934, for the most recent 12 years as State administrative officer for the ASC State office in North Carolina. He is a career employee who has made steady advancement through diligent application to the job to be done.

January 1961 was a critical time for agriculture, calling for aggressive action, tuned to the needs of farmers and performed so as to provide maximum assurance of success. Price supports for major commodities had been successively lowered, farm prices had declined, and farm income had dropped to low levels at the same time that farm operation costs had steadily increased. Government stocks of such important agricultural commodities as feed grains and wheat had climbed to record levels, and the costs of these and other major price-supported operations had skyrocketed.

Soil bank programs initiated in the 1950's had failed to stop increases in surpluses, had cost tremendous sums of money, and had seriously affected local communities where a large portion of the farms had been retired from production. Conservation efforts had become confused and were not especially encouraged. The organizational structure of the agency administering the programs was not adequate for the job.

Since the new Administrator took office, improvements in both programs and the administrative organization have benefited the whole agricultural industry, directly affecting not only the welfare of farmers, but also markets, general business operations, international relationships, and individual consumers and taxpayers generally. ASCS operations include price support, production adjustment, conservation assistance, surplus inventory management and disposition, sugar and wool payments, and many related activities.

Agency operations involve transactions in practically every county in the United States, growing out of individual dealings with the great majority of all farmers, warehousemen, banks, cooperatives, overland and water carriers, and others.

Changes in operations—such as the elimination or reduction in fees and other deductions made from farmers' price-support benefits—have provided more income to farmers from their crops. Administrative decisions on rates of payment for warehouse charges and similar items have resulted in saving millions of dollars. The agricultural conservation program has been revitalized, resulting in more conservation practiced by more farmers each year; the number of participants increased by 11 percent in just 1 year. Farm income has increased. Government stocks have been reduced.

The first emergency feed grain program, authorized 2 months after the new administration took office—for crops which were to be planted within a few weeks—resulted in the actual diversion of more than 25 million acres from production into approved conserving uses. This program has been followed by similar diversion programs for wheat and subsequent feed grain crops. Just this spring, new programs were authorized for the next two crops of upland cotton and wheat.

These new programs have meant increased workloads, but they have been performed with less manpower. ASCS was one of the very few agencies of Government which actually reduced employment last year, and the reduction was greater than that for any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

In streamlining the organizational structure of ASCS, lines of authority and responsibility have been clarified and es-

tablished on a functional basis. The net result has been a reduction of 545 man-years of Federal employment in fiscal 1963 compared with 1962—saving $3,320,000—and an expected further reduction of 493 in the current fiscal year, saving an additional $4,117,000.

County office administration also has been improved. Man-years worked in fiscal 1963 in these offices were nearly 6 percent less than in the preceding year, a trend that is expected to continue.

North Carolinians are proud of their fellow citizen, Horace D. Godfrey, and the record of achievement he has made in administering farm programs and saving money for taxpayers.

History, Tradition, and Importance of Springfield Armory, Oldest of the Government Arsenals, Cited in Two Informative Articles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Armory in Massachusetts, which is the oldest and one of the most vital facilities in the Army's arsenal system, has been the subject of two very interesting articles in current issues of national magazines. I refer to one article in the May issue of "The Gun Report," written by Chris Dvarecks, information officer at the Springfield Armory, and former Springfield newspaperman; and the second, entitled "Legend of the Springfield Armory," by Arnold M. Chernoff, appearing in the June issue of "Gun & Ammo." The Springfield Armory played an important role in supplying American colonial troops with rifles during the Revolutionary War; was selected by President Washington in 1794 as the Nation's first Army arsenal; and has since played a vital role in national defense, both in wartime and peacetime. I ask unanimous consent permission to have the news stories from the Springfield Daily News on these articles printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, May 19, 1964]

NATIONAL GUN MAGAZINE CARRIES STORY OF ARMORY—FOREWORD NOTES ARSENAL HAS TURNED OUT GREAT ARMS OF HISTORY SINCE DAYS OF 1776

Unless well versed in local historical development, present-day Springfield Armory employees undoubtedly won't recognize prints of the machinery or the products of the facility used to illustrate a two-part national gun magazine article on the armory.

But all will know the truth of the introductory text of the article entitled "Legend of the Springfield Armory" by Arnold M. Chernoff appearing in the June issue of the magazine "Guns & Ammo."

STEEPED IN TRADITION

The introduction states: "Steeped in tradition and as American as the Stars and Stripes, 'SP' since 1776 has turned out some of the most famous arms in history."

"SP" is the Army Weapons Command teletype designation for Springfield Armory.

Part 1 of the series appears in this issue and the article is generously illustrated with prints of the old manufacturing processes as well as the famous old flintlocks made at the gun plant, long before its officials urged that the title of "gun plant" not be used to describe its mission.

Mr. Chernoff's article notes that in the pre-Revolutionary War days gunmaking was a household industry, an art which saw each piece handcrafted to an individual's taste and needs. There were no factories anywhere in the Colonies where a uniform scale in quantities large enough to supply a great number of troops could be undertaken.

The first ordnance depot was constructed at Carlisle, Pa., to be reasonably safe from enemy capture during the Revolutionary War.

Yet the centrally located Carlisle depot did not answer the needs of supplying troops fighting in the New England sector. Since Brookfield was then the largest town in the western part of Massachusetts, in December 1776, the Council of Massachusetts, acting on its own accord, passed a resolution which established Brookfield as the site of the new depot, the article says.

HARTFORD SUGGESTED

However, the choice made General Washington furious and the general suggested the city of Hartford on the Connecticut River as the logical location.

Col. Henry Knox, one of Washington's ablest commanders, pointed out that Hartford was too close for comfort to the then British-controlled New York City, so a much safer choice was Springfield.

"There were many good reasons for selecting Springfield as the site of the new depot," the article notes. "Perhaps, the most essential one was its water transportation facilities. Located on the direct line of travel between the Hudson River and Massachusetts Bay, it provided distinct advantages for small shipping vessels. Then, too, there was the problem of building materials. Springfield was rich in prime timber which was vital to the construction of the depot; and several sawmills were located nearby."

The growth from rented high ground from the town and the first mission of the filling of cartridges for muskets and general repair of muskets is then traced.

The point became an important military supply storage area and, says Author Chernoff, "The decisive victory in repulsing and capturing Burgoyne's army can be credited to the resourceful efforts of the workers at the Springfield Depot. Also, the successful operations against Howe and St. Leger in 1777 and against Canada in 1779 could not have been accomplished without the constant stream of supplies that poured forth from this principal artery."

DEVELOPMENT TRACED

The article traces the development of the facility and its products to the model 1835, which was the last smoothbore flintlock musket produced.

The author will describe the conversion of weapons from the flintlock to percussion models in the final article.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, May 20, 1964]

ARMORY MAN IS PUBLISHED IN MAGAZINE—ARTICLE BY DVARECKA TRACES HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT AT FACILITY

A major article tracing the history of weapons development and highlighting the important effect of the Springfield Armory upon the worldwide weapons picture is currently appearing as the feature article in the May issue of "The Gun Report," a nationally circulated magazine.

Written by Chris Dvarecka, information officer at the armory, the article, entitled "The Rifle—Its Birth and Growth," traces the evolution of hand-held weapons beginning with the discovery of gunpowder in the mid-18th century.

ARSENAL ESTABLISHED

The European origin of weapons developments ranges from the mid-13th century to the year 1794 when this Nation's first arsenal was established by act of the Third Congress in Springfield—the installation now known as the Springfield Armory.

From that point on to the present, the history of military hand arms and shoulder arms becomes the story of the Springfield Armory, since each successive and progressive development took place in America's dean of all arsenals in the city of Springfield. Since the success of American troops in battle is directly attributable to the weapons with which they are equipped, it can be truly said that the Springfield Armory has played an important part in the surge of this country as a leader among nations.

The 5,000-word article brings the reader up to date with the M-14 rifle, the current standard rifle for American troops, and stresses the point that scientists and technicians at the Springfield Armory are pointing toward an ever constant goal that today's efforts are very closely allied with the plans of future weapons requirements.

AUTHOR'S BACKGROUND

The author of the article has been information officer at the Springfield Armory since 1953. Well known in the region as a speaker as well as an author, he is also a member of the Public Relations Society of America; has a mobilization assignment in the office of the Chief of Information, Department of Army; holds the grade of major in the Army Reserve; is author of the weekly "One Army Report" column which has appeared in the Daily News for the past 6 years; and has been listed in the "Who's Who In Public Relations" for the past several years.

The current article appearing in "The Gun Report" is the 17th national writing credit which Mr. Dvarecka has obtained. One of his writings was further developed into a half-hour movie film entitled "Commence Firing," an Army "Big Picture" sequence.

Castro on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, with 18 million acre-feet of water in storage back of Hoover Dam and dams upstream, there are enough reserves in the Colorado River mainstream to cope with 4 more years as dry as 1963 and 1964. Yet Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, in order to build up a head of water to produce power at Lake Powell, behind Glen Canyon Dam, has arbitrarily cut off the flow of the Colorado River at that point, like Castro cut off the water for the Guantanamo Naval Base. Further, as a direct consequence, he has imposed a 10-percent cut on water uses downstream in violation of the Colorado River compact, which prohibits withholding of water upstream for power uses which is needed for consumption downstream.

The following opinion was expressed today by M. J. Dowd, Colorado River Commissioner of California and chairman of the committee of six agencies

which put Colorado River water to beneficial use in southern California:

The Udall order of a 10-percent cut in water uses in the lower basin does not reflect an actual drought situation. The order reflects an artificial crisis, an Udall illusion intended to gratify interests related only to power generation, upper basin interests which are careless of urban and irrigation needs of people living in the lower basin of the river. The order of Secretary Udall to reduce water use is not justifiable at this time.

The Udall order to cut water uses in the lower basin by 10 percent makes no sense. It forces the spending of local water reserves, where they exist, as is the case in San Diego, for example, for a foolish rehearsal which will dissipate savings that later may be badly needed.

The Udall order to cut water uses comes without warning to irrigators and ignores crop patterns now in progress as result of careful planning by growers who relied upon contractual promises and who cannot shift operations impulsively. They face an unnecessary risk of financial loss.

A further criticism was made by Samuel B. Nelson, general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power, the agency with which the Bureau of Reclamation contracts to operate the public power generators at Hoover Dam. He said:

The Udall order to sequester so much water back of Glen Canyon Dam, out of which this water will come hard if a real drought develops, has by no means been proven to be the most profitable way to manage power production on the river. To reduce production of 18 electrical generators at Hoover Dam in order to start one at Glen Canyon, and months later another there, and months later a third—maybe, is supposed to be supported by Federal figures which are yet to be given for checking by engineers who advise other interested public agencies. When we receive these data as now promised, and analyze them, more detailed comment may be made on this financial aspect of the power situation. As of now, we are skeptical.

The six agencies for which Commissioner Dowd spoke are the Imperial Irrigation District, of which he is executive officer, the Coachella Valley County Water District, the Palo Verde Irrigation District, the Metropolitan Water District which serves 9 million people in 113 cities in southern California, the San Diego County Water Authority, and the Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power.

From Indio, Raymond R. Rummonds spoke for the Coachella Valley growers. He cited the current expenditure of $7 million there on water conservation improvements. Unusually high efficiency in water employment results. There is less and less slack which can be taken up. He added that income from water sales to growers is one of the principal sources of money available to pay back that $7 million, and to repay the $26 million U.S. loan used to build the irrigation system. The mandatory 10-percent cut in water availability could upset funding plans of the district, he said.

In Blythe, officials of the Palo Verde Irrigation District observed that its water right is the first established on the river and has legal priority. Since all unused water drains back to the river, an improvement in efficiency of use seemed difficult to accomplish. The mandatory 10-percent cut announced by Secretary Udall to "gain experience" in ways to cope with a possible third dry year in 1965 brought the counter question, "What is reasonable?" The Secretary of the Interior is charged by law to make reasonable regulations.

There is little doubt that the troubles on the Colorado River stem from the fact that the river simply does not contain enough water to satisfy all the uses to which it can be put. There is also little doubt that this situation can be remedied, although it may cost a lot of money. That remedy, endorsed by these six southern California water agencies is embodied in bills introduced on the Senate side by Senator KUCHEL, and on the House side by myself and others. These would look to augmenting the Colorado's limited flow by diversion of surplus, unused, and unneeded waters from other river basins.

It is time the Interior Secretary stops aping the fatuous Fidel and starts supporting feasible permanent solutions to western water problems.

Port Tax Drop Kills Pork Barrel Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, last August Life magazine carried an attack on a number of Federal projects throughout the country. One of these which Life magazine labeled "pork barrel" and unnecessary was the Sacramento deep water ship channel at Sacramento, Calif.

At that time I characterized the article as regards the Sacramento port misleading and deliberately inaccurate. How correct I was in this characterization can readily be seen in the following article from the Sacramento Bee of May 15, 1964, which states the port in its first year of operation has been so successful that it now appears the port's operating budget for 1964–65 will reflect a 50-percent reduction in local tax support money required to run the port next year.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

PORT TAX DROP KILLS PORK BARREL CHARGE

The port of Sacramento, once a target of "political pork barrel" charges in a national magazine, today turned the table on the scoffers by announcing a substantial reduction in tax support money will be possible as the result of its first year of operation. In fact, Port Director Melvin Shore said today, indications are that the port's operating budget for 1964–65 will reflect a 50-percent reduction in the tax support money required to run the port next year.

The budget, now set at $1,171,000 will come up for approval by the county board of supervisors June 1. Shore said the new budget will call for $190,985 in tax funds as opposed to $383,190 last year.

SET AT 4 CENTS

A current tax rate for the port is 4 cents for operations and 7 cents for bond retirement. The reduction in operating expenses for 1964–65 could mean a 2-cent reduction in the rate.

Robinson N. Crowell, chairman of the port commission, said at the close of a special commission meeting yesterday afternoon that the commission "is most happy to be able to consider this unexpected reduction in tax money requirements, especially in view of the fact we have been in operation for only a year. This reduction points up the importance of operating this port as a business."

Commissioner Ivory J. Rodda said "there are many ports that still are on the tax rolls after many years of operation."

CITES REASONS

Shore reported the reduction in the county budget request for funds for the port next fiscal year is the result of strict business procedures plus the fact "the port was able to show a small operating profit during its first year."

The port commission also announced plans for major expansions at the year old port.

They call for the construction of a complete rice storage and loading facility and additions to the present grain terminal.

Bids will be sought shortly. Construction is scheduled to start about the middle of June.

TON CAPACITY: 19,000

The rice storage facility will have a capacity of 19,000 tons. A conveyor system will load rice in bulk directly to ships at dockside. The loading capacity will be 600 tons per hour.

The 19,000-ton capacity, Shore explained, is sufficient to handle the amount specified in a recently signed agreement with the Rice Growers Association of California with enough additional space to accommodate the needs of others who wish to move bulk rice through the port.

New tanks at the grain terminal will bring the storage capacity up to a planned 1,250,000 tons.

"With the business outlook for the port even better than we had hoped," Crowell said, "we are pleased that we can compete these additions to the terminal area. Now we can offer the best of service to the rice and grain industries in our area."

Late Hon. Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, this House, the Congress, and the Government of the United States have lost not only one of the oldest and most powerful Members of the House but one of the best and greatest Members of the House. CLARENCE CANNON loved America and embodied the typical virtues of America—individualism, high character, and great courage. He was deeply dedicated to the American way of life and to everything which made America greater and stronger.

He was a frugal man with money but his vista of America was great, indeed magnificent. He helped to build this

greater America immeasurably by all that he did in the service of this House and the country in the more than one-half century of his public service.

He was a warm friend, a gracious and charming gentleman, a distinguished American.

The passing of CLARENCE CANNON is to me a poignant personal loss for I enjoyed his friendship from the time I came to the other body at the beginning of 1937 and was the beneficiary of immeasurable kindnesses from him.

His example will ever be an inspiration to those who knew him and learn of him and his mighty works will long endure.

Mrs. Pepper and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Cannon and all his loved ones.

Centennial of the Battle of New Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on May 15th and 16th, it was my privilege to participate in the commemoration of the valor of the cadets of Virginia Military Institute as displayed 100 years earlier at the Battle of New Market, Va.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the significant addresses given on this occasion by Maj. Gen. George R. E. Shell, superintendent of Virginia Military Institute, and of Mr. William S. Miller, executive vice president of the Chase Manhattan Foreign Investment Corp., a distinguished son of New Market who returned to the community to participate in this commemoration. Mr. Miller's remarks follow:

Congressman MARSH, distinguished guests, ladies of the Women's Memorial Society, members of the various volunteer units who are participating in this centennial anniversary, ladies and gentlemen:

We are assembled here this afternoon for just one purpose—to honor those who fought and died during the Battle of New Market. That battle took place exactly 100 years ago—and almost at this hour. Those who participated in the battle included not only the seasoned veterans of 3 years of bloody fighting in many battlefields of the Civil War, but a band of young men who until that day had not experienced the horrors of war or the emotions of facing death. This group of young men were, as you know, the Virginia Military Institute Corps of Cadets—some 280 strong—who were called from their classrooms to march from Lexington to New Market to join their brave Confederate comrades in arms in protecting the Shennandoah Valley from occupation by the Federal Armies.

There is no one present among us today who was an eyewitness to the Battle of New Market, but there are many of us here who can recall hearing our parents or grandparents, who were living in New Market, tell of events that took place that day. Also there are those among us who, in the years gone by, marched in the parade, just as the boys and girls did today, and stood on this hallowed ground to celebrate the 50th, 60th or 75th anniversary of the Battle of New Market. We remember that many of the speakers told us of the courageous charge by the VMI cadets, the successful rout of the Yankee army, and the attention given to the wounded by Mrs. Eliza Crim, the mother of the VMI cadets, and by the other ladies of the town.

Those of you who will attend the reenactment of the battle tomorrow will hear Gen. George Shell, superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute, describe the strategy of the battle, the role of the VMI cadets and the events that resulted in a victory for the Confederacy. Yet, a brief outline of the battle is appropriately part of this memorial service.

Gen. Robert E. Lee had instructed Maj. Gen. John C. Breckinridge, who was in command of the Western Department of Virginia, with about 3,000 soldiers, to join up with Brig. Gen. John Imboden's forces of 2,000 men then camped near Harrisonburg. General Lee's order was to resist at all costs any further progress by an army of 6,000 Union soldiers under the command of Gen. Franz Sigel, to seize control of the Shenandoah Valley—the granary of the Confederacy.

On the evening of May 10, 1864, orders were received by the Virginia Military Institute for the cadet corps to join the forces of General Breckinridge, as soon as possible, and to advance up the Valley to engage in battle with the Union Army under Sigel's command. The Confederate Army, augmented by the corps of cadets, camped on the night of May 14 near Lacey Springs. Before daybreak on the 15th, orders were given to move forward to positions on Shirleys Hill, just a half mile southwest of New Market, and await deployment.

On the rise on which we now stand were placed the advance artillery batteries of the Federal Army. Orders were given by the Confederate commanders to attack this outpost, which when executed, caused the Federal batteries to fall back about 1 mile north, where they joined up with their other fighting units and awaited the advancing southern army. The cadets and the infantry units under General Breckinridge pressed forward and took up positions a short distance south of the Bushong farm. It was there that the VMI cadets being placed as reserves in the center of the battle formation, were facing their first ordeal as fighting soldiers.

From about 2 o'clock until 4, on that Sunday afternoon 100 years ago, the attacks and counterattacks by elements of both armies increased in intensity, with the outcome of the battle in doubt. The VMI cadets were ordered to advance across the fields toward the Bushong house to attack the enemy's guns, which had been inflicting heavy losses on the Confederate units. This band of young cadets moved forward fearlessly. It was this act that inspired the entire Confederate line to press on against the foe. The Federal forces wavered under the assault and were driven off the field of battle—with some units not pausing until they reached Mount Jackson.

The Battle of New Market, measured in killed, wounded, or captured, was not a decisive one. The Federal Army lost 800 men while the Confederate forces suffered losses of nearly 600, including 9 cadets killed and 48 wounded.

Military historians may not be in general agreement that the charge of the VMI cadets was the key to victory on that battlefield, but they do agree that the bravery and discipline, while under constant attack, of this small regiment of new recruits, inspired the older veterans to subbornly resist the enemy charges. We do know that this group of boys took their positions in the line of battle with a coolness and determination of more experienced soldiers.

Let us all note that the Battle of New Market was not one of the major battles of the Civil War. It cannot compare with the clash of arms of tens of thousands of soldiers at the battles of Bull Run, Manassas, Chancellorsville, or Gettysburg. Douglas Southall Freeman, Virginia's noted historian on the War Between the States, in his brilliant three-volume work "Lee's Lieutenants," devotes one page to the Battle of New Market. However, he makes these two significant observations: First, "the cadets had fought wis a disciplined courage," and, second, "seldom did a small victory have so large an effect. Had Sigel not been driven back when he was, the Valley of Virginia might have been occupied by the Federals before the wheat crop was harvested. Hunger would have come sooner" * * * "short as was the time saved by the Battle of New Market, it was invaluable."

It is, therefore, fitting that we inquire as to the reason why we pay tribute now—100 years after the battle—to those who fought and fell on the fields around the Bushong house, whether they be VMI cadets or the war-weary soldiers of many previous campaigns. It is because we want to honor those who bled and died here—those gallant men whose courage, valor, and devotion should be an inspiration to us all. They were men with a firm conviction of the rightness of their cause and a sense of duty to their country and to their loved ones. Those on the Confederate side were to see the collapse, within a year, of their gallant and noble efforts. With General Lee's surrender at Appomattox in April 1865, the hope of the Confederacy as a separate nation was ended.

We can be thankful, I think, that over the years the wounds of the Civil War have healed. We have had two World Wars within our own lifetime, in which sons and grandsons of the brave soldiers of the North and South fought side by side on foreign soil to preserve freedom and the dignity of mankind. In comparison with the horrors experienced by those who fought in the Battle of New Market, the World Wars were infinitely more cruel and devastating. Yet the same discipline, courage, and the will to win stirred men's souls—the same devotion to a cause that they thought was right has inspired those who faced death on the battlefields of Europe, Africa, and the Pacific in defense of their country.

I also like to think that those of us who are standing here today may take pride in the fact that for the past 99 years the women of this community, through the efforts of the Women's Memorial Society, have arranged for appropriate tributes to the honored dead who lie beneath this spot and in the graves to the south of us. Many of us can remember the untiring efforts of Mrs. White Williamson, Mrs. Ellen Roberts, Mrs. Frank Rice, Miss Martha Williamson, and other members of the society to carry on the observance of this May 15th celebration of the Battle of New Market. We also know that the Virginia Military Institute each year has had fitting ceremonies to honor the brave cadets killed in the Battle of New Market who lie adjacent to the monument "Virginia Mourning Her Dead" on the VMI campus at Lexington. Will the women of this community continue to observe the celebration of the Battle of New Market in the years to come? I like to think so—not because the Battle of New Market was so important, but as a reminder that these brave men have given their lives for a cause they considered sacred. May we glean an inspiration from the sacrifice of those who fought here and died here.

Thus, we pay tribute to the courageous soldiers who—100 years ago today—fought in the Battle of New Market. In the words of the southern poet, Theodore O'Hara, in his poem, "The Bivouac of the Dead"; we close with these words:

"Nor shall your story be forgot
While fame her record keeps
Or honor points the hallowed spot
Where valor proudly sleeps."

ADDRESS BY GENERAL SHELL

Senator BYRD, Congressman MARSH, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is good to be with you today. We at VMI share the memory of the events here as we join with you in paying tribute to the gallant forces of the Confederacy—including the VMI cadets who were engaged in battle on this field 100 years ago yesterday at just about this time of day. I am very privileged to represent the institute as are the cadets present who represent the corps of cadets.

I am sure it is safe to assume that nearly everyone here has some kind of special interest and pride in this commemoration. I should mention that the distinguished guest who introduced me, Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Jr., can boast a double portion of this pride. For not only is he a great-great nephew of Charles James Faulkner, a VMI New Market cadet of the class of 1867, but his charming wife is also the granddaughter of another New Market cadet, Augustus Pembroke Thomson, of the VMI class of 1866.

The centennial commemorative program which has taken place over the past 3 days is indicative of the devotion of this community to a significant event in the history of Virginia and the South. It is a tribute to those who have labored so unselfishly to bring this observance to fruition. I join with others in expressing heartfelt thanks to the citizens of New Market and to Mrs. Sellers and to her committee.

Today we salute those who fought and those who fell on this ground, whether veteran or the VMI cadet facing his first engagement. We are not here to honor those men, for they have been honored. It was their privilege to fight for a cause in which they believed.

The 100 years which have passed since noble blood was shed on this field represent more than half the lifetime of the United States as a Republic. Yet, in all this time, there have been few events which could equal in heroism the action of those men and boys who fought together at New Market; perhaps no event in our history could be said to surpass it in dauntlessness.

The institute had been founded in Lexington some 25 years before that May night in 1864, when the long roll of the drum and the sharp notes of the bugle routed 284 cadets of the VMI corps from their sleep in the barracks. They received their orders to march to Staunton, and accepted their mission with eagerness and excitement. Many had been wishing since the beginning of the war for just such a moment as this—a moment that started them on their way to New Market and into history.

Most of us present are probably familiar with the events of that day and the story of the battle is so well known it will not need footnoting by me. It is a good thing to recall that the effort made by our fatigued, outnumbered, and poorly equipped troops was a gigantic one.

The cadets and their officers had marched through clogging mud and soaking rain to Staunton and on to New Market, pausing only long enough for a brief breakfast on May 15, when they went directly into action.

For Col. Scott Shipp, the commandant of cadets responsible for the corps, there is little of recorded history to show his feelings as he realized that his young charges were to face the test of their courage so early in their lives. Here was a leader of sterling character who recognized the task to be accomplished—knew full well the responsibilities that were his. He must have considered the lives and possible death of his cadets—here was a religious and kindly man, facing the most challenging moment of his lifetime as he complied with the orders for his cadets to move forward and the shot and shell commenced to strike their ranks.

He, too, was to suffer wounds and to be withdrawn from the action early in the battle.

The action of the cadets reminds one of Goethe's words, "But what is your duty? What the day demands." That day called for great courage, unselfish devotion to duty, disregard for personal safety—that is what the day called for, and that is how the cadets responded. Their actions served to rally others and together they overran the Union position and the cannon battery.

One of every three of the cadets was a "Rat," some only 15 years of age. One of every four was to be a casualty and 10 gave their lives. There was a greatness in their sense of devotion and loyalty to cause. This devotion and determination drew tribute even from the Union troops opposing the cadets.

As we reflect upon the events of that day, they are significant to us in two very important respects. First, the victory of the day was carried by young men—young men who displayed a new brand of courage to the war-weary veterans of the Confederacy. It is the respect for that bravery and devotion to duty that brings us together today. Second, for VMI it was the birth of something that, in the century to follow, has become a legend in Virginia and is known throughout the Nation as "The Spirit of VMI." "The Spirit of VMI," born in battle, is that intangible, indefinable element that aids and inspires and has, in fact, characterized cadets of the Virginia Military Institute from that day until this.

The Battle of New Market has been ended now for 100 years, but since that time it has been necessary for our country to call upon its youth to march off to battle, just as the VMI cadets were called upon to march to McDowell, to Richmond, and to New Market. In periods of stress and strife, every nation must turn to its young men, and so this Nation has also turned. Never have our young men failed to display the courage that was so characteristically displayed here and is so symbolic of these United States.

It is in the crucible of conflict, that the youth of the nation is molded into the leaders of the new generations that arise. In the challenge of conflict, men of strong will and devotion to duty emerge from the gallant young fighters who are called to carry the battle.

As it was at New Market, so it was in the Argonne Forest, in New Guinea, on Utah Beach at Normandy—young men across this Nation carried us to victory as the faced the challenge of the day to assure the future security of free peoples. Each time they have responded to these calls with happy certainty and self-confidence.

In these times of uncertain peace, we continue to look for hopeful signs of the future. We should, however, derive our strongest encouragement from our greatest resource—the youth of America. But during times of peace we appear to lament and comment upon the sad state of our young people. We frown upon their sense of responsibility. We are concerned over their morals and ethics. We admonish them for their lack of effort. The prophets of doom would forever have us feel that each coming generation is a "beat" generation; that it has lost its admiration for the heroic; that it prefers compromise above principle; security over right; safety above boldness. This evaluation, I feel, is incorrect. The traits of character displayed so gallantly here in 1864 are just as deeply engrained in the young men and young women of our time. The lack, if there is one, lies not in the younger generation, but rather in our own for our failure to challenge them enough—to demand enough of them.

I am confident that the greater majority of the young people in our country are composed of firm, strong citizens—young men and women of purpose and resolution. They are our hope in war and our salvation in peace. I am convinced that they will always be proud to live up to our expectation of them. We cannot help them by making life easier, their younger years uninhibited and without responsibilities, or education a period of painless adjustment for their generation.

History reflects little change from generation to generation in the basic human values and characteristics of the people of the United States—values and characteristics that have brought this Nation to the forefront of world leadership—that have strengthened its adherence to principle and to right.

Though the generations do not change, we nevertheless live in a changing and more complex world with changing responsibilities. Every aspect of man's independence is involved, and the changes are occurring in every geographical region on the face of the globe. And now changes are reaching out beyond the world as we have known it—as we probe outer space. These are the challenges for the young.

Ever-increasing economic potential and capability have raised the hopes and aspirations of nations and individuals. New social and political patterns are emerging and developing almost daily. New nations have earned, or have demanded and received, national independence and sovereign rights. These are the challenges for the young.

In such a world community, our Nation has taken on the mantle of responsibility and leadership. The American Revolution turned the eyes of all peoples toward the United States. Today, a world deeply involved in changing social orders, turns them again toward this country. We set the pattern for freedom and independence. Now, when others are following that pattern, we must help them find their place in the world with dignity and purpose. This is a challenge for the new generation of young men and young women. The opportunity is theirs to influence and guide our future and the future of humanity lies in their hands.

Just as the New Market cadets had the courage to carry their battle flag here 100 years ago, the new generation will have the courage to carry its banner. In 1864, the cadets answered the question, "But what is your duty?" so will the generations of today respond as did the New Market cadets—"What the day demands."

And the day demands that we put new emphasis upon the values that we uphold, the standards of integrity and morality, that have made this Nation a great nation. We must reaffirm our belief in these values—honesty, devotion to duty, courage, the will to do the right—this is the challenge to be met.

The young people of today are perhaps better prepared than any previous generation to accept this challenge. Our responsibility is to assure their education and their training is thorough and hard enough to prepare for the more complex future which is theirs.

In 1864, young men were summoned to battle. Today, the summons is to a different battle, a battle for peace, a battle to preserve a way of life known to many, and a battle to present that way of life to many more. No less than it did in the face of gunfire in 1864, today's battle calls for courage and devotion to duty. The youth of the Nation answered in 1864 and I am confident that they will answer it again when called upon.

As we reflect upon the great event which we commemorate today, our attention should not be upon the fact that we are remembering a great fight—a bloody conflict carried to the death—but rather that we are, and as long as our memory serves us well, we always will be aware of that strain of courage and fearlessness which we can draw upon from our heritage—a heritage we pass on today to yet another generation.

Right or Wrong, Governor Wallace Has a Right To Speak His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the Governor of Alabama, the Honorable George Wallace, has concluded his invasion of the northern Democrat Party primaries, I hope that the emotionalism and controversy he produced will properly subside.

It is necessary for us, however, to review the reasons and results of the contribution, if any, Governor Wallace made by his campaign. The Summit Valley Times, Brookfield, Ill., issue of May 20 carried a column by Mrs. Lyn Daunoras, its staff writer, that is a blunt, thought-provoking commentary relative to Governor Wallace and the controversy that surrounded his campaigns.

I believe this column worthy of everyone's attention and deserving of reflection, and insert it into the RECORD at this point:

RIGHT OR WRONG, GOVERNOR WALLACE HAS A RIGHT TO SPEAK HIS MIND

(By Lyn Daunoras)

In reading about the campaign adventures of Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, we again ponder the obvious double standards for those men the American public agrees with and those with whom it disagrees.

Freedom of speech and expression is one of our most precious rights, but apparently it has now become reserved only for certain persons. Because Mr. Wallace happens to be antisegregation and anticivil rights, he has become the object of ridicule and victim of the most atrocious public behavior on the part of audiences that surely has ever been recorded. What's more, this behavior of his audiences is roundly applauded by the press.

Perhaps we may not agree with Wallace, but this is no reason to lose sight of the fact that he has a right to expound his beliefs and theories. We remember the day, not too long ago, when parents descended upon Lyons Township High School to protest the scheduling of a Communist who addressed the student body. The parents were ordered to behave or be removed by police.

This "courtesy" was extended a Communist, but an audience of so-called intelligent students at Notre Dame could get out of hand, catcall, jeer, hiss, and harass the speaker of the day who is just another American but with different views. What is more deplorable in the South Bend exhibition was the report that priests and nuns were picketing the Governor. If true, we have certainly sunk to a new low when spiritual leaders who should set an example, resort to such tactics.

To listen courteously, to question intently, and argue intelligently should be the code of any audience. We must say for Mr. Wallace, he certainly has the courage of his convictions and plenty of brass to invade the North with his philosophy. The fact that he has shown well in the Wisconsin and Indiana primaries may be due to Republican crossovers, but Republicans are still people and they still express the feelings of a segment of the residents of those two States.

Another point that must not be overlooked in appraising Wallace's viewpoint is that he has the nerve to say what he really feels, which is more than many politicians who give token blessings to civil rights for the sake of winning a gratitude vote to maintain them in office are doing today. While President Johnson last week condemned the opinion that the civil rights bill is just a gimmick, we believe it has become just that and nothing more.

Negroes should ask themselves where all these political crusaders for their rights were the past 100 years. The Democratic Party is the oldest party there is, yet it was the Republican Party, only 4 years old and under its first elected President, that freed the slaves. It took 70–80 years more before the Democrats saw gold in exploiting the hapless plight of the Negro.

And today, politicians of both parties bleat and rant about their poor brethren when they probably could be counted on one hand for sincerity. Johnson, Goldwater, Rockefeller, Lodge, Bobby Kennedy, and all the rest should be asked how many Negro friends they count among their personal clique. How many Negro friends do their children have? Do their children go to segregated or integrated schools? Are they fighting to integrate their children's schools?

Everyone in the country knows exactly where Wallace stands. Can the same be said of all the others? How deep do these good intentions go beyond the surface? We get the distinct feeling that Wallace speaks for a good many of his fellow politicians but they don't share his courage in saying so and in this respect we submit that he may not be right but at least he is no hypocrite.

We find it amazing that the press will call him a crackpot, yet a man who throws himself in front of a bulldozer in a civil rights demonstration is considered a martyr. One is alive and still scoring points, the other is dead and already forgotten. One wonders.

This is no endorsement of Gov. George Wallace, but we still believe in fair play for all and the continued public display of ignorance does little to further the cause of civil rights or anything else. It is even entirely possible that many of his primary votes come from others who still believe in giving every man the right to speak his mind and show a little tolerant acceptance of a speaker whether we agree with him or not.

There is an excellent place in which to disagree. It's called a polling booth.

Excellent Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been most gratifying to me to see the wonderful support which is apparent all over the Nation for our able friend and colleague, the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, of Texas. Comments from leaders in every walk of life have been most complimentary. The Nation seems to recognize what, in his unimposing but very effective manner, GEORGE MAHON has contributed to the growth and progress of this Nation during his many years of dedicated service.

The Wichita Falls, Tex., Times, in an editorial on May 18, 1964, titled "Excellent Successor," expresses the pride of Texas in this outstanding legislator. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

EXCELLENT SUCCESSOR

The seniority system in Congress may have its drawbacks, but in the case of the Lubbock district member of the House of Representatives it has provided an excellent successor to the chairmanship of the powerful Appropriations Committee in Representative GEORGE MAHON.

Through the years, a good many Texans have risen either to the chairmanship or to high-ranking position on the committees of the House. The reason is partly because Texas keeps able men in Congress for long tenures, and partly because it sends Representatives to Washington who have the ability to handle major assignments.

Congressman MAHON has the seniority and the proven ability on the Appropriations Committee to offer his Nation service of the highest order. Like other outstanding men who have held the chairmanship before him, MAHON has a reputation for checking and double-checking appropriations requests. His actions have been those of a man who regards the extraction of taxes from the taxpayer as a matter which requires studious consideration.

It has been 27 years since a Texan has headed the Appropriations Committee. Representative James P. Buchanan of the Austin district held the post until his death in 1937 and Lyndon B. Johnson was sent to Washington as his successor.

The west Texan assumes the chairmanship with every reason for his district and nationwide constituency to expect he will provide the high caliber of service the post demands.

Sorry, Mr. Jones, 47 Pages Won't Hold Antipoverty Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star columnist, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, last Thursday authored a column entitled, "Antipoverty Bill Runs 47 Pages." Mr. Jones deserves a medal of some sort. He has obviously read the bill, and that puts him in a select group.

Only trouble is his effort must be redone and redoubled, because by the time the Committee on Education and Labor gives birth to an antipoverty bill, 47 pages will not hold it. It may be twice that long.

This makes Mr. Jones' preliminary observations nonetheless helpful, and I recommend his column for careful reading, especially by Congressmen who have not—and perhaps do not intend to read—the bill, original version or enlarged.

Here it is:

ANTIPOVERTY BILL RUNS 47 PAGES—EVERYBODY TALKS ABOUT JOHNSON PLAN BUT FEW HAVE READ H.R. 10440

Tolstoy's "War and Peace," is a classic that everybody talks about but that not many people have read. The same goes for H.R. 10440, the bill under which President Johnson intends to wage his much-heralded war on poverty.

The bill occupies 47 pages and, like Venus, it is surrounded by thick clouds of vapor

and shines brightly. Among many other things, it seems to be a land reform measure unique in American history. Under its provisions American taxpayers will go far toward buying farms for people who think they would like to farm.

Section 302 provides for grants—that is, gifts—up to $1,500 to low-income rural families for purchasing farms, reducing mortgages on existing farms, or "to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income."

There will also be offered 15-year loans of up to $2,500 per family. This will be in addition to loans presently available under other Federal programs. But that's not all.

Section 303 calls for Federal assistance for "family farm development corporations." Such corporations will buy land, divide it into family-sized farms, build farm buildings, fences, etc., and sell it "at appraised value when used for agricultural purposes."

In many States "appraised value" for tax purposes runs 30 percent or less of actual value. But Uncle Sam will take care of that, too. For subsection (d) says: "The Director is authorized to make grants to such corporations in amounts sufficient to make up the deficiency between the cost of the farms and the net proceeds received from the sale of such farms."

What this all seems to mean is that while citizen A, if he wants a farm, must make his own down payment and borrow the rest at commercial rates, citizen B, being deemed underprivileged, will get a Government gift of the down payment, plus a loan, plus a sale price below cost.

With the Nation already suffering from a glut of farm produce, much of which must be purchased by the taxpayers to rot or be given away, it remains to be seen how much the national economy will be improved by creating thousands of new Government-subsidized family farms for the benefits of those who haven't been able to make the grade otherwise.

Section 411 on page 29 carries a curious proposal to make loans to employers who will agree to hire more men. It would lend up to $10,000 multiplied by the number of new jobs. The new jobs are to be filled (the bill reads) by "persons not already employed by the borrower, a majority of whom will be recruited from among the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families."

This seems to mean that an employer wanting to build a $100,000 plant can get his money at Treasury rates if he hires six jobless people at minimum wages and another four men away from some other employer.

If you like shotguns filled with fine birdshot you might enjoy section 602 (k) and (l) as follows:

"The Director is authorized to, notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property by the United States, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash or credit at his discretion any properties acquired by him in connection with loans, participations, and guarantees made by him pursuant to titles III (programs to combat poverty in rural areas) and IV (employment in investment incentives) of this act;

"To collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection."

If this is the English language these passages exempt the Director from all existing laws governing the handling of U.S. property plus granting him the privilege of "compromising," i.e., forgiving, part or all of loans advanced in good faith by the U.S. Government until such time as these loans "may be," not "must be," referred to the Attorney General for collection.

What is this but carte blanche for a new Federal giveaway?

There's a lot more in this bill, including the stirring windup on page 47, calling for an appropriation of $962,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, "and thereafter such sums as are necessary to carry out this act."

"War on poverty." It's a terrific slogan, particularly in an election year. It puts doubters under the unenviable suspicion of being in favor of poverty.

But if you haven't read H.R. 10440 ask your Congressman for a copy. If you show enough interest maybe he'll read it—himself.

Law Is No Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent editorial entitled, "Law Is No Remedy," from the Mt. Morris Index. This editorial is directed to an examination of the rulings of the Supreme Court with respect to Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. It points out the farfetched nature of the Court's opinions. In this regard they echo what has long been a sentiment of mine; namely, that the penchant that the Court seems to have for stretching its authority to interpret the Constitution has produced not only a great deal of mischief but introduced a lot of unnecessary confusion into this area.

I applaude the author of the editorial for getting to the heart of the matter by suggesting that the real question involved in these much-controverted decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court is whether or not the Court is assuming powers that upset the balance between the judiciary, the legislative, and the executive.

I am appalled at the fact that so few people today are at all aware of the inherent danger of a kind of judicial despotism that can overtake us. Just a few days ago the Supreme Court said that the Congress of the United States had gone beyond its constitutional prerogatives in legislating on the subject of immigration and naturalization. The facts in the particular case involved a legislative decision by the Congress that a naturalized citizen who resided for more than 5 years abroad thereby lost his citizenship. The Court, as I have indicated, said that although Congress does have authority to prescribe rules and regulations with respect to naturalization that it did not have constitutional authority to enact such a provision. It is not my purpose here to quarrel with the Court's decision. However, I should like to point out that in contradistinction to this ability of the Supreme Court to say that the Congress has gone too far in its interpretation of a particular exercise of constitutional authority, there seems to be no way of telling the U.S. Supreme Court that it has erred or that it has misapplied or misinterpreted a provision or section of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who in good conscience oppose any constitutional amendment relative to the subject of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. Although I respect their right to disagree with me on that issue, I cannot pretend to accept the notion that we must forever and for all time shun the use of the amending process in order to correct a misinterpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court or to rein in that body when it has overreached its power and authority. After all, a constitutional amendment enacted through the Congress not only requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of both branches, but it also must be ratified by a majority of the legislatures of three-fourths of the 50 States. I think that a resort to the amending process would have a healthy, indeed, a therapeutic effect on the U.S. Supreme Court. As matters now stand, if we reject the use of the amending process, there is absolutely no way to correct an abuse of the Court's authority and power unless it be to wait until one or more of the Justices has retired from the bench or otherwise passed from the scene. As they are appointed for life, and there seems to be some connection between tenure on the supreme bench and longevity, the latter does not seem to be a very satisfying solution.

Mr. Speaker, again I compliment the author of this editorial for directing our attention to what ought to be the fundamental issue in the controversy in which we are now embroiled. Judicial arrogance and absolutionism should be no more palatable under our system of law and separation of powers than the existence of such inimical attitudes in either the legislative or the executive branch of Government.

The editorial follows:

LAW IS NO REMEDY

It took no genius to predict at the time of the famous school prayer decisions that the U.S. Supreme Court was heading into a dangerous and confusing wilderness.

From a legalistic standpoint the decision seemed far-fetched for the Court's rulings against prayer and Bible reading in the public schools was based on a clause in the Bill of Rights that "Congress shall make no law respecting religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congress of course has never made such a law so the Court's decision hinged on the odd conclusion that a child's recital of a prayer in a tax-supported school breaks down the barrier of separation of church and state.

Once this decision was reached the courts and the Nation were confronted with a multitude of perplexing questions: Could tax-supported schools observe holidays that have religious significance? Is the traditional baccalaureate sermon unconstitutional? Is it unlawful to have the children give the Pledge of Allegiance that contains the words "under God"? Can the Federal Government legally imprint the words "In God We Trust" on its coins? Is it legal for a minister to say a prayer in the halls of Congress or in any other building constructed or maintained by tax funds?

The possibilities raised by the school prayer decision are endless and the repercussions are still being felt as a congressional committee hold hearings on various laws that would circumvent the Court's rulings.

In attempting to follow the testimony that is being given at the hearings the layman is

finding it impossible to distinguish right from wrong in this issue.

A deep split exists in the ranks of the clergy, the educators, the legislators, and news media with strong arguments being presented on each side.

Our present dilemma lies in the fact that the subject is one that cannot be dealt with by legislation. As long as there was widespread acceptance of the principle that this was a nation "under God" the point of legality was never raised.

Recognition of a Divine Power has been given repeatedly in nearly all important state papers since the founding of the Republic. Presidents have taken their oath of office with a hand on the Bible and the concluding phrase "so help me God" has been a part of the oath of office.

But reverence of a Supreme Being is similar to patriotism—it depends on voluntary acceptance and would lose its meaning completely if any attempt was made to establish it by legislation.

The Supreme Court's tortured interpretation of the first amendment recognized the right to attack our deeply-imbedded customs by questioning their legality but those who would like to defend them cannot resort to law without doing more damage to their cause than the opposition.

The damage that has been done cannot be repaired by a law, a constitutional amendment or a reversal by the Supreme Court. The egg has been broken and cannot be restored no matter how we try.

The question that we should be asking is whether the Court is assuming powers that upset the balance between the judiciary, the legislative and the executive. For an answer we might refer to statements that were made a long time ago by Thomas Jefferson, who as one of its authors, should know what the Constitution was designed to do.

He evidently foresaw the present situation when he wrote more than 150 years ago that "The question whether the judges are invested with exclusive authority to decide on the constitutionality of a law has been heretofore a subject of consideration with me in the exercise of official duties. Certainly there is not a word in the Constitution which gives that power to them more than to the executive or legislative branches."

And again: "The opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional and what are not, not only for themselves in their own spheres of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch.

They are practicing on the Constitution by inference, analogies and sophisms as they would on an ordinary law. They do not seem aware that it is not even a Constitution formed by a single authority and subject to a single superindendence of control, but that it is a compact of many independent powers, every single one of which claims an equal right to understand it and to require its observance.

Times have changed greatly since those words were written but it might be well to examine them closely to determine their validity in the light of recent actions by the Supreme Court.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the benefit of my colleagues a set of principles of public school support in California.

With the increasing attention given to the overwhelming need to formulate an adequate financing program for our educational needs, I think the Members of Congress will find the outlined principles of great interest.

HOW SCHOOL PEOPLE WOULD SOLVE THEIR EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROBLEM

A set of "Principles of Public School Support in California" recently prepared by the School Finance Committee of the California Association of Public School Business Officials will be of interest to the members of California Taxpayers' Association. There are many points with which the taxpayer will agree. The objectivity of this business-minded educational group should be commended for they appear to be facing squarely the realities of today. The Finance Committee points are:

1. The primary goal of the system of public education in California is the provision of free and equal educational opportunity for all children.

2. It is the State's responsibility to establish an acceptable educational program for all children in the State.

3. It is the local board of education's responsibility to carry out the State's acceptable educational program, and by local option, may extend the State's acceptable program.

4. The provision for special override tax rates should be eliminated, and the maximum statutory tax rates for school districts be abolished.

5. Under existing tax structures, the cost of the total educational program should be shared by the State and local district on a basis which recognizes the district's limits of ability to finance the acceptable educational program.

6. To achieve an educationally and economically sound school district organization, the concept of unification should be pursued with specified time limits for accomplishment.

7. A realistic foundation program should be established in relation to the actual costs of the acceptable educational program.

8. State support of the acceptable educational program should be based upon realistic cost controls incorporating consideration of all salaries, class size, allied services, etc., to combat competitive spiraling costs.

9. Recognizing that conditions change in the area of economics, a serious and continuing review of existing tax structures for school support should be made.

Training Center for Retarded Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, getting out in front of a problem is the rule rather than the exception in Oakland County, Mich., the area which comprises the 18th District which I represent here in the House of Representatives.

Recently I noted that Oakland County is again taking the lead, and this is in plans for the establishment of a work-training center for the mentally retarded.

An organization called, "New Horizons," has been formed to establish these work centers to train the mentally retarded in useful work upon their completion of schooling.

For the information of my colleagues, there follows an article which appeared recently in the Pontiac Press on this organization and its objectives:

TRAINING CENTER FOR RETARDED SOUGHT

A work-training center for the mentally retarded of Oakland County is the aim of a new county organization.

Called "New Horizons," the group has two objectives:

To provide a vocational training program so mentally retarded young adults can be upgraded in their abilities to hold jobs.

Creation of a work center where those unable to handle normal employment can be occupied in productive work.

Stanford Wallace, interim president of the nonprofit organization, said New Horizons hopes to service 100 trainees by the end of 1965.

Pointing to the need for a sheltered workshop program, Wallace said there are close to 100,000 mentally retarded living in the tricounty area who could benefit from the program.

COUNTY CLASSES

Oakland County has 1,700 students enrolled in special education classes, most of whom could be served by the work centers upon separation from school.

Wallace added that the work-training centers are part of an overall plan for the metropolitan Detroit area.

The planning is conducted under the auspices of the Metropolitan Advisory Committee, a United Foundation agency.

New Horizons is now searching for a qualified executive director who will develop the specific program.

CUTS TOTAL COSTS

"The cost of providing work training and sheltered employment for these mentally handicapped people is about one-third the cost of institutional care," Wallace said.

He said the alternative to the work-training center is to increase the burden on already overcrowded and understaffed State institutions.

There are 130 on the county waiting list for admission to nonexistent beds in State institutions. Statewide, the list is about 1,600.

Eventually, Wallace said, New Horizons hopes to solicit contract work from industrial and business firms.

SEEK CONTRACTS

"There are many types of work that are considered nuisance jobs by the average manufacturer who often does it as a courtesy to his customers. This is the type of contract we will seek," he said.

Horace D. Godfrey, North Carolinian, Receives Agriculture Department's Highest Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Horace D. Godfrey of North Carolina has been presented the Department of Agriculture's highest award for distinguished service.

and shines brightly. Among many other things, it seems to be a land reform measure unique in American history. Under its provisions American taxpayers will go far toward buying farms for people who think they would like to farm.

Section 302 provides for grants—that is, gifts—up to $1,500 to low-income rural families for purchasing farms, reducing mortgages on existing farms, or "to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income."

There will also be offered 15-year loans of up to $2,500 per family. This will be in addition to loans presently available under other Federal programs. But that's not all.

Section 303 calls for Federal assistance for "family farm development corporations." Such corporations will buy land, divide it into family-sized farms, build farm buildings, fences, etc., and sell it "at appraised value when used for agricultural purposes."

In many States "appraised value" for tax purposes runs 30 percent or less of actual value. But Uncle Sam will take care of that, too. For subsection (d) says: "The Director is authorized to make grants to such corporations in amounts sufficient to make up the deficiency between the cost of the farms and the net proceeds received from the sale of such farms."

What this all seems to mean is that while citizen A, if he wants a farm, must make his own down payment and borrow the rest at commercial rates, citizen B, being deemed underprivileged, will get a Government gift of the down payment, plus a loan, plus a sale price below cost.

With the Nation already suffering from a glut of farm produce, much of which must be purchased by the taxpayers to rot or be given away, it remains to be seen how much the national economy will be improved by creating thousands of new Government-subsidized family farms for the benefits of those who haven't been able to make the grade otherwise.

Section 411 on page 29 carries a curious proposal to make loans to employers who will agree to hire more men. It would lend up to $10,000 multiplied by the number of new jobs. The new jobs are to be filled (the bill reads) by "persons not already employed by the borrower, a majority of whom will be recruited from among the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families."

This seems to mean that an employer wanting to build a $100,000 plant can get his money at Treasury rates if he hires six jobless people at minimum wages and another four men away from some other employer.

If you like shotguns filled with fine birdshot you might enjoy section 602 (k) and (l) as follows:

"The Director is authorized to, notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property by the United States, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash or credit at his discretion any properties acquired by him in connection with loans, participations, and guarantees made by him pursuant to titles III (programs to combat poverty in rural areas) and IV (employment in investment incentives) of this act;

"To collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection."

If this is the English language these passages exempt the Director from all existing laws governing the handling of U.S. property plus granting him the privilege of "compromising," i.e., forgiving, part or all of loans advanced in good faith by the U.S. Government until such time as these loans "may be," not "must be," referred to the Attorney General for collection.

What is this but carte blanche for a new Federal giveaway?

There's a lot more in this bill, including the stirring windup on page 47, calling for an appropriation of $962,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, "and thereafter such sums as are necessary to carry out this act."

"War on poverty." It's a terrific slogan, particularly in an election year. It puts doubters under the unenviable suspicion of being in favor of poverty.

But if you haven't read H.R. 10440 ask your Congressman for a copy. If you show enough interest maybe he'll read it—himself.

Law Is No Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent editorial entitled, "Law Is No Remedy," from the Mt. Morris Index. This editorial is directed to an examination of the rulings of the Supreme Court with respect to Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. It points out the farfetched nature of the Court's opinions. In this regard they echo what has long been a sentiment of mine; namely, that the penchant that the Court seems to have for stretching its authority to interpret the Constitution has produced not only a great deal of mischief but introduced a lot of unnecessary confusion into this area.

I applaude the author of the editorial for getting to the heart of the matter by suggesting that the real question involved in these much-controverted decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court is whether or not the Court is assuming powers that upset the balance between the judiciary, the legislative, and the executive.

I am appalled at the fact that so few people today are at all aware of the inherent danger of a kind of judicial despotism that can overtake us. Just a few days ago the Supreme Court said that the Congress of the United States had gone beyond its constitutional prerogatives in legislating on the subject of immigration and naturalization. The facts in the particular case involved a legislative decision by the Congress that a naturalized citizen who resided for more than 5 years abroad thereby lost his citizenship. The Court, as I have indicated, said that although Congress does have authority to prescribe rules and regulations with respect to naturalization that it did not have constitutional authority to enact such a provision. It is not my purpose here to quarrel with the Court's decision. However, I should like to point out that in contradistinction to this ability of the Supreme Court to say that the Congress has gone too far in its interpretation of a particular exercise of constitutional authority, there seems to be no way of telling the U.S. Supreme Court that it has erred or that it has misapplied or misinterpreted a provision or section of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who in good conscience oppose any constitutional amendment relative to the subject of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. Although I respect their right to disagree with me on that issue, I cannot pretend to accept the notion that we must forever and for all time shun the use of the amending process in order to correct a misinterpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court or to rein in that body when it has overreached its power and authority. After all, a constitutional amendment enacted through the Congress not only requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of both branches, but it also must be ratified by a majority of the legislatures of three-fourths of the 50 States. I think that a resort to the amending process would have a healthy, indeed, a therapeutic effect on the U.S. Supreme Court. As matters now stand, if we reject the use of the amending process, there is absolutely no way to correct an abuse of the Court's authority and power unless it be to wait until one or more of the Justices has retired from the bench or otherwise passed from the scene. As they are appointed for life, and there seems to be some connection between tenure on the supreme bench and longevity, the latter does not seem to be a very satisfying solution.

Mr. Speaker, again I compliment the author of this editorial for directing our attention to what ought to be the fundamental issue in the controversy in which we are now embroiled. Judicial arrogance and absolutionism should be no more palatable under our system of law and separation of powers than the existence of such inimical attitudes in either the legislative or the executive branch of Government.

The editorial follows:

LAW IS NO REMEDY

It took no genius to predict at the time of the famous school prayer decisions that the U.S. Supreme Court was heading into a dangerous and confusing wilderness.

From a legalistic standpoint the decision seemed far-fetched for the Court's rulings against prayer and Bible reading in the public schools was based on a clause in the Bill of Rights that "Congress shall make no law respecting religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congress of course has never made such a law so the Court's decision hinged on the odd conclusion that a child's recital of a prayer in a tax-supported school breaks down the barrier of separation of church and state.

Once this decision was reached the courts and the Nation were confronted with a multitude of perplexing questions: Could tax-supported schools observe holidays that have religious significance? Is the traditional baccalaureate sermon unconstitutional? Is it unlawful to have the children give the Pledge of Allegiance that contains the words "under God"? Can the Federal Government legally imprint the words "In God We Trust" on its coins? Is it legal for a minister to say a prayer in the halls of Congress or in any other building constructed or maintained by tax funds?

The possibilities raised by the school prayer decision are endless and the repercussions are still being felt as a congressional committee hold hearings on various laws that would circumvent the Court's rulings.

In attempting to follow the testimony that is being given at the hearings the layman is

finding it impossible to distinguish right from wrong in this issue.

A deep split exists in the ranks of the clergy, the educators, the legislators, and news media with strong arguments being presented on each side.

Our present dilemma lies in the fact that the subject is one that cannot be dealt with by legislation. As long as there was widespread acceptance of the principle that this was a nation "under God" the point of legality was never raised.

Recognition of a Divine Power has been given repeatedly in nearly all important state papers since the founding of the Republic. Presidents have taken their oath of office with a hand on the Bible and the concluding phrase "so help me God" has been a part of the oath of office.

But reverence of a Supreme Being is similar to patriotism—it depends on voluntary acceptance and would lose its meaning completely if any attempt was made to establish it by legislation.

The Supreme Court's tortured interpretation of the first amendment recognized the right to attack our deeply-imbedded customs by questioning their legality but those who would like to defend them cannot resort to law without doing more damage to their cause than the opposition.

The damage that has been done cannot be repaired by a law, a constitutional amendment or a reversal by the Supreme Court. The egg has been broken and cannot be restored no matter how we try.

The question that we should be asking is whether the Court is assuming powers that upset the balance between the judiciary, the legislative and the executive. For an answer we might refer to statements that were made a long time ago by Thomas Jefferson, who as one of its authors, should know what the Constitution was designed to do.

He evidently foresaw the present situation when he wrote more than 150 years ago that "The question whether the judges are invested with exclusive authority to decide on the constitutionality of a law has been heretofore a subject of consideration with me in the exercise of official duties. Certainly there is not a word in the Constitution which gives that power to them more than to the executive or legislative branches."

And again: "The opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional and what are not, not only for themselves in their own spheres of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch.

They are practicing on the Constitution by inference, analogies and sophisms as they would on an ordinary law. They do not seem aware that it is not even a Constitution formed by a single authority and subject to a single superindendence of control, but that it is a compact of many independent powers, every single one of which claims an equal right to understand it and to require its observance.

Times have changed greatly since those words were written but it might be well to examine them closely to determine their validity in the light of recent actions by the Supreme Court.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the benefit of my colleagues a set of principles of public school support in California.

With the increasing attention given to the overwhelming need to formulate an adequate financing program for our educational needs, I think the Members of Congress will find the outlined principles of great interest.

HOW SCHOOL PEOPLE WOULD SOLVE THEIR EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROBLEM

A set of "Principles of Public School Support in California" recently prepared by the School Finance Committee of the California Association of Public School Business Officials will be of interest to the members of California Taxpayers' Association. There are many points with which the taxpayer will agree. The objectivity of this business-minded educational group should be commended for they appear to be facing squarely the realities of today. The Finance Committee points are:

1. The primary goal of the system of public education in California is the provision of free and equal educational opportunity for all children.

2. It is the State's responsibility to establish an acceptable educational program for all children in the State.

3. It is the local board of education's responsibility to carry out the State's acceptable educational program, and by local option, may extend the State's acceptable program.

4. The provision for special override tax rates should be eliminated, and the maximum statutory tax rates for school districts be abolished.

5. Under existing tax structures, the cost of the total educational program should be shared by the State and local district on a basis which recognizes the district's limits of ability to finance the acceptable educational program.

6. To achieve an educationally and economically sound school district organization, the concept of unification should be pursued with specified time limits for accomplishment.

7. A realistic foundation program should be established in relation to the actual costs of the acceptable educational program.

8. State support of the acceptable educational program should be based upon realistic cost controls incorporating consideration of all salaries, class size, allied services, etc., to combat competitive spiraling costs.

9. Recognizing that conditions change in the area of economics, a serious and continuing review of existing tax structures for school support should be made.

Training Center for Retarded Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, getting out in front of a problem is the rule rather than the exception in Oakland County, Mich., the area which comprises the 18th District which I represent here in the House of Representatives.

Recently I noted that Oakland County is again taking the lead, and this is in plans for the establishment of a work-training center for the mentally retarded.

An organization called, "New Horizons," has been formed to establish these work centers to train the mentally retarded in useful work upon their completion of schooling.

For the information of my colleagues, there follows an article which appeared recently in the Pontiac Press on this organization and its objectives:

TRAINING CENTER FOR RETARDED SOUGHT

A work-training center for the mentally retarded of Oakland County is the aim of a new county organization.

Called "New Horizons," the group has two objectives:

To provide a vocational training program so mentally retarded young adults can be upgraded in their abilities to hold jobs.

Creation of a work center where those unable to handle normal employment can be occupied in productive work.

Stanford Wallace, interim president of the nonprofit organization, said New Horizons hopes to service 100 trainees by the end of 1965.

Pointing to the need for a sheltered workshop program, Wallace said there are close to 100,000 mentally retarded living in the tricounty area who could benefit from the program.

COUNTY CLASSES

Oakland County has 1,700 students enrolled in special education classes, most of whom could be served by the work centers upon separation from school.

Wallace added that the work-training centers are part of an overall plan for the metropolitan Detroit area.

The planning is conducted under the auspices of the Metropolitan Advisory Committee, a United Foundation agency.

New Horizons is now searching for a qualified executive director who will develop the specific program.

CUTS TOTAL COSTS

"The cost of providing work training and sheltered employment for these mentally handicapped people is about one-third the cost of institutional care," Wallace said.

He said the alternative to the work-training center is to increase the burden on already overcrowded and understaffed State institutions.

There are 130 on the county waiting list for admission to nonexistent beds in State institutions. Statewide, the list is about 1,600.

Eventually, Wallace said, New Horizons hopes to solicit contract work from industrial and business firms.

SEEK CONTRACTS

"There are many types of work that are considered nuisance jobs by the average manufacturer who often does it as a courtesy to his customers. This is the type of contract we will seek," he said.

Horace D. Godfrey, North Carolinian, Receives Agriculture Department's Highest Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Horace D. Godfrey of North Carolina has been presented the Department of Agriculture's highest award for distinguished service.

We salute this North Carolinian for his dedication and service to the farm people of America.

Mr. Speaker, as Administrator of the Department's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Horace D. Godfrey is a key man in farm-action programs affecting most phases of farm production and marketing. He heads up programs that influence the production, conservation and use of soil and water resources on millions of farms throughout the Nation.

As Executive Vice President and a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department's banking agency, he participates in policymaking that puts millions of dollars annually into the Nation's economic bloodstream, protecting farm income and encouraging the orderly and increased marketing of farm commodities both at home and abroad.

The award citation reads:

For distinctive leadership in the development and operation of major programs affecting farm income and conservation, and for outstanding skill in administration resulting in increased efficiency and economy.

Mr. Godfrey was appointed Administrator of ASCS—then known as the Commodity Stabilization Service—and Executive Vice President of the CCC in January 1961. Except for wartime service in the Air Force, he had served continuously in farm program administration since 1934. For 12 years, prior to coming to Washington, he was State administrative officer for the ASCS State office in North Carolina.

January 1961 was a critical time for agriculture, calling for aggressive action, tuned to the needs of farmers and performed so as to provide maximum assurance of success. Price supports for major commodities had been successively lowered, farm prices had declined, and farm income had dropped to low levels at the same time that farm operation costs had steadily increased. Government stocks of such important agricultural commodities as feed grains and wheat had climed to record levels, and the costs of these and other major price-support operations had skyrocketed.

Soil bank programs initiated in the 1950's had failed to stop increases in surpluses, had cost tremendous sums of money, and had seriously affected local communities where a large portion of the farms had been retired from production. Conservation efforts had become confused and were not especially encouraged. The organizational structure of the agency administering the programs was not adequate for the job.

The whole agricultural industry—and rural living generally throughout the United States—have benefited from the improvements made in both programs and the administrative organization since the new Administrator took office. ASCS operations include price support, production adjustment, conservation assistance, surplus inventory management and disposition, sugar and wool payments, and many related activities.

Agency operations in the fiscal year 1963 involved paying out about $7 billion in Government funds and receiving about $3 billion. They involved transactions in practically every county in the United States, growing out of individual dealings with the great majority of all farmers, warehousemen, banks, cooperatives, overland and water carriers, and others.

Decisions made in the administration of these activities have directly affected not only the welfare of farmers, but also markets, general business operations, international relationships, and individual consumers, and taxpayers generally.

Changes in operations to provide more income to farmers from their crops have included elimination or reduction in fees and other deductions made from farmers' price-support benefits, more adequate recognition of grades and qualities in setting support prices, and more effective use of reseal loans to provide timely storage income to farmers and give them the benefit of higher prices that might occur during the reseal period.

Administrative decisions on payment of warehouse charges and similar items have resulted in saving millions of dollars.

A revitalization of the agricultural conservation program has resulted in more conservation practiced by more farmers every year. The number of participants in this program, under which the Government shares with producers the cost of needed conservation, was increased by 11 percent in just 1 year. This was done through encouraging community committeemen to visit their neighbors, on their own time, and to convince them of the need for practicing more conservation on their farms. The conservation programs can be effectively used as a part of the attack on rural poverty in certain areas of the country, such as the Appalachian region.

Mr. Speaker, during the time Mr. Godfrey has served as ASCS Administrator, farm income has increased, and the organizational structure has been revamped. I would like to review for the benefit of the Members some of these events.

Two months after the new administration took office—on March 22, 1961, Congress took action to increase farm income, reduce stocks, and cut Government costs by enacting the first emergency feed grain program. This was slated to become effective for crops which were to be planted within a few weeks. Its success can be judged from the fact that the 1961 program resulted in the actual diversion of more than 25 million acres from the production of corn and grain sorghum into approved conserving uses.

The following August, legislation authorized diversion programs for 1962 crops of feed grains and of wheat—then being planted in some sections.

In September of 1962, the Food and Agriculture Act was enacted, authorizing a feed grain program and a wheat stabilization program for 1963 and providing a broader diversion and price program for 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat.

In May of 1963, legislation extended the feed grain program for 1964 and 1965.

In April of 1964, to forestall a drastic drop in farmer income—expected to follow the removal of wheat quotas with an attendant cut in the available price support—a voluntary program was authorized for the 1964—and 1965—crop of wheat—much of it already in the ground—and additional new program provisions were authorized for the 1964—and 1965—crop of upland cotton—already planted in many sections.

While ASCS has taken on a substantially increased workload during this period, the agency has performed it effectively with less manpower. ASCS was one of the very few agencies of Government which actually reduced employment last year, and the reduction was greater than that for any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

Starting in June 1961, the organizational structure of the administrative agency was streamlined—and it was further realined in November of 1962—to more effectively operate the farm programs with less money and manpower. Lines of authority and responsibility have been clarified and established on a functional basis. Policy advisory functions now are vested in a small group of policy staffs, reporting directly to the Administrator and in effect serving as his eyes and ears in their respective fields.

Despite the fact that the second reorganization of ASCS involved closing three large field offices employing nearly 1,000 people, moving another field office employing over 400 people, and reassigning the functions and responsibilities performed by about 550 people in Washington, the reorganization was completed within a 4-month period, with little or no loss in overall effectiveness during the period of transition.

The net result has been a reduction of 545 man-years of Federal employment in fiscal 1963 compared with 1962—saving $3,320,000—and an expected further reduction of 493 in the current fiscal year, saving an additional $4,117,000.

County office administration also has been improved. These small offices, nearly 3,000 in number, are the points at which program operations reach individual farmers. Man-years worked in fiscal 1963 in these offices were nearly 6 percent less than in the preceding year, a trend that is expected to continue.

During the summer of 1961, a data processing center was established in Kansas City, Mo., to handle program work, thus reducing the manpower required in handling the masses of paperwork incident to ASCS programs. The center is now in the process of taking over responsibility for accounting and related work for all CCC-owned grain inventories in the country, in addition to handling all CCC price-support loans on grains.

And the work of reviewing and analyzing the techniques and staffs is continuing. Additional methods are being initiated as possible sources of further economy and greater efficiency. Management surveys and justifications of each individual position are a part of this effort. So is an operational analysis of individual programs, to determine whether program objectives can be met and operating policy carried out in a more effective manner.

Mr. Speaker, Horace Godfrey, from my home State of North Carolina, has been entrusted with very large responsibility. For his performance in discharging this responsibility he has received the highest award of the Department of Agriculture.

Local Chambers Favor Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, critics of urban renewal frequently point out that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is opposed to Federal aid in local renewal programs. These same critics often fail to mention that many local chambers do favor Federal aid for urban renewal.

In the Pittsburgh area, the local chambers—specifically, the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, the Northside chamber, and the East Liberty chamber—have all endorsed enthusiastically the Federal urban renewal program. In the issue of Nation's Cities, a publication of the American Municipal Association, there is an article by Mr. Jason Rouby entitled "Local Chambers Are for Urban Renewal." Mr. Rouby is managing director of the metropolitan planning and developing division of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Speaker, I place this article in the RECORD:

LOCAL CHAMBERS ARE FOR URBAN RENEWAL

(Jason Rouby, Omaha Chamber of Commerce)

(Mr. Rouby is managing director of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce's Metropolitan Planning and Development Division. A specialist in downtown business districts, he has served in both staff and consultant capacities to private organizations. Before coming to Omaha in 1962, he was with the Urban Progress Association, Little Rock, Ark. The views he expresses here are personal, and not officially those of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce.)

At a meeting with local chamber executives in a midwestern city not too long ago, a staffman from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce defended the U.S. chamber policy on urban renewal.

Triumphantly, he declared that the U.S. chamber policy had been approved in 1963 without one voice of opposition raised by a delegate. That was proof, he said, that local chambers were solidly in support of the U.S. chamber position—opposition to any Federal participation in local renewal programs.

But then a local staffer asked: "Was that because everybody agreed with you or was it that they just didn't give a damn about the national chamber policy?"

There are indications that the latter is true, in city after city. Frustrated by the seemingly immutable policy of the U.S. chamber, local chambers in cities where federally assisted urban renewal programs are underway have just ignored the national policy. They have determined their own policy, supporting local programs and projects.

Just last month the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry adopted a policy statement which opened with this declaration:

"The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry opposes at this time the stand taken by the chamber of commerce of the United States in urging action by member companies and associations to bring about the termination of Federal participation in urban renewal and public housing programs."

This was true in city after city—Boston, Nashville, Cleveland, Kansas City, St. Louis, Denver, Atlanta.

Occasionally, there were efforts to change the national policy of the U.S. chamber. In 1961, the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce went on record as:

"Advocating continuation of the present Federal Government-local government participation plan for urban renewal until such time as a practical and workable plan is developed that would provide for urban renewal to continue at its current rate of progress without Federal participation, and that the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce advocates a change in the official policy statement on urban renewal by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to the extent that its policy statement will not be in conflict with this organization's position."

The Little Rock resolution got nowhere, but it stirred discussion and thought at the national conference that year. The idea lingered that local chambers not only could but also should change the U.S. chamber policy on renewal.

It took the amazing words of Edwin P. Neilan, 1963—64 president of the U.S. chamber, to stir up the situation. In a speech before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce-sponsored Voice of Freedom Forum, January 6, 1964, and repeated since, Neilan made blanket accusations of gross immorality, corruption, irresponsibility, dishonesty, and bribery against certain Congressmen and Senators, local political bosses, Federal bureaucrats, and, implicitly, against public officials and citizens of cities with federally assisted urban renewal programs—more than 700 cities altogether.

In Neilan's jargon, these corrupters are really "political pigs who have pushed their snouts into the public trough and are gorging themselves on human misery."

He called on decent Americans to put a stop to the Federal portion of the urban renewal program, and thus condemned to indecency all those Americans who disagreed with him.

By his indiscriminate and intemperate language, Neilan has caused a reaction which is the very opposite of the one he was seeking. Local chambers have been spurred to counteraction by Neilan's remarks. There have been rumblings in the local chamber grapevine of withdrawals from the national chamber. The Lynn, Mass., chamber has already informed Congressmen that it disassociates itself from the U.S. chamber positions on urban renewal, mass transit subsidies, and demonstration grants, and that it will devote its efforts to reversing those positions.

The Nashville, Tenn., Chamber of Commerce issued a statement reiterating its longstanding support for urban renewal which includes such outstanding accomplishments as the Capitol Hill redevelopment project, which was America's first major program under the Housing Act of 1949.

Through the years, the Nashville chamber has worked closely with former Mayor Ben West, the city planning commission, and the Nashville Housing Authority, and now with Mayor Beverly Briley.

Other organizations are reacting, too. Although its official position is that of encouraging and supporting any community improvement and development effort, Action, Inc., is concerned about attacks on urban renewal emanating from the U.S. chamber. The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials is, of course, directly concerned and is marshalling its resources to defend urban renewal. One wonders whether the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association of America will consider themselves tarred with Neilan's splattering tarbrush and whether they will vocally and effectively express their resentment.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors initiated its own poll to determine whether Neilan and the U.S. chamber really enjoyed total and unanimous support from local chambers on the urban renewal question. The conference said that on the basis of early returns, local chambers "overwhelmingly" oppose the U.S. chamber position.

The poll was directed to the mayors of 585 cities with populations of more than 30,000 persons. Of the first 220 mayors to reply, 156 reported that their local chambers actively "and often enthusiastically" participated in and formally supported local renewal.

A total of 59 mayors reported that their local chambers had taken no formal position but that there was no reported opposition to urban renewal in their cities. Five mayors said the local chambers had gone on record officially against urban renewal.

It is not unreasonable to assume that those 156 local chambers and others, like the Omaha Chamber of Commerce which is leading and directing the campaign in Omaha for the creation of an urban renewal authority, could form the nucleus of a dissident bloc within the U.S. chamber that would force revisions not only on urban renewal but on other policies of the U.S. chamber that are not reflective of local policies.

The president of the Stamford, Conn., chamber commented in his reply to the Conference of Mayors poll: "It is rather unfortunate that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is so out of touch with the constituent members of the organization all over the country."

Arthur J. Lumsden, executive vice president of the Greater Hartford, Conn., chamber, said: "While we think very highly of the national chamber and are members and support them in 90 percent of their activities, we feel that they have yet to learn that America has changed from a rural to an urban society."

In Omaha, the head of a large corporation who has maintained his national chamber membership for years canceled it soon after Neilan visited Omaha and repeated his attack on urban renewal.

"The stand that the U.S. chamber has taken on many issues during the past few years, and the dog-in-the-manger attitude they adopt toward Government has made it impossible for me to be sympathetic with their views," he wrote.

From Little Rock, Raymond Rebsamen addressed a blistering letter to Neilan. Rebsamen is president of the Urban Progress Association of Little Rock, Chairman of the St. Louis District of the Federal Reserve Board, a former president of the Little Rock Chamber, and a businessman whose combined payrolls from all his companies run to more than $2 million.

After reading Neilan's Indianapolis speech, Rebsamen wrote: "It is with great regret that I must conclude that a realistic, objective attitude and approach to the social and economic problems of the Nation has been totally forsaken by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It has apparently been abandoned in favor of narrow, naive, contrived propaganda rantings; the likes of which rival the old methods of the labor unions from the standpoint of their slanted, totally biased approach and conglomeration of irresponsible conclusions and half-truths. I am shocked almost beyond belief that a person in a position such as yours would promulgate a capricious diatribe. * * *"

Rebsamen continued: "I have always felt that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce repre-

sented (or should represent) the voice of the business community and Nation. I strongly challenge whether this is the case today."

Rebsamen called Neilan's charges against "corrupters" and "political pigs * * * gorging themselves on human misery" a direct and unqualified slander. He challenged Neilan to "either publicly substantiate your accusations or publicly recant your statements as an irresponsible insult to the integrity of those individuals, both professional and civic minded citizens, who have given of their talent and energy to make these programs work and thereby help to create a better community."

"To attack the urban renewal program on an unfounded charge such as this is a vicious and insidious abuse of the office you hold," Rebsamen told Neilan.

Rebsamen included in his letter to Neilan excerpts from the hearings on urban renewal in November before the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in which Louis W. Hunter, assistant director of the General Accounting Office, testified that the GAO had found no instances of "crookedness" anywhere and that the program was being administered in accordance with the law.

The excerpt also included the statement of Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, inserted in the urban renewal testimony by Housing Subcommittee Chairman ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama:

"It has been fantastic to me, the amount of money and the amount of different pieces involved. I think there are around 60,000 to 65,000 pieces of property that have been bought. I have not heard of any public scandal. It is fantastic."

The same hearing produced some strong statements in favor of urban renewal from several local chambers either by direct testimony or by letters.

Curtis Lee Smith, president of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, reviewed the achievements of urban renewal in that city and declared: "We appreciate the past efforts and now reassert the need for continued understanding on the part of this Congress to recognize the social and economic needs of our metropolitan communities."

H. Lew Malcolm, general manager of the chamber at Joplin, Mo., was outspoken in his support for Joplin's program: "This chamber of commerce heartily endorses the urban renewal program as it exists and functions in our community. It has been most helpful to the rebuilding of our total community and has embarked on a program in Joplin that was both necessary and needed."

Malcolm continued: "While I am aware there are those who condemn urban renewal, using examples that are valid, I suggest that each of those study urban renewal as it operates in Joplin. I believe our program to be a model that operates as planned by those who originally established this program."

Lester S. Moody, secretary of the Augusta, Ga., chamber, talked about "the important role urban renewal is playing in the redevelopment of the wornout areas of our city."

"The Augusta Chamber of Commerce is in full support of urban renewal and would like to encourage its continuation and expansion," Moody said.

Hunter A. Hogan, president of the Norfolk, Va., chamber, endorsed urban renewal and talked about its economic benefits:

"With the stand usually taken on urban renewal by the national chamber of commerce, as well as some local chambers, I feel confident that it is a little out of the ordinary to find the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce 100 percent behind Norfolk's fine redevelopment program.

"Our city fathers, backed by the leading citizens, made the decision for urban renewal and, by doing so, Norfolk has become one of the bright spots in the Nation, the envy of thousands that have visited our city to see what it has accomplished and to find out how it is done. We will never turn back."

What about the reaction of the U.S. chamber and Neilan? They are apparently very satisfied with what they have been saying and with the general reaction, as they see it. In late February, 2 weeks after the Indianapolis outburst, Neilan said his campaign had produced letters 10,000 to 1 in his favor.

Neilan was constrained to answer Rebsamen's three-page letter with a seven-page reply. On Rebsamen's first point, that the U.S. Chamber has forsaken "a realistic, objective attitude and approach to the social and economic problems of the Nation", Neilan replied that the U.S. Chamber "has a positive program for solving community development problems."

If Neilan is referring to Erie, Pa. (and this is the city to which the U.S. chamber always points with pride) then he has ignored the existence of the Erie Redevelopment Authority, established in 1955, and its two projects in execution.

Replying to the next comment, that the U.S. Chamber does not represent "the voice of the business community and Nation," Neilan explained the "very democratic process" undertaken by the U.S. chamber and its policy committee to determine policies.

"Our policy on community development and renewal has gone through this procedure. It was reaffirmed at the 1963 annual meeting on May 1, without one audible vote of opposition among 900 delegates present. A board statement in furtherance of this policy was reaffirmed at the February 21–22, 1964, meeting of the board without one opposing vote."

Turning to Rebsamen's demand that he publicly substantiate or recant the accusations made in the Indianapolis speech, Neilan then drew upon hearings before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, chaired by Representative JOHN DOWDY, Democrat, of Texas.

Commenting on the testimony regarding the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project in Washington, Chairman DOWDY said it raised "substantial questions of legality and propriety." Other members of the subcommittee were quoted by Neilan as using phrases like "abuses of the law," "subversion of public powers and processes for private purposes," "collusion or conspiracy."

Neilan claimed that the "U.S. chamber has received hundreds of letters and other information * * * from citizens in all parts of the Nation" which purportedly provide "preliminary evidence on abuses which we believe should have a full-scale congressional investigation."

But none of the Congressmen quoted nor Neilan himself call for indictments, arrests, trials for alleged criminal acts. This suggests then that Neilan is actually attacking urban renewal and not abuses, actual or inferred, of the law and the program.

Obviously, certain officials and staff members of the U.S. chamber are happy with its stand on urban renewal; left alone, they will act only to preserve the status quo. If there is to be a change, it will have to be initiated by dissident chambers.

These dissidents, both local chambers and corporate members, who provide the greatest part by far of the U.S. chamber's income, have three choices:

1. They could, singly or in concert, withdraw from the U.S. Chamber or boycott it. This could lead to a rump session held concurrently with the U.S. chamber annual meeting and even to some kind of coalition that would speak up for its members in support of urban renewal.

2. They can speak up and vote within the U.S. chamber organization, at the policy committee meeting, at the annual meeting, at Aircades and at other forums provided by the U.S. chamber, using their influence to determine the policy of the organization.

3. They can, as the local chamber executive suggested, not "give a damn" what the U.S. chamber policy is and pursue their own policies for urban renewal in their own cities.

The Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 11, President Johnson in a meeting with the Latin American Ambassadors reiterated his deep conviction in the Alliance for Progress. His comments were received most enthusiastically by our partners in the Alliance who are making significant efforts to mobilize their own resources, with marginal assistance from us, required to bring about necessary social, economic and political reforms.

Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State, has been charged by President Johnson with the task of heading U.S. efforts under the Alliance. This most able and experienced diplomat, last week in an address to the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs, underscored the reasons for U.S. participation in the Alliance for Progress and the problems and progress of this 2-year-old program.

Mr. Mann points out our traditional concern for our neighbors together with the importance to the United States of the "achievement of an American family of democratic, prosperous free nations."

His analysis substantiates President Johnson's strong belief that although "the path ahead is long and the way is hard—we have reached a turning point. Our Alliance for Progress will succeed."

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Mr. Mann's address to our fellow Members that they may gain insight into the heart and head of this fine American, and under unanimous consent, I insert excerpts from his speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The ultimate purpose of the Alliance for Progress is to help the people—all of the people—of the hemisphere to achieve a better life in freedom. Both the Bogotá and Punta del Este Charters speak not only about economic growth but about social justice and the dignity and freedom of the individual.

* * * * *

There are those who oppose any and all change—who seek to preserve archaic practices and attitudes which are the legacy of an age already past.

This group is few in number. Their influence on Government policies throughout the hemisphere is diminishing with each passing day. As President Johnson said the other day: "To struggle to stand still in Latin America is just to 'throw the sand against the wind.'"

I should like to state in the very beginning—and to say it very clearly—that the Government and people of the United States do not forget that their own Nation was born in revolution. Nor can we forget that the process of social, economic, and political change in our country has been continuous since 1776. It still goes on. We still seek that kind of change which will bring about the greatest good for the greatest number of our people.

We therefore have a natural sympathy and affinity for those governments who seek change and progress. Those governments which institute bold, soundly conceived programs of reform designed to achieve national and individual freedom, a high and sustained level of economic growth, a greater degree of social justice, and equal opportunity for all to rise as high in society as their talents and efforts will take them, will find warm-hearted sympathy in Washington. Those who seek to portray the United States as the defender of the status quo are deluding themselves. For as President Johnson has said, we, as a nation, are dedicated to "the principles of development, of diversity, and democracy." This dedication commands change. We are seeking, as the President also said, "to retain freedom and protect moral values while pursuing progress in a world on the march."

* * * * *

I do not share the despair about change that I hear expressed in some quarters.

More and more responsible leaders of organized labor are emerging better able to participate in progress;

An ever-increasing number of hard-working men of conscience from industry, from commerce, from the professional groups and from agriculture are striving for reform and improvement in the established order;

The Church, in many areas, is providing leadership in the fight for progress in freedom;

The military establishments are demonstrating an ever greater degree of social consciousness and political responsibility;

The number of qualified and experienced civil servants capable of coping with the complex economic and social problems of our time is rapidly growing;

Many schools and universities are striving for a higher standard of academic excellence. While our attention is more often drawn to irresponsible acts of a well-organized and noisy minority, the great majority of Latin American students are seriously working to acquire the skills and education necessary to improve themselves and their societies.

Our task is to work with all in every country who work for economic progress and for social justice—to work for unity rather than to encourage divisive hatreds—to help build a better hemisphere.

The Alliance for Progress is more than a statement of high resolve. It provides a program for progress consisting of specific, identifiable parts. One of these is agrarian reform.

THE FARMER

More than 50 percent of Latin America's population lives in rural areas. The alliance, therefore, very properly gives a high priority to helping the farmer help himself. It seeks to do this by helping him to increase his production because this is the only way, under any economic system, to increase his income and the income of the society as a whole.

We seek, therefore, a technological revolution in Latin American agriculture such as the one that has taken place in many countries, including the United States. Supervised agricultural credit, various kinds of cooperatives, land improvement programs, technical assistance to farmers, agricultural research programs, diversification of product, wider use of fertilizers, better storage facilities, rural education, community development programs, farm to market roads are some of the components of soundly conceived agrarian reform programs.

Improved land tenure systems aimed at giving more farmers titles to the land they work and, hence greater security and dignity as well as an incentive to produce, are also essential ingredients. In some countries, land distribution programs are underway or have already taken place on a large scale; others long have had equitable and efficient land tenure systems. Some are now actively engaged in large-scale settlement of farmers in undeveloped portions of their countries in the general pattern of the western movement of farms in our country; fortunately, most countries have large public domains available for settlement and distribution.

* * * * *

THE WORKER

The Alliance is as concerned about the worker as it is about the farmer. The Alliance cannot succeed unless it develops a labor force of growing skills and increasing ability to produce in a modern society.

Free trade union organizations throughout the hemisphere work to insure that labor receives its fair share of increased productivity. As in agrarian reform, these efforts to achieve a better life for the worker also help expand the purchasing power of the people and hence contribute to the ability of domestic markets to support growing industries.

* * * * *

THE NEED FOR CAPITAL

Another major factor in the Alliance is the need for capital for development both from internal and external sources.

The population of Latin America will, say the demographers, double in about 20 years. This is a fact of outstanding importance.

It means that jobs and food production must be increased at an extraordinary rate or unemployment and hunger will increase. It means that educational and health and all the other facilities required by civilized man today in our age of rising expectations must be built at the same rapid rate. It means that governments must also promptly provide additional infrastructure required by their growing agriculture and industry. Never in our history have political and economic systems been required to meet so many needs in such a short period of time.

If nations are to meet this challenge, their economies must obviously have very large amounts of capital for development.

TAX REFORM

One way to mobilize capital is, of course, to increase tax revenues substantially. In most countries tax systems still do not bring in sufficient revenue for governments to meet their social and economic responsibilities.

The Charter of Punta del Este speaks of the need to reform tax laws so that those who can afford it will shoulder more of the burden. It calls for the elimination of tax evasion and recognizes that taxes which impede growth must be discouraged. There is, I believe, general agreement that reforms in tax administration are essential so that effective tax collection can be achieved with all taxpayers meeting their obligations.

* * * * *

Increased revenues from tax reforms must be accompanied by administrative reforms to assure that those revenues are used wisely for development and progress. If the confidence and cooperation of the taxpayers are to be earned, swollen bureaucracies, misuse of public funds, and deficits in public enterprises must be replaced by efficiency, probity, and sound fiscal practice.

* * * * *

AID PROGRAM

If a greater effort is required of Latin American taxpayers it is equally essential that our country continue to meet its commitment to supply, through our foreign aid program, that vital margin of resources for development. We shall continue to meet our obligations under the Charter of Punta del Este.

At the same time, we must continue to do what we can to encourage other capital-exporting nations to provide a larger volume of capital for Latin America not merely in export credits but in long- and medium-term loans for development.

Loans, and in appropriate cases, grants from foreign governments are an essential ingredient of progress. But they can supply only a fraction of the capital needed. Unless they are accompanied by adequate self-help measures on the part of the developing country itself, the Alliance goals will not be achieved. We therefore must continue to relate the amount of our financial assistance to the efforts of the developing country to create conditions propitious for economic growth and social progress.

* * * * *

DOMESTIC PRIVATE CAPITAL

Most industry and agriculture in Latin America is privately and domestically owned. About 90 percent of private sector capital investment in expanding industry and agriculture is domestic, not foreign.

If this hemisphere is to achieve and maintain the high and sustained rate of economic growth so urgently needed to meet rising expectations and to keep pace with the population increase, the role and responsibilities of domestic private capital in the development process needs to be better understood.

Clearly the tax revenues of governments, even when they are substantially increased, as they must be, will be inadequate to finance industrial and agricultural expansion; a large part of domestic public sector funds must be invested in economic infrastructure, education, health, and social projects which the private sector cannot finance.

It is equally clear that public and private sector funds of foreign, capital-exporting nations, including the United States, can supply only a small part of the capital required to finance the rapid expansion needed to prevent rising unemployment and hunger.

Great dependence must therefore be placed on the domestic private sector.

If the domestic private sector is to play its vital role, it must be more venturesome, more imaginative and more willing than it has been in the past to risk its capital in job-producing industries which can supply the goods needed by their peoples.

Governments have a heavy responsibility in this regard. They must create the conditions favorable for expansion, growth, and prosperity by giving to their own people a sense of faith and confidence; by following the fiscal and monetary policies which make large-scale domestic savings and private investments feasible; by giving leadership and direction to the development process; and by discouraging too much investment in real estate and other investments which are marginal from the standpoint of economic development.

* * * * *

FOREIGN PRIVATE CAPITAL

The foreign private investor contributes only about 10 percent of the total private sector investment in growth. But because the foreign investor brings with him his own capital, the benefits of research, advanced technology and know-how, he makes a much greater contribution than the percentage suggests.

Contrary to some assertions, the United States has no internal economic reason to urge its private investors on any foreign country. Any sovereign government has a right to decide for itself whether or not it will accept foreign investors. And we prefer that our investors go only where they are welcome

even though this may mean a reduction in the rate of growth of those which reject it.

* * * * *

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Economic growth is not, of course, the only goal of the Alliance for Progress. We place equal emphasis on social justice, for rising national incomes are not the only measure of the well-being of societies and the individuals that compose them. We seek societies based on social justice in which the fruits of production are widely and fairly shared, in which the farmer owns his own land and the worker benefits fairly from his labor, in which educational and health facilities are available to all, in which equal opportunity and individual dignity have real meaning in the life of all the people.

Each nation of the Alliance has its own problems in reaching the goal of social justice. Each must seek its national way. Neither conformity nor uniformity is desirable or feasible.

* * * * *

THE FUTURE

Finally, I should like to say a few words about the spirit of the Alliance and the hope which it inspired in the hearts of men throughout the hemisphere.

Hope and spirit are not only important, they are essential to the success of the Alliance. But in the long run the best way to nourish hope is by solid achievement. And the way to get solid achievement is to identify the obstacles in the way of progress and then to cooperate in their removal.

There is no quick, easy, cheap way to success. The road is long and our task will require courage, steady nerves and sacrifice by all the peoples of the hemisphere.

I do not think we should arouse false hopes in this complex and dangerous world we live in. Nor do I think that the Alliance is on the road to failure.

Great progress has been made in the last few years. Many countries are marching forward in the quest for progress under the Alliance. Others unfortunately face internal problems at the moment, some serious and some less formidable.

But the nations of the hemisphere have demonstrated their firm intention of dealing with their problems and of trying to meet the challenges of the coming years. By common agreement, an Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress has been established under the leadership of a distinguished hemisphere statesman, Sr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria. Its task is to provide leadership, guidance and assistance to all the signers of the Charter of Punta del Este in the formulation and implementation of social and economic policies designed to bring a better life to all the peoples of the continent.

What is needed today is a rededication by all the American peoples from the Great Lakes to the Straits of Magellan to the noblest of all alliances: an alliance not to prepare for war but to make the blessings of peace available to all; not to defend what is bad in the established order but to defend freedom and produce what we need; not to deny opportunity to anyone but to make the circle large enough for everyone. Let us, through this alliance, make the Americas one great community, where every man, woman and child is free, equal and as prosperous as enterprise and talent allow. This is the dream of Simon Bolivar and Thomas Jefferson.

The United States is fully and irrevocably committed to this program. Our pledge to cooperate with the nations of Latin America in making it succeed is secure. Our dedication has not slackened. The dream will come true. How soon will depend on our collective wisdom, our will, and our courage.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 23, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 23, 1964)

ARE WE FIGHTING COMMUNISM OR HELPING IT?

Just what is going on? Are we going to win the war against communism or have we already capitulated? These are questions the American people have a right to ask after the key vote this week on the agricultural appropriation bill, H.R. 11202.

The key vote was on an amendment by Congressman FRANK BOW, of Ohio:

"That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to making export payments or export subsidies on any agricultural commodities being sold or sold to the government of any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or to any agency or national thereof."

This was a simple statement that no money taken from the American people would be used to subsidize agricultural commodities for Communist countries.

The amendment did not prohibit the sale of goods to Communist countries. It merely said we wouldn't subsidize them.

This amendment, which said we wouldn't help communism, was defeated by 1 vote—187 to 186. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, May 21, 1964, p. 11061. You should know how the Members voted. Only five Republicans were against the amendment.)

OBJECTIONS TO ENTIRE BILL

My own objections to the agriculture appropriation bill are based (1) in my disbelief in control of the farmer and farm products; (2) the unconstitutional nature of the present farm law. More specifically, I listed the following objections in speaking against the appropriation:

1. There is a conflict between sections 32 and 22 of the Agriculture Act. Even as Government is buying $400 million of meats, between 1936 and 1962, as surplus under section 32, we find the United States being flooded with foreign meats under section 22.

2. There is overlapping jurisdiction and expenditures in Public Law 480, funded in this bill, and the AID in the foreign aid bill.

3. There is an increase of $167 million to a total of $1.9 billion in Public Law 480 funds to give away or sell short, agriculture products overseas, including to Communists.

4. The REA is granted $450 million more when the great bulk of rural electrification is behind us and private enterprise can take over the job.

5. There is room for reasonable doubts on other sections of the bill including Federal aid for land conservation to grow crops when we are retiring land from crop use; Federal food stamp plan; Federal school milk and lunch; illegal grain shipment diversion; Farm Home Administration; Government loans to farmers; Federal rural renewal; Federal rural public housing for the elderly, etc.

HERE WE GO AGAIN

Is the Johnson administration cutting spending? Not so you can notice it. Next week the Committee on Ways and Means is going to be asked to raise the debt ceiling to $325 billion. The President opposes reducing or eliminating Korean war excise taxes. Yet he and those pressing for his programs would have you believe they believe in economy and lower taxes. What's the record?

1. The cash budget this year may run as high as $140 billion. (Far from the $98 billion we are led to believe the President will spend).

2. The political gimmick, war on poverty, calls for new billions of Federal money.

3. Just this week the President asked Congress for $125 million more to carry on his war in Vietnam.

4. The President is demanding Congress increase Federal salaries, especially in the high bracket political areas.

5. The President is putting every conceivable pressure on Congress to pass a medicare bill with all the funds coming out of the general treasury.

We just increased the debt ceiling to $315 billion on November 7. Republicans opposed it at that time and warned that debt ceiling increases are never temporary. I said in that debate:

"Debt ceiling has been used as a gimmick. Increases are seldom temporary. Some have vainly tried to use it as a check rein on Government which has no limitation on spending, borrowing, or taxing. The sky is the limit. Perhaps we should repeal the debt ceiling mechanism. Or we could make it a practical tool to aid in controlling the rate of expenditures, which now is entirely in the hands of the Chief Executive."

Instead we go merrily along with the Democrat philosophy that all problems can be solved by throwing money at them. It can't be done and 30 years of the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, and the present wheeling and dealing has proved it can't.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The United States and Cuban Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many people who have followed the news announcements relating to Cuba and the efforts of Cubans to overthrow Castro's regime are more than passingly concerned about the identity and past records of some of the Cubans who appear to be in the forefront of the current activity.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that my weekly report to the people of May 25, 1964, entitled "United States and Cuban Independence," and an excellent editorial published in the May 20, 1964, edition of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AND CUBAN INDEPENDENCE

(Report to the people by Senator STROM THURMOND

On April 19, 1898, the United States knowingly precipitated a war with Spain when Congress passed a joint resolution which stated that "Cuba is and of right ought to be free" and which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces to achieve that end. With this act, the United States voluntarily undertook the role of Cuba's liberator and the guarantor of Cuba's independence.

The depth of the United States commitment to Cuban independence was demonstrated not only by the war with Spain, but also by many events in the years after the war. Following 3½ years of military occupation, the United States proclaimed Cuban independence and transferred executive powers to elected Cuban officials. For 30 years thereafter, however, the United States retained the right by treaty to intervene in Cuba's internal affairs to insure continuance of Cuba's independence.

The influence of the United States on Cuba's freedom has not been confined to military matters. The United States gave to Cuba a favored position for the export of sugar, Cuba's chief crop, to the United States at premium prices. This, together with other types of financial aid from the United States, was a major factor in Cuban political stability.

In addition to these long established commitments to Cuban independence, the United States entered into treaties with all Latin American nations which had the effect of committing the United States to the defense of Cuba's independence.

The United States blindly contributed to the takeover of Cuba by Castro. From this point on, the traditional firmness of United States commitment to Cuban independence wavered, and by 1962, apparently disappeared. Following the "crisis" in the fall of 1962, the United States not only failed to undertake the liberation of Cuba from the yoke of Soviet satellite status, but also took positive action to prevent Cuban refugees from striking military blows against the Communist oppressors in Cuba.

U.S. policy on the independence of Cuba has undergone a radical change, but U.S. influence on the independence of Cuba remains predominant. By undertaking, as a great world power, to make Cuban independence our business, the United States established an influence on Cuba's fate that cannot be erased by a mere change in U.S. policy. U.S. influence is still predominant. In years past, it was a positive influence and, thereby, Cuba was independent; today U.S. influence is negative, and Cuba is enslaved.

We cannot escape our influence on the future of Cuban independence. Because of this, the United States has a deep and continuing responsibility to Cubans. We flout this responsibility when we deny Cubans, in or out of Cuba, their moral right to attempt to overthrow their Communist oppressors. We fail in this responsibility when we withhold moral and material support from Cubans who are attempting to liberate their country and countrymen.

The United States failed to meet its heavy responsibility when Castro's takeover was supported and made possible. It would be an equal failure of U.S. responsibility if U.S. influence was used to replace Castro with a man of identical or similar political attitude who merely had, or could be given, a better image in the United States. The historic commitment of the United States to Cuban independence will not be satisfied by swapping Castro for a Latin "Tito," or as the Cubans call it, a continuation of "Fidelissimo without Fidel."

Cuban independence cannot be obtained without the complete elimination of communism from power in Cuba.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, May 20, 1964]

NO MARXISTS WANTED

While Americans read about the possibility of new anti-Castro raids by Cuban refugees, they know next to nothing about the character of the leaders seeking change in Cuba. It is time the U.S. public be informed by President Johnson of the Cuban leadership this Republic is supporting.

We submit that the United States should not support Cubans in exile who were former partners of Fidel Castro in his crimes against freedom. We are dismayed to find that two of the raider groups are led respectively by Manuel Artime and Manuel Ray, former Castro supporters. Moreover, word comes to us from a patriotic Cuban exile that the U.S. Government is in close touch with Raul Chibas, former head of the kangaroo courts that sent so many Cubans to Castro's firing squads.

Onetime collaborators with Castro have a right to struggle in their country's behalf. If they have learned their lesson, Cuban exiles and the American people can be thankful. But Castro's old lieutenants should not be allowed to head organizations now planning to oust him.

A great nation looks far into the future and bases today's operations on tomorrow's needs. The U.S. aim for Cuba should be a truly free nation, dedicated to liberty and opposed to socialism in every respect. We question whether those who were in Castro's inner circle have lost their Marxist, revolutionary beliefs.

In no circumstance should the U.S. Government recognize any free Cuban leadership or government-in-exile that lacks a constitutional basis. No doubt there are elements in the State Department which would like to handpick a future Cuban Government, selecting those leaders who believe in the so-called social revolution in Latin America.

The U.S. public should not be satisfied with any provisional government unless its members are supporters of the Cuban Constitution which was in effect when the Marxist conspiracy triumphed in Cuba. The only Cubans worthy of support are those who are determined to uphold that Constitution. Such Cuban constitutionalists would be duty-bound to restore the rights of those imprisoned by Castro, and to return property confiscated by the revolutionary government.

Castro's old friends have never fully abandoned his cause. Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, who praised the Cuban tyrant as a Robin Hood, is still at work. Mr. Matthews' new book, entitled "Cuba," maintains that the "Castro revolution has done much for education, housing, health, communications, and industrialization. * * * Whole sections of the population that were neglected and mistreated in the past have become equal or even favored citizens." Thus the pro-Castro propaganda machine continues to operate in the United States of America.

The U.S. Government must make clear that it is utterly opposed to those who in one way or another still subscribe to the Castro revolution. Only by dealing with Cuban constitutionalists can a free, happy, and prosperous Cuba be rebuilt in the years to come. For the United States to deal with former Castroites who haven't shed their Marxism would be a betrayal of the cause of freedom in Cuba and throughout the hemisphere.

The Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by Thomas W. Braden, president of the State Board of Education of California. As a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have listened to over 100 witnesses testify on the prayer amendment resolutions now before us. No witness has stated the issues more succinctly than Mr. Braden. With a merciful absence of high-flown rhetoric and a good reporter's economy of words, Mr. Braden brought this emotional issue into the perspective where it belongs: what can happen in our public schools if we allow the Government to encroach on our religious

liberties. Mr. Braden occupies the most responsible education office in the State of California, and his views are the result of firsthand knowledge of the practical consequences.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS W. BRADEN, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, MAY 13, 1964

My name is Thomas W. Braden, I am a newspaperman and president of the California State Board of Education.

I have come here at the request of the chairman of the committee, to state my opinion on the question of an amendment to the Constitution of our country which would permit children to pray in our public schools.

I do not find anything in the Constitution which prohibits children from saying prayers in school or out.

If this is so—and I think it is so—then what is the question involved in the amendment?

The question is whether government in the United States may force or coerce or embarrass children into prayer.

It has been said that this is not the intent of the proposal. Argument will be made that a child who does not wish to pray may leave the room or turn his back or keep his lips immobile or look for his eraser.

But what this amendment says is that by law there may be a time for prayer. The moment this amendment is enacted, some religious group in each community in the United States will insist that the time be set, that a prayer be delivered and that teachers or other officials rise before classrooms and say in effect, "pray."

I think there is a danger here of what Mr. Madison called "the tyranny of the community."

I do not believe there is a teacher in the United States capable of conducting a classroom prayer without suggesting that the approved thing, the right and proper thing, for children to do at that moment is to pray.

So if you gentlemen approve this amendment you are saying that every child must pray or that if he does not he will be marked among his classmates as odd or queer.

I do not know the effect which this might have upon a child who does not wish to pray, or whose parents have taught him in the words of Jesus, to "enter into thy closet and when thou has shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret."

But there is a second tyranny involved here. It is the tyranny which would be exercised by the community against those who have no objection to praying in public but whose parents and church have taught them to recite a particular prayer.

Whose prayer would be offered in the public schools? Would it not be the prayer which reflected the majority sentiment in each community?

Will minorities always acquiesce? Might there not be factionalism and community strife?

In California alone there are more than 2,000 religious groups possessed of more than 50,000 members. In any given California town, I doubt that a sect which represents the majority would be satisfied with a prayer which also satisfied the minority.

Let me illustrate. California's State Board of Education considered recently a proposal that our State-selected textbooks should contain a disclaimer on the subject of science. It was the idea of our State superintendent of public instruction that any reference to science which might dispute the story of creation as outlined in Genesis should be labeled in the text as theory only, not fact.

Our State superintendent proposed this idea in order to placate a large religious sect in our State which objects to statements that the earth is millions of years old or that hard coal is millions of years. These people wanted our texts to state that the earth is only about 4,000 years old, a figure they arrived at by adding up the ages of the patriarchs mentioned in Genesis.

It seemed to him a minor concession in order to placate a large and insistent religious group.

But as we Californians began to examine our textbooks we realized that if we changed them in order to please fundamentalists, we were only beginning the job.

We realized that we might have to change our history books in order to satisfy the Mormons because the Mormons are taught that the American Indian descended from the lost tribes of Israel. Or we might have to change our health books to satisfy the Jews many of whom believe that no man should eat pork.

Or we might have to change our medical books in order to satisfy Christian Scientists. In other words we came to realize that our texts would be so full of disclaimers about what was being taught that it would be difficult to use them. And so we decided to stick to our present system which is to let scientists write science and preachers preach religion.

We could not make our books please all religious sects and I do not think any public official can devise a prayer which will please all religious sects.

But it is said that unless we pass this amendment, we shall "take God out of the schools." In California our State superintendent of public instruction is frightening our parents by telling them that the Supreme Court is doing this now or is about to do it.

I do not think this is so. There is a place for religion in our schools. I do not think we can teach art, history, or ethics without teaching about religion. Moreover, I think it is incumbent upon our teachers to emphasize to our children that we are the inheritors of a great religious tradition—that our Founding Fathers based our form of government squarely upon the notion that all men are brothers, and that whether we accept our kinship because we truly believe we are brothers under God or because we have found some other rationale, our democracy is unintelligible and unworkable without this concept of the equality and kinship of man.

In California our State board of education has reminded all our schools of their duty to teach about religion.

But the members of our board believe that our teachers are competent to distinguish between teaching about religion and conducting compulsory worship.

We think it is possible for Americans to remain a religious people and also remain a nation devoted to the rights of individuals. One of these rights is the right to the free exercise of religion. It means that any American may pray when he wishes and only when he wishes and may pray as he chooses and only as he chooses and that no official of a government, Federal, State, or local may order or coerce or embarrass him into prayer.

Administration Drive for Additional Export Trade Succeeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the May 19 issue of the Evening Star there was an excellent article by Sylvia Porter entitled "Massive Drive Pushed To Increase Exports." In this article Mrs. Porter very ably points out the manner in which export trade in being developed.

This report is of special interest to the House Small Business Committee and others as my committee during this term of Congress has joined with others in a coordinated effort to help expand our export trade and to see that small business is fully apprised of export trade opportunities. Our committee report—House Report No. 1303—concerning small business and foreign trade has been widely distributed and well received.

I desire to call Mrs. Porter's article to the attention of the Members. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have the article entitled "Massive Drive Pushed To Increase Exports" reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—MASSIVE DRIVE PUSHED TO INCREASE EXPORTS

(By Sylvia Porter)

In 1964, the United States will participate in 13 commercial trade fairs abroad, compared with last year's 8. We'll send 24 trade missions around the globe, double last year's 12. We have just opened a new trade center in Milan—fifth since 1961—and have signed a lease for a sixth to open in Stockholm next spring.

We are also launching this month the first of a fleet of "mobile trade fairs" to carry a wide range of commercial exhibits on ships and planes. Buyers will be invited aboard in foreign ports to view our wares—and to place orders.

We are pushing "America Weeks" in foreign department stores, featuring the label "Made in U.S.A." on a wide variety of goods.

We are sending—for the first time—a team of business and Government men to Europe to interest wealthy Europeans in investing in properties here—shopping centers, office buildings, industry sites.

We are, in short, in the midst of the most massive export drive in the Nation's history, and our target for 1964 alone is to encourage 10,000 additional U.S. companies to enter the export markets—fully 50 percent more than the 15,000 to 20,000 now selling goods abroad.

We have two clear objectives. First, a rise in exports will narrow the difference between the overall total we spend abroad and earn abroad, thus help close the balance-of-payments gap. Although we already run a huge merchandise export surplus, we are determined to make it even bigger to offset our excess spending in other areas.

Second, the more goods we sell abroad, the more jobs will be made at home. President Johnson's own estimate is that every $1 billion rise in our exports will create 100,000 new jobs within the United States.

It's hard to believe that when the U.S. export expansion program got into high gear just 2 years ago, only 4 percent of America's 300,000 manufacturing companies were selling any of their products to other nations. The vast majority of America's businessmen were not only making no effort to sell outside the United States, they were actually repelling foreign buyers by not even bothering to answer inquiries.

Now the situation is changing dramatically. Paul Pauly of the Commerce Department's Bureau of International Commerce says "We've made a sharp turnaround. We are no longer sending image-making, good will missions abroad; we're sending hard-sell missions. If we can sell goods at home—in the most competitive market in the world—why can't we sell anywhere on earth?"

Of course, key factors in the recent surge in exports—up 60 percent in the past 5 years to an unprecedented $24 billion rate in the

first quarter of 1964—have been the comparative quality and price attractiveness of our goods. While we've been holding the price-wage line, Europe's wage costs and prices have been jumping—with the result that our competitive position has improved.

But there is no question that we would not be doing as well as we are were it not for the export drive.

Through trade centers we've introduced products ranging from barbecue sets to bourbon whisky, generators to girdles, and exposed more than 400 new companies to foreign markets. At the trade fairs in which we participated in 1963 we displayed everything from pleasure boats to ladies' lingerie, laid the groundwork for sales running into hundreds of millions.

Via trade missions, we have taken more than 13,000 individual new business proposals abroad since 1960 and returned with over 20,000 new trade and investment opportunities.

Announcement of Student Composers Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 Robert J. Burton, president of Broadcast Music, Inc., of New York City, announced completion of the final judging for its annual Student Composers Awards, instituted 13 years go to encourage the composition of concert music in this hemisphere. Two young composers from my district have been selected for cash awards to aid their further musical studies. They are Ellene Susan Levenson, age 9, of Woodland Hills, Calif., a student of Herbert Donaldson, at Westwood Music Center, Los Angeles, Calif., and Fredric Edgar Myrow, age 24, of West Hollywood, Calif., a student of Goffredo Petrassi, at the Accademia Santa Cecilia, Rome.

Miss Levenson was born in 1954 in Santa Monica, Calif., and is in the fourth grade. She started improvising on the piano at the age of 3½ and began her piano studies at 4½ with Caletta Bertrand. Discovery of her absolute pitch was made soon after. Theory and composition studies with Herbert Donaldson were begun when Ellene was 6½. Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco has been teaching her counterpoint since late last year. Miss Levenson received a letter of recognition, encouragement, and honorable mention from the Student Composers Awards 1962 national judging panel.

Mr. Myrow, an SCA winner for the third time, is currently studying in Rome. He was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1939 and has lived in Los Angeles, Calif., since 1944. Mr. Myrow began piano studies at the age of 6 and composition studies at 13. In 1961 he received a bachelor of music degree from the University of Southern California. Myrow has studied composition with Harold Johnson, 1952–56; Darius Milhaud, Aspen, 1956; and Ingolf Dahl, 1957–61. Also in 1961 he was awarded a $2,000 fellowship for graduate work at Brandeis University, to be fulfilled when time allows, and was given his first Student Composers Awards grant.

The Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to invite the attention of the Members of Congress to an editorial by William A. Mullen as it appeared in the April 30, 1964, edition of the Fort Lauderdale News.

This fine editorial is worthy of considerable thought and again points up the fact these matters will not just go away or can be swept under the rug.

In this connection, I would encourage the Members of Congress to study H.R. 11070, which I introduced last month in an effort to resolve some of these serious problems.

The editorial follows:

OUSTING OF 63 RISKS FROM U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT SHOULD SPUR MORE EFFORT

Finger pointers who charge Americans concerned over Communist activities and subversion are "right-wing extremists," and who maintain there is nothing to fear from friendly Russia in these times of great rapport with the Soviet Union should take a long, hard look at things after seeing a brief story out of Washington.

The news item last week merely announced that 63 employees of the State Department were permitted to resign during 1963 as "potential sources of classified information to enemy agents." The account said the 63 quit after being confronted with evidence against them and none chose to fight the charges.

This information was given behind closed doors on February 4 to a House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee by Raymond W. Laugel, Acting Assistance Secretary in the State Department's Office of Security, and that's about all the information that was made public. It's most interesting, particularly in view of the fact that three of the departing risks were senior officers of the Foreign Service.

That three score and three potential friends of the enemy were weeded out of the State Department is some sort of progress. And the finger pointers and viewers, with no alarm, probably will take note that the number is only a small total of the vast State Department roster; that the risks have been booted out, and that everything now is hunky-dory so there is no further need to worry.

To a degree, it is an accomplishment; only a small one, for the disclosure raises more concern than it mitigates. For one thing, these potential enemies of the United States are cloaked in anonymity, which gives them a pretty good chance of taking up new activities elsewhere that may be of some benefit to their Communist pals.

What should have been done was for the subcommittee to disclose their names and positions so that the entire country knows who they are and can be on their guard accordingly when any of these risks comes into their midst.

It also would be nice to know who cleared these individuals for employment by State; how thoroughly they were investigated beforehand, and, most of all, whether they had done any damage or mischief harmful to this Nation during their tenure.

Another curious aspect is whether any of the 63 was among the some 250 State employees who were on the 800-name list provided by the late Scott McLeod and rated by him as serious cases against whom the evidence was substantial. If they were, what about the remaining 187, and what potential aid and comfort might they be able to render to the enemy?

Sixty-three may not be a large number among the thousands of State employees, particularly when most of these employees are loyal Americans dedicated to their work, but it becomes an alarming number in view of the recent disclosures that top-secret Korean war information ran through a transmission belt from State to the British to the Communists.

In that case, it required only a small group to sell out an entire nation and cause the death or wounding of thousands of American boys fighting in that war.

The quiet departures of the 63 also offer pause for thought about the case of Otto Otepka, the department's security chief who was ostracized for apparently providing the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee with information about State Department risks.

Otepka wasn't fired, but, to all indications, neither is he any longer in a position to expose potential risks. In other words, he was "neutralized," which is the Washington technique for dealing with a thorny problem without stirring up a fuss.

We say good riddance of the 63. We cannot, however, settle back into complacence and consider a grevious problem resolved. We think, instead, that the time is long overdue for a moment of truth between State Department officials and the people whom they serve.

A good beginning would be publication of the names of the 63, the positions they held and some information about their personal lives, such as the organizations with which they were affiliated. Coupled with that, there should be action in the Attorney General's office for publishing a new list of subversive activities groups and organizations.

The list has not been updated since November 1, 1955, and it's a safe bet that with the Communist practice of forming a front, dissipating it and then regrouping there are some organizations in this country cloaked in respect as they busily tunnel away.

More of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's testimony on Communist activities should be made public; Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy should recant his declaration that there aren't enough Communists in this country to pose a security risk, and the State Department ought to give a public report on its efforts to clean house.

Above all, there should be national emphasis on the Communist menace, rather than playing it down, irrespective of our present policy of classifying Communists as "good" and "bad," and playing pattycake with the "good" ones in the world market place.—WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this spring, my office mailed out

195,000 questionnaires to the registered voters of all parties in my congressional district. To date more than 18,000 returns have been received, indicating further that the people of my district are opposed to the continuing spending program and the increased assumption of Federal authority in the Federal-State-local government area.

The results received from the questionnaires are noted as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. Do you believe the U.S. Export-Import Bank should guarantee credit for the sale of wheat and other commodities to Soviet Russia?	11	77	12
2. Do you approve of our present foreign policy?	17	58	25
3. Should the United States make further concessions in our Panama Treaty negotiations?	20	63	17
4. Do you believe that the Alliance for Progress in Latin America has been worth its cost of about $600,000,000 per year?	21	60	19
5. The current cost of our foreign aid program is about $3,000,000,000 per year. Do you favor—			
(a) Expanding present program?	2	52	46
(b) Maintaining present program?	11	42	47
(c) Creating a smaller more selective program?	76	8	16
SOCIAL			
1. Do you believe that medical problems for the aged should be handled by expanding present Federal-State legislation, such as the Kerr-Mills bill, with the funds to be administered by the respective States and local units of government?	51	31	18
2. Do you favor increasing social security taxes to finance medical care for the aged, regardless of financial need?	20	72	8
3. Are you in favor of a voluntary, private medical plan for the aged, with no Federal involvement?	49	27	24
4. A bill has been proposed that will promote quality and price stabilization very similar to the former Fair Trade Act. Basically the bill would prevent price-cutting on trademarked items. Are you in favor of this type of legislation?	22	60	18
5. Would you vote to establish a Federal domestic National Service Corps like the Foreign Peace Corps?	41	40	19
6. Do you believe the Federal Government should help provide the money for cities to modernize their mass transit systems?	15	75	10
7. Should a Department of Urban Affairs be established to supervise housing, transportation, and other problems of big cities?	20	65	15
EDUCATION			
1. Should loans to college students under the National Defense Education Act be expanded?	61	26	13
2. Are you in favor of a moderate income tax allowance for parents with college-enrolled children?	67	27	6
3. Should the Constitution be amended to permit voluntary Bible reading and prayer in the public schools?	88	8	4
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe that we can carry out the administration's proposed extensive program and still reduce the budget?	20	66	14
2. Do you believe the limit on the national debt should continue to be raised to permit the Federal Government to spend more than it receives?	5	89	6
3. Are you in favor of a 1964 salary increase for—			
(a) Postal employees and other Government workers of about 6 percent?	37	53	10
(b) Members of Congress in the amount of $10,000 per year?	10	82	8
FISCAL—continued			
4. A bill is pending before Congress authorizing veterans of World War I to receive a pension of $100 per month, unless they have other income exceeding $2,400 if single or $3,600 with dependents. The estimated cost of this program the 1st year, according to the Veterans' Administration, would be $1,266,247,000. Would you favor this bill?	39	49	12
5. There is a bill in Congress to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting outdoor recreation needs. Part of the fund would be financed by admission and user fees paid by persons admitted to federally administered areas where recreational facilities or services are provided. Do you favor this proposal?	51	36	13
AGRICULTURE			
1. Do you favor a farm program with mandatory controls and quotas?	13	69	18
2. Do you think the food stamp program should be broadened?	27	45	28
3. Do you favor a voluntary base-surplus 2-price plan for milk?	21	34	45
LABOR			
1. Are you in favor of legislation reducing the standard workweek from 40 to 35 hours?	25	67	8
2. Would you approve a proposal to increase the overtime wage rates above their present level of time and one-half to double time, in order to discourage excessive overtime work, in the hope that some of the presently unemployed workers might be hired instead?	42	49	9
3. Do you favor legislation making labor unions subject to similar antitrust laws now applicable to business?	79	8	13
GENERAL			
1. Do you believe the present law of Presidential succession should be changed?	50	35	15
2. Should the Congress continue to exercise control over the administration's proposed programs?	80	5	15
3. Should the House Committee on Un-American Activities be continued?	69	12	19
4. Do you favor a bill to change immigration requirements so that individuals would be admitted to the United States on the basis of personal skills or relationship to U.S. citizens rather than by quotas allocated according to national origin?	56	25	19
5. Do you think the moon race is worth the effort and the presently projected cost of $40,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000?	18	73	9
6. Do you approve of—	15	66	19
(a) Further control of government at the Federal level?	73	12	15
(b) Extension of State and local government responsibility?			

Howard Buffett, VIP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, recently our Nation lost a gallant fighter for the cause of individual freedom when Mr. Howard Buffett, of Omaha, Nebr., passed from this earthly scene.

Though it was not my privilege to serve with him in Congress, I knew him and am familiar with many of his valiant efforts to stop the tide of Federal encroachment. A fitting tribute to this outstanding former colleague is contained in the May 19, 1964, issue of National Review and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOWARD BUFFETT, VIP

Mr. Buffett served in Congress several terms, specifically in the 78th to the 80th Congresses, and again in the 82d. He had been a journalist, then a businessman in Omaha, Nebr., and he piled up an unbroken record of enlightened conservative resistance to statism at home, and appeasement abroad. He retired from Congress not because his constituency tired of him, but because he did not like the parasitic air in Washington. and despaired of Congress issuing the kind of protest he thought necessary against the accumulation of power in the executive. But he was active in community affairs on his return to Omaha, and wrote effective polemics (one of them for National Review) against the socializers. He was a man of gentle manners and quiet ways, and will be greatly missed by his friends. He died knowing that he had requited his debt to his country.

Panama Canal Protection: Undiluted U.S. Control of Highways and Bridges Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a number of statements to the House, I have opposed giving any type of jurisdiction over the Canal Zone territory, its highways, bridges or other structures to the Republic of Panama for use as corridors or any other purpose. The importance of maintaining undiluted control by the United States of all avenues of vehicular

and pedestrian transport across the Canal Zone and Panama Canal was emphasized in my address to this body on April 20, 1964, as essential for protecting the canal, especially during periods of lawlessness and disorder, such as occurred on January 9–11, of this year.

The reasons for my stand must be obvious, especially to experienced members of the Canal Zone police force and the armed services charged with responsibility for the protection of the canal. Even so, there are elements in our Government willing to toy with the idea of giving some form of jurisdiction to Panama over corridors across the Canal Zone, which would include the new Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa.

The importance of the United States retaining full and complete control of this bridge over the Panama Canal and its approaches was recently illustrated by an attempt to bomb the Victoria Bridge across the St. Lawrence Seaway at Montreal. If such effort to sabotage the bridge across the water route to the Great Lakes could be made in Canada, the same could well occur on a bridge over the vital Panama Canal under Panamanian jurisdiction with far more disastrous results.

The established policy of the international Communist conspiracy for worldwide conquests is to infiltrate countries near strategic maritime routes and to plant their trained agents of terror to commit every form of sabotage and violence and thus to establish Red control. Certainly, at this hour of grave peril caused by such methods is no time to surrender U.S. control over the Panama Canal or the land and utilities that serve to protect it. No patriotic citizen of our country will ever support such effort for surrender.

The news story of the attempted Montreal bridge sabotage follows:

BOMB FOUND ON SEAWAY

MONTREAL, May 19.—A homemade bomb was found on the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence Seaway early today, after hours of separatist disturbances in Montreal.

Detective Sergeant Leo Plouffe, Montreal police bomb-disposal expert, dropped the explosive into the St. Lawrence River, well away from the St. Lambert locks.

Earlier in the night about 1,000 police battled crowds of youths demanding separation of French-speaking Quebec from the English-speaking Canadian Provinces.

Police arrested at least 85 on charges of disturbing the peace.

Two demonstrations at a patriots' monument blocked the Jacques Cartier Bridge across the St. Lawrence. Autos lined up for miles south of the city. Many of the motorists were returning from the long Victoria Day holiday weekend.

The bomb was found on the Victoria Bridge 5 hours after an anonymous threat was telephoned to the police. Auto and railroad traffic was kept from the bridge during that time.

The bridge connects Montreal and the south shore of the St. Lawrence. Several trains running to the east and to the United States were held up.

The Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, many Americans of German ancestry recently observed May 21 as the anniversary of German Founders Day of the Steuben Society of America. It is fitting that we joint in commemorating this event in honor to an outstanding patriotic and civic organization.

Gen. Frederick von Steuben is well known as one of the leading patriots of the Revolutionary War. He received a great estate and a large award from Congress and the State of New York for his outstanding contributions to the winning of American independence. Along with General Lafayette he was second only to General Washington as a shaper of the Continental Army.

General von Steuben came to America in 1777 to offer his talents to that great cause then being born on this continent. In so doing he set the example for all time for millions of other Americans of German origin, who have contributed untold wealth to their nation.

During the bitter days at Valley Forge, General von Steuben sustained the courage of the men. He drilled and taught them so that when winter subsided the American troops emerged more prepared than ever to engage the best army of the day in equal combat. In that winter also he wrote the "Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States." In 1781 von Steuben served with Lafayette in the battle against Cornwallis's invasion of Virginia, and at the battle of Yorktown he commanded one of the three divisions of the Continental Army.

This notable example of service to freedom has justly inspired German-Americans for many years. In 1919 a group of leaders in the German-American community gathered in New York to discuss the role of their fellow citizens in American society, especially their lack of political interest and activity. They rightly perceived that individual discussion and participation in the affairs of the nation were the foundations of democracy. These German founders of a new society to further these conditions quickly selected General von Steuben as their patron and gave his name to their group.

Since 1919 the Steuben Society has performed a valuable service in stimulating discussion and service to the Nation among Americans of German origin. The Steuben Society has been a leading nonpartisan patriotic force. Its interests and activities are in the best traditions of American free association. Many of its members served with distinction in three American wars.

It is a pleasure to commemorate Founders' Day of the Steuben Society of America. The Society does honor to the memory of General von Steuben in the interests of all the American people.

The Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death on May 12 of CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, brought to an end a long career of dedicated public service.

Chairman CANNON first came to the House in 1911 as confidential secretary to House Speaker Champ Clark. Thereafter, he became House Parliamentarian, the first to serve under both Democrat and Republican administrations. We are all familiar with "Cannon's Procedure" and "Cannon's Precedents," which he wrote during this time.

In 1922, Mr. CANNON ran for the congressional seat in Missouri's Ninth District and won. In 1941 he became chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It was in this capacity that CLARENCE CANNON best served his country, for he took his responsibility for the Nation's economy most seriously, spending many long and tedious hours poring over voluminous justifications in order to be able to make the most intelligent decision possible as to where the national budget might best be reduced.

I first met Mr. CANNON when I served as secretary to the Honorable Styles Bridges, then chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1948. At that time, John Taber served as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and Mr. CANNON was the ranking minority member for the brief period of the 80th Congress. During these years, before and since, CLARENCE CANNON had labored long and mightily to keep appropriations of the public moneys from flowing over into the never-never land of pork barrel pressures.

As the junior member of the largest committee of the House, I find it a particular pleasure to be able to say that the distinguished committee chairman, Mr. CANNON, was always kind, gracious, and patient with me. He was not one, who despite his enormous power in his official position, would either abuse it, take advantage of it, or allow it to go to his head. One of the freshman class in any congression session can pay no greater compliment to a senior Member than to recite these simple facts.

All of us on the Appropriations Committee who knew and worked with Chairman CANNON will sorely miss his presence at both subcommittee and full committee meetings. We are fortunate, however, that this giant of a man will be succeded by a Member of equal competence and dedication, our distinguished colleague, Hon. GEORGE MAHON, who, I am sure, feels the same overwhelming sense of responsibility to the American people for the appropriation of their tax dollars as did our late Chairman CLARENCE CANNON.

America is better off because the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON lived among us. Would that such might be the epitaph of more Americans.

Incredible!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star:

INCREDIBLE!

If we hadn't seen the item in print several times we wouldn't have believed our own eyes.

In black and white the news item from Washington informed us that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, being very worried about the catastrophic situation in Laos, had decided to ask Red China for help.

The U.S. Government, Washington officials have disclosed to the press, has asked several foreign governments to "urge Communist China to use its influence with the pro-Communist Pathet Lao to stop the attacks on neutralist and rightwing positions" in Laos.

The United States has taken these positions, officials explained, because Washington felt that the genuine neutralization of Laos was in the interests of Red China, as well as of the West. The idea is that further Communist successes in Laos might be considered too difficult to swallow by the West. They might require, for this reason, some form of retaliatory moves by the West.

"Please be reasonable," the State Department in effect is saying, to the Reds. "You have so far overrun, by the force of arms, two-thirds of Laos. Why not be satisfied with that and let the 'neutralists' live peacefully as your puppets in the remaining one-third of the country—at least for the time being? If you go on with your military conquest we—the United States—might take a serious view and might do something. Please be reasonable."

We find this kind of Washington diplomacy incredible. Does Mr. Rusk believe that the Communists have suddenly gone mad? Does he think that the Reds in China would listen to Washington's pathetic pleas for reason and moderation? As the United States for 3 long years, has done nothing to help the anti-Communist and the non-Communist political and military forces in Laos, why should the Reds suddenly get scared of U.S. theoretical retaliatory moves in the future?

The present Communist victorious military march in Laos is the direct result of Washington's policy of weakness and retreat in southeast Asia. It was the United States, through the so-called Harriman formula of neutralization of Laos, that paved the way for the Communists' most recent triumphs. The Communists, accustomed to U.S. weakness and indecision for more than 3 years, are certainly not going to become reasonable and responsible overnight—especially when they are confronted with another example of American diplomatic folly—the Rusk appeal to Red China to use its influence and stop the Laos fighting.

The Red Chinese will use their influence in Laos, but not in the way Mr. Rusk wants them to. The Chinese Reds will advise their Laotian comrades to go on advancing and to go on defeating their political opponents. The Red Chinese would do this because such action—Mr. Rusk notwithstanding—really serves Communist interests, in China as well as in Laos.

Older Worker's Job Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, America's most distinguished columnist on economic matters, Miss Sylvia Porter, has performed a very worthwhile public service by calling attention, through her widely syndicated column, to the fact that a most recent survey on the output of American workers shows that older age makes little, if any, difference in the capability of workers in office jobs or in occupations requiring limited physical effort.

Miss Porter quotes the survey as showing conclusively that a worker age 60 performs as well as or even better than one age 30. She points out further that if a worker has superior capabilities, he will turn in a far superior performance at 60 than an average persone one-half his age.

It is my hope that the survey being quoted by Miss Porter will help reverse the cruel and mounting inhumane practice in American industry of refusing to hire workers merely because they have exceeded certain age limits.

Throughout this country there are vast numbers of American workers who are unable to obtain employment for no other reason than because they are considered too old by potential employers even though these workers are still in their middle forties or early fifties.

A recent Department of Commerce survey shows that an American worker who has past his 45th birthday has odds of 6 to 1 against him in getting another job similar to one he has previously held if for some reason or other he loses his original employment.

It is my hope that the survey cited by Miss Porter will arouse this Congress to deal with this matter because it is my judgment that there is a serious gap in our present efforts to deal with poverty in America so long as we permit discrimination against workers for no other reason than their age.

It has been my contention for some time, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason employers fail to hire older workers is not because older workers cannot adequately perform their duty but rather because it costs an employer more to hire an older worker for fringe benefits and other health and welfare provisions associated with employment.

As a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on various discriminatory practices in hiring, I had asked employers in New York, Chicago, and California, if indeed there is a cost factor involved and, Mr. Speaker, the record of my committee's proceedings shows that employers do indeed experience an increased cost factor for fringe benefits in hiring older workers.

It appears to me, therefore, that in light of Miss Porter's own observations today and in light of the testimony before my committee establishing the increased cost factor, this Congress should evolve a plan under which an employer would be able to claim as a tax credit any differential in cost between the hiring of a younger worker and an older worker; thus, the employer would not have to bear the additional cost out of profits. If this were to be done, all American workers would then be placed on an equal basis and experience would become the criteria for employment. The additional cost factor would be removed as a consideration. I believe this type of parity would give the older worker a better opportunity at employment.

Mr. Speaker, the full cruelty of this increasing practice of refusing to hire older workers hits with most devasting impact the so-called middle-aged American—that worker between the age of 45 and 55—who in many instances still has a relatively young family to feed, clothe, house and educate.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would permit a tax credit for the differential in the cost of hiring people by age brackets. I am including my proposal following Miss Porter's excellent article which I should like to have appear in the RECORD at this point:

OLDER WORKER'S JOB PERFORMANCE

(By Sylvia Porter)

Age makes little, if any, difference in the output of workers in office jobs or in occupations requiring limited physical effort. A worker age 60 performs as well as or even better than one age 30—and if the worker has superior capabilities, he'll turn in a far superior performance at 60 than an average person half his age.

Sex also makes little, if any, difference in jobs which do not demand major physical strength, and what difference does exist is in favor of women. In office jobs women chalk up better scores than men at all ages and the women who achieve the most favorable comparative scores are in the oldest age groups.

Experience is a basic factor affecting the output of an office worker and the consistency of his (or her) performance. The older the worker, the steadier his rate of output, and the experienced individual of 60-plus turns in a more consistent performance than the individual of under 25.

Again and again, over a long stretch of years, I have been writing reports along the above lines—trying unceasingly to help break down the cruel prejudice against the older worker and to help puncture the unjustified bias against women in the labor force.

SOME SUCCESS

A far as women are concerned, those dedicated to battling prejudice have had some success, but we have been tragic failures in our drive for fair treatment of the older worker in the job market.

In fact, the prejudice today seems more virulent than ever—at a time when a cold, hard headed assessment of the capabilities of the older worker never has been more imperative.

For it is the older worker who is most in danger of losing his job in this era of galloping automation of offices and factories.

It is the older worker with a long and satisfactory record of service who is most in danger of finding himself unemployed at an age when he is too old to be hired and still too young to retire.

It is the older worker whom many firms across the Nation refuse to employ because, say they, he will be unable to meet their production standards.

But now comes a new study of comparative job performance by the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics which dramatizes once more the points made at the start of this column about age, sex and experience.

The study, made under the direction of the BLS's James F. Walker, covers 6,000 Federal mail sorters—work typical of office jobs—over an 8-week period in 12 selected cities. The BLS, figures output per man-hour of workers age 35 to 44 as an index of 100, then measures production of various groups against this index base. It finds:

1. "Differences in output among workers at various age levels are largely insignificant and capability for superior performance abounds in all age groups."

The 25–29 age group's output index was 100.1; the 50–54 age group's output index was 100.9; even the groups of 60–65 and 65 and over had an index of 96.2 an unimportant drop.

WOMEN RATE HIGHER

2. "The average performance for all men studied was a little over 3 percent lower than that for all women included in the survey. The higher performance of women was found in each age group and the difference was greatest in the oldest age groups."

Men mail sorters aged 35–44 scored 99.6, while women sorters in this age group scored 101.9. Men aged 55 and over scored 97, while women aged 55 and over scored 101.1.

3. "A significant finding is the evidence of consistency in performance among older workers, attributable to increasing experience on the job. In some situations this steady growth of consistency with age may compensate for a possible slight decline in productivity rates of older workers."

These findings confirm all previous studies of the job performance of office workers. How can employers justify policies and practices which flagrantly discriminate against a worker because of age or sex in view of them? Questions of decency and equity aside, the discrimination doesn't even make good business sense.

H.R. 3431

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by redesignating section 38 as section 39 and by adding after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. CREDIT FOR EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER PERSONS

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an employer (as defined in section 3401(d)), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—The credit allowed an employer by subsection (a) for any taxable year shall be an amount equal to the increase in his cost of doing business during such year which results from the employment of older persons, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. For purposes of this subsection, any expenditure made by an employer in the conduct of his trade or business (including insurance premiums, contributions to pension funds, contributions to medical costs, contributions to workmen's compensation funds, and any other trade or business expense, including the increased cost of training an older worker and increased cost of maintaining an increased medical and nursing staff necessary where older persons are employed, within the meaning of section 162), whether attributable to an individual employee or to the employees of such employer generally, shall be considered an increase in the cost of doing business which results from the employment of older persons to the extent that it would not have been required or made if the age of each employee involved were the lowest age at which an employee could reasonably (and consistently with the sound operation of the trade or business) be hired to perform substantially the same duties (and no factor other than age were taken into account).

"(c) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under the provisions of this part other than this section and sections 31 and 32.

"(d) CREDIT IN ADDITION TO DEDUCTIONS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be in addition to, and shall not reduce or otherwise affect, any deduction which may be allowable under this chapter."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out

"Sec. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 38. Credit for employment of older persons.

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disallowance of credits to individuals paying optional tax or taking standard deduction) is amended by striking out "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof "35, and 38".

(b) Section 37(a) of such Code (relating to retirement income credit) is amended by striking out "and section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and section 38 (relating to credit for employment of older persons)".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

How Popular the Wheat Deal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for inclusion in the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the May 22 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times and which I believe reflects the views of the majority of the citizens of this country on the use of tax dollars to facilitate the sale of subsidized farm products to Communist countries:

HOW POPULAR THE WHEAT DEAL?

When the late President Kennedy authorized the sale of American wheat to Russia last October, we pointed out at the time that such sale was contrary to the declared policy of Congress as expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1961. That act provided that no agricultural commodities on which a Federal subsidy is paid should be sold to Russia. Mr. Kennedy presumed that there had been a change in public sentiment toward such a sale since 1961. He was told by his Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, that public sentiment was running 4 to 1 in favor of the wheat deal.

We expressed doubt at the time about the accuracy of Freeman's statement. A vote in the House Wednesday confirms our belief that a substantial portion of the citizenry opposes the payment of a subsidy to exporters who sell farm products to Communist countries. An effort to kill the wheat deal, made by Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, failed by just one vote. The test was largely a party matter; 182 Democrats and 5 Republicans voted for the deal and 30 Democrats and 156 Republicans voted against it.

Two Florida Democrats were present but passed their vote. Fifty-six Representatives—39 Democrats and 17 Republicans—were listed as not voting and presumably were absent. Any two of these might have tipped the result against the sale of subsidized wheat to Russia. The sale continues but it can hardly be said that it is immensely popular with the taxpayers.

Amendment of Federal Bail Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor three bills to amend the Federal bail laws. These bills would ease the financial burden which the Federal bail laws place on indigent defendants.

The first bill provides that no person shall be denied bail solely because he is financially unable to post bond. Rather, any indigent defendant may be released on a personal guarantee, subject to such conditions as the court or commissioner might reasonably prescribe to assure his appearance—unless there is good cause shown why the indigent defendant should not be released. It is simple justice that indigent persons who are not shown to be likely to violate the conditions of their bond be released pending trial.

The second bill would provide that any convicted defendant who is confined because he is unable to post bail would receive credit toward his sentence for time spent in confinement.

The third bill would allow persons admitted to bail to make a cash deposit with the court instead of having to supply sureties or other collateral security often required by professional bail bondsmen. It would also allow bail to those

who could not find a bondsman willing to write a bond for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is unjust that while our law provides an absolute right to bail in other than capital cases, this right can be very easily nullified at the discretion of private persons; for a bondsman is not required to write a bond just because a court has set bail, and the bondsman's decision may not be reviewed by a court no matter how arbitrary his refusal.

Because present bail laws discriminate against the poor, only the defendant who has money can be free before his trial to prepare for his defense. These laws violate the spirit of the sixth amendment to the Constitution which forbids imposition of excessive bail. They contradict our heritage of equal justice under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is appropriate that these measures guaranteeing equal justice to rich and poor alike be considered by the House as a vital part of the President's war on poverty, and that we should carry this war on poverty to the field of administration of criminal justice.

A New View of Government by the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Walter F. Carey, a Michigan man, has been elected president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. His acceptance speech to this high post, made on April 29, should be read by everyone. It is notable in the fact that he does not regard the American Government as a hostile power. I commend him for his attitude, for his "can-do" ability, and for his positive approach. It is mighty refreshing:

STATEMENT OF WALTER F. CAREY, PRESIDENT OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

In the entire range of human endeavor there have been only a few who really have merited the mantle of greatness—giants who left bright beacons to help guide humanity across the misty reaches of time.

Most of us, in our own few moments, can only strive to add a little fuel to the beacons—to do what we can to preserve and progress the principles, ideals, and institutions entrusted to our care.

And strive we must, without ever underestimating either our responsibility or our collective potential for significant contribution in mankind's stumbling pursuit of the great dream.

We are meeting today in an era which history will record as a time of unprecedented social and economic revolution all over the globe.

Will future historians report that this revolution found us wanting; that it undermined our system and trampled our ideals and institutions?

Or will they write that this was our finest hour—the turning point when the fires of yearning which burned in so many individual hearts began consolidating into a single universal torch, lighting the way for all men and making the great dream a living reality?

You and I need apologize to no man for our dedication to the American system and the great ideals which are, at once, both the foundation and the goal of that system.

We want to make that system work to the full, and to yield the good life not just for ourselves but for all Americans—and someday, perhaps, for all the people of the world.

As American businessmen we can be justly proud of the contribution we have made toward the common objective.

But our country continues to be plagued by complex and serious problems.

I suggest that the magnitude of these problems and the stakes involved demand a degree of partnership and cooperation between American business and American government surpassing anything we have ever known. I am not the first to say this, but no one has meant it more sincerely.

The vast majority of those who comprise the government are reasonable and moderate men, with their sights set upon the same goals which beckon to us. I believe they should and would welcome such a partnership and that, together, we can handle any problem confronting us.

It is my firm conviction that we, the business leaders of the Nation who comprise this federation, possess tremendous capacity for finding and helping to carry out solutions to these problems.

I am not so positive, however, that we have yet assumed a degree of responsibility commensurate with our can-do ability.

It is not enough—not nearly enough—only to sit in judgement on solutions or ideas put forth by others.

We should be positive in our approach. We must originate and initiate. We must approach the problems of the Nation with the same zest and energy with which we tackle the challenges of our own business

We love our country as much and our stake in its future certainly is as great as that other group of men who collectively constitute the Government.

Who can say, then, that our responsibility for assuring that future is any less, for example, than that of the President in the White House or the Senators and Congressmen who labor on the Hill.

With your permission and in your behalf, I would like to offer to them, without equivocation or reservation and without regard to political persuasion, our hands, our minds, and our hearts.

As I accept the high office you have given me, I am unable to reward you with any great new programs or brilliant solutions.

I can only share with you my dream of a bright new era of business and Government cooperation and partnership.

I shall dedicate myself to that objective with every confidence that, with your support, it can be attained.

President Johnson Honored by University of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, our great President, Lyndon Johnson, received fitting recognition from the University of Michigan last Friday, when that famous institution of higher learning conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of civil law.

In paying this tribute to President Johnson, the remarks of Dr. Hatcher, president of the University were particularly appropriate and, I ask unanimous consent that the citation accompanying the honorary degree be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The citation follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN HONORARY DEGREES, DOCTOR OF CIVIL LAW, MAY 1964

Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States. Assuming an office which an act of wanton hatred had left vacant, President Johnson picked up the reins of Government with an assurance born of understanding and experience and entered upon a task for which he was preeminently fitted: a ministry of reconciliation joined with vigorous pursuit of peace and human welfare. He has labored to improve the lot of citizens deprived of civil rights and of economic opportunity; he has yet avoided those doctrinaire antagonisms which can render the most humane of purposes inhumane. He has shown a realistic awareness of human complexity, a worthily American respect for diversity, and a will to act always in the spirit of an immortal predecessor—"with malice toward none and with charity for all." Upon this greatly gifted man and leader of men, the university respectfully confers the degree doctor of civil law.

Tribute to Rudolph Friml

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the illustrious musical career of Rudolph Friml, a resident of Los Angeles since 1907 and now living at 8782 Applan Way, Hollywood, Calif. An octogenarian, Mr. Friml is the last of the giants from that golden era of American musicals which gave us Victor Herbert, Jerome Kern, George Gershwin, and Otto Harbach.

Born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, Mr. Friml studied at the Prague Conservatory with the distinguished composer Dvorak, and piano with Jiranek. He first came to the United States as a concert pianist. But with his first operetta, "The Firefly," his career was channeled into the field of composition. As a composer his many successful Broadway musicals, including "Rose Marie," "The Vagabond King," "Three Musketeers," and several of the Ziegfeld Follies, have contributed such outstanding songs as "Indian Love Call," "Rose Marie," "March of the Vagabonds," "Only a Rose," "Giannina Mia," "Donkey Serenade," and literally hundreds of others.

This distinguished composer and pianist is a charter member of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, now celebrating the 50th year of its founding. Stanley Adams, ASCAP president, recently wrote of Rudolf Friml:

His career stands as an inspiration, not only to all his fellow colleagues in ASCAP, but to all Americans who have ever loved a beautiful song.

Residual Oil Relief for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, there was a recent news item to the effect that the GAO's Defense Accounting and Auditing Director had brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense the subject of unnecessary buttonholes in Navy coats. GAO estimated that by 1966 $60,000 will be spent needlessly by the Department of Defense unless it does something about these empty holes.

Sixty thousand dollars, even in this era of the $100 billion budget is a substantial saving, and I certainly hope the Secretary will take action to plug up these holes.

This is of particular interest to me, however, in view of recent communications I have had with the Secretary of Defense with regard to excess costs his Department is incurring as a result of the mandatory oil import program.

My concern with this program and the fact that it has cost the Defense Department over $50 million in excess fuel costs, stems to a large degree from my concern over the economic hardship the people of New England have suffered and are still suffering because of the continuing restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil. This is the fuel we must have in New England to heat our hospitals, schools, and apartment houses, to power our industries and to generate our electricity.

Certain recent developments and particularly a decision by the Secretary of the Interior clearly show the absurdity of continuing this program.

On March 22, 1964, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, GSA Administrator wrote to the Chairman of the Oil Import Appeals Board pointing out that because of residual import controls, GSA was experiencing extreme difficulty in obtaining sufficient oil to heat Government buildings in the Washington area. Mr. Boutin pointed out that it was costing the Government between $500,000 and $700,000 a year to obtain fuel because GSA had no import quota. The following editorial from the May 4, 1964, Boston Herald I think, very concisely summarizes the ridiculousness of this situation:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald May 4, 1964]

GOVERNMENT AGAINST ITSELF

The Federal Government is so big that no one should be surprised that it sometimes catches itself by its own tail. So the incident we are about to relate is not unique and probably isn't very funny, as things go in Washington.

But what has happened is that the Government-instituted pinch on the imports of residual fuel oil is pinching the Government. Non-Government users of this cheap fuel oil, particularly in New England, are also painfully pinched (all for an illusory benefit to the soft coal industry), but they squeal in vain against the powerful coal lobby. Here, now, is an agency of Government squealing.

The General Services Administration provides heating fuels for Government buildings in Washington. It supplies 1.2 million barrels of residual oil annually.

The unjustified import restrictions have hurt the GSA—as they have hurt private users—by increasing the cost of residual and making its orderly purchase difficult.

With the oil in short supply and importers limited, it has become strictly a sellers' market. The GSA can no longer get competing bids from suppliers, and the lack of competition has forced it to pay from $500,000 to $700,000 a year more than it would if it could get competing bids.

The importers who used to supply GSA got import allocations as a result. But they don't have to sell to the GSA now; they can look for more desirable customers.

The GSA asked for transfer of the import allocations to itself, but got turned down by the Oil Import Administration. It is caught in a preposterous squeeze. But then, so are other residual users all over the east coast.

The contrived shortage of residual oil has hurt consumers, disorganized distribution and injured the economy of Venezuela, the major exporter. It helps nobody but the lucky dealers with import allocations. It does not help employment in the coal mines and it does not help the domestic oil industry, which is discontinuing the production of residual.

Here is Government not only against itself but against a lot outside of Government. The import restrictions must be lifted.

GSA's appeal fell on sympathetic ears and on May 7, 1964, the Secretary of the Interior announced that GSA had been granted an allocation of 1 million barrels of residual fuel oil imports to be used in meeting requirements for Federal Government installations in the Washington, D.C., area. I think the following quote from the Interior Department's announcement of this decision is most revealing:

A Department of the Interior spokesman pointed out that the allocation was made in the public interest to relieve the General Services Administration of the difficulties it has experienced in obtaining supplies of residual fuel oil necessary to discharge its responsibilities in the Washington metropolitan area.

On Monday, May 18, 1964, the Boston Herald seized on the key phrase in the Department's announcement that its decision to grant GSA's appeal was made "in the public interest" and printed the following editorial with a plea to the Secretary of the Interior to further "serve the public interest by removing all import curbs on residual":

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, May 18, 1964]

OIL IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The Government has decided to stop punishing itself by half a million dollars a year. The Department of the Interior has granted the General Services Administration an import quota for a million barrels of residual oil. This means that GSA can now get several bids for the heavy heating oil needed for Government buildings in Washington and not have to pay what some importer with a quota can exact virtually without competition.

This is the same costly position that utilities, industries and building owners and State and local governments all up and down the Eastern seaboard find themselves in. They are having to pay millions of dollars more for residual oil because the coal interests have unwarrantedly pressured the Government into import restrictions on this inexpensive fuel. But these sufferers have so far cried in vain.

GSA did not cry in vain. Interior decided that "in the public interest" GSA should be able to buy for a competitive price.

"In the public interest."

Why is it not also in the public interest that the Boston Edison and other utilities up here should be able to buy in an open market? It is nice that the tax-consuming GSA can buy oil at a fair price; why wouldn't it be nice if taxpaying users of electricity could enjoy similar beneficial consequences of completitively priced oil?

Not to mention the Defense Department, which has no import allocation either, and uses much more residual oil than GSA. Here the Government is still punishing itself to the tune of $8 or $9 million a year.

Yes, the department that casts a sternly economizing eye on the Navy yard and the Watertown Arsenal, is still overpaying by millions for the residual oil it uses.

In fact Congressman BATES has just reminded Secretary McNamara that the whole oil import control program—crude products and residual—has cost the Department over $50 million in premium prices since its imposition in 1959. Government against itself.

(Residual oil is, however, in a special class, because its importation does not displace domestic production, which is rapidly falling to zero.)

Yes, the Interior Department is correct. A free market in residual oil is in the public interest. Secretary Udall, to whom President Johnson has entrusted the Government's oil policies, can serve the public interest by removing all import curbs on residual.

With this as background, I would like to introduce at this point the full text of my letter to the Secretary of Defense on May 15, 1964:

MAY 15, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On February 28, 1964, I wrote to you with regard to excess costs incurred by the Department of Defense as a result of the mandatory oil import program.

I knew that you were most anxious to find ways to reduce operating costs of the Defense Establishment. This would be a saving, I would like to stress, which could be realized without causing the discharge of a single Defense Department employee in contrast to the loss of hundreds of jobs every time a Defense Establishment, such as the arsenal in Watertown, Mass., is closed. That is why I thought you might like to consider this possibility of saving your Department an additional several million dollars every year.

On March 2, 1964, Deputy Assistant Secretary Paul H. Riley wrote to me that although the Defense Department did not agree with all parts of the mandatory oil import control program, it would be impractical to request exemption from controls relating to residual fuel oil.

It is true that my original suggestion to you related only to Defense exemption from residual controls but in light of Mr. Riley's answer and in view of recent information coming to my attention, I think it would be

proper for you at this time to review the cost to the Department of Defense of the entire oil import control program.

I have been informed that every year the Defense Establishment under current controls has authorized quotas for the import of approximately 15 million barrels of finished and residual petroleum products. It is my further understanding that the greatest differential between offshore and domestic price is provided by jet fuel, combat motor gasoline and residual fuel oil, and that these are the products imported by the Defense Establishment.

As you are aware, the mandatory oil import control program has been in effect since March 1959. Your own Department estimated in September 1962 that from the program's inception through June 1962 the cost to the military because of inadequate Defense Department quotas under the mandatory oil import control program totaled $26.5 million. It would be reasonable to assume that this figure has at least doubled in the last 2 years.

It is my conviction that the Defense Department, in the interest of national economy, should be exempt from this program.

Ample precedence for such a request can be found, I believe, in a recent decision by the Oil Import Administration of the Interior Department relating to the General Services Administration (GSA).

On March 23, 1964, GSA appealed to the Chairman of the Interior Department's Oil Import Appeals Board for relief from difficulties being experienced as a result of the oil import control program. GSA requested that it be granted its own allocation to import residual fuel oil. In its appeal GSA pointed out that because of restrictions imposed by the control program, it was paying $500,000 to $700,000 in premium prices every year to obtain sufficient residual fuel oil for use in Government buildings in the Washington, D.C., area alone. I believe you will find that corresponding excess costs are being incurred by the Defense Department in its petroleum purchases.

In the interest of national economy, I strongly urge you to look into this situation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. BATES.

I certainly agree with the Boston Herald that if relief for GSA was in the public interest, then similar relief for the Defense Department and all other residual oil consumers should be forthcoming immediately. Residual fuel oil import restrictions should be terminated immediately.

Voluntary Wheat Program With Teeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, looking back on my vote in opposition to the politically inspired wheat-cotton bill, which passed the House by such a narrow margin, the only second thought I have had on the matter is the firm conviction that were the issue again before us, I would repeat my original action.

Despite the pious affirmation that the legislation is strictly voluntary it is becoming increasingly apparent that the armtwisting for which this administration is famed is being applied in a not-too subtle fashion. Included with these remarks is an article by Harold Hawley appearing in the May 1964 issue of the "American Agriculturist." Therein set forth are Mr. Hawley's comments on the un-American assumption that a man is presumed guilty until he is proved innocent. May I suggest that you read the entire article to get an idea where we may be going—even with a program long since renounced by American wheatgrowers.

A TURNING POINT

There is a card in our files which we will keep—not because it gives us any satisfaction, but because it is possibly a most significant communication.

Many of you received a similar one from your ASC office. It says that we must request measurement of our wheat acreage or it will be assumed we are overplanted. In the event of a future wheat program with acreage controls we will then automatically be penalized because of the alleged overplanting.

Can this be America? Since when has a man been guilty unless he proves himself innocent? Is there any basis in law for any Government official to issue a directive which is in contradiction to the basic foundation of the laws of the land? So far as I am concerned, it is no one's business how much wheat I have this year, inasmuch as the wheat referendum was defeated last spring.

However, that is not the point. Neither is it the point that the administration pushed a bill which would again provide for a referendum on a certificate wheat plan after we had overwhelmingly said "No" on this once. Makes you wonder what you have to say to say "No."

The point I want to make is that for the first time in my experience I have been treated like a citizen would be in some other countries. I have been told I will be assumed to be guilty and be penalized accordingly unless I prove myself innocent.

I fear this could mark a turning point in this country of ours if it is allowed to go unchallenged. No one, no matter how highly placed, should have the power or the audacity to issue such a directive unless and until we first go through the formality of scrapping the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Some legislators with whom I have discussed this were both surprised and indignant that this could happen. Have you told your Congressman and Senator about your card? I sincerely hope you will, because I think we have started around a wrong turn. Now is the time to correct this.

Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NESCOPEK AREA JOINT SCHOOLS,
Nescopeck, Pa., May 20, 1964.

DEAR MR. BECKER: We all watched you today and were proud of you. Your sincerity is the factor that will carry you through any debate. Our kids even cheered when you got in a few licks. We were prepared for the first amendment Bill of Rights and what version of the Bible arguments. I am firmly convinced that none of these would be effective if people would take time and be informed. Perhaps a little more explanation of these things would be effective. Can't we get one candidate to take a stand on this issue? This would force the others to do the same. Enclose find copy of my Memorial Day address to be delivered on Sunday, May 24. Can we do anything?

Sincerely,

CHET DOYLE.

The Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me I wish to include at this point in the RECORD the remarks I made during the hearings of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee:

THE LATE HONORABLE CLARENCE CANNON

Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning the House Appropriations Committee suffered a great loss in the death of our beloved chairman, CLARENCE CANNON. The sudden and untimely passing of Mr. CANNON has shocked and saddened us all. To his family, it has brought a sorrow that will ease with time—but never cease. Among his friends and colleagues, it has left an emptiness that will be filled with memories—but never a replacement.

More than just an admired and respected colleague, Mr. CANNON was a true and devoted friend whose death came as a great personal loss to me. His advice and assistance were always welcomed because I knew they were based on sound judgment and unfailing loyalty.

He was truly a dedicated man. One of the memories that I will always cherish is the opportunity that I had to serve under him on the House Appropriations Committee. Throughout our service together, my respect and admiration for him grew ever greater with the passing of years. No Member of the House of Representatives had greater wisdom or influence. He could be gentle, but he could also act with the strength and toughness of a man who knows no fear. He stamped the print of his personality on the course of events in this committee as few men have done. When we consider the stature of the man, we realize that anything we might say about him would be an understatement. I never met a man who did not respect him. Driven by an indefatigable determination to pursue and fulfill all his dreams, he set his goals high.

As chairman of the great House Appropriations Committee he held tightly the purse strings of our Government's expenditures in an effort to curb unnecessary spending and extravagance. As a parliamentarian, he was without equal. He was an outstanding legislator, and his love for this great country of ours was unsurpassed.

I find words, mere words, truly are inadequate to express the emotions and sentiments that well up in my heart on this occasion. I extend to his beloved wife and the other members of the family my deepest sympathy in their great sorrow.

Plight of Haitian Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, too little attention has been paid to the plight of 5,000 Haitian refugees who have fled Francois Duvalier's brutal dictatorship. The situation of these refugees is desperate. They lack work, adequate food, and shelter; they live in squalor.

I take this opportunity to call this body's attention to a letter which appeared in the May 25 New York Times by Nicholas Duke Biddle, chairman of the Caribbean Committee, International Rescue Committee. Mr. Biddle points out that these people have received little meaningful assistance and that the Dominican Republic, the country to which the refugees have filed, has been unable to ease their situation. Mr. Biddle concludes by making the following point:

If the United States is still interested in the encouragement of democratic forces in our own hemisphere, we cannot afford to ignore the desperate plight of these Haitian victims of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am inserting Mr. Biddle's excellent letter in the RECORD:

PLIGHT OF HAITIAN REFUGEES—VICTIMS OF TERROR REPORTED LIVING IN ABJECT POVERTY

To the EDITOR:

The recent arbitrary expulsion of the Episcopal Bishop of Haiti by the country's dictatorial ruler is only one of many similar acts of repression and terror committed by Dr. François Duvalier and his colleagues. Only a few weeks earlier the Haitian tyrant installed himself as President for life, thereby indicating a reign of indefinite misery for the unfortunate Haitian people.

By now the civilized world is no longer shocked by such behavior on the part of Dr. Duvalier. But what surprises we who follow the explosive Caribbean situation closely is the almost total apathy on the part of the United States toward this cruel regime.

Perhaps the least known aspect of Dr. Duvalier's repression is the exodus to the Dominican Republic of more than 5,000 refugees. A good many of them were harshly victimized by the Haitian dictator and his band of brigands—the ton-ton Macoute. These refugees include much of Haiti's very small elite—students, teachers, professionals, artisans, civil servants, and a small number of labor, business, community, and political leaders. Presumably among them are the nucleus of a decently governed future Haiti.

Today the vast majority of these refugees are living in the most abject poverty. Without work, inadequately fed and clothed, sheltered in primitive huts with mud floors and no sanitation, they have become the "forgotten refugees of the Caribbean." Except for some modest support from the International Rescue Committee and an occasional donation on the spot, they have received no meaningful outside assistance and the Dominican economy has been unable to help them.

We have good reason to recall similar Caribbean experiences in the recent past. If the United States is still interested in the encouragement of democratic forces in our own hemisphere, we cannot afford to ignore the desperate plight of these Haitian victims of tyranny.

NICHOLAS DUKE BIDDLE,
Chairman, Caribbean Committee, International Rescue Committee.
NEW YORK, *May 15, 1964.*

Henry J. Kaiser

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of my fondest and most honored privileges as a Member of Congress was to support the authorization of a gold medal—the Congressional Medal of National Honor—for Henry J. Kaiser.

The awarding of this medal to Henry Kaiser is long overdue. His overwhelming accomplishments toward Allied victory in World War II alone have earned for him our respect and tribute in the manner H.J. Res. 1020 authorized.

Moreover, his private medical care program and his imaginative solutions to age-old labor-management problems single out Henry J. Kaiser as a man who has contributed to the welfare of all mankind for all times.

He has indeed helped his neighbor, not only by his physical accomplishments, but more significantly, by his ability to inspire all men to rise above their physical adversity and mental despair and look within themselves for new strength, courage, and resoluteness.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my friends to listen to a few excerpts of an interview with Mr. Kaiser that a Christian Science Monitor reporter wrote some time ago. The reporter catches what I think is the essence of the man:

"My mother used to say," Henry J. Kaiser told this correspondent at the beginning of a long interview, "that if she could only give me one thing, it would be joy in work."

Norman Vincent Peale once said that Mr. Kaiser would have made an outstanding preacher—but that if he had become one, American industry would have lost one of its most brilliant figures. Neither field—preaching nor industry—has been the loser. Given the opportunity, Mr. Kaiser enjoys probing the spiritual implications of his work.

These implications, as he sees them, are the limitless possibilities of human achievement.

Somebody was standing beside him at Bonneville Dam once and asked, "How did you do it?" Mr. Kaiser said one word, "Faith."

But he tells the story somewhat differently. He says he did it because he put the work in charge of young men who didn't know that it couldn't be done. There's a saying of Jesus that he likes to quote more than any other: "All things are possible to him that believeth." Mr. Kaiser takes this literally.

How does a man, though, decide what is the impossible thing he ought to tackle? What leads a man to his career?

Mr. Kaiser started speaking thoughtfully, almost to himself.

"What to do?" he mused. "For 8 years * * * I didn't know what it was that I should do. I found the greatest thing is something simple.

"It is to fill human needs.

"It is not to work for profit. To meet human needs is always the sound thing to do."

He looked for an example and took it from his early entry into the highway construction business.

"We could not get the amount of cement we needed," he said. "The western cement makers said they had 7-million-barrel capacity and were using only 6. What they meant, of course, was at their price. So we went into the cement business."

"It was the same with shipbuilding.

"The British couldn't get ships as fast as their ships were being sunk. There was a need. So we made ships.

"The only reason we are in the Hawaiian Islands is that there is a need. * * *

"There's no such thing as security. You find the way if you are interested in meeting human needs."

Mr. Kaiser saw a new field for needmeeting in South America.

"In August 1954," he said, "I traveled 75,000 miles on three trips around South America. I saw that it must be industrialized. The United States has grown great by selling people on the idea that they can have more things, and if they need more and haven't the money, they can have credit.

"I had no trouble with Peron. He knew what I could do. So we went down there to make automobiles.

"Today about 90 percent of the auto is made in Argentina. At first it was 40 percent. Next year it will be 100 percent. Orders are stacked up—for jeeps, trucks, passenger cars."

Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Kaiser is a leader of men, a leader completely and unselfishly devoted to making our world a more livable place. This Congress should take the leadership initiative and honor this dedicated human being. I trust that House Joint Resolution 1020 can be introduced again at a later date, and that it will meet with the approval of my colleagues.

Shortage of Coins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the present shortage of coins in the United States is a matter of serious concern. It is possible that the Senate will soon clear the way to provide funds for the operation of Government mints on a round-the-clock basis to improve this situation. This step and other courses of action have been strongly urged by the Maryland Bankers Association. For the RECORD I would like to submit a resolution of the Maryland Bankers Association on this subject:

RESOLUTION OF THE MARYLAND BANKERS ASSOCIATION

The Maryland Bankers Association is cognizant of the acute shortage of coins which has developed throughout the country during the past several years and is aware that the present shortage of coins will continue until the proposed new mint facilities in Philadelphia are brought into production.

Temporary relief is available if the present mint facilities are used to their fullest and if these facilities are supplemented by using private commercial facilities under proper controls. However, funds are needed to enable the Bureau of the Mint to adopt these procedures: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to give immediate consideration to appropriate the necessary funds to utilize to the fullest the facilities of the Philadelphia and Denver Mints and to utilize private commercial facilities to augment Government mint facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury, acting through the Administrator of the General Services, give the highest priority to the construction of the new mint facilities at Philadelphia already authorized by Public Law 88-102 of the 88th Congress of the United States and that the Congress of the United States to make the necessary appropriations to cover the cost of such a building.

Increase in Oil Import Seen Appalachia Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about problems of Appalachia and the need for some direction by the Federal Government in attacking these problems. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we cannot stand much more attention. The recent action of Secretary of the Interior Udall in increasing residual fuel imports will cost my State well over $40 million a year.

To portray this damage, I include, under unanimous consent, with my remarks, an interview published in the Charleston Gazette with Mr. Walter R. Thurmond, an informed member on West Virginia economic difficulties:

INCREASE IN OIL IMPORTS SEEN APPALACHIA BLOW

(By George Lawless)

A leading coal industry figure said Friday an authorized 63,000-barrel-per-day increase in residual oil imports will cost the Appalachian area economy more than $50 million per year.

Walter R. Thurmond, of Charleston, retired secretary of the Southern Coal Producers Association, said the Executive order issued Thursday by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall would:

Displace more than 2,000 coal mining jobs with an average of 4 dependents per family.

Increase oil imports more than 20 percent—largest quota increase in history—at a time when domestic consumption is declining.

"In addition, the increase of 23 million barrels of foreign oil every year will mean that coal producers can't find a market for 5.5 million tons of coal. This will eliminate an unknown number of railroad jobs and service industries," he added.

Thurmond, who said he was speaking as an individual and not for the Southern Coal Producers Association, pointed out that West Virginia will be the hardest hit State if the Executive order is carried out.

In the face of President Johnson's declaration that the Appalachian area is a poverty-stricken area, it just doesn't make sense," Thurmond declared. He added that the order is directly contrary to previous statements made by Secretary Udall regarding quotas.

Udall announced that starting April 1 the maximum daily amount of residual fuel oil that can be imported under license to the east coast will rise from 575,000 to 638,000 barrels—an increase of 63,000 barrels daily. Venezuela is the largest foreign supplier of fuel oil to the United States.

Anticipating criticism from coal mining interests, which have long opposed increasing residual oil competition, Udall said: "The new level is consistent with the national security objectives of the total oil import program. It takes into account the continued decline in domestic production and an anticipated substantial increase in industrial activity."

Coal men have long maintained that if foreign competition was curtailed, the industry could adequately service the east coast industrial areas in any emergency.

Udall said the new quota level is higher because east coast stocks are at relatively low levels. His edict requires that three-fourths of the oil quotas be imported by next January 31, to assure that adequate supplies of residual oil will be available during the winter months, when demand is usually highest.

"There is a great need of regulating quotas by law rather than by Executive edict," Thurmond asserted. He said bills are pending both in the House and Senate which should be speedily advanced and enacted to correct the oil import situation. Thurmond urged all persons who are directly or indirectly dependent upon the coal industry to "communicate protests to their Congressmen, the President, and the Secretary of the Interior."

He said it is not just the coal industry's responsibility to safeguard its markets, but the responsibility of every citizen of West Virginia, including State officials of all ranks.

"West Virginia can't afford to lose business to Venezuela and other countries while many of its miners already are walking the streets looking for jobs that are not to be found," the veteran coal executive declared.

"Neither can our coal producers—now in their longest period of low profits and high expenses, afford to sit idle. The miner needs employment and the producer needs markets," Thurmond stated.

Economic Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the need to apply our research and development skills to the problem of preparing for the inevitable cutbacks in defense spending is becoming increasingly acute.

The inadequacy of our efforts to date was outlined recently in a fine article by Vincent Burke of the Los Angeles Times. Under unanimous consent I include his article, which appeared on May 17, 1964, in the RECORD:

NEEDED: SOME R. & D. ON CONVERSION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRY CAPABILITIES

(By Vincent J. Burke)

WASHINGTON.—This is a time of uncertainty and apprehension for many defense contractors, their employees, and the communities dependent upon their payrolls.

After a period of rapid growth, Government orders for development and production of weapons have "peaked" and started to decline. There already have been some layoffs. More are expected.

Although few here anticipate a precipitous drop in defense procurement over the next 5 years, even a modest cutback could have adverse affects on those industrial areas on the west, east, and gulf coasts where production for the military market is concentrated.

For example, during the fiscal year ended last June 30, California firms were awarded $5.8 billion, or 23 percent of the $25.2 billion in military prime contracts. New York State was second with $2.5 billion. Contracts totaling more than $1 billion went to each of six States—Massachusetts, Washington, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas.

In this period of transition into an uncharted future, many questions are being asked for which no answers are forthcoming in Washington.

Will the Federal Government take steps to create, or help create, new nondefense markets for defense contractors? Will it permit some of the resarch and development teams, which succeeded in creating fantastic new weapons systems, to be disbanded for lack of defense demands? Or will it try to channel their defense skills and know-how into the solution of domestic problems?

Some Government officials foresee the possibility that in the years ahead the Government may offer industrial firms a chance to compete for contracts to develop for a profit medical and educational and other civilian programs just as they have produced missiles, bombers, and tanks.

The future now is uncharted largely because President Johnson as yet has no policy for dealing with problems of "economic conversion" that may arise, if defense procurement continues to decline.

Moreover, the President has made it clear that he doesn't even want to discuss the issue with worried lawmakers from defense areas who are insistent that a Federal policy be formulated.

Opinion is divided as to whether Mr. Johnson will feel compelled before the November election to chart the beginning of some policies in this field.

The Members of Congress who are concerned are stepping up pressure on the President to give the problem higher priority.

The issue is now assured a congressional airing.

Starting a week from today, the Senate Commerce Committee will begin public hearings on a bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, composed of chiefs of nine Federal agencies and headed by the Secretary of Commerce.

The proposed Commission would be staffed by Presidential appointment and would be required to submit recommendations within a year on policies and programs that should be adopted to help defense industries with declining military orders convert to peacetime production.

REQUIRE PLAN

The bill also would require that a national "conversion" conference be convened.

In addition, it would require, as a condition for obtaining defense contracts, that every company which has more than one-fourth of its employees working on defense contracts set up a committee to plan for "conversion" in case defense business slackens.

The Johnson administration opposes the bill, which has 14 sponsors in the Senate and 20 in the House.

Almost a dozen Federal agencies, including the Defense Department, have submitted written reports to the committee saying the

proposed Commission is unneeded because the President already has set up an interdepartmental committee to study the problem.

The Presidential group is known as the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament.

SEPTEMBER DUE DATE

Mr. Johnson ordered it created last December 21. He announced its membership on March 25. The 10-man panel is headed by Gordon Ackley, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Ordering a study is the classic method by which a President can sweep a problem under the rug until such time as events require him to give it serious attention. The White House has indicated that Ackley's group will not be ready before September to make even a preliminary report.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, a leading sponsor of the proposed "conversion commission," has interrogated Ackley and concluded that the study in this instance is "more form than substance."

"Ackley's group has done very little long-range planning," MCGOVERN concluded. "I don't think it is doing the job that needs doing. It has no staff, no budget, no legislative authority. It is composed of extremely busy people who have full-time responsibilities for other matters."

AID ANSWERS

A similar complaint comes from Representative R. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts, leader of a bipartisan group of 26 House Members who have tried in vain to get an appointment with Mr. Johnson to discuss the policies needed to "ease the economic transition."

Their first letter to the President brought a reply from White House aid Lawrence O'Brien that closest attention was being given the problem by Ackley's group.

MORSE wrote the President again, saying the problem is "more immediate than the present timetable of the (Ackley) committee indicates" and asking again for an appointment for the congressional group.

Again the President did not reply directly. MORSE got a letter from Ackley saying the President had suggested that Ackley meet with MORSE's group.

Ackley will testify at the Senate hearings a week from tomorrow. MORSE's group probably will meet with Ackley behind closed doors later that week.

SOME COUNTERPARTS

In its report on McGovern's bill, the Defense Department sought to put into perspective the economic impact of a decline in defense spending.

It said that only about $20 billion of the approximately $50 billion a year the Defense Department is spending goes for uniquely military hard goods. Moreover, this includes items with commercial counterparts such as trucks, transport planes and certain components of weapons systems.

Thus, it contended that only about $10 billion represents the hard-core military sector of the economy which would be difficult to change over to civilian uses in event of drastic disarmament.

Moreover, it recalled that after the Korean war there was a massive loss of defense business for the Middle West where military orders (for tanks and ordnance) then were concentrated.

PROBLEM DIFFERS

"The very fact that many people to this day, remain wholly unaware how smoothly many quite severe problems can be handled provided overall economic demand remains strong."

But the conversion problem today is different. Our fantastic new weapons systems have to a large extent been developed by aerospace and other contractors who have no experience in producing for the consumer market and the consumer market is almost saturated now.

Thus, regardless of what anyone says, a decline in this Government-created defense market will pose serious economic and political problems with which Washington sooner or later will have to grapple.

Drugging and Blackmail in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the despicable means being employed by the Soviet Union to compromise and subvert representatives of the United States and other Western nations in that country seem to be of only mild concern to our State Department.

In March, three American and one British military attaches were drugged in Odessa so that they could be photographed for purposes of blackmailing them into helping the Russians. This should call for the strongest of protests from the State Department, but it objected only mildly and then only after the American press began asking questions about the incident.

Aside from the hazards to our security which are involved in these Communist tactics, we should all be concerned over the possibility that the failure of the State Department to protect and support American diplomatic and military personnel on duty in the Soviet Union can result in the refusal of able, conscientious public servants to accept assignment to that country.

And this, of course, may be the real, long-range purpose of these vile Kremlin tactics, perhaps of greater importance to the Reds than the gaining of any immediate knowledge of American diplomatic or military planning.

The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial published on May 10, 1964, entitled "Drugging and Blackmail in Russia," ably set forth the obligation upon our State Department to more vigorously protest these activities of the Soviet Government. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point:

DRUGGING AND BLACKMAIL IN RUSSIA

The U.S. Government has issued what seems a surprisingly mild verbal protest to the Soviet Government over the drugging of three American military attachés in Odessa, Russia, last March.

Britain joined in our protest, since one of their naval atachés who was traveling with the Americans also was drugged, although they didn't appear particularly excited about the incident. "This sort of thing happens quite often," a British foreign office spokesman noted.

Indeed it does.

But this hardly seems reason for either the American or British Governments to adopt such a blase attitude over the affair. There are clear indications, in fact, that the State Department wouldn't have bothered to say anything publicly about the whole messy business had not a published press report led to further questions by newsmen.

When foreigners, especially Western embassy personnel, are victimized in Russia, quite obviously the Soviet Government is responsible. And almost always the purpose of the action is to gain information in one way or another from the victims.

The most common means of doing this is through blackmail. The drugged or intoxicated victim is frequently photographed while unconscious after first being posed in a compromising position, sometimes even engaged in purported acts of sexual perversion. Such photos are then used in an attempt to browbeat the victim into helping the Russians.

This has happened not only to Western embassy personnel but also to ordinary tourists and at least one American newswoman. The most notorious recent case involved William Vassall, a British Admiralty clerk. Vassall was blackmailed into spying for the Rusians after he was photographed engaging in homosexual practices at a Moscow party. Vassall later claimed he had been so drunk he didn't know what was happening.

This is a revolting and vicious business. That it goes on all the time, with Western embassy personnel forewarned that it could happen to them, is no reason for the State Department to seek to keep it unpublicized. For one thing, Americans who might someday tour Russia deserve ample warning of the risks they run.

And most importantly, the vile methods used by the Communists for their own purposes should be exposed whenever they occur.

Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr Speaker:

Men of perverse opinion do not know
The excellence of what is in their hands
Until someone dash it from them.

Sophocles.

It takes a long time to bring excellence to maturity.

Publilius Syrus.

Experience is an arch to build upon.

Henry Adams.

And long experience made him sage.

John Gay.

These are a few of the thoughts that come to mind when we contemplate the remarkable record of Congressman CLARENCE CANNON. The fate of this Republic has always rested in the hands of strong men who have it in their power to do well or ill. How fortunate we are that so many have chosen to serve the public interest with devotion and fortitude. Their careers have meant to them the establishment of justice and freedom and opportunity, instead of the grasp of personal power and privilege.

Mr. CANNON gave a lifetime—a long and arduous lifetime—to the development of a single arm of this Nation's Government. Early in his youth he chose a definite field in which he might work out his destiny, and he labored in

it until the end. We congratulate his native State, Missouri, on its wisdom in placing his ability and selflessness at the disposal of Congress through a full half century of the most far-reaching change the world has ever witnessed. We congratulate this House on having profited from his wise counsel and his unfailing courage in doing what was necessary to be done in order to insure progress and stability. We shall miss him—acutely. But monuments to his memory remain in the action which he has fostered and in the orderly procedure which he has stamped upon this assembly.

He gave the people of his best:
The worst he kept, the best he gave.

Tennyson.

U.S. Record in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the mass of publicity in the United States that followed the Panamanian outbreak on January 9, 1964, and attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone, has been featured by much hostile propaganda against the treaty-based interests of the United States over both the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. Much of it was designed to create a sense of guilt on the part of the people of our country for an undertaking that should be a source of pride.

It was, therefore, highly gratifying to read in the May 18, 1964, issue of the U.S. News & World Report an objective historical discussion of the record of the United States in Panama and its realistic conclusions as to the benefits extended by our country to the tropical Republic.

The article follows:

RECORD OF THE UNITED STATES IN PANAMA AS A NEW ERA BEGINS

(The United States was a dominant issue in Panama's May 10 election. Has the United States bullied and robbed that tiny country for years, as charged? Would Panama be better off without its ties to United States? A search of the record produces some surprises.)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—At a time when the United States and Panama are beginning to neogtiate their differences over the Panama Canal, the decision of Panamanian officials not to demand revision of the canal treaty is drawing widespread attention.

For years, many Americans have been led to believe that there is a "skeleton in the closet" in their country's treatment of tiny Panama. This feeling of guilt often has been encouraged by Panamanian charges of exploitation by the bigger, stronger United States.

The actual record of what has happened presents an entirely different picture. A study of conditions in Panama, before and after the United States built the canal, turns up a record of American assistance of many kinds to this narrow strip of land that joins North and South America.

Before the Americans came here, in 1904, Panama was a sparsely settled province of northwest Colombia. It had no economy of its own, few schools, and hospitals. It was poverty stricken, disease ridden. Streets were unpaved and sewer systems were nonexistent.

Today, the Republic of Panama, with a population of 1.1 million people, enjoys a growing economy, bolstered by steady revenues from the canal. Its sanitary facilities are good, its people healthy. It has excellent schools and hospitals. Modern cars cram the paved streets of its cities.

What is behind all these changes in a relatively short space of time? To find the answers, it is necessary to check back into history.

For nearly four centuries after its settlement by the Spanish in the early 1500's, Panama slumbered in the backwash of progress. It grained a reputation of being a killer of men, and the population hovered at about 150,000.

Between 1850 and 1855, while a U.S. company was building a railroad across the isthmus to handle traffic stimulated by the California gold rush, between 6,000 and 12,000 railroad laborers died in Panama's swamps.

"A FOUL HOLE"

Little had changed by the time Count Ferdinand de Lesseps, builder of the Suez Canal, arrived in the 1880's to dig a passageway through Panama for the French Canal Co.

A French writer of the time described Panama's second-largest city this way:

"Colón is a foul hole. By comparison, the ghettoes of White Russia, the slums of Toulon, Naples and old Stamboul * * * deserve prizes for cleanliness. There are neither sewers nor street cleaners * * * toilets are quite unknown, all the rubbish is thrown into the swamps or onto rubbish heaps. Toads splash in the liquid muck * * * rats infest the solid filth * * * snakes hunt both toads and rats; clouds of mosquitoes swarm into the homes."

In the 9-year period when the Franch were trying to build a canal, yellow fever, malaria, and dysentery killed more than 22,000 workers. One of the chief reasons given by the French for abandonment of the project was the fact that one-third of the labor force generally was on the sick list; one-fifth died each year.

PRIORITY

All this changed when the United States began to build the canal in 1904.

One of the first jobs undertaken by U.S. Army Col. William Crawford Gorgas, who was put in charge of public health for the building of the canal, was the cleaning up of Panama's cities.

A published report of the time says: "Typhoid, cholera, and dysentery diminished as streets were paved, sewers and water mains were laid, filter plants were built and incinerators installed. On July 4, 1905, when the water was turned on in Panama City, officials declared a holiday and passed a resolution of thanks."

This sanitation effort paid off, despite Panamanian cynicism about some methods. Deaths from malaria dropped from 7.45 per thousand in 1904 to none in 1914. Yellow fever also was wiped out.

American sources consider that the health record of the isthmus stands unmatched throughout the torrid zone, but even today, they say, a few brief months of total neglect would be enough to bring it back to the old days.

Still, most of Panama, almost the size of South Carolina, remains uninhabited. With the exception of cities and towns around the canal, and several newly developed agricultural and cattle-grazing communities, the land is all but empty. This points up the dependence of Panama on the canal.

When you look at the background of the people who call themselves Panamanians, you realize that this is not a normal "nation." Students of the area say many years will have to pass before the assorted peoples who came to the isthmus to build a railroad and a canal become integrated.

These are descendants of slaves, laborers and merchants and of travelers who decided to stop here. Some of the original nationalities or racial groupings found among the 1.1 million people now living in Panama are these:

Native Indians; Colombian Indians; Negroes from Martinique, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Barbados, Jamaica, and Cuba; Africans from Senegal and Sierra Leone; Chinese from China and San Francisco; American Negroes from New Orleans; white Americans; and English, Scots, Welsh, French, Germans, Hindustanis, Malaysians, Spaniards, Italians, Greeks, Turks, Syrians.

INTERNATIONAL HERITAGE

If any territory anywhere belongs to the entire world, says one student of this area, it is the interocean passageway through Panama, which was built with the blood of the peoples of the world, including Americans.

The one unifying force in this polyglot population in Panama today is the charge frequently made that the United States through its power, has robbed them.

This belief is said to be fostered by the 20 ruling families of Panama. It has been charged that members of these families have diverted to their own pockets most of the wealth produced in their country by U.S. investment. There is evidence that they have spread the word to their countrymen who live in misery that the United States and the Panama Canal are solely responsible for that misery.

Without this escape valve to divert attention from what is really happening here, many fear that the Panamanian people would soon be fighting among themselves. The Panamanian nation might be caught up in a civil war among the country's many factions.

THE SCAPEGOAT

If the United States decides to build a canal elsewhere to link the Atlantic and the Pacific, Panamanians for the first time will have to face up to their own problems without the United States as a scapegoat. Panamanian officials who attack the United States in speeches often admit privately how much the United States really has done for their country. Says one official:

"We've all become accustomed to living well since 1903, and we don't want to give it up. If the United States does go someplace else to build a new canal, Panama will be ruined. We'll all go back to living the way we did before the canal was built."

Some Panamanians have contended that the United States arranged for the revolution against Colombia in 1903 and then took advantage of the weak, new country to impose unfair terms in a treaty to build and control the canal.

The impression is given that the United States suddenly became aware of the importance of a canal at the turn of the century and used its strength as a big power to make up for lost time.

The historical record shows what really happened.

U.S. interest in an interocean route through Central America goes back to 1825. It was realized then that a water passageway between the Atlantic and the Pacific would vitally concern the national security and development of the United States and the commerce of the world.

A number of times during the 19th century, Congress passed resolutions concerning the advisability of digging such a canal, with "free and equal rights of navigating" the channel to all upon payment of reasonable tolls.

The United States and Colombia in 1846 signed a treaty in which Colombia granted to the United States "the right-of-way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama upon the modes of transit that now exist, or that may be hereafter constructed."

The United States, in turn, guaranteed to Colombia the neutrality of the Isthmus, Colombia's rights of sovereignty over the territory, and that free transit from one side to the other would not be "interrupted or embarrassed."

After the close of the Civil War, the United States and Colombia signed a convention in 1869 providing for a canal to be cut through Panama. The Colombian Senate, however, rejected the treaty before the U.S. Senate could vote on it.

THE SPUR—WAR

After De Lesseps' failure to build a canal, the United States hesitated until spurred by the Spanish-American War. When it took the battleship *Oregon* 69 days to steam 16,000 miles around Cape Horn from the Philippines to Cuba, the U.S. Congress decided that a canal was an immediate necessity. It instructed President Theodore Roosevelt to try to build a canal through Panama, but, if that was impossible, to build one through Nicaragua.

In 1903, after a long and difficult period of negotiation, the United States and Colombia signed a treaty for the construction of a canal through Panama. The U.S. Senate ratified it on March 17, 1903. On October 31 of the same year, the Colombian Senate rejected the treaty.

COLOMBIA'S ROLE

The feeling grew in both the United States and Panama that Colombia was blackmailing the United States to get more money for canal rights. Three days after rejection of the treaty by the Colombians, a group of Panamanian leaders declared their country's independence. The United States recognized the new republic on November 6, 1903.

It was this sequence of events that has given rise to the theory, pushed by Panamanian leaders today, that the United States engineered the Panamanian revolt and then took advantage of the new country.

Once again, the record indicates that this was not what happened.

Panama had become an independent republic in 1821, when it revolted against Spain. But, after a few months, it voluntarily joined Colombia.

Relations between Panama and Colombia were alternately peaceful and violent right up to 1903. Panama seceded from Colombia in 1830, 1841, and 1861, but each time was brought back under Colombian control. Between 1846 and 1903, there were 53 revolutions, riots, rebellions, or outbreaks of violence in Panama. By the time independence finally was declared, the leading families of Panama were ready to renounce Colombian rule forever. They did not need U.S. help or encouragement.

The U.S. position was described by President Theodore Roosevelt in his autobiography, published in 1913:

"I did not lift my finger to incite the revolutionists," the President said. "The right simile to use is totally different. I simply ceased to stamp out the different revolutionary fuses that were already burning. When Colombia committed flagrant wrong against us, I considered it no part of my duty to aid and abet her in wrongdoing at our expense, and also at the expense of Panama, of the French company, and of the world generally.

"We gave to the people of Panama self-government, and freed them from subjection to alien oppressors."

UNDER SCRUTINY—A PHRASE

In the U.S. treaty with Panama, the width of the Canal Zone was set at 10 miles, and the United States was granted "all the rights, power, and authority" which it would possess within that zone "if it were the sovereign."

It is the phrase, "if it were the sovereign," that in recent years has given rise to charges and countercharges over whether the United States does or does not own the Canal Zone territory. The fact is that, if the United States decides to build a passageway elsewhere and abandons the Panama Canal, the zone automatically reverts to Panama.

After sifting all the arguments, students of the history of the Panama Canal come to these conlusions:

American work and American lives, plus laborers from the entire world, built the canal. American doctors made Panama a healthy place to live.

American money built the Panamanian economy and gave it its present wealth. Of the $1.5 billions invested by American taxpayers in the building and maintenance of the canal, $500 millions still has not yet been recovered.

Toll rates have not been increased since the canal was opened in 1914. The United States has been under pressure by Panamanians to raise the tolls. But the United States has constantly taken the position that the canal is being run as an international utility and that raising the tolls would hurt countries that are marginal exporters of basic products.

Instead of raising tolls, United States has increased annual payment to Panama from the original $430,000 to $1,930,000.

An impartial search of the record turns up impressive evidence that the United States has provided valuable assistance in the development of the Republic of Panama.

New Paperbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a book review article which appeared in the May 17 issue of the Chicago Tribune. After reading this article, I certainly intend to read the book, "The Inside on L.B.J.," written by the same author who wrote "America Listen." Frank Kluckhohn is a master with the pen as this review indicates.

NEW PAPERBACKS

(By Clarence Petersen)

"The Inside on L.B.J.," by Frank L. Kluckhohn (Monarch Books, 75 cents). The author is a former New York Times foreign and Washington correspondent and a former Defense Department official. "As its 36th President," he writes, "the United States has inherited a promoter, perhaps the greatest 'wheeler-dealer' of them all. He is a man who has manipulated himself by his bootstraps to the highest office of all, grasping every opportunity, accepting any rebuffs, a man whose life is too garishly unique to be believable as fiction." The book traces that life through the first months of Johnson's Presidency and finds little to admire. The question it poses for the American people next November, the author says, is: "Can a promoter—clever, slick, and experienced, but not a man of wide knowledge, not a political genius, and certainly not a man of deep convictions—handle what has been described as the hardest job in the world?" Those who would answer yes, he says, invite a series of further retreats and defeats both at home and abroad, including diplomatic recognition of Red China almost immediately after the election.

National Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, traditionally each year May 22, is proclaimed by the President as National Maritime Day in commemoration of that day 145 years ago when the first oceangoing steamship, the SS *Savannah*, set sail on its epoch-making voyage across the Atlantic. National Maritime Day symbolizes the importance of maritime strength to the past, the present, and the future of our country.

It is customary each year for the Propeller Clubs of the United States and other groups interested in our maritime welfare to celebrate the occasion by calling upon those most intimately concerned with the various aspects of national seapower to review our current status, point out shortcomings, and set a course for the future.

One of the outstanding Maritime Day speeches given this year, or any year, was that delivered at the Propeller Club, port of Los Angeles, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT C. BONNER. His discussion of our maritime heritage, his review of current problems, and his timely warnings that we are falling dangerously behind in our maritime standing in a troubled world should be read by every Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert the text of Chairman BONNER'S address at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, DEMOCRAT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF LOS ANGELES, ON NATIONAL MARITIME DAY, MAY 22, 1964

Mr. Chairman, members of the Propeller Club of the Port of Los Angeles, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed an honor and a great pleasure to be here in Los Angeles again on this occasion when we observe National Maritime Day—a day when we commemorate the sailing of the steamship *Savannah* as the first oceangoing steamship—symbol of the dramatic development of the industrial revolution in transportation.

On this day 145 years ago a unique ship—born of American ingenuity—broke with the traditions of the past thousands of years to set sail into a future of inestimable promise. It was a proud day for the enterprise of this youthful nation which had gained its independence and freedom scarcely more than a generation before. The SS *Savannah*, with her coal-burning, 90-horsepower steam engine, her three masts with full set of sails, was a bold and imaginative symbol of the creativeness of the new Republic. Although far in advance of her time, she was the transitional step that foretold the end of the age of sail on the high seas.

Despite the great interest and excitement this revolutionary new ship stirred during her triumphant tour of the ports of Europe, she was deemed a failure by her sponsors. Her fuel supply had been sufficient to run her engine only for a total of 80 hours during the entire 29-day crossing. She was too costly to operate.

Our maritime heritage is filled with many events—outstanding ship designs and historic ships—which might justly have been chosen as the symbol for commemoration each year in recognition of the dependence of our great country upon the sea for its growth and its strength.

Yet I believe selection of the steamship *Savannah* and the sailing date of her maiden voyage across the Atlantic was a particularly happy choice for commemorative purposes. Her history presents in miniature the history of the American merchant marine over the years. An advanced concept—a bold venture—and—a failure to press an advantage gained.

It is therefore, I think most fitting that we should annually confront the memory of the SS *Savannah* as both an inspiration and a warning when we take stock of our seaborne posture and our standing among the nations of the world. It is a world covered 75 percent by the oceans—providing the principal avenues of trade and commerce, vast supplies of food and mineral wealth, and an environment in which the security of this Nation and other nations can be decided.

It is a paradox that even as we turned our back upon the promising technology that applied steam to the SS *Savannah*, our naval architects were designing and our shipyards were building the splendid clipper ships that assured American supremacy on the seas until the end of the Civil War. American shipowners paid little heed to the continuing development of steam vessels by the British. In 1847 an American company built two paddle steamers for transatlantic operation but, unable to raise sufficient capital at home, it had to receive its financing from various German states seeking passenger accommodations and direct postal service for their emigrants to the United States. Another effort to meet the foreign trend toward development of steam was blocked by the Cunard Line in a rate war against the technically advanced experimental steamer, *United States*, of the famous Black Ball Line of sailing packets, which 30 years earlier had ushered in the era of the ocean liner operating on stated schedules.

During this period the largely unchallenged excellence of the designers and builders of our world-roving sailing ships blinded us to the march of the individual revolution. With the finest captians and mates on the seas; the navigational genius of Nathaniel Bowditch; and the pioneering studies of winds and currents by Matthew Fontaine Maury, the "Father of Oceanography," we brought the sailing vessel to unheard of peaks of speed and efficiency—only to find ourselves a third-rate maritime power at the end of the Civil War. The steamship, which we had initiated with the *Savannah*, became the power that drove us from the seas for 50 years until the advent of the frantic, largely futile and costly mass-building effort in World War I.

The pattern has continued to repeat itself.

The past 100 years has repeatedly affirmed the importance to this country of strength at sea—of balanced seapower. Yet we have continually lagged behind our requirements until cataclysmic events have forced us into crash programs to catch up—simply in order to survive.

Fortunately, in the recent past, circumstances have enabled us to generate the seapower necessary to insure our freedom in the two great wars of this century. Happily, our national defense reserve fleet of vessels built during World War II was still available with sufficient numbers of ships "in being" to lift and transport 85 percent of all war materiel during the Korean conflict. The Korean war, following the pattern of the past, jarred us again into construction of 35 of the large, fast Mariner-class vessels. The first Mariner was not deliverd into service until October of 1952. And only 10 were completed prior to the formal ending of hostilities in Korea in July of 1953.

We can be thankful that our now aging reserve fleet was still relatively young and in good condition at that time. To meet our needs during those hostilities, our privately owned fleet was augmented by 770 Government-owned ships, withdrawn, repaired, refitted, and put into service at the rate of more than three vessels every 2 days. Let us pray that we are not confronted with a similar emergency anytime soon.

Now, some 13 years later, with our privately owned fleet operating at a median age level of 18 to 19 years, and our existing reserve fleet consisting largely of war-built Liberties and Victories, 90 percent of which border on 20 years of age, it is extremely unlikely that we could so quickly and effectively rise to a similar occasion today.

In 1951, when our reserve fleet was still of large quantity and great value, as demonstrated by the Korean war, we also had a privately owned American-flag fleet of some 1,264 oceangoing vessels of over 15 million deadweight tons.

As of January of this year, our total privately owned merchant fleet had diminished by almost 300 vessels in number, and about 1 million deadweight tons in capacity.

In all fairness, let me point out that those figures alone do not tell the whole story of the past 13 years. During that period we have seen most of the splendid Mariner vessels become absorbed into the privately owned fleet. Since 1958, upward of 100 new, larger and faster cargo liners entered service in the replacement program of the subsidized lines. Several major new passenger and combination ships have been delivered. And American tanker operators, particularly in the coastwise trades, have replaced war-built tonnage with much larger and more efficient ships.

In addition, though somewhat makeshift in character, vessel-exchange legislation has made it possible for nonsubsidized operators in both domestic and offshore trades to trade-in old tonnage and acquire from the Reserve Fleet much better ships for adaptation to their particular services. And, finally, the technique of "jumboizing" vessels, particularly tankers, has been the means of lengthening the life and increasing the efficiency of a number of vessels which otherwise would have had to be swapped or transferred foreign.

In view of these developments it has been said that since 1951 our fleet has actually increased about 2 percent in terms of capability to move cargo.

Thus, if the world had stood still it might seem that we are not in such bad shape.

But a few comparisons are in order, because neither the United States nor the world at large has remained static.

Since 1951:

Our gross national product has doubled—from $329 to $650 billion.

Our dry cargo waterborne foreign trade, exclusive of the military and Canada, has increased from 103 million long tons to over 153 million tons per year.

Our flag partcipation in our commerce has dropped from around 42 percent to 10 or 11 percent currently.

While the world fleet has increased by 44 percent in number, the U.S. privately owned fleet has decreased by 22 percent.

While the world fleet has increased by 99 percent in deadweight, the U.S. privately owned fleet has decreased by 4 percent.

U.S. freighters show a decrease of 19 percent against an increase of 39 percent for the world as a whole.

The U.S. tanker fleet has decreased by a sizable 33 percent against an increase of 52 percent for the world.

In the bulk carrier, domestic and other nonsubsidized trades, we have been refurbishing old vessels. The foreigners have been building new ships, specially designed for their trades. The average age of the foreign bulk fleets is the lowest of any category in the world.

This situation reminds me of one of the adventures of Alice in Wonderland when she went through the looking glass into a strange and fantastic world where a huge game of chess was being played. While contemplating the limitless panorama of the chess squares, Alice and the Red Queen suddenly found themselves running faster and faster and faster, until, gasping for breath, they stopped to rest, only to find that they were still under the tree from whence their race had started. Alice expressed surprise at their lack of progress and said, "In our country you generally get to somewhere else if you run very fast for a long time, as we have been doing."

"A slow sort of country," said the Queen. "Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

I think that little adventure contains an important lesson for us as we attempt to play our part in the worldwide game of chess.

I will not recite the figures, but the build-up of the merchant fleets of the maritime nations of the world since 1951 has been astounding. It is useful to bear in mind that a great proportion of the foreign fleets were composed of the more than 1,100 war-built ships which many of those nations purchased from us. So it is clear that the great increases since that time represent new construction. Contrast this with our situation here in numbers of ships. We have fallen well below 1951 totals, and, of our present total fleet, approximately 75 percent are 18 years of age or older.

The figures I have cited are not simply dry statistics. On the contrary, they are flagrant warning signs to all who would maintain our position in the world, and build up our economy at home.

We cannot ignore the figures that show that most of our free world foreign competitors are carrying vastly greater percentages of their own commerce than we are carrying of ours. Relative weakness in relation to those competitors will inevitably leave us at their mercy in world trading.

Since 1951 there has been a steady annual increase in passenger traffic by sea between the United States and foreign countries. With rising income levels and increasing lengths of vacations both here and abroad, we are clearly in a period marking an increasing demand for surface ocean travel. Yet since the entry into service in the early 1950's of the steamships *United States, Independence,* and *Constitution,* only one new ship, the converted Mariner, SS *Atlantic,* has been introduced in the flourishing transatlantic trade under the American flag. In the same period new foreign-flag passenger ships are regularly entering the trans-Atlantic service and cruise service out of American ports.

With an obligation to replace the SS *America,* Congress, in 1958, authorized the consrtuction of a sister ship to the SS *United States.* The legislation was enacted into law, but the Eisenhower and succeeding administrations have refrained from taking any steps to implement it. Despite the clear trend of ocean passenger travel and the proven excellence of the SS *United States,* a recent high-level Government-sponsored report on our merchant shipping requirements, while recommending the development of U.S.-flag passenger ship operations, called for continuing delay while a new study is undertaken. The report makes the absurd observation that, during the time outlay for a sister ship to the SS *United States* is being deferred, interest at the rate of an estimated $3 million per year is being saved.

There has been much public attention called to our efforts with an experimental hydrofoil craft for commercial purposes. At long last the HS *Denison* was delivered, but now, after a series of trial runs during the past year, she is now, following a grounding accident, tied up in the backwaters of a river and the project apparently has been abandoned indefinitely. In the meantime, a currecent issue of a British shipping journal contain a report of a British hydrofoil ferry which entered service on May 1, for regular commercial operation in the English Channel. Again we are feeling the spray from the wake of our competitors.

In 1951, recognizing the trend toward increased movement of bulk cargoes in our foreign commerce, the Congress amended the 1936 Act to authorize construction subsidy to operators in irregular or nonliner trades. The trend evident at that time has reached major magnitude today, when almost 80 percent of our exports and imports are moving in bulk. With the exception of Government-sponsored cargoes under the 50–50 law moving in war-built ships and a few tankers of recent vintage, the transportation of our vital raw materials is almost entirely in foreign-flag ships.

Not a single deep-sea, dry bulk carrier has been built in the United States since 1946. Notwithstanding overtures and applications by qualified operators, the congressional intent has been consistently avoided as far as true modernization of our bulk fleet is concerned. American operators, with American capital, have been forced to build abroad and operate under foreign flag. While applications for construction subsidy for seven fully modern and efficient bulk carriers have been pending before the Maritime Administration for some 6 months to more than a year, the foreigners are regularly bringing out new ships of the same class to carry our ores and other bulk commerce. If the present American applicants dispair and build abroad, our balance of payments position will be further damaged.

In June 1955, the Virginia and Maryland ports authorities requested the Maritime Administration to make a determination of an essential trade route from Chesapeake Bay and Hampton Roads ports to Europe. Two years later, after appropriate study, the determination of essentiality was made. In 1960 application was filed for operating subsidy on the route. The first public hearing was not held until almost a year later, in September 1961. The years have dragged on through examiners' rulings, oral arguments, a split decision by the Maritime Subsidy Board, appeal to the Secretary of Commerce, remand by the Secretary to the Board, reversal by the Board, and now further study. Nine years have passed since this route, which would serve one of the fastest growing commercial and population areas of the country, was first proposed, and later recognized, as a trade route essential to the United States. In the meantime, foreign-flag operators have been quietly moving in on the growing trade.

On the opposite side of the coin, an item in the New York Times in recent months mentioned a Greek operator, maintaining headquarters in New York, who came out of World War II with only one ship, having lost eight in the war. Today, the line has 29 modern cargo liners, and has just announced the construction of 6 more, all for operation under Greek flag in the foreign commerce of the United States. Unfortunately, both of these situations are much too typical, and perhaps they explain why we are sliding behind—why we must run twice as fast to get somewhere else.

One hundred years ago, and in the years that followed, we licked the wounds of war and set about the opening up of the Western two-thirds of our country. Historians frequently use this period of Western expansion as explanation—or excuse—for our maritime lag up to the time of World War I. We were too busy and prospering too well on our own land to be much concerned about oversea trade.

Today the challenge which faces us is far vaster than the winning of the West. Today the race is on to open up the entire world. It can only be done through seapower capability—a fact well known, recognized, and acted upon, not only by the maritime nations of the free world who much of the time we consider to be our friends, but by the increasingly powerful Communist nations. In particular, Soviet Russia, learning that massive land power is not enough, is concentrating heavily on the development of commercial, as well as military, seapower, with the threat to "bury" us.

A look at the Soviet development in recent years is particularly interesting because 1951, the year that marked the beginning of our decline, also marked the beginning of their postwar merchant ship expansion.

Between 1952 and 1964 the Soviet merchant fleet more than doubled, and in the first 5 years of their current 7-year plan the fleet increased by 70 percent. It is estimated that by 1970 it will be three times the tonnage they had at the end of 1958. Their goal is to have a merchant fleet of 20 to 25 million deadweight tons by 1980, not counting their rapidly growing fleet of special service ships, mostly assigned to their fishing fleet.

Any complacency which we might have had in past years should be shattered by the facts as they are widely known today. Russian intervention on behalf of the Communist-Castro regime in Cuba could not have occurred in 1951 before their merchant marine program got seriously underway.

Today a considerable number of their most modern units are continually deployed in support of Cuba.

Today the Soviet merchant fleet operates worldwide, except for calls at United States ports.

Their oversea maritime operations are heaviest in the European area and with the lesser developed countries of the free world, especially the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa.

The Soviet high seas fishing fleet, consisting of between 3,000 and 4,000 vessels, is the largest and most modern fleet of its kind in the world. It operates throughout the world. But of particular importance are its operations in waters adjacent to the United States. A large Soviet fishing fleet operates off our New England coast during the summer months. An equally large fleet conducts fishing operations off the coast of Alaska. And a Cuban-based fishing fleet operates in the Gulf of Mexico and northward to George's Bank off the New England coast.

The large expansion of the Soviet fleet is being pursued in deadly earnest, in realization of a fact we may have forgotten—that when trading with the world, market accessibility is reliant in a very large degree upon a nation's merchant marine. They realize that their merchant fleet which functions as a cold war navy provides them with a powerful political weapon to carry out the objective of converting the lesser developed countries. They have announced their intention to enter the world shipping market for the purpose of making ocean shipping unprofitable for Western tramp and liner operators, as well as to disrupt established ocean shipping patterns. And with the worldwide operations of their fishing fleet they can exploit the principal fishing areas of the world, conducting hydrographic and oceanographic research, and avail themselves of opportunities for the collection of naval and other types of intelligence, particularly in areas contiguous to the United States.

Just 2 years ago President Kennedy called for expanded foreign trade by the United States. He pointed to the importance of trade expansion from the standpoint of our international prosperity, the improvement of our balance of international payments and the maintenance of our position as a world power in rapidly changing times. He struck the keynote when he said, "We must either trade or fade. We must either go forward or backward." Since then our Government has been pressing aggressively to encourage American producers to enter foreign commerce. But relatively little emphasis has been placed upon the value of American shipping services as invisible exports. Yet in recent years the foreign trade earnings of our shipping services have been well over $900 million per year. Shipping now ranks third in the American export industry. Considering the crucial importance which we attach to our balance-of-payments position, it is incomprehensible that there should be so little Government support for building up our merchant marine, rather than somewhat reluctantly being content with something less than maintenance of the status quo of 10 or more years ago.

I do not believe that I have been painting an exaggerated picture of our maritime inadequacies, even though I recognize that there are many bright spots too.

Such new ships as we are building under the subsidized replacement program are among the finest in the world. One hundred and seventeen out of a total of three-hundred have been built since 1958, or are under contract.

Shipboard mechanization is now being extensively applied to our liner fleet with consequent improvement in competitive efficiency and reduced subsidy costs.

A few hardy souls in the domestic trades are exercising imagination and initiative to maintain and build up their services.

Labor and management appear to be working more cooperatively together than they have in many years. This is particularly true here on the west coast where longshore labor and shipping management have faced up to the realities of the times and worked out an agreement consistent with modern cargo handling techniques which is mutually beneficial to both labor and management.

The accord reached between the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the Pacific Maritime Association could well be a model for widespread application in maritime labor-management relations.

A few years ago our passenger shipping situation received a substantial lift as a result of legislation authorizing pleasure cruises by American ships in the off seasons.

More recently, the initiative of one great American steamship line resulted in legislation making possible cooperative efforts by the American shipping industry and the Government to promote export expansion through the use of mobile trade fairs. The possibilities of the mobile trade fairs program are unlimited in their promise to American producers, American shipping lines and improvement of our balance-of-payments position.

Finally, after many trials and tribulations, the NS *Savannah* is again in operation and setting forth on her mission to prove to this country and the world the value of peaceful uses of atomic energy. At times in the recent past it has looked as if the *Savannah* might meet the same fate as the steamship *Savannah*. It has looked as if all that we have learned through her creation would be ignored by our own people while those lessons would be adapted by foreign merchant marines to haunt us in future years.

I have reasons to hope that this will not be the case. Forward looking American steamship lines are currently giving the most serious consideration to building ships in the near future with atomic power.

Thus, all is not dark, but the facts nevertheless remain that our standing in the world today will depend upon our taking the Queen's advice to Alice—to run at least twice as fast as we have been.

Thank you.

The Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Col. L. H. Ripley, chief of staff, headquarters, VI U.S. Army Corps, Battle Creek, Mich., delivered what, in my opinion, was a very refreshing and well-documented speech which goes a long way toward destroying some of the myths which have developed regarding the U.S. position in the cold war.

I find this speech to be a reasoned answer to all those of faint heart who are under the misapprehension that we are somehow losing the cold war. I take this occasion to insert Colonel Ripley's speech in the RECORD and recommend its consideration by all thoughtful Americans.

WE ARE WINNING THE COLD WAR

(By Col. Lyman H. Ripley)

For many years, I have been disturbed by a body of opinion which has been building up in this country. The subject is the cold war. It seems to me that too many of our columnists, editorial writers, broadcasters, magazine writers, and others have been trying to sell the idea that communism is winning the cold war. Communist strength seems to be almost an obsession with some of the commentators. The gloom and doom shouters have been convinced a sizable portion of the population that the West is pretty weak compared to the Soviet bloc.

This obsession has generated quite a string of myths about the Soviet Union which add up to a mental picture of a bunch of Russians who are about 9 feet tall. What I propose today is to try to whittle this mythical giant down to something close to his true stature.

The peddlers of doom and gloom have been trying to tell us for years that:

1. The Communists have the greatest strength in the world.

2. That communism continues to gain all over the world.

3. That the Communist system of government is inherently strong.

4. Some non-Communist even seem to agree with Khrushchev when he says he will bury us.

Many other myths have been built up over the years, but I think a brief discussion of these four should suffice to isolate some fact from a great deal of fiction.

Perhaps some facts, deductions and even conjecture can place the myths in proper perspective. I am, of course, speaking only for myself and the opinions I have formulated over the years. The subject is extremely broad and, in a talk of this length, nothing can possibly be covered in depth. First, let's take a closer look at the first myth—concerning Communist military strength—and decide if what we have all heard is true.

When I want to find out the facts about a problem in VI Corps, I call for that staff officer who has the most information immediately available on the subject. I venture to say that no one in the entire world, with the possible exception of the President of the United States, has more information about free world miltary strength compared to Communist strength than our Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. And, as you are aware, Mr. McNamara is perhaps the hungriest man for facts our Government has ever seen. And most certainly, I have never heard his integrity questioned. In a speech before the Economic Club of New York this past November, he pointed out the salient facts about population, economy, military strength and the industrial base of the Western alliance as versus the Soviet Union plus its Eastern European satellites. Summarized it goes about like this: The West boasts about 100 million more people and an aggregate of gross national product of about double that of the Soviet bloc.

In the realm of the military, Mr. McNamara pointed out our clear and unmistakable superiority in strategic weapons—the Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris missiles and the manned bombers of the Strategic Air Command. As deductive proof, may I suggest that the tremendous risk Khrushchev was willing to take in placing his shorter range missiles in Cuba is ample evidence of his inferior strategic position.

Mr. McNamara also pointed out in unmistakable terms that we are also ahead in tactical strength. He brought clearly into focus, for the first time in my memory, the fact that the vaunted Soviet strength in ground forces that could be brought to bear against Western Europe, for example, is not so formidable as almost everyone had assumed. We have been bombarded for years about the total number of Soviet divisions. The magic number has been, since World War II, 175.

I have been asking the question for years how the Soviet Union could possibly have 175 divisions considering the strength of their ground forces. The answer is simple—they do not. Intensive investigation has come up with the clear answer that the Soviet Union could not conceivably support 175 divisions or even half that number with their military budget and the number of men in their ground forces. (The Soviet division, incidentally, is far smaller than ours.) With the vast area of the U.S.S.R. and the requirement for military forces on all borders, it is not surprising then, that the ground forces in any one area, even central Europe, are rather modest.

Needless to say, I do not have anywhere near the time to run over all the compelling facts Mr. McNamara presented in this speech. What it adds up to was well summarized by him in one sentence: "I would not trade our strategic posture for that of the Soviets at any point during the coming decade."

The second of our great myths holds that the commies are gaining all over the world. Here I would like to point out that practically all the Communist expansion since World War II took place between 1945 and 1949. Can anyone show me where the Communists have made any significant advance anywhere in the world since then? There have been, of course, niggling pinpricks here and there, but take a look at Western Europe. Just show me 1 square foot of real estate taken over by the Communists since 1949.

And why do the Soviets expend such a massive effort trying to fragment NATO? Precisely because that alliance stopped them cold. This brings up the point too that no gains of any kind have been made by the Communists anywhere in the world where U.S. troops are stationed.

But you say, "How about Berlin?" Despite the reams of glooom published and spoken about Berlin, I would like to point out that the situation is unchanged—except for the wall. And can you think of a more massive, obvious and thoroughgoing admission of the basic weakness of the Communist system than the monstrous wall? Built to keep anyone out but to keep their own people in. What a complete and utter admission of weakness and failure on the part of the Communists.

So you bring up the subject of Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Tibet, India, and Cuba. We fought them to a standstill in Korea, not exactly the way some people thought it should be done, but we are still there, and the South Korean Government is still in business.

So how about southeast Asia? It wasn't too long ago that the self-appointed experts had written off the entire southeast Asia area as completely indefensible against the Communist might. Well here we are about 10 years later and the Communists haven't even won South Vietnam or Laos, and until and unless they win these two pieces of real estate (and I, for one, do not think they will), Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, and Indonesia, while vulnerable, do not have a direct threat. I really can't see that the commies have a great deal to shout about in that part of the world. And, incidentally, why haven't the Chinese Communists invaded Taiwan (Formosa) or the Pescadores, or even the offshore islands which are within artillery range of the Chinese mainland.

And how about Tibet? Not what I would call a sparkling victory for a strategically important area of the world. It did give them a jumping-off place for small-scale incursions into northern India, which if it didn't accomplish anything else, pointed up some of the weaknesses of the Indian defenses. The operation itself was more pinpricking in perhaps the most forbidding terrain anywhere in the world. As a military man, I shudder at the thought of military operations on even a modest scale in that part of the world. In any event, the Communist action here probably pointed up to the Indians the virtual impossibility of neutralism for a country of the size and location of India. This could, in fact, have a highly favorable effect on the West.

And finally we get to the subject of Cuba—a bad situation admittedly, but one we could handle with force of arms any month we decide to do so. I don't believe it will be necessary since, in the space of 5 years, Castro has managed to put Cuba flat on its economic backside, utterly dependent upon the Soviet Union to keep his regime in business. The day the Russians stop their financial aid or the day the Cuban people get completely fed up, Castro is certainly not long for this world. And before either of these events, I wouldn't be surprised at a military coup. In any event, I wouldn't care to underwrite an insurance policy on the life of Castro.

One thing the gloomy pessimists never quite get around to talking about is the Communist defeats and reverses over the years. Let's review the bidding here a bit.

Greece: Can there be any doubt that, without timely U.S. assistance in the late 1940's, that Greece would be a Communist satellite today?

Turkey: High on any Russian list of coveted real estate is the Bosphorus and Dardanelles. As a matter of fact, over the centuries, the Russians have engaged in no less than 13 wars trying to seize this outlet from the Black Sea. U.S. military assistance and Turkish membership in the NATO alliance are the prime reasons that a friendly Turkish Government still sits astride those vital waterways.

Iran: Would you call the Soviet's unwilling withdrawal from the Azerbaijan region

after World War II a great Communist victory? Note that the Russians are still north of the border, thanks, incidentally, to timely U.S. military assistance.

Hungary and Poland: The revolt in Hungary and the near revolt in Poland in 1956 were two of the most devastating events in the history of the Communists. These actions showed the Kremlin in no uncertain terms just how far they could trust the people of Eastern Europe. How would you like to be a Russian general fighting a war in Western Europe with a line of communication running across one or possibly two of the so-called satellite countries? I made a remark at the time (and I haven't changed my opinion) that these events were the equivalent of adding 30 to 40 divisions to our allied forces in Western Europe.

Philippines: The all-out efforts of the Communist Huks after the Philippines gained their independence was defeated completely and now, with internal security restored, the Government and people of the Philippines can devote their time and energy to improving the economic, political, and social status of their country.

Malaya: An all-out overwhelming defeat of the Communists. A magnificent showcase of counterguerrilla warfare.

Africa south of the Sahara. With approaching independence of dozens of former colonies in Africa, the Communists thought they would have a field day in taking them over one by one. Their success thus far has been absolutely zero. They have been booted out of the Congo twice and from Guinea once. They have gotten the needle from some leaders who appeared at first ready to play footsie with them. About the only place where it even looked for a time that the Communists might have a chance was Ghana. Even here the Communists must be convinced by now that they couldn't possibly overcome the overwhelming egomania of Kwame Nkrumah who is about as ready to be dictated to from the outside as Khrushchev himself.

No, I can't see that, in the last 15 years, the Communists have anything substantial to brag about anywhere in the world.

Communist ideology has never won a nation anywhere on the face of the earth. It did win one country temporarily. The Republic of San Marino, a country about the size of a pool table, voted in a Communist government some years ago. The members of the Government made one small mistake. They gave the vote to women and the women voted them right out within 2 years. Everything else the Communists have done in the way of taking over governments has been by the direct application of force, the threat of force, or the proximity of Communist arms.

And when the people of a country taken over by the Communists have an opportunity to get out, they have done so by the hundreds of thousands, even at the risk of being shot down in cold blood. Look at East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba and even many of their famous athletes during the winter Olympic games. Remember the horror about the handful of misguided American prisoners who defected to the Communists after the Korean war. About 20, as I recall. At the same time about 14,000 Chinese prisoners chose Nationalist China rather than return to Communist China.

So I ask again—where are they gaining?

The third of our myths is the one which holds that the Communist system is inherently strong, that there is a monumental solidarity in the Kremlin and in the entire Communist bloc for that matter, that they are more efficient by virtue of strong central control than the so-called decadent democracies. The fact of the matter is that the Communist system, as it now exists in the Soviet Union, is perhaps the weakest system that mankind has ever devised. It is a system that cannot work, that will not work—a system of vast and incurable vulnerabilities.

At the outset, we might establish a tone by citing an illogical, unlikely, "for instance." Let's assume that by some mistake a single thermonuclear weapon were launched by mistake against either Washington or Moscow. What would happen? In the case of Moscow, the entire state machinery would immediately grind to a screeching halt. The entire Government would be paralyzed. The people in the far reaches of the Soviet Union have no experience, no capability, and perhaps no will to enable them to continue the centralized policies set forth by the Communist regime. Utter chaos would inevitably result.

How about Washington? It would, of course, be a tremendous tragedy, but it really wouldn't really change anything. Fifty governors would take over, the Armed Forces including the Reserve components would do what is necessary to support constituted authority and certain elements would be put at the disposal of the Governors. Every city and county official would continue to run his own government. Perhaps 8 weeks later there would be another national election. Nothing would be paralyzed. So I ask you, which is the stronger system?

In this connection, I would also invite your attention to the smooth, almost effortless turnover of power to President Johnson on the untimely death of President Kennedy. None of our basic strengths were changed even slightly during the hectic days following the assassination. Contrast this with the chaos in the Kremlin which started with the death of Stalin over 10 years ago and which, as near as I can make out, has not been settled to this day.

The psychological changes in the Soviet Union in the last 10 years have been enormous. First the shaky rule of Malenkov, later that of the gold dust twins, Bulganin and Khrushchev, and finally with Khrushchev emerging as the supposed leader. They went through an era of de-Stalinization, and they didn't do this voluntarily, but were propelled into it by the pressure of public opinion. The people were fed up with the Stalinist kind of rule. They wanted more personal freedom, more consumer-type goods, and a better life all around. I found it downright amusing to find the Soviet hierarchy bowing to the pressure of public opinion and the spectacle of Soviet leaders rattling around the countryside electioneering as if they were running for senator or perhaps governor. This relaxation from the harsh, uncompromising central control has led to a definite trend toward decentralization.

The only trouble from the Communist viewpoint is that it simply will not work. The whole Communist system has been geared from the start to strong central planning. The decentralization brought about during the last 10 years is precisely the opposite of Stalinism. When you take a cold, hard look at it, you inevitably conclude that you cannot run a Communist system except by strong central control. The Polish, Hungarian, and East German uprisings pointed to pressures for more freedom.

Secondly, agriculture. I don't think I need say too much about that. Agriculture throughout the Communist system has been a failure of phenomenal proportions from the start. Here we have a spectacle of a nation which has about 50 percent more cropland than the United States, and an agricultural labor force almost seven times as large. With all of this they are able to produce only two-thirds as much food as the United States and has recently been faced with the necessity of trying to buy hundreds of millions of dollars worth of wheat from those decadent capatilists in the United States, which year after year produces hundreds of millions of dollars in agricultural surpluses while using a mere 8 or 9 percent of the population for active agricultural production. Stated another way, the U.S.S.R. with nearly half of its labor force in agriculture still falls short of meeting the needs of the country. The United States with only 3 percent of its labor force could still produce great surpluses. Need I say more? I have been saying for years that, the day Khrushchev converts collective agriculture to the free enterprise system, we might have something to worry about.

Related, of course, is the fact that the upper echelons of the Soviet Union have suddenly discovered that they had an insufficient chemical industry. One major reason for all the current noise about chemicals is that they desperately need chemical fertilizers for their faltering agriculture. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal contained the following:

"In a free economy, allocation of resources is determined by the workings of supply and demand. A shortage of chemicals, for example, will lead to rising prices, inducing manufacturers to add new facilities and step up output.

"In a planned economy, on the other hand, allocation of resources is determined by the planners. But planners usually find it impossible to keep up with all facets of a modern, complex economy. By the time shortages are discovered, they're often so huge that the planners decide they must rush in with massive programs. Thus they often aim for too much too fast."

Point 3: The pressures for higher living standards and a greater margin of freedom which started with Stalin's death in 1953 have posed even greater planning problems. Soviet planning in the past was characterized by a more uncompromising imposition of the plans with total disregard for the requirements and desires of the people. And with the things the people have managed to get over the last 10 years in the way of consumer goods—better food, better clothing, and the like—they, like all human beings in the world, want more, not less. Soviet planning has never functioned properly and the long-range effect of this one fact is incalculable.

Point 4: The Eastern European bloc countries are perhaps more of a liability than an asset. I have already mentioned the fact that it is highly questionable if they will even fight on the Soviet side in case of a war. The Eastern European countries were exploited in the early years after the war, but today in some instances they cost the Soviet Union more than they bring in.

Point 5: In the top echelons of the Soviet hierarchy today we seem to have some sort of government by committee. At least all the evidence points in that direction. Khrushchev in 1956 took the obviously painful step of denouncing the "cult of the individual." My question is this. Is it possible to run a dictator system without a single dictator? I doubt it. The moment you have other people at the top level, you've got to maneuver with them in order to gain their support and, at the same time, prevent them from taking your job the moment they have the chance. And government by committee reminds me of the old definition of a camel. A camel, it seems, is a horse that was put together by a committee.

Point 6: How well informed are they at the top? How well informed has any dictator ever been? Who dares to tell dictators things that they should know?

How many of their judgments in both the domestic and international field are based on misinformation? And misinformation, gentlemen, is weakness.

Point seven: The China problem. This is far and away the most important and earth-shaking point I have to make about Soviet vulnerabilities. This hassle between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung really started in 1956 and reached a crescendo of some sort in 1960. To that point it was very much behind the scenes. By 1960 little hints that

all was not well between the Communist giants began to trickle out through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. This trickle became so persistent that many of us, as long as 3 years ago, were convinced that an open break was inevitable. Just about every expert in the field has, by now, concluded that the point of no return has been reached within the last few months. Speeches by Khrushchev and Suslov a few weeks ago added two more nails to the coffin of Sino-Soviet relations. Of course, this trend toward complete deterioration in Moscow-Peiping relations could be reversed. External events, changes in leadership or other factors might bring this about. One thing shines unmistakably through all verbiage—written and spoken. What had been long considered an ideological difference of opinion turns out to be something quite different. It can perhaps be best described as a purely nationalistic-imperialistic brawl. Since the Communists couldn't conceivably bring themselves to admit such a thing, they are forced to hurl ideological brickbats at each other. Ideology thus has become the ammunition of the fight, not the cause. Name calling is merely symptomatic of the true causes of the split, not the cause itself. Nothing in the Communist world will ever be the same again in view of this earth-shaking fact.

The total list of Soviet bloc vulnerabilities is enormous. I have merely touched the surface of a few of them today. I would like to finish the discussion of vulnerabilities with one that is a little nebulous. It is something I cannot prove, but I swear that most of you will believe me, especially those of you who have sons. There is bound to be a conflict between generations, whether you are in the Soviet Union or China or anywhere else. Any generation worth its salt is unwilling to accept the teachings of its fathers without question. Young people do not really believe—and I am glad they don't—that their fathers have all the answers. The fathers are a bunch of stuffed shirts, old fuddy-duddies who can't possibly understand modern times. This is happening in the Soviet Union, although a little difficult to prove. But we do have the spectacle of students demonstrating and rioting in Leningrad and Moscow and elsewhere. It is happening there but it is directed against the Communist functionaries because they represent the father image—they are the people who run the show. They are the stuffed shirts and the fuddy-duddies who do not understand modern times. There is a generation growing up which is questioning the wisdom of people who were active revolutionaries 45 years ago but who are now functioning at the top and do not really understand what young people are thinking about and things that the youth should have. Even the Communists canont repeal human nature.

The fourth of our myths is the one that got started when the Communist leader announced that he would bury us. I am sure Khrushchev wishes he had never uttered this statement. I think, in view of all else I have had to say on the matter, we can dismiss this piece of Communist bluster with no further comment. One footnote, though. I read recently where the Chinese Communists have announced that they will bury Khrushchev and company.

In conclusion I would point out that I long ago decided that the Russian was not 9 feet tall at all. When critically examined he turns out to have a stature considerably smaller than his opponents in the West. They are outgunned, outmanned, outproduced, and outsmarted by us and our allies. They have a system of government that is inherently weak and loaded with vulnerabilities from top to bottom. And finally, I should point out the only language they seem to understand is the language of force. And when they have gone so far as to make the West flex its muscles and lay down in no uncertain terms the consequences of certain intolerable Soviet actions, they have backed down in every case. The withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba is really the latest of a long line of such backtracking.

Well, I hope I haven't left with you the impression that I think all is "peaches and cream" in the West. Certainly we and all other nations in the West have our problems, domestic and international. We have today and have had for years problems with certain of our allies, particularly with certain free world leaders. What I am saying is that, notwithstanding the problems in the West, as many and varied as they are and as serious as they may be from time to time, the problems in the Kremlin make ours look about as earth shaking as those facing the wife trying to decide which dress to wear to the country club dance.

You may well ask the impact of certain recent events on all of this—such things as the French recognition of Red China. You may ask about the Cyprus situation and the uprising in east Africa. Unlike some of our widely syndicated columnists, I do not take this morning's headlines and try to prove that we are losing our shirt all over the world. This week's events and those of the last several months must fit ultimately into the overall pattern of long-range impact. Some recent events will soon be forgotten and others will have some effect on the West—favorable or unfavorable—but, frankly, I see nothing even in apparently unfavorable recent events to make me change my mind on the basic thesis of this talk.

So, as I said at the beginning, the unmistakable evidence is that we are winning the cold war and have been winning it for the last 15 years.

Loans for Students of Optometry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I submitted today to the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in connection with its hearings on legislation to provide Federal loans to students of optometry. My statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE TO HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, MAY 26, 1964, ON H.R. 8546

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am delighted to know that your committee has scheduled hearings on the bill, H.R. 8546, by the distinguished gentleman of Alabama, the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS. This bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to make students of optometry eligible for Federal loans.

As you are well aware, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act passed by Congress last year provided such loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and related professions, but unfortunately students of optometry were omitted. This is unfair and discriminatory against an honorable profession in the field of health, one that is as vital for the care of eyesight as dentistry is for the care of teeth.

Optometry is rendering a very important service in the complex age in which we live, and there is a steadily growing demand for such services. The Connecticut Optometric Society informs me that there is a serious shortage of optometrists in Connecticut and that all help should be given to young people to enter this profession. One of these ways is to provide loan funds to students who are unable to finance their schooling in optometry.

It is estimated that some 100 million people in the United States require some form of vision care, such as correction by glasses, visual training, or other treatment. Our present ratio of available service to the population is 1 optometrist per 9,500 people, which is regarded as being way below the required needs.

The bill under consideration would authorize the use of Federal funds for student loans to schools of optometry on the same basis as such loans are being extended to students of medicine and dentistry. These loans are subsequently to be repaid after the student will have completed the studies and established himself in the profession. The estimated cost is reported to be less than $1 million for the program.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge you and the members of your committee to take favorable action on this bill.

A Firm Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, upon request, I submit a recent speech of Hon. Josef Stingl, member of the Bundestag in Bonn, Germany, who represents the city of free Berlin.

No doubt, Mr. Stingl's message has lost something in the translation. But on the whole, I think it emphasizes the firm determination of free Berliners to hold fast to their resolve to maintain their freedoms at all cost and to persist in the current struggle for freedom.

Since Mr. Stingl represents Berlin in the General Parliament of West Germany, his views are of special interest and their firmness indicates the unyielding determination of West Germans in standing with the free world against communism, Communist aggression and Communist infiltration, in fact against communism in any form.

I am sure that Congress and the country will be deeply interested in his able remarks, which follow:

A man who works as member of Parliament for Berlin in the German Federal Parliament for this city does not even get the idea that his work might be done for a myth. All the same he sometimes feels in discussion that a certain discouragement is expanding. He perhaps might even doubt whether his right to talk for Berlin objectively exists. But Berlin is no myth. The existence of liberty is decided over Berlin. This is true for the whole free world. It is particularly true for all Germans and before all, of course, for the Berliner himself.

To begin with it must be clearly stated that Berlin's place in the Western World is not a concession of the Soviets to the Western Allies. The Western Allies are in Berlin thanks to their own good right. The Allies have agreed already before the defeat of the German Reich to divide Germany into two occupation zones and into a special region Berlin. There is not even a semblance of truth in the pretention that Berlin is situated in the territory of the Soviet occupation zone. Every concession in this point will thus mean giving over liberty rights and will be a gain of the East. The safety guaranty of the Western Powers and particularly the NATO Council Declaration of 1958 is not only for the Berliner himself, but also for all free powers the clear expression of the will to risk everything for liberty. One cannot represent convincingly one's own liberty if one is not ready to maintain the guaranty which one has given for one's liberty in spite of all consequences. Berlin does not doubt the readiness of the Western World.

DANGER OF CONCESSIONS

Berlin is for all Germans the symbol and bridge for a reunification in liberty. This will for reunification would loose of its convincing power if one would begin to make concessions in Berlin. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany stipulates that the Federal Government is the sole voice for all Germans. The Federal Government is also obliged to act for all Germans and to represent the rights of all Germans. The man who allows that the faked administration in the Soviet Occupation Zone acts as a government, must not be astonished if some day the same government will appear abroad. He is guilty of inviting the inhabitants of the zone to consider the despots as legal Government. In the development of the commercial relations with the Eastern bloc the German Government earned a success in that Berlin is not considered as a free city but as a part of the Federal territory. This shows that only a self-confident bearing gives chances for success. The position of the Federal Republic as against the claims of the Eastern bloc is moreover not insignificant. The political and economic situation must be changed in such a way that it is of the Eastern bloc's own interest to grant the Germans their right to self-determination. Nobody will think quite seriously about the Germans if they are ready to let others touch liberty where it still exists. He who thinks that political concessions should be made for a limited humanity risks the unlimited humanity. The wall is inhuman. Nobody will raise even the least difficulty if the East tries to be human. He just needs to erase the wall and to allow visitors. Nobody in the West asks for any kind of authorizations for travels to and from the zone, from East to West Berlin or from West to East Berlin.

BERLIN—THE PEACE TREATY

In 1958 Khrushchev required a peace treaty with two German states and the formation of a free city of West Berlin. This has been opposed unanimously and successfully as long at it has been required openly. Hidden behind alleged humanity it is obviously no longer recognized as a menace and is no longer taken seriously as such. The East tries with hammer and tongs to realize a partnership West Berlin zone so that it might be said that the Berliners had considered themselves as citizens on their own territory. But our position in Berlin is also important for our position in negotiations for a German peace treaty. If we make concessions in Berlin, our legal standpoint will be shaken in all questions particularly with respect to the borders. We must recognize that also in this problem obligations are arising for the Allies from the situation of 1945.

Even the Allies have not considered it as possible in the moment of the greatest defeat of the German nation to fix definite borders with unbearable territory losses. It would be unnatural if one would give without further ado today what the Allies have considered as impossible at the time of Germany's impotence. Even the argument Germany should pay for the lost war cannot be held as true. In this case Germany's sacrifices and payments should first be appraised. Just remember the exportations of the territories under Eastern administration and the supplies of the zone to the Eastern bloc. It is high time we listed these contributions. Germany must preserve her legal rights. If the free world refuses to recognize the annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union it would be paradoxical if the Germans would be required to recognize the annexation of its own territories. Moreover expulsions and unilateral theft of territory would be considered as legal means in the future.

Berlin has a special significance for the zone. If the West admits an inroad here, its hope for liberty is reduced. As long as the Germans in the zone know that risks and sacrifices will be accepted for liberty's sake, our claims for liberty in middle Germany and in the whole European Middle East remain trustworthy. If, however, we question the right for self-determination in Berlin—and with this the will of the population to be a member of the Federation—we have no chance that other people will give a thought to our claim for self-determination for all Germans.

THE LEVER OF THE RELATIONS WITH THE EAST

Finally Berlin is obviously no myth for the Berliners themselves. They are concerned with their free existence attacked by the Soviets. Renouncing to the commodities of Stalin's food cards they have made sacrifices and have with Western help resisted to the blockade. And today they are still ready to make sacrifices for their liberty, as is proven for example by the boycott of the high speed railway. They desire and want a free circulation in their own city. But they do not desire and want it for the price of concessions which might endanger their liberty.

Thus our attitude with respect to Berlin has no mythical significance. It is a scale of our readiness to make sacrifices for liberty's sake. Simultaneously Berlin remains the lever in the relations with Germany and the East whose end will be the reunification of the German people and a just order in Middle Europe.

Honor Where Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of Members of Congress to the following significant editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times of May 20:

HONOR WHERE DUE

Congress has decided not to give a gold medal to industrialist Henry J. Kaiser for his wartime production accomplishments and his other contributions to the Nation. Dissenting Congressmen noted that they might be establishing a precedent for "countless demands" for such gold medals for other businessmen.

We would hazard a guess that most businessmen do not hanker after gold medals. A more fitting recognition of the contribution that business makes to this Nation would be a lessening of the restrictive controls that Government seems bent on applying to business. That is something Congress might consider if it is in a mood to honor business.

Legislators Scan Cost of Service Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star yesterday carried an Associated Press report that Congressmen are beginning to worry about the cost of pay and benefits to retired members of the Armed Services which, by 1980, may reach an annual expenditure of $10 billion.

This is a most serious problem and I am gratified that there are elements within the Congress that are giving this matter serious consideration.

I am particularly gratified that the incoming chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who always is sympathetic to the problem of retired servicemen, is in the forefront in leading a discussion on this subject.

While I recognize that it is much too early to discuss any possible solutions to this increasing obligation which this Nation is assuming, I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a subject which deserves our most earnest attention.

It is for this reason that I am calling attention to my colleagues to the Associated Press article which follows:

LEGISLATORS SCAN COST OF SERVICE RETIREMENT

Some Congressmen are beginning to worry that the cost of pay and benefits to retired members of the armed services may reach several billion dollars by 1980. One prediction goes as high as $10 billion.

This prospect has led to unprecedented talk that the retirement program, or at least part of it, be put on a contributory basis, with servicemen paying part of the costs of their future hospitalization and retirement pay.

Any proposal like this, however, is sure to run into vigorous opposition from such groups as the Retired Officers Association, a powerful lobby on Capitol Hill.

But, what makes the talk significant is the fact that it is coming from some key members of the House Armed Services Committee, a congressional group most friendly to retired servicemen.

For example, Representative RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, the man who will succeed the retiring Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, as chairman next year, says, "We have to be concerned about the mounting cost of retirement.

"We don't want to erode any of the benefits of past retirement," Mr. RIVERS said in an interview, "but we have to look toward the future and control this thing."

He did not say what members of the committee had in mind, but he said that he could not rule out a contributory plan.

Mr. RIVERS emphasized that such a plan would be paid by men who are in service now toward their retirement, not by men who have already retired.

Mr. RIVERS heads a subcommittee studying the problem. One member, Representative HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, has made the prediction that the retirement program could cost $10 billion by 1980.

"In any case," he said, "we can't ignore this situation any longer. Retirement costs are going up and up. We have to find some solution."

Johnson Budget Loaded With Juggled Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are being sold a phony bill of goods on the economies being practiced by the Johnson administration. To put it in the venacular, "It Ain't Necessarily So." The fact is new Federal spending is being demanded in every program. Almost every appropriation bill we pass, while it is under the amount requested is higher than the amount spent in the last year. There has never been a more concentrated campaign to fool the people and the administration is getting away with it, thanks to unprecedented help from certain newsmen, columnists, and magazine writers.

Some of us have been pointing out the fallacies of the Johnson figures and have been called hatemongers, rightwing extremists, obstructionists, and I understand in private conversations, names not so polite. Now comes Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, to substantiate the charge of the reckless use of budget figures. Senator BYRD made his analysis after detailed study by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 26 turns the spotlight on budget juggling:

SENATOR BYRD AND THE BUDGET

We have heard it from Republicans and from economists, and now we hear it from Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, a leading Democrat and chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures: The Johnson budget for 1965 is so loaded with juggled figures, bookkeeping tricks, and horrible examples of budgetary deception that it is almost impossible to penetrate the fiscal jungle.

Senator BYRD's committee took 2 months longer than usual trying to decipher Mr. Johnson's budget. The Senator ignored appeals from the White House to go easy on it. Instead, he said it could and should be cut by $6.5 billion. He urged postponing the billion dollar item for fighting poverty until it was made clearer just how the administration proposes to start eliminating poverty. He would trim another $1.3 billion from foreign aid.

Senator BYRD cited deceptive figures in the budgets for the Federal National Mortgage Association [Fanny Mae], the Veterans' Administration, and the Export-Import Bank. These agencies have optimistically trimmed $2.3 billion off their anticipated expenditures because that is the amount they hope to receive through the sale of home mortgages and bank loan notes to private investors. It is widely doubted that receipts will increase to this extent, especially at a time when so many Government-guaranteed loans are going sour.

Other savings were proposed in scores of Departments. "Waste and extravagance," the Senator said, "can be found in virtually every Federal program and activity."

As if to illustrate his point, the House Appropriations Committee trimmed $280 million from a Defense Department appropriation request for construction projects. Among the items it objected to were silk wallpaper for a general's bathroom, a general's office larger than that of the Secretary of the Army, and two Navy bowling alleys costing about $250,000 each. Meanwhile, the General Accounting Office charged that the Navy had wasted almost $30 million in the purchase of radio transmitters.

In what was perhaps a last minute effort to head off Senator BYRD's onslaught, the President acknowledged that next year's deficit will probably be $900 million greater than planned in the budget but said that the deficit for the present year might be $1.2 billion less than last predicted.

Time will tell whether these figures are accurate and how much Mr. Johnson has actually saved by closing certain military bases, ordering cuts in personnel, and turning off White House lights. We hope he is sincere in demanding economy. But if he is, it hardly seems necessary to gimmick up his 1965 budget to such an extent that experienced Senate accountants cry out in disgust, nor does it seem consistent for him to keep popping up with new spending programs. We're glad Senator BYRD feels the same.

Unwarranted Curtailment of California's Water Supply by the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the needs of the arid area of southern California, Arizona, and Nevada, which comprise the Lower Colorado River Basin, for its rightful, legal share of the waters of that stream are well known to all.

It is also generally agreed that the Colorado River alone will not be capable of fulfilling these needs in the future and that water from other sources will have to be imported. Even in the near future, the growing population and industry of southern California are threatened with serious water shortages.

As if the outlook were not bad enough, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has now ordered a 10-percent reduction in the use of Colorado River water by California, Arizona, and Nevada. The purpose of this is to permit the filling of Lake Powell, behind the new Glen Canyon Dam in Utah, for power generation, even though there is no present need for additional power in that upper basin area.

This totally arbitrary action by the Secretary would seem to call for some curb by Congress on the power he has to divert and distribute the river's flow.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "California and the River Wars," from the May 20, 1964, Los Angeles Times, which contains pertinent and timely comment on this situation:

CALIFORNIA AND THE RIVER WARS

More than 100,000 soldiers are currently shooting at each other over water rights to the Colorado River. But theirs is a mythical war, only a training exercise involving the fictitious nations of Calonia and Nezona.

Elsewhere, another kind of war is being fought over the Colorado in dead earnest—and California seems to be losing on all fronts.

The latest setback came Saturday when Interior Secretary Stewart Udall shot a mandatory 10-percent reduction of Colorado River water at California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Logic and justice proved to be inadequate ammunition in resisting the Secretary's order, which resulted from his political decision to take water from behind Hoover Dam to fill the reservoir upstream at Glen Canyon Dam. Udall is determined that there will be a buildup of water at Glen Canyon whatever the detrimental effects upon the lower basin States.

Although the Secretary had reaffirmed a pledge to keep the water behind Hoover Dam at an absolute minimum of 14.5 million acre-feet, he informed California, Arizona, and Nevada that Glen Canyon Dam had to start producing power (although there is no power shortage) and that the only solution for the three lower basin States was to get along with less water.

Udall, however, seems to have forgotten the provisions of the Colorado River compact that the use of the river for power generation shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes.

This is the same Secretary of the Interior who proposes that California join in a regional water plan in which we depend upon the good faith of the Secretary for protection of our basic rights to the Colorado.

Governor Brown, who heretofore has favored Udall's regional plan, wasn't as pleased by the Secretary's latest treatment of California. Perhaps the Governor will now reexamine his position and will join the vast majority of the State's water experts who support Senator THOMAS KUCHEL's plan to develop more water for the Southwest without diminishing California's legitimate rights.

"Calonia" and "Nezona" would also do well to watch the Secretary.

Poetic Tribute to President Kennedy by Betty Smith, Sixth Grade Student at Balliet School in Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Friday, May 29, will be the 47th birthday of our

late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. This day will be appropriately observed throughout the United States and the free world. However, one of the most touching birthday tributes to President Kennedy was received by me in this morning's mail. It is a poem composed by a sixth grade student at the Thomas M. Balliet School in my home city of Springfield, Mass., Betty Smith, age 11. Under permission granted, I include Betty Smith's poem, entitled "President Kennedy," with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(By Betty Smith)

President Kennedy now will lie
Beneath the still and starry sky.
His soul from earth will never die
From morning till the day is nigh.

Everyone shall bow their head
And say to yourself that he is dead.
But in our hearts he is still alive
And to us he shall never die.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, Chet Doyle is a teacher in the Nescopeck Area Joint Schools, Nescopeck, Pa.

I am inserting herewith in the RECORD a copy of the Memorial Day address delivered by Chet Doyle on Sunday, May 24. In this address, anyone can read the thoughts with tremendous interest of a young and dedicated teacher. This man has in his hands children who will be the leaders of tomorrow. I know in this article he refers to me, and I assure you it is not my intention to take advantage of these remarks—but I feel that this one man, together with the hundreds of children whom he is teaching, not only for the purpose of educating their minds, but also as good citizens of our beloved country, should be commended by everyone for his outstanding address as I believe it has great value to all adults.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

(By Chet Doyle)

We are gathered here today to honor our noble dead. Their deeds are recorded in history. Many of these men with whom we associated in our lifetime are, I am sure, pleased because we have not forgotten them.

This day is dedicated to the men of our Armed Forces who have served and returned to their commander. I don't believe that they will mind if we use their day as a day of awakening. Today, we say to our veterans, "Thanks. We are proud of you." But I wonder if they are proud of us, I wonder if they are concerned by the apathy of us who would allow liberties to be taken away without a fight. I suspect that they are not happy with us, and I am sure that they are as gravely worried about our future, as I am.

You know that if human beings were thrown into hot water, they would climb out; but if they were immersed into cool water, and heat applied slowly, they might not climb out in time. This is the treatment which we are getting now. The water is still cool, but it is getting warmer and we are not worrying much about it.

I am speaking of the cause for which your children and I have been fighting—to return God to the school. If we are not successful in this first step, it will lead to God's being removed from our currency, our courts, our public offices, our documents, and, of course, our Armed Forces. Could a country, endowed by God with so much, allow this to happen? Yes. And it is happening simply because almost all of us are too busy or too unconcerned. Do you think that these men whom we honor here today are pleased with us? Do you think that they are proud of us?

Did you know that an underground movement is ready and waiting to remove all chaplains from the Armed Forces? Of course, this step will not be taken until the prayer amendment is resolved one way or another. These chaplains, it will be claimed, are a violation of the first amendment since these men are paid by the Government, and this means that the Government is dealing in religion. Our bright protectors of constitutional freedoms will then propose that chaplains be replaced with trained social workers. All chapels at military installations will be removed as well as those found at our three military academies. Our servicemen will be denied their inherent right—the freedom to worship, each in his own way.

How many thousands of our veterans were helped in their last moments by these men of God, whom we call chaplains? Can you picture a young man, whose life's blood is seeping away, and whose thoughts are of home, of parents, and of God, being surveyed by a social worker? This can and this will happen unless you prevent it.

A few months ago, I was privileged to meet a great American, the Honorable FRANK BECKER, Congressman from the State of New York. He is waging a one-man fight against the conspiracy, even though he plans to retire at the end of this term. He could easily have finished this term with an unblemished record of 20 years of devoted service to his country, by simply doing, as most Congressmen are doing—agree, but nothing else.

I say a one-man fight because this little dynamo is spearheading a move for 60 of his colleagues to have a amendment put before the people. And his reward for these efforts is more work than he can handle and a deliberately well-planned smear campaign using tactics which were invented in Russia. This conspiracy isn't entirely against FRANK BECKER; it is against you. How strong, how powerful is it? Well, it is so powerful that many of our local people are mouthing its half-truths and innuendos. They are learning these from our news media. Not only hearing it, but they are spreading it.

Let's look at a few of these half-truths and show how those who are uninformed in these matters can be dangerous.

We are told that the first amendment should never be changed, and the Becker amendment will change it, thus jeopardizing our Bill of Rights.

The truth is that the Becker amendment will not touch the first amendment. As a matter of fact, FRANK BECKER would fight to the death to uphold and to keep the first amendment. But what he proposed is an amendment to rectify a ruling made by the Supreme Court.

Would you believe that many clergymen today are appearing before the Judiciary Committee defending the ruling of the Supreme Court that was instigated by atheists? Of course, they give many reasons, and when one plays with words, one can confuse the issue. These men state that God belongs only in the church and in the home. Do you agree? Do we ever get enough of truth and God? Could the race and strike crises in our schools be overcome by returning God? I think so.

What Bible shall we use? Don't you think that the people in each community are intelligent enough to handle this? Many of our schools are approaching commencement ceremonies with its time-honored baccalaureate services. If we could tell our dead heroes that an atheist in Baltimore was able to stop this tradition, would they believe us?

If we told them that it was unconstitutional for a group of first graders in California to say, "God is great and God is good and we thank Him for our food," before they ate their morning cookies, do you think they would believe us?

Remember, only with a complete religious freedom can a democracy exist. In our Government, the people are sovereign. The government is a servant and never a master. Our Government is based on a majority rule.

I would like to propose that this Memorial Day, 1964, be dedicated to our most honored dead; and so they will not have died in vain, we also dedicate ourselves to take action that will guarantee that they rest in peace. I hope and pray to God that we can return here on Memorial Day, 1965, and say to our fallen dead, "We have returned to its rightful place the freedom you preserved for us." Neither the Nazis, the Japanese, nor the Communists were able to take this freedom from us because of these men. But we allowed a few atheists to take advantage of our lethargy and steal it from us.

Let's prove to our fallen comrades that we are worthy of their supreme sacrifices by waking up and acting. I beg of you—each of you—speak up, write your Representatives. Now, before it is too late.

If you will do this, our next Memorial Day will be a much greater day, because we will be able to come here with a gift—the gift of having done a little to repay these great men who asked for so little and gave so much.

Settlement of Railroad Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a very fine article commending the President on "Settlement of Railroad Dispute," which appeared in the Houston Chronicle on April 24, 1964, as follows:

SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD DISPUTE

Settlement of the railroad dispute, which, although not yet final, is considered next to certain, is a tremendous boon to the Nation. Had the threatened strike occurred it could have cost billions of dollars.

The agreement is a great personal victory for President Johnson. He succeeded where two previous Presidents had failed.

It is a victory also for the principle of collective bargaining—and a big one. The railroad dispute was considered the most difficult labor conflict to resolve in many years. It has been widely believed that the points at issue could not be settled short of resorting again to compulsory arbitration—the device used last summer to prevent a strike, but one which is most distasteful to both management and labor.

While the terms of settlement include give and take on each side, labor came out ahead in general this time. That makes the score 1 to 1, for in the arbitration award last fall the railroads won a qualified victory.

That award is still under court attack by the unions.

According to one estimate the railroads will save $317 million annually through elimination of unnecessary jobs under the arbitration award, while Wednesday's settlement will cost them $64 million a year, mainly in wage increases and paid holidays.

Episcopal Church Sponsors Housing for Elderly in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing number of older citizens who find it impossible to maintain their homes for various reasons and therefore the increasing need for adequate living quarters with features not found in the average home or apartment, it is encouraging to know that something is being done with this group in mind. Of course, retirement areas such as Florida have been building along these lines. However, many of our older citizens do not wish to leave the cities where their families and friends live and settle in unfamiliar areas, even though the climate may be somewhat more agreeable.

To the Episcopal Church in Baltimore goes the credit for sponsoring the first housing of this type for middle-income elderly persons, with the help of a low-interest Government loan under the legislation authorized by Congress in 1959. Knowing that this matter is of great interest to the Members, I am inserting an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 22, describing the Baltimore project:

ROLAND VIEW TOWERS: AGED HAVEN

(By Donald Bremner)

From his window on Roland Avenue, a vigorous, hard-driving Episcopal minister watches a hoist raise building materials into a growing skeleton of steel, concrete and wood.

He smiles with satisfaction. The work is on schedule.

By this fall, the first elderly occupants will by moving into the 15-story apartment building, climaxing a dream which began nearly 4 years ago with a desire to do something for the aged.

For the Rev. George F. Packard, rector of St. Mary's Episcopal Church, the years since then have been a busy mixture of preaching, attending conferences, studying, filling out Government forms, working with the contractor, and sifting applications for residence in 1 of the 149 apartments.

FIRST OF ITS TYPE HERE

By December, the landscaping and other finishing touches will be completed on Roland View Towers—the first housing of its type in Baltimore for middle-income elderly persons built by a nonprofit group using a low-interest Government loan.

Roland View Towers exemplifies the trend toward special housing designed to be safe and comfortable for the elderly and to make it easy for them to stay active in community life.

Located next to St. Mary's Episcopal Church, in the 3800 block Roland Avenue on the edge of Hampden, it is close to public transportation and two blocks from a shopping district and a library.

MODERN CONTROLS

Each apartment will have individual controls for heating and air-conditioning, a kitchen with a stove and refrigerator, and wall-to-wall carpeting.

The apartment house will have a beauty shop, drugstore, library branch, and arts and crafts room. Automatic laundry machines will be installed on each floor so that residents will not have to go to the basement to wash their clothes.

To ease the fear of many older persons that they will become ill and no one will know of it, an intercom system will allow the office staff to call each tenant daily if he fails to check in and notify the office that he is all right. A nurse will be on duty around the clock, with a doctor on call.

DINING ROOM

Elderly residents may cook in their own apartments, or eat in the dining room on the 15th floor.

The rents, including utilities, will be approximately $75 a month for each of the 69 efficiency apartments, $100 a month for the 67 1-bedroom apartments, and $140 a month for the 13 2-bedroom apartments.

The Reverend Mr. Packard said the rents do not include taxes on the building, which would add at least $5 a month.

"We think we ought to pay some taxes, but if the city wants to help the aged, tax abatement is one way," he said.

ONE-THIRD OF NORMAL

"We've proposed to the city that we pay $5 a month per apartment," he said. "That would be about one-third of normal taxes, and would be what has been done in similar cases in other cities."

To be eligible to live in Roland View Towers, a person must be 62 or older, with a maximum income of $4,050 a year for a single person, and $6,000 a year for a couple.

Roland View Towers is not restricted to Episcopalians, but is open to elderly persons of all creeds and colors. Reverend Packard said that more than 850 persons from all over the country have applied, including some former Baltimoreans who want to come back from Florida.

HOUSING DECISION

Roland View Towers was born 4 years ago when members of St. Mary's Church began looking for a way to be of help to older people in the community. They considered housing, a nursing home and hospital service. They decided upon housing, because they had land for it, the Reverend Mr. Packard said.

He said he learned how to go about the project at a meeting of the Housing Committee of the Maryland Commission on the Aging late in 1961.

The key to the building was Federal financing. The Reverend Mr. Packard said the Federal money is lent at less than 3½ percent interest a year, compared with nearly 6 percent for commercial loans.

"You save quite a bit on $1,900,000 at that rate," he said.

APPROVAL DIFFICULT

But getting Federal approval of the project was no easy matter.

"The application form for the loan is 8 inches thick," he said. "Here it is—I measured it with the ruler," he said, jabbing the air with a ruler from his desk.

"This is one of the reasons you need a consultant to get through all the redtape," he added. "And it's one of the reasons so many people get bogged down and quit.

"It took us a year from the time we put in our application until we got approval," he said.

The clanking of Federal machinery might have continued even longer if the Reverend Mr. Packard had not greased the wheels with a telegram to President Kennedy in October 1962, referring to the delay and asking his assistance in getting approval.

"In 2 days, there was a man from Washington here in my office, sitting right there," the Reverend Mr. Packard said.

Chastened Federal officials told him that, "We'll do everything we can to hurry this up, but please don't send any more telegrams to the President," the Reverend Mr. Packard added.

A zoning change was secured from the city council, and construction began last July.

TRUSTEE DIRECTION

The project has been directed by a seven-member board of trustees, including the Reverend Mr. Packard as president, the Right Reverend Harry Lee Doll, Episcopal bishop of Maryland, vice president, and five members of the church elected by the vestry.

The Reverend H. Kearney Jones, former rector of St. James Episcopal Church, Irvington, will take over July 1 as the manager for the apartment building.

Roland View Towers has attracted such a response—more than 850 applications for only 149 apartments—that the church is planning a second apartment building across Roland Avenue from the first one.

The Reverend Mr. Packard said that the second building will have 209 apartments and will cost $2,250,000. Plans are also being made for a 50-bed nursing home in a third building on the church property.

PROGRAM'S START

The program under which Roland View Towers is being built got its start in 1959 when Congress authorized $50 million for direct loans to nonprofit groups. The amount available for loans was increased to $275 million in later years.

As of March 31, there were 27 projects completed throughout the country, and 32 more under construction, with a combined total of 5,000 apartments. Funds were earmarked for 76 more, with 9,044 apartments.

Sidney Spector, assistant administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in charge of housing for senior citizens, said that $150 million in Federal money has been committed to loans, and another $100 million is available.

ONE-HUNDRED-PERCENT LOANS

The money can be lent to cover 100 percent of the cost either of new construction, or alteration and conversion of an existing building. The loans can be repaid over a period of up to 50 years. The current interest rate is 3⅜ percent.

Mr. Spector said that church groups have led the way in building housing for the elderly under the Federal loan program. Other groups include unions, civic groups, health and welfare federations, consumer cooperatives, and even public agencies if they are not engaged in federally financing public housing.

One requirement is that the group overseeing the project have an identity and the prospect of continuity.

"We won't allow a group of five or six individuals, no matter how distinguished, to do it," Mr. Spector said.

"But a small group or one individual can go to an agency in the community and get it fired up; he can act as a catalyst to get it to undertake the project."

Unions Increase Members in 1962, Reversing Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a report prepared by the Associated Press quotes the Labor Department as indicating that organized labor may be finally reversing a 6-year decline in union membership.

This is, indeed, a welcome report, for certainly we can all agree that sound, dedicated union membership serves the best interest of America. The late Senator Robert Taft stated in the preamble of his legislation that America's national labor policy is to encourage working men and women to organize into unions for the puropse of collective bargaining.

The American labor movement has helped its members participate more effectively in the benefits of our Nation's free enterprise system. For the most part, the ranks of America's organized labor have complemented the economic growth and expansion of this country rather than, as some would have you believe, hindered it.

I am pleased to learn that there has been a 300,000-member increase in 1962 in the ranks of America's organized labor.

I am sure we can all agree that much remains to be done if we are to experience the dynamic economic growth necessary to assure full employment. It is my firm conviction that labor and management working together will speed the day when all Americans reach that goal.

Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press article follows:

UNIONS INCREASE MEMBERS IN 1962, REVERSING TREND

Figures reported by the Labor Department today indicated that organized labor may be finally reversing a 6-year decline in union memberhip.

A 300,000-member increase in 1962 was the sharpest gain since union membership hit a peak of 17.5 million in 1956 and then started dropping, the Bureau of Labor Statistics said.

And while total membership is still nearly 1 million below the 1956 figure, the 1962 increase "may foreshadow a change in directions," the Bureau said.

The figures, based on latest membership totals available, were given by H. James Neary of the Bureau in an article in the monthly Labor Review. The study covers 1960–62.

Total union membership in the United States in 1962 was 16.4 million, the article said.

Mr. Neary attributed much of the 1962 rise to a presidential executive order encouraging union membership among Government employees, as well as increased membership among other white collar workers.

Both the Labor Department and the AFL-CIO attribute much of the union membership loss in recent years to technological improvements in manufacturing where there has been the greatest reduction in employment and thus in union membership.

Statement of Prof. Wilbur G. Katz Before the House Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on April 29, Prof. Wilber G. Katz, of the University of Wisconsin Law School, stated with remarkable precision and brevity the fundamental case against a change in the first amendment. What he said was not complicated; in fact the great majority of the letters I have received during the past few weeks have expressed many of the same thoughts. Yet Professor Katz' short presentation deserves to be read and considered widely because it is the work of a distinguished legal educator who has had long experience with the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom. What emerges from this experience is the firm conviction that the proposals now under consideration in the Judiciary Committee would, in Professor Katz own words, "make our Constitution less appropriate to the religious diversity of American society."

As one who believes that America's religious diversity has been an essential ingredient in her emergence as a mature and distinct society, I subscribe to Professor Katz' statement and commend it to all Members who share this belief:

STATEMENT OF WILBER G. KATZ, PROFESSOR OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 29, 1964

I am opposed to the amendments which are before your committee because I believe that the adoption of any of them would make our Constitution less appropriate to the religious diversity of American society. Our society includes believers in many different religions and also many who find no basis for belief in God and whose ultimate devotion is to their fellow men or to ethical principle.

Our general constitutional policy has been one of freedom and equality for all of these groups. To assure this equal freedom, a requirement of impartiality is imposed upon our State and Federal Governments. Government agencies must be impartial not only between religions but also between religious and nonreligious philosophies.

The requirement of impartiality means that government must be neutral with respect to religion. This is not because the religious and ethical beliefs of its citizens are a matter of no concern to government. It is because one of the deepest concerns of democratic government is that its citizens have freedom in the area of their ultimate devotion. It is for this reason that Government agencies should stay out of the business of promoting religious practices or beliefs.

When Government schools include regular religious devotions in their programs, the school authorities are not impartial. They discriminate not only against those who have no religious belief but also against those whose beliefs are incompatible with the particular devotions in question.

There is a special danger inherent in public school prayers which are "nonsectarian" and which have wide support among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The danger is that those who cannot conscientiously participate may be regarded as less than 100 percent American, and that those who oppose such prayers may be branded as "cynics, atheists, and unbelievers."

The objection to regular prayers or devotional reading in public schools is not met by merely excusing those who do not wish to participate. Making excuses available does not make the program truly voluntary. The supreme court of my State (Wisconsin) recognized this in 1890 when it held that devotional Bible reading is forbidden by the State constitution. The court said that a pupil who has to withdraw from group devotions "loses caste with his fellows, and is liable to be regarded with aversion and subjected to reproach and insult."

In recent years this view has been expressed by many experienced educators and child psychologists. A committee of the National Council of Churches concluded that so-called voluntary exemption does not overcome the compulsion exerted by majority behavior.

No constitutional amendment is necessary to permit continuance of provisions for worship in the armed services. Our traditional practices in this area have not been designed to promote religion. They have reflected rather a policy of neutrality. Without some provision for worship, the regulations of the armed services would result in restraining religious freedom.

No constitutional amendment is necessary to permit continuance of prayers offered in the Houses of Congress and on occasions such as the inauguration of a President. There is no doubt that a President is free to express publicly his need for God's help as he takes his oath of office.

Nor does the Constitution forbid all religious expression in the public schools. For example, if a teacher had expressed her shock at President Kennedy's assassination by a prayer for the Nation and for the bereaved family, her action would not have been open to criticism.

What is open to criticism is a regular public school program designed to inculcate religious beliefs or habits. I respectfully urge the committee to preserve the constitutional barrier to such programs.

What Can I Do for Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently Sgt. Thomas Bartlett, of East Meadow, in the fabulous Fourth Congressional District of New York, was awarded the Freedoms Foundation Medal for his article, "What Can I Do for Freedom?"

Sergeant Bartlett is editor of the corps newspaper at 1st Marine Corps Headquarters in Garden City, also in the fabulous Fourth Congressional District of New York.

I am pleased that the award was earned by a resident of the area I represent; but the words are sincere and sensitive ones, good for all times and for all peoples in our great land. Therefore,

I am spreading them on the RECORD so that all America may benefit by them:

What can I do for freedom when all about me there is turmoil and chaos? Even here, in my own country, there are some believing that bruises and bloodshed are necessities in a struggle for peace.

Who am I to stand for freedom while others battle for recognition, publicity, and yet-to-be-decided causes? Countries are split in half by barbed wire or a stone wall; the blood of one family may flow on both sides of that wire or wall.

Who am I? What are my responsibilities? What are my obligations and who do I serve?

First, permit me to introduce myself. I hold no titles nor rule any lands. I have no great wealth nor medals or decorations from my country.

I may be compared to the man who furnished the quills for those signing the Declaration of Independence. Though I did not directly contribute to this historical event, the signing would not have been accomplished without my assistance.

I am one of millions who contribute a small amount toward freedom. Alone, our efforts are trivial; seemingly insignificant. Together, our efforts provide a massed contribution.

We were in Korea, Vietnam, and Lebanon. We flew into Berlin carrying food and medical supplies. We provide the voice for "Radio Free Europe," and the money for CARE.

My responsibilities are to all men, women, and children, regardless of their age, beliefs, or how far away their home.

I serve my God, my country, and my corps. It is not what my country can do for me; it is, rather, what my country has already done for me, my family, and friends.

Freedom is a precious, often costly privilege. I would give my limbs, my senses, my life for the promise that freedom would some day be universal. Many have thus sacrificed without a lasting effect on this world.

What can I do for freedom?

I can pray to my God; I can believe in my country; I can stand ready for my corps. I can continue to contribute time, effort, and money for appropriate causes.

It is not enough to reflect on what "might have been done." This is the present and tomorrow is the future. Yesterday we learned; today we do—hoping that tomorrow brings success.

True, success may be a small measuring cup of freedom when dipped from an ocean of discord with swells of unrest. But with each cup, the ocean's level dips, until finally, the seas are calm and the swells are ripples.

What can I do for freedom? I have rolled up my sleeves. I have two strong arms. I can grasp a measuring cup in each hand and dip into that ocean. The end, or is it a beginning?

Howard Bertsch, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, Gets Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howard Bertsch, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, a great champion of the family farms of America, has received the Department of Agriculture's Distinguished Service Award, the Department's highest citation.

The coveted award was presented to Mr. Bertsch by Secretary Orville L. Freeman in honor award ceremonies on the grounds of the Washington Monument, May 19.

Secretary Freeman cited Mr. Bertsch "for dynamic leadership in revitalizing the spirit, redoubling the impact, and greatly increasing the rural credit program, and thus sharply increasing the Department's attack on rural poverty."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bertsch has devoted his entire life to serving the needs of disadvantaged rural families.

His first attack on the difficulties rural people endure came in 1934 when he began his USDA career. He joined the Resettlement Administration as a county supervisor in Clackamas County, Oreg., and served that agency as well as the Farm Security Administration in Oregon during the following 9 years.

His ability to cope with difficult rural problems was recognized in 1943, when Mr. Bertsch was placed in charged of the farm ownership loan program of the Farm Security Administration for Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Alaska. His administrative talents were again recognized in 1947 when he was promoted to the national headquarters of the agency.

In 1954 Mr. Bertsch left the agency to assume a position as a consultant to the Ford Foundation on rural credit programs. During the next 7 years he was financial adviser to the Development Bank and to the Agricultural Bank of Iran, and played a major role in the development of that country's village improvement program, rural credit program and rural cooperative program.

Bertsch was awarded "The Order of the Crown" in 1958 by his Imperial Majesty, Mohammed Reza Pahlevi, and decorated by the Minister of Education, Government of Iran, by order of the Council of Ministers, for distinguished service to Iran.

Under Administrator Bertsch's leadership, the Farmers Home Administration has increased the volume of its lending activities from $300 to $800 million a year, and greatly increased its support of the family farm and the rural communities that are so vital to the welfare of rural America and the nation.

Under Bertsch's leadership:

The Farmers Home Administration has been assigned a role of growing important in rural areas development.

Farm ownership and operating loans have been broadened to serve the full range of family farmers including small farmers. Credit may now be advanced for the financing of income-producing recreational enterprises. The emergency loan program has been streamlined.

Small towns and associations of farmers and other rural residents may now borrow funds to finance community water systems and to shift land to forestry, grazing, and recreational uses.

The housing program has been broadened to serve people in small towns as well as farmers. Special loan programs have been authorized to help the rural elderly buy or build homes suited to their needs and to provide them with rental housing. Credit is available to improve housing for farm laborers.

All Farmers Home Administration loans are accompanied by technical advice on farm and financial management. Loans are made only to applicants who are unable to obtain needed credit from conventional lenders.

Collections on loans continue to set records. Since the midthirties the agency and its predecessors have loaned more than $7.4 billion. About $5.9 billion in principal and interest have been repaid. Losses on loans made under current programs are less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

Bertsch graduated from Oregon State University in 1931 with a B.S. degree in agriculture, and obtained his master's degree the following year from Kansas State University.

Mr. Speaker, Howard Bertsch is a dedicated friend of the farm families of America. I congratulate him, and I commend the Department of Agriculture for its wisdom in recognizing the quality and the service of this man by conferring upon him the Department's highest award for distinguished service.

Experiment in International Living: Frances P. Bolton Honored

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and beloved colleague FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, of Ohio, has received a fitting and significant honor, the Experiment in International Living's sixth annual citation for outstanding service and contributions to international understanding. Earlier this year, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—February 13, pages 2764–2765—I outlined the activities and purposes of this outstanding organization in promoting international understanding by means of a program of sending visiting American students abroad for home visits with foreign families and of bringing foreign students into our American homes. I pointed out that Mrs. BOLTON through the Payne Fund was instrumental in establishing the Experiment back in 1931, and she has continued to take an active and important part in the development of the Experiment through the years. Mrs. BOLTON's faith and interest in the Experiment has helped insure its success.

GORDON BOYCE ALSO HONORED

Since its founding the Experiment through the leadership of Dr. Donald B. Watt and Dr. F. Gordon Boyce has grown in size and reputation until its work is now internationally famous and highly praised around the world. Boyce was recently awarded the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit, West Germany's highest civilian decoration, for his ef-

forts toward the peaceful rebuilding of Germany and its international relations. He has been a moving force in getting West Germany to participate in the activities of the Experiment in International Living.

The Experiment in International Living has its headquarters in Putney, Vt., with an international training and orientation center in Brattleboro. Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include here for the benefit of my colleagues an article about the citation award given to Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON that appeared in the May 16 issue of the Brattleboro, Vt., Daily Reformer:

REPRESENTATIVE BOLTON HONORED: RECEIVES CITATION FROM EXPERIMENT

WASHINGTON.—FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, Congresswoman from Ohio's 22d District, received the Experiment in International Living's 6th annual citation for outstanding service and contributions to international understanding at a reception and dinner given in her honor last evening at Decatur House. The award was presented to her by Gordon Boyce, Experiment president, on behalf of the organization's board of trustees.

Cited for her progressive and early stand on social welfare issues, Mrs. BOLTON was singled out for her role as the Experiment's first benefactor. It was a grant from the Payne Fund in 1931 which enabled Dr. Donald B. Watt, Experiment founder, to attend a conference on problems of international government in Geneva. A year later he launched his first program in international understanding based on personal diplomacy.

From the beginning, Mrs. BOLTON has demonstrated a persistent faith in the Experiment's objectives and has generously supported many of its major efforts. In 1962, the Payne Fund, of which she is chairman, contributed $25,000 toward the purchase of Sandanona, the Experiment's international training and orientation center in Brattleboro, Vt.

Since the opening of the center, some 3,400 individuals, including incoming and outbound Experiments, Peace Corps volunteers and language students, have prepared for international experiences through training provided at the facility. In addition, it has played host to ambassadors, Government officials involved in the State Department's cultural exchange programs, educators and universities, and representatives and volunteers who administer and support Experiment programs in more than 90 countries.

Last evening's presentation was the highlight of a round of activities for members of the organization's board of trustees who are attending their spring meeting at the Washington Cathedral. Rev. Bayard S. Clark, canon of the cathedral and an Experiment trustee, is hosting the working sessions.

Previous recipients of the citation include the Chester Bowles family; the Clarence Gamble family; the Reverend James Robinson, founder of Crossroads Africa, and Mrs. Robinson; and R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps.

Judge Samuel Weiss Chosen for Sports Hall of Fame of Duquesne University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to give to the U.S. Congress the news that our former fellow Member and colleague in the House, now Judge Samuel A. Weiss, of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been chosen for the Sports Hall of Fame at Duquesne University, in Pittsburgh.

Judge Weiss is a well-known and well-liked figure in judicial, official, and sports circles in the United States, as well as in western Pennsylvania. He has many, many friends, and has given much of his time and energy to help his alma mater, Duquesne University, the Rosalia Foundling Home, and many other civic and charitable causes. Sam Weiss is a loyal son of wide interests, from Israel to his own home community, of which the Jewish people and our Pittsburgh citizens can well be proud.

Judge Weiss represented well his people in Allegheny County, Pa., where Pittsburgh is located, being elected by large majorities as a Member to the 77th, 78th, and 79th Congresses. He was then elected for a 10-year term to the bench of the Court of Common Pleas, the court of general jurisdiction of Allegheny County, where he has been reelected, and now serves so well.

Many people will remember Judge Weiss as an outstanding and one of the most popular referees of the National Professional Football League. He refereed games of the Washington Redskins, Chicago Bears, Green Bay Packers, Pittsburgh Steelers, and New York Giants, in many of their close, hard fought, and historic games.

Sam Weiss was a great athlete at Duquesne University in his own right: Captain of the football team in 1924 and captain of the baseball team in 1925. He could regularly break 10 seconds in the 100-yard dash and never batted under .300 in 4 years of college baseball.

It was no surprise to all Pennsylvanians when the faculty and sports leaders of Duquesne University, as well as western Pennsylvania, picked Judge Samuel A. Weiss as one of first five outstanding Duquesne University alumni to be inducted into the first hall of fame of the university at the large banquet on April 27, 1964. Among the outstanding Pittsburgh newspaper editors and sportscasters choosing Judge Weiss are: Chet Smith, dean of Pittsburgh Press; Al Abrams, Pittsburgh Post Gazette; Bob Prince, one of the country's great sportscasters, KDKA-TV; Joe Tucker, WWSW, another great sportscaster.

The alumni news article follows, which I am happy to place in the RECORD:

[From the Duquesne University Alumni News]

FIRST "HALL OF FAMERS" NAMED—INITIAL HALL INDUCTEES PROVE POPULAR CHOICES

Every sports fan has a favorite athlete on the national schedule level and at the fan's favorite school.

Hall of fame teams, all-time teams, etc., that will please everyone are therefore difficult to select; but the first five selections for Duquesne's Hall of Fame have proved very popular.

Many comments, both in writing and verbally, have come to the attention of the alumni and public information offices at the university and all have been favorable with a minimum number of gripes on "I thought my man would make it."

The quintet of Paul Birch, Chick Davies, Buff Donelli, Judge Samuel Weiss, and Father Silas (Dan) Rooney seemed to have struck a harmonious chord with former athletes and present and former fans.

Discussions with former athletes have proven tremendously interesting as they recap incidents which highlighted the careers of the "first five" Hall of Famers.

REAMS OF STORIES

Reams of stories can be told about Chick Davies' long tenure as basketball coach and Buff Donelli's reign as football coach of Duquesne powerhouses. Buff's football playing days and his outstanding feats on the soccer field are also "fodder" for many nostalgic stories.

Paul Birch, always referred to as "Mr. Basketball" on the Bluff, has also been a prime supplier of story material, both from his playing days at the university and his coaching and playing days as an outstanding professional.

Judge Weiss' playing days at Duquesne and his subsequent lengthy and illustrious career as a college and pro official also share in the "hot stove league" discussions.

Stories of Father Rooney's football and baseball days at Duquesne and his further athletic career at St. Bonaventure are other sources of endless stories, many of which also feature his famous brother, Art Rooney, owner of the Pittsburgh Steelers.

A brief history of the birth of the hall of fame would read something like this:

The four veterans of the various news media of the city, Al Abrams, sports editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette; Chester L. Smith, sports editor of the Pittsburgh Press; Bob Prince, "Voice of the Pittsburgh Pirates" and sports director of KDKA; and Joe Tucker, Steelers broadcaster and sports director of WWSW, were asked by the Reverend Joseph A. Lauritis, C.S.Sp., university vice president for relations, to serve on a nominating selection committee.

Representing the university and its alumni on the selection team (or committee) were: Louis E. (Doc) Skender, athletic director; Stanley Noszka, Monogram Club president, and Clair N. Brown, director of sports information.

TEN NOMINEES

This selection team presented 10 nominees to a special alumni officer's committee, which then voted on the nominees.

The 5 initial members of the hall of fame chosen from the list of 10 were: Paul Birch, All-American basketball player in 1935; Chick Davies, coach of outstanding Duquesne University teams from 1924 to 1947; Buff Donelli, football coach of immediate pre-World War II teams; Judge Samuel Weiss, Duquesne football star in the late twenties and later a famous college and National Football League official; and the Reverend Silas (Dan) Rooney, baseball and football star in the 1920's.

Subsequent meetings of the committe laid the groundwork for an all-sports banquet for all varsity athletic teams now active at the university to appropriately honor the five initial hall of famers. This outstanding banquet was successfully held on April 27, 1964.

A capsule outline of those to be inducted into the Sports Hall of Fame:

Paul Birch, all-time Duquesne basketballer and an All-American in 1935.

Chick Davies, coach of some of the Dukes' greatest basketball teams from 1924 to 1947.

Buff Donelli, football coach of Duquesne gridiron powerhouses in the immediate postwar years.

Father Silas (Dan) Rooney, O.F.M., baseball and football star at Duquesne in the early 1920's.

Judge Samuel Weiss, football start at Duquesne University in the late twenties, who later went on to national fame as a college and National Football League official.

Constituents Oppose So-Called Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence between Mr. Ira Schoenfeld, of the Braddock White Cross in Pennsylvania, and the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK in opposition to the iniquitous quality stabilization bill.

As you know, it was the White Cross stores who were responsible for having the nonsigner provision of the Pennsylvania State Fair Trade Act invalidated by the courts. It is evident from Mr. Schoenfeld's letter to Senator CLARK that they are continuing their work to maintain our free enterprise system by actively opposing the so-called quality stabilization bill.

Senator CLARK is to be commended for his admirable and courageous response to Mr. Schoenfeld. The Senator's position against quality stabilization and for the consumer stands as a courageous example to all. I urge my colleagues to follow his lead by working to defeat this invidious legislation.

The correspondence follows:

WHITE CROSS RETAIL DRUG,
HEALTH, AND BEAUTY AID CENTERS,
Monroeville, Pa., March 20, 1964.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I manage a retail store selling drug preparations, cosmetics and health and beauty aid products. I am writing to you about a bill known as quality stabilization now before Congress.

You will note from the enclosed petitions that my customers are opposed to this legislation. There are 2,746 signatures on these petitions, illustrating the overwhelming opposition to this bill by your constituents.

My customers and I urge you to use your influence to defeat this legislation.

Respectfully,

IRA SCHOENFELD,
Braddock White Cross.

APRIL 1, 1964.

Mr. IRA SCHOENFELD,
Braddock White Cross,
Braddock, Pa.

DEAR MR. SCHOENFELD: Thank you very much for your recent letter on the quality stabilization bill and the enclosed petitions signed by your customers.

Please assure your customers that I will not support this proposal. This bill would allow manufacturers to set the prices for wholesalers as well as higher prices for consumers. This bill is an unnecessary intrusion into our competitive system of free enterprise.

I am in agreement with President Lyndon Johnson's insistence that "freedom of choice for consumers from our storehouse of goods, at the lowest possible prices, is the very cornerstone of American consumer policy."

I appreciate your bringing the opinions of your customers to my attention. Please feel free to convey my position on this important question to them.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Position of the Board of Directors of the Child Welfare League of America Concerning the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America has recently adopted a position concerning the so-called poverty bill which I feel, for the most part, exhibits sound judgment and a realistic administrative approach.

This is the position paper:

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

We endorse the basic long range and continuing efforts on the part of Federal, State and local authorities, and the voluntary groups to strike at the roots of economic dependency in the United States.

The present effort to bring hidden poverty to a point of visibility is of vital importance.

With respect to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 we approve of some of its proposed programs but have a number of reservations.

Poverty in the United States has been and is a major social problem. Its blighting effects on family life are such that eradicating the causes of poverty should have the highest priority for action. Its nature is such that long range and comprehensive action is required, not emergency measures.

From our knowledge of problems of youth we especially approve of the aims of title I, youth programs; title V, family unity through jobs; and section 603 of title VI, the volunteer program.

We believe, however, that certain basic principles of administration should be stressed in whatever final form the bill takes and which are essential to effective long-range efforts:

1. All programs should make full utilization of existing Federal agencies, and wherever feasible funds should be channeled through them.

2. Every effort should be made to strengthen, and invigorate present Federal, State and local programs in poverty prevention and eradication.

3. The entire bill should affirm the existing partnership of Federal, State and local programs both voluntary and governmental. There should be Federal-State or State-approved administration of the program. If States fail to establish appropriate programs the Federal Government should directly establish federally administered programs within the State.

4. Authority delegated to the Director of the program should be consistent with sound principles of administration. Advisory groups on Federal and State levels should be responsible for advising the Director on the development of administrative policy, continually appraising the effectiveness of the program and reporting to Congress and the public. The Director should not be a member of the advisory committee.

5. Any exceptions to applicable Federal law should be specifically stipulated in the bill.

6. For purposes of long-range operation the program should be periodically reviewed with the aim of making the Office of Economic Opportunity a coordinating office only and placing the administration of specific programs in appropriate existing Federal agencies.

Testimony of Congressman James C. Healey on Veterans' Pension Bill, H.R. 10970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, ever since becoming a Member of Congress I have supported and worked for numerous bills to benefit our veterans.

Our veterans highly merit our best consideration and all the assistance we can give them when we consider the great sacrifice which they have been called upon to make for our Nation. In view of the ever-skyrocketing living costs, high taxes, and increasing costs of medical care, I believe that it is imperative that we recognize the hardships being suffered by our veterans today and that we take appropriate action to liberalize and improve our existing laws which govern veterans pensions.

I was pleased to have had the opportunity to testify before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee today on my bill, H.R. 10970, and to urge that favorable action be taken by the committee, not only on my bill, but on other bills under consideration which would give our veterans the assistance which is so vitally necessary to them at this time.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS, OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, MAY 26, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to present my views concerning H.R. 10970 which proposes certain changes and improvements in the non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

My approach to this bill is a result of a comprehensive review and study on my part of the pension program which has commanded a great deal of my attention and consideration during this Congress. The liberalizing proposals and changes in my bill will help hundreds of thousands of veterans who are in the greatest need.

What are these changes and improvements? How best can the veterans in the greatest need be helped? First, the income limitations for the minimum and intermediate steps, both for single and married veterans, is much too restrictive. An increase in these limitations, as provided in my bill, will result in a large number of veterans receiving a higher pension payment.

Second, in addition to increasing the income limitations, I am also proposing that all pension rates from the lowest to the highest be increased on the average of $10 to $15 a month. Presently the pension rates range from a low of $40 to a high of $100 a month depending upon the veterans income and dependency status. My bill will increase the rates in the minimum income steps from a low of $50 a month for a veteran with no dependents to a high of $110 a month for veterans with three or more dependents.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, by increasing both the income limitation of those in the greatest need and by increasing the pension payments for all qualifying veterans, the Congress will sub-

stantially help the majority of veterans who need the most help.

My bill, however, is not limited to these two liberalizing provisions. I have taken note of the large number of World War I veterans and the increasing number of World War II veterans who have reached 65. Under the terms of my bill the disability requirement for a veteran 65 or over will be eliminated. The veteran who reaches 65 will be presumed to be totally disabed and have met the disability requirement for entitlement to pension.

Another provision takes into account the large number of veterans who served overseas and in combat. During wartime veterans who served overseas and in certain combat areas were recognized for this greater effort by additional pay. You will recall that the basic pay of all servicemen in World War II was increased by 20 percent for example, while serving overseas. My bill will continue this principle by providing an honorarium for oversea and combat service by increasing all pension rates for qualifying veterans by 10 percent.

Another group of veterans who in my opinion should also receive special recognition are those who are not only totally and permanently disabled but are so helpless that they are unable to take care of themselves or are housebound for the rest of their lives. These veterans who need the aid and attendance of another person or if their disabilities are not quite so severe, nevertheless are cutoff from society to be housebound for the rest of their lives would receive under the terms of my bill an additional pension payment. The aid and attendance allowance would be increased by $15 a month from the present $70 to $85 a month. The housebound veterans, of whom there are a small number, would receive an additional $35.

Mr. Chairman, these are the major provisions in my bill which relate to an increase in the pension payments liberalizing the disability and income limitations to provide more money for veterans in the greatest need of larger pension payments. In addition, my bill also includes several provisions which are presently disregarded in determining the income limitations. For example, it seems a great injustice that a veteran who loses his wife or child through death cannot deduct the cost of burial when determining the annual income limitation. A similar inequity is the medical expenses of the veteran and his family which presently are not considered or deducted from the income limitation of the veteran. Likewise, it is a gross inequity to have the earned income of the wife counted as the income of the veteran.

Accordingly, my bill in determining income would exclude the following items:

1. Earned income of the veteran's spouse. This provides relief in the case of the wife who is forced to work, and maintains integrity of the family unit.

2. The amounts equal to the amounts paid by the veteran for the expenses of burial for his wife or child. This recognizes there are unavoidable and unanticipated expenses beyond normal needs of veterans which should be excluded.

3. Any profit realized from the sale or disposition of any real estate other than in the course of a trade or business. Sale of home by veteran is not income but a change in the form of assets.

4. Amounts equal to the amount paid by the veteran or by his wife for medical, dental, or hospital expenses of the veteran, his wife, or children. This expense recognizes the increasing high cost of drugs and medical care for a veteran.

5. Any payments received for discharge of any obligated civic duties such as jury duty.

These Mr. Chairman are the major and principle provisions of my bill which, if enacted, will bring about many desirable changes in the Veterans Pension Act of 1959 which is generally called Public Law 86-211, and has been the governing statute respecting veterans' pensions since it went into effect on July 1, 1960. World War I veterans now represent about 90 percent of all veterans receiving pension payments. It naturally follows that under the provisions of my bill the veterans of World War I will be helped more than any other group of veterans. At the same time these provisions would eliminate many of the complaints and inequities which have become manifest since Public Law 86-211 has been in operation.

As I stated in the beginning H.R. 10970 is the end result of a lengthy review on my part of the veteran pension program. It is my earnest hope that the provisions of my bill represent an acceptable solution to the problems of hundreds of thousands of war veterans, especially the older, aging war veteran, which includes a large number of World War I veterans. I respectfully urge this subcommittee, the full committee and the House to give favorable consideration to these views which I am sure all will agree will substantially improve the pension program for these war veterans who did so much to preserve our way of life and keep freedom alive.

Thank you.

Reaping the Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now that many of our national leaders have made it clear that any group dissatisfied with the law may break the law and have approved the use of violence to gain whatever objectives sought, we are beginning to reap the whirlwind.

The following news story from the Chicago Tribune telling of a vicious incident in Philadelphia yesterday when union goons spread a reign of terror around a building project should strike a warning for every decent law-abiding American citizen. Are we henceforth to be ruled by mobs, terror, violence? Are decent citizens to be beaten, murdered, have their property destroyed whenever any group decides it wants something?

Is not it time for public officials to stand on the side of law and order instead of encouraging lawbreaking, and urging demonstrations?

The news story from the Chicago Tribune follows:

GOONS ATTACK, ROUT WORKERS ON HOUSING JOB—SWING AXES, CLUBS; SIX MEN INJURED

PHILADELPHIA, May 25.—A gang of labor terrorists raided a housing project with clubs, axes, and hammers today causing thousands of dollars damage. The raiders chased 35 workmen from their jobs and injured at least 6 of them, including a man hurled downstairs.

The builder had been warned by an anonymous telephone call to expect trouble at the construction project because nonunion employees were working there.

[The Associated Press quoted the builder, Roy Fuiman, as saying that the nonunion workers were employed by subcontractors, and that he pays his employees union wages.]

A police labor squad detail had patroled the area this morning, but left shortly before the gang of more than 100 men swept through the project, swinging axes and hammers.

PIPES RIPPED OUT

They smashed locks with axes, ripped out window sills, drainpipes, and iron banisters, and tore newly placed kitchen cabinets from the walls.

The attack apparently had been well planned. As the gang swept through the project, small details broke off from the larger group and entered individual houses.

In one of the homes, one of the workers resisted briefly and was thrown down a flight of stairs. Another workman was pulled from a truck and beaten and kicked. Several other workmen suffered nail puncture wounds in their feet when they fled from the raiders over unfinished floors.

The housing project is 6 blocks from city hall.

DAMAGE SET AT $12,000

Builder Roy Fuiman estimated that damage to the 12 homes in the project was between $12,000 and $15,000. He said the men working in the project were employees of a construction company he has done business with for several years.

Fuiman said a group of men called at the construction site and warned the workmen to lay down their tools and get out of the area.

Lt. Michael Levin of the police labor squad and a detail of four men showed up at the project when the men reported for work. But when there were no incidents, the police left.

The project has been picketed since last March, Fuiman said. He said he had given the workers orders to run—not fight—if violence broke out.

Amerigo Vespucci Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, On March 9, 1964, Amerigo Vespucci Day, a ceremony was held in Washington at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Auditorium, spearheaded by the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., an organization of which I am happy to be a member. The occasion was the presentation of the "Landmark Memorial Tablet" to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in tribute to President John F. Kennedy. The presentation was made by the Honorable Alfred E. Santangelo, president of the federation and a former Member of this body, to the Honorable James E. Webb, Administrator. The Landmark Memorial Tablet is now at Cape Kennedy and reads, as follows:

Amerigo Vespucci, was born in Florence, Italy, on March 9, 1451. He outfitted several expeditions to "The New World" from 1497 to 1504. "America," the name bestowed on our continent by historians, is derived from Amerigo Vespucci. He was the first discoverer of the Western Hemisphere mainland. In his third voyage in 1501–1502, Vespucci was the first to sight Cape Canaveral, Fla., renamed in 1963 as Cape Kennedy, in

everlasting memory of the 35th President of the United States of America, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Presented to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on behalf of the community of 21 million Americans of Italian origin in observance of the 513th birthday of Amerigo Vespucci on March 9, 1964.

One of the highlights of the ceremony was the reading of a letter from President Lyndon B. Johnson by Hon. Jack Valenti, assistant to the President. The text of the President's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1964.

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
President, Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of New York, New York, N.Y.

MY DEAR MR. SANTANGELO: On behalf of the Nation, I want to thank the Americans of Italian descent for the unique Landmark Memorial Tablet which they have presented to the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

Amerigo Vespucci, whose family name all of us bear in our identity as Americans, was born 509 years before the death of John F. Kennedy.

Yet in spirit and in deed, they were contemporaries. It is right that a memorial tablet should seal their union.

Both were brave and skilled navigators. Both faced and welcomed the challenges of the unknown. Both surmounted great barriers to push the frontiers of knowledge beyond previous limits.

In Vespucci's day, the frontier ran parallel to the earth, and for only a short distance at that. But by the time he sailed his last voyage of discovery and drew his last map, he had made plain a revolutionary truth: That a very new world, and not the coast of Asia, lay due west of Europe.

In John Kennedy's day, the frontier had begun to run perpendicular to the earth, but for only a short distance at that. In the course of his brief Presidency, he gave thrust to the reach of discovery into the far reaches of outer space.

It is fitting that Americans of Italian descent should conceive this linking of the Italian navigator and the American President.

For this land, and all its greatness, owes much to the Italians who came here looking for freedom and opportunity and who brought with them vitality, grace, and strength.

And so today, we offer our gratitude for the Italian immigrants who have peopled this land, for their children who have strengthened this Nation, and for the greatest gift of all: Their contribution to all aspects of American life.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Another highlight of the ceremony was the reading of a telegram from the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 9, 1964.

J. P. SOMMER,
NASA Headquarters,
Washington, D.C.:

Please express my warmest wishes to the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Organizations at this noteworthy ceremony. Your presentation of a landmark memorial tablet to be placed at Cape Kennedy is a reflection of how much America owes to those of Italian descent. An Italian gave our country its name and generations of adopted Italians have worked—and died—to help give that name the meaning it has around the world—liberty. And yet this presentation is more, even, than a reflection of your pride and patriotism. It is a tribute to the pioneering spirit which is common to men of all nations and of all times, whether the 15th century or the 20th. May our new voyages in the oceans of space, like the voyages of Vespucci, which this tablet commemorates, expand the frontiers of freedom for all men.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

This tablet, although given by the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., was cosponsored by the following organizations: Alpha Phi Delta Fraternity; American Committee on Italian Migration, Inc.; Amita, Inc.; Citizens Forum of the State and City of New York, Inc.; Columbus Alliance, Inc.; Esca Club, Inc.; Italian Historical Society of America, Inc.; Italian Sons & Daughters of America, Inc.; Italian Big Sisters; Knights of Columbus; Lido Club; Long Island Columbian Association, Inc.; Sons of Italy; Unico, Inc.; United Shoe Workers of America, Inc.

Guest speakers on this occasion were: Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; Justice Michael A. Musmanno, Pennsylvania Supreme Court; Hon. George P. Miller, chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives; Hon. John O. Pastore, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island; Hon. Angier Biddle Duke, Chief of Protocol, Department of State; Hon. Sergio Fenoaltea, Italian Ambassador to the United States. Many distinguished guests were present from both public and private life.

Prayer Amendment Would Undermine Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the May 20, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond.

The issue in the "prayers in schools" hearings goes to the very heart of the separation of church and state doctrine contained in our Constitution. If we amend the first amendment we will be undermining that doctrine.

The article follows:

ISSUES INVOLVE FREEDOM—SCHOOL PRAYER HEARINGS GUARD THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The House Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, is performing a valuable service in holding thorough hearings on the various proposals to permit prayers and Bible readings in public schools.

When you think of the care and genius which went into the Bill of Rights, nothing could be more dangerous than to rush through an amendment.

Chairman CELLER is acting wisely to examine the implications of every proposal.

The need is to clarify the issues so that we continue to put first things first in considering any changes in the precious first amendment, the pertinent section of which reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The first thing is to realize that the greatest boon to religion in the United States is the absolute constitutional protection for religious freedom and against any involvement by the state. This means that religion must compete for men's minds and will be neither favored nor hindered by Government.

The guarantee that neither the States nor the Federal Government shall make any law "respecting an establishment of religion" is the strongest shield and buckler securing religion's freedom.

This is what guarantees the separation of church and state. This means that government will not extend a preferred position to one religion over another. Obviously the drafters of the first amendment were convinced that the best protection against the state's favoring one religion was to make sure that it could make no law whatsoever affecting religion.

All this is why it is crucial to bear in mind that to take every precaution to keep the state out of religion is not antireligious. It is profreedom.

The leaders of the National Council of Churches, the Synogogue Council of America, and those Catholic publications which have opposed overruling the Supreme Court—these men and women are not antireligious because they deem it unwise to alter the first amendment.

Did the Supreme Court disdain religion because it ruled, 7 to 1, that prayers in the public schools violated the first amendment? At one point the Court said: "Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the first amendment."

It seems to me that Chief Justice Earl Warren went to the heart of the matter when, in speaking at a dedication ceremony at the Washington Cathedral last week, he said: "Religion is, under our Constitution, incapable of state establishment; this is for the protection not only of the state, but of faith itself, in all its forms. The interaction of religion and the state is, therefore, made informal and free, not barren and nonexistent as some suppose. It is as fruitful and unfettered as we have the strength to make it."

If we are to allow government-sanctioned prayer in public schools, it seems to me that we would be taking a step toward undermining the separation of church and state.

The 50th Anniversary Reunion and Banquet of the Class of 1914 of the Boston English High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, May 23, it was my distinct pleasure to address the 50th Anniversary Reunion and Banquet of the Class of 1914

of the Boston English High School. The meeting was truly a memorable occasion.

Following the opening prayer by Albert S. Wingersky and a welcoming speech by President Maurice Altshuler of the class of 1914, we enjoyed a fine dinner. Later the group conducted a business meeting and distributed annual membership cards before proceeding to the election of new officers.

The dinner, which was held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Boston, was a fine example of good fellowship and mutual respect carried over five decades. I was proud to be included in the festivities.

Land of the Noble Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following Memorial Day address by the Reverend John F. Streng, pastor of the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, Wheeling, W. Va., delivered to the Rotary Club in Wheeling, W. Va., on May 26.

Reverend Streng is one of our foremost clergymen, and I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading his remarks:

LAND OF THE NOBLE FREE

Through the sustaining grace and benevolent protections of Almighty God America moves again into the crescendo cadence of the sacred season of solemnity known as Memorial Day. When the meridian reaches 11 a.m. on the 30th day of May the eyes of millions will pause for an international moment of silence fixed upon a simple banner of red, white, and blue, three colors guaranteed not to run, not for anybody. Eardrums will reverberate with the repercussion of "load" "aim" "fire" commands. Center of national focus, by congressional commitment, will be the marble cenotaph in Arlington National Cemetery within whose immediate embrace now rest in honored glory three buddies known but to God.

This hallowed spot describes America at her best, because it is not known who of the three represent Army, Navy, Marine Corps or the air arm. Nor has creed or color ever made an iota of difference.

These comrades fought, bled, and died to save the Nation. That is the only criterion that matters. For this devotion they deserve a nation's everlasting tribute within the communion of the bivouac of the dead.

From these guarded gravesites America's eyes will wander over the sloping hillside rows of white crosses in the same silent environment. And then in an ever-enlarging sweep the panorama of sacred sunset hills will encompass Gettysburg, Valley Forge, Bunker Hill, and 94 similar cemeteries on U.S. soil plus 22 military rest areas and arenas on foreign ground.

These memorable mounds have been carved out of the good earth to have and to hold American crusaders faithful above and beyond the call of duty. Truly an awe-inspiring heritage. And still the caissons keep rolling along past America's memorials into Arlington's cross-crowned arteries adding comrades at the rate of 92 each week. From Flanders Field to Vietnam the unbroken assembly line of reverie swells this roll of honor from one Memorial Day to another.

In muffled rhythm an international chorus echoes the stirring requiem liturgy composed by John McCrae: "We are the dead. Short days we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow. Loved and were loved, and now we lie between the crosses row on row scarce heard amid the guns below. Take up our quarrel with the foe! To you from falling hands we throw the torch! 'Tis yours to take and hold it high. If you break faith with us who die we shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders Field."

Is America too preoccupied in 1964 with recreation, sports, refreshments, and family picnics to hear either the words of the Lord in judgment or the message of war or see the handwriting on the wall of civilization? Lest we forget, these brave comrades changed the course of history in our favor that we might live under freedom's holy light.

The original order of the day issued by Gen. John J. Logan on May 5, 1868, has, by Presidential preference, become a mandate for millions. The five wars in which America has engaged since and the four wars preceding this order lend added prestige to the noble slogan of America's recent illustrious son: "Old soldiers never die; they just fade away." He echoed Gen. Dwight Eisenhower's order of June 6, 1944, to the allied troops invading France: "The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching together to victory. * * * Good luck." These men were locked in mortal combat never to return alive to loved ones. If ever silence is golden it must be beside the graves of these whose lives are far more important than ours or our speeches. For sheer love of country they accepted death. Their patriotism and virture are not hidden behind the fifth amendment, the fifth column, or the fifth dimension of turncoat philosophy. They did not defect in the hour of crisis.

No heroic effort is ever in vain. The character of today's youth is molded by their elders' example on Memorial Day. On Gettysburg's country site burns the eternal flame symbolizing devotion far deeper than triumphal arches and shafts. Its radiance inspires almost all who stand at its base and read its message. Not since the Civil War on whose battlefield this light of liberty stands has the issue whether this Nation or any other may long endure been so in doubt. When statesmanship is crucified and the plagiaristic promises of the demagog are exalted the moral fiber is exposed to the cancer of communism.

The problem of patriotism is as old as freemen. The oldest records of man are documents sealed with the blood of the people. Memorials large and small, costly and simple, identify many world generations. Primitive and civilized people have engraved and perpetuated memorial messages of mystery in museums and mansions of marvel. Every national frontier ultimately becomes a homestead of triumph, a keystone of conquest linked to the past. And beneath each strata lie buried vanished civilizations whose chivalry and courage left their mark. Each Memorial Day burdens our minds with revived reminiscences, as we walk among the shrines that cradle unsung heroes.

Let it be said to the everlasting credit of America's veteran groups and auxiliaries that their vigil over our honored peace corps of yesteryear is not unnoticed. Representatives of many faiths and cultures will invoke the blessing of the Almighty upon nation and neighbors. It is a custom we copied from the historic assemblies of ancient peoples who prayed: "The Lord lift His countenance upon thee and give thee peace."

Memorial Day in charge of those under arms in behalf of those who laid down their arms and in order to protect those yet in arms, urges upon all citizens unqualified loyalty and obedience to documented principles for freedom. Thirty-five million Americans have been mobilized since 1776. Two million are officially listed as dead, wounded, or missing in action. Eighteen veterans' hospitals harbor the maimed and crippled and blind and demented. Has the public forgotten them? Streetcorner superpatriots refuse to buy even a poppy for 25 cents made by and for veterans. Faded, dilapidated, public military honor rolls disgrace some city squares. Their condition is a barometer to the community's actual patriotism. Inscribed names are blurred and bronze scrolls have become green with age. To be sure it is the nature of history to erase the past, but human sacrifice is no mere historical statistic.

We need courageous, aroused citizens who insist that law and order, obedience, and loyalty remain an integral part of American citizenship. Freedom is a divine gift. Therefore, it is treason to help blow out freedom's holy light.

Whether we stand amid Arlington's 420-acre breathtaking stillness where the 119,000th veteran's body was recently interred; or whether patriotic private patrol reconnaissance stumble upon a hitherto unknown knoll on some barren atoll of abandoned American wilderness, our tribute is always the same: "Peace with honor." Whether we recall the ancient battle prophecy of Joshua, venerable military leader of Israel's refugees: "These stones shall forever be a memorial"; or whether we remember the theme of the current New York World's Fair: "Peace through understanding"; or whether we read again the inscription on the Bastogne, Belgium, war memorial: "Seldom has so much American blood been shed in a single action. Lord, help us remember," the call to relentless vigilance is the same.

Human blood is the price of liberty. Perhaps our sons and daughters will have to seal its truth someday. Much depends on how well we guard our inheritance. As we walk amid the rubble of rumored races who trusted in the solemn promises of allies let us remember that in God we trust and not in others.

Are our children familiar with the sacred documents, the Constitution of the United States, the flag of this country, the Holy Bible? Can they sing the first stanza of the national anthem without stumbling over the rockets' red glare? Will our grandchildren say that we guarded liberty?

What is Americanism? It is many dialects blended into one language. It is many avenues of prosperity converging into one way of life. It is many services forged into one loyalty. It is the sacred trust that government rests upon the consent of the governed.

Let us boldly, and if necessary bitterly, meet all carping criticism of our country. Who are these self-appointed foreign freeloaders who land on our shores and gripe even as they use our prerogative of free speech? There's nothing wrong with America a good lesson in democracy from an informed John Q. Public cannot cure in a hurry. If these aliens don't like the United States, let us gladly and generously supply them with one-way return schedules.

John Stuart Mill once said: "A people may prefer free government. But if from indolence, carelessness, cowardice or want of public spirit they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it, if they can be induced to lay their liberty at the feet of even a great man, or trust him with powers enabling him to subvert their institutions—in all those cases the people are more or less unfit for liberty."

Jesus of Nazareth, universally acclaimed Prince of Peace, once said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his

life for his friends." Let this be our approach to another Memorial Day. By the help of God and with commonsense added, government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish.

Herbert H. Lehman—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most eloquent tribute to the late Senator Herbert H. Lehman. The tribute by former Senator Frank Graham, one of our outstanding citizens, appeared in the April 1964 edition of the Carolina Isrelite. Senator Graham's close association with Herbert H. Lehman adds a valuable personal touch to this tribute. Among the many thousands of well deserved words written about Governor Lehman, none have captured his greatness more than those of Senator Graham:

[From the Carolina Isrelite, April 1964]

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

(By Frank Graham)

(NOTE.—The writer of this letter is Dr. Frank P. Graham, former president of the University of North Carolina, former U.S. Senator from our State, and for the past 15 years a member of the Secretariat of the United Nations and Mediator in the Pakistan-India dispute over the Kashmir. Dr. Frank was a close friend of the late Senator Herbert H. Lehman, and was deeply affected by his death.)

As a Christmas gift there came to me from my dear and ever thoughtful wife, the much desired biography by Allan Nevins, "Herbert Lehman and His Era." During the holidays I could hardly put the book down for the man so humanly revealed and the history so authentically told. The biography was written by a Pulitzer Prize winning historian in whose tale are combined thorough scholarship and winsome style, detachment and admiration, the reserve of the scholar and the responsive warmth of the human being in the documented presence of one of the noblest spirits of the era which Lehman so devotedly helped to shape and Nevins so vividly helps all who read to understand.

In Herbert Henry Lehman, personal goodness grew into public greatness in his fighting-honest service of the people of New York, America, and the world. In him we find in balanced unity the depth of religious faith and the breadth of modern reform; southern family heritage and national outlook; personal integrity and intelligent realism; large business successes and generous manifold benevolences; militant politics and high statesmanship; steadfast principles and effective political struggles for the equal freedom, human dignity, and well-being of all people in the State and Nation; humane succor of his own stricken European religious community and the effective direction of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation of scores of millions of people, regardless of region or race, color, or creed, in Europe, Africa, Asia, or wherever people were disinherited by war, bigotry, or desolation.

With his wealth of details as an objective scholar, Nevins struggles hard to find in the Lehman Saga some small share of the human frailties common to the best of the great as wayfaring men on their long and arduous human pilgrimage toward their majestic goals. To balance the inevitable encomium so justly Lehman's due, Nevins finds such lacks as: The brilliant flares and moving eloquence; the imaginative sweep of perspective; his high sensitiveness to ruthlessly unfair criticism; his anxieties and bedtime worries over any shortcomings in the days' work; and the alleged ambiguity in his stand on foreign policy as between Truman, his bold leader, and Wallace, his old friend, Lehman felt, I am sure, that Wallace was mistaken in his place and timing and yet in some ways may have been prophetic of the policy of coexistence, as a possible way out from the fast-developing cold war, which, however, with due acknowledgment of our own faults, Stalin was cruelly making hopeless in his time.

Whatever be the slight frailties found by the objective research scholar, the documents also revealed that Lehman, in his very spiritual heritage, humane hopes, and solid character, instinctively had the profound ethical insights and the courageously ethical commitments, higher in values than brilliant eloquence, which they, in all their meaning and goals, seek to achieve.

From the documented facts and details with which Nevins' authentic and brilliant generalization are saturated, there stands forth a giant in character and moral courage in heroic battles for the disadvantaged of the earth. As the honest basis of all these efforts, were days in and days out and through the long nights, the patient, unresting, largely undramatic, and oftentimes unrecognized routine and mastery of details. This stomach for details and this administrative drudgery, were the sincere substance of his high and effective administration of large business enterprises, generous private benevolences, far-flung humanitarian organizations, and exhausing public services in the city, the State, earth of local and global human needs.

One of the crowning glories of Lehman's life was his direction of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which literally saved many millions of the people of Europe, northern Africa, and China from starvation and the epidemics, plagues, and tuberculosis which would have swept over much of three continents in the wake of the marching and countermarching of armies which laid in ruins from the air and on the land the productive capacities of the nations by which the people could exist and survive.

UNRRA utilized Lehman's extraordinary capacities for organization and administration and provided the outlet for his natural humane instincts and his deep compassion with people who were hungry, sick, without jobs, and without even the opportunity to look for a better day. Some of Nevins' most poignantly graphic paragraphs are his description of the stunned, starving, and hopeless people and the lost little children wandering over pathless fields with scant clothing, no food, no direction, and no hope, and often without their eyes, which had been blown out in stumbling over the mined fields of central and eastern Europe.

In his heart Lehman carried to the end of his days his two greatest sorrows, one, the death of his son, Peter, in an experimental flight over Britain after more than 50 combat missions over Europe; and the other the picture in his memory of the people and the abandoned little children made homeless and hopeless by the cruelties and agonies of war and the postwar desolation—forgotten of the world except for the three successive relief agencies in whose ministrations Herbert Lehman had such a creative and directing part.

The humane work and experience of the Jewish Relief Committee helped to prepare the way for the Office of Foreign Relief Operation of the U.S. State Department, guided by Hull and Acheson. OFRO helped to prepare the way for UNRRA. In UNRRA, Lehman had the indispensable financial support of the United States, Britain, and Canada, which contributed 1 percent of their gross national income which amounted to $3,872,749,021. He had the indispensable pioneering and always wise cooperation of Leith-Jones, of Britain; R. G. A. Jackson, of Australia (now the husband of the great economist and profound thinker, Barbara Ward, of Britain); Lester Pearson, of Canada; Sir Arthur Salter, Senior Deputy Director General; Francis B. Sayre, R. F. Hendrickson, H. R. Jackson, Michael A. Menshikov, P. W. Kuo, and other such public leaders, diplomats, financiers, doctors, social workers, and experts in agriculture, nutrition, and all the fields of humane and technical aid.

Lehman's experience, wisdom and capacity for organization, administration and mediation, prepared him for the magnificent direction of UNRRA as he effectively sought to reconcile the stubborn differences between military and civilian authorities, the conflicting claims of nations and the possible duplication of humanitarian agencies.

UNRRA saved much of the existence of the European people and thereby laid the foundation for the Truman-Acheson-Marshall plan administered by Paul Hoffman in the recovery of Western Europe as one of the main sources of modern civilization and one of today's hopes of freedom and peace in the world.

All these agencies of relief, rehabilitation, recovery, and progress reinforced the international programs of the United Nations for technical assistance, economic development and humane progress as part of the meaning of the United Nations as the world's best hope of human survival and progress on the earth as the God-given home of the family of man.

In the era of Herbert Lehman, as banker, humanitarian, Governor, Administrator of UNRRA, U.S. Senator, and political reformer, which includes the years of his strenuous and devoted life, the great leaders of his party, such as Woodrow Wilson, Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Adlai Stevenson, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson, were beneficiaries of his influence. With them all Herbert H. Lehman played his vital and creative part.

With him in it all and through it all, and for it all, stood his wife, Edith Altschul, of San Francisco and New York.

It was James Wechsler, I believe, who suggested the substance of the real name of President F. D. Roosevelt was Franklin Eleanor Roosevelt. So, likewise, we might call H. H. Lehman, Herbert Edith Lehman, for her who mothered his three children and was not only his ever devoted wife, but was also his companion, critic, and partner in great enterprises for 53 happy years.

The shock of the tragic death of President Kennedy contributed to the timing of the death of Herbert Lehman. When President Lyndon B. Johnson came to his funeral in Temple Emanuel, he came bringing not only the tribute of Lehman's former majority leader of the Senate, but also the tribute of the people of the United States, who revered Herbert Lehman as the exemplar of the American dream, which became more personal in his life and more prophetic in his commitments.

To all who knew Herbert Lehman, it was common knowledge that he was a good man, a noble spirit, and a fearless fighter. It was as a fighter he preferred to be known, whether standing up for his beloved brother, Irving, who was his lifelong philosopher and adviser, or his unavailing fight for a place on varsity athletic teams at Williams College, or effectively breasting the power of political machines, or standing up against McCarthy-

ism in its hey day of hysteria and power. Yet there also emerges from Nevins' narrative of his combats, the Lehman who was a sympathizer with the combatants as persons, a mediator of differences and a synthesizer of the values of the contending sides.

A son of immigrant parents of the revolutionary Germanies of the late 1840's, he became steeped in the native American Revolutionary spirit of 1776. In his southern background, through his parents, was his birth in Montgomery, Ala., former capital of the Southern Confederacy, his parents' sympathy with the southern cause. In his northern foreground were to be his uncompromising battles for the equal rights of Negroes. His father and uncle sought aid from Britain for the Confederacy. Prophetic of his son's later concern for the casualties of war, Lehman's father, as representative of the South on a nonpolitical basis, tried unavailingly to get General Grant to allow food and clothing from their families to go to captured Confederate soldiers suffering in northern prisons from the privations and the cold of an unaccustomed climate.

Herbert Lehman was named for a dear friend of the family, Hilary A. Herbert, officer in the Confederate Army and later the Secretary of the Navy under Grover Cleveland. Herbert Lehman, to the day of his death, nevertheless, was in the forefront of the battle for the full civil rights of Negroes in the contemporary American and global revolution for the equal freedom of the colonial, colored, and exploited people of the earth for themselves and all their children.

Knowing from the experience of his own parents, uncles, and aunts, as slaveowners and southern sympathizers how human beings become involved in the transmitted custom of the centuries, Herbert Lehman was, by heritage and his own nature, incapable of hate or bitterness in the midst of the hottest battles over civil rights. Much as they differed over this issue, Herbert Lehman and Lister Hill were bridgebuilders across the chasm that divided them, and were fellow warriors in the struggles for Federal aid to education, health, medical care, equal rights of labor and management in collective bargaining, and other embattled humane causes. Lehman would rather have his friend and fellow native of Montgomery in the Senate, who was humanely liberal on all issues except one, than to have in the Senate a successor to Hill who would likely be reactionary on most issues and most illiberal on the issue of civil rights.

Herbert Lehman had a will of steel for great causes, tender concern for the lowliest human being, constant courage at the farthest fronts of many and various battlefields of the human spirit for people in need of food and freedom, dignity and brotherhood. All these, entwined together as balanced parts of his personal life and as blended strands of his public service, will forever run like a golden cord through the fabric of the history of his times—a blessed heritage and a valiant hope from generation to generation.

There is one observation unrecorded in the public prints, to which I can bear firsthand witness. When the McCarran bill on internal security was before the Senate, it soon became clear that the bill had the support of the overwhelming majority of both parties. The bill had some good provisions for internal security but also had some very bad provisions in restrictions of civil liberties. Senator Lehman was, at the time, up for a return to the Senate. The case was made to him by one of his constituent advisers, as I recall, substantially as follows: The bill was sure to pass and he was not called upon to take a futile stand which would jeopardize his return to the Senate, where he was vitally needed on important measures which had a chance of being adopted with his strong support. Senator Lehman's reply was as simple as it was characteristically direct, "If I am the only person in the Congress to do so, I will speak and vote against the McCarran bill." He was one of the half dozen who spoke and voted against the bill and then in support of President Truman's eloquent veto, which, however, was overwhelmed in the final rollcall. Herbert Lehman voted in the Senate as he had acted in both his private and public life, for what he considered was right, regardless of political expediency or personal consequences.

As I think of him now, there lives again the spirit of the words which Shakespeare has Mark Anthony say upon the death of Brutus.

"This was the noblest Roman of
Them all: * * * he * * *
* * * in general honest thought,
And common good to all made one of them.
His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world: 'This was a man.'"

—FRANK GRAHAM.

Social Security Benefits for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills, identical in all but one provision, amending the disability insurance cash benefits provisions of title II of the Social Security Act, so that this social insurance program will more adequately meet the disastrous economic consequences of blindness in the lives of our fellow citizens. These bills are H.R. 11393 and H.R. 11394.

We have today some 400,000 persons in the United States who are afflicted with blindness. Of this number, about 10 percent are under 21 years of age and about 50 percent are over 65. In my own State of Connecticut the State board of education reported in March of this year that we had 3,346 blind persons in 1963. During the year, the board reported, 327 new blind clients were registered in the State. About half of all the blind persons in Connecticut were more than 65 years old.

Although training, techniques, and tools are now available to assist a person without sight to function fully and successfully, the loss of sight still remains a severe disability.

This is so, not because of the nature of blindness, but because of the economic consequences which result upon its occurrance.

This was so a thousand years ago—in times we today consider the Dark Ages—but it is still true today in our age of enlightment.

It is very difficult for a person without sight to earn a decent diving—or to even get the chance to demonstrate his ability to fill a vacant job.

It is very difficult for a blind man with talents and abilities, with education and specialized training, to secure any employment at all; it is even more difficult to obtain a position equal to his qualification.

Today it is possible for individuals without sight to adjust to the changed, and at first seemingly catastrophic, conditions of a lifetime without sight.

But man is wonderfully adaptable. Adjustments are made. New ways of doing former activities are learned. New and different skills are acquired and developed.

But many is the blind person who has discovered that, however well he may travel alone without sight; however completely and successfully he may have adjusted to the circumstances of blindness—in spite of all this, he discovers when he looks for a job, when he seeks to earn a living—rejecting dependency as the easy way out—too often he finds that he is regarded and treated with a wary sympathy, a kind but aloof interest.

His request for work too often is greeted by equivocations and evasions.

Too often he is told by the company manager that there is nothing more he would rather do than put him to work—but, and too often this is the catch—unfortunately, the company has no jobs the blind can do.

Not only does the trained and qualified applicant for a job not get a job—too often he does not even get the opportunity of demonstrating his qualifications to handle a job.

Too often the experienced worker who loses his sight is believed no longer capable of performing the same work without sight that he did for years with sight. Nor is he believed capable of filling any kind of job in the very field he has worked in, been active in all of his working life.

No, Mr. Speaker, the consequences of blindness no longer need be a terrible tragedy, shattering hope and destroying ambition—but too often it is.

However well trained and qualified they may be to fill positions of productive responsibility in business and industry, blind persons are subjected to economic discriminations which act as barriers in their way. They are limited in their opportunities even today—and this makes blindness still an economic catastrophe.

The bills I have introduced would lessen the economic disadvantages of blindness, would offset the economic losses sustained when blindness occurs in the lives of working people.

The first provision, identical in both bills, would incorporate in the disability insurance cash benefits provisions of the Social Security Act the definition of blindness which is generally used in Federal and State programs which deal with the blind, which is commonly recognized and accepted in work for the blind throughout the Nation.

This definition provides an ophthalmological standard for determining blindness; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees.

A person who meets this definition of blindness, whose visual impairment is such as to constitute blindness and who is otherwise eligible would, according to this first provision of my bills, be entitled to receive cash payments under the disability insurance program and would continue in this entitlement to receive cash payments so long as he remains blind.

Mr. Speaker, this provision of my bills enacted into law would serve to make the disability insurance program truly a program providing cash benefits to offset economic losses sustained, providing regular cash income to replace lost earnings, regular fixed money payments to compensate for lost or diminished earning power.

Conditioning the right to receive disability payments upon proof of the existence of the definable disability of blindness, this proposal as Federal law would grant the blind person seeking work, the blind person already employed, a floor of financial security. Not only would it equalize his disadvantaged economic status, but it would provide him with the money he needs to meet the extra costs incurred as he operates without sight in a sight-dominated world.

Fulfilling his obligations as provider for his family's needs as he is able to pay household bills with disability insurance benefit checks, the workman newly without sight can and will concern himself with rehabilitation; he can and will achieve restoration to normal life and living.

Entitled to draw disability benefits when blindness occurs, the worker, newly without sight, would be assured of minimum income while he learns to live again, as he is re-educated and retrained to work again.

But though rehabilitation may be completed and employment secured, too often the job obtained will be of the lowest paying, most unskilled kind—packaging for special short-term "test runs," simple touch inspection, uncomplicated assembling and the like—"handwork" jobs that everyone knows the blind are capable of doing.

And he may be hired for such work even though he is highly skilled by training and experience to do very much different work, better paying and offering a permanent work future.

So, even after the blind man gets a job, he will still have need for his disability cash benefits payments.

So, even though the newly blind workman is one of the fortunate few who share his disability to be hired for a job, he will still need disability benefits to bridge the gap between his former economic level and the present marginal one. He will still need these benefits to reduce the adverse effects on his diminished earning power.

Mr. Speaker, the second provision, and again it is the same in both of my bills, would abolish the present requirement in the disability insurance law which conditions entitlement to receive cash benefits or to continue to receive such benefits upon the acceptance of vocational rehabilitation services.

I believe that this provision of existing law which conditions the right to receive benefits upon a factor other than the existence of a medically determinable disability is a negation of the whole concept and purpose of the program as a disability insurance program.

This condition of compulsion—this requirement in present law that a disabled person must accept vocational rehabilitation services or forfeit his rightful benefits—"rightful" since he is disabled—is a rejection of the object and spirit of rehabilitation—for rehabilitation is achieved through stimulation and encouragement, not by threats of punishment, not by penalties exacted under coercive provisions of law.

A man newly disabled must not, cannot be frightened into rebuilding his life; he cannot be compelled to hope again. This man needs help and guidance, not hostility and compulsion.

This provision of law, I believe, hinders, rather than helps, the attainment of the goal of rehabilitation. It should be removed from the law.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, my two bills, which would make certain improvements in the disability insurance program, differ, but the difference between them is only in degree, it is not a difference in purpose or intent.

The final provision of H.R. 11393 (first bill) would reduce the length of time blind persons must work in covered employment to establish eligibility for disability cash benefits, from the present requirement of 20 to 6 quarters.

My proposal is an effort to make the disability insurance program cash benefits available to workers who are blind, or to workers who become blind, after they have been employed in work covered by the provisions of the Social Security Act for a year and one-half.

To require that blind persons work only six quarters in covered employment to qualify for disability benefits, is to recognize that the usual kinds of work in industry offered to them is what I would describe as peripheral work—special, short-term jobs, where it is not worthwhile or necessary to add regular workers to the company's work force. Too often, these are the jobs available to blind persons—unskilled, poorly paying jobs, uncertain in duration—these are the jobs they are hired to do, and they are fired when they are over.

A total of six quarters' employment at this kind of work may be spread over a period of several years. It is always uncertain in duration, uncertain of availability, and always pays the lowest possible wages.

Five years, 20 quarters, is much too long a time as an eligibility requirement if the disability insurance program is to be of help to a substantial number of blind persons; some of them will not work this long in covered employment.

I believe that it is extremely important that disability payments be available to a worker when the calamity of blindness occurs, to reduce the corrosive consequences of lost income, lost economic independence, with resultant dependency upon public or private charity.

Mr. Speaker, reducing the required length of time a blind person must be engaged in employment covered by the Social Security Act would be of great assistance at such a time, for working men and women who must learn to live again without sight.

However, Mr. Speaker, should Congress be unwilling to approve such a departure from existing law and disability insurance requirements, then I urge the acceptance of the final provision of my other bill, H.R. 11394.

This provision, as Federal law, would make it possible for a person who is blind, according to the generally accepted and used definition of blindness, who has been employed in work covered by the Social Security Act for the presently prescribed period of time—20 quarters—to establish eligibility for, and receive disability insurance benefits so long as he remains disabled by blindness.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say, from my experience with blind people over the years, I am confident that, given the help that adoption of either of my bills would provide, given the minimum financial security of either bill would make available to them, substantial numbers of sightless people would gain renewed hope, would have the heart to work toward and to achieve rehabilitation and economic self-sufficiency.

A blind person—or a sighted person either, for that matter—cannot think and plan and work toward a new, different, and difficult future when he is buried beneath an avalanche of accumulated family debts, when he is pauperized and dependent upon others for his very need, when he is displaced as head of his family and becomes its nonproductive, unemployable member.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of sightless Americans need and merit the help and hope which either of my bills, enacted into law, would give them.

Our Speaker Presents Views on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein two very timely, comprehensive, and penetrating articles on President Johnson's antipoverty program by our esteemed and dear friend, our great Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

In these articles our illustrious Speaker, with characteristic keen insight, broad vision, and humane feeling, has brilliantly postulated some of the principal considerations implicit in the forward-looking antipoverty program of the President.

I am sure that the Congress and the country will appreciate having the bene-

fit of our beloved Speaker's wise observations and commentaries on this tremendously vital problem, as ably presented in the column entitled, "Washington," by my good friend, the well-known, talented writer, Mr. Frank Daley.

The articles follow:

L.B.J. SEES POVERTY FIRSTHAND

(By Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives)

Lyndon Johnson has brought hope to Appalachia. A man who always wants to see for himself, he chose to go behind the statistics to the suffering they pinpoint.

He wanted to talk to the man who had found no work at all this year—to the woman who had to serve her family cold potatoes and water meal after meal—to the boy who was gaining nothing from his few hours in the one-room schoolhouse shack because he lacked the physical energy to stay awake.

The President observed mountains of misery, long valleys of despair. I am sure his experiences redoubled his determination to batter down the barriers that bar Americans in Appalachia and elsewhere from the mainstream of the Nation's life.

In parts of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia there are few roads to travel, few radios and television sets to bring in news, few factories to hire the unemployed.

Appalachia's economy was based on coal. As automation revolutionized the coal industry, new products cut down the demand for coal. Thousands of mines and allied industries that depended on them fell idle.

Men who would willingly learn new skills find no new industries coming in to replace the mines. Factories are not attracted to an area without highways, electric power, and a trained work force. This is the challenge which President Johnson is meeting.

On his trips into Appalachia, the President realized that the crucial need was for hope. And that he could give. As President of the United States he is leader of the "other America" as well as of the more affluent segments of our society.

So he went to Appalachia as a man to whom a down-and-out miner could talk—despite the awesome power of the Presidency. On a ramshackle porch, Johnson asked questions and got answers, and the miner knew he'd met a man who understood poverty and who could sense the helplessness of a father caught in its vicious cycle.

Federal aid now going into stopgap relief is costing half a billion dollars a year. This money can only hold off the immediate threats of malnutrition and complete collapse—it cannot change the status quo. It cannot give the poor new jobs so they can participate in our free enterprise system.

After his first visit to Appalachia, the President proposed to Congress a $238 million program to blast through the walls, sending highways into previously inaccessible hamlets, developing natural resources, preventing floods, and training workers for the industries that will follow the highways in to build their factories.

He approved a comprehensive regional development plan to be guided by a commission. If this is enacted, the relief lines will dwindle, the supermarket lines will lengthen. Industrial and personal profits will rise.

I know that Americans of all political shades of conviction will see the eminent good sense of the President's plan and will give him their wholehearted support.

POVERTY CURE NO PIPEDREAM

(By Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives)

The Nation today faces a hard, basic challenge: to eliminate poverty. This is no pipedream. It can be done. It is a plausible objective within our reach.

President Johnson has analyzed this challenge and proposed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as a blueprint for action.

President Johnson's antipoverty program is a carefully drawn, logical plan that will enable us to gradually bring all our people into the comfortable life most of us now enjoy.

These are 35 million of our fellow citizens who are shackled to poverty, largely through circumstance. They live marginal existences, outside the circle of affluence, outside the free enterprise system.

Clear Fork Valley, Tenn., is deep in the heart of America's poverty-stricken Appalachian country. There Mrs. Marlow and her eight children struggle daily against the grinding poverty in which they must live—but it is a losing struggle.

Last November Thomas Marlow and a companion were trying to scratch a living from one of the pitiful little coal pits that dot the region. As so often happens, there was a cave-in. The companion was killed and Marlow's back was crushed. He is still a charity patient in the hospital, but will return home soon—paralyzed.

Home is a shack that rents for $8 a week. There the Marlows conduct their battle against hunger and dirt.

The Marlows are better off than some. Next month they will receive a check for $110 a month from the Welfare Department. The trouble is, it isn't enough.

Columbus Cooper started clearing his 26-acre South Carolina farm when he was 16 years old. Now he is 57. Four years ago he had to mortgage his farm for the first time.

It is estimated that to maintain an ordinary standard of living a farmer needs to gross at least $10,000 a year cash income. Columbus Cooper, with a family of 12, grosses $1,500.

President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act outlines the basic steps that will help these victims of the "other America" to break their economic bonds.

As President Johnson said in his poverty message:

"Today, for the first time in our history, we have the power to strike away the barriers to full participation in our society. Having the power, we have the duty."

Address of Secretary of Defense McNamara on Military Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the National Industrial Conference Board in New York, May 21, 1964. I trust the remarks of the Secretary will be read with great care:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1964, 8:00 P.M. (EDT)

For more than 15 years, one of the foundation stones upon which the United States has built its foreign policy has been the program of economic and military assistance to friendly nations. The fact that this policy has held communism in check and has helped many of our allies and other nations of the Free World toward self-sustaining growth is proof of its success.

Yet, this program is under fire.

Many Americans are disturbed because although President after President has requested funds annually to support armed forces and economic development in countries far from our shores, the Congress seems to reduce the requests as a standard practice. Many of the questions raised in the Congress, by the press and among our citizens reveal misunderstanding of the program, including the military assistance part of it.

Last year, for example, the military assistance program submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy called for $1.4 billion in appropriations. The Congress, halfway through the fiscal year in which the money was to be spent, cut that amount to $1 billion. This was a severely disrupting reduction of almost 30 percent. In January this year, President Johnson, after taking account of the mood of the Congress and the public, as well as of the minimum need, requested just $1 billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

It is against this background that I would like to talk to you tonight about military assistance. I shall not discuss economic assistance in detail because it does not fall within the area of my immediate responsibility. However, as a citizen and as one who has been close to the issues, I assure you that strong and plentiful plowshares are as important as sharp swords in the complex equation that produces national security. And I assure you further that the President's program for economic aid deserves your full support.

My theme tonight is that the defense of the free world and of the vital interests of the United States are dependent upon the strength of the entire free world and not merely upon the strength of the United States alone. Although the United States is the central power source in the free world struggle for national independence, integrity and economic progress, the United States, by itself, cannot be everywhere at once, doing everything best. Only with staunch friends, well armed and ready, can we provide the integrated balance of forces and the options necessary in a nuclear world.

The military assistance program is designed to help achieve that integrated balance. It helps support military forces that complement our own Armed Forces.

Let me remind you, first, of the past of the military assistance program.

The year 1945 found the American people proud of victory but weary of war. Our men returned to civil life. Our industries shifted to meet demands long denied by war.

While we demobilized the Soviets maintained enough of their wartime strength to pursue an aggressive policy in Europe. The war legacy of poverty, destruction, and political disruption left no European nation or group of European nations capable of resisting the power of the Soviet Union. Thus the Communist system was imposed on Eastern European states occupied by Soviet forces.

In the Far East, the Chinese Communists spread from the base areas they had developed in the war against Japan over all of mainland China. By 1949 they were in physical control.

Communist movements, generally directed from Moscow, were dangerously close to seizing power in Greece, Italy, the Philippines, Malaya, and many feared in scores of other countries. Communist military pressures mounted against those nations on the periphery of the Communist bloc, particularly against Greece, Turkey, and Iran.

The erosion of freedom and independence throughout the world could be stopped effectively only if the United States gave leadership. No other free country then had sufficient resources. Our response was in the American tradition. It was humanitarian and utilitarian.

The Marshall plan provided the basis for the recovery of economic strength in Europe. Both military assistance and economic aid were provided to assist Greece, Turkey, and the Philippines in their struggles against Communists. These programs, and the warning given to the Soviets to withdraw from northern Iran, signaled the beginning of our efforts to meet the rapidly growing Communist threat in all corners of the world.

The United States assumed this leadership in its own self-interest. In a shrinking, increasingly interdependent world, we could no longer wear the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans as blinders.

The Berlin blockade in 1948–49 and the atack on South Korean in 1950 merely confirmed that we were faced in faraway places with major challenges to our security. Our response was to increase our own military strength. At the same time we made appropriations five times as large as today's for programs of military assistance to free nations through the world whose security was vital to the United States and who could not fully support their own requirements.

What was accomplished with these resources?

Most of the funds appropriated during the early 1950's were used as a matter of priority to build the forces of our European allies. Neither the United States alone nor our European allies alone could provide forces enough to meet a Soviet threat in Europe. Furthermore, our European allies could not recover economically and at the same time train and equip the forces they needed. Therefore, a combination of U.S. forces on the one hand and U.S. equipment and training for European forces on the other helped create the needed military strength in Western Europe.

The policy worked.

The Soviets were deterred from moving against this strength. Indeed, by the late fifties, recovery in Europe had advanced markedly, and this crucial focus of allied power became better able to support its own military forces. One of the first steps which President Kennedy took in 1961, therefore, was to direct the closing out of our military assistance programs to the European NATO nations, except for Greece, Turkey, and Portugal. In the case of two other countries, Norway and Denmark, we are completing prior commitments.

During the buildup in Europe, there was a strenuous effort toward build up in the Pacific as a result of the confrontation with Communist China in Korea. Foremost in our concern were the Republics of Korea and of China, whose combined forces reached more than 1 million men.

Here, too, the program worked.

Communist Chinese aggression against these two outposts has been deterred.

At the peak of our military assistance program during the midfifties, the United States was contributing to the development and equipment of a free world strength of 200 divisions of friendly military forces—forces with some 27,000 aircraft and 2,500 naval vessels.

The great accomplishments of the foreign economic and military assistance programs in the past, particularly in Western Europe, have not by any means eliminated the need for a sizable level of effort to promote free world security in the present and in the future.

The Communist threat that we and our allies continue to face is great, and it is complex. At one end of the spectrum there is the possibility of nuclear war. At the other end, there is the threat of subversion and terrorism. In between the extremes are the threats of major conventional attack, local probes, and logistics and manpower support across borders. This entire spectrum remains relevant, and the threats must be dealt with where they cast their shadow.

Unfortunately, we shall not have time this evening to discuss three of the smaller portions of the President's request for military assistance funds. One of these elements, accounting for 14 percent of the funds requested, provides for the small but very important military assistance programs for the 15 countries in Latin America; the aid for the 3 countries where we have military base rights; the projects for the emerging nations where resistance to the extension of Communist influence is critical to our national interests; and the programs for the 3 countries—Denmark, Norway, and Japan—where our aid is being phased out.

A second of these elements includes the highly inflexible 11 percent of the budget figure which must go to cover administrative and support expenses of the military assistance program.

And the third accounting for 11 percent of the budget includes funds to finance military sales or to cover the U.S. share of the cost of facilities and activities which are essential to effective oversea deployment of U.S. military strength.

Our military assistance program today is oriented mainly toward those countries on the periphery of the major Communist nations where the threats are greatest and in which the indigenous resources are least. In the fiscal year 1965 program now before the Congress, about two-thirds of the total amount is scheduled to go to the 11 nations on the southern and eastern perimeters of the Soviet and Red Chinese blocs. These sentinels of the free world, in a sense, are in double jeopardy from potential military aggression from without and from attempted subversion from within. These countries are under the Red shadow. They face the major threat and they are the ones most affected by the modernization of Communist forces. For this group we requested $745 million in military assistance. They best illustrate the points I want to make.

Imagine a globe, if you will, and on that globe the Sino-Soviet bloc. The bloc is contained at the north by the Arctic. To the west are the revitalized nations of Western Europe. But across the south and to the east you find the "forward defense" nations—Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, Laos, Thailand, South Vietnam, the Philippines, and the Republics of China and Korea. These nations, together with stretches of the Pacific Ocean bearing the U.S. fleet, describe an arc along which the free world draws its front lines of defense.

The front lines are there in the interests of those 11 nations; the lines are there also in the interests of the United States and the rest of the free world. The areas which this 11-nation arc protects are of obvious strategic importance to the United States. More significant, however, is the importance of the arc to the principle that nations have a right to be independent—a right to develop in peace, in freedom, and according to the principle of self-determination. United States support of these rights at the frontiers thickens the blood of the free world family; it strentghens our security at home.

We must recognize, however, that the United States does not have the resources to maintain a credible force by itself along all of this great arc of forward positions. Such a strategy would be unbearably costly to us in both money and human resources. The United States maintains major combat units ashore in forward positions only in Europe and in parts of the Far East. Such deployments are costly and hurt our balance-of-payments position. We do not now contemplate additional semipermanent deployments of forces aboard.

On the other hand, the free world cannot leave long stretches of that arc undefended. The answer to the problem, of course, is a mix of forces—of local forces deployed in their homelands and of United States and other defense treaty forces ready for rapid deployment in the event of attack wherever and whenever it might come.

The United States part of the mix has grown greatly in strength and flexibility:

Since 1961, the United States has made great strides in developing strategic retaliatory forces. These bomber and missile forces, which stand ready at all times, are a powerful deterrent to nuclear war in particular and, indeed, to major war of any sort. They are one of the great U.S. contributions to the free world defense posture.

We are making dramatic increases in strategic airlift.

We have organized the U.S. Strike Command which comprises a powerful array of forces that can be deployed rapidly abroad.

Our improved amphibious lift, together with modernized Marine forces, provide us with the ability to keep forces just over the horizon, so to speak, from any threatened spot, and to commit these forces quickly where and when needed and to support them over a sustained period of time.

No matter how much we spend and no matter what advances are made in military transportation or in the weapons available to the United States to provide the vital and mobile reserve behind the local forces, the requirement for local forces—forces on the spot—as the first line of resistance remains. To make the strategy effective, these forces must both appear to be able, and actually be able, to force external aggression to be unambiguous, to hold vital terrain long enough for reinforcement, and to fight and win in concert with other free world forces. In this mix, it should be noted, local forces sometimes have important advantages over U.S. forces. They are more familiar with local terrain and conditions. In the main, they can get much of their support locally; they are defending their own homelands.

The 11 "forward defense" nations contribute more than 3½ million men to the defense of freedom. Together, they maintain more men under arms than does the United States. A completely fair cost comparison is impossible. But it should be noted that the estimated average annual cost of each U.S. soldier overseas—just for his pay, allowances, subsistence and individual clothing—is almost $4,000. The average cost of the 3½ million men under arms in the 11 "forward defense" countries ranges from $200 to $750 per soldier—a cost fully borne in all but 3 cases by the nation itself. For the United States to replace the contribution in manpower that these countries make would require a completely unacceptable level of conscription in this country. And the cost would be enormous.

Let me come at this point from another direction:

Why do we have a military budget exceeding $50 billion, exclusive of military assistance? We do not need that much to maintain the forces required at this moment in time to defend the territorial limits of the 50 United States. A large fraction of the $50 billion is spent on things designed to insure that aggression is stopped at the outer limits of the free world, far from our territory. Such insurance necessarily implies close cooperation, and allocation of functions, among the nations of the free world.

Just as we do our best to allocate our resources sensibly within the U.S. military budget, so must we allocate our resources sensibly in the larger context. The United States has advantages in technology and wealth over the countries at the frontier. But the nations at the frontier have advantages, too—in manpower, proximity and familiarity with local conditions. If they tried to do for themselves what we can do best, there would be enormous waste and frustration.

Similarly, if we tried to do for ourself what they can do best, the cost in men and

other resources could increase by a factor of 5, 10 or 20, if we could do it at all. Therefore, just as a given number of dollars spent on the U.S. Navy would make no sense if disproportionately few dollars were invested in the U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force, so it is that $50 billion spent on the U.S. component of the free world mix of forces makes no sense if disproportionately few resources are invested in the components which our allies and friends can best provide.

It is nonsense to forge a strong horseshoe without strong horseshoe nails.

But how can the local-force element of the mix be achieved? Most of our friends along the Communist periphery are poor—some, very poor. The annual per capita gross national product in these countries ranges from $440 in Greece to $80 in India. By way of comparison, our per capita gross national product is almost $3,000. It is as unrealistic to expect them to equip their own units adequately as it is to expect the United States to provide the manpower. With proper training, their men can use modern equipment well, and they have a profound awareness of the threat they face.

The answer is: They must have U.S. military assistance.

To give you an idea of the situation that now exists in the forward defense countries, I am going to talk about three examples—Vietnam, Greece and Turkey. In two of these there is no major effort being made at subversion. The third—Vietnam—is the country of the forward group which now faces the most serious and direct armed action. Let me say a few words about that special case first.

In Vietnam, as I reported fully after my March trip, we are faced with active and unprovoked externally supplied and directed insurgency. Our military assistance equipment, training, advice—is vital there not only to answer the call of the South Vietnamese and to help prevent the danger of Communist expansion throughout that part of the world, but also to prove that the free world can cope with wars of liberation as we have been able to cope with Communist aggression at other levels.

I was in Vietnam again last week, as you know. I found some progress in the fight there—progress toward "bottoming out" the difficulties caused by the recent double change in government—but the journey ahead will still be long, difficult and frustrating. We have agreed with the Vietnamese Government that their regular military and paramilitary forces must be increased substantially and soon. We are now strengthening the Vietnamese Air Force with 100 A-1 aircraft and the number of Vietnamese combat pilots is being doubled. The A-1 aircraft are suited to the changed type of war being fought today and to the capabilities of the Vietnamese to fly and maintain them. To meet these and other special requirements, the President this week asked the Congress to add $55 million in military assistance for Vietnam to the 1965 budget request.

Now let me turn to Greece and Turkey.

The Turks and the Greeks cannot forget that their territory has been the target of Russian aggressive intentions that long predate the Communist Revolution. They remember that the Russians asked for territorial concessions from Turkey after the Second World War. The Turks are aware that their control of the Bosporus and the Dardanelles puts them astride a gateway of great strategic importance to Russia. The Greeks well remember the Red-inspired civil war.

Opposing these two countries are the Soviet Union and Bulgaria, which have been modernizing their forces. Improvements in U.S. forces have generally kept pace with the U.S.S.R. and her satellites, but this has not been possible in the case of Greece and Turkey. Equipment of several types is rapidly becoming obsolete. This obsolescence, particularly in the face of modernization on the other side, could create a dangerous feeling of weakness among our allies and could invite adventurous sorties by their Communist neighbors.

Consider what has happened in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian Army structure since 1959 has changed from one consisting of 10 rifle divisions with limited defensive strength to one consisting of 7 motorized and 3 tank divisions with strong offensive capabilities.

The increased mobility of Bulgarian forces has not been matched by improvements in Greek and Turkish equipment. Bulgarian forces for example, are now equipped with Russian T-54 and T-55 tanks, which are first-line medium tanks equipped with the 100 mm. gun. In addition to the standard military trucks which have been introduced to motorize the infantry divisions, the Bulgarians have received the newest Russian 8-wheeled armored personnel carrier. Bulgaria also possesses relatively large quantities of self-propelled guns, howitzers, and antiaircraft guns, as well as the various communications, maintenance and support equipment required by a modern army.

This impressive record of modernization and improvement has not been matched by equivalent progress in the Greek and Turkish armed forces. In almost all categories of equipment, the Greeks and Turks are either seriously short of equipment or are operating equipment which is so old as to be of marginal usefulness. The Greeks and Turks have the manpower, and they have the will to defend themselves; the problem is that the necessary equipment is missing, and that Greece and Turkey, valiant as they are, are simply too poor to purchase it on their own account.

Now, how did this situation come about?

Improved mobility, firepower and communications for Greek and Turkish forces could not be provided in the fiscal year 1963 military assistance program because of the combined effect of a congressional reduction in the administration request and increased requirements in Vietnam and India which had to be funded within the overall total available. Some of the most vital requirements could have been met within the $1.4 billion request for fiscal year 1964. However, the congressional 29-percent reduction to $1 billion forced cuts of over 20 percent in the programs for both Greece and Turkey. These reductions, for example, meant complete elimination of self-propelled 105-mm. howitzers and machineguns from the programs for these countries, and reductions in the number of rockets and vehicle spares.

It is proper that the total level of military aid has been reduced over the years. The termination of assistance to economically sufficient countries of Europe justifies a reduction. However, the reductions that have taken place go well beyond those warranted by the world situation. As cuts have continued, the executive branch has attempted to trim its planning and its requests to a level which would permit full congressional support and avoid the administrative difficulties, inefficiency and waste that are inevitable when previously planned programs are sharply reduced. The requests for military assistance have been consistently decreasing. President Johnson's request for the fiscal year beginning July 1 is roughly half of President Eisenhower's request for fiscal year 1962. Despite these decreasing requests, congressional budget cutting has continued unabated. The cuts have ranged from 10 percent in 1961 to last year's 29 percent.

The prospects for the future are not bright.

General Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has characterized the 1965 level for military assistance and the program associated with it as "a holding operation of borderline adequacy." He believes that we cannot operate with that level in the next few years "without a serious loss of military effectiveness in many countries which it is in our interest to support." I agree. But in light of public attitudes toward this program reflected in the reductions made each recent year by the Congress, I was unwilling to recommend that the President request a higher figure.

Past appropriations by the Congress significantly below the level requested by the executive branch have made a shambles out of the military assistance planning process and have caused waste. I would rather request and receive $1 billion than request a substantially higher figure only to have the request sharply cut after months of controversy and well into the year in which the funds are to be committed.

If I am able to leave but one thought with you this evening, it is this: It would be less than wise—indeed, it would be foolhardy—for the United States to spend $50 billion a year to develop and maintain its own forces and at the same time to refuse to help provide training and equipment to the people in the frontlines who must complement our forces and who are the key to successful joint defense. To have a strong U.S. Military Establishment, and at the same time to neglect the allied forces who would fight alongside our own, is a shortsighted and wasteful approach to our national security. As I said earlier, it is nonsense to forge a strong horseshoe without strong horseshoe nails. We must maintain a balance, and that balance can be maintained only by an adequate level of military assistance.

Unwillingness to devote sufficient resources to military assistance will weaken the national forces of our friends and thereby weaken the combined forces of the free world on which we rely for defense and for the credibility needed to prevent Communist miscalculation in showdowns.

The alternatives are clear: If military assistance is cut, the United States either must make up for the reductions with U.S. forces, or must retrench its foreign policy.

The executive branch has stated that military assistance must be kept at the necessary level. The question now rests with you and the Congress of the United States.

Thank you.

Swept Under the Rug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1964, Radio Press International, on its panel program entitled "From the People," interviewed Mr. Don B. Reynolds, Silver Spring, Md., insuranceman whose former association with Bobby Baker and information concerning the latter's activities led to the scandal that has rocked Washington and the Nation.

Also appearing on the interviewing panel were Mr. Harry Clarkson, moderator; Mr. Herb Brubaker, of Radio Press International, and Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles Publications.

The interview is especially interesting in view of the determined effort that

is being made to sweep the Bobby Baker activities and scandals under the rug.

The interview makes it clear that there are many ramifications of the Baker activities that have not been explored and the failure to get to the bottom of this sorry mess leaves a smear upon both the congressional and executive branches of Government.

The previous testimony given under oath by Mr. Reynolds has not been explored in any substantial part of its ramifications and, apparently, there is not the slightest desire on the part of some people to hear the full story of this key witness. In other words, it is apparent that the public is to be denied facts concerning the operation of their Government that they have every right to know.

Following are the pertinent portions of the interview with Mr. Reynolds:

FROM THE PEOPLE

Mr. CLARKSON. Mr. Reynolds, why did you want to appear again before the Rules Committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I felt that at the time of my appearance there with the committee that my questions and answers were controlled by the phraseology used in bringing out the questions, and let's say they assiduously stayed away from questions I felt they should have gone into.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, what are some of the things you wanted to tell the Rules Committee that you didn't have a chance to tell it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it is more of a question of going into fields of exploration than to tell any specifics. I think the question of the whole background of Bobby Baker coming into being. The thing that spawned Bobby Baker. The environment that produced Bobby Baker is a thing that the American public is entitled to know, which they have never gone into.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Do you have any theories as to why the committee did not go into them?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, because the people that helped produce Bobby Baker as a finished product are very high in political life.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, you say there are some things the American public should know about Bobby Baker. What are some of those things?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well in my humble opinion Bobby came to Washington as a youngster; a very adept youngster, a very intelligent one, and he was exposed to what is commonly considered the top of our political field. When I first knew Bobby some 10 years ago I had no higher regard for any young man I had ever been exposed to. But unfortunately, as time came and passed, I had the feeling that Bobby was being exposed to people, or things, of which I did not approve. And I found Bobby drawn closely toward people whose personalities or actions I did not approve.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, with regard to the current situation. In the last week or so we've had Mr. Walter Jenkins, who is the aid to the President of the United States, divesting himself of this L.B.J. Co. interest, etc. What do you think that amounts to? Do you think that's enough of a separation for him to make in the light of his present job?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I'm no legal expert obviously, but I have a layman's opinion. Based upon the skulduggery that has gone on in the past it is obviously done for subterfuge in the present.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In this respect there have been a lot of stories and statements made relative to the fact that you sold $200,000 worth of insurance to the President and then subsequently there was the television set that was given to the President of the United States, when he was Vice President, I guess he was majority leader, and there was also some payment for advertising. Now you had a personal relationship with Mr. Jenkins on this matter?

Mr. REYNOLDS. With the question of television advertising time, only with Walter Jenkins. No other person at any time.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. And now, was this an isolated case Mr. Reynolds. Do you feel that this was the only time that Jenkins was doing any amount of work for the L.B.J. Co.? In advertising matters?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No. In recent days I have learned that Mr. Jenkins and others in having rendered services to Mr. Johnson, or to the L.B.J. Co., were faced with the same situation of shakedowns as far as getting payment in taking out TV advertising themselves with the radio station.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In other words Mr. Reynolds, you say in the last few days you have come across knowledge again that there are other persons who were required to purchase television time at the L.B.J. Co.?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. This is correct.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In a respect this was referred to, I guess, in the Senate and the House floor and some other places and newspapers as a rebate of sorts, and a rebate arrangement has some sort of illegality in the insurance field I understand. How do you regard this?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I had considered it from the beginning to the end as coercion. The parcels were sold and they were delivered. There was no implication of any impropriety at the time of the sale. After they were sold and delivered the question of purchasing advertising time was brought up and I was put up in a position where I felt that I had to purchase advertising time because of my smallness and the bigness of the people with whom I was doing business. And the question about the stereo set I considered a shakedown from beginning to end. I never even discussed giving a set to anyone so it was not a gift from me.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Mr. Reynolds, how did you happen to contact and talk with Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware at the outset in this investigation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Senator WILLIAMS called me and unfortunately I was not well enough informed of the Senate to know the relationship and different status of different Members. I had heard his name but I had no knowledge as to who he is or what he represented. So I had the courtesy to call Bobby Baker and I said, "Bobby, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware has called me and he requested that I come over and talk with him. What should I do?" Bobby said, "You get out of town and you stay out of town for a couple of weeks. Don't you talk with him. He'll get you and the rest of us into jail." And he said, "if you need any money let me know and I'll send you some."

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, then, you saw the Senator. Why did you see the Senator under these circumstances? Why did you go over and talk to him and cooperate?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wanted, No. 1, to show my respect for a man in that position, and to see what Senator WILLIAMS himself was like. And I had reached a crossroads in my life as far as Bobby and his associates were concerned, anyway. And if he was identified with what I considered at the moment correct and right, I at least wanted to give him the opportunity of talking with me.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, I understood, I had heard some report, that at some stage along about this stage that your wife had said that she preferred that you not associate with Bobby Baker and some of those people. What was the basic situation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was long before this. Jerry and I—my better half—had discussed the fact that Bobby was doing things that she did not approve of, and she didn't think it was good for me. But this began back as early as 1960 or late 1959.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In other words, your relationship from Bobby changed along about late 1959 or early 1960? That it was not as close?

Mr. REYNOLDS. This is true. There was a gradual drift and a final breakoff.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, then, after you got to the point where you were cooperating with the Senator, did you have any contact with any representatives of the Vice President's office? It was Vice President Johnson then. Relative to this insurance matter?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, when it first started I received a call from Mr. George Reedy, and he contacted me in my downtown office in Washington and informed me that he had had the President in contact with him and that possibly it would be better for me to refrain from making any statements at all. That he would release all information pertaining to the insurance on the previously Senator Johnson.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Did you go into the detail with him relative to the stereo and the payments back to the L.B.J. Co. at that stage?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all, nor did he ask.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. He didn't want you to say anything at all about it, but let him release everything.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He said that he would take care of everything for releases.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, are these so-called shakedowns still going on?

Mr. REYNOLDS. With me, of course not. They terminated. But, having seen the pattern, having seen what I've learned in the past few days with other small people who were involved with them, I can believe that the pattern having previously been established has continued.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Do you have any information, Mr. Reynolds, to whom these people might be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it will be made public in the next few days and I don't think I should disclose my information.

Mr. BRUBAKER. On this program several weeks ago Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, told us this, "that your records were looked into and in essence you were being intimidated by someone in the administration." What's your comment on those charges?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well they intended to. They intended to frighten me, but I was never frightened, thank God, because of the courage I had myself and was furnished by friends.

Mr. BRUBAKER. He also indicated that the man who was trying to intimidate you was Walter Jenkins. Is that your information?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I think certainly Walter Jenkins, I think Bobby through his friends were trying to intimidate me, but I think they were still trying to protect other people.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, we have also heard a great deal of talk about a so-called call girl ring on Capitol Hill. What do you know about that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I don't know about call girls, but I say ladies of leisure or ladies in waiting.

Mr. BRUBAKER. And is this thing widespread? Whom might it touch and what other information do you have?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I don't think there's any limit to where it will go, if they wish to know the truth, and if the American public wishes to know how its public officials live.

Mr. BRUBAKER. What else can you tell us about that matter?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I can tell you that I was exposed to it long enough to know the existence of ladies of leisure and they were used with people in terms of potentiality of defense contracts and influencing other people. But it's not unusual because I saw the pat-

tern in the operation of the Murchison Bros.

Mr. BRUBAKER. So this was used, this so-called ladies of leisure ring, was used to so-called illegal ends.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I would say it's immoral and unethical ends. Whether it's legal or not I don't know. I don't know the legal aspect of it.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Possibly with a view Mr. Reynolds, of influencing very important people to get fat contracts to business.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They found out what the persons they were dealing with were weak in—if it were a question of power or position they'd try to provide it, or if it were a question of money, or a question of whisky, or if it's a question of ladies of leisure I think they'd provide what the persons wanted.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, how long has this being going on on the Hill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh Lord, I don't know. Ever since I've known it.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Mr. Reynolds, now at one stage, in effort to discredit you, there was some information that was leaked around to some columnists, allegations I guess, personal things of one kind or another. Do you know who leaked this information?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. It was leaked obviously through Mr. Anderson and Mr. Pearson but the information was collected and presented so that full knowledge and information of Mr. Jenkins and the Press side of the White House knew where it was, therefore Mr. Anderson was told where to go to obtain it.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In other words the White House had full knowledge of this effort to discredit you.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Without a question.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. And now in that respect what about your record, as a whole. I mean it was trying to reflect upon your record in the Air Force and your record as a Foreign Service officer. What is your record as a Foreign Service officer as far as the records are concerned?

Mr. REYNOLDS. As far as I'm personally concerned, I ended military service as a private as a youngster and I ended up in the Air Force intelligence as a major.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well was it an honorable discharge?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, that goes without saying. But there's another thing. Both of my first promotions were given me in a highly sensitive job in the operations division of War Department general staff under General Eisenhower.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well what about in the Foreign Service? Do you have an honorable discharge?

Mr. REYNOLDS. As far as I know. I left the Foreign Service to enter the military service to go on a two or three period of military service, and I had received in the Foreign Service, I started out as a vice consul, I've forgotten the grade, but I received yearly promotions and I was promoted from a vice consul to a full consul.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In other words, it was considered a proper type of record from a standpoint of everything that you knew.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well I advanced much more rapidly than the average man did.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States, keeps on saying that Bobby Baker was not his protege. What's your comment on that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, if a mother denies a son then I'll agree that is right.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Do you believe that Mr. Johnson has personally asked his people to go easy on the investigation, and has anybody in the White House told you to "lay off" as it were?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, but I have been told by Baker's law partner to be very careful, I might get hanged.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well in this respect, from the time this started, how many contacts have you had with Bobby Baker, say from back in late last September up 'til at least when you testified on November 22?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well number one, after it happened I went to Bobby and I told him of Senator Williams' desire to see me and I approached Bobby a second time with the idea if he would meet with a group of Senators and selected individuals and live up to certain terms they would probably permit him staying there and resigning at the end of the year, instead of forcing him with a situation. And as I was told, his resignation was typed, it was undated and unsigned.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Now I understand that there was a young woman involved in some financial transactions, Mrs. Novak, and that she'd had a rather, what she considered a very tough time in trying to collect certain moneys from Bobby Baker. Was this a part of the things that you were discussing with him? I heard something along that line.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, when Trudy lost her husband, Al Novak, I lost one of my best friends. And I had to come face to face with the fact that I had lost Al because of the pressure built upon him by Bobby Baker.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well then after he died then were you, I knew that some of their friends in the earlier period of time tried to get Bobby Baker to straighten the matter out, financially. Did you have anything to do with this? Did you ask Bobby to straighten things out with Trudy Novak?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I had mentioned it to him but Bobby told me I was a nit picker.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well what about the campaign contributions? There were some allegations generally that Bobby collected some campaign contributions while you were present, or something along this line. What do you know about Bobby collecting big sums?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Part of it I saw myself. For example, Mr. Fred Black transferring funds to Bobby Baker, I saw in the hotel myself. I did not see it counted there nor did I ever see Bobby count it, but when he was in my car we returned to the Capitol, he opened the envelope to show me it contained hundred dollar bills. This I saw with my own eyes.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. How much was this supposed to be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Supposed to have been approximately $10,000.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Was there any conversation indicating that it was campaign?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, it was filed for L.B.J.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. It was for Mr. Johnson?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, Mr. Black said to Bobby Baker, he said "this is for our friend, L.B.J. to be the next President."

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. And when would this have been?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In the summer of 1960.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. This was, the campaign was on. The Johnson for President campaign.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Right, and he said there was plenty more where that came from and he could produce a hundred thousand dollars for him.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, what more can you tell us about the Murchison business interests and its involvement with Bobby Baker and the whole issue?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, the only thing I can say is, thank God I had the good fortune to withdraw from them. Because I was informed by some good friends of mine, in New York, that it wasn't the type of thing that I would wish to become obligated to. And this is the unfortunate side of it because I saw Bobby being used by the Murchison interests.

Mr. BRUBAKER. In your estimation is the Justice Department looking into these matters vigorously?

Mr. REYNOLDS. They may look into them, but what they do with what they find God only knows.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Is there an indication that they are going soft on this affair?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It's a matter of opinion but I know that if I were the Attorney General of the United States and know only what I know I would not accept heat from any position to keep me from doing what I consider the right thing.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Mr. Reynolds, you said Mr. Novak died partially because of the pressures at least of Bobby Baker. There seems to be a little bit of confusion over whether he committed suicide. Do you believe he did and would you say there is a direct relation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. This is an unfortunate issue. I wish I did not believe, and have reason to believe, that Al Novak died because of his own conscious acts.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well Mr. Reynolds, now you have been testifying, you have testified and you have cooperated with Senator WILLIAMS for a period of months, and there has been quite a little bit of pressure put on you. Do you at this stage have any regrets that you decided that you would sit down and tell Senator WILLIAMS the story?

Mr. REYNOLDS. None whatsoever. I had reached a crossroads and if I had it to do all over again I would still choose Senator WILLIAM'S side because I am sure it was and is still the right way.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Now in this respect this represents a very serious and difficult thing for an individual to do and also from the standpoint of family. How does your wife feel about this at this stage where she's had to go through this whole problem of seeing you attacked publicly, seeing great efforts to discredit you. What does she think about it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. She's been a stalwart soldier. Without her help and support from the beginning up to the present time I could not have faced it.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well now there are some other areas that I've heard some reports on dealing with Mr. Bobby Baker and his activity; one relative to some expansion in the field of vending machines, which is where he made a great deal of his money; and one of those expansions was supposed to take place down in Fort Worth, Tex. Have you heard anything about that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I heard about it many months ago about General Dynamics Corp., but this leads into another field by Bobby's being the means or medium through which funds were channeled from General Dynamics to Mr. LBJ or the Democratic Party through a Grumman Aircraft representative, a Mr. Evans.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. I see. Well do you have any of the detail on that

Mr. REYNOLDS. I only have enough that if someone cared to ask me I would have given the information that Bobby told me direct himself.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. In other words, you have largely a number of leads that a committee or someone could follow out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; only direct information that Bobby gave me of his own first-hand knowledge.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Bobby talked with you about some of these matters.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; he did.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. He told you then that he was going to go into the General Dynamics plant?

Mr. REYNOLDS. He indicated they were looking in the Fort Worth area for a facility. That he felt sure, I didn't know what sort he was at that time. I had no conception of it but that he was going to make a lot of money down there.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. One of the other major scandals around in Government in recent

years that's involved Texas operation has been Billie Sol Estes. Is there any indication in your relationship with Bobby Baker that he might have had any knowledge about this matter?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Bobby had full knowledge of Mr. Billie Sol Estes furnishing funds for the then Senator Johnson. And also that Senator Johnson had intervened for him on behalf of let's say Soil Conservation contracts. There wasn't a question on the scrutiny.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. I see.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But also Mr. Fred Korth who was Secretary of the Navy was involved in irregular procedures of the TFX that was awarded General Dynamics.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, did you have direct contact with Bobby? Did you have any discussions with him on that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. Up to this point I had only known what Bobby wished to tell me. I never asked questions. But at least I had good ears and a retentive memory.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, this is similar to—you were dealing with Bobby relative to the performance bond on the D.C. Stadium at that period of time? And other matters?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. In other words, I was dealing with Bobby originally as a close friend. I had considered him that way. Then he finally drifted farther away and in the final analysis when things started breaking I still was obligated to him as a previous friend.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. When did you last see Bobby?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In person; November of last year.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. What was the basic attitude that he had at that particular time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, he had dark glasses on. I never saw his eyes. And he indicated Milton Hauft who was with me that Wilson would be in position of losing his job and I was in a hell of a position myself. And he was anything but friendly but he was frightened and it didn't concern me, too much.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. But you felt he was threatening you at that stage and Mr. Hauft also?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Without a question.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Where would this have taken place?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Near my residence in Colesville, Md.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Did he come out there?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; he did on a Saturday morning.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. On a Saturday morning and there was three of you present?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would not see Bobby alone not knowing his intentions of what his attitude was, so Hauft went with me.

Mr. CLARKSON. Now Mr. Reynolds in closing, earlier you indicated that you felt the country would be demoralized if they knew all about their political leader. Can you tell us what you mean by that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. I have rather a provincial idea of morality and ethics. Having come from a small rural community their idea of what a leader should be is maybe one of idealism, I don't know. But children must have an image to look up to and have respect for and that means dedicated leaders who do not think of themself or what do I get out of it but what does my country get from me. And I'm afraid any close scrutiny of this present situation of the peoples directly and indirectly involved would not divulge that they had the interest of the United States at heart but they had their interest first and foremost.

Mr. CLARKSON. Are you talking about the President of the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am talking about the previous Senator Johnson and Vice President Johnson. I would have no knowledge of him as President.

Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein's 25th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, a thousand persons gathered at dinner in the grand ballroom of the Palmer House in Chicago to observe the 25th anniversary at Temple K.A.M. of Rabbi and Mrs. Jacob J. Weinstein. The guest speaker was a long time member of Rabbi Weinstein's congregation, Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the Supreme Court of the United States. The full text of Justice Goldberg's address on this historic and memorable occasion will be found in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in today's proceedings in the House of Representatives.

President Lyndon B. Johnson's personal message, strongly and warmly phrased, expressing his admiration and affection for one of the great spiritual leaders of our times, was delivered by Hobart Taylor, Jr., executive vice chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Here is the sketch of Rabbi Weinstein's life and his standing in the hearts of the members of his congregation as recited in the statement in the anniversary dinner program:

"Two men I honor, and no third. First, the toilworn craftsman that with earth-made implements laboriously conquers the earth and makes her man's * * * A second man I honor and still more highly; him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread, but the bread of life."—CARLYLE.

We gather today, the 24th of May 1964, the temple family of K.A.M., friends, and colleagues of Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein, Janet Weinstein, and their children, to honor our rabbi, to remember his deeds, his teachings, his courage and commitment, his unfaltering toil in the service of the spiritually indispensable, the bread of life—the knowledge that "our life would be altogether vanity, were it not for the soul, which fashioned in God's image, gives us assurance of our higher destiny and imparts to our fleeting days an abiding value."

In his 25 years as spiritual leader of K.A.M., Jacob J. Weinstein has led us, his congregants, in the paths of righteousness, taught us that faith must be professed through deeds and not through prayer alone. That we have learned the true meaning of tzedaka, of mitzvah has been his doing; that K.A.M. has been an articulate voice for human rights and human dignity, has been his doing. For his leadership, his wisdom, his profundity of minds, his strength to meet adversity with quiet courage, unshakable trust, we gather in gratitude, to honor him on this day and to wish him and his family life and sustenance, contentment and peace.

Our rabbi was born in Stephin, Poland, and brought to Portland, Oreg., when he was six. He attended the Josiah Failing Elementary School, the Lincoln High School and Reed College in Portland, working his way through school as newsboy, department store clerk and logger. Upon graduation from Reed in 1923, he came to Columbia University to do graduate work in political science, but followed Charles A. Beard to the New School for Social Research. It was there, under the stimulation of Horace Kallen, and Hayim Greenberg, that he decided to enter the rabbinate and came to Cincinnati in the fall of 1923 to begin his studies at the Hebrew Union College. He graduated from the college in 1929 and was appointed Hillel director of the University of Texas as well as rabbi of Congregation Beth Israel. He was called to Sherith Israel in San Francisco in 1930 and remained until 1932, having won the fairest lady in that queenly city, Janet Harris, in 1931. Then followed 3 years in New York as adviser to students at Columbia, book reviewer of the New York Times, codirector with Leo Schwartz of the School for Jewish Studies and special writer for the American Jewish Committee. It was during this period that he assisted Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan in the preparation of "Judaism as a Civilization."

In 1935 he was called to San Francisco to found in the School for Adult Jewish Studies and to serve on the faculty of Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn's "School for Social Studies." It was from these positions that he was called to K.A.M. in 1939. He came with Janet and 1-year-old Ruth, and now on his silver anniversary can proudly point in addition to Daniel, Judith, and Deborah as his and Janet's faithful and handsome coworkers in the vineyard of the Lord.

Honors are not new to our rabbi.

In April 1961 President Kennedy appointed Rabbi Weinstein to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Also in 1961, Secretary of Commerce Hodges appointed him to the Business Ethics Advisory Council. In 1962 he received both the Immigrant Service League Award and a Daniel Burnham Award from Roosevelt University in recognition of his distinguished religious leadership in Metropolitan Chicago.

He has been an officer and member of the Chicago Rabbinical Association, Citizens Committee for Judicial Reform, Hyde Park Council of Churches and Synagogues, South East Chicago Commission, American Civil Liberties Union, Hyde Park Kenwood Community Conference, Advisory Committee to the Philip Murray Memorial Foundation. For 3 years he was public member of the War Labor Board Panels and is a member of the National Panel of Arbitrators of the National Arbitration Association.

He is currently national chairman of the National Committee for Labor Israel (Histadrut) and serves on the special Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and as a CCAR representative on the board of trustees of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

In June 1963, he was elected vice president of the CCAR and in 1965 will succeed to the presidency.

It is our hope that Jacob will be with us for many years to come, that through him we may each year be "new in consecration of purpose and in renewal of earnestness and sincerity, steadfast in rejecting all that is unworthy of us and of our heritage and strengthened in will to live as God would have us live * * *."

For the mission which Jacob J. Weinstein undertook, in God's name, and fulfilled with dignity and wisdom, may he and his be inscribed in the Book of Life, as he is in the hearts of his congregants and friends.

TRIBUTE OF CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Daily News of May 23, 1964, the day before this anniversary dinner, appeared this article by Joseph Haas:

IF CHANGE COMES: YOU CAN FIGHT, OR YOU CAN FLEE, OR * * *

(By Joseph Haas)

Thousands of American communities today are confronted with the problem of

"change"—the euphemism that means Negroes are moving into white neighborhoods.

The citizens of these communities have three main courses they can follow. They can run, they can fight—or they can try to bring about a peaceful, orderly integration that recognizes that all Americans are entitled to the same dignity and rights.

If they choose the latter course, they can profit by the experience of the people of Kenwood and Hyde Park over the last 25 years. For here was achieved perhaps the very first, and certainly one of the most effective, orderly integrations of a big-city neighborhood in the Nation.

It would be unfair to single out any one person and say that he deserves most of the credit for the successful integration of Hyde Park-Kenwood. But few people who are aware of how it came about would disagree that Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, of Kehilath Anshe Mayriv Temple, 930 East 50th Street, merits as much praise for it as anyone.

This year marks Rabbi Weinstein's 25th anniversary as spiritual leader of K.A.M. Temple, the city's oldest synagogue founded in 1847 at the site of the present U.S. Courthouse. When he accepted the call to head the congregation in 1939, he set one importan condition. He insisted that he be given total freedom of the pulpit—and that phrase is as important to a minister as the words "freedom of the press" are to a newspaperman.

In 1939, Kenwood was one of the city's choicest residential areas. It was near the lake and on hot summer days its people could enjoy its beaches and cool breezes. It had ample parks, tree-lined streets, large and sturdy old houses on big lots, and it was close to downtown.

Few persons suspected what lay ahead. One of the few, Rabbi Weinstein recalls, was the late Louis A. Wirth, famed sociologist at the nearby University of Chicago. Professor Wirth warned that Bronzeville, the Negro belt to the west of the Hyde Park-Kenwood area (bounded by 47th and 59th Streets, Cottage Grove, and the lake), would soon burst its boundaries. As the Nation girded for war, workers were needed for defense plants, and many Negroes came here from the South seeking more pay, more freedom, and better places to live.

Which way would overcrowded Bronzeville expand? First, to the south and to the east, to white neighborhoods such as Chatham, Woodlawn, Avalon Park and, of course, Hyde Park and Kenwood.

Few paid any attention to Wirth's predictions. The war was on—that was foremost on everyone's mind.

One of the first things Rabbi Weinstein learned after assuming leadership of K.A.M. was that its temple stood on land covered by restrictive covenants.

"Well, we couldn't have that," the rabbi says. "It wasn't congruous with what Reform Judaism teaches about the dignity and equality of man—and, of course, it wasn't Christian, either. It was a shocking situation."

Some reactionary members of the temple tried to discourage the rabbi from hiring a lawyer to get the restrictive covenant removed from temple property. "Some tried to tell me that it was not the business of a rabbi to go into court and get involved in legal and civic battles," he remembers. "But my feeling then, as now, is that the duty of a rabbi is twofold—that of priest and prophet. Mere ritual isn't enough. He must move beyond the priestly function and obey the prophetic dictates of action on his beliefs. Faith without action is meaningless."

He enlisted the aid of liberal members of the temple and they made visits to many homes in the area recruiting other property owners in the fight. Within a year, the court battle was won and the whites only clauses were removed from the temple's deed as well as from those of other properties in the neighborhood.

And then came the first hints of change. Someone bought a fine old home at 50th Street and Ellis and in a very short time it was partitioned into 17 cramped living units that were rented to Negroes at higher prices than whites were paying for decent-sized flats.

Rabbi Weinstein swept into action. He contacted the city corporation counsel to try to induce him to act against the illegal conversion of the building.

"He told us he couldn't do anything unless we knew the name of the owner," the rabbi recalls. "The building manager said he dealt with a neighborhood bank. The bank said the land was held in a confidential trust. So we went to court to get an order to make the bank reveal the name of the owner. It turned out to be a Jewish furniture dealer, a member of a good Orthodox congregation. I asked him why he did it and he shrugged and said, 'Everybody's doing it.' He offered to sell us the building at a tidy profit to himself. But our lawyers told us to reject it. Instead, we filed complaints against him for building violations. It took 3 years, but finally he was fined and ordered to make building repairs."

The fines were so meager that they seemed a mere slap on the wrist. Thus the temple's Pyrrhic victory was its first indication that they were not concluding a mere skirmish, but opening a long, hard campaign.

From the end of the war in 1945 to 1950 was the period of greatest change. Some blocks in Kenwood became 95 percent Negro as the illegal conversions went on, and the rabbi and members of the temple kept trying to get the city to halt them. The temple itself suffered in the flight of whites out of the changing neighborhood. Its membership in those years fell from more than 900 families to about 600.

One influential member came to Rabbi Weinstein one day and said: "Let us sell the temple—there is a man who will give us a good price for it to convert it into a Negro church. Then we can easily raise a million dollars and build somewhere else." Instead, the rabbi announced a plan to build a $250,000 community center beside the temple. "That really stirred up some members," he recalls. "You're throwing good money after bad," they said. "Let's sell and move to a stable neighborhood." But the bulk of the congregation was with its rabbi and the center was built. And more members left Kenwood, moving to the North Side and suburbs, and to South Shore.

"The problem was too big for the temple alone," Rabbi Weinstein recalls. "It needed communitywide action." In 1949, he met with the Reverend Dr. Leslie T. Pennington of First Unitarian Church. Their agreement that broad action was needed led to further meetings with other church and community leaders and the result was the formation that year of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference. Among its founders were men such as Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, Robert E. Merriam, and now Alderman Leon Despres.

The conference, and its militant individual units such as the members of K.A.M. Temple, began to learn by trial and error how to save a neighborhood and bring about an orderly integration. Block clubs were formed and each was an intelligence unit keeping tabs on all of the buildings in its area. If a building changed hands, someone would visit the new owner to learn what he intended to do with the property—if he had illegal conversion in mind, he was quickly dissuaded by the conference's warning that it would fight him every step of the way.

The Kenwood open house program was launched to show people what a fine community Kenwood was and to try to induce solid families—white and Negro—to buy and maintain the big, fine homes of the lakefront community. Legislative committees were formed to lobby in city hall and in Springfield for tougher legislation against illegal conversions and blockbusting. Realtors who refused to cooperate were blacklisted—residents were advised not to place property with such firms.

School committees sat in on school board policy meetings in an effort to keep up the quality of schools in the neighborhood. Delegates were sent to urban renewal meetings and city council sessions. Wherever anything was happening that might affect their community, someone was on hand to listen and, if necessary, to speak out.

"For awhile, it seemed to be a losing battle," the balding, 62-year-old rabbi remembers, looking back. "But then, slowly in the early 1950's, the tide changed. Bit by bit, battle by battle, we stabilized Kenwood and Hyde Park. Today we are a happily integrated community of pleasant homes and decent apartment buildings. The ratio of white to Negro residents now is about 60 to 40 percent."

Today, temple membership has risen to over 700 families again. Teenagers from the temple, including the rabbi's twin daughters, Judy and Debbi, 16, and some 75 adults from K.A.M are helping as tutors in neighborhood youth and community centers to aid Negro youths with educational problems. And, ironically, one of the first chores of the temple's new social action committee is helping to educate community groups in South Shore—where, years earlier, some frightened K.A.M. members fled from "changing" Kenwood—in how to bring about the orderly integration of their now-changing community.

The list of honors Rabbi Weinstein has achieved for his work on behalf of humanitarian causes would fill a page. Only yesterday, he served as chairman for a regional conference of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities which brought 1,000 delegates to Chicago from five Midwest States.

Tomorrow, Justice Arthur Goldberg of the U.S. Supreme Court will speak at a dinner in the Palmer House at which 1,000 guests will pay homage to the rabbi on his silver jubilee as leader of K.A.M. Temple. Justice Goldberg moved his home to Washington years ago, but he still maintains his membership in K.A.M.

Rabbi Weinstein's reaction to all of this is typical of him. "Of course, we could have achieved none of this if it had not been for my congregation. It was their wholehearted support that made it possible."

Last Yom Kippur, Rabbi Jacob Weinstein spoke these words to his congregation:

"For the sin of the grit in our voice and the slur in our eye when we have spoken of 'the colored' as though we could merge all black folk into one unseemly image.

"For the sin by word of mouth in spreading as truth the shadiest rumors, the most disparaging jokes, the most cynical judgments.

"For the sin by moving from a neighborhood because Negroes moved into it.

"For the sin of paying the Negro less for the same labor performed by a white man, and charging him more for the same goods and services.

"For the sin of believing that God made the black man inferior to the white man and intended to keep him so.

"For the sin of aiding and abetting segregated schooling and thus changing the locks on the doors of the one place where the Negro might find the means to redeem himself from the handicaps of his primitive origins and his slavery.

"For the sin which we have sinned in standing idly by while the blood of our black brother is shed, in wiping our hands clean because someone else pulled the lynch rope,

fired the gun, cracked the skull, threw the dynamite.

"For all these sins, O God of forgiveness, bear with us, pardon and forgive us."

Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, humbly, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our former colleagues, the late CLARENCE CANNON. There is no doubt of the "nitch" in which historians will place Mr. CANNON. He is truly one of the great. His record as a Representative from the State of Missouri, his record as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, his record as a parliamentarian, his record as an author—of "Cannon's Procedures," "Cannon's Precedents," "Procedure in the House of Representatives," "A Synopsis of the Procedure of the House," "National Convention Parliamentarian Manual"—constitute an enormous contribution to history for one man.

I am proud to have served with him and I am proud to have been one of his admirers. He was a kindly man, he was a devoted family man. At this time, I extend to his devoted wife and his family my sympathy on his death. He will be missed by them and he will be missed by his colleagues.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

American Baptists and Tithing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 years, I have watched with interest an emphasis being placed on tithing—the giving of 10 percent of one's income to the church—being stressed by the American Baptist Convention, a denomination of 6,300 churches and 1,600,000 members. Last week, at its annual meeting in Atlantic City, N.J., a report was given by the Reverend Mr. Newton E. Woodbury, executive director of the Division of World Mission Support of the American Baptist Convention. As one of the results of the tithing enlistment program, American Baptists have increased their giving to world missions by nearly $1 million during the last 2 years. An amount probably five times greater has been contributed to the local work of these churches as increased giving during these 2 years. Since American Baptists are in the forefront of a growing emphasis on tithing and are actually training churches to enlist tithers, Mr. Woodbury's report will be of interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD this report:

REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF WORLD MISSION SUPPORT, AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION

Mr. President and fellow delegates, the division of world mission support has two main tasks: developing a spirit of beneficence or generosity among our constituency, and raising funds necessary to carry out the work of the convention. It is our conviction that if we succeed in the first, success in the second task will follow.

In 1963 American Baptists gave a total of $11,091,490 to the unified budget—the largest amount in our history. Ten years ago gifts for the same purposes totaled only $7,097,808, showing a gain of 56 percent in 10 years.

Since launching the tithing enlistment program in 1962, giving has increased by nearly a million dollars. Last year's gain was the largest since 1958. This encouraging upward trend is continuing in 1964. At the end of April we showed a gain of $207,778 or 5.82 percent over the same period a year ago. By maintaining this rate of gain, we can reach our 1964 objective of $11,680,000.

It is our conviction that a steady and forthright emphasis upon proportionate giving, with the tithe as our basic standard, is our best means of developing a spirit of generosity in the hearts of individual Baptists and in the corporate stewardship of our churches.

While we rejoice in the gains of recent years, we are keenly aware of how far short we have fallen of our potential. A conservative estimate of the tithe potential of American Baptists would be $400 million. Yet our total giving for all causes through our churches is only $110 million—about one-fourth of a tithe.

Let us face facts. We do not begin to take our stewardship as seriously as our government encourages us to. Income tax laws permit deductions for contributions of up to 30 percent of one's income under certain circumstances—yet we average less than 3 percent as American Baptists. In the heart of the depression we were giving an average of 4½ percent of our income.

We realize there are those who object to this emphasis on tithing. Some say it is legalistic. Our answer is that it can be, but it does not have to be legalistic.

Others say tithing is an Old Testament standard. Our answer is that the New Testament clearly teaches proportionate giving and nowhere is the proportion stated at less than the tithe. Zacchaeus gave half of his goods to feed the poor, and Jesus said the poor widow who cast her two mites into the treasury had put in all that she had.

Others say tithing tends to set an upper limit to giving and there are many who should give more than 10 percent. Our answer is that tithing is not a ceiling but a floor. It is a door leading to a deeper Christian experience. Many can and do go beyond the tithe, but none go beyond the tithe without going through that door of tithing.

We now know from the experience of churches that have taken it seriously, the tithing enlistment program is effective. Not only does it provide the added financial resources to undergird the work of the church and its world outreach, but it can also bring spiritual renewal to individuals and to churches as they deepen their commitment and stewardship concern. To this end we shall continue to emphasize tithing until more and more of our Baptist people come to experience its blessings.

NEWTON E. WOODBURY,
Executive Director, Division of World Mission Support, American Baptist Convention.

Mass Transportation in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, one of the major problems in a growing community is transportation, and in an older community which is attempting to replace its downtown area this problem is crucial. Recently the chairman of the Mass Transportation Committee of the Boston Chamber of Commerce wrote an article for the chamber magazine on the situation in Boston. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASS TRANSPORTATION: A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

(By Robert M. Jenney)

In spite of spending huge sums of money on highways the attempt in American cities to rely solely or mainly on private-auto transport has manifestly failed. The proof of this is in the fact that billions are in the process of being spent by our sister metropolitan areas to create, expand, or improve their rapid transit systems.

We already have the nucleus of the ultimate system needed to relieve our ever-growing traffic strangulation. But we have been moving at a snail's pace since the formulation of the Coolidge report in 1945. The principle of which is still valid today; namely, radial rapid transit extensions.

The nucleus of our system has a replacement value of $1,500 million. Many do not realize what a tremendously valuable asset we already have in this transit plant. Its existence was a vital factor in the selection by NASA of Boston for its new space center.

San Francisco is in the process of spending close to a billion dollars for rapid transit and other cities are following suit. So you see our problem is not unique. The fact that we aren't doing anything about it is, however, tragically unique.

Three-quarters of our Nation's vast population now live in high density urban regions. We now live in great metropolitan complexes which have evolved out of core city structures with satellite communities. The interdependence of the people comprising these communities upon each other knows no city or town boundary lines. The increased flow of traffic which now characterizes the metropolis is but a symptom of the times. Americans have been increasingly mobile people since the turn of the century. No amount of crying in the wilderness about the perils of traffic stagnation is going to change that. With a projected population of 230 million in this country by 1980 we can no longer be parochial in our attitudes about regional problems and mass transportation is a regional problem. This is further aggravated by the fact that our automobile population is growing at a faster rate than our human population.

The 78 cities and towns of the standard metropolitan area of Greater Boston include Topsfield and Hamilton on the north to Walpole and Sharon on the south; from Framingham on the west to Pembroke and Duxbury on the southeast.

The realization already dawned that autos and cities simply don't go well together, and a city's core has to have fast, high capacity mass transit service in order to survive. This need has been brought about by a combination of factors which have not even begun to build up to their ultimate peak. These factors include, besides the explosive population growth, the revolution in the standard of living which affords so many citizens the opportunity to be mobile. This year alone it is estimated that new car sales will exceed 8 million.

My being a marketer of petroleum products may have a bearing on an oft expressed opinion of mine that we certainly need more and better roads. However, my occupation should also lend emphasis and credulity to my statement that we desperately need an expanded rapid transit system to give some balance to a critically unbalanced situation.

We can say categorically now that we know a problem exists and we know generally what the solution is. The question, apparently, still begging an answer in some people's minds is—whose problem is it?

I say it belongs to the 78 city and town areas of Metropolitan Boston and to a lesser but still important degree to the entire State. If suburbanites are to work in a city or use the cultural and other advantages of a city—no matter how indirectly—they must help pay the costs involved.

The Federal Highway Act of 1962 clearly expresses the need for overall transport planning and development in urban areas and will require cities to come up with plans tying in road and rail and other transportation developments or Federal highway grants will be held up after 1965.

I know many suburban residents are vigorously disdainful of what they term "Boston's" problem. They point out that they don't work in Boston and couldn't care less about their ability or inability to commute to the capital city. Our modern metropolitan society is more complex than this, however. We are all interdependent; one with the other; city to city; town to town; a crisscrossing of community interests tying all 78 cities and towns into one great metropolitan complex.

How many firms would have located on Route 128 and elsewhere within that famous perimeter, if the central city was Sheffield, Adams, or Conway, Mass., instead of Boston?

How many A.B.'s, B.A.'s, Ph. D.'s; engineers, doctors, and lawyers would have matriculated out of this area had it not been for the many great and eminent universities thriving in the shadow of Beacon Hill?

How many suburban residents * * * throughout Massachusetts * * * haven't at one time or another had occasion to be thankful for the world famous medical facilities in Boston?

We could go on and on with similar items of community interest—but suffice it to say that we are a metropolitan community in fact if not by political boundaries. We need each other and will rise or fall depending upon our common realization of that fact.

I have stated that this metropolis is complex. Being complex it acts upon and in turn is itself acted upon by many facets of our modern society. However, were I to isolate the one factor that does more than any other to influence the "actor" and the "reactor" I would have to call it transportation.

Transportation is the one thing that keeps this complex of interests so useful to so many people. It is most effective when it enables people to move freely, and in great numbers, in, out and around the core area. The most efficient way to accomplish this, of course, is by rapid transit. But we are not—I repeat—not arguing for rapid transit or any other form of mass transit to the exclusion or detriment of a person's freedom of choice to use his automobile. What we are saying is that to attain this freedom in fact * * * because we don't have it now * * * we must coordinate and balance the mixture of highways and rapid transit facilities.

The ultimate and really vitally necessary objective, then, to the socioeconomic survival of our metrocomplex is the successful coupling in tandem, of our present commuter transport dichotomy: the highway and the rail.

To those who still resist the extension of rapid transit to their community because of some innate fear of burdensome deficits I say—be not afraid. Think of this in terms of what you canont afford not to do.

For example according to a recent highway department study—you—the taxpayers are currently subsidizing the automobile at the rate of some $76 per vehicle. That's $76 in excess of the revenue realized by gas, excise, and other automotive taxes and fees.

In addition it has been demonstrated that rapid transit, as a bookkeeping operation, isolated from the so-called surface and feeder lines comes very close to breaking even. So to paraphrase a famous President—the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

The time for peacemeal solutions is past. We cannot resolve any one segment of our transportation muddle on a sectional basis. What is a critical problem today on the south shore is also a growing problem to the north. We have procrastinated to the point where we are faced with the traditional problem—solving method of our area—solution by crisis.

We have to face up to the realities of the problem solving process. The final decision will be made on Beacon Hill. It has to be a comprehensive solution involving the entire metropolitan area. No section of this area has the necessary number of votes in the legislature to carry the ball alone. But, the 78 cities and towns of the metropolitan area have within it over half the legislators serving in the general court. The conclusion is inescapable. * * * Joined together we can realize a comprehensive solution to our metropolitan transportation problem.

There are some who will say we should wait for Federal aid in the form of the long-awaited mass transit bill now pending in Congress.

This is not the cure-all for our problem. With or without that bill we must face up to our own problem and solve it within our own region. Waiting will not make the problem any less critical—as a matter of fact it will make any solution more costly. If and when (and it's a big if at this date) the mass transit bill passes, we would be in a better position to take advantage of any available aid therein because we would have a head start as, compared to other areas competing for such aid by adopting a comprehensive solution or transit plan now.

Others will maintain that only those who use a transit system should be required to support it. We can dispose of that argument quite quickly. First of all it is well known that a self-supporting fare structure for rapid transit is prohibatory and self-defeating. Secondly, the "user" theory cannot logically be applied to a public facility such as this. It is somewhat like saying the only one who should pay taxes for police and fire protection are the victims of arson and robbery. The facts are that we're all only too happy to pay for this protection whether we use it or not. The common denomination between these public services and the availability of public mass transit is the fact that it too benefits users and nonusers to a very substantial degree.

Let me say also here, that it is the best thinking of many people I have talked to that the only hope we have for a comprehensive rapid transit solution this year is the Governor's support behind such a proposal.

What we are hoping for then—is for the Governor to introduce such a bill in this legislative session. If he does * * * we would be in a very good position to see a major beginning to the end of this burdensome problem.

Democratic Raise Program Ad Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the full contents of a letter recently sent to the Attorney General of the United States regarding what I consider to be a clear violation of the U.S. Criminal Code on the part of the Democratic National Committee. I refer to the attempt on the part of the Democratic Convention Program Committee to raise several million dollars through sale of this year's convention program.

It may be recalled that I first discussed this matter on April 18 last. On April 29 I again brought the details of the scheme to the attention of the House, pages 9162–9164, volume 110, No. 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 29, 1964.

Because there has been absolutely no indication by any of the parties involved to heed what I consider to be either the letter or the spirit of the law, I have addressed the following letter to Attorney General Kennedy requesting appropriate action. In addition, I am inserting an article from the New York Times of May 27, 1964, and a Scripps Howard editorial from the May 25, 1964 edition of the Washington Daily News.

The material follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The enforcement of 18 United States Code 608(b) is obviously the duty of the Department of Justice. I believe that the Department has a concomitant obligation to warn against serious, potential violations of this provision in order to insure, as much as possible, the purity of the Federal electoral process, and to protect numerous citizens and business organizations against committing violations of the Federal criminal law.

In this regard I wish to direct your attention to the plans announced by the National Democratic Chairman, Mr. John Bailey, as set forth in the April 6, 1964, edition of the Democratic National Committee's publication, "The Democrat," to utilize the 1964 national convention program of the party to gross several million dollars in revenue.

Mr. Bailey is reported to have said that the plan for the distribution of the program, which will be dedicated to the memory of the late President, John F. Kennedy, "marks the first time that the publication will be distributed outside a convention, where it was available previously only to delegates and other registered officials."

Mr. Bailey is reported initially to have estimated that several hundred thousand copies of the program will be available for distribution at $10 a copy by State central committees, Democratic women's groups, and Young Democrat Clubs.

It had previously been reported that advertising in the program would run to $15,000 per page as compared to a high of $5,000 per page for previous convention programs. It has been reported that businessmen who have been approached to purchase advertising in the program have stated that they have been advised that the party's goal was to sell 200 pages of advertising.

Based on these announced goals and figures, the apparent, estimated return of revenue from such sales of the program and of advertising therein would be about $5 million.

In the past, receipts from advertising in national convention programs have been remitted to the local, nonpartisan convention

committees in each host city as a part of their bids for attracting the conventions.

The proceeds have not inured to the benefit of candidates for Federal office or to political committees interested therein.

Furthermore, national convention costs have usually not exceeded $1 million.

Although Mr. Bailey reiterated on April 19, 1964, that all proceeds from the sale of the book and advertising would be used to underwrite costs of the national convention, on the same day the Ohio Press Service reported that Mr. William Coleman, Democratic State Chairman of Ohio was quoted as saying: "For each $10 program sale made in Ohio, the State committee would receive $4."

It has subsequently been reported that the Democratic National Committee has announced that it plans to have the programs sold by individual members of the party who will receive a 40-percent commission on each sale while remitting 60 percent to the national committee. The individuals might retain the 40 percent, or they could presumably contribute some or all of it as a campaign contribution.

Such announcements and statements contain patent contradictions and, in the aggregate, result in a far-from-clear declaration as to the intended use of the funds.

They do raise such questions as: Are the revenues to be used by the Democratic National Committee only for convention costs or are some of them to be apportioned to the Democratic State committees? If they are to be used only for convention costs what is the significance of the fact that the estimated revenues will exceed by at least four to five times the normal, usual costs of a convention? If some of the funds are to be apportioned to State commiteees for alleged "political education" purposes as stated by Mr. Coleman, will such a use constitute an "indirect benefit" to candidates for Federal office or to political committees or organizations interested in such candidacies, in violation of the prohibitions of 18 U.S.C. 608 (b); is the planned sale by individuals with a remission of funds to the national committee and/or States or local committees and the possibility that such funds could be used to benefit candidates for Federal office, any different in principle from the planned sale of similar programs in 1940 by State and local committees, a plan deplored by Attorney General Robert Jackson and by Senator CARL HATCH?

It is submitted that this lack of clarification is a matter of serious concern because the intent and purpose of section 608 (b) and the strict prohibitions thereof militate against such indefiniteness. The public policy embodied in the provision is directed against any use of such revenues whether direct or indirect in aid of the election of any candidate to Federal office or by any political committee or organization interested therein. It might be noted that the term "political committee" in the law is not restricted solely to national committees or branches thereof such as is applicable to other provisions of the Corrupt Practices and Hatch Acts (see 18 U.S.C. 608 (b), 591; 2 U.S.C. 241).

It might also be noted that section 608(b) does not define or list "seller." Its interdiction is against the purchase (and thus, correlatively, the sale), of goods, advertising, etc., by any person, organization, etc., from any person, organization, etc., where all or any portion of the proceeds inures to the benefit, directly or indirectly, of a candidate for Federal office or a political committee interested therein. The thrust of the provision, in good part, is at any purchase from any source, the proceeds of which contribute to political coffers in Federal election campaigns. The "who" of the sale is not the important factor. It is the use of the proceeds that is.

It is therefore respectfully suggested that the magnitude of the deviation from normal practices respecting national convention programs and their distribution, and the absence of a statement by the Democratic National Committee respecting an explicit nonpolitical use of these funds, constitute strong reasons for the Department of Justice to take the following steps, at this time, in the public interest:

1. Investigate the intended use of these funds and secure from the Democratic National Committee a clear and detailed statement as to the intended nonpolitical use thereof;

2. In the event such a response does not satisfy the standards and spirit of section 608(b), issue a warning against the use of such funds and consequently against the sale of such programs.

Section 608(b) of title 18 United States Code (54 Stat. 770–771, July 19, 1940) is generally referred to as section 13(b) of the Hatch Act and reads as follows:

"(b) Whoever purchases or buys any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind of description, the proceeds of which, or any portion thereof, directly or indirectly inures to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office including the offices of President of the United States, and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or any political committee or other political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both.

"This subsection shall not interfere with the usual and known business, trade or profession of any candidate."

There seems to be no doubt as to why this subsection was written into the Hatch Act when it was amended by an act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767, 770). The House Committee on the Judiciary inserted the provision as an amendment to S. 3046 (amending the Hatch Act) thinking that it would serve to prevent an individual, etc., from avoiding the $5,000 limitation on contributions. The committee in reporting S. 3046 on June 4, 1940, stated (H. Rept. 2376, 76th Cong., p. 11):

"This amendment was made by the Committee on the Judiciary to make more effective the prohibition against excessive contributions. Under the amendment it would not be possible for a person, organization, or group of persons to subvert the prohibition against excessive financial aid by purchasing goods, commodities, advertising, or articles where the proceeds would inure to the benefit of a candidate for an elective Federal office or a political committee or organization."

The above amendment as recommended by the House Judiciary Committee was adopted by the House on July 10, 1940 and concurred in by the Senate on July 11, 1940. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vol. 86, pp. 9463, 9497; 54 Stat. 770–771, ch. 640, Sec. 13 [Public No. 753, July 19, 1940].

What actually prompted the House Judiciary Committee to write this prohibition into S. 3046 was the manner in which the major parties had financed their 1935 presidential campaigns.

The Democratic National Committee published and sold thousands of copies of a book entitled "The Democratic National Convention 1936."

The Democratic National Committee not only sold advertising space in the convention book to corporations having Government contracts but also engaged in selling thousands of copies of the book to corporations and individuals doing business with the Government. Various appointive Federal officers such as ambassadors were obligated to buy the book. Deluxe editions autographed by the President were sold at premium prices. The Special Senate Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures of Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Candidates in 1936 reported that the Democratic National Committee had total receipts of $5,183,157.52 during 1936 and of that amount $385,525 had been collected for advertising in this single publication and $401,487.64 had been collected for sales of the book. The Senate Committee made this observation (S. Rept. 151, 75th Cong., pp. 18, 24, 137):

"During the campaign complaint was made that certain corporations, forbidden by the law to make contributions, were actually contributing under the guise of advertising. If it is desired to completely prohibit advertising on the part of corporations, the same would be done by more clearly defining the word contributions in the present Corrupt Practices Act."

During the same 1936 campaign the Senate Committee found that the receipts totalling $7,370,323.73 of the Republican National Committee during 1936 had even exceeded those of the Democratic National Committee. In addition the Republican Party had set up a separate organization locally created in Cleveland which published a Republican Convention book for which advertising was also solicited and sold but the funds were not channeled through the national committee (S. Rept. 151, 75th Cong. (1937), pp. 18, 23).

The publicity given to this type of party financing was not heeded by those having proper political responsibility. Starting the off-election year 1937 with a deficit of $445,258.12 and hoping to build up a surplus to finance the 1938 congressional elections and the 1940 presidential election, the Democratic Party again launched a book advertising campaign, this time through sale of the Democratic Congressional Register. In addition businessmen furnishing material to or having contracts with the WPA and other Government agencies were solicited to buy copies of the "Democratic Handbook" autographed by the President as the price of $250 apiece. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 81, pp. 6429–6430, 9141–9143, and Appendix pp. 1981, 2008, 2141–2142, 2161–2162, 2199, 2506–2512 (1937)). The Republican minority leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. Bertrand N. Snell, on July 10, 1937, demanded an investigation. When the Rules Committee refused to recommend an investigation Mr. Snell on August 13, 1937 placed the matter before Attorney General Homer S. Cummings. Although no indictments were had, the Attorney General did recommend (Ex. Comm. 903) to the Congress on January 11, 1938 certain amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 81 Appendix pp. 2508–2512 (1937) and vol. 83, p. 359 (1938)).

The Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee appointed to investigate the 1938 campaign reported (S. Rept. 1, 76th Cong.) on January 3, 1939 but its time seems to have been consumed in investigating specific complaints involving senatorial contests in 18 States. The committee did recommend that a limitation be placed upon contributions by individuals and that section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting contributions by federally chartered corporations be amended to prohibit contributions by any corporation engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and that the prohibition apply to primaries as well as the general election (S. Rept. 1, 76th Cong. (1939) pp. 40, 41). The committee report was silent on the question of sale of political advertising and did not go into the finances of the national committees of the parties.

The Special House Committees appointed to investigate the campaigns of 1936 and 1938 limited their investigations to the election of Representatives. The committees did not assume jurisdiction over primaries. Neither of these two committees filed a formal report. For the 1936 committee see House Resolution 347, 74th Congress, agreed to August 23, 1935 and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, pages 13758, 14121, 14215, 14382, 14820 (1935). For the 1938 committee see House Resolution 291, agreed to June 2, 1938 and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 81, page 7916 (1937) and volume 83, pages 7883, 7912, 8022–8023 (1938).

At the time S. 3046 (amending the Hatch Act) came up for debate in the Senate on March 5, 1940, it contained no provisions limiting contributions by individuals and no provisions limiting contributions to and expenditures by the national committees. Much publicity had been given to the excessive expenditures by the national committees, the huge sums contributed by wealthy families to both parties, the exorbitant prices ranging up to $1,000 for tickets to political dinners, the granting of free time by radio stations (dependent upon the Government in power for their licenses) to certain candidates, and generally the questionable manner in which campaign funds were raised. These factors probably prompted the Senate to adopt an amendment offered by Senator Bankhead to limit individual contributions to $5,000. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 86, pages 2636, 2720–2721, 2767, 2790, 2852, 9495–9497 (1940).

The same factors presumably caused the House Judiciary Committee to further amend the bill to place a $3 million limitation on the national committees. The House Judiciary Committee further sought to strengthen the Bankhead amendment so that the individual limitation could not be avoided indirectly by giving $5,000 in cash and turning around and buying $5,000 worth of advertising or tickets to a political rally. (See H. Rept. 2376, 76th Cong. (1940) and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vol. 86, pp. 9360–9380, 9426–9432, 9434–9463 (1940).)

Immediately following the enactment of section 608(b) there was some indication that it might be violated in the 1940 campaign, but these fears were alleviated following warnings by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson and Senator Hatch.

On August 5, 1940, Senator Hatch had conference with the Attorney General concerning announced plans of both the Democratic and Republican National Committees to evade the law (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vol. 86, p. 9909, and Appendix p. 5205 (1940)).

As a result of this conference on August 6, 1940, Attorney General Jackson by letter asked Senator Hatch to revise that provision just enacted which prohibited the buying of books or advertising. He advised the Senator:

"Another difficulty exists in connection with the provisions forbidding the sale of campaign books, advertising space, etc. While the act provides penalties for those why buy books or advertising we find no penalty for those who sell them.

"It is the seller who systematically plans such devices and brings pressure on buyers to subscribe. If we are to be successful in going before juries to punish those who buy, we must also be authorized to include in the proceedings those who sell" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vol. 86, p. 9910 (1940)).

On August 9, 1940, Edward J. Flynn, chairman designate of the Democratic National Committee, through Charles Nicholson announced the intended sale of a campaign book for 25 cents a copy. It was reported that $140,000 in advertising in the book had been sold (New York Times, Aug. 10, 1940, p. 20, col. 5). Oliver A. Quayle, treasurer of the Democratic National Committee explained, however, that the advertising had been sold prior to enactment of the amendment, further that no books would be sold. Distribution, he explained would be through the State and local committees (New York Times, Aug. 11, 1940, p. 2, col. 2).

Attorney General Jackson on August 12, 1940, warned the Democratic National Committee that its plan to distribute the Democratic book of 1940 through local committees at a cost of 25 cents each for handling would violate the amendment. The Attorney General referring to Mr. Quayle's plan said:

"There has been brought to my attention the statement issued by Oliver A. Quayle, Jr., treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, concerning the Democratic book of 1940. Mr. Quayle is reported to have said that the plan for the distribution of this publication is to send it to the various State and county organizations for redistribution. According to his statement, 'the price of 25 cents appears on the cover so that any State or local organization, which might be permitted by its own laws to sell such a book, cannot charge more than 25 cents, which covers the cost of the handling and postage.'

"Since this statement may be interpreted by others to mean that State laws could make permissible that which a Federal law prohibits, I think it only fair to point out that no such view has been accepted or approved by the Department of Justice." (New York Times, Aug. 13, 1940, p. 1, col. 4.)

On the same day, Senator Hatch made a statement in the Senate to the effect that while the sale of the advertisng prior to the amendment of the Hatch Act on July 19, was probably legal, the sale of the book would be contrary to the spirit of the law. He advised that the only thing to do would be to discontinue the sales of the book. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, pp. 10121–10122 (Aug. 12, 1940).)

Senator Hatch stated:

"A week ago today I took the floor to criticize and condemn what I thought was, and what I characterized as, an open, flagrant violation, or rather evasion of the bill Congress recently passed, as well as the one it passed last year, relating to political activities. In that instance I criticized and condemned a flagrant evasion of the terms of the bill relating to campaign contributions as laid down and expressed in the opinion of Mr. Fletcher, general counsel for the Republican National Committee. I did not hesitate to say that I thought the scheme was vicious, and bad, and was destructive of the principle and intent of the law. I am of the same opinion today.

"But, Mr. President, over the weekend there has developed another situation. In fairness I feel compelled today to take the same attitude I took 1 week ago today, except that on this occasion my criticism goes to the actions of the committees of my own party, the Democratic National Committee, with reference to the so-called convention book.

"I had heard about that book for some time. I knew about the instance of the last campaign, in 1936. I had hoped that would not be repeated in this campaign. I read in the press the statements made by members of the committee as to the reasons for the publication and sale of the campaign book this year; and I say now, Mr. President, that I think what the national committee of my own party is doing today, or proposing to do, with the publication and sale of the convention book, amounts to just as much of an evasion of the law, an evasion of its principle and purpose, as the plan which Mr. Fletcher conceived, and which I denounced last week.

"Every word I used in denunciation of the plan proposed by Mr. Fletcher I use today in connection with the Democratic convention book. I wish to point out, Mr. President, exactly where the vice in the sale of the convention book lies.

"I think probably it is entirely correct, from the standpoint of strict legal construction that advertising which had been contracted for and paid for before the book was published is probably not a technical violation of the act. The contracts having been made before the act became effective, and being completed transactions, a law reaching backward would probably be in the nature of an ex post facto law. So, technically, that contention may be correct. So far as the so-called Hatch Act is concerned, such advertising may not be a violation of the provisions of that particular law. However, last week I said that I did not care about the technical construction placed upon the act by Mr. Fletcher and his committee. This week I do not care about the technical construction placed upon the act by members of my own party. If it is bad in the one case, it is bad in the other. Even though the advertising in the convention may be technically legal under the so-called Hatch Act, in my opinion it clearly amounts to an evasion, if not a violation, of the Corrupt Practices Act, insofar as advertising was solicited from corporations, and corporations paid for advertising in the convention book.

"I know the terms of the Corrupt Practices Act. I have it before me. I know that it relates only to contributions. Corporations are forbidden to make contributions to campaigns; and, again, technically there may be no violation of that law, because the corportation buys advertising space. But I say, as I said about Mr Fletcher's plan, that it is an evasion of the law, because no corporation will buy advertising space in a campaign book for its value from an advertising standpoint. I my judgment, it amounts to at least an indirect contribution to the campaign fund and an evasion of the Corrupt Practices Act. So much for that.

"I do not wish to talk long on this occasion. I merely wish to make clear and definite the fact that I do not apply to the Republican Party a rule which I do not also apply to the Democratic Party. However, at this time I wish to mention particularly the exact conditions of the sale or distribution of the book.

"It was said that the national committee proposes to sell the book for 25 cents a copy. The proceeds of the sale naturally—it could not be otherwise—would inure to the benefit of the Democratic National Committee and the candidates on the Democratic ticket. As Attorney General Jackson pointed out, unfortunately the sale is not prohibited; but the buying is prohibited, whether the sale is made directly by the Democratic National Committee, or indirectly, through State and local committees, as is suggested in one news dispatch on my desk, wherein it said the national committee does not propose to sell the books itself, but to send them to State and county committees and let them sell them for a price not to exceed 25 cents. Possibly, so far as the selling agency is concerned, such a transaction would be strictly legal. However, every person who bought the book would be violating a criminal statute enacted by the Congress.

"The Corrupt Practices Act provides that:

" 'It is further declared to be pernicious political activity, and it shall hereafter be unlawful for any person, individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons, to purchase or buy any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or description where the proceeds of such a purchase, or any portion thereof, shall directly or indirectly inure to the benefit of or for any candidate for any elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States and presidential and vice presidential electors) or any political committee or other political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any

national political party: Provided, That nothing in this sentence shall be construed to interfere with the usual and known business, trade or profession of any candidate.'

"So I say, Mr. President, that whether a sale is made by the national committee, by a State committee, or by a local or county committee, every person who buys one of the books is violating that provision of the law. I do not think the national committee of my party or any other party wants to sponsor sales which subject the purchasers to penalties consisting of fines of as much as $5,000 or 5 years in the penitentiary.

"There is but one thing to do about the convention book, Mr. President. Regardless of what the cost may be, or what effect it may have, it should be discontinued at once. Last week I said to the Republican National Committee, 'Obey the spirit as well as the letter of the law.' This week I say to the Democratic National Committee, 'Obey the spirit as well as the letter of the law.'"

On August 17, 1940, Mr. Quayle ended the controversy by announcing that the Democratic Campaign Book would be distributed free to party workers, that the advertising campaign had ended, and all advertising had been paid for (New York Times, Aug. 18, 1940, p. 34, col. 4).

The similarity of this occurrence to the situation set forth at the beginning of this letter is obvious. There is the same contemplated sale of advertising in convention programs which in turn are to be sold, at a price; there is the same type of plan for the remission of all or part of the proceeds from the sale of the programs to the Democratic National Committee; there is the same apparent purpose on the part of the Democratic National Committee to retain all or a great percentage of the advertising proceeds.

What factors are apparently different in the present situation are (1) the announcement that a sum of money, several times the normal cost of a national convention, is to be used to pay for such purpose; (2) the announcement by a State chairman that some portion of the proceeds from the sale of the programs might be used in the State for very ambiguous purpose labeled "political education"; and, (3) the announcement that sales of the programs might not be through State or local committees but through individuals.

It is respectfully submitted that these current announcements do not, in themselves, contribute sufficient definiteness of nonpolitical purpose in the intended expenditure of the funds to remove the proposal from the principle laid down by Attorney General Jackson and Senator Hatch in 1940. The contradictions in the statements as to the national and/or State use of the funds, the fact that the estimated receipts far exceed the known, usual costs of a national convention, and the ambiguity about "political education" by an organized State party political committee, are factors which contribute to uncertainty about the intended expenditure of the funds. For it is this latter which is the nub of the problem. It is not important how sales are conducted or by whom. It is the use of the proceeds which is the central prohibition of the statute and the central principle with which the 1940 opinions were concerned.

The factors noted certainly, do not, without more, exempt the contemplated procedure from the application of the strict standards of section 608(b).

I, therefore, respectfully suggest that, in view of the legislative history of the enactment of 18 U.S.C. 608(b) and the principle in the 1940 precedent, that the Department of Justice conduct an investigation into the proceedings, and, if it is found necessary, issue an appropriate warning as was done in 1940.

Such would clearly be consonant with the public interest.

Respectfully submitted.

OLIVER P. BOLTON,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1964]

DEMOCRATS RAISE PROGRAM AD COST—PRICE IN CONVENTION ISSUE IS TRIPLED TO $15,000 A PAGE

WASHINGTON, May 26.—The Democratic National Committee is offering advertising space in its convention program at $15,000 a page. The old rate was $5,000.

The program will go on sale at $10 a copy around the end of July. Individual salesmen, if they wish, can keep a commission of $4 a copy.

Sam Brightman, deputy national chairman, explaining the new advertising rate, said:

"We held the line for years and finally had to recognize the increase in costs.

"Besides it's a bigger page and will have a greater circulation than in former years. It's going to be a real good program that people will be proud to keep."

The page size is 13 by 10.

Professional writers have contracted to write articles for the program, but Mr. Brightman would not say what their fees were.

The net income from the program will be used to pay expenses of the national convention, which opens August 24 in Atlantic City.

Mr. Brightman guessed there would be 100 pages in the program.

Salesmen are being recruited through the Democratic Party structure. Mr. Brightman said it was not true, as some reports have said, that commissions on sales would go to Democratic State committees and clubs.

Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, has raised a question of the legality about the project.

Mr. Brightman explained, however, that corporations have a right to contribute funds, for example, to help New Jersey bring the convention to that State, either for the direct profit that the corporation might receive through sales of some product or service to the convention participants, or to enhance their standing and goodwill in the community.

Corporations, he conceded, can not legally contribute to a political candidate or campaign, but the program revenue is to defray convention expenses.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 25, 1964]

THE SLUGGERS

We know it costs a heap of money to stage a national political campaign—in 1960, the Democratic Party spent nearly $10 million, and ended up $3.8 million in debt.

We know there are many ways to raise this money, and both major parties have used all methods. And that all along there have been good legal questions about some of these schemes.

Corporations are barred by law from making political contributions. But at the national conventions they regularly are pressured to buy program advertising, more or less worthless.

This has been condoned because both parties have been doing it, and because, technically at least, the money has gone to local committees to finance the expenses of the convention—not to the general campaign.

It is one thing to solicit a convention city businessman for a program ad on the ground he may reap extra business from the convention delegates. It is something else to badger corporations around the country who could not possibly profit from the delegate visitation.

The Democratic National Committee now has a new gimmick. It has taken over the program for the July convention in Atlantic City and boosted the ad prices—$15,000 for a full page, for instance, as against $5,000 in 1960. Hundreds of companies, far away from Atlantic City, have been solicited. Many of these firms do business with the Government or are otherwise involved with Government agencies: They are subject to agency regulation, or are liable to antitrust prosecution.

In addition to tripling the advertising fees, the Democratic National Committee proposes to sell souvenir copies of the program for $10 each, all around the country. It hopes to raise some $5 million this way, many times the normal cost of staging a convention.

Similar schemes in the past have been condemned as illegal by such authorities as the late Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson and Senator Carl Hatch, author of the 1939 "pernicious political activities" law. In addition to this serious legal question, it is wrong, anyway it is looked at, for a party in power to put the slug on companies which can be hurt or favored by direct Government action.

Politics in the Pulpit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the important questions of the day which is causing much concern across this country is the question of politics in the pulpit. I am pleased to call to the attention of Senators an excellent article on this subject, written by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., and published in the May 22, 1964, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Politics in the Pulpit," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS IN THE PULPIT

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Attending church last Sunday I received, along with everyone else, a copy of the official bulletin listing the affairs of the parish during the forthcoming week.

There I saw a reference to the pending civil rights bill now being debated, or more properly, filibustered, in the Senate.

"Write your two Senators," the message sponsored by the local interracial society exhorted us, "or wire them, to urge passage of the bill."

I should not have been suprised but pleased to have read in the bulletin, or heard from the lips of the preacher, exhortations to take more seriously God's commandments to brotherly love.

But the traveler who starts out at the premise that one must love one's brother, and limps home thousands of miles later at the conclusion that the civil rights bill now pending should be passed, is a traveler who has managed to vault great paralogistic obstacles.

It is not unlike the soritical dreamworld that some men of the right are given to: Start with the premise that you disapprove of communism and end at the conclusion that we should bomb Moscow. It is not, the liberals are fond of saying in respect of com-

munism, that simple. It is not, I am unfond of saying, but constrained to say, that simple in respect of interracial harmony.

It is uncertain whether the civil rights bill now pending in the Senate would appreciably better relations between the races. But what clearly is not certain is that a vote against the bill is an act of Christian infidelity; it is certain that any such suggestion is an act of uncharity, which kind of thing one is reluctant to see enjoined in the bulletin of one's church.

The problem of how far churches and churchmen should probe into political issues is a vexed one, on which the finest moralizers have split hairs for centuries.

I once discussed the whole issue on a television network with Mr. Charles P. Taft, brother of my late lamented hero, the senator. I remember asking him, intending to understand just where he thought the churches might establish useful limits against political factionalism, whether he didn't at least agree that churches should not take a stand for or against fluoridated water.

He replied by accusing me of desiring the Nation's youth to mature with rotted teeth. I remember being astonished at the time, as I continue to be even 3 years later, at the National Council of Churches recommending the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

What, one wonders, just what has that got to do with the business of God on earth?

How closely have those who recommend the civil rights bill studied its several provisions? How keenly are they aware of some of the sophistries implicit in some of its language?

Sample: If you run a hotdog stand and get a license to operate it from the State, then you are a State agent, which means that you may not discriminate. Doesn't that mean that virtually all of us have become State agents?

Do we not, almost all of us, have licenses to drive cars? Are we then State agents—who must pick up hikers without reference to the color of their thumb?

And if we're going to get into the business of passing Federal laws telling everyone what to do and how to behave, I propose a law requiring all ministers of the Gospel to read once a year the passage from Edmund Burke which warned:

"No sound ought to be heard in the church but the healing voice of Christian charity. The cause of civil liberty and civil government gains as little as that of religion by this confusion of duties. Those who quit their proper character to assume what does not belong to them are, for the greater part, ignorant both of the character they leave, and of the character they assume."

Hold the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., has come out strongly against the new pay increase bill, H.R. 11049 contending that it "is a clear bid to gain political favor" for the Johnson administration within the Federal employment system.

Since President Johnson supposedly wants labor and industry to hold the wage-price line, the Memphis newspaper suggests that the President and Members of Congress ought to take the same advice as far as Federal pay is concerned.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the May 22 issue of the Commercial Appeal:

BREEZING ALONG

The House Rules Committee, which can bury a bill effectively when it wishes to, has expedited the Federal pay raise measure and floor action may come within a few weeks.

When that time comes, let each Representative stand up and be counted. The vote on this touchy issues should be by rollcall.

An almost identical bill was defeated by the House, 222 to 184, back in March—simply because the House Members agreed to a rollcall vote.

The major difference between the new bill and the old one is the reduction of the raise proposed for Members of Congress from $10,000 a year to $7,500 annually. They now receive $22,500 a year, plus expenses and other fringe benefits.

But the planned pay increase is much more sweeping. It would cost the taxpayers $512 million a year, and would be spread over about 1.7 million Federal career and postal employes, more than 400 Cabinet and sub-Cabinet executives, 486 Federal judges, and 13,000 congressional and judicial employees and officials.

There have been no real hearings on the measure. It has not been adequately deliberated by any of the Members of Congress. And the only information the public is given is the result of a committee vote to move the bill forward—first the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and now the Rules Committee.

As now written, the raise scales run directly contrary to all the claims of economy in Government being made by the Johnson administration and so loudly touted by some Members of Congress.

In selective cases, there may be reason to increase Government pay. But the scope and size of this bill is a clear bid to gain political favor for the administration within the Federal employment system.

Moreover, no Federal pay raise can be justified so long as the budget of this Nation's Government remain unbalanced. And when it is balanced, if ever, the first priority should be debt reduction.

President Johnson has been urging labor and industry to hold the wage-price line. He, and the Members of Congress, should take that same advice in regard to Federal pay.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT?

One hundred and twenty years ago yesterday these words were sent by Samuel Finley Breese Morse as the first public telegraph message from the U.S. Supreme Courtroom in the National Capitol of Washington to Morse's associate, Alfred Vail, in Baltimore.

When an artist paints a masterpiece or a composer completes a new symphony, or an architect designs a new kind of structure, or a laboratory researcher discovers a new cure for some dread disease, it is natural that he will experience a feeling of self-satisfaction but, at the same time, give thanks to God for His strength and guidance in helping to create magic on canvas, thrilling musical scores, breathtaking skyscrapers, or lifesaving medical discoveries. So it must have been on May 24, 1844, when, after much research and experiments, Samuel Morse successfully sent by means of telegraphy these four words from Washington to Baltimore in the form of a question, What hath God wrought? The discoverer of the telegraph gave God all the credit for this amazing 1844 achievement in communications that brought the American people and States closer together and aided in the development of the new west.

We Americans of today should ponder thoughtfully over those four words that were sent from our Nation's Capitol to the city of Baltimore, 120 years ago, by means of telegraph, and which led to many other outstanding discoveries of modern communication, including radio and television. We should note carefully that those history-making words, "What hath God wrought?" were sent from the U.S. Supreme Courtroom. Quite a switch in religious beliefs and due credit to a Supreme Being when we consider the U.S. Supreme Court of today as the only Federal agency to refuse to display a four-word plaque, "In God We Trust." We wonder if, when Samuel Finley Breese Morse sent those four words of exultation in the 19th century, "What hath God wrought?" did he have any inkling that in the following century, and in the U.S. Supreme Courtroom, a great change in religious concept would take place so as to render decisions contrary to God and country? Would the telegrapher ever have dreamed that the same highest tribunal in our Republic would decide most cases favorable to the American Communists, who are atheists and sworn enemies of our United States of America? Could Samuel Morse have ever conceived the possibility that the same Supreme Court would rule that Bible readings and prayers were to be banned from public schools? Would the inventor of the telegraph, who completed his invention at the age of 53, have ever comprehended the astounding turn of events, 120 years later, that possibly also could remove "In God We Trust" from our coins, prayers in the U.S. Congress, use of Bibles for various ceremonies, removal of reference to God from our Pledge of Allegiance to the flag and in our national anthem, no more singing of hymns, anthems, or Christmas carols in public functions, and the firing of all chaplains from military service? Could the discoverer of telegraphy have ever imagined that misguided and brainwashed clergymen and youth of all denominations, races, colors, and creeds would clamor for the continued banning of Bibles and prayers from public schools, would march on Washington to pressure the U.S. Congress for enactment of legislation that would destroy further the principles of freedom, under a godly nation, and subject all American people to the bonds of Federal tyranny, would raise their voices in

"What Hath God Wrought?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager of the Weaver Broadcasting Corp., station WOKE in Charleston, S.C., is noted for his interesting and eloquent broadcast editorial commentaries. I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues another one of these outstanding editorials by Mr. Weaver entitled "What Hath God Wrought?"

agreement with the proponents of demonstrations, riots, racial hatred, and bloodshed in the streets of American communities?

If we might transpose two words of the four words, "What hath God wrought?" that were sent from the U.S. Supreme Courtroom in Washington to Baltimore on May 24, 1844, by Samuel Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, we would direct this vital message to the citizens of a democracy within a republic. What God hath wrought, let not materialistic men of the Supreme Court, the Federal bureaucracy, the clergy, or the citizenry put asunder, one century later.

GOP Study on Cuba Rates Bigger Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Richard Wilson appearing in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 6, 1964, has great significance as our Government searches for a Cuba policy:

GOP STUDY ON CUBA RATES BIGGER NOTICE

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The Republican "critical issues" study on Cuba has gotten far less attention than it deserves. These studies of which the Cuban problem was only one, would have won more attention had they been sponsored, as they should have been, by Dwight D. Eisenhower, Richard M. Dixon, and Thomas E. Dewey.

The chairmanship of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the former President's brother, is not enough. Dr. Eisenhower has done an excellent job organizing these studies, but they need the imprimatur of the leaders of the Republican Party.

The Cuban study was important because it offered a solution or at least the shadow of one, and this is extremely rare in the Cuban debate. This shadow of a solution fell into two parts: organization of a government-in-exile and hard pressure on our allies to stop trading with Cuba.

A principle of great significance is involved. Cuba would be deemed of primary importance to the security of the United States and the hemisphere. We would tell our allies this and let them know that we were going to solve the Cuban problem even if this meant giving lesser priority to Cyprus, Vietnam, Laos or other areas more remote from our primary area of security. We would demand assistance in this just as we have assisted our allies in so many areas of the world, including Berlin, for the past 20 years.

The American intellectual community, however, seems content to accept the judgment of England, France or the Scandinavian countries on the degree of jeopardy to the Western Hemisphere's security. Very little will get done anywhere in the world, however, if the prevailing intellectual complaisance is to become universal policy.

The Republican study was useful because it centers attention on the fact that virtually nothing is being done either by the U.S. Government or the Organization of American States about the problem in Cuba. A kind of paralysis has set in on even discussing it. The Democrats apparently hope that voters will not think about Cuba when they go to the polls this fall.

In the meantime, the Communist position is being strengthened, subversion and penetration in Latin America are increasing, and the Government in Cuba is stable enough so that Russian troops can be withdrawn. Mr. Johnson discusses Cuba with about the same detachment as he discusses the Baker case.

Some think that this hides the behind the scenes activity being organized by Presidential Adviser Thomas Mann, or that President Johnson has some carefully drawn plan of action. There is no evidence of this, except a little plain talk with the British Prime Minister, and some grumbling about General de Gaulle.

Otherwise, the allied trade with Cuba is increasing and we are still discouraging refugee raids even when they originate in countries other than the United States. This is not a very firm policy, whether measured by Republican or Democratic standards.

In actual fact, there is probably not too much in the Republican study that the White House would disagree with, except that it is a Republican study.

Some would say that this is a critical time and the Republicans have no business making foreign policy a political issue. This is really beside the point.

The point is whether or not the administration in power will devote its full efforts to a reexamination of the Cuban question and arrive at a fixed policy with an objective in sight.

If not, the administration will be fair game on this issue throughout the preelection period, not only from Senator GOLDWATER but from the moderates in the opposition who are just looking for issues but want solutions.

The Question of Morality in Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been much impressed with a recently published sermon by Dr. Walter Courtenay, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tenn., entitled "The Problem of Equilibrium." The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] recently placed this outstanding and most timely sermon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it was printed in the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn.

There has now come to my attention an excellent editorial which has been published in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on May 24, 1964, discussing this sermon, the so-called civil rights legislation, and the false question of morality which has been raised by proponents of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS AND MORALITY

Many are they who cry shame and worse upon others who oppose the civil rights bills and condemn the proposals as immoral, materialistic, and tyrannical but who, nonetheless, work for better race relations in the right way as they are given vision to see the right.

For the benefit of both we cite here passages from a recent sermon by a distinguished Nashville, Tenn., minister.

Until the maximum force began to be applied by paid agitators and well meaning people who support them, Nashville was making progress in stable race relations, moving toward equality without embracing integration as a false panacea. Since then, Nashville has been troubled and wracked by strife and bitterness.

It was this which prompted Dr. Walter Courtenay, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, to speak out against forced integration under the topic of "The Problem of Equilibrium."

He condemned demonstrations and called for a moratorium on the efforts of integrationists and certain Members of Congress to force a majority of the citizens of the United States into a police state for the dubious benefit of a minority.

Dr. Courtenay has won two Freedom Foundation Awards. The second was for a sermon delivered this year and entitled "The Problems of Equality." His latest sermon was printed in the Nashville Banner of May 18.

"So unbalanced are the times in which we live, Dr. Courtenay said, and so fuzzy our thinking, that church leaders now say that anyone who does not wholeheartedly support the total integration of the races is un-American and pagan * * * They would compress all Christians into their mold or destroy them."

Of the demonstrations, he said:

"Again I stand to decry sit-ins, lie-downs, kneel-downs, and the demonstrations that create fear, block traffic, rob merchants of essential business, and make a mockery of law and order. I decry those who incite such actions, even as I decry their opposites who meet unreasonableness with unreasonableness.

"I decry so-called nonviolent marches that create feelings of violence in others and fuse every day with danger.

"I find little of the spirit of Jesus in most of what has been said and done to date, and with all too little justification.

"The methods used are hate and fear builders, and are in fact a shotgun held at a community's or businessman's stomach and such actions are as reprehensible as the actions of a gun-wielding robber."

Of the effect of the civil rights bills, he said:

"One can only conclude that many people are living in a tailspin of confusion. If all the integrationist schemes now extant were enacted into law we would create a Federal power free men could not long endure.

"We would turn this land into a police state for the benefit of a minority of favored citizens. Men and women, who, by hard work and frugality, have built profitable businesses would lose all privileges if they declined to meet the social conditions passed for the benefit of this group.

"We would create chaos in our streets, fear in our hearts, and alter irretrievably everything that has been American in the past."

There is, as every sincere citizen must agree, a need for justice in the justifiable grievances of Negroes who have been denied opportunity even though they were qualified to assume the responsibilities that go along with them. Dr. Courtenay put it this way:

"Let no one doubt that our colored friends and fellow citizens have reasonable grievances that call for justice. No one argues that fact. * * *

"But many do argue, and with justification, that the method of remedying the grievances merely creates new grievances. One injustice is no excuse for concocting others."

There is, however, a remedy:

"Experience suggests that we need a long-range program of advance, a program that

will give people time to adjust and gain understanding, a program that will slowly but surely bring about a rectification of injustices, a program that will be Christian in spirit and method, a program that will not increase racial tensions, but decrease them.

"One thing seems clear to me as a white American: if the erosion of the private rights of responsible, honorable citizens, continues for the next 10 years, if the federalization of communities and States is accelerated, our American dream will never be fulfilled, and all citizens, and the entire world will suffer in consequence.

"The imbalance existing now cannot be solved by fired-up Negro leaders who are hired to stoke fires and keep pots boiling.

"Nor can it be solved by those whites whose minds are closed to the just complaints of black men.

"Nor can it be solved by politicians whose primary aim is votes.

"Nor by the so-called civil rights bill in Washington with its undefined and undefinable phrases.

"What we need and need desperately, is a moratorium on racial pressures. We need a cooling-off period. We need a cessation of the effort to compel white people by threat of force to meet both the fair and unfair demands of colored leaders.

"We need a prolonged period of interracial planning in depth, in an atmosphere free of coercion.

"Such a moratorium would do more to restore national equilibrium than all the laws Congress can pass in the next 4 years."

We agree with Dr. Courtenay that unless the national climate and the minds of many men can be cleared of confusion and hysteria, all may be lost.

Further, the new-found doctrine of salvation by integration needs reexamination. The problem of racial equality encompasses so many dilemmas that it is incapable of solution to the satisfaction of all. But it can only be solved by education and religious inspiration, not by force and coercion.

The civil rights bills, now seized upon as a moral issue, are nothing of the sort. They are entirely political in their origin, completely materialistic in their approach and cynical in the false promises they hold out to the minority and their threat to the majority.

Sorensen's Unpublished Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are few persons who were closer to our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy than Theodore C. Sorensen.

On December 13, 1963 released by permission of Mr. Sorensen and appearing in the Boston Globe of May 24, 1964, is an eloquent and touching tribute to our late beloved President, delivered by Mr. Sorensen to the Forum of the Wellesley College of Massachusetts, which eloquent, touching, and beautiful tribute I include in my remarks.

SORENSEN'S UNPUBLISHED TRIBUTE

(By Theodore C. Sorensen)

Three weeks ago today three shots rang out under a Texas sky—and the brightest light of our time was snuffed out by senseless evil.

The voice which had always been calm even in the face of adversity was silenced.

The heart which had always been kind even in the midst of emergency was stopped.

And the laugh which had always been gay even in reply to abuse was heard no more in the land.

Crowds waited all night in the cold and the wet to pass by his coffin in the dawn. They wept on the streets of Moscow. They prayed in the villages of Asia. They brought candles to the wall in West Berlin.

Elders who had scoffed at his youth felt suddenly that they had been orphaned. Youth who had been impatient with his patience felt suddenly older and grayer.

And those of us who knew and served and loved him felt, as the Irish felt on the death of Owen Roe O'Neill, that we were lost and alone,

"Sheep without a shepherd when the snow
shuts out the sky—
O why did you leave us—why did you die?"

For all of us, life goes on—but brightness has fallen from the air. The world continues in the same orbit—but it is a different world. His hand-picked successor has picked up the fallen torch and carries it proudly and ably forward—but a golden age is over.

HIS MANY FIRSTS

Meanwhile, out among the tombs and tablets of Arlington, a flickering light in the night reminds us of Shelley's words on the death of the youthful Keats:

"* * * 'til the Future dares
Forget the past, his fate and fame shall be
An echo and a light unto eternity."

For John Fitzgerald Kennedy was not an ordinary man, in either life or death. He was the first President born in this century, the first of the Catholic faith, the first to reach out to space, the first to bear throughout his term the awful and awesome obligation of the age of mutual destruction.

He was also the first, with the possible exception of Jefferson, to care so deeply about the quality of American life and its meaning in the world.

There were poets and performers at his inaugural. There were princes and prime ministers at his funeral.

That special Kennedy quality that some called by the superficial name of "style" was in reality his insistence on excellence—excellence for his country and for himself, excellence in matters of talent as well as taste.

For he believed in the good society as well as the good life. He restored learning to the seats of power, politics as a profession of respect and pride in the hearts of his countrymen.

He was eloquent but never pompous, tough but always gentle, an idealist but still a realist. He knew when to reflect and when to act.

He was a student of the past and a prophet of the future, a thinker and doer who both studied history and changed it.

He always saw the larger picture while demanding all details. He thought of the next generation as well as his own—and he understood the difference between patience and hesitation.

President Kennedy was unique in public life. For he truly did not ask what his country could do for him—only what he could do for his country.

He inspired the loyalty of his associates, yet encouraged us to dissent. Beloved by his political friends, he courted his political enemies.

He took the world very seriously but he never took himself too seriously. He accepted blame that others sought to evade and he shattered precedents that others thought unbreakable.

LOVED BEING IN COMMAND

In a world caught up in a series of peaceful and not so peaceful revolutions—revolutions for which his countrymen and Congress were not always fully prepared—he charted new courses with caution as well as courage.

He did not try to force solutions but to find them—and his restraint was born not out of irresolution but of reason.

He loved the command of his ship of state, mindful of the views of his crew and passengers but determined to keep to his course; and always prepared for the storm, he neither turned back in the face of its fury, nor lost his way, nor trimmed his sails.

In the end he was struck down by the very malice and madness he had sought to cast out—an ironic victim of the extreme left in a citadel of the extreme right.

John Kennedy died as he would have wanted to die—on his feet, in action, being applauded by his friends and assaulted by his foes as he carried the word of reason and understanding to all who would hear and heed him.

Even in death, he was teaching us—proving through his martyrdom the stupidity and the futility of violence and venom—and proving, as he had always maintained, that the extremists of left and right, each busily denouncing the other, in reality fear reason and hate truth far more than they fear and hate each other.

WHAT HE DID IN 1,000 DAYS

He would remind us now that there is "a time to be born and a time to die"—but in our grief over the grotesque prematurity of his death we could not believe this was his time to die.

There was so much more he wanted to do—he so dearly loved his family and his work and life itself—he had so narrowly escaped death twice before—and he had, as he said so often quoting Robert Frost, "promises to keep and miles to go before I sleep."

How, then, could it be that he should be taken from us when he stood on the very threshold of the promised land to which he had led us?

John Kennedy led the American people to the frontiers of a modern "Promised Land"—an era of enduring peace and equal rights, a new age of space and a renewed age of reason—and though he has not been allowed to cross over, we need not turn back now.

Kennedy was young—some may say did he not die too young and too soon to be a major figure in history? The answer is all about us, in the works and words of those who died even younger than he.

We have not forgotten Byron or Keats or Shelley. We do not now regard as incomplete the music of Schumann or Schubert, the art of Van Gogh or Van Dyck.

No—nor did the continent explored by Henry Hudson and Meriwether Lewis, or the philosophies devised by Thoreau and Pascal and Kierkegaard, perish with their untimely deaths.

Yet still the thought remains that he had so little time. The administration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in little more than 1,000 days and 1,000 nights, breathed new spirit and new quality into every aspect of American life. He wasted no time and he wasted no opportunities.

No other President in history did so much to show friend and foe alike the suicidal futility of nuclear war and the enduring possibilities of peace.

No other President in this century did so much for human rights and the recognition of human dignity.

No other President in this century achieved so much legislation for the health and education of Americans.

No other President in peacetime history ever achieved so great and rapid an increase

in our capacity to deter aggression and defend freedom.

No other President in our time did so much to summon the American people to the realities of their responsibilities.

And, finally, no other President in our time did so much to bring hope to the world—hope for a life of decency, hope for a world of peace, hope for the American destiny.

COMPLETING THE VOYAGE

He was a man of his time—and the times demanded such a man.

Without his patience and strength the missiles in Cuba might never have been withdrawn, the test ban treaty might never have been signed, the Peace Corps might never have been created, outer space might never have been peacefully explored, and all the new and compassionate programs, which are so little known but for which he worked so hard—for the mentally ill and retarded, for the unemployed and the underpaid, for the very young and the very old.

All this and more John Kennedy did, in little more than 1,000 days and nights.

Who are we, therefore, to say that his life was incomplete or his promise unfulfilled?

We have reason to be proud and grateful—proud that we elected him President—grateful that we had him 3 years.

But pride and gratitude can only go so far and they cannot hide our sorrow. For today the one overriding thought is still the fact that he is gone—his wit and his wisdom, his cool mind and his warm heart, his gaiety and his grace, all are gone.

"The glory is departed" from the land. We remain—determined to be worthy of his legacy, dedicated to maintaining his standards, committed to completing the voyage he charted.

"And (so) the stately ships go on
To their haven under the hill
But O for the touch of a vanished hand
And the sound of a voice that is still."

Role of Communists in Race Disturbances and Agitational Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished news columnist, Mr. Holmes Alexander, has been doing an outstanding job of trying to alert and inform the American public as to the role which Communists have been playing in race disturbances and agitational efforts in this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Mr. Alexander entitled "An Organ of Chinese Communism Meddles in Race Relations in the United States." This column was printed in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., on May 25, 1964.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ORGAN OF CHINESE COMMUNISM MEDDLES IN RACE RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Doing business through a Boston post office box is a Communist monthly publication named Hammer and Steel. It is at once the organ of Chinese communism and the anvil of Negro revolution in the United States.

If the Justice Department, which pooh-poohs any alarm over Communist infiltration into the race movement, doesn't know what's going on, it's because of a policy of to see no Red, hear no Red, speak no Red in the black tide of violence. Here is a chronology which clearly identifies Hammer and Steel as the organ of the Mao Tse-tung faction of world communism and as the Chinese trumper for war and racial strife.

In March 1963, the World Communist Review warned its readership against "a publication called Hammer and Steel * * * edited by a renegade with Trotskyite views," and accusing the Chinese of aiding the publication.

In August 1963, the publication countervolleyed with a blast declaring that both Russian Communists and "their U.S. echoes should be treated as agents of the class enemy."

In May 1963, Hammer and Steel laid out its racial policy for America. It called for a "Negro liberation front, as in Vietnam and Algeria." It stated its claim that "the South is a Negro nation—an oppressed nation." It predicted that, after the triumph of street fighting and law defiance in America, "a free Negro nation will decide whether its best interests lie in separation or as an autonomous part of the United States."

As surely as I open a column with the thesis that race demonstrations have fallen into radical leadership and that some of the leadership is Communist, I will get letters accusing me of fictioneering or of going to prejudiced anti-Negro sources. But, in fact, I have lifted these quotations from an official, tax-supported document of the Federal Government.

They appear in the March–April 1964 issue of a bimonthly magazine published by the U.S. Information Service, entitled "Problems of Communism." This magazine is distributed free of cost outside the United States and is for sale at the Government Printing Office. The author of the contribution from which I have quoted is not a southerner. or a radical rightist, but an Irish journalist named Kevin Devlin, formerly on the foreign desk of the Manchester Guardian, a liberal British newspaper. His article, "Boring From Within." deals with the Sino-Russian split as it manifests itself in the Western Hemisphere.

As Devlin points out with an enormous amount of documentation, Sinocommunism has moved in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the United States not to recite the weary Russian cliche about socialism versus capitalism, but to exploit the simplicities which are readily understandable to ignorant and emotional malcontents.

With the Chinese Reds, it is a matter of inciting the "have nots" against the "haves," and the blacks against the whites. The Mao Reds would be entirely disappointed in their aims if somehow the American have nots were turned rich and fortunate by President Johnson's war on poverty, or if the American Negro somehow was equalized by passage of the civil rights bill. The aims of the Chinese branch of world communism are to bring down the American Republic in bloody revolution and to build a Communist system upon the rubble.

When I say that the Justice Department pooh-poohs any serious treatment of communism in the race demonstrations, I am speaking from personal interviews and because I have discussed this Red infiltration with those who ought to take it seriously. Their attitude, which I can say without breaking off-record rules, is that the race problem would exist whether or not we had a Communist problem, that the patient, downtrodden American Negro can hardly be blamed for turning to whatever leadership he can find, and that the Communist presence in the race demonstrations is too small to be significant.

But it has seemed to me that the two problems, of race and of communism, are no longer in separate compartments, that no Federal officer under oath and under hire to the United States ought to be making excuses for patient, downtrodden, misled violators of domestic peace, and that any belittling of the Communist presence in social disturbances is at least a sin of omission in vigilance.

We are not going to take measures against the enemy until we officially admit that he's here.

NASA Views of Another Strong Texas Voice in House Significant to Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the appraisal of the gentleman from Texas, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON, in the Galveston News of Sunday, May 24, 1964, is reflected in a most appropriate editorial which I herewirth insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The views expressed are very much like those heard around these halls in recent weeks. The significant part is that Mr. MAHON's reputation has spread so widely and that an appraisal by a neutral editor is so accurate and so much in line with those of us who have worked so closely with him through the years.

The editorial follows:

NASA VIEWS OF ANOTHER STRONG TEXAS VOICE IN HOUSE SIGNIFICANT TO AREA

Texas now has another powerful voice in the House of Representatives in Washington, adding to the substantial influence the Lone Star State already wields in Congress.

Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, 63, a self-described "middle of the road" Texas Democrat, has succeeded the late Clarence Cannon as chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee. His views are almost certain to be more in line wtih President Johnson's than were those of his colorful, 85-year-old predecessor from Missouri.

Many claim to be middle of the roaders who aren't. Others are middle of the roaders simply because it seems to be the easy way out of tough, controversial situations.

Representative MAHON fits neither category. His description of his political philosophy as middle of the road is accurate. He represents a West Texas congressional district—and has for many years—which includes all shades of political opinion. His constituents are farmers and a lot of ranchmen in the sprawling West Texas rangelands who have grown violently ultraconservative. Portions of his district have spawned vigorous Birch societies.

At the same time he has represented the Big Spring area, center of large refineries where union labor and liberal elements are strong. A number of large Federal and State installations with their hundreds of Federal and State employees provide yet another shading of political and economic thought.

Nevertheless he has been reelected from such a conglomerate district time after time until he climbed the seniority ladder to one of the three or four most influential committee chairmanship in Congress. Always a loyal party man himself, as most success-

ful congressmen must be apparently, many of his most influential and closest personal friends in West Texas deserted the national ticket in 1952 and 1956 to support Republican Eisenhower for the Presidency.

Many of these same friends returned to the Democratic fold nationally in 1960 only because Lyndon Johnson was on the ticket and not because of any admiration at the time of John F. Kennedy. Representative MAHON's relations with these friends and associates remains close.

For us on the gulf coast perhaps it is most significant to know that Representative MAHON has been a consistently strong national defense Congressman. For years he has wielded substantial influence in Armed Forces matters and we believe has been correctly identified generally as a friend of the space program. In this respect he differs sharply from Representative Cannon who had his doubts about many phases of the space program and especially its cost. Representative MAHON on his views on the $5 billion space program:

"We have launched it and I feel we have put our hand to the plow and shouldn't look back. The overall benefits will be tremendous."

To those of us on the gulf coast who are becoming increasingly concerned economically and otherwise with the space program and activities at the Manned Spacecraft Center this attitude can well be both important and significant.

U.S. Foreign Policy in War on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 1, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a brief and incisive analysis of U.S. foreign policy in the war with the forces of world communism. This analysis of U.S. attempts to make an accommodation with the Communists rather than to win the war is most worthy of the attention of the Members of the Congress and, in fact, all Americans. The analysis is contained in the newsgram printed in the front of U.S. News & World Report. Following this analysis is an even briefer analysis of the Wallace vote in the recent presidential preference primaries in Maryland, Indiana, and Wisconsin, and also the reaction of many voters in the North to the pending so-called civil rights legislation on unlawful agitational efforts to bring about immediate integration of the races in private as well as public facilities.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these analyses as printed in the newsgram of the U.S. News & World Report be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analyses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

It's beginning to look as if another "noble experiment" is in trouble. This one is attempted "togetherness" of United States with the world's Communists.

"Togetherness," in practice, seems to be turning into a snare.

In southeast Asia, a war in which Americans are fighting is being lost.

Americans go on fighting under rules that Communists violate. Laos is as good as lost, because United States kept agreements and Communists violated them.

Cambodia has shifted to the Communist side because United States is losing in Laos and Vietnam. Vietnam is being lost because the war that Communists push in violation of agreements is limited to people of South Vietnam and is not being carried to North Vietnam—the base of key manpower, supplies, and training.

And. If southeast Asia goes, all of Asia will be in danger.

Fear underlies U.S. policy in this part of the world. Fear is that, if United States really gets rough, Red China and Red Russia both will be offended.

There's fear that, if United States really hits Communist vitals, the war will be turned from a little war being lost into a bigger war that might be lost, too. Russia might heat up Berlin. Red China might hit India or Formosa.

In that case, the theory is, "togetherness" would be shattered.

Cuba is part of the same pattern. U.S. allies are helping Castro in Cuba. Russia and her satellites are helping him in a big way as well. Red China, besides fighting United States in Asia, is helping Castro in Cuba.

Castro, on his part, is causing trouble for United States in this hemisphere.

But. United States fears to do much about Castro because a move next door could bring a Russian move in Western Europe and a new Chinese move in Asia.

Fear, as a guide to a policy of "togetherness," seems to get nowhere.

U.S. policymakers had thought they could fight a "secret war" in Vietnam. Idea was that American soldiers, being killed in driblets, would not draw much attention in United States—at least until after voting in November.

War itself never has been authorized by Congress. Subterfuge is used to picture a major American effort as limited to an "advisory" role.

This whole situation gives signs now of breaking into the open.

Mr. Johnson, it seems, is not happy with the "togetherness" policy.

Red China, as a result, could find itself with trouble in North Vietnam. War cannot always be fought by accepting blows and not delivery any.

Castro in Cuba, too, may find the going a little harder.

If there comes to be any sign that American voters are impatient with a policy based on fear of Communists, then things could firm up somewhat.

There's an obvious white reaction to Negro pressures in the North.

Wallace vote in Maryland, Indiana, Wisconsin reveals that. Wallace vote was a majority of white Democrats in Maryland, big in all white voter groups.

Civil rights law, when enacted, will not end this growing issue. Civil rights, as Congress is to guarantee them, will be directed largely at the South. Northern States with civil rights laws will not be affected much.

But. Negro unrest now is greater in the North than in the South. State laws, in other words, do not seem to be the answer.

Fear again is back of the white reaction to Negro demands. Job loss for whites to spread the work is one fear. Loss in property value of homes as Government tries to force integration of neighborhoods is another fear.

Fear of a breakup of neighborhood schools is still another.

Congress is preparing to write into law a direct bar that will prevent any judge or court from taking action affecting neighborhood pattern of schools. That one contains too much political dynamite for Northern Congressmen to accept. Result is that voluntary segregation will largely be undisturbed.

Now there's fear of race violence in months just ahead. An uprising by Negroes is openly predicted for New York City. Cleveland is described as a danger spot. Chicago likewise is said to be in danger of trouble.

Mississippi, in the South, is the objective of planned Negro moves.

No Will To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NO WILL TO WIN

After his second Saigon survey in 2 months, Defense Secretary Robert F. McNamara again warned that the Vietnam war will be a long, drawn out affair. This is a discouraging sterile sounding refrain.

The 2-year battle against the invading Red Vietcong—guerrilla armies from North Vietnam, backed by Communist China—is regarded by the State Department as a South Vietnamese war. So it is. But it also is a U.S. war, no matter what euphemisms are used to shield the fact.

America has sunk a big stake of prestige and treasure to protect South Vietnam against Communist runover. Hundreds of American soldiers are dying in a war they can't direct. We have more than 15,000 troops there, many of them in combat action using equipment reported old and inadequate.

We are now in a war to block Red expansion throughout southeast Asia. We are losing this war. Yet we do nothing significant about it but keep on hoping and losing.

Washington policy continues one of temporizing. There seems no will to win.

If this warfare continues 5 years or a decade, perhaps the American people—precisely as the Vietcong expects—may get fed up with the whole thing and demand their boys be brought home.

That, of course, is the long-range design of Asian Communists in their brush war strategy. Tire out the enemy with guerrilla raids; slaughter noncombatants, sack town after town. Time is not important.

The prize sought by North Vietnam and their Peking backers is glittering and very clear: The gradual smothering of free peoples throughout Asia, perhaps the entire Far East; the triumph of Communist domination without nuclear war.

The key stand has been made in Vietnam. If the Saigon country falls, or is neutralized as a power vacuum for Red subversion, Mao Tze-tung and his henchmen will have demonstrated that force can win by nibbling spot-wars, because Washington and the rest of the West haven't the belly for what it takes to stop them.

Mr. McNamara thinks there will be a "stepup" in the war against the Vietcong. He said preparations are under way to receive 75 new fighter-bombers from the United States.

Washington has requested Saigon assistance from our allies; reaction was cool or outright rebuff. NATO and SEATO friends consider the whole problem lies in the lap of the United States; and in fact we have virtually taken it upon ourselves.

But the efforts and thin optimism of the Secretary and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are unimpressive beside the recurring stories of bloody Red gains in Vietnam.

Instead of embracing a 10-year war possibility, we ought to take whatever means are necessary to shorten this fight—and win it.

Obvious military strategy indicates cutting Vietcong supply lines, effectively bombing Red staging areas in North Vietnam, if necessary invading North Vietnam in force.

Defense authorities doubt this would escalate to major war. There is, of course, hazard whatever course we adopt.

If U.S. direct involvement in this warfare is required, we should take that step.

It is unreal to accept crisis without meeting it. That can grow terribly costly in American lives and in American aid. It can easily result in final defeat.

The United States should either quit Vietnam, which would be abject violation of solemn pledges and just what Communists expect. Or we must show the will to win by whatever force is necessary.

We are in a war in Vietnam, and in war there will never be a substitute for victory.

Where Aid Did Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear and read many criticisms of waste and ineffective operation of our foreign aid program. I think that we should point out its successes as well as its failures. Recently Herbert H. Krauch, retired editor of the Herald-Examiner, visited the island of Taiwan and his report on his visit detailed the effective operation of foreign aid in Taiwan. To provide balance to the picture and give credit where credit is due, I insert the following article at this point in the RECORD.

WHERE AID DID WORK—REPORT FROM TAIWAN

(By Herbert H. Krauch)

(Herbert H. Krauch, retired editor of the Herald-Examiner, visited the island of Taiwan, seat of the Nationalist China Government, during a recent tour of the Orient. Today's article, third in a series, tells how U.S. foreign aid has helped the free Chinese to develop a prosperous economy, in contrast to the millions of starving people on the Communist mainland.)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—The island of Taiwan, seat of the Government of the Republic of China, is a living example of a working democracy in Asia. Like West Germany, with the help of the United States in getting on its feet, it shows what can be done by people living in freedom and under a capitalistic economy.

Its growth since the Nationalist Government was forced to leave the mainland by the Communist invasion is phenomenal—not only in industry, foreign trade, and production of electrical power, but in education, the arts, and medicine.

In contrast to the mainland of China under the rule of the Reds, where food and clothing are rationed, Taiwan is the same as West Germany is to East Germany.

It is a nation where U.S. aid has paid off. The money has not been wasted on marble palaces, boondoggles, and a rich life for its leaders.

Instead, it has been used to develop a bastion of freedom on the shores of communism and to create a future gateway for the release of millions of unwilling captive people from behind the Bamboo Curtain.

The Nationalist government has put the money into industry, hospitals, airports, harbors, farming, and education.

THE REACTION

During an interview with President Chiang Kai-shek, he asked me what was the most important thing I had seen during my week's tour of the island. I replied:

"The most important thing that I had seen was the wonderful progress that had been made here since the Chinese Government moved from the mainland to this province. I remarked about the new airport, the oil refinery, the aluminum plant and the general welfare of the people. They all seemed to be working and happy as you could tell from the smiling faces you saw all over Taiwan.

When the Government of China moved to the province of Taiwan in 1949 the island's industry, railways and highways were in a state of shambles as a result of U.S. bombings to oust the Japanese in 1944–45.

All government agencies were thrown into the fight to restore the economy. With the U.S. aid program that began in 1950, Taiwan has progressed to the point where it is only second to Japan in economic development and ahead of the Philippines. The rest of the Far East trails.

During the last decade the national income has doubled, employment has gone from 2.8 to 3.3 million, per capita income has increased 4.2 percent annually, agricultural production has doubled, industrial production has tripled and exports have increased from $93 to $360 million annually.

Continuing American assistance was of vital importance in the surge forward. China has received more than a billion dollars since 1950 in addition to military assistance. If it were not for the constant threat of Communist invasion and resultant high defenes costs, the nation could get along without U.S. aid.

Sugar and pineapple are the backbone of the nation's agricultural economy with more than $60 million in sugar exports a year. Taiwan is now the world's largest canned pineapple exporter with $12 million a year. Half a million farmers and 17,000 employees of 25 mills are supported by sugar. Fisheries support another quarter million people. Bananas are another valuable export crop.

MORE EDUCATION

Foreign aid farm education has reached a high level on the island, according to Spencer P. S. Shih of the Rural Reconstruction Commission. He related how 6 years ago there were no mushrooms grown commercially on the island. As a result of an experiment that cost $150, Taiwan this year is exporting $13 million worth of canned mushrooms to the United States and other parts of the world.

The textile industry has become Taiwan's second largest employer with more than 55,000 in 1,500 mills. Forty percent of the production is sold abroad.

Kaohsiung is Taiwan's biggest harbor in the south. Started with U.S. loans in 1958, the first phase of a $14 million expansion program has just been completed. It is a 12-year project that will increase harbor facilities six times, making it the largest port and industrial center on the island.

MAIN IMPORTS

Taiwan's main imports through this port are crude oil from the Middle East and bauxite from Malaysia. The Taiwan Aluminum Corp.'s big plant, employing thousands, is located at Kaohsiung and uses bauxite to produce 20,000 tons of ingots per year, much of which is exported to Japan and other Asian countries.

The big oil refinery at Kaohsiung was built by all Chinese labor under the direction of the Fluor Corp. of Los Angeles. T.C. Fei, assistant manager, said the plant handles 45,000 barrels of crude per day. It supplies all Taiwan with gasoline, jet, and other airplane fuels, plus making asphalt and other byproducts. Gasoline sells for 50 cents a gallon.

More than a hundred foreign firms have invested over $35 million in Taiwan shipbuilding, textiles, drugs and electrical appliance plants.

The island birth rate is the highest in the world at 3.6 percent annually, against 1.7 in the United States. The population in 1952 was 8 million and in 1964 it was almost 12 million. As a result, new jobs must be found for 100,000 each year.

This is the last year of the Government's third 4-year plan and Taiwan is accomplishing its purpose of creating more jobs, raising the standard of living and expanding exports all in the face of increasing heavy population pressure.

This, surely, is one place where U.S. foreign aid is accomplishing its purpose.

Mrs. Sullivan, ABWA Woman of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Galveston News on Sunday, May 24, 1964, carried an article concerning the long-time friend of mine, Mrs. Mary Sullivan, who has just been named Galveston Woman of the Year by the American Business Women's Association.

As I read this article, it struck me that the Association could not have made a wiser choice nor could their award have gone to one who more richly deserved it.

I shall not add to the article which follows these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD except to say that in recognizing Mary her association has recognized one of the finest examples I ever knew of a courageous mother who, on being widowed, carried on her family life according to the best American traditions and at the same time provided the wherewithal to support them.

The article follows:

MRS. SULLIVAN ABWA WOMAN OF YEAR

(By Terry MacLeod)

Mrs. Mary Sullivan is the choice of the Galveston charter chapter of the American Business Women's Association for the honor of Galveston's Woman of the Year.

And on her the organization pins its hope for national recognition when the American Business Woman of the Year is chosen at the convention in Milwaukee, Wis., in October.

A mild-mannered brunette with ready smile and pleasing personality, Mrs. Sullivan is employed as traffic director and secretary of radio station KGBC, a post she's held for the past 9 years.

Mrs. Sullivan is a native Galvestonian and received her education in the parochial schools, graduating from Ursuline Academy.

She is the daughter of Mrs. Emma Dipuccio.

Her first job was with the American National Insurance Co., and then she went to

work for the Santa Fe where she met and married Patrick J. Sullivan, who died in 1959.

Mrs. Sullivan, in addition to her job with the radio station, is kept busy making a home for her three children, Carol, 17, who is a junior at Ursuline; 14-year-old Terry, a freshman at Kirwin; and 6-year-old Lynn, a first grader also at Ursuline.

Her time is taken up with cooking, though she says her youngsters are of the anything-will-do variety, sewing for the girls, gardening and going * * * going.

The son is catcher in the pony league, so the family has to turn out and cheer at the games.

And there is the homework which she must supervise. She admits she does pretty well until it comes to this modern math, which is making her study all over again so she can keep up with the youngsters.

Mrs. Sullivan is secretary of the Ursuline PTA, vice president of the Ursuline Alumnae and serves as substitute teacher for the Christian Doctrine classes at St. Patrick's Church where the family attends church.

She has been a member of the American Business Women's Association for the past 8 years.

Of being elected the Woman of the Year by the organization she says, "I feel honored, but I don't feel that I deserve it."

However her boss, Steve Cowan, has his own opinion about the honor.

"Mrs. Sullivan fulfills every requirement of what you call a good Girl Friday.

"She's an excellent secretary and above all an excellent mother and homemaker. I think the club is totally justified in selecting her and we feel proud and will be at the sidelines rooting for her to be chosen the American Woman of the Year when the national convention makes the selection."

Don't Buck the System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Richard Wilson, the well-known and widely read chief of the Washington bureau of the Minneapolis Tribune reported in a recent column that blind loyalty and coverup are spreading in Washington. "It is not," Wilson commented, "a very healthy atmosphere for the prudent conduct of the public's business."

Mr. Wilson's article follows:

BLIND LOYALTY AND "COVERUP" ARE SPREADING IN WASHINGTON

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The handwriting on the wall has been written large here: Don't buck the system.

This truth is freshly proved by a Government Distinguished Service Award to an obscure official named Horace D. Godfrey. Godfrey is the administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service under Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman.

It is charged in the House of Representatives that Godfrey was given this award although in his branch of the Federal service "obviously a coverup was attempted in the entire Billie Sol Estes case." The evidence in the Billie Sol Estes investigation showed, it is charged, incredible confusion, mismanagement, lack of records, duplication and "woeful lack of management and knowledge of what was going on in the Estes case."

Yet Freeman confers on Godfrey the Department's highest accolade.

But what of the man who testified and supplied records to show that the bigtime Texas promoter now under prison sentence for fraud was shown favoritism in Freeman's department as early as November 1961?

This man, N. Battle Hales, has been denied an automatic in-grade promotion which would ordinarily have come to him in the course of his Federal service. Thus the accuser languishes and the accused flourishes, although the record seems clear that Billie Sol enjoyed a favored position in the Department of Agriculture.

Freeman has no monopoly on this technique. One Jerry Jackis, who revealed to Congress the use of foreign aid funds in Cambodia for a Communist-sponsored hospital, was fired while the State Department official who made a record against him was promoted.

Otto Otepka, State Department security official who committed the unforgiveable sin of peaching on his superiors and telling Congress what is wrong with the internal security system in the State Department, is in limbo. But William J. Crockett, deputy undersecretary, who was in charge of the Otepka matter for Secretary Rusk, is up for promotion to career minister.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is looking into this because the record shows wiretapping, general harassment, and attempts to degrade Otepka after he helped the Senate Internal Security Committee expose some of the weaknesses of the State Department security system.

It is worth noting also that Gen. Curtis LeMay has been given an extension, at least until after the election, of his tenure as air chief of staff. LeMay protested against the multibillion-dollar award of the TFX contract for what he thought was a second-best fighter plane to be used by both the Navy and Air Force.

The Navy commander, Admiral Anderson, who also objected openly before Congress, has long since vanished from the Washington scene. But LeMay was pointedly given only a 1-year reappointment, and this has now been extended.

The pattern set in these several cases is shocking. The lesson taught to Federal officials is that if they see mismangement, wrongdoing or bad judgment, they would be wise to keep their mouths shut.

Their worst sin would be to tell their story to Congress, although it is the clear and imperative responsibility of Congress to inquire into the operation of Federal executive departments funded solely by the votes of Congress. Congress controls absolutely the appropriation of money to operate the Federal Government and taxation to provide these funds, and it has the right to know how the funds are spent.

Some kind of new morality seems to have gotten a lodge in official Washington. It is the morality of blind loyalty to superior authority and complete obeisance to the word from on high. And it is not a very healthy atmosphere for the prudent conduct of the public's business.

Address of Representative John M. Murphy to Italy-America Foundation, Inc., May 24, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 24, 1964, I had the pleasure of addressing the Italy-America Foundation, Inc., dinner dance at the Commodore Hotel. The event was in honor of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart of Milan and Rome, Italy. His Excellency, the Most Reverend Joseph M. Pernicone, auxiliary bishop of New York, presided; Mr. Salvatore Esposito, president of the foundation was present; and the toastmaster was former New York Congressman Alfred E. Santangelo.

The main purposes of the Italy-America Foundation is to perpetuate the cultural and charitable traditions of Italy and America by the encouragement and promotion of education through voluntary grants, by scholarships or otherwise, to individuals, institutions and organizations and by the encouragement and promotion of scientific research through grants to individuals, institutions and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, OF NEW YORK

At a gathering not long ago, I was approached by an elderly gentleman who inquired, "You went to West Point, didn't you?" I told him yes, that I was a graduate of the Military Academy. "Government paid for your education, eh?" Again, I said yes, that was correct. "You're in Congress now?" he prodded. I nodded. "Government paying your salary, eh?" I told him that was not quite correct; the taxpayers were paying my salary, since the government can't really pay anybody. "About time you got out on your own, isn't it?" he observed. I mention this only because his phrase, "on your own," put me to thinking.

Now, I am one among many who were fortunate enough to have been selected to attend the Military Academy, which ranges across the whole spectrum of American life to choose its student body—regardless, as we all know, of race, creed, color or financial status. In my own case, it would have been possible for me to attend another university. But what if I had been, in the elderly gentleman's words, "on my own?" Lacking funds or the training to enable me to work my way through college, what would have been my prospects in our increasingly competitive and technical society? I can give you the answer in a word: "dismaying." To be without education in the modern world is to be armless; in other words, helpless and hopeless.

We all know, or think we do, the value of an education. From childhood, we are inculcated with the idea that if we study diligently the door of opportunity will swing open when we are ready to pass through it. In fact, we have all been inculcated with this idea to such a degree that it has become a platitude. But how many of us here really know what it is like to be deprived of an education, to be totally without schooling? What happens when the opportunity for education, something we take for granted, suddenly is taken away?

To persons familiar with the tragic events in Italy from 1942 to 1945, where homeless, motherless, fatherless, religionless, educationless children were left to drift by themselves, we can see the totality in ruined lives. However, here in our civilized United States is a story. It is a grim and shocking story—and all too tragically true. To the south of us, in Prince Edward County, Va., the issue of civil rights is a bitter one. So bitter, in fact, that, in 1959, the county closed its schools—padlocked them—rather than bow to a Supreme Court order to integrate them. One day, the schools were open; the

next, public education stopped for almost 3,000 children. In a matter of weeks, stopgap schools—in church basements, libraries, fraternal halls, anywhere there was room—opened for the white children. These, of course, were privately financed. In time, a whole new private school system, with its own buildings, libraries, and other facilities, was provided for the white children in a massive community effort. But what about the Negro children, the vast majority of whom come from grindingly poor families?

Appallingly, all but a few of the 1,650 Negro children in Prince Edward County went totally untaught for 4 long years. Until this year, when a group of public-spirited men and women put their time, talent, and money to work, there were no classes at all for Negroes. The new schools for them opened with high optimism—but not even the educators realized the damage that this 4-year blank had wrought.

Consider this * * * for hundreds of Negro children who entered school for the first time this year the loss was complete. An 11-year-old girl had to be shown how to hold a pencil. A 10-year-old clapped his hands to his sides and tearfully refused to touch a library book because, as he said, "I can't read." First graders couldn't or wouldn't say their own names * * * those of high school age had forgotten how to read or do grade-school arithmetic * * * their speech was almost unintelligible * * * some of the young people, in the 18 to 22 age bracket, mind you, tried to take up their high school work again but found the pace too fast and quit * * * many have dropped out, permanently lost to themselves and to a society that simply cannot afford this waste of human resources.

All these children suffered the stultifying effects of living in complete social isolation for 4 years. Extremely quiet and withdrawn, they would slink down the halls with their faces to the wall and refuse to look at their teachers when they spoke.

As a shocked teacher commented, "We noticed that coming into assembly the children acted as though they were coming into church. Then it occurred to us that church was the only place they had ever assembled."

This is what can happen when you are "on your own"—poor, on the bottom of the heap and deprived of the opportunity for even a basic education through circumstances over which you have no control. A moment ago, I noted the tragic waste of human resources that inevitably results when we abdicate our responsibilities to education * * * now let me give you a classic example, again from Prince Edward County. Among the Negro children who had never attended school was an 8-year-old boy named Beauregard Lee * * * Beauregard was no different from the rest—timid and fearful. But when he took the general IQ test his teachers were astounded; Beauregard came up with an IQ of 153 percent. which means he has more brainpower than 99 percent of all Americans! Now he is already solving algebraic equations. We discovered simply because those of us who are in tunity will swing open for him. But how many others like him will be forever undiscovered simply because those of us who are in position to help, indifferently turn aside? It was Benjamin Franklin, a canny man, who said that "An investment in knowledge pays the best interest." Think of the interest that someone's small investment in Beauregard Lee will pay.

Another wise and prophetic man, H. G. Wells, once observed that "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." We would do well to ponder his words. The cold war has been defined as a struggle for men's minds, and, unfortunately, our enemies became aware of this earlier than did we. Their weapon in this conflict is indoctrination, massive and total, and it is being employed with vigor and skill in those areas of the world where education is the privilege of the select few. In the emerging nations of Africa and southeast Asia there is a hunger for learning almost beyond our comprehension, any sort of learning. To these people the Communists bring indoctrination, not education, and, lacking knowledge of any other philosophy of government, the people are converted to this tyrannical system. Ignorance is the ideal seedbed for communism; to bring this point home, let me cite the cases of the misguided few among our soldiers who, taken prisoner in the Korean war, were brainwashed into defecting to Red China. These men were of diverse background and from widely scattered areas in our country. But each had one thing in common: an education that had not gone beyond the early grammar grades, if that. Thus they were putty in the hands of cunning Communist indoctrinators. In their cases, someone—parents, educators, the community—had turned aside. The result? Ruined lives for the men involved, a blot on our country's military record and a propaganda coup of incalculable value to our enemies.

At this critical point in our history, as we strive on the one hand to build a better society for ourselves and the rest of the free world, and on the other to defend what we build from the onslaughts of a clever and resourceful enemy, only through education can we succeed. First, we must see to it that every child is prepared to take his place in an economy that is growing more complex every day; that the Beauregard Lees are discovered and developed to their full potential, and that the day comes soon when "dropout" is a forgotten term. And we must widen our horizons; this is not a single battle, it is a war that is being fought in every emerging nation. We must see to it that education—not indoctrination—is available to Africans and southeast Asians. In this historical struggle our freedom will depend, inevitably, on their freedom, and their freedom depends on education. They look to us to keep alight the spirit of liberty which Judge Learned Hand so eloquently defined in these words:

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

The bedrock of liberty is enlightenment, through education. Make this fine cause your own, foster it with your money, your time, and your talent. Do not turn aside. Lend your assistance to Prof. Adolfo Volta; lend your assistance to the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart of Milan and Rome, Italy. Thank you.

Hon. Emil N. Baar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings in connection with the presentation of the annual gold medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association to Hon. Emil N. Baar at a luncheon held at the Towers Hotel in Brooklyn on January 27, 1964:

PRESENTATION OF THE ANNUAL GOLD MEDAL OF THE DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN ASSOCIATION TO HON. EMIL N. BAAR

(Proceedings of the Downtown Brooklyn Association's luncheon, held at the Towers Hotel, January 27, 1964, By Mr. Wilbur A. Levin, president)

The national anthem will be led by Henry Middendorf accompanied by C. Wesley Meytrott.

Thank you. You may be interested in knowing that when not occupied with our national anthem, Hank Middendorf spends his surplus time as dean of Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and Wes Meytrott whiles away his spare hours as vice president of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York.

Enjoy your lunch.

Ladies and gentlemen, please continue with your lnucheon and to the capable staff, please serve those tables that have not yet finished. However, in keeping with our cherished tradition for promptness, may I respectfully request that you direct your attention to the Chair.

It is my privilege to once again welcome you to an annual meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association—the 35th. I extend my appreciation for your attendance on behalf of the members, directors, and officers.

We are fortunate in having with us two past presidents of the association—Robert E. Blum and Andrew S. Roscoe—whom I shall have the pleasure of presenting to you shortly, and I should like to acknowledge the heavy debt owed to the late Henry Joralemon Davenport, the founder and longtime head of our association and the late Dr. Harry Rogers who, as president of Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, presided over our affairs so significantly and wisely. We are the poorer for the passing this year of our esteemed vice president, Edmund Madden, who served with such distinction. I have the feeling that you may wish to learn the identities of the somewhat familiar faces to my left, and right. In honoring your questioning glances, may I request that you withhold your applause until all have been introduced and then let it ring out loud and long.

On the upper dais, all past recipients of the Downtown Brooklyn Association's Gold Medal Award, from your left to right:

Dr. Paul D. Shafer, gold medal recipient, 1961; president, Packer Collegiate Institute of Brooklyn, a distinguished educator whose communal labors run the gamut of that which keeps us healthy and wise.

Hon. Miles F. McDonald, gold medal recipient, 1954: justice of the Supreme Court, State of New York; a constant constructive force for the good, while being a prudent proficient proponent of the law.

Louis C. Wills, gold medal recipient, 1937; who plays his role as one of our community's most respected elder statesmen but with increased vigor each year.

Robert E. Blum, gold medal recipient, 1956; vice president, Abraham & Straus, former president, DBA; an unusual man without whose support, invariably forthcoming, no worthy endeavor in our great city is initiated.

Andrew S. Roscoe, gold medal recipient, 1962; president, Equitable Savings & Loan Association; immediate past president DBA; a special sort of man is Andy—strong, sagacious, sophisticated, seeking suitable opportunities to render service.

In the same order on the lower dais:

Charles Bugeja, president, Brooklyn Civic Council; who is utterly devoted to that which is best for our borough.

Clarence M. Ernst, president, Brooklyn Real Estate Board; a distinguished realtor who radiates warmth and a complete command of his subject.

Hon. John F. Hayes, deputy borough president; capable, conscientious, cooperative, constantly coping calmly, candidly, clairvoyantly yet with cogency.

Hon. HUGH L. CAREY, Member of Congress from our 15th District; he works hard and produces the desired results for his constituency; equally admired in the Halls of Congress and the byways of Brooklyn.

Richard B. Loomis, president, South Brooklyn Savings Bank; chairman, gold medal committee of awards; a leader who exemplifies the best that the business community has to offer.

Hon. John R. Crews, commissioner of elections, chairman of the Kings County Republican Committee whose tenure of office is a tribute to the wisdom of his colleagues; forthright, frank, and faithful to the best interests of Brooklyn. May I also bow to his charming coleader, Mrs. Marguerite Bergen Kuhn, who is one of our honored guests.

Hon. Abe Stark, president, Borough of Brooklyn; first in the hearts of his countrymen, a leader whose sincerity is matched only by his ability to perform.

I should like to skip the gentlemen on my right and on my left but promise to divulge their identities shortly.

Hon. Abraham D. Beame, comptroller of the city of New York; a diligent wise public official who has given his high office even greater stature by his meaningful stewardship.

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Member of Congress, 11th Congressional District, whose winning ways in Washington and Brooklyn are richly deserved; one whose friendship and support our association holds in highest regard.

Hon. Edward J. Quigley, postmaster, Brooklyn; a man whose charm and wit are exceeded only by the efficient manner in which he discharges his vast responsibilities.

Next—our arm of the law—the county's definitely adroit devastator of disorder, the Honorable Edward Silver, district attorney.

Walter R. Miller, president, East Brooklyn Savings Bank; president, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; a tireless responsible citizen whose close cooperation is a source of constant satisfaction.

Hon. Charles A. Riedel, consulting engineer, Borough of Brooklyn; that rare sort of a planner who sees to it that his well-conceived ideas rise from the drawing board.

The Downtown Brooklyn Association has a very active and enthusiastic board of directors. I have yet to make a request for time, guidance, or material that has gone unanswered. With this sort of support, the job of president becomes particularly pleasurable. To one and all, I should like to express my most sincere gratitude. May I present to you, our officers. Will they please stand when called upon.

Robert M. Burke, vice president, Downtown Brooklyn Association; vice president, New York Telephone Co.; a pillar of strength to me. I would like to make special mention of the outstanding job he is doing at this moment as a member of the borough President's Committee for Equal Opportunity.

Frank X. Kissane, treasurer, Downtown Brooklyn Association; vice president, Chase Manhattan Bank; a mainstay in assuring our solvency.

Hon. George C. Wildermuth, our distinguished counsel whose sound advice has guided us safely for these many years.

And may I present to you also, Fred J. Zeitz, president, Martin's, former vice president of this association and a founder; one of the downtown area's most respected citizens, whose special relationship has served me in good stead.

A friend of mine is wont to offer these words of wisdom: "Consider the postage stamp. Its usefulness consists in the ability to stick to one thing till it gets there."

Would that we could heed his advice and proceed directly to our honored guests. However, this is a regularly constituted meeting of the association and I have been advised by our learned counsel that our bylaws require that there be a rollcall, reading of minutes, reports of officers, reports of committees, election of directors, unfinished business and new business.

A motion was made that the regular order of business be dispensed with, but that the report of the nominating committee concerning election of directors be read to the assembled members.

Do I hear the motion seconded?

All those in favor?

Motion carried.

The work of an association such as ours is a daily activity and its affairs are conducted by its staff headed by our able executive vice president. The success or failure of our efforts depend almost entirely on his execution of the policies as set by the board. We are most fortunate in having as this officer, a man whose diligence, integrity, and knowledge enable us to gather here today in such force. May I call upon this talented gentleman, Grover M. Moscowitz, for his report:

(Mr. Grover M. Moscowitz, the executive vice president, read the report of the nominating committee which renominated to the board the following:)

Edgar A. Baum, president, Arebec Corp.

Robert M. Burke, vice president, New York Telephone Co.

Paul F. Ely, president, the Brooklyn Savings Bank.

Joseph D. Farrell, vice president, the First National City Bank of New York.

J. Victor Herd, chairman of the boards, the Continental Insurance Co.

George C. Johnson, chairman and president, the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn.

Wilbur A. Levin, vice president, Martin's.

Richard B. Loomis, president, South Brooklyn Savings Bank.

Milton T. Vander Veer, president, Lafayette National Bank of Brooklyn.

All to serve as directors of the Downtown Brooklyn Association for a period of 3 years, their terms to begin February 1, 1964.

The committee also nominated Philip H. Milner, senior vice president, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. as a member of the board of directors to fill an unexpired term beginning February 1, 1964, which will terminate on January 31, 1965.

You have heard the report of the nominating committee. All in favor say, "Aye."

The "ayes" have it.

I declare the report approved as submitted.

I trust Senator KEATING will take note of this example of "democracy in action" and make what use of it he will.

"A man wrapped up in himself makes a mighty small package." Emil Baar, whom we are gathered here today to honor, has intertwined himself in the affairs of his community and nation since the First World War when he served his country with distinction in France. By any standard, he is a big man. Despite his many positions of trust and honor, he retains the humility and gentleness that have been his hallmark these many years. When I called at his office to notify him of his selection for this award, his obviously sincere reaction was one of incredulity. "Why me?" was his response. We welcome you into Brooklyn's Legion of Honor today, not only for your notable list of communal accomplishments, but also for the manner in which they were performed. Sir, you are the classic example of Webster's definition of a gentleman—"A well-bred man of fine feelings."

I have selected at random some of your activities, which are too numerous to mention in their entirety:

In the field of philanthropy and civic affairs: Chairman of board of trustees, Union of American Hebrew Congregation, 1959–63; trustee of Brooklyn Institute of Arts & Sciences; president of Union Temple of Brooklyn, 1941–49 and currently honorary president; trustee, United Hospital Fund of New York; president, 1948–54, Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, now honorary chairman of the board; trustee, Men's League of Brooklyn; governing committee of both the Brooklyn Museum and the Children's Museum; trustee and former vice president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; past county commander, Kings County American Legion.

In your profession and the field of finance: Member of law firm Baar, Bennett & Fullen since 1926; member of the Bar Associations of Brooklyn, the City of New York, and New York State; Republican candidate for borough president, 1940; justice of the supreme court, 1951; trustee, Brevoort Savings Bank; advisory board manufacturers, Hanover Trust Co., Borough Hall branch.

Awards are no novelty to you, having been honored by the Men's League of Brooklyn, the American Legion, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to mention a few.

Just as surely as you merit this award, so does your charming wife well earn the moment of pride she must feel at seeing the community pause to do you homage. Her active cooperation and understanding have been the indispensable requisite upon which your activities have been based.

Brooklyn's Legion of Honor well deserves your addition to its ranks and I take great pleasure in reading the scroll that accompanies this beautiful gold medal.

"The Downtown Brooklyn Association awards for the year 1963 the association's gold medal for the most distinguished services to Brooklyn to Emil N. Baar, in recognition of his inspiring leadership in humanitarian causes and cultural institutions and his devoted interest in important communal and civic activities."

REMARKS BY MR. BAAR

Mr. President, Senator Keating, Comptroller Beame, Borough President Stark, members of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, and friends, perhaps the best way to express my feelings at this moment is to echo the statement made by Yogi Berra, the new manager of the New York Yankees, at a dinner tendered to him in honor of his being so designated. He said, "I thank all those that made this function necessary."

I am overwhelmed by this gathering of my partners, friends, and associates in several of our community organizations, and am deeply touched by this tribute. This is so particularly when I scan the list of the great citizens of Brooklyn who were the previous recipients of this award. It is a great compliment to be included with such a distinguished group.

If there has been any accomplishment on my part, I must pay tribute to three sources of inspiration. Firstly, this great and beloved country with its lofty traditions of democracy making available to immigrants the golden opportunity of the individual's right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Secondly, the teachings of my faith as so beautifully expressed by one of our martyred patriarchs of ancient days, the Prophet Hillel, who said:

"If I am not for myself, who am I;
If I am for myself only, what am I;
If not now, when."

Thirdly, my family. My parents who had the forethought to emigrate to this country with my four other brothers and sisters, and at the summit my wife from whom each day I draw new inspiration and without whose understanding and forbearance I could have accomplished nothing. The tribute is due her at least equally as it is to me because while I have been out attending as best I

could to matters involving communal welfare, it was she who was alone, and in this respect made a sacrifice of the companionship which husband and wife should have.

Our great President, if not the greatest, Abraham Lincoln, said: "It is good to see a man proud of the place in which he lives, and so lives that his place is proud of him." This occasion, therefore, when your neighbors give you a pat on the back, has special virtue and significance for me. Yes, I am proud of Brooklyn where I live and so happy that my neighbors today have thus recognized me. In accepting the award, I am mindful of the lines written by some wag which run as follows:

"Sometime, when you are feeling important,
Sometime when your ego is in bloom,
Sometime when you take it for granted,
You're the best qualified in the room;

"Sometime when you feel that your going
Would leave an unfillable hole,
Just follow these simple instructions
And see how it humbles your soul.

"Take a bucket and fill it with water,
Stick your hand in up to your wrist,
Pull it out and the hole that's remaining
Could be the measure of how little you're missed."

I hope I have deserved this honor and pray that the future will vindicate your judgment. Thank you for this cherished moment so happy for my wife and myself and thanks, too, for coming here to share this joyful occasion with us.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

It is the tradition of our association to call attention at its meetings to any member of the board who has been honored. In that spirit, may I congratulate George Gray on his elevation to the presidency of the Kings County Trust Co.

How does one introduce a U.S. Senator—particularly one who looks like a Senator, acts like a Senator, and whose conduct in this high office has made him one of the most respected Members of this august forum. My solution is to say simply, but most sincerely, that I am privileged to present to you a man who has so very ably represented our State in the Halls of Congress for 18 years, and whose address, I feel certain, will be Capitol Hill for many years to come: the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING.

REMARKS OF HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

Mr. Wilbur Levin, members of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, I am delighted to attend this luncheon honoring Judge Baar by presenting him with your association's gold medal for—and I quote—"Outstanding service to the community."

"Outstanding" Judge Barr's service has been. The wide range of his community activities is almost unbelievable. It seems to me that a famous saying of Winston Churchill could be adapted to describe Judge Baar's career—"Seldom before has one man done so much good for so many."

I am tempted to ask "How many lifetimes has Judge Baar lived?"

With citizens such as Judge Baar, no wonder Brooklyn is called the bustling borough. No wonder Brooklynites have the know-how, the skills, the business genius, and the manpower to turn out anything from a roll of adhesive tape to one of the world's biggest aircraft carriers. No wonder that the list of Brooklyn's companies reads like a "who's who" of the business world.

If population were the sole standard for statehood, Brooklyn wouldn't be a borough, it would be "the State of Brooklyn." It exceeds in population 26 existing States.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Downtown Brooklyn Association on the magnificent job it is doing for Brooklyn's shopping and business districts. I am told that on a busy day, your downtown stores serve as many as a quarter of a million people and do half a billion dollars a year in retail sales.

What I consider Brooklyn's outstanding attribute is the wonderful way Brooklynites get along together. Yours is a complex borough, made up of all kinds of people. Of course, Brooklyn has its problems, but organizations such as this are a model of what dedicated citizens can do when they work together in harmony.

You have shown how astonishingly adaptable mankind can be to differences in race and religion. In fact, you have shown, by your tolerance and your understanding, how necessary adaptability is in this the jet age.

Frankly, I am sometimes astounded at the incredible adaptability of the human race. Think of it, in one generation we have—without turning a hair—bridged the gap between the tin lizzie and the space capsule.

Of course, women are more adaptable than men. They have to be. They have to cram 50 years of progress and technological advancement into 35—or is it 39?

With the Moon within touching distance and Mars only a short arms length out of reach, I would like, today, to look into the future and examine with you the wonders it will bring.

But supposing we first compare briefly the year 1929 with the year 1964—a time gap of 35 years.

For the ladies a mere 20 years. The changes have been phenomenal; the accomplishments, out of this world.

For one thing, the life expectancy of the average man or woman has been extended 20 years.

Astronauts have seen, from outer space, the glorious panorama of the world turning. Nuclear-powered submarines have mapped out a world-encircling, underwater route from Maine to California.

All this, the human race has taken in its stride, with a cool nonchalance that astounds.

I assure you, it will need all its flexibility, all its adaptability to absorb the wonders that the next 35 years will bring.

I honestly believe—if the leaders of our country have the courage and spiritual wisdom to avoid the threatened holocaust—America can, in 35 years, come very close to being a utopia.

In passing, may I give you a thumbnail sketch of what utopia is? It is a mythical country whose citizens enjoy 1964 wages, 1932 prices, and 1910 taxes.

I don't foresee quite that. But I do foresee unbelievable change.

The inscription on the National Archives Building puts it far more beautifully than I can. It reads: "What Is Past Is Prologue," which a District of Columbia cabdriver is supposed to have explained to a fare as "Government language" meaning—"you ain't seen nothing yet."

All my life, I have tried to be forward looking. I have tried to live as though the future was something I shall exist to see and to enjoy. My staff say that they are sure I shall pass the century mark, I'm so interested in what lies ahead. They also think—I wouldn't be a bit surprised—that I'm ornery enough to reach my hundredth year just so that I can say "I told you so." A psychiatrist friend of mine once told me that a lively interest in the future, was the best way to stay young. So supposing today we take a dose of youth preservative and look into the future.

By the year 2000, the population of the United States will have almost doubled. It will be close to 333 million people. These millions of Americans will earn more, spend more and—hold on to your seats as I say this—will probably pay less taxes.

A recent report indicates that the average family income in A.D. 2000, will be about $14,750—after taxes and in 1959 dollars.

I heard a remark recently that by the year 2000 may be "no joke." A man was asked by a friend "Where are you going on your vacation this year?" He replied, "I want to take a trip around the world, but my wife, as usual, wants to go someplace else."

Two cars in every garage will have come true by the turn of the century. And what cars they will be. One may well be called the family local, the other the family express.

The family local may well be a wheelless vehicle riding a foot above the ground on cushions of air. Think of it, no chains, no snow tires, no punctures, no skidding, and capable of crossing fields and lakes and swamps. The family express may be a jet-powered, 5-passenger sedan capable of flying at speeds up to 500 miles an hour and able to rise and land vertically. A representative of one of our aircraft manufacturers has stated that any grandmother who can drive a conventional automobile, will be able to fly this jet sedan.

All these coming wonders will, of course, bring with them added problems—civic problems. It is absolutely essential therefore that cities and communities look ahead and that the Federal Government look ahead with them. It is absolutely essential, in my opinion, that a Presidential commission be established to draw up a series of comprehensive reports on the needs and challenges that our urban centers face. They should, I think, be a series of 5-year reports outlining what must be accomplished every 5 years between now and the turn of the century.

Perhaps the first thing to do is to draw up a master plan for the ideal city. It should have parks and playgrounds and recreation centers. Its buildings should be modern and beautiful. Its living quarters should be efficient and comfortable. And, above all, its traffic facilities must be so planned that it will flow smoothly and without interruption.

Our present slums are the direct result of lack of planning. They are the rotten fruit of stopgap methods. If these are to be eliminated, as they must be, careful, comprehensive plans must be made. A building or rebuilding schedule must be set up and strictly adhered to. America the beautiful, must be beautiful all over. It must not be fitted with unsightly spots and scarred with streaks of rottenness.

Hand in hand with this city planning, must go a master plan for our young people.

It is estimated that by the year 2000, America's labor forces will reach the 135 million mark. And with every passing year, this labor force will have to become more and more skilled. A high school diploma will become a must. Any youngster who fails to graduate from high school will automatically join the ranks of the unemployed and the unemployable.

It is estimated that—if the present trend continues, if we ignore our educational dropouts—by the year 1970 more than 8 million young Americans will not receive a high school diploma.

This is the age of experimental daring. I say we should dare to experiment in every kind of worker training program. Of what use is a beautiful city if a large percentage of its inhabitants are unemployable dropouts?

The book of the future holds many chapters. The chapter on science will be full of astonishing brilliance and newly acquired wisdom. The chapter on medicine will be breathtaking for its achievements. The chapter on exploration may well be the most fabulous of all. Let us see that the chapter on the humanities does not fall short of the others. Let us dare for the happiness of the individual as greatly as we have dared for the preservation of the Nation. What we build toward, the young will inherit. Let us see to it that they are worthy of their inheritance.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

Thank you Senator KEATING.

The Chair declares the 35th annual luncheon meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association adjourned.

The Man and the Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of May 27, 1964:

THE MAN AND THE PARTY

Everyone who's done any sounding into people's current political attitudes, from Dr. Gallup to Samuel Lubell, has noted the growth of the "independent" voter who proudly proclaims that he casts his ballot for the man, not the party.

This attitude is particularly widespread among those who like to think of themselves as the thinking man's voter, including intellectuals, the educated middle class, and collegians just coming of age. Lately it's been spreading even among those who are party political leaders themselves.

In several recent elections southern Democrats have walked out on their party when they didn't approve of the party's presidential candidate, and just the other day Senator JAVITS, a leading New York Republican, implied he wasn't going to play if he didn't like the GOP choice at San Francisco.

All this may sound very elevated, lifting a man above "mere partisan politics." Still, it strikes us that to vote by the candidate alone, particularly in a presidential election, can be as unthinking as to vote by any other pat formula.

In 1960, when people voted for Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Nixon, many decided by their "liking" for one or the other, or maybe by a dislike of one. But whether they realized it or not, they actually chose between two groups of men and between political philosophies of noticeable, if sometimes illidefined, difference.

President Kennedy was an unusually independent-minded man. Yet he was not insulated from those he picked as his close associates, nor free of influence by the political views of those who helped put him in office. In voting for the man, the country voted for a political party.

This doesn't mean that all the members of the Democratic Party, even all those who supported him, agreed with Mr. Kennedy on every particular. Many Democrats, indeed, preferred Lyndon Johnson, HUBERT HUMPHREY, or others as the party leader. Many wished Mr. Kennedy had taken different positions on the specific issues, on labor legislation or on civil rights.

Nonetheless, for those in the Democratic Party to have voted Republican just because they didn't think Mr. Kennedy "the best man" of the party—or perhaps not as experienced and able as Mr. Nixon—would have been unthinking on their part. For there remained the fact that a Democratic victory would, and in fact did, give the Government a different political cast from what it would have had with a Republican administration, whether led by Mr. Nixon or somebody else.

So it will be in November. In the Republican Party, Governor Rockefeller and Senator Goldwater appear the furthest apart and many Republicans prefer one or the other, or somebody else entirely, as the party leader. Yet in reality neither could stray beyond the broad area of consensus in the Republican Party, and either would perforce offer political leadership differing in philosophical approach from a Democratic administration.

For while the probable Democratic nominee, President Johnson, may make some decisions in a different fashion from President Kennedy, and change the emphasis in other ways, he cannot alter the basic complexion of the national Democratic Party, even if he would.

Each of our political parties covers a wide political spectrum, and sometimes the edges between them do indeed grow fuzzy. Yet the absence of sharp cleavages in the middle cannot obscure the fact that there are, all the same, major differences between the effective political attitude of each.

The Democratic Party, by and large and with due exceptions, is in its national character more receptive to centralized Government, less disturbed by fiscal excesses, more attracted to the glitter of great welfare programs, less trusting of the ability of individuals and local communities to manage their own affairs, and in foreign policy more prone to conciliate communism and sanctify international concepts, than is the Republican Party.

Often on specific issues—a tax proposal, say, or the details of a farm program—individual Republicans may disagree with other Republicans or agree with a Democratic proposal. But this crisscrossing on many immediate issues, though it frequently confuses the picture, is less significant than the differences in attitude.

Thus differences in the political parties are meaningful, even if Senator JAVITS sometimes sounds as though he ought to be in the Democratic Party and Senator BYRD in the Republican Pary. And it is only through the system of political parties, we ought not to forget, that the country can make meaningful political choices.

Reflections on the candidate are important for every voter, not only because we don't want an incompetent in the White House but because the candidate often proclaims the party. Yet it is also true that it is a thoughtless voter who thinks no further.

"Lunch at the White House"—Article by Howard B. Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, among the guests present at the White House last week at a luncheon given by President Johnson for Mayor Willie Brandt, of West Berlin, was an outstanding St. Louis newspaperman, Mr. Howard B. Woods, executive editor of the St. Louis Argus. His column, "One Man's Journal," in last Friday's issue of the Argus gives a very delightful report on the luncheon and on some of those who were present. I particularly enjoyed reading the final sentence of the column in which he wrote:

But perhaps the most significant thing of the occasion was when the distinguished visitor toasted Mr. Johnson, he said, "I am not simply toasting the President of a great nation, but I am toasting a great man, a real human being with compassion and understanding of human needs":

Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members of the House and of the Senate will also enjoy this informal report by the executive editor of the St. Louis Argus on his visit to the White House, as it appeared in the Argus of Friday, May 22, 1964, as follows:

ONE MAN'S JOURNAL

(By Howard B. Woods)

LUNCH AT THE WHITE HOUSE

The note said simply that "The social secretary at the White House, 456-1414 (The White House telephone) inquired if you will accept the President's invitation to lunch Monday at 1 o'clock, honoring Willie Brandt." It was written with that automatic transcriber used in the Hilton Hotels which makes all messages seem as if they were handled by the same person. The note was a follow-up to a telegraphed invitation which was lying on our desk in St. Louis. We had been away for days. An invitation from the President is tantamount to a summons. You accept. What else? The instructions said to come in through the southwest gate. This was similar to the time the late President Kennedy asked us Missouri editors to lunch to discuss matters. The southwest gate is on the far side of the White House. The white shirted guards directed the cars around the winding drive to the front entrance.

From then on it was ceremony. From the tall and erect military personnel who directed you across the expansive rooms. (And no matter how often you walk into the White House you always seem kind of awe stricken at the massiveness of its halls and the ever-presence of its history.) A polite instruction here and a white gloved direction there and you are ushered into the great hall where a brief social hour takes place. When the President and Mayor Brandt enter the receiving line you catch a glimpse of the vigor of both of these men. You note also the mutual respect between the two men. This is later borne out in the content of the toasts each proposed at the conclusion of the meal. There were about 40 persons invited to the stag luncheon. They ranged from Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State to General Lucius Clay. Attorney Claude Ferguson, dean of the Howard University Law School was there and so was the former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, looking very, very British.

The President also numbered among his guests for the occasion Justice William O. Douglas and Post-Dispatch pundit, Marquis Childs. Getting the most attention, however, from the star studded guest list was tall and sensitive Sidney Poitier, who told us as we walked back to the hotel that he is going to the Berlin Festival in June. It was an informal 2 hours. Mayor Brandt in excellent English did bring greetings from West Berlin and the German people. But perhaps the most significant thing of the occasion was when the distinguished visitor toasted Mr. Johnson, he said I am not simply toasting the President of a great Nation, but I am toasting a great man, a real human being with compassion and understanding of human needs.

Mortimer Caplin's Resignation as Commissioner of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to learn last week of the resignation of Mortimer Caplin as Commissioner

of Internal Revenue. Mr. Caplin's resignation was reluctantly accepted by President Johnson last Friday and there is wide agreement that the Federal Government is losing an outstanding public servant. Before coming to Washington Mr. Caplin was a professor of law in my State at the University of Virginia and it was my pleasure and privilege to work closely with him here in the appropriation of funds necessary for the operation of the Internal Revenue Service. I found him highly intelligent, extremely cooperative, and dedicated to the best interests of the people of this country.

I hate to see him go but I wish him well in his future undertakings. Mr. Caplin is leaving because of personal responsibilities that cannot be met at his present inadequate compensation and I would like to include at this point in the RECORD editorials from the Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Washington Evening Star on this outstanding public servant.

The editorials follow:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 25, 1964]

LOST—A GOOD MAN

Mortimer Caplin's resignation as Commissioner of Internal Revenue is a real loss. He has done a first-rate job of handling his important assignment and he has even tried to do the impossible—to make tax collection less painful to the taxpayer.

Evidently Mr. Caplin's decision to bow out was prompted by more than one consideration. But money—not enough of it—seems to have been high on the list. His salary in a job which involves the collection of billions of dollars is $21,000 a year. What better argument can be found for a substantial pay increase for the people who really do the job of running our gigantic Federal establishment?

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 26, 1964]

THANKS TO MORTIMER CAPLIN

Resignation of Mortimer Caplin as U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, effective July 10, will remove an able and effective official from public life. Mr. Caplin wishes to resume the practice of law in Charlottesville. Whether he will return to the University of Virginia law faculty, of which, for some years, he was a leading member, has not been made known.

During his more than 3 years as the Nation's chief tax collector, Commissioner Caplin operated on the principle of reasonableness and maintaining "largeness of attitude," while at the same time cracking down on tax dodgers and expense account padders.

A brilliant authority in the field of tax law, he brought to his post in the Federal service not only a first-rate mind but high character and dedication to the public weal.

His squeeze on those who were trying to make illegal expense account deductions for luxurious yachts, wives at conventions and so on, caused a major howl. But much of this should have been directed at Congress, which did, in fact, seek to require unreasonably detailed expense account returns from taxpayers. As matters turned out, Commissioner Caplin's "reasonableness" prevailed, but it was made considerably more difficult for expense account padders to "gyp" the Government.

As a former intercollegiate boxing champion, "Morty" Caplin learned how to "dish it out" and also "take it." In his internal revenue post, Commissioner Caplin delivered haymakers at fiscal malefactors, while absorbing some punishment of his own from irate citizens, many of whom were irate simply because they could no longer swindle Uncle Sam.

Like other men who accept high positions in Washington, and who do so believing that they will be in complete control and can institute any improvements they desire, Mr. Caplin undoubtedly found himself frustrated, at times, by bureaucratic redtape and career officials wedded to the status quo. But he performed well, in the face of these obstacles, and should be thanked for more than 3 years of constructive and useful public service.

Why Feed Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union which appeared May 15, 1964, entitled "Why Feed Communism?—U.S. Policy Shaping To Aid Reds":

WHY FEED COMMUNISM?—U.S. POLICY SHAPING TO AID REDS

There can be no doubt now but that our foreign policy is undergoing a drastic change.

The United States and Communist Rumania are going to enter high-level discussions on economic and trade matters which may alter our relations with Eastern Europe.

Rumania has resisted subordinating its industrial system to a joint Moscow-Eastern European development plan, and is seeking equipment, and in some cases, entire industrial plants, from the West. This does not necessarily represent a turning away from communism. More likely it will mean a strengthening of the hand of the individual Communist regimes within the satellites.

A thaw in the cold war is definitely underway, and the firm lines of American foreign policy are cracking wide open. The recent speech of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, in which he urged Americans to face the realities as they exist today, was dismissed too easily and too quickly.

It was a deliberate trial balloon. And, though some of his recommendations, such as acceptance of the existence of the Communist regime in Cuba, met unfavorable reaction and were quickly rejected, his speech obviously was intended to adjust the people to important changes about to take place.

The theory now seems to be that by helping to finance and support communism we can do away with it. Even a Republican Senator, GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, agreed with Senator FULBRIGHT that our economic blockade of Cuba has failed and said that "I've never known a country to be starved into democracy."

That is a meaningless statement but it sounds good. A country can be starved into revolt against a dictatorship.

It was Senator FULBRIGHT who challenged the so-called myths held by Americans regarding atheistic communism. Among the myths, he said, was the idea that every Communist state is an unmitigated evil and a relentless enemy of the free world; that trade with a Communist country is a pact with the devil, and that we can either win the cold war or end it immediately and completely.

If we accept the viewpoint of Senator FULBRIGHT, it would be easy to resume trade with countries which we have considered to be the enemies of everything we stand for as a nation and a free people.

We continue to regard peaceful coexistence as synonymous with an end to the cold war, and we are just as continually surprised when the leaders of the Soviet Union tell us that it does not mean that at all.

They are just talking about eliminating any military pressure on their own security and progress. A directive issued from Moscow to the Communist parties of Eastern Europe has assured them that the policy of peaceful coexistence does not mean any relaxation in the ideological war and that increasing contacts with the West will open new channels of infiltration and propaganda.

It is, in the words of Janos Kadar, the Hungarian Communist leader, merely another form of class warfare.

We can liquidate the cold war, as obviously desired by European Communists, as it is costly and dangerous to them, but there is no guarantee we also are going to liquidate communism by accepting it and feeding it.

The School Prayer Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a speech delivered recently by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] in reference to the school prayer controversy, deserves the attention of all Members, regardless of their personal views.

Congressman STEPHENS came to Congress with an outstanding reputation as a member of the Georgia bar and as a political scientist of note. His comments and suggestions follow, together with an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution.

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., OF GEORGIA

So much emotion has been generated about proposals to amend the Constitution and change the first amendment to include school prayers that it is difficult for reason to be heard.

There has arisen a type of hysteria which is based upon the most prominent proposal made by Congressman BECKER of New York. This amendment to the Constitution has the effect of trying to define freedom of religion as contained in the first amendment to the Constitution. This amendment is part of that great American inheritance, the Bill of Rights, adopted in 1791.

It reads, in part: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Many times when a law is passed, it is necessary to show the full intent of the legislative body by defining words and terminology employed in the act. When the intent is so defined, it almost always operates to restrict the meaning of the law. This is exactly what the proposed Becker amendment would do. It seeks to spell out certain exceptions to the words of the first amendment. Freedom of religion, like the other freedoms in the first amendment such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and the right to petition the Government for redress of grievances, will only be effective when they are not restricted.

If we seek to define freedom of religion, we will also find emotions engendered for

defining freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the other rights which we have.

To illustrate the dangers in being too detailed, I give this experience: Before coming to Congress, I was general counsel for the Georgia Press Association. While serving in that capacity, I was one of the attorneys who represented the association when it opposed rules that had been announced by one of the judges of a superior court. In his rules of court, he defined what would be considered contempt of court by press photographers and newspapermen, saying specifically that no witness, attorney, nor spectator attending his court could be photographed in the courtroom, court corridors, the courthouse, or on the sidewalks adjacent to the courthouse.

The chief complaint made by the newspaper editors was that this group of rules abridged the freedom of the press. The objection actually was that the judge was defining freedom of the press. They did not believe that there should be this definition because it restricted the language of the Constitution. There is no difference in the proposal involved in restricting the freedom of religion by adding a definition.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in all its decisions on prayer, has said only one basic thing:

No governmental authority shall make laws or rules requiring a specific prayer or directing religious exercises in a school supported by public funds.

I feel, too, that people who have written to me do not fully understand that this is what the decisions say. If they understood this, they would certainly agree with me that we do not want to be told by anyone, except by our religious leaders, how to pray, when to pray and if we do pray, what we will say.

Reflection upon this will show the reason why. If such power in government were legal, then it would be possible for an order to be issued requiring that only the Old Testament be used or only the New Testament be read; or an order issued that Buddism be taught, or that some godless and pagan religious philosophy be read. Surely, this is not what is desired.

People who have written to me about the Becker amendment do not realize the problems created when he uses the language "Biblical Scriptures." I would like to ask anyone to tell me what is meant by the words "Biblical Scriptures?" Does it mean the Catholic translation of the Bible known as the Vulgate? Is it the King James version of the Bible we find so beautiful and well known? Does it mean the Moffett or Phillips translations of the Bible? Does it mean the standard revised version of the Bible published and widely used in the last few years? It could be possible to interpret that "Biblical Scriptures" means parts of the history of the Hebrew race known as the "Maccabees" that were not made a part of the Christian Bible but which, nevertheless, were Scriptures of the same era as the latter part of the Old Testament. To the Mormon believer, the term is associated with the revelations of Gabriel to Joseph Smith. To the Moslem, it would be Koran.

People who have written to me about the Becker amendment are not aware of the significance of the terminology "God or a Supreme Being." Do they think there is among Christians any difference? The amendment implies there is. Do they know that the use of the term "Supreme Being" is not good Christian philosophy but is the term used by Deist who think that the Holy Trinity of the Christian faith is not the true religious belief and that Jesus Christ is not recognized as divine? Surely, the people who have written me would not want me to support an amendment to the Constitution that does not recognize the trinity of the Godhead and the divinity of Jesus Christ as in the Apostles' Creed.

Does it become clear now how impossible it is to improve on the simple language of amendment 1?

I do not wish anyone anywhere to think by these statements that I am opposed to having prayer in public schools. I am not. But I am opposed to having any form of government tell me and my children that we do not have freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences and without governmental direction.

I have been asked how prayer can be carried on in our public schools as a result of the decisions by the Supreme Court. The answer to this important question constitutes a challenge to all ministers and parents. I have proposed a plan which requires no legislation. The plan I propose to the National Congress of Parents and Teachers and to the Georgia Parents and Teachers Association and which I propose to every local parent and teacher association in Georgia and in the United States is as follows:

The Supreme Court has said that no govenmental agency may require or direct religious exercise in a public school. However, the Supreme Court has not said, and I do not believe will ever say, that worship cannot be carried on by private groups on a voluntary basis in a public school. I ask that the parent and teachers associations, by resolution, at every level, request school authorities to establish during every schoolday a period of free time. No mention in such resolution shall be made that this free time will be used for religious purposes. However, during the period of free time the grade mothers, mothers, dad-presidents, the schoolteachers, the ministers and Sunday school teachers, and many other devoted Christians, could hold a Bible reading for children in the classroom and allow the children voluntarily to attend on their free time. There is no governmental action in this method of bringing prayer back to the school and it does not contradict any of the decisions of the Supreme Court. It will fit in with the tradition of service requiring Christians to make a sacrifice because it will take an effort on the part of the mothers, fathers, and ministers to staff such an undertaking. If such a great challenge is not met then it is apparent that we are asking the schools to take over. We would be throwing religious instruction into the public school system and not keeping it in the churches where it belongs. The Supreme Court in a decision about 90 years ago said this:

"True Christianity asks no aid from the sword of civil authority. It began without the sword, and wherever it has taken the sword it has perished by the sword. To depend on civil authority for its enforcement is to acknowledge its own weakness, which it can never afford to do. It is able to fight its own battles. Its weapons are moral and spiritual. Armed with these, and these alone, it is not afraid nor ashamed to be compared with other religions, and to withstand them singlehanded. And the very reason why it is not so afraid or ashamed is that it is not the power of man but the power of God on which it depends. True Christianity never shields itself behind majorities. * * * and it was only when it attempted itself to enforce religion by the arm of authority that it began to wane. A form of religion that cannot live under equal and impartial laws ought to die, and sooner or later must die."

No legislation of any kind with this constructive proposal will be necessary. There will be no need to confuse the people of America with definitions which restrict the freedom of religion rather than enlarge it. We will keep America as the land where people have the wonderful exercise of complete freedom of religion which, among many other reasons, was a chief one for settlement of this country.

When I am sick, I consult a doctor. If I need drugs, I buy from a druggist. If I need building plans, I advise with an architect. If I have a legal problem, I hire a lawyer. And so, in religious matters, I should give great weight to professionals in the realm of theology.

The issue before the Congress now is a legal one and a religious one. What do the experts say? The American Bar Association opposes any change in the first amendment. The leaders of the Southern Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Christian Church, the Episcopal Church, and the Jewish synagogues all oppose any change in the freedom of religion clause of the Constitution. If history is consulted, you will discover that these entities have always been in the forefront of the fight for preservation of the separation of church and state. I do not believe we will go wrong if we follow their guidance in opposing the Becker amendment and the many other proposals which would do serious damage to the freedom of religion. Let the PTA, as a nongovernment organization, pick up the challenge offered and bring religious exercises to the schools on a voluntary basis and hold inviolate the principles of our inheritance.

I know that the people who have written to me are perfectly devoted Christians and completely sincere in their concern. I hope my comments will also be considered in the same spirit of Christian forbearance. They are expressed with the same sincere feelings of what is the best for Christians, as are the feelings of those who advocate the changes in the Bill of Rights.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 26, 1964]

FACTS GAINING IN CHURCH-STATE DEBATE, AND REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS IS DOING HIS PART

It takes courage for a Congressman to stand against the emotional tide that threatens to sweep away the basic American principle of church-state separation.

Representative ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Athens proved his courage the other day when he addressed the 10th district rural mail carriers in Hephzibah.

Representative STEPHENS came out against the Becker school prayer proposal. The first amendment, he asserted, ought to be left alone.

"So much emotion has been generated about proposals to amend the Constitution and change the first amendment to include school prayers that it is difficult for reason to be heard," said Representative STEPHENS.

How true. But gradually the facts are showing above the emotional flood. The first amendment was written to guarantee religious freedom by forbidding government sponsorship or interference. By upholding the first amendment, the Supreme Court was protecting freedom of religion—not attacking it. And if the Bill of Rights is now altered to authorize government involvement in religion, individual freedom in America will be diminished rather than increased.

When emotionalists run short of facts, they resort to name calling. Representative STEPHENS evidently was bracing himself when he said:

"I do not wish anyone anywhere to think by these statements that I am opposed to having prayer in public schools. I am not.

"But I am opposed to having any form of government tell me and my children that we do not have freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences and without governmental direction."

The Athens Congressman suggests that free-time periods be set aside for voluntary religious exercises.

As Representative STEPHENS points out, both legal and religious leaders are warning against leap-before-you-look efforts to undercut church-state separation.

Senior Citizen Declares War on Johnson-Shriver War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a senior citizen in Richland Center, Wis., Mr. Frank Harris, does not like it one bit that President Johnson apparently classifies him as poverty stricken. In response, he has declared his own war on the Johnson-Shriver war on poverty by writing a series of letters to the editors of various newspapers.

There is a great deal of merit to the views he expresses. I include the following letter I received from Mr. Harris and the text of his letter to the editor of the Washington Star:

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS.,
May 15, 1964.

MY DEAR MR. GROSS: I just finished reading your report No. 751 dealing with the Johnson-Shriver war on poverty

For the past month I have been carrying on my own private war on their war on poverty with a series of letters to the editors, a copy of which is enclosed, and I shall continue to send out this letter all the rest of this summer to newspapers all over the United States

When anyone says that two people are living in poverty on $3,000 per year they are deliberately distorting the facts or else they don't know what they are talking about. I know a lot of senior citizens who are living a full, happy and contented life on a whole lot less than $3,000 and I mean married people.

I have two very close friends, both single men who stay in the same camp near Yuma, Ariz., where we spend the winters. Both of these men receive a pension of $107 per month from the State of California. The oldest is 75 and he told me 2 years ago that he had $1,500 in a safety deposit box in a Yuma bank which he had saved from his $107 per month.

The other friend is 69. Last winter he bought $1,000 in bonds from the Yuma Federal Savings & Loan Association, which he had saved from his pension in less than 4 years. I know this to be a fact because I was with him when he bought them. I asked him why he was saving the money and his answer was, "I can't spend all this money, I don't know what to spend it for, I have everything I want and need.

Anyone who will give it a little thought, knows that Johnson's war on poverty is as phony as a $3 bill and is motivated by a bunch of starry eyed liberals to influence a few votes.

If anyone has any doubts that we can't live a carefree life on $3,000 per year, I will be very happy to furnish them a copy of my budget, and this budget includes at least one weekend in Las Vegas. Of course I fish out of a rowboat instead of a $3,000 motorboat, I drive a Ford instead of a Cadillac, we never throw any Washington style booze parties, we don't try to keep up with the Jones because I don't give a damn what the Jones have or do.

Most sincerely yours,

FRANK HARRIS.

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS.,
May 15, 1964.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON STAR,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: President Johnson has denounced the critics of his war on poverty, but to most of us senior citizens, his war on poverty seems just a little silly and riduculous.

As a married senior citizen 70 years old who never had it so good, I was disturbed and disgusted to learn from Johnson-Shriver & Co. that we senior citizens in the $3,000 per year bracket are now considered to be destitute and poverty stricken, despite the fact that on $3,000 per year I maintain a home in Wisconsin, a trailer home in Arizona, we buy everything we need and a lot of things we don't need. I buy a new station wagon every other year, we pay cash for everything and have money in the bank.

But now, just at a time when I thought we were sitting on top of the world living the life of Riley, along come these starry-eyed do-gooders to tell me that with only $3,000 per year we are living in destitution and abject poverty. How depraved can these liberals get to influence a few votes?

And who will pay for all this socialistic pie in the sky? Not us oldtimers, we won't live long enough. Then who? The young people who are struggling to raise families and pay for homes, that's who, and if no brakes are applied to the freewheeling spenders, then long before they reach 65 the Federal debt will have reached such astronomical proportions, they and their children will be living under an austerity program that will make $3,000 look like a fortune.

But if that's the way they want it, let's keep the Democrat spenders in Washington. At my age I've got nothing to worry about.

FRANK HARRIS.

Russian People "Go Wild" in Applauding Great American Choir From Oberlin College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, the Oberlin College Choir, under the exceptionally able direction of Prof. Robert Fountain, recently concluded a 2-month tour of the Soviet Union. The Oberlin Choir's seventh annual concert appearance before a capacity audience in New York City's Town Hall suitably marked their return to these shores. The New York critics gave the singers superlative notices.

This 73-member ensemble was the first American group of performing artists to tour the Soviet Union officially under the new 2-year U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. cultural exchange agreement. In many of the Russian cities, they were the first Americans ever to perform. They presented 33 concerts in 12 Russian communities, as well as three additional concerts in Rumania.

Mr. Speaker, it is with much personal pride and pleasure that I bring this wonderfully talented group of young people to your attention, and to the attention of our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I speak not only as Representative from the 13th Congressional District, in which the college is located, but as a proud alumnus and trustee of that college and resident of the Oberlin community.

Everywhere the students traveled, as representatives of the American people, they were received with unprecedented warmth and enthusiasm by the Russian people. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that no other American musical group performing abroad has so successfully represented America as has the Oberlin College Choir.

For example, in Leningrad's Philharmonic Hall on the opening concert of their tour, it was reported that by intermission time, the capacity audience of 2,000 was clapping in a steady rhythmic beat, considered a very special mark of tribute and admiration. In their final Moscow concert, even standing room had been sold out. In Kiev, it was reported that crowds of admirers were lined from the backstage dressing room to the exit to applaud the Oberlin singers following their performance. Everywhere throughout the entire tour their programs were received with ovations far beyond anything that could have been anticipated. And, perhaps most significant of all, in their informal, person-to-person contacts with the Soviet people at all levels, the Oberlin students obviously made a most favorable impression, representing the lively, free spirit of America at its very best.

A member of our Embassy staff in Moscow reports that the Oberlin College Choir is "one of the greatest things that ever happened to the cultural life of the Soviet Union." He described the group's opening night audience at the great hall of the Moscow Conservatory as a sophisticated one, and which "absolutely went wild over those college kids from Ohio. I've never felt better about being an American than I did sitting there among several thousand cheering, wildly applauding Soviets."

Mr. Speaker, I believe it appropriate, not only because of the significance of the choir's tour, and their performance, but also in recognition of the truly outstanding job they did in projecting a most favorable image of America, to include here some of the glowing words of praise accorded the group by the Soviet press.

[From Tass, Mar. 13, 1964]

The 4-day guest performance of the Choir of the American Oberlin College which ended in Moscow today were a source of great pleasure to music lovers.

The art of the young ensemble has been praised in glowing terms by such exacting connoisseurs as Rudolf Barshai and Zara Dolukhanova. Moscow critics note the wonderful tradition of the Oberlin Choir, its culture and broad range. The vast and very complex repertoire enabled the ensemble to reveal both the perfectness of its academic training and fine feelings for style.

[From Litaratura Mastatstva, Mar. 17, 1964]

Young choristers, students of Oberlin College of the distant State of Ohio of the United States of America came to visit our country in order to demonstrate their artistry. At present their choir, considered to be one of the best university choirs of the United States of America, performs in Minsk, in the Byelorussian Philharmony Hall.

Their quivering and fresh sentimentality, their ability to express the wealth of human experience with extremely fine sensitivity and feeling—this is what struck the Minsk audience in the choir's performance. Fine, inspired musicality and soft, exquisite painting of details distinguish Prof. Robert Fountain's interpretation. The youthful choir's performance attracts by its great professional mastery, by the purity and accuracy of its a cappella singing.

[From Sovetskaya Byelorussia, Mar. 17, 1964]

A good song will always find its way into the heart of man; it excites and gives joy. And if such a song is performed by a gifted singer or by a talented group, this is doubly true. It is this feeling that one experiences when listening to the songs performed by the Oberlin College Choir which last Sunday began its tour in Minsk.

The repertoire of our guests is great and varied. It includes many choral works created during the last five centuries. The choir's composition is youthful—they are students. The boys and girls who are members of the choir directed by the experienced conductor, Robert Fountain, represent the youth of 20 different States from the United States of America, including even Alaska.

[From Sovetskaya Kultura, Mar. 21, 1964]

The supreme level of performance which—to mention a foreign chorus—has been reached by the Robert Shaw Chorale, is still to be attained by the Oberlin Chorus, but there can be no doubt that it will achieve it. We have assurance of this in the great gifts of the director, Robert Fountain, and the enthusiasm of the members of the chorus. Once having heard how unselfconsciously they sing, how soft and unusually beautiful their voices are, the listener is himself infected with that love for music and for beauty which literally permeates the art of the Oberlin College Chorale. * * * The remarkable evenness and harmony of the chorus' sound yielded some overwhelming effects: at times it seemed as though an organ was playing. The soft power of the sounds pouring into the hall filled it completely as far as the ear could reach, becoming in a sense eternal. * * * Robert Fountain and his chorus are guided by strict and painstaking taste and by a thorough understanding of music. In their performance of the compositions of great composers the Soviet listeners found satisfaction, beauty and inspiration.

[From Sovetskaya Moldsviva, Apr. 7, 1964]

The members of the Oberlin College Chorus are not professionals. These are students. But they sing in a completely professional manner. * * * What was so attractive about this chorus? Their directness, for one. The young men and women sing enthusiastically and capably, and behave simply and modestly on the stage. * * * To be noted is the fact that all selections were performed in their language of composition. We hear Bach, Mozart, and Brahms in German; Palestrina and Lotti in Latin; Debussy in French, and Tchaikovsky and Chesnokov in Russian. The diction of the Oberlin students is irreproachable. This made the performance more expressive.

Mr. Speaker, those are but a few of the many, many favorable reviews printed in the Soviet press. Following is a review by Howard Klein in the New York Times for Friday, May 1, concerning the Oberlin Choir's seventh annual appearance at the town hall. I believe it, too, is worthy of special note, and therefore, I respectfully request that it be printed in full.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1964]

The Oberlin College Choir gave its seventh annual town hall concert last night. The 73 young men and women of whom it consists should have looked or at least sounded less than fresh, for they have just returned from a 2-month tour of the Soviet Union during which a concert was given about every other day.

But the vitality and warmth of the singing showed no strain and, in fact, the program turned out to be the richest of musical experiences.

The program was traditionally arranged, beginning with works by Palestrina, Lotti, Morley, and other 16th-century composers. And in them the choir showed the most refined group sound this listener has ever heard, from collegiate or professional ensembles. The balances, the diction, the accentuations and rhythms were immaculately coordinated.

But never was the effect studied or machinelike. Rather, the music flowed with supple ease, making the salient points strongly and the details finely chiseled. In short, it sounded natural, which is extremely rare.

Bach's Cantata No. 150, "Nach dir, Herr," closed the first half and the performance throbbed with warmth. The arias were taken by the entire sections, and because the voices were so on-pitch, the many sounded as one. And for this 10 members stepped out of the choir to furnish the eight string, bassoon and harpsichord parts.

Robert Fountain, the director of the choir since 1948, has molded his group with dedication and understanding that goes beyond mere choral expertise. For though the oneness of the group is extraordinary, the individuals act like soloists, moving independently of one another in response to their lines. The group resembled a field of grass through which the wind blows. And the joy they expressed by their singing gave a breath of life to each phrase.

Many Oberlin alumni must have been in the capacity audience but the sustained applause was not mere partisanship. This is a choir to hear.—Howard Klein.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I know that I may speak for all of us in congratulating Robert Fountain and the Oberlin College Choir for a job exceedingly well done. Our Oberlin singers are a credit to their school, to the Department of State's cultural exchange program, to their respective home communities, American youth everywhere, and the privilege of Americans to express themselves in complete freedom, without fear of governmental intervention. They are deserving of praise far beyond that I have expressed here.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress, I salute the Oberlin College Choir, now in their 35th year of existence, for their tremendously successful tour of the Soviet Union. I hope they may have other future opportunities to represent America in other parts of the world.

The message they spread about our Nation is most effective because in the most universal of all languages, joyful song.

The Case for the World War I Veteran—Statement by the Honorable Winfield K. Denton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always popular to speak of proposed legislation to aid World War I veterans as a pension grab, with the implication that these older veterans are anxious to raid the Federal Treasury for undeserved handouts. Members of Congress who support legislation of this nature are often attacked as political opportunists willing to bankrupt the Treasury and destroy the Nation's solvency in an attempt to curry favor with a pressure group and attract votes on election day.

If that were the true situation, it is inconceivable that many of the most responsible and levelheaded Members of Congress—who do not hesitate to stand up and be counted on extremely controversial issues regardless of which pressure groups or lobbies are involved—would be willing to continue to support legislation for the World War I veterans. So there must be more to the story than would appear from some of the attacks we read against Members who have signed the discharge petitions for World War I veterans' pension bills.

Mr. Speaker, one of the truly outstanding Members of this House is the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] who is the sponsor of the discharge petition to bring World War I pension legislation before the House. Recently, he testified before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on his bill on this subject. His statement is well worth reading, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WINFIELD K. DENTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, EIGHTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA, AT A HEARING ON H.R. 2332, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, MAY 19, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you gentlemen for two things. First, let me thank you for holding a hearing on this bill, H.R. 2332, and, secondly, let me thank you for the opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the measure.

This bill, as you know, is an attempt to provide for the veterans of World War I and their widows pensions of $100 and $75 per month, respectively. And, in the case of those veterans who need constant care and attention, an additional $70 per month. These pensions would be based on need, with a means test of income not in excess of $2,400 per year for single veterans and $3,600 per year for married veterans. In addition, this bill would allow the veterans or their widows to receive up to $1,200 per year from social security, railroad retirement, or other prepaid annuities.

I look at the bill, however, in much broader terms. I look at it as an attempt to bring the benefits of the veterans of World War I—the first of our major global conflicts—in line with the benefits enjoyed by the veterans of other wars.

At the present time there are two laws applicable to pensions for veterans of World War I. One is section 3 of the Economy Act, under which veterans over 65 years of age with a 10-percent disability receive a pension of $78.75 monthly. The other is Public Law 86-211, which provides pensions varying between $40 and $85 monthly for veterans without dependents and $45 to $100 monthly for veterans with three or more dependents. The same age and disability requirements hold for both laws.

The widows of veterans of World War I, under the Economy Act, section 3, are entitled to $50.40 monthly and under Public Law 86-211 their pensions vary from $26 to $60 for a widow without children and from $50 to $75 monthly for a widow with one child.

World War I ended nearly 46 years ago and I feel it is time that proper compensation is afforded its veterans.

It was George Washington who first proposed the pension—for the veterans of the Revolutionary War as a reward for their services.

In regard to pensions, Abraham Lincoln said, "It is the duty of all of us to provide for those who bore the brunt of battle."

And Theodore Roosevelt said, "No other citizen deserves so well of the Republic as the veteran. They did the one deed which if left undone, would have meant that all else in our history went for nothing. But for their steadfast promise all our annals would be meaningless and our great experiment in popular freedom and self-government a gloomy failure."

The platform of the Democratic Party, in 1960, contained the following statement:

"Veterans of World War I, whose Federal benefits have not matched those of subsequent service, will receive the special attention of the Democratic Party looking toward equitable adjustments."

It is now 1964. Let us put that promise behind us.

I am a veteran of both World War I and World War II and am fully cognizant of the disparity of benefits afforded veterans of the two conflicts. The veterans of World War II received mustering out pay immediately on being discharged from service. It took 18 years for the veterans of World War I to obtain mustering out payments.

In addition, veterans of World War II received unemployment insurance for 6 months after their separation, or until they were able to find employment on their return to civilian life; pay for terminal leave accrued before separation; social security credits for the time they were in service, and perhaps most important of all, the benefits from the GI bill of rights. The GI bill gave World War II veterans assistance in obtaining an academic education leading to a college degree, or vocational, on-the-job training which would prepare them for a civilian occupation. It provided guaranteed loans for homes, businesses, or farms, and provided protection and guarantees of the jobs the veterans left to enter the service.

The veterans of the Korean war received similar, although not quite as great, benefits.

The amount of money expended on veterans of World War II has been 30 times as great as that expended on the veterans of World War I. The number of veterans of World War II is much greater, of course, than that of World War I, but even so the per capita expenditure for World War II veterans has been four times that for World War I veterans.

I am confident that the promise of the Democratic platform did not mean that there should be on-the-job training; college training, or even guaranteed home loans for these World War I veterans, now of an average age of 70. The only adjustment that could have been meant for persons of that age group would be some form of pension or annuity.

There are currently statutes providing for pensions for World War I veterans, therefore the only way to meet this promise of equitable treatment would be for an increase in those pensions. This is what my bill proposes.

My bill provides for bringing the benefits of these veterans into line with current modes of living.

Using consumer prices of the years 1957-59 as a base of 100, let us analyze the pension status of World War I veterans. In 1933 a means clause was placed in the World War I pension law which allowed a single veteran a maximum of $1,000 annual income and a married veteran a maximum of $2,500 annual income to qualify for the pensions. In that year (using our agreed standards) 45 cents bought a dollar's worth of goods. Today it takes $1.07 to buy that same dollar's worth of goods, indicating a shrinkage in the buying power of the dollar of 138 percent.

This loss of buying power, coupled with the fact that greater productivity in this country has brought about a higher standard of living, has caused many other changes in the laws of our country. It is now time to consider the World War I pensions.

Since 1939 when the first minimum wage law was enacted it has become necessary to increase that rate from 25 cents to $1.25 per hour—an increase of 400 percent.

In 1933 the jurisdictional amount for cases in the Federal courts, based on the diversity of citizenship, was a minimum of $3,000. Today it is $10,000—an increase of 233 percent.

Since that time the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has risen 73 percent; Associate Justices salaries have risen 75 percent, and Cabinet members' salaries have risen 66⅔ percent.

Similar increases have been granted our servicemen; other Federal employees; in retirement allowances; public assistance payments, and most all civilian salary schedules.

For example: In 1932 a private entering the Army received $21 per month. Today he receives $78—an increase of 271 percent. A civil servant in the equivalent grade of GS-2 made $1,440 annually in 1932. Today the salary is $3,560—an increase of 147 percent. In 1940 the average monthly benefit for a retired worker under the old-age and survivors insurance program was $22.10. Today it is $76.19—an increase of 244 percent. Under public assistance programs average monthly payments for old-age assistance in 1936 were $16.31. Today they are $77.89—an increase of 377 percent. Aid to dependent children payments were $8.13 in 1936. Today they are $31.24—an increase of 284 percent. Aid to the blind payments then were $21.42. Today they are $81.72—an increase of 281 percent. Railroad retirement benefits have risen from an average of $26.47 in 1945 to $91.44 today—a 245 percent increase.

The term applied to the reasons for these necessary increases is "the cost of living." The cost of living for veterans of World War I has not remained magically stationary. It too has increased.

The income limitation on which a veteran of World War I's pension qualification is based was raised in 1952 to $1,400 for single veterans and $2,700 for married veterans, under section 3 of the Economy Act. Under Public Law 86-211 there are various limits—the highest being $1,800 for a single veteran and $3,000 for a married veteran.

Therefore the highest family income which a veteran may now receive and still be eligible for a pension is $3,000.

Mr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, last year at Kansas City, said "a family with an income below $3,000 a year is living in a poverty status."

And in hearings before the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with labor, health, education, and welfare this $3,000 income standard has been used a number of times to establish a level of need.

Certainly a veteran of World War I should not have to be in a poverty statuts to be eligible for a pension. The country owes a greater obligation than this to its veterans.

My bill would increase the maximum income a veteran could have to $2,400 and $3,6000, respectively, for single and married veterans. At the same time it would allow them a maximum of $1,200 in additional income from public or private pensions or annuities before making them ineligible for pensions. I feel that the pensions or annuities that these men have paid for outside their service to the United States should not be held gainst their claim for just compensation for their service. The $1,200 limit in my bill is a compromise measure.

This proposed increase in allowances and pensions does not begin to equal those granted in other cases and is definitely justified by the increase in the cost of living.

It is true that World War I was of rather short duration. But that was because it was necessary to throw American troops into action before they were adequately trained and equipped, causing their casualties to be extremely high compared with other conflicts. By helping to bring that war to a speedy conclusion they saved the Federal Government many times the amount of money it would require to pay them a just compensation.

Now, turning to the cost of my bill. Whenever the question of just compensation for these veterans is raised, we always hear the cost estimated in astronomical figures. For some reason an estimate is always made through the year 2000, or 36 years from now. If we were to forecast our national defense cost, our farm program costs, or our foreign aid expenditures for a period of 36 years they would be astounding.

No one knows what the condition of the country will be during the next 36 years—how conditions will affect the number of veterans eligible for the pension—or the number who will claim the pension. Further, no one knows what legislation might be enacted by future Congresses. Nor does anyone know for a certainty how long the remaining veterans of World War I will remain alive.

Three years ago I introduced a similar pension bill, H.R. 3745. The income limitation in that bill was more liberal than in this bill. In both bills the means test was $3,600 for a married veteran and $2,400 for a single veteran. But, under H.R. 3745, a veteran would have been permitted to receive any sum from public or private annuities.

Under H.R. 2332, the sum is limited to $1,200 from pensions or annuities. Nevertheless the Veterans' Administration estimates that there will be more veterans drawing compensation under this bill, H.R. 2332, than under the former bill, H.R. 3745.

In addition to this fact, the pension is not as liberal under this bill as it was proposed under the previous bill, H.R. 3745. However, the Veterans' Administration estimates that this bill, H.R. 2332, with a more strict means test and lower payments, will cost nearly twice as much as they estimated for H.R. 3745.

It is true that the present bill provides for increased pensions for the widows of veterans of World War I, but by the Veterans' Administration's own figures this sum would not nearly account for this great discrepancy. It should be quite obvious that these figures set out by the Veterans' Administration do not even qualify for the title of a good "educated guess."

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the first year's cost of the program, for the veterans themselves, under H.R. 2332, would be $993,490,000. Naturally the amount would decline each year as death claims more and more of the veterans.

The Government is now paying out $5,300 million in veterans payments each year. With this law it would be raised to about $6,300 million for the first year.

In 1947 the Government paid out $8,300 million to veterans. In that year the gross national product of this country was $234,-300 million. The latest gross national product for 1963 was in excess of $600 billion. Certainly if the Government could afford to pay $8,300 million in 1947 it can afford to pay $6,300 million now, out of a more than doubled gross national product.

As I said, the average age of veternas of World War I is 70 years. It is estimated that the greatest number of deaths among those now surviving will occur in the next 6½ years. Figures given say there will be 840,-000 World War I veterans die between 1964 and 1970. That gives us an average of more than 328 veterans dying each day over the next 6½ years.

Also, as I said before, World War I ended nearly 46 years ago. General pensions for Revolutionary War veterans were provided 35 years after the end of that conflict; pensions were provided 39 years after the Mexican War; between 26 and 53 years after various campaigns of the Indian wars; 24 years after the Civil War, and 18 years after the Spanish-American War. There was a need clause in two instances—the Revolutionary War and the Mexican War—but, in both cases it was removed. In all cases, pensions have not been considered as a charity, but as a delayed payment for services rendered.

That is what the veterans of World War I are asking—delayed payment, not charity.

The Department of Commerce has estimated that an annual income of $3,600 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple is necessary to maintain the average standard of living in this country. Those figures include all people and do not make allowances for the higher medical expenses of people whose average age is that of the veterans of World War I.

If we are ever going to equalize the benefits received by the veterans of World War I with those paid to veterans of other wars, now is the time.

If we fail to do it now there will be few veterans living to receive the promised equitable benefit adjustments.

President Johnson has launched an all-out war on poverty. If we can eliminate the poverty status among the veterans of World War I we can chalk up a victory in one of the many battles we will have to fight in the President's war on poverty.

Hon. Thomas E. Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs noted with pleasure that proper tribute and recognition was paid to our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, by the New York Times this morning.

The article refers to "Doc" MORGAN as a "hulking bear of a man." Those of us who have worked closely with him well realize that his heart matches his magnificent stature, and that he is a friend to all on the Foreign Affairs Committee, regardless of political affiliation.

I am especially pleased to note that "Doc" MORGAN attended the Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery in my native Michigan, and that he specialized in surgery at Wayne State University and Grace Hospital in Detroit.

As long as he is chairman of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs, we can rest assured that "Doc" MORGAN will put his surgeon's skills to good use in cutting out the unnecessary and perfecting the imperfect in legislation proposed to his committee.

The article which appeared in the New York Times follows:

FOREIGN AID SHEPHERD: THOMAS ELLSWORTH MORGAN

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is a hulking bear of a man who hates spinach and likes snakes.

Both traits developed early in his boyhood days in the town of Ellsworth, Pa., from which he was given his middle name. There he worked around the coal mines cleaning lamps and learned from the men who went down the shaft—his father among them—how the world looks from a bituminous gallery.

He stands 6 feet 4 inches tall and weighs 240 pounds. He walks and sits with a slight stoop. His House colleagues have always said of him that he is modest to a fault.

He has neither an enemy nor detractor on either side of the political aisle. And, except for a scholarly benignity as the only practicing physician in Congress, he might be taken for just another politician.

Actually, "Doc" MORGAN, as he is known and addressed both in his committee and on the House floor, is a consummate politician without even trying.

When it was suggested to him today that his committee had paid him quite a tribute by approving, without cutting a dime, the first foreign aid bill to emerge intact in 17 years, he said he was "right pleased."

Even this comment must have struck him as being out of character. He quickly added that "I didn't have anything to do with it" and that "the committee was persuaded—as I was—that the President's combined request for $3.5 billion in the next fiscal year was, indeed, a 'bare bones' program."

The afterthought was characteristic of the man who brought to one of the more important committees of the House a detachment and objectivity that he first learned in the operating room.

Doc MORGAN'S election to the House in 1944 from Pennsylvania's 26th District was a natural extension of his service to his community of Fredericktown.

He continues to practice medicine with the aid of two every weekend to see that the practice does not suffer in his absence.

He readily acknowledges that "I am mostly a consultant now, but it helps me keep my hand in."

Most of his patients are employees of the mining companies in the Pittsburgh area. They are what he calls his "paying" patients.

But House colleagues from neighboring areas say that MORGAN'S medical practice is his chief stock in trade as a politician and that more than half of the services dispensed from his clinic are "for free."

"I'll never willingly cut off my links with medicine," he says.

He says that he always wanted to be a doctor and that he has always been fascinated by snakes. He spent days walking the creekbeds as a boy, stick in hand, and flipping the the things up on the bank to a chum carrying a gunny sack.

But to obtain a medical degree was a wrench for him and for the entire family. His father was dismissed from his job in the mines in 1927 because of his outspoken support of the United Mine Workers of America. The elder Morgan took a job in Detroit but the family remained in Pennsylvania—all but Thomas.

He was graduated from Waynesburg College in 1930 and went on to Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery where he received a medical degree in 1933. He then specialized in surgery at Wayne University and Grace Hospital in Detroit.

House Members were glad "Doc" MORGAN was around that day in 1954 when pistol shots rang out in the House of Representatives and several Congressmen fell wounded at the hands of Puerto Rican fanatics.

Poverty Can Be Voluntary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Marion Star of Ohio brings out some views about poverty which seem to have been overlooked to date. Any discussion in depth of this subject ought to include these views:

"POVERTY" CAN BE VOLUNTARY

President Johnson's current campaign against "poverty" has brought Republican retaliation.

Two Congressmen—M. G. SNYDER, of Kentucky, and DAVE MARTIN, of Nebraska—have asked the President, in effect: "What about Lady Bird's acreage in Alabama where her tenants live in abject poverty? Why don't you do something about them?"

The First Lady's staff director has explained that it is true that a Negro sharecropper family does occupy some of Mrs. Johnson's Alabama acreage which once was cotton land and now has been diverted mostly into timber.

It so happens that the sharecroppers pleaded with Mrs. Johnson to let them stay on as long as they lived. They pay her $5-a-month rent. She provides them with clothes and gifts occasionally. They are grateful to her. They have what they want for their own happiness.

The incident simply points up a question which many more affluent Americans have overlooked: What is poverty?

Some define it as anything below an artificial figure of annual income. Others define it in terms of housing, clothing, automobiles, material possessions.

There is no real definition. The family accustomed to $20,000 a year might feel poverty-stricken if it were cut to $15,000. The family with $5,000 a year might consider itself "poor" if it were reduced to $4,000. Some families with $1,000 are not "poor": They are wealthy because thye have all they need and want for their own happiness.

President Johnson has made a big to-do about the so-called "poverty" in "Appalachia." There's no doubt that some families in this one-time comparatively prosperous coal mining belt are in dire financial straits. They are dejetced and frustrated and deserve the sympathy and help of fellow Americans.

Some of them, however, would not change places with the so-called affluent for anything in the world. They like life as they have it.

Some parts of Ohio have individuals intelligent and skilled enough to hold down good-paying industrial jobs but don't want to work. Their employers are forced to beg them to work when there's work to be done.

But they work only long enough to earn enough to buy a new stove, or a television set, or an auto, or perhaps shoes. They'd rather hunt and fish than work. They have their own little garden plots, a few hens, perhaps a couple of hogs for meat.

They like it that way. No amount of money offered for a job can lure them to change their way of life.

There are thousands of this same sort of people elsewhere in "Appalachia."

President Johnson needs to be careful whom a generous Uncle Sam offers to help. Good Americans sympathize with those genuinely in need. They won't be interested in shelling out for those who are happy as they are and don't want jobs or money.

It Won't Work, So Double It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IT WON'T WORK, SO DOUBLE IT

The Alliance for Progres has been a colossal failure, by everyone's admission up to this time, and now President Johnson has decided to double it.

This is a sad commentary on an altogether too frequent conduct of Government, that if things don't work, double the spending.

The Alliance for Progress was set up by President Kennedy in August, 1961, with 19 Latin American nations. This country was to give $10 billion, with $90 billion from Latin American self-help and other sources, including private investment over a 10-year period.

In the first 2 years, almost $2,500 million of U.S. taxpayers' money was committed, but it resulted in more private investment flowing out of Latin America than flowed in.

This, combined with galloping inflation—particularly in Brazil, which received the most aid—completed the dreary picture of not only no progress, but failing even to keep even.

To this was added the failure of the Latin American countries to provide self-help and to institute the reforms upon which Mr. Kennedy based his program. Respect for the United States declined, gratitude was nil, and our position south of the border deteriorated—notwithstanding the high idealism of the program and the very substantial funds provided.

There are many reasons for the failure. First, in classic South American fashion, the money went to the politicians and almost none trickled down to the desperately impoverished masses.

Second, the Latin American mentality more than anything else admires honor. The United States honor was lessened in the Latin American mind by the ease with which Castro was able to humiliate us and expand his revolution 90 miles from our shore, in the face of the no-longer-observed Monroe Doctrine.

Third, after honor the Latins admire strength. America has shown no strength or leadership in its dealings with the Central and Sonth American nations. Quite to the contrary, many of these nations—particularly with respect to Castro—have been far more anxious than we to seize the initiative against this cancer which is spreading throughout the hemisphere.

Notwithstanding their marked poverty, Latin Americans will follow an honorable leader and strong direction rather than wishy-washy leadership as shown by lack of initiative in the Kennedy-Johnson Administration.

The appeasement-minded schemes lately propounded by Senator FULBRIGHT were, rightly or wrongly, considered a trial balloon because of his important position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We admired President Kennedy's idealism and the dedication of President Johnson to eradicating poverty. Unfortunately, dollars alone won't do it. There must be a systematic plan and a large degree of self-help, and this apparently is little envisioned in Mr. Johnson's current scheme.

Anyone who has ever been south of the border recognizes the almost unbelievable poverty of these areas. There is no questioning the need. A hostile Latin America is unthinkable and we must help them, but dollar bills alone never could and now less than ever can do the job.

Fighting without a plan is no fight at all, but a mockery. Emphasize and insist on self-help, Mr. President, and make our aid contingent on meaningful progress in this direction—benefiting the people, not the politicians—and then the Nation will be with you in your laudable objectives.

Advice to Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year countless orators will speak to thousands of high school and college graduating classes. Words of wisdom, words of inspiration will be the order of the day.

A powerful sermon on economics in a free society and a potent lesson for all of us, including those who are just completing their education, is contained in the following copy from the Warner & Swasey advertisement in the U.S. News & World Report for June 1, 1964.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, 1964

This is the day you graduates commence to make full use of all you have been learning so far. Put it to use with hard work, and you'll be all right, never fear.

Your economics should have shown you that you can only be paid out of what you produce. The rest goes for the equipment you may soon be using (so demand good equipment) and for the taxes of the government that protects your liberty (so make sure no taxes go to restrict your liberty).

Your history should have shown you that wherever any government or power has promised the people something for nothing, it has always had to be paid for after all—with the peoples' liberty.

Your English should have taught you that there is no real world free in our language; and that the synonym for security is hard work.

And no matter how high you went in mathematics, don't forget this important fact of arithmetic—that price is the sum of labor plus materials plus taxes plus a small rent for use of machines, and you can't add to any of these without increasing the sum—increasing price.

You've learned all this, of course, and if you remember it and act accordingly you'll succeed, because the world needs and wants people who understand basic facts.

So be of good cheer. This is a splendid year to start an energetic life of earnest work and solid achievement.

The President Achieves One More Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The President Achieves One More Success" which appeared in the April 29 issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville.

The editorial is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT ACHIEVES ONE MORE SUCCESS

The logic, skill, and humor with which Lyndon B. Johnson won wave after wave of applause from the predominantly Republican audience of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce were almost as remarkable as the effect. It is fresh evidence that, in Walter Lippmann's terms, the President is preempting title to the great center of American politics as opposed to its extremes.

The throng of 5,000 businessmen and their wives naturally would applaud the Presidential prediction that 1964 would bring industry $30 billion in profits after taxes—up from $17.2 billion in 1942, as he cannily noted, $24.6 billion in 1962, $27.1 billion last year. The same is true of Presidential pointing with pride to a Federal budget cut of almost a billion dollars, ending of the rail dispute "without a strike and without compulsion," the halving of the deficit, the reduction of Federal employment by some 13,000 jobs from a year ago, the "largest tax cut in all history," a record $608.5-billion rate of national output.

But Mr. Johnson, with his unique mixture of Texas corn, wry humor, and political skill, scored a more meaningful triumph than just winning applause for a prediction of bigger profits or reiterated enthusiasm for frugality. He put in highly effective plugs for his antipoverty campaign (poverty is "a mounting burden" to all taxpayers), for the end of racial and religious discrimination the cost of which he put at $15 billion in output each year, for the closing of outmoded "cavalry forts" and military activities, for a foreign-aid policy to fight poverty elsewhere in the world justified by this fact: "If peaceful change is impossible * * * then violent change is inevitable."

Reporters present noted that Mr. Johnson was interrupted with applause or laughter or both about 60 times, that he drew a prolonged ovation at the end for "an independent, taxpayin', light-bill-savin' President." And all that despite fresh urging to business to hold the line on prices and profits, just

as he is asking labor to hold a noninflationary line on wages. And, of course, the President hewed to his now famous slogan of "come, let us reason together," by inviting a hundred or so members and officials of the chamber to conference in the White House.

In taking firmer title to the center, Mr. Johnson came up with a slogan and a line likely to make history in 1964 and most unlikely to give any comfort to his political rivals, "restraint and responsibility":

"I do not accept the viewpoint, on either side, that business and Government are inherently hostile opponents * * *. I pledge you, from your Government, restraint and responsibility—a hand that means only to help and never to hinder so long as the public interest is being served. I ask from you only the same—restraint in those decisions you make which affect the general economic well-being, responsibility in choosing to support or not support the policies and proposals of your Government which serves all the people."

Analysis of Cyprus Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the May 25, 1964, Washington Report of the American Security Council contains an excellent analysis of the important Cyprus question. This report is entitled "Cyprus: Key to Soviet Mediterranean Strategy" and was written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding analysis of the troublesome situation in Cyprus be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CYPRUS: KEY TO SOVIET MEDITERRANEAN STRATEGY

Cyprus has been described as a nerve center of the eastern Mediterranean, a springboard for military action, and an unsinkable aircraft carrier for whatever country possesses base rights on the island. Lying 40 miles off the southern coast of Turkey and 60 miles from Syria, the island-state of Cyprus is all that and much more. It is a target of Soviet expansionism and a potential Cuba of the Middle East, with the same relation to Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, and Israel that Cuba has to the countries of the Caribbean world.

The Cyprus question is considerably more complicated than that of Cuba, for the strife on the island involves Greece and Turkey, two anti-Communist nations that are members of the NATO alliance. Even if the Soviets are not successful in capturing control of affairs on Cyprus, they already have wrought havoc in the Western alliance by stirring ancient animosities between the Turks and the Greeks who, since the early 1950's, have worked together to resist the Communist colossus to the north.

At the root of the Cyprus problem lies a Russian power drive that goes back to czarist times. The Greek and Turkish Cypriots who have been locked in communal conflict are mere pawns in the hands of the Communist successors of the Romanoffs. It was the pretension of the czars that they were the authentic successors to the Byzantine Empire at Constantinople. Vigorously asserting this claim, they sought for centuries to control the Bosporous and the Dardenelles and to gain access to the warm waters of the Mediterranean. The present masters of the Kremlin have the same objectives.

In the 19th century, when the czars were extending their authority from central Asia to the Balkans, Britain moved to protect her lifeline in the Mediterranean. By a convention with Turkey signed in 1878, the British took over the island of Cyprus. But this strategically located island proved to be one of the most restless and problem-ridden of Britain's oversea territories. The Enosis movement, calling for Cypriot union with Greece, started in the middle of the last century. The leaders of this movement have been high dignitaries of the Orthodox Church in Cyprus, which enjoyed toleration under the rule of the Ottoman empire. In the absence of regular political leadership, the churchmen became the natural leaders in temporal affairs. This explains the political role of the present Archbishop Makarios III, president of Cyprus, who was chosen as spiritual leader in 1950 at the age of 37. Enosis was and is abhorrent to the Turkish Cypriot minority, which comprises 18 percent of the population of the island. It is important to note that in 1915 Great Britain offered to cede Cyprus to Greece on condition she join the Allies. The offer was declined.

The agitation for Enosis continued through the 1920's and burst into flaming disorder in 1931. Then came World War II and the intensive activity of the Communists. The Progressive Party of the Working People (AKEL), which is Communist, was founded in 1943 and immediately caused disturbances. About the same time there was formed the underground terrorist group EOKA under George Grivas. EOKA corrupted many of the young people of Cyprus, drawing them into terrorist activities.

Maj. F. C. Batten, British army officer now serving on Cyprus, recently stated in the Marine Corps Gazette: "This movement (EOKA) had little popular support from Greek Cypriots initially, until they became browbeaten by a combination of acts of terrorism, violent racial propaganda, and an intense political campaign by the church." There was "oathing" of school children by EOKA in 1955 and a wave of terrorism. Britain was forced to dispatch 10,000 troops to the island in October 1955 for the purpose of riot breaking and search operations. Anti-Turkish attacks on Cyprus in turn triggered anti-Greek riots in Istanbul and Smyrna (Izmir) in Turkey, in which Greek churches were burned. In March of 1956 Archbishop Makarios was deported to the Seychelles Islands in the Indian Ocean. Sir John Harding, the British governor on Cyprus, stated that the archbishop was deeply implicated in the terrorist campaign.

After the Suez disaster, in which Britain suffered heavy loss of prestige and authority in the Eastern Mediterannean, the Zurich conference was convened and the Republic of Cyprus was created, coming into existence in 1960 as a result of negotiations among British, Turkish, Greek, and Cypriot leaders. The independence agreement was unusual in that Greece and Turkey retained the right to intervene in certain circumstances, a provision similar to the Platt amendment that formerly authorized U.S. intervention in Cuba. Moreover, the Cypriots agreed to British military enclaves on the island totaling 99 square miles and pledged never to demand return of the base areas.

Thus one period of trouble ended on Cyprus and a new period of strife came into being. In June 1963 Gordon Gaskill, reporting on conditions in the island, wrote that "among the Greek majority the Cyprus Communist Party flourishes ominously." Out of concealment came former terrorists, and the British and U.S. Embassies became the object of mob attacks. On Christmas Day 1963, President Makarios proposed changes in the Cypriot Constitution—changes which would have substantial lesslessened the rights of the Turkish Cypriot minority.

The pattern of agitation since that time has been one designed to embarrass and disrupt the NATO alliance by rupturing the harmonious relations between Greece and Turkey, with the Soviet Union being the beneficiary of a reduction in Western strength in the Eastern Mediterranean.

In the face of continuing attacks on Turkish Cypriots, Turkey has showed remarkable restraint. Martial law has been in effect in Turkey since the worsening of the Cyprus crisis. The Turkish Government has endeavored to hold down public protests calling for invasion of the island. Moreover, the Greeks in Istanbul and other Turkish cities have not been harmed.

Conservative Greek leaders are in a very difficult position. They do not welcome the sight of Communist-led elements battling in Cyprus with homemade tanks and armored cars, mortars and heavy machineguns. The memory of the Communist civil war in Greece is still fresh in memory. But Premier Papandreou is making no move to restrain his people or to crack down on Communist elements fanning the Cyprus question. He is politically dependent on left-of-center political forces in Greece, and his conduct reflects this dependence. Thus he refused to do anything about the anti-American demonstrations in Athens. Moreover, as Peter N. Marudas recently stated in the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Papandreou intends to "reintegrate former Communists into Greek society."

In Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios has been negotiating with the Soviet airline Aeroflot for landing rights on the island. If obtained, the Soviet aircraft will be able to swoop down over British bases and maintain close surveillance. Communist countries in the United Nations are solidly behind the wily Makarios. Nikita Khrushchev demonstrated his support for Makarios in February 1964 when he cited the proposed NATO peacekeeping force as "crude encroachment on the sovereignty, independence and freedom of the Republic of Cyprus." He warned Britain and the United States to keep their hands off the island, precisely as he warned the United States not to intervene in Cuba.

Reports continue to come in of increasing Communist participation in the Makarios governments and of the flow of arms and ammunition from the Soviets. Fighting on the island has not been fully controlled despite the presence of a U.N. garrison estimated at 7,000 men. The Turks, under the Makarios "law and order" campaign, have received a heavy clobbering. Thus the Turkish Government has called for "geographical separation" or partition of the island.

The United States national interest in Cyprus is to prevent Soviet domination of this strategic island in the eastern Mediterranean and to prevent further strife between two NATO allies.

The long-range Soviet objective is clear. Khrushchev wants to shatter the NATO barrier in the eastern Mediterranean and to establish a new base for subversion and eventual domination of the entire Middle East from Turkey to southern Arabia. His strategy in Cyprus parallels his strategy in Cuba. In this case, the Soviets aim to extend their political control through the Mediterranean down to the Arabian Sea.

In preventing Soviet attainment of these objectives, the United States and its NATO allies must make full use of their decisive advantage—seapower. The quarantine of Cuba in 1962 suggests that what is needed in the Cyprus situation is similar naval ac-

tion, only of a tougher and more comprehensive character. The strategic imperative would seem to be isolation of Cyprus' increasingly Red-leaning government by a quarantine involving the U.S. 6th Fleet, with the 6th Fleet commander operating as Commander Naval Striking Support Forces Southern Europe, a NATO command. If NATO power is not used to block the Soviet design on Cyprus, then Cyprus is likely to go the way of Cuba under Fidel Castro. NATO intervention in Cyprus, utilizing the British military enclaves, can be justified under the terms of the Zurich agreement (to which the NATO countries of Britain, Turkey, and Greece are parties) and under article II of the protocol of the North Atlantic Treaty signed in 1951. This article provides for collective self-defense by the NATO countries if and when there is a military threat to territories under the jurisdiction of any of the NATO allies. As Cyprus, in which NATO countries have rights of intervention as well as base facilities, is threatened by Communist subversion (as much so as Cuba was during the Castro rebellion), landing of a strong NATO force at the enclaves on the island, in combination with a naval quarantine, would seem fully in order from the standpoint of international law and alliance policy.

Once the Communist influence in Cyprus is checked, then the Greek and Turkish Cypriots can sit down to negotiate new ways and means of restoring political cooperation. But timely use of free world power is essential if Cyprus is not to go the way of Cuba. Intervention in Cyprus under NATO auspices would spare the Greek and Turkish Cypriots the tragedy of becoming captive people of the new Communist empire spreading into the Middle East.

Hope for easing the Cyprus problem came in mid-May when members of the NATO alliance asked Dr. Dirk Stikker, retiring NATO Secretary General, to try to mediate relations between Greece and Turkey. But even if Greece and Turkey come to agreement on Cyprus, there is no certainty that the Makarios government will follow their lead. Moreover, the Soviet power drive aimed at Cyprus will not be ended. More affirmative NATO action seems in order, therefore.

ANTHONY HARRIGAN,
Strategy Staff.

The Invisible Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of May 27 raises some interesting questions about a particular State Department publication:

THE INVISIBLE CRISIS

Any American who wants to be absolutely uninformed about what is going on in the world is invited to become a subscriber to Foreign Policy Briefs.

This is a blue sheet published by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, Washington, D.C. It carries the seal of the Department of State. It purports to be "a fortnightly summary based on U.S. Government statements, reports, and documents."

Do you know what appeared in volume XIII, No. 23, of May 25, 1964? A lead story on the Alliance for Progress and another on NATO. These breathless bits of information were rounded out by a column of "developments, some comment and finally capsule notes."

There was not a single line, not one single, word, not even a parenthetical or footnote reference to the fact that the world is falling apart under the feet of the State Department in southeast Asia. There is only one mention of that inflammatory area. Here is what the State Department has to say on May 25, 1964, in its official summary: "The Treasury Department on May 5 announced that it had added North Vietnam to the list of blocked countries in the Foreign Assets Control Regulations. The action was taken at the recommendation of the State Department in the light of the continued Vietcong aggression in Vietnam."

Oh, there are some naughty boys around State these days when this sort of awful action is recommended. Think of it. The Treasury Department is going to block the assets of any North Vietnamese who may have socked some of that Red money away in the United States. Isn't that horrible? Don't you just know that there are millions and thousands and hundreds and maybe even $15 or $20 worth of North Vietnamese assets in this country?

Can this be the State Department in action?

In the official fortnightly summary "compiled as an aid to wider public understanding of foreign-policy developments" surely there should have been some passing note about Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Thailand. If nothing else, someone on the staff must read a daily newspaper of some sort.

There was a quote from W. Averell Harriman, the diplomatic undertaker who created the collapsible neutrality treaty in southeast Asia. But Harriman wasn't discussing that fiasco. He was talking about the "Sino-Soviet conflict."

We do not ask a great deal from the State Department. It is proper to expect that someone in authority would have more judgment than circulate this sort of official absurdity that blandly ignores the most pressing international crisis since Cuba.

Either the State Department should hammer some sense into this publication or it should quit printing it.

Urban Renewal Under Brisk Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the problems of urban renewal have concerned us all for many months and will continue to do so. We need to mobilize the best thinking of our business leaders, government officials at all levels, economists, and sociologists in an effort to find the answers to these problems. The Minneapolis Star, on April 27, 28, and 29, carried a series of three articles presenting helpful information and viewpoints on urban renewal. All of us can benefit from the work which has gone into the series:

URBAN RENEWAL UNDER BRISK FIRE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Urban renewal is being analyzed and questioned, attacked and defended, more widely than ever before—in hearings, newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets in Minneapolis and all across the country. Three aspects of this reapraisal will be discussed in a series of three articles, the first of which appears below.)

(By Ted Kolderie)

One would not normally expect to find Edward Straus and the New Republic magazine aligned on the same side on any issue.

Yet dedicated opponents of urban renewal and the liberal journals of opinion are currently saying some very similar things.

Both, from their vastly different points of view, are challenging the assumptions of the program * * * asking whether tall new offices and apartments really are better than the neighborhoods they replace, and whether displaced families and businesses are simply being pushed aside for the benefit of wealthier and more powerful people.

It is important to have these questions asked.

Yet responsible public officials also require answers.

Above all—from anyone who insists the program be halted—they are entitled to expect workable alternatives.

From the New Republic they do get a proposal—that the Government build "new towns" for the low-income disadvantaged now flocking to the cities, so that the renewal of the older central cities can go ahead without injuring these people.

From the dedicated opponents, in Minneapolis, they get nothing.

Edward Straus—former newspaperman, sometime secretary of the retail grocers association, now a full-time research director and lobbyist for various neighborhood associations (with generally unknown sources of support)—appears against the renewal projects of any sort, at any time, in any place.

With his bulging red folder, and his rolled-back tablet of yellow note paper, he is one of city hall's most familiar figures.

He is also one of the most effective. He has discovered that simply by knowing more about any zoning bill or renewal plan than a whole committee of aldermen, he can get pretty much what he wants in the way of time, information and attention.

The aldermen give him their ear because he can frequently tell them things they want to know, because he has the power to embrass them in public, and because they know how successful he can be in stirring up protests in their wards.

Straus sees the renewal issue as a simple case of black and white: It is wrong; it accomplishes nothing; there is not a good word to be said for it. It is all part of a vast conspiracy of bankers, bureaucrats, newspapers and commercial developers, all thoroughly insincere and equally self-interested.

Against this he presents the human problems created by any public land-taking: the people who must move, the replacement of small business by chain stores, and the uncertainty and apparent arbitrariness of it all.

The net of his message is: "Leave us alone."

Yet the projects continue to move ahead because the aldermen know that they cannot just "leave the city alone." They could not, if they wanted to, stop the changes taking place. This is an older city now, and lacking a conscious effort by both private and public agencies its housing, its streets and its public facilities will continue to deteriorate.

Most important, the aldermen know that if the city is not conserved and rehabilitated, there is no future here for any of the low-income families, the small businesses and the elderly property owners except a steady rise in their real estate taxes as buildings and neighborhoods deteriorate, as the tax base declines and as the cost of welfare, police, fire and other services continues to rise.

And it is just at this point that it really becomes clear how little opponents like Strauss have to offer.

For he not only opposes the programs intended to renew and revitalize the city. He also opposes all the alternatives—planning, zoning, code enforcement—even the effort to send building inspectors into homes in order to require and/or encourage the sort of private rehabilitation that could, perhaps, some day make formal renenwal projects unnecessary.

Nor Strauss or any of his associates, significantly, lifted a finger to help pass a bill in the 1963 legislature which now provides moving expenses and relocation assistance for people and businesses displaced by public construction.

There are partial alternatives to renewal. Some of them are being pursued in Chicago, in Philadelphia, in Boston. With self-help, with effective political organization, with a tough-minded search for mortgage money, some neighborhoods can bring themselves back without "outside" help.

This can be done. But it requires much more than standing in public hearings and repeating endlessly, "No—No—No."

SOME SAY PAY FOR RENEWAL LOCALLY—PART 2

(By Ted Kolderie)

The business community has been a pivotal group at every stage in the evolution of the urban renewal program.

At times many of its prominent members have experimented with alternatives like the voluntary "clean-up, paint-up" campaigns. Currently there is a revival of interest in what neighborhoods can be encouraged to do for themselves.

Yet it is probably fair to say that in city after city—including some of the most conservative—the consensus of the business community has come out in favor of planning and renewal * * * the belief that rebuilding our cities requires a deliberate, long-range action program in which private organizations and government will, inevitably, be equal partners.

Nowhere in the business community has this decision been more difficut than within the chamber of commerce movement.

At the national level, urban renewal has been bitterly fought. Edward Neilan, retiring president of the U.S. Chamber, ignoring the program's local support, denounced "the Federal urban renewal program" as a bribe, and as a scheme by which the poorer cities have been subsidizing the richer.

This line of attack has been followed up nationally in magazines like the Reader's Digest ("The Mounting Scandal of Urban Renewal," March 1964).

Similar criticism has also appreared locally. Bloomington's new mayor, Donald Hasselberg, on April 2 came out in favor of dropping federally aided renewal in Minnesota.

And a resolution, passed by the Hennepin County Republican convention, calling for increased emphasis on private rehabilitation and for a referendum on all proposed renewal projects, will be before the GOP State convention in June.

The national chamber recognizes the need for the renewal and modernization of cities. It simply argues: Handle it locally; finance it privately.

The heart of the matter is the Federal involvement.

The national position is that both the urban renewal and low-rent housing programs "must be considered experimental" and that "the Central Government should develop and implement, at the earliest practical time, plans for the withdrawal of authorizations, appropriations, and contributions for community development activities."

This position is simply not accepted by most of the major city chambers—including those in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Here the chambers have consistently supported renewal in general—and a series of federally aided projects in particular. Minneapolis business leaders visited the city council caucus during the debate over the St. Anthony West project this spring to reaffirm their position.

It is, of course, partly a question of the money. With this program, as with the highway program, there are obvious advantages to raising and spending the funds on a national basis. The local chamber simply takes the position that so long as this arrangement exists (and so long as Minneapolis taxes help support it) Minneapolis is entitled to share in it.

But a large part of the local businessman's position is also based in an understanding that—despite the redtape and the occasional bureaucratic inflexibility—the Federal involvement has, on the whole, been useful and constructive.

Their practical judgment is, in effect, that the "handle it locally" alternative is not likely to be—at least not in Minneapolis—a better or more effective or more locally responsive program than the one we have at present.

For the businessmen responsible for sparking the city's development understand, as the chamber's national staff in Washington may not, that there are times (as when a local project divides the business community itself, or threatens a fight betweeen the businessmen and city hall) when the presence of the Federal standards and deadlines and assistance and encouragement may help local people reach a decision they could never reach alone.

NEEDED: A "WHITE PAPER" ON NEW POSSIBILITIES FOR LICKING BLIGHT—PART 3

(By Ted Kolderie)

Urban renewal has been a good program in Minneapolis, and has been getting better.

It has been effectively administered by the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, scandalfree. Land cleared has been sold to private developers according to schedule. Wrecking and rebuilding, as a technique, is giving way to "repairing" existing neigbhorhoods. We are far ahead of other cities in helping the families and businesses displaced.

Yet a growing number of people in city hall are interested in looking at new possibilities, new techniques, and possible alternatives to urban renewal.

Among some aldermen, particularly, there is a growing interest in making a real effort to stop blight short of the point where renewal (whoever finances it) is required.

The council has encouraged CLIC's urban renewal task force, working with the top staff involved in city development to review the Minneapolis urban renewal program.

At least four courses have been suggested.

One would be to expand the council's role in the early planning of renewal projects.

A second approach assumes there are already enough people looking over the housing authority's shoulder at individual projects, and would concentrate on helping the council develop its own basic policies for the whole program.

Coming up to the Seward East rehabilitation for example, the council still has no policy on what share of the cost of new paving, sidewalks, etc. is to be paid by the local property owner, and what part by the city. The council applied one standard in Harrison; another in St. Anthony West.

It does not know whether all streets in a rehabilitation area should be paved, or whether some should be left oiled-dirt.

More basic is the question: Where is the whole program going? The authority has learned by painful experience to propose pretty much the projects it knows ahead of time the council wants, or will accept. The trouble is that although a few aldermen suspect there are parts of the city that need attention and are not getting it, the council has no priorly system for picking the most important areas first.

A third approach would be to look at other techniques of handling, and financing, renewal that have scarcely been tried in Minneapolis at all.

Since the Hi-Lo project in northeast Minneapolis (1950–52) the city has operated entirely through the federally assisted renewal program. Projetcs can, however, be financed through local bonds and tax levies. It is possible under State law to pay the net cost of a project by setting aside (toward the repayment of bonds) the increased tax revenues created by redevelopment. In addition, State law permits private "redevelopment companies" to take the initiative in certain residential projects, and permits the city to grant them a tax exemption for up to 25 years on whatever increase in assessed valuation results from their rebuilding.

The fourth approach essentially asks how long the city is going to go on attacking the symptoms of blight while ignoring most of the causes.

Minneapolis is not really cheating when it swears to the Federal Government each summer (as a condition to receiving Federal aid for renewal) that it is doing all it can, on its own, to prevent blight. No doubt our local enforcement programs are a great deal better than in many cities.

Yet it is a gentle understatement to say Minneapolis could do more, far more, to hold and conserve its older neighborhoods than it is now doing.

Perhaps the most useful thing the CLIC task force could do would be to bring to the council a detailed and forceful report on the needs and opportunities for organizing and coordinating the city's day-to-day programs so they increase, not reduce, this city's tax base, its looks and its "livability."

The annual street-improvement program, for example, might be planned more with an eye to its effect on residential property values than it is at present. Proposed changes in zoning, on the other hand, might routinely be routed through the traffic engineer and other technical offices (including the assessor), since a major change in the permitted land use is likely to have direct effects on traffic patterns, on water and sewer use, and on the values of surrounding property (i.e., on the tax base).

Most important, perhaps, the program of building inspection and code enforcement could be strengthened.

The inescapable truth is that Minneapolis has, now, only enough inspectors to (a) keep up with the new construction and (b) to check out complaints. There is nothing left over for the sort of routine, continuing inspection and enforcement program needed to keep blight from starting.

An old wisdom among the aldermen insists that really tough code enforcement is political suicide. Yet, currently, a number of neighborhoods, which can see the cancer starting along their streets, are appealing for it. This is new, and hopeful.

No such program would be easy for the council. By and large the people who oppose renewal also oppose planning and zoning and code enforcement. There may even be a problem in encouraging the inspectors to crack down on violations.

But there is an increasing interest among many aldermen in giving all this a try. They are aware that, in the community improvement program, they now have enough information about "what's really happening in the city" to make this sort of blight-prevention possible.

Many ideas are being tossed around. The real need is for some group to give the council, in a sort of "white paper," some clear, precise idea what the possibilities are, and to spell out what should be done, when and by whom.

Prayer in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, often unsound viewpoints are allowed to achieve status merely for lack of challenge. Lest this be the case with those of Dr. F. A. Schiotz, president of the American Lutheran Church, on the subject of prayer in the public schools, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD at this point an excellent reply to Dr. Schiotz by Herbert A. Philbrick, of Rye, N.H.

I cannot understand why U.S. citizens, whether or not connected with a church, oppose allowing children to hear or recite a prayer or to decline to do so, on an optional basis, in the public schools of our land. It makes no difference whether the prayer is the simple one to Almighty God composed by the New York Board of Regents, a series of Hail Mary's, or anything else. The point to the whole problem is that we must remain humble before a Supreme Being. It is wise to encourage our young people to believe in a Supreme Being—from whatever perspective.

Without such a belief—without the genuine humility it develops—the restrictions of conscience on human behavior can fall by the wayside for belief in God strengthens conscience.

No policy that encourages disbelief or denies exposure to belief on a voluntary basis is good for America. Language such as in my resolution proposed in June of 1963—House Joint Resolution 603—provides:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution it shall be the right of all persons attending or otherwise participating in public schools, in public institutions, and in other public places, throughout the United States, its territories and possessions, to participate or to decline to participate in prayers, prayerful meditation or the reading of sacred scriptures or the Holy Bible and the right to decline to participate shall include the right, upon request, to be excused from the presence of participants.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution reference to belief in or reliance upon God or a divine being may be made in any governmental or public document, proceeding, ceremony, or institution, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States: *Provided, however*, That no citizen of the United States may be required, upon objection, to give oath or affirmation of such belief or reliance as a condition to entitlement to Federal or State rights, privileges, or public office.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. Philbrick's letter to Dr. Schiotz reads as follows:

MAY 26, 1964.

Dr. FREDRIK A. SCHIOTZ,
President, American Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR DR. SCHIOTZ: I noticed your testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota (p. A2372, vol. 110, No. 91).

Your plea was to allow the Constitution to remain the way it is, and to reject the Becker amendment on prayer in public schools.

May I submit that the purpose of the Becker amendment is to do precisely that; and to correct the gross misinterpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court.

I enclose herewith a copy of "Foundations of American Constitutionalism," a series of lectures by Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin, printed by Fawcett Publications. I respectfully call to your attention the many passages which point to the fact that our Government was founded, not only upon mere belief in God or acceptance of God; our Constitution was made in compact with God.

The whole Constitution was considered a contract, in which men agreed to live together in conformity with the laws of God, the laws of nature, the laws of the universe. Within this framework, God Himself was considered to be the supreme constiutional monarch. Thus it is no more unnatural to salute God, or praise God, or pray to God, than it is to salute the flag; in fact, the first is even more natural than the second.

The Supreme Court ruling, therefore, was a grotesque distortion of the meaning of the words of the first amendment. Hence it is the Supreme Court which refuses to allow the Constitution to remain as it is. Because within the context and meaning of the Constitution, Congress, which also means the Supreme Court, is specifically denied any power to restrict, or prohibit, or deny the right of the people to pray to God, our Supreme Monarch who rules our land and the world in accord with His promises and in accordance with divine justice.

Justice Douglas was technically correct, in his concurring opinion, that if it is "right and proper" that we deny the Lord of our land in the classroom, we must also do so in the pledge of allegiance, the mention of God on our coins, the employment of chaplains in the armed services, the exemption of church property from taxes, and in all other matters. To paraphrase a popular song, "you can't do away with one without the other."

We cannot logically disavow God in one area, particularly among children in public schools, and still pledge allegiance to God in other areas of public life.

I further submit that the principle of separation of church and state specifically prohibits the unconstitutional and illegal practice of the National Council of Churches and other church establishments to lobby in favor or against various legislative matters in Washington. No church, whether Lutheran, Baptist, or any other, has any legal right under the Constitution to act in favor or against Government rules and regulations. Christians, as individuals, have the right to do so; but not organized church pressure and power groups. This, the Founding Fathers greatly feared.

I beg of you to read carefully the series of lectures by Professor McLaughlin; and restudy the early documents (which may take some time, since most of them have been purged from our modern history books); and I believe that having done so, you will wish to change your testimony.

May the Lord be with each of us, as we seek His way.

Yours in Christ,

HERBERT A. PHILBRICK.

(Copy to Congressman Donald Fraser, Congressman Frank J. Becker, Congressman Louis C. Wyman, Dr. Daniel Poling, Dr. J. D. Bales, Mr. J. Howard Pew, and Mr. John Loehnert.)

Barry Goldwater—The Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the May 21, 1964, edition of the Dixon Evening Telegraph, Dixon, Ill., entitled "Barry Goldwater—The Man."

The editorial follows:

BARRY GOLDWATER—THE MAN

The kingmakers of New York and the money interests of the eastern seaboard with their mouthpieces, the liberals and Socialists of the liberal press and airwave commentators, are all in a dither, and their hands are fluttering because Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is really gathering up the necessary delegates to elect and nominate him as Republican standard bearer come the San Francisco convention in July.

The desperate effort of the eastern liberals and money crowd to stop the only real sincere and dedicated man that is running is something that is much more than ridiculous.

We wonder if you have noticed that Rockefeller and the Lodge crowd both attack and try to ridicule and belittle Senator GOLDWATER and are trying to tear down a wonderful American—a tried and true patriot—a man who has made it himself—a man who is so honest in his statements he sometimes hurts himself.

BARRY GOLDWATER over the years has dedicated himself to go into the political battle to defend and campaign in their States for these same "little men" who are now out to stop GOLDWATER.

Well, in our own little old midwestern mind we have a good thought and in our heart we have a wonderful feeling that the vast majority of plain, God-fearing people west of the Hudson River, plus thousands of wonderful homespun people of New England and the East, are going to be just old-fashioned "happy," knowing that they will be given an opportunity to vote for BARRY GOLDWATER, the man of their choice, a plain man of the people, a man who is not lazy, who is not a stuffed shirt, and a man who is not out for his own personal gain, but has a dedicated sense of honesty and duty, and is for his country and the conservative principles that made our country great.

The California primary will probably be a rough campaign these last few weeks, with the moneybags throwing all the underhanded punches they can to stop Senator GOLDWATER.

The Rockefeller and Lodge groups would do the Republican Party a much better service if they concentrated their attacks and told the truth about what is going on in

Washington and all over the world instead of fighting one of the greatest and most honorable Republicans of this era—Senator BARY GOLDWATER.

Thousands of BARRY GOLDWATER backers in Illinois will be watching the outcome of the Illinois State Republican Convention in Springfield Saturday to see if Mr. Percy keeps his campaign pledge to nominate 10 delegates to the Republican Nominating Convention in San Francisco who will support Senator BARRY GOLDWATER all the way.

Florida's Next Governor—Haydon Burns a Dynamic Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, May 26, 1964, was election day in the State of Florida. The most important race in the second Democratic primary was that for the Democratic nomination for Governor. I am proud today to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the Nation the news that Haydon Burns, mayor of Jacksonville, Fla., for the last 15 years, has been nominated for Governor by an overwhelming vote. Mayor Burns, practically speaking, since the Democratic nomination is tantamount to victory in Florida, will be the next Governor of Florida. I congratulate Haydon Burns, his lovely wife, Mildred, his beloved mother, and his entire wonderful family, on this tremendous victory. I am sure Haydon Burns will be a great Governor of Florida. I include in the RECORD two editorials from Mayor Burns' hometown newspapers that attest to his abilities which will strengthen Florida and its eminent position among the 50 States.

[From the Florida Times-Union, May 24, 1964]

STATE RESPONSIBILITY IS BURNS' CREED

Florida Democrats will choose their nominee for the office of Governor in Tuesday's runoff primary. A combination of the State's long political tradition and the special circumstance of a constitutional change taking effect this year makes it possible, and even probable, that the nominee chosen on Tuesday will be Governor for the next 6 years.

Events since the first primary on May 5, when Jacksonville's Mayor Haydon Burns led the field of 6 candidates by a substantial plurality and won the endorsement of more than 300,000 voters, have added to his stature and strengthened his claim to preferment in the runoff balloting.

One aspect of that claim, by coincidence, is pointed up by the annual meeting of the conference of mayors, opening today in New York City, an organization of which Mayor Burns is a past president. As in the past, the annual meeting will deal with a multitude of matters involving Federal-municipal cooperation, which in turn necessarily involves the constant threat of Federal encroachment, a subject on which Mayor Burns holds sound and well-known views.

His stand in support of the full exercise of local and State rights and responsibilities in solving the complex problems of the times is in sharp contrast to those who would surrender those rights and responsibilities in exchange for a handout, accompanied by dictation as to its use, from Washington.

His views are solidly grounded in his own background and experience as a small businessman, in which he encountered the stultifying effects of Federal Government red-tape and interference with the free workings of private enterprise.

His views on the proper exercise of State responsibility in handling its own affairs are pointed up by his call for a "long-range, fair, and equitable tax program" to correct the present hodgepodge of State tax laws and put the State's fiscal policies and finances on a business-like basis.

The job is too complex to be completed in a single session of the legislature, he noted, but it can be achieved in a 6-year term.

Mayor Burns' stand on this and other issues, emphasizing affirmative and responsible government at the State and local levels, constitutes in the final analysis the surest protection against the creation of a vacuum in the administration of the public's business which opportunists in Washington stand ready and eager to fill with further encroachments of centralized power.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, May 15, 1964]

IT'S BURNS TIME—FOR ALL FLORIDA

Now that Miami's Robert King High has been officially declared winner of a runoff spot in the second State Democratic primary, and now that it is perfectly clear that the choice for Governor narrows down to Mayor High and Jacksonville's Mayor Haydon Burns, it is now that—

The Jacksonville Journal recommends to its readers that they vote for Mayor Burns, of Jacksonville, on May 26.

We give him our complete endorsement. We wish him the very best of luck and hope that his victory will be a clear-cut one that will leave no doubt about whom Floridians want for the No. 1 spot.

It was apparent, even before State Senator Scott Kelly, of Lakeland, was ruled out of the runoff, that the ultimate race would boil down to a battle between the mayors of the State's two leading cities. There are those in south Florida who portray Mr. High not only as Miami's great hope for that city's first man in the Governor's mansion, but also as the man who can do the most for south Florida.

Although we recognize there may be some advantage to our area having a north Florida man in the Governor's seat, we also firmly believe that Mr. Burns is the better choice for a chief executive representing all of Florida. We do not sound our call on a sectional basis; we feel that what is reflected in his 15-year record as Jacksonville mayor also is indicative of the kind of progress and leadership required statewide during the next 2, and perhaps 6, years.

Some of the reasons we believe Mayor Burns to be the best choice for all Florida are:

He will see that Interstate Route 95 is completed, aiding all of Florida's east coast, especially tourist-rich Miami and Dade Counties.

He can expect a friendly legislature, resulting in a productive and efficient session, because he has the backing of both the speaker-designate of the house and the president-designate of the senate.

He has made some suggestions for improvements in higher education that would affect State-supported schools throughout Florida if they are adopted.

He has no sectionalism identification, as has Mayor High, so will be in a better position to represent all of Florida.

Today's recommendation by the Journal breaks a longstanding policy of Florida Publishing Co. of not endorsing any political candidate. But we feel that our obligation to the people of Florida is more urgent and more obvious this year than at any time in the past.

Haydon Burns, on his record of successful administration and leadership, is the man needed to maintain Florida's dynamic progress currently underway. We recommend him to you.

Long-Range Water Program Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Tyler County Times Sunday, March 15, 1964. Our possibilities for growth and industrial development in east Texas are unlimited provided we wisely conserve and develop our water resources in east Texas. Federal money is being made available annually to conduct surveys on the Neches and Sabine Rivers:

LONG-RANGE WATER PROGRAM NEEDED

The city commission voted last week to drill three wells so that Tyler will not run short of water this summer.

This is fine, and it should handle the situation for the summer. But it reflects a civic job that we have not done in our city.

We need to move ahead quickly on developing a permanent and long-range solution to our city's water needs.

In this regard, the fact that Tyler has fallen behind in the past 7 or 8 years is illustrated all the more vividly by the fact that it is now necessary to take stopgap measures. Chamber of Commerce President Connally McKay has pointed out that a long-range water plan is one of our most pressing problems.

Many Tyler people in all walks of life talk favorably of Tyler participation in the development of the Blackburn Crossing Reservoir on the Neches River as the permanent, long-range solution to our water problems.

It is possible for Tyler to participate in the Blackburn Crossing project in any one of several different ways. We can join with Palestine in the Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority, or we can make any of several arrangements for purchase of water from the authority, or take measures somewhere in between.

Our city's participation in any of the several ways will go a long way toward assuring the development of the present Lake Palestine to its ultimate potential.

And it is the only sure way now open to us that would enable us to insure that our city will always have the water available that it will need as it continues to grow over the years.

The Upper Neches lake at its ultimate size would offer the fringe benefits that any large lake offers in the way of attractions for tourists and vacationers, all of which would be an economic boon to the area.

What the city commission will or will not do soon on this score is not known to us.

But if Tyler citizens are interested in the project sufficiently, it isn't necessary to wait for the commission itself to initiate action.

Citizens interested in Tyler's participation in Blackburn Crossing can initiate such action themselves—by way of petition. Petitions with an impressive number of names of responsible citizens in many segments of

community life would no doubt be entertained by the city commission on this proect, as they would be by any local governing body on any project of such wide interest.

Tyler needs to make its moves to develop its water supplies and insure adequate water on as nearly a permanent basis as is possible. If we wait too long, our share of water rights will be taken by someone else.

Today's Talent, Tomorrow's Tyrant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the address of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. McClafferty, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Staten Island, N.Y., at the annual father-son holy name communion breakfast of St. Sylvester's Church on Sunday, May 17, 1964:

TODAY'S TALENT, TOMORROW'S TYRANT?

During the last 100 years or more, knowledge among specialists in scientific fields has leaped forward literally with seven-league boots. And this rapidly advancing knowledge has been put to ever more extensive and inventive application.

Scientific knowledge has placed in the hands of man tremendous power over natural phenomena. Most technical applications of this knowledge foster human well-being. But some may pose human and even cosmic disaster unless guided by values.

The problems of values is old. Even in this age of the rocket upsurge of science, it is the old problem of the proper use of creatures. The knowledge explosion may be as perplexing as the population explosion. Sheer quantity of information doubles every 10 years. This year's crop exceeds 60 million pages of technical papers alone. Librarians wrestle with solving how these can be stored, classified, retrieved, and disseminated.

God created the material universe and He saw that it was good. God gave man intelligence and deputed him lord of a good creation. God endowed man with freedom so that man could act responsibly and nobly. "The church looks upon the world with profound understanding, with admiration and the firm conviction to serve, not to conquer it. She does not despise it, she appreciates it. She does not condemn it but hopes to strengthen and to save it" (Paul VI).

Evil men, however, can pervert this good universe; and their capacity to do so is vastly increased by advancing technology. But good men can use the same technology to develop the intrinsic goodness of material things and contribute thereby to human progress.

Man, according to the Scriptures, is created in the image of God—if in the image of God, then in the image of the Creator. In his own measure, finite though it is, man may imitate God in the domination of nature. The French poet, Claudel, wrote: "Nature must hear in the depths of her being the orders that we bring her in the name of God." The Bible tells us that when God had made man He rested on the seventh day. Did God do so because there was then someone to leave in charge of the completion and unfolding of His work?

Values, and specifically the absolute values which affirm man's imperishable God-given dignity and destiny, and man's enduring responsible relation to God and neighbor, must guide the applications and uses of scientific knowledge—else today's talent will become tomorrow's tyrant.

Today, a hectic hunt for talent is on. Business, labor, industry, government and the professions diligently search for bright, promising young men and women.

Internationally, the race for scientific supremacy is accelerating. Victory will go to the nation or grouping which mobilizes and trains swiftly its talent. The issue between freedom and thraldom, between the open society and the omnipotent state may turn on talent. Lifting through knowledge the veil of ignorance and guiding the application of that knowledge may raise ultimately the Iron Curtain.

The demand for talent comes of the nature of our present-day dynamic society, the rate of technological change and the consequent social complexities which confront us. Our society needs imaginative scientists, competent technicians, able public leaders, inspiring teachers, devoted professional workers, dedicated scholars and researchers, gifted creators in the arts, and constructive critics.

There has occured a most encouraging rise of educated talent. In this century while the population roughly was doubling, the number of bachelor and first professional degrees multiplied 11 times, and the number of doctoral degrees 22 times. Between 1870 and 1950, the number of professional workers increased 3½ times faster than the population, and 3 times faster than the labor force.

The most startling increments in educated talent have come in the field of science and technology. Scientists and engineers in 1870 represented approximately 3 percent of all professional persons; by 1950 they made up over 20 percent. In 1870 only 1 in 1,000 workers was a scientist, engineer or other technician; in 1950, 1 in 60. Yet, even though such rise of educated talent has been great, the demand for this talent far outreaches the increase.

This search for educated talent has brought sharply into the foreground of public attention the importance of the work of our colleges and universities.

As the demand for educated talent spirals because of social and technological advancement, more and more will be exacted of our universities. Business, labor, government, the social institutions and the professions look now and will look even more expectantly to our halls of higher learning to educate the talent so critically needed.

Progress stimulates increasing emphasis upon specialization. But specialization may encourage narrow training. For certain purposes of science, business, and government, this is useful. But a world of ever-ramifying, ever-deepening, ever-insulating specialties soon yearns, yes cries out, for generalists. There should be some able to see the forest as well as the trees. Someone should be capable of discerning the larger relationships, and of invoking wisdom and the accumulated experience of mankind for the solution of problems.

To give flexibility and breadth, the training of the specialist should proceed from a base of liberal education. The speedy rate of social change and technological innovation, moreover, makes impossible any guarantee of stability within narrowly specialized fields. There is, accordingly, even a utilitarian advantage to a type of training which will be sufficiently broad and flexible as to enable the individual to survive the capricious ups and downs of specific demand, and accommodate himself to changing situations.

The prime concern of higher education is with the intellectual development of the person, not because there is a shortage of talent to be met, but because education esteems the development of the powers of each person. This solicitude for education for education's own sake, for the individual and his formation for his sake is a blessed heritage of the traditional values which have made and suffused our culture. The taproots of these values lie in the Old and New Testaments and the philosophy of Greece. This is the tradition of divine and human values that should influence the technical and specialized training of today's talent, that should guide the application of the new knowledge gained by today's educated talent lest today's talent become tomorrow's tyrant. It is liberal education that communicates, conserves, and fosters this tradition and system of values.

Man is an intrinsic unity, living and therefore developing from within, intelligent and hence consciously taking a free part in his own development.

Education must respect this unity as an ultimate to be treated with deep reverence. This essential unity operates through a multiplicity of powers: physiological psychological and spiritual. Education does not bring into being and function these powers, but assists in their differentiation, development and coordination. Liberal education respects and serves this basic unity of human nature.

The higher powers of man, intellect and will, are educable. Each, just as the lower powers, has been made to deal with a special class of objects but objects which are so general, rich and varied that, though such higher powers of intellect and will dealing with objects general, rich and varied, man's nature opens to the vast realm of reality. The intellect opens on all that is true, the will on the totality of the good. To educate these higher powers is not merely to condition but to focus them upon the final goal of happiness for which man's nature has been created. To such perfecting of man's sublimest capacities the ancients gave the name virtue, the quality of a man—whether the perfecting of the powers of desire, the moral virtues, or the powers of knowing and planning, the intellectual virtues.

Education for action toward a goal may be deemed completely successful only in relation to the achievement of the ultimate objective. The end in view is not adequate substitute for this ultimate. Success is not to be judged by the accomplishment of what we think will make us happy, but by the attainment of what will satisfy the human nature with which we are endowed, and whose fundamental needs are beyond our control.

What is this ultimate goal and complete measure of successful action, and of successful education for action?

Is man to be measured by adaptation to his environment? Man is by his intelligence superior to his environment. Education should free man to perfect the world, not chain him to it.

Is man to be measured by his own creativity? Man can neither create the world nor himself. He can only modify, rearrange, and perfect created things within the limits of his own given nature and the world pattern of which he is a part.

The core of man's self is to be found in his powers of intellect and will, and these cannot be content with anything less than all. They reach out to the whole of reality, beyond the little area of man's control to that universe of truth and good which man did not make, and which he can possess only by a special submission and union, in the objectivity of knowledge and the reverence of love.

The action by which man achieves his ultimate goal is neither making nor doing but contemplating. If education is adequately to prepare man for life and for happiness, it ultimately should be a preparation for contemplation. Its task should be the development of those virtues by which contempla-

tion is possible, wisdom and the love which wisdom presupposes and in which it flowers.

Liberal education gives knowledge that is good to have for its own value, as distinct from knowledge that is ordained, to something further, such as work or action. "It is evident * * *," said Aristotle, "that there is a sort of education in which parents should train their sons, not as being useful or necessary but because it is liberal or noble."

The truly liberal mind asks not what things are for, but what things are in themselves, why they are as they are, act as they act, why they even are at all. The truly liberal mind possesses the kind of knowledge that is a world view within which alone all practice and productions can be significant; the kind of knowledge that brings man face to face with those ultimate truths about which he can do nothing save accept, follow, obey, and apply.

The liberally educated man knows how to read, write, and reason, to count, measure and compute, in order to bring these intellectual "know how's" to a study of the what and why of the world and man. He uses the arts of the mind to attain knowledge and science, and ultimately wisdom.

That which the Greeks, Hebrews and medieval Christians called wisdom is the principal aim of the liberal curriculum. Wisdom presupposes science and science, in turn, presupposes understanding. Wisdom deals with the first principles of all things and the highest causes of all things. It thus puts all knowledge in order. Order is a special property of wisdom. Only wisdom can claim such ultimate, universal and intellectual eminence as to be the ruling discipline.

Wisdom is not so much concerned with discovery, as is science, not with application as is technology, but with reflection. It considers the conclusions obtained by the sciences, compares them with the principles from which they were derived, and sees among these very principles and conclusions a basic relationship and unity. Wisdom retaining the clarity, detail and fullness of science restores the original unity of intuition not by fusion but by ordering.

If the student is left at the level of intuition and commonsense experiences, he will never be equipped for the complexities and specialized thinking required in our developed culture. If we leave him at the level of science, he may become intellectually and personally distintegrated and, in time, a disintegrative force in society.

The liberal curriculum aims at the culture of the intelligence—the mind endowed with a universal view, and enabled with certainty, clarity, force and imagination, to translate this view to problems of thought and action. Such an intelligence must first be soundly equipped with the arts of the mind, to reason correctly, express itself clearly and with grace, and reckon in number and measure.

Possessing these arts the mind will use them to reach an articulated knowledge of the world, man and God, through theology and philosophy which deal with ultimate things, through the sciences of nature which explore the world of creatures, through the moral sciences which indicate the pattern of man's responsibilities and perfection, through history which acquaints man with his multiple doings in the perspective of time, through the social sciences which treat of human behavior, relationships and institutions, through other languages which enlarge man's sympathies, exercise his mind and introduce him to the treasury of other cultures, through the fine arts and literature which, in addition to enriching the imagination, expand man's perception and appreciation of value.

While liberal education does not purpose explicitly to train students for jobs, whatever its graduates undertake will be done better because of it. As Aristotle has said in the Politics, "The same education and the same habits will be found to make a good man and a good statesman and king."

Integrated knowledge is truth organized in terms of a total view.

Education should be informed by the integrative power of wisdom.

The specialist more and more will be managing our society and its affairs. As business executive, labor leader, professional man, government legislator, executive, judge, researcher, teacher, scientist or technological expert, he will shape our future. Our colleges and universities should produce not just knowledgeable and skillful specialists but men with that wisdom, perspective and breadth commensurate with their destined respective roles of leadership.

Intelligence untempered by wisdom can be a dagger without a sheath. Technical competence unguided by absolute values can be a juggernaut. Such naked intelligence and such ruthless technical competence could be our downfall just as surely as ignorance and incompetence. Today's talent—will it be tomorrow's tyrant?

Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee has been holding hearings on the proposed Becker amendment for 5 weeks. During that time the members of the committee have heard many distinguished clergymen, lawyers, and public officials express their views on this subject. The following statement by John Wesley Lord, bishop of the Methodist Church in Washington, D.C., is one of the best I have heard. I commend it to my colleagues and all those who seek to gain a better understanding of the issues raised by this proposal.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

My name is John Wesley Lord. As a bishop of the Methodist Church charged with the residential and presidential supervision of the Washington area of that church, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before the members of this committee in opposition to the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, House Joint Resolution 693, relating to prayer and the Bible in the public school. As a former teacher and principal in the public schools of New Jersey, Pompton Lakes Grammar School, and Wayne Public School No. 6, I appear today to urge the members of this committee to refrain from encouraging or supporting devotional exercises as a part of the educational program of public schools as provided for in Resolution 693.

I have just returned from the General Conference of the Methodist Church held in Pittsburgh, Pa., where the Becker amendment was considered in the General Conference Committee on Christian Social Concerns. One hundred and ten memorials were received in support of this amendment. The committee voted 46 to 14 nonconcurrence with these supporting memorials. However, when this vote of nonconcurrence was brought to the floor of the general conference for debate in plenary session, a motion of referral was sustained by a vote of 341 for referral and 339 against referral. This had the effect of preventing debate and was the closest vote of the conference. It would indicate that the conference was divided, confused, or both, as to the wisdom of the amendment under discusion. The committee was more than 3 to 1 opposed to the amendment; the delegates about evenly divided.

There are many who cannot understand why a churchman should or could be opposed to this amendment. Before stating my reasons for opposing, allow me to state that in which I do believe.

I believe that objective religion has a rightful place in the public school program, and that it is possible for public school teachers, without violating the tradational American principle of separation of church and state, to teach moral principles and spiritual values by precept and example. All education that is worthy the name must inculcate a sense of duty and a sense of reverence. I also believe that it is possible and indeed necessary within this same principle of separation of church and state to integrate objective religious instruction with the regular curriculum; for example, teaching religious classics in courses of literature and in social studies showing the influence of religion upon our society. Such teaching would afford a background for further and more specific instruction on the part of the home and the church. The home and the church must carry the chief responsibility for nurturing vital faith which motivates life, but the home and the church must have the support of the public school, and we must now discover the techniques by which that support can be achieved.

The Supreme Court's decision comes as a challenge to educators and administrators of the public school system to tackle the tough assignment of offering objective courses in religion. Severe criticism should be directed against any school system that fails to introduce its students to the world of religion.

Despite the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in the past in the public school, we have produced a generation of Biblical illiterates. We have insisted upon a devotional practice the meaning of which was lost upon the child and for which he was not prepared. The entire practice was profaned by the secularized atmosphere in which worship was conducted. Worship is a high art demanding the fulfillment of certain preconditions if it is to be authentic and meaningful to the participant. The cliche that "I can worship God on the golf course" is more often an excuse for failure to worship Him than a statement of reality. We truly worship when the conditions are present for that experience. With all the so-called "devotional services" of the public school, so greatly defended in this present hearing, I doubt the evidence of much devotion on the part of the child. The loss is more imagined than real. I speak from experience.

The Court has clearly proscribed devotional exercises as a part of the school program. It did not exclude teaching about religion in the curriculum, nor the use of the Bible as a reference text in appropriate courses. Even an atheist could profit from this if only to learn what he did not believe. The basic distinction is between a proper educational effort on the one hand, and indoctrination of either beliefs or religious habits on the other. The school may not pray, but it must teach. Religion as an objective fact of life cannot be excluded from education; nor does the Court's decision intend this.

There are standards in life, in art, in law whose sense we must recover if we would maintain the rugged fabric of a sound democracy. The absurd aversion to certitude that we have about us today weakens the very fabric of life including the judgments of our courts. The decision of the Court in

this matter recognizes the absolute within the relative, and Mr. Justice Black clearly believes that the first amendment of our Constitution is such an absolute. I, too, believe that this first amendment is the finest part of our American heritage and is adequate as it stands to protect the religious freedom of all the people. Such amendments as are now being proposed would open doors to more serious religious problems than we now face.

I, therefore, oppose the Becker amendment to our Constitution for the following reasons:

1. Prayer and Bible reading in the atmosphere of religious devotion and worship in the home and in the church are of great value, but serious question can be raised about their use in the public school when such atmosphere does not exist and when pupils come from varied religious backgrounds and faiths. Indeed to secularize or to profane this holy practice is to place in jeopardy the very good that we seek to preserve in the Christian heritage.

2. Public schools are institutions of the community as a whole. They are maintained and operated by government for and on behalf of all people of the community. Their existence can be justified on the grounds of their usefulness to the total society. A basic social reality of our society today is cultural pluralism.

As institutions of the community as a whole, public schools reflect that pluralism in the composition of their student bodies and faculties. Devotional services that reflect the habits and holy books and practices of one group in such a society, even when such services are congenial to the faith of the majority in the society, violate the integrity of religious freedom as a right derived not from the state but from God. We recall the words of James Madison in his "Memorial and Remonstrance" address of 1785:

"Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects?" If the Becker amendment were to become the law of the land, I shudder to think of the questions that would shortly face the Supreme Court for clarification and decision.

3. Finally, I oppose the Becker amendment because of my great respect for the first amendment in its present form. For 173 years this amendment has served the Nation well. To change it, or amend it, would imply a removal of the longstanding barrier against an official establishment of religion in our Nation. There is no need to rectify or correct or improve our Bill of Rights. Those who seek to do so may well breach the barrier and open the way for state-supported religious schools and precipitate a divisive religious controversy that will rend our Nation assunder. The dangers inherent in this amendment far outweigh any temporary gains.

In an hour when God appears to be at work reshaping His world; when the Church—Roman, Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox—is being drawn and driven toward a greater unity; when this unity is taking shape faster than we can understand or express it; at a time when it is increasingly clear that many of our long-defended positions are irrelevant to God's purposes; would it not be tragic, if moved by emotion and religious sentiment, we were to take such action as would lead this Nation into an official orthodoxy, denying the freedom we have enjoyed under the first amendment?

We need not a new amendment but greater respect for the first amendment in its present form. The first amendment's "free exercise" clause allows us to follow the logic of an increasingly pluralistic society, while guaranteeing freedom of worship to all.

The late Pope John endeared himself to all mankind by calling the Vatican Council, the purpose of which he summed up in the word "aggiornamento" (getting in step with the needs of the times). The Becker amendment puts us out of step with the times and provides a "bargain basement" view of religion that is both a symptom and a disease. Men are moving into a greater humanity made necessary by scientific discovery and achievement. In such an hour, religious faith must be bold and creative for this new world is too dangerous for anything but the truth. Faith must take risks, but there is no risk so great as the fear of freedom. We do not "guarantee" religious freedom by "fixing" the Bill of Rights. Even the darkness of this hour is light enough for us to see the peril of the Becker amendment.

Important Resolutions Adopted by the Massachusetts Branch, Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the opportunity to address the Polish American Women's Citizens Club of Holyoke, Mass., on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

During the course of my remarks, I called attention to the recent anniversary of the historic Polish Constitution of 1791, which remains as one of the great liberal documents of all time.

The principles of this document are continually being renewed by the Polish people in the United States. A series of resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress held at Easthampton, Mass., on April 26, 1964, demonstrate the past courage, desires, and wishes of the Polish people whose relatives and friends remain subjugated behind the Iron Curtain of despair and disillusion.

Mr. Speaker, I could not add to the resolutions that follow, except to say that I trust they will be widely read by all Americans:

1. We declare our complete devotion to the Constitution of the United States, and our undivided loyalty to the Government of the United States.

2. We are deeply disturbed by the tragedy that has overtaken Poland. In a sense of fairness we demand justice for Poland.

3. It is proper to recall here, the following historic facts:

(a) Poland was first to resist the Nazi onslaught, expecting to be helped by the Allies. Help did not come; nevertheless the Poles resisted heroicly Hitler's armies.

When the Atlantic Charter was formulated President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill called Poland: "The inspiration of nations," and in one of his speeches Senator McMahon stated: "It was this heroic resistance of Poland which inspired the free world to take up arms against Hitler."

(b) In spite of those tremendous odds, and in a situation which would seem to be a complete defeat, the Poles did not lay down their arms, and did not surrender. Most of the able-bodied men fled abroad to organize—with the help of the Allies—strong military forces, which were ready to fight Hitler. At home—an underground army was formed, and did a heroic and good job in harassing Hitler's occupation army, preventing it from being sent to other Allied fronts.

(d) In France, under the leadership of General Sikorski, the first Polish military units were organized. The Grenadiers Division, commanded by General Duch, distinguished itself in the battles of the Marne-Rhine Canal, in the Vosges, at Beranson, in the region of Belfort, and in the covering of the French retreat of the maginot line. They fought gallantly and lost heavily. Indeed, they gave their full share of "sweat, blood and tears" on the battlefields of France.

(e) In June of 1940 the Polish Commander in Chief General Sikorski, realizing the need of an organized and complete evacuation of the Allied military forces from France, flew to London, and had a 2-hour conversation with Prime Minister Churchill and the British Admiralty officials. At 7 that evening the evacuation began. Indeed, the Poles had a share in Dunkirk.

(f) In 1940 also, the Nazis threw great forces against Norway and Denmark.

The largest group sent to Norway by the Allied Expeditionary Forces was the Polish Highland Brigade. Indeed, they had a share in the battles of Norway and they distinguished themselves at Narwik.

(g) In Britain a Polish air force was organized: The Kosciuszko Squadron 303.

It took part in the Battle of Britain and it was credited for having shot down 10 percent of the total number of enemy aircraft, destroyed by the Royal Air Force. Indeed the Poles had their share in the Battle of Britain.

(h) In the Near East—the Polish Brigade of Highlanders or the Carpathian Brigade, under General Kopanski was attached to the British Army in Libia. This brigade distinguished itself in Tobruk.

(i) In 1941 under the Polish-Russian agreement some of the Polish war prisoners were released from the prisoners camps, scattered in the vast Russian territory in Europe and Asia. Immediately Polish recruiting centers were set up and all those men, undernourished, clad in rags, under severe climatic conditions, set out to enlist. Transportation was almost nonexistant, so many went on foot, taking tremendous risks and enduring incredible hardships. Many died on the way. Those who reached the centers were enlisted and organized under General Anders, into a new Polish Army, ready again to fight Hitler. They were assigned to the Allied military forces in Italy and took a decisive part in the famous battle of Monte Cassino. After this victory they joined the Polish armed forces in England.

(j) Polish armed forces were also organized in Canada. The Polish war effort has no parallel in history. Out of their own territory they fled abroad to form new armies, and to fight the war again on the side of the Allies. This was not a sporadic effort, but it was sustained to the very end, to the complete defeat of Hitler, and the victory of the Allies. The Polish underground resistance forces gained the world's admiration for their patriotism and heroism. The climax of this struggle came during the Warsaw uprising against the Nazis in 1944.

4. These historic facts show clearly that the Poles had their full share of, "taxation" in "sweat, blood and tears" during the war but not representation at post-war conferences which were to decide Polish affairs. This was true in Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and in San Francisco when the United Nations have been organized.

5. The secret agreement of Yalta in 1945 factually destroyed the independence of Poland sanctioning there the authority of a puppet regime, dominated by Communists. This agreement also transferred some 12 million Polish citizens (about a third of Poland's population) to the Soviet Union, without any pretense of a plebescite. Almost a half of Poland's prewar territory, including Polish oil fields, was also transferred to Soviet Russia.

6. Two decades have past since World War II, and still some voices are heard in Western Germany demanding a revision of the Polish-German borders of the Oder-Neisse line, and wishing to extend these borders to the East. Under the Potsdam Allied agreement the territory east of the Oder-Neisse line was restored to Poland as a land, historically Polish and seized by Germany in the past. A revision of these boundaries would be a flagrant violation of an Allied agreement, and would deprive Poland of a large part of her coal mines which constitute one of her main sources of industrial energy.

We, the Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress feel very strongly in this matter, and demand that the borders of the Oder-Neisse line be definitely recognized, and the question be declared closed.

The eastern borders of Poland should be restored to the pre-war status.

7. The Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress appeals to the sense of justice.

We request that every effort, every action, be undertaken to help Poland in her present struggle for independence and freedom of choice of her form of government. Historically the Polish spirit of freedom found its expression in the Polish Democratic Constitution of May 3, 1791.

We demand justice for Poland—our valiant, intrepid ally.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to one of our distinguished residents of Hudson County, N.J., Mrs. Bertha Oberndorf, of Jersey City, N.J., who passed away on May 10, 1964. She is mother to one of my congressional aids. Throughout her life she evidenced great interest in civic and world affairs. She is well known for her short stories and poems. I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives one of her poems which is particularly timely and apropos entitled "Memorial Day," which National holiday is being celebrated this weekend in the United States:

MEMORIAL DAY

Some people think Memorial Days'
Just set aside for us to pray
O'er soldiers' graves, plant flowers for
Brave men who fought and died at war.

Why honor only those who fell,
When countless others live—to tell
Of battles fought, and battles won—
With proof that their jobs well were done.

These men gave all they had to give,
Just like the men who do not live
To face their future lives in dread,
Without their health through years ahead.

So buy the poppies that they make,
And give donations for their sake,
For they, too, faced the gas and gun.
Don't let your task be just half done!

Oklahoma Leaves Impact on Poetess Muna Lee, a Leading Lady in Pan-American Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most talented and charming persons to come from Oklahoma's Third Congressional District is Miss Muna Lee, who presently serves as the cultural officer of the public affairs staff of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs of the Department of State.

Miss Lee is a distinguished poetess and has written several books. She is also a former first lady of Puerto Rico.

Miss Lee attended the public schools in Hugo, Okla. The Tulsa Daily World recently featured an article describing her many accomplishments and her always fascinating life. It was written by Miss Malvina Stephenson, another distinguished former resident of my district. I am sure all Members will be interested in the article, which follows:

[Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World, Apr. 26, 1964]

OKLAHOMA LEAVES IMPACT ON MUNA LEE, LEADING LADY IN PAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON.—In the early 1900's a pretty little girl with shining dark eyes and a quick warm smile could be seen romping excitedly in the suburbs of Hugo. The "beauties of the prairie" fascinated her, as she gathered great armloads of wild flowers and gazed at the hues of the sunset.

This early experience deeply impressed talented Muna Lee during her girlhood in southeast Oklahoma, and helped inspire her prize-winning poetry. Her notable career in the literary field broadened into cultural and political leadership for the entire hemisphere. Today she is recognized as Uncle Sam's leading lady in Pan-American affairs.

A former first lady of Puerto Rico, she also has many other firsts to her credit, participating in numerous international conferences, pulling strings for history behind the scenes, and hobnobbing with some of the great names of the literary world. Her close friendship with Carl Sandburg began in 1915 when she received the "lyric award" from Poetry: A magazine of verse in Chicago. Only recently the famous poet Archibald MacLeish repraised the "encouragement and help of that wise and gifted American, Muna Lee."

Miss Lee, as she is known professionally, is the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. B. F. Lee. She was born in Raymond, Miss., but grew up in Hugo, graduating from its high school in 1911. The following year found her at the University of Oklahoma, and in 1913, at the age of 18, she received a B.S. degree from the University of Mississippi. Her brother and sister-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Lee, now live at Norman.

Miss Lee is the former wife of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin of Puerto Rico, from whom she was divorced in 1946. Since 1941, she has been connected with the U.S. State Department in Washington. Her present title is cultural officer of the public affairs staff of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs of the Department of State. With characteristic humor, she modestly insists that relative importance is in reverse to the length of title, citing the big boss as only "the Secretary."

Her long record of achievement and dedication refutes this self-appraisal. Her significant contributions, especially in promoting stronger ties throughout this hemisphere, were recognized in 1962 when she was presented the meritorious award for "commendable service as a public servant" by the General Federation of Women's Clubs of which Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn of Oklahoma City was then president. A similar citation came the year before from the National Federation of Business and Professional Women. Miss Lee praises both of these organizations for the effective programs being carried on for hemispheric solidarity.

An intellectual and a crusading feminist who was once a spearhead for the National Women's Party, Miss Lee nevertheless cherishes her traditional role as a homemaker and mother. Of all her accomplishments, she considers her finest efforts were directed into bringing up two children and seven grandchildren.

Muna Muñoz-Lee, who received her masters in anthropology at the Univeristy of Chicago, has a position working on consumer problems with the Department of Interior of Puerto Rico, and son Luis Muñoz-Lee, who has an advanced degree in journalism from Columbia University, New York, is editor of the English-language weekly, the Island Times, in San Juan.

Miss Lee still has a very warm feeling for the scenes of her girlhood in Hugo. With keen powers of observation, she began writing early, and it was a mutual love of poetry which brought her together with the young Puerto Rican, Luis Muñoz-Marin, in New York. Their marriage took place in 1919, and they lived a couple of years in nearby New Jersey.

In 1923, Miss Lee had a poetry collection, "Sea Change" published by Macmillan, in New York and London. "My first book of poems was full of Oklahoma and Puerto Rico," she recalls fondly.

While she is dedicated to improving the lot of free citizens throughout the Southern Hemisphere, her first love remains Puerto Rico, whose "operation bootstrap" in this last generation, she thinks, is unequaled in history. Next February, Miss Lee plans to retire from Government service and take herself back to Puerto Rico to her ancient restored home on a cliff overlooking the bay, to her children and grandchildren, and to the resumption of her literary career.

"You must have time to write poetry, time to dream and to think," she reminds, explaining the lapse in this phase of her career. "I have done some translating in recent years, but very little poetry of my own."

Her prose rendering of De Nogales' "Four Years Before the Crescent," her introduction of Carrera Andrade's poetry to American readers, and her translation of Altamira's monumental "History of Spain" have been widely acclaimed.

Apparently, she can do about any kind of writing she chooses, so varied are her talents. In the 1930's, she collaborated with Maurice Guinness under the pen name of Newton Gayle in five mystery novels, including such titillating titles as "Death Follows a Formula" and "Murder at 28:10." In collaboration with Ruth McMurry, she wrote "The Cultural Approach," "Another Way in International Relations," published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1947. All royalties were donated by the authors for furtherance of our international cultural relations program.

For years, Miss Lee has been the only woman or one of a select few representing

the United States at international conferences and events. Most recently, she was an official representative of State at the inauguration of the new President in Venezuela. She was president of the Society of Women Geographers, 1949–52. From 1928 to 1941, she was director of international relations, University of Puerto Rico.

One of the first to appreciate Miss Lee's talent was the famed H. L. Mencken, editor of the renowned Smart Set magazine. Sometimes he would publish several of her poems in the same issue, but under different pen names.

A three-line piece which won for her the "mostest for the least" was inspired by a trip of her OU psychology class to a local mental institution. This was it:

"His gaze, a strained attention, he stood in the doorway.
'How are you, today, Charlie?' asked the doctor.
And, he said, 'I shall know her when she comes.'"

That was all, but Mencken used it in his magazine, and Edward O'Brien selected it for his annual publication of best short stories. "But, it wasn't really a poem or a short story," Miss Lee insisted highly amused. But whatever it was, it twice brought her top national recognition.

And, whether it is 3 lines, or 300, whether she is writing or speaking, she continues to command attention and respect. But whatever she does and wherever she goes, there is an Oklahoma flavor to her thoughts and reflections, rooted in the southwest prairies which she still loves.

Fantastic Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a tribute not only to A.T. & T. and its subsidiary, Southern Bell, but to our great private enterprise system.

A.T. & T. is unrivaled for its efficiency and devoted service to the people of this Nation. This company is a classic example of private enterprise.

This tribute is taken from a splendid article in the May 29 issue of Time magazine devoted to Chairman Frederick Russell Kappel and A.T. & T.

Hooray. For all the complaints, big and small, A.T. & T. has given the United States the world's least frustrating telephone service with the world's most trouble free gadget. Kappel points out that the average United States phone needs a repair only once every 5 years; except in times of flood or other natural disasters, no A.T. & T. switching office in the past 40 years has been out of order for as long as 10 minutes. No place is too inaccessible, no service request too small for A.T. & T.'s telephone men. They have put up phone booths in the middle of forests for the convenience of hunters, offer phones with gentle chimes for those who cannot stand the regular bells. Even former FCC Chairman Newton Minow, a voluble critic of many other institutions, told a Senate committee last year: "Having just returned from Europe, I would say hooray for the phone service you get here."

That service is growing even faster than the United States. Every working day, A.T. & T. installs 11,500 new phones and handles 251 million calls. The number of Bell telephone calls within the United States is expanding by 15 percent a year, and A.T. & T. is straining to prevent a massive clogging of overloaded circuits by steadily expanding and improving its equipment. Actually, the Bell System is one great computer, linked by 2½ billion interconnections and by enough copper wire to spin a four-ply cable to the sun. The computer's innards are an orderly assemblage of $24 billion worth of the most sophisticated equipment ever devised, and its long limbs sprawl over 3 million square miles of city, plain, mountain, valley and river. It is in constant change, works around the clock, seldom errs—and often corrects itself when it does.

A Prophecy Fulfilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to note that a number of well-known editors are forcefully bringing to the attention of their readers the shocking, deplorable, disastrous, and dictatorial decision of the U.S. Supreme Court rendered in the so-called Prince Edward school case on Monday, May 25. This is another "Black Monday."

This decision tears down the constitutional principle of separation of the three branches of the Government. The Court, in one fell swoop, without authority or right but by naked power alone, has destroyed the constitutional principle of the separation of the legislative and judicial branches. The Court has assumed the power to substitute its own decrees for the judgment usually rendered by a State or county legislative body elected by the people.

This means that an oligarchy of nine men, who are appointed for life, have taken over the control of the income and its disbursement of an entire people, and, in effect, will force the spending of public funds to carry out this oligarchy's political and social philosophy without any right to do so, save its naked power which it has arrogated unto itself without precedent and without any constitutional or statutory authority. This means that the Court is taking over the operation of the local schools because, if it can say that the taxes must be levied, it follows as night the day that it must say how much taxes are to be levied, how many schools are to be operated, how many buses, how many teachers, how many janitors, how large the recreational area, ad infinitum. God forbid.

If it can do this to Prince Edward County, it can do it to all the counties in America. It can do it to the Legislature of Virginia and to all the legislatures of America. Then, does it not follow that the next step will be the taking over of the congressional power to tax and to spend.

The Lynchburg News of Tuesday, May 26, 1964, had an editorial entitled, "A Prophecy Fulfilled." The News has one of the finest editorial staffs in Virginia. I include with my remarks the editorial which is cogent and to the point, and I commend its reading and study to those Members of Congress who believe in this Republic, who cherish our Constitution, and who desire the continuation of constitutional government in America as envisioned by our Founding Fathers with the separation of powers between the judiciary, the executive and the legislative branches.

The editorial is as follows:

A PROPHECY FULFILLED

The U.S. Supreme Court has solved the problem of integrating schools by ruling that the Federal courts have the power to control the votes of legislators and thus determine what taxes can be levied and how the money shall be spent.

Thus ends what began 10 years ago as a lawsuit by Negro parents to force their children to be accepted in the white schools of Prince Edward County. The means used to enforce that decision strike at the foundation of the American concept of government.

In delivering the Court's main opinion, Justice Hugo L. Black declared that the Federal district court in Virginia may, if necessary to prevent further racial discrimination, require the county supervisors "to exercise the power that is their's to levy taxes to raise funds adequate to reopen, operate, and maintain, without racial discrimination, a public school system in Prince Edward County like that operated in other counties in Virginia."

State and county officials had contended, of course, that no courts, Federal or State, have power to require the operation of public schools, nor the power to require that taxes be levied or funds appropriated for schools, or any other purpose.

The Court does not have the right and did not have the power, prior to Monday. It has the power now, by its own decree. Thus does the Court reign, and thus are basic freedoms lost in this day and age, not by constitutional amendment but by the new system of judicial fiat.

For the Court's decision does far more than end Prince Edward County's stubborn defiance of the Federal Government; it usurped powers reserved in the Federal Constitution for the States or the people. From now on the Federal courts will have the final say on how legislators shall vote and what taxes can be levied and for what purpose—for this is the direct effect of this decision. It sets the precedent by which the Court establishes its power to levy taxes to support programs it deems necessary or desirable, and to control legislative decisions in all respects.

Thomas Jefferson warned us repeatedly of the danger of the Federal courts destroying our representative Republican form of government, through usurpation of power. As on many other occasions, Mr. Jefferson, you were a prophet.

Panama Canal: Bombmakers on Canal Zone Army Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the Panamanian outbreak on January 9–11, 1964, I have repeatedly stressed the danger of infiltration by trained Red agents

into the ranks of those charged with the protection of the Panama Canal, with especial reference to the plan of the Governor of the Canal Zone to employ alien Panamanians as members of the Canal Zone police force. The reasons for my concern are the safeguarding of the lives of our citizens and the security of vital structures of the canal itself.

The latest news from the Isthmus is a special dispatch from Balboa, Canal Zone, published in the New York Times of May 25, 1964, to the effect that five persons, one U.S. citizen and four Panamanians, have been arrested and charged with having made "nipple bombs" on an Army post in the Canal Zone.

Because of the potentially grave hazard that this intelligence implies, I have requested the Secretary of the Army for full information.

The indicated news story follows:

FIVE HELD AS BOMBMAKERS AT CANAL ZONE ARMY POST

BALBOA, C.Z., May 24.—An American civilian employee of the U.S. Army and four Panamanians were free on bail today pending a preliminary hearing tomorrow on charges of having made "nipple bombs" on an Army post.

Acting on a tip, authorities raided the quarters of Gilbert J. Markum, 42 years old. They said they had found him and the Panamanians making the bombs by filling iron pipe with powder and affixing detonators.

About 15 finished bombs were said to have been seized.

The Panamanians were identified, as Jesus D. Arjona, 39; Publio Arjona, 32; Clemente Cespedes, 35, and Roberto Samudio, 35, all of Panama.

Improved Mass Transit Wins Public Acceptance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for the RECORD an excellent and informative article from the Weekly Bond Buyer on a highly successful mass transit demonstration project. In 1961, the Congress authorized a limited program to see just what we needed in the way of aid for mass transit and to test public acceptance of improvements in this form of transportation. The project on the Skokie Line in Illinois is dramatic evidence that people will use mass transit in increasing numbers if its service is improved. The fact is that the farebox cannot support all of the heavy capital investment required but if the margin of aid needed is extended, ridership will increase and, as this article notes, it can be put back on a paying basis.

I would like to note that I do not agree with every aspect of this article. It makes it sound as though there is a direct conflict between mass transit and highways, which is not the case. We do need more freeways and streets because unquestionably existing facilities are overcrowded and there will be an increase in automobile travel in the future. However, it is equally clear that the private automobile cannot handle all our commuter and in-town transportation needs. According to testimony on this bill—and I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency which is handling this bill when hearings were held in 1960—if mass transit were abandoned in Chicago, an additional 600,000 automobiles would be required and 160 additional expressway lanes to accommodate them, plus extensive parking facilities. Obviously the problems of traffic control would be monumental and the people of Chicago would spend a major part of their time and effort and a substantial part of their incomes going to and from work, shopping, and making other necessary trips.

The purpose of the pending mass transit bill, H.R. 3881, is to give us a balanced local transit system in which both the private automobile and mass transit can play their proper role. This bill has been granted a rule and I hope will be called up and passed in the very near future.

EXPRESS TRANSIT LINE SCORES KNOCKOUT OVER AUTO IN SKOKIE

(By Nelson M. Schneider)

The Chicago Transit Authority has found itself to be the author of what could turn out to be the most surprising success story in the transit field this year.

The authority has undertaken, with both Federal, State, and local help, an experimental express transit line from the affluent suburb of Skokie into downtown Chicago.

The attempt was made with the basic aim of seeing whether or not significant numbers of automobile commuters could be weaned from the region's highways and onto a mass transit facility. Generally, many experts in the area had not been too optimistic about this experiment succeeding to any great extent.

For, in the back of everyone's mind was the knowledge that probably with the exception of Los Angeles, Chicago commuters were the most avid auto devotees in the Nation. And, an experiment involving Skokie, a town in which the majority of the commuters would be in the upper income brackets, was thought probably to have less of a chance to succeed than in some other suburban area.

SUPERSUCCESSFUL

But now, after only 1 month of the experiment, the results can be described as "supersuccessful." In the original design of the test, it was thought that the trains over the 5½-mile run should be operated at a 10- to 15-minute headway.

Within the first week of the test, the schedules were revised twice, and within the month, a third revision has taken place. Now, at peak rush-hour periods, the trains are being operated on headways of less than 5 minutes.

In addition, where it was initially thought that weekends would be rest periods for the line, the high volume weekday traffic caused the authority to try a Saturday test run. The results here, too, have been far above expectations, and this schedule has since been increased.

Another schedule change caused by the high demand has been the lengthening of operating hours of the line. Original plans called for operations from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. on the Monday-through-Friday basis. When the Saturday service was inaugurated, the service was in operation from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Both of these schedules have since been extended, and now the system is operating from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. for all 6 days.

COOPERATIVE VENTURE

"We were extremely fortunate in finding a situation such as this for our test," George L. Dement, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority told "The Weekly Bond Buyer." "We were able to purchase an already existing track system at a relatively inexpensive cost, and received cooperation from both the State and the town of Skokie in remodeling the facilities," he said.

The CTA spent about $2 million for the track from the old North Shore Railroad, and another $137,000 to put the plan into operation. The total operation costs were about $523,000.

The Office of Transportation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is committed to pay two-thirds of this cost, or about $349,000 and Skokie will contribute the remaining $37,000.

Mr. Dement explained that the authority was also fortunate in having on hand the proper rolling stock for use in this situation. These are high-speed individually-run cars capable of running on both "third rail" tracks and on "overhead powerline" tracks, by just the flick of a switch.

The Skokie tracks contain both types of electrification. "With this immediate convertibility, and the speed potential of the cars at 70 miles per hour," stated Mr. Dement, "we are able to provide the needed service."

SPEED, CONVENIENCE, COST

According to previous HHFA studies, as well as studies by other organizations, in order to lure commuters off the expressways and onto a mass transit facility, the mass transit operation must be able to surpass considerably in speed, convenience, comfort, and cost of the use of the private automobile.

Failure to do this in many places has been the major cause of the loss of much commuting traffic on many of the Nation's railroads. Generally, it is conceded that mass transit units almost always offer speedier and less costly means of getting to and from work than do automobiles.

Many persons, however, would prefer to spend a little more time and a little more money for their convenience and comfort, which is normally far superior in the private auto.

But the Skokie test has apparently more than matched the automobile all the way down the line.

For example, in speed, the CTA cars make the 5½-mile run from the Dempster Street station in northwest Skokie to the Howard Street station in Chicago in only 6 minutes. From there, a passenger can stand on the same platform and get a regular CTA subway right into the Loop.

THIRTY MINUTES VERSUS FIFTY MINUTES

This trip will take about 22 to 24 minutes. Overall, the trip from Dempster Street to the heart of downtown Chicago—a distance of some 14 miles—can be made within half an hour with average train connections.

By car, traveling between the same two points, it is estimated that rush-hour traffic would prevent a motorist from arriving at the Loop any earlier than about 45 or 50 minutes after departure. Then, noted Mr. Dement, he would first have to go about parking his car.

As for the cost factor, here, too, the Skokie run wins handily over the private automobile. The one-way charge on the trip is 45 cents. Actually, this breaks down to 20 cents for the shuttle service and 25 cents for the ordinary fare on the regular CTA that the rider would get on "free" to go anywhere in Chicago from the Howard Street station.

The CTA is also operating buslines from the surrounding areas of the Skokie terminus to the terminus itself, and charges 25 cents

for these. Also, it operates parking lots at the Skokie station for 25 cents for the full day.

Thus the commuter using the buslines and the Skokie run will pay 70 cents each way for the use of public transportation, or $1.40 a day. On the other hand, a commuter who gets to the station by a very short car trip and leaves it there all day, pays $1.15 a day, and the one who can get to and from the terminus without charge, pays only the 90-cent round-trip fare.

To get to downtown Chicago from the general Skokie area, is a round trip by car of possibly 30 miles. To park a car in downtown Chicago will cost probably $2 for the day. An average car, then, through the obviously heavy traffic, would use about 3 gallons of gas on the round trip, costing about $1. Add to this, general additional operating expenses of a car of possibly 3 or 4 cents a mile, and the total per day cost of driving a car into downtown Chicago would come to $4.20.

This is just three times the cost of the most expensive method of using the new Skokie line. And, apparently, the early results are showing that a good portion of the ridership is coming from commuters who would ordinarily have a car available to go to work.

"We have constructed two parking lots adjacent to the terminal," Mr. Dement said, "with a capacity of about 450 cars. These are generally filled to capacity by 8:30 or 9 a.m."

As for convenience of the facility, the headways involved would seem to indicate that it is hard to beat the Skokie run on that score. Certainly, it is hard to rationalize that a private automobile could be more convenient that a high-speed transit operation that would have a maximum rush hour waiting time of only 4 minutes.

From the point of view of comfort, too, the high density number of trains precludes the "packed like sardines" effect of many of today's transit facilities. Mr. Dement notes that in some cases, there have been standees on the trains, but these have been only to a limited extent. By far, he said, the vast majority of riders are seated comfortably.

And, the proof that these advantages weigh heavily in the favor of the CTA's Skokie run, definitely lies in the ridership figures. An HHFA spokesman said that when the idea was proposed, a rough estimate of 1,600 passengers daily was forecast.

This figure was arrived at by figuring that the old level of about 800 a day on the same North Shore tracks when that line was operating could be doubled by the improved service.

NEW PEAK NEAR 5,000

On the first day that the service was put in operation, April 20, the users numbered 4,082. This was not just an unusually swollen initial response, according to the evidence that has been received.

Indeed, present figures indicate that it turned out to be an unusually low traffic day. By the end of the first week, a peak of 4,767 had been reached, and the Saturday service installed. The first Saturday brought what had been thought to be an astounding total of 1,814 passengers.

Earlier this month, a new peak level of 4,968 passengers was set for a weekday and 2,401 for a Saturday, indicating a continuous upward movement of the passenger levels.

For the first 4 weeks of operation, a total of 99,389 paid passengers have used the line, for a per-day average (including Saturdays) of 4,141.

In fact, in one 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. period recently, the line accommodated 1,673 passengers alone—or more than the original forecast had projected for a full day's operations.

SELF-SUPPORTING LINE

As for the financial success of the test thus far, Mr. Dement stated that "it is now our belief that this line will be able to become financially self-supporting on strictly an operating basis. In other words," he explained, "if the capital costs do not have to be included, then it would pay for itself and leave over a profit as well."

Mr. Dement also noted that it was becoming common procedure for transit lines not to include capital cost in figuring their profits or loss. And, it is true that the vast majority of today's transit systems are subsidized by either State or local governments to the extent of the capital needs.

The HHFA, according to a spokesman, has, in effect, paid for an exhaustive study of putting one of its principles into practice; namely, the results of a transit operation that shows every advantage over automobiles.

"We feel the money that will go to this project will certainly be well spent, regardless of the results," he stated. "But we are extremely gratified that it is turning out so overwhelmingly successful."

He estimated that some of the principles derived from the study to be made on this Skokie run could be transferred to virtually every other major metropolitan area needing transit aid.

The CTA itself, according to the chairman, "has already just about decided for sure to make this a permanent section of its system." And, he noted, in this regard, "it is a definite success."

Seafarers Not Fooled by Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, among the many publications delivered to my office is a biweekly newspaper, the Seafarers Log, which is the official organ of the Seafarers International Union, headed by Mr. Paul Hall. In addition to the type of organization news one is accustomed to seeing in most such publications, the Seafarers Log also carries general maritime news, pictures, and descriptions of new U.S. merchant ships, and some good feature stories. It is a lively, interesting, and well-edited and well-printed newspaper.

Among the articles carried in its May 1 issue was one by Seafarer Charles E. Rawlings about his voyage on one of the U.S. merchant ships which carried wheat we sold the Soviet Union into the port of Odessa. I was impressed with Seafarer Rawlings' most enlightening account of his visit ashore and his impressions of the Soviet system as he saw it.

I had been less impressed a few weeks before by the remarks of one Dr. John McKay, president emeritus of the Theological Seminary of Princeton University following Dr. McKay's visit to Cuba. As a comparison, I used Seafarer Rawlings' article as the subject of my next newsletter and sent the editor of Seafarers Log a copy. In the next issue of the newspaper, they published my newsletter and then I received a letter from Seafarer Rawlings. His letter to me exemplified our fight against communism and is more impressive because it comes from a man unlettered by college degrees but endowed with true wisdom, commonsense, devotion and loyalty to his family and country, and faith in God.

I include both the newsletter, as published in Seafarers Log, and Seafarer Charles E. Rawlings' letter in the RECORD:

SEAFARERS NOT FOOLED BY REDS

(Congressman JAMES F. BATTIN, of Montana, noted the by-lined story in the last Log by Seafarer Charles E. Rawlings, describing some of his reactions on a trip to Odessa, Russia, with American grain. He contrasts Rawlings' firsthand impression and report on the "inside" of communism with others in the following report from Washington to his constituents in the Second District of Montana.)

Recently I mentioned some remarks made by Dr. John McKay, president emeritus of Princeton Theological Seminary, before a student group at American University here in Washington. Dr. McKay in a lecture gave his impressions of his visit to Cuba and was reported as "tearing down some popular myths about Cuba" and crediting Castro with many worthwhile accomplishments and reforms.

This week another report on the "inside" of communism came to my attention through an article carried in the May 1 issue of Seafarers Log, the official organ of the Seafarers Union, which has waged a battle with the administration over the use of U.S.-flag ships in transporting wheat to Russia.

Seafarer Charles E. Rawlings, one of the crewmen of the U.S. tanker *Transerie*, which was one of the few American-flag vessels chartered, wrote his account of the Odessa trip. He said he had always wanted to visit the Soviet Union, not for any particular political reason, but to see for myself, to get a firsthand impression of a certain way of life. Rawlings is a numismatist and also wanted to complete a set of Russian coins.

After a stormy voyage and arrival at the Russian port of Odessa which Rawlings described as one long, drawn-out mess of red-tape, he and several other crewman ventured into the town. Rawlings narrated his experiences in locating the bank where he completed his own coin set and, to the amazement of the woman who assisted him, bought several sets for friends. "And you are just going to give these people these sets of coins?" she asked.

Next, Rawlings visited one of the general stores which, he said, handles anything from candy to booze. Here he found that the clerk in the store handles no money at all. First, one must go to the state cashier, make his purchase, then carry the ticket or receipt to the clerk for the item purchased. He said the procedure was so confusing that he bought six candy bars so that he would not have to go through the same procedure again.

Next, Rawlings visited the Seamen's Club where other crewmen of his ship were departing for a ballet performance which was free. He, however, decided to just look around. At the club, Rawlings was approached by one of the hostesses who, he learned, was a local schoolteacher and also a devout believer in the Soviet system.

From here I will quote from Rawlings' story:

"All through the ancient palace there was Communist propaganda and literature, from the Moscow News to the complete works of Lenin.

" 'Here is some interesting matter,' she said, handing me a pamphlet. It was entitled 'The Rights of the Factory (Office) Trade Union Committee in the U.S.S.R.,' by V. Nikitinsky [sic]. Another booklet she handed me was called 'Grievance Procedures in the U.S.S.R.,' which, I feel, must have been written by the firing squad boys in some back alley.

"Another booklet she handed to me was entitled, 'How Labor Disputes Are Settled in the Soviet Union,' by N. Khrushchev himself. All of the booklets mentioned were available free.

"This procedure went on for what seemed like hours and hours, and was getting duller by the minute. 'Don't you have any twist—dance records?' I asked her. She looked at me as though I was crazy.

"By this time, an old acquaintance of mine from Baltimore came into the library. Mel is the chief pumpman on the *Transbay*, and that ship had come in about the same time we hit Odessa. We greeted each other and fell into a nonchalant conversation.

"She asked Mel his opinion of the J.F.K., Oswald, and Ruby incident.

"Naturally, Mel thought that Oswald must have been some sort of psycho case and said so; then he said the same of Ruby. Then, this chick pops in with: 'Your country must be run by lunatics.'

"Now Mel really tuned in. He told her that he didn't believe that old line and, pausing a moment, said: 'At least we don't run around the country shooting our opposition by the thousands or disposing of them via the salt mines.'

"Angrily, the gal came back: 'And where is that done?'

" 'Why here in Russia, where else?'

" 'Our government never does things like that,' she answered quickly.

"Then Mel came in and said, 'No? Then tell me what happened to Beria and his gang of mobsters when they tried to beat Krushy to the prize seat?'

" 'I think you are all liars,' she said hotly, 'and furthermore, Beria was an enemy of the people. He's around someplace.'

"Then she departed.

"Now here we have a paradox. A Princeton professor, a doctor of theology, visiting Cuba in spite of a State Department ban on travel by Americans to Cuba, and his praise of a system which is the antithesis of Christianity compared with the impressions of two seamen who, I will presume, would not be classed in the same academic league with Dr. McKay but who were not fooled by misrepresentations of communism. This seems to be a common weakness of many of our so-called intelligentsia.

"Possibly we need some seafarers like Charles E. Rawlings and his good commonsense appraisal of communism in some of our colleges and universities."

THE ANGELICA DIAZ,
High Point, N.C., May 22, 1964.

Hon. JIM BATTIN,
Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is quite difficult for me to find the appropriate words befitting such an outstanding Congressman as yourself nor, do I dare waste any of your valuable time with any ravings on my behalf but, while resting here at home, away from the high-seas, tilling my vegetable garden, tinkering with the car, taking language courses from my wife or, just figuring out new arrangements for my coin collection among other chores, had been my daily way of life. But, today; I received from the president of my union Mr. Paul Hall, a copy of your newsletter. How delightfully kind of you to speak so highly of this lowly seafaring man. I would believe with no doubt that you must be a close friend of Dale Carnegie.

Your last paragraph: Possibly we need some seafarers like Charles E. Rawlings and his good commonsense appraisal of communism in some of our colleges and universities. How deeply I agree with you. As a child in Baltimore, I had always dreamed of such a position but, not in that particular field of education unless, it was via the arts of the motion picture industry. I recall picturing myself as another Raul Walsh or, Cecil B. DeMille. I'd even settle for half the greatness of that delightful Milton Carter. But, various happenings in the past 23 years has faded away such dreams of becoming another great in that particular field. So, I now settle for second best. I hardly miss a good movie, and often sit in the theater and absorb the techniques instead of the story that the producer is attempting to portray, I must admit that the last of the great spenders from the West, are destroying a great educational medium. The flop entitled "Cleopatra" is a perfect example. Claudette Colbert in the thirties did a much greater performance of the same flick.

This Princeton professor, a doctor of theology, perhaps he's getting old and disagreeable. How could one with brains so to speak, develop any praise for this foul form of man's inhumanity toward man called communism?

I am certainly a far cry from a college graduate and, I am by no means a journalist nor, a politician but, I am certainly not all stupid and believe me, this fellow who's so brainy there at Princeton would sure have to get up eary in the morning to pull the wool over my eyes and convince me that communism is good for me. When that day comes, when the United States falls along the wayside by some misfortune, and the populace as a whole falls under that spell of communism which lurks about every corner. Yes, on that day—I shall again shoulder a weapon and head to the hills and however long I live, that's how long I'd fight and I am willing to bet all that I possess in worldly goods, to include by coin collection that, I'd not be in those hills alone.

Confiding in one is quite difficult at times and this is one of those times. But, when I returned home here from the Soviet Union. I took a long good look at my family. My wife is Puerto Rican. She's very lovely. We have two boys and two girls. One boy and one girl are teenagers. I walked about my $20,000 home here in the Greenwood section. I looked at the art in its construction with a different pride. I admired it deeply. I rubbed my hand across the hood of my new XL-500 Ford tenderly. Even the blooms from my small vegetable garden seemed to wave at me as they swayed in the sofe breeze that crosses my land. I greeted my neighbors with a wider smile and a more heartier handshake and when I went to the Lexington Avenue Baptist Church the following Sunday, Preacher Robbins almost fainted and showed me out, but good. (Haven't been attending too often.) Yes, on that particular day, I prayed that there is such a place as the United States in our world. I was most greatful. With all my worries and debts, I am still greatful because, I can remember those in the Soviet Union who are much worse off than I.

Now, sir, like I've previously mentioned, I am far from being a journalist so, you will have to pardon my grade school approach. In regards to the coins in mentioning (Russian). If perhaps, you happen to see President Lyndon Johnson in one of his leisure periods which I am sure, are but few. Would you please ask him if he has received the set of Russian coins that I posted on to him? I would like to know his views on this thing as I am hoping to do an article for the Seafarer's Log as well as for the American Numismatic Asociation's publication entitled "Numismatist." I also sent a set of the coins to the executive secretary Mr. Don Shorer(ANA). He was pleased no end, advising me to stay clear of those "saltmines".

Again sir, I'd like to thank you for your kind reproduction of my tale to the Log about my journey to the Soviet Union. It has all my friends and neighbors here somewhat fabbergasted but, no more than myself as it was really a nice surprise to me too. Again, my hearty thanks to you. May God be with you and yours daily, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES E. RAWLINGS.

Foreign Aid Shepherd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried a most interesting and informative feature story on our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN. I was especially delighted to read this article because as the Times stated "his House colleagues have always said of him that he is modest to a fault." "Doc" MORGAN and I came to Congress at the same time and over a period of two decades and as a fellow Pennsylvanian I have admired him both as an outstanding legislator and as a humanitarian. His career is truly another chapter in the very best Horatio Alger tradition which I am sure will be agreed by all who read the following story from today's New York Times.

The article follows:

FOREIGN AID SHEPHERD—THOMAS ELLSWORTH MORGAN

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is a hulking bear of a man who hates spinach and likes snakes.

Both traits developed early in his boyhood days in the town of Ellsworth, Pa., from which he was given his middle name. There he worked around the coal mines cleaning lamps and learned from the men who went down the shaft—his father among them—how the world looks from a bituminous gallery.

He stands 6 feet 4 inches tall and weighs 240 pounds. He walks and sits with a slight stoop. His House colleagues have always said of him that he is modest to a fault.

He has neither an enemy nor detractor on either side of the political aisle. And, except for a scholarly benignity as the only practicing physician in Congress, he might be taken for just another politician.

Actually "Doc" MORGAN, as he is known and addressed both in his committee and on the House floor, is a consummate politician without even trying.

When it was suggested to him today that his committee had paid him quite a tribute by approving, without cutting a dime, the first foreign aid bill to emerge intact in 17 years, he said he was "right pleased."

Even this comment must have struck him as being out of character. He quickly added that "I didn't have anything to do with it" and that "the committee was persuaded—as I was—that the President's combined request for $3.5 billion in the next fiscal year was, indeed, a 'bare bones' program."

The after thought was characteristic of the man who brought to one of more important committees of the House a detachment and objectively that he first earned in the operating room.

DOC MORGAN'S election to the House in 1944 from Pennsylvania's 26th District was a natural extension of his service to his community of Fredericktown.

He continues to practice medicine with the aid of two every weekend to see that the practice does not suffer in his absence.

He readily acknowledges that, "I am mostly a consultant now, but it helps me keep my hand in."

Most of his patients are employees of the mining companies in the Pittsburgh area. They are what he calls his "paying" patients.

But House colleagues from neighboring areas say DOC MORGAN's medical practice is his chief stock in trade as a politician and that more than half of the services dispensed from his clinic are "for free."

"I'll never willing cut my links with medicine," he says.

He says that he always wanted to be a doctor and that he has always been "fascinated" by snakes. He spent days walking the creek beds as a boy stick in hand flipping the things up on the bank to a chum carrying a gunny sack.

But to obtain a medical degree was a wrench for him and for the entire family. His father was dismissed from his job in the mines in 1927 because of his outspoken support of the United Mine Workers of America. The elder Morgan took a job in Detroit but the family remained in Pennsylvania—all but THOMAS.

He was graduated from Waynesburg College in 1930 and went on to Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery where he received a medical degree in 1933. He then specialized in surgery at Wayne University and Grace Hospital in Detroit.

House Members were glad DOC MORGAN was around that day in 1954 when pistol shots rang out in the House of Representatives and several Congressman fell wounded at the hands of Puerto Rican fanatics.

The Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened with the recent passing of the great chairman of our House Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON.

Critics of the congressional committee system would do well to ponder the outstanding performance of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I know of no man who could have served more diligently or effectively, more objectively or more patriotically, as chairman of this committee than the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, who was one of the most distinguished products of the seniority system of our committee procedure. I should like to point out further that we are most fortunate to have succeeding the great CLARENCE CANNON, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON. I should like also to observe that I know of no other system which we could devise that would now place as chairman of our House Committee on Appropriations a more distinguished, consecrated, and able patriot than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON.]

I realize that we must in no way detract from the unique contribution of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON in paying our eulogy to this great American, but I believe that one of the most effective tributes that could be paid to him would be again to emphasize how effectively the House Committee on Appropriations operated under Mr. CANNON's leadership. I pay tribute to this gentleman from Missouri because of his effective and consecrated work as chairman of a powerful House committee.

I did not have the pleasure of knowing the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON in the warm personal relationship that was enjoyed by so many of his colleagues. I do, however, remember with deep appreciation the tremendous service he rendered his Nation, the courtly attitude he always expressed in dealing with his colleagues, and I, too, shall miss him.

The gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, expressed to me more than any other man in the House the "Character of the Happy Warrior" so beautifully expressed by William Wordsworth when he said:

Who, if he rise to station of command
Rises by open means, and there will stand
On honorable terms, or else retire,
And in himself possess his own desire;
Who comprehends his trust, and to the same
Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
For wealth or honors, or for worldly state,
Whom they must follow; on whose head must fall,
Like showers of manna, if they come at all.

I express to Mr. CANNON's widow, and to the people of Missouri, my profound sympathy because of the passing of this illustrious and noble man.

That Horrendous Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the May 26, 1964, edition of the Richmond News-Leader, a large and progressive newspaper in Virginia. The editor, Mr. J. J. Kilpatrick, is one of the ablest and most noted writers in America.

The subject matter of this editorial is the recent Supreme Court ruling concerning the Prince Edward County schools, and I would like all to read it because it cites so pointedly the extent to which the court seems to have gone beyond its legal prerogatives in reaching this decision.

This decision must astonish all right-thinking Americans, whether they be from Virginia or any other State.

The editorial follows:

The Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, yesterday erected another of its milestone decisions—a milestone, that is, to the decay of the Constitution and to the arrogance of judges.

This latest chapter in the Prince Edward County case put squarely before the Court one of the most profound questions of constitutional law ever brought before our highest Tribunal. In its simplest terms, the question was whether the Federal courts have power to compel a local legislative body to levy taxes in order to perform a discretionary act. This was a question that demanded full and serious exposition, for the question was founded on bedrock principles of American government—the principle, among others, that taxation without representation is tyranny.

The Court did not grapple with these principles at all. Mr. Justice Black's opinion amounts to no more than a bland assertion that of course the Federal courts are possessed of such power. "The district court may, if necessary to prevent further racial discrimination, require the supervisors to exercise the power that is theirs to levy taxes to raise funds adequate to reopen, operate, and maintain without racial discrimination a public school system in Prince Edward County like that operated in other counties in Virginia."

That is the heart of the opinion, wrapped up in a single easy sentence. The Court's seven-man majority did not spell out precisely how the district court is to accomplish this unprecedented step. "An order of this kind is within the Court's power." That was all the Court had to say.

The mind spins off in a dozen directions. The gist of the Court's opinion is that "the colored schoolchildren" of Prince Edward since 1959 have been denied the equal protection of the laws. This is because "Prince Edward children must go to a private school or none at all," while "all other Virginia children can go to a public school." But our own Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals has ruled that under the laws and constitution of Virginia, the State's system of public schools depends entirely upon local decisions. Within limits fixed by the State constitution, a county is free to operate no schools, some schools, or very elaborate schools. This is what our highest State court held in *Prince Edward County* v. *Griffin*, that in Virginia, the operation of local schools is a local responsibility. The U.S. Supreme Court, to the layman's bewilderment, said yesterday that "We accept this case as a definitive and authoritative holding of Virginia law, binding on us."

But the Prince Edward case is "unique." It has been characterized by "entirely too much deliberation and not enough speed." Despite the fact that the "colored children" of Prince Edward have not been denied one single benefit, opportunity, or advantage made available by the county to white children, in some fashion perceived only by the Supreme Court the colored children have been denied "equal protection." This is because they do not have public schools while all other counties do. But Prince Edward has no control over what all other counties do. That was the authoritative, definitive, and binding decision of the Virginia Supreme Court. One travels around in circles.

So District Judge Oren Lewis, who failed wretchedly in drafting an order in the first place, must now try again. He may "require the supervisors to exercise the power that is theirs to levy taxes." How much taxes? On what property or transactions? At what rate? If the supervisors refuse to levy taxes on their constituents against their will, are the supervisors to be imprisoned for contempt? If the supervisors resign, are new supervisors to be similarly jailed? Or suppose the supervisors, thus intimidated, levy appropriate taxes, and the resentful people of Prince Edward refuse to pay? To jail with them too?

Other questions come to mind. The supervisors, under this judgment, may be compelled to levy taxes sufficient to maintain a public school system "like that operated in other counties in Virginia." What other counties? Arlington? Fairfax? Henrico? Or at the other end of the economic scale, Tazewell, Scott, Buchanan? Total per pupil costs range from $170 or $180 in some parts of the State to $400 or $500 in others. In one recent year, Arlington appropriated in

local funds alone $383 per child; Nansemond County appropriated $37 per pupil only.

The amount of taxes to be levied is a function not only of the quality of school to be maintained, but also of the number of pupils to be educated, the ratio of teachers to pupils, the salaries to be paid, the frills to be provided. It would seem to us inescapable that Judge Lewis, explicitly or implicitly, must pass upon all of these things, thereby assuming the role not merely of Federal judge, but also of county supervisor, school board, and school superintendent. Who elected him to these offices?

With this decision, the American Republic glimpses what Jefferson feared—a dictatorship imposed by judicial oligarchy. If the Supreme Court may order a tax imposed for one purpose, it may order a tax imposed for any purpose. The principles of the Court's 1954 decision, limited at the outset to public schools, swiftly were extended to parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, libraries, bus terminals, and hospitals. Many Southern communities are hanging back from public housing projects, lest they wind up with integrated housing projects. Are we to understand that in such communities, Negro plaintiffs may now compel the levying of taxes to construct public housing facilities like those of Boston or New York?

Only once before in the Court's history has the Court attempted anything approaching this grasp for power. That was in a bond case, where certain constitutional principles of contract were involved in the payment of a nonrecurring fixed sum. Here the supervisors are ordered to levy an unspecified tax, for the indefinite future, to operate schools of undefined cost; under threat of imprisonment, they are ordered to perform a discretionary act contrary to the expressed wishes of their people. This was the milestone reached yetserday by the Court. It is a milestone that stands far down a darkening road.

Johnson and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, residents of the Atlanta metropolitan area were honored by the visit of President Johnson. Our city extended to the President an almost overwhelming welcome, with crowds estimated at one-half million people.

Quite naturally, this event generated a great deal of public discussion.

I offer for enclosure in the RECORD the comments of Ralph McGill and Eugene Patterson, publisher and editor, respectively, of the Atlanta Constitution:

JOHNSON AND THE PEOPLE

(By Ralph McGill)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is quite possible that President Lyndon Johnson is closer to the American people than are the pundits and the voices of press and radio. There are those in the Capital City, used to the clean intellectual prose that was a part of the elegant, overall style of the late John Kennedy, who profess to find a high corn content in commentaries of L.B.J. This makes them wince.

But Mr. Johnson is not supposed to be another Kennedy. He is Lyndon Johnson, onetime schoolteacher, whose mother had a total of $25 when her husband died. He worked his way through the small, obscure, sun-baked Southwest State Teachers College. His accent "belongs to be" different. He is a direct man. He knows how to speak concisely, clearly, and persuasively. His phrases are not honed on a whetstone of classical Greek, Latin, and a familiarity with the poets. But, he communicates as did John Kennedy. The President may be at his very best in small groups, rather than in addressing vast audiences. But, he is by no means at a loss with either.

TRUMAN'S TASTE

There was objection, one may recall, to Mr. Truman's flat Missouri twang and, more especially, to his taste in sport shirts. The louder they were, the better. In fact, once Mr. Truman learned that the loud patterns annoyed the more effete, the more he sought for garish, clashing colors. Odious comparisons were made between his style and that of ebullient and dramatic F.D.R. When Mr. Truman called feuding groups together to knock heads, it was said by some he "demeaned" the office. A critic said exactly this of L.B.J. when he got the railway unions and operators together in a last-ditch effort to avoid a strike and to save the processes of negotiation.

What we also have before us is an explanation of why there is quite a difference between the two parties—the Democratic and the Republican. There is, admittedly, no tie that binds Governor Rockefeller and Senator GOLDWATER. Harold Stassen and Richard M. Nixon have little in common. The Arizona redeemer has no philosophy to share with Henry Cabot Lodge.

There is, however, a very strong tie between the late John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson as there was between Harry S. Truman and Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is a thread of political principle, or philosophy, that reaches all the way up from Jefferson to Johnson. The President is carrying out principles expressed and delineated by Mr. Kennedy. They are principles that have evolved with the Nation itself. It is these principles that continue to hold the party of many minorities and differences together. A man from Hyannis Port and Harvard may believe in them as well as a man from Southwest Teachers College and Johnson City.

CIVIL RIGHTS

So, we find Mr. Johnson going along very well. The civil rights fight will hurt him some—but how could it be otherwise? Those who fight the bill aren't going anywhere. The Nation must treat all its citizens alike. It hasn't done so. Either American citizenship is commonly and equally held or it isn't. A President can't get really hurt standing for that principle. Some say they find it hard to "identify with him." This has been true of all Presidents * * * there always were those who didn't warm to them. It is difficult to follow a man like John F. Kennedy.

But, if we look back in history, we find that it was a country lawyer and soldier, Andrew Jackson, who reformed the bank, who brought Texas into the Union, who broke the theory of interposition and established the essential principles that the eloquent philosopher, Jefferson, had written into the Declaration of Independence.

Performance counts most.

HE SETTLED RAILS—SO WHAT?

(By Eugene Patterson)

Lyndon Johnson is emphatically southern. He understates what he is, instead of posing as something more than he is. He retains his prairie talk in the presence of professors. He gloves his claws in courtesy but wears his feelings on his sleeve.

Closing a talk to editors in the White House rose garden, he waved his hand and said, "Come in the house."

The scene was Jacksonian. Marine musicians, who used to sit massed in the entrance hall playing chamber music, were dispersed in combos playing dance rhythms.

The President was quickly on the east room floor, dancing first with one editor's lady, then another. The Marines had to play "Good Night, Ladies" half a dozen times before the overstaying guests made for the door.

During the dancing some women wept, remembering John F. Kennedy and his austere entertainments. They were stiff functions, and crowds representing cross sections of America were made a little uneasy by the formality, but they also were impressive by their majesty, and besides, many loved Mr. Kennedy fiercely.

Mr. Johnson's old-shoe use of the White House made a clashing contrast and some criticized him. But the thoughtful ones gave Mr. Johnson credit due.

He, more than anyone else, knew unfavorable comparisons might be drawn. But he was honest enough to be himself anyway. He knew that any effort by him to pretend to the elegance of Mr. Kennedy would be hollow. As he said on the night he became President, he will do the best he can for that is all he can do. He has the honesty to be himself. Until the value of this fact registers on many otherwise sophisticated Americans, he is going to be resented and hooted at.

Lyndon Johnson is a President southerners can understand instinctively. They know the power and the judgment that can reside behind the homely front. But other Americans are having to work at it to understand this man and his unfamiliar ways. Theirs is not entirely a prejudice against the southern manner, but some of that is present, even if unintentionally. The President must have the help of his fellow southerners if he is to succeed in reestablishing national faith in southern leadership that existed in the founding days of the Republic.

If his native region is the very one to undercut or lowrate his aims and intentions, he will be crippled in his historic efforts to regain understanding of the South's leadership worth, and of his own.

Eventually results will speak for themselves. The President engineered a rail strike settlement by leadership methods without modern parallel. This remarkable success, and others that may come, can create an appreciation and a trust after awhile.

But right now President Johnson especially needs, beyond all party argument, the hand of his own region's people. He is deeply troubled by the misunderstandings he is encountering. He needs the South's help because he—a southerner—is embarked on nothing less than a missionary effort to reunite the land in all its parts and peoples. He is better equipped for it than Tennessee's Andrew Johnson was in his day. The question facing the southern people is whether we are.

Allies' Cuban Sales May Be Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the continuing problems that beset us in our relationship with

Cuba, and daily recognize the "head in the sand" attitude of the administration on this question.

Recently, it has become evident that the administration is making moves, seemingly to halt the flow of our allies' support of the Castro government and the ineffectiveness of these moves is evident.

Columnist Eliot Janeway, featured in this morning's Chicago Tribune, emphasizes the economic problem facing the Castro machine in an article which dramatizes the potential for removal of Communist control of Cuba if we had a foreign policy that was determined to produce this.

The article follows:

JANEWAY'S VIEW: ALLIES' CUBAN SALES MAY BE EXPENSIVE

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, May 26.—The price of sugar has dropped again. With the world economy booming, and with other commodity prices rising in response to strengthened demand, the sugar market is nevertheless a shambles. This is of interest to others than housewives and manufacturers of candy bars and soft drinks. Common prudence dictates that it should be of interest to our various allies who have been asserting so vigorously their right to do business with Castro's Cuba.

For Cuba is a one-crop economy, and her credit is tied to the price of sugar. What Cuba needs to buy are manufactured products, particularly expensive heavy equipment like the big buses the British have just sold her. The only way they and our other allies can crack whatever market Cuba offers is by shipping on credit—long-term credit.

As a practical matter, this means that the countries selling to Cuba are paying out cash for the raw materials they must import, for the labor they must hire to fabricate goods, and for the shipping and insurance they must buy each time they deliver a product.

ACCEPT NOTES IN RETURN

In return, they are accepting IOU's. That is, they are paying out their own cash for the privilege of buying a raffle ticket on Cuba's future stability—a raffle ticket, moreover, that may cost them millions of dollars. Each time the price of sugar wobbles or sinks, this looks like a chancier bet.

Cuba, of course, all along has had some cash, and still has. Trouble is, she isn't using it to pay for the hard industrial goods which her economy needs so desperately (and which the U.S. Government and U.S. business were installing there before Castro took over).

The import of the wherewithal for industrial development does not claim a priority on Cuba's cash, but the export of political trouble does. One million dollars a month to buy the Chilean election for the Communists, plus whatever it took to bring Brazil to the verge of revolution and Panama to mob rule in the streets—or even to send a bearded military adviser or two to far-off Zanzibar—for this Cuba can pay cash. And so she will continue to spend her cash on the export of violence as long as our allies bank her.

NOT MUCH EFFORT MADE

World politics being world politics, many a foreign politician in even the friendliest countries can get good mileage out of telling the United States to mind its own business. This is the story of the argument over the right of Europe and Canada to sell to Cuba.

The fact of the matter is that we haven't put any muscle into an effort to stop this. All that we've done has been to advise our good friends that they may be throwing good money after bad.

They may begin to figure this out for themselves as the price of sugar drops; as Italy is forced to reborrow dollars after she's dug herself into a hole by just such self-defeating finance; and as the West Germans warn the British to stop doing it while there's still time to avoid trouble. A Cuba at war with her natural U.S. market and with the democratic ideal of the hemisphere cannot be a good credit risk.

The Mythical Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the American people to take note of the reason why the debate is extending so long on the civil rights bill. It is not that reasonable men cannot agree on a reasonable course of action to correct known injustices. It is simply that we are debating two different bills at the same time—the actual civil rights bill, passed by the House by a very substantial margin of Democrats and Republicans, and the mythical civil rights bill, conjured up by elements in our society wishing to preserve the status quo, however unjust.

Recently the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an editorial distinguishing how the actual and mythical bills differ in 12 important respects. The editorial was read by William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Ariz., and he in turn published an editorial on May 21, 1964, agreeing in all respects with the Post's points but expressing some concern over one particular provision of the bill as it passed the House.

I found this analysis illuminating and wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues. The Arizona Daily Star editorial follows:

CORRECTING THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Under the title of "The Mythical Rights Bill," the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an illuminating editorial on the civil rights bill now before the Senate. It is illuminating, because it not only explodes numerous myths about what is in the bill, and is not in the bill, but astonishingly condones a provision in it that forbids American citizens from "threatening or coercing others to disobey the law." It makes little of this provision in the following words, "which is a far cry from the denial of free speech and press."

The Star thinks differently, although it approves of all of the points as explained by the Post-Dispatch, from No. 1 to, but not including, No. 12. This offending provision would forbid the very civil rights demonstrations that are being carried on today by Negroes all over the country.

The purpose of civil rights demonstrations is to threaten and coerce. Indeed, the freedom to threaten and coerce are civil rights that have been practiced by Americans since the Boston Tea Party down to the time of the Volstead Act and much other legislation. Those forms of criticism go on constantly in a wide variety of ways. If such a prohibition is legal in the civil rights bill, it can be made legal in all other legislation.

It is a denial of free speech, and the right "peacefully to assemble" which the Constitution guarantees every American. It makes no sense to grant Negroes and others the same civil rights that all Americans should enjoy, and then in such legislation forbid the right to "threaten and coerce." This present bill would not be before Congress. It would not have passed the House, unless Negroes, in their programs of civil disobedience, had threatened and coerced. Indeed, it will take some more of their threats and coercion to get the present bill through the Senate.

The Post-Dispatch's editorial follows:

"As the Senate's civil rights debate goes into its 10th week, it is obvious that supporters and opponents of the rights bill are not talking about the same kind of bill at all.

"Proponents are discussing the bill actually before the Senate. The opponents, for purposes of fright propaganda, have in effect drafted a mythical bill that they oppose. It has the following provisions:

"1. The Federal Government and not the States will now fix voting qualifications. (The real bill only says States cannot enforce racial discrimination against voters.)

"2. Public schools must be brought into a racial balance. (The real bill specifically rejects that idea.)

"3. Employers must hire from minority groups by quotas. (The real bill only says an employer cannot refuse to hire an applicant solely because of his race or religion.)

"4. The Federal Government can deny all aid to any State that affronts the purpose of the bill. (The actual bill permits denial of aid to projects—not to States—that create racial discrimination.)

"5. Hotel, restaurant, and entertainment operators must admit any ill-behaved, ill-dressed citizen who seeks entrance. (Nonsense; the bill only says the operators cannot refuse entrance solely because of race or religion.)

"6. The Government is authorized to tell homeowners to whom they must sell their homes. (The bill does not even discuss such housing matters.)

"7. Private clubs must admit Negroes (or Mexicans, Catholics Protestants, Indians, Jews, etc.). (The actual bill exempts private clubs.)

"8. The Attorney General will be a dictator. (The bill allows him to go to court to seek enforcement of the law.)

"9. Well, then, Federal judges will be dictators. (They are empowered to issue injunctions to enforce the law, which is hardly unusual.)

"10. Jury trial will be denied in rights cases. (The issue does not come up in the present bill, since it provides only for civil actions. Jury trial is not today required even for criminal contempt cases, but the bill may be amended to permit it.)

"11. Enforcement of the rights bill requires Federal police everywhere. (The bill requires no police anywhere; largely, it leaves enforcement up to court action by those aggrieved.)

"12. It shall be illegal to discuss segregation, or to express discriminatory thoughts. (The bill prohibits anyone from threatening or coercing others to disobey the law, which is a far cry from denial of free speech and press.)

"In short, the whole picture of the rights bill drawn by southern propagandists is one of a terrible tyranny being forced upon a majority of Americans in the name of a minority. We are asked to believe that this is the sort of horrendous plot for which the House voted by an overwhelming 290 to 130. How silly can propagandists get?

"The answer to that question seems to be that they will be as silly as necessary to avoid any honest discussion of the facts of the civil rights case. Fearing facts, they insist upon constant repetition of hokum. That is the content of their mythical bill."

Stage-Managed Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press story which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of May 26 should arouse more than casual interest from the American people. It appears the administration is carefully staging the visits of the President and the First Lady to so-called poverty areas. The Associated Press story reveals the William David Marlow family of Rocky Mount, N.C., are a little put out at the whole business. They did not even know they were poverty stricken until the President told them.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some limit to the extent the campaign to win votes is carried. At the very least, responsible politicians should respect the dignity and intelligence of the people. Holding some of our citizens up to ridicule, causing ill feeling among their neighbors, and using stage tricks to improve the story is not worthy of the office of President of the United States. Surely, if such performances are required to sell the Johnson poverty program, the whole project is open to suspicion.

The Associated Press story on the Marlow family follows:

MADE TO LOOK POOR, FARM FAMILY SAYS—INSTRUCTIONS FOR JOHNSON VISIT TOLD BY WIFE

ROCKY MOUNT, N.C., May 25.—The William David Marlow family has had hardly a minute to itself since President Johnson dropped in by helicopter for a visit May 7.

"We've been talked at, talked to, talked about, and throwed off on (criticized)," said Mrs. Marlow, 40, a sharecropper's wife with sun-bleached hair and strong features.

"There's been about as much excitement since he left as while he was here," she added, recalling what has happened since Johnson's visit.

DEPENDS ON CROPS

Hundreds of persons have driven past their door, she said, and many have come at night to shine their lights on the house to see what it looks like.

Mrs. Marlow said some of the neighbors have appeared jealous of the attention received by the family, which lives 2 miles south of Rocky Mount and depends on tobacco and cotton for a living.

"But we didn't invite the President," she said. "He invited himself."

Cars came by all afternoon and night after the President left, she said. The next day, the children counted 146 carloads of people. Some stopped to talk.

A $4,000 INCOME EXPECTED

"We've missed several days' work and don't expect to get one thing out of it," Mrs. Marlow said. "I've burned my husband's lunch three times while I was answering questions," she added. "He's getting pretty ill about it."

Marlow said he expects to gross about $4,000 from his 9 acres of tobacco and 11½ acres of cotton this year and perhaps have $1,500 clear with which to start the next year.

This would be much more than the $1,500 the President suggested during their conversation. Johnson apparently thought that would be the total for the year before living expenses were subtracted.

Mrs. Marlow said: "We didn't even feel like we were in poverty. We thought we were on our feet for the first time in 4 years. And along come the word that we're the poorest folks in the country."

PLENTY OF LOVING

Mrs. Marlow said her five children "have always had plenty to eat and plenty of loving. We're a close-knit group."

Pointing to a newspaper picture of Dr. George Smith, associate director of the North Carolina Extension Service. Mrs. Marlow said, "The Governor's man tried to make us look poorer than we are."

She said Smith "told me to be sure and have a washing on the line when the President came and also be sure the children were barefoot when the President arrived."

In Raleigh, Smith said he did not intend to make the Marlows look any better or any worse but to make them appear homey. He said the President wanted the Marlows "to act natural."

Mrs. Davis Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Friday, May 15, issue of the Austin Statesman, Austin, Tex., carried an article which was of personal interest to me in view of the fact of my close personal relationship with the entire family. The article which I will include at the close of these remarks deals with the graduation of Mrs. Davis Grant, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bassett J. Orr, of Bryan, Tex. Mr. Davis Grant is the General Counsel for the Texas Bar Association, and was formerly employed on a special subcommittee here in the U.S. Congress engaged in investigative work.

I take pleasure in saluting Mrs. Grant and extending my congratulations to her.

"MRS. AUSTIN" DUE DEGREE—KEEPING PROMISE

(By Anita Brewer)

Ann Grant was "Mrs. Austin" in 1958 because she could cook liver and onions so well, iron a man's shirt to perfection, and looked like a million dollars.

When she won the title, someone asked her what were her plans for the future.

"I'd like to go back to the University of Texas and earn my degree," she answered.

On May 30 before the President of the United States and her husband and five children, the degree will be awarded to Mrs. Grant. It will represent many nights of burning midnight oil, many suppers cooked by her husband—Davis Grant, general counsel for the State bar of Texas, and many dresses and blue jeans ironed by her daughters.

Her degree is in elementary education with emphasis on speech therapy, and she has some more plans now for the future: She will teach next fall in the Austin public schools, at Highland Park School around the corner from the Grant home at 3311 Big Bend.

While Mrs. Grant has been going to school, the children have learned to be independent—and even to handle emergencies. Just last week, 8-year-old Richard and 10-year-old John were home alone one afternoon after school. Richard fell, cut his chin and chipped a tooth.

John said, "Now lie still and bleed quietly. I'll get help."

And he did—good help. He got M. K. Hage, Jr., principal of Highland Park School. Everything was all right in no time.

Both 14-year-old Kathy and 12-year-old Melissa know how to sew, iron, and cook—because they have had to help their mother. As a result, they always are well groomed and they will be even when their mother isn't there to check up on their hair and fingernails.

Davis, the 16-year-old, is an independent self-starter also. He is in the 10th grade at McCallum High School and works 3 afternoons a week at Handy Andy.

All year—in fact for the 3 years Mrs. Grant has been going to school—things around 3311 Big Bend become mighty quiet about 8:30 p.m. That's when everybody starts studying.

While Mrs. Grant has enjoyed her classwork and the inspiration of going to school, she warns her daughters that she did it the wrong way.

"I'm all for a girl getting her education before marriage and five children," she says. "But it can be done either way."

She looks forward to teaching.

"I've always wanted to be a teacher," she says, "and for 15 years I operated a kindergarten and first grade. But I'm really looking forward to the future."

Another happy event is due soon for the Grants. Mrs. Grant's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bassett Orr, will be returning in a few weeks from Ugandi where Orr has been stationed with the Agency for International Development—but not soon enough to see their daughter graduate.

Negro Leader Warns of Demonstration Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Negro, retired Army Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, has spoken out on the subject of racial demonstrations and their ultimate effect on his race. Because his forthright views are of interest to the House, I include the following article written by Major Robinson which first appeared in the Albany, Ga., Herald:

NEGRO LEADER WARNS OF DEMONSTRATION COSTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article, written by a Negro, appeared in the February 6 issue of the Albany (Ga.) Herald. Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, a prominent government and military figure who now makes his home in Fort Valley, Ga., is a retired Army officer, educator, and industrial executive. Feeling that his people were being led

into unproductive paths by current agitators he was moved to write the article.)

(By Maj. Hughes A. Robinson)

During December and January I visited the principal metropolitan areas of the eastern seaboard, including Boston, Providence, New Haven, Hartford, New York, Newark, Wilmington, Washington, Richmond, Charlotte, Charleston, Columbia, Savannah, Jacksonville, and Miami in addition to the principal cities of Georgia throughout the interior. My finds convince me more than ever that demonstrations sponsored by the Southern Leadership Conference (Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., head), the Congress of Racial Equality (James M. Farmer, national director), the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (James Foreman, executive secretary, and John Lewis, chairman) are doing much more harm to the progress of the Negro people in the United States than they are doing good. They are making conditions 100 percent more difficult to change or compromise.

The Negroes have lost, due primarily to sit-in demonstrations, good will of the white citizen in every section of the country.

Many young Negroes have been encouraged by the racial elements who head up the organizations to demonstrate a hostile attitude toward many white people, even those of their employers. By reasons of their attitude in this regard, some 550,000 jobs have been given to others that usually are held by Negroes. This group being unqualified for other positions in any area of employment, it finds itself among the unemployed. Some have gone so far as to argue with employers about their rights which they know nothing about, and the type of privileges that do not exist.

The sit-in demonstrations are costing the Negroes approximately $1.5 billion annually at the present time. It is true that sit-in demonstrations won a few battles and the privileges of eating and sleeping in places denied them previously; however, privileges with no money to pay for them are worthless.

During the past 100 years the Negroes have been consumers, and not producers. They are not in position to hire one another. They failed to organize business as other racial groups, and used their money for good times—on pleasure and liquor. Now they place blame on white citizens for their failures and for their laziness.

Many of the leading politicians are under the erroneous impression that the professional agitators represent the majority of the Negroes in the United States. The contrary is true; they represent only about 5 percent of the Negroes, and this 5 percent for the most part, are those with extreme views on racial matters, and usually left-wingers.

Demonstrators have greatly decreased the earning power of the Negroes in the United States, and they have provided no outlet for employment; they are responsible for those being out of work.

The integration leaders advance the view that the Negroes have been deprived of so much of their liberties in the past that the country now owes them a living. Yet many other racial groups have among them men and women who, say as recently as 25 years ago, were without money and without work, and now control large industrial concerns employing millions of people. The Negro could have, with the money spent on pleasure alone accomplished just as much had he utilized his brains for advancement rather than spent all of his time agitating against the other racial groups for what the Negroes themselves failed to do.

The agitation about schools, hotels, motels, and public accommodations is a waste of time. You cannot legislate the mind and heart of men. Individualism must not be permitted to be destroyed by agitators.

If the agitators and demagogs really want to help the Negro people, let them stop their agitating against other racial groups and get the Negroes to improve their living habits, their sanitation, clean up their homes and backyards, reduce their habitual sex relations wherein excessive babies are born in families where there is insufficient financial arrangements provided for them, and sponsor a program to expose the exploitation of teachers in our elementary and secondary schools.

So long as there are these conditions, the Negro agitators cannot, in good conscience, agitate against any other matter whatsoever. The Negro agitators ignore entirely the basic need of the Negro people. I find thousands of young men right here in Georgia too lazy to work; they spend their time in activities that no man with ambition would spend as much as 1 minute. Thousands of young women have babies by different fathers, and bring them into the world for others to support. Until such time as this type of activity ceases, the integration leaders have sufficient work to do within their own race without going out agitating against another race. What the Negro needs is a different type of leadership than those now heading up such organizations as the Southern Leadership Conference, the Conference of Racial Equality, the Student Non-Violent Committee, the National Urban League, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The endorsement of any potential candidate for high office by any one of the above-named groups will almost make certain his defeat in 1964, regardless of the party label. The bloc votes of the Negro will drive other racial groups on the opposite side of the political fence, and no one will be so ignorant as to believe 90 percent of the population will lose in competition with 10 percent of the same population.

The campaign to register Negro voters is a waste of time; there should be campaigns to register voters, period. The registering of Negro voters send out immediately five new white voters to every Negro voter who has not previously registered. The integration leaders seem to be too ignorant to understand how politics works.

In general, the Negro people would be 150 percent better off if the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Urban League ceased all activities within the United States and moved their leadership and their headquarters to some other countries whose racial elements also thrive on propaganda and agitation.

One thing is certain: These groups or organizations are certainly doing the American Negroes more harm than good. They are creating a potential wall between the whites and the blacks in all sections of the United States, and the ill will resulting therefrom is depriving the Negroes of jobs that they otherwise would hold.

It is my view that the Negroes in the United States would have been 70 percent further advanced had not any of the above organizations ever existed. A continuous flow of agitation throughout the year is bad and makes for resentment and suspicion. Confidence between members of one race is reduced and confusion results.

During my entire period of existence, I have never associated myself with any group that agitates against some other racial group, and yet I find myself holding positions of importance in the Federal Government, in State government, and in private interests for a long period of years. All employment and public accommodations and individual matters should be determined on merit alone. Under this philosophy every individual, regardless of race, has equal opportunity to advance. Without initiative and without preparations, the individual meets with keen competition.

The courts should not permit violence or delay or deceit of the law by the racial agitators. Without law and obedience to its rule, neither the city, nor the State, nor the Nation can long survive. The citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by his personal preference because the law exists to protect all and not just some minority group. Ultimatums by integration leaders and others have done much to destroy patriotic citizenship among the youth of the land. The demonstrations have created a surge of antagonism against Negroes that is really appalling. There is now much resentment and bitterness among whites in all sections of the United States and there is much turmoil.

The cordial relationship which existed between the races in many areas has been destroyed by the racial elements with extreme views to the left. Demonstrations are usually in the form of intimidation. The competent are to be told to make room for the incompetent. They seek to replace the private enterprise system with a public enterprise system. This is anti-United States.

As the incentive of individualism is gradually destroyed, free enterprise will be abolished. This is not the road to happiness, but to the same distasters that befell autocracies in the past centuries. Freemen of intelligence have risen before to quell the intolerance and tyrannies of minorities as well as majorities. They will in time do so again.

General Hershey To Receive Minute Man Hall of Fame Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the magazine of the Reserve Officers Association, the Officer, carries an editorial relating to the long service to this Nation of Lewis Blaine Hershey.

Mr. Hershey is a lieutenant general in the U.S. Army, and for the past 24 years has been Director of the Selective Service System. General Hershey is an Indianian, and all Hoosiers take pride in the tremendous record he has made and the inestimable value of the contribution he has made to national security, and to public understanding of our great and free system.

The Reserve Officers Association at its convention in Portland, Oreg. in June is giving recognition to General Hershey for what he means to this Nation by giving him ROA's annual Minute Man Hall of Fame Award.

This editorial eloquently cites the basis for this fine award, and I ask consent that it be inserted into the RECORD.

In this same issue of the Officer, ROA's executive director, Col. John T. Carlton, who is known to most of us, has an article also dealing with General Hershey's life and career and what it means to this Nation. This article follows the editorial:

LEWIS BLAINE HERSHEY

ROA's assessment of the still vital career of our General Hershey quite understandably encompasses a fine degree of emotion.

Few men of the military community have exhibited the congeniality, the calmness, the sound good sense, and the patience possessed in abundance and exhibited generously by General Hershey.

From year to year he has endeared himself to an even greater degree to our membership. His appearance usually is greeted by a standing ovation. His wisdom, which he usually shares with us, is accepted enthusiastically, and with a new sense of awareness upon each occasion.

General Hershey's role as chairman of the memorial building fund campaign is filled in the manner so characteristic of him: He assumes that ROA members are men and women of sturdy intentions, and he is awaiting universal response to his suggestion that we all pull together to put the job across.

Yet, Lewis Blaine Hershey's role far exceeds any of those mentioned above.

Lewis Hershey first donned the uniform of a soldier in 1911. In that year, those of us who in the last 5 years have reached the military retirement age were toddlers. In the White House was a President whose oldest son, then a boy, has since completed a nationally recognized career and passed on and whose grandson now is in the House of Representatives, aspiring to the Senate—William Howard Taft.

World War I was then only a cloud on the horizon; King Edward VII had just died on England's throne and "Cousin Willie," later to become the hated Kaiser Wilhelm, and America's robust "Teddy" Roosevelt were together at his funeral. The population of the United States had reached the astonishing census of 91,972,266 and a young genius named Henry Ford had put the "tin lizzie" on such highways as America had, a feat at the time quite as remarkable as that of the Wright Brothers, one of whom could speak and one of whom could fly.

In the intervening 52 years, Lewis B. Hershey has seen America reach greatness; he has been a part of that emergence from a brash young nation to the greatest power on the earth, now bowed with responsibility.

General Hershey, sitting quietly and yet with effectiveness over the great machine which measures and assesses America's manpower, is there not only because of his exceptional competence and his experience, but because of his character.

General Hershey represented the character of America which has developed through hard work and brilliance over the past half century—because that character, and the character which should be America, is Lewis Blaine Hershey.

His career is so rich in service, is so meaningful in its genuine dedication, so brimful of the virtues—integrity, courage, compassion, and a true love of duty, honor and country—that there is little ROA can do except to stand in tribute before him.

In truth, few Americans so richly deserve a place in our Nation's Hall of Fame. We are confident history will so place him.

ACROSS THE EXECUTIVE DESK

(By Col. John T. Carlton)

Reserve Officers Association's 38th national convention is in the immediate foreground and there is a great deal of scurrying around everywhere in preparation for it.

The ROA-wide assembly follows close on the heels of the various department conventions, so that the issues, if any, raised at these sessions come hot from the griddle to Portland, Oreg.

It is perhaps appropriate that the "City of Roses" is the site for the gathering of the clans this year. Roses usually betoken affection in some degree, and certainly connote a fine spirit.

Reports from our departments this year indicate that the finest morale in some years characterizes our association in 1964.

This is due to a great many things. The most important, perhaps, is the type of leadership you will find everywhere. From the chapter level up through the highest office in the gift of our free, voluntary, and independent association, we have had a better deal this year perhaps than many of us deserve.

So, we will come into the convention in good order, with heads up and colors flying. What more can be asked of us in these times?

It is only natural, of course, that our convention, which will assemble many distinguished military leaders of the Nation, will be built around Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the most eminent citizen-soldier who, like they say on TV, has "become a legend in his own time."

General Hershey has been able to achieve the rare distinction of being familiar, and yet always being new. His homespun philosophy, his down-to-earth friendliness, and his humor which rocks us at unexpected moments makes his appearance always welcome. Someone once said he was the man Kipling had in mind when he wrote about greatness.

One of the legends built recently about the name of General Hershey exemplifies the manner in which he has grown with the Nation, and remained the master of its complex manpower problems.

In recent years, a congressional committee, considering the work of the Selective Service System, went critically into all aspects. Needless to say, General Hershey, who was the witness, came to the conclusion with his flag still at full staff. One frustrated Congressman finally complained, however, of the high rank of the Director.

"I am told," he said, "that in World War II, when we had a pretty troublesome draft problem that a lieutenant colonel was the Director of Selective Service. Is it really necessary to have a lieutenant general today?"

One of the other members perked up.

"Mr. Chairman," he asked, "does the record show who this lieutenant colonel was?"

"Oh, yes," responded the chairman, who had been around long enough to know and understand the answers.

"He was Lt. Col. Lewis Blaine Hershey."

Hate and Violence Is Not Confined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for months leftwing extremists, New York newspapers, television comedians, and even some respectable speakers and writers have had a field day pointing the finger at Dallas. It has become a popular pastime to attempt to convince the world that evil exists only in Dallas. Fortunately, intelligent people, fairminded people have recognized the forces at work behind the smear and the people of Dallas have been recognized as decent, law-abiding, responsible citizens.

What about hate and violence? Why are incidents played up in one city and ignored in another? Why is no public outcry or official condemnation made when National Guardsmen trying to prevent lawlessness and injury in Cambridge, Md., are shot and stoned and sent to the hospital? Where are the headlines about the tremendous increase of vicious crime in Washington? What are the New York papers doing about a situation in that city which has resulted in the formation of citizen patrols by Jewish members of the community to protect the innocent from murderous hoodlums?

So that the complete record may be kept in perspective, I include an article from the June 1, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report, "As Crime Rises in Washington," and a news story from this morning's Washington Post, "Jews Patrol New York Area in Crime War."

The material follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, June 1, 1964]

AS CRIME RISES IN WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—The following is from an editorial, entitled "Crime in Washington," which appeared in the Evening Star of May 15:

"It looks as though Congress may do something to curb crime on Capitol Hill.

"The Senate Sergeant at Arms has recommended that eight experienced patrolmen, including three to handle police dogs, be hired to patrol the Capitol Grounds at night. These patrolmen would help the special Capitol Police force of 180 men make the area safer for Senators, their women employees, and tourists.

"This sounds like a great idea. For one thing, it would relieve Chief Justice Warren, Senator SALTONSTALL, and others of the need to escort women members of their staff to their cars or to bus stops. But what about the rest of us?

"Capitol Hill isn't Washington. And in Washington during the year ending April 30 serious crime rose by a whopping 30.2 percent. In April alone the increase was 33.4 percent over April of last year. Robbery during the year went up 67.9 percent. The increase in rapes was 30.8 percent, in housebreaking 51.7 percent, and in auto thefts an astonishing 108.2 percent.

"What does the Senate propose to do to provide better protection for the people of Washington as well as for Capitol Hill? It could enact pending legislation which would relieve the Metropolitan Police of some of the crippling restrictions laid on them by incredible court decisions. * * * And it certainly could make funds available to beef up the police force. Of course, the Senate may not do any of these things. But we'll bet it provides the extra men and dogs for Capitol Hill."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 27, 19, 1964]

JEWS PATROL NEW YORK AREA IN CRIME WAR

NEW YORK, May 26.—The Maccabees were fearless warriors who roamed the Middle East in pre-Christian days, fighting Greek and Syrian efforts to force the worship of idols upon vanquished Jews.

Tonight, a latter-day version of the Maccabees is roaming the streets of Brooklyn—a "citizens patrol force" to combat the rising incidence of crime in the borough's Crown Heights section.

The Maccabees of the community," as one leader of the citizens' patrol force describes them, are about 100 volunteers of the ultra-Orthodox Hasidic Jewish persuasion who are assigned to duty in four patrol cars equipped with two-way radios.

Every night for the last week, from sunset to sunrise, the Maccabees, working out of

their headquarters have been acting as escorts for people who want to get safely home from synagogues, subway stations, and meeting halls.

The police spokesman said that at the request of leaders of the Hasidic Jews in Crown Heights "extra policemen have been supplied, including, on occasion, the deployment of the tactical patrol force there."

Hasidic Jewish leaders wince at having the term "vigilante" applied to their patrol force. They also soft-pedal an apparent racial angle to the trouble in Crown Heights, although they say privately most of the hoodlums who are said to be roaming the area are Negroes.

The police give no statistics on crimes in the area but Jewish community leaders claim that in the past 2 months, there have been an average of at least five "incidents" a night in Crown Heights—purse snatchings, muggings, burglaries.

The Hasidic Jews of Crown Heights, who began moving into the area from the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn about 5 years ago, now number about 65,000.

According to their Orthodox customs, the women dress severely. The Hasidic men grow long beards and sideburns, and wear long coats and broad-brimmed hats, black or gray.

Because they look different, Masidic leaders claim, members of the sect have been easy targets of hoodlums.

The head of "the Maccabees," Rabbi Samuel Schrage, 28, administrator of the United Lubavitcher Yeshiva, said today that Hasidic Jews have been subjected to "robbery and harassment" on the streets.

It was at one of Rabbi Schrage's schools that 16 Jewish children and a rabbi were injured April 21 in an attack by a band of about 50 youths.

But the straw that broke the camel's back—and led to formation of the Maccabees—occurred about 2 weeks ago. The wife of a prominent rabbi was attacked by a knife-wielding man in her home.

The four patrol cars equipped with two-way radios were obtained through donations, as was the patrol force headquarters.

The Maccabee patrol will continue, Rabbi Schrage said, "until the situation is corrected."

Tax Deduction for Educational Expenses of Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week I introduced a bill to clarify the deductibility of expenses incurred by teachers in order to improve their professional capabilities. The bill—H.R. 11346—also provides a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deductions.

Most professional people can deduct on their income tax any expenses incurred for improvement of their skills. However, many teachers have been denied this exemption because of conflicting interpretations of the law by the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair that businessmen should be allowed to deduct the cost of entertainment, while teachers are prevented from deducting the cost of education which improves their teaching ability. The bill which I have introduced places teachers on a parity with other professional people.

The bill which I have introduced:

First. Provides that a statement from an authorized school official will be acceptable as proof—in the absence of clear proof to the contrary—that such education was appropriate for maintaining or improving skills as a teacher or to meet the express requirements of his employer.

Second. Uniformly defines a teacher as an individual who is employed by a school as a classroom teacher, as a supervisor, administrator, or adviser, or in any other professional capacity related to the instructional program, including guidance counselors and librarians.

Third. Provides for all educational expenses to be deductible in the same manner that travel, meals, and lodging now are, that is, from gross income.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will give this bill favorable consideration. The relief which it seeks to provide is long overdue. To the extent its passage will encourage those in the teaching profession to supplement their training and experience when opportunity permits, the whole Nation will benefit. The quality of American education is high, and we need to encourage those who seek to maintain or advance these high standards.

The bill in its entirety follows:

H.R. 11346

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses (including related expenses described in subsection (a)(2)) paid or incurred by a teacher during the taxable year for his education.

"(2) PROOF OF ENTITLEMENT TO DEDUCTION.—A written statement from an authorized school official or school authority, made in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe, to the effect that—

"(A) a taxpayer during his taxable year was employed as a teacher for not less than six months, and undertook and completed education (specified in such statement) after becoming so employed; and

"(B) such education was appropriate for maintaining or improving the taxpayer's skills as a teacher, or to meet the express requirements imposed by his employer in connection with his employment as a teacher,

shall (in the absence of clear proof to the contrary) be accepted as proof that the expenses reasonably paid or incurred by the taxpayer in such taxable year for such education (including related expenses described in subsection (a)(2)) were expenses to which paragraph (1) applies. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent a taxpayer from utilizing methods otherwise available to him in establishing his entitlement to a deduction under this section.

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'teacher' means an individual employed by a school as a classroom teacher, or as a supervisor, administrator, or adviser or in any other professional capacity related to the instructional program (including but not limited to guidance counselors and librarians);

"(B) the term 'school' means an educational institution described in section 503 (b)(2); and

"(C) the term 'education' includes any course, travel, or other educational activity which—

"(i) is required by the teacher's employer to meet the express requirements of his employment as a teacher; or

"(ii) is within the area of employment (including the subject area, grade level, or other area) in which the teacher performs his duties as such, or is directly related to such area; or

"(iii) is directly related to the improvement of the teaching, administrative, or other skills of the teacher, including but not limited to courses in education, psychology, sociology, anthropology, English, the language of the students involved where English is a second language, guidance, administration, library science, and audiovisual techniques; or

"(iv) is allowed by the institution of higher education at or by which it is offered or made available as a credit toward an advanced degree in the area in which the teacher is employed.

Such term does not include any course, travel, or other activity if it is undertaken primarily for the purpose of qualifying for a type of employment which is different from that in which the teacher is engaged at the time it is undertaken."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (2) of section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—The deduction allowed by section 162 for the educational (and related) expenses of a teacher."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Source of Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Medford Evans, of Jackson, Miss., and field consultant to the Citizens' Councils of America, addressed the South Carolina Association of Citizens' Councils in Columbia, S.C.

Dr. Evans is an author, a highly respected scholar, and one capable and noted for the eloquent expression of his ideas. Because his views will be interesting to many persons, I include the remarks he made in Columbia on Sunday, March 1, 1964:

SOURCE OF CONFLICT

(An address by Dr. Medford Evans, field consultant, Citizens' Councils of America, to South Carolina Association of Citizens' Councils, Columbia, S.C.)

It is an honor to speak before South Carolinians in Columbia. Before your city was burned on February 17, 1865, the day Sherman entered, Columbia was called the most beautiful city in North America. It has subsequently regained a claim to that title. The name Columbia is, of course, one of the synonyms for America. And South Carolina has always represented the best and truest Americanism. I am myself a native Texan. In Texas, we do not forget—some of us do not forget—Col. William B. Travis of South Carolina, who with his sword drew the line in the floor of the Alamo and challenged the defenders under his command to cross willingly into eternal fame—as they did. Prior to Santa Anna's attack Travis sent out a letter appealing for volunter reinforcements. It was a tremendous document, concluding with the words "victory or death." The point I would now make is that in this letter Travis appealed to Americans. It was what you and I mean by America that was defended by that great South Carolinian who became one of the immortals of Texas.

It was America that was defended in the Revolution by Francis Marion, the invincible Swamp Fox. Let me digress long enough to observe that the so-called American Revolution was not a revolution at all, in the sense that the French and Russian upheavals were. The historic action that made good the Declaration of Independence was not a revolution, but a secession. The Jacobins of 1793 cut off Louis XVI's head, and the Communists of 1918 machinegunned at pointblank range Czar Nicholas II and his family. Our forefathers merely separated themselves from the tyrannical rule of George III, and would have left him in peace had he left them in peace. What South Carolina and her sister Colonies did in 1776 was not different in principle from what South Carolina led the Confederacy in doing in 1860 and 1861, but simply more successful. The attitude was American all the way.

It was America that Wade Hampton, the third of that name, defended so successfully during the first Reconstruction. It was America for which Mr. Justice Byrnes spoke when he branded as un-Constitutional the Black Monday decision of that Supreme Court of which he himself had once been a member.

When I was a young man—an era somewhat remote—it was fashionable to think of the South's preoccupation with history as at best charmingly quaint and at worst a serious impediment to progress. Today, we can recognize that a knowledge of the southern past is the best available preparation for America's future.

For what we face now is a massive attempt to reopen the basic issues of the Reconstruction era. Increasingly, students are referring to our contemporary crisis as the beginning of Reconstruction II. Let me remind you of the basic fact about Reconstruction I—which is that it ended in victory for the South. Recall that the Civil War—I trust you will forgive me for calling it that, but I am not merely sentimental in attitude toward the events to which I refer, and this term is practical—the Civil War was fought over the issue of secession. (The Yankees no longer believed in it.) The war began over that issue. The issue of slavery was fully involved before the end. The South surrendered in the Civil War, and neither secession nor slavery has been a live issue since. No one has tried to start the Civil War over again.

But following the Civil War there was a more prolonged if less openly dramatic struggle—the 12-year war of Reconstruction I. The issues were those now emblazoned in the seal of the Citizens' Council—"States rights" and "Racial Integrity." The Reconstruction Congress and the Grant administrations undertook to obliterate States rights and to compel racial integration in the South. That was the objective of Thaddeus Stevens, Ben Wade, and other northern radicals. Military, political, and economic power was employed to this end. The attempt failed. It failed because southern resistance—which had wearied of the effort to make good the acts of secession, and which was willing to surrender legal title to the slaves—never even considered yielding to demands for racial integration, never considered acknowledging that the Federal Government had any right to order such integration.

It is still fashionable in some quarters to allege that the Civil War settled the issue of States rights adversely to the States righters. Not so. The only right waived at Appomattox was the right of secession. The only right abrogated by a legally adopted constitutional amendment was the right to hold slaves. The right of the States to order their internal affairs was still maintained, and by the end of Reconstruction was made good. Admissions of this fact are found even in liberal texts. For example, the "Concise Dictionary of American History" (Scribner's, 1962) says in its article on Reconstruction, "Gradually self-rule came to the States of the South" (p. 804) similarly, Hofstadter, Miller, and Aaron in a college textbook conclude their chapter on Reconstruction with a section called simply, "The Return to White Supremacy" (p. 406).

The South won the first war of Reconstruction. The victory was formalized by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions legalizing segregation, and codified by the so-called Jim Crow laws. The unique era of American progress that was the first half of the 20th century was based solidly on a northern victory in the Civil War and a southern victory in the war of Reconstruction. Today, we are faced—not at all with an attempt by segregationists to reopen the Civil War, but an attempt by integrationists to reopen the war of Reconstruction. They don't like the way it turned out.

Reconstruction I and II are alike in that both represent an effort by a comparatively small group of fanatics to achieve total power through centralization of government and application of governmental powers to activities previously exempt. The difference between Reconstruction I and Reconstruction II is that in the 1860's and 1870's even the wildest fanatic never thought of centralizing power not just nationally but internationally, and never seriously attempted to apply the central power to schools, shops, and social activities. Today, the bureaucratic elite dream precisely of a world police state in which everything shall be controlled from a center to which have been drawn all powers formerly exercised by individuals, local authorities, states, and nations. The U.N. is the great maelstrom into which all rival sovereignties are to be sucked. What Washington takes from Columbia it will faithfully deliver to Lake Success, which in turn will clear everything with Moscow.

Resisting this program are the upholders of States rights and racial integrity. Why are these concepts so important? Why are they so important to us who uphold them? Why are they so important to the enemies who would destroy them? Part of the answer is that both States rights and racial integrity are essential to what we call Americanism. The United States stems legally from three documents: (1) the Declaration of Independence, (2) the Treaty of Paris of September 3, 1783, (3) the Constitution. The Declaration contains the utterance "All men are created equal" which is so often quoted out of context by enemies of America who wish to confront us with a dilemma. But the Declaration contains first that other phrase "the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle" a people—"one people." Certainly Jefferson and the signers did not contemplate that "one people" should include Negroes. They took racial integrity for granted. They did not include all white men in the concept of "one people," but they never even thought about including any that were not white. In philosophical parlance, to be white was a necessary though not a sufficient condition.

As the Declaration is actually a document that supports racial integrity, so the Treaty of Paris, which validated the results of our military struggle for independence, fully supports States rights. His Britannic Majesty recognized not 1 but 13 free and independent States. Of course, the Declaration too had said that "these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States." The verb is are, not is, plural not singular. "State governments," says the "Concise Dictionary of American History," "had carried the people through the war with Great Britain while the impotent Congress of the Confederation had been unable to achieve the objects for which it was created. By the Treaty of Paris the Congress was to make certain recommendations to the States, but that it had no ability to do more than recommend was fully taken for granted. Authority was in the States, not the Congress.

Then, under the Constitution, which went into effect 13 years after the representatives of the States had declared their independence, and 6 years after King George had admitted that they were independent, the rights of the States were made as secure as law can make anything. The 10th amendment is familiar to you. Of more immediate application at the time was the so-called great compromise, which is at the heart of the Constitution, under which representation in the House of Representatives is proportional to population, while representation in the Senate is equal for all States. Equality of representation in the Senate is the most fundamental provision of the Constitution, for it is the only provision that may not be changed by the regular process of amendment. If States rights is an obsolete doctrine, then the Senate is an obsolete institution. I understand that some people think that is so, but I do not, and should hope the Senate does not.

Of course, if the slogan "one man, one vote"—which first became popular in Kenya in conjunction with the Mau Mau butcheries and was later adopted by the U.S. Supreme Court in dealing with congressional districts—if that slogan prevails the Senate will have to go, for obviously two Senators from Delaware and two from New York do not represent the same number of voters.

Actually, under the original Constitution the slogan "One Man, One Vote" did not apply to the House of Representatives either. For under the "Three-Fifths Compromise" only three-fifths of the number of Negroes in any State were counted in determining its numerical representation. The Founding Fathers hardly took "all men are created equal" in a literal mathematical sense.

But the concepts of States rights and racial integrity rest not alone on formal law—important as that is. Without attempting to recreate for you anything approaching the whole picture, let me merely remind you that the whole of modern civilization is a fabric erected throughout the world by white men, laboring directly and directing the labor of colored men. Put in other terms, the nations of Western Europe through colonization unified, Christianized, civilized, and enriched Asia, Africa, and the Americas. What can be the motives of the fanatic enemies of "colonialism" who would

obliterate the results of this historic process, who would destroy the conditions under which modern civilization has been achieved?

We know from the Congo, we know from Cuba that when white leadership goes, civilization goes. We very nearly know the same thing from the District of Columbia.

What can be the motive?

I think it was suggested in Fitzgerald's translation of Omar Khayyam:

"Ah, love, couldst thou and I with Him conspire,
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits, and then,
Remold it nearer to the heart's desire?"

The key line is "shatter it to bits." The revolution rejoices in destruction for its own sake. Both the Russian Communist poet Ilya Ehrenburg and the American scientist Robert Oppenheimer have testified to the fascination of destroying things, including worlds. Inasmuch as complete nihilism and complete ambition both require the achievement of power, the crucial objective of the revolutionists is in any case that—the achievement of total power. In the words of the late President Kennedy, "Power all the way."

The great obstacles in the way of the power seekers include most notably the sovereignty and independence of the United States and the world leadership role of the West European white nations. The programs and methods of attack center at present in the campaigns for national disarmament and racial homogenization. An essential auxiliary program is the purging of so-called "counterrevolutionaries," which means you, me, and other conservatives.

It is in the light of the necessity the Communists feel for purging counterrevolutionaries that I think the assassination of John Kennedy must be evaluated. The historic parallel is in the assassination in December 1934 of S. M. Kirov, then considered the No. 2 Communist in the world. The No. 1 Communist, Joseph Stalin, made an impressive public display of grief over Kirov's death, going so far as to kiss the corpse. In the sequel he put to work his secret police, under a man named Yagoda, and began 18 months later the great purges, in which all his most remotely conceivable rivals were liquidated. Recently it has come to light that Stalin himself had procured the murder of Kirov.

Now, the present parallel consists in the fact that 4 days after the murder, or assassination, or shall we say execution of Jack Kennedy, the Communist Worker published an editorial demand for the immediate establishment of an "extraordinary commission" to bring all parties whose hands are bloody with performance or complicity in this crime against the Nation to full justice. It is worth noting, I think, that the term "extraordinary commission," which the Worker here used, is the original name of the Soviet secret police, established as the "Cheka" in December 1917. The editors of the Worker would of course, be familiar with that fact. It makes Earl Warren, whom the Worker said should head the Commission, sound like Yagoda, while Kennedy sounds like Kirov. Of course, President Johnson did exactly what the Worker dictated. I predict we shall find the Warren Commission acting primarily as an agency for purging counterrevolutionaries—to whatever extent it is able.

The Citizens' Councils, however, do not intend to be purged, though along with General Walker, Governor Wallace, and Senator Thurmond we are on the Worker's list. The Citizens' Councils are growing and prospering throughout the South. We are determined, and confident, that segregation and civilization are here to stay.

To recapitulate and perhaps sharpen the points I have tried to make:

The world revolution is trying to kill you. "You" means 95 percent of the white southerners and 50 percent or more of the white Yankees. It is inconceivable that this attempt could succeed, except that for so long whites have been conditioned not only to fight whites, but only whites. Also, such a liquidation of American whites could succeed only in conjunction with an international struggle—not necessarily a formally declared war in the traditional pattern, but an international struggle nevertheless.

Since actual execution of the slaughter of white Americans has not begun, resistance to it at this time must be concerned with strategic planning and basic defensive measures. The murderer is maneuvering for position. He must be dissuaded or immobilized. The warfare is mainly psychological—political, propagandistic—though occasional physical acts are already necessary.

So far, only the Deep South—for the most part only Mississippi—is vigorously opposing the strategic maneuvers of the race murderers. Other sections of the country, other States, are often sympathetic, but unless they do something positive to support the Deep South in general and Mississippi in particular, then they will be driven by the inertia of events to assist in the planned destruction of Mississippi and much of the rest of the Deep South. There will at length be no room for neutrality.

The citizens' council is important as the only organization dedicated to resistance to the racial aspect of the world revolution—which in practice is the decisive aspect. Without the mobilization of the colored masses of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the world revolution would have no expansive power. It is the race consciousness of the yellow, brown, and black nations that drives the "revolution of rising expectations," that stirs the "winds of change." It will require a renaissance of white race consciousness to forestall the catastropic consequences that would ensue should the world revolution succeed. The white man must avow his purpose to keep the helm of civilization—if there is still to be civilization. An organization openly committed to racial integrity is required. Hidden organizations may also be necessary, but they cannot operate with full effectiveness in the present phase of the struggle, which is primarily political and propagandistic.

The key centers of struggle now are the polls, the mass media of communication, the academy, the ecclesiastical organizations, and various southern towns and cities.

But the prize is the Nation and the world.

I congratulate you on having come here today to strengthen the Citizens' Councils of America by reorganizing, remobilizing, revitalizing the South Carolina Association of Citizens' Councils. Under God, we shall win.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Distinguished Service Citation Awarded to Senator Stuart Symington in American War Mothers Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, perhaps no statement of the dedicated American spirit will ever surpass in simple eloquence those words spoken by the late President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

The American War Mothers represent the highest order of service and sacrifice to American ideals; and their annual ceremony on Mother's Day at Arlington National Cemetery is one of the most moving hours of patriotic devotion any citizen can experience.

On Mother's Day this year, May 10, it was my privilege to be present at the ceremony and hear an eloquent brief address by the senior Senator from Missouri. I believe he stated with great insight the essence of America's present and future challenge, in pressing toward that ultimate world order in which freedom and peace will surely endure.

It was fitting also that this distinguished American, STUART SYMINGTON, who has served this Nation well not only as a Member of the Senate, but as first Secretary of the Air Force and in other positions of highest trust related to the security of this Nation, was honored on that occasion with a citation presented on behalf of the American War Mothers by their national president, Mrs. Louis H. Breuer. I ask that the text of that citation be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask that Senator SYMINGTON'S address, as principal speaker on this occasion, also be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American War Mothers, in their 40th annual Mother's Day program at Arlington National Cemetery, present this citation to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, in recognition of his leadership in business, as a member of the executive branch of the Federal Government and as a U.S. Senator in the continuing effort to keep our country strong in order that we may remain free.

We honor him not only for his work and support of the armed services of our beloved country but also for his dedication and devotion to the cause of keeping our country strong economically and, above all, for his public service in furtherance of our cherished American ideals.

Done this 10th day of May 1964.

MRS. LOUIS H. BREUER,
National President.

"THE GOAL OF PEACE WITH HONOR AND JUSTICE"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS' ANNUAL MOTHER'S DAY CEREMONY, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, MAY 10, 1964

It is a rare privilege and honor to be here today as we commemorate all that this great organization, the American War Mothers, stands for.

And that pleasure is emphasized by the fact that Mary Breuer, from my State, is your president.

No nation in world history is more proud of its tradition of freedom than is the United States.

Today as we gather here in memory of those who gave their lives to make that freedom possible, we realize the depths of sacrifice that constitutes our heritage; a sacrifice expressed by white crosses, both in our own country, and in countless lands across the sea.

This inheritance not only comes from our forefathers, but also from those who only yesterday constituted our youth. It is a trust, first established, and then preserved through self-sacrifice and devotion to a cause these heroes considered more meaningful and worthy than life itself.

Today it is for us, the living, to dedicate ourselves to the preservation of liberty, both in our time and for those future generations of Americans we know could only be happy as free men and free women.

In this resting place among our honored dead, therefore, as we also honor the memory of all mothers, let us again this Sunday afternoon reaffirm our pledge to do whatever is necessary so as to maintain the principles and ideals for which they died.

Now a new generation comes forth, to assume responsibilities in a time of potential danger never before experienced by mankind; and as we both reach across the corridors of time to touch hands for a moment of spiritual communion with our heroic dead, this generation knows also that there is no alternative to peace.

War is no longer "the thin red line of our sons." In any possible future general conflict, our homes, our cities, every man, woman, and child will be part of that line; and our way of life, possibly civilization itself, could well be ended.

But we will not flinch. Those we revere today did not flinch. Strong in our faith, determined to remain strong so as to remain free, we will carry out the gentle warning in the phrase "lest we forget."

The people of this Nation will never forget.

And if they could speak, I believe that those who lie here in eternal peace would have this message for us: "Do whatever is necessary to carry on the traditions for which we gave our lives; and with that premise, strive mightily in this nuclear space age to preserve the peace, with honor and justice."

We accept these words. We know that true honor can only be ours if it is associated with justice; therefore world peace under world law should be the goal in our effort to carry out this message. For it is only under law that liberty can endure.

Automation: Chill or Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, automation and unemployment is one of the most important questions facing the Nation and the Congress. I have introduced H.R. 8429 to create a Federal Commission on Automation which would begin to deal with the problem. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a symposium on automation which appeared in the winter 1964 edition of the University of Chicago's magazine Context. The articles in the symposium have been written by three highly qualified individuals: Donald N. Michael, a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies and author of "Cybernation: The Silent Conquest"; Arnold Weber, associate professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago; and Thomas Whisler, professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago.

The first article, by Donald N. Michael, follows:

[From Context, winter 1964]

A CONTEXT SYMPOSIUM: AUTOMATION: CHILL OR CHALLENGE?

I. "The Silent Conquest," by Donald N. Michael.

II. "The Have-Nots at Home," by Arnold R. Weber.

III. "Will Management Be Obsolete?" by Thomas L. Whisler.

(NOTE.—Before looking at the specifics of this decade's problem, we should place automation in the perspective of the continuing stream of history. Although the techniques now being applied are the result of an engineering revolution, they are, in an economic and cultural sense, nothing more than a continuation of an evolution that has been going on for centuries.

(Beginning with a world in which men could barely gather and capture enough to keep themselves alive, we went through a first technological revolution, ending about 3000 B.C. It raised productivity sufficiently that societies could afford priests, an aristocracy, armies, and a bureaucracy. We even reached the stage of the Greek democracies. These were democraies of the few, however, resting on a large class of slaves.

(The second technological revolution did away with slavery, since it became cheaper to use mechanical power than human muscle, and created the base on which mass democracy now rests. The economic gains of the first revolution went to the few; those of the second have gone to the many; perhaps the automation revolution will carry us on from a mass democracy to a mass aristocracy.

(In the past quarter century, we have doubled the productivity of the average man. If we can do the same in the next quarter

century, average family income will go to $14,000 a year instead of the present $7,000. Median education attainment, which rose from the grade school graduate to the high school graduate level, will move to that of the junior college graduate. Similiar movements in the availability of leisure, the consumption of world travel, music, fine art, and medical services will occur if productivity and income trends continue. Essentially, this is what automation promises.)

YALE BROZEN,
Professor, Graduate School of Business, the University of Chicago.

I. THE SILENT CONQUEST

(By Donald Michael)

What are the implications for our entire social system when cybernation takes over?

Both optimists and pessimists often claim that automation is simply the latest stage in the evolution of technological means for removing the burdens of work. The assertion is misleading. There is a very good possibility that automation is so different in degree as to be a profound difference in kind, and that it will pose unique problems for society, challenging our basic values and the ways in which we express and enforce them.

In order to understand what both the differences and the problems are and, even more, will be, we have to know something of the nature and use of automation and computers. There are two important classes of devices. One class, usually referred to when one speaks of automation, is made up of devices that automatically perform sensing and motor tasks, replacing or improving on human capacities for performing these functions. The second class, usually referred to when one speaks of computers, is composed of devices that perform, very rapidly, routine or complex logical and decisionmaking tasks, replacing or improving on human capacities for performing these functions.

Using these machines does not merely involve replacing men by having machines do tasks that men did before. It is, as John Diebold says, a way of "thinking as much as it is a way of doing. * * * It is no longer necessary to think in terms of individual machines or even in terms of groups of machines; instead, for the first time, it is practical to look at an entire production or information-handling process as an integrated system and not as a series of individual steps." For example, if the building trades were to be automated, it would not mean inventing machines to do the various tasks now done by men; rather, buildings would be redesigned so that they could be built by machines. One might invent an automatic bricklayer, but it is more likely that housing would be designed so that bricks would not be laid.

The two classes of devices overlap. At one pole are the automatic producers of material objects and, at the other, the sophisticated analyzers and interpreters of complex data. In the middle zone are the mixed systems, in which computers control complicated processes, such as the operations of an oil refinery, on the basis of interpretations that they make of data automatically fed to them about the environment. Also in this middle zone are those routine, automatic, data-processing activities which provide men with the bases for controlling, or at least understanding, what is happening to a particular environment. Processing of social security data and making straightforward tabulations of census information are examples of these activities. In order to eliminate the awkwardness of repeating the words "automation" and "computers" each time we wish to refer to both at the same time, and in order to avoid the semantic difficulties involved in using one term or the other to mean both ends of the continuum, we invent the term "cybernation" to refer to both automation and computers. The word is legitimate at least to the extent that it derives from "cybernetics," a term invented by Norbert Wiener to mean the processes of communication and control in man and machines. He derived it from the Greek word for "steersman." The theory and practice of cybernetics underlie all systematic design and application of automation and computers.

Cybernated systems perform with a precision and a rapidity unmatched in humans. They also perform in ways that would be impractical or impossible for humans to duplicate. They can be built to detect and correct errors in their own performance and to indicate to men which of their components are producing the error. They can make judgments on the basis of instructions programed into them. They can remember and search their memories for appropriate data, which either has been programed into them along with their instructions or has been acquired in the process of manipulating new data. Thus, they can learn on the basis of past experience with their environment. They can receive information in more codes and sensory modes than men can. They are beginning to perceive and to recognize.

As a result of these characteristics, automation is being used to make and roll steel, mine coal, manufacture engine blocks, weave cloth, sort and grade everything from oranges to bank checks. At the other end of the continuum, computers are being used rather regularly to analyze market portfolios for brokers; compute the best combination of crops and livestock for given farm conditions; design and fly under typical and extreme conditions rockets and airplanes before they are built; design, in terms of costs and traffic-flow characteristics, the appropriate angles and grades for complex traffic interchanges; keep up-to-date inventory records and print new stock orders as automatically computed rates of sales and inventory status indicate. Computers have also been programed to write mediocre TV dramas (by manipulating segments of the plot), write music, translate tolerably if not perfectly from one language to another, and simulate some logical brain processses (so that the machine goes about solving puzzles—and making mistakes in the process—in the ways people do). Also, computers are programed to play elaborate games by themselves or in collaboration with human beings. Among other reasons, these games are played to understand and plan more efficiently for the conduct of wars and procedures for industrial and business aggrandizement. Through such games, involving a vast number of variables, and contingencies within which these variables act and interact, the best or most likely solutions to complex problems are obtained.

It is no fantasy, then, to be concerned with the implications of the thinking machines. There is every reason to believe that within the next two decades machines will be available outside the laboratory that will do a credible job of original thinking, certainly as good thinking as that expected of most middle-level people who are supposed to use their minds. There is no basis for knowing where this process will stop, nor, as Norbert Wiener has pointed out, is there any comfort in the assertion that, since man built the machine, he will always be smarter or more capable than it is.

Cybernation is by nature the sort of process that will be introduced selectively by organization, industry, and locality. The ill effects will be felt at first only locally and, as a result, will not be recognized by those who introduce it, and perhaps not even by the Government, as a national problem with many serious implications for the whole social system. Also, because one of the chief effects of cybernation on employment is not to hire rather than to fire, the economic-social consequences will be delayed and will at any time be exacerbated or ameliorated by other economic and social factors such as the condition of our foreign markets, which also are being changed and challenged by European and Russian cybernation. By the time the adverse effects of cybernation are sufficiently noticeable to be ascribed to cybernation, the equipment will be in and operating.

The Government, too, must turn to computers to handle many of its major problems simply because the data involved are so massive and the factors so complex that only machines can handle the material fast enough to allow timely action based on understanding of the facts. In the nature of the situation, the decisions made by the Government with the help of computers would be based in good part on computers that have been programed with more or less confidential information, and privileged access to information, at the time it is needed, is a sufficient if not always necessary condition for attaining and maintaining power. There may not be any easy way to insure that decisions based on computers could not become a threat to democratic government.

Most of the necessary inputs for the Government's computer systems are available only to the Government, because it is the only institution with sufficiently extensive facilities for massive surveys. (whether they be photographic, observational, paper and pencil, or electronic in nature). Also, the costs of these facilities and their computer installations are so great that buying and maintaining such a system is sensible only if one has the decisionmaking needs of a government and the data required to feed the machines. Other organizations, with other purposes, would not need this kind of installation. These machines can provide more potent information than merely rapidly produced summaries and tabulations of data. They can quickly provide information on relationships among data, which may be appreciated as significant only by those already having privileged information based on a simpler level of analysis or on other nonquantified intelligence to which the user is privy. Computers can also provide information in the form of extrapolations of the consequences of specific strategies and probabilities that these consequences will arise. This information can be based on exceedingly complex contingencies. The utility and applicability of these extrapolations will be fully understandable only to those knowing the particular assumptions that went into the programing of the machines.

It may be impossible to allow much of the Government, to say nothing of the public, access to the kind of information we have been discussing here. But let us assume that somehow the operation of the Government has been reorganized so that procedures are enforced to permit competing political parties and other private organizations to have access to the Government's raw data, to have parallel systems for the processing of data as well as to have access to the Government's computer programs. Even then, most people will be incapable of judging the validity of one contending computer program compared to another, or whether the policies based on them are appropriate.

This condition exists today about military postures. These are derived in good part from computer analyses and computer-based games that produce probabilities based on programed assumptions about weapon systems and our and the enemy's behavior. Here the intellectual ineffectualness of the layman is obscured by the secrecy that keeps him from finding out what he probably would not be able to understand anyway. If this sounds condescending, it only needs to be pointed out that there are large areas of misunderstanding and misinterpretation among the military too. At any given time, some of these people do not fully appreciate the relationships between the programs used

in the computers and the real world in which the consequences are supposed to follow. As it is now, the average intelligent man has little basis for judging the differing opinions of economists about the state of the economy or even about the reasons for a past state. He also has little basis for appraising the conflicting opinions among scientists and engineers about the costs and results of complex scientific developments such as man in space. In both examples, computers play important roles in the esoteric arguments involved.

Thus, even if people may have more leisure time to attend more closely to politics, they may not have the ability to contribute to the formulation of policy. Some observers feel that the middle class does not now take a strong interest in voting and is alienated in its responsibility for the conduct of government. Leisure may not change this trend, especially when government becomes in large part the complex computer operation that it must necessarily become.

Significant public opinion may come from only a relatively small portion of the public: (a) those who are able to follow the battles of the computers and to understand the implications of their programs; and (b) those who are concerned with government policy but who are outside of or unfamiliar with the computer environment.

As for the selection of the men who are to play or make policy, a computerized government will require different training from that which executive personnel in most governmental agencies have today. Certainly without such training (and perhaps with it) there is bound to be a deepening of the split between politics and facts. For example, it is evident that the attitudes of many Congressmen toward space activities are motivated more by politics and conventional interpretations of reality than by engineering facts or the realities of international relations.

For reasons of personality as well as professional perspective, many operations researchers, and systems analysts have great difficulty in coping with the more ambiguous and less logical aspects of society. Their temperaments, training, and sympathies may not incline them to indulge the slow, ponderous, illogical, and emotional tendencies of democratic processes. Or they may ignore the extra-logical nature of man. Emphasis on logic, in association with the other factors we have mentioned, may encourage a trend toward the recruitment of authoritarian personalities. There is no necessary correlation between the desire to apply scientific logic to problems and the desire to apply democratic principles to daily, or even to professional scientific life.

The psychological influence of computers is overwhelming: they symbolize and reinforce the potency of America's belief in the utility of science and technology. There is a sense of security in nicely worked-up curves and complex displays of information which are the products of almost unimaginably intricate and elegant machinery. In general, the influence of computers will continue to be enhanced if those who use them attend chiefly to those components of reality which can be put into a computer and processed by it, and the important values will become those which are compatible with this approach to analyzing and manipulating the world. For example, the influence of computers has already been sufficiently strong to seduce military planners and civil defense planners away from those aspects of their problems which are not now subject to data processing. Most of the planning for survival following nuclear attack has to do with those parts of the situation which can be studied by computers. Crucial aspects of psychological and social reorganization have been pushed into the background simply because they cannot be handled statistically with convenience or with the demonstrated expertness of the specialist in computers. Thus, the nature of the postattack situation is argued learnedly but spuriously by those who have the attention of leadership, an attention stimulated by the glamor of computers, the prestige of their scientist-keepers, and the comfort of their hard facts.

Computers are especially useful for dealing with social situations that pertain to people in the mass, such as traffic control, financial transactions, mass-demand consumer goods, allocation of resources, etc. They are so useful in these areas that they undoubtedly will help to seduce planners into inventing a society with goals that can be dealt with in the mass rather than in terms of the individual. In fact, the whole trend toward cybernation can be seen as an effort to remove the variabilities in man's on-the-job behavior and off-the-job needs which, because of their non-statistical nature, complicate production and consumption. Thus, somewhere along the line, the idea of the individual may be completely swallowed up in statistics. The planner and those he plans for may become divorced from one another, and the alienation of the individual from his Government and individual from individual within Government may grow ever greater.

In 20 years, other things being equal, most of the routine blue-collar and white-collar tasks that can be done by cybernation will be. Our schools will probably be turning out a larger proportion of the population better educated than they are today, but most of our citizens will be unable to understand the cybernated world in which they live. Perhaps they will understand the rudiments of calculus, biology, nuclear physics, and the humanities. But the research realm of scientists, the problems of Government, and the interplay between them will be beyond the ken even of our college graduates. Besides, most people will have had to recognize that, when it comes to logic, the machines by and large can think better than they, for in that time reasonably good thinking computers should be operating on a large scale.

There will be a small, almost separate, society of people in rapport with the advanced computers. These cyberneticians will have established a relationship with their machines that cannot be shared with the average man any more than the average man today can understand the problems of molecular biology, nuclear physics, or neurophyschiatry. Indeed, many scholars will not have the capacity to share their knowledge or feeling about this new man-machine relationship. Those with the talent for the work probably will have to develop it from childhood and will be trained as intensively as the classical ballerina.

Some of the remaining population will be productively engaged in human-to-human or human-to-machine activities requiring judgment and a high level of intelligence and training. But the rest, whose innate intelligence or training is not of the highest, what will they do? We can foresee a nation with a large portion of its people doing, directly or indirectly, the endless public tasks that the welfare state needs and that the Government will not allow to be cybernated because of the serious unemployment that would result. These people will work short hours, with much time for the pursuit of leisure activities.

Even with a college education, what will they do all their long lives, day after day, 4-day weekend after weekend, vacation after vacation, in a more and more crowded world? (There is a population explosion to face in another 10 to 30 years.) What will they believe in and aspire to as they work their shorter hours and, on the outside, pursue their "self-fulfilling" activities, whatever they may be? No one has ever seriously envisioned what characteristics these activities might have in order to be able to engross most men and women most of their adult lives. What will be the relationship of these people to government, to the "upper intellectuals," to the rest of the world, to themselves?

Obviously, attitudes toward work, play, and social responsibility will have changed greatly. Somehow we shall have had to cope emotionally with the vast gap in living standards that will then typify the difference between us and the have-not nations. We shall presumably have found some way to give meaning to the consumption of mass leisure. It would seem that a life oriented to private recreation might carry with it an attitude of relative indifference to public responsibility. This indifference, plus the centralization of authority, would seem to imply a governing elite and a popular acceptance of such an elite.

If this world is to exist as a coherent society, it will have to have its own "logic," so that it will make sense to its inhabitants. Today, for most of our population, our society makes sense, even though some other eyes hardly see us as logical in the formal sense of the word and the eyes of some of our own people look on us as a more or less pointless society. We make and solve our problems chiefly by other than mathematical-logical standards, and so must the cybernated generations. What these standards might be, we do not know. But if they are inadequate, the frustration and pointlessness that they produce may well evoke, in turn, a war of desperation—ostensibly against some external enemy but, in fact, a war to make the world safe for human beings by destroying most of society's sophisticated technological base. One thing is clear: if the new "logic" is to resolve the problems raised here, it will have to generate beliefs, behavior, and goals far different from those which we have held until now and which are driving us more and more inexorably into a contradictory world run by (and for?) ever more intelligent, ever more versatile slaves.

Finalists in the American Legion's National High School Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, an outstanding young man from Pocatello, Idaho, recently placed in the finals of the American Legion's National High School Oratorical Contest. His name is Don Burnett, and he has been a credit to his family and community.

I take pride in asking unanimous consent to print the text of his oration, "An American Citizen's Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

What are we talking about when we speak of an American citizen? What makes him stand out from others? Generally, the American stands no taller and weighs no more than any other person in the world. In fact, both physically and mentally, he is a fairly typical human being. What makes him unique is not something he is, but some-

thing he has. He has a free country, governed democratically. The immediate reaction is, I've heard all that before. Yet, I have very seldom encountered an American who could give a good definition of Americanism. Americanism is a complex pyramid of an infinite number of blocks. Americanism is the defiant signature of John Hancock; the simple eloquence of Abraham Lincoln; a soldier lying face down in the Argonne Forest; the cheer in a ball park as the last notes of our National Anthem ring in the air; an American astronaut being lifted into space abroad a thundering monster of flame and steel; the breeze that ripples Old Glory on a sunny Fourth of July. It's something new and fresh. It's something strong and undefeated. It's something to live for. It's also something to die for.

We've not even scratched the surface. Americanism goes much deeper. It's a system of freedom under law which accounts for basic human desires and needs. These are as complex and variable as people themselves; yet, there are four which are significantly important. Allow me to spell these basic rights out to you in symbolic form.

A key is the symbol of the first. It could be the key to your house, my house, or a place of business. It opens the door to individuality, and locks the door to protect it. The ability to choose your own personal rainbow, and find the pot of gold at the end of its arc, is our most cherished American right. The privilege of competing in an economy of free enterprise is one which is hard earned and hard kept. You can be what you want to be. If that statement were put to the majority of the younger people of the world, the result would be that of hopeless disbelief. For them, the future has been foretold, either by binding custom or by the all-powerful state. They have been converted from people into tools. The right to individuality is far, far away. We have the key. We possess that right, which, while it is so simple and basic, was not discovered for thousands upon thousands of years.

The second symbol is the pencil. It can represent two of our basic liberties. With this simple instrument of wood and lead, the future of the Nation can be written. It can be used to mark "X's" on a ballot, or to express a political philosophy. If only the pencil were allowed to make its mark all over the earth, gigantic government tyrannies would fall helpless before it. A pencil—so fragile it can be broken by hand * * * so powerful that one stroke can shatter an empire. Such is the strength of the record of human expression.

Third, the podium is the very emblem of that human expression itself. Here we find the rights of free speech and freedom of assembly. The spoken word, while it is the simplest form of communication, is the ultimate weapon for the defense of human liberty. Words can tell of human strength, or human weakness; knowledge, or ignorance; fear, or courage. Artificial censorship by power-hungry administrators of contempt for human dignity in other lands only serves to lead mankind down the road to primitivism by depriving him of the full use of his greatest asset—his mind.

The fourth symbol is a book—the Bible, the basis for all Christian belief. Freedom of religious conviction is an infant. These United States have served as its cradle. It's difficult now to believe that thousands of people lost their lives simply because they did not view a higher power in exactly the same light as the king. Yet, if civilized history were reduced to a minute, nearly 58 seconds would elapse before liberty of worship made a feeble beginning. Thus it is that a great deal of the uniqueness of our Nation stems from the fact that you may interpret the book as you wish, accepting all of it, part of it, or none of it.

There we have some of the rights enjoyed by 190 million persons who call themselves Americans. But the U.S. citizen is on a two-way avenue. While gaining satisfaction in his rare possessions, he is also confronted with obligations. He has the dual responsibility of making certain that those privileges are used and used correctly, and also to defend and protect his liberties wherever and whenever they are threatened. This is a call for action.

It is a call for action against public apathy concerning freedom. It is a call for increased devotion toward the cause gallantly advertised by that banner of red, white, and blue. Yes, there's something to be desired in this Nation when only about 60 percent of the eligible voters in our citizenry go to the polls to make the most crucial of decisions. We often proudly broadcast the fact that all citizens are represented fairly and equally in our government; yet, dishonest creation of districts shades that statement with the blackness of falsehood. It's time to insure the purest form of democracy attainable for ourselves and generations to follow. It is time for the realization that patriotism and "eternal vigilance" are small prices to pay for a priceless possession. In fact, it is time for a new wave of Americanism among Americans.

But decay from within is not our only danger. A greedy, malicious enemy preys on our ideals from without. An unrelenting destroyer of the human individual, the Communist's great dream is to bury the free world in an avalanche of deliberate lies, subversive persuasion, and scattered warfare. He can afford to fail many times. We dare not fail once. We can defend against worldwide slavery by substituting truth for twisted, ugly propaganda; alertness for ignorance; and prompt action for idle complacency. We must protect a treasure valued at the worth of humanity itself.

On November 22, tragedy drew the Nation together. An entire population, for all its internal differences and contrasts, found unity in devotion to the memory of a leader. That same type of devotion to our country every day is the keystone to success for democracy. Americans must never let themselves forget the courageous sacrifices that have made our land a great one. They must never forget their obligation to be prepared to protect their precious way of life. For, if Americans such as you or I ever allow ourselves to forget, we may awaken in a world in which we will not be allowed to remember.

DON BURNETT.

The Healing Voice of Christian Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while the current civil rights debate is continuing in the Senate, it is wise to recall the words of Edmund Burke, who said many years ago: "No sound ought to be heard in the church but the healing voice of Christian charity." Today, there is great pressure throughout the land for adoption of the civil rights legislation. This pressure is strong and organized, even though the bill is filled with passages which would deliver the individual citizen to be but a pawn of the Federal Government. No better explanation of this organized pressure has come to my attention than the article below, by William F. Buckley, Jr. I call it to your attention at this time of national crisis in the field of personal liberty.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., May 22, 1964]

WHAT IS THE CHURCH'S PLACE ON POLITICAL ISSUES?

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Attending church last Sunday I received, along with everyone else, a copy of the official bulletin listing the affairs of the parish during the forthcoming week. There I saw a reference to the pending civil rights bill now being debated, or more properly, filibustered, in the Senate. "Write your two Senators," the message sponsored by the local interracial society exhorted us, "or wire them, to urge passage of the bill."

I should not have been surprised but pleased to have read in the bulletin, or heard from the lips of the preacher, exhortations to take more seriously God's commandments to brotherly love. But the traveler who starts out at the premise that one must love one's brother, and limps home thousands of miles later at the conclusion that the civil rights bill now pending should be passed, is a traveler who has managed to vault great paralogistic obstacles. It is not unlike the soritical dreamworld that some men of the right are given to: start with the premise that you disapprove of communism, and end at the conclusion that we should bomb Moscow. It is not, the liberals are fond of saying in respect of communism, that simple. It is not, I am unfond of saying, but constrained to say, that simple in respect of interracial harmony.

It is uncertain whether the civil rights bill now pending in the Senate would appreciably better relations between the races. But what clearly is not certain is that a vote against the bill is an act of Christian infidelity; it is certain that any such suggestion is an act of uncharity, which kind of thing one is reluctant to see enjoined in the bulletin of one's church.

The problem of how far churches and churchmen should probe into political issues is a vexed one, on which the finest moralizers have split hairs for centuries. I once discussed the whole issue on a television network with Mr. Charles P. Taft, brother of my late lamented hero the Senator. I remember asking him, intending to understand just where he thought the churches might establish useful limits against political factionalism, whether he didn't at least agree that churches should not take a stand for or against fluoridated water. He replied by accusing me of desiring the Nation's youth to mature with rotted teeth. I remember being astonished at the time, as I continue to be even 3 years later, at the National Council of Churches' recommending the admission of Red China into the United Nations. What, one wonders, just what has that got to do with the business of God on earth?

How closely have those who recommend the civil rights bill studied its several provisions? How keenly are they aware of some of the sophistries implicit in some of its language? Sample: If you run a hot dog stand and get a license to operate it from the State, then you are a State agent, which means that you may not discriminate. Doesn't that mean that virtually all of us have become State agents? Do we not, almost all of us, have licenses to drive cars? Are we then State agents?—who must pick up hikers without reference to the color of their thumb? The proposed law is full of maneuvers of this kind, which poke fun at the Constitution of the United States—even as some southern voting registrars poke fun at the 13th amendment by giving Negroes impossible literacy tests. How certain are the bill's advocates that to surrender conventional freedoms in behalf of the goal

of equality will serve in the long run the end we all seek?

Not, I warrant, certain enough to justify leasing out the moral machinery of the Christian churches to the advocates of the bill. The utopianist divine should show prudence and respect for the elusiveness of the evidence in such complicated matters as the Federal civil rights bill, and lean in the direction of action by local communities. And if we're going to get into the business of passing Federal laws telling everyone what to do and how to behave, I propose a law requiring all ministers of the gospel to read once a year the passage from Edmund Burke which warned that "No sound ought to be heard in the church but the healing voice of Christian charity. The cause of civil liberty and civil government gains as little as that of religion by this confusion of duties. Those who quit their proper character to assume what does not belong to them are, for the greater part, ignorant both of the character they leave, and of the charater they assume."

Centennial Birthday of Father Joseph Murgas Observed by Slovak-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD certain remarks of his with respect to the centennial birthday of Father Joseph Murgas, together with articles.

There being no objection, the statement and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY OF FATHER JOSEPH MURGAS OBSERVED BY SLOVAK-AMERICANS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

Slovaks and Americans of Slovak descent are commemorating this year the centennial birthday of the Reverend Joseph Murgas, noted priest and scientist, and founder of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America. Father Murgas also was one of the founding fathers of the First Republic of Czechoslovakia.

This month marks the 35th anniversary of his death and two respected journalists have commented extensively on Father Murgas' accomplishments.

John C. Sciranka, an American-Slovak writer who knew Father Murgas, has noted that even the Communists in Czechoslovakia paid the priest tribute by publishing his picture and biography in the Ceskoslovensky Svet (Czechoslovak World).

Harrison H. Smith, of the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, has said that Wilkes-Barre was almost the "birthplace of radio" because of Father Murgas' inventions. Mr. Smith has had two articles on the Reverend Murgas reprinted in the Dobry Pastier (Good Shepard).

[From the Good Shepherd]

CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY: REV. JOSEPH MURGAS, FOUNDER OF THE SLOVAK CATHOLIC FEDERATION OF AMERICA RECOGNIZED AS THE FATHER OF WIRELESS—CITY OF WILKES-BARRE, PA., WAS ALMOST THE BIRTHPLACE OF RADIO THROUGH HIS INVENTIONS, WRITES HARRISON H. SMITH OF WILKES-BARRE TIMES-LEADER

Shortly after the dawn of the 20th century, the eyes of the entire communications world were drawn to Wilkes-Barre as the result of studies conducted by Rev. Father Murgas, one of the pioneers in the perfection of wireless telegraphy.

Rev. Father Murgas served as pastor of Sacred Heart Slovak Church of Wilkes-Barre for nearly 35 years before his death in 1929.

MAINTAINED LABORATORY

In a small homemade laboratory in rear of the parish house, he devised a transmission system of radio signals by means of two musical tones differing in pitch, one tone forming the dot and the other, the dash, in common with the Morse code.

In 1904, his first patent for the "Murgas System of Rapid Wireless Telegraphy" was sold to the Universal Aether Co. of Philadelphia.

For the purposes of a public test of Father Murgas' system, $18,000 was appropriated to erect a 200-foot transmitting tower in north Wilkes-Barre and a similar one in Scranton, 19 miles away, the first of its type ever erected.

First test of the tower was made in September 1905, which was witnessed by several prominent men of the community, as well as by a Lieutenant Robinson, of the U.S. Navy, representing naval communications.

On November 23, 1905, was to occur a series of tests which brought this city into the national limelight as site of a unique scientific experiment, attracting representatives of the U.S. Government, scientists, the press, and many interested citizens of Wilkes-Barre and Scranton.

The first test included messages exchanged between Mayor Fred C. Kirkendall of Wilkes-Barre and Mayor Alexander R. Connell of Scranton, and the system of communication between the two evperimental towers was considered successful in every way.

A CREATIVE GENIUS

A scientific report rendered after Father Murgas filed his first patents, called him "a man of great creative genius" and cited him prominently for his original and valuable contributions to the development of "the remarkable innovation of transmission by wireless telegraphy."

The report stated: "The second patent letter describes a new method of wireless communication, the so-called tone system. The invention consists of the construction in proper relation of the units of the so-called oscillatory circuit apparatus in the sending station, comprising the condensers, inductances, the spark gap and by a given electrical energy adjusting the same permanently in such a way that they emit a musical tone of a certain pitch.

"By selecting properly the units of the mentioned closed circuit in the sending station, it is possible to obtain at will several tones of different pitch, of which can be formed the alphabet replacing the Morse signals, the dot with one tone and the dash with another one of different pitch.

"Because the tones thus obtained to form the Morse code do not depend upon time duration, the musical tones emitted are all of short duration, but differ in pitch, thus making it possible to send and receive signals with greater ease and certainty.

"PERFECT RECEPTION

"However, this property of utilizing tones is not the only factor in establishing Father Murgas' system as superior to all rivals, as one of the greatest advantages in the perfect reception of signals from long distances. By negotiating a common sender in a sending station, the spark emitted from the spark gap has irregular crackling noises, and in receiving the same from a distance, the noise is similar to the ever-present static interfering therefore with the clear reading of the signals.

"On the other hand, in signals employing the musical tones, the pitch of the tone is clearly distinguished from the static noises, thus making possible direct messages between points of greater remoteness."

Following the unique experiment on November 23, 1905, of interchanging wireless messages from the towers in Wilkes-Barre to another in Scranton, 19 miles distance, Rev. Father Joseph Murgas journeyed to New York to meet with two other inventors in radio communication who had newly arrived in America—the now-famous Marconi and his associate, Professor Fessenden.

DESTROYED BY GALE

Meanwhile, a quirk of fate was destined to prevent continuation of the Wilkes-Barre to Scranton tower experiments, when the Scranton station was destroyed by a gale.

Shortly thereafter, two prominent members of the Universal Aether Co., which had been formed to test the Murgas system, died and with this withdrawal of financial support, all work on the local project was abandoned.

MARCONI USED SYSTEM

Both Marconi and Professor Fessenden had already known of the Murgas inventions before arriving in America, and had made what they termed "improvements" to his tested procedures which they called the sonorous system.

Undaunted by the abandonment of his wireless projects here in Wilkes-Barre, and by the fact that others were claiming part of his inventions as their own, Rev. Father Murgas continued his research here, perfecting 12 additional patents in the field of wireless telegraphy invention.

It has been felt by biographers that it was only through a technicality that due credit had never been given the Slovak clergyman as the foremost inventor of wireless telegraphy, the predecessor of radio.

RECEIVED SOME HONORS

Rev. Father Murgas, however, was to receive honors before his death, including the highest award of achievement from his native Slovakia, which was also to issue a commemorative postage stamp in his honor; the distinction of having a Liberty ship named after him; also his appointment by President Coolidge as a member of the National Radio Commission, to mention a few.

Even today, Father Murgas' inventions are difficult to comprehend, so far ahead were they of the times. The Universal Aether Co., which could have been the A.T. & T. Co. of that era, had great plans to erect a whole system of towers nationwide—all similar to the ones erected on an experimental basis here in Wilkes-Barre and in Scranton back at the turn of the century, and which were far ahead of the times.

Call it what you wish, fate, misfortune, misadventure—Rev. Father Murgas never really received the public acclaim to which he was entitled and as a result, Wilkes-Barre never fully shared in the limelight as the site of the first telegrapher's tower ever erected in this country.

While the innovation of wireless telegraphy did not occur until shortly after the turn of the century, Wilkes-Barre had been one of the earliest communities outside of eastern metropolitan centers to be linked up with a major network of telegraph lines.

On November 15, 1848, this notice appeared under a headline in the Wilkes-Barre Advocate:

"A gentleman from Washington visited the village the early part of the week for the purpose of inquiring into the practicability of establishing a magnetic telegraph line to connect with Philadelphia. In order to get the line, $4,500 worth of stock must be subscribed for."

A year later, the Philadelphia & Wilkes-Barre Telegraph Co. was formed, with H. M. Fuller of Wilkes-Barre as a director, and the line began supply service to way points, from an office in the store of S. B. Collins, until the line was finally completed to Philadelphia in 1863. First telegraph operator here

was J. L. Mingle and the first message which came over the wire was that announcing the death of President Zachary Taylor.

Just 100 years ago, on July 9, 1863, the office was moved to Seth Tuck's drugstore on Public Square, where a competing line, called the Susquehanna West & North Branch Co., also supplied telegraph service. Later, after all these smaller competing lines had been absorbed by Western Union Telegraph Co., the merged offices were relocated for a time in the Wilkes-Barre Record Building.

Results of 1964 Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year my office mailed out 113,000 questionnaires—reaching every home in my congressional district.

The return was 18,367, or 16.2 percent, which is far above the national average for similar surveys.

On most questions, whether dealing with domestic issues or foreign affairs, a definite pattern emerged. My constituents were either definitely for or decidely against a given program. About the closest thing to a standoff came on the question:

Do you favor Federal aid to education for construction of public schools?

On that particular question, the favorable responses totaled 42.2 percent compared with 50.9 percent for the opposition. Only 6.9 percent were undecided or had no opinion.

With respect to whether or not our foreign aid program was effective, 69.9 percent or a better than four-to-one margin answered in the negative.

The complete results of the questionnaires are as follows:

Results of 1964 legislative questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Domestic issues:			
1. With regard to medical care for the elderly do you favor—			
(a) Increasing social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65?	24.3	62.7	13.0
(b) A tax credit or Federal financing to enable individuals to purchase private insurance for both medical and hospital care?	31.9	46.2	21.9
(c) Federal participation in any area in this field?	21.9	54.0	24.1
2. Do you favor Federal aid to education for—			
(a) The construction of public schools?	42.2	50.9	6.9
(b) Paying teachers' salaries?	16.2	72.8	11.0
(c) Private and/or parochial schools?	11.1	78.0	10.9
3. Do you believe a constitutional amendment should be passed to permit prayers in public schools on an optional and nonsectarian basis?	64.8	28.6	6.6
4. Do you believe a Federal budget in excess of $100,000,000,000 is justified during peacetime?	12.9	74.2	12.9
5. Do you believe we should start a Domestic Youth Conservation Corps?	37.9	39.5	22.6
6 Do you favor the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs?	14.6	65.4	20.0
7. Do you believe we are spending too much in space exploration?	61.5	27.7	10.8
8. Do you favor legislation to establish a $375,000,000 Federal program to assist in mass transportation?	13.4	68.0	18.6
9. Do you support a plan which would provide for gradual withdrawal by the Government from farm programs?	83.3	10.2	6.5
10. Do you feel the Federal Government is usurping the powers of State and local governments?	70.5	19.4	10.1
Foreign affairs:			
1. Do you favor admission of Red China to the United Nations?	9.3	82.4	8.3
2. Do you feel more effective steps should be taken to eliminate the Communist threat in Cuba and Latin America?	88.1	6.1	5.8
3. With regard to foreign aid do you feel—			
(a) It is effective?	15.5	69.9	14.6
(b) Economic aid to other nations should be continued?	37.0	43.6	19.4
(c) Military aid to other nations should be continued?	41.0	37.8	21.2
4. Should the President have authority to extend credit to communistic nations for purchase of agricultural commodities?	13.3	80.9	5.8

Fernandina Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, Fernandina Beach, Fla., in my congressional district, is tremendously rich in history. On June 5 and 6 of this year, the General Duncan Lamont Clinch Historical Society will present a pageant titled, "The Romance of Eight Flags."

This great pageant will interpret, in music and dance, the early history of this area—the only part of the United States that has been under eight flags.

I should like to insert here for the RECORD a splendid article which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, May 24, of this year, concerning the beautiful and historic city of Fernandina Beach, Fla.

FETE FOR FLORIDA'S FERNANDINA BEACH

FERNANDINA BEACH, FLA.—This little resort city in northeast Florida, as rich in history as St. Augustine, Fort Caroline or Pensacola, is planning a restoration project in what is called Old Town. This consists of five square blocks of homes that were built during the settlement's second Spanish period, which started in 1783.

On June 5 and 6, the Gen. Duncan Lamont Clinch Historical Society will present a pageant titled "The Romance of Eight Flags." This will interpret, in music and dance, the early history of this area—the only part of the United States that has been under eight flags. Other areas of Florida can boast of no more than five. Representatives of France, Spain, England, Mexico, and the United States, whose flags flew over Fernandina at one time or another, have been invited to attend the affair. The area was also ruled by adventurers during two brief periods, and, of course, by Indians.

Amelia Island, on which Fernandina Beach is situated, was inhabited by Timuquan Indians when the French admiral, Jean Ribault, sailed into the harbor in May 1562. Following the French, the Spanish built a mission and fort.

RULED BY ENGLAND

From 1763 to 1783, the English flag flew over the island. Then the Spanish returned under a treaty with the British. Fernandina, a Spanish town close to the U.S. border, became a haven for smugglers and slave traders when the Embargo Act of 1807 closed American ports to foreign shipping. As a free port, Fernandina thrived upon illicit trade.

Then a group of American patriots, with the Government's blessing, seized Fernandina and raised the flag of "The Republic of Florida." Gen. John McIntosh became Governor. Fernandina later returned to Spanish rule, but in June 1817, Gen. Sir Gregory McGregor, a Scot with a flair for adventure, captured the town, ran up a white flag with a green cross, and ruled for a few months.

In October of that year, the French pirate, Luis Aury, who had been appointed Governor of Texas under the new Mexican Government, seized Fernandina and hoisted the flag of Mexico. Soon afterward, the United States sent troops, who held Fernandina in trust for the Spanish until 1821, when the United States bought Florida from Spain.

In 1847, the United States built a fort on the island's military reservation, which was named Fort Clinch in honor of Gen. Duncan Lamont Clinch, a veteran of the Seminole and Mexican Wars. Today, Fort Clinch State Park is one of the showplaces of the State park system and a popular camping ground, particularly during the summer months, for many Florida vacationists.

SITE OF PAGEANT

The June pageant will be held on the fort's parade grounds. It will be an annual fund-raising affair, the proceeds to go toward rebuilding the Old Town.

The restoration project was initiated by the Historical Society about a year ago, when an arrangement was made with the Florida Park Service for an archeological excavation of the ruins of Fort San Carlos; the fort is situated in the center of the restoration area and owned by the park service. An archeologist of Florida State University, aided by students, participated in the project.

During the 1963 legislative session, a State restoration commission was created, but no money was appropriated. However, an anonymous donor purchased property in the restoration area to preserve the site for the program. The Historical Society has hopes of receiving assistance from the Florida Outdoor Recreation Commission.

One of the projects is the reconstruction of Fort San Carlos. The society has received technical assistance from Alfred Manucy, historian for the National Park Service at St. Augustine, and from Dr. Charles Arnade, head of the history department of the University of Florida, who has done extensive work in the St. Augustine restorations.

One of the historical episodes that will be reenacted in the pageant is Florida's first and only bullfight, which took place in Fernandina about 1811. It will be interpreted as a ballet, although the original was the real thing.

A LADY HONORED

The story is that a Captain Pangua, commandant of Fort San Carlos, gave an elaborate party in honor of one Doña Isabel, a

Fernandina beauty, in which the bullfight was a feature. The fight was staged in an orange grove, where a small grandstand and sawdust ring were built. A matador, so the story goes, armed with only a stiletto, fought with a young, wild bull. The fight was declared a draw.

One of the personages of the early days who will be represented in the pageant is Don Domingo Fernandez, an astronomer who received a grant of land from the Spanish Government prior to 1800. It was on his property that the village of Fernandina was situated.

For those who motor to Florida on U.S. 1, 23, 301, or 17, Fernandina Beach is easily reached. Travelers on U.S. 1, 23, and 301, should turn eastward on A1A at Callahan; those coming south on U.S. 17 should turn eastward on A2A at Yule.

Even for those who may not want to devote their vacation time to things historical, there is much that is of interest in Fernandina Beach. The Florida Park Service calls Fort Clinch State Park "one of the finest military-nature-seaside parks in the Nation."

MANY ACCOMMODATIONS

There are miles of cottages and motels along a beautiful beach. An 18-hole golf course lies within a few hundred feet of the ocean, and there is a fishing pier jutting into the Atlantic.

Fernandina Beach is noted also for the first and only "marine welcome station" in the world. Situated on the Intracoastal Waterway, it is one of the first sights for boatmen approaching Fernandina from the north.—C.E.W.

Automation: Chill or Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues part II of the symposium on automation which appeared in the winter 1964 edition of the University of Chicago's magazine Context. Part II is written by Arnold Weber, associate professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago. Part II follows:

II. THE HAVE-NOTS AT HOME

(By Arnold R. Weber)

What kind of training programs should be provided for those made jobless by automation?

The last time full employment was attained in the American economy was in 1953, when unemployment fell to 2.9 percent of the labor force. Since 1957, the average unemployment rate has been 5.5 percent or more, and all forms of political exorcism have failed to cut this economic devil down to size.

The severity of the unemployment problem has been accentuated by the parallel increase in the proportion of long-term or hard-core unemployed.

Unemployment, like all other forms of leisure, has not been evenly distributed among the various segments of the population. If a person is under 20 years of age, or a Negro, or a recent school dropout, the odds that he will be jobless will range between 1 in 4 and 1 in 9. At the other end of the chronological scale, the unemployment rate for workers over 45 years of age is somewhat below the national average, but in the event that an older worker is laid off from his job there is a strong likelihood that he will face a prolonged period of joblessness. In 1962, approximately 40 percent of the long-term unemployed fell into this age category.

These inauspicious developments have taken place against a backdrop of extensive technological change popularly identified as "automation." Broadly speaking, automation involves the substitution of machines for human effort and judgment in the implementation and control of production.

The effect of recent technological change on employment cannot be easily determined. It is possible, however, to offer a few generalizations with some degree of confidence.

First, it is undeniable that in specific situations technical change, i.e., automation, has resulted in a net reduction in employment. This consequence has been observed in particular plants in the meatpacking, oil-refining, electronics, coal, and paper industries. Paradoxically, these reductions in employment may not result in any direct unemployment, because the size of the work force is diminished by the so-called attrition approach, through deaths, resignations, and retirements. Nonetheless, there is a diminution of particular employment opportunities which no longer exist for new entrants into the labor market.

Second, automation has been a powerful force contributing to changes in the structure of the labor force. Recent technological advances have dealt the heaviest blows to semiskilled operatives and industrial laborers—those groups that have long been the exemplification of blue-collar virtue. At the same time, automation has led to major gains in the number of professional and technical workers, mechanics, repairmen, and other occupational groups concerned with the development and maintenance of complex productive equipment. In aggregate, automation has reinforced other trends in the economy which have undermined the dominance of blue-collar workers.

One additional consequence of automation for the structure of employment warrants attention. When a firm introduces a major technical change it is likely to make other basic economic adjustments, particularly those relating to the geographical location of production facilities. Thus, when advanced technology is introduced it probably will be in a new plant located in an area that meets a broad range of economic requirements.

Third, the problems posed by the persistence of high unemployment rates and the diffusion of technical change are not likely to be dissipated by the passage of time. Indeed, it would be difficult for Dr. Pangloss—or even Casey Stengel—to retain equanimity in the face of current labor-force trends. During the decade of the 1960's the United States will experience the largest increase in the work force for any 10-year period in history, when 26 million new young workers enter the labor market. Even with the attrition of people presently working, the Nation's labor force will grow by 13 million. Nearly half of this net increase will be youths under 25 years of age.

The existence of unemployment is, of course, nothing new. In the past, the economy, through the operation of open labor markets, has been able to respond effectively to changing conditions. However, this capacity for adaptation is being impaired by developments that threaten to establish enduring cleavages in the labor market between the "haves" and the "have-nots." These developments stem from corporate and union policies formulated within the context of the new technological environment.

Driven by increased fringe-benefit costs, many corporations have adopted conscious programs to stabilize employment in their plants and offices. In general, such programs aim at maintaining a relatively constant number of employees over the year and adjusting man-hours to production requirements. This means that production increases are more likely to result in reaping of overtime by workers who are presently employed rather than in hiring of new employees who will impose additional benefit obligations on the company.

Trade unions have added their own bricks to the walls that divide the labor market. Since the end of World War II, unions have pressed for pension and welfare plans, supplemental unemployment benefits, and a diversity of related fringe items. These measures undoubtedly have afforded greater security to the incumbent worker, but, as indicated, they have also created an incentive for employers to restrict the distribution of employment opportunities to fewer workers. At the same time, the actuarial basis for many of the fringe benefits, such as pensions, has created additional obstacles to the reemployment of older workers.

The situation is aggravated by the requirements for entry into the fastest growing sections of the labor force. The rapid growth in the number of white-collar jobs has meant a sharp increase in educational requirements. In 1962, professional and technical workers in the labor force averaged 16.2 years of education, clerical workers 12.5 years, machine operatives 10.1 years, and laborers 8.7 years. Not everyone will be able to fill the position of oceanographer, health physicist, or data telemetrist, or to serve in the other exotic callings cited by the Department of Labor as occupations for which there will be a shortage of qualified persons. The problem is underscored by the expectation that approximately 30 percent of the 26 million new entrants into the labor force in this decade will not have completed high school.

Blocked from traditional blue-collar jobs by protective corporate and union arrangements, persons seeking entry into the white-collar occupations will, in many cases, be thwarted by failure to satisfy minimum educational standards. The unemployment rate for the school dropout has risen sharply in recent years, and in 1961 was 27 percent. In addition, when he did find a job, the male dropout was increasingly likely to be employed in the lower paying, less secure, service or casual labor occupations.

Essentially, the problem of employment in a free society can be attacked in only two ways: by maintaining a high level of demand for goods and services and thus for labor; and by facilitating the matching of workers with jobs that are available or that will become available as a consequence of economic change.

To date, two types of Government programs have been initiated or are contemplated to enhance the employability of jobless workers: the various retraining measures and the proposed Youth Employment Act. The first major Federal support for the concept of retraining was provided by the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. This legislation specifies that the Federal Government may assist depressed areas to retrain unemployed workers as part of a comprehensive plan for local economic development.

The ARA was followed by the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 which signaled the most ambitious Government venture in retraining. Over a 3-year period an estimated 400,000 workers will enjoy the benefits of the act.

The expenditure of large amounts of resources for training is bound to have some salutary effect on the condition of the unemployed. The crucial question, however, is whether these resources will be utilized in the most effective manner. In this respect, these programs suffer from some serious defects in concept and administration. Neither act offers financial support for the voluntary geographical relocation of retrainees. Without the encouragement of geographical labor mobility, any retraining activity aimed

at the unemployed operates under severe limitations: the trick is to bring coal miners to new jobs rather than coal to West Virginia.

Beyond this statutory defect, there is substantial evidence that the officials charged with the administration of the retraining acts have imposed excessively stringent selection standards on prospective trainees. An examination of the characteristics of the initial participants in the training courses reveals that the highest proportion came from the younger better educated applicants. Only 10 percent of the manpower development trainees were 45 years or over in contrast with the 40 percent of the long-term unemployed who fall into that age group. Similarly, 60 percent of the manpower development trainees had 12 or more years of education while, as indicated, an estimated 75 percent of the hard-core jobless had failed to complete high school.

Present Federal retraining efforts are also limited by deficiencies in the operational concept of training. That is, current training programs generally are limited to the acquisition of specific skills. This approach, of course, is a necessary component of effective training. However, the universal application of this principle means that many applicants who may have the ability to learn, but who lack competence in fundamental educational areas, are denied the opportunity to acquire new skills. For example, one manpower development program involved the training of electronic technicians. Applicants were limited to persons with 1 year of college. Because persons with 1 year of college were less likely to be unemployed than jobseekers with fewer years of education, the employment service resorted to newspaper advertisements to recruit applicants with the desired prerequisites.

The Youth Employment Act, introduced in Congress in 1963, offers another alternative for coping with the present and prospective problems of employment. As its title indicates, this act is directed at providing employment opportunities for young people by the establishment of Conservation Corps camps and local service programs. But it is difficult to see how this act can have any substantial impact on the problem of rising unemployment among young people. Trimming trees, digging irrigation ditches, and cultivating picnic grounds can scarcely be expected to equip young people for a highly productive working life today.

These deficiencies are cast in sharper relief by reference to the cost of the program. Estimates of the annual cost per enrollee range from $4,000 to as high as $10,000, depending on whether one is for or against the act. Even if the lower figure is accepted as a reasonable projection, it should be compared with the actual cost of $1,200 per trainee under the manpower development program. In addition, the $4,000 figure includes only $300 in the "education and training" category. By all relevant standards the expected returns would not justify an expenditure of this magnitude when more efficient alternatives may exist.

The local area youth employment provisions of the act appear to have a slightly greater promise, since they do provide for gainful employment in a job that has at least some relevance to the modern world. Also, it is easier to accept the contention that this activity may help to reduce the school dropout rate. On the other hand, even without the burden of subsistence allowances underwritten by the Youth Conservation Corps, the program will cost an estimated $1,700 per enrollee, or 40 percent more than the average cost per trainee under the manpower development program. Also, the types of jobs contemplated for the enrollees will still leave the young person on the outside of those sheltered segments of the labor market in which the more generous economic returns are to be won.

Programs for occupational training such as the manpower development program should focus primarily on long-term members of the labor force who have been victimized by technical change and geographical shifts in employment opportunities. Here retraining can create a sense of mobility in workers whose established skills have been rendered obsolete or redundant. Under these circumstances, retraining does not have to transform the unemployed person into a polished professional worker. Rather, it can provide him with "foothold skills" by which he can climb to a new career. In many instances, this will mean a movement away from industrial jobs to employment in the service sector, where opportunities have been multiplying rapidly and where age restrictions are not as stringent. Thus, Government programs should concentrate on the difficult cases. Training and placing older workers with limited educational backgrounds can be a hard and possibly unrewarding task. But relegating these persons to public relief rolls is an equally burdensome alternative.

Second, retraining should be linked to Government support for voluntary geographical relocation. Support for voluntary relocation is commonplace in several countries in Western Europe, where it has helped to promote sound labor market operations. In addition, the payment of moving allowances is becoming an important issue in collective bargaining and recently has been negotiated for workers in a few industries.

Third, greatly expanded investment should be made for the renovation of vocational education. Vocational education in the United States has long had an anachronistic quality, signified by breadboards and plowshares. The basic legislation for Federal support of vocational education is the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. Under this act, and supplementary statutes, more than half of the $48 million appropriated for vocational education annually is earmarked for the support of training in home economics and agricultural occupations. With a fine sense of irony, this distribution of funds runs directly counter to current labor-force trends. In 1950, approximately 15 percent of the labor force was engaged in agricultural vocations; in 1960, only 8.5 percent of the Nation's work force remained on the farm.

Fourth, public programs to expand the job horizons of the young should supplement rather than serve as a substitute for private efforts. Each year, as a matter of course, private industry trains and retrains millions of workers for jobs that are presently available. To attain maximum leverage, Government activities should attempt to build upon these private ventures.

Greater consideration should be given to methods for creating financial incentives for employers to expand on-the-job training opportunities for young people. There is the obvious danger that employers will reap a premium for doing what they might do in any event; however, these costs may be overbalanced by the benefits derived from breaching the barriers that separate the youthful unemployed from the well-paid, technologically advanced sectors of the labor market.

Last, the major private economic institutions will have to assume their burden of responsibility for maintaining equality of access to employment opportunities. On the corporate side, this means the removal of restrictions based on race and other extraneous considerations. Also, the larger firms especially can devote increased resources to comprehensive planning in order to balance future manpower requirements against the present age distribution of workers in the firm.

On the union side, the maintenance of open labor markets will require a reevaluation of present programs for employee security. For years unions fought long, bitter battles to elevate the economic status of those they considered to be oppressed and downtrodden. Now, through the extension of pension plans, expanded seniority units, and interplant transfer systems, unions may engender a new form of discrimination based on the simple fact of present job incumbency.

Without a general improvement in economic conditions, basic changes in union policy are not likely to be forthcoming. Unions are steadfast proponents of the old maxim that charity begins at home. Nonetheless, a few unions, such as the electrical workers' union in New York City, have made concerted efforts to open up economic opportunities for young people, many of whom are members of minority groups. With pressure from outside agencies, this effort may give rise to modest emulation.

The concern about unemployment and automation should not obscure the fact that 68 million people are at work in the United States today. In addition, it is readily conceded that technological change has been a powerful engine that has helped to create great wealth and to move our standard of living steadily upward. These observations do not explain away the present problems. Instead, they underscore the possibility that effective remedial programs may be developed. Economic privation will always be with us in one form or another, but it is because we enjoy a high level of well-being as a nation that we can afford to allocate resources to the alleviation of such hardship. Indeed, the lessons of the past indicate that the problems of employment will be solved one way or the other, through various economic and political measures. It would be best, however, if we met the challenge on our own terms and within the framework of a free labor market, rather than having solutions thrust upon us by forces beyond our control.

Scouting Leads to a Strong Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call attention today to one of the most important institutions helping to mold America for the future—Scouting. The North Florida Council of the Boy Scouts of America is a particularly fine group of young men and adults who have received national recognition for their role in extending the advantages of good citizenship through Scouting to the people of north Florida. I congratulate Council President Prime F. Osborn, of Jacksonville, who has given his time and efforts to the Scouting movement, and to all the other men of the community who have played such an unselfish role in this endeavor. I would also like to praise an outstanding Boy Scout executive, Horace S. Williamson, of Jacksonville, who has done so much to build boys into industrious, dedicated young men. The Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of May 22, 1964, has an excellent editorial on the north Florida council, and I am pleased to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a former Boy Scout and Eagle Scout, the work that is being done

in my home area is particularly inspiring to me.

[From the Florida Times-Union, May 22, 1964]

BOY SCOUTS ARE TAUGHT ETERNAL VERITIES

Honors awarded the North Florida Council of the Boy Scouts of America at the annual meeting of Scouting's National Council in Cleveland, Ohio, came at a fortuitous moment to spotlight the council's effective work just as it is launching a drive to make possible even greater service.

The north Florida council was cited for outstanding work in extending the advantages of Scouting to youths in rural areas of its jurisdiction, which extends from the Georgia line south to Levy and Marion Counties, west to Live Oak, and to Cedar Key on the gulf coast.

Present to accept the award were Council President Prime F. Osborn, vice president and general counsel of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, and Horace S. Williamson, council Scout executive.

The council was designated a "Rural Blue Ribbon Council" in recognition of the 1963 increase of 60 units of approximately 900 scouts in its area. Such growth, the citation declared, "has made a significant contribution to rural America and our Nation."

Anything which honors and encourages the rural boyhood tradition serves the Nation's greatest source of strength. The ideals and goals of the Scout movement, indeed, emphasize those elements of independence, self-reliance, and initative which are most strongly nurtured by a rural upbringing.

The facetious remark, often heard in a derogatory sense, that "you can take a boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of a boy" takes on a higher meaning in the light of scouting's dedication to the preservation of those "old fashioned" virtues in the characters of rural and urban boys alike.

In that sense, scouting takes on even greater importance in the face of population trends toward urbanization, and becomes an effective antidote to the poison of new and dangerous social theories encouraging young people in the belief that the world owes them a living, and security from cradle to grave.

Citation of the North Florida Council follows close on announcement of plans for a $533,000 capital funds drive to be held next year, on a 3-year pledge basis, to finance purchase of a new campsite and improve existing facilities. The drive, to be held separately from the United Fund campaign, has been approved by the United Community Services executive committee.

The recognition accorded the North Florida Council by national leaders testifies to its effectiveness in promoting and preserving the ideals of scouting, and should spur every resident of the council area to give moral and financial support to the expansion drive.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, day after tomorrow is the day we set aside each year at which time we pause in reverent memory of our loved ones who have gone to their reward. It is the day we stand silently and with prayer in our hearts, decorate their last resting place. It is the day we pay tribute to our brave Nation's defenders who served under the Stars and Stripes, that we who followed them, might continue to be free.

Because they had beat their plows into swords, most of them at much sacrifice, a grateful people have generally shown their appreciation, by proper deeds, as well as by words.

Mr. Speaker, there is one glaring exception to that national virtue. Many of our retiring World War I veterans found themselves and their families in a nearly destitute condition, hence shortly after that war, a law was enacted by Congress, giving them a monthly pension of from $8 to $20, that they might be kept out of the breadlines, and live as best they could like respectable American citizens, but lest we forget, that meager pension was taken from them early in 1933 by a new administration who had just come into power, by promising to reduce the cost of Government by at least 25 percent. Those veterans were then required to take a pauper's oath, before they could again be placed on the pension rolls, which most of them refused to do out of self-respect for themselves and their families. Most of them controlled their feelings for a time, and until the new administration began piling on the Federal payroll, thousands of their political henchmen at high salaries, costing hundreds of times more than the small pensions that had been paid our veterans.

It was this disgraceful act that triggered the memorable bonus march on Washington, D.C. Those marchers were driven out of town by military forces demanded from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Yes, lest we forget.

Need I say more, Mr. Speaker, in defense of those many needy World War I veterans living today, whose average age is now over 70, and who are pleading with Members of Congress and the President to grant them a $100 per month pension?

Here is my recent statement to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in support of the many bills that have been introduced providing for the above:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN, OF IOWA, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members, I appreciate this opportunity to state my position on my bill, H.R. 4536, and other similar bills that provide a hundred dollars per month for our aging World War I veterans. I sincerely hope and pray that this committee will act favorably, and report our bill out of committee very soon, so it can get to the floor of the House and Senate during this session.

Mr. Chairman, if our bill can be considered by the House and Senate, I am confident it will pass both bodies by a large majority, for I know most every Member wants Uncle Sam to be fair and just to our World War I vets, their wives, and widows, by extending to them equal treatment with Civil War and Spanish War vets, their wives, and widows.

The average age of the World War I veteran is now over 70, and they are going down the valley fast, one by one. In 10 more years, only a relatively few of them will be with us. Let us make the remaining years of their lives just a little more happy by the passage of our bill.

Yes, I am a conservative, Mr. Chairman, but I will never have it on my conscience, nor will I be guilty of economizing on those who served and fought under Old Glory, that you and I might be privileged to enjoy the blessings of freemen.

In conclusion, I must say that I hope my bill, which provides for no means test, will be approved by this committee. No means test was imposed on our Civil War and Spanish War veterans, and I am sure, my colleagues, that few well-to-do World War I vets will make application for this pension. To ask a veteran of any of our wars to in effect, sign a pauper's oath, to me does not square with our American tradition toward our Nation's defenders. Also from a dollar standpoint, it would require only a few people to mail out the checks if no means test is provided, while if a means test is provided, it will require thousands of additional Federal employees to check carefully each and every applicant's financial worth, and in addition will cause considerable embarrassment to many veterans, their wives, and families.

I trust you will very soon report a bill out, and preferably without a means test.

Thank you.

In closing, please Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, indulge me long enough to recite a poem, "The Unknown Soldier," in honor and memory of those who gave their all that we might be free. This poem was composed by an unknown author during those trying days after the above mentioned pensions had been taken from our needy veterans and their families.

"THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

"There's a graveyard near the White House,
where the Unknown Soldier lies,
And the flowers there are sprinkled, by the
tears from mothers' eyes.
I stood there not so long ago, with flowers
for the brave,
When suddenly I heard a voice, it sprang
out from the grave.
I am the Unknown Soldier, the spirit voice
began, and
Have a few questions I must ask, man to
man.
Are my buddies taken care of, was their
victory complete,
Or is the big reward you promised, selling
pencils on the street?
Did we really win that victory we struggled
to achieve,
And do you still respect that Croix de
Guerre, above that empty sleeve?
And that babe who sang, Hello Central, give
me No Man's Land,
Can you replace her daddy with a military
band?
Does a Gold Star in the window now mean
anything at all?
I wonder how my old girl feels when she
hears a bugle call.
I wonder if the profiteers have satisfied
their greed?
I wonder if a soldier's mother ever is in
need?
Yes, I am the Unknown Soldier, maybe I
died in vain.
But if I were alive and my country called,
I'd do it all over again."

An Example of "the Kansas Spirit"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1963, I was scheduled to participate in dedication ceremonies of the

Natoma, Kans., Medical Center, but did not because of the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22.

In reviewing the remarks prepared, I felt they might be of interest to my colleagues because of the ever-growing dependence upon the Federal Government for solutions to community problems and an ever-increasing number of appeals to Washington for aid, of one kind or another. The building of the Natoma clinic illustrates what can be done in a community, what was done in Natoma, Kans., and also the important role of the Sears, Roebuck Foundation community medical assistance program. This achievement is symbolic of "the Kansas spirit" and the invaluable efforts being made by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation in helping communities help themselves.

The remarks follow:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to be here today to take part in the formal opening of your new clinic and to join with you in welcoming Dr. and Mrs. Datillo to Natoma. I am especially delighted to participate for I know many of you and how long and tirelessly you have worked to make this day possible.

The pride and satisfaction you feel in seeing a community goal achieved, however, is more than equaled by my pride and admiration for the splendid manner in which you provided Natoma with medical treatment facilities and found a doctor to locate here. The second task proved more difficult than the first—and I will say more about that in a moment—the job of planning, building, and equipping a clinic of this type is a big one. Modern medical equipment for taking X-rays, electrocardiograms, and laboratory tests is costly, as you discovered. Nevertheless, once the need was determined nearly everyone contributed generously. I understand civic organizations and the Public Service Co. through its donation of part of the labor helped make the clinic a reality but that it was built principally through the efforts of many individual, public-spirited citizens from Natoma and the surrounding area.

It is certainly impressive—that your community has built a $33,000 clinic, complete with all the necessary medical equipment. Such an example of initiative, enterprise, and perseverance—qualities we associate with the growth and strength of this Nation—should make us proud to be Americans and Kansans. Carl Becker made an accurate appraisal of the people of this State when he wrote, "The Kansas spirit is the American spirit double distilled. It is a * * * product of American individualism and American idealism * * *." At any rate, whether we call it the Kansas spirit or the American spirit, all of you here today possess it in abundance. It is that spirit of independence and industrial responsibility which led to finding a way to solve your community problem without appealing to Washington for aid, as is habit—usually done these days.

In the face of your example of what can be done by a small community, one can question the necessity of some of the Federal programs. I firmly believe in the proposition the Federal Government should not do those things which communities can and should do for themselves, and feel certain many other communities and cities throughout the country can, as you have overcome the growing tendency of asking for aid before even trying to do the job alone. As a child never learns to climb the stairs if always carried, we do not learn to assume our rightful responsibilities if the Government is always standing by. It is sad, too, that just as the fond and anxious parent denies the toddler the exhilaration of having reached the top alone, an over indulgent Government precludes many communities from experiencing the pride and satisfaction you feel today.

I do not suggest, of course, that communities must be totally self-reliant and that there is no legitimate sphere in which local, State, and Federal Governments can properly assist. Your difficulties in planning a clinic and locating a doctor are evidence that expert assistance is sometimes needed. You found, however, a private foundation to give the guidance needed, and where this is available, it is certainly preferred, I believe.

The Sears-Roebuck foundation community medical assistance program is extremely interesting, and appears to be a particularly valuable kind of philanthropy. Over the years wealthy individuals and successful business corporations have built museums, libraries, and hospitals. They have endowed colleges, supported social welfare programs, and medical research foundations—to name just a few of the many forms American philanthropy has taken. Moreover, it would be difficult to overestimate the importance of these contributions to the improvement of social conditions in our country and to the enrichment of our intellectual and cultural life.

Now let us contrast this approach to the one taken by the Sears-Roebuck foundation in its medical assistance program.

Here we do not find the foundation building or endowing schools, libraries, or museums. Here we do not even find the foundation putting up funds and requiring that they be matched by the recipient of the funds.

Yet we see, just the same, a foundation which is rendering a great service. And it is doing so by helping the community to help itself.

Instead of making awards or grants, the foundation, under this program, supplies expert advice during all stages of a small community's efforts to build a clinic and find a doctor to practice there.

This assistance includes a survey of the area to determine the ability of the population to support a clinic or hospital, counseling in how to form a nonprofit organization to raise and administer funds, and finally help in obtaining suitable blueprints for the building. In the meanwhile the foundation is constantly looking for doctors interested in smalltown practice and acts as a sort of clearinghouse for information on vacancies and applicants.

According to an article which appeared in Business Week magazine about 2 years ago, the foundation spends approximately $7,000 for each town it helps in this way. However, the value to the community of this assistance is not accurately reflected by that figure, I am sure. Each community receives not only $7,000 worth of an expert's time spent in making surveys and drawing blueprints but also the incalculable benefits and savings which can be obtained by taking advantage of the foundation's knowledge and experience. Most important of all, of course, is the fact that in many cases small communities would probably not be successful in raising sufficient funds and attracting doctors without the guidance of the foundation's knowledge and experience. Monetary value cannot be assigned to show the value to a community in having its own doctor and adequate treatment facilities. Your hard work and financial sacrifices best indicate how important you think it is; therefore, I speak for all of you in thanking the Sears, Roebuck Foundation for helping make today's dedication possible.

This ceremony has aroused varied thoughts and feelings on my part. As stated I am proud to see the initiative and perseverance of the people of this community, and grateful to the Sears-Roebuck Foundation for its contribution, and know your frustration that this clinic has been unused for 4 years while you tried to locate a doctor. In persuading Dr. Dattilo to come, you have a man not only with fine academic credentials but one born and raised in Kansas. As you know, his wife, a trained nurse, serves as his assistant in the clinic, so it is really a family affair.

While I share in your satisfaction in having a doctor of osteopathy in Natoma, I am concerned about the growing shortage of physicians and osteopaths throughout the country, especially among general or family practitioners and especially in our rural areas. There are many reasons for failure to train enough doctors of all types today, but even more numerous and complex are the reasons more and more young doctors are choosing to specialize rather than enter general practice. I will not presume to say what may be done about these trends since a number of medical educators who participated in a recent AMA symposium on family practice failed to reach any conclusion on these points but it is extremely important an answer be found. The general practitioner has traditionally played a very important role in the health care of Americans, and there is every reason to believe that he can and should continue.

We must have specialists too, of course, but the general physician serves a unique function in preventive medicine and in family counseling. At the present time only about 22 percent of each year's graduating M.D.'s enter general practice as compared to 70 percent 30 years ago. This is of particular concern to us as a rural population since we can only hope to draw our community doctors from among these general practitioners. As this group grows smaller, we will have increasing difficulties. The ratio of doctors to the population which is now 79 per 100,000 in semirural counties and 46 per 100,000 in isolated rural counties (as compared to 146 per 100,000 in metropolitan areas) will probably become even more unfavorable.

Although the number of general practitioners is declining, this does not suggest that the public does not want them and prefers to use specialists exclusively. In a paper presented before the 1963 Annual Congress on Medical Education, Mr. Mac F. Cahal of Kansas City, who is executive director and general counsel of the American Academy of General Practice, reported the results of a recent poll made by the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J. The poll showed clearly that the public relies quite heavily upon general practitioners and that 75 percent call the general practitioners first when they need help. The poll further revealed that among all doctors—and far surpassing the profession as a whole—the general practitioner has the most favorable image and greatest reputation asset of any profession. Perhaps this study and others, as well as the increasing emphasis by the medical schools and the AMA upon family practice, will convince many young doctors of the valuable role they can perform as general physicians and that we will soon see an increase in the number choosing this field.

I have enjoyed being with you today to join in the long-awaited dedication of your clinic. May I congratulate you all once again on this remarkable achievement and wish you success in all future community projects.

Survey Serves on Land, Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, is the Nation's oldest scientific body, but its activities, important as they are, are unfortunately not well known to the general public.

Yet this agency, headed by Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, who has devoted almost his entire adult life to its advancement, plays a vital role in the life of the Nation. Upon the accuracy of its nautical and aeronautical charts depends the safe passage of our ships and planes. Its oceanographic operations are essential to the advancement of our commerce, engineering, and navigation. It oversees the operation of a worldwide network of seismographs which one day may lead to a system of detection against earthquakes. It administers a warning system which helps protect millions of people on the Pacific coast, in Hawaii, and elsewhere in the Pacific basin against the onslaught of destructive seismic sea waves; and it provides geodetic, geophysical, photogrammetric, and cartographic data for charting and scientific purposes and for defense needs.

Recently, the Copley News Service distributed to the San Pedro News-Pilot and other newspapers in California an article by John McLaren, one of its Washington correspondents, on the activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Mr. McLaren's article:

SURVEY SERVES ON LAND, SEA

(By John McLaren)

WASHINGTON.—The officers wear uniforms and have ranks like lieutenant and rear admiral, and most of them are handy with a plumb line in the desert or a tossing ship on the high seas. But they have no connection with the armed forces.

They are members of the Nation's oldest scientific group, the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, which came into being 157 years ago when Congress wanted to chart the Atlantic coast line.

No existing Federal agency was equipped to do the job, so the 1807 Congress authorized $25,000 for "a survey of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals and places of anchorage." President Thomas Jefferson named a renowned Swiss mathematician, Ferdinand R. Hassler, to head the new Federal surveying team.

Today the survey can claim, with justification, that the casual fisherman and the weekend yachtsman are equally dependent on the survey's charts and tide tables, though they may not know it.

The agency operates so quietly, in fact, that hardly anybody is aware its activities include dragging the ocean bottom for sunken ships.

Nor have many people heard about the survey's oceanography effort, greater than that of any other Federal civilian office. The survey has a 14-ship fleet probing the secrets of the deep.

The survey also is an official source of information on earthquakes, on the magnetic forces affecting compasses and radios, on varying pulls of gravity which can deflect a surveyor's plumb bob and on land points for controlling surveys and engineering surveys.

You name it, and if it's anything to do with ascertaining your location on this earth, the Survey probably can tell you.

The Survey's current Director, Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, 60, commands a force of 2,600 persons to perform the agency's varied tasks.

They deal with impressive numbers. For instance, they publish about 45 million aeronautical and nautical charts a year and are responsible for the upkeep of 550,000 bronze markers, scattered mostly in remote valleys and mountains.

The 200 officers, recruited from colleges, have alternating sea and land duty. "When they're on shore duty, they're rarely behind desks," a spokesman said. "Usually they're out in the field as chiefs of work groups."

A high degree of technical proficiency obviously is an asset, and most of the officers have studied engineering, oceanography, or one of the physical sciences.

The work is often unusual, like that of the "wrecking crew"—18 men in two ships—which is prodding the Gulf of Mexico for ancient ship hulls, abandoned sea derricks, and other sunken wrecks.

They are not treasure hunters or curiosity seekers. With a stainless steel dragwire, attached to two buoys pulled by the 66-foot vessels, they're dragging the sea bottom because they view the wrecks as potential hazards to shipping.

When the wire snags on an underwater object, it is duly noted on the nautical charts provided to boat operators. Survey spokesmen say more than 1,400 shipwrecks line the ocean floor off this Nation's three coasts.

There are 15 identified World War II German submarines off the Atlantic coast alone.

Automation: Chill or Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues part III of the symposium on automation which appeared in the winter 1964 edition of the University of Chicago's magazine Context. Part III is written by Thomas Whisler, professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago. Part III follows:

III. WILL EXECUTIVES BE OBSOLETE?

(By Thomas L. Whisler)

When a company's organizational structure is changed by automation, will managers become job hunters?

A revolution in the technology of management in private and public enterprise is well underway. One important effect of this revolution is to change the knowledge and skills required in management jobs so rapidly and completely that traditional methods of adapting to change within organizations will be inadequate. University schools of business and management staff specialists—groups primarily responsible for professional training of managers—will have to devise new means of meeting this problem, and, in the process, reorient and retrain themselves. In short, managers, professors, and deans share a serious problem.

I am aware that we seem to be bombarded perpetually by one expert or another with announcements that we are entering a new era of some sort, that the way we are doing things will shortly be archaic, and so forth. But I believe that a strong argument can be made in the case of the current technological change in management.

The technological change involves both machines—the computer hardware and concepts—organizations as information processing networks, decision problems as amenable to solution through logical models derived from mathematics and statistics, computers as simulators of all or parts of an organization.

This combination I call information technology, a technology moving in rapidly on organizations, large and small, private and public. I have lost count of how many computers are presently in operation in organizations, or on order. But 10 years ago the number was just above zero. Also, 10 years ago, operations research was not much more than a series of papers, read to each other by a few Government and university eggheads. Today operations research saves money, stirs controversy, and generates frustration and anxiety in hundreds of public and private organizations.

Information technology will have profound effects upon decisionmaking and upon organization structure and job content, chiefly at the managerial level. These effects have already shown up in some organizations and have been documented. They are:

1. The shape of the organization structure is altered, with the immediate effect being a reduction in the number of middle management jobs relative to the rest of the organization.

In one large corporation a 2-year program of computer installation reduced the number of managerial positions by 34 percent in the areas affected. Nonmanagerial positions were reduced by 20 percent. In the North American Defense Command, the installation of SAGE flattened the organization structure by one whole command level.

2. Traditional functions and departments in the organization are being broken up and rearranged as information flows cut new channels through the organization.

One organization has, through computer programs, so closely knit merchandising and production that these functions, formerly separated under two vice presidents, are now consolidated under one.

3. Control becomes more centralized at the management level.

A feed formula application, for example, resulted in central control of buying decisions by a large milling firm, decisions once made at the discretion of individual buyers. Such an application, by the way, is an example of the operations research aspect of information technology. Relatively little computer time is involved.

4. Decisionmaking becomes more quantitative, more explicit, more visible, more rational, less intuitive.

The steel warehouse manager who once tried simultaneously to minimize inventory investment and to deliver any steel form upon demand from the customer usually "played by ear" the decision of what inventory level to maintain. Higher level management often second-guessed him. Today, operations research people can present to top management a schedule of rates of exchange between service and investment, leaving the explicit choice to top management.

These are the primary effects. A variety of secondary effects follow. Some of these involve displacement. Managers must leave jobs they had because the jobs no longer exist. People get new jobs made up of pieces of jobs formerly held by others. These effects are familiar. They are like the ones that have occurred for years in the factory. The major difference—but an important

one—is that the group that suffers the consequences of these changes today is the group responsible for creating them: the managers. Additional but less obvious effects follow from the basic changes in jobs, organization, and decisionmaking. Many of the traditional concepts of how one approaches the job of managing are changing. For example:

1. The rhythm and scope of managerial planning change. At the same time that it becomes possible to extend strategic planning much farther into the future, it becomes possible and useful to shorten tactical planning periods.

Production planning, purchasing, labor force scheduling once were quarterly planning activities in one large corporation. Today they are done weekly. On the other hand, United Air Lines, with its "corporate laboratory" can estimate (through simulation) the effect of decisions far into the future.

2. The character of interpersonal relationships—man and boss, staff and line—changes. The former relationships may be becoming less crucial in day-to-day operations—the latter may be losing all meaning.

An Air Force officer writes of the effect of the electronic defense system upon personnel: "One of the queerest observations that I have made concerns this mass of engineers, technicians, machine operators, and operations people milling around and working almost unaware that anyone else exists. That is to say, there doesn't seem to be any interaction between the individuals. All of the interaction seems to be with the electronic system. This is quite a change from the old squadron where communication and interaction between individuals were a must to accomplish the mission. In addition, it carried over into the social environment and it developed friendships, cliques, and competitions. This leads to a question about the importance of tradition, regulations, lines of authority, and morale. These have always been an integral part of military organizations, but, in this instance, they seem to be relatively unimportant. I believe that the computer is the cohesive element in these up and coming systems, and they simply set the pace and individuals blindly follow. It's like a fire into which everyone is throwing everything he owns for fear that, should it go out, they will all die of the cold."

3. Concepts of loyalty to the company, of experience in relation to authority and pay, and of the ideal career pattern for a manager—concepts which have been dogma for years—are going by the boards. Young technologists don't care about such traditions. And, serious problems are created. In short, the attitudes and sentiments associated with the profession of management are changing as radically as the technology of management and its functional groupings. With such a variety of changes occurring, I believe, within half a management generation, we must anticipate the threat of managerial obsolescence. Experienced managers will find that their skills and knowledge (whether rule of thumb or textbook principle) no longer have the power they once had—and these managers may be 20 years from retirement. Their concepts of effective organization of human activity and of knowledge will need to be modified substantially. Their beliefs and philosophy will be considered old fashioned. A smaller group of managers will even face direct threat of unemployment in midcareer.

These changes will create a number of challenges for those of us in business education—executive retraining, reorganization of many parts of the business school curriculum, increasing the output of Ph. D.'s, research on the new technology and its effects, and—basic and important to all the others—substantial professional development and growth on the part of each of us as individual faculty members.

Let's Never Forget Individual Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pope Haley, editorial writer for the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., has written an article in praise of the individual citizen, who has far more sense and interest in the national welfare than some of the bureaucracy recognizes. Mr. Haley points out that we should never forget that the "consent of the governed" controls the fate and future of our Nation. I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his fine, well-written article:

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., May 22, 1964]

"CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED" CONTROLS

(By Pope Haley)

A Census Bureau experiment in "do-it-yourself" census taking in Louisville, Ky., and adjoining counties, the first ever undertaken in a large metropolitan area, resulted in what the bureau called a colossal response when two-thirds of the 240,000 forms were filled out and returned on the designated day.

Officials said the experiment would be considered a success if late returns, coming in within a few days after the target date, pushed the total response to 80 to 85 percent.

The elaborate test was undertaken to determine whether citizens and taxpayers would voluntarily spend a few minutes filling out a questionnaire and return it by mail, thereby saving the expense of census takers.

The system, combining the do-it-yourself questionnaire with automated processing, could result in tremendous savings in the next nationwide count in 1970.

It cost about 30 cents a person to count the 180 million population in 1960, and indications are the total will be 25 million greater in 1970. Census officials make no estimates of concrete savings, but predict that if the system proves workable, only about half of the 205,000 census takers employed in 1960 will be needed to make follow-up visits to those who fail to return questionnaires or who omitted some answers.

The questionnaire is a simple one, completed by penciling in small circles. It is fed directly into an optical scanner geared to electronic computers which record and tabulate the answers to all questions with a minimum of paperwork or chance of error.

The Louisville area was chosen for the test because it was a typical urban-suburban-rural area.

The promising success of the experiment only bears out the idea of citizen responsibility demonstrated each April 15 when the overwhelming majority of the Nation's taxpayers voluntarily and honestly report their taxable income, calculate the taxes due, and pay up or enter claims for refunds of overpayments according to their own calculations. Without such a high degree of taxpayer cooperation, the Nation's tax collectors agree, the system would quickly break down and tax collection would become an impossible job.

In these and many other ways, the Government relies, and must rely, on the commonsense, honesty, and patriotism of the individual private citizen in keeping the necessary functions of government operating. When the rank and file are convinced a project is necessary or desirable, their support and cooperation will be forthcoming. With that cooperation, success is assured; without it, it is impossible.

This is the essential ingredient scorned by the power hungry who would dictate rather than lead, and who regard individuals as pawns in a power play rather than the source of their power. Vested bureaucracy to the contrary notwithstanding, government still derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed."

Dr. W. A. Lanagan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, east Texas and Texas lost one of the great and outstanding schoolmen of Texas very recently. I include an editorial that was written May 5, 1964, by our very outstanding east Texas publisher, Hon. Carl Estes, the publisher of the Longview Daily News, Longview, Tex. It appropriately summarizes the attainments of this outstanding educator, Dr. Lanagan. We all lament his passing.

The editorial follows:

DR. W. A. LANAGAN

(After receiving by airmail special delivery a copy of Thursday's Longview Daily News carrying the story about the untimely death of his good friend Dr. W. A. Lanagan, publisher Carl Estes called long distance from Ames, Iowa, and dictated the following editorial:)

Longview was stunned and saddened by the tragic news of the death of Dr. William A. Lanagan, the brilliant superintendent of Pine Tree schools.

His passing removes from the Texas educational scene one of its greatest and most influential personalities.

Dr. Lanagan's splendid record of achievement here had received national recognition and wide acclaim throughout the State.

Blessed with keen imagination, vision, perseverance and dynamism, this outstanding self-made man was endowed with all the qualities of good leadership.

The tribute paid him last November by Dr. Holmes Webb, of Texas Technological College, was an excellent world portrait. "Bill Lanagan," he wrote, "is a two-fisted administrator who is very capable and puts forth every effort to have the best school possible. He is possessed of unusual energy and determination and is creative."

Dr. Webb's praise was in an article he wrote about his friend for publication in Texas School Business, a periodical for school management. It was used in conjunction with the magazine's selection of Dr. Lanagan as "Educator of the Month."

His assignment at Pine Tree was a tremendous challenge, and he accepted it with the same tenacity and courage that had carried him through high school and college, on to positions of great responsibility in several schools and one college. Eighteen new classrooms were added to the large, modern school

plant the first year he was superintendent. Eighteen additional classrooms were completed in 1961 as well as a new auditorium seating 1,000 persons. Several weeks ago he directed a successful campaign for a $450,000 bond issue for further expansion. The size and scope of his job at Pine Tree can be readily appreciated by the knowledge that the school had a 75-percent growth in scholastic population during his 6-year tenure.

Bill Lanagan knew that only through work can an objective be reached. At the early age of 14, he started on his own by making the most of the time available to him while he was not in classes. He served at intervals as a motion picture projectionist, theater manager, and retail manager. He was a product of the Longview school system from the eighth grade through high school. College was a financial struggle, and it took 6 years for him to get his B.B.A. He was on the college honor list 4 years.

It was during his service as a commissioned officer in the Coast Guard, in which he enlisted in 1942, that his interest was aroused in the teaching field. As commanding officer of a troop carrier and freighter in the Pacific, he was in contact with many young men who had not made the most of their educational opportunities. This caused him to chart the course that was to bring happiness and success in subsequent years.

After being separated from the service, Bill Lanagan returned to Nacogdoches and got a job as a teacher and coach. He received his master's degree in history by attending night classes. While holding a job as junior high principal, he commuted 3 years to the University of Houston for work on his doctor's degree in education administration, which he received in 1953.

Despite the press of his many duties as administrator of the rapidly-growing Pine Tree school system, Dr. Lanagan could always budget his time so as to be useful to his community in many other ways. He taught an adult Bible class at Greggton's First Baptist Church, was secretary of the community's welfare fund, was an active member of both the Boy Scout and Camp Fire Girls Area Councils and the Longview Planning and Zoning Board. In previous years, he was president of the Greggton Lions Club and vice president of the chamber of commerce.

Longview and a wide section of east Texas mourn the loss of Dr. Lanagan. He was a pillar of strength in Texas educational fields, and a fine example of good citizenship in his community.

May the knowledge that he was a devoted husband, father, son, and brother, as well as a dedicated church, school, and civil leader, bring comfort and understanding to his loved ones.

Bill Lanagan has left a glorious heritage. Neither time nor circumstances can ever dim our memory of him.—CARL L. ESTES.

Statement of John W. Hight, Executive Director of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., Before U.S. Tariff Commission on Beef and Beef Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to submit for the RECORD the following statement by Mr. John W. Hight, executive director of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., before the U.S. Tariff Commission on the subject of beef and beef products:

STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION CONCERNING INVESTIGATION UNDER SECTION 332 IN CONNECTION WITH BEEF AND BEEF PRODUCTS PRESENTED BY JOHN W. HIGHT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The Committee for a National Trade Policy appears before the Tariff Commission today to present testimony on the "conditions of competition in the United States between beef and beef products produced in the United States and in foreign countries."

We recognize that the Tariff Commission in this instance acts solely as a factfinding agency and will report to the Senate Finance Committee the facts bearing on the competition between domestic and imported beef and beef products.

This Committee has appeared before the Commission on several occasions in the past. We are a business-supported organization concerned solely with the development of a trade expansion policy calculated to advance the interest of the Nation as a whole. We represent no special interest.

We believe that the United States should continue to move forthrightly in the direction of trade liberalization. As part of this movement, we believe that the United States should seek the earliest possible reduction or removal of foreign restrictions against U.S. exports as well as U.S. restrictions against imports.

In connection with this section 332 investigation of the conditions of competition between domestic and imported beef, we urge upon the Commission certain criteria and assumptions which we feel are warranted under both the spirit and the letter of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which is the cornerstone of U.S. foreign trade policy. This policy should have an important bearing on the scope of the Commission's analysis in this case.

The investigation before the Commission has been initiated by the domestic cattle-raising industry which seeks rigid quotas on the importation of beef and beef products. Such quotas, should they be enacted by the Congress, after consideration by the Senate Finance Committee which has requested the study you have undertaken, directly contravene the broad thrust of the act of 1962 and can only result in a contraction of world trade rather than an expansion of such trade. The act declares that it is the policy of the United States to reduce trade barriers maintained by this country on a reciprocal basis with other free world countries to the end that trade within the free world may be expanded for the benefit of all.

This Commission has heard in recent months the pleas of many industries that they be exempted from any tariff reduction in the course of the Kennedy round tariff negotiations. Although most of the industries making such pleas have not formally initiated Tariff Commission investigations of their economic situation, the present intiative of the cattlegrowers industry through the Senate Finance Committee is not unlike the pleadings made by other industries during the hearings under section 221 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Our assumptions, in the light of the national policy specifically declared in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, are:

1. that no new restrictions will be placed upon imports of any product unless it can be demonstrated that "serious injury" has been caused "in major part" by tariff concessions and that alternative remedies are not likely to be effective;

2. that particular industries will proceed vigorously and imaginatively with efforts to make a successful adjustment to growing competition and increasing change from whatever quarter, domestic or foreign;

3. that the U.S. Government will concern itself with the correction of domestic policies found to impose unfair burdens on such industries—burdens which make their competitive position unfavorable in relation to the position of the same industry in other countries.

In the light of these assumptions, we have some comments to make on the present case before the Tariff Commission. We do not profess to be experts in the cattle and beef industry. Nevertheless, we believe certain facts have been demonstrated in the course of the testimony on the economic situation of this industry:

1. The current depressed prices of fed cattle are due largely to conditions within the U.S. industry—the phase of the cattle cycle, the overproduction and overinventory of cattle, the overmarketing of steers and heifers to feed lots, the heavier weights at which cattle are marketed from feed lots, the retention of overage cows and bulls on ranches.

2. Imports have been mainly in the form of utility or cutter-and-canner beef—grass-fed beef which is used for manufacturing purposes and not directly competitive with grain-fed beef. The evidence indicates that there has been a decline in recent years of marketings of domestic manufacturing beef and that the U.S. domestic requirements for this type of beef have been filled by imports.

3. The increased imports in the last several years, according to the Department of Agriculture, have had only a minor effect upon the price of fed beef.

4. Without the imports of manufacturing beef, that portion of the market which is filled by luncheon meats, frankfurters, and hamburgers might have been lost to alternative products and this could represent a permanent loss to the domestic beef industry.

5. In recent years the domestic beef industry has undergone a fundamental change. Cattle raising is no longer confined to grass ranges in the West but has spread to almost every State in the Union to one degree or another. Cattle raising is no longer an entirely commercial operation; for many entrepreneurs it has become an avocation or a tax-saving device. The result is that overproduction is endemic. In this situation the industry has difficulties which are peculiarly domestic and cannot be attributed to international trade.

6. A restriction on imports of manufacturing beef would be a palliative, not a cure. Any real relief for depressed prices must come over the course of time—as it has in previous cattle cycles—from a reduction in cattle population and a reduction in marketing weights of fed cattle. This will take time. Corrective action should be taken by the domestic industry to the fullest before any action is taken on import controls and even these should be circumscribed by the criteria of the Trade Expansion Act. Such action includes an early culling of herds and increased marketing of cows and bulls, both to reduce the production of calves and to increase the supply of domestic manufacturing beef. On the basis of 1964 figures, imports are likely to decline in the near future because of limitations of foreign capacity. This fits in directly with the immediate desirability of culling of herds of grass-fed beef.

If these facts and conclusions are correct, as we believe they are, we would urge upon the Tariff Commission, in its analysis of the "conditions of competition" between domestic and imported beef and beef products, to point out clearly that the difficulties presently faced by the industry are due largely to miscalculations by the domestic industry and only to a small degree to the increase in imports.

Under these circumstances restrictions of imports could be no substantial factor in the improvement of the situation, and any improvement they might achieve would be at a high price in terms of national trade policy and the national interest.

This brings us to the additional factors which any economic analysis of the beef industry should take into account. These factors deal with the matters of public policy in the United States, both domestic and foreign:

1. There is a serious degree of poverty in the United States despite the general economic affluence we have had for a number of years. The war on poverty is a primary objective of the administration and an immediate issue before the Congress. Beef is a major item in the American food budget, accounting for nearly 13 cents out of every food dollar, which represents more money than is spent for any other single food. Thus, any reduction in the supply of, or increase in the price of, manufacturing beef has a greater impact on consumer pocketbooks than would be the case in any other food. This would hit directly at the low-income groups, and would measurably reduce their opportunities for well-balanced diets.

2. Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (as indicated earlier) the United States has declared it to be its policy to reduce its own tariffs and import restrictions on a reciprocal basis with other free world nations so that there can be a general expansion of world trade. Restrictions, outside the Trade Expansion Act, on imports of beef and beef products would run directly counter to this adopted policy. In addition, the United States would be placed at a disadvantage in the forthcoming Kennedy round at GATT negotiations in Geneva. Our avowed faith in the reduction of trade restrictions could not help but be questioned.

3. Our good faith in the conclusion of "voluntary" agreements with Australia and New Zealand would be brought into question. It should be said we of this committee are not happy with "voluntary" agreements, such as the beef agreement and the cotton textiles agreement. In our view they depart from the normal and proper process of a determination of injury by the Tariff Commission. They represent an end-run around the procedures legislated and are a political expedient to avoid such procedures.

We fear a tendency toward their proliferation as more and more industries bring pressure upon the Government for protection against imports. While we feel they are less undesirable than quotas fixed by legislation both methods are a departure from a marketplace economy and a move in the direction of more restricted, rather than more liberalized, world trade. At the same time the "voluntary" method is less permanent and more readily eliminated. The Commission's analysis might usefully assess the likely impact of these agreements on the time it will take for a more normal supply-demand pattern to appear.

The Trail John Muir Blazed Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Secretary of Agriculture established a new wilderness area under the provisions of his existing authority. This wilderness area was named in honor of one of California's greatest conservationists, John Muir. The dedication of the wilderness area to this outstanding leader in this field was dedicated by the Chief of the Forest Service, Edward P. Cliff, at the celebration held in connection with the issuance of a postage stamp also honoring John Muir.

Mr. Cliff, in his comments made that day in Martinez, Calif., paid his tribute to John Muir, and at this point I would like to insert his remarks in the RECORD:

THE TRAIL HE BLAZED LIVES ON

(By Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at ceremonies incident to release of the John Muir postage stamp, Martinez, Calif., April 29. 1964)

John Muir would have liked these ceremonies in his honor. I think he would share the warm feeling I have in this opportunity to stand side by side with so many people who love the outdoors as he did, and whose interest in conservation reflects, in one way or another, the things he stood and fought for.

John Muir would take some satisfaction in our progress along the trail he blazed so clearly. Only in rare instances do we now have the flagrant abuse of our natural resources that was common in his day and prompted him to cry out in fear and alarm. The lessons he taught down through the years were learned well, and they have paid off. Muir would recognize and applaud the fact that the extreme exploitation of our land that so angered and dismayed him is no longer the order of the day.

I don't mean to say that all of his dreams have been realized—not by a long shot. I don't even say they ever will be realized, because the dreams of this magnificent Scotsman were prodigious ones; ranging as high and as far as the mountains he loved. But there has been progress, worthwhile accomplishment in conservation in this country. A large measure of this accomplishment may be attributed to John Muir, who got excited when excitement was most needed, and caused others to spring into effective action for the public good.

Someone has said that Muir helped the cause of America's conservation when it needed all the help it could get. This is well documented. In particular, I'm mindful of his historic 3-day trip into the mountains with Theodore Roosevelt in 1903. As many of you know, Muir postponed a world tour to make the trip. He saw it as a chance "to do some forest good in freely talking around the campfire." The enthusiasm these campfire talks engendered surely must have ranked high among the factors that paved the way for the creation of 4 national parks and 14 national monuments, and the setting aside of 148 million acres of national forests during Roosevelt's administration.

Especially significant were some of the remarks the President made in Sacramento after the trip. Let me recall them for you. He said, "No small part of the prosperity of California * * * depends upon the preservation of her water supply * * * and the water supply cannot be preserved unless the forests are preserved. As regards some of the trees, I want them preserved because they are the only things of their kind in the world. * * * I ask for the preservation of other forests on grounds of wise and farsighted economic policy. I do not ask that lumbering be stopped * * * only that the forests be so used that not only shall we here, this generation, get the benefit for the next few years, but that our children and our children's children shall get the benefit. * * * We are not building this country of ours for a day. It is to last through the ages."

And what about John Muir and Gifford Pinchot? They knew each other well. They got together when the Forest Commission was formed in 1896. Pinchot described Muir as a man "in his fifties, tall, thin, cordial, and a most fascinating talker." He took to him at once and they spent some memorable days and nights together letting the beauties of nature soak in and talking seriously of matters close to the hearts of both of them. In particular, I'd like to quote from Pinchot's description of his trip to the Calaveras Grove with John Muir and C. Hart Merriam, head of the Biological Survey: "This journey was for me in the nature of a liberal education. Never were there two more delightful talkers than Muir and Merriam, or with a richer fund of experience to talk about. * * * They were full of facts I needed in my business."

There isn't any doubt in my mind that fundamentally Muir and Pinchot were in the same business. Both men saw the misuse of upland watersheds as a great tragedy. Both fought on the same side in the fight against the waste and mismanagement of the national estate that characterized their times. Both opposed overgrazing, overcutting, and watershed abuse. Both favored Government action including Federal forest reserves, and scientific programs of planning and management. Both valued strong support among citizens and elected officials. Both were aflame with a missionary zeal which lighted the way for their followers long after they had passed from the scene.

Today, some people attempt to make much of what they describe as great differences in the philosophies and personal objectives of Pinchot and Muir. They were both well-trained, intelligent, and spirited men with strong convictions and personalities. They were both public figures. That they might disagree on some issues was to be expected. And they did. But it is unfortunate that some people have tended to pull them farther apart than they actually were. I, for one, believe that Muir's philosophy and Pinchot's philosophy were not, in the main, very far apart and in fact supplemented each other.

It's strange but true that, just as similarities in points of view tend to strengthen with the passage of time, so too do differences in points of view. But I have high hopes that just as Theodore Roosevelt blended and welded together the best of Muril's and Pinchot's zeal, experience, and judgments, commonsense will prevail to erase the differences between today's leaders of the conservation movement.

We're well on the right track and I am sure that John Muir would approve. The commemorative postage stamp, for example, pays homage to John Muir not as a botanist alone, not as a naturalist alone, not as a preservationist alone, but in the larger, all-embracing sense, as a conservationist.

John Muir wrote his first book, I understand, with a quill pen he had made from the wing feather of a golden eagle that he picked up on a mountain a few miles from Yosemite. I prepared the notes for this talk with a ballpoint pen. There is a half century or more between these two writing instruments—and in that intervening time much has happened to blend the idealism and poetic philosophy of John Muir as represented by a quill pen with the practicality of a ballpoint pen symbolic of today's increasing pressures and demands upon our natural resources.

And yet, even today, Roosevelt and Muir, and Pinchot and Muir, could return to a large part of the wilderness that they once visited and that was so close to Muir's heart, and not find great physical change. Then, as now, the pines stir as the winds blow, the waterfalls rumble on and on, the ouzel still darts in and out of the rushing streams. Many of the trees Muir observed, sketched, and rested and dreamed under, still stand proud against the sky. They are a bit taller

in many cases, and bigger around with added rings of growth.

There is more conservation consciousness today and a greater appreciation for the value of wilderness than in John Muir's time. In my opinion, passage of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act in 1960 helped spark this good, rising tide. John Muir would be pleased with this law because it recognized that the maintenance of wilderness is consistent with the multiple-use concept and for the first time it gave statutory recognition of the place of wilderness in he management of the national forests.

John Muir would also be pleased that today, almost 14.5 million acres of national forest lands are included in 86 wilderness and wilderness-type areas; that his adopted California alone has 20 of these areas covering nearly 1.7 million acres. As recently as this past year, two new wild areas have come into being here in California—Dome Land in the Sequoia National Forest, and Mokelumne in the Eldorado and Stanislaus National Forests. Two primitive areas have been reclassified as wilderness areas—the Minarets in California and the Selway-Bitterroot in Montana and Idaho.

Presently pending is the reclassification of five other primitives areas to wild or wilderness areas.

In addition, and I know this would warm John Muir's heart, too, a new wild area is being established in North Carolina.

If we measure time by the clock and by the days on a calendar, we have traveled a long time on the trail that John Muir blazed so well. We have come a long way toward achieving the spirit and practical aspects of his dreams.

There was magnificent wilderness in this country to stir this great man's blood and keep him wandering on trails far away from the burdensome life in towns and cities. There is still magnificent wilderness here, and there always will be. This is in keeping with the temper of our own times and it gives bright promise for the future. Although we must never become complacent, we have every right, here and now, to recognize and take heart in the measure of progress that paces the conservation effort in America today; and in doing it we can take on new strength and new purpose in the struggle for the progress we know must still be made.

John Muir was an idealist, a poet, a philosopher, and, I submit, a practical man, too. These all combined to make him a great conservationist. Because of him and others like him, the forests of America will continue to yield their bounty of practical and spiritual good through the ages.

The Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, in stature he was small, but in the respect and esteem in which he was held by the Members of the House of Representatives he was a giant. It is difficult to imagine the appropriations process in the House without his stern presence and his equally stern insistence on economy in the administration of the Federal Government. His understanding of the legislative branch of the Government was immense, his knowledge of the uses to which the funds appropriated by Congress were put by the executive branch was extraordinary, his concern for his constituents and the welfare of his district was profound, and his love for his country was infinite.

The Members of both Houses of Congress join with President Johnson who knew and admired Mr. CANNON when both served together in the House of Representatives in his statement of praise for this redoubtable son of Missouri.

Mr. CANNON left a distinguished imprint upon the decisions and policies of our times—

The President said—

We shall miss his counsel, his candor, and the courage with which he held steadfastly to his convictions.

It was in 1911 that the Speaker of the House, the Honorable Champ Clark, brought CLARENCE CANNON to Washington as a temporary clerk in the Speaker's office. He remained to the end of his life. He served as Parliamentarian of the House until his own election to fill Speaker Clark's seat as a Member. He was sworn in for his first term on March 4, 1923, and won reelection every 2 years through 1962, when he was chosen for his 21st consecutive term. As a parliamentarian he was widely accepted as the greatest authority in the country, and in addition to his early duties as House Parliamentarian he served as parliamentarian of Democratic National Conventions from 1920 to 1960. His achievements as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee are known to every Member of the House of Representatives.

His courage and honesty, his determination and his knowledge, his love for this House, his devotion to his friends and his country, all will be terribly missed.

A Planned Decrease in Unemployment Through Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the greatest immediate manpower challenge before us today, as pointed out by President Johnson in the 1964 manpower report of the President, is overcoming unemployment.

Our gross national product was boosted by $30 billion to a record $600 billion a year in 1963, and employment increased by almost a million, going over the 70 million mark. However, during an average week in 1963, 4.2 million Americans seeking work were unemployed due in part to the increasing number of persons coming into the labor market as a result of the population explosion. This was 5.7 percent of our labor force. Another 2.6 million persons seeking full-time work were employed only part time.

Annual increases in the labor force are expected to reach 1.4 million per year between now and 1970. Labor force growth and productivity increases, including technological advances and automation, will require creation of the equivalent of 3.3 to 3.7 million new jobs per year between now and 1970 to prevent unemployment from rising.

The largest increases in the labor force are occuring among those under age 25 and among married women. Unskilled jobs are declining in importance as far as employer demand is concerned. Demand is expanding most in professional and technical, clerical, and service occupations. There are still almost 50 percent of the labor force, as analyzed recently in a study from the new Census Congressional Data Book, engaged in those type jobs described as "blue collar." This category includes all craftsmen, foremen, operatives, service workers, private household workers, and laborers—except farm laborers. White-collar workers make up 44 percent of the work force. And farmworkers constitute a relatively small 7 percent of the work force.

Requirements for education and training for employment are increasing steadily. The skilled and well-educated worker in general continues to do well in the Nation's labor market, but for the relatively uneducated and unskilled portion of the labor force employment opportunities are deteriorating. Unskilled occupations, except private household work, had unemployment rates in 1963 above the national average of 5.7 percent, ranging up to 12.1 percent for nonfarm laborers. The President's Manpower Report said that current trends, if not sharply altered, indicate that as many as 30 percent of the young people beginning work in the 1960's—7½ million out of the expected decade total of 26 million new entrants—may not even have completed high school.

Training the unemployed does not create jobs. Some vacancies do exist which can be filled by fitting the unemployed worker to the job, either by retraining or relocation but the problem of unemployment cannot be entirely solved in those ways. The jobs looking for workers balance no more than a minor percentage of the workers looking for jobs, according to a recent extensive survey by the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. It is difficult then, to develop the abilities of our people, create jobs, and match people and jobs—the active manpower policy of the country—when so many of our people are incapable of learning new skills. We have many Government programs now in operation that are aimed at training the unskilled for better paying, skilled jobs and at creating jobs for unskilled workers, for example, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the labor adjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act, the Vocational Education Acts and the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. However, for the most part, these programs have not been very productive in creating jobs.

Let us look at ARA, for example. The original Area Redevelopment Administration authorization bill was signed into

law on May 1, 1961. This measure authorized a 4-year $451 million area redevelopment program. In 1963, amendments to the act requested an authorization of $455 million more. At that time, only $42 million of industrial loans had been approved out of the existing authorization of $200 million. ARA apparently couldn't spend the money it had, but still asserted it needed $455 million more. Recently, the ARA reported that $235 million of Federal funds had been obligated. This left a balance of some $215 million from the original authorization. The ARA further stated that 104,000 workers "directly or indirectly" would have jobs when all these approved projects and businesses are "fully operational," but there have been outspoken doubts raised even as to these modest claims. During the recent hearings on ARA before the House Appropriations Committee, William L. Batt, Jr., the ARA Administrator, said that his agency was the only agency of the Federal Government whose primary function is to create jobs. The greatest benefits to the Nation in solving the unemployment problem as a whole, however, Administrator Batt said, "come from programs like the tax cut, and also from the general improvement in the economy."

The tax reduction measure passed in 1964 was proposed to solve problems of the Nation's growth in several fields, that is, to step up the growth and vigor of the national economy, to increase job and investment opportunities and to improve our productivity. This was the largest Federal tax cut—in dollar terms, $11 billion—in the Nation's history. And it was the third major reduction in income taxes in the postwar period. The 1948 cut amounted to $4.7 billion and the 1954 cut reduced Federal revenue by some $6.1 billion and lowered personal and corporate income taxes, while upping the social security tax. This second cut was a planned decrease in the personal income tax which had been increased to provide funds for a strong defense during the Korean war. There is evidence that the economy continued to rise after these tax cuts. However, the unemployment picture was not greatly changed. The 1964 tax cut was not tied directly to creating jobs, and neither were the two previous reductions. Now, there is talk of another tax cut in the near future. It seems to me that the next tax cut, if we are to have one, must be tied directly to creating jobs, for we will need 4 million more jobs annually after 1970.

In the meantime, considering that training the unemployed does not create jobs, we must take steps to provide new jobs for both skilled and unskilled workers.

Basically, jobs have to be produced by employers, and I am delighted to see what the local chambers of commerce are doing to help solve the unemployment problem in their own backyards. A recent publication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, "Target: Employment" presents 36 examples of how business, government, and education are cooperating to solve employment. I call attention to this booklet, and congratulate the members of the chamber of commerce for splendid efforts.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which I believe will help fill the gap in the unemployment ranks of our country. If enacted, it would be an immediate aid in cutting down on unemployment, a challenge to us all, which I class in importance with the education crisis now facing many our our local communities.

My bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide deductions for persons engaged in trade or business who provide new jobs for the skilled and for all persons who provide new jobs for domestics and the unskilled. I have included a copy of the bill in my remarks and hope it will be an inspiration for creative thinking in this field. I have brought the general idea to the attention of Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, and he recently wrote to me: "There is much that is appealing in the part of the proposal dealing with encouragement of the hiring of unemployed workers by special tax relief for the employer." I agree with those learned scholars in the field of employment and taxation that this is not an easy problem to solve. But no hard problems with difficult solutions have ever been solved by ignoring the problem altogether.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Albany Times-Union of Sunday, May 24, 1964:

JIM FARLEY AT 76: VETERAN DEMOCRAT SEES JOHNSON "LANDSLIDE"; WAGNER STRONGEST POSSIBLE KEATING FOE

James A. Farley, the man who managed the first two presidential campaigns of Franklin D. Roosevelt, says that President Lyndon B. Johnson "could very well be the recipient of a landslide victory" in the November election.

In an exclusive interview with the Times-Union, the former Postmaster General who is now rounding out 24 years as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. said:

"I think the situation has greatly improved since February, when I said in Washington that in my judgment President Johnson would do almost as well as President Roosevelt did in 1932.

"As of now I still hold to that opinion and feel even more strongly about it. He has created a fine image in himself all over the country and developed in the electorate a confidence in him.

"Maybe he has an even better chance to carry more States (than Roosevelt in 1932). He is surely going to carry Hawaii and Alaska."

WEAK ON FARMS

Speaking from behind his work-piled desk in his Madison Avenue office in New York City, Mr. Farley said:

"Mr. Johnson's weakness—if he has any—is in the farm belt. I think he will carry North and South Dakota and Iowa, too. Nebraska and Kansas as a rule are fairly strong Republican States. Mr. Roosevelt carried them in 1932 and 1936, and as time goes on I think his [Johnson's] position would be strengthened.

"He could very well be the recipient of a landslide victory."

Farley, the man who won his spurs as an election forecaster in 1932 and 1936 when he was campaign manager for F.D.R., and later became his Postmaster General, said if President Johnson lost any States "it'll be by a very small vote. He'll carry every one of the Southern States * * * The only place he'll have to campaign will be in the Farm Belt."

Mr. Farley granted the interview to the Times-Union in advance of his 76th birthday on Memorial Day.

In capsule form, he commented:

Mayor Wagner, of New York City, would be the strongest nominee for the Senate race against KENNETH KEATING.

President Kennedy was a great President, and his election and the manner in which he administered his office should sweep aside for all time lingering doubts about a Catholic in the White House.

The Democratic Party is still leaderless in New York State because too many leaders have been competing for control.

On the Republican nominee, there are so many men seeking the nomination for President it's quite possible a darkhorse will emerge as the nominee.

Ambassador Lodge's primary victories are not necessarily votes for Lodge, but votes against the other men.

If Senator GOLDWATER takes the California primary, he'll be a hard man to stop, but if Rockefeller is victorious there, his position will be clearly enhanced.

Children should be allowed to say prayers in schools.

On himself—"I have no plans to return to active politics." And he has no desire now to be the candidate against Senator KEATING "even if on both tickets."

NO COMMENT

As for President Johnson's choice of a running mate, Mr. Farley says "it would be presumptuous of me to indicate which he would select. I have one man in mind (who would) make a fine Vice President. I doubt if Mr. Johnson will make his decision until after the Republican convention."

Commenting on recent reports that Governor Rockefeller was in the nomination race solely to keep Senator GOLDWATER out, Mr. Farley said "Oh, I don't think there's anything to that. I think he's in it all the way.

"If GOLDWATER wins the Republican California primaries, in my judgment they're going to have a terrific time stopping him for the nomination. If, on the contrary, Governor Rockefeller is successful there, that's going to naturally enhance his chances and have a very serious effect on GOLDWATER'S opportunities. Until that primary is over, I don't want to make any further observations."

Mr. Farley is a close personal friend of the Governor and his family and is also a Rockefeller appointee to the three-man State harness racing commission.

PICKS WAGNER

As to who would run against Senator KEATING, Mr. Farley said: "In my judgment, Mayor Wagner would make the strongest nominee, if he would make the race. Until such time as he makes known what he's going to do, there's no sense in making a prophecy. He has control of the situation in the city of New York, and he also has many friends upstate, and is well known. He would be the strongest candidate."

A year ago, during another birthday interview, Farley said the trouble with the Democratic Party in New York City was that it had been leaderless because too many leaders were competing for control. "That difficulty is still there," he said. "There's not the close working relationship existing in the State that is helpful to Democratic victory.

"But despite that, I think Mr. Johnson's strength is so great that despite the leadership he'll carry the State with a substantial margin. Not because of the leadership or lack of it, but because the people will want to see him reelected President."

As for Republican unity, he says, "Despite all the trouble, when the chips are down, they get together. As far as the leadership is concerned, they are united."

FRANK COMMENTS

Mr. Farley's comments, for the most part, were delivered with utter frankness and without a trace of a smile. But when questioned about Ambassador Lodge's primary victories, a slight smile crossed his face as he said, "I think the Lodge vote is not as a vote for Lodge, as much as it is a vote against the others mentioned. The votes for MARGARET CHASE SMITH were certainly not from people wanting her as President, but against the other candidates.

"Ambassador Lodge must be in complete agreement with President Johnson's foreign policy; otherwise he would have resigned long ago."

The political craftsman of F.D.R.'s New Deal era began his career as a bookkeeper in a paper firm in New York City. He drifted into salesmanship, and 20 years after he had taken his first job in 1906, he merged several building supply firms into the General Building Supply Corp., which he headed.

His political career began in 1912 when he was clerk of his hometown of Stony Point from 1912 to 1919. Then he became port warden for port of New York, served in the State assembly, became a member of the New York Athletic Commission and chairman of the commission for 8 years.

Jim Farley entered bigtime politics in 1930 when he started out to make Franklin D. Roosevelt the next President of the United States. He was chairman of the State Democratic Committee, and Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York in 1928. Farley "invaded" every State in the Union, lined up State leaders, and "sold" Roosevelt.

The result was Roosevelt went to the Chicago convention with more first and secondary strength than any other candidate. Roosevelt won and naturally made Farley chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

NEW LEADERS

Farley's earlier months of "selling" Roosevelt stood him in good stead, and he knew the leaders in every State. He called them by their first names and they called him Jim. Farley is a natural politician and politics is his life's blood.

Roosevelt's victory was overwhelming—he carried all but six States—and F.D.R. appointed Big Jim to his Cabinet as Postmaster General. He retained his chairmanship of the National Committee and during the first 4 years of the Roosevelt administration, he steadily built up the Democratic organization.

Jim Farley built up the organization on a systematic basis, step by step, county by county, State by State, in each of the 48 States. He did it so efficiently that in 1936 he was able to predict the exact outcome of the election.

In that year, when the polls were showing Alfred M. Landon the winner, Mr. Farley handed newsmen the written prediction that the Roosevelt-Garner ticket would carry all States but Maine and Vermont.

That is precisely how the voting turned out, and he called it a week before the election. That written prediction now hangs framed with other framed mementos on the wall of his New York City offices.

Farley has a photographic mind for names and faces—an invaluable asset to a professional politician. He has a genial personality, a shrewd brain, a keen Irish wit and an almost devastating frankness.

HIS TRADEMARKS

These—and the fact he personally signs all his correspondence in Irish green ink and wears a straw "skimmer"—are his trade marks.

Big Jim Farley wears his 205 pounds well on his 6-foot-4-inch frame. He takes walks daily as exercise ("but not if the weather's bad underfoot or overhead"), relaxes in Turkish baths, and has never smoked nor drinked.

"I took a pledge when I was confirmed (as a Roman Catholic) not to drink or smoke until I was 21," he says. "When I reached that age I was in politics and my mother suggested I shouldn't drink or smoke. I've never done either. I don't think I could have carried on when the pace was hard if I had."

Big Jim's day starts at 7:30 a.m. and he arrives at his office about an hour later. His work frequently keeps him at his desk until 6:30 p.m. or later, and he is generally in bed by 11:30 p.m.

Despite the heavy schedule of lunches and dinners, he watches his weight closely, walks as much as he can but does no formal exercise. He goes to Turkish baths as one of the few places he can relax.

Since resigning as Postmaster General in 1940 and splitting with Roosevelt over the controversial third-term issue, Mr. Farley is "not very active" politically, "because I'm not invited to be * * * but that's no complaint."

A year ago he was withholding a decision on whether or not to seek the nomination to run against Senator KEATING. But now, he says "I have no desire to be a candidate for the senatorship at all, even if on both tickets. I would have taken the nomination for the Senate in 1958 and for Governor in 1962, but the leadership has do desire for me to be nominated, and that was that.

"I say modestly that I could have defeated Keating in 1958 and Rockefeller in 1962, despite what some of the leaders thought."

He has figured as a political planner—in Mayor Wagner's campaigns in New York City—and keeps close watch on political matters. He and President Johnson are in frequent touch with each other.

As far as his return to active politics, Mr. Farley says he has no plans. "I will do as I have always done," he said. "When my assistance has been sought I'll do everything I possibly can to be helpful to the Democratic Party."

A LOAD OF MAIL

Jim Farley receives an overwhelming amount of mail daily (he keeps six secretaries busy every day just answering his mail). He also travels more than 50,000 miles a year, and somehow manages to be a speaker at 100 dinners and 75 luncheons a year.

But his greatest response to any single speech or article he wrote was to one entitled "The Two Magic Words," which appeared in the January 1964, issue of Guideposts. In this article he shared his New Year's resolution to change his attitude from a passive to more active one where gratitude was concerned * * * "to thank people who make the world run smoothly".

What prompted the article, and his resolution, was a request he received from a college student writing a thesis on government. Farley spent an entire afternoon dictating his answers to more than 40 questions the students asked, and sent it off.

"I looked forward to receiving from this young man some acknowledgment as to whether I had helped him or not. But I have yet to hear from him to this day."

As a result of the Guideposts article, Farley was swamped with mail, much of it from people for whom he had done something as long as 30 years ago.

FARLEY-ISMS

On honesty: "I hear people praised for their honesty and integrity, telling the truth and being loyal. I think these are elements we should possess. I kind of laugh when they say, 'He's an honest official.' Well, after all, he should be honest."

On school prayer: "In my opinion, it is wrong for the students not to say prayers in school. The people who are bringing suits to have prayers banned, or to have the words 'under God' stricken from the pledge to the flag are more to be pitied than blamed. We live in a country where there's a right of free speech, free worship, and free assembly, and this country came to greatness under that kind of situation. We have become more tolerant in recent years. The election of President Kennedy gave evidence of that. His election was one of the greatest things that happened to this country. I think he was a great President, and had he lived, he would have been a very great President."

On the Mets: "They're great for the city. It's not a particularly good club, and it will take a year or two before they are. * * * Fortunately they have Casey. * * * I don't think the Yankees were ever a popular team in this town * * * on the other hand, the Mets can be an exceedingly popular club."

Paul Findley's Battle Against News Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the assurances that our country will remain strong and free rests on the independence of the fourth estate—that of the journalistic world. One source of this freedom and strength lies in the individual newsman—the man who has a nose for news and can dig for the facts and report them without fear or favor.

Recently our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, PAUL FINDLEY, has been in the forefront of the battle to insure the continued independence of our news media. In several recent insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman FINDLEY has called attention to the Agricultural Marketing Service—the news wire service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In an editorial which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of May 15, 1964, attention is called to the dangers inherent in such a Government-owned system. The article points out that:

> The manipulation of news to serve the interest of an administration is a constant threat to the efficacy of a free press.

I ask that unanimous consent be granted to insert this article from the Richmond Times-Dispatch in the RECORD at this point.

BIG FOOT IN THE DOOR

Once Uncle Sam gets his foot in the door of any private enterprise, the door, to all intents and purposes, is wide open. It's a big foot.

The manipulation of news to serve the interest of an administration is a constant threat to the efficacy of a free press.

This can now be done sub rosa, by labeling information "classified" or "top secret" and by orders to department heads not to divulge information which would put the administration in an unfavorable light.

However, such concealment in news is essentially negative. The most effective way in which this administration—or any administration—could influence public opinion would be to create a news-wire service which would carry only the news the administration considered politically expedient to disclose.

If that news-wire service were to be furnished free—or virtually free of charge—to newspapers, TV and radio stations, the chances are that the less prosperous ones would grab the opportunity to "get something for nothing"—at the taxpayers' expense.

That has a nightmarish sound. Most Americans might protest that "It can't happen here."

The principal character in Sinclair Lewis' 1935 novel of that title was Doremus Jessup, a smalltown publisher who refused to believe that it could ever happen.

Unlike the fictional Jessup, Representative PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois (also a smalltown publisher), has no such illusions. Last week he sounded an alarm to alert Americans to the danger of political news control, incipient in the taxpayer-financed farm news service now supplied, virtually free of charge, to some 70 TV and radio stations and two newspapers in the Mississippi Delta.

Those who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may read Representative FINDLEY's analysis in full, in the May 7 and April 28 issues.

"The new USDA wire services," said Representative FINDLEY in part, "establish the power of censorship * * * the AMS (Agricultural Marketing Service) retains the right to discontinue (its service). Government has the right to grant—or deny—these services. This right is open to abuse, and would enable vindictive Government officials to retaliate effectively against media which refuse to cooperate."

The Illinois Congressman cites as an example the memorandum issued on April 12, 1963, by USDA Deputy Administrator Ray Fitzgerald, in connection with last year's wheat referendum. Fitzgerald, he says, informed State ASC committeemen of the dependence of radio and TV stations on Federal licensing, and urged them to "act aggressively to get the stations to carry USDA's viewpoint on the wheat referendum."

Government, warns Mr. FINDLEY, is not always a reliable source of information and he quotes Arthur Sylvester, Under Secretary of Defense, as having declared last year that Government "has the inherent right to lie."

The Congressman says he has documented several instances in which Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman "used exaggerations, half-truths, and misleading data to sell a viewpoint."

The Government has 24-hour control over what is now only a USDA and Weather Bureau wire network—in competition with private agricultural marketing services—at the taxpayers' expense.

The bulk of the farm and weather news keeps the wires busy only intermittently.

Mr. FINDLEY puts a rhetorical question:

"Why not," he asks, "use the idle time to feed in a digest of information put together by each of the Departments—State, Defense, Post Office, Justice, and so on? Each is a major news source. Then why not let the White House publicity staff utilize whatever time remains? What better news source than the White House?

Alarmist and fantastic? Not at all. That idle time presents an alluring temptation to do what Goebbels did in Nazi Germany, and what Khrushchev is doing in Russia today.

This, says Mr. FINDLEY, could eventually eliminate the reporter:

"* * * the fellow who has a nose for news, digs in deep, verifies the facts, and writes them without fear or favor * * * strong enough to brush off bribes—tough enough to withstand pressure and threats, courageous enough to write the truth as he sees it—not slanted to official viewpoint."

With whatever flaws and frailties it may exhibit from time to time, our free press is a precious thing—a free people's best protection against government, big or little. The slightest initial attempt to encroach on its field—at the taxpayers' expense—must be vigorously resisted.

A Measure of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot of May 25, 1964:

A MEASURE OF PROGRESS

Michiganites can be thankful that a semblance of order has appeared in one phase of the seemingly endless hassle and utter confusion over governmental processes in their State.

A congressional districting bill has been passed and will be signed by the Governor. It comes so close to the one man, one vote principle that the U.S. Supreme Court probably won't even look at it.

The Democrats are not happy. They refused the votes which would give the bill immediate effect. And they are fighting efforts to revamp the election processes.

This is natural. Such matters as splitting the State into congressional districts are deeply involved in politics. If the weight of the majority were on the other side of the aisle, we would expect to see the Republicans using every possible delaying tactic to prevent the bills from becoming laws. That's politics.

Still, it is good to know that the legislature has moved in an area where the U.S. Supreme Court says it can and must act.

We pass no judgment on the merits of the redistricting plan. There could have been much politics involved. That is to be expected. Again, it would have been that way had the Democrats been running the show.

These are decisions which essentially are of a political nature. We have cited the obvious difficulties which arise from the bipartisan theory of creating representative districts. That is in connection with the attempts by the State reapportionment commission to draw new districts for the State legislature. The theory of nonpartisan action in such a field is fine, except for one thing: It doesn't work. Now, the State supreme court, theoretically, but not actually, a nonpartisan body, can't seme to get off dead center.

Be that as it may, a law is in the works which will let the people of Michigan know for whom and where they are voting for their representatives to Congress come November.

The gracious thing for the Democrats to do would be to go along and provide the votes needed to give the bill immediate effect.

They have lost the battle. They know that. They can't win the war. They haven't the votes.

There is a saying: There is no sense in flogging a dead horse. There is a time to push aggressively. There is a time to retreat. And there is a time to count the fight lost, to sink partisan differences, and to give a thought to the public interest.

Jackson County, incidentally, is in the new Sixth District. It includes Jackson, Ingham, and Shiawassee Counties, plus Bath and Dewitt townships of Clinton County. The incumbent Congressman is CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN, of Lansing. GEORGE MEADER, who has represented Jackson County well for so many years, will have a new district.

We shall miss Mr. MEADER.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, among the many subject people of the Soviet Union is the ancient nation of Armenia. May 28 is celebrated by many Armenians as their national independence day. We should say a few words in the way of a tribute to the bravery of past Armenian patriots, and a reminder of the cruel oppression which still denies Armenians their rightful independence.

It is noteworthy that for many centuries Armenia was closely related to Europe. In about A.D. 300 Armenia became the first Christian nation. In the Middle Ages, arts and letters flourished in Armenia. Indeed, much of the renowned church art of east Europe can be traced to Armenia origins.

Despite its significant cultural and national accomplishments, however, Armenia was often attacked and decimated by expansive neighbors, the Turks, the Persians, the Russians, the Mongols. As is so true of many other crossroads nations, Armenia struggled just to maintain its national identity.

In the 15th century Armenian independence was once destroyed. Numerous times after that Armenians tried to regain freedom. Most of Armenia was divided between Russia and Turkey This subject position resulted in terrible massacres of Armenians in 1895 and again in 1915, when the nation in Turkey was almost completely eliminated and 600,000 Armenians were killed.

This sad state of affairs was rejected by the people, when, in 1918, they declared their independence. For 2 hopeful years they were able to live as free people, ruled by a popular government. Unfortunately, as soon as the Bolsheviks won the Russian civil war, they attacked Armenia and destroyed once again Armenian independence. Soon free Armenia became the Communist-ruled puppet state, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, which exists today.

We must take this opportunity to join our Armenian friends in protesting the deplorable condition of Armenia. The

Armenian people have the right to the free exercise of their national religion and the full development of their unique nation. They have no similarity to Russians, and no love for Communists. The only reason for Armenia's vassal condition today is Russian imperialism. On this anniversary of Armenian independence we appeal to Armenia's conquerors to be humane, to allow Armenia to go free. And we remind Armenians of the dedication of their many martyred forebears, who found it necessary to fight for what they believed in.

Supreme Court and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country who have been concerned for some years over the trends of decisions rendered by the Federal judiciary have become increasingly alarmed as a result of the Prince Edward County decision announced last Monday by the Supreme Court.

Countless editorials and articles by nationally known editors and columnists have come to my attention within the past few days. There are, of course, many varying shades of opinion on the general questions raised by the Brown decision 10 years ago, but many of our people are shocked by the extent to which the Court went in trying to implement its decision in the Prince Edward case.

The Prince Edward story is a long and involved one, but the people of Prince Edward County deserve the commendations of the citizens of the United States. I believe that time will prove that much of the criticism of Prince Edward by the national press has been most unjustified.

The people of Prince Edward are law-abiding citizens who have no desire to deprive anyone of an education. The white citizens of the county have, from the beginning, dedicated themselves to the proposition that a locality has the right to operate its schools according to its own desires. They fully recognize the rights of others, and the same opportunities which have been afforded to the white students have also been offered to the Negro pupils. For reasons of their own, certain Negro leaders dictated to the colored citizens that they should refuse such offers, and this is the only reason why colored pupils have not benefited from the same type of private education which has been pursued by the white students.

The national press, by and large, has been critical about Prince Edward over the years, and it is interesting to note that within recent days some of the most critical writers in the past have questioned the wisdom of the Court's action last Monday. One of those who has been pointing out the fallacies of the Brown decision over the years has been Mr. David Lawrence, one of the most respected columnists of America. Mr. Lawrence has written a significant column, which appeared in the May 27, 1964, edition of the Washington Evening Star, and I commend this article to the reading of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

SUPREME COURT AND EDUCATION—PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY DECISION IS MOST SWEEPING IN U.S. HISTORY

(By David Lawrence)

The Supreme Court of the United States has just handed down a decision which transcends in importance its ruling of May 1954, ordering public schools to be desegregated.

This time the Supreme Court goes further. It undertakes to tell the legislative body of a Virginia county how it shall appropriate the taxpayers' money. It tells the board of supervisors, which is the legislative body of the county under the constitution of the State of Virginia, that a Federal court order can be issued commanding the county board to levy certain taxes and spend certain funds for purposes specified by the court.

No such sweeping decision has ever come from the Supreme Court in the history of the United States. The theory of the Federal Constitution has always been that the executive, legislative, and judicial powers are separate, and that the right of the people to govern themselves and to elect a legislative body to decide how tax money shall be spent cannot be interfered with or impaired by any order of a court.

The Supreme Court, in this instance, admitted that a State "has a wide discretion in deciding whether laws shall operate statewide or shall operate only in certain counties, the legislature 'having in mind the needs and desires of each'." But the opinion went on to say that the Supreme Court of the United States may decide for itself what objectives the board of supervisors may have had in mind and can veto such legislation if it doesn't conform to the Court's conception of how the county's money shall be spent.

The Supreme Court was explicit in its command as it ruled that the Federal court may, if necessary, "require the supervisors to exercise the power that is theirs to levy taxes to raise funds adequate to reopen, operate, and maintain without racial discrimination the public school system in Prince Edward County like that operated in other counties in Virginia."

So, while conceding that a State may give counties local autonomy, the Supreme Court now reserves for itself the right to censor such actions and issue court decrees compelling legislatures to vote certain taxes. This has heretofore always been believed to be discretionary with the legislative body.

If the principle established by the high court is accepted, it could mean that the Federal judiciary may undertake to tell Congress how it shall spend tax money, and particularly to order the National Legislature, as well as the State legislatures, to spend the money in ways which the Court itself would decide.

Again and again, spokesmen for various States have argued that other States got more appropriations or more assistance from the Federal Government, and that this constituted a form of discrimination. The Supreme Court of the United States now can rule not only on such questions but can claim that the citizens are not being given "the equal protection of the laws" when one State or one part of a State is favored over another by Federal or State appropriations.

Even more sensational is the Supreme Court's ruling that a county, and perhaps even a State must operate its educational system in accordance with the dictates of the judiciary. The legislature of the State of Virginia, for instance, passed laws in 1959 and 1960, providing grants of tuition to parents of "every child, regardless of race," so as to finance the attendance of such a child at any "nonsectarian private school or a public school outside his locality." All localities were also authorized to provide their own grants on a similar nondiscriminatory basis.

The people of Prince Edward County, where the dispute arose over the closing of the public schools, offered to set up private schools for colored children as well as private schools for white children. But the Negro organizations declined the offer, preferring to depend upon a court battle by which they sought a compulsory opening of the public schools.

Thus a county in the State of Virginia is prevented by the highest Court in the land from treating children of all races equally in permitting them to go to private schools of their own choosing or to attend public schools in other counties or localities.

The day cannot be far distant when private schools throughout the country may be subjected to the same judicial supervision on the ground that, while they might not have State financial support, these schools, nevertheless, operate under a State license or must obtain educational accreditation from State authorities.

Most surprising of all, however, is the concept expressed by the Supreme Court that it may at will substitute its own decrees for the judgment usually rendered by a State or county legislative body elected by the people. An oligarchy of nine men, appointed for life, could virtually control the income and outgo of the budgets and, in effect, force the spending of public funds for purposes not approved by the people's representatives.

Promotion of Gala for Johnson Leaves Taint of Pressure

SPEECH

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, increasing numbers of Federal employees have complained about the tactics that have been employed in the sale of $100 tickets for political fundraising affairs. This practice has been growing progressively more prevalent and brazen, and it threatens the entire Civil Service System.

There are almost daily reports of arm twisting, but politicians belittle them, and the Civil Service Commission does not stir on the ground that they have had no signed complaints and, therefore, no basis for action. It is understandable that no Federal employee would dare to sign a complaint because of the fear of losing his job, when he sees what happens to men who have dared to talk. Battle Hales was denied promotion, because he talked out of turn, in the eyes of Secretary Freeman. Jerry Jickis, who revealed to Congress questionable use of foreign aid funds in Cambodia, was fired. Otto Otepka, a State Department security officer, presented information to the Congress and has been in hot water ever since.

So it is easy to understand that a career employee would be most hesitant about signing a complaint.

I call to the attention of the Civil Service Commission that it has the authority as expressed in existing law to initiate its own investigation. This Commission was established by the Congress for the express purpose of protecting the integrity of our Civil Service System, and if improper political pressures are being used, as many are reporting, it is the Commission's duty to initiate action under the authority they now have.

For example, as I reported to the President last week, my own files contain a considerable amount of information which could be useful, and it is evident from such articles as the one by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post of May 28, that there is plenty of material if there were a will to act.

Perhaps the only course is that proposed by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, who called for a Justice Department investigation to determine whether laws are being violated, and to propose legislation if needed.

I ask that Mr. Kluttz' article be included at this point in my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1964]

PROMOTION OF GALA FOR JOHNSON LEAVES TAINT OF PRESSURE

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Democratic gala is over but the political taint from it lingers on in Federal offices here.

There isn't much doubt that Tuesday night's $100 Democratic fundraising salute to President Johnson was actively promoted in Federal offices in violation of the spirit if not the letter of the law which makes it illegal to solicit political funds on Federal property.

In the past the State Department with its large body of professional Foreign Service personnel was bypassed by political fundraisers. But things have changed and scores of higher paid employees there were sent invitations to the gala at their offices.

The employees charge that the Protocol Office there not only distributed the invitations, and apparent violation of law, but also made calls to jog them into responding to them. This is the story of one of the employees:

"About 2 weeks ago a mysterious-looking letter was hand-delivered to my office in the State Department. * * * Inside was an invitation to the gala honoring President Johnson.

"Monday the Protocol Office called to ask if I were going to the gala. * * * On inquiring of some of my colleagues, I found that they, too, had received handwritten, hand-delivered invitations at their offices as well as solicitous calls from the Protocol Office. There was more than a little consternation in the minds of many of them.

"I'm at a loss to explain why the invitation was a matter of protocol * * * but the incident has begun to worry me. Lots of timid souls clearly attended the gala for fear that some of their colleagues, who are dependent on political patronage for their jobs, will record the fact and remind any and all who might be interested.

"This may be okay for Assistant Secretaries or even Deputy Assistant Secretaries but for those who are supposedly part of the Civil Service and Foreign Service this potential for alfresco blackmail is a serious business.

"I am sure the President wants a Civil Service and a Foreign Service which will give him, through his appointees, the best professional advice possible, without fear or favor. After all, one of the hardest problems of being President is making the bureaucracy work effectively for the program of his administration.

"Those who were in charge of issuing invitations didn't help the President. Somebody ought to tell him."

Representative NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, charged on the House floor that topgrade employees in Rural Electrification were asked to buy $100 tickets in their offices. Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, is sponsoring a resolution to direct the Attorney General to investigate the charges.

Employees in Small Business, Housing and Home Finance, Office of Emergency Planning and Post Office, among others, have called to say they were "invited" to attend the gala by either phone calls or personal contacts at their offices.

In most cases they say they were asked to attend cocktail parties which were held prior to the gala and given by agency heads. Those who attended the parties were expected to attend the gala.

A postal official commented yesterday that he had never seen employees "so eager to buy the $100 tickets" and he added that he had heard no one in the Department complain about the pressure.

"Pressure wasn't necessary to sell the tickets this year," he explained, "the employees bought them willingly because I suspect they feel that Mr. Johnson will be around for awhile."

A Commerce official said the "educational" approach was used to sell tickets to employees there. He simply said that employees in the top grades were given the "opportunity" to contribute to the party of his choice and he expressed the personal belief that those who could afford it should contribute to help sustain the two-party system. He also said no pressure was necessary to sell $100 tickets to the gala.

Complaints from employees who charged their arms were twisted to buy tickets were far fewer than last year. Two reasons were were cited for the slump in complaints. First, that employees were getting accustomed to the pressure, and secondly, tickets sold better this year as many business firms bought them.

Steel Industry Opposes Tariff Reduction Negotiations at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the current GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—negotiations are a matter of great concern to all Americans interested in protecting the employment of our citizens, and the economic well-being of our industrial complex.

The President of the United States, under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, was given the power to reduce across-the-board tariffs by as much as 50 percent. Hundreds of domestic industries here in the United States, already hurt by foreign imports, are threatened with shutdowns.

Organized labor has joined management in opposing suicidal efforts to spur international trade.

In the steel industry, David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, joined with Bethlehem Steel President Stewart S. Cort, in urging the U.S. negotiators at Geneva to refrain from agreeing to any further tariff reductions on foreign steel imports.

Mr. McDonald said:

> We export to the six Common Market nations less than 1 ton of steel for every ton it exports to the United States.

The steel industry estimates that foreign steel imports will displace 70,000 American jobs over the next 3 years.

Comparative costs of the entry of heavy structural steel into the United States from foreign countries and from the United States into foreign countries already show the domestic U.S. steel industry to be at a tremendous disadvantage. The U.S. tariff on heavy structural steel imported from any foreign country into the United States, for example, is $2 per ton. The same type steel exported from the United States, on the other hand, to foreign countries, bears varying tariffs running all the way from $13.84 per ton in the United Kingdom, to $46.30 per ton in France.

I might note that the steel tariff set by our neighbor, Canada, is $33.25 per ton.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sanction any program that would place our domestic steel industry in a more disadvantageous competitive position in the world market.

I regret that this House saw fit, in 1962, to empower the President of the United States to reduce tariffs by as much as 50 percent. I am certain that many Members of this body have now seen the error of the ways. I voted against the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, because I was fearful that the industries and workers injured by a reduction in tariffs could not seek relief from Congress due to the absolute delegation of this power to the President.

Many areas of the United States are more adversely affected by foreign imports than others. Our coastal regions, for example, are more vulnerable to foreign imports than are our interior markets.

In my own city of Buffalo, the steady increase in foreign imports has placed in jeopardy literally thousands of jobs. The steel industry is only one of a score of major industries located in the Greater Buffalo area that would feel the crippling effects of an across-the-board tariff reduction.

I, for one, will do everything I can to oppose the sweeping nonselective tariff reduction proposals which the State Department has announced as its objective at the Geneva Conference.

It is my intention to introduce legislation in the very near future, for the purpose of restricting the unlimited power surrendered by Congress to the President in 1962, in the field of foreign trade.

The following is an excellent article outlining the position of the entire steel industry, both labor and management, on the subject of tariff reductions.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

YOU CAN BE HURT BY LOWER STEEL TARIFFS

"Within the next 3 years 10 to 15 percent of U.S. steel consumption will be imported steel, as compared to about 7 percent last year. * * * Such steel imports would mean 70,000 fewer jobs than would otherwise exist.

"This is equivalent to total production-worker employment at all of Bethlehem's steel-producing plants at present. In addition, profits and Federal income taxes paid by the steel companies and their employees would be adversely affected."

So said Stewart S. Cort, Bethlehem's president, at special hearings of the Trade Information Committee of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in Washington February 19. He was speaking out against lowered tariffs on foreign-made steel which would seriously hurt the long-term job security of Bethlehem employees and other steelworkers as well.

The day before, Mr. Cort had appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission. His story to the Commission was much the same—if the importation of steel into this country is made easier and cheaper for foreign producers, steelworkers, steel companies, and even the Federal Government will be hurt.

COASTAL MARKETS SERIOUSLY AFFECTED

Before the Tariff Commission, Mr. Cort emphasized that domestic steel producers who sell mainly to the coastal regions of this country—and this most certainly is true in Bethlehem's case—are hurt by foreign steel imports to a far-greater degree than national steel import figures would indicate.

For example, Mr. Cort pointed out that in 1963 foreign steel took 7 percent of the total U.S. market. "But in our Atlantic coast market this is 9 percent; in our gulf coast market 25 percent; in our west coast market 18 percent. In the balance of the country, accounting for two-thirds of steel consumption, foreign steel accounts for only 3 percent. Thus foreign steel is three times as big a factor in our Atlantic coast market; eight times in the gulf coast market; and six times as important on the west coast."

It is in those three heavily affected market areas that most of the steel we now make at Bethlehem plants must be sold. If we sell less in those areas, we make less and employ fewer people.

DIRECT EFFECT ON BETHLEHEM

Speaking of the direct effect that foreign steel imports have on jobs for domestic steelworkers, Mr. Cort told the trade negotiators that "3 years ago, Bethlehem decided to install new finishing facilities on the west coast. Our initial plan," he said, "called for a mill which would have given employment to about 3,000 people. Because of the increasing flood of imports, we have not been able to do anything about putting this decision into effect."

Mr. Cort also pointed out that Bethlehem's Sparrows Point plant had, for more than 30 years, operated consistently above the average for the industry—in good steel years and bad. "But, starting in late 1962, it began to lag behind the average for the industry," he reported.

Mr. Cort was by no means the only person speaking out against possible lowering of this country's already dangerously low import tariffs at forthcoming Geneva tariff talks. Executives from all the major domestic companies appeared. They spoke both for their companies and their employees, and for the entire industry and its employees.

UNITED STEELWORKERS SPEAKS OUT

But this was not solely a steel management plea made to the Government. Officials of the United Steelworkers added their strong support.

In a letter to the Honorable Christian Herter, special U.S. representative at the Geneva trade negotiations, David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, opposed the argument made by Western European countries (when they raised their import tariffs on steel) that the increases were needed to meet the underpriced competition from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. McDonald said: "We are not impressed by this excuse. In our judgment, another motive was preventive protectionism. We export to the six-nation[1] group less than 1 ton of steel products for every 10 tons it exports to us.

"We reaffirm our faith in the freest possible international trade, under reasonable and equitable conditions on both sides," Mr. McDonald wrote. "We should demand from other industrialized nations the same liberal and honest treatment we are willing to accord them," he concluded.

COST OF ENTRY DIFFERENTIALS

To highlight the disparties in the struggle between domestic steel and foreign steel, Mr. Cort explained the wide difference in the "cost of entry" of a ton of foreign-made structural steel into the United States and the cost of entry of a ton of domestic steel exported to a foreign country. Structural steel, made overseas, enters the United States at a cost of $2 per ton regardless of country of origin; the $2 covers all tariff rates, assessment duties, and transaction taxes.

On the other hand, the cost of entry into a foreign country for a ton of U.S.-made structural steel ranges all the way from $13.84 to $46.30. (The table gives the "cost of entry" figures for the various countries with which we find ourselves competing.)

Mr. Cort, speaking for the future job security of us all, urged the Tariff Commission: "It is my recommendation that you advise the President it is not in the best interest of the United States to effect any further reduction in the tariff structure on any steel product. * * * Tariff rates on steel are already the lowest of any manufacturing industry in this country, except certain agricultural supplies. Any further reduction will widen the area and the product range * * * where foreign steel can compete. It would cause increased dislocation of steelworkers—many of whom, we believe, would find it impossible to duplicate their standards of living through employment opportunities now available in other industries."

Cost of entry for heavy structural shapes

Country of origin	Country of destination	Dollars per net ton
All	United States	2.00
United States	United Kingdom	13.84
Do	Belgium	16.02
Do	Germany	19.33
Do	Japan	21.91
Do	Italy	24.51
Do	Canada	33.25
Do	France	46.30

[1] Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and West Germany.

Report From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents in the 13th District of Texas:

REPORT FROM CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Another Texan has recently been thrust by fate into a position of awesome responsibility. Like President Johnson, this Texan is most capable of dealing with his new position of responsibility. I am speaking of Congressman GEORGE MAHON of Lubbock, the new chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The recent death of long-time Member of Congress Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, who served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for more than two decades, elevated Congressman MAHON to his new position. This committee is charged with writing the legislation which appropriates all the funds of our national budget, more than $100 billion per year.

Congressman MAHON is well prepared. He came to Congress in 1934, and has served on the Committee on Appropriations since 1939. For many years he has been chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, which is responsible for the defense expenditures of our Federal Government, involving over half the budget. GEORGE MAHON is a respected and responsible Member of Congress. We can be certain that the operation of this most powerful committee of the Congress is in good hands. Altogether the 23 Texas Congressmen in the House have a combined total of almost 300 years in congressional experience. In addition to Congressman MAHON, three of our Members hold important committee chairmanships, and several are chairmen of important subcommittees.

Congrssman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texarkana, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has served in Congress since 1928, longer than any other Texan. Mr. PATMAN is one of the most respected Members of Congress.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE of College Station has risen to the chairmanship of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. "TIGER" TEAGUE was one of the most decorated heroes of World War II. He has been honored by almost every veterans' organization in the Nation for his work in Congress on their behalf. His committee supervises the third largest expenditure in the Federal budget.

Congressman OMAR BURLESON, of Anson, is chairman of the Committee on House Administration. Mr. BURLESON started his life of public service long before his election to Congress 18 years ago. He is a former FBI agent, a county attorney, and he served in the Navy during World War II.

Another Texan with large responsibilities is Congressman BOB POAGE, of Waco, who serves as vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. To my knowledge, this is the only committee which formerly elects a vice chairman. The honor is paid to BOB POAGE because of his dedication, hard work, and unsurpassed knowledge of the field of agricultural legislation.

There are two other Texas Congressmen that will never be forgotten. They are "Mr. Sam" Rayburn and John Nance Garner. Both of these men rendered distinguished service as Speaker of the House of Representatives. I think there is no doubt that "Mr. Sam" lived to become the most respected Member of Congress in our time. He had an unblemished reputation of fairness and honesty in dealing with Members of the House. He was loved and he is still missed by all who knew him.

Members of the Texas delegation work very closely together. Each Wednesday we meet during our noon hour to discuss matters of mutual interest. We have been pleased and fortunate that President Johnson has continued to meet with us when his demanding schedule permits.

In almost every instance, the citizens of Texas have had the wisdom to elect good men to Congress, and to keep them there long enough for them to be effective. It

takes a lot of experience and knowledge to be an effective Member of Congress. Texas has every right to be proud of its representation in our Nation's Capitol, for its Members are respected, honored, and often consulted in Congress.

Cordially,

GRAHAM PURCELL.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday we commemorate Memorial Day, one of the great traditional and inspiring holidays of our land.

The Tri-City Advertiser, serving the communities of Dolton, Riverdale and South Holland in south suburban Cook County in its edition of Thursday, May 21, carried a most expressive and dramatic editorial comment on Memorial Day, which I place into the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

MEMORIAL DAY

The beginning of the summer holiday season comes soon. The date is May 30. For thousands this means a week end holiday with the various resorts and tourist attractions anxiously awaiting the throngs that will set out for a good time. This should not be denied to anyone.

But May 30 is also Memorial Day when the Nation pauses to honor the memory of its war dead. Groups of faithful men and women of the various veterans organizations all over the Nation will forego any pleasure to devote their time and effort to the memory of those who went through the hell of war for the safety and protection of those of us who are here now.

This year the day assumes an additional importance because it will include the many of our men who died and who will die in the present conflicts going on in the world. These too, will be honored.

Those of us who went through the wars remember all too well the horrors of such conflicts and the pain, misery, sorrow and despair that follow in the wake of these conflicts.

Many of us remember we were promised that World War I would be "the war to end all wars," only to find ourselves in the wars to follow. No wonder men ask the answer which, up to now, has not come.

Those of you who wonder at the staggering amount of time, effort and money being spent on armaments and research for instruments of war, might do well to remember that force, as a deterrent, could avoid any worldwide conflict.

We doubt if any one man or group of men can give us the means of achieving permanent peace. But it seems to us that if all of us joined in a concerted effort of prayer and constructive thinking and living, we might come closer to that most desired of all desires—peace for all men.

It has been well said that "peace comes not from the cannon's mouth." Likewise it has been said that "peace can only come in the hearts of men."

We are impressed by a statement written by a prominent theologian wherein it was made plain that Christ came on earth not to help people as much as to teach people to help themselves.

Maybe we had better get busy on that line of thought.

And we suggest that on this Memorial Day all of us remember those who have died for us and utter a fervent prayer for those who must serve their country in the days to come.

The Cover-Up—A New Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, of March 27, 1964:

THE COVER-UP—A NEW MORALITY—RECORD SHOWS FEDERAL OFFICIALS WHO EXPOSE SHADY DEALS GET BOUNCED

(By Richard Wilson)

The handwriting on the wall has been written large here: Don't buck the system. This truth is freshly proved by a Government distinguished service award to an obscure official named Horace D. Godfrey. Mr. Godfrey is the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service under Agriculture Secretary Freeman.

It is charged in the House of Reprsentatives that Mr. Godfrey was given this award although in his branch of the Federal service "obviously a cover-up was attempted in the entire Billie Sol Estes case." The evidence in the Billie Sol Estes investigation showed, it is charged, incredible confusion, mismanagement, lack of records, duplication, and "woeful lack of management and knowledge of what was going on in the Estes case."

Mr. Freeman so values Mr. Godfrey today, however, that he confers upon him the highest accolade of his department as an example to others.

But what of the man who testified and supplied records to show that the big time Texas promoter now under prison sentence for fraud was shown favoritism in Mr. Freeman's department as early as November 1961? This man, N. Battle Hales, has been denied an automatic in-grade promotion which would ordinarily have come to him in the course of his Federal service. Thus the accuser languishes and the accused flourishes, although the record seems clear that Billie Sol enjoyed a favored position in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Freeman has no monopoly on this technique. One Jerry Jackis, who revealed to Congress the use of foreign aid funds in Cambodia for a Communist-sponsored hospital, was fired while the State Department official who made a record against him was promoted.

Otto Otepka, State Department security official, who committed the unforgivable sin of preaching on his superiors and telling Congress what is wrong with the internal security system in the State Department, is in limbo. But William J. Crockett, deputy undersecretary, who was in charge of the Otepka matter for Secretary Rusk, is up for promotion to career minister, a better job. The Senater Foreign Relations Committee is looking into this because the record shows wiretapping, general harassment, and attempts to degrade Mr. Otepka after he helped the Senate Internal Security Committee to expose some of the weaknesses of the State Department security system.

It is worth noting also that Gen. Curtis LeMay has been given an extension, at least until after the election, of his tenure as Air Chief of Staff. General LeMay protested against the multibillion dollar award of the TFX contract for what he thought was a second best fighter plane to be used by both the Navy and Air Force. The Navy commander, Admiral Anderson, who also objected openly before Congress, has long since vanished from the Washington scene. But General LeMay was pointedly given only a 1-year reappointment, instead of the usual 2, and this has now been extended. But it looks as if General LeMay's service is rapidly coming to a close.

The pattern set in these several cases is shocking. The lesson taught to Federal officials is that if they see mismanagement, wrongdoing, or bad judgment they would be wise to keep their mouths shut if they wish to maintain or improve their job status.

Their worst sin would be to tell their story to Congress, although it is the clear and imperative responsibility of Congress to inquire into the operation of Federal executive departments funded solely by the votes of Congress. Congress controls absolutely the appropriation of money to operate the Federal Government and of taxation to provide these funds. This is its exclusive power, and Congress has the right to know how the funds are spent.

Some kind of a new morality seems to have gotten lodged in official Washington. It is the morality of blind loyalty to superior authority and complete obeisance to the word from on high. It is the morality of cover-up in the Billie Sol Estes case and whitewash in the Baker case. And it is not a very healthy atmosphere for the prudent conduct of the public's business.

Another State Department Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I read in the New York Times this morning that the State Department, in insisting on a $40 million loan from the International Monetary Fund to the United Arab Republic, not only had broken a long-standing rule of the Fund that establishes a bad precedent, but puts the United States in the embarrassing position of competing with the Soviet Union for the friendship of the Nasser regime. How many other nations are now going to play the Soviet Union against the United States to their own benefit?

Further, I cannot help but agree with the article from the Times that this ill-advised loan is bound to increase European reluctance to augment the role of the Fund at a time when efforts are being made to encourage them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible faux paus. In my humble opinion, we can ill afford to have the State Department making continuous blunders such as this. I would certainly hope that our Foreign Affairs Committee or some appropriate committee of the Congress will make a thorough investigation.

The news article to which I refer follows:

UNITED STATES VEXES ALLIES ON LOAN TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC—$40 MILLION FROM WORLD FUND ON LIBERAL TERMS PUSHED THROUGH BY WASHINGTON

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 27.—The United States, over the objections of its Western European allies, has virtually forced through the International Monetary Fund a $40 million loan to the United Arab Republic that sets precedents in its liberal terms.

The loan, formally approved earlier this week, came just after Premier Khrushchev's triumphant reception in the United Arab Republic on the occasion of the dedication of the Aswan High Dam. Mr. Khrushchev pledged additional economic aid to Cairo.

Approval of the loan also came just before a visit to Washington next week by the Israel Premier, Levi Eshkol. This visit has aroused sharp concern in the Arab countries.

European resentment of what is viewed as political use of the Monetary Fund is deep. This week's action, it is understood, may gravely jeopardize U.S. proposals to increase the resources of the Fund as a keystone of a plan to preserve the stability of the international financial system.

The State Department, according to reliable sources, insisted on U.S. backing for the Monetary Fund loan over the objections of the Treasury. Under the weighted voting rules of the 102-nation Monetary Fund, the U.S. position on any question is decisive, and U.S. support of the loan pushed it through.

The objections of the European nations and, it is reported, of the U.S. Treasury were not based on political opinions of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's regime. Rather they arose from the fact that this loan broke a longstanding rule of the Monetary Fund.

Essentially, this rule is that a nation can draw upon its full borrowing quota in the Fund only if it adopts austere internal financial policies to strengthen its currency, halt inflation and improve its international balance of payments. The balance is the relationship between payments to foreigners and receipts from foreigners.

The Monetary Fund rule has been enforced consistently in the case of Latin American countries and others.

In the view of those who opposed the loan, including almost all of the industrial countries that dominate the Fund's Board of Directors, the United Arab Republic did not meet these conditions. Thus they regarded the loan as essentially political.

The international management of the Fund, headed by its managing director, Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, supported the loan. Rightly or wrongly, many Europeans believe that the Fund's management is dominated by an American point of view even though its chief is French.

The Egyptian incident is thus crucial in the current secret negotiations among the 10 leading industrial nations looking toward strengthening and improvement of the international monetary system. The United States is known to be backing an increase in each member's payment into the Fund, and hence its drawing quota, as a major element in strengthening the system.

The Fund has been a quiet but major prop behind postwar international prosperity, ready to provide foreign exchange reserves for nations temporarily pinched.

A major objection by the nations of continental Europe led by France, to giving an expanding role to the Monetary Fund is that its voting system and its management are believed to give the United States a predominant role. Given the current financial strength of the European countries, this situation is not believed to reflect the real balance of financial power.

Thus the loan to the United Arab Republic is bound to increase European reluctance to augment the role of the fund, in the view of authoritative sources today.

The State Department's basic policy has been to preserve U.S. links with President Nasser's regime. In the view of officials, Mr. Khrushchev did not win complete support for Soviet foreign policy in his Egyptian tour earlier this month.

The Monetary Fund loan was thus important evidence that the United States is continuing its policy of assisting Mr. Nasser despite his statements that seem to back Soviet policy in part and despite his open hostility to Israel. In the State Department view, Mr. Nasser's policy has been responsible on the whole.

Some European financial officials view the loan to Cairo as an example of how less developed countries can play off the Soviet Union against the United States to their own benefit.

It is known that the U.S. Treasury will fight hard to keep the present incident an isolated one and to preserve the basic financial rules of the fund.

The Monetary Fund has available more than $15 billion in gold and national currencies for quick international credit. By the fall of 1963 it had provided more than $7 billion in short-term financial assistance to 48 of its members. The Fund was founded by 44 nations at the Bretton Woods Conference of July 1944.

National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable John A. Carver, Jr., given at the dedication of the Visitor Center at Colorado National Monument, near Grand Junction, Colo., Sunday, May 24, 1964.

We, in the West, are interested in the proper development of national parks, national forests, and national monuments. I am sure all Members of Congress will be pleased to read this address. The address follows:

A year ago I helped the Park Service dedicate a visitor center at Chancellorsville, Va. What I remember of that occasion, with continuing embarrassment, was that it was there that I found, to my consternation when I turned over page 4 of my text, not the final page I expected, but page 1 again. Page 5 was back at my seat.

I've been traveling these last 2 days with your Congressman, WAYNE ASPINALL. To tell you the truth, I've been traveling with him for a lot longer than 2 days. He is the chairman of the best run committee of the U.S. Congress, and it is the best run because he is the chairman. His House Interior Committee is the most important committee of the Congress for the Western United States, exercising jurisdiction over the public lands, parks, water resource development, minerals, Indians, and all the other subjects which are, in the executive branch, the assigned responsibilities of the Interior Department, where I serve.

We could talk for a long time about the public lands, and the reclamation projects, and the Indians, and the minerals of this great area, but our purpose today leads us to the national system of parks, monuments, and recreation areas of which the Colorado National Monument is one.

On my last trip through the monument, I asked Superintendent Bussey what he thought was the most significant thing about the history of the monument. Without hesitation he mentioned the spirit of cooperation and mutual helpfulness of the people of the area about the park. He singled out the friendly and helpful interest which Congressman ASPINALL had always shown to the activities here.

I've had a theory for a long time about park areas—what makes for their establishment, and what makes for their successful operation.

For establishment, one key is vision and insight—the capacity to see a natural feature, which may seem commonplace, a damned nuisance, economically worthless, or all three, at the time and place, against a larger backdrop—the backdrop of geology, archeology, history or esthetics, for example.

But vision and insight aren't enough. Added to that must be the wracking, endless work of achieving something like a political consensus locally. Not necessarily evidenced by a political act, such as an election, but by general acceptance in the community, support which may be evidenced in myriad ways—by chamber of commerce resolutions, by newspaper support, by elected officials' espousal, by urgings on the floor of Congress.

If there is such a community consensus at the outset, it tends to be self-generating. With any kind of nurturing, the good feeling about parks tends to grow. Even parks which seemed just to squeak by come to be regarded as great boons, after awhile.

This unit of the park system was blessed from the beginning, both in the vision and inspiration of early leaders, and in the maintenance of that spirit of cooperation. This is clearly evidenced by its early history, which I personally checked in the files of the Department about it for the period from 1907 to 1912.

There is no question but that the idea for the Colorado National Monument was singlehandedly conceived, and singlemindedly pursued, by the colorful John Otto.

When the vision or inspiration for making this a national area came to him I didn't find out. Our earliest records only show that the first efforts must have been concentrated on the citizens of Grand Junction. In 1907, Judge Walter Sullivan was the draftsman and scrivener of a formal letter to the Register of the U.S. Land Office at Montrose, asking "that the Interior Department set aside certain lands for a public park and that they be eventually granted to Mesa County." Other signers included every elected official of the county, the mayor, city clerk, and city treasurer of Grand Junction, the State senator, and the officers of the Grand Junction Chamber of Commerce. To this evidence of local unanimity they were able to add the formal endorsement of the Governor and the auditor of State.

In due course, the Interior Department heeded the request for a temporary withdrawal, being swayed, perhaps, by the argument in the petition that to fail to do so would permit "any interested person who was so disposed to make filing thereof as agricultural land or entry thereof as timber and stone land" all for the "mercenary purpose of charging fees to visitors" and "to make a profit out of the same to the detriment of the thousands of persons now living or who may hereafter become citizens of this county and vicinity."

Within 2 months, the temporary withdrawal for about 5,000 acres was processed, notwithstanding a land office clerk's note that it was not authorized by the Antiquities Act. Another clerk indirectly referred to President Theodore Roosevelt's midnight creation of the forest reserves by calling "special attention to the fact that the withdrawal

is not for forestry purposes and I do not therefore believe it would be antagonistic even to the spirit of the act of March 4, 1907, prohibiting the creation of the national forests in Colorado and certain other States except by act of Congress."

With the withdrawal made, John Otto took up his pen to get a more permanent status for the area. On August 8, 1909, in a "My Dear President" letter to William H. Taft, he begins "Again I take the liberty to call your attention to our national monument park proposition," and invited the President to visit the area.

Whether in response to the invitation, I doubt, but Taft did visit and another "My Dear President" letter opens, "Almost a year has passed since you visited our valley. Perhaps you remember the Peach Queen." I'll wager Mr. Taft did indeed remember the Peach Queen. Then a sly political reference, perhaps looking forward to the 1912 Bull Moose campaign which unseated Taft in favor of Wilson, although 1910 was an off year: "We are standpatters, that is, we always stand pat for the continuance of prosperity." He asked Mr. Taft to permanently establish the area as a national park, and signed himself "John Otto, trailbuilder and guide."

Mr. Otto recognized that even then Presidents had to be preoccupied with Congress: "We hope that now in between sessions you can give this matter the attention that it as we believe duly deserves."

The Presidential trip to the valley had been for the purpose of dedicating the Gunnison Tunnel. Mr. Otto appreciated the tunnel: "A great achievement it is as the world knows; as such it is simply the work of man."

In December 1909, an additional withdrawal, up to about 15,000 acres, was requested by the chamber of commerce. Probably more because Senator Guggenheim had announced his intention to introduce a bill to make the area a national park, than the chamber petition, this withdrawal got prompt and favorable Department action. Senator Guggenheim's stationery was from the now defunct "Committee on the University of the United States."

Congress not having acted by 1911, either on Senator Guggenheim's bill, or on Congressman Edward Taylor's companion measure, the move started for a Presidential proclamation of a national monument. The petition from the Grand Junction area to the President bears literally hundreds of names, probably the grandparents or parents of many in this audience. Maybe some of you here today signed.

President Taft, after getting a favorable report from the Department, signed the proclamation on May 24, 1911. And it was here that I found the only ripple of disharmony—over the name. On May 9, 1911, Mr. Taylor received a telegram from Grand Junction: "chamber of commerce recommends Hooper National Monument in honor Maj. S. K. Hooper who has done more to advertise Colorado's scenic attraction than any six men in State." A penciled note on the telegram says: "Held up by violent protests from Colorado, Taylor."

The chamber explained to the Congressman what was up in two letters, both dated May 15, 1911. In one this informative sentence appears: "The Fruita people could have very easily arranged the matter without any friction if they had called up anyone here in the city and made a suggestion."

And "I think Otto should be consulted about the matter, but he was off in the woods somewhere."

And finally: "As I said before, we will not make any further suggestions * * * and will leave the matter of selecting a name entirely with you and the Secretary of the Interior."

But under the same date, the same chamber secretary listed 18-typed names, and one written as an afterthought in pen. Here are the 18 typed: Dinosaur, Mammoth, Mesa Rojo, Grand National, Grand River National, Otto, Ute, Robideau (he was a trapper who lived in this territory in 1832), Escalante, Dominguez, Independence, Crawford, Liberty, Sphinx, Mile-High, Columbus, Columbine, and Centennial.

The one penned in? You guessed it. "Colorado National Monument." Congressman Taylor was responsible for its selection.

Well, other interesting things happened. Mr. Otto got married. Collier's weekly, although they had written the Department to verify their facts, announced erroneously that it was to be named "Monolithic National Monument." And they started a legend about where the marriage took place:

"The segregation of this section of land crowns the personal work of the last 5 years of one of the West's most peculiar characters, John Otto. Otto, without any hope of personal gain, unpaid, and for a long time actually discouraged by the open jeers with which his work was greeted, opened up the natural wonders of this district to the world. With the aid of two burros he has built over 12 miles of splendid trail, leading into and through the various canyons of the park. In places he has drilled through solid rock for long distances. During the last few years he has been supported by the Grand Junction and Fruita Chambers of Commerce.

"On July 4 (1912), he will be married on the top of Independence Monument to Miss Beatrice Farnham of Weymouth, Mass., an artist * * * Otto has just completed an iron ladder to the top of this shaft which is 575 feet high."

An equally fascinating story is the episode of the flag to fly atop Independence. I must abbreviate it. Mr. Otto, after the proclamation was signed, was hired as custodian and sole employee at $1 a month. He took to writing through channels, never again to the President, but instead to his boss, the commissioner of the General Land Office.

At first he wrote that he would use his salary to buy a $12 flag once a year to fly on Independence, but he soon decided he ought to get one free from the Government—and he did. Then he located a couple of Bureau of Reclamation mules not being used, which the Reclamation man was willing to let him have "but for the trouble of it."

It is always fun, and instructive too, to poke around in the old files of the Department. Invariably one finds that however much things have changed, they remain always the same.

The people don't react differently now than they did in 1911. We have today our John Ottos—some unrecognized. The benefits of cooperation in the identification of values on the public lands, and the protection and development of these values in the public interest remain the same, too.

This is an auspicious occasion, dedicating as we do this fine structure to serve the needs of numbers of people which even the farseeing Grand Junction people couldn't have imagined in 1907. I hope that we rededicate ourselves, too, to the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness which has marked the entire history of Colorado National Monument.

With men like WAYNE ASPINALL in Congress, this relationship will be built on solid footing. For he understands the duties and responsibilities of each branch of the Government with respect to the public lands, including the parks and monuments.

The source of our national strength is not in the structures we build, whether physical or governmental, but in the people and their elected officials.

President Johnson has infused all of Government and the American people too with a new awareness of this elemental fact. Where opportunity is blighted, where the people cannot break out of the chains of poverty forced upon them, where people cannot vote or are denied the rights of Americans, to that extent the whole Nation suffers. A spirit of national cooperation in meeting these problems is evident everywhere.

As the oldtimers here express satisfaction that they helped make this park a reality, so all of us will someday express satisfaction that we helped in the great struggles for equality and justice in the 1960's.

"New" Johnson Being Created

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the following column of editorial comment was written by one of the most experienced political writers in West Virginia and I think it represents a development which is becoming increasingly recognized. I commend the comments of the writer, Harry Hoffmann, of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, to your attention.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Apr. 21, 1964]

"NEW" JOHNSON BEING CREATED

(By Harry Hoffmann)

WASHINGTON.—Last week marked the start of what might be called the creation of the "new" Lyndon Johnson. A change in "image" was needed, and the results so far are good.

The act of violence last November that moved the tall Texan abruptly from relative obscurity into the full glare that goes with the Presidency was not an easy transition for him.

What made it most difficult was the new aura of dignity, of intellectual composure, of sparkling wit and serious demeanor that had been brought to the White House by John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He had given the American people a new appreciation of the Nation's highest office—and it was evident they liked what they saw.

It was evident also that no one could be expected to reflect the new image in quite the same good grace as John Kennedy—certainly not the outgoing rancher from Texas with his back-slapping tendencies ranging from the boisterous guffaw to the wheeler-dealer hug.

For a period it seemed that Johnson might have determined to force a transfer of the Kennedy image to himself—without being quite able to distinguish between sparkling wit and clownishness, as indicated by his recent episode. He was dignified, sincere, even humble as he talked about "this job which fate has thrust upon me."

"The President always has to think of America as a continuing community," he said. "He has to try to see how his decisions will affect not only today's citizens, but their children and their children's children unto the third and fourth generation. He has to try to peer into the future, and he has to prepare for that future.

"If the policies he advocates lack this dimention of depth and this dimension of staying power, he may gain this or that advantage in the short term, but he can set the country on a false course and profit today at the expense of all the world tomorrow."

Then, disregarding the possibility some editors might object that he was taking advantage of them as a captive audience, he

pounded home some persuasive arguments on America's needs.

Civil rights: "Our Nation will live in tormented ease until the civil rights bill now being considered is written into the books of law. The question is no longer, 'shall it be passed?'

"Is it asking too much for this bountiful country to prepare a law so that older folks can face illness when it inevitably comes and face it without the chill foreboding of an empty purse, or an inadequate insurance policy?"

There was no clownishness here, no lack of sincerity, no impression of a wheeler-dealer. This was a man who seemed to recognize that fate had given him a destiny to fulfill.

Uncle Sam's Grocery Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Joint Economic Committee had occasion to study the military procurement system. In connection with those hearings, a report from the Comptroller General of the United States was requested on the operation of the military commissary stores. That report, when received, indicated that not only were there considerable operating losses, but also there was much wasted effort and money in the annual survey that is conducted by the Defense Department. The report also indicated that the administrative regulations of the Defense Department in this regard were in conflict with the congressional intent in passage of the law. To remedy this situation, the Comptroller suggested that either the back-door appropriations for these commissaries be suspended, or that some guidelines be set by legislation to insure their operation within the scope of the law. On May 14, I introduced a bill that would have the effect of establishing these guidelines. This week, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post of May 25 which points up the problem that is attendent in this area.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 25, 1964]

UNCLE SAM'S SUPERMARKETS

Long ago when most military bases were located in thinly populated frontier areas, Government-operated commissary stores were established to provide the families of personnel with staples at reasonable prices. But like weeds in a garden the commissaries have continued to multiply in an era when the typical military installation in this country can be amply served by private enterprises.

Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee reveals the Defense Department is now operating a nationwide chain of 269 supermarkets which do an annual business of $730 million. These stores, which have increased in number by 38 percent over the last decade, sell merchandise to the military and civilian employees of the Defense Department at prices which on the average are about 23 percent below those charged by private food stores.

The bargain prices save those privileged to shop at the commissaries about $270 million a year. But these benefits must be reduced by $150 million in uncovered commissary costs, losses made up by the taxpayers in each year, and by the erosion of the private tax base.

Clearly the savings conferred by the operations of the commissaries constitute a subsidy, and it is proper to ask who is being subsidized and why. Perhaps a case can be made—a rather weak one—for subsidizing the enlisted military man who attempts to raise a family on a small salary. But what reasonable defense can be made for extending commissary privileges to civilians whose civil service salaries exceed the national averages?

In addition to inviting invidious comparisons by the vast majority of citizens who must pay prices that reflect the full costs of food distribution, the perpetuation and expansion of the commissary chain clearly violate the expressed wishes of the Congress. A law passed in 1953 instructs the Secretary of Defense to operate commissaries only when food items are "not otherwise available at a reasonable distance and a reasonable price." By arbitrarily assuming a markup of no more than 20 percent over commissary costs to constitute a reasonable price, the Defense Department justifies the operation of eight commissary stores in the Washington area and others in almost every large city.

The House Appropriations Committee has just refused a "top priority" request from the Air Force to build a $145,000 commissary in Portland, Oreg. This reluctance to expand the system, while welcome, hardly cuts to the heart of the matter. Both the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Budget appear unable or unwilling to close down the commissaries by administrative action. And if they fail to act in the near future, Congress would do well to consider the carefully drafted bill (H.R. 11259) submitted by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, which would close down those stores in the continental United States that cannot meet the test of necessity and compel those remaining in business to charge competitive prices which reflect full costs.

If the low-ranking military personnel were compensated by salary increases for the loss of the commissary subsidy, a net saving would still be effected by eliminating the operating losses on a chain of stores appropriate only on frontier posts.

Bette Davis-Joan Crawford Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1964, the city of Los Angeles will honor, through a proclamation by its mayor, Actresses Joan Crawford and Bette Davis on the occasion of the start of their second costarring motion picture. They are being honored not only by the city, but by the State of California and their fellow workers in the motion picture industry, many of whom reside in my district.

Misses Davis and Crawford have, through the years, helped to create the glamour that is Hollywood and have, by their much acclaimed talent, won recognition throughout the world for our country's cultural achievements as well as for their own personal success.

Both of these great ladies have not only contributed much honor to our motion picture industry and to their profession, but have also contributed immeasuraby to the welfare and adment of our society.

Miss Davis, the only woman to have served as president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, was the cofounder of the Hollywood Canteen during World War II and is the permanent president of the canteen, which now exists to provide funds to the Motion Picture Relief Fund and charitable activities of the Variety Clubs International. A Los Angeles Times "Woman of the Year," Miss Davis is also well known for her articles on mentally retarded children, with reference to her retarded adopted daughter, which have aided important research in this field. She is president of the Tailwaggers, an organization dedicated to all dog lovers. Nominated 10 times for an Academy Award and one of the few to have won 2 Academy Awards, Miss Davis takes her obligations as a citizen with as much seriousness and pride as she does her professional career. Her other philanthropies include time given to the WAIFS, service as a good will ambassadress, and cooperating with numerous worldwide charitable organizations.

Miss Crawford's efforts on behalf of our country and society are conspicuous by their unending number. She is chairwoman of the Stars for Mental Health of the National Association for Mental Health, ambassadress at large for CARE, member of the board of directors of the USO in New York, member of the board of directors of the World Rehabilitation Fund and serves as a sponsor for New York's Tuberculosis and Health Association Christmas Seals Campaign. The actress, also an Academy Award winner, helped to establish free theater for the public in the annual Shakespeare Festival in New York's Central Park and she has helped to raise funds for the American Cancer Society, Muscular Dystrophy, Salvation Army, Young Women's Christian Association, New York Herald Tribune Fresh Air Fund, and many other worthwhile causes.

Along with the many constituents in my district who will be honoring Joan Crawford and Bette Davis at 20th Century-Fox Studios on the day named in their honor, I wish to publicly acknowledge and commend their contributions to the welfare of our society as well as their great talents which have done so much to make our motion picture industry the greatest in the world.

The Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

CLARENCE CANNON's career in Government has spanned over 50 years. Our country and its representative institutions will long feel his impact as a great parliamentarian, as a Member of the House for over 40 years, and as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

His eulogy can be spoken simply; he was an honorable man, a man of integrity and great ability, and he has served his country well.

My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Cannon, their daughters, and other members of his family.

A Success in Foreign Aid: 4-K Clubs in Kenya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital resources in any nation is its youth, and in a basically agricultural country the economic future can well depend upon the skill of its future farmers.

The Agency for International Development, through technical cooperation development assistance, provides agricultural extension services similar to those in the United States which have helped our country achieve agricultural progress. Today, AID's extension farm youth movement thrives in 62 different countries, including Kenya.

In Kenya farming has long been considered the work of girls and women. However, as cash crops have increased in importance, more men have taken an interest in the land, but the young ones must be shown the attractiveness and worthiness of agricultural production. With only 10 percent of their secondary school age children attending school and with only a small number of youth agricultural technical stations, Kenya needed a widespread grassroots program in agriculture and home economics through which boys and girls could learn by actual experience and discover at the same time the joy of creating with their own hands.

For their inspiration, U.S. AID and Kenyan Department of Agriculture officials turned to the extension farm youth movement, using our own 4-H Clubs as an example. They chose the name 4-K Clubs, the K's standing for three Swahili words meaning to "unite," to "work" with one's hands and to "help" oneself, one's community, and Kenya.

Government Agriculture extension staff members were trained to assist and advise local 4-K Clubs. In April 1963 actual organization began. Staff members first approached the local community leaders, then informal leaders, progressive farmers, and the parents to enlist their support, explaining that they would be needed as unpaid volunteer leaders and to help the youngsters buy garden seed. Finally, the children themselves were approached. Interest here was already high because of discussion with their parents. The children formed their own club in which they democratically elected officers and made plans for projects. They were divided into two groups: 8- to 15- and 16- to 22-year-olds.

Each youth, given his or her own project, raises rabbits, poultry or other livestock or grows vegetables or other field crops, usually on his family's plot of land. All outlay is at his own expenses and produce grown is often sold on the market which teaches the boys and girls techniques of selling. Participants visit each other's plots and enter different shows where their produce is judged in competition.

The whole project has cost little. No dues are collected, volunteers lead groups and suitable—usually informal—meeting places are chosen. AID and the Kenyan Department of Agriculture jointly provide money to run the organization and to assist in training leaders.

The movement, belonging to the people, is growing rapidly. Already there are over 75 clubs who boast a combined membership of more than 1,800.

Thus, the 4-K Clubs are training Kenya's farmers of the future in more scientific ways and are inculcating an understanding and appreciation of the value of farming. At the same time the youth are obtaining experience in democratic methods at a local level and the thrill of individual initiative and achievement.

Constitutional Protection of the Human Person

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1964, Law Day U.S.A. was observed throughout our Nation. A very inspiring and moving ceremony was held at the World's Fair grounds, New York, under the auspices of the Queens County Bar Association. All who were able to participate in this program or witness it owe a debt of gratitude to this association, especially its very able president, Nat Hentel, Esq.

The main speaker at this event was our distinguished colleague from New York, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of his fine address:

CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF THE HUMAN PERSON

(Address by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, Law Day observance, Queens County Bar Association, May 1, 1964)

I feel most honored to join with you in the celebration of Law Day, and am particularly pleased to see so many new citizens present for this occasion. The observance of this day and the interest and enthusiasm it has generated proves once more the truth of Judge Learned Hand's statement, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men."

We, as Americans, have set this day aside to show our appreciation of liberty and to reaffirm our loyalty to the United States of America—a nation ruled by laws and not by men. Law Day is a time of rededication to the ideals of equality and justice—equality and justice under the law.

While America began with a government in which liberty and the law stood hand in hand, I do not believe we could have maintained those high ideals without the constant reinforcement of our moral and spiritual bulwarks by citizens who recognized their value. For liberty does indeed live in the hearts of men and, again quoting Judge Hand, "when it dies there, no court can save it."

America received the necessary reinforcements from many countries. Men and women who sought equality and liberty came to our shores, leaving behind oppression, bigotry, and hunger. To them it was a land of hope and freedom, a land of opportunity. These immigrants, these new Americans, have been the wellspring of renewed patriotism and promoters of freedom in this land.

We pride ourselves in the fact that the newest American stands equal to the oldest in the eyes of the law.

Daniel Webster said, "God grants liberty to those who love it." There are few of us here who respect the rule of law as much, comprehend its magnificence so completely, or understand its meaning so deeply as those who have lived outside its protection.

On this Law Day we owe special thanks to those men and women who, by profession, bear the heaviest burden in supporting the law. Principally, these are the members of the judiciary, practicing attorneys, and law enforcement officers.

Their responsibilities go far beyond the requirements of technical competence, for they are key men in the preservation of individual rights and dignity. To them each problem must be seen as a new problem and each man crossing their paths as a new man, an individual. They cannot fall into routine. They cannot become jaded in their work. For if they become careless with the rights of men, those rights are no longer meaningful. The fact that liberty flourishes across this land is undeniable testament to their continuing success.

The Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, in a speech delivered at Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y., on the 26th day of March 1961 said: "There is a law behind the law." He suggested that the study of Aristotle, Maimonides, and Aquinas would reveal the key to the "law behind the law."

In our Anglo-American jurisprudence the concept of freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person has been the touchstone which has given life to our constitutional history and has, in reality, been the "law behind the law" referred to by the Chief Justice of the United States.

Fortunately for us the civil law of Rome, a totalitarian system of law, never prevailed in England or the United States. Although Anglo-American law, to use Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes' language "Borrowed its modern procedure from the Roman law, it never accepted the substantive law of the Roman code as the law of the realm."

The Judaic Christian tradition and its concept of the dignity of the human person has made its influence felt in Anglo-American law from the 13th century down to and including the present time. Bracton in the first book written on English law under the title of "Law and Customs of the Angles," stated: "The king is under God and the law." In modern terminology this would mean that all government is under God and the law. This is the beginning of the recognition of the primacy of the human person and the limitation of the state in Anglo-American law. Substantially the same language was repeated in the Magna Carta in the 13th century and is also to be found in the writings of Sir John Fortescue in "The Monarchy" which is the first book written in English on the English Constitution. This

same principle of exalting the dignity of the human person as against the state or organized society was repeated by Lord Coke, the father of the common law in his great controversy with King James, in the 17th century in which Lord Coke said when he repeated the language of Bracton: "The King is subject not to men, but to God and the law."

Commenting on this Professor Plucknett of Harvard University, in his "Concise History of the Common Law" stated: "In other words, Coke was prepared to revive the age-old dogma that law, in its origin and sanction, is the basis upon which civil society is built, and that this law is supreme above king and people equally." Professor Plucknett also stated in the same work: "It was medievalists in England, armed with Bracton and the yearbooks who ended Stuart statecraft, and the Constitution of the United States was written by men who had Magna Carta and Coke on Littleton before their eyes."

While the English Constitution was unwritten and the right of the human person was protected by tradition the Founding Fathers of the American Republic set forth their philosophy of government in the Declaration of Independence and stated: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Shortly thereafter the Founding Fathers of the American Republic, toward the close of the 18th century, caused to be adopted the Constitution of the United States as the fundamental and basic law of our country. For the first time in the history of mankind the fundamental and basic law of a nation limited the power of government. The first 10 amendments, or the Bill of Rights, proclaimed and guaranteed the freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person. Thereafter, in the mid 19th century, after the close of the War Between the States, amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15 were adopted to the Federal Constitution. These three amendments again had, as their purpose, the freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person. As is well known the 13th amendment prohibited slavery or involuntary servitude. The 14th amendment placed a prohibition against a State depriving any person of life, liberty or property without due process of the law and also guaranteed the equal protection of the laws to all persons. The 15th amendment seeks to guarantee human persons the right to vote as does the 19th, 23d, and 24th amendments.

Lest, it is thought that what has been said up to now is merely good history, it is my purpose to examine and discuss all of the controversial constitutional issues which have been decided by the U.S. Supreme Court during its last five terms, 1957 to 1962, and to demonstrate how, in all of these cases, the criterion has been, and is, the freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person as against the State or organized society.

The cases before the U.S. Supreme Court during its last five terms deal with the freedom of religion, expression, and assembly under the 1st amendment, the right of defendants in criminal proceedings, the civil rights of persons under the 14th amendment, the right to vote under the 15th, 19th, 23d, and 24th amendments, the right to travel and the right to citizenship. In all of these instances the basic issue is the freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person.

An examination of these cases will reveal that the issue involved was either freedom of the human person, equality of the human person or the dignity of the human person. The application of these three tests was the deciding issue in all of the controversial constitutional cases passed upon by the U.S. Supreme Court during the last 5 years. It is well to remember that in all of these cases the U.S. Supreme Court is interpreting basic law so as to protect the freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person against the act of any and all human legislators whether State or Federal.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION (1)

The first amendment to the Constitution is really a freedom of the human person amendment. It is usually subdivided into freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and freedom of association.

During the last five terms the leading cases dealing with religious freedom, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld, as constitutional that the Lincoln Square project, which provided land to Fordham University, at substantially less than its cost, did not raise any constitutional issue (*Harris* v. *City of New York*). In *Kissinger* v. *United States*, the Supreme Court refused to hear a claim of a farmer that a Federal statute penalizing him for exceeding his wheat quota violated his religious beliefs. In *Engel* v. *Vitale*, the Court held unconstitutional a State nondenominational regents prayer as constitutional violative of the first amendment. In *School District of Abington Township* v. *Schempp*, the Supreme Court held that the compulsory recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and the compulsory Bible reading in the public schools is unconstitutional. In *Sherbert* v. *Verner*, the Court held that a Seventh-day Adventist who refused to work on Saturdays because of her religious beliefs could not be deprived of the benefit of unemployment insurance and further directed that a State statute which had this effect would be in violation of the first amendment.

Thus it would be seen that in all of the cases involving religious freedom, under the first amendment, the issue involved was the freedom of the human person to think and practice his religion with complete freedom, free from any coercion by the State.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION (2)

It must be remembered that when the Supreme Court restrains governmental action in freedom of expression it does not necessarily approve or justify the expressions uttered but rather merely holds that it is not a matter for human legislation.

In *One, Inc.* v. *Oleson*, *Sunshine Book Co.* v. *Summerfield*, *Times Film Co.* v. *City of Chicago*, and *Smith* v. *California*, which dealt with two Federal statutes and an Illinois statute prohibiting obscenity, the Court held that the publications and expressions complained of did not constitute hard-core obscenity and sustained the right of the individuals to express themselves in the manner in which they did.

In *Talley* v. *California*, a California ordinance made it a crime to distribute handbills unless they carried the name of the author and distributor. The U.S. Supreme Court struck down the statute as unconstitutional as abridging the freedom of expression of the human person.

In *Manual Enterprises* v. *Day*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Postmaster General could not bar from the mails certain lascivious photographs. Likewise in *Wood* v. *Georgia*, the Court reversed a contempt conviction of a sheriff in Georgia who published statements critical of grand jury proceedings.

In *Bantam Books, Inc., et al.* v. *Sullivan*, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional a Rhode Island statute which authorized a State commission to circularize listing of objectionable books and reminding the seller of the commission's duty to recommend prosecution of purveyors of obscenity, as it constituted a governmental censorship prohibited by the first amendment.

In *Edwards* v. *South Carolina*, the Court set aside a conviction of a number of Negro students in the State of South Carolina who were engaged in peaceful demonstrations against segregation. The Court likewise held that this conviction violated the first amendment. Here again we see that the test in all of these freedom of expression cases involved the freedom of the human person to express himself without restraint insofar as governmental action is concerned.

FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY (3)

In *NAACP* v. *Alabama* the Court set aside a $100,000 fine for contempt of court imposed by the State of Alabama on the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as unconstitutional. The Court held that the first amendment guaranteed to human persons the freedom to engage in associations.

In *Staub* v. *City of Baxley*, the Court set aside a Georgia ordinance which prohibited solicitation of members for any dues-collecting "organization, union or society" unless application was first made to the city and the city council. The defendant attempted to solicit members for the ILGW Union and was convicted under the ordinance in question. The Court set aside the ordinance as unconstitutional and held that the human person had the right to associate and to assemble with other persons of his own choosing under both the 1st and 14th amendments.

In *Bates* v. *Little Rock*, the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously reversed the conviction of a group of officers of the NAACP for refusing to submit the membership list to the cities of Little Rock and North Little Rock, Ark. Here again the Court held that human persons had the right to assemble and associate with other human persons without any interference by the State.

In *Gibson* v. *Florida Legislative Investigation Committee*, the Court held that absent substantial evidence of a connection between subversive activities and a local NAACP branch, a State investigative committee could not compel the president of the branch to use members lists to refresh his memory as to whether specific individuals were members of the NAACP. Here again the right to assemble guaranteed by the first amendment was involved.

In *NAACP* v. *Button*, the Court held that a Virginia statute which attempted to interfere with the activities of the NAACP on the grounds that the NAACP was engaged in the improper solicitation of legal business was unconstitutional under the first amendment.

In all of these cases it will be seen that the freedom of the human person to assemble and associate with other human persons was placed beyond the power of any human legislature to interfere with.

EQUALITY OF HUMAN PERSONS BEFORE THE LAW (4)

The due process clauses of the 5th and 14th amendments guarantees equality of human persons before the law and also, in substance, provide that in the distribution of taxes, honors or other emoluments, that the principle of distributive justice should apply. A careful examination of the many cases involving civil rights, the right to vote, the furnishing of various facilities by the States and National Government, including the opportunity for an education, when the State provides it, all turn on the principle of equality of the human person before the law.

THE DIGNITY OF THE HUMAN PERSON BEFORE THE LAW (5)

The large number of cases set forth in the footnote involving rights of defendants in criminal cases, including privilege against self-incrimination, wiretapping, entrapment, searches and seizures, double jeopardy, coerce confession and the right to counsel, all stem from the recognition of the dignity of the human person.

Although it might seem to be oversimplification, it is submitted that the recognition of the freedom, equality and dignity of the human person is the rationale behind all of these highly controversial constitutional questions, and that dedication to the freedom, equality, and dignity of the human person is definitely the law behind the law referred to by Chief Justice Warren.

Liberty and the law still stand hand in hand in America. This is the strongest single proof of the rightness of our cause. It will save us from disenchantment in the search for a just and enduring peace.

Law gives the individual security he could obtain in no other way. Law becomes the servant and not the master of men. It is this fact which gives such great virility to our constitutional system.

As we leave here today, let us carry one thought with us. "Liberty and the law do not flourish unattended. They must be understood, cherished, discussed and defended."

I am happy to be observing Law Day with you.

Ambassador, Mrs., and Miss Doherty—A Peerless Trio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said by many that never has the United States been more gloriously and graciously represented in an ambassadorial post than by the Doherty trio—William C., Gertrude, and Peggy—in Jamaica.

By unaimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the June 1964, issue of Postal Record:

JAMAICA BIDS DOHERTY SAD FAREWELL—CONGRATULATES HIM ON JOB WELL DONE

When Ambassador William C. Doherty, immediate past president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, resigned his diplomatic post in Jamaica, on April 24, the citizens and the press of the Caribbean island poured out their affection and appreciation for a job superbly done.

During his 18 months at Kingtson, labor's first diplomat won the hearts and the imagination of Jamaica's populace, from the topmost echelons of Government to the most depressed income groups.

THE VOICE OF JAMAICA

Typical of the reaction was an editorial in the Voice of Jamaica, which said: "Mr. Doherty stands in a class by himself. * * * With innate courtesy and skill, born of his genuine liking for people, Mr. Doherty soon endeared himself to all classes by his friendly contacts. His genuine interest in the country and its people has been shown by his eagerness to do everything in his official capacity to help the young nation in every way, and, if all were told, the amount and quality of his assistance would be a revelation to the general public."

The Voice of Jamaica also said that "the Ambassador's success was aided considerably by his wife, Gertrude, whose unassuming dignity was undoubtedly of immense assistance." It went on, also, to praise "the charming and vivacious Miss (Peggy) Doherty," who helped her parents fill their numerous social obligations during the time she was with them.

THE DAILY GLEANER

William Strong, one of the most widely read columnists in Jamaica, had this to say in the Daily Gleaner: "If Bill Doherty had memorized Dale Carnegie's famous book 'How To Win Friends and Influence People,' he could not have been a greater success as America's first Ambassador to a country that is, frankly, still leery about Americans.* * * On the social and civic scene he has associated himself with everything Jamaican, official and unofficial.* * * When he wasn't around, he was missed. His speeches have been no empty, platitudinous doubletalk. They have been simple, homespun, lucid, sincere—straight from the heart—and now and again, from the shoulder.* * * He and the Peace Corps, the Ambassador and his Prime Minister developed an early friendship that has been more than official. They became bosom pals and have stayed that way.* * * Whoever succeeds him will need big shoes, and a heart to match."

THE STAR

Vere Johns, the top columnist for the Jamaica Star, was equally enthusiastic. "Unlike former consul generals, there are few people in this island who do not know that Bill Doherty * * * is the American Ambassador. He has made friends by the score and acquaintances by the thousands. The assistance which he gave to Jamaica's economy has been outstanding and largely through his influence in Washington and his love of Jamaica. * * * In her own quiet way, Mrs. Doherty made quite an impact on our social and philanthropic circles. A perfect helpmate, a love that will endure.* * * May God go with you and bring you back to our shores one day soon. Jamaica's welcome mat will always be laid out for you, good friends."

CATHOLIC OPINION

All the stories about the departing Ambassador emphasized his deep religious faith and his sincere practice of that faith. This was particularly notable since the Catholic Church is distinctly a minority in the island Republic.

Catholic Opinion added these comments to the chorus of commendation: "Though not a professional diplomat, Mr. Doherty sought eagerly, and received the warm friendliness and cooperation of our Government. Very few facets of our political and economic life missed his zealous attention; no area of the island was neglected by him. With graciousness he was received in our towns and villages.* * * In cooperation with the U.S. Agency for International Development mission here in Jamaica, and with the volunteers of the United States, assistants charted a policy of mutual self-help that will influence the next few decades of Jamaica's relationship with the West.* * * More Jamaican people are housed, areas of Jamaica's green lands are engineered and institutions of Jamaica's children are enriched by the workmanlike procedures of Mr. Doherty's office.* * * Mr. Doherty and his charitable wife have enriched the island with their quiet courtesies. They have set a benchmark of competence and quality.* * * His Government now has been placed under an embarrassment. They must give us another Mr. Doherty."

A CREDIT TO THE COUNTRY

The encomiums upon the Ambassador's work could fill this entire issue of the Record. Suffice it to say that his mission in Jamaica was a glittering success. His performance was a tremendous credit to the National Association of Letter Carriers, to the entire labor movement of the free world and, of course, most importantly, to the United States of America which he represented so ably.

California Junior Philharmonic Orchestra Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to join with thousands of California music lovers in honoring the Junior Philharmonic Orchestra of California and Mr. Ernst H. Katz, the founder-conductor of this outstanding group, on the observance of the 27th anniversary of the organization's founding.

The anniversary celebration will take the form of a gala event scheduled to take place at 8 p.m. Wednesday evening, June 10, 1964, in the Elks Temple at 607 South Parkview Street, Los Angeles.

As you know, the Junior Philharmonic Orchestra is a unique nonprofessional and noncommercial all-youth symphony originated in 1937 by Mr. Katz to stimulate and encourage the youth of California to use their talents for the benefit of their fellow men.

The orchestra's personnel is comprised of over 100 talented young musicians between the ages of 12 and 19. During its remarkable 27-year history it has presented almost 600 concerts in behalf of civic, charitable and cultural institutions throughout California.

As a further note of esteem, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles City Council setting aside June 10, 1964, as California Junior Philharmonic Orchestra Day. The city council also urged the citizens of Los Angeles to honor this outstanding musical group and its founder-conductor, Ernst H. Katz, who, in the words of the resolution, "has created a rare opportunity for our American youth and has shown us one among many ways in which devotion, earnestness and cooperation can make life beautiful and worth while."

The resolution follows:

Whereas in 1937 a gifted young American musician with a dream founded the Junior Philharmonic Orchestra of California to stimulate the participation of the youth of our State in the creation of good music; and

Whereas his friends and critics said Ernst Katz had a special genius for translating this dream into a character-building force; and

Whereas today their predications stand on a high-note of triumph for Ernst Katz' Junior Philharmonic Orchestra of California is unique since it is a completely nonprofessional all-youth symphony that is also noncommercial, performing frequently for philanthropic and civic projects; and

Whereas more than 27,000 young people between the ages of 12 and 19 have auditioned for membership in the symphony which has played hundreds of concerts and helped raise noteworthy funds for charity in southern California; and

Whereas its membership has grown from its original 4 musicians to its present roster of 110 talented teenagers; and

Whereas the Junior Philharmonic Orchestra has been participating in Gen. Dwight

D. Eisenhower's "People to People Program"; and

Whereas Los Angeles city and county officials, representatives of the State of California, stars of stage, screen and television and music lovers of Los Angeles participate in the 27th annual civic observance for this internationally renowned group; and

Whereas the 27th birthday of the Junior Philharmonic Orchestra of California will be observed Wednesday, June 10, 1964, at elaborate ceremonies by the B.P.O.E. Elks "99" with Judge Carlos Teran, exalted ruler, and California Supreme Court Justice Marshall F. McComb presiding; and

Whereas the orchestra will present for its 27th anniversary concert:

"The Star-Spangled Banner," Damrosch-Smith; "Overture to Egmont," Beethoven; "Symphony in F Major," Dittersdorf; "The Dream of Olwen," Charles Williams; "Andalucia Suite," Lecuona; "The Music Man," Meredith Wilson; "Sound of Music," Richard Rodgers; "Bacchanale," Saint-Saens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles City Council set aside June 10, 1964, as California Junior Philharmonic Orchestra Day and urge our citizens to honor this outstanding musical organization and its founder-conductor, Ernst H. Katz, who has created a rare opportunity for our American youth and shows us one among the many ways in which devotion, earnestness, and cooperation can make life beautiful and worthwhile.

HAROLD A. HENEY,
Councilman, 4th District.
JOHN P. CASSIDY,
Councilman, 12th District.

MAY 20, 1964.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following "Calendar of Events, June 1964" from the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JUNE 1964

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New exhibitions: 7,000 years of Iranian art. Central gallery, galleries G–7 and G–8. June 7 through July 19.

Portrait of the artist's mother: "Arrangement in Gray and Black, No. 1," by James Abbott McNeill Whistler. Lent by the Musée du Louvre. Rotunda. June 10 through June 30.

New publication: "7,000 Years of Iranian Art." Exhibition catalog; 188 pages, 10¾ inches by 8¼ inches, with foreword by S. Dillon Ripley, and essays by Edith Porada and Richard Ettinghausen, 18 color plates and 140 black-and-white illustrations; $3.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: Color reproductions, 11 inches by 14 inches. Rembrandt, "Joseph Accused by Potiphar's Wife"; Velazquez, "The Needlewoman"; Rembrandt, "Portrait of a Lady With an Ostrich-Feather Fan"; Turner, "The Junction of the Thames and the Medway"; Pater, "Fête Champêtre"; Juan de Flandes, "The Adoration of the Magi." Twenty-five cents each, postpaid.

Lectures: A series of Sunday lectures on "Iranian Art" will begin on June 7 and continue through June 21.

On Saturday, June 13, Prof. Roman Ghirshman, chief of the French archeological mission in Iran, will lecture in French on "Archeological Discoveries in Iran." Lecture Hall, 3 p.m.

Concerts: Following the program of June 28 the concerts will be discontinued until fall.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, JUNE 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 7

Painting of the week: Copley. "Epes Sargent" (gift of the Avalon Foundation), gallery 67; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Flemish costumes in art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Ancient Art of Iran." Guest speaker: Edith Porada, professor of archaeology, Columbia University, New York, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Last concert of the 21st American Music Festival. National Gallery orchestra; Richard Bales, conductor, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 8, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 14

Painting of the week: Turner. "The Dogana and Santa Maria della Salute, Venice" (given in memory of Gov. Alvan T. Fuller by the Fuller Foundation), galley 61, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Architecture in art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Latest Great Flowering of Iranian Art." Guest speaker: Richard Ettinghausen, head curator of Near Eastern Art, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Peggy Zabawa, soprano; Jule Zabawa, baritone; assisted by instrumental quartet; east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, JUNE 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 21

Painting of the week: Constable. "A View of Salisbury Cathedral" (Mellon collection), gallery 59, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: 7,000 years of Iranian art, I. Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Aesthetics of Iranian Art." Guest speaker: John Shapley, professor of art history, Howard University, Washington. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Chattanooga Boys Choir, Stephen J. Ortlip, director, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 22, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 28

Painting of the week: Panini. "The Interior of the Pantheon" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 36, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: 7,000 years of Iranian art, II. Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Epochs of Art in Turkey." Speaker: Margaret Bouton, Associate Curator of Education, National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: LoisAnn Oakes, mezzo-soporano; Samuel Sanders, pianist; east garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

Old Age Can Be Healthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on the aged in the March 1964 edition of the Eagle written by the famous novelist James T. Farrell. The article presents many insights into a most important problem, and I commend it to all my colleagues.

The article follows:

OLD AGE CAN BE HEALTHY

(By James T. Farrell)

Today, the problems of the aged have much news value. In the press and the public mind, the social and economic problems of the aged are the focus of interest. Unemployment among senior citizens, housing for old couples, social security, pensions, the cost of medical care, recreation, homes for the aged have all become burning questions.

The questions refer to very real and important problems. The weight of these problems and the cost of their solution is becoming heavier as senior citizens rapidly increase in number.

There were approximately 5 million persons 65 or over in the United States in 1920, comprising approximately 5 percent of the population. In 1956, that number grew to about 14.5 million, representing 8.6 percent of the population. In 1975, the number of aged in the United States will be about 21 million or between 9 and 10 percent of the population.

Today, a man of 60 can hopefully look ahead to another 15 to 20 years of life. If his health is good he can hope to pass the 80-year-mark.

The principal cause of this increased life expectancy has been medical research. Whereas, the ancients believed that old age was a disease, today we make every effort to differentiate between the aging process and the diseases that occur later in life.

There are changes that come with age, some of them observable by anyone, others evident only through medical examination. Although growing old results in a limitation of various powers, this comes about gradually. Old age is not a disease in itself.

With the aid of new ideas and new techniques, modern medicine has made considerable progress in understanding and saving old people.

But we cannot think of healthy old age in a purely medical framework. Health is not merely the absence of infirmity or disease. Healthy old age means psychological health and healthy social relationships.

There is now sufficient evidence, medically and psychologically, that men and women can grow old and remain healthy in body and mind. The concept of healthy old age as something attainable for large numbers can serve as a starting point for society and the individual in improving the conditions of living for the aged and aging.

Today, the social prejudice against employing older people is strong, and many older people are being discharged principally because of their age. Even as early as 35, many people encounter increasing difficulty in obtaining jobs.

The decline of income among the elderly is a definite and appalling fact of our society.

Those who grow old without owning their own homes often must live in reduced circumstances, suffering a loss of a sense of dignity and a feeling of status. All too many of our aged live in slums or tenement areas. After a lifetime of work, some of them spend their final years in wretched conditions. Lonely old people with no one to live with can be found in boarding houses and cramped rooms.

The cost of medical care rises with age, and the older person cannot benefit from new techniques without the ability to pay for them. A national study made a few years ago showed that the average cost of medical care for persons over 65 was $102 as against $65 for the population as a whole.

Obviously the best solution for many of the aged is employment. The number who can do full- or part-time work is very large.

The prejudice against hiring older people is far from being broken. Were it not for the seniority system in many firms and industrial plants, the plight of the aged would be incalculably worse.

With a longer lifespan and improvement in the health of the aging, employment practices must be changed. It is equally clear that more aid and welfare must be given to this senior group of citizens, whether from private or from governmental sources, or from both. To do less would be immoral and cruel.

If the life of man is lengthened, he must have the means to pursue that life rather than waste away, to rot inwardly and then in misery and bitterness, become a veritable refugee in his own land, a land of opportunity.

Another possibility exists. The older citizens will come together as a voting bloc. If this happens, in 15 years those 65 and older will be able to sway national elections.

Such a development would be harmful. It would make old age a separate vested interest, if not a disease, and the old would be pushed more among one another. They would have an inadequate opportunity to participate in the life and culture of our society.

The principle that society bears some responsibility for the welfare of the aged is now gaining wide acceptance. There is danger, however, that with increased attention and publicity, the public will believe that the problem is closer to solution than is the case. A little progress sometimes produces blindness and complacency.

The needs of the old far exceed their capacities even now. If they are not met, this Nation will be in a mess in 1975. Old age will become a new social or sociological disease.

Many actions must be taken, private and public, to provide for the increasing needs of the aged and aging. These are a test of our society. If we fail to meet this test, we will be morally condemned in history. The solutions of these problems can be many and mixed.

Much, relatively speaking, has been done. Medically, psychiatrically, socially, and economically, the means exist for helping the old, and for creating better conditions of living for them within their financial means.

Administration by Coverup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, for all the glowing praises this administration is receiving everywhere, the fact remains that it has been an administration by coverup. Whether concerned with Vietnam, Bobby Baker, or the question of subversion. Richard Wilson, in the Washington Evening Star of May 27, itemizes the record as follows:

THE COVERUP—A NEW MORALITY: RECORD SHOWS FEDERAL OFFICIALS WHO EXPOSE SHADY DEALS GET BOUNCED

(By Richard Wilson)

The handwriting on the wall has been written large here: Don't buck the system. This truth is freshly proved by a Government distinguished service award to an obscure official named Horace D. Godfrey. Mr. Godfrey is the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service under Agriculture Secretary Freeman.

It is charged in the House of Representatives that Mr. Godfrey was given this award although in his branch of the Federal Service "obviously a coverup was attempted in the entire Billie Sol Estes case." The evidence in the Billie Sol Estes investigation showed, it is charged, incredible confusion, mismanagement, lack of records, duplication, and "woeful lack of management and knowledge of what was going on in the Estes case."

Mr. Freeman so values Mr. Godfrey today, however, that he confers upon him the highest accolade of his department as an example to others.

But what of the man who testified and supplied records to show that the big-time Texas promoter now under prison sentence for fraud was shown favoritism in Mr. Freeman's department as early as November 1961? This man, N. Battle Hales, has been denied an automatic ingrade promotion which would ordinarily have come to him in the course of his Federal service. Thus, the accuser languishes and the accused flourishes, although the record seems clear that Billie Sol had enjoyed a favored position in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Freeman has no monopoly on this technique. One Jerry Jackis, who revealed to Congress the use of foreign aid funds in Cambodia for a Communist-sponsored hospital, was fired while the State Department official who made a record against him was promoted.

Otto Otepka, State Department security official, who committed the unforgivable sin of peaching on his superiors and telling Congress what is wrong with the internal security system in the State Department, is in limbo. But William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary, who was in charge of the Otepka matter for Secretary Rusk, is up for promotion to career minister, a better job. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is looking into this because the record shows wiretapping, general harassment, and attempts to degrade Mr. Otepka after he helped the Senate Internal Security Committee to expose some of the weaknesses of the State Department security system.

It is worth noting also that Gen. Curtis LeMay has been given an extension, at least until after the election, of his tenure as Air Chief of Staff. General LeMay protested against the multi-billion-dollar award of the TFX contract for what he thought was a second-best fighter plane to be used by both the Navy and Air Force. The Navy commander, Admiral Anderson, who also objected openly before Congress, has long since vanished from the Washington scene. But General LeMay was pointedly given only a 1-year reappointment, instead of the usual 2, and this has now been extended. But it looks as if General LeMay's service is rapidly coming to a close.

The pattern set in these several cases is shocking. The lesson taught to Federal officials is that if they see mismanagement, wrongdoing, or bad judgment they would be wise to keep their mouths shut if they wish to maintain or improve their job status.

Their worst sin would be to tell their story to Congress, although it is the clear and imperative responsibility of Congress to inquire into the operation of Federal executive departments funded solely by the votes of Congress. Congress controls absolutely the appropriation of money to operate the Federal Government and of taxation to provide these funds. This is its exclusive power, and Congress has the right to know how the funds are spent.

Some kind of a new morality seems to have gotten lodged in official Washington. It is the morality of blind loyalty to superior authority and complete obeisance to the word from on high. It is the morality of coverup in the Billie Sol Estes case and whitewash in the Baker case. And it is not a very healthy atmosphere for the prudent conduct of the public's business.

Tribute to Rev. Peter A. Coad, M.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, Rev. Peter A. Coad, M.A., dean of the faculties of Mount St. Mary's College and Seminary, will celebrate his 70th year of ordination to the holy priesthood.

It has been my privilege to call Father Coad a personal friend for a number of years and to admire and respect his many abilities. At age 94, this master of the teaching profession still conducts a class in patristic Latin at the seminary. In recognition of his outstanding contribution, the president and council of Mount St. Mary's recently announced that the new million-dollar science hall now under construction on the campus will bear the name of Coad Hall.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert here an article from the May 11 Frederick (Md.) News giving the personal background of this wonderful citizen, teacher, and man of God as follows:

TO NAME MILLION-DOLLAR HALL AFTER DEAN OF FACULTIES

The president and council of Mount St. Mary's College and Seminary have announced that the new million dollar science hall now under construction at the college will be named Coad Hall, honoring Rev. Peter A.

Coad, M.A., dean of the faculties of the college and seminary.

Father Coad, who celebrated his 94th birthday last December, will celebrate his 70th year of ordination to the holy priesthood on June 23. Still very active and alert, he celebrates daily mass, takes his daily walks, reads the newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and walks to the seminary 3 days a week to teach a class of patristic Latin.

Father Coad, son of John Coad and Mary Ryan, was born in Johnstown, Pa., December 23, 1869. He obtained his elementary schooling under the direction of the Sisters of Charity at St. John Gualbert parochial school there. He next entered Mount St. Mary's preparatory school in the fall of 1885 and continued on into the college where he received his bachelor of arts degree in 1890.

One month before his graduation, he lost his parents, a brother and sister and a grandmother in the Johnstown flood.

He continued his studies at the Mount, receiving his master's degree in 1892 and his priestly studies in 1894. He was ordained for the diocese of Pittsburgh in the college chapel by Bishop McGovern of Harrisburg in June of 1894.

He was assigned to the Church of St. Mary, Sharpsburg, Pa., where he served until February 22, 1896, when he was recalled to the faculty of Mount St. Mary's. He was elected to membership on the college council in 1897.

With the exception of the years 1898–1901, Father Coad has spent his adult life on the campus of the mount. During this 3-year period, he studied in Athens, Greece. He is a scholar of varied interests. He has specialized in classical languages, ancient history, and church history. He also served for a time as professor of moral theology in the seminary.

Although recognized as a master of the teaching profession with a wealth of wisdom, illustration, and anecdote, he has declined all honors. He is loved by his students and has become a legend on the campus of the college and seminary.

A View of President Lyndon B. Johnson From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Times of London of May 13 contained a discerning profile of the President. Members may find it of interest:

MR. JOHNSON'S CHANCE OF GREATNESS

The country over which President Johnson shows every sign of presiding for the next 8 years will be a society in crisis. The fact is something of a paradox since normally one connects the risk of crisis with some disastrous failure in national resources or power. In fact, since the end of the war America has remained overwhelmingly powerful and has also grown steadily richer. By 1975, according to a survey published last week by the 20th Century Fund, national income should be well above the $100 billion mark.

All this hardly sounds like a crisis. Yet a brilliant postwar recovery in the whole Atlantic arena, coupled with sustained prosperity in the United States, does not make up the whole picture. While national income among the Atlantic powers, industrially sophisticated, technologically advanced, grows by never less than 3 percent a year, the preindustrial societies in the undeveloped "south" of the globe keep ahead of their growth in population—if they are lucky—by not much more than 1 percent. The gap widens between the poor nations, poor in everything except aspirations, and the Atlantic group of states, rich, white and enormously outnumbered. Russia may be successfully contained in Europe. But the risk remains that the Atlantic flank could be turned by a worldwide revolt of the dispossessed.

DOMESTIC POVERTY

The crisis is not simply external. In the past year or so the American public has begun to be aware of startling pockets of domestic poverty—regions deserted by industry, farmers on marginal land, above all, the existence in the core of great cities of racial ghettoes where young people without skills or hope turn into tomorrow's delinquents or threaten to add a new edge of violence to the fight for civil rights.

There are some features in common between the external and the internal crisis. Both are concerned with the protest of the poor. Both could acquire dangerous racial overtones. Above all, they are not self-correcting. The growth of Atlantic wealth does not now automatically spark comparable increases in investment and trade around the world. Wealthy nations invest predominantly in other wealthy nations and tend to engross most of the gains from international trade. Similarly, families living in the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty, ignorance, and ill health do not easily break free in an increasingly automated society, demanding ever higher skills and intelligence.

There is, of course, no physical obstacle to the mounting of a really adequate counterattack. America's national income, already above $600,000 million, is growing at present by more than $30,000 million, a year. If the familiar yardstick of 1 percent of national income were devoted to the worldwide war on poverty and 2 percent to the same war on the domestic front, America would still have virtually an equivalent amount of fresh resources to devote to its other desirable pursuits. There are no physical limitations here.

PURPOSIVE GOALS

But the psychological obstacles are formidable. Any sustained, large-scale attack on domestic and world poverty demands the acceptance of two fundamental ideas—that resources for the task are available, even lavish, and that a society may properly set itself purposive public goals—such as the conquest of poverty. These assumptions run directly counter to some of the most widespread and most publicized beliefs about the American economy. Newspapers, business leaders, senior statesmen are as likely to warn the public of the risks of inflation leading to national bankruptcy as to extol the new scale of national resources. "Purposive goals" become terrifying prospects of compulsory planning by big government. Only a month ago so revered a figure as General Eisenhower warned a wide public, through the pages of the Saturday Evening Post, that inflation was America's urgent problem—even though through the last 3 years of deficit financing and rapid growth there has been no trace of it.

Such invincible myth making would present formidable obstacles to effective action, wherever it appeared. Unhappily, it is strong in the crucial arena of Congress. Only large-scale spending on defense—to which one should perhaps add space and highways—has been able fully to legitimize itself. The hatchets are out for the smallest request yet made for foreign aid—$3,400 million—and men who blithely and unhesitatingly vote a couple of thousand million for an unwanted bomber are anxiously scrutinizing every cent in the President's thousand million-dollar program for the domestic war on poverty. Whatever the rising urgency of the crises of race and poverty round the world, they are not yet focused enough either in the public mind or in Congress to be translated into really large scale action.

CONSERVATIVE GIANT

Since, however, it is chiefly psychological obstacles that lie in the way, the issue of effective leadership becomes critical. There is, of course, only one office in the United States to which this function is inescapably attached—the Presidency. Under President Eisenhower the office was used to soothe, not stimulate. President Kennedy's term, tragically cut short, brought new vision and vigor to Washington but left open the question of full national leadership. Congress at least had shown signs of going on strike. Now President Johnson faces the task. His dilemma is to persuade an affluent but conservative giant to pursue and expand a number of liberal policies—in aid, in trade, in domestic redevelopment—which are physically possible but are also, on the full scale required, still "unthinkable," to adopt Senator FULBRIGHT's phrase. What are the prospects?

The President so far has shown uncanny powers of balance. He has carried through Congress Mr. Kennedy's chief measure of sophisticated "Keynesian" reform—the tax cut at a time of budgetary deficit designed to accelerate growth and thus increase revenue. Yet he did so while keeping the budget below the traumatic figure of $100 billion—and while turning out the White House lights to symbolize his care for "frugal government."

He speaks with the accents of a southerner, but his commitment to civil rights is complete and few doubt the civil rights bill will pass this summer. He has come almost literally from the proverbial log cabin but his own escape from poverty has left him not complacent and condemnatory but profoundly compassionate for those still caught in the ancient trap. He has not lost his early commitment to the generosity of the New Deal. Yet his family has made a small fortune. He admires the drive and professionalism of business and extols the merits of free enterprise as a creator of unequalled affluence.

COMMON TOUCH

To this unusual balance of opposites, one should add a flexible, tough, uniquely experienced handling of Congress—"Kennedy respected them too much," say the cynics, "Lyndon knows them"—and a sure touch with the ordinary voter, inviting the Washington tourist into "your White House," greeting the little girl who can see her granny because the rail strike is settled. One can say that the tone is, if you like, as reassuring as General Eisenhower's. But it happens to be telling America very different things. If one were to make a quick survey of the President's recent speeches, one theme above all would seem to be dominant—precisely the theme of the present crisis of poverty in the midst of affluence and the moral duty to act. "God is not mocked," he said to a gathering of editors. "We reap as we sow. Our God is still a jealous God—jealous for the least of his children who went unfed while 'the rich sat down to eat and rose up to play.' "

This is a new note in American politics since the war—an almost Biblical appeal beyond the frustrations and fears of uneasy affluence to a force and a commitment which America's greatest leaders have never been afraid to evoke—the force of moral obligation, the commitment to a vision of justice. Such an appeal, combined as it is with the President's unique drive of energy, toughness, shrewdness and strategy may well prove a highly effective answer to the challenge of national leadership. The "Johnson era" is

certain to be one "piled high with difficulty." But there is a good chance that it will bear the marks of greatness too.

An Indispensable Guy Replaces Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a recent article concerning the distinguished new chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, was written by one of the most astute and celebrated columnists in the Nation, Mr. William S. White.

Mr. White pays well-founded tribute to the qualities and character which have made GEORGE MAHON the leader he is today. The article cites Chairman MAHON's sense of duty, fairplay, and justice, and articulates the very great role which our colleague plays not only in the Congress but in our Nation's destiny.

I urge that Mr. White's column be included in the RECORD in order that it may receive the widest possible audience:

AN INDISPENSABLE GUY REPLACES CANNON

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Not even in politics do nice guys always finish last. For distinguished evidence of this there is Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, who has just ascended to the chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee in succession to the dead Clarence Cannon of Missouri.

For more than 20 years GEORGE MAHON has been a significant Member of Congress. For most of these years he has had a responsible hand in the allocation of countless billions of dollars and a critical and decisive role in defense appropriations alone running to more than $450 billion.

For a decade, at least, he has been among the 10 or 12 men who really run Congress, as head of the Appropriations Subcommittee which has the military directly in its charge. Now, as chairman of the entire committee, his power runs everywhere. Now he is unquestionably among the topmost six of Congress.

MAHON, a tall, shy, reticent, and soft-spoken man of 63 who at a glance could pass for 45, is a leathery product of west Texas who could easily be either the fellow in the white hat or the fellow in the black hat in any Dodge City of television. His simple, undemanding demeanor masks one of the wisest and most sophisticated minds in the United States in the strategic fundamentals of warfare as seen from the ultimately controlling vantage point held by such political masters of all high strategy.

It is said of him, and rightly so, that he knows the byways of the Pentagon far better than any Secretary of Defense we have ever had because while Secretaries come and go, MAHON has stayed on and on.

In reality, MAHON is to, say, an Assistant Secretary of State about what a commanding general of an army group is to an aid-de-camp wearing his shoulder cord over the gilt bars of a second lieutenant. But reality escapes many people here—and this is fine with such as GEORGE MAHON. For they have the work to do.

Moreover, the Mahons as a class, and GEORGE MAHON specifically, are also the last and best justifications of the very two congressional facts of life now under the widest attack from reformers: the seniority system and the one-party system believed by many to be so notably evil.

But for the seniority system, mere personal popularity polls and logrolling and not the hard competence that can only come from long experience, would choose the committee chairmen of Congress. And but for the one-party system, with all its faults, men like GEORGE MAHON could never survive long enough to reach that place of power from which the Mahons alone are able to disregard the little local pressures and passing hysterias and so to concentrate on the great and timeless national issues.

At this point they are in fact statesmen—and only politicians some of the time and then only incidentally. They are nice guys, yes; but they are something far more. They are indispensable guys.

Jackson Probes Bomber Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the noted syndicated columnist, Holmes Alexander, recently carried a series of articles dealing with the organization known as the Council for a Livable World, one of the groups espousing unilateral disarmament which has contributed generously to the campaign coffers of candidates it has endorsed. Mr. Alexander brings out astounding facts regarding the objectives and activities of this group which I think will be of general interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Alexander's syndicated column for March 3, 1964:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Mar. 3, 1964]

JACKSON PROBES BOMBER LAG

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Senator HENRY (SCOOP) JACKSON, a skeptical supporter of the test ban treaty, has been visiting our nuclear laboratories to check up on our nuclear vigilance in the wake of the treaty which the Senate ratified last autumn.

JACKSON is asking the Preparedness Subcommittee, of which he is a member, to follow up his check with a full-scale investigation of the four safeguards which the Kennedy-Johnson administration is pledged to observe. In convenient shorthand, the safeguards are:

1. Stepped-up underground testing to compensate for the ban against atmospheric testing.

2. Maintenance of high efficiency and morale among scientists entrusted with our nuclear armament.

3. Readiness to resume atmospheric testing if the national interest requires it.

4. Improved detection to insure against Soviet cheating on the treaty.

JACKSON, a member of both the Armed Services and Atomic Energy Committees, has "majored" in atomic legislation since coming to the House of Representatives in 1940, with time out for wartime Army service. His skepticism is that of an informed and concerned patriot who believes that the United States should keep a definite superiority, not a parity, in nuclear arms. Here are some of the factors that are wrinkling his studious brow:

Coming from Washington State, where much of the employment depends upon the defense industries, JACKSON is up for reelection with no strong opposition, except from the various peacemongering organizations which like to tag him as a minion of the munitions lobby.

In 1962, one of these unilateral disarmament groups, the Council for a Livable World, endorsed and financially supported the election of two Democratic Senators, MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, and CLARK, of Pennsylvania. The Livable (with communism) Worlders, I am told by their executive director, Col. Henry Aston Crosby, have endorsed four other Democrats for reelection this year: MCGEE, of Wyoming; BURDICK, of North Dakota; Moss, of Utah; and MCCARTHY, of Minnesota. The Livable Worlders have also supported the liberal Republicans, JAVITS, of New York, and KUCHEL, of California. Thus there is in the Senate a perceptible and respectable nucleaus of men who are beholden to a group that favors disarmament in the face of the enemy.

Specifically, Dr. Leo Szilard, chairman of the Livable Worlders and a noted pacifist-physicist, has testified on Capitol Hill against making the safeguards too safe. He told the Foreign Relations Committee that "an extensive program of underground bomb testing" (safeguard No. 1) would not be "furthering the cause of peace," but that it would "be likely to do just the opposite."

Again, as part of the background for JACKSON's skepticism, are charges by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, that the Defense Department is spending only "peanuts" in keeping up the safeguard. HOSMER has peppered both J.F.K. and L.B.J. with demands for hard information, but up till now is not satisfied either with the general or detailed material that has been sent him.

HOSMER has a set of figures which show that the four safeguards require a round figure investment of $1 billion, plus annual operating outlays of about $250 million. Secretary McNamara has asked for a total safeguard investment of only $279.2 million for the coming fiscal year—far below HOSMER's calculation of what is required.

At the moment the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is going into Senator GOLDWATER's charges that our long-range missiles are unreliable. After that, says JACKSON, the safeguards.

Discount Houses, Congress, and the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph de Toledano has once again penetrated the fog of opposition propaganda against the quality stabilization bill with an incisive analysis of what passage of this vital legislation will mean to the American buying public.

Mr. de Toledano's recent article, "Discount House, Congress, and the Consumer," should be read and digested by everyone really concerned about the need to protect consumer interests in today's marketplace.

With unanimous consent, I, therefore,

include the de Toledano column in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DISCOUNT HOUSES, CONGRESS, AND THE CONSUMER

(By Ralph de Toledano)

The Congress of the United States is considering a bill which will protect the small merchant from the near-monopolist discount houses. The Quality Stabilization Act, if passed, will protect a manufacturer's trademark and his patents. It makes certain that a consumer is aware of pricing practices which at present frequently put him in a position of paying less money for much less goods, though on the surface he thinks he is paying less for more.

As I have noted here before, support of the quality stabilization bill comes from Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals—from Senators like KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. When the measure was first introduced, its opponents banded together and secured the services of a high-powered Madison Avenue firm (one of whose partners was once a sub-Cabinet member of the Kennedy administration) to mount a propaganda campaign against quality stabilization.

The thrust of this campaign, repeated in letters, handbills, and other media of communications, was that the Quality Stabilization Act would somehow hurt the consumer by putting the discount houses on the same bargaining plane as the smaller merchants. If this were true, then the proponents of quality stabilization would have some arguing to do. It is not true, however you may slice it. As an example, I would like to cite the case of Mr. X. This is not a hypothetical account. Mr. X is real, and every statement in what follows can be documented to the hilt.

This is the story:

A little less than a year ago, Mr. X—who is separated from his wife—was informed that she had used a joint charge account they had taken in the happier days of their marriage to make some substantial purchases. The charge account was with GEM International, a discount chain with outlets in several cities.

Mr. X's first—and natural—reaction was to wonder what purchases had been made. The answer to this should have been simple. But GEM told him that it was impossible to give him an itemized list of the purchases allegedly made by his wife. The second request he made of the discount house was for proof, in the form of copies of sales slips, that the purchases had actually been made. This, too, was impossible, for reasons which Mr. X would still like explained.

In short, he was asked in the rudest possible terms to pay a bill with no proof offered that purchases to that sum had indeed been made. An employee of GEM—presumably trained in protecting the interests of the public—called him names, accused him of attempting to cheat the company, and badgered him with a series of consecutive phone calls. It took many months and considerable correspondence before Mr. X was given a list only of the departments in which the alleged purchases were made. No proof was forthcoming.

But the answer to those who attack the quality stabilization bill because it is supposed not to look out for the consumer comes in the sequel. Mr. X is still trying to get an adequate statement of his indebtedness. The bill, however, keeps mounting. Under the guise of a service charge GEM has been charging him 1½ percent a month, then compounding it. As a result, in a little more than a year, Mr. X's interest on an indebtedness which he should not pay until he is given proof that it exists has added up to 50 percent of the principal. In short, he is being asked to pay 1½ times the cost of what his wife may have bought.

A banker who tried to charge that kind of interest would end up in jail—yet a bank's income must of necessity come from interest. Loan sharks get away with this, but they operate outside the law. GEM—and there is no reason to believe that other discount houses do not follow the same practice—very blandly adds up the additional dollars, still refusing Mr. X an itemized bill. At the same time the company has embarked on a program of organized harassment—calls on weekends in the early morning—to force Mr. X to pay.

All of this may seem petty. But it points to a situation which would not continue if the smaller merchant were returned to a competitive position. Every year the discount houses are increasing their share of the Nation's retail business. Every year, too, they are bringing down the quality level—using devices such as "loss leaders" to get the customer into the store. As competition perishes, the natural result is a growing attitude of "the public be damned."

Much of this will be eliminated by passage of the Quality Stabilization Act. Whenever the consumer has been exposed to the provisions of this bill, he has endorsed them. The bill is before the Congress. For those who don't want to become pawns in the hands of giant retail monopolies, the course is clear—to let Congress know where they stand.

The War Against Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with all the outlandish, distorted statements made by the opponents of a simple prayer, it is refreshing to read an editorial from a very responsible spokesman of the business community, the Wall Street Journal. Its editorial of May 6, on the subject of prayer is outstanding and eloquent, and I include it herewith:

THE WAR AGAINST RELIGION

What is the place, if any, of religion in the public schools?

Contrary to some prevalent views, we think it self-evident that it has a place and an important one. Yet much of the discussion, both for and against, turns on issues that are secondary and even trivial.

Religion has a place in education because it is an integral part of the life of man. No one, whether he professes a religion or not, whether he considers himself an agnostic or an atheist, can escape its presence. It is all about us, in the material as well as the spiritual world.

One of the great streams from which our culture flows is, as Matthew Arnold long ago observed, Hellenism, the legacy of Greece; the other Hebraism, the Judeo-Christian tradition. Over the centuries the two have intertwined and fed on each other and enriched the life of the mind of Western man.

The Judeo-Christian concept gave us not only one of the world's most majestic literary works but a whole torrent of additional poetry and art and architecture. It is more than the direct inspiration in the holy sonnets of Donne or Hopkins or the Pieta of Michelangelo; it is also the implicit fabric of almost all art that is recognizable as such.

For it is the same concept, with its significant Hellenistic heritage which fashions our society, informs our relations with other men and provides us with the philosophical view of the universe that makes it possible to live on a higher plane than the beasts. Even the secular philosophy of humanism is Aristotelian-Christian without the supernatural edifice.

Not to teach the Bible, directly or derivatively; not to teach about religion—this attitude is a silly attempt to escape reality and is in fact all but impossible if teaching is to mean anything. How can anyone presume to teach history or art or philosophy or economics or government without reference to the religious underpinning of it all?

The men who formed our Nation understood the reality well enough. Unlike some people today, they were not seeking to drive religion out of the schools or other structures of society. They were only concerned that no denomination become established as a State religion. They proscribed it and no one is attempting to do any such thing.

Since that is the real as opposed to the imagined situation, the controversy often seems tangential at best. Just how tangential can be seen in Congress, where the Members scratch their heads in a laborious effort to determine what sort of school prayers might be permissible. To use a religious allusion, it is a bit like the famed argument concerning the number of angels that can dance on a pin.

We think the local authorities should be able to decide whether they want prayers; if they do, it is not going to hurt anybody so long as there is no compulsion and no attempt to indoctrinate in a particular creed. But the issue, of course, is much broader than prayers. There is a push to eradicate all traces of religion from all public life, even to the barring of any Christmas observances in schools and communities.

This undertaking would be pitiable if it were not rather formidable. It represents, we suppose, not so much an attack on religion as a hopeless misunderstanding of our culture. Certainly it is the wildest kind of discrimination, not least against the children it would deprive of pleasure and spiritual profit.

The prevalance of such views must reflect something peculiar to and about our age. Perhaps, reduced to fundamentals, they develop because the Judaeo-Christian ethic is being denied in other and subtler ways as well—notably the denial of the responsibility of the individual for his conduct and his life.

Whatever the causes, it is an unhealthy and unhappy development. The furor need not have arisen at all, had not reason fled the forum.

Two Men Called John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Roy Wolfe, of the North Shore Baptist Church, was recently honored in an article entitled "Two Men Called John." The authors of the article, Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr., were prompted to write their words of praise upon the announcement that Dr. Wolfe intends to retire soon.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the REC-

ORD and extend to its readers the opportunity to become acquainted with one of the widely respected religious leaders of the Ninth Congressional District:

TWO MEN CALLED JOHN

(By Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

On at least three occasions the authors have written words of high praise for Dr. John R. Rice. The 1957 edition of "Essays in Education and Related Areas," is the first example. The second occasion was on June 17, 1959, in the article entitled "Man Sent From God—Mr. C. C. Smith." The final example was on May 13, 1963, in the article entitled "We Die a Little."

On March 13, 1964, the second author returned from a trip abroad with Dr. and Mrs. John R. Rice and others. She described the trip thus:

"We flew from New York by jet plane on Saturday night, February 22, flying directly to Cairo, with two nights and a day there. We saw the Nile, the Pyramids, the Sphinx; we rode camels on the desert. We saw the famous Mosque and Citadel and fascinating, colorful native bazaars. Then, we flew to Beirut, Lebanon, and went by cars up to the forest of giant cedars of Lebanon; we saw the oldest and largest Roman ruins at Baalbek, many centuries old, then, we went on to Damascus.

"In Damascus, we visited the 'Street Called Straight,' entered the house of Ananias where Saul went, and we saw the traditional window in the house on the wall from which Paul the apostle was let down in a basket, escaping the soldiers, after his conversion. We saw the extraordinary handwoven silk brocades being made, the copper and silver workmanship and the great Mosque, the Rivers Abana and Pharpar Naaman, which the Syrian general loved.

"Then, we went by car south down to Decapolis and saw the ancient Roman ruins, then on to Amman, the capital of Jordan (the Bible name was Philadelphia), then to the Dead Sea, the Qumran Caves, Jericho, the excavations of the ancient city before Joshua's days.

"After being by the saltiest sea in the world, far below sea level, we went up to Jerusalem. We passed the Inn of the Good Samaritan, the barren hills, and arrived at Bethany. We saw the cave in which, traditionally, Lazarus was buried. We saw the Mount of Olives, the Garden of Gethsemane. We saw the site of Solomon's temple and the Mohammedan Dome of the Rock where Abraham offered Isaac. We saw the famous Catholic Church, the floor of Pilate's Judgment Hall, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Church of St. Anne, the gates and walls of Jerusalem, and the Brook Kidron. We had a service under Calvary, at the Sepulchre of Jesus.

"We went to Bethlehem, then to the Sepulchre of Rachel. We saw the fields of the shepherds, the cave where traditionally Jesus was born. We went north of Jerusalem into Samaria and saw Jacob's Well at Nablus (Sychar). We crossed over to Israel and entered Tel Aviv, Haifa, Mount Carmel, then on to the Valley of Megiddo, Nazareth, the Sea of Galilee, and other famous spots dear to every Bible lover.

"We flew from Tel Aviv to Athens. While visiting friends in Athens, we saw the beloved Royal Family of Greece as they entered the palace with the casket of King Paul. We then went by bus 60 miles to the excavations of Old Corinth. Then we saw the very Bema Judgment Seat where Paul was brought to judgment. We stood on Mars Hill where Paul preached at Athens and also saw the Acropolis and the Parthenon.

"We flew to Rome, visited the Vatican Museum, St. Peter's, the Church of St. John Lateran, the Holy Stairs, said to have been brought from Pilate's Judgment Hall in Jerusalem, where Martin Luther, climbing on his knees, was converted, we are told. We took a trip down to Naples and also visited the ancient buried city of Pompeii, now excavated.

"Next, we flew to London. We saw Spurgeon's Tabernacle. We saw Prince Andrew while at Buckingham Palace for the pageantry of the changing of the guard. We saw the Tower of London and the Crown Jewels, the Thames River, Houses of Parliament, and Westminster Abbey, where so many great are buried. After seeing many other famous sights, we flew home. It thus took us 3 full weeks from New York back to New York."

After the fellowship of the trip with Dr. John R. Rice, certainly this noble Christian statesman is worthy of being termed "A Man Called John," but there is another John among God's spiritual leaders. He is Dr. John Roy Wolfe, of North Shore Baptist Church, Chicago.

Upon learning of the planned retirement of Dr. Wolfe on January 7, 1965, when he becomes 65, the first author wired:

"Many of us were shocked and sad to learn of your plans of retiring from North Shore Baptist Church next January. Since your friends and supporters are legion we hope Pastor Myers will insist that you remain at least through 1965. You should remain for at least the following reasons:

"1. You are loved and respected by hundreds of our members—you are truly Mr. North Shore Baptist.

"2. You are doing an excellent work for the church.

"3. Your teaching is recognized as superb. Your preaching is very superior.

"4. Pastor Myers needs you during this crucial period when it is so easy for him to get misinformation. His long tenure depends on you staying and providing him with the foundation.

"5. Your charming wife is such an inspiration to all.

"My wife joins me in this from London."

Dr. Wolfe is a native of Charleston, W. Va. He attended Charleston public schools and was graduated from the Charleston High School. He attended West Virginia Technical College in Montgomery and was graduated "cum laude" from Morris Harvey College in Charleston, with an A.B. degree. He received his theological training at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky., and was graduated from there. Alderson-Broaddus College of Philippi, W. Va., conferred the honorary doctor of divinity degree on Dr. Wolfe in 1956.

Since November 1, 1958, Dr. Wolfe has been associate pastor (and acting pastor) of North Shore Baptist Church, Chicago. Prior to coming to Chicago, he was pastor of the following churches: First Baptist Church, Dunbar, W. Va. (11 years); First Baptist Church, Kenova, W. Va. (10 years); and First Baptist Church, Welch, W. Va. (6 years).

Dr. Wolfe's career is rich in denominational service. He was a member of the executive board of the West Virginia Baptist Convention for many years, as well as its president. He was twice elected for 3-year terms as a trustee of Alderson-Broaddus College. He served 6 years as a member of the Council on Missionary Cooperation of the American Baptist Convention (eastern area).

Beginning on September 1, 1953, he became field counselor for the Council on Missionary Cooperation of the American Baptist Convention in West Virginia and Washington, D.C. He represented the council at the London, England, meeting of the Baptist World Alliance in 1955. The American Baptist Convention in June of 1958, at Cincinnati, Ohio, advanced Dr. Wolfe to the rank of senior field counselor. He is persently chairman of the committe on missionary concern of the Chicago Baptist Association.

Dr. Wolfe wrote the introduction for our book, "One Blood," and George E. Reddick, of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, commented: "The striking but delightful introduction of John Roy Wolfe displays a depth of concern and a wide background of reading on the race question. Wolfe, a Christian minister, born in the American South, is obviousy not afraid of facing the most searing and ugly facets of this problem."

Dr. Wolfe's charming wife, Lida Jane, was honored a few years ago by being chosen by the American Baptist Convention as its "first lady" for the year. She is presently a part of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago. Dr. and Mrs. Wolfe have one son, now residing in Florida.

We are certain that John the Baptist, of the Bible, is proud of these two current religious statesmen and their dear families, because they are constantly making our world a better place for humanity. Perhaps, relatives of these giants will continue to inspire the masses, because we are already aware of the great leadership of Dr. and Mrs. Bill Rice.

Thank you Lord for "Two Men Called John."

Sea Trials of U.S.S. "Ulysses S. Grant"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to include a letter which I have received from Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, whom I highly admire for his outstanding achievements.

My letter acknowledging recognition of Admiral Rickover's dedication, perseverance, and amazing successes represents my hearty congratulations and high esteem to the "Father of the nuclear propulsion submarine" and his fine staff.

The letter follows:

U.S.S. "ULYSSES S. GRANT" (SSBN 631)
Care of Fleet Post Office, New York, N.Y.

(*At sea, North Atlantic, May 25, 1964.*)

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FULTON: The U.S.S. *Ulysses S. Grant*, our 22d Polaris submarine, has just completed sea trials. With the *Grant* we now have in operation a total of 42 nuclear powered Polaris and attack submarines.

This ship is named for the illustrious American of whom President Lincoln said: "He is the quietest fellow you ever saw. The only evidence that he is in any place is that he makes things go. Wherever he is they move."

As soldier and as President, General Grant "trod unswervingly the pathway of duty, undeterred by doubts, single-minded and straightforward." Conscious of the heavy responsibilities which had devolved upon him during and after the Civil War, he wrote:

"He who undertakes to conduct the affairs of a great government as a faithful public servant, if sustained by the approval of his own conscience, may rely with confidence upon the candor and intelligence of a free people * * * and can bear with patience the censure of disappointed men."

Summarizing his many years of service, he said:

"Successful men owe more to their perseverance than to their natural powers, or

their friends, or favorable circumstances. Talent is desirable, but perseverance is more so; for it will strengthen the mental powers and intensify their energy."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1964.

Vice Adm. HYMAN G. RICKOVER,
Navy Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL RICKOVER: I am writing to congratulate you on the success of the sea trials for the U.S.S. *Ulysses S. Grant*, which is cheering and heart-warming news.

America should be forever grateful to you and your fine staff, as well as the technicians and workingmen for this tremendous progress in our U.S. defense.

Hearty congratulations on our 22d Polaris submarine, as I believe the 42 nuclear powered Polaris and attack submarines of the U.S. Navy are our greatest defense and security in these difficult times.

As one American citizen and friend, I want to thank you sincerely for your dedication, perseverance and amazing successes.

Personal regards,

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

A New Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the column of Richard Wilson, carried in the May 27, 1964, issue of the Washington Star.

Columnist Wilson sets out the most interesting facts which demonstrate a decay of a great system of government.

The article is as follows:

THE COVERUP—A NEW MORALITY—RECORD SHOWS FEDERAL OFFICIALS WHO EXPOSE SHADY DEALS GET BOUNCED

(By Richard Wilson)

The handwriting on the wall has been written large here: Don't buck the system. This truth is freshly proved by a Government distinguished service award to an obscure official named Horace D. Godfrey. Mr. Godfrey is the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service under Agriculture Secretary Freeman.

It is charged in the House of Representatives that Mr. Godfrey was given this award although in his branch of the Federal service obviously a cover up was attempted in the entire Billie Sol Estes case. The evidence in the Billie Sol Estes investigation showed, it is charged, incredible confusion, mismanagement, lack of records, duplication, and woeful lack of management and knowledge of what was going on in the Estes case.

Mr. Freeman so values Mr. Godfrey today, however, that he confers upon him the highest accolade of his Department as an example to others.

But what of the man who testified and supplied records to show that the bigtime Texas promoter now under prison sentence for fraud was shown favoritism in Mr. Freeman's Department as early as November 1961? This man, N. Battle Hales, has been denied an automatic in-grade promotion which would ordinarily have come to him in the course of his Federal service. Thus the accuser languishes and the accused flourishes, although the record seems clear that Billie Sol enjoyed a favored position in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Freeman has no monopoly on this technique. One Jerry Jackis, who revealed to Congress the use of foreign aid funds in Cambodia for a Communist-sponsored hospital, was fired while the State Department official who made a record against him was promoted.

Otto Otepka, State Department security official, who committed the unforgivable sin of peaching on his superiors and telling Congress what is wrong with the internal security system in the State Department, is in limbo. But William J. Crockett, deputy undersecretary, who was in charge of the Otepka matter for Secretary Rusk, is up for promotion to career minister, a better job. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is looking into this because the record shows wiretapping, general harassment, and attempts to degrade Mr. Otepka after he helped the Senate Internal Security Committee to expose some of the weaknesses of the State Department security system.

It is worth noting also that Gen. Curtis LeMay has been given an extension, at least until after the election, of his tenure as Air Chief of Staff. General LeMay protested against the multibillion-dollar award of the TFX contract for what he thought was a second best fighter plane to be used by both the Navy and Air Force. The Navy commander, Admiral Anderson, who also objected openly before Congress, has long since vanished from the Washington scene. But General LeMay was pointedly given only a 1-year reappointment, instead of the usual 2, and this has now been extended. But it looks as if General LeMay's service is rapidly coming to a close.

The pattern set in these several cases is shocking. The lesson taught to Federal officials is that if they see mismanagement, wrongdoing, or bad judgment they would be wise to keep their mouths shut if they wish to maintain or improve their job status.

Their worst sin would be to tell their story to Congress, although it is the clear and imperative responsibility of Congress to inquire into the operation of Federal executive departments funded solely by the votes of Congress. Congress controls absolutely the appropriation of money to operate the Federal Government and of taxation to provide these funds. This is its exclusive power, and Congress has the right to know how the funds are spent.

Some kind of a new morality seems to have gotten lodged in official Washington. It is the morality of blind loyalty to superior authority and complete obeisance to the word from on high. It is the morality of coverup in the Billie Sol Estes case and whitewash in the Baker case. And it is not a very healthy atmosphere for the prudent conduct of the public's business.

Johnstown Flood, 1889

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the coming Saturday will mark the 75th anniversary of one of the most tragic events in America's history. It was on the afternoon of May 31, 1889, that the South Fork Dam, 14 miles up the Conemaugh River from the city of Johnstown, collapsed and opened the way to a disaster that shocked the world.

Johnstown, which had shown steady growth since its settlement a century earlier, rose rapidly as an iron and steel center after the Civil War had ended. Proud of their beautiful mountain setting, residents of the community had undertaken to develop the natural resources with which the area was richly endowed. The surrounding forests offered ample building supplies for homes and business houses. Coal was extracted from vast underground storehouses to convert crude iron into steel. The Pennsylvania Railroad provided a direct connection with markets in Pittsburgh and to the East.

The Johnstown flood transformed a thriving, happy community into a ghastly twisted wreckage in which more than 2,200 men, women, and children perished. Death came swiftly to more than half the victims caught in the avalanche of water that swept through the city. Nearly 1,000 others found temporary refuge on an old stone bridge that held debris and human beings alike against the swirling floodwaters. Then fire moved in to complete the carnage, and only a very few of those persons atop the bridge were able to escape the deadly flames.

Johnstown was a shambles. A stunned and heartbroken people buried victims that included 99 families completely wiped out.

Only the spirit of the survivors remained unbroken. Johnstown had to be rebuilt, and the long job began without hesistation. Contributions began coming in from all over the world. A Red Cross contingent headed by Clara Barton, who served in the Civil War, undertook to aid the battered and distressed people.

Saturday's event in Johnstown will not only honor the victims of the Johnstown flood but also pay tribute to those whose rededicated efforts were responsible for the new Johnstown that was to follow and become a vital part of western Pennsylvania. The few persons who lived through the flood and are still alive will be the special guests of a grateful community.

While a record number of visitors is anticipated for Saturday, the observance will by no means be terminated that day. For anyone who has never had the pleasure of seeing Johnstown, a trip over that way in the weeks ahead will provide an unforgettable experience. Certainly everyone in the Washington area should at some time see the city where tragedy struck quickly and violently, but which would not remain submerged.

The community, the family, the individual suffering seemingly insurmountable reverses needs only to look at the miracle that is Johnstown for hope and inspiration.

The road has not by any means been easy in the years that followed the actual rebuilding of the city. The entire area around Johnstown has often felt the pangs of economic distress, and even today too many within our employable populace are without jobs through no fault of their own. The 1936 flood, which inundated so many parts of western Penn-

sylvania, caused considerable property damage in the same downtown district that suffered through the fateful afternoon and night in May 1889. This time, however, there was time for people to reach the safety of higher ground and rebuilding began immediately.

Over the years God somehow gave the residents of our community the strength that was needed to carry on, and Johnstown has contributed more than its share of outstanding industrialists, educators, doctors, and men of every profession. Heroes from this district are listed prominently in the annals of our fighting forces, and today the district is well represented in every branch of the service stationed in the far corners of the world.

Join with us, Mr. Speaker, in Saturday's observance of a tragedy to mark the rebirth of an outstanding American community.

Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, among the many statements received by the Judiciary Committee from clergymen opposing the Becker amendment is one from Gerald Kennedy, bishop of the Los Angeles area, southern California-Arizona conference of the Methodist Church. Bishop Kennedy excellently summarizes recent Supreme Court decisions, their constitutional basis, and the evils which would result from adoption of this proposal. I commend Bishop Kennedy's statement to all my colleagues as follows:

I write in opposition to the 146 pending resolutions which propose amendments to the Constitution relating to Bible reading and prayers in the public schools. I am bishop of the Los Angeles area of the Methodist church and also 1 of the 10 members of the board of education of the State of California. I believe I speak for by church and for the board of education in voicing this opposition.

Proposals of amendments to the Constitution are based largely on a misunderstanding of what the Supreme Court decision said. The Justices who wrote opinions made it perfectly clear that they were not against our public schools treating religion as one of the subject to be studied nor were they against the Bible as a book to be used for reference. They opposed a religious service but emphasized that along with the vast majority of Americans they regarded religion as one of the very significant values of our country.

The fathers of the Constitution sought to preserve religious study and inquiry while preventing anything of a divisive or sectarian religious service being held within the schools. They sought also to protect the rights of any minority who were opposed to religion of any kind. The Constitution has suceeded in doing this through the years and it would be a great mistake to tamper with this tried and tested document.

An amendment to the Constituion providing for Bible reading and prayers in the public schools would open the door to any number of evils. For certainly there would be debate and argument as to what kind of prayers and what kind of Bible readings. The suggested amendments to the Constitution would be a breech in the dike of our doctrine of separation of church and state and I think it would be tragic to take such a step.

We must preserve at all cost the public schools of the United States as the common experience of all our children from all religious backgrounds. To turn these schools into centers of violent debate and bitterness over religious questions, would be to destroy them.

I hope therefore that the Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary will not allow these proposals to go any farther.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Floyd I. Silk's Memorial Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the Appendix of this RECORD, a speech delivered by Floyd I. Silk, on Saturday, May 30, 1964, on behalf of the United War Veterans Memorial and Executive Committee of New York City.

The speech was made at a Memorial Day breakfast.

The text of Mr. Silk's speech follows:

FLOYD I. SILK'S MESSAGE, MEMORIAL DAY, SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1964

Comrades, friends and patriots, we are gathered here today to pay tribute to those gallant heroes who fought, bled and died, so that our Nation, under God, might prevail in freedom and liberty.

On this Memorial Day, we pay tribute to our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose life was dedicated to peace, democracy and freedom. Had he lived, he would have celebrated his 47th birthday yesterday.

On this day, too, let us bow our heads in prayer for the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He was a gallant soldier, a great American, a person whom all the world loved and will miss.

On this day in particular and on every day of our lives, it behooves each of us to keep the flame of patriotism alive and make every effort to keep the freedom that we all cherish so dearly. We owe this, not only to those who sacrificed so much to provide us with all the liberties we enjoy today, but to all who come after us, so that they may continue to live in these United States of America and enjoy the liberties that have been ours for the past 189 years. To this we must be sure that our younger generations and those who come after them learn and understand the full meaning of our American ideals and principles. Memorial Day is a sacred trust to all Americans. We must know and understand the scrifices that were made in our behalf, so that the great American heritage that is ours and will be theirs to enjoy in the future, will be appreciated and not just taken for granted.

We, and those who come after us, must have the courage to face any challenges from those who would attempt to take our liberties away. We and they must be imbued with a new determination, so that we may be fearless and confident, no matter how great the challenge.

We must not tolerate the misuse of free assembly, free speech, free press, and freedom of religion. If we are not vigilant regarding misuse of the aforementioned we stand to lose all the liberties our gallant heroes of all wars fought and died for. Let us continue to keep the United States of America a shrine of freedom-loving people, where democracy, equality, and justice are practiced. In the words of Francis Scott Key, let us continue the traditions of our Nation and keep it the "Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave."

In closing, I should like to thank Mayor Robert F. Wagner for his splendid cooperation. We are most grateful. I should like to thank all the members of our United War Veterans Memorial and Executive Committee, who made the success of these ceremonies possible. Especially Marshal Charles Becker, Thomas J. Foley, Robert J. DeSanctis, and Col. James W. Irving. We are grateful to all of our other city officials who cooperated and are present here this morning. Thanks, too, to their color guards, musicians, park department employees, New York's finest, radio station WNYC—and a special thanks to all the participating organizations and all of you present here this morning. Without you here to participate with us, all of our efforts would have far less meaning. God bless you and keep you and yours in good health and in peace.

FLOYD I. SILK,
Chairman, United War Veterans Memorial and Executive Committee, New York County, New York City.

Another Nail in the Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, from the Shreveport Times, discussing the Prince Edward County decision of the Supreme Court, which undertook to rule that the Supreme Court of the United States can require a State or the governing body of a county to levy and collect a tax—contrary to what we have always regarded as being powers reserved to the people and the States, under the 10th amendment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER NAIL IN THE COFFIN

The Supreme Court ruling that Prince Edward County, Va., must reopen its public schools—closed since 1959—on a desegregated basis and that the Federal judiciary can require the county to levy taxes to operate a desegregated public school system is outrageous. But it also is the final nail driven into the coffin of perhaps the best planned and most carefully carried out attempt in the Nation to prevent school integration through establishment of private institutions supported at least in part by State grants to students.

In the opinion of the Times, the ruling itself is entirely unconstitutional and even absurd from the standpoint of basic principles of the American form of government. In our opinion the original 1954 desegregation decision was in violation of the Constitution, consequently, all Federal court rulings since which are in accordance with that decision are unconstitutional.

But, the simple fact remains that once the Supreme Court declares something unconstitutional, it is unconstitutional for all practical purposes and there is no further judicial recourse. Further, the present Court ruling is in full compliance with various previous Court rulings. No one should be surprised at it. It simply emphasizes that desegregation of public schools, through Court edict, no longer is a judicial issue.

As has been pointed out in these columns a number of times, the Supreme Court ruled in 1958 that any action by any governmental official or governmental agency which hampered or blocked the carrying out of a Federal court desegregation order automatically was in itself unconstitutional. The Court's present ruling, written by Justice Hugo Black, further emphasizes the 1958 rulnig in these words:

"Whatever nonracial grounds might support a State allowing a county to abandon public schools the object must be a constitutional one and grounds of race and opposition to desegregation do not qualify as constitutional."

In other words, the Court is making it clear that any action involving desegregation and any "opposition to desegregation" from the sources specified in the 1958 ruling "do not qualify as constitutional."

In this decision, the Supreme Court also has specified that the phrase it used in 1954 in barring compulsory school segregation—that steps to carry out the 1954 decision were to be taken with "all deliberate speed"—no longer is applicable as a general step to delay segregation. There has been, Justice Black said, "too much deliberation and not enough speed."

Thus, the Supreme Court once again is, in effect, pounding home to the American people that there will be no change and no lessening in the original ruling through subsequent rulings.

All of this means that so far as public schools are concerned, segregation is absolutely a dead issue except for two recourses: A constitutional amendment, which from the practical standpoint certainly is not possible at this time, and private schools that are genuinely private in their operation and not merely a means to nullify a court desegregation order.

A Federal district court ruling in Virginia already has held that Prince Edward County students in a private school could not receive State grants unless a desegregated public school system was in operation; that in the eyes of the Federal judiciary, private schools established to replace a public school system ordered desegregated (and which was closed) could not be assisted by the public funds in any way.

What this means is that wherever private schools are used to provide segregation that has been ordered ended in public schools, a system of integrated public schools—for both Negroes and whites—must be maintained.

To localize the situation, under this present ruling and previous rulings, if Caddo Parish or Bossier Parish or any Louisiana parish closed its schools and refused to provide or appropriate taxes to operate integrated public schools, the Federal judiciary could require that such taxes be levied and spent for a desegregated public school system; private school students could receive State grants only if such a desegregated public school system was operated.

Thus, the decision strikes also, by some inferences at least, at the scholarship grants

system, which never has been dealt with directly by the Federal courts except to the extent of the Virginia district court ruling that scholarship grants could not be paid so long as the public schools were closed.

Prince Edward County was one of the four school systems on which the Supreme Court ruled specifically in 1954. Its people, chiefly farmers, immediately began laying plans to close their public school system and create a private school—for white children only—as soon as it became no longer possible, because of Court orders, to retain segregation.

The last of the Court tests in efforts to prevent desegregation ended in 1959 with adverse decisions. So, the county's public schools were closed. A private school was etsablished, chiefly through contributions. State scholarship grants were paid to students. There were no public or private schools for Negroes. Offers from white people to assist a Negro private school system were rejected by Negro leaders.

Now, the Supreme Court has ended the Prince Edward County type of school system and use of it as a means of avoiding segregation.

Watertown Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the projected closing of the Watertown Arsenal announced by Secretary of Defense McNamara comes as a severe blow to the economy of Massachusetts and to our national security as well. Recently I made a personal inspection tour of the arsenal and was impressed with the importance of the work being conducted there and with the competence and loyalty of the personnel.

A recent editorial in the Lowell, Mass., Sun outlines the dimensions of the economic importance of the Watertown facility. In addition it notes that the arsenal has kept pace with developing technology and has been converted to meet the demands of the space age.

Under unanimous consent I insert the May 26 editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ARSENAL

The threatened closing of the Watertown Arsenal as an economy measure instigated by Defense Secretary McNamara presents a threat to a broad section in this part of the State, including Middlesex County.

A Sun reader in Bedford, who has been at the arsenal for a long while, calls our attention to the fact that there are 217 from the Greater Lowell area at this facility, representing an annual payroll of $1,379,000. Moreover, the total from the Fifth Congressional District, of which Lowell is the principal community, there are 345 arsenal workers, with a payroll of $2,511,000. Such facts and figures cannot be taken lightly by anyone interested in the economic stability of this area and in the welfare of the many families that would face hardship if the arsenal is shut down.

Secretary McNamara's contention that the arsenal is obsolete has not been sufficiently substantiated. Whereas during World War II this big plant was noted for its rapid molding of big gun barrels for American battlewagons and lesser ships, the demand for such armament has cut back to virtually zero with the great changes in the concept of warfare made by the Navy Department.

However, the arsenal, since the end of the war, has been converted to meet the demands of the space age in technology, research, and production.

Mr. McNamara should take another look—long and penetrating—into what the arsenal really means to military and defense systems of the country before arbitrarily ordering the abandonment of the Watertown installation.

Uncle Bill Thomas, of Weslaco, Tex., Celebrates 91st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, W. J. Bill Thomas, Weslaco's friend of Presidents and nearly everyone else, has passed his 91st birthday, and since he has worked all his adult life for the betterment of his State and country, he has been accorded considerable news coverage, all of it richly deserved.

Known to some as Uncle Bill, to others as Mr. Democrat, this distinguished and beloved Texan received a telegram on his 90th birthday from President Kennedy. President Johnson sent him a birthday greeting on his 91st, as I did also.

"Uncle" Bill Thomas has been a friend of mine for more than a quarter of a century. Every time I visit Weslaco, Uncle Bill is there to meet me.

Because of the esteem in which Uncle Bill is held, I ask that the following newspaper articles be printed in the Appendix: "President Greets Him as Uncle Bill Hits 91," from the Weslaco News, May 14, 1964; "Weslaco Man Celebrating His 91st Birthday Today," from the Valley Evening Monitor, May 11, 1964.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Weslaco (Tex.) News, May 14, 1964]

PRESIDENT GREETS HIM AS UNCLE BILL HITS 91

Weslaco's patriarch of the Democratic Party turned 91 years young Monday.

There was a spring in his step, a smile on his face, a glint in his eye and a quick retort on his tongue as he jauntily did his daily 2 or more miles of walking on downtown streets and said hello to folks here and there.

He looked just like he would make it to 150, but he wasn't talking about age, though. There are too many other things to talk about and to discuss and to think about for W. J. (Bill) Thomas to think about the passing of a mere 90 years.

Heck, there's Lyndon to reelect, and a few other Democrats out there in the field who need a little comfort and support, especially with all those Republicans working up a lather these days.

And Uncle Bill Thomas is the fellow who will give 'em that comfort and support and keep those Republicans in a lather too. Politics are a matter of pure joy to Uncle Bill who is Mr. Democrat here. He puffs a meditative pipe quietly or a big cigar vigorously, depending on the candidate discussed.

For a man whose interest in politics is overshadowed by nothing except an interest in mankind in general, Uncle Bill has been in politics as a candidate only once. And then he got licked by six votes. That was shortly after he retired from more than 50 years as a railroad agent and telegrapher and somebody got his name on the ballot for justice of the peace.

His participation in politics is doing what he can for his party, campaigning for favorite candidates, helping hold elections and enjoying discussions on any State or national election.

Bill Thomas was born May 11, 1873, in Trimble, Tenn., moving with the family to Texas when he was a boy. He was reared at Chico. He has lived in Weslaco since 1929, yet he maintains ties with old friends in Chico and in Odem and Seadrift where he worked for the railroad. In his long career as a railroadman, he worked for the Fort Worth & Denver, the Rock Island, and the Missouri-Pacific.

His first job was as a telegrapher at Duncan, Okla., at that time a part of Indian Territory. He was a railroader all his working days except for a few months when he taught school at Chico after a woman teacher was fired before the end of the term because she could not control unruly pupils. He took the job for $45 a month, and one of the students he had to switch threatened to grow up and whip him, but after the lad grew up he turned up to be one of Uncle Bill's railroad's best customers in the valley for a long, long time.

Bill Thomas studied railroad telegraphy at Decatur (in north Texas) after deciding schoolteaching wasn't for him. From then on he was a railroad man.

Uncle Bill's wife died in 1938. He has a son, James Henry Thomas of San Antonio; a daughter, Mrs. Margaret Elliott, of Harlingen; and another daughter, Miss Mary Elizabeth Thomas, who lives with her father here at 605 South Texas Boulevard.

Uncle Bill sheds no tears at the changes in railroading, for he takes change in his stride, and perhaps one would wonder if he now and then grows nostalgic for the long, long whistle of a steam locomotive, the smell of coal dust and the depot station. But he never indicates any nostalgia. His interest is in the future. Last year, for his birthday, the late President John F. Kennedy telegraphed his greetings, and this year Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH wired his congratulations. Wednesday morning Uncle Bill received a special delivery, airmail card from President Johnson.

So Uncle Bill walks uptown, to the post office, to the drugstores, to the hotel coffeeshop, here and there, and like a true railroad man, he never drives a car and never has driven one. He has owned several, but the womenfolk in his family usually did or do the driving.

He reads three daily newspapers and the Weslaco News. He keeps the editor of the Weslaco News "straightened out." When he thinks the editor is leaning too close to the Republican side, he saunters up the sidewalk, opens the News office door, pokes his head in, and tells the girl in front: "Tell that Republican editor to cancel my paper."

The "independent" editor just grins and goes about his business and thinks up things like this to write about Uncle Bill.

[From the Valley Evening Monitor, May 11, 1964]

WESLACO MAN CELEBRATING HIS 91ST BIRTHDAY TODAY—TOO BUSY TO FEEL HIS AGE

WESLACO.—One of the disadvantages of reaching your 91st birthday is that there is little doubt left you are in the old-age category.

But it has been the firsthand experience of W. J. (Bill) Thomas, of Weslaco, that you can grow old without life becoming stale.

"I don't feel it so much," Thomas will tell you about his age. "I get around pretty good." However, he is not interested in dwelling on the subject when there are other interesting things to talk about.

He retired in 1945 after 50 years and 8 months as a railroad agent and telegrapher. His 91st birthday will roll around Monday.

The Weslaco man didn't get to be nearly 91 by sitting around in a rocking chair, either. He gets in a good 2 miles of walking daily, mostly around town where he holds the undisputed title of "Mr. Democrat."

His birthday is always a big occasion. Last year he received a congratulatory telegram from another widely known Democrat, the late President Kennedy. And nobody will be surprised if President Johnson sends a greeting this year.

He does a lot of campaigning in season, helps hold Weslaco elections and is a good man to have on your side in any vote contest, candidates have learned through the years.

With politics one of his main interests, he has had only one personal venture in office-seeking. That was way back when he first retired and got his name on the ballot for justice of the peace.

"I got beat by six votes," he recalled.

Thomas subscribes to—and reads—three daily papers. He is an active member of the First Methodist Church, is a Rotarian, and keeps up his membership in the Masonic Lodge which he joined in 1901.

Baseball is another of his big interests. He gets in quite a few domino games, too. And he will write a letter quick as a wink if the occasion presents itself. He usually has a few cigars in his shirt pocket and can be found with a pipe most of the time, unless he left it at the last place he stopped.

Thomas has lived in Weslaco since 1929, but he still maintains ties with old friends in such places as Chico, where he was reared and later worked as railroad agent, Odem and Seadrift. He is regularly an honor guest at the Methodist Church homecoming in Odem, where he was agent 10 years.

He had a little experience teaching school at Chico when a woman teacher was fired before finishing the term because she couldn't control the unruly pupils. He took on the job at $45 a month.

"Those were the days of switches," he remembered, and he went to the job well fortified with some big ones.

One of the students he punished was Bob Stuart, whose father was on the school board. Young Stuart was chagrined that his father's status failed to save him from the switching.

At the end of the term, Thomas decided to leave the teaching field and went to nearby Decantur to study as a telegrapher. But he was to meet up with Stuart again.

The next time was on a Fort Worth street.

"I said I was going to whip you when I got big enough," Stuart told his former teacher, "but I don't think I'm big enough." Instead he took Thomas to the building where his offices occupied a whole floor and they had a congenial visit.

Still later, Thomas came to the valley and found his former pupil in a thriving real estate operation at Stuart Place. Stuart, who was bringing in land parties by train, was able to give his onetime teacher a lot of business.

Stuart died several years ago.

Some of the early days with the railroads were rough, but Thomas was robbed only once in his long career. That was on his first job as telegrapher at Duncan, Okla., then a part of Indian territory.

During his railroading days he worked for the Fort Worth & Denver, the Rock Island, and the Missouri Pacific.

He was born May 11, 1873, in Trimble, Tenn., and the family moved to Texas when he was a boy.

He has a son, James Henry Thomas, of San Antonio; a daughter, Mrs. Margaret Elliott, of Harlingen; and another daughter, Miss Mary Elizabeth Thomas, who lives with her father. His wife died in 1938.

If you insist on health and longevity advice, Thomas says the best he can offer from his own experience is "take care of yourself and walk a lot.

"Never drove a car in my life," he said. "I bought several but my wife and daughters drove them."

And you can see him every day of the week, striding leisurely along.

Salute to Gladewater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one who lives near Gladewater, Tex., I am very pleased about the industrial expansion in Gladewater and in the Gladewater area. I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that appeared in the Longview Daily News May 21, 1964:

SALUTE TO GLADEWATER

Mark up a major accomplishment for Gladewater, Gregg County's third largest city and a municipality blessed by geography and community spirit as one of the major crossroads of east Texas.

Honey Togs, Inc., manufacturer of modern wearing apparel for girls and young women, laid the basis for further economic progress and multiplied its production capacity as it formally opened a new $150,000 operations center on State Highway 271 immediately north of the downtown area late last week.

In truth, the new plant doubled floor space, coupling the new building with existing facilities in the downtown area.

Cutting, sewing, and pressing departments of the firm are now located in the new building while the former main plant on U.S. Highway 60 in the downtown area is housing company offices, and warehousing and shipping divisions.

Yet, the true story of success lies not in physical facilities but in the steady progress the company has enjoyed since beginning production in 1959. Annual sales that first year stopped at $300,000, and each year has seen healthy increases, reaching the $2 million mark in the past year and necessitating expansion.

Popularity of the apparel created by Honey Togs has drawn a host of new customers from across the Nation and orders continue to pile up to give the firm substantial backlog for steady operations. Realizing that expansion was a must, P. L. Hamilton, Honey Togs president, and other officials of the firm last year projected the future production rise and with the financed cooperation of the Gladewater Industrial Foundation formulated plans for the new building to meet the demand for orders.

Assisting in the step forward were Quentin Ab. nathy, president of the city industrial foundation, the foundation board, and Al Meadows, president of General American Oil Co., who donated the tract of land for location of the all steel and masonry structure.

The new facility already has made it possible for the firm to boost employment by another half hundred employees, which will increase the payroll to a total of more than 250 persons. This in itself means a financial shot in the arm for the company as well as the city of Gladewater and surrounding area because a great part of the employees of Honey Togs are skilled women who add a second paycheck weekly to family income.

Honey Togs officials have expressed overwhelming confidence in the future of Gladewater through the investment for expansion. And, they have made a wise decision because the city's potential has only been tapped. As a crossroad center of U.S. Highway 80 and State Highway 271, which is becoming more and more important as a regional thoroughfare, Gladewater is in a unique position geographically for further successes as a manufacturing center. Among its assets also are railroad facilities, abundant surface water for municipal and industrial purposes, a very stable Government and tax structure and several thousand friendly inhabitants.

Yes, chalk up "accomplishment" for Gregg County's third city because the new plant probably is the first of numerous which soon will be located there.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Addresses 91st and Best Attended Shepherd College Commencement in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 1964 graduating class at Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, W. Va., this morning heard the distinguished U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, discuss "The Third Revolution—the Revolution of Abundance," which he said, is:

The most unique and far reaching of all, for it is an entirely new dimension to human experience.

Secretary Freedman, whom I was privileged to introduce to the 174 graduating seniors and their guests at the 91st annual—and the best attended—Shepherd College commencement, emphasized that:

Throughout the agricultural and industrial revolutions, our institutions and our attitudes were fixed by the conditions of scarcity * * * of not quite enough of everything for everybody * * *. The new dimension in our third productive revolution is the potential for abundance that science and technology have made possible in today's world—it is that we can produce enough to go around

In summarizing his discussion of the three revolutions of the human society, Secretary Freeman recalled that:

The agricultural revolution led to the golden age of Greece and the foundations of western culture * * * and to the terror of the Middle Ages. The industrial revolution led to the rise of middle-class democracy * * * and with Hitler to the ravages of civilized man gone mad. The revolution of abundance can lead to new dimensions of a life and society greater than ever before * * * or to the end of civilization; we can reach out to new planets * * * or we can destroy this planet. This is the challenge

of abundance. These are the decisions which your generation will make. Never before have so many people had so great a voice in so massive an opportunity.

The invocation for the commencement was by Rev. George H. V. Hunter, Jr., minister of the Shepherdstown Presbyterian Church. Music was by the Shepherd College Brass Ensemble under direction of Joseph Labuta, and included a trombone solo by Jay Wiles, with Jane Specht as pianist. Hon. Herbert K. Baer, secretary of the West Virginia State Board of Education, expressed greetings for that body.

Dean A. G. Slonaker presented the graduates and Dr. Oliver S. Ikenberry, the very outstanding educator and the president of Shepherd College, conferred the degrees. Thomas Bowman, president of the senior class, presented the class memorial, and the acceptance was by Dr. Raymond O. Waldkoetter, dean of students, of this institution which now has more than a thousand students each year.

Rev. Conan Gallagher, M.S.Ss.T., of Holy Trinity Mission Seminary, Winchester, Va., pronounced the benediction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks the text of the thought-provoking and challenging address of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE THIRD REVOLUTION"—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN

Commencement is a happy time for young people and a proud time for their families. It is therefore a special honor to be entrusted with a place on this program. And it is a special pleasure to be on such an attractive campus in the picturesque hills of West Virginia.

Many people visit West Virginia both for its beauty and to get away from the heat in Washington. Today such is not my purpose, although it is true that the Secretary of Agriculture does experience "heat"—more I suspect than most Washington residents.

Many people say that the Secretary of Agriculture has the worst job in Washington—some even say in the world. But—after almost 3½ years on the job—I cannot agree.

On the other hand, it is true that my job has its frustrations.

It is frustrating to realize that American farmers are the most accomplished providers in the history of the world—yet rural America remains the scene of almost half of our Nation's poverty.

It is frustrating to realize that net income per farm has risen 16 percent since 1960—yet the average income of people in farming is still only 60 percent of that received by individuals who are not farmers.

It is frustrating to see agriculture labeled as a "problem" when it is first and foremost a tremendous success—providing Americans with such plenty, with much quality, at such a low real cost, that we take it for granted and complain accordingly.

Yet I am not a frustrated man. But I am a man with a challenge. I am perhaps challenged beyond the limits of any one man to deliver. Yet I find the struggle tremendously exciting and I want to share with you, if I can, some of the excitement, some of the suspense, some of the thrill, of working in the vanguard of a major economic and social revolution.

It is a story that affects each of you personally because your generation, like mine, will be called on to deal with it—and to build your lives in its turbulence.

In something like a million years of human existence, mankind has been through only two major productive revolutions.

For more than 99 percent of the time he has been on earth, man existed by finding food. He gathered it, picked it, fished for it, or hunted it with primitive weapons. But it never occurred to him to plant crops and look after them. It never occurred to him to domesticate animals and use them for food.

When it did occur to him, he had a revolution on his hands.

And this was not so long ago—perhaps 8,000 years. Look at it this way. If you assume that man has been on earth for a total of 24 hours—then the agricultural revolution is only 12 minutes old.

It brought far-reaching changes. A settled agriculture made civilization possible. It enabled some societies to produce a surplus above subsistence. It permitted the develoment of a small intellectual elite. It is quite possible that the full-time intellectuals in the extraordinary age of Pericles were a group not much larger than this graduating class. Yet their contribution to civilizations, including ours, is enormous.

The second great productive revolution came much more rapidly.

Put man's existence on a 24-hour clock once again, and the industrial revolution began about a half minute ago. Yet in the less than 200 years of this revolution, the substitution of power for muscle has had an impact on virtually the entire human community. It created the industrial era which we are now leaving.

We are only beginning to grasp the implications of the third productive revolution now in process. It manifests itself in different ways. We talk about it in different terms, depending on our chief interests.

Some call it a cybernation revolution.

Certainly, there is an enormous portent in the building of electronic machines of such enormous complexity that in many ways they can be substituted for the human brain—in fact for the entire nervous system. We not only have electronic brains, we have electronic brains with a high school education.

My colleague in the Cabinet, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, points out further that some machines even have college and postgraduate educations. And the striking thing is that the performance levels of these machines are rising more rapidly than the educational attainments of human beings.

The third revolution is called by some an automation revolution.

One machine takes over the job of boring and machining the engine block for an automobile or tractor—and an entire production line can be closed down. Inspection is performed automatically, and the human hands and eyes thus freed can be devoted to more productive and satisfying assignments—we hope.

An automobile manufacturer once asked a great American labor leader, Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers: "Where are you going to look for jobs when machines take over the work of making cars?" The reply was quick: "The same place you'll be looking for new car customers when our people no longer have jobs."

Then there are some who say we are in a communications revolution.

Certainly, the high-speed transmission of business data can revolutionize management. Immediate market decisions can be made by executives thousands of miles away. New kinds of visual aids widen the dimensions of business decisionmaking as well as of education and the arts.

Examples: The cartridge inserted television set which plays programs like a phonograph is already being field tested. The pocket projector will follow. These are some of the less spectacular developments that are in the minds of the communications people. The sky is not even the limit.

Or you might call this an information revolution. Of all the scientific information available in the world, over half has been produced in the past 10 to 20 years. And we can expect a doubling in output each decade for at least the 20th century. The job of assembling, storing, and communicating this information is a major concern in scientific circles.

Each of these is a revolution of a kind. Each is related one to the other. Each is a part of the third great productive revolution, which I choose to call the revolution of abundance.

So as we take a quick look at the history of man, we find the agricultural revolution * * * the industrial revolution * * * and now the revolution of abundance.

And the third revolution is the most unique and far reaching of all * * for it is an entirely new dimension to human experience.

Throughout the agricultural and industrial revolutions, our institutions and our attitudes were fixed by the conditions of scarcity * * * of not quite enough of everything for everybody. The goal was clear and simple, even though the means might be complex—it was to produce more because there wasn't enough to go around.

The new dimension in our third productive revolution is the potential for abundance that science and technology have made possible in today's world—it is that we can produce enough to go around.

For the first time in history we know that is is physically possible to produce plenty, not just for a few but for everyone on earth. It is physically possible to produce this abundance with fewer farmers, fewer workers, and more machines. This is the potential of automation, technology, and mechanization in the new world of potential abundance.

You are coming to your majority as this Nation begins to explore the potential for the great society which abundance can provide. This is the challenge which spurs me on as Secretary of Agriculture, for agriculture has progressed further beyond the abundance barrier than any other segment of our economy.

Some people tell me that agriculture is out of step with the rest of the economy. They are right in what they sense, but their analysis is wrong. Agriculture has been dealing with the challenge of abundance for more than a decade, a challenge that only now is beginning to be felt more generally throughout the rest of the economy. Agriculture has not been out of step, it has been a pace ahead of the rest of our economy.

It is your opportunity to explore this new dimension * * * this new frontier of abundance as it will increasingly affect all areas of our national life in the days ahead. What we make of it will largely depend on how well you and the thousands of others who are graduated today and in the years ahead from colleges and universities have prepared for it and how well you continue to study and learn as you experience the impact of the revolution of abundance.

President Johnson, speaking on the University of Michigan campus last month, described the challenge in these words:

"The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use the wealth to enrich and elevate our national life—and to advance the quality of American civilization."

This will require that you and all of us break the mold which presently tends to restrict the boundaries of our thinking to

dimensions of scarcity rather than of abundance.

There is nothing in history, except the record of man's creative ability, which tells us how we are to meet this new challenge of abundance.

The potential is enormous. We know that by 1975:

There will be 8 million more families than there are today, and 8 million more students in college—twice the present number;

The gross national product will be almost a trillion dollars a year;

There will be 93 million people in the work force;

Per capita income will be 50 percent greater than it was in 1960.

This is a future of great promise; a future which should excite and stimulate all people.

Yet we know there is fear and great uncertainty in the minds of many people as to what the future holds in store. Some are farmers who have seen the neighboring farm disappear as production soared and prices dropped. They fear that they are next. Others are the workers who have seen machines replace jobs at the next bench or in nearby shops. They fear that they are next. Some are people who have known only discrimination, and the poverty and deprivation it brings. They fear it will never end. Some are people who know only that their children, like their parents before them, are cut off from prosperity. They fear there is no escape.

These fears are real for just one reason—the failure of our generation, thus far, to take full advantage of the greatest opportunity mankind has even seen.

The revolution of abundance has released hundreds of millions of man-hours of talent and effort which are no longer needed for the sheer physical production of the necessities of life.

Now that machines have taken over the drudgery, what is left for human brains and human hands?

What we must achieve is a revolutionary reallocation of human energy that corresponds in magnitude to the technological revolutions we are passing through.

Because we have failed in that reallocation, the released man-hours are reflected in unemployment, and underemployment, and frustration, and privation—when they ought to be employed in other ways.

You may ask: How can they be used, if we need fewer and fewer people to produce our food, clothing, and shelter?

The answer is: They must be used to help create what President Johnson has called the great society.

Look all around us. There is work to be done—endless work. It is a different kind of work—that is all. And it is far more creative, far more challenging, far more inspiring than the kind of work to which the rigors of existence compelled our forefathers to devote their time.

To serve the American ideal of giving every child an equal opportunity to develop his talents to the fullest, we should be using—over the next few years—fully a million more people in the field of education. Here is America's great growth industry. The finest private schools don't figure in terms of 30 or 35 or 40 pupils per teacher; they figure in terms of 15 or 20. Is there any reason why our public school system, all over America, should not be elevated to the kind of standards that only the rich have been able to enjoy? The answer is no. For the first time in history, the resources of talent and manpower are freed for these kinds of purposes.

If the health needs of our people were to be fully met, from the cradle to the grave, in every region and in every home, hundreds of thousands more people would be employed.

Look at our urban and rural slums. If we can redirect the liberated energies of our people into the rebuilding and revitalizing of sick and dying communities, the manpower that can be used will be almost limitless.

We must rescue our countryside from misuse, and begin the greatest conservation movement in all history. We must clear our rivers and streams from pollution and cleanse the air of the waste that now befouls it. We must develop new parks and playgrounds and, at the same time, recognize that farmland can produce recreation as well as food and fiber for an income crop.

We must preserve the green areas and open spaces which sustain the spirit and give true meaning to life.

All this requires manpower—and womanpower.

This massive reallocation of America's resources is not just idle daydreaming. It is grim necessity, too. Because the alternative to utilizing our resources of manpower for the great, constructive jobs that demand attention is not to use them at all. And our society cannot rest upon a base of idle, unemployed, despairing people—without, sooner or later, the kind of explosions that have wrecked other societies in similar circumstances in the long course of history.

It is a happy choice to make. But it is not an easy one to carry out.

The first requirement is that we adjust our minds and attitudes to the new era of abundance. The empty shibboleths that have carried over from earlier centuries, before the revolutions of our time, must be swept aside.

After that, there are many other requirements: Our educational institutions must make the adjustmetns necessary to turn out young people for the growth occupations of the future. For some of these occupations—like the lieutenants, captains, and majors in the war on poverty—nobody has yet developed hardly any curricula at all.

The relations between Federal, State, and local governments must be further adjusted, in directions in which we are already clearly moving, to permit a pooling of resources and a concert of effort.

The distribution of resources between the private and the public sectors of the economy must be reconsidered.

The notions and concepts of planning—which for a time were considered subversive in many circles—must be brought the rest of the way back into good repute.

We must somehow bring about a revival of conscience and of the old tradition of neighborliness—the realization that racial discrimination is intolerable, that denial of adequate hospital care is an indecent penalty on old age, that poverty is an infection that weakens and demeans a proud and prosperous people, that ignorance and lack of education can be removed from the American spirit.

There is no blueprint, no grand design which tells us how best to respond to the challenge. Perhaps there never will be. Instead, we must work our way step by step, learning as we go, how to creatively shape our new world of abundance.

Our attitudes will be guided by our understanding that the material wealth to create the great society is at our disposal, and that the larged task is to mobilize the power for good that lies in people's essential willingness and desire to assume responsibility for something more than their own personal condition.

Your generation has shown formidable signs of this wisdom, as reflected in young America's response to the Peace Corp.

It is within our power to make the decisions to use this wealth to serve the good of all men. If history will not provide the blueprint we seek, it will show us how man responded to the other two revolutions, and we can learn from this.

The agricultural revolution led to the golden age of Greece and the foundations of Western culture, and to the terror of the Middle Ages.

The industrial revolution led to the rise of middle class democracy, and with Hitler to the ravages of civilized man gone mad.

The revolution of abundance can lead to new dimensions of a life and society greater than ever before, or to the end of civilization; we can reach out to new planets, or we can destroy this planet.

This is the challenge of abundance. These are the decisions which you will make. Never before have so many people had so great a voice in so massive an opportunity.

It is a tremendously exciting time to be alive, especially for young people like yourself who arrive on the scene better prepared than any of use who speak here today. Be sure you make the most of it. As the popular saying goes "Live it up."

I congratulate you on your success and wish you Godspeed.

Independence Day of Tunisia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Tunisia today celebrates the 18th anniversary of her independence. On this great occasion, we take pleasure in extending warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba; and His Excellency the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Rachid Driss.

Tunisia, situated on the divide between the western and eastern Mediterranean basis, has long been famous in world history. The Phoenicians of the ancient world settled on its coastline thousands of years ago. Later Carthage fought the Punic Wars with its rival, Rome, for control of the Mediterraenean world. During Roman ascendancy, famous Tunisians—Tertullian, St. Augustine and others—made lasting contributions to world civilization. This Christian society was swept away by the Arab invasion which overpowered the local Berber inhabitants. During the following centuries Tunisia played its role in Muslim power struggles and at the end of the Middle Ages became an important base in the naval clash between the Spanish kings and the Turkish sultans. Later, Europeans struggled for favored positions in Tunisia until the French obtained control in the 1880's.

Mr. Bourguiba played a major role in Tunisia's independence movement which finally obtained its objective on March 20, 1956. A year later Tunisia was proclaimed a republic.

Tunisia, under the guidance of Mr. Bourguiba and his party, the Neo-Destour, has made remarkable progress toward building a modern, viable state. Their approach has been one of moderation and pragmatism, now sprinkled with a touch of Neo-Destour socialism. A list of some of their accomplishments

shows how far they have gone. Since independence, a concerted school constrution and enrollment program has resulted in the literacy rate doubling to 30 percent. Agricultural projects and land reform have increased production and provided a living for more tunisians. Through joint endeavors, the Government is encouraging private initiative in the industrial field. Cities have been modernized. At the same time social change is gathering momentum and many women are now living a new life. With one of the best development plans, leaders have come from neighboring countries to explore the Tunisian road to progress.

Tunisia, on the whole, has been careful to maintain good relations with the United States and the rest of the Western World. They have been grateful for the aid that they have received from these sources.

We congratulate Tunisia on the progress that it has made so far and look forward to seeing it do even more in the future.

Tribute to Representative D. R. (Billy) Matthews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendidly written article by Mr. Lee Winfrey, of the Knight Newspaper Bureau. I think Mr. Winfrey is an exceptionally fine and objective writer. He has written about Representative BILLY MATTHEWS, one of the able and distinguished members of our Florida delegation, and certainly a longtime personal friend of mine and of my able senior colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I believe the article deserves to be presented in the RECORD; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILTERED AND COOL IS BILLY MATTHEWS

(By Lee Winfrey)

WASHINGTON.—When the U.S. Government last January cited tobacco as a health menace, Representative DONALD RAY (BILLY) MATTHEWS realized right away that corrective action was imperative.

Since his north Florida ditsrict grows more than $10 million worth of Flue-cured tobacco each year, it would have been impolitic for him to quit the weed altogether. So carefully, he slipped over the end of his cigars a wooden tip with a filter inside.

Thus personally protected, MATTHEWS turned his thoughts to the 2,000 tobacco farmers in his district.

"The evidence is overwhelming," he said of the report. "You can not deny it. But exactly what makes cigarettes harmful to health? The type of tobacco? The paper? The way it is cured? Pesticides used on it? I am very much interested in finding out."

In the meantime, the Congressman from Gainesville will continue to be a strong defender of Government price supports for the tobacco industry.

MATTHEWS, 56, blames the harsh realities of politics for his addiction to cigars.

"I started smoking in the Florida Legislature in 1935," he recalls. "I got so bored with committee meetings I had to do something. I am a teetotaler, so I took up cigars. I guess I am lucky I got out with no worse habits than that."

MATTHEWS' bad habits are few. He is a lay preacher, an elder in Gainesville's First Presbyterian Church and probably the most popular Congressman in Florida's 12-man delegation.

MATTHEW's forte is humor. He has a sharp chin and a sharp nose, big round glasses and thinning black hair. When he tells a story, his eyes close, his head rolls and his expressive hands float in the air like an orchestra conductor's.

He opens his mouth and out come the voices of his fellow Congressmen—the high, thin singsong of Georgia's TIC FORRESTER, the raw growl of old CARL VINSON, the lulling cadences of Alabama-born CLAUDE PEPPER. He is a master mimic and his better stories are as accurate as tape recordings.

You would be wrong, though, if you dismissed him as a clown. Lyndon Johnson, whose voice MATTHEWS is presently practicing, would straighten you out on that.

Last February, Johnson traveled to Palatka in MATTHEWS' district to get work started on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. There he publicly recalled MATTHEWS' dedidated drive to get the ditch dug.

"Every time I went to the House," the President said, BILLY would catch me by the lapels of my coat."

BILLY's own coats are several. He is, among other things, a Lion, an Elk, a Moose, a Kiwanian, a Knight of Pythias, and an American Legionnaire. He has been a Spanish teacher in Orlando and a high school principal in Newberry.

For 16 years he was at the University of Florida as director of the student union and director of alumni affairs. During World War II, he was a captain training infantrymen.

He is wrapping up his sixth term in Congress now, with no one opposing his bid for a seventh. He is halfway up the seniority ladder in the mammoth House Agriculture Committee and seems settled in for a long stay.

The depression knocked him out of seminary and defeated his ambition to be a minister. But the residue remains and it becomes him.

Few Congressmen are in his league as a storyteller. And perhaps even fewer could say, and be believed:

"It may sound corny, but I've always wanted to be of service—preaching, teaching school. Now I look upon my district as my parish, and my congressional service as my ministry."

Disastrous Effect of Further Tariff Cuts in the Pottery Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. C. Frank Dales, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, before the Tariff Commission, February 13, 1964.

The statement shows clearly how critical the GATT tariff negotiations now going on at Geneva are to our pottery workers. As Mr. Dales states, a further tariff reduction means that what remains of this important industry will be marked for extinction. I urge that our negotiators at Geneva take a firm stand against this disastrous course.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY C. FRANK DALES, VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF OPERATIVE POTTERS, BEFORE TARIFF COMMISSION FEBRUARY 13, 1964

My name is C. Frank Dales, and I serve as vice president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters. Our president, Mr. E. L. Wheatley, could not be here today because of a meeting of the AFL–CIO executive council, of which he is a member, so I am speaking in his place.

Certainly the Tariff Commission is no stranger to the problems of the pottery industry. Almost exactly a year ago, this Commission was preparing its reports on household china, tableware, and kitchenware, investigation No. 7–113; and on earthenware table and kitchen articles, investigation No. 7–114.

A year ago, the earthenware and household china industry eagerly awaited the reports to be forthcoming from this body. Several thousands of our members waited anxiously.

These were the good men who are unable to find new jobs to replace the ones which disappeared when the potteries started closing their doors. These members hoped that as a result of the Tariff Commission recommendations, they would become eligible for economic assistance and for retraining in skill for which there is a demand.

I need not dwell on the fact that when these reports were issued in April 1963, these hopes were dashed.

The Tariff Commission concluded that in 1961: "The number of workers employed in the production of household dinnerware was 23 percent smaller than in 1957."

You also concluded: "The man-hours spent annually by production and related workers in producing household earthenware dinnerware declined between 1957 and 1961 by 4.5 million hours, or by about 27 percent."

I can bring you up to date on the developments since that report in a word: More of the same. While we are awaiting final 1963 figures, from all indications, imports, continued their rise, and our records show that domestic employment continued its irregular downhill slide.

Having made an exhaustive study of our industry only a year ago, and having concluded that wage differentials were not the cause of the boom in imports and the high mortality rate in the plants where our members work, you are not likely to alter your conclusions only a year later, but perhaps we can agree that any reduction in the tariff barriers can only serve to intensify the situation.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce publications, in 1962, the U.S. imported $102,546,000 worth of clay and clay products of which $49,713,000 worth came from Japan. Now this category includes more than just pottery and earthenware, but the latter are a substantial part of it, and almost exactly half of our total imports came from Japan.

We bought approximately $50 million worth of clay and clay products from Japan and we sold her just a little over $2 million worth.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, precise figures on Japanese employment in this category are unavailable, but between

1955 and December 1962, total ceramic, stone and clay products employment in Japan rose from 260,919 to 284,000 workers—a gain of some 23,000 or 8 percent. During the same period in America, total employment in pottery and related products fell from 53,800 jobs in 1955 to 43,800 at the end of 1962, a decline of 10,000 jobs, or 19 percent.

It is our sincere belief that the jobs of these 10,000 Americans have been exported, primarily to Japan.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average wage in the American pottery and related products industry is $2.31. The same source provides us figures indicating that the comparable wage in Japan may be as high as 39 cents an hour. How can the things we make compete with the products of 39-cent-an-hour labor?

Our union has encouraged our industry to install laborsaving equipment whenever possible in order to compete.

Our industry has modernized wherever this is feasible.

However, a Department of Labor story of the industry covering the period from 1954 to 1959 showed that "total payrolls in earthenware plants averaged from 57 to 60 percent of the value of shipments and in chinaware plants from 57 to 62 percent." Those approximate the figures today.

With the labor cost that high, it is manifestly impossible for American manufacturers to pay a decent wage and compete successfully with the products of 39-cent labor from Japan.

Look what happened to art and novelty ware. I am told that Lady Astor once described the United States as the only country where all the souvenirs are marked "made in Japan."

Japan does have not only the souvenirs but the bulk of the business.

The art and novelty ware segment of our industry once employed thousands in small plants in New Jersey and California, and just four companies who used to make art and novelty ware in Sebring, Ohio, used to employ about a thousand men. Between 1954 and 1961, all four of those Sebring artware potteries closed, and that town now has an unemployment rate in excess of 6 percent.

A china producer in Sebring, the French Saxon China Co., employing about 380 men when it is going well, was closed during most of 1963.

Our industry is concentrated in little towns like Sebring, and Chester, W. Va., and Newell, W. Va., and the hard-pressed Wheeling, W. Va., area—towns with unemployment rates in excess of 6 percent.

When the potteries start laying off, or close down, our members simply do not have other job opportunities. For the most part, these are high seniority men. They have growing families to look after. It is not easy for them to move, and they have no jobs to move to.

Because more Americans are eating off tableware produced in Japan, more Japanese workers are eating better, but our members are not eating as well.

We have read with great care the Tariff Commission's reasoning on denying our members the assistance available under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. You take the industry to task for not competing as well as you think it should.

We happen to disagree with your position, but, in a sense, that is beside the point. The fact is, regardless of the reason, many of our members cannot find jobs and that anything which encourages more imports will simply add to our troubles.

From our standpoint, we are literally being asked to compete against "scab" labor. We say this without any malice toward our brothers in Japan. We are grateful for the progress they are making, but just as American labor does not like to be forced to compete against low-wage domestic production so do we in the Pottery Workers Union resent being forced to compete against such incredibly low wages abroad.

That the existing tariff level does not afford adequate protection seems amply clear from the condition of our industry.

Currently much of it is being held together by the premium business. The cup or saucer in the box of soap chips, or the dinner set given with groceries are now the bread and butter items accounting for about half the domestic production in the earthenware potteries.

This is fragile business, subject to the whim of the big chains and brand distributors. The moment another type of giveaway of comparable cost enters the picture, we can lose out.

Moreover, while oversea suppliers have not yet entered the competition for this business because of the demand that the ware be stocked until the level of the demand is established, we have no assurance that they will not do so in the future.

It seems like only yesterday when the skilled hands of our members produced nearly all of the ware on which America dined. Today, except for restaurant and hotel ware, much of America is eating on plates and drinking from cups from Japan.

And tomorrow?

The tomorrow for our industry depends in great measure on what happens in the GATT negotiations.

The tomorrow for several thousand pottery workers and several score small towns where potteries are the chief source of livelihood, depends on the outcome of the GATT negotiations.

Having denied these workers and their towns the assistance we thought we had coming under the Trade Expansion Act, we appeal to you now not to deny us whatever future is left.

If, in the GATT negotiations, tariff walls drop still lower, then what remains of our industry will have been marked for extinction.

On behalf of thousands of unemployed family breadwinners who are members of our union, I appeal to you to recommend against any such catastrophe.

In short, don't kick us while we're down.

Resolution of Brooklyn Jewish Community Council on United States-Israel Relations for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Brooklyn Jewish Community on United States-Israel relations for peace.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council duly assembled at its silver jubilee anniversary meeting held at the Brooklyn Jewish Center on May 5, 1964, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Whereas for more than a decade the very existence of the State of Israel has been threatened with extinction by the repeated public declarations and preparations of the ruler of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser;

"Whereas since he came to power President Nasser has constantly declared over his radio and in public his determination, and that of his associated Arab States, to drive the Israelis into the sea;

"Whereas he has in recent years, in pursuance and preparations of such threats and declarations of policy built up a formidable armament of jetplanes, submarines, tanks, and more recently offensive missiles, in the building of which he has been aided by former Nazis who have found refuge in Egypt from prosecution in Germany;

"Whereas for a year and a half he has kept an army of Egyptian troops in Yemen which were transported there by Russian planes and supplied by Russian arms;

"Whereas contrary to his repeated promises, he has not only not withdrawn his troops but has increased their number so that they now reportedly number 40,000 and, through rotation, has used the war in Yemen to battle-train his entire army;

"Whereas the United States has consistently supported Nasser with generous gifts of foreign aid in an amount now approaching nearly a billion dollars;

"Whereas this policy encourages the aggressive tactics and purposes of Egypt's dictator;

"Whereas the United States has repeatedly declared its interest in the preservation of peace in the Middle East and elsewhere and the development of the economy and well-being of nations recipient of U.S. aid;

"Whereas the actions of the United States in supporting Nasser are wholly inconsistent with U.S. declarations of policy;

"Whereas there is imminent danger that Egypt shortly will be in a position to destroy Israel overnight by the rocketry and sophisticated weapons which Nasser is accumulating, supported by his now battle-trained army;

"Whereas although the Congress of the United States provided by law that U.S. economic aid should not be given to any nation preparing for aggression against any other country aided by the United States, the administration has not acted to stop aid to Egypt; and

"Whereas President Nasser has admitted openly that Egypt is preparing for an aggressive war against Israel and is actively carrying on aggression elsewhere;

"Whereas Nasser has alined himself with the Communist bloc in their efforts to control the African nations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the administration should immediately reverse its longtime policy of appeasing Nasser;

"That the United States take a firm stand before all the world on behalf of the peacefully intentioned, liberty loving, democratic, and free people of Israel to ward off its destruction; and

"That to prevent this catastrophe the United States should: (a) withdraw aid from Nasser as long as that aid is used for aggressive purposes and (b) announce its readiness to enter into a treaty of mutual defense and support with Israel as it has with other nations."

Mississippi: Big Test Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this summer a massive education, community improvement, and voter registra-

tion drive in the State of Mississippi will be conducted under the auspices of the Council of Federated Organizations—COFO—a coalition of Mississippi civil rights groups comprised of the Congress of Racial Equality, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. The National Council of Churches has joined the civil rights groups in this Mississippi operation in which volunteer students, clergymen, teachers, and lawyers will participate.

James Wechsler, in an article in the May 27 issue of the New York Post, points out the implications of the continued denial of constitutional rights in Mississippi and the importance of President Johnson conferring with the leaders of the project. Now is the time for the administration to take steps to provide protection for the volunteers. I urge my colleagues to read this article and seriously consider James Wechsler's appeal that "clearcut signs of Federal concern and conviction at this juncture might avert infinitely larger trouble in the warmer summer days."

[From the New York Post, May 27, 1964]

BIG TEST CASE

(James A. Wechsler)

President Johnson may soon confront the first major domestic crisis of his administration.

It involves the question of whether the U.S. Government will throw its weight behind this summer's massive effort of the civil rights forces to establish some form of democracy in that oppressive police State known as Mississippi, or whether it will try to remain above the battle.

In anticipation of the coming storm, leaders of the "Mississippi Summer Project" have decided to seek a meeting with Mr. Johnson. A joint letter urgently requesting such a session is being sent to him by representatives of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the NAACP, and CORE who are linked together in the Mississippi Council of Federated Organizations.

The letter, signed by SNCC's Robert Moses, NAACP's Aaron Henry, and CORE's Dave Dennis, declares that "during the past 3 years civil rights workers and local citizens in Mississippi have faced violence and brutal resistance when they have tried to exercise their constitutional rights." It asks for a chance to discuss this summer's outlook before the first contingents of summer volunteer's assemble in the State. Such a meeting, if the President consents to it, will produce appeals for Federal aid and protection on a wide front.

As James Forman, SNCC's executive secretary, describes the summer offensive, it will be a many-phased drive. The local battalions will be augmented by at least 700 students from many areas, about 100 ministers, some 150 lawyers prepared to serve on the legal battlelines and a number of teachers who will help to conduct freedom schools.

The major thrust will be the stepped-up voter registration campaign, coupled with support for the "freedom candidates" seeking congressional office. At the same time community centers will be set up to provide services—cultural, medical, vocational—normally denied to Mississippi's Negro populace. Law students will undertake suits against State and local officials engaged in the business of "official tyranny." Amid the local political operations, a delegation to challenge the seating of the lily-white Mississippi contingent at the Democratic convention will be organized.

An orientation program for the volunteers will begin at Western Reserve University, in Ohio, on June 15; the first detachments will enter the State to join hands with the local groups a week later.

Meanwhile, there have been ominous portents of Mississippi's counter offensive. There have been widely publicized reports of new weapons being assembled by State and city units, an obviously intimidatory gambit in view of the nonviolence commitments of the civil rights groups; there have been hurried legislative enactments to legalize even more drastic restrictions on the rights of assembly and speech; there have been increasing arrests of civil rights field workers and sporadic outbreaks of violence against heretic whites—including a few courageous local journalists like Hodding Carter. The State police force has been doubled and its powers of law enforcement

In the face of this developing civil war atmosphere, these is a clear prospect that Federal intervention will be required. That is what the civil rights chieftains want to discuss with President Johnson.

What can the President do to uphold the Constitution in Mississippi and to protect the freedom forces?

In the view of Forman, a spirited 35-year-old Negro veteran of the southern wars, he can do many things. The first and perhaps most crucial step, he believes, would be for Lyndon Johnson to confer with Paul Johnson, Mississippi's new Governor, and make it plain that U.S. policy will not be neutralist if peaceful activity is subjected to lawless violence.

Beyond that dramatic gesture lie many other possible moves. The creation of a special Federal force of E-men (Equality Men) attached to the Justice Department and specifically assigned to the civil rights fronts would, it is argued, have strong psychological and practical impact; there is deep, continuing doubt that the FBI's southern G-men are prepared to police the area in any affirmative fashion. Judicial appointments will also be closely watched in the South as a clue to Washington's attitude. Finally, of course, there is the question of what posture the President will assume in the row over the seating of the Mississippi delegation.

Many other detailed points of strategy and substance will develop in any full-scale appraisal of the Mississippi outlook. The immediate question is whether the President will be disposed to face the issue now, before the storm breaks.

Certainly there is a compelling case for the argument that clear-cut signs of Federal concern and conviction at this juncture might avert infinitely larger trouble in the warmer summer days. That is the message the civil rights spokesmen hope to transmit if and when they see the President. One hopes he will listen and respond. Surely a government that stands firm on so many distance world fronts should be capable of upholding the rule of law in Mississippi, and perhaps even negotiating effectively with the rulers of that despotism.

Immigration Hearings To Begin in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee, I take this occasion to announce that the subcommittee will commence public hearings immediately on pending immigration legislation. The precise date on which these hearings are to commence will be announced within the next several days.

Speech by Dr. Vernon R. Alden, President of Ohio State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, May 28, 1964, Dr. Vernon R. Alden, illustrious president of Ohio University, delivered a splendid address to the Ohio Society entitled "The State of Ohio and the World of 1984."

I commend this address to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

THE STATE OF OHIO AND THE WORLD OF 1984

(By Vernon R. Alden, president, of Ohio University)

For the fiscal year 1964–65, the budget appropriated for the State of Ohio amounts to over $1,500 million.

In 1804 the budget appropriated for the State of Ohio was $20,250.28. Some of the items listed in the 1804 budget read as follows: $7 for the Secretary of State for "stretching the map of the State"; $250 was also given to the Secretary of State to "distribute the laws of the State"; $3.25 was paid to Adam Betz for "candles supplied to the legislature"; $57 was appropriated for firewood for the State House.

There was a mysterious item—$7.60 paid to David Abbot and labeled simply "his appropriation"—$20 was appropriated to "John S. Wills, attorney at law, to prosecute sheriffs."

Under education, and for Ohio University, the early legislators appropriated $90 to the commissioners, "for their services in appraising the college townships of Athens."

There is little need to elaborate on the comparison between today's budget and the budget of 1804. The changes are self-evident. But today the changes are even more rapid. They occur at an even faster rate. They accelerate with each passing year.

The exhibits and the technical wonders of the New York World's Fair are presented to us daily. But stop and recall for a moment the 1939 New York World's Fair. I recall seeing a novel gadget at the 1939 fair. It was a tiny box with a blurred screen. My parents explained to me that it was called television. Very few of us realized at that time, that in 1964 millions of Americans would own television sets. Very few of us realized that we would be watching programs beamed from all over the world.

In 1939 there were no commercial jet planes. I recall my first transcontinental flight—a day and one-half experience. We tested the first military jet planes on my aircraft carrier only 20 years ago.

In those days we had not yet unlocked the secrets of atomic energy. Only a handful of men in the world could comprehend the extent to which our lives would change by the creation of atomic and hydrogen bombs and the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

As we look back 20 years, all of us can recall changes which have dramatically affected our pattern of living. But it takes a more fertile imagination to look ahead to 1984. It takes a wider vision to anticipate the rapid rate of change to come.

Our world is evolving and exploding. We are reaching out to other spheres. A characteristic effort of our age is the attempt to make contact with other planets: To investigate those other solid objects, also traveling in space. Such efforts will stir up revolutions in philosophy, new directions in thought, and new patterns of behavior.

Our young people accept all this. They have lived and grown with the potentials and possibilities of space travel. They live with change. They are accustomed to new directions. It is my generation—it is your generation that finds it hard to adjust to the thought that our children may some day travel to the moon. Our children will find nothing strange in the fact that the State of Ohio too is also changing rapidly and fundamentally.

POPULATION GROWTH

Such forces as population growth are revolutionizing our lives and will hit us with even greater impact in the decades ahead. To illustrate the rate of this increase, let me remind you that in less than 3½ days, enough new people will be born to populate a city the size of Columbus. The world is increasing its population at the rate of 50 million per year. By the time our students who are now freshmen graduate from our universities, the population of the United States will have grown to over 200 million people. By 1984, the population of the United States will have soared to 285 million. This so-called population explosion has implications for all of us, whether we are in business, in education, or in government. In education, for example, we at Ohio University will be enrolling as many students within the next 10 years as we have had in our entire 160-year history.

TECHNICAL CHANGES

At the same time, we can expect continuing growth of the economy of the United States. Within 10 years, the gross national product of the United States will have soared to over $1 trillion per year.

Other kinds of dramatic changes are affecting our lives with equal force. The forecast that we shall land a man on the moon within a decade is now widely accepted and has become a significant national goal. Some people are predicting that in a few years we shall be traveling at supersonic speeds in commercial airplanes. With President Johnson's announcement of the A–11 plane a few months ago, this forecast comes even closer to reality.

It has been said that 90 percent of the scientists who have ever lived are alive today. Clearly this is one reason why the rate of change is accelerating. In the years ahead, change will take place at an even more rapid rate. Let me give you a simple illustration of how much the rate of change has accelerated. It took almost 2,000 years in the recorded history of man to reach speeds of 100 miles per hour, but within the past 10 years we have progressed from speeds of 500 to 18,000 miles per hour. It is possible that by 1970 we shall reach speeds of 180,000 miles per hour in interplanetary travel.

Other kinds of dramatic research breakthroughs are taking place. We are on the threshold of discoveries too awesome to comprehend. Live organisms have been created in laboratory test tubes. Other studies are inducing mutations in living creatures, heralding the day when humans can adapt themselves to survival in the atmosphere of outer space and the strange climates on other planets. Other experiments are leading to the creation of a "thought machine" which will permit communication between people without the use of language. It will be possible for people to exchange innermost thoughts and deep-seated emotions now beyond the threshold of articulation. Such a device will be to the brain what eyeglasses are to the eyes and what hearing aids are to the ears today.

Some of the forecasts for the world of 1984 border on the fantastic. The new world will bring to us increasing wealth, greater leisure time, greater opportunities for travel and recreation, and even greater opportunities for service. But the new world will not be without its share of problems, too. Even now unless we solve some of the problems that are looming just over the horizon, none of us may experience and enjoy the world of 1984.

CHANGES IN THE ECONOMY

All of us are aware of the problems caused by the growing strength and influence of the Russians and the Red Chinese. We have also observed the impact of growing competition from friendly nations such as Japan, West Germany, France, and other countries—countries which are developing strong economies and sophisticated marketing programs of their own. We have seen the effects of new processes, new products, and new research activity upon our own economy. How will these breakthroughs in research affect our basic industries? What will happen, for example, if new modes of mass commuter transportation are developed or if cars are moved about on something other than tires? Not too many years ago, the automobile ruined the buggy and harness business. The automobile completely closed down the old blacksmith shops. What will happen to the refrigerator business when widespread use is made of nuclear treatment for preservation of food?

UNEMPLOYMENT

What will happen to all of our industries and our entire economy if we cannot solve the vexing problem of growing unemployment in our country? Today, poverty and unemployment constitute the most dangerous threat to the American free way of life as we know it. The contrast between the successful, affluent people in our society and the impoverished people in our metropolitan slums and rural areas is too great to be ignored.

Almost 6 percent of our working population is unemployed. With the progress being made in automation and data processing systems, our unemployment rate will continue to increase unless we find ways to create new jobs and retain workers in new skills required by industry today. John Snyder, of U.S. Industries, tells us that the skills of 40,000 workers per week are being rendered obsolete by automation and other laborsaving techniques.

A closer look at unemployment figures gives us even greater cause for concern—750,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 21 are out of school and out of work today. Another 250,000 young men are working only part time or are in casual, dead-end jobs. The rate of unemployment among this group of young people is three times the national average for other age groups. This is an alarming portent of the future. Almost all of these unemployed young men dropped out of school or for other reasons do not have the educational background required by our complex, technological world. With the growing size of our youth population and the great shift from unskilled to skilled jobs now taking place, we are facing a national problem with explosive potential. These youngsters have been called "social dynamite" by Dr. James Conant. These unemployed young men roam the streets in our metropolitan areas today. They represent an increasingly dangerous element in our society. And their situation is becoming more desperate as their numbers increase at a geometric rate. This is a problem we cannot sweep under the rug; this is a threat we can no longer ignore. Leaders in both political parties, businessmen, labor leaders, educators, and others are showing increasing concern and a readiness to act.

Our economy is becoming more sophisticated. Proper training and skill are essential in holding a job. Because of these facts education at all levels is taking on even greater importance. We are faced in America with a massive task of education at the elementary, secondary, technical, college, and graduate levels. Very few people now fully comprehend this educational task, and even fewer people are planning.

I have been very much heartened by the recognition given in Ohio to the importance of higher education in the development of Ohio's economy. I have also been encouraged by the priority which has been given to universities in sparking the economic development envisioned for our great State.

The technical institutes which will be established under university sponsorship will surely help to upgrade our rapidly growing numbers of young people. An expanded and adequately financed program of research at university centers will help create new processes, new products, and new jobs. The training and retraining programs sponsored by private business represent another significant step toward the solution of the problems of unemployment. And on the national level, the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the launching of the Job Corps program will strike at the roots of poverty and unemployment in our metropolitan and rural areas. All of these programs, I am sure, will have the support of thoughtful individuals, because we are all concerned about the education and training of young people.

PERSONAL GROWTH

But for just a few more minutes I should like to talk about a more personal aspect of education. I mean the continuing education of each one of us. As the world changes, we as individuals must change. As our jobs grow, we must grow. As more is required of us by society, we must be prepared to give more. The education of one's self is a never-ending process. All of us have seen colleagues who have stopped learning and growing at the ages of 45 or 50. Today we cannot afford executive obsolescence in business, in education, in government, or in any other profession.

All of us must broaden our interests beyond the immediate day-to-day concerns. We need to develop a better feel for history, philosophy, sociology, and other liberal arts subjects in order to be able to grasp the major issues before us and to be articulate and influential. What I am saying simply is this: To be effective on our jobs and in our communities today, all of us must keep pace with the rapidly changing world around us. We must keep up with progress in the arts; we must study social trends; we must acquire knowledge in the complex, changing area of international relations and in the exploding fields of science. Such personal growth and development calls for a lifetime commitment to study, to reading and to serious conversation.

During the past several minutes, I have talked about the world which we knew 20 years ago and the changes which have taken place on the national and international level. At the same time, I have looked ahead with you to the world of 1984. I have tried to describe some of the technological and social changes which we can expect in the next 20 years. Surely these changes will influence our State of Ohio and will influence all of us as individuals. I have mentioned two of the major problems which may prevent us from achieving our objectives as a State. The changes which I have talked about can create many other problems for us and for Ohio. But problems can also

create opportunities. I shall never forget that while I was attending a Navy Japanese language school during World War II, we learned that the Japanese ideograph or character for the word "crisis" consisted of the characters for two other words—they were "danger" and "opportunity." Thousands of years ago the Chinese and the Japanese were aware that a crisis situation was threatening—but it also offered opportunity.

Our changing world presents new opportunities—great opportunities for those who are willing to learn and to grow and to adapt themselves to a changing environment. Rather than expressing concern about our future of change and uncertainty, the enlightened person today is preparing himself to understand our new world, to serve it, to help shape it, and to live in it fully and wisely.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it had been my hope on Sunday to have joined with the Chicago, Waukegan, and West Pullman Committees of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation and the Chicago chapter of the Armenian Youth Federation in their joint celebration of the 46th anniversary of the May 28 independence day. While my congressional duties kept me in Washington, my thoughts were of the brave people of Armenia and their long fight to regain the freedom that is their right and which cannot for long be denied them. I have great admiration for the people of Armenia and among my close friends have been many Americans of Armenian birth or descent.

May 28, 1918, is one of the greatest dates in the history of the Armenian nation. It is the date on which the Armenian people successfully arose against their oppressors and declared their country a free and independent nation.

In religion, in arts and letters, in cultural and national accomplishments, the history of the Armenian people is a proud history.

In A.D. 300 Armenia was a Christian nation, and the renowned church art of Europe can be traced to Armenian origins.

But despite all of her moral and cultural strength Armenia was at the crossroads often under attack by powerful neighbors, the Turks, the Persians, the Russians, the Mongols.

In the 15th century Armenian independence was destroyed. Numerous times after that Armenians tried to regain freedom. Most of Armenia was divided between Russia and Turkey. This resulted in terrible massacres of Armenians in 1895 and again in 1915, when the nation in Turkey was almost completely eliminated and 600,000 Armenians were killed.

In 1918 the people arose and declared their independence. For 2 hopeful years they were able to live as free people, ruled by a popular government. Unfortunately, as soon as the Bolsheviks won the Russian civil war, they attacked Armenia and destroyed once again Armenian independence. Soon free Armenia became the Communist-ruled puppet state, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, which exists today.

On this anniversary of Armenian independence it is fitting that all Americans of all origins should join with all Americans of Armenian blood in the pledge that together we shall stand by in eternal determination until the foot of the Russian oppressor has been lifted and again Armenia is free.

Speech Given by Nathan M. Klein, at the 200 West 90th Street Tree-Planting Ceremony on May 9, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the remarks made by Mr. Klein on the occasion of the tree-planting ceremony described below is especially significant during these times. With this in mind, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPEECH GIVEN BY NATHAN M. KLEIN, AT THE 200 WEST 90TH STREET TREE-PLANTING CEREMONY ON MAY 9, 1964

Members of West 88th to 91st Street Neighborhood Improvement Association, members of the Hudson Conservation Project, Inc., distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, young men and young women, on behalf of the owners of 200 West 90th Street and Abbott & Adams, Inc., managing agents, I am very happy to accept this tree. This tree symoblizes integrated housing at 200 West 90th Street and also symbolizes the effort to promote integrated housing in this and every other neighborhood.

At 200 West 90th Street, people of all race, color, and creed have lived peacefully and in complete harmony with their neighbors and community for many years.

Integration of housing is a major start on the path of true democracy. It evaporates fears and hallucinations harbored in the minds of the warped, the bigots, and the confused.

This tree stands for one of natures greatest gifts to mankind. From the tree we build our homes and receive our fruits. However, this tree and every other tree in order to grow up good and strong must have plenty of space, sunshine, and good soil, and water. We also, especially our children and the generations to follow, must have good housing, good food, decent clothing, and education, medical care, and equal opportunities, to grow up as a good, strong, nation.

All this is our inherited right, guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, which prescribed that all men are created equal.

To us this tree stands for all of this. I am indeed happy and proud to accept this tree on behalf of the owners and Abbott & Adams, Inc., the managing agents.

Great Lakes Region of Hadassah Expresses Its Views on Foreign Aid, Civil Rights, Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes Region of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, at its spring conference in Milwaukee in May 1964, passed a number of resolutions on issues of the day. I am very glad to include the text of these thought-provoking resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS ON AMERICAN AFFAIRS

(Resolutions adopted at spring conference of the Great Lakes region of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., May 1964)

FOREIGN AID

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc., representing over 300,000 American-Jewish women in every State of the United States, endorses and supports the program of the Agency for International Development.

While recognizing inevitable imperfections in the administration of the complicated program of the Agency for International Development (AID), Hadassah urges the continuance of this Agency as presently organized, as the most effective instrument for constructive channeling of American foreign aid.

We are convinced that our foreign aid program, in assisting uncommitted countries to conquer poverty, illiteracy and disease, is not only morally right, but constitutes an effective weapon in preventing the spread of communism.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, representing over 300,000 American-Jewish women in every State of the United States, endorses and supports the Civil Rights program introduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 7152 and in the Senate as S. 1731.

We believe this bill sets forth a comprehensive program to insure equality for every American in the exercise of the franchise, in schooling, housing, employment and public accommodation.

This program is in full accord with Hadassah's traditional position on civil rights. We are grateful that there is public evidence that the American people is cognizant of the need for this long overdue legislation.

We call upon our members, as individuals, to make known their views to their congressional Representatives. Hadassah believes that the enactment of effective and realistic legislation by this session of Congress is a moral issue and is imperative for guaranteeing to all citizens their constitutional rights and for enhancing the image of America at home and abroad.

M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION LAW

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, known as the McCarran-Walter Act, embodies policies and principles entirely out of harmony with the American tradition of offering a haven to the oppressed, and of equality and of justice; and

Whereas it is the consensus of Hadassah and other countless American organizations representing millions of American citizens

that this act injures our people at home, causes much resentment against us abroad, impairs our position among the free nations—great and small—whose friendship and understanding is necessary if we are to meet and overcome the totalitarian menace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc., in convention assembled, support efforts to remove the defects and inequities of the current act; eliminate resentment, discrimination, and injustice from our immigration laws; and to formulate for the American people and the people of the world a generous, just and democratic solution to an urgent problem.

Discrediting FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the May 28, 1964, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

DISCREDITING FEPC

The Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission continues to dillydally with the Motorola case, which has caused so much alarm throughout the country that it has affected the civil rights bill now before the Senate. The mishandling of the matter raises the question whether the members and staff of the commission comprehend the function of the commission as intended by the legislature.

The case involves Leon Myart, a Negro, who was denied employment by Motorola, Inc., after he failed to pass a general ability test given to all applicants for hourly rate jobs. He filed a charge of unfair employment practices, alleging that he was not given the job because of his race.

A public hearing was held last January 27 before Robert E. Bryant, a Negro attorney selected as hearing examiner by the FEPC. Among the witnesses was Dr. Philip Shurrager, head of the department of psychology of the Illinois Institute of Technology, author of the test in question. The test, compiled in 1949, has been in use since then by large companies in the United States. A study by Dr. Shurrager showed that the test was passed by 72 percent of Negro applicants in a 6-week period and by 76 percent of all other applicants.

Nevertheless, Examiner Bryant ordered Motorola to hire Myart and to desist using the test on the ground that it discriminated against disadvantaged and culturally deprived groups. Motorola appealed to the Commission, contending that it has a right to use race-free tests in the selection of its employees.

This week, at a Commission hearing, three psychologists from Illinois Institute of Technology testified in support of the company. Dr. Marion Groves, acting dean of the graduate school, said the test only measures verbal comprehension and simple reasoning. Such tests, he added, favor the Negro more effectively than other tests which might be administered. He said it is impossible 'by design or not" to discriminate racially in such a test.

The hearing was continued to permit Myart to call additional witnesses and will be set for a date later than June 20. In the meantime, some of the most ardent advocates of FEPC legislation have denounced Examiner Bryant's decision.

Prof. John Coons of the Northwestern University Law School charges the Commission with tragic ineptitude in an article in "New City," a publication of the Catholic Council on Working Life. He writes:

"The statute requires that employers refrain, not from all discrimination, but from discrimination based upon limited, specific grounds—race, creed, national origin. The act was not passed to turn every business by law into a welfare agency. When a case before the FEPC involves the use of a qualification test, the question is simply: Does the test discriminate upon a forbidden ground? To survive as a respected and constructive force—a goal to be cherished—an FEPC must confine its enthusiasm to the domain assigned by statute."

The Illinois FEPC is providing ample reasons for amendments limiting and clarifying the employment section of the pending Federal civil rights bill. Perhaps the Illinois FEPC act also needs amendments. Certainly the Illinois commission has cause for dispensing with any further services from Examiner Bryant. A good look at the method of hiring examiners also is in order.

Terms and Eligibility for Office of Senator and Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, I introduced a piece of legislation that I feel is of interest to each and every Member of the Congress. It deals with a subject that is timidly accepted as too difficult for study and docilely regarded as too delicate for open discussion. It would lead to a reorganization and modernization of the structure of the Congress.

It is a House joint resolution which would require that no person over the age of 70 years would be eligible for election to the Congress; the terms of office for Senators would be limited to three of the present 6-year terms; Members of the House of Representatives would be limited to five terms in office, but the term of office would be extended from the present 2-year term to a 4-year term.

The subject of age of Members of Congress and the seniority system is seldom discussed in open in Washington. Under the present system of seniority it is necessary only for a Member of Congress to continue to gain reelection and to live to a ripe old age. Merit and ability are of little consequence in committee assignments, chairmanships or subcommittee chairmanships. As a result we often find in the Congress a ruling clique of men from a relatively one-party region. These men, having served several decades in Congress, have little interest or understanding of the needs of our growing metropolitan areas and are often totally unresponsive to the needs of our modern age.

The seniority system has been a problem for decades. I have studied writings published over 30 years ago lamenting the same conditions that exist in the Congress today. The situation in Congress has reached such proportions that the Congress cannot effectively legislate as was intended in its creation by the Constitution—to serve the needs and interests of the Nation and the American people as outlined in the Preamble of the Constitution.

An age 70 limitation would assure that Members whose thinking is not in accord to the needs of our modern and dynamic society would be retired to make way for younger men who are aware of the modern needs of the people, that is, mass transportation, urban renewal, revision of our Military Establishment, air pollution problems, medicare, and the many other areas that need legislation introduced and enacted to serve the health, welfare, and development of the full capabilities of our society. Another point to consider is that a younger man entering the Congress will feel that he will be able to accomplish some of the goals which he stated in his campaigning, and not have to wait 20 to 25 years before he would be able to accomplish anything of really great importance to the good of the country.

The 4-year term system proposed here would relieve Members of the House from having to be "continually running for office." Under the present system, a man is hardly in office before he must start campaigning again for reelection. This places an excessive burden on the individual legislator and does not leave him sufficient or adequate time to prepare and study legislation as he would wish.

As far as limiting the number of terms a Member may serve, I believe that this would help up the encrusted seniority system as it now exists. A limitation on the number of terms a man may serve in Congress would assure that there would be a relatively frequent rotation in committee chairmanships and subcommittee chairmanships because Members would no longer be permited to remain in Congress for an indefinite period. Under the present system, a person may remain in Congress an unlimited length of time and accrues to his committee and personal office a high degree of power and influence. Power to kill a bill without even a cursory hearing—influence to such an extent that one man can frustrate the entire Congress by blocking a bill in the legislative process. One of my suggestions to help select committee chairmanships in the future would be the use of a secret ballot for selection of chairman in the event that several of the ranking members of a committee are tied in seniority. Another suggestion would be the rotation of chairmanship among ranking members of a committee who have equal time in Congress. This proposal would call for many revisions, if not outright abolishment of some of the existing Rules of the House of Representatives. I feel that it is about time the Congress did something to modernize itself, to bring its operation and ability to legislate in line with the needs of our modern, nuclear age.

One of the more notable effects of a limitation on tenure of office in Congress would be that there would be a periodic rotation of the membership and eventually, with every election, about one-fifth of the House membership would be

of new and younger men. Men who would know what the current needs and desires of the people really are. By causing a more frequent change in the Membership of the Congress we would bring involvement and responsibility for government to more people. We would relieve ourselves of the situations in which one man may dominate a particular area of governmental policy for several decades. I feel that by bringing more people into active participation of government we would be spreading democracy among the people in the true sense of the democratic spirit. The problem of keeping as many people involved in the activities of government as possible has been in existence for thousands of years. History records that even prior to 300 B.C. laws were passed that certain magistrates and officials of the Roman and Athenian governments were limited to only one term of office. The reasoning behind this was that it was good for the state as well as the citizen to have an active part in the affairs of the state.

It is doubtful that I, as one man, will accomplish any of the almost imperative sweeping reforms needed in the Congress today. However, I intend to keep the issue alive by keeping the people and, hopefully, the other Members of Congress aware of the problem. The only way this problem may possibly be resolved is by "mail from home." I feel that if the people are interested in seeing the Congress reform itself, if the people were to contact their own Representative and Senator, if they write to their State legislators urging support for the amendment I have introduced, perhaps we can get something done. Reform in government is accomplished only when the people demand it and let their voices be heard. In this essential and very important problem I hope all of the people will make their concern known to their elected representatives in Congress and in their State legislatures. Only then will the Congress attempt to put its house in order.

Because of the importance of the resolution I introduced, I place the entirety of it to be published in the RECORD following these remarks.

I hope each Member of this House and the Senate will study this measure with an eye toward constructive comment and encouragement to move it forward in the legislative processes, or constructive criticism of the resolution which would justify the present system of things in the Congress. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the examination of the ideas embodied in my proposal will serve only to help this great legislative body meet the needs and demands of our modern age more effectively, and to regain some of our lost stature as the representative body of the American people.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 1025

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms and eligibility for office of Senators and Representatives

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person may be elected or appointed to the office of Senator or Representative who, at the time of his election or appointment, has attained to the age of seventy years.

"SEC. 2. Representatives shall be chosen in the year in which this article becomes effective and in every fourth year thereafter.

"SEC. 3. No person may serve as Senator for more than three terms, nor as Representative for more than five terms. A Senator or Representative shall be deemed to have served for a full term under this section only if he was elected or appointed to such term after the date this article becomes effective and has served for more than half of such term.

"SEC. 4. This article shall become effective after its ratification on January 4 in the first year in which electors of the President are chosen."

Ranger: Oversight Subcommittee Asks Why NASA Doesn't Prevail on Jet Propulsion Laboratory To "Rigidize" Projectwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently a subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, under the chairmanship of Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH, conducted an investigation into Project Ranger, a spacecraft designed to provide a photographic record of the lunar surface.

The May 15 issue of Science magazine contains an excellent article which gives a factual account of the subcommittee hearings. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the article which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues:

RANGER: OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE ASKS WHY NASA DOESN'T PREVAIL ON JET PROPULSION LABORATORY TO "RIGIDIZE" PROJECTWISE

On May 4 a subcommittee of the House Space Committee finished 4 days of hearings on Project Ranger with testimony from NASA Administrator James E. Webb, in which he assured the legislators that NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL)—contractor for the Ranger unmanned lunar spacecraft program—were reaching a meeting of the minds on issues which have ruffled their relationships.

Inferences of a showdown over renewal of a contract between NASA and JPL, which is managed by the California Institute of Technology, had been read into a Webb press conference in February by many observers (Science, Mar. 6, p. 1014). But the strong support given JPL by Webb during the hearings led some people on Capitol Hill to conclude that Webb, like the grand old Duke of York in the nursery rhyme, had marched his soldiers up the hill then marched them down again.

At the hearings Webb indicated that the press had overaccentuated the negative in his press conference and that the important difficulties between the space agency and JPL not only were soluble but were being solved.

While it will be necessary to await the subcommittee report on the hearings to learn if the NASA and JPL officials' comments satisfied the Congressmen, the hearings themselves provided an unusually free public airing of the problems of management of a major Federal research and development program.

The hearings were held by the House Science and Astronautics Committee's Special Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, created this year by Committee Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER to look into problem areas demarcated by the regular authorizing subcommittees in the course of their work.

To give weight to this Oversight Subcommittee, which is essentially an investigating group, MILLER assigned all his subcommittee chairmen and senior members of both parties to it. With 14 members, it is the Space Committee's biggest subcommittee.

Chairman of the subcommittee is the Science and Astronautics Committee's ranking Democrat, OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, who is also chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

In the Ranger hearings TEAGUE stepped aside to turn over acting chairmanship to Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH, Democrat, of Minnesota, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications and deals with Project Ranger in the line of ordinary duty. TEAGUE's action, incidentally is consonant with the general atmosphere established by MILLER in the space committee, where seniority does not bind with the straitjacket closeness that it does in most other committees. Junior Members are not systematically squelched, as they are in some other committees, and in space committee business partisanship seems to be minimal. MILLER, for example, scheduled the Oversight Subcommittee's first full hearings in March on the subject of nuclear propulsion and chemical propulsion, and one Republican member of the subcommittee, Congressman ALPHONZO BELL, of California, who has demonstrated a strong interest in the potentialities of the so-called gaseous core engine for nuclear space propulsion, was given scope for pursuing that interest that he, as a minority member, could not have hoped for in some other committees.

While a double meaning can be extracted from the formal name of the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, the oversight function in Congress is a hallowed one which, as KARTH pointed out, implies a "vigilant review of the performance of the administration." KARTH expressed the common congressional view that oversight or supervision of Federal programs is appropriate at a time when most programs are proposed by the executive rather than by Congress. The NASA program is particularly worthy of study since it has increased so rapidly in size and complexity.

As the hearings opened, the usually polite relations between the space agency and the space committee were frayed by a letter from Webb in which he said that the "timing of the hearings is unfortunate in that the factors of morale and program execution are both deeply involved."

KARTH noted in his opening remarks at the hearings that the investigation had in fact been precipitated by an earlier letter Webb sent to the chairmen of both House and Senate space committees, and he went on to give a mild lecture to Webb in absentia on the prerogatives and responsibilities of Congress.

Specifically at issue was the subcommittee's right of access to a report of an internal review committee headed by Earl D. Hilburn, NASA's deputy associate administrator for industry affairs, and formed to investigate the Ranger 6 failure. NASA was reluctant to furnish the report, on the grounds that it was only one working paper and "not a definitive agency position."

In a similar inquest on the troubles of Ranger 5—the so-called Kelly report (Science, July 12, 1963, p. 139)—NASA had also resisted making the whole report available to the committee, in part on the grounds that the report was classified because military systems were involved.

KARTH bore down on the fact that the committee wished to compare the Kelly and Hilburn reports to learn to what extent recommendations had been carried out. The space agency provided enough information to satisfy the committee's curiosity, and no full-blown incident over executive privilege developed.

The aim of the Ranger hearings was described by KARTH, who said, "I want to state at the outset it is not our purpose to second-guess the scientists and engineers who have worked hard and long on this frustrating project. While we intend to review the technical difficulties that may have existed or continue to exist, I think it is fair to say that our primary interest has to do with the problem of management."

The focus of the hearings, predictably, became the relationship between NASA headquarters and JPL-Caltech. This relationship is a unique one for NASA, since Caltech manages JPL under contract, while all other major NASA laboratories, which perform research and administer contracts with industry, are Government installations operating under the civil service system.

JPL has been NASA's main overseer of its program for unmanned lunar and interplanetary exploration. Disappointment in all six Ranger spacecraft flights to date has created adverse publicity for Ranger and for JPL, despite the technical difficulty of the project and the JPL's success with the Mariner II flyby of Venus and other achievements.

Attention to negotiation of a new contract with JPL was stirred by Webb in his February press conference, when he said it was necessary to insure "a strong, hard-headed, industrial type of management of programs at JPL."

Subcommittee questioning during the hearings was aimed mainly at learning how the new contract would be modified to insure this stronger management, or in even more direct terms, why NASA didn't exert the same sort of supervision over Project Ranger that it did over other NASA projects outside JPL.

In Webb's testimony, the edge of irritation with JPL which seemed detectable in the press conference had disappeared, and the and other NASA officials strove to explain the nuances of the liaison which makes JPL valuable to the space effort.

No single quote sums up the NASA view; the burden of agency testimony was that JPL offers special problems but provides special services. JPL not only administers specific projects—Ranger included—but it conducts research on the frontiers of space science which is necessary to the space agency's operations now and, especially, in the future.

In short, seeing that JPL's projects are managed as tightly as projects are in industry or in a NASA center, while at the same time preserving an atmosphere conducive to frontier research, requires a managerial tightrope act.

Discussing the human element, Webb noted that people with brilliant ideas about designing, testing, and flying equipment are often not interested in administration, housekeeping problems, and agency rules and regulations.

JPL has an advantage over industry in recruiting, said Webb, because at JPL people have an opportunity not only to work on a specific project—Ranger, Surveyor, or Mariner—but to participate in a "fluxing group that is advancing the state of the art" by doing research comparable to that done in university laboratories.

The matter of JPL organization came in for a good deal of discussion, with at least one Congressman, succumbing to the spacemen's proclivity for making verbs of nouns and adjectives, asking why NASA didn't see that JPL "rigidize" its system.

Until the troubles with Ranger 5 arose, JPL operated under a "matrix" organization composed of seven technical-discipline divisions with a project organization superimposed.

Under a matrix form, project personnel are drawn as required from various divisions. These people remain responsible to their own department heads.

In management jargon, "projectizing" an organization means that people working on a program like Ranger are brought under the line authority of a project manager and cannot, for example, be transferred elsewhere without the manager's concurrence.

After Ranger 5 fizzled, Project Ranger was partially projectized by JPL but, as was noted in the hearings, it took more than a year and a half to accomplish the job of centralizing power and responsibility.

The leisureliness of the process was traceable in large part to a mutuality clause in the present contract which required agreement by both parties not only on what jobs JPL should take—"tasking," in the aerospace vernacular—but also on how the work should be done.

The new contract, though it has not been signed and the terms have not been made public, will give NASA much greater leverage on these decisions.

Other changes have been made as well. A separate quality-assurance and quality-control section has been set up within the Ranger group, and the number of persons engaged in this pursuit has been increased sharply; for example, accounting and record-keeping procedures have been tightened up. And a NASA "resident office" has been set up at JPL with a staff large enough and competent enough to give NASA headquarters a supervisory conduit to the laboratory.

All these things bring management at JPL closer to the "industrial type" which Webb talked about in his press conference and which seems to be admired by the subcommittee.

In delaying the signing of the new contract, perhaps until near the end of the year, NASA seems to be allowing time to see how these changes and others are implemented and also to permit further negotiation of differences with JPL and Caltech officials.

In the past year or so JPL also has ceased to be NASA's sole agent and prime contractor in unmanned lunar exploration, in part because JPL-Caltech officials were unwilling to see the lab undertake the heavy design and production tasks which proposed new projects would have required. The Surveyor spacecraft, which is scheduled to make soft landings on the moon beginning in 1965, will be built by Hughes Aircraft as prime contractor, with JPL as technical manager. Last week NASA named the Boeing Corp., of Seattle, as prime contractor for Lunar Orbiter spacecraft which are expected to fly photo missions around the moon, starting in 1966. Technical management of the Orbiter program has been moved to NASA's Langley Research Center in Virginia. JPL will continue as prime contractor for Ranger and Mariner programs and, presumably, for the Mars probes. The new programs, incidentally, will permit NASA to compare performances on the basis of differing contractual arrangements.

The Space Committees are certain to keep close watch on Ranger and JPL. But, while the congressional committees are becoming increasingly well informed and inquisitive, the consequences of their investigations and recommendations are unclear.

Well before creation of the oversight committee, KARTH's subcommittee on space sciences and applications held investigatory hearings on the Project Anna geodetic satellite system, the Project Advent military communications satellite program, and the Centaur launch vehicle development programs, all of which were experiencing difficulties.

In the case of Centaur, more money and better management moved the project out of the doldrums, but the action appears to have been initiated by NASA. Congressional criticism on these three projects seems to have produced no direct results, although public discussion of faults and expressions of congressional displeasure generally have a stimulating effect on agencies.

Congress has, until now at least, exercised influence on the space program primarily by setting limits on total funds available to NASA. The fact that authority on space agency matters is divided between House and Senate and between authorization and appropriations committees in each House contributes to Congress' difficulty in influencing specific NASA programs. And the space agency itself, by and large, has made the decisions on which programs to cut and which to fatten.

The latest round of hearings should make clear to NASA that in the future the House committee will be interested not only in the management of the program for the unmanned exploration of space but in results. For the present the encounter with the censorious Congressmen may actually strengthen NASA's hand in the attempt to reach a modus vivendi with JPL which will, in Webb's words, "preserve the values and get the job done."—JOHN WALSH.

Kidshows Propel WGN–TV Into Tie for Chicago Second Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently about self-regulation and the advocacy of the free enterprise system of business administration.

In my home State of Illinois, I am proud to report that, in the field of broadcasting, WGN Television, an "independent" station in the Nation's No. 2 market, can make such wide gains in audience without benefit of networking programing. This, of course, could only be made possible under our system of free enterprise.

As reported in a recent issue of Variety magazine, WGN–TV, under the leadership of Ward L. Quaal, executive vice president and general manager, succeeded in tying WNBQ, NBC, for second place in the Chicago television market minus one item of the programing enjoyed by the three interconnected net-

work stations. This one exception is the telecasting of the annual College All-Stars football game fed by the American Broadcasting Co., with WGN-TV as the outlet in Chicago, and various sports "specials" from Sports Network, Inc.

The audience gains made by WGN-TV since the start of Mr. Quaal's stewardship of this precious broadcast property on August 1, 1956, were made with no assistance from "Big Brother" in Washington. It has been accomplished by the best system there is in broadcasting—that which is totally "free" for aggressive and independent broadcasters to act upon.

Mr. Quaal and his associates have demonstrated a rare talent for being successful against network competition.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Variety article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIDSHOWS PROPEL WGN-TV INTO TIE FOR CHICAGO SECOND PLACE

CHICAGO, April 7.—Largely on the strength of its 23 powerhouse kidshows, WGN-TV has jumped into a tie for second place in this market in the just published February ARB's. The Chicago "indie," reaching its highest notch yet during a fall-winter TV season, scored a 23 average share of audience in the sign-on-to-signoff breakdown putting it on a par with the NBC anchor, WNBQ. Matter of fact, the Tribune Co. flagship topped the NBC station in total homes, 156,600 to 154,300.

That would seem to give WGN-TV claim to being the top indie in the Nation, a status that appears to be verified by ARB comparisons with nonaffiliated stations in other markets. The closest runner-up, in point of relative metro audience shares, would be Time-Life's WTCN-TV, Minneapolis-St. Paul, which averages a 17 share against three-network competition. However, it still places fourth in a four-station market.

By the same yardstick, WNEW, New York, ranks third among independents in the Nation with a 15 share of its market, although WGN-TV concedes it is unfair to compare independents in six- and seven-station markets with those having no other "indie" competition. The Gotham station, a Metromedia property, tops all independents in total homes with 329,700, more than twice WGN-TV's total, having the advantage of a larger market.

Other independents getting better than a 10-percent share of their markets from sign-on to signoff, in the latest ARB survey, are CKLW, Detroit-Windsor, with a 14; KTVT, Dallas-Fort Worth, with 13; KTVU, San Francisco, with 12; and KATU, Portland, Oreg., with 11.

WGN-TV has run ahead of WBKB-TV (ABC) for much of the current season and has maintained its 23 percent share for the past two rating periods. But both WBKB and WNBQ each lost audience in the latest survey to the front-running WBBM-TV, and that gave the indie a clear edge over the ABC station and a tie with WNBQ. Indicative of where WGN-TV's strength lies is that the ARB analysis of audience components (men, women, teens and children) shows the Trib station fourth in all categories save the last, where it is a whopping first.

While the second place tie represents WGN-TV's zenith during a regular TV season, the indie has been known to run first in the market during the summer months, especially during baseball season.

The Far West: Its Growth, Its Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have lived our lives in the Western States have watched the growth and development of the West through the years. We never cease to be amazed at the population increase, the expansion of our economy, the diversification of our agriculture, our commerce and our industry.

A few days ago a good friend of mine, Mr. Paul Claiborne, president of the Placer Savings & Loan Association in Auburn, Calif., addressed the Pacific Water Conditioning Association. His subject was "The Far West: Its Growth, Its Potential."

Paul Claiborne reduced to words a dramatic picture of the growth of California and the West. I would like to share this with the rest of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and at this point I would like to insert his remarks into the RECORD:

"THE FAR WEST: ITS GROWTH; ITS POTENTIAL"—AN ADDRESS BY PAUL CLAIBORNE, PRESIDENT, PLACER SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION, AUBURN, CALIF., BEFORE PACIFIC WATER CONDITIONING ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, HARVEY'S WAGON WHEEL, STATELINE, NEV., MAY 22, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen, the subject assigned for discussion today—"The Far West: Its Growth and Its Potential"—is, I feel, best exemplified by the growth and potential of California. I will cite some statistics on growth and trends of California, but in many cases, they could apply to other Western States—Arizona, Oregon, or any of the others. Also, being a Californian for 60 years, I am better equipped to talk about it. The subject of the Far West is as great or big as the geography implied by the word California.

The migration of people to the West in the last 100 years has never been equaled in the history of the world or mankind. Starting with the discovery of gold in California in 1848, the trek of people to the West has never ceased.

California has come a long way since it was admitted to the Union in 1850. At the outset, any success California has had—may be traced to the type of people who came here as miners and homesteaders. They came from the eastern seaboard and Plains States. They were God-fearing and hard-working people to whom the building of a new country was a challenge.

A few years ago, on a trip to Tennessee, after hearing me brag about the greatness of California, an elderly uncle of mine remarked with a twinkle in his eyes, "You know, Paul, with the type of people like your parents migrating to California—California couldn't help becoming a great State." Thus, we do have a great heritage.

To appreciate the future, one must have a feeling of reverence and repect for the past. Those early pioneers and settlers were more fortunate than they expected. Coming to a land with the zeal and industry they possessed, they found it blessed with the natural resources not found anywhere else in the world.

These resources consist of minerals (the discovery of gold, which sparked the migration), petroleum, agriculture, lumbering, fishing (a 1,200-mile coastline, plus rivers and lakes), water and electric power in abundance, and climate.

Having lived in this motherlode area for 60 years, I have witnessed many changes. After attending school in El Dorado County; Roseville, Calif.; and Sacramento, I moved to Auburn in 1926, where I have been in business since. Then, we had a population of 4,929,000. We ranked sixth among the States in population. The total annual income of all of our people was $4,640 million. The value of our agricultural products amounted to $600 million. Annual value added by manufacture was but $992 million. We had only 1,700,000 motor vehicles on our streets and highways. Our State budget amounted to $103,430,275 for the biennium 2 years) of 1925-27. Our enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools was just over a million.

Compared with today, our problems were relatively simple. We needed unity then to fight our way to the top, but we need unity today even more for, as the first State in the Union, we are in a sense a target for other sections and areas of the United States. Look at what has happened to us in just 37 years.

We have just emerged from a fabulous period. We have given the world a spectacular demonstration of our ability to absorb people. Job opportunities have been created by the thousands. The Nation has been astonished at our capability to build homes, schools, freeways, and shopping centers. California and the West has been, and is still, the land of opportunity. The shift of population continues to the West. With it has come expansion in business activities and in our financial resources. Giant steel, electronics, space and missile operations, food and aviation industries have grown up.

With an area of 158,000 square miles and 1,200 miles of coastline, California has every possible contrasting extreme of topography, climate, soils, minerals, and plant and animal life. The second highest peak in the continental United States is found in California—Mount Whitney—as is the lowest place—Death Valley. The population growth of the Far West has been phenomenal. It has shown significant increases in every decade since 1850. Between 1940 and 1950, California alone had a 53-percent increase, while the 1960 census placed our population count at 15,717,000—9 percent of the Nation. This was an increase of more than 5 million, or 48 percent, twice the gain recorded by any other State.

The State Department of Finance estimates that in 1970 our population will be 22 million; and by 1975—25 million. California is now growing at the rate of 12,000 people per week. To give you an idea of what this means to the California economy, let me cite a few of the weekly requirements of these new people: 4,200 units of new housing; 6,780 new registrations of motor vehicles; 120 new classrooms for 3,000 new students; 122 additional retail outlets; 6,100 additional telephones, every week, just to take care of our population increase.

As everyone knows, we are now the No. 1 State in the Union, in terms of people, and this brings obligations as well as glory and opportunities. California should not become obsessed with a single-minded devotion to largeness without striving for the virtues which, in the past, have made States and nations great. Population alone does not make a state endure. If it did, China and India for centuries would have been the greatest nations on the globe. The State chamber believes that California's position as first in population is not a sanctified end, but rather an historic opportunity to achieve

higher goals. This imposes an urgent need for intelligent and cooperative action.

Thoughtful people these days, I think, are concerned more than ever with problems. The problems of the world, the nation, and of our State. The problems of the latter we are concerned with today. The problems consist of growth, increased population, education, government, and business. Automation is probably our biggest social problem today. In order to keep up with our expected growth during the next 10 years, it will be necessary to provide approximately 234,000 new jobs each year, which will necessitate $3.2 billion of new capital investments per annum.

California has a large supply of experienced labor, possessing many skills in a wide variety of employment categories. The prosperity of this State depends upon the growth and development of jobmaking firms. The annual value added by manufactures in California approximates a rate of $15 billion. We have nearly 1½ million persons gainfully employed in our manufacturing industries, an annual payroll of about $9½ billion. Wages and salaries have increased 100 percent in the past 10 years.

While the population in California historically doubles every 20 years, the consumption of electric energy doubles every 10 years. This indicates a high standard of living. The number of manufacturing employees in California has increased more than 326,000, while New York has lost 270,000. Ohio has lost 230,000; and Pennsylvania has lost 251,000; and Michigan has lost 281,000. Yes, California and the entire West is on the march.

It surely will not be many years before California becomes the No. 1 State, not only in population but in industrial production. In order for this to occur, it is necessary to realize that the continued rate and soundness of California's economic growth, the State's ability to absorb industry the fastest growing labor force in the Nation, and its ability to maintain a solvent government, will depend heavily upon the continuous improvement of our business climate. We have the biggest job of all the States of attracting the capital necessary to keep our economy moving and expanding. Capital is mobile and tends to flow to areas which facilitate its most advantageous use. Population alone does not attract capital. Being the largest State in terms of population may be a dubious distinction, unless the breadwinners of that population are gainfully employed.

Most employment in our economy must originate in the private sector of our economy. Jobs are created by private enterprise when the savings of individuals are invested to start new business ventures in the hope of earning profits or to add or expand existing business in the hope of increasing profits. It is the prospects of profits that inspires the productive employment of people in the private economy. The dimming of that prospect breeds unemployment and stops economic growth.

Let's look at agriculture. Do you realize that one out of every four jobs in California rests directly or indirectly on the State's agriculture? California is the Nation's leader in this field, ranking first in value of agricultural products (including livestock). Our production has reached the $3.4 billion mark. Of California's 158,000 square miles of total land which I mentioned earlier, 20,000 square miles, about 12 percent, are croplands, with over 8.5 million acres under irrigation.

It appears that as the California economy matures there will be shifts in the patterns of land usage. More land will be devoted to industrial, residential, and commercial purposes. This in no way suggests a decline in the standing of California as an agricultural State. We expect the acreage under irrigation to expand and productivity to an acre to increase. We expect there will be more fruit and vegetable crops and less grain and forage crops. Since fruit and vegetables require more labor, agricultural employment should hold up in the years ahead.

We produce almost 300 different agricultural products, among them more than one quarter of the Nation's total supply of fruits, nuts, and vegetables. We are number one in production of almonds, apricots, grapes, lemons, lettuce, peaches, pears, prunes, sugar beets, tomatoes, and walnuts, and a dozen other universally used fruits and vegetables and their products.

Because of our variety of soils and climate, we have 118 different types of farming, as compared with 8 in Illinois, 20 in Texas, 12 in Kansas, and 25 in Pennsylvania, for example. Six of the top ten counties of the United States in value of agricultural products are in California. I have just mentioned the 118 different types of farming we have here in California which involve many specialty crops, crops that are grown only in this State. Quite naturally we are concerned as to what will happen to California's agriculture and our specialty crops in the Common Market. When you consider that for the year 1961, the exports of California's agricultural products, including livestock and livestock products, amounted to $477½ million, compared with imports of like products of only $195 million, some of us are concerned as to how our agriculture will fare in the Common Market negotiations.

Too many figures can be boring, I know, but once in a while it pays to look at them in order to get the full impact of California's preeminence in industry and agriculture.

We shine in other fields, too. The West is recognized as one of the most varied recreational areas in the country, with vacationers spending billions of dollars a year. Just in California there are 11 national parks and monuments, 19 national forests, 168 State parks, 25,000 campsites, not to mention those in Arizona, Nevada, and the other Western States.

And with all of our dedication to scenic beauty and preservation of nature's blessings, such as the big trees, we manage to be second in the Nation in lumber production, with 30,000 square miles of land in commercial timber growth.

We are third among the States in the production of crude petroleum. And our commercial fisheries pour 700 million pounds annually into the Nation's supply of canned and frozen fish of all types.

The moving picture industry in California is unsurpassed anywhere else in the world. The impact movies have on people, no doubt has played a leading role in influencing people in the world to come to California.

Considering the problems of our Western States and the importance of our relationship to them, it is then for us to plan aggressively for a greater future. To do this we must put aside our microscopes and cease busying ourselves with seeking petty flaws. We must instead pick up our telescopes, catch a fresh vision of the potentials and consecrate ourselves fully to their realization. With our capabilities and know-how, a successful, beneficial, worthwhile, and profitable future seems assured.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, among the valiant peoples now subjected to cruel Soviet oppression are the Armenians. On May 28 we marked the day thought of by the Armenian people as their independence day. In 1918 after the brutal massacres of the World War I period, Armenia declared her independence. But free government was to exist for only 2 promising years; in 1920 the Bolsheviks, having won the Russian civil war that followed the overthrow of the Czarist regime, attacked Armenia and destroyed that independence. Armenia became a puppet state, the Armenian Soviet Socialist puppet state.

The Soviets were not the first to assault Armenian liberty. For centuries, Armenian patriots fought to preserve their national identity against the onslaughts of Persians, Turks, Mongols, and Russians whose expansionist desires led across Armenian soil.

But against these overwhelming odds, the Armenian people have remained true to their love of liberty and have fought time and again to regain their independence.

On the occasion of Armenian Independence Day we should pay tribute to their gallantry and assure the Armenian people that we are not indifferent to their struggle.

Debt Management: The Record and the Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Barr, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, delivered a speech before the Chicago district of the Illinois Bankers Association on March 31, 1964. I believe this speech contained material that all of us ought to study and ponder. I am therefore, placing it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEBT MANAGEMENT: THE RECORD AND THE OUTLOOK

On January 31, 1961, the day I was sworn in as assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, problems of debt management facing the country and facing those charged with the responsibilities of Government were formidable indeed.

Three problem areas clamored for attention. In the first place, the debt structure was sorely out of balance with a huge volume of short-term maturities ever in need of refunding. Secondly, there was a persistent deficit in the balance of payments. Finally, the economic climate of the Nation was such that the traditional remedies for the first two problems led to contradictions and inconsistencies.

A few figures will give you some idea of the magnitudes involved in the management of a debt which was largely the heritage of World War II. In 1961, more than $85 billion of the marketable debt was due to mature in 1 year and behind this was another $58 billion moving down toward this category. Long-term debt—maturities beyond 20 years—accounted for only $11 billion, or 4 percent of the total. Moreover, the average maturity of the marketable public debt had declined rather persistently from 9 years and 5 months in June 1947 to as little as

4 years and 2 months at the postwar low in 1960, or by more than 50 percent.

The first task, of course, was to cut down the size of the near-term maturities and to restore balance in the entire debt structure. Too much short-term debt means a constant stream of sizable refundings. Thus, the Treasury lacks the option to avoid financing when market conditions are unfavorable. Moreover, this refunding pressure can inhibit the execution of monetary policies. Only for short intervals would the Federal Reserve be able to work out gradations of change, or shifts, in monetary policy freely and independently without risking undue disruption of the markets and of the Treasury financing operations as well.

Of course, for very short periods it is possible to defer debt extension, should this conflict with economic policy considerations. But this is like deferred maintenance on a railroad or on an industrial plant. If the deferral is continued too long, the deterioration may virtually preclude return to a sound debt structure. This is one reason why the debt managers have to seize every appropriate opportunity to extend maturities. And, I might add, this takes courage. Sizable and vocal elements in the community can always be depended upon to insist that any time is the wrong time to lengthen the debt.

Quite apart from the structure of the public debt, the second major problem facing the debt manager in 1961 was our posture in the international balance of payments. The payments deficit in 1960 was $3.8 billion. In the previous 3 years, the Nation had run a total deficit of $10 billion in its basic international accounts. Gold was leaving the country at a rate of more than $300 million a month. Confidence was shaken abroad in our willingness and our ability to maintain and defend the stability of the dollar.

Whatever debt management could do to remedy our balance-of-payments deficit clearly needed to be done. According to the classical prescription, the therapy for such a balance-of-payments deficit was simple enough: tighten money across the board with the objective of shrinking domestic business activity. But remember, this prescription assumes business excesses as chiefly responsible for the payments deficit.

Owing to the peculiar shape of our payments deficit problem in early 1961, and at present, it has not been amenable to the classical remedies, except at a cost to economic well-being that is wholly unwarranted. This brings us to the third problem area—the economic climate of the Nation in January 1961. Our economy was in the grip of recession. Almost 7 percent of the labor force was unemployed. Productive output was running $50 billion short of the economy's potential. Nearly one-fifth of manufacturing capacity lay in idleness. These conditions reflected not only the 1960 setback, but also some carryover from the incomplete recovery from the recession of 1957–58. In other words, the problem was not only how to recover from one recession but how to recover from two. Moreover, acceleration of the economic growth rate would help to alleviate both our domestic and foreign problems.

Application of classical remedies for the balance-of-payments deficit in 1961, as today, would injure our domestic economy and would be of very dubious value on the international front. We found ourselves, in short, with new problems calling for new methods and policies. I think we can justly take a great deal of satisfaction in the ingenious techniques which have been devised and applied so successfully to redress the balance of payments without harming domestic business.

Now what was done and how have we fared? In the circumstances, the debt manager had to weigh goals one at a time against each of the others with due regard for possible conflicts. The need to restore balance in the structure of the public debt argued for issuing long-term securities. But such a policy carried the risk of raising long-term interest rates. This, in turn, could discourage businessmen from borrowing for investment in productive facilities, an essential for combating a recession. Furthermore, higher interest rates in the United States were indicated as a corrective for the balance-of-payments problem. Yet, the depressed condition of business domestically called for decided credit ease. Reduced cost and increased availability of credit were needed to stimulate confidence and encourage businesses to replenish their inventories and to pour new resources into plant and equipment. Then the familiar multiplier and acceleration effects could be expected to inject new life throughout the economy and reverse the prevailing downward trend.

To meet this complex of difficulties there emerged a policy framework which took account of both the domestic and the international situation. Efforts were concentrated on encouraging and raising the level of private investment as an essential stimulant to recovery and basic economic growth. Such investment in the longer run would increase the productivity of American industry and its competitive position in world markets.

Close cooperation between the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury maintained general monetary ease to assure an ample supply of credit and attractive rates in the long-term capital market. This was designed to promote business and mortgage borrowing. At the same time, the short-term interest rate structure was shored up to levels which would discourage the outflow of funds by removing the attractiveness of competitive investment opportunities abroad—and yet not put undue upward pressure on our own long-term interest rates.

Meanwhile, reduction of the FHA ceiling rates on insured mortgages, supported by FNMA mortgage purchases, eased mortgage credit and stimulated homebuilding. The Small Business Administration made its credit more widely available at lower cost.

In the financial community, there were many who doubted the efficacy of these multipurpose remedies. As they saw it, any efforts to compartmentalize the money market were doomed to failure. Fortunately, the remarkable success of the program has dissipated most of these misgivings. The business expansion which got underway in February 1961 is now 38 months old and on its way to becoming one of the longest on record. Our progress since 1960 speaks for itself.

GNP up 16 percent in constant dollars.
Wholesale price index unchanged.
Industrial production up 23 percent.
Personal income up 17 percent.
Corporate profits up 44 percent.
Average length of the public debt increased 15 percent.

Ownership distribution of the public debt improved with the relative proportion of the total held by banks decreased by 11 percent.

Gold outflow from $1,669 million in 1960 to only $391 million in 1963; only $15 million in the last quarter of the year.

The policy of maintaining stability in long-term interest rates while at the same time permitting short-term rates to rise—the so-called twist mechanism—has been much more successful than appeared likely at the outset. While short-term rates (Treasury bills) have risen approximately 50 percent since 1961, long-term rates and corporate bond rates are today actually lower than they were in February 1961. This is particularly significant. A builder, an industrialist, anyone in the economy who wanted to borrow money finally began to realize that he did not have to hedge or speculate on a merciless money market. Industrialists, municipalities, builders, and just plain people did not need to play the market to get the best rate, because an environment had been created which enabled a person in need of money to borrow on fair and reasonable terms.

And how about the impact of management policies on our debt structure and our goal of noninflationary finance? Skillful use of the advance refunding techniques has made it possible to extend the maturity of the debt in sizable amounts and to offset the increased volume of Treasury bills that had to be sold for balance-of-payments reasons. Furthermore, so far as ownership of the debt goes, the policy of noninflationary finance has been pursued vigorously. Commercial banks have not been called to monetize the Federal debt. From the yearend 1960 to 1963 the debt has risen about $20 billion, reflecting budget deficits in a period of inadequate economic growth. During the same period, commercial bank holdings have risen only $2 billion. This, it can be argued, is evidence of excessive conservatism. After all, savings deposits in commercial banks have grown at the rate of about $10 billion annually.

This leads to just one more thought that I should like to leave with you. It concerns investment in obligations of the United States. Sound and sensible Federal debt management needs the support and cooperation of the lending and investing institutions. I am appalled that many corporate treasurers and financial officers of other institutions do not invest a reasonable portion of their funds in U.S. bonds. Ordinary prudence dictates the wisdom of such commitments.

There is no safer investment than the obligations of the U.S. Government. These securities should not be forgotten in an era which has seen a fair number of sophisticated lenders absorb sizable losses because they paid too little attention to credit quality.

U.S. Government securities also have the virtue of being easily marketable. There is no question but that, even for the long-dated obligations, Federal bonds in multimillion-dollar blocks can be sold on very short notice. The superior marketability will be appreciated by anyone who has ever tried to sell a comparable amount of corporate bonds.

Generally, the owner of Federal bonds has protection for a longer period against a call for payment prior to maturity than do corporate bondholders. The corporate bond investor is fortunate if he has 5 years of protection against a call for payment. Yet there are U.S. Government securities outstanding that cannot be called for 23 years. To be sure corporates offer a higher coupon but in recent months the spread between corporate and Treasury bond yields, 4⅜ percent or even 4½ percent against 4¼ percent, has been much too narrow to compensate for the greater vulnerability owing to the call date feature.

Commercial banks, of course, have investment problems that make it difficult for them to take full advantage of good buying opportunities in the bond market. They are always balancing the alternatives for the employment of funds—loans versus investments. Their investment record does not appear to be outstanding. But banks are primarily lending institutions and when loan demands are high, bond prices go down as yields go up. At such times, liquidation of bonds often is the chief source of funds needed to accommodate borrowing customers. Banks thus face a general dilemma. I do suggest, however, that many banks could manage their bond portfolios more advantageously for themselves and for their stockholders by studying the choices with greater care than heretofore.

President Johnson has directed me to keep in mind the history of the great depression,

and especially the years 1932–34. I understand this era only from what I have read. But I do remember distinctly the evening of May 28, 1962, the day of the largest stock market break in recent history. I sat in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury that night while we pondered what we could or should do and what should we say. We decided that we could not do anything, that we should not do anything, and that silence was the best statement.

In retrospect I am convinced that we were right. We did not and could not move to protect investors in a disorderly stock market. But the investors in the obligations of the United States are in a different position. They know that in this one sector of our financial system their Government can and should act to correct or prevent a disorderly market. Only holders of U.S. Governments are safeguarded by an assurance of this nature; no comparable securities are available in the world today.

To conclude, I would like to share with you a few personal observations on my 3 years in the U.S. Treasury. First of all, debt management to me is no "dry as dust" affair. If it is bungled, the economic strength of the country—at home and abroad—can be seriously damaged. Secondly, the credit of the United States is no petty partisan affair. Douglas Dillon, a Republican, has served Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy faithfully and well for the past 3 years and has established the record which I have attempted to describe. But Douglas Dillon and Bob Roosa built on a sturdy framework of development and change that was bequeathed to us by Mr. Robert Anderson and Mr. Julian Baird. Thirdly, I am convinced that the pace of change in the Nation and in the world today forces all of us in Government and all of you in the financial community to a constant appraisal of ways and means to meet new situations. And, finally, I am convinced that the U.S. Treasury is no place for a lazy or a complacent man. However, the credit of the United States is surely worth all the effort.

Maxfield Parrish: Noted American Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire's Maxfield Parrish, a resident of Plainfield, N.H., has long been a resident of Plainfield, N.H., has long been a leading American painter, illustrator, and muralist. An exhibition of his art was recently held at Bennington College in Vermont, and the Daily Eagle of Claremont, N.H., published an editorial calling attention to Parrish's distinguished career and the renewed interest in his work by the art world and the public.

Now 94, Parrish is remembered by millions for his covers on the old Collier's, Harpers Weekly, and the National Weekly, for landscapes on calendars, for murals in the St. Regis Hotel in New York and the Palace Hotel in San Francisco, and for his illustrations of many books including "Mother Goose in Prose," "Wonder Book," "The Arabian Nights," "Poems of Childhood," "Knickerbocker's History of New York," "Dream Days," and "Golden Age."

Known for his powerful use of color, Parrish has found considerable inspiration for his art from his life amidst the mountains of New Hampshire. We are proud of him not only for his outstanding artistic talent but for his qualities as a fine person and a valuable citizen.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention Associate Editor James L. Farley's editorial, "Renascence of Maxfield Parrish" from the Daily Eagle:

RENASCENCE OF MAXFIELD PARRISH

A week ago Monday an exhibit opened at Bennington College that should be of interest of all of a certain age, and of particular interest to the Twin State Valley. It is called "A Second Look at Maxfield Parrish" and it is displayed in the new gallery of the Bennington College Carriage Barn. Gallery hours are from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and from 8 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. No admission is charged and the public is invited. It will run through May 21.

Maxfield Parrish, what that name evokes. To the greatest number, no doubt, his landscapes on calendars; to others, his magazine covers for Harper Weekly, the National Weekly, the old Collier's; to the more fortunate few, his murals in the King Cole Bar of the St. Regis Hotel in New York and the Palace Hotel in San Francisco; and, to a whole generation of us as children, his wonderful, whimsical illustrations for such books as "The Arabian Nights."

It always comes as something of a shock to those who live outside the Twin State Valley that Mr. Parrish is alive—very much so. But those of us who have been his friends and neighbors his stocky, broad-shouldered figure, crowned by a magnificent head and thistle-down hair has long been a familiar sight.

At 94, he still is as witty and courteous as ever, and his mastery of anecdote points up how sadly this art has fallen from present-day conversational habits. So remarkable is the vigor of this mangnificent old man, that it was only a year or two ago that he voluntarily gave up driving his own car, an operation he had always conducted with his usual, sure skill.

In the current issue of Show magazine, there is an article entitled 'The Return of Maxfield Parrish," by Lawrence Alloway. In it, it is suggested that Mr. Parrish as one of the last artists who was also a commercial artist (i.e., calendar, book, and advertising illustrations), as opposed to a pure artist (one who paints with collectors, museums, and galleries as well as himself in mind), may be about to have a renascence in critical attention.

That may be so. Surely Mr. Parrish, who has always diavowed being an artist, preferring to call himself a good mechanic, would be the last to claim any pretension. His self-classification as a good mechanic is in a way an apt one, for he is a superb master of technique in the sheer mechanics of paint and of composition. And he is also, quite literally, a superb mechanic, as anyone knows who has seen the ingenious and meticulously skillful products that have come out of his well-equipped machine shop.

Further, he is a very sound critic of art. knowledge of the subject

This writer, with an admittedly limited knowledge of the subject, has found it a delight to listen to him discourse on the subject.

Of additional interest to the upper valley about the Parrish exhibit at Bennington is that the bulk of its is from the collection of the Betsey P. C. Purves Trust from the Vose Galleries in Boston, collected by the late Austin M. Purves, who for years maintained a summer home in Cornish.

Jawaharlal Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to Mr. Nehru as a great source of inspiration to India and, through India, to the world. His part in the struggle for Indian independence, showed his great strength of character and his concern for liberty.

Imprisoned for his beliefs, he was yet a tower of strength and moderation during the early, perilous years of independence. He saw democracy as a method of directing and implementing progress. His thoughts and actions stressed not only the significance of political machinery but also an emphasis on democratic objectives; upon broad development of all phases of Indian life and culture; upon education as well as economic growth; upon light industry as well as heavy; upon concern for the individual as a person as well as great problems of the nation; upon the development of local self-government as well as strengthening the bonds uniting all Indians; upon the participation of women as well as men in political life; upon uplifting the submerged castes; and, above all, upon the infusion of rationality into areas previously governed by blind tradition or untrammeled emotion.

Pandit Nehru never lost his longtime optimism for mankind's future, in the midst of struggles to solve immediate problems.

He managed always to maintain the long perspective of a statesman. This sometimes expressed itself in puzzling forms, but Nehru never gave ground in his essential faith in the ability of diverse people to understand each other and in man's ultimate capacity to work out international and interpersonal relations on a level of mutual respect rather than unilateral force.

The loss of so powerful and so pervasive a figure as Nehru has naturally raised the question of the ability of the Congress Party to reach agreement on a successor and to give such a successor sufficient support to continue the policy laid down by Pandit Nehru.

Firsthand observation leads me to complete confidence that the Indian Congress Party will have no more difficulty in finding continuous leadership than any other major political party in a democracy. Indeed, it may have considerable less than U.S. political parties on some occasions. There is every reason to believe that the great wealth of leadership in the Indian states and the strong experience and sense of purpose which that leadership enjoys will give India a continuation of Congress programs.

India is a great democracy. The death of its leader has come as a shock to us all but the system and its values which Pandit Nehru so nobly served will go on.

Farm Problems Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a series of articles and editorials, the Chicago Tribune has pointed up the colossal failures of the administration on the farm front. The following articles are recommended reading for everyone who is interested in the present plight of American agriculture:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, May 11, 1964]

HOME TO ROOST

Republican farm policy experts meeting in Kansas City the other day expressed confidence they have the issues to win the farm vote again this year, as they did in 1960. They are right, and the majority of farmers are aware of it.

The Democratic Party has not fulfilled a single one of the extravagant pledges to farmers in its 1960 platform. Despite the squandering of billions of dollars on farm programs in the last 3 years, net farm income this year actually will be lower than in the last year of the Eisenhower administration. The parity ratio is several points below the average for the Eisenhower years.

No better example of the miserable failure of Democratic farm policies is to be found than the debacle that has brought severe financial losses to the beef cattle industry. More monetary lumps are in store for the farmers and ranchers who feed cattle for market this year.

The evidence seems conclusive that the major cause of this catastrophe was the Kennedy administration's costly and ill-advised feedgrain program, which dumped hundreds of millions of bushels of Government-owned surplus corn and other grains on the market in 1961 and 1962. The objective was to keep market prices low and thereby prevent farmers who declined to cooperate with the program from benefiting from the high prices it guaranteed to cooperators. Huge quantities of cheap feed encouraged expanded breeding and feeding of livestock, putting more animals on the market and causing prices to collapse.

By the end of this year the feedgrain program will have cost well over $3 billion in payments for idling acreage alone, not including the costs of fixing prices at levels above the market, and omitting administrative expenses. Add to these costs the $1 to $2 billion cattle feeders are estimated to have lost thus far, together with the economic disruption in the industry, and the calamitous failure of Democratic policies become clear.

On top of all this, the Johnson administration will have to explain why it beat down the amendment offered by Senator HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, which would have established effective import quotas on beef to take some of the pressure off domestic producers exerted by a record quantity of foreign beef now flooding the country.

Thus once again the adverse effects of bureaucratic meddling in agriculture have been graphically illustrated in a way that could hardly be more painful.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, May 1 1964]

THE "FORGOTTEN" FARMER

Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK, Republican leaders in the Senate and the House, emphasized the wrong point when they charged the Johnson administration with having forgotten the farmer. The two GOP leaders, speaking for the entire Republican leadership in Congress, were right, however, when they said the farm economy has slipped badly under 3 years of Democratic policies.

What the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have or have not done for the farmer is not as important as what they have done to him. The parity-price ratio, which averaged 84.5 during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, now is down to 75, lowest level in 24 years. This ratio, by relating prices of farm commodities to production costs, is supposed to provide a measurement of farmers' purchasing power.

In their 1960 platform, the Democrats pledged positive action to raise farm income to full parity with the incomes of workers in business and industry, which would have required raising the parity price ratio at least to 100 and probably much higher.

The Johnson administration is trying to make some political hay with its new subsidy programs for wheat and cotton. The cotton program is going to encourage Southern farmers who take cotton land out of production in return for payments to plant more soybeans in competition with Midwest farmers, who already are producing as many beans as the market can take.

The wheat program, by dropping the market price of wheat substantially, is likely to throw big supplies of cheap wheat on the market in competition with corn and other feed grains that are already in surplus. Thus it threatens further expansion and an even greater price debacle than has already occurred in the overexpanded beef cattle industry.

It was the Kennedy administration's feed grain program, which dumped vast quantities of cheap feed on the market, that helped stimulate the current overexpansion in cattle that has brought the most severe financial losses to cattlemen in the history of the industry. Prime cattle are bringing the lowest prices in 18 years. Prices are so low, in fact, that older cows and bulls which should be culled and sent to market are, instead, being held back to produce more calves or are being bought by farmers turning to cattle because of Government crop restrictions.

All this chaos and more has been accomplished through unprecedented Federal spending on agriculture. This year Government payments to farmers will alone total an estimated $2.1 billion, and that comes on top of the nearly $5 billion in payments in the last 3 years.

Farmers are now reaping the bitter harvest of Democratic policies which have been ill-advised, misdirected, and severely disruptive to the farm economy. The Democrats have not forgotten the farmer. He would have been better off if they had.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, April 29, 1964]

GOP GATHERS WEAPONS FOR FARM VOTE BATTLE—SAYS DEMOCRATS DEFAULT ON 1960 PLEDGE

(By Richard Orr)

KANSAS CITY, MO., April 28.—Republican farm policymakers met here today to gather ammunition for the forthcoming election year battle for the farm vote.

The Republicans said they will capitalize on what they called the failure of the Democrats to make good on their 1960 platform pledges to farmers. The GOP also expects to make election year hay over widespread discontent and financial distress in the beef cattle industry and unrest among farmers with the Democratic-sponsored wheat and other crop programs designed to extend Federal controls over agriculture.

These points were emphasized in a program conducted by a panel of Republican farm experts before several hundred farmers and ranchers in the Muehlebach hotel here. The program was the third in a series of six national "party to people" forums, which were suggested earlier this year by former President Eisenhower.

CHICAGO IS NEXT

The fourth forum of the series will be held in Chicago on May 7 on the subject of "Jobs and Our Economy." The first forum, devoted to a discussion of peace and security, was held in Los Angeles, and the second, on Latin American affairs by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, chairman of the 1964 Republican platform committee. Panel members included Representative ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas, and Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, members of the House Agriculture Committee; Gov. Henry Bradshaw, Republican senatorial candidate from Missouri, and Mrs. Glenn Pardun of Brandon, Iowa, program chairman of the Iowa Council of Republican Women.

Charles H. Percy, Republican candidate for Governor of Illinois, and Gov. John A. Love of Colorado were scheduled to be on the panel but withdrew.

GRUMBLING IS REPORTED

DOLE, who first district comprises virtually the entire western half of Kansas and whose constituents are largely wheat and beef cattle producers, said there is much grumbling and discontent in the rural areas over the Johnson administration's new wheat subsidy and control program as well as over substantial losses from low cattle prices.

"The cattlemen think they have been flimflammed right down the line by an administration which has permitted record quantities of imported beef to come into this country," said DOLE. "Our people don't want Government programs. They want protection from imports."

He accused the Democratic control House Ways and Means Committee of stalling on hearings on several bills to establish beef import quotas.

CITE CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

Among the platform pledges the Democrats were accused of failing on was one which promised: "We shall take positive action to raise farm income to full parity levels and to preserve family farmings as a way of life."

Republicans charged that Democratic farm policies failed to bring parity of income, and even failed to sustain parity prices. In 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, the Republicans said, the parity-price ratio averaged 84.5. During the last 3 years under a Democratic administration, the ratio averaged 79, and recently it dropped to 77, lowest since 1939.

The Republicans also noted that net farm income this year estimated at $11,600 million, which is $392 million less than in 1960, the last Eisenhower year. Yet, the Democrats in 3 years have given farmers $4,900 million in Government payments, compared with $4,700 million in payments in the entire 8 years of the Eisenhowner administration.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Friday, May 1, 1964]

GOP VIEWS ON FARM ISSUES

(By Richard Orr)

KANSAS CITY, April 30.—"If the Republican Party were in office now, what would it propose as a solution to our farm problems?"

The question was put to a panel of Republican farm policymakers at a meeting here with farmers and ranchers from six States. It was asked by Martin Byrne, of Manhattan, Kans., president of the Kansas Farmers Union, an organization which has consistently supported Democratic farm policies.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, a Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, was the first panelist to answer. He drew applause from the audience when he said, "We'd make certain in every program that farmers would make management decisions themselves—this would be basic."

GOVERNMENT BLAMED

"Secondly," he added, "we'd investigate every avenue to see what possibilities there would be for the farmer to increase his bargaining power. Third, Republicans would recognize that the Government has gotten farmers into some of the troubles they are in today, and the Government thereby has a responsibility to help them get out of their difficulties."

At that point Quie was interrupted by more applause before he added, "We would move toward a free market, but we wouldn't pull the rug out from under farmers."

Gov. Henry Bellmon, of Oklahoma, another panel member and a wheat and cattle producer himself, also responded to the question.

"Republicans want to give farming back to the farmers as quickly as possible without wrecking the country," he said. "Under Democrats we always move in the direction of more controls. Republicans would move the other way until eventually we would get in the position where farmers were making their own decisions."

QUOTAS DISCUSSED

Representative ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas, another member of the House Agriculture Committee, added that Republicans would increase domestic quotas to allow farmers to produce more sugarbeets. The GOP also would establish quotas to cut the current record quantity of beef imports to this country at least in half, he said.

"We would also stop bailing out Russia," DOLE asserted. "To me it is inconsistent to fight communism on one hand and feed Communists on the other. Nor can I reconcile feeding Communists while Americans are being killed by Communists in Vietnam."

Mrs. Glenn Pardun, a panel member from Brandon, Iowa, whose husband is a farmer and feeds cattle and hogs for market, phrased her answer this way:

"I don't feel that we as farmers should make any aggressive public appeal for sympathy. We should appeal vigorously for public understanding of our problems, based on the theory that everybody has a stake in a healthy farm economy."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 30, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 30, 1964)

SPENDING GOES UP AND UP AND UP

It's going to cost you $13 million more for military construction this year than it did last year. The House approved the military construction appropriation bill, H.R. 11369, which is up $13 million over what we spent last year and brings this year's total to $1.5 billion with $472 million unobligated as a carryover from last year. In debate on the bill I said:

"As a matter of principle I cannot approve an increase in spending over last year while we are deficit financing. We should not spend more and borrow and charge it to the future."

This appropriation bill is typical of most we are passing. The President's request in the budget was set high, we cut the amount appropriated below the budget figures and this gives us an opportunity to say we are saving money. The truth is we are approving higher spending over last year in practically every appropriation bill that has passed the House. The President is getting away with one of the most complete brainwashing jobs in history with the cooperation of most of the news media. This is why the President demanded a $9 billion increase in the debt ceiling from $315 to $324 billion.

An editorial in the Chicago Tribune this week states: "The Johnson budget for 1965 is so loaded with juggled figures, bookkeeping tricks, and horrible examples of budgetary deception that it is almost impossible to penetrate the fiscal jungle."

The Tribune editorial was based on a report by Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The Byrd committee took 2 month longer than usual trying to decipher the Johnson budget. The editorial continues: "The Senator ignored appeals from the White House to go easy on it. Instead he said it could and should be cut by $6.5 billion. He urged postponing the billion dollar item for fighting poverty until it was made clear just how the administration proposes to start eliminating poverty."

THAT POVERTY BILL

What about that poverty bill? Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones, in the Washington Evening Star, described it best: "Tolstoy's 'War and Peace' is a classic that everybody talks about but that not many people have read. The same goes for House Resolution 10440, the bill under which President Johnson intends to wage his much-heralded 'war on poverty.' The bill occupies 47 pages and like Venus it is surrounded by thick clouds of vapor and shines brightly."

The bill calls for an additional billion in Federal spending. Another example of Johnson economy.

STAGE-MANAGED POVERTY

No trick is overlooked by the President in selling the Nation on poverty and himself as the messiah to lead all the faithful to the promised land of something for nothing for everybody. An Associated Press story from Rocky Mount, N.C., tells us about the President's visit to a "poverty stricken" family, the William David Marlow family.

The Marlows, a sharecropper family, say they didn't know they were in poverty until the President's visit. * * *

"We didn't invite the President. He invited himself." * * * Marlow said he expects to gross about $4,000 from his 9 acres of tobacco and 11½ acres of cotton this year and perhaps have $1,500 clear with which to start the next year. This would be much more than the $1,500 the President suggested during their conversation. * * * Mrs. Marlow said, "We didn't even feel like we were in poverty. We thought we were on our feet for the first time in 4 years. And along come the word that we're the poorest folks in the country." * * * Mrs. Marlow said her five children have always had plenty to eat and plenty of loving. * * * Mrs. Marlow said, "The Governor's man tried to make us look poorer than we are. He told me to be sure and have a washing on the line when the President came and also be sure the children were barefooted when the President arrived."

Such tactics not only rob our people of self-respect for political purposes, but set a dangerous precedent for going far beyond news management to deliberately creating propaganda through the use of the news media.

The President and the First Lady are introducing an entirely new philosophy to replace our Judeo-Christian belief of charity through individual effort, highly motivated. The new idea is that only the Government should direct charity and on a political basis. It is apparent they believe the individual landowner should wait for the Government to take care of those in need and that no individual responsibility is involved. This new philosophy is what is on trial in this election year. Which philosophy do you choose?

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE BILL

The House recommitted H.R. 5130, to raise the Federal deposit insurance, 197 to 147. It was a protest against the Banking and Currency Committee's incomplete presentation and lack of opposition views.

A Pittsburgh Answer to Training Teenagers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of May 29, 1964, carried an article on a teenage training project at Diane Electronics, a Pittsburgh area maker of automotive-testing equipment. In view of the current interest in teenage problems I want to bring the results of this project before the Members of the House:

TRAINING TEENAGERS: A PITTSBURGH AREA SCHOOL PROVIDES SOME POINTERS

(By Albert R. Karr)

MONROEVILLE, PA.—Bill Snodgrass and Ira Rhodes, 17-year-old high school seniors, claim a fortunate outlook not shared by most fellow teenagers this spring: they've had postgraduation jobs lined up for several months.

Bill and Ira are slated to become technical assistants at Diane Electronics, Inc., a Pittsburgh area maker of automotive testing equipment. Along with regular high school study, they're currently winding up a 2-year course in automotive engine technology at the Forbes Trail Area Technical School here.

Except for this preparation, says Ronald J. Warner, the course's instructor, "they'd be lost. There's no job today of any significance in the Pittsburgh area without some kind of training."

Mr. Warner's comment may be a bit strong, but the job outlook for these two boys underlines the successful role of the Forbes Trail School in furnishing training to help teenagers get jobs that unskilled youth would find harder to obtain. Forbes Trail boast a record of placing 87 percent of available graduates in jobs related to their training, against an average of about 70 percent for technical high schools in 13 North Atlantic States surveyed by the U.S. Office of Education.

The school tightly tailors its instruction to the kinds of technically trained personnel wanted by industry. In contrast, the programs of many of the Nation's vocational education high schools have come in for criticism as being misdirected. At the same time, Forbes Trail is experiencing some of

the problems shared by all such schools, including difficulties in keeping facilities attuned to fast-changing technology and an inability to do much for the low-aptitude student who typically drops out of high school before graduation.

FEDERAL AID BOOSTED

The Federal Government is looking increasingly to technical high schools and other vocational schools to alleviate unemployment. A new vocational education act, for example, boosts the yearly ceiling on Federal aid to such programs from $58 to $118 million initially, and to $283 million by 1967. Forbes Trail, which would get an estimated 25 percent of its fiscal 1964–65 budget of about $400,000 from Federal funds, is likely to have its income from the Government boosted beyond that, and its program expanded under the new law.

The reasons for attention to teenagers are indicated by Labor Department reports on the jobless. They show that while the overall unemployment rate at mid-April was 5.4 percent, that for teenagers was 16.2 percent. Nearly a third of jobless persons are under 25, and this problem is likely to be aggravated as the big postwar baby crop reaches employable age in soaring numbers in the next few years.

Here at Forbes Trail, high schools in 16 school districts east of Pittsburgh send some of their juniors and seniors, for 3 hours of instruction every day in electronics, civil construction, data processing, automotive internal combustion engines, advanced chemistry, and marketing. Although Forbes Trail is only in its fifth year, it has been successful enough to spur start of a second Allegheny County technical high school last fall, a third next fall, and to encourage the county to consider still a fourth for later. The county's school officials, in addition, will formally propose a higher level vocational training-oriented junior college next month. Forbes Trail and other Allegheny County facilities also provide adult vocational training under federally aided programs.

CHANGE OF EMPHASIS

Forbes Trail officials proudly cite figures which show that of the 75 graduates of its high school training program in the past 3 years not going to college, into the Armed Forces or otherwise unavailable for jobs, 65 have been placed in work related to their training here, and all but one of the 75 are now employed. Francis J. Brown, the school's director, explains the high placement record this way: "We're training in areas in which there are jobs."

Forbes Trail works hard to avoid what one Federal education official terms "training for dying occupations." Vocational programs around the country have been educating youngsters in fields where, relatively, there aren't jobs, critics say. In 1963, only 17 percent of enrollment in high school vocational schooling involved subjects like electronics or machine repair; nearly all the rest was in home economics and agriculture.

Unlike past vocational education acts, which require the use of big portions of Federal funds for these subjects, the 1963 act finances only job-oriented training. It also calls for States receiving this money to determine the specific technical personnel needs of their job markets before launching technical training programs. Forbes Trail is already doing this on its own. For instance, advisory committees made up of experts from industry and sciences set up its courses and periodically recommend revisions based on changes in technology and personnel needs in their own fields.

As a result, prospective employers say, Forbes Trail trainees find a ready market for their services. Forbes Trail graduates in data processing can be trained "much sooner" than green recruits, says Joseph Deal, general manager of systems and procedures at United States Steel Corp., and an advisory committeeman for the school. "The training time for somebody who knows nothing about a computer is almost a year," he adds. G. C. Murphy Co., McKeesport, Pa., variety store chain, would hire three or four boys from the Forbes Train marketing course and train them for store management positions, says Henry Sangler, personnel training director, but the course has only one boy enrolled.

Mary Sharkins, a 1962 graduate of the Forbes Trail data processing course, was hired by Gulf Oil Corp.'s research and development facility at Harmarville, Pa., and works in its personnel records section. Because of her training here, she says, "when I got out of school I was way ahead of others looking for a job in this field. Companies want people who already have a background in what they're going to be doing."

UP-TO-DATE TOOLS

Forbes Trail tries to furnish its students with up-to-date tools, even ones that anticipate future manpower needs. Right now, the schools wants to buy a new, more versatile computer, at an advisory committee's suggestion, to broaden the scope of its data processing course.

Employment is considered so much the school's objective that training of some students is abruptly stopped if a job is offered and there's no conflict with academic school work. Anthony Dan, who had finished about half his data processing work as a high school postgraduate (some of Forbes Trail's students complete part or all of the 2-year program after they graduate from high school), last month, was allowed to pull out to take a tab operator's position with Mechanized Business, Inc., a Pittsburgh data processing service.

Qualifying students for jobs "is our only intent," says Mr. Brown. "It's not like an English class, where you have to sort of march step."

Even though the Forbes Trail program isn't designed for college preparation, it also helps a good many of its graduates to go on to a university, by qualifying them for technical positions that meet the cost of college study, or by interesting them in a subject that logically paves the way to higher level learning in a related field.

Despite its accomplishments, however, Forbes Trail labors under some handicaps in meeting its goal of training youngsters for skilled work. Its program is still limited, though courses in mechanical technology and printing are being added next year. Mr. Brown says the school should train technicians in such fields as air conditioning and refrigeration, biological sciences and food preparation, and that the total offerings "should be increased considerably."

The school, too, admits only those high school students with average or above average grades and aptitude who receive a recommendation from their school and satisfy a county school interviewer. Like the potential college freshman, they must demonstrate ability, which rules out the possibility of Forbest Trail helping teenagers with low aptitude to find employment. The school annually rejects from a third to two-thirds of applicants, with the rejections dwindling lately as potential enrollees become more aware of the caliber of student wanted, Mr. Brown says.

LITTLE AID FOR DROPOUTS

Dropouts, which nationally average about 29 percent of high-school freshman enrollment, generally are not helped by the school's technical training, though some potential dropouts with above average ability are probably encouraged to stay in school by vocational courses. Albert G. Clark, assistant school superintendent for Allegheny County, comments: "The dropout problem is at a lower level level of ability. We are still struggling with the upper level [in technical schools]."

The school's biggest problem, Mr. Brown figures, is that it has not been able to attract enough students. "Everybody wants their boy or girl to go to college, and this is really admirable, but it is not realistic," he says. He cites Government figures which show that out of every seven high school graduates, only four go on to college, and two of those never finish.

"We have got to give more status to technical education," sums up one Pittsburgh area educator. "The American public tends to look down its nose at somebody who makes a living by hand."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Concordian Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, an editorial in the Fargo Forum, May 30, 1964, explains how Concordia College in Moorhead, Minn., faced up to a problem in racial relations. The Fargo Forum gives recognition and agreement to an editorial written by Marcus Borg, appearing in the Concordian, a student newspaper. The editorial goes to the heart of the issue when it asks:

For if a Christian will not stand up for the rights of a minority, who will?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE'S ENLIGHTENMENT OF SOME KIND IN AREA OF WHAT NEGRO IS AFTER

When the noted sports hero, Jackie Robinson, spoke at Concordia College the other week, he said, "I understand you have no racial problems in this comunity. I find it is because there are few Negroes. I had hoped it was because of some kind of enlightenment in this area of what the Negro is after."

It is true that we rarely face the problems of those living in the South or the big eastern cities. It is true that we sometimes criticize without having a real knowledge of what it is like to be outnumbered by those of another race.

But from time to time incidents arise which demonstrate that there is "some kind of enlightenment in this area of what the Negro is after."

The latest example is pointed out by the Concordian, the weekly newspaper published by Concordia students. An editorial reveals the hitherto unpublished story of a decision. Because we agree that the decision was right, and because student editor Marcus Borg of Moorhead put the case eloquently we quote the editorial at length:

"In January of this year, a very few weeks before the Concordia choir was to leave on its southern tour, a decision was reached after agonizing days and weeks of pondering.

"Inadvertently, through no fault or foreknowledge on the part of the choir, two concerts in its southern tour were scheduled to be segregated. After this fact came to light, a decision was reached to cancel the two segregated concerts.

"Admittedly, this was not a clear-cut decision of absolute right versus absolute wrong. Many people in the South who had anticipated hearing the choir were denied this privilege because their concerts were slated to be segregated and thus were canceled.

"But Concordia did take a stand. Even though this stand was not spontaneous and not without much questioning, it is commendable that the college did reach this decision.

"Had we not, had we gone through with the segregated concerts, we would have been contributing in some small way to the perpetuation of the separate and unequal doctrine. For as long as we allow individuals anywhere to have their own way in matters of discrimination, we are just as guilty as they are in perpetuating the un-Christian inequality of men.

"Had we not made that decision, a foul air of hypocrisy would have filled Memorial Auditorium as Jackie Robinson spoke. For to sit there and to applaud this great man and yet realize that we were giving only lipservice to what he believes would have been a very uncomfortable and hypocritical position.

"We are not going off half cocked to suggest that this is a great moral issue and that we are all involved in this matter. For if a Christian will not stand up for the rights of a minority, who will? And as a Christian college, supposedly representing Jesus Christ in all that we do, can we honestly say that this is no concern of ours?

"We are not raising this issue to open old wounds or to tear open half-sealed memories. This is not our object. Rather, we believe that Concordia ought to be proud of that decision. Proud, not in a self-righteous back-slapping way, but proud in the sense that we can humbly say that we did reach the right decision.

"For, as Jackie Robinson said, every great adventure is fraught with danger. To be sure, danger was involved in that decision: The danger of hurt feelings, of an unsympathetic public, of lawsuits for breach of contract, of endangering the physical safety of the choir as they toured the rest of the South.

"And because it was a decision in which the college defied these dangers, because it was an ethically right decision, we do not believe that it should be cloaked in silence any longer.

"Oftentimes the greatest inspiration for people to do good comes from seeing another embarking upon a great adventure that is filled with danger. For this reason, if for no other, this story has to be told.

"Because maybe then other people will realize that our Christian ethics do mean something more than an interesting topic of conversation. They might even follow us."

Prosperity and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 27, I attended the University of Maryland's School of Social Work Graduation Convocation. The principal speaker for the evening was the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen who gave the graduates a stimulating sendoff. He emphasized the importance of the individual roles the graduate must play in assuring that our amazing affluence is not marred by the neglect of serious social problems and the basic causes of these problems. The text of his remarks follows:

PROSPERITY AND POVERTY

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Our educational system imposes upon all students as a prerequisite to graduation a few parting words of encouragement and advice from a guest speaker. This is why you and I are here today.

If I were to follow tradition and precedent and talk to you as hundreds of other speakers are now talking to hundreds of graduating classes, I should tell you of the amazing world awaiting you, in which you can find both fame and fortune.

It is an amazing world. We are living in a dynamic environment such as the world has never seen before. Statistics after statistics are available to demonstrate that creative opportunities are awaiting plucking by your eager and useful hands.

Our economic activity is smashing all records and, in many instances, outstripping even the most optimistic predictions of just a few years ago. There is every expectation that our gross national product is going to approximate $630 billion in 1964. That's more than six times what it was when most of you were born a couple of decades ago.

Affluence? One measure of our wealth is how hard it is to find a parking space at any university. Yet we produced another 7 million cars last year and are well on the road to another banner year in automobile production in 1964.

Average—average, mind you—family income in the United States in 1963 was about $6,000. Even when adjusted to constant dollar values, this is twice as much as the average income when most of you were born.

Consider for a moment the progress just since 1947—when our country first settled down to normalcy after World War II—up to the present.

Aluminum output has doubled and redoubled since 1947. Production of crude oil and natural gases has increased by approximately 50 percent. Our output in the cement industry has nearly doubled. We practically doubled pulp and paper output, and printing is up 40 percent. Our output of synthetic materials has increased more than 500 percent. Petroleum production has been doubled. The revenue ton-miles of air freight, standing at 1 billion in 1947, is now at 7 billion and still increasing. The number of telephones in use in the Nation has increased from approximately 35 million to 85 million this year. Our electric power output in that 17-year period zoomed up so sharply that it is three times higher now than it was in 1947.

The statistics I have just given you—and there are many more that are comparable—rightfully reflect what astounding progress has taken place in the last 17 years and is continuing to take place. The production graphs, the indicators of the health of our economy, all point one way—up.

Graphs for other areas show the same trend. In 1947 the Federal Reserve System processed 1.7 billion checks. This year it

will process more than 4 billion. The number of life insurance policies in force in 1947 was 188 million; today Americans hold more than 323 million life insurance policies.

This astounding progress, even more astoundingly, is not only continuing but in most areas is accelerating. It is no wonder, then, that most persons addressing graduating students such as yourselves, this year, take a rather optimistic view of the future and encourage the graduates to do likewise.

But today I'm addressing a special group of graduating students—graduates of a school of social work. So I want to discuss the other side of the coin of progress and, perhaps, give you a little something to worry about and hopefully stimulate even more your interest in the career you have chosen for yourselves.

Let's take a second look at those statistics I gave you just a moment ago.

While aluminum output has quadrupled since 1947, the number of production workers in that field has not even doubled. It is currently increasing by only 2.1 percent per year, while output increases 5.8 percent per year.

Production of crude oil and natural gas has increased, to be sure, but the number of production workers involved is about the same now as it was in 1947—and is decreasing by about 4.2 percent per year.

Lumber and wood products have increased by 20 percent in the same period, but there are 250,000 less production workers in that field now, and employment continues to decline by about 2.2 percent per year, even though production is increasing at roughly the same rate.

Automobile production is increasing and yet, compared to 1947, 90,000 less production workers are needed by the industry now, and employment continues to decline by approximately 2.3 percent per year. Textile mill products are up, but there are 400,000 less production workers in that field today. And employment continues to decline by 2 percent per year even though output in the field increases by 3.6 percent per year. Pulp and paper production has almost doubled. The number of production workers needed now is roughly the same as in 1947.

The production of synthetic materials is up some 500 percent over 1947, and yet only 12,000 production workers have been added. Petroleum refining has almost doubled. Yet the number of production workers in that field is down from 113,000 to 87,000 and is continuing to decline at an amazing 5 percent per year.

The number of telephones—almost three times that of 1947. Yet the number of employees in this field reached a peak of 768,000 in 1957 and has been declining at an annual rate of 2.2 percent since then. Electric power output—way up—but the number of production workers involved is about the same now as in 1947 and is declining at an annual rate of 1.5 percent.

These statistics, like the statistics measuring the affluence of a country, are also practically inexhaustible. Yet the story is pretty much the same from one field to another.

More and more work can be done by less and less people.

More and more the work of the world is mental work, work that requires skills, education, and training.

Very rapidly our advancing technology is making manual labor unnecessary in the production process. Even semiskilled, and some highly skilled, workers are losing their jobs as more and more work is given over to machinery and other assorted hardware.

In manufacturing, for instance, production is today more than 20 percent higher than in 1956. And yet, manufacturing employment fell 6 percent in the same period.

And how rapidly we now improve our way of doing things. Consider for a moment that the punch card has been with us only during your lifetimes. And yet, in that short period, it has revolutionized recordkeeping and made possible unbelievably complex tasks in handling data.

Yet, even in its comparative youth, the punch card is becoming obsolete. It is too slow, too awkward, and takes up too much space—when compared to its younger cousin, the electronic data retrieval and computer machinery.

In short, the routine functions in many fields no longer demand the arduous physical effort and long hours required of your grandparents. This relentless progress has naturally increased our national wealth.

Even today, our lives—because of recent advances in technology—are utopian by the standards of your grandparents. Heat—as dictated by man's needs—is automatically supplied in our homes and where we work. Energy is available to do the lifting, the carrying, the moving. Energy speeds our voices and images around the world—and ourselves if need be. Energy—from the dynamo, from natural sources, and, increasingly, from the atom—is available to all. And, less and less is man called upon to dictate and control the energy. These tasks are now being relegated to machinery.

What then of the individual? How does the farmer react when he is no longer needed to run the farm? What does the bookkeeper do when he isn't needed to keep the books? What does the ditchdigger, the machinist, the assembler do when the machine takes over his job and the particular skills he has developed are no longer needed? This is not only their problem; this is a problem of the community also. And, in part, the social worker is responsible for finding and applying the solution.

Today, the fate of the individual is bound to the health and forward movement of his community. Only by first overcoming many of our community problems—the problems that predetermine and precipitate most individual problems—is it possible successfully to help the individual in trouble climb out of his difficulties.

This calls for a two-way approach—one which prepares the family to make the most of the opportunities offered by the community and one which, at the same time, makes it possible for the community to offer opportunities to the family on the way up: Educational opportunities, work opportunities, and opportunities to participate fully in community life.

We have come to recognize that there is a relationship between good health and economic independence. There is a relationship between education and economic independence. There is a relationship between the advances of our technology and economic independence.

We must be concerned with education, for the opportunity to acquire an education is becoming more and more the key to full participation in our national effort and the abundance that it produces.

We must be concerned with discrimination of every sort, for discrimination limits opportunity, and limited opportunity, in turn, increases our social problems and contributes to family instability and dependence.

We must be concerned with technological change, because it is inevitable that continuing change will sometimes adversely affect persons, families, and even geographic areas. The accuracy with which we anticipate and plan for change will affect the degree and amount of individual suffering that results when the community as a whole progresses.

We must be concerned with shortages both of classrooms and adequately trained teachers in our elementary and secondary schools—shortages that years of experience clearly demonstrate can be adequately met only by adding Federal assistance to State and local funds.

And we must be concerned with the pressing problem confronting our older people and their families—the high cost of illness combined with the generally restricted incomes of people over 65. Again, this is a problem that can be met adequately only through the kind of Federal action vigorously advocated by both President Kennedy and President Johnson—hospital insurance for the aged through social security.

We must, in short, be concerned with all those areas of our national effort that have a bearing on the well-being of the individual. We must bring together the efforts of social welfare with other forces in the community toward the common goal of well-being for all.

It was in recognition of the complexity of the problem—and the paradox of poverty existing alongside of the widespread prosperity of our country—that President Johnson has declared a national war on poverty. He has proposed, strengthening programs of health, education, and welfare in a comprehensive effort to rid America of the sources of poverty. It is interesting to note the emphasis he has placed on knowledge, skill, and work training as a means of attacking poverty.

He has proposed:

Job Corps: To provide basic education, job training, and outdoor work on conservation projects for youth between 16 and 21 whose backgrounds make employment difficult.

Work study: To provide Federal funds for part-time jobs to make it possible for able but extremely needy students to attend college.

Work training: To provide full or part-time work experience and training for young men and women to increase their employability and, where possible, to encourage them to continue or resume their education.

Family unity through jobs: To encourage expansion of existing programs that provide help for dependent children of unemployed parents and to initiate work and training programs on a pilot basis where they do not now exist.

Community action: To provide aid to community efforts to combat poverty, with emphasis on education, health, and counseling of families.

Farm investment: To provide loans, grants, and advisory services to raise the income-producing capacities of poor farm families and to open up new opportunities for them to gain economic strength in the community.

Employment and investment incentives: To provide business loans for the establishment, preservation, and expansion of promising business ventures in poverty areas beyond the reach of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Volunteers for America: To provide an opportunity for service to others by working in the proposed poverty program, as well as in existing Federal, State, and local activities related to poverty problems.

As social workers, you will be deeply involved in implementing the programs called for by President Johnson.

Public welfare, as I am sure most of you know, was recently given the nucleus of a powerful force than can be unleashed in the battle against poverty—the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

When he signed this legislation on July 25, 1962, President Kennedy said, in part:

"I have approved a bill which makes possible the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935. This measure embodies a new approach—stressing services in addition to support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency. This important legislation will assist our States and local public welfare agencies to redirect the incentives and services they offer to needy families and children,

and to aged and disabled people. Our objective is to prevent or reduce dependency and to encourage self-care and self-support—to maintain family life where it is adequate and to restore it where it is deficient."

Although the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments are familiar to most of you, I would like to touch on some of the major provisions and objectives of that legislation and the challenge ahead in their full utilization.

Through increased financial incentives, the States are encouraged to provide welfare services that are likely to prevent or reduce dependency and to promote self-reliance. The new Federal share in the cost of providing services is 75 percent. This means that States can now receive three Federal dollars for each State dollar spent for this purpose. Thus, for exactly the same amount of State funds as in the past, services can now be doubled.

The 1962 amendments also increased Federal participation from 50 to 75 percent in expenditures for training personnel employed or preparing for employment in public assistance. This applies to the administrative costs of inservice training programs, training grants for prospective employees, and payment of salaries and costs of education to welfare staff on educational leave.

Provision was made in the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments for demonstration projects at State and local public assistance agencies so that new methods, techniques, and practices can be tested. Federal funds are now available for a wide range of costs of demonstration projects not otherwise reimbursable, such as the purchase of services from private nonprofit agencies or to cover items not generally included in the family budget, or even to extend the assistance payments for services to members of the family not otherwise eligible. When necessary, demonstration projects may be funded up to 100 percent by the Federal Government.

It takes time to initiate new programs when three levels of government are involved—Federal, State, and local. Eagerness for social change is not universally shared, and it is never easy to introduce innovation. In many instances, new State legislation is necessary, and State funds must be appropriated to obtain the additional Federal funds made available. Implementing policy and procedure must be developed for State and local use. New staff must be added and training provided. New guides and training materials must be developed. All this must be done while the everyday responsibilities of administering public welfare programs already tax to the utmost the time and effort of State and local staff.

In spite of these difficulties, giant steps have been taken by many States. The record shows a promising beginning. Although States have until 1967 to put the services amendments fully into effect, throughout the country there is a general quickening of the pulse of public welfare and a sense of urgency for those responsible for its planning.

Work has gone forward at the Federal level in preparing guides for program planning and development of teaching materials directed toward the needs of the new workers, in identifying and adapting casework concepts appropriate for use by staff without professional education and in establishing career lines in public welfare, and in determining functions that can best be performed by staff with professional social work education, college degrees, or technical training. Significant gains have been made in identifying the components of the job that can be performed adequately by the college graduate with appropriate inservice training.

However, most States have been unable to go much beyond the commitment basis. They still must plan the steps that are necessary to assure progress and fulfillment of their State plans. Although considerable progress has been made, the gaps between what is planned, what is in operation, and what can be done within existing Federal legislation are still wide. There is much work to be done in public welfare in coming years, and I hope a number of you here today have decided, or will decide, to be a part of that effort. Public welfare needs the benefit of your knowledge and skills and can offer you a most rewarding career.

Regardless of whether you choose to work in public or private welfare, the years ahead will not be easy. There will be times when you will be frustrated—times when you will feel all your effort is for nothing. By the very nature of your work, you will daily observe the unmet needs of fellow citizens—financial, social, psychological, and health—and you may be tempted to curse the day you decided on social work as a career.

At the same time, though, your work as social workers will be exciting, challenging, and rewarding.

It will be exciting because you will be right in the middle of a great period of change now sending its first ripples of shock waves throughout our communities.

It will be challenging because change will bring with it new problems to be solved.

It will be rewarding because, progressively, the levels of living of our people will be pushed upward, and, through your efforts, the opportunity to share in these higher levels will be made available to all Americans.

I envy you the experiences that will be yours, and I wish you well as you embark upon your important careers in the changing years ahead.

West Virginia State College Commencement Enhanced by Forthright Message of Justice William O. Douglas—Justice Douglas, Dr. Thomas E. Posey, Senator Randolph, Receive Honorary Doctor of Humanities Degrees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 30, 1964, at the commencement exercises of West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., an inspiring address was delivered by Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States.

A large and appreciative audience heard this eminent jurist discuss the important role of the United States in a world which is embroiled in the turmoil of rapid change. Pointing out that the need exists to develop around the world communities which permit of evolution and growth in a variety of patterns, Justice Douglas stated:

> The common search of all men these days is for the basis of a world society that will satisfy the multiracial, multireligious, and multipolitical needs of the 3 to 4 billion inhabitants now on earth.

He added:

> I like to think of this oncoming generation of Americans as the educators and emissaries of freedom the world over. The voices of America are numerous and her talents great. She is, I think, at her best when she is the teacher, the educator, the one who shows by example how to get on with the practical solutions of the problems of the day. The American businessman, the American farmer, the American engineer, the American lawyer, the American nurse, the American doctor—these are the people who have the wisdom and insight to show those who have not yet had a chance to come into their inheritance how to build viable free societies.

The West Virginia State College graduating class of 1964, their families and friends, and faculty members listened attentively as Justice Douglas concluded by saying:

> We of the West are committed to the democratic way of life because we realize that only through it can the full talents of a nation be developed. In final analysis democracy is an aristocracy. But it is not an aristocracy of wealth, or of family, or of race, or of creed. Democracy is an aristocracy of talent.
>
> It provides a system whereby the man of genius, whatever his race or creed or color, no matter what his ideology, no matter what his beginnings, may rise to the top and serve his fellow man. This is why democracy is the great hope of the world; this is why it has the greatest appeal even in the wastelands of the world where people still live like cattle.
>
> This is why—if we exert ourselves—we are certain to win.

Mr. President, it is especially fitting that this 1964 commencement address was given by a member of the Supreme Court of the United States who participated affirmatively in the Court's 1954 decision barring racial discrimination in public schools. Ten years ago—prior to the High Court ruling—West Virginia State College was attended only by Negro students. Today, the college has successfully undergone "integration in reverse" and the enrollment is approximately evenly divided between Negro and white. We are gratified that this respected institution of higher learning has exerted a positive influence in the effort to bring about increased opportunity and understanding for all citizens of our Nation.

The commencement exercises were begun by a musical prelude and the processional by the college band under the direction of Mr. Donald Fisher. Following the national anthem, the invocation was offered by the Rev. Russell H. McConnell, executive secretary of the West Virginia Council of Churches. The college choir, conducted by Prof. Glayds B. Johnson, sang the Lizt-Reibold composition "Preludes to Eternity."

Honorary degrees of doctor of humanities were then conferred on Justice Douglas, on Dr. Thomas E. Posey, former member of the college staff and now chief of the labor and industrial management and training branch of the State Department's Agency for International Development, and on myself. The degree citations were read by Dean Harrison H. Ferrell and Dean Edwin D. Hoffman. There was then the awarding of honors to deserving students, and the conferring of degrees.

The scholarly and energetic president of West Virginia State College, Dr. William J. L. Wallace, gave the commencement statement, after which greetings were expressed by Dr. S. J. Baskerville of

the West Virginia Board of Education. Attorney William L. Lonesome, president of the college's alumni organization, then led the alumni pledge. There was a recognition of State officials and honored guests, and the singing of the alma mater.

Mr. President, I commend faculty, students, and alumni of West Virginia State College for their outstanding record of scholastic excellence and for their meaningful contributions to the building of a better America. They have translated high ideals into significant action in an inspiring manner.

Additionally, I take this opportunity to express genuine gratitude for naming me for an honorary doctor of humanities. It is a citation I shall cherish.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Associate Justice William O. Douglas at the commencement exercises at West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., Saturday, May 30, 1964, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS

Those who received their education in this Nation prior to World War II saw the foreign scene through different spectacles than those who graduate today. In those days if one wanted to know about India he asked the British. Indochina was a province of the French, Indonesia of the Dutch, and Africa of many different European powers. So it was that we learned about these foreign nations and their problems through our European friends.

Now that the bonds of colonialism have been broken, the new governments are speaking for themselves. The task of communicating with them has become America's greatest problem. There are several dozen of their languages we do not even teach. Few American reporters can cover the Middle East for they do not speak Arabic, Persian, or Urdu. The stories they write are mostly propaganda pieces for those who catch their ear.

We have come a long way since Roosevelt's quarantine speech in Chicago in 1938 at which time we were largely isolationist. We have made great progress in bearing responsibilities that go with leadership of the free world. But there is so much that remains undone that the task of the oncoming generation is staggering.

If the problems were military, the matter would be relatively simple. But science has produced so many destructive weapons, that the military solution is now the one and only impossible solution. With the arrival of nuclear fission and the atomic bomb, we temporarily had a monopoly; but that monopoly is now gone and in the next decade a dozen or more nations including the Peiping regime (which contains one-fourth of the people of the world) will have their own atomic warheads riding with all of the bombers that they produce in their new industrial plants.

The solutions are tremendously difficult because of the complexity of the world. Its problems are compounded by racial accents. Of these perhaps the greatest is the hostility generated between the yellows and the browns. Once we were warmhearted in our Asian relations. Today the Peiping regime and the West are poles apart; their common bonds have largely dissolved; there is hate and suspicion where there should be friendly exchanges. The Chinese constitute today one-fourth of the people of the world.

They are increasing at the rate of 15 million a year. In the lifetime of the average college student there will be as many Chinese in the world as there are people today. Can we pretend much longer that they do not exist?

We in America have our own problems of multiracial, multireligious, multipolitical communities. The world itself is multiracial, multireligious, and multi-ideological.

The problem is more than a problem of coexistence. It is one of producing communities around the world which permit of evolution and growth in a variety of patterns. Development and growth are essential to all forms of life. No society has ever remained static. No civilization has been frozen into one mold. Man, the product of evolution, is also the master of it and has produced changing tides and conditions throughout history. That, I think, will continue to be the case. And so the common search of all men these days is for the basis of a world society that will satisfy the multiracial, multireligious, and multipolitical needs of the 3 to 4 billion inhabitants now on earth.

This undertaking is vast and complex. It requires the establishment of a rule of law to take the place of a rule by force of arms. The development of this rule of law means extensive conferences with the peoples of all races and all tongues. It means an effort to evolve through the United Nations the institutions whereby disputes can be settled peaceably. That there will always be disputes, we can be sure. My State of Washington, like the State of West Virginia, like the District of Columbia, has law enforcement problems. In most communities there are psychotic people as well as poor people, people with criminal tendencies as well as law-abiding citizens. That means we will always need a police force, and courts, agencies, and tribunals of various kinds so that the disputes can be settled and not end up in family feuds or racial feuds. The same is true at the world level. To establish a rule of law at the world level means that an agreement among the nations of the world, a consensus so to speak, is necessary. That means a close collaboration with all nations of the world—much closer collaboration and association than anything we have experienced to date.

We have come to think of foreign aid as disbursement of vast sums of money to foreign nations. Foreign aid does require an expenditure of money; but the most important foreign aid is the transmission of ideas. Those ideas involve the training of technicians, scientists, lawyers, political scientists, philosophers—all of whom are needed in every underdeveloped nation that wants a modern society or a free society or both. What we call the free society is unknown in most parts of the world. In Latin America, as in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, the question is not whether democracy will be saved; it is whether democracy will ever be born. To produce the conditions under which democracy thrives is a stupendous undertaking. Democracy does not arrive ready-made in a package. It is acquired slowly and painstakingly as a result of experience. Democracy does not flourish in an impoverished society where only 1 or 2 percent of the people have a decent standard of living. Democracy means equality of opportunity for work and advancement, as well as political equality.

We of the West have severe competition. The Communists have their own type of society to export. And there are other virulent kinds of dictatorships abroad—as virulent as Hitler's in Germany and as Trujillo's in the Dominican Republic. Moreover we are not the sole proprietors of the secrets of industrialization. Russia, which was backward 40 years ago, is now the second greatest industrial power in the world. Some think that China which was long asleep in an agricultural economy, has now progressed industrially to the point that she is about where Russia was in 1940. Outer Mongolia which was a pastoral society up to the end of World War II, became in less than 15 years under Russian direction and instruction, a modern industrial society. It took the West many decades to discover all the secrets of science and technology; but now that they have been made known, their skills can be transferred very quickly to primitive people, to illiterate people, to underprivileged people.

We of the West plus Russia, Yugoslavia, and Outer Mongolia represent the affluent society of the world. We of the West plus the Russians, Yugoslavs, and Mongolians make up the 15 percent of the people of the world who make more than $450 per annum. Eighty-five percent of the people in the world make less than that. If those 85 percent are to raise their standard of living, the secrets of science and technology must be transmitted to them.

There need not be hungry people in the world. There need not be substandard conditions. Hunger and other substandards can disappear only if the peoples of the underdeveloped nations find within themselves the power and capacity to improve their living conditions.

I like to think of this oncoming generation of Americans as the educators and emissaries of freedom the world over. The voices of America are numerous and her talents great. She is, I think, at her best when she is the teacher, the educator, the one who shows by example how to get on with the practical solutions of the problems of the day. The American businessman, the American farmer, the American engineer, the American lawyer, the American nurse, the American doctor—these are the people who have the wisdom and insight to show those who have not yet had a chance to come into their inheritance how to build viable free societies.

To serve in the role of the educator abroad, vast preparation is needed. The Russians are masters at that task because they have planned for at least 40 or 50 years to communize the world. In Russia a precocious child at the age of 8 is introduced to some foreign language. Those who visit the linguistic institutes of Russia will find that there are least 68 foreign languages being taught. There are thousands and often tens of thousands who can be summoned in the field of agriculture, chemistry, industrial engineering, medicine, or whatnot, to go to any country in the world and to teach the natives in their local tongue. On my first visit to Russia in 1955 they were bragging about the 300,000 agricultural experts who could speak some 60 different languages and were ready to be sent overseas. The number has increased since then; and as the Russian skills develop, more and more educated emissaries at the technical level will be available for export. The Peiping regime has not yet acquired surplus men and women needed for this overseas endeavor but they will soon have them by the tens of thousands. The competition of the West, in other words, is going to be severe and persistent.

We must start in the primary schools by introducing our students to the world and its problems. We too must develop linguistic institutes to cover all the important languages of the world. We too must prepare our youngsters for service abroad as teachers on the faculties of overseas schools, as technicians attached to a foreign government, as nurses and doctors out on medical missions, as agricultural experts who can establish and run model farms. This must be our preoccupation if we wish to keep the balance of the world on the side of liberty and freedom.

We have at last started in this direction. The Peace Corps is symbolic of what must be done. Operation Crossroads Africa, headed by Harlem's distinguished pastor, Dr. James Robinson, is another, International Mass Ed-

ucation Movement managed by Dr. Y. C. James Yen is still another. Churches, clubs, universities, schools, business firms, industrial plants, labor unions—all these are making contributions. But the effort must be better organized and every school in America must be somehow implicated in it if we are to match the tremendous efforts of the totalitarian competition already active in villages whose names we do not even know.

Perhaps one illustration from my experience with Operation Crossroads Africa, which I helped Dr. Robinson found in 1958, will indicate the dimensions of the problem. In 1961 at the request of the Liberian Government, we sent eleven American teachers to Liberia to run a 2-months teachers' training school. Teacher training is one of Africa's most pressing problems because the average African teacher has not been trained beyond the seventh grade. One hundred and ten Liberian teachers signed up for the teachers' training course. When our eleven teachers arrived they discovered that 1,157 Liberian teachers had come to sit at their feet to try to learn to become good teachers. Some of these 1,157 Liberian teachers had walked from 3 to 4 days to reach the capital.

The need is astronomical around the world. A small country like Libya that now spends 85 percent of its budget on education, has had to import about 2,000 teachers because none of her own was qualified to teach at the college level. Nigeria alone will need from 800 to 1,000 a year foreign teachers to man its educational institutions. The list is long, the demand is immeasurable.

So it is with both a feeling of hope and a feeling of sadness that I speak of these things. I speak with sadness because we have wasted most of the years since World War II in vain military ventures. Our armament program abroad has largely resulted in increasing strength of totalitarian regimes run by feudal kings and feudal families. Our military aid to Iran, for example, has been so great that now it is almost impossible for anybody to revolt. Those who espouse democratic causes are either in jail or in exile. Our financial aid resulted in vast corruption; huge sums were banked abroad by the heads of foreign governments. Our foreign aid was very seldom hitched to reforms. During those long wasted years the image of America abroad was changed from that of a warm-hearted people to a selfish, rich, arrogant people. That is the reason for the sadness in these words.

But my hope comes from knowledge that once the American people see the challenge they will respond quickly and energetically. The advantage in the American system of government is that no one needs to await a command from the top to move into action. The right to form clubs and associations, to join organizations, to form committees for this or that purpose, is greatly protected by our Constitution. This means that the vast energies of our people can be quickly mobilized through their voluntary efforts. Therein lies our great strength. Once the American people understand the conditions that prevail in the benighted areas of the world, once they see the problems which have long been neglected, their energies, ingenuity, and inventive genius will be turned loose and great and sudden transformation can take place.

We of the West espouse democracy not only because it respects the dignity of man and his right to think and worship and speak as he chooses. We of the West espouse democracy not only because we recognize the importance of Jefferson's creed that all men are created equal. We of the West are committed to the democratic way of life because we realize that only through it can the full talents of a nation be developed. In final analysis democracy is an aristocracy. But it is not an aristocracy of wealth, or of family, or of race, or of creed. Democracy is an aristocracy of talent. It provides a system whereby the man of genius, whatever his race or creed or color, no matter what his ideology, no matter what his beginnings, may rise to the top and serve his fellow man. This is why democracy is the great hope of the world; this is why it has the greatest appeal even in the wastelands of the world where people still live like cattle.

This is why—if we exert ourselves—we are certain to win.

Another Look at the NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the May 7, 1964, edition of an outstanding weekly newspaper, the Lapeer County Press, Lapeer, Mich., carried an excellent editorial, I believe, on the National Labor Relations Board. I share the view expressed in this editorial that the NLRB ought to receive less work and that our Government insist that union and management settle their own arguments:

NLRB TOO AVAILABLE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD DISPUTES

Another Federal labor hearing has come and gone. Without taking sides in the UAW-Aircraft Specialties dispute, we'll make this observation: It was a waste of money. Your money, dear old taxpayer.

Admittedly, we may be a little lopsided on the subject. We didn't even like President Johnson sticking his powerful paw into the railroad labor fuss, but everyone else seems to think it was a magnificent piece of statesmanship. There's a large gap between the threat of a national railroad strike and the firing of a worker in a Lapeer tool plant. What bugs us is that it is becoming less of a gap and more of an unbroken line, with Washington bureaucrats stepping in to settle every dispute except barroom fistfights. We don't like it, not only because it doesn't jibe with free enterprise, but also because every time Uncle Sam judges a bout, we pay his fees.

We're sure there are times when Federal intervention is necessary for the good of the people. But this intervention should be a rare, last-stop thing, not an everyday occurrence. We fear that the extreme availability of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) has become too much for the unions to resist. Too often the UAW, for instance, will file unfair labor practice charges and holler for Federal help when it might better solve its problems on a local level. And the blame for this "run-to-Uncle" policy must be shared by inflexible management which refuses to believe unions are here to stay.

The UAW-Aircraft labor hearing was typical of several held here in recent years. A worker has been fired and the UAW charged it was because of his union activities.

Aircraft claimed it was because of his attitude. Also at issue was the nebulous question of whether Aircraft had failed to bargain in good faith. To settle this earth-shaking disagreement, the Federal Government sent a trial examiner from Washington, a lawyer from Detroit, and a court stenographer from somewhere else. Before the hearing, the NLRB had investigated the charges. We don't know what the total bill for these services was, but we know who paid it.

Except for a pigeon trapped in the courtroom, the hearing produced no surprises. The witnesses said what you'd expect them to say. The trial examiner gave no verdict. He told the lawyers to save their arguments for their briefs and gave them a month in which to file them. And then everyone went home except the pigeon.

The examiner will issue a ruling from his Washington office sometime within the next few months, whenever he can find time, and belive us, he is busy. Multiply this Lapeer hearing, involving a factory with about 30 on the payroll, by the number of other U.S. factories with labor problems and you'll get some idea how busy. The NLRB men in Detroit continually tell us how the cases pile up. They say they are understaffed and overworked. They'd like more help.

We'd rather give the NLRB less work. "We'd rather that Washington start insisting that union and management settle their own arguments." We think if Washington umpiring was harder to get, there would be be less requests for it. Local cooperation might be substituted for Federal rulings.

Everyone hollers about high taxes and Government by bureaucracy. Last week's NLRB hearing here was a fine example of what they are hollering about.

Tribute to the Late Refus W. Fant, of Anderson, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently the Anderson Independent, of Anderson, S.C., published an editorial entitled "Rufus W. Fant Leaves Record of Honesty, Fairness, and Integrity." The editorial deals with the personal and public life of one of the outstanding solicitors of South Carolina.

Rufus W. Fant served as solicitor from the 10th judicial circuit for 28 years, an unparalleled record of public service. Mr. Fant's personal and public life was, as the editorial points out, marked only by honesty, fairness, integrity, and high courage.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this editorial from the Anderson Independent of May 22, 1964, concerning my friend, Rufus Fant.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUFUS W. FANT LEAVES RECORD OF HONESTY, FAIRNESS, AND INTEGRITY

South Carolina has lost one of its most brilliant and finest leaders in the death of Rufus W. Fant, of Anderson.

In public life he was a dedicated servant of the people.

His record of having served 28 years as solicitor of the 10th Judicial Circuit (1932–60) was unparalleled.

That record was marked by honesty, fairness, integrity, and high courage.

From the mountains to the sea the thousands who knew and deeply respected him are sorrowed by his passing.

In private life, he was a devoted husband and father. His host of friends will ever

remember him as an individual of keen wit and humor, outgoing and unpretentious.

During his nearly three decades as solicitor, or prosecuting attorney, for Anderson and Oconee Counties, Mr. Fant engaged in many notable legal battles in which were alined against him some of the best brains of the legal profession.

His meticulous preparation of cases, knowledge of the law, and courtroom behavior earned him the high respect of judges, opposing attorneys, and all citizens who appreciated his vast contribution to law enforcement.

When he was first elected solicitor in 1932, he let it be known his philosophy and purpose in these words:

"I decided in the beginning that I would always treat everyone alike, without regard to the personality of any defendant, any opposing attorney, or any judge; that I would base my prosecution solely on the facts of each respective case."

How well he succeeded in this purpose was reflected to some degree when his career in that post was ended. The bar associations of Anderson and Oconee Counties joined in holding a "Rufus Fant Day" as testimonial to a great career.

The measure of the man is to be found in quotations on that occasion by attorneys in both counties, judges, the State attorney general, and others.

A sampling of leading attorneys' remarks:

"We've battled side by side, and on opposite sides of the fence. No man has more respect for Mr. Fant's honesty, integrity, and fairness than I do."

"He always has been guided by what he thought was right. He always has been consistent.

"He has done a magnificent job.

"He leaned over backwards to see that justice has been done. He always has given defendants the benefit of any doubt.

"He never left one stone unturned to convict a defendant if he believed him guilty, acting without fear or favor and treating one and all alike.

"Solicitor Fant will never be equaled for his unswerving fairness in the prosecution of defendants he believed to be guilty, nor will he ever be bettered in honesty and integrity in that office."

Judge J. B. Pruitt: "He is a vigorous prosecutor, but he always was fair and square. There is no doubt on that score."

Judge George T. Gregory: "He is widely recognized as one of the all-time ablest of prosecutors."

Oconee attorneys and the grand jury joined in praise.

"He is tops as a solicitor," said one. "He has been fair to the prosecuted as well as fair to the prosecution," said another.

The Oconee grand jury: "We feel our county is enriched as the result of Mr. Fant's diligence and attendance to duty and we convey our best wishes for his health and happiness in his future work."

In a letter, Atty. Gen. Daniel McLeod wrote:

"I pay my tribute to you as a sterling and conscientious public servant. The people of the tenth circuit and the people of the entire State, are indebted to you for the contribution you have made to this State."

Seldom, if ever, has a solicitor received the praise that Mr. Fant did on that occasion.

In his earlier years, Mr. Fant served the people of Anderson County efficiently as a member of the house and the State senate.

Despite high praise and admiration so widely and frequently expressed during his career, Mr. Fant remained down to earth. He was an humble, friendly, and modest man who did his utmost in professional, civic, religious, and other capacities.

Reward? Mr. Fant's philosophy: "Anyone who has a job to do and does the best he can, and who has the feeling inside him that he has done his task well that is enough to reward him for his effort."

His example? Inspiration and dedication have left an indelible heritage for all.

Peace to his memory.

A Tribute to the Men of SAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a most fitting, poetic tribute to the men of the Strategic Air Command was paid recently in a special edition of the Amarillo Citizen, a weekly newspaper published in Amarillo, Tex., in the district I have the honor to represent.

The entire Citizen edition of Tuesday, May 19, was devoted to the men, units, and facilities at Amarillo Air Force Base. That the newspaper would devote its pages entirely to a tribute to the base and its personnel reflects the excellent relations which exist among members of the military and civilian communities in Amarillo. I wish to thank the publisher of the Citizen, Mr. D. E. Alford; its editor, Mr. Bill G. Cox; and a staff member who assisted in the preparation of this special edition, Mr. Fred Tripp; as well as the others on the editorial and advertising staffs of the Citizen for an excellent, informative journalistic accomplishment.

I particularly wish to acknowledge the work of Mrs. Mildred Crabtree Speer, whose poem, "SAC—A Ground View," was published in the Citizen edition, and whose words provide a most moving tribute to Air Force officers and men of the Strategic Air Command. Her poem is as follows:

SAC—A GROUND VIEW

(By Mildred Crabtree Speer)

We stand in awe
Of the keeper of the stars,
Stars on the blue field of a flag—
Guardian of peace.
Strategic Air Command—headquarters:
Day, night, Sunday, holiday,
He is there—
Almost an ordinary man—
Lounging, laughing, eating;
But waiting, always waiting
Until it comes, the alert—
The Paul Revere scream
That an enemy may be on the land.
Minutes revved into seconds' span, he runs!
Time to kiss her, perhaps,
Ann with the flag-blue eyes;
To yell, Tell Randy I'll be back
For Operation Boy Scout!
How many times he rises—practicing.
But always he must go,
Death in his hand,
For he is keeper of the stars,
Guardian of peace.
His jet crosses the sun . . . the moon . . .
Silhouetting the age of wings, his part of history,
In the panoramic march of man—
Man with a rifle safeguarding a wagon train,
Chariot wheel and spear,
A cave with fire against the tigers of the night,
A club, a stone—
Man forever on guard
That the innocent have chance to grow.
We stand in awe
Of the keeper of the stars,
And yet we know him
As our fathers knew his father.
Guardian of peace, master of bomb and missiles;
Yet his greater strength is of the ages,
Our common strength:
He polices the skies
But his gladness is to return to earth,
To stand by, his lips in silent rote,
As his son in Boy Scout vow repeats,
I pledge allegiance to the flag. . . .

International Food Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the United States, in cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization, is participating very actively in creating a system of international food standards. New food technology, development of trade areas throughout the world, and improved transportation have accelerated the need for such a body of food standards. Mr. Nathan Koenig, Chairman, USFAO Interagency Subcommittee on Codex Alimentarious and Special Assistant to the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, outlined the activity in this field in an address on May 25 to the 24th annual meeting of the Institute of Food Technologists, Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW VITAL INFLUENCE IN INTERNATIONAL FOOD STANDARDS

Never before in history has there been the multitude of international, regional, and industry bodies and other organizations concerned with the promulgation of standards in the food field that we now have functioning in different parts of the world.

In 1962 the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations listed 135 organizations and instrumentalities other than governments, as working on international food standards and related problems. And at that time, FAO pointed out this was not a complete list. The standards work of these 135 bodies alone ranges through the entire food field and includes every aspect from standards governing sanitation, sampling, analysis, additives, and pesticide residues to standards of identity and quality.

In recent years the development of trading areas throughout the world, improved transportation facilities, and new food technology have all accelerated the pace of international trade in food. This brought about a new urgency for the establishment of standards that would facilitate international trading and also provide essential safeguards for protecting consumer health and insuring fair practices in food trade.

Many organizations and groups responded to meet the expanded and intensified need for various food standards. Many new bodies also came into being to promulgate standards. As a result of this great buildup,

much of the work carried on has encountered duplication, confusion, and conflict. The need to simplify and harmonize international food standards work on a broad basis soon became apparent and there was a growing demand for corrective action. The response came through the leadership taken by the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization in establishing a joint program on food standards. This program is being carried out through the Codex Alimentarius Commission, which is now in its first year of operation.

The basic purpose of the Codex Alimentarius Commission is to simplify and harmonize international food standards work by allocating priorities in the development of standards, by coordinating and supplementing the work of other bodies in this field, and by providing for finalization of draft standards at the government level and their publication in a consolidated Codex Alimentarius.

The concept of an international body that would assume leadership in simplifying and harmonizing international food standards so as to facilitate trade and at the same time protect the interest of consumers in wholesome foods dates back about a decade. It was Dr. Hans Frenzel, a former Minister in the Austrian Government, who advanced the idea of unification of European legislation on food in June 1953 at a meeting of the research group of the German food industry held at Bad Neuenahr.

Dr. Frenzel's proposal assumed a more concrete form in October 1954 on the occasion of the conferment of the Werder Medal in Berne, when an Austrian delegation, in the presence of representatives of several countries, held a series of short lectures. The lectures dealt with the subject of bringing about the suggested unification and the effects of such an undertaking on the quality of food, the protection of the consumers, and the promotion of international trade. This idea met with great interest, and encouragement came from many European countries.

Many lectures were delivered by Dr. Frenzel to explain his proposal for the unification of food legislation through the establishment of a Codex Alimentarius, and he did so quite successfully. As a result, in June 1958, the European Council of the Codex Alimentarius was established in Vienna following a preparatory meeting held in Paris the previous April under the auspices of the Commission Internationale des Industries Agricoles which had been founded in 1934. Dr. Frenzel was elected first president of the council.

It is interesting to note that at the time of the inception of the European Council of the Codex Alimentarius certain governments took the position that functions relating to the Codex Alimentarius could be absorbed into the activities of existing international organizations, particularly FAO and WHO. Thus, the statutes of the European Council were drafted in such a manner as to permit the absorption of the activities of the council by one or more general international organizations.

With the growing focus of attention on problems of international trade, the integration of markets into regional groups, and the growing number of food standard programs undertaken by many organizations, including newcomers in the field, the problem of coordination and harmonization of food standards work again came to the fore in October 1960 in Rome at the first FAO Regional Conference for Europe. Out of the discussion that took place resulted this statement by the Conference: "* * * a valuable step forward would be achieved if the Director General of FAO, in collaboration with the Director General of WHO and after consultation with the international governmental and nongovernmental organizations active in this field, could submit to the 11th session of the Conference proposals for a joint FAO/WHO program on food standards and associated requirements, with particular reference in the first instance to the principal food stuffs offered for sale on the European market."

Following discussions with the European Council of the Codex Alimentarius, FAO undertook to develop a joint FAO/WHO program on food standards in keeping with the views expressed at the first FAO Regional Conference for Europe. In February 1961 the European Council of the Codex Alimentarius formally authorized its presidial body to enter into an association with FAO and WHO.

At the 11th session of the FAO Conference in November 1961, formal action was taken by FAO initiating a joint FAO/WHO program on food standards. This provided for the establishment of a Codex Alimentarius Commission open to all member nations and associate members of FAO and WHO which are interested in international food standards. The work of the Commission was to be financed out of a special trust fund into which would be received contributions from participating countries. The FAO action, later concurred in by the WHO Executive Board, also called for holding in 1962 a joint FAO/WHO meeting of government representatives in order to review the proposed program of food standards and to draw up recommendations for future activities in this field.

The meeting of government representatives to consider the proposal for establishing a Codex Alimentarius Commission under the joint auspices of FAO and WHO was held in Geneva, October 1–5, 1962. A total of 44 countries and 24 international organizations were represented.

The need to develop and simplify work on international food standards, both on a worldwide and regional basis, was fully reviewed. The Geneva meeting endorsed the proposal for a joint FAO/WHO program on food standards and the establishment of a Codex Alimentarius Commission for carrying on the work. Guidelines for the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission were developed and priorities established. It was agreed that the first session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission should be held at FAO headquarters in Rome. The date later set was June 25–July 3, 1963.

Some 120 participants, including the representatives of 30 countries and observers from 16 international organizations, attended the first session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission that met in Rome in mid-1963.

With the guidelines developed at the Geneva Conference in October 1962, the first session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, meeting less than a year later, had the basis for developing its rules of procedure and its general program of work.

One feature of the rules of procedure is a provision for establishing subsidiary bodies, including expert committees, for the preparation of draft standards and setting up advisory groups for a given region or group of countries specifically enumerated by the Commission. Under this provision the Commission established an advisory group for Europe with the European Council of the Codex Alimentarius agreeing to serve in this new capacity under the name "Advisory Group for Europe of the Joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission." As such, this body became an organ of the Commission and it was determined that participation would be open to all member governments of FAO and WHO within the geographic area of Europe, including Israel, Turkey, and the U.S.S.R.

Also in keeping with the rules of procedure, the Commission appointed a Coordinator for Europe who, under the terms of reference, is advised and assisted by the Advisory Group for Europe on all matters concerning the preparation of draft standards for submission to the Commission. The function of the Coordinator for Europe is to advise and assist the chairmen of expert committees based on countries in Europe in their common work on food standards throughout the region. The Coordinator for Europe is aso ex officio Chairman of the Advisory Group for Europe.

The Commission also adopted a number of "guiding principles" for use by its expert committees and other bodies preparing draft standards for its consideration. The general aim is to arrive at standards that are both practical and meaningful from the standpoint of trade as well as consumer interests. So-called recipe standards are to be avoided.

Through discussion and debate at the Rome meeting the principle was firmly established that the food standards work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission should be on an international basis and only in those instances where no other alternative was available (primarily in the case of highly perishable commodities) should standards be on a regional basis and then recognition must be given to equivalency of products coming from outside the region.

The Commission also reviewed the trust fund method of financing the food standards program and recommended that the costs involved should be covered by the regular FAO and WHO budgets as soon as the different budgetary procedures of the two organizations would make this step practicable. This recommendation was discussed at the recent conferences of FAO and WHO and is expected that financing of the Commission's work will be covered by the regular FAO and WHO budgets in about 2 years, which has been indicated as the earliest that the required action can be taken. In the meantime, the financing of the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission from contributions to the trust fund poses a problem, not only for the program itself, but also for many of the participating countries.

To get its program of work underway, the Codex Alimentarius Commission allocated preparatory work on draft standards, largely in accordance with the list of priorities previously established by the joint FAO/WHO conference held in Geneva in 1962. The assignments were made either to ad hoc expert committees established by the Commission or to existing outside specialist bodies. As a result, the following work is now being done:

1. As a result of its offer accepted by the Commission, the FAO Fisheries Division has assumed leadership in preparatory work looking toward the establishment of a code of principles concerning fish and fishery products and associated individual standards. A meeting of fisheries experts was held February 18–20, 1964, in Rome under the auspices of FAO with representatives of 12 countries actively participating. The report and recommendations resulting from this meeting will be considered at the next session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

2. The United Kingdom chairs a worldwide Expert Committee on Oils and Fats. This committee has the responsibility of elaborating draft international standards for oils and fats of animal, vegetable, and marine origin but excluding margarine and olive oil. Its first meeting, held in London, February 23–28, was attended by representatives from 12 countries and 7 international organizations. Draft standards developed at this session are now being reviewed by country representatives who took part in the meeting. Later in the year a second meeting of the Expert Committee on Fats and Oils will be held to prepare final drafts of standards for presentation to the Commission.

3. A worldwide Expert Committee on Sugars is chaired by the United Kingdom to develop draft international standards cover-

ing all types of nutritional sweeteners other than honey. This Expert Committee held its first meeting in London, March 3–5, with representatives from 10 governments and 4 international organizations attending. Draft standards developed as a result of the meeting are currently being reviewed by those who participated in the session. The completed draft standards will be submitted to the Commission for consideration at its next meeting. A second meeting of the Expert Committee will be held, possibly in November 1964, to discuss standards for the sugars not covered at its first meeting.

4. The development of fruit juice standards by the Working Party on the Standardization of Perishable Foodstuffs of the Economic Commission for Europe is now being carried on jointly with the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The first meeting involving joint participation by Economic Commission for Europe and the Commission to consider draft standards for fruit juices was held April 6–10 in Geneva with representatives from 13 countries participating. When agreement is reached on fruit juice standards, they will be submitted to the Commission for finalization under its procedures.

5. Switzerland is chairing an Expert Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate. The first meeting of this group was held in Neuchatel, Switzerland, November 5-6, 1963, with representatives from nine countries participating. A second meeting of the committee was held this year in Montreux, April 22–24, and representatives from 10 countries took part in the deliberations.

6. An Expert Committee on Food Additives is functioning under the chairmanship of the Netherlands. The task of this committee is to develop draft lists of acceptable additives and to survey and designate wherever possible proposed maximum levels of use for these additives in individual foods. The first session of the Expert Committee on Food Additives was held at The Hague, May 19–22.

7. The United States is serving as chairman of an Expert Committee on Food Hygiene. The first session of this group will be held here in Washington this week, May 27–28, to consider the development of draft hygiene standards for foods other than meat and milk and milk products. Hygiene standards for meat are to be developed by the existing Joint FAO/WHO Panel on Meat Hygiene since it is the commission's advisory body on this subject. Questions concerning milk hygiene are within the terms of reference of the Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles Concerning Milk and Milk Products. This committee of government experts is considered by the commission as having exclusive competence for all questions concerning milk and milk products and is treated as a Committee of the Whole of the Commission.

8. The United States is also chairing a worldwide Expert Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables. This Committee is responsible for developing draft standards for all types of processed fruits and vegetables, including dried products and jams and jellies. The first meeting of this Expert Committee is being held here in Washington this week, May 29–30.

9. A worldwide Expert Committee on Meat and Processed Meat Products is under the chairmanship of the Federal Republic of Germany. This Committee is to develop proposals for: (a) Classification and grading for carcasses and cuts of beef, lamb, mutton, pork and veal; (b) Definitions, labelling and other requirements for such processed meat products as may be deemed desirable at this stage.

This Expert Committee is obligated to work in cooperation with the Joint FAO/WHO Committee on Meat Hygiene.

10. A worldwide Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues is also being chaired by the Netherlands. This Committee has the responsibility of surveying and proposing where possible tolerances for pesticides residues in individual foods.

11. Austria is chairing a worldwide Expert Committee to develop draft international standards for honey.

12. A worldwide Expert Committee on Methods of Analysis is also under the chairmanship of Austria.

13. The International Standards Organization, at the request of the Codex Alimentarius Commission is developing methods of sampling for physically similar product groups and, where necessary, specific methods for important individual products. The ISO is to make a progress report in time for the Commission's consideration at its next session.

14. The Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission is drafting for submission to the next session a concise resume of food labelling laws, particularly those in countries participating actively in the work of the Commission. This resume is to cover provisions dealing with identity, net contents designations, indication of manufacturer, and special requirements on type and style of label declarations.

15. At the request of the Commission, the United States is preparing a background study on standards for poultry. Work on this is nearing completion and is to be submitted to the Commission in time for its next session when the question of draft standards for poultry, an important product in international trade, is to be taken up.

16. The International Federal of Margarine Associations is developing a draft standard for margarine for early submission to the Commission.

17. The possibility of developing draft standards for eggs is to be considered at the next session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission when more information is expected to be available on the program of standards work undertaken by the International Egg Commission.

18. At the request of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the United Kingdom is preparing a background paper on soft drinks for consideration and possible further action at the next session of the Commission.

19. Responding to a request of the Commission, the International Standards Organization is making a survey of work being done by several interested organizations on methods of sampling and analysis for wheat. The results of this survey are to be made available for submission to governments in good time before the next session to the Commission.

At its next session, the Codex Alimentarius Commission will consider in second reading draft standards on which governments participating in its work have already submitted their views and comments. These draft standards were drawn up before the Commission was constituted and at its meeting in Rome last year were considered in first reading and then referred to governments for detailed comments. These drafts involve standards for (a) cocoa beans prepared by the Working Party under the FAC Committee on Commodity Problems; (b) olive oil drawn up by the International Olive Oil Council; (c) a number of fresh fruits and vegetables drafted by the Economic Commission for Europe; (d) edible fungi, a text prepared by the former European Council of the Codex Alimentarius, now the Advisory Group for Europe of the Joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission, and an extract from the draft Latin-American Food Code; (e) sampling, text prepared by the former European Council of the Codex Alimentarius; (f) general principles, two texts, one from the former European Council of the Codex Alimentarius, the second extracted from the draft Latin-American Food Code; (g) general principles for the use of food additives, text prepared by the Commission Secretariat from reports of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives; (h) permitted lists of food additives, four texts, prepared by the Commission Secretariat on the basis of the reports of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives.

The second session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, September 28–October 7, 1964. This session will be largely concerned with the detailed consideration in second reading of the draft standards on which comments have been received from governments. It will also be concerned with the reports on work accomplished by expert committees and other specialist groups to which the Commission last year made assignments for promulgating standards and developing drafts of various background papers.

It is expected that as a result of the Commission meeting certain draft standards will be ready for submission to governments for consideration and comment. This is in accordance with the rules of procedure and enables all participating governments to express their views on proposed standards which may subsequently be accepted by the Commission for inclusion in the Codex Alimentarius. The prior submission of the draft text of any standard to all members of the Commission applies both to international standards as well as to any standard primarily intended for a region or group of countries. This is an important safeguard for the interests of all concerned, either directly or indirectly.

The Codex Alimentarius Commission represents a new and vital influence in the realm of international food standards. A general observation of basic importance is that a food standard, when appropriately supported and backstopped by practical standards for sampling, analysis, and other requisites, should aim at insuring the market of a sound, wholesome product, correctly labeled and presented. It should not be intended to affect consumer preference, but should aim at insuring that the consumer can know what he is buying.

These purposes served by a standard are especially important in providing buyers and sellers with a common language for local and long-distance trading and a yardstick for determining value. Otherwise, the use of widely varying standards, particularly among countries, leads to misunderstandings and confusion in international trade, undue restrictions in trade, and added marketing costs.

The leadership of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in simplifying and harmonizing international food standards also provides the guidance and coordination which are so greatly needed among all groups, including governments, engaged in the elaboration of such standards. Thus the work of the Commission merits full support for the opportunity that it offers in developing equitable food standards and thereby combating the use of standards for purposes of impeding or restricting international trade, thereby providing essential safeguards for both buyers and sellers as well as consumers. This calls for essential backing and cooperation not only from governments and the various independent bodies engaged in international food standards work, but also from private industry, business, trade, agriculture, and the general consuming public.

The Late Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House of Representatives will

miss our colleague, the late CLARENCE CANNON. He left the imprint of his knowledge and his personality upon not only the membership but the actual House itself. He was the author of the very parliamentary procedure followed here and that, alone, would be an everlasting testimonial of the highest order to him.

His vast store of information, along with his vigilant efforts to effect necessary legislation and yet preserve the sound economy of our Nation, over his long years of service here, made an invaluable contribution to the history of Congress and of our country.

We shall miss him sorely but we are grateful for the privilege of having been associated with him in a common endeavor and for his many outstanding accomplishments. He was a great American and a noble son of old Missouri. He loved both with a passion.

It is my fervent prayer that God will give comfort to his family.

Observing Senior Citizens Month, Columnist Sylvia Porter Says, Women, Elderly, Targets of Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, President Johnson and many other have said during Senior Citizens Month that the elderly deserve an opportunity to take on tasks of interest to them and of value to their communities and Nation.

This is a significant theme for this year's observance, and I hope that every American heeds it. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes in the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have heard much convincing, significant testimony on this matter within recent months. Our subcommittee's hearings on employment opportunities for older workers have been printed, and I commend that testimony to the attention of all citizens.

Much the same point was made on May 25 in a widely circulated column by the famous authority on economics, Sylvia Porter. Miss Porter's opening statement sums up:

> Age makes little, if any, difference in the output of workers in office jobs or in occupations requiring limited physical effort. A worker age 60 performs as well as or even better than one age 30—and if the worker has superior capabilities, he'll turn in a far superior performance at 60 than an average person half his age.

Miss Porter then describes a study that punctures the prejudice against older workers. This is a particularly timely commentary, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: AGE LITTLE BAR TO PERFORMANCE

(By Sylvia Porter)

Age makes little, if any, difference in the output of workers in office jobs or in occupations requiring limited physical effort. A worker age 60 performs as well as or even better than one age 30—and if the worker has superior capabilities, he'll turn in a far superior performance at 60 than an average person half his age.

Sex also makes little, if any, difference in jobs which do not demand major physical strength, and what difference does exist is in favor of women. In office jobs women chalk up better scores than men at all ages and the women who achieve the most favorable comparative scores are in the oldest age groups.

Experience is a basic factor affecting the output of an officeworker and the consistency of his (or her) performance. The older the worker, the steadier his rate of output, and the experienced individual of 60-plus turns in a startlingly more consistent performance than the individual of under 25.

Again and again, over a long stretch of years, I have been writing reports along the above lines—trying unceasingly to help break down the senselessly cruel prejudice against the older worker and to help puncture the unjustified bias against women in the U.S. labor force.

As far as women are concerned, those dedicated to battling prejudice have had some success, but we have been tragic failures in our drive for fair treatment of the older worker in the job market.

In fact, the prejudice today seems more virulent than ever—at a time when a cold, hardheaded assessment of the capabilities of the older worker never has been more imperative.

For it is the older worker who is most in danger of losing his job in this era of galloping automation of offices and factories.

It is the older worker with a long and satisfactory record of service who is most in danger of finding himself unemployed at an age when he is too old to be hired and still too young to retire.

It is the older worker whom many firms across the Nation refuse to employ because, say they, he will be unable to meet their production standards.

But now comes a new study of comparative job performance by the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics which dramatize once more the points made at the start of this column about age, sex, and experience.

The study, made under the direction of the BLS's James F. Walker, covers 6,000 Federal mail sorters—work typical of office jobs—over an 8-week period of 12 selected cities. The BLS figures output per man-hour of workers age 35 to 44 as an index of 100, then measures production of various groups against this index base. It finds:

(1) "Differences in output among workers at various age levels are largely insignificant, and capability for superior performance abounds in all age groups."

Men mail sorters aged 35–44 scored 99.6, while women sorters in the age group scored 101.9. Men aged 55 and over scored 97, while women aged 55 and over scored 101.1.

* * * * *

(3) "A significant finding is the evidence of consistency in performing among older workers * * * attributable to increasing experience on the job. In some situations this steady growth of consistency with age may compensate for a possible slight decline in productivity rates of older workers."

These findings confirm all previous studies of the job performance of office workers. How can employers justify policies and practices which flagrantly discriminate against a worker because of age and sex in view of them? Questions of decency and equity aside, the discrimination doesn't even make good business sense.

Individual Responsibility and the Negro Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, officials of the National Urban League have brought to my attention a thoughtful address by Mr. John H. Johnson, of Chicago, entitled "Individual Responsibility and the Negro Image." Mr. Johnson is a distinguished Chicago businessman and civic leader. He is the president of Johnson Publishing Co., and publisher of Ebony and Jet magazines.

Mr. Johnson points out that before there is real progress in the effort to assure equal opportunity and justice for all Americans every individual must assume a personal responsibility for race relations in this country. His discussion of the deficiencies in communication and in understanding among us deserves wide consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Johnson's address, along with a foreword by Mr. Henry Steeger, president of the National Urban League, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and foreword were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE NEGRO IMAGE

FOREWORD

The National Urban League is pleased to publish the talk delivered by Mr. John H. Johnson at a meeting in Detroit jointly sponsored by the trustees of the National Urban League and the board of directors of the Detroit Urban League. We do this because we believe that his perceptive insight into the current social revolution and his discerning analysis should be made available to a much wider audience. These remarks, enthusiastically received in Detroit, highlight the responsibility of individuals and community leaders during this frightening and exciting period of our Nation's history.

Mr. Johnson has posed a challenge before all of us, calling for special effort and commitment by whites and Negroes alike. He bids every American to assume personal obligation for the improvement of race relations and community relations.

These pages require only 6 minutes of reading time. The message will remain with you much longer. We earnestly hope that you will respond with positive action.

HENRY STEEGER,
President, National Urban League.

More than 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln addressed himself to the duties of free men and free women in an age of rapid social change.

"We cannot escape history," he said, "* * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

These words were spoken a hundred years ago but they cut to the bone of our current

dilemma—a dilemma which cannot be solved without the help of free individuals who stand up to the challenge presented by the men, women, and little children who are sitting down in the marketplace.

We stand today at a forking point in the American experience. We are in the middle of a nonviolent social revolution that goes to the heart of our meaning as a people. The social revolution speaks to us—as individuals and as community leaders—and we must respond—as individuals and as community leaders—if we are to make an effective contribution to the continuation and the strengthening of the democratic way of life.

The National Urban League is the lengthened shadow of men and women—Negro and white—who rose to the challenge of their times. The Baldwins, the Hayneses, the Woods, the Joneses, and the Grangers made a great contribution not only to the Negro but also to America. And the Urban League tradition of interracial affirmation is maintained today by the Youngs and the Steegers and the thousands of other Americans who are reminding us of "the holy dream we were to be."

For more than a half century, the Urban League has hammered away at the wall that distorts the personalities of both Negro and white Americans. We stand on a new plateau today as a direct result of the efforts of the league and other organizations. But much work remains to be done. Our cities—the chief area of Urban League service—are threatened today as they have never been before. Millions of Americans are fleeing the central city in a white panic. And millions of Negroes are being tossed and turned by the cold black wind of despair. The demonstrations in the streets are reflections of a despair rooted in figures cited by a prominent American who said:

"The Negro baby born in America today—regardless of the section or State in which he is born—has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day—one-third as much chance of completing college—one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man—twice as much chance of becoming unemployed—about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 a year—a life expectancy which is 7 years less—and the prospects of earning only half as much."

Malcolm X didn't say that.

Whitney Young didn't say it.

James Baldwin didn't say it.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy said it in a special message to Congress. And the statement contains a tremendous challenge to every individual American.

What can we do about this challenge?

More meetings? More conferences? I think not.

It seems to me that we will not make any real progress in this area until every individual assumes a personal responsibility for race relations in America. In his book, "The Ordeal of Power," Emmett John Hughes spoke of "the cleansing anguish of responsibility and decision." One of the great problems in all areas of American life is the lack of individual responsibility and commitment. Too many people say: "Let George do it." Too many people are reluctant to take personal responsibility for hard decisions in the arenas of life they control.

The challenge we face today cannot be solved solely by education, law, or time; but it cannot be solved without them. Ne need law, we need education, we need time. But most of all we need dedicated individuals carrying out the duties of freemen and freewomen in their neighborhoods and offices.

Free individuals—Negro and white—can make a real contribution to American democracy by challenging the distorted images that blind us to racial and social reality. The biggest stumbling block to interracial peace in America is the distorted Negro image that poisons communications at the very roots. Millions of white Americans react not to Negroes but to their image of Negroes, an image that has always been out of date and out of focus.

An indispensable prerequisite for racial progress in America is the abandonment of the traditional American error of confusing the Negro image with the individual Negroes who enter into our lives. There are Negroes of every conceivable description, of every shape and size and color. There are Negro millionaires and Negro paupers, Negro Ph. D.'s and Negro policemen, and a strong Negro middle class which has grown by more than 300 percent in the last 10 years.

There is a tendency in America to put "Negro facts" and "white facts" into separate compartments. There is poverty, and then there is "Negro poverty." There is immorality, and then there is "Negro immorality." And the two things are almost always interpreted by different lights. Millions of American Negroes, for example, are poor, but so, according to President Johnson, are 40 to 50 million American whites.

At this crucial hour, there is a desperate need for adequate understanding and precise interpretation of the Negro in human terms. We suffer in America from a distressing lack of communication between Negroes and whites. I am appalled by the large number of businessmen and professional people who have never known a Negro as a friend and who have never exchanged home visits with Negro couples. White Americans can make a real contribution—to themselves and to America—by crossing the Berlin wall that divides us.

I would urge a special effort to grasp the disadvantages of Negro Americans. A disproportionate number of Negroes are members of lower income groups where, among all people, crime and social disorganization flourish. More Negroes than whites, proportionately, are on welfare rolls, because they cannot find gainful employment, because for 100 years they have been the last hired and the first fired. For too long now, we have barred Negroes from employment and condemned them for idleness. For too long now, we have barred Negroes from the best schools and condemned them for illiteracy.

We must make a special effort to provide better educational and employment opportunities for Negroes. This effort will pay off in less crime, less delinquency, less maladjustment, smaller tax bills, and larger wholesale and retail revenue. We can do these things and create garden cities for all Americans if we abandon ghetto images and confront the human beings behind the myths that blind.

This is a task that recommends itself to both Negroes and whites. Negroes have a responsibility to tell Americans the truth about their lives and their aspirations. In many areas, they must take the first step in initiating a dialog between real individuals who confront each other in truth, in responsibility, and in trust.

There is a similar need to upgrade the image of the white man. Millions of American Negroes have never known a white man who was not insulting, patronizing, or exploitative. We must make an immediate effort to stop the increasing polarization of American life based on the negative image of men who approach Negroes with negative attitudes. This will take deeds as well as words. More Negroes must be exposed to fair-minded whites, and fairminded whites must take the lead in debunking the widely held view that most white Americans have a line in their hearts or in their neighborhoods beyond which they are not willing for Negroes to go.

This whole problem of images—negative and positive—is a responsibility of individual men and women. As community leaders, we must take the lead in redefining the Negro and the white image. In the process, we will create an image not of the Negro or the white man, but an image of the American—neither white nor black, Jew nor Gentile.

The Urban League has made a great contribution in this area. By insisting on interracial cooperation, the league has exposed thousands of Negroes and whites to sensitive members of the other race. More importantly, the Negro community, through the league, has received a positive image of whites and Negroes working together for the advancement of all people.

The Urban League approach is as sound today as it was 54 years ago. There is an even greater need today for conciliation, negotiation, and preparation. We need organizations to open doors, but we still need an organization to prepare men to enter the doors and to negotiate with the men who open and close doors.

The league will play an even greater role in the years to come. For what is at stake in the social revolution is the urban foundation of our urban civilization. We have reached a point in America where we cannot continue business as usual. The first order of business in America today is the salvation of the American city. And the American city cannot be saved if we do not face the challenge and the opportunity of the urban Negro.

There has been a great deal of comment recently about the tactics of different organizations. Most of the comments, I think, miss the basic point. No army is composed entirely of foot soldiers. Men have different gifts and different insights. Some men are not fitted, by instinct, temperament, or training, for the frontlines. But we have a right to ask them to fight somewhere.

Every individual ought to be involved at some level—if not on the firing line, then at the conference table; if not at the conference table, then in logistics or supply, giving money, attending meetings, holding up the right arm of the Steegers and the Youngs.

This campaign must be deepened and extended. It will be necessary to interpret the Negro to the white man and the white man to the Negro; but it will also be necessary to act. To know and not to do, an old proverb says, is in fact not to know. Negroes today are judging men by what they do and not by what they say. It is no longer possible to buy Negroes off with token appointments and token commitments. It is no longer possible to buy them off with rhetoric. A deed is required.

In the Italian film, "General Della Rovere," there was an interesting scene that dramatized this whole problem of individual responsibility. It was during the German occupation of Italy and the Nazis rounded up a group of people in a frantic effort to crush the resistance movement. Some of the people caught in the dragnet were members and leaders of the resistance, but some were not. The officer in charge tried to identify the resistance leaders and failed. So he decided to shoot them all—leaders and innocent bystanders. On a cold morning, the men were taken to a room to await their execution. One man cried out in anguish: "I'm innocent, I didn't do anything." A resistance leader approached him and said: "You didn't do anything?" The man said: "No, I didn't do anything." The resistance leader said: "I don't understand. Our way of life was being destroyed. Minds were being warped, babies, Jews, Christians, and old men and women were being killed; and you didn't do anything?" The man replied: 'No, I didn't do anything." The resistance leader declared: "If you didn't do anything, then you deserve to be shot."

What are you doing?

Minds are being warped, babies are dying, Jews, Christians, and old men and women are being humiliated, degraded, and excluded.

What have you done?

To be human in this crucial age is to be, precisely, responsible—and no man can avoid the hard claims of responsibility, by not acting.

This fight, in the final analysis, will be won or lost not by organizations, although organizations are needed; not by conferences, although conferences are useful; not by study groups, although study groups serve a purpose; not by tens and twenties and fifties but by individual men and women accepting responsibility for unpopular decisions in their neighborhoods, offices, clubs, synagogues, and churches.

We must not deceive ourselves.

We act now not for the Negro, but for America; not for civil rights, but for the city; not for love, but for economic salvation and the preservation of the democratic way of life.

Red Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, every trade concession granted by us and our allies to the Communist bloc which strengthens the economies of the Iron Curtain countries represents a step forward in the Communist goal of world domination.

A new U.S.S.R. trade venture is its attempts to expand trade with Japan. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article from the May 26, 1964, New York Times on the U.S.S.R.-Japan negotiations, and an article by Eliot Janeway appearing in the May 25, 1964, Washington Evening Star. Mr. Janeway makes some pertinent observations on the hazards of dealing with the Communists:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 26, 1964]

JAPAN-SOVIET TRADE PROSPECT REPORTED GAINING—MIKOYAN, IN TOKYO, PRESSING FOR WIDENING EXCHANGES

MOSCOW'S PLANS FOR INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION A BIG FACTOR

TOKYO, May 25.—Prospects for the expansion of Soviet-Japanese trade are brightening as a result of talks that Anastas I. Mikoyan, a Soviet First Deputy Premier, has had with Japanese Government, business, and industrial leaders, commercial sources here said today.

Mr. Mikoyan, who arrived May 14, is in Japan as head of an 11-member delegation representing the supreme Soviet. He submitted last week a list of $350 million worth of goods that the Soviet Union wanted to buy from Japan on a deferred-payment basis.

Mr. Mikoyan told the Japanese executives that, besides its 7-year program for developing the Soviet chemical industry, his country was scheduling a new 5-year plan, starting in 1966, for the developing of other industries.

The development of Siberia, he said, would be among the objectives of the new 5-year program. The Soviet leader called for Japanese cooperation in the development of Siberia and for liberal credit terms.

Mr. Mikoyan continued today his talks with senior Japanese industrial leaders. It was the first time that executives of industrial concerns affiliated with the former Zaibatsu (financial combine) in Japan had discussed trade issues frankly with a high Soviet leader.

Observers said the meetings indicated the importance that Moscow attached to Japan's economy from the standpoint of the Soviet chemical and industrial program.

The Japanese business and industrial leaders expressed keen interest in doing more business with the Russians. Mr. Mikoyan urged the granting of credit ranging from 10 to 15 years, which he said Western European countries were offering.

The Soviet leader discussed trade problems separately yesterday with top executives of the three biggest industrial interests—Sumitomo, Mitsui, and Mitsubishi.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 25, 1964]

AS JANEWAY VIEWS IT: JAPAN SHOULD LOOK TO ITALY

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—It wasn't so long ago that the No. 1 growth economy in the West was Italy's. All the praise and admiration bestowed on the Common Market went double for Italy, its most flourishing member. Then, a couple of months ago, there was quite a change. Italy ran out of money, and the Italian boom ran out of steam.

This familiar pattern of cyclical boom and bust, of "new era" growth and "old era" collapse, has an extra dimension. Back when the Italian economy was straining at the leash, and the only ceiling in sight was more blue sky, a good deal of the motive power was supplied by Moscow. A good deal of her present distress can be labeled "made in Moscow," too.

TOWERS IN ITALY

The master magician of the Italian bubble was Enrico Mattei. His power base was a hydra-headed entity known as ENI—Ente Nazionale Idrocaburis. When looked at from the point of view of private people, it looked like the government. When approached on the governmental or public side, it was big business. And, in fact, the structure of ENI combined all the power attributes of big government and of high finance.

Under Mr. Mattei, ENI towered over all of Italy's pure and simple corporate entities, as if it were the government. At the same time, it was able to dominate the Italian Government—and not merely because it had emerged as the biggest business slush fund in Italian politics.

As far as candidates and their press agents were concerned, it was the season for Christmas-giving all year round. During the heyday of the Italian boom, the biggest money power in the Italian economy played political sugardaddy to the more ambitious brethren of the leftist political fraternity.

Mr. Mattei seemed to have discovered the secret of perpetual motion in Italy's "new era" political economy. The more he expanded his operations, and the more new ones he took on, the more political patronage he was able to dispense; and the tighter grew his hammerlock on the Italian Government.

WIELDS POLITICAL MIGHT

And the more decisive his control became over the Italian Government, the more readily available became the wherewithal of expansion—thanks to his Russian friends. All Mr. Mattei had to show in order to finance his way into any new operation was a promise of Russian orders. In addition, Moscow made him look richer still—on paper, that is—by paying him in barter oil for the manufactured products the Soviet purchasing agents had on order.

Then Mr. Mattei crashed—literally. In October 1962 his private plane cracked up. It took something over a year for his machinations and manipulations to flare up into a full-fledged credit crisis—including the credit of political candidates and officeholders.

Because Mr. Mattei had been the channel for Soviet penetration of the Italian economy and Italian politics, and because Russia had come to loom so large as a customer and as a source of supply, Mr. Mattei's crash shocked the Italian economy from the toe of the boot to the Alps.

HAD TO SEEK RELIEF

Rome has had to turn to the West for $1 billion of cash relief, and Washington has provided our share.

This story has a moral for the present. Mr Mattei's best friend, Anastas Mikoyan, the Kremlin's premier businessman, has just turned up in Tokyo, where he is assuring the financially extended Japanese that they need have nothing to worry about.

But before the Japanese grasp this helping hand from Moscow, they'll do well to take a look at the financial wreckage Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Mattei have left behind them in Italy. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce will do well to take note, too.

The New England Governors' Council Resolutions on Residual Oil and Grain Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed a great deal by the series of outstanding resolutions adopted by the New England Governors' Council during its May 18 meeting at Manchester, N.H.

Two of these resolutions concerned problems that I have been actively involved with here in the Congress. I refer to the increasingly serious problem of residual oil import restrictions and the problem of railroad freight rates on feed grains and bulk corn in the eastern section of the United States.

In depth, the Governors' resolutions on these two issues stated the serious problems facing New England.

I am pleased to insert a copy of one of these resolutions in the RECORD, and I trust that they will have wide reading. The other on residual oil has already been inserted in the RECORD.

A close reading of these resolutions will place in perspective the drastic consequences that New England would face if certain actions, as called for in these documents, are not adopted:

THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE RESOLUTION ON GRAIN RATES

Whereas railroad freight rates applying on feed grains and in particular bulk corn have been before the general freight traffic committee and the Traffic Executive Association—Eastern Railroads in various proposed rate adjustments for several years; and

Whereas, on February 20, 1964, certain eastern carriers published reduced rates on bulk whole corn from midwestern points to Delmarva allegedly to meet motor truck competition, but more realistically to meet the low rates on this commodity to the Carolinas and Georgia maintained by the southern carriers; and

Whereas, on April 9, 1964, the Traffic Executive Association approved for publication, effective July 1, 1964, reduced rates on grain and grain products as set forth in TEA Bulletin No. 193, which rates retained intact the origin and destination rate groups while providing some measure of relief to eastern receivers; and

Whereas concurrently therewith the Traffic Executive Association approved for publication reduced rates on grain and grain products as set forth in TEA Bulletin No. 195 which rates are related to ICC docket No. 28300 miles and groups thereby making drastic changes in both origin and destination grain rate groups; and

Whereas, on May 4, at a special meeting of the Traffic Executive Association, it was voted to rescind the prior approval of rate reductions as provided in Bulletin No. 193 and in lieu thereof authorized the publication of rates provided in Bulletin No. 195 with such rates restricted to apply on bulk whole corn; and

Whereas this action by Traffic Executive Association results in the complete disruption of grain rate groups of long standing under the McGraham formula with the resulting changes in competitive marketing, all of which has an unjustified discriminatory effect upon the receivers of whole corn in New England as it results in further widening the spread in freight rates to New England as compared with rates to other competitive areas such as Delmarva in the face of rate relationships of long standing under the aforesaid McGraham formula upon which this industry in both regions has developed; and

Whereas poultry and livestock growing is of primary economic importance to the New England States, and the recent action of Traffic Executive Association could result in the loss of these industries; and

Whereas the loss of this traffic would have a serious effect upon the New England railroads whose financial difficulties are already substantial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a special committee headed by Gov. John H. Reed, of Maine, and comprised of representatives of the Governors of the New England States, personally present to Mr. R. C. Gill, chairman of the Traffic Executive Association, the strong and united opposition of the New England Governors to the outrageous action taken by TEA on May 4, 1964, and urge upon the rail carriers as a minimum remedy the reinstatement for publication of rates proposed in TEA Bulletin No. 193 if need be restricted to apply only on bulk whole corn and the rejection of rates proposed in Bulletin No. 195, together with the cancellation of present point to point commodity rates published on bulk whole corn in TEA Tariff C/TN 245-I and, in lieu thereof, authorize publication of the rates as originally proposed in Bulletin No. 193 at the earliest practicable date, thereby restoring historical competitive relationships throughout the East. Failure to obtain such relief will force the New England Governors' conference to pursue all appropriate legal remedy. We further urge that a special grain committee of TEA be established to review the grain rate structure in the East with a view to making such further adjustments as are deemed necessary, but only after full public hearings are held. It is further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable A. M. Goff, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., and to each member of the New England congressional delegation.

Address of John E. McKeen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 5, 1964, it was my privilege to attend the dedication ceremony of a modern vaccine packaging plant, at the facility of Charles Pfizer & Co., located just south of Terre Haute, Ind. The citizens of Terre Haute and the Sixth District are most proud of this fine plant and the contribution being made by its employees in the age-old battle against diseases that ravage mankind. Many high officials of the company attended these ceremonies and I am sure what they had to say will be of interest to the Congress. Their comment concerning the drug industries' contribution to modern medicine and research is especially illuminating. The text of remarks by John E. McKeen, chairman of the board and president of Charles Pfizer & Co. and the remarks of Herman A. Poitras, vice president of the company, follow:

REMARKS BY JOHN E. MCKEEN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND PRESIDENT, CHAS. PFIZER & CO., INC., AT DEDICATION OF VACCINE PACKAGING PLANT, TERRE HAUTE, IND., MAY 5, 1964

These scientific facilities which we are here to dedicate today, symbolize in a very material way, the triumph of modern medicine in our times. The very fact that we can convert the patch of ground—where corn and soybeans once grew—to the production of lifesaving vaccines is a measure of how far science has progressed.

In just the past few years, the vaccines made here at Vigo under the direction of Mr. Benning and Dr. Mabry, and Dr. Warren's research group, have protected millions of our fellow citizens from polio, from influenza, from measles.

The effect of vaccines on public health has been dramatic—and heartwarming. Since the introduction of the Salk and Sabin vaccines, paralytical polio in this country has declined from a high of more than 21,000 cases in the early 1950's to only 368 cases reported last year. So this specter no longer haunts mothers and fathers with its heartbreaking threat of crippled limbs and lifeless young bodies.

This dedication then, has significance not only to this community and to the State of Indiana, but ultimately to the economy and the health of our Nation.

We at Pfizer have made no secret of the fact that we are bending every effort to make this community the vaccine center of the world. To that end we are concentrating scientific talent, equipment, and capital here with the splendid results that you can see. New buildings, new facilities, new research equipment, and expanded agricultural program—all add to an increasing attack against disease.

With something like 2,000 acres here we still have a considerable area for future expansion.

The manufacture of vaccines requires a familiarity with viruses which is appalling. For a long time viruses were known only by inference; that is, you couldn't see anything, but something was happening, so scientists deduced the presence of something too small to see even with the most powerful microscope.

The inference was proven correct when the electron microscope was developed, offering magnifications up to 100,000 times or more and for the first time we had a look at the tiny assassins which were causing polio and influenza and other dangerous diseases.

We are destined, it seems, to live more and more intimately with viruses. This is a consequence of our population explosion. The more people we have, the better breeding ground we offer viruses, which must have living cells in which to grow. They cannot reproduce independently outside of the host, as bacteria can do.

New kinds of viruses are constantly appearing. This was pointed out by Dr. Robert J. Huebner, Director of the Laboratory of Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md.

When our population was small and travel was limited, epidemics of viral diseases were also relatively small and confined. And, as a community developed resistance to a virus strain, the disease tended to be held in check, having no place to go. That is why epidemics were often years apart—the virus had to wait for a new generation of susceptibles to grow up.

In our time, with people traveling constantly from one part of the world to another, hitchhiking viruses have a much better chance of meeting new victims to infect. This keeps an epidemic alive and makes it bigger—as witness our worldwide influenza cycles.

Moreover, Dr. Huebner says, this increased activity of viruses opens the way for more mutations to appear, so that we face another threat: the constant emergence of new virus strains. This requires the continual reappraisal and adjustment of vaccines. As an example, we have this year again changed the formula of our influenza vaccine made here at Terre Haute, adding two more strains which are new virus mutants.

If we interpret this situation correctly, we are going to have a need for new vaccines in the years to come. And we at Pfizer intend to stay in the forefront of virus research. Both on our own, and in cooperation with the National Institutes of Health, we are conducting a number of programs in virology here at this center.

Several hundred miles east of here at Maywood, N.J., viruses are being grown and studied at our cancer research laboratories under a Government-sponsored program.

A definite strain of virus seems implicated in leukemia, which is cancer of the blood-forming cells. At Maywood, leukemia viruses are now being grown by modern tissue culture techniques and a team of specialists is recording the destructive activity with a high-powered electron microscope.

Other laboratories have reported encouraging results with drugs for leukemia. Only a few years ago, the prognosis for children with leukemia was 6 months of life at most. Now this can sometimes be extended to 2 years or more.

Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott, Director of the National Cancer Institute, said recently that some 60 children have survived more than 5 years—something unheard of when he was a student.

Maywood is now beginning to work with the National Cancer Institute and we hope that our combined studies in virology and drug therapy will result in some progress as time goes on.

Two antibiotics discovered at Maywood—Streptonigrin and Mithramycin—have shown some promise against tumors in clinical studies. They are by no means cures, but they do represent small steps along the road to victory.

So we are waging this attack against cancer on two fronts—seeking curative drugs on the one hand, seeking answers in virology on the other. If ever it should prove possible to prevent cancer with vaccination, the experience and skill so much in evidence here at Terre Haute will be put to an important new use.

The location of this new facility here in the heartland of America gives it a strategic position to serve the entire Nation. It is like a standing army, ready for action whenever invasion or epidemic threatens. It is, in a real sense, a bulwark against disease.

It stands as testimony to our confidence in the people of Terre Haute and their community leaders, and as testimony to our faith that science and man's God-given ingenuity will continue to make this a better world for all mankind.

REMARKS BY HERMAN A. POITRAS, VICE PRESIDENT, PRODUCTION, CHAS. PFIZER & CO., INC., AT DEDICATION OF VACCINE PACKAGING PLANT, TERRE HAUTE, IND., MAY 5, 1964

To look at this new vaccine facility—to study for a moment or two this complex of buildings and highly sophisticated scientific equipment which surrounds us—to take in all of this in a glance of the mind's eye, is to understand how human ingenuity, and dedication, and hard work are capable of achievements almost beyond imagination.

Back in 1957, Pfizer did not produce a solitary dose of vaccine anywhere in the world. The ground we are standing on now was an open field. At that time there was little more than open sky to occupy the vision of anyone who stood here and looked toward the horizon.

But another kind of vision was at work. At Pfizer headquarters in the East, the decision had been made that Pfizer was to introduce products in the field of immunology.

So our engineers came here with blueprints—and something more. They came here with a deep belief in the capacity of this community to help us accomplish this undertaking.

And so the work of transforming this countryside into a major vaccine center was begun. Rapidly, but deliberately, the work progressed from vision to accomplishment—the influenza vaccine—the very first Pfizer biological product approved by the U.S. Government; then the Salk polio vaccine, the measles vaccine, and so on.

With each step, the facilities here have grown, so that today Terre Haute is fast becoming an important industrial center of immunology.

None of this could have been accomplished without people of a very special kind. Here at Terre Haute our company has always found a work force of people who were able to grasp quickly the delicate technical requirements of work in the plant and in the laboratory.

Here, too, we have found community leadership which encourages industrial growth, and this means making the community itself a good place to live and work.

So our company has been able to gather from all parts of the country scientists of the highest caliber to direct and carry out our research and production operations here at Terre Haute. These men and women are among the finest in virology to be found anywhere.

This new facility places additional resources at their disposal.

The new building being dedicated today represents another step in the development of Terre Haute as a major vaccine center. It will permit the entire process to be carried out directly here at the Vigo plant. Until now, bulk supplies of vaccines were shipped from Terre Haute to Pfizer's plant at Brooklyn, N.Y., where they were subdivided, packaged in ready-to-use form and shipped throughout the country.

This new building, as you see, is a modern structure. The sterile vaccine packing area is of the latest design and incorporates the best of Pfizer's wide experience in sterile operations. It is versatile enough to handle almost any kind of vaccine packaging operation. It is designed to allow for future expansion in biologicals, and the research underway here makes that expansion likely, very likely indeed.

Here at Vigo, for instance, research programs are aimed at developing new vaccines against respiratory diseases—including the common cold. Other work is going forward to find some kind of protection against infectious hepatitis. A part of the work here is done under Government contract. Other projects are financed out of our own budget of some $19.5 million. Rubella, or German measles, is one problem. It is a mild disease, but in women expecting children, it threatens the unborn child with deformity.

Our research groups developed the first killed-measles vaccine. If this vaccine can be combined with vaccines for polio, tetanus, diphtheria, and whooping cough in a five-way vaccine, it would be a great boon to parents.

And we are well along on perfecting a live-measles-virus vaccine, so that the physician will have a choice of vaccines to meet a particular situation.

Just recently announced is another brilliant pieces of research on an exciting substance called interferon.

Interferon is a protective substance manufactured, by our own body cells in response to a virus invasion. It doesn't kill the virus, but it seems to protect the cell from invasion by the virus.

Pfizer scientists did not discover interferon, but they did develop a way to mobilize it against viruses by administering the nucleic acids of yeasts to laboratory mice. Twenty-four hours later, the mice were injected with a dose of influenza virus that should have killed them in short order. But none of the mice died.

This experiment has tremendous implications. It opens a new area of research, and it may someday give us a remarkable new approach to the prevention of disease. Our research men here caution us that we must carry out much further study and obtain a great deal of information before we can even think of applying this to man. But a start has been made, and we always must start at the beginning.

By the same token, Pfizer is now taking its first steps in producing vaccines for veterinary medicine here at Terre Haute—using the same concepts and approaches which have proven so successful in the field of human medicine.

This is a dedicated group of men and women here at Terre Haute. When faced with a technical or scientific challenge, they will strive to do more than is required, and they will do it better than is required.

This is the spirit that has made Terre Haute a keystone of Pfizer's past growth. This is the spirit that will make Pfizer look to this plant as the source of continued growth for tomorrow.

Resolution Covering Needed Protection of North Pacific Fisheries Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting held May 20, 1964, by the Ballard Exchange Club in the congressional district I am honored to serve, a resolution concerning the welfare of the U.S. commercial fishing fleet was unanimously passed.

This resolution was adopted by a club composed of business and professional men and indicates public concern over the adverse impact the Japanese and Soviet fishing fleets are having on North Pacific fisheries resources.

I hope my colleagues will give sympathetic consideration to all necessary legislation to carry out the specific recommendations contained in this resolution—the full text of which is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PROTECTION OF NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES

Whereas the members of the Ballard Exchange Club of Seattle, Wash., have gained information through a resident of the State of Alaska, Mr. J. E. Caldwell, that the Japanese fishing fleet has been using Alaskan port facilities to supply its ships operating in waters off the coast of Alaska, and that the U.S. State Department has either authorized or acquiesced in such use of said ports; and

Whereas it is well known that, in addition to the use of fishing gear which severely damages the Alaskan commercial fishery and repeated violations of international agreements pretaining to fishing seasons, the Japanese fishing fleet has engaged and continues to engage in commercial fishing within the existing territorial waters of the United States in direct violation of international laws pertaining thereto, and our inadequate Coast Guard fleet has been unable to prevent such encroachments; and

Whereas the members of the Exchange Club of Ballard unanimously believe that the use of American port facilities constitutes a significant economic aid to the Japanese fishery, and encourages the Japanese to continue their Alaska fishing operations outside as well as inside the 3-mile limit, and whereas the Ballard Exchange Club deplores the use of American ports and the encroachment in and upon American waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Exchange Club of Ballard memorialized our representatives in Congress to introduce and effect the passage of legislation or to take such other action as may be appropriate to accomplish the following ends:

1. That the Japanese fishing fleet be prevented from using American ports for any purpose whatsoever, save and except only marine disasters;

2. That the territorial waters of the United States be extended to the Continental Shelf;

3. That adequate appropriations be made for the modernization and improvement of our Coast Guard vessels and the increase in the number of our vessels to such number as may be necessary to adequately patrol said waters; and

4. That all laws pertaining to the use of American ports and encroachment upon American waters be strictly and vigorously enforced.

Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely delighted to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of all the Members a truly remarkable accomplishment by the Wickes Boiler Co., Division of the Wickes Corp., Saginaw, Mich. Located in the largest city in Michigan's Eighth Congressional District, the Wickes firm has provided "Saginaw's answer to Castro." It is in the form of a 100-ton boiler to aid in converting sea water to fresh water for use at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The boiler, to the credit of Wickes workers and management, was completed a month ahead of schedule. Work is now proceeding on two identical boilers. The three Wickes boilers will

provide steam for flash evaporators which will boil salt from sea water, converting it to fresh water. They also will supply power for the base and are capable of producing enough heat for 1,500 average-size homes.

Mr. Castro may have turned the water off at Guantanamo, but he also turned on America's industrial might. I believe the Wickes Boiler Co. Division has performed a remarkable feat for our military at Guantanamo and for our Nation.

Permit me to insert the following material on this excellent job performance, including newspaper articles from the Saginaw News and the Toledo Blade, Toledo, Ohio:

DESALTER WAITS AT PORT ON WAY TO GUANTANAMO—BIG LUCAS TO LOAD 91-TON BOILER, HOUSING; DEVICE TO SUPPLY WATER TO BASE

An enormous desalting machine, which the Navy is sending to its base at Guantanamo, Cuba, is to be loaded aboard a Norwegian ship in the Port of Toledo on Wednesday.

There are several parts to the desalter, which arrived by rail earlier this week at the port authority's Presque Isle dock site. The largest weighs more than 91 tons.

This piece, consisting of a prefabricated boiler and housing, is to be hoisted aboard the *K. C. Rogenaes*, a Norweigian freighter under charter to Saguenay Shipping Ltd., a Canadian line, by the port authority's gantry crane, Big Lucas.

In terms of weight, it will be one of the heaviest loads ever lifted by the crane, which has a handling capacity of 110 tons. In terms of size it will be easily the largest piece of cargo ever lifted by the machine.

The desalter was manufactured by the Wickes Boiler Co., Saginaw, Mich., and it will be loaded onto the *Rogenaes* by Toledo Overseas Terminals longshoremen. Two other desalters are expected to follow the original shipment.

Frank Miller, port authority site superintendent, who also operates the crane, said the actual weight of the boiler housing is 182,500 pounds.

In February, the Guantanamo base commander ordered the cutting of the water lines connecting the base with Cuban supplies after the United States had been accused of stealing Cuban water.

Installation of the desalters, which are used to turn sea water into drinkable fresh water, is part of a plan to make the base independent of Cuban water supplies.

NAVY'S CUBA BASE GETS WICKES' AID—BOILER AN ANSWER TO CASTRO

(By Edward W. Miller)

Saginaw's answer to Castro in the form of a 100-ton boiler made by Wickes Boiler Co. Division, Wickes Corp., to aid in converting sea water to fresh water for use at the U.S. Navy Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is en route to its destination.

"We were a month ahead of our June 5 completion schedule," said E. Peter Garwood, Wickes Boiler divisional manager. "I think you might call the boiler 'Saginaw's answer to Castro.' "

He referred to the Cuban Premier's blustering threats to permanently shut off the flow of fresh water to the famed Navy base which Navy officials then voluntarily turned off in favor of a supply brought in by American warships.

Garwood said Wickes, as a subcontractor, is building two other identical boilers for the sea water to fresh water project at the Navy base for a total estimated cost of $750,000. Westinghouse Electric International Co. is prime contractor for the Cuban water plant.

The first boiler was shipped Thursday to Toledo for loading aboard the freighter *K. C. Rogenaes* of Saguenay Shipping, Ltd., of Canada. It is the largest completely shop-assembled steam generator ever built in the world, according to Garwood. It will make steam at temperatures greater than 800 degrees Fahrenheit at the rate of 120,000 pounds an hour.

The three Wickes boilers will provide steam for flash evaporators which will boil salt from sea water, converting it to fresh water. They also will supply power for the base and are capable of producing enough heat for 1,500 average-size homes, according to Garwood.

The water converter project for the Navy's bastion in Cuba also is a "hot" one in urgency. During construction of the first Wickes boiler, weekly project reports were made directly to President Johnson.

Wickes has kept crews working around the clock since receiving the contract order March 2 and has astonished Navy officials with its production performance which beat the June 5 delivery date of the first unit by more than a month.

Wickes boilers have had an international reputation for many years and are used in many foreign factories and institutions. Some of the other large ones made by the 104-year-old Saginaw firm serve U.S. atomic energy plants.

The first unit for the Guantanamo installation is expected to be in transit 2 weeks. It is the heaviest piece of equipment ever loaded on a ship at the port of Toledo, say officials.

The other two units are expected to be ready for delivery late this summer.

Will We Ever Pay Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, faced again with a request to raise the Federal debt limit, Members of Congress and high Government officials should at least pause for some sober reflection on what the present enormous debt means.

Some thought-provoking facts are presented by Mr. Henry Hazlitt in his "Business Tides" column of the June 8, 1964, issue of Newsweek magazine. I hope my colleagues will read his article and for that reason I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD. It follows:

WILL WE EVER PAY OFF?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In 1930, the national debt was $16 billion. In 1945, at the end of World War II it was $260 billion. During the war, while the debt was piling up, the general assumption was that this borrowing was proper and even unavoidable in a time of crisis, but that once the war was over the debt would be gradually reduced or paid off. Instead, in the 18 years since the end of the war, the national debt has been increased to $308 billion, or an average of $6,500 for every family in the United States.

Today interest on the debt alone amounts to $11 billion a year, or more than three times as much as the Government spent annually for all purposes in the year 1926 to 1930.

There is curiously little concern about this. On the contrary, every once in a while some writer emerges to ridicule what little concern there is. J. David Stern did this in the January Atlantic. Even academic economists belittle the problem.

Stern's argument was summed up in the statement that "the Nation is growing faster than its debt." One academic economist, trying to prove the same point, epitomized his argument in the following table:

	1945	1963
National debt	$260	$305
Gross national debt	$214	$585
Debt as a burden to GNP (percent)	121	52

The triumphant conclusion the professor drew from this table was that "the national debt, when viewed as a burden to a year's production, has been more than cut in two."

DEBT VERSUS GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

The figures are official, and the conclusion is technically correct. The complacency of the conclusion is unjustified.

The reason the national debt is less of a burden is that, through inflation, the purchasing power of the dollar has been steadily reduced. It has been reduced 63 percent since 1933 and 43 percent since 1945. Let us state this another way. By failing to balance its budget, by borrowing, by monetizing the debt, by printing more dollars, by steadily diluting the dollar's purchasing power, the Government has in effect repudiated 63 cents of every dollar it borrowed in 1933 and 43 cents of every dollar it borrowed in 1945.

To put it bluntly, the creditors, the holders of U.S. Government bonds, have been cheated.

Let's make this even clearer by an illustration from another country. At the end of 1923, the purchasing power of the German paper mark fell to less than one-trillionth of its 1913 value. This meant that prices rose more than a trillion times. Therefore Germany's gross national product, measured in paper marks, rose more than a trillion times. As a result, its accumulated debt, represented by borrowings of marks of a much higher purchasing power, was reduced to practically no burden on the economy at all. Though Germany was the extreme case, the situation did not differ in principle from what happened in France (where the franc eventually fell to less than one one-hundredth of its 1913 value) and a score of other European countries.

A PRETENDED PAYMENT

Adam Smith, writing in 1776, was perfectly familiar with this method of disguised repudiation. "When national debts have once been accumulated to a certain degree," he wrote, "there is scarce, I believe, a single instance of their having been fairly and completely paid." But governments usually covered "the disgrace of a real bankruptcy" by the "juggling trick" of "a pretended payment" in depreciated currency.

So the relationship that seems to give some present-day writers so much satisfaction—that the national debt, in dollar terms, has been falling in relation to the gross national product in dollar terms, is simply the outcome of the steady depreciation of the dollar. The more inflation we have, and the more the purchasing power of the dollar is depreciated, the more the national debt will "fall" in relation to the gross national product, because the gross national product, measured in rising prices, will rise in relation to the debt, and so these writers will have increasing reasons for statistical satisfaction.

Do we have any serious intention of ever paying off our national debt in dollars of at least present purchasing power? If so, isn't it about time we balanced the budget and made an honest start?

Report from Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, with the news that the United States and the U.S.S.R. have entered into a consular agreement which will come before the Senate for ratification, I believe the recent report from Spain by Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, is timely and significant I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

REPORT FROM SPAIN

(By Walter Trohan)

MADRID, May 26.—More in sorrow than in anger, the Spanish press this week gave prominence to the American State Department's disclosure that a network of more than 40 microphones was found in the American Embassy in Moscow in 1952 and 1953. It also was reported that missions of other nations were studded with spying mikes.

Spain, which does not recognize Russia, wonders why its great and good friend does, especially since it has been demonstrated from time to time that Russia has used its Embassy, its United Nations representatives, and its press as avenues for spying on the United States. Spain learned its lesson the hard way when it recognized Russia 30 years ago only to find that the Red Embassy in Madrid was staffed with scores of Spanish-speaking subversive agents, who helped provoke the Spanish Civil War.

Spain has been suspicious of Red peace overtures against a background of denunciations of the Spanish regime that has given this country 25 years of peace. Its people find it hard to understand why the United States continues to meet the Reds more than halfway after continuous Kremlin denunciation of the American way of private enterprise.

NOBLE GESTURE IS WAY OF LIFE

It isn't that the Spaniards don't understand a gesture. No people on earth are more given to the grand gesture. A noble gesture and a dedication to honor are a way of life here, as real as it is earnest, but the gesture is never suicidal, and the cheek is never turned more than once if ever.

In Spain, for example, there is an annual poetry prize in Catalonia, where the third prize is a rose of gold, the second a rose of silver, and the first a living rose. Only a great people can be capable of such a grand gesture, and only men dedicated to the muse of song can work so hard for the fragile bloom rather than of silver or gold.

The Spaniards are not a simple people. Therefore they are convinced that if the Russians had more than 40 microphones in the American Embassy in Moscow, the Americans must have had a few in the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Still, they are not certain of this, because they know well that if the Reds would have, the openhearted and generous United States which has been and is so trusting, might not.

REDS SEEK TO MOVE EMBASSY

Yet Spaniards wonder how a State Department, which knows the Reds had a network of more than 40 microphones in its Embassy in Moscow 10 years ago, and can be expected to do better today with modern techniques, can support Kremlin plans to move the Russian Embassy in Washington from a central area, where comings and goings at least can be watched, to a more distant and secluded area, where Embassy staffers might pursue espionage and subversion with less chance of detection.

The Spaniards can understand American failure to match the Russians microphone for microphone, but they don't understand why the United States continues to grant most favored nation treatment to a power that is dedicated to dominating the world thru the frequently expressed means of destroying individual freedom and liberty.

Nor can they understand sending wheat to feed the Communist enemy, even if it means dollars for the economy, the Spanish economy needs fiscal help more than most. They do not trade with Russia, nor do they accept intent where deeds would seem most to be demanded.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is becoming increasingly more apprehensive about the Vietnam situation—about the type of equipment furnished for our men there, and basic policies, and about the shortcomings of the basic policies relating to our involvement in that struggle.

An example of the concern is an editorial which appeared in the May 24, 1964, issue of the San Gabriel Valley (Calif.) Tribune:

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

LET'S GO TO WIN OR GET OUT

It is beginning to dawn on the American people that they have once again been sucked into a Korean-type war that we are not supposed to win. This time, of course, it is in South Vietnam, and there are other differences. U.S. military men are supposed to be advising and training South Vietnam forces in their struggle against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas, not fighting. They are not, as yet at least, under U.N. direction as in Korea, their orders coming from Washington. But they are fighting—and dying—in another war in which the enemy cannot be pursued or harassed beyond the borders of South Vietnam into the Red sanctuaries of Cambodia or Laos or North Vietnam.

Most shocking of all the reports coming out of this heartbreaking struggle tell of the obsolete planes and helicopters our pilots have had to fly, presumably because of the terms of a Geneva treaty of 1954 requiring that wornout equipment in South Vietnam could only be replaced (piece by piece) by similarly dilapidated items. And the story that rocked Washington was that of Jim Lucas, of Scripps Howard, who told of two U.S. airmen who died in their T-28 trainers when the wings came off in bombing runs—and of the other pilots who could expect the same fate any day. For good measure, it is now revealed that the United States was not a signatory to that 1954 treaty.

As a result of the growing uproar, better planes, more ammunition and more troops are to be sent to South Vietnam. President Johnson has asked $125 million more in military and economic aid. But, at this writing, there has been no word of a change in policy that would permit U.S. forces to carry the war to the enemy and into his supply bases and staging areas, that would indicate our determination to win or assure those who are facing death in the faraway jungles that such a sacrifice will not be in vain.

"It will be a long war," Secretary McNamara reported on his latest return from Saigon. If it is not a war to be won, it should not last a minute longer than it will take to get our fightingmen out.

SBA Administrator Foley Sees Bright Future for Small Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a very excellent article entitled "SBA Head Sees Bright Future for Small Firms," by Eugene P. Foley, the able Administrator of the Small Business Administration, appeared in the Sunday, May 24, issue of the Washington Post. The article coincided with the beginning of National Small Business Week, as proclaimed by President Johnson.

Administrator Foley points out a bright picture for small firms and describes the tremendous role that they play in our national economy. He also discusses the manner in which the SBA loan programs can be of assistance in the war against poverty.

This excellent article by Administrator Foley should be of interest to all of those interested in small business. As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I desire to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "SBA Head Sees Bright Future for Small Firms," follows:

FOLEY CALLS THEM AID IN POVERTY WAR—SBA HEAD SEES BRIGHT FUTURE FOR SMALL FIRMS

(By Eugene P. Foley, Small Business Administrator)

Small business in America is in relatively good health today and can look forward to an even brighter future.

More than 9 out of every 10 businesses in this country are small enterprises. Moreover, the Nation's small firms are increasing at about 50,000 a year and account for virtually all the net gain in our business population.

This no doubt will surprise those who fear small business is on the way out in this country, that it is being swallowed up by the giants. Actually, at the current pace of the economy, the small business population of 4.6 million will go over 5 million by 1970.

In recognition of the tremendous role small firms play in our national economy, President Johnson has claimed the week starting today as National Small Business Week. The President pointed out that small businesses provide:

About one-third of the Nation's goods and services;

A broad source of diversified employment opportunities;

An opportunity for expression and growth of personal initiative and judgment;

New ideas, new methods, and new products which stimulate our economy.

It is in the area of service industries that the small businessman is dominant and where he will have his best future. The service field promises to continue to be an area of exceptional dynamic growth.

SERVICES ON RISE

During the period 1946 through 1963, employment in businesses providing services increased from 4.7 million to 8.3 million—rise of 76 perecnt. For the rest of the economy, the growth in employment was 18 percent.

Americans with more money to spend are demanding more services. The man or woman wha has an idea, some capital and a willingness to take risks has an excellent chance to establish a successful small business today.

In rapidly growing suburbia, the small businessman can find many opportunities to establish a successful business, particularly in the service field but also in retail trade.

I do not mean to suggest that small business is without problems. The number of small manufacturers has been declining in recent years—frmo 332,000 in 1947 to 313,000 on January 1, 1963. This important sector of the small business world must not be weakened.

Of concern, too, is the matter of increasing the amount of Government work done by small firms. Federal Government purchases in fiscal 1963 added up to $33.8 billion—but only 16.8 percent or $5.7 billion went to small business.

R. & D. POTENTIAL

In research and development, small business handled a mere 3.5 percent of the $5.7 billion the Federal Government spent in fiscal 1963. We believe smaller firms are qualified to do a greater part of this and other Government work.

Time and again small firms have produced a higher quality product at a lower price and at an earlier delivery date than the Government could have obtained from their giant competitors.

The line between small and big business often is difficult to draw. Many think of small business as only the mom-and-pop type of operation, such as the corner grocery. But a factory could have 250 employees and still be considered small. The yardsticks for measuring the size of a business vary by industry. Basically, a small business must be independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field.

In the President's war against poverty, the small business community can perform combat duty. The SBA will supply ammunition.

By assisting and encouraging small businesses to expand, the SBA can help open up a major source of jobs for the unemployed. As an indication of what can be achieved, nearly 23,000 new jobs have been created by one of our programs alone. This is the one under which $53.3 million have been loaned to local development companies since 1958 for use in constructing plants or otherwise aiding expansion.

ALLY AGAINST POVERTY

In another attack on poverty, the SBA has launched pilot projects in Philadelphia and New York with a liberalized small loan program that gives more attention to the human qualities of the applicants and less to their collateral, though it, too, is considered. The projects are aimed at opening the doors of the business world to the man or woman who has a good idea but is prevented from putting it into effect merely because of lack of capital. We believe that if the potential is there, we should be willing to take a calculated risk.

The pilot projects also cover very small businessmen who, while established, need help to expand.

In this era of rapid change the small businessman, far from being at a disadvantage, often has the edge over the industrial greats. This is because it is usually the small businessman who is the innovator, who takes a chance on developing new products and new techniques. Many significant inventions are the work of individuals who have imagination and are willing to gamble by founding a small firm to market their inventions.

Big companies have heavy investments that tend to make them conservative, that make them resist radical change. It is the small businessman we must look to for new products, new services, new ideals in retailing.

Promotions for Sale?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, from all reports the recent fund raising affair staged by the Democratic Party was quite a wing-ding. The high-pressure ticket sales campaign among Government workers before the event was even more of a wing-ding with credit card trimmings. At least, according to columnist Arthur Hoppe, it left one Government employee wondering whether, in the presence of the Democratic high command, he should put his hand over his heart or put his hand on his pocketbook.

Mr. Hoppe's article entitled "Loyalty on the Installment Plan," appeared in the Washington Star, May 30, and follows:

LOYALTY ON THE INSTALLMENT PLAN: JOHNSON FOLLOWER DUMPS BLOND TO ATTEND GALA ARMORY SHOW

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I think it's heart stirring the way 7,000 Government workers turned out for a gala the other night to pay tribute to President Johnson. Considering they had to pay $100 in tribute apiece.

As you know, these tribute-paying galas are very traditional in Washington. The incumbent President, whoever he is, has gone way in the hole getting elected. Or he plans to toss away money hand over fist to get reelected. So the party chairman says grimly to the National Committee: "Gentlemen, due to the prolifigacy of our wastrel President, we are in dire financial straits. There is only one thing to do. We must throw a great big party in his honor."

The call goes out to the party's members in all the Government agencies to buy $100 tickets and demonstrate their unity. Which they do by groaning equally loudly.

In the event you might like to know how these happy party-goers feel, I attended Mr. Johnson's gala with a young gentleman whose name and agency I won't reveal. Because he likes his work. And I can't tell you how happy he was to be going to a party. That I can't.

"Boy, they really had it organized this year," he said, as we were driving over to the National Armory for the fun-filled festivities. "I'm pretty low echelon and they never hit me up before. But this time, the guy who is the bagman for our building comes in with a list and says, 'How'd you like to pay tribute to our beloved President? In one lump? Or $25 down and the rest in easy payments?'

"So I said I had an engagement with a gorgeous blond but I would much prefer to go sit on a hard chair in the armory for 3 hours. If I knew what was good for me. Actually, what I should've done was call Eliot Ness. I understand that tickets to this thing have fallen into the hands of unscrupulous scalpers. They're getting 50 cents each."

We joined the gay, mad throng, all wearing their best clothes and rather pained expressions, and filed into the armory, which looks like an armory. Inside, the place was all gussied up with red, white and blue bunting, balloons, banners and a huge heart saying: "U.S.A. loves L.B.J."

You would have loved the entertainment, if you would like watching the Ed Sullivan show for 3 hours. The high point came when everybody—well, some people—joined in singing, "Once in love with Lyndon, always in love with Lyndon * * *." And ending: " 'Cause Lyndon's always been in love with us." But my friend said he couldn't sing because he was too choked up.

The party ended with a speech by the Democratic National Chairman, John Bailey, who said, "Thanks a million." Which I calculated was a $300,000 exaggeration. And a speech by Mr. Johnson himself, who said it sure had been "a wonderful party." Everybody then demonstrated their love for the leader by applauding. Very politely.

Well, it certainly isn't Mr. Johnson's fault. Every President, I suppose, has to be the leader of his Nation and also of his party. But these two incompatible roles do tend to make people a little schizophrenic. Or, as my friend put it on the way out: "Whenever our beloved President passes by, I never know whether to put my hand over my heart or over my wallet."

ARA's Political Funnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 18, 1964:

ARA'S POLITICAL FUNNEL

Though not yet 4 years old, the Area Redevelopment Administration has committed so many offenses against public sensibility and the public purse that the country's patience with it should have long since been exhausted.

There is a modified Senate bill now pending in House Rules which would almost double the present $375 million spending authorization of ARA. This new boodle could be entirely dispensed under law by June of 1965. The past record of ARA indicates the new power must be denied the administration in an election year especially.

In ARA, Congress was supposed to have designed a poverty war weapon to eliminate pockets of penury by the concentrated and timely deployment of Federal funds. Today, in a documented article in the May issue of Reader's Digest, ARA stands charged with a multitude of bureaucratic sins.

First, it has been lending money to competitors of existing firms and driven some out of business. Thus it has destroyed jobs as well as created them.

In Sandpoint, Idaho, ARA funds built a ski resort which bankrupted another ski run built with private capital.

In Detroit, where two hotels went bankrupt using private moneys, ARA came in with Federal funds to finance three more. The result: The existing hotels, already suffering

from lack of clients, have taken a beating from the federally-sponsored competition.

Originally, ARA was designed to assist some 100 depressed areas. Well today, one-third of the United States, some 1,000 odd counties, and their 42 million inhabitants qualify under aid for the "depressed."

Included have been such as prosperous Rice County, Kans., and oil-rich Gregg County, Tex., which leads the Lone Star State in petroleum production.

The author also charges, on the basis of his investigation, that ARA is releasing statistics on its job-creating, which bear only the most casual relation to fact.

The ARA has also taken lightly the law under which it was created and which specified that it grant only loans that cannot be reasonably obtained elsewhere.

Yet, the chain of Howard Johnson and the firm of A. G. Spalding & Bros. (hardly paupers) have been on the receiving end of loans, the former for $2,275,000 of our tax dollars.

But the greatest danger of ARA is in the political realm in an election year. With such a wide area of jurisdiction, ARA is the ideal funnel through which to pour dollars into sectors where not only the people, but the Democratic politicians, are hard-pressed. This is not merely a vague possibility.

Just last year, for similar activities, the ARA was dubbed by some sarcastic Congressmen, the Administration Reelection Agency.

In addition, the Reader's Digest article points out that Democratic politicians, strangely enough, are the ones who normally announce the coming of ARA and that, after the Federal agency departs, there is often a reminder left in the form of a giant billboard naming the President of the United States and the local Congressman (Democrat) as benefactors.

It is time Congress sharply pulled in the reins on this high-handed agency, which puts only $2 of every $5 it spends into areas of high unemployment.

As for those Republicans who wish to return to Washington this year, we urge they call an investigation of this powerful Federal wheelhorse of the Democratic Party.

Red Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial comment from the May 18, 1964, issue of Los Angeles Commerical News.

In the editorial, Commercial News presents perceptive reasoning for its position against recognition of or trade with Red China which I believe will be of interest to Congress and the public.

The editorial follows:

REFLECTIONS: ON RED TRADE

Voices continue to be heard urging a policy of open, or limited trade with Red China, despite many sound warnings against such a policy.

Now, as World Trade Week again is observed, Commercial News finds it incumbent to stress its position as unequivocally opposed to any form of recognition, particularly trade, with the gangster regime that sits in Peiping.

For many reasons, but two in particular, this opposition remains steadfast. First, and most strongly, such trade is immoral; and, second, it is an invitation to economic suicide.

Free and legitimate trade practiced as free enterprise among honorable nations is one thing. Traffic with murderers and criminals of the worst description is something else. Commercial News supports and fosters the one; deplores and detests the other.

It cannot really be necessary to defend the first argument, for to do so would at best be a sad commentary on our times; for is it really so difficult to understand that to promote or to sustain or to help evil is to do evil—that to willfully aid a criminal in the pursuit of his crime is to become a partner in that crime?

To sustain the second reason, history and commonsense tell us that the honest man who trades with a thief will be robbed; who bargains with a cheat will be cheated; who listens to a liar will be lied to. And who aids his own enemy will be vanquished.

Trade to a Communist is not an exchange of goods, on a mutually beneficial basis; it is by their own definition "a weapon to achieve the long-range strategic aims of the Communist Party."

Is it possible there in any knowledgeable person in America today who doubts what those long-range aims are? To abet them, surely, is nothing less than suicide.—L.H.C.

Cold War Comes Into Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Liveable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 9, 1964]

COLD WAR COMES INTO WYOMING

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Wyoming is only one of 35 States to elect a Senator in 1964, but a case can be made to call it a microcosm, an America-in-miniature.

This is true because the incumbent, Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, has run up distress signals, claiming himself under attack by the John Birch Society. He has gotten some mileage out of this claim—it has attracted the sympathetic attention of liberal columnists and of the antiextremists.

That in itself could not make the Wyoming election a national incident, but MCGEE's candidacy is now being backed with his avowed approval by an extremist outfit on the opposite end of the ideological spectrum, the Council for a Liveable World.

For perfect laboratory conditions of the test case, it would help if MCGEE, who's a professional rather than political type, were further identified. For example, at President Johnson's first "live" television press conference, the question arose as to whether reporters should give their names before asking questions.

GOOD GUY OR BAD GUY

It was jocularly proposed among us that the questioner, instead of bothering with his name, should merely say whether he was a good guy or a bad guy. So, as a true word, though spoken in jest, let us say at the outset that MCGEE is a good guy, whose worthiness is strictly a local issue. But the head-on clash in Wyoming between the Birch Society and the Liveable World Council should bear some wider examination.

The society is headed by Robert Welch, whose ideas are too well known to need expatiation here. The council is headed by Dr. Leo Szilard, actually its cochairman, who is not less outspoken than Welch, but who has yet to become a household word for polemic politics. Yet a candidate who accepts Welch's backing should not, I think, be held more responsible for the company he keeps than one who accepts Szilard's backing.

Leo Szilard, Hungarian born, is one of many intellectuals who were refugees from Hitler. Like others of his bent, Szilard participated in making the A-bomb to incinerate Fascists, but he doesn't feel the same way about incinerating Communists. While the Axis was intolerable to Dr. Szilard and to others holding his views they are willing to tolerate a worse evil in communism. They aim to make the world not free, but "livable." They are among the first to condemn anti-Communists for asserting that any "means" are justified if they achieve the "end" of exposing and defeating the Red menace. But some of the "means" by which Dr. Szilard would make the world "livable" with communism will leave Americans aghast.

Specifically, there is the disarmament plan that Dr. Szilard put before the so-called "Pugwash Conference of Free World and Communist Scientists," which met in September 1961 at Stowe, Vt. Among his ideas for policing a nuclear peace are these:

1. An informer system among Americans: The President would post a $1 million tax-free award to any American who reported nuclear treaty violations to a U.N. Control Commission. To enable the squealer to become happily adjusted, Szilard adds that "the recipient of such an award who wishes to enjoy * * * a life of leisure and luxury abroad * * * would not be hampered by currency restrictions."

2. A head-hunt system: A U.N. Peace Court, following a barbaric precedent of the Middle Ages, would pass the death sentence upon any American citizen or Government official deemed guilty of violating "peace." In almost incredible savagery Szilard told this international group, which included some vicious enemies of America, that:

"The court could deputize any and all Americans to try and execute the sentence. An American citizen killing an 'outlaw' could not be legally tried for murder in an American court, inasmuch as the treaty * * * would be law of the land."

SITUATION CAN BE REMEDIED

Whether this sort of gabble comes from an unbalanced mind, or from a kindly scientist talking of matters out of his field, or from a genuine "hater" of the American Constitution and people, or from a gargantuan hoaxster, it is about to be injected into the Wyoming campaign.

The situation could be remedied if MCGEE would repudiate the support of Dr. Szilard and the Council, just as many candidates have repudiated the support of the Society and Robert Welch. This MCGEE has declined to do in an interview with me. Or, if the Council members could publicly dissociate themselves from Dr. Szilard, just as many Birch members have done in regard to Mr. Welch.

But in the absence of such repudiation and dissociation, Wyoming will show what could happen (and, under the surface, may be happening) in many States where the desperate conflict of the cold war has come home to America.

My Role in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the fact so many, so often, turn to the Federal Government is evidence that many of the issues basic to the greatness of this country are gradually being shrouded by misunderstanding and irresponsibility. Many efforts have been made to remind us of this Nation's true meaning and national purpose, but I doubt many have equaled Miss Tima Sue Heusner's award-winning essay "My Role in America."

As the winner in a contest sponsored by the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., Miss Heusner, 11th grade, Liberal High School, Liberal, Kans., portrays citizenship at its best, and reminds all of us that if this Nation is to endure strong and free ultimate confidence must be placed in the people themselves. Miss Heusner's grasp of America expressed in this refreshing essay is not only a tribute to her, but to her family, school, community, and the State of Kansas. It is moreover a special tribute to the cherished ideals of this free Republic whose meaning she has imparted with simplicity and more than ordinary understanding. To those who become discouraged with the apparent dissipation of responsibility in our individual citizens, I call her fine essay to your attention:

MY ROLE IN AMERICA

This is my America to mold, to shape, to destroy, to let decay, or to give to the opposing powers. How can the man in the street, the woman in the kitchen, or a high school student help prevent the blunders by which we are aiding our enemies all over the world? What can I do to help?

In my opinion, the strongest thread in the fabric of a free and united country is education. Education in my home, on my street, in my school, in my community, and in my Nation. Education is wealth for the poor, honor to the rich, and support and comfort for the aged. Education is for everyone. Education is almost, if not quite, the most important of all human activities; consequently, it is very important for one to have a good education to succeed. Many people seem to think that education ends with graduation, but in actuality education only begins with graduation. Buddha once said, "A single day among the learned is longer than the longest life among the ignorant. The ink of a scholar is more sacred than the blood of a martyr."

I have heard it said that American society has grown sluggish. My world is fuller of opportunity today than it has ever been before. Everything is in need of being made over. Intellectually, the "Age of Doubt" asks for a new "Age of Faith." Politically, a new situation (possible mutual destruction), threat to the human race, calls for new institutions and bold imaginative measures far exceeding what people have been able to accomplish in bygone days. We must educate the political leaders to the wants and needs of the common people. The arts must rise from technical experiments to general communication. The common people are ready to once again make art more meaningful to society as a whole. Socially, the main task would seem to be the transformation of a mass humanity into a free society of morally responsible persons, where each person as an individual can think for himself. Then good leaders would be no problem. My country is only as strong as its weakest citizen.

A general breakdown in moral stamina is doubly serious when it is observed in youth, for they are the leaders of tomorrow's world. It is not enough to know what is right and wrong; I must care. I must feel that it matters whether or not I do right always. I was not bron with the courage always to do right. I am learning from experience, right from wrong.

America has more assets than any other nation on the globe. Sociologists have said that we can succeed only if we have a strong leader. I do not believe this to be so. The state of the Nation depends upon individual citizens. It is we who in our democracy must set an example for the officials and leaders. This is the law of functioning democracy. A nation operates honestly and well as long as citizens show interest; but when citizens become apathetic, then dictatorship, ignorance, and national decline take over. A successful nation is not a nation without problems; it is simply a nation that has learned to solve the problems that it encounters.

The average man or woman can have a powerful effect on the success of our Nation once the realization strikes home that no voice should go unheard. Leadership remains with the individual as long as he makes it his major responsibility.

In spite of the billions of dollars that have been spent for foreign aid in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, the United States has largely failed in its efforts to help the world's poor, to create a world climate favorable to democratic ideas.

It was my pleasure as an individual to entertain an International Farm Youth Exchange student in my home last summer. When I first met him, he was odd and different. But when I educated myself to his country, his beliefs, and his ways, my opinion changed considerably. I learned to enjoy and appreciate his peculiarities.

Upon his arrival in our home, I realized the plans I had made for showing him around would have left him with a false impression of our way of life. I had to show him that we had different economic classes in the United States also. My responsibility as a citizen of this country was to sell my country and its ideals to any and all people and to make its ideals fine enough to make people want to live under a democracy as mine.

I also attempted to show him the ships that could be built under a strong democracy. Workmanship through better methods of farming and homemaking. Fellowship through developing common interests and objectives of boys and girls throughout the United States and foreign countries alike. Acquaintanceship through work in group activities and projects. Friendship through intimate association with others in work and in play. Leadership by knowing about my Government and what it stands for. To me, citizenship is the most important ship built under a strong democracy. What greater things does America need today or will it need in the future than development of youth, its greatest resource, into citizens and leaders who will insure democracy to the world. Democracy is very important in developing citizenship as a person grows from childhood to maturity.

No, I probably never will be known as President Tima Sue Heusner, but if I have helped to build the individuals around me in my society into deepthinking, morally responsible people, I have partially fulfilled my obligation and shown some appreciation for the privilege of being born in my United States. But merely to preserve my inheritance is not enough. I, as a future citizen must make my country strong by stressing my beliefs in God and my country because the communistic world is challenging everything in our system from our belief in God to our rights in the Constitution. I must make my democratic ideas strong enough that people throughout the world will want to live under a democracy.

Address by Hon. F. Bradford Morse at Dedication of New Suburban Campus at Northeastern University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, Northeastern University dedicated a new suburban campus in Burlington, Mass. The speaker at the dedication exercises was my colleague from the Fifth Massachusetts District, F. BRADFORD MORSE. Congressman MORSE outlined the need for increased efforts by government, private industry, and the academic world to prepare for the economic transitions occasioned by current and projected decreases in Federal defense spending.

I would like to make Congressman MORSE's address available to all Members of the House. Under unanimous consent I am inserting his text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

The years since World War II have witnessed a tremendous development of our scientific and technological capacity. Constant world tension and persistent threats to freedom all over the globe have required the United States to devote a significant proportion of our national resources to the production of arms and supporting equipment.

An increasingly large part of our national economy has become involved in the defense effort. Ten percent of our gross national product is attributable to defense and defense-related spending; 9 percent of our labor force works, directly or indirectly, for the Defense Establishment; 3 of every 5 scientists and engineers currently work on a defense-related project. Although 47 percent of our total research and development effort was carried out with private funds in 1954, that percentage had fallen to 35 percent by 1962.

This economic concentration has brought about important gains for scientists and engineers. It has raised the status of the profession and provided tremendous new opportunities for personal advancement. To some extent, however, the gains have produced some unfortunate trends which signal trouble in the years to come.

For example, the typical defense industry has been hiring four or five times the number of scientists and engineers employed by civilian industry to support the same level of production and sales.

Without wishing to sound a note of gloom on this happy occasion, I would like to discuss with you briefly some of the implications of the facts I have outlined in light of predictable changes in our military posture.

All the signs point to a leveling off—indeed to a reduction in the level of our military spending. Secretary of Defense McNamara outlined a 5-year cost reduction

program to the House Armed Services Committee in January. Committee Chairman CARL VINSON has stated that we are reaching the level of saturation in our stockpile of certain forms of armament. In the April issue of Foreign Affairs, former Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric predicted that our military spending, currently in excess of $50 billion annually, might be as low as $38.5 billion by 1970.

In the judgment of our top defense officials, these reductions will be achieved without impairing our national security or our ability to defend freedom and liberty by whatever means prove necessary.

We can measure the dimensions of these cuts by the number of military installations which are scheduled to be closed or curtailed, by the size of Government contracts, and by the multiplier effect contract reductions will have on our ecnoomy as a whole.

How many communities have blossomed forth with new schools, recreation centers, hospitals, and homes bcause defense dollars brought lots of jobs and good salaries to the area? What will happen to the investment in these facilities should the contracts be terminated, cut back, or cancelled?

So far, we have tended to ignore the problem. Certainly it is far easier not to worry about it. But we cannot continue to take this attitude. The facts are clear and we must face them realistically and intelligently. The problem won't go away while we hide our heads in the sand. I am convinced that we have got to begin to prepare for the inevitable consequences of reduced Government spending in this area. It is a factor which poses real problems for our economy; by the same token it provides us with the opportunity to make technological gains we could not have dreamed of even 10 or 15 years ago.

Conversion from military to civilian or commercial production is far different from what it was after World War II. General Motors went back to building cars; General Electric to building refrigerators. Shortages during the war coupled with relatively high defense salaries had created a tremendous demand for consumer goods. What many economists had menacingly described as a severe depression turned out to be a tremendous boom.

At the present time, we have no such backlog of consumer wants—the demand for appliances and automobiles is relatively constant. In addition, the firms which have thrived on defense contracts often have never produced anything else. It is not a matter of reconversion to an earlier method of production, but of conversion to new lines of production.

This process will involve coming to grips with problems of plants, products, promotion and people.

Industry will have to shift from producing a few items with a high unit cost for the military to producing a larger number of items with a lower unit cost for commercial marketing. We will have to face the problem of product differentiation. Whoever heard of color coordinated space capsules or a Hercules missile with tail fins?

New products must be developed. Thus far, the efforts of a few defense contractors to develop commercial lines of production have not been dramatically successful. Marginal profits forced many firms to abandon even these limted efforts. In part this may be due to an absence of promotional and marketing skills. When your customer is assured in advance, there is no need to compete for sales. Besides, there wouldn't be much advertising mileage in asserting that you produced the second best guided missile.

I am hopeful that all of these problems can be faced by Government, industry, and university working together. I am hopeful because we have a vast reserve of imagination and inventiveness among our skilled professional people. The same people who put John Glenn in orbit and built the Nike-Zeus missile can turn their innovative minds toward the solution of other pressing needs.

The possibilities for civilian production are limitless: modernization of plant and equipment in a number of existing industries; expanded research efforts in health and medical technology; improved transportation systems and facilities; meaningful control of air and water pollution; the development of new sources of power; greater exploration of civilian applications of our space technology; to name just a few.

We have only begun to realize the tremendous market potential of the emerging nations of the world. Computer technology can be applied to the development of economic projects for developing nations. This approach is being used today to draw up a model for economic growth in Venezuela.

These are exciting challenges which call for the most creative response which we, as a nation, can bring to them.

This ceremony here today represents just such a creative response. Northeastern University's suburban campus here in Burlington is one of the most exciting developments we have seen in this whole field. It is a perfect example of Government-industry-university cooperation to which I referred earlier. Those who teach and study here will make tremendous contributions to our defense industries and will pave the way for the inevitable transitions to civilian production.

It is my understanding that industrial firms in the area have made it possible for their personnel to attend courses—and that the university is working with local school systems to make it possible for teachers to keep their skills updated. From what I can tell, everything has been done to make this campus a vital center for the continued prosperity and dynamism of the area.

Here is a laboratory where we can confound the skeptics who question our ability to make the transition from a military to a civilian orientation. It is a privilege for me to be here today and I want to congratulate all those who have given their time and energy to the development of this exciting new facility. I am happy to welcome Northeastern to the Fifth District and I feel sure that we will thrive and prosper together in the years ahead.

The Future of Business Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mrs. Olive Ann Beech, president of Beech Aircraft Corp., of Wichita, Kans., and published in the June issue of National Aeronautics magazine. Mrs. Beech has knowledgeably and effectively emphasized the contribution of aviation to the growth of business and industry in the United States. The article follows:

AS I SEE THE FUTURE OF BUSINESS AVIATION

(By Olive Ann Beech)

The growth of aviation is indicative of this Nation's leadership in the world of flight. Today the aerospace industry is the largest single industry in the United States. The part that business aviation is contributing is very real and quite noteworthy.

Today there are more than 40,000 company and privately owned business airplanes flown within the continental United States alone. This business fleet is 20 times the number of domestic airliners, and more than double the U.S. military fleet. Additionally, there are about 40,000 utility-type civil aircraft operated for a wide variety of purposes—agriculture, aircargo and taxi service, instruction, charter, geophysical research, survey and patrol, and nonbusiness personal use.

These 80,000 business and utility aircraft comprise what our industry calls general aviation. They operate to and from nearly 8,000 airports in the United States. They fly a combined total of more than 13 million hours annually. They take their passengers where they want to go, when they want to go. This is the fastest growing segment of all aviation. The Federal Aviation Agency estimates that by 1968 there will be 99,000 active aircraft in general aviation flying more than 17 million hours annually. Of this increase, business flying and personal flying are expected to contribute most of the growth because of the profitable contributions these aircraft make for their owners.

The business airplane fleet in 1963 flew over 5,700,000 hours. It has doubled in size since 1950, and it is expected to double again by 1970. It flies over 3 million miles each day of the week, or more than a billion miles a year.

Thus a new era in business history is being written and bettered every year because of the benefits and the advantages of a proven new system of faster transportation for business.

New concepts of business geography have been established by company-owned airplanes. Modern business market opportunities stretch far beyond the limits of older travel and transport methods. Today there are some 8,000 airports throughout this Nation, but fewer than 600 of them are served by scheduled commercial airlines. Thus the fast, comfortable, economical practical mobility of the private plane permits busy people to go where they want to go, when they want to go, on schedules that fit their business and professional requirements.

The fact that executive travel by air saves up to 75 percent travel time is by itself one prime factor for the continued growth of business aviation. Certainly the company-owned business plane represents one of the most efficient business machines ever made available to American industry. Throughout the entire free world business enterprises are profiting through a wide variety of uses of America's fine fleet of business aircraft.

Business aviation has enjoyed a tremendous growth in the past 15 years—we have sound reasons to be highly enthusiastic about the growth years that lie ahead. Despite the present widespread use of personal planes for business, we have barely scratched the surface. Industry surveys reveal that of the 3,000 leading industrial and commercial companies in the United States, less than 12 percent have airplanes. This leaves market potentials of great magnitude for our industry. Added to this, of course, are the tens of thousands of smaller companies, independent businessmen and professional men who need and can afford the profitmaking, timesaving benefits of personal air transportation.

We know that in the years ahead business airplanes will contribute more benefits to more individuals, businesses, and communities. For our great industry the future definitely holds bright and almost limitless horizons.

Self-Determination for Peoples of the European Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the United States has failed to give its citizens or the peoples of the world an aspiration. No meaningful world movement can be launched without a cause, policies and an organization.

The most valid cause to which the peoples of the world can aspire is that of spiritual, political and economic freedom. Freedom is the antithesis of the Soviet-Communist goals and actualities.

Mr. Walter V. Chopyk, public relations director of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York, has urged that the United States demand self-determination for the satellite and captive nations in the Soviet orbit. He proposes that free elections be held under United Nations supervision.

The United States ought to repeatedly demand the realization of the principle of self-determination by means of free elections. This principle and a program for its attainment must become a basic part of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Chopyk recently addressed the Kenilworth volunteer fire company, of Tonawanda, N.Y., on this subject.

His concise and excellent address follows:

PEACEFUL DISINTEGRATION OF THE RED RUSSIAN EMPIRE

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We have seen this morning the techniques of subversion applied by the Soviet Union used in capturing 25 once free and independent nations and placing them in its prison house of nations and bleeding their wealth for the Soviet master plan of world conquest. Through the use of diplomatic duplicity, the U.S.S.R. is also using the West to supply her the tools of conquest.

Congressman GLENARD LIPSCOMB, of California, recently stated: "The Washington administration has a peculiar desire to both fight communism and to feed it at the same time." So far, $700 billion has been spent over the 15 years to fight communism. We lost thousands of men in Korea, and American servicemen are dying daily in Vietnam. Lest we forget, our Defense Department spends billions of dollars to maintain an arsenal to answer the Communist threat to "bury us."

The recent decision of the U.S. Government to sell about 100 million bushels of American wheat to the Soviet Union plus the Canadian wheat sold (much of it will be turned into industrial alcohol) is certainly going to facilitate the aggressive plans of the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Union could sustain itself with food, providing that it were not the fact that all of its capital and energy is currently being devoted to the manufacturing of war equipment and heavy machinery. Moscow is now supplying arms, planes, and technical equipment to Indonesia for it to attack Malaysia: to Cuba in order to foster Communist upheavals; and revolts in Venezuela and elsewhere in Latin America; and to Communist guerrillas in Laos.

While the West, in the meantime, is shoring up the Soviet Union, Khrushchev is continually selling his coexistence policy to his suppliers. So it goes, and his territorial expansion plans continue on and on.

Today, the average man feels that the only method that can be used in stopping this plodding Frankenstein, which the West has helped to build, is war. He fears it, doesn't want it. The average man knows that the Soviet Union has to be stopped before it engulfs him. The fear of a nuclear attack has also paralyzed him, a job of the Red parrots well done.

However, today a solution to dismembering this Frankenstein and putting him down to his size can be accomplished without the use of nuclear weapons and without bloodshed. The secret weapon that the West has, exists in the U.N. Charter, which reads:

The purposes of the United Nations are (art. 1, sec. 2): "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

Accordingly, all captive nations should be granted the right to hold elections under U.N. supervision, to determine whether they wish to be further enslaved by their ruthless, totalitarian, despotic dictator or again establish their free independent nations, and finally breathe their long-awaited fresh air of freedom from the stench of captivity in a subjugated nation or a Siberian concentration camp. Ninety-nine percent will choose freedom.

Finally, fellow Americans, here we have a secret weapon on our doorstep, with which to peacefully disintegrate the Red Russian colonial empire, why don't we use it now?

Later could be too late.

President Johnson Honors Small Businessman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1964, I was privileged to attend a meeting at the White House, at which time President Johnson presented the award to the small businessman of the year, Mr. Berkley W. Bedell, of Spirit Lake, Iowa.

In making the presentation the President paid tribute to all small businessmen of the Nation and pointed out the strong role which they play in our national economy. He also announced the beginning of a liberalized nationwide lending program by the Small Business Administration geared to the needs of very small businesses.

It is felt that my colleagues will be interested in the President's statement in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the President's remarks at the presentation of the award to the small businessman of the year, follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE AWARD TO THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR, BERKLEY W. BEDELL, OF SPIRIT LAKE, IOWA, IN FLOWER GARDEN, THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. Foley, Miss McKee, and ladies and gentlemen, there is a proverb which says, "Seest thou a man diligent in his business; he shall stand before kings. He shall not stand before mean men."

We don't have a king handy, but I hope that you men who have been so diligent in your business will appreciate a president instead and allow that kind of a substitute.

I appreciate your coming here to the White House this morning. I especially appreciate the service you render as members of the National Advisory Council for Small Business. The Greek philosopher who said that giving advice is the easiest thing in the world, lived a long time before businessmen had to fill out so many forms and reports. He might not say that if he were living today.

We are trying to do something about all of these reports and all of these forms and also about the excessive publications and pamphlets that businessmen get in the mail. I became interested in this when a small business man told a member of my staff that he was being flooded by pamphlets advising him how to step up egg production in the Rio Grande Valley. He manufactures plumbing fixtures in the Midwest.

My campaign is already paying off. We have eliminated 141 publications at savings in excess of $1 million a year. We have reduced by 98 the number of questionnaires and other reports which private citizens had been expected to fill out and return to their Government.

We may have come a long way since Samuel Adams said, "This is a nation of shopkeepers," but small businesses still provide one-third of the Nation's goods and services. This administration has those small businessmen very much in mind every day. Since 1960, we have increased the number of individual business loans by 4,000—from 13,000 to 17,000. The dollar amount of those loans has increased from $636 to $942 million.

Our efforts to insure that small firms receive a fair share of the Government purchasing dollar have almost doubled the amount from $2.5 billion to more than $4.7 billion in 3 years. We have more than tripled loans to State and local development companies which are set up by public spirited citizens to bring new economic life to their community.

Today I am pleased to announce that we are beginning a liberalized nationwide lending program geared to the needs of very small businesses. This program will be known as SBA's small loan program, and will make it easier for businessmen to obtain loans of up to $15,000 for a maximum of 6 years.

I am also extremely happy to welcome here this morning the winner of the First Small Businessman of the Year Award, Mr. Berkley W. Bedell—one of those rare men whose pleasure is their business, and whose business is their pleasure.

Mr. Bedell represents millions of American businessmen who are in the words of the scripture, "not slothful in business but fervant in spirit." Your imagination and your industry are typical of the qualities that built America, and will keep it growing stronger.

I know the people back home in Spirit Lake, Iowa, and your Senators and your Congressmen, are proud of you, Mr. Bedell. I take a great deal of pleasure on behalf of the people of the Nation to present this award to you formally today.

School Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the split in thinking

within and between religions over the necessity of amending the Bill of Rights to allegedly bring our prayers back to school, I would like to present to the House the testimony of Father William Kenealy, professor of law at Boston College Law School.

With Catholics fighting Catholics and Methodists fighting Methodists, an extremely poor base is contemplated by the Becker amendment for the further propagation of all faiths.

The Lutherans correctly pointed up last year that what is this homage that we give to God on a nonsectarian, nondominational, noncompulsory, inconsequential and collateral basis in the public schools?

Let us bring our prayers back to church where they belong and where they have been in my home State for over 62 years and before.

The testimony of Father Kenealy follows:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM J. KENEALY, S.J.

Gentlemen, previously testimony at this hearing, as reported in the press, prompts me to preface my remarks by stating that I am neither an atheist, nor an agnostic, nor a secularist, nor a Communist. I am a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, a member of the Jesuit Order, a lawyer and professor in the Boston College Law School. However, I do not speak for the Catholic Church, or for the Society of Jesus, or for Boston College. I speak for myself alone. With the exception of 3 years in the U.S. Navy in World War II, I have been continually and closely involved in education, as a student or as a teacher, for 54 years; and for the past 25 years I have taught various law courses, with a particular interest in constitutional law, especially in the field of civil rights.

From this background, I believe that it would be a grave mistake to change the Constitution by an amendment authorizing, in the public schools of the country, those prayers or bible readings which were outlawed by the Supreme Court in *Engel* v. *Vitale* and *Abington School District* v. *Schempp*. I do not subscribe, by any means, to all that was said in the opinions expressed in Engel and in Schempp, but I do agree with the results. I do not subscribe to what seems to me the Court's uncritical invocation of the "wall of separation" metaphor, nor to its simplistic interpretation of the "establishment of religion" clause of the 1st amendment, nor to its mechanistic incorporation of that clause into the "due process" clause of the 14th amendment. But I do believe that the prayers and bible readings condemned by Engel and Schempp were violative of the fundamental constitutional and personal right of the "free exercise" of religion, expressly protected against Federal action by the 1st amendment, and properly protected against State action by the "due process" clause of the 14th amendment.

Wherefore, prescinding from the disputes about the "establishment" clause which have divided constitutional scholars since 1947, I oppose any constitutional amendment which would nullify the results of Engel and Schempp precisely because any such amendment would seriously abridge the constitutional "free exercise" of religion, which is beyond all dispute a fundamental personal right implicit in the concept of ordered liberty and essential to our pluralistic and democratic society.

For we are a pluralistic society whose members adhere to many religions and to none. We are a democratic society whose members, regardless of religious faith or lack thereof, stand equal before the law. Therefore the constitutional free exercise of religion means, not merely freedom of religion, but also freedom from religion as far as State coercion or pressure is concerned. Suppose a State should enact a statute requiring all persons within its jurisdiction to join some church of the person's choice—any church, Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, Buddhist, or any other—but some church. This would be freedom of religion in a restricted and Pickwickian sense, but it would obviously not be the constitutional free exercise of religion, precisely because it would not be freedom from religion as far as State coercion or pressure is concerned.

So too, and for exactly the same reason, a State enactment which would require the profession of any religious belief, the performance of any religious ritual, the recitation of any religious prayer, the devotional reading of (or listen to) any religious scripture, would obviously violate the constitutional free exercise of religion. But the free exercise of religion is a fundamental personal right of each and every individual, independent of political controversies, subject to no primaries or elections, above popular passions and majority votes, beyond the power of State officials and local school boards, guaranteed by our Constitution and entrusted by it to the protection of our courts. I would not abridge it. I would keep it intact, for the sake of ordered liberty, civic equality, and personal dignity, in our pluralistic and democratic society.

The free exercise of religion is such a fundamental personal right that, long before the Supreme Court of the United States had occasion in 1940 to hold it applicable to the States via the due process clause of the 14th amendment, the supreme courts of half a dozen States found compulsory religious exercises in the public schools in violation of their respective State constitutions: Wisconsin in 1890, Illinois in 1910, Louisiana in 1915, Washington in 1918, South Dakota in 1929, and Washington in 1930. Compulsion is incompatible with freedom.

It has been argued, however, that the proposed constitutional amendments provide, not for compulsory, but for voluntary prayers and Bible readings; that dissenting pupils may be excused from such religious exercises; and therefore that religious freedom is neither denied nor abridged. But the free exercise of religion is not a sterile legal concept or an academic abstraction. It is a practical freedom in the real context of a child's life in the actual circumstances of the elementary and secondary school. The fact that some pupils, or theoretically all pupils, may be excused from the officially scheduled religious exercises does not obscure the obligatory nature of the ceremony, nor does it mitigate the serious practical pressure upon the dissenting child to conform to the official orthodoxy.

Seventy-four years ago the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, in *Weiss* v. *District Board*, 76 Wis. 177 (1890), put the practicalities of school life this way:

"When * * * a small minority of the pupils in the public school is excluded for any cause from a stated school exercise, particularly when such a cause is apparent hostility to the Bible which a majority of the other pupils have been taught to revere, from that moment the excluded pupil loses caste with his fellows, and is liable to be regarded with aversion and subjected to reproach and insult."

Fifty-four years ago the Supreme Court of Illinois, in *Ring* v. *Board of Education*, 245 Ill. 334 (1910), explained the same realities as follows:

"The exclusion of a pupil from this part of the school exercises in which the rest of the school joins, separates him from his fellows, puts him in a class by himself, deprives him of his equality with the other pupils, subjects him to a religious stigma, and places him at a disadvantage in the school, which the law never contemplated. All this because of his religious belief."

Forty-nine years ago the Supreme Court of Louisiana, in *Herold* v. *Board of School Directors*, 136 La. 1034 (1915), described the facts in these words:

"Excusing such children on religious grounds, although the number might be very small, would be a distinct preference in favor of the religious beliefs of the majority, and would work a discrimination against those who were excused. The exclusion of a pupil under such circumstances puts him in a class by himself; it subjects him to a religious stigma; and all because of his religious belief."

And 11 years ago the Supreme Court of New Jersey, in *Tudor* v. *Board of Education*, 14 N.J. 31 (1953), concluded that children of minority groups, who decline to join in the religious activities of the school, will be subjected to disadvantages and pressures to conform, and that a supposition to the contrary "ignores the realities of life." In the Tudor case the New Jersey court had the benefit of extensive testimony by behavioral scientists concerning the effect of such practices upon the attitudes and behaviors of school children. It would seem that, as with the testimony of psychologists concerning the harmful effects of racial segregation in the school segregation cases of 1954, the formalized data of the social scientists simply strengthened the findings of informal experience and corroborated the conclusions of common sense.

Moreover, I think it important to note that the genuine religious freedom of both child and parent is involved. The primary right of education is parental. The Supreme Court of the United States in the Oregon school case of 1925 decided unanimously that "due process" includes the fundamental constitutional right of parents, subject to reasonable State standards and regulations, to choose the education of their children, whether it shall be private or public, religious or nonreligious. Freedom of educational philosophy, freedom of religion, and freedom from religion as far as State coercion or pressure is concerned, are constituent elements of this fundamental parental right.

The State may compel a child to attend an accredited school of the parent's free choice; but the State may not deny or unreasonably restrict the freedom of that parental choice. Similarly, if the parent, for financial or other reasons, has no actual choice but to send his child to a public school, the State violates his primary parental right by coercing or pressuring his child into religious exercises against his parental will. It is wrong in principle, wrong against both parent and child, to force the child into the cruel dilemma of going along with the crowd in the classroom or of obeying his parent and suffering the consequences at the hands of his unthinking classmates. I would respect and protect the religious freedom of both parent and child.

But what of the spiritual heritage and religious character of America? The Supreme Court itself has said, in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." Some of our religious presuppositions are set out in the Declaration of Independence, which expressly referred to God, to the Creator, to the Supreme Judge of the world, and expressly committed our young nation to His Divine Providence. Despite the cynics and the secularists, and the moral evils existing among us, we are in fact a predominantly religious people in our origins and in our traditions.

Nevertheless, the logic of our political principles and constitutional law forces us to attribute this spiritual heritage and religious character to the American people, the American community, the American society as such, and not to the American constitution, the American government, the American state as such. The state derives its

limited authority from society; within that limited authority, the state governs society; but the state is not society. One of the matters subtracted from state competence is religion. Although our society is religious, our state is not. Neither is it secularistic or irreligious. It is religiously neutral. It has been deliberately constituted religiously neutral, by a religious society, precisely because religious neutrality is the essential condition of religious freedom in a pluralistic society. As a result, while the state can and must protect its constitutional existence and structure, it cannot coercively protect its own religious presuppositions without violating its constitutional obligation to guarantee complete religious and ideological freedom.

The preservation and tradition of the religious heritage of America, therefore, must depend chiefly upon the nongovernmental institutions and activities of American society: upon the church, the home, the religious school, the groups and associations which carry on study, discussion, teaching, writing, and publishing on matters philosophical and theological. But the public school, as an official agent of the religiously neutral state, cannot, without betraying the religious neutrality of its principal, provide religious devotions or exercises of its pupils.

What then of the religious parent who wishes to send his child to a school with a religious atmosphere, in which religious exercises are allowed, in which religious instruction is available along with other subjects of desirable human education? Can he too enjoy the free exercise of religion as part of his parental right to choose the education of his child? He can send his child to a religious school, if he is financially able to do so—or is succored by private charity. The plight of the parent who pays his taxes, and would like to send his child to a religious school, but cannot afford to do so, is not made easier by the statement in *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania* that "Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion are available to all, not merely to those who are able to pay." We have not yet devised or enacted a means to provide practical freedom of parental choice of religious education for children. The principle of the GI bill of rights seems available within constitutional limitations, but that is another and longer topic.

In the meantime, although I favor the most complete religious liberty for all parents and schoolchildren, believing or unbelieving, I think it would be most unfortunate to abridge the present religious liberty of any by the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendments concerning prayers and Bible readings in the public schools. With patience and civil dialog, we may someday realize genuine and practical religious freedom and equality for all parents and for all schoolchildren.

Can a Company Afford To Fight an Antitrust Suit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 of this year Mr. Daniel Peterkin, Jr., president of the Morton Salt Co., delivered an address before the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "Can a Company Afford To Fight an Antitrust Suit?"

The Morton Salt Co. has a large operation in the 11th Congressional District of California and I was very much interested in reading his address and to me it offers a very intelligent program of cooperation between Government and business to obviate the expense and trouble of antitrust suits.

Mr. Peterkin's speech follows:

"CAN A COMPANY AFFORD TO FIGHT AN ANTITRUST SUIT?"—A TALK BY DANIEL PETERKIN, JR., PRESIDENT, MORTON SALT CO., CHICAGO, ILL., BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA, MAY 22, 1964

The title of my talk to you today presents a difficult question not only for members of the Commonwealth Club of California, but for the entire business community. Finding the answer has imposed on me the obligation of a good deal of thought for I am a veteran, I might say, of antitrust suits. Since the question has a negative implication, I am inclined to seek a positive and constructive answer based on my company's courtroom experience and conclusions.

The answer must be given in two parts, and the first part is a blunt, "No." A company cannot afford to fight an antitrust suit. Fighting any kind of a suit is expensive. It is much more than saying to your legal counsel, "Look, Bill, the Government has jumped us. Take care of it, will you?"

If you have been through this kind of fight, and I daresay quite a few of you have, then you know what it means. Sooner or later it involves not only your legal staff but your entire executive personnel—practically everyone in the end except the janitor and the office boy and even they go around with a worried look. It involves endless travel, correspondence, phone calls, and precious hours, days, months, and sometimes years, which cannot well be spared from the normal conduct of anyone's business.

That's why I say, "No, a company cannot afford to fight an antitrust suit."

But I immediately have to qualify that answer with the opposite, equally blunt. A company cannot afford not to fight an antitrust suit. You simply cannot let the charges stand by default. You know you are not a criminal and you know you are innocent of any criminal intent no matter what the newspaper headlines and Government lawyers may imply. Hence, by every dictate of your personal and corporate conscience, your duty is clear. You must defend yourself. Your first and chief concern, of course, is to protect the good name of your company. But your obligation goes even further; conceivably it entails not only the protection of your own company but the protection of the industry of which your company is part, and even, in some instances, the protection of American business as a whole.

I have given you two blunt negative answers; a company cannot afford to fight an antitrust suit, and it cannot afford not to.

Two negatives make a positive, and two minuses make a plus, as we learned in those innocent years in algebra class before we grappled with the insoluble equations of antitrust jurisprudence.

COOPERATION NECESSARY

The positive or plus factor in this case—and business must find it—is some means to eliminate the need to fight an antitrust suit. Such suits should be completely unnecessary, and with mutual understanding and cooperation between Government and business people they need not arise.

This is not an impossible task. And, it is essential for the economic welfare and progress of our country.

President Johnson has indicated in recent speeches his readiness to cooperate with business. Business, I am sure, is equally ready to let the old wounds heal and try once more to clear up the old misunderstandings. It will take more, however, than good will on the part of President Johnson and business leaders to dig out the root of the problem.

I have given this matter a good deal of thought and it seems to me our troubles stem from a belief, rather a kind of religious zeal by many career officials in Washington that they are pursuing some Holy Grail and that business is the dragon they have to slay. The economic ignorance that abounds in our land allows this fantasy to go unchallenged. But there are some solutions for this.

Some of you may wonder what are my credentials to talk so freely on antitrust matters and economics. Let me start by saying that salt is a very tough highly competitive business. I have been in it all my life, as was my father before me. Salt has an ancient and fascinating history. It was the first article of commerce. All civilization depended on it, and still does. Wars were fought over it and it brought wealth and power to the nations that controlled it.

Today, although it has thousands of industrial uses—it's in your fountain pen, your suit of clothes, even your wife's lipstick—it is a low-cost product with a profit in pennies. The basic economic laws, the law of supply and demand, of the marketplace, have been functioning for a long, long time in the salt business. The bones of companies that couldn't meet the competition stretch all the way back to colonial times.

SALT, TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

Of course, anyone can make salt. You can scoop up a pan of sea water from the bay and let it evaporate in the sun in your back yard. You'll have solar salt, after a fashion. But it takes a high order of technology and a heavy investment in plant and equipment to make salt of top purity for a few cents a pound, blasting it out of mines, pumping it from deep brine wells, drying it from sea water, and shipping it to market by the ounce and by the ton. Sometimes I think I am in six or seven different businesses, not just one.

I cite these facts of life of my business merely to show that between the range of production, storage, shipping and marketing problems of our principal product and fighting the competition in the some three dozen industries we serve, I have had to learn a bit about economics. I've learned not how the economy works in theory, but how it works in actuality. And, you'll agree, there's a difference. I'd like to see some of that knowledge and the knowledge of this group, which was attained the same way, in the marketplace, at least given equal credence with the theories of professional men who never set foot in that arena.

As to the antitrust laws which enmesh us so tightly, they now constitute a body of doctrine containing so much conflict, contradiction and confusion that it is virtually impossible for a businessman to conduct his business without violating one or more statutes every day.

My company defended itself in a criminal antitrust suit that concerned our pricing of rock salt for highway use. We fought that suit for 12 months, but I will not bore you with the details. It is perhaps enough to say we were successful and we were acquitted. Subsequently, we have had to defend ourselves in a civil suit, the outcome of which is pending, brought by the government on exactly the same evidence.

ANTITRUST MISUNDERSTANDINGS

No less an idustrialist than Benjamin Fairless, former president of United States Steel, recognized years ago the impossibility of trying to run a business profitably and with strict legality under the crazy quilt of antitrust doctrine. Mr. Fairless said, "We have on our Federal statute books a complete hodgepodge of so-called 'antitrust' laws which have been allowed to grow for 60

years and which cannot be reconciled with each other."

The situation is worse today and many businessmen are guilty in the eyes of Washington's antitrust prosecutors of criminal conduct even before they are tried. Unfortunately, they are often guilty in the eyes of a substantial segment of the public which too often assumes, without knowing the facts, that a Government antitrust indictment is tantamount to proof of wrongdoing. A large part of the public also assumes, erroneously, that a "no contest" plea is an admission of guilt.

That is why business as a whole needs the protection of each of its individual members. That is why every successful defense of an antitrust suit imparts a little more of the glow of health and integrity to the countenance of business as a whole.

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Some students of the antitrust laws advocate their wholesale repeal. Most thoughtful businessmen would regard this as a long step backward into a primitive economy that no longer exists. Such a proposal is thoroughly impractical; moreover, it is undesirable. These laws were passed for the protection of the people, and the people includes us. The government's role is to make sure the laws protect all the people from economic harm.

Since the laws are a hodge-podge and repeal should not even be considered, what is left? The best solution, I think, is for business to arrive at some prior understanding with the Government, before trouble begins, on how business is supposed to interpret the laws. Many of these matters that reach court are completely legal technicalities.

How do we achieve this understanding? Well, the mechanics of setting up a meeting, or a seminar, if you will, are simple. On the initiative of business, representatives of industry may meet with representatives of the Federal Trade Commission, members of appropriate congressional committees, Justice Department attorneys, and with anyone else in Washington—including the Attorney General or the President if the subject is of sufficient importance—to dissipate the miasma of misunderstanding which enshrouds the entire body of antitrust legislation.

We need to know whether the sort of competitive practices we deem fair and practical, and which arise naturally in the market place, will be construed as illegal and actionable under the Sherman Act or the Robinson-Patman Act, or possibly both.

We need to know whether a price structure which we know to be honest and equitable not only to ourselves but to our customers will be held discriminatory under the Federal Trade Act.

We need to know that our Government is working on behalf of the whole nation including us, giving business as well as everyone else a fair treatment.

Business has a great deal to gain if we can sit down with Government people and try to find out what practices Government men interpret as contrary to the public interest. To prevent a suit, business must know just where it stands with Government. I am sure we can tell Government where we stand. If Government can do the same for us, we will know how to conduct our business in the future to keep off the legal rocks and shoals. If Government lawyers cannot do that—if they are unable to define the lines between legal and illegal conduct as that conduct relates to the antitrust statutes, then they are persecuting not prosecuting business.

I have a further suggestion. I think a graduate school of business practices should be set up with "exchange students" from Government and business. We could take turns being teacher and pupil. For we have mainly constructive policies of proved success and public benefits to expound. We could learn, on the other hand, at least what appear to be, in the eyes of Government people, the long-range consequences of some present economic practices.

The key thing is exposure to each other's ideas. We meet here smarting from the scars of our economic wars and ready to battle again if need be. The Government people meet in their groups and perhaps pat each other on the back for successful encounters with the business dragon. We need to communicate with each other and fix our eyes on our common goals.

Our economy is vast, its complexities are staggering. It is no wonder, perhaps, that how it works and why it works is so poorly comprehended by most of the public. Nevertheless, I was shocked the other day to read that a survey of college seniors showed that two-thirds of the women felt that the Government should control production and prices.

Just think, these young women have probably had all the instruction on economics that they will get in their lifetime. They will go on to careers and families without the slightest understanding of how quickly this Nation would stagnate and its prosperity crumble under such a system. They have no concept of how many of the benefits I'm sure they cherish have been created and are sustained by our free economy, by business.

Something is very wrong when the sources of a standard of living that is the envy of the world is misunderstood so badly. The Government is waging an antipoverty war. What is the great need? Jobs, a million more jobs, at least. But Government cannot create jobs any more than it can create wealth.

The source of jobs is an employer—a businessman. Businessmen using the profits from their enterprises risk that money to expand, to grow, to progress, and in so doing they add to the Nation's jobs and the Nation's wealth.

I don't see how there can be any question of this simple fact. Yet we must realize that among millions of persons, and as I said before, some of the career officials in Washington, there is a tendency to regard businessmen as potential conspirators engaged only in unsavory pursuits.

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING A MUST

The American businessman has contributed hugely to his country's greatness, and his products and management talents have helped win his country's wars. For these reasons, and for reasons of ordinary decency and justice, I am disturbed at the reputation currently assigned to the businessman, particularly to those of the largest responsibilities, that he is, ipso facto, a public enemy if not a criminal. I am getting particularly annoyed at the assumption that the outstandingly successful businessman could have achieved his success only through unfair competition, monopolistic practices, price fixing and all the other alleged sins that are inevitably related by ignorant or jealous people to business success.

This warped opinion of the business world and the responsible companies that are its core is surprising. Some of your forefathers came West to help build this magnificent city of San Francisco. They led wagons built by honest businessmen. They carried rifles and axes forged by factories of integrity. I like to think, in fact I am sure, that some of those pioneers carried good salt from our warehouse set up in Chicago nearly 125 years ago, for there was no salt to be had on the long trek across the plains.

Today, of course, San Francisco is one of the principal solar salt producing areas in the United States. Our company has a plant near here at Newark from which we conduct our campaign to capture all the salt business of the west coast.

I would like to say in closing that we all need now and then to remind ourselves of the national welfare and the obligation on all of us to advance it. We are not a set of warring tribes, but one Nation. As Saint Paul told the bickering Christians of 2,000 years ago, the eye is no good without the hand, the head no good without the feet, all parts are needed for the body.

Government servants are as human as we, and capable of constructive thinking. It is constructive and in the spirit of free enterprise in a free society to seek to restore the cooperation between Government and business.

Business is ready to try, I'm sure. President Johnson has indicated he would like to see more understanding and cooperation. Now how about the people who run the bureaus and regulatory agencies in Washington? I hope they will join in a common effort which would benefit everyone.

No Braceros, No Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a recent newsletter published by the firm of Mendelson-Zeller Co., Inc., growers and shippers in California, should be of interest to all persons either for or against Public Law 78, which will expire December 31 of this year. We will undoubtedly be reading many such articles in the future, so I commend this one to my colleagues as an indication of grower concern in the State of California:

NO BRACEROS, NO NOTHIN'

As you know, the Mexican bracero program will expire December 31. Tired with being a political football, disgusted with do-gooders who at the very best are stupidly ignorant of the true situation, fed up with crackpot speeches by people from nonfarming States, California agriculture finally gave up the ghost and told the State and Federal labor officials that it would not ask for a renewal of the bracero program but would try to live with any sort of plan the Government people would work out. Agriculture has promised, offered, and is willing to help in any system which would furnish reliable labor for our crops.

Since then, the air has been filled with suggestions, recommendations, and some of the damndest ideas ever seen by the eyes of farmers and growers. Someone has suddenly learned that the so-called pool of unemployed labor available to agriculture after deducting women, teenagers, children, sick people, half drunks, full drunks, quarter drunks, social security collectors, and just-too-tired-to-work people might possibly add up to one-tenth of 1 percent. Of the tenth of 1 percent maybe half of one-twentieth of 1 percent get their fill of cantaloupe picking, lettuce cutting, and berry picking within 18 minutes after starting to work in the dust and hot sun.

Just to mention something with which we are closely connected, there are today in Orange County probably 5,000 strawberry pickers. Outside of the braceros and "green card" Mexican workers probably less than 5 percent is domestic labor. You realize that before a grower can hire braceros he must have exhausted all possible sources for domestic labor. At one time earlier in the season, when our people sent out a call to Government agencies, we got some 50 or 60 peo-

ple who stayed not less than a half-hour in the fields. At this very moment one of our largest growers, whose Mexican braceros are a little late in arriving, couldn't today hire a single domestic worker.

Next year, without braceros, how many acres of berries would you like to plant at a cost of around $2,000 per acre? When they start yelling for laborers in the San Joaquin Valley for cantaloup picking in 105° to 110° weather next year, have you any names you can suggest who would be willing to do this delightful work?

It must be admitted some of the suggested plans are exciting. For instance, someone claims we could bring in unemployed West Virginia coal miners but they have neglected to ask the coal miners about it. Mining coal and picking strawberries on the surface seem slightly incompatible. And I wonder who would house them between after seasons. Maybe they could be used in precision work in the aircraft factories? Of course, the Government could pirate Texas labor, Idaho potato and fruit workers, Washington apple pickers, but wasn't one Civil War enough?

Civic groups are busy developing housing listings for migrant workers. Rents of wrath? Los Angeles County farm labor officials say 300 out-of-school youths could be used immediately in strawberry picking. Another great suggestion is the hauling of teenagers from county to county on a commute deal (complete with Beatles?). Last year in that area the department was able to recruit only 150 youths for farmwork in Los Angeles County and absolutely none for neighboring county fields. That really shouldn't bother anyone. Last year California employed a peak of 62,670 braceros.

Actually, I'm not too frightened, I am absolutely and completely scared stiff at this collision course on which California agriculture is pointed. The nicest thing you can say about the mess that will result starting January 1, 1965, is—chaotic.

A Call for Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has forwarded to me an editorial clipped from a California community newspaper.

This editorial forthrightly expresses an opinion on U.S. policy in connection with Vietnam. This opinion may not agree with the views of the administration. Obviously it does not. Nor is this blunt outburst by a redblooded American editor in harmony, necessarily, with the views of our State Department and the President. Obviously it is not.

Furthermore, it clashes completely with the so-called theory of realism and reappraisal as to world communism recently advanced by the chairman of an appropriate committee of the other body.

But, Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up with what is going on in southeast Asia. Americans are disgusted with the halfhearted, halfway conduct of our affairs in South Vietnam.

I applaud and support, as I know the citizens of this country support, the position of John Edwards the writer of this editorial. It is about time, indeed, that America started fighting.

Listen to what Mr. Edwards says:

IT'S ABOUT TIME WE START FIGHTING

The U.S.S. *Card* has been sunk by Vietcong Reds.

Alright. How about it? What now Washington?

What in the name of God are you going to do now? We are not at war in Vietnam? This is just a military containing maneuver? The Vietcong are only misguided orientals? Time will show them the error of their ways? Good old status quo? Sit on our fat dumb duffs and let anyone anyplace shoot, loot, capture, torture, maim, and kill with impunity? Is that the answer?

Where does it end? When does it end? When in the name of all that's good and holy are we going to belt them back? I don't mean a nice soft, lilly fingered, limp wristed letter.

I mean a great big fat American belt in the mouth. A backhanded Irisher slap in the chops.

I mean war, red war, all out, no holds barred, bloody bombing of Vietcong forces and any other that in any way, shape, form, or fashion threatens with words or deeds the integrity of these United States.

I know that somewhere in this American public there are some sort of guts. I've seen it before and I know that it still lives, and I want to know when we're going to show some of them.

Oh, I know that the meek inherit the earth. What I want to see is some of their meek inherit their earth. Six feet of it.

I'm sick and tired of understanding our enemy brothers. I think it's just about time that they started to understand me.

Now I don't know about you, Mr. President. I know about me. I know that I have had it. That I am filled right up to here with diplomacy, and gentle understanding, and love one another and all the bully ragging hokum I can stand.

I fought twice, Mr. President. My father fought once, my grandfather fought in the Philippines, and I have two greats that fought in the Civil War, and we go clear back to the American Revolution in my family.

Now then. By God it's about time that we remembered that you can get peace only when you stomp on a bully and let him have blood.

Let them want peace for a change.—JOHN EDWARDS.

Give Them Good Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American public senses that all is not well in Vietnam despite the numerous trips of Secretary of Defense McNamara to that country and repeated conferences and declarations as to how the problems are being overcome.

The Chicago Daily News of Monday, June 1, effectively offered a practical suggestion to the administration as to what could be done to help in Vietnam. I insert the article into the RECORD at this point:

GIVE THEM GOOD WEAPONS

South Vietnam, as a place to live and fight, is no bargain at best. It has a murky climate, and the jungles and disposition of the people provide exasperating hazards to the American military man.

Over and above all this, it now appears that the United States has been providing some gratuitous homemade hazards for its fighting men by sending ancient and rickety helicopters for service in the combat zone.

Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes said on Thursday that eight Americans have been killed in South Vietnam because of structural failures of the old "flying banana" type of helicopters, and that these old aircraft are now being taken out of service.

Why were they in service? Particularly, why were they in service in an area where casualty risks are already great?

Ailes says that the structural failures that killed the American airmen "had no similarity and were not specifically due to age or length of service." This strains credulity; surely new craft incorporating latest concepts of design and dependability are likely to be safer than old craft. Otherwise, why are the old ones being replaced?

Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, and others are demanding a congressional investigation of all aerial equipment in South Vietnam to discover whether casualties are resulting from obsolete planes of any type. Defense Secretary McNamara says the suspicion is "absolutely without foundation."

Some foundation surely exists in the record of the eight dead American fighting men. We hope Congress will satisfy itself as to whether there are any more.

A Memorial Day Letter by Senator Norris Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Senator NORRIS COTTON, a Member of the other body and former Member and colleague of ours in the House, wrote what I think is one of the finest Memorial Day letters to his constituents I have had the pleasure to read and in order that it may have wider circulation, under unanimous consent I insert his letter of May 28, 1964, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NORRIS COTTON REPORTS TO YOU FROM THE U.S. SENATE

This Memorial Day marks the centennial of the Civil War's bloodiest year. As the Senate pauses to observe it, I invite you to go with me from the clamor of Congress, across the historic Potomac, to that city of silence—Arlington National Cemetery. There, engraved in granite, is the history of our country.

For Arlington, too, this month is a centennial. On May 13, 1864, as Grant was launching the wilderness campaign, the first soldier was buried there—Pvt. William Christman, 67th Pennsylvania Infantry. From that day to the burial of our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, 125,000 have there been laid to rest.

Despite the grandeur of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier or the presence of Pershing and Marshall and Wainwright, and the honored dead of all our wars, Arlington, like Memorial Day, will always speak to us of the Civil War. And so it should. More Americans died in the 4 years of that conflict than

in all our other wars from colonial times through Korea. Almost in sight of the tomb of the three unknowns, rarely noticed by the passerby, is a massive monument darkened by the years. Beneath it in three huge vaults are 2,111 bodies gathered from the shallow graves at Bull Run and along the Rappahannock. These are but a fraction of the unknown dead of the Civil War.

There is much to stir the imagination of the thoughtful visitor. The common grave of 14 unknowns of the War of 1812, found in the cellars of Fort Washington, killed when the British burned the city and fort. The obelisk of Gen. Joe Wheeler, Confederate cavalry commander, later Congressman, and finally, a general in the Spanish-American War. The grave of John Clem, legendary "Johnny Shiloh," 14-year-old drummer boy who lived to be a major general. Abner Doubleday, gunner at Fort Sumter, corps commander at Gettysburg, inventor of American baseball. The mast from the battleship *Maine*, the base of which is a receiving vault where are held the remains of Jan Paderewski, Polish pianist and statesman, to be taken home when Poland is free. The pointed-topped markers over the Confederate dead, thus designed, it was said, "so no damyankee could ever sit on their graves."

Passion and hate played their part in the founding of Arlington. General Meigs, bitter at his old comrade Robert E. Lee, seized the Lee Mansion for a cemetery and quickly buried 26 bodies in Mrs. Lee's rose garden so the family would never return. As always, hate defeated its own purpose, for the stately mansion remains as the crown of our national shrine, and Robert E. Lee could have no finer memorial.

Indeed, the most eloquent inscription in the cemetery is found on the monument to the Confederate dead, written by a southern chaplain:

"Not for fame or reward, not for place or for rank, not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, but in simple obedience to duty as they understood it, these men suffered all, sacrificed all, dared all, and died."

The storm of the years has softened the sorrow for most who sleep at Arlington. Sad to the visitor, however, are the marching escorts, the muted bands, the farewell taps of the constant funerals, many of them for young Americans who have perished in the air or on land and sea in our worldwide Military Establishment—or under fire in far-off Vietnam.

Sad, too, is the knowledge that combat pay is already being drawn by over 3,000 in Vietnam and that the total of our killed and missing has reached 239, with 877 wounded.

I cannot here debate the justification. I will say that if a long-drawn-out war must be fought in the rice fields of Asia, it should be by the combined power of the United Nations or the SEATO Alliance. Why should our country alone man the bastions of freedom in every corner of the world?

The tragedy is that on this Memorial Day, as we honor our soldier dead, we are sadly conscious that war is not only still with us but looming larger each passing day.

Yours sincerely,

NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator.

Justice's Guardian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, deterioration of the conduct of foreign affairs is dramatically seen in the manner in which our State Department bureaucrats help dictatorships such as the one in Ghana.

The Wall Street Journal of Thursday, May 21, presents us with a very pointed, concise editorial insight into this subject, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

JUSTICE'S GUARDIAN

Dictator Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, who among other things is one of the legion of recipients of U.S. aid, obviously has a high regard for justice. Especially within his own borders.

Indeed, no miscarriage of justice is too small to escape his notice. When two fight judges were so unfair as to hold, in Accra the other day, that a local lad had not won the world's featherweight championship, one of Nkrumah's agencies stepped in, voided the decision, and ruled that the hometown boy was the new titleholder.

On a larger scale, a few motnhs ago a special court headed by Ghana's Chief Justice was unjust enough to acquit three citizens of treason. Nkrumah took care of that by voiding the decision and firing the Chief Justice. Ghana's jails, of course, are full of political opponents, while others have been able to flee.

All in all, it's about par for a police state. What is a little odd, though, is that the United States continues to be so solicitous of such champions of justice.

King Cotton Had Better Mend His Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, many Members of the House had strong misgivings over the cotton-wheat bill recently signed into law.

Many Members felt it made little sense to compound the misery of the cotton industry by giving a subsidy to textile producers. It now appears clear that those fears will be borne out.

With this thought in mind and with unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I introduce the following editorial taken from Barron's magazine of May 18, 1964:

KING COTTON HAD BETTER MEND HIS WAYS

The general information bulletin of the National Council of American Importers, Inc., as its most ardent admirers would doubtless concede, is not light reading. However, the latest issue must have called forth from council members at least a wry grin. The front page dutifully notes that the President of the United States "has proclaimed the week beginning May 17 as World Trade Week. In this proclamation, the President asks all the people to hold meetings and other functions to emphasize the importance of international trade to the United States."

On page 2 the bulletin gets down to business with a deadpan report on the latest moves made by the Federal Government in blatant restraint of trade: "The Interagency Textile Administrative Committee has taken the following actions with respect to imports of cotton textiles and cotton textile products: (1) Has established new levels of restraint and revised existing levels in a number of categories under the bilateral agreement with Spain * * * (3) in the bilateral agreement with Taiwan, it established a subceiling of 1.8 million square yards for duck fabric under category 26 during the 12-month period beginning October 1, 1963, * * * (5) set a limit of 500,000 square yards in category 9 from Brazil during the 12-month period beginning October 28, 1963; (6) has renewed restraints from Korea in category 43 at 15,750 dozen and in category 50 at 20,000 dozen, during the 12-month period beginning April 2, 1964, * * * and (8) has concluded a bilateral agreement with India covering categories 9, 18, 19, 22, 26, and 31."

The contrast between words and deeds in Washington by now is an old story. In the case of cotton textiles, however, the plot contains several new twists. After years of tugging and hauling, Congress recently granted the industry, which has suffered under the burden of an overpriced raw material, a measure of relief. However, the proposal passed (by the slimmest of margins) less on its merits than as part of a sleazy legislative package deal. Furthermore, while labeled and sold as a means to lower price tags, the program—especially when tied to existing tariffs and import quotas—is far more likely to raise profit margins at the mill. Trade restraint and subsidy make a seductive blend, but they are scarcely the stuff of sound policy, public or private.

Policywise, King Cotton and his subjects have been in trouble for years. Their woes stem mainly from farm price supports, which have succeeded in keeping quotations for the natural fiber artificially high at the expense of demand, both at home and abroad. After the fashion of the camel in the tent, one Federal intrusion inevitably has led to another. Nearly a decade ago the Department of Agriculture, in an effort to expand shrinking sales, began to subsidize U.S. exports of cotton. The move, which gave a cost advantage to textile mills outside the country, quickly led domestic manufacturers to seek new Federal protection. Atop the steep tariff which they have always enjoyed, they persuaded Washington to impose a network of more-or-less rigid import quotas on textiles and textile products. Finally, last month Congress passed the so-called Cotton Equalization Act, which enables American mills, thanks to Federal bounty, to buy at the same price as their foreign competitors.

On its own the cotton bill might never have passed. However, it squeaked through in one of the most adroit displays of log-rolling on record. In order to rally the support of what used to be called the farm bloc, cotton and wheat were linked together in one piece of legislation. Its sponsors then bid for the votes of big-city liberals, who ordinarily would be cool to the scheme, by pledging to line up behind an expanded food stamp plan. Southern backing of a pay raise for Congressmen tied a ribbon on the package. Despite all the wheeling and dealing, however, the cotton-wheat measure passed the House by exactly eight votes. Moreover, its provisions run for only 2 years; next year the issue will come up for fresh debate.

The limited mandate suggests that plenty of lawmakers take a dim view of the whole idea. Well they might. Both prior to and since its passage, the measure has raised hob with the cotton market. The mere prospect of the subsidy—which amounts to 6½ cents per pound—for months caused buyers to hold off. Hesitation and confusion still prevail throughout the trade. For until the Secretary of Agriculture, as empowered by law, decides where the subsidy will finally go—whether to country dealers, merchants, or mills—nobody knows how much to pay for cotton for future delivery. As various rumors swept the marketplace last week, cotton futures fluctuated wildly. Amidst the general uncertainty, only one thing seems clear: Contrary to industry forecasts, precious little of the subsidy will trickle down to consumers. Since early April, when the

bill was signed, the cost of cotton has declined. Price cuts on piece goods, however, have conspicuously failed to appear.

Price cuts are rare these days in most lines. Few, however, enjoy the privileged market position which the President and Congress have lavished on cotton textiles. Thanks to the subsidy, the industry's cost of raw materials henceforth will match that of the rest of the world. In addition, the mills will continue to benefit from the longstanding, and proliferating, patchwork of protection. New England, of course, has always stood for high protective tariffs. Hence, according to one knowledgeable source, the U.S. duty on 16 standard cotton constructions today exceeds that of Canada by roughly 21 percent. Great Britain by 50 percent and West Germany by 125 percent. Overall, this country exacts nearly 27 percent on the value of imported cotton goods, one of the highest levies of the kind in the Western World. In the so-called Kennedy round of negotiations on lower tariffs, the industry is urging, with preliminary signs of success, that bargaining bypass its products.

As for the products of others, domestic mills in recent years have been highly successful in barring them from these shores. The Eisenhower administration negotiated the first "voluntary" import quotas with Japan. Since then, under the so-called long-term agreement regarding international trade in cotton textiles, the pattern has spread to every other exporting country. In this blanket of controls—some strands of which were cited above—Washington has smothered much of the competition for the American textile market. Thereby, to change the metaphor, it also has raised impassable barriers to the principal line of manufacturers which so-called developing nations (notably India, which has just resigned itself to a quota) can hope to sell over here. Trade, not aid, is a worthy precept. In cotton textiles, however, the United States has displayed scant moral fiber.

The same holds true of the cotton mills. To be sure, their privileged status may well yield a temporary windfall. However, it is likely to expose them to further inroads from synthetics, the prices of which continue to decline. It certainly will make the whole industry more vulnerable to political pressure, and, in consequence, less able to manage its own affairs. A century ago woolen mills and wool growers struck a similar bargain, with unfortunate results. While there is still time, King Cotton had better mend his ways.

Florida Federation of Women's Club Supports Bible Reading and Prayer in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that one of the most respected and responsible ladies organization in Florida, the Florida Federation of Woman's Club at their recent convention adopted the following resolution which supports the position of many of us in trying to restore the voluntary reading of the Bible and the offer of prayer in the public schools of this country.

I submit this resolution for the information of my colleagues:

Whereas on June 17, 1963, the Supreme Court of the United State, in an 8 to 1 ruling barred the reading of the Bible and recitation of prayer in public schools as part of classroom exercises; and

Whereas in so doing, the Supreme Court turned its back on the religious heritage of this Nation, for the right to practice freely one's religion was one of the principal causes for the settlement of America; and

Whereas amendment 1 of the U.S. Constitution states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and no local or State school board compels any student to attend exercises where Bible reading or recitation of prayer takes place and is on a strictly voluntary basis, it seems this ruling is a violation of the second part of this sentence for it puts the Federal Government right into the business of regulating religion, and

Whereas many Congressmen immediately submitted bills clearly spelling out the will of Congress regarding this edict of the Supreme Court, a committee was formed and an amendment to the U.S. Constitution was drafted called House Joint Resolution 693, or the Becker amendment, which reads as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school institution, or place.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

" 'SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

" 'SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.' "

And therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs go on record as favoring the passage of the Becker amendment, and that this resolution be sent to all Florida Members of the U.S. Congress and to Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Signed: MRS. LYLE L. CHAFFEE,
Chairman, Education Department.

Rescue in the Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last weekend a near tragedy was averted in Lowell, Mass., when three courageous men acted spontaneously to save the life of a small boy who was drowning in the Lowell Canal.

Ronald Perigny, Harry Charity, and Samuel Manoian risked their lives to save the drowning boy. Their heroism was praised in a recent Lowell Sun editorial. Mr. Charity has been rewarded with the post of commander of the Walker-Rogers Post of the Disabled American Veterans.

The editorial follows:

RESCUE IN THE CANAL

A fine demonstration of spontaneous heroism took place downtown Friday afternoon when a small boy was rescued from drowning through the combined and selfless efforts of three men.

As the swift current of the canal carried the struggling youngster toward death, three men, without the slightest hesitation, plunged into the canal—and a happy ending came for all.

The first man to hurdle the bridge on East Merrimack Street and dive into the swirling 30-foot water was Ronald Perigny of Pleasant Street. When he surfaced he discovered that the current had carried the boy well beyond his reach. Then came Harry Charity of Dracut Street, who plunged in, fully clothed, to help Perigny.

Finally, Samuel Manoian, a letter carrier, raced along the canal walk to get ahead of the exhausted and frightened little victim. Sure that he could intercept at a point near the 95 Bridge Street industrial complex, he jumped into the canal and managed to get a grip on the boy.

When the excitement had died down, a resumé of what had happened in those few moments proved that when anyone suddenly faces serious danger, there are good people of Lowell nearby who will give succor, regardless of the personal risk involved.

The three men named above in this editorial surely deserve some special recognition for their wonderful display of courage.

Arab Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Emil N. Baar, acting president of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, and a resolution which was adopted at the silver jubilee anniversary meeting of the council on May 5, 1964:

BROOKLYN JEWISH
COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Brooklyn, N.Y., May 25, 1964.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, representing more than 800 organizations in the largest Jewish community in America, is deeply concerned and troubled over the repeated threats by President Nasser to annihilate Israel.

In view of the fact that the U.S. Government has and is still giving economic aid to Nasser's Arab countries, the council, with its 800 affiliated organizations, representing almost 1 million Jews residing in Brooklyn,

has taken a strong stand in this situation, unless the Arab policy is changed into one of peace.

At a mass meeting sponsored by the council, held at the Brooklyn Jewish Center on May 5, the attached resolution was unanimously adopted with the request that the matter be called to the attention of the President, to the Secretary of State, and to all Members of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

EMIL N. BAAR,
Acting President.

RESOLUTION OF THE BROOKLYN JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Whereas for more than a decade the very existence of the State of Israel has been threatened with extinction by the repeated public declarations and preparations of the ruler of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser; and

Whereas since he came to power President Nasser has constantly declared over his radio and in public his determination and that of his associated Arab States to drive the Israelis into the sea; and

Whereas he has in recent years, in pursuance and preparations of such threats and declarations of policy built up a formidable armament of jet planes, submarines, tanks, and more recently offensive missiles, in the building of which he has been aided by former Nazis who have found refuge in Egypt from prosecution in Germany; and

Whereas for a year and a half he has kept an army of Egyptian troops in Yemen which were transported there by Russian planes and supplied by Russian arms; and

Whereas contrary to his repeated promises, he has not only not withdrawn his troops but has increased their number so that they now reportedly number 40,000 and, through rotation, has used the war in Yemen to battle train his entire army; and

Whereas the United States has consistently supported Nasser with generous gifts of foreign aid in an amount now approaching nearly a billion dollars; and

Whereas this policy encourages the aggressive tactics and purposes of Egypt's dictator; and

Whereas the United States has repeatedly declared its interest in the preservation of peace in the Middle East and elsewhere and the development of the economy and well-being of nations recipient of United States aid; and

Whereas the actions of the United States in supporting Nasser are wholly inconsistent with U.S. declarations of policy; and

Whereas there is imminent danger that Egypt shortly will be in a position to destroy Israel overnight by the rocketry and sophisticated weapons which Nasser is accumulating, supported by his now battle-trained army; and

Whereas although the Congress of the United States provided by law that U.S. economic aid should not be given to any nation preparing for aggression against any other country aided by the United States, the administration has not acted to stop aid to Egypt; and

Whereas President Nasser has admitted openly that Egypt is preparing for an aggressive war against Israel and is actively carrying on aggression elsewhere; and

Whereas Nasser has alined himself with the Communist bloc in their efforts to control the African nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the administration should immediately reverse its longtime policy of appeasing Nasser;

That the United States take a firm stand before all the world on behalf of the peacefully intentioned, liberty loving, democratic, and free people of Israel to ward off its destruction; and

That to prevent this catastrophe the United States should: (a) withdraw aid from Nasser as long as that aid is used for aggressive purposes; and (b) announce its readiness to enter into a treaty of mutual defense and support with Israel as it has with other nations.

The 18th Anniversary of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the 18th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic. On June 2, 1946, the Italians held their first elections following World War II and decisively rejected the past to set their sights on becoming a modern democratic republic. The tasks at hand were immense. Fascism and war had wrought untold destruction; hunger and misery afflicted large portions of the population; a large Communist Party posed an immediate threat to new democratic institutions. It is a measure of the vitality and determination of the Italian people that these conditions did not reduce them to despair and resignation. They set out not only to rebuild their shattered industry, but also to exceed prewar levels of industrial production. They sought not only to found solid democratic institutions at home, but also to participate in the movement toward a strong, democratic, and United Europe. They not only rejected the blandishments and threats of the Communists; they set out to show that social reform may be initiated and successfully carried out by a democratic regime.

Italy today stands as proof of how successful Italian efforts have been. Enterprising individuals have built the north into one of the leading industrial centers of Europe. Industries have been modernized and made fully competitive. Unemployment, in the past a severe problem in Italy, has been reduced to a low level. New sources of energy have reduced Italian dependence on imported raw materials; old sources of energy have been fully exploited. Postwar Italy has provided the world with striking examples of modern architecture and of innovation in industrial design. Italians are among the leaders in the world of fashion; Italian movies have commanded admiration and respect throughout the world.

The underdeveloped south has long been one of the most intractable problems with which Italians have had to deal. But here, too, sustained efforts and progress have marked the postwar period. A special fund set up by the Italian Government has financed agricultural reform, improved methods of agriculture, the building of roads, the provision of incentives to industries willing to build plants in the area, and the establishment of technical, vocational schools. True, much remains to be done in the south. But there is every sign that Italians will continue and even increase their efforts on behalf of this region and its inhabitants in coming years.

Americans have watched the progress of postwar Italy with sympathy and satisfaction. Indeed, they take pride in having contributed to Italian achievements. From 1946 through 1963 Americans provided more than $6 billion of economic and military assistance to Italy. Aid alone, however, is never enough. Without the industry and sacrifices of the Italians, American assistance could not have played a part in the Italian miracle.

There are other ties linking Americans and Italians. Italy has steadfastly supported the Western cause in postwar years, and through her membership in NATO and the divisions she has made available to the NATO Command, has made an important contribution to Western defense forces.

Only recently, the talented Italian Ambassador to France, Manlio Brosio, was chosen to become the next Secretary-General of NATO.

Americans of Italian descent have taken special pride in the achievements of the country of their forebears. I am sure that all Americans will join with me in extending their best wishes to their Italian friends on this memorable occasion.

The Bill of Rights in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, counsel to the National Council of Churches of Christ, and one of New York's most distinguished lawyers, testified before and submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary a most perceptive analysis of House Joint Resolution 693 relating to prayer and Bible reading in the public schools and religious references in public affairs. Mr. Tuttle has done a service to the Congress in his thoughtful presentation.

More recently Mr. Tuttle wrote an excellent letter to the New York Herald Tribune on this subject. Under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Tuttle's letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, published on Saturday, May 16, 1964, entitled "The Bill of Rights in Jeopardy":

THE BILL OF RIGHTS IN JEOPARDY

(Mr. Tuttle is general counsel to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Along with others, he testified recently before the House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the Becker amendment to the Constitution.)

(By Charles H. Tuttle)

Your editorial, "It's Not a Vote Against God," moves me to commend your opposition to this anti-Bill of Rights amendment.

It ties religion, personal liberty, and individual freedom of conscience to National,

State, and local ballot boxes. The potentials lurking in its political words throw into reverse the whole theory of our Constitution that the minority and the individual have certain inalienable rights which cannot be abridged by government or by the majority of the moment.

The first amendment gave the preferred place in our Constitution to five cognate freedoms basic to personal liberty for all—the freedoms to believe, to speak, to print, to assemble, and to petition for redress.

But now comes the Becker amendment containing in its words and in its potentials the means for abridging each and all of these five basic and integrated personal freedoms. Its coverage is far more than prayers and Bible reading.

By its very terms it makes of itself and its subject matter a separate, independent, and exclusive constitution. Each of its principal sections opens with the words of absolute separation and exclusion, to wit, "Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit." What were prohibitions are replaced by permissions.

For example, section 2 abrogates the existing prohibition against incorporating in an oath of office or an attestation to an official paper or as a witness a required profession of a religious belief according to the Government's choice of wording. No voluntary basis is provided as a condition of exemption.

Likewise, since a textbook furnished by a National, State or local government to public schools or institutions is a governmental or public document, and the furnishing is a governmental proceeding (or) activity, section 2 removes all bars to the inclusion of reference therein to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God, to wit, all bars to indoctrination thereby in a governmental formulation of religious belief. Again, no voluntary basis is reserved.

Likewise, section 2 removes, as to all public schools, all bars to "invoking the aid of God" as part of the educational program according to governmental formulation and conduct of the religious exercise. Again, no "voluntary basis" is reserved.

There is no escaping the facts that a public school represents an audience assembled by government by compulsion of law; that the program and procedure therein are governmental activities by law; that such activities are paid for by public funds raised by public, general taxation from persons of all beliefs and no beliefs; and that in our pluralistic society any governmental formulation of a religious exercise in the public schools must entail in the last analysis the overriding by way of the ballot box of the religious beliefs or disbeliefs of dissenting minorities and individuals.

Furthermore, and equally fundamental to personal liberty, is the right and high duty of parents to nurture and direct the destiny of their children. Our children are not the property of the state; and nothing could be more fatal to the substance of liberty than acceptance of any general power of the state to standardize them in matters of religion.

Recently before the House Judiciary Committee, Rev. William J. Kennedy, the Jesuit priest who is professor of law at Boston College Law School, superbly said of personal liberty in the free exercise of religion:

(It is) "independent of political controversies, subject to no primaries or elections, above popular passions and majority votes and beyond the power of state officials and local school boards, guaranteed by our Constitution and entrusted by it to the protection of our courts. I would not abridge it."

True religion has been authoritatively said to be "the perfect law of liberty." What has true religion to fear from being true to itself?

Radio Station WIND's Editorial Gives President Johnson's Antipoverty Bill a Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent radio editorial which was broadcast in Chicago on Tuesday May 19, over the facilities of radio station WIND, a Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. affiliate.

It is most pleasing to see this very highly respected radio station join in the present discussion of the persistent problem that we have in this Nation with unemployment, even though the sum total of America's labor force now stands at an unprecedented level of gainful employment.

WIND quite properly points to the fact that education is the key to making these unfortunate people presently unemployed employable.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's antipoverty program is designed to do the very things which WIND quite properly points out need to be done if we are to make these people gainfully employed.

It is my firm conviction that as more Americans recognize the fact that President Johnson has proposed a bold program to get Americans off the relief rolls and to restore to all Americans the dignity that follows a man who is able to stand on his own two feet, more and more of those who formulate public opinion in America will get behind the President's program.

I am very happy to include in the RECORD today this excellent radio editorial broadcast by WIND. The editorial follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY IN ILLINOIS

Illinois, like the majority of States, faces a serious problem: complex and mounting potential unemployment. Our unemployment rate has ranged between 4.6 and 6.2 percent since 1958 and is at its lowest rate of unemployment as of the latest figures available. Illinois unemployment has consistently run below the unemployment average for the Nation as a whole; however, this is little consolation or relief for the hundreds of thousands still without work.

In the Chicago metropolitan area, six Illinois counties and two in Indiana, the unemployment figure corresponds exactly to the national average of 5.2 percent; however, the concentration of this unemployment lies in two counties—Cook and Lake County, Ill. In the face of a booming prosperity and rising standards of living, this paints a curious and sad picture that would seem to be contradictory.

In our opinion, two people have been stating the situation very clearly and recommending very similar patterns for cure * * * Ray Hilliard, the director of Cook County Public Aid, and Frank Cassell, who was the chairman of the Governor's committee on unemployment. We're not claiming for them exclusivity in their ideas, for they are most certainly shared by many others. Perhaps, we hear them clearer, because they're closer. Hilliard calls it the "new poverty" * * * the spreading unemployment among people who aren't equipped for skilled jobs and the resultant overloading of the relief rolls. Cassell's survey reveals that unemployment results from the unskilled worker, or the one with obsolescent skills, the uneducated, the youth and the nonwhite worker in areas of declining economic activity.

One thing stands out, however, in both opinions: education is the first need, that money spent on schooling, or retraining, is an investment, while relief expenditures, necessary as they are, just go down the drain, as interim action with nonresidual effects. The greatest employment opportunities lie in industries emerging from scientific discoveries * * * this is where principal concern lies for the advancement in educational levels, that has not been as great as it should have been. The proportion of highly educated adults in Illinois is far below the average for the country, while our economy is strong our educational investment is not. If all people are to be equipped adequately to find and hold jobs in the near as well as the distant future, Illinois educational investment, as well as Chicago's, will have to increase. We would add this * * * this is not a problem alone for government to solve, it must be actively shared by business and industry alike. Unemployment and poverty cannot be solved quickly * * * but unless lots of us start doing something about it quickly, it may not be solved at all.

I invite your attention to Focal Point, a seminar on "Unemployment and the Elimination of Poverty," tonight and tomorrow night, on WIND at 8:15 p.m. You'll hear the views of a number of local and national authorities on the subject.

Free Enterprise Gains in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Journal of Commerce which I think deserves careful attention. Under the leadership of the new finance minister, and after experience with the problems of government regulations, India has announced a new emphasis on private enterprise. I think this is a development of the highest significance, which is a tribute to Indian good sense, as well as to the good influence of the United States on Indian development.

The foreign aid program is frequently criticized because it is a government-to-government program. These developments in India are an example of the success of the foreign aid program in influencing other governments in the direction of greater freedom for private business.

This new development should also serve as a reminder to those who are impatient with the progress being achieved under the foreign aid program. There is progress, and this is one very good example. But progress takes time and it

has taken the Indians several years to realize that too much government control can inhibit development.

India is rapidly becoming a great showcase of the progress which can be achieved by free men. The Indians are struggling with enormous difficulties, but they are beginning to win the battle for democratic self-development.

The article follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE POLICY SHIFT IS SEEN IN INDIA—AIMED AT ENCOURAGEMENT

(By Al Wyss)

With industrial growth lagging in India well behind the urgent needs and stated goals of the country, a new Government policy appears to be emerging, aimed at giving greater encouragement to private enterprise.

This policy was clearly evident in the country's new budget, just presented by Finance Minister T. T. Krishnamachari, which provides for a number of tax reforms, reductions in personal taxes, and incentives designed to open the door wider for private investors, both Indian and foreign.

OTHER MEASURES

A number of other measures recently instituted by the Indian Government to encourage both private investment and increased savings and accumulation of capital, actually point to a shift in policy on the role of private industry in the economic development of the country.

The removal of price controls on a number of commodities as recently announced by Finance Minister Krishnamachari, also, is considered indicative of this new trend. Other measures taken recently include:

1. Proposals of a high level Government and business committee to speed up official approval of industrial projects have been accepted, with steps taken to immediately activate the plan and push final approval of key private investment projects through within 60 days.

2. Industries once confined to Government or public control are being opened to private investors.

3. The creation of the Unit Trust of India to facilitate the investment by the public by providing the channel through which various classes of investors can invest their savings in the trust. The trust will invest its initial capital and capital obtained by the sale of units in stock shares and other securities.

4. Steps also are being taken to invigorate the capital market and facilitate new issue flotations.

5. Industrial licensing and capital issues control are being eliminated for new ventures and expansions involving $525,000.

INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT LAGS

Behind these developments is the recognition in India that industrial production has not been increasing at a rapid enough pace in relation to the country's exploding population, which now is estimated at about 460 million, and that it is urgent that industrial production be increased at a faster pace than has been the case so far.

This was also stressed in a recent statement in the India Parliament on the economic situation by Mr. Krishnamachari, who said:

"* * * Unless industrial investment in a number of vital sectors is increased as quickly as possible, and unless production in some of the important consumer goods industries, such as cotton, textiles, and sugar, picks up to a significant extent, it will not be possible for us to achieve an overall rate of growth in industrial production of the kind that we urgently need."

The fact that the third 5-year plan also fell behind schedule due to several factors is believed to have a bearing on the current policy of giving greater encouragement and emphasis to private enterprise.

PLAN FALLS SHORT

While prospects for the balance of the third 5-year plan looks brighter, according to Government spokesmen, the increases of 6.5 and 8 percent, respectively, in the first 2 years of the plan fell short of the planned 11-percent annual increase.

Some factors which contributed to the lag in the plan, according to M. Gopala Menon, resident director of the Indian Investment Center here, are a shortage of power and coal; a shortage of components and parts, and the fact that those industries which needed such components and parts could not work at capacity.

Businessmen in the United States believe that the Indian Government is just beginning to take steps to encourage private investment and that further changes are necessary and probably will be instituted.

INCOME TAX ISSUE

It is pointed out, for example, that while the new budget does extend more tax benefits, there are elements in it which could have an unfavorable effect on savings and capital formation.

The budget provides for an annuity scheme to offset personal income tax cuts for the higher income group into which Indian citizens earning over $3,150, or 15,000 rupees, will be required to contribute, while forcing the higher income groups to increase savings to private industry. Consequently the forced annuity plan will tend to divert this flow of private investment, it is held.

OTHER ASPECTS PRAISED

But the important aspect of recent government action, international business spokesmen point out, is that India appears to have taken a definite turn toward stimulating private enterprise on a practical basis.

Statements such as those recently made by Finance Minister Krishnamachari and other Indian officials are making United States and other foreign investors sit up and take a second look about investments in India.

A check with American businessmen, in fact, indicates that some private investment projects which had been shelved in late 1962 and early 1963 now are being pulled off the shelf and reassessed.

Skepticism and caution naturally do exist in investment circles here, with some businessmen saying, in effect, "I see it and hear it, but I still don't believe it."

Such opinion, however, is not general and apears to be dwindling in the face of the steps being taken by the Indian Government.

SUPERTAX REPLACED

Among the tax concessions in the field of company taxation provided in the new budget is the elimination of the supertax and its replacement by a surtax of 40 percent on profits in excess of 10 percent of employed capital. A number of priority industries, including steel, copper, aluminum, coal, iron ore, industrial machinery, cement, fertilizers, pulp and paper, tractors, tea, coffee, and rubber, will get a tax reduction of 50 to 45 percent in the standard rate of corporate tax.

The intercorporate dividend tax also is to be reduced to a flat rate of 25 percent, benefiting the transmittal of dividends by the large number of foreign-owned companies in India.

On the other hand, closely held companies will be taxed at a higher rate, with the basic tax rate in such cases rising from 50 to 60 percent.

India for some time has been seeking to discourage tight control of a number of companies and urging that shares of such companies be placed on the market. India businessmen have complained that an adequate market for the sale of securities did not exist in India. With the establishment of the Unit Trust, however, the Indian Government will be able to provide for the ready sales of securities and consequently more and more "tightly held" companies are likely to be pressured to put their stock on the market.

Private Enterprise and Developing Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, many U.S. firms are finding excellent business investments in the developing countries as well as augmenting the economic development of their host nations. A novel and successful approach for all involved has been taken by the Intercontinental Hotels Corp. From Bali to Bangkok, IHC has demonstrated the benefits of private enterprise and has acted as a catalyst for economic growth.

A recent article appearing in the Wall Street Journal tells the story of IHC's international venture in world development. The article follows:

ENTERPRISE AND DIPLOMACY: PAN AM AIRWAY'S HOTEL UNIT HELPS ITSELF BY AIDING NATIONS

(By Ruth Sheldon Knowles)

A privately owned U.S. enterprise has found that it can be good business to help other countries of the world develop economically.

Intercontinental Hotels Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of Pan American World Airways, is making its international hotel business into an informal instrument of U.S. foreign policy by an imaginative approach that benefits Government and private interest wherever it goes. It does this by specializing in building or managing hotels in areas where the establishment of a first-class hotel will itself create tourist and commercial business.

That IHC's approach is unusual is attested by this statement from a prospectus with which it and several partners made a public offering of stock for five hotels in Pakistan: "A related benefit not to be measured financially is the mutual understanding of people of different races and nationalities promoted by intensified traveling from abroad."

But the fact is that IHC also has scored some striking successes financially. For one thing, most of its hotels are heavily patronized almost as soon as they open, and some establishments, only a few years old, already are expanding. Beyond this, the existence of the hotels has greatly stimulated air travel to areas served by Pan Am.

At the same time, IHC has been pioneering some novel investment techniques, bringing together U.S. and foreign capital, both public and private, to finance most of its hotels. IHC itself shares in the ownership of each hotel it operates, always as a minority stockholder. This, too, varies the familiar pattern; Hilton Hotels International, IHC's chief rival in the foreign field, does not own any of the hotels it manages. Hilton also contributes to economic development in the countries where it goes, and a close look at IHC shows what impact such American operations can have.

IHC's growth has been so spectacular that by the end of 1966 it expects to be operating 33 hotels in 26 countries and 6 continents.

If IHC has been successful in spurring economic development where it puts up hotels, the result is by no means accidental. IHC was born of an effort to help alleviate a critical economic and political problem in the Western Hemisphere toward the end of World War II.

At that time the U.S. Government was considerably concerned over the need of South American countries for dollars to strengthen their economies and increase needed imports. But businessmen and tourists alike were avoiding South America because of the lack of first-class hotels.

Since Pan Am was the largest air carrier for South America, President Roosevelt, in one of his last acts before his death, approached Juan Trippe, the airline's president, with the idea that Pan Am undertake to build hotels in South America and upgrade existing ones.

SHIFT IN EUROPE, ASIA

IHC's early efforts went into renovating and building hotels in Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, Uruguay, Mexico, El Salvador, Curacao, Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico. In recent years, however, it has concentrated in Europe, Asia, and lately has ventured into Africa. IHC hotels are in operation or planned in such places as Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, Liberia, the Ivory Coast, and even the fabled island of Bali.

To be sure, political and economic instability may sometimes adversely affect IHC earnings. The IHC hotel in Havana, the Nacional, was expropriated when Castro came to power, and Venezuela's political troubles have reduced the business of IHC's Tequendama in Caracas.

But this part of the risk does not bother IHC executives unduly. They look upon their projects as providing self-made long-range insurance. "We are a catalyst for economic growth and trade," declares John Gates, IHC's chairman. "This will contribute to greater political stability."

The IHC prospectus for the Pakistani hotels asserts, for example, that Pakistan is entering the most important phase of its economic development and that its lack of hotel accommodations of international standards is handicapping the efforts of government and private investment. So with the aim of bringing businessmen and tourists to the country, five hotels will be built, the first in Karachi opening next month.

The 1,116 rooms which the Pakistan hotels will provide are expected to bring an increase of 40,000 foreign guests a year. Figuring that each will spend an average of $200, this will increase Pakistan's annual foreign exchange by $8 million. Moreover, the hotels will have a stimulating effect on the economy by increasing employment and by leading to the expansion and establishment of businesses and service industries. Economic studies show that one unit of tourist expenditure adds three units to the national income.

The financing of three of the Pakistani hotels, costing $21,237,700 altogether, illustrates the new foreign investment patterns being established by IHC and the diverse partners this type of venture assembles.

Dollar loans of $8,892,300 were obtained from the U.S. Export-Import Bank, rupee loans of $2,966,000 were secured from the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Government of Pakistan took $2,848,400 of 4-percent rupee debentures. IHC took a minority stock position—23 percent in this case—with the balance of the $6,531,000 equity being provided by the Pakistan Government, the Pakistan Airlines, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, local businessmen and the public.

In establishing its equity position, IHC borrowed Pakistan rupees from AID funds which have accumulated from the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural products to Pakistan.

In Ireland, where in 1963 the IHC opened a 314-room hotel in Dublin and two 96-room hotels in Limerick and Cork, the financing brought together a similarly strange assortment of partners.

The Irish Government made an outright grant of $490,000 and it guaranteed the first mortgage of $4,015,000 taken by the Ulster Bank. The bank also took a $700,000 second mortgage. The shareholders providing the balance of the money were IHC; Irish Airlines; the Gresham Hotel Co. of Ireland, which had operated Dublin's leading hotel; Guinness, Ireland's noted brewing company; and a group of European investors, including Baron Rothschild and Countess Bismarck.

The Dublin Intercontinental is the largest, most modern building in this perfect example of an 18th century European city, but it is not an anachronism. It is contemporary in design but it also is Irish throughout. IHC decorators and designers worked with Irish mills and manufacturers to produce the textiles, furniture, china, silver, and glassware for all three hotels.

At first many Irish were inclined to scoff at the new hotels and what they could do, but they now have become important business and social centers, the tourist trade is increasing and the government has been able to launch an intensive industrial development drive.

IMPACT IN FRANKFURT

No less an impact has been made by the $10 million Hotel Frankfurt Intercontinental, which opened in the German Main River city in June 1963. Frankfurt is not interested in industrialization; it has a labor shortage. But as the banking center of Germany and with Europe's third largest airport in traffic volume, it was interested in promoting itself as a center for international commercial and scientific conventions to stimulate overall German trade.

But the shortage of first-class hotels was a preventive. So IHC was brought in to put up a 20-story, 504-room hotel, the largest in Germany. The State of Hesse considered the hotel so important to the growth of Frankfurt that it guaranteed the second mortgage loan.

Owners of other Frankfurt hotels initially were exceedingly hostile to the new hotel because they thought it would detract from their business. However, when the Intercontinental opened every hotel in Frankfurt was filled to overflowing. The reason: The Intercontinental had made it possible for the World Petroleum Congress, with 8,000 delegates, to hold its meeting in Frankfurt.

Foreigners always have been inclined to look on American hotels as being dedicated to plumbing, efficiency, and size to the exclusion of graciousness, art, and culture. IHC decorators and architects take great delight in confounding this image.

In Frankfurt, a center of theater, art and music, the theme of the Intercontinental's main restaurant and bar centers on the international theater, with paintings, tapestries and puppet scenes from great plays and operas. Even the coffee shop is decorated with original Picasso ceramic plates. Also, the architects took advantage of the hotel's spectacular panoramic view to design a glass-enclosed supper club and bar which has become a favorite of Frankfurters.

But it is in the Middle East, at Beirut, Lebanon, that IHC has put up perhaps its most magnificent hotel.

Beirut is the traditional gateway to the Orient, the banking center of the Mideast and a tourist's paradise. It offers breathtaking scenery, year-round bathing in the Mediterranean, the most spectacular Roman ruins extant, Crusaders' fortresses and easy access to all the historical places of the Holy Lands. The city is a miniature Paris with a lavish casino and night life.

When IHC opened the $9.5 million, 315-room Hotel Phoenicia at the end of 1961, it increased Beirut's first-class hotel room capacity by 38 percent and gave the city its first convention facilities.

The Hotel Phoenicia is a work of art in itself. It is one of the outstanding examples of Architect Edward F. Stone's talent. It states in contemporary mood the essence of Oriental beauty with its lacy balconies, white marble columns, spacious rooms, and courtyard swimming pool overlooking the sea.

In working in the less developed lands of Africa and the Orient, IHC frequently encounters unique challenges and unusual experiences. In Indonesia, for example, IHC's director of training, Leo de Franco, had to start with help who had never worn shoes, much less seen the inside of a hotel, used knives or forks or had any exposure to Western customs, food and drink. It takes 1,600 employees to service the Intercontinental's 420-room Hotel Indonesia in Djakarta, possibly a record for hotel employees per room.

EXORCISING EVIL SPIRITS

In Bangkok, Thailand, IHC ran into difficulties of another sort. When the $5 million, 224-room hotel IHC is putting up there did not progress in the beginning as rapidly as it should, the Thai Government concluded it was because of the activity of evil spirits.

The royal astrologer advised the Government the most propitious day on which ceremonies should be carried out to exorcise the spirits. Thus, last December a corps of Buddhist priests thoroughly decontaminated the hotel acreage. This undoubtedly was the most unusual preconstruction cost any hotel ever has had to bear.

IHC is particularly interested in what it can contribute to and gain by the development of the new African countries. So far it is operating a 230-room hotel in Liberia, and an expectedly lavish 17-story hotel in Abidjan which expresses the desire of the Republic of Ivory Coast to become Africa's Riviera.

The Ivory Coast Government wanted a showplace and it got it. There is now a park, a yacht basin, a garden patio accommodating 3,000 guests, a ballroom, conference rooms, 3 nightclubs, a supper club, and an Olympic-sized swimming pool. The hotel's capacity already is being increased from 220 to 500 rooms.

However, this hotel is not typical of what IHC is plannnig and negotiating in other African lands.

"There is no real tourist travel to Africa yet," Mr. Gates says. "The need of the African countries is for hotels that will provide simple basic requirements for businessmen and diplomats so that they will stay there long enough to do the job in each country that needs to be done."

From the evidence at hand from other parts of the world, it is practically a foregone conclusion that IHC will bring many benefits to Africa—demonstrating in actual practice how private enterprise can help others while it helps itself.

Newark: A Climate for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of our beloved Nation stems from many factors, but more important than

all the rest is the dedicated, courageous spirit of the people that have made up our land since its beginnings. The courage of those who pioneered settlement across America enables us now to enjoy the fruits of living in America. The courage of those who now pioneer resolution of the problems facing communities everywhere will enable our and future generations to continue to enjoy those fruits.

Typical of these modern pioneers is the film of J. J. Kislak, Inc., one of the leading realtors in my hometown of Newark, N.J. And in an inspiring article recently published in the Realtor, the official publication of the Real Estate Board of Newark, Irvington, and Hillside, North, the firm's president, David Kislak, calls on his colleagues in the realty business to join with him in preserving and developing our city. Since the need for such thinking and such action exists in many other parts of our Nation, I would like to commend Mr. Kislak's article to my colleagues at this time:

What makes a city great?

The answer, of course, is very complex. Greatness in a city arises out of so many factors. It involves such things as location, natural resources, transportation facilities, proximity to markets, and the like. We all know about such things; they are part of our everyday working vocabulary.

As realtors, therefore, we're well aware of Newark's many unique advantages. At the same time, however, we're also aware of some of its problems.

Certainly, Newark is not unique among cities in that it faces certain fiscal problems. Again, Newark is not unique in that it faces problems arising out of a changing population during a period of transition. Traffic problems are not unique to Newark, either.

We're not even unique in the fact that so many of our business and professional people do not live and vote in the community in which they work.

Since I came to Newark, I have given a great deal of thought to these problems. I've tried to analyze cause and effect. Some people, I've found, appear to take some perverse pleasure in voicing only the most pessimistic view of the city's future. As for myself, I've weighed the pros and the cons, and I say that for my organization, Newark is great.

Moving our headquarters to Newark about 3 years ago was a major decision for us. It meant leaving the county where our business was started, and where we had been located for 55 years. It also involved our making a tremendous investment in an old, long-vacant building which we had to rehabilitate completely.

But, even before we came here, we had confidence in Newark. We felt strongly then, and believe even more strongly now, that Newark's many pros far outweigh the cons.

We were confident that in Newark we would thrive as an integral part of the industrial, financial, commercial hub of the State. That confidence was not misplaced.

In less than 3 years, our organization has doubled its personnel, and we have also doubled our business volume. With Newark as our headquarters, we have branched out into new offices in New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Del., and Newport News, Va. We are continuing to look even further afield for expansion of our activities. But we are satisfied that our headquarters office will remain in Newark.

There's a vastly important ingredient in Newark's greatness. It is the attitude of Newark's business community, and the confidence that business leaders have displayed in the future of the city. All around us we may see evidences of the very substantial investments they have made here. Their confidence is based on the certainty that the city can be preserved and that it will progress and prosper.

Personally, I have found it very gratifying to join hands with other members of the business community. These leaders do more than build buildings. They accept more than their fair share of responsibility for the welfare of the people of the city. The Kislak organization has thrived here and it is our philosophy, too, that we owe a debt to the community.

Our gratitude has found expression in many ways, notably in our work for charitable causes such as the united appeals and other drives. On the cultural side, we've supported projects such as the concepts of the New Jersey Symphony. Even though many members of my organization live outside of the city, they feel the responsibility to support many charitable and cultural endeavors.

From a strictly dollars and cents business point of view, when one considers the time and effort involved in projects such as the sale and development of the Newark Academy site, and the Distribution Center on the Meadowlands, it may not be the most profitable way for a realtor to spend his time. But if the city is to be preserved and is to grow, it requires just this kind of effort on the part of everyone equipped to do it.

If realtors, who have the experience and the ability to plan for this kind of growth, won't do it, who will?

What I'm getting at is just this: Newark can be a great city. We realtors can make it great.

Proud of America and His Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed to present for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a salutary address by Mr. Henri Aldridge, counsel for the International Paper Co. Mr. Aldridge is an outstanding citizen of Mobile in the great State of Alabama. His address is one which should be of especial interest to every patriotic American for it emphasizes the essentiality of pride in America and pride in being a citizen. It is a message which will stand reading and rereading.

Mr. Aldridge's fine address was printed in the Unit, the official publication of the Southern Pulpwood Association.

PROUD OF AMERICA AND HIS REASONS

While I am deeply grateful for—and as I shall shortly demonstrate—unworthy of, the gracious introduction that my distinguished friend has accorded me, I am by no means unmindful of my temerity in essaying to address so erudite a group as this, nor of his understandable concern in vouching, as it were by his introduction, for the adequacy of my presentation.

Let me plead in mitigation of the magnitude of his responsibility and mine, that the crashing descent in the quality of the program tonight from the apogee of Governor Sanders' presence to the perigee of that of Lawyer Aldridge was none of his doing (nor for that matter of mine), but came to pass, as you know, by the requirement of the Governor's presence in Washington tonight in discharge of his official duties. My learned friend, then, coming to launch from this pad an interstellar rocket has found himself confronted with a far smaller squib of negligible thrust. Instead of a countdown on a Titan of the first magnitude, pulsing eagerly upon this launching site, fully loaded and "all systems go," he has been confronted, so to speak, with a 2-inch salute and a box of matches with a dampened striking surface. Surely then we must treat him with understanding and compassion, and applaud his courage, if not his judgment, in the selection of speakers to introduce.

I cannot say why providence visits these trials upon His children, and I am far too cautious to dwell upon the many fascinating explanations that readily occur. Perhaps it makes us all more spiritual—and I hope you will try to look upon it in that spirit of Christian piety and resignation. As the poet tells us—"Life is real and life is earnest"—and nobody appreciates the cold hard fact of it better than I at this moment.

Despite my utterly charming and disarmingly candid admission of inadequacy, I have not wholly despaired of meeting the challenge, for while my ignorance of the technical niceties of forestry and conservation may be both comprehensive and profound, I believe that there is yet common ground upon which we may meet for these few minutes this evening—an area of mutual concern in which I boldly surmise we share a certain congeniality of opinion, despite the fact that it shall deal in no wise with forestry or conservation.

You see, I would like you to consider with me for these few minutes tonight a familiar topic—our country, with respect to which I must, in candor concede, I bear some pretty old fashioned ideas and ideals. This is not only my opinion, but that of my 16-year-old daughter, who voices it more in sorrow than in outrage on frequent occasions. Indeed, it was only yesterday that she forthrightly described me to her mother as "Harry Hypotenuse—the sum of the squares."

Be that as it may, let's consider our country from a point of view that perhaps is somewhat different from that so commonplace today—let's think for a moment about what is right with America, for a change.

The thing that brings all this to mind is that which I conceive to be a growing tendency, indeed a trend, among the powerful and presumably well-informed, that there is something basically wrong with Americans, that all of a sudden the things we once believed were wonderful and fine are really shoddy and tarnished and that all the world stands about us shaking its head and wagging its finger in disappointment and reproach. There is developing, I suggest, a massive national inferiority complex, that is as dangerous as it is false. Certain of our own leaders have suggested that we are fast becoming a "second-class" power unless we mend our ways—that our "world-image" has become distasteful in the eyes of right-thinking people.

Well, I don't believe it for 1 minute and I think the time has come to say so. Indeed, I am far less concerned with our "image in the eyes of emerging nations" than I am with the vision we are placing in the eyes of our children and our children's children.

If you can agree with me that this is so, let's step apologizing for a few minutes and see what's right with America, for now, of all times, is a good one for a weighing of values and this is no mere emotional exercise.

Nearly three-quarters of a century ago Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, in speaking to the New England society said:

"Of 'Americanism' of the right sort we cannot have too much. Mere vaporing and boasting become a nation as little as a man. But honest, outspoken pride and faith in our country are infinitely better and more to be

respected than the cultivated reserve which sets it down as ill bred and in bad taste to refer to our country except by way of deprecation, criticism, or general negation.

"Let every man honor and love the land of his birth and the race from which he springs, and keep their memory green. It is a pious and honorable duty."

This, of course, is true, but yet I approach the concept with a peculiar conflict of conviction and uncertainty. Essaying to voice a deeply felt emotion is not an easy thing. It is like asking a man if he loves his family—and if so, why? He knows, of course, that he does—deeply, devotedly, elementally, instinctively—but how to express it?

Am I proud to be an American? Is there something right about my homeland? Yes, of a certainty, the question is almost offensive in suggesting that a question exists. But why? How can we say it?

Well, let us see:

First, I am truly persuaded that we Americans hold a privileged membership in a society that for some mighty and mysterious reason providence has selected to effect His purposes, and that, however so often we are prone to turn our backs upon Him, we have never yet entirely forgotten Him, nor a sincere desire that somehow we can be worthy leaders in a world where leadership for good was never more sorely needed. Surely no thinking man suggests that it is a cosmic accident that men everywhere turn their hungry and despairing eyes upon us for guidance and national strength of character. Surely this is part of God's design.

Have you ever considered how helpless and pathetic it would be to live in some remote and nameless realm, unknown and ignored, nationally impotent and subject to the whims of other nations' ambitions, never knowing from day to day who your current masters may be? I actually think that we cannot imagine it. It is simply beyond our comprehension and certainly beyond our experience. And yet, so it is over the major portion of the earth's surface and among the mass of this world's population. We have existed so long as a citadel of wealth and strength that we cannot envision national weakness or poverty.

No one knows better than do I that we are far from perfect and that we have failed so many times before and will again—yet, I believe, and I am at once proud and humble, that basically my country is a God-fearing, Christian nation and I entertain no question that it wants to, and will ultimately, do His will.

Secondly, I am proud that America is essentially a nation of fairminded men, men infused by instinct and tradition with a profound regard for the dignity of the individual, and with an inherent yearning and concept for justice and law among themselves. I know that no matter how far the pendulum of injustice, and even tyranny, may swing in individual instances and at particular times, there is in us a builtin equilibrium that can, and does, bring the scales of right into true and equal balance again.

Again, I am intensely proud of the almost unique homogeneity of the people of this favored land, the spirit of oneness and mutual esteem that permeates our national way of life—unique, indeed, when viewed in the light of the countless and divergent wellsprings and origins of our people. I seriously doubt that upon any other continent, nor at any point of time, have so many men of varying races, nationalities, religions, cultures, customs, backgrounds or traditions devised among themselves so happy a mode of living or a greater congeniality of mutual effort and respect. Oh yes, I know we have our differences of opinion and points of view which frequently we enthusiastically hammer upon the heads of our neighbors. Indeed, an apparent intense desire to "improve" and "elevate" our neighbors to a height of serenity and perfection equal to our own has become almost a national obsession.

But woe to him beyond our shores who confuses our brotherly zeal with weakness or disunity. No less than twice within this generation have certain ambitious leaders abroad erred in their appraisal of our national character in this respect only to find our unity carved into the breastplates of their shattered legions. Yet, alas, they continue to persist in their illusions as a certain bewhiskered Latin pipsqueak can recently testify. I am proud, indeed, of all of my American brothers.

I am proud that Americans are a people given to an essential stability of political science, peculiarly gifted in the art of self-government and democratic processes. They give and take in fair and open debate and, in the main, settle their differences in a cool and level-headed appraisal. We are not, we have never been, and God grant we never shall be, a race of assassins and intriguers, a people of constant upheaval and violence, of revolution, the barricades and the torch, for these are the seeds of self-destruction and oblivion. To be sure, and as General MacArthur recently said, "we endlessly argue among ourselves the merits and demerits of our processes of government: Whether our strength is being sapped by deficit financing too long indulged, by Federal paternalism grown too mighty, by power groups grown too arrogant, by politics grown too corrupt, by crime grown too rampant, by morals grown too low, by taxes grown too high, by extremists grown too violent and whether our personal liberties are as firm and unassailable as they should be." And these are questions that should be argued and answered, but I know that this will be done within the orderly framework of our constitutional processes and in no other way. Of this I am proud, indeed.

Again, I am proud that my land has repeatedly demonstrated to history and to the other nations of the world that there can be a people capable of generating unparalleled power and dedicating it to good purposes throughout the globe, a civilization that can create riches heretofore undreamed of, and yet can share them with others less blessed in either strength or wealth. Oh, I know the cynics tell us that we are so rich that there is nothing left elsewhere to covet, and we are so powerful that we need not look around for friends, but they tend to overlook the cold historical fact that there have been many civilizations now forgotten who in their times were equally rich and comparably strong. Never, I think, has there ever been a land with a deeper or more generous regard than ours for the other people of the world. Perhaps we have been profligate and wasteful in many respects, and I hope that a patient providence can forgive us for it, but I would rather have it thus than to know I lived among people crouched, bloated and snarling over their bounty, growling with greed to seize the property of others or to tyrannize the weak.

And yet once more, to those who denigrate our land and its ways of life, I shall say that my pride is unshakeable in the fact that of all the nations and races of this world—of the present or in the past—America stands unchallenged in its freedom of opportunity for men of vision, imagination, industry, integrity and, above all, courage and tenacity of purpose. Here, as nowhere else, is one's ability and capacity for hard and unremitting effort the only true limits to his capacity to triumph and achieve. Although our taxes have tended to circumscribe the market to some admitted degree there yet exists in this country no law, nor custom, nor caste, nor guild to suppress or prevent either you or me from becoming as rich and powerful as Croesus—if, of course, I am smart enough and persistent enough, and courageous enough to accept the risks and shoulder the burden. America alone is still the El Dorado of achievement—an unplumbed Golconda of golden opportunity. To one who would seek to beguile us from the fact, let me suggest that he try his luck somewhere else—anywhere else in the world. I shall be curious to see how well he fares.

Lastly, and fully conscious of the faults that are ours. I am proud above all else that my fellow countrymen are, in the great majority, a good God-fearing people, a self-assured people, an affectionate family and home-loving people, content to live their lives and do their jobs with a minimum of ostentation and with an intensely sympathetic interest in problems of their fellows.

These, I submit, are my reasons, and are justifiable sources of quiet pride—the characteristics of a nation basically sound and worthy of the world's respect. I am sick and weary of those who would lead us down strange paths in sackcloth and ashes, crying "mea culpa," and hanging our heads in shame and self reproach. This is a wonderful country and, by the eternal. I think we should say so from time to time.

You have been gracious and indulgent to hear me out tonight, and I can only hope that I have not entirely exhausted your patience. I sincerely believe that the things that have been touched upon are things that badly want full discussion from time to time lest any of us forget God's mercy and goodness to us.

In the topic of my talk and throughout its text. I have had occasion to speak of "pride," a two-edged, and ofttimes a dangerous emotion. It is my hope that you appreciate the sense in which it has been employed inasmuch as I am not entirely unmindful that pride goeth before a fall, nor of the Pharisee who thanked God that he was not as other men. It was Alexander Pope, I believe, who wrote:

"Of all the causes which conspire to blind
Man's erring judgment, and misguide the mind,
What the weak head with strongest bias rules,
Is pride, the never-failing vice of fools."

I trust it is not the "vice of fools" to which I have addressed myself, but rather as Lodge said, an effort to express, however incoherently, the honor and love of the land of our birth and the race from which we spring, that we may keep their memory green.

Our Oversea Military Shrines, Memorials, and Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting and timely article entitled "Our Oversea Military Shrines, Memorials, and Cemeteries," by Mr. Adolph N. Sutro, past national senior vice commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and now a resident of my 30th district at 4125 Rosewood Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

In reading this excellent article, one cannot help but recall the great sacrifices made over the years by so many in order

that we may continue to live in freedom and in safety in an America for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

The debt we owe them can never be repaid in full. But at least we can attempt in our limited and hesitant way to live our lives so that the great promise of America will be fulfilled, and their lives will not have been sacrificed in vain.

The article follows:

OUR OVERSEA MILITARY SHRINES, MEMORIALS, AND CEMETERIES

(By Adolph N. Sutro, past national senior vice commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart)

There are 22 oversea American military cemeteries around the world under the jurisdiction of the American Battle Monuments Commission, established by the Congress in March 1923.

These cemeteries are beautifully landscaped and maintained. There are 11 in France; 3 in Belgium; 2 each in England and Italy; 1 in Holland, Africa, Luxembourg, and the Philippines. These cemeteries contain bodies of those who laid down their lives in both World Wars. Those who lie in unknown graves on land or in the sea, have their names carved in stone on the "Wall of the Missing" at one of these cemeteries. The names of all of these will live as long as there is a United States of America. Only about 39 percent of all the bodies originally buried in one of these cemeteries remain, the others having been shipped home at the request of the next of kin. This is written so that all of our war veterans and the public may better know and understand about these American heroes who lie overseas.

From my personal observation, these are far more than cemeteries. Each one is and should be called a "Shrine, Memorial, and Cemetery." Most of these bits of the United States of America in foreign lands have great maps of stone, depicting events of American history, enacted in the immediate vicinity, which will endure down through the ages as part of our heritage. In my travels throughout nations around the world, there is nothing that I have seen more beautiful than these American shrines. At each of these American shrines there is a beautiful memorial chapel, each different from the other, designed by various famous architects. At some high point of that battlefield, there is a great monument, explaining the battle, which has been built and is maintained by the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Except for a very few cases, in which members of our Armed Forces were killed by an accident or died of disease, all others who lie in these cemeteries, or whose names are carved in the stone "Wall of the Missing," were killed in action by the enemy. Each of these have been awarded the Purple Heart medal posthumously.

The Purple Heart Medal is the world's second oldest military decoration in present use. Spain, Russia, and England each had older military decorations, but these were discontinued in Spain and Russia with the termination of their monarchy. This left the Military Badge of the British Order of the Bath still in use, antedating the Purple Heart. On each Purple Heart Medal is depicted the birth and elements of the stars and stripes of our flag, derived from the coat of arms of Gen. George Washington, an inclusive part of this decoration. It is therefore fitting and proper that the Department of Defense should award a Purple Heart Medal to each cemetery administrative office. With it should be a card explaining the reason for displaying the Purple Heart Medal. With it for all to see hundreds of years from now, it should be explained that on December 13, 1775, Gen. George Washington invited Benjamin Franklin to dinner, naming him chairman of a commission to design an American flag, free of any part of the design of the British flag. At that time there were many flags with stripes; that first being the 13 red and white stripes of the East India Co., chartered by Queen Elizabeth of England in the year 1600, but none had combined both stars and stripes. The design submitted by Benjamin Franklin set forth stars and stripes as depicted in the coat of arms of his close personal friend, Gen. George Washington. At the home of Gen. George Washington's grandfather and his ancestors at "Sulgrave Manor" in Northamptonshire, England, a sign states that the design of the American flag originated from the coat of arms of the Washington family.

Each year thousands of Americans go to Europe, as tourists or as members of our Armed Forces. Americans traveling to foreign lands obtain a passport and the State Department issues a pamphlet telling them how to comport themselves. A paragraph or two should be included, or on a separate card as an invitation to the tourist to visit one or more of these beautiful American shrines, and learn about American history born in the immediate vicinity. At home, seldom do we visit a cemetery where none of one's family are buried, but our oversea American shrines should be a must to visit by members of our Armed Forces and tourists.

On some weekends our American shrines overseas are visited by thousands of the natives of the country in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and England, as well as the Philippines, but the one at Carthage, Tunisia, Africa, had less than 300 visitors last year. Here lie the American dead of the African campaign. This beautiful shrine does not even lie in the American zone of operations, but in the British zone of action. When Tunisia was under French rule, many more visited this cemetery, but now seldom does an Arab visit it. Many cemeteries have been moved in the past. All the temporary cemeteries from the Pallu Islands to Burma and from Australia to the Philippines were closed and the bodies brought to the cemetery at Fort McKinley, Manila. The Congress should appropriate the necessary funds to move the graves at Carthage, Tunisia, to Sicily or consolidate them with the graves at the Sicily-Rome Cemetery at Nettuno near Anzio, Italy. Here loved ones could visit the graves without the difficulty and cost now necessary of going to Tunisia, Africa.

All of the memorials and battle monuments on all of the many American battlefields of both World Wars erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission, are beautiful and well maintained, telling the story of the battle fought there. There are many other battle monuments erected by division associations that have not had proper maintenance and have become ruins. Such an example is the 91st Division Monument erected at Bologne, Italy, which had to be demolished. The American Battle Monuments Commission, however, agreed to having the figure on this monument placed on a base at its Florence, Italy, Military Cemetery. The wording on the base states that it was from the 91st Division Monument. As the years roll by, the same lack of maintenance for the monuments of other division associations will become a problem, and organizations concerned should decide how their monuments will be maintained 100 years from now.

Except for an official of the American Battle Monuments Commission, I am told that as far as is known I am the first individual to inspect each of the 22 oversea cemeteries under their jurisdiction. This I have done without cost to any other person or organization. It is my tribute to the Gold Star mothers, fathers, wives, and children of the American Patriots who lie at or are named at these American shrines. In addition, I visited the Punch Bowl, Cemetery of the Pacific at Honolulu, under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster of the Army and the battleship *Arizona* with its 1,100 entombed bodies at Pearl Harbor, under the jurisdiction of the Navy. All Americans should never forget that our heritage is based upon the men who laid down their lives that this Nation might endure, and that this knowledge be passed on to future generations.

It would have been impossible to pass on this information without the assistance, good will, and support for Gen. Jacob L. Devers, Chairman; Maj. Gen. Thomas North, Secretary; and Col. William A. Walker, Administrative Officer, of the American Battle Monuments Commission at Washington, D.C.; together with Col. G. M. ver Hulst; Col. John D. Holm; Mrs. Celia S. Moginier; Mr. Michael Francis; Mrs. Huguette Lesage and others at the European Office at Paris, France. Also, Col. Mario Chamberlain; Mr. Piero Martinelli; Mrs. Lieudmille Austin of the Mediterranean Office at Rome, Italy, together with each of the Superintendents and their Assistants at each of the cemeteries around the world for all their help and kindness, which enabled me to complete my mission. I left California in November 1962 and returned November 1963. Further information may be had addressing the writer at 7354 Hollywood Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif., 90046, or the American Battle Monuments Commission, Washington, D.C., 20360.

Remarks by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the City of New York at I Am an American Day Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following remarks made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, on Sunday, May 24, 1964, at the I Am an American Day ceremonies held in Central Park, New York City:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT I AM AN AMERICAN DAY CEREMONIES

We are gathered here to celebrate I am an American Day, which was initiated 25 years ago by the city of New York in cooperation with the New York Journal-American.

We honor today hundreds of newly naturalized citizens and also first voters, and it is inspiring to see this demonstration of thousands of Americans reaffirming their faith in our country.

The founders of this Republic planned a government of the people, by the people, and for the people * * * built on the solid rock of freedom and justice for all. This plan has never been altered. We can look around us at many other nations where, under totalitarian rule, violent upheaval constantly threatens. With all our problems, ours is the most stable government in the world today.

We proudly welcome all those gathered here who have sought and obtained the priv-

ileges of citizenship and full membership in our free and democratic society, with all the rights and responsibilities that go with such citizenship.

We hear a great deal about rights these days, civil and otherwise. And we should. One of the major rights of citizenship is the right to participate in the principal decisions of government through the ballot box. That is a precious right. In fact, it is an important responsibility to exercise that right, even when it is personally inconvenient to do so. To vote is a duty to one's country, State and city.

Today in some parts of our own country a struggle is necessary in order to secure for all citizens equally the right to vote. Here in New York City our constant effort is to induce each American citizen to exercise his right to vote, and to come to the polls on election day.

Many if not most Americans take their citizenship for granted. I hope that none of you do. Last Monday the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a historic decision, holding that no distinction can be made between naturalized and native born American citizens with regard to their right to go abroad—whether they want to reside temporarily or permanently in the country of their birth. In my judgment, this decision ranks in importance with the historic Supreme Court decision on the segregation of schools.

I have been urging for a long time that the McCarran-Walter Act should be amended to remove this distinction which gave the stigma of second-class citizenship to our naturalized citizens.

Now the Supreme Court has acted and rendered legislative action unnecessary. This was a great decision. We may well include the celebration of this decision on the occasion of I Am an American Day.

A moment ago I spoke of the responsibility as well as the right to vote. New citizens and first voters assume other responsibilities, too.

Perhaps the most important of all of these is a share in the burden of the national responsibility to help insure peace, freedom and justice throughout the world. Today America is the leader of the free world. Our country is the sword and shield of the cause of freedom everywhere. Each citizen assumes a proportionate share of the responsibility for the cost and consequences of this role.

The decisions made by our country affect the course of events in every country, in every continent, in every corner of the globe. Your vote and your voice provide the basis of these fateful decisions.

You bear a responsibility not only to your country but also to your city, to your community, and to your neighbors. In a city like New York you are responsible to accommodate yourself to your neighbors and they, to you. Each of you must be concerned for your neighbors' personal safety, security and welfare, whoever they are—and vice versa. Each New Yorker must regard himself as his brother's keeper, and his neighbor's keeper.

You must regard each fellow New Yorker as your neighbor, and each neighbor as your brother. These are my most meaningful words to you on this I Am an American Day.

Now let me congratulate all of you on your new privileges and responsibilities as citizens and new voters. You now have a share in the heritage of the greatest country in the world. So I say to you: Face the future with faith and confidence in yourselves and in this country of yours and mine. Hold your flag aloft with pride; and may God bless you, and may God bless America.

General Wheeler Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Officer magazine, monthly publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, published in one of its recent issues a most interesting and informative article by the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler.

This article explains succinctly but with irrefutable logic why this Nation throughout its history and especially today must rely upon the citizen-reservist for its safety in times of crisis.

General Wheeler is one of the best informed military leaders in our Nation and occupies a position of responsibility which is vitally important to every citizen. We should consider his views on this most important subject.

The Reserve Officers Association itself is performing a service to our Nation in continuing to remind the Congress and the people of the United States of the vital necessity for maintaining strong Reserve Forces in support of our active duty forces. ROA is known to all of us as a free voluntary, independent institution which throughout the years has contributed substantially to national security.

General Wheeler's article from the Officer follows:

THE UNITED STATES LOOKS TO THE CITIZEN OFFICER IN TIME OF CRISIS—THE ARMY CHIEF OF STAFF BELIEVES THE ROLE OF THE RESERVIST UNCHANGED IN THE MODERN ARMY

(By Gen. Earle G. Wheeler)

In the confusions existing in these "cold war" years, the Reserve officer properly wishes evaluation of his role in the modern Army.

Historically, the Reserve officer has shared the Army's continuing mission of conducting prompt, sustained, and successful combat with his Regular counterpart. The United States, from our earliest beginnings, has looked to the citizen officer in time of crisis. In the 146 Army campaigns honored by the watered-silk streamers on the Army flag, there is not one that does not include participation by Reserve officers. While it is true that in the Army's early days the Reserve structure did not exist in its current configuration, it is nonetheless true that in concept the great bulk of Army wartime leadership has always been provided by men who dropped civilian pursuits to pick up sidearms an epaulette, moving to the crisis at hand. From our earliest colonial beginnings to the support actions now underway in Vietnam, the Army counts on the citizen officer to fall in step with the Regular Army. Thus the reason that I say the Reserve officer shares equally in the Army's mission with the Regular is because the nature of modern warfares requires the Reserve officer to maintain his military proficiency at the same level as his professional counterpart.

ALWAYS ONLY HOURS AWAY

In view of the global commitments of the United States, the growing complexity of military equipment and organization, and the tempo of international affairs, the Reserve officer accordingly bears a heavy responsibility. No longer can his traditional readiness be maintained on a passive random basis. Today and in the future, the requisite readiness may be achieved only by a continuing active absorption with professional military competence.

In other words, today's Reserve officer must be a student of soldiering in its modern sense. The motivation for this study cannot come from outside; while the Army may offer opportunity, assistance, and convenience for such study, the Reserve officer must take full heed of the wording of his commission with its reference to special trust and confidence in his abilities as the basis for his motivation to study.

This study, in turn, is more than achieving a routine proficiency in a given military occupational specialty. It is the pursuit of an understanding of military affairs and the modern role of military force with the attitude that each officer may be needed by the United States not once in a lifetime, but twice, thrice, or oftener. In the present world atmosphere, mobilization is always only hours away. Who can predict the exact nature of responsibilities the citizen officer may be called on to assume on short notice?

In the modern Army, today's platoon leader is tomorrow's brigade commander. Today's division staff officer is tomorrow's theater staff head. Accordingly, study is required not merely to meet immediate responsibility; study is required to meet larger responsibilities predictable only in terms of the certainty that they will come quickly and with little advance notice. This is the kind of basic professional individual readiness demanded of the Reserve officer today.

CITIZEN-SOLDIER LINK

Next, the Reserve officer today is an active link between U.S. military policy and the citizens we all protect and serve. No amount of organized information activity, no amount of money, and no programs of the Active Army can tell the Army story to the public at home and abroad as well as the man who has his uniform and equipment on hand in the neighborhood. While it is true that there is today a closer identification between citizen and soldier than was the case in the past, it is also true that the Army still needs as many spokesmen as it can get who can explain the worth of landpower to the people we serve. The Reserve officer, in his community, provides this service.

But the role of the Reserve officer in the modern Army is not merely subjective. In today's Army, the reservist and the Regular are more than partners. They are interchangeable. Of the active Army Officer Corps, 57.7 percent are reservists, a significant indication of Reserve contribution and the community of responsibility shared by reservist and Regular alike.

It is this interchangeability which defines the role of the Reserve officer and which underscore the point I made earlier about the professional proficiency of the individual Reserve officer. Any existing distinctions in terms of duty tours, tenure, and similar administrative considerations are, in my view, academic.

I say this because the nature of our Army tasks, the multiplicity of our commitments, and the nature of the threat we face all create a requirement for leaders who can organize and direct the successful accomplishment of prompt and sustained combat on land with regard to subtle distinctions of component or status. The true professional officer, meaning the officer who knows what to do when war comes. Meeting this require-

ment in the U.S. Army permits no distinctions between career soldiers and an officer who serves on active wartime service only.

THE SIDE OF VICTORY

It is a feature of the current spectrum of warfare in which we are involved that modern technology has victimized time more than other facet of readiness. Napoleon's complaint, "Ask anything of me but time," has poignant meaning for us today because time can no longer be regarded as an effective dimension of our national security. I am convinced that in any conflict we may undertake in the future, be it limited or general war, the margin of victory will go to the side that can mobilize and field major forces most efficiently and effectively.

The efficiency of mobilization can be provided by mobilization planning and means, but the effectiveness can be provided only by the readiness of units and individuals. The current trend in foreshortened readiness schedules is one effort to respond to this requirement for effectiveness, but the motivation, the hard skills, and the team play that constitute real effectiveness can only be generated and guided by the Army's leader.

Thus, the role of the Reserve officer, on active duty or not, is the role of the professional in an era when the demands on him were never higher when the stakes were never greater. No longer can the reservist count on dropping his civilian pursuits and catching up his sidearms and epaulettes en route to join his unit. In a very real sense, the Reserve officer today must not only be in step with the Active Army, he must be out in front of it, showing the way to meaningful effectiveness by the example of his own hard-won professional skills.

A SENSE OF URGENCY

Doing this requires first of all the cultivation of a sense of urgency regarding our Army mission. This urgency takes it heightened tempo from both our active confrontation of aggressor forces in Europe, Korea, and Vietnam and from the volatile potential of trouble spots in other parts of the world. Our deployed forces constitute the line of contact, but the depth the Army needs for sustained combat comes from more than the Active Army divisions in the United States—it comes from Reserve component units. The requisite readiness of these units has to begin with this sense of urgency which is best generated by the officers.

Next, the Reserve officer must develop confidence in his own individual qualifications. This is achieved by more than annual active duty training; it can be achieved only by continuing concern and respect for the performance standards of the professional.

Next, the Reserve officer must communicate to his unit more than routine combat skills—he must establish the rapport that always exists between good leaders and their troops, a mystique that manifests itself in a group conviction that no job is too tough, no task too great. This we recognize as the will to win.

Next, the Reserve officer must cultivate a flexibility in himself and in his unit so that when the alarm is sounded, entry on active duty is accomplished at no sacrifice in individual or group readiness. This in turn is more than routine attention to readiness standards; it is a careful and continuing assessment of the many factors which create effectiveness—manpower, equipment, training, esprit, and motivation to name but a few.

AN UNCEASING TASK

In spite of our complex system of readiness categories and the community of our organization and doctrine, these readiness factors vary from unit to unit. Only the officer on the ground can assess his situation and the situation in his unit. The corrections, adjustments, and other actions to establish and maintain effectiveness are to be accomplished only by careful study, planning, and supervision. This is an unceasing task for every officer assigned to a unit.

The officer who is not part of a unit, and this is the situation for the majority of our Reserve officers, has a similar responsibility to the service as a whole and to himself as an individual. The officer must prepare himself on a broad scale to meet the requirements of any assignment on short notice. The challenge is tremendous and individual initiative is the key to meeting this challenge. The officer should be looking beyond his immediate possible mobilizaton assignments and building his potential for the next higher duty. He must follow a self-directed career pattern similar in many respects to the career pattern of his Active Army counterpart. The Reserve officer who is not a part of a unit must do this himself without counsel and guidance. This requires voluntary effort and sacrifice, but the traditions of the Reserve officer and the demands of modern warfare permit no other course.

These may sound like severe standards, but they have to be. They are the standards by which the professional officer is measured today. Meeting these standards is thus the role of the Reserve officer in the modern Army. As I pointed out in the beginning, the Army counts on the citizen officer to fall into ranks without faltering. So far in our history, the citizen officer has never failed in this duty. All of us, as brothers in arms, regular or reservist, can do no less than to keep faith with this great tradition.

"Witness for Aid"—By the Honorable Frank Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Frank Coffin, a former distinguished Member of this body and of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who has been more recently Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and who is now U.S. representative to the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD in Paris, has written a very excellent book on foreign aid entitled "Witness for Aid."

Frank Coffin makes a clear and convincing case for the importance of foreign aid, and for the success being achieved in the foreign aid program. It is an interesting book, reflecting the commonsense and clear thinking of our former colleague. Frank Coffin has an unusual gift for expressing ideas clearly and persuasively, and in this excellent little book he has made a clear and convincing case for foreign aid.

The Honorable Eugene Black, former President of the World Bank, recently reviewed Mr. Coffin's book in the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent to have his review inserted at this point in the RECORD.

THE HELPING HAND

(By Eugene R. Black)

In his foreword, Frank M. Coffin says, "This is not a book about the dark side of the moon. It is a book about a relatively unknown side of the United States." The subject is foreign aid, an aspect of our national purpose that is far from dark. Indeed, it reflects well on this country and holds bright promise for the world. The author has ably caught its glow.

The book is thoroughly readable, and there is a happy absence of that esoteric jargon and governmental lingo which frequently mar works of this type. Mr. Coffin offers calm and reasoned rebuttal to the irrational and often hysterical denunciations of our oversea assistance programs.

He explains how objectives are determined, how projects are evaluated, how actual work is implemented in Washington and throughout the world. He also shows the dedication, diligence, and tolerance for frustration of the administrative personnel. Mr. Coffin modestly omits mention of his own important work, which includes two terms in Congress and Presidential appointment to posts in the Development Loan Fund, the Agency for International Development—and, currently, as U.S. representative to the Development Assistance Committee in Paris.

"Witness for Aid" addresses itself to three broad questions. First: Do our aid programs have the right objectives?

The actual legislation bears a "statement of purpose" so ambitious and all encompassing as to invite the rejoinder, "On the seventh day, do we rest?" The author of this book rightly sees a long-term defense and development of the free world as the goal. It consists of patiently strengthening the economies of Western and noncommitted nations, fostering a spirit of independence and the means to maintain it.

The key words are economic growth and development. While military aid contributes nothing to this end, the author joins Congress and successive administrations in calling it aid. That may help win program approval, but it reinforces the erroneous view that aid is an effective weapon in cold war skirmishes, giving rise to unreasonable hopes and resultant disillusionment. We, and the Soviet Union even more so, have learned the limitations of aid as a short-run tactical device. Coffin points out that useful assistance should not be turned off periodically when some country's actions displease us. He fails to acknowledge so clearly that neither can it be turned on sporadically whenever we seek an immediate return. Nor does he face the sensible alternative of separating military from economic aid and putting it into the defense budget where it properly belongs.

He does emphasize the importance of a stronger national consensus on oversea assistance, based on an enlightened and widespread public commitment to its objectives.

The second question is: Are we spending too much?

This book says emphatically "No." It shatters the myth that the $100 billion already spent on foreign aid should have completed the job. Only $7 billion of that was economic aid to underdeveloped nations, which pose the real challenge now. Moreover, our present aid expenditures are a fraction of 1 percent of our gross national product.

"Over four-fifths of our economic aid today is in goods and services purchased in the United States," Coffin indicates. The adverse effect on the balance of payments is minor; the stimulus to export-oriented industries and jobs is major. We are also developing foreign markets for future profitable trade.

The author feels, and I believe correctly, that other nations, especially prosperous ones which are former aid recipients, could do more. True, their per capita expenditures in this field exceed ours. But the overwhelming share of the cost for military preparedness which the United States now pays for the security of the entire free world

makes our total burden disproportionate. Others should expand their efforts.

Third, and perhaps most important: Are we conducting our aid properly? Of the Agency for International Development program, the author admits that "it is complex. It is remote. Its failures are apparent. Its triumphs remain obscure." Considered a vast giveaway by many (actually almost two-thirds of development aid is in loans, rather than grants), it is harshly criticized. Errors are, of course, inevitable in any undertaking of this magnitude, and they get the headlines. Successes are seldom news, while diplomacy necessarily shrouds in silence the many times AID officials say "No" to unrealistic requests.

Yet, there is room for improvement. An outstanding need is for more stability and continuity in the programs and more career professionalism in personnel, what Coffin calls closing "the skill gap." In 15 years, we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA, and now AID. Eleven administrators have averaged less than 18 months in office.

Another obstacle is the annual review of aid by congressional committees. Sometimes these are mere sniping sessions, but they can produce legislation of genuine merit, which Mr. Coffin does not give due credit. On the other hand, he accurately indicts these reviews as a monumental drain on the time, energy, and resources of AID officials. He offers some worthwhile recommendations for streamlining this cumbersome process and substituting long-range planning for short-range chaos.

The book concentrates on the AID and gives relatively scant attention to other efforts, such as the U.N. technical assistance program, the World Bank and International Development Association, the Common Market's Overseas Development Fund, the Inter-America Bank, and the Development Assistance Committee. This may account for the author's failure to examine the advantages of a more multilateral approach.

Actually, a multilateral agency makes it easier to insist that certain conditions be met by aid recipients, who often resent purely American stipulations. Mr. Coffin thinks conditions are hard to impose in any case, implying that the withholding of aid is an insufficient lever, because it accounts for a very small part of the recipient's gross national product. It provides, however, capital goods which a shortage of foreign exchange would otherwise make unobtainable. It gives the crucial investment funds which cannot be accumulated through local savings. The United States learned how essential these investments from abroad could be in its own period of growth, and we remained a debtor nation until the turn of this century.

Our aid now can be helpful only where there is real self-help. We should insist on sound fiscal policies, equitable taxation, effective mobilization of resources, realistic priorities, programs for widespread education, and a climate that attracts instead of deters private investment as an essential concomitant of public aid.

We must be more selective about both the general environment and specific projects in which we invest, putting greater stress on the "quality" of aid, and directing it to those who "put their houses in order." But Coffin argues that "the interests of the United States range much more broadly, that it is the poorest nations who need help the most and that we cannot ignore the hard-pressed nations on the fringe of the Communist block."

This is a tangential rebuttal to the case for greater selectivity. Our task is not only to identify our interests, locate needs, and decide what should not be ignored. It is to determine exactly where and under what conditions our aid can be truly effective and to help bring these into being. Still, as Frank Coffin clearly shows, past achievements justify the confidence of our people and continuance in our purpose.

"Witness for Aid," is one of the better books on a subject that has received too little thoughtful attention. The conscientious citizen will find it well worth reading.

The Judas Kiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, could they distort the truth? Certainly not the American press. But this morning, buried in a story on page 2 of the Washington Post was a statement by former President Eisenhower indicating that his remarks about the qualifications of the 1964 GOP presidential candidate were completely misrepresented. According to the Post, Ike stated:

> You people read GOLDWATER out of the party, I didn't.

The show of affection by the press for the words of President Eisenhower on candidate qualifications were actually a cover for a betrayal and the chickens have come home to roost. When we find a system developing where supposed objective reporting is slanted into political propaganda, we are in trouble.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article on this subject from the June 1964 issue of Intelligence Digest just came to my attention. The digest contains a comprehensive view of world affairs and I commend this pamphlet to the attention of my colleagues. Under unanimous consent I include at this point an article from the aforementioned issue of Intelligence Digest:

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF WESTERN CULTURE

Wherever in the free world there is awareness of Communist infiltration and its dangers, that awareness tends to be confined to the more obvious outcrops of infiltration in the political and strategic fields. Surprise is often expressed at the apparent ease with which events and developments which a generation ago would have been well-nigh inconceivable have, in fact, been accepted as irremediable and condoned as inevitable.

The apparent inability of the free world to react decisively to what amounts to a series of disasters arises not so much from a basic inability to appreciate them correctly as from a state of mind which has been brought about by the influence of Marxist materialism on Western intellectual thought.

Recently, in Pretoria, a conference was held under the title of the "National Conference To Combat Communism." Papers were read by a number of responsible experts in their different fields. We have seen some of these papers, and the following report is an abstract of one which was read by a professor of a South African university. This professor is an Englishman who went to South Africa only 5 years ago.

Space does not allow us to reproduce the paper as a whole, and we have adapted some of the author's wording. In the opinion of this service, what he said is of the highest importance; because when the people of the free world, and in particular the Western World, realize the influence of Marxist materialism on Western intellectual thought and when they remember with pride their own particular heritage, then we will be at any rate on the way to solving the desperate problem with which the world is faced.

The world is threatened today with the concept of a worldwide culture and overall control in the field of which man becomes absorbed into an amorphous collective society. Everywhere, quantitative values have replaced, or are rapidly replacing, those of quality.

The world is economically, politically, and socially divided, but tremendous and well-thought-out efforts are being made to unite it on the internationalist theme of materialism.

A "PROGRESSIVE" ATTITUDE

One of the resulting phenomena is what is popularly called a "progressive" attitude. In the field of education, such an attitude describes a system which is intended to fit the student into a future place in modern society—a place where he can best serve the interests of the projected new community. The system is also designed to condition the student so that he may the more easily be absorbed into interests of a noneducational nature.

The new educational aims are quite distinct from previous concepts of education which, broadly speaking, concerned themselves with standards of quality and with building a critical structure of selective powers with which to face the problems of life, rather than merely to be integrated into its commercial or political ways. The Greeks, who began Western education, were careful to distinguish between culture and instruction; between value and scientific fact.

The cutting off of the past and the forming of entirely new patterns of life reflecting what is called the philosophy of modern life is now general practice. We have, of course, to live in accordaance with the times, but a sense of contemporaneity does not distinguish us from our forebears. What is new, is burning the bridges which link us with past experience so that we may be unencumbered and isolated in the strictly modern dogmatic path which we are treading.

TWO CHOICES

Cut off from the past and obliged to conform with the present, youth has two readily available choices:

1. Passively to enter the ranks of spiritual lethargy and uninspired jobseeking, and to accept what the commercial world offers in place of culture and enlightenment.

2. Aggressively to indulge in activities or thoughts which will speed up the totalisation of uprootedness and thus bring about the "comfort" of world unity wrapped in a new code of values with its own methods of communication.

Methods or schemes which readily offer an apparent solution to world problems are leftist intellectualism or, for the more urgent minded, Marxist socialism. For the leftist intellectual life is relatively simple, being devoid of all values except those of rational approach.

The rights of man having displaced those of God, man becomes a law unto himself and can generously indulge in what is called humanism.

This does not mean that he is tolerant of all men. On the contrary, he is quite intolerant of those who oppose his ideology. In particular, he is intolerant of men who retain and cherish their links with the past. He scorns tradition; for tradition has to do with nature rather than with science; and the traditionally minded man is concerned more with the experiences of the past than with so-called progress; and, above all, he believes in God rather than in man.

LOOSENING OF ROOTS

In a concept bent on world unification through totalitarianism it is necessary for the new man to tempt or force traditional man to loosen his roots. Like a tree, a man divested of his roots falls the more easily or, having lost support, will grab at whatever is offered in the way of alternatives.

Thus, by means of persuasion, propaganda, and "education", total uniformity is sought; but there are also ways of force and violence.

Methods used in Communist countries, such as mass liquidation of "bourgeois reptiles", are, of course, known, although they are not well known, let alone well cataloged; but in the Western World itself the French maquis systematically murdered an estimated 105,000 of their political opponents after the liberation. This revolution of 1944–46 accounted for 80,000 more victims than did the reign of terror in the first French Revolution and the masacres were no less savage and were certainly more numerous and on a wider scale than those of St. Bartholomew's Day and the Commune.

Yet such historical facts are rarely given the same publicity as crimes attributed or attributable to what are called rightists. Indeed, what are called world courts of justice, seem to have been set up for the sole purpose of judging the right, whereas the left occupies the positions of both judge and jury.

This is perhaps an example of the international solidarity of ideas; but this kind of solidarity allows no opportunity for the opponent of the leftist concept to become a martyr, for the only obituary allowed is one in the nature of a "confession."

THE REVOLUTION MATURES

As the world Socialist revolution matures in the way that Lenin predicted, some interesting and significant trends of ideological infiltration have occurred.

What is called international opinion has organized the West into discarding its former responsibilities to less advanced communities.

There is also the Third International, with the objective of organizing the world.

There is a certain overlapping of effort between these two forms of subversion which has resulted in a certain confusion of opinion between those in the West who have succumbed.

For example, a popular modern catchword is "Better Red than dead." This is a slogan which has been repeated by more than one prominent churchman. One wonders whether these churchmen realize that what the slogan really means is that it is better to live as an atheist than to die believing in God.

However, the most effective sentiment of the leftist intellectual is more truly expressed in a phrase which is scarcely mentioned, but obviously believed, namely: "Better Red than anti-Red."

These political passwords which masses of people have been cozened into accepting as principles have acquired an international codification. The anti-Red is always referred to as "reactionary" or "extremist" or "Fascist."

ORGANIZED INFILTRATION

Communist front infiltration via the cell system and so-called neutral organizations is now common, even if not sufficiently appreciated. The names of some of these front organizations show both the wide field covered and the apparently respectable titles which are part of the international codification.

The World Federation of Trades Unions.

The World Peace Council.

The World Federation of Democratic Youth.

The World Federation of Teachers' Unions.

The World Congress of Doctors.

The International Organization of Journalists.

The International Broadcasting Organization.

The International Union of Students.

The Women's International Democratic Federation.

The Association of Democratic Lawyers.

The Federation of Scientific Workers.

The Artists for Peace.

The Authors' World Peace Appeal.

The Teachers for Peace.

The Musicians' Organization for Peace.

The Committee for the Promotion of International Trade.

The Dove of Peace has become the instrument of Communist infiltration. The visitor to a place like Trafalgar Square in London, where demonstrations of every kind are constantly held, could hardly fail to notice the use of babes in arms at Communist-inspired partisan processions; and the so-called passive resistance of youthful squatters led by old men and political priests whose real purpose is to destroy law and order.

In another field, the industrial front continues its system of crippling strikes through now well-established channels.

It is, however, the intellectual front which has won the most ground and it is this front, the subtleties of which so often pass unrecognized, that is, therefore, the most dangerous of all. It is this front—handled not so much by party members as by fellow-travelers and near-travelers—which saturates cultural societies, church organizations, universities, and "progressive" intellectuals with a Marxist-Socialist ideology.

THE CULTURE FRONT

The culture front covers a wide variety of media and expressive forms, but the symptoms throughout, in accordance with a rigid dialectic, are similar and are familiar to those who are acquainted with the methods of the early Bolsheviks.

The Bolshevik revolution in Russia concerned itself with the removal of personal values and individual man, so that mentally conditioned, collective man could be firmly established. The purpose was to obliterate all inheritances from the past and all antimaterialist thought. All education was completely overhauled; history was reshuffled; a new status was given to science and to scientific methods; a new meaning was given to art, the proletarian expressions of which developed in a quick rotation of styles.

By these means the new State rapidly established itself, laying down new limits of reality, and every effort was made to make knowledge visible only through the perspective of scientific method and Marxist ideology.

Unfortunately, it is far too little recognized that this early Bolshevik style has been refashioned by a deeply infiltrated Western World—still nominally anti-Communist—and is now coming to be established as a facet of the West's own sociopolitical ideals.

THE NEW MIND

What may be called the new mind is more and more becoming a decisive factor in western ideology. The difference in attitude between the old mind and the new mind can be described as follows:

The old mind, imperfect as it was and is, nevertheless gropes toward the completion of an idea—an idea of which there preexisted some kind of awareness; an idea of purpose; an idea seeking to subscribe to what used to be called a natural or Divine order of things.

The new mind is not groping toward anything, because reality does not exist—so we are told—beyond the active and material experience of physical being.

The old mind gropes toward an objective outside its normal orbit.

The new mind gestures within its limited material field.

PAINTING AND MUSIC

All this is very clearly expressed in painting and music. For example, what is called American Action Painting consists of dripping, flinging, or squirting the paint rather than calmly brushing it on. It is a highly excitable act which is supposed to give expression to the unconscious and throw it into effective vision, and is closely allied to Freudianism.

The new mind also expresses itself in music without focus, purpose, or direction. In many quarters electronic tape sounds, mathematical formulae, mechanical conductors, fragments of "non-melody" and "non-rhythm," and duels between "live" and "computer" sounds are becoming the rage.

All new mind art is not of the same style and one must, of course, be careful to avoid a slavish and unthinking attachment to traditionalism for its own sake, particularly if one does not appreciate its spiritual and historical background. At the same time, a careful examination of this subject reveals the fact that what one might call new mind art, although it has a number of styles and methods of expression. all conforms to the same basic ideology—that of materialism.

A PATTERN OF THOUGHT

There is, in fact, a clear pattern of thought in all these things. One would have thought that the intellectual pattern of thought of Western Christendom would be the exact opposite to that of the Marxist world. On the contrary, however, a survey of Communist "culture" in its violent beginnings comes very near to describing the nature of cultural trends now so prevalent in the West. The Bolshevik revolutionaries did the following:

They set about the destruction of all established values.

They swept away all traditional impediments ("everything traditional must be smashed," said Pissarev) in order that they might concern themselves solely with what they considered to be the realities of the present.

They totally rejected as guides the spiritual and the absolute.

They armed spiritual negation with so-called scientific method.

They sought to make art a physiological, mechanical process. As Trotsky said, only those materials which were the foundation of scientific and industrial organization should provide the material for culture.

In 1930, the Comintern formulated four principles of Communist culture:

1. Art is not an end in itself.
2. For us, art is education.
3. For us, art is collective striving.
4. We do not waste time thinking about the future or searching through the past. We are living today. For us, art proclaims and expresses our will toward communism.

These four principles are becoming more and more reflected in the trends of Western so-called culture.

TWO CONCLUSIONS

One can reasonably draw two conclusions:

1. A new form of Western intellectualism has arisen which, far from being anti-Communist as claimed, is in fact fully engaged in the implementation of Marxist Socialist ideology and practice. It differs from modern Russian or Chinese communism only by being nonnationalistic.

2. Whereas this form of Western intellectualism claims to lead and sometimes, indeed, to be in rebellion, it is in fact a result, knowingly or unknowingly, of consent and submission to Marxist ideology.

The claim to progressiveness is entirely false. A massive deceptive propaganda has blinded us to the deep infiltration of Marxist materialist thought. In fact, a very great

deal of what is falsely claimed to be individualistic rebellion against outworn tradition is totally devoid of individualism and is a slavish reflection of Marxist political forms.

THE COLLECTIVE MATERIALISTIC STATE

The prospect ahead is that of a uniform dialectic which, although denying the absolute, is itself absolutist and which declares to be untrue or even nonexistent everything which does not conform to itself.

Its ideologies are adapted to economic circumstances.

Its political passwords are put forward as principles.

It aims at complete domination, using as its means the uprooted new man or proletariat.

It has destroyed the old scale of values and has instigated a new set of values which describe:

A state of general unrest as peaceful coexistence;

A state of economic slavery as political freedom;

A state of Marxist materialist philosophy as Christianity;

A state of collective vulgarity as civilized culture;

A state of aggression and anarchy as peaceful protest;

A state of sabotage and subversion as the expression of political rights;

A system of slanted political propaganda as dispassionate investigation;

A system of group indoctrination as education;

A system of scientific methodizing as artistic expression.

The system into which man is being steadily absorbed is a totalitarian reorganization of the world, from which the accumulated experiences of past civilizations and cultures are being exterminated.

THE DEMANDS OF TRUTH

The product of this system is an incomplete man who is a danger to humanity. Free thought can be shaped only by man who has not been degraded by a system.

Truth is not reassuring; it is demanding.

The prevailing disease which is steadily saturating the world has become so widespread that it is no longer easy to locate and pinpoint it. The cure, therefore, cannot consist only of surgery. Indeed, too much has already been cut away.

What is needed is a rebuilding of man to his original strength of purpose and individuality so that he may reacquire the knowledge and the power to resist and destroy the new totalitarian concept. The basic need is, of course, a spiritual one.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Mark Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, Before Philadelphia Rotary Club, May 27, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to greet the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, when he was in Philadelphia on May 27. The Governor delivered an address to the Philadelphia Rotary Club which I believe deserves wide circulation.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY GOV. MARK O. HATFIELD

A recent theater production carried the title "Stop the World, I Want To Get Off." From what I read about the national debates on foreign policy, there are quite a number of Americans who wish it were possible.

For them, the title of a TV play of some years ago may provide the proper answer: "You Say Goodby but It Doesn't Go Away."

The 190 million people of these United States share this terrestrial ball with nearly 3 billion other human beings. There are, in other words, about 15 "foreigners" for every citizen of the United States of America. We are the fourth nation in terms of population but we stand first in most measures of material wealth. And we long ago decided that our independence and the means for defending it held first place on our national agenda.

As we look at the rest of the world—with which we are inevitably involved, we are both appalled and challenged. We are appalled by the abject poverty that is the constant condition of most of the world's population. Although we need to maintain our attack on poverty here at home, the single most significant fact that must underlie our thinking about foreign affairs is that hunger is fast becoming the central element in world tension.

Any survey of the world in which we live reveals a bewildering array of economic and governmental systems—from near anarchy through the most despotic of dictatorships; from primitive agriculture to the most sophisticated of industrial complexes. Despite the awesome accomplishments of free enterprise in the United States, most of the people of the world share to only a limited extent in the benefits it has built. Communism, socialism, or some middle way is the condition of economic life in most of the world.

When an American looks at the state of world affairs, he is struck again by the complexity of the issues that preclude a tranquil world. One can call a long roll of frictions that threaten to spread to wider theaters: Greek versus Turk in Cyprus; Moslem versus Hindu in India and Pakistan; the shifting of relationships among Russia and China and Ethiopia and Albania and Guinea and France and Morocco and Yugoslavia; the tensions in the Near East and among the new nations of Africa. The formation of Malaysia has been far from easy. Stability in Africa may be decades away. These are but a few of the active places of concern—the hot spots that at any time could start a conflagration.

In addition to the threats—and actuality—of violence as a fact of international relations, there are the subtler but significant developments that pose their thorny problems. The intricacies of Common Market discussions are one example. The Inner Six, the Outer Seven and all their suppliers and customers are bound in a web of commerce but they do not exist in a world of their own any more than we do. We may guess that trying times yet lie ahead in Western Europe.

Most of us try to relate America's role, responsibility and interest to any such catalog of the world's ills. No longer do we speak of "the white man's burden," or "manifest destiny." We are suspicious of these and other slogans of yesteryear. We are groping through a fog of present blunders. We ask for leadership that acts rather than reacts. We ask for leadership that has a program and a policy predicated on forthright and unambiguous principles to which we can willingly pledge our allegiance.

Such a policy can be built only on a clear conception of our national interest—and—how to secure it. Such a foreign policy must rely on America's strength, recognize our weaknesses, and listen to no uncertain trumpets.

We are strong. Secretary McNamara must be buying something behind the drawn shades of the Pentagon for $50 billion a year. Our space program, on Eisenhower administration foundations, is producing significant results. Despite the absence of needed tax reform to stimulate the production of jobs for those now unemployed, we have been making economic progress that (by world standards) is fantastic. Our technological progress is so impressive that some of our economic pessimists, with little faith in free enterprise, view technology as a threat rather than the promise it truly is.

We are dealing effectively with the social challenges that confront us. I can remember when "life could be beautiful at 35—and beyond." We now look to "three score and ten" as a low average instead of a high goal. We are not yet certain of the new social patterns implicit in our expanded life expectancy—but what a joyful challenge.

We have seen our farm population cut in half and then in half again, while we eat better than any nation and are appalled by surpluses that bulge our storehouses.

We have been attacking poverty consciously and explicitly for many years—successfully. We now seem committed to a final assault on its last remnants.

Despite these (and other) strengths, we are still inclined to wish the world would go away and are distressed because there are some in the world who apparently wish we would. The Premier of Indonesia tells us where we can go. The Prince of Cambodia tells us what we can do with our gifts to his people. Our embassies are attacked. Yankees are told to go home. And the President of the United States tells us "we are a much-beloved people throughout the world" (February 21, 1964).

After 17 years of Marshall plan and mutual security and economic cooperation and foreign assistance, and international cooperation and international development, and Alliance for Progress—$100 billion later—we seem to have fewer friends, fewer allies, and an understandable sense of frustration. (And having run through MSA, ECA, FOA, ICA, and AID, we have used up a good share of the alphabet.) We have dispatched a sum to other nations totaling one-third of our national debt, with a mixture of selfish and unselfish motives; we are perturbed that in many places we have achieved neither our selfish aims or our unselfish hopes.

Concerned about the threat to the freedom and dignity of man that is posed by the ruthlessness of communism, we have seen its tentacles extend to within 90 miles of our shores. We place a boycott on trade with one Communist dictatorship and sell wheat to another. We sell vital materials to Poland, which ships similar goods to Cuba. In Vietnam, we are engaged in a conflict which we seem unwilling or unable either to win or withdraw.

A few years ago, one of our military men wrote about "The Uncertain Trumpet." We now have uncertain trombones, slurring over a theme blended of despair and discontent with the failures of recent years. Of course, we must discard old myths. Of course, we must recognize new realities. Of course, we should improve the management of foreign assistance.

Regrettably, in the uncertain sliding of Senator FULBRIGHT'S trombone and in Representative PASSMAN'S confession that "the aid program, in my candid opinion, is uncontrolled and uncontrollable," we do not find a constructive alternative for American action.

There has been much criticism of General de Gaulle's recognition of Red China. Our ally in revolution and in war, France has received over $10 billion in help from us in recovery from World War II. We are dismayed that France should follow a course so repugnant to us.

Perplexing though they may seem, when viewed in terms of French interest, French aspirations, we can understand the benefits France seeks. Although they contribute to the fragmentation of the free world, it must seem to the French Government that these new policies are to the advantage of France.

Although we may judge the French action to be a blunder of magnificent proportions, we can learn from it a lesson of motive.

For too long, our foreign policy has been predicated on an exaggerated sense of guilt. Our gratitude to divine providence for the fact that in less than 30 years there were two World Wars in which our own land escaped devastation while indescribable horror stalked much of Europe is understandable. We have allowed a misguided sense of historical objectivity to focus on our least worthy moments—to allow "debunking" to destroy our rightful pride in the valiant fortitude of Valley Forge, in the heroism of the pioneers who won the West, and in the idealism and humanitarianism of a Woodrow Wilson or a Herbert Hoover.

We face unique problems:

The Communist conspiracy—ruthless, relentless, imaginative.

New nations and a new nationalism arising in large measure from our example and our encouragement but destroying in the process the forces that maintained a degree of stability.

Nuclear war—the possibility that rests uneasily in the back of our minds in every consideration of international relations.

Our response to the challenge of these problems must cope with them ideologically, practically, and with frank recognition of our national interest.

As I suggested at the outset, hunger may shortly magnify international tensions. Disease and poverty persists around the world. India, for example, seems to be moving steadily toward mass famine within a decade.

And India is not alone in facing this problem. There are food shortages in Indonesia, in Russia, and in many other lands.

What does this imply for American foreign policy?

Do we sell our surpluses? To friend? To foe? Do we give them away? And what happens to the world when our surpluses are gone? And to the American taxpayer who foots the foreign assistance bill?

Our foreign policy has been inadequate to serve the needs of this nation or of the people whose hunger we would feed. Although we are beginning to recognize that birth control must be a factor in the balancing of population and food supply, it is apparent that our radical revolution in agricultural production must be shared with the world. Only in Europe and North America, and perhaps Japan, is food production no longer a problem of subsistance.

What our foreign policies and programs must achieve (if relief of international tension is to be gained) is a sharing of our abundance that does not carry with it the gall of continued dependence. This means continued technical assistance that is aimed at eliminating hunger by raising the capacity of each nation to meet its own needs. We must take a course which will not result in steel mills and factories surrounded by starvation.

This is, of course, a long-range challenge. We have been at the business of foreign aid on a massive scale for nearly two decades.

We must think of staying with a reoriented program for decades more. I suggest that the reorientation should embrace four modifications and innovations:

1. A CONTINUATION AND INTENSIFICATION OF THE PEACE CORPS APPROACH

We must reach the people we are trying to help. A chief cause of our failures, repeatedly documented around the world, has been the fact that so little of the benefits have trickled down to those for whom we have intended them.

We must deal with primary needs—food, health, education. Too many of our efforts have resulted in the construction of monuments to our own folly (highways where there are few automobiles, dams where there is no water).

We must expose other nations to the idealism of our young people, which is far more representative of us than is the jaded cynicism of so many of our career representatives abroad.

2. INCREASING THE UNDERSTANDING OF PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES IN FOREIGN RELATIONS

There needs to be a high degree of coordination between what is being done abroad by nongovernmental units such as the Ford Foundation, the American Friends Service Committee and others and what is being attempted through official governmental channels. It is not always evident that this is the case.

We should consider whether there should be a formal orientation program that would broaden the perspective and understanding of personnel sent abroad by American firms. U.S. citizens spending a substantial period of time in foreign communities can often materially affect international understanding. They need to recognize their responsibilities as unofficial representatives of this Nation.

It is important that this Nation's presence in other countries exhibit a consistency of goals. Mutually inconsistent programs are self-defeating. Individual actions, reflecting lack of understanding of U.S. interests, can do grave harm. I have the impression that we have generally been quite fortunate in this respect but this is too important to be left entirely to voluntary and independent action.

3. CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO A DECENTRALIZATION OF OUR EFFORTS TO ASSIST FOREIGN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Our efforts to assist in the economic development of foreign nations have included a substantial investment in their industrial potential. These investments involve a multitude of complex decisions that are now highly centralized in Washington.

In other governmental functions, there has been experimentation with a decentralization of some kinds of decision-making to quasi-governmental agencies. I think, for example, of the Rand Corp., and the Systems Development Corp. These are independent of, yet designed primarily to serve the National Government's needs in dealing with extremely complicated matters.

At this point of time, I would only suggest that we ought to explore the possibility that quasi-governmental economic development corporations might provide a useful device to enhance the effectiveness of the choices we must make.

In economic development, we should be concerned primarily with self-justifying investments. Certainly, they should be subjected to hard business judgment as well as to purely political or humanitarian decisions.

Whether such an approach is fully feasible, only further study can establish. I do believe, however, that it is a concept worthy of extensive analysis.

4. OUR PROGRAMS OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED

The propriety and usefulness of military assistance programs (which have cost us no little embarrassment) deserve early reconsideration. They have cast us in the anomalous role of arming those who one day may be at odds with each other or with us. It is my judgment that our proper goal is renovation and enlargement of the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations. Conceivably, we could make the acceptance of United Nations rather than U.S. troops a condition prerequisite to the availability of economic or technical assistance from this Nation.

These proposals are presented with earnest humility. The earnestness stems from my conviction that the path we are following serves our national interest inadequately. The humility stems from my recognition that no one of us has all the wisdom the design of foreign policy requires.

There is no question, however, that the time for reappraisal is once again arrived. Periodic revision is inevitable in a changing world, if we are to avoid the pursuit of policies which have outlived whatever usefulness they may have had.

In our present circumstance—and that of the world—we must devise a new program, a coherent policy that will merit popular support, international respect, and the approval of those who will live in a world shaped by these decisions.

How Desperate Can They Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have noted with a great deal of interest, as I have, reaction to a recent attempt by prominent members of the Republican Party to discredit President Johnson's recommendations to Congress to abolish poverty through a political expedition to Alabama.

Frankly, I was disappointed that our opposition feels it must oppose by personal attacks. As an editorial in the Houston Post of May 20, 1964, points out:

> This is the kind of political attack * * * that usually is not used except in desperation.

I believe the Post editorial sums up the feeling of the majority of our countrymen and I offer it for the RECORD at this point:

LOW POLITICAL BLOW

The "exposure" by two Republican Congressmen of the conditions under which a few elderly tenants live on land owned by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson in Alabama was frankly and admittedly an attempt to discredit President Johnson's antipoverty program.

The Congressmen, whose trip to Alabama was aided by their party's congressional campaign committee, said that their purpose was to show that the President's war on poverty is only an election gimmick.

Their actions also were a personal attack upon the President, not merely because he and his family were involved, but because they questioned his sincerity in the compassion that he has shown for the Nation's less fortunate citizens.

This is the kind of political attack that one has to expect from time to time, but it is one that usually is not used except in desperation. It is a type that does not set well with most of the American people, and in most cases its use does more to discredit the users than those against whom it is directed.

Surely, there are plenty of legitimate issues for this year's political campaigns without having to resort to tactics of this kind.

In this case, the facts were taken out of their context, and the result of the exclusion was a gross and unfair distortion. This is readily recognized by anyone at all familiar with the conditions and patterns of rural poverty throughout the South. They are conditions that deeply trouble all thoughtful and humane Southerners, but there are no pat, readymade answers that can be bought at the neighborhood supermarket.

To attempt to pin responsibility upon any individual, whether he is President of the United States or not, is unfair unless all the relevant factors are taken into account. It betrays a lack of understanding of the nature of the broader problem.

In the case of Mrs. Johnson's tenants, it would be well to ask what the living conditions of these tenants would be if they were forced to move. Bad as their present living conditions may be by the standards of most

Americans, they would be very much worse anywhere else they might go. At the very least, they have not been forced upon urban relief rolls. By far their greatest loss, however, would be that of contentment.

When all factors are taken into account, the action of the two Congressmen can be described only as a "low blow." Americans don't like the political game to be played that way.

Dedication of the Federal Office Building, Kansas City, Mo.—Address by Hon. Richard Bolling, May 29, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Honorable RICARD BOLLING, of the Fifth District of Missouri, made at the dedication of the Federal office building in Kansas City on May 29.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD BOLLING, KANSAS CITY, MO.

It gives me special pleasure to stand here today to help in the dedication of this building. One of the great rewards of serving in the Congress is that the results of our work for legislation is almost always visible in some way. What Member of Congress does not feel proud when one of his appointees stands straight in the graduating class at West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy? Or when a child enters a school whose doors have been opened to her by law? Or when a country across the sea is able to resist a totalitarian philosophy, armed with aid provided by the United States? Or when new laws give opportunity to the young and hope to the aged?

The most satisfying moment comes, however, when a legislator can come home and see material manifestation of his labors. This is such a moment.

Soon this red steel skeleton will be fleshed out by rivers of concrete, miles of wire, acres of glass: with marble and bricks and mortar and lime. And sometime next year it will become the daytime home of 5,000 Federal employees. It will be as modern and functional as design and engineering can make it. It will be the biggest office building in Missouri—bigger, it has been noted—than the Federal buildings in Austin and Boston. It will stand here for generations, lending its functional beauty to the heart of Kansas City.

But more than that, it will stand here as a symbol of the continuing progress of Kansas City. Only a few short years ago this site was covered by decaying buildings, a reminder of the past that has made way for the future.

This building will also stand as a constant reminder of the strong ties between the people of this area and the Federal Government in Washington. It will stand as a reminder that the energy, the talent, and the dedication of the people of our city are recognized and appreciated by that Government. Just how well these things have been recognized may surprise you.

The part the Federal Government plays in the economic life of Kansas City will be readily visible to the people in this neighborhood next year when this building is occupied. Every day the thousands of Government employees who will work here will arrive in the morning and depart in the evening and their numbers will be an impressive reminder of the multimillion-dollar payroll they will take into the marketplaces.

But how about when they disperse to their own neighborhoods? What is there to remind the baker from whom they buy their bread and the bank where they save their money, that their wage is material evidence of the role of the Government in the local economy?

The impressive total of Government investment in Kansas City, I am afraid, just isn't visible to the people who daily benefit from it.

I would like to take a few minutes here to outline for you just what this investment means to the people, the economy, and the community of Kansas City.

Perhaps this can best be expressed by a look at what I found to be a rather amazing statistic: Since 1949, the year I first went to Congress, Federal investments in and for Kansas City have amounted to nearly $3 billion. This is quite a sum of money. As a matter of fact it is more than the entire revenues from all sources collected by the U.S. Government in the entire first 75 years of its existence.

Put another way it is more than the cost of the War of 1812, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War together. It is nearly twice the cost of the first year of World War I.

It is significant, I think, that in the last 16 years the Federal Government has spent more in Kansas City for the cause of peace than it spent in three major wars over the period of a century.

Where does this money go?

Ultimately, and importantly, it goes into the mainstreams of commerce here at home. It goes to the butcher, the baker, and the clothing merchant; it goes for power to light our homes and fuel to heat them; it goes into local banks as savings and into the local government as taxes and it goes for transportation, medical expenses, education, and amusement.

It would be very difficult to find a citizen of this city whose life is not touched in some way for the good by Federal spending here.

A few moments ago I mentioned that 5,000 Federal employees would be housed in this building. This figure by no means represents all the Federal workers in this district. There are in fact, nearly 18,000. This is a raise of 57 percent since 1949. To this number can be added $19 million annual payroll for military personnel in the area.

When these people receive their paychecks it says on them very clearly: "Treasurer of the United States." When they cash those checks the banker or the merchant knows where they came from. But how about the men who are working on this building? This building will cost more than $32 million and a great deal of it will go into wages for the men who are building it. Their paychecks do not bear the stamp of the U.S. Treasury but the money they spend is indeed legal tender and it is computed at 100 cents to the dollar when it is spent in our local markets and it comes as a result of a Federal decision to build this building here in Kansas City.

The same is true for the men and women who work at the Bendix plant. In the last 16 years the Federal Government has awarded the local Bendix plant atomic energy contracts valued at more than $1¼ billion. Again, a great proportion of this money went and continues to go into the economy of Kansas City in the form of wages.

Some of the aid the Government furnishes to the economy of Kansas City is not so direct as those few examples I have outlined. Even so they are of significant importance.

If I could take you to the top of this building you could see the Missouri River winding through the city. The Missouri River is not very clear water but a glance across its surface will tell you how deep it is. You can tell from the barges plowing up and down that it is 7 feet deep in the channel. Since that channel was opened in 1953, after it was deepened with Federal funds, commercial barge traffic on the river has increased twentyfold, and three new grain elevators have been built on its banks.

This channel has provided the shippers of this area with a gate to the sea. This year legislative obstacles to a 9-foot channel have been removed. When it is completed it will allow the barges to take additional weight and could reduce rates as much as 35 percent. When this takes place more shippers will come to take advantage of the facilities here and the whole economy will profit.

If we were on the roof of this building we might take another look at the river and then try to remember what it looked like on that black Friday, July 13, 1951. Joined by the Kaw, it churned and boiled and breeched its banks to devastate whole sections of the city. Since then key dams have been built to better control the flow of the powerful Kaw. Dams like the one at Tuttle Creek and the Perry and Milford Dams. Again, Kansas City has benefited through this added protection for its waterfront.

I would venture to say that most of you here, if, indeed, not all of you benefited to some degree by Federal expenditures in the area on your way here this morning. I refer to your ride to this dedication site. Was it a little smoother, a little shorter, a little faster? In the last decade and a half the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has contributed $106 million toward the construction of more than 90 miles of roads right here in Jackson County.

Did you know that there are nearly 50,000 people in Kansas City who are 65 or older. Suppose for a moment there was no social security for most of our aging. Suppose they had to depend entirely on their sons and daughters or on the public dole. It is not a pretty picture and, fortunately not one that is likely to materialize. Last year social security payments in this district totaled nearly $34 million. Incidentally, that compares with $1¼ million in 1949.

These statistics could go on and on. I could demonstrate for you that there is hardly a department or an agency of the U.S. Government that does not have an investment in Kansas City.

Why, you might ask, has Kansas City been singled out for all this munificence? The facts are that Kansas City has not been singled out. The Federal investments here have come as the result of the hard work and combined effort of the business community, the labor community, the local government and the legislators in Washington.

This building we are dedicating today is a good example of what coordinated effort can produce. Long ago, when this building was first discussed, it was quickly apparent that in the order of first things first, a building site must be agreed upon. It was done quickly and with a minimum of disagreement.

The result was that when the plan for the building was submitted the site was ready and waiting. This was more than a little helpful in getting the legislation passed to authorize its construction.

I now say to you that in my opinion this building, above all stands for the will of all the people of this community to push ahead, to work, to progress. Let us so dedicate it.

Socialists Acclaim Johnson Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now we have it from an authority on socialism, Norman Thomas, that the administration's war on poverty is "a socialistic approach."

Thomas, six time candidate for President on the Socialist Party ticket, addressing the Socialist Party convention in Chicago told his party members they should "be grateful for President Johnson."

All Americans believe in a great society, Mr. Speaker. Most Americans believe that we have and have always had a great society. Under the private enterprise system we have created the highest standard of living in all human history. We have provided more jobs for more people at higher wages than any other country on earth. In spite of our imperfections, and we freely admit them as we strive to correct them, the great majority of our people eat better, are better housed, better clothed than any people on earth. In building the American society under capitalism, freedom of the individual has not been sacrificed. We have had no police State. For the past 100 years we have had no men held in slavery.

We do not deny there has been injustice, but even the minority groups, ethnic and racial, have been given the opportunity to rise to whatever heights their talents, ability, initiative, and willingness to learn and work would lift them. Hundreds of thousands of Irish immigrants came to America and faced up to discrimination, ridicule, hardship, and poverty. In spite of it the Irish made their opportunities and have contributed some of our greatest national leaders in business, industry, politics. The same has been true of Italian groups, and Hungarians, and Polish, and people from the Middle East and Asia. The Negro race, also has had among its members those who struggled against the odds and won and they have made notable contributions to our national life and our culture.

The point is that under capitalism we can solve the problems among human beings and we can offer a better solution for more people than any dictator government or socialistic society.

Does this administration point proudly to the tremendous achievements of the people under the capitalist system? No. Instead, our national leaders under the New Frontier and the big deal now being sold to us constantly downgrade the United States, the private enterprise system, the initiative and the wisdom of the people. We are told by the President that only the Federal Government can end poverty.

We have not been told that to do this we must give up freedom and adopt a socialist system. Now, Norman Thomas, makes it a matter of record, the war on poverty is a socialist program. We should remember that the adoption of socialism in America will mean the end of private enterprise and the sacrifice of individual freedom. Remember, Mr. Speaker, these remarks were made by a respected Socialist, not by a Republican. We who have dared to be this blunt and accurate as to U.S. socialism have been roundly denounced as partisan, negative, obstructive and in other less complimentary terms.

As part of these remarks I would like to include a news item from the Chicago Tribune of May 30, 1964, describing the Norman Thomas speech.

The article follows:

THOMAS HAILS JOHNSON, RAPS GOLDWATER—HUMPHREY HIS CHOICE FOR PRESIDENT

(By William Kling)

Dr. Norman Thomas, six-time Socialist Party candidate for President, said yesterday that President Johnson's administration "is so much better than I feared," and called Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, "the greatest evil."

Thomas, in Chicago to make what he called his farewell speech to the Socialist Party's national convention, said that his choice for President would be Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, whom he called "the type of Democrat I like and one who would be a Socialist if he got to England."

Of President Johnson, Thomas said: "We all have reason to be grateful for him, in the way he is handling civil rights and poverty. I ought to rejoice, and I do. I rub my eyes in amazement and surprise. His war on poverty is a socialistic approach and may be the No. 1 issue in the 1964 campaign."

SCARED OF GOLDWATER

Of GOLDWATER, Thomas said: "He is a personable man and has some good stands on domestic issues, but I am scared of his stands on foreign affairs. He shoots from the hip. He would blunder us into war."

Of the showing made in Democratic presidential primaries by Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, Thomas said: "He is a disgrace to a great many Americans. Neither he nor the people who vote for him are concerned about States rights. Their only issue is racism."

Thomas, who will be 80 in November, said his speech to about 200 convention delegates will be "my farewell address because maybe I won't have any time left to make another one."

HAS NO PLANS

He said he had no plans to seek the Presidency again.

"Six times are enough," he quipped. "It gets to be a joke after that many times. Maybe it got to be a joke before that.

"I decided that 1948 was the last time I would run. I haven't changed my mind since then like a lot of politicians."

Asked if he thought his support aided a candidate, he replied: "My support of myself never seemed to do me much good."

HOPES TO GO FISHING

Would he take an interest in the Republican nominating convention July 13 in San Francisco?

"I would hope that the weather would permit me to go fishing," he said.

The Socialist convention is being held through tomorrow in the Hotel Maryland, 900 Rush Street.

Dr. Norman Thomas, six-time Socialist candidate for President, says Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Senate whip, is his choice for President.

Church and Race—Report From the Committee on Christian Social Concerns, General Conference of the Methodist Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter and statement from the general conference, the Methodist Church, as requested in Rev. Leon T. Moore's letter.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed report of the committee on Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church was adopted by the general conference of the Methodist Church in session at Pittsburgh, Pa., May 4, 1964, and ordered sent to all Members of the Senate of the United States with the request that it be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

LEON T. MOORE.

CHURCH AND RACE

"We affirm the legality and right of those minorities who are oppressed anywhere in the world, to protest, to assemble in public, and to agitate for redress from grievances, provided this is done in an orderly way." (The Council of Bishops, Detroit, Mich., November 13, 1963.) A public march or other demonstration as a dramatic petition for attention and justice is in line with the principles and practices of a free society. When such orderly protests are undertaken, the goal should be clearly identifiable.

When resort to orderly, responsible, nonviolent public demonstrations by those engaged in the struggle for racial justice provokes violent retaliation on the part of police or onlookers, the blame for the violence should be placed on the violent, and not on the peaceable demonstrators. On the other hand, any demonstration that turns itself to violence takes to itself the same blame. Even peaceable demonstrations supporting entirely just causes must be restrained and limited by the recognition that no decent society can exist apart from the rule of just law and decent order. Thus limited, however, orderly and responsible demonstrations, can serve to bring a better order into being.

There are certain circumstances when arbitrary authority is sought to be imposed under laws which are neither just nor valid as law. Even under such imposition the salutary principle of the rule of law requires that in all but the most extreme circumstances the individual confronting such authority must resort to legal processes for the redress of his grievances. However, Christians have long recognized that after exhausting every reasonable legal means for redress of grievances, the individual is faced with the moral and legal dilemma of whether or not his peculiar circumstances require obedience to God rather than to men. There are instances in the current struggle for racial justice when responsible Christians cannot avoid such a decision. Wherever legal recourse for the redress of grievances exists, the responsible Christian will obtain the best available legal and religious counsel for his dilemma. In rare instances, where legal recourse is unavailable or inadequate for redress of grievances from laws or their appli-

cation that, on their face, are unjust or immoral, the Christian conscience will obey God rather than man. Even then, meticulous care must be taken to prevent proliferation of civil disobedience beyond most carefully circumstanced limits.

Equality for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called national attention to equality of opportunity, regardless of sex, by putting women into high Government positions and encouraging their promotion in the Federal service. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 passed by Congress writes into law the principle of equal pay for equal work. Hawaii has had such a law since 1959. I include an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser entitled "Equality for Women," expressing Hawaii's support for this concept.

EQUALITY FOR WOMEN

President Johnson is bringing more women into high Government positions.

He has always worked to upgrade the work status of women, but as President he is obviously able to get broader results.

A tally shows Johnson has appointed 98 women and promoted 600 others in the $10,000-to-$20,000-a-year bracket. This is significant, since of the top Federal posts fewer than 3 percent are filled by women.

But the President cannot do the whole job. Discrimination against women is widespread. They frequently are paid less and given fewer promotions than men doing the same work.

All this was shown dramatically in a recent report by the late President Kennedy's Commission on the Status of Women, set up in 1961.

The Commission's report noted that the increased lifespan in America now permits women to be both mothers and career women, either simultaneously or at separate times.

This work pattern, the report said, calls for special educational and counseling help for women. Example: women who quit work to raise a family need to keep up educationally so they can return to work when they are ready.

The importance of women to the work force is obvious. Some 23 million hold about a third of the jobs.

The largest concentration—about 30 percent of working women—is in clerical jobs. Managerial, professional, and operative jobs account for large numbers, and sales, household service and other service areas provide for most of the rest.

Earnings, however, fall far behind those of men. And the gap is widening. In 1950, for example, the median salary for a woman was just over $1,000 a year. A man's was about $3,000. In 1960, the woman received less than $2,000, while the man moved up to about $4,500.

To counter some of this, the Federal Government now operates under a 1963 act which requires equal pay for equal work.

Unequal pay still persists in private employment, but is being worked on.

Another problem for working women, the report said, is that many better paying and more responsible jobs are reserved for men. An equality of opportunity and promotion policy would help women tremendously, just as it would minority groups.

Still another problem dealt with by the report involves discriminatory legal practices. Three States, for example, exclude women from juries. And there is discrimination against women in family and property rights.

There are close to 100 million women in America, 4 million more than there are males. Nine out of ten women will marry, the eight out of ten at some time will be in the labor force.

Much remains to be done to put women on a par with men. There really are few jobs that women cannot do. One step is to generally forbid job discrimination among the sexes, as Hawaii has recently done.

President Johnson's effort at the highest levels hopefully will impress both the Federal bureaucracy and private business.

American Education and the Foreign Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, our very able Ambassador to Switzerland, Mr. True Davis, of St. Joseph, Mo., recently delivered a lecture at Fribourg University commemorating the 175th anniversary of Georgetown University.

In this lecture, I believe that Ambassador Davis has captured the true distinctiveness of the American educational system, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN EDUCATION AND THE FOREIGN STUDENT

(By American Ambassador True Davis)

I would like to say, first of all, how pleased I am to be here to celebrate with you the 175th anniversary of Georgetown University. Since a number of you in the audience tonight are from Georgetown, let me wish you a happy birthday. Father Moffit, I would ask you—as director of the Georgetown junior year at Fribourg—to convey to President Bunn my best wishes, for many multiples of the present 175.

You have asked me to come and speak to you tonight and I have accepted the invitation with a great deal of pleasure. I expected to find an audience of a handful of students. Now, looking around me, I see the handful of students all right, but I also see a roomful of professors and I cannot help but smile at finding myself in this situation. When I look back upon my own college days, the presence of just one professor was enough to make me uncomfortable. The thought of a whole roomful would have been petrifying.

Whether student or professor, you all have one thing in common, though perhaps in varying degrees: you are educated men (and women) and I recall the words of Will Rogers, that cracker barrel philosopher, who said he loved to talk to an educated audience so long as he could get "off the subject they was educated in." If I share with you tonight some thoughts about American education and the foreign student, I will be "off the thing you was educated in" and I can speak with a greater degree of confidence.

Americans have prized education—and particularly higher education—from their earliest colonial days. With the growth and development of democratic ideals there emerged two beliefs of major importance for education; first, the belief that effective democracy requires education for all citizens; and, second, the conviction that higher education should be accessible not to a social and intellectual elite but to all citizens on the basis of ability. As Horace Mann said: "In a republic, ignorance is a crime."

No generation in U.S. history has realized the goal more completely than the generation now attending colleges and universities. The 4,500,000 degree candidates who were enrolled in the 2,140 U.S. colleges and universities in the fall of 1963, represents an increase of 185 percent over the number of students who attended colleges before World War II, and an increase of 8 percent over the previous year alone.

Although a small percentage of degree candidates are mature persons in their twenties, forties, and even seventies (every commencement season has its pictures showing grandmothers and grandfathers receiving college degrees side by side with their grandchildren), the overwhelming majority of American undergraduates are in the age group from 18 to 21. It is, in fact, estimated that 40 percent of the population in this age bracket now attends college.

What kind of institutional framework exists to provide higher education for students in such numbers? Given American reliance on education as the most important source of individual and social benefit, what is the philosophy behind the institutional framework. What kind of life does the American student live? Can a foreign student profit from one year spent in an American institution? Or how does he know which college or university is best for him?

In the course of my remarks I shall try to answer these questions because I think they are of interest to a group such as this. The non-American students in this audience may wish one day to study in the United States; the professors may be asked for their counsel; and the Americans among you I hope will enjoy reviewing with me the situation as it exists in the United States.

But first, what is higher education? In Switzerland the term does not include teacher training institutions, but does include the Federal Technical Institute. In the United States, the term "higher education" embraces not only colleges and universities, but also teacher training schools, technical institutes, and other vocational schools. Their common denominator is that each institution limits admission to students who have completed secondary education or its equivalent, generally judged on the basis of an entrance examination.

Higher education in the United States is characterized above all by its diversity—diversity of standards, requirements, and opportunities. It comes as a shock to most visitors to the United States to learn there is no central policymaking authority and no single agency, public or private, responsible for supervising all institutions of higher education. This is not to say that there are no general standards of teaching or academic achievement. There are. National teacher associations and academic groups have effectively influenced high schools and universities throughout the Nation to set up general standards. Within this broad framework, however, there is room for individual initiative and creativity. So that we are in the fortunate position of having both diversity and conformity in our educational system.

The more than 2,000 American colleges and universities are variously supported by the individual State governments, by the

educational boards of many cities and towns, by churches of many denominations, and by nonprofit corporations supported and operated by private citizens. Historically, the private liberal arts college is the oldest institution of higher learning in the United States, and if one calculates strength in terms of numbers, it is still the dominant one. In the number of students enrolled, however, tax supported colleges and universities account for 60 perecnt of the 4½ million students presently working for degrees.

Before we go any further a few clarifying remarks on the differences between colleges and universities are in order. Both are institutions of higher learning and are not easily distinguishable, even to Americans. A major distinction can be made in terms of complexity. Universities usually offer undergraduate study in many fields, such as liberal arts, engineering, education, business, nursing, science, etc. More importantly, they have large graduate programs in medicine, dentistry, law science, and liberal arts. They are active centers of research, whether it be in the science laboratory, sociology or agriculture. Any university of standing works simultaneously at conveying knowledge to its student body and at extending the frontiers of knowledge through the work of its faculty.

The term "college" generally refers to a less complex, but not necessarily smaller, institution. For the most part, colleges emphasize undergraduate work. They devote more time and energy to undergraduate study and they do not, generally, engage in research activities comparable to those of a university. Frequently, within universities the term "college" is used to denote an undergraduate division of the university. For example, there are colleges of liberal arts at many universities. At Georgetown University these subdivisions are called schools, like the school of nursing, or the school of foreign service, so you see how interchangeably we use the terms "university," "college," and "school."

In any event, none of these general considerations affects the quality of teaching, and need not influence the foreign student's choice of an institution of higher learning. For convenience sake, I shall use the terms interchangeably as I have already done, during the rest of my remarks.

Given the diversity of American colleges and universities, it is inevitable that there be a number of differences, in the requirements to be met for a specific degree, in teaching methods, and in the standards of excellence demanded of students. Minimum standards do exist, however, and are imposed as previously noted by indirect means. Yet the benefits of diversity are many, and competition among institutions and their educational programs is generally considered a strength rather than a weakness of the American system. The independence of each institution divorces education from Central Government control, though not from Government support; it leaves completely open the possibility of continuing experimentation and change; and it insures the teaching profession against bureaucratic control dedicated to the status quo.

It goes without saying that this diversity of American universities makes selection of a satisfactory one a matter of critical importance for the student, whether American or foreign. Most foreigners tend to think of American education as taking place in half a dozen institutions of the stature of Harvard, Yale, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or the University of California. But equally high standards are maintained by much smaller schools which may admit only 1 percent as many students.

Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania, or Wesleyan University in Connecticut, are representative of the small but excellent institution. There are many more of their caliber and I certainly would want to include Georgetown University with its enrollment of 7,000, or Cornell University, of which I am a member of the advisory council. In short, size and fame are not adequate bases for choosing the most suitable college: one must know much more about the institution to determine whether it will meet your needs and expectations.

An important basis for selection is academic standing. Though each institution sets its own standards for admission and graduation, minimal requirements have been made. Several regional associations of universities have been formed to set these standards. The members agree to minimal standards each institution must meet in its teaching, faculty qualifications, and degree requirements. Colleges and universities accepting these criteria are referred to as "accredited" a term denoting approval by the regional association. The term insures recognition of an approved school's offerings. It adds stature to the student's degree, and gives him greater possibilities in the market for a job. Thus, if any of you may consider a year or more of study in the United States, you may wish to ascertain whether the college you choose is an accredited one. It means not only recognition of intellectual achievement, but much more important, a better education.

If one tries to generalize as to the American curriculum, it is impossible to include all American institutions. Therefore the generalizations that I will make should be prefaced with many qualifications such as "for the most part," and "with a few exceptions."

Its most distinctive characteristic—and the one most difficult for Europeans to grasp—is its elective system, developed at Harvard during the latter 19th century and now followed almost everywhere in the United States. Undergraduate students rarely belong to a single faculty. They choose or elect courses from the entire curriculum and are, in fact, required to range widely in their choices, especially during their first 2 years which correspond roughly to the final 2 years of preparatory work for admission to a European university. Few students graduate from American universities without having attended lectures and passed examinations in the four general areas of physical science, biological science, the social sciences, and the humanities. In addition, they are required to do practical work in the laboratory, in writing the English language, and often in at least one foreign language—however poorly they may speak it later.

Specialization is rarely permitted before the last 2 undergraduate years, and even then it is not complete. The upper division student is expected to choose a major subject and study it intensively, but he is rarely encouraged to devote more than 40 percent or allowed to spend more than 60 percent of his time on his specialty.

This election of courses, however, is never as free as it appears to be to those critics who accuse American educations of offering a smorgasbord to their students. It must follow certain prescribed patterns and for that reason the statement of requirements for a degree and of requirements for a major, which are to be found in every American college bulletin are of great importance to every foreign student who registers as an undergraduate in an American college. He is likely to be classified as a lower or upper division student with reference to these requirements, and his freedom to elect courses of his choice will be affected by them. He has freedom only under the law, and the requirements for graduation are the law.

This brings us to the second distinctive characteristic of American higher education—its day-to-day discipline of a sort that the European student leaves behind when he completes his secondary school training. With its vast numbers of students to train, the American system of higher education cannot afford to tolerate individuals who like to linger in the ivory tower. Even in specialized graduate work, students are not only subject to the law of requirements for graduation but to the law of progress toward graduation. They must not only attend lectures, but they must read and study the materials to which the lectures are related and be examined with a frequency which distresses Europeans who prepare more leisurely for their more general examinations. This means, in actual practice, that every student is required to take a certain number of courses for credit, and that to obtain credit he must do a specified amount of reading or other assigned work and be examined on it, in each course, at the end of each term and often in the middle of the term. If he is lazy or incompetent, he is subject to dismissal at the end of any term.

The conviction underlying this system is that education should not merely prepare a person for a job or a profession but for living. And living in the United States is far more flexible than it is in most European countries. Americans as a whole people are more mobile than Europeans—they move in greater numbers from State to State and from community to community. Economic opportunities are more varied. Relatively few young people can or will commit themselves to specific careers at the age of 21 or 22. Even within the educational system itself there is extraordinary mobility. Large numbers of students attend more than one university, and many others change majors within a single institution. The credit system of courses has led to the charge that the IBM machine is the real administrator of higher education in America, but it is probably a necessary system in a country where people have always been accustomed to move about freely, and show no signs of changing their habits.

Another conviction underlying this system is that the well-educated person must have breadth and range of intellectual interests as well as specialization. There is, too, a belief that colleges and universities exist to provide leaders for the community; men and women who as scholars will not retreat to ivory towers. There is a widespread conviction that an educated man, in contrast to a trained man, must have sufficient perspective to view his profession in a large social context and that, therefore, he must not begin to specialize until his range of vision has widened.

One happy byproduct of the American system is the informal relationship which exists between most professors and their students. You will find that large lecture courses are not infrequently interrupted by students who ask the professor to repeat or expand the presentation of a point, or who wish to challenge either the assumption behind an argument or the conclusion arrived at by the professor. Father Moffit may bear me out that in small seminars and discussion sections, the dialogue may actually be predominantly in the hands of student participants with the instructor responsible for the pattern of discussion rather than its content.

At first glance, the kind of relationship which exists between the American faculty member and his student may seem undignified and lacking in respect. The function of such informality, however, is not informality for its own sake. It is rather, encouragement to the individual student to think for himself and to have the courage of his convictions. John Dewey once remarked that the aim of all education should be to teach students how to think, not what to think. As a statement of an ideal, Dewey's generalization still holds true.

Most American campuses, particularly those in smaller communities, are looked

upon as local cultural centers. Nationally and internationally known symphony orchestras, individual concert artists and theater troupes perform in the university auditorium, and at prices students can generally afford. Here also addressing student and community audiences are visiting lecturers, many of them outstanding writers, thinkers and leaders of our day. What students who have heard them, will ever forget E. E. Cummings reading his poetry, or John Dos Passos and Thornton Wilder talking on American literature, Karl Barth on religion? Many historically important speeches have been presented at American colleges.

Take for example Winston Churchill's address in 1946 at small Westminster College in Fulton, in my own home State of Missouri, in which he first coined the phrase "Iron Curtain" countries; or Secretary of State George C. Marshall's 1947 commencement address at Harvard University, outlining the Marshall plan, a massive economic aid program to revitalize Europe; or President Kennedy's statement at the American University in Washington less than a year ago (June 1963) when speaking of world peace: "I speak of peace as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not so exciting as the pursuit of war * * * but we have no more urgent task."

Judging by statistics, foreign students are either becoming more popular each year, or American universities are. Perhaps it is both. In any event, the number of foreign students attending American universities has more than tripled in recent years. Five American institutions have more than 1,000 foreign students (University of California, New York University, University of Michigan, Columbia, and University of Minnesota); 18 have more than 400 foreign scholars enrolled. Some of them include representatives from more than a hundred different countries—students to whose ways the American university cannot adapt itself, but who must try to adapt themselves to an academic way of life which is more demanding in its daily routine than the one to which they are accustomed.

American institutions like having foreign students on their campuses and believe firmly that their presence benefits students and faculty alike. The competition is keen, the number who may go is not unlimited, but if some of you ultimately go to the United States as students, and I hope that many of you will be able to, I would wish for you good health, a zest for new experiences, a willingness to work at the peak of your capacity, and the same kind of openheartedness you will find in your fellow students and faculty.

A Little Bit Phony?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star, in an editorial in its May 28, 1964, edition, raises a very good question: "Could there possibly be something just a little bit phony about this war on poverty?"

The full text of the Star editorial follows:

WAR ON POVERTY

The poor, it is said, will always be with us. And Lyndon B. Johnson doubtless will always be with the poor. Which may or may not be a comforting thought to the William David Marlow family.

The Marlows were visited by President Johnson and Linda Bird at their home near Rocky Mount, N.C., on May 7. Since the story and pictures appeared hundreds of people have driven by to see the house, many of them shining their headlights in at night. One day the Marlows counted 146 carloads of people. A woman visitor wanted to buy the bed on which the President and his daughter had sat, offering a complete bedroom suite for it. Mrs. Marlow wouldn't trade. She said "It's too good a sleeper."

There also seems to be a rather large question about the target chosen for this particular Presidential mission. A county official had urged Mrs. Marlow to have a wash out on the line and to be sure the kids were barefoot. In other words, live it down.

But Mrs. Marlow, who evidently hasn't been boning up on wars on poverty, said the strange thing was that "we didn't even feel like we were in poverty." And Mr. Marlow, who was transplanting tobacco when a reporter got to him, said he expects to clear about $1,500 over and above all expenses this year.

"What we need right now," he said, "is rain."

Perhaps President Johnson, whose talent for getting things done is legendary, will produce the rain. If he can, the rest of the war on poverty should be a cinch. Meanwhile, however, the Marlow story deepens a small shadow of doubt which had already crossed our mind. Could there possibly be something just a little bit phony about this war?

Some Elementary Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a timely article by Henry Hazlitt in the June 8 issue of Newsweek. Mr. Hazlitt points out the danger in our disregard of the ever increasing national debt:

WILL WE EVER PAY OFF?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In 1930, the national debt was $16 billion. In 1945, at the end of World War II, it was $260 billion. During the war, while the debt was piling up, the general assumption was that this borrowing was proper and even unavoidable in a time of crisis, but that once the war was over the debt would be gradually reduced or paid off. Instead, in the 18 years since the end of the war, the national debt has been increased to $308 billion, or an average of $6,500 for every family in the United States.

Today interest on the debt alone amounts to $11 billion a year, or more than three times as much as the Government spent annually for all purposes in the years 1926 to 1930.

There is curiously little concern about this. On the contrary, every once in a while some writer emerges to ridicule what little concern there is. J. David Stern did this in the January Atlantic. Even academic economists belittle the problem.

Stern's argument was summed up in the statement that "the Nation is growing faster than its debt." One academic economist, trying to prove the same point, epitomized his argument in the following table:

	1945	1963
National debt	$260	$305
Gross national debt	$214	$585
Debt as a burden to GNP (percent)	121	52

The triumphant conclusion the professor drew from this table was that "the national debt, when viewed as a burden to a year's production, has been more than cut in two."

DEBT VERSUS GNP

The figures are official, and the conclusion is technically correct. The complacency of the conclusion is unjustified.

The reason the national debt is less of a burden is that, through inflation, the purchasing power of the dollar has been steadily reduced. It has been reduced 63 percent since 1933 and 43 percent since 1945. Let us state this another way. By failing to balance its budget, by borrowing, by monetizing the debt, by printing more dollars, by steadily diluting the dollar's purchasing power, the Government has in effect repudiated 63 cents of every dollar it borrowed in 1933 and 43 cents of every dollar it borrowed in 1945.

To put it bluntly, the creditors, the holders of U.S. Government bonds, have been cheated.

Let's make this even clearer by an illustration from another country. At the end of 1923, the purchasing power of the German paper mark fell to less than one-trillionth of its 1913 value. This meant that prices rose more than a trillion times. Therefore Germany's "GNP," measured in paper marks, rose more than a trillion times. As a result, its accumulated debt, represented by borrowings of marks of a much higher purchasing power, was reduced to practically no burden on the economy at all. Though Germany was the extreme case, the situation did not differ in principle from what happened in France (where the franc eventually fell to less than one one-hundredth of its 1913 value) and a score of other European countries.

A PRETENDED PAYMENT

Adam Smith, writing in 1776, was perfectly familiar with this method of disguised repudiation. "When national debts have once been accumulated to a certain degree," he wrote, "there is scarce, I believe, a single instance of their having been fairly and completely paid." But governments usually covered "the disgrace of a real bankruptcy" by the "juggling trick" of "a pretended payment" in depreciated currency.

So the relationship that seems to give some present-day writers so much satisfaction—that the national debt, in dollar terms, has been falling in relation to the gross national product in dollar terms, is simply the outcome of the steady depreciation of the dollar. The more inflation we have, and the more the purchasing power of the dollar is depreciated, the more the national debt will "fall" in relation to the GNP, because the GNP, measured in rising prices, will rise in relation to the debt, and so these writers will have increasing reasons for statistical satisfaction.

Do we have any serious intention of ever paying off our national debt in dollars of at least present purchasing power? If so, isn't it about time we balanced the budget and made an honest start?

Reds Gambling on Election Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William S. White wrote an interesting and timely column that appeared in the Washington Star on May 25, 1964. As this is the year of our national elections, I am sure other Members of the Congress

who have not already seen Mr. White's article will find it as interesting as I did.

The article follows:

THE PASSING SCENE

(By William S. White)

REDS GAMBLING ON ELECTION YEAR

The Communists in southeast Asia are playing a kind of high noon exercise with President Johnson in their harshly stepped up acts of aggression in both South Vietnam and Laos.

They are gambling that they can push the United States close to but not quite over the brink of direct intervention. Their notion is that they can thus weaken to the point of irreparable futility the resistance of the anti-Communist forces of both countries.

They are acting on the assumption, as some of our ablest intelligence appraisers see it, that no American administration will dare commit itself to major military action in a presidential election year.

For them, however, this is a game of Russian roulette of infinite danger. In that game a man puts to his head a six-shooter in which five firing chambers are empty but the sixth is loaded. The simple fact is that if the Communists spin the revolver long enough the sixth chamber is going to come up for them, election or no election.

Committed to help

In other words, President Johnson has committed the United States with full awareness of all the possible implications, to do whatever may be necessary to help the southeast Asians resist Communist assault as long as they continue to ask our help. He did not undertake this pledge lightly. He will never withdraw it, election or no election, just as he will not withdraw the 15,000 American troops who now stand just back of the fighting line in support of the South Vietnamese. Of all this, those who have seen him of late can have no doubt.

At present, we are not so directly committed in Laos. Nevertheless, the American aircraft which are now flying high over Laos in surveillance over what is occurring below have not been sent there simply to give their pilots more flight training.

The truth is that in a major foreign mission for President Kennedy 3 years ago, Mr. Johnson as Vice President made a tough report to his then chief saying plainly that southeast Asia must be held unless the United States wished eventually to find itself fighting with its back to San Francisco.

The attitude he took then is the attitude he has now. Certainly he is not looking for bigger war in Asia. Certainly he hopes to avoid having to put in American bombing strikes against North Vietnam, the marshal areas for the ceaseless Communist stabs to the south. But it is not the West that is threatening the spread of warfare in southeast Asia.

It is the Asian Communists, who have repeatedly broken their promises for peace in both South Vietnam and Laos and who now persistently widen an already dangerous aggression upon their neighbors. If they go on with this they are going to bring Ameriman military power increasingly onto the scene. And that is that.

For the fundamental Communist political assumption—that American administrations will never go all the way militarily in an election year—is totally wrong, in the case of this administration, at any rate, for two reasons. It wholly misreads the President's character, one facet of which is the conviction that the worst sin of any leader is to fail to lead in crisis. And it wholly misreads the reality of the general political atmosphere itself.

No disunion

There is actually no significant disunion between the two parties on the issue of fighting Communist aggression in southeast Asia. No Republican presidential aspirant criticizes President Johnson for his determination. To the contrary, the only real complaint comes from those who, like Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, say not that he is doing too much but that he is not doing enough.

The prospect of an American election this fall will not in the smallest way deter this Government from doing whatever it may be necessary to do out there. Those who suppose otherwise are victims of that deepest of all forms of self-delusion, the self-delusion of junior-grade cynicism. Real cynics proceed from a recognition of reality; junior-grade cynics upon sophomoric cliches.

Johnson's 6 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, included herewith is an article by the dean of the able group of correspondents for the New York Times, Arthur Krock. I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading this excellent analysis:

JOHNSON'S 6 MONTHS—PRESIDENT'S FAR-REACHING ACTIVITIES HAVE BROUGHT HIM WIDE POPULARITY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—The most political animal to occupy the White House since Andrew Jackson, if not since the creation of the Federal Government, has just completed the first 6 months of his Presidency. The man of action has succeeded the man of contemplation, and Congress and the American people are moving under his pressures in the direction he wants them to go.

These are generalities, with the weakness of all generalities, which is that they are subject to major exceptions. President Johnson often takes a long look before he leaps. And President Kennedy sometimes acted on impulse.

President Johnson has given weeks to contemplation of the risks of military action which would check the steady erosion of anti-Communist resistance in southeast Asia, but he has not yet brought himself to assume them. President Kennedy reacted instantly and aggressively when most of the largest units in the steel industry announced an increase in prices. But the overall difference in their personalities and administrative methods is the difference between the activist politician and the politican whose decisions are guided by a sense of history.

DIFFICULT

No contemporary can say whether President Kennedy's contributions to the American democratic system and to a stable world peace would not have been more constructive and enduring than his successor's if fate had allowed him the time required to complete his labor as the leader of the Nation. Even if President Johnson's programs survive the test of their soundness and general welfare potential that only a tenure of several more years in the White House can provide, there will be no basis for either contemporary or historical comparison between his contribution and that of the shining, inspirational young President who preceded him so briefly.

But, awaiting the test of time in which Mr. Johnson's public service will be evaluated, the product of his 6 months in office has been extraordinary in volume, in the scope of his aspirations, in his expenditure of energy and in his tangible accomplishments. These have ranged from the halls of Congress to the minefields of international relations, from the conventions of every special-interest group in the country to the crowds in which all interests of the American people are represented.

SUPPORTED BY LABOR

Congress, also being a political animal, has responded to his pressures to legislate measures it denied to President Kennedy or deeply abridged in granting. Tensions with the U.S.S.R. have been relaxed, however superficial and transient this development may prove. Mr. Johnson not only has charmed the proprietors and managers of private industry and finance with his personality and his attitude of sympathetic cooperation, in large degree they appear to view with favor the prospect of his election to a 4-year term.

Organized labor, although declining to abide by his economic guidelines, is planning to become his open political ally in the presidential campaign. His apparent popularity with the ethnic minorities is enormous, especially among the Negroes.

There is little new, and much that is politically motivated in his "war on poverty"; moreover, its administrative structure promises inefficiency and waste. But the President has imbued this war with a persuasive show that his heart is more deeply involved than the obvious consideration of the votes to be accrued.

All this has covered the Nation with promises of something for everybody at the punitive expense of nobody, with general gain for the social and economic order and the Military Establishment of the United States, and with a descending rate of Government expenditure. The President has been candid in conceding to the people that unforseen events, including war, could force a suspension of his programs in general and a long postponement of some units in particular. He has not satisfied many qualified authorities that he can make good his promises, even if the status quo at the end of his 6 months as President lasts long enough for a thorough tryout. But insofar as unanimity among those who make a business of "sampling" public opinion can indicate the trend, the majority of the American people approve his efforts and are willing to gamble he will redeem an impressive percentage of his claims.

EVERYONE'S PRESIDENT

A very important explanation of this phenomenon seems to be a nationwide belief in the sincerity of Mr. Johnson's expressed wish to be the best President in history for the people as a whole; and their acceptance of his flagrantly professional politicking as the method experience has shown him to be necessary to his purpose.

But this experience has also taught the President that his acclaim at the end of 6 months carries no guarantee of durability, even through election day. He knows that unforeseen events could reverse the dismal prospect of any contender for the Presidency who might emerge from the fratricidal conflict current in the Republican Party. He knows that candidates seemingly as far in the lead as he is now have made blunders which caused their defeat at the polls—a possibility always inherent in his own natural exuberance.

He is acutely aware of disaster factors in the involvement of the United States in southeast Asia that a strong Republican campaigner could successfully attribute to administration policy, and could require him to make the fateful decision, he hopes, to postpone until the election is over. And he also realizes that, if race rioting is the bitter fruit of the equal rights bill on which he has staked so much of his power and prestige, he and many of the Members of Congress who stand with him could go down to defeat at the November poll.

But as yet these possibilities are casting only light shadows on the horizon of his popularity at the end of the half year in which the President so quickly and firmly established that this is "the Johnson administration." And he does not share the fear of some friends that he is taking too heavy a toll of his incredible energy, and has already incurred whatever political peril there may be in overexposure.

"The 12th amendment," one of these friends ironically remarked to him the other day, "does not require you to get all the votes to be elected, not even a popular majority, only a majority of the electors." But there is no sign the President was listening.

Freedom From War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I shall include the following letter from an esteemed friend of long standing:

MAY 27, 1964.

Hon. BEN FRANKLIN JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: As a friend of yours and an admirer of your outstanding career in Congress, I take the liberty to address you on a problem that I have. Knowing how busy you are, I shall be as brief as possible.

For many years, I have made a careful study of the political and economic ills of our world and, as a result, I have come up with an idea that might be of the utmost importance in our generation. I honestly believe that not only the United States but the whole world would reap untold benefits if my plan were accepted and given the support of at least one government to begin with.

My idea is that the whole world should have freedom from war. I know that millions of people will agree with me, and I don't doubt that millions upon millions of others dream of such a state of affairs but believe it unattainable. The fact, however, is that it can be realized; and I have worked out a plan.

My thinking has run like this:

Why should we have to put up with more wars when the majority of the people throughout the world want peace?

What makes the little fellow, like you and me—we who have to do the actual fighting, killing and dying and paying—put up with war and go to war?

Why does an enlightened world spend 125 billions of dollars each year for destruction and death when such a sum is so badly needed for raising the living standard, abolishing hunger and ending unemployment?

The above are only a few of the many questions that should make any intelligent person begin to think. It has occurred to me that if the millions of victims of past and future wars were told the truth—and aren't we all such victims in one way or another—then the world would undoubtedly come to its senses.

This is no pacifist movement in which reduction of our national defenses is contemplated; it is a project to educate mankind to understand the immeasurable advantages that will accrue from life without fear of war. The billions now spent on the tools of war and destruction could be diverted to education and construction and the raising of all living standards. Our educational project, therefore, should extend throughout the entire world—yes, throughout China and the Soviet Union, too. We are fully aware of the fact that the ruling elite of the Communist camps will taboo dissemination of any such knowledge that we propose but, with the aid of our Government and its modern communications technology, the Iron and Bamboo Curtains will not remain impenetrable.

As a matter of fact, I believe that even Russia, in its present state of uncertainty vis-a-vis Red China, might be willing to champion a movement for freedom from war. I, therefore, ask you most earnestly to give this matter your careful consideration and help if at all possible. Any opportunity to submit this matter to debate would be most welcome, for commonsense would be certain to prevail in these present times when every man and women lives from day to day under the threat of annihilation.

Very sincerely yours,

EINAR V. BULOW.

President Johnson Offers To Help East European Nations Be More Independent of Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, another step to ease East-West tension was taken by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his speech at the George C. Marshall Library dedication recently.

This far-reaching and inspiring plan is described in a report by Douglas Kiker in the May 24, 1964, New York Herald Tribune:

JOHNSON'S BOLD PLAN ON MARSHALL'S DAY

(By Douglas Kiker)

LEXINGTON, VA.—President Johnson, making a new, important and dramatic bid to ease East-West relations, said here yesterday that his administration "will continue to build bridges across the gulf which has divided" the United States from Eastern Europe in the postwar world.

The "identity of interest and the prospects of progress for Eastern Europe lie in a wider relationship with the West," the President maintained.

Declaring that today "there is no longer a single Iron Curtain" but many separating East from West, he pledged "bridges of increased trade, of ideas, of visitors, and of humanitarian aid" to "bring every European nation closer to its neighbors in the relationships of peace."

Mr. Johnson warned that the United States will continue to keep its "unalterable commitment to the defense of Europe and the reunification of Germany."

But he voiced the belief that "wise and skillful development of relationships with the nations of Eastern Europe can speed the day when Germany will be reunited."

The President's offer and declaration of intent came at ceremonies dedicating the George C. Marshall Library, built on the campus of the Virginia Military Institute, the general's alma mater. It carried with it distinct overtones of a new initiative of Marshall plan scope.

CONVICTION UNCHANGED

He declared that General Marshall's vision of American aid to European recovery did not originally "stop where Soviet conquest began." To the contrary, he said, "permanent peace depended upon rebuilding all European civilization within its historic boundaries," and "the correctness of his conviction has not changed."

The United States has granted economic aid to both Poland and Yugoslavia in the past, when they showed signs of independence, but ceased to do so after the Cuban trade blockade commenced. Trade still exists between them, however, and, in addition, new trade negotiations currently are underway with Rumania.

The importance of the President's short and meticulously worded address had been emphasized privately and advertised widely by administration officials in Washington prior to his visit here.

His choice of background—the dedication of the library honoring the man who founded the massive U.S. economic aid program which allowed Western Europe to recover from the ruin of World War II and the blue-ribbon audience present—served to further dramatize and strengthen the import of the address.

PEACEFUL TIES

The United States still works today "to carry on the vision of the Marshall plan," the President declared, "first to strengthen the ability of every European people to select and shape its own society," and "second, to bring every European nation closer to its neighbor in the relationships of peace."

Realinement with the West will "not be achieved by sudden settlement or dramatic deed," he added. But, he went on, "the nations of Eastern Europe are beginning to reassert their own identity." The United States, he said, has good reason to help promote this:

"First, to open new relationships to countries seeking increased independence yet unable to risk isolation."

"Second, to open the minds of a new generation to the values and visions of the Western civilization from which they come and to which they belong."

"Third, to give freer play to the powerful forces of legitimate national pride—the strongest barrier to the ambition of any country to dominate another."

"Fourth, the demonstrate that identity of interest and the prospects of progress for Eastern Europe lie in a wider relationship with the West."

The current wall of isolation surround Eastern European nations "differs in strength and thickness—in the light that can pass through it and the hopes that can prosper behind it," he said.

Others in attendance included former Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman; former European Recovery Plan Administrator Paul G. Hoffman; former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett; former High Commissioner of Berlin John J. McCloy, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Mr. Johnson told them that "no words of mine can add to the eloquence of your presence. The name which can command your tribute gains no luster from what I might say." General Marshall died October 16, 1959.

The George C. Marshall Research Library cost $600,000 to build and, once subscribed, will operate on a $2 million endowment.

It will house the personal honors and mementos and the private and public papers of the Nobel Peace-Prize winner whose analytical mind and commanding presence inspired such deep loyalty and respect from

the men who worked with him and for him when he was World War II Army Chief of Staff, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State.

Foreign Policy in Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, while criticism of the "ins" by the "outs" is a part of our American political system, irresponsible criticism of foreign policy based upon wrong or lack of information is a luxury that the leading world power can hardly afford. President Johnson has recently made a proposal designed to reduce the damage that could occur to our country in the conduct of foreign affairs and a recent editorial in the Des Moines Register sets forth some thoughts on the subject that I believe should be available for consideration of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY IN ELECTION

President Johnson brought something new to presidential campaign practices when he offered to confer with the potential Republican nominees for President in an effort to chart the ground rules for debating foreign policy problems.

It has been customary for the nominee of the party seeking to oust the incumbent administration to be briefed on current developments in foreign affairs by Government intelligence agencies. This is the first time, however, that the offer of intelligence briefings has been made to candidates for the opposing party's nomination. It is the first time also, that a President has suggested sitting down with his potential opponents and attempting to agree on foreign policy subjects to be debated, and presumably set up limits beyond which neither side would go.

Most of the Republican candidates will be wary about the latter portion of the offer. And they should be. They are not likely to want to be bound by an agreement that might prevent them from making use of a new development for improving their position. They may feel that President Johnson is trying to make foreign policy issues out of bounds during the campaign or at least restricting the field to innocuous generalities.

There is, however, something to be said in behalf of the President's offer. Certainly any person who considers himself a candidate for the Presidency will want to study any information available. No one of them, not even the President, can safely rely entirely on sources of information other than our own intelligence agencies.

Their evaluation of that information may differ considerably. They may disagree on what the proper solution for an individual problem may be. But it will be difficult to offer responsible criticism or propose well-founded courses of action if they refuse information offered them.

However, there is no obligation on the part of the Republican candidates to enter into an agreement that might limit the field of debate before the party's nominee for President is chosen. Until then they are still private citizens accountable only to themselves. Their opinions, reckless or wise, can have no official bearing on this Government's foreign policy.

The situation will be different after the Republican nominee is chosen. Thoughtless or uninformed statements by either candidate for President could do serious damage to this country in its conduct of foreign affairs.

Even though some of the candidates for the Republican nomination reject the President's offer of a briefing now on foreign affairs—Barry Goldwater has already done so—President Johnson should renew his offer after the party presidential conventions. And his Republican opponent should accept the offer.

The Visions of the Practical Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point an editorial which appeared in the New York Post of May 24, entitled "The Visions of the Practical Man." I believe the editorial speaks for itself:

THE VISIONS OF THE PRACTICAL MAN

President Johnson, speaking at the University of Michigan's commencement exercises, delivered one of the memorable addresses of the first 6 months of his regime.

It was not a speech that evoked large headlines. The Associated Press described it as a "philosophical" lecture, a way of saying that it contained no bulletins and should stop no presses.

Yet it offered the country a glimpse of the broader reflections and aspirations of a President so often depicted as a pragmatic politician entirely absorbed with immediacies.

On this occasion Mr. Johnson, while concerning himself with many current matters, took a long look at America's future. He told the graduates that, in their lifetime, "we have the opportunity to move not only toward the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the great society."

The foundations of such a society are "abundance and liberty for all," an end to "poverty and racial injustice." But these are the basic conditions, not the total goals, of a "great society." Beyond them lies the quest for a way of life in which "leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause for boredom and restlessness," in which "the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community," a society which "honors creation for its own sake" and in which men are "more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods." It is most of all a nation "where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labors."

The perils to this vision multiply—the decay of our cities, the despoiling of the suburbs, the congested slums, the transportation jam, the pollution of air, the destruction of "natural splendors," the educational gap.

In effect Mr. Johnson was saying that no quick legislative formulas can solve the deep dilemmas of our exploding world and that only a new "creative federalism," involving the concerted effort of Federal and community leadership, can begin to shape the "great society."

To the assembled students he addressed this challenge: Will you join in the battle for equality, economic justice and world peace, and in "the battle to build the great society—to prove that our material progress is only the foundation on which we build a richer life of mind and spirit" and enable us to live what Aristotle called "the good life?"

There was no neat blueprint in the address, nor any spectacularly new program for breaking the massive bottlenecks of our age. There will be skeptics who protest he was offering only high-minded pie-in-the-sky to a Nation shadowed by the urgencies of racial crisis and Asian conflict. Yet we found it a reassuring image of a President who is looking beyond the immediate storms, and at least groping for new concepts. Let the cynics remember that it was on the same campus that John F. Kennedy issued his call for the Peace Corps—branded at the time a form of naive idealism and so swiftly transformed into worldwide reality.

If Mr. Johnson's Michigan speech suggests that this most "hardheaded" and "practical" of Presidents also dreams large dreams, there is reason to herald the signs.

Disarmament Propaganda at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg, a physicist, is employed by the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and thereby hangs a detective story.

As a suspicious reporter, I have worked up some curiosity about an outfit in Washington known as the Council for a Livable World. The council began life under the name of the Council To Abolish War. Its founder and cochairman is Dr. Leo Szilard, a noted Hungarian-born physicist. He made a splash at the Pugwash Conference of 1961 by proposing his personal nuclear peace treaty. Under its terms, any American who violated the treaty would be declared an "outlaw" to be shot on sight, and any American who informed on an "outlaw" would be given a $1 million tax-free award.

After this extravagant keynote, the council in 1962 set about to pour money into the campaigns of Senators who would support its program, among other things, to reduce Defense spending and "to work toward bringing (Red) China into the family of nations." The amount of $22,000 was given by council members to finance the South Dakota campaign of GEORGE MCGOVERN (Democrat) who had lost the 1960 Senate race to Senator KARL MUNDT. This time MCGOVERN, with the council supplying 20 percent of his funds, won by 600-odd votes, and he soon began introducing unilateral disarmament legislation.

I recently discovered that the council membership in 1963–64 had donated $14,351.84 (thus far) to the campaign of another little-known western Senator—QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and that BURDICK was expected by the coun-

cil to make a speech to its Syracuse chapter on May 5.

BURDICK tells me that he did not actually accept the Syracuse engagement, but that the Council sent him around a speech manuscript on approval. I managed to acquire a draft of the manuscript. Since it read like a disarmament tract, I surmised that it had been prepared by the State Department, or its Disarmament Agency.

When I called the Disarmament Agency to ask if somebody there had prepared a speech entitled, "Prospects for Controlling the Arms Race," I received a flat denial. But after some sleuthing, I called again and, with some choice remarks on "managed news," I disclosed my information that the speech had indeed been prepared by the man whose name leads this column—Dr. Leonard Rodberg. This time, the State Department's Disarmament Agency followed through and asked Dr. Rodberg. He admitted he'd written the speech at home in his private capacity, at the request of the Council.

There is my detective story, or part of it. When Senator BURDICK declined to make the speech, although under a campaign fund obligation of better than $14,000, Senator MCGOVERN (a $22,000 beneficiary) contacted Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, to whose reelection campaign the Council members have thus far given $372.30. MUSKIE's name was substituted on the speech draft, but he declined to use it—and ended up making a speech of his own at the Syracuse meeting.

Well, what goes on here? A disarmament lobby is getting Senators on the financial hook. It is offering them prepared propaganda that is written by a State Department employee who is "moonlighting" for the Council. Do the Senators who take this campaign money know their sponsors?

"I hereby dissociate myself from Dr. Szilard," BURDICK told me after thinking it over. "And I am making inquiries which may lead to renouncing the Council's support. I don't want to be unfair. I want to give the Council a chance to reply to my questions."

This seems a good note on which to end a chapter of the strange story on the Council, which wants us to inhabit a "livable" world with communism.

America Discovers the New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on every hand there is mounting evidence that a new world of trade and industry is evolving today. The postwar period of unchallenged supremacy for American industry has been replaced by an era of intense international competition as other nations of the world expand and modernize their industrial capability. It is clear that these changing conditions demand a rethinking of both our economic and political customs and practices if we are to meet the challenges of this New World.

Leaders of both industry and government must be giving serious consideration to the new course to be charted. Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Co., presented a thoughtful discussion of the situation in a recent address at Union College in Schenectady, N.Y., and I am submitting a copy of his address for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress.

AMERICA DISCOVERS THE NEW WORLD: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMMON MARKET AND OTHER WORLDWIDE DEVELOPMENTS ON AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., Apr. 11, 1964)

Anyone who spent as many wonderful years of his life in Schenectady as I did, is always delighted to get back and visit. As chairman of General Electric, my duties frequently bring me back here since they directly concern many Schenectady operations. However, it is not often that I have a chance to be with a gathering such as this, including many old friends from this community.

Another source of satisfaction in my being here today is the chance to join in honoring Union College. We have always known that Union College was a fine place to learn engineering. When Charles Proteus Steinmetz was performing his magic for General Electric during the early part of the century, he was at the same time teaching a full schedule here at Union College. Generations of our company's scientists have continued this practice of academic moonlighting—which I heartily endorse.

As long as General Electric remains a technically oriented company, we will retain a close interest in engineering education. Indeed, over half of our corporate officers and over half of our executive office are graduates of technical colleges. A number are members of the Tau Beta Pi.

So when Tau Beta Pi recognized the high standards in engineering education at Union College by establishing a chapter here, I was delighted at the opportunity to add my own small contribution to the applause.

The first round of congratulations should really go to the young men who have become the initial group representing Union College in Tau Beta Pi. The rest of us may get carried away thinking about what all this occasion means to the college and to the community, and it means a great deal to both. But to these talented few who earned the right to be here, through the long semesters of mastering the discipline of an engineering education, this is truly their shining hour.

However, it does not dim the luster of their attainment—rather it enhances that luster—if we reflect a few minutes on what this ceremony means to the college and to the community.

This is an occasion which preeminently recognizes the academic standing and respect which has been earned by Union College. It also recognizes the place of technical education in the larger community, not simply as a skill to be mastered but as a discipline in which standards of excellence are as worthy of being honored as in the liberal arts. This ceremony, furthermore, recognizes the stake of the community in its intellectual resources—and in this exciting world of change in which we live, awareness of the crucial role of our intellectual resources is inescapable. The ready availability of higher education is essential to the success of every community and every business today.

Most of the important good things that happen in this world are the products of men's minds. After all, except for a few widely scattered disturbances like the recent earthquake in Alaska, no particularly striking changes in the face of the earth have been wrought by nature since the Himalayas were raised. Yet consider what changes have been wrought in the conditions of human life since that time. From an animal existence, chained to darkness and subsistence survival, mankind has steadily applied his ability to think to the world around him and slowly built all this wondrous creation we call civilization; all essentially flowing out of his intellect, his ideas—from the invention of the wheel to the harnessing of electricity to the exploration of the moon. It is probably significant that those three obvious examples I pick are essentially engineering achievements, and the principal purpose of engineering hasn't really changed since the invention of the wheel. (Perhaps I should concede the truth pointed out by another defrocked accountant, Bob Newhart: that the man who invented the wheel didn't accomplish much, but the fellow that put four of them together, he really had something.)

Each generation probably likes to consider itself unique; and in some way each is. Yet has any generation faced a world that is changing quite so explosively as ours? All over the planet, from Zanzibar to Panama, from Brazil to Vietnam, nations are in political ferment, social revolution, cultural convulsion. Societies are turning upside down, old values and attitudes overthrown. Along with the political and social unrest goes the plunging forward pace of scientific inquiry and its constant companion, technological development. Old ideas and social patterns have simply been unable to remain intact under the shock of the information and communications revolutions. It is men's minds which have fundamentally stimulated all this change.

In such a gathering as this, I am not going to pose as a commentator on social or political events. Anyway, what happened in New Hampshire a month ago yesterday should remind us anew that, on political affairs, the world rewards those who keep their mouths shut. Furthermore, I am certainly not going to try to tell a Tau Beta Pi ceremony anything new on the technical front, being an old beancounter by trade myself.

I would like to share with you, however, some thoughts, from where I sit, on how this world of change affects all of us directly in the realm of economic and business life. The more I see of recent economic developments the more convinced I become that all of us—General Electric, Schenectady, Union College, the United States—need to look beyond our shores more than ever and assess the future in worldwide terms.

American enterprise, and all of us whose jobs are part of American enterprise, have entered a new era of worldwide economic relationships. From the Common Market especially, but also from the rest of Europe, from Japan, and in many instances from the developing nations, America's once vaunted competitive capability confronts a suddenly effective challenge.

It comes as something of a blow to our national pride to realize that many American industries were caught unprepared for this competition and have been rocked back on their heels. In fact, I suspect that many who should be concerned are still unaware of just how much the world has changed from that easy postwar condition when we enjoyed the comfort which came naturally to the one industrial nation spared from the ravages of World War II. Now America is discovering the new world.

American enterprise was built on the principle of free competition in a country-wide market in which no trade barriers hampered the full development of economic efficiency. In theory, those who believe in this free market economy have always argued that extension of this principle on a worldwide scale would bring about a correspondingly higher burst of economic development worldwide. Now we are confronted with facts, not theories. Are we really prepared for this new world?

Let's pause and inquire just how strong the United States stands in the growing competitive struggle.

First, look at the comparative cost of manpower, including wages, salaries, and social benefits. The level of manpower costs in the United States is, of course, higher: about 3 times higher than in Europe and 5 to 8 times higher than in Japan.

These differences in manpower costs extend beyond factory labor to skilled personnel, officeworkers, as well as scientists and engineers. In a Japanese competitor of General Electric's, a manufacturer of steam turbines, a first-rate machinist earns from $75 to $100 per month above fringe benefits, though benefits in his case will be different than our machinist receives. Qualified engineers receive less take-home pay than our newest unskilled clerk or sweeper.

Some cost inflation in Western Europe and Japan appears in the cards. Since they start from such a very low level, however, we estimate that at least through 1970 the current gap will not even begin to narrow, let alone be closed. Going on recent trends, for example, average American compensation may go up only half as fast as wage inflation in Italy. But while their rate of increase may be double ours, in actual money terms this increase in their average wage will be only about two-thirds the dollars and cents by which American compensation will increase. Thus the dollar wage differential will widen, not diminish.

U.S. industry has been able to maintain a partially offsetting lead in productivity because of some of our advantages in research and development, in scale of operations, and in many of the skills of our people. But several omens point to a narrowing of this gap.

Modern technology is rapidly catching on abroad, as oversea manufacturers adapt quickly the technical gains which for us, represented the fruits of years of research and engineering expense. Furthermore, Europe has never really yielded its preeminence in many fields of basic scientific research. Many of you know, I am sure, that not all of the employees of the research laboratory work out on that hill overlooking the Mohawk Valley. We also have a few representatives working fulltime in Europe. Why? Because we have found it absolutely essential that our own research efforts maintain a direct view into technological advances abroad which might affect the company's future competitive capability—not just by reading reports in foreign journals, but by having top-grade men on the spot in Europe.

Another factor increasing foreign productivity is the expansion in their scale of operations to something more like that of ours. Formation of the Common Market is a giant step in this direction by providing exactly what the name says, a larger "common market." Growth in output of this new economic community is expected to be faster than that of the United States during this decade—60 percent compared with just 44 percent in the United States. Furthermore, the Common Market is actively promoting horizontal mergers (of companies in the same product lines) as yet another means of improving productivity through larger volume, with its resulting lower per-unit cost. The two German steel giants—Phoenix Rheinrohr and Thyssen—recently joined forces, for example.

How about the cost of raw materials, components, and energy? Comparative costs here vary widely from commodity to commodity. In general, many basic materials are cheaper here, while items that have undergone some manufacturing are cheaper abroad. For example, aluminum ingot is cheaper here, while certain aluminum alloys and castings are cheaper in Europe.

How about freight rates in foreign trade? This is another area where American business is at a severe competitive disadvantage, especially the American exporter as against the foreign exporter. It costs $68 per ton to send U.S. books to England, but only $29 to ship English publications here—an example which the academicians in the audience, I am sure, will agree seems especially important in terms of the importance of human knowledge in this competitive struggle. It costs an American exporter $67 per ton to ship stainless steel bars to Japan, while his Japanese competitor pays only $36 to ship comparable products to the United States.

In taxes lies another area of disadvantage to the American businessman. European nations are not without business taxes. But, among Common Market countries, for example, heavy reliance on indirect taxes makes it possible to rebate taxes on exports, a concession which the American tax system with its emphasis on direct taxes does not permit. In addition, many European nations levy equalizations taxes on products they import.

But tangible cost differentials are not always decisive in the battle for position in international markets. What may hurt U.S. business more is our tradition of thinking and planning in national terms in an era when both our markets and the competition are global.

The entire electrical industry of Belgium, for example, derives 37 percent of its sales from exports; that of the Netherlands, 58 percent. One Dutch competitor of ours has only 38 percent of its assets actually located in the Netherlands, and another 46 percent elsewhere in Europe, with the remaining 16 percent deployed around the globe.

Many of these oversea producers are way ahead of us in their familiarity with international business dealings. They speak several languages. They are accustomed to crossing national borders. They have an intimate familiarity with subtle differences in commercial practices between countries. They are, many of them, thoroughly multinational organizations, formulating strategy in terms of world markets, not national ones.

Too many American businessmen speak at best three languages (English, American, and Berlitz).

This is a challenge for engineers as much as for any other segment of U.S. management. It is through engineering's contribution that many of the otherwise prohibitive cost disadvantages may be overcome. Through engineering, American enterprise can increase the useful productivity of all resources—man and machine. But are we focused on this job? A profession which has made a trip to the moon possible, through imagination, intelligence, and drive—can't this profession be reasonably expected to help keep the Nation fully competitive with other nations all across the board? The nations of Europe are concentrating their engineering talent not on far-out space work, but on designing product leadership to win world markets. At the very least, we should be getting a better flow of technical ideas from our defense and space research into commercial applications.

The growing internationalization of commerce should be an opportunity as well as a challenge for American firms, of course. Common Market income is expected to go up 60 percent in a period when for the United States a rise of 44 percent is indicated. Any seller of electrical appliances, for example, can recognize a big market in those numbers, especially when we note that consumer products account for some 30 percent of the European market for electrical goods, as against just 24 percent of ours. In 1962, 3 out of every 10 turbine generators leaving the Schenectady plant went overseas, almost all to Latin America, Japan, and elsewhere in Asia. As a matter of fact, General Electric as a whole derived some $900 million worth of sales revenue from foreign business last year.

But sometimes observations like these can be misleading. If you hear glowing reports about an American firm's great increase in oversea sales, better check the figures closely before jumping to conclusions. For example, find out how much of the business is financed by U.S. foreign-aid money, or by loans from the Export-Import Bank. Then ask yourself whether this business constitutes a permanent basis for ongoing foreign business.

Or take the turbine business. This great growing Common Market and the rest of Europe aren't going to provide us much of any market in turbines, even if all tariffs were abolished tomorrow. Why not? Aren't the world's best turbines made right here in Schenectady? Sure they are. But the power suppliers of most European countries, almost entirely government owned, will buy only from electrical manufacturers in their own countries. American manufacturers, General Electric included, are effectively foreclosed from sales to European countries by these nationalistic purchasing practices. I do not mean we have to bid extra low—I mean there is, in effect, no point in our bidding at all. Meanwhile, some of our European competitors, in effect, are encouraged by their own governments to compete in U.S. markets, while within their own borders their domestic markets are held secure.

I do not suggest that the answer is going to be found in the U.S. Government adopting such a policy—nor should it. Economic challenges cannot be met with political solutions.

Perhaps there is almost something too impressive about that world-famous large steam turbine building. It invites the complacent feeling that it has always been here and always will be here. Yet there are some mighty resourceful oversea plants, often more modern and more expensively equipped, which are dedicated to taking every bit of business away from that turbine plant—and which have a lot of things going for them in their efforts to do just that. A similar challenge confronts almost every General Electric operation in Schenectady.

Needless to say, I strongly believe that these rapidly changing conditions of world economics compel us all to do some fresh thinking. We need to reexamine past attitudes and practices.

Obviously . any subject so vitally affecting the national interest, governmental policy decisions must be made. I would not presume to lay down exactly what these might be, but clearly some of the relevant areas for policy decision include tax policy, the so-called guidelines for wage-price settlements, and governmental attitudes toward large-scale business.

Aside from essential government policies, however, response to the international challenge ultimately rests on us all. The genius of the free market economy is that it calls forth action in thousands of decentralized decision centers—indeed, ultimately among all the people. The new conditions of world competition command the attention and deliberate action of all of us.

For the engineer, the international dimension to the new business environment has implications which must be carefully weighed. In one sense, engineering problems and their solutions know no national boundaries; the laws of nature do not change when spoken in a different language; nor do the basic needs of man which engineering seeks to satisfy. But today's engineers have long since learned that the working environment for a large share of engineering today is a business firm. If that firm cannot stay competitive and profitable, it will become a less and less productive environment for creative engineering. Ultimately, it may, of course, disappear from the competitive scene.

In the newly intensified world competition, engineers must become more business minded. They must help American industry

keep competitive. Their contributions can take the form of:

1. Conceiving and designing the new or improved products and performance—in a word, innovation.

2. Helping the business enterprise improve efficiency so as to stay fully competitive on a unit-cost basis, worldwide.

Through either or both of these contributions, engineering can and must help meet the international challenge—remembering that without competitive businesses to hire engineers, without profits to finance creative engineering work, the profession cannot properly pursue its calling: doing useful things for mankind.

Not only engineers, but every person engaged in the business enterprise is affected by the new international competition. Merely matching the next domestic competitor, who may be subject to a similar union contract, is no longer enough.

The goal of every U.S. business should be to achieve the lowest costs, worldwide, per unit of value produced. Providing the most value for their money is the best assurance of the future that any plant or community can have.

Ultimately this is a job for all. Value starts in the minds and hearts of dedicated people. I am firmly convinced that the genuine dedication of all employees must be earned if American enterprise is to stay competitive. Union leadership must see the big picture. State and local governments need an awareness of worldwide trends.

For example, the New York State Legislature had placed before it this year legislation to repeal the excess crew law under which the railroads are required to keep on people who don't have useful work to do. Whatever may have prompted the beginnings of this policy 50 years ago, such restrictive practices have become not simply archaic. In the face of the world challenge, they have become a serious impediment to keeping New York industries competitive and New York workers employed. Outmoded laws may prove as bad or worse to a business that's trying to be competitive as obsolete equipment or insufficiently trained people—or even uncreative engineers. Reexamining old habits and attitudes is essential—and so is the courage to take corrective action where needed.

Communities all over the United States must think about how these new conditions affect them—Schenectady no less than other communities. I hope you will find that all of my associates in General Electric's various operations here will join in this sober reappraisal and resulting action.

I want it to be crystal clear from what I said that I am no pessimist on this subject. I hope I am a realist, but from where I sit there is no reason for any real doubt that governmental leaders, businessmen, employees at all levels, union leadership, and communities like Schenectady have the capacity and the will to confront the new conditions of a changing world. American enterprise has technology second to none. We have the volume that permits mechanization. We have great distribution and sales promotion strengths. We build quality products and back them with dependable service.

Confident in these strengths, there is no intrinsic reason why the increased prosperity and productive efficiency of the other parts of the world should damage the United States. On the contrary—these developments abroad should open up a new era of broader business opportunities; an even more creative division of labor between nations; and ultimately even a further step toward international understanding and cooperation among peoples.

Perhaps my final word should be addressed again, to those young men whose initiation in Tau Beta Pi evidences their early commitment to standards of excellence in intellectual effort.

U.S. leadership, in the new world economics as in the political and social confrontation, depends in the last analysis on our ability, as a Nation and as individuals, to think and plan in terms of the new forces at work in the world. It is not our weapons of war, not our treaties and agreements, not our words, but our ideas which must earn our place in the world—our ideas and our ideals. Let us continue to prize excellence in ideas and ideals, and buttress them with the courage to act.

Bobby Baker Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to note the excellent editorial support in newspapers throughout the country for disclosure of all the facts in the Bobby Baker scandal.

Why has the investigation been stymied? Why has a determined effort been made to sweep the scandal under the rug?

Could it be true, as the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star suggests the evidence indicates, that "a full airing of the Baker mess could dissipate Democratic election hopes"?

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Rockford Star of May 31, 1964:

SERIOUS ACCUSATIONS

New disclosures in the Bobby Baker scandal add compelling reasons for reopening the inquiry, abandoned under White House pressure. President Johnson and some of his chief White House aids are not put in a favorable light in the new disclosures.

The evidence indicates that a full airing of the Baker mess could dissipate Democratic election hopes. The Democratic leadership is finding that the Baker case will not stay submerged. It was brought into the open again when Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a broadcast made April 13 by Don R. Reynolds, an insurance man and key witness in the Rules Committee's probe.

Reynolds disclosed in his broadcast comments that Baker had told him to "get out of town" lest he "and the rest of us" go to jail. The advice was given, Reynolds said, when he informed Baker that Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who instituted the investigation, wanted to see him.

Reynolds became a prominent figure in the case when he testified before the Rules Committee that Walter Jenkins, top White House aid, had put pressure on him to buy $1,280 worth of advertising over the Johnson family's Texas TV station after he had sold a $100,000 insurance policy to Mr. Johnson. The committee failed to question Jenkins, who has said he knows nothing about the advertising purchase.

In his broadcast comments, Reynolds repeated this accusation. He also said that President Johnson helped Billie Sol Estes, now under sentence for an agricultural swindle. Reynolds said Mr. Johnson had intervened for Estes on behalf of soil conservation contracts. The insurance man explained that these matters occurred during the time Mr. Johnson was Senate majority leader and Baker was secretary to the Senate Democratic majority.

Reynolds repeated a number of other accusations he had made when he appeared before the Rules Committee early in its investigation of the Baker scandal.

There should be a clear determination of the truth or falsity of Reynolds' statements. His accusation of a Johnson tie with the Billie Sol Estes scandal is indeed a serious matter. It is the duty of the Rules Committee to reopen its investigation and to recall Reynolds for further questioning. Jenkins, too, should be made to answer questions. If the probe continues to be stymied in Congress, a Federal grand jury should take up the matter.

Freeing the Oil Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office's Defense Accounting and Auditing Director has pointed out to the Secretary of Defense that the Navy may save an estimated $60,000 if unnecessary buttonholes were eliminated from Navy coats. This is an important item; but I would like to point out that greater savings can be made not only by the Defense Department but within the economy of New England if the mandatory oil import program is terminated.

This is fuel which we must have for a great portion of our industries in New England. In view of the substantial number of military installations in the New England area, it is quite evident that great savings could be made by the Department of Defense and over $30 million a year could be saved by the New England economy if the mandatory oil import quotas were lifted.

I would like to point out that on March 22, 1964, Bernard L. Boutin, GSA Administrator, wrote to the Chairman of the Oil Import Appeals Board pointing out that because of the residual oil import controls, GSA was experiencing extreme difficulty in obtaining sufficient oil to heat Government buildings in the Washington area.

The Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun of May 25, 1964, has an editorial that I believe to be an important contribution to the discussion which has been taking place relative to residual oil imports. There is little doubt but what competition within the fuel market is very substantially reduced by this import quota program.

I certainly agree with the Lewiston Daily Sun and the GSA that this import quota program adds very serious and tremendous costs to the users of heating fuel not only in Washington but in New England, Florida, and many other points along our eastern coast.

The editorial follows:

FREEING THE OIL MARKET

If it is in the public interest for the General Services Administration of the Federal

Government to buy residual oil outside the rigid quota system, as a money saving proposition, it is even more in the public interest to do away with the quotas so that the general public may be relieved of the high price burden.

That position was taken editorially by the Boston Herald a few days ago. We feel that the point is well taken.

There never has been a sound case for the import quotas on residual oil. The restrictions have cost New England industries and institutions, as well as consumers generally, many millions of dollars in higher prices. Although originally intended to encourage the use of coal, so that the depressed coal mining areas would be helped, the quotas have not had such an effect, as expert studies have demonstrated. Nevertheless, the unfair burden has continued to be borne.

The GSA rebelled at the higher prices it had to pay and the Department of the Interior, which now has charge of the quota program, made an exception of it.

The Defense Department continues to pay the premium prices, at an added cost to the Government of $8 or $9 million a year, an obviously ridiculous situation.

Maine and New England institutions, utilities and industries which need residual oil to fill their fuel requirements are as worthy of consideration as any Federal agency. The public interest can best be served by a free market in oil, a market in which competition will bring the price down to a reasonable level. New England should not continue to be a scapegoat.

Young Carteret Artist Wins National Maritime Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Michael Maskaly, Jr., of Carteret, N.J., who resides in the 15th Congressional District, recently was awarded first prize in a nationwide contest.

Over 8,500 persons participated in the National Maritime Poster contest, with Michael receiving a $500 check for first prize. Even more gratifying than his cash award is that his prize-winning poster is now being displayed throughout the Nation on postal trucks, post offices, and other buildings.

There are few such contests in the country that have the approval of high school authorities and it is a tribute to the American maritime industry, the Maritime Administration, and the Post Office Department for sponsoring this nationwide contest. Industry sponsors include the American Merchant Marine Institute, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, the Lake Carriers' Association, the Pacific American Steamship Association, the Propeller Club of the United States, and the Shipbuilders Council of America.

Last year Michael won third prize, so his success might be a lesson to other artists that by persevering, they might also reach their goals. Naturally, residents of the 15th District and those of New Jersey are extremely proud of the distinguished ability and accomplishment of Michael Maskaly, Jr., whose painting centered around "Keep America Strong, Use American Ships."

The Evening News of Perth Amboy, N.J., covered his success in an article that appeared on May 1, 1964.

The article follows:

CARTERET.—Sixteen-year-old Michael Maskaly, Jr., 13 George Street, who learned to paint in his father's art classes at Carteret High School, yetserday was named first prize winner of the National Maritime Poster contest.

Reproductions of Michael's red, white and blue poster, which depicts a naval officer raising the American flag with the inscription "Keep America Strong, Use American Ships," will be displayed this month on 40,000 mail trucks and in post offices and other public buildings throughout the country.

Michael, along with representatives from several major steamship lines, participated in ceremonies this morning at the New York post office, marking the first public display of the poster.

THIRD LAST YEAR

Young Maskaly, whose father has taught art classes at the high school for 8 years, won third place in the contest as a freshman art student last year.

Now a sophomore, he determined to do better this year, submitting two entries. Entrants are allowed to submit as many posters as they can produce during the 3-month contest.

Michael's first effort, a red orange and black portrayal of a ship passing before the Statue of Liberty, didn't satisfy the young artist after his sister remarked that Miss Liberty looked like she was standing on the ship and would sink it.

So Michael returned to the easel and came up with the first prize winner.

His major problem, he says was in creating a hazy effect for the background when the class did not have an airbrush to use. (An airbrush, about the size of a ballpoint pen, is a spray gun in miniature.)

But Michael's teacher-father came up with the solution. By spreading the paint on a toothbrush and flicking it off with a penknife, Michael achieved the fuzzy effect he was looking for. The painting took a week to complete.

Maskaly, Sr., says his son is one of half a dozen students in his classes who have won awards in national poster contests since 1959. He says the students enter the contest voluntarily, and must do most of the work outside of class, although they may bring nearly completed posters to class to apply the finishing touches.

DINNER IN WASHINGTON

Michael will be feted for his poster at a dinner in Washington May 27.

The National Maritime Industry, a group of industrial organizations representing all facets of shipping, will award Michael $500.

Michael says he plans to put the money in the bank for college—but he doesn't know which one. He says he wants eventually to be an art teacher, like his father.

Although posters are painted in watercolor, most of Michael's classwork is done in oils. He specializes in landscapes. Recently, however, he has begun work on woodcarving.

Michael says he did little artistic work until he began taking his father's art courses last year. When he tried to recall his previous efforts at painting, his mother suggested that the biggest part of it was done on the outside of the family home—a one-color masterpiece that took a whole summer to complete.

Wasted Know-How: The Skills of Retired Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the intelligent use of the brainpower and the know-how of men and women who have retired—or who have been forced to retire—from responsible positions in the working force of the Nation is a problem which deserves a great deal more attention and many more solutions than have so far been attempted. Recently, a friend of mine who had done an outstanding promotional and merchandising job for a major industry found himself involuntarily retired at age 62. I urged him to make his services available to the Federal Government which—thanks to action by this House several years ago—has no bar because of age for employment in most positions of men and women in their sixties. After considering the possibility, this highly qualified businessman decided to go into business for himself. I am sure he will do well.

But many retirees, while not interested in full-time employment or in the heavy responsibility of running a business, nevertheless are very much interested in "keeping their hand in" in fields in which they spent most of their lives, and preventing their skills from rusting. The Small Business Administration, which comes under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has launched a very significant experiment by inviting retired business executives and others with distinctive skills in the business world to serve as consultants and troubleshooters for small business firms needing guidance and know-how. The response to the SBA announcement was so dramatic that it led the New York Journal of Commerce on Tuesday to comment editorially on the valuable skills of those over 65 which are being neglected in the business world.

Mr. Speaker, I think this editorial raises some very provocative ideas and suggestions, not only for the retired businessman, but for many of our skilled craftsmen and workers in every industry. Much more should be done in this field.

I would like to suggest that the Social Security Administration develop plans and programs for the intelligent use of the skills of many of the men and women now retired who would dearly love to keep active at least on a part-time basis in the fields in which they have experience and competence. Of course, this means rethinking the stringent earning limitations concept in the present law. I know we cannot pay full social security benefits to everyone over 62 or even over 65 regardless of earnings, but I think the present limitation and its administration contribute unnecessarily to the wastage

of brainpower needed in solving the manpower needs of today's economy.

The editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce of Tuesday, June 2, 1964, referred to above, is as follows:

HELP WANTED: PEOPLE OVER 65

Age cannot wither nor custom stale the demand for services of men and women who have experience in important lines of business activity, to paraphrase Shakespeare. We feel that it is a significant sign of these times that there seems to be a pickup in the employment of oldsters who still want to work long past a constantly accelerating retirement age and who have the vigorous health to make such activities possible.

Long before social security was ever enacted this newspaper used to chronicle the activities of a Wall Street bank president who was 103 and commuted 20 miles to work every day. When his directors said, one day, that after all, old boy, you should give somebody else a chance, he died. As he saw it, there wasn't anything else to do.

And we also used to have stories about the corporate coups of a vigorous "young" man of 84 who ran a railroad and served as a director of about 14 other corporations. He was a most ferocious match for anybody who came down the pike with a fixed idea that he was just an old man who could be pushed around.

What brings up these reflections is the recent announcement by the Small Business Administration that it could use retired people who were still able to flit about the country and give advice on how properly to run their business to people who got loans from Uncle Sam through SBA. These people, it seems, through inexperience, played ducks and drakes with the Government's money. The SBA is positively embarrassed by the response it had from qualified oldsters to this opportunity to pick up some extra income and it seems to be assured of no end of talent if it can use it.

In fact, it seems assured of at least 600 of these oldsters—some not so ancient, but retired—and is thinking of calling them the Light Brigade. It is sure they will do much better than the original gallant 600 did at Balaclava.

The attraction of oldsters as instruments to solve problems seems to be contagious. Just recently Alan S. Jeffrey, the executive vice-president of the National Association of Credit Management, who has been worried about the huge annual total of business failures, with a consequent loss of 250,000 jobs and $1¼ billion of wages over a 3 year period, proposed a brigade of trouble shooting oldsters who could cut down on the bankruptcy rolls and save jobs for others and money too. He said credit agencies should get together and finance the relatively low cost of such a brigade.

Still another example of the growing demand for retirees who want to work is the experience the New Jersey highway authorities have had in hiring people over 65 as toll takers on the Garden State Parkway, on a part time basis (they have to be part-time unless they are over 72, at which age social security doesn't limit a retiree with full benefits to a maximum outside income of $1,200 a year). These people are efficient, aren't late to work, don't let little things such as storms or tempests bother them and can tell a Canadian quarter just by feeling it. The highway people in Jersey just love these oldsters.

That age doesn't necessarily downgrade the value of years of experience in special skills has, of course, long been recognized by business. A modern example is the great number of retirees who, as soon as they are retired, are employed as "consultants", either full or part time. Consultant's fees, however, count against his social security benefits. His dividend and interest income of course do not.

Many banks, conscious that they now have few officers who have real experience with events such as those of the early 1930's, keep a careful reference list of those former members of their staffs who were around in those days and who could be temporarily recalled.

There are, of course, some oldsters who are moonlighting or butterflying (part-time work) to eke out social security within the permitted limits, but a great many retirees don't want income so much as the challenge imposed by having something difficult or interesting to do. The demand for these special talents is always present. One may expect more want ads that say that persons under 72 need not apply.

A Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, one event of great political interest occurred on President Johnson's recent visit to Michigan. Henry Ford II, who announced himself as a previously lifelong Republican, told the President that he would support him in the coming election.

This endorsement broadens greatly the support being given the President and his programs. That he has the support of groups ranging in diversity from the AFL–CIO to Henry Ford II will surely offer the Republican candidate a great challenge this November.

I wish to include an editorial from the New York Times, May 24, 1964, commenting on Mr. Ford's endorsement and the challenge to the Republicans that such broad support given the President will bring. I trust that my colleagues will find it interesting.

The editorial follows:

CHALLENGE TO THE REPUBLICANS

The announcement by Henry Ford II, a lifelong Republican, that he intends to support and vote for President Johnson provides dramatic new evidence of the breadth of Mr. Johnson's political appeal. The Ford announcement, one of many such declarations recently by prominent industrialists, came just 2 days after the AFL–CIO had taken the first step toward a formal union endorsement of the President.

In 6 months Mr. Johnson has forged a coalition that includes both the poverty vote and the prosperity vote. Those who believe in a vastly expanded role for Government are rallying behind him. So are the advocates of economy in Government. He has earned the respect of civil rights groups without fatal damage to his personal popularity in the South. In speeches such as those he made at the University of Michigan Friday and at the George Marshall Research Library yesterday, he is seeking to break down the coolness of the intellectuals by identifying himself as an exponent of elevated concepts of quality in American life—the concepts John F. Kennedy articulated with such grace.

Whether any President, confronted with the conflicting problems and pressures of the United States in the mid-sixties, can hold the allegiance of so many divergent groups for long is doubtful. In the end, Mr. Johnson will have to enunciate programs and make fiscal decisions that may alienate some of his current enthusiasts. But, given the proximity of the election and the present confusion and lack of affirmative program in the Republican Party, there seems an excellent chance that Mr. Johnson will set a record for electoral votes in November. This will be doubly true if the Republicans resolve their indecision by putting all their faith in a candidate whose sole appeal is to those who believe America should move backward, rather than forward, in finding answers to the titanic problems of change.

Transit System Needs Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, over 10 days have elapsed since the Mass Transit Act was reported by the Rules Committee. It is my hope that this legislation will be very speedily considered by the House so that our cities can plan for the utilization of this very essential legislation upon which depends the life of our central cities.

The following editorial supporting the Mass Transit Act appeared in the Cleveland Press on Friday, May 29, 1964, entitled "Transit Systems Need Help":

TRANSIT SYSTEMS NEED HELP

Greater Cleveland Congressmen should support the urban mass transportation bill now starting its long-delayed examination by the House of Represenatives.

Passage of the bill is important to every person in this metropolitan area, not just to bus and rapid riders. The reasons are obvious.

Cleveland Transit System stands to benefit greatly from money to be spent under the law—$500 million in the House version, $375 million in the version passed last year by the Senate.

According to Don Hyde, general manager, CTS is confident of immediate help if the proposal becomes law.

"We would be able to carry out an orderly expansion program," said Hyde. He is surely thinking of more expansion than the Airport Rapid extension; other areas of the county could confidently look forward to speedy rail transportation downtown.

America is engaged in a losing effort to supply superhighways and parking areas into and through its greatest cities. The demand always exceeds the need, despite tremendous construction.

And highway users do not pay for the roads by themselves. The money collected by the States from motorists just about pays the States' share. Some of the Federal money comes from all Americans whether they use roads or not.

So there is justifictaion in Federal aid to other forms of mass transportation.

The amount being contemplated for use on transit systems is peanuts compared to freeway building figures. Both forms of transit are designed largely to take people to the great downtowns, which merchants urge.

Why take cars downtown? Somebody has pointed out that no car, not even a Cadillac, has ever bought a nickel's worth of merchandise.

Protected District of Columbia Hoodlums Rob, Rape, and Kill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, some writers suggest that the Supreme Court, in its decisions since 1950, as chartered bold, new horizons for the good of the American people. Others believe that many of America's more serious domestic troubles today are directly attributable to confusion, indecision, immorality, and license that have stemmed from Supreme Court decisions disregarding the rights of an overwhelming majority of citizens and emphasizing exaggerated rights for a motley assortment of pinks, punks, and queers whose cases have come before the Court.

One direct and readily demonstrable result of the Court's decisions is in the criminal field—the field of law enforcement. This has been the marked increase of crime in the District of Columbia, right on Capitol Hill. Not only is this dismal situation a poor example for the rest of the Nation, but it is a direct reflection of the inability of police officers in the District to exercise that degree of firm, swift justice in law enforcement that is essential to retain both the respect and fear of the criminal element.

Under unanimous consent and as indicative of just how bad the situation has become in the Nation's Capital, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article by William Moore of the Chicago Tribune Press Service appearing in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, entitled "Protected District of Columbia Hoodlums Rob, Rape, Kill."

It is about time that those in the highest places in the United States who want to see a better America get hold of themselves and start helping, rather than hurting, America.

The article follows:

PROTECTED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOODLUMS ROB, RAPE, KILL

(By William Moore)

WASHINGTON.—Thirty-six girls and boys from Maine, who came here to march in the National School Safety Patrol parade, walked out of their hotel to go sightseeing the other evening—into an ambush by one of the wolfpack gangs of the Nation's Capital.

The young visitors were stoned, manhandled, and jeered by a mob of Negro boys before they could escape back to their hotel.

A few nights later, Mrs. Mari Christersen, receptionist for Senator CARL CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, was choked and beaten in her bed in her home near Capitol Hill.

Washingtonians fear for their lives by night and by day in a capital where murder, mass rape, robbery, burglary, and sadistic beatings accompanied by eye gouging and stomping have become commonplace.

Last month major crimes here were 34 percent higher than in April a year ago. For 23 consecutive months the crime rate has been rising.

Some of the more recent terrifying crimes committed by members of both races in this capital turned jungle are these:

A 17-year-old girl, who fell while trying to escape a wolfpack, was raped by 10 boys.

A pack of 25 boys beat and robbed 2 women sitting in a stalled car. Two teenage girls hailed a cab, held up the driver, and shot him in the back as he tried to flee.

A busdriver was brutally beaten and robbed by a small pack while 39 passengers watched without giving help.

Merchants are advertising tear gas weapons for citizens' protection, 85 percent of the cabdrivers fear to work at night, and men as well as women are afraid to leave their homes after nightfall.

Policemen with dogs roam the grounds of the Capitol but they cannot prevent such attacks on tourists as that in which a woman was beaten and robbed on the Capitol steps by girls who smashed her eye glasses.

Police are assigned to escort women employees of Members of Congress to their cars when they leave work at night. Women employees of the Supreme Court, facing the Capitol, are similarly guarded.

Representative JOHN MCFALL, Democrat, of California, has said it is irony for Chief Justice Earl Warren's Court to guard its women while making rulings that hamper the police and protect the criminal.

One Supreme Court ruling under fire is known as the Mallory rule. Under it, judges free murderers and other criminals whom judges deem to have been held too long before arraignment, even though guilt is evident.

The Durham rule by the Federal court of appeals is another rule about which the police complain.

Under it, a jury here found a man not guilty of raping three women, but it found him guilty of robbing the women at the same time the rapes were committed. He had pleaded insanity and the jury invoked the rule, holding that he was insane about rape but sane about robbery.

Members of Congress complain jurists recognize every technicality to protect the criminal but do little to protect the citizen.

The District of Columbia Commissioners, without consulting Congress, banned "investigative arrests." The ban prevents police from questioning known criminals suspected of specific crimes unless the police have a formal charge against them.

Members of wolfpacks now taunt police with:

"I don't have to talk to you or even give you my name unless you've got a charge against me."

GUNS AVAILABLE

The Constitution guarantees the right of citizens to bear arms. Any Washington boy with $6.98 can buy a pistol from a mail order house. A high school girl recently was shot by a youthful sniper.

Switch-blade knives are the standard equipment of juvenile lawbreakers who have not achieved the gun-toting class.

The cruelty of Washington's wolfpacks is incomprehensible. When young criminals finished robbing an elderly concert pianist recently, they beat him to death with a tree limb.

The beatings these criminals administer to old men sitting on park benches are beyond comprehension. Shopkeepers who submit to holdups are stabbed, beaten, and sometimes murdered.

Some of the wolfpacks, after beating their victims to the ground, gouge their eyes and stomp them to break their ribs.

Even Members of Congress, Government officials, and members of congressional staffs have been victims of robberies, beatings, burglaries, and purse snatchings.

Two Chinas Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit a letter written to the editor of the New York Times, by Mr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, former Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs of the Department of State, and published in that newspaper on June 2, 1964.

No man is more competent to judge the present situation than he, with the experience he has had in the past. It is an excellent dissertation from a man who has been through "two Chinas" before:

TWO CHINAS OPPOSED—TAIWAN'S TAKEOVER BY PEIPING SEEN IF SEPARATION IS EFFECTED

To the EDITOR:

In your issue of May 19 you offer under the caption "Self-Determination for Taiwan" a variant of the long proposed two-China solution to the China dilemma. What you suggest is a variant not as regards the goal but as regards the taking of the first step toward that solution.

As recently as April 22 you contended that we now should declare ourselves prepared to give diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communists on condition that continuation of the Republic of China's membership in the United Nations be assured. What you now suggest is that the first step should be to effect the creating of an independent Taiwan. Either way, what you throughout advocate is the bringing into existence of two states where there has been but one.

MANCHURIA'S HISTORY

You declare confidently: "No one can doubt that Peiping ultimately is going to be * * * accepted generally as the Government of China," and "An independent Taiwan * * * is certainly the best solution for which the West can hope." Recalling that you elsewhere have well said, "Looking back a little may help us to look ahead," may one who looks back more than a little suggest consideration of a chapter wherein there occurred, in the years before Pearl Harbor, another envisioning of another political separating?

At the Washington Conference (1921–22), several statesmen asked: "What is China?" with implication that China's claim to Manchuria was disputable. Ten years later Japanese armies occupied Manchuria, and Japanese authorities created there a Republic of Manchukuo. Thereafter, there came repeatedly to the U.S. Department of State, persons asking: Why does not the American Government accord to Manchukuo diplomatic recognition? Manchukuo is a going concern, there to stay; why ignore it; why not be realistic?

And officers thus approached repeatedly replied in terms of: What is Manchukuo; the United States does not ignore it; realism requires that we consider the whole of the situation in which its existence is only a part; why hurry? Well—as a result of developments not then foreseeable, Manchukuo and the prognostications and demands regarding it soon disappeared. One cites this bit of history not by way of suggesting that it will or might be repeated but by way of a caveat in regard to overly confident envisioning, predicting, and prescribing.

One who looks ahead with less assurance than do the proponents of the "two-China solutions" wonders, How much thought have the said proponents given to the problem of

implementation and to questions of concomitants and consequences?

By what process would you have it that the everywhere-affirmed allergy of all Chinese (except some born on Taiwan) to the separation concept be overcome? If the envisioned de lege dichotomy were effected, for how long could the "independent Taiwan" be viable and that setup endure?

PULL ON SMALLER STATE

Would not the pull of ethnic, social, economic, and political gravity, irresistibly draw the smaller of those two states into the orbit and community of the larger, with the result that there soon would be effected an annexation and the world be confronted with the emergence of a unified and all-embracing China, a huge, locally unchallengeable and little inhibited Communist state?

Gone the Nationalist opposition; flourishing, the Communist People's Republic. Could pursuance of a "two-China" policy fail to increase the capabilities of China's Communist rulers and to diminish relatively the capabilities of the "free" world in today's and tomorrow's global conflict?

We must take risks, of course. But need we take these?

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

WASHINGTON, *May 25, 1964.*

School Prayer Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning a distinguished constituent of mine, Dr. Francis J. Brown, professor of economics, DePaul University, Chicago, appeared before the House Committee on the Judiciary. He appeared as chairman of the board of the National Association for Personal Rights in Education, representing that organization in hearings being conducted by the Judiciary Committee on the various constitutional amendments relating to prayer in public schools.

His testimony, however, was most unique since it basically dealt with issues other than the one that is normally raised before the committee in its legislative sessions. I feel that Dr. Brown and the organization he represents made an interesting contribution to the committee's deliberations.

However, a good deal of the testimony might as well have been directed to the Committee on Education and Labor, under whose jurisdiction educational legislation is processed, or to the Committee on Ways and Means, exercising its control over our tax laws.

Dr. Brown's statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF DR. FRANCIS J. BROWN

The National Association for Personal Rights in Education (NAPRE) is an organization of citizens interested in the study and advancement of the personal rights of parents and children in American education.

NAPRE is concerned with the personal right of parents to control the education of their children in schools of their own free choice and conscience. It is concerned with the civil rights of every American child to religious liberty and to the equal protection of the laws.

In approaching the proposed constitutional amendments now before this distinguished committee, we limit our remarks today to the question of prayer and Bible reading in the tax-supported State schools.

As a background, we first discuss educational philosophies and the historical use of the education tax dollar under the public school system.

We note that every school, whether tax supported or not, has two main elements, its academic content and its educational philosophy. Most people understand academic content to mean such subjects as reading, language, and science, but many are in the dark as to the existence, nature, and influence of educational philosophies.

The educational philosophy of a school is the frame of reference within which the academic content is presented. It includes the relevancy or irrelevancy of God and religion for living and learning. It includes values on man, morality, rights, duties, and other ultimates. It includes the influence of the teaching, counseling, discipline, values, and example of the faculty. It includes the permeating influence of the total life of the school as a social institution.

We note also that traditionally American parents have desired three main educational philosophies: nondenominational Protestantism; sectarian (Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox Jew, etc.); and secular. We hold that these private philosophies cannot be reduced to a common denominator in any one school; we hold that for many taxpayers educational philosophy is an integral part of their religious beliefs; we hold that there is no neutral educational philosophy.

Finally we note that it is one thing to tax for the public benefit of academic content and quite another thing to tax for the support of private educational philosophies.

Turning to the historical use of the education tax dollar, we see that in the middle of the 19th century the dominant Protestant groups established a state school which they called a public or common school and to which they awarded a monopoly of the education tax.

This establishment violated the principle of separation of church and state. For it was basically a union of the state and a combination of Protestant forces whereby the State used public taxation not simply to teach academic content but also to support a Protestant educational philosophy spearheaded by prayer and the reading of the Bible.

This establishment violated individual religious freedom. For it imposed the personal civil disability of the loss of tax-supported academic content upon those young citizens whose parents through individual religious conscience could not enroll them under the influence of the State-sponsored Protestant educational philosophy.

Finally this establishment was in our opinion a grave error on the part of the dominant Protestants, for they set up the state as the schoolteacher of American children. Undoubtedly this did not appear dangerous then for Protestantism must have seemed unlikely ever to lose control of the public schools.

But since then secularism has for a variety of reasons largely come into dominance in the State schools. Actually John Dewey and others have had little difficulty in solidifying secularism in many of the public schools.

But not content with their de facto conquests, secularists have insisted on a legal victory. Thus they have gone to the Supreme Court to demand that the last links of the alliance of nondenominational Protestantism with the public schools be severed. We know how successful they have been.

Today secularism is the establishment. Speaking generally, if American parents wish their children to receive a share of the commonly collected tax dollar for academic content, they must enroll them within the tax-supported educational philosophy of secularism. In our judgment this modern union of the state and secularism perverts the principle of separation of church and state and violates the civil right of religious freedom.

In turning to the prayer and Bible amendments, we state first our opinion that this is no time for one-sided action on behalf of nondenominationalism. But neither is it a time to brush aside the legitimate concern of millions of parents about the educational philosophy within which their children are taught academic content.

In our judgment this is a time to reexamine thoroughly the fundamental relationships of the state, the church, and the citizens in the matter of a State compulsory education system supported by commonly collected taxation.

This is a time to recognize the violations of individual religious freedom and of the church-state separation principle that are inherent in the State's preferential tax support of one or another of the competing educational philosophies.

This is a time to move toward true neutrality in American education.

The Supreme Court has correctly seen some of the errors in the American State system of education and has rightfully moved to strip nondenominational Protestantism of preferential tax support, but the Court has fallen into error by assuming that there is a neutral educational philosophy.

Some taxpayers believe that academic content should be taught within a nondenominational educational philosophy; others believe that it should be taught within a sectarian educational philosophy; and still others believe that academic content should be taught within a secular philosophy. What is neutral about giving the secular philosophy exclusive tax support and about making it the monopolistic repository of the public benefit of academic content?

In our opinion true neutrality would consist in the reasonable and equal support of either none or all of the educational philosophies of the taxpayers. It would consist in giving citizens their share of the public benefit of academic content in the schools of their own free choice.

Despite our dissatisfaction with the neutrality doctrine of the Supreme Court, we hold that the first amendment should not be amended at this time. We believe that, once the Court puts aside the religious wars of our ancestors, it will come to true neutrality in these matters.

However, we advocate that at this time the Congress adopt a resolution restating a fundamental principle and recommending an approach to true neutrality.

The principle is that for many citizens educational philosophy is an integral part of their religious beliefs and thus comes under the protection of the religious freedom clauses of the Federal and State Constitutions.

Our recommendation is twofold. First, within the State education system, we recommend that those who voluntarily elect to preserve such traditional forms of religious expression as prayer and Bible reading and study should enjoy wide latitude to do so, provided the rights of others are respected. Secondly, for those parents who do not accept the State educational philosophy, we recommend that they be given a fair share of the education tax dollar for academic content to bring to the schools of their free choice and conscience.

Such a resolution would point the way to true neutrality. It would ease the grave concern of so many millions of citizens in this potentially explosive matter. It would be a major advance on the road to that long-awaited day on which religious liberty and the equal protection of the laws will become a reality in American education.

Texas Manufacturers Association Supports Government of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at issue in the United States today is whether we are going to have government by law or government by men. The present administration strongly advocates the cult of the personal philosophy, a benevolent government, with Federal largess ladled out to the good at the hand of a kindly President.

Of course, our country was not built on this kind of philosophy. The United States was founded in law—law which protected the people against the hand of big government. We can continue to be great and to grow and to prosper only if we return to a government of law.

In this connection I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, a resolution passed by the Texas Manufacturers Association. The resolution points out the dangerous trend toward the centralization of power in Washington in the hands of a few men and supports government by law.

TEXAS MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION ON REGAINING OF CONGRESSIONAL PREROGATIVES

The Constitution of the United States provides for a check and balance system to avoid the possibility of excessive concentration of power in either of the divisions it created. To attain this objective, it provides for a Congress to pass the laws; the executive division to administer and enforce the laws; and the judiciary to interpret the laws and determine their constitutionality.

The Texas Manufacturers Association strongly supports this system and favors a government by laws that are duly passed by the elected Congress, as representatives of all the people; and that specifically establish, in plain language, their area of application and purpose so that citizens, by reading the laws as passed by the Congress, may be able to circumscribe their own action and thus avoid violation.

TMA is, therefore, opposed to the enactment of legislation which empowers the administrative agency to extend the law through executive or administrative edict which will, if continued, subject the American people to be governed by men instead of by law. The continued practice of delegating legislative authority to the executive department and to administrative agencies will tend to ultimately destroy our constitutional system and pave the way for a dictatorship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas delegation in the National Congress be requested to utilize its influence and power to—

(1) resist the enactment of any legislation that is so written as to provide that the executive department or the administrative agency may through edict extend the law passed, or write new law through edicts dealing with the same general subject;

(2) limit the function of agencies solely to the administration of the law as passed, and the writing of such standards for compliance as are needed for the purpose of administrating the act as clearly specified in the law;

(3) resist the passage of any law that would give to any executive, official or government, or administrative agency any power over the people, or any segment thereof, that the Congress would not be willing to give, with equal zeal, to the rankest enemy of the American constitutional government and/or the private competitive enterprise system;

(4) initiate the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress designed to vacate the office of any administrator wherein the administrator extended, or attempted to extend, the application of the law, over and beyond the area of the law as clearly defined in the bill (or law) as passed by the Congress, or in any other fashion violated the intent of the Congress. Provide further that in event of areas of doubt, said agency be required to submit said proposed extension or edict to the Congress for approval, and failure to receive an affirmative approval within a specified time (90 or 120 days) would serve as an automatic rejection by the Congress; and

(5) require existing agencies to submit the existing administratively established laws and edicts for congressional review and approval and those edicts or administrative laws not so approved within 2 years shall become null and void.

America's First Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during the short 6 months President Johnson has been in office, we have all had many opportunities to observe our charming First Lady as she goes about her official duties.

When the President assumed office under the most difficult of circumstances it was Mrs. Johnson who made the move into the White House less of a burden by her quiet and efficient handling of the thousands of small details associated with moving. And it was this attractive and sympathetic lady who stood by to help the bereaved Mrs. Kennedy in her most trying hours.

We all admire this courageous First Lady who goes about her duties, large and small, with such vitality and resourcefulness. The Baltimore Sun carried an article on May 24, which reminds us what a remarkable woman Mrs. Johnson is and I wish to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD.

THE FIRST LADY

The 6 months of office which have established President Johnson's style in office have revealed also that Mrs. Johnson is a political personality in her own right. Even without the Kentucky and Pennsylvania forays which underlined the resemblance, the country would have been forcibly reminded of Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt. Not for almost 20 years has the United States seen the chatelaine of the White House make a full-scale campaign speech, tour the country plugging her husband's program with an energy and enthusiasm equal to his or show such awareness of the facts of legislative life.

As everyone knows, Mrs. Johnson is a businesswoman and a domestic organizer second to none. Surprisingly she has managed for all her forcefulness to remain feminine. Maybe it is not so surprising to southern women, who are brought up to conceal iron constitutions with an appearance of elegant fragility and to feign at all times a delicate deference to masculine opinion while they go their predetermined ways. Whether the combination is due to birth or temperament, Mrs. Johnson has it and uses it with a success which is already drawing groans of anguished admiration from her husband's opponents.

One other advantage is that Mrs. Johnson has a touch with people, something which seems independent of birth or education. She may be a millionairess but, like Mrs. Roosevelt, she can eat a school lunch, wade through a stream, dandle a baby, or chat with a queen without a trace of self-consciousness. When election time comes, Mrs. Johnson's "Howdy, y'all" is going to be worth its weight in votes.

Known as "Great Campaigner"—Entry of Johnson the Politician Awaited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1964

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1964, the Washington Post carried an article about President Johnson by one of the paper's most talented reporters, Mr. Edward T. Folliard. I commend this interesting piece of writing to my colleagues and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KNOWN AS "GREAT CAMPAIGNER"—ENTRY OF JOHNSON THE POLITICIAN AWAITED

(By Edward T. Folliard)

President Johnson is proud to call himself a politician, and prouder still that he is a Democratic politician. He once said he "practiced partisanship with enthusiasm," but only in proper seasons.

This is mentioned now because Mr. Johnson has seemed to be above politics, so much so that some of his countrymen may be surprised when he turns political warrior later this year.

John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, says that Mr. Johnson is "a great campaigner."

In the 6 months that he has been Chief Executive, Mr. Johnson has spoken at several Democratic fundraising dinners and rallies. He has glorified his own party, naturally, but not once has he attacked the Republican Party as a party.

NOT PROPER SEASON

Evidently he has not thought it was the proper season for partisan warfare, one reason being that he has not yet acknowledged something that just about everybody takes for granted—that he will run for a full, 4-year term in November.

What will he have to say about the political opposition after he is nominated at Atlantic City in August?

Much will depend, of course, on the identity of the Republican presidential nominee, who will have been chosen at San Francisco in mid-July. Obviously, Mr. Johnson's strategy and tactics would be of one kind for a Barry Goldwater and of another kind for, say, Richard M. Nixon, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Henry Cabot Lodge, or Gov. William W. Scranton.

The President hopes to get the votes of millions of Republicans in November, and it is therefore likely that he will fire over

the heads of the rank and file and attack only the leadership of the Grand Old Party.

PARTY DIFFERENCE

He used to say, in the speeches he made as Vice President, that the big difference between the Democratic Party and Republican Party was that one proposed action and that the other proposed only to block action.

He summed it up in a speech at San Jose, Calif., on October 4, 1962, when he said:

"The choice is clearly drawn. Republicans say the issue is what America cannot do. Democrats say the issue is what America can do."

He said on other occasions that the Republicans kept harping on the idea that "America cannot afford the programs that we need"—a charge to which some Republicans in Congress plead guilty when, in their judgment, the financial security of the Nation is involved.

President Johnson has said that he expects "a hard, close fight" in this year's election. Some of his associates, however, are talking about a Johnson landslide, with something like 40 States ending up in the Democratic column.

It has even been suggested that the President might be wise to pass up the traditional "swing around the circle" and remain at his desk in the White House throughout the campaign.

That might work, but it wouldn't be at all like Lyndon B. Johnson. In a speech before the New Frontier Club on May 30 of last year, he said:

"Politics is the first business of our system—and we ought to give it our serious attention at all times. If I had a son, I would be proud for him to be a politician."

He quoted John Adams as saying, "I must study politics and war, that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy."

A man who feels as passionately about politics as Mr. Johnson does can be expected to make a furious race once the starting gate opens.

He has already indicated what his positive campaign arguments will be: that the Democratic Party has made good on its 1960 promises and that "America is on the march," and a 1964 promise "to do what we can to make sure that the average man and woman can lead a finer and happier life."

The Republican Party, from all indications, will aim its heaviest fire on what it regards as the failures of the administration in foreign affairs.

Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the western counties of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland which I represent lie in the area known as Appalachia. It has been my thought for some time that we need to have the spotlight of attention focused on the good things in that part of the country so that we may emphasize what is positive and overcome the deficiencies and defects in our communities.

A great step in this direction has been taken by the formation of the Council of the Alleghenies, an organization of interested citizens, whose purpose is to preserve the cultural heritage and promote the cultural development of the Allegheny highlands.

The positive approach taken by the council is described in an article which appeared in the Cumberland, Md., News on April 13. Because of its significance in the solution of some of the problems in Appalachia, I include the article here:

BETTER ROADS, ATTRACTIONS, STRESSED AT CONFERENCE

Improved highways to bring in more tourists, preservation of the things of historic significance for these tourists to see, and development of adequate lodging and eating facilities to satisfy their needs were stressed Saturday at the first annual cultural conference of the Council of the Alleghenies.

About 100 interested citizens from the mountain areas of Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia attended the all-day conference in the Thomas G. Pullen School of Frostburg State College.

The Council of the Alleghenies is an organization whose purpose is to preserve the cultural heritage and promote the cultural development of the Allegheny highlands, including parts of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

SECOND NEXT SPRING?

It is hoped that a second cultural conference can be held next spring preferably on the campus of a college in West Virginia or Pennsylvania.

In his keynote address at the start of the conference Saturday morning, Dr. Lawrence Thurman, of Ambridge, Pa., suggested the preservation of this section of the tristates as one great park kept under the auspices of the communities involved.

With the increasing concentration of population in the urban centers of the East, there is a corresponding "rush back to nature" when vacation time arrives for these city dwellers. Dr. Thurmond, who is the curator of Old Economy Museum of Ambridge, said the tourist industry in Pennsylvania alone was a $2 billion industry in 1963.

Outdoor theaters and historic dramas were stressed as possible tourist attractions by the conference luncheon speaker, Dr. William Sebastian Hart, Jr., of Baltimore, who is musical director of the Gettysburg Symphony Orchestra.

TERMS OVERSIMPLIFIED

Dr. Thurman told the group that such terms as "distressed areas" and "poverty stricken," used frequently by Federal officials in discussing the Appalachian region, are an oversimplification that does injustice to many fine people in this region.

In closing remarks at the end of the conference, Dr. Thurman stressed that the Council of the Alleghenies could perform a major service by cooperating with the Federal Government in offering advice as to where Federal money might best be spent in preserving things of value.

Oddly, the importance of the Frostburg conference was emphasized by four messages of regrets sent by prominent men who were unable to attend the conference. One of them was Undersecretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who is chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission. This commission's report to President Lyndon B. Johnson Thursday called for the expenditure of about $3 billion in Federal funds and $1.3 billion in State money in the next 5 years to provide a new base for the 10-State area's economy.

Others who sent their regrets were U.S. Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia's Second Congressional District, and Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland's Sixth Congressional District. All expressed interest in following the recommendations coming from the conference.

FIVE DISCUSSION GROUPS

Dr. B. Floyd Flickinger, of Baltimore, director of cultural planning and programs of the Council of the Alleghenies, presided at the opening session of the conference. Greetings were extended by Dr. Alta Schrock, president of the council, and Alice R. Manicur, dean of students at Frostburg State College.

Conference delegates were divided into five discussion groups. Leaders of the groups were J. Kenna Burke, professor of sociology and history at Potomac State College; Dr. Verne E. Chatelain, professor of American history at the University of Maryland; Dr. Patrick Gainer, professor of English at West Virginia University; Philip S. Klein, professor of history at Pennsylvania State University, and Harold Manakee, director of the Maryland Historical Society.

Allegany County was well represented at the conference. Among those attending from this county were Mayor Earl D. Chaney, Mr. and Mrs. Francis A. Kenney, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph M. Race, John G. Thomas, Miss Mary P. Wise, Mrs. Raymond O. McCullough, Mrs. John A. Cupler II, Mrs. John A. Jacobsen, Miss Ruth A. Clauson, Mrs. Doris Ours, Rollin P. Marquis, and Albert D. Darby.

President Johnson Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months, President Johnson has given the country and the world a memorable demonstration of personal vitality and purpose in facing the daily challenges and opportunities of the Presidency. But he has done more than that. Even as he works with the daily burdens of his office, the President is thinking and planning ahead on the great opportunities which open before our Nation today.

Mr. William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, has given us a perceptive insight into this reassuring aspect of President Johnson's conduct of his office in an article in the Christian Science Monitor of May 16, 1964:

BUILDING THE "GREAT SOCIETY"

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—It is encouraging to discover that, despite all the bustle and "action this day" at the White House, President Johnson is giving some thought to the trends and prospects of tomorrow.

Mr. Johnson has discovered, as have other Presidents before him, that unless a Chief Executive makes conscious effort to perceive what is up ahead, and seizes the initiative to influence the pattern of events, the events will circumscribe the presidential initiative, and he will become the prisoner of his daily routine.

This is why President Johnson has actually detailed individuals on the presidential staff to do some thinking ahead for him. For the world is changing, and the patterns of American society are changing, and the tides are running ever more swiftly. And the President sees great possibilities ahead for the United States, if events are handled with perception and wisdom.

In a recent talk Mr. Johnson referred to the vision of building a "great society" in the United States. Possibly we shall hear more of this prospect as the 1964 campaign crescendoes; certainly it would be a theme for next year if Mr. Johnson were reelected in November.

Politics aside, we have only to look about us to perceive the unprecedented prosperity and dynamism of the American society of today. Despite the harsh poverty hidden in the hills, the blight of the cities and slow pace of Negro rights, the chroniclers will surely say of this period in American history: Never have so many people lived so well, materially speaking, or had such opportunity for individual improvement and advancement.

President Johnson is aware of this. He is simultaneously aware that an increasing concern for Americans will be their leisure time and what to do with it. He is bemused by a statistic of Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission that someday 2 percent of the population will produce 98 percent of the necessities of life. This is not an immediate prospect, but it is a jolting calculation for the future.

There are more immediate developments which threaten to deface the rosy prospects of the great society. Automation is devouring unskilled jobs by the hundreds of thousands. Poverty is repeating itself, generation unto generation. Individuals, tied down by mortgages and special industrial skills, are becoming less mobile. Urban blight and river pollution are defacing the freshness of America.

The President notes that, because of lack of rapid-transit lines, millions of Americans condemn themselves to wasting 2 precious hours a day simply driving to and from work.

Thus on the domestic front as on the global front, complex change is the order of the day. The rural society is fast vanishing, but the policies necessary to bring order into—and protect—the new urban society are inchoate and fragmentary. There is vast unfinished business ahead.

It is significant that President Johnson, whose own career spans the poor-farmer-to-successful-rancher transition, is thinking about the changing national landscape, what the needs are, and where the Government's role lies. It is undoubtedly true that these are the kind of domestic challenges which will face any President in the swift-churning future.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the statement made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York on the occasion of I am an American Day. I believe the mayor's remarks will be of interest to all who read them:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT I AM AN AMERICAN DAY CEREMONIES

We are gathered here to celebrate I Am an American Day, which was initiated 25 years ago by the city of New York in cooperation with the New York Journal-American.

We honor today hundreds of newly naturalized citizens and also first voters, and it is inspiring to see this demonstration of thousands of Americans reaffirming their faith in our country.

The founders of this Republic planned a government of the people, by the people, and for the people built on the solid rock of freedom and justice for all. This plan has never been altered. We can look around us at many other nations where, under totalitarian rule, violent upheaval constantly threatens. With all our problems, ours is the most stable government in the world today.

We proudly welcome all those gathered here who have sought and obtained the privileges of citizenship and full membership in our free and democratic society, with all the rights and responsibilities that go with such citizenship.

We hear a great deal about rights these days, civil and otherwise. And we should. One of the major rights of citizenship is the right to participate in the principal decisions of Government through the ballot box. That is a precious right. In fact, it is an important responsibility to exercise that right, even when it is personally inconvenient to do so. To vote is a duty to one's country, State, and city.

Today in some parts of our own country a struggle is necessary in order to secure for all citizens equally the right to vote. Here in New York City our constant effort is to induce each American citizen to exercise his right to vote and to come to the polls on election day.

Many if not most Americans take their citizenship for granted. I hope that none of you does. Last Monday the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a historic decision, holding that no distinction can be made between naturalized and native-born American citizens with regard to their right to go abroad, whether they want to reside temporarily or permanently in the country of their birth. In my judgment, this decision ranks in importance with the historic Supreme Court decision on the segregation of schools.

I have been urging for a long time that the McCarran-Walter Act should be amended to remove this distinction which gave the stigma of second-class citizenship to our naturalized citizens.

Now the Supreme Court has acted and rendered legislative action unnecessary. This was a great decision. We may well include the celebration of this decision on the occasion of I Am an American Day.

A moment ago I spoke of the responsibility as well as the right to vote. New citizens and first voters assume other responsibilities, too.

Perhaps the most important of all of these is a share in the burden of the national responsibility to help insure peace, freedom and justice throughout the world. Today America is the leader of the free world. Our country is the sword and shield of the cause of freedom everywhere. Each citizen assumes a proportionate share of the responsibility for the cost and consequences of this role.

The decisions made by our country affect the course of events in every country, in every continent, in every corner of the globe. Your vote and your voice provide the basis of these fateful decisions.

You bear a responsibility not only to your country but also to your city, to your community, and to your neighbors. In a city like New York you are responsible to accommodate yourself to your neighbors and they, to you. Each of you must be concerned for your neighbors' personal safety, security and welfare, whoever they are—and vice versa. Each New Yorker must regard himself as his brother's keeper, and his neighbor's keeper.

You must regard each fellow New Yorker as your neighbor, and each neighbor as your brother. These are my most meaningful words to you on this I Am an American Day.

Now let me congratulate all of you on your new privileges and responsibilities as citizens and new voters. You now have a share in the heritage of the greatest country in the world. So I say to you: Face the future with faith and confidence in yourselves and in this country of yours and mine. Hold your flag aloft with pride; and may God bless you, and may God bless America.

A Success in the Foreign Aid Program: Highway Bridge Replacement in Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, U.S. economic assistance to Thailand is devoted to helping the country meet the internal security threat as well as maintain a satisfactory rate of economic growth. The assistance program emphasizes projects which promote economic and social progress in the more backward rural areas.

Thailand's 198,455 square miles are lush and fertile; its population of 27,181,000 is comparatively poor, having an average income of only $105. The major factor for this low figure is that the Thai economy is based predominantly on agriculture and agricultural produce, and, therefore, subject to fluctuating prices of the international market. To reduce the dependency on rice, rubber, and teak, the three most important export commodities, the Thai Government has attempted to industrialize the country.

A combination of U.S. foreign aid and Thai self-help measures has produced important economic gains. For example, since 1956 the gross national product has increased at an average annual rate of 5½ percent while per capita gross national product has risen 2½ percent per year. Nevertheless, Thailand's principal task has been to extend its central economic growth to the more remote areas chiefly through improvement in its transportation network.

With the help of U.S. aid the Thai Government inaugurated a program whereby 400 kilometers of all-weather roads will be opened each year. Because of the terrain, however, which is bisected by numerous streams and rivers, bridges are an integral part of the road network. The existing bridges were constructed of timber and bamboo, many of which were in constant need of repair or replacement. Thai and American technicians who inspected the situation in 1955, recommended that 1,011 bridges be replaced with permanent structures in order to open up over 4,000 kilometers of adequate existing highways to commercial traffic.

Construction was begun that same year, each structure made of reinforced concrete, 8 meters wide and capable of carrying 20-ton loads. The projects were financed by local currency from U.S. counterpart funds of surplus food sales from years gone by, and by deposits from the Thai Government. All neces-

sary engineering was provided by the Royal Thai Highway Department, with design and supervision furnished by Sverdrup & Parcel Engineering Co., an American firm. An integral part of this program has been the instruction given to Thai contractors by the engineering company's personnel. When first initiated, there were only seven contractors in Thailand capable of undertaking bridge construction. The number has now risen to 78 competent firms who are providing service for the development of their country.

As of December 30, 1963, all 1,011 bridges were completed. The total cost of the program amounted to $13,840,-860 and the results have been well worth the expenditures. The trend of Thai per capita income is upward, while the gross national income increases annually by approximately 5 percent. Moreover, the hinterland has been opened to such an extent that where it used to take teak logs up to 5 or 6 years to reach the mills in Bangkok, the journey has been reduced to several weeks. These are only a few indications that acclaim the highway bridge replacement program as a "success" of our foreign aid assistance.

The Government's Role in Consumer Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pertinent portions of a very excellent address by Mr. William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, delivered before the Conference on the Government's Role in Consumer Protection at the University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, on Friday, April 24, 1964, regarding the Government's role in consumer protection as viewed from the executive-judicial perspective.

Mr. Orrick, throughout his address, reiterates again and again the importance of competition to the proper functioning of our economy. Competition, he tells us, is the means by which we can most effectively allocate the goods and services in our economy. Ill-conceived measures such as the proposed so-called quality stabilization bill would tamper with our well-tested and reliable free enterprise system, adversely affecting not only the consumer but industrial growth and profits.

Mr. Orrick's well-phrased reasons for his opposition to the quality stabilization bill and his discussion of the advantages of maintaining our present economic system is sufficient evidence alone to make us all work to defeat any "fair trade" proposals which would weaken our present economic way of life. The quality stabilization bill is one of the threats against which we must continue to fight.

Mr. Orrick's address follows:

You have asked me to discuss the Government's role in consumer protection as viewed from the "Executive-Judicial Perspective." That is a tall order indeed, for one could give an entire law school course on the protections courts alone have fashioned for consumers. For example, until Judge Cardozo's landmark decision in the 1916 *McPherson* v. *Buick Motor Co.*, a consumer had no right to sue a motor car manufacturer for an injury arising out of a defect in his automobile. Until that time he could sue only the dealer who sold him the automobile. It is reasonable to suppose that the imposition of that direct liability on the manufacturer had its effect in terms of the care with which automobiles were thereafter designed and manufactured.

There are many, many more examples of protections afforded to the consumer by the courts under the law of negligence, breach of warranty, and other doctrines familiar to contract and tort lawyers, but I shall restrict my remarks here this afternoon to the role which the antitrust laws have in protecting consumers.

Those laws, which I am sworn to enforce, are designed to protect the functioning of our particular economic system of free enterprise. All antitrust enforcement is ultimately directed to the benefit of each individual man, woman, and child in this Nation. These laws have a direct and obvious impact on the consumer in terms of the ultimate price that he must pay for goods and services. * * * Less obviously and directly, but perhaps of greater importance to the consumer, the antitrust laws prevent interference with our system of economic democracy in which consumers vote by their expenditures how this Nation's resources are to be allocated.

Competition, and more particularly price competition, is the premise on which our economic system is founded. I am sure that all elements of our society—labor, management, consumer, government—would agree. Yet too often I see the Sherman Act criticized as an "antiquated" "horse-and-buggy" statute, passed in an earlier century, which somehow needs rethinking and updating.

I don't agree with these criticisms. It is no more antiquated than the freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly which date back to the adoption of the first amendment in the 18th century. These freedoms remain today, April 24, 1964, fundamental in our system of ordered liberty. So it is with the Sherman Act in the sphere of economic liberty. * * * As head of the Antitrust Division I have occasion to "rethink" the Sherman Act almost daily. My rethinking has only reinforced my belief in the prime importance of competition to our system and the wisdom of the Sherman Act's protection of competition. Competition is as basic as the wheel, but as modern as the missile.

Any economic system has to apportion the production of goods and services to the various sectors of the economy on some basis. The techniques within our own system for achieving this allocation are numerous. Some of them doubtless are not wholly consistent with an idealized free enterprise system but experience has proved them necessary in certain limited situations. Among these are Government ownership, as with our own Post Office, Government competition with private enterprise, as in certain areas involving the production of defense material, and various types of regulation and licensing. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Communications Satellite Corp. are still other techniques.

But in most sectors of our economy it is competition on which we depend to maintain a proper allocation of goods and services in the market. In general, as demand for a product or a service increases, suppliers of that product or service tend to increase the price. As an increasing price makes that particular activity more profitable, new capacity will enter the market, either through new companies or through expansion of existing companies. While there are imperfections in the free market mechanism, I am satisfied that this is the best system. * * *

Since competition occupies so basic a position in our system it is natural that any attempt to tamper with it produces ill effects which ripple through the entire economy. If there is overcapacity in an industry, for example, competition would ordinarily force the price down. When, however, there is an agreement which keeps prices artificially high, the normal market response continues to produce even more capacity. The problem becomes increasingly acute until the stress produced by the overcapacity finally forces prices to fall drastically.

Not only may additional capacity be attracted to the industry in which the prices are kept high, but a price conspiracy may provoke foreign competition. Indeed, elimination of tariff protection was widely supported as a trust-busting technique at the time the Sherman Act was passed.

Perhaps the most fundamental impact of prices kept high by agreement is that products so priced are simply beyond the reach of the budgets of some consumers. Some companies may agree not to compete in price on the ground that the public is well-enough served by their continued competition in areas of quality, service, and innovation. But if I have only $5 to buy a widget and there are no $5 widgets available, it is not much solace that for $10 I can buy a sterling silver widget, or a widget that can be turned on and off by remote control, or a miniaturized widget. I don't have $10 and so must do without any widget.

I do not agree that unrealistic price levels set by collusion are justifiable as a spur to research and development. In many cases the results are precisely to the contrary. If a good profit is being made with the current product, the companies involved may have little incentive to upset their economic applecart by developing new products.

Thus, any agreements or other activities which tamper with competitive factors, particularly prices, jeopardize the proper functioning of our economic system. Not only does such activity put products out of the financial reach of some consumers, but by disrupting the ability of the market mechanism to reflect the true needs of an expanding economy, it deranges the proper allocation of goods and services within this economy. In short, when businessmen act to tamper with the market by agreement they throw sand in its mechanism. As Attorney General Kennedy has so aptly put it, this is nothing more nor less than economic racketeering.

Since that free market mechanism depends upon competition, and particularly price competition, we in the Antitrust Division are distressed over the persistence of price collusion in our economy. Unfortunately, there is nothing new in this. As long ago as 1776, Adam Smith, the classical spokesman for free enterprise, said: [1]

"People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."

More recently, in testimony before the Federal Trade Commission, a businessman said: [2]

"I could go on and on and on, but I want to say that when any two businessmen get together, whether it is a chain institute meeting or a Bible class meeting, if they happen to belong to the same industry, just as soon

Footnotes at end of speech.

as the prayers have been said, they start talking about the conditions in the industry, and it is bound definitely to gravitate, that talk, to the price structure in the industry. What else is there to talk about?"

We are equally concerned over the tendency among certain businessmen to disparage price competition. Associations of pharmacists have openly claimed, incorrectly, a right to fix the price of prescription drugs. Other associations promulgate codes of conduct which make price competition "unethical." Concerns which compete in price are frequently given the label "chiselers" by their competitors. But even unilateral refusals to compete in price or to sell to retailers who compete in price may very well be as corrosive of our economic and ultimately our political liberties as actual illegal agreements. When the affairs of an industry are so conducted, the kind of competitive incentive necessary for product improvement and greater efficiency is missing and the self-regulatory character of the market is disrupted. The industry stagnates. Direct Government intervention by Congress becomes a political possibility. In short, the entrepreneur or company which engages in price competition is in the great American tradition. It is his detractors who are literally the chiselers, for they chisel away at the economic underpinnings of our personal liberties.

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice enforces the law to some extent by announcement of its enforcement intentions. Last week, for example, in a speech to the American Bar Association, I discussed some of our current thoughts on a program to combat overconcentration. In similar fashion, I consider that I am enforcing the antitrust laws by addressing these remarks to you here today, for I am taking this occasion to stress the Attorney General's particular concern over collusion which results in higher consumer prices, including illegal resale price fixing and abuses of the so-called fair trade laws. His concern reflects the President's own concern with the welfare of consumers which led him to appoint Mrs. Esther Peterson as the first "special assistant to the President for consumer affairs."

This special concern over competitive consumer prices has of course been a matter which has for long engaged a good part of the energies of the Antitrust Division. It has recently produced several significant cases. Among those cases are the following:

On December 27 of last year, a complaint was filed against a major producer of cosmetics, Max Factor & Co., in which it was charged that Max Factor had agreed with retail sellers of its products that those sellers would sell only at prices fixed by Max Factor, with the alleged result that "retail prices of Max Factor cosmetics have been maintained at noncompetitive levels."

On March 10 of this year, a civil action was filed against four major manufacturers of swimwear, Jantzen, Catalina, Cole of California, and Rose Marie Reid. That complaint charges that defendants agreed among themselves on the date on which they would permit retailers to reduce the price of swimwear to the public, and that they exchanged information with respect to retailers who would not abide by defendants' wishes in this matter. Apart from this alleged meddling with the business judgment of the retailers who had purchased and paid for defendants' swimwear, this activity is alleged to have resulted in the prices of swimwear being "fixed, maintained, and stabilized at high and artificial levels."[3]

Twenty days later, on March 30, a civil action was filed against the O. M. Scott & Sons Co., a seller of lawn-care products. That complaint alleges that Scott has entered into resale price fixing agreements in States where those agreements are not lawful, which has allegedly had the result of "forcing consumers * * * to pay noncompetitive prices for lawn-care products manufactured by defendant O. M. Scott."[4]

In addition to those cases which have been filed in the past 4 months, three other cases, all charging unlawful agreements by members of druggists' associations to enforce so-called fair-trade prices, have recently been settled by consent decrees prohibiting those practices.

The significance of the cases which I have just discussed is emphasized by the relief which is demanded in them. As you may know, two Federal statutes provide an exemption from the antitrust laws for resale price fixing on branded articles in certain limited situations. The Department is seeking to enjoin the defendants who have misused this limited fair-trade exemption from thereafter fair trading any of their products as the only effective way to prevent recurrence of the violation. Thus, in the Max Factor complaint, the Department seeks to have defendant "enjoined from applying or seeking to apply any State fair-trade laws against any person buying or selling Max Factor cosmetics." Similar relief is requested in the Swimwear complaint. In addition, there the Department is asking that "each defendant be enjoined from preticketing its swimwear with a retail price" and "from suggesting any price to be charged by any retailer for swimwear."

Thus we have been and will continue to be taking action against those concerns which illegally fix consumer prices and thereby abuse the narrow fair-trade exemption. We shall also seek to prevent defendants from thereafter engaging in any resale price maintenance activities, where appropriate to prevent a recurrence of the violation.

I wish to emphasize one further point. The Swimwear civil case, which I have previously mentioned, was preceded by a criminal indictment against those same four companies for agreeing on the date at which they would permit their dealers to set swimwear prices independently. All four companies have pleaded nolo contendere, which is the equivalent of guilty for the purposes of that case, and last Monday were fined a total of $68,000. It has been clear to every responsible antitrust practitioner and every company which sought responsible legal advice ever since at least 1940, that any agreement formed for the purpose and with the effect of raising, depressing, fixing, pegging, or stabilizing the price of a commodity is a criminal violation of the antitrust laws. Nor, as the Supreme Court reminded us in *Simpson* v. *Union Oil Co.*, decided last Monday, can there be any possible question that resale price maintenance not carried on within the narrow confines of the fair-trade exemption is a criminal antitrust violation, as is a horizontal agreement to enforce so-called fair-trade prices. This has been established Department policy since at least July 18, 1951, when the Department issued the following release:

"Those who are engaged in programs or schemes of the following type, involving commodities which flow in interstate commerce, should know that they may be subject to criminal prosecution: Agreements among competing retailers to maintain and adhere to specified minimum prices; agreements to coerce and induce wholesalers or manufacturers, through threat of boycott or other reprisals, to refrain from selling to price-cutting retailers; agreements to coerce or induce manufacturers or wholesalers to enter into so-called fair-trade contracts; agreements to coerce or force retailers to sign such contracts; agreements on the prices or margins of profits which should be set forth in such contracts and on methods to require producers or wholesalers to specify certain prices or markups in such contracts."

Indeed, in the last 20 years, the Department of Justice has instituted case after where State fair-trade laws have been used to cloak illegal price fixing. These cases variously involved agreements among competing manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and among manufacturers competing with others at different levels of distribution.

In view of these demonstrated abuses of existing fair-trade laws, I unqualifiedly oppose the so-called quality stabilization bill which would legalize resale price fixing on a nationwide scale. As President Johnson said in his message on consumer interests of February 5, 1964:

"Freedom of choice for consumers from our storehouse of goods, at the lowest possible prices, is the very cornerstone of American consumer policy. I believe strongly in this principle. Therefore, I oppose legislation which limits price competition, whether under the label of 'quality stabilization' or any other name."

I was not merely using a figure of speech when I said, in my testimony before a special Senate subcommittee: "The bill might more aptly be named 'The Consumer High Price Act.'"

In conclusion, I desire to emphasize in the strongest terms, what I have already said—that price competition is the foundation of our economic system, that price competition is in the finest tradition of the American way of doing things, and that we are a freer people today because price competition has been at the core of our economic system. As our recent cases clearly indicate, the Department will vigorously attack illegal agreements influencing consumer prices, whether horizontal or vertical, and whether by large companies or small. A climate in which price competition is disparaged, even if not pursuant to an illegal agreement, is an unhealthy climate for this country. I leave you with the words of Senator Sherman, who had this to say of those who take into their own hands the regulation of the economy for their private gain:

"If we will not endure a king as a political power, we should not endure a king over the production, transportation and sale of any of the necessaries of life. If we would not submit to an emperor, we should not submit to an autocrat of trade, with power to prevent competition and to fix the price of any commodity."

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] "Wealth of Nations," Mod. Lib. ed. 1937, p. 128.

[2] *In the Matter of Chain Institute, Inc.*, F.T.C. Docket No. 4878, quoted in Jacobs, "Statistical, Standardization, and Research Activities," 6 A.B.A. Antitrust Sec. Rep. 80 at 80–81 (1955).

[3] *United States* v. *Jantzen, Inc.* (D. Oreg. Civ. No. 64–111).

[4] *United States* v. *O. M. Scott & Sons Co.* (D.D.C. Civ. No. 760–64).

Food Marketing Study Essential to Consumer, Farmer, Food Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the consumers of America enjoy the benefits of the most efficient food distribution system in the world, but this distribution

system still is too costly and there is an urgent need for study and appraisal of the dramatic changes taking place in the marketing structure of the food industry.

Our farmers have blessed America with the greatest abundance of food at the lowest cost in terms of individual income ever enjoyed by any people in any nation in all history; yet our farm people are woefully underpaid in relation to those in other occupations who contribute to the extraordinary achievements of our free enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, these facts are of immediate concern to the American people as a whole, and they deserve the special attention and consideration of the Congress.

This is the purpose of House Joint Resolution 977, which comes tomorrow into the House for debate and action.

House Joint Resolution 977 proposes to establish a bipartisan 15-member National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer.

The other body has approved a similar resolution unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, the pressing need for this inquiry is established by a special study conducted, at my direction, by the staff of the House Committee on Agriculture. From this study the staff report concluded:

First. There is an ever-widening spread between the price the farmer receives and what the consumer pays, for food.

Second. Due to the efficiency of our farmers, and notwithstanding the increased costs of processing and marketing, food now is cheaper in relation to the wages received by Americans than in any prior period of our history or in any other country in the world.

Third. The farmer is the least benefited of all our people by the wealth of abundance he has created.

Farmers delivered 40 percent more food into markets last year than they did annually in the 1947–49 period. Americans paid at retail $67 billion for the farm-produced food they consumed in 1963—$26.2 billion or 64 percent more than their average food bill in 1947–49. Of this $26.2 billion increase in the retail costs, $23.2 billion, or 88.5 percent, went to processors and marketing agencies—the middlemen—while only $3 billion trickled back to farmers in payment for their 40 percent greater volume of marketings.

Only 37 cents of each $1 a consumer spends for food goes to the farmer. As late as 1948 the farmer received 51 cents of each food dollar.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the food industry—labor, management, and investors—can claim very substantial increases in efficiency in recent years. Certainly, great changes have taken place in the food industry generally.

And, certainly, the overall cost of food to consumers in relation to their earnings continues to decline. In 1963 food costs represented only 18.8 percent of the average family's income, after taxes, while as recently as 1950 food costs represented 22.8 percent of consumer income. In contrast, consumers in the United Kingdom spend 30 percent of their income for food; in Russia, 53 percent; France, 30.6 percent; Japan, about 45 percent; and in lesser developed nations the percentage is considerably higher.

Of course the consumer food bargains in the United States are related primarily to the exploding efficiency in agriculture and the decline in prices farmers receive. One American farmworker feeds thirty-one persons, while in Europe one worker produces enough for ten persons and in Russia, under a collectivist system, for only four to five persons.

Before a hungry world, our agriculture is America's greatest success story. But our farmers, who wrote this success story, have not done so well themselves, where their own incomes are concerned. In the 10 years 1953 to 1962 inclusive, while all other major segments of the economy boomed, the net income of agriculture was $25 billion less than in the previous 10 years, 1943 to 1952 inclusive.

Mr. Speaker, these facts and more, were presented by the staff study of the Committee on Agriculture, and are embraced in the staff report "Food Costs-Farm Prices." The interest of the public in this study has been demonstrated by the flood of requests we have had for copies of this report. We printed 7,000 copies. The supply now is almost exhausted, but we plan a new printing.

The committee's staff study did not attempt to explore all the facets, changes and new trends of the food marketing system, and the probable effects upon consumers and upon farmers. It did, however, develop information pointing directly to the need for a depth study of these facets, changes, and trends.

House Joint Resolution 977 establishes a national commission to undertake this important work. The Commission, bipartisan in nature, would be composed of five members of the House appointed by the Speaker, five members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members named by the President of the United States. The resolution directs the Commission to study and appraise the marketing structure of the food industry, including the following:

First. The actual changes, principally in the past two decades, in the various segments of the food industry.

Second. The changes likely to materialize if present trends continue.

Third. The kind of food industry that would assure efficiency of production, assembly, processing, and distribution, provide appropriate services to consumers, and yet maintain acceptable competitive alternatives of procurement and sale in all segments of the industry from producer to consumer.

Fourth. The changes in statutes or public policy, the organization of farming and of food assembly, processing, and distribution, and the interrelationships between segments of the food industry which would be appropriate to achieve a desired distribution of power as well as desired levels of efficiency.

Fifth. The effectiveness of the services and regulatory activities of the Federal Government in terms of present and probable developments in the industry.

As you will note from the committee report, our committee amended the resolution to speed the work of the Commission by requiring that its study be completed and its report filed by July 1, 1965, instead of July 1, 1966. The committee reduced the authorized expenditures of the Commission from $2,500,000 to $1,500,000 to conform with the new time schedule for the Commission's work.

The committee also adopted amendments requiring that at least three members of the Commission be present to conduct hearings and that subpenas could be issued only by a majority vote of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on Food Marketing, which has been proposed by President Johnson to study and appraise changes in the marketing structure of the food industry, is of vital concern to every citizen of the United States. President Johnson has said:

> The growth and stability of our entire economy depends, to a large extent, upon the food industry. * * * We do not know enough about the new character of the industry. * * * The Commission would gather the necessary information and report to the Congress, the President, and the public.

The food industry of the United States accounts for annual retail sales of about $70 billion and provides employment for about 11 million wage earners. It is our most basic industry which directly touches the life of every American every day.

Changes in the food industry in the past two decades have been dramatic and far reaching. Business relationships among producers, assemblers, processors, wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, and other traditional types of marketing firms have been altered, and in many cases these traditional functionaries have lost their separate identities. Through a process of growth, specialization, merger, horizontal and vertical integration and various forms of contractual arrangements, food marketing has evolved into a system of interrelated and highly coordinated business operations.

The changes of the past two decades have brought great advances in physical efficiency and service to consumers. They also have resulted in significant concentrations of market power and have altered the relationships among various groups in the food industry. Some have gained; others have lost during this period of rapid change.

We urgently need an assessment of the benefits and the costs of the changes which have been taking place. We need an evaluation of the road we have been traveling and the direction we believe the food industry of the United States should take for the future. This will require the best talents we can muster.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that House Joint Resolution 977 and the work of this Commission will have the overwhelming support of the Members of this House.

A Recipient Country Looks at Food Aid—Its Benefits and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, and particularly as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I was most happy to read the statement of the delegate for Israel to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Adin Talbar, Economic Counselor of the Embassy of Israel here in Washington—concerning the distribution by this country of surplus food commodities under Public Law 480.

It is most helpful to all of us, as Members of Congress, to have a firsthand and factual report on the good which has resulted from the food-for-peace program, at least in one of the recipient countries.

This is a record in which we can take much pride, as it has done much to strengthen and solidify our relations, not only with Israel, but with other countries throughout the world with which we are willing to share our abundance.

The statement follows:

A RECIPIENT COUNTRY LOOKS AT FOOD AID—ITS BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS

(Statement of the delegate for Israel, Adin Talbar, Economic Counselor, Embassy of Israel, Washington, D.C., at the 99th meeting of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Committee on Commodity Problems, Consultative Subcommittee on Surplus Disposal, February 17, 1964)

The purchase of surplus food commodities pursuant to the provisions of title I of Public Law 480 has played a most significant role in the development of the economy of Israel during the 10 years since the inception of the program in 1955.

The availability of these goods facilitated the establishment of basic food reserves and made possible the development of nutritional levels which would otherwise not have been possible. As a direct result of the flow of Public Law 480 title I commodities, the Government of Israel was able to abolish distribution controls and to permit complete derationing of all commodities. At the same time, this program helped to increase the consumption of United States agricultural products in Israel, and U.S. cash purchases substantially grew, while purchases from other traditional suppliers were continued. Public Law 480 imports did not compete with local agricultural production; they were on the contrary complementary in character, enabling Israel's farmers to switch to more profitable cultivation of cash crops and to make more efficient use of limited land and water at their disposal. This meant optimum utilization of Israel resources. The economy received greater benefits from international trade. Exports attributable to the program increased.

On the other hand, the proceeds from the sale of the commodities in local currency were fully utilized for countless development projects. The availability of large-scale additional investment funds brought about a permanent increase in the total resources of the economy. Of major importance was the great deflationary effect the program had of holding down the rising price levels in a rapidly developing economy.

In assessing these benefits of Public Law 480 to Israel's economy during the past 10 years, it should be borne in mind that during this period the population of Israel grew by almost 50 percent from 1.7 million people in 1955 to 2.5 million in 1964, the annual growth of the gross national product averaging 8 to 10 percent.

I should like to take the opportunity to refer to an unusually fine study on this subject, "Uses of Agricultural Surpluses—Analysis and Assessment of the Economic Effect of Public Law 480 Title I Program in Israel," made by my colleague, Dr. Fanny Ginor, and published by the Bank of Israel Economic Research Department in Jerusalem in 1963.

In her study, Dr. Ginor examines in great detail the beneficial effects of the Public Law 480 programs from 1955 through 1960, analyzing their impact on a year-to-year basis on investments, national product, employment, distribution of incremental income, commodity imports and consumption patterns, and their stabilizing influence on the balance of payments. She investigates the utilization of these imports product by product, and their effect on the processing, livestock, and other industries. An important chapter is devoted to stockpiling—which was made possible solely through the availability of Public Law 480 commodities.

At this point, I should like to touch upon a few aspects of Israel's Public Law 480 experience which might, I think, be of particular interest.

Since July 1, 1954, the United States and Israel Governments have signed Public Law 480 title I agreements totaling $291.2 million. This includes a multiyear agreement for calendar years 1963 through 1965. Wheat and feed grain make up two-thirds of the agreements, which have also included rice, tobacco, dairy products, fats, oils, and cotton.

Israel's first and foremost interest is, of course, in what Public Law 480 commodity imports and the utilization of the counterpart funds can contribute to the strengthening of its economy and the well-being of its people; it is equally natural that the United States, as well as other countries traditionally engaged in trade with Israel, be concerned with the effect of this program on their own primary commercial interests. In this connection I would like to draw your attention to a number of facts:

Before the launching of the first Public Law 480 title I program in 1955, Israel imported goods at a total cost of just over $300 million on an annual average during the years 1950–54. These annual imports of $300 million prior to the Public Law 480 program consisted of $100 million worth of goods from the United States and $213 million from other countries, mainly Western Europe. In 1963 Israel's total imports had more than doubled over the figure of 10 years ago. This more than twofold increase of imports, however, consisting mainly of cash purchases, has benefited both United States and exporters of other countries. In this growth of Israeli imports, the United States has retained its proportionate share continuing to supply about one-third of all goods purchased, while other countries have benefited equally by Israel's increased purchasing power for investment and consumption goods. With regard to commodities supplied under Public Law 480 title I agreements, some changes took place in the import pattern, but on the whole these purchases have prompted a substantial increase in cash sales by the United States and other countries. I shall mention just a few commodities to illustrate this point:

Feed grains: The annual import of feed grains in 1950–54 amounted to 61,000 tons—of which the United States supplied 26,000 tons and other countries 35,000 tons. In 1963 our total imports have risen from the 61,000 tons in the pre-Public Law 480 days to a total of 422,000 tons—exactly 700 percent over 10 years ago. The United States increased its cash dollar sales from the 26,000 tons in 1954 to 205,000 tons in 1963, while countries such as Turkey, Cyprus, and Argentina sold to Israel 77,000 tons of feed grain, more than double the quantity imported by Israel from other countries exactly a decade ago.

Rice: Israel imported 4,000 tons of rice in 1954. Cash sales to Israel 10 years later amounted to more than 9,000 tons, with the United States increasing its commercial sales from 300 to 2,350 tons over the 10-year period, and other countries doubling their initially substantial exports to Israel from 3,700 to 6,800 tons in the same period.

Tobacco: Commercial sales of tobacco, another Public Law 480 commodity included in United States-Israel agreements, have risen considerably, benefiting the export trade of Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia, while Israel has become a substantial market for American cigarettes.

Oil seeds: Possibly the most striking example of the beneficial effect of Public Law 480 on commercial sales has been the introduction of oil seeds, particularly soyabeans, into Israel. Israel has become the biggest importer of soyabeans, per capita in the world, ranging in absolute terms second after Japan. In 1954, Israel imported less than 4,000 tons of edible oils and oil seeds from the United States and other countries. In 1963 Israel imported 207,000 tons of soyabeans, an equivalent of 35,000 tons of oil or $20 million worth of dollar cash purchases in the United States. At the same time, larger quantities of oil seeds than in the past were imported from other trading nations.

Primed by the Public Law 480, title I, program, cash purchases of U.S. foodstuffs have increased. However, Israel is looking for supplies from other trading partners which buy our export products. Israel's ships, plying through the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean and the Pacific, now carry cereals from Australia, as well as rice from Burma. The diversification and increase of such trade ties is being actively pursued in view of the fact that Israel will become an even bigger importer of feed grains in the future; consumption of homegrown meat will undoubtedly rise, and feed grains cannot be economically grown in Israel.

An essential element in the Public Law 480 programs has been its stabilizing effect on young developing economies. In the case of Israel, beset with many pressing problems and a relatively decreasing but still very wide trade deficit, Public Law 480 sales, carefully planned and negotiated, have given us a feeling of security in the areas of vital basic supplies. The title I 3-year agreement which became effective at the beginning of last year, is a particularly important factor in the overall planning of my Government. It is significant in the budgetary development and balance-of-payment structure of the country, local currency loans to Israel under section 104(a) being part of the annual development budget, and planning of this budget has been greatly facilitated through this long-term agreement.

In this connection, I can here devote only a fleeting remark to the other side of the Public Law 480 title I picture: the utilization of local currency funds for development purposes. Out of total sales contracts of $291 million worth of commodities since 1954, the Israel Government has been receiving loans for economic development totaling the equivalent of $173 million and grants for economic development totalling the equivalent of $33 million. Under the Cooley loan provision $47 million in Israel currency have been made available for loans to private enterprise, and $39 million have been used by the U.S. Government for other U.S. uses.

The Israel Government as well as private enterprise have used these loans for development of agriculture, industry and mining,

transportation, health and sanitation. Millions of dollars have been spent on international educational exchange projects, on agricultural research, and the translation of scientific papers, etc. The impact of these projects on the economy is immeasurable.

In this connection I must mention the role that title II and title III programs have played. Last year saw the introduction of a title II school lunch program of $1.5 million, to be effective for 5 years, after which time the Israel Government will take it over entirely. During the 10-year period under review, $12.1 million worth of commodities under title III were administered by a number of American voluntary agencies. Tens of thousands of needy families have received most effective help in the form of basic food commodities.

In conclusion, I should like to salute the initiators of this unique American food for peace program called Public Law 480 title I. Its successful story has been aptly summarized, as follows:

1. It has utilized fruitfully some of the tremendous surplus which was accumulating in the United States.

2. It has improved the diets of millions of people in the world who live in substandard conditions.

3. It has been a most potent weapon for intelligent and constructive use among developing nations.

Israel is one of the developing countries that has found the food for peace program of considerable benefit to its people and economy. It has, indeed, been singularly effective.

We are all aware of the fact that this program has been the outcome of two factors: the superabundance of food production of the American farmer, and the enlightenment of the American people of our generation in not allowing these surpluses to be destroyed, but rather in giving to those in need. While the distribution of the surplus food is a deliberate, farsighted act, the actual superabundance has been an accidental phenomenon rather than the result of planning. The thought occurs that as long as there are hundreds of millions of people in the world who struggle for decent human living conditions, the sale of superabundant food should be planned by the United States, as well as by other agricultural, developed nations which are so fortunate as to have evolved highly efficient methods of cheap large-scale production of food and other basic commodities. In other words, the United States Public Law 480 title I programs should be expanded, as should the world food program which has recently been started.

In my opinion, the food for peace program, in particular the title I concept, has been the most useful vehicle of foreign aid during the past decade.

This is a program which has made a dramatic contribution to the development of many countries and to the immediate well-being of their peoples. While strengthening the beneficiary countries, the program has helped to raise their absorptive capacity, their productivity, and their purchasing power to such a degree, that they are becoming regular markets for commercial, international commodity sales. However, at the same time, it would be shortsighted to lay too much emphasis on the commercial aspects of these surplus food sales to developing countries. Today and tomorrow, the newly emerging nations need economic assistance—particularly this kind of aid in the form of surplus foods administered under the Public Law 480 title I; for commercial international sales remain an academic phrase when applied to people who do not produce enough for themselves, let alone to pay for imports. The benefit accruing from a program such as Public Law 480 title I will be shared in the long run by all of us—the supplier, the recipient, and third countries. The Public Law 480 program is the "bootstrap" by which emerging countries can raise themselves into the mainstream of international economic activity.

Hal Higdon and His Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Hal Higdon, a constituent with a keen inquiring mind and brilliant literary flare, favored me with a visit to my office in 1408 Longworth Building some months ago, and in the course of our conversation he told me of the research in which he was engaged while writing a book on Dr. Samuel Mudd's connection with John Wilkes Booth. I was greatly interested and I now am happy to note from the following article by Robert Cromie in the Chicago Tribune that the book by my friend and constituent on a subject on which little is known has recently hit the bookstores:

CROMIE LOOKS AT AUTHORS AND BOOKS

(By Robert Cromie)

Hal Higdon, 32-year-old author of "The Union Versus Dr. Mudd" (Folett, $5.95), is one of perhaps half a dozen full-time freelance writers in the Chicagoland area, and with the possible exception of a staff job on some favorite magazine there isn't anything else he'd rather be doing.

Higdon was graduated from Carleton College in 1953, and then went to the University of Chicago, where he did graduate work and ran on the varsity track team. After 2 years in the Army (Germany, 1954–56) he became an assistant editor on Kiwanis magazine. He gave this up in July 1959, to become a freelance.

"I was doing a major article an issue," he says, "and realized I could make more money writing for the magazine on the outside."

Since that time he has sold about 25 articles a year—he does not write fiction—and estimates that the freelancers he is well acquainted with average "over $10,000" a year.

Among the magazines for which Higdon writes are Sports Illustrated, the Reporter, Today's Health, Kiwanis, and Home and Highway. He never has sold to the Saturday Evening Post—a primary target for all professional writers—but now has a tentative go-ahead from that magazine.

"I sort of like the freedom you have as a freelance," he says, "although with freedom comes responsibility (Higdon must support a wife, two sons, one daughter). It provides a comfortable living for me and I enjoy working when I want to and stopping when I want to.

"My workday is pretty well ordered. It allows for my quitting at 4 o'clock, when I can go and run on the beach. I have more time for myself than if I worked for someone else."

Higdon's day begins about 9 a.m.—"give or take an hour either way"—and he allows only 15 minutes for lunch, since he works at home. He does most of his writing in the morning and research and/or correspondence in the afternoon. Occasionally, if pressed by a deadline, he will return to the typewriter evenings or—more rarely—on weekends.

"The Union Versus Dr. Mudd" grew out of an article on fortifications. While reading about Fort Jefferson, where Dr. Samuel Mudd was confined after being found guilty of conspiracy because he treated John Wilkes Booth following the shooting of Lincoln, Higdon found a chance paragraph which intrigued him.

He queried Ken Anderson, editor of Today's Health, who OK'd a 2,000-word article on Dr. Mudd, which he later returned as too short. Eventually he bought a 4,000-word article and from this grew the book, in which Max Siegel, Higdon's agent, interested Follett.

Writing the book was a 6-month chore, although Higdon was greatly aided by material loaned him by Dr. Mudd's grandson. As to whether Dr. Mudd was guilty of the conspiracy charge, for which he was sentenced to life imprisonment, Higdon has his doubts.

"I think he was probably innocent," Higdon says. "But he was accused of a lot of things at the trial that were not true. Probably he was not completely truthful himself. He had met Booth before, though I feel that when Booth came to him he didn't realize what Booth had done. When he did realize it, he tried to cover up, and got into more trouble than if he had been 100 percent truthful. Even if he were guilty he didn't deserve the treatment he got. Many who were more obviously guilty were let go. It was as if fate centered on him alone."

For further information on Dr. Mudd read the book.

For further information on Higdon read the sports pages.

He was the first U.S. runner to finish in the recent Boston marathon, and plans to try out for the U.S. Olympic team. Naturally, he's also doing a book on the Olympics. Freelancers can't afford to waste time.

In 1867 Would Queen Victoria Have Turned Down a U.S. Request for Foreign Aid To Build the Transcontinenal Railway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention an amusing description of what the British Foreign Office might have done in 1867 if the United States had applied for a foreign aid loan to build the transcontinental railway from the Missouri River to San Francisco.

Having been a colony ourselves, and having created the world's greatest industrial nation out of the wilderness, we can appreciate some of the problems confronting some of the less-developed countries. We had to reply on foreign capital for our own development during the 19th century in much the same way that other countries rely on us for foreign assistance.

I think this story about the transcontinental railway makes in an amusing way a very important point: that foreign aid, in order to be a success, necessarily involves an element of risk. Strict accounting and careful safeguards are certainly necessary, but foreign aid must be more than a strictly commercial- or banking-type operation if it is going to succeed.

I have unanimous consent to have this description inserted at this point in the RECORD:

HER MAJESTY'S AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESENT AND PRIOR COLONIES

Department of U.S. Affairs.

Memorandum to the Honorable Arthur L. C. L. Worthingham, MOP, HHR, CQM, July 29, 1867.

Re: Assistance Loan No. 77-US-89.4. Transcontinental Railway.

1. Recommendation: Disapprove.

2. The proposed railway from the Missouri River at Omaha to San Francisco Bay has received careful attention due to the request of the U.S. Ambassador that it be financed under the present aid program with our former colony. As you know, the Ambassador has implied that unless Her Majesty's Government extends the long-term loan which would be required, the United States will request a loan from France.

However, the Department feels that the loan is unwise for the following reasons:

1. The transcontinental railway is not included in the 10-year development program, 1861-70, prepared by the U.S. Government with technical assistance from Her Majesty's Mission for Overseas Growth.

According to the priorities in that program, the United States should concentrate on increasing its agricultural exports already within the zone of attraction of existing railways as well as improving the navigability of the Mississippi River, of especial importance to cotton and tobacco exports.

2. The project is typical of the grandiose works which the present U.S. Government finds attractive for political reasons.

It might even be that France would be attracted to the proposal for the same reason. The political impact is far greater than that of the more limited but more useful projects under our present program.

The transcontinental railway can serve no conceivable useful economic objective. There is no traffic at present over this route, and generations will pass before such a railway will be needed.

The proposed route begins nowhere and ends nowhere.

Coastwise shipping, with transshipment over the Isthmus of Panama, is far more economical and more than adequate for many years to come. A rough calculation shows that the estimated cost-benefit ratio is 3,778.98665 using an interest rate of 7½ percent.

3. The project proposal is based on the use of rails and equipment produced in the United States, so that a loan for this purpose would worsen the balance-of-payments problem of Great Britain.

4. The United States is already heavily indebted abroad and would likely have difficulty meeting the interest payments and debt amortization.

5. Politically the United States is unstable and only recently has emerged from a civil war. Furthermore, it is common knowledge that graft and corruption have been common in past railway construction. God save the Queen.

Prizewinners in the Albert Rains Speech Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, each spring, Snead College, at Boaz, Ala., conducts the Albert Rains speech contest at which time young orators speak on a given subject and are awarded according to their abilities. This year's subject was "Should Red China Be Admitted to the United Nations?" and I believe the three winning speeches are of interest to my colleagues. These speeches show what our youth is thinking on this subject and thus are worthy of our attention.

This year all three winners were young ladies. First place went to Miss Glenda Washington, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Tommy Washington, Springville, Ala.; second prize went to Mrs. Sue Fobbus, Gadsden, Ala.; and third place was won by Miss Sandra Burns, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Burns, Gadsden.

Following are the three prizewinning speeches delivered at Snead College on May 19, 1964, in the Albert Rains speech contest:

SHOULD RED CHINA BE ADMITTED TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Glenda Sue Washington)

"Communism is not love," said Mao Tse-tung, head of the Communist Party in China. "Communism is but a hammer we use to destroy our enemies." It has been shown that Red China's goal is the destruction of her enemies. The proof of this is the brush war in Vietnam, the sneak attack used against India, or war such as she forced in Korea. Against such a nation as this, a buffer must be maintained or there might build up the possibility of a world war III.

We find ourselves confronted with a very serious question and one that will have to be answered by our generation—Should Red China be admitted as a member of the United Nations? In 1945, when the Republic of China was awarded seats in the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations, the country was being run by the Nationalist Government, headed by Chiang Kai-shek. This regime, now located on the island of Formosa, still fills these places in the United Nations while the Communist government, which controls the mainland, is excluded. Both the Nationalists and the Communists claim they alone speak for China. It has been suggested that a "Two Chinas" policy might be adopted and that both would occupy seats in the United Nations. However, neither the Nationalist nor the Communist would accept such a policy. If the United States did recognize this type policy it can hardly be expected that this recognition would decrease the tension between the two governments. Many Asian nations would interpret our stand as a surrender to the Red Chinese and our position in the Far East would suffer considerably. This policy would also serve to weaken the influence and prestige of the Nationalists.

The very existence of the Nationalists regime, backed by strong U.S. support, is the only hope left to millions that they too may some day be freed from the Communists. If we were to establish relations with the Chinese Reds, other nations in southeast Asia might think they should, too. This would open the way for the expansion of communism in southeast Asia.

We should not forget that during World War II, the United States and her allies including Russia, agreed to recognize Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government of China. Suppose we were to tell the world that we consider such an agreement worthless as the Russians did by supplying the Chinese Reds with weapons during their campaign to drive Chiang from the mainland? If we displayed actions such as those of the Russians, would we still be considered the leader of the free world? Are we to turn our backs on the honor and trust with which international agreements are supposed to be held?

The question of recognizing two Chinas raises another question—Would such a step help U.S. interests? Such a relationship would produce no tangible benefits to the United States or to the free world as a whole but it would be of significant value to the Chinese Communists in their efforts to engulf Asia. The expansion of diplomatic recognition by a large power such as that of the United States carries with it not only increased access to international councils but enhanced international standing and influence. If the Communist Government of China is denied recognition, this regime will be greatly handicapped.

Woodrow Wilson insisted on taking into consideration the morality of a government before he suggested negotiatons. "So long as the power of recognition rests with me," he stated, "the Government of the United States will refuse to extend the hand of welcome to anyone who obtains power by treachery and violence." The United States stands throughout the world as a symbol of freedom, liberty, and the rights of man. Red China stands for just the opposite. If we recognized Communist China we would lose face in the eyesight of the world; we would forfeit our superior status on the international scene.

How would the admission of Communist China affect the United Nations? We can see how the Soviet Union has impaired the Security Council by their veto power and Red China would be able to accomplish the same task. If the Chinese Communists were allowed to join the other Communist members, the United Nations would be less able to function in the future than at the present.

"Harsh and belligerent" are the words used by President Kennedy to describe the Red Chinese attitude. Are we to reward their record of aggression, brutality, suppression, and indifference with warmth and friendliness? It has been said of the people of China, "Life is cheap, why pay for expensive machinery when the people can serve as oxen." With more than 700 million slaves living there, this might be true. But in the course of history, slavery never endured long—they arose, threw off their chains, and conquered their masters. Possibly one day the people of China will do this and when and if it happens, I am sure a seat will be reserved for them in the United Nations. I suggest that until that day arrives isolationism against China is possibly the best policy we can use to insure us that tomorrow will come.

RESOLVED: RED CHINA SHOULD NOT BE ADMITTED TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Sue Fobbus)

The question is should Red China be admitted to the United Nations or should we follow our present policy of ignoring her existence. There are and have been in the past 14 years many arguments, both pro and con, concerning this question. After much research and thought I have decided that they should not be admitted to this great world organization.

I base my decision on the following arguments:

First, there is in the United Nations' Charter, a clause which provides that an applicant nation be peace loving. Is Red China peace loving? No. We know Red China has killed appalling numbers of Chinese, enslaved tens of millions of her own people, waged war against the United Nations in Korea and committed acts of aggression against her neighbors. Even now Red China is engaged in a conflict with Russia concerning peaceful coexistence. Red China wants all-out nuclear war in order that communism might rule the world.

As for being a peaceful applicant, Red China is as qualified as Martin Luther King

is to be Governor Wallace's campaign manager.

Second, those who want Red China in the United Nations argue that she is just too big and too powerful for us to go on ignoring and that two Chinas exist in fact, why not in diplomatic practice?

As for two Chinas, both the nationalist and Communists claim that they alone speak for all Chinese. Neither side has ever shown any willingness to accept the doctrine of two Chinas. Many Asian nations would interpret our policy of two Chinas as a surrender to Red Chinese might.

Late President Kennedy described the Red Chinese attitude as being harsh and belligerant. He stressed that the United States would not surrender in order to get a relaxation of international tensions.

Third, some argue that important international agreements are meaningless without Red China's recognition.

I do not believe the Red Chinese have to be in the U.N. to discuss international questions. The United States has dealt with her on many occasions, such as, over the Korean and Indochina armistics. reciprocal renunciation of force and for the release of our citizens. We have then been able to accomplish certain things without recognizing her and we can do so in the future.

Fourth, one of the most compelling reasons why we should oppose the admission of Red China is the simple fact that if Red China does come into the United Nations, that body would be rendered ineffective as a world organization.

It's entire character would change, Russia has already hamstrung the Security Council with more than a hundred vetoes. Imagine what the Soviet Union could do with the help of an alltime master of delay and deceit in negotiations. Remember that the Korean armistice talks dragged out for 2 years in more than 500 meetings.

In the General Assembly Red China's lobbying among the Asians, Latin Americans, and Africans could help the Soviet Union get the votes needed to reorganize the United Nations on her own terms. The Secretary General would then be replaced by a threeman commission. Each would have a veto. This would be the end of the United Nations. The executive power that sent emergency aid to Korea, the Gaza strip, and the Congo would be no more. United Nations wheels would come to a complete halt.

Fifth. If we helped Red China into the U.N. we would face grim consequences in the Far East. Increased military equipment or additional economic aid could hardly retain allies who had watched the greatest free nation in the world give in to the Communists. One by one they would be forced to leave us to make peace with their near and powerful neighbor, Red China.

Quite likely, too, the supporters of Red China's admission to the United Nations would soon feel that our deployed military forces should be pulled back to convince our new associates of our peaceful intentions. You can be sure that as we moved out, the Communists would waste no time moving in.

Before we knew it, we would be back where we were on December 8, 1941. Red China's admission to the U.N. would be the most catastrophic event since Munich.

None of this is inevitable. We need only time, patience, and courage to win in Asia. Our present Asian allies are courageous and will follow courageous leadership and the mainland Chinese know it.

Just because the Communists are in control of the Government of China is no proof that it is expressing the will of the people. Let us not forget that Hitler at the height of his military success seemed unbeatable, but when the collapse did come in Germany what seemed to be so strong on the outside was actually decaying from within. There had been courageous opposition to Hitler at all times. This could also be very true in Red China.

The people of the United States have spoken decisively on this subject through their representatives in Congress before. In the interest of our national survival they must do so again.

They must make certain that the world knows that the United States of America will not betray the hopes of the millions of people in Asia and behind the bamboo curtain who have proved that they have the will and courage to resist communism. The membership of the United Nations must be told that they have to choose; that this is "either-or"—either Red China as a member, or the United States as a member, but not both.

Admission of Red China to the United Nations will be inevitable only when we cease to fight.

DEFEAT OR VICTORY

(By Sandra Burns)

One of the basic, perennial issues facing the United Nations is the China question. For over a decade, it has hung over the organization like a developing thundercloud, and today the forecast is for severe squalls ahead.

On October 21, 1963, the General Assembly, for the 14th consecutive time, opposed the seating of Communist China in place of Nationalist China. For the last 14 years, the United States has managed to keep Communist China out of the the United Nations. But many new nations do not oppose its admission as we do, and some experts predict that its entry is inevitable. Failure on our part in this problem would be a fatal error. It would mean trouble for everybody in the Far East. To bow to Red China would demoralize South Korea, the Philippines, and the Chinese on Formosa.

The real chance of a new war is in the Far East. America has kept the peace largely by a policy of firmness embodied in what is know as the Eisenhower resolution.

Red China knows we have drawn a line in the Far East. Will we defend it?

American U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson expressed his views indicating a belief that Red China will eventually be admitted to the U.N. To predict it is a sign of weakness.

Many people in the free world will come to regard such comments as part of a trend toward the abandonment of moral force.

It is not customary for an athletic team to go into a game announcing in advance that its defeat is inevitable. Where is our faith in the power of American idealism? Why do we concede we cannot win a debate in the U.N. on the merits of this question? Has Red China changed since the U.N. itself declared by formal resolution that the Peiping regime was the aggressor in Korea? Have we in America forgotten the 157,000 casualties we suffered there? Will the United Nations have any real influence in the world if it sacrifices its own self-respect and yields to the Communist bloc? The late President Kennedy said and I quote, "The United Nations is our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace." If we admit Red China to the U.N. will these words still have any meaning?

There are compelling reasons why we should oppose the admission of Red China as long as the question exists. The case does not rest alone on the fact that Red China is an aggressive power; that she has made war on the U.N., committed aggression against Tibet and India, and today is fomenting trouble and violence in Africa, Latin America, and southeast Asia. These facts obviously flout the U.N. Charter requirements that member nations must be "peace loving" states.

The case against Red Chinese admission rests on a stronger argument. That is the simple fact that such a step would either wreck or greatly weaken the United Nations.

Nothing could be more destructive of that organization. As U.N. Ambassador Stevenson has said, and I quote, "The Peiping regime, far from being reformed by its experience in the United Nations, would be encouraged by its success in gaining admission to exert, all the more forcefully by threats and maneuvers, as more disruptive and demoralizing influence on the organization."

The admission of Communist China would encourage our enemies in the Communist world and dishearten our friends in free Asia. If Red China were to take Nationalist China's seat on the U.N. Security Council, the Communist world would have another powerful means to obstruct U.N. proceedings with the veto. Together with Russia and the satellite countries of Eastern Europe, Communist China could exploit every opportunity to impair the workings of the U.N. in every area where Red intrigue is at work.

The major opposition to the seating of Red China is the fact that she does not represent the will of the people she controls. The Red Chinese government is an outlaw regime. Imposed by military force, it is neither democratic not representative.

Thus far, during its 11-year regime, at least 120 million Chinese have been enslaved, and more than 8 million murdered in so-called purges. Hundreds of missionaries and religious leaders have been killed, and many foreign civilians, including U.S. citizens, imprisoned.

Those who favor U.N. membership for Red China muddy the question by urging us to recognize "reality," the world "as it is." The rising incidence of cancer is also a reality. But does this mean we should accept it and not do something about it?

Analysis of the recent U.N. General Assembly vote postponing discussion of Red China's membership indicated that the so-called neutral nations may soon upset the balance of power in the U.N. that now favors West over the East, and bring about the eventual admission of Red China whether we approve or not.

In this case, the West, particularly the United States, would do well to review and possibly revamp its position. If the United States is forced to use its veto for the time to bar Red China's membership, then our entire position in the U.N. and our prestige throughout the world will be seriously hurt.

An American statesman once made this plea and I quote:

"Moral power can be a powerful force in the world. That is not a mere pious hope. It is the judgment of every realist throughout history. It was Napoleon who said that 'in war, moral consideration makes up three-fourths of the game.' It was Admiral Maham who said that physical force was useful only 'to give moral ideals time to take root.' * * *

"The need is for more effective political use of moral power. The moral law, happily, is a universal law."

These words of the late John Foster Dulles, in a paper submitted to the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches in September 1948, are as valid today as when they were written.

Why should we retreat on the moral issue of Red China? Why can't we convince our allies that idealism wins far more battles than materialism?

The late President Kennedy at his first news conference said, and I quote, "There has been a rather belligerent attitude expressed toward us in recent days by the Chinese Communists."

This is not the road to peace but the road to war. Defeatism on one side causes the enemy to miscalculate to assume we will not fight for our policies.

What is needed is not defeatism, but a counteroffensive in behalf of idealism, a

strong manifestation of moral power. Otherwise, we will find the United Nations gradually stripped of the only force that can save mankind. Those of us who want to see the U.N. survive and grow in strength should exert every effort to keep Red China out. Admission of Red China to the U.N. will be inevitable only when we cease to fight.

Antietam's 97th Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 it was my privilege to participate in the 97th annual Memorial Day exercises at the Antietam National Cemetery in Sharpsburg, Md. The exercises were organized and conducted by Antietam Post No. 236 American Legion, under the supervision of Post Commander E. Donald Hinton. Chairman of the day's events was the capable Mrs. F. Leon Carnahan with Joseph B. Guiney again serving as host and master of ceremonies.

Two new monuments being erected on the Antietam battlefield by the Delaware Civil War Centennial Commission were dedicated by the Honorable Elbert N. Carvel, Governor of Delaware. Other participants in the program were the Honorable George L. Radcliffe, chairman of the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission; Harold L. Lessem, superintendent of the Antietam National Battlefield Site; George A. Palmer, assistant regional director, national park service; Rev. Charles Birx, Trinity Lutheran Church, Sharpsburg; the Rohrersville Band; and the Independent Honor Guard from Boonsboro, Md.

Thomas M. McCall, commander, Department of Maryland, American Legion, gave the main address at the afternoon ceremonies. His words are worthy of the attention of my colleagues and are herewith inserted in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THOMAS M. MCCALL, COMMANDER, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, AMERICAN LEGION

We are here on this Memorial Day, 1964, for reverent tribute to the memory of heroes who fell so that this Nation might stand as a living and meaningful symbol of free government for the world for all time.

The deepest meaning that this day can hold for us is a reaffirmation in our minds and hearts in our day as free men and women of the faith and devotion of those heroes to our Nation.

The observance of Memorial Day is a sacred trust to members of the American Legion. We believe this day important in the life of America because we must know and understand our past and fully appreciate the blessings that have been ours as a nation.

You and I, from this knowledge, then may draw new courage to face the challenges of the present. For in our times—almost from World War II to the present—we have known a troubled world and an imperfect peace. Armed also with this knowledge, we will find greater determination to meet fearlessly and confidently the challenges that tomorrow is sure to bring.

Our young men, along with their leaders whose mettle was tested in earlier wars, face new demands for courage in the deltas, hills, and jungles of Vietnam. In the monotonous and dusty hills of Korea as they stand guard in an area that has claimed much American treasure. Treasure both in manhood and material.

Here are the outposts of the free world. Here are the gray or hard-to-define areas where even the troubled peace could be lost if the alert on the part of the United States and her allies were missing.

Here our troops aid local forces in fighting subversion and insurgency—twin elements of trouble that have defied modern armies and destroyed the will of many peoples. This is a type of action by the Communists that is at once as old as the history of warfare and as new as today.

Here we have a new breed of men as soldiers. Here beside a variety of hard-to-come-by skills, our new soldier must not only know how to flight proficiently, but understand why he fights as well. The mental and physical tests these men face are at times more demanding than more conventional warfare. The human toll is tragic.

These sentinels in these outposts of freedom die almost daily. Their deaths are the lonely ones of men far away from home and loved ones. Fortunately, their deaths have to date been limited in number. But they are grim reminders for us.

The deaths of these heroes remind us today—just as heroes past do—that freedom has come to us with a costly price tag in human and material expenditure. Preserving freedom will never come at a bargain price. Future generations, unfortunately, are not likely to find the challenge any less demanding.

We believe it the solemn obligation of those who have lived through our Nation's wars to take this occasion on this Memorial Day to remind the Nation—youth and adult alike—of the sacrifice that has been required to preserve the priceless heritage that we share today as Americans.

It is all the more important that we put forth this reminder on this Memorial Day, 1964, because a new generation stands on the threshold of maturity and civic responsibility. From this new generation's ranks, in a brief time that will seem all too soon, will come the leaders of America tomorrow. To them will be entrusted the helm of the Ship of State and its awesome responsibilities.

Time erases memories, we know. We know also that this rising young generation has no firsthand knowledge of the horrors of war. World War I, World War II and the Korean war are for this new generation just chapters in their history books.

Dad may have flown a B-26 in World War II or the Korean war. He may have served aboard a PT boat in some South Pacific area that had an exotic name and little else. Or he may have shouldered a rifle in the Battle of the Bulge or at some spot dubbed the Punchbowl or Porkchop Hill. But essentially for the young generation these are remote events, well apart from his world.

For this we are grateful to our God. Our prayer is that such a fate as involvement in a major or even minor war shall not befall this generation. We pray that these young men and young women in roles of leadership to come might be able to devote their talents and their Nation's wealth to further positive, uninterrupted building of their country in a world that might come to know war only remotely from the pages of history.

But good sense and the will to survive demands that we must be realistic in a world that requires the facing of real facts now and on our tomorrows. We must consider a foe that is cruelly real. A foe that threatens our very existence as a nation and the existence of our neighbors in the free world. A patient but powerful foe that would swamp us under the minute our guard was even momentarily dropped, or our will to resist the Communist prey lessened.

Against this dark background, we must on this occasion bring forth for emphasis the responsibilities that accompany the priceless heritage that go to each new generation of Americans. Both heritage and responsibilities are very real, very enduring.

Toward the preservation of this heritage, the blood of every generation of Americans has been shed in our own and in distant lands that were frontiers of liberty. Those in the new generation must know that if they would preserve for their children the blessings they enjoy they must be prepared, if the need arises, to defend these blessings with their very lives just as others before them have done.

Technically speaking, of course, America has been at peace for more than a decade. But the datelines from Vietnam, Panama and from the often strange and hard-to-pronounce names of villages and cities that are part of the newly emerging nations, subversive and insurgent actions of the enemy tell a different story.

Our Nation, our young men, as we earlier cited, of necessity play a role in the tragic drama now a part of current world events on this Memorial Day.

Any meaningful observance of this Memorial Day, thus, appropriately serves a double purpose. First, there is remembrance for those who by their sacrifice have helped to keep America great. Second, there is the reminder for those who are soon to assume the awesome responsibility for maintaining and for furthering the cause of freedom which America must always champion here and elsewhere in the world.

From the War of Independence and the birth of the Nation through the Korean war, the United States has been involved in eight major wars. But never has she gone into battle for imperialistic or materialistic causes. She has fought only when forced to fight. Then only in the defense of the ideals of freedom and justice.

Through the path of our history which began 188 years ago with the signing and proclamation of the Declaration of Independence, over 30 million Americans have borne arms in their country's defense in actual time of war.

Nearly 3 million have shed their blood in freedom's cause. More than 1 million made the supreme sacrifice that freedom might endure not only in their own land but throughout the world.

To these valient men and women—more than one million airmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines of all ranks from the highest to the lowest, of all races, creeds and colors, and representing fighters for freedom in every war—we today pay special tribute to their memory. Let the world—free and otherwise—note that from the deeds of our heroes in their day that we on this day draw new strength for the task that faces America and the free world in the years ahead.

Let the world also note that this unselfish devotion to duty will serve as inspiration and warning to keep this Nation strong. Strong not only in the expected military sense but in economic areas as well. And most assuredly in a moral and religious sense.

By emphasizing these qualities in the years ahead America will prevail over a strong, a dangerous enemy. Our aims must include in addition, the best education and research programs that our rich resources can provide.

The cost of winning and holding freedom in terms of human life and suffering has been staggering. Yet, this represents only a part of the total cost that we are willing to pay. Hard won as it has been, liberty's potential loss cannot be lightly regarded by any of us.

In a sad inventory of the present and past, we find the tragic fact that men still have not learned to live at peace with one another and that armed conflict seems an all too ready means of settling differences.

Moving ruthlessly over the earth today is a powerful, tyrannical force which seeks to extend its influence over all men. This cancerous force has destroyed the freedoms of almost a billion people since World War II.

This is the force that has substituted for freedom a slavish existence under Communist rule. This deadly, insatiable force since its beginning over a century ago has proclaimed its ultimate objective as world conquest. You must agree that there is no indication that it has altered its course.

Other "isms" with similar objectives within modern man's span have been doomed to failure and crushed. The creeping monstrosity of communism is the only exception. And it is dangerously close to American shores as represented by Castro's Cuba. Its dangerous influence is felt in South and Central America.

Today is an appropriate occasion to call attention once again to the major threat to freedom in our own backyard. A threat which would destroy the very virtues for which those whom we honor today gave their lives to defend.

In facing a dedicated and determined foe, we believe that our determination and dedication must equal, if not excel, that of the Communists. We must achieve the greater glory of freeborn men and insure our freedoms for our children and for generations yet unborn.

The American Legion has every confidence in the ability and will of the American people, individually and as a nation, to measure up to whatever commitment is required for them to achieve this noble result.

Now let us reflect for a final moment upon the deeds and sacrifices of the freemen whose memory comes alive for us once more this Memorial Day. There was no halfway measure with them. They placed upon the altar of freedom the best that they could give—their very lives.

There are those among us, we know, who will ask why these men died. If their sacrifice was worth the price they paid. They must be told our martyred dead died for a cause. For you and for me. For our rights to live in freedom and dignity. They died to preserve those rights for those who would cynically weigh the reason and question the merit.

They died that we might have the freedom to live, to work, to worship, to speak, to write, and to play. To express ourselves in every human endeavor as we see fit and so long as we do not infringe upon others' rights.

Let each of us forever remember that there was purpose both in the lives and in the deaths of those whom we honor today. Their memory is ours to cherish. Their devoted example of duty is ours as an inspiration to seek that which is best for our Nation. To serve her faithfully in all ways, big and small.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).